UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 94—PART 7

JUNE 15, 1948, TO JUNE 19, 1948
(PAGES 8229 TO 9352)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1948

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1948

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who are the guiding wisdom in the life of men and nations, we pray that Thy servants may be blessed with clear minds and courageous hearts as they take counsel together for the building of a better world. Grant unto them insight and inspiration as they frame policies and enact laws which shall lift our own beloved country into nobler and happier ways of living.

Help us to put forth a more heroic effort in behalf of a social order in which there shall be a finer spirit of brotherhood and all the members of the human family shall seek one another's welfare.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate, each with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 418. An act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) welcoming the Inter-American Bar Association to the United States for its conference in Detroit, Mich., in May 1949.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6247. An act to provide for the air security and defense of the United States, to establish the composition of the Air Force, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6411. An act to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in furtherance of national safety against traffic and other accident hazards.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2642. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; and

S. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key Mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Memorial, and for other purposes.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday be approved without reading.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to expedite in every possible way the business of the Senate, but I have examined the RECORD this morning, and there is considerable confusion as to the exact parliamentary status, as to what shall transpire this morning in the morning hour. I dislike to invoke the consequences of the application of rule VIII, but unless there can be arranged an appropriate unanimous-consent agreement which will carry out the seeming understanding of the Senate as to the order of business, I shall feel constrained to object to dispensing with the reading of the Journal. I should dislike very much to take that step.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the unfinished business is the so-called long-range agricultural bill. It was definitely made the unfinished business yesterday afternoon by unanimous consent, no objection being registered. So certainly the status of that bill has been cleared up. The intention this morning is to have a call of the calendar from the beginning. The reason why I did not ask unanimous consent for a call of the calendar was the fact that there are some Senators on both sides of the aisle who have bills they would like to ask to have considered and voted on, and following the adjournment taken last night the calendar would be called automatically during the morning hour. We may just as well be frank about it; that is why an adjournment was taken last night.

Mr. TAFT. I understand the Senator from Georgia has the floor. Will he yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have the floor, and I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator's objection based on the fact that this is not Monday, and would the Senator be satisfied with a unanimous-consent agreement that the calendar be called as if this were Monday?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the calendar may be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, with the understanding that no motion may be made to proceed to the consideration of a bill to which there is objection, I shall not insist upon the reading of the Journal.

Mr. TAFT. What is the Senator's objection to such a motion? After all, the consideration of a measure taken up on motion would come to an end at 1 o'clock. Certainly I think the Senator would have no difficulty with an agreement that the unfinished business would not be displaced during that time, if that is what the Senator is concerned about.

Mr. RUSSELL. There may be some doubt, from a reading of the RECORD of yesterday, as to what is the unfinished business. I am perfectly aware of the fact that the Chair ruled last evening that the unfinished business, or at least the business that would be before the Senate, would be the long-range agricultural bill. The Senator from Georgia was present last evening when the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the Government corporations appropriation bill, and that bill was brought before the Senate by motion. The Chair ruled last evening—not the present occupant of the chair, but the presiding officer at the time—that inasmuch as he heard no "no" votes, he considered that as being a unanimous-consent agreement. But, Mr. President, there is a great deal of difference, in parliamentary effect, between a unanimous vote of the Senate and a unanimous-consent agreement.

This matter might be submitted to the Members of the Senate on an appeal, in the present situation. I prefer to have the business of the Senate, during this period, conducted by unanimous consent. I think it will expedite the business of the Senate to a very great extent if we proceed as we have recently done, under unanimous-consent orders.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The situation at the moment is that the Senator from Nebraska has asked unanimous consent for approval of the Journal. The Senator from Georgia has objected, and requests the reading of the Journal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have reserved the right to object.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have just come into the Chamber, and I heard the Senator

state what he might do if he could have unanimous consent that no Senator would move to proceed to the consideration of a bill on the calendar to which objection was made. It had been my intention to make such a motion. There is a bill on the calendar to which I am quite sure objection will be made. I have had no opportunity to discuss it. It is impossible to discuss it under the 5-minute rule, and it is my intention—it has been, at least—to make a motion to take the bill up, in the hope that at the conclusion of the calendar, when there would be some time remaining, the Senate might proceed to the consideration of this particular bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no assurance that the Senator from New Mexico will be recognized for the purpose of making the motion which he has in mind.

Mr. HATCH. I am quite sure the Presiding Officer, whoever he may be, will be courteous to any Senator, and give him the recognition to which he is entitled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair cannot hear what courtesy is to be extended.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Georgia will yield, I may say that the Senator from Georgia just observed that he had no assurance that the Chair would recognize the Senator from New Mexico to make a motion, and I observed that I was quite sure that whoever was presiding over the Senate at the time would accord to the Senator from New Mexico or any other Senator the courtesy to make any motion which was within the rules of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I refuse to permit the Senator from New Mexico to put me in the position of casting any aspersion on the Presiding Officer. I know that in the concluding hours of a session there are many Senators who are anxious to make motions to proceed to the consideration of bills, and the Chair is bound by the rules to recognize the Senator he first sees rise and address the Chair, and since 10 or 12 Members of the Senate might rise and address the Chair for the purpose of moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of some measure, I cannot afford to gamble with the hope that the Chair would recognize the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair cannot be put in the position, either, of being committed to recognize the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. In keeping with the time-honored custom of the Senate, the Senator from New Mexico now states publicly that when Calendar No. 802, House bill 3834, to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes, is reached, if objection is made, he will seek to make a motion, at the conclusion of the call of the calendar, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill, and he respectfully asks that the Presiding Officer look in the direction of the Senator from New Mexico when he rises for that purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The rules provide a regular method by which the calendar shall be called. It is sometimes called by a different method, by unanimous consent, and some doubt results because of the calendar being called differently on Mondays from the way it is called on some other days.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is quite a great difference.

Mr. TAFT. I wondered if the Senator would be satisfied if the unanimous-consent agreement should provide that the calendar would be called as if this were Monday, and, second, that there be unanimous consent that the unfinished business would in no case be set aside by motion during the morning hour, before 1 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would be perfectly willing, if the Chair would further rule that there is unfinished business coming over from the previous day. I think that would be adequate protection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Ohio restate his proposal?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the call of the calendar is reached in the morning hour, that it be called as if this were Monday; and, second, I ask unanimous consent that at 1 o'clock, under any circumstances, we return to consideration of Senate bill 2318, a bill to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, as the unfinished business of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The unfinished business is the bill to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, even though it is so restated in the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair that that is so.

Mr. WHERRY. And will automatically come up at 1 o'clock regardless of what happens.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I am not familiar with what the difference is between the calling of the calendar on Monday and on any other day.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that on Monday the calendar must be called in order, and objection to any bill may be made at any time. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. And no motion to proceed to consideration of any bill out of order is in order.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair make the situation plain. When the calendar is called on Monday and a bill is objected to when it is reached in order on the calendar, it is in order to move to proceed to the consideration of the bill at that point.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if that be the case I shall have to object, because I had understood that if the motion were made, when the hour of 2 o'clock arrives, or 1 o'clock when the Senate meets at 11 a. m., the bill under discussion would go back to the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. And it is the holding of the Chair that if the unanimous-consent request be agreed to, and a motion be made on the call of the calendar to proceed to the consideration of any bill on the calendar, the motion itself is not debatable, but the bill is debatable, and then upon the arrival of the hour of 1 o'clock the bill under discussion returns to its place on the calendar and the unfinished business is laid down.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the state of the situation, as the Chair understands it, and that is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of that statement by the Chair, I withdraw any objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not hear the proposal by the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is asking unanimous consent that the calendar be called as under rule VIII on Monday.

Mr. RUSSELL. I mean my objection will be withdrawn if the unanimous consent is obtained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair so understands.

Mr. CONNALLY. Do I correctly understand that under the rule with respect to the call of the calendar on Monday, if a bill is called and it is objected to it may then be moved that it be considered?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I regret very much that I shall have to object.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am not going to assume the attitude of tying up the business of the Senate. I know full well the condition that prevails. If I should make a motion to take up the Fort Sumner project bill perhaps the motion would be defeated, and if not, the debate would be continued until the end of the morning hour. I would gain nothing by such procedure except to delay the business of the Senate. That, Mr. President, I do not propose to do at this time. So, in order that the business of the Senate may be conducted expeditiously, I shall not make the motion to take up House bill 3834, Calendar No. 802. If the fear that I shall do so is what causes the Senator from Texas to object, I now suggest that he withdraw his objection on my assurance that I shall not make the motion before the end of the morning hour, but before the Senate adjourns I shall by amendment to some pending bill seek to have the matter thoroughly discussed in the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the ruling, as appears from the RECORD of yesterday, that a motion to which there is no objection is comparable to a unanimous-consent agreement? Is that the precedent laid down by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not consider that that is a precedent. The Chair accepts the net result which the RECORD discloses, that the agricultural bill is the unfinished business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Regardless of how it was set aside?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no precedent involved in the pending matter, if I correctly understand the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; that does not affect the question. It solely affects the question whether a motion could be considered equivalent to a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I express the hope that that may not be regarded as the permanent ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair makes the same statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. We all know that there is quite a difference between making a motion and asking unanimous consent temporarily to set aside the unfinished business, in order that another bill may be taken up, which action does not displace the unfinished business. A motion to proceed to the consideration of another bill, even though it is unanimously agreed to without opposition, does automatically displace the unfinished business, and I doubt very much whether the Chair can interpret the maker of a motion as being in the attitude of asking unanimous consent.

I do not object to this procedure now. I think it is the best way out of the difficulty, but I hope it will not be regarded as the permanent ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair state that that is precisely the state of mind of the Chair. The Chair is not going back into that question. He is simply accepting the fact that the so-called long-range agricultural bill is the unfinished business of the Senate on the record.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is true, I may say, that sometimes a Senator makes a motion to take up a bill, when he does not really mean it; he means to ask unanimous consent; because certainly in this case he would not want to displace the unfinished business.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand further that the request of the Senator from Ohio brought in the long-range agricultural program bill as the unfinished business regardless of the ruling of the Chair last evening.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is correct.

Let the Chair submit the unanimous-consent request.

The first unanimous consent is the request of the Senator from Nebraska to approve the Journal. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. I submit that I should prefer to have approval given to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well. Without objection, the Chair will submit the second unanimous-consent request first.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if any decision has been reached with regard to bringing up the bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine?

Mr. TAFT. No. We have reached no decision as to what bill will follow the long-term agricultural program measure. It is anticipated that bill will take several days, with the various appropriation bills which will have to be considered. No decision has been reached as to the next bill to be taken up on the calendar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask further if any decision has been made by the policy committee with regard to the closing of the session of Congress?

Mr. TAFT. Whether or not what?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Whether the session of the Congress will be continued beyond Saturday?

Mr. TAFT. We hope we shall be able to reach that on Saturday without the necessity of coming back, but we cannot be certain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour the calendar be called under rule VIII.

Mr. RUSSELL. At the conclusion of morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; that at the conclusion of the morning business the calendar shall be called under rule VIII, as it is on Mondays, and that at 1 o'clock, when the morning hour is finally concluded, the unfinished business, to wit, Senate bill 2318, shall be laid before the Senate. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Now the Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the Journal be approved without reading. Without objection, the Journal is approved.

Morning business will therefore be pursued.

CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representative to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, which was in line 10, to strike out all after "exceed" down to and including "$10,500" in line 11, and insert "$11,000."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER, Mr. ECTON, and Mr. O'CONOR conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PRODUCTION AND PROCUREMENT OF COPRA AND PALM OIL IN THE NETHERLANDS INDIES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, an agreement entered into by and between the Government of the Netherlands Indies and the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the Government of the United States, relating to the production and procurement of copra and palm oil in the Netherlands Indies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

MEMORIAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a memorial signed by sundry members of the Department Store Union, CIO, Local No. 3, of the State of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Mundt un-American activities bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FARWELL (NEBR.) IRRIGATION CONSTRUCTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Farwell, Nebr., irrigation district, in annual meeting assembled at Farwell, Nebr., favoring the enactment of legislation to bring about early construction and completion of the irrigation work in that district.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Farwell Irrigation District in annuel meeting assembled, That we fully realize the advantages and necessities of irrigation in this territory; that we hereby wholeheartedly endorse the splendid work this far done by your Bureau in this district, and that we hereby urge you to take speedily any and all steps necessary to bring about the early construction and completion of the irrigation district planned for this territory; be it further

Resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent immediately to each Senator and Congressman from Nebraska.

Respectfully submitted.

President of Farwell Irrigation District.

Attest:

ALEX WM. LAMB,
Secretary.

The foregoing resolution was unanimously passed this 25th day of April 1948.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate the 14th instant,

Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, reported it on June 14, 1948, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1626) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2316. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 1628).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. J. Res. 223, Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1627).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2504. A bill for the relief of Horace J. Fenton, former associate professor at the United States Naval Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1667); and

H. R. 6454. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1668).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 4917. A bill to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken; without amendment (Rept. No. 1630);

H. R. 6039. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134); without amendment (Rept. No. 1679); and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of girl scouting in the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 1631).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 4660. A bill to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1629).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1301. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Felice; with amendments (Rept. No. 1630);

S. 1672. A bill for the relief of Jose Babace; without amendment (Rept. No. 1631);

S. 1973. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; with amendments (Rept. No. 1632);

S. 2050. A bill for the relief of Gracy Marifuch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1633);

S. 2054. A bill for the relief of Engebert Axer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1634);

S. 2075. A bill for the relief of Wisia Paryzenberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1635);

S. 2235. A bill for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic; Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; without amendment (Rept. No. 1636);

S. 2360. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui; without amendment (Rept. No. 1637);

H. R. 333. A bill for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, veterans of World War II; without amendment (Rept. No. 1649);

H. R. 371. A bill for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1658);

H. R. 564. A bill for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1659);

H. R. 700. A bill for the relief of Anthony Arancio; without amendment (Rept. No. 1650);

H. R. 911. A bill for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado; without amendment (Rept. No. 1651);

H. R. 912. A bill for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1652);

H. R. 1409. A bill for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik; without amendment (Rept. No. 1638);

H. R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader; without amendment (Rept. No. 1660);

H. R. 1930. A bill for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1642);

H. R. 2009. A bill for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1653);

H. R. 2372. A bill for the relief of George Cleve Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 1643);

H. R. 2489. A bill for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1654);

H. R. 2551. A bill for the relief of William R. Ramsey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1644);

H. R. 2729. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1655);

H. R. 2732. A bill for the relief of Dennis Stanton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1645);

H. R. 2734. A bill for the relief of Joseph M. Henry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1661);

H. R. 2889. A bill for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston; without amendment (Rept. No. 1662);

H. R. 2918. A bill for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association; without amendment (Rept. No. 1646);

H. R. 3062. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1656);

H. R. 3499. A bill for the relief of Petrol Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1647);

H. R. 3937. A bill for the relief of William C. Reese; without amendment (Rept. No. 1663);

H. R. 4047. A bill for the relief of Edmund Huppler; without amendment (Rept. No. 1639);

H. R. 4441. A bill for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency; without amendment (Rept. No. 1648);

H. R. 4452. A bill for the relief of Douglas L. Craig; without amendment (Rept. No. 1664);

H. R. 4518. A bill for the relief of Gerald S. Furman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1665);

H. R. 4587. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey); without amendment (Rept. No. 1640);

H. R. 4590. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1657);

H. R. 5886. A bill to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1641); and

H. R. 6224. A bill for the relief of John Watkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1666).

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 2850. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1669);

S. 2351. A bill to authorize temporary increases in the salary rates of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose pay is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1670);

H. R. 5047. A bill to grant a cost-of-living increase in the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1671);

H. R. 6295. A bill to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1672); and

H. R. 6452. A bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1673).

By Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 6087. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1674); and

H. R. 6598. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939; without amendment (Rept. No. 1675).

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 4635. A bill to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1676);

H. R. 6327. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette; without amendment (Rept. No. 1677); and

H. J Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1678).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds of the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 1682).

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 15, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 2642. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; and

S. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key Mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Memorial, and for other purposes.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 260), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $2,500 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. CORDON, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. MAGNUSON) introduced Senate bill 2863, to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans to provide housing accommodations for families in the Vancouver-Portland area deprived of their homes as a result of the flood disaster, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2864. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2865. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mepelli; and

S. 2866. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Spano and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE COLUMBIA RIVER FLOOD DISASTER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in connection with an emergency bill which I am now introducing in behalf of my colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and myself.

Yesterday the Senators from Washington and Oregon had a long conference with representatives of various Government agencies in regard to the very serious emergency which exists in the Portland area as a result of the flood. I shall be very brief. I know that only a brief statement is necessary to apprise the Senate of the seriousness of the situation which confronts more than 30,000 people this very hour in the Vanport area.

As the result of the report which General Fleming, Mr. Foley, and Mr. George Field presented to us yesterday in regard to that very serious situation, we are introducing an emergency bill, for immediate reference, we understand, to the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is Chairman, in the hope that the bill will be considered immediately, and that we may have an immediate report, or an early report, to the Senate, for action prior to Saturday night.

Briefly, Mr. President, the bill authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans to provide housing accommodations for families in the Vancouver-Portland area deprived of their homes as a result of the flood disaster. It provides briefly as follows:

First. A $30,000,000 Vancouver-Portland area flood disaster fund to be made available to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator through the issuance and sale of notes to the Secretary of the Treasury.

I point out that we are dealing here with the destruction of what was, after all, a Federal city. Vanport was a war city, built by the Federal Government in order to meet the emergencies of war production.

Second. The bill authorizes the Administrator to make loans to public and private agencies to enable them to construct and sell or rent dwelling accommodations for families deprived of their homes by the disaster with a first preference to families who had been tenants in the Vanport housing project. One hundred percent loans based on necessary current cost would be available for both sales and rental housing, at a 4-percent interest rate in the case of private corporations or persons and a 3-percent rate in the case of loans to public bodies.

Third. Loans to public agencies cannot be made without the prior approval of the local governing body. To enable such housing to be made available to low income families deprived of their homes by the flood disaster, the Administrator may agree to waive principal and interest payments during the first 5 years of occupancy to the extent necessary to permit adjustment of rentals, provided that the State, municipality or other local public body or agency shall similarly agree to make a contribution to the project for such low-rent purposes in the form of cash, land, community services or facilities for which a charge is usually made, or tax remissions or tax exemptions in an amount not less than 20 percent of the amount of the principal and interest payments waived by the Administrator.

Fourth. Loans for housing built for sale may not exceed 25 years and the aggregate amount of the loan and any other obligation shall not exceed: (A) $7,500 if such dwelling is designed for a single-family residence, or (B) $12,500 if such dwelling is designed for a two-family residence, or (C) $16,000 if such dwelling is designed for a three-family residence, or (D) $18,500 if such dwelling is designed for a four-family residence.

Fifth. Loans for rental housing shall have maturities satisfactory to the Administrator and shall not exceed $7,500 per family unit for such part of the property or project attributable to dwelling use.

Sixth. In addition to the usual administrative provisions and authority to issue and sell notes to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Administrator is authorized to make necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the act, and he shall maintain a separate set of accounts for this program and report to the Congress annually on the program authorized by the act.

Seventh. No loan shall be made under the act after March 31, 1949, except pursuant to a commitment to make a loan issued before March 31, 1949.

I wish to point out that the bill has the endorsement and support of the Senators from both Washington and Oregon. A companion bill is being introduced in the House of Representatives this morning by Mr. ANGELL, from the Portland district.

I want to stress, Mr. President, that we are introducing this bill as an emergency bill, because all the heads, so-called, who have been working on this problem since this terrible tragedy has afflicted our section of the country—and it is the worst disaster in all the history of the Pacific Northwest—all the heads, I say, who have been working on it have come to the conclusion that the passage of this bill is of vital importance if we are going to bring the relief or sustenance and the help to these thousands of fellow Americans who have been wiped out, so far as their worldly possessions are concerned, by this tragic flood.

I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire will see to it that the bill receives early consideration by the committee, and I am convinced that, if the committee does consider it, it will receive a favorable report, and if it receives a favorable report I cannot imagine the Congress of the United States adjourning on Saturday night without having taken action on this meritorious bill.

On behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], I now introduce the bill and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2863) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administration to make loans to provide housing accommodations for families in the Vancouver-Portland area deprived of their homes as a result of the flood disaster, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to assist in relieving the critical housing emergency in the Vancouver-Portland area resulting from the flood disaster, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized to make loans (including advances thereon) to public and private agencies, as hereinafter provided, to enable them to undertake the construction and sale or rental of dwelling accommodations for families deprived of their homes by said disaster: *Provided*, That no loan shall be made under this act unless the Administrator finds that adequate financing at reasonable rates and terms is not available from other sources, and that no loan shall be made to a public agency without the prior approval of the local governing body.

SEC. 2. (a) No loan shall be made under this act unless—

(1) it involves, in the case of a property upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for residential use for not more than four families in the aggregate, a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Administrator shall approve) in an amount which, together with the amounts of the principal obligations of

any loans obtained for the development of the property or project from other sources, does not exceed the Administrator's estimate of the necessary current cost (including the land and such initial service charges and such appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Administrator shall approve) of the property: *Provided*, That such aggregate amount shall in no event exceed—

(A) $7,500 if such dwelling is designed for a single-family residence, or

(B) $12,500 if such dwelling is designed for a 2-family residence, or

(C) $16,000 if such dwelling is designed for a three-family residence, or

(D) $18,500 if such dwelling is designed for a four-family residence.

(2) it involves, in the case of properties not covered by paragraph (1) hereof, a principal obligation in an amount, which, together with the amounts of the principal obligations of any loans obtained for the development of the property or project from other sources, does not exceed—

(A) the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost of the completed property or project, including the land; the proposed physical improvements; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous charges incidental to construction and approved by the Administrator;

(B) $7,500 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use:

Provided, That in the case of a loan on any such property to a private agency, the Administrator may, in his discretion, require the borrower to be regulated or restricted as to rents or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and methods of operation;

(3) it has a maturity satisfactory to the Administrator, but not exceeding in the case of properties on which loans are made under paragraph (1) hereof, 25 years from the date of the loan;

(4) it contains complete amortization provisions satisfactory to the Administrator and provides, in a manner satisfactory to the Administrator, for the application of the borrower's periodic payments (exclusive of the amount allocated to interest) to amortization of the principal of the loan: *Provided*, That in the case of housing undertaken by a State or local public agency, the Administrator may, in order to enable such housing to be made available in whole or in part to families of low income who have been deprived of their homes by the flood disaster, agree to waive principal and interest payments on the loan during the first 5 years of occupancy to the extent necessary to permit adjustment of the rentals charged such families to the amounts such families can reasonably afford: *Provided further*, That the State, municipality, or other local public body or agency shall likewise agree to make a contribution to the project or housing for such purpose (in the form of cash, land, community services, or facilities for which a charge is usually made, or tax remissions or tax exemptions) in an amount not less than 20 percent of the amount of the principal and interest payments waived by the Administrator hereunder;

(5) it bears interest at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, or not to exceed 3 percent per annum on such amount in the case of a loan to a State or local public body or agency;

(6) it contains such terms and provisions with respect to security, which may include a second mortgage, insurance, repairs, alterations, payment of taxes, default reserves, delinquency charges, foreclosure proceedings, anticipation of maturity, prior or other additional liens in other parties, and other matters as the Administrator may in his discretion prescribe.

(b) The Administrator shall prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to assure to families deprived of their homes by the flood disaster, preference or priority of opportunity to purchase (and at a down payment of not more than 10 percent) or rent properties with respect to which loans are made under this act: *Provided*, That first preference shall be given to families who had been tenants in the Vanport housing project of the Federal Government.

(c) The Administrator may at any time, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consent to the release of the borrower from his liability under the mortgage or the credit instrument secured thereby, or consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage, and the mortgage may provide for any such release: *Provided*, That the borrower shall not be released from such liability in any case until the Administrator is satisfied that the property has been sold to a purchaser satisfactory to the Administrator.

(d) Nothing in this act shall be construed to exempt any real property, acquired and held by the Administrator under this act from taxation by any State, or any political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

SEC. 3. The total amount of loans (exclusive of advances and temporary loans made in anticipation of definitive loans) made pursuant to this act shall not exceed $30,000,000. The Administrator may, on and after the effective date of this act, issue, from time to time, notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, in such amounts as may be necessary to obtain funds for such purposes (and advances thereon) and for administrative expenses of the Administrator in carrying out the program authorized by this act. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Administrator issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

SEC. 4. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this act, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law—

(1) shall make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

(2) shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That loan transactions of the Administrator hereunder and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government;

(3) shall include in his annual report to the Congress a report with respect to the program authorized by this act;

(4) may delegate his functions, powers, and duties hereunder to such agencies, officials, or personnel as he may designate, and may authorize redelegation by such agencies, officials, or personnel; may utilize, contract with, and act through, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, any State or local public body or agency; and may utilize, and exercise any powers through, the facilities, officers, and employees of the Federal home-loan banks, or of any department, agency, corporation, or establishment of the Government; and may (without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended) contract with any such agency or any other agency or individual or private corporation for the furnishing of any services or facilities, including appraisal, management, title, and other work in connection with property, and contract to make payment or reimbursement for any services or facilities;

(5) may sue and be sued;

(6) may foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale, or obtain by voluntary conveyance, or otherwise acquire, any housing project, or part thereof, in connection with which he has made a loan pursuant to this act: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive the State or any political subdivision thereof of its civil jurisdiction in and over such a property or impair the civil rights under the laws of the State or any local law of the inhabitants on such property. Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States, the Administrator shall have power to deal with, complete, operate, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, make contracts, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash or credit or lease, in his discretion, any properties conveyed to or otherwise acquired by him pursuant to this act; and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator shall also have power to pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or otherwise, all claims against borrowers;

(7) may sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, upon such terms as he may fix; and may obtain insurance against loss in connection with property and other assets held;

(8) subject to the specific limitations in this act, may consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other term, of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this act; and may include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this act such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this act will be achieved. No provisions of this act shall be construed or administered to permit speculation in land holding.

(b) Funds made available to the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this act shall be available for any of the purposes of this act, and all funds available for carrying out the functions of the Administrator under this act (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administrator in connection with the performance of such functions.

(c) Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract for hazard insurance, or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of any property acquired pursuant to this act if the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Administrator deeds of conveyances, deeds of release, assignments, and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real property or any interest therein acquired by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this act, may be exercised by the Administrator or by any Assistant Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the Administrator from delegating such power by order or by power of attorney in his discretion, to any officer, agent, or employee he may appoint.

SEC. 5. No loan shall be made under this act after March 31, 1949, except pursuant to a commitment to make a loan issued before March 31, 1949.

Mr. CAIN. In my opinion, Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has just stated the disaster needs and requirements in the Portland-Vancouver area both well and fully. Because of the lateness of the hour I simply join with him and others from that stricken area in hoping that time will permit our colleagues in the Senate to give consideration to this meritorious disaster need legislation within the confines of the few days yet remaining.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934—CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF S. 2388

Mr. WHITE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 261), which was ordered to lie over under the rule:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of S. 2833, a bill to amend section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and that said bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and Mr. MORSE) submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM—AMENDMENT

Mr. JENNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6777) to extend the coverage of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System, to increase certain benefits payable under such system, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

EXPLANATION OF STATEMENT IN THE RECORD

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I note on page 8036 of yesterday's RECORD the following statement—the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is speaking:

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Colorado, with whom I am in perfect agreement regarding his amendment on reciprocal trade agreements as being the best thing and the wisest thing we can do at the present time—I call his attention again to the fact that the Democratic platform of 1932 said:

"We advocate a competitive tariff for revenue, with a fact-finding Tariff Commission free from Executive interference."

I ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado if that is not exactly what we are advocating in this amendment?

The junior Senator from Colorado replied:

That is exactly what we are advocating in this amendment.

The junior Senator from Colorado intended only to give approval of that part of the platform which was read, which referred to a fact-finding Tariff Commission free from Executive interference.

ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Finish the Job," published in the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Tribune of June 9, 1948, and an editorial entitled "Congressional Recess," published in the Washington Post of June 15, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

POLITICAL GRAVY—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Political Gravy," published in the Washington (D. C.) Post of June 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN THOMAS

[Mr. BROOKS, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted senatorial and newspaper comment on the life, character, and public service of John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, which appear in the Appendix.]

MURDER OF GEORGE POLK IN GREECE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted on May 27, 1948, by the standing committee of the United Nations correspondents and editorial comment on the murder of George Polk in Greece, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE OMINOUS ATOM—POLITICS AND THE ATOM—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial The Ominous Atom, published in the Hartford (Conn.) Daily Courant of Friday, June 11, 1948, and an editorial entitled "Politics and the Atom," published in the New York Times of June 15, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the calendar under rule VIII, as of Monday.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 669) to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946, was announced as first in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 25) amending rule XXII relating to cloture, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 354) to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 402) to repeal section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, to amend section 13 of the said act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF RECLAMATION LAWS TO STATE OF ARKANSAS

The bill (S. 299), to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. A number of Senators are absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stennis
Connally	Lodge	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Frazel	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	White
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The clerk will again call Calendar No. 169, Senate bill 299.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the name "Arkansas" to insert a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," approved June 17, 1902, as amended and supplemented, are hereby extended so as to include and apply to the State of Arkansas: *Provided*, That the generation by, and the disposal and marketing of electric energy and power from, any Federal reclamation project in the State of Arkansas shall be administered by the Bureau of Reclamation through, and in accordance with, the Federal reclamation laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1179) to aid in defraying the expenses of the Seventeenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1947 was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 140) to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 829) to provide for control and regulation of bank holding companies and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 12) to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in Federal courts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 518) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens who were unable to return to the United States prior to October 14, 1946, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1038) to amend the Federal Airport Act was annuonced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated general appropriation bill was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to object to this measure, because I believe in it. However, I will say to Members of the Senate that it provides for the inclusion of all general appropriation bills in one consolidated general appropriation bill.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 493) to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technological and scientific information was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 84) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 as amended was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 150) to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 116 was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3051) to amend the act of July 19, 1940, and to amend section 2 and repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 430) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of national farm loan associations and production credit associations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2978) to provide for the temporary advancement in ranks and increase in salary of lieutenants in the Metropolitan Police Force of the District of Columbia serving as supervisors of certain squads was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1663) to prohibit the payment of retirement annuities to former Members of Congress convicted of offenses involving the improper use of authority, influence, power, or privileges as Members of Congress was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 968) to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to limit the number of taxicabs licensed and operated in the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4042) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1653) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1015) to amend section 7 of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, to reduce the interest rate on postal savings deposits to 1 percent per annum, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

FORT SUMNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NEW MEXICO

The bill (H. R. 3834) to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we have again reached Calendar Order No. 302, relating to the Fort Sumner project. Under the 5-minute rule, it will be impossible to discuss that project as I greatly desire to do.

I presume it is useless to request the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] not to object, as he has previously done. Yesterday evening, a friendly and neutral Senator in this war between the States rather facetiously said to me, "You have used both vinegar and oil on the Senator from Texas. What do you propose to do tomorrow?"

Today, Mr. President, I expect to use neither vinegar nor oil. I shall merely say to the distinguished statesman who has so well and ably represented his State and the Nation in his long service in this body as a Senator from the State of Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that I still cling to the hope—vain and as hopeless as that hope may be—that he will not object today, that he will permit this measure to pass, and that we may, at the next session of Congress concludes. I hope the

sion, obtain the necessary appropriation to begin the necessary rehabilitation and repair of the Fort Sumner project, which will in no sense injure or hurt the great State of Texas or any of its projects.

Standing only upon the undisputed and uncontradicted facts, I make this appeal to the Senator from Texas, without bitterness and without expressing sweet sentiments which I do not honestly feel, and shall today but remind the Senator from Texas that preventing the doing of this work, so essential to the welfare of the little irrigation district at Fort Sumner, can only impoverish that district and the already overburdened farmers who reside therein, and can and will in no sense or manner benefit or enrich the great State of Texas.

In short, stopping this work, preventing the passage of this bill, helps neither Texas nor New Mexico and only hurts that small district and tends to disturb and perhaps destroy the neighborly accord and harmony which should exist between our two States, which in the past have held so much in common and have worked together for the mutual benefit and advantage of each.

I earnestly hope that the Senator from Texas will not object.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas very much regrets that the Senator from New Mexico makes this sort of appeal. The Senator from Texas is doing no more than is the Senator from New Mexico——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. He is trying to represent the interests of his State and his people. That is my duty, and I must do it.

Mr. HATCH. On another occasion—it was during the consideration of the Mexican treaty—when the projects on the lower Rio Grande in Texas were vitally affected, the residents of my State thought that treaty would injure them, and they objected and protested, and asked me to do the same. But, Mr. President, I believed that those projects in Texas were necessary. So I joined the State of Texas and the distinguished Senator from Texas and supported the Mexican treaty, over and against the protests and objections of citizens of my own State.

So I ask the Senator to do today what I did under similar circumstances when his State was affected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no animus toward New Mexico or its projects. On a former occasion I agreed to a bill which related to this project, and which provided that $60,000 be taken out of the reclamation fund and turned over to this district. But the bill did not pass in the House of Representatives. I have been agreeable to its being revived to that extent here in the Senate.

However, the bill to which we are presently addressing ourselves provides for the permanent establishment of this project under the Reclamation Service I hold in my hand a report of the Bureau of the Budget which is adverse to this project. I have before me the protest of my Governor and all the water engineers of my State.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, not of all the water engineers, for I hold in my hand a report signed by some of the water engineers.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask the Senator please not to take up all my time.

Mr. HATCH. But the Senator used the word "all."

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, I have an official report here.

Mr. HATCH. I also have an official report here, signed by your engineers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not by all of them.

Mr. President, I have an official protest signed by the Governor, and by the board of water engineers, and others.

All we want to do is ask New Mexico to agree to a compact with us. Twice we have agreed so far as the engineers were concerned, but twice New Mexico refused to ratify the compact. Once the refusal was by the legislature, and once by the Governor. They are now sitting at Santa Fe, trying to get a compact. If they get it, our troubles will be over.

But New Mexico insists upon proceeding unilaterally and gathering all the water she can, without a compact. Every gallon of water taken by New Mexico reduces the amount of water which can come to Texas. We in Texas are dependent upon having the water come down the Pecos River to our projects. We have a project there that is practically useless now because it cannot get water, because water is taken out of the river by New Mexico.

I hate to object, but it is my duty to object; I must object. I hate to be at cross purposes with the Senator from New Mexico. I have voted for projects here—at least, in the committee I recently so voted—and I have agreed with him on a project on the same river, at Carlsbad, N. Mex. At this session I agreed with him on a project called the Middle Rio Grande project. I am not out of harmony with him. But when it comes to the point where I have to represent my people and my State and make an objection, and when I am fortified by a report by the United States Bureau of the Budget adverse to this project, I do not see how I can be blamed for making objection.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in order that the record may be made clear and complete, I wonder whether the Senator from Texas will put into the RECORD the letters and telegrams he has from his people in Texas; and I also wish to say at some time I shall advance this proposal as an amendment to a bill when we can discuss it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill is passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

NATIONAL FREEDOM DAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, in line 2, after the word "authorized", to strike out "and requested"; and in line 10, after the word "America", to strike out "and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and thanksgiving", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to issue a proclamation designating the 1st day of February of each year as National Freedom Day for the purpose of commemorating the signing by President Abraham Lincoln, on February 1, 1865, of the joint resolution adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, proposing the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 164) to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make loans to fur farmers and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2142) to make the Government-owned alcohol plant at Muscatine, Iowa, available for processing agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 984) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1989) to provide for the payment of certain Government employees for accumulated annual leave in cases involving transfers to other Government agencies under different leave systems was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3536) to authorize the Department of Agriculture to investigate and report on project for reclaiming lands by drainage was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2173) to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreement and orders was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REPEAL OF ALASKA RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

The bill (S. 2226) to repeal the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such act of June 29,

1936, is applicable was announced as next

portions of such unpatented lands which

1936, is applicable was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask that this bill be temporarily laid aside until we see about certain matters in connection with it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC LANDS IN OREGON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 580) relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 3, after line 18, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Nothwithstanding any provisions of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), or any other act relating to the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, all of such revested or reconveyed lands, except power sites, shall be open for exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the mineral land laws of the United States, and all mineral claims heretofore located upon said lands, if otherwise valid under the mineral land laws of the United States, are hereby declared valid to the same extent as if such lands had remained open to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under such laws from August 28, 1937, to the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That any person who under such laws has entered since August 28, 1937, or shall hereafter enter, any of said lands, shall not acquire title, possessory or otherwise, to the timber, now or hereafter growing thereon, which timber may be managed and disposed of as is or may be provided by law, except that such person shall have the right to use so much of the timber thereon as may be necessary in the development and operation of his mine until such time as such timber is disposed of by the United States: *Provided further*, That locations made prior to August 28, 1937, may be perfected in accordance with the laws under which initiated.

And on page 4 to strike out:

SEC. 4. The owner of any unpatented mining claim located upon any of such lands shall file for record in the United States district land office of the land district in which the claim is situated: (1) Within 180 days after the effective date of this act, as to locations heretofore made, or within 60 days of locations, as to locations hereafter made, a copy of the notice of location of the claim; (2) within 60 days after the expiration of any annual assessment year, a statement under oath as to the assessment work done or improvements made during the previous assessment year, or as to compliance, in lieu thereof, with any applicable relief act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the act entitled "An act relating to the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, situated in the State of Oregon," approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), the authority of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the administration of the revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands shall be deemed to extend to, among other lands, all the unpatented lands in the odd-numbered sections included within the indemnity limits of the grant made to such railroad by the act of July 25, 1866 (14 Stat. 239), as amended, and for which payment was made by the United States to such railroad or its successors in interest under the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218), except the portions of such unpatented lands which have been specifically placed under the jurisdiction of an executive department (other than the Department of the Interior) since June 9, 1916, by an act of Congress.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are authorized and directed, as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, to exchange administrative jurisdiction of revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands or reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands lying within the boundaries of any national forest, and national-forest lands of approximately equal aggregate value, when by such exchange the administration of the lands will be facilitated: *Provided*, That the said national-forest lands, administrative jurisdiction of which is transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, shall be excluded from the national forest and shall become subject to administration under the same provisions of law as the revested or reconveyed lands in exchange for which they were transferred and the revested or reconveyed lands, administrative jurisdiction of which is transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture, shall become a part of the national forest within the boundaries of which they are situated and subject to administration under the laws applicable to such national forest: *Provided further*, That the revested or reconveyed lands and the national-forest lands, administrative jurisdiction of which is exchanged in any county, shall be approximately equal aggregate value: *Provided further*, That those certain revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands, described in the acts of February 11, 1920 (41 Stat. 405), September 22, 1922 (42 Stat. 1019), and June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1460), shall, for the purpose of exchange under the terms of this section, be deemed to be revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands and subject to exchange for national-forest lands. The exchanges provided for herein shall in each case be evidenced by an order signed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and such orders shall be transmitted to the Division of the Federal Register for filing and publication.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTMASTERS AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 1949) to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am very much interested, and I know that thousands of others are also interested, in knowing what action we can expect on this bill before the end of the session.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand, the House has now agreed to give a rule for a bill on this subject, amounting to a $450 increase, with some additional revenue provisions to make up in part for the increased expenditures resulting from the bill. It is my understanding that the House will act first. I can assure the Senator that action will be taken at this session by the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me add that I also am interested in this bill, as all of us are. I appreciate the attention the Senator from Connecticut has given it and the comments he has made in the RECORD, and also the comments which have been made by the Senator from Ohio. I feel that this bill must be given our consideration before this session of Congress concludes. I hope the House bill comes to us promptly. If it does not come to us within the next day or so, I think we are duty bound to consider this proposed legislation before the session concludes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, with the statements of the able chairman of the majority policy committee and also that of the acting floor leader, I am greatly reassured.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been made——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, before the bill is passed over, I merely wish to express my thorough agreement with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and by the acting leader of the majority. I sincerely hope that this so-called must legislation of which the Senator from Connecticut has spoken, will become law and will be a reality before this session of Congress recesses or adjourns, as may be determined upon. I think it most unfortunate that these employees, who are faced with the high cost of living and the other conditions with which they have to contend during these difficult years, have not previously received a sufficient increase in salary to enable them to take care of themselves and their families.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

The clerk will proceed with the call of the calendar.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1537) to increase the rate of compensation of heads and assistant heads of executive departments, and of other officers, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 191) giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

FREE IMPORTATION OF LIMESTONE FOR MANUFACTURE OF FERTILIZER

The bill (H. R. 5275) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the bill contains the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska with reference to baler twine.

Mr. BUTLER. I am sorry that it does not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1113) to emancipate United States Indians in certain cases was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4725) to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1686) to provide for the settlement of certain obligations of the United States to the Indians of New York was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1687) to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ALLIED AVIATION CORP.

The bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp. was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator who objected will withhold his objection for a moment, to permit me to make an explanation.

The persons mainly affected by this bill are not constituents of mine, so far as I know. I am not on the committee which considered the bill. The chairman of the subcommittee was the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

However, a small wartime plant was located in the State of Maryland; and because of that circumstance the persons affected by the bill came to me and asked me to look into the bill. The main claimants, I believe, are residents of New York, as I understand.

I have looked into the bill; I have read the committee report through carefully. In my opinion, a grave injustice will be done if relief is denied these persons further. The counsel of the Navy Department admits the justice of their claim, as shown in the report of the House committee.

I likewise read an exact excerpt of a telephone conversation between the general counsel of the Navy Department and my office. It is as follows:

Mr. HILL. The Navy Department is not going to take any position in active opposition to a bill for the relief of this company.

We know they lost money and we will not act to prevent their recoupment. We cannot grant relief on the authority we have.

Further than that, a concern in New York which had a contract identical to that of the claimant named in this bill has obtained its relief.

There should be a rule of uniform justice. I submit it is not fair to give the New York company compensation for its losses and deny the Allied Aviation Corp. equal compensation for identical losses. As a matter of fact this particular company, the Allied Corp., did perform a service. It made planes. The planes were accepted by the Navy, and the company received no compensation for its loss. However, the New York company did not make any planes, its models were not approved, and it was paid in full.

I appeal to the fairness of the Senate as a matter of simple justice that these claimants have their day in court and get their money. The Senator from Kentucky has written a very comprehensive report. They are not constituents of mine, but my sense of justice is strongly urged to rally to the support of the bill. I hope very much that Senators will not deny these claimants their losses and opportunity for compensation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should also like to state that the Small Business Committee is very much interested in this claim. Was there an objection made? I could not hear.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My objection was the result of a mistake. I was not objecting to this particular bill. I was on a committee some time ago that investigated the particular bill and I think it should be passed.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. I am sure the favorable attitude evidenced toward the consideration of this measure by people who have no interest in it from the standpoint of constituents, should make an appeal, particularly since the overwhelming evidence shows the claimants are entitled to their day in court. This is a House bill. It has already run the gamut of the House, and the Senate should not deny the relief at this late hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments: On page 1, line 7, to strike out "$108,753.13" and insert "$234,195.20", and in line 9, before the word "in", to insert "under contract No. S-92657."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2285) relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees in navy yards was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY (and other Senators). Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over. I want the RECORD to show I make the objection on behalf of other Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

The bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2216) to amend section 205 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint boards, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2759) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2426) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5992) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 200) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

PLACING A CERTAIN PORTION OF IDAHO IN THE THIRD TIME ZONE

The bill (S. 2547) to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This bill is identical with Calendar No. 1408, House bill 6318, and without objection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill and will now be considered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6318) to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, when this bill was formerly reached on the call of the calendar I

objected, but I have no objection to Senate bill 2547.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the House bill will be amended as the committee proposed the Senate bill should be amended.

The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 10, strike out "That the Union Pacific Railroad Company may use Pocatello as the point at which it changes from mountain time to Pacific time and vice versa, and may conduct all its operations on its main and branch lines west of Pocatello on Pacific time," and insert "That common carriers within such portion of the State of Idaho may conduct their operations on Pacific time."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The bill (S. 2688) to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator who objected to the bill will withhold his objection if he feels he can do so. Last year under the Unification Act the Central Intelligence Agency was established. It is now functioning as a part of the general unification scheme. In order to conduct its business properly with the other agencies of the Government it should have a seal of its own and the necessary authority to act in the ordinary way other bureaus of the Government act. The bill is essentially for that purpose. It gives the Agency several advantages over other departments, because of the confidential nature of its undertaking and of the necessity of many of its employees being located in foreign countries under circumstances not open to disclosure.

The Committee on Armed Services considered the bill very carefully, and spent several days on it. I believe if we want the Unification Act to function, if we want the Central Intelligence to have full opportunity to take its proper place in the activities of the Government at this stage, particularly in our relations with other countries, and in obtaining knowledge from other countries, the bill should become a law at this time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I was the one who raised the objection, and I want to assure the Senator from Massachusetts and the other members of the committee that the objection I have is not captious. I have assured Senators that as soon as the information I have requested is available, I trust the whole matter can be worked out. The people who have indicated an interest in this bill—and they were of rather responsible character—were not in town and were not back until this morning. I did not realize the calendar was going to be called. I hoped to be able to adjust the matter and that my objection will be of only a temporary character.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1390) to broaden the cooperative-extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5310) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to Siam and make them racially eligible for naturalization was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2589) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am quite satisfied that those interested in this legislation would not want it to pass on the call of the Calendar. I ask that the bill go over for the time being.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2664) to authorize the Indian Claims Commission to hear and determine certain claims of the Indians of California was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4112) to provide for the acceptance and use of funds for support of the National Weather Service supplementing the funds appropriated for the operation of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4427) to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INDIAN RESERVATIONS IN ALASKA

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162) to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY (and other Senators). Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I have no objection to Calendar 1421, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162). I was mistaken in the calendar number. I ask that the Senate revert to a consideration of it.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the objection the Chair just heard an objection to the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162).

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, did Calendar 1421, Senate Joint Resolution 162, go over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I inquire who made the objection?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT AND SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT AND NATIONAL BANK ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2636) to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the National Bank Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is on the table an amendment which has been reported from the committee by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 17, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. In order that the Congress may from time to time review the operation and effect of the provisions of this act, the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems shall transmit to the President and to the Congress special reports on the operation and effect of the provisions of this act as hereinafter in this paragraph provided. The first report shall be made not later than 2 years after the approval of this act and a report shall be made every 2 years after the making of the first report. Each report shall cover and include the extent to which the exemptions herein provided for have accomplished their purposes; the operations and the policies of the bank in the marketing of obligations issued or guaranteed by it; the extent to which such exemptions have aided the bank in the marketing of such obligations; the extent, if any, to which modifications of this act may be advisable in the opinion of said Council in order adequately to protect the interests of investors and securities dealers; and the recommendations of said Council with regard to the advisability of continuing, modifying, or terminating such exemptions, with particular reference to the extent to which the discontinuance or modification of such exemptions may affect the bank in respect of the aid which it may be able to afford under its articles of agreement in the financing of European recovery and the reconstruction and development of the economic resources and facilities of its members. Before making any such report said Council shall afford to any association of brokers or dealers which shall be registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission as a national securities association under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 an opportunity to present to said Council its views with regard to the matters to be covered and included in such report as herebefore provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRICKER subsequently said: Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate today passed the bill, S. 2636, to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the National Bank Act. It is calendar No. 1435.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The motion will be entered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is this a motion to reconsider?

Mr. BRICKER. It is a motion to reconsider.

Mr. AIKEN. Or did the Senator ask unanimous consent for reconsideration of the bill?

Mr. BRICKER. No; I made a motion to reconsider.

Mr. AIKEN. I object to the motion.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. I have been requested by some friends of mine connected with institutions affected by the bill to do what I can to see that the bill is passed. I ask if the Senator from Ohio is objecting to the passage of the bill?

Mr. BRICKER. I voice my objection to the passage of the bill now. I have moved that the vote by which it was passed be reconsidered. The bill was passed on the call of the Consent Calendar. I was not present in the Senate Chamber at the time the bill was reached on the calendar and passed. I am opposed to the bill. I think we should have hearings in committee on it. There have been no hearings held on the bill. The bill deals with a matter of too great importance to have the bill pass on the call of the calendar without any hearings having been had on the bill in the Senate committee, and without any debate upon the bill on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. I will say that various groups in the State of New Jersey are embarrassed because of their inability to deal in these securities, because of the situation which now exists. I have been asked to do what I can to assist in relieving the situation in which they find themselves. I think it is important that the bill be enacted into law.

Mr. BRICKER. I take the opposite view, and I think most of the people of my State do.

Mr. SMITH. I was not aware of any such opposition. I desire to obtain the facts, if I can, so that we may see where we are.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the motion made by the Senator from Ohio is acted on, will it not mean that the pending business, the Government corporations appropriation bill, will be permanently laid aside until a new motion is made respecting it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator from Ohio submitted a privileged motion, and his motion was entered. The mere entering of the motion does not affect the status of the pending business.

Mr. AIKEN. But if there is any effort made to act upon the motion, I should have to ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No action on the motion has been asked.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5703) to exempt civilian members of the permanent Joint Board on Defense, United States and Canada, from certain statutory restrictions on outside activities was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2155) to transfer jurisdiction over certain school buildings in Vanport, Oreg., to Federal Works Administrator was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2417) to adjust the premium charge of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REORGANIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF PROCUREMENT, UTILIZATION, AND DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

The bill (S. 2754) to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have consideration of a proposed amendment to this bill, which I have taken up with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. My amendment is acceptable to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2754) to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment I offer is as follows:

On page 29, line 21, before the letter (g), insert the letter (a), and after the letter (g), insert the letter (h); on the same page, line 24, delete the following language: "(a) and."

My amendment is acceptable to the author and sponsor of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is a bill which transfers the War Assets Administration to the Bureau of Federal Supply of the Federal Works Administration. The reason for this transfer is that the War Assets Administrator estimates that it will not be very long before it will be costing more than a dollar to sell a dollar's worth of surplus property. It provides for the disposal of surplus property which any of the agencies of the Government may have. It also provides that the Federal Works Administrator shall perform the functions of the Bureau of Federal Supply in the matter of making purchases for various agencies of the Government. The reason for consolidating the two agencies is to make sure that one agency of the Government is not disposing of certain articles of property while another agency of the Government is attempting to buy the same things.

Mr. PEPPER. Does this bill put the War Assets Administration out of existence on the 1st of July?

Mr. AIKEN. The functions of the War Assets Administration are transferred to the Federal Works Administration. The Administrator of War Assets recommends that action. That is one administration of Government which has come before the Congress and recommended that it be abolished. The provisions of law now pertaining to the War Assets Administration will carry over for the length of time which is provided by the law, which is next year.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it not a fact that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments went quite fully into the problem and were unanimous in the opinion that the proposed change would be to the benefit of all concerned?

Mr. AIKEN. That is quite true. This is a committee bill. It was worked over for several weeks with the Federal agencies involved and was reported as a committee bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that this bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCORPORATION OF VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

The bill (S. 1183) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, there was objection made to the consideration of the bill on the previous call of the calendar, but that objection has been removed.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] asked me to object.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Delaware has withdrawn his objection and filed a statement in the Appendix of the RECORD of yesterday, explaining his position.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of Senate bill 1183?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1183) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, The Virgin Islands Company shall continue as an agency of the United States until

the close of business June 30, 1949. It is authorized to borrow from the Treasury of the United States, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall loan to it upon the request of its president, such sums as may be required to carry out its operations until such date, not exceeding in the aggregate $950,000. Each loan shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to know if The Virgin Islands Company is to be a permanent corporation, or whether there is any time limit set?

Mr. BUTLER. The time for a permanent extension for the life of this corporation was dropped entirely. The bill is merely a limitation agreed upon by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate in order to legalize the operations of the corporation for a term of 1 year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to continue The Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 286) to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass., was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2680) to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic system was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, referring to Calendar No. 1479, Senate bill 286, I have amendments I desire to offer. At the last call of the calendar the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] objected to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator is speaking of the wrong number. It was Calendar 1480.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Both bills have gone over.

DISCLOSURES OF INFORMATION OF THE CRYPTOGRAPH SYSTEM

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate do return to the consideration of Calendar No. 1480, Senate bill 2680.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2680) to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic system.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, at the last call of the Calendar the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] objected to the consideration of the bill. Since that time we have worked out a series of amendments which meet with his approval. I should like very much to have those amendments considered, unless there be further objection to the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, is the Senator speaking of calendar 1480?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is correct. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2319) to provide for a survey of physically handicapped citizens was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF TRACT OF LAND TO JOHNSON CITY, TENN.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2580) to authorize the Administration of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Tennessee to the city of Johnson City.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the following language:

Provided, That Johnson City shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of its property, to be determined by the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair notes that Calendar 1611, House bill 6443, is a similar bill. The Chair inquires whether it is the desire of the Senator to consider the House bill and that his amendment be offered to the House bill.

Mr. MORSE. That is the desire of the Senator from Oregon, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to considering House bill 6443?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City.

Mr. MORSE. I offer my amendment to the House bill. The amendment is as follows:

Provided, That Johnson City shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of its property, to be determined by the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H. R. 6448.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 23, it is proposed to strike out:

SEC. 2. It shall be made a condition of the deed of conveyance that the tract of land so conveyed shall be maintained by such municipal corporation only for fairground or other recreational purposes. If such municipal corporation ceases to maintain such tract for such purposes or attempts to alienate all or any part of such tract, title thereto shall revert to the United States. The deed shall reserve to the United States the interests in fissionable material as provided in Executive Order 9908, dated December 5, 1947.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 2. The tract of land authorized to be transferred by the first section of this act shall be used by the grantee for fair grounds and recreational purposes; and the deed of conveyance of such lands shall contain (1) the provision that all such property shall be used and maintained for the purposes for which it was conveyed for a period of not less than 20 years, and that in the event such property ceases to be used or maintained for such purposes during such period, or is alienated or an attempt is made to alienate such property during such period, all or any portion of such property shall in its then existing condition, at the option of the United States, revert to the United States; and (2) such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States. The deed shall reserve to the United States the interests in fissionable material as provided in Executive Order 9908, dated December 5, 1947.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2580 is indefinitely postponed.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 197) to continue the Joint Committee on Housing beyond March 15, 1948, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAX

The bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is the bill objected to?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to be recognized under the 5-minute rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words regarding the bill. I think that the Policy Committee, in refusing to place the bill on the agenda, must assume full responsibility for killing the bill, if it is killed at this session. It was reported unanimously by the Finance Committee. I want to read for the RECORD the last sentence of the report:

In the opinion of the committee, the bill (H. R. 2245) is in the public interest and should be enacted without delay.

As the Senate well knows, after long discussion of this bill on the question of referral, its past history, and the way it had been bottled up by one committee after another in the House, and had been refused a hearing in the Senate because such a bill must originate in the House, finally now we have the bill on the calendar, after some 62 years, and we have an opportunity now to vote on it. Yet the majority of the committee, although the chairman of the committee has approved the bill in committee, refuses to let the Senate vote on it on its merits.

Apparently the only way a vote can be had is by having the bill offered as an amendment to some other bill, and I suggest now to the policy committee, and the majority leadership, that I assume, in view of the statement made a few moments ago, there being no hope of getting a vote in any other way, the bill will have to be offered as an amendment to the long-range farm bill.

I dislike to offer this bill as an amendment to any bill, because on its own bottom it has passed the House by better than a 2-to-1 vote, the vote being 260 to 106, and in the Senate it received a vote of 47 to 30, which I think could be interpreted as a vote on the merits in many respects, the vote being on the question of referring the bill to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, this whole matter has been very erroneously interpreted by the margarine people. What is happening is that the margarine manufacturers are profiting greatly by the favorable publicity that has arisen from the controversy in the Senate and the House. The only ones who are suffering are the housewives, the ordinary citizens, who, because of the great demand, because of the refusal to give relief from the taxes, are having to pay more, while at the same time the production of margarine has doubled within the past 3 or 4 years. It is not to the interest of the margarine manufacturers particularly, in fact, I doubt if at all, that the bill be passed, but it certainly is to the interest of the millions of housewives and ordinary citizens.

I think it is disgraceful, after all the effort which has been put on this bill in the House and in the Senate, that it should be simply shoved aside in this manner, and the Senate prevented from voting on it on its merits. Twice before in recent years, notably in 1944, the same proposal was before the Senate, and we could not get a vote on the merits. It had to be offered as an amendment to a bill. I well recognize that Senators are loath to vote a bill of this kind as an amendment to another bill in which they have an interest, because it does add a controversial feature, and it may very well deter some Senators from voting on it because of its effect on the main bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator should take the course he has suggested, I would say the amendment would be germane to the agricultural bill, because, after all, the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, as the Senator will recall, decided definitely that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is where the oleomargarine repeal bill belonged. While the Senate on an appeal overruled the decision, nevertheless the bill has agricultural features.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator that it would be germane to the farm bill. My only reservation about attaching it to that bill is the probability that in conference the conferees of the House would be the same members of the Committee on Agriculture who have bottled it up, and who have recently bottled it up by a vote of 16 to 10. The House later evidenced its approval of the bill by a vote of 260 to 106. The action in bottling it up for so long a time is perfectly indefensible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to add my approval to what the Senator from Arkansas has said. This bill was called up last week and was objected to. It was called up again today and objected to, and I imagine every time it is called it will be objected to.

I have come to the conclusion that the oleomargarine manufacturers do not want the bill passed. I have come to the further conclusion that the dairy interests are rather foolish not to let the bill pass. Every time the bill is called, every time a statement is made in the Senate about it, millions upon millions of dollars worth of publicity is given free to Nucoa and to oleo and other products made from soy beans, cottonseed, and other agricultural products.

So, Mr. President, in view of the fact that this bill is objected to, I intend to object to all the other bills on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

Mr. EASTLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Baldwin	Hawkes	Murray
Ball	Hayden	Myers
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brewster	Hill	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Langer	Stennis
Cooper	Lodge	Stewart
Cordon	Lucas	Taft
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Feazel	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Flanders	Martin	Williams
Fulbright	Maybank	Young
Green	Millikin	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1485, House bill 2245, to repeal the tax on oleomargarine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's motion is in order, and is not debatable.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House bill 2245, Calendar No. 1485. On the motion the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the motion prevails will the result be to displace the unfinished business, or merely to displace it up to 1 o'clock?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Only until 1 o'clock.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is unavoidably detained and is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], who is detained on official committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official committee business. If present and voting the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who would vote "nay," if present.

On this vote the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired with the Senator from

Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who would vote "nay," if present.

I announce further that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired on this vote with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—57

Baldwin	Hayden	Myers
Barkley	Hill	O'Conor
Bridges	Hoey	O'Daniel
Brooks	Holland	O'Mahoney
Buck	Ives	Pepper
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Cain	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Connally	Kilgore	Russell
Cooper	Knowland	Saltonstall
Downey	Lodge	Smith
Eastland	Lucas	Sparkman
Ecton	McClellan	Stennis
Ellender	McFarland	Stewart
Fessel	McGrath	Taft
Flanders	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McMahon	Tydings
Green	Magnuson	Umstead
Hatch	Maybank	Vandenberg
Hawkes	Murray	Williams

NAYS—26

Aiken	Dworshak	Millikin
Ball	Ferguson	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Jenner	Thye
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Watkins
Capehart	Langer	Wherry
Capper	McCarthy	Wiley
Cordon	Malone	Young
Donnell	Martin	

NOT VOTING—13

Bushfield	Moore	Wagner
Chavez	Reed	White
George	Taylor	Wilson
Gurney	Thomas, Utah	
McCarran	Tobey	

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. EASTLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion until I make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Has the suggestion of the absence of a quorum been withdrawn?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; it has not been withdrawn.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Mississippi will withhold his request I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. I want to ask how long consideration of the oleomargarine bill may continue before reverting to the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Until 1 o'clock.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I suggested the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must recognize the call for a quorum whenever it is made.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Barkley	Bridges
Baldwin	Brewster	Brooks
Ball	Bricker	Buck
Butler	Hoey	Myers
Byrd	Holland	O'Conor
Cain	Ives	O'Daniel
Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Connally	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Cooper	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Cordon	Knowland	Russell
Donnell	Langer	Saltonstall
Downey	Lodge	Smith
Dworshak	Lucas	Sparkman
Eastland	McCarthy	Stennis
Ecton	McClellan	Stewart
Ellender	McFarland	Taft
Fessel	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McKellar	Thye
Fulbright	McMahon	Tydings
Green	Magnuson	Umstead
Hatch	Malone	Vandenberg
Hawkes	Martin	Watkins
Hayden	Maybank	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Wiley
Hill	Morse	Williams
	Murray	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to House bill 2245.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate. The committee amendment will have to be considered first.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the amendment, which is as follows:

At the proper place in the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. 201. To guarantee, insofar as it lies within the constitutional power of the Congress so to do within the subject matter of this act, (a) that each and every citizen of the United States be secured in the equal protection of the laws of the United States, and of the several States, and (b) that no citizen of the United States be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, the Congress, in the exercise of all powers which it possesses, does hereby legislate with respect to the crime of lynching as hereinafter defined.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 202. Any assemblage of two or more persons which shall, without authority of law, exercise or attempt to exercise, by acts of physical force against person or property, any power of correction or punishment over any person, who is (1) in the custody of any peace officer or (2) charged with or convicted of the commission of any criminal offense, or (3) suspected by such assemblage of the commission of any criminal offense, with the purpose or consequence of preventing the apprehension or trial or punishment by law of such person, or of imposing a punishment, shall constitute a lynch mob within the meaning of this act. Any such exercise of power or attempt to exercise power by a lynch mob shall constitute lynching within the meaning of this act.

"CONSPIRACY BETWEEN MEMBERS OF LYNCH MOB AND FEDERAL OR STATE OFFICERS

"SEC. 203. Whenever a lynching occurs, any member of the lynch mob who conspires with any officer or employee of the United States or of a State or governmental subdivision thereof who is charged with the duty or possesses the authority as such officer or employee to prevent the lynching or to protect the person lynched, and any such officer or employee who conspires with any member of the lynch mob, to commit, instigate, incite, organize, aid, or abet the lynching shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $10,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 30 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"PUNISHMENT UPON STATE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR WILLFUL FAILURE TO PREVENT LYNCHING

"SEC. 204. Whenever a lynching shall occur, any officer or employee of a State or any governmental subdivision thereof, who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority of such officer or employee to prevent the lynching, but shall have willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to do so, and any officer or employee of a State or governmental subdivision thereof who, under authority or duty granted or imposed by the law of such State, shall have had custody of the person lynched and shall have willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to protect such person from lynching, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"PUNISHMENT UPON FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR WILLFUL FAILURE TO PREVENT LYNCHING

"SEC. 205. Whenever a lynching shall occur, any officer or employee of the United States, (1) who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee to prevent the lynching, but shall have willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to do so; or (2) who, under authority or duty granted or imposed by the law of the United States, shall have had custody of the person lynched and shall have willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to protect such person from lynching; or (3) who, in violation of his duty as such officer or employee, shall willfully fail or refuse to make all reasonable efforts to apprehend, keep in custody, or prosecute any person who violates section 3, section 4, or this section, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"DUTY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 206. Whenever a lynching of any person shall occur, and information on oath is submitted to the Attorney General of the United States that any officer or employee of the United States or of a State or any governmental subdivision thereof who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee to protect such person from lynching, or who, under authority or duty granted or imposed by the law of the United States or of such State, respectively, shall have had custody of the person lynched, has willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to protect such person from lynching or that any officer or employee of the United States, in violation of his duty as such officer or employee, has willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to apprehend, keep in custody, or prosecute any person who has violated section 3, section 4, or section 5 of this act, the Attorney General of the United States shall cause an investigation to be made to determine whether there has been any violation of this act. The duty imposed by this section shall be in addition to all other duties of the Attorney General.

"CIVIL ACTIONS BY INDIVIDUALS LYNCHED

"SEC. 207. (a) Any individual who is lynched as defined in this act, and who suffers injury to his person or damage to his property as a result of the lynching, or the next of kin of any such individual if such injury results in death, shall be entitled to maintain a civil action for damages for such injury, damage, or death against any person violating section 3 section 4, or section 5 of this act with respect to such lynching: *Provided*, That the satisfaction of judgment against one person who may be liable shall bar further proceedings under this section, by the individual who has obtained satisfaction of his judgment, against any other person who may also be liable.

"(b) Actions provided by this section shall be brought in the United States District Court for the judicial district of which the defendant is a resident. Any such action may be brought and prosecuted by the Attorney General of the United States or his authorized representative in the name of the United States for the use of the real party in interest, or, if the claimant shall so elect, by counsel employed by the claimant, but in any event without prepayment of costs. If the amount of any such judgment shall not be paid upon demand, payment thereof may be enforced by any process, and to the extent, available under the State law for the enforcement of any other money judgment against the defendant. The cause of action occurring hereunder to a person injured by lynching shall not abate with the subsequent death of that person before final jurgment but shall survive to his next of kin. For the purpose of this section the next of kin of a deceased victim of lynching shall be determined according to the laws of intestate distribution of the State of domicile of the decedent. Any judgment under this section shall be exempt from all claims of creditors."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is it in order to move to dispense with further reading of the amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such a motion is not in order, because the reading is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does not require unanimous consent to read it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota asked that the amendment be read at the desk. The Journal does not disclose unanimous consent to that effect, but the Chair states that the reading is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is there no way, under the ruling, to dispense with the further reading of the amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks the Senator could object to its present reading. Of course, when it is brought up for consideration by the Senate, it will have to be read.

The Chair suggests to the Senator that if he wishes to object to the continuation of the reading of the amendment, he can do so at the present time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I object to the continuation of the reading of the amendment at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question, then, is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether it would be appropriate to hear the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, beginning in line 15, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that the sale of colored oleomargarine without clear identification as such or which is otherwise adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act depresses the market in interstate commerce for butter and for oleomargarine clearly identified and neither adulterated nor misbranded, and constitutes a burden on interstate commerce in such articles. Such burden exists, irrespective of whether such oleomargarine originates from an interstate source or from the State in which it is sold.

(b) Section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 331), is amended by adding a new paragraph as follows:

"(m) The serving of colored oleomargarine in violation of section 407 (b)."

(c) Chapter IV of such Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 341 and the following), is amended by adding a new section as follows:

"COLORED OLEOMARGARINE

"SEC. 407. (a) Colored oleomargarine which is sold in the same State or Territory in which it is produced shall be subject in the same manner and to the same extent to the provisions of this act as if it had been introduced in interstate commerce.

"(b) No person shall serve colored oleomargarine at a public eating place, whether or not any charge is made therefor, unless, (1) each separate serving bears labeling identifying it as oleomargarine, and (2) a notice that oleomargarine is served is displayed prominently and conspicuously in such place.

"(c) Colored oleomargarine when served with meals at a public eating place shall at the time of such service be exempt from the labeling requirements of section 403 (except 403 (f) if it complies with the requirements of subsection (b) of this section.

"(d) For the purpose of this section colored oleomargarine is oleomargarine having a tint or shade containing more than one and six-tenths degrees of yellow, or of yellow and red collectively, but with an excess of yellow over red, measured in terms of Lovibond tintometer scale or its equivalent."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I inquire if this opera bouffe ends at 1 o'clock?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Whatever it is, it ends at 1 o'clock. [Laughter.]

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

TIME FOR A CHANGE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, after coming to the Chamber a few moments ago, I recalled a statement made by Abraham Lincoln, and I quote it at this time:

The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. * * * As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves.

That statement was made by Abraham Lincoln in his message on December 1, 1862. Those words of a Republican President point the way to the American people today to the solving of some of their problems.

THE NATION NEEDS AND WANTS REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP IN THE ADMINISTRATION AND IN THE CONGRESS

History teaches us that the very worst thing that can happen to a nation is for it to fail to make a change in leadership when such a change is long overdue. The election in November 1948 presents the American people with a challenge to make such a change, which has been so long overdue. America must disenthrall itself; it must think anew and act anew, with courageous Republican leadership. America must reject a fifth term to the Democratic Party.

Since March 30, 1933, the Nation has been burdened by a Democratic administration which has boasted of looking forward, but which in large measure has really looked backward to the days of the regimentation of man by the state. For 14 years, up until January 1947, the Nation had also been burdened by a Democratic Congress. Fortunately, the past 2 years have seen a long-overdue replacement of Democratic control of the Congress by Republican leadership.

NATIONAL WELFARE REQUIRES CHANGE

Mr. President, I do not make this plea now for a change in the national administration and for continuation of Republican control of the Congress merely on the basis of partisan feeling or as a partisan matter. Of course, I am a Republican, and I am proud of it. However, I appeal not only to Republican voters but also to Democratic voters and, most important, to independent voters, to assure Republican leadership during the next fateful period of American history. My appeal is not only on the basis of the aspirations of my party but on the basis of the needs of our country.

NEED FOR A NATIONAL AUDIT

Mr. President, why should there be a change? The first reason is because we feel that there should be a national audit, an audit of every bureau and agency in the Federal Government, an audit of its operations and of its personnel. There can be no such audit until there is a Republican in the White House and Republican leadership throughout the administration.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I prefer not to yield at this time, please.

Mr. President, during the past 2 years, when we Republicans have nominally been in charge of the Congress, where we have had a slim majority, we have been confronted again and again by opposition and obstruction on the part of the administration to our demands for cleaning out the dry rot in the Federal Government. We cannot clean out that dry rot unless the Republicans are given the helm of the national administration.

Mr. President, what I have to say on this point is far more important than some of the subjects which recently have been interjected into the proceedings on the floor of the Senate.

TOO LONG A RULE BY ONE PARTY MEANS RUIN

Mr. President, the second reason for the need for a national change is the one which was given by Franklin Roosevelt himself when he was campaigning aginst the Republicans in 1932. I wish Senators to pay particular attention to the language he used at that time. In 1932 Mr. Roosevelt quoted President Calvin Coolidge as follows:

For one reason or another even a wisely led political party, given a long enough tenure of office, finally fails to express any longer the will of the people, and when it does so fail to express the will of the people, it ceases to be an effective instrument of government. It is far better for such a political party—and certainly better for the state—that it should be relegated to the role of the critic and that the opposing political party should assume the reins of government. This condition appears to have arrived in America.

After referring to that statement by Calvin Coolidge, Mr. Roosevelt said:

That, my friends, is the sober conclusion of a cautious public man, not long ago President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge. With every word of it I heartily agree.

Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senate that if oleomargarine or butter or a contest between the two becomes an issue on this floor, I shall have something to say on that subject, too. I am hoping that what I am interjecting here will be a little oil on the troubled waters.

Let me say at this point, parenthetically, that I have quoted Franklin D. Roosevelt and I have quoted President Coolidge. I ask Senators to bear in mind that the very heart of that salient statement was that any party, I care not which it is, that has possession of government over a long term of years becomes literally debilitated so far as performance is concerned and so far as doing a good job is concerned. That was the consensus of the two ex-Presidents.

GIVE OPPORTUNITY TO NEW LEADERS

A third reason for a change in the administration is to give opportunity for the new leadership which has developed in the Nation since 1933, but which has not had the chance to express itself because of the Democratic monopoly in the administration. During these 16 years, the overwhelming proportion of appointments in the executive branch and in the judiciary have been assigned to Democrats. While some few of the President's appointments during these years have been on a merit basis, most of them have been on a spoils basis. Many appointees have been cheap political hacks from corrupt Democratic municipal machines. It is time for a change to a merit basis. I do not have to refer simply to Republican criticism. Democratic Members of the Senate, time and time again, have mentioned the conclusion that I have just stated, that civil service has been corrupted. There is no longer a question of a constructive operation of the civil-service rules. And we have seen it demonstrated here on the floor of the Senate in relation to postmasters before the Republican Party came into control. We have had to fight on the floor of the Senate, and the Senator who is speaking has had to fight, to see to it that civil-service rules were not violated in the interest of political hacks. It is time to allow efficient Republican leadership to assert itself, to allow the new generation of leaders the opportunity to work out its constructive role for the good of the Nation, not on the basis of spoils but on the basis of proven merit.

PROUD RECORD OF GOP CONGRESS

There is another reason, Mr. President, the next reason for a change. The next reason for a change is the Republican record. I say to you, Mr. President, that in spite of the impediments, in spite of the road blocks, in spite of the obstruction, that record stands. You and I know that each of us has ideas about some particular bill or project which we might have hoped this Republican Congress would pass, but which hopes have not been realized. It is almost impossible to satisfy everyone, and yet we know that the Republican Party has conscientiously tried to satisfy the needs of the Nation by its record during these last 2 years in the Congress. I need only mention a few of the laws which we have passed as an indication of our constructive work:

The tax-reduction law.

The Taft-Hartley labor law.

Overseas-information law.

Commission on reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

Portal-to-Portal Pay Act.

Bill for increasing subsistence allowances for disabled veterans.

Bill for increasing on-the-job training ceilings for veterans.

Terminal Cash Pay Act for enlisted men.

The unification bill for the armed forces.

Many foreign-aid measures to control communism and prevent a third world war in addition to a number of other bills.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of a motion?

Mr. WILEY. For what purpose?

Mr. BRICKER. For the purpose of making a motion to reconsider.

Mr. WILEY. No; I desire to finish this talk at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, while the Senator is interrupted, would he yield for the purpose of my proposing a unanimous-consent agreement to return to the calendar for the remainder of the morning hour?

Mr. WILEY. No. I want to finish. I was caught unawares by certain activities, which is apparent, and I am going to talk until after 1 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator yield for an announcement, please?

Mr. WILEY. I will yield for a question, providing I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not want to take the floor away from the Senator, but Senators have asked what is the program when 1 o'clock arrives. I should like to say, if the Senator will permit, that at 1 o'clock the unfinished business, which is the long-range agricultural program, will then automatically be laid before the Senate. It will be our purpose to get unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the farm bill and take up and conclude consideration of the Government corporations bill.

I thank the Senator for yielding. I should like to say in conclusion, there will be a session of the Senate tonight.

Mr. WILEY. As I say, there are many bills on which action was not completed and which I personally would have liked to see pass, just as my listeners and readers would. We recognize, however, the staggering burden on this first Republican Congress in over 14 years in trying to set a new path of economy, of efficiency, in place of the Democratic mismanagement which characterized the previous decade or more. Anyone who has ever tried to clean up a dusty attic which has been untended to for 14 years knows the job we Republicans faced.

NEED FOR ECONOMY

Another reason for change is that the Republican Party needs to take the helm if we are to achieve true Government economy. I know that many of our citizens feel that the expenditures in the Eightieth Congress have been excessive, and in many instances, I am inclined to agree with them. But Mr. President, we have a 50-cent dollar. As I said the other day on the floor of the Senate, I think that by and large when we come to analyze the expenditures of the Congress in the light of the 50-cent dollar, in the light of pressure from foreign parts, and in the light of pressure internally upon our national income and capacity, history will record "well done." Even though I voted against some of the appropriations, my associates felt they were justified. I feel that the strength of America is not in our being able unanimously to agree to everything, but rather, that the strength of America is to be found in the fact that strong men can meet and exchange ideas in this forum, and then agree that to the majority the spoils do not belong, but the victory.

Some Republicans have, unfortunately, caught the spending fever. We recognize, however, the heavy financial costs imposed upon us by the need to combat communism abroad and the need to build up our national defense. All of the money that we are using in this national defense program consists of 50-cent dollars—costs of construction have increased all along the line, and that has served to increase the cost of Government and defense.

Still the Republicans have made great advances, have watered down some of the administration's bloated budget requests, have balanced the budget, and have assured several billion dollars to reduce our national indebtedness.

Another reason for a change—a change that is necessary—in addition to the reasons set forth in the five previous points, including the statements of President Coolidge and President Roosevelt—that after a long period of political domination by one party conditions arise requiring a change—there is the sixth point.

VIGILANCE REQUIRED IN ATOMIC AGE

Another reason for a change is that the Republican Party can assure for the Nation the vigilance at home and abroad against every menace, particularly the menace of communism. The Democratic Party, with its record of secret diplomacy, its record of the appeasement of communism and of building up the forces of communism at home and abroad, cannot assure for the Nation that adequacy which is so indispensable in this atomic age. America has been precipitated to leadership among the nations of the earth and she must be vigilant in the careful exercise of that leadership.

CARRYING THROUGH GOP PROGRAM

Continued Republican leadership of the Senate and House of Representatives is necessary if we are to carry through on the constructive program which we have begun in this Eightieth Congress, and in order to carry through on those items for which time was not available to complete. The question of high prices

is still with us; the question of labor difficulties and of many other problems are still to be solved. The fact that these were not solved during the brief time that we have had available to us is not an indication that we were inadequate to our responsibility, and that from every angle it appears will be thrust upon the party next January; rather it is an indication that we need more time, plus leadership of the national administration, in order that we might complete the job that the Nation has assigned to us. We have been working night and day on thousands of bills; we have not shirked our responsibility in any sense.

The Republican Party does not appeal to the Nation on the basis of making glib promises about accomplishing the millennium. We know that our national economy is so complicated that Congress alone cannot do the job and cannot, by itself, assure national prosperity. The Republican Party does promise the Nation, however, that it will create a climate, an atmosphere of freedom which will give to the farmer, the businessman, the laboring man, to commerce, to transportation, and to every other segment of our economy that freedom, that encouragement which they have so long missed during the last 16 years of Democratic control—the era of bureaucratic bossing, of crisis psychology, of planned emergencies.

Mr. President, what I have said today expresses my earnest personal conviction as to why I think there is a need for a change. I have just returned from a visit to my own State, where I attended the Republican convention. I talked to many persons representing a fine cross section of the people who represent the grassroots of that great State, which produces 50 percent industrially and 50 percent agriculturally. It is a State filled with the common people, of whom Lincoln said, "God Almighty must have loved them, he made so many of them." I have come back encouraged, because I find that much of the fear, the doubt, and the worry we hear expressed on the floor and elsewhere regarding the future of this great Nation is not lodged in the breasts of the men and women of my State who produce, build, and construct. They have a hope, and they are equal to the task which is before them. They have faith that we shall come through the crisis and meet the problems of today and tomorrow as we have met every problem and every crisis which have arisen in the history of this great country. They are the people who build the Nation. Back in the grassroots sections they are working. They are not striking. They are aware of the fact, Mr. President, that from the villages, small cities, and farmsteads will come the direction which will guide us. Were I to listen to all the fears and doubts expressed through the press and over the radio I would think this country were going to hell. But when I listen to the voices of the commen men and women, I am strengthened and encouraged to face, without doubt, the problems which we have to solve.

I learned a little philosophy in politics while I was at home, Mr. President. I heard of a Scotchman who went from the Isle of Ayr to London. When he returned, a friend said to him: "Sandy, how did you like it in London?" Sandy replied, "I didna like it. I don't like those Londoners. Mon, they are a queer people, a very queer people." His friend said, "What do you mean, Sandy?" Sandy said, "I went up to my room in the hotel at night. I had my bagpipes along, of course. But those Londoners are queer people. They pounded on the ceiling, on the floor, and on the walls." His friend inquired, "What did you do, Sandy?" Sandy replied, "I didn't let them upset me. I didn't pay any attention to the knocking; I just kept on playing my bagpipes."

Mr. President, I think that both parties might very well, in this election campaign, as they go out through the country, play their own bagpipes. If they do so, they will make a great contribution to the thinking of the American people. From my own little experience in politics I have found that never to mention my opponent is good politics. Never to indulge in personalities regarding individuals is good politics. I found it to be so, because the common people know it is so. They do not like folks who indulge in manure-spreading. They do not like that kind of tactics. The people are looking for more light. Light is what they want. It was Goethe who, when he was about to die, uttered the words, "More light." A friend who was standing by his bed said, "He wants a candle." Another friend said, "No. He is passing through the vestibule between this existence and the next existence, and wise men say that when a man goes through that vestibule he can look both ways." Goethe was looking both ways and saw that what the world needed was more light. Yes, Mr. President, more light. That is also what the grass-roots people want. They do not want our Executive or our candidates to go about spreading murkiness. They want to know the facts; they want to become acquainted with the light.

I respectfully submit, therefore, that when the voters go to their voting booths on November 2, 1948, they should cast their ballot for a Republican President, for Republican Senators, and Republican Representatives. Where they feel that they cannot vote the straight party ticket, because there are some individuals in the Democratic Party who merit their support, I fully respect their judgment. But I do feel that it is the Republican Party to which the Nation must look for the vision and leadership that is so necessary during these chaotic and confused times, but also glorious times.

It is time for a change, Mr. President. It is time for GOP leadership of the national administration and for continued GOP guidance at the helm of Congress.

America must disenthrall itself from the Democratic clutch. We must think anew and act anew, as Lincoln advised us.

The choice is before us, freedom under Republicans or regimentation under Democrats; economy or extravagance; merit or spoils; constitutional Americanism or alien collectivism.

I am sure America will make the correct choice.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the pending bill will be returned to the Calendar and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 1673, House bill 6481, the Government corporations appropriations bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it has become very clear that there will not be time at this session of Congress for favorable action on Senate Joint Resolution 200, which is a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment so that in electing a President and Vice President the electoral votes shall be counted in proportion to the popular vote. This proposal has been unanimously reported by the Judiciary Committees of both Houses of Congress, and is an extremely meritorious legislative proposal. It would prevent such a situation as has arisen three times in our history, when the candidate who received the largest popular vote was not elected.

Mr. President, if we shall return after the session on Saturday, I serve notice now that I shall attempt to bring the joint resolution up. In any case, I shall renew my effort to get it before the Congress at the next regular session.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret very much to hear the Senator from Massachusetts state that he does not think the joint resolution can be considered at this session. I know of no more important legislative proposal, and I hope the circumstances will permit the Senate to consider the joint resolution at an early date.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator. I am glad he feels as he has stated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD several articles and editorials which have been printed in support of this very important reform, an editorial from the Recorder-Gazette, of Greenfield, Mass., an editorial from the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, one from the Lawrence (Mass.) Tribune, an article by Blair Moody from the Boston Globe, an editorial from the Jamestown Shopping

Guide, of Jamestown, N. Y., and an article from the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder-Gazette of May 4, 1948]

"ELECTION MACHINERY"

The 1948 campaign will decide who will be President of the United States for the next 4 years. It also has provided impetus to make drastic changes in both Federal and State election machinery The Federal change would increase the degree of democracy; the State would reduce it. However, those values are not the measure of Government efficiency or effectiveness under the two proposals.

The State proposal is to end direct Presidential primaries and to return to the convention system of electing delegates to the national-party conventions, as was done prior to 1912. Theoretically, the direct primary gives the people direct and decisive voice on who shall rule them. It might be actually so if, as in some States, delegates ran pledged to specific candidates or if they were bound to follow an order of preference expressed by the voters.

Under the Bay State system the direct primary has been a farce. The legislature would not permit voters to express a choice for President. Such delegate contests as appeared reflected local political rivalries rather than national issues. So the great majority of voters, and even of those enrolled in parties, stayed away from the polls.

Ever, in a three-way contest for delegates at large, as the Democrats had this year, there was not even a suggestion of nominating anyone other than President Truman. The convention system is at least inexpensive to the taxpayers, even if it reflects no more of the people's choice. It would be interesting to know, incidentally, if Mayor James M. Curley (seeking his first political post since his liberation from jail) would have placed second on the slate from a Democratic State convention as he did in the direct primary.

The Federal change, if effected, would be vastly more important. It would end the solid South. It would end such landslides as swept Hoover and F. D. Roosevelt (among others) into the White House.

Now a State's representation (proportionate to the number of its registered voters) in the electoral college is bound to vote for the man who attains a majority of the popular vote, even if the majority consists of a single vote in a million ballots. The decision has never been so close, but 40 or more electoral votes have several times been delivered by popular majorities of only a few thousand.

It is now proposed that the electoral vote of each State be counted for candidates in the proportion of the popular vote they receive. A bill to accomplish this has been approved by the House Judiciary Committee and is awaiting admission by the rules committee. An identical bill, submitted by Senator LODGE, was approved 6 to 1 by the Senate Judiciary Committee yesterday, and LODGE is pressing the Republican policy committee for early floor action. But even if Congress approves, it must be ratified by 36 States.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of May 24, 1948]

"ELECTORAL REFORM"

Thus far the opponents of Senator LODGE's plan for reforming the Electoral College have not produced any weighty arguments against it. Under his proposal, the electoral votes of a State would no longer be cast as a unit; instead, they would be divided in proportion to the popular votes. This has caused alarm among the advocates of so-called State sovereignty. They argue that a State ought not to be compelled to split its electoral votes; that it ought to give them all to one party if it wants to do so.

That, however, is not really an appeal for State authority. The voters in a State are not worried about its "sovereignty" in regard to Presidential elections. They are thinking in terms of advantage for their own political parties. A Democrat is not going to burst with State pride because all of the electoral votes of his State go to a Republican nominee even if the popular majority in favor of the Republicans is very small.

Further, our party system has turned our Presidential electors into mere party agents or rubber stamps. Thus there is a wide gap between theory and practice, and this gap ought to be closed.

Full debate may show the need of some changes in the Lodge plan itself. But Americans have long been too complacent about electing their Presidents by one method while solemnly pretending to do it by another.

[From the Lawrence (Mass.) Tribune of May 18, 1948]

PRACTICABLE SUGGESTIONS

In the past year, Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts, has taken leadership in two moves of outstanding importance in connection with the office of President of the United States that unquestionably appeal to innumerable Americans regardless of the political parties to which they belong. They seem so sound and sensible as to merit substantial support.

Under the provisions of the Constitution, all the electoral votes of a State are credited to the candidate whose electors get the largest number of votes at the polls on the day of the Presidential election, no matter how small their winning margin may be. The minority of the electorate that barely loses gets no credit whatever for its vote and that definitely does not seem fair. Senator LODGE has a bill before Congress to correct that condition by dividing the electoral vote of a State proportionately on the same basis as the popular vote is cast and that seems sound and just. The measure has a long way to go, because if approved by Congress it would have to be submitted to the legislatures of the various States for action as an amendment to the Constitution. The proposal merits acceptance, however, and ultimately should be accorded the approval it deserves.

A special commission led by ex-President Herbert Hoover is making a study of the possible reorganization of the executive branch of the Government and Senator LODGE has called its attention to the fact that while the Constitution clearly and efficiently outlines the procedure to be followed in the event of the death of a President, there is nothing there regarding the course to be taken if the President is incapacitated by illness. He urged the Commission to study this serious situation most carefully and make a recommendation for its correction.

Although the Bay State Senator cited the poor health of the late Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt toward the end of their final terms of office to support his contention, the case of the former probably provided the strongest argument for specific procedure under such circumstances. In the closing months of his administration, President Wilson made no public appearances for a prolonged period and was kept closely guarded in such complete seclusion that even delegations from Congress were unable to get any information to support or refute prevailing rumors regarding the serious nature of his illness. A situation of that sort is much too dangerous to the best interests of the United States and its people to be risked indefinitely. Most Americans will agree that official procedure should be established to enable Congress to determine if or when a President is physically incapable of performing the duties of his office and then to follow the course of action prescribed by law.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Globe of May 9, 1948]

NEW SYSTEM OF ELECTING PRESIDENT GAINS MOMENTUM

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, May 8.—A proposal for drastic and fundamental reform of the system of electing the President of the United States, is gaining momentum in Congress as the possibility of a 1948 electoral college mess begins to take shape.

Judiciary Committees of both Senate and House have now reported favorably a revolutionary constitutional amendment on which Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., Republican, of Massachusetts, and several House colleagues have been quietly plugging for several months.

This scheme would wipe out the system under which all the electoral votes of a State are plunked for the candidate who wins the State, however narrow his margin.

Instead, an automatic system of splitting the electoral vote of each State, in proportion to the actual popular vote cast, would be substituted. It would be tantamount to a direct popular election of President, but retain the electoral-vote device as a protection against a situation, where fraud in one State nullified honest votes in other States.

The whole system of adding up the votes that actually elect a President would be changed. The electoral college itself would be abolished. There would be no opportunity for an "elector" to cast the votes of several hundred thousand people according to his individual whim.

Here is how the change would work:

In 1944, Michigan cast slightly over 2,200,000 votes for President, with Roosevelt getting 22,000 more votes than Dewey. In electoral college, Roosevelt got 19 votes, Dewey none.

Under the Lodge amendment, Roosevelt would have won 9536 votes from Michigan, Dewey 9343.

Massachusetts cast about 2,000,000 votes giving Roosevelt a margin of 114,000. Instead of all 16 Bay State votes going to F. D. R., Lodge would have split them 8448 to 7618.

The 1944 nation-wide vote was 25,602,505 for Roosevelt, 22,006,278 for Dewey. The electoral vote was 432 to 99.

The new scheme would have made the electoral vote exactly in proportion to the popular vote—300,726 for Roosevelt and 223,529 for Dewey.

CITE ALABAMA ELECTION

The Senate Committee acted following this week's election in Alabama, where 11 Democratic Presidential electors were chosen who, had pledged themselves to vote against President Truman or any other "civil rights" nominee.

If this pattern is followed in other Southern States, as expected, there is strong prospect that the Democrats will lose 60 electoral votes which otherwise they would surely get under the South's one-party system.

In a close election, this could take the election out of the hands of the people entirely and throw it into the hands of the House of Representatives. The electoral college chooses the President only if it casts a majority for one man.

Few observers think this will happen this year because of the anticipated Republican Presidential victory. To vitiate the popular election, Mr. Truman would have to carry the country by a margin less than the total

electoral votes of which rebel electors were depriving him.

Only if the President reversed all the forecasts through an uexpected show of strength or the nomination of a GOP candidate the people would not accept could this situation develop this year.

PRIED OUT OF COMMITTEE

But the Alabama high light of the antiquated electoral system gave Lodge his opportunity not alone to pry his amendment out of the Senate Judiciary Committee, but to get a promise of serious consideration from the GOP Senate Policy Committee. Representatives GOSSETT, Democrat of Texas and LEA, Democrat of California had already obtained a unanimous vote from the Judiciary Committee.

LODGE argues his amendment will not only assure the people's votes of being counted as they are cast, but would eliminate many evils long considered inherent in our political "game," which in fact are based on the system itself.

It would, for example, end the balance-of-power system in which a narrow margin of votes in a big State can mean more in an election than many more votes cast in less pivotal States.

LODGE says, it would also end the system under which minority votes in a State are disenfranchised. It would make a vote in a small State as potent as one in a big State. It would end the situation where Presidential candidates are drawn almost invariably from large doubtful States where their local appeal will help tip a big electoral bonus into the party basket.

It would, above all, end any danger that the candidate receiving a popular majority might be shut out in the electoral college. This happened three times in our history—when John Quincy Adams was counted in over Jackson in 1824, Hayes over Tilden in 1876, and Harrison over Cleveland in 1888.

RANKIN AGAINST IT

No one of influence in Congress has come out against the Lodge-Gossett proposal, its most easily audible opponent being Representative JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi. Several Republican leaders, however, are looking on it with skepticism.

Senator TAFT and House Majority Leader HALLECK suspect it might have an adverse effect on the Republican Party, since big Northern States would ordinarily split their electoral votes almost evenly while Southern States ordinarily cast an overwhelming vote for the Democratic candidate.

LODGE is endeavoring to lift consideration above the partisan level. He suggests to his party leaders, whose support is needed to pass the measure, that while Texas would cast a more lopsided electoral vote than New York, and South Carolina than Massachusetts, a system of making every vote count might ultimately smash the one-party system in both heavily Democratic and heavily Republican States.

[From the Jamestown (N. Y.) Shopping Guide of May 13, 1948]

"REAL DEMOCRACY AT HOME"

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, has returned from the wars overseas to his own private war to do away with the electoral college and let total majority votes do the electing of President and Vice President. Such a change, of course, would require a constitutional amendment, and up to now it has been thought impossible to get an amendment ratified, because all or most of the small States would refuse. Their argument would be that since each has as many electors as it has Senators and Representatives, each small State, which has just as many Senators as each large State, really has more votes in the college in proportion to population than a larger State.

There is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary a joint resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution so that in future Presidential elections the electoral votes of the States shall be counted in proportion to the popular vote. That will remedy one of the most serious defects in our present system of electing a President.

It would make the popular vote decisive. In the 1944 Presidential election Governor Dewey carried Ohio. He received 1,582,293 votes. President Roosevelt received 1,570,763 votes. That was a difference of only 11,530 votes. Yet Governor Dewey chalked up all of Ohio's electors. In other words, 11,530 voters determined the election so far as Ohio was concerned, and more than one and one-half million Democratic voters were in effect disfranchised.

If 2,000,000 people in New York State vote for one candidate for President, and 2,000,500 vote for another man, there is no reason why 500 votes should swing the whole 2,000,000 votes to the other man. But that is the way it now stands, and it is high time to change it, since we are out to wet nurse the world on democratic breakfast food.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of June 5, 1948]

IMAGINE! REAL GOP VOTES CAST IN THE SOLID SOUTH!

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, June 4.—Picture the Republican nominee for President of the United States campaigning for electoral votes in deepest Alabama and Mississippi—and getting them.

Picture his Democratic opponent confidently stumping Maine and Verment for votes in the same election race—and getting them.

Picture Negroes voting in large numbers in the South—and their votes counting.

Picture it, because it can happen here—and because the chances are better than you think of its happenings in the next few years.

Senate Joint Resolution 200 is the little known piece of legislation which would break down once and for all the solid South and the one-party monopoly States of the North.

It actually has gotten as far as approval by the Senate Judiciary Committee, while a companion measure has been approved by the House Judiciary Committee. Its sponsor is Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts.

The legislation will get no further this time but maybe next year, in the Eighty-first Congress, it will catch fire and roll through to passage. Sentiment for it has been growing strongly in Congress, even among, southern Democrats.

In a Presidential election year, Senate Joint Resolution 200 is a mighty interesting piece of legislation. It proposes a constitutional amendment to wipe out the archaic electoral college system, which today is no more use to the body politic than an appendix is to the human body.

Unlike other proposed repealers of recent years, the resolution would not wipe out the 531 electoral votes and throw the election open on a national across-the-board basis, depending upon the total popular vote. (That proposal would never get anywhere because the small States say they would lose their importance completely.)

Here is what it would do:

It would continue the present 531 electoral votes. They would be divided among the States as at present—one for each Member of the House and one for each Member of the Senate from the State.

But they would be divided proportionately depending upon the division of the popular vote among the candidates. In 1944, for example, Pennsylvania cast 1,940,479 votes for Franklin D. Roosevelt. It cast 1,835,048 votes for Thomas E. Dewey. Yet all of Pennsylvania's 35 electoral votes were given to Roosevelt. But in the State of South Dakota, in which he received 135,265 votes, Dewey got the 4 electoral votes. Thus, Dewey got more electoral votes in South Dakota than he received in Pennsylvania which gave him about twelve times as many popular votes.

Under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 200, the 35 Pennsylvania votes would be divided as follows: Roosevelt, 17,897 electoral votes; Dewey, 16,924 electoral votes. In South Dakota, on the basis of the vote cast, Dewey would have received only 2,333 electoral votes; Roosevelt would have received 1,666.

All of these votes from all the States would be added together. The winner would be the man with the most.

Go back to 1944 again. Nation-wide, Roosevelt received 25,602,505 popular votes which brought him 432 electoral votes. Dewey, with 22,006,278 popular votes, received only 99 electoral votes.

Under Senate Joint Resolution 200—carrying through the State by State break-down—Roosevelt would have gotten 300,726 electoral votes. Dewey's share would have been 223,529. The small discrepancy between these figures and 531 total is taken up by the small third party votes.

Here is what would happen in the South. Whether Mississippi cast 250,000 popular votes in a general election for President or only 60,000, it would still have the same number of electoral votes—nine.

But for the first time since it became a one-party State all of whose fights are settled in the primary, there would be real incentive to turn out a big vote in the general election. The moribund Republican Party of the State would come alive. Even though its vote were small, it would count for something toward the total electoral votes of the Republican nominee. And, in order to keep the Democratic ratio very large, the Democrats in their turn would turn out a bigger vote.

The same would be true in all the other Dixie States. And the Democrats there who have fought to keep Negroes out of the Democratic primaries would watch Southern Negroes march to the polls in the general election to vote the Republican ticket—knowing that every vote so cast would help the GOP nominee. Southern Democrats favor the plan, too. They say their party would no longer take them for granted, but would have to woo them.

Of course, in solidly Republican Maine and Vermont, the reverse would be true, with the Democrats the gainers.

Hence, for the first time, everybody's vote would count. No territory would be sure territory. Candidates would pursue voters in places where the nominees have never bothered to go before.

Democracy would really be in action in our Presidential elections.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1274. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Wilkinson County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins;

S. 1275. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Warren County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans;

S. 1303. An act for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson;

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Hou Chung Chay;

S. 1469. An act for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu; and

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6556 to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to each of the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation; and

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JENSEN, Mr. FENTON, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. NORRELL, and Mr. GORE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 4663. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the middle district of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners of the fee-simple titles and leasehold interests in lands leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Georgia, for the use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga.;

H. R. 5524. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6716. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California; and

H. R. 6726. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I understand that the Senate is now considering the committee amendment to House bill 6481, which is in effect an amendment to increase by $4,000,000 the appropriation in the bill so as to provide for the construction of one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. Am I correct in my understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 7, after the word "vehicles," it is proposed to strike out "$27,389,061", and insert in lieu thereof "$30,972,061."

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, when the Tennessee Valley Authority was created in 1933 it was established to improved the navigability and to provide for the flood control of the Tennessee River, to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley, to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of said valley, to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes.

The President's budget message for the fiscal year 1948 contains language summarizing the specific congressional authority granted to the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I read from that message:

To accomplish these purposes the corporation was specifically authorized to construct such dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee River and its tributaries as will provide and maintain a 9-foot channel in the river from Knoxville to its mouth, and will best serve to promote navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and control destructive flood waters in the Tennessee and Mississippi drainage basins.

Then the statement goes on further to say:

Insofar as may be consistent with these navigation and flood-control objectives, it was directed to provide and operate facilities for the generation and sale of electric energy.

In other words, at all times the generation of electric energy as a result of this great public work was of a secondary and incidental consideration.

I would be the last one to say that in a development so gigantic as this we should not use every advantage we can obtain from it. In other words, when the Federal Government enters upon the task of developing a great natural resource it seems to me altogether proper that we should develop that resource to the ultimate use to which it can be put, that is, as a natural resource.

In this particular situation—and there are many others like it throughout the United States—there are natural resources which cannot be developed by private capital, which cannot be developed in any other way than by the Government stepping in and providing funds for the development. That was done in the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, my objection to the committee amendment is based upon the fundamental proposition that it is now proposed by the amendment to go further than was ever originally intended. It seems to me that we have reached the place where we must make a very important decision in the matter of policy. It is perfectly proper for the Federal Government to develop the Nation's natural resources and use them to their utmost advantage. But the proposition now appears to be this: There is in prospect the probability that there will be a demand for electric power over and beyond what can be provided as originally intended in the act. There is in prospect a demand for more than the ordinary and proper development by the Government of these natural resources, can provide. It was essentially considered that the hydroelectric energy generated would be developed exclusively and entirely as a result of the construction of the various dams and the improvement of the rivers; but now it is proposed to go a step further. It is proposed to take the step of supplementing with steam plants, built at Government expense, the deficiencies in the water-power potential.

The result of such a policy is bound to be that the Government having undertaken to develop a natural resource when it is found that the cheaper power provided is in great demand, and that the demand exceeds the potential of the hydroelectric development, the Government will then take Federal funds and proceed to tax all the taxpayers in the United States in order that the companies which are attracted to the Tennessee Valley by cheap power may enjoy the subsidy of cheaper power.

It seems to me that that is a very marked departure from what was the original intention. It is a marked departure from the apparent and announced purpose of the act in all the years from the time the enterprise was first conceived up until now. It puts the Government into the field of supplying public power, no matter how it may be supplied, whether by the development of a natural resource or by the development of a steam plant at tremendous expense.

This is only an initial appropriation of $4,000,000. I understand that the total will reach an additional $54,000,000 for the steam plant. So eventually we shall have invested there a very substantial sum.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. In addition to the $54,000,000, does not the project involve

an expense of many million dollars more, which would bring the total up to approximately $85,000,000?

Mr. FERGUSON. $84,000,000.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I am thoroughly in accord with what the Senator from Connecticut is saying. I am not against this appropriation because I believe that some other part of the country ought to have it instead of Tennessee. I would not be standing here on that basis. There may be a good argument on that basis; but I am against the proposal as being a fundamental invasion of the private enterprise system of the United States. To me it means the very thing which Chief Justice John Marshall had in mind when he said that the power to tax is the power to destroy. I think that is what the Senator from Connecticut is talking about. If we can tax the people all over the United States and put the Government in business in one section with that tax money, and putting it in business in that section interferes with the free competitive enterprise system, we are getting away from what made America. Is that what the Senator had in mind?

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator for his comment. This is a deliberate step in that direction.

The proponents of this measure say that those who oppose it are protecting the power interests. But the issue goes a good deal further than that. It goes to the extent of providing cheaper-power subsidies at the expense of the Federal taxpayers, subsidies which I believe will have the effect of taking industries from other parts of the country and moving them to this particular area.

It appears from the record in this particular case that the demand for power in this area, so far as industrial use is concerned, is not a demand from a great many small industries. It is a demand from several large industries which have gone there.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Last night I had in mind a point which I did not have an opportunity to bring up. I believe that the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], a very dear friend of mine, stated that the TVA power had not attracted any new industry. He asked anyone to name the new industries which had been attracted.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to the fact that even if it did not attract any new industry, but made the industries which are there grow and develop at the expense of other industries in competition with them in other parts of the Nation because the industries in the favored section obtained power more cheaply than anyone could furnish it at any other point in the United States because of the use of the taxpayers' money in producing power at a cheaper cost, that would not change my position.

No one in the world knows exactly what the cost is. I have heard the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] argue that the books and accounting records did not tell us what the cost of the power was in the TVA. I have heard him argue that point time and again.

So I say that in justice to the rest of the Nation, we should support what I believe is the foundation upon which the whole country rests, the protection of the right of the private individual to invest his funds in private business and serve the people in competition with other private individuals, rather than in competition with the Government, which takes tax money out of the pockets of the people through the power to tax. That is the thing which the Senator and I must protect if we are to preserve the American system, the greatest system in the world, to which system th whole world has come twice in the past 25 years for relief from slavery.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator is correct, and I thank him for his comment.

Mr. President, I was saying that those who propose this amendment, and those who object to the position which the junior Senator from Connecticut has taken, are prone to cry that we are trying to protect the power interests.

The issue goes much deeper than that. We are not primarily concerned in protecting the power interests of our State or any other. They have done a great job for the economy of the country. They have been well able to take care of themselves. What I am primarily interested in is this: If the industries in any section of the country—in Connecticut, other States of New England, the Northwest, or any other part of the country—are attracted away from those areas by cheap subsidized power in any other part of the country, then the people in the territories from which those industries are withdrawn, or in the territories to which no new industries come, will be without employment. In my own State we are now faced with the prospect in my home town of the removal of a large industry to another part of the United States. We recognize that because of the nature of this industry and its requirements, it probably will have to go to some other part of the country as a matter of policy. But the result will be to leave 7,500 people in that small community without employment which many of them have been accustomed to have over a period of 20 years. So many of those people will be out of work; they will lose their jobs, or else they will have to pull up their roots and move to some other part of the country.

I am primarily interested in that phase of the matter, Mr. President.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. From what I heard the Senator say last night, and also from what he has said today, I believe he is no more interested in protecting the private power industry per se than I am. The Senator from Connecticut wishes to see the power industry, as a part of the American free enterprise system, get a square deal.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. And the Senator wishes to see the people generally get a square deal, by not having taxes taken from all over the Nation and used in only one locality in a way that is opposed to the people's fundamental interests.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. I agree with the Senator as to that. I hold no more brief for that industry than I do for any other segment of the economy of the United States.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey is correct. The private power companies employ hundreds of thousands of people, and they represent the investments of literally millions of people.

So we have great conflicting interests here. When the Government steps in, as is proposed to be done in this case, under the guise of developing a natural resource, and then after that development is made, proposes to subsidize something really incidental to the development of that natural resource, the Government is going too far.

There is no more reason why this amendment to make an appropriation for a steam plant in Tennessee should be made than there is that the Congress should enact a bill providing an appropriation for a steam plant in any other part of the United States where additional power is needed; and there are other sections of the United States where the power load now is too heavy for the facilities at present provided.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that his observation, which has been repeated several times, that there is a possibility that industry will be drawn from other sections of the United States into the Tennessee Valley is, I think, based upon an improper predicate, because of the fact that, as I am advised, there is nothing on which he can base such a statement. I inquired rather carefully whether the presence of cheap power, as we call it, in the Tennessee Valley, by reason of the TVA, had attracted outside industries; and I was advised that that had not occurred.

As has been pointed out by the Senator from New Jersey, no doubt there has been some growth of industry in the valley by reason of the establishment of new industries, starting from scratch, so to speak. The Senator has pointed to that several times. I agree with the Senator that I do not wish to see the United States Government indulge in any activity which will give any section of the United States an undue and improper advantage over any other section. But I do not believe that will be the case in this instance.

Mr. President, for the past 25 or 30 years, and, indeed until the advent of World War II, it has been historically true that in the part of the Southland now served by the TVA, and also in other sections of the South, the youth of our land have been attracted to the large, highly-industrialized centers of the East. They have gone there by the hundreds of thousands. Those whom we had hoped would be our future citizens, those whom we had hoped would build our communities in the years ahead, have left our part of the country, and have gone to the industrialized sections of the East, because in those highly industrialized sections, employment existed in

a manner and to an extent not common in the South.

In the South we have come up from an utterly impoverished state to a sort of mediocre industrial activity, and now we are beginning to taste just a little of the better things related to industries. But for 25 or 30 years we saw the youth of the South, both white and black, go to the industrial centers of the East, because of the fact that sufficient industrial employment was not available in the South.

I wish to state one of the reasons for that situation, and it is one of the inequalities which has existed for 25 years. I have fought it with all the power and ability at my command, and many others have fought equally hard to have that situation corrected. Today we are just beginning to see it corrected. I refer to the inequality of the freight rates in the South and Southeast and in the area generally south of the Ohio River. We paid a freight rate on manufactured goods approximately 30 or 40 percent higher than the rates paid in the industrial East. In other words, in Chicago there is a great market for shoes and in New York there is a great market for shoes, because there are more people there. However, a shoe factory in Nashville, Tenn., could not sell to the people in those areas in competition with a factory located in Ohio or in a place as far from that market as Ohio is, for the freight charges from Nashville were approximately 30 percent more on that manufactured article. That was an unfair condition. It was a subsidy to the manufacturers in the industrial East.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. That has been corrected; has it not?

Mr. STEWART. It is in the process of correction, and I understand from the Interstate Commerce Commission that possibly 60 to 70 percent of that condition has already been corrected.

I prefaced my remarks with the statement that I do not believe in subsidies and I do not believe in one section of the United States being given by its Government an unfair advantage over another section. Of course, we are certainly entitled to take advantage of natural conditions which exist.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Tennessee that I have no objection whatever to having the Government take advantage of natural conditions which exist, and the Government already has taken advantage of the natural conditions which exist there, to the tune of millions upon millions of dollars. What I do object to is having Federal funds used to add artificial, mechanical means to supplement the natural ones; and that is what this proposal is.

If we adopt this policy in connection with the development of every natural resource, eventually we shall supplement our natural resources with artificial, mechanical supplementation, until finally we shall have made that which was at first incidental of primary importance and have completely subsidized the power business in the United States.

If we wish to do that as a matter of policy, of course, it can be done; but I wish to point out to the Senate that that is the direction in which we are about to set out, under the provisions of this amendment.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Connecticut that I do not seek any unfair or unjust advantage at all. I do not wish to have the Government subsidize the power interests in that valley.

In order that we may find a common ground on which to stand, let me ask this question of the Senator: He agrees, does he not, that there is proper justification for the improvement of the valley by the building of these dams?

Mr. BALDWIN. I absolutely do.

Mr. STEWART. They are built, of course, for multiple purposes—for flood control and navigation; and, as the Senator pointed out a moment ago, power is incidental.

Then it seems to me that the Government and the people are entitled to have manufactured at those dams such amounts of electrical power as can be manufactured by the hydroelectric elements there.

Mr. BALDWIN. I agree as to that.

Mr. STEWART. Suppose in normal times, by the erection of these dams, we can supply 18,000,000,000 kilowatts, or whatever the number might be, of power; but suppose a drought comes along and cuts down to 15,000,000,000 kilowatts the amount of power which can be generated. That makes for an uneconomical condition; does it not?

Mr. BALDWIN. As I read the charts which were submitted at the hearing, there is yet a tremendous margin of possibility for the development of the hydroelectric potential there. I would say that if we have to have more development of a hydroelectric nature there, let us have it along those lines, but let us not step in with a steam plant to supplement it.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, last night it was suggested that in order to make an economic balance—I believe that is the way it was expressed—the relation of steam power to hydroelectric power should be about 25 percent, in order to come out on the proposition and make it economically practical. At least that is the way businessmen figure it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Exactly. Now, let the businessmen treat it that way. Let it be dealt with that way, because we went into this undertaking, not primarily for the purpose of developing hydroelectric energy; we went into it primarily for the purpose of a navigation program, of a flood-control program, and things of that kind. Those were the primary purposes of the project.

Mr. STEWART. But it has become a business, and we are now confronted with the proposition of only 17 percent steam power, and with the completion of other dams, I am advised this morning it will be cut down to about 12 or 13 percent.

Mr. BALDWIN. I understand there is a steam plant down there now standing idle. It could be very well used.

Mr. STEWART. Yes. That was brought out I understand. I endeavored to find that testimony, but the Senate was about to adjourn at that time, and I did not inject myself into the argument because I was not sure about it. That is an old antiquated steam plant which would not produce enough electricity to burn half a dozen old Mazda bulbs, speaking figuratively. It is at Memphis, practically ready to be dismantled. Sixty percent of its output, at the least, I believe, was sold to the electric power company in Arkansas, and I think it has about 40 percent more, but it is not practical to use that plant at all. It is an out-of-date plant located in the heart of the city of Memphis. It could not be expanded. It would not be practical to use it, and I do not think it ought to play any part in the consideration of this suggestion at all, because it could not generate enough electricity even to begin to relieve the situation. The TVA is getting 20 percent of its capacity now.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, to finish my statement in connection with this subject, I should first like to have the correct figures in the RECORD as to the amount of money it would cost. The appropriation is $4,000,000. The total ultimate cost is estimated at approximately $84,000,000. The justification offered for the construction of such a generating plant, as testified in the hearings by the chairman of the TVA, is based upon alleged obligations of the TVA to supply all power demands no matter how great, of the Tennessee Valley area. There is where we have got to make a decision, Mr. President. Are we going to invest Federal funds to furnish all the power for the Tennessee Valley, no matter how great the demand for it may be?

The testimony of the officials of the TVA further indicates that the Authority recognizes that although substantial additional power can be generated by the installation of new hydro generators, it is approaching the limit of the amount of electricity which can be generated by water power harnessed primarily for purposes of flood control and navigation. Therefore, Mr. President, the original purpose, the original intention for which millions of dollars of Federal funds have been poured into this Authority, is going to be changed, it is going to be diverted, it is going to be enlarged. It is something else than we intended originally it would be.

The proposal to construct this steam plant is based upon the recognition of these two factors, and is intended to provide additional generating capacity to meet the currently estimated requirements of the foreseeable future for electric power in the Tennessee Valley area.

That last paragraph I read directly from the House committee report.

It was originally contemplated that the electric energy generated here would be sold to municipalities and private users and people who were listed as preferred customers, and I think, Mr. President, that is a perfectly laudable thing in the development of a natural resource of this kind.

The point I make is that the reason why the present capacity is overloaded now is because of some big industries that are going there and some other big industries that may very well be attracted there, that will leave people in other parts of the country without employment or else require them to move into this section of the country and compete for jobs with the people already there.

The report goes on to state:

There is no necessity whatsoever for the installation now or in the foreseeable future of the proposed steam plant so far as the preferred class of customers is concerned.

Reading still further from the report:

In fact, at the present time less than a third of the power generated by TVA is used by the preferred customers. The balance is sold to industrial users and private public utility companies, including such companies as the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., Victor Chemical Works, Reynolds Metal Co., etc.

Mr. President, I strenuously object to taking money from the taxpayers in other parts of the country, particularly from my own New England, and my own Connecticut, to subsidize power to be sold at cheap rates to these tremendously large corporations, and that is why I am speaking in opposition to the provision in the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. COOPER, Mr. McKELLAR, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. If I may say to the Senator from Michigan, I should like to be permitted merely to finish my remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield at this time?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Connecticut does not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor, and he has yielded to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator evidently did not hear the testimony taken in this very case. The statement was made time and time again that we would take into the Valley business and industries from other parts of the country. Then the witnesses would be asked the question, "Whom do you know that has gone from your State or from anywhere else down to the Tennessee Valley? Who is it? What business has been lost to your part of the country? Can you name a single one?" Without exception, and I ask those who are on the committee to confirm what I say—the witnesses replied they did not know of a single concern that had moved to the Tennessee Valley from another part of the country. The Senator from Connecticut is mistaken in his facts. The testimony is not that way. The testimony is the other way.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator for his comment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I know the Senator from Connecticut wants to make a speech, and I hesitate to transgress, but the Senator is reading a report from the House committee, which report I very earnestly submit was based on misinformation, on untruths and half-truths submitted by the power companies through their representatives here in Washington, Mr. Purcell Smith, and others. Mr. Smith, himself, in a meeting of the Senate committee, with the charts and graphs which he had presented to the House committee, and which he brought to the Senate committee, admitted they were not true, were not accurate. On page 269 of the hearings, the Senator will find that admitted when I asked Mr. Smith some questions. I merely want to read this question, addressed to Mr. Smith:

Senator HILL. Then the truth is these graphs that you have here really—may not be your fault—but they do not present a true picture, do they?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly not.

I suggest to the Senator that he, in my time, analyze the graphs and charts presented by the power people. He will then see wherein they are misleading, wherein they are not true, wherein they are false. I submit that the report from which the Senator is now reading was based upon those misleading and untrue charts, and, therefore, the report is not a correct report, because it is based on incorrect information.

Mr. BALDWIN. What is right and what is wrong is often a matter of opinion, but the fundamental fact remains, Mr. President, that when at the expense of customers who pay the rates and stockholders who advance the money and others who are willing to invest in the enterprise, all the facilities have to be built by private means in one part of the country, and then like facilities are constructed out of public tax funds in some other part of the country, the price of the power which is generated by the investment of public funds is bound to be cheaper. It is just as simple as that. That is exactly the direction in which we are moving here. We are moving in the direction of subsidizing power. If we want to do that, it is a matter of policy. We can do it, but we should know what we are doing before we undertake it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I always have great admiration for the logic Senator, but in this instance I submit that his argument is based upon a misapprehension and an unjustified assumption. He assumes that Congress is being asked to appropriate money to build this plant solely for the purpose of supplying anticipated demands in the Tennessee Valley. I know the Senator is a good lawyer, and I want to ask him if it is not true that Congress has authority to appropriate money to build this plant if its construction is necessary to balance and firm the power generated by the dams in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. BALDWIN. I think the Government has the power to spend the taxpayers' money for any reasonable public purpose. The question with which we are concerned is not a question of legal power. I am not attacking this amendment on the ground of constitutionality, but on the ground of national policy. I say that when we subsidize power in one part of the country, eventually we shall retard the development of other parts of the country where the people generate their own power and its generation is not supported by Federal funds.

Mr. COOPER. I address the Senator now upon the question of policy. Would the Senator say that it is good policy to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to construct dams and to develop hydroelectric power, and yet to deny it the authority to construct sufficient steam plants to firm and sell efficiently the power developed at the dams?

Mr. BALDWIN. I would say that when the Federal Government embarks upon the appropriation of millions of dollars for the ostensible purpose of flood control, improvement of navigation, and incidentally supplying hydroelectric power to municipalities and private owners, and then embarks upon another tremendous program of constructing steam generating plants in order to supply electricity to some other part of the country, it is a marked departure from what was originally intended.

Mr. COOPER. I submit that the Senator has not answered my question. I asked the Senator if he thought it good policy to appropriate money to build dams and permit the distribution of power from the dams, and yet deny the Authority the power to build sufficient steam plants to market efficiently the power developed at the dams. I think the Senator will admit that private companies producing hydroelectric power find it necessary to build steam plants. Does the Senator think that it should not be done by the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. BALDWIN. I say, very definitely, that as a matter of policy it should not be done. The Tennessee Valley Authority started as a navigation proposition, a reforestation proposition, a flood-control proposition. The power-generating feature was incidental. If, in order to make the power element efficient, we have to appropriate Federal funds, there will be no end to it. If a steam-generating plant costing $84,000,000 will not supply sufficient power, we will have to have another $84,000,000 plant, and then another, ad infinitum, to supplement the hydroelectric development. I have no objection to a steam plant being erected, but let it be paid for in the same way it is done in other sections of the country.

Mr. COOPER. I again submit that the distinguished Senator has not answered my question. The point I am making is this: The courts and the Congress have said that money can be appropriated to build dams and that there is authority to dispose of the power developed at the dams. If there is the right to dispose of the power, there is authority to do so efficiently, and of electric energy developed there, it follows that we should appropriate sufficient

money to build such steam plants as will enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to efficiently dispose of the power. There is a distinction between my point and the statement of the Senator from Connecticut a few minutes ago.

Mr. BALDWIN. There is nothing in the bill which says that.

Mr. COOPER. The facts developed show that the steam plant is to be constructed to secure sufficient power to balance and firm the power produced at the dams. There is a great difference between such an objective and the objective of supplying large industries, which the distinguished Senator states is the purpose of the appropriation.

I desire to correct my good friend on his reference to $84,000,000 as the cost of the project. If he will study the testimony of Mr. Clapp, he will find that Mr. Clapp makes it clear that the cost of the steam plant is $54,000,000, to be expended on three sections, and that the first section to which the pending appropriation would apply will cost $22,500,000.

Mr. BALDWIN. The amount is not of primary importance; so far as the principle is concerned, it is more or less incidental. I took the figure of $84,000,000 from page 12 of the House report on the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to reply to the Senator from Kentucky. As I understand his argument, it is that if the United States Government erects in a river valley a large dam for the purpose of flood control, and there is a flood, the maximum amount of water in the dam at the peak is used as a basis for the computation, and if for 2 or 3 days power is generated at that peak, after that they are entitled to erect steam plants or other plants to generate that amount of power the remainder of the year until the next flood comes. That is exactly the argument here.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is exactly it.

Mr. COOPER. I disagree. I say there is a second question involved: Is it good policy? In the case stated by the Senator from Michigan, no one would say it is good policy to construct steam plants.

Mr. FERGUSON. In what part of the year do they generate the peak?

Mr. COOPER. In the case of TVA, we have spent millions of dollars. We have appropriated year after year money to construct dams. It is evident that the construction of this steam plant is required to balance the production of power in the valley, and it is good policy in this case.

Mr. FERGUSON. I heard the testimoney and I have read it. The testimony does not bear out that statment. The testimony is the cities intend and expect to grow in the next 2 or 3 years, and if power were generated from the steam plant it would be available for the industry that is coming in.

Mr. COOPER. I do not want to disagree with the Senator as to what he heard. I suppose it is written down in the record. I should like, however, to read what Mr. Clapp said on this point.

Mr. FERGUSON. We have had experience with Mr. Clapp's testimony. I want to relate to the Senate at this time that last year the Authority was given approximately $3,000,000 in connection with the South Holston and Wataguga Dams, and Mr. Clapp, as manager of the TVA, used the money, not on the dams, but for what he called resource development. That is shown by the official record. So the record is clear as to what they want to use the power for.

Mr. HILL rose.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to read, if the Senator will permit——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOBEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that there was a disagreement or misunderstanding between the Senate conferees and the House conferees about the expenditure of the $3,000,000, and the TVA did spend that money, as the Senator has said, but in accord with what was the view of the House conferees?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this is what happened. Mr. Clapp had some friends in the House who were favorable to it, and he went to them and got an opinion. He then went to the Bureau of the Budget and received an adverse opinion. He never came near the Senate conferees until after they discovered what he was doing, and then they called him in for an examination. That is what Mr. Clapp did. That is the way Mr. Clapp has treated the Senate of the United States.

In this connection I submit an extract from a letter from Mr. P. S. Lawton, Acting Director of the Budget, to Mr. Gordon Clapp, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACT FROM LETTER DATED OCTOBER 3, 1947, FROM BUREAU OF THE BUDGET TO MR. GORDON CLAPP

This leaves for consideration the following allocations from the new appropriations:

(a) Investigations, future projects	$299,000
(b) South Holston-Watauga Dams	2,320,000
(c) Chemical plant	3,243,000
(d) Resource development	5,490,000

The budget provided $90,000 for item (a) Investigations. The record indicates that this figure was acceptable to both House and Senate. The allocation of $299,000 to this work, despite a congressional cut of 30 percent in the total new appropriation requested for TVA would, in the absence of extraordinary justification, be at least questionable.

In justifying your budget before the Congress you urged the necessity of $5,254,000 new appropriation as an addition to $12,056,000 of carry-over funds, or a total of $17,310,000 to carry forward the work on the South Holston and Watauga Dams according to schedule in fiscal year 1948. The House, assuming a $12,056,000 carry-over, cut the new appropriation item to $3,254,000. The Senate eliminated provision of new funds for these projects. The conferees restored the $3,254,000. You have allocated $2,320,000.

Your Miss Owen informs us that while the conferees were at work on the bill she, in response to a request for the minimum sum necessary to continue the work on the two dams on schedule, gave the House Clerk serving the conferees a figure of $13,910,000. This with a carry-over allocation of $12,056,000, of which the conferees were doubtless aware, would have required new funds in the amount of $1,854,000. The conferees, nevertheless, provided $3,254,000, and the bill as enacted specifies "not to exceed" this sum for these two projects.

Miss Owen has also informed us that two minority Members of the House conferee group have assured her that it was the intention of the conference committee that, if TVA had any funds not necessary for the dam construction work, such funds could be used for resource development work and other features of the agency program. Accepting all this, the fact remains that the $18,700,000 finally appropriated included "not to exceed $3,254,000" for these projects, and there is nothing in the record to indicate that less than that sum would be necessary. In addition, you had urged, in presenting the budget to both House and Senate, that $5,254,000 would be necessary, plus carry-over, or a total of $17,310,000. Even though this entire sum were available for 1948, additional funds would be necessary for 1949, 1950, and 1951. Obviously the more done in 1948 the less needed in subsequent years.

It is, therefore, most difficult for us to find any basis for advice to anyone that less than the budgeted amount would be necessary in 1948, or for a finding by you that of the $3,254,000 earmarked for these projects in the appropriation act, any amount could be regarded as "left over" or "not necessary for 1948 construction."

The budget as submitted to Congress provided for chemical plant new money in the sum of $8,686,000. The House cut this to $6,686,000. The Senate, aware of the probability that your carry-over would be $15,000,000 instead of $12,056,000, cut this item to $8,000,000. The conferees restored it to $5,000,000 and the bill earmarked "not to exceed" $5,000,000 of the new appropriation. You have allocated $2,216,000 of carry-over plus $3,243,000 of the new appropriation, or a total of $5,459,000 to this project. This allocation is $3,227,000, or 37 percent below the budget, and $1,227,000 below the House-approved figure. Apparently there has been no statement or suggestion by anyone, except as inferred by your allocation, that your budget request of $8,686,000 did not represent the minimum necessary for 1948.

With respect to resource development, the budget provided $6,000,000. The House approved $5,500,000; the Senate, $3,000,000. The conferees' intentions with respect to this item are not entirely clear, but by eliminating the items which are not in dispute between the Houses of Congress, and considering "not to exceed" $3,254,000 earmarked for the South Holston and Watauga Dams and "not to exceed" $5,000,000 for the chemical-plant project, there would remain $3,328,000 for resource development. Your allocation is $5,490,000—within $10,000 of the House figure, $2,490,000 above the Senate figure, $2,162,000 above the conference figure indicated by the record, and only 9-plus percent below the budget figure.

Again, without questioning the statements given us of the intention of the conferees that any of the new funds appropriated found not necessary for dam construction in 1948 might be used for resource development or other features of your program, it is still contrary to all established precedent and practice to assume that the Congress, in specifying "not to exceed" $3,254,000 of the new appropriation for the dams and $5,000,000 for the chemical plant, entertained any feeling that these allowances were materially larger than actually necessary for the purposes stated, or that other than minor amounts would be diverted from these projects.

Quite aside from the legislative history and intent with respect to these matters, your fund allocations as they now stand bring into question the soundness of the executive

budgetary process. This is illustrated by the fact that in applying the congressional cut in new appropriation proposed, the great burden of that cut is placed upon the dams and chemical plant for which additional money must sooner or later be provided, while resource development, and administratively controllable activity, is reduced but slightly, and the allocations for investigations, similarly controllable, is more than triple the amount contemplated by the budget transmitted by the President to Congress.

In view of the President's budget recommendations and the subsequent action by the Congress, it appears that the $3,254,000 maximum specified in the appropriation act for the South Holston and Watauga Dams, and the $5,000,000 similarly earmarked for the chemical plant would be required to meet the minimum needs of these projects either this year or in 1949 and, therefore, should be so applied. If circumstances have arisen which now make it impracticable to proceed with these projects at the rate which these sums make possible, the unusable portions of the funds appropriated for these projects should be placed in budget reserve, at least until your 1949 budget estimates have been reviewed here. It is requested, therefore, that the Form 1 given temporary approval last month be reconsidered by you; that the underlying fund allocations be appropriately adjusted, and that a Form 2 be submitted to modify the existing apportionment and reserve pattern. We should also appreciate your furnishing a revised supplemental statement of your fund allocations.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
Acting Director.

HON. GORDON R. CLAPP,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
Tennessee Valley Authority,
Knoxville, Tenn.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Michigan yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Clapp went to the chairman of the House subcommittee, Representative PLOESER, on this matter, and got the understanding from Representative PLOESER that the money could be expended just as TVA did expend it. There was some misunderstanding, I understand, between the House conferees and the Senate conferees, and Mr. Clapp did go to Representative PLOESER, the chairman of the House conferees.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the situation was as it is claimed it was, that it was necessary to get more power to firm up the hydroelectric power, then why did Mr. Clapp get an appropriation of some $3,000,000, and not use it in the construction of dams, from which he could have obtained hydroelectric power, but use it on resource development? They would not need this power until about 1949, 1950, 1951, or 1952. They did not ask for the money last year to start this steam-power plant, because they did not need it. They did not need it, as shown by the fact that they did not use the money on the Holston and the other dams. No; Mr. Clapp wants an empire of his own, and when it comes down to the record, the record speaks volumes as to what Mr. Clapp has been doing.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. In drawing my already overly extended remarks to a close, there are just two things I should like to add. I should like to read briefly from a letter which was written by the Connecticut Development Commission, through its chairman, Mr. Willard B. Rogers, to Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER, chairman of the subcommittee in the House, in charge of the hearing on this appropriation bill. He said:

The Connecticut Development Commission, whose purpose is to encourage the economic development of the State of Connecticut, is greatly concerned over the implications involved through further Federal subsidies to the Tennessee Valley Authority, such as the one now proposed involving construction of a steam-power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

We understand that the present and future shortages in power output are caused by the additional needs of large manufacturers which have been encouraged to locate in that area because of the low power rates made possible through Federal subsidies.

Then he proceeds further to say:

If it now becomes a Federal policy to subsidize steam power plants in direct competition with privately owned utilities and if the resultant lower rates are to be used as an incentive to attract industries away from present industrial regions, such as Connecticut, we feel that this is not only unfair competition to the industries now providing the bulk of the taxes—

And, I may incidentally add, the bulk of employment in our own State—

which make Federal subsidies possible but it is particularly unfair to their employees whose continued employment and wages depend upon their profitable operation.

Mr. President, I ask that this letter from the Connecticut Development Commission be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARTFORD, CONN., *April 1, 1948.*

Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Corporations,
House Appropriations Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Connecticut Development Commission, whose purpose is to encourage the economic development of the State of Connecticut, is greatly concerned over the implications involved through further Federal subsidies to the Tennessee Valley Authority, such as the one now proposed involving construction of a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

We understand that the present and future shortages in power output are caused by the additional needs of large manufacturers which have been encouraged to locate in that area because of the low power rates made possible through Federal subsidy.

It is our further understanding that such use of TVA electric power is definitely at variance with the original concepts of TVA and the act of 1933 which required TVA to give preference to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations not organized for profit.

If it now becomes the Federal policy to subsidize steam power plants in direct competition with privately owned utilities and if the resultant lower rates are to be used as an incentive to attract industries away from present industrial regions, such as Connecticut, we feel that this is not only unfair competition to the industries now providing the bulk of the taxes which make Federal subsidies possible but it is particularly unfair to their employees whose continued employment and wages depend upon their profitable operation.

If the large industrial users of that region need more power than is currently available through the hydroelectric plants operated by TVA, why is it not in the interests of national economy and fair dealing to insist that such needs be supplied by privately owned and financed enterprises rather than inflict further financial demands on an already overtaxed public?

If in the interests of national defense, as well as in the interests of maintaining a strong economy throughout the country, we feel that private enterprise and the investment of private funds should be encouraged rather than discouraged. It is our further feeling that the competitive effect in other parts of the country should be carefully weighed in each instance.

We can see no essential difference between a federally operated enterprise and a privately operated enterprise where the Government guarantees such a company against loss. Either type of operation is bound to promote inefficiency and can only be justified at a time of national emergency.

CONNECTICUT DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,
By WILLARD B. ROGERS, *Chairman.*

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, as a further evidence of how the whole conception of this Tennessee Valley Authority has changed I should like to read a brief excerpt from what is represented to be the testimony given on January 8, 1937, which appears in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals Record, the Sixth District, at the time when the constitutionality of the TVA Act was being challenged. This is the statement:

It is true that by the terms of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act the steam electric generating plant located at Sheffield, Ala., near Wilson Dam, was turned over to the defendant Tennessee Valley Authority. But the defendants allege that the said steam electric generating plant has not been and is not being operated and that there is no plan or intention to operate such plant now or in the future, or to construct or operate any other steam electric generating plants.

There was a representation made in 1937 that there were going to be no steam generating plants in this area to supplement this particular development of a natural resource. Yet as the demand for increased power has come, there has been a demand for steam plants, and as a greater demand for power comes from the cheaper rates, there will be an increased demand for steam plants, until the Federal Treasury will be pouring in literally millions of dollars to supplement by steam generated electricity that was originally intended to be supplemental to a navigation development and reforestation plan.

Mr. President, that is not a policy which we as a government should develop. We should devote Federal funds to the development of those natural resources which can be developed with public funds, and in no other way, for the use of the people in a particular locality, but when the full potential of such a development has been absorbed, and the question comes as to how we are going to increase that potential, then I submit that every part of the country should be on the same basis as to the

manner in which these facilities are provided. If we are to provide power with public money in one part of the country, then let us provide it with public money in all parts of the country, but we will be departing from the course we have hitherto followed with great success.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield a moment?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator referred to some language in connection with a decision in 1937. Is the Senator familiar with the act which Congress passed in 1939 amending the TVA Act?

Mr BALDWIN. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator is not familiar with the act of 1939, I can understand how the Senator may perhaps see this situation as he does. The 1939 act, I will say to the Senator, was the act passed by Congress which authorized the TVA, through mutual arrangement and mutual negotiation, to buy out the private power companies in the TVA area.

By that act Congress authorized and made the TVA the monopoly power generator and distributor in the Tennessee Valley. When we did that, the situation changed entirely in the Tennessee Valley, so far as power was concerned. No longer were there private power companies serving cities, towns, industries, REA's, or anybody else. Then and there, by that act, TVA became the one, sole and only generator and distributor of power in that area. That changed the situation very greatly. The people in that valley today have but one source of power available to them, namely, the TVA.

Congress was wise in doing what it did in establishing the TVA.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say to my friend from Alabama that the argument he is now making bears out exactly what I have said, that we started in on the TVA as a reforestation, navigation, and flood control project, and then in 1939 we changed it into something else. How? By legislative enactment. Now it is proposed that more law be enacted to change it, and to pour millions of dollars of Federal funds into the Authority. That is exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. HILL. The Senator will find that in the original act we provided for the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority to be a coordinated and integrated development of all the resources of that valley predicated, of course, on navigation, on reforestation, on flood control, on power, and all those things. But we envisioned the very thing that has transpired, and it finally came to pass when we enacted the law of 1939.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder if the Senator from Alabama has an answer to the query that runs in my mind. If the proposed appropriation fails to be approved do we have adequate reason to assume that the Tennessee Valley Authority has authority to go ahead and build the facility anyway? So far as I know the Tennessee Valley Authority is not accountable to Congress for the way in which the Tennessee Valley Authority spends its earnings. The Tennessee Valley Authority reports to the Congress on an annual basis, on the basis of what it has spent, but not on the basis of what it intends to do in the future. So I am wondering to what extent the Tennessee Valley Authority will go ahead and do what conceivably might be denied by the Senate?

Mr. HILL. I would say that no matter how much the TVA feels that it is wise and prudent and necessary to build the plant, it would not attempt to build it if the Congress by its action said it should not do so.

Mr. CAIN. I merely raised the question, and I am very much pleased by the answer of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I intend to take but little of the time of the Senate in a discussion of the matter of the TVA steam plant in the Tennessee Valley. However, it happened to have been my privilege about a year and half ago to go down into the Tennessee Valley area. I went there in somewhat of a skeptical frame of mind because—like many Members of the Senate—I had heard arguments on both sides of the question, and wanted to go down and have a look-see for myself. It has been contended in some areas that the TVA is a vast experiment in State socialism. I want to say that what I saw in the various States and cities that comprise the Tennessee Valley area convinced me that it is no such thing, but rather it is a great encouragement to the American free enterprise system. It is true that by act of the Congress of the United States we have set up a Tennessee Valley Authority and have given it certain powers in the matter of the distribution of electric energy, and certain other powers granted it by the Congress of the United States. But by the use of that power, by the use of the transportation facilities made available to the Authority, by the flood-control projects which we have built there, I think we have made a great investment in the future of America.

Mr. President, I happen to be one of the Members of the Senate who believe that something that is beneficial to one section of our great country is ultimately beneficial to all sections of our country.

During the past few years this Nation has made great investments in other areas of the world, and I think that it was fitting and proper that we should do so, because we have learned that we live in one world, and when there is chaos and war and revolution we cannot be unconcerned thereby.

By the same token, Mr. President, I believe that when we add to the economic advancement of the great Tennessee Valley area we are adding to the wealth of our Nation in every section of our Nation.

I listened very carefully to the arguments which were made today and last night on the subject, and I sat through most of the committee hearings, and have read those hearings when I could not attend some of the sessions. It strikes me that we have, as President Cleveland once said, a condition, and not a theory confronting us.

Some of the arguments which have been made in opposition to the TVA might well have been made perhaps in 1937—at least if one has that point of view—they might even have been made in 1939. But the fact remains, Mr. President, that we have established this Authority. We have said that the Authority has the power facilities down there for the generation and the distribution of electric power. So as a very practical matter, no private power company is going to go into the middle of the Tennessee Valley area and build one steam-generating plant for the firming up of electric power. It just is not going to be done. What does that mean, Mr. President? It means that if we do not advance the Authority the funds—loan it the money, so to speak, to build this steam plant, and the money will be repaid to the Federal Government—the Authority will not have the plant which good business judgment indicates it should have in order to firm up the electric power energy in that vast area of the Tennessee Valley.

Consequently, Mr. President, I say that we have a heavy responsibility upon us on the floor of the United States Senate today, because it is my judgment that if we deny the Authority the right to build this power plant in the Tennessee Valley area, we in effect put that vast area in chains as far as its future development is concerned.

I think the situation there is entirely different than it is in other sections of the Nation, because in no other section of the Nation have we set up a TVA. Men can quite properly question the advisability of having set up that TVA, or of setting up any similar agencies elsewhere in the Nation, and men may honestly differ as to the public policy involved. But in the Tennessee Valley we have already done it. It is an accomplished fact. It is not a theoretical discussion. We have created such an agency there, and now to deny the Authority the right to have the facilities it needs properly to serve that area is, I repeat, to put that area in chains. I do not think the Senate of the United States should do that.

What are the facts of the situation? As of the present time the percentage of steam capacity to total generating capacity of TVA is down, as I remember the figure, to about 16 percent of the total hydroelectric capacity. What would happen in this vast area of the Tennessee if this were a privately owned public utility? Well, we fortunately have some figures in the record which will indicate what would be done. Senators will find on page 47 of the record that as far as the privately owned companies are concerned their "steam plants as approximate percentages of total generating capacity" are as follows: The Alabama Power Co., 43 percent; the Carolina Power & Light Co., 34 percent; the Duke Power Co., 51 percent; the Georgia Power Co., 53 percent; the Niagara-Hudson, in New York State, 48

percent, and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 38 percent.

If we let the TVA build this generating plant which it needs to firm up its power, and we provide the funds, it will only bring that percentage up approximately 20 percent, which will still be far below what any well-operated privately owned public utility would require in the United States.

Mr. President, I think we should carefully consider the situation. I happen to come from an area of the country which has recently suffered a brown-out as far as electric power is concerned. Like the Tennessee Valley, our section of the Nation is growing. Yet with all the power facilities which could be provided by the privately owned utilities and the power facilities which could be provided by the publicly owned utilities, we have been still short of an adequate power supply.

Criticism is made for the directors of TVA that they are coming here and doing some advance planning. I do not believe that they should be criticized for that. I believe that they should be congratulated for doing it. Unfortunately over a period of years private power companies in my area of the country have come before the Congress of the United States and have attempted to block the development of hydroelectric power and transmission lines in the State of California. I regret to say they have had some success. By so doing they contributed to the brown-out we had this year, which adversely affected industry in California, which in turn adversely affected employment, with a resulting adverse effect upon the tax revenues which flowed into the Federal Treasury.

The fact of the matter is that, according to the testimony before the committee, in 1934 the Tennessee Valley region contributed roughly 3.3 percent of the tax revenues. Because of this investment we have made in the Tennessee Valley area, by 1949 that percentage had increased to 6.2 percent. I think that is a fine contribution to the future of our country.

If we were managers of a business concern, if we had the responsibility for this vast power development, and if the facts were as they are here today I am convinced that we would make this steam-plant investment in that vast area of our country. Unless we permit this plant to be built, no one else is going to build it. Our failure to build it may in turn lead to a vast power shortage in the Tennessee Valley area.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I think the Senator has made a wonderful statement. His argument is a 100-percent high-class contribution to the discussion.

I should like to ask the Senator one or two questions. Did it not appear in the hearings, and is it not a fact as a matter of law anyway, that an amortization plan has been devised by which the Government is being reimbursed for its entire investment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. On a 30- or 40-year basis.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On a 40-year basis, I believe.

Mr. STEWART. Is it not a fact that the earnings of the Tennessee Valley Authority were about $97,000,000 last year? Does the Senator remember the figure?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not recall the figures.

Mr. STEWART. At any rate, it is a going concern. It is making money. It is not in the red. It is not being subsidized.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that when we make an investment in an area like that and part of it is chargeable to flood control, part to navigation, and part to power development there will always be arguments, and men will honestly differ as to what percentage should be applied to each. The earnings will vary, depending upon what the percentage is. But so far as being an investment for the good of America is concerned, regardless of what the allocation is, I believe that the return will be one hundredfold, in comparison with the return on a great many investments which we have made elsewhere in the world.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like to make one further point.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. Of course, the question which is being considered here is whether or not this steam plant can be justified chiefly upon the basis of firming up the power which now exists or is latent in the hydro development. I invite the Senator's attention to the statement at the bottom of page 45 of the hearings, at the conclusion of Mr. Clapp's statement:

> The virtue and the necessity for this steam plant, therefore, is to firm up and help us make more useful the water power that we can generate from the river.
>
> Senator KNOWLAND. You are only recommending here what any well-run privately owned public utility would recommend in running a business, and that is that you be able to serve your customers with a firm supply of power regardless of what the weather conditions might be in a year. If you are not able to take that, you are not able to do your job.
>
> Mr. CLAPP. That is correct, sir.

Does not that practically sum up the entire testimony in the hearings?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In answer to the question raised by the Senator from Tennessee, let me say that if I had not been convinced at the hearings that this plant was legitimately needed for firming up power, I would not have supported the amendment in the committee. After all, spending an additional $4,000,000, which is merely the first installment on a larger investment, would not be justified, in my opinion, if this were a small and extraneous addition which was not needed, and could be better handled otherwise. I believe that the overwhelming weight of the evidence shows that, based upon good business judgment, if a privately owned utility were in the same position as TVA, it would long ago have started to make plans and to lay the foundations for the steam plant. Obviously a number of years will be required to construct it. A private utility company with a progressive outlook would have begun to plan years ago, rather than run the danger of being caught short, as we have been caught in the State of California. Other sections of the country have been faced with power shortages.

It is planned to have an adequate supply of power when it is needed. I do not need to tell the able Senator from Tennessee that if we had not had this source of power available in the Tennessee Valley the war effort of this country would have been greatly handicapped.

I happen to be a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The great atomic plant at Oak Ridge is there primarily, in my judgment, because this source of power existed. The other great plants, which contributed to the war effort by supplying aluminum needed in the Air Forces, are there because there is an adequate supply of power.

We talk about national defense. Should we ever be challenged again from any section of the world, we shall need an adequate supply of power. In my judgment if war were to come tomorrow, one of the weakest links in our entire industrial situation as related to our national defense would be a shortage of electric energy.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there anything in the record to show that any power from the hydro plants in the Tennessee Valley was used at Oak Ridge? Is not the record void of such evidence?

Let me ask a second question. Is there anything in the record to show what Mr. Clapp said was the amount of power which needed to be firmed up?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe that a set of charts was exhibited to the committee, indicating that, based upon the present situation, to say nothing of the situation as it will appear in 1952, there will be a shortage of firm power in the TVA area.

Mr. FERGUSON. But today there is no shortage of firm power. It is the anticipated industrial development which will demand more power.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not think that is correct, as I read the testimony and the charts.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I believe the Senator made the point a few minutes ago that the ratio of power produced at steam plants to power produced at hydroelectric dams, is larger in the case of private companies throughout the country, than in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Would the Senator say that this disparity is evidence of the fact that there is a lack of balance in TVA today between steam and water power?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think there is no question about it. A properly operated utility company—I do not care whether it is a private company or a public company—cannot operate efficiently if it sells to its customers merely based upon the peak-load capacity, so to speak. That

fluctuates. But when a utility signs a contract, it must be prepared to deliver the power, both during good times of production and hard times of production. If it is not able to do that, obviously it cannot satisfy its customers, whether they be industrial plants or private consumers.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that two additional dams are now under construction, and that their completion will increase the imbalance between steam-generated power and hydroelectric power in the TVA system?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask another question. The Senator stated that, in his opinion, failure to construct this plant will result in a deprivation of power to customers in the Tennessee Valley. The arguments made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and other Senators who oppose the construction of this steam plant, are based almost entirely on the assumption that this plant is being built to supply certain large industrial consumers. Was there testimony at the hearings to the effect that there are many rural electric cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley in Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, and North Carolina?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not recall the exact number.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a very large number.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But I know there are a large number of such customers.

Mr. McKELLAR. There are a large number of them.

Mr. COOPER. Is it the Senator's opinion that a failure to build this plant will deprive the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge of needed power in time of emergency?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If anything should cut off the fuel supply to the steam plant there, the availability of a source of adequate power would be of tremendous interest and, I think, would be an absolute necessity to the plant at Oak Ridge.

Mr. COOPER. A few moments ago, I think, the Senator from Michigan said he did not recall any testimony about deliveries of power to Oak Ridge. I should like to call his attention to page 59 of the hearings. Mr. Wessenauer, power manager of the TVA, stated as follows, speaking in regard to certain charts which had been introduced:

> The sales shown on that chart, however, are actually sales to the municipalities and cooperatives. The total shown by the utilities did not include sales to the Government for its own use, the largest use being at the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge.

Further down on that page we see that he said the following:

> Because it may disclose energy deliveries to the Atomic Energy Commission, we cannot put this chart in, but I do have some others which can go in.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then there is no record that any power actually went there.

Mr. COOPER. There was the flat statement that the largest use by the Government was for the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator from California will remember, in connection with the statement about nothing being shown in the record about Oak Ridge, that when I appeared before the subcommittee and made a statement, I urged the subcommittee to hold an executive session in order to go into that very question; and I said it was something that ought not be spread on the public record. I also suggested that the subcommittee go into the whole question of the defense requirements down there.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I recall the situation. As I have stated, I did not want to go into a detailed discussion on that point.

I know a chart was presented, and I know a specific request was made that it not be placed in the record.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A few moments ago the Senator from Michigan, I believe it was, stated that the additional power to be provided by this proposed steam plant would be used primarily to supply industries which were expected to develop in that area. As a matter of fact, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Michigan and the attention of other Senators to the chart appearing on page 62, in which it is shown that the great increase over the past years and the great increase in the years ahead lies with preference customers; and they are defined—as a matter of fact, they are defined in the act itself, by the wording of Congress—as Government agencies, municipalities, and rural cooperatives.

The chart shows virtually no increase whatsoever to private industries.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say one word, if the Senator will permit me, before I yield the floor. There has been considerable discussion in regard to taxes. It is true, and we might as well face it, of course, that no government agency pays income taxes. But I wish to call attention to the fact that when I went through the Tennessee Valley, I talked with many public officials, and also with many businessmen, some of whom had been very bitterly opposed to the original creation of the TVA, when it was first considered. I believe I can say that almost without exception, regardless of their partisanship or their economic station in life—and I talked to bankers, businessmen, farmers, employees, employers, public officials,—all felt that the TVA was making a great contribution to that area of the country. In every community where I went, if I had a chance to do so I asked whether the TVA and its related organizations were paying local taxes, because I was concerned, as a great many of us are, with that question as it affects the various States where properties will be taken off the tax rolls, with a resultant adverse effect on the local agencies of government. In every case where I made inquiry—I do not say this applies to every part of the Tennessee Valley, but it applies to every place where I was able to make my inquiry—I was told that the TVA was paying, as in lieu of taxes, as much or even more than what had been paid by the privately-owned public utilities in the days before they were taken over. So to that extent, at least, the TVA is making a contribution to the local agencies of government.

Mr. HILL. Mr President, will the Senator yield in that connection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that no private power company or private utility ever amortizes out its capital investment; but it goes on, year after year, without any amortization; whereas, under the law, the TVA is required to amortize out within 40 years the funds the Government puts into the TVA projects?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Frankly, I am not in a position to say that no private utility company ever amortizes out; but I understand it is a general practice in many areas of the country for them not to amortize out the capital investment.

Of course in the TVA area, that is being done in a period of 40 years.

Mr. HILL. In that connection it is interesting to note, let me say, if the Senator will yield further, that the TVA has made approximately $92,000,000 in net profits, and of that $92,000,000, $23,000,000 has gone into the Federal Treasury, $11,000,000 went to pay off bonds which had been issued in connection with the purchase of the properties of the private power companies by TVA and $59,000,000 went into capital investments—new projects—which, of course, today are the property of the Government of the United States.

To come back to the point regarding the industries about which we hear so much, does not the record show that, so far as the large industries that we hear so much about are concerned—the Aluminum Co. of America, the Reynolds Metals Co., the Victor Metals Co., and so forth—some five or six of them—this year, in 1949, those big industries will not use more than 10 percent of the firm power capacity available in the Tennessee Valley from the TVA? Is that not true?

Is it not true also that if we were to cut off all those large industries from the TVA power, and if the TVA did not supply a single kilowatt of power to those large industries, there still would not be sufficient power to meet the estimated growth in the demands for power in the next 2 years?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. In regard to the point that perhaps industries move into the valley, does the evidence disclose that this quest for an appropriation is based on the theory that industries will move there?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is not my interpretation of the testimony I read and heard. I think primarily new industries may develop there rather than

that industries will pick up and move there—lock, stock, and barrel—from some some other area of the country.

But I say to the Senator from Illinois that, if such a movement does occur, it will not disturb me because from the point of view of national defense in this atomic age, if we have some diversification of our great industrial centers, I think ultimately we may be adding to the potential national defense of the Nation.

Mr. LUCAS. I wholeheartedly agree with the statement made by the able Senator from California.

Let me ask the Senator one more question with respect to the industries located in the Tennessee Valley producing for instance aluminum and other metal. As I understand, they do not manufacture the finished product, but produce certain products in the raw, which are shipped or transmitted to practically every State in the Union, where the products are finished. So, it seems to me, to those who argue that the Government is subsidizing the Tennessee Valley Authority to the extent that certain people may be receiving a benefit out of it, the reply may properly be made that the whole industry of America that uses the products which go out of the Tennessee Valley and are ultimately finished in the factories in other States of the Union, are equally getting the benefit of the facilities of TVA.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator from Illinois I think he is exactly correct. Not only are they furnishing raw materials which are put into finished products elsewhere in the Nation, by which process the Tennessee Valley area is making a great contribution to the industries in other sections of the country, but in turn as the standard of living increases due to some development down in the Tennessee Valley area the people, the employees who get better wages have more purchasing power to buy the automobiles that are manufactured in Michigan or the products manufactured in Connecticut or Indiana or these other States of the Union. I might include dried fruit products and other items from the Pacific coast. So I think it has a two-way effect in being beneficial both to the Nation and to the Tennessee Valley area.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. To illustrate the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the splendid answer of the Senator from California, on page 64 of the Senate hearings there appears a letter addressed by Mr. R. M. Ferry, manager, Tennessee Operations, of the Aluminum Co. of America, at Alcoa, Tenn., to Mr. G. O. Wessenaeur, manager of power, Tennessee Valley Authority, Chattanooga, Tenn. In that letter Mr. Ferry has this to say:

> The great proportion of the aluminum and basic aluminum products made by Aluminum Co. of America at the Alcoa works—

That is the plant in Tennessee—

> goes outside the State of Tennessee for final manufacture into end products. In the first quarter of 1948, for example, 98.8 percent of the various aluminum products produced at the Alcoa works was shipped to 47 States, other than Tennessee, for further processing, involving great amounts of additional work on the basic or semifinished aluminum materials before they are ready for final use.
>
> Not only are the aluminum products from Alcoa shipped to other States as shown, but also other States than Tennessee provide most of the raw materials for the production of aluminum at Alcoa.

So, of course, the project at Alcoa, Ala., is not a Tennessee project. It is what I may call a very important link in the whole chain of our domestic economy. It is a very important wheel in the whole economy of the 48 States of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. BALDWIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Indiana has been on his feet. I had agreed to yield to him.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, perhaps I had better get the floor in my own right, because I have a little more than a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well. Then if I could finish with these questions, I shall yield the floor to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to have it appear in the RECORD here what I believe to be a repetition of the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee when we first began the discussion of this bill, which was to the effect that the Senate committee, as I recall the statement, relied in great part upon the record that was made in the House, as there were very extended hearings held on the appropriation bill in the House, to the tune of 1,111 pages as compared to some 517 pages in the Senate. The reports are likewise correspondingly different in the extent to which they go into the matter, and that is why it seems to me, the House having made such a thorough study of the whole project, that the House record is of great importance and should be given considerable weight, because obviously the House committee went much further into it than did the Senate committee. In fact, it was the duty of the House to go thoroughly into the subject, because, under the Constitution, the House is primarily concerned with appropriation bills.

The House report very distinctively says this:

> Testimony of officials of TVA further indicates that the Authority recognizes that although substantial additional power can be generated by installation of new hydro generators, it is approaching the limit of the amount of electricity which can be generated by water power harnessed primarily for purposes of flood control and navigation.
>
> The proposal to construct this steam plant is based upon the recognition of these two factors, and is intended to provide additional generating capacity to meet the currently estimated requirements of the foreseeable future for electric power in the Tennessee Valley area.

I have no quarrel at all with the Federal Congress using Federal funds, to develop a natural resource, and if this undertaking has been, as I think it has been, of tremendous value to the Tennessee Valley, then I am glad of it, and I agree with my friend from California that that benefit is ultimately spread all the way across the country.

My difficulty is this: If the Federal Government used Federal funds to develop a natural resource, and the full potentiality of that natural resource is developed, and if it is put to its full use as the development of a natural resource, then should the Federal Government, because of the cheaper facilities thus provided, add artificial resources, artificial means to expand that natural resource, at the expense of all the taxpayers of the country?

It seems to me there is where we come to a parting of the ways on a question of policy, because once we step in to develop a natural resource to its full potentiality, then it seems to me we ought to use Federal funds in developing some other natural resources, and not pile Pelion on Ossa in an attempt to develop one great area where the development in the first place was mainly concerned with a natural resource, but has finally worked into a federally-subsidized project in competition with all the others in the country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely want to say that I recognize it is an easy selection to pick between black and white. Where one gets into difficulty is when he gets into the gray field, in between. Of course the argument the Senator makes that instead of merely the development of natural resources, when a steam plant is established or constructed, it is getting a little out of that field and I think there is considerable merit and weight to the Senator's argument. But if we take the next step, on transmission lines, we are also getting out of that field, and if that is carried on through to its logical conclusion, it would mean merely the dam being built to hold the water, and perhaps a power house itself being built by the privately owned public utilities, taking the power at the dam rather than at the bus bar as some now advocate, and transmitting it over their lines.

Arguments can be made pro and con over that. My chief point is that depending on the way one looks at it, for either good or evil, that question is a moot question in the TVA area. The Congress has already established a valley authority there. Now, Congress may never again want to establish another valley authority. They may want to, in the future. No one has a crystal bill to enable him to know that.

I certainly think we should proceed with great care before we establish another valley authority as such. But in the Tennessee Valley area we have one. Having taken the responsibility, having made the people dependent for their power supply directly upon TVA, my only point is that when any well-operated privately owned power utilities have an adequate steam stand-by service in order to firm up power, Congress should

not do something which, in my judgment, would ultimately strangle the further development of the great Tennessee Valley area. For my part, I do not want to take the responsibility of withholding from them something which I believe they need in their economic development.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from California still claiming the floor?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; to answer some questions.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I think the suggestion made a few moments ago by the Senator, concerning the importance of this measure as part of a possible defense program, is one which merits considerable exploration. I think it was well expressed. I believe the building of the plant is justified on the basis of national need for national defense. I explored the question somewhat during the hearings, by correspondence and conversations with some of the various agencies of the Government. I am advised that there is approximately a 35 percent anticipated shortage of electric power in the next year or two in the entire United States. Since the plant has been requested by TVA, plans have been drawn, the location has been selected in close proximity to an adequate supply of cheap coal, and since an adequate supply of water will be afforded, I think we should proceed with the project. Its location has been chosen at a point at which it can be most economically operated. With the unsettled conditions which exist in the world today, I think we should turn more than ordinary attention to this project as an aid, not only for economic reasons, but for reasons of national defense.

During the recent World War, as the Senator has acknowledged, the Tennessee Valley was a perfect beehive of industry, constantly manufacturing munitions of war. I am told that at one time, when demand was made by the President for the building of 50,000 airplanes, Tennessee Valley electric current was utilized in manufacturing more than 51 percent of the aluminum which went into our fighting planes. The Tennessee Valley made a great contribution, as the Senator has pointed out, to the war effort. If we had not had that great supply of power, there is no telling how much longer the end of the war might have been delayed. I think we should take notice of the unsettled, chaotic conditions in the world. We do not know at what moment we might need to place an order for a large supply of products, such as aluminum, which might be manufactured by the utilization of electric power.

I think that, at least, should help influence the votes of other Members of the Senate who may not feel quite certain with respect to the situation from an economic standpoint.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Tennessee had risen. I want to apologize for not having yielded to him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor in my own right.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The observations which the Senator has made are, so far as I am concerned, conclusive and almost unchallengeable. There is no way to limit the potential amount of power which can be developed in the Tennessee Valley, and consequently the products which may be made by the utilization of the power. Some Members of the Congress, before the Tennessee Valley Authority was ever created, tried to bring about the very result which we are seeking today. Some of the same individuals, when we were confronted by a very serious situation during the war, went before the Appropriations Committees and asked for an additional $50,000,000 for further development of the Tennessee Valley, and many persons who, in the beginning, were fighting the improvement of the valley through the Tennessee Valley Authority, joined in the request.

I, for one, solely on the theory of national defense, would support this project, if for no other reason. As has been pointed out time and again by able Senators who have made a study of the entire proposition, by Senators who live in the valley and know it, by Senators who understand world conditions, we cannot invest $4,500,000 more wisely at this particular time than in the development of steam plants in the Tennessee Valley, because no one knows what will happen tomorrow. What happened during the last war, so far as our needs were concerned, may in the next war be a mere bagatelle.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, as the able Senator from California has so well pointed out, has already been developed and redeveloped. It has the facilities for further development, from the point of view of national defense. Certainly the Congress should not let down at this hour on a small appropriation for the further development of the valley.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for the splendid speech he has made. He heard all the testimony, and it evidently made an impression upon him, as it should have.

I shall talk but a short time this afternoon, Mr. President, but I want to give a little history of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I was unexpectedly elected to the House of Representatives in 1911. That has been a long time ago. I came to Washington on the 4th of December 1911. Fourteen days after that I introduced a good-roads bill. Approximately a month later, in January, I introduced a bill to construct the Muscle Shoals Dam at Muscle Shoals, Ala., on the Tennessee River. Very little progress was made. The House was very much opposed to building a dam at that time. We made very little progress until the First World War occurred in 1917, when the project for producing needed power for war purposes was sponsored by the later Senator Bankhead. I do not mean John H. Bankhead, Jr., but John H. Bankhead, Sr., who was a Senator from Alabama when I entered the House of Representatives.

When the war came on Senator Bankhead and I went to the White House and interviewed President Wilson, and asked him if he would not recommend the building of a dam at Muscle Shoals in order to get the water power from that dam. The President said he would, and I believe he did. A short time later we got an appropriation, and with that appropriation we built the first dam at Muscle Shoals, and no dam was built thereafter until 1933. I had been a Senator for some 15 years before another dam was built. Senator Norris got a bill passed to build another dam on the Tennessee River, but President Hoover vetoed the bill and it did not become a law.

When Mr. Roosevelt became President he was tremendously interested in the building of dams. Senators can see that I have been with this proposition a long time. It has been a long time from 1911 to the present. I introduced the first Muscle Shoals bill in the House of Representatives, as I have said, in 1912. When Mr. Roosevelt became President he was very much interested in the matter of building dams, and he came down in a private car from New York before he was sworn in as President and invited three men to go with him to Muscle Shoals to see the dam which had already been completed under a former administration. Senator Norris, supposedly representing the Missouri River, was one of those who was invited to make the trip in the private car of President-elect Roosevelt. The second gentleman was Senator Clarence C. Dill, of the State of Washington, and Senator Dill went along as a representative of the Columbia River. The President was good enough to invite me as the representative of the Tennessee River, as he said at the time, the Tennessee being a river flowing mostly in my State, beginning in upper east Tennessee and flowing through upper Alabama, and then north into the Ohio through Tennessee and Kentucky.

Senators may see a picture in my office of the Presidential party, with these three gentlemen, and Governor Miller, of Alabama, and his wife, who met us. After spending a most pleasant day seeing that great dam, which had been completed, we returned on the train after dinner, and the President had his secretary bring out some bills for the improvement of the Tennessee Valley. One of the bills is now substantially the law as it was enacted soon after that. After reading the bill aloud, the President took one copy of the bill and handed it to George Norris and told

him that he was going to ask him to introduce it in the Senate. He told his secretary to mail a copy of it to LISTER HILL, who was at that time a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Alabama, and that he would have LISTER HILL introduce the bill in the House. It seemed to me that that was rather unusual, as Senator Norris was supposed to come from the Missouri Valley; but I was very anxious to have the dam built and the project started, and therefore, said nothing about it.

The bill was introduced by Senator Norris, and a copy of the same bill was introduced by Senator HILL, then a Member of the House, as I have said. The bill passed the House, and came to the Senate. In the meantime the Senate had passed the Norris bill, the bills went to conference, and in the conference the Hill bill was accepted, as I recall, and the Norris bill was merely one of those which had been passed, but so far as the outside world was concerned, the newspaper world especially, it was the Norris bill that developed the Tennessee Valley, though it was the Hill bill that was actually passed. I am bringing this matter forward for the purpose of showing the Senate my long history with this project.

Not much progress was made until President Roosevelt became President and the first two dams were built, the dam now known as the Wheeler Dam and that known as the Cove Creek Dam, now called the Norris Dam.

Were those dams built in the ordinary way? Quite the contrary. The House of Representatives would not appropriate the money to finance the building. It takes money to construct dams, and therefore the dams were not built.

I presume all the Members of the Senate remember the PWA legislation, which came in 1933, the first year Mr. Roosevelt was President. It was legislation providing work for people who were out of employment. The same Senator Bankhead to whom I have referred went with me to see Mr. Roosevelt to get him to allot some of the civil-works money, people-out-of-employment money, to bebing the two dams on the Tennessee, one in Alabama and one in Tennessee. We had to do that because the Senate was willing to appropriate the money, but the House had not done so. The House would not appropriate the money. So legislation was enacted authorizing construction of the dams, but no money was available to build them, and we induced President Roosevelt to allot a certain sum out of the money provided for civil works in 1933, the first year he was President. The two dams were then begun.

The next year the WPA legislation was passed. Out of money provided for WPA we secured an allotment to do more work on the two dams.

During the next year, 1934, I was sent to the Philippine Islands. The late Senator McAdoo; the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who now sits near me in the Senate Chamber; the late Senator Gibson, of Vermont, a good Republican and one of the finest men I ever knew; and I were appointed members of the committee to make an investigation of the situation in the Philippine Islands and report to the Senate. We went west via San Francisco, the Hawaiian Islands, Japan, and China. We traveled all over the Philippine Islands and came back by way of the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea. Remarkable to state, on the return trip through the Red Sea our ship passed Mount Sinai. It was a very interesting experience to the four of us. The captain of our vessel—it was a Dutch vessel—told us we could see the mountain, and made arrangements so we could have a good view of it. That naturally brought up conversation respecting Jerusalem, and we concluded that when we arrived at Alexandria we would arrange to go to Jerusalem by bus and catch next week's boat for France.

The morning after we had made that agreement I received a radiogram from President Roosevelt. I was at that time a member of the Appropriations Committee, and had been a member of it for many years. Carter Glass was chairman of the committee, and I was next in rank following him. The President in his cablegram said:

> The Senate Committee on Appropriations yesterday, by a tie vote, defeated an appropriation to complete the two dams, one in Alabama and one in Tennessee. Hurry home and break the tie.

The vote was 8 to 8. I thereupon canceled my plan for going to Jerusalem. I told my friends I was obliged to return. I felt it my duty to do so and returned. They also concluded to return home.

On my return I found that Carter Glass was ill. I went to see him. He told me he was one of those who had voted against appropriation of money to build the dams in Tennessee and Alabama. He said he thought he had made a mistake, and would give me his proxy, and I could vote it in favor of the appropriation, and asked me to call a meeting of the committee. I called the committee together, as the record in the committee room downstairs will show. At the meeting I voted Senator Glass as favoring the appropriation. The appropriation was voted favorably by the committee by a vote of 14 to 5. There were two members of the committee absent. The appropriation thereafter was made, and the first dam was built.

I then introduced a bill providing for the building of a second dam, and have since introduced bills providing for all the dams that have been built. The House was not in favor of the project primarily, and it was only as the result of amendments placed on appropriation bills in the Senate that I was able to obtain the money to build all the dams along the Tennessee River and also along the Cumberland River.

That, Mr. President, is a short history of how the dams happened to be built.

At that time the private power companies had control of power in Alabama and Tennessee. They had large investments in those States. They saw the dams being built and felt that the work was inimical to them, and it was not long before they undertook to sell out to the TVA. Many negotiations were conducted, and finally the private power companies sold out to the TVA. They had large investments in all the big cities. The Chattanooga Power Co. alone was sold for $10,800,000. The company operating in Memphis was sold for $17,360,000. Every large city in the State purchased, through the TVA, the private power companies' property virtually at the private power companies' own price. The TVA did not fix the price. The Government did not fix the price. The power companies wanted to get out of Tennessee and did get out of Tennessee.

There is no longer a fight between the private power companies and the TVA. That fight has been ended for 10 or 12 years or more. The TVA has paid the full price, over $150,000,000, for the private power companies as they previously existed. The private power companies have never been dissatisfied with the transaction. I have never heard of any complaint because of the sale of the properties. A great many of the employees of the private companies were kept in employment. No hardship was worked on the power companies.

I want to assure my distinguished and handsome friend, a man I admire very much, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], a former Governor of the great State of Connecticut and now a United States Senator from that State, that the private power companies were not mulcted in that deal. They had the advantage. They received virtually their own price. They sold what they had after the price had been fixed and agreed upon. There has never been a rumor of any trouble at all respecting the sales.

Now, what is the fact since the TVA has taken hold down there? The TVA built many dams. As I recall, thirty-odd dams have been built by the TVA. The Government has furnished the money for the building of the dams. The Government permitted bonds to be issued in some cases, but mostly furnished the money. So the fight is not between the private power companies, as my distinguished friend seemed to think earlier today, and the TVA. It is a fact that has already been established. This thing has already been done.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. One unhappy thing about my position on this question is that I find myself on the opposite side of an important question from my distinguished friend from Tennessee, whom I have come to admire and hold in real affection. I look back upon his record with admiration.

I assure the Senator from Tennessee that my interest in this question is not primarily from the standpoint of the power companies. I think they are well able to take care of themselves, and they have done so. There is certainly no claim that I have ever heard that the power companies did not get a perfectly fair deal. They were paid for their properties what they were worth, and the transaction was satisfactorily closed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

Mr. BALDWIN. My difficulty is with the question whether, as a matter of policy, we should use Federal funds to subsidize the implementation of a natural resource the full potentialities of which have already been reached. The natural resource having been developed as it should be—and properly so—by Federal funds for the benefit of the State, and its full potentiality now being in prospect, should the Federal Government now step in with Federal funds and subsidize the expansion of a natural resource by artificial means? Hydroelectric development having reached its ultimate, should the Federal Government now step in and supplement it by subsidizing an artificial plant? That is my difficulty with this question.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is mistaken about its having reached its ultimate. It has not. We are building two of the largest dams. They were started about 10 years ago, and they have been developed to a remarkable extent, but we are still making appropriations for them. They are still in the course of construction. They will be completed in the next 2 years.

In addition, we have built a number of dams on the Cumberland River. The new dams will require additional steam power—what is known in power parlance as firming up power for the water power.

There are many other dam sites. There are dam sites along the tributaries of the Tennessee River in Alabama. I am not sure that there are any in Mississippi. I should have to ask the Senator from Mississippi. I do not believe there are any. But in Tennessee and in North Carolina there are tributaries of this river where there are excellent sites. The Cumberland River in Tennessee empties into the Ohio just above the point where the Tennessee empties into the Ohio River. That river has tributaries upon which are other dam sites. The territory has been developed. A wonderful work has been done.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in that connection?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure that the able Senator from Connecticut would not consider any hydroelectric development fully developed to its ultimate if it were being operated by a private utility, until and unless the private utility incorporated into the system a sufficient amount of steam power in order to firm it up to its maximum efficiency. They all do it. Then why should he argue that the Federal Government should not do likewise? The practice is efficient, effective, and economical.

Mr. McKELLAR. Knowing the Senator from Connecticut as I do, I believe that if he had been before our committee he would have taken exactly the same position, after hearing the testimony, that the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has taken. The Senator from California is the son of an old-time friend of mine from California who was a Member of the House when I was there, nearly 40 years ago. He is a grand man, just as his father before him, W. P. Knowland, was a grand man when he served in the House.

I recommend to the Senator from Connecticut that he read the Senate committee hearings. I am not as familiar with the House hearings. I did not go through those as closely, perhaps, as I did the testimony of my own witnesses. I brought some of the witnesses here. They are some of the finest men in Tennessee or in the United States. They came here to testify. Among them were Democrats as well as Republicans. It made no difference. I remember Mr. Bruce, one of the most distinguished Republicans in my State. Many others came with him to testify to the facts as they were, and to show what a wonderful thing was being accomplished not only for Tennessee, but for the entire United States through this great development of water power in the Tennessee Basin, and the firming up of power in the proper way with steam power.

The Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. FERGUSON] is a fine man. I am sorry that he has taken the position which he takes. He will remember that the very best men came here to testify to what was being done. The operation has been a success.

I remember when people said that our efforts to develop the Tennessee Valley from an economic standpoint would not be a success. We have been at it for some time. A great deal of money has been invested in power alone—probably between $300,000,000 and $400,000,000. The other moneys which were spent were spent for navigation, and for development of the entire valley.

Let us see whether the United States is losing anything. In 1940 we had not developed the dams to such an extent that we were making much out of the operation. In that year we made only $3,294,000; in 1941, $3,992,000; in 1942, $6,117,000; in 1943, $7,962,000; in 1944, $4,047,000; in 1945, $5,247,000. Remember that the last figure which I have given is a little more than $5,000,000. In 1946 the income from this great development, after paying all expenses, was $18,301,000; for the year 1947 it was $21,950,000. I understand that this year it will be in excess of $25,000,000.

While we have developed a great State, and brought the best kind of government to the people of that State and the surrounding States, have we done so at a loss? Have we thrown our money away, as may possibly be the case with the money which we are sending to Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, and various other parts of the world? Senators will notice that I use the word "possibly." So far as the Tennessee Valley is concerned, we are getting a first-class rate of interest on every dollar of money that is invested there.

Mr. President, I turn to my distinguished friend the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], whom I have known ever since he was a boy. I knew his uncle, and I served in the House of Representatives with him. I think one of the first times I ever saw the Senator from Virginia was when he and I were groomsmen for Henry D. Flood, of Virginia. When I think of what we have down in Tennessee, with a little careful management, and when I think how Representative Flood helped with it, how disappointed I am this afternoon when, rather belatedly, I hear from my distinguished friend the Senator from Virginia that he cannot go along with such a wonderful development and such wonderful progress. It is disappointing to hear that statement from him—he who has been so successful in life, and has one of the most beautiful homes the eyes of mortal ever beheld. Senators who have traveled approximately 100 miles to the west of Washington have no doubt seen his beautiful home in Virginia and his wonderful apple orchard, the greatest apple orchard in all the world. Senators who have been there have seen what a wonderful success he has made in something besides politics, for politics is not the only thing he has succeeded at. He has succeeded in everything. If he were a kinsman of mine, I would not have felt more injured than I was in not having him go along with me in endorsing a great project; in fact, in my judgment, the greatest governmental project I was ever connected with. I am proud of it.

I have a statement from my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was one of them; and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], good, splendid CARL HAYDEN, than whom there is not a purer, finer, more gracious man in all the world, was another member of the committee who joined in that statement; CARL HAYDEN is one of those who said that I had gotten from the Congress the money to build all those dams and to buy the plants from the private power companies when it was found that they could not work in harmony in Tennessee with the TVA. They were purchased, and the plan works splendidly.

In January 1912, if I remember correctly—and I know it could not have been later than February 1912—I distressed my brothers who were in the railroad business in Memphis, Tenn., where they were working for the Southern Railway, and they were located in the old offices of the Southern Railway there, when I told them I wanted to improve the Tennessee River and improve the navigation on it and develop hydroelectric power along the bed of that river, beside which they had their railroad—one of the great railroads of the country. When I told them that, my statement certainly created consternation in my family. They thought I was doing something awful to advocate developing that river, when they were running a railroad along its banks. They did not want any opposition. But I finally lived to see the day when they agreed I was correct about it, and it worked out all right so far as my family was concerned.

In the 40 years since that time, I have lived to see practically everyone in Tennessee in favor of it. But some of my friends on the other side of the aisle here in the Senate Chamber say that is because we are getting from the Government something we should not get. Mr. President, do the available figures support such an argument? The TVA has made money; it is making money all the time, and it will continue to make money, if properly managed. If we take the advice of my young friend the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]—and certainly he is a disinterested man—and let this bill be enacted as now proposed, that development will be one of the greatest development any State has had. Today other States have such developments and other States will have similar developments. I refer to the States through which the Missouri River, the Colorado River, and the Columbia River flow. Some of those developments already have been made, and of course they should be made.

Now, Mr. President, let me recapitulate.

First. The TVA is the one and only light plant in the State of Tennessee.

Second. There is no question of competing private plants in the State. Whether that is right or wrong that is the situation that exists in the State. The Tennessee Valley Authority is the one and only source of power. There are no private companies unless in the extreme eastern end of the State in or near Bristol.

Third. The Johnsonville power plant is absolutely necessary to firm up the water power so that no city and no town and no farm and no factory in the State or surrounding States that need power and light can be without them.

Fourth. It is absolutely necessary that this be done to give the manufacturers and others a steady and uninterrupted flow of power and light.

Fifth. There has been a tremendous growth of manufacturing and business in our State since we have had the water power and the needs are tremendously increasing in city, town, and county.

Sixth. It is absolutely necessary that we know in advance there will be no shortage of power and light.

Seventh. The plant is absolutely necessary for defense purposes. The Oak Ridge atomic energy plant, the plants of the Aluminum Co. of America, and the plants of the Reynolds Metals Co., which will be called upon to produce aluminum for the 70-group air force Congress has just voted will need this additional steam power. Aluminum production requires enormous quantities of power.

Eighth. The municipalities and cooperatives which distribute TVA power in the Tennessee Valley have experienced a 60-percent increase in demand since the war and expect another 65-percent increase on top of that; and the TVA is not only short but the whole Nation is short of power.

Ninth. The growth and prosperity and development of our State, the capacity of her many plants, and the development of her many farms and especially of the war plants now existing in the State will all be put in jeopardy if we fail to have a proper supply of power and light. Page 2 of the hearing.

WITNESSES

The witnesses who testified for this plant were:

Mr. Frank Ahlgren, the editor of the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn.—pages 3 to 18.

The Honorable Tom Stewart—pages 18 and 19.

Mayor Jim Pleasants, of Memphis, Tenn.—pages 20 to 24.

Senator STENNIS from Mississippi—pages 24 to 25.

Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama—pages 26 to 35.

Mr. Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the TVA—pages 36 to 58.

Mr. Wessenauer, TVA power engineer—pages 59 to 66.

Mayor Hugh P. Wasson, mayor of Chattanooga—pages 71 to 76.

Mayor Tom Cummings, mayor of Nashville—pages 76 to 89.

Mayor James W. Elmore, Jr., mayor of Knoxville—pages 91 to 104.

Mr. C. Arthur Bruce, of Memphis, Tenn., who has a hardwood-lumber manufacturing business and who has a private plant of his own—pages 105 to 109.

Mr. Thomas H. Allen, president of the Memphis Light, Gas & Water division—pages 109 to 127.

Mayor R. J. Murray, of Huntingdon, Tenn.—pages 127 to 132.

Mr. Ken G. Whitaker, Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, Tenn.—pages 133 to 135.

Mr. James N. Bloodworth, Decatur, Ala.—pages 135 to 138.

Mr. Charles E. Shaver, of Huntsville, Ala.—pages 138 to 140.

Mr. C. H. Jackson, executive secretary, Florence Chamber of Commerce, Florence, Ala.—pages 141 to 142.

Telegrams and letters from mayors, businessmen, and laboring men from all over my State to me—pages 143 to 161.

Statement by Congressman KEFAUVER—pages 161 to 162.

Senator LISTER HILL—pages 162 to 168.

Mr. James L. Mattox, superintendent Municipal Light & Power Department, Columbus, Miss.—pages 168 to 171.

All these witnesses made out a splendid case for the building of this additional dam.

They showed it would be necessary in national defense because of the war plants in east Tennessee.

Because of the great atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Because it is necessary for the manufacturers, the laboring people, and all others in Tennessee and those several nearby States.

They showed that in 1940 the increase was $3,294,255; 1941, $5,992,083; 1942, $6,117,464; 1943, $7,962,533; 1944, $4,047,005; 1945, $5,247,666; 1946, $18,301,494; 1947, $21,950,985—page 511.

Practically everybody in the Tennessee Valley wants to continue it and build it.

They showed beyond a doubt that if properly managed it will pay good interest on the money the Government has got invested in it.

THE PRIVATE COMPANIES

The private companies then put on their proof.

Mr. James H. Greene, executive vice president, Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburgh, Pa. He objected to it largely because the private companies had to pay Federal taxes and the TVA did not have to—pages 171 and 176.

Mr. Elton Kile, president, National Associated Businessmen, Kileville, Ohio. He thought the stand-by plant was unnecessary and thought the steam plant was unauthorized although the TVA has five steam plants already and that they were asking for monopolistic privileges—pages 176 to 179.

Mr. Grey Dresie, secretary, Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association, Wichita, Kans. Thought substantially the same thing—pages 179 to 185.

Mr. Frederick A. Kimmich, vice president, Ostendorf-Morris Co., Cleveland, Ohio. He was opposed to the project as "an unnatural and arbitrary rearrangement of the economic forces that apply in the selection of plant location." He thought it was an attempt to "subsidize industry"—pages 185 to 188.

Mr. John H. Bream, lawyer, Harrisburg, Pa. Felt that it was unfair not to have the TVA taxed like other power companies—pages 188 to 189.

Mr. Garner M. Lester, president, National Tax Equality Association, Jackson, Miss.—pages 189 to 193.

Mr. H. A. Stansbury, managing director, Virginia Chamber of Commerce, Charleston, W. Va. He complained of migration of industries although all the testimony showed there has been no migration of industries—pages 194 to 197.

Mr. George T. Holmes, secretary, Kentucky Tax Research Association, Louisville, Ky.—pages 197 to 198.

Mr. Edward J. Bachman, president, Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Minneapolis, Minn. Took the position that this was "subsidized power"—pages 199 to 201.

Mr. N. W. Kelley, president, Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, Roanoke, Va. He complained of movement of industrials to Tennessee. He could not give any names at all—page 202.

Mr. Charles Eaton, executive vice president, New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, Newark, N. J. His complaint was unfairness in taxes—pages 203 to 207.

These witnesses did not really know anything about the particular situation or the particular plant and though some of them were researchers I do not believe that anyone would claim their evidence was important one way or the other. All of them were nice gentlemen. I have no doubt.

I next come to the two principal witnesses offered on the other side. They were Mr. P. L. Smith, president of the National Association of Electric Companies, at Washington, D. C., and Mr. Raymond T. Jackson, attorney for this association, living at Cleveland, Ohio. In a way their evidence was along the same lines as the others but in one respect it was important.

Mr. Thomas H. Allen, one of the TVA witnesses, was asked what he received for his services and his answer promptly was $12,500 a year. Mr. Allen was also

asked for whom he appeared and he answered he appeared for the city of Memphis. Now, when Mr. Jackson went on the stand I asked him for whom he appeared and he said he appeared for the National Association of Electric Companies. I tried my best to find out whether he was on a salary or fee but he would not tell me.

Mr. Jackson also further said:

I told you exactly what I am doing, Senator. I don't know anything about power lobbies, and to me they are no different—when anybody comes before the Congress, I don't know whether they are a lobby or not (p. 256).

I then said:

Let me proceed with reading this article: Power companies fight building of TVA stem plant. Pursell L. Smith, head of the National Association of Electric Companies (here there was an interruption) and the head of the private power lobby which is fighting against an appropriation for the TVA Johnsonville steam plant is being paid $65,000 a year as the head of this private power lobby. Some of the arguments of this lobby being advanced in opposition to the proposed construction (pp. 256–257).

I then questioned Mr. Jackson.

Senator McKELLAR. You were employed, were you not, by Mr. Smith?

Mr. JACKSON. No; I just stated that I was not.

Senator McKELLAR. Who did employ you?

Mr. JACKSON. I said I have been employed on special matters by American Gas & Electric Co.

He came with Mr. Smith and Mr. Smith, on pages 208 and 209 suggested that he be examined first and later on Mr. Jackson said he was not employed by Mr. Smith but he was an employee of the American Gas & Electric Co., the Appalachian Electric Power Co., the West Virginia Power Co., the Ohio Power Co., and a number of others.

I then asked:

All private power companies?

Mr. JACKSON. Oh, yes. We have no Government subsidy—they don't. They are not in partnership with the United States Treasury or anything. All they have to do is pay taxes (p. 257).

Later Mr. Smith said:

Inasmuch as Senator McKELLAR has raised the question of my salary, I would like to make an explanation, please

Senator McKELLAR. It was raised yesterday on Mr. Thomas A. Allen, and that is why.

Mr. SMITH. You quoted from a newspaper there.

Senator McKELLAR. Yes, sir, I did. I would be glad to have you do it.

Mr. SMITH. I just want to say this, so there will be no misunderstanding. I am not paid $65,000 a year by the National Association of Electric Companies for the purpose of opposing the TVA as such. I am employed by the association for many duties in connection with the activities of the association, one of which is the question of the interest of the utility companies in matters involving TVA and many related subjects. We also handle problems with respect to Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Central Valley project in California and many other situations, and I would like to emphasize that because it is so important and comes out here so frequently.

Senator McKELLAR. You live in Cleveland?

Mr. SMITH. I live in Washington, D. C.

Senator McKELLAR. You represent all these companies here?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. In what capacity?

Mr. SMITH. I am president of the association (p. 261).

Then again:

Senator McKELLAR. Was this paper mistaken about the amount of your salary?

Mr. SMITH. My salary is $65,000 a year by contract.

Senator McKELLAR. You represent all these electric companies here at that salary?

Mr. SMITH. That is correct (p. 262).

I suppose Mr. Smith is probably the highest-paid lobbyist in the world. I have never heard of anyone getting quite so much salary. Just $10,000 less than the President of the United States. These private companies are not being injured by the Government if they are able to pay $65,000 a year for lobbying in Washington. I do not believe even as high-paid lobbyist as he is that Mr. Smith made very much of an impression on anyone as a witness, or Mr. Jackson, either, for that matter, as he would not say what fee he was going to charge.

The Chattanooga Power Board paid $10,800,000 for the facilities at Chattanooga.

The TVA and 38 distributors paid the Tennessee Power Co., which was the private power company owning most of the property, $78,500,000.

TVA, $44,949,400; municipalities and corporations, $33,650,000.

The Memphis Power Board and the TVA jointly paid $17,360,000 for the Memphis plant.

The city of Knoxville and the TVA paid jointly $8,274,000. Nashville paid about $8,000,000 for its property.

They paid over $100,000,000 in the State of Tennessee alone.

In Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, and Georgia, a total in the neighborhood of $125,000,000.

Mr. President, I am a little regretful that a man as able and as handsome as my attractive friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the chairman of this subcommittee which has had charge of this matter, does not go along with this great project. It is a great project for our State; it is a great project for the entire country.

There are several reasons in support of the appropriation that I wish to state, although I shall be brief and shall hurry along as fast as possible. The Senate, and particularly the members of the committee, will recall that the testimony before the committee was of a peculiar nature. Mr. James H. Greene, of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., testified; and thereafter, probably a dozen witnesses who were secretaries of chambers of commerce testified. What did they know about this matter? Were they engineers? Oh, no; they were chamber of commerce men. Of course, chamber of commerce men are good men; I do not mean to criticize them. But I do not believe they have the same sort of knowledge and the same kind of judgment that the businessmen we submitted as witnesses on the other side of the question showed they had.

The testimony on that side was by Mr. Kimmich, from Cleveland, Ohio; Mr. John H. Bream, from Harrisburg, Pa.; Mr. Garner M. Lester, Mr. H. A. Stansbury, Mr. George T. Holmes, Mr. Edward J. Bachman, from Minnesota; in fact, testimony was presented by a Virginian, too, the secretary of a chamber of commerce in Virginia. They were nice men and they made very interesting witnesses; but we cannot depend on testimony of that kind for what we wish to know. This is a practical matter. Proposals of this sort must be based on facts, and so we must obtain the facts. I omitted the two most important witnesses on the other side, Mr. Jackson, a lawyer from Cleveland, Ohio, and Mr. Smith, the greatest representative of the power interests in this country, or in any country, I suppose. They both made very intelligent witnesses. They should have. Mr. Jackson did not tell how much he got from the private power companies for coming down here and making an argument, but Mr. Smith very promptly stated he got $65,000 a year for managing transactions of this kind. We are all familiar with that. He was a nice man. I have no criticism to make of a man who can make that much money. Just think of it. He can represent here in Washington companies that desire favors from the Government and get $65,000, which is but $10,000 less than the salary of the President. He is a pretty good man. I compliment him on his ability as a businessman, on being able to be the leader of his profession in all the world. No other representative around the Government or the Congress, or a part of it, ever was known to get that much money before. I compliment Mr. Smith upon it.

What sort of proof did the people in Tennessee and Alabama produce? I tell Senators in the long service I have had here, now nearly 40 years, I never had as many fine witnesses from my State on any matter of importance, as on this.

I shall ask a Senator on one side of the question and a Senator on the other side to confirm what I am about to say. I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee on the one side and the distinguished Senator from California, who took the other view of it, will say that Mr. Allen and Mr. Bruce and the various other gentlemen presented by the people of Alabama and Tennessee and Georgia, and the neighboring States, were men of the highest type and made excellent witnesses. I take it by the silence of Senators, they agree with that statement. I felt sure they would.

Just a few more remarks, and I shall leave the matter with Senators. Mr. President, we are all aware of the great success the TVA has achieved and the fine example it has been to the rest of the country. If there were such an organization in Oregon, California, Washington, Idaho, or Colorado, or on the Missouri River, or on any other river in our country, what a wonderful thing it would be.

I may say to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], that TVA has been a wonderful success. Mistakes have been made. Those in charge have not always done just what I should have liked to see them do, but taking it as a whole they have made a success of the proposition and it has paid the Government. All Government projects do not pay off in money, but this one does, some $20,000,000 a year, and yet it has been in real operation only the last 2 or 3 years. It is engaged in some things probably it ought not to be engaged in, such as developing the farm industry. I doubt if TVA ought to be in that. I will join other Senators at any time in restricting that activity, because I do not think it ought to be done. I think this enterprise ought to be conducted as a genuine, honest, straight organization. It has been a great success. It has made money. It has built up our State. The Government will not lose anything at all by it, but will make money on the investment, because the investment is worth exactly what it is represented to be on the books of the Authority today. If mistakes have been made, they should be corrected.

Mr. President, if there is anyone who wants to ask any questions that I can answer, I shall be glad to answer them. Otherwise, I have said all I want to say at this time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEM. The point is based on rule XVI, section 2, reading as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation.

The amendment under consideration——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair interrupt the Senator to say we have not reached the amendment to which the Senator is addressing his point of order.

Mr. KEM. If the Chair will permit me to say, on examination of the amendment it seems to me the amendment now is the appropriation of some $30,000,000 for certain construction, including one small plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. The Chair, with his ready and quick perception, I think foresees that the particular language to which the Senator from Missouri objects is the "one steam plant, New Johnsonville, Tenn."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That was the Chair's understanding.

Mr. KEM. If the Chair will permit me to say, it seems to me the point goes to the amendment now under consideration, because we are considering the amendment proposing the appropriation of some $30,000,000 for certain construction, including one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. If the Chair feels that the discussion of the point I make should be deferred, I shall be glad to defer it under the ruling of the Chair. I should like the Senate to know I have in mind that this is new legislation which should not be introduced into the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wants to be quite sure the Senator from Missouri does not misunderstand the Chair. If the Senator from Missouri desires to address his point of order to the appropriation figure, as well as to the language, it certainly is in order at the moment.

Mr. KEM. I should like to do so, if the Chair will bear with me, in view of the fact that it seems the two are intermingled and connected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well.

Mr. KEM. As has just been said, we are dealing with an amendment that proposes the appropriation of some $30,000,000 for certain purposes. One of the purposes for which the $30,000,000 is to be devoted is the construction of one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. The point of order, Mr. President, is predicated on the proposition that the construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., is entirely new legislation. It has not previously appeared on the statute books. It is improper to introduce such legislation for the first time in an appropriation bill. Of course the question involved is a simple one, namely, whether the TVA Act as amended contains authority or authorization to construct a steam plant. I have examined the act with some care. It seems to me that the purposes of the act are summarized in section 23. Those purposes are enumerated as follows:

(1) The maximum amount of flood control; (2) the maximum development of said Tennessee River for navigation purposes; (3) the maximum generation of electric power consistent with flood control and navigation; (4) the proper use of marginal lands; (5) the proper method of reforestation of all lands in said drainage basin suitable for reforestation; and (6) the economic and social well-being of the people living in said river basin.

In carrying out those general powers, steam plants are referred to in various places. The Corporation which is created by the act is authorized in section 7, subsection (a), to purchase certain nitrate plants, including steam plants located, respectively, at Sheffield, Ala., and Muscle Shoals, Ala. Certainly that does not cover a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call the Senator's attention to the following provision of the act, which will be found on page 3:

Except as otherwise specifically provided in this act, the Corporation—

That means the TVA—

shall have power to construct dams, reservoirs, powerhouses—

The bill provides for the construction of powerhouses, and it has been complained that they cost too much money.

I read further—

powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems by transmission lines.

It is also provided that it shall have power to acquire real estate for the construction of dams, reservoirs, transmission lines, powerhouses, and other structures and navigation projects at any point along the Tennessee River, or any of its tributaries.

Fuller authority to construct powerhouses could not be given than this power which Congress has given by the act.

Mr. KEM. I have in mind the language to which the Senator from Tennessee directs attention. It is perfectly apparent from the context that what the Congress had in mind when the act was passed was powerhouses connected with hydroelectric development. It is constantly used in that way in the act. When Congress meant steam plants, as I shall show the Senate in a few minutes, Congress knew perfectly well how to express that idea. There was no confusion in the mind of Congress as to what was meant by a powerhouse and what was meant by a steam plant. When Congress meant a hydroelectric powerhouse, it said hydroelectric powerhouse. When it meant a steam plant, it said steam plant.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wanted to ask the able Senator what Congress meant when it referred to power structures?

Mr. KEM. Where does that phrase appear?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In section 4 (j). What did Congress mean when it said: in the construction of any future dam, steam plant——

Mr. KEM. If the Senator will ask me the questions one by one, and direct my attention to the section of the act, I shall be glad to answer.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield twice to me, I shall be glad to ask him the questions.

Mr. KEM. Very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Section 4 (j) of the original act provided, among other powers enumerated, that

The Corporation—

Meaning the TVA—

shall have power to construct dams, reservoirs, powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works.

Mr. KEM. The Senator has just picked out a few words from the section. The Senator should read the entire language. The language is perfectly clear——

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will permit me, I will read the entire section.

Mr. KEM. I am capable of reading it myself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator asked me if I would read it.

Mr. KEM. The Senator chose to read a certain part. If the Senator will read the entire section, I shall be glad to have it read.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Different powers are enumerated. One series of powers is enumerated in section 4 (j). Let me read all of section 4 (j). Of course it starts by saying "the Corporations," referring to TVA "Shall have power to construct dams, reservoirs, powerhouses, power structures"——

Mr. KEM. The Senator is not reading the language correctly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, yes, the Senator is reading the language correctly.

Mr. KEM. The Senator omitted the words "such dam."

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is where the Senator from Missouri falls into a fatal argument, because he is reading from the 1935 act, and not the original act.

Mr. KEM. I am reading from the original act, as amended. That is what governs the procedure today.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all. If the Senator wants to construe what Congress meant when it passed the act, he must go back to the original act. The original act of 1933 did not contain the language upon which the Senator is depending to make his argument. I have read the entire section as it is given in the original act.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I submit that the statute which governs proceedings today is the TVA Act as amended, and the question as to whether the acquisition or construction of a steam power-plant is authorized under existing law depends not upon what the law was when it was originally passed, but upon the law as it stands amended today.

I believe that the Senator from Alabama had another question, and I shall be glad to answer it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair ask the Senator from Missouri whether it is his position that the amended act repeals the language to which the Senator from Alabama has referred?

Mr. KEM. No. My position is that the amended act reads as follows:

Shall have power to construct such dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee River—

The Senator from Alabama in reading it omitted the word "such"—

Shall have power to construct such dams, and reservoirs in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, as in conjunction with Wilson Dam, and Norris Wheeler, and Pickwick Landing Dams, now under construction, will provide a 9-foot channel in the said river and maintain a water supply for the same, from Knoxville to its mouth, and will best serve to promote navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries and control destructive flood waters in the Tennessee and Mississippi River drainage basins; and shall have power to acquire or construct powerhouses.

It is perfectly clear that it means powerhouses on these rivers—

Power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems by transmission lines.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me there?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The last clause the Senator read is the identical language of the original act, and that is the only part that was in the original act. Therefore it could not possibly have depended on the first part of this amended section for its interpretation.

Mr. KEM. I take it that if there is any rule of statutory construction that is well known and universally followed it is the rule that the construction depends upon the four corners of the instrument, the four corners of the statute, and the statute which the President pro tempore is called upon to construe today is the statute as it was amended and stands on the books today.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield, of course, in order to ascertain what Congress intended from this whole instrument, one must go back and get the original expression of intent, and the original act merely contained a like provision, which shows clearly that it was not tied to the first part of the provision, as the Senator would have us believe now.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator permit me to say that Congress frequently changes its mind, and that it has changed its mind with reference to the project it meant to authorize in the Tennessee Valley, not once, but several times? The question before the Senate today is, what authority exists as of today for the construction and ownership of works in that area?

I believe the Senator had some other question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I was quoting from section 15. This was in the original act.

Mr. KEM. Very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And it was in the act as amended in 1935.

Mr. KEM. Very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It reads:

In the construction of any future dam—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is page 10.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Section 15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It reads, "In the construction of any future dam, steam plant," and so forth. What did Congress mean when it inserted that language?

Mr. KEM. I can tell the Senator in a very few words what it means as of today. I invite the Senator's attention to section 15 (a), which was an amendment inserted in the year 1939, by the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Section 15 as originally passed provided that in the construction of any future steam plant the Corporation, or the Board, was authorized and empowered to issue, on the credit of the United States, certain serial bonds, not exceeding $50,000,000.

In 1939 Congress amended that by inserting section 15 (a), and if the Senator will look at the last line in section 15 (a), he will see the following language:

The authority of the Corporation to issue bonds hereunder shall expire at the end of 5 years from the date when the section as amended herein becomes law except that such bonds which may be issued—

And so forth. In other words, Mr. President, in 1939 Congress provided that that authority should terminate and be at an end within 5 years from the date of that amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KEM. The authority, therefore, to issue those bonds, to which the Senator from Alabama directs attention, expired in the year 1944.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield for a question, not for an argument.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to make a comment on what the Senator has just said.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield for that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I well remember the act of 1939. As a matter of fact, I was a joint author of that act, from which the Senator has just quoted.

Mr. KEM. Was the Senator joint author also of the amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of the act he has just quoted.

Mr. KEM. Was the Senator author of the amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I am telling the Senator that that was an amendment of the TVA Act. I am telling the Senator that.

Mr. KEM. What intrigued me was that the Senator's recollection of the act seemed to be better than his recollection of the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I remember the amendment quite well, and what I am saying refers to the amendment which the Congress adopted in 1939, to which the Senator has just referred. If he will read the last sentence again, the Senator will see that it took away from the TVA the power to pay for steam plants from the issuance of bonds, but it did not say one word about taking away the power to build steam plants.

Mr. KEM. The Senator is trying to lift himself up by his own bootstraps. He calls attention to section 15, which gives the power to issue bonds, then he says that power is taken away, but it remained. Let me ask the Senator, if the power conferred by section 15 was terminated in the year 1944, how can it be said that any vestige of that power remains in the corporation or the board?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to make myself clear. I do not contend that the power to construct steam plants is derived solely from section 15. As a matter of fact, section 15 recognized that the power existed to construct steam plants, and provided a way by which they could be paid for, that is, by the issuance of bonds.

Mr. KEM. Of course, I have already directed the attention of the Senate to certain steam plants which were authorized to be bought, a steam plant at Muscle Shoals, and another in Memphis. There is no question but that certain specific, definite, steam plants were authorized to be purchased. My point is, if the Senator will bear with me, that there is no blanket authority to go out into the Tennessee Valley, anywhere the corporation may elect to go, and purchase or erect a steam plant. In other words, the authority to buy a steam plant at Muscle Shoals does not carry with it by any implication, the authority to buy or erect a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with the Senator in that statement, but let me ask him what this means in section 14, on the same page. It says, "In like manner, the cost and book value of any dams, steam plants, or other similar improvements hereafter constructed and turned over to said board for the purpose of control and management shall be ascertained," and so forth.

Mr. KEM. I was just pointing out to the Senator what those steam plants are. They are the steam plants referred to in section 7, the steam plant at Muscle Shoals, and other plants. There is no question but that certain specific steam plants are authorized. At the very outset of my remarks I pointed out the authority to buy a certain steam plant, that is, the steam plant at Muscle Shoals. The act proceeds and makes certain provisions for the handling and the financing of that steam plant. But the Senator misses the point of my argument entirely if he thinks that I am contending for a minute that no steam plants are authorized. My contention is that no steam plant is authorized at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope the Senator does not contend that the act has set out in it exactly where every dam is to be built and every steam plant is to be constructed.

Mr. KEM. No. If the Senator will permit me to say it, that is the vice into which the Appropriations Committee has fallen. It has undertaken to authorize the construction of a plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., which is entirely outside and extraneous to the proper office of an appropriation measure.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. COOPER. Will the Senator cite to me the section of the act or amendment of the act on which he is basing his argument?

Mr. KEM. I am basing my argument on the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, Public No. 17, passed in the Seventy-third Congress, first session; as amended by Public No. 412 in the Seventy-fourth Congress; as further amended by Public No. 224 in the Seventy-sixth Congress; as further amended by Public Resolution No. 88 in the Seventy-sixth Congress; as further amended by Public No. 184 in the Seventy-seventh Congress; and finally as amended by Public No. 306 in the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Mr. COOPER. May I ask the Senator a question? I missed the first part of his argument.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. COOPER. Is the Senator contending that there is no authority to construct a particular dam or a particular steam plant without the specific naming by Congress of such plant or such dam?

Mr. KEM. Not for a minute. I hope the Senator from Kentucky would not think I would make an argument of that kind.

Mr. COOPER. Is the Senator contending that there is no general authority in the act to construct such steam plants as are necessary for the efficient operation of the Authority?

Mr. KEM. Absolutely, and I challenge the Senator from Kentucky to point out such a general authority.

Mr. COOPER. I find in section 4 of the TVA act, which I understand the Senator does not now deem applicable—an opinion which I think is subject to question—the following provisions:

Sec. 4. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this act, the Corporation—

* * * * * *

(f) May purchase or lease and hold such real and personal property as it deems necessary or convenient in the transaction of its business, and may dispose of any such personal property held by it.

(g) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers herein specifically conferred upon the Corporation.

* * * * * *

(i) Shall have power to acquire real estate for the construction of dams, reservoirs, transmission lines, power houses, and other structures and navigation projects at any point along the Tennessee River, or any of its tributaries.

* * * * * *

(j) Shall have power to * * * acquire or construct power houses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries.

I call attention to the words "other structures" in subsection (i), also to the fact that it has been held that transmission lines could be constructed, and I would ask the Senator to draw the distinction between the construction of transmission lines needed for efficient disposition of power and the construction of plants needed for the efficient disposition of power.

Mr. KEM. I will be glad to do so, Mr. President. The transmission lines are physically connected with the distribution of power from a hydroelectric dam. Certainly the right to construct and operate those dams could be fairly said to be an incidental power when the authority was given to construct the dam and to market the power from it.

Mr. COOPER. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. KEM. Yes, I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. COOPER. I point out that it was not absolutely necessary for the Tennessee Valley Authority to construct transmission lines to the dams in order to dispose of power. It could possibly be done by private companies. It was necessary to efficiently dispose of the power. It can as reasonably be argued that steam plants can be constructed to efficiently dispose of power developed at the dams.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the courts have held that the construction of the transmission lines from the hydroelectric dam were reasonably connected; were incidental facilities the right to construct which was given in the power to construct the dams. For my part I think there is no reason to quarrel with that decision. I think it was clearly right and correct. But I ask the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Alabama or any other Senator if they know of any decision of any court of record which has held that the right to construct a hydroelectric dam and powerhouse carries with it the incidental right to construct a steam power plant.

Mr. COOPER. I think the Senator from Missouri is the first one who has questioned that power. I do not know that it has been decided by any court. I will say that a few years ago Congress appropriated money to construct a steam plant in the Tennessee Valley at Watts Bar. Congress did not question its power at that time. The Congress appropriated money for the Tennessee Valley Authority to purchase private utility companies which included steam plants. At that time the power was not questioned.

Going back to the matter of principle and not just the specific words, it seems reasonable to me that if a court would hold that it was necessary and essential to build transmission lines to make proper disposition of power taking into consideration the well-known fact that steam plants are needed properly to dispose of water power, it would follow that there would be authority to construct sufficient steam plants properly to dispose of power developed at dams.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do not desire to wear down the patience of the Chair, but I do want to say that the argument of the Senator from Kentucky and the argument of the Senator from Alabama to an extent would carry us to the point where under this statute the TVA would be authorized to build or buy or operate power plants anywhere in the United States that the corporation thought were reasonably incidental to its efforts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator a moment ago asked if either the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Alabama would point out to him any Supreme Court decision.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know of a Supreme Court decision, but I do have something here which I believe the Senator from Missouri would accept as being pretty close to it. This is taken from a complaint filed in a suit which went to the Supreme Court of the United States testing the TVA authority. The complaint was signed by the Honorable Raymond T. Jackson, an attorney of Cleveland, Ohio, who, by the way, testified befor the committee against the provision in the bill. I refer the Senator to a statement in that complaint signed by Mr. Jackson as counsel for all the power companies which were trying to overthrow the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. I read:

Under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act as amended the number and capacity of steam and hydroelectric plants for the generation of electricity which the defendants—

That is, the Tennessee Valley Authority—

may construct and operate in the Tennessee Basin—

And I agree that it ought to be confined to the Tennessee Basin—

are wholly undefined. Said act as amended purports to vest complete and uncontrolled

discretion in the defendants in relation to such matters.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, that is the first time I have ever heard it seriously contended that the statement made by a lawyer in a pleading was an authority. I thought it was pretty generally recognized that we lawyers sometimes say as we are paid, that any qualms of conscience are salved by the tinkling jingle of our clients' gold. The proposition that a statement made in a pleading on behalf of a litigant by his counsel is an authority which the United States Senate should consider, or which the President pro tempore of the Senate should seriously consider in ruling on a point of order, is, indeed, unique.

Are there any further questions?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to make it clear that I was not citing the statement as authority upon which I recommended that anyone rely. However, this distinguished lawyer takes the same position today which the Senator from Missouri takes. But when he was fighting the case in the Supreme Court, this is what he said about it. He is a distinguished lawyer.

Mr. KEM. That is an admission against Mr. Jackson's interest. I take it it is hardly an admission against my interest.

Mr. HILL rose.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Alabama have a question?

Mr. HILL. I desire to address the Senate in my own time.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to advise the Senator from Alabama when I have completed my remarks.

Mr. President, as I was saying, steam plants are referred to in more than one place in this statute. They are referred to in section 15, in which the authority to issue bonds for the purchase of steam plants is expressly given. In a later amendment the authority was expressly terminated, so that it could be exercised only within 5 years.

It seems apparent that in 1939 the Congress looked at this statute and said, "We have given a power to the Tennessee Valley Authority which goes pretty far. It is a power which we do not see now is directly connected with the generation of hydroelectric power and flood protection in the Tennessee Valley. If that power is to be exercised, it must be exercised within 5 years from this date." That time expired in 1944.

Let me get these references in order. In section 7, a steam plant is referred to. It is the plant at Muscle Shoals. I take it that it would be admitted by learned Senators that that does not authorize the construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville.

The next section to which I wish to refer is section 15. That is the section in which authority was given to issue bonds. The authority terminated in 1944. In section 15 there is reference again to a steam plant:

> The Board, whenever the President deems it advisable, is hereby empowered and instructed to complete dam No. 2 at Muscle Shoals, Ala., and the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 2 in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals.

If the Congress intended that the Board should have the authority to construct steam plants anywhere at any time, why did it use printer's ink to give this specific authority to construct, own, and operate the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 2 at Muscle Shoals? I think the question carries with it its own answer.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude as I started. I think the authority given to the TVA under the act is summarized as clearly and specifically as it is possible to do in words. That language is contained in section 23 of the act. There are set out six purposes which Congress says are the general purposes of the act. I submit that not one of them is the purpose to construct, maintain, or operate a steam plant.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. KEM. No.

Mr. President, I believe that clearly, through an excusable omission in failing to consult the general act of authority, our committee has inserted in this appropriation bill a piece of general or new legislation, and that the point of order should be sustained.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit that the point of order is not well taken, because I think we must consider not only the whole TVA Act, but the common-sense principles upon which it must rest.

Certainly there is no question of doubt that the spirit of the TVA Act was not only to set up hydroelectric plants and multiple-purpose dams, but also to set up an integrated electric-power system in that area, to such an extent that authority was given for the TVA to take over the existing power system. Inasmuch as that was done, it is not common sense, in the judgment of the junior Senator from California, that they would set up an integrated power system and at the same time would eliminate the possibility of firming up power with a steam plant, when there is not a publicly owned or privately owned utility system in the country which does not have to depend upon steam plants for the firming up of electric power.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me finish this thought, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

During the course of the hearings the junior Senator from California, who presided at a number of them, raised certain questions as to the reason for the location at New Johnsonville. The reason will be found on page 42. A map of that area was submitted, showing that the New Johnsonville location is substantially in the center of the power load. The question occurred to me as to why it should not be located at Memphis or some other place.

Therefore I submit that the language in the bill, "one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.," is not in fact new legislation, but rather is merely a limitation in the appropriation act, so that they could not take the money which the committee desired to have appropriated for the purpose of constructing a steam plant and locate it either outside the TVA area—which, of course, they would not do—or in some area where they could not get the full economic use of the plant.

I am sure that the able Senator from Missouri knows the farther electricity must be transmitted—and this is true whether it be a steam plant or a hydroelectric plant—the greater the power losses are in transmission. It seems to me that it is good economics, and is a saving of money to the TVA—which in turn means saving money to the Federal Treasury—to have this plant located where it can receive the greatest economic benefit. Therefore, the language is merely a limitation in an appropriation bill, for which there is ample right and precedent, rather than in any degree being new legislation.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Did the Senator understand the Senator from Missouri to say that he was objecting to the location of the plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., if such plant were to be built?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I did not. I was merely pointing out to the able Senator that to that extent the language was a limitation by the Appropriations Committee so that the plant would be placed where the testimony showed it would render the greatest economic value to the TVA project.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I think the Senator is devoting his very respectable powers of argument to the point that New Johnsonville, Tenn., is a proper, fit, and apt location for this plant, which is entirely beside the point. I did not for a minute make the point that New Johnsonville is not a good location for such a plant, if such a plant is to be built, or that New Johnsonville is not a central location. I know nothing about that.

My point is that at no time has the Congress authorized the construction by the TVA of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, or at Knoxville, or at New York, or at Oakland, Calif., or at Kansas City, Mo., or anywhere else. Until such an authorization is made, I say it is improper, and subject to a point of order, for the Appropriations Committee to undertake to put such a law on the statute books.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit to the able Senator from Missouri that it is not at all unusual for the Appropriations Committee, in dealing with an authorized project—and I think there is no question that the TVA is an authorized project—to indicate in an appropriation bill that certain amounts of the funds to be appropriated will be for transmission lines or for power plants or, as in the case of the Central Valley project in my State, will specifically be allocated for the Friant-Kern canal, or the Delta-Mendota canal, or the Shasta Dam, or whatever it may be. It is well within the province of the Appropriations Committee, when recommending the appropriation of money for irrigation purposes, to place certain limitations on the money, so that it will not be misapplied by being used for power projects, or vice versa.

In this limitation we have tried to indicate that of that amount of money, a part of it—as we have set forth in our report and in the bill—shall be for the construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., and shall not be used for some other purpose—for instance, let us say, for research work or for something else. I think that is well within the power of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will permit me to say so, I think he is assuming the point at argument, which is that the TVA is authorized to build or construct or own a steam plant. If the Senator from California will be kind enough to point out to us the place in the TVA Act where the ownership and construction of such a steam plant is authorized, then I shall be glad to take into consideration the argument he has made.

However, the point is not the good faith of the Appropriations Committee. Certainly, that has not been challenged. The point is not whether New Johnsonville, Tenn., is a proper or central location for the proposed plant.

The question is whether under the enabling statute the ownership or construction of a steam power plant anywhere has been authorized by the Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I submit that when the act says "powerhouses," it is obvious that a powerhouse or power plant can be either a steam plant or a hydroelectric plant, and that the intent of the Congress and the language of the law are sufficient to cover either one, both of which would be necessary in order to carry out this integrated program.

For the Senator from Missouri to take a narrow interpretation of the phrase "power plant" as meaning solely a hydroelectric power plant, I do not think is a realistic approach. I think a power plant can be either a steam power plant or a hydroelectric power plant—or, in fact, it could be an atomic-energy power plant. If, either in this case or in any other case, the law provided for a power plant, and if, 10 or 15 years later, we were to find that we could better generate power by means of atomic energy, I hope the Senator would not take the position that that narrow interpretation should be placed on that term—namely, that we could not make the fullest possible use of the technological developments which we hope to achieve.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, several rather interesting propositions have been advanced in the course of this discussion, but I think the one advanced just now by the Senator from California is perhaps the most interesting of all. That seems to be that if the TVA is authorized to construct a power plant for hydroelectric power, which we admit it is, or if it is authorized to own a steam plant at Muscle Shoals, which we admit it is, then by some hocus-pocus it has acquired the power to keep up with industrial and scientific developments, wherever they may lead.

As I understand the Senator from California, he is advancing the proposition that if the Congress authorizes the TVA to construct and own a steam plant at Muscle Shoals or to construct, own, and operate hydroelectric plants along the Tennessee River, then the TVA may also keep a weather eye on scientific development and may acquire an atomic plant at Kingsport, Tenn.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the language to which I called the Senator's attention did not refer to a hydroelectric plant or to a steam plant. It was "powerhouses," or "power structures." I submit to the able Senator from Missouri that it would be the duty of any well-run firm, whether privately owned or publicly owned—of course, this is purely a hypothetical question, as the Senator must realize, because we do not now have commercial production of atomic power for electric-generating purposes—but if in the course of years it should be established that it was possible more economically and more efficiently to generate power by means of atomic energy than by means of a hydroelectric power plant or a steam plant, I should say that probably every public utility in the country would be interested in that, if they could save money to their rate payers and also to the companies themselves. In that case, I think every privately owned public utility and every publicly owned public utility would be interested, and certainly they should not be foreclosed from participating in that development in the course of the years, if such a development occurs.

Therefore, I merely say that when power plants are mentioned in this connection, I do not think that specifically means hydroelectric power plants and I do not think it specifically means steam power plants, but I think it means power plants using whatever can be used best to do the particular job.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Senator from California is, then, of the serious opinion that under the TVA Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority could engage, today, in the generation of power by atomic energy created from fissionable materials.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I did not say that, because of course that would depend on the Atomic Energy Act itself and on the safeguards which might be set up by the Atomic Energy Commission, and whether in the judgment of that Commission it would be possible, without disclosing anything that might be of a military nature, to license—either to publicly owned or privately owned power companies—whatever type of plant might be necessary for the manufacture of electric power through the use of fissionable materials. I merely mention that as a possibility for the future. No man is wise enough today to know how quickly such a future development might come upon us.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do not know that I follow the Senator from California in the various ramifications of his argument. But so far as the Senator from Missouri is concerned, I say that if the TVA wishes to engage in the use of atomic energy, it should come to Congress for specific authority for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair inquire of the Senator from Missouri whether he takes the position that the term "powerhouses" refers exclusively to hydroelectric power?

Mr. KEM. I think it does specifically so refer, in view of the context in which it is used. The President pro tempore has in mind section 4; does he?

As was pointed out in the colloquy with the Senator from Alabama, I think language authorizing the construction of the dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries, as set out spetifically—the Wilson Dam, the Norris Dam, the Wheeler Dam, and the Pickwick Landing Dam—specifically modifies the language of the entire section, and that the authority to construct power structures, as well as transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works on the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various projects by one or more transmission lines, necessarily is so modified and qualified.

I shall tell the Chair why I think that is so. If it were not so, that would have created on the Tennessee River a veritable octopus that could reach out all over the United States and acquire all sorts of power plants. As the Senator from California has said, they could engage in the generation of atomic energy. They could come into my State and say, "We think in our judgment it is wise for us to come into Missouri, because your power plants could compete with ours, and you compete in our market." I think the only reasonable construction of the language is that the power structures referred to are the power structures at the Wilson Dam, Norris Dam, Wheeler Dam, and the Pickwick Landing Dam, and incidental dams on the Tennessee River.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to submit another question to some Senator who can answer it. The Chair would like to know whether the subject of justification arose in the committee in the consideration of the amendment. If it did, the Chair assumes the presence of the amendment in the reported bill would indicate the committee had resolved the matter in favor of the validity of the amendment. But the Chair has understood there was some discussion of the matter in the committee and would like to be advised what happened in committee in this connection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I recall no discussion at all as to whether this was legislation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator will agree with me when I say—and it fits in with his explanation, which I agree

is correct—that no point of order was raised against this amendment as being legislative and therefore inappropriate.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. It was not mentioned, was it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It was not mentioned as to that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I mean.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, the power plant at New Johnsonville was mentioned and there was considerable discussion concerning it, but the point of order was not raised.

Mr. FERGUSON. The point of order was not raised.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. We have an understanding of it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, referring to the words "powerhouses and other structures," in paragraph (i) subsection 4, and the words "powerhouses" and "power structures" of subsection (j) of section 4, I strongly contend that the use of those words meant any kind of powerhouse or power structure, whether it was a hydroelectric powerhouse or a steam powerhouse. A steam plant is as much a powerhouse as any other power plant, you get electric power from a steam plant as well as from a hydro plant. But if for the sake of argument there should be any doubt that "powerhouses and power structures and other structures" means steam plants, when we turn to the other sections of the bill, the other sections make it absolutely clear that those words mean a steam plant or steam powerhouse as well as a water powerhouse. I call the Chair's attention to page 22, section 14, of the TVA Act, the language of which has been quoted before. The last sentence in that section says:

In like manner, the cost and book value of any dams, steam plants, or other similar improvements hereafter constructed and turned over to said Board for the purpose of control and management shall be ascertained and allocated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator state again where he is reading?

Mr. HILL. I am reading from page 22, section 14 of the TVA Act. Possibly I had better read the whole section. Section 14 reads:

The Board—

That means the TVA Board—

shall make a thorough investigation as to the present value of dam No. 2—

We knew it then as dam No. 2. It is now known as the Wilson Dam. That was the dam under construction during World War I, in 1917–18. The dam was in existence, owned by the Government of the United States, at the time the TVA Act was passed in 1933.

The Board shall make a thorough investigation as to the present value of dam No. 3—

The Wilson Dam, in other words—

and the steam plants at nitrate plant No. 1 and nitrate plant No. 2—

Both those steam plants, the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 1, the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 2, were built in 1917–18, during World War I, and were in existence when the TVA Act was enacted. Congress directed that the Board should estimate the value of the dam and of those two steam plants, and then, as to the cost of the Cove Creek Dam, which was a dam then under consideration for construction, now known as the Norris Dam—

for the purpose of ascertaining how much of the value or the cost of said properties shall be allocated and charged up to (1) flood control, (2) navigation, (3) fertilizer, (4) national defense, and (5) the development of power. The findings thus made by the Board, when approved by the President of the United States, shall be final, and such findings shall thereafter be used in all allocation of value for the purpose of keeping the book value of said properties.

Up to that point, Mr. President, section 14 dealt with properties, steam plants, and a dam then owned by the Government of the United States, and which, under the act, were to be turned over to the TVA Board. The act did not stop there. It went further and said what?

In like manner—

That is, in the manner previously provided in section 14—

the cost and the book value of the dams, steam plants, or other similar improvements hereafter constructed—

Showing it was the clear intent and purpose of the act that, there would be steam plants, in the language of this section, "hereafter constructed."

So there can be no question but what section 14 confirmed the fact that it was the intent and purpose that powerhouses, power structures, and other structures should include steam plants as well as water plants. The statute was doing what? It was providing for the allocation of costs and book value of what? Of this very Johnsonville plant which is before the Congress today, if Congress appropriates the money and the steam plant is constructed.

I turn to section 15. What do we find in that section? Section 15 was a part of the original act, Mr. President. Section 15 says:

In the construction of any future dam, steam plant, or other facility, to be used in whole or in part for the generation or transmission of electric power, the Board is hereby authorized and empowered to issue on the credit of the United States and to sell serial bonds not exceeding $50,000,000 in amount, having a maturity not more than 50 years from the date of issue thereof.

In other words, Congress provided not only for the construction of steam plants, but for the issuance of bonds with which to pay for them, the idea at that time being that it might be that the TVA would be financed not so much from appropriations out of the Treasury as from bonds issued by the TVA, and guaranteed by the Government. So Congress again clearly authorized the construction of steam plants.

As to section 15 (a), Mr. President, that section does not in any way, shape, fashion, or form, take anything away from section 15 or in any way repeal section 15. It simply adds additional power for the purchase of steam plants, dams, and power facilities. Section 15 (c) constitutes the language of the bill which Congress enacted in 1939, authorizing the TVA to purchase properties of private power companies in the Tennessee Valley. The question arose as to whether, under the act, the TVA would have the authority to purchase dams, steam plants, and other power facilities. There was no question raised that TVA would not have the power to construct steam plants, dams, transmission lines, and power facilities, but there was a question as to purchasing properties without some further authorization from the Congress.

That is how section 15 (c) came into the act.

Mr. President, section 15 clearly authorized the construction of steam plants, dams, and so forth, and the issuance of bonds to pay for the same. Then the question came up as to buying the properties of private power companies in the TVA area, and whether or not the TVA had authority to purchase dams and steam plants or transmission lines and other power facilities. In order that there might be no doubt about the authority, section 15 (c) was added to the act through the bill which was passed in 1939, to give to the TVA the additional power of purchasing as well as constructing steam plants, dams, and other power facilities.

In that connection, Mr. President, I should like to call the Chair's attention to the language of the report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture made on the bill reported in 1939, the bill which, as I say, embodied section 15 (c). Here is what the Senate committee said:

Under the existing Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority are empowered to issue bonds and use the proceeds thereof for the construction of dams, steam plants, or other facilities to be used for the generation and transmission of electric power, also for the construction or acquisition of transmission lines, and for making loans to municipalities and cooperative organizations for the purchase of existing transmission lines and distribution properties. The authority under the law to issue bonds for the purchase——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. From what section is the Senator reading?

Mr. HILL. I am reading from a report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which accompanied the bill which was passed in 1939 embodying section 15 (c).

Mr. BALDWIN. I apologize for the interruption.

Mr. HILL. The committee report went on to say:

The authority under the law to issue bonds for the purchase of existing generating facilities is extremely doubtful. It is this defect—

That is, a defect with reference to purchase—

It is this defect in existing law which the proposed amendment is designed to remedy.

That is Senate Report 189, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, pages 1 and 2.

When the bill came up for consideration by the Senate the then majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], had this to say:

This bill proposes, to consolidate sections 15 and 15 (a) of the existing Tennessee Valley Authority Act, so as to make it perfectly clear that in addition to the right and authority to construct transmission lines and all other sorts of public utilities, such as those that are contemplated by this purchase—

Remember, Mr. President, that in the purchase were some steam plants owned by private power companies—

the Tennessee Valley Authority may also purchase them. There has been some doubt expressed as to the authority of the TVA under existing law, to purchase these properties.

That is, the properties of private power companies, referring to dams, steam plants, transmission lines, and other power facilities.

The Senator from Kentucky then stated that—

The Tennessee Valley Authority could undoubtedly construct similar properties.

The late Senator Norris spoke on that occasion, and here is what he had to say, Mr. President:

Under existing law the TVA could issue bonds and build the plants—

Namely, the steam plants of private power companies, along with any other installations which the private power companies had—

but there is a question whether it can purchase the plants when they have been built by others. It may be a doubtful question, but in order to be sure about that, this measure has been offered.

Mr. President, I happen to be the author of the bill for the creation of the TVA. It was passed by the House of Representatives, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] said earlier in the afternoon. I sat on the conference committee of the two Houses assisting in ironing out certain differences. There was no question in the minds of the conferees that the act authorized the TVA Board to build dams, steam plants, transmission lines, and any other power facilities which might be necessary for the orderly, economical, and businesslike generation and distribution of power and for the development and operation of an integrated and complete system in the Tennessee Valley.

I submit to the Chair that the language in section 4 certainly, as it is fortified and sustained by the language in sections 14 and 15 of the act, make it definite and clear that there is no question but that the construction of a steam plant is authorized by the Congress.

In that connection, Mr. President, I have before me the language which authorized the construction of the Watts Bar steam plant, a plant constructed by the TVA. I quote the language in the law today (54 Stat. 781):

as an additional amount to carry out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, approved May 18, 1933, as amended by the Acts approved August 31, 1935, and July 26, 1939, including the funds necessary to begin construction of a dam on the Holston River near Jefferson City, Tenn.; to begin installation of two additional electric generating units at Wilson Dam, Alabama, and one additional electric generating unit at Pickwick Landing Dam, Tennessee; and to begin construction of steam electric generating facilities with a rated capacity of approximately 120,000 kilowatts in the area served by the Authority.

Mr. President, that is the language of the act passed by Congress in 1940 for the construction, for the building of what is known as the Watts Bar steam plant, a plant built with funds from the Treasury of the United States appropriated by the Congress, built by the TVA for the TVA and now a part of the TVA system.

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of the clear language of the act, the clear intent of the Congress, there can be no question but that the steam plant is authorized, and that the Appropriations Committee has full authority to bring in this appropriation under this authorization, and the point of order should be overruled.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I do not wish to labor the point, but I should like to say just one further word.

It has always been a rule of construction in the courts, I have understood, that when items are set forth in specific terms, it is a fair assumption that those items which are not included in specific terms are not to be included as being implied. In other words, if a statute mentions one thing specifically and fails to mention another specifically, it is rather indicated that the item which is left out was left out intentionally, and only those things are to be included which were specifically set forth.

Applying that to the section of the bill which gives the power to this corporation, we find that there is no mention whatever of steam plants. The mention is of dams, reservoirs, rivers, tributaries, and the construction of channels to maintain a water level. The language is all in terms dealing with water, in connection with a hydroelectric development.

The clause granting powers to this corporation then proceeds to say:

shall have power to acquire or construct powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries.

There is no mention whatever of a steam plant. Therefore the powerhouses and the power structures specifically referred to are to be considered in connection with a hydroelectric development, and not a steam development.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator if section 7, section 15, and section 16 do not each show that the draftsman of the act knew exactly how to express the concept of the steam plant when and if he intended to use it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I think that is definitely so. I intended to make the further point that since subsequent provisions specifically mention steam plants, it is a fair assumption that they were not included in the earlier sections. Had they been, there would have been no need of making specific reference to them later.

Mr. HILL. Section 15 was in the original act and section 15 (c) was subsequent thereto to authorize the purchase, in addition to the construction of steam plants, dams, and power facilities.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is the very point I am making.

Mr. HILL. They are both parts of the act today—one supplements the other.

Mr. BALDWIN. The very fact that the term "steam plant" is not mentioned in the first section I read, which was the one of general authorization, and that it is mentioned specifically later, but in terms that place a limitation upon it, is significant. For example, section 15 (a) provides, "The authority of the Corporation to issue bonds hereunder shall expire at the end of 5 years," which means bonds in connection with the construction of the steam plant. So that the authority to issue bonds in connection with the construction of the steam plant, I submit, expired at the end of 5 years.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It was not a limitation of 5 years on the subsequent steam plants. Section 15 (a) was inserted in 1939 for the purchase of private power plants. It gave the TVA 5 years in which to buy these properties—to purchase them. It was not a limitation on the power of the TVA to construct plants.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say, in concluding my remarks, that since the specific steam-plant provision was not included in the original general authorization of authority, although many other specific things were included, it is, under a fair rule of interpretation, to be assumed that steam plants were not intended to be encompassed by the general and specific authority granted.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to point out what I believe to be the fallacy in the argument of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and in the argument of my good friend the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

I should like to have the President pro tempore consider exactly what is being proposed. The distinguished Senator from Missouri and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut are saying that because section 4 of the act creating the TVA does not specifically use the words "steam plant," or name the New Johnsonville steam plant, there is no authority contained in the act for the construction of this plant.

The Senator from Connecticut in his last argument, however, did not say that in section 4, subsection (i), after the words "dams, reservoirs, transmission lines, and powerhouses" are used, the general term "other structures" follows. The question which the President pro tempore must resolve is: Do the words "other structures" include steam plants?

As has been so ably argued by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] sections 14 and 15 of the same act indicate clearly that it is contemplated that the words "other structures" shall be interpreted to include steam plants and to authorize their construction. If such general authority is not

contemplated in the words "other structures" found in section 4, then it would be utterly ridiculous to speak in sections 14 and 15 of the construction of steam plants in the future. Section 14 first relates to the allocation of the cost of existing dams. Then it states:

> In like manner, the cost and book value of any dams, steam plants, or other similar improvements hereafter constructed and turned over to said board for the purpose of control and management shall be ascertained and allocated.

Senators will note the use of the word "dams." Dams are specifically named in section 4 and their construction authorized. In section 14 steam plants are named with dams which implies that the construction of steam plants was authorized by the use of the words "other structures" in section 14.

In section 15 a method of financing the construction of steam plants was provided. Which could only mean that it was contemplated by the use of the words "other structures" in section 4 that steam plants could be constructed. If this is not a correct deduction and if it was never contemplated that steam plants could be built, why was it necessary to provide for their financing?

Argument has been made by the Senator from Missouri that the amendment of the TVA Act in 1938 withdrawing the power to finance steam plants by the issuance of bonds, destroyed any authority to construct steam plants. I say that the amendment simply removed a method of financing—a method of financing steam plants by bonds—but did not deprive the Congress of using other means, such as appropriations, to provide for the payment of steam plants, as is now proposed by the Committee on Appropriations.

In support of my position I point out that after section 15 was amended Congress appropriated funds to build a dam at Watts Bar.

So I say that by any reasonable theory of construction I believe there is no doubt that the words "other structures" in section 4 which relates to the general powers and authority of the TVA, certainly mean, when construed with other sections, that there is authority to construct steam plants.

One more point and I shall close. Section 31 of the act provides that the act must be liberally construed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri makes points of order against three committee amendments on page 2; the first amendment which he challenges being the increased appropriation in line 7, the second amendment which he challenges being the increased appropriation in line 11, and the third amendment which he challenges being the language in line 13 "one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn."

So far as the points of order against the first two amendments are concerned, the Chair thinks the situation is very clear. Rule XVI prohibits increased appropriations—

> Unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate.

It seems to me quite clear that these increases are moved by a standing committee of the Senate. The points of order are overruled with respect to the first two amendments to which the Senator from Missouri has addressed himself.

This leaves the much more difficult question involved at line 13, and involved in the identification of "one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn." The Chair finds himself in great perplexity in this connection, and regrets that the only wisdom he can bring to bear upon the subject is that of an ex-editor instead of a Senator seeking appointment as a judge of the United States Court with the equipment to justify him.

It seems to the Chair that the entire purpose of the legislation which must be construed, and particularly that purpose as described and identified in the committee reports accompanying the original legislation, contemplates an integrated system, and it seems to the Chair that an integrated system includes not only dams and hydroelectric works, but also steam plants, as identified in the specific language in section 14 of the amended act.

It seems to the Chair that the point made by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is thoroughly persuasive, and that the words "other structures" in subsection (1) of section 4 must refer to something other than and in addition to dams, reservoirs, transmission lines, powerhouses, and so forth. It seems to the occupant of the Chair that the phrase "and other structures," in view of the nature of the entire legislation, could well include steam plants, in view of the other factors to which the Chair has referred.

The Chair is very reluctant to overrule the point of order because of the very persuasive argument presented by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and his associates in connection with it. It seems to the Chair that it is a close point. The Chair would like to make it very plain that after he has ruled he will consider that the action is in no sense prejudicial if the able Senator from Missouri wishes to appeal from the decision of the Chair. In fact, the first impulse of the Chair was to leave the decision to the Senate, as would be possible under the rules, but it seemed to the Chair that he first should indicate his own impression on the subject.

Therefore the point of order is overruled, and if the able Senator wishes to appeal from the decision of the Chair, the Chair will be very glad indeed to submit the appeal to the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am content with the ruling of the Chair. The matter, of course, will be finally disposed of by a vote on the proposed amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, certain statements have been made in relation to the available power throughout the United States generally. I want to submit for the RECORD a "key list for summary of power survey" and a "summary of capability, peak load, and margins of reserve in the Federal Power Commission region, 1947 to 1951." There seems to be considerable misinformation respecting the availability of power in America. I present the following figures from the summary of capability, peak load, and margins of reserve.

The United States total for 1947 was as follows: Capability, 45,278. Peak load, 43,225. Margin of reserve, 2,053. Percentage of reserve, 4.7.

The same percentage of reserve, 4.7, exists for 1948.

The figures for 1949 are as follows: capability, 54,482. Peak load, 50,416. Margin of reserve, 4,066. Percentage of reserve, 8.1.

In 1950 the capability will be 59,612. The peak load will be 53,256. The margin of reserve will be 6,356. The percentage of reserve will be 11.9.

In 1951 the capability will be 64,028. The peak load will be 55,798. The margin of reserve will be 8,230. The percentage of reserve will be 14.7.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the key list for summary of power survey, and the summary of capability, peak load, and margins of reserve, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Key list for summary of power survey

Region	Area	Code No.	Company name
I	1		
	2	Pool A	New England pool.
	3	Pool B	Upper New York State.
	4	363	Consolidated Edison Co. of New York.
		354	Central Hudson Gas & Electric Co.
		361	Long Island lighting system.
	5	Pool C	Pennsylvania-New Jersey interconnection.
	6	Pool D	Baltimore-Washington pool.
II	7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 19.	Pool E	North Central.
	11	Pool F	Michigan.
III	18	541	Virginia Electric & Power Co.
	19		
	20		
	21	384	Carolina Power & Light Co.
		389	Duke Power Co.
		474	South Carolina Electric & Gas Co.
	22, 23, 24	Pool G	Commonwealth & Southern-Savannah Electric and Power and Florida Companies.
IV	13	Pool H	5 major utilities—eastern Wisconsin.
	14–40	Pool I	Northern Illinois pool.
	14, 17, 29	Pool J	United interconnection (less Iowa companies).
	15	392	Union Electric Co. of Missouri and subsidiaries.
	16	277	Northern States Power Co.
	17	163	Iowa Illinois Gas & Electric Co.
		160c	Iowa Power & Light Co.: Central.
		160 s w	Southwest.
		157	Iowa Electric Co.
		161	Central States Electric Co.
		151	Interstate Power Co.
		156 e	Iowa Public Service (east).
		164–156 w	Sioux City Gas & Electric and Iowa Public Service (west).
		222	Iowa Electric Light & Power Co.
		158	Iowa Southern Utilities.
V	25, 33, 34, 35, 38.	Pool K	Southwest power pool.
	36	347	Southwestern Public Service Co.
	37, 38	Pool L	North Texas interconnected.
		Pool M	South Texas interconnected.
		516	West Texas Utilities Co.
VI			
VII		Pool N	Northwest power pool.
VIII		Pool O	Pacific Southwest pool.

Summary of capability—peak load—margins of reserve—FPC regions, 1947–51

ADVERSE HYDRO CONDITIONS

	1947	1948	Percent	1949	Percent	1950	Percent	1951	Percent
Region I:									
Capability	13,192	14,332		15,388		16,523		17,647	
Peak load	12,456	13,215	6.1	13,748	4.0	14,242	3.6	14,680	3.1
Margin of reserve	736	1,117		1,640		2,281		2,967	
Percent reserve	5.9	8.5		11.9		16.0		19.5	
Region II:									
Capability	10,293	10,916		12,440		13,443		14,198	
Peak load	9,732	10,842	11.4	11,520	6.3	12,161	3.6	12,714	4.5
Margin of reserve	561	74		920		1,282		1,484	
Percent reserve	5.8	0.7		8.0		10.5		11.7	
Region III:									
Capability	4,267	4,715		5,048		5,490		5,942	
Peak load	4,168	4,595	10.2	4,939	7.5	5,232	5.9	5,530	5.7
Margin of reserve	89	120		109		258		412	
Percent reserve	2.1	2.6		2.2		4.9		7.5	
Region IV:									
Capability	5,709	6,225		6,679		7,453		7,945	
Peak load	5,767	6,260	8.5	6,644	6.1	6,897	3.8	7,149	8.7
Margin of reserve	(?)	(35)		35		556		796	
Percent reserve	(0.1)	(0.6)		0.5		8.1		11.1	
Region V:									
Capability	3,127	3,558		4,033		4,684		5,300	
Peak load	3,002	3,474	15.7	3,850	10.8	4,234	10.0	4,490	6.0
Margin of reserve	125	84		183		450		810	
Percent reserve	4.2	2.4		4.8		10.6		18.0	
Region VI:									
Capability									
Peak load	(1)	(1)	(?)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Margin of reserve									
Percent reserve									
Region VII:									
Capability	3,560	3,820		4,000		4,330		4,370	
Peak load	3,550	3,975	12.0	4,365	9.8	4,740	8.6	5,085	7.3
Margin of reserve	10	(155)		(365)		(410)		(715)	
Percent reserve	0.3	(3.9)		(8.4)		(8.6)		(14.1)	
Region VIII:									
Capability	4,418	5,205		5,772		6,302		7,074	
Peak load	4,550	4,950	8.8	5,350	8.1	5,750	7.5	6,150	7.0
Margin of reserve	(132)	255		422		552		924	
Percent reserve	(2.9)	5.2		7.9		9.6		15.0	
United States total:									
Capability	44,607	48,771		53,361		58,225		62,376	
Peak load	43,225	47,311	9.5	50,416	6.6	53,256	5.6	55,798	4.8
Margin of reserve	1,382	1,460		2,945		4,969		6,578	
Percent reserve	3.2	3.1		5.8		9.3		11.8	

MEDIAN HYDRO CONDITIONS

Region I:									
Capability	13,274	14,416		15,472		16,607		17,631	
Peak load	12,456	13,215	6.1	13,748	4.0	14,242	3.6	14,680	3.1
Margin of reserve	818	1,201		1,724		2,365		2,951	
Percent reserve	6.6	9.1		12.5		16.6		20.1	
Region II:									
Capability	10,328	10,981		12,505		13,508		14,263	
Peak load	9,732	10,842	11.4	11,520	6.3	12,161	3.6	12,714	4.5
Margin of reserve	596	139		985		1,347		1,549	
Percent reserve	6.1	1.2		8.6		11.1		12.2	
Region III:									
Capability	4,357	4,815		5,148		5,590		6,042	
Peak load	4,168	4,595	10.2	4,939	7.5	5,232	5.9	5,530	5.7
Margin of reserve	189	220		209		358		512	
Percent reserve	4.5	4.8		4.2		6.8		9.3	
Region IV:									
Capability	5,846	6,315		6,773		7,553		8,050	
Peak load	5,767	6,260	8.5	6,644	6.1	6,897	3.8	7,149	8.7
Margin of reserve	79	55		129		656		901	
Percent reserve	1.4	.9		1.9		9.5		12.6	
Region V:									
Capability	3,145	3,576		4,051		4,702		5,318	
Peak load	3,002	3,474	15.7	3,850	10.8	4,234	10.0	4,490	6.0
Margin of reserve	143	102		201		468		828	
Percent reserve	4.8	2.9		5.2		11.1		18.4	
Region VI:									
Capability									
Peak load	(1)	(1)	(?)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Margin of reserve									
Percent reserve									
Region VII:									
Capability	3,560	3,850		4,360		4,950		5,200	
Peak load	3,550	3,975	12.0	4,365	9.8	4,740	8.6	5,085	7.3
Margin of reserve	10	(125)		(5)		210		115	
Percent reserve	0.3	(3.1)		(0.1)		4.4		2.3	
Region VIII:									
Capability	4,768	5,605		6,173		6,702		7,524	
Peak load	4,550	4,950	8.8	5,250	8.1	5,750	7.5	6,150	7.4
Margin of reserve	218	655		923		952		1,374	
Percent reserve	4.8	13.2		15.4		16.6		22.3	
United States total:									
Capability	45,278	49,558		54,482		59,612		64,028	
Peak load	43,225	47,311	9.5	50,416	6.6	53,256	5.6	55,798	4.8
Margin of reserve	2,053	2,247		4,066		6,356		8,230	
Percent reserve	4.7	4.7		8.1		11.9		14.7	

[1] No data.

Mr. FERGUSON. These tables indicate that we do not have the shortage of power which has been stated from time to time in this debate.

I invite the attention of the Senate to some facts which were obtained from the TVA office today, showing peak demands. In 1945, on July 31, there was a peak demand of 1,192,000 kilowatts, of which 311,000 were from steam. On December 20, 1946—and these are the highest peak demands in the year—the figure was 2,304,000 kilowatts, of which 332,000 were from steam. On December 30, 1947, the figure was 2,309,000 kilowatts, of which 383,000 were from steam. The reason I call this to the attention of the Senate is that there was a capacity in the steam

plants of 450,000. Therefore they were not using all of their capacity.

It has been stated a number of times that the purpose of the steam plant is merely to firm up the power and avoid a shortage. In the record of the hearings is to be found language which I shall read into the RECORD. As I stated yesterday, these are my personal views and not the views of the committee. I do not speak for the committee, as I indicated yesterday.

I read from page 268:

Those are the sales to the so-called preference customers, being the sales to municipalities and cooperatives, plus the very minor amount of retail sales. In our view as related to the total sales, the striking feature of that chart is the small proportion of the TVA's energy production which went to these preference customers. Obviously TVA's energy production is far in excess of the requirements of those preference customers.

That would indicate that the preference customers were not going to get the big increase shown by the chart which Mr. Clapp placed in the record.

On page 268 will also be found the following:

This would be particularly true, if from TVA sales to Federal agencies, there were omitted the sales of secondary or "dump" energy made as a matter of money saving to, and not one of necessity on the part of, the Federal agencies.

On the question as to whether Oak Ridge is using any of this power, on page 269 we find the following:

Let us point out, this is new—that the great diffusion plant at Oak Ridge is provided with its own steam power plant of 238,000 kilowatts of capacity. While the details have not been made public, it is the general presumption that this vital enterprise is essentially self-sufficient as to electric power, with the TVA supplying stand-by service and supplying dump—

No amount was given.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to quote from page 8115 of yesterday's RECORD. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] made the following statement:

As I understand, the testimony showed that today there is in Memphis, Tenn., a steam plant that is not being operated, but which could be used to firm up any power. They do not need that power at the present time. They anticipate in the future large industrial developments in the Tennessee Valley, and they want to be ready by 1952, with this $54,000,000 plant, to furnish power to those new industries.

In the past few moments I have received a telegram from Mr. Thomas H. Allen, of the Memphis Power & Light Co., which is the light division in Memphis. The telegram is dated today, and is addressed to me. It reads as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *June 15, 1948.*

Hon. K. D. MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Commercial Appeal reports that Senator FERGUSON states there is a steam plant at Memphis that is not being operated. This plant has been operated continuously at high capacity. Further if money is made available now it would be fast work to complete a large plant by 1952.

THOS. H. ALLEN,
Memphis Power & Light Co.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, does the Senator recall what the testimony was at the hearing? It was to the effect that there was a plant there. It was at the Fisher body plant or one of the other plants. It was not in operation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not recall the testimony that it was not in operation. It is there.

Mr. FERGUSON. The record will show that.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was bought by the TVA.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the hearing shows not only that the plant to which the Senator from Tennessee is referring is in operation, but that 60 percent of the power goes to the Arkansas Power & Light Co., and 40 percent into the TVA system.

The Senator from Michigan said something about the TVA not using its peak capacity. Of course, no power company can contract for the sale of its peak capacity, because no power company knows what the peak capacity will be from year to year. A great deal depends upon how much rain the good Lord sends us, and how long a period of low water there is. One year the peak capacity may be very high. Another year the peak capacity may be very low. During 1 year conditions may be very tight, and it may be necessary to buy power from some other power company. During some other year, there may be power available above the amount which is contracted for sale. We cannot tell. A power company cannot sell right up to its peak capacity, because it does not know exactly what that peak capacity is going to be, and it must operate with some degree of safety.

In that connection, the Senator from Michigan made a statement with reference to the power available at this time. I have before me a news release by the National Security Resources Board. The Senate will recall that last year when the Congress passed the act for the unification of the armed services we established the National Security Resources Board. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] will recall it, because he played a large part in drafting that legislation.

The idea in establishing the National Security Resources Board was that it might make plans and make some kind of a check on industrial preparedness, and prepare a program so that we could have not only military preparedness, but industrial preparedness, which is just as essential, and in a way is basic to military preparedness.

The National Security Resources Board under the chairmanship of Mr. Arthur M. Hill, named a committee composed of Mr. E. Robert de Luccia, chief, bureau of power, Federal Power Commission; V. M. Marquis, American Gas & Electric Service Corp.; J. E. Moore, Ebasco Services, Inc.; and Barclay J. Sickler, of the Bonneville Power Administration, to make a study of our available power at this time. As a result of the investigation and the study by that committee, and after consultation with some 40 other experts on the question of power and the generation of power, who were brought here from throughout the country, the National Security Resources Board made a release on the twentieth of last May, in which it is stated, among other things:

The electric power situation in the United States was described as tight today by Arthur M. Hill, chairman of the National Security Resources Board, in a statement summarizing the results of a staff study.

Mr. President, I looked in the dictionary to see just what the definition of "tight" was. I had an idea what it was, but I was curious to see what the dictionary would say. One definition is "too close for comfort." So, Mr. President, the situation today is too close for comfort.

The release then says:

The seriousness of the situation, he said, lies in the fact that during 1947, electric power capacity was consumed to within a 5-percent average margin over peak loads, compared with more than a 20-percent margin in 1941.

In other words, in 1941, at the time when we were hurled into World War II, we had a 20-percent margin; but in 1947, the year just passed, we had less than a 5-percent margin.

The release continues as follows:

"The National Security Resources Board," Mr. Hill asserted, "will work actively with the other Government agencies and the industries involved to explore every possibility of expediting and enlarging the power program. We shall also keep in touch with developments so that we can recommend such governmental action as may be required in the light of future contingencies."

In that connection, too, Mr. President, I might add, inasmuch as the Senator from Kentucky seems to have yielded me the floor for the time being—for which I am grateful—that Mr. Arthur Hill, as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, wrote a letter to the President of the United States, with the suggestion that the President might wish to transmit the letter to the Senate Appropriations Committee—which was done under date of May 24. In that letter Mr. Hill stated this:

On May 19, 1948, I submitted to you a report on the national electric power situation. With specific reference to the southeast, it is clear that the margins for reserves are inadequate for the period 1948 through 1951. Accordingly, every effort should be made by the Federal Government to support and expedite the power expansion program designed to relieve this critical power situation. From the standpoint of national security, a larger power cushion should be provided in order to permit prompt handling of future loads that may arise in connection with the rearmament program.

It is our understanding that the Senate Appropriations Committee is now considering the Tennessee Valley Authority's request for an appropriation to start construction of a steam generating plant on Kentucky Lake at New Johnsonville, Tenn. It is the opinion of the National Security Resources Board that the capacity from this proposed new steam plant is needed in the area and will provide, in combination with existing hydroelectric power, a greater margin of safety.

While other steam facilities might be constructed outside of the Tennessee Valley Authority's operating area, the New Johnsonville project would, in our opinion, provide a better solution to the power supply problem from the standpoint of location, fuel supply, coordination with existing hydro and minimum transmission to load centers.

If you agree with our conclusions, which are based entirely on national security considerations, you may wish to transmit this recommendation to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR M. HILL,
Chairman.

Mr. President, I do not desire to take any further time of the Senator from Kentucky, who has been very generous, except I wish to call the attention of Senators to the chart on page 60 of the hearings, which shows how this power is needed, not for large industries, not for new industries, but in large measure for residential consumption and for farmers and farm homes.

Mr. CAIN and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have promised to yield to the Senator from Tennessee, and I now yield to him.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief observation as a matter of interest. I am advised that today the TVA paid into the general fund of the Treasury the sum of $7,536,325. That is out of power proceeds. That makes a total of approximately $10,500,000 paid during this year.

In that connection, as a matter of further interest, I wish to say that if my information is correct, the TVA has earned a net profit, to date, after all depreciation allowances, of approximately $97,000,000. Of that amount, nearly two-thirds has been reinvested in the expansion of the utility system. About $34,000,000 has been paid back into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, we were discussing the steam-power plant at Memphis. I should like to refer to the testimony at pages 112 and 113 of the hearings on the Government corporations appropriation bill, where Mr. Allen, who is the manager of the plant in the city of Memphis, was interrogated by the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I should like to read a little of the testimony. The Senator from Michigan asked Mr. Allen this question:

Where did you get power prior to that time?

In other words, prior to 1938, I believe, or about that date, when they first purchased TVA power.

Mr. Allen replied:

Prior to that, the city of Memphis was supplied by a plant then owned by the Memphis Power & Light Co.

The testimony continues as follows:

Senator FERGUSON. Who owns that plant now?

Mr. ALLEN. The Memphis Generating Co.

Senator FERGUSON. And who is the Memphis Generating Co.?

Mr. ALLEN. That is all that is left in that area of the old Electric Bond & Share Co. property.

Senator FERGUSON. And what are they doing with that plant?

Mr. ALLEN. It has been operated 60 percent for the Arkansas Power & Light Co. and 40 percent purchased by the TVA; all that power comes into our system.

Then, after discussing that point a little, the following occurred:

Senator FERGUSON. It is still operating at full capacity, is it?

Mr. ALLEN. It has been operating at full capacity.

Senator FERGUSON. What would there be to prevent that plant from being enlarged by private industry?

Mr. ALLEN. That is a very old plant, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. Is that the only thing that you know that would stop it from being enlarged?

Mr. ALLEN. It is located right in the heart of the city, almost, and enlargement of that plant to any great degree would involve the problem of securing water in large quantities, or to extend its spray pond, which it now uses for cooling the water, in an area where the land is not available for that kind of thing.

Senator FERGUSON. Did that plant, at the time you took this power from it, in 1938, furnish all power to the city of Memphis?

Mr. ALLEN. Not quite; some of it came from across the river, then.

Senator FERGUSON. But would you say practically all of it?

Mr. ALLEN. At that time, in July 1939, the peak of the Memphis Gas and Water Division, just after we took it over, on June 27, was 57,000 kilowatts and that plan would turn out 52,000 kilowatts. The rest of it came in by exchange from Arkansas Power & Light Co.

Senator FERGUSON. As you see this plant today, it would die just a natural death, it is going to pass out of the power picture?

Mr. ALLEN. We have all kept it alive down there because we need the power.

Senator McKELLAR. When was it built, if you remember?

Mr. ALLEN. I don't know when that plant was built. I remember with the curiosity of a kid of 15 or 16, roaming around in there, and that is a long time ago.

I read that testimony to emphasize that it is an old steam plant, practically incapable of being enlarged, and it is a plant of very small capacity for present needs. I read that testimony also to emphasize the fact that the plant has been operating at full capacity, and there has been no failure to use all the power developed at the plant and no lack of need for the operation of the plant at full capacity.

I think that is all I care to say, except that I want to see the amendment adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was there not another steam plant?

Mr. STEWART. My attention was called only to the one that Mr. Allen testified about.

Mr. FERGUSON. There was another one that was owned by some private company.

Mr. STEWART. If it was owned by some private company, that would be one. The testimony of Mr. Allen is another. That had not been called to my attention. I was not on the committee, and I attended only part of the hearings, but I heard that testimony.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I recall the fact, there were two plants.

Mr. STEWART. The hearings would disclose that. I did not know about it.

That is all I care to say, except I am anxious to see the amendment adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the point at which the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] made certain remarks about the use of a plant at Memphis, Tenn., page 106 and 12 lines of page 107 of the hearings, which explain the matter and show that all the power facilities are not being used.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE INDUSTRIAL PLANTS FURNISHING THEIR OWN POWER

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Bruce, you do furnish your own power?

Mr. BRUCE. That is right, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know why some of these larger industries, like the Reynolds Metals, and the other aluminum companies, should not put in plants and furnish their own power?

Mr. BRUCE. I could not answer that. Of course, the reason, Mr. Senator, why we furnish our power, is that we have waste from our manufacture, sawdust and shavings, and we utilize that to make our own power.

Senator FERGUSON. But it is not unusual for manufacturers, when they have a plant, to create their own power?

Mr. BRUCE. In the past, there have been quite a few of them. The Fisher Body Co. at Memphis, had a big power plant before it moved, and recently the paper plant which moved in there still has that operation.

Senator FERGUSON. You do not know whether they even operate that plant now, do you?

Mr. BRUCE. I do not know. The Firestone Rubber Co. in our city is the largest manufacturing plant for tires under one roof, in the world. They have a big plant.

Senator FERGUSON. They have a private power plant?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. And do you know whether that is being operated?

Mr. BRUCE. I do not; no sir.

Senator FERGUSON. So these two plants, the former Fisher Body plant and the Firestone Rubber Co. plant—you do not know whether they operated their own power plants?

Mr. BRUCE. No; I do not.

Senator FERGUSON. Is there anyone here who has that information?

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Allen, do you know whether the former Fisher Body plant or the Firestone Rubber Co. plant operate their own power plant?

Mr. THOMAS H. ALLEN (of Memphis, Tenn.). The Firestone Rubber Co. does run its plant to the extent of their capacity, and they use the steam for processing purposes.

Senator FERGUSON. But not for power?

Mr. ALLEN. You see, as they need steam in the handling of their rubber, they take it off the intermediate stages of the turbine, and, therefore, any amount of power they take off the turbines, produced by that amount of steam, they get for nothing. The balance of their power they buy from us. They are a very large user of our power. They just furnish enough of their own for the processing.

Senator FERGUSON. You are talking about the rubber?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. What about the other plant?

Mr. ALLEN. Do you mean the Kimberly-Clark?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. They are under our own power.

Senator FERGUSON. And when did they start operations there?

Mr. ALLEN. They just started that plant. That was the Fisher Body before the war; after the war, Kimberly-Clark bought the plant.

Senator FERGUSON. When was the private power plant in the Fisher plant constructed?

Mr. ALLEN. It has been a good many years ago; I do not remember how long ago.

Senator FERGUSON. About how many years ago?

Mr. ALLEN. I would say 15 or 20 years.

Senator FERGUSON. What we are seeing down in this valley is that the private plants creating power are ceasing to function and the TVA is taking over that business?

Mr. ALLEN. We are taking over a large part of it.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The matter the Senator from Michigan has just had inserted in the RECORD applies to power plants owned by private industry, I believe.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in support of the committee amendment dealing with construction of the steam plant. I do not do so merely because I live within the Tennessee Valley. Under the same circumstances I would support such an amendment if it were in the Connecticut Valley, the Columbia Valley, or any other valley in the United States.

I suppose our proximity to a given problem has influence upon the degree of our support or opposition to it. I do not believe I am prejudiced in favor of the Tennessee Valley as against any other valley, because I should very much like to see ultimately all the water resources in the United States harnessed for the benefit of the American people. I realize that private enterprise or private capital is not going to do that and cannot do it, any more than it could do it in the Tennessee Valley. So I hope nobody in the Senate or anywhere else will feel that I am prejudiced in behalf of this particular amendment because it is in the Tennessee Valley.

In the first place, I support the amendment because its adoption and the construction of the plant will not necessitate nor probably result in the transfer of any industry from any other part of the United States into the Tennessee Valley. Up until this time I do not believe there has been a single industry or a single plant moved from its original situs into the Tennessee Valley because of the development of that valley. Enterprises and industries have developed in the valley, some of them, as has already been indicated, for the production of raw materials that feed important industrial plants all over the United States. I have in mind now an industry located in the State of Pennsylvania which would like to establish a subsidiary plant in the Tennessee Valley for the production of raw materials to be sent to its factory in Pennsylvania to supply it with the material from which it produces the finished product. That is not a detriment to the industry where it is located. It is a benefit to it, because it supplies a larger quantity of raw material with which to furnish the country the finished product, which it produces, and gives more employment to more people in the community where it is located. So I would, if I could, calm the fears of any Senator who opposes the amendment because of any thought that it may result in the removal from his State or his own section of some vital industry. It has not done so up until now, and I do not believe it will do so, because there is room for the development of industries in the Tennessee Valley as a part of a chain of industries without in any way affecting those that already exist in other parts of the country. So much for that.

It was the original intention of the TVA, with which I have been associated legislatively ever since World War I, in the construction of the Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals, that whenever the facilities and the resources of the Tennessee Valley should be developed it would invite within that valley the creation of industrial activity that would be continuous. Any plant that wants to establish itself in any community naturally desires continuity of power and of resources.

Attention has already been called to the fact that due to floods and low water and various other things in connection with the power the valley can develop, we have a peak and we have a depression or a valley; we have ups and downs. A plant contemplating its development in a live community will not develop itself, it will not establish itself, unless it has a reasonable prospect of year-round power or resources which will feed it. That is an elemental fact, and it has developed now in the Tennessee Valley so far as industries are concerned that there is a need for this plant and a need for what we might call ancillary power in that community, in order that there may not be any recess or hiatus in any given period of a year during which these plants may operate.

Something has been said with reference to the REA. I know that in the Tennessee Valley, within the radius in which power can be distributed, there has been a vast increase in the installation of rural electrical energy. There has been a vast increase in the availability for farm life of the power generated in the Tennessee Valley, whether hydroelectric energy or energy generated by steam in the operation of steam plants already in existence. It might be said, and no doubt will be by those who are adamant against this appropriation, that no additional power should be created for the benefit of the farmers in that region of the country; that so far as those are concerned who are now receiving electric energy on their farms, all well and good, but that we are under no obligation to establish an additional plant or to create additional power in order that more farmers may partake of the benefits of the TVA.

I do not subscribe to that theory, because private power plants will not be established in the Tennessee Valley to any great extent for the reason that the Tennessee Valley Authority, by authorization of the Congress, bought all the private utilities within the radius of the Tennessee Valley's power to generate or to distribute, and therefore there is no longer any inducement for private enterprise to build plants, whether for REA or for industrial purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. In line with what the Senator from Tennessee has said, at the time Congress had before it the bill, which was passed in 1939, to provide for the purchase of private companies in the Tennessee Valley, Mr. Wendell Willkie, who, it will be recalled, was the head of the Commonwealth & Southern Co., which was a holding company of the power companies which the Tennessee Valley Authority bought, appeared before the House Committee on Military Affairs and made a statement. To me, in Mr. Willkie's words, there seems to be the gist of the whole picture presented to the committee. Mr. Willkie said:

> I know not a man that is a man of any thought, whether he believes in the public operation of power or in the private operation of power, but who does not also believe that it should be noncompetitive. Something has been said here about monopolies. Now, I know not the distinction between public and private monopolies, but I do know, as any student of the utility business knows, that it is a natural monopoly and should be such, whether in public or in private hands, and the man who represents the public agency here sits and pleads for it to be a public monopoly, and in that he is right.

The Congress recognized the wisdom and the inevitability, I may say, of what Mr. Willkie had to say, and that is why Congress passed the act of 1939 to buy private power companies. Mr. Willkie said that the supplying of electrical energy should be a monopoly. It owns the source from which residential consumers, farmers, and all users get power.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for his observation. That being true, if there is any additional power created in that region, it must be created by TVA. It will not be done by private enterprise. He would be a foolhardy man who would compete against the TVA by establishing a plant for industrial distribution, for the REA, or to supply power for Government agencies which are essential in defense.

Mr. HILL. There was no compulsion on the plants to sell. The Government did not in any way contest their ownership. The sales were made in free and open negotiations between the TVA, representing the Government, on the one hand, and the private companies on the other hand, the private power companies selling of their own accord.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. It came about not through coercion, but through negotiation. The Government was generous. I do not say it was too much so, but it was generous and fair with the Commonwealth & Southern Co., and has been generous and fair with other private utilities which have been taken over. The TVA has been beneficial to private utilities, within the region, because it has furnished power to them which they, in turn, distribute among the people. They benefit by receiving cheaper power than they could otherwise receive, and the people have been benefited by the transmission of that power through the agency at a lower rate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. In a moment.

There is no danger to any other community in the United States that industries will be drained away from them and located in the Tennessee Valley. That has not happened up to this time, and it will not happen. It will benefit these very communities by enabling them to produce raw materials which are needed by industries all over the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It is interesting to note that for every dollar the people of the Tennessee Valley are today expending for power, they are expending $2 for electrical appliances, which are not manufactured in the Tennessee Valley; they come from Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, New York—from all over the United States, from many of the States of the Union.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. In other words, every time a farmer in that section has electricity brought into his house he has power available to operate a washing machine or a refrigerator, a corn husker or a corn sheller, or other machinery, manufactured outside the Tennessee Valley and shipped there, thereby giving employment and profit to labor and capital in other sections of the country, of which they would be deprived if it were not for the power generated in the valley.

I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was going to say that the experience in the Pacific Northwest might be applicable to this subject. The private power people always opposed such projects as Grand Coulee and Bonneville. They are now buying power from those plants at a cheaper rate than they ever before paid. They are using their own distribution lines and making more money than they ever made before. In other words, they are tickled to death that Congress has had the foresight to build these great dams, with steam plants made adjuncts to them. There is a great power pool. That is what it will mean in the Tennessee Valley. It does not hurt them one iota. They are doing better than they have ever done. It means more rural electrification.

It is strange to me, I will say to the distinguished minority leader, that in the Congress of the United States we always have a fight to get appropriations for power projects. Always the argument is, What are we going to do with the power? The country is always short of power; it never has enough. The more we generate, the more the people use. Appropriations for the generation of power are the only ones we make that pay back and, in some cases, make a profit.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

I shall now conclude. I did not want to take much time and I wish to stand by my resolution. In the Tennessee Valley or in any other valley where power is generated we do not want the situation to become static. There may be a point beyond which the use of power cannot be absorbed, but we know that if there is any more power to be generated in the Tennessee Valley it will be done by the TVA. We want a generation of power that will be in operation all the year round, so that persons who invest their money in industry will not be caught in a situation in which they have to wait for months before there is a peak of power which will enable them to resume operations. I think that is a fundamental situation.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have not been able to hear all the discussion on the floor. I have read a meager reference to the project in the report, and I find myself with some questions on my mind, one of which the Senator from Kentucky just touched upon. That is the question of the continuity of the power supply under the conditions of a variable water supply.

It is conceivable that one might equalize the supply of power either at a minimum or a maximum. At a minimum one would perhaps install at the dams only the amount of hydroelectric power apparatus as would be appropriate to the minimum summer flow of the river. That, of course, is ridiculous. The maximum provision for maintaining a year-round supply of power would be to install in the dams the amount of hydraulic machinery capable of taking care of the heaviest flood, which would in turn require the provision of a very large amount of stand-by steam plants. Somewhere in between those two extremes is obviously the proper thing to do.

There would be little difficulty for a private power company to decide where it should balance out its power between steam and hydraulic. It would turn over to its engineers the problem of the most profitable point at which the steam and hydraulic power should be balanced. That having been determined, the hydraulic plant would be built of that appropriate size, and a steam plant of appropriate size to balance it would be built.

It is difficult for me to imagine any basis on which a public power operation, particularly this one, which is tied up so tightly with flood control and navigation, would start in making its calculation.

The question I wish to ask, after this preamble, is, Is there any figure set by the TVA in asking for its appropriation as to the size of the steam plant which is proposed? I find no reference to it in the very brief paragraph in the committee's report. In the extreme case, is there anything to prevent their going ahead with indefinite expansion plans for the steam plant? That is the first question.

Mr. BARKLEY. A minimum for that purpose, of course, would be fixed by the appropriations the Congress would make. The present appropriation for this particular plant is $4,500,000, I believe. It is estimated it will cost four million. The Senator from Michigan has said that, including transmission lines and all customary installations, it would cost something like $80,000,000 or $84,000,000.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have heard the figure eighty-four or eighty-five million.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is a speculative figure. But it is estimated, I think by the TVA itself, that the construction of the plant will cost approximately $54,000,000. Thereafer, of course, in regard to any other plant—if any other plant should be under contemplation, and I do not know that it is—it will be a matter for Congress to determine whether there should be expansion by the construction of another steam plant. But I do believe this plant is necessary in order to give a guaranty, not this year because it will take 4 or 5 years to construct the plant, but that there might be a guaranty of continuous service to those plants which are developing in the valley, and which may be developed in the valley, because I do not think we should fix such a low ceiling upon it that even a plant which is already there might not enlarge its capacity if it saw fit to do so in order to supply goods to other parts of the country, because obviously more goods turned out there are used in other parts of the country than in the Tennessee Valley itself.

It has been difficult to hear the Senator from Vermont because of the interference on the floor. I should like to hear what the Senator asked me.

Mr. FLANDERS. Just going back to the preamble of my first question—and I have another yet in reserve, if I may be allowed to continue to question the Senator——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. In what I said before asking the question I intended to express my conviction that there is perhaps no definite point which the TVA is setting as the scientific point for balancing out its water power. It may come back for steam-power expansion every year, in which case the system becomes a steam-power system; or it may set the balancing point where it will be primarily a hydroelectric system. Had I been in position to catechise the TVA folk I would have wanted some expression of purpose or calculation on their part as to whether they were definitely moving into the steam-power area of generation, or whether the balancing out was to be done at a lower figure, which kept it primarily as a hydraulic system.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I might respond there, I am not a member of the committee, and I did not have an opportunity to interrogate the TVA authorities, but my knowledge of and familiarity with the TVA convinces me that they are not seeking to develop the steam phases of their power to the point where steam will predominate over hydraulic. They are seeking to strike a general average which will enable them to say to those who are interested in electric power, whether industrial, agricultural, or municipal, that there will be an ample supply during any given year, regardless of the fluctuations of water fall, upon which they may depend. It is necessary that that be so, in order that the hydraulic features of the development shall be successful to the fullest extent.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is absolutely undisputed; there is no doubt about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Vermont wanted to ask me another question, I believe.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have another question to ask, if the Senator will permit me to continue.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have taken the position for many years past in private conversations, and on the occasion of my primary campaign for the nomination for the Senate, that I was not against Federal power as such, but that I was against subsidized power. In giving an example for myself or for anyone who questioned me as to what I meant by that, I would refer to the Hoover Dam as an example of Federal power which was not subsidized power. The Hoover Dam power generation pays for itself, pays the interest on its bonds, and is in the process, if I am correctly informed, of amortizing its cost. So that is a public power and water-supply outfit, a little mixture of both, but is a Federal project involving the generation of an immense amount of power, which I feel is in the public interest, and which I thoroughly approve. Now, it is a little difficult for me—and I say this with regret to the senior Senator from Kentucky—to justify the payments of taxes from the very meager aggregate incomes of my green but still stony State for the support of power generation in as fertile and as lovely and as prosperous a section of the country as is represented by the Tennessee Valley. I should like to know, and I do not know how to find out, whether our small aggregate incomes up in Vermont are helping to pay for this power in Tennessee. I heard no particular discussion on that point. There is no evidence, so far as the report is concerned, that the question was brought up as to whether these power plants would pay for themselves, would carry their load of local taxation, would pay appropriate interest on the bond issues, and would amortize themselves before the equipment wore out or became obsolete. That is one of the things, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, that I should like to know.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the sincerity of the question of the Senator from Vermont and his attitude in respect to the project. I do not regard the appropriations which are made out of the Treasury for the TVA as subsidizing the TVA, or industry in the TVA, or the cities or the inhabitants of the TVA region, any more than appropriations for flood control in remote sections of the country are subsidies to those particular sections because the money raised to pay the expenses is raised by general taxation all over the United States.

It would be impossible—and I do not know whether it will ever be consummated—that all our river valleys should be developed for the use of the people. I myself believe in that theory. But if it should be possible, and if all the valleys and all the people in all the valleys wanted their valleys developed for purposes such as are included in the TVA Act, it would be utterly impossible to do that simultaneously, any more than it is possible to erect all flood-control projects that are needed in the United States at the same time. We have to begin somewhere.

Insofar as any particular expenditure is being made in one part of the country and not all over the country so that it is spread out everywhere, it could be said that people in another section are helping to pay for that expense. That is an inevitable result because of the impossibility of covering a vast country such as ours with simultaneous development in all parts of it.

On the subject of amortization I think I should say that the TVA is being amortized by the turning into the Treasury of annual amounts. I think I just heard the Senator from Tennessee a while ago say that at this very time over $7,000,000 is being turned into the Treasury by the TVA, so that it is being amortized.

I do not think it is quite accurate or precise to say that because of this development in the Tennessee Valley, which is a larger development of its type than anywhere else in the country, it is being subsidized at the expense of any other section of the country. When the time comes, if it comes, when the Connecticut Valley or the Merrimack Valley, or the Delaware Valley, or the Missouri Valley, or any other valley shall be developed at public expense, of course people from all other sections of the country will be contributing to such enterprises. Whether that ever takes place is a matter for future speculation. I myself do not know.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator I might say that when certain preliminary negotiations were entered into with the people of my region with regard to a possible Connecticut Valley Authority or Connecticut-Merrimack Valley Authority, the general public sentiment rather put a damper on the enterprise. It looks to me as though the folks of the Connecticut Valley region are going to be perpetually in the condition of subsidizing other projects simply because they think subsidization is wrong or undesirable. That is one of the penalties of having a little conscience on a matter of this sort. You have to pay for your virtue, such as it is.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that, but I will say to the Senator that I recall that 2 years ago, when there was a disastrous flood in the Connecticut River, we voted for some flood protection on that river, not simply as a theoretical proposition, but in order to protect the people who live in that valley—not only their homes, but their industries. When I voted for such assistance I did not think I was subsidizing the people of the Connecticut Valley. The people whom I represent in Kentucky did not think I was voting to subsidize the people of that valley, although it was an expenditure out of the Public Treasury for the benefit of some very great industries in that valley. I have in mind one in particular which was greatly benefited by the expenditure, or the proposal to expend money for its protection.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the Senator whether that expenditure was before or after the Supreme Court decided that the Federal Government controlled the water clear up into the springhouse in the pasture above my house?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator's interpretation of the Supreme Court decision is a little exaggerated, but that expenditure was before the Supreme Court decision in regard to the Tidelands case, if that is what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. It is now nearly 6:20 o'clock. We have only started on the first amendment to the bill. We have not even gotten the first committee amendment adopted or rejected, whichever way the vote on it may go. We have another amendment or two which are very controversial. The bill is quite a long one. I wonder if we cannot facilitate matters. Of course, we do not in any way want to cut off anyone who desires to speak on the first committee amendment. We have not only the pending bill under consideration, but the naval appropriations bill is ready for action, and the bill providing the appropriations for the Economic Cooperation Administration has been reported. I understand there are two veto messages which will have to be acted upon. We certainly would like to get through with those matters and begin consideration of the farm bill quickly. I suggest to Senators that if we have a night session, opportunity will be afforded for full debate, but I beg of Senators to expedite action, and either accept or reject the amendments which are pending as quickly as possible.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to state that we are approaching the time when we can no longer delay action upon the farm program bill if we are to continue a farm program of any kind whatsoever. When that bill passes the Senate it will have to go to conference with the House. So at least 2 days would be required before it could be brought back to the respective Houses by the conferences. It is to me unthinkable that Congress should go home without continuing a farm program. It is true the House has passed a stopgap bill which has a good many deficiencies in it, but there is no opportunity to hold hearings upon that bill, and I believe hearings should be held upon it if it is to be considered. The shortest cut is to take up our own bill, pass it, and go to conference with it. But if we delay much longer we cannot even do that.

So as far as I am concerned, the farm program bill is the pending business. It has been temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the Government corporations appropriation bill. I understand that the naval appropriations bill will probably not take more than a few minutes—considerably less than an hour. If we complete action on the Government corporations appropriation bill within a reasonable time I should be willing to have the naval appropriations bill taken up. I should like to make the initial presentation on the farm bill tonight so

that action on it may be concluded tomorrow. I feel safe in saying that unless action on a farm program bill is concluded tomorrow there will be no continuation of a farm program after January 1, but we shall revert to the old 52 percent support level for a few basic commodities. Therefore I would object to taking up any further legislation after the naval appropriations bill is disposed of.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I address an inquiry to the Senator from Vermont?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for that purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope I did not correctly understand the Senator from Vermont to say that unless this bill were enacted we would have no farm legislation at this session. Did the Senator make such a statement?

Mr. AIKEN. I made the statement that it was my belief that there would be no continuation of a farm program, other than reversion to the 1938 level of support. I know that the Senator from Georgia wonders why.

I do not want to criticize the House bill; but we would almost have to have hearings on it, or at least meetings of our committee before we could adopt the proper amendments to that bill. For example, there is no provision in it for continuing support for any commodity of more than 90 percent, regardless of how badly it might be needed. It is written in such a way that it eliminates support for a full year for Maryland tobacco, while it gives support to other types of tobacco. It continues a 90 percent guarantee support price for eggs, which means that we would probably have to spend $100,000,000 to purchase eggs which we do not need next year.

It continues 90 percent parity support for dairy products, which means absolutely nothing whatsoever unless the parity formula is revived.

Furthermore, the Commodity Credit Corporation goes out of existence on July 1. There has been no indication as yet when the House is going to act upon the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. There is every indication that if it does act on the bill which has been reported, it will be almost impossible for the conferees of the House and Senate to get together, because the bills have such drastically varying provisions.

Therefore it seems to me now that the only way we can insure the future existence of the Commodity Credit Corporation, that agency of Government which makes purchases not only for the European recovery program, but for the occupied areas and for the armed services, besides supporting farm prices, is to enact a bill continuing it in existence. It may go out of existence on July 1 unless we can continue it for a year in the farm bill which is now before the Senate.

We have all those things to consider, and have very little time to consider them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I realize that we are greatly pressed for time, but I deplore the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who has always been such a stout fighter in this body for farmers. Surely if nothing else could be accomplished, a joint resolution could be enacted continuing any present laws which might be on the books, which would prevent an absolute collapse of the farm program.

I am not familiar with all the details of the House bill. Personally I was disposed to support a proposal which would continue the existing laws for a period of 12 months, to enable us to study more in detail a measure of such tremendous importance as that which the Senator from Vermont has reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I trust that if the worse comes to the worst the Senator will not close the door to a joint resolution continuing any existing laws for a period of 12 or 18 months.

Mr. AIKEN. I assure the Senator from Georgia that the Senator from Vermont is not taking a defeatist attitude. I was simply making the statement that we did not intend to take defeat by letting one legislative measure after another come up, setting the farm program aside, so long as the farm bill is the pending business.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection——

Mr. AIKEN. We must continue a good program. As I say, the stopgap legislation passed by the House cannot be accepted as is, under any circumstances, because I have just pointed out some of the things in it which would not work. Therefore I do not believe that we should be too long in considering the long-range farm program. I do not know how many Members wish to speak. I know that there are some amendments to be offered. Some will be quickly accepted by the committee, so that they should not take very long.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. I, too, am tremendously interested, as the Senator well knows, in the continuation of a farm program at this session of Congress. I understand—and this may be incorrect; perhaps the Senator has better information—that the Committee on Agriculture of the House will not take this long-range farm program upon which the Senator from Vermont and other Senators have been working. I am wondering whether or not he has any information in that connection.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no information. We shall not, of course, know how closely we can get together with the House until we get into conference. I do know that while we may not get all we want on the part of the Senate in the form of a bill, there is a good chance of getting a better bill than the one which has already passed the House.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding, upon very reliable authority, that two of the members of the Committee on Agriculture of the House have made the suggestion that, in view of the shortness of time and in view of the importance of this particular farm bill, the committee probably would have no opportunity really to study the bill, if it were passed, and to enable them intelligently to reach a decision between now and Saturday night. I thought perhaps the Senator had heard something in that connection.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that some Members of the House are in favor of a long-range bill at this time. We have worked on this bill for almost 9 months. I realize that, while the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has spent this time on the bill, there are Members of the Senate who have not had the time to spend on it. I do not know whether they would ever have the time they ought to have to spend on it.

I am satisfied that the farm people generally are supporting this long-range farm bill. I know that the Department of Agriculture has withdrawn any objections it may previously have had. I know that last night in Los Angeles President Truman stated, according to the press, that he was fully in accord with it and hoped it might be passed at this session.

In view of all that support, I do not know why we should throw away the money spent in acquiring information and the months spent in preparation of the bill. I do not believe that the Senate will be so minded; and I do not believe that the House will, when it comes to the matter of accepting a good program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. To me this is a question of tremendous importance, in view of what the Senator says, and in view of what I understand to be the attitude of some members of the House Agriculture Committee. If we are to have a farm program at this session, it seems to me that members of the House Agriculture Committee and Members of the Senate will have to get together pretty fast. As the Senator well said a moment ago, there are certainly some objectionable features in the continuation of the present support program for another year, and certain amendments should be added if we are to be compelled to adopt that means. We cannot do that in a moment, either. I will say to the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Georgia. That is something that will have to be worked upon. If there is no possibility of getting through the House the sort of program provided by the Senate bill, something should be done between now and Saturday so that some kind of a program can be provided.

Mr. AIKEN. I think, if we can pass this bill through the Senate tomorrow, a workable program can be arrived at.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to add to and concur in what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said concerning the farm program. I also should like to reply to the question raised by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. The members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry met at various times with Members of the House Committee on Agriculture on the different phases of the farm program—not only on the support price phase but also on other phases. I believe there is a meeting of the minds on many of those questions, insofar as the two Committees on Agriculture are concerned; and I am very hopeful, in fact, quite confident, that we can accomplish and obtain concurrence by the House committee on the farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the first three amendments be considered en bloc, because they are so tied together, it seems to me, that a vote on one of them will determine the vote on all of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the three amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the first three committee amendments, which are being considered and will be voted upon en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays. But first I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Millikin
Baldwin	Gurney	Moore
Ball	Hatch	Morse
Barkley	Hawkes	Murray
Brewster	Hayden	O'Conor
Bricker	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Hoey	Pepper
Buck	Holland	Revercomb
Butler	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kem	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Feazel	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	Williams
Flanders	Martin	Young
Fulbright	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the first three committee amendments, which, by unanimous consent, are considered and are to be voted on en bloc. On this question the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate for more than a few moments. I do not intend to argue the philosophy of public power versus private power.

In my capacity as ranking minority member of the Committee on Atomic Energy, I have listened to certain testimony which indicated that there was a strong possibility that the facilities at Oak Ridge would find it necessary to ask the Tennessee Valley Authority for more power. Because of that information, on June 7, I addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. It is a short letter, and I shall read it to the Senate at this time:

DEAR MR. LILIENTHAL: The reactivation of certain facilities at Oak Ridge will, I am informed, necessitate a considerable increase in power requirements. I am further informed that the power now used, and the power to be required, at Oak Ridge is considered to be classified information.

This would seem to be nonsense on two grounds: First, because it wouldn't take much of a detective in the Tennessee Valley to figure out how much electricity is going to Oak Ridge; and, second, even if he did figure it out, what good would it do? If I am right in my conclusion as to the nonsecrecy of this information, will you please advise me how much power you are using now and how much you intend to use. I am planning to write to the Tennessee Valley Authority to ask them if they can supply the necessary power with their present requirements.

Under date of June 10, I received an answer to my inquiry. The answer is signed by Sumner T. Pike, Acting Chairman of the Commission:

JUNE 10, 1948.

DEAR SENATOR MCMAHON: We have your letter of June 7 regarding power requirements for Oak Ridge. While we have not publicized the figures on the quantity of power furnished Oak Ridge by the Tennessee Valley Authority, we agree with you that such information does not involve classified information. The present contract between the commission and TVA establishes an electrical power demand of 235,000 kilowatts. The present power load averages about 211,000 kilowatts. There are, however, certain particulars regarding our power requirements that do involve classified information, because these particulars, together with certain other facts, could possibly provide an index to the rate of production of fissionable materials at Oak Ridge. This information would include figures on the power generated by the Commission itself at Oak Ridge, details on type and quantity of power required by any individual facility within Oak Ridge, and records of total power consumption over an extended period of operation. If you wish, we shall be glad to send a representative of the commission to discuss these matters with you.

At present there is no definite program for reactivating any of the facilities at Oak Ridge which are in standby status. However, there is always the possibility that future developments—

I particularly call the attention of the Senate to this phrase:

or an emergency might necessitate the start-up of these facilities. The minimum additional power required for reactivating such facilities is estimated to be in excess of 50,000 kilowatts and the maximum might be several times this figure. None of this additional power requirement could be met from the commission's own installed power generating capacity at Oak Ridge.

Sincerely yours,

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
SUMNER T. PIKE,
Acting Chairman.

On receipt of that letter informing me of the possible future requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission, I got in touch with the Tennessee Valley Authority. Under date of June 15, they wrote me as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MCMAHON: Your office has advised us that the Atomic Energy Commission has informed you that its future operations may require 50,000 kilowatts of power in addition to the amounts which the TVA has now contracted to supply to the Commission's operations at Oak Ridge. You have asked whether the TVA will be able to meet this requirement from its present authorized system.

This additional amount of power has not been included in any of our estimates for future loads served by the TVA, and TVA would not be able to meet this additional requirement unless we are able to add generating capacity over and above the facilities already authorized and in process of installation on the system.

Mr. President, it is because I have been convinced by the testimony I have heard, and because it is the estimate of the Commission that in the event of an emergency, which we all know might develop tomorrow, next week, next month, or a year from now, it would become necessary to reactivate the now closed-down facilities at Oak Ridge, and additional power might be required in order to meet the requirements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that I feel there is nothing else for me to do except to vote for the $4,000,000 steam plant. Purely as a matter of defense, without any regard whatever to the basic argument as to whether or not we should further expand TVA for power purposes, it would certainly seem to be self-evident, in view of the situation which I have described, that the defense requirements of the United States demand that we start the construction of this facility. It will be impossible for the Oak Ridge installation to open up certain other facilities that are now being considered for reopening, and to service them, unless we provide for additional power.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague from Connecticut yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Do I correctly understand that this letter does not say that the Tennessee Valley Authority must have the steam plant; it simply says it must have additional facilities?

Mr. McMAHON. The net effect of it. I may say to my colleague, is that there may well be additional requirements, which, I am told are 50,000 kilowatts. The TVA say they cannot furnish that amount of power with their present facilities.

Mr. BALDWIN. But they do not say they need a steam plant in order to furnish that additional amount of power, do they?

Mr. McMAHON. No, they do not.

Mr. BALDWIN. They merely say they need additional facilities. The point I wanted to make was that there were hydroelectric potentials still possible of development there which probably would take care of additional requirements.

Mr. FERGUSON. If I may answer——

Mr. McMAHON. Just a moment please. I will yield to the Senator from Michigan in a moment. I want to reply to my colleague. That may well be true. I do not pretend to be a hydroelectric engineer. I have made no study of the water table or the possibilities of further power to be derived from water plants. I am faced with a condition, not a theory. They say they are short of power and they suggest that this is the way the need should be met. I care not whether the power comes from steam or whether it comes from water, or whether they get a jet-propelled engine, but I know the additional power is needed, and this amendment is reported by the committee in order to provide it. I do not see how the Senate could take the responsibility of depriving the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge of 50,000 kilowatts that it may well need within 6 months.

I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely desire to say in reply to what has been said by the junior Senator from Connecticut, that the word received here from the TVA office today indicates there are now under way developments which will produce 700,000 kilowatts of hydro power. So there will be plenty of hydro power to meet requirements. Another thing I should like to call to the attention of the Senator is that the letter is dated the 7th of June. The bill had not then been reported from the committee. It was reported last Saturday. The subcommittee voted on it on June 8. As chairman of the subcommittee I have had no knowledge of this information from the TVA or from anyone else. Now, just at the moment of voting on the proposal, there is produced on the Senate floor this information. It seems queer to the chairman of the subcommittee that the information could not have been furnished either to the subcommittee or the full committee.

Mr. BALDWIN and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Connecticut has yielded the floor. The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. I am informed the House Appropriations Committee took testimony in respect to the Oak Ridge requirements. I have not read that testimony myself but I am informed there was testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I merely want to say, I thank the junior Senator from Michigan for the information he has given us. I know that my distinguished colleague is much concerned about atomic energy and its development and the power requirements for it, as am I. But it would seem to me from what the Senator from Michigan has said that there is in prospect adequate development in the reasonably foreseeable future to take care of additional requirements, which gives me reassurance in the matter.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, as a member of the committee I have not participated in the debate, and I shall not delay consideration of the bill at this time, but I think it is very unfair to attempt to place a national-preparedness or national-defense label on the amendment which is currently before the Senate. Everyone knows that TVA has a procedure involving preference customers. I ask my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] if there would be any justification for denying Oak Ridge increased power for operation for national defense and to give all the power which is currently being subsidized to some of the large industrial users. Every Senator knows that under the operation of the TVA system there are preference customers. TVA could not deny to Oak Ridge, which is engaged in a federally operated defense project, or to any other plant which is essential to the national security, all the power which might be required for their operations.

Mr. President, as I said, I did not intend to participate in this debate, but I deeply deplore any effort made at this hour of the debate to embarrass or seek to embarras any Member of this body who does not find it possible to go along and support this steam-plant project.

I have in my hand a letter, dated Spokane, Wash., May 28, 1948, written by the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane. I should like to read it, because I think it will disprove some of the contentions made here that there is any shortage of power in TVA, or that there is an inadequate supply of power with which to operate any expanded operations of the Oak Ridge plant.

This letter was written to a Member of the House, and I shall read it so that the Senators may have the information. It reads as follows:

Here is a situation that has just developed which I believe you will find of some interest.

During the war the Government built a ferrosilicon plant—four furnaces—at Rock Island on the Columbia River, near Wenatchee, Wash. The War Assets Administration is now advertising that plant for sale, with the privileges of complete removal from this territory.

We are exceedingly anxious to retain that plant in the Northwest because we feel it balances out our economy, and is really an essential plant—not only for peacetime operations, but especially in case of an emergency such as national defense. The plant will require 25,000 kilowatts of power.

As you already know, we in the Northwest are starving for power, in spite of the fact that we have wonderful dams like Grand Coulee and Bonneville, and in spite of the fact that Grand Coulee Dam is now producing in round numbers, 200,000 kilowatts more power than it did at the wartime peak.

The Bonneville Administration maintains that it is unable to allocate any power to the Rock Island plant, and I am willing to accept their statement as a fact in view of our general power shortage.

For example: We need 2,000 kilowatts more for the Pend Oreille Mining & Metals Co., which has leased part of the magnesium plant in Spokane. We need 13,000 kilowatts more for the Chromium Mining & Smelting Co., which has leased the other part of the magnesium plant. We need 35,000 kilowatts additional firm power for our aluminum reduction plant operated by the Kaiser Co. These are all right here in Spokane. The Bonneville Administration is unable to supply any of these.

Consequently, I am willing to accept the Bonneville Power Administration's statement that they will be unable to allocate any power for the Rock Island ferrosilicon plant until 3 or 4 years from now.

However, we are informed by reliable sources that the prospective purchaser of the Rock Island ferrosilicon plant is assured of an immediate allocation of adequate power by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and consequently is considering moving the plant to that area.

Now, I come to the real point of this letter. If the Tennessee Valley Authority has such a surplus of power, and can promise such heavy loads as 25,000 kilowatts for immediate delivery to the Rock Island ferrosilicon plant, then how comes it—that the Tennessee Valley Authority comes to Congress pleading that they are so short of power that they want an appropriation to build a steam plant.

That is the real point I want to make, Congressman JENSEN. It doesn't add up to me, and I am just passing it on to you for whatever value it may have.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. FORD,
Managing Secretary.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I cannot understand how such overtures or promises are being currently made by TVA to any plants in the Northwest or in any other section of the country.

I reiterate at this time that it would be approaching treason for the TVA to deny an adequate supply of power generated in that area to Oak Ridge, if the Oak Ridge operations required such power for the national defense. I think it is entirely improper to interject such an approach or such an argument into this debate. I did not intend to say a word, but I feel it is incumbent upon me, as a member of the subcommittee, to attempt to refute some of the arguments which are being made here, obviously designed to change the minds of members of this body, because every Senator, all other loyal patriotic Americans, will insist that priorities be given to Oak Ridge and to every other national security operation of the Federal Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I happen to be familiar with the situation referred to in the letter which was read by the Senator from Idaho, coming from the Chamber of Commerce at Spokane, Wash. It is not true that the TVA has guaranteed to that concern, or that it had any interest in, purchasing the plant at Rock Island. On the contrary, the TVA has advised them that they cannot furnish power to them from the supply of power which is now available.

I hope the Senator will believe that I am in good faith, because I have been interested, as a Senator, in knowing

whether the very situation to which the Senator has referred, through the letter, has been accurately stated. I find that it is now the plan of the concern, which is a Pittsburgh outfit, by the way, a very large and reputable concern which was interested in the purchase of surplus property in Rock Island, Wash., to abandon that theory entirely, because power cannot be obtained. It has started on a new enterprise, if power becomes available, to build a plant that will supply the Pittsburgh plant with the raw material which it needs.

I do not think the statement of the Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce in Spokane should be accepted as evidence against the known fact that the TVA not only has not guaranteed any such power, but has advised the concern that it cannot furnish it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the three committee amendments en bloc.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it is with some hesitation that I rise to reply to the Senator from Idaho. I thought the floor of the Senate was a place in which Senators give their brother Senators information which they believe to be pertinent to the question under discussion. If I were to accept the criterion of conduct suggested by the junior Senator from Idaho I would conceal information vital to the matter under discussion. This, of course, I could not do.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the letter which I received is dated June 15, today. I am not a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I take it that the Senator from Idaho, in considering the appropriation, must have had in mind that the Oak Ridge installation was where it is. I think I might properly ask him why it did not occur to him that he might inquire of the interested authorities as to whether they had any information which bore on the problem in hand.

Mr. President, I resent the statements of the junior Senator from Idaho and his criticism that I have delayed bringing information to the attention of the Senate. I bring it in good faith. I do not even vouch for it personally. I told the Senate who had given it to me. I say, for myself, that it influenced my vote. The Senator from Idaho can vote as he pleases.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, there certainly was no intention on my part of casting any reflections upon the Senator from Connecticut. I simply wanted to stress the point which apparently had been submerged throughout the debate, and that is that under the operation of TVA there are preference customers, public buyers, and REA. I ask my colleagues if the Oak Ridge plant does not qualify as a preference customer. If it does so qualify, it is difficult for me to conceive of any situation wherein the Oak Ridge plant would be denied any power which it currently needs, or any increased amount which might legitimately and justifiably be denied to other users who have been operating defense plants.

Mr. President, that is the point I am making because I am assuming that those in charge of the TVA operation are loyal patriotic Americans and never could there be any question in my mind that the Oak Ridge plant could be denied all the power required for the operation of that plant in the interest of national security.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to speak for just a moment. I would not have taken the floor at all but I should like to express the hope that the judgment and foresight of the junior Senator from Idaho can be better relied upon in this instance than in the past. I have had a Columbia Valley Authority bill kicking around committees of the Senate for some years and nothing has been done about it. If action had been taken on that measure there would be no shortage of power in the Pacific Northwest at this moment. I am forced to agree with the junior Senator from Idaho that there is a serious power shortage there and that we are suffering the loss of plants and potential industrial developments which otherwise would come to our section of the country.

Furthermore, if the Columbia Valley development bill had been acted upon, there would not have been the disastrous floods which have wrought such havoc in our section of the Nation in the past few weeks. Indeed, the loss there has been so great that it would have gone a long way toward paying the initial cost at least of a Columbia Valley Authority project.

Therefore I hope that in opposing the provision for this steam plant to even up the power load in the Tennessee Valley the junior Senator from Idaho will be proven more correct if he votes against it than he has been in his opposition to the Columbia Valley Authority project, which opposition has been largely responsible for the inaction, the terrible loss from flood, and the serious power shortage which now confronts the Northwest.

I should hope, in view of that experience, that he would be for this appropriation, and also that he would join with me in sponsoring the Columbia Valley Authority bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first three committee amendments, which are being considered en bloc.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. A vote in the affirmative will be for the amendments, and a vote in the negative will be against them, will it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote "yea" is a vote for the committee amendments, and a vote "nay" is a vote against the committee amendments.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. On this vote the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. I am advised that if present and voting the senior Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the senior Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent due to being called to the hospital on account of an accident to a member of his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is necessarily absent on important public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who would vote "nay" if present, is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who would vote "yea" if present.

If present and voting the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Hayden	Maybank
Barkley	Hill	Morse
Chavez	Hoey	Murray
Connally	Holland	O'Conor
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Donnell	Knowland	Russell
Downey	Langer	Sparkman
Eastland	Lucas	Stennis
Ellender	McClellan	Stewart
Fenzel	McFarland	Taylor
Flanders	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McKellar	Tydings
Green	McMahon	Wherry
Hatch	Magnuson	Young

NAYS—37

Baldwin	Ecton	Moore
Ball	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Brewster	Gurney	Reverconib
Bricker	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Brooks	Ives	Taft
Buck	Jenner	Thye
Butler	Kem	Umstead
Byrd	Lodge	Vandenberg
Cain	McCarthy	Watkins
Capehart	Malone	Williams
Capper	Martin	
Dworshak	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—14

Bushfield	Reed	Wagner
George	Robertson, Va.	White
Kilgore	Smith	Wiley
McCarran	Thomas, Utah	Wilson
Myers	Tobey	

So the first three committee amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendments were agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate that when action shall have been had on the pending bill, it is proposed to take up for consideration the naval appropriation bill. After that a statement will be made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] respecting the farm bill, at the conclusion of which we would like to take up for consideration the bill making appropriations for the European recovery program. If we all cooperate I believe we can tonight complete the program I have just outlined. Thus we will be able to send the appropriation bills to conference quickly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the Senate would proceed with the farm bill before acting on the ERP bill?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] desires to make a presentation of the farm bill, so it will be in the RECORD for Senators to read in the morning. I think the Senator from Vermont will be reasonable in respect to the amount of time he will take to make his presentation.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has informed me that he is ready to take up the bill making appropriations for ERP at the conclusion of the presentation by the Senator from Vermont.

It may be necessary to run a little late tonight, but I hope Senators will bear with us and cooperate with us, because it is very necessary that we get the appropriation bills passed and in the hands of the conferees quickly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Independent agencies and corporations," on page 8, line 13, after the word "That", to strike out "immediately upon the enactment of this act" and insert "prior to July 31, 1948", and in line 17, after the figures "$10,000,000," to insert "if not otherwise required to be turned into the Treasury under the provisions of the proposed Federal charter."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 19, to strike out:

Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Incorporated: Of the funds available to the Corporation, not to exceed $500 shall be available for administrative expenses related to liquidation and dissolution, and not to exceed $500 for the cost of audit, as required by the Government Corporation Control Act of December 6, 1945 (Public Law 248): *Provided*, That all administrative duties and responsibilities shall be assumed by such officers and employees of the Treasury Department as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, and who shall receive no additional compensation for such duties: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall take appropriate steps to secure the final dissolution and liquidation of said Corporation at the earliest practicable date: *Provided further*, That the total cost of liquidation and dissolution shall be paid out of funds available to the Corporation without additional appropriations therefor: *Provded further*, That the Board of Directors of the Corporation is authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury title to assets (other than real property) of the Corporation upon certification of the president of the Corporation that such transfer is to the interest of the Government of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to dispose of such assets at such times and in such manner as he may determine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 14, after the word "with", to strike out "its" and insert "generally recognized."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Housing and Home Finance Agency," on page 15, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,250,000" and insert "$2,500,000"; on page 16, line 21, after the word "cancel", to strike out "the capital stock" and insert "bonds"; in line 22, after the word "in", to strike out "par value" and insert "an"; and in line 24, after the word "transferred", to insert "plus accrued dividends thereon."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 25, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That not to exceed $5,000 of the funds of said Corporation shall be available until June 30, 1952, for the payment of such expenses as the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board or his designee or designees may find necessary for winding up the affairs and effecting the dissolution of the United States Housing Corporation and the United States Housing Corporation of Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 8, after the words "to the", to strike out "Secretary of the Treasury for cancellation" and insert "Reconstruction Finance Corporation"; and in line 14, after the word "transferred", to strike out "within 30 days after the date of enactment hereof" and insert "as of June 30, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 2, to insert:

Not to exceed $3,000 of the funds available to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for expenses of travel shall be available, when specifically authorized by the Administrator or head of the constituent agency concerned, for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation or authorization is made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Agriculture," on page 23, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$373,600" and insert "$223,600."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to make inquiry of the junior Senator from Michigan as to why the Senate committee could not concur in the sum stipulated in line 6, on page 23. I note that the appropriation was cut by $150,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the committee denied a request to increase the administrative-expense limitation in the budget estimate of $1,755,300, but has decreased the amount which may be paid to the Farm Credit Administration for supervisory or other services from $373,600 to $223,600, a reduction of $150,000. The attempt is to have the agencies in the field given a greater proportion of the money. The $150,000 is taken from the organization in Washington. That will reduce the amount of the Washington appropriation, but give more in proportion to the field. I should like to take this question to conference and have it adjusted at that time.

Mr. THYE. I should like to say to the junior Senator from Michigan that this reduction, so far as it pertains to the home or central office, would have quite a crippling effect upon that office. I beg of the Senator to give due consideration to the question and make a complete study, so as not to cripple the function of the bank.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Minnesota can rest assured that the subject will be given attention in the conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I fear that this cut is too severe. If it goes into effect, it will cripple the work of the Department.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as I stated, it is a question which in my opinion should be taken to conference. We have changed the figure from $373,600 to $223,600, so the difference can be adjusted in conference. I shall certainly keep in mind what the Senator says. I have talked with a number of persons and I hope the difficulty can be adjusted.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have had prepared a statement on the subject. To save time, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks, so that it will be available for the information of the conferees.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the information.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Page 23, line 6, delete $223,600 and substitute $373,600, the amount approved by the House.

This would make $293,600 available for administrative expenses for supervisory or other services rendered by the Farm Credit Administration both in Washington and the districts, and $80,000 would be available for liquidation of obligations incurred in the fiscal year 1948.

Under the committee print only $143,600 would be available for payment to the Farm Credit Administration for supervisory or other services rendered in Washington and in the field. This would not be sufficient to enable the Farm Credit Administration to carry out its responsibilities during the next fiscal year. It is estimated that the examination of the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks in 1949 will cost $48,000 and that the cost to Federal intermediate credit banks of the services of the registrars will be in excess of $85,000. While these two costs are charged to the central office because these services are required to be performed by public officials, they are activities that are carried on in the field. The examination costs average only about $4,000 per Federal intermediate credit bank, and it should be kept in mind that the 12 banks will average lending approximately $100,000,000 each in 1949. The cost of services of the registrars will average slightly in excess of $7,000 per bank, which is a conservative figure in view of the service performed and the responsibilities. The registrars are public officials employed by the Farm Credit Administration of Washington, D. C. They perform a very important and necessary function for the Federal intermediate credit banks. They are custodians for all the collateral which is used in support of the debentures sold to the public. They must at all times have sufficient collateral in their possession to fully secure all outstanding debentures of the Federal intermediate credit banks. It is gratifying to note that in the years of operation of the Federal intermediate credit banks there has been no misappropriation of collateral held by the registrars in any of the districts. The buyers of debentures have bought with the knowledge that proper procedures are being followed to protect the collateral behind these debentures.

Under the committee print, after paying the cost of registrars in the 12 districts and the cost of examination of the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks, which would total in excess of $133,000, there would remain only $10,200 available for payment to the Farm Credit Administration for the remaining supervisory and other services rendered. These supervisory functions and services include an Intermediate Credit Bank Commissioner, a position established by law and his office which it is estimated will cost $46,500 in 1949, include the service performed by the Finance and Accounts Division in connection with the handling of securities, supervision of the registrars, assembling and tabulating reports, development of budgets and certain supervisory accounting work which is necessary in connection with the operations of institutions of this type, also the Federal intermediate credit banks' portion of the cost of the Office of the Governor of Farm Credit Administration, cost of maintaining files and other services performed by the service divisions of the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan, in line with the question raised by the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Minnesota, that I have received a good many communications from production credit corporations in my State. They are very much disturbed about the budget cuts in the bill affecting their work.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from one of the production credit corporations in my State, setting forth its point of view on the questions which the Senator from Michigan says he is going to take to conference, in the sincere hope that in conference he will be able to meet some of the objections raised in this letter.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that information from the Senator from Oregon.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLAMETTE PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATION,
Salem, Oreg., May 24, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have before me a copy of H. R. 6481, a bill making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

I have studied this bill very carefully. Because of my affiliation with and knowledge of the Production Credit System, I cannot help but feel that the House committee under Mr. PLOESER on appropriations has failed to study the situation and has reached conclusions that are not founded on factual information.

As you know, the production credit system, including the central office in Washington and the 12 production credit corporations, have been doing an exceptionally fine job in serving agriculture and operating most economically. The system requested and the Budget Bureau approved a budget for the 12 corporations and the central office amounting to $1,602,600. The subcommittee on appropriations cut this amount to $1,350,000, a total cut of $252,600. Also, the committee recommended that prior to June 30, 1949, the corporations shall return Government capital aggregating not less than $60,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury. The Governor of the Farm Credit Administration was authorized and directed to cancel such stock.

This appears to me a most dangerous piece of legislation especially in view of the fact that all of us are concerned not only about the present inflationary period in which our business is being conducted, but more especially are concerned about what may be in store for us in the future.

For your information, the system originally had $120,000,000 of Government capital. As the production credit associations became established and developed earnings of their own, they started returning capital to the United States Treasury's revolving fund. To date approximately $39,000,000 has been returned.

From the progress of my own association and neighboring associations, together with my knowledge of the system, another large amount will be returned at the end of 1948, perhaps from another $12,000,000 to $15,000,000. After 15 years of operation this would appear that the System is making real progress in retiring the Government capital.

We in Production Credit have always been told that the funds to be retired from the System would be placed into the revolving fund to be used for capital purposes in case of any real emergency which may arise either on a national or district-wide basis. The return of these funds to the revolving fund will not affect our present program of continuing to retire the Government's capital which I can say from many contracts with other production credit association secretaries, all of us are striving to achieve as soon as possible.

As for my own association and other associations in the district, we are all in favor of farmer ownership and are vigorously proceeding in that direction. It seems a shame that the House would pass H. R. 6481 without amendment and without study and debate in view of the record.

I have before me a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I quote from page 5522, May 10, 1948, an excerpt from the statement of Mr. PLOESER:

"The production credit corporations requested $1,602,000; we gave them $1,350,000.

"I could go on at great length on this subject, but I do not care to take that much time of the Committee, but their operation is almost purely paternalistic. The day has arrived when they are not making any extensive investments in production credit associations, but more in the social field than in the actual lending field or the extension of capital.

"We found that they had about $60,000,000 invested in Government bonds in which they were obviously speculating. They were speculating to their heart's content in the Government bond market throughout the year and they were having a good time at it. We see no excuse whatsoever for any agency of the Government using surplus funds just to satisfy their own vanity as investment speculators, and we have written into this bill a provision taking $60,000,000 of their funds and putting it in the Treasury in the fiscal year 1949."

This in itself would indicate that Mr. PLOESER is receiving his advice presumably from the American Bankers Association, our competitors. Certainly he hasn't taken the time to review the record or he would not be careless enough to state that the corporations have been speculating throughout the year. A survey of the activities of the 12 production credit corporations would indicate that the only bond investments made during the year were for production credit associations sending in surplus earnings to be invested in bonds for the purpose of augmenting their capital structure. I can imagine the only other sale was when the system returned approximately $8,000,000 in cash to the revolving fund of the United States Treasury. To return this cash it was necessary to sell bonds. It would be ridiculous for the corporations, the Government, or any other business institution to sell bonds on the open market and not accept the premium that was being paid.

I am not aware of any activities of the corporations in the social field. My guess is that Mr. PLOESER is thinking of the Farmers' Home Administration. My acquaintance and confidence in you prompts me to be helpful in bringing you down to date on these facts so that when the Senate acts on the budget of the production credit corporations, you will have some knowledge of what has transpired and what is needed.

There never has been a time in the history of the system when the supervision rendered to the production credit associations by the production credit corporations has been of such great importance. More and more farmers are turning to production credit as can be seen by the enclosed statistics. With business more than doubling in the past 2 years, it hardly seems provident to curtail the system of checks and balances which has enabled us to build our cooperatives on a sound framework over the past 14 years. We have experienced a recession in the fruit industry—the fur farmers are having a desperate time. The net returned to growers from many of the agricultural commodities that we finance has been narrowed because of rising costs; therefore, we need the wise counsel and judgment of the experienced people in the corporation to assist us in maintaining a proper balance in the extension of credit to farmers in our area. We are adhering to conservative policies. In doing so we are doing our best to contribute our share to heading off further inflation. Also we have the sincere desire to see that the farmers and stockmen using the facilities of our association keep themselves in liquid condition. Great harm could be done to the average farmer through over-extension of credit. We work with him, counsel with him, and have on our board of directors experienced and qualified farmers who approve the loans and manage the affairs of our organization. The same is true of the five-hundred-odd other associations in the United States.

May I plead with you and urge that you give us your support in maintaining an economical set-up that is not asking Congress for an appropriation but asking Congress for an approved budget?

The production credit corporations receive their earnings from the income on bond investments and dividends paid by production credit associations. All surplus earnings by these corporations belong to the United States Government and are not being wasted. If you care to confer with members of the subcommittee, you may be helpful. The Subcommittee on Appropriations for Government corporations is chaired by Mr. FERGUSON.

Anything you can do in aiding us in the restoration of this drastic cut will be appreciated by the thousands of member stockholders of production credit associations in Oregon.

Please accept my best regards.

Very truly yours,
PHILIP M. BRANDT, JR.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

P. S.—I understand hearings on this bill are to come up this week. P. M. B.

Willamette Production Credit Association—Comparative statistics, April 30

	1946	1947	1948
Loans outstanding:			
Number	198	315	441
Amount	$538,000	$882,000	$1,199,000
Production credit association stock	$125,000	$115,000	$75,000
A stockholders (nonborrowing):			
Number	186	184	201
Amount	$12,020	$11,885	$11,970
B stockholders (active borrowers):			
Number	464	497	607
Amount	$114,200	$116,145	$134,060
Accumulated reserves	$88,020	$103,640	$116,750
Net earnings, year to date	$1,188	$4,280	$3,295
Average size of loan	$2,717	$2,800	$2,720
Number loans made year to date	133	181	255
Applications approved, Jan. 1 to Apr. 23			243
Applications rejected, Jan. 1 to Apr. 23			112
Applications approved above, repeat and renewal loans			139
Applications approved above, new members			104

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 23, line 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,350,000" and insert "$1,500,000"; and on page 24, line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 24, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$46,800" and insert "$146,800"; in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$12,500" and insert "$21,000"; and on page 25, line 11, after the figures "$25,000,000", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That, notwithstanding any provisions of law to the contrary, in addition to the foregoing the Corporation is authorized to utilize, from the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (12 U. S. C. 1148a), such sums as may be necessary (a) to make loans, during a period of 5 years, to bona fide fur farmers in accordance with the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148), the aggregate principal amount of which loans shall not exceed $4,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and (b) not to exceed $50,000 for administrative expenses of the Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration in connection with such loans.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Commerce," on page 26, line 19, after the word "area", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the Corporation is authorized to pay not to exceed $3,918.48 for services actually rendered by 18 of its former employees during the fiscal year 1947 and for which there is no present authority to pay.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 27, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
VIRGIN ISLANDS COMPANY

There is hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000 to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be made available by him, as a loan, to The Virgin Islands Company, upon request of the President of the Company, for the purpose of enabling the Company to continue its present operation until June 30, 1949. The loan shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan to the Company.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Justice," on page 28, line 8, after the word "interest", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That funds of the Corporation shall be available, in amounts not to exceed $338,000 during the fiscal year 1948 and $380,000 during the fiscal year 1949, for expenses of vocational training of prisoners as authorized by the act of May 11, 1948 (Public Law 521), such expenses to be computed and determined on the same basis and with the same exclusions (except vocational training expenses) as provided herein with respect to administrative expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—General provisions," on page 31, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 305. After the date of enactment hereof the salaries of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall be at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 7, to change the section number from "306" to "305"; in line 16, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947"; on page 32, line 7, after the word "violence," to strike out the comma and "or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947"; and in line 18, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 5, to change the section number from "307" to "306."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there are no further committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "$4,840,000" and insert "$6,200,000"; and on page 3 it is proposed to strike out the proviso beginning in line 20 and ending in line 1, on page 4, reading as follows: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any public-housing agency any contribution occasioned by payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the amount specified in the original contract between such agency and the Public Housing Administration or its predecessor agencies."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I apologize to the Appropriations Committee for my failure to present this amendment directly to the committee. As we all know, Senators are extremely busy, and I have had no opportunity to get the facts and figures together and present them formally before the committee, but I do so now before the Senate.

Let me say to the Senate that this amendment seeks to effect a change which will give a more equitable distribution on the question of payment of taxes by the public-housing authorities over the country. All told, there are 273 of such projects in operation throughout the United States.

This amendment is designed to restore equitable treatment to the municipalities which are now subject to what I contend, under the language of the bill, is a gross discrimination as the result of this proviso. By the way, the proviso was inserted in the bill for the first time last year. Previous to that time there was no such proviso.

The proviso is directed toward the relationship between the Federal Government and the local housing agencies which own and operate low-rent housing projects throughout the United States.

There are now some 273 of these projects in operation throughout the United

States. The issue involved in this proviso is the amount of local taxes which these projects shall pay to the cities and counties in which they are located.

When the projects were first set up, beginning in 1938, it was recognized that the successful operation of low-rent housing projects depended upon the amount of taxes which the project would have to bear. Under the arrangement between the State governments and the Federal Government local housing authorities are exempt by law from the payment of local taxes. The payment which they make to the cities and counties is in a sense a payment of an amount "in lieu of taxes." This is an amount specified in the contract between the housing authority and the local government. The amount to be paid must be approved by the Federal Public Housing Authority.

In the beginning stages of the program no one was sure exactly what amount should be paid in lieu of taxes. As a consequence, the original contracts contained different provisions with respect to taxes.

That is the point I wish to make and bear down on in connection with this amendment.

In Illinois, for example, the local housing authorities' contracts in Granite City, Quincy, Champaign County, Madison County, Rock Island County, and Alexander County call for a payment in lieu of taxes of 2 percent of the amount of shelter rent paid by the tenants; that is to say, 2 percent of the rent minus any payments on account of utility services. In Decatur, Ill., the original contract specified a payment of 2¾ percent. In the city of Rock Island, St. Clair County, and Winnebago County, the original contracts called for a payment of 3 percent of the net shelter rent. In the cities of Chicago and Peoria, the original contracts called for a 5-percent payment. In the city of Danville, the contract called for a flat payment of only $100 a year; and in Henry County, the contract called for a payment of $165 a year.

The variation in the amounts to be paid was brought about because of the uncertainty as to the amount which could be paid. The important point was to keep those low-rent housing projects operating on the least expensive basis, so that the rents could remain low and serve the beneficial purposes of the acts of Congress, which were designed to give the lowest-income groups in the population adequate housing.

As time went on, it became clear that these public-housing authorities were not paying adequately for the services which were being supplied to them by the local government, such as education, fire and police protection, sanitation, and so forth. Although the United States Housing Act of 1937 requires that the local governments must contribute toward the operation of the low-rent projects at least 20 percent of the amount contributed by the Federal Government, it was very clear that in most cases the cost of the services rendered was several times the amount of local contribution. Moreover, the system for payments in lieu of taxes was inequitable as between cities. The cities which had participated first in the program had agreed to accept very small amounts in lieu of taxes, as contrasted with the cities which came in later. As a result of this situation, the Federal Public Housing Authority conducted an extensive study of the whole question of payments in lieu of taxes. Conferences were held with many public bodies, including the National Association of Housing Officials, the Municipal Finance Officers Association, the National Association of Assessing Officers, and the United States Conference of Mayors. As a result of those conferences, it was agreed that the local housing authorities could pay more than the amounts provided for in the original contract. So at this point practically every housing authority is now paying 10 percent of the net shelter rent.

By this move, each city or county in which a local housing authority existed was receiving the same proportion of the rent as a payment in lieu of taxes. The proviso in this bill and in last year's bill requires that no payment in lieu of taxes can be made in excess of the amount specified in the original contract. This pushes everything back to the situation which prevailed at the beginning of the program, and perpetuates the inequities contained in the original contracts under which some cities paid nothing and other cities paid various amounts ranging from 2 percent to 5 percent.

Of the 273 projects now in operation, in the case of 153 of them there is no provision at all in the original contracts for payments in lieu of taxes. Others provide specific dollar-and-cents amounts. Most of them provide for 3 percent.

Thus, in addition to reducing drastically the amounts which the cities and counties are to receive in lieu of taxes, the proviso perpetuates the inequities as between the various cities and counties. The cities have been relying year by year upon the payment of the 10-percent contribution to support the local government. But, Mr. President, under this provision of the bill, which was written in last year, they cannot obtain that 10 percent from the Housing Authority, because the contract is different. Yet that is what the Congress last year said should be done.

Congress has known for 3 years about this arrangement whereby increased amounts were paid to the local governments, and Congress did not see fit to change it until last year. What is proposed now is to continue the provisions of last year's bill.

If the proviso is continued, the amount which will be saved by the Government in making annual contributions is in the neighborhood of $1,300,000. For the sake of saving that amount of money, the Appropriations Committee is apparently prepared to continue the inequitable system of payments among the various local housing authorities and to deprive the local governments of the revenue which they desperately need. It is a matter of common knowledge that almost every city and county in the country is seeking new sources of revenue in order to meet the mounting costs of local government for education, fire and police protection, and so forth. It is another instance of an economy-minded Congress throwing discretion overboard for the sake of saving a pitifully small amount. That is not very much money nowadays, in terms of Federal Government expenditures, but it is a tremendous amount of money for the municipalities that are taxed to the limit at the present time for health and sanitation services and police and fire protection, and the other essential services and utilities that are necessary for the proper running of a city. As everyone knows, practically every city in the United States is bonded up to the limit, and it is difficult for the cities to do the things that should be done. For instance, the city of Chicago alone, because of the tremendous housing projects there, would benefit to the amount of $250,000 under the provisions of this amendment.

These low-rent housing projects constitute one of the worth-while contributions of the Federal Government to the health and welfare of the low-income groups of our people. Their continued operation is essential. We must not make any move in this Congress which would impair their efficient operation. I urge the Senate to strike this proviso from the bill.

In order to provide funds with which to raise the payment to local governments up to the 10-percent rate which prevailed for 3 years prior to last year, the appropriation to the Public Housing Administration is increased by my amendment from $4,840,000 to $6,200,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think this matter can be explained better by reading from the House committee hearings, rather than in any other way, because in those hearings the matter is boiled down and the facts are presented. I read now from page 791 of the House committee hearings:

PROVISIONS OF ORIGINAL CONTRACTS

In determining its policy in respect to local contributions and payments in lieu of taxes, the PHA has taken into consideration not only that local contributions must be received in an amount equal to the required 20 percent, but also that the local contributions together with the Federal contributions must be sufficient to achieve rents within the means of low-income families.

Even in the earliest days of the program, when the first low-rent housing projects were being planned, it was apparent that local contributions larger than the 20-percent minimum would have to be obtained if low rents were to be achieved. It was, therefore, the original policy of the PHA to encourage localities to grant complete tax exemption for their low-rent housing projects. It was only when a locality insisted upon receiving some payments in lieu of taxes that the PHA authorized the making of contracts providing for such payments.

As a result of this original policy of case-by-case negotiations with the localities, the original contracts present a wide diversity of provisions as to payments in lieu of taxes. More than half of the original contracts contain no provision whatsoever for such payments, and only 7 percent of the contracts provided for payments equal to as much as 5 percent of shelter rent. The following table summarizes the provisions of the original contracts for the low-rent projects established under the original act (Public Law 412, 75th Cong.) and for the projects developed under the defense amendment (Public Law 671, 76th Cong.) after their conversion to low-rent use.

Provisions of original contracts in respect to payments in lieu of taxes on locally owned low-rent projects under the United States Housing Act

	Public Law 412 projects		Public Law 671 projects		Total, all projects	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
No payments in lieu of taxes	99	60.4	54	49.5	153	56.0
2 to 2¾ percent of shelter rent	8	4.9	12	11.0	20	7.4
3 percent of shelter rent	26	15.9	28	25.7	54	19.7
4¾ percent of shelter rent	3	1.8	1	.9	4	1.5
5 percent of shelter rent	14	8.5	6	5.5	20	7.3
Fixed amount	13	7.9	3	2.8	16	5.9
Other arrangements	1	.6	5	4.6	6	2.2
Total	164	100.0	109	100.0	273	100.0

FIRST UNIFORM POLICY

The various localities throughout the country speedily came to feel that there had been unfair discrimination between them; those cities which had insisted upon payments in lieu of taxes had received them, whereas those which had not insisted had received none. In order to bring about a uniformity of administration and to treat all localities on the same basis, the PHA in 1942 promulgated a uniform policy in regard to payments in lieu of taxes. Local authorities were authorized to make payments in lieu of taxes which, together with the amounts stipulated in the original contracts, would amount to 5 percent of the shelter rents charged in the project for the year. This authorization was, of course, subject to the statutory condition that local contributions were to be not less than 20 percent of Federal contribution.

Mr. President, here is what happened. The cities were very anxious to get the low-rent housing. They were perfectly willing not to have any payment in lieu of taxes, because they wanted to make a contribution to low-rent housing. The PHA was perfectly willing to do that. It was out to get public housing in every city in the United States. In order to get it, the PHA came to Congress and indicated to Congress, "We can build these houses; the local communities will contribute the amount of taxes."

Then the PHA found some cities that would not do that. For instance, there was a town in Texas that said, "We want, as taxes, the amount we are now collecting on this vacant land." Such a provision was put in their contract.

Then, after the Congress provided those houses, the PHA broke faith with the Congress, without giving any notice and without doing anything other than making special deals with each one of the cities, raising to 10 percent of the shelter rate the amount to be paid in lieu of taxes.

So, Mr. President, if we do not include this provision, the result will be to cost the Federal Government a subsidy of $1,360,000.

My city of Detroit has sent representatives here to Washington to see me. They want this 10-percent payment in lieu of taxes. But I have said to them, as I say to the representatives of all the other cities, that so far as I am concerned, they made their contract; they wanted the housing; they agreed that they would put up the amount in lieu of taxes, as their share; so now they should not get a further subsidy, but they should stand by their contract, the same as all the other cities do.

I think the time has come when the cities of the country as well as the Federal Government must help furnish the poor people of the Nation with housing. That is the only way we are going to have careful operation of the housing projects, because the people will realize they are sharing the burden. This is a burden upon all the people, not only of the cities, but of the United States, and not only of the United States but of the respective cities.

I hope the measure will be left just as it is. As I recall, there was in the committee no discussion about this phase of it, I know the committee was unanimous on it. The cities agreed to this, and they should now carry out the agreement, after they have the housing projects, without changing it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Murray
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Brewster	Holland	Reed
Bricker	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Cooper	Knowland	Sparkman
Cordon	Langer	Stennis
Donnell	Lodge	Stewart
Dworshak	Lucas	Taft
Eastland	McClellan	Taylor
Ecton	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McKellar	Thye
Feazel	McMahon	Tobey
Ferguson	Magnuson	Umstead
Flanders	Martin	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Maybank	Watkins
Green	Millikin	Wherry
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hawkes	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LODGE. Let the amendment be stated for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the figures "$4,840,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,200,000"; and on page 3, to strike the proviso beginning on line 20 and ending on line 1, page 4, which reads as follows: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any public housing agency any contribution occasioned by payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the amount specified in the original contract between such agency and the Public Housing Administration or its predecessor agencies."

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—42

Aiken	Holland	Maybank
Baldwin	Ives	Morse
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Cooper	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Knowland	Pepper
Donnell	Langer	Saltonstall
Eastland	Lodge	Smith
Ellender	Lucas	Sparkman
Feazel	McClellan	Stennis
Flanders	McFarland	Stewart
Green	McKellar	Taylor
Hayden	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Magnuson	Tobey

NAYS—33

Ball	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Brewster	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Russell
Butler	Hoey	Taft
Byrd	Jenner	Thye
Cain	Kem	Umstead
Capper	Martin	Vandenberg
Dworshak	Millikin	Watkins
Ecton	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Reed	Williams
Fulbright	Revercomb	Young

NOT VOTING—21

Bridges	George	O'Daniel
Buck	Hatch	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	McCarran	Tydings
Capehart	McCarthy	Wagner
Chavez	McGrath	White
Connally	Malone	Wiley
Downey	Myers	Wilson

So Mr. LUCAS' amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the amendment I have submitted would provide for $1,000,000 additional capital-stock subscription to the Inland Waterways Corporation, which operates the Federal Barge Lines and the Warrior River Terminal Company. This appropriation of $1,000,000 would complete the capital subscription of this Corporation under the existing authorization.

The Federal Barge Lines was organized in its present form in 1924 and since that time has hauled an average of 2,000,000 tons of freight per year. At the time of its organization there were no other common carriers of freight on the Mississippi River proper, and, largely because of the pioneering work which it did, there were, by 1944, over a hundred common, contract, and private carriers operating on the Mississippi River system. In addition to the pioneer work which the lines did, I am of the opinion that the service offered to a large number of small shippers was a basis of considerable support for the improvement of our streams and rivers, thus making profitable private barge-line operations possible.

Perhaps the best example of the need for a service such as is offered by Federal Barge Lines can be found in the Tennessee River, where millions of dollars have been spent in developing a 9-foot channel to Knoxville, a distance of more than 600 miles from the mouth of the river. Although large tonnage is being carried on the Tennessee today, there is not a single ton carried in less than barge-load lots, which means that the small shipper or the shipper who has need of common-carrier service is receiving no benefit whatsoever from that improvement. For instance, a small lot of sugar destined from New Orleans to Knoxville cannot be shipped by water, since there is no common-carrier service beyond Cairo, Ill. As a consequence, the wholesale grocer in Knoxville is not receiving the benefits from the Tennessee River that otherwise should accrue to him.

Quite obviously the reason for this situation is that the operation of package freight service by barge lines is comparatively unprofitable. A bargeload of sugar, for instance, being hauled from New Orleans to St. Louis, can be hauled much cheaper than the hauling of odd lots to numerous points along the river between New Orleans and St. Louis, where stops must be made to unload and distribute. Despite this lack of profit in such form of transportation, the Federal Barge Lines, during most of its existence, has operated at a profit, and, in the 24 years since its formation, the Federal Government has put only $12,000,000 into the enterprise. This amount, I may say, was utilized to buy the equipment which is now being used in order to carry freight on the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

The Federal Barge Lines is now burdened with obsolete and dilapidated equipment, which has made its operation unprofitable in recent years. Until it is rehabilitated, its operation will, no doubt, continue to be at a loss. Under the very capable management of Capt. A. C. Ingersoll, the present president of the Corporation, the Lines is engaged in developing new equipment designed materially to decrease the line-haul cost. Within the last few weeks an integrated towboat has been launched, which is designed to reduce operating cost approximately 50 percent. For instance, using the new unit, a tow consisting of one boat and nine barges, hauling 12,000 tons, or, roughly, two and one-half trainloads, would be able to proceed upstream at a rate of 7 miles per hour, compared with the present speed of 3 to 3½ miles per hour. Captain Ingersoll is confident that outfitting the Lines with several of these units would wipe out present operating deficits, in addition to attracting more business because of the better service which could be offered because of the new equipment.

The Budget requested $3,000,000 in this appropriation for fiscal year 1949, which would be used to construct a second integrated towboat and 29,300 tons of integrated barge capacity and also allow for improving and increasing the capacity of the East St. Louis Terminal. The towboat would cost an estimated $600,000; the barge capacity, an estimated $2,197,500; and the terminal work, approximately $200,000.

If we are to obtain full dividends from the appropriations we have been making for river and harbor development, then we must see to it that the Federal Barge Lines not only continues in existence but is placed in a position of rendering service. Development of the Missouri River, the Arkansas River, the Red River, and numerous other streams, for transportation purposes, will not be fully effective if there is no agency existent to pioneer the transportation service on them. In the beginning of such service, operations are necessarily unprofitable. No private carrier is willing to lose the money over a period perhaps of several years which extension of common carrier service entails. On the other hand, an established line like the Federal Barge Lines, because it is able to balance the loss on shipments of less than bargeload lots against profits on bulk shipments in bargeload lots, is able, when properly equipped, to do this business at little or no loss.

I wish to point out to my colleagues throughout the Mississippi Valley that their entire freight rate structure, rail, barge, and truck, is based upon the rates offered by the Federal Barge Lines. Grain, regardless of its mode of transportation, is shipped cheaper from Omaha to New Orleans, because of the existence of the Federal Barge Lines. Industrial products from Pittsburgh and Chicago likewise carry a cheap rate because of the work which this Government corporation is doing. Minneapolis-St. Paul has developed into a principal river port largely because of the pioneering work of the Federal Barge Lines on the Mississippi River after its canalization. This is a service from which the small-business man and the farmer all reap a reward. It is a small amount which this amendment provides, but it is a vital amount to thousands of shippers throughout the great midcontinent area.

Let me repeat that the amount provided by my amendment is to be used solely to purchase new barges and a new towboat. As I indicated a moment ago, the entire amount which has been so far spent by the Federal Government for this service has been expended to purchase towboats and barges. Most of this equipment is more than 20 years old, and the money proposed to be added will be more or less an investment on the part of the Federal Government to continue this service for the people of the valley.

I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter under date of May 25, 1948, addressed to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], by Lewis I. Bourgeois be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE PORT OF NEW ORLEANS,
New Orleans, La., May 25, 1948.

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am advised that on Thursday of this week, the Subcommittee on Government Corporations of the Senate Appropriations Committee, will hold a hearing relative to the Federal Barge Lines, with particular reference to appropriating $3,000,000 to make up the deficiency in its original capital stock. These lines are operated by the Inland Waterways Corporation, which was incorporated at $15,000,000, but only received $12,000,000.

A house bill recently introduced sought to make up the deficiency of $3,000,000, but we learn this was cut to $2,000,000, which was most unfortunate.

We in New Orleans urge most earnestly your committee to authorize the full $3,000,000.

Just last week the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans, a civic organization of business and professional men, a membership of 3,500, took cognizance of various bills now before the Congress, some aimed to sell the Federal Barge Lines to private ownership, and one particularly, in the Senate, which aimed to continue the lines and rehabilitate them. I am now the chairman of this club's committee, and am authorized to submit to you our views.

We are all gravely apprehensive that, pending final decision on any legislation, the Federal Barge Lines will find themselves with insufficient funds to operate properly, to furnish regular service, to maintain its equipment, and at the same time do some urgent rehabilitating, with the final result that the lines will disintegrate for lack of funds. We are fearful that the lines will find their equipment in such shape that they may be forced to curtail acceptance of all kinds of freight from all types of shippers, small and large. If this takes place, business interests of the midcontinent and of this port will suffer, as many businesses and industries did locate in that area because of the assured existence of the lines' services, schedules, rates, and rate territory.

It is well to point out that when the corporation was authorized by the Congress, there were guarantees written in the act. The people of the midcontinent area have every right to ask for their fulfillment. The act provides for certain plans for sale to private ownership, and they embody these guarantees. Therefore the people, when establishing or expanding industry in the midcontinent, could expect either continued Government or private ownership, since in either case the act, if followed, gives assurance of continuation of service.

The executive of the Federal Barge Lines, and his staff, have devised a new type of towboat which should revolutionize inland waterway barge operation. This towboat was demonstrated to the public at New Orleans this week, and its performance won public acclaim. The press carried most encouraging news stories of the demonstration. Its use will be attractive to the shipping public because it will cut down the long transit time now in effect by river barge lines, between river ports. It will enable the small shipper who, heretofore, could not afford to anticipate his needs for merchandise and thus was deprived of the opportunity to save money on transportation costs to use the lines. Faster deliveries will help him. But this one tow certainly will not be sufficient. The other equipment, almost worn out during the war, need a lot of repair. These lines therefore must have sufficient funds to carry on; and certainly to carry on until the Congress decides as to continuing Government operation, or sell to private interests. We fear it may take the Congress too long to decide.

We respectfully urge your committee, if it is to pass only upon the $3,000,000 appropriation to vote this total amount favorably. This is most important so that the lines can maintain proper service to the midcontinent area, and certainly this service should be continued without interruption.

It will be our committee's purpose to submit our views to every Member of the Senate and the House relative to the disposition of the Federal Barge Lines, but we will do this in separate communications.

Sincerely yours,
LEWIS I. BOURGEOIS,
Chairman.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, when this question came before the subcommittee and the committee the amount was placed at $2,000,000 instead of $3,000,000. The House allowed $2,000,000, and Mr. Ingersoll when he testified before the Senate committee, stated that he thought the House committee went on the assumption that their revenues would be as estimated in their budget. In other words, they came before the budget and stated that they were able to get a certain amount of revenues, and when they came before the committees they indicated that they could not obtain those revenues.

The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana would add $1,000,000 to the amount of the bill. The amendment would be used for the erection of a barge. They have already built a barge, and they want to build another just like it before they even experiment with the one they have. This is what the House says about the matter:

> After a few months of experimental operation with this equipment to ascertain its practicability for river transportation, the management hopes to add additional barge equipment to its facilities and procure additional "integrated tow" boats. If such equipment proves successful, it is possible that the feasibility of providing common-carrier barge service on inland waterways can be demonstrated in such manner that private capital can be attracted to this operation, thus enabling the Government to get out of the barge business.

In other words, it is the intention of the Government to liquidate this business. They have built one barge. The Government corporation wants to build another barge for $1,000,000 before it has even experimented with the one which has been built.

I read further from the House report:

> In view of the fact that legislation to authorize the sale of the barge line is pending, the committee is reluctant to recommend appropriation of the entire request in the budget of $3,000,000. The amount of $2,000,000 is recommended for 1949. This sum should enable the Corporation to obtain enough new capital equipment to demonstrate efficient operation and to attract private capital to this enterprise, and also to provide working capital adequate under careful management to maintain the Corporation as a going concern.

Mr. President, in a few words that is the substance of what the amendment would do. It would take another $1,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to build an experimental tug or towboat for the river; and they have not demonstrated that they have one now which will work. I hope the Senate will sustain the action of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think that concludes the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 24, lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to strike out "to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury" and insert "the revolving fund authorized in title 12, United States Code, section 1311."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, first I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question. In House bill 6481, on my desk, page 24, line 3, I find the figure "$60,000,000." Has the figure been reduced to $20,000,000?

Mr. FERGUSON. It has been reduced from $60,000,000 to $20,000,000.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President the pending measure provides in the section "Production credit corporations"—

> That prior to June 30, 1949, the corporations—

Speaking of production credit corporations—

> shall return Government capital aggregating not less than $20,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury, and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration is authorized and directed to cancel the capital stock of the corporations in par value amount equal thereto.

My amendment does not involve any increased appropriation of money. It simply provides that the $20,000,000 which is to be paid by the production credit corporation and credit associations shall go to the revolving fund which is their reservoir of capital for loans rather than back to the Treasury of the United States. I shall briefly state my reasons for offering the amendment.

As Senators know, there has been created in the past a revolving fund of approximately $120,000,000, from which funds could be made available to local production credit associations for loans to farmers for purposes for which loans were not usually available from banks at that time—for seed loans, machinery loans, fertilizer and similar loans. My amendment would keep intact the revolving fund of $120,000,000 so that if great need arises in the future, funds will be available for the purpose. The Production Credit Corporation has made a fine record in my State, Kentucky, and in the Nation. The need for its services is still present, and I do not see any reason for reducing the revolving fund, which makes this type of credit available. This may lead to the eventual destruction of the fund.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I realize that we have been a long time on this particular bill, but I urge the Senate not to adopt this amendment for this reason: This Corporation was financed by the Treasury, or the money of the taxpayers of the United States. It has now accumulated in the Corporation treasury a surplus of $60,000,000. The Government wants that money repaid to its Treasury through the cancellation of stock. The stockholders of the Corporation are the farmers. I agree that it has been a good thing for the farmers. But they have this fund accumulated. They are not paying 1 cent of interest to the United States Government. Now they do not want to return the $20,000,000. The House said $60,000,000, but the Senate committee said $20,000,000. They do not want to pay it back into the Treasury because they feel that if they keep it in the revolving fund, if they need it in the future they can go and get it. They have now a $60,000,000 surplus. There is no reason why the taxpayers should not have this money paid back into the Treasury, so that they will not have to pay interest on it. This Corporation is paying no interest at the present time.

I therefore hope that the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I understand that no objection is made by the Production Credit Corporation, or by their local agencies, to paying this money into the revolving fund. The committee provision is that it shall be paid back into the Treasury, which could mean that the revolving fund, established for the benefit of the farmers and for this type of loan, would be eventually destroyed. My amendment will assure the maintenance of the revolving fund, and its continued availability for the use of farmers in the future.

I am not in any way in controversy with the Senator from Michigan upon the point that the money should be paid back. I am in controversy, however, upon the point that it should be paid back into the Treasury rather than to the

revolving fund. I believe that the farmers of the Nation desire that the revolving fund should be kept intact.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Corporation now has a surplus of $60,000,000. According to the terms of the bill, we allow it to retain $40,000,000. All we are asking it to do is to pay back $20,000,000, so that the Federal Government will not be compelled to pay interest on it. This Corporation pays no interest; and if we adopt this amendment it means that nothing will come back to the United States Treasury or the United States Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. COOPER. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, in line 13, it is proposed to strike out "$19,000,000" and insert "$20,650,000."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this amendment relates to the amount of money provided for the Federal Housing Administration for administrative expenses. When the $19,000,000 figure was fixed it was anticipated that the program would be only under title II. We know that title VI of the National Housing Act was scheduled to go out of effect on March 31 of this year. So when the budget was sent up, only $19,000,000 was asked for, in order to handle the title II loans.

But following that time, Congress extended the life of the operations under title VI, and authorized $750,000,000 of additional loans to be insured. Later, Congress extended it again, and authorized an additional $400,000,000. That makes a total of $1,150,000,000 which the Congress authorized the FHA to handle, without giving it any increase whatsoever in the funds available for paying the expenses of handling those loans.

This amendment would increase the amount by $1,650,000. As a matter of fact, it will not be money the Treasury will pay out, because every loan that is made pays a fee to pay the expenses of closing the loan. If we go along with the $19,000,000, that simply will mean one of two things: Either it will slow up the work of clearing the title VI loans, which we authorized, and for which commitments are already made, or we shall get shoddy inspections, and thereby will get loans that will be poor risks, and eventually a loss will fall upon the Treasury.

As I stated a moment ago, all the money is paid in by the borrowers, so in the long run this amendment will not cost the Government anything. By giving the agency this $1,650,000 additional, we can have efficient operation and can have reasonably prompt closure of loans and can have good inspections which will result in giving us better risks.

I think it will be a good investment, and I hope the Congress will authorize the use of the additional amount of money by the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, title VI has not been passed as yet. The reason for the difference between the $19,000,000 figure and the $20,650,000 figure is that the authorization for title VI of the housing bill had not been passed, and the Senate committee believed it should accept the judgment of the House, because the work has not been authorized.

As the House committee said in its report:

> The budget estimate of $19,000,000 relates primarily to work under title II. The amount has been approved, and the expenses relating to title VI of the program will be considered after enactment of a new title VI authorization.

So, Mr. President, when title VI is passed, it will carry an authorization, and then in the Appropriations Committee a deficiency appropriation can be handled.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, is it not a fact, and was it not brought out before the Senator's committee, that there are now outstanding commitments, under title VI, in the amount of approximately $1,000,000,000? I am sure the Senator remembers that back in December, we authorized $750,000,000 in loans, and that authority was to run until March 31. I am sure the Senator also remembers that in March we again extended title VI, and authorized $400,000,000 additional. The greater amount of those two authorizations is still outstanding. The commitments have been made, but those projects are simply held up, waiting until inspections can be made.

As the Senator has said, this $19,000,000 goes primarily to title II loans. The result is that there is nothing upon which to operate for title VI loans; and as a result we have $1,000,000,000 of outstanding commitments, but no opportunity to make the proper inspections.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, just one sentence before the vote on this amendment: The $400,000,000 which was provided for was on a 30-day extension of the title on April 30, under the appropriation for 1948; but the appropriation we are talking about now would be from June 30, so there is nothing really to provide for at the present time, until further legislation is enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama, on page 17, in line 13.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I now send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, it is proposed to strike out all beginning with the word "That", in line 11, through the words *"Provided further"*, in line 6.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the language I am trying to strike out by this amendment is a limitation on the number of officers and employees in the classification grade 11 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, and of class 4 of the professional service, used in the Public Housing Administration. It provides that not more than 20 percent of the total number of that class of officers can be in those grades.

I shall take only a minute to explain this amendment. The Public Housing Administration, as it stands today, really is the custodian of a large number of various housing programs which were developed and put into effect during the war. They were developed by other agencies, but they have been turned over to the Public Housing Administration for it to administer. A great many of them are in process of liquidation and are being closed out.

Practically all the work of this particular division is of a supervisory nature. It is not a case in which the usual run-of-the-mine employees are used—employees such as stenographers, clerks, typists, and others who are in the lower grades; but the work is largely supervisory, and naturally it calls for a high percentage of supervisory personnel. So this limitation, as it is written into the bill, is an undue restriction upon that agency, if we are to have proper administration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, just a few words on this amendment. Last year the Congress of the United States undertook to say that this agency had too many high-paid employees in its services; and therefore the Congress provided that not to exceed 20 percent of the total number of officers and employees of the agency of that class were to be in the higher-salaried group which have just been referred to, and whose salaries would be paid from such funds. The agency got along all right with that arrangement last year. There is no reason why Congress should not say at this time that the agency has had too many high-paid officers, and there is no reason why the Congress should not stipulate here that that agency cannot have as many high-paid employees as it desires. That is all there is to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama on page 19, in lines 1 to 6.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. REED, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2744. An act to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 3889. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases;

H. R. 6028. An act to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status; and

H. R. 6758. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 6411. An act to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in furtherance of national safety against traffic and other accident hazards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6247. An act to provide for the air security and defense of the United States, to establish the composition of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ACCEPTANCE OF CONSTITUTION OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION INSTRUMENT OF AMENDMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution from the Senate (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, which was, on page 2, to strike out all after line 7, down to and including line 2 on page 4, and insert:

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—

(a) such sums, not to exceed $550,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization, as apportioned by the International Labour Conference in accordance with article 13 (c) of the constitution of the Organization: *Provided, however*, That the annual United States quota of contribution to the total budget of the Organization shall not be greater in proportion than the United States quota of contribution to the total budget of the United Nations; and

(b) Such additional sums, not to exceed $95,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization, including—

(1) salaries of the representative or representatives and alternates and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light and cost of living allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and

(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 30, 1946, Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).

SEC. 3. No person shall serve as representative, delegate, or alternate from the United States until such person has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and no citizen of or resident in the United States shall participate in any session, conference, or meeting, or other work of the International Labor Organization or of any subordinate committee or organization thereof without the consent of the Secretary of State.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. CONNALLY conferees on the part of the Senate.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF OCEAN STATIONS BY COAST GUARD—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 2122, to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:
>
> In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Coast Guard is authorized to operate and maintain floating ocean stations for the purpose of providing search and rescue, communication, and air-navigation facilities, and meteorological services in such ocean areas as are regularly traversed by aircraft of the United States.
>
> "SEC. 2. The Coast Guard is authorized, subject to approval by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, to operate, on floating ocean stations authorized by section 1 hereof, such air navigation facilities as the Administrator may find necessary or desirable for the safe and efficient protection and control of air traffic. The Coast Guard, in establishing, maintaining, or operating any air navigation facilities herein provided, shall request the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage."
>
> And the House agree to the same.
>
> OWEN BREWSTER,
> A. W. HAWKES,
> HOMER CAPEHART,
> ED. C. JOHNSON,
> ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
> *Managers on the Part of the Senate.*
>
> S. O. BLAND,
> EDW. J. HART,
> T. MILLET HAND,
> HENRY J. LATHAM,
> ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
> *Managers on the Part of the House.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION BY COAST GUARD—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 1853, to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1853) to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That in order to aid navigation

and to prevent disasters, collisions, and wrecks of vessels and aircraft, the Coast Guard is authorized to establish, maintain, and operate—

"(a) aids to maritime navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces or of the commerce of the United States;

"(b) aids to air navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States as requested by the Secretary of the appropriate Department within the National Military Establishment; and

"(c) Loran stations (1) required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States; or (2) required to serve the needs of the maritime commerce of the United States; or (3) required to serve the needs of the air commerce of the United States as determined by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

"SEC. 2. The Coast Guard in establishing, maintaining, or operating any aids to air navigation herein provided shall solicit the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage. Before locating and operating any such aid on military or naval bases or regions, the consent of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, shall first be obtained. No such aid shall be located within the territorial jurisdiction of any foreign country without the consent of the government thereof. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to limit the authority granted by the provisions of section 77 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 621), or by section 5 (f) of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (49 U. S. C. 175), or by title III of Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 451 and the following).

"SEC. 3. Such aids to navigation other than Loran stations shall be established and operated only within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States at places where naval or military bases of the United States are or may be located, and at other places where such aids to navigation have been established on the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

OWEN BREWSTER,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER CAPEHART,
ED. C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agree to.

PROGRAM IN FIELD OF LIGHTER-THAN-AIR AERONAUTICS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 6628, to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the United States Maritime Commission is authorized and directed to study, and plan for, experimental lighter-than-air rigid airship construction and operation. The Commission shall report to the Congress as soon as practicable in the first regular session of the Eighty-first Congress the results of its study with such recommendations for further legislation as it may consider desirable and feasible for the development and operation of lighter-than-air rigid airships for commercial use."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The United States Maritime Commission shall receive the assistance and cooperation of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government, and may avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in conducting the study provided for in this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

OWEN BREWSTER,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER CAPEHART,
ED. C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 5416, to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows; In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That those provisions of the order of the Secretary of the Interior, dated February 6, 1948, which are based on certain recommendations contained in the Report on Conditions Found to Exist on the Fort Hall Irrigation Project and the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho, dated February 26, 1941, and which are described in the said order as made pursuant to the authority contained in the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), are hereby approved pursuant to the provisions of such Act.

"SEC. 2. During such periods as water for the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project may be available in excess of the present duty of three acre-feet per acre per annum, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion and under regulations to be prescribed by him, to permit the delivery of such excess water equally to the project lands in an amount not to exceed five-tenths acre-feet per acre per annum, in addition to the present duty of three acre-feet per acre per annum: *Provided, however*, That any surplus water temporarily available in addition to the three and five-tenths acre-feet per acre per annum may be furnished for use on project lands on terms, conditions, and rates to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 3. The Little Indian Unit containing one thousand one hundred eighty-six and thirty-three one-hundredths acres of irrigable land in townships 2 and 3 south, ranges 36 and 37 east, Boise meridian, within the boundaries of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, is hereby made a part of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project and the lands therein shall have the benefit of, and be subject to, all existing legislation applicable to said project to the same extent as other lands of like ownership and character within the project. The Indian-owned irrigable land in the unit shall be charged with its proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $15.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act. The non-Indian-owned irrigable land of the unit shall be entitled to receive only natural-flow water until a full project water right is acquired for said land through the execution by the owner of a contract, or contracts, providing for the repayment to the United States of like per-acre costs as are charged against the Indian-owned land in the unit. Said charges, as to Indian and non-Indian lands, shall be a first lien against the lands, under the Act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210).

"SEC. 4. The net irrigable area of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project is hereby established as forty-seven thousand and forty-four and sixty-three one-hundredths acres of land, more or less. This area includes the forty-six thousand eight hundred and three and seventy-two one-hundredths acres of land, more or less, shown as the irrigable area of the project by the maps and plats in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act, and the two hundred and forty and ninety-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, included in eight additional tracts of land described as follows: (a) An irregular shaped area in the northeast corner of the east half southwest quarter southeast quarter of section 36, township 5 south, range 33 east, Boise meridian, containing one and seventy one-hundredths acres; (b) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall Main Canal in the west half of section 35, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing twenty-eight and seventeen one-hundredths acres; (c) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall Main Canal in the south half of section 14, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing forty acres; (d) a portion of the northwest

quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing thirty-three and forty-two one-hundredths acres; (e) Fairview Park in the east half southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter and west half southeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres; (f) the east half northeast quarter northwest quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian containing twenty acres; (g) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Pocatello lateral in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ninety-seven sixty-two one-hundredths acres; and (h) the southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter of section 24, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres. The above-described tracts of land, together with such lands in the portion of the village of Alameda lying between the Pocatello lateral and the Oregon Short Line Railroad right-of-way in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, as (notwithstanding their inclusion in the irrigable acreage shown by the maps and plats hereinabove mentioned) have no water right at present, shall be entitled to receive, or to continue to receive, water through pumping operations or by gravity flow, provided the respective owners thereof, within five years from the date of the enactment of this Act, enter into contracts whereby they agree (1) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project construction costs of $18.12 per acre, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act, for such of their lands as do not now have a project water right, (2) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $15.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, for such of their lands as are not now covered by contracts for the repayment of such costs, and (3) to install, maintain, and operate, at their own expense, pumping machinery to lift the water from the project canals or laterals for the irrigation of such of their lands as cannot be supplied by gravity flow. The noninclusion of the Fort Hall town site within the net irrigable area of the project as hereby established shall not prevent the obtaining of water rights therefor in accordance with the Act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1015, 1025).

"SEC. 5. There is excluded from the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project by the designation of the project area in section 4 of this Act the nine thousand six hundred and seventy acres of tribal, allotted, and non-Indian-owned lands located between Fort Hall and Gibson, Idaho, heretofore authorized to be included in the project by the Act of March 3, 1927 (Ch. 371, 44 Stat. 1398). The construction costs apportioned to the tribal lands so excluded are hereby canceled and the water rights are made available for project use. The water rights for the lands of the several allottees and non-Indian owners within the area so excluded shall not be impaired or affected by reason of such exclusion, but water shall be delivered only at the head of the laterals serving these lands. The respective owners of such lands may make their water rights available for project use, whereupon the construction costs assessed or assessable against their lands with respect to the water rights thus made available shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior. Allottees of lands within the excluded area, or their heirs or devisees, may donate or sell their lands to the tribe or may exchange their lands for assignments of tribal lands within the project area. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, $6,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase by the Secretary of the Interior, in the name of the United States of America in trust for the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation, of one hundred and eighty acres of non-Indian-owned land, with water rights and improvements appurtenant thereto, described as the north half southeast quarter southwest quarter section 13, township 4 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, and south half northeast quarter and north half southeast quarter section 7, township 4 south, range 35 east, Boise meridian, located within the area excluded from the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project by section 4 of this Act.

"SEC. 6. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,995 to compensate the following-named landowners, or their heirs, for work accomplished or for future work necessary in filling, leveling, and otherwise preparing for irrigation the abandoned portion of the old Fort Hall Main Canal within their holdings, in not to exceed the following amounts: Frank E. DeKay, $401; Henry Jensen, $633; Theodore H. Gathe, $654; A. E. Albert, $106; Ezra D. Wilson, $127; J. M. Bistline, $378 Ambrose H. McGuire, $424; Ellen Griffith, $412; C. M. Allen, $116; Olive A. Granden, $184; William Webster, $28; Hiram Faulkner, $114; Williamette Blakeslee, $298; Frank Parker, $99; and Henrietta C. Blakeslee, $21.

"SEC. 7. Pending the construction of a siphon to provide gravity flow water to ninety-six and six-tenths acres of irrigable lands in the southwest quarter section 27, and east half section 28, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, Idaho, which lands have been irrigated by pumping operations over a period of years, the Secretary of the Interior may accept the conveyance by the landowners of the pumping equipment for use of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project and may operate such equipment as a part of said project in order to provide water for the irrigation of such lands; the acceptance of such conveyance being subject to the owners of the lands executing releases to the United States of any and all claims whatsover due to the pumping operations carried on by such landowners.

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to revise and reform, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine to be fair and equitable in all the circumstances affecting the interests of the United States and the contractors, existing contracts between the United States and the Idaho Irrigation District, the Progressive Irrigation District, and the Snake River Valley Irrigation District in Idaho, which contracts provide for certain payments by the districts to the United States for the benefit of works of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project.

"SEC. 9. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for refunds to Indians, or their heirs, the sum of $1,419.55, representing irrigation assessments of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project erroneously made and collected, as follows: Andrew F. Cutler, $153.80; Alice Sorrell Johns, $168.95; Nettie Stinson LaVatta, $146.62; Earl Edmund Cutler, $159.20; Charles Faulkner, $145.25; Josephine LaVatta Rumas, $155.20; May Phyllis LaVatta Brower, $29.90; Leonard I. Cutler, $135.85; Effie Diggie Houtz, $122.75; Lucy Yandell Spencer, $25; Charles Gerard Cutler, $121.53; and Hattie Sorrell Siler Tillotson, $55.50.

"SEC. 10. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the reloating, rehabilitating, cleaning, and extending of irrigation systems serving the lands irrigated from Ross Fork, Bannock, and Lincoln Creeks, which lands are outside of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, including the construction of a storage reservoir on Bannock Creek. The costs of any work benefiting Indian lands performed pursuant to this authorization shall be apportioned on a per acre basis and collected under laws applicable to Indian irrigable lands on the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project. Operation and maintenance charges against such lands shall likewise be subject to the same laws, rules, and regulations as apply to Indian lands on the Fort Hall project. Any unpaid charges against such lands shall be subject to a first lien as provided in the Act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210). No expenditure shall be made under this authorization which will benefit lands in non-Indian ownership unless the owners thereof execute contracts providing for the repayment of their proportionate per acre share of the costs of the work assessable against their lands.

"SEC. 11. In order to preven the accumulation of delinquent project assessments or other charges against the non-Indian-owned lands of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause liquidation of all delinquent assessments or charges by taking such action as may be necessary, including the foreclosure of the Government's lien covering any such delinquent charges or by initiating such other procedure as may be legally available, which action may be taken by him at any time when in his judgment the best interests of the project would be served thereby.

"SEC. 12. All Acts or parts of Acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
JOHN SANBORN,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

WATER-POLLUTION-CONTROL ACTIVITIES IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 418) to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the waterways of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public health and welfare by the abatement of stream pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research to devise and perfect methods of treatment of industrial wastes which are not susceptible to known effective methods of treatment, and to provide Federal technical services to State and interstate agencies and to industries, and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities, in the formulation and execution of their stream-pollution-abatement programs. To this end, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator) and the Federal Works Administrator shall have the

responsibilities and authority relating to water-pollution control vested in them respectively by this act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Surgeon General shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State water-pollution agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or adopt comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries thereof hereinafter declared to be a public nuisance and improving the sanitary condition of such interstate waters and tributaries thereof. In the development of such comprehensive programs due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. For the purpose of this subsection the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters in any State or States, and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or substance which may deleteriously affect such waters.

(b) The Surgeon General shall encourage cooperative activities by the States for the prevention and abatement of water pollution; encourage the enactment of uniform State laws relating to water pollution; encourage compacts between States for the prevention and abatement of water pollution; collect and disseminate information relating to water pollution and the prevention and abatement thereof; support and aid technical research to devise and perfect methods of treatment of industrial wastes which are not susceptible to known effective methods of treatment; make available to State and interstate agencies, municipalities, industries, and individuals the results of surveys, studies, investigations, research, and experiments relating to water pollution and the prevention and abatement thereof conducted by the Surgeon General and by authorized cooperating agencies; and furnish such assistance to State agencies as may be authorized by law.

(c) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and abatement of water pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by the Congress.

(d) (1) The pollution of interstate waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters), which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, is hereby declared to be a public nuisance and subject to abatement as herein provided.

(2) Whenever the Surgeon General, on the basis of reports, surveys, and studies, finds that any pollution declared to be a public nuisance by paragraph (1) of this subsection is occurring, he shall give formal notification thereof to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution and shall advise the water-pollution agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate of such notification. This notification may outline recommended remedial measures which are reasonable and equitable in that case and shall specify a reasonable time to secure abatement of the pollution. If action calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified is not commenced, this failure shall again be brought to the attention of the person or persons discharging the matter and of the water-pollution agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate. The notification to such agency may be accompanied by a recommendation that it initiate a suit to abate the pollution in a court of proper jurisdiction.

(3) If, within a reasonable time after the second notification by the Surgeon General, the person or persons discharging the matter fail to initiate action to abate the pollution or the State water pollution agency or interstate agency fails to initiate a suit to secure abatement, the Federal Security Administrator is authorized to call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originate, before a board of five or more persons appointed by the Administrator, who may be officers or employees of the Federal Security Agency or of the water pollution agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate (except that at least one of the members of the board shall be a representative of the water pollution agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate and at least one shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Federal Security Agency). On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing the board shall make its recommendations to the Federal Security Administrator concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution.

(4) After affording the person or persons discharging the matter causing or contributing to the pollution reasonable opportunity to comply with the recommendations of the board, the Federal Security Administrator may, with the consent of the water pollution agency (or of any officer or agency authorized to give such consent) of the State or States in which the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged, request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

(5) Before or after any suit authorized by paragraph (4) is commenced, any person who is alleged to be discharging matter contributing to the pollution, abatement of which is sought, may, with the consent of the water pollution agency (or of any officer or agency authorized to give such consent) of the State in which such matter is discharged, be joined as a defendant. The court shall have power to enforce its judgment against any such defendant.

(6) In any suit brought pursuant to paragraph (4) in which two or more persons in different judicial districts are originally joined as defendants, the suit may be commenced in the judicial district in which any discharge caused by any of the defendants occurs.

(7) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the board and a copy of the board's recommendation; and may receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require. The jurisdiction of the Surgeon General, or any other agency which has jurisdiction pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall not extend to any region or areas nor shall it affect the rights or jurisdiction of any public body where there are in effect provisions for sewage disposal pursuant to agreement between the United States of America and any such public body by stipulation entered in the Supreme Court of the United States. While any such stipulation or modification thereof is in force and effect, no proceedings of any kind may be maintained by virtue of this act against such public body or any public agency, corporation, or individual within its jurisdiction. Neither this provision nor any provision of this act shall be construed to give to the Surgeon General or any other person or agency the right to intervene in the said proceedings wherein such stipulation was entered.

(8) As used in this subsection the term "person" includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, a State, municipality, and a political subdivision of a State.

SEC. 3. The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State water-pollution agency or interstate agency, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, interstate agency, community, municipality, or industrial plant, with a view to recommending a solution of such problem.

SEC. 4. The Surgeon General shall prepare and publish, from time to time, reports of such surveys, studies, investigations, research, and experiments made under the authority of this act as he may consider desirable, together with appropriate recommendations with regard to the control of water pollution.

SEC. 5. The Federal Works Administrator is authorized, subject to the provisions of section 9 (c), to make loans to any State, municipality, or interstate agency for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge by such State or municipality of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into interstate waters or into a tributary of such waters, and for the preparation (either by its engineering staff or by practicing engineers employed for that purpose) of engineering reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith. Such loans shall be subject, however, to the following limitations: (a) No loan shall be made for any project unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General, and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this act; (b) no loan shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 33⅓ percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof, as determined by the Federal Works Administrator, or in an amount exceeding $200,000, whichever amount is the smaller; (c) every such loan shall bear interest at the rate of 2 percent per annum, payable semiannually; and (d) the bonds or other obligations evidencing any such loan (1) must be duly authorized and issued pursuant to State and local law, and (2) may, as to the security thereof and the payment of principal thereof and interest thereon, be subordinated (to the extent deemed feasible and desirable by the Federal Works Administrator for facilitating the financing of such projects) to other bonds or obligations of the obligor issued to finance such project or that may then be outstanding.

SEC. 6. (a) The Surgeon General and the Federal Works Administrator, in carrying out their respective functions under this act, shall provide for the review of all reports of examinations, research, investigations, plans, studies, and surveys, made pursuant to the provisions of this act and all applications for loans under section 5. In determining the desirability of projects for treatment works and of approving loans in connection therewith, consideration shall be given to the public benefits to be derived by the construction thereof, the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of constructing and maintaining the works to the public interest and to the public necessity for the works, and the adequacy of the provisions made or proposed by the applicant for the loan for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the works after completion of the construction thereof.

(b) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board to be composed as follows: The Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer officer designated by him, who shall be Chairman of the Board, a representative of the Department of the Army, a representative of the Department of the Interior, a representative of the Federal Works Agency, and a representative of the Department of Agriculture, designated by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior, the Federal Works Administrator, and the Secretary of Agriculture, respectively; and six persons (not officers or employees of the Federal Government) to be appointed annually by the President. One of the persons appointed by the President shall be an engineer who is expert in sewage and industrial-waste disposal, one shall be a person who shall have shown an active interest in the field of wildlife conservation, and, except as the President may determine that the purposes of this act will be better furthered by different representation, one shall be a person representative of municipal government, one shall be a person representative of State government, and one shall be a person representative of affected industry. The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States shall be entitled to receive compensation at a per diem rate to be fixed by the Federal Security Administrator, together with an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while engaged on the business of the Board. It shall be the duty of the Board to review the policies and program of the Public Health Service as undertaken under authority of this act and to make recommendations thereon in reports to the Surgeon General. Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Public Health Service.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Security Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, a sum not to exceed the sum of $20,000,000 for the purpose of making loans under section 5 of this act. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Security Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, the sum of $1,000,000, to be allotted equitably and paid to the States for expenditure by or under the direction of their respective State water pollution agencies, and to interstate agencies for expenditure by them, for the conduct of investigations, research, surveys, and studies related to the prevention and control of water pollution caused by industrial wastes. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended, shall be allotted by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Federal Security Administrator, and shall be paid prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Works Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, a sum not to exceed $800,000 to enable the Federal Works Administrator to erect facilities at Cincinnati, Ohio, as may be necessary for the use of the Public Health Service in connection with the research and study of pollution of interstate waters and the training of personnel in work related to the control of pollution of interstate waters. The amount authorized for this purpose shall include the cost of preparation of drawings and specifications, supervision of construction and other administrative expenses incident to the work: *Provided*, That the Federal Works Agency shall prepare the plans and specifications, make all necessary contracts and supervise construction. Sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available until expended.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Works Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, a sum not to exceed the sum of $1,000,000 to enable the Federal Works Administrator to make grants to States, municipalities, or interstate agencies to aid in financing the cost of engineering, architectural, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of projects approved by the appropriate State water pollution agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General. Grants made under this subsection with respect to any project shall not exceed whichever of the following amounts is the smaller: (1) $20,000, or (2) 33⅓ percent of the estimated reasonable cost (as determined by the Federal Works Administrator) of the action preliminary to the construction of such project. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Security Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, such sum (not to exceed the sum of $2,000,000) as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this act.

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Works Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, such sum (not to exceed the sum of $500,000) as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this act.

SEC. 9. (a) To assist in carrying out the purposes of this act, the appointment of engineer and scientist officers may be made under the provisions of section 208 (b) (1) of the Public Health Service Act, in addition to the appointments authorized by such section 208 (b) (1); but not more than five such additional officers shall hold office at the same time.

(b) The Federal Security Administrator, with the consent of the head of any other agency of the Federal Government, may utilize such officers and employees of such agency as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

(c) (1) Upon written request of the Federal Works Administrator, from time to time submitted to the Federal Security Administrator, specifying (a) particular projects approved by the Surgeon General, (b) the total estimated costs of such projects, and (c) the total sum requested for loan which the Federal Works Administrator proposes to make for such projects, the Federal Security Administrator shall transfer such total sum (within the amount appropriated therefor) to the Federal Works Administrator for the making of loans for such projects pursuant to section 5 hereof. In making such loans, the Federal Works Administrator shall adhere to the order or sequence of priority for projects established by the Surgeon General and shall take such measures as, in his judgment, will assure that the engineering plans and specifications, the details of construction, and the completed treatment works conform to the project as approved by the Surgeon General; and the Federal Works Administrator shall furnish written reports to the Federal Security Administrator on the progress of the work.

(2) The Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized (a) to hold, administer, exchange, refund, or sell at public or private sale any bonds or other obligations evidencing loans made under this act; and (b) to collect, or provide for the collection of, interest on and principal of such bonds or other obligations. All moneys received as proceeds from such sales, and all moneys so collected, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(d) The Surgeon General and the Federal Works Administrator are each authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out their respective functions under this act.

SEC. 10. When used in this act—

(a) The term "State water pollution agency" means the State health authority, except that, in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency, other than the State health authority, charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of water pollution, it means such other State agency;

(b) The term "interstate agency" means an agency of two or more States having powers or duties pertaining to the abatement of pollution of waters;

(c) The term "treatment works" means the various devices used in the treatment of sewage or industrial waste of a liquid nature, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances, and includes any extensions, improvements, remodeling, additions, and alternations thereof;

(d) The term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands;

(e) The term "interstate waters" means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, State boundaries; and

(f) The term "municipality" means a city, town, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes.

SEC. 11. This act shall not be construed as (1) superseding or limiting the functions, under any other law, of the Surgeon General or of the Public Health Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to water pollution, or (2) affecting or impairing the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, or sections 13 through 17 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1899, as amended, or (3) affecting or impairing the provisions of any treaty of the United States.

SEC. 12. If any provision of this act, or the application of any provision of this act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this act, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 13. This act may be cited as the "Water Pollution Control Act."

Mr. REVERCOMB. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the

two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. MCCLELLAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 2691. A bill authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement; without amendment (Rept. No. 1684).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2740. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1685);

H. R. 6293. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1687); and

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer United States Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War; without amendment (Rept. No. 1686).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 617. A bill for the relief of Richart T. Charett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1688);

S. 2049. A bill for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1689);

H. R. 851. A bill for the relief of Adney W. Gray; without amendment (Rept. No. 1690);

H. R. 1220. A bill for the relief of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand III; without amendment (Rept. No. 1691);

H. R. 1779. A bill for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation, of Winona, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1692);

H. R. 1910. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1693);

H. R. 2260. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Constable; without amendment (Rept. No. 1694);

H. R. 2431. A bill for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 1695);

H. R. 2552. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1696);

H. R. 3261. A bill for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1697);

H. R. 3427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1698);

H. R. 4644. A bill for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1699); and

S. Res. 256. Resolution to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 2834) for the relief of Elizabeth R. Pendleton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1700).

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 2790. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1701);

S. 2795. A bill to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments; with amendments (Rept. No. 1702);

S. 2861. A bill to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1703); and

H. R. 4816. A bill to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals; with amendments (Rept. No. 1704).

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report an original bill, continuing the authority for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State for 1 year, and I submit a report (No. 1683) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and printed, and the bill will be placed on the Calendar.

The bill (S. 2869) continuing the authority for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State for 1 year, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 2867. A bill providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2868. A bill to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to Trenton Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original bill (S. 2869) continuing the authority for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State for 1 year, which was ordered to be placed on the Calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2870. A bill for the relief of Roman Szymanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. CORDON, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. MAGNUSON) introduced Senate bill 2871, to aid in the production of permanent housing in the Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash., area, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

AID IN PRODUCTION OF PERMANENT HOUSING IN PORTLAND-VANPORT AREA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill dealing with aid in the production of permanent housing in the Portland-Vanport area. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and that a one-page brief statement in explanation of the bill may also be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2871) to aid in the production of permanent housing in the Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash., area, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. CORDON, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. MAGNUSON), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to assist in providing housing accommodations for families in the Portland-Vancouver area deprived of their homes as a result of the flood disaster, the Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is hereby authorized to purchase at a price equal to the unpaid balance plus accrued interest, any first mortgage made after the effective date of this act, and within 2 years of the date of the purchase, for the purpose of financing the building of a new residential structure or structures located in the metropolitan area of Portland, Oreg., or Vancouver, Wash., with respect to which the financial institution from which such mortgage is purchased has insurance under section 2 of the National Housing Act, as amended: *Provided*, That not more than $10,000,000 of the funds available to the Federal National Mortgage Association shall, in the aggregate, be used for the purchase of such mortgages.

SEC. 2. Section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act is amended by striking out "$1,500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,510,000,000."

The statement presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

STATEMENT ON BILL TO AID PRODUCTION OF PERMANENT HOUSING IN THE PORTLAND, OREG.-VANCOUVER, WASH., AREA

This bill would encourage the extension of necessary credit to assist in providing low cost housing urgently needed in the Portland-Vancouver area as a result of recent floods. The bill would authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association (a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation) to purchase first mortgages made, after the enactment of this bill, for the purpose of financing the construction of new residential structures in that area, if the financial institutions from which the mortgages are purchased have insurance under section 2 of the National Housing Act with respect to such mortgages. Any such purchase would have to be made within 2 years from the date of the mortgage at a price equal to the unpaid balance plus accrued interest.

Under this section 2 of the National Housing Act, financial institutions may be insured against losses, up to 10 percent, on the total amount of their loans made for the purpose of financing alterations, repairs, and improvements of existing structures or financing the building of new structures. Any such loan for building a new structure (referred to as title I, class 3 loans) may not presently exceed $3,000. Legislation (S. 866) is pending which would increase this amount to $4,500.

The total amount of funds the bill would make available to the Federal National Mortgage Association for this purpose would be $10,000,000, which would be provided by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The total amount of authorized investments, loans, purchases, and commitments of the Corporation would be increased accordingly. The bill would not require any appropriation of funds by the Congress.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted three amendments, Mr. RUSSELL submitted several amendments, and Mr. AIKEN submitted several amendments, intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 2318, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on June 12 I entered a motion to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3214) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Codes, which had passed both Houses. I desire to withdraw the motion at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion referred to by the Senator from Colorado is withdrawn.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business, Calendar No. 1346, Senate bill 2318 to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6772, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this is the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes. The original and supplemental estimates amounted to $3,927,738,700. The House reduced that in the amount of $241,005,450. Of these amounts, the Senate restored $116,437,000.

In addition to that, Mr. President, and following the submission of the original bill, the President requested $9,000,000 for exploration in the Elk Hills oil reservation in California. This came in after the House had considered the bill. Both the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services approved the request. We therefore inserted it in the bill. With that insertion, the total restoration by the Senate amounts to $125,437,000.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point my remarks the first 7½ pages of the report on the bill.

There being no objection, the portion of the report (No. 1621) specified was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate, with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

SENATE ACTION

General information

[In millions of dollars]

	Appropriation	Senate action (+ or −)
Budget request	[1] 3,937	−125
House action	3,687	+125
Restoration request	[1] 3,878	−66
Senate action	[1] 3,812	

[1] Includes $9,000,000 submitted as supplemental in S. Doc. No. 164.

SCOPE OF THE BILL

The bill calling for a total appropriation of $3,812,170,250 embraces all regular naval appropriations for the Department of the Navy; the headquarters, United States Marine Corps; the entire operating forces of the United States Navy, including naval aviation, and of the United States Marine Corps, including the Reserve components of such forces; all field activities, headquarters, forces, bases, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Navy. Attention should be called to the fact that in the Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1948, $315,000,000 in appropriations was provided for aircraft procurement of which $150,000,000 is earmarked to liquidate previous contract authority. In addition, $538,000,000 in new contract authority was included. These amounts normally would have been carried in this bill but were approved and passed by the Congress as a 1948 measure in order to accelerate procurement of needed aircraft for adequate national defense.

On June 3 the President submitted a request for an appropriation of $50,500,000 and contract authorization of $66,500,000 for public works for the National Military Establishment, Department of the Navy. These amounts are not included in this bill since they will be reviewed as a part of the requests submitted in the second deficiency appropriation bill, 1948.

COST OF THE NAVY

The committee last year pointed out that actual cash expenditures for the Department of the Navy were running about $525,000,000 ahead of actual cash appropriations. During the fiscal year 1949, cash expenditures will exceed appropriations by approximately $700,000,000. The committee wishes to point out that in addition to this outlay of cash a very sizable amount of wartime inventory is being consumed. In the fiscal year 1949, inventory to be consumed is estimated at $1,028,000,000. This figure represents original cost to the Navy. Its replacement with modern equipment at current prices is estimated at $1,750,000,000 by the Department of the Navy.

In addition, as will be shown in more detail under "Aviation and construction of ships," various sizable additional sums besides those now being spent will be required in the immediate years to come. The following table shows budget comparisons including consumption of inventory.

Comparison, Department of Navy budget by appropriations, expenditures, and actual costs, fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1949

[In millions of dollars]

	1947	1948	Estimate, 1949
Budget:			
Cash appropriations	4,663	3,757	3,812
Less cash to liquidate prior contract authority	250	150	56
Net appropriation	4,413	3,607	3,756
New contract authority	.....	[1] 1,101	[2] 280
Total new program	4,413	[1] 4,709	[2] 4,036
Actual costs:			
Expenditures	5,159	4,134	4,505
Inventory consumed	1,055	680	1,028
Cash collections	375	125	25
Total actual costs	5,589	4,939	5,558

[1] Includes 1949 aircraft procurement program.
[2] Shipbuilding only. Does not include 1949 aircraft procurement program, included in Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1948.

This tabulation reveals several important facts:

1. The actual cost of the Navy (nearly $5,000,000,000 in the 1948 fiscal year; $5,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1949) is substantially more than the $3,800,000,000 being appropriated. This is due primarily to two factors—(a) the carry-over of money from prior years' appropriations to be expended as equipment and materials are completed and delivered, and (b) the use of surplus inventory.

2. A substantial part (probably as much as 1¾ billion dollars) of the Navy's current program is being met by utilization of inventory—war reserves and current working-stock items such as aircraft from storage and material from the appropriation-purchase account, ship-material account, medical-stores account, and marine stores—in excess of purchases. This use of inventory is important because if the Navy is thus meeting current needs for war reserves and normal working stocks that is reaching the point of exhaustion, the inevitable result (all other factors being equal) will be a forcing of substantially increased appropriations in the future to support the present size and scope of naval operations.

Obviously it is difficult at this time to forecast future needs. However, in their testimony before the Senate subcommittee, Navy representatives did indicate that a future level of appropriation requirements during the 1950 and 1951 fiscal years might reach $6,500,000,000. This estimate was predicated upon assumptions that we maintain in those years the same naval strength as now planned, plus appropriations to continue the shipbuilding and conversion program at approximately a $300,000,000 annual rate; the public works program on an annual basis of about $200,000,000 and full implementation of the aircraft procurement program in accordance with recommendations of the Congressional Air Policy Committee.

The committee concurs with the report of the House of Representatives which stated:

"This is a matter of grave concern which the Congress should be prepared to consider in the near future. We must have in mind the question of whether we are going to continue even larger appropriations to maintain the same size Navy, or whether we can safely maintain our place in the world with a smaller one. It is to be hoped that the world situation will soon stabilize so that we will have a better idea as to the exact future requirements."

FLEET

This bill will permit the Department of the Navy to allocate to the active fleet: 277 naval combatant ships, 486 auxiliary combatant ships, 763 total active. To the reserve fleet: 664 major combatant ships, 1,215 other vessels, 1,879 total reserve.

This calls for the maintenance and preservation in a state of readiness of virtually the same size fleet as provided by the 1948 fiscal year appropriations. Representing, as it does, the world's most formidable Navy, it is a real national asset and merits the continued confidence and support of this Congress and the Nation.

NAVAL RESERVE

While the committee continues its active and sympathetic interest in the Reserve components, it believes the exact sums necessary for their support can be better determined when the effects of a selective service law are better known.

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

While the committee expects the Navy to restrict its civilian personnel to minimum requirements, it desires to point out that wise administration of the huge amounts appropriated require adequate and properly trained personnel. In restoring amounts for salaries for this purpose, it believes that $1 added may well save five or more.

INCREASED COSTS

In considering its recommendations, the committee has been mindful of the unanimous testimony of the material bureau heads that costs are up about 18 percent over 1 year ago.

PROJECT ORDERS

The committee last year in its report stated:

"The committee as a result of its detailed study of appropriations obligated by the Navy Department noted the extensive use of project orders. While the committee recognizes the necessity of their use under many circumstances, yet it strongly recommends the prompt formulation of a basic policy designed to control, within limits, the employment of this method of obligating funds."

As a result of the committee's recommendation, the Department of the Navy has made commendable progress in tightening up the controls relating to project orders more nearly to conform with the basic law and the original concept of their use. However, the committee feels that additional progress can and should be made in view of the unusual condition found surrounding the use of project orders in 1947. For example, in a study of the 1947 project orders, it was found that an unduly high percentage was placed in the last 60 days of the fiscal year, in many cases in the last 30 days. In one bureau 93 percent of the total project orders was placed in the last 60 days and 84 percent in the last 30 days. In another, 71 percent and 42 percent were placed in similar fashion. While these are the extreme examples, a detailed study carefully shows that this practice is more common than uncommon. It further appears that in some instances an apparent effort is made at the last moment to obligate funds rather than permit money to revert to the Treasury. Other investigations reveal that some bureaus of the Department of the Navy have obligated funds by the project order device for work of a recurring and general operating nature, which by no means could be construed to be either permanent or unusual in accordance with the original concept of the project order device.

The Department of the Navy is able to support its contention that more judicious use of project orders has been made during 1948. However, the committee recommends that the Department of the Navy continue to study this question to the end that it consistently improved its fiscal control at all levels so that project orders will be used only as originally intended by law and subsequent regulations. It also recommends that the staff of the Appropriations Committee continue to study this question in cooperation with the Department of the Navy.

CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS

Since this bill appropriates funds for ship construction and conversions begun before the fiscal year 1949, but does not specify the amount of contract authorization for additional conversions or shipbuilding and ordnance, the committee invites attention to the legal authority which permits the Department of the Navy to start construction of ships. This procedure works as follows:

There is presently available to the Navy as a composite result of the following laws, 1,161,718 tons of combatant vessels. The authorization laws are:

Act of March 27, 1934, Public Law 135 of Seventy-third Congress.

Act of May 17, 1938, Public Law 528 of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

Act of June 14, 1940, Public Law 629 of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Act of July 19, 1940, Public Law 757 of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Act of December 23, 1941, Public Law 369 of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Act of July 9, 1942, Public Law 666 of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

The total standard displacement of six new ships contemplated in the 1949 program is estimated at about 75,000 tons. The balance of tons is available to the Navy until used. Furthermore, certain parts of existing tonnage authorizations are self-perpetuating since new tonnage authorization becomes available as existing ships are lost or otherwise disposed of or become over-age.

Seventeen conversions in the present program are authorized by Public Law 319 of the Eightieth Congress. There is no limitation as to the number of ships which can be converted under this authority.

In the case of either new construction or conversion, the appropriation which is made has two features.

1. By the wording of the act it authorizes the Navy to proceed with whatever program the President has approved within existing authorizations. This program is not set forth in the law but is presented to the Appropriations Committee at the time of the hearings. This language, in effect, constitutes contract authority during the fiscal year of the appropriation for the entire cost of the approved program, in the 1949 case, $280,000,000.

2. An appropriation of cash is made annually equivalent to the estimated expenditures for all construction under way.

During the 1949 fiscal year, conversions of existing ships, new construction, including armament, and payment of previous obligations incurred for shipbuilding, will call for a total expenditure of $312,080,000. This amount is provided by funds in two appropriation titles, namely,

(a) The "Increase and replacement of naval vessels" (IRNV) program, under which no new construction has been authorized since 1948 but which provides current funds for the liquidation of the vast war-construction program, and

(b) A new appropriation program, begun in 1948, called "Construction of Ships, Navy," and "Ordnance for new construction, Navy," which finances the construction costs of new vessels, largely prototypes in the 1948 and 1949 budgets.

1. Increase and replacement of naval vessels: The IRNV program, including armament costs, calls for expenditures of $224,000,000 during 1949. Funds appropriated during the war period remain available in sufficient amounts to cover these estimated 1949 expenditures so that no "new" money is requested of Congress for this fund in this bill.

2. "Construction of ships, Navy," and "Ordnance for new construction, Navy": The total amount expected to be spent during 1949 in this fund to meet obligations incurred for new ship construction and conversions previously authorized, as indicated above, will amount to $88,080,000, of which $82,270,000 is appropriated in this bill.

The above details only the costs of these programs in the form of cash outlay during the fiscal year 1949. The actual total cost of these programs initialed in 1948 and 1949 is substantially more; and, while the committee believes it entirely proper and necessary for the national defense to construct prototype ships in order to incorporate and test out the more modern devices and also to modernize present ships, it believes the Congress and the Nation should know the future cost. Latest estimates indicate that to complete the old program (IRNV) expenditures after 1949 will total approximately $442,000,000. The same future cost to complete the new program will amount to about $463,000,000, or a total of $905,000,000 for both. This will be spread over a period of approximately 4 years.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT

Although the naval aircraft procurement programs submitted at this session has already been approved, the committee desires to make a few observations. In order to maintain the authorized level of 14,500 available aircraft, it will be necessary to procure approximately 3,300 each fiscal year. At present costs it is estimated that expenditures for the purpose will reach a peak in 1952 of approximately $1,800,000,000 annually as contrasted with an estimated expenditure of $430,000,000 during 1949. Obviously, expenditures during the next fiscal year represent only the beginning increments of a much heavier level of expenditure needs to maintain our established goal of adequate naval aircraft.

RATION ALLOWANCES

The committee is in accord with a proposal from the Secretary of the Navy to increase the commuted ration allowances for enlisted naval personnel from the present standards of approximately 90 cents per diem to $1.05 per diem effective July 1, 1948, particularly since it understands that this would bring Navy practices in line with similar commuted leave rations as established by the Army earlier this calendar year.

REVISION OF THE NAVAL APPROPRIATION ACT

In 1947 the naval appropriations were submitted in alternate form—the one form as used in this bill, with minor modifications, and the other a so-called functional budget which would organize appropriations in terms of primary Navy functions. The alternate proposal would appear to have provided parallel fiscal control with management responsibility, greater clarity in budget presentation, and a more definite determination of costs for each of the several naval activities. The committee endorsed these objectives last year and wishes again to draw attention to this alternate budget proposal. It recommends that both the staff of the Appropriations Committee and the fiscal and budget personnel of the Department of the Navy cooperatively consider at an early date the complete ramifications of such a budgeting procedure for the Department of the Navy so that, if its merits are as great as they now appear to be, the presentations and structure of the 1950 naval budget appropriations may

be in accordance with the form of the alternate budget requests of 1947.

Amount of bill as passed the House	$3,686,733,250
Amount of increase by Senate (net)	125,437,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	3,812,170,250
Amount of regular and supplemental estimates, 1949	3,936,738,700
Amount of appropriations, 1948	3,181,723,100
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the estimates for 1949	124,568,450
Exceeds the appropriations for 1948	630,447,150

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD some figures which give the status of the Navy bill in different calculations. I trust the figures may be informative.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Status of Navy bill

HOUSE ACTION

Original and supplemental estimates	$3,927,738,700
House action	3,686,733,250
House reduction	241,005,450

NAVY RESTORATION REQUEST

Of the House reduction of $241,005,450:	
The Navy requested restoration of	182,900,600
Plus President's late request for oil reserves	9,000,000
Or a total restoration of	191,900,600

SENATE ACTION

The Senate restored	116,437,000
Plus oil reserves of	9,000,000
Making total restoration of	125,437,000

SENATE SUMMARY

Thus, from total budget requests of	$3,936,738,700
The Senate's recommendation of	3,812,170,250
Represents a net reduction of	[1] 124,568,450

[1] From original and supplemental budget requests.

Military personnel

	End of fiscal 1948	Average fiscal 1949
Navy:		
Officers	42,623	45,700
Enlisted	361,079	386,061
Nurses	2,600	2,914
Total	406,302	434,675
Difference	28,373	
Marine Corps:		
Officers	7,001	7,303
Enlisted	79,164	81,892
Total	86,165	89,225
Difference	3,060	
Grand total	492,467	[1] 523,900
Difference	31,433	

[1] End strength, 552,000.

Operating planes

	End, fiscal 1948	Average, fiscal 1949
Fleet combatant	2,506	[1] 3,154
Combat support	936	1,158
Aircraft supporting fleet	2,351	2,582
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	2,651	2,302
Total operating	7,844	9,266
Logistic support (now operating)	3,078	3,433
Grand total	10,922	12,699

Ships

	Active fleet	Reserve fleet
Major combatant	277	664
Auxiliary	486	1,215
Total	763	1,879

NOTE.—Same numbers, 1948 and 1949.

Major shore stations

Jan. 1, 1948	176
June 30, 1948	166
June 30, 1949	170

Material bureaus

	1948	1949 [1]
Ordnance	$184,000,000	$248,000,000
Bureau Ships	370,000,000	370,000,000
Bureau Supplies and Accounts	200,000,000	218,000,000
Aviation, Navy	411,000,000	605,000,000
Bureau Yards and Docks	132,450,000	150,375,000

[1] Costs up about 18 percent over 1948.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I now ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Naval Establishment—Office of the Secretary—Miscellaneous expenses", on page 2, line 19, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$7,500,000"; and in the same line, after the words "of which", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Research, Navy," on page 3, line 13, after the word "Research", to strike out "$45,000,000" and insert "$42,255,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and conservation of naval petroleum reserves," on page 3, line 23, after the word "reserves", to strike out "$245,500" and insert "$9,245,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval Observatory," on page 5, line 7, after the word "Observatory", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$465,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Hydrographic Office," on page 5, line 14, after the word "publications", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$3,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Naval Personnel—Training and education, Navy," on page 6, line 3, after the word "for", to strike out "$13,000,000" and insert "$13,741,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General expenses, Bureau of Naval Personnel," on page 7, line 2, after the word "medals", to strike out "$1,250,000" and insert "$1,570,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval Reserve," on page 7, line 14, after the word "Activities", to strike out "$125,000,000" and insert "$125,436,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Ships—Maintenance, Bureau of Ships," on page 10, line 15, after the word "expeditions", to strike out "$350,000,000" and insert $370,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Ordnance—Ordnance and Ordnance Stores, Navy," on page 11, line 5, after "(Public Law 604)," to strike out "$210,000,000" and insert "$248,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts—Pay and subsistence of naval personnel," on page 12, line 13, after the word "duty", to insert "and those performing service in the quarters of female officers and enlisted women, and except those performing service in the residences or quarters of naval attachés as authorized by the Secretary of the Navy."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," on page 15, line 14, after "(Public Law 248)", to strike out "$200,000,000" and insert $218,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Yards and Docks—Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 17, line 9, after the word "housing", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$4,875,000"; in line 10, after the words "in all", to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$150,375,000"; and in line 18, after the word "located", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available for any expenses incident to transferring offices of the Navy Department between buildings at the seat of government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Aeronautics—Aviation, Navy," on page 18, line 10, after "(Public Law 604)", to strike out "$440,000,000" and insert "$470,000,000"; and in line 12, after the words "in all", to strike out "$575,000,000" and insert "$605,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Marine Corps—Pay, Marine Corps," on page 19, line 13, after the word "conditions", to strike out "$144,662,000" and insert "$148,744,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 16, after the word "law", to strike out "$14,400,000" and insert "$15,313,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 20, after the words "In all", to strike out "$199,492,000" and insert "$201,287,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General expenses, Marine Corps," on page 22, line 13, after the word "Reserve", to strike out "$130,000,000" and insert "$134,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Shipbuilding—Increase and replacement of naval vessels," on page 24, line 2, after the word "vessels", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That of the balances remaining of appropriations under this head, there shall be available during the fiscal year 1949 such sums as the Secretary may from time to time determine to be necessary for the employment of personnel in the Bureau of Ships and the Bureau of Ordnance in connection with the construction of vessels which have been heretofore authorized under this head.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department, salaries," on page 24, line 15, after the word "services", to strike out "$3,641,000" and insert "$4,289,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 17, after the word "Research", to strike out "$1,152,000" and insert "$1,262,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 18, after the word "Library", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$78,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 19, after the word "General", to strike out "$294,300" and insert "$316,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 20, after the word "Operations", to strike out "$1,125,000" and insert "$1,325,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 22, after the word "Survey", to strike out "$36,000" and insert "$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 25, after the word "Personnel", to strike out "$3,870,000" and insert "$5,194,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 1, after the word "Ships", to strike out "$5,715,000" and insert "$6,702,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 2, after the word "Ordnance", to strike out "$2,757,600" and insert "$3,267,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 3, after the word "Accounts", to strike out "$3,960,000" and insert "$4,810,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 5, after the word "Surgery", to strike out "$970,200" and insert "$1,122,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 6, after the word "Docks", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,175,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 8, after the word "Department", to strike out "$30,111,100" and insert "$35,111,110."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses", on page 25, line 17, after the word "offices", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions—Department of the Navy," on page 28, line 17, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947"; and on page 29, line 5, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 22, to insert:

SEC. 112. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when, in the judgment of the Secretary, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary, be advantageous to the national defense.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I offer as a substitute an amendment to the committee amendment, printed as section 112.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the amendment of the committee beginning on page 32, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for contracts with any person, firm, or corporation to make or cause to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any employee; no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person or persons having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when, in the judgment of the Secretary, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary, be advantageous to the national defense.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Massachusetts to say that this is a committee amendment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is not a committee amendment. It is an amendment which has been in Navy appropriation bills since approximately 1915. It is a prohibition against the stop-watch time studies as practiced in the Navy industrial establishments. It was inserted by the Subcommittee on Navy Appropriations this year and eliminated by a tie vote in the full committee. The amendment simply reinserts the provision in the bill. It has been in all Navy appropriation bills since the late Senator Borah started it in 1912, I believe.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator says that the provision has been in the Navy bills since 1912. That is 36 years too long, in my estimation. The Navy, in these words, has been prevented from following accepted and acceptable practices which are followed in practically every other industry in the Nation. I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the fact that naval workers are not allowed to strike, as other workers are, and this provision has worked well through two wars. In my opinion, this is a wrong time for the practice to be changed, when we are trying to stimulate work in naval establishments.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. This amendment is a substitute for the entire section 112, is it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It substitutes the first four lines. The balance of the section is as printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a query comes to my mind, very naturally, as I have heard the amendments stated. There are probably 40 as to which there is a hundred percent record, that is, the appropriations have been increased over the amounts carried by the House bill. The query is, Why does it happen that way? What would happen if, when a bill came before the Senate, we found that in a few instances the amounts had been reduced? How does the Senator account for that?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I respectfully reply to the Senator that he is not 100 percent correct.

Mr. TOBEY. How much am I off the beam?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are probably three instances in which the amounts have been reduced.

Mr. TOBEY. In 3 out of 40 cases?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the short experience I have had as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I would say that the responsibility of the Senate is to see whether the reductions made by the House should be maintained, or whether in the interest of good service in the Navy, Army, or any other branch of the Government, they should be in part restored. Let me call to the Senator's attention the fact that in this instance the Navy requested the restoration of $191,000,000 out of a reduction of $250,000,000. The bill, as reported to the Senate, restores $125,000,000, or approximately half of what the Navy authorities requested. I would say that the fact that we have restored approximately half is coincidental. The amount turned out to be approximately half.

Mr. TOBEY. Did it ever occur to the Senator from Massachusetts that possibly there is a potential that the parties interested in the legislation let the House put what it will into the bills, knowing that the Senate will increase the amounts? Is there less resistance in the House or in the Senate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from New Hampshire had been present in the meetings of the committee he would agree with me that all the details were worked out. In fact, all day Sunday we considered the requests and made the figures as fair as possible.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Massachusetts knows that there is no personal criticism of my friend. I simply failed to find any reductions. I sometimes wonder if in the life of the Senate of the United States, we shall have an appropriation bill in which the predominant changes are reductions rather than increases.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope that will be the case, provided it does not ruin the Government service. I will say to the Senator that over the past 2 years, since I have been following Navy appropriations, certain methods of bookkeeping and accounting have been greatly improved. On the other hand, I warn the Senator that because of the increase in the Air Force requirements, on account of increased ship requirements, and on account, particularly, of the reduction in the "fat" left over from the war, the Navy budget, unless there is a material reduction in Navy service, will be larger next year and in the next 4 years than it is this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma conferees on the part of the Senate.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Several Senators have inquired about how long the Senate will remain in session tonight. It is the present intention to take up the Economic Cooperation Administration bill at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was just wondering at what hour the Senator from Nebraska thought we would take up the Economic Cooperation Administration appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Vermont has told he me would speak about 35 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Ordinarily it would take me about 35 minutes to present the preliminary statement on Senate bill 2318. I would not refuse to answer questions, but I should prefer to have them postponed until tomorrow, if my colleagues will agree.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wished to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont a question or two at the completion of his address this evening. I understood him to say the farm bill would not be taken up until tomorrow. Am I correct?

Mr. WHERRY. It is the unfinished business. I think it would be fair to comply with the suggestion of the distinguished Senator, as his bill has been displaced three or four times, and he has very kindly deferred his explanation and presentation of the bill, and his address will be made tonight. After the Senator from Vermont concludes his remarks, it will be the intention to ask that the long-range agricultural bill be temporarily laid aside and that the ECA bill be taken up.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hope no one will misunderstand my motive. I am in thorough agreement with the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I merely asked whether after his speech had been concluded the Senate would take up the ECA bill, and postpone further consideration of the farm bill until tomorrow. Am I correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with the Senator from Vermont, and I appreciate the difficulty he has had. I am in thorough accord with him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did I understand correctly the Senator to say that he desired not to be interrupted tonight?

Mr. AIKEN. I should prefer not to have questions asked tonight. I should rather have them put off until tomorrow, so that at the conclusion of the analysis of the bill the Senate may take up the ECA appropriation bill and dispose of that, and then tomorrow morning start in with the long-range farm bill and keep at it until it is concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to postpone my questions.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no intention of being discourteous. If any Senator were urged too greatly to ask a question, I should probably not refuse to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have a good many questions in mind about the bill, but I shall endeavor to suppress the questions until tomorrow. At that time, however, I shall propound a number of inquiries with regard to the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont hopes that when the Senator from Georgia asks his questions tomorrow, he may receive satisfactory answers.

Mr. RUSSELL. I trust I may.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last July the Senate made an appropriation of $15,000 to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to enable it to make a study of the trends and needs of agriculture in the United States, and to make recommendations to meet the situation as they found it.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was appointed consisting of seven members, and beginning October 1 we started holding hearings in different parts of the country, as well as in Washington. We heard the

representatives of all the major farm organizations, we listened to the representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the State departments of agriculture, we heard about 325 to 350 farmers from all parts of the United States—from Denver east and south. As a result, we made a report of our findings about February 1, which has been placed in the hands of the Members of the Senate, and then as rapidly as possible we formulated Senate bill 2319 to implement the report. We felt that it was useless to say what we found as to the conditions in agriculture in the United States if we did nothing about it.

I wish to say, as I have said before, that all during the work of the subcommittee and the full committee we acted as a unit. No partisanship entered into our deliberations. At no time did we have to have a formal vote or division of opinion in the committee in order to determine what was to go into the report or into the bill. We discussed every problem informally, and agreed without the necessity of having a formal vote.

Senate bill 2318 is the bill of this body itself. It is a bill which was prepared in accordance with the instructions given the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last July. It was reported out of the committee unanimously, and, as I have said, we have acted unanimously all the way through, from the very beginning, almost 9 months ago.

I shall now undertake a section by section analysis of the bill. I know that many questions will arise in the minds of Senators, and tomorrow I shall be very glad to try to answer all the questions, and I think there will be an answer to most of them at least.

Mr. President, sections 1 and 2 provide for a short title and declaration of policy.

TITLE I—REORGANIZATION

Title I deals with reorganization and reassignment of functions performed by the United States Department of Agriculture—hereinafter called the Department. Soil conservation and other functions requiring direct dealing with farmers are decentralized so as to bring their exercise closer to farmers, provide for greater farmer participation, and to coordinate services at the local level.

ADMINISTRATION OF CONSERVATION AND OTHER PROGRAMS REQUIRING FARMER PARTICIPATION

Section 101 creates a new agency, the Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement, and centralizes in it, at the departmental level, administration of:

First, functions now administered by the Soil Conservation Service;

Second, functions now administered by the Agricultural Conservation Programs Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration;

Third, other functions related to soil conservation; and

Fourth, other functions requiring direct dealings with farmers.

This is in accordance with the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture before a joint committee of Congress on a long-range agricultural program.

At State, county, and local levels, the major educational, informational, and demonstrational features of these functions will be exercised by the State extension services, and research will be performed by the State experiment stations, which is a reaffirmation of present practice provided for in several legislative acts. Other features will be performed by the State agricultural councils, the county and community agricultural program committees and the county agricultural program executive committees, hereinafter discussed. However, the furnishing of technical assistance and machinery and equipment to soil conservation districts will be performed by the Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement.

It is not the committee's intention that the Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement should carry out educational, informational, or demonstrational programs of its own, except insofar as such activities are incidental to the carrying out of its expressly assigned programs. Likewise it is not the intention that the Extension Service will carry out soil and agricultural action programs except insofar as such activities are an integral part of educational, informational, and demonstrational activities.

Regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service are to be abolished, unless the State agricultural councils elect to retain them or establish similar offices between two or more States.

Sections 102 and 104 provide additional (unmatched) funds for the State extension services and experiment stations to carry out any additional functions given them by section 101.

Section 103 sets up an establishment within the Office of Experiment Stations to cooperate with the State experiment stations in carrying out the functions assigned to them by section 101.

At present most of the Soil Conservation Service research work is carried on cooperatively with the State agricultural experiment stations.

COMMUNITY AND COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM COMMITTEES, COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES, AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COUNCILS

At present, pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U. S. C. A. 590h (b)), the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) utilizes local, county, and State committees chosen as provided in that section in administering the agricultural conservation payment programs. Pursuant to section 388 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. A. 1388) these same committees are utilized in administering the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. These committees are chosen as follows: First, the farmers in local areas (designated by the Secretary) elect (A) "local committees" and (B) delegates to a county convention; second, the county convention elects a "county committee"; and third, the Secretary appoints a "State committee." Under S. 2318 these committees would be replaced by new organizations to be known as "community agricultural program committees", "county agricultural program committees", "county agricultural program executive committees", and "State agricultural councils."

I may say that this organizational procedure has the approval of the Department of Agriculture, and for the most part simply writes into law many of the practices which they are already employing.

Under the provisions of section 105 of S. 2318, the local committee would become a "community agricultural program committee."

I want to say here something about the definition of "farm operators." In this section 105 the committee used the term "farm operators" in a broad sense to include sharecroppers and tenants. The term "farm operators" has a narrow connotation in some areas, but the committee had no intention to exclude anyone in the use of this term who receives a substantial part of his income from the land. I am making that explanation now so that if the question of the definition of a farm operator should come up later, it will be plain.

Section 106 provides for a county agricultural program committee consisting of the members of the community agricultural program committees in the county, the agricultural extension agent, and representatives of such soil-conservation districts or other agencies as the State agricultural council may specify. Since S. 2318 was reported your committee has prepared an amendment to this section providing that the county agent shall be ex officio and shall have no vote.

Under the provisions of section 107, each county agricultural program committee elects from among its members a county agricultural program executive committee of not less than three nor more than five members.

Section 108 provides for a State agricultural council, consisting of at least six elected members and three ex officio members, in lieu of the present State committee appointed by the Secretary. Provision is made for election of additional members in the larger States.

I want to say here that since the bill was reported out, the committee has decided on an amendment which will be printed and will be available tomorrow, which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture will appoint the members of the State council who are to be nominated by the farmers of the State through their county chairmen. There will have to be three persons nominated for each position to be filled by the Secretary. We felt that by using this method we would retain that continuity of the program from the Secretary right straight down through to the farmer, but at the same time, while the Secretary appoints a State council, every member whom he appoints has to be approved and nominated by the farmers of the State before he can be appointed.

The committees and council provided for in sections 105, 106, 107, and 108 assist the Secretary in the administration of soil conservation and other programs requiring direct dealings with farmers.

Section 109 makes provision for administrative expenses of the various committees and the State agricultural council and prescribes limitations upon expenditures.

Section 110 limits any one person to membership in one council or executive committee.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

STATE PLANS

Section 201 provides that no State soil-conservation plan submitted under section 7 (c) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U. S. C. A. 590g (c)) shall be approved by the Secretary except "after consultation with" the appropriate State agricultural council, and unless it contains certain provisions for participation and cooperation by the State agricultural council and the community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees.

The committee has decided upon another amendment at this point, and the Department of Agriculture has suggested that instead of requiring the Secretary to approve the State program after consultation with the State council, that we require him to approve the program upon the recommendation of the State council, which, in our opinion, concentrates a little more authority with the State, although as the bill is written it would be almost impossible for the State, the local, and the national levels to work any way except in full cooperation with one another.

EXTENSION OF CONSERVATION-PAYMENT PROGRAMS

Section 202 extends to December 31, 1950, the period within which conservation payments or grants may be made directly by the Secretary instead of through grants-in-aid to States.

As the bill was set up originally in 1938, it was contemplated that it would operate as a grant-in-aid program. However, only 23 States so far have shown interest enough in having it operate as a grant-in-aid program to enact the necessary legislation. Therefore, we are extending for 2 years more the time in which they can put themselves in shape to operate on a grant-in-aid basis if they see fit. If they do not see fit in 1950, after having 12 years in which to decide, I think we might conclude that they prefer to have it operate as a national program and not bother with the grant-in-aid proposition any longer. However, we did feel that we should give them 2 years more to see if they wanted to operate on that basis.

UTILIZATION OF COMMUNITY AND COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM COMMITTEES AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COUNCILS

Section 203 amends existing law to provide for utilization in agricultural conservation-payment programs of community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees and State agricultural councils, in lieu of the committees now utilized.

The committees utilized now are set up in accordance with plans promulgated by the Secretary, and for the most part it will be seen that we are simply writing the present method into law. That is the effect anyway, except for the State council, which is now appointed as he sees fit by the Secretary, but which in the future will be appointed by members designated or nominated by the farmers of each State.

LIMITATIONS ON CONSERVATION PAYMENTS AND GRANTS

Section 204 provides that payments or grants of aid for soil building or conserving practices, whether made under a State plan or by the Secretary, may be made only for practices, first, approved by the Secretary after consultation with the appropriate State agricultural council; and that would be changed to be approved by the Secretary on recommendation of the appropriate State agricultural council; and second, having (except in the case of demonstration or experimental farms) long-term value. Such payments would be divided among landlords, tenants, and sharecroppers on the basis or the relative value of their contributions to such practices. This section also provides for a limitation of $1,000 upon the total payments which may be made in any year to any person (except with respect to demonstration or experimental farms); but payment for practices having long-term effect may be distributed over a period of 5 years.

In other words, while the payments are limited to $1,000 in 1 year, yet the farmer might do a $5,000 soil-conservation job and be paid at the rate of $1,000 a year for 5 years. This amount of $1,000 is a controversial figure. Last year the Appropriations Committee restricted the amount which could be paid to any one farmer to $500. This year it is $750. The recommendation of the Department of Agriculture was that it be made $2,500 for any 1 year.

There are good arguments to be made for all these figures. There are some truck farms in the East, large ranches in the West, and large cotton farms in the delta district of Arkansas and Mississippi where the acreage is so large that the payments would amount to several thousand dollars each year, either for the application of lime or for ditching, terracing, or for whatever sort of program the State council authorized payments. I think only 1 percent of the farms of the United States, however, would draw more than $750 a year under the present law. We are not changing the basic soil-conservation law at all in this bill, and we are not changing the basic phases of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Section 205 amends section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to substitute references to the community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees, and State agricultural councils for references to the present local, county, and State committees.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

This is the title dealing with price supports. It differs materially from either the 1938 Agricultural Act or the Steagall amendment in that this plan bases price supports on the supply as well as upon market prices, thus giving flexible price supports.

Section 301 amends section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 in the following respects:

First. The method of computing parity prices would be changed to the extent necessary to give appropriate recognition to changes in relationships between the agricultural commodities themselves occurring since the base period, 1910–14, such as those resulting from the discovery of new uses or new methods of production.

As an example of change in use, during the period from 1910 to 1914 practically no soy beans were produced. Now it is a major crop, involving in excess of 12,000,000 acres. As an example of shift in method of production, or mechanization in production of crops, the best example is probably wheat.

While it is essential that the proper balance be maintained between farm and nonfarm prices, in view of changes in uses and methods of production, any parity price formula will necessarily become an unworkable standard in the course of time, if it does not permit adjustment in the prices of the agricultural commodities as among themselves. In fact, this has already occurred to such an extent that the 1910–14 base-price of the commodity is used in computing the parity prices of only 47 of the 157 items for which parity or comparable prices are now calculated. S. 2318 would provide a formula which, while preserving the 1910–14 relationship between farm and nonfarm prices, will reflect the developments of recent years. Thus, while parity prices on the average would be based on the differences between the 1910–14 and the present prices of things that farmers buy, the new parity price formula in S. 2318 accepts the prices of individual farm commodities for the 10 immediately preceding years as reflecting the current relative supply of and demand for different farm products better than the price relationships between different farm commodities in 1910–14. However, the period 1910–14 is retained as the base period in showing the over-all relationship between the prices of things farmers buy and the prices of farm products. The period of 1910–14 has advantages as a base period for farm products as a group because no large segment of our economy was badly out of adjustment with other segments of our economy at that time due to the absence of war, depression, or seriously disturbed international trade conditions. On the other hand, changes in population, consumption of products, trade, total production, and other factors have had a marked effect in changing the relative demand for different farm products now as compared to the period 1910–14.

PARITY PRICES OF BASIC COMMODITIES

Corn (per bushel): New, $0.953 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $0.567 times $2.50 equals $1.42; old, $0.642 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $1.60.

Wheat (per bushel): New, $1.22 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $0.726 times $2.50 equals $1.82; old, $0.884 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $2.21.

Cotton (per pound): New, $0.1809 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $0.1076 times $2.50 equals $0.2659; old, $0.124 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $0.3100.

Peanuts (per pound): New, $0.062 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $0.37 times $2.50 equals $0.091; old, $0.048 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $0.120.

Rice (per bushel): New, $1.44 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $0.857 times $2.50 equals $2.12; old, $0.813 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $2.03.

Tobacco (per pound): Flue-cured, new, $0.336 (10-year average price)[1] divided by $1.68 equals $0.200 times $2.50 equals $0.500; old, $0.229 (present base price)[2] times $2.12[3] equals $0.485; Burley, new $0.340 (10-year average price)[1] divided by $1.68 equals $0.202 times $2.50 equals $0.505; old, $0.222 (present price)[2] times $2.12[3] equals $0.471.

PARITY PRICES OF SELECTED NONBASIC COMMODITIES

Cottonseed (per ton): New, $44.60 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $26.50 times $2.50 equals $66.20; old, $22.28 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $56.40.

Hogs (per hundredweight): New, $12.50 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $7.44 times $2.50 equals $18.60; old, $7.28 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $18.20.

Beef cattle (per hundredweight): New, $10.90 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $6.49 times $2.50 equals $16.20; old, $5.41 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $13.60.

Milk (per hundredweight): New, $2.81 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $1.67 times $2.50 equals $4.18[4]; old, $1.60 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $4.00.[4]

In making these calculations, the following data were used to tie the new parity formula to the 1910–14 base period: The 10-year average of prices received by farmers for their products—1938–47—was 168 percent of the 1910–14 base period, and the May 15, 1948, index of prices farmers paid for products purchased, including interest and taxes, was 250 percent of the 1910–14 base period. The new parity price calculation uses the preceding 10-year average price—1938–47—of the individual commodity to determine the current relationship of the commodity to all farm products sold. The old parity price calculation uses the 1910–14 individual commodity price—unless some other base period has been accepted, as in the case of tobacco—to show the price relationships between farm products.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES

Using corn as an example, the calculation of parity under the new parity formula is as follows: The 10-year average price of corn—1938–47—was $0.953. Average prices of all farm products during the last 10 years is 168 percent of the average prices of all farm products during the 1910–14 base period. Thus, $0.953 is divided by 1.68 to show the parity price of corn in 1910–14, which would amount to $0.567. Since the prices of things farmers buy are now 250 percent, or 2.50 times as high as in 1910–14, the current parity price of corn would be 2.50 times $0.567, or $1.42.

In calculating the parity price for corn under the old formula, the actual price of corn from 1910–14 is used, which was $0.642. Since the prices of things the farmer buys are 2.50 times as high as in 1910–14, the 1910–14 price of corn, $0.642, is multiplied by 2.50, which gives $1.60 as the old parity price of corn, as figured under the present method. It would be $1.42 under the new method, 18 cents a bushel less than under the old method. I shall explain why that is not a disadvantage as I go on.

It should be noted that while the parity prices of some products are higher and others lower under the new formula, the average parity price of all commodities will be the same under the old and new formulas. In the change from the old to the new parity formula the parity price of livestock, livestock products, and oil seeds are higher, while parity prices for grain crops are lower. It is because the relationships between prices of individual farm commodities have changed materially since 1910–14 that there is need of revising the parity formula to use current price relationships between individual farm commodities.

A provision in Senate bill 2318, however, provides that where there is a difference between the two parity prices for a product exceeding 5 percent of the old parity price, the adjustment to the new parity will not take place at the rate of more than 5 percent in 1 year. The main reason for that it so there can be no abrupt drop in the parity price of any commodity. The main reason for the lower parity prices for the basic commodities under the new parity formula, except for rice and tobacco, for which the parity prices will be higher, is the low prices for the other products in the years 1938, 1939 and 1940. For instance, cotton had three 9-cent years—in 1938, 1939 and 1940—as compared to a probable average of 30 cents a pound during the last 3 years. Insofar as the prices in 1948, 1949 and 1950 may be higher than in 1938, 1939 and 1940 for these products, their parity prices under the two formulas will come closer together in the next 3 years, and the new parity for a product may exceed the old if the 10-year average price of the product becomes relatively higher than those of other commodities. The formula provides for the annual adjustment of dropping the first and adding a new year's price to the 10-year average price of farm products.

It is desirable that the new parity prices for livestock and oil seeds be somewhat higher relative to grain prices because 85 percent of the corn crop and a large part of other grains are normally fed to livestock. This change in the relationship of parity prices for livestock and grains will encourage the feeding of grain which is the most desirable means of utilizing grain when supplies become burdensome.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Can it be said that the formula which takes a 10-year period as the criterion might permit or require, as the decade moves up toward a higher 10-year period of prices, that farm prices start upward at a time when the prices of the things the farmers buy would be tending downward, so that one would be moving in the opposite direction from the other, whereas generally they would be expected to move in the same direction?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat his question, please?

Mr. PEPPER. If the 10-year bracket is the period that influences the parity figure, as you move from a lower-price structure, let us say, up into a decade all of which has high-price structures, you would tend to raise the parity price, under the formula, would you not? The parity price would tend to rise. I was wondering whether there could be a case in which there would be a tendency for farm prices to rise at the time when the prices of the things the farmers buy would have tendency to be falling.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think so. I think there would tend to be a relationship between the prices of the things farmers buy and the prices they receive for the things they sell, that is that the purpose of parity is to give the same or constant purchasing power to a given amount of farm products.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wonder whether the Senator from Vermont has an estimate as to the difference in cost of the new program, as now proposed, as compared with the cost of the old program, annually.

Mr. AIKEN. I think there probably could be no accurate estimate of the cost; but it is my belief that the cost of the new program will be lower because it lowers the incentive price of the commodities of which we have too large a supply. We provide here for a lower price-support level for potatoes and eggs and some of the other commodities on which we have been spending a good many millions of dollars. On the whole, I believe it will be a fairly inexpensive program to administer.

Of course, no one can tell for sure. We have had the best agricultural economists in the country, not only in the Department of Agriculture, but those of the farm organizations, and other economists, such as Dr. Black, of Harvard, working with us; and the bill is a result of their combined knowledge, although I must state that they did not always agree, any more than economists in any other line always agree.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The implication of the Senator's answer, then, is that although this program has been modernized and, to use his explanation, has been improved in the light of experience, nevtherless, barring unforeseen happenings, the program will not cost as much to administer as the program as we have had has cost. Is that correct, or, rather, is that the Senator's belief?

[1] Ten marketing years beginning during calendar years 1938–47.
[2] Based on marketing seasons 1934–38.
[3] May 15 index of prices paid August 1934–July 1939 equals 100.
[4] Not adjusted for seasonal trends.

Mr. AIKEN. Personally, I am satisfied as to that, for the simple reason that we encourage the production of the items we are short of, and discourage the overproduction of the commodities of which we already have too large a supply.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Vermont said he would yield for questions tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Senator will follow that arrangement.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator is to yield, I have a number of questions to ask, which would lengthen this discussion considerably. I had understood that it would go over until tomorrow. I know that other Senators also have questions.

Mr. AIKEN. I should prefer to have it go over until tomorrow, if that is agreeable to the Senator. I shall take about 10 or 12 minutes more to make my general presentation and analysis of the bill.

Mr. President, I continue with the analysis:

Second. "Parity" as applied to income is redefined for the purpose of establishing a more useful and accurate standard. This change has no substantive effect.

Third. The term "carry-over" as applied to corn, rice, peanuts, and cotton is redefined to include imports. This term was not previously applied to peanuts.

Fourth. The term "normal supply" as applied to corn, cotton, rice, wheat, and peanuts is redefined to represent current requirements more accurately than has heretofore been the case. In defining "normal supply," the estimated exports for the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined and estimated domestic consumption for the preceding marketing year would be used. The allowance for carry-over provided for in the existing definition of "normal supply" remains the same as in the present law, except in the case of cotton, which would be 23 percent in the bill as reported, in lieu of 40 percent in existing law. Since the bill was reported, however, your committee has prepared an amendment which would make this allowance 30 percent, instead of 23 percent. The definition in existing law of "normal supply" is not applicable to peanuts, but the new definition would be made so under the bill. The allowance for carry-over in the case of peanuts would be 15 percent. Provision is made in the bill for necessary adjustments for current trends in consumption and for unusual conditions. The term "normal supply" as applied to tobacco would not be changed.

Fifth. The term "total supply" has been redefined to cover peanuts; and in the case of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and peanuts, to include imports. The term as applied to tobacco has not been changed.

PRICE SUPPORT

Section 302 contains the price-support provisions of the bill.

Price supports have proven to be an effective and sound device for improving farm prices, influencing production, and, in the case of storable commodities, accumulating reserve stores which have been of great value in times of war and crop disasters. They are an essential part of any well-rounded farm program. The committee devoted a great deal of time and study to this question, in the light of past experience, and arrived at several general principles which we believe should characterize future price-support programs.

First. Price supports should take into account both market prices and the supply of farm products.

Second. Mandatory price-support operations should be limited or conditioned to the storability of the products.

Third. The minimum price-support level (in periods of heavy supply) should be below the desirable long-time price level, in order to encourage producers to shift part of their productive resources to those products in short supply or greatest demand.

Fourth. There is need of giving considerable discretionary power in adjusting the price-support plan to meet changing or unforeseen conditions.

However, there should be discretionary power to establish support levels on any commodity above the mandatory level in order, in time of emergency, to encourage or maintain needed production. An example of that this year is the case of flax, where the Department of Agriculture is supporting the price at 150 percent of parity, because of the acute shortage and the national need.

With these principles in mind, section 302 of S. 2318 would amend section 302 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938—which contains the principal permanent price-support provisions—to provide as follows:

First. Price support of any agricultural commodity through loans, purchases, payments, or other operations would be authorized. This authorization provides the necessary flexibility in the choice of methods to be used in supporting prices. Thus it authorizes not only loans and purchases but also direct payments to farmers. The use of indirect methods such as the development of improved merchandising methods is encouraged. In determining the methods to be used, as well as the other terms and conditions of price-support operations, the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation are required to give consideration to, first, the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor; second, the price levels at which other commodities are being supported; third, the availability of funds; fourth, the perishability of the commodity; fifth, its importance to agriculture and national economy; sixth, the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation; and, seventh, the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand. Compliance with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices may be required as a condition of price support on either basic or nonbasic commodities.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if I may inquire, does the Senator desire to yield before completing his speech?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has said he would like to finish his speech without interruption.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to finish. I am nearly through. I shall be glad tomorrow to try to answer all the questions that I may be asked pertaining to the bill.

In the case of the basic commodities, cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, the authority to impose marketing practice requirements as a condition of eligibility for price support would not authorize the imposition of marketing quotas if they have been voted down by farmers, and the acreage allotments used for purposes of eligibility would be the same as those determined pursuant to the marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Before deciding upon the farm-support schedule, the committee examined the farm price and production data over the past 25 years and found that even with an 85-percent price-support program, let alone a 90-percent support as under the Steagall amendment, that some of our major farm products would have had Federal support about three-fourths of the time over the 25-year period. That is a heavy burden to place on the Treasury and it encourages farmers to produce the things that they are accustomed to producing without considering what the Nation needs. Probably there is no better guide to production needs than a flexible price system that reflects supply and demand conditions, just so price does not fluctuate so widely or so quickly as to bring economic ruin to producers.

A flexible price support schedule varying inversely to supply in like manner will encourage farmers to adjust production to demand.

High support prices—near the normal market price—also have the tendency to freeze production or acreages in undesirable patterns rather than to encourage adjustment in production to meet demands.

In the case of the basic commodities price support at from 60 to 90 percent of parity, the minimum level depending upon the relationship of the total supply of each commodity to its normal supply—would be required to be made available to cooperators (those who do not exceed farm acreage allotments); except that if marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers the level of price support would be reduced to 50 percent of parity. Your committee felt that this minimum price support of 50 percent should be given even though marketing quotas should be disapproved since the complete lack of price support for a basic agricultural commodity would so seriously lower the income of a particular producer group as to impair the general welfare. If, however, marketing quotas are approved by producers, the level of price support which would otherwise be given to the commodity would be increased under the bill as reported by a minimum of 10 percent of parity, but not beyond 90 percent of parity.

Since reporting the bill the committee has recommended that instead of a premium of 10 percent of parity plus an additional percent to be given by the Secretary if he felt it desirable, the premium for quotas be 20 percent of the support price computed without regard to the premium. It would be 20 percent of the support price but not exceeding 90 percent of parity. Under the bill price support is not required to be made available to noncooperators, but at the Secretary's discretion such support may be provided at levels not in excess of those provided for cooperators.

Third. Price support for nonbasic commodities is discretionary with the Secretary up to a maximum level of 90 percent of parity. It is difficult to provide any procedure for controlling the marketing of certain products in order to make price support effective. Potatoes constitute one of the most difficult problems although the Secretary may prescribe conditions pertaining to compliance and a large percentage of the producers follow the plan, difficulty arises with the noncooperator who proceeds to dump all of his production on the market. The problem is further complicated because the early, medium, and late potato markets overlap. Even though the cooperators follow prescribed conditions and may hold their cull potatoes off of the market and receive a minimum price for them, noncooperators may benefit from marketing their entire production. This will tend to help break the market for the cooperators. This difficulty arises because potatoes, unlike tobacco, do not pass through central markets where controls can be exercised. One of the most promising approaches to this problem is that of potato-marketing agreements. Last year such an agreement was developed for Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota for the marketing of late potatoes. One is being considered by the Maine potato growers for the current year. Also Virginia and North Carolina have developed a potato-marketing agreement for the current year. Potato-marketing agreements entered into by the growers promises to be an effective way of holding low-grade potatoes off of the market. The growers who enter into such an agreement will help to make it effective in their localities. If a price-support program for potatoes is developed, the language of the bill would make it possible for the Secretary to give preference to the producers who are operating under marketing agreements.

The price of wool, however, is required to be supported at such level between 60 and 90 percent of parity as the Secretary considers necessary in order to encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds. The present production of wool is approximately 300,000,000 pounds, which is not considered adequate and which places this country in too great a state of dependence upon foreign countries for wool. There has been a consistently decreasing number of stock sheep and lambs on farms and ranges in this country until now we have only thirty and a half million—the lowest since 1867.

Fourth. In case the national interest requires, price-support operations at levels in excess of 90 percent of parity are permitted with respect to either basic or nonbasic commodities.

I have already mentioned flax as this year's example of that.

Fifth. The Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from using its funds to carry out any operation to support the price of any nonbasic agricultural commodity which is so perishable in nature as not to be reasonably storable without excessive loss or excessive cost, but this prohibition does not prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from using its funds to support the price of such perishable commodities by operations with respect to storable commodities processed therefrom. For example the Commodity Credit Corporation could support the price of milk through the purchase of powdered dry milk, or the price of citrus fruit through the purchase of canned concentrated juice. The bill expressly permits direct price support for perishable nonbasic commodities through other means available to the Secretary. Thus section 32 funds would be available for such price support. Since the bill was reported, the committee has recommended an amendment which would make it clear that the Commodity Credit Corporation's facilities could be utilized in carrying out section 32 and school lunch programs, involving the procurement of perishable commodities. The cost of such programs would, of course, be defrayed from section 32 or school-lunch program funds. The basis for differentiating between storable and nonstorable commodities is that on storable commodities the Corporation has a reasonable prospect of avoiding losses by disposing of its inventories during times of shortages or increased demand. The price support operations of Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to the basic commodities have in the aggregate been carried out without loss to the Corporation. Perishable commodities must be disposed of promptly and the losses involved are often great. Moreover, the yields of the more perishable commodities are so variable and so subject to the control of the producer, as by the application of fertilizer, insecticide, and water in the case of irrigated crops, that the acreage planted may have little relationship to production. Section 32 is the recognized medium for the disposal of surpluses of perishable commodities and provides for such disposal largely through donation to charitable institutions and through the school lunch program. It should also be noted that in the case of all the basic commodities, there is in effect a statutory system for adjusting production to demand through the establishment of marketing quotas and penalties.

Sixth. Limitations are imposed upon the price at which Commodity Credit Corporation can sell farm commodities subject to a number of exceptions. These limitations and exceptions are generally comparable to those now in effect and are intended to prevent sales of farm commodities by Commodity Credit Corporation in a manner which would impair price-support operations with respect to such commodities.

MARKETING QUOTAS

Sections 303, 304, 305, and 306 change the conditions which must be determined by the Secretary to exist before marketing quotas can be imposed upon corn, wheat, cotton, and rice. As reported, the sections would provide that whenever the Secretary determines—

First, that the total supply of the commodity for the marketing year beginning in the then current calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 15 percent, or

Second, that the total supply of the commodity for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for the marketing year so ending and that the average price for the commodity for three successive months does not exceed 70 percent of parity, the Secretary shall proclaim marketing quotas for the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year.

Since reporting the bill, your committee has reported out amendments to each of these sections which would increase the amount by which total supply must exceed normal supply from 15 percent to 20 percent, and would decrease the requirement with respect to the average farm price from 70 percent of parity to 66 percent of parity, except that in the case of cotton the amount by which the total supply is required to exceed the normal supply would be reduced to 8 percent.

A careful study of available data indicates that the amendments set up comparable conditions of supply and prices as a guide in voting quotas for the different basic commodities.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—IMPORTS

Section 307 requires the Secretary to take imports into consideration in determining acreage allotments for corn, wheat, and rice for the purposes of marketing quotas.

UTILIZATION OF COUNTY AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATIONS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COUNCILS UNDER AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Section 308 provides for the utilization of the community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees and State agricultural councils in carrying out the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SECTION 32 FUNDS

Section 401 provides for accumulation, up to $300,000,000, of section 32 funds not currently required for program purposes. Section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), appropriates for each fiscal year an amount equal to 30 percent of the customs duties for the preceding calendar year, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage exportation and to increase (by means of diversion programs) domestic consumption of agricultural commodities and products and to reestablish farmers' purchasing power. To the extent that funds annually appropriated by section 32 are not fully utilized during any fiscal year, this provision would permit the balance of the funds not utilized to be carried over to subsequent fiscal years and used for the purpose for which such funds were appropriated. This provision would make it possible to formulate long-range surplus-disposal programs.

PARITY—OTHER STATUTES

Section 403 conforms the definitions of parity contained in other statutes to the definition of parity contained in section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by S. 2318.

SECTION 22

Section 402 would amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. The bill is designed to strengthen price-support programs for American agricultural commodities and to prevent their disruption through excessive imports of foreign commodities.

The revision of section 22 would carry out recommendations heretofore made by the President to the Congress and more recently requested of this Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In requesting revision of section 22, the Secretary of Agriculture stated:

> The field within which the authority granted by section 22 may be exercised is so limited that the authority cannot be of much aid to the Department of Agriculture in discharging its price-support obligations in this period of adjustment. If a program of the Department is not undertaken pursuant to one of the three statutes referred to in section 22, the authority conferred by that section may not be utilized to control the importation of an article the importation of which is materially interfering with the successful operation of the program by the Department.

The principal changes contemplated by this section of the bill are:

First. To extend the authority of section 22 so as to cover not only agricultural commodities, but also the products thereof;

Second. To extend such authority so as to cover articles the import of which affects any loan, purchase, or other programs or operations undertaken by the Department of Agriculture (including price support and stabilization operations) with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof;

Third. To make the provisions with respect to quantitative limitation restrictions applicable to the total quantity of an article imported during a representative period as determined by the President, rather than to each country's average annual quantity of the article imported during the period from January 1, 1929, to December 31, 1933, as now provided;

Fourth. To authorize the President, by a specific grant of authority, to describe designated articles by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such bases as he determines;

Fifth. To clarify the definition with respect to the fees authorized, which are considered duties for some purposes, as now provided, so that they shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States, as, for example, our duty preference arrangements with Cuba; and

Sixth. To prohibit enforcement of a proclamation under section 22 that would be in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is a party.

I understand that this proposed amendment to section 22 has been cleared with the State Department, and we are assured there will be no veto of it this time.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 404 provides that the act shall take effect on January 1, 1949, except that section 402 would take effect upon enactment. Present price support provisions under which the basic commodities are supported at 90 percent of parity—92½ percent in the case of cotton—expire with the crops of such commodities harvested prior to January 1, 1949. The Steagall amendment, under which the so-called Steagall commodities are required to be supported at not less than 90 percent of parity, expires on December 31, 1948.

AMENDMENTS

Since reporting out the bill, your committee has reported out a number of additional amendments, some of which have been discussed in the foregoing analysis. All of the remaining amendments are technical and perfecting in nature with one exception, as follows:

A new section 309 would be inserted. The section would amend section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to require the Secretary, first, to proclaim a national marketing quota for each marketing year for each kind of tobacco for which a national marketing quota was proclaimed for the immediately preceding marketing year, and, second, to proclaim a national marketing quota for Virginia sun-cured tobacco for each marketing year for which a quota is proclaimed for fire-cured tobacco. This would mean that, once the Secretary proclaims a marketing quota for any kind of tobacco, he is required to proclaim a marketing quota for that kind of tobacco for each succeeding year without regard to the supply conditions presently required by the statute, unless growers vote to discard the quota system. Since marketing quotas have been proclaimed for the marketing years beginning in 1948 for flue-cured, burley, and fire-cured tobaccos, this section would require marketing quotas to be proclaimed each year hereafter for these three kinds of tobacco, and also for Virginia sun-cured tobacco.

Because of the long period for which tobacco is held to properly age, tobacco presents problems of market supply not found in other commodities.

I shall be glad to discuss that further tomorrow if it has not been made clear.

Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of my colleagues in bearing with me and giving me an opportunity to present this preliminary analysis of the bill tonight.

I have some amendments, practically all of them technical in nature, we might say, relating to crossing "t's" and dotting "i's," which I shall submit so that they may be printed and be available tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. So long as the Senate does not get out of patience.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall not take any time. I merely wish to send to the desk sundry amendments to the bill which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield the floor?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. On behalf of the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and myself, I send to the desk an amendment to be offered to the bill, to be printed and to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont technically still has the floor. He did not yield the floor. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I understand this long-range agricultural bill, insofar as cotton is concerned and so far as the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned, it makes a reduction in cotton parity from 90 percent to 75 percent, with an additional 4-cent reduction and an additional variation in regard to other commodities.

Mr. AIKEN. It would mean 75 percent for normal supply. Beginning last year the supply was just a trifle over normal. It would probably be normal next year.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Vermont will admit that the Commodity Credit Corporation made over $100,000,000 on cotton last year, as stated by C. C. Smith, the chairman of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In other words, the parity on cotton is going to be reduced from 90 percent to 75 percent?

Mr. AIKEN. No, not in 1 year. We provide that parity cannot be reduced over 5 percent in any 1 year. In the meantime, the bad years of cotton, when it brought only 9 cents, 1938, 1939, and 1940, will be dropped from the 10-year period, and the 30-cent years will be added, so that the parity price of cotton is very likely to come up, and possibly in 3 years might exceed what the parity would be under the old method of computing it. I have no figures with me tonight, but I shall be glad to produce them tomorrow.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator will remember the late John Bankhead, of Alabama, who took such an interest in the cotton growers, and Representative

Steagall, who was a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives. The Senator from Vermont well knows that cotton was not at parity in 1939 and 1940, but also was not during the war years, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and am I now to be told, coming from a cotton State, that the plan is further to reduce the parity on cotton, after the cotton farmer has been robbed of millions of dollars, so that the Government can ship it to Japan to run MacArthur's business, and to make a record for the Army and to run the Government of Japan? The farmer seems to be forgotten. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Vermont that I think it is an outrage and a disgrace that cotton should be reduced and the loan should be reduced from 90 to 75 percent in the face of what has happened to cotton.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further, but I do hope the Senator from South Carolina will not forget the efforts I have put in to help the cotton growers when they needed it most, and I say to him tonight that this new parity formula I know will increase the price of cottonseed 20 percent, and will, I believe, more than offset the slight reduction in cotton. But I refuse to yield further.

Mr. MAYBANK. If I may make a remark as one coming from a cotton State, the cottonseed is only used to pay the expense of ginning and baling the cotton and the picking of cotton. That has nothing to do with the price of raw cotton.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily set aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6801, the so-called Economic Cooperation Administration appropriations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, at this time I wish to present from the Senate Committee on Appropriations the recommendations for foreign aid appropriations for the coming year. It is my belief that the Senate will not consider during this year a bill of greater import to our economy or of more lasting significance to the security of this Nation and the world.

In its simplest terms, the appropriation which the committee recommends calls for the expenditure of American dollars to aid the recovery of Europe and to extend help into many war-ravaged areas of the world. In its broader aspects, however, this bill provides for the shipment of American production and wealth at a cost of personal sacrifice of every citizen of the Republic. The appropriation is a venture in faith on the part of this Nation. It expresses the belief that the freedom-loving people of the world, by sharing their resources and their strength, can withstand the tyrannous forces of a philosophy and government that holds in slavery the peoples of more than half of Europe. The appropriation is recommended because there is in America a widespread conviction that the free people of the world must stand or fall together and that a portion of the resources of this Nation should be put temporarily at the disposal of other free peoples until the non-Communist governments can recover their mutual strength.

The great bulk of the money will be distributed in western Germany and the 16 nations of Europe who were signatories at the Paris Conference. Members of the Senate Appropriations Committee traveled during the past year through these various countries. We have seen at first hand the conditions which we seek to correct through this appropriation. We have seen the shattered cities and towns that were destroyed by a war which has disrupted also the normal patterns of industry and trade. We have seen people in Europe who have turned to the false promises and early disillusionment of communism because the difficulties of ordinary living have made them lose confidence in the institutions of free government. Members of the committee believe, as most Americans believe, that free governments can be maintained in Europe if two conditions are fulfilled. The first condition is that the European nations must make a total effort to help themselves. The second condition is that some limited outside assistance be given them to start again the flow of raw materials, the movement of goods in trade and the stabilization of inflated currencies.

Obviously the resources of the United States are not adequate to meet the full needs of the world. Such aid as we can extend to nations on whose strength we can count in future years must be extended wisely and with great caution. Those of us who have seen Europe since the war have seen also vast stores of American equipment dumped in foreign fields. We have seen the production and wealth of American workers spent to no good purpose whatsoever. I can conceive of no more tragic a conclusion than that this appropriation should follow the pattern of past appropriations made by this Government in some instances for foreign aid. If such should be the case, then we should be guilty of having exploited human hope to waste the substance of this Nation.

With adequate precautions on the part of Congress and with responsible administration by those to whom these funds will be entrusted, no such consequences need occur. In the hope that such consequences will not occur the committee presents its program.

Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Appropriations recommends that the sum of $6,125,710,228 be provided for assistance to the people of foreign countries during the coming year. This amount is $408,000,000 below the budget estimates for the program. It is $245,000,000 above the amounts allowed by the House action on the foreign-aid bill.

To present a proper perspective of the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in relation to that of the House, however, it will be necessary to state in greater detail the differences between the bill as it passed the House and the bill that is recommended to the Senate. Actually, the committee recommendation, if adopted, would increase expenditure under this program by an indefinite amount, in excess of $1,100,000,000. The effect of the possible Senate action upon the expenditures for foreign aid can be stated in terms of the amounts recommended for the European recovery program and for China.

FOR THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The budget estimate requested $5,300,000,000 for 17 countries for 12 months.

The House allowed $5,055,000,000 for 21 countries for 15 months.

The committee recommends the sum of $5,055,000,000 for 18 countries for 12 months.

FOR THE CHINA PROGRAM

The authorization provided for $463,000,000 for 12 months, of which $125,000,000 was for grants sought by the Chinese Government.

The House allowed $400,000,000 for 15 months to be expended in accordance with the provisions for Greek-Turkey aid.

The Senate Appropriations Committee recommends that $460,000,000 be provided for 12 months, of which $125,000,000 shall be given in grants for military and other requirements of the Chinese Government.

The committee recommends that other programs which are provided for in this bill be furnished the following amounts:

Government and relief in occupied areas should have $1,325,000,000, of which $125,000,000 is earmarked for recovery in the Japanese area, and the remainder is designated for the prevention of disease and unrest in Germany, Austria, and the Japanese area.

The sum of $250,000,000 should be applied to the Greek-Turkey program, which is an increase of $50,000,000 over the House amount and a decrease of $25,000,000 below the budget estimate.

The full budget estimate of $70,710,228 is recommended for the use of the International Refugee Organization of $20,000,000 is allowed for the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, which is $40,000,000 below the amount allowed by the House.

Although this bill is reported in the rush of the closing days of this session, and is presented to the Senate within a week of the vote in the House, the bill has had careful study by the Senate Appropriations Committee. We began our hearings more than a month ago without any bill before us and with no knowledge of what action the House would take. Such a procedure is highly unusual and to my knowledge has only the precedent that the Appropriations Committee made when we proceeded in advance, without waiting for House action, to study the interim aid bill.

In the committee hearings testimony was offered by many witnesses of the Government, by the individuals who will administer the funds appropriated, and by private citizens who the committee

felt had pertinent experience and knowledge.

There was evidenced strong support for the aims and purposes of the foreign-aid programs, and particularly for the European recovery program, but in all the great detail of testimony submitted to the committee there was little information on which the committee could base a firm, precise, stable, and undisputed appropriation figure.

Let me discuss with the Senate very briefly the type of evidence on which we have had to recommend this appropriation.

We were given detailed analyses of the type of goods which might move from the Western Hemisphere to the participating countries of western Europe. It was on this trade movement that the estimates for the program were computed by the executive branch of the Government, yet the committee was told, also, that ECA purchases will not be limited to the Western Hemisphere and that the dollars we appropriate in this bill may be spent anywhere on earth.

The committee was given an estimate that $22,000,000 will be required out of ECA funds to meet shipping costs and other dollar deficits during the next 12 months. The figure was derived by deducting miscellaneous dollar income from the total dollar payments for shipping of the participating nations. It was testified that, without reservation, the $22,000,000 figure is utterly unrealistic as a statement of the payments which the Administrator of the program must make to move the goods furnished.

The justifications by which the committee had to determine the amount of the appropriation were extremely general. We were not asked to provide money to purchase any particular goods or to meet any specified needs. In effect, we were told that we were buying recovery and the price tag was established by a deficit in the balance of payment arising out of projected trade patterns. The proponents of the program did not justify the expenditure of $5,300,000,000 on a reasonable basis. Instead, the committee has been challenged to justify a cut in a program that has shifted its figures constantly as the Congress has questioned the propriety of the various component parts.

From the testimony which the committee heard on the European recovery program, the members of the committee felt that for many reasons the executive branch of the Government had set some of its estimates too high.

In the list of 50 items studied there were many instances where it appeared that shipments for the coming year, in view of past European imports, were unrealistically large. Such commodities as tobacco, petroleum, agricultural machinery, fertilizer, fats and oils, and cotton were listed to move from the Western Hemisphere in relatively large quantities.

There was a fundamental doubt in the minds of many members that $4,000,000,000 can be expended wisely in the short space of a year, and there is a remaining fear that expenditures may be forced, and will result in a repetition of UNRRA tactics with wholesale dumping of American wealth in foreign lands. In this respect the committee presents the four-billion-dollar figure with hopes that the Watchdog committee, so-called, established in the authorization act can be successful as a deterrent to unwise expenditure.

Over the months in which the justifications for the foreign-aid program have been before this Congress the executive branch has shifted its studies constantly, obtaining ever-new subtotals out of the same set of facts, yet remaining always within the same $5,300,000,000 grand total of the program. Despite the vast improvement in crop prospects in Europe, imports of food and tobacco were estimated to total $308,000,000 more in March than they were estimated in December. The proposed imports of seven nations were reduced by $800,000,000 in late revisions of the estimates, and the estimated needs of the remaining nations were increased by the same amount.

It is the earnest hope of the Senate Appropriations Committee that more realistic justifications will be presented for any appropriation to be made after next January for further expenditure in 1949 and in 1950. There is no reason why this appropriation cannot be sought in terms of expenditures that somebody actually proposes to make. The Congress should be asked to provide fixed sums for relief, for development of power, for shipping costs, for inland transportation, for administration, and for various recovery items. There is no reason why this Congress should be asked to appropriate money freely for worldwide expenditure for any commodity under the sun on the basis of studies of possible trade movement between the Western Hemisphere and western Europe.

The funds the committee recommends at this time are extremely generous. It is the largest recommendation for an appropriation ever made in peacetime for foreign aid in the history of our country. If the money is expended wisely, it may result in savings in our national military budget. If the recovery program is successful to any appreciable degree, it will open certainly whole new areas of trade and enterprise to American commerce.

With faith that a better world can be built out of the hopes of mankind; with hope for the promise of restored stability of European government and trade; with hope for a strong United States in a prosperous and peaceful family of democratic nations, the Senate Committee on Appropriations presents this bill to the Senate for action and asks for its passage.

Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "for", to strike out "the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949" and insert "such periods as are specified herein ending not later than June 30, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title I—Economic Cooperation", on page 2, line 1, after the word "until", to strike out "June 30" and insert "April 2."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this is the key amendment in the bill, and I shall ask for the yeas and nays, because I think it is highly important that the position of the Senate should be unmistakably plain.

I wish to say in a sentence to the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee that I am personally profoundly grateful to him and his committee for the good faith and good spirit in which they have approached this entire problem. It has never occurred to me that the figures which came down in the estimates were untouchable. As the Senator may recall, in my own plea to the committee I was chiefly urging against the general horizontal cut of more than $1,000,000,000 involved in the pending amendment, rather than challenging any of the specific figures.

I would not undertake to say that I was in accord with the committee in respect to all the various amendments which it made; but, speaking generally and over all, I think the report is a highly acceptable one under all the circumstances, and I feel that the committee has proceeded in full accord with the tremendous undertaking which we are underwriting in the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. On behalf of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 1.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Moore
Baldwin	Hawkes	Morse
Ball	Hayden	Murray
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bricker	Hill	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Butler	Ives	Revercomb
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kem	Smith
Chavez	Kilgore	Sparkman
Connally	Knowland	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Stewart
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McClellan	Thye
Ecton	McFarland	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Umstead
Feazel	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
Green	Maybank	Young
Gurney	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment at the top of page 2, striking out "June 30" and inserting "April 2."

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—64

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hoey	Russell
Bridges	Holland	Saltonstall
Cain	Ives	Smith
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Chavez	Kilgore	Stennis
Connally	Knowland	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Young
Green	Morse	
Gurney	Murray	

NAYS—15

Brooks	Hawkes	Malone
Butler	Jenner	Moore
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	O'Daniel
Capehart	Kem	Revercomb
Dworshak	McClellan	Taylor

NOT VOTING—17

Brewster	McCarran	Tobey
Buck	McGrath	Wagner
Bushfield	Myers	White
Downey	Reed	Williams
George	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson
Langer	Thomas, Utah	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$100,000"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "purchases of typewriters and similar machines where same cannot be procured under the provisions of the Treasury-Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1949;"; in line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "forty" and insert "sixty"; in line 9, after the word "vehicles", to insert "purchase (not to exceed two), maintenance, and operation of aircraft;"; in line 12, after "(28 U. S. C. 921)", to insert "deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail (39 U. S. C. 321d)"; and in line 25, after the word "certified", to insert a semicolon and "and of which such amount as may be necessary but not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be available for assistance to the Free Territory of Trieste or either of its zones under the provisions of Public Law 389, Eightieth Congress, first session, until the Free Territory of Trieste or either of its zones becomes eligible for assistance under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which amount shall be charged with any advances made heretofore by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to section 103 (b) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and the Administrator is hereby authorized to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for advances pursuant to section 103 (b) from the sum available for assistance to Trieste or either of its zones under this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 13, after the amendment last above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That of the amount herein appropriated not less than $65,000,000 shall be utilized for acquiring in the United States nonfat dry milk solids:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 16, after the amendment last stated, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That not to exceed $68,000,000 may be expended for administrative and other expenses including not to exceed $10,000,000 for direct administration and not to exceed $10,000,000 for guaranties of investment in enterprises producing or distributing informational media provided for under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, after the amendment last stated, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That not less than 10 percent of each special local currency account established pursuant to section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government for expenditure for strategic materials or other local currency requirements of the United States of America:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 3, after the amendment last stated, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That allocations of funds provided pursuant to provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 for Austria and any country under occupation by forces of the United States shall be made to the United States Military Government of such countries for administrative and other expenses:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 9, after the amendment last stated, to strike out the following additional proviso:

And provided further, That expenditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 13, after the amendment last stated, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That where the Economic Cooperation Administrator requests the United States military authorities to perform certain functions under the act, the Economic Cooperation Administrator shall reimburse the military authorities for administrative expenses incurred in the performance of such functions: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $63,000,000 may be expended for administrative and other expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 20, after the amendment last stated, to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That pursuant to section 117 (c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, the Administrator shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to any participating foreign country, regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 1, after the amendment last stated, to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That guaranties of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media provided for under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 shall not exceed $10,000,000 in the first year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 6, after the amendment last stated, to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That there shall be included within the local currency administrative expenditures of the United States such sums as may be necessary to meet expenditures of members and staff of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation in the course of performance of committee functions within respecting participating countries.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "International Children's Emergency Fund," on page 5, line 17, after the numerals "1948", to strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000."

Mr. MORSE. I would like to have an explanation by the distinguished chairman of the committee in regard to that reduction, and I perhaps can save time by asking him whether I am correctly advised that one reason for the reduction from $60,000,000 to $20,000,000 for the International Children's Emergency Fund was the belief or finding of the committee that a certain portion of the fund was to be used behind the iron curtain.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. More than 60 percent of it last year went to countries behind the iron curtain. The committee found no evidence that there was any guaranty that the money going behind the iron curtain went to children of parents who were free with respect to their own political affiliations. In other words, the assistance, according to many of the reports which the committee received, went to children who were affiliated in some way with families who were Communist or were in favor with the governments, not to the children of parents who favored the democracies or who had no Communist feelings. This in no way shuts off all the funds. It allows a fund to go forward, but it does not provide them with as much money as they would like to have; and I have stated one of the major reasons for that.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask a second question of the Senator in regard to this particular item, referring to the information which I am sure many Senators have been receiving concerning the need for an increase in the funds for use among children in countries which are not behind the iron curtain. I inquire as to whether or not the committee is satisfied that $20,000,000 will meet the needs of children in the countries which are not behind the iron curtain?

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe the answer to the question is yes. The fund already has a substantial carry-over. For instance, of the amount we appropriated last year there is a balance of something over $12,000,000, and certain other amounts are going into the fund from UNRRA. All in all, in cash and in matching funds, there is available at this time around $57,000,000. So there are adequate funds to work with, so the next objective should be to avoid indiscriminate feeding of those behind the iron curtain who are pro-Communist.

Mr. MORSE. I do not want to take any more time at this late hour, other than to call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee to my hope that when this matter goes to conference—and it is bound to be the subject of discussions in conference—that the Senate conferees will keep in mind, as I am sure they will, that there could hardly be a better expenditure of American dollars under the economic recovery program than the expenditure of American money for the benefit of the thousands upon thousands of homeless and orphan children in the devastated areas of Europe, the solution to whose problems after all will determine in large measure I think on the way Europe will go in the future. I certainly hope—and I shall take the Senator's word for it—that in conference the committee will make absolutely certain that all the money actually needed—and I think if we err at all on this item, we should err in the direction of over-generosity rather than of parsimony—for the help of those thousands of children will be made available. I would rather save elsewhere in the bill than save on giving aid to children, who, after all, are going to become the adults of Europe in a very few years, and will determine in large measure future American-European relations.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that there are $5,300,000,000 earmarked for children and adults of the participating countries. Much of that, of course, will find its way to [illegible] children of the free countries as well. This fund goes to the United Nations, and through United Nations participation must go to the countries all over Europe, including those behind the iron curtain. Reports of dozens and dozens of cases have come to us that this money is being used to foster Communists in countries behind the iron curtain, while others who believe in freedom and who are tinged with anticommunism in those countries are prevented from sharing in those funds, due to Government controls. There are certain steps taken by the Administrator to prevent abuses, insofar as possible, and they are making progress in that direction, but nevertheless that situation continues on a large scale.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire knows the junior Senator from Oregon does not want any of our money used to aid communism. On the other hand, if we can work out the checks within the United Nations that would make it possible even for us to help children behind the iron curtain itself, I would be willing to see some American dollars used for that purpose, if we could have at least some reasonable assurances that it would have an influence in leading the child away from communism, rather than have to implant in him more deeply doctrines of communism.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, reference to page 3 of the committee report shows that the budget estimate for the Economic Cooperation Administration is $5,300,000,000 for 17 countries for 12 months. By the House action the amount is $5,055,000,000 for 21 countries for 15 months. The committee recommendation is $5,055,000,000 for 18 countries for 12 months.

In other words, Mr. President, the Senate committee has increased by a considerable amount the amount of the appropriation for the Economic Cooperation Administration, and yet the item now under consideration shows that the committee reduced by $40,000,000 the appropriation for the International Children's Emergency Fund.

Mr. President, I shall not ask for a vote, and I shall not offer any amendment, because I am hopeful that the matter can be worked out in conference, but I wish to say that it is a sad commentary upon this bill that we increase by millions the amounts available for the 18 countries of western Europe, and diminish by one-third the amount of the appropriation for the 20,000,000 hungry children of the world. What will be the comment by those who look at the action of the Senate, when they see that we have increased one fund and have diminished another that actually goes to the survival of 20,000,000 children of the world?

I mentioned in the debate on the ERP bill that the International Children's Emergency Fund needed $250,000,000; not $60,000,000, but $250,000,000. That is needed in order to give one meal a day, with matching by the countries affected, to the 20,000,000 hungry children of the world. What is to be the answer to those children, Mr. President—that we have not enough money to help them to get one meal a day?

In instance after instance we claim we are supporting the United Nations, that every individual unilateral action we take is in support of the United Nations, and yet when we look at the facts we find that when we cooperate at all with the United Nations we do it only to a very limited degree. It is an international agency functioning under the United Nations organization, yet we have given them only a pittance. Mr. President, it will not make any difference at this time, but some day someone reading the report will pass judgment upon what we do.

I simply want to register a protest against a policy which allows almost unlimited and uncounted millions for certain purposes, and nothing but penury, poverty, continued hunger, and continuing lack of cooperation with the United Nations to furnish one meal a day to the 20,000,000 hungry children of the world.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Florida, who speaks of hundreds of millions of dollars going to the participating countries, that a substantial part of the amount will go to the orphans and other children. A very large part of the appropriation will find its way into a program to strengthen the children of Europe. Sixty percent of the fund last year went to countries behind the iron curtain. On the day when anyone can stand on the floor of the Senate, or come before the Appropriations Committee, and say that a child born to non-Communist parents, in one of those countries behind the iron curtain, will receive an even break with children of Communist parents, I shall be willing to support appropriations. But it makes me sick and tired to appropriate money that helps to promote communism

in those countries, and at the same time, have it denied to the only friends we have in those particular countries. How must it seem to a father or mother who desires an element of freedom and does not want to bow down to Soviet domination, to find that their children are denied food from the United States, while food supplied through the International Children's Fund goes to children of Communists in slave states?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell me what children are not included?

Mr. BRIDGES. In the International Children's Fund?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. What children are not included?

Mr. BRIDGES. Those participating in the fund last year were children in Albania, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxemburg, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Rumania, South Africa, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Uraguay, and Yugoslavia.

Mr. LANGER. I take it that the children in Germany are not included?

Mr. BRIDGES. The children in Germany are not included in this appropriation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the able Senator whether, under this amendment, all children in Communist countries will be excluded from the relief?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. All we did was to reduce the amount. We did not offer any amendment to exclude them.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the amount was cut from $60,000,000 to $20,000,000, and the same countries which have been given relief heretofore will continue to receive it?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. Because we have no control over that. It is a United Nations program. We put the money into an International Fund which is administered by the United Nations. We have no control over where the money goes.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not quite see under what theory we should make a contribution to children in outright Communist countries.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not, either; but, as a matter of fact, the only way we can prevent that is to make no contribution, because we are only one of the United Nations, and, although we supply most of the money, we cannot exercise a veto over the Fund. Therefore we must either withdraw from it, or continue our participation.

Mr. LUCAS. It seems to me that $60,000,000 for the relief of children is a small sum, to begin with, if it is properly distributed. If we cannot have it distributed to those to whom it should go, to people who are friendly to our cause, it strikes me that we should establish an organization of our own to the end that we make a contribution of $60,000,000 or more to children in the nations which are in sympathy with our ideals.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I am very willing to appropriate $60,000,000 and more than that in $5,300,000,000 to go to children in countries which are participating in the European recovery program, but I am unwilling to throw the money to countries behind the iron curtain, unless I have assurance that the children of parents who love and want freedom will receive an even break with the other children.

Mr. LUCAS. I have great respect and compassion for every child, wherever he might be, but I definitely know that the child that is tutored under the Communist regime will grow up to be a Communist. That is a certainty. However, I would not hesitate to give to children in countries controlled by the Communists who resist communism if I knew they were getting the relief—that I seriously question?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wish to suggest that probably the United Nations itself, in the distribution of this fund, is not free to discriminate against any of the members of the United Nations, and a number of the nations to which reference has been made here are members of the United Nations, and therefore theoretically are on the same basis with other nations. I doubt whether the United Nations itself would feel authorized to discriminate against the children of these particular countries because they happen to be behind the iron curtain, but are still members of the United Nations, and must be dealt with as such. Therefore the only way by which we could control that probably would be in the reduction of the amount.

I deeply appreciate the inadequacy of the sum of $20,000,000, even for the nations which are sympathetic with us and on our side in the controversy. Yet the $60,000,000 probably would have to be distributed under the United Nations in approximately the same proportion as it has been heretofore, because the countries are members of the United Nations, and they would not feel justified in discriminating.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator has the figures at hand, will he tell us what the total amount appropriated for the International Children's Fund has been for the present fiscal year, during the time of the existence of the organization?

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator mean by the United States?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; by the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. A hundred million dollars was authorized, and $40,000,000 has already been appropriated by the United States. There are still $60,000,000 authorized, but we are recommending an appropriation of $20,000,000.

Mr. PEPPER. Here is the figure I wish to call the Senate's attention. On page 12 of the committee report the following appears:

> This year the Children's Fund had an appropriation under Public Law 84 of $40,000,000 to be matched with funds of other nations in the feeding of children. Under its original matching formulas the fund was able to distribute only $15,000,000 of the amount awarded by the United States.

That means that only $15,000,000 was actually employed, because the other countries could match only $15,000,000. So we put up only $15,000,000.

I continue to read from the report:

> A revision of the matching formula in the passage of the ECA authorization bill enabled the fund to distribute in the past few months an additional $12,652,364.

That makes a total of not quite $28,000,000 we have actually disbursed. I read further:

> However, an unobligated balance of $12,347,636 remained in the fund as of May 1, 1948. In addition to funds directly appropriated by the Congress, the Children's Fund has been the recipient of several million dollars arising out of the liquidation of UNRRA. Money from this source continues to be received even at this late date.

What I wanted to suggest was, would the Senator say I was correct if I supposed that, let us say, $75,000,000 would be the outside limit of all the United States has thus far contributed to this International Children's Emergency Fund? Would I be in error if I should say $75,000,000 was the outside limit?

Mr. BRIDGES. We have not given that. We gave $40,000,000 in an appropriation last year, of which there still remains in the fund $12,652,364.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the point I wanted to make. Now we are cutting it down to $20,000,000, in addition to what has been appropriated in the past. Yet I do not think anyone would question the fact that this international organization said there were from twenty to thirty million needy children in the world, that the funds should be made available on a matching basis. I heard on the floor of the Senate that the leader of the International Children's Emergency Fund said the children were having good meals, that the Organization was getting good cooperation from all these countries, and was gradually expanding the program. Yet the record convicts us—of course not with any evil design—on the facts and the figures, even with this appropriation, of not having made $100,000,000 available to feed the twenty to thirty million hungry children in the world.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me point out to the Senator that this is just one fund. The United States has been donating billions and billions and billions of dollars over the world, some $23,000,000,000, since the war ended; and I might say to the Senator that a very large part of that has gone to feed the people of the world, a large percentage of whom have been children. So children all over the world have been among the prime beneficiaries of this very generous aid by the United States. This is just one particular project.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President, but if the Senator will allow me, I think it

is substantially accurate at least to say that that was the UNRRA program, under which that kind of relief was distributed. The children's emergency fund came along as the successor to the UNRRA program.

I am not talking about the children in only one part of the world. I am talking about a child, whether it is black, or yellow, or brown, or red, or white, wherever it is under God's shining stars.

Mr. President, the able Senator has referred to the fact that some of these children are behind the iron curtain. I wonder if it is not a fact that in the memory of Senators on this floor there was nothing that so embittered the German population, probably nothing that gave Hitler more fuel for his evil designs, than for him to be able to point to the fact that the Allies kept a blockade around Germany's coast after the end of World War I and starved the German children. I wonder whether this odious communism, which we hope will at some time, like a pest, pass from the earth, will be more aided and expedited in its passage and dissolution by making friends out of children wherever they are.

I do not question the motives of the committee, of course, but I do question the policy of showing the world that we have $5,000,000,000 to spend upon the economic recovery of 18 western European countries, but could not even match the House appropriation to meet the hunger of the world's children.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from New Hampshire and the Committee on Appropriations on what they have done with this appropriation. I think they have performed an exceptional service, and I thank the chairman and all the members of the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am grateful to the Senator for his comment.

Mr. HATCH. But I am wondering if the committee has not made a mistake in this particular item. It occurs to me a grave and serious mistake may be made right here. In the first place, we are going to herald throughout the world that the chief reduction made is in the children's fund.

Everything that has been said here tonight about hungry children is, of course, appealing to all of us, but I wish to suggest to the Senator and to the Senate that merely because a country is behind the iron curtain is no sign at all that the people of that country are Communists, or that any considerable number of them are. Take, for instance, the country of Poland, a country behind the iron curtain, or take Czechoslovakia, which is now behind the iron curtain. We can take nearly every one of the countries behind the so-called iron curtain and find that from 85 to 90 percent of the people are opposed to communism. It is only the very small minority, which has obtained control of the government by police methods, and by forcing their will upon the great mass of the population, that belongs to the Communist class. The children of those people who are not Communists are discriminated against because they happen to be behind the iron curtain.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will permit, they are the very ones who do not get the food when it is sent into those countries.

Mr. HATCH. We cannot send food into Poland.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly not.

Mr. HATCH. But the great majority of the children of Poland are from among those who are opposed to communism.

Mr. WHERRY. And they are the very ones who do not get the food when it is sent in there. I was over there and saw the conditions.

Mr. HATCH. If I knew that they would not receive the food, I would agree with the position taken by the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator brought UNRRA into the discussion. UNRRA was mentioned.

Mr. HATCH. I did not bring it up.

Mr. WHERRY. It was brought up in the discussion. I wish to say that I should like to support the children's fund. I certainly would on the basis of the humanitarian plea which is made to us. But the argument the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is making is the very argument by reason of which the committee did not increase the fund, but reduced it. The reason why the reduction was made was because those to whom the Senator would like to give the food over there, those who are holding out against communism, will not receive the food. We cannot reach them. I was in Russian-occupied territory. I went to the city of Wiener Neustadt, 50 miles inside the Russian-occupied territory, and I saw the conditions which prevailed there. I tell the Senate that in the distribution by UNRRA those who opposed communism were being discriminated against in the matter of food that was being distributed. I saw the discrimination with my own eyes.

Mr. President, I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I supported the committee in its action. I have a great deal of sympathy for the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who in his heart wants to help the children. So do I. I also wish to endorse what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said. With all the power at my command, I endorse the statement made by the chairman of the committee, who said that if we can be assured that the people we desire to help will receive the food, we would provide it. If I were certain of it, I would vote for any appropriation the Senate might want to make.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had not intended to yield. I wanted to get through with what I had to say as quickly as possible. The hour is late. I merely wanted to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that a grave and serious mistake may be made right here and now. I will say when the word penetrates into Poland, into Czechoslovakia, and the other countries behind the iron curtain that these funds have been cut off, it may result in the making of Communists out of 85 to 90 percent of those who are this day fighting against communism as best they can, and who in the future hold the hope to overthrow the communistic governments under which they live.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico, whom I know is very sincere in what he says, that a great deal of the information which came to us formed the basis upon which we took action. The information which came to us from Czechoslovakia, from Poland, from Yugoslavia, and from other nations was that the children of those who are not in the Communist clique running the government right down to a village level, although hungry and in squalor and in desperate circumstances, did not receive the food that was sent to nourish them, while the little children of the Communists and their followers received it. That was one of the reasons why we took the action we did. I do not now know how we can help relieve that situation. The Senator was fair when he said we might or might not be making a mistake by the action we now propose to take.

Mr. HATCH. I know the Senator from New Hampshire does not want to make a mistake, and certainly if the money is going to the Communist children, whereas the children of non-Communists would be discriminated against, none of us would want to do anything that would result in such discrimination. But I am not at all sure that that is what is happening. I am not a member of the committee. I have not had the advantage of the information the committee has had. But with what little knowledge I possess of the conditions I feel that a grave mistake is being made. While there will be no yea-and-nay vote on the amendment, I personally now register my protest and disapproval of the Senate amendment, and express the hope that the House figure will remain in the bill.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Did the Senator from New Hampshire receive any evidence on the situation in Finland? I am very much concerned with Finland, because the information I have received is that the Finnish children need this help desperately. The people of Finland have been 100 percent loyal to the things we believe in. I want to be very careful that we do not overlook some of the people who are trying to make this fight, by cutting this aid too fast and too low. I have not received the latest information on the subject, but I want to raise the question with the Senator from New Hampshire with respect to Finland, so that when the conferees meet they will look into that question, so that we may not make the mistake which the Senator from New Mexico has spoken of, and which he fears might be made.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that even with the cut which the committee made, assuming it will stand, that with the money the fund is carrying over the organization will have more money to spend next year than it spent this year.

Mr. SMITH. I was told recently by a representative of the fund that they have just $4,000,000 now in the bank; that that is all they have to use.

Mr. BRIDGES. If that is what the Senator has been told, it is different from

what the committee has been told. If the information to you is true, then testimony presented to us was false.

Mr. SMITH. I have attempted to get the accurate figures, but I have not been able to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. If they falsified the records to us, then, so far as I am concerned, they will never get another cent until such time as we learn the true situation. They seem to have said to the Senator, on the one hand, that they have but $4,000,000 left, but they certified to us they have over $12,000,000. If there is such a discrepancy, then someone is committing a very grave breach of truth. I believe in dealing with people who tell the truth. If they cannot tell the truth to us, of course, we cannot have any faith in them.

Mr. President, let us clearly understand the issue. We have dished out $23,000,000,000 for foreign aid since the war ended. We have shown ourselves to be the most generous Nation on the face of the globe. We have given aid to people all over the world. We have helped hundreds of millions of people, and tens of millions of children have been fed by reason of the appropriations we have made to aid people in foreign countries. We did not cut out the children's fund altogether. We are willing to continue it. But we cannot control the United Nations. If the committee could be sure that the children of those who have freedom in their hearts, children who are hungry and cold and who live in poverty and squalor were not going to be denied, but would receive the same aid that is given to the children of Communist parents, then we would have taken a different attitude. But as it was we left the children's fund sufficient money so that next year they will have more money to spend than they did this year.

(Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All in favor will say "Aye."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has been very helpful to me in presenting facts on this matter of which I was not aware when the debate started, and I think I have two more questions to which I am going to seek to obtain an answer from the Senator and I know he will cooperate with me in giving the answers. Am I correct in my understanding that this is the only part of the bill that involves the appropriation to any United Nations organization?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; more than $70,000,000 is provided for the International Refugee Organization, which we left as budgeted, which was the exact amount requested.

Mr. MORSE. There are two appropriations then in the bill to divisions of the United Nations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. And this one affecting the children involves a cut from $60,000,000 to $20,000,000. Now I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey if it is not true that when we appropriate the $20,000,000 and assume that the $20,000,000 stands in conference the same proportion of the $20,000,000 will go supposedly to children behind the iron curtain that would go to them if we appropriate the $60,000,000. We are in no way changing the fact that we are aiding children behind the iron curtain who may be of Communist heritage except we are not giving so much money of the total program?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. I might say that the moral effect might be that the United Nations group administering the fund might tighten their regulations so that they can have stricter control and see that the true objective is reached.

Mr. MORSE. I think I have made clear to the Senator from New Hampshire that I share his views that I am not in favor of building up communism in the world, but does the Senator think that there is any danger that the proposed action on this particular item may result in the reaction throughout the world that when it comes to giving support to the United Nations this is another evidence of our retreating from cooperating with the United Nations rather than giving this particular division of the United Nations support?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator that this last year we gave so much that they could not match it. It looks as though they may not be able to match the appropriation this year.

Mr. MORSE. I am greatly impressed by the fact that apparently they are going to have more money under this appropriation this year than they had last year.

Mr. BRIDGES. Slightly more.

Mr. MORSE. I am very much concerned about the propaganda abroad in the world that we talk about supporting the United Nations only when it is favorable to us to support the United Nations, but that when we are called upon to give aid which may be of special benefit to some other nation, and not necessarily to us, then we find a spirit of noncooperation with the United Nations creeping into American policy. I am inclined to share at least a part of the view of the Senator from New Mexico, that this cut might result in further propaganda. I admit that we are going to be faced with Russian propaganda anyway, but the result may be further Russian propaganda that this is another evidence that we are not giving actual support, but only lip service to the United Nations.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. As I understand, the reduction will apply just the same among the free nations as it does among the nations behind the iron curtain, so all the children will be affected. Is this sum sufficient to carry out the matching program, or are we reducing aid to all the nations, whether they are behind the iron curtain or not?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from New Mexico overlooks one fact——

Mr. HATCH. I am merely trying to get the facts. I am not familiar with them.

Mr. BRIDGES. In this appropriation we are giving more than $5,000,000,000 for economic relief.

Mr. HATCH. Let me interrupt to say that I realize full well that that relief is of decided advantage and benefit so far as helping children is concerned.

Mr. BRIDGES. The people of the free countries who receive direct relief will probably——

Mr. HATCH. They will probably not need so much.

Mr. BRIDGES. They will be taken care of to a large degree, so the cuts will come in the countries behind the iron curtain, because we are supplementing our aid in such a generous way in other countries.

Mr. President, it seems to me that it was a reasonable attitude for us to take.

Mr. HATCH. I am still concerned that a mistake is being made, but I want to be very straightforward and say that I certainly understand that the committee intends no mistake. However, in connection with these complicated matters it is very easy to make a mistake. If we are to make a mistake, I would rather make it anywhere else than in connection with aid to children.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In fairness, and so that the RECORD may contain the statement which the committee had before it, Mr. Maurice Pate, Executive Director of the International Children's Organization, on page 144 of the hearings, in response to an inquiry by the chairman, testified as follows:

> Mr. PATE. In each country we have set up a small mission of international staff, that is, of citizens of countries other than the country in which they operate, and these missions run anywhere from one in the case of a very small country like Albania to half a dozen in a larger country like Poland.
>
> The mission is in constant contact with the government or with local agencies handling the distribution of food. In each country the staff moves about observing the distribution, seeing that the general policies of the fund are carried out.

I thank the chairman of the committee for allowing me to place that statement in the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator from Florida that I was one member of the committee who had some misgivings, along with others, about cutting the funds. On the other hand, I wish to say to the able chairman of the committee that I sat through the hearings and listened to Mr. Pate. The testimony before us showed that a number of heads of missions in countries behind the iron curtain were citizens of other countries behind the iron curtain. During the hearings I raised the point as to why, for example, a Swiss citizen rather than a citizen of Yugoslavia was not used as head of a mission.

Rather than Yugoslavia using a Pole as the head of a mission, I raised the question as to why they did not use Swiss, Swedes, or someone else, so that we could feel sure that there was not the type of discrimination to which reference has been made. I believe that if the United Nations itself will try to solve that problem, it will find the Congress in a more generous mood.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I rise to pay tribute to the American people and the American taxpayers for their generosity and their charity, and for the help which they have given to the peoples of the world since the war ended, and before. We have been the most generous people in the history of the world. I am sure that the Congress of the United States, and particularly Members of the Senate, will join me in paying great tribute to the American taxpayers for their generosity and their charity, because they have been generous and they have been charitable. They have paid the bills which the Congress has incurred through appropriations since the war ended, and during the war, and they have accepted the burden with a smile. I, for one, want to pay great tribute to the taxpayers of America. I pay tribute to their generosity and their charity. I know of no equal in the history of the world. No other peoples have been so generous. It would be appropriate for the Senate of the United States to stand for at least half a minute in silent tribute to the generosity of the American people.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I made it known earlier in the evening that I wanted to speak on the bill. I would have preferred to speak before the vote was taken on the second amendment, shortening the time; but it was said that it was desired to get the vote over so that some of the older Members could go home, because they were tired. Therefore I take it that all Senators left in the Chamber are young, hale, and hearty. However, I do not intend to abuse the privilege of the floor. I had estimated, and so stated, that I might speak for half an hour; but I shall cut that time in two, and hope to get through sooner than that.

Mr. President, I voted against the so-called Marshall plan when it was before the Senate, because I felt that it bypassed the United Nations. If I had it to do over again—and I do have in another form tonight—I would still vote against it. I intend to vote against the bill. I am opposed to the plan. I think it is becoming apparent—to me, at any rate—that this is the most colossal hoax ever perpetrated upon any people, including the American taxpayers.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] just paid tribute to the generosity of the American people. I think they are being sadly imposed upon in this so-called European Economic Cooperation Administration scheme.

Recently I purchased a copy of the New York Times. I bought it in North Carolina, so it was an early edition. I saw an article in it which astounded me. When I returned to my office I told my staff about it and they could not believe that what I told them was true. I said, "Get the New York Times and read it for yourselves." We get a copy in the office. They got the New York Times for that particular day, and looked all through it; and they said, "There is nothing like you say in the New York Times."

So I looked at it and, lo and behold, the article was not there.

So I went home and got my copy of the New York Times, and brought it down to the office and spread that page of my copy down beside the corresponding page of the office copy of the New York Times. I found that the two pages were identical, with the exception of the one article which I had quoted. That article had been left out of the other edition of the Times, and another one had been substituted.

Since then I have come to have a better understanding of why such a thing could happen, since I have learned that $10,000,000 of the money to be appropriated here is to go to the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and to the magazines Time, Life, News Week, and Reader's Digest, I believe, as their part of a reward for helping sell the Europeans, presumably, on the Marshall plan. But of course it is hard to separate the funds. When those publications get the money, they are anxious to sell the plan to anyone.

Of course, Mr. President, the American people, including the Members of the Senate, were told that the European Recovery Program was necessary because people were starving, or that it was necessary because people in Europe were in imminent danger of starving. I read an interesting item in the Wall Street publication Financial Aid. I do not know whether they were boasting about how clever the advocates of the Marshall plan were, or what their object was in printing this statement: but the article said that the State Department sent out two different groups of speakers—with many teams to each group, of course; but one group of speakers went to women's clubs and church organizations, and told them, "The Marshall plan is to feed hungry people, especially starving babies; and you good religious people, you women, certainly will support the Marshall plan, won't you?"

And of course those people said, "Yes."

Another group of speakers was sent out by the State Department to businessmen's organizations, such as chambers of commerce, manufacturers' associations, and what not. They told those businessmen, "Don't let anybody kid you at all. This Marshall plan is going to get business for American business and American products." They were that cynical in selling the Marshall plan.

Anyway, I heard those arguments.

I should have liked to vote for the Marshall plan in the first instance, if it had been channeled through the United Nations, because I want to see the United Nations work; I believe it should be strengthened; I think it is our one best hope. I was elected on the basis of supporting the United Nations, and I intend to keep that pledge.

Now I shall read the headline of an article which appeared in the New York Times; it will be sufficient to read the headline, and then I shall describe "on the cuff" the material following the headline:

> Europe feels pang—

Mr. President, a pang is a pain; it is bad; it is not good—

> Europe feels pang of—

Mr. President, what do you imagine the pang is that Europe feels? After all the sad tales we have been told about the necessity of the Marshall plan, surely the pang Europe feels must be a pang of hunger or of starvation, or perhaps it is pestilence as a result of starvation.

No; it is none of those things. The headline says:

> Europe feels pang of overproducing.

Is not that a terrible pang for our friends in Europe to suffer? We must hurry up with the Marshall plan, so as to alleviate that situation and ease that pain, that pang that is afflicting our brethren across the ocean.

The article following the headline states that in Holland food is being destroyed; that in many parts of Europe production is being curtailed because in many lines they have produced more than they can sell.

To substantiate that, I shall quote from the United States News and World Report for May 14. This is a publication aimed at businessmen. In speaking about Europe, it says:

> Surpluses are beginning to show here and there.

Mr. President, the reference is to Europe, of course.

> Surpluses are beginning to show here and there. Dutch vegetables, Italian fruits, German textiles, are examples. These things are spoiling or sitting in warehouses. It is not that they are not needed by neighboring countries. At the bottom, it is money trouble that is blocking trade.

Imagine, Mr. President! Food spoiling in warehouses in Holland; Italian fruit spoiling—fruit that is needed by everyone to maintain health, and that is needed especially by children. Of course, I imagine that in Italy they raise a good many oranges. But that fruit is spoiling because people do not have little pieces of paper with certain figures and pictures on it, possibly. Italy, with the lowest standard of living in Europe, is destroying food; and even in Germany, textiles are piling up in the warehouses, unused.

Mr. President, in view of this information, I can come to no other conclusion than that the Marshall plan is a hoax. I can see reasons for it, other than feeding hungry people. It is evident that is not the reason. If all the people of Europe lack is money with which to buy their own products, it strikes me as rather foolish that we should have to send them money with which to buy their own products. The New York Times and the United States News and World Report say their products are spoiling.

Here is something that may give us a clue as to what the Marshall plan is really for. I read from the New York Times of May 14:

Pressure is urged on Latin-America. Banker wants ECA—

That is the Economic Cooperation Administration—

buy plan used to end Argentine trade bars and spur Brazil payments.

In other words, you bribe them with Marshall plan funds to lower their trade bars so our monopolists can grow richer; and in Brazil they have already bought stuff they cannot pay for, so we give them some Marshall plan money to pay our monopolists for stuff they have sold on credit and cannot collect for.

Mr. President, it seems to me that in the case of Marshall-plan funds, so far as I can find out, the object is to enable our cartelists and our monopolists to gain control of the economic life of foreign nations with these bribes to corrupt politicians, enabling our businessmen to infiltrate and get control of foreign business.

Of course, we are sending billions of dollars' worth of our products abroad. It may be only a coincidence that makes things here at home scarce and keeps prices high in this country. That may be only a coincidence, although the Marshall plan was conceived and perpetrated on the American people, it happens, at a time when we were just about to get over the hump of production, here at home, and be able to buy an automobile or a Frigidaire, or whatever we might happen to want, at a respectable price. But along came the Marshall plan and a big armament program to keep things scarce again.

So we have the Marshall plan going through the Senate at a very late hour at night, when one is hesitant to discuss it at any length. There are a great many things I should like to say about it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my good friend from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder if the Senator saw the article in the Times-Herald a few days ago, saying that the New York Times was getting nearly a million dollars out of the amendment on page 5, line 2.

Mr. TAYLOR. I read that article, not in the Herald Tribune. I read it some place, though, about the bonus being paid to the newspapers and magazines.

Mr. LANGER. The Times-Herald was getting $850,000, according to that article; is not that correct?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Times-Herald in Washington?

Mr. LANGER. No. I mean the Herald Tribune of New York.

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, yes, yes.

Mr. LANGER. And Fortune magazine, and Life?

Mr. TAYLOR. Time.

Mr. LANGER. And Time?

Mr. TAYLOR. And the New York Times.

Mr. LANGER. I mean Time magazine.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; Time magazine and the newspaper, the New York Times.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator remember whether in that list any single newspaper opposed to the Marshall plan received one single dollar?

Mr. TAYLOR. No. no; no newspaper opposed to the Marshall plan got anything. In fact, the Chicago Tribune, which was opposed to the Marshall plan, was very much upset over the whole thing.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not a fact also that the various magazines I have mentioned time and time again have carried beautiful photographs of some of the leading Members of this distinguished body?

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, anybody who has been for the Marshall plan could get plenty of space in those publications.

Mr. LANGER. I understand some of that money is going to the movie magnates.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I guess they need the movies to help them sell the plan. They need every means of propaganda to sell a scheme like this. There is no doubt about it at all.

Mr. LANGER. Under the amendment they have reduced it from $15,000,000 to $10,000,000, I understand.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is to make the people feel good and think how much they have saved.

Mr. LANGER. I take it that is covered by line 2 of the amendment on page 5, which says, "That guaranties of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media provided under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 shall not exceed $10,000,000 in the first year."

Mr. TAYLOR. That is a very clever technique. First, they are to be given $15,000,000; then, when it is cut down to $10,000,000, the people are duly grateful and very happy that it only costs them $10,000,000 to learn all about the Marshall plan. Of course, Mr. President, it is difficult for the people to find out about these things because of this subsidy to the press, which has pulled the wool over the eyes of the American people. So we have the sorry prospect of using the taxpayers' money also to guarantee the profits of American industry.

Here is another little item from the United States News and World Report, "How to Earn Dollars Abroad," is the title of it. It says, "Guarantees of payment in U. S. currency." This is from the United States News and World Report of May 14 again. The heading on the article says, "Money invested in Europe by private investors is to get some Government protection. Profits, if any, will be paid in dollars."

There is the answer to the Marshall plan. Our businessmen are muscling in on the folks over in Europe, taking over; but they cannot get their profits out. Marks, lire, and francs are no good to them, so they figure out a Marshall plan, and now the taxpayers are going to be taxed to guarantee the profits in dollars to our businessmen over there in those countries. The article goes on to say, "The idea is to lessen the risk of doing business abroad and encourage new enterprises." Listen to this next line: "European recovery, too, will be helped." That is the whole thing they worry about—"European recovery, too, will be helped." That is wonderful. Hallelujah?

Mr. President, I could go on and talk all night about this thing and never say the same thing twice.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand the bill, then, we are appropriating $20,000,000 to feed all the hungry children in this world; then we are appropriating half as much for the New York Times, the New York Herald, Fortune magazine, Newsweek, and Time magazine.

Mr. TAYLOR. Time and Life.

Mr. LANGER. And Life, and a few movie institutions.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Is that right?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, of course, they got The Iron Curtain out of that money given to the movies, and they will get more. I do not believe the people who are foisting these measures on the American people are generally worried about the Communist threat; they are just stirring it up all the time so they can get away with these great appropriations for armament profits, for the Marshall plan to guarantee their profits abroad, and to pay the newspapers and magazines for selling the people on the idea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, line 17.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are asked for.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator insist upon a quorum call?

Mr. LANGER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Millikin
Baldwin	Hatch	Moore
Ball	Hawkes	Morse
Barkley	Hayden	Murray
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bricker	Hill	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Butler	Ives	Revercomb
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kem	Smith
Chavez	Kilgore	Sparkman
Connally	Knowland	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Stewart
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McClellan	Thye
Ecton	McFarland	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Umstead
Feazel	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
Green	Maybank	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, line 17. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Assistance to Greece and Turkey," on page 5, line 24, after the numerals "1949", to strike out "$200,000,000" and insert "$250,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Assistance to China," on page 6, line 21, after the word "until", to strike out "June 30, 1949" and insert "April 2, 1949"; in line 25, after the word "aircraft", to insert "deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail (39 U. S. C. 321 (d));"; on page 7, line 7, after the word "exchange", to strike out "$400,000,000, of which not to exceed $1,200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses" and insert "$460,000,000, of which $125,000,000 shall be available exclusively as provided in subsection 404 (b) of said act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 11, after the word "Act", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That expenditures hereunder shall be made and administered in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives and the limitations provided in the Act for Assistance to Greece and Turkey (Public Law 75, 80th Cong.), as amended and supplemented by the Greek-Turkish Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Military Establishment—Department of the Army—Civil Functions—Government and Relief in Occupied Areas," on page 8, line 21, after the word "Army", to strike out "such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished; $1,250,000,000" and insert "such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; $1,325,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 21, after the word "Congress", to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That expenditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 1, after the numerals "1948", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That funds appropriated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termination of occupation by the United States, of any area for which such funds are made available, may be expended by the President for the procurement of such commodities and technical services, and commodities procured from funds herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area prior to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the maintenance of the political and economic stability of such areas: *Provided*, That before any such assistance is made available, an agreement shall be entered into between the United States and the recognized government or authority with respect to such area containing such undertakings by such government or authority as the President may determine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of such assistance in furtherance of such purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 18, after the word "purposes", to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That such agreement shall, where applicable, include requirements and undertakings corresponding to the requirements and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and 7 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 23, after the word "Congress", to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That funds appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable, and under such rules and regulations as prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, to pay ocean transportation charges from United States ports, including Territorial ports, to ports in Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus for the movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals residing in such countries.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 7, after the word "countries", to insert the following proviso:

Provided further, That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the Secretary of the Army shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to Japan, Korea, or the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 14, after the word "transportation", to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That service during the fiscal year 1949 of an individual rendered to the Department of the Army under this appropriation as an expert, consultant, or technician shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), of section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99), or of section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State—International activities," on page 12, line 19, after the word "contribution", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for contribution to the International Refugee Organization until such time as there are effected agreements providing for a caloric diet for the occupants of refugee camps that is no higher than that prevailing in the country in which such camps are located.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—General provisions," on page 13, line 10, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947," and in line 24, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 16, to strike out:

SEC. 202. No funds made available under the authority of this act shall be used for the purchase of any commodities (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498), as amended), at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase: *Provided*, That no funds available under this act shall be used for the purchase of wool other than from existing stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless or until such stocks are exhausted.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 202. None of the funds available under this act shall be used for the purchase of wool other than from existing stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless or until such stocks are exhausted.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 6, to strike out section 203, as follows:

SEC. 203. Not more than $50,000,000 of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the purchase of farm machinery, including farm tractors.

And in lieu thereof to insert a new section 203, as follows:

SEC. 203. No part of of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to purchase farm machinery in the United States in an amount which will bring the total purchases of such machinery during fiscal year 1949, in the United States, by or for the benefit of the countries participating in the European recovery program, to more than $75,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 15, to strike out section 204, as follows:

SEC. 204. Whenever an export license for a commodity, the production or shipment of which to a nonparticipating country was contracted for in good faith prior to March

1, 1948, is denied and cannot be obtained under section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, the Administrator shall provide for the procurement of such commodity to transfer to a participating country in accordance with the requirements of such country, at not less than the contract price of such commodity to the producer or exporter, as the case may be, including any cost incurred in converting the commodity to meet the requirements of the participating country.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 2, to strike out section 205, as follows:

SEC. 205. Not less than 50 percent of all nitrates or nitrogenous fertilizer material, including anhydrous ammonia, obtained for participating countries by the Economic Cooperation Administration under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 with funds provided herein shall come from production of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Army is hereby authorized to produce and sell such nitrogenous fertilizer materials, including anhydrous ammonia, to fill such 50 percent of such export requirements.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 12, to insert:

SEC. 204. Not less than 50 percent of the United States export requirements of nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) for nonoccupied areas shall come from production of plants operated by or for the Department of the Army. The Department of the Army is hereby authorized to produce and sell, in addition to its production for occupied areas, such nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) required for United States exports to nonoccupied areas and to credit the proceeds of such export sales to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 24, to change the section number from "206" to "205."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there is an article in yesterday morning's newspaper which expresses very well the thought which I have before expressed, particularly regarding the authorization of this legislation. I want to read one paragraph of the article in the nature of a summary of what I think is the truth about the program. This is an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann. I read:

> The failure of the European governments and of the State Department to promote the political unity of Europe and to uphold the authority of the United Nations has sapped the only foundation on which sustained American support of the recovery program could rest. No doubt it required high statesmanship to put the program on a constructive foundation. It was much easier to put it across as a measure of the cold war, to depend on the fear of communism rather than on faith in a new democratic order.

I realize that it is rather late in the discussion of this question again to refer to the subject, but I merely want to reiterate my belief that this program has been and is continuing to be restricted too closely to the economic aspect, and that the political aspect, particularly the political unity of Europe, has been neglected. I doubt very seriously, unless something is done along that line, that it will be successful.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the entire article in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN EXPECTATIONS

(By Walter Lippmann)

"Until then I beg of you," said Senator VANDENBERG, "that you give ECA a fair chance." Until when? Until "next January when we shall know whereof we speak. When the second annual appropriation impends, we shall know what kind of job Administrator Hoffman and his staff are doing. We shall know to what extent self-help and mutual cooperation are meeting our expectations."

Though these words were part of Senator VANDENBERG's appeal to Congress to honor a solemn commitment, they carry with them an urgent warning to the leading governments of Europe and also to the President and the Department of State. It is a warning that the continuation of ECA is not assured by the original authorization, nor will it be if the Martin-Taber raid is repulsed. It is notice that "a general overhaul," as Mr. VANDENBERG put it—that is to say a general reconsideration of the basic policy—will be undertaken by the next Administration and the next Congress. It will be undertaken not merely by the enemies of ECA but by its strongest supporters,—who will then "know to what extent self-help and mutual cooperation are meeting our expectations."

No doubt 6 months—for that is what it comes to—will seem like an exceedingly short time in which to prove that ECA should be continued. But if the European governments, and particularly the British and French, make a serious effort to understand the real attitude of this country, they will know what kind of action on their part will in fact meet American "expectation."

They will find, I believe, that the key to the mystery is that while the European recovery program has been "justified" by a torrent of statistics, in fact this extraordinary enterprise, unique in the history of the world, will have to be justified by intangible, uneconomic, political and moral results. The American people hope, of course, that production will rise, that trade will increase, that inflation will be mastered, and that the balance of payments will be righted. But what they are really looking for are signs which they can take seriously that a new Europe is in the making.

It is because signs of that kind are lacking that even the first appropriation for ECA is in danger. For the Martin-Taber attack reflected not so much the strength of the opposition to the recovery program as it did the lack of strong conviction on the part of its supporters. They were absent from the House in large numbers, and those who were present did not fight very effectively. Why? Because, so it seems to me, the governments in Europe and the State Department here have deflated the hopes of the people. In the past few months they have seen "western union" degenerate into little more than an impotent military alliance. They have seen the United Nations maltreated. They have seen the Labor government cold shoulder the movement for European union. They have seen their own government invite the Russians to talk, and then unable to think of anything to say.

As a result, if they have not become isolationists, they are certainly disillusioned at the prospect of huge subsidies, huge armaments, and the draft, all at the expense of housing, health, education, and internal development, with no progress toward a new and better international order.

The failure of the European goveraments and of the State Department to promote the political unity of Europe and to uphold the authority of the United Nations has sapped the only foundation on which sustained American support of the recovery program could rest. No doubt it required high statesmanship to put the program on a constructive foundation. It was much easier to put it across as a measure of the cold war, to depend on the fear of communism rather than on faith in a new democratic order.

But fear will not sustain a continuing effect. It will work for a few emergencies but not for 4 years. It is good for a sprint but not for a long run. The Russians, once they are bright enough to realize that we are depending on their provocations to generate the steam to carry on, have only to stop being quite so irritating in order to reduce the pressure. Then, no longer frightened but without a sustaining faith in place of their fears, the people's interest languishes. It is languishing now. That is where MARTIN and TABER saw their opportunity.

These are the imponderables, I think, which men like Attlee, Cripps, and Bevin, Schumann, Rene Mayer, and Bidault will do well to take very seriously if—6 months hence when the ECA must undergo a more crucial test than the MARTIN-TABER affair—they intend to meet what Senator VANDENBERG called American "expectations" about the extent of self-help and mutual cooperation in Europe.

It will not be good enough for them to complain about the uncertainty of American public opinion. If they are fair about it, and also wise, they will recognize that what the American public is being asked to do is something which no people has ever before been asked to do, and that, therefore, this altogether unprecedented enterprise can be sustained only if they contribute to it not merely sweat and austerity but also audacity and faith.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, have all the amendments been acted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All but one. The clerk will state the last amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 3, to change the section number from "207" to "206."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is now open to further amendment.

The Chair agreed to recognize the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I had intended to discuss this bill at considerable length. For rather obvious reasons I shall not do so. I do want to say, however, that I believe this scheme to effectuate European recovery by the appropriation of this very large sum of money may undermine the American economy and may well make our Nation as vulnerable to communism as are those we are seeking to aid.

Such a plan entails the risk of an unparalleled price debacle at home. Already the American housewife is beginning to feel the inflationary effects of the artificial foreign demand created by our gifts of dollars. Only a few days ago we read headlines telling of record high meat prices. A Missourian recently sent me a telegram complaining of the rising cotton prices, particularly as they affected the cost of his cotton shirts. I went to the Department of Agriculture and was informed there that the upsurge in the cotton market is due in no small part to the placing of orders by foreign purchasing agents to be filled when the

$511,000,000 in the Marshall plan funds for the purchase of cotton is forthcoming for the use of their respective foreign governments.

Every ton of steel and every barrel of oil we send abroad without the benefit that comes from ordinary foreign trade weakens by that much our own national economy. The United States simply does not have an inexhaustible supply of resources. Although this vast dumping operation may serve to prolong the Truman artificial prosperity, anyone who supports this plan upon that theory, or for such a reason is living in a fool's paradise.

In my judgment, the plan we are about to implement by this gigantic appropriation poses a grave threat to our traditional capitalist economy. Heavy tax rates necessitated in no small part by heavy spending abroad, combined with the rise in consumer price levels, have drastically reduced the savings of our middle-income group available for capital accumulation. There is real danger that there will not be sufficient accumulated savings and invested capital to supply the needs for machinery and tools in our industry of the future.

Mr. President, I stated before my belief that the welfare of the people of the United States, and not the people in foreign lands across the seas, should be the first concern of the American Congress.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Am I correct in understanding the Senator's trend of thinking in this matter to be that if these large appropriations are used for the purchase of goods in this country, the effect is further inflation?

Mr. KEM. I do not see how it could be otherwise. We are already seeing the effects, and the process has just begun, in my humble opinion.

Mr. MALONE. Am I to understand further, then, that the making of these huge loans and the consequent siphoning off of incomes and the increases in the wages of workers, which was done first, according to Mr. Roosevelt and others of the administration for the past 10 years, with the announced purpose of preventing inflation, prevents, in the Senator's opinion, the proper accumulation of venture capital for investment?

Mr. KEM. Precisely so. I think evidence of that is already available.

Mr. President, I should like to correct the Senator from Nevada in one respect. I prefer to refer to these remittances to foreign countries, not as loans, but as gifts or grants. I do not see how anyone who reviews our experience of the past 20 years in distributing our wealth around the world can regard these remittances otherwise than outright gifts and grants. I think we are living in a fool's paradise if we call them anything else.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know how much of the money is going for tobacco?

Mr. KEM. I shall get to that in a very few minutes. It is a very surprisingly large amount.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. Why does the Senator think that there is not an inexhaustible supply of funds in the United States so that we can continue this course forever?

Mr. KEM. I think the figures we have indicate the answer, and I believe there is already evidence of the supply of funds and goods being drained away.

Mr. HAWKES. Does not the Senator think we are acting in everything we are doing in connection with those great gifts, as though there were no bottom to the barrel?

Mr. KEM. Exactly so.

Mr. HAWKES. And does not the Senator realize that in every bit of this money we are giving, in excess of that which is necessary to keep people from starving, we are taking a chance of about 10 to 1 of making a contribution to communism, because when the barrel bottom is reached, so that we can no longer buy friendship, I say that if communism is going to spread in Europe, it will spread then, and the Communists will take over all the contributions we have made and all the gifts we have given.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator. I think that was very aptly said.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Can the Senator tell me whether he knows when the European recovery program got the "new look?" It is now the "European Cooperation Administration."

Mr. KEM. I think it was originally known as the Truman plan. Then it became the Marshall plan. Then it became the European recovery plan, and I think it now has the "new look," to which the Senator from Indiana has referred, and I believe it is called the "Economic cooperation plan".

Mr. JENNER. Is it the Senator's understanding that Europe has already made sufficient recovery so that the program does not need to be called a recovery program?

Mr. KEM. I cannot advise the Senator why the frequent change in name.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator was here the other day when we passed the displaced persons bill, was he not?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. JENNER. When we passed the European recovery program, as I understood the proposal—and I believe the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made the address outlining it—he explained to me and the other Members of the Senate that the main purpose of the European recovery program was to help the European people get up off their knees so that we would not have to go on taking care of them forever. Is not that correct?

Mr. KEM. I believe it was something along that line.

Mr. JENNER. It was said that what they needed most was production, but under the displaced persons program, as I understand it, 200,000 are to be permitted to come into the United States, and of the 200,000, 50 percent are to be agricultural workers, and the remaining 50 percent are to be skilled mechanics and skilled technicians. So, following the theory that the idea was to have Europe get on its feet so that it could help itself, what business have we today permitting 200,000 of their skilled workmen to come to America? Why should we send them our money and our material wealth, and then bring over 200,000 skilled workmen from Europe, when they are needed there? Can the Senator explain that to me?

Mr. KEM. Perhaps some other Senator can explain it. I cannot.

Mr. JENNER. Can anyone explain it to me? In the absence of response, I will sit down. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I appreciate the very pertinent suggestion the Senator from Indiana has made, and I thank him for it.

I pointed out on a previous occasion my belief that emotional interest exhibited in some quarters today in favor of distributing around the world the accumulated wealth of the people of this country, accumulated by many generations of thrifty and frugal-minded people, appears to be one of those strange emotional epidemics or moral manias which have excited the minds of men from time to time at many stages in the world's history. For example, there were the children's crusade of the Middle Ages, the South Sea bubble, the tulip craze, the witchcraft persecutions in Europe and America.

Mr. President, I shall be as brief as I can, and merely sketch the points I have in mind.

I wish to say that tonight we are confronted with the question of providing billions of dollars called for by a seemingly endless series of foreign adventures. Tonight we are confronted face to face with a proposition that 2 and 2 make 4 and always have.

Those who oppose the authorization of these plans are, of course, faced with a difficult decision. We can either vote to provide the funds asked for by the Administration and allow these experiments to run their course, a course which some of us believe to be perilous to the welfare and happiness of our people, or we can make an effort to salvage as much of the taxpayers' money as possible by cutting down as much as we can the pouring out of money of American taxpayers in these foreign schemes.

I must admit, Mr. President, that I gave serious consideration to offering no objection, either by word or vote, to allowing Mr. Truman and Mr. Marshall to carry out what may perhaps prove to be a last futile fling at global spending. However, I could not bring myself to evade the responsibility I feel to the people of my State, just as I could not bring myself to fail to raise my voice tonight. I cannot help but remember the solemn pledge I made to the people of my State in the last election to make every effort to reduce governmental expenditures wherever possible. Furthermore, I cannot shirk my duty to the American people to take every step I can, as futile as it

may be, to protect and preserve our American institutions, which have given us the highest standard of living the world has ever seen.

Now we are told, Mr. President, there is nothing to justify a reduction in appropriations for foreign aid in 1948. Economic Cooperative Administrator Hoffman stated, according to the press, in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee that less money means less recovery. The Secretary of State characterized the action of the House in reducing these funds as changing the picture from a calculated risk of success to a calculated risk of failure.

I should say that there not only can but should be a sharp reduction for 1948, and here are some of the reasons. In the first place, Mr. President, the House of Representatives was guilty of no hasty and ill-considered action. In the second place, the House of Representatives is the traditional source of decision on matters of appropriations. I shall not, as I intended to do, sketch the history of that situation, but I should like to quote the word of a man whom I hope is still honored in America. A grand committee of the constitutional convention recommended that "all bills for raising or appropriating money shall originate in the first branch of the Legislature, and shall not be altered or amended by the second branch."

A member of that committee was Dr. Benjamin Franklin. He was asked what purpose was intended to be served by the restrictions on the second branch. He remarked that it was always of importance that the people should know who had disposed of their money and how it has been disposed of. "It was a maxim," said he, "that those who feel, can best judge."

So it would seem to me to be wise to give very careful consideration and attention to the recommendations of the branch of Congress which must answer to the people this year for what is being done in connection with this appropriation. Certainly it was the intention of the founding fathers that we should do so.

In the second place, foreign aid is no substitute for national defense. During the hearings held before the Foreign Relations Committee Secretary of the Army Royall said:

> Without such effort—
>
> That is, the passage of the pending bill—
>
> the Army budget and the Army itself should be increased.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has asked me something about tobacco. I should like to review very briefly, so the people may know just what is being done in that connection in the appropriation bill. According to the latest estimates available $138,000,000 of the Marshall plan funds would be utilized for the purchase of tobacco during the first 15 months of the program. I suppose under the Senate amendments that amount will apply to the first 12 months of the program. Is that correct, I will ask the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LANGER. Let me say, Mr. President, I understand it is $299,000,000. In other words, we give $20,000,000 to feed all the children in the world, and 10 times as much for tobacco.

Mr. KEM. The figure I have received is $138,000,000. My authority is the United States News.

Mr. LANGER. I have the figures; $299,000,000——

Mr. KEM. For tobacco alone?

Mr. LANGER. That is the total for tobacco alone, of which we supply $110,200,000.

Mr. KEM. I am frank to say, Mr. President, the situation is much worse than I had understood. In other words, I understand that this enormous sum of money, more than $200,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money, will be used to send gifts of tobacco abroad to countries whose people are said to be starving, and whose economic recovery is at stake. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if that is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is about correct respecting the amount of tobacco that is being sent abroad.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if $35,000,000 is the amount provided for coffee to be distributed free of charge among the participating nations.

Mr. BRIDGES. One hundred and eighteen million three hundred thousand dollars worth of coffee will move from the Western Hemisphere, of which amount we will pay $26,100,000.

Mr. KEM. Our portion of the gift is $26,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, plus.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who pays for the difference between $118,000,000 and $26,000,000?

Mr. BRIDGES. Forty-four million eight hundred thousand dollars will be paid out of their own dollar earnings or from some other source. Sixteen million two hundred thousand dollars is paid out of loans and credits which they receive from some other sources. Twenty-six million one hundred thousand dollars is what we pay for.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, we loan them other moneys, but in reality do not we pay for it?

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot tell the Senator where it comes from. It is listed in the justification as loans and credits from other sources.

Mr. KEM. When this plan was first suggested, representatives of the tobacco industry came to my office and suggested that they had a plan to send a large amount of tobacco abroad, and they suggested that, Missouri being a tobacco-producing State, I should be interested in the project. I inquired who was to pay for the tobacco. I was told that under the plan it would be paid for by the United States Government. I asked what was to be done with the tobacco, and was told it was to be given to the starving peoples of the world.

Mr. President, it seemed to me when that proposition was presented by the representatives of the tobacco interests that it was too preposterous even to be considered seriously by the Congress of the United States. Yet, Mr. President, that is exactly what is now about to be done.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know how much Coca-Cola we are going to send abroad?

Mr. KEM. I do not have the figures on that. Perhaps the Senator from New Hampshire could give them.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will answer that question. We export about $398,000 of sweetened sirups to participating countries, but it is not my understanding that that comes directly out of these funds. It is out of some other exchange or dollar credits.

Mr. KEM. But the American Treasury pays for it in the end, does it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. They have other dollar earnings which are used for that particular purpose.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if there is not this difference between tobacco and coffee: When tobacco is given away, something comes back to the American producer; when coffee is given away, the proceeds go to South America, Java, or some other place in the world.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEM. So it is a total loss to the American economy.

As I understand, the only reply which has come from the Administration with respect to these items is this: They say simply that the programs have been scaled down to rock bottom, and that we must not appropriate a penny less.

Mr. President, there is another reason, it seems to me, why we should pause and consider what we are doing, and that is that a large part of the funds we are about to grant will be granted to participating countries—that is, the 16 countries of western Europe—to meet obligations to the United States. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, in his testimony before the House Appropriations Committee on May 25, stated:

> In arriving at the estimates of aid requirements the National Advisory Council assumed that the countries participating would be required to use their present and future exchange income to meet their existing financial obligations falling due to the United States and third countries, including both obligations to governments and to private citizens.

What this means, as I understand, is that in the last analysis the American taxpayer is being asked to give money to France, Britain, and other participating countries in order that those countries may continue to pay interest to us, or perhaps installments on debts. In other words, we are making gifts of money to our debtor nations in order that they may pay us what they owe us. What I should like to ask is this: How in the name of common sense, if we start that kind of business, are we ever going to collect any debt anywhere in all the world?

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. What reason has the Senator for thinking that they are going to pay us anything—interest on our debts or anything else? I had not heard that they were going to do that.

Mr. KEM. I do not think they are. I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that the reason why I am so particularly concerned about this situation is that in my judgment we are creating a precedent that will make it impossible for our children and our children's children to carry on foreign trade with other nations of the world, because those nations will have acquired the idea that they do not have to pay America, that America will give them the money to settle the debt.

Mr. HAWKES. I am thoroughly in agreement with the Senator. I should like to remark that I have never in my life seen anyone who was able to buy a friend and keep that friend after his funds were exhausted so that he could not continue buying the friend. I wish I could throw this off as lightly as do some other Senators. I do not believe that we can get out of this thing when we want to do so. When we start a program such as this, it is like taking on one's back a poor relative who is perfectly able to do things for himself ultimately, but who will not do them because he has found an easy place. The greatest contribution any man can make in Christianity is to teach people to take care of themselves, to endure hardships, and solve their own problems. So long as they find that we will solve their problems for them we shall be destroying the initiative which is the only hope for the redemption of the world.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator. As the Senator knows, one reason why I am so concerned about this situation is that it puts the Senate in the position of showing a disregard for the realistic approach undertaken by our brethren at the other end of the Capitol. Let me read a short excerpt from the House committee report on this appropriation bill. I ask my colleagues if this language does not indicate an effort to approach the matter in an intelligent, common-sense American way.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I have tried very hard to find out whether the American people—the ordinary man and woman—understand in the slightest degree that we now have on our backs a national debt of $253,000,000,000, and whether they comprehend what that means. I find that there is a total disregard of it on the part of the American people. If I am wrong I should like to have some Senator correct me, but in my judgment there is a failure on the part of the American people to recognize the fact that the national debt is a mortgage on every industry, every business, every piece of property which every citizen of the United States owns, because of the right to tax and the power of taxation. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. KEM. I agree absolutely. I was very much impressed by the statement in the address of the Senator from New Jersey in which he pointed out that the debt of the American people today is greater than the combined debt of all the nations to which we are giving away our property and our sustenance.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. This is the language of the House committee:

> It would seem that the administration is not only disregarding the basic principles of sound business practices, but also is in a sense undermining the character of international agreements. Anyone with the slightest experience in business realizes that when one owes a debt and is not able to pay it, the way to maintain his morale is to extend the time for the payment of his debt, rather than directly or indirectly to pay the debt for him. If you give him the funds with which to pay the debt, he will expect the same treatment every time he owes any money, and nothing but complete demoralization may result.

Mr. President, I think we ought to stop and consider whether we are undermining the whole basis of international trade throughout the world for generations to come, in what we are doing in a few hours tonight.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator realizes that God has been pretty kind to the American people throughout the entire tragedy of the past few years.

Mr. KEM. God has been kind, and we are now in a period of inflation.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator realizes that God has given us crops year after year. He has given us the material with which we have done these charitable things in feeding the world—with which I am in perfect harmony. I am in perfect agreement that we should have done the things we did to prevent starvation. But the Senator must realize that in time the American people will wake up and find out what this debt means, and what their situation is. They will realize that they will be accused of bad faith at the time when they find themselves unable to proceed further along the path on which we have started. That is the time when we are going to wake up.

Mr. KEM. When the Senator and I were young fellows we used to call it "the cool, gray dawn of the morning after."

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator realizes that this is not a pleasant thing which he and I as Senators are doing. It would be much more pleasant to say, "Come on in, boys, the water is fine"—and go on with this great program, rather than to think of the American people, and, I say to the Senator from Missouri, think of the people of the world, because we have to reestablish their faith in themselves and their initiative if we expect them to get on their feet again and stay on their feet.

Mr. KEM. Not only the people alive in the world today, but generations yet unborn. Does the Senator from New Jersey agree with me that what we are about to do may affect our children and our children's children?

Mr. HAWKES. I could not agree with the Senator more.

I find that those who stop, look, and listen, and look down the pathway of cause and effect, often are not understood.

Benjamin Franklin said a very wonderful thing in 1772:

> Often those who serve in public office are misunderstood, and what they are doing is not appreciated. But that should not keep them from persevering in trying to do the right thing for the people, in the hope that some day the people will understand that their minds were right and their hearts were right, and will understand what they were trying to do.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have been talking about giving the British, the French, and the other nations of the world money with which to pay their debts to us. But there is another consideration, and that is that we are giving the British money with which to pay the Argentine and the people of other creditor nations throughout the world. If there is any reason in the world why we should put the British in funds so that they can pay their debts to the bankers and entrepreneurs of the Argentine, so far as I know it has not yet been suggested in this discussion. Yet, reason or no reason, that is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. President, I had intended to speak at considerable length; but I shall bring to a close what I have to say.

I have set forth a few reasons why in my judgment the appropriations for this program should be cut, or the reductions should be held to coincide with the recommendations of the House of Representatives, or perhaps cut to an even greater extent. It is imperative that at this time the Congress take every possible step to safeguard our remaining national resources and preserve our domestic economy.

If we are to remain one of the last democratic strongholds in all the world, we must eliminate the grapeshot scattering of American commodities around the world, with no return.

Tom Paine once spoke of three classes of men. Of the third class, he said:

> A certain set of moderate men who think better of the European world than it deserves, and this last class by an ill-judged deliberation will be the cause of more calamities to this continent than all the other three.

Mr. President, applying that language to the situation today, I wish to say that I hope Tom Paine was not a prophet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have discussed with the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] an amendment to be added in line 23 on page 16; and the Senator from New Hampshire is going to accept the amendment. He desires to have the record show a sentence or two of intent, because the purpose of this amendment is to make certain at long last that we are going to take care of our domestic needs for anhydrous ammonia necessary to keep certain fertilizer plants in this country in operation, in order to supply American farmers with the fertilizer they need.

Therefore, I offer the amendment, with the understanding that the language can be perfected in conference, in order to carry out the intent I have enunciated, which is to see to it that the Army must take out from foreign allotments a small quantity of anhydrous ammonia—in the neighborhood of from 3 percent to 5 percent—that is to say keep for domestic use from 3 percent to 5 percent of the amount now being exported—or, in other words, whatever is needed to keep these plants in operation.

So on page 16, line 23, after the word "Treasury", I offer this amendment:

Provided, That the Administrator and the Secretary of the Army shall adjust the export allotments of fertilizer materials and compounds herein provided, including anhydrous ammonia, by taking into account domestic needs of anyhdrous ammonia for the manufacture of fertilizer, to the end of supplying domestic fertilizer plants with that quantity of anhydrous ammonia necessary to meet domestic fertilizer needs.

Mr. BRIDGES. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

During the call of the roll,

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that the calling of the yeas and nays had begun, and the Senator from Vermont had voted, when his name was called, before the suggestion of the absence of a quorum was made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina was on his feet and was addressing the Chair before the Senator from Vermont had answered to his name. The Chair apologizes to the Senator from South Carolina and to the Senator from Vermont.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Millikin
Baldwin	Hayden	Morse
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Murray
Brewster	Hoey	O'Conor
Bricker	Holland	O'Daniel
Bridges	Ives	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Jenner	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kem	Saltonstall
Cooper	Kilgore	Smith
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Lodge	Stewart
Ecton	Lucas	Taft
Ellender	McCarthy	Taylor
Feazel	McClellan	Thye
Ferguson	McFarland	Tydings
Flanders	McMahon	Umstead
Fulbright	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Green	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hatch	Maybank	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Navada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—60

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Barkley	Hayden	O'Conor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Ives	Russell
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Smith
Cooper	Knowland	Sparkman
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Donnell	Lucas	Stewart
Dworshak	McCarthy	Taft
Ecton	McClellan	Thye
Ellender	McFarland	Tydings
Feazel	McMahon	Umstead
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Young

NAYS—9

Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Malone
Hawkes	Kem	O'Daniel
Jenner	Langer	Taylor

NOT VOTING—27

Ball	George	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Hill	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Butler	McGrath	Tobey
Byrd	McKellar	Wagner
Capper	Moore	Watkins
Chavez	Myers	White
Downey	Reed	Williams
Eastland	Revercomb	Wilson

So the bill (H. R. 6801) was passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. REED, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 3566, to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3566) to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 5 of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the below quoted language appearing in lines 9 to 20:

"If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or if a case is reported less than 90 days prior to the close of the session, then during the next session of the Congress, the Congress passes a resolution stating in substance that it favors the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or if a case is reported less than 90 days prior to the close of the session, then during the next session of the Congress, the Congress does not pass such a resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law."

And insert in lieu thereof the below quoted language:

"If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it favors the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. If prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress does not pass such a concurrent resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FRANK FELLOWS,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
EMANUEL CELLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Claude G. Bowers, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Chile, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States in the Economic Commission for Latin America established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations February 25, 1948;

J. Klahr Huddle, of Ohio, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Burma, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States on the Kashmir Commission of the Security Council of the United Nations;

William E. DeCourcy, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Haiti;

Harold H. Tittmann, Jr., of Missouri, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Haiti, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Peru;

William C. Burdett, Jr., of Georgia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul;

Charles E. Bohlen, of Massachusetts, and sundry other persons for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States;

John P. Gardiner, of the District of Columbia, and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers and secretaries in the diplomatic service;

Leo J. Callanan, of Massachusetts, and several persons for appointment in the Foreign Service;

Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, and sundry other persons for appointment in the diplomatice service; and

Richard M. Connell, of Missouri, and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers and secretaries in the diplomatic service.

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1948;

Henry W. Hemple, and sundry other officers to be captains, commanders, lieutenant commanders, and lieutenants in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

Arthur E. Mueller and sundry other officers for appointment in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Henry W. Kassel, and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Lee C. Watkins, and sundry other candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES ALTERNATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry J. Tasca to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Claude P. Stephens to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph J. Hancock, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge of the Canal Zone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard C. Gilmer, Jr., to be United States attorney for the western district of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until today at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes a. m., Wednesday, June 16, 1948) the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock noon the same day.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15, 1948:

UNITED STATES ALTERNATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Henry J. Tasca, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

William Ford
Lorin E. Kerr
Henry I. Kohn
Reuben F. Reider

To be scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Charles G. Dobrovolny
Willard T. Haskins

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Joseph J. Hancock to be United States district judge of the Canal Zone.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Claude P. Stephens to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky.
Howard C. Gilmer, Jr., to be United States attorney for the western district of Virginia.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Paul Jackson Anderson, Anniston.
Joe N. White, Beaverton.
Robert L. Roberts, Boylston.
James Ernest Lambert, Darlington.
Joseph T. Evans, Elkmont.
Virlie M. Sawyer, Frisco City.
William E. Smith, Glen Allen.
John J. Howell, Gordo.
Joseph N. Cooper, Grand Bay.
Leland M. Cox, Mentone.
Marion Earl Sims, Moundville.

Benjamin F. Screws, Shorter.
Charles B. Brock, Steele.
Larry Robinson, Tuskegee Institute.

ARIZONA

Edward S. Brewer, Cactus.
Emma D. Guillet, Chinle.
H. Fay Hall, Chloride.
Ollie A. Caldwell, Gila Bend.
Lillie M. McEntire, Higley.
Nellie C. Sawyer, Inspiration.

ARKANSAS

Woodrow M. Freese, Jr., Cash.
Willard C. Wall, Coal Hill.
James Vernon Huntley, Judsonia.
Ernest J. Stroub, Lavaca.
Iva S. Matlock, Leola.
Horace M. Grogan, Mabelvale.
Jennie C. McDonald, Marvell.
Otis W. Neely, North Little Rock.
Dallas Johnson, Pollard.
Robert D. O'Keefe, Rosston.
Albert A. Hill, Scranton.
E. Clay Bumpers, Wabash.
Paul Stonesifer, Winslow.

CONNECTICUT

Thomas F. Honan, Gaylordsville.
Newman C. Clark, Old Lyme.
Herman F. LeDoyt, South Coventry.
Charles C. Logan, West Cheshire.

COLORADO

Harold Iacovetto, Artesia.
Phillip W. Hanning, Jr., Boulder.
Richard Ernest Lemesany, Calhan.
Elma N. Adams, Colbran.
Donald W. Kelly, Lafayette.
Netta M. Finch, Springfield.

FLORIDA

Chandos W. McMullen, Bay Pines.
Donald E. McDermott, Boca Raton.
James L. Mayton, Carrabelle.
Ray M. Coburn, Eagle Lake.
Ruth F. Muir, Everglades.
George P. Adams, Greenacres City.
Willie H. Andreasen, Greenwood.
Lois A. Brown, Immokalee.
Evangeline W. Shuler, Indian River City.
Loice J. Jones, Killarney.
Bernice M. Stefurak, Rockledge.
John O. Rogers, Sebastian.
Daniel Floyd Fager, Shalimar.
Edith Z. Petrey, Valparaiso.
Merle P. Blanchard, Waverly.
Stanton M. Gideons, Webster.
Elmer F. Mosley, Wellborn.

GEORGIA

Dwain S. Brock, Baldwin.
Henry C. Geer, Bogart.
John D. Watts, Brinson.
Thomas R. Davenport, Buchanan.
Eleanor K. Pitts, Chattahoochee.
Frederick L. Dekle, Clyo.
Joseph R. Johnson, Coleman.
Bernarr B. Adams, Dewyrose.
Victor H. Tomlinson, Fort Valley.
James H. Sellers, Jr., Graham.
Maurice F. Smith, Hapeville.
Walter E. Ard, Iron City.
Robert C. Harris, Leesburg.
Kermit Q. Ward, Molena.
Daniel L. Murphy, Sr., Moreland.
Tommie Louise Pressey, Rocky Ford.
Julius M. Engram, Scottdale.
John T. Stubbs, Jr., Summerville.
Horace C. Kelly, Jr., Toomsboro.

HAWAII

Robert K. Matsueda, Kaihului.
Mildred O. Kuwana, Pahoa.

KANSAS

Victor A. Zeckser, Alma.
Reginald E. Snapp, Belleville.
Lee R. Highland, Brewster.
Alice I. Van Sickle, Cedar Point.
George Floyd Hart, Copeland.
Arnold C. Kettler, Deerfield.
Ellen McEnulty, Denton.
Ethel S. Watson, Elsmore.
Allen M. Hunter, Garden City.
Harlan C. Atkinson, Goodland.
Warren W. Nye, Harper.
Wayne M. Stoffer, Haven.
Howard L. Hanson, Hepler.
James F. Lambert, Inman.
Allyan H. Beers, Jennings.
Buford L. Emmele, Kiowa.
Abe W. Fox, Larned.
William P. Helwig, Jr., Macksville.
Ralph M. Plotner, McCracken.
Cleal M. Harrison, Oakley.
Wayne L. Green, Osborne.
Harold E. Hinnen, Potwin.
Roy B. Volz, Powhattan.
Gail L. Hohman, Randolph.
Wayne B. Blackburn, Rozel.
Raymond J. Laudick, Spearville.
Wayne W. Muller, Sylvan Grove.
Eugene H. Riggle, Thayer.
David Mallory Howell, Winfield.

KENTUCKY

James Paul Dodson, Scottsville.

LOUISIANA

Clarence P. Simmons, Georgetown.
Allen J. Lorio, Hahnville.
Alton I. Carter, Jonesville.
Vardaman J. Maples, Mount Hermon.
Marion T. Files, Oak Ridge.
John P. George, Oil City.
Jean H. Clark, Rosedale.
Harvey J. Rabalais, Simmesport.
Charles D. Block, Slidell.
Virginia C. Kent, Tangipahoa.
Erna P. Watts, Walker.
Oliver W. Boyd, Jr., West Monroe.

MAINE

Frederick A. Hobbs II, Alfred.
Donald F. Lord, Belgrade Lakes.
Arnold L. Staples, Brooklin.
Corice B. Feindel, Denmark.
Samuel H. Ring, Lovell.
Hurschel A. Ryerson, North Bridgton.
Ella Mae Quimby, Oquossoc.
Cyril Paul Pelletier, St. Francis.
Frank C. Creteau, Sanford.
Vera M. McDonald, Sherman Station.
Robert M. Heggeman, Standish.

MASSACHUSETTS

Elizabeth R. Colby, Byfield.
Elizabeth S. Russell, Carlisle.
Leo G. Tetreault, Colrain.
William J. Powers, Leicester.
Georgia R. Harvey, Lynnfield.
William P. Stone, Jr., Monson.
George M. Olin, Seekonk.
John Franklin Morton, South Duxbury.
Richard S. Patterson, South Egremont.
Edward G. Caron, South Swansea.
Lorraine W. Russell, Sturbridge.
Eleanor P. Hatton, Woronoco.

MINNESOTA

Ellert M. Erickson, Brooten.
Knute W. Ringstad, Lengby.
Edward S. Thomas, Nashwauk.
Elias B. Scofield, Newport.

MISSOURI

Henry H. Womack, Catron.
Leo G. Kidd, Eureka.
Henry E. Bowers, Langdon.
Florence E. Godman, Miami.
Archie Norman Cooper, Rushville.
Jefferson D. Marsh, Steelville.

MONTANA

Donald R. Lamoreux, Corvallis.
Edwin Russell Bennett, Superior.

NEBRASKA

Bernard E. Hess, Henry.

NEW JERSEY

William A. Allen, Allenwood.
Edward N. Hoffman, Birmingham.
Catherine Gleason, Cresskill.
Edwin L. Giesner, Naughright.
Henry O. Kopp, Riverdale.
George Majoros, Jr., Roebling.

NORTH DAKOTA

Lloyd P. Aanrud, Balfour.
Vernon H. Lane, Carson.
Virginia P. Allen, Coleharbor.
Esther A. Dahlen, Edmore.
James A. Kreitinger, Golva.
Carl V. Larson, Gwinner.
Merwin G. McGregor, Litchville.
Edward N. Swanson, McHenry.
Norman N. Berg, McVille.
Neimer L. Talmo, Portal.
Lewis E. Peterson, Wimbledon.
Herbert William Whalen, York.

OKLAHOMA

Cecil D. Gray, Canton.
James W. Chalfant, Cheyenne.
Clarence H. Chambers, Chickasha.
Waldine E. Knodel, Cyril.
Joel F. Halliday, Eldorado.
Wily S. Bird, Fort Cobb.
Joseph C. R. Boyd, Granite.
George T. Wilkinson, Hitchcock.
William E. Powers, McCurtain.
Gertrude E. Locke, Panama.
Ina L. Snyder, Piedmont.
Lowell V. Doke, Pocasset.
Edward P. Souligny, Ponca City.
Orville E. Marlatt, Ringwood.
Thelma L. McKnight, Shamrock.
Hughell F. Legg, Spencer.
John R. Redwine, Jr., Spiro.
Treal A. McPherson, Thackerville.
Lewis E. Weeden, Washington.
Rex L. Wall, Willow.

OREGON

Agnes M. Hashberger, Colton.
Kenneth P. McCollum, Elkton.
Myra M. Brinker, Freewater.
Ivan A. Blagg, Grass Valley.
Quincy E. Smith, Idanha.
George T. Benson, John Day.
Dorothy L. Halverson, Lacomb.
Opal F. Maphet, Murphy.
Chester O. Stallard, Nelscott.
Merle R. Brown, Philomath.
Celia W. Smith, Wauna.

PENNSYLVANIA

Pearl E. Chappell, Barnesville.
Ruth Findley Stem, Buckingham.
Gladys M. Parry, Elrama.
Edna I. Keefer, Grantham.
Erma K. Hay, Jennerstown.
Walter A. Hilsbos, Jr., Oakford.
William G. McCurdy, Pitcairn.
Jane M. Martin, St. Thomas.
Abram Miller Kurtz, Scotland.
Renald R. Vogelsong, South Enola.
Howard A. Rathburn, Sugargrove.
Charles A. Brader, Tannersville.
Albert Howe, Vanport.
Marian H. Van Wyk, Whitford.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Harry G. Cushman, Conway.
David M. Peden, Gray Court.
William S. Simpson, Jr., Iva.
Rennie W. Baird, Lake City.
Pearsall LeRoy Rogers, Mullins.
Emily K. Bishop, Port Royal.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Leo V. Marek, Avon.
Nettie A. Boatman, Columbia.
Franklin deHaai, Corsica.
Mildred M. Abernathy, Gannvalley.
Ralph G. Garvey, Gayville.
Rubin A. Madsen, Lake Preston.
Vernon Morgan, Pine Ridge.
Milton B. Tracy, Pollock.
Ruby Frederick, Rosebud.
John C. Miller, Volga.
Leroy Patrick Clare, Wakonda.

TENNESSEE

Mae P. Jackson, Bethel.
John B. Overstreet, Celina.
Eugene William Beckman, Loretto.
Richard L. Adkins, Munford.
Stella E. Murphy, Rockford.

VERMONT

Kenneth W. Brady, Bakersfield.
Katherine L. Moore, Cavendish.
Marguerite D. Wolcott, Orwell.
Ora John Slade, South Londonderry.
Kathleen H. Shove, South Woodstock.

VIRGINIA

Nellie S. Wilkinson, Bon Air.
Carl L. Wingate, Crockett.
Willie W. Paulette, Drakes Branch.
Wright H. Dawson, Esmont.
Archie W. Arthur, Evington.
John P. Arehart, Fairfield.
David W. Paulette, Farmville.
Louis H. Suddith, Jr., Highland Springs.
Gordon B. Cartwright, King George.
Harry W. Easterly, Lebanon.
James A. O'Neil, Lorton.
David J. Lee, Middleburg.
George H. Sonafrank, Nokesville.
Minna D. Deane, Nottoway.
William H. Grubb, Jr., Purcellville.
Samuel Francis Atwill, Jr., Reedville.
Boyd Boggess, Richlands.
Olive G. Kidd, Roseland.
Virginia M. Dent, Stafford.

WEST VIRGINIA

L. Stanley Gibson, Widen.

WISCONSIN

William George McCoy, Brookfield.
Laura E. Maxfield, Browntown.
Herbert H. Hilgendorf, Burnett.
William J. Peterman, Cecil.
Gertrude C. Stanton, Clyman.
Norman M. DeMuth, Darlington.
Sheldon E. Cantlon, Ettrick.
Norbert I. Lehmann, Hustisford.
Robert C. Biddick, Livingston.
Ernest H. Thorpe, Mattoon.
Albert G. Willgrubs, Norwalk.
Ralph J. Lemke, Omro.
Jay P. Phillips, Palmyra.
Harry M. Harms, Platteville.
Joseph Homel, Pulaski.
Casimer C. Ruthe, Somers.
Florence E. Dexter, Trevor.
Robert A. King, Wautoma.
Richard R. Williams, Wild Rose.
Eugene E. Farrow, Winnebago.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, by whose power we live and by whose mercy we are spared, we thank Thee for the endless renewing of our daily blessings. Keep us this day without sin and free from the bondage of fear.

Bless richly our Speaker and all Members; grant that they may so serve that they may be models of rectitude, with every root of bitterness cast out and the good of all the goal of each. Help us to believe the best we know and the best our hearts have hoped for; hence we shall be delivered from haste and dismay. Keep us constant in our labors, just in our decisions, relating our vocations to the Divine One who taught as never man taught. O fill us with Thy spirit that we may be armed and guided in the path of the perfect day. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution accepting the invitation to attend the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda; and

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate, having proceeded to reconsider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) entitled "Joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage," returned by the President of the United States, with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, and passed by the House of Representatives, on reconsideration of the same, it was—

Resolved, That the said joint resolution pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CONNALLY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6705. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WHERRY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. O'MAHONEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3735) entitled "An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. BYRD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6419) entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. HOLLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5883) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 to the above-entitled bill; that the Senate further insists upon its amendment numbered 1 to said bill, disagreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. REED, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5524) entitled "An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 34 and 39 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2237) entitled "An act to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive requests for extension of remarks but not for 1-minute speeches, owing to

the fact that there is unfinished business which will be taken up immediately.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to call the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him on yesterday at Independence Hall, Philadelphia.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix on the subject of Presidential veto of the Bulwinkle bill.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bibliography of certain publications on the Panama Canal.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD to follow the remarks by Mr. GRANT of Indiana.

Mr. GROSS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article sent in by a mother, entitled "A Mother Speaks."

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and to include extraneous material in two instances.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials and an article.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HART asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper item and an editorial.

WE MUST HAVE A STOCK PILE OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the Russell bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise in support of the Russell bill which provides for incentive payments for exploration and development of our domestic production of strategic materials.

First, I wish to discuss the legislation from the standpoint of national defense. In 1939 Congress passed a Stock Pile Act with the intent of building up a supply of strategic materials. When we were attacked by Japan at Pearl Harbor in 1941, we found that there was no stock pile because of the failure of the administration of the act to carry out the intent of Congress.

Our failure to have such a stock pile of strategic materials placed us in a precarious position and unquestionably resulted in extending the length of the war and the loss of more lives than would have been the case if these strategic materials had been ready for use.

We are facing a similar situation today. In 1946 Congress passed another Stock Pile Act known as Public Law 520. Two years later in 1948 we find that there is no stock pile and if war were to break out tomorrow, we would be in dire need of such materials. Administrative policies have permitted many mines to close and it would take months to reopen these mines for production.

During this session of Congress we have appropriated billions of dollars for European aid. We have appropriated billions of dollars for military purposes. We are again about to draft our young men for military service to protect the Nation in case of war.

All of these billions will be of no avail unless we in some way or other provide the metals which are provided for in this bill. We cannot produce steel without manganese. We cannot produce the necessary types of steel alloys without many of the metals listed in this legislation. We need them all in either peace or war.

In case of war the only safe source of supply is mines within the United States. Submarines can block imports. Revolutions in other nations, strikes and embargoes can shut off supplies from other nations. We cannot risk the welfare of the United States in depending upon ores from nations that lie across thousands of miles of sea lanes.

I maintain that if we can spend $20,000,000,000 for European aid and military purposes that it would be the height of folly to neglect the very production of the materials which are required. I realize full well that the policies of this administration have been geared to obtaining these materials through trade and that many of our large mining companies are contemplating foreign investments to produce these minerals which I maintain should be produced in the United States because of the safety which lies in a source of supply that cannot be disrupted or shut off.

Second, I wish to discuss this legislation from an economic standpoint. Regardless of economic theories, new wealth still finds its source in the soil. The income of the United States depends directly upon the production, processing, and distribution of this new wealth in the form of finished goods. Our supply of new wealth determines our standard of living and times price determines the income which will determine whether we have prosperity and national solvency.

We are still a young Nation and in the case of mineral resources we have merely scratched the surface of our landed area. Who knows how much we have in the way of strategic materials? Who knows the tonnage of ore that may be uncovered by the development of an outcropping of ore? No one, and it is only by exploration and development that this can be determined. For the Congress of the United States to provide legislation which will make possible such development should be considered as an investment in the future of the United States. Failure to pass this legislation will bring upon us the indictment of future generations that the Congress of the United States did not have the vision to legislate for the future welfare of the United States.

In my opinion we are in the same position that Congress found itself in the year 1852. At that time Congress was considering the building of railroads to open up the western part of the United States. At that time Daniel Webster, then a United States Senator, spoke as follows during the debate:

> What do we want with this vast, worthless area, this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts or those endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their very base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast of 3,000 miles, rockbound, cheerless, uninviting, and not a harbor on it?
>
> Mr. President, I will never vote one cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific Ocean one inch nearer to Boston than it is.

That, Mr. Speaker, was less than 100 years ago and today the State of California ranks third in population. Yet if that Congress had followed the advice of Daniel Webster, we would still be a Nation of oxcarts and wagons. The building of the railroads and the development of the Middle West and the Western States brought forth the new wealth that built our present system.

There are those today who like Webster, say that the West has little ores and that we must go to other nations. There are those who are against the investment of these funds to develop the future resources which the generations to come will need. I hope that this Congress will have more vision than Daniel Webster and pass legislation before we adjourn which will make it possible to develop and tap new sources of wealth

which abound in these western mountain ranges as well as in other sections of our Nation, our Territories included, especially Alaska.

Finally I wish to point out that these incentive payments are an investment and should not be classed as subsidies. A careful examination of our economy will reveal that for the past 25 years each $1 of new wealth produced in the United States from the farms, mines, and sea combined has translated into $5 of national income, regardless of depression or prosperity. We have had depressions, only because of our failure to properly price our production of new wealth.

Applying this turn of raw material income let us assume that by the payment of $100,000,000 a year in incentive payments, we can bring into production an additional $1,000,000,000 of new wealth. In the normal process of production and use it will provide the foundation for $5,000,000,000 of national income and with the present rate of tax levy for Federal revenue of 20 cents on the dollar, the increased income will provide the revenue to pay the bill. In addition it will give us the permanent supply of materials for either peace or war.

As you all know we have approximately $260,000,000,000 of national debt. If that debt is ever to be paid it must be paid from the production of new wealth from the soil of the United States. It will never be repaid by imports or production of these strategic materials in other nations.

A FRIEND OF MINE IS DEAD, FOR ISRAEL

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a copy of a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I lost a friend, my country lost a truly great man, and the Jewish community of the world lost a hero who now belongs to history, when "Mickey" Marcus died in the hills of Palestine.

Truly it may be said, he died that men might live.

I knew Col. David Marcus well, and long.

Physically, he was no giant; but in his heart he had the courage and the vision of King David.

By temperament and environment he was a civilian citizen of America who served his country well; but by his West Point training and the compulsion of compassion he was a soldier who served the world and died for democracy.

Whatever "Mickey" Marcus did, he did well. He was a capable assistant United States attorney; he was an outstanding commissioner of corrections for the city of New York; he was an American soldier who proved his patriotism at risk of his life.

He was a Jew who gladly and voluntarily left all that men hold dear to help create the new state of Israel, and I know that if he had one moment in which to reflect before his soul fled, he died without regret, because he died for an ideal of a happier human society which was bigger than he was.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I can say here which can add to the stature of a brave man. His life is a shining monument to Colonel Marcus which no fleeting words can improve.

But that the record of the life and death of a good man may be written where all may read, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert as part of my remarks the touching requiem written by Loy Warwick and printed in the June 13 issue of the New York Post.

DACHAU MADE DAVID MARCUS, UNITED STATES HERO, A ZION MARTYR

(By Loy Warwick)

David Marcus died at his post in the hills of Jerusalem. And now Palestine seemed so much closer to home.

To many an American, to countless New Yorkers, that "Mickey" Marcus had given his life that others might live in freedom, there was something intensely personal.

The question came naturally: Why?

Why had this American, a West Pointer, a hero of World War II, a successful, respected citizen and public servant—why had he chosen again to forsake the safety and security of home to die in battle on the seemingly remote battlefield of Jerusalem?

The answer was not altogether lost.

Gideon Ruffer, of the Israeli delegation at the United Nations, had at least a part of it:

Marcus had been at the head of an American tank column that liberated the Dachau concentration camp.

"He was one of the first Americans to enter Dachau, and see the terrible things the Nazis had done," Ruffer said. "He remembered the tragedy and horror and the piles of Jewish bodies.

"This he never forgot. He told us:

"'It made me fiercely interested in a Jewish state, a state where the Jews would not be a minority at the mercy of the majority's whims.'"

It was when Ruffer was studying at the Jewish Agency Public-College in Jerusalem that he met Marcus.

"He stayed with us at the school, instead of going to a hotel," Ruffer recalled. "He was very friendly, very popular. He danced with us and told us stories—stories of how he had become a Zionist.

"Mickey Marcus was deeply impressed by the spirit of Jewish youth. He believed that the spirit of the Jewish people is more valuable as a military factor than the numerical superiority of the Arabs.

"For this reason, he was convinced the Jews would win the war. He never lost his faith in final victory."

Marcus' presence in beleagured Palestine had been a closely guarded secret. As he went about the grim, vital task of creating—almost singlehanded—the Army of Israel, there were not many who knew the real identity of this likeable, purposeful man of 47.

Few knew, for example, that this man who had responded so unselfishly to the urgent appeal from the Jewish agency, had once served New York City as commissioner of correction. Only a handful were aware that he was a former United States Army colonel, twice decorated by the United States during World War II.

Marcus held the Distinguished Service Cross for his part in the surrender of Italy and Germany and the Bronze Star Medal for gallantry in action. He saw service in nearly every theater of operations, helped draft the surrender terms for Italy and Germany, and the legal side to the United States delegation at Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam.

With all his fine legal talent and value as a planner and a strategist, Colonel Marcus was no swivel-chair soldier. He didn't enter Normandy in a command car—he came down in a parachute. And, when the Americans swept into Dachau in 1945, Colonel Marcus rode at the head of a rumbling tank column.

The death of Marcus in the Jerusalem hills was the first officially recorded by the Israeli Government of a former high-ranking United States Army officer, although several former American soldiers have died in Palestine while serving with Israeli forces.

Marcus had been appointed supreme commander of the forces of Jerusalem only a short while before he fell Thursday night on the field of battle.

"Please inform Mrs. David Marcus that her husband fell last night at his post in the hills of Jerusalem," said cablegram from Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion to his widow, Mrs. Emma Marcus, of 485 Westminster Road, Brooklyn.

Mrs. Marcus was prostrated by the tragic news.

PLAN TRIBUTE

There will be a tribute to his memory from his friends and legal associates in Kings County Court, just before the session opens at 10 a. m. Monday.

Many joined Ben-Gurion Saturday in paying tribute to Marcus. In performing the sad duty of disclosing Marcus death, Ben-Gurion had said: "His name will live forever in the annals of the Jewish people and we feel confident American Jewry will be proud of its great and gallant son who has given his life for the liberation of Israel."

Said Dr. Emanuel Neumann, president of the Zionist Organization of America:

"The memory of the late Col. David Marcus will be enshrined in the hearts of all Americans along with the names of Lafayette and Koecliusko, who fought for the rights of human dignity and freedom. As Americans we are proud of his contributions and sorrowful at the passing of a great spirit."

Said Mayor O'Dwyer: "I knew him well enough to know that, if he had to die, that was the way he would have preferred to go—fighting for freedom."

BROOKLYN NATIVE

David Marcus was born February 22, 1901, in Brooklyn, where he was graduated from Boys High School. He attended West Point and was commissioned in the infantry in 1924. Two years later he resigned and went into law—receiving a degree from Brooklyn Law School, at that time part of St. Lawrence University.

He became an assistant United States attorney in 1929, and in 1933 was appointed by Mayor LaGuardia first deputy commissioner of correction. He was made full commissioner in 1940, rejoining the Army that same year.

After the war he served on the German occupation staff of General Clay. In 1946 he was decorated by the British Government, "in recognition of the distinguished service performed in cooperation with the British armed forces during the war."

ANSWERED PLEA OF ZION

Marcus remained in the service until January 1947, and had just resumed his law practice here—at 545 Fifth Avenue—when he answered the plea of the Jewish Agency and went to Palestine, there to accomplish in 6 months what had seemed an insurmountable task.

He was smuggled into the Holy Land shortly after Christmas and immediately began transforming the Haganah into a modern fighting army. He worked day and night,

He wrote military manuals, established officers' training schools, organized a general staff and supervised field and school training.

Marcus fell at Jerusalem and a spokesman of the Israeli Government said:

"He died trying to open the road to get food through to the people of Jerusalem. This was not the responsibility of the Jewish government. It was a world responsibility."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after any other special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6556, an act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That this act may be cited as the 'Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948.'

"SEC. 2. The period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1351), is hereby extended from June 12, 1948, until the close of June 30, 1949.

"SEC. 3. (a) Before entering into negotiations concerning any proposed foreign trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the President shall furnish the United States Tariff Commission (hereinafter in this act referred to as the 'Commission') with a list of all articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or continuance of existing customs or excise treatment. Upon receipt of such list the Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each such article as to (1) the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350 without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles; and (2) if increases in duties or additional import restrictions are required to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles the minimum increases in duties or additional import restrictions required. Such report shall be made by the Commission to the President not later than 120 days after the receipt of such list by the Commission. No such foreign trade agreement shall be entered into until the Commission has made its report to the President or until the expiration of the 120-day period.

"(b) In the course of any investigation pursuant to this section the Commission shall hold hearings and give reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

"(c) Section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930," approved June 12, 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1354), is hereby amended by striking out the matter following the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'and before concluding such agreement the President shall request the Tariff Commission to make the investigation and report provided for by section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, and shall seek information and advice with respect to such agreement from the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, from the National Military Establishment, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate.'

"SEC. 4. The Commission shall furnish facts, statistics, and other information at its command to officers and employees of the United States preparing for or participating in the negotiation of any foreign trade agreement; but neither the Commission nor any member, officer, or employee of the Commission shall participate in any manner (except to report findings, as provided in section 3 of this act and to furnish facts, statistics, and other information as required by this section) in the making of decisions with respect to the proposed terms of any foreign trade agreement or in the negotiation of any such agreement.

"SEC. 5. (a) Within 30 days after any trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, has been entered into which, when effective, will (1) require or make appropriate any modification of duties or other import restrictions, the imposition of additional import restrictions, or the continuance of existing customs or excise treatment, which modification, imposition, or continuance will exceed the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles as found and reported by the Tariff Commission under section 3, or (2) fail to require or make appropriate the minimum increase in duty or additional import restrictions required to avoid such injury, the President shall transmit to Congress a copy of such agreement, together with a message accurately identifying the article with respect to which such limits or minimum requirements are not complied with, and stating his reasons for the acton taken with respect to such article. If either the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, are not in session at the time of such transmission, such agreement and message shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House or Representatives, or both, as the case may be.

"(b) Promptly after the President has transmitted such foreign trade agreement to Congress the Commission shall deposit with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a copy of its report to the President with respect to such agreement."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. RAYBURN. What is the request?

The SPEAKER. That the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. Nobody has spoken to me about it. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] was here a moment ago and he did not know what was going to be done. Of course, I am going to object for the present because we do not know what the amendment is.

Mr. KNUTSON. What is to be gained by holding it up?

Mr. RAYBURN. I object because the gentleman has not said anything to me or to any Member on the minority side that he was going to submit this request. That is a very good reason.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from Minnesota withdraw his request.

The Chair wishes to state at this time that many matters will be disposed of by unanimous consent this week. To facilitate the dispatch of that business it is advisable, in fact, it is imperative, that Members submitting such requests first confer with both majority and minority leaders.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of the fact that it was necessary to consult anyone with regard to taking a matter off the Speaker's table, and if I have offended in the matter, I apologize.

The SPEAKER. It is not necessary, of course, but it will help expedite matters if that course is followed.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is rather necessary.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an advertisement of the postal and Federal employees which appeared in all the newspapers of the country entitled "The Laborer Is Worthy of His Hire."

Mr. CARSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Will not the gentleman withhold it until after the pending business is disposed of to pass the bill we had under consideration last night?

Mr. RANKIN. I think if we are going to wreck the Republic the Members ought to be here to participate, and I shall insist. We may not want to pass it. I am going to insist.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand, the unfinished business before the House is the vote on the bill which was under consideration as we adjourned last night.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. May the gentleman from Mississippi insist upon his point of no quorum, then?

The SPEAKER. He may if he wishes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will withhold my point of order until that vote is taken, if it will be worth anything.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN SCHOOL AGENCIES

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the vote on the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or postwar national defense-incurred enrollments.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that two-thirds had voted in favor thereof.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCK. Last night when the vote was taken I objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present and then the House adjourned. I understood that unanimous consent was given that the roll call would be taken as the first order of business this morning.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent was given that the vote be taken again. The gentleman still has the right to object to the vote.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 325, nays 48, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—325

Abbitt	Clason	Gavin
Abernethy	Clevenger	Gearhart
Albert	Clippinger	Gillette
Allen, Calif.	Cole, Kans.	Gillie
Allen, Ill.	Cole, Mo.	Goff
Allen, La.	Colmer	Goodwin
Anderson, Calif.	Combs	Gordon
Andrews, Ala.	Cooley	Gore
Angell	Cooper	Gorski
Arends	Corbett	Gossett
Arnold	Cox	Graham
Bakewell	Craven	Granger
Banta	Crosser	Grant, Ala.
Barden	Crow	Grant, Ind.
Barrett	Curtis	Gregory
Bates, Ky.	Dague	Hagen
Bates, Mass.	Davis, Ga.	Halleck
Battle	Deane	Hardy
Beall	Delaney	Harless, Ariz.
Beckworth	Devitt	Harness, Ind.
Bender	D'Ewart	Harris
Bennett, Mich.	Dirksen	Harrison
Bennett, Mo.	Dolliver	Hart
Bishop	Domengeaux	Harvey
Blackney	Dondero	Havenner
Bland	Donohue	Hays
Bloom	Doughton	Hedrick
Boggs, La.	Douglas	Heffernan
Bolton	Durham	Hess
Bonner	Eberharter	Hill
Boykin	Elliott	Hobbs
Bradley	Ellis	Hoeven
Bramblett	Ellsworth	Hoffman
Brehm	Elsaesser	Holifield
Brophy	Elston	Holmes
Brown, Ga.	Engel, Mich.	Hope
Bryson	Engle, Calif.	Horan
Buchanan	Evins	Huber
Bulwinkle	Fallon	Hull
Burke	Feighan	Isacson
Burleson	Fellows	Jackson, Calif.
Busbey	Fenton	Jackson, Wash.
Butler	Fernandez	Jarman
Byrne, N. Y.	Fisher	Javits
Camp	Flannagan	Jenison
Canfield	Fletcher	Jenkins, Ohio
Cannon	Fogarty	Jenkins, Pa.
Carson	Folger	Johnson, Calif.
Case, S. Dak.	Foote	Johnson, Ill.
Celler	Forand	Jones, Ala.
Chadwick	Fuller	Jones, N. C.
Chelf	Fulton	Jones, Wash.
Chenoweth	Garmatz	Jonkman
Chiperfield	Gary	Judd
Church	Gathings	Karsten, Mo.
Kearney	Morgan	Sabath
Kee	Morris	Sadlak
Keefe	Morrison	St. George
Kelley	Morton	Sanborn
Kerr	Muhlenberg	Sasscer
Kersten, Wis.	Multer	Schwabe, Mo.
Kilburn	Mundt	Schwabe, Okla.
Kilday	Murdock	Scoblick
Kirwan	Murray, Tenn.	Sheppard
Klein	Murray, Wis.	Short
Knutson	Nodar	Sikes
Kunkel	Norblad	Simpson, Ill.
Landis	Norrell	Smathers
Lanham	Norton	Smith, Kans.
Larcade	O'Brien	Smith, Va.
Latham	O'Hara	Smith, Wis.
Lea	O'Konski	Snyder
LeCompte	O'Toole	Somers
Lemke	Pace	Spence
Lesinski	Passman	Stanley
Lewis, Ky.	Patman	Stefan
Lewis, Ohio	Patterson	Stevenson
Lichtenwalter	Peterson	Stratton
Love	Philbin	Talle
Lucas	Phillips, Tenn.	Taylor
Lusk	Pickett	Teague
Lyle	Ploeser	Thomas, Tex.
Lynch	Poage	Thompson
McConnell	Potter	Tibbott
McCormack	Poulson	Tollefson
McCowen	Powell	Trimble
McCulloch	Preston	Twyman
McDonough	Price, Fla.	Vail
McDowell	Price, Ill.	Van Zandt
McGregor	Priest	Vinson
McMahon	Rains	Vorys
McMillan, S. C.	Ramey	Walter
McMillen, Ill.	Rankin	Weichel
Mack	Rayburn	Welch
Macy	Redden	Wheeler
Mahon	Reed, Ill.	Whitaker
Manasco	Reed, N. Y.	Whitten
Mansfield	Rees	Whittington
Marcantonio	Reeves	Williams
Martin, Iowa	Richards	Wilson, Tex.
Mathews	Richlman	Winstead
Merrow	Riley	Wolcott
Meyer	Rivers	Wolverton
Michener	Rizley	Wood
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.	Woodruff
Miller, Nebr.	Rogers, Mass.	Worley
Mills	Rohrbough	Youngblood
Mitchell	Rooney	
Monroney	Russell	

NAYS—48

Andersen, H. Carl	Gross	Plumley
Andrews, N. Y.	Hale	Potts
Boggs, Del.	Hall, Leonard W.	Rich
Buck	Hand	Rockwell
Buffett	Heselton	Ross
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Scott, Hardie
Case, N. J.	Kean	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Cole, N. Y.	Keating	Scrivner
Cotton	LeFevre	Seely-Brown
Coudert	Lodge	Shafer
Crawford	MacKinnon	Smith, Ohio
Davis, Wis.	Maloney	Sundstrom
Dawson, Utah	Mason	Taber
Eaton	Miller, Conn.	Vursell
Gamble	Miller, Md.	Wadsworth
Griffiths	Nicholson	Wigglesworth

NOT VOTING—57

Andresen, August H.	Gwynne, Iowa	Madden
Auchincloss	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Meade, Ky.
Bell	Hartley	Meade, Md.
Blatnik	Hébert	Nixon
Brooks	Hendricks	Peden
Brown, Ohio	Herter	Pfeifer
Buckley	Hinshaw	Phillips, Calif.
Carroll	Jennings	Regan
Chapman	Johnson, Ind.	Robertson
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Sadowski
Coffin	Johnson, Tex.	Sarbacher
Courtney	Kearns	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy	Stockman
Dawson, Ill.	Keogh	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	King	Towe
Dorn	Lane	West
Gallagher	Ludlow	Wilson, Ind.
Gwinn, N. Y.	McGarvey	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Chapman.

Mr. Auchincloss with Mr. Regan.

Mr. Herter with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Madden.

Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Stigler.

Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Kearns with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Arthur Edwin Hall with Mr. Carroll.

Mr. Coffin with Mr. Peden.

Mr. Cunningham, with Mr. Sadowski.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. King.

Mr. Towe with Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Stockman with Mr. Rooney.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Scrivner with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. Phillips of California with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Brooks.

Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Meade of Maryland.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Nixon with Mr. Bell of Missouri.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Courtney.

Mr. HOFFMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GROSS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, with reference to this bill, H. R. 6527, extending the period for providing assistance to certain school agencies still overburdened with war-incurred school enrollments, I discussed the situation in my district with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], who reported this bill from the Committee on Education and Labor and also other members of the committee, which I wish to be included in this debate for clarification.

As there were only 40 minutes debate because the bill is being considered under suspension of rules, I did not feel that I should endeavor to inject the discussion of some particular project. The bill is too important to jeopardize by trying to adjust each particular situation that might apply to some one project.

I have supported this program from its inception. I believe it is only fair and just that the Government bear the necessary expenditures imposed on school districts by the great influx of students in war areas necessary to our national defense. If the school districts are willing to burden themselves by taking care of these children and helping to educate them even though it became necessary for the Government to bring them there in the interest of the war and our national defense, the Government should in my opinion take care of the added expense.

Many of these areas become highly congested. It is impossible for the school districts to take care of the sudden increased attendance. In our own State we are heavily taxed for school purposes. Our school districts and State education program are providing far above the national average in percentage of tax

money for school purposes. Many of these war projects are being continued causing the continuous burden on the school districts and therefore, this legislation is highly desirable and thoroughly justified.

But the situation I have in mind in my district, Mr. Speaker, is one that I wish to call to your attention. As you know, I represent the Seventh District of Arkansas in the southern part of our State. During the war the Navy Department established Schumaker Naval Ammunition Depot near Camden, Ark. It is not only in my district but the home of Senator MCCLELLAN.

This project requires thousands of people in its construction and operation. It is a highly important project in the operation of the Navy and the Navy still carries it as one of its necessary operations.

This project is in Harmony Grove school district, which is a fairly large consolidated school. The school is several miles from the project and to get to the school by bus it is necessary to go through the Camden district.

As it is much more convenient and facilities are more readily available, the Camden school district receives and takes care of these students, several hundred of them.

Under the provisions of the Lanham Act, which this bill would extend, it is provided that Federal assistance is continued to those schools that previously received Federal contribution. Under this bill, it is provided that contributions for operation and maintenance of school facilities to local school agencies requiring assistance will be made to those that are still overburdened with school enrollment caused by war activities and the transition from war to peacetime conditions and who have received during this fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, Federal contributions administered by the Federal Works Agency for such operation and maintenance.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Harmony Grove School District under the act would be the one to receive the funds because the application originally was made by that school district to take care of these school children. Harmony Grove School District has in return transferred the funds to the Camden School District. The Camden School District has been providing for and taking care of these students.

Therefore, this bill extends to those districts, and logically so, that heretofore have received contributions. This means that Camden actually is entitled to continue receiving contributions for taking care of these schools, but because of the situation, the Harmony Grove District must make the application and transmit the funds to the Camden District. The Federal Works Agency has recognized this practical situation before and I have talked with them about this extension, and they recognize the problem now. It is generally understood that this relief can be obtained under such agreement and administration of the funds as we have experienced in the past.

I feel sure there will not be too much trouble in working it out as has been indicated by the provisions of this legislation and with those I have discussed it with in the Federal Works Agency. I recognize the Harmony Grove District would like to keep this money for their own operation and would be glad to take care of these schools to the best of their ability if it were convenient for them to go there. Nevertheless, the money is being provided to take care of the schools which are providing for the children, and I want this statement in the interest of these children who must receive their educational training to be made in order that it might help not only to clarify but explain the history of the legislation insofar as it affects this project.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from Robert P. Cort, of Greenwich, Conn.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include newspaper articles.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted, the Florida delegation may have 30 minutes for the purpose of paying tribute to two of our Members who are retiring, Messrs. PRICE and HENDRICKS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Flag Day address delivered by his colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. RUSSELL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three newspaper articles.

H. R. 6923 AND H. R. 6924

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today H. R. 6923 which is for the purpose of providing permanent housing for the flood victims in the Vancouver-Portland area deprived of their houses as a result of the disaster, most of whom were occupying federally owned housing which has been destroyed, and unless relief is granted they will be without habitations. This bill provides as follows:

H. R. 6923

The attached bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans to provide housing accommodations for families in the Vancouver-Portland area deprived of their homes as a result of the flood disaster, briefly provides:

(1) A $30,000,000 Vancouver-Portland area flood-disaster fund to be made available to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator through the issuance and sale of notes to the Secretary of the Treasury;

(2) Authorizes the Administrator to make loans to public and private agencies to enable them to construct and sell or rent dwelling accommodations for families deprived of their homes by the disaster with a first preference to families who had been tenants in the Vanport housing project. One hundred percent loans based on necessary current cost would be available for both sales and rental housing, at a 4-percent interest rate in the case of private corporations or persons and a 3-percent rate in the case of loans to public bodies;

(3) Loans to public agencies cannot be made without the prior approval of the local governing body. To enable such housing to be made available to low-income families deprived of their homes by the flood disaster, the Administrator may agree to waive principal and interest payments during the first 5 years of occupancy to the extent necessary to permit adjustment of rentals, provided that the State, municipality, or other local public body or agency shall similarly agree to make a contribution to the project for such low-rent purposes in the form of cash, land, community services or facilities for which a charge is usually made, or tax remissions or tax exemptions in an amount not less than 20 percent of the amount of the principal and interest payments waived by the Administrator;

(4) Loans for housing built for sale may not exceed 25 years, and the aggregate amount of the loan and any other obligation shall not exceed: (A) $7,500 if such dwelling is designed for a single-family residence, or (B) $12,500 if such dwelling is designed for a two-family residence, or (C) $16,000 if such dwelling is designed for a three-family residence, or (D) $18,500 if such dwelling is designed for a four-family residence;

(5) Loans for rental housing shall have maturities satisfactory to the Administrator and shall not exceed $7,500 per family unit for such part of the property or project attributable to dwelling use;

(6) In addition to the usual administrative provisions and authority to issue and sell notes to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Administrator is authorized to make necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the act, and he shall maintain a separate set of accounts for this program and report to the Congress annually on the program authorized by the act;

(7) No loan shall be made under the act after March 31, 1949, except pursuant to a commitment to make a loan issued before March 31, 1949.

Mr. Speaker, I have also introduced today H. R. 6924 which authorizes an additional $10,000,000 to the Federal National Mortgage Association for loans under section 2 of the National Housing Act. The bill provides as follows:

H. R. 6924

STATEMENT ON BILL TO AID PRODUCTION OF PERMANENT HOUSING IN THE PORTLAND, OREG.-VANCOUVER, WASH., AREA

This bill would encourage the extension of necessary credit to assist in providing low-cost housing urgently needed in the Portland-Vancouver area as a result of recent floods. The bill would authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association (a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation) to purchase first mortgages made, after the enactment of this bill, for the purpose of financing the construction of new residential structures in that area, if the financial institutions from which the mortgages are purchased have insurance under section 2 of the National Housing Act with respect to such mortgages. Any such purchase would have to be made within 2 years from the date of the mortgage at a price equal to the unpaid balance plus accrued interest.

Under this section 2 of the National Housing Act, financial institutions may be insured against losses, up to 10 percent, on the total amount of their loans made for the purpose of financing alterations, repairs, and improvements of existing structures or financing the building of new structures. Any such loan for building a new structure (referred to as title I, class 3 loans) may not presently exceed $3,000. Legislation (S. 866) is pending which would increase this amount to $4,500.

The total amount of funds the bill would make available to the Federal National Mortgage Association for this purpose would be $10,000,000, which would be provided by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The total amount of authorized investments, loans, purchases, and commitments of the Corporation would be increased accordingly. The bill would not require any appropriation of funds by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the emergency in the Columbia River area due to the disastrous flood is growing worse from day to day. The river is still at top flood level and many thousands of acres of farm land, suburban, city, and village areas are completely flooded out and more than 50,000 people have been deprived of their homes, and the damage will run far in excess of $100,000,000. I am sure that the people of this area are grateful to the Congress for the enactment of legislation last week, Senate Joint Resolution 231—my companion bill, House Joint Resolution 423—which provided some temporary stopgap housing. But permanent housing relief is necessary as well as funds for reconstruction of public facilities, both Federal and local, in order to protect the lives and welfare of this vast area 120 miles in length up and down the fertile Columbia River Valley.

Owing to the imminent adjournment of the Congress it is essential that extraordinary steps be taken to secure the necessary legislation and appropriations to meet this great emergency which has overtaken our own people. We have been very generous with our aid to many distressed peoples around the world. We now have an opportunity to give some of our largess to some of our own people. I hope the Congress will pass H. R. 6923 and H. R. 6924, and other bills pending to provide housing, emergency aid, and the repair, restoration, or replacement of dikes, highways, and facilities of the Federal Government, and any needed aid to local communities.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit today during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was objection.

INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 56.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Inter-American Bar Association will hold its sixth conference at Detroit, Mich., during the month of May 1949; and

Whereas this is the first time that the Inter-American Bar Association has planned a conference in the United States; and

Whereas the purposes of the association, as stated in its constitution, are to establish and maintain relations between associations and organizations of lawyers, national and local, in the various countries of the Americas, to provide a forum for exchange of views, and to encourage cordial relations among the lawyers of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the high character of this international association, its deliberations, and its members can do much to encourage cordial relations among the countries of the Western Hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States welcomes the Inter-American Bar Association to the United States, and wishes the association unparalleled success in its sixth conference; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary General of the Inter-American Bar Association.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution passed the Senate yesterday. It was before the full committee on the Judiciary of the House this morning, and as chairman I was unanimously directed to make this request. I have cleared through the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader, and there is no objection. This resolution will not become a law: it is merely an expression of good will and welcome. It will cost no money. I cannot imagine any objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman what we can do here about this. They sent that over here, as I understand, unanimously. Now, we have a conference report, and the House conferees all signed it. Two of the Members of the other body have signed it, but the other one is carrying it around in his pocket. Now, my question is, How do we get that one out?

Mr. MICHENER. That is a parliamentary question that should be directed to the Speaker. I would be usurping the prerogatives of the Speaker if I attempted to answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Could the gentleman answer it in the lobby afterward?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That will be satisfactory. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

LT. GEN. LESLIE RICHARD GROVES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5596) to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas the development of an atomic bomb by the Manhattan engineer district, United States Army, during World War II represents not only the greatest achievement in weapon production but also one of the greatest achievements in the coordination of science, industry, and management in world history and was also a major factor in bringing that war to an earlier victorious close resulting in the saving of thousands of lives and great stores of resources; and

Whereas this accomplishment has also opened unlimited possibilities for peacetime and humanitarian application and expansion of atomic science for future use for the benefit of mankind; and

Whereas this initial achievement was successfully concluded under the leadership, supervision, and direction of Leslie Richard Groves, as Director of the Manhattan engineer district, with superior judgment and courage and in accordance with the highest traditions of the United States Army; and

Whereas the said Leslie Richard Groves has requested that he be retired from service as an officer of the United States Army and such retirement has been authorized; and

Whereas the American people and the Congress of the United States deeply appreciate the outstanding and unique service to the Nation and to humanity thus rendered by the said Leslie Richard Groves and desire to express this appreciation by means of official recognition thereof: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to appoint, without confirmation by the Senate, Leslie Richard Groves, Army serial No. 012043, lieutenant general, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of major general in the Regular Army, such appointment to be effective as of the day prior to the effective date of his retirement from the active list of the Regular Army and such appointment shall entitle him to receive the retired pay of major general of the Regular Army.

SEC. 2. The President is further authorized and requested, without confirmation by the Senate, to place the said Leslie Richard Groves on the retired list with the rank and grade of lieutenant general with honorary date of rank thereof as of July 16, 1945, which date commemorates the first explosion by man of an atomic bomb, at the Trinity site, Alamogordo, N. Mex. Such advancement in

grade and rank on the retired list, however, shall not result in any increase in retired pay.

SEC. 3. This act shall result in no permanent increase in the authorized number of major generals on the active list of the Regular Army.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEIRS, ASSIGNS, AND SUCCESSORS IN TITLE OF MOSES EVANS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1275) conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Warren County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the southwest quarter of section 6, township 14 north, range 4 east, Washington meridian, Warren County, Miss., consisting of approximately one hundred and sixty-three and forty-five one hundredths acres, is hereby granted, released, relinquished, and conveyed by the United States to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans upon payment by them into the Treasury of the United States the sum of $245.18; such land being the same land which was conveyed under the credit system laws (credit prior receipt numbered 9309) on September 15, 1818, to Moses Evans who, agreeing to pay to the United States the sum of $2 per acre for same, paid only the sum of $61.72 on entry leaving a balance due thereon of $245.18, now to be paid by the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of the said Moses Evans.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM COLLINS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1274) conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Wilkinson County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all right title, and interest of the United States in and to fractional section 4, township 1 north, range 5 west, Washington meridian, Wilkinson County, Miss., consisting of approximately four hundred and ninety acres, is hereby granted, released, relinquished, and conveyed by the United States to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins upon payment by them into the Treasury of the United States the sum of $735; such land being the same land which was conveyed under the credit system laws (credit prior receipts No. 11650, and 11753, dated July 21, 1819, and August 30, 1819, respectively) to William Collins who, agreeing to pay to the United States the sum of $2 per acre for same, paid only the sum of $245 on entry leaving a balance due thereon of $735, now to be paid by the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of the said William Collins.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH PICKERING WINN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 83) authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN BASQUE ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 158) for the relief of certain Basque aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of Gaspar Ybarzabal, Pedro Ybarzabal, and Antonio Monasterio, all of Ontario, Oreg., legally admitted as seamen but who have remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and that these aliens shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of their actual entry on the payment of the visa fees of $10 and head taxes of $8 per person.

Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to permit Gaspar Ybarzabal, Pedro Ybarzabal, and Antonio Monasterio to reside in the United States as temporary visitors for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof, provided they remain employed in the sheep industry. If any of the above-named aliens fails to maintain his occupation in the sheep industry at any time within 5 years after the date of enactment hereof, he shall be deemed to have remained in the United States for a longer time than permitted and shall be subject to deportation as provided in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended.

"If, at the expiration of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof, the Attorney General shall, after due investigation, find that any of the above-named aliens has maintained an employment in the sheep industry during the entire 5-year period, he is hereby authorized and directed to record such alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of his actual entry into the United States if he is otherwise found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas. The Attorney General shall communicate his findings to the Secretary of State, who shall thereupon instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number for each alien so lawfully admitted for permanent residence from the quota of Spain for the first year that said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTIAGO SOLABARRIETA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 765) for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, Santiago Solabarrieta, of Parma, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to permit Santiago Solabarrieta, of Parma, Idaho, to reside in the United States as a temporary visitor for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof, provided he remains employed in the sheep industry. In the event that the said Santiago Solabarrieta fails to maintain his occupation in the sheep industry at any time within 5 years after the date of enactment hereof, he shall be deemed to have remained in the United States for a longer time than permitted and shall be subject to deportation as provided in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

"If, at the expiration of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof the Attorney General shall, after due investigation, find that the said Santiago Solabarrieta has maintained an employment in the sheep industry during the entire 5-year period, he is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Santiago Solabarrieta as of December 1, 1924, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and head tax of $8, if he is otherwise found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas. The Attorney General shall communicate his finding to the Secretary of State, who shall thereupon instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Spain for the first year that said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOU CHUNG CHAY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1337) for the relief of Hou Chung Chay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Hou Chung Chay, of New York, N. Y., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted on June 5, 1942, to the United States for permanent resident, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon enactment of this Act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year in which such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKOTO IWAMATSU, ATSUSHI JUN IWAMATSU, AND TOMOE IWAMATSU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1409) for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703, 57 Stat. 600), Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, who rendered outstanding services to the United States Government during the war with Japan, and his wife, Tomoe Iwamatsu, both of whom entered the United States temporarily as visitors in 1939, may be permitted to remain permanently in the United States if they are found to be admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to persons of races ineligible to naturalization.

SEC. 2. That their 12-year-old son, Markoto Iwamatsu, now presently residing in Japan, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he can qualify for admission under all of the immigration laws other than those relating to persons of races ineligible to citizenship and those laws requiring an immigration visa.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WLADYSLAV PLYWACKI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1606) for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, Wladyslav Plywacki, who served with the United States Army in Europe following his liberation from a German prison camp, and who entered the United States illegally in June 1947, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Poland.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, if any, issued in the case of Wladyslav Plywacki. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Wladyslav Plywacki shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or such warrants and order have issued.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNA V. REYER AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1730) for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LEON MOORE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5336) for the relief of Leon Moore.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General shall not consider as applicable to Leon Moore (a) the provisions of (1) the act relating to certain excludable classes of aliens approved October 16, 1918, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 137), and (2) sections 3 and 19 (a) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, secs. 136 and 155 (a); Supp. V, title 8, sec. 155); and (b) the provisions of section 305 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 705).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LYDIA A. THOMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1303) for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the requirements of sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in the case of the late William M. Thompson, formerly employed by the War Department as a construction manager at Nitro, W. Va., who died on May 10, 1918, as a result of typhoid fever contracted by him while an employee in such capacity, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized and directed to consider and act upon any claim which may be filed with the Commission by Lydia A. Thompson, widow of said William M. Thompson, within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act, for compensation under the provisions of such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, for the death of said William M. Thompson; but compensation, if any, shall commence from and after the date of the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

O'CONNELL & SWEENEY, INC.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 644) for the relief of O'Connell & Sweeney, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 5974) entitled "A bill for the relief of O'Connell & Sweeney, Inc.," now pending in the House of Representatives, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to section 151 of the Judicial Code, as amended; and the said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said section and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of facts and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDA WAHLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1643) for the relief of Freda Wahler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the civil-service retirement and disability fund, to Freda Wahler, of Freeport, Ill., the widow of William F. Wahler, formerly a railway-mail clerk, an annuity equal in amount to the annuity which she would have been entitled to receive had William F. Wahler been promptly and properly advised by the Civil Service Commission of his rights as to retirement and had he upon receipt of the proper information elected in writing to receive a reduced annuity equal to such reduced annuity payable after his death to the said Freda Wahler as surviving beneficiary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time; and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE G. McCARTHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3066) for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, the alien Lawrence G. McCarthy, Toronto, Dominion of Canada, who is the husband of Mrs. Ruth Gardner McCarthy, a citizen and resident of the United States, shall not be subject (a) to the provisions of section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 136), insofar as such provisions may be applicable to his conviction in his youth in Toronto, on November 5, 1936, of the theft of personal property valued at less than $25; or (b) to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 4 of the act of March 4, 1929, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, secs. 180a, 180b, 180c), or of any other law prescribing a penalty for illegal entries by aliens into the United States, insofar as such provisions may be applicable to any entry by the said Lawrence G. McCarthy into the United States for a temporary stay. The Secretary of State, through the proper consular officer, is authorized and directed to issue to the said Lawrence G. McCarthy an immigration visa entitling him to immediate admission to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)) Lawrence G. McCarthy, a native and citizen of Toronto, Canada, whose wife is a citizen and resident of the United States, may be admitted for permanent residence under the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, if he is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES M. DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4103) for the relief of Charles M. Davis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles M. Davis, Frannie, Wyo., the sum of $25,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Charles M. Davis against the United States for personal injuries, which have resulted in permanent disability, sustained by him on June 21, 1939, near Deaver, Wyo., when he was pinned against his automobile by a Bureau of Reclamation tractor operated by an enrollee in the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARLTON C. GRANT AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4128) for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carlton C. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $1,312.50; to Clarence W. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $4,272.50; to Gordon W. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $1,500; to Margaret S. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $193.75; to W. P. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $3,500; to J. Perry Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $9,375; to A. A. Everett, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $737.50; to E. J. Lewis, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $7,500; to E. J. Lewis, Jr., of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $5,000; to Mrs. E. J. Lewis, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $2,500; to J. Stacy Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $593.75; to H. L. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $1,031.25; to J. Rufus Yopp, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $100; to Liston T. Yopp, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $37.50; to Lonnie Everett, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $1,057.50; to the estate of James B. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $825; to D. T. Millis, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $500; to A. T. Horne, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $200; to R. E. Sanders, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $441; to L. D. Hobbs, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $830; to Major Davis, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $825; to M. Donald Davis, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $396; to D. D. Justice, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $800; to the estate of Wade J. Everett, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $400; to L. E. Coleburn, of Morehead City, N. C., the sum of $2,500; to D. V. Justice, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $460; to T. R. Murphy, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $2,021; to Vance Howard, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $567; to Kater Howard, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $1,193; to Harry Moore, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $1,071; to G. C. Hansley, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $882; to Strickland Hobbs, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $440; to Corbett Hansley, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $690; to C. R. Bush, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $420; to R. D. Everett, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $560; to Austin Hobbs, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $750; to J. W. Everett, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $600; to L. M. Davis, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $300; to J. R. Hobbs, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $675; to Sherman R. Edens, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $900; to O. S. Edens, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $600; and to L. M. Davis, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $6,747, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for property damage to their cultivated oyster beds sustained by them as a result of the dumping of sewage and laundry waste from Camp Davis, N. C., which caused the pollution of the waters in which their cultivated oyster beds had been established and resulted in the loss of their cultivated oysters: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after the enacting clause, strike out the remainder of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, all claims of Carlton C. Grant, Rudolph Hobbs, Clarence W. Grant, Gordon W. Grant, Margaret S. Grant, W. P. Grant, J. Perry Grant, A. A. Everett, E. J. Lewis, E. J. Lewis, Jr., Mrs. E. J. Lewis, J. Stacy Grant, H. L. Grant, J. Rufus Yopp, Murray Guthrie, Liston T. Yopp, Lonnie T. Everett, the estate of James B. Grant, I. S. Thompson, all of Sneads Ferry, N. C.; D. T. Millis, A. T. Horne, R. E. Sanders, L. D. Hobbs, Major Davis, M. Donald Davis, D. D. Justice, Wade J. Everett, Millie C. Everett, D. V. Justice, T. R. Murphy, Vance Howard, Kater Howard, Harry Moore, G. C. Hansley, Strickland Hobbs, Corbett Hansley, C. R. Bush, R. D. Everett, Austin Hobbs, J. W. Everett, C. S. Everett, J. R. Hobbs, Sherman R. Edens, O. S. Edens, L. M. Davis, Guy L. Everett, C. C. Hines, L. W. Bishop, of Holly Ridge, N. C.; L. E. Coleburn, of Morehead City, N. C.; Mary Shepard, of route No. 1, Jacksonville, N. C.; E. B. Smith, of Jacksonville, N. C.; or the heirs, administrators, or executors of either or any of said persons who may now be dead, or hereafter die, against the United States for damages for injury to property resulting, at any time on or after May 1, 1941, from dumping of sewage and laundry waste from Camp Davis, N. C., into Goose Creek, Barlow Creek, and Kings Creek.

"SEC. 2. Proceedings for the determination of such claims shall be had in the same manner as in cases of which said court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended: *Provided*, That suits hereunder shall be instituted within 4 months after the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That this act shall be construed only to waive the immunity from suit of the Government of the United States and to confer jurisdiction upon said court to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the persons named in section 1 hereof, and not otherwise to affect any substantive rights of the parties."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. LEROY HANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4456) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann the aggregate sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the personal injury, the hospital and medical expenses, pain and suffering, loss of earnings, and property damage incurred by reason of the injuries and the property damage sustained by them as a result of being struck by an Army vehicle operated by Army personnel on Route 40, one-half mile north of Pennsville, N. J., on March 4, 1943, and said injuries and damage having been caused by the negligent operation of said Army vehicle so as to cause it to turn into the vehicle in which said Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann were riding: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$2,500."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "injury, the hospital and medical expenses, pain and suffering, loss of earnings, and property damage" and insert "injuries."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the date "4" and insert "3."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT A. ATLAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4601) for the relief of Robert A. Atlas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert A. Atlas, of Minneapolis, Minn., the sum of $615. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert A. Atlas against the United States for services rendered to the War Department during February and March 1946, when he served as civilian optometrist at Fort Snelling, Minn: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIMITRI PETROU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4881) for the relief of Dimitri Petrou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the alien Dimitri Petrou, of New York, N. Y., as of the 16th of July 1945, the date on which he entered the United States temporarily as a visitor, if he is otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota of Greece for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 8 after the word "visitor", strike out the balance of line 8 and all of line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREW FERDINAND DEWITT, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5145) for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Jr., a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Anderw Ferdinand DeWitt, Jr., of route 21, Alexandria, La., a minor, the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of his father, Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Sr., in an accident caused by a United States Army vehicle, near the city of Alexandria, La., in the parish of Rapides, State of Louisiana, on March 15, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the name "DeWitt", strike out "Junior" and insert "III."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$6,000."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Senior" and insert "Junior."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt III, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN KEITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5339) for the relief of John Keith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Keith, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $9,000. Such sum represents the loss sustained by Mr. Keith with respect to a contract entered into with the Federal Works Agency in 1944 for the construction of the Frontier Elementary School in San Diego, Calif. An error in transposing estimate figures to determine bid resulted in contracts drawn up for a sum lower than had been intended by the contractor. However, the correct sum of the bid was much lower than that submitted by any other contractor on this project.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. NEILL RAYMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5423) for the relief of E. Neill Raymond.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to E. Neill Raymond, examiner, Farmers Home Administration, Denver, Colo., the sum of $130.78, which represents the cost of transporting his immediate family from Washington, District of Columbia, to Denver, Colo., on August 21, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "pay", insert "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING TITLE TO MINERAL RIGHTS IN LAND IN OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5201) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey by quitclaim deed certain mineral rights in certain lands situated in the State of Oklahoma to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DORIS E. SNYDER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 165) for the relief of Doris E. Snyder.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, Calendar No. 664, and Calendar No. 665, and Calendar No. 666 be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6556), an act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Senate amendment has already been read, I ask unanimous consent that it be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6556 and agree to the Senate amendment?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to H. R. 6556, the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. When the bill was considered in the House, I made two principal objections:

First, that the requirement that the President obtain a report from the Tariff Commission as to the maximum permissible reduction to avoid injury to a

domestic producer would involve such interminable delay as to make negotiation of any new trade agreements almost impossible with the limited 1-year extension. The Senate amendments have substantially answered my criticism of the House bill in this respect. A time limitation of 4 months is placed upon the preparation of a report by the Tariff Commission. If the Tariff Commission does not file its report on the articles proposed for negotiation in a trade agreement to the President within such 4 months' period, then the President is authorized to proceed to negotiate, just as under existing law, without regard for the recommendations of the Tariff Commission.

Moreover, the Tariff Commission, in conducting its hearings and investigation, would not be limited to consideration of the effect of proposed changes in tariff rates upon the welfare of individual domestic producers, but rather of the effect upon an entire domestic industry. Not only is this sound policy, but it would also expedite the work of the Tariff Commission in making its findings and report to the President.

My second objection to the House bill was the requirement that the President submit to Congress for review and possible disapproval any trade agreement which would modify any duty or other import restriction to an extent greater than that recommended to him by the Tariff Commission. I argued that this proposal would constitute a return to the old Republican logrolling tariff policy embodied in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930. The deletion by the Senate of this requirement is, in my opinion, an important recognition by the other body, in which I wholeheartedly concur, that the Congress is in no position to scientifically fix specific tariff rates upon the thousands of diverse articles coming into this country.

Under the Senate amendments the President would be required, within 30 days after a trade agreement exceeding the recommendations of the Tariff Commission has been entered into, to send to the Congress a copy of the agreement together with a message accurately identifying the articles with respect to which such recommendations are not complied with and stating his reasons for the action taken with respect to such article. In my opinion, this requirement is not unduly restrictive upon the President, and in fact may be a constructive contribution to the reciprocal trade agreements procedure.

Mr. Speaker, while I should have preferred a 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act, both because it would have permitted better planning by the President for negotiating additional trade agreements and would have provided additional assurance to foreign countries that the Hull reciprocal trade policy will not be abandoned, I am convinced that H. R. 6556, as amended by the Senate, is infinitely preferable to allowing the present act to expire.

It is for these reasons, therefore, that I am supporting the Senate amendments.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a commencement address delivered at the University of Notre Dame by Mr. Paul G. Hoffman.

FOREIGN TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say regarding the unanimous request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] with regard to his request to concur in the Senate amendments to the extension of the Foreign Trade Agreements Act, having had an opportunity to consider the matter, we, the minority, have no objection to the gentleman's request that the House concur in the Senate amendments. The bill as amended by the Senate is less objectionable to the minority Members than the House bill, and with the restrictions and limitations with which the conferees would have to contend in their deliberations we see no reason for the delay which would be necessitated by sending the bill to conference. We have no objection to his request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain editorials.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial published in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

FLOATING OCEAN STATIONS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report of the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Coast Guard is authorized to operate and maintain floating ocean stations for the purpose of providing search and rescue, communication, and air-navigation facilities, and meteorological services in such ocean areas as are regularly traversed by aircraft of the United States.

"SEC. 2. The Coast Guard is authorized, subject to approval by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, to operate, on floating ocean stations authorized by section 1 hereof, such air-navigation facilities as the Administrator may find necessary or desirable for the safe and efficient protection and control of air traffic. The Coast Guard, in establishing, maintaining, or operating any air-navigation facilities herein provided, shall request the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage."

And the House agree to the same.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OWEN BREWSTER,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER CAPEHART,
ED. C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 1 of the Senate bill authorized the Coast Guard to operate and maintain such floating ocean stations as may be necessary or desirable to serve the needs of the armed forces and commerce of the United States and to fulfill the international obligations of the United States. Such stations were to be established to provide adequate meteorological, communication, search and rescue facilities for the safe, regular, and economic operation of air services over regions regularly traversed by commercial or military aircraft of the United States. The House amendment accomplished substantially the same objectives in different language, but (a) omitted reference to the establishment of such stations for the purpose of fulfilling the international obligations of the United States, and (b) added a proviso requiring the certificate of the Secretary of Defense as a condition precedent to the establishment of any such station. The conferees agreed to the adoption of the language employed by the House amendment, after eliminating the requirement that the Secretary of Defense certify the need for such stations.

Section 2 of the Senate bill (a) provided that the Coast Guard should obtain the approval of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for the operation, on such floating stations, of such air navigation facilities as the Administrator might find necessary or desirable to protect and control air traffic, and (b) directed the Coast Guard to solicit the cooperation of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to insure the utilization of personnel and facilities of the Administration to the fullest possible advantage. The House amendment omitted this section. The conferees agreed to the restoration of such section with one minor change in phrasing.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF AIDS TO NAVIGATION BY COAST GUARD

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1853) to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1853) to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That in order to aid navigation and to prevent disasters, collisions, and wrecks of vessels and aircraft, the Coast Guard is authorized to establish, maintain, and operate—

"(a) aids to maritime navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces or of the commerce of the United States;

"(b) aids to air navigation required to serve the needs of the armed force of the United States as requested by the Secretary of the appropriate Department within the National Military Establishment; and

"(c) Loran stations (1) required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States; or (2) required to serve the needs of the maritime commerce of the United States; or (3) required to serve the needs of the air commerce of the United States as determined by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

"SEC. 2. The Coast Guard in establishing, maintaining, or operating any aids to air navigation herein provided shall solicit the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage. Before locating and operating any such aid on military or naval bases or regions, the consent of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, shall first be obtained. No such aid shall be located within the territorial jurisdiction of any foreign country without the consent of the government thereof. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to limit the authority granted by the provisions of section 77 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 621), or by section 5 (f) of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (49 U. S. C. 175), or by title III of Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 451 and the following).

"SEC. 3. Such aids to navigation other that loran stations shall be established and operated only within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States at places where naval or military bases of the United States are or may be located, and at other places where such aids to navigation have been established on the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OWEN BREWSTER,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER CAPEHART,
ED C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (H. R. 1853) to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill—

(1) Authorized the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to maritime navigation and air navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces, and also loran stations required to serve the needs of such forces, the maritime commerce of the United States, and the air commerce of the United States;

(2) Specified that such aids might be established within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and at other places, including military or naval bases, beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States;

(3) Prescribed that loran stations so established to serve the needs of the air commerce of the United States be such as may be determined by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to be required;

(4) Specifically required the Coast Guard to solicit the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in obtaining the fullest utilization of the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

(5) Specifically required the Coast Guard to obtain the consent of the Secretary of the armed service concerned before establishing any such aids on military or naval bases or regions;

(6) Specifically required the procurement of the consent of any foreign country before establishing any such aid therein; and

(7) Provided expressly that nothing in the bill should limit the authority granted by certain cited statutes.

Section 1 of the House amendment contained in substance the provisions of the Senate bill referred to in paragraph (1) above, but omitted the remaining elements of the Senate bill. Section 2 of the House amendment contains in substance the provisions of element (2) of the Senate bill, and in addition provides authority for the establishment and operation of such aids other than the loran stations "at other places where such aids to navigation have been established on the date of the enactment of this Act."

The conferees agreed to a bill which, in three sections, contains all elements of the Senate bill and the House amendment thereto. Section 1 includes elements (1) and (3) of the Senate bill. Section 2 contains all other elements of the Senate bill. Section 3 contains the text of section 2 of the House amendment.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM IN THE FIELD OF LIGHTER-THAN-AIR AERONAUTICS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the United States Maritime Commission is authorized and directed to study, and plan for, experimental lighter-than-air rigid airship construction and operation. The Commission shall report to the Congress as soon as practicable in the first regular session of the Eighty-first Congress the results of its study with such recommendations for further legislation as it may consider desirable and feasible for the development and operation of lighter-than-air rigid airships for commercial use."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted

by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The United States Maritime Commission shall receive the assistance and cooperation of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government, and may avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in conducting the study provided for in this act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OWEN BREWSTER,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER CAPEHART,
ED C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Section 1 of the House bill authorized and directed the United States Maritime Commission to formulate and carry into effect a program for the development, experimentation, procurement, and operation of lighter-than-air aircraft, and provided authority for the making of purchases and the execution of contracts necessarily incident thereto. The Senate amendment merely authorized the Commission to prepare a study and plan for experimental lighter-than-air rigid airship construction and operation, and required a report to be made to the Congress as soon as practicable during the first regular session of the Eighty-first Congress. The House recedes, with an amendment which directs the preparation of such study and plan, and the submission of such report to the Congress.

Amendment No. 2: The House bill authorized the Commission to (a) confer with and (b) utilize the personnel and facilities of other Government agencies in carrying out the provisions of the bill. The Senate amendment omitted element (a), but included element (b) in revised language. The House recedes, with an amendment making mandatory the rendition of assistance by other Government agencies to the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the bill.

Amendment No. 3: Section 3 of the House bill authorized the appropriation of such sums as shall be necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill. The Senate amendment thereto accomplished substantially the same objective, but in revised language. The House recedes.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVERSION, MERGER, OR CONSOLIDATION OF NATIONAL BANKS INTO STATE BANKS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6570) to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, feeling as I do about the potential effect and the implication involved in this bill, I was compelled to say when the matter was considered in the committee that I could not go along with the enactment of this legislation. As you may have observed, it is a bill to change the long-standing policy and law of the Nation with respect to the conversion, merger, or consolidation of national banks and State banks.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is the most dangercus time and period in our economy when this action could be taken. When I came to the Committee on Banking and Currency I spent about 3 months studying the law with respect to the Treasury Department, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Reserve System, the latter, of course, being relatively a newer set-up in our economy and financial structure. The result of that study did not yield me enough knowledge to assume or presume to write a book on it, but I was satisfied that as we have the situation now as the result of these several establishments and monetary developments that it ought not to be disturbed, and that we have a very excellent method of banking in this country, each one necessary, and the law pertaining to them very jealously guarded, or should be. The proposal in this bill is to change the manner of the conversion of national banks into State banks. We have about 14,000 banks in the United States. Nine thousand of this number, or substantially that, are State banks; about 5,005 are national banks. The Federal Reserve System is dependent upon the national banks for its existence. Under the law it is required that national banks shall be members of the Federal Reserve System; as to the State banks, it is optional with them. Some of them come in and some do not. There is some, I think, slight ground for saving a little charge for banks desiring to withhold their membership or to withdraw their membership from the Reserve System, but this is not to be compared with the value of the system that we have and which obtains in the United States today.

Substantially, our financial structure has been orderly and preserved by the Treasury, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Reserve Banking System, since it was adopted some 30 years ago, or maybe not so long. There would be, to speak frankly about it, too much of a monetary temptation on the part of some national banks to withdraw from the Federal Reserve System, which they could only do by converting themselves into State banks. Then it would be optional with them as to whether they were members of the Federal Reserve System. I can see the possibility and maybe the probability that to make it easy, as this bill does, for national banks to convert into State banks, would be a temptation to them to do this, and there is potentially more than a possibility that enough of these banks would convert into State banks for the simple objective of avoiding the monetary requirement for the support of the Federal Reserve System. And, we could have at a time when this Nation owes—nobody can state the exact amount, but somewhere between $250,000,000,000 and $260,000,000,000, there would be difficulty in financing that and the ability to guarantee against disaster in these matters is so much fixed in the Federal Reserve System that we ought not to do anything that would lend itself to crippling our Federal Reserve System in the United States.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman is saying. I just wonder, if there is a real danger, why the Federal Reserve Board did not express opposition to the bill.

Mr. FOLGER. I did not intend to bring that up, Mr. Speaker, but you know that at this time we have as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board a very fine gentleman, whom I have met, and whom I regard most highly, upon whom we are likely to thrust without sufficient consideration this legislation that might result in the destruction of the Federal Reserve System. Frankly, I should like to have furnished to Mr. McCabe sufficient time for him to acquaint himself with the potentialities of such legislation. I do not mean to say this, but I doubt seriously whether Mr. McCabe has had an opportunity to give what he himself would determine to be a sufficient consideration to the implications involved in this legislation. I am persuaded from the little acquaintanceship I have had with him that if he had the time he would not allow somebody to come down from the Federal Reserve System and say, "We have no objection to this legislation." We are endangering his position as a relatively new Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board in insisting upon this legislation now.

I think, as a matter of fact, such legislation ought to be postponed, and ought to have been postponed until a later date. The two banking systems, the State banking system and the national banks, have run right along together in that proportion. The 9,000 State banks have remained at about that figure in number and the 5,000 national banks have remained at about that figure in number. I think there are 5,011 now.

I believe we are projecting a dangerous proposal in making it easier for banks to escape the amount of money they must keep with the Federal Reserve System to sustain it by voluntary withdrawal when they come to the State banks, and crippling the whole financial system of the United States, and I suggest that it is highly dangerous.

I am opposed to this bill, as I consider it very dangerous legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. (a) As used in this act the term "State bank" means any bank, banking association, trust company, savings bank (other than a mutual savings bank), or other banking institution which is engaged in the business of receiving deposits and which is incorporated under the laws of any State, any Territory of the United States, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, or which is operating under the Code of Law for the District of Columbia (except a national banking association).

(b) For purposes of merger or consolidation under the act the term "national banking association" means one or more national banking associations, and the term "State bank" means one or more State banks.

CONVERSION OF NATIONAL BANK INTO AND MERGER OR CONSOLIDATION WITH STATE BANK; PROCEDURE

SEC. 2. A national banking association may, by vote of the holders of at least two-thirds of each class of its capital stock, convert into, or merge or consolidate with, a State bank in the same State in which the national bank is located, under a State charter, in the following manner:

(a) The plan of conversion, merger, or consolidation must be approved by a majority of the entire board of directors of the national banking association. The bank shall publish notice of the time, place, and object of the shareholders' meeting to act upon the plan, in some newspaper with general circulation in the place where the principal office of the national bank is located, at least once a week for four consecutive weeks: *Provided*, That newspaper publication may be dispensed with entirely if waived by all the shareholders and in the case of a merger or consolidation one publication at least 10 days before the meeting shall be sufficient if publication for 4 weeks is waived by holders of at least two-thirds of each class of capital stock and prior written consent of the Comptroller of the Currency is obtained. The national banking association shall send such notice to each shareholder of record by registered mail at least 10 days prior to the meeting, which notice may be waived specifically by any shareholder.

(b) A shareholder of a national banking association who votes against the conversion, merger, or consolidation, or who has given notice in writing to the bank at or prior to such meeting that he dissents from the plan, shall be entitled to receive in cash the value of the shares held by him, if and when the conversion, merger, or consolidation is consummated, upon written request made to the resulting State bank at any time before 30 days after the date of consummation of such conversion, merger, or consolidation, accompanied by the surrender of his stock certificates. The value of such shares shall be determined as of the date on which the shareholders' meeting was held authorizing the conversion, merger, or consolidation, by a committee of three persons, one to be selected by unanimous vote of the dissenting shareholders entitled to receive the value of their shares, one by the directors of the resulting State bank, and the third by the two so chosen. The valuation agreed upon by any two of three appraisers thus chosen shall govern; but, if the value so fixed shall not be satisfactory to any dissenting shareholder who has requested payment as provided herein, such shareholder may within 5 days after being notified of the appraised value of his shares appeal to the Comptroller of the Currency, who shall cause a reappraisal to be made, which shall be final and binding as to the value of the shares of the appellant. If, within 90 days from the date of consummation of the conversion, merger, or consolidation, for any reason one or more of the appraisers is not selected as herein provided, or the appraisers fail to determine the value of such shares, the Comptroller shall upon written request of any interested party, cause an appraisal to be made, which shall be final and binding on all parties. The expenses of the Comptroller in making the reappraisal, or the appraisal as the case may be, shall be paid by the resulting State bank. The plan of conversion, merger, or consolidation shall provide the manner of disposing of the shares of the resulting State bank not taken by the dissenting shareholders of the national banking association.

SAME ENTITY

SEC. 3. The franchise of a national banking association as a national banking association shall automatically terminate when its conversion into or its merger or consolidation with a State bank under a State charter is consummated and the resulting State bank shall be considered the same business and corporate entity as the national banking association, although as to rights, powers, and duties the resulting bank is a State bank. Any reference to such national banking association in any contract, will, or document shall be considered a reference to the State bank if not inconsistent with the provisions of the contract, will, or document or applicable law.

FEDERAL TAXATION

SEC. 4. Without limiting the application of section 3, a State or national banking association resulting from a conversion, merger, or consolidation shall for purposes of Federal taxation be considered the same taxpayer as the bank from which it has converted or a bank which has merged or consolidated with it.

CONTRAVENTION WITH STATE LAW

SEC. 5. No conversion of a national banking association into a State bank or its merger or consolidation with a State bank shall take place under this act in contravention of the law of the State in which the national banking association is located; and no such conversion, merger, or consolidation shall take place under this act unless under the law of the State in which such national banking association is located State banks may without approval by any State authority convert into and merge or consolidate with national banking associations as provided by Federal law.

CONSENT OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 6. Section 12B (v) (4) of the Federal Reserve Act (title 12, U. S. C., sec. 264 (v) (4)), is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Without prior written consent by the Corporation, no insured bank shall (a) merge or consolidate with any nominsured bank or institution or convert into a noninsured bank or institution or (b) assume liability to pay any deposits made in, or similar liabilities of, any noninsured bank or institution or (c) transfer assets to any noninsured bank or institution in consideration of the assumption of liabilities for any portion of the deposits made in such insured bank. No insured bank shall convert into an insured State bank if its capital stock, or its surplus will be less than the capital stock or surplus, respectively, of the converting bank at the time of the shareholders' meeting approving such conversion, without prior written consent by the Comptroller of the Currency if the resulting bank is to be a district bank, or by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System if the resulting bank is to be a State member bank (except a District bank), or by the Corporation if the resulting bank is to be a State nonmember insured bank (except a District bank). No insured bank shall (a) merge or consolidate with an insured State bank under the charter of a State bank or (b) assume liability to pay any deposits made in another insured bank, if the capital stock or surplus of the resulting or assuming bank will be less than the aggregate capital stock or aggregate surplus, respectively, of all the merging or consolidating banks or of all the parties to the assumption of liabilities, at the time of the shareholders' meetings which authorized the merger or consolidation or at the time of the assumption of liabilities, unless the Comptroller of the Currency shall give prior written consent if the assuming bank is to be a national bank or the assuming or resulting bank is to be a District bank; or unless the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System gives prior written consent if the assuming or resulting bank is to be a State member bank (except a District bank); or unless the Corporation gives prior written consent if the assuming or resulting bank is to be a nonmember insured bank (except a District bank). No insured State nonmember bank (except a District bank) shall without the prior consent of the Corporation, reduce the amount or retire any part of its common or preferred capital stock, or retire any part of its capital notes or debentures."

CONTINUED DEPOSIT INSURANCE

SEC. 7. Section 12B (e) (2) of the Federal Reserve Act (title 12, U. S. C., sec. 264 (e) (2)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentences: "A State bank, resulting from the conversion of an insured national bank, shall continue as an insured bank. A State bank, resulting from the merger or consolidation of insured banks, or from the merger or consolidation of a noninsured bank or institution with an insured State bank, shall continue as an insured bank."

EFFECT OF TERMINATION OF INSURANCE OF MEMBER BANKS

SEC. 8. The last sentence of section 12B (1) (2) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U. S. C., sec. 264 (1) (2)), is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of this section, whenever a member bank shall cease to be a member of the Federal Reserve System, its status as an insured bank shall, without notice or other action by the board of directors, terminate on the date the bank shall cease to be a member of the Federal Reserve System, with like effect as if its insured status had been terminated on said date by the board of directors after proceedings under paragraph (1) of this subsection."

CONTINUED MEMBERSHIP IN THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

SEC. 9. Section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act (title 12, U. S. C., sec. 321) as amended, is amended by inserting after the first paragraph thereof the following new paragraph: "Upon the conversion of a national bank into a State bank, or the merger or consolidation of a national bank with a State bank which is not a member of the Federal Reserve System, the resulting or continuing State bank may be admitted to membership in the Federal Reserve System by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in accordance with the provisions of this section, but, otherwise, the Federal Reserve bank stock owned by the national bank shall be canceled and paid for as provided in section 5 of this act. Upon the merger or consolidation of a national bank with a State member bank under a State charter, the membership of the State bank in the Federal Reserve System shall continue."

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision

to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "the" and insert "this."

Page 2, line 13, after "national", strike out "bank" and insert "banking association."

Page 2, line 22, strike out "bank" and insert "banking association."

Page 5, strike out lines 10 to 16 inclusive.

Page 5, line 18, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Page 6, line 5, strike out "6" and insert "5."

Page 8, line 4, strike out "7" and insert "6."

Page 8, line 15, strike out "8" and insert "7."

Page 9, line 5, strike out "9" and insert "8."

Page 9, line 23, strike out "10" and insert "9."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFERRING ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT TO FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2225) to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all functions, powers, and duties of the Farm Credit Administration and of the Governor thereof under the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, secs. 1751–1772), together with the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect thereto, which were transferred to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1947, part IV, section 401, are hereby transferred to the Federal Security Agency.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the Federal Security Agency a Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, which shall be under the supervision of a director appointed by the Federal Security Administrator. The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions and the Director thereof shall be under the general direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator. The functions, powers, and duties of the Farm Credit Administration under the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, shall be exercised by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. The functions, powers, and duties of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration under the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, shall be exercised by the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions.

SEC. 3. There are hereby transferred to the Federal Security Agency, to be used in the administration of the functions hereby transferred, (a) all property, including office equipment, transferred to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation pursuant to Executive Order 9148 of April 27, 1942, and in use on the effective date of this act; (b) all property, including office equipment, purchased by the Corporation for use exclusively in connection with the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, the cost of which has been charged to such functions and which is in use on the effective date of this act; (c) all records and files pertaining exclusively to the supervision of Federal Credit Unions; and (d) all personnel employed primarily in the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, on the effective date of this act.

SEC. 4. All funds allocated, specifically or otherwise, in the budget of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, which may be unexpended on the effective date of this act, shall be transferred by the Corporation to the Federal Security Agency for use in the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended. The Corporation shall be reimbursed for the funds so transferred and shall also be reimbursed for all other funds expended by it prior to the effective date of this act in the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, in excess of fees from Federal credit unions received by the Corporation, by deducting such amounts from the first moneys payable to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of the retirement of the stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation owned by the United States, and the Corporation shall have a charge on such stock for such amounts.

SEC. 5. This act shall become effective on the thirtieth day following the date of enactment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 3, line 6, strike out "1948" and insert "1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 671, providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill (H. R. 6401) it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill, S. 2655, and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H. R. 6401 as passed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for 3 hours of general debate. It also waives all points of order. The bill is open to amendment under the 5-minute rule. It also provides for one motion to recommit. I am not personally going to ask for a roll call on the rule, but I am going to do so upon the final passage of the bill itself. The reason I am not going to ask for a roll call on the rule is that I believe the great majority of the Members of the House, after hearing debate on the bill, will be convinced that this is not a necessary or a good bill. We all want national security. The question is, do we want national security by the American way, or by coercion, compulsion, regimentation, and controls? What was disclosed before the Committee on Rules at the hearings in regard to this draft bill? I know that a few brass hats and braid and others were for this bill. The only thing they say is that there is a great emergency confronting this Nation, which necessitates shackling the youth of this country. These people say there is a great emergency, an emergency that will shackle the youth of the Nation, but at the same time they are not saying that there is an emergency in Washington, so that it will be necessary that the Congress of the United States should be here to meet it. I say it confuses me to have these people say there is such an emergency throughout the world that we need to take our young men from the mines and mills, farms and factories, and at the same time, these same individuals do not say that there is an emergency that should keep the Congress of the United States here in Washington.

What about voluntary enlistments? Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that voluntary enlistments have not been given a fair trial. I went back to my own district in Illinois last year and spent considerable time delving into this method of voluntary enlistments. I saw young boys come into my district trying to enlist these young men. They could not sell a sack of peanuts to anyone, but they would contact high-school boys and talk to them about 5 minutes—youths whom they had never seen—then go away, thinking that that 5-minute talk to a stranger would be enough to convince those young men to give up three or four of the best years of their lives.

I have heard it said, "Well, you voted for the 70-group air force. We must put in these additional young men to take care of that." The record discloses that the Air Force and the Navy are getting more applicants than they need for the Air Force and the Navy. My information is that the Air Force and Navy are not urging this peacetime draft bill.

We must all know that the history of wars shows clearly that it is not manpower in the armed services that it is most difficult to obtain when war starts, but after war is declared we know that manpower to produce equipment, airplanes, ships, and so forth, is our chief problem.

It has been said that Russia is a great threat. I think history will disclose that Russian communism does not spread through military aggression, but the method that the Communists use is through infiltration. They did that in Czechoslovakia; they are doing it in Italy; they are doing it in France; they are doing it in America. History discloses that they do not use military aggression in spreading their unfair, unreasonable, and detestable doctrines.

While some Members of Congress have taken the floor against regimentation and controls of cattle and sugar and meat and nylons—oh, they stood here and said, "We cannot have controls and regulations on nylons and sugar and cattle and sheep," but they are willing to regiment and control the lives of human beings.

I know that a strong national security is dependent upon a contented people and a solvent government. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot have a contented people when you take the youth of our Nation off the farms—out of the mines and mills and factories. Let those young people stay on and produce. Let those young men stay on the farms, in the mines, factories, or mills to produce. We have taken on an obligation to feed and take care of most of the world. We know that sending these billions of dollars' worth of goods abroad has raised prices, and will raise prices up to the sky. So, I say, let these young men remain there. Let them be carpenters or mechanics in their home life because it is also important in the event of an emergency that we have some skilled laborers.

After all, who is for this draft bill? All I know for it is the brass and the braid. That is all; a few international newspapers; probably a few top American Legion officials.

Who is opposed to it? From whom do we receive hundreds of letters? Are the patriotic groups for it? Certainly they are not for it. Are the schools for it? Most of them, Mr. Speaker, are opposed to the draft. Are the colleges for it? Why, of course not. Are the churches? No. Are the farm organizations? No. Are the labor organizations? No. Are the millions of young men for it? Of course not, Mr. Speaker, because if they were for military service we would not have this draft bill before us; they would be in the armed forces. Some people say these young boys just love military service. Mr. Speaker, I say if they loved it they would naturally be in it.

Are the millions of mothers and fathers for this bill? If they were, we would not have this bill before us.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. No; not now.

So I will say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I am not going to ask for a roll call vote on the rule, but I am going to ask for a roll call on the final vote. I believe that after you hear this debate you will be convinced that the Army has deliberately not tried to obtain volunteers, that they have intentionally raised the qualifications so high they cannot get recruits.

I may say that in the Rules Committee a change of one vote would have kept this bill bottled up.

I repeat, I am not going to ask a roll call on the rule, but I certainly will ask for a roll call on final passage, and I hope everyone will seriously consider the alternative: Do we want to go the American way, or do we want to go the way of compulsion, coercion, regimentation, and control?

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949, SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate, and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JENSEN, FENTON, STOCKMAN, SCHWABE of Oklahoma, KIRWAN, NORRELL, and GORE.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the opposition that I find to what is here proposed is something that alarms me greatly. It makes me wonder if self-defense and resistance to wrong is no longer regarded as moral law. Surely no one is insensible to the danger to liberty which impends. That our country is embroiled in a worldwide struggle that the people would like to have avoided, must be apparent to all. To use the occasion to stimulate prejudice against our armed forces is to forget the gravity of the moment and to lend encouragement to the effort to undermine the foundations upon which the Republic rests.

There is in my heart no ill will toward those who have views contrary to my own, and I would not intentionally give offense, but that the strength of the Nation must now be marshaled in its own defense is my profoundest conviction. Concern for the welfare of our country must be the guide to what we do. We should not here impeach the expressed intention of what we have done. We should not sabotage the defense program that we have set up and render useless the billions and billions of dollars that we have spent and are now spending.

That Russia means to enslave the whole of mankind, the entire world takes cognizance. Her masters have said that communism and democracy cannot live side by side, that either the one or the other must perish.

To Russia's campaign of aggression, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Poland have fallen. Russia is in Austria, eastern Germany, and Korea. There is no place on this globe that is inhabited by man but that her agents are there promoting discord, fomenting strife, preaching revolution. Unhappily, we, simpleton-like, have permitted her to use our own resources to make war on us and the rest of the world. Shamefully, let it be confessed, we are in great measure responsible for the power which she now wields and the threat which she holds over the heads of mankind.

It has been with difficulty that the people have learned that which has heretofore been kept concealed from them, that is, that our policy of appeasement—amounting to something of a partnership arrangement with Russia—has brought this country to the verge of ruin and made necessary the spending of billions in the endeavor to overcome the most colossal blunder ever committed in the international field and to expiate the greatest crime of all time.

Mr. Speaker, what is proposed in this bill which the pending resolution is intended to make in order? The Committee sponsoring the bill has reported that the armed services needs to be increased in the interest of national security. The majority report filed is a simple, direct, plain, understandable statement of the situation as it exists. The minority report is a magnificent oration, but it is neither consistent nor convincing. In the minority report there is this language: "We feel that our objections to the conscription program in no way compromises our recognition that America must remain strong and well defended." So, the Committee on Armed Services are in agreement as the bill states, "That an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of the Nation." The difference we find between members of the committee is the method by which the needed strength may be attained, whether by voluntary enlistment or by the method provided for in the bill.

It is proposed that the strength of the Army be increased to 837,000 over its present strength of 542,000, that the Navy be increased from 397,000 to 556,882; Marine Corps from 81,000 to 110,000, and the Air Force from 364,000 to 502,600. In the light of present world conditions these increases are modest and reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, the testimony taken by the committee disclosed that the strength of all the branches of the Armed Services has been progressively diminishing with the exception of the Air Force. Let me turn to the report of the committee. From July 1947, to March 1, 1948, the Army personnel dropped from 594,078 to 469,496. The Navy fell off from 434,000 to 351,000. The Air Force increased in its enlistment from 263,000 to 317,000.

The report of the committee discloses that the Army, resorting to every means at its command, has failed to obtain the necessary enlistments by the volunteer system. That is also true as to the Navy.

If the now authorized method of obtaining enlistments has not produced men sufficient to maintain the Army and Navy at present or presently authorized strength, then is it not reasonable to

suppose that it would fail to produce men in numbers sufficient to fill the requirements of an enlarged Army and Navy?

The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. ALLEN], insists that we should continue to rely upon the volunteer system, but if that plan has failed and cannot be made productive then what would he recommend? We must get the men by some means. The bill states that in a free society the obligations and privileges of such service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selection as herein provided.

Let me make disclosure to you of something of which I am proud. Gentlemen opposing this bill tell you of the number of communications that they have had, telegrams and letters, in protest to the bill. I have had from my district and from the people of my State hundreds and hundreds of letters and telegrams, and up to this moment I have not had one in opposition to the bill. Now, why am I for conscription? I favor it because I do not want my part of the country drained of its young manhood in order that the full requirements of the armed services may be met. I have not forgotten that prior to World War II when relying upon the voluntary system my congressional district alone was putting more men into the armed services to fight the coming war than many of the States with their teeming millions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, obviously it is quite impossible to discuss all the details or anything like a considerable portion of the details of this legislation in a period of 6 minutes. We have before us now the matter of adopting a rule which will enable the House of Representatives to debate this question and make its own decision on the legislation. I have been contending for a good many weeks that it was the proper function, under these peculiar circumstances, of the Committee on Rules to give the House of Representatives this opportunity. The issue is too vital to be dodged, and the bill too important to be buried. For one, I rejoice that upon yesterday the Committee on Rules decided to bring in this rule which will make it possible for the Members of the House to make their decision.

I have listened, Mr. Speaker, for a good many years to debates and discussions on the problems of national defense. Some of the observations which I hear being made today and that have been made in the last several days are, unless I am very much mistaken, exactly along the same lines that I heard in 1940. Indeed, although it is not important and probably not even interesting, I heard the same sort of arguments made in 1920, when I happened to be chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate. Always the contention is made that it is not necessary to do this or that for our defense. Always the contention has been made that we can get along without this or without that. Upon a good many occasions in the past those urgings were influential and were accepted in very large degree, dating back to 1920, with the result, in my humble judgment, that we have lost thousands of lives and spent billions and billions of dollars as a result of our neglect. I know people may differ with me on that, but I cannot avoid at this time expressing that opinion, for it has been deep-seated in me for 28 years.

Among other things which so many people are apt to do when a war is over is to start denouncing the military services and saying that if they would do this differently or that differently all would be at its best. Denouncing the Army seems to be the fashion amongst a good many people as soon as the Army and the other military services have won a great victory. Expressions of lack of confidence in our military leaders are very numerous. Only a short time ago they were heroes in the minds of the public, and today those same men are not worthy of confidence in the minds of some.

I have encountered a good many of those men, and never once have I found a man who loved war, never once have I found a man who did not abhor war. Yet, charged as they are with the duty of studying our national defense and its potentials and expressing their opinions decently, one should not put aside ruthlessly the evidence which they produce.

It is not only they who produce the evidence which confronts us today. Mr. Speaker, you and I know full well that this world is in an exceedingly tense situation, exceedingly tense. I am not here to say that war is to come tomorrow or next week or in this calendar year or next year, but that the situation contains a menace to the freedom of the people of the United States cannot be denied.

If all the human race were angels or angelic characters the situation would be very different, but the trouble is that every so often in the history of our race a group arises composed of wicked people, that is, wicked in the sense that we understand that word here in the United States, people intent upon doing wrong and doing it in wholesale fashion. If those regrettable characteristics did not underlie some parts of human nature we would not have to maintain police forces in our cities. Why do we maintain them? To protect society against the wicked. Today it turns out—and we have not sought the responsibility—today it turns out that the United States is the country most looked to for the protection of liberty. Obviously we protect it primarily in our own interests, but we cannot protect our own liberty without at the same time doing our best to protect the liberties of other peoples who normally are our friends. And if we are not strong in the face of this menace, strong in the cause of righteousness, then we may very well fail.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to my distinguished friends, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who, I am sure you will join me in saying, are two of the most valued Members of the House of Representatives. Possibly it would be the better part of wisdom for "a sparrow to seek cover when the eagles begin to fly". But I am so thoroughly convinced—I have such strong convictions about this matter that I have no hesitancy in taking issue with the two distinguished gentlemen. I listened with great care to the remarks of my friend from Georgia, whom I love—and he knows it. At times he has a tongue as blistering as the tropical sun, but he has an inner spirit and a soul as refreshing as the evening dew.

I want to discuss some features of this bill now before us. At the outset I want to say this: It is thoroughly out of place for any man on the floor of the House to begin to insinuate with reference to the patriotism of any man who might oppose this legislation. I have no hesitancy in proclaiming my patriotism. I served in one war as many of you did, and if necessary to save this Nation, there is not a man in the House that I know of who would not serve in another. There is no question of patriotism involved here. It is a plain question of right or wrong. And when the gentleman from New York refers to "righteousness," he opens up a very important subject. He wants protection but is apparently unwilling to pay his protection fair compensation for services rendered unless they are commissioned officers. I am opposed to this legislation because it is undemocratic; it is not necessary. It is not in the best interests of society; it does not provide maximum safety; and it is definitely—definitely, I repeat, to the detriment of the educational system and the future of this country. Why do I say it is undemocratic? Because we are now stepping away for the first time, in times such as these, and saying that we are going to invoke the rules of regimentation. I want a strong Army, I want a strong Navy, I want a strong Air Corps and Marine Corps—but let us get them in the American way.

I say to those gentlemen who advocate this, How will you get the planes made for which you have appropriated billions of dollars? You will pay men to build them, you will pay good salaries. How do you propose to get men to build machines, and buildings to house these young men that you would reach out and take with the strong arm of this Government, and say, "You must come in"? You are going to pay them for it. That is how you will get them. Yet to the private in the Army you pay $75 a month. Does that hold any future? Is there anything there that would give to a young man an inspiration for 2 years? Talk about the morale of this country! My God, there is nothing that would

wreck it any more completely than this bill at this time and that I know.

I just witnessed the graduation of 2,300 young men and women at Duke University and the University of North Carolina. The young men were filled with optimism and enthusiasm to make good. What is the future for them? Do not tell me that young men will not go where it is attractive. They will. You do not have anything to do but make it attractive. Certainly, we want an insurance policy. But who are you and who am I to walk around and say, "I want that insurance policy furnished by someone else," when we are not even willing to pay for it? For too long the policy of this Government has been that 5 percent of the people do the marching, fighting, and dying while the other 95 percent make money.

I was struck by this statement in the bill:

> The Congress further declared that in a free society the obligations and privileges of such service should be shared generally.

Why, certainly, it should be shared generally. Does that mean that we shall extract from these young men 2 years, black them out, so to speak, for $75 per month? No it means that we should all do our part. To those who serve as our protectors in peacetime should be paid fair compensation by those who are receiving protection. To do otherwise is obviously unfair. And certainly $75 per month for 24 hours service per day is insufficient, unfair, and unattractive.

The Navy is not enthusiastic over this bill. The Marine Corps is not enthusiastic over this bill. What is the matter with the Army? Why can they not make it attractive? Why is it that they have not encouraged their Reserve Corps? Why is it they have not given more attention to the National Guard? Why is it that they have not built the Reserve Corps? Why did they raise the physical and mental requirements of the men? Why is it they have those conditions prevailing which led the minority report to say that their lack of interest in those branches of our national defense had almost reached the point of a national scandal? Why is it they did not carry on with the National Guard and the Reserve? Why is it, when they were wanting universal military training, that they made the statement that they could get along with a minimum of 6 months' training for these men, and yet they now want them for 2 years? You and I know they have been pumping for this condition for years and years, and have been busy setting the stage. When the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] says he has been advocating this for 28 years, he did not make any mistake. I have been here only 14 years, but he has been grinding constantly for 14 years, to my knowledge. Certainly the Army wants more men, and more power, and no more wise statement was ever made than that men who want power and love to exercise it, should not be trusted with power. The heads are men; men are ambitious. The Congress of the United States should see to it that this country is protected against all isms including militarism.

I say to you, now watch the airplanes go up. Watch the machinery go to turning. Watch the pay rolls begin to build. This bill will set off more wartime prosperity but will present a gloomy picture to those who must serve against their will for $75 per month. Right now we have a half million postal employees. Never has it been necessary to draft them into the postal service. You have a million and a half civil-service employees, and right now we are fixing to raise their salaries, which is already many times what the private in the Army gets. But to the private you will say, if you are unwilling to serve for a paltry $75 per month, we will make you serve.

I am not fighting the Army, but the Army is supposed to tell us—the Congress—how many men they need and then get out of the picture, and not come up here and spend months and months and millions of dollars trying to propagandize this Congress and the country, trying to put over their doctrines and systems. They spent the taxpayers' money, and you know it, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], signed the report in which he very caustically condemned the Army for misspending certain of the taxpayers' money in propagandizing this country for the very bill we are now considering, and I quote from House Report No. 1073 of the first session of the Eightieth Congress:

> Your committee, therefore, reports its firm conclusion that, on the basis of the evidence at hand, the War Department, its personnel and civilian employees have gone beyond the limits of their proper duty of providing factual information to the people and the Congress, and have engaged in propaganda supported by taxpayers' money to influence legislation now pending before the Congress.

Approved and signed by FOREST A. HARNESS, chairman, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, HENRY J. LATHAM, CARTER MANASCO, J. FRANK WILSON.

If we need more men, then why employ the most drastic method, the draft, first? Why not arrange for fair compensation—increase the pay and see if that does not work. I am definitely of the opinion it will and am sure the Army is afraid it will.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I have never felt anything in my life more keenly than I do this. It is unjust, it is unfair, and there is enough fair play in this country, God knows, there is still enough for everybody. To say to me that with only approximately seven enlisted men in the Army for every officer right now, then I ask you what chance has an enlisted man or a drafted man for promotion? The real difficulty is that you cannot find any openings above the rank of sergeant. Your openings are below the rank of sergeant, and there is where you do not pay the men and that is why you do not get them. Make it attractive and you will get them. Do you want to build up and turn loose in this country, those of you who are interested in society and the welfare of society, do you want to turn loose a million and a half men who cannot get married, who cannot support a family if they get married; the wife must go back home to her parents? If they do not get married, they roam this country jumping back fences. That is not such a nice picture. Treat them fairly and pay them and you will not have these problems that are confronting you. If you reach in and draft the young high-school and college boys, where are you expecting to get your future scientists, doctors, and engineers from? A boy is seldom prepared to enter medicine before he is 21 or 22 years old.

In my opinion, this bill will unnecessarily set education back 2 years at least. If it was necessary, if the threat justified it, if war was in the foreseeable future, it might be justified. But fair pay, fair treatment, and a reasonable effort put forth by the armed services will, I am sure, produce the desired results, which is an adequate Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, there are certain incontrovertible facts with respect to this legislation that even the proponents must admit. The first is that this is a major step toward war. The second is that it militarizes the youth of the country. The third is that conscription plus military appropriations to the extent to which we have gone will beyond any doubt place this Nation on a basis of a war economy. I for one would support such a program if such a program were in the interest of the defense of the American people and the best interests of the common people of this Nation. It definitely is not. Despite the tons of newspaper headlines and the millions of radio words we are not in danger of attack.

This program of war and consequent depression is not a program in defense of the best interests of the American people. It is merely a military implementation of the foreign policy which protects the expansionism of Wall Street monopoly capital all over the world.

We must examine this war policy in the light of past and present events.

Our policy in Greece is not a policy in defense of the interests of the American people; it is the policy of imperialistic aggression even going to the extent of establishing and supporting an out-and-out Fascist government.

Our policy in China certainly is not a policy in the interests of the democratic rights of either the people of this Nation or of Asia; it is a policy of supporting Wall Street's imperialistic expansionism there even to the extent of repeating in China, in Asia, what Wall Street did in Europe prior to and subsequent to Munich; that is, the protection of the Hitler of China, Chiang Kai-shek.

This legislation, therefore, is merely an implementation of a program of Wall Street, Wall Street capital, that has gone into Europe, that went into Europe even before the last shot was fired, and is taking over the economy and destroying the liberties of all the people of the world. For that imperialism, we first use the money of the American people; for that

imperialism we are now asked to destroy the very liberty and future of America's youth. Conscription, not for defense, but for Wall Street profit is the proposition before us. For me, the blood of Americans comes before the profits of the big trusts. Yes, the same trusts that impoverish Americans and now would have us take the sons of Americans to guarantee the big trust exploitation of the peoples of the world.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I beg the privilege to introduce myself in connection with this proposed legislation to those who may have forgotten or who never knew how I stood in 1941 before Pearl Harbor, and every day thereafter. I did not fail to vote for any method or any bill for the defense before Pearl Harbor, after June 14, 1941, and until it was all over.

War was abroad in the world. There was no reasonable ground to believe that we would not be drawn into it. Some of us insist that every effort was made to keep out of it and to persuade the warring nations to cease their warfare and compose their differences. Some very patriotic men said we waited too long. I do not reckon that we did.

But I am opposed to this bill. I think it is one of the most awful contemplations I have ever known in all of my life. In a day when there is only a little skirmishing going on, and with which we have no part, we propose to enact a law that would take and put into what we call selective service—but when you call it correctly, it is conscription—our boys from 18 and 19 to 26 years of age, at the very time when they ought to be at home, at the very period in their lives when to take the youths within those ages is the most harmful thing we can do to the growth of the morale and the morality of the growing youth of the land.

I got mighty tired of voting to send these boys into war when it was on and when it was inevitable, but I had to do it. We do not have to do it now. It is a difference of opinion, a contemplation, largely a matter of hysteria among some people. I am not going to say anything that reflects upon the military people of this Nation other than to say that we have been fed too much of it in this world.

There has been too much of a disposition on the part of the civilian population to accept that idea of danger 100 percent that is suggested to the Congress and to the people by the military mind. What we are doing is a futile thing anyway. The day of ground forces is gone. The time of airpower with all of its destructive implications and possibilities is here. We are chasing rabbits in a fox race when you run off conscripting boys between 19 and 26 years of age to fight with guns and toy pistols and things like that in the face of airplanes and atomic power. They did a glorious job in the war with Germany, but the war was finally brought to an end by the bombing of the cities of Germany that brought them to their knees. In one or two nights Japan was brought to her knees and to surrender, by atomic power and not at the sacrifice of lives of the boys who had been conscripted.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, and fellow Members of the House, we are presented here with a very important and far-reaching issue in American life. For my part let me say at the outset that I expect to support the resolution for the rules, and I am prepared to recognize that the circumstances may require, the situation in the United States and in the world may require, and the needs of the armed services may require a reasonable, fair, and proper draft bill. Gentlemen, if we must have a conscription law, must we have the worst conscription law in the entire western world? Stop and think of this a moment. In all the countries of western Europe where conscription exists there is not one that has a term of service in excess of 1 year. Great Britain, 12 months commencing next January; France, 12 months; Belgium, 12 months; Holland, 12 months; Sweden, 11 months; Denmark, 11 months; Norway and Italy, 12 months. Moreover, the age categories subject to immediate induction in those conscription countries is generally limited to 18 or 19 through 21. Yet, for the first time that we are called upon for conscription in the United States, in a period when no great war is being waged in other parts of the world as in 1939, we are asked to impose upon the American people the harshest and most ruthless draft law in the Western World. And there is no conscription at all in any country in the Western Hemisphere.

Now, just stop and think for a moment what this bill provides. The 19 to 26 provision in the pending bill means that in effect every boy who registers at 19 will be subject to call with a Damoclean sword hanging over his head between the ages of 19 and 26, unless he be called early in the game. That means that for the period of time between registration and actual call to service he will have no freedom of choice or action; he will be frozen in suspense; he will be paralyzed in his occupation; he will be unable with assurance to start a career, learn a skill or undertake a new business, or plan to carry through his education.

I am going to propose amendments at the appropriate time, and I hope the Members of the House will support me, providing, first, that the term of service be reduced to 1 year for the individual, and second that the age groups subject to immediate induction, be limited to men between 19 through 21 years of age.

The third amendment has to do with categories. In the deferment provision of the pending bill the President is given authority to defer any category or class of persons as described. Who can forget the scandal that arose out of the First World War draft when categories of persons were exempted? Do you remember the case of one of the great pugilists, who had become a shipyard worker and, as a member of such category, was exempt from military call? These amendments will make available practically all men in three age classes, 19, 20, and 21. Each year an additional group of 1,138,000 young men turn 18. This makes a very large pool of manpower available for call.

It seems to me that we do not have to follow blindly the dictates of the generals. Of course, they prefer the easier course for themselves—to wit, the longest possible term of service. Should we not give some attention to the people who are going to suffer the impact of this draft? Should we not think a little bit of the young man who is going to have 2 years taken out of his formative period, and perhaps 7 years of his life frozen by liability to a delayed call?

I hope the Members will be here at the time these amendments are offered and will support them.

THE $15,000,000 MILITARY PROPAGANDA HAS PREVAILED

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen favoring this legislation say that it may be necessary for the defense and protection of our country, but in view of the President's statement in California in which he stated he was working for peace and the strengthening of the authority and power of the United Nations and in consideration of the opinion of the Honorable James F. Byrnes, former Secretary of State, the Honorable Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, and many military authorities that there is no danger of war, and that it has been widely publicized that Russia is gradually making overtures and suggesting negotiations for the purpose of bringing about peace and reduction in armaments, I feel that these are factors that should be seriously considered by the membership before voting on the bill.

It is my opinion that it is unwarranted to force conscription on our people in peacetime. All the kings and emperors of Europe forced conscription on their subjects through all the years, and what good did it do them. Do we want to follow their foolish policy? Conscription and militarism will not aid anything; in fact, it will endanger our Nation. Consequently, I have been and am opposed to this bill to conscript young men in peacetime, affecting as it will from five to six million of our youth and unnecessarily disrupting their lives.

This legislation will add to the already heavy war burdens, increasing the expenditures for our armed forces to $33,000,000,000, and will reach the staggering sum of $45,000,000,000, which is more than the total income of the Nation in 1932. It will put a strain on the taxpayers of our country and I fear the increase in taxes that will be necessary to carry out the program will affect and weaken our economic policy. Where will the money come from? How long can a nation, though rich, be able to stand these expenditures? To me our country's sound economy is stronger than conscription.

Mr. Speaker, I have received within the last 4 or 5 days, as a member of the Committee on Rules, at least 1,800 telegrams and letters from churches, universities, colleges, and organizations of all kinds protesting the enactment of this legislation. I venture to say that 90 percent of the American people are against peacetime conscription. I want you to believe me—if I thought that our country was in danger now and needed conscription I, naturally, would support this resolution for a peactime draft. I voted in favor of a declaration of war in the First and Second World Wars and the interests of my country are closest to my heart.

I love my country and I want to preserve its democracy, its freedom, and its liberties, but I am not willing to turn the country over to a militaristic gang that spent, according to the testimony before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, $15,000,000 in propaganda to create hysteria and fear throughout the Nation, and especially in the hearts of the mothers of our youth. It is regrettable that the membership should be swayed by this hysteria. It has been made clear by those having the real interest of our country and our democratic form of government at heart that the conscription of our youth is not necessary at this time because the records of enlistments show that our Air Force and Navy are able to obtain more men than either of these branches actually need and are rejecting many applicants. It is charged that the war-minded gentlemen in the War Department have deliberately failed to make an honest effort to obtain the required personnel through voluntary enlistments. They have ignored the National Guard and Air Force Reserve and have flooded the country with propaganda that there is a shortage in the armed forces. Yes; it has been stated that it is selfishness on the part of the military gentlemen who advocate the expansion of the armed forces because it means promotions and increased compensation for them. If the military leaders would accord better treatment of the enlisted soldier, provide them with better quarters, increase their compensation, give consideration to the National Guard, and draw on and utilize the 2,000,000 men in the Reserves, there would be no difficulty in obtaining the men they claim are needed without resorting to conscription.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot add much to what has been said by the loyal and sincere members who have preceded me. They have made it clear that it would be unfair and unwise to pass this legislation. I am confident that if the membership had been present at the meeting of the Committee on Rules and heard the testimony of the gentlemen from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER], and the ranking member of the Committee on the Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], no amount of pressure could make you vote for this legislation.

It has been stated by the sponsors of this legislation that the proposed conscription will be for a temporary period, but the fear is expressed by those protesting the enactment of the bill that it will be permanent and will be the first step in turning our Government over to the militaristic forces. Members of the Committee on Armed Services state that this is not a bad bill but, to me, nothing could be worse than a bill that would disrupt the lives of millions of our young men.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I say and hope that after the conclusion of general debate, when the Members have all the facts before them, I am confident they will vote against the bill and will approve the action of those members of the Committee on Rules who sought to save the House from voting on this legislation at this time—legislation that, if enacted, would tend, yes, threaten to destroy our democratic form of Government and give the selfish militaristic clique the power to rule the country. If we have the actual interest of the country at heart, we will first show our appreciation to the millions of ex-servicemen and their kinfolk who, for years have been unsuccessfully seeking a decent place to live, by passing the housing bill to provide them with low-cost homes within their financial reach; we will adopt legislation that will stop the ever-increasing cost of living which is creating unrest and discord in our Nation; we will pass decent social security legislation instead of passing a bill that will take away social-security benefits from 750,000 workers; we will pass a 75 cents an hour minimum wage bill to help the low-paid wage earner meet the 40-percent increase in the cost of living; we will pass the oleomargarine tax repeal bill in the interest of the American housewives; and at least give consideration to the Fair Employment Practices Commission bill. Favorable action on this and other meritorious legislation would bring about contentment instead of fear and misgivings to a great majority of the American people. It is the record of the Republican majority of the Eightieth Congress that they have not legislated in the interest of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I have yielded more times to Members who desired to speak than I had anticipated and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include therein excerpts from a few of the 1,800 telegrams and communications which I received and which I intended to read to indicate to the membership the strong opposition to this proposed peacetime conscription. They give the sentiment of persons and organizations from every section of the United States and are in much stronger terms than I could express. I urge the Members to read these communications before they cast their vote.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

From the pastor of the Lewiston, Mo., Methodist Church:

It drafts boys who are not even privileged to vote into this caldron of hate and blood and death. They are helpless and voiceless.

It ushers immature boys into the atmosphere of vice, nicotine, and liquor.

The measure is war-provoking in several ways. Russia will say we are warlike. Our own military leaders will be less inclined to be patient, and incidents will occur leading to war.

Following from the Northern California Baptist Convention:

Compulsory military conscription in time of peace is contrary both to the American ideal of religious and civil liberties.

History has demonstrated that compulsory military establishments in time of peace have not forestalled war.

Compulsory military conscription would be destructive of the morals of our American youth.

Some of us are thoroughly convinced of the evil of such universal military conscription, and feel that if it is fastened on our Nation, our dream of world peace will be pushed farther and farther away. We feel that our young people should be protected from such regimentation, and indoctrination for war.

From the pastor of the First Evangelical United Brethern Church in Elgin:

I am convinced that this is a step toward totalitarianism, and that it may lead us into another futile and destructive war.

From the pastor of the Asbury Methodist Church, Chicago:

We have fought two devastating wars against militarism on the claim that we stand for the democratic way of life. We have argued that an intelligent democracy can defend itself against aggression without surrendering its freedom of life in time of peace. And we have proved to the world that our position is sane and safe. We did defend ourselves. Why surrender those convictions now? A regimented mass of militarily trained people may be as outmoded in the next war as were the Hindenburg and the Seigfried lines in the last.

The minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Syracuse, N. Y., writes:

It is my conviction that such legislation would divert vast amounts of funds from more adequate means of defense and would fasten upon the United States a military mentality and a military system which would in a very short time do violence to our cherished way of American life.

The minister of the Ridge Farm Friends Church, Ridge Farm, Ill., writes:

I, too, am opposed to UMT. First, on the grounds that it has never prevented wars (European history is clear on this point). Second, UMT would be just another "rathole" spending operation, and yet could not make the United States effective militarily, in a defensive war in this atomic age. Third, UMT is, obviously, not an American institution, and is more likely to lead to totalitarian practices than to a greater democracy.

The general secretary of the Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, Philadelphia, writes:

We reaffirm our historic position of opposition to peacetime military conscription as constituting a dangerous extension of regimentation by Government, an inadequate measure of defense in an atomic age, and a violation of the spirit of our present determination to secure the multilateral reduction of arms and armies.

A California writer points out, that as Washington said, "The greatest single threat to a Republic is an overgrown military establishment."

A letter from a man in Seattle, Wash., states in part:

If Congress votes in a conscription or draft law, thereby capitulating to the military, the whirlwind which we American people will ultimately reap will be deserved. A draft law will signify to the world that we are more-

interested in mobilizing for war than for peace. It will signify to the world that we are willing to fight again in spite of the fact that the Nobel Prize scientist, Harold C. Urey, has said, "As a scientist I tell you there must never be another war." It will notify the world that we are willing to put an end to this our civilization in order to fight what will undoubtedly be called, when the time comes, a defensive war.

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building:
As First World War veteran and father of Army pilot in last war urge more study before passage of first peacetime draft in Nation's history. Leaders of all religious faiths nearly unanimous in opposition to conscription which guarantees neither peace nor victory. No good reason for passage this session with war not impending.
JOHN J. IRWIN.
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Representative ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building:
National Youth Council of Church of Brethren composed of 100 youths representing 40,000 youth in 35 States unanimously instructed me today to urge barring draft bill from House debate. Urge consideration constructive efforts to raise living standards at home and abroad and develop international harmony through United Nations.
CHARLOTTE WEAVER,
President, Chicago, Ill.

Representative ADOLPH SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
Earnestly urge you to oppose peacetime draft the threat of military control of civilian life the military conditioning of youth and the hostile international gesture make this an unwise reversal of our national policy.
HAROLD LEONARD BOWMAN,
Minister, First Presbyterian Church of Chicago.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.
Deeply concerned Senate action on selective service; 132 representatives Woman's Society Christian Service Methodist Church from nine North Central States in annual session strongly urge bill be kept in committee. Feel bill inconsistent with policies we accepted as members of United Nations and imperils peace of world.
WOMAN'S SOCIETY, CHRISTIAN SERVICE, NORTH CENTRAL JURISDICTION, METHODIST CHURCH,
Lake Forest, Ill.

Representative A. SABATH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.
We commend your opposition to conscription. We fear any such step toward military totalitarianism. Our security rests in United Nations and sound democracy at home.
DELBERT BLICKENSTAFF,
President, Wesley Foundation, St. Paul Methodist, Chicago, Ill.

Representative ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.
Just returned from Illinois Methodist conference where lay and ministerial delegates from 700 churches showed much alarm at Senate action on conscription and order telegrams sent to Representative ALLEN urging House leadership to seek prevention of such legislation by any legal means.
C. W. GAMER,
Monmouth, Ill.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge vote to keep unnecessary un-American warlike draft in Rules Committee rather than letting brass hats run Nation.
Mr. and Mrs. H. C. GEMMER,
Rev. ROBERT GEMMER,
Indianapolis, Ind.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
Washington, D. C.:
As military leaders admit no immediate danger of war I urge delay of action on draft to afford time to counteract misleading illegal Army propaganda.
GELSTON MCNEIL,
Baltimore, Md.

Representative A. J. SABATH,
House Office Building:
Peacetime conscription seems absolute repudiation of our peaceful protestations in view of recent Russian softening entirely needless. We should explore this softened attitude as Secretary Marshall seems inclined to do. There is plainly no immediate crisis and no need for haste. I urge strongly rejection of selective service bill now.
HALE SUTHERLAND,
Bethlehem, Pa.

ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Army propaganda and military hysteria threaten our democratic way. Vote against peacetime conscription.
Mr. and Mrs. J. A. CADWALLADER,
Yardley, Pa.

Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Washington, D. C.:
A peacetime draft is un-American, breeds suspicion and pessimism, overtaxes our economy, and strengthens fascism without overthrowing communism. Please vote against draft.
JOHN ANNAS,
Syracuse, N. Y.

Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives:
Please don't destroy precious American freedom; pigeonhole freedom-destroying un-American draft bill. Stop fanatical warmongers; be a patriot; fight for American liberty; kill the draft.
A. MUNZLINGER,
Pasadena, Calif.

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building:
This is to commend you for your admirable stand to protect this country from peacetime militarism. Please do everything you can to prevent the House from making a hasty, ill-advised decision on this bill—the greatest internal threat in history to American individualism; a proposal to surrender our youth to the tutelage of military minds. The Nation will be grateful to you.
HENRY WOLFF,
Baltimore, Md.

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
House Building, Washington, D. C.:
Defeat draft bill. Military means for solving world problems outmoded since Hiroshima. Create Secretary of Peace, also international students exchange.
COMBAT VETERANS LOUIS and
MERYL LIAMS,
Chicago, Ill.

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Most evidently the real purpose for the proposed draft is not to defend the United States against an invasion but to force our boys against their will and convictions to give their lives, health, and freedom for people who are divided against themselves. I understand that you are wisely against this peacetime draft for such a purpose and urgently request you to vote against it in the House Rules Committee, where your vote will be most effective and consistent with your convictions. If service for such a purpose cannot be secured by our voluntary system than our Representatives should never force it on the American people. The proposed draft will never solve the problem. Please vote against it every time and do all in your power to prevent its passage.
R. R. WALL,
Bluefield, W. Va.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

(Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, and include some extracts.)

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I fear if this bill is passed that we will have conscription in this country for years and years to come, not only because the Army is after 800,000 more men at the present time, but because we are building up an armed service in this country so that we will be domineered by the armed services branch of the Government. The fact of the matter is that I am afraid the armed services of the Government will take the country over. We are headed in that direction. This is the beginning of driving this country into socialism—into communism, it might come to that point—but certainly it will drive it into militarism.

Militarism is what Hitler gave to Germany after World War I. It brought on World War II. Should we pass this bill it means that the military arm of our Government, Navy, Air Corps, Militia, Marines, will control the destiny of our great Government. None of that for me, I want no part of it in Government control.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] made the statement that this bill was too vital to be buried. I say, if you do not bury this bill now you will bury hundreds and thousands of our young men in the future, and you will bury many, many heartbreaks that are bound to come because of this bill. To my mind, it is one of the most uncalled-for pieces of legislation that has ever been presented to the Congress since I have been a Member of the Congress. Kill the bill before the bill is the cause of your slow death in enslavement of the armed forces.

It seems to me that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] hit the nail on the head. Under this bill you will go out and conscript the youth of this Nation, 19 to 25 years of age, and throw them into the Army against their will. Just think of the fathers and mothers who have counted on their boys to go out and do the things they would like to have them do, in the professional life, in business life, or any other walk of life that they may wish to enjoy. Here, you are compelling them now to go into the Army. Never in the history of our country in peacetime have we done that.

There are many, many boys who would join the Army if they were given the same advantage and the same opportunity that men have in industry, that men have in professional life, or that men have in any avocation they choose to follow.

You are going to take this man's boy and put him in the Army at $70 a month, when your neighbor's boy, who may be exempt because he is physically incapacitated, will be able to go out and earn two or three or four hundred dollars a month, and he will have a grand time doing it. When you put that boy in the Army against his will, for 2 or 3 years, at only $70 a month, is there anything right or just or honest in a bill of that kind? If that is the kind of legislation you Members of this Congress want to vote for, that is all right with me, but I would not vote for it under any consideration. I think it is unfair and unjust, as much so as any legislation that has ever been presented to this House since I have been a Member of it.

Why are you passing this legislation? Has anybody shown you any reason why we need it? It has never been brought to my attention since I have been a Member of this House or a member of the Rules Committee. I have heard all kinds of arguments, but the only thing is that we need more men in the Army. Who wants it? The armed forces themselves want it. They are not treating the volunteers right now. They have put the pressure on that. They have raised the qualification tests to 80 points. If they would put that down and shorten the enlistment period and give them better housing and give the Organized Reserves an opportunity, and pay the enlistees $125 per month you would not need to draft one single man. They would fill the quota in 3 months, and this un-American bill would not be necessary. I would vote for a bill for national defense if the conditions warrant. They do not warrant it now. That has been reliably told to us by our Intelligence Service. We have not the $3,000,000,000 to waste in this program. This bill will put our armed services expenses for past wars and for our armed services annual expenditures up to over thirty billions a year. Add to that the interest on the debt of five billions, then add the cost of government, and you have a budget annually of over forty-five billions a year. It will wreck us financially, and a nation that is not solvent cannot support such a budget. This bill is wrong for our Nation at this time, and I hope we can defeat it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SABATH) there were—ayes 128, noes 44.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members; and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and there were—yeas 329, nays 61, answering "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—329

Abbitt	Dorn	Karsten, Mo.	Potts	Sasscer	Thomas, Tex.
Abernethy	Durham	Kean	Poulson	Schwabe, Okla.	Thompson
Albert	Eaton	Kearney	Preston	Scott, Hardie	Tibbott
Allen, Calif.	Eberharter	Kearns	Price, Fla.	Scott,	Tollefson
Allen, Ill.	Elliott	Keating	Price, Ill.	Hugh D., Jr.	Trimble
Allen, La.	Ellsworth	Kee	Priest	Scrivner	Van Zandt
Andersen,	Elston	Keefe	Rains	Seely-Brown	Vinson
H. Carl	Engel, Mich.	Kelley	Ramey	Shafer	Vorys
Anderson, Calif.	Engle, Calif.	Kennedy	Rayburn	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Andrews, Ala.	Evins	Kersten, Wis.	Redden	Sikes	Walter
Andrews, N. Y.	Fallon	Kilburn	Rees	Smathers	Welchel
Angell	Fellows	Kilday	Reeves	Smith, Kans.	Welch
Arends	Fenton	King	Richlman	Smith, Va.	Wheeler
Bakewell	Fernandez	Kirwan	Riley	Smith, Wis.	Whitaker
Barrett	Fisher	Kunkel	Rivers	Snyder	Whitten
Bates, Ky.	Flannagan	Lanham	Rizley	Somers	Whittington
Bates, Mass.	Fletcher	Larcade	Rockwell	Spence	Wigglesworth
Battle	Fogarty	Latham	Rogers, Fla.	Stanley	Williams
Beall	Foote	Lea	Rogers, Mass.	Stefan	Wilson, Tex.
Beckworth	Forand	LeCompte	Rohrbough	Stevenson	Winstead
Bell	Fuller	LeFevre	Rooney	Stockman	Wolcott
Bender	Fulton	Lesinski	Ross	Sundstrom	Wolverton
Bennett, Mich.	Gallagher	Lewis, Ky.	Russell	Taber	Wood
Bennett, Mo.	Gamble	Lewis, Ohio	Sadlak	Talle	Woodruff
Blackney	Garmatz	Lichtenwalter	St. George	Taylor	Worley
Bland	Gary	Lodge	Sanborn	Teague	Youngblood
Blatnik	Gathings	Love			
Bloom	Gavin	Lucas		NAYS—61	
Boggs, Del.	Gearhart	Lusk	Arnold	Havenner	O'Brien
Boggs, La.	Gillette	Lyle	Banta	Hefferman	Philbin
Bolton	Gillie	Lynch	Barden	Holifield	Powell
Bonner	Goff	McConnell	Busbey	Hull	Rankin
Boykin	Goodwin	McCormack	Butler	Isacson	Reed, Ill.
Bradley	Gordon	McCulloch	Celler	Jenison	Reed, N. Y.
Bramblett	Gore	McDonough	Chiperfield	Jensen	Rich
Brehm	Gorski	McDowell	Church	Johnson, Ill.	Sabath
Brophy	Gossett	McGregor	Clevenger	Johnson, Ind.	Sadowski
Brown, Ga.	Graham	McMahon	Cole, Mo.	Kerr	Schwabe, Mo.
Bryson	Grant, Ala.	McMillan, S. C.	Crosser	Klein	Scoblick
Buchanan	Grant, Ind.	McMillen, Ill.	Davis, Wis.	Knutson	Short
Buck	Gregory	Mack	Delaney	Landis	Simpson, Ill.
Buffett	Gross	MacKinnon	Doughton	Lemke	Smith, Ohio
Bulwinkle	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mahon	Douglas	McCowen	Stratton
Burke	Gwynne, Iowa	Maloney	Ellis	McGarvey	Twyman
Burleson	Hagen	Manasco	Elsaesser	Mansfield	Vail
Byrnes, Wis.	Hale	Mathews	Feighan	Marcantonio	Vursell
Camp	Hall,	Meade, Ky.	Folger	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Ind.
Canfield	Edwin Arthur	Merrow	Granger	Mason	
Cannon	Hall,	Meyer	Griffiths	Murray, Wis.	
Carroll	Leonard W.	Michener			
Carson	Halleck	Miller, Calif.		ANSWERING "PRESENT"—1	
Case, N. J.	Hand	Miller, Conn.		Chenoweth	
Case, S. Dak.	Hardy	Miller, Md.			
Chadwick	Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Nebr.		NOT VOTING—39	
Chelf	Harness, Ind.	Mills			
Clason	Harris	Mitchell	Andresen,	Hendricks	Peden
Cole, Kans.	Harrison	Monroney	August H.	Herter	Pfeifer
Cole, N. Y.	Hart	Morgan	Auchincloss	Jennings	Regan
Colmer	Harvey	Morris	Bishop	Johnson, Okla.	Richards
Combs	Hays	Morrison	Brooks	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cooley	Hébert	Morton	Brown, Ohio	Kefauver	Sarbacher
Cooper	Hedrick	Muhlenberg	Buckley	Keogh	Simpson, Pa.
Corbett	Heselton	Multer	Byrne, N. Y.	Lane	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Hess	Mundt	Chapman	Ludlow	Stigler
Coudert	Hill	Murdock	Clark	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Courtney	Hinshaw	Murray, Tenn.	Clippinger	Madden	Towe
Cox	Hobbs	Nicholson	Coffin	Meade, Md.	West
Cravens	Hoeven	Nixon	Cunningham	Norton	
Crawford	Hoffman	Nodar	Hartley	O'Toole	
Crow	Holmes	Norblad			
Curtis	Hope	Norrell			
Dague	Horan	O'Hara			
Davis, Ga.	Huber	O'Konski			
Davis, Tenn.	Jackson, Calif.	Pace			
Dawson, Ill.	Jackson, Wash.	Passman			
Dawson, Utah	Jarman	Patman			
Deane	Javits	Patterson			
Devitt	Jenkins, Ohio	Peterson			
D'Ewart	Jenkins, Pa.	Phillips, Calif.			
Dingell	Johnson, Calif.	Phillips, Tenn.			
Dirksen	Jones, Ala.	Pickett			
Dolliver	Jones, N. C.	Ploeser			
Domengeaux	Jones, Wash.	Plumley			
Dondero	Jonkman	Poage			
Donohue	Judd	Potter			

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Chenoweth against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Auchincloss with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Towe with Mrs. Norton.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Coffin with Mr. Lane.
Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Byrne of New York.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. NICHOLSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. HERTER. If he were present he would have

voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6935, Rept. No. 2349) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was read the first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, tentatively I reserve points of order on the bill, subject to any agreement which the gentleman from New York desires to submit to the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that title III of the bill and section 401, the penalty-mail provision and the provision for renegotiation of contracts may be considered in order in consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was reported out unanimously by the subcommittee and by the full committee. The suggestion of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York, that the two titles to which he referred be made in order meets with the approval of the minority members of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order against the remainder of the bill.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, many Members have inquired whether or not it is planned to have a night session tonight in order to bring about final action on the pending measure. I wish the Members to know what the program is and arrange their own plans accordingly.

I may say, at the outset, that the measure before us is one of great consequence to the country and one with respect to which we carry a very great responsibility.

It is my hope, as I stated on yesterday, that we can proceed expeditiously with the consideration of the bill. I am sure, however, that action cannot be completed this evening, so it is my idea that we work along until a reasonable hour this evening, disposing of general debate and such amendments as may be offered to the bill and that we continue consideration of the bill and amendments tomorrow.

I do very much hope that all of the amendments which may be offered may be considered tomorrow so that by some reasonable time in the afternoon we can conclude our action on the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the gentleman be agreeable to the Committee rising at 5:30 this evening?

Mr. HALLECK. At 5:30 or 6. That would be my idea of a reasonable time, particularly having met at 10 o'clock this morning. That probably would represent a very good day's work.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON STREAM-POLLUTION BILL

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill S. 418, the stream-pollution bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in regard to the President's veto of the Reed-Bulwinkle bill; and to extend his remarks by including an endorsement of the Conference of American Small Business, comprising 600 organizations.

Mr. NODAR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ISACSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement of certain benefits to veterans in North Carolina.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained from attendance at the proceedings of the House on yesterday. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on roll call 103, "no" on roll call 104, and "aye" on roll call 105.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6401), to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6401, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, may I announce that the time on the minority side will be under the control of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, general debate will continue for 3 hours, one-half of the time to be under the control of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and pursuant to the announcement by the gentleman from Georgia, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who will those opposed to the bill apply to for time in general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. To either of the gentlemen mentioned, who will yield the time.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself not to exceed 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to say, referring to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], that I have been in consultation with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who generally heads the opposition on this bill in the Armed Services Committee on the Republican side, and we have reached an agreement as to the disposition of time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The time in opposition to the bill, as well as that of those in favor of the bill, has been allotted in accordance with consultation with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. Chairman, the committee reported this bill by a vote of 28 to 5. Seventeen out of nineteen Republicans—there may be some who have changed their minds—voted in favor of it, and 11 out of 14 on the minority side.

I had nothing to do with the allotment of time. If I had my way about it, this bill would have been before the committee a month ago, and we would have 2 days' general debate; but, as I say, I have had nothing to do with the allotment of time, and was not consulted. We have received 3 hours of general debate, which is 90 minutes for each side.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York now addressing you, who has unsuspectingly but

courteously yielded, has announced he is not a candidate for renomination or reelection.

Mr. Chairman, when I first came to the Congress, I became second or third, or thereabout, in rank to the gentleman from New York on the Military Affairs Committee. No better man has ever served the country than the gentleman from New York, old HAM ANDREWS, in Congress or out.

It will be a great loss to the Congress, to the United States of America, and to all of us when he puts more of his furniture into that old car and moves up to Buffalo to stay, leaving us down here alone.

We all regret his departure. I wish to assure him right now that we will all miss him, as we wish he may realize the fruition of his hopes so long as he enjoys the relief from the great and tremendous responsibilities as have been his. You have earned a vacation, HAM. Our best wishes go with you from all sides of any aisle. Sorry I took advantage of your good nature, if you have any, but it was my last chance. More power to you.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Members of the Committee, if I may have your attention, this bill will be well discussed by many of the committee during the debate, but I want to bring to your attention some observations. It was not much over 400 years ago that we discovered that the earth was round. It was 250 years before this country was really colonized. Everybody in this country today is here because of oppression, social, economic, or religious. We have within the citizenship of this country the prototype of every civilization on the face of the earth, with the possible exception of the yellow race. I sat in this Chamber in 1937 on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary commemorating the Constitution of the United States, at which time Chief Justice Hughes delivered the address. On that occasion he was about 75 years of age, and therefore at that time, twice his age or twice the life of any man 75 years of age was the entire constitutional life of this country. During the last 75 years practically all of the inventions in the world have taken place. Almost everything you can think of in modern science has taken place in the last 75 years. During the 150 years in the constitutional history of this country we have had seven wars, starting with the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World War I and then World War II. After each of these wars up to the present time we have let down our guard; we have collapsed; the pacifists have taken over; we have given in and failed to continue our preparedness. About every 20 or 25 years we have had a war, even with the ocean separating us. Think of how civilization has developed in that time. If there was a continent in the Pacific Ocean today with untold riches on it, and the world had not developed, we would not be able to stop cars on the way to San Francisco or Los Angeles to get there. We reached the point 50 years ago where there is not a solid square foot of ground on the face of the globe on which some country's flag does not fly. We fought World War I, presumably, for democracy, and we fought World War II to end wars but one strong ideology contrary to all our belief remains, and it is the ideology of communism.

This bill that we have before us today is a bill that comes from the desire of those who support it to give us reasonable strength insofar as the armed forces are concerned. It is not a harsh bill. You will hear much criticism of it, and I shall come to the rebuttal of some of the arguments during the amendment period. The cold facts are that the armed services, the Army in particular, will need in the next current year roughly between 800,000 and 900,000 men to take care of the attrition in the regular forces, that is, those whose enlistments have run out.

It is presumed that a portion, we will say roughly half of those, will be secured by induction and the other half by voluntary enlistment.

Statistics show all the way through that enlistments are up at the highest peak when selective service is in being. The Navy is always a great beneficiary of voluntary enlistments when selective service is in being. The services need many men. It will be claimed that the Army is not trying hard to get men to enlist, or the services generally are not, but as a matter of fact, the enlistment record of the services over the last 2 or 3 years is the most remarkable record of voluntary enlistments on the part of any country in the entire history of the world.

It will be said that the qualifications are too high. Only 12 percent have been refused for enlistment because of inability to meet the requirements. The tests are very fair, in spite of what you may have heard to the contrary. This bill is opposed by every radical, subversive organization within the United States. It is also opposed by some very fine organizations, but I do not believe they are enlightened, that they quite understand what is behind it. This bill has the support of every veterans' organization and every patriotic organization in the United States.

After World War I we had a world court, but it fell through. We have made a reasonable start with the United Nations. Our experience with the United Nations is, however, far from a happy one as yet. We have nothing with which to enforce our views—even through the United Nations.

I shall go into the other details of the bill as the various amendments arise.

In conclusion, I should simply like to say this: It is those who wish to remain weak, whether they realize it or not, who invite possible future disaster. It is those who would be strong only who stand for freedom and an ultimate chance for permanent peace.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, those of us on the Committee on Armed Services appreciate the fact that we have here a heavy duty and responsibility. I can assure you that it is not one that we sought, nor one that we relish, but one that we realize and appreciate, and we feel that we have brought here the type of legislation which is essential at this time in view of the present situation in the world.

I would not attempt at this late hour to convince the House that international affairs are in a very troublesome state. I think it would be futile now to attempt to convince the Congress of the United States, which embarked upon Greek and Turkish aid, and the European recovery plan, and which has implemented those programs with appropriations amounting to billions of dollars, that there is a troublesome condition existing in the world. I take it that by the recurring votes of both Houses of Congress that has been well established and thoroughly recognized.

In addition to the programs which we are now carrying on throughout the world to prevent the further expansion of communism, we are convinced that we must be adequate in a military sense. We feel that a nation which possesses some 235 divisions at this time, and a large air force, and which has embarked upon a program of expansion, cannot be expected to listen to arguments, no matter how logical, unless the one with whom she is arguing possesses the requisite strength with which to reinforce the arguments and the logic used.

Quite some time ago, the Congress of the United States determined what would be a reasonable force for a nation such as ours in the conditions which then existed in the world. At that time we said that the Army and the Air Force should consist of 1,070,000 men, and that the Navy and Marine Corps should consist of 666,882 men. Now what is the situation? We find that the services have not been able to maintain those authorized strengths. They were not fixed by the armed services, but they were fixed by the Congress and written into law. Even at those modest strengths, we have not been able to maintain the services at the figures set. There may have been some who are at fault. I am not willing to say that no one is at fault. On the other hand, the situation does exist that we do not have what we regarded as a minimum necessary strength. We feel we must secure the minimum necessary strength, and secure it promptly. Voluntary enlistments thus far have failed, and we see no other alternative but to embark upon this limited program.

Let me emphasize the fact that this is a limited program. It will not be the unlimited program that we had during the war under the Selective Training and Service Act, because during that time all ceilings were removed. One of the very first provisions of this bill fixes the authorized strength of each of the three military establishments. None of them can exceed those maximum strengths. Of course, in no event can they exceed the amount appropriated to carry out the program and to provide for the size of the Army. We are providing here a

maximum of 837,000 for the Army, a maximum of 662,882 in the Navy, and the Air Force 502,000. Who has fixed these figures? These recommendations have been made to you by your Committee on Armed Services after hearings and much consideration. As to the Air Force, I can say that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States have fixed those figures because we overwhelmingly passed the 70-group air program and passed it over some rather strenuous opposition of persons within the administration. So those are the figures that we have determined on in the committee and recommended to you as being adequate for our defense at the present time.

I would like to give a brief outline of the provisions of the bill. It requires all persons between 18 and 30 years of age to register. It makes liable for service persons between 19 and 25 years of age inclusive. There is a provision under which members of the medical professions will be subject to service until they are 45 years of age, in accordance with a formula provided in the bill.

The exemptions are most liberal under this bill. Personnel on active duty are exempt.

All holders of the Purple Heart are exempt.

Veterans with over 12 months' service are completely exempt.

Veterans with 90 days' to 12 months' service are exempt if members of Organized Reserve units.

All veterans with combat service are exempt.

Reserves in organized units on effective date of the act are exempt.

Persons entering the Organized Reserve units after the act is passed, but before they are 18½ years of age, will likewise be exempted.

Of course, ministers and ministerial students and nondeclared aliens are exempt.

Deferred from service are members of the ROTC and the Holloway plan; the Holloway plan being the reserve plan of the Navy.

Accepted aviation cadets are deferred for a period of 4 months.

Persons elected to office by the people of an entire State and Federal elective officials are deferred.

Essential workers; persons with dependents; physically and mentally unfit; high-school students are deferred, until they complete their high-school education or become 20 years of age or fail to satisfactorily pursue their course of study. So that high-school students will be permitted to complete high school before they are subject to service under this bill.

College students enrolled in the academic year will be deferred until the end of the academic year in which they are enrolled.

Conscientious objectors, objecting to any type of military service, are also deferred.

In those cases in which there is a sole surviving son in families in which a deceased son or sons were killed or died in line of duty in service will be assigned to noncombat duty.

Another thing that is of importance to a great many States; not only will calls be made on a quota basis, but every State will get credit against its quota for those already in the service. As each quota is made and each call is sent out, each area will get credit against the quota for those who are in the service.

It has reemployment rights comparable to those of the Selective Training and Service Act, as interpreted in Supreme Court decisions. Of course, it sets up a Selective Service System and provides penalties for its violations.

The bill, as reported by the committee in section 23, the last section of the bill, provides that induction shall not begin prior to a period of 90 days after the effective date of the act. However, the committee has voted to offer as a committee amendment a new section 23. That amendment will provide that inductions will not be begun until a proclamation has been made by the President. It provides that he may make that proclamation no earlier than 75 days after the effective date of the act, and that thereafter the inductions cannot begin for a period of 15 days. This is a provision requested by many of the members. It places the legislation in a standby position and does not become operative until the President has issued a proclamation that voluntary enlistments have not been sufficient and it has become necessary to place the provisions of this bill in effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Then, it is the feeling of the committee that an imminent emergency does not exist.

Mr. KILDAY. The committee has never taken the position that there is an imminent emergency or it would never have included a provision for 90 days' delay before inductions may begin. We do feel we are in a position of great stress. We do know that we do not have our armed forces up to what is regarded as being the minimum strength that we should have.

Mr. BUFFETT. The bill, as it will be finished with this amendment, does not provide that the draft can take place before December 1, or 6 weeks after the election. Is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. I think the gentleman can add 75 and 15.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman mentioned the strength authorized under this bill. I wonder if the gentleman would give us the latest figure as to the present strength of the different services.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, as the gentleman understands, they are constantly coming in and going out. The attrition is one of the things that is bothering us at this time because of the men who enlisted shortly after the cessation of hostilities.

As of July 1 1948 it is expected that the Army will have 540,000, the Navy, 427,000, the Air Force, 395,000, and the Marines, 82,000.

As of February 1, to give you an idea of the attrition, the actual strength of the Army was 552,150, the Navy, 395,936; the Air Force, 353,143; and the marines, 79,659.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HEDRICK. Will these draftees get the benefits of the GI bill of rights?

Mr. KILDAY. The bill does not provide that the inductees shall have the privileges of the GI bill of rights.

Mr. HEDRICK. Is there any clause in the bill that will take care of them as far as schooling is concerned when they get out?

Mr. KILDAY. No. This does not contain any of the provisions of the GI bill of rights. The matter was discussed at great length in the committee. It was recognized in the committee that the GI bill of rights was adopted for the benefit of those who participated in actual combat during the period of the actual shooting war, and it was not felt that the same situation exists at this stage of the game as existed at the time the GI bill of rights was adopted.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me as to whether or not the Army has recently increased its standards for voluntary enlistment?

Mr. KILDAY. Physical standards?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Physical and mental.

Mr. KILDAY. No; there was no material increase in the standards other than that during the war they had two categories, one for limited service and one for general service. They do not now maintain the limited-service category.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understand that the Army recruiting officers are not taking new recruits for 2-year enlistments.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct; except that under our bill we make them do it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I am now, of course, talking about the voluntary recruitment program. Are you complying with that law in respect to 2-year enlistments?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; they are complying with the law. The law provides for 2-, 3-, and 4-year enlistments. They have by regulation and policy been refusing to accept voluntary enlistments for a period of 2 years. The bill we have under consideration, however, requires them to accept men between 19 and 26 for a period of 2-year voluntary enlistment. That is as to the Army. That does not apply to the Navy or Air Force.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. How do the standard requirements of the Army recruiting office compare with the standard requirements of the Navy and the Marine Corps?

Mr. KILDAY. I am not sure. Some other member of the committee might

be able to answer the gentleman, but I feel quite positive that the Navy standards are a little higher than those of the Army.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The standards of all the other services are much higher than those of the Army.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The reason I asked the question is because I received a letter from a mother in my district whose son desired to enlist voluntarily in the Army. He appled at the recruiting office and was turned down because he did not meet their requirements. He walked right over to the Marines recruiting office and was accepted.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, many have known of one doctor saying something is wrong with a person and another saying there is not.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The reason I bring this out is because it looks to me like the Army is doing all it can to discourage voluntary enlistments in order to justify their demand for selective service or UMT and that they are rejecting many of those who voluntarily apply for enlistment to accomplish this.

Mr. KILDAY. That argument has been made and it furnishes a nice escape clause for those who do not want to vote for this bill, but I do not believe it can be sustained by the facts.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the distinguished National Guard man from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I wish to ask the gentleman a question with reference to paragraph 3, on page 13, and section 22, on page 49. It seems to me these sections are in direct conflict with each other. They pertain to the calling out of the Organized Reserves and the National Guard. One states that the President is authorized to order into active service those civilian components provided he has the consent of the governors of the various States. As I read the section on page 49, it is the Congress of the United States who calls out the civilian components.

Mr. KILDAY. That is when the Congress has declared an emergency. That has been the situation all along. They are subject to active duty without their consent in that instance. The other refers to those instances in which the governor grants his permission for portions of the Reserve components to be called.

Mr. KEARNEY. That being so, may I ask if the provision on page 13 with respect to ordering members of the National Guard of the United States into active service of the United States should not be stricken from the bill?

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, I am familiar with all of the talk that we have had with reference to the National Guard, its recognition, and so forth. Until there should be a declaration of a national emergency, I would not agree that the National Guard should be called without the governor's consent. The National Guard is our militia; it is protected by the Constitution; and in time of peace constitutes the only military force at the disposal of the governor. I do not believe that the Federal Government in time of peace should be in a position to deprive any State of its National Guard unless the governor gives his consent.

Mr. KEARNEY. With the consent of the governor, they can be ordered into the service of the United States for a period of 24 months?

Mr. KILDAY. Each individual governor knows the situation in his State. It might be that a civil commotion is imminent. The governor would know that. In that situation I do not think it would be good policy for the Federal Government to deprive the State of its military force.

Mr. KEARNEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. With reference to the discussion had with the gentleman from Missouri, it might be well to call to the attention of the Members that almost 30 percent of the people who served in the armed forces in the recent war have filed applications for disability on account of injury or something that occurred during their service. It is extremely important to the country and the people that these boys be well screened physically, that every applicant be screened carefully before service in the armed forces.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. With further reference to one of the questions of the gentleman from Missouri, can the gentleman tell us why the Army will not accept a 2-year enlistment?

Mr. KILDAY. The Army takes the position, and has in the past, that it is not economical. I have been through that fight before. Those 18-month enlistments that we had right after the war were the result of my amendment which I got adopted here on the floor. At that time, a man who was in the service as much as 6 months, had his equipment and his basic training, could be enlisted for an additional year. I am now convinced that perhaps the Army knew more about this than I did. They did not get very much out of the so-called 18-month tour of enlistment. We spent most of the time getting him in and getting him out, and darned little time using him. The same is true when you cut this down. The further you cut it down the less you get. It costs money to bring a man into the Army. The first year costs about $5,000, and every year after that costs you between $3,000 and $3,500. When you talk about getting him into the service and equipping him, it costs $5,000 for the first year, which runs very high.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman suggested that under this bill we are forcing them to do that.

Mr. KILDAY. We are.

Mr. MORRIS. If it was not economical then, why is it now?

Mr. KILDAY. The Army contended in the past it was not economical, which I explained. During consideration of the rule the gentleman stated he intends to offer an amendment to reduce this to 1 year. Now, you might just as well take the $5,000 and throw it away, if you are going to reduce it to 1 year.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The gentleman from North Carolina stated the contrast of the young man who went into the airplane factory; he was induced to go there by virtue of the high wages, and the young man who went into the Army at a very much lower rate. Does the committee intend to bring out the point that nothing more can be done by way of making the salary more attractive or by raising the salary so as to bring it to a voluntary basis?

Mr. KILDAY. There are members of the committee who have spent a good many years studying this thing from an objective standpoint. It is one of my hobbies about how you are going to make military service attractive. Shortly after the war we increased the pay 50 percent for the private. We took him from $50 to $75, but it did not produce results. The pay inducement alone does not do it; we have seen that; we have tried it and it will not work. The same thing exists here. It proves itself. The Air Force does not feel that it is going to have to take one person by draft under this bill if passed. The Navy feels that it will not have to take one person by draft under this bill, because when the young man goes in the Air Force they promise to make a meterologist or an airplane or engine mechanic out of him; one of dozens of specialties. In the Navy it will be the same thing. He will be a machinist or learn some other trade. The Army can tell them that "We will make the finest infantryman out of you that ever lived," but that is not something that holds a future for him except in the military service. So, at the same rate of pay the Navy and the Air Force are able to get their men but the Army finds it difficult to do so. If we cannot get them by voluntary enlistment we will have to get them the best way we can. It is not a task that we relish, but it is one that we feel we are forced to undertake.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMPSON. Has there been any special deferment provided for premedical students?

Mr. KILDAY. There is nothing by name in this bill but ample authority is given the President for that purpose,

and the National Resources Planning Board has its program to take care of that. Now, we started out to put in medical students, then we put in something else, and by the time we got through we had 8 or 10 different categories, and then we were not sure that we had covered the necessary elements, so we left it in general language, because when you stress some few of them, you exclude all others.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. Will the gentleman explain what is the meaning of "between the ages of 19 and 26"? What are the limits?

Mr. KILDAY. He must have reached his nineteenth birthday and not passed his twenty-sixth.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. As I understand the bill, the man who attends a military school and takes 4 years of ROTC, is then required to serve 3 years on active duty; is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true. Let us be practical about it. The gentleman is one of those, but he received his commission when he came out though, did he not?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. And practically all of these will.

Mr. TEAGUE. Still, by awarding the man, or complimenting the man for having taken ROTC, it appears to me you are changing that here and you are requiring that he serve 3 years after he gets his commission. Are you not going to drive men away from the ROTC school?

Mr. KILDAY. No.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is only because we educate these boys at no cost to themselves.

Mr. TEAGUE. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under the ROTC and the Holloway plan.

Mr. KILDAY. Not the ROTC.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The ROTC plan, then.

Mr. TEAGUE. Will the gentleman comment on that a little bit?

Mr. KILDAY. Those boys have prepared themselves militarily, that is true, while they were acquiring their education. Then they are qualified for a commission, and most of them will have their commissions, or get them when they will go on active duty. I do not see why you feel there is any penalty involved because of that man going on active duty with the others of his own age group and family relationships.

Mr. TEAGUE. If he is needed, yes; but you do not say "if he is needed." You say that he must serve 3 years.

Mr. KILDAY. The whole bill is based on whether he is needed, and the quotas will be set.

I trust that this bill will be adopted by a very substantial majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of advising the Committee that when we reach the amendment stage of the bill it is my purpose to offer the military-justice bill as title II of this bill. Since the military-justice bill passed the House last January, it is possible that some of the members of the committee may not be entirely familiar with the history of efforts to amend the Articles of War and improve the Army system of justice. During the year 1944 the Secretary of War appointed Col. Philip McCook, a distinguished New York jurist, to investigate complaints about the administration of military justice. Thereafter, on March 25, 1946, the Secretary of War selected the War Department advisory committee on military justice, the chairman of which was Hon. Arthur T. Vanderbilt. This committee consisted of nine eminent lawyers and jurists. It held hearings all over the United States and rendered a report that was given consideration by the Secretary of War and by congressional committees.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress, after many Members of Congress had received complaints about the administration of justice in the armed services, the Committee on Military Affairs, through a subcommittee, the chairman of which was the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], conducted about a year's investigation and rendered an excellent report, but no legislation was forthcoming at that session.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think it should be pointed out that the bill the House passed, from a subcommittee of which the gentleman from Ohio was the chairman, contained a major recommendation of the American Bar Association's report. In other words, they stressed one thing, and we adopted that.

Mr. ELSTON. Yes, the gentleman is entirely correct about that. The recommendations of the American Bar Association were given every consideration by our committee. The gentleman from California was a member of our committee and made a very valuable contribution to the report we finally made and to the writing of the bill finally adopted by the House.

Shortly after this Congress convened, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services designated the legal subcommittee to conduct hearings and to consider the writing of a military-justice bill. Our committee conducted hearings extending over a great many months. As the gentleman from California has pointed out, we took into consideration the recommendations of the American Bar Association. We also took into consideration the report of the Vanderbilt committee and the Durham committee report from the previous Congress. We heard from all of the veterans' groups and from all other groups and individuals who asked to testify.

After the House passed the military justice bill on January 15, 1948, it went over to the other body and was referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. That committee did not conduct any hearings, but when the selective service bill was before that body a few days ago the bill passed by the House was offered as an amendment and was adopted by a vote of 44 to 39. Therefore, as matters stand today, the Senate bill contains the military-justice bill exactly as it passed the House.

The purpose of offering this amendment in connection with this bill, if it is held to be germane, is to make our bill correspond with the bill as passed by the Senate, at least so far as the military justice feature is concerned and to assure passage at this session of legislation which will improve our present system in the Army and the Air Force.

To enumerate a few of the provisions of the justice bill: It provides for enlisted men on the court, if enlisted men desire them. Officers are made subject to trial by special court martial.

An accused person is entitled to counsel in the pretrial investigation. Review and appellate provisions have been greatly strengthened, a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps has been established, and command influence over the courts has been curtailed.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I shall offer will guarantee a fair and impartial trial to any inductee under the pending bill should he at any time be charged with a military offense.

OPPOSED TO DRAFT

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, before determining to oppose the selective-service bill, H. R. 6401, which is now before us, I read and carefully considered all the arguments, pro and con, which I could lay my hands on. For weeks I refused to take a stand, in the face of terrific pressure from both sides. I thought that I owed my country and my constituency more than a snap judgment.

Now, having maturely considered the arguments, I am forced to the reasoned conclusion that the proponents of a peacetime draft have failed to make out a case.

I must oppose this bill.

The proponents have claimed that a danger to our national security of emergency proportions exists. They have failed to prove it.

They have claimed that they have exhausted the possibilities of voluntary enlistments to maintain the armed services at safe strength. They have failed to prove it.

FAILED TO DISPROVE OPPOSING ARGUMENTS

On the other hand, they have failed to disprove the arguments of opponents that the proposals for a peacetime draft

are and must constitute a Trojan horse under which military control of civilian life is to be introduced into the United States.

I am not a baiter of the armed services. I have many friends among officers and enlisted men. I honor their courage and sacrifice in time of danger and I do not for one moment impugn the honesty, the patriotism, or the motives of those who have called for this draft. I was prepared to support this measure if the arguments in favor of it carried in my own mind.

My decision is the product of reason, not of emotion.

NO NATIONAL DANGER PROVED

The mere absence of amicable international relationships with a single great power does not constitute a clear threat to American security. Something more than mere words is necessary to prove an aggressive intent.

The American people have been subjected to an unceasing bombardment of incendiary propaganda for 3 years from our own militarists. They have had the help of the Soviet press and radio, which has spared no exaggeration, no innuendo, no blanket charge, however absurd, in the crusade.

This has been a political war, in which the clank of tanks and the roar of big guns and the click of the Geiger counters were sound effects for both sides.

There has been a lot of shooting but it has all been with the mouth.

International crisis has resolved in anticlimax.

It is not my purpose to absolve the Soviets of their share of the blame for our own hysteria; neither is it my purpose to absolve Americans for their self-fed fears.

We are a great and powerful nation with a productive capacity beyond the dreams of man of only a few years ago. We have a way of life which leads to strength because it is a free way of life. It is incomprehensible and incredible that any nation exists today so completely insane as to clearly challenge our military and industrial might and our atomic bombs.

MANY VOLUNTARY METHODS STILL UNTRIED

It has proved equally fruitless for the proponents of a peacetime draft to attempt to prove that they have exhausted the resources of voluntary methods.

Little or nothing has been done to implement the recommendations of the Doolittle report.

On the contrary, we hear frequently of favoritism and special privileges for officers out of all proportion to their rank; of arbitrary court-martial sentences, of special duties, and pulling rank against enlisted men.

When enlisted men in our armed services can feel that they are not discriminated against, that voluntary Army service is not an unjust sacrifice, that they have not surrendered the proud title of citizen because they have acquired the title of soldier, and when their pay has been adjusted to meet the needs of their dependents, they will prove less reluctant to join.

Furthermore, the armed services themselves have reduced the proportion of eligibles in imposing physical standards so high as to be selective beyond all reason.

During the war, when manpower was even more acutely in short supply and demands of the armed services were given top priority, there were a score of jokes. We all remember them. One was, "If he's breathing, he's as good as in the Army."

None of us expects the peacetime Army to be that indiscriminate, but neither do we expect it to become an elite corps of supermen.

QUOTA SYSTEM RANKLY EXTRAVAGANT

Furthermore, the armed services continue to maintain their cruel and extravagant quota system of racial discrimination.

It is a simple statement of fact to say that, economically, our Negro Americans are the most depressed as a group. To them, more than to any other group within the framework of American democracy, Army life is economically more desirable than civilian life. It has social advantages, educational advantages, housing advantages as well.

Yet a rigid system of segregation, limitation of enlistments, and discrimination in ratings and assignments has been practiced by each of the armed services, differing only in degree.

In spite of the blind prejudices of some of our high-ranking officers, the facts speak for themselves. Here are thousands upon thousands of young Americans, anxious to serve their country in the full status of citizens, many of them of the highest possible physical development, going to waste while the services cry for men.

DEMOCRACY WOULD SUFFER FROM DRAFT

There are clear and present dangers to our democratic way of life in the introduction of a professional military caste into American life through a peacetime conscription act.

Already our Government is filled with military men in key positions—men whose courage and patriotism and honesty I do not question, but who are astigmatic because of their military training.

What the future might be with a nation of young men graduated from the hard school of Army training I shudder to think.

The object of democratic education is to make good citizens, capable of thinking for themselves and of governing themselves.

The object of military training is to make good soldiers, disciplined, unquestioning, automatic in reaction to given commands.

While more limited in its scope than earlier measures, the present bill is sweeping in its powers over private property and private lives. It would necessarily make the National Defense Establishment the pivot of our foreign policy and our domestic polity and economy.

MEASURE IS DANGEROUS

I must oppose this measure just as I have opposed all other efforts to whittle away individual freedoms by repressive laws.

While I do not impute to the proponents of this bill the unworthy motives that I have found for some other repressive measures, the effect is the same. A peacetime conscription act, calling for universal military service, must call also, and does call, for universal registration. That will be followed by a system of espionage intolerable to a free people, not because we intend it to follow, but because it is an inevitable consequence in the train of events.

No, Mr. Chairman; this measure is too dangerous—too dangerous to our country and to its institutions, too dangerous to world peace, too dangerous to free private enterprise and to free world trade.

I must vote against it, whatever the political penalties which may be assessed against me, and I hope profoundly that a majority of the House joins with me in that vote.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the gentleman from Ohio advise the Committee that he intends to offer the so-called court-martial legislation which we have already passed in this body, as an amendment to this bill. There has been a great deal of study given to this subject, and you Members who care to add some incentive to the services, in my opinion, will be rendering a great service if this is enacted into law, because we all know there were many, many cases of unfair court martials which were uncovered before the committee. The gentleman from Ohio is rendering a service by offering this amendment.

I firmly believe that today America holds the peace of the world in her hands. The decision rests with us whether the weaker nations of the world can live and breathe under our banner of freedom or whether they will be gradually engulfed by their more powerful neighbors. We cannot close our eyes to the lessons of history or overlook our bitter experiences since the war, that if we desire peace we must maintain adequate armed forces. The size and level of efficiency of these forces must be such as would deter any further acts of aggression throughout the world.

We have gambled too long already with world peace by allowing our armed strength to reach a dangerously low level. The folly of such action is only too apparent to all of us.

Conflicts which have arisen might have been avoided if we had only maintained our strength. This is our last chance to correct that deficiency.

When our Nation assumed its position of world leadership, it assumed also world responsibilities — responsibilities which we can no longer shirk. Just as a boy when he becomes a man assumes the responsibility of manhood, so must we justify our growth to world leadership by assuming our world obligations. One of these obligations is to maintain strength commensurate with our world posture. To do this requires the present form of selective service. I honestly wish that there was some way we could

avoid this draft in time of peace. I honestly wish we did not have to spend the money required. I am just as reluctant as any of you to spend these billions of dollars on military expenditures. I am only too well aware of the vast reconstruction and educational programs which have yet to be completed in our own country for which this money could be spent. However, I feel that these latter programs must wait, for to complete them without providing the strength to back up our moral obligations would be an invitation to national destruction. We would be impotent in a world which is still run largely by force. The days are gone when we can consider our own economy alone. We can no longer confine our views to our own horizons. There are too many dangers to our own security and to our own homes peering over these horizons.

Let me assure you that your Armed Services Committee investigated all alternatives before recommending the draft bill in its present form. Each section of the bill was accepted only after a complete analysis of its provisions had been made and after all the arguments against it had been considered.

There are several provisions which were the subject of considerable discussion and for this reason I would like to clarify them for you.

The first question very naturally was why do not the armed forces get their men by voluntary means? The answer is very obvious but worth developing. For 2 years the armed forces have tried to do just this and have not succeeded. For 2 years they have conducted the greatest recruiting campaign in the history of this or any country. In spite of all their efforts the numbers of men required cannot be obtained by voluntary means alone.

Many of the opponents of the bill contend, honestly or otherwise, that if the mental standards were lowered the services would obtain all the men they needed without resorting to a draft. Recruiting statistics show that such assertions are absolutely erroneous. Only 13 percent of the men who apply for the service are rejected because of mental requirements. In numbers this amounts to about 2,500 men per month. The actual shortage per month for the Army alone, over and above some 20,000 volunteers, is 25,000 or 10 times the number rejected. Even if the armed forces took every one who volunteered, they could not possibly meet their quotas.

However, I do not subscribe to an elimination of standards. I personally am in favor of our services continuing to maintain some reasonable set of standards for enlistment. If all the bums, misfits, and morons are to be enlisted as our first line of defense, our national security will certainly be resting on a feeble foundation. Furthermore, in talking to many of the men now in the service I raised this same question of standards with them. They said if the standards are lowered to permit a free entry of the lowest elements into the services, they, themselves, would leave immediately. I personally want to see our armed forces the best and most efficient in the world and they will be anything but that with substandard personnel.

There is a final point I wish to raise for it is one which the Committee considered at great length. That is the question of the length of service to be required of the selectees. Our committee wisely agreed on a 2-year term of service for these inductees for three major reasons. Actually the services would have preferred 3 years.

First, it would be impossible, in view of the many details involved, to obtain any satisfactory service from a man if he were to serve less than 2 years. As you know, the missions our armed forces are carrying on today require not partially trained men, but on the contrary, men of the highest qualification and experience. Eighteen-month servicemen could never fit the bill.

Second, the cost jumps radically as the term of service decreases. The reduction of, as little as, 6 months in the term of service would increase the personnel cost alone almost a half a billion dollars while at the same time increasing the number of men needed.

Third, and most important, it is doubtful if our manpower pool will permit a change in the term of service unless we want to draw upon the veterans and married men who, under the bill as now written, are deferred.

Addressing myself now to the first reason, namely, the unsatisfactory state of training and inefficiency that would result if the service period were reduced from 2 years. This is a selective-service bill. The purpose of selective-service is to provide necessary reinforcements for our occupation troops, and equally, if not more important, to furnish a trained and mobile force in being in this country capable of taking effective military action.

A provision of less than 2 years of service would effectively prevent these men from being used for overseas assignments. The time required after induction for processing, training and transporting, plus the time required at the end of their term of service for return transportation and separation would for practical purposes render their use in overseas areas impossible.

The second objection to less than 2 years of service is the prohibitive cost involved. It is a proven fact that the first year of service necessarily involves the original training and equipping of each man and involves an investment completely out of proportion to the service to be obtained from that man. Only by spreading this investment over a 2-year period can a satisfactory return be had. As an example, it has been estimated that the cost of maintaining an 18 months' enlistee in overseas peacetime service costs approximately $1,000 per month of such overseas service. By extending the period of enlistment to 24 months or longer this per month cost would be substantially reduced.

Finally, the manpower statistics prove conclusively that there just are not enough men within the age groups concerned who are available to serve on less than a 2-year basis unless the World War II veterans group and perhaps fathers with dependent children are also made subject to the draft.

For these reasons I submit that the proposal to reduce the term of service, attractive though it may seem, is not practicable and, therefore, was not approved by your committee.

In closing, let me state that although some people have arrived at the theory that the American people are unwilling to accept their personal duty and responsibility as citizens to share in the common defense, I personally do not subscribe to that theory. Our history bears concrete evidence to the fact that Americans are willing to make any necessary sacrifices for their country and their ideals.

I would be deeply embarrassed if any Member of Congress would propose that the obligation for service in the armed forces, in this emergency, should or must be accompanied by the payment of some bonus. This would mean that men from the wealthier classes could easily avoid their responsibilities by foregoing some trifling amount of money, thereby placing the burden of national security on our poorer and less fortunate classes. In addition to maligning the character of the American citizen such a suggestion presents clear evidence to the peoples of the world that we are in favor of world peace and security only if it does not interfere with our own lives. We will give anything but ourselves.

True world leadership cannot be exercised by a nation which has grown soft. The world knows it. I do not believe that we can shirk our world responsibility and I do not believe our citizens expect us to.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is the second time within a decade that Congress has given its attention to compulsory military service in a period of nominal peace. It is the second time within that period that events in the world have impelled this country to consider, in the interest of its own security, steps which are novel to its traditions.

The visible dangers to the security of the United States are as great in 1948 as they were in 1940—perhaps greater—and the demand for prompt action is no less urgent. But the world situation of 1948 is not closely analogous to that of 1940 and it would be erroneous to attempt to draw too close a parallel. The odds on peace are much greater in 1948 than in 1940, provided the American people can properly evaluate the situation and take the necessary steps to cope with it.

In 1940 the greater part of the civilized world was already at war. When Congress debated the Selective Service Act in September Poland had been gutted and France overrun by the German blitzkrieg. The British had withdrawn the remnants of their ill-fated expeditionary force at Dunkerque and the desperate, decisive battle in the air over England was in full sway. In short, the battle lines had already been drawn and the armies committed. There was no

real hope in September 1940 of limiting the conflict or negotiating a peace. Twenty years of sterile and negative diplomacy on the part of the western democracies, including the United States, had ended and the American people belatedly realized their own survival was at stake.

In 1948 the situation is markedly different. In spite of an unremitting political struggle between the only two great powers to emerge from the Second World War, the world is nominally at peace. The armies have not been committed and the situation has not yet drifted beyond the point of "no return."

The purpose of reviving selective-service legislation in 1948 is different also from the purpose of 1940. It is not primarily to prepare this country against any eventuality arising out of a situation that has clearly got out of control, although without question this is one of the purposes. The primary purpose is, on the contrary, to prevent the situation from getting out of control. We require an increase in our standing armed forces today in order that American military strength—actual rather than potential—may be effectively applied as a stabilizing influence in world affairs and as a deterrent to aggression.

The need for such a stabilizing influence is unmistakable. The complete collapse of Germany, and the near-exhaustion of those other European countries who struggled to defeat her, have created a power vacuum throughout western and southern Europe which, by the law of nature, invites the encroachments of power systems outside that region. Life in Europe has been rendered, as a result of the war, precarious and unstable, and attempts at positive reconstruction have been—until the launching of the Marshall plan—inhibited by the fear of invasion from the East.

Such a fear is real and exists today. From the termination of hostilities to the present, the Soviet Union has consistently sought to frustrate and thwart European recovery, hoping in this way to create such intolerable political and economic conditions in western Europe that freely elected governments could not stand, and that desperate, hungry peoples would at length deliver themselves to the tightly organized Communist minorities, who at least promised food in exchange for political servitude. By thus fomenting economic misery, the Soviet Union hoped to achieve domination of the entire European Continent without open war.

The enactment of the European recovery program, which bears such great hope for the democratic future because it points a way out of the present morass, has not altered the Soviet aim but only frustrated its original tactic.

Europe is now on the road to recovery. That is a fact which the Cominform has not been able either to obscure or prevent by any means short of war. Vituperation in the press and on the radio, demonstrations, strikes, and riots by Communist followers in Italy and France have all failed to kill the hope which the anticipation of ERP had kindled in the minds of Europeans who earnestly seek a future for a free Europe. Europe is on the road to recovery—and a free, united Europe, as we have learned from painful experience in two great wars, is a basic requirement for the continued security and tranquillity of the American people.

Why, then, if recovery has been successfully begun, must the United States now undertake, in an atmosphere of urgency, to augment its standing military forces? The answer is simple if we will keep in our minds the inherent nature of the Soviet Empire and its overriding, avowed objective—Communist domination of the world.

I said a moment ago that the enactment of ERP did not alter the Soviet objective in western Europe, but merely frustrated its original tactic. It has also altered the tactic. Having failed to destroy the ERP, the Soviet Union immediately undertook to consolidate its position in those countries on its borders which, through fear of Russian disapproval, had refrained from participation in the Marshall plan. If the ERP could not be destroyed, then the Soviet Union was determined that its effectiveness should be geographically limited and the strategic position of the Soviet Union improved in the process. Thus there followed the blatant coup d'état in Czechoslovakia, the démarche on Finland, and the excessive pressure put upon the entire Scandinavian peninsula for alliances with the Soviet Union. To these were added the severe and annoying restrictions put upon the American occupation forces in Berlin and Vienna.

The coup in Czechoslovakia contains a very special lesson for those who still wish to believe that our economic support of Europe is sufficient by itself and need not be buttressed by American armed strength. For that event proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that Soviet communism does not expand the areas of its control through economic misery alone, but that it spreads as well by the application of political pressure backed by poised military strength. Czechoslovakia did not fall to communism because its economic system had failed, nor because of widespread discontent with its political structure. It fell because it was intimidated by the threat of physical force and organized terror which it could not match. Recovery in France or in Italy could be as abruptly terminated, however great the American monetary contribution, if the Soviet Union should feel a compelling necessity to prevent recovery in those countries by overt means.

Taken collectively, this series of Russian actions reflects unquestionably the severe impact of ERP upon Soviet ambitions in western Europe, and indicates a stepping-up of the tempo of Soviet resistance to the emerging unity of that region. What is the significance of these events? In my view, these Soviet actions raise the very real possibility—which it would be criminal negligence to ignore—that the Soviet Union may now be willing to use overt means to dominate key areas in western Europe on the assumption that present American policies, unless interrupted, can lead only to the conclusion which would permanently frustrate Russian ambitions—the recovery of Europe as a free and productive community.

In order to deter any such rash decision on the part of the Soviet Government, it is imperative for the United States to transform without delay a reasonable measure of its armed strength from potential to actual.

It was to be expected that we would have to protect our investment in American security, which is simultaneously an investment in European recovery. Now that the nature of Russian resistance has become clear, we must without hesitation take the steps necessary to cope with it. American economic and military efforts to achieve world stability are each the corollary of the other and they are interdependent. This is the crux of the matter.

The need for an increase in our armed forces therefore exists. Why must we invoke a compulsory draft in order to achieve the necessary increase? The answer is fundamentally simple: Because even extraordinarily successful efforts at voluntary recruitment have proved insufficient. As is set forth extensively in the majority report on H. R. 6401, the recruiting efforts of all the armed forces since the termination of hostilities have resulted in the establishment and maintenance of 1,385,000 men—by far the largest voluntary force in the Nation's history.

The magnitude of the achievement is further emphasized by the circumstances surrounding it: The Nation is nominally at peace, has just concluded an exhausting war, and is enjoying an unprecedented level of employment and prosperity. Ready employment at good pay is available in civilian life.

Notwithstanding the success of this recruiting program, it is evident that the top limits obtainable through voluntary means have already been reached in the Army. In the Navy voluntary recruitment can produce additional men, but not to the level of their authorized strength under existing law. The Air Force expects to meet all of its needs through voluntary recruitment, but this expectation appears optimistic, at least in the absence of a selective-service law. Two of the three military services could not, therefore, achieve by voluntary means alone the increases proposed in the Andrews bill, which are considered minimum requirements in the light of present world conditions. It is thus clear that the voluntary-recruiting program must be supplemented by a system of compulsory selective service, unless the country is willing to gamble dangerously with its own security, or to see the integrity of its vital policies compromised and rendered ineffective by default.

I, therefore, sincerely hope that the House will act promptly on the Andrews bill. I believe such action would be in the highest interest of the United States.

In the light of the circumstances in which we now find ourselves, the proposals in the Andrews bill are not excessive. Their implementation would not put the country on a war footing, but would merely provide an adequate foundation upon which to build in the event

a greater mobilization were required. They would provide for the recruitment of a respectable, but not overwhelming, force capable of restoring a balance between our heavy commitments in the world and our ability to cover them—a balance we have not enjoyed since our hasty and misguided demobilization in 1945.

I wish to emphasize the limited nature of this measure. The Andrews bill would permit an over-all increase in the standing forces of approximately 620,000 men. It would provide the Army, in addition to its occupation forces overseas, with five full-strength divisions to be based in the continental United States. In addition, it would permit the maintenance of six fully-trained and equipped divisions of National Guard and Reserve troops to serve as a first-line reserve in being. This would constitute the emergency force, or strategic reserve, or deployable, uncommitted troops. Such a force is now required for three basic reasons: (1) To support our minimal occupation forces in the event of internal trouble in Germany, Japan, or Korea; (2) To serve with the United Nations' police force, if such is established, in the common effort to reduce existing tensions throughout the world; (3) To seize and hold advance bases for the Air Force in the event of war. The day of intercontinental warfare is many years away. Unless we possess a mobile striking force able, in the event of war, to secure air bases within reach of the enemy, the finest American air force will be, for the next several years, virtually limited to the defense of the Western Hemisphere; the present and foreseeable range of aircraft will not permit American planes to strike an enemy in Europe or Asia with decisive effect from bases within the continental United States.

The bill would permit the Air Force to attain the number of men required to man 70 air groups, which the Congress has already authorized and for which funds have already been appropriated.

The bill would also permit the Navy to achieve its presently authorized strength, to strengthen the complements of ships now in commission, to activate additional air units and other facilities proportionate to the Navy's increased mission, as required by the activation of 70 air groups and the increased strength of the Army.

Surely, this does not constitute an overwhelming force in the light of present dangers, future uncertainties, and the immense responsibilities that have fallen to the United States—however unwittingly—because of our vast material wealth, our strategic position, and our success as a free democracy. If to these is added—and it cannot be ignored—the condition of basic instability existing in a world that is in the throes of a politico-economic revolution, accelerated by a profoundly significant shift in the power balance, it becomes unmistakably clear that the proposed strengths in the Andrews bill are not disproportionate to the problems that face us.

In closing, I should like to restate my belief that this measure, if enacted, will not tend to provoke war, but will, on the contrary, serve as a definite deterrent to any rash decision that may be contemplated by the Soviet Government. It will strengthen the security of the United States by assuring that the European recovery program and similar constructive policies pursued by other free governments will be permitted to proceed, without interference, to their logical conclusion—the reconstitution of a healthy and productive world community.

This Congress has over the past year set in motion several great constructive enterprises which made the hope of world recovery and world stability far more real than appeared possible a year ago. We must now sustain these enterprises against new difficulties which have arisen until they can come to fruition. This will require continued maintenance of adequate armed strength and, above all, perseverance.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the members of the House Armed Services Committee who subscribed to the minority report in opposition to the enactment of H. R. 6401, which is entitled "The Selective Service Act of 1948."

I think I have devoted as much time as any other member of the committee, except the chairman, in attendance at the hearings on the bill, and I have attempted to assemble from the RECORD in consecutive form what I regard as compelling reasons against the enactment of this legislation.

I voted for the Selective Service Act of 1940 because I was convinced that the American people were at that time in the shadow of a great national emergency, and that the registration of all able-bodied male citizens was essential in order to protect our Nation against imminent danger of military attack. Subsequent events prove that my conviction was well founded. I would vote for such a measure again under similar circumstances.

However, the present bill has been presented to Congress as a peacetime preparedness measure. All of our top military experts have assured the Armed Services Committee that this is not an emergency measure, based upon the imminence of war. They have declared that the United States is not confronted with a national emergency in that sense. They say, instead, that the world is in a state of tension, and assert the belief that some form of permanent compulsory military service is essential to adequate preparation for the national defense in the future.

During the hearings held by the Armed Services Committee on the pending bill all of the titular heads of the National Military Establishment, from Secretary of Defense Forrestal down, were repeatedly asked whether they expected this country to be involved in another war in the immediate future. In every instance the response was in the negative. All of our military experts, as well as spokesmen for the State Department, expressed the opinion that the present program of the Russian Government does not contemplate the use of armed force at this time.

The principal reason which they advanced in support of their advocacy of the enactment of a selective-service law now was based upon the allegation that the Army was unable to obtain a sufficient number of men through the present system of voluntary recruitment to maintain its authorized strength. Spokesmen for the Navy Department and the Department of the Air Force testified that they did not need selective service in order to obtain their manpower requirements.

It appears, therefore, that the only semblance of a national emergency upon which any necessity for the enactment of a peacetime conscription law at this time can be argued is the alleged inability of the Army to maintain its authorized strength through voluntary enlistment. I will explain later why the minority members of the Armed Services Committee do not believe that the Department of the Army has exhausted the possibilities of the voluntary recruitment system.

First, however, I want to correct a false impression which has been created in the minds of the American people that the enactment of a selective-service law at this time would be merely a temporary measure. Proponents of the bill have contributed to this false impression by pointing to the fact that this bill contains an expiration date. I wish to emphasize the fact that the record of the hearings before the Armed Services Committee is replete with forthright statements from Secretary of Defense Forrestal and other authorized spokesmen for the National Military Establishment that this selective-service program is designed to remain in effect indefinitely until universal military training is adopted as the permanent law of the land. There can be no doubt that this is the purpose of the sponsors of this bill.

In my opinion the testimony taken by the House Armed Services Committee proves, beyond reasonable doubt, that the National Military Establishment has deliberately refrained in the recent past from making all-out efforts to bring the Army up to the full strength authorized by Congress through the system of voluntary recruitment now provided by law. The Army has refused to accept applications for voluntary enlistment by men who do not make a passing grade of 80 percent in the arbitrary entrance tests which have been revised sharply upward during the recent postwar period. In response to questioning before the House committee, a spokesman for the Army attempted to justify the rigorous new entrance examinations by stating that they want every man in the service to be capable of functioning as a one-man army when stationed on a post alone with a rifle. I desire to point out that some of the outstanding heroes of World War I and World War II were men who could not have met these new entrance tests. The only conclusion I could reach after listening to this kind of testimony was that the Army chiefs are determined to take only the best-educated young men of America out of civil life and bring them into the armed services.

The National Military Establishment has failed to maintain the National Guard and the Reserve organizations on an efficient basis. Before the Armed Services Committee General Bradley testified as follows:

> If our reserve units were filled with men with proper training we believe we could reduce the size of our Regular Army. And it might get it down to a point where it could be maintained by voluntary enlistment.

The bill before you will do nothing to increase the strength and efficiency of the Reserve components. On the contrary, Gen. E. A. Walsh, president of the National Guard Association, on May 3, 1948, wired each of the members of the House Armed Services as follows:

> The enactment of H. R. 6401, as now drafted, will mean the complete dissolution of the National Guard of the United States by June 30, 1950. The security of the Nation cannot be assured by destroying its Reserves. If there is a possibility of war the measures proposed are utterly inadequate. If there is no possibility of war, then the measures proposed are excessive.

General Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association, told the Armed Services Committee that the Army had done very little to help the Reserves, had done nothing to furnish equipment, and did not contact or put in units the members of the Reserves. General Evans added:

> I am not talking about procurement; all I am urging and begging and what I have been trying for 3 years is to have somebody to do something with what we have now.

General Evans agreed that—

> There would be no need for a draft, UMT or anything else if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and the Reserves, having made a sincere, earnest, and determined effort to bring them up.

He supplemented this testimony by saying that he had heard the statement made that the Army leaders "felt they need not build up either the Organized Reserves or the National Guard because they were going to get UMT or the draft."

The recruiting program is an Army problem, since the Air Force and the Navy are able to get the recruits they need. It is in no sense an unsolvable problem. The following steps would, in my judgment, substantially improve Army recruiting:

First. Revision of the court-martial system so that enlisted men would feel that they would get as fair and equitable treatment as officers.

Second. Improvement of relationships between officers and enlisted men as recommended by the Doolittle board.

Third. Provision for adequate housing for enlisted men.

Fourth. Acceptance of 1-year- and 18-month-term reenlistments.

Fifth. Acceptance of men who make a 70-percent grade in the Army general classification test.

Sixth. Increase the pay scales for enlisted men.

There is apparent disagreement among Army officers about the proper score for admission of applicants. A recently published pamphlet, The Fort Knox Experiment, printed in the Senate hearings, refers to the 70-percent minimum which is usual for Army enlistments.

General Eisenhower, testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 2, said:

> I thought I had directed before I left as Chief of Staff to drop, for the Ground Forces at least, the figure back to 70, so that we could fill up certain places.

Lieutenant General Paul, in a letter to the Senate Armed Services Committee, stated that the Army did have men of prior service with good records whose score is between 70 and 80. Other witnesses expressed the belief that men who were good noncommissioned officers of the Army would not now be able to enter if they had to pass the present tests.

There is an abundance of experienced military opinion that the Army should lower its intelligence requirements.

In my opinion, the obvious conclusion is that the National Military Establishment has purposely permitted the voluntary recruitment system and the whole Organized Reserve system to deteriorate in order to substitute a permanent compulsory program in peacetime. The only statement by Pentagon spokesmen on this subject is that they have done what they could with the funds given them by Congress; but the records of the House Appropriations Committee do not show that any urgent appeal has been made by the National Military Establishment during the postwar period for additional funds to build up the Reserves and the National Guard.

There are other significant facts in the official records of this postwar period which strengthen my conclusion that the National Military Establishment has deliberately blocked the development of a strong and effective Reserve system in order to substitute some method of compulsory service. The Selective Service Act of 1940 contained directives, which were purposely inserted by the Congress, that the veterans of World War II should be placed in a Reserve status for a period of 10 years after they were discharged from active service. This provision was specifically extended by the Congress at the time the old Selective Service Act expired.

I now quote from the testimony of Mr. B. N. Harlow, a member of the technical staff of the House Armed Services Committee, on page 6532 of the House committee report of the hearings on the pending bill:

> The services did not abide by this provision. The service position was originally to abide by the law. Then, as I recall it, they took a certain proportion of the discharged men in the Reserve. Later, for some reason which I never was able to discover, they discontinued that procedure.
>
> The issue became very warm inside the War Department, and the Department went to the Judge Advocate General to find out what they should do about the situation. The Judge Advocate General came to the conclusion that the President had the authority to discharge these men under another act of Congress, and their position is predicated upon that act.

While this subject was being discussed in the committee hearing, General Evans called attention to the concluding paragraph of the Judge Advocate General's opinion, reading as follows:

> It is proper to add that, although in my opinion discharges may be ordered in appropriate cases, such complete separations from the service should be based upon adequate grounds, and effected in accordance with sound policies. Otherwise it is quite likely that accusations may be made that discrimination is being practiced or that one of the major purposes of the act; i. e., the creation of a large trained reserve, is being defeated.

General Evans described this concluding paragraph as a warning from the Judge Advocate.

Despite this warning from their chief legal adviser, the War Department and the other branches of the armed services proceeded thereafter to discharge the millions of men who had served in World War II without transferring them to a reserve status, thereby defeating the major purpose of Congress to create a large trained reserve in the postwar period.

Gentlemen of the Committee, you can draw your own conclusions as to the reasons which impelled the armed services to disregard the emphatically expressed intention of Congress that a large trained reserve should be automatically created in this postwar period. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have not been able to get any satisfactory explanation of this unprecedented evasion of a congressional mandate. In my own mind it is unmistakably associated with the deep-seated determination of our military high command to force some form of compulsory service upon the American people at this time.

I am sure that all of the members of the Rules Committee are familiar with the reports made by the publicity and propaganda subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, following their investigation of the participation of Federal officials of the War Department in publicity and propaganda relating to universal military training. For the purpose of this record I ask permission to read an excerpt from a letter addressed to the Attorney General of the United States by the gentleman from Indiana, Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS, chairman of the subcommittee, dated July 23, 1947:

> I am impelled to call to your attention what the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments concludes

to be improper and unlawful activities of Federal officials of the War Department in propagandizing for legislation now pending before Congress, relating to universal military training.

The subcommittee report which was transmitted to the Attorney General with the letter referred to above ends with the following statement:

Your committee reports its firm conclusion that, on the basis of the evidence at hand, the War Department, its personnel, and civilian employees have gone beyond the limits of their proper duty of providing factual information to the people and the Congress, and have engaged in propaganda supported by taxpayers' money to influence legislation now pending in Congress.

This report was signed by the following Members of the House of Representatives: Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS, chairman, Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Hon. HENRY J. LATHAM, Hon. CARTER MANASCO, and Hon. J. FRANK WILSON.

To sum up the foregoing statements, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the failure of the National Military Establishment to make any adequate provisions for an efficient Reserve and National Guard in the postwar period, the arbitrary restrictions imposed by the Department of the Army upon the voluntary recruitment system, the amazing refusal of the military high command to comply with the mandate of Congress to transfer millions of men into a reserve status after World War II, and the improper expenditure of tax funds by the War Department on propaganda in support of universal military training clearly demonstrate that the insistent demand from the above-mentioned military sources for the enactment of this bill is not based upon any grave emergency which imperils our national security, but is the culmination of a long-term, carefully conceived campaign to compel Congress to approve some kind of compulsory military service at this time.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that my fundamental objection to this bill arises from a grave apprehension about its impact upon the American way of life. The enactment of this measure would mean the abdication, perhaps for all time, of one of the basic principles upon which the free democratic society of America has endured throughout the history of this Republic. That principle is freedom for all of our citizens from any form of military compulsion in peacetime.

The military leaders of this country have always favored some form of peacetime compulsory military service. But the American people, in their wisdom, have always rejected this doctrine. They have insisted that civil authority should be superior to military authority in the affairs of our Government, and public opinion has up to this time prevented the injection of military compulsion into the fabric of our free democracy, in time of peace.

Under this traditional peacetime policy, the United States of America has become the greatest and most prosperous Nation in the history of the world. In the past three decades, without adopting either peacetime conscription or universal military training, this Nation has fought and won the two greatest wars in all history. It was no mere accident that the free democracies of the west—the United States and Great Britain—without a long peacetime period of conscription and a well-developed military bureaucracy, were enabled to assemble a more powerful striking force than the Axis Powers. World War II was a war of modern machines, and the unprepared western democracies demonstrated a clear superiority in this type of warfare. I am convinced that this superiority is based upon our incomparable ability in the all-important field of production which would be even more important in the scientific warfare of the future.

The disruptive effect of this kind of legislation upon the American home was the subject of thoughtful discussion in the minority report upon this bill. I quote briefly from the report:

In the American home are centered the hopes and aspirations of fathers, mothers, and children; there is the sacrifice that has spelled much of our great achievement as a people; there is the love and understanding that binds us together in millions of families having common aspirations, common hopes, common beliefs. Anything which will undermine such a cultural force, such a religious strength, such a source of national patriotism, is not to be legislated lightly into existence.

Yet this compulsory draft bill proposes to invade the family and disrupt its character. It will take the sons away from the home in the most formative and impressionable years, removing them from the steadying hand of a father and the abiding faith and love of a mother. It will interrupt, and in many cases permanently prevent, the college educations of thousands of our young people. It will deny to many needy families gainful returns from employment of their younger members.

If there were war, or the threat of imminent war, no members of this minority, and no patriotic father or mother in this great Nation of ours would refuse to make the sacrifice of their sons, as they have done in the past. But even in this period of international tension no evidence has been produced by the military authorities, by the State Department, or by any responsible witness, that would warrant a peacetime draft which will so drastically affect all American families.

Mr. Chairman, in these times we hear much of the threat to the American way of life from certain alien ideologies. I am as much opposed to the tyrannical cults which are embodied in those alien ideologies as any other American can possibly be. But I believe that the most immediate threat to our cherished American way of life is from the ideology of militarism. This ideology is as old as civilization; yes, even older. It has always sought to fasten itself upon the societies of free men. Whenever it has succeeded in doing so those societies, ancient and modern, have been marked for destruction.

Mr. Chairman, it is the ideology of militarism, that is inherent in this bill, which makes me fear it so much. I earnestly hope that it will never become the law of our land.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to and I shall vote against the pending bill. It is in my opinion unwise, unsafe, unnecessary, undemocratic, and un-American.

Every impulse of my mind, heart, and soul cries out against militarism and military slavery in peacetime, and in my opinion that is just what this bill implies.

It is with sincere humility that I approach the great issue of peacetime military conscription. The factors to be considered are so diverse and complex that it would be easier, perhaps, to conclude that the military leaders know what is best than to weigh the effects of passing or rejecting the selective-service legislation, and to come to an independent decision.

Having served in Congress during two terrible wars, I fully realize the necessity of an effective, efficient military organization in an international crisis. Yet, as the military might shields us in war, so, if unchecked in peace, it will curtail and oppress the very liberties so dearly defended against the foreign enemy.

My determination to oppose the pending bill (H. R. 6401) is the result of the most solemn and prayerful deliberation on the following questions:

First. Does a peacetime draft law present a serious threat to democratic government and to individual liberty and morality?

Second. Is a draft law at present necessary to obtain the required manpower for the armed forces?

Third. Is the cost of establishment of a system of selective service now justified?

Fourth. Would enactment of a peacetime draft provide the most effective preparedness program?

Fifth. Would not passage of the pending bill overshadow the basic, long-range program to assure a lasting peace?

First, let us weigh the dangers of peacetime conscription to democratic government. Although the pending bill deals solely with selective service, the Minority Report of the Armed Services Committee points out that "the record of the hearings before the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress is replete with forthright statements from authorized spokesmen of the National Military Establishment that this program is designed to remain in effect indefinitely until universal military training is adopted as the permanent law of the land.

So we must not delude ourselves that we are passing upon selective service alone. If this bill passes, the military leaders, by their own admission, will not desist until they have obtained universal military training. The ultimate result will be a perpetual military yoke about the family freedom of the American home. The young men of the Nation—and eventually the women—will be subjected during their most impressionable years to military discipline and training. The caste system of the military is the antithesis of democracy. Young people will be taught to obey without question at a time when the power of independent thought and decision should be fostered. Without such fundamental education, Mr. Chairman, democratic government cannot long endure.

And would anyone dare say that military camps are a beneficial influence upon the cultural, moral, and religious development of the youth of the Nation? Citizenship and morality, my friends, can best be developed in the homes, schools, and churches. The Army has but one object and that is to turn these young men into precision military machines.

Not the least in the sinister influences of militarization is the present and potential power of the brass hats over the economy of the country. The spending of $20,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 a year is not to be entrusted lightly to a small group of military dictators who all too frequently use army discipline and security regulations to cover up their own mistakes and ambitions. Nor can we neglect the dangerous influence of military men, with billions to spend, upon the freedom of deliberations of the legislators who authorized such vast expenditures.

Even the freedom of the press may be endangered by military advertising budgets and constant propaganda. My grave fears, therefore, of the adverse effects of peacetime conscription—as a prelude to universal military training—upon the youth of the Nation as individuals, and upon such fundamental American institutions as the family, the private-enterprise economy, a free press, and a Congress answerable to civilians and not to the military, impel me to the conviction that its adoption would be a terrible plague upon the body politic.

Our forefathers braved the wilderness of the New World to be relieved of despotism resting upon compulsory military training. Even in the darker hours of the American Revolution Thomas Jefferson advised against the draft, in a letter to John Adams:

It ever was the most unpopular and impractical thing that could be attempted. Our people under the monarchical government had learned to consider it as the last of all oppressions.

The Congress today may well heed the advice of this great President and author of the Declaration of Independence.

Second, even if the hazards of selective service could be safely assumed, is it necessary at the present time? On this question civilians—whether on the farm or in Congress—may admittedly have to decide without knowing all the facts. Yet, as Mr. J. T. Sanders, spokesman for the National Grange, told the House Armed Services Committee on April 20, 1948:

Frankly, and with no more information than we now have, we have our serious doubts that there is impending a war crisis that justifies an immediate resort to selective service. We grant that certain information must be kept confidential; but unless there is a far more serious threat than we know about, and on which the people cannot now safely be informed, we can see no imminent danger that would call for either the draft or universal military training.

With a more sensible respect and treatment of servicemen by officers—with more liberal pay, with greater educational advantages and opportunities, and so forth, we believe an adequate armed force will volunteer.

But the doubts of us civilians about the real necessity for conscription are supported by military spokesmen who may be presumed to have ready access to classified information on our international relations.

Secretary of Air Symington told the House Armed Services Committee on April 13, 1948:

We do not feel that selective service is necessary, in order to get the people up to the 502,000, based on our calendar for the Air Force.

General Spaatz on the same day agreed:

I have no doubt in my mind but what the Air Force will get sufficient recruits to maintain the Air Force proper on a voluntary enlistment basis.

Secretary of the Navy Sullivan told the House Armed Services Committee on April 13:

We do not know whether we can get those additional people without selective service. We believe that the way our enlistments have been running we probably will be able to do it.

And Admiral Denfeld, on whether the Navy could maintain its strength without the draft, said:

I think you can get it if the present situation continues.

Since the Air Force, and the Navy probably do not need conscription, only the Army is involved. As the minority report of the House committee summarizes this question:

The immediate excuse for the measure boils down to the alleged inability of the Army to secure voluntary enlistments for the Ground Forces. Both Air Corps and Navy spokesmen have admitted that voluntary methods will be sufficient to their needs. The committee records show that the Army has deliberately refrained from making all-out efforts to utilize voluntary recruitment methods. Just as little interest has been shown in supporting the Reserve establishments as long as the Army feels that universal conscription is obtainable, so the Army has been unwilling to pursue energetically the problem of making Army service more desirable to the average potential soldier.

The revision of the court-martial system in accord with the Doolittle report, the improvement of relations between officers and enlisted men, provision of adequate housing for married enlisted personnel, shorter term enlistments, and more realistic general classification-test requirements, are all feasible measures which we believe would substantially improve recruiting.

And I should add to these suggestions an adjustment in pay scale with a more substantial reward in increased pay based upon length of service. Moreover, if fewer men in uniform were assigned to desk jobs that civilians could readily perform, the Army needs might very well be met by voluntary enlistment. Nor has anyone explained satisfactorily the sudden increase in the passing grade for recruits from 59 to 80.

Of particular merit, in my opinion, is the alternative of proper utilization of the 2,400,000 Organized Reserves. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee charged the Army with neglect of the voluntary Reserves and the National Guard in order to get compulsory military training. In the Senate hearings, General Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association, said:

There is an apparent policy which exists in the Pentagon today which says we will do very little with the Reserve program until the National Guard program is 100-percent organized. It cannot be 100-percent organized in the manner in which it is supposed to be, completely, until the passage of universal military training.

In desperation our military leaders have suggested the possibility of war to substantiate their clamor for peacetime conscription.

On May 13, 1948, General Bradley told the House Appropriations Subcommittee:

The precipitation of armed hostilities, either by a deliberate or accidental incident, is a plausible possibility so long as our forces face each other on opposing frontiers in this strained atmosphere of distrust and tension.

Stripped to a simple subject and predicate, I interpret the general to say:

War is now a plausible possibility.

Since I felt sure that General Bradley's statement was the result of painstaking preparation, I decided to scrutinize it with equal care. War, of course, for as long as there shall be independent nations, is always a possibility. But just what is "a plausible possibility"? For that I had to go to Webster's New International Dictionary, where I found the following definitions of "plausible":

Worthy of being applauded; obtaining approbation or favor; agreeable; affable; obtaining general approval; popular; superficially fair, reasonable, or valuable; apparently right or trustworthy; specious; using specious arguments or discourse; fair-spoken; applausive; and plauditory.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that not one of the meanings of the adjective "plausible" is applicable. Stripped of all its unnecessary verbiage, all that General Bradley said in support of his request for a supplemental budget for the Army was: "War is a possibility."

Let us discuss now the third question of whether the cost of selective service is an unnecessary expenditure and burden under present conditions. If we assume—without conceding—that world conditions may warrant a stronger military force, we still should consider whether the draft is the most economical method of preparedness.

Secretary Forrestal on April 12, 1948, stated that the draft program for fiscal year 1949 "involves a supplemental budget request of $3,000,000,000 in cash

and contract authorizations, over and above the authorizations which have already been requested." We should also add the cost of reactivating the draft boards, which would be $40,000,000, since the armed forces intend to maintain their recruiting program in addition to conscription. The Armed Services Committee minority report, however, summarized the cost of the program as follows:

The cost of the program provided by the bill appears as two substantial items. One amount of $2,149,000,000 would be expended for the training equipment and the initial machinery setting the program in operation. In addition, an estimated $3,900,000,000 for reequipping the 25 divisions of the Army will be required in fiscal 1949. These items are in addition to the $11,000,000,000 budget appropriation, the $3,000,000,000 supplementary appropriation and the $822,000,000 Air Corps appropriation. Thus, the total military budget for 1949 is seen to be more than $21,000,000,000.

The annual cost of selective service per man has been estimated at $8,000 the first year and $5,000 the next. Consider for a moment what a fine college education could be provided for every inductee with such sums, and what a contribution this would be to their own lives and to cultural and scientific advancement.

Fourth, a vital question to the very existence of this Nation is whether selective service—and its contemplated successor, universal military training—will provide effective preparedness against the eventuality of another war.

With such fearful weapons as the atomic bomb, rocket propulsion, and bacteriological warfare available to our potential enemies, I am compelled to agree with Admiral Schoeffel of the United States Naval Ordnance that—

It will never again be possible for us to depend upon dusting off the weapons of a previous conflict when war breaks out. It would be like reverting to the bow and arrow.

Yet the military, through stress upon peacetime conscription, would create for us a Maginot defense line of drilling foot soldiers.

Instead we should for the present build up our atomic stock pile and expend our resources and energy in the advancement of scientific research. Only thus can we maintain a preponderance of power to guarantee national survival if war again should come.

Finally, all this talk by our military leaders about the plausible possibility of war and the necessity for universal military training and the draft are loathesome burdens as we seek the path toward a permanent peace. Instead of concentrating so heavily upon numbers of military personnel, we should, I firmly believe, work toward the following goals, without which our civilization cannot survive:

First. The United Nations must be strengthened by abandonment of the veto. It must be made to work, for there are no differences between nations that cannot be solved at a conference table to the betterment of all concerned far more wisely than by resorting to modern weapons of war. To the extent that this involves a surrender of sovereignty to the United Nations, I think we might accept it as the only rational alternative to world anarchy in which the will of a single nation is allowed to obstruct the desires of all the rest. Accordingly, I believe that the United States should initiate action under the terms of article 109 of the Charter of the United Nations. This article provides that a general conference of the members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council.

Second. When the stature of the United Nations as a force for maintaining peace and security among nations is fully developed, world disarmament will logically follow. It will be impossible then to justify military forces in excess of those required for internal police within a country and for meeting the commitments of a nation to the forces assigned to the United Nations. Universal disarmament would, of course, involve the adoption of the Baruch plan for atomic-energy control, and would mean the universal abolition of military conscription.

In conclusion, a peacetime draft with the forecast of universal military training, is a negative and dangerous departure from our democratic tradition against militarism. It is an unnecessary, costly, and ineffective preparedness program—that is utterly inconsistent with our proclaimed policies of peace. This bill would impose an unnecessary load on the already overburdened taxpayers of America, and a galling yoke of military servitude upon the necks of American youth. I fear the way we are headed is exactly contrary to the direction in which we say we want to go. On these earnest convictions I must rest my opposition to the pending bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCOWEN].

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to peacetime compulsory military conscription for many reasons. One of the most important reasons is that it is contrary to the philosophy of our American constitutional republican form of government. A very large percentage of early immigrants to this land came here to get away from the very thing this Congress is now asked to set up. In my opinion one of the best ways to begin the destruction of the freedom of the individual and our freedom in general is to pass this peacetime draft which would be a radical change in our Government, the first peacetime draft in our history when no emergency existed.

Our top military authorities have testified before the Armed Services Committees that there is no immediate danger of war. James A. Farley, a Democrat high in the councils of his party has said the same thing in the press. The United States News very recently carried the same statement. It has been testified also by high military authorities that the draft is not needed for either the Navy or the Air Force, and that the shortage in the Army is only about 250,000. It is also freely charged that the Army raised its standards which caused the rejection of many volunteers and that it has not exhausted its power to get volunteers.

If Congress can give billions of dollars to Europe, why could it not raise the salaries of enlisted men and thereby cause many to volunteer who would do it willingly, and thus fill the small shortage.

No, the great purpose of this compulsory peacetime military draft is to fasten on this country forever, a system that has led to the downfall of every country in all history that has had it.

If this draft law is passed and goes into effect in the form the bill is in now, look for rationing and gradually increasing regimentation of our people in the United States. The bill should not pass.

If there were a real emergency or if war were imminent, I would vote for the draft. But neither situation now exists. I voted for all defense measures including that for the large Air Force. I am for a strong national defense and have uniformly voted for it, and expect to continue to do so. But this draft bill is not now necessary.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has just made an excellent statement and I agree with him on the point that the Army has not exhausted all of its possibilities to obtain recruits to bring the armed forces up to authorized strength. I shall later offer an amendment that would provide for an honest, intensified campaign for voluntary enlistments before this act could be made effective.

In this connection I had an unexpected and significant experience this morning. A prominent businessman from Elmira, N. Y., called on me and we took seats in the gallery while the rule on this bill was being discussed. I explained the situation in the House and he made the observation that he doubted if a peacetime draft is necessary. He then said:

"Coming into Washington this morning in the diner I had breakfast opposite a young man in uniform. We passed the time of day and I asked him about his service in the Army. He finally told me that he was in the recruiting service."

My friend from Elmira then asked the young man if he were on his way to Washington on a furlough.

"Oh, no," the young man replied. "My parents live there."

The gentleman then asked, "Do you get home often?"

"Oh," the soldier replied, "I'm there about 3 weeks out of each month."

"How do you do that?" my friend said he asked.

The soldier replied, "My quota is 12 men per month. I work hard and get my 12 men in 5 days or a week, and then I am able to spend the rest of the month in Washington."

Now, Mr. Chairman, that conversation was related to me in the gallery of this House not more than an hour ago by a very responsible businessman. I have no reason whatever to doubt his word.

I had previously received reports that the Army had placed quotas for recruiting in certain districts but my friend's casual story of his chance meeting with this recruiting sergeant was the first verification of such quotas that I have been able to obtain.

Mr. Chairman, certainly if quotas on recruiting are ordered by the armed services, their statements that they are unable to get sufficient recruits through voluntary enlistments, can be questioned by Members of Congress.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I do not want to take the gentleman's time but I do want to say that I have had protests from people in my district whose sons have been let out before the expiration of their enlistments. These boys did not want to get out. They volunteered, but the Army let them out.

Mr. SHAFER. There is no question but what that has happened. There is also no doubt but what the Army has raised the requirements up to 80 points, 10 points above what it should be; and there is no doubt that they have rejected enlistments of boys who have sought to enlist for less than 3 years.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to confirm his statement. I have had similar complaints from my district.

Mr. SHAFER. I thank the gentleman. I say the Army is taking this Congress for a bunch of suckers. There is no doubt about it.

We are getting the cart before the horse on this thing. A most inconsistent spectacle took place in the Rules Committee yesterday. Being chairman of Subcommittee No. 3 of the Armed Services Committee I am particularly interested in the strategic materials stockpiling program. This Congress knows that this program has not been carried out according to the intent of Congress in legislation that we passed 3 years ago. It was not until after I called the attention of the President on February 24 this year that the administration decided to reinstate some $400,000,000 for purchasing in that program. But yesterday during the Rules Committee session we had the Russell strategic materials bill before the committee and they refused to grant a rule on that bill despite the fact that it is vitally important that we have that legislation if we are going to have strategic materials with which to provide our armed forces with the proper arms and munitions. I repeat, this bill puts the cart before the horse.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to deal briefly with the purely military considerations which make necessary the enactment of selective service at this time—that is to say, the military judgments of professional soldiers whose primary function is to prepare measures for the adequate security of the United States and its interests in the world. While the condition of international relations is a factor which cannot be divorced from the determination of security requirements, military judgments as to these requirements are based generally upon the capabilities of possible enemies, without regard to their hypothetical intent.

The armed forces of the United States are charged with certain missions which they must be capable of carrying out if the country is to be assured of reasonable protection from foreign attack. These missions generally remain constant, but the requirements in weapons and manpower to carry them out tend to vary with the change in the capabilities of possible enemies. For example, there was a time in our country's history when the expanse of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans afforded us a splendid isolation. This geographical remoteness was a defense in itself and required for its complement only a negligible armed force. Today our geographical isolation is gone. We are vulnerable, under certain conditions, to direct attack from the air, and, accordingly, we must maintain a substantially larger armed force if we are to have reasonable security.

On the basis of present developments in weapons and the known strength of Soviet armed forces, the Chief of Staff of the Army has determined that he needs a minimum of 822,000 men to carry out the missions assigned the Army by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. How does he arrive at such a judgment? Let us look first at the Army missions.

First. As a result of the war, the Army is now burdened with the job of occupying Germany, Austria, Trieste, Japan, and Korea—a job which, to paraphrase General Bradley, has rendered the Army primarily an administrative rather than a military force. Over half the present armed strength of the Army is spread over this vast area, and yet these occupation forces number only 253,000 troops. The Chief of Staff believes that the occupation forces should be increased by 14,000 men; if this is done he will regard the size of the occupation forces as an acceptable risk, provided there is behind these thinly spread troops an emergency force in the United States, able to support them promptly in the event of internal trouble in the occupied areas.

Second. A second Army mission is to occupy, in the event of war, those strategic areas from which air attack could be launched against our industrial cities. General Bradley, in a convincing statement before the Armed Services Committee on April 14, said bluntly that there are now neutral areas in the world, accessible to possible enemies, from which aircraft could attack the continental United States with decisive effect. I quote from his statement:

If we, as a result of weakness in land or naval strength, permit any enemy power to seize such bases as Alaska, Greenland, Iceland, Spitzbergen, or the Azores, then we shall have laid our industrial and population centers open to air attack. All the air force and antiaircraft artilleries of the world could not prevent it. Only troops actually occupying such bases could give us protection. Those troops are the Army.

What does this statement mean to the people of this country whose hope is to live out their lives in security and with whose welfare the Congress is directly charged? It means that if war should come, the American people will be forced to fight it on their own soil, unless there are sufficient ground forces available on the very first day of the conflict to seize those neutral areas from which an enemy could organize and launch attacks against our homeland.

I do not believe there is any doubt as to the decision the American people would make if, these facts were clear to them. I wonder if there can be any rational man who would prefer to fight a desperate, defensive action on the American continent—if war should unfortunately come—if it was in his power to prevent such a disastrous occurrence.

And I ask you to mark well this particular point: The only way to prevent attack upon this country, in the event of war, is to hold the bases from which the enemy can reach us with his aircraft and his airborne troops. Antiaircraft batteries and interceptor aircraft based in this country may be able to destroy a substantial portion of an attacking force, but they can never prevent destruction of our cities and devastation of our population.

Third. The Third Army mission is to seize overseas areas of vital importance to the counteroffensive efforts of our Air Force, in the event of war. Although a Senator from Ohio has seen fit to believe that air power alone is a panacea for national security—and I regret to say there are some Members of the House who hold the same misguided view—the best military judgment is that the American Air Force, regardless of its size, could not operate effectively against an enemy in Asia or Europe from bases in the continental United States. It would be necessary to obtain bases much nearer the target areas—bases which would most certainly have to be seized and held by American ground troops, and supported and supplied by the American Navy. Obviously, this means that trained combat troops must be available in adequate numbers, or our Air Force will be virtually limited to the defense of the Western Hemisphere in any conflict that may arise within the foreseeable future. The day of intercontinental warfare is many years away.

Fourth. The final mission of the Army—and perhaps the most easily understood—is to protect the continental United States; to repel attacks against it, and to protect its population against bombing and sabotage.

The Army thus has four basic missions in addition to the burden of occupation: First, to support the occupation; second, to be ready to occupy neutral areas from which an enemy could launch air attacks against us; third, to seize advance bases for the Air Force in the event of war; and fourth, to protect the continental United States. These are staggering tasks. All of them, with the exception of the last, are tasks peculiar to the Army which only the Army can carry out.

How many combat troops do we now have in this country, ready, mobile, and uncommitted to other tasks? We have 54,000—two and one-third divisions, no one of which is up to full strength.

I ask you quite frankly whether any sensible man can possibly consider this tiny force to be adequate to carry out the assigned missions of the Army. I ask you whether any sensible man would suggest eliminating one or all of these missions on grounds that it is unnecessary to the national security.

Fifty-four thousand men do not go very far when they are required simultaneously to support occupation forces overseas, to protect the vast land area of the continental United States, to prevent enemy seizure of air bases within range of the United States, and to spearhead the advance of the Air Force in the event of war. It should be obvious to everyone that 54,000 men would scarcely be adequate to carry out one of the above missions. To carry out more than one would spread such a force impossibly thin.

I submit there is no doubt of the compelling need to augment at once the effective combat strength of the Ground Forces.

The Andrews bill will provide the Army with only moderate increases. It will increase the combat strength within the continental United States from 54,000 to 223,000. Translated into units, this will mean five full strength divisions to comprise the emergency force, supplemented by six fully equipped and trained divisions composed of National Guard and Reserve troops. It should be understood that these Reserve divisions will not comprise a standing force, but rather a reserve force in being.

The Andrews bill will not provide, then, an overwhelming force. It will provide a minimal strength below which we dare not go without seriously jeopardizing the national security. Even then the Ground Forces will be, as General Bradley has said, "essentially a stopgap, one-shot Army, a plug in the dike until we could rally sufficient and effective reserves."

The Air Force and the Navy have equally vital missions, for which they must possess the capability to carry out, if the country is to be secure. Maximum security can be achieved only through the maintenance of carefully balanced land, sea, and air forces trained to operate as a team. No one military service can safeguard the country alone in this day of three dimensional warfare.

Congress has already taken steps to see that the Air Force shall be capable of carrying out its essential missions: First, to wage successful strategic air warfare; second, to gain and maintain general air supremacy; third, to control vital air areas.

The Navy is already capable of maintaining general sea supremacy and of controlling vital sea areas. It has, however, direct and specific need of selective-service legislation, if it is to provide sufficient naval forces for the conduct of joint amphibious operations in support of 70 air groups. Make no mistake about it, a 70-group air force, if it is to be effective, must be adequately supported and supplied by naval vessels and naval escorts, as well as by Army Ground Forces. Although there is no question that the Air Force has become the most important element of military strength, nevertheless an air force remains the most immobile and ineffective element if it is inadequately supported.

I am prepared to hear the time-worn arguments of those who oppose this bill. I do not believe they will be illogical enough to attack the validity of the missions assigned the several services, nor the need to increase the combat strength of each of them; but I assume they will insist—as they did repeatedly in 1940—that the armed forces can achieve the required increases by voluntary means alone. They cannot.

In the light of present circumstances, the recruiting record of the armed forces since the termination of hostilities is a very impressive one. In a period of nominal peace, when the Nation has just concluded an exhausting war, when we are enjoying an unprecedented level of employment, the armed forces have recruited and maintained a voluntary force of over 1,300,000 men—the largest voluntary force in the history of this or any other nation. This is factual.

The circumstances in which we now find ourselves require, however, that we further increase the strength of our standing forces. The required increases cannot be achieved by voluntary means alone, except in the Air Force. It is evident that the top limits attainable through voluntary recruitment have already been reached in the Army, and that although the Navy can enlist additional men, it cannot hope to reach the level of strength provided in the Andrews bill without the aid of selective-service legislation.

The missions assigned the armed forces are valid; the judgments of our trained professional officers, as to the manpower required to carry out these missions, are unquestionably proper in the light of the present world situation.

The United States has emerged from the recent war as the most powerful and influential nation in the world. It is now clear that if the world is to achieve a new equilibrium the United States must exercise the full measure of its leadership, and must accept the full responsibility that is the obligation of greater power.

The United States must do these things in its own interest, if for no other reason, for if leadership is not exercised, it is always lost; and if we do not strive, commensurate with our immense influence, to achieve the kind of world in which we hope to live, then there is no doubt that others will shape the world according to concepts entirely alien to our own.

The American people have accepted this great challenge to their leadership, which has been unwittingly thrust upon them as the result of victory in the recent war.

If the voice of the United States is to be clear and resonant in world councils, then it must be backed by strength, for weakness cannot negotiate; it can only beg.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, in the short space of 5 minutes it would be impossible for me to adequately express my opposition to peacetime conscription.

Accordingly, these remarks will be brief and, when they appear in the RECORD, they will include additional material.

In this proposal the House is debating a scheme to regiment the youth of America. Yet this House has not had the need of this scheme honestly explained to it.

Why do I say that?

Because, despite all the bombast about the world situation, our so-called commitments abroad, the threat of "aggressor nations," and so forth, no Member of Congress can tell the House or his people what the present national defense program embraces.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that. No Member of this House can tell any prospective draftee what our military and foreign policy is—in plain, understandable English.

Just as during the war, Members of Congress could not tell what we were fighting for except perhaps to mumble about the four freedoms and the Atlantic Charter—now both in the wastebasket, neither can a Member of Congress tell what our present military policy includes—whether we are trying to dominate the non-Russian world, prop up the British Empire, or what. No one can answer. Why not?

AMERICANS, LIKE RUSSIANS, KEPT IN DARK

If this bill is passed, the House will be shoving down the throats of the American people the despotic concept of—

Theirs not to reason why;
Theirs but to do and die.

More than a month ago I asked Secretary Forrestal what our defensive boundaries are. I received a reply that can mean anything you choose to make of it.

Once the need for larger manpower is determined, then it should be shown that every intelligent method of enlarging the forces by volunteer methods has failed. That has not been done.

Increased pay, 1-year enlistments, the morale-building proposals of the Doolittle report, and changes in the court-martial system—all of these have been given what amounts to the run-around.

H. R. 6401 would establish in America, without the people having any genuine voice in the decision, the totalitarian concept that the state owns the individual.

Such a lesser abridgment of liberty as the prohibition amendment, even after being taken to the people, failed because popular support evaporated.

This measure would cause a steady deterioration in the morale of the American people to the point of disaster.

This measure would declare to the world that Hitler was right—that the threat of communism externally justified militarism and regimentation at home.

Congress would be surrendering to the militarism that it sent 400,000 American boys to die fighting against—thereby outlawing the Declaration of Independence concept that man is endowed with certain inalienable rights.

(a) Having made this surrender of human liberty, Congress can no longer effectively defend the rights of the people from aggrandizement by the state. You cannot enslave youth and then defend lesser individual right.

CONSCRIPTION MAKES ERP A CERTAIN FLOP

Passage of this bill would practically guarantee that ERP will be operation rat hole. It will be a signal to shrewd people everywhere that United States hostilities with Russia are to be expected.

That prospect would cause the people of Europe and Asia to abandon most plans for private domestic investment. No sane person makes permanent investments on a prospective battlefield.

Passage of this bill would play right into Stalin's hands.

(a) It would imitate the Communists by adopting the principle of article 132 of the Russian Constitution—peacetime conscription.

(b) It would multiply the tensions among our own people. It would enable the Communists to truthfully proclaim that our talk about the dignity of man and freedom was rotten hypocrisy.

You cannot send a conscript, who has been deprived of freedom, to Germany to teach the German people about the blessings of freedom.

HYSTERIA FANNED HERE IN HITLER FASHION

This bill seems to be the product of carefully created hysteria designed to stampede Congress into full-blown militarism.

(a) Great Britain is spending only 23 percent of its budget on military costs whereas we are about to spend at least 37 percent. That amount is almost 60 percent larger than Britain.

(b) Canada has no draft and is spending only $20 per capita on defense, against over $100 per capita here.

(c) Many people have swallowed the propaganda that our 1948 military position is comparable with 1938. They have accepted the deliberate untruth that our defense is a hollow shell. Nothing could be further from the truth.

First. Our military expenditures for the fiscal year 1949 will be around $15,000,000,000. The enormity of this amount is shown by the fact that in the 18 years ended July 1, 1939, our total military expenditures were just over $15,000,000,000.

Second. In 1939 Army ammunition on hand was nil. Today it is 8,500,000 tons.

In 1939 Army matériel on hand was nil. Today it is 9,000,000 tons.

Third. Our Navy today is larger than all the rest of the world put together.

Fourth. We have the atomic bomb. We have powerful bases, especially air, almost around the world.

(d) Continued hysteria and surrender to the militarists would repeat France's fatal stupidity of the twenties when her surrender to the militarists weakened her civilian economy so that it collapsed when the test came.

IS CONGRESS BECOMING SUBSERVIENT TO MILITARY?

H. R. 6401 may move Congress decisively into the realm of impotence in the direction of national affairs. The military already has the fearful power inherent in the spending of close to $15,000,000,000 annually.

The additional coercive powers surrendered to the military by this bill can make the civilian branch of the Government completely subservient to the military. Already there is much evidence to indicate that Army spending and interference in civil government approaches the point of domination.

For 160 years a youth born in America has been assured at birth of opportunity and freedom unsurpassed on this planet.

This measure would destroy that heritage and reduce an American boy to a second-rate degree of freedom compared with the youth of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and other lands.

Congress should not make such a surrender of liberty on the basis of 10-day hearings.

AN ECONOMIC PEARL HARBOR IS PARAMOUNT DANGER

Passage of this measure would accelerate the wholesale Government spending that will eventually cause run-away inflation. That is made to order for our enemies. You cannot achieve economy in public spending in an America that is conscripting its young men. The Communists could win their aim of world control by avoiding open hostilities.

Once run-away inflation occurs here, the military advantages we have today will evaporate.

Mr. Chairman, the most plausible excuse for this bill is, to quote its advocates, "to show Russia that we mean business."

Let us examine this claim realistically. Do you remember 2 years ago when Byrnes started "talking tough" to Russia? What did that accomplish?

Or do you remember Marshall's claim that we would erect a dollar curtain that would halt Russia? Already that claim, used to put over the Marshall plan, has been exploded by Marshall himself in demanding the draft.

BILL PROMOTES RUSSIAN AIMS

Mr. Chairman, instead of stopping the Russian menace, the so-called show of force embraced in the draft bill actually promotes the Soviet objective.

That objective today, as always, is an economic Pearl Harbor in America.

Mr. Chairman, the record proves that this administration does not comprehend the real tactics of Russian expansion.

Their aggression is based upon inducing America to become more and more economically overextended—without a let-up. Thus far that policy has worked perfectly—for Russia.

By cleverly opposing our economic blood-letting scheme, the Communists may have promoted their adoption. They have given us a long rope, which the administration has grabbed enthusiastically. This bill would wrap that rope around our neck.

This bill would constitute an unsurpassed grant of power to an administration with an unbroken record of bungling in our foreign and domestic affairs. For Congress, with full knowledge of this record of failure to make this surrender seems to approach the irresponsible. That, I believe, is the kindest appraisal you can make of such action.

HAS HOUSE LOST FAITH IN FREEDOM?

In meeting the challenge of the times we have three roads open to us. One is appeasement—finally the leadership that now demands conscription claims to have abandoned that stupid policy.

Now that same leadership demands an equally stupid course, the Hitler road of militarism, regimentation, and economic collapse at home.

The third course open to us is to remain free and strong, to keep the lights of liberty burning on this Western shore as an inspiration and example to those struggling for liberty elsewhere.

Extinguish liberty here by conscription, Mr. Chairman, and the powerhouse that sends out the current of liberty to other lands will slowly or quickly atrophy. That is the unbroken record of history.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services for affording me an opportunity to speak on this legislation about which I feel most keenly. During my short tenure in Congress I have heard many men in the well of this House praise the Air Force and say that our national defense, our national security, is well provided for by our possession of the atomic bomb and in our scientific warfare. It so happened that in World War II I served as an infantry officer, a doughboy, with that grand old Pennsylvania Division, the Twenty-eighth National Guard Division. I recall at that time there were a lot of other men that were serving in the infantry, approximately 4,000,000 carrying rifles; not a very glamorous branch of the service. I assume that those men, too, played a part in winning the victory in World War II as well as our fine Air Corps.

I recall the battle of St. Lo. I saw the Eighth Air Force come over and destroyed St. Lo, France, but there were several divisions waiting at the edge of the town and we had a terrible battle to secure that city that the Air Force had destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the proponents of a strong Air Force, and I agree with them it is necessary to our national defense, and it is perhaps the more glamorous way and the easiest way to have national security. However, I am inclined to believe that we are still

going to need men on the ground. All the arguments I have heard today deserve considerable merit. Certainly we need to have a stock pile of strategic materials.

We need our strong Air Force, we need our strong Navy, but we are still going to have the man—a trained man—with the rifle in case of any eventuality that we might encounter. At the present time we do not have aircraft that can leave the continental United States on a military mission and travel to any potential enemy and return. How are we going to secure that base for our aircraft to take off from? I believe it was mentioned a while ago that it is going to be necessary for somebody to seize and secure those bases. That can be done only by trained ground troops. After sites have been secured it is necessary then to protect these installations, and that only can be done by trained ground troops. Therefore, despite our proposed 70-group air force, I am firmly convinced that our strength lies in properly trained ground troops. The history of the United States military operations has been that our strength lies not in our professional Army but, rather, in citizen soldiers, who are trained for any emergency. In the past wars we have had sufficient time to train citizen soldiers from the time war was declared until actual operations began. We have been fortunate enough to have allies who bore the brunt of initial attacks. However, we have no assurance we can plan on this condition ever existing again.

As I have said, I believe trained manpower is necessary for a balanced defense set-up. However, I am reluctant to support this draft legislation for the reason that a few men between the ages of 19 and 25 will be selected to go into the armed forces, while other men in the same age group will not have to assume that responsibility. The Member who supports this legislation should realize that he is actually voting for legislation that drafts the poor boy, the boy whose parents do not have influence, politically or otherwise. They are the boys who will be called upon to protect all of us. I am personally ashamed and embarrassed by this type of program. I believe each of us owe many obligations to our country. We brag about the equal opportunities that this country affords to each of us. Why is it not logical for us to equally share our responsibilities—and one of the greatest responsibilities is to provide for our national security. We all pay taxes—that is a responsibility each of us as citizens owe. So training to preserve our country should be shared on an equal basis. It is a little ironical when just a few years ago men were called into the armed services to save this great Nation of ours. It does not seem unjust to me that we should ask the present generation to preserve that which many of us spent 5 years to save.

Personally, I have advocated a universal-military-training program for some time. If that had been adopted there would be no need for us to be considering the draft today. You would have your trained citizen Reserve and your professional Army could be left at the required minimum.

My deepest condolences go to the members of the selective-service boards who have to make the decision as to what boy will be selected of his community to assume the responsibility for everyone in that community. The pressure on those men will be tremendous.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, on the threshold of this historic debate of the peacetime Selective Service Act of 1948 may I take this opportunity before we have engaged in it, before we have actually entered into the arena, to serve notice that I will not tolerate any gentleman's agreement in respect to the civil-rights amendments which I am going to offer.

It has been indicated before in this Eightieth Congress by Representatives on both sides that there have been gentlemen's agreements concerning the question of civil rights. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7 bears printed proof that such an agreement was made.

I am demanding that such a momentous question as peacetime military conscription shall not in any way be gagged by any gentleman's agreement. I am assuming the leadership of this fight to bring out the Selective Service Act which, at least, will have some of the decencies of our rapidly being jeopardized as a democracy.

We took our time in debating the Marshall plan, aid for Europe. Do we hold the American plan so cheaply that we are going to gag full discussion, gag a full, free, and complete discussion? Well, I am not going to tolerate it. The leadership of this House wants to get out by this coming Saturday. There is a lot of important legislation which must be finished by then. I intend to ask for full and complete discussion under the 5-minute rule of all of the amendments presented by all Members of this House, whether on the question of civil rights or not. I have prepared 31, all of which will not be offered by me. Some are going to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS], by our colleagues the gentlemen from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. ISAACSON], and others. Let us stay in session all night, if necessary. I want to be blunt and state that if there is any attempt to limit the time in a way that will prevent any opponent or proponent from discussing each amendment to the fullest, then I propose to object to every unanimous-consent request for the balance of this week, to demand an engrossed copy, to ask for quorum calls. May I emphatically state that I do not mind an honest vote on each amendment, in other words, I am not making this statement from the basis that I demand that the amendments be passed, which would be thoroughly undemocratic, I am making this statement from the basis that I demand that full time be allowed which is consonant with the highest principles of democracy.

Under time which I am sure will be granted to me under the 5-minute rule, I will more thoroughly discuss my opposition to various items in the peacetime draft.

In the first place, I am opposed to this draft as a Christian. All of my life I have believed in the power of nonviolence. All of my life I have been a pacifist. I never changed that position until Pearl Harbor. I have never seen wars solve any solution—any problem.

JESUS—HIGHEST AUTHORITY

In the second place, I am against this as an American citizen. I am against the staggering, needless cost. I am against the doing away with rule by majority and substituting wars that destroy.

Third, I am against this bill as a human being because it will destroy our educational system, it will completely disrupt and corrupt family life, it will jeopardize the moral life of the cream of our manhood. Europe has tried it and failed. And I prophesy that if it is passed, America will be reduced to the second-class status of western Europe.

I am against this bill in the fourth place because a vast majority of specialists who have come before the Armed Services Committee or who have been quoted in the public press, including our military leadership, did not state a necessity.

THE PROPONENTS OF A DRAFT DO NOT PLAN TO MAKE IT TEMPORARY

Read the history of how the militarists twisted our wartime selective-service laws to meet their own ends. This could be obtained from the National Council Against Conscription at 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington. A temporary draft of 19- to 25-year-olds could easily become permanent peacetime conscription and total regimentation.

On April 12, when Secretary Forrestal testified before the House Armed Services Committee the following conversation occurred:

Congressman HÉBERT. I understood you to say that selective service is merely a temporary measure?

Secretary FORRESTAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. Which will be on the books so long as you do not have UMT; is that correct?

Secretary FORRESTAL. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. HÉBERT. Then it will be as temporary as some of those buildings on Constitution Avenue which were erected during World War I which are still there—if we do not have universal military training?

Secretary FORRESTAL. That is my opinion. (House Armed Services Committee hearings, p. 6114.)

Our opposition to peacetime conscription is based upon our studied conviction that:

First. The draft is not necessary. This is documented on the accompanying sheet. Secretary Symington told the House Armed Services Committee:

At one time from the standpoint of pilots that have served we had some 80,000 applications for 6,000 jobs. (April 13, House Armed Services Committee hearings, p. 6142.)

Second. It could be a first step toward a war. Our scientists say that no one could hope to win in a major war.

Third. The draft for military service could be followed by drafts or regimentation of labor, capital, industry, and loss of our democracy in America.

Fourth. It is contrary to the American way of life. Read the testimony of one of America's best-loved and leading historians, Dr. Charles A. Beard, pages 1053–1057 of the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings. This is a solemn warning that all should heed.

Even the most ardent protagonists of the draft admit that the present world situation is not such as warrants emergency measures. They think of peacetime conscription as a permanent change from our American way of life. Colonel Taylor, of the American Legion, ardently desires UMT and the draft. He testified to the House committee that this is not an emergency when he said:

When the emergency comes you are going to take them all in anyway. (House Armed Services Committee hearings, p. 6560.)

Some of the proponents of the draft do not now recommend regimentation of industry. If the international situation warranted emergency measures they should not call for conscription of industry as well as of young men. Many Americans do not realize that those measures would follow the adoption of the draft program. Note carefully the testimony of Secretary of Defense Forrestal on April 12 to the House committee in response to questioning by Mr. VINSON, House Armed Services Committee hearings, pages 6099–6100.

It is very unwise to even consider such a revolutionary change withing thinking of the cost. The effect of this measure upon our national economy could be disastrous. A $21,000,000,000 defense budget could break our American economy. These figures are found on page 6600, House Armed Services Committee hearings.

It appears that a deliberate attempt has been made to justify the demands of selective service by juggling figures. Study the figures presented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 4, 1948, on pages 5239–5240.

The draft is absolutely unnecessary to bring our forces up to the authorized strength. Read the testimony of Dr. Alonzo F. Meyers to the House Armed Services Committee on pages 6464–6474 in House Armed Services Committee hearings. Read also the minority report on this question.

We feel that an honest effort should be made to make our American voluntary system of recruiting work. The proposal of Chairman ALLEN of the House Rules Committee that the men who serve should receive the extra benefits has merit we feel. From July 1, 1946, to March 31, 1948, selective service cost $1,155 per man drafted. That money could be given to boys as an inducement for voluntary enlistment.

Any form of even temporary draft legislation would be a step in the direction of permanent peacetime regimentation for military purposes—House Armed Services Committee hearings, page 6114.

Note: The majority of the protagonists of UMT and/or a temporary draft have favored peacetime conscription since World War I.

The churches of America have stated repeatedly their opposition to UMT and/or peacetime regimentation for military purposes—see House Armed Services Committee hearings, pages 6295–6305.

The protagonists of peacetime conscription argue that war is inevitable—Senate Armed Services Committee hearings page 1012. Read the statements of our atomic scientists who warn us that we dare not have another war. The article by William T. Holliday in the January 1948 Reader's Digest points this up.

The propaganda to regiment America with UMT has been carried on improperly and illegally by public tax money according to the findings of the House Committee on Expenditures. A copy of this report can be obtained from the gentleman from Indiana, Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS.

The effort to promote peacetime regimentation for a military dictatorship upon the American Nation has been promoted by deliberate lies and double talk. For example, former Justice Owen J. Roberts has charged that the "Communists are the solid core of opposition to UMT." Justice Roberts knows that the Christian people who really believe in American democracy are firmly opposed to UMT, the draft, and all unnecessary peacetime regimentation. Read the top paragraph on page 1001 of Senate Armed Services Committee hearings.

On May 4, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative LEO ALLEN, chairman of the Rules Committee, came out with a bill (H. R. 6444) which is a sincere attempt to get away from the un-American conscription features of our militaristic administration. It calls for lowering the Army general classification test grade from 80 to 70. It was 59 during the war. It would give bonuses of $1,000 or $1,500 for men enlisting for 2 and 3 years respectively after March 31, 1947, or give them the benefits of the GI bill for school.

President Truman called Mr. ALLEN's proposal asinine. At a press conference Mr. Truman said that Mr. ALLEN's suggestion was the most asinine thing he had heard yet. Note: When sound reasoning fails we call names. Remember that selective service spent $22,878,000 from July 1, 1946, until March 31, 1947, in order to draft 19,797 men at an average cost of $1,155 per man.

Sixty-four dollar question: Is it asinine to give $1,000 to the boy who enlists instead of to generals, colonels, and draft-board personnel who conscript the boy for military service against his will?

Every Congressman should ponder this question in light of our tradition of a peacetime voluntary Army.

How large an Army do we need? On January 6, 1948, President Truman in his budget message recommended an Army strength for the fiscal year 1949 of 560,000 men. At the Senate hearings on March 18, 1948, it was revealed that as of March 1, 1948, our Army had 542,000 men. That is 18,000 short of the budgeted strength of the Army. General Hershey told the House Armed Services Committee that Selective Service required 25,000 paid personnel and 185,000 volunteer personnel during the war. It is obvious that it would be unwise to set up expensive selective-service machinery and hire thousands of men to draft 18,000 men.

In order to justify a draft the figures have changed rapidly.

On March 25, 1948, Secretary of Defense Forrestal proposed an Army of 782,000 men. On April 14, 1948, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended an Army of 837,000 men. On April 15, 1948, General Bradley recommended an Army of 822,000 men plus 15,000 if a 70-group air force passes, plus 95,000 men if UMT passes—totaling 932,000 men. On April 21, 1948, the Secretary of Defense suggested that with a 66-group air force we should have an Army of 790,000 men. The above figures are all documented in the May 4, 1948, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 5239–5240.

Ike's tricky memory: When General Eisenhower was asked whether a lowering of the AGCT grade from 80 to 70 would make SS or UMT unnecessary, he replied:

My memory is sometimes tricky, but I thought I had directed, before I left as Chief of Staff, to drop, for the Ground Forces at least, the figure back to 70, and I thought there is where it was. (Senate Armed Services Committee hearings on UMT, p. 1001.)

Remember, on March 18, Senator BYRD asked Secretary of Defense Forrestal how they planned to run the draft. Secretary Forrestal said:

I would prefer to not get into a detailed analysis, because I have not approved a plan nor have I thought that plan through in detail that I think would satisfy your question, and I would rather not try to speculate upon the answers. (Senate Armed Services Committee hearings, p. 43.)

The big question: When did our Secretary of Defense first hear of the Truman draft proposal? A week later he had plans.

The Air Force does not need it. Secretary of Air Symington told the House Armed Services Committee on April 13:

We do not feel that selective service is necessary in order to get the people • • • for the Air Force.

General Spaatz added:

I have no doubt in my mind but what the Air Force will get sufficient recruits to maintain the Air Force proper on a voluntary enlistment basis.

The Navy does not need selective service. Secretary of Navy Sullivan told the House Armed Services Committee on April 13:

We believe the way our enlistments have been running we probably will be able to do it without selective service.

Admiral Denfeld, in reply to a question as to whether the Navy could get its strength without a draft, said:

I think you could get it if the present situation continues.

The Army has not made a case for selective service. Secretary Royall told the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 25 that war is not imminent. The Italian elections went off smoothly without selective service.

On March 18—after the President's appeal for selective service—Secretary Forrestal told the Senate Armed Services Committee "the authorized strength of the Army is 670,000, and they have a current strength of 560,000," page 37 in Senate Armed Services Committee hearings.

On pages 636 and 640 of the President's budget for 1948 we find the strength recommended for the Army is 560,000. In other words, if Secretary Forrestal's figures which he gave in his testimony were correct, the Army has its strength as provided by the President's budget. On March 25 Secretary Royall testified—Senate Armed Services Committee hearings, page 343:

At present, as of March 1, we have 542,000 in the Army.

If Secretary Forrestal was correct on March 18, there was no deficit in the budgeted strength of the Army. If Secretary Royall was correct we were short only 18,000 men, which is a poor excuse for a very expensive and undemocratic draft in peacetime. Also the country should realize with what ease mistakes are made in figures in places of high responsibility.

Are the Reserves being used? Read April 10 Collier's, Does the Army Want the Reserves? On April 21, page 6536 in House Armed Services Committee hearings—before the House Armed Services Committee, General Evans, of the Reserve Officers Association, testified:

It is true we have 600,000 on paper; but they have not been contacted. They have not been put into units. They have not been given any training.

He pleaded:

All I am urging and begging and what I have been doing for 3 years is to have somebody do something with what we now have.

Does the world situation necessitate selective service now? General Clay in Germany says the crisis is "a political one and not a military one"—New York Times, March 26, 1948. Secretary Royall told the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 25 that "war is not imminent." Secretary Forrestal on April 26 told a Senate committee:

I don't want to give the impression that we think war is near. But I do believe we are in a state of tension that may last for many years.

He explained that if he had felt war was likely he would have asked for twenty-five to fifty billions instead of the requested appropriation.

In thus stating its case, the Army should have pointed out that rapid mobilization really would have to be instantaneous mobilization to be worth anything. The testimony of the atom scientists is clear that if there is another war there will not be time for mobilization. For example, Dr. Morris Perlman, according to the Washington Times-Herald of October 28, 1945, told his fellow scientists that "victory for an aggressor nation can be assured in a few terrible hours in an atom war of the future." In support of this is the statement of a former Lockheed executive, Harry E. Stowe of Los Angeles, who, as assistant to the president of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce of America, said on June 8, 1945:

The future aggressor's aim would be total destruction of his victim in the first 24 hours of hostilities.

Admiral Halsey confirms the statements of General MacArthur, the atom scientists, and others, that if there is another war it will be over in a very short time. Halsey is reported in an October 29, 1945, UP dispatch from St. Louis as having said at a Navy Day Victory War Loan Rally that the next war probably will not last 6 months and that when the term "duration and 6 months" is applied to future struggles the 6 months are likely to be considerably longer than the duration.

Contrast these statements with General Marshall's in his last biennial report that it would take a year fully to muster those who have had their peacetime training and have returned to civilian life. In line with General Marshall's comment is the testimony of Admiral King on November 16, 1945, before the House Military Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Iowa, Representative MARTIN asked: "The principal value of your peacetime training would be in the early weeks of the emergency."

Admiral King replied: "I think, Mr. MARTIN, it would be rather a matter of months than weeks."

Secretary of War Patterson also spoke of the difficulties of mobilization when at a press conference in San Francisco, according to the September 3 Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, he said:

It would take 6 months to mobilize the strength we had a year ago.

Patterson was speaking of boys who had a lot of military service and who would be mobilized by trained and experienced draft-board personnel.

Moreover, boys trained under the Army plan would, after mobilization, need to be retrained before they could be used. General Palmer in the August 1944 Reserve Officer wrote:

Every able-bodied young American should be trained to fight for his country if a war should come within 3 or 4 years after he completes his training.

In other words, a boy trained at the age of 18 will be useless after he is 21 or 22 unless he is trained all over again. General Eisenhower goes further to indicate that without any 3- or 4-year time limit all will have to be retrained in the event of war. He said in June 1945 to the House Committee on Postwar Military Policy:

Physical training will always have to be repeated after the war starts, but takes the least time. Psychological indoctrination • • • requires the longest time but fortunately it is never completely forgotten.

Furthermore, those who would have had their training and gone back into civilian life would not be brought back into the Army as members of teams as the War Department plan proposes. Once the training is over the teams would be broken up and men would be drafted and placed in the Army according to General Marshall's statement in his biennial report "just as men are now called by a committee of local neighbors in an order of priority." The Army has never proposed any other plan than selective service, which automatically breaks up teams. Many men trained in teams will become indispensable in industry and will never be called in the event of war.

Nor would the compulsory-training proposal provide "individual specialists" as the War Department plan claims. Any training in the technical schools and colleges would be gotten by men in civilian status as readily as if they wore uniforms while attending college. Other than such training there is no real likelihood of specialists developing. Certainly they will not develop in the 6 months the Army suggests. Many military leaders have pointed out that it takes a year or more for ordinary training, to say nothing of specialist training.

For example, General Chennault, according to the October 29, 1945, Washington Post, called for 18 months' training, saying:

It takes 12 months alone to teach men to operate modern weapons. The man should also perform some field service if the training is to be of any benefit.

Admiral King is quoted in the October 28, 1945, Washington Star as saying that from the naval point of view, 1 year's training would probably not be enough. He thought it would require 15 to 18 months.

The Army completely omits reference to the problems involved in mobilization in the event of atomic war. We have the testimony of the scientists that any aggressor could in a few hours time destroy New York, Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and other large cities, killing 40,000,000 people, almost a third of our population. No mobilization set-up would be possible before America could be completely destroyed. In the initial attack railroad centers, transportation devices, ships and docks, selective-service headquarters, trained officers and men—all necessary for mobilization—would be wiped out. In such an event, how would the Army carry out its purpose of mobilization rapidly in an emergency?

Even if it were possible to mobilize the peacetime conscripts, they could not be used for the invasion of enemy lands or to prevent further atomic attack. Commodore H. S. Schade, formerly chief of the United States naval technical mission in Europe, told a Senate subcommittee—page 271, Senate hearings on Senate Resolution 107—that if Germany had had enough atom bombs, the Allied landings on Normandy's beachhead would presumably have been unsuccessful. Gen. Henry A. Arnold, the commander of

Army Air Forces, in reply to the question, "Can the United States be invaded by a water-borne armed force in the face of planes with atomic bombs?" said, "Who would want to invade by water if they had the atomic bomb?"—Capitol Gist, volume 8, No. 4.

As a result of circumstances such as these, Charles Bolté, chairman of the American Veterans Committee, wrote in the September 29, 1945, Nation:

A conscript army could hardly be assembled, and, if assembled, would hardly find a place where it could fight to any good purpose—I hasten to withdraw my argument in favor of universal military training.

The second major purpose the Army gives for compulsory training is—

The readiness of the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserve Corps can be maintained at the highest level during peacetime due to prior intensive training of enlistees.

Unless the War Department assumes that every young man who has had compulsory training will or must later serve for a period in the Army, the Guard, or the Organized Reserves, why not on a voluntary basis give prior training only to those who will serve in one of these military organizations. There is no point in forcing everyone into the same mold so that the few who enlist in military service may have prior training.

There is also an undefined element in the term "maintained at the highest level." Will the highest level mean anything in the event of actual war, or will further training be required? Ranson Baldwin, Annapolis-trained military analyst of the New York Times, said in that paper on December 1, 1946:

No part-time soldier, such as the National Guard man, can ever become, even with the best will in the world, ready for service anywhere in the world on M-day.

On October 23, 1946, Baldwin wrote:

Six months of training, even though followed by part-time training in the Guard or Reserve components, is too short to make an efficient soldier.

The fifth purpose of the Army is to train men who would be able to defend and assist in the community in the event of local disasters resulting from initial enemy action which may be expected in the early stages of a war of the future.

The Army does not suggest how it will through military training prepare boys after they have returned to civilian status, to defend local communities from atomic bombs. In an article, There Is No Defense Against Atomic Bombs, W. A. Higginbotham, chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, writes in the November 3, 1946, New York Times of the difficulties which the defenders of London and Antwerp faced against ordinary rockets.

You could not entrust to boys of a year's training such defense and no other defense even approaches realism. Not only would no real defense be possible, but the Army has not indicated how it would train disaster units. No scheme was worked out at Bikini except to keep men out of the areas of radioactivity. Real disaster training should be civilian, not military, and it should include first aid, mechanical, fire fighting, and other skills which do not require generals and colonels for instructors.

General Eisenhower himself, perhaps inadvertently, revealed the Army's real uncertainty and indecision when on September 28 from Frankfurt-on-the-Main, Germany, he replied to a question from a United Press correspondent:

What the atom bomb is going to mean to us is a matter over which we study and sweat blood every day. I think there is no one who can say what this means to the numbers and equipments of armies.

I am against this bill in the fifth place as a lover of pure democracy. This bill is a rape of democracy. The Mundt-Nixon bill began it and this bill will finish it. The Republican-dominated Congress will not be kissing democracy good-by. It is a military coup. It is a bloodless revolution on the part of brass hats.

And lastly, I am against this bill not because I am a Negro but because I know that until this Nation of ours faces the Negro problem squarely and stops preaching democracy for Europe and denying it in America, we are going to have trouble and plenty of it because no nation in this world is going to view us with any respect. The greatest propaganda used in the Pacific and in Europe during wartime by the Nazi-Fascist-Jap military axis was the way American people were treating Negro people.

Now do not think for a minute that this speech is demogogic politics because it is not. Let no one bring out the bugaboo of communism either unless you want to charge the members of the President's commission on peacetime conscription as being Communists, unless you want to charge the Federal Council of Churches, unless you want to charge the Protestant churches of the State of Indiana, where our majority leader comes from, as being Communists. Let no one bring up the issue of partisanship because I am placing the blame squarely where it belongs. If this bill is passed, it will be the fault of the Republicans. And I further charge that if the President of the United States signs this bill in its present shape, he will be branding himself as a two-faced liar talking civil rights out of one corner of his mouth and refusing to practice them out of the other corner.

As I said before, I intend to go through all of these items very carefully under the 5-minute rule, and as we debate through the week on this subject, that is if the time is given me. And if not, I intend to resort to every parliamentary trick to keep this House in session.

I make no apology for what I have said, will say, or plan to do. There is a higher authority than this House of Representatives, even higher than our Supreme Court, yes the Constitution and the Bill of Rights included, that authority since the foundation of the earth, has laid down the inexorable, indisputable law that there is none and therefore shall be no difference between the races of people.

Finally, let no one say that these amendments which I propose to offer are not germane.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, 4 minutes is a very short time in which to try to compress some 35 years of interest in this particular subject. Anticipating that, I put my speech in the RECORD. It appears in the Appendix of today's RECORD at page 3864. I could not possibly cover that speech in 4 minutes' time, so I will discuss some of the points a little further. I wish to thank the gentleman from New York for the opportunity to speak in opposition to this bill.

I believe I am the only retired Regular Army officer in the House. I claim no military prowess because of that, because I served my last duty 25 years ago. I finished my final service in October 1923, as assistant professor of military science and tactics at the University of Iowa. I taught military policy. I thought I had worked out a policy that would bring us national defense. Throughout my entire life I have opposed anything drifting toward militarism. I do not confuse militarism with defense. I believe I know enough about this subject to draw a clear line of demarcation between them. I have given more time in Congress to the matter of adequate equipment of our armed forces than any other one subject. I was on the conference committee between the House and Senate in 1939 on Public Law No. 117, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, the first strategic materials bill. I am one of two survivors of that conference committee now in the House. I served on the subcommittee that developed Public Law No. 520 in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I served on Special Committee No. 3 of the Military Affairs Committee to investigate the war program in 1941, in which we pointed out the weakness of this Nation in our strategic and critical materials.

To my amazement, in the year 1948, June 11, I find before the Ordnance Association in Detroit a statement quoted in the Evening Star, which reads:

The Army has nearly enough World War II stocks on hand to equip the additional six and one-half divisions it has asked Congress to authorize, but a spokesman said today the equipment would be "out of balance."

By being unbalanced we mean, for instance, that we have sufficient artillery but no prime movers to pull that artillery, and, similarly, we have plenty of antiaircraft guns, but no modern fire-control equipment; we have weapons of great technological advances and design, but no ammunition for use of this equipment in either training or in combat. Examples of this type of unbalance are manifold and these are but a few pertinent examples.

Then I got hold of General Bradley's speech before that same Ordnance Association, delivered on June 9. He said:

Contrary to popular belief, the Army does not have sufficient balanced stocks of weapons and other equipment to tide us through industrial conversion in the event of another war.

Skipping a bit, he said:

The military value of our existing reserve stocks is limited not only by their inadequate over-all quantities but likewise by their unbalanced composition.

Even with the best advanced planning of civilian consultants to the Munitions Board, and even with the full cooperation of industry, we shall face an irreducible lag of 1 year or more in the production of munitions in the event of war. Our ability to defend sensitive outposts and to support a limited offensive during that first year of waiting will depend entirely upon our stock pile of equipment reserves. Without this margin of safety, we could conceivably lose a war or certainly prolong a costly conflict, long before our industrial plan could be brought into action.

As the range and power of offensive weapons are increased with each passing year, it becomes more and more necessary for us to bank upon strength-in-being rather than upon our potential reserves.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment my very good friend and colleague from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who has a very distinguished war record, serving under Gen. Dan Strickler of the Twenty-eighth Division. I was pleased and greatly impressed with what the gentleman had to say today.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I gladly yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. The General, he was Colonel Strickler then—was my battalion commander and one of the finest, grandest soldiers that ever lived.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan. I know General Strickler will be pleased to hear of this fine tribute that has been paid to him.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take my time to discuss with the membership amendments I intend to introduce at the proper time. They read as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 6401

After section 11, page 41, line 4, insert the following new sections to be numbered 12, 13, and 14, respectively, and renumber the existing sections 12 through 23 accordingly:

"SEC. 12. Under policies established by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army, the United States Navy (including the Marine Corps) and the United States Air Force from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age for enlistment periods of not less than 3 years: *Provided*, That the total number of aliens who may be enlisted pursuant to this section shall not exceed 100,000 at any one time. Persons enlisted pursuant to this section shall, upon completion of 3 years' honorable service in one or more of the armed forces of the United States, be eligible, subject to such qualifications and examinations as may be prescribed, for naturalization in accordance with the provisions of section 324 of the act approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1149; 8 U. S. C. 724), and other provisions of applicable law.

"SEC. 13. Provisions of law prohibiting the payment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall neither apply to aliens who enlisted in the Regular Army, the United States Navy (including the Marine Corps), or the Air Force, under the provisions of section 12 of this act, nor to their dependents or beneficiaries.

"SEC. 14. So much of section 2 of the act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat., ch. 179, 216; 10 U. S. C. 625), as amended, as reads '; and in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States, or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army,' is hereby repealed."

Section 12 is similar to an amendment adopted in the Senate to the selective service bill known as the Lodge amendment. Let me point out the difference between my amendment and the Lodge amendment.

The Lodge amendment would authorize only the Secretary of the Army until June 30, 1950, to accept not to exceed 25,000 enlistments in the Regular Army whereas my amendment would authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, under policies established by the Secretary of Defense, indefinitely to accept enlistments in the Regular Army, the United States Navy, and the Regular Air Force provided the total number of aliens who may be enlisted shall not exceed 100,000 at any one time.

The Lodge amendment would establish a maximum age of 35 years whereas my amendment would contain no such restriction.

The Lodge amendment would set a minimum enlistment of 5 years whereas my amendment sets one of 3 years.

The Lodge amendment makes no mention of naturalization whereas my amendment spells it out and insures an alien after completion of 3 years' honorable service of becoming eligible for naturalization.

The Lodge amendment would suspend until June 30, 1950, the present prohibition on original enlistment of aliens which is now effective in time of peace whereas my amendment would repeal the prohibition.

This amendment, if adopted, will give us an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, of securing the services of some hundred thousand aliens, stateless people in most instances, who are anxious to become citizens of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, on several occasions during the past 3 years I have discussed at length on this floor the reasons why I am fundamentally opposed to compulsory military training in peacetime. They are well known to the Congress and to the people of the Fourth Indiana District.

Peacetime military conscription has never prevented a war in the past. It has been weighed in the balance and found wanting in many European countries. In this atomic age it is a futile gesture toward preventing a future war. It is significant that every major nation in history which has had peacetime conscription inevitably has been led into war and eventually to defeat and ruin.

Compulsory peacetime military conscription is, as a matter of fact, a breeder of wars. The conquests of Alexander, Caesar, and Napoleon have proven that military-minded nations have become aggressor nations. When nations arm to the teeth and put forth their energies into the establishment of huge armies and navies, situations arise or create themselves for the use of these forces.

We are interested in preserving our American form of democracy and this can best be accomplished by devoting our energies toward the establishment and maintenance of world-wide lasting peace.

The majority report of the Committee on Armed Services has been widely quoted in support of this measure. The opposition report of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and his colleagues however, makes a lot more sense—in my opinion.

In recommending a stepped-up program of voluntary recruitment for the Army, the report points out the Army has deliberately refrained from making all-out efforts to utilize voluntary recruitment methods. "Just as little interest has been shown in supporting the Reserve establishments as long as the Army feels that universal conscription is obtainable, so the Army has been unwilling to pursue energetically the problem of making Army service more desirable to the average potential soldier," the report states.

Summing up arguments against this bill, and in support of our traditional peacetime volunteer methods, the report asserts:

We have taken all steps necessary to provide the United States with an adequate defense against any enemy. The most modern weapons, the greatest Air Force and Navy in the world, the possession of the newest and most effective atomic bombs, and a modernized Ground and Service Force backed by the productive resources and manpower of the United States are a formidable defense.

The men needed to complete our Ground Forces can be secured, just as those of the Navy and Air Force are being kept at peak requirements, through voluntary enlistments. Backed by a Reserve force and a National Guard brought to full strength, the Army will be of such size and quality as to meet all our defense requirements. Ample evidence is available * * * to prove that no compulsory peacetime draft is needed to build up the Army to required strength.

Various public-opinion polls have been cited by proponents of this measure in an attempt to prove that a majority of the American people favor this radical departure from traditional American policy. Questioning the accuracy of these polls, I conducted one of my own in April of this year among the citizens of the Fourth Indiana District. A detailed report of this poll appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, May 11, 1948.

More than 60,000 ballots were sent out containing the following question: Do you favor compulsory peacetime military training?

In spite of the tremendous Nation-wide propaganda campaign which has been carried on in support of this measure, only 37.8 percent replied in the affirmative. Expressing opposition were 59.8 percent, while 3.4 percent had no opinion on the question.

I intend to vote against this bill because I believe, along with many other sincere Americans, that peacetime military conscription is a form of slavery which will wreck our free institutions; that it will turn America into a militarist Nation and that, instead of insuring peace, it will surely and inevitably lead to another devastating war.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, we have before us a bill to induct into the Army certain of our young men. We are told that need for this compulsion has been proven by the failure of voluntary enlistments. Other Members have emphasized the fact that the methods and regulations of the Army itself have been to a very great extent responsible for this failure. I shall not go into the details already put before you. But I cannot refrain from protesting the regulations now current governing enlistment and reenlistment. The high I. Q.'s demanded, the consequent difficulty in obtaining reenlistment or enlistment all have a very real bearing on what is considered the failure of voluntary enlistments. I want to point out to you that high I. Q.'s are not necessarily the best material for a hard-fighting two-fisted army. We need intelligence, yes, but we do not want nor can we handle, as we certainly proved in the last war, the high-tensioned nervous systems of some of the high I. Q.'s. That sort of sensitivity makes poor soldiers. The high-strung boys who are between boyhood and manhood, who are to be requisitioned under this bill, and subjected to Regular Army life, not to training as such, may not be the material that we are supposed to need so dramatically. Under this bill you propose to take a group whose feet are not yet secure upon life's road. You take them away from their families. You put them into situations for which they are not prepared, unless they exempt themselves by hasty marriages, emotional instability, psychiatric unbalance, categories of that kind, and by all the things they can find to do to escape compulsory service as they did before. You will put these boys into situations for which they are not ready. You take some of them, only a small number of lads of these ages, filled with the ambitions that are so strong in the early years and what do you give them? Security? Strength? Balance? Surely not! You give them obsolete methods, Mr. Chairman, for if the world goes to war again nothing we now know will hold.

Can you not see that the military service you are setting up under this legislation actually defeats itself? You will recall that the trained armies in Europe and Asia did not get very far until the fresh, inexperienced, green troops from this country appeared on the scene. Yes, they were raw troops, and undisciplined, but they were vigorous and they brought a new force the trained armies did not possess.

True, we lost men who did not know how to protect themselves, boys taken by the so-called selective service on their eighteenth birthdays and shipped over to their death, in spite of the assurance given the country by the Army that such inadequate training would not be possible.

Where is the American tradition in this bill as submitted to us? A small group of boys only—is that democratic, Mr. Chairman? How will they be chosen? What pressures will be used to force some in and keep others out? What is intelligent about refusing additional service to men who want to stay in the Army through reenlistment and then declare the voluntary system a failure?

It has been said on this floor that failure to pass this bill will be a sign to the U. S. S. R. that we will not back up our protests in language they understand. This is not true. What will be a signal to them is that we know what we want and that we will do just that, no more, no less.

No Member of this House is more sincerely interested in keeping America strong than I am, but that strength must rest upon firm foundations. In company with many others here assembled, I do not find justification for action so far removed from our American tradition as is peacetime compulsory military service. I have not been able to find sound reason for this action. Nor do I believe it is an adequate solution for the security of this country and the peace of the world.

I shall support certain amendments that are to be introduced, Mr. Chairman. Without these it will be legislation I cannot in good conscience support.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to all the testimony that was given on this problem to our committee. What we propose to do today is, under ordinary peacetime conditions, contrary to our traditions—it is contrary to our democratic way of life—yet I believe that the wise step for us to take is to pass this bill.

Why do I say that? Why do I feel that way when I have been opposed to militarism or anything military all my life? The reason is simple and plain. I have traveled around the world trying to find out what the condition of things is in various parts of the world. All over the world, following the terrible destruction of four long years which you cannot imagine unless you have seen it, are kegs of powder, dynamite, tinder. I am terribly afraid that we might light one of those spots in Korea, in Austria, perhaps in France or in Trieste, or even in China.

We are not living in an ordinary time. We have not peace in the sense which we used and interpreted that word 10 or more years ago. We are living in a world of fear, of chaos, of uncertainty, and, to a certain extent, of hopelessness. After the great destruction caused by 4 years of war, the world is having a hard time to get on a peace basis. Our efforts at bringing about peace have been obstructed, delayed, and frustrated. Why? Partly the fault is ours because of bad commitments we made and for other reasons. But it is useless to dwell on our failures or mistakes. We are confronted with the problem—how can we forge the peace?

I believe that we can lead the world to peace by retaining or building our military strength. We are the one nation that has that obligation and the capacity to carry out a strong program for peace. Our able colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who as a young soldier, fought with the Twenty-eighth Division, the great Keystone Division, pointed out to you that the land soldier is still a very important cog in our military machine. We do not yet have the long-range airplanes that can go from our continent to a target abroad and return. Our fliers can go to the target, but we cannot get them back. So, in the event that trouble should come—and we all pray that it will not come—we must have the land soldier to hold the bases that we will require to strike back. It is true that our military men say that there is no direct evidence that war is upon us. But, do you not see that if we get weak and one of the great powers of the world interferes politically, economically, or subversively with other countries, the very crisis that we are trying to avoid might be upon us. I believe that if we will retain our strength, if we are prepared for any eventuality, that, that eventuality will not come. That is why I am going to support this bill. It goes contrary to our ideas in peacetimes to do a thing like this, but there is no greater mission that we have to perform than to try to make the peace. We are the ones that can furnish the leadership through our economic, our military, our social, and our political strength. This is one of the steps that I believe will bring this about. If we do not do it we are going to waste 200,000 lives and we are going to disappoint a million wounded men that are lying in the hospitals, who fought for freedom. Security is the very cornerstone of freedom. You cannot have liberty unless you have security. This bill will help bring about world security, in my opinion. The little countries of the world, like Norway, the home of my mother, look to us to furnish the strength that will protect them, and if we protect ourselves then these little nations of the world, these small peoples, and the American citizen on our own continent, will have the freedom that we all cherish. But, we must retain our strength. We must live up to the status of the great world giant in the military field, in the

industrial field, and in the productive field. We are the colossus that can lead the nations out of this chaotic, transitory world into a world of peace, and it is my opinion that this bill will help to solve that situation.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a step in the direction of militarism. It is a realistic step toward peace. It is a temporary step that world conditions require us to take if we wish to bring the peace that our fighting men fought and died for. The law is limited in its duration. It is one of those contradictory things that we must do to really win the peace that the war was fought for. It is a positive step as distinguished from "drifting" that has gotten many nations into war. The one symbol that any antagonist will look at with respect is strength—military, productive, and social strength. This is evidence that we not only intend to remain strong but that we are determined that we will have security and freedom even at the risk of fighting for it. Our 70-group air force; our mighty Navy and a strong Army, well drilled and disciplined will bring the respect that will result in agreements and compromises that will produce the peace. That briefly is my reason for supporting this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, the American merchant marine has not been a success in the general understanding of that term for many decades. To be candid, it has been a very lame duck—unable to take care of itself financially except in war or national emergency—unable to strongly attract passengers at times because of a reputation for inefficient or impolite service—unable even to propagate itself without outside aid. Yet the United States must have an adequate merchant marine, both to protect its industrial position in time of peace and to bolster its national defense in time of war. To get this merchant marine, we have spent countless millions of the taxpayers money during recent wars. In World War II alone we spent more than $15,000,000,000 for ship construction. Now this great fleet of ships is being rapidly disintegrated by the influx of new foreign ships into the overseas commerce. New foreign ships are coming out almost daily. New American ships are not coming out. We are too short of steel to be able to build ships at any price reasonable even according to American standards. Yet there is a ray of sunshine for the merchant marine in the attitude of the Eightieth Congress which one of our great national publications declares "has restored faith in Government by discussion at a time when that has seemed by many to be a losing proposition," and further that "the Congress, like the people who elected it, has acted in the last 2 years with great good sense."

This speech, Mr. Chairman, is an appeal for fair and just treatment of the American seaman on the part of this Eightieth Congress which, with sound wisdom, stopped sales and charters of American ships to foreign nations and directed that at least 50 percent of American goods bought in this country with ERP funds for shipment abroad be shipped in American bottoms; which only a few days ago granted funds to the Maritime Commission to commence the construction of urgently needed vessels; and which only yesterday passed two bills amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to encourage ship construction in the United States and ship operation under the American flag. It is an appeal for that same sort of justice which the House demonstrated so forcefully a few days ago when it accepted an amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] to the displaced persons bill so as to admit some 2,000 deserving Czech patriots who had fought for liberty.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons why we do not have a better merchant marine, a more reliable merchant marine, a more efficient merchant marine, is that we have treated the men who go to sea in merchant vessels with utter contempt; we have refused to give them even the most basic recognition of their accomplishments in time of war; we have turned them out to be beggars on the streets or recipients of public charity even when sick or disabled—because their disabilities could not be connected directly to a war-risk casualty. I know of no class of workingmen in the entire Nation who have been treated more shabbily by a supposedly grateful Nation than have the merchant seamen who were absolutely indispensable to victory in World War II.

I believe that most of this ingratitude and indecent treatment has been due to a misunderstanding of facts. I wish I had time to spread these facts before you. Unfortunately, I do not, so shall confine myself to only one or two outstanding examples.

The very first thing one hears when he discusses wartime merchant seamen is the big wages they got in comparison to the armed services. We hear that they made fortunes through high pay, bonuses, overtime, and so forth. At one time I almost believed this myth. Fortunately, however, I learned the truth during extensive hearings the Subcommittee on Ship Operation, Construction, and Maritime Labor had last session. Now, Mr. Chairman, this testimony regarding earnings is conclusive insofar as anything human can be. It represents the facts as given by ship operators, by the Maritime Commission, and by the men themselves. If you will examine the tables which I am inserting here—tables furnished by the United States Maritime Commission—you will find that, all things considered, the earnings of naval personnel and of merchant seamen of comparable positions were approximately equal.

Annual earnings of seamen in selected occupations whose employment in the maritime industry ranged from 8 to 11 months, Oct. 1, 1943, through Sept. 30, 1944

Occupation	Number of men		Average days worked [1]	Average net income [2]	Average gross income [1]	Voyage earnings					
	In 8–11 months' range	Percentage of total in occupational subgroup				Average earnings [3]	Average basic wages		Average overtime		Average war-risk bonus	
							Amount	Percent of earnings	Amount	Percent of earnings	Amount	Percent of earnings
Able-bodied seaman:												
A	88	54.7	296	$2,185	$2,596	$2,555	$984	36.6	$378	14.8	$1,230	48.1
B	57	63.3	288	2,236	2,624	2,574	973	37.8	400	15.5	1,187	46.1
C	29	73.7	285	2,115	2,530	2,492	891	35.8	396	15.9	1,199	48.1
Ordinary seaman:												
A	11	29.7	290	2,131	2,553	2,528	816	32.3	328	13.0	1,366	54.0
B	49	64.5	284	2,014	2,386	2,356	816	34.6	353	15.0	1,178	50.0
Oiler:												
A	69	61.1	287	2,263	2,648	2,606	1,021	39.2	283	10.9	1,291	49.5
B	22	75.9	278	2,300	2,755	2,702	1,087	40.2	327	12.1	1,286	47.6
C	10	45.5	280	2,155	2,568	2,549	950	37.3	328	12.9	1,265	49.6
Messman:												
A	56	44.8	281	1,991	2,335	2,292	799	34.9	289	12.6	1,196	52.1
B	9	42.9	300	2,200	2,491	2,431	916	37.7	314	12.9	1,199	49.3

A Worked in rating during entire part of year employed.
B Worked in rating during major part of year employed, and on higher paid job(s) rest of work year.
C Worked in rating during major part of year employed, and on lower paid job(s) rest of work year.

[1] Includes port work as well as voyage.
[2] Average net income is average gross income minus income-tax deductions and social-security tax withheld at source. Cost of room and subsistence not included.
[3] Includes explosives and penalty cargo bonuses and other minor earnings.

Monthly pay and average allotment of complement of Navy-operated Liberty cargo vessel

Branch and rating [1]	Duties	Number in rating [2]	Base pay [3]	Base pay plus sea-duty pay [4]	Average allotment [5]	Total	
						Each man	Each rating
OFFICERS							
Commander	Commanding	1	$292	$321	----------	$321	$321
Lieutenant commander	Executive officer	1	250	275	----------	275	275
Lieutenant	First lieutenant	1	200	220	----------	220	220
Do	Navigator	1	200	220	----------	220	220
Do	Engineer officer	1	200	220	----------	220	220
Lieutenant (jg)	Gunnery officer	1	167	183	----------	183	183
Do	Communications officer	1	167	183	----------	183	183
Do	Watch and division officer	1	167	183	----------	183	183
Lieutenant	Medical officer	1	200	220	----------	220	220
Do	Supply officer	1	200	220	----------	220	220
Boatswain	Assistant to first lieutenant	1	150	180	$51	231	231
Machinist	Assistant to engineer officer	1	150	180	51	231	231
Pay clerk	Assistant for disbursing	1	150	180	51	231	231
ENLISTED PERSONNEL							
SEAMAN BRANCH							
Chief boatswain's mate		1	138	166	51	217	217
Boatswain's mate, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Boatswain's mate, second class		2	96	115	51	166	332
Coxswain		7	78	94	51	145	1,015
Gunner's mate, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Gunner's mate, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Gunner's mate, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Quartermaster, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Quartermaster, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Signalman, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Signalman, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Seaman, first class		20	66	79	51	130	2,600
Seaman, second class		32	54	65	51	116	3,712
ARTIFICER BRANCH							
Radioman, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Radioman, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Radioman, third class		2	78	94	51	145	290
Radio technician, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Radarman, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Radarman, third class		2	78	94	51	145	290
Carpenter's mate, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Ship fitter, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Ship fitter, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
ENGINE ROOM							
Chief machinist's mate		3	138	166	51	217	651
Machinist's mate, first class		3	114	137	51	188	564
Machinist's mate, second class		3	96	115	51	166	498
Machinist's mate, third class		4	78	94	51	145	580
Motor machinist's mate, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Motor machinist's mate, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Electrician's mate, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Electrician's mate, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Electrician's mate, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Chief water tender		1	138	166	51	217	217
Water tender, first class		2	114	137	51	188	376
Water tender, second class		2	96	115	51	166	332
Water tender, third class		2	78	94	51	145	290
Fireman, first class		7	78	94	51	145	1,015
Fireman, second class		8	66	79	51	130	1,040
SPECIAL BRANCH							
Yeoman, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Yeoman, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Yeoman, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Chief storekeeper		1	138	166	51	217	217
Storekeeper, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Storekeeper, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Storekeeper, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Chief pharmacist's mate		1	138	166	51	217	217
Pharmacist's mate, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
COMMISSARY							
Chief commissary steward		1	138	166	51	217	217
Ship's cook, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Ship's cook, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Ship's cook, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Baker, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
STEWARD'S BRANCH							
Steward, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Steward, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Cook, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Cook, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Steward's mate, first class		2	78	94	51	145	290
Steward's mate, second class		3	66	79	51	130	390
Total		167	----------	----------	----------	----------	25,516
Weighted average each man		----------	----------	105	----------	----------	----------

[1] Complement of AK type vessels, as revised Feb. 28, 1944.
[2] Number in certain ratings may vary slightly, although total number in complement remains the same.
[3] Under 3 years' service.
[4] Sea-duty pay is 10 percent of base pay for officers; 20 percent for enlisted men.
[5] Average payment received by dependents of Navy enlisted personnel from Federal funds, as of Nov. 20, 1944; servicemen's contribution not included.

Source: Navy Department, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

Average monthly earnings of crew of commercially operated Liberty cargo vessel, Southwest Pacific area

[Rounded to nearest dollars]

Department and rating	Number in rating	Wages	Bonus [1]				Overtime [1]	Total	
			Total	Voyage	Area	Attack		Each man	Each rating
DECK DEPARTMENT									
Master	1	$398	$406	$357	$43	$6		$804	$804
First officer	1	231	252	203	43	6	$113	596	596
Second officer	1	202	224	175	43	6	95	521	521
Third officer	1	184	209	160	43	6	83	476	476
First radio operator	1	175	201	152	43	6	14	390	390
Second radio operator	1	165	193	144	43	6	10	368	368
Purser-pharmacist mate	1	152	181	132	43	6		333	333
Boatswain	1	113	147	98	43	6	59	319	319
Carpenter	1	113	147	98	43	6	53	313	313
Able seaman	6	100	137	88	43	6	51	288	1,728
Ordinary seaman	3	82	137	88	43	6	52	271	813
Cadet	1	82	137	88	43	6		219	219
ENGINE DEPARTMENT									
Chief engineer	1	363	363	314	43	6		726	726
First assistant engineer	1	231	252	203	43	6	85	568	568
Second assistant engineer	1	202	224	175	43	6	80	506	506
Third assistant engineer	1	184	209	160	43	6	75	468	468
Deck engineer	1	120	151	102	45	6	25	296	296
Oiler	3	110	145	96	43	6	46	301	903
Fireman-watertender	3	110	145	96	43	6	44	299	897
Wiper	2	88	137	88	43	6	12	237	474
Cadet	1	82	137	88	43	6		219	219
STEWARD'S DEPARTMENT									
Chief steward	1	155	184	135	43	6	63	402	402
Chief cook	1	138	167	118	43	6	42	347	347
Second cook and baker	1	122	156	107	43	6	42	320	320
Night cook (third cook)	1	138	167	118	43	6	20	325	325
Messman	4	88	137	88	43	6	33	298	1,192
Utilityman	2	88	137	88	43	6	30	255	510
Total	43								14,873
Weighted average, each man		134							

Navy gun crews [2]	Number carried	Monthly pay [3]	Average allotment [4]	Total	
				Each man	Each rating
Lieutenant, junior grade	1	$183		$183	$183
Chief petty officer	1	166	$51	217	217
Petty officer, first class	2	137	51	188	376
Petty officer, second class	2	115	51	166	332
Petty officer, third class	2	94	51	145	290
Seaman, first class	19	79	51	130	2,470
Total	27				3,868

[1] When rated as third cook total earnings average $326 divided as follows: Wages, $113; voyage bonus, $98; area bonus, $43; attack bonus, $6; overtime, $66.
[2] Gun crew data are from the Navy Department.
[3] Includes sea duty pay (10 percent additional for officers; 20 percent for enlisted men).
[4] Average payment received by dependents of Navy enlisted personnel from Federal funds, as of Nov. 30, 1944; serviceman's contribution not included.

Source: Based upon data from 26 round voyages of commercially operated Liberty ships from United States ports beginning after Mar. 1, 1943, ending before July 28, 1944, except as noted. (See note 2 above.)

Let us take comparisons between the Navy and the merchant marine. Exact comparisons are not possible as there are no exactly equivalent ratings.

Navy: Chief petty officers, $217 per month, petty officer, first class $188 per month.

Merchant marine: Able-bodied seaman, $182 per month.

Navy: Petty officer, third class, $145 per month. Seaman, first class, $130 per month.

Merchant marine: Ordinary seaman, $177 per month.

NOTE.—The wages of naval personnel include family allowances. The wages of merchant-marine personnel are after income taxes. Naval personnel in these brackets paid no income taxes during the war. Retirement benefits for naval personnel have not been taken into account in these wages.

It is to be noted that the earnings of merchant-marine personnel given above include bonuses and overtime, this latter being a very minor item during the war in comparison with present practices.

Now just as a matter of interest let us see what the comparative personnel costs of operating a Liberty ship under the Navy and under the merchant marine were during the war.

Navy: For AK with complement as of February 28, 1944, $25,516 per month.

Merchant Marine: Same vessel, merchant complement, $14,873. Navy gun crew, armed guard, $3,868. Total for ship plus armed guard, $18,741 per month.

A difference in favor of the merchant marine of $6,775 per month.

I appreciate fully that a ship under naval jurisdiction usually did a different job from that of the merchant marine and I have no criticism of the higher costs for personnel. My sole intent in the comparison is to show that the Government got its money's worth from merchant marine crews.

It appears to me that this data should thoroughly dispel the illusion of extraordinarily high pay for the merchant seaman during the war.

Another field in which the merchant marine is supposed to have had an advantage is in free life insurance. This also is largely a myth. What they did have was a war-risk insurance good only for casualties due strictly to war as distinguished from usual occupational hazards. This insurance did not cover a man who died of heart trouble or who was killed by a falling boom. Even in the event of death through combat casualty, it furnished no continuing protection to the dependents of the deceased. In fact, the war-risk insurance is just about the same as the Government furnished free to every member of the armed forces for 3 months after entry into the service, and continuously for every holder of a Government service life-insurance policy. Only a few seem to understand that Government policies make no charge for war risks but, rather, have their premiums based upon the actuarial tables of peacetime deaths and disabilities. Merchant seamen would have paid for Government insurance policies with joy if such had been made available to them. As it is, the soldier or sailor had all the best of the insurance situation any way one wants to look at it.

And now, Mr. Chairman, we find that the men who went to sea during the war in merchant ships are entirely forgotten in this selective-service bill. They are treated as though they had not existed—had performed no war service for the Nation. It is an amazing picture to me—a direct reversal of the policy in effect toward the close of the war when these men were exempted from induction if they held certificates from the Maritime Commission of substantially continuous service for as much as 12 months. Apparently, we hold here that we should cast aside all feelings of gratitude; that we should waste all of our financial investment in the training of these men; that we should say to them, in effect: "You are in the same catagory as if you had remained ashore in safe, remunerative, civilian occupations." We say this, Mr. Chairman, to a body of men whose loss of life was at a higher percentage than that of the armed services for the first year or more of hostilities, and which ended the war with a percentage loss of life equal to that of the armed services. We say this, Mr. Chairman, to men who sailed through the ice cold seas off northern Europe in the long winter nights when the expected loss of ships was just 50 percent of those which cleared for Russian Arctic ports. It seems fantastic that we should regard these men in such a cold-blooded way just because they do not wear the uniform of one of the armed services.

How can we expect to build up a satisfactory body of merchant seamen while we regard them as outcasts, and as undeserving of even the simplest recognition by a people for whom they died to the extent of more than 7,500, for whom they starved on rafts, were cremated in the burning oil of torpedoed tankers, or were blown to bits by falling bombs. Some say the veterans object to recognition of the wartime merchant seaman in any way whatsoever. I do not believe this. Brave men do not object to decent recognition of other brave men. The American fighting man is not built on a narrow, biased pattern. He can share a little of his glory and shine yet more brilliantly from the added appreciation which will then become his lot.

Please take recognition of these comments from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission:

> Unlike those employed in shore-side war industries, they signed employment contracts which obligated them to serve for 12 months, if the voyage, as many do, should need to be that long; they were subjected to military court martial; their employment was not continuous and they were not compensated between voyages; they could not live at home nor could they take their leisure daily at liberty; and shore leave in foreign ports was rigidly curtailed. Like the military, however, they served in active theaters of war; and, as part of active task forces, they carried troops, ammunition, and supplies to such theaters of war as the Pacific islands, Anzio and Normandy beachheads—

And so forth. Mr. Chairman, there are relatively only a few of these men who would fall into the age limits of this selective-service act for peacetime service. No one wishes to exempt them from service in time of national emergency or of war. We do want to preserve their skills and their readiness for those very emergencies.

Mr. Chairman, to me, looking back over two wars; looking back over the years of training it takes to make a good seaman; looking back particularly at the fine new ships I have seen largely useless due to lack of adequate trained personnel to operate them; this drafting of the merchant seaman for Army services does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, to me, considering the outstanding achievements of the merchant marine during the long years of World War II—the fact that we could not have conducted our overseas campaigns without merchant ships in the thick of combat activities—this complete lack of recognition of the heroism and steadfastness of the men of the wartime merchant marine does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, to me, the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars each year to build up and maintain a merchant marine under the American flag, while at the same time we completely destroy every vestige of pride in service on American merchant ships—every vestige of desire to serve again in such vessels in the event of war—simply does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, an amendment will be introduced at the proper time to give some sign of recognition to the wartime seaman. I hope this House will give it most careful consideration.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON].

CONSCRIPTION

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, the district I represent—Twenty-fourth Congressional District, Bronx—is in many respects a cross section of America. It is populated by many peoples—most of whom came to the New World to escape the tyranny of the Old World. To escape the very system of Prussian peacetime conscription which we are considering here. They could tell you that conscription fails to prevent war. They could tell you that conscription corrupts our freedom and liberty.

I rise to speak out against the peacetime draft of our young men between the ages of 19 and 26.

I rise to speak out against this bipartisan design to commandeer these young men, in time of peace, away from their homes, their jobs, their schools, their careers—for precious years which can never be returned to them.

I rise to speak out against this plot to conscript the sons and kid brothers of America, the teen-agers of today and tomorrow; the lad courting his first sweetheart—starting out to college—or bringing home his first pay check; to teach and indoctrinate these youths of 19 years in the fine art of killing other boys 19 years of age.

I rise to speak against this bill which seeks to conscript the youth of America, while my bill, H. R. 6780, which would conscript industry by nationalizing the manufacturers of munitions, is bypassed. Why not draft the profits of the wealthy before we draft the lives of our youth?

I charge that President Truman and his coterie of military schemers and profit-hungry monopolists have deliberately and openly created a spurious war hysteria and have scorned all efforts to bring about a century of peace.

I charge that the Republican leaders in both Houses of Congress have joined with the Truman administration, its Wall Street brass, and the business-controlled press and radio of the Nation to wage a psychological war of fear against the American people in order to whip them into line behind this unconscionable grab for profit and world power.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT PEACE—NOT WAR

The people of America do not want another war.

The people of America want peace.

They want a permanent peace, a dignified peace, a peace with honor achieved through world cooperation in the United Nations.

The people of America want a strong and prosperous country.

They want homes; and health and the promise that educational advantages will be available to every boy or girl, in the calling he or she may choose; with no exclusions, no discrimination, no deprivation because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

They want new, modern schools; and broad, free public parks and playgrounds. They want improved social security for all; old age pensions; full employment so that men may no longer be driven to strife against one another for the right to earn a living.

They want a future of promise; a future guaranteed and safeguarded against the ominous, terrible threats of the kind of war which might befall if the heads of nations are men unfit to lead; if the moneyed interests and the military cliques win the control of our Nation as they have sought to do with unparalleled vehemence in the last 3 years following the victorious end of the war against fascism, nazism, and Japanese militarism.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL PREPARE FOR WAR IF THEY ARE THREATENED

Yet, beyond all these things which our people want and hope for, they are deeply and sincerely stirred by a love of country first. They stand ready and willing to offer great self-sacrifice and, yes, sacrifice of the very lives and futures of their children, if the security of our great land of promise be in true peril.

For love of country, for preservation of the sacred heritage of America, all Americans whether of ancient American lineage or newly come to our shores, would sacrifice all these things and more.

This is the deep-rooted faith of the people of America in the hope and promise of democracy as inscribed in our Declaration of Independence, in our Constitution, in our Bill of Rights, and the other epoch-making resolutions which compose the greatest fabric of freedom ever designed in the history of the world.

OUR COUNTRY IS NOT THREATENED

But our country is not in danger.

Its security is not threatened.

Therefore it is most scurrilous, Mr. Chairman, it is an unthinkable breach of trust to the great, self-sacrificing people of our country that our Nation's power-mad, profit-hungry leaders dare to exploit this great spirit of America in order to assure profits for the overpowering corporations of the free-enterprise system. Step by step they are taking us down the road to war.

The administration wants us to believe that a world crisis has arisen which threatens our security. But it has presented no facts to substantiate this. I charge that an artificial crisis was deliberately manufactured to stampede

Congress and the people into accepting universal military training and conscription which they have always strongly opposed.

It was General Ludendorff, Hitler's military mentor, who first advanced the totalitarian theory that the imminent danger of war must be drilled into people's minds in order to prepare a nation for an aggressive, militaristic course.

The danger of attack and the need to prepare to fight for existence must be stressed. Then the Nation will go obediently through the steps and sacrifices and human costs of building a war machine. Then on command, the people will go willingly to war—an aggressive war and not a war of defense.

This was the Ludendorff theory; this was the trick Adolf Hitler played on the German people.

This is the trick now being played on the American people.

THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE WANT PEACE—NOT WAR

Are we threatened by the Soviet Union? That nation lost 10,000,000 lives in the war. The most productive sectors of its economy were destroyed. After 2½ years of reconstruction its production has just regained the prewar level. It will take the Soviet Union many years to attain an industrial output equal to one-half our current production. Meanwhile, if we do not squander our resources in preparations for war, the United States can increase its output by 50 percent in the next decade, raise itself to an undreamed-of prosperity, and help promote the prosperity of the rest of the world.

The Soviet Union has just adopted its sixth demobilization measure since the end of the war and has been steadily reducing the percentage of its national budget for munitions expenditures.

Does anyone seriously believe that the Soviet Union wants another war? The most ardent advocates of the get-tough-with-and-hate Russia policy admit that the Soviet Union does not want war. They even concede that the Soviet Union fears war. The fact is that the Soviet Union cannot attack the United States. As the hard-headed Wall Street Journal cynically said, if the Russians wanted to attack us, they would have to swim to get here.

There is no military threat to our national security. The administration has merely concocted a nonexistent threat to force through unpopular legislation and to guarantee great corporation profits.

To insure corporation profits, to halt the march of real democratic progress in our Nation and in other countries of the world, the administration has conjured up a great, dynamic lie—as evil in its own way as Hitler's great lie which took the lives of millions of people including 6,000,000 in Europe solely because they were Jews.

Behind the propaganda front of this great lie—behind the campaign of fear against the mind of America—these men conspire to conscript the youth of America—to take America's sons and plunge them into regimentation of mind and body of the very sort over which we have fought the totalitarian world. They would indeed perpetuate Jim Crow and racial discrimination by refusing to eradicate this un-American principle from our military branches and from the production of military material.

They seek to destroy civil liberties and to train the mind of young America the way Hitler trained the Hitler youth—to the necessity of a holy war to protect profit and greed.

Mr. Chairman, the leaders of our Nation have deceived the American people and withheld vital information from them in order to traduce the Nation into accepting the totalitarian regimentation demanded by American monopoly capital.

Here are the facts, unchallenged and undisputed although our Administration has sought desperately to draw a curtain of iron and steel and cotton and tobacco and oil over this vital information upon which our people must base their decisions between war and peace.

WE HAVE NOT REALLY SOUGHT PEACE

On March 17, 1948, the President of the United States stood before the joined bodies of the Congress and, with apparent concern and desperation, called upon the legislative branches of the Government to take immediate steps to mobilize and militarize America. He declared that peace was threatened and that our power to maintain peace was nearing an end.

Yet the fact now stands indisputably revealed that last January, a full 2 months before the President made his appearance before Congress his own administration had flatly turned down an overture from the Soviet Union for peace.

The facts now stand revealed that on a certain evening in January of this year, an emissary of the Soviet Government in Berlin called upon Mr. Robert Murphy, the adviser and consultant assigned by our Department of State to Gen. Lucius Clay, who heads our military government in Germany.

This emissary came to the house of Mr. Murphy at 8 o'clock on that January evening.

The two men talked until 2 o'clock the next morning. They discussed in detail the problems and differences existing between the Soviet Union and the United States which had led the existence of the cold war and the threat of open conflict.

This was last January—let us not forget—two full months before President Truman wrung his hands before Congress and pleaded for the mobilization of America for war.

What was the result of that Berlin discussion last January, by an accredited representative of the Soviet Union and participated in by our top policy-maker in the area of immediate conflict between Soviet and American interests?

Did our Nation pause in its waging of the cold war?

Did we ask for more details?

Did we send General Marshall to meet Mr. Molotov to air further these problems and differences?

We did not.

Rather, our White House and State Department not only refused to discuss the matter, but even went so far as to deny that the original exchange of views had ever taken place.

Clearly, even last January, our administration was determined to conjure up a Frankenstein monster of war.

No peace overture could be permitted to upset the creation of the specter of war.

For unless that Frankenstein, that specter, were created, the American people could not be regimented into docile battalions for the profit of the monopolists.

Then, significantly, two whole months later, President Truman appeared before Congress to ask for a peacetime draft to build our Army to wartime strength.

This act—undertaken 2 months after the Soviet Union had sought to initiate conferences to iron out our differences—was a clear and indisputable indication that certain forces in our Nation were determined on a war program, even though the peoples of the world wanted peace.

Can we, as an intelligent, democratic, progressive Nation, condone acts like these?

Are we to be so taken in by those who make huge and unconscionable profits out of war and war programs that we can close our eyes and ears to facts such as these?

The answer should be obvious, but there is still another chapter to this story of greed, deception, and bipartisan flouting of our people's will for peace.

On May 9, our Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, held a conversation with Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov and later submitted to him a confirming note. Our Ambassador said that the United States considered the door always open to negotiations for peaceful relations between the Soviet Union and ourselves.

Perhaps General Smith thought that this conversation, like the one in Berlin 4 months earlier, could be blotted out by our expensive tapestry of iron and steel and cotton and tobacco and oil.

At any rate, he went fishing.

But this time the Russians decided to tell the story to the world.

Perhaps, it is true that as our President and State Department cried later, the Russians sought to put them on a spot.

Whether or not that was the Soviet's intention, our leaders were put on a spot. But the spot was the spot of peace. Did they want peace or not, yes or no?

The whole world waited breathlessly for the answer.

Again our President and our Secretary of State made it indubitably clear that even on this point they were determined to disagree with the Soviet Union.

In plain, simple diplomatic mumbo-jumbo they said General Smith's conversation was misinterpreted, its meaning distorted.

Did they mean that General Smith did not mean to propose peace?

Do our leaders mean that the American Nation wants war?

CONSCRIPTION BRINGS WAR

We, the people of America, want peace. We have never wanted anything else. Peace is a basic ethic of America. We are a peace-loving people. We do not raise our sons to die in wars—we raise

them to be useful citizens in a democracy at peace.

Our leaders, in their desperation to sell their war-profits regimentation to the American people, tell us that the way to peace is through military strength, a swollen armaments program, and conscription of America's young manhood to train for war.

What nonsense this is.

If you train men for war, will you have peace?

If you teach our youth to fight and kill, how can we ever, ever expect our future generations to want peace?

Mr. Chairman, all the great institutions of our democracy cry out against militarization, against the peacetime conscription of American youth. The churches, the colleges, the trade unions, our social agencies, the fathers and mothers of America and even youth itself—all these oppose conscription and war.

Only business and the military and the press and politicians representing them are behind this back-to-war movement.

Let us call a halt now, in this final crucial moment in the drive to war, before greed and political blindness steer us all into the total destruction of atomic war.

Let us turn our course toward peace—peace and understanding and a sincere helping hand to the oppressed and suffering peoples of the rest of the world.

Let us turn the mind of America away from war and toward achieving full democracy in our own land for all our people.

And above all, let us cherish and preserve our youth for this great American mission.

CONSCRIPTION BRINGS FASCISM

Let us not conscript a whole American generation to sacrifice themselves on the battlefields of greed and hate.

For conscription of our youth means conscription of their minds as well as their bodies.

Sir Norman Angell has said:

> Conscription to be effective must be a conscription of minds as well as bodies • • • the state must take charge not only of the expression of opinion, but of the dissemination of facts which lead to the formation of opinion.

Major Hinman of the Morale Division told a writer:

> It is not our job to teach the men in the Army what is right. It is simply our job to teach them to fight for what is right—as laid down by the Government.

Let us consider the impact of thinking like this, in the teaching of all our young people. In the current war psychosis, what is "right" as laid down by the Government? Current-events teachers may be permitted to say that our Government's betrayal on Palestine was unfortunate, but they will be compelled to add that it is right because it adds to the profits of the oil monopolists. They will have to teach that it is right to feed the power of Fascist Franco, Salazar, Peron, Chiang, the Grand Mufti, and the puppets of Greece and Turkey.

Civic teachers will be compelled to teach that only Reds are in favor of racial equality, for segregation is as fixed a part of UMT as it is in a Memphis railroad station. It will be their job to explain how right it is for the President of the United States to trail along behind the denunciations by the British Foreign Minister of disloyal New York Jews.

It is this aggressive military doctrine which constitutes the real threat to American security.

Yes; we must keep our Nation strong.

America is strong.

But we must keep America free.

A compulsory peacetime draft will reduce us to slavery.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the debate thus far on the floor reminds one of the tragic days before Munich. It takes one back in memory to the sad trail taken by Neville Chamberlain, umbrella under his arm, and hope in his heart, as he walked unhesitatingly down the path of appeasement, that unhappy path followed by so many who were blind to the fact that when you are dealing with brute, fanatical force, sometimes controlled and directed force is the only weapon at your command. Reason would be far more desirable, but reasoning with a blueprint for world conquest is less than futile.

So long as we are in the business of subsidizing almost every group, bloc, and faction in this great land of ours, people who raise everything from potatoes to peanuts, it might be well for us to subsidize some of the firms who make umbrellas, because certainly we are going to be in need of them if this trend continues.

After the rain of death that fell upon Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, it is indeed astounding that so many minds remain so relatively dry. In my district I have several hospitals full of the maimed, broken, and crippled who paid, in that attack and in the attacks that came later, for the criminal negligence that preceded that fateful day. These men are watching this House today and watching the action that we take toward preserving those things for which they fought.

It must have been a debate of this kind that caused Patrick Henry to rise angrily from his seat in the Virginia Assembly and give impassioned voice to those immortal words known today to every American schoolboy. You will remember them, too:

> Gentlemen may cry "Peace, peace," but there is no peace. The war has actually begun. The next gale that sweeps from the north may bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms. Our brothers are already in the field. Why stand we here idle?

Our brethren are in the field, Mr. Chairman, in France and in Italy, in the low countries, in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, Greece, and Turkey. Men and women who believe in liberty, willing to fight for it, are taking up their stand against the specter of militaristic communism, that ever-enveloping shadow that creeps across the face of the earth and threatens the things that free men hold sacred. They are determined that their lands will not be added to the tragic roll call of nations who fell victims to aggression. Others have found out too late the high price of attempting to shield liberty with a veil of hope and a wishful dream.

This body would do well to heed the words of warning and of sound judgment spoken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] who paid a high price in his distinguished service. Brute force prowls undisguised across the world today. Apologists and fellow travelers here at home cannot make it look like anything but terror on the march. I suggest, if you have not read the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, that you read it. It is 100 years old this year. If you want to know what fate holds in store for you in a Communist world read it and read it well, for it affects not only you, but millions and millions of other American citizens whom the drafters of the manifesto and their beneficiaries call the bourgeois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to ask the gentleman when Czechoslovakia went Communist, if the brute force of the Russian Army marched into Czechoslovakia to take it over?

Mr. JACKSON of California. There I take issue with the gentleman. Czechoslovakia did not go Communist. Czechoslovakia had communism forced upon it by a minority. That is the very real danger that faces every nation which tries to stand in constitutional dignity and human decency. We are dealing with force, and if we are wise we will show any aggressor that we can and will use force to defend ourselves if necessary.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thought the gentleman was dealing with ideologies.

Mr. JACKSON of California. That is where the gentleman and myself have a serious difference of opinion.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the fifth column of Russia, that operated in Czechoslovakia, was backed up by an army?

Mr. JACKSON of California. The threat of the Red Army was an ever-present factor in the Czechoslovak coup.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear at the outset of my remarks that I deeply regret to have to differ with my distinguished chairman and other distinguished members of the Armed Services Committee with respect to the merits of this bill.

Let me also make it clear that I do not intend anything expressed in my remarks to be construed as indicating animosity or ill-will toward high-ranking members of the armed forces or toward those who have sponsored the viewpoints of the armed services before our committee.

I have admiration and highest regard for most of the men who are leaders of our armed forces because on the whole in war and in peace they have demonstrated not only great ability but great personal valor and loyalty to our country. My differences of opinion with them concerning this issue are honest, deep-rooted, and fundamental. I do not believe that the military should control the American Nation or the American economy. I believe that under our Constitution the military was definitely intended to be subordinate to the civilian authority and I stand here supporting the continuance of that time-honored tradition of our democratic Nation.

This present draft measure is the most far-reaching and the most revolutionary peacetime proposal ever advanced to place shackles upon American freedom. Unless the Nation is facing a genuine emergency, unless the national security is at stake or in jeopardy, there can be no logical rational justification for the imposition upon American youth and the American economy of the burdens contemplated by this bill. I cannot concede that such an emergency exists.

This bill demonstrates that the country is confronted as never before with the evil of supermilitarism. The only barrier to a completely militarized and regimented American society is this Congress.

Warmongering, war scares, and war hysteria have been feverishly generated and flagrantly promoted by those high in official civil and military authority.

Misleading reports have been spread throughout the country that foreign submarines have been seen off our coasts, though it is a common and perfectly legal practice in time of peace—one which we follow ourselves—for naval craft of foreign nations to ply the high seas.

Reports are circulated that Russian planes have been observed in Alaskan waters, though it is a known fact that in these waters Russian territory is only 47 miles away from the Alaskan coast and one of our own islands in that area is only 3 miles away from a Russian-owned island.

The Army has recently released to the press, from the Surgeon General's Department no less, a news article which was widely disseminated containing full instructions to the American people on how to conduct themselves in the event of an atomic-bomb attack on American cities, though it is known to the Army and every other informed source that no nation, apart from our own, is presently able to make atomic bombs for military use.

Another war-scare report declares that the United States Army in occupied Germany has been put on guard against "flying dises."

In countless other ways of late since this bill has been pending a campaign to develop a war spirit in this country has been carried on and a war fear has thus been artificially produced and spread in the Nation which has unwarrantedly but gravely upset our people, and has had disturbing repercussions on the public sentiment of other friendly and peace-loving nations.

All these propaganda devices have been utilized lately in the intensive drive for full compulsory military regimentation of the Nation.

This bill will ruin and wreck the United States which we have traditionally known. It will enslave our youth, undermine our educational, religious, social, and industrial standards, regiment our economic system and business, reinstate wartime controls over industry and commodities, and completely militarize the Nation. This permanent militarization—for that is what it will be—means excessive tax burdens—about twenty-two billions for military purposes for fiscal year 1949 and steadily growing thereafter to even higher figures—and threatens the country with stagnation and bankruptcy.

There is absolutely no necessity in peacetime to militarize our cherished American institutions of freedom of the individual and freedom of initiative in order to secure the Nation against danger from foreign attack or to prepare it to meet other types of aggression or dangerous infiltration. I favor and support a strong and impregnable national defense, a modernized, streamlined, fast-thinking, and fast-moving Army, the mightiest fleet in the world to protect our bases, our commerce, and lines of communication—which we already have—and an overwhelming air force comprised of the latest type of aircraft and invention. These powerful forces in peacetime under our American system should and can be manned entirely by volunteers. The evidence conclusively shows that the Navy can get all the men it needs without the draft, that the Air Corps is now turning volunteers away, and it is neither wise or necessary to institute the draft, or any other compulsory system in order to get the relatively limited number of men allegedly required by the Army at a time when there is no national emergency. The voluntary system has not been given a fair chance. The Army high command is prejudiced against it.

Immature boys cannot handle the intricate devices of modern war. Experienced, professional career men, organized voluntarily, well-paid, well-housed, well-treated, and scientifically trained are required for this task. Organized Reserves and the National Guard—an organization which has rendered such conspicuous service to the country in the past—should be encouraged and built up to adequate strength though the Army has done virtually nothing along these lines, in fact by the provisions of this bill, the National Guard will be absorbed into the Federal military bureaucracy of highly paid, high-ranking officers at an early date.

If the Army would put half the effort into getting the men it claims it now needs, which it has put into hysteria-producing, war-scare measures, which it has put into its campaign for UMT and the peacetime draft, it would have no trouble getting an adequate force.

Our armed services must be streamlined and modernized, ancient, outmoded concepts of organization, strategy, tactics, techniques, and personnel relations, modeled after the Prussianized army of continental Europe—the same kind of reactionary outlook which was responsible for drumming the late and great Gen. Billy Mitchell out of the Army because he dared to assert the growing importance of air power—must not be permitted to dominate the thinking of our military leadership. Under our Constitution the military authority is subordinate to the civilian authority and that is the way it should remain. It should not be permitted to dominate, as it is now seeking to do, the policy-making functions of the Congress. This country exists for the people and not for the military. Supermilitarism as provided for in this bill is no answer to the problems of democracy any more than it is an answer to the problems of national defense in this advanced atomic age.

Americans have amply demonstrated that they can outwork, outproduce, and outfight nations and that they do these things best when they are free and unfettered by the techniques of autocratic militaristic government. Only war or the danger of imminent war could justify compulsory military services by our youth. We are not now facing that danger.

In my opinion, Russia has no intention of attacking this country and Red Russian leaders know better than anyone that their nation does not have the strength or the industrial potential to stand up for long against this country in war. Moreover, the problems of dealing with Russia and establishing an enduring peace cannot be solved by warmongering militarism, bluff, threats, bluster, and swashbuckling. Military men cannot alone settle these problems. They are problems that will have to be dealt with by trained, seasoned, experienced diplomats and statesmen and will have to be approached in a spirit of moderation and fairness. Be adequately prepared as we must be, and we intend to be, but also let us work and seek permanent enduring peace with all nations and thus try to avoid the horrible bloodshed, slaughter that will inevitably attend the next great war.

Militaristic fascism is just as much of an outrage to America, just as obnoxious to our people, just as alien to our institutions as is Marxist communism. Both systems are the enemies of democracy. Both are alien to the spirit of freedom. Let us recognize these dangers before the hour is too late or we will lose our birthright of freedom to the organized might and intrigue of totalitarianism, Red or black it matters not. This bill gravely imperils the institutions of America and I hope the American Congress will rise up and fight it and defeat it and thus repudiate militarism just as we are prepared to repudiate communism.

The draft is merely a stopgap arrangement to build up the manpower of the armed forces until universal military training can be adopted. It is just the first step in the program for complete militarization of the Nation by those who believe, among other things that the Army can train our young men; yes, and our young women, better than they can be trained in the homes, the churches, and the schools and colleges of the Nation. It was freely admitted by Army officials testifying before the committee that the draft was a temporary measure to tide the Army over until UMT could be enacted.

The Army has made no real effort to enlist volunteers, or to build up the Organized Reserves or the National Guard. The classification test rating which was fixed at 59 during the war has been raised to 80 thus barring many capable young men able and anxious to serve. If this rating were reduced to 59 large numbers of able-bodied young men would join the Army.

The failure of the Army high command to build up the National Guard is shocking. Congress made generous provision for the development of the National Guard and provided nearly $150,000,000 of which up to a recent date only $30,000,000 had actually been spent. The National Guard has been in the past a most effective instrument for implementing the national defense. This bill will relegate it to be a mere adjunct of the vast military machine contemplated by the draft and UMT.

The Organized Reserves, according to the clear testimony presented to the committee, stands in virtually the same position. No real attempt has been made to build it up to the levels intended by Congress. Under the 1940 Selective Service Act, it was specifically provided that all Army personnel should be discharged into the Reserve, but this provision was disregarded by Army officials, and according to testimony presented to the committee, instead of discharging the very large numbers of personnel taken into the Reserve under that act, the Army availed itself of the plenary war powers of the President in order to give unconditional discharges to millions of trained men who would have made excellent material for Reserve components.

The present bill is being enacted on the theory that it is necessary in order to meet conditions of tension and crisis and emergency that exist throughout the world and gravely threaten the security of the United States. If this bill is adopted it will be very difficult to convince the American people that we are confronting a state of crisis and emergency when the Congress passes this measure and then adjourns. The American people will not be much impressed by the argument that an emergency exists. When the Army starts taking young men under this bill, a vast public protest will arise.

There is no question of preparedness involved in this measure because most every Member of this House is agreed that the Nation should have and must have in these uncertain days an adequate and formidable national defense. Military preparedness must keep pace with scientific advancement. It cannot be based exclusively or even in large part upon massed armies as the recent war has so well demonstrated. The atomic bomb and other equally destructive weapons and agents have revolutionized modern warfare. Our armed services must be implemented along scientific lines, and must be manned in very large measure by experienced and trained technicians. Six months' training or even 1 or 2 years' training is not sufficient properly to indoctrinate and train modern, scientific, armed-forces personnel.

New weapons and agents are developing with bewildering speed and assuming amazing character. Jet-propelled planes, radio-directed aircraft, rockets and guided missiles will have great and most important effect upon the shape, composition, and technique of modern armies. The colleges and technical schools of the Nation as well as certain of our industries will have to train and furnish the high skills required by this new type of warfare. As constituted at present and based upon the draft and UMT as proposed, our armed services cannot do this great job. I repeat—the armed forces must be modernized and streamlined to conform to the requirements and fast-moving developments of scientific warfare.

Our armed forces to be sure, have made some very commendable efforts to adapt themselves to these new needs but much remains to be done in this direction. In my opinion, the armed forces will have to be fundamentally changed before they can be welded into a smooth-functioning, instantaneously-responding, effective fighting force.

Another objection to this bill—and this relates to our whole military set-up—is the present high cost involved in maintaining our national defense establishments, including the draft. It was testified for example that the cost of the military program for fiscal year 1949 would be more than $22,000,000,000, a staggering sum, a crushing burden to place upon the American people in peacetime. Clearly as we proceed with the draft program and with UMT and other programs being projected, this huge cost will rise still higher and we will move into a situation where military establishments will be consuming a disproportionate share of the product of our industry and labor and the substance of our people to the exclusion, or at least the very marked detriment, of other essential activities and functions of our Government such as proper care and provision for our veterans, social security and pensions, salaries of Government employees, payments on the national debt and proper provision for agriculture and labor. But this is not all.

The gigantic military machine provided by this and other bills will have to reach out for the resumption of controls over our economy, for the return of priorities, allocations, rationing, price fixing, and all those other onerous and irritating social and economic controls which were hard enough to stand during wartime, accompanied as they were by gross bureaucratic abuses, but which in peacetime can never be tolerated by the American people except in periods of genuine emergency.

Let us not blind ourselves to these realities because the militarization proposed by this bill and ancillary measures will inevitably entail crushing burdens on the taxpayers, misadjustment and maladjustment of industry and the economy and will definitely move in the direction of that which most Americans have been striving so anxiously and so aggressively to avoid—the regimented totalitarian state.

The lessons of history plainly show, and the demonstrated experience of nations clearly prove, that unbridled militarism in any nation, let alone a democracy, has led to war, absolutism, ravaged economies, and loss of that cherished thing called human freedom.

Because I believe that this measure is not necessary at this time, because I believe in a national defense based on scientifically devised and trained units and not on massed armies, because I believe it is a dangerous departure from traditional American practice of raising armed forces in peacetime, because I believe that it is a forerunnner of additional measures to militarize the United States which leads in the direction of a military dictatorship, because I believe that it unsettles our educational and family relationships, provides for permanent conscription which has been so disastrous in European countries and which has been responsible for so many wars in the past, because I believe it is an indefensible encroachment upon the American free way of life, because it involves staggering financial burdens and controls, I propose to vote against this bill if I have to stand alone. But I will not have to stand alone. There will be many here moved by the same considerations which move me, who will also vote against this bill. In another forum, the greatest forum in the Nation, the forum of the American people working their will through the ballot, this matter will be finally determined. I am convinced that when that time comes an overwhelming verdict will be rendered against this monstrous, coercive, un-American measure which so greatly threatens American family life, American education, the welfare of the American youth, and the shape of our free political, social, and economic institutions.

War is not imminent. Peace is not impossible. International order is not beyond our reach if we but strive for it. In order to set up an adequate national defense there is absolutely no need to militarize the Nation, no need for drafting our young men and taking them away from their parents, homes, and schools and forming them into what may well become a vast military dictatorship that will ultimately overpower freedom in this country.

Let us exercise prudence and level-headedness in meeting present difficulties and moving to solve present problems, great as they are. I hope this un-American bill will be defeated.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, obviously in the brief time allowed each of us, it is utterly impossible for one to discuss fully and satisfactorily a measure such as that before us of such vital importance, and that is fraught with such momentous consequences to all the American people.

Regardless of the opinion which any individual in this Chamber might have of the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ANDREWS), the able chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, I can state, I think, the true feelings of every member of that committee that we all regret very much he is leaving as a Member of this House and the committee. For several years I have sat at his side, and much as we have differed on various occasions, I have learned to respect his ability, to admire his courage, and to appreciate the very valuable and useful service he has rendered in committee.

I am just a little regretful that at the beginning of his remarks today he rather insinuated that those who opposed this particular measure are either ignorant or are unpatriotic. It may be true that every subversive element in this country is opposed to this pending measure, but I can hasten to assure other Members of the House that not every opponent of this measure is a member of any subversive organization. And some of us we like to feel are not too ignorant but know a little about this bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. In view of the fact that my good friend is obliged to take time from his main discussion to refer to this latter matter, I am going to yield him an additional 5 minutes. But may I say that it was the least thought in my mind that anyone who opposed this measure is of the kind the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. SHORT. I am sure the gentleman has properly stated his position. I did not want anyone to gather the inference that he meant otherwise. That is the reason I take this time, and again I want to thank the gentleman for being eminently fair in granting me 5 additional minutes. He has always been kind and considerate with me.

Mr. Chairman, should the United States become engaged in a major war tomorrow, we would find ourselves in a very precarious situation, due chiefly to the lack of strategic and critical materials and minerals to make the weapons with which to wage war. Modern mechanized warfare consumes enormous quantities of raw materials. In winning two World Wars in our generation, we have depleted and exhausted many of our national resources. We pumped many of our oil wells dry; greatly reduced the deposits of copper in Montana and Arizona; depleted much of the lead and zinc in our mines all over America; slashed the best timber from our forests; and devoured much of the iron ore on our Mesabi Range.

I regret very much that on yesterday, after spending over an hour before the Committee on Rules on this particular bill, they saw fit to table the Russell bill by a vote of 5 to 4 which would have continued premium payments on the production of lead, copper, zinc and manganese to build up a sufficient and adequate stock pile so that the present members of our armed forces would have something to shoot. Then immediately after tabling that meritorious measure that would provide the sinews of war, because the minerals produced under it would have gone into our stock pile, they reported out this bill by a vote of 6 to 4.

I want to reiterate what I said on that occasion that to me it is utterly foolish to spend billions upon billions of dollars in appropriations on our armed services, or to build up and increase the numbers of men in the Army, Navy, and the Air Force, unless we first furnish them the weapons of war with which to wage a conflict. You know and I know that in this troubled world, war torn and bleeding, in this time of stress and strain, until the United Nations becomes more firmly established and we have an international police force to carry out its decisions, the United States of America, which has been left militarily supreme among the sovereign nations of this earth must, of necessity, and in self-defense, remain strong on land, on sea, and in the air.

Let us make it clear that there is no difference whatever between the proponents and the opponents of the pending measure so far as maintaining a strong national defense. Those of us who are opposed to peacetime military conscription are not against adequate preparedness. We want to see this Nation strong, able to defend itself against any possible emergency. But I submit to you that with our Navy greater than all the other combined navies of the world, with a splendid Air Force, and with a reservoir of men who know how to fly the latest ships, with more than half a million men in our ground forces, our Army, almost 500,000 in the Navy and Marine Corps, with 370,000 in our Air Force—a total of 1,400,000 in our armed services, and after appropriating $11,000,000,000 in January of this year for national preparedness, this Nation is not weak. We are carrying on scientific research, technological development, and building up a strong intelligence. When the Secretary of State says after such vast expenditures, and with the equipment that we now have, in spite of certain shortages in our stock pile, that our defense is "a hollow shell," then I say something is rotten in Denmark and we need some new managers somewhere.

This Nation is not weak or impotent. We have control of the atomic bomb, the latest bacteriological methods of modern warfare; we have the greatest reservoir of highly trained, skilled, technical men in this country; with the greatest industrial output—superior to any likely combination of nations on the face of the earth. And it was America's industrial output, our productive capacity, the men in the mines, on the farms, in the forests, and in the factories of America who helped win this war as much as the men on the front battle lines. That is something that we must keep constantly in mind. Russia has not forgotten that it was American equipment that saved the day at Stalingrad.

Now, that we we are living in uncertain times, no one will deny, but every single witness, from the Secretary of State and from the Chiefs of Staff, General Eisenhower, General Bradley, and the Secretaries of the defense forces, frankly admitted to us that we are not in a crisis at this moment. None of them believed we are in grave danger of imminent war. They did say that we were in the midst of great international tension, but we have had so many crises during the past 16 years in this country, in both time of peace and war, that some of us cannot keep from feeling that some of these crises, perhaps, are artificially manufactured for political gain.

Now, what are the facts? We all know that the whole world, especially Europe and Asia, is a heap of rats, rubble, and ruin today. The world is in a state of economic collapse. General Clay, in Germany, is absolutely right when he says that the struggle in Europe is not a military one but a political one.

Many of you have seen the devastated cities, the razed factories, the underfed and underclothed helpless peoples wandering like nomads not only in Japan but in all the countries of Europe. While we must be alert and on our guard, and never go to sleep at the switch, we must not grow panicky and become unduly alarmed or show great fear of any other world power. I know that Germany, Japan, and Italy are not going to jump on anybody for a long, long time.

I do not view with great consternation that Boston, New York, Washington, or Philadelphia will be bombarded by the Greek Navy. I do not think the Bulgarian hordes will soon be running over the plains of Texas. I do not think that even Russia, with all her potential possibilities, her vast territory, her virgin forests, her rich mineral deposits, her diversified agriculture, is capable of waging a global conflict today against the United States.

The truth of the matter is the economy of Russia is very bad. Her standard of living is low. The misery of her people is great. There is much discontent. One of the greatest things we could do would be to use psychological warfare to penetrate the iron curtain and get over our ideas of freedom to those people, because I believe that any totalitarian state, whether it is Communist, Nazi, or Fascist, is doomed to utter failure. It is a government of force, of terror, of murder, of the gestapo, of the ogpu, of the concentration camp, and of the firing squad.

The present world crisis is fundamentally a moral and spiritual one. Bread and bayonets alone will not establish world peace. Ideas and ideals are just as necessary. The chief trouble with every nation is that men have lost faith in themselves and in their fellowmen. In an age of might, money, and materialism, we must not overlook faith, hope, and charity. We shall continue to trust God and keep our powder dry, but we will not place our whole redemption upon sheer physical force.

There must be no weakening of America's position—no evidence of fear. But likewise there must be no provocative act that will convince the world that war is inevitable. The United States must not now begin an armament race but rather accept the opportunity to give real leadership for peace. We do not want the rest of the world to think by

our action here that we are going to march down once more the road to war. We must, however, maintain the strength to end all appeasement with wrongdoing but at the same time give evidence of a policy that is both firm and patient. In order to accomplish this sane balance it is not necessary to adopt peacetime military conscription which is a radical departure from our American tradition, and the acceptance of a discredited European philosophy.

It seems incredible to me that after fighting two world wars in our generation and winning both as freemen we should now reach the point where we are going to adopt the techniques, the methods, and the plans of the very nations we fought to destroy. Germany had peacetime military conscription, Italy had universal military training, Japan put her faith solely "in horses that run upon the rocks." I submit that history is replete with instances where every major nation that has had peacetime military conscription has inevitably been led down the road to war and eventually to utter ruin.

After the expenditure of so much of this Nation's wealth in both men and money, in blood and treasure, are we now to admit that freemen are not as strong as conscripts or as slaves? If the last war taught us one lesson it was that freemen can outwork, outproduce, and outfight slaves anywhere. The Axis Powers looked upon Great Britain and the United States as the two western, "unprepared, weak, and soft democracies." It did not require long, however, for us to rise in our might and go forth as freemen to conquer and all but destroy those countries where men were compelled to live in a regimented society, cast in a military mold, and forced to goose-step to the commands of the Fuehrer and Il Duce.

The Air Force can get all the volunteers it needs. There are 80,000 applications down there for 6,000 jobs. I have had men come to my office recently and I have talked to them, as dozens of Members of this House have, who are not only willing but eager to get back into the service, but they are rejected. The Navy admits it could get all the men it needs through the volunteer system. It is only the ground forces that are short.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Would the gentleman like to call back into active service the reservists who fought in the last war and make them fill up the Army this time?

Mr. SHORT. If they want to. If you give them the inducements, they are not only willing but eager to do so, and I would take them. I would not deny any man. I think they would make much better soldiers to protect and defend this country than the men you take into the service against their will. A volunteer army, every militarist will admit, is the best army on the face of the earth. Now since the Air Force and the Navy can get the men they need by the volunteer method, why must the Army resort to peacetime conscription?

Here are a few of the reasons:

First. The Army has opposed any change in its courts-martial system that would correct many injustices and abuses and treat officers and enlisted men impartially and alike.

Second. The Army has been slow to abolish its caste system and to carry out the constructive suggestions of the Doolittle board which would improve relations between officers and enlisted men.

Third. The Army has failed to provide anything like adequate and decent housing for enlisted personnel and noncommissioned officers. If this is due to a lack of funds the Congress is partly if not mainly responsible.

Fourth. Whether deliberately or not, the Army has unmistakably circumvented the clear intent of Congress in its shameful treatment of our Organized Reserves. Gen. E. A. Evans, Director of the Reserve Officers Association told our Armed Services Committee that the Army had done "very little" to help the Reserves, had done nothing to furnish equipment, and did not contact or put in units the members of the Reserve. He agreed that "there would be no need for a draft, UMT, or anything else if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and the Reserves, having made a sincere and earnest effort to build them up."

Only today General Evans, according to the AP, stated in Denver, Colo., that—

> Our military leaders have been sitting for 3 years watching a highly trained, combat, hardened Reserve force disintegrate. The Navy has done something, but not enough.
>
> They all have lost the cream of the enlisted men of World War II who joined the Reserves for a 3-year hitch. The average Reserve officer is disgusted, his morale is way down. We have no real Reserve force which could be rallied for national defense in an emergency.

It is also interesting to note that in the same article our former colleague from Minnesota, Hon. Melvin Maas, who is a colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve, declared:

> In the last war, 98 percent of the fighting was done by civilians. Yet in peacetime today less than 2 percent of the armed forces budget is devoted to civilian defense activities.

Fifth. The Army has neglected our National Guard in such a way they would make one blush. Maj. Gen. E. A. Walsh, president of the National Guard Association, advised us in a telegram dated May 3, 1948:

> The enactment of H. R. 6401 as now drafted will mean the complete dissolution of the National Guard of the United States by June 1950. The security of the Nation cannot be assured by destroying its reserves. If there is a possibility of war the measures proposed are utterly inadequate. If there is no possibility of war then the measures proposed are excessive.

Mr. Chairman, these are just five—but very good—reasons that the Army wants peacetime conscription. It would seem that in peacetime at least some officers are interested chiefly in pay and promotion and would like to govern large bodies of men. The only reason one can think that the National Guard and the Organized Reserves have been ignored or sadly neglected is to force UMT or selective service upon this Nation. The Congress and not the Army is the policy-making body of this Nation, and we should never become a rubber stamp of certain officers who want to prussianize the Nation.

It is also interesting to note that in our demobilization after World War I 1 officer was discharged for every 8 enlisted men discharged while following World War II, the military discharged only 1 officer for every 16 enlisted men discharged. In other words there was twice the ratio of officers retained with respect to enlisted personnel after World War II as after World War I. This meant that thousands of highly paid individuals were retained as officers with little or nothing to do since 1945 unless to plug for the enactment of UMT or peacetime military conscription.

Now when a man gets a big salary plus an authority over his subordinates in rank, far greater than that possible under a civilian system such as America enjoyed in the past, it is to be expected that he will take steps to insure that his pay and position are not abolished through a return to a peacetime economy.

What are we doing? We appropriated $11,000,000,000 in January for national defense. Then we appropriated $3,400,000,000 in supplemental appropriations following the President's frightening speech of March 17. We also voted $882,000,000 for the 70-group air force. If we enact this measure, we will require $2,000,000,000, or more than two billion, to set up the machinery of the Government for training, equipment, and to get the program under way. Then if we reequip the 25 divisions, we will require four billion additional dollars, and you will have a budget for $21,000,000,000 alone for national defense. Add to that, if you please, $7,000,000,000 that the Veterans' Administration is paying, and you have $28,000,000,000. Add to that $5,500,000,000 in interest on our national debt at the present rate, which is a very low rate of interest, and then you will have an annual budget of $33,000,000,000 for national defense, Veterans' Administration, and interest on the national debt without a single dime for any of the ordinary functions and operations of the Federal Government.

How much longer can we continue down this road? I believe in a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force. If we are ever attacked, it will be from the air and from the sea. With our superior Air Force and with the best Navy on earth, who is going to attack us or can attack us in the immediate future? The only reason anyone would attempt it is if we bleed ourselves white. Take all the money that we are spending on the preparedness program, plus the $17,000,000,000 we are going to send to Europe under the ERP plus the proposed aid under new legislation to rearm western European countries—figure that up and then you will know that we are in great danger of becoming a bankrupt Nation.

A bankrupt nation has never been able to lick anybody. I think the Army and Navy and Air Force constitute only one arm of our national defense. The first line of any nation's defense is its financial solvency, a sound economy, and a thriving, going industry.

If we enact this bill, I want to say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], whose arguments impressed me greatly, we are going to control the lives of the youth of America, we will invade homes, and disrupt family life by taking men against their will. You can talk about universal training or service, but this peacetime conscription is compulsion—it is coercion. The Army will go out as the strong arm of the Government and will take these 18- and 19-year-old boys at the most formative and impressionable years of their lives and will segregate them into a body by themselves. I have never thought that it was a wholesome thing for any body of men to be segregated regardless of their age, and certainly not boys in the adolescent stage, such as they are talking about. They will imbue them with a militaristic spirit. Mere boys will be taught to kill. A few will become leaders—most blind followers. In the meantime, you are building up a great military hierarchy in this country with militarists sitting in high places and positions of the Government who will control, who may impose upon us a type of military control which most of the citizens of America do not want and which their ancestors left the Old World in order to escape.

We must keep ourselves strong as a nation in time of peace as well as in time of war. The front line is never stronger than the home line. If you enact this draft bill now in time of peace, you will control not only the lives of the youth of America, but industry as well. You will be causing increased demands for weapons and materials of war which will be required. You will be forcing control of the productive processes of this country. Military orders will take priority over many of the other civilian orders that we have for durable and consumers goods today. We all know that we need all of the materials and manpower that we can get. Many factories are holding back in production because we have allocated steel. If we pass this legislation, with the great demands not only for military expenditures, but for our exports to Europe under the ERP, and particularly under the contemplated lend-lease to rearm western Europe, we will have to resort to the rationing of many commodities. I do not like priorities, allocations, rationing, but we will perhaps have to return to the rationing of gasoline and the allocation of steel. There will be a shortage of the supply of food. Groceries will be even higher in price. There will be less lumber to build homes. Because of the lack of steel we will not have as many automobiles and less farm machinery.

Because of the lack of copper, you are holding back REA and crippling the electrical industry. You cannot create scarcity at home without further adding to this vicious spiral of inflation that is now threatening to destroy us. I am not so much fearful of Russia today as I am fearful of the things she is hoping and praying will happen—economic collapse in America, with vast unemployment, a discredited currency, and a prolonged depression. Russia has won every diplomatic battle not with her army; she has won every diplomatic battle since VJ-day without firing a shot. Psychological penetration, infiltration; divide and conquer. Here we are. Seven or eight years ago we had about $7,000,000,000 in currency in circulation. Today we have $28,500,000,000—four times as much money—greenbacks—in the pockets of the American people. But it is not worth 50 cents on the dollar. If we continue to bleed ourselves white, if we continue to put our faith only in material things, I say the time is not far distant when many of us will be cashing in our Government bonds and life-insurance policies that we purchased with good sound money at 10 cents on the dollar. That is the thing that threatens this country with disruption and defeat. God help us men to stand firm and to exercise reason, and not give completely away to emotion in this jittery age when many people have grown panicky, due to the everlasting, tireless propaganda waged by some of the brass, who frankly admitted, before a subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], spending thousands of dollars in order to put over the UMT and to cram this bill down our throats against our will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri is always eloquent and entertaining. He was in good form today—as good form as I have seen him except on one prior occasion, to which I will refer a little later. I also appreciate the fact that there are many here who intend, under no circumstances, to vote for this bill or anything similar to it, and who got a great deal of comfort out of the eloquence of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

I have been somewhat amused, too, at the satisfaction which has come to some in talking about stock piles, small arms and ammunition and everything else in the world except facing the realities which we have here. No one in opposition to this bill has come forward with anything concrete with reference to our ability to secure, by voluntary enlistments, the minimum number regarded by all as being necessary for our protection.

Talk about Russia winning all of her battles politically. Let it be thoroughly understood that she has never taken over any country that her army did not occupy or surround. In each instance that she has taken over the government of a country, her army has either occupied it or surrounded it. She has never taken over any country when her army did not occupy it or surround it. She did not get Greece or Italy because she neither occupied nor surrounded those countries. She did not get Italy through election because the United States came forward with the European recovery plan. Many of those who speak so eloquently here against this proposal at that time opposed just as eloquently that effort.

We are facing here a practical situation: A great nation at this time wants to arm by 1950 to the extent of only 2,000,000 men when the only other major ideology existing in the world now has at its disposal 235 divisions. Oh, yes; the gentleman from Missouri is eloquent. I remember another time when the gentleman was eloquent, a little before December 1941, when the attack came on Pearl Harbor. The speech that he made here that day was just as eloquent and just as persuasive and made every point that he made here today, saying how secure we were and how there was no danger of anyone attacking this Nation, and that we ought not then to extend the Selective Service Act. I shall never forget that night. I sat in this Chamber and watched extension of the Selective Service Act carry by one single vote. Had one other Member voted the opposite way, instead of carrying by 1 vote it would have lost by 1 vote. That was in August 1941. The same people who tell us today that we do not need this, that we are totally secure, told us exactly the same thing in August 1941, and I think they are just as good prophets today as they were then. I believe it is up to those Members of this House who have always carried the burden of protecting this Nation in national defense to protect it again and vote down this effort to protect us with eloquence and nothing else.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, what I want to leave with the membership in closing is simple fact.

The amount required to be added to the national defense program through passage of this bill is $1,700,000,000. The total budget on that basis will be $17,500,000,000.

Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that when the House almost unanimously adopted the 70-group air-force program, that meant an expenditure of $3,200,000,000. I should like to point out to you that of those 70 groups, 10 groups alone consist of many squadrons and each squadron has many planes, and there are from 45 to 50 men specifically set aside for each plane, airborne troops, engineers, and infantry. The number of planes placed end to end and wing to wing would fill the Mall completely from the Capitol to the river and the men to man them the Army has not got today. That is something for those who voted for it to think about.

One-third of the Army overhead goes for the upkeep of the Air Force. Thousands of men in the Army must be utilized to supply the Air Force.

I should like to say something about enlistments. Statistics definitely show that with the increase required for the Navy in this bill alone the Navy will require a very large enlistment, far more than they have ever received during peacetime except when selective service was in being. Selective service automatically makes enlistments easy for the Navy.

So far as the Army itself is concerned, it today has 540,000 men, approximately 300,000 of whom are serving overseas in Japan, Germany, and other places, leaving the balance in this country. There are only 2½ active, well-trained combat divisions in the entire American Army of that large number of 540,000. The rest are all police in foreign countries.

The Army will require within the next year some 800,000 men. That does not necessarily mean that large an increase. That is the increase needed to bring it up to strength for the Air Corps and to take care of the natural attrition that will result during this year.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that in every war we ever fought, including the Revolutionary War, we never were able to obtain the necessary number of men to fight the war, no matter what inducement was offered, and this is no exception to any past experience we ever had?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes, the gentleman is quite correct. The actual inference as a result of this bill will not be so much. I cannot see that it is going to mean rationing this or rationing that simply because we increase the armed forces by two or three or three hundred thousand people. That is not going to do it. Why, a most remarkable report has been prepared, one of the most remarkable in the history of this Congress for a long while, by a subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], even before we had passed the 70-group air force bill, pointing out that in their opinion the rationing of gasoline was imminent now.

Mr. SHORT. Which proves my point.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I think it does.

Mr. SHORT. We have an acute shortage of petroleum and steel at this time.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. And we have the 70-group air force. As I stated, I cannot see how increasing the Army by two or three hundred thousand means all the other controls are going to be thrown in, too.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman said a moment ago that we have a 70-group air force.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. We have not today; we will have in 1951.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman's report says that the cost of selective service will be $40,000,000 and the cost under this bill will be $1,700,000,000. Is not the difference for troops, which opponents of this bill say are needed, anyhow; therefore there is no additional cost because of the draft?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Each man who is brought into the Army is an added expense, and he is just as expensive if he volunteers as if selective service is put into effect.

Mr. Chairman, it comes down to the question, Do you want an army or not?

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to say something about the members of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring out that should this legislation be enacted into law, there will be 25,000 additional people placed on the Federal pay roll in order to carry out the act.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. There will be quite a few people in the Office of Selective Service Records. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it is, I know, unnecessary for me to make any effort to convince the membership of this House of the importance of national defense, nor is it necessary for me to preface my remarks with an explanation that our very existence as a nation depends upon an adequate national defense. You ladies and gentlemen of the House are well aware of that fact.

Before we go more thoroughly into the preparedness program and what is being done about it, let us review briefly the structure of our national defense. The system is based upon two fundamental principles which are set forth in the Constitution of the United States. First, defense is a national function; it is the responsibility of the Federal Government and is not to be left to the States alone. The States are allowed to maintain militia to enforce their own proper authority, but they may not maintain troops or ships of war in peacetime without the permission of Congress. Neither may they engage in war unless they are actually invaded or are in imminent danger which will not permit delay. The efforts of the States are part of an overall effort, but let me emphasize the fact that full responsibility rest with the Federal Government. The second principle is that in our system civil authority is supreme over military authority. We have always relied upon a civilian army, hurriedly recruited in time of crisis, rather than upon a large standing army. We have resisted and shall continue to resist all attempts of the military authorities to extend their powers beyond the rigid limits prescribed.

The responsibility for the national defense rests primarily upon the Congress and upon the President. Congress has the sole power to raise and support armies and to provide a navy. Congress alone can raise and appropriate money for the maintenance of the Military, Naval, or Air Establishment. Congress determines the broad policies which are to be followed by the armed forces. War can be declared only by Congress although hostilities may, of course, begin without an actual declaration of war. There is also the possibility that the President in his conduct of foreign relations may bring the country to a point where there is no honorable alternative to war. Congress also endows the Chief Executive with much of the broad power required for the mobilization of a successful national war effort.

The President is the central figure in national defense by reason of the powers he derives from two sources—the Constitution and the Congress. In addition to being the Chief Executive of the Nation, he is also Commander in Chief of the armed forces, and as such has broad powers if he cares to exercise them. Beside these powers, he has those granted to him by the Congress in order to facilitate the mobilization of the national strength in time of war.

To assist Congress and the President in discharge of their responsibilities relative to the national defense, there are a number of Government establishments. Chief among them, of course, is the National Military Establishment, but several of the executive departments and independent offices, agencies, and establishments of the Federal Government have some concern with national defense. Then, too, there are the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps, both of which play an essential part in our organization for national defense.

In addition to these obvious components there are others which we sometimes overlook. Where would we be without industrial production to supply the innumerable items, including weapons, munitions, clothing, vehicles, and so forth, which would be needed in case of war? National defense cannot be effective unless industry produces a sufficient quantity of good quality materials. A weapon which will not fire affords little protection against an attacker armed with the most modern and most efficiently functioning weapons. The influence of industry is also making itself increasingly felt in the field of policy formation. There are agencies within the National Military Establishment which deal with the mobilization of our economic resources in case of a national emergency. The Munitions Board and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces are examples. Operating outside the National Military Establishment, but working very closely with it, is the National Security Resources Board, which is charged with the function of advising the President relative to the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization.

Another important factor in the national defense is scientific research and development. Between 1940 and 1944 the Federal Government spent more than $2,000,000,000 for research and development. The first session of the Eightieth Congress passed the National Science Foundation bill, which constitute a recognition of scientific research as of vital importance to the United

States. Although the President vetoed that bill, it was because of objections to the particular administrative set-up provided, rather than because of any objection to the purposes of the bill. The place of scientific research in national defense is most effectively illustrated by the development of the atomic bomb during World War II. I shall speak of this in more detail in a few minutes.

Often forgotten in any recital of the various elements which go to make up the national defense is that United States' membership in international organizations represents implementation of United States foreign policy. It is axiomatic that our foreign policy is directed primarily at preserving our national sovereignty. Thus international organizations which contribute to world peace and stability and of which the United States is an active member are in a very real sense a part of our national defense. The outstanding example of such an organization is, of course, the United Nations.

In spite of all claims that in modern warfare machines are of maximum importance, the basis of national defense is still an adequate supply of manpower. We need men to serve in the armed forces in case of need. We need men to work in industry to produce the weapons and materials of war. We need men in the scientific laboratories. We need men in the National Guard and in the various Reserve components of the armed forces. We need men to serve in the Government departments and agencies which are concerned with the national defense. There can be no adequate defense of the United States if we do not have a large body of men who are physically and mentally qualified to perform the functions which will be required of them. We learned during World War I, and it was confirmed in even more shocking fashion in World War II, that millions of our young men are not fit for such service. Of the 22,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 32 years who were registered for military duty in World War II, 5,000,000 were deferred on essential occupational grounds; 5,000,000 of the remaining 17,000,000 were found unfit to join the armed services. In North Carolina, 227,600, or nearly 43 percent of the 530,800 men between the ages of 18 through 37 examined by August 1, 1945, were rejected. This percentage was far higher than the national average; in fact, only one State had a worse record. The defects most commonly found in North Carolina were musculoskeletal—affecting the muscles attached to bones as distinguished from the heart, intestines, and so forth—feet, mental deficiency, eyes, and certain heart disorders.

Mental deficiency was one of the most important causes for rejection and included educational deficiency, mental deficiency, and the specific diagnosis of morons, imbeciles, and idiots. What do these statistics mean? They mean that our present health program is inadequate. When I say our health program I mean the program not only in North Carolina but in the rest of the United States as well. The figures also indicate that we have failed to accomplish the ideal of spreading the benefits of education to all the people. This situation must not be allowed to continue. We cannot permit our reservoir of manpower for national defense to be so reduced by lack of adequate health and education programs. Neither is it fair for a man in Iowa, for example, to be drafted to serve in the armed forces, at considerable cost to himself, because a man in North Carolina has been deferred for illiteracy. Furthermore the existence within the population of such a large group of physically and mentally disqualified persons can result only in the reduced social efficiency of the Nation.

What is to be done about it? Some of you have undoubtedly heard me call for a national public health program. North Carolina could spend a greater portion of her revenue on health measures. She could take advantage of legislation already passed by the Congress and support all Federal legislation proposed for that purpose. The over-all solution to the education problem calls for the passage of a sound Federal aid for education bill by the Congress. In the meantime the States must do all that it is in their power to do to improve the status of education. North Carolina should not wait for the Federal Government to take action but should do what she can herself. I am delighted to hear that at the end of March of this year nearly 75,000 veterans in North Carolina were taking advantage of the provisions of Public Laws 16 and 346. Five and a half thousand disabled veterans were receiving aid in colleges, schools, on the farm, or on the job. Nearly 19,000 veterans were attending college under the GI bill; 13,000 were in other schools below the college level; more than 18,000 were in training on farms; and more than 19,000 were participating in on-the-job training. I sincerely hope that these men will realize the value of the training they are receiving and will see to it that their children have equal or better opportunities.

Let us now turn to a brief consideration of the defense issues other than a national health program and Federal aid to education which have been up for consideration during this session of the Congress. The most significant of these are the proposals outlined in the legislation we now consider, and the 70-group air force which this Congress set in motion some weeks ago.

The Selective Service Act of 1948 is one way by which our Nation would provide a sufficient supply of manpower for the armed services in order to insure an adequate national defense.

President Truman in his St. Patrick's Day message to the Congress explained the state of international affairs which makes preparedness necessary for the United States at this time. Secretary of State Marshall, appearing as a witness before the Senate Committee on Armed Services on the same day, declared:

> We desire a state of affairs which would make repetitions of the fate of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, the intimidation of Finland, the subversive operations in Italy and France, and the cold-blooded efforts to destroy the Greek Government unlikely, because they would definitely be fraught with real danger to those who would attempt such action.

General Marshall and witnesses who followed him went on to point out that the present strength of the armed forces is inadequate for the national security due to the failure of the voluntary enlistment system, and that UMT, or in my opinion selective service, would fill the long-range need for adequate military strength at the lowest cost. Selective service would make the National Guard and the Organized Reserves fully effective by providing them with the necessary number of trained men.

There are those who believe that there is no need for building a new reserve of men, that we can simply call again upon the 15,000,000 veterans now in this country. Not only is this decidedly unfair to the veteran who has already given some of his best years to the service of his country, but it completely ignores the fact that this veteran reserve is being rapidly depleted as the men grow older, marry and gain dependents. Within a few years this reserve will have been thoroughly depleted and what shall we do then unless we make preparation now? In the meantime, diplomatic action to be effective must be backed by force. The bully is not impressed when his victim declares: "If you do not stop that right now I will hit you smack in the face with this cream puff."

There are several other good arguments for selective service but I should like to mention just one more—one which is connected with the problem of health which I have already mentioned. Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, wartime director of the Selective Service System, recommends a year of training essentially for national preservation but including such secondary objectives as physical conditioning, physical rehabilitation, practice in healthful living, and training in democracy by having one place and 1 year when and where young Americans will meet in training.

By an overwhelming vote in both the House and the Senate, a 70-group air force has been authorized. It was over this issue that Secretary of Defense Forrestal and Secretary of the Air Force Symington differed. This difference between the two has been seized upon by the newspapers as indicating a total lack of cooperation within the National Military Establishment. This view is exaggerated. It is, on the contrary, an example of democracy at work, an example of a subordinate voicing his views even though he is well aware that they are not in accord with the beliefs of his superior. Secretary Forrestal is not opposed to the 70-group air force as such, but fears that "building up any one service without commensurate augmentation of its supporting sister services can be as dangerous as the neglect of such a service." Secretary Symington believes that balancing the Army, Navy, and Air Force should be subordinate to providing a sufficient number of the only adequate defense weapons now available to us.

The 70-group air force will require nearly 6,900 planes of various types. A group is composed of as many as 30 bombers, requiring 9,000 men, or 75 fighters with a complement of 6,500 men. In addition to the bombers and fighters there will have to be a large number of troop carriers, trainers, reconnaissance planes and so forth. Those who believe that the establishment of the 70-group air force will eliminate the need for the draft or other means of supplying manpower may find themselves much mistaken. Life magazine for May 17 carried an estimate of the number of men it would take to operate and maintain a typical large overseas air base. Six groups of bombers would require 55,000 men; 6 groups of fighters would require 48,000 men; 6 groups of miscellaneous planes would require 22,000 men. In addition, there would have to be an inner security force of 50,000 men, and a flank security force of 115,000 men. An Army supply base, including 100 harbor craft, would take 176,000 men. A Navy force of 15,000 men would be necessary to man the 300 ships required for transportation and supply. The total number of men required for such a base would be over 500,000. On this basis the 70-group air force would necessitate the services of more than 1,750,000 men. Support of such a program would also mean the development of a reserve of several thousand planes and adequate numbers of aircraft for the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve.

The monetary cost of such a program will eventually run into more than $7,000,000,000 a year. The effect on our economy will probably not be felt until about 1950 when the program gets into full stride. Then there may be fewer automobiles due to a shortage of steel for that purpose, fewer vacuum cleaners, fewer refrigerators, fewer houses and kitchen utensils which require aluminum. There may well be higher prices as the result of higher wages paid to lure workers into remobilization factories and the consequent reduction in the amount of civilian goods produced. In spite of this fact, we cannot say that the 70-group air force is either unwise or unnecessary. The price of freedom is never low, but neither can it be too high.

No survey of national defense would be complete without mention of atomic energy. On January 1, 1948, a report was released by the President's Air Policy Commission entitled "Survival in the Air Age"—otherwise known as the Fineletter Report. This report recommended a strong Military Establishment—particularly a strong air force to protect the United States against new forms of aggression, chief among them being atomic attack. The authors of the report stated frankly that they could not forecast definitely when such an attack might occur, but the conclusion they reached, after consulting a large number of estimates, was that other powers would have atomic weapons some time between 1951 and 1957. The new strategy of defense formulated by the Commission called for the building of an air arm capable of dealing with a possible atomic attack on this country by January 1, 1953. The minimum force needed was estimated to be 12,400 modern planes organized into 70 combat groups, and 22 special squadrons supplemented by 27 National Guard groups and 24 groups of Air Reserves. The findings of this Commission were borne out later by the Senate Congressional Aviation Policy Board in its report released March 1, 1948. The recommendations of these two Boards provided a basis for Public Law 547, enacted May 21, 1948, which provides for appropriations for a 70-group air force and otherwise strengthens the Military Establishment.

The hope of averting an atomic war has recently been greatly dimmed by the collapse of the United Nations' efforts to reach an international working agreement. After more than 2 years of negotiations for world control of atomic energy, 7 countries in the 11-member Atomic Energy Commission decided there was no use talking about atomic control any longer until the U. S. S. R. changed its mind and was willing to accept the essential provisions of the majority plan. On May 7 the Commission made a report to the Security Council declaring that it had reached an impasse and recommending that the report be referred to the General Assembly at its next regular meeting, which is scheduled to take place in Paris this summer. The report and its recommendations were accepted, and the Commission was authorized to discontinue all further meetings for the present.

The need for a change in our defensive as well as our offensive strategy has recently been highlighted by an announcement of the United States Atomic Energy Commission that three "improved" atomic bombs have been successfully fired at Eniwetok. In this connection, we learn from an article in the New York Times of May 23, that Secretary Forrestal has "borrowed" Mr. Russell J. Hopley, president of the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., to draw up a country-wide plan for civil defense. Mr. Hopley and his assistants hope to evolve a plan by the end of July under which the civil, or passive defense of the United States could be conducted in case of an atomic attack. The ideal pattern for civil defense is said to start with the principle of self-help. We are then told that an estimated 555,000 persons would be killed and a like number wounded if a single bomb were dropped on each of 37 cities of the United States having populations greater than 250,000. It is difficult to conceive of any plan which would be effective in the event of such atomic slaughter.

But let us turn from these frightening figures and suppose, for the sake of improving our spirits, that men and nations are able and willing to base their hopes for survival on the constructive rather than the destructive uses of atomic energy. Here are some of the heartening facts. A few weeks ago David Lilienthal, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, announced that cobalt, a cheap and plentiful mineral, could, after irradiation in an atomic oven, be used just as effectively in the treatment of cancer as radium, an extremely rare and costly material. Besides this and other medical uses of products of atomic energy, there is indication that the lot of the farmer will be improved. For instance, tracer atoms of phosphate allow plant chemists to learn what happens to phosphate in the soil, how it is taken up by the plant, where it goes in the plant, what happens as as a result of its presence there. It may be some years before atomic energy is available as a source of industrial power but researchers have listed more than 1,000 potential industrial uses for atomic radiation. There are, then, phases of atomic energy which promise us a future of health, welfare, and human betterment. Let us pray that atomic energy is used in this fashion rather than for mass destruction.

In conclusion, let me leave with you these thoughts: The health and education of all our people are the basis of any sound system of national defense; enactment of a national health program and legislation for Federal aid to education is therefore necessary in the interests of national defense. Industrial production and scientific research and development are essential to an adequate defense and must be maintained at a high level. Let me state with emphasis, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion the passage of H. R. 6401 is necessary to provide the necessary and minimum adequate manpower for the armed forces and their Reserve components, all of which must be kept strong while world conditions remain so sensitive and unsettled which today is undeniable.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to this draft bill, H. R. 6401, which is now under consideration. The adoption of this proposal to subject to conscription some two-thirds of our single, nonveteran men in the 19- to 26-year age group will mean the establishment of the first genuine peacetime draft in American history, and I am convinced that such unprecedented action represents a serious departure from American tradition and a violation of the principles of our democracy. I am thoroughly convinced that this measure is neither practical nor necessary, and I am going to vote against it.

I am opposed to this measure on several counts. One reason is that military conscription in time of peace is contrary to our American traditions, and the establishment of such a set-up poses a serious threat to our democratic way of life. Over 150 years ago Thomas Jefferson—the great apostle of democracy and author of the Declaration of Independence—warned our Nation that military conscription, large peacetime armies, and militarism are extremely dangerous to democratic governments—that militarism leads to war and loss of freedom. Dr. Arnold J. Toynbee, one of the most popular historians of our times, in his monumental study of the rise and fall of past civilizations, states: "Militarism has been by far the commonest cause of the breakdown of civilization." The leading American historian and political scientist, Charles A. Beard, has expressed the same sentiments.

In my opinion, it would be a serious mistake for the United States to adopt

the peacetime draft. We cannot adopt

refutably proved that there is no alternative.

If this is true, I ask why do we not enlarge the WAC? The last war proved

year-old boys. During the course of the debate, quite an effort was made to

the peacetime draft. We cannot adopt ways that have corrupted and destroyed other civilizations and expect to escape the same fate. I might say that we have already witnessed trends to militarism in this country during the last 2 years. Today the military is extending its control over our democratic institutions, and the result has been the gradual weakening of one of the most important safeguards of democracy—civilian control of government.

Let us examine the record. One index of the influence of the military in government is the amount of money appropriated for military purposes. The record shows that 54 percent of the 1947 Federal budget was appropriated for the military and agencies relating to the military. An even greater amount was appropriated for 1948, when some $18,000,000,000—66.3 percent of the total budget—was granted to the various war agencies. Over $31,000,000,000—79 percent of the total 1949 budget—is for war or the effects of war. About $14,000,000,000 of this goes for direct military expenditures, or more than $85 a piece per person in the United States, and 12 times more than was spent for military purposes in 1940.

The increasing size of our military budget, however, is only one measure of the growing influence of the military in our national life. Another index of this trend is the growing number of admirals and generals finding their way into key governmental positions. For example, Admiral Leahy is President Truman's chief adviser, General Marshall is Secretary of State, and Marshall's chief advisers are Brigadier General Carter, West Point's John Peurifoy, and General Hilldring. Gen. Lucius Clay controls Germany and General MacArthur runs Japan. Ten of the 20 ranking executives in the State Department are military men. Many of our top diplomatic posts are held by military men—Gen. Bedell Smith is Ambassador to Russia, Admiral Kirk is in Belgium, General Holcomb represents us in South Africa, just to mention a few.

In other words, the recent trend has been toward more and more generals and admirals in Government, and their increasing influence in political affairs. This pattern becomes doubly disturbing when you couple it with the Wall Street infiltration into Government. For example, Defense Secretary Forrestal, ECA Ambassador at Large Harriman, former Secretary of Commerce, and the Treasury Secretary Snyder all belong to the Wall Street banking circle. This combination of military and Wall Street influence makes for reactionary politics—at home and abroad—as their logical consequences.

I maintain that the adoption of peacetime draft legislation would present a serious threat to our democratic government and our precious American liberties. Militarism is gaining a strong foothold in America—the military is exercising ever growing influence in Government, politics, in our schools and universities, and in control of atomic and other scientific research. The military is also exercising tremendous influence over American foreign affairs to the detriment of peaceful international relations and world peace. Now the militarists and their Wall Street allies are attempting to extend their influence by seeking the adoption of the peacetime draft.

I am opposed to surrendering any more power to the military crowd. I believe that draft legislation in times of peace is a denial of the spirit of the United Nations in that it rejects international cooperation in favor of unilateral action as the basis of international security.

Those who are supporting this measure base their whole case on the claim that this conscription program is necessary to our national defense. An examination of the facts, however, show that the United States is today the strongest military power in the world. The authorized strength of the Regular armed forces is 1,703,000 men, and the actual strength of the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force units plus the Organized Reserves adds up to nearly 3,000,000 men. In addition, we have the strongest Navy in the world, and a monopoly on the atomic bomb.

It is true that our Regular forces are not at full strength because enlistment quotas fall below monthly quotas. The proponents of this bill are using this as a justification for a return to the draft; but they ignore the fact that the War Department has raised the enlistment standards far above prewar levels, and is rejecting 50 percent of all volunteers at the present time. I fail to see the logic of drafting boys when the Army is turning down volunteers by the thousands every month.

Furthermore, there are more practical methods of obtaining the manpower needed for our military needs. Enlistments in the Regular armed forces can be stimulated by offering additional inducements for volunteers, such as better pay, and more opportunities for promotion and education. The suggestion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] some months ago to pay a $1,000 bonus to all those who complete a 2-year enlistment, and $1,500 for 3 years, would encourage many young men to enter the armed forces. In addition, the Army would become more attractive to our youth if some of its undemocratic features were eliminated—we should abolish the special privileges now enjoyed by commissioned officers, and the caste system which it creates. We should also eliminate Jim Crowism, and all other forms of racial discrimination in the Army and Navy. In other words, the military crowd in America have ample means of securing a sufficient number of volunteers to fill their monthly quotas, but they prefer conscription because it enhances their prestige and power at the expense of democratic government.

Just to make the record clear, I have always supported adequate appropriations for national defense, and I intend to continue to do so. During this session, I have voted for military appropriations totaling nearly $14,000,000,000—the largest peacetime military budget in American history. I have supported the building of a 70-group air force, and I have always advocated the expansion of the National Guard and the Organized Reserves. I have repeatedly urged that additional inductments be offered for enlistments, and that the caste system and racial discrimination be eliminated in the Army and Navy, as a means of attracting more volunteers.

We have been told here today that voluntary enlistments and Reserve training cannot do the job of providing the trained men necessary to man our country's defenses. I wonder if we have given these voluntary programs a real chance to prove their worth. This Congress has been most generous with appropriations for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, appropriating the $14,000,000,000 I have mentioned, but there has been no time to demonstrate whether the additional facilities this money can provide will do the job.

There is no question but that the various Reserve units have had a hard time during the past year in holding their members because of poor facilities.

Recently I paid a visit to the headquarters of the Fifth Infantry Battalion of the United States Marine Corps Reserve here in Washington. This battalion is located a few blocks away from the Capitol, in the old Boys Club building. There is a tiny room for inside drill which is too crowded and cramped for any real exercise. It isn't even large enough for a basketball court. No wonder that many former marines who enlisted in the Organized Reserves are dropping out.

The Fifth Infantry Battalion is one of the famous Marine outfits. The Marines have always preferred volunteers, and in the early part of the war the men who fought at Guadalcanal and Tarawa were 100 percent volunteers, and a large proportion from the Organized Reserve. A great many of the Fifth Infantry men, who were called up in April, 1940, were among the gallant defenders of Guadalcanal.

I am convinced that the provision of better facilities for volunteer groups like this Marine battalion, and for the Army, Navy, and Air Force Organized Reserve, will pay real dividends and prove a workable substitute for the proposed draft.

But this military-conscription bill now under consideration, Mr. Chairman, is a measure to militarize America rather than to promote national defense. It is a proposal designed to regiment our Nation rather than protect it. It is not a desirable means of obtaining military manpower, and it is contrary to America's democratic heritage. For these reasons, I have no honest course but to oppose it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, the Army has asked for a draft of our young men. It is the job of this Congress to determine whether or not the draft is essential to obtain the authorized strength of the Army. A draft in peacetime is a very serious matter. To enter upon a peacetime-conscription program is to depart from the tradition that has been the foundation and bulwark of our freedom.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot take this step in good conscience unless it has been irrefutably proved that there is no alternative.

Secretary of the Air Force Symington and General Spaatz both told the House Armed Services Committee on April 13 that they did not feel selective service was necessary to bring the Air Force up to requirements. Secretary of the Navy Sullivan and Admiral Denfeld testified that the Navy could get its authorized strength without a draft.

I have seen a Navy chart which shows that in June 1947 they were accepting volunteers at the rate of 5,500 men a month. In July volunteers were being accepted at the rate of 12,500 a month. Volunteer recruitment fell back to 11,500 a month in August, but rose to 15,000 a month in September. In January 1948 it rose to over 19,000 per month. The volunteers exceeded the appropriation the Congress had authorized for recruitment.

The Air Force has had little trouble in obtaining volunteers for numerous reasons:

(a) Its recruiting drive has never slackened.

(b) It has something specific to offer in training young men for highly skilled trades.

(c) It gives better pay and better living conditions than the Army.

Until the Army reforms itself it will never be able to compete with the other services. I can see no reason otherwise among the services which would make it more difficult for the Army to recruit.

I cannot help but feel that, after serious study of the hearings, the Army has failed not in its efforts, but through its lack of effort to obtain volunteers.

General Bradley told the House Armed Services Committee on April 14 that if our Reserve units were filled up with men with proper training we believe we could reduce the size of our Regular Army.

General Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association, told the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 1:

> We talk of doing things, we talk of spending money and the possibility of legislation, but nowhere do we hear of the possibility of doing something to maintain, revitalize, keep intact our Reserve which we have at the present time. A 2,400,000 Reserve is no small-sized Army and Navy.

The Army has neglected the volunteer Reserves and the National Guard in order to get a compulsory program. It is all very well and proper for the Army to ask for a draft, but it is the duty of the Members, Mr. Chairman, as custodians of the people's liberty to evaluate this request calmly and objectively in the light of the needs of the Republic.

I am convinced that the Army could get more volunteers if it really wanted to do so.

The hearings show that of the 240,000 men the Army says it needs and can only get through the draft a very small percentage will be sent overseas. General Bradley on March 25 told the Senate committee that only 13,000 additional combat troops and 1,000 service troops would be sent overseas if the Army increased its strength by 240,000 men and got a peacetime draft.

If this is true, I ask why do we not enlarge the WAC? The last war proved how efficient women could be in military jobs, taking over all the clerical work, radar plotting, ack-ack batteries, the supply services, the many jobs which the Army itself calls housekeeping—not kitchen work. Women have shown eagerness to get into uniform. Why not let them, since we need them? Every Wac enlisted gives the Army a man for another job.

If there was a sincere desire on the part of the Army to obtain volunteers without the aid of the draft many ideas suggest themselves to me which the Army could initiate. It could try to make army life as normal as possible, that is, like civilian life. It could provide decent housing near posts so men could live with their families. It could permit men to live off post and come to work every morning as they would on any other job—b and c would help get enough mechanics for the air force. Mechanics do not have to be as young as pilots or infantrymen.

The Army could keep promises when enlistees are allowed to choose branch of service and type of duty. It could abolish "chicken" regulations which make post life unbearable. Reveille could be at a useful hour instead of a traditional one. Furloughs, passes, parade regulations could be liberalized. Martinets could be prevented from ruining the Army.

These smaller reasons for opposing the draft are based on the belief that the Army by reforming itself could attract enough young, intelligent men to fill its present needs. The Army has not yet been able to prove otherwise. Let the Army make the reforms and see if it is not true. Then, if it is not, let us think about compulsory military service.

If men are to be drafted, why not women, too? And above all, why not industry, too—at least to the extent of providing all goods to the armed services at absolute cost. Not one cent of profit. No cost-plus. If young men must give their youth and their lives, then the least the older men can give is their profits.

If we pass this peacetime draft we might as well recognize the fact that it is not a temporary measure. It is one with which we will be saddled for many years to come, with the danger of our country becoming a hugh military state dominated by military ideas and military people.

How can we take this step unless we have honestly tried every voluntary means of obtaining manpower needed to bring our Army up to authorized strength?

At this point it is well to remember history. In every nation where compulsory peacetime conscription has been adopted freedom of speech and action has been jeopardized or lost altogether.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

LEST WE FORGET

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, in the fall of 1941 during the Seventy-seventh Congress, legislation came before the House to extend the draft to 18- and 19-year-old boys. During the course of the debate, quite an effort was made to amend the bill so as to guarantee these boys at least a year's training before going into combat. The War Department and the Chief of Staff objected to this amendment, asking that the determination of the period of training be left to their good judgment and assuring the Congress that sufficient training would be given, as nearly a year as possible, and that the units in which the boys would be incorporated would have thorough training before combat. On the strength of that assurance many Members voted for the extension to include these young men.

My own disillusionment came a short time later when a young man from my district was killed in France just 5 months after he was inducted. No Chief of Staff or Secretary of War could tell me that he had been sufficiently trained or that the loss of his life might not be traceable to that fact. There were many other examples of men killed shortly after their induction, so apparently the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of War talked to the Congress with tongue in cheek. I wrote to the Secretary of War of the circumstances in this particular case, and after some delay I had a long letter, saying practically nothing, but from which I learned that by their assurances when the legislation was being considered they meant that the units would have a year's training, not the individual soldier.

I am just recounting this now to show that one should accept with a grain of salt a lot of the promises of the War Department. Another thing I remember is that during the war many young men came to me and told me that their officers had forbidden them to write to their Congressman. This may not have been on instruction from headquarters, but it was done. What these officers did was to deny these citizens in the Army the right to petition the Congress. Why should these men be denied the right of any other citizen just because they were in the Army? Will this sort of thing be done again? Some measures should be taken to instruct the officers that the soldier has every right to talk to his Congressman or write to him if he pleases.

I expect to support this legislation, but I do it with a great deal of reluctance because I am not convinced, as many others are not, that the War Department has done everything it could do to build up its strength through voluntary enlistments. Certainly the Congress has granted its every request and made voluntary recruitment as easy as possible, in the hope that our strength could be built in that way. But that method has failed, and we have arrived at the point where the Congress now has to pass legislation to permit the Army to go into the homes and seize the young men again. I know there are many Americans who feel that the War Department has fallen down on its efforts to build up the forces by voluntary enlistment, and now with the draft the people must pay for the War Department's shortcomings.

Under selective service in this last war many injustices were worked when young men were taken from homes where they were needed and their induction created a hardship. When once they were taken, there was scarcely any recourse. The appeal boards almost never reversed the orders of the local boards. In several deserving cases, it was necessary for me to go to the director in the State in order to have the local-board action countermanded. Appealing to Washington was of no use. There was one instance of a local board persecuting a family for personal reasons. Other injustices were committed, but they were upheld by the appeal board. I wonder if we will have this sort of thing again. If we are, the public will know about it. More consideration should be given to the people in this, for it is a terrible thing to give authority to the War Department, or any other department to draft young men out of their homes for Army service. It is about the most ruthless thing that I know of, and the possession of such authority should not be misused, but exercised with wisdom and discretion.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support this bill. In doing so, I realize that traditionally we are departing from a long established policy of depending upon a peacetime military establishment composed of volunteers.

As a member of the House Committee on the Armed Services, full information as to world conditions and the threat to universal peace was laid before us by responsible spokesman of our Government. I want to emphasize that it was not the military alone but spokesmen for nonmilitary agencies that stressed the need for the immediate strengthening of our national defenses.

As a veteran of two wars, I learned to appreciate the value of an adequate national defense. My memory takes me back to 1917, when we were pushed into World War I totally unprepared. Likewise, I think of December 7, 1941, when in the matter of a few moments we found ourselves involved in World War II.

On both of these occasions we soon realized the inadequacy of our national defense and the value of preparedness. No one can deny the fact that we depended upon our allies to hold the front lines while we moved into high speed in perfecting a program of national defense. At this point, let me add that as a result of our unpreparedness many American lives were sacrificed.

When World II concluded we had the greatest fighting machine ever assembled. But overnight demands for demobilization caused that war machine to crumble until today it is a mere skeleton.

While we were demobilizing and preaching peace on earth, good will toward men, Russia, our ally of World War II, continued to maintain, modernize, and expand her military defenses. Without going into detail, today Russian military forces are strategically distributed on the continents of Europe and Asia in a manner that threatens the peace of the world.

It is not my intention to become involved in our problem of foreign relations with other nations or the delaying tactics of Russia at the peace table. But I do want to point out that it is the blunders and mistakes in the world of diplomacy that often overnight can plunge a nation into war. At that moment the need of an adequate national defense is imperative.

This bill is designed to provide our armed forces with the necessary manpower that will permit building our armed forces to the point where they can be expanded within a reasonable time to meet any national emergency.

While we are living in a period of peace, it is common knowledge that dark clouds have gathered on the world horizon. With such a situation demanding that this Nation be equipped with an adequate national defense and the fact manpower is needed to reach such an objective, in my opinion this bill is necessary.

By this legislation, the responsibility of serving in the armed forces is not placed upon a few but becomes the duty of all young men between the ages of 19 and 25, who are physically qualified. The provisions of this bill are a guaranty that the rich and the poor will be treated alike.

For months we have heard the statement that voluntary enlistments can provide the reservoir of manpower needed for our national defense. While this question has been discussed quite freely, as a Member of Congress, I feel I cannot discharge my obligation to the American people by taking the world of armchair strategists, regardless of how sincere they may be.

To the contrary, I prefer to follow a great soldier—Gen. Omar Bradley, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, who, in testifying before the House Committee on the Armed Services, cited the urgent need for this legislation. The statement of General Bradley emphasized the inability of the Army to recruit foot soldiers for the Ground Forces. His statement alone on this point is sufficient evidence to warrant the enactment of this bill.

Like many Members of Congress, this bill does not entirely satisfy me. For that reason, when the opportunity presents itself, it is my intention to offer a series of perfecting amendments, which I hope will have your favorable consideration.

Three of my amendments concern the National Guard, which we all recognize as a strong arm of our national defense.

My first amendment concerns section 5, paragraph D, page 12, lines 1 to 5, inclusive. This amendment provides that a young man who enlists in the National Guard either before or after this legislation becomes a law, shall be permitted to serve in the National Guard. Under the present language of the bill, after it becomes law, a young man cannot enlist in the National Guard.

The second amendment concerns section 19, paragraph G, page 48, lines 8 to 11 inclusive, and deals with the definition of "organized unit." My amendment provides a definition so that exemption from the draft will not be on the basis of the amount of pay received by the individual, but rather on the amount of training the man actually receives.

The third amendment concerns section 22, paragraph G, page 49, lines 3 to 16 inclusive. My amendment will rewrite this statement of policy to conform to the provisions made in the Selective Service Act of 1940, which guarantees that the National Guard will be trained and equipped, ready to be used in case of emergency, and not left standing on the sidelines as could be the case if the present language of the bill remains unaltered.

These three amendments have the endorsement of the National Guard Association of the United States, who join me in the hope they will be adopted as an aid in maintaining the National Guard at its proper strength and protecting its functions as a reserve component.

As I said in my opening remarks, I am in favor of this bill. I think it would be a mistake for us to pull our punches at this time when a two-fisted national defense is our best guaranty for world peace and our own national security.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss this very important matter, the drafting of our boys during peacetime. This is a move that has never been necessary in the history of our country and we have engaged in quite a few wars, with what I believe could be called a perfect record; we have never been defeated.

I would like to ask the question, "Why is it necessary to draft our young men, now that World War II is over?" I ask that question advisedly for it seems to me that even the heads of our present Administration have different ideas on the subject. President Truman on Sunday night said:

> There is no danger of war. ERP is having a wonderful effect on the peoples of Europe and peace is certain.

But only yesterday General Bradley appeared before the Appropriations Committee and said:

> The world situation which dictated the necessity for this expanded military program has not changed. We must still measure the capabilities of our nations without trying to guess what they will do.

General Bradley is merely pointing out that the military must look at the darkest picture that can be painted, but for him to say that the picture has not changed does not make sense. We all know that things are not as bad as they have been painted.

I would like to discuss the possibility of Russia starting an armed conflict with the United States. That would be the last thing in the world she would want to do. Could Russia supply her armies in case of another war? We all know that she could not last a year without the factories of the United States resupplying her with equipment. Germany would have completed the campaign in Russia with ease if we had not been successful in getting our equipment to Russia in time, and sometimes I think that might have been a good solution, let Hitler clean up the Communist Government in Russia and save our equipment to wipe out Hitler and Mussolini. Then we would not have had the trouble of trying to complete our moves for peace in the world with all of the dictators wiped out.

We ended the war winners but we started the appeasing of Stalin and permitted him to move into Poland and other Balkan countries, and what did we do? Sent him a note of protest on the one day and recognized his Communist Government on the next. Now that he keeps on his political moves and gets into Czechslovakia, we finally feel that we had better arm to the hilt, and stop the robber. It is like locking the stable door after the horse was stolen. There is still no more danger of war today than there was when Stalin moved into Poland. What this administration needed was the backbone to stand up and tell Stalin where to stop.

I remember when I was overseas and was finally told that I had enough points to go home, I told my boss, General Englehart, that he should not be sending me home but we should keep our armies intact and tell Stalin right then what he was going to do toward peace and we should have kept that big stick over his head to see that he complied with our requests.

Mr. Chairman, the people back home did not see it that way and our armies were broken up. The National Security Act required that when the men were discharged they were to be assigned to Reserve units and kept in the Reserve until the emergency was declared over and peace treaties completed. Was this done by our armed services? No, the men were permitted to volunteer for the Reserves and they were informed that they would be assigned to organized units. Some 1,500,000 men signed up for the Reserve and even to this date only a very small number were ever contacted and assigned to any units. Most of the men are unassigned or members of conglomerate groups of the Reserves. It has been a peculiar thing to me that the Regular Army has been so negligent in the forming of Reserve groups to make up a strong national defense. Here we have about 15,000,000 men, all war trained and ready and able to don a uniform at any time, if necessary, and the Army decides that the only thing they are interested in is UMT and the draft. I have been told by men in high places that they were not interested in the old Reserves, what they wanted were the 18-year-old boys for their Reserves.

The Regular Army has spent your money and the taxpayers' money for all manner of propaganda for the purpose of selling UMT and to me it is the most ridiculous idea of a way to secure an adequate national defense. The UMT program even specifies that the 18-year-old boys would be trained in all lines even up to the division commander. I know that some of you men who have served in the armed forces will appreciate that. I personally believe that it was nothing but a plan to try and keep some of the stars on the shoulders of some of the Regular Army officers.

Mr. Chairman, here we are today spending $11,000,000,000 for our national security and the top brass admits that we have no security. Someone should be required to answer for that. If we do not have any defense, where has the $11,000,000,000 gone? What rat hole are they using? I think I can answer for part of it. When the end of a fiscal year comes near orders are issued to spend all of the money in your budget, whether you need anything or not. Get rid of the money or Congress will cut our appropriation next year. I think it is high time that some method is devised to put a stop to such waste, when so much of their supplies are in the hands of the WAA and still they buy. This information was given to me by a Government employee very recently, and he stated that it disgusted him. I think that our committees in Congress should start some investigations of our own to bring out some of these facts.

Mr. Chairman, I was discussing the Reserves and I want to emphasize the importance of the Reserve and National Guard units as a real national defense. If we had not had our National Guard divisions and our about 160,000 Reserve officers at the start of the last war our Regular Army would have been lost. I served overseas for a period of 41 months and I served in several headquarters, the last one being the Pacific Ocean Area Headquarters, under General Richardson, and at no time were there more than 3 percent Regular Army officers assigned to it. The other 97 percent were Reserve, National Guard, and AUS officers. In the other headquarters there were only 1 percent Regular Army. Now does that show that there are some Reserve officers, National Guard and AUS officers, who are available with proper training under war conditions to be assigned to organized units and be ready for any eventuality? I believe that the Army has taken the wrong position toward the Reserve.

I am pleased to read the minority report on H. R. 6401 and I wish to state that I agree with it 100 percent. I am glad to see that General Evans, the head of the Reserve Officers Association has expressed the same sentiments as I have outlined above. I do not believe that any draft of any kind would be necessary if they had complied with the law and built up the Reserves and National Guard. In fact if they had only encouraged instead of discouraged the Reserves who are patriotic enough to want to remain in training and be ready if they are needed in the future. I am a colonel in the Ordnance Reserve and I feel that I could still go out and do my job in the Ordnance if necessary.

Mr. Chairman, once a man becomes a member of the Reserve he will be so interested in the work he will continue to be a Reserve and will remain in it as long as there are training courses and they are kept interesting. I have been a member of the ROA since 1925, and we were very much interested in the work. I started as a second lieutenant and when the emergency came in 1940 I had worked up to the grade of major, and when called we were all glad that we had kept up to date on our work because we felt we were capable of handling anything that might come up. I am sure the Reserves of today will be the same type of enlisted men and officers and will make you the strongest national security that any nation could organize at this time, including Russia.

I am opposed to breaking up the period of education of our boys and if you do not think we are already doing that you should have been with me last Sunday when seven college boys were in my home and if you could have heard the questions that were asked of me, you would have realized that the youth of our Nation are so confused and disturbed that they are not able to study. They all feel that they might just as well quit and join up and get it over with, so why study. Some of the boys had very poor marks for the first time in their lives. I blame the Regular Army and the propagandists who are trying to paint the ugliest picture that can be painted.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the eyes of every mother in the Nation are on us today and there will be many heartbreaks when this day is over if this bill is passed, as I expect it will be, if the vote in the other body is any criterion. We all know that all mothers will gladly lend their sons to their country in time of emergency and many will bravely withstand the many sacrifices that must come out of the ravages of war, but when their is no apparent emergency, no war in sight, it is most difficult for them to believe that this is a real emergency, and not just a trumped up emergency to save the New Deal in an election year. Everyone is aware that the New Deal thrives on emergencies and the western nonpolitical trip of the President's show how far they will go, at the taxpayers expense, to try to win their point.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the proper solution to the problem of personnel could be solved by the proper action on the part of the Army. They have increased the I. Q. rating of enlisted personnel from 55 to 80 and this to me is ridiculous. There are many jobs in the Army that can be done by boys without an I. Q. of 80. I realize that some jobs must be held by scientists but they are few and far between, there are still many others that can be performed by the lower I. Q. men. I believe that the Army could reduce their requirements to 60 and get many good men. In fact they are refusing to take the men every day. I also believe that the Army could be made more inviting by having better food facilities for their troops overseas. Refrigeration is very important to the stomach of the fighting man. During the last war in the Pacific, the Navy always had room for reefers for the Navy units but not for the Army. We had to eat the canned foods and they on their ships would have steaks and ice cream. Even the Navy units who were landed on an island base carried their reefers. These sound like small items but they are the main point when you talk of the morale of the men and I believe that it is part of the solution in getting men to join the Army rather than the Navy.

I feel that the Army should go to work on the solution of this problem, at least as hard as they have worked to try and sell the country UMT, and maybe they could have had a solution by this time. The money would be spent for a better purpose.

In conclusion, I believe that the draft should be adopted as the last resort, and, to my way of thinking, we have not given the matter of enlistments a fair trial or enough energy to say that we have reached the end of our string and the draft is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) this act may be cited as the "Selective Service Act of 1948."

(b) The Congress declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

(c) The Congress further declares that such armed strength, to be adequate, requires an increase at the earliest practicable date in the number of persons on active service in the armed forces to not to exceed the manpower strengths authorized in section 2 of this act.

(d) The Congress further declares that if at any time such requisite manpower strengths are not attained and maintained by voluntary means, the national security requires that they be provided through a system of compulsory selective service.

(e) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of such service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selecton as hereinafter provided.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I discussed this matter with the Speaker and the floor leaders. It is our intention to let the amendments run just as freely as possible, but there is a great desire to finish the bill as soon as possible. So I must say to my good friend and former colleague on the Committee on Military Affairs that I must object to the request for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I will quote also from the Detroit meeting of the Ordnance Association some remarks of General McNarney, Commanding General of the Air Matériel Command.

Several years would be required to tool up for proper production because of the weakened state of the aviation industry.

If war occurred today, the Air Force combat groups would be composed primarily of planes that were on the drawing boards prior to Pearl Harbor.

In the forty-eighth annual edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica I found an article just off the press by Brig. Gen. Edwin L. Sibert, Assistant Director of our Central Intelligence Group. I was interested in seeing what he had to say about Russia on equipment. I quote:

The Soviet Union spent more than $1,225,000,000 in 1947 on military strength. An additional $9,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 was spent on new equipment. A considerable proportion of the allotment to research was spent on atom-bomb development. More than 500 German scientists worked on the development of new and improved weapons, particularly guided missiles, tanks, and aircraft. A new tank, probably the largest in the world, was developed.

In going over General Eisenhower's final report of the Chief of Staff, United States Army, to Secretary of the Army, dated February 7, 1948, I will quote certain parts that I thought were very important. The first is found on page 8:

Many lessons of the last war are available for the design of a defense pattern: The necessity for unified direction of all combat forces in war; the strategic role of the air arm; the need for accurate military, economic, and political intelligence; the necessity of eliminating the costly industrial time lag between mobilization and the application of significant military effort; the necessity for ready Reserve units and a reservoir of trained men; the dependence of the United States for many raw materials on external sources and the consequent need for stock piling adequate reserves of critical items essential to a defense program.

Again, over on page 19:

Widespread dispersion of factories or the establishment of underground facilities is an obvious remedy. However, the economic, social and political obstacles in the way of mass dispersion are so numerous and stupendous as to make an accomplishment practically impossible.

Then I was interested in an article in Factory Management for May 1948, by Robert Magidoff, McGraw-Hill World News correspondent who was expelled from Russia on April 15 of this year. I will not take the time to quote those extracts, but I do wish that the Members of the House would read them. I insert them as part of my remarks so that you will have some idea of what Russia has done to disperse and spread out back of the Ural Mountains their industrial development:

Russia is producing several times the volume of war weapons that the United States is turning out. For example, the Soviets, according to United States Army testimony, are producing 12 times as many combat aircraft as we are building.

And, more important, they are sacrificing their civilian economy to a large extent to multiply munitions-producing capacity.

* * * * * *

It would be a fatal error to accept Russia's low standard of living as indicating a comparably low war potential. Russia's war potential is very much greater than her low standard of living might lead Americans to believe.

* * * * * *

The building up of huge new industrial centers in Russia's interior—beyond reach, the Russians hope, of American planes carrying atomic bombs. More than half of her current industrial investment is now going into these new centers, many beyond the Urals.

Much of this vast decentralization movement is already complete. Some 1,300 plants and 15,000,000 workers and their families were shifted eastward during the war. Most of them have remained there. By 1950, half of all Russia's steel and coal will come from the East—where only one-third did before the war. Shifts in other industries are comparable.

Yet our own Chief of Staff said that was too vast a project for us to undertake.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Since the gentleman has referred to this report, in that report it is also stated that Russia has 3,800,000 men in her army and the United States has 670,000. Is that not correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. DURHAM. That is a vast difference.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. There is quite a difference. I must say they are certainly carrying out a balanced program on some points we are completely overlooking.

What is the condition in our own country? I am leading up here to a situation that has developed in the Eightieth Congress, something you are going to have to carry home and explain to your people. As I have stated above, General Bradley and General McNarney have told us we do not have adequate and balanced arms and ammunition for the armed forces to be raised through the draft as presently planned. In the Committee on Appropriations Secretary Krug, on April 29, regarding stock piles, said:

Frankly, I will let the committee know that military strategic stock piles don't exist.

He is talking about America.

We have a few items that are not important, but on the extremely important, critical materials, we have virtually nothing in the stock pile.

In commercial use we are pinched in practically every way, and we will even be more pinched with the increase in productivity activity that must come to meet this heavy production program for foreign aid and the defense program.

The foregoing situation makes the action of the Rules Committee extremely illogical in bringing before the House the bill, H. R. 6401, which proposes to draft men into military service in peacetime, and on the same day disapproving and refusing to bring before Congress the Russell bill, H. R. 6623, for national mineral development and conservation, which has for its purpose the building of a healthy mining industry and the building of our stockpile of strategic and critical materials pursuant to Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. As I stated in my speech which appears on page A3864, we must face the present situation in international affairs with sounder logic as to our own preparedness. If war is upon us, the responsible leaders in our Government should be severely punished for America's failure to preserve and produce an adequate supply of weapons for our defense and an adequate stockpile of strategic and critical materials for the making of new and superior weapons. Their total failure to do these things and their total failure to disperse our own postwar industrial development in this atomic age completely discredit the claim of the proponents of compulsory military service that the enactment of H. R. 6401 is necessary or logical at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 2, line 11, strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "and without discrimination in selection or service, or segregation on account of race, creed, color, or national origin."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane, and therefore should not be considered at this point.

Mr. JAVITS. May I be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment was offered at that point in the bill which declares the policy of Congress, and the bill itself provides that service should be shared in accordance with a fair and just system of selection. I respectfully submit that the amendment I have offered states in more specific terms what is a fair and just system of selection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's argument simply sustains what I have said. This amendment is absolutely not germane to this section of the bill and has no place in it. Therefore, I submit that my point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). The Chair calls attention to the fact that the amendment is directed to subparagraph (e), which reads:

The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of such service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selection as hereinafter provided.

The amendment inserts a semicolon and adds the following language:

and without discrimination in selection or service or segregation on account of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The Chair is of the opinion that the language proposed by the amendment clearly follows the suggestion of a fair and just system in the declaration of policy. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, there is bound to be a considerable amount of discussion about the issue just raised by my amendment to the declaration of policy in this bill. I can think of no more appropriate place to have that discussion than right in the declaration of policy.

I served in the Army of the United States, as did so many other Members of the Congress, as an officer in the operations branch. We were taught that it was proper to order what, where, and when, but never how. Therefore when I read this bill to try to decide where this issue of discrimination and segregation ought to be raised—because I am firmly convinced that if we are to have a citizens' army, which is the basic rationale of this bill, it must be a citizens' army with discrimination or segregation excised—I felt it ought to be in the declaration of policy. When the Congress has declared the policy of the United States, for both military and civil officers to follow, then we can of right expect compliance in the administration of selective service.

I might say now that I shall offer at a later point in the bill an amendment to set up a committee composed of representatives from the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, and Education and Labor, which will be empowered to watch that the civil, rather than the military, remains dominant in the military policy of the United States. The text of this amendment follows:

Page 48, line 24, insert the following new section and remember the succeeding sections accordingly:

"SEC. 21. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Military Policy (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of 18 members, as follows: (1) Three members who are members of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, two from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (2) two members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (3) two members from the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman; (4) two members from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (5) three members who are members of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, two from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (6) two members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (7) two members from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (8) two members from the Education and Labor Committee of the House, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee.

"A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(b) It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the military policy of the United States with respect to (1) its capability to enable the United States to discharge its international responsibilities; (2) the dominance of civilian control in the military policy; (3) the training and orientation in citizenship of the personnel of the armed forces; and (4) the participation of personnel of the armed forces in the foreign and domestic affairs of the United States, and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration of the military policy of the United States.

"Upon request the committee shall aid the several standing committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over the military policy of the United States and shall make reports to the Senate and House of Representatives from time to time concerning the results of its studies together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable. The Director, at the request of the committee, shall consult with the committee from time to time with respect to the actions of the committee.

"(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

"(d) The committee is authorized to appoint and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians and organizations thereof, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman."

I served as Government appeal agent of a draft board in the course of the first months of the draft before I went into Army service myself. In that capacity I interviewed hundreds of Negro inductees, as my board was right in the heart of a district largely composed of Negro families. Man after man said to me, "I want to serve my country. I love the United States for everything it has given to me, and for the opportunities which it gives me, but I have this gnawing feeling that in some parts of the country, and for some reasons which I cannot understand, I am put down as a second-class citizen. That is something that worries me and bothers me very much." I said to those men from my own experience that much had been and would be accomplished to make this not so, and that in addition they had the constitutional right, a God-given right of every American, to seek and to fight for change.

We are here in Congress to see that inductees who are of a minority race, creed, or color should not have this gnawing feeling when they are called upon to serve the country equally with other citizens. I believe we can do that, and do it effectively by stating the policy, by setting forth clearly and precisely in the declaration of policy which precedes everything else in the bill, that there will be no discrimination in selection or service, or segregation on grounds of race, creed, color or national origin. This is where I think we ought to have this question considered and decided.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. Is the gentleman in sympathy with the over-all objectives of this legislation? Does he expect to support it?

Mr. JAVITS. If the gentleman will permit me to continue, I think I will make that very clear.

Mr. COLMER. I wanted to ask that question as preliminary to another question.

Mr. JAVITS. I will make that clear, and if I had more time, I would be glad

to yield further, under the circumstances I hope the gentleman will forgive me for not yielding further.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman has yielded to me.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield no further if the gentleman will forgive me. I would like to make this point: As I see this particular piece of legislation, it has to fit in, if it fits in at all, with the over-all foreign policy of the United States. As I see it, that policy is premised on three bases: Assistance by us toward European economic recovery and economic recovery in other parts of the world; but based on the self-help and mutual cooperation of those assisted; a strong and effective United States adequate to preserve the peace; and the ability by the United States to perform its international responsibilities wherever it has to perform them to stand by our obligations under the Atlantic charter and war and post-war agreements to give self-determination and democracy to all peoples. The intent of this bill should be and what this bill should be directed toward, is implementing our capability to perform our international responsibilities.

That, in my opinion, can be its only justification if there is to be a peacetime draft. I believe those who are observing us to see whether we intend to perform our international responsibilities will judge us not by what we say or even by how many dollars we are willing to grant or lend alone, but by whether the United States is also willing if necessary to implement our foreign policy with the service of citizens, whether we mean what we say, when we say that the United States intends to perform its international responsibilities and to back that up with every resource at its command, financial and material.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentleman state if this is the segregation amendment? Is it not stated in the bill exactly who is going to be inducted into the service of the United States? Is there anything about segregation?

Mr. JAVITS. My amendment deals with policy, and so requires both the policy of antidiscrimination and the policy of antisegregation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to put the House on notice that, at the proper time, I shall offer an amendment to section 23.

This amendment, I believe, will give the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] his concrete proposal to do something about building an army by voluntary methods.

The amendment will read:

Strike out section 23 and substitute therefor the following:

"Sec. 23. No person shall be registered or inducted under this act until January 31, 1949, and then only after the President, with the concurrence of the Congress, shall find that sufficient voluntary enlistments have not been provided by an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign. This intensified campaign shall be instituted by the armed forces promptly upon the enactment of this act and shall include the following provisions:

"(a) base pay of enlisted men shall be increased by 25 percent for all grades.

"(b) passing mark on the Army general classification test shall be reduced to not more than 70 points.

"(c) two-year new enlistments shall be accepted for all age groups suitable for military service, with enlistment privileges at least similar to those now provided for longer term enlistments.

"(d) one-year and two-year reenlistments shall be accepted, with proportionate payment of any reenlistment incentives, and other privileges similar to those now provided for longer term reenlistments.

"(e) regular monthly reports and consultation on the methods and results of the intensified campaign shall be furnished by the armed forces to a special joint committee of the Senate and House Armed Services Committee established for that purpose."

That will be my amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] strikes at the very heart of what I said a few minutes ago in the course of general debate.

In response to a question asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] by one of his colleagues, "Does this amendment strike at discrimination and segregation?" we say, unqualifiedly, "Yes."

"Does it also include selection and service?" Yes.

During the wartime certain efforts were made by outstanding people of America, of both races, to see that the army fighting for world democracy from the United States was a democratic army. We were engaged in a people's war, and we wanted to attain a people's victory, and we knew it could not be attained except through a people's army. We were told during that period by our leadership, from our great Commander in Chief, Mr. Roosevelt, on down, that during wartime was not the time to make any significant changes. Nevertheless, under our late President certain experimental groups were set up in Europe, and certain units of our armed services in the Army, in the Navy, and in the Coast Guard, served without any discrimination or segregation. So well did this policy work out that the Coast Guard adopted it as its policy. In response to a letter from the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Coast Guard said that they were in favor of the Powell bill—my bill—to eliminate discrimination in the armed services. The Navy did likewise.

I would like to remind the gentleman again of what I said a few moments ago, that it was the specific pledge of the Republican Party of 1940 and 1944 to "eliminate segregation in the armed services."

I should like to remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the President's Commission on Universal Military Training also unqualifiedly recommend that we have an armed service without any segregation.

There is no war on now. No excuse can be given. This is peacetime. We are getting together a citizens' Army to show the world we are strong. The world, however, is not going to believe that we are anything but hypocrites. A lot of us have traveled throughout the world since World War I, and we know with what skepticism our actions here are being viewed in various sections of the earth; and logically, because they do not believe that we practice in America the democracy that we are trying to sell Europe and other places specifically.

Let us have a people's Army or let us have a Fascist Army, one or the other, because that is the choice here before us.

We make no apology for the way the Negro has served this Nation. You cannot find any minority group in America that has served our Nation more loyally than my people have served; no minority from the earliest days of the birth of this Republic. On that day on Boston Common, the first man to die for this Nation in 1773, that first person to fall was a Negro. We have done enough for this country not to be treated as second-class citizens but as first-class citizens. We have proven ourselves.

When George Washington's ragged irregulars of the Continental Army swept over the snows at Valley Forge there were 10,000 black men marching with him.

When Commodore Perry fought his battles on Lake Erie 70 percent of his men were Negro sailors.

In the war with Spain, when Teddy Roosevelt swept up San Juan Hill, Negro cavalrymen rode with him.

When Black Jack Pershing went into Mexico the black troops of the Tenth Cavalry were by his side. In World Wars I and II we were there.

This is the bill, this is the time to tell the world by our actions that we believe in this democracy that we preach and teach or shut up and confess our hypocrisy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot bring debate on this first amendment to a close. This is merely the preamble of the bill.

I move that all debate on this amendment close in 7 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope the gentleman will not press his motion.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the motion.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, this is not an easy task that we are called upon to perform today. I am sure every Member has not only thought over this measure, but has prayed over it.

There has been quite a bit of talk to the effect that this bill will break up the families to take these youngsters into the service. I left my home and family when I was 19. It did not break up our family and the 2 years of service I put in in the service and two more in hospitals following the First World War did not demoralize me. I have an 18-year-old daughter who left last fall to attend a school hundreds of miles away. She went out from under our control but it did not break up our family. The fact that many young men may leave home under this bill will not break up their families. They do it every year to obtain employment and for many other reasons.

I too am a Christian. To serve your country in time of need is not un-Christian. I can remember very well reading that when Christ went before Pilate He told Pilate:

My kingdom is not of this world, but if My kingdom were of this world, then would My people fight.

In other words, as head of an earthly kingdom—a nation—He would have an army.

I recall that when He was in the garden of Gethsemane in those darkest of dark hours, He told His followers who were without swords to sell their coats and buy themselves one. This is what this preparedness program means to us today.

Furthermore, that Christ said to His disciples that in days of old it was said "thou shalt not kill," but Christ said that he who is angry with his brother without just cause is in danger of condemnation. Certainly ruthless forces are abroad in the world today and we have every right to rise in righteous anger and not fear that condemnation will be heaped upon us.

I feel, however, that there should be safeguards placed in this legislation and at the proper time I will offer an amendment on page 4 to section (b) which might be called an amendment to regulate the regulators. We can recall when Selective Service Director Hershey ignored the express and direct language and edicts of Congress and that we as Members of Congress had to pass a law to repeal a regulation issued by the Director of Selective Service relating to farm exemptions.

The amendment I shall offer is as follows:

(a) Before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of this act shall be issued by any governmental agency exercising authority conferred hereunder, other than intra-agency administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of its activities or interagency rules governing relations with other agencies of the Government, a draft thereof shall be submitted to the President of the Senate for the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House for the House of Representatives.

(b) The draft of such proposed regulation or order shall be immediately assigned to the Committee on Armed Services in the Senate and to the Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives for study, to consider whether such rule or regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, intent, letter and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of powers herein granted is proposed. Such regulation or order may be approved or disapproved by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either. In the absence of action by either committee approving or disapproving such regulation or order, it may go into effect not earlier than the fifteenth day following, but not including, the date of the receipt of the draft of such proposed regulation or order by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. If sooner approved by either committee, it may go into effect immediately upon such approval. Disapproval of such regulation or order by either committee shall suspend its issuance: *Provided*, that in the event of conflicting committee actions, the earlier action shall govern.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, are authorized to sit and act during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, if there ever was a time when legislation like this should be under the direct control of Congress it is now. May I say to my friends who fear that militarism or a military clique will rule this Nation that as long as we have a House of Representatives which is alert to its duty and does it, we need have no fear of a military control. The Congress, the House and the Senate, can control the military by controlling the purse strings which furnishes the dollars which pays the troops and buys the supplies. When you control the money you certainly have controlled every activity of the armed forces. The American Congress will not shirk its duty nor forsake those they represent. No military coup need be feared as long as we have constitutional government.

Mr. Chairman, some mention has been made of the Organized Reserves and the National Guard. Those two units did get off to a bad start because the President curtailed and stopped the spending of over half of their funds in the first year, fiscal 1947, their formative year. Congress has remedied that and I am sure you will see in the coming months that both the National Guard and the Organized Reserves will make rapid strides and with a well-rounded, well-thought-out program of training, we will again have civilian components that will be ready to answer the call of the country in time of need.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my sincere conviction that if we had been prepared—if we had been militarily strong we would not have been involved in either World War I or World War II. Twice we have been lucky in having strong allies who were able to fight while we armed and trained. Dare we take a chance on unpreparedness a third time, especially when we stand almost alone?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on one occasion when England was emerging from one war and threatened with another, Shakespeare described the condition of the British people in these words:

So shaken as we are, so wan with care,
Find we a time for frighted peace to pant,
And breathe short-winded accents of new broils
To be commenc'd in strands afar remote.

It seems to me that we only emerge from one war when certain elements begin to pull the scare of another conflict in strands far remote.

Mr. Chairman, I look in the faces of men I served with in the Sixty-seventh Congress, and I am reminded that in 1921, right after the First World War, the same efforts were made to induce Congress to adopt militarism. Now, what is militarism? There can be but one answer. It is universal, compulsory military service in times of peace with all the armaments that go with it.

If we will build the strongest air force on earth, and keep an ample supply of atomic bombs on hand, it will not be necessary to transform America into a military camp or to transform our Government into a military dictatorship, which I fear will follow the passage of legislation of this kind.

For that reason I am opposed to the passage of this bill.

I want to say a word in opposition to the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr JAVITS].

This is an attempt to stir up the race question by representatives of certain minorities, or misrepresentatives of certain minorities.

They attempt to frighten the Congress into passing legislation that is unreasonable, unnecessary, unjustifiable, and which will do more harm to all people than it will do good.

You cannot reverse the laws of nature by an act of Congress. You cannot please anybody who wants to stir up the racial question for personal or political gains. You cannot afford to ignore the vast majority of the white Americans who will serve under this law, if it passes, and bring upon them a condition that will do infinitely more harm than good.

For that reason I say that this amendment should be voted down. And those Members who are always whining about racial minorities had better remember that there are some majorities in America that are going to be heard from.

Now, I am speaking for the majority—the white Americans who fight the Nation's battles in time of war and sustain its institutions in time of peace. I am tired of these misrepresentatives of racial minorities getting up here, whining about race discriminations, and trying to pass legislation or adopt amendments that would injure the great majority of the men in the service and would not do the minorities any good.

I hope the amendment is voted down.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, listening to the gentleman from Kansas I was almost persuaded that war was a good thing. I heard him tell what Christ said, and I heard him quote the Scripture. If one had not listened closely, he might have thought that war was a glorious pastime. We all know it is a curse to mankind and to nations.

I remember from my early days' training when the children of Israel decided that they could no longer make brick without straw that they even walked across the Red Sea and the Lord let them out by rolling the water back for a dry

path across. Then I remember when they got a little uppity from time to time, they had some trouble with their neighbors, and the Lord sent them back to the wilderness to dig a few roots, after they got hungry, to get something to eat, until they behaved themselves and became God-fearing again.

I remember the gentleman from Kansas saying that he went to war at 19. His home was not broken up, so he said. Somebody from his family went somewhere, but still the home was all right. He did not say anything about those young men who were married and went across the sea to fight a war for the four freedoms and did not come back; he did not say a word about them. They died and were buried and their homes knew them no more. Oh, I know it is wonderfully fine when the boys march down the street with the flags awaving, drums abeating, fifes athrilling, the bands aplaying, the crowds cheering. That is a wonderful sight, but I never heard of many of the cheering throngs going down to meet the ships when the boys came back in boxes. Just a few old rags, a few musty bones. Yes, there were some homes broken up. What about these measures we have up now to build houses? Had the boys stayed at home, maybe they would have built their own homes. What about the two or three million young women of America, the would-be mothers of the future soldiers? If you are going to have wars, just who are they going to marry? Who are going to be the fathers of their children? There are two or three million of these young girls who have no opportunity to marry a fine young American. Maybe they can marry those brought in in these foreign labor battalions. Perhaps they can marry some of the Jamaicans, some of the Mexicans, or even some of the refugees from concentration camps, 200,000 of whom are to be rushed to America. I do not know. But, those are the things that we ought to think about.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] talks about liberty so often. He is a very eloquent man, a good American. I wonder if he really believes in the America we have known and which has given us all so much. I wonder if he does.

What is this amendment, and what will it do? Why, the boys that enlist under it, if I interpret it rightly, will be forced into a regiment where they must associate with and fight with others of various races whether they will or no. Do we not fight better, more courageously, more tenaciously, when we fight with those we like? The gentleman may not like me. Should we have a law which will force him to sleep in my bed, in my room with me, to eat with me, if he does not like me nor my ways?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield now, but I will ask the gentleman sometime to answer this question, which is fundamental: When does preference begin and when does it end? When does preference cease and discrimination begin? The gentleman married the lady of his choice. I am sure, without knowing his younger days, or being acquainted with him in those days, that there were many, many young ladies who would have been happy and honored to have been asked into wedlock by him. And what did he do? He discriminated—yes, he did—against all the other women he knew. You may laugh if you want to but that is true. My question is, Where does the right to choose your associates, business and social and in marriage, end, and where, for what and when are you to be accused of discrimination?

Would the gentleman have felt that he was free had he been compelled to marry, I will say, the first good-looking, intelligent young woman, true American, who stepped up and said that she would like to be his wife? Oh, no; no, no. He would have fought to the bitter end, even if she had had millions of dollars; I am sure he would.

There is something wrong with American statesmanship, with those who guide the destinies of this Nation of ours. Here we are at the end of the war, according to Churchill and in our own estimation the greatest, the richest, the most powerful Nation in all the world, and yet what? We want to adopt the methods of Hitler and Stalin and force our men into the Army, as they did. What for? We have the most of everything good in this country, have we not, of any people in all the world? The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] nods "Yes." Sure we have. Then are we so lacking in patriotism that our young people would not volunteer if they believed their services were needed? No, indeed. If the Army would make the proper regulations they would come in if there was need but they are not fooled by the internationalists nor those who, too old to serve, are willing that American blood be shed everywhere any time some "thinker" thinks it is our duty to save the world.

Mr. POWELL. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In everything I said?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, first I should like very briefly to state my feelings on this bill. I despise isolationism. I have never been an isolationist. Way back as far as 1935, when President Roosevelt made his now historic speech, I backed him strongly. I did not believe then and I do not believe today that we can shut ourselves off from what is happening in the rest of the world.

My first reaction to the present draft bill was, of course, if the Army needs the draft to meet our commitments around the world, we must give it to them, even at the risk of departing from our democratic tradition with all the serious implications of that departure.

When the last draft was passed on the eve of war, the gentleman from Texas reminded us that it passed with one vote. I was one of those who sat at the phone in California and called California Congressmen and every other Representative I knew in this House, begging them to vote for that draft.

The draft in 1940 was needed to protect our Nation. There is no imminent danger of war today. There is no testimony in the hearings on this bill to the contrary. There is world-wide tension. On that we are all agreed and it should be the business of this Nation to try to relieve that tension.

Presumably, it is because we would prevent another and more terrible war that the Army has asked the Congress to pass this compulsory peacetime draft. The draft is asked today so that we may preserve the peace, and I am all for that; but I do not want to destroy our democratic way of life in the process.

I approached this bill with the attitude that I would of course vote for the draft if the Army needed it. However, because compulsory military training has such far-reaching implications, I could not come to a sudden decision in this matter. I locked myself in with the Senate and House committee hearings and every bit of evidence I could get on the subject.

I approached the subject in one frame of mind. At the end of my studies I was convinced that the need for the draft had not been proved.

I do not think a sincere effort has been made to obtain young men through the voluntary system. You ask me, will I vote for this bill? I will, if the amendment read by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is attached at the end of the bill. If I were convinced that men could not be gotten by voluntary methods, if I were convinced that every sincere effort had been made to obtain men by voluntary efforts, then I would vote for the bill before us. For some reason, and I impugn the motives of no one, certain of the armed forces want this draft. Let us put it on the highest plane. They want it because of the psychological impact that it might have on Russia, of course, hoping then that that would be another deterrent that would keep them from war. Well, in Heaven's name, if the atomic bomb will not stop them, if the biggest Navy in the world will not stop them—I voted for the 70-group Air Force, and I will vote for the aircraft carrier bill when it comes up—if these will not stop them, do you mean to say that the draft will?

Let us boil it down to a very few words—I see ourselves in this draft bill erecting a mental Maginot line built out of the young men of this country.

Where is the integrated program that is needed to truly defend this country by permitting us to win the peace? Where is the price control that we need? Where is the allocation program? Where is the program to expand our steel capacity? Why did we cut the steam plant out of the TVA program? This cut down our power capacity.

Why has the Congress wantonly tried to destroy the reciprocal trade program without which world-wide economic recovery is impossible?

There is a great hue and cry against controls from those who would now draft the young men of America without having first made the simple corrections in Army life that might make drafting unnecessary.

I shall insert in the RECORD the testimony given by Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, CIO, before the Senate Committee on Armed Services which I think is one of the most intelligent and comprehensive statements made on the subject of total preparedness for peace.

Winning the war was not an easy job. Winning the peace is not easy either. We had better make up our minds to that fact. Drafting the young men of America will not make up for our failures to grapple with the problems that confront us at home and abroad realistically.

I support the amendment of the gentleman from New York. Of course I support it. The man whom I have revered most in political life was Franklin D. Roosevelt. The reason why I entered politics was to support Franklin D. Roosevelt and his program for the people. I believe President Roosevelt would support this amendment today.

I resent very much the suggestion that Members who stand on the floor of this House in support of antidiscriminatory measures represent minority groups, and that that is their only interest in such amendments. I think I express the feeling of the majority of Americans in this country when I support a democratic army free from discrimination. I ask the gentleman from New York: Under President Roosevelt during the war did we not have an Executive order which in effect laid down exactly the principles that you are proposing today?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the gentlewoman is better acquainted with the terms of that order than I am. The intent I have is very clearly expressed in this amendment. It is to that ultimate effect. I am not aware of the specific details of the order.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I believe that was the case. Mr. Chairman, it is my simple belief that we should work for greater unity. Surely, a democratic country should have a democratic army. That was the policy laid down in the last war. It is the policy which we should follow today. Discrimination and segregation in the armed forces and traditional Jim Crow policies have the serious result of emphasizing irrelevant differences and in effect create a white army and a black army, instead of an American Army.

Just as I despise isolationism, so I despise any kind of isolationism in the community which sets one group apart, and I beg you in thinking of this bill to think of all the people in their proper perspective in relation to Almighty God.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a great congressional district in the South, and I believe that in rising in opposition to this amendment, I am representing the people of my district of all colors, all races, and all creeds. I frankly do not believe that the Negroes in my district want to break down the segregation laws. I rather believe that they prefer to keep their separate churches, their separate schools, and their separate recreational centers. I do not believe that they would want their Congressman to vote for this amendment, and even if they did want me to vote for it, I would not vote for it, because I know enough about the relationship between the races in the South to know what this thing just would not work.

As the advocates of this amendment have pointed out, we never have lost a war, and yet through every war we have had segregation of the races. Why it is that some Members of Congress seem to believe that Negroes want to camp and sleep with the white people and that the white people want to sleep with the Negroes, I just do not understand.

I will wager there is not a Member of Congress from a southern district, where Negroes are greatly in the majority in some places, who has had a single petition or a single letter or a single telegram from a single Negro asking him to break down the segregation laws. All of this originates north of the Mason-Dixon line. I cannot help but believe that those who are trying to put this amendment on this bill want to make it so obnoxious and so objectionable that many people who would like to vote for the bill would be forced to vote against it.

I do not see any good that could be accomplished. Even during the war, when Negroes went side by side with white men away from my district, I never received a single complaint from a single Negro anywhere in Europe, Asia, or anywhere. Yet the proposition is now put up to me to support an amendment to force white folks and Negroes to associate together.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Does not the majority of the people have any rights in this country? We are told about the rights of minorities. What about the rights of the majority to do as they please?

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman. I think we are making a mountain out of a molehill. I do not want to impugn the motives of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who introduced this amendment, or any man who supports it, but, frankly, it is a ridiculous proposition, and every right-thinking man in this House knows it.

It seems to me that some of the good Negroes in my district, and I know many of them are my friends, and I am their friend, and they feel free to discuss all of their problems with me when I go home—it seems to me that some of them, from the pulpits or the platforms or some place, would have communicated with me saying, "I want you to break down the segregation laws in the armed forces."

Why should a Negro feel that he is a second-class citizen because he is in company with other Negroes? There is no more reason for his feeling that way than there is for a white man to feel he is inferior because he is in a separate barracks and marches with a separate group. They are all fighting for the same cause. They all have the same interest at stake. It seems to me we should come to an end of this proposition once and for all. It will never be done. There is no way you can pass Federal laws to make the white people of the South accept the Negro on social equality.

A Negro schoolteacher asked me to make his commencement speech. I would have readily agreed to do so except for the fact I was not going to be home. I asked him why he did not get one of the Negro Congressmen to come down and make a speech for him.

He said, "No, sir, lawyer. I wouldn't think of it." He said, "They would come down here and start talking about social equality and break up my school and cause more trouble than I would ever be able to get over."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS), there were—ayes 23, noes 135.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 1? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the number of persons on active service in the Army of the United States is hereby authorized to be 837,000; in the Navy, including the Marine Corps, the present statutory authorized strength of 666,882; and in the Air Force of the United States, 502,000: *Provided*, That the number of persons provided for in this section shall be construed to mean the daily average number of persons in the armed forces during the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the number of persons who are serving on active duty for training purposes only and the number of officer candidates shall be excluded in computing the number of persons within these authorized strengths or on active service.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: On page 3, line 2, after the period strike out: "*Provided further*, That there shall be no discrimination on account of race, creed, or color in each and every branch of the armed services."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to say a word to my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. The gentleman from Michigan and I are very good friends. We do not agree on anything but we are good friends. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] said that I married the person of my choice. He is right; but this bill does not allow you to do what you want to do; you are drafted under this bill. However, Mr. HOFFMAN, if I had been drafted into marriage, I would have done my best. Just as I expect

white and Negro men to do their best in a nonsegregated army.

I wish to say to my colleague from Texas who spoke last that I appreciate his point of view, I understand it, I understand the problems that he faces and that sort of thing. I don't agree with him. But there are certain things that I should like to enlighten him about that are happening in this world and have already happened.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, some very radical changes have taken place all over America, in Texas as well. I have been in Texas repeatedly, I have been to his city. Lots of things are taking place down there that I am sure he is aware of, but maybe he forgot when he said there has been no desire for a change in segregation. Because changes have and are taking place.

He undoubtedly forgets that a very militant effort was made by outstanding white people and Negroes of Texas, not we damned Yankees from the North, to get Negroes admitted to the law school of the University of Texas. The Supreme Court of the United States has handed down a decision in that case and supported them.

The gentleman from Texas also probably does not know—or forgot, rather—that Negroes are voting in such vast quantities in Texas now that in the city of Houston, for instance, one of the Congressmen running there in July will be defeated or elected according to the Negro vote. There are between 30,000 and 40,000 registered Negro voters in Houston, Tex., where just 2 years ago there were not 1,000. Changes are taking place.

When the gentleman from Texas says that Negroes and whites will not serve together in the armed forces, then may I enlighten him and you: They have served and are serving on a nonsegregated basis right now in the Coast Guard and in the United States Navy. And our Navy is not any weaker. Our Navy is the greatest navy in the world, not only by virtue of its tonnage, but by virtue of the fact that men, irrespective of race, creed, or color, are serving together side by side. This they always did until the 1920's when the rules were changed, but now under liberal leadership the rules have again been changed and Negroes and whites are serving together.

May I say to him also that you may not have received many letters from Negroes in the South about this, but I will be happy to show you letters from Negro people in the South to me from your district saying that they would like to see a genuine people's democracy established in these United States, rather than a segregated one.

May I say, finally, that, yes; the majority do have rights, but the first right of a majority in a democracy is to see that all people, irrespective of whether they belong to the majority or the minority, are treated equal. That is what democracy is. Of course, if you do not believe in a democratic form of government you should not be here.

This amendment I have offered says that Negroes shall serve in all branches of the services of our Government without discrimination. I say that because during World War II the vast majority of the Negroes who were drafted were forced to serve in the Quartermaster Corps. There are Negro men today products of the schools of Texas and the other 47 States. They have been especially trained, they are equipped to serve in every branch of the armed services. If you will go back into the Army records, you will read there, according to the Army psychological tests, that where a Negro has been given the same opportunity that a white man has been given, his psychological test is the same and his efficiency rating is the same. In fact, Negro Alpha Beta tests showed a higher I. Q. of New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan and Ohio than whites of Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana and Georgia.

This is only going to make America stronger, not weaker: if we give the Negro man an opportunity to serve in all branches of our services without discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments to the section close in 8 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO), there were—ayes 110, noes 14.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman offers a rather peculiar amendment. Let me read it to you:

On page 3, line 2, after the period, strike out *"Provided further"*—

and so forth.

There is no such language in the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Insert.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says now he means "insert" instead of "strike out." That is all right, if that is what he meant. But I was just wondering if he is just as mistaken in his theory of life and as to how we should do things as he was in drawing that amendment.

He is correct when he says this measure is different than some things to which he made reference previously. He states, and he is correct, that under this legislation Uncle Sam goes out and grabs the young men. That is true.

And he grabs them with just as arbitrary a grip, just as securely and just as finally, as ever did a Hitler or a Stalin. When Uncle Sam grabs them, they go, and they fight when and where—and they will be fighting for what reason or for no reason—they will be fighting on the order of that superworld organization known as the United Nations, controlled by individuals who have no interest whatever in America, her people, or her future.

That is why this amendment should not be in there, or any amendment of this kind, because after Uncle Sam grabs them he would under the gentlemen's agreement mix them all up together, according to the gentleman's theory, and put them all in one place according to chance.

That gets back to my original argument. We fight better when we are doing the things we want to do and are fighting for the things in which we believe.

Now, I still believe, in my own ignorant way, that the Lord did create the heaven and the earth. I do not know of any other way to account for our existence. If God wanted us to be all of one kind, I think he would have made us all black or yellow or brown or white, any one of these four colors. Maybe there are a lot more, I do not know. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] shakes his head. I accept his statement. But, the ultimate objective of most of these people that advocate this sort of legislation is amalgamation of the races, and in that I do not believe, because I think the Lord tried to do a fairly good job, and I do not believe that these modern agitators—I will not call them rabblerousers, and I am not referring to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for I think he is sincere, but those who sincerely believe as does my good friend from New York—I do not believe they know any more about how the people should be colored or live than did the Lord. Maybe I am wrong about that, and maybe the Lord was wrong about that, but that is the way he left it. Some black, some brown, some yellow, some white, some tall, some short, some fat, some thin. My experience tells me, whether it is with plants or animals or flowers or human beings, when you begin to cross them indiscriminately and mix them up, the ultimate result, while it may be an improvement in some strains, the strains that are better will go down. I think an examination of the history of those countries where we have had that sort of thing will show that while perhaps the brown or the yellow or the colored race has been advanced in some way by association and intermarriage and interbreeding with the whites, the over-all result and the average on the whole has been lower and downward. That is why I do not believe in this kind of an amendment, for while it says nothing about intermarriage that is usually where the thing ends.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman does not understand my amendment. My amendment does not advocate social equality. We are dealing with a draft bill, and it is going to be of importance. It would be very interesting if that did occur, though.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right. The gentleman said "interesting," did he? It might be. But, there are many things that are interesting that are not for the good of the human race; many, many things, and I do not want to try some experiment which I honestly believe will lower the standard of our people just because it is interesting.

I know that none of these amendments on its face deals either with social equality or with intermarriage, but I do remember many, many previous discussions and arguments which began with the proposition that there should be no denial of opportunity because of race, creed, color or state of origin, and to that proposition I wholeheartedly subscribe.

But that was never the end of the argument. Well do I recall that when, some years ago, a special committee of this House had before it Mr. Ross, who was then the head of President Roosevelt's FEPC, witness after witness appeared and, while, in the beginning, the controversy was all over the question of equality of opportunity in employment, almost always, either directly or openly or subtly and by implication, the advocates of the FEPC were insisting upon social equality and intermarriage of the races.

There should be not only equality of opportunity as to employment and education, there should be opportunity for equality of social intercourse. But never should there be an attempt made by law to force upon either the individual or any group the society, social intercourse, with those with whom they do not choose to associate.

The Constitution does guarantee equality of opportunity, but it also guarantees the right of every man to seek his own happiness through the choice of his own associates.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 19, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and of every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and thirty-one, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is amazing to me that serious consideration can be given to a peacetime draft proposal at this time in view of the information that we have. If our information is incorrect, then we should be properly advised. No such enlightenment has been forthcoming from the proponents of this measure. Aside from the fact that we generally understand that conditions throughout the world are unsettled, we are called upon to act in hysteria and further disrupt our own economy. We are told that a peacetime draft is necessary in order to bring our armed services up to the necessary strength. We are asked to accept this in spite of the fact that we know that such a statement is not true. There are many present here today who heard me personally ask Major General Vandenberg of the Army Air Force whether or not they were able to obtain all of the men they need by voluntary enlistment. Those who were present heard the General reply that they had a backlog of applications and that they had stopped recruiting. You know that the Navy and the Marine Corps do not want and do not need this peacetime conscription. You are all aware of the fact that the physical standards of the Army have been raised as well as the mental requirements. You are aware of the fact that the Army, for which this peacetime conscription is primarily intended, clings to the old-fashioned recruiting methods.

The armed forces need men trained for various duties. We have learned that these men can be better trained in civilian life and in private industry than they can be trained in the armed forces. Carpenters, electricians, machinists, mechanics of all kinds, are needed in modern warfare. By leaving these men in their civilian occupations they can perform useful service in providing the things we need, and at the same time they are being trained better than they could be if they were inducted into the Army. We are going into a period of uncertainty for the young men of this country and their families and upset homes and lives in a manner unprecedented. We are losing sight of the fact that employers will be very reluctant to hire and train men within the draft ages, because of the uncertainty which will exist due to the possibility of these men being inducted into the armed services after they are brought up to the point of productivity. We have all kinds of shortages, including an acute housing shortage, and yet we are considering taking men out of industry when there already exists a shortage of building mechanics. The whole thing just does not make sense.

As many of you know, I am thoroughly in accord with the view that we should maintain our Military Establishment. I have voted for all the appropriations which would provide for an adequate Army, Air Force, and Navy. I served voluntarily in two World Wars in the Navy and have never been obliged to register for the draft. I have a son who is a corporal in the Army Air Forces, having enlisted voluntarily 2 years ago. My ancestors came to this country hundreds of years ago to get away from Old World regimentation. The principles on which this country were founded, which have made it great and strong, will be violated by the enactment of this type of legislation. I am thoroughly opposed to it, and it is my belief that the American people are opposed to it. I hope that this peacetime conscription proposal will be defeated.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLGER: On page 3, line 7, after the words "between the ages of" strike out "eighteen" and insert "twenty-one."

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, while I subscribe entirely to the magnificent statement made by the gentleman who preceded me, I am not offering this amendment as a dilatory tactic. I am offering it because I believe it is just. If we are going to have conscription, we are not morally in a position to reach down and get the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old boys who ought to be in school, and whose education has not been finished. They cannot vote. They cannot say a word. When we pass this law, we take that 18-year-old boy who ought to be in school of all places in the world and for 2 years at least we command him to surrender his liberty in the name of conscription and learn to carry on war in peacetime.

Let me read you the section which refers to this. It sounds like a condemnation, something like a sentence pronounced by a judge for cause—and this is not for cause, and when applied to a person under 21 years of age, it is taking advantage of one who is helpless in his own right.

The bill reads as follows:

Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States—

Oh, that 18-year-old boy. Oh, that 19-year-old boy. If you would let me draw up another amendment, I suspect I would make the age from 40 to 68, and then then let us see how it would feel to be conscripted for 2 years and taken out of our pursuits in order to make a useless gesture, when we have all the implements of war, if they would apply them, that a nation can have in times of peace.

The bill reads further:

who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 31.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a period in my opinion in the life of any young man that is so important that he remain at home. They say he will go to college. Yes; but he can come back home on weekends when he wants to, and his mother and his daddy can see him and ask him every day that they please, how he is. There is no valid force in putting forth such an argument as that. I say to you that between the ages of 18 and 21 we have no right to reach below that age of 21, especially, and demand that they give 2 years of their lives to this conscription in time of peace.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LYLE. How many men would be available under this amendment or under this bill?

Mr. FOLGER. I am not able to tell the gentleman that. I am not figuring on the total number of cogs in the machine. I am talking about humanity and human rights and fairness toward the people who are helpless and who are in our hands.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. Is it not a fact that in World War I no one was drafted under 20 years of age?

Mr. FOLGER. I do not remember about that. But I do remember a bill was offered which I am sorry that I did not vote for, and that was to require that they must be 21 years of age before they are drafted.

I am going to offer an amendment to section 4, which reads:

Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, except those aliens who have not declared their intention to become citizens thereof, who is between the ages of 19 and 26 at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 19 after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this act, shall be liable for service in the armed forces of the United States.

Do you believe that is fair? Do you believe that is the part of the exposition of manhood, to go down and say to the 18-year-old boy, "You must register, and when you shall have registered, when you reach the age of 19 years, by proclamation of the President, under the authority granted in this act of Congress, you shall be taken by the nape of the neck out of your school, away from your home, at a crucial time in your life, and put in 2 years of military service"? It is not right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered seeks to strike out the figure "18" and insert the figure "21" in that provision of the bill which provides for registration. The argument that was made in support of the amendment had to do almost entirely with the question of the service of 18-year-olds. There is no proposal that the 18-year-olds shall be called for service. There is no point in not registering them at 18, because, of course, it is an expensive proposition to carry on the registration. It permits the orderly registration, and a sufficient period of time for the records to be prepared. So that as to the 18-year-olds and 19-year-olds on registration, the arguments made do not apply to the amendment offered.

Of course, we have to be a little practical. We continued to induct men until October 1946. At that time we were inducting them at 19, having gone up from 18. During the war we inducted a great many 18-year-olds. So that when you come to the group above 21 years of age, unless you want to get into the veterans who have already fought a war, put in a long period of active service, unless you want to take married men and do away with your deferments, you will not be able to get any men under this bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Why did the committee put in the bill that they would draft men who were over 21 years of age, then?

Mr. KILDAY. Because there are in that group some men, as the gentleman knows, having been in the service of the country, who were released from duty with less than 12 months of service, and who will, under this bill, be channeled into the Reserve organization.

Mr. SMATHERS. But the great reservoir who have not had service, are in the group under 21?

Mr. KILDAY. They are in the group under 21, because up until October 1946, those men were inducted. I have available the figures for each age bracket.

The 19-year-old group has 692,400; 20-year-old, 528,200. Then, when you come to 21, you drop down to 307,800. So that you immediately lose out of your pool 1,100,000 men 19 years and over. Of course, there is no convenient age at which to do this service, but it is far more convenient if it could be made in that period immediately after high school, when the time can be taken out before entering college. The average boy comes out at 18. Then he is in a position to arrange his affairs so that between his high-school training and his college training he can put in this service and get it behind him.

The bill has been worked out with careful thought and intention as to what is available in the pool. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Would this not include a great many of the boys who are in college?

Mr. KILDAY. If he is in college he can complete the year for which he is enrolled.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. But only the 1 year.

Mr. KILDAY. He gets only the year in which he is enrolled. As I said, there is no convenient time. I fully appreciate the disruptions which will come here and that there would be no time when it could be done with perfect convenience; but I think it is the best that we can do in working on a personnel problem as complicated as this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 6401, which will provide us with the necessary manpower to adequately care for the needs of our national defense program and which makes provisions for industrial mobilization.

After every war we resolve that there shall be no new war, but we also resolve that if war does come in the future as it has in the past, we shall be prepared. The changed conditions of modern war—bacterial warfare, speed of movement by air, and the atom bomb—make it a certainty that mistaken calculations in regard to being prepared for national defense will be fatal to America and possibly to the world. The Eightieth Congress must make this calculation.

One of the most important cogs in this great wheel of national defense is manpower. Some people say we have the atom bomb, the best planes in the world, the best guns, and need not worry about manpower. I say that the strength of this country will be determined more by the strength of the men handling the weapons of war than by the guns, bombs, and planes. I am not happy and it will not be with pleasure that I vote for the selective-service bill. The idea of a peacetime draft or conscription law is obnoxious to me, and I believe it is to most Americans. However, I shall vote for the bill because under the circumstances it appears to be the wise course to follow for the protection and security of our country.

Mr. Chairman, our country was caught unprepared in two great world wars. We can only guess as to what might have happened if we had been prepared. It is my personal belief and the belief of many other people that had we been militarily strong, both wars would have been avoided. Every sensible God-loving and God-fearing person in this world knows that this country has led the world in the battle for peace. We continue to assume the responsibilities of this leadership.

Our preparedness at this time can very easily result in a great saving of American lives, resources and money in the future. Near the end of World War II we were spending $90,000,000,000 a year to carry on the war effort. If preparedness shortened a future war by 6 months as no doubt it would, the saving for this period alone would be tens of thousands of lives and $45,000,000,000. If preparedness should prevent war—as we hope it will—the savings would be incalculable.

I am supporting the selective-service bill in the interest of peace and not to prepare us for war. I would rather have training without fighting than fighting without training. General Eisenhower has stated:

In terms of the larger issue of victory or defeat comparison is not possible, because in modern war it is not possible to win without training. But in the more personal matter of the individual's chances for survival, I should say that the trained combat soldier has at least three times the chances of the untrained to live to become a veteran.

Some have said that the Selective Service Act will not frighten Russia. As far as I am concerned, it is not intended to frighten Russia or any other country. However, we do want to demonstrate to the world that we are prepared and our national defenses are strong. Surely everyone will admit that those who speak with authority and possess the power to back up what they say wield more force and influence than do those who talk, boast, or threaten without the power to back up their statements.

I believe the passage of this bill will assure the world that we are going to play our part in the world, that we are going to win the battle for peace. The people of the world who want peace and freedom will be pleased and will welcome the passage of this selective service bill. The aggressor nations of the world will stop, look, and listen for a long time before making further aggressive moves.

Mr. Chairman, again quoting from General Eisenhower, this great leader said:

I am intimately familiar with the attitude of the leaders of the other nations to the armed forces of the United States. It is my personal opinion that the greatest single motivation force for world peace is the organized military potential of the United States.

Former Ambassador to Japan, Mr. Joseph G. Grew, said recently:

Without preparedness, diplomacy (our first line of defense) is bankrupt. The extension of the selective service draft is plain common sense.

The armed services have an authorized strength at the present time of 1,736,882, but they have been able to secure only 1,380,888 volunteers for military and naval duty. We have been unable to provide the necessary manpower through volunteer methods.

The Armed Services Committee has decided after extensive hearings that the combined strength of our armed forces should be 2,005,882. This figure was agreed upon after considering the advice of the best authorities we have in the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the report of civilian commissions which studied this question. Adequate strength of the armed forces is determined by considering these three important factors: First, the international situation; second, capabilities of any possible enemies; and, third, evident intent of governments of other nations.

The proposed law requires that those between the ages of 18 through 30 must register with local draft boards and those 19 through 25, unless deferred or exempted, are liable for induction for 2 years of service. Members of the medical profession are liable for service until age 45 with those deferred during the war and those educated at Government expense to be called first.

After 2 years of service the inductee must, first, take another year of active duty, or, second, stay in an organized reserve unit for 3 years, or, third, stay in unorganized reserves for 5 years or until age 35. A person liable for induction may volunteer for 2 years' service to permit his beginning the required period of service when it is most convenient.

Exemptions will be given Purple Heart holders, veterans with combat or 12 months' service, members of organized reserve units, and ministers and ministerial students. Deferments will be given ROTC students until graduation, essential workers, persons with dependents, high-school and college students. An inducted sole surviving son cannot be sent outside the United States and must be assigned noncombatant duty.

Two years of service is required for those inducted and this law will also require that those ROTC students who are deferred until graduation must serve 2 years active duty upon completion of college. However, the present selective-service bill provides that those entering the senior division of ROTC after enactment of this law must serve 3 years on active duty upon graduation. I am offering an amendment to reduce this period of active duty to 2 years as it will then provide for the same amount of service as we require of inductees and other ROTC graduates. I urge the Members to favorably consider this amendment.

My hope and prayer is that my sons, ages 11 and 12, and other young men of America will not have to face an enemy in combat like so many of us had to do. I am convinced that we must have selective-service legislation now which will provide us with the strength to make possible aggressors reconsider their plans to wage a war. In the event of another conflict, our sons will be much better trained and prepared to carry out their responsibilities as defenders of their country.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and on this section close in 5 minutes, at which time it is the purpose of the Committee to rise.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. What was the gentleman's request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York requested that all debate on this amendment and this section close in 5 minutes, following which the gentleman stated that he would move that the Committee rise.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition; I was on my feet.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid this Congress will go down in history, a Congress of which I am a Member—as a Congress of hysteria.

Back in 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938 I was one of the strongest supporters of an all-out armament, all-out military training program. I was called a militarist and a warmonger back home, but I knew that America had to be prepared, for at that time we did not even have rifles to give to our boys. Today the situation is different; we not only have rifles but we have tanks, we have guns, we have boats, we have planes, we have even got the atomic bomb. It is a different situation.

They come in here and say, "Vote for a peacetime draft" and they throw it right at you.

I am not going to vote for any peacetime draft because we do not need a peacetime draft. If you really want to make America strong and keep her powerful then you can go right back to World War I when I was a student at high school and when I was taking the ROTC program at that time, and we students were obliged to take 1 hour of ROTC training every day. Then we had a little program during the recess period in which they trained us some more. It was a fine program. That program can be put into effect today. Start in your high schools. Give your high-school students an ROTC program. Have them out there 3 months in the vacation period and give them an intensive program of training. Have them out the following vacation period for 3 months and give them a further intensive training program, but do not disrupt, do not disrupt the educational program of our States. It is not necessary.

Who wants this draft? Who is asking for it? Why is it necessary? Why am I compelled to vote one way or another on this question when we are not at war and there is no reason for it? I will tell you who is asking for it. There are two men you can get rid of and you will not have to have a draft. Get rid of Mr. Forrestal, the Secretary of Defense, and get rid of General Draper, the Assistant Secretary of Defense. You get rid of the former president of the international bankers, Dillon, Read & Co., Mr. Forrestal, get rid of the vice president of the international bank of Dillon, Read & Co., General Draper, and you will not have anybody asking for a draft or wanting a draft.

Why do they want a draft? Because there is a big gold rush on. There is the gold rush of 1948, the gold rush for the Ruhr. It is greater than the gold rush of 1849 in California. There will not be as many people going in 1948 to the Ruhr as there were to California in 1849, but the amount of gold and the amount of money involved is far greater in 1948 than it was in 1849.

They are going over there to take over the Ruhr. Your big boys, your big international boys, are moving into the Ruhr, and the Ruhr is going to be owned by American bankers, not by Germans. Now, I have no love for the Nazis, everybody knows that. I have no particular love for the Germans, as such, but I do not believe that it is right for me to go in there or for American big business to join with the cartelists and monopolists, to go in there and do this dastardly thing. We will bring upon us another war in order to make these investments secure in the Rhur. They will tell you there are other reasons for this call for the draft, but I tell you there is no other reason except to have an army to protest those American investments in Germany.

Your boys will have to be drafted to go into Germany. To do what? To protect American investments in the Ruhr. Whose investments? The investments of my industrialists in Detroit? Oh, no. It is not going to be the investments of the industrialists of my city. It will be the investments of the big bankers, the international banking crowd.

Do you know what is happening in the automobile business today? The Fiat car of Italy is being sold all over Europe. Markets are being created all over the world for that car.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

The question was taken, and on a divi-

Second. Those who participated in the

THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. SADOWSKI) there were—ayes 32, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, except those aliens who have not declared their intention to become citizens thereof, who is between the ages of 19 and 26 at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 19 after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this act, shall be liable for service in the armed forces of the United States. The President is authorized from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the armed forces of the United States for service in the manner provided in this act such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain manpower strengths of the respective armed forces not to exceed those authorized by section 2 of this act.

No person shall be inducted for service under this act unless and until he is acceptable to the armed forces for such service and his physical and mental fitness for such service has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be members of the Army of the United States; persons inducted into the naval forces of the United States pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be members of the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, as appropriate; and persons inducted into the Air Forces of the United States pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be members of the Air Force of the United States.

No person, without his consent, shall be inducted for service under this act, except as otherwise provided herein, after he has attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of his birth.

(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of this section shall serve for a period of 24 months, unless sooner discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

(c) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, except sections 19 (b) and 22, the President is authorized, pursuant to requisitions submitted by the armed forces, to require special registration of and to make special calls for members of the medical, dental, osteopathic, veterinary, pharmacy, and optometric professions, who have not yet reached the age of forty-five at time of such call, in such professional categories as he shall determine, and persons called hereunder shall be liable for induction for not to exceed 24 months of service in the armed forces: *Provided*, That during the life of this act there shall be, in the Army, including the Air Force, and in the Navy, including the Marine Corps, a ratio to total active strength of not to exceed 5 doctors of medicine and 2 dentists per 1,000 men, 1 osteopath per 5,000 men, 1 veterinarian per 2,000 men, and 1 pharmacist and 1 optometrist per 3,000 men.

(2) In inducting persons pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President shall induct, in the following order of priority:

First. Those who participated as medical or dental students in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy, and persons who were deferred from service during World War II for the purpose of pursuing a course of instruction leading to education in one of the above professions, and have had no active duty as commissioned officers.

Second. Those who participated in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy and who have served on active duty as commissioned officers for less than 24 months (exclusive of time spent as intern).

Third. Those who are less than 35 years of age and have had less than 90 day's prior active honorable military or naval duty.

Fourth. Those who are over 35 years of age and have had less than 90 days' prior active honorable military or naval duty.

Fifth. Those whose total active honorable military or naval duty is less than 24 months.

Sixth. Others as prescribed by the President.

(d) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of 19 and 26 shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section.

(e) Each person who hereafter is inducted, enlisted, or appointed and serves for a period of less than 3 years in one of the armed services and meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, shall be transferred to a reserve component of the armed forces of the United States and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component until he attains the age of 35, or until the expiration of a period of 5 years after such transfer, or until he is discharged from such reserve component, whichever occurs first, and shall be subject to such additional service as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law for such component: *Provided*, That any person who completes at least 24 months of service in the armed forces under subsection (b), and who thereafter serves satisfactorily on active duty in the armed forces under a voluntary extension for a period of at least 1 year, which extension is hereby authorized, or in an organized unit of any reserve component of any of the services for which he is entitled to receive pay for attendance at drill or equivalent duty for a period of at least 36 consecutive months, shall, in time of peace, be relieved from any liability under this subsection to serve in any reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any such persons, while in a reserve component of such forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such forces in accordance with other applicable laws.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York (interrupting the reading of section 4). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of this section be considered as read and open to amendment tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk concluded the reading of section 4.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL MEMORIAL PARK

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 427 correcting the act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas a clerical or printer's error by omission of words appears in section 1 of Public Law No. 6200 amending the act of April 25, 1947, establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That section 1 of the act of April 25, 1947, establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park as amended by Public Law No. 6200 be further amended by striking out the period at the end of section 1 and inserting the following: ", are hereby dedicated and set apart as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people, and shall be known as the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to construct and maintain a road or highway through the park connecting with a State or Federal highway".

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "6200" and insert "620"

Page 1, line 5, strike out "6200" and insert "620"

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT HALL INDIAN RESERVATION PROJECT OF IDAHO

Mr. D'EWART submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interest of the Fort Hall Indian irigation project of Idaho, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture—exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration—for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concur in Senate amendment No. 1, the only amendment in disagreement. This has the unanimous concurrence of the subcommittee.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 3, strike out all after line 24 down to and including line 6 on page 4.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 679, Rept. No. 2361) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6402) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 680, Rept. No. 2362), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6263) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 681, Rept. No. 2363), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment, and no amendment shall be in order to the said bill. At the conclusion of general debate, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 682, Rept. No. 2364), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6917) to provide a temporary increase in the compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia municipal government, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment, and no amendment shall be in order to the said bill. At the conclusion of general debate, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AIR PARCEL-POST SERVICE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 683, Rept. No. 2365), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6773, to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

NATIONAL FUEL POLICY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 595, Rept. No. 2366), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas it appears that current and anticipated shortages of petroleum products threaten the present and future economy and security of the people of the United States; and

Whereas such shortages must be considered in the light of the availability of other fuels and energy resources; and

Whereas, in order to deal effectively with the problem of making petroleum and other fuels available in quantities adequate for an expanding economy and for the security of the United States, it is necessary to formulate sound national policies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it shall be the duty of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to formulate and recommend a national fuel policy adequate to meet the needs of the United States in times of peace and war, including recommendations for a national petroleum policy and the integration of such policy with policies relating to other fuels and energy resources except atomic energy; and for such purposes the committee shall study the current and future fuel supply and demand of the United States and shall study methods of encouraging needed developments to assure the availability of fuels adequate for an expanding economy and the security of the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a report not later than the close of the present Congress. Such report may be made to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof—

(1) Is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is in session, has adjourned, or has recessed, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary; and subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member;

(2) May utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies;

(3) May seek information from such sources and conduct its studies and investigations in such manner as it deems advisable in the interest of a full and correct ascertainment of the facts.

JOSEPH P. KAMP

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 495, Rept. No. 2367), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the citation heretofore voted by the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1944, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, for contempt against Joseph P. Kamp, vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, Inc., be, and the same hereby is, rescinded for the following reasons:

1. Said citation was not the legal act of the said committee for the reason that information necessary to said committee and to each member thereof for their consideration was withheld from them.

Certain of said withheld and necessary information was improperly deleted from the official printed record of the hearings without the knowledge of any member of said committee and, therefore, was not available to the members of said committee at the time they considered the matter and took action resulting in voting a citation for contempt.

Certain of other withheld and necessary information was denied to some members of said committee who were refused answers to specific questions about information available to other members of the committee. Some of this same withheld and necessary information was deliberately kept from the knowledge and consideration of a majority of the members of the said committee.

2. Said citation was not the legal act of the said committee for the reason that exhibits in evidence before the committee and necessary to said committee and to each member thereof for their consideration was withheld from them.

The said withheld necessary exhibits were illegally removed from the committee's files prior to the consideration of the matter by the committee and were not available to the members of the committee at the time they took final action resulting in voting a citation for contempt.

3. The said citation resulted in the indictment of the said Joseph P. Kamp, who was tried for criminal contempt of the Congress in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in December 1946.

On behalf of the defense, the court issued a subpena for one of the said withheld exhibits. Because the said withheld exhibit was not available in the files of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, where it legally belonged, having been removed without the knowledge of the committee or by the authority of the House, the defendant, the said Joseph P. Kamp, was prevented from presenting a full defense and therefore was denied a fair trial.

4. The said Joseph P. Kamp is again to be tried under the said indictment which resulted from the said illegal act of the said committee. The said withheld exhibit, together with the other committee exhibits, were delivered to a representative of the American branch of an international propaganda movement, and the former chairman of the said committee has unsuccessfully attempted to have the said withheld exhibits returned to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and has written to the said Joseph P. Kamp, * * * "We have made another effort to secure the memorandum you desire. We have not been able to get it." Therefore, the said withheld exhibit will again be unavailable and the said Joseph P. Kamp will again be unable to subpena this evidence in his behalf and will therefore again be denied his constitutional right to a fair trial.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order for a few moments?

Mr. POWELL. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. There was a gag placed on discussion this afternoon on one of my amendments. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to state that there is a veto message from the President of the United States which should be read to the House today, and also several enrolled bills which are of vital importance to many departments of the Government.

Mr. POWELL. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SUPPLEMENTAL FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 714)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 6355, "Making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

This bill would provide funds for the next fiscal year for the Social Security Administration, the United States Employment Service, and some functions of the Public Health Service. A measure of this kind clearly should not be disapproved by the President except under unusual circumstances and for the most compelling reasons. Such circumstances are presented by the provisions of this bill which would transfer the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency.

I believe that this transfer would be a serious error from the standpoint of the proper location of this important function of government. I believe also that this transfer is clearly substantive legislation which should not be included in an appropriation bill.

Over the past 3 years considerable study has been directed to the proper location of the Employment Service in the Government. It is apparent that a system of public employment offices to secure jobs for the workers of this country is directly related to the major purpose of the Department of Labor, which is "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States." It is equally apparent that it would be far less appropriate to place the Employment Service, together with its auxiliary Farm Placement Service and Veterans' Employment Service, in the Federal Security Agency, which is primarily concerned with matters of health, welfare, and education.

I am, therefore, firmly convinced that because of its intimate relationship to the functions of the Department of Labor the Employment Service should remain permanently in that Department.

To achieve this end, I transmitted to the Congress on January 19, 1948, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, placing the United States Employment Service permanently in the Department of Labor and transferring to that Department the Bureau of Employment Security, now in the Federal Security Agency. This reorganization plan was not accepted by the Congress, principally on the ground that no basic changes should be made in the structure of the executive branch until the Commission on Organization of the executive branch of the government has completed its studies and submitted its recommendations. This seems to me a reasonable viewpoint.

But in this bill the Congress has acted contrary to its own declared position, and has attempted to effect a far-reaching change in the organization of the executive branch without waiting for the Commission on Organization to report.

In fact this legislation, which is of such paramount importance to the interests of millions of wage earners and employers, and which is plainly substantive in nature, was passed by the Congress entirely without reference to or hearings by the legislative committees concerned with such matters. Neither the House Committee on Education and Labor nor the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was given an opportunity to consider the measure. Instead it was conceived by a subcommittee on appropriations and tacked onto an appropriations bill.

I do not believe that it is in the interest of good government that legislation of such importance should be enacted in such a manner. As I stated in December 1945, in withholding my approval from an appropriation bill which contained substantive legislation, "a matter of such grave importance as our public employment system deserves not only permanent legislation, but legislation carefully and separately considered. Issues of such a difficult and vital nature should not be dealt with as riders to appropriation bills." I note also that on March 4, 1946, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress recommended "That the practice of attaching legislation to appropriation bills be discontinued."

What makes this matter even more disturbing is that the present bill is another in a series of legislative actions stripping the Department of Labor of essential funds and functions. Last year the Congress removed the United States Conciliation Service from the Department and drastically slashed the Department's appropriations. To remove the United States employment Service from the Department would further weaken and demoralize it and reduce the entire Department to such a minor status as to raise seriously the question of the validity of its continuance as a separate Department.

I am convinced, therefore, that the provisions of this bill which would transfer the United States Employment Service represent unwise legislative action, enacted in an unsound manner.

For these compelling reasons I am returning the bill without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 14, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

By unanimous consent, the bill and message were ordered to be printed as a House document.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings in connection with the veto message of the President on the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, be postponed until tomorrow and that it may be in order at any time tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief statement on social security.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain tables prepared by the Maritime Commission as part of the remarks he made this afternoon in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, during debate on the bill H. R. 6401 under the 5-minute rule, I made some remarks under pro forma amendments. I ask unanimous consent that they be incorporated with my remarks made in general debate on the bill, and also to include therein certain extracts from Factory Management magazne.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. O'KONSKI) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper articles and extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a sermon by Rev. John Curry Walker, of Waterbury.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from a speech by Hon. Harold E. Stassen.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the speech made by the President of the United States at Los Angeles yesterday.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS SPECIAL AND SECOND SESSION RECORD AND FORECAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, many of the problems which we faced on January 3, 1947, when the Eightieth Congress convened have been dealt with during the past 18 months, but other serious problems will remain unsolved as we adjourn to prepare for the coming Presidential election. A review of the work of this Congress and its record and an assessment of what is likely to face the 81st Congress should prove useful information to all interested citizens.

I campaigned on a platform of international peace through cooperation within the United Nations, and domestic prosperity and stability based on an ever rising standard of living for all of the people of the United States.

FIRST SESSION RECAPITULATED

By the time the President summoned the Members of Congress back to Washington on November 17, 1947, the Eightieth Congress had written a good deal of legislation on the statute books. It had extended Federal rent control, and acted on labor, and relief for European countries like Greece, Austria, and Italy, tax reduction, unification of the armed services, Presidential succession, and had passed the important appropriation measures affecting literally hundreds of thousands of governmental activities. It had laid the groundwork for much of the action that has been taken during the second session of the Eightieth Congress. When the first session recessed on June 26, 1947, the Members dispersed to go home to their own districts to find out how their constituents felt about the momentous national problems confronting us. Other Members, including myself, took up committee assignments either in the United States or abroad. Everyone hoped that it would be unnecessary to return to Washington until the beginning of the new year.

THE SUMMER RECESS

As a member of the Subcommittee on the International Refugee Organization and the International Trade Organization of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I spent 8 weeks in Europe last summer visiting hundreds of DP camps, speaking to thousands of DP's and also to the men and women in the governmental and private agencies responsible for the care and resettlement of these people who had lived through terror and death sustained only by the hope that they would find a new life in a new land as soon as the shooting was over.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRISIS AND THE SPECIAL SESSION

While I was visiting DP camps and studying the ITO, others of my colleagues were making other investigations in Europe, South America, Asia, and other foreign territories, too. More Congressmen went abroad last summer than at any other time in American history. I think this fact is of extreme importance because it highlights the paramount role that foreign affairs plays in our domestic and personal lives. Even before all of the Congressmen had returned to the United States and had analyzed their experiences and reported them to the country, the foreign situation had become so serious in terms of American policy that the President of the United States asked the Members of Congress to reconvene in November of 1947, in a special interim session to take action on a foreign-aid bill. This bill was designed to help the countries of western Europe avoid disaster and reject the grim alternative of the "police state" by providing them with enough food and other basic commodities to see them through until they could rehabilitate themselves economically, socially, and politically, fortify their democracy, and rebuild their resources and trade.

THE MARSHALL PLAN

Preliminary work had already been started by what are now known as the 16 Marshall plan countries of Europe (Denmark, Austria, Belgium, France, Greece, Eire, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey). As we all know, they are called the Marshall plan countries because they developed a plan of cooperative economic action as a result of a suggestion made by Secretary of State Marshall at the Harvard commencement in June 1947. Secretary Marshall said at that time if the countries of Europe would cooperate and draw up plans to help themselves in a free and democratic manner, the United States would back them up with money, men, and materials.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, started hearings on the program for the Marshall plan early in November and carried on these hearings continuously for approximately 5 months.

For 6 weeks the Congress studied, debated, and finally passed an interim foreign aid program preliminary to Marshall plan aid, to meet the immediate needs of foreign countries faced with starvation and the prospect of fuel shortages during the winter months. The vote was overwhelmingly in favor of such a program. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, responsible for carrying this legislation through the Congress, I played an active part in writing this legislation which was so largely responsible for giving life and hope to the peoples of Europe in time to prevent them from plunging themselves and the United States into a new political and economic upheaval which could have led inevitably to war.

Today the European recovery program which was a blueprint for action only a few months ago, is a reality. The United States is appointing heads of mission to all of the ERP countries and the Economic Cooperation Administration is being built up in the United States, but 3 months ago it faced a hard fight. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I was one of the active participants in the mighty effort to legislatively implement Secretary Marshall's pregnant suggestion of June 4, 1947, and the monumental work of the 16 European nations who joined together to work for their mutual economic recovery. The final vote in favor of the European recovery program was gratifyingly large. I believe it will prove to be one of the really great achievements of American foreign policy as significant as the Monroe Doctrine in expressing our determination to have world peace.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND PALESTINE

The European recovery program is but one example of the action that the United States has taken in the international sphere. The United States is actively working within the framework of the UN to achieve world peace, security, and prosperity. For example, as a result of action recently taken by the Congress, the United States is now a member of the World Health Organization, a proposal which we in the Committee on Foreign Affairs worked for and supported for months.

The UN has had to deal with many difficult issues, a very important one of which is Palestine. Last year during the

interim session we had good cause for gratification when the United States through the UN adopted the partition plan of the UN General Assembly on Palestine on November 29, 1947. It seemed possible then that bloodshed would be averted through this timely and decisive action by the nations of the world. Unfortunately, however, the action of the UN on this issue never was implemented. Almost as soon as the decision was made it was repudiated by the very countries which should have breathed life into it. Both as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and as one who had made a tremendous effort to get justice in Palestine so as to establish the true Jewish national home there, I tried to make a constructive contribution toward the education of the other Members of the House who I knew would inevitably have to become concerned with this situation since it affected the peace and security of the United States as well as of the other members of the UN.

With 30 of my colleagues, who acted together on this issue, I kept in constant communication with the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States representative to the UN, on the Palestine issue urging that the United States actively work for the realization of the partition plan, the protection of the shrines of Christians, Moslems, and Jews, and peace in the Holy Land. When it became apparent that the UN could not and would not act swiftly enough to prevent the outbreak of war in Palestine, I united with my 30 colleagues in urging the lifting of the United States arms embargo in the Middle East which had been invoked by the President and which in effect was preventing only the Jewish people of Palestine from receiving arms to defend themselves, and not the Arabs, since it was an open secret that the Arabs were receiving arms and money from Britain to carry on a war of aggression for many months. I protested in speech after speech on the floor of Congress against this British double dealing and demanded that it be ended or that the whole United States policy of helping Britain be reconsidered decisively.

When the new state of Israel was proclaimed on May 15, 1948, I introduced legislation authorizing the appropriation of $100,000,000 so that the people of Israel could purchase military and other supplies to help them end the aggression against their territory, rebuild their shattered economy and realize the hopes and dreams that had been nurtured by the Jewish people for centuries. Recognition of the state of Israel by the United States which came almost immediately was the first real break in resolving the problem.

Now that there is a truce in Palestine I have continued to expose Britain's support of Transjordan's Arab Legion in its attack on Jerusalem in the effort to get Britain to atone for her actions by calling off the Arabs; and, second, I have pointed out that the truce cannot be used to appease the Arabs, but that Israel's independence, won by much sacrifice, and the boundaries established by the United Nations partition decision must be respected.

The Palestine situation demonstrated better than any other the present weaknesses of the UN as well as its potential power and effectiveness. Ever since its inception the UN has been plagued by excessive use of the veto and by vacillation instead of determined action of its member nations. The great tension that exists in the world today, especially between the two great powers of Soviet Russia and the United States (which is considered later in these remarks) had dwarfed and almost paralyzed the functioning of the UN. But on the Palestine issue both the United States and Soviet Russia were on the same side and still the new world organization was helpless to cope with the very threatening problem involving the peace of the middle eastern region but perhaps of the whole world.

REORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The enemies of the UN and the skeptics of international cooperation used the Palestine situation as the occasion for condemning the whole organization and for seeking a reorganization so drastic in character as to have destroyed it in the attempt to rebuild it. They based this demand also on UN failure in resolving the problem of control of atom bombs, or in settling the contentions between the United States and the U. S. S. R. As a result of the extensive hearings held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the testimony presented by members of the State Department, especially Secretary Marshall and other well-informed witnesses, any precipitous action has been forestalled and serious and well-thought-out action will be taken by the Congress. I contributed to the discussion and resolution of the issue through participation in the Town Hall of the Air program on the Reorganization of the UN and countless other radio and platform forums, as well as during the open hearings of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. One of the most effective steps taken by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has been the reporting of a bill on the UN, providing in addition to other things, a $65,000,000 loan to the UN so that it can build a permanent home on the site selected in New York City. I introduced the legislation for the loan in the House of Representatives.

THE PLIGHT OF THE DISPLACED PERSONS

These are fine people, skillful, productive, and anxious to work. About two-thirds of them from eastern Europe, of Catholic faith, about 10 percent from northern Europe, Protestant, and about 20 percent, from many parts of Europe, of Jewish faith. But all equally homeless and unhappy. They were faced with the prospect of spending years in almost the same concentration camps that had claimed their friends and families and imprisoned their souls and bodies; labeled DP camps, they were no less deadly to the morale and spirit of already martyred peoples than when they were known as concentration camps. Armed with the knowledge that this could prove to be one of the worst reflections on the record of our own and the other United Nations, I came back to the United States from our investigation determined to do everything I possibly could to eliminate the problem of the DP's. Swift legislative action by the Congress was indicated to open the gates of the United States to our fair share of the DP's, so that instead of displaced persons they could become productive new citizens in the United States and in other peace-loving, democratic countries.

So far the legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress is not nearly as complete as I had hoped for and worked for and effects a discrimination against one group in the DP camps which I consider fatal to its original purposes. The bill only provides for the admission of 220,000 DP's in 2 years instead of 400,000 DP's in 4 years, as did the Stratton bill. Also, it picks a date at which eligible DP's should be determined which discriminates most unfairly against the existing population of the DP camps, for it admits not the actual percentage of 23 percent but only about 3 percent of the DP's from Poland and eastern Europe of Jewish faith who escaped from the religious persecution of the months immediately following the war which had been left as a heritage by the Nazis. The only comfort we have left is the United States participation in and contribution to the International Refugee Organization, for which I worked so hard, and the inclusion in the DP bill of the substance of the legislation introduced by Senator IVES and myself early in 1947 to allow DP children who became orphans as a result of the war to enter the United States without regard to immigration quotas. The fight to eliminate discrimination in the DP bill must be continued.

THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

While in Europe last year I had the opportunity to review at Geneva the beginnings of the International Trade Organization. This organization contains the basis for future world economic cooperation which is the necessary foundation for international peace. Representatives of the United States and 19 other nations sat together at Geneva to catalog the problems that plague international trade and weaken the economic structure of individual peoples. They sought to create machinery capable of dealing with these troublesome problems and promoting international trade through the elimination of artificially created trade barriers.

Three months later as one of the United States delegates to the International Trade Organization conference in Havana, I again met with the draftsmen of the new ITO in Havana—representing 60 countries—and brought back to the Congress a report of the contribution that the United States delegates were making to the creation of this new organization. Although the United States has not yet formally ratified the new ITO charter, the way has been paved for doing so in the next Congress.

When the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act came up recently I supported and voted for the passage of a straight 3-year extension with no crippling restrictions and testified before the House Ways and Means Committee and

the Senate Finance Committee to that effect, I also spoke in the House on the debate to warn my colleagues of the dangers to American business if the program were emasculated in favor of protectionism over reciprocity. I am gratified that the Congress has seen fit to continue the RTA program for another year without the congressional veto, although I preferred a straight 3-year extension.

DOMESTIC LEGISLATION

I have described at some length the action taken by the Congress in the field of foreign policy because the problems of world peace have lately overshadowed what are too, the pressing needs that our people face in the United States.

RENT CONTROL AND HOUSING

Our people have been vitally concerned with the problems of housing and rent control as a result of lack of construction during the war and the increase of families and marriages. The housing shortage became critical during the years when millions of American boys were living in foxholes and jungle huts dreaming of the day when they could return to the United States and live civilian lives in comfortable homes. Instead, when they returned they were confronted with the problem of finding any kind of shelter, decent or otherwise, at a price they could afford. The long-dreamed-of privacy that so many veterans had lived for during the war years turned into a cruel joke. Instead of living with his buddies, the veteran found himself living with his in-laws under difficult and overcrowded conditions, or spending much of his income and savings earmarked for other essential commodities and services on providing living accommodations, generally of an inadequate character, for his family.

As a veteran myself I have been very conscious of the problems faced by millions of veterans and their families throughout the country and I have worked diligently and ceaselessly for adequate rent control and housing legislation.

Congress passed a rent control bill again early this year. It was not as tightly drawn as I should have liked to see it, but we did manage to keep Federal rent control. I fought for better controls to get tenants the painting, decorating, and building maintenance they were entitled to, to prevent unfair evictions of tenants by landlords, and against across-the-board rent increases. I also warned all the people of my district not to be pressured into making the so-called voluntary 15 percent rent increases.

When it comes to housing, however, the story is not encouraging. Millions of Americans cannot afford to buy or rent houses built by private industry under existing costs unless they do so at the price of their standard of living. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Act, which I introduced in the House, was the legislation veterans and citizens looked to as a means to end the drastic housing shortage. It was the only comprehensive long-range housing bill up for consideration. It had been before the Congress for more than 4 years, in one form or another, extensive hearings had been held on it by both the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees, the Joint Committee on Housing which was created by the Eightieth Congress to make an exhaustive study of the housing situation, had supported its main provisions, including federally assisted low-rent housing, Government-supported research to reduce housing costs, slum clearance, and farm housing and it had twice been passed by the Senate.

Together with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman KENNEDY, and several other veterans representing all of the major veteran organizations, I sponsored a veterans housing conference which was held in Washington on February 29 and March 1 for the purpose of marshalling support and getting action on the T-E-W bill for the Eightieth Congress. More than 1,350 veterans from all parts of the country representing all national veterans organizations attended this conference. The response was immediate and encouraging. Many Congressmen who had recognized the need for action in housing and who had not understood the overwhelming interest that the people of the United States have in the T-E-W bill had their eyes opened, and it got many signatures on the discharge petition by which the bill could be brought up on the floor of the House.

Despite the drive to bring the T-E-W bill up for action by discharge petition and the ceaseless efforts of those like myself in the Congress in behalf of the T-E-W bill, and although the bill was finally reported out by a majority of the House Banking and Currency Committee, it could not get action on the floor of the House. I pledged the House, however, that the fight for the T-E-W bill would continue and refused to compromise my position in support of this bill in any way.

OTHER DOMESTIC ISSUES—NATIONAL HEART DISEASE INSTITUTE

Housing is the country's No. 1 domestic issue, but the questions of health, education, social security, minimum wages, civil rights, have also demanded action by the Eightieth Congress. Few of these issues have been acted upon, yet it is very gratifying to me that after a year's work the Congress passed the bill H. R. 3792, which I introduced in June 1947 to create a National Heart Disease Institute within the Federal Public Health Service. There is no doubt in my mind but that heart disease, which is the Nation's foremost disease killer, will be dealt a body blow as a result of the research and clinical work that will be initiated as a result of this legislation.

FEDERAL YOUTH ASSISTANCE ACT

During the special session I introduced a bill to provide Federal financial assistance to State and local youth projects. In my own district of Washington Heights and Inwood in New York City, the problems of youth demand immediate attention if they are to be dealt with in time to prevent broken lives. An outstanding citizens' organization, Youth Aid, Inc., has been working there and doing a great job on youth problems, under President Wright, of the College of the City of New York, Anne Lee Jacobs, Professor Shulman, of City College, and other leaders. But it needs financial help. This bill has met with a tremendous amount of enthusiasm among those engaged in the fight against juvenile delinquency because it provides what has been lacking for so long, the funds to carry out the many excellent preventative youth programs which never get beyond the blueprint stage, because of the lack of funds to carry them out. The very crowded schedule of the Committee on Education and Labor has prevented the consideration of this bill during the Eightieth Congress. From the ever-mounting support that this bill is getting, however, I feel confident that the Eighty-first Congress will pass this or similar legislation.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

Ever aware of the burden that the high cost of living has placed upon the people of this country and my constituents, I have been engaged in the effort to stabilize and bring down the cost of living. I have already mentioned the fight to maintain rent control. This was a principal effort in behalf of stabilizing the cost of living since rents normally constitute 20 to 30 percent of the family budget. But the high cost of clothing, food, and taxes as well as shelter demanded attention and I have tried in every way possible to meet these adversaries of a high standard of living head on. I voted against giving special treatment and a subsidy to the wool growers. I campaigned for food-conservation measures and succeeded in getting the House of Representatives to write such a provision in the interim-aid bill passed by the Congress in December 1947. I joined in the fight to eliminate taxes on oleomargarine. Together with Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, I sponsored a meat-rationing bill. Although the bill never got out of committee I believe that Senator FLANDERS and I accomplished a great deal by warning the meat industry against the same squeeze on the public of which they had been guilty in the spring of 1946. This action aroused a great deal of discussion and although the bill did not pass I believe the public opinion created was an important element in preventing a complete run-away of meat prices during the ensuing months.

When the controversial matter of tax reduction came up, I was guided primarily by the needs of the people of middle and low income in my district and all over the country to meet the high cost of living. As I said during the debate, "I voted for the reduction because the need of my constituents for some kind of help to meet the high living costs is so great that I feel as their Representative that I must vote for this bill with its imperfections rather than to accord them no help at all at this time." It is my conviction that the people of our district will be willing to increase taxes again if necessary, but they want the reduction now while we can afford it in view of the high living costs.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The problem of safeguarding the cherished American tradition of civil

XCIV——530

liberties has loomed large on the con-

VETERANS' BENEFITS

Nation and on no other basis. People in

liberties has loomed large on the congressional horizon during the second session of the Eightieth Congress. The report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights touched off a tremendous amount of discussion in this field. Legislation has been introduced to create a Federal FEPC, to abolish the poll tax, to make lynching a Federal offense, and to eliminate segregation in its many forms.

Together with other Members I introduced legislation to create an FEPC during the first session of the Eightieth Congress, but unfortunately no action has been taken on this measure on the House side and from all appearances nothing will be done on it during the rush to adjourn. But this is must legislation and I intend to work for its passage early in the next Congress.

The dilemma of how to cope with the threat of communism in the United States was crystallized during the debate on the Mundt-Nixon Subversive Control Act of 1948. This measure became one of the most thoroughly discussed pieces of legislation to come before the Eightieth Congress and even was the subject of a great radio debate by two Presidential candidates. I am in accord with those who believe that no stone should be left unturned in dealing decisively with any threat by subversive elements to American political and economic institutions. I had to vote, finally, against this measure because I believed with Governor Dewey and Senator Taft that the Mundt-Nixon bill did not accomplish the purpose we sought, but outlawed the Communist Party and I did not believe that forcing the Communist Party underground is a way of dealing with the Communist threat, but rather of increasing it. There is sufficient legislation on the books, if vigorously prosecuted, to deal effectively with those dominated by a foreign government who seek to undermine American institutions. The Senate has shown that it agrees, for the Mundt-Nixon bill is not even coming out of committee there. To strike a blow at totalitarianism with totalitarian weapons is to put a time bomb under the great American fortress of civil rights.

I have stood against efforts to overthrow the guaranties of our Constitution, realizing that these guaranties must protect all if they are to protect any. I showed my evenhandedness in this by voting to punish those guilty of acts against our laws regardless of their politics, hence I voted to cite for contempt Messrs. Eisler and Josephson who had refused to answer the questions of a congressional committee. Disturbed by the manner in which the Committee on Un-American Activities was handling witnesses where their reputation and character was at stake, I introduced by resolutions a plan to substitute for the House Un-American Activities Committee a new joint committee of the House and Senate to investigate all Communist, Fascist, or other extremist movements in the United States with the understanding that the committee would have rules of procedure which would give people whose character was on trial a fair opportunity to clear themselves.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

The whole question of veterans' rights and benefits has also been a major consideration of the 80th Congress. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs successfully sponsored through the Congress a bill increasing subsistence benefits from $65 to $75 for single veterans, $90 to $105 for married veterans, and $90 to $120 for veterans with more than one dependent.

This Congress took action to authorize the cashing of veterans' terminal-leave bonds.

Legislation has been enacted in connection with the disposal of war housing and to arrange for putting up barracks and other temporary structures for housing students attending schools and colleges under the GI bill of rights. I supported all this legislation and worked for it. I also was able to get some Government buildings put up at 187th Street and Amsterdam Avenue in my own district to help expand the facilities of Yeshiva University.

There was also passed by the House a bill to increase the allowances for dependents of disabled veterans and to help war widows and orphans. Also legislation was enacted to help with homes for paraplegics with Government assistance.

I believe that the Eightieth Congress has dealt with the most pressing of the veterans matters before it but there is still a tremendous backlog that will have to be taken up in the Eighty-first Congress.

FEDERAL AND POST OFFICE PAY RAISES

Another subject which deserves special attention is that of a pay raise for Federal and post office employees. The high cost of living has been especially hard on those who have been receiving incomes fixed by law despite the fact that the cost of living has skyrocketed during the last 2 years. The postal employees have been particularly handicapped because their basic salaries are lower than most other Federal employee pay schedules to begin with. I have consistently worked for and supported a $1,000 Federal and postal employee pay increase which would be realistic in terms of the present cost of living. A bill has now passed granting the postal employees a $450 annual pay raise, and other Federal employees an average $330 per annum increase. That is not enough, but it will help.

Some action has been taken, also, to help those Federal employees who have already retired through the enactment of the Stevenson retirement bill which increased the annuities of retired Federal employees by 25 percent or $300 a year, whichever was the smaller, made provisions for refunding retirement contributions of employees who worked at least 5 years and less than 10 years, and generally made more flexible the retirement age of Federal employees.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Every citizen will be giving the most serious consideration to the peacetime draft. It can only be justified if absolutely necessary in the interests of the Nation and on no other basis. People in my district will want to feel that the enactment of the draft at this time is not a measure in contemplation of war, but a measure to keep the peace. It must be tested, therefore, on the basis of its being an essential element in our foreign policy, which is a policy for peace. This policy consists of three parts: First, assisting in the economic reconstruction of the European democracies and other democratic nations provided that they do their best to help themselves and each other; second, strengthening the UN to make it what we want—a true world organization for preserving the peace; and third, full performance of our international responsibilities.

It is the implementation of this last point which would require selective service if we could not get otherwise adequate occupation forces in Germany, Austria, Trieste, Korea, and Japan. I voted against the bill because I did not believe that a sufficient case was made out that we could not get the necessary volunteer forces, so that we had to have a peacetime draft to fulfill our occupation obligations or to back up our foreign policy. If I thought we needed a draft right now I would have voted for it, but the Navy and Air Force appear to be able to do adequate recruiting, and only the Army is not getting enough men at this time. I believed additional measures should have been taken to recruit men for the Army before enacting a peacetime draft in the present international conditions.

It is estimated that the draft will call up about 200,000 men between 19 and 26 each year for 21 months' duty. There are restrictions in the law regarding the exemptions of veterans who have already served a year or more, those with dependents, and the deferment of young men attending schools or colleges until the end of the school year, those taking professional training, and others. It will be up to us as legislators to guard carefully against any dominance of the country by the military and to insure that civilians at all times shall dominate the military forces and the Federal Government, in accordance with American tradition. We showed our ability to do this even in war, and we should be able to do it just as well in peace.

The prize of peace, prosperity, and stability which the American people fought for at great sacrifice and which they thought they had won in 1945 still lies just beyond our reach, but with wisdom, responsibility, and generosity, we can go far during the next years toward really accomplishing the goals for which the recent disastrous war was fought. The 80th Congress made some good beginnings, and there are also failures and frustrations to point to. I believe that in the 81st Congress, as in the 80th, the nettling problems of foreign policy will again be in the forefront of our consideration, and that the people of the United States will also want action on the social issues which were passed over by the 80th Congress. Together, we, the people of the United States, will be building tomorrow as we are today a country capable of greatness and of leading toward a united and peaceful world organized democratically for its own salvation.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

THE MAKING OF A CONGRESSMAN

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, yielding to the insistence and suggestion of many Members, I had prepared a revision of the 1947 revision of the making of a Congressman. It will be postponed until a later date and either be made by me or somebody else.

FEDERAL PAY BILL SHOULD CARRY FLEXIBILITY FORMULA

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, if permitted by the rule under which the Rees bills for a cost-of-living pay increase are to be considered, I shall offer an amendment to provide for a flexible formula based upon the cost-of-living index. This will not only achieve justice for Federal workers but will avoid maintaining inordinate salary levels if the need for a cost-of-living bonus should cease to exist.

My proposed amendment to H. R. 6917 is as follows:

On page 2, line 19, of H. R. 6917, amend by striking all of paragraph (b) and substituting therefor the following:

"(b) The additional compensation provided in section 1 shall be increased by $90 for each increase of nine points in the Consumers Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics as of April 1948; and the additional compensation shall be decreased by $90 for each decrease of nine points in the Consumers Price Index as of April 1948. Such increase or decrease shall become effective on the first day of the month following the publication by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of such nine-point change in the Consumers Price Index."

The figure $90 is 25 percent of the temporary increase of $360, bearing the same relation to the total as 9 points bear to 36. The April 1948 index is 36 points above the July 1946 index and if the cost of living should decline to the 1946 level then a reduction to the salary level of that date when previous adjustments were made would be achieved in four steps. Further increases in the cost of living would be reflected in gradual advances in salary. It would be sound from the Government's standpoint because it would avoid heavy expenditures if not justified by the economic situation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. REGAN (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN) for today and tomorrow, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

VETERANS' HOUSING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in our earnest desire to solve the housing shortage let us not lose sight of the preferential order of the importance of our housing problems. The veterans' problem is still the most acute, and its treatment must command our first attention until it is completely solved.

I would like to call your attention to the all-important fact that the preference in occupancy provided in the Housing and Rent Act, and the preference in occupancy provided under title VI of the National Housing Act is a mere sham and delusion unless the veteran is also provided with an effective preference in his attempt to finance his purchase. Today, only the GI bill stands to offer the veteran any such financial preference. It obviously means nothing to tell our veterans that they may have first call on new homes if they do not have at least equal financing resources to compete with non-veterans. But we all recognize that our young veterans who were called away from their jobs and their education during the war cannot be expected to compete on equal terms with those who stayed home and accumulated savings during the war years.

In a nutshell, if we hope to tackle our most important housing problem first, we must provide preferential home financing aids to veterans.

The so-called T-E-W bill fails completely to solve this all-important, first problem. The net practical effect of the combined provisions of that bill is to nullify and destroy the last vestiges of financial preference to veterans of World War II that still remain in the housing picture. To do so in the face of facts published by the Bureau of the Census, that as late as April 1947 there were 14 veteran families overcrowded for every 4 nonveteran families overcrowded, would be an unpardonable repudiation by the Congress of the obligation of their Government to those veterans. This is accomplished through devious twistings of statutes, the meaning of which is already so obscure as to preclude the Members of this Congress from taking time to appreciate adequately their significance. When hearings were held in the Senate on a bill containing similar provisions to title VI of the T-E-W bill, Gen. Omar Bradley, then the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, wrote in part as follows:

It is believed that the enactment of those sections into law would accomplish results immediately and positively prejudicial to veterans in that—

(1) The substantially increased advantages to lenders embodied in the proposed changes will channelize lending under title I and title II of the National Housing Act, and thus divert or stem the flow of credit now participating generally in lending under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, with the result that the veteran will be compelled to accept loans on terms substantially less advantageous to him than of the terms which govern the GI loan.

(2) They will stimulate the ability of nonveterans to compete with the veteran for the purchase of housing in the lower-to-medium-cost brackets. This will further inflate the price of new housing to the prejudice of each prospective veteran purchaser.

It might be further pointed out that those of the proposals which are designed to inject further credit into the single-family housing field seek to attack the housing problem from almost the sole angle at which it is at least deficient. There is general agreement that the supply of financing under present legislation is more than adequate. The real need is to supply more materials and more labor and to translate those factors into more building at lower cost. To approach the problem by providing additional stimulants to credit expansion may result in further price inflation.

The consequences that General Bradley correctly foresaw and feared are even more real and fearsome in view of the elaborated layering of credit support on credit support which is sandwiched into the various titles of the T-E-W bill.

The attention of the Members of this House is drawn to the fact that despite the lapse of the insuring authorization of title VI of the National Housing Act, builders are proceeding with new home construction on an unprecedented scale. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that in April of this year 90,000 new dwelling units were started, with prospects that in May the number may possibly reach the 100,000 level. In the face of such performance and on the record of prior months, it appears that the combination of conventional loans plus the GI bill and FHA's title II will attract and provide ample production credit to keep the home-building industry at full steam. The Federal Housing Administration has liberalized their valuation standards for homes built under title II so that for practical purposes builders have about the same benefits as under the old title VI.

Rather than a rejuvenation of title VI, which is available to veterans and to nonveterans as well, the critical need of our home-hungry veterans is for a distinct plan whereby they may help themselves and under which we may be assured that a fair proportion of our none-too-large supply of construction materials and labor will be available to them. Precisely such a plan, clear and simple of operation, has been provided in the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, H. R. 4488. This bill was reported out by the Veterans' Affairs Committee unanimously. I would emphasize this unanimous endorsement of the veterans' homestead bill after very extensive hearings, because it is in focal contrast to other recent developments in this field.

Accordingly, in justice to our debt to the veterans of World War II, I urge you again to give the most careful consideration to the provisions of the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, H. R. 4488. The bill has the wholehearted support of the American Legion.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the

following titles, which were thereupon

H.R. 5524. An act making appropriations

1651. A letter from the Comptroller Gen-

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office

following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2744. An act to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 3689. An act to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases;

H. R. 4663. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners of the fee-simple titles and leasehold interests in lands leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga.;

H. R. 5524. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6028. An act to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6716. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California;

H. R. 6726. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6758. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2642. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; and

S. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key Mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Memorial, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4663. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners of the fee-simple titles and leasehold interests in lands leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga.;

H. R. 5524. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6716. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California; and

H. R. 6726. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 16, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1645. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for transfer by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1646. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 12, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of channels to Lake Ogleton and Walnut Lake, Anne Arundel County, Md., and Walnut Creek, Anne Arundel County, Md., lying between Bay Ridge and Arundel-on-the-Bay, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 712); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1647. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a project designed by the Commodity Credit Corporation to stimulate and increase the production and procurement of copra and palm oil in the Netherland Indies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1648. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1649. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, prepared by the Commissioner of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1650. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting volume 8 of the report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 713); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1651. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report concerning the conversion of two cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts between the United States Maritime Commission and the Permanente Metals Corp. to a fixed-price basis, and the subsequent settlement of the fixed-price contract; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6935. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report on Voice of America broadcasts; without amendment (Rept. No. 2350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report on investigation of the public housing authority at San Diego and Los Angeles; without amendment (Rept. No. 2351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3871. A bill to amend the act creating the Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6917. A bill to provide a temporary increase in the compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia Municipal Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 2353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands, S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner irrigation district, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands, S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State; with amendments (Rept. No. 2355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands, S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4928. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6916. A bill to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 2358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MICHENER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 56. Concurrent resolution welcoming the Inter-American Bar Association to the United States for its conference in Detroit, Mich., in May 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 2359). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 679. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6402, a bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 2361). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 680. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6263, a bill to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2362). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 681. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6916, a bill to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 2363). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 682. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6917, a bill to provide a temporary increase in the compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia municipal government; without amendment (Rept. No. 2364). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 683. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 6773, a bill to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2365). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 595. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to recommend a national fuel policy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2366). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 495. Resolution to rescind the citation for contempt against Joseph P. Kamp, vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2367). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2440. An act for the relief of Charles Duncan Montieth; without amendment (Rept. No. 2349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 6923. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans to provide housing accommodations for families in the Vancouver-Portland area deprived of their homes as a result of the flood disaster; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6924. A bill to aid in the production of permanent housing in the Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash., area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ARNOLD:

H. R. 6925. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Kahoka, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6926. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Milan, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6927. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Princeton, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6928. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Lancaster, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6929. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Memphis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6930. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Shelbina, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6931. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Kirksville, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6932. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Edina, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6933. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Gallatin, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 6934. A bill to provide, in certain cases, that internal-revenue stamps may be affixed in foreign countries to tobacco products manufactured in such countries before importation into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 6935. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6936. A bill to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgages of certain limited-dividend corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6937. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 so as to authorize the renewal for an additional 8 years of 5-year level-premium term policies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code for the purpose of providing a tax incentive for the production of additional rental housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 6939. A bill to provide that certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, shall be pursued for vocational or occupational purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. Res. 673. Resolution to investigate the feasibility of making insured loans to students; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. Res. 674. Resolution providing for the further expenses of the studies and investigations conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 404, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. Res. 675. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the Joint Committee on Housing for the purpose of concluding its business; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 676. Resolution to provide further expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by House Resolution 298, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. Res. 677. Resolution for the relief of Evelyn Richardson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 678. Resolution authorizing the printing of the volume entitled "The Democratic Way and the Totalitarian Way" as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 6940. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Estella Wolfe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6941. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mark Wolfe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 6942. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Juana Mercado Valle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6943. A bill for the relief of Hector Luis Melendez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6944. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Colon Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6945. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Ovidio Vazquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6946. A bill for the relief of Winston A. Brownie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6947. A bill for the relief of Daniel Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 6948. A bill for the relief of George Craciun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6949. A bill for the relief of Peter I. Tirbak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 6950. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Governali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 6951. A bill for the relief of George Nicholas Lyras and Angeliki George Lyras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Health Service of the Federal Security

H. R. 3066. An act for the relief of Lawrence

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2100. Mr. FOOTE presented a petition of 18,805 residents of Greater New Haven, Conn., urging the President and the Congress to call immediately for amendments to the United Nations Charter under article 109 to enable the United Nations to enact, interpret, and enforce world laws to prevent war, formally presented to Congressman FOOTE by the Greater New Haven Committee To Strengthen the United Nations, at the city hall in New Haven on June 14, 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 15, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, we are again approaching Thy throne of grace through the old and familiar way of prayer which is always open to those who come with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

Grant that this day may be glorious in the realization of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power, and in the assurance that we are serving our generation according to Thy divine will. May we carry on bravely in the high adventure of building a finer civilization.

Make us eager to have a large part in ministering to the needs of all who are finding the struggle of life so difficult and who are discouraged because of hardships and handicaps.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 15, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2223) to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta; and

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 418) to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DONDERO, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. MCGREGOR, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. BLATNIK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.

The message further announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, Mr. HALE, Mr. MILLER of Connecticut, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. PRIEST were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FLORNEY, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. CLEVENGER, Mr. MAHON, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mr. GORE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mr. PLOESER, Mr. SCRIVNER, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. HENDRICKS, and Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1643. An act for the relief of Freda Wahler;

H. R. 3066. An act for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4128. An act for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others;

H. R. 4456. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Robert A. Atlas;

H. R. 4881. An act for the relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 5145. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt III, a minor;

H. R. 5336. An act for the relief of Leon Moore;

H. R. 5339. An act for the relief of John Keith;

H. R. 5423. An act for the relief of E. Neill Raymond;

H. R. 6570. An act to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1274. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Wilkinson County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins;

S. 1275. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Warren County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans;

S. 1303. An act for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson;

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Hou Chung Chay;

S. 1409. An act for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki;

S. 1863. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation;

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations;

S. 2237. An act to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act;

H. R. 5275. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer;

H. R. 5869. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6626. An act to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram just received from Allan B. Kline, president, American Farm Bureau Federation Board of Directors, urging early and favorable action on S. 2318, the long-range farm program measure.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 15, 1948.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Farm Bureau Federation Board of Directors in session today in Chicago heartily commends the Senate on their apparent progress toward the passage of long-range farm program legislation. We earnestly solicit your support for prompt and favorable action on S. 2318, including Aiken amendments.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President.

RESOLUTIONS OF CUSTER COUNTY, NEBR., POWER DISTRICT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the Custer County, Nebr., power district, at Broken Bow, Nebr., relating to power supply by the Bureau of Reclamation.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUSTER PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT, BROKEN BOW, NEBR.—REA PROJECT NO. NEBR. 63, CUSTER

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
County of Custer, ss.

I, Ivan D. Evans, secretary of the Custer Public Power District, do hereby certify that the resolution stated below is a full, true, and correct transcript and literal copy of a resolution passed by the board of directors at a meeting held May 20, 1948, as the same appears in the original minutes book, which is now in my possession and custody.

"Resolved, That this district request the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Interior, and our Senators and Representative in Congress, to take all steps necessary to protect the interests of this district in any proposed allocations of Bureau of Reclamation power that would affect any distribution of power in the State of Nebraska and particularly in the territory this district serves or will serve as an REA project.

"Further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator BUTLER, Senator WHERRY, and Congressman MILLER, and also the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Interior, Washington, D. C., and Denver, Colo."

Dated this 14th day of June 1948.

[SEAL] IVAN D. EVANS,
Secretary.

CUSTER PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT, BROKEN BOW, NEBR.—REA PROJECT NO. NEBR. 63, CUSTER

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
County of Custer, ss.

I, Ivan D. Evans, secretary of the Custer Public Power District, do hereby certify that the resolution stated below is a full, true, and correct transcript and literal copy of a resolution passed by the board of directors at a meeting held June 12, 1948, as the same appears in the original minutes book, which is now in my possession and custody:

"REQUEST FOR POWER SUPPLY BY THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"Resolved, That the board of directors of the Custer Public Power District hereby request that the Bureau of Reclamation include in its plans to construct a 115-kilovolt transmission line to North Platte, Nebr., sufficient energy and substation capacity to supply the initial and ultimate wholesale power requirements of this district.

"Further resolved, That inasmuch as the Bureau of Reclamation has plans for hydroelectric and irrigation development in the Middle Loup River Basin within the project area of this district, that we urgently request the Bureau to make a full study of the desirability of extending their proposed North Platte transmission line on to the load center of this district, which load center would be immediately adjacent to the transmission lines that the Bureau would construct to interconnect their proposed hydroelectric plants in this area.

"Further resolved, That the Bureau of Reclamation be requested to furnish this district copies of their standard 'if and when' wholesale power contract containing the applicable terms, conditions, and rate schedules for customers such as this district.

"Further resolved, That if such contract is found satisfactory by the board of directors, that favorable action in regard to same be taken. The foregoing action being subject to the approval of the Rural Electrification Administration."

Dated this 14th day of June 1948.

[SEAL] IVAN D. EVANS,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2024. A bill for the relief of Carl Plowaty and W. J. Plowaty; without amendment (Rept. No. 1712).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 2640. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1734);

H. R. 6162. A bill to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1709);

H. R. 6507. A bill to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level-premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1710);

H. R. 6808. A bill to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1711); and

H. R. 6818. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting; without amendment (Rept. No. 1727).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 10 years old); without amendment (Rept. No. 1716);

S. 1691. A bill for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1717);

S. 1982. A bill for the relief of Herman A. Bennink; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1718);

S. 2382. A bill for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1719);

S. 2662. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach; without amendment (Rept. No. 1720);

S. 2709. A bill for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1721);

H. R. 1076. A bill for the relief of Chester O. Glenn; without amendment (Rept. No. 1729);

H. R. 1733. A bill for the relief of G. C. Hedrick; without amendment (Rept. No. 1730);

H. R. 2193. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Graham; without amendment (Rept. No. 1722);

H. R. 2696. A bill for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1731);

H. R. 4199. A bill for the relief of George Haniotis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1723);

H. R. 4516. A bill for the relief of the Moore Dry Dock Co., of Oakland, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1732);

H. R. 4881. A bill for the relief of Dimitri Petrou; without amendment (Rept. No. 1724);

H. R. 5040. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1733); and

H. R. 6184. A bill for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Nonik, Conn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1725).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 2096. A bill to amend section 11 of the act approved June 8, 1940 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1708); and

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1706).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2339. A bill to prohibit the mailing of propaganda disseminated by agents of foreign principals unless the source of such propaganda is identified therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 1707); and

S. 2677. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to clerks in air mail field railway post offices; without amendment (Rept. No. 1708).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 6634. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea; without amendment (Rept. No. 1735).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2310. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1713).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 6633. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1714).

By Mr. MALONE, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 2667. A bill to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey; with amendments (Rept. No. 1726); and

S. 2831. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas and to provide emergency aid, including aid for the repair, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of public facilities in such areas, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1728).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2705. A bill to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1736);

S. 2726. A bill for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1737);

H. R. 1734. A bill for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1738); and

H. R. 6428. A bill to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1739).

By Mr. MALONE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2756. A bill to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1741).

By Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3999. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders; with amendments (Rept. No. 1740); and

H. R. 4044. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1742).

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 262), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress $5,000 in addition to the amount and for the same purpose specified in Senate Resolution 120, agreed to July 26, 1947.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2672. A bill for the relief of Julio Lafitte; and

S. 2673. A bill recording the lawful entry for permanent residence into the United States and authorizing the naturalization of Ellen Rodriguez Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2674. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain real property at Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y., to the custody and control of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

S. 2675. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2676. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, part III; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original bill (S. 2677) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2678. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 18, between lines 14 and 15, to insert the following:

"BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

"Education of Indians: For an additional amount for education of Indian pupils in the Winnebago Public Schools, District No. 17, Winnebago, Nebr., fiscal year 1948, $9,055.90."

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF ALASKA RAILROAD—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. ECTON) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2326) to repeal the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such act of June 29, 1936, is applicable, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5710) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill S. 2318, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 18, after line 14, insert: "For payment to the following named contractors in the following designated amounts in full settlement of their claims, legal or equitable, of any nature whatsoever arising out of or connected with the notice by the United States Reclamation Service of the exhaustion of funds for payment of contractors earnings in connection with the construction of the Friant-Kern Canal, Calif., Peter Kiewit Son's Co., $186,195.93; Arizona-Nevada Constructors, $348,867.62; Morrison-Knudsen, Inc., and M. H. Hassler, $217,918.47; Bechtel Bros.-McCone Co., $32,018.[illegible] in all, $794,699.99."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6935 making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1643. An act for the relief of Freda Wahler;

H. R. 3066. An act for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4128. An act for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others;

H. R. 4456. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Robert A. Atlas;

H. R. 4881. An act for the relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 5145. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt III, a minor;

H. R. 5336. An act for the relief of Leon Moore;

H. R. 5339. An act for the relief of John Keith; and

H. R. 5433. An act for the relief of E. Neill Raymond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6570. An act to provide for the conversion of national banking association into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 2239, to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 2 of said Senate engrossed amendment, after the word "certified" insert "by the Governor of the State in which the property is situated and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HOMER FERGUSON,
EDWARD J. THYE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
MELVIN C. SNYDER,
CARTER MANASCO,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

REVERCOMB-WEST VIRGINIA PLAN FOR VETERANS

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain letters, statements, and supporting material pertaining to the Revercomb-West Virginia plan for veterans, which appear in the Appendix.]

HOUSING PROGRESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE PROVIDENCE JOURNAL

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Housing Progress," published in the Providence (R. I.) Journal of June 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN H. BANKHEAD

[Mr. SPARKMAN, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public service of John H. Bankhead, late a Senator from the State of Alabama, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE POLISH PEOPLE BY SENATOR BROOKS

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech in tribute to the Polish people delivered by him June 6, 1948, in Humboldt Park, Chicago, Ill., under the auspices of the Polish National Alliance, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SILENT CURTAIN SEPARATING AUSTRIA FROM GERMANY

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Compassion Inn," as told to Margaret Pearson by Ulrich Haussman, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHILDREN'S FUND

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senate for a moment. Last night, or perhaps it was this morning, the question was before the Senate on the European recovery appropriation bill relative to the Children's Fund, and the reduction of the provision contained in the House bill, from $60,000,000 to $20,000,000. Last night I voiced, most inadequately, my disapproval of the Senate amendment. I had not had time to think about it fully, but I thought then that a grave mistake was being made by the Senate. I was disturbed about it, Mr. President, and even after the long hours we had been in session, I did not rest too well last night, because I could not help but think of the circumstances and conditions of the people in the eastern countries of Europe, the people behind the iron curtain.

Mr. President, they are not Communists in large part. The people themselves are liberty loving. Their desire for liberty today is greater than ever, because they are living under the tyrant's heel. They want the kind of life we have. They look to America. We are spending millions upon millions of dollars in carrying our way of life to the people behind the iron curtain, and their governments, and the government of the Soviet Union, are combating our efforts with every kind of propaganda. When the word goes out that the Senate of the United States has reduced the sum which was allowed by the House from $60,000,000 to the pitiful sum of $20,000,000 for the care of little children in those countries, children who themselves are our hope for the future of democratic life in the very countries behind the iron curtain, I know it will be seized upon and used against us in all our efforts in those countries.

It was said last night that it makes no difference; that propaganda will be used against us anyway. That is quite true. But every bit of true ammunition we give to be used against us makes that propaganda more effective and more deadly.

So I rose again this morning only to express my even stronger and firmer conviction on the subject, and my hope that the conferees on the part of the Senate will see the situation as it really is and will recede from the position taken by the Senate, and permit the appropriation for the Children's Fund to remain at $60,000,000.

TIDELANDS LEGISLATION — TELEGRAM FROM GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of a telegram sent to several Senators by a number of governors relative to the tidelands legislation.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT,
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Senator GUY CORDON,
Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senator HOMER FERGUSON,
Senator ALBERT W. HAWKES,
Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Senator RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN:

The Governors' conference being on record as favoring the submerged lands and tidelands legislation now pending in the Congress, and this being a matter of vital concern to the States as it affects the fundamental rights of the States, and the Supreme Court having in its opinion clearly indicated that the Congress has the right and power to determine the national policy involved, and it being generally considered that the Congress at this session would pass upon this legislation before irreparable damage is done, and the House of Representatives having some time ago overwhelmingly passed this legislation, we respectfully urge that it be given priority on the agenda of remaining legislation to insure that action be taken upon it by the Senate before adjournment.

Horace A. Hildreth, Maine; Dwight H. Green, Illinois; C. A. Robins, Idaho; Frank Carlson, Kansas; Earl Warren, California; Alfred E. Driscoll, New Jersey; Robert D. Blue, Iowa; Walter W. Bacon, Delaware; Luther W. Youngdahl, Minnesota; Kim Sigler, Michigan; John H. Hall, Oregon; Thomas E. Dewey, New York; James H. Duff, Pennsylvania.

"THE LITTLE MAN" ALSO HAS SOME TARGETS—ARTICLE BY JOHN W. OWENS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "'The Little Man' Also Has Some Targets," written by John W. Owens, and published in the Baltimore Sun of June 16, 1948. It is an article of challenging pith and moment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE LITTLE MAN" ALSO HAS SOME TARGETS

(By John W. Owens)

Whether or not Mr. Truman has made lasting gains on this tour of the country nobody can say, but there is not much doubt left that he has done rather well by himself. The reason is not far to seek. Mr. Truman turned the tables.

Everybody had got into the habit of speaking of the President as an average man and many had come to speak of him habitually as a little man. In Congress, condescension often was unconcealed. What nearly everybody forgot was that this Republican Congress, which has been bedeviling Mr. Truman, is not overstocked with intellectual giants. For that matter, the Republican Presidential race is not overstocked with intellectual giants. There is no lack of targets on the Republican side. The "little man in the White House" put on his hat, went into the country and began to shoot. From time to time he placed his shot on a target. This, of course, does not overnight project Mr. Truman as a great statesman. But it does bring things into better proportion for Mr. Truman's benefit. It does direct attention to the fact that under the Dome of the Capitol is a considerable number of important figures who certainly need not be accepted as great statesmen.

Moreover, the fight itself makes an appeal. Mr. Truman has been politically flat on his back. Flat on his back, he found the stamina which is a prime quality in his make-up. In politics, few things are more appealing—for the moment anyway—than the sight of a mild, good-tempered man who comes up fighting in circumstances which would break the hearts of most of the tough guys.

If one stands off at a little distance and looks at the scene, one may sometimes marvel that the Republicans can be toplofty with Mr. Truman and his mistakes.

Take this question of aid to Europe under the Marshall plan. As a concept it is comparable to the lend-lease plan evolved by Mr. Roosevelt. Each was the work of bold imagination in dealing with international conditions beyond precedent. Lend-lease served mightily in war to keep this Nation's friends on their feet. Thus it served a cause which this Nation believed to be the cause of humanity. At the same time, it helped to guard our welfare while we were trying to find our way and our policy. Aid to Europe under the Marshall plan is designed in the postwar period to keep this Nation's friends on their feet. In keeping this Nation's friends in Europe on their feet, it is designed—according to our kind of democratic faith—to serve the cause of humanity. At the same time it is designed to preserve our national defenses by holding outposts during the months or years in which we move toward some sort of settlement with Russia.

This Marshall plan of aid to Europe—on a scheduled, sustained basis—won the instant support of the large majority of men and women in this country who are concerned in the promotion of law and order in the world. It won their support in its first outlines and it won their support in its patiently detailed structure. It came to Europe as a beacon of salvation. Almost from the hour that it was announced some checking of the process of disintegration could be seen. Winter relief for some nations in the west of Europe became necessary last autumn, and winter relief may have saved the instant situation. But it was the prospect of scheduled, sustained aid in rehabilitation as well as in relief that steadied Europe in the touch-and-go months of the winter and early spring. So clear was the case for the Marshall plan that Mr. Stassen and Mr. Dewey supported it outright and Mr. VANDENBERG led the fight for it in Congress.

And who produced this massive plan for the preservation in Europe of our kind of democracy and our kind of freedom? Secretary of State George C. Marshall. Who appointed George C. Marshall to be Secretary of State? "The little man in the White House." Who has supported Secretary Marshall full and fair, through thick and thin? "The little man in the White House." And who sniped at the plan, who dawdled over the plan? Old-line Republicans in both branches of Congress. There was so much sniping, so much dawdling that but for the fidelity of ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG—aided by the scare in the Italian elections—old-line Republicans might have fatally damaged authorization of the plan. And who in late days has been trying to meat-ax the appropriation to carry out the plan—endorsed as it is by three of the four leading Republican candidates for President? Who, indeed? You know the answer. Old-line Republicans in Congress.

Let "the little man in the White House" make it a fight. The mistakes are not all at his end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

OMINOUS IMPLICATIONS OF THE TARIFF COMPROMISE—EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. TYDINGS. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Ominous Implications of the Tariff Compromise," published in the Baltimore Sun of today. The article deals with the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OMINOUS IMPLICATIONS OF THE TARIFF COMPROMISE

The vote in the Senate on the renewal of the reciprocal trade-agreements program was 70 to 18. But the size of the majority in favor of it gives a false impression—23 of those 70 favorable votes were cast reluctantly by Democrats compelled to make a choice between renewal of the trade-agreements program on a weakened basis and no renewal at all.

The attack on the program started in the House of Representatives, which passed a renewal bill in a form calculated to cripple the whole program. The net effect of the House bill, if it had become the law, would have been to throw the whole business of tariff making back into Congress, and thus to revive all that log-rolling and back-scratching which were notoriously characteristic of tariff making for so many years. This evidence of Republican hostility to the program, this outburst of old-fashioned protectionism, was reflected in the Senate. But under the leadership of Senators VANDENBERG and MILLIKIN a compromise was finally worked out which got the approval of the Senate.

The compromise eliminated the worst feature of the House bill—that which would have restored the power of Congress to veto any changes in tariff rates under the program. But the compromise renews the program for 1 year only instead of 3; and it contains certain provisions which will clearly handicap the President in tariff negotiations.

The Senate compromise, therefore, is not one which can be greeted with enthusiasm by those who look upon the reciprocal trade-agreements program as an important element in our foreign policy. The best that can be said of it is that it is the lesser evil.

Yesterday, moving swiftly, the House accepted the Senate compromise, and the bill has been sent to the President. The trade-agreements program has been saved, thanks largely to the efforts of Senator VANDENBERG and Senator MILLIKIN, but those who are hostile to it have shown their strength, and we may be sure that they will come back to the fight a year from now more determined than ever to kill it.

REPORTING AND PRINTING THE PROCEEDINGS FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished President pro tempore lay down the business that is privileged at this time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before doing that, the President pro tempore would like to take advantage of this opportunity to express a word of appreciation to some of the Senate servants whose efficiency is so total and constant that it is scarcely ever recognized.

The Chair reminds Senators that the Senate adjourned at 12:50 o'clock this morning. When we arrived at our offices we found the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the day, consisting of 248 pages, a complete and accurate transcription of the entire proceedings, which is, the Chair must say, as one who knows something about the publishing business, little short of a miracle in efficient production.

The Chair wishes to express our debt not only for this performance in itself, but as a symbol of the constancy with which we are served so efficiently not only by our reporting staff but by the Government Printing Office.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to join in the eloquent words expressed by the President of the Senate in expressing my deep appreciation of the services to which he has referred.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2318, to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, and the pending question is on the first amendment to the committee substitute. Meanwhile, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is recognized.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 169)

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay down the veto message on Senate bill 110.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, as follows:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 110, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, because it would permit an important segment of the economy to obtain immunity from the antitrust laws, and would do so without providing adequate safeguards to protect the public interest.

This bill would authorize exemption from the antitrust laws for any carrier acting in concert with one or more competing carriers in the establishment of rates and related matters, if the Interstate Commerce Commission approves the procedural agreements under which such action would be taken. The Commission would be required to approve these agreements if it should find that exemption from the antitrust laws would be in "furtherance of the national transportation policy."

Under this bill private carrier associations and rate bureaus, free from the restraints of the antitrust laws, could exercise broad powers over most forms of domestic transportation, including railroads, trucks and busses, water carriers, pipe lines, and freight forwarders. Carriers could agree privately among themselves upon the rates to be filed with, or withheld from, the Interstate Commerce Commission. Acting through these bureaus, groups of carriers could exercise a powerful deterrent influence upon the filing by an individual carrier of proposed rates which might benefit the public.

The exercise by private groups of this substantial control over the transportation industry involves serious potential harm to the public. Transportation rates affect the cost of goods as they move through each phase of production—from raw materials, through finished products, to the consumer. Power to control transportation rates is power to influence the competitive success or failure of other businesses. Legislation furthering the exercise of this power by private groups would clearly be contrary to the public interest.

My disapproval of this bill does not signify opposition to carrier associations as such, or to all of their present functions. Many of their activities are useful and desirable. However, this legislation is not necessary for the continuation of such activities.

No legislation giving a major industry immunity from the antitrust laws should be enacted unless adequate alternative safeguards are provided for the public interest. This measure fails to provide such safeguards. Even the limited safeguards incorporated in the bill as originally passed by the Senate are omitted from the bill in its present form. It would require the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve any agreement which it finds to be in "furtherance of the national transportation policy." This is a vague and general standard and is manifestly neither adequate nor appropriate as a criterion for waiving the protection afforded the public by the antitrust laws.

Furthermore, the Commission would be placed in the position of applying this general criterion to the basic procedural agreements without being able to foresee fully the nature and effect of the joint actions which would be taken thereunder. Nevertheless, the exemption from the antitrust laws would extend to these subsequent actions without the necessity of further Commission approval. It would extend, moreover, even beyond the parties to the basic agreement to any "other persons" who participate in such actions.

Even though transportation rates are subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the public interest nevertheless demands that the general national policy of maintaining competition continue to be applied to this industry. Our present transportation policy contemplates a pattern of partial regulation, within the framework of which the pressures of competition will remain substantially effective. Regulation cannot entirely replace these competitive pressures. It can guard against some of the potential abuses of monopoly power, but it cannot be an effective substitute for the affirmative stimulus toward improved service and lower rates which competition provides. By sanctioning rate control by groups of carriers, this legislation would represent a departure from the present transportation policy of regulated competition. This, I believe, would be a serious mistake, with far-reaching effects on our economy.

Antitrust cases are now before the courts challenging some of the very activities which would be covered by this bill. Pending judicial clarification of the issues raised in these proceedings, it would be inappropriate to provide the immunity proposed by this bill.

I have repeatedly urged upon the Congress the necessity for a vigorous anti-monopoly program. This bill would be inconsistent with such a program.

For these compelling reasons, I find it necessary to withhold my approval from the measure.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 1948.*

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask whether this privileged matter displaces all other business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is entirely privileged, and displaces nothing.

Mr. AIKEN. It does displace the pending business, does it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Only long enough for the Senate to act on the veto message, then the unfinished business will be automatically resumed.

Mr. AIKEN. The discussion and vote will not displace the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They will not.

The question before the Senate is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. REED. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Dworshak
Baldwin	Cain	Eastland
Ball	Capehart	Ecton
Barkley	Capper	Ellender
Brewster	Chavez	Fenzel
Bricker	Connally	Ferguson
Bridges	Cooper	Flanders
Brooks	Cordon	Fulbright
Buck	Donnell	Green
Butler	Downey	Gurney
Hatch	McKellar	Smith
Hawkes	McMahon	Sparkman
Hayden	Magnuson	Stennis
Hickenlooper	Malone	Stewart
Hill	Martin	Taft
Hoey	Maybank	Taylor
Holland	Millikin	Thomas, Okla.
Ives	Moore	Thye
Jenner	Morse	Tobey
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Tydings
Johnston, S. C.	Myers	Umstead
Kem	O'Conor	Vandenberg
Kilgore	O'Daniel	Watkins
Knowland	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Langer	Pepper	White
Lodge	Reed	Wiley
Lucas	Revercomb	Williams
McCarthy	Robertson, Va.	Wilson
McClellan	Robertson, Wyo.	Young
McFarland	Russell	
McGrath	Saltonstall	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we have just had a quorum call. I should like to propose a unanimous-consent request for a limitation of debate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request until the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] returns to the Chamber?

Mr. WHERRY. I can make the request, and we can discuss it. The Senator from Georgia will be in the Chamber shortly.

Mr. RUSSELL entered the Chamber.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if he will not confer with the minority leader [Mr. BARKLEY], with whom I usually consult before proposing such an agreement, although I did not have an opportunity to talk with him this time.

I think it would expedite matters if we could agree on a time to vote. I am not one to set the hour. The time for voting should be agreeable to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If the Senator from Georgia could suggest a time which would be acceptable to him, and the time between now and the time for voting could be properly divided, I think the work of the Senate today would be very much expedited.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me suggest to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that he withhold his request for a few moments until I can make a few inquiries

and confer with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is now on his way to the Chamber.

Mr. WHERRY. If he is on his way to the Chamber, let me make a suggestion so that we can begin thinking about it. It is now nearly 12:30. I am wondering if 2 o'clock would be a satisfactory hour.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure that that time would not be satisfactory. I am anxious to arrive at a reasonable time, but 2 o'clock would allow entirely too little time to devote to a subject of this magnitude.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator consider any other hour, depending upon the approval of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be glad to consider the hour of 3 o'clock, but I do not wish to be committed to that hour at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] wishes to get ahead with the farm program bill, and proceed to a vote. This is a privileged matter. I am quite sure that if we could get unanimous consent we could expedite reconsideration of Senate bill 110 and get back to the farm program bill. I hope to have the full approval of the Senator from Vermont in arriving at a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at some appropriate hour.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I understood the ruling of the Chair a few moments ago, the laying down of the veto message is a privileged matter, but reconsideration of the bill is not a privileged matter. However, I would not object to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at 3 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that consideration of the veto message is a privileged matter, as well as the matter of laying it before the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we had a different occupant of the chair a few minutes ago——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Chair is absolutely correct. There would be no point in making the laying down of the message a privileged matter, if its consideration were not privileged. I have always understood that consideration of a veto message is a privileged matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator in charge of the proposed legislation. My only hope is that Senators in a position to do so can see their way clear to agree upon an hour for voting. I am not undertaking to fix the hour. I should like to have an hour fixed for the vote, for the reason that many Senators are busy in committees, and it would be a great help to them to know when the vote will be had. I appeal to my colleague from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is working with me on a very important conference, to agree to fix a time for the vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the persuasive qualities of my friend from Nebraska. This bill is one of the most important measures that this Congress will have to consider. In the terrific rush which the able and distinguished driver of the majority is managing with his bull whip, we have no time to devote to the important problems of the people. Probably I shall not object eventually to a settlement; but until there has been some opportunity to explain what was done with respect to this bill in the conference, and until those of us who are opposed to changing the traditional American system of free competitive enterprise have an opportunity to debate this question so that at least some Members of this body who are not in various subcommittees or conferences which are now meeting all over the Capitol in the insensate rush to close the Congress by the 19th of June may have an opportunity to know what this is all about, I shall not agree to a limitation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of that statement, I suppose it is hopeless to go further. We are now taking up valuable time that might be used for debate. However, I am hopeful that after the debate has proceeded for a time the distinguished Senator from Wyoming can suggest an hour which he feels will be acceptable. Later, in the event that the debate promises to continue for some time, we may obtain unanimous consent.

I do not wish to deprive the able Senator from Wyoming of the opportunity to make an argument. However, I wish to observe that the bill has been debated, and the only question before the Senate now is consideration of the veto message. I think it would be a very fine thing if the Senator from Wyoming would consider the fact that Senators working on committees would like to know at what hour the vote will be had.

Mr. President, later I shall make another suggestion, but I shall wait until the Senator from Wyoming feels that the debate has progressed sufficiently far so that we may obtain an agreement to vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Members of the Senate who have been working day and night during the past week probably are more or less physically exhausted, and they may not be able to prolong the debate. They may not be able to develop all the issues which ought to be developed. Speaking for myself, I have no intention of addressing the Senate at any undue length. However, I wish to have the opportunity clearly to lay before Members of this body the significance and effect of the passage of this bill, if I am capable of doing it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there gathered in Washington yesterday about 60 or 75 representatives of traffic organizations, covering the entire Nation. At the close of their deliberations yesterday afternoon they issued a statement which is so clearly an exposition of everything that is included in the veto message that I shall read it to the Senate as my statement. Those who issued this statement are the top-flight traffic experts of the country. Among them are representatives of agricultural, industrial, and commercial organizations. At the close of my comments on this matter and the reading of the statement, I shall place in the RECORD a list of the organizations participating in the conference.

Here is the statement of fact the conference made:

President Truman on June 12 vetoed S. 110, the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, to extend the regulatory power of the Interstate Commerce Commission to cover procedures among regulated carriers—rail, motor, and water—through which carriers and shippers may give consideration to rate changes preliminary to their publication and filing with the Interstate Commerce Commission. In his message, the President says his disapproval of the bill "does not signify opposition to carrier associations," many of whose activities be described as "useful and desirable." The shippers of the country go further than the President and say that carrier rate committees are not only useful and desirable but are absolutely necessary.

Mr. President, these are the top-flight executive traffic men in the country, representing shippers, and only shippers.

I read further from their statement:

The system of regulated transportation under the Interstate Commerce Act could not function successfully if there were no such committees.

In transportation circles, either among shippers, carriers, or governmental regulatory bodies there has been no doubt that such committees, as they have been organized and have operated for half a century, were lawful. It is only within the past few years that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has made such an issue of their legality under the antitrust laws that it has become necessary to appeal to Congress to say what is its intent in the area of conflict asserted to exist between two of its own acts.

Both Houses of Congress, at the insistent and urgent demand of thousands of shippers in every section of the Nation, and after most exhaustive hearings and careful consideration, passed S. 110, the Reed-Bulwinkle bill. The bill does not do the things alleged in the veto message of the President. It does not enable private groups to control rates. It does not remove the rate-making process from the full and final control of the Commission. It does not substitute private rate making for government supervision and regulation of transportation rates under the Interstate Commerce Act.

It does not, as implied in the President's veto, remove the carriers from the general provisions of the antitrust laws. It does not render moot or defeat the pending antitrust suit of the State of Georgia or the one at Lincoln, Nebr.

It does not remove or weaken the safeguards thrown around commerce by present laws. On the contrary it continues all the safeguards we now have and throws new safeguards around such regulation and procedures by giving the Interstate Commerce Commission, for the first time, jurisdiction over and power to control rate-committee practices.

The bill resolves the conflict alleged to exist between the antitrust laws and the Interstate Commerce Act. It reaffirms the intent of Congress that regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act shall continue to be the responsibility and function of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It recognizes that this is the only way in which transportation rates can be successfully regulated and that the present system of rate making must be preserved in the interest of the shippers.

Large shippers might be able, after a fashion, to cope with the situation that would result from the elimination of the present method of rate making. The hundreds of thousands of small shippers, whose business does not justify the maintenance of large traffic departments, however, would be next to helpless if the present rate-making method is discontinued. No shipper should be subjected to the confusion that would result from such action.

Without present rate-making methods, the small shipper particularly, would not be informed of proposed changes in his rates or those of his competitors, or of existing services. He would be put to the impossible task of trying to confer separately and individually with numerous rail carriers and still more numerous carriers by motor. It would also lead to costly and endless litigation to all parties.

That is why, with virtual unanimity, shippers and shippers' organizations from every section of the country, representing agriculture and industry, urged that Congress pass S.110, the Reed-Bulwinkle bill. That is why today, after the bill has been vetoed by President Truman under an apparent misconception of its meaning and effect, these shippers now urge upon Congress that the bill be enacted into law over the President's veto.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 15, 1948.*

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a list of the shippers' organizations that participated in the conference yesterday.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Among the national and regional shippers' organizations represented at the meeting on the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, S. 110, on June 15, 1948, were the following: The National Industrial Traffic League, National Association of Shipper Advisory Boards, Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, National Council of Farm Cooperatives, National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, National League of Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, American Paper and Pulp Association, Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Automobile Manufacturer's Association, Mississippi Valley Association, New England Industrial Traffic League, the Southern Traffic League, the Southwestern Industrial Traffic League, the Illinois Territory Industrial Traffic League, the Central Territory Rate Conference, the New England Shipper's Advisory Board, the Atlantic States Shipper's Advisory Board, the Midwest Shipper's Advisory Board, the Southern Shipper's Advisory Board, the Northwest Shipper's Advisory Board, the Growers and Shipper's League, New England Paper and Pulp Traffic Association, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, Northwest Horticultural Council, Apple Grower's Association, West Coast Lumberman's Association, Georgia-Alabama Textile Traffic Association, Wisconsin Paper & Pulp Manufacturers Traffic Association, Texas Industrial Traffic League, Southern Hardwood Traffic Association.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me say to my southern friends that in the conference held yesterday not only was all the shipping world covered by the conference represented, but there were also in attendance representatives of the National Association of Shipper Advisory Boards, the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, the National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, the Mississippi Valley Association, the Southern Traffic League, the Southwestern Industrial Traffic League, the Southern Shippers' Advisory Board, the Georgia-Alabama Textile Traffic Association, the Texas Industrial Traffic League, and the Southern Hardwood Traffic Association.

In all my experience in the Senate, I have never seen a piece of legislation which has commanded such widespread support from shippers the United States over. The Grange, the Farm Bureau, and the various other agricultural associations, with one exception, have endorsed this bill.

Mr. President, during the hearings we filed in the record approximately 950 expressions of approval of the bill. Its enactment is absolutely necessary.

I do not wish to prolong this debate. What I am saying has been said over and over again. But here is the fact: In the beginning of railroad rate making, every railroad published its own rates. As the commerce of the country grew in volume it also grew in complexity, and the rate-making process became so complex that to enable shippers intelligently to determine what rates would be applied there had to be rate bureaus and rate conferences that included more than one railroad. About thirty-odd bureaus and conferences of that kind have operated in the last 40 or 50 years. For 40 years, up to 1942, no question was ever raised as to their lawfulness or legality.

There is no way to make freight rates except through the conference method. The Interstate Commerce Act requires that the railroads form through routes and then establish joint rates. The through-route requirement was included in the Interstate Commerce Act, section 1, so that a shipper would not have to unload his car when it got to the end of any particular railroad. As I recall, it is section 18 of the Interstate Commerce Act that requires—not permits, but requires—the railroads to establish through rates on which to operate the joint routes.

Now, Mr. President, in the name of high heaven, how can two or more railroads establish joint rates and through routes without conferring with each other? The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, under what was in my opinion a wholly strained construction of the antitrust law, filed a criminal proceeding in Chicago against one of these rate bureaus in 1942. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Department of Agriculture, virtually all State authorities of the country, and every shipper's organization of which I have any knowledge have filed their approval of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was interested in the Senator's statement that all the departments of the Government ask that the veto be overridden. I should like to know the basis of the Senator's statement.

Mr. REED. They have supported the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator have any statement here from any department that is now urging the Senate to override the veto?

Mr. REED. There are the most complete hearings on the bill of any bill of which I have any knowledge. There was special authority given under the War Powers Act to waive the antitrust law where certain things were necessary during the emergency, and after the case was filed in 1942 in Chicago, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Production Board joined in an action through the War Production Board to continue the conference system of establishing rates.

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me there is quite a difference between the situation the Senator outlines, and having the departments request the Congress to override a veto of the President of the United States.

Mr. REED. I do not think I said that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I so understood the Senator.

Mr. REED. Of course, they have always supported the bill, and if they were going to be consistent they would have to continue their support. Be that as it may, I want to say to my friend from Georgia and my friend from Alabama, there is nothing in the bill that in any way allows or permits discrimination against the South in the freight-rate structure; there is nothing in the bill that would affect the validity of the Georgia suit in the Supreme Court, and there is nothing in the bill that would affect the antitrust proceedings pending in the court at Lincoln, Nebr. This bill has been trimmed down to where the only thing it does is to give exemption in the making of rates, fares, and charges and the actual handling of equipment and costs of handling equipment as between the different railroads.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the course of the trimming down to which the Senator refers it is quite unusual that the amendment which specifically retained all the rights of action to the State of Georgia was among the first of the casualties. It was the first to be eliminated in the trimming. I hope the statement of the distinguished Senator as to the effect the bill will have upon the right of action in the State of Georgia in the Supreme Court is correct, but I apprehend that if the Congress shall override the veto of the President and enact the bill into law despite the veto, there will immediately be filed a supplemental brief or pleadings in the Supreme Court pointing out that the cause of action of the State of Georgia can only be applied to past conduct on the part of the rate-making agency and can have no possible effect upon what may take place in the future.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Let me answer the Senator from Georgia. I intend to deal with what has been included in the agreements or the definition of agreements in the different phases of what was originally called the Bulwinkle bill, as I shall identify it here.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the Senator is entirely too modest. Without the earnest, diligent, continuous and ardent support of the Senator from Kansas the bill would not now be before the Senate after a veto; it would never have been passed. If there is to be any justice in applying names to legislation, and if the Senate is willing to share whatever criticism or ignominy may be heaped upon him in the future

as a result of the enactment of the bill, I think the name of the distinguished Senator from Kansas, like that of Abou Ben Adhem should lead all the rest in connection with the amendment, because he has certainly been more responsible than any other individual for having carried it thus far in the legislative process.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. If I correctly understood the Senator, he stated the bill would not affect the Georgia case.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. The attorneys who are handling the Georgia case will not agree with the Senator, will they?

Mr. REED. I think they will.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is not the information the Senator from Arizona has received. Would the Senator say the bill would not affect the western case so far as rates are concerned?

Mr. REED. The Senator from Kansas so contends.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Department of Justice informed the Senator from Arizona that so far as the rate part of that case is concerned it will do away with it. Where does the Senator get his information? Is it the result of his own analysis, or is it from the attorneys for the defendants in those cases?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the case of the State of Georgia rests upon the allegation of a conspiracy between the railroads to establish rates which were illegal because discriminatory. The bill has no relation at all to any case that rests upon conspiracy. The bill, if enacted into law as I firmly believe it will be today, will not affect the Georgia case or the Lincoln case in the slightest degree.

Mr. McFARLAND. Where does the Senator get his information? Is it from his analysis, or is it from the opinion of the attorneys from the defendants in the cases?

Mr. REED. It is from my own analysis plus the information I have had from attorneys in the case.

Mr. McFARLAND. Attorneys for the defendants?

Mr. REED. Yes; for the defendants.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes—because the attorneys who are handling the case, who are prosecuting the case, say emphatically it will do away with the case so far as rates are concerned.

The bill cuts the very heart out of the case. Who shall we believe—the attorneys who are prosecuting the case, or the attorneys who are defending the case?

Mr. REED. I do not know what particular attorneys the Senator has in mind, but if they were not any nearer to the truth than the group of "screwballs" from the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice who appeared continuously and at length in the hearings, their statement is not worth much.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not like to hear the Senator from Kansas say that the representatives of the Department of Justice are "screwballs." I would not say that in regard to the attorneys who are defending the legislation. I think they are able attorneys, on both sides. I give them both credit for having their own views and expressing them; but on the floor of the United States Senate I do not like to hear able attorneys called "screwballs."

Mr. REED. I had no reference to any particular attorney engaged in the case. I do not know who the attorneys are.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator does not know who they are, to whom was he referring when he called them "screwballs"?

Mr. REED. I was referring to attorneys from the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. If those gentlemen are not "screwballs," I cannot recognize "screwballs," after listening to them day after day for a long time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator says that this bill will not affect the Georgia case. As the Senator well knows, when the bill was before the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] offered an amendment, which was adopted by the Senate, expressly stating that this bill should not affect the Georgia case, and yet, when the bill went to conference, his amendment was eliminated. If the bill will not affect the Georgia case, why was not the language of that amendment permitted to remain in the bill?

Mr. REED. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] made a more careful analysis of the effect of the so-called Russell amendment than did the Senator from Kansas, and he expressed himself during the debate upon the report of the conference committee.

Mr. HILL. But it is not a question of what the Senator from New Jersey thinks about it. The Senate of the United States adopted that amendment, and the Senate conferees went to conference as the agents of the Senate to fight for the amendments which the Senate had made to the bill. I am now asking one of those agents of the Senate why that amendment was taken out of the bill, particularly since the Senator from Kansas says that the bill does not affect the Georgia case in any way.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Georgia have sat in many conferences. I suggest they furnish a list of conferences over controverted questions——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Let me finish.

Mr. HILL. The Senate conferees may have come back with everything they individually wanted, but they certainly did not come back with everything the Senate wanted, when they surrendered and permitted the amendment to be stricken from the bill.

Mr. REED. We discussed specifically every amendment which the Senate wrote into the bill. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] offered four amendments which were adopted by the Senate. The conference committee saved one. The other three went out. The Senator from Georgia put in one amendment, but the House conferees were determined not to touch it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the House conferees take the position that the amendment did not in any way affect the case pending in the Supreme Court?

Mr. REED. I do not know that the matter was discussed in that detail, but I think that was the impression of the House conferees.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, we all know that in conferences there must be a spirit of compromise if legislation is to be obtained, but it is rather remarkable in this case that an amendment, which the Senator says was of no effect, but which the majority of the Senate thought was necessary to protect the State of Georgia, was stricken from the bill. The mere fact that the House conferees were adamant in their stand against the amendment, as the Senator relates they were, is clear evidence to me that the elimination of this amendment strikes a death blow at a cause of action which has cost the State of Georgia a great deal of money and a great deal of time, and as to which the Supreme Court has said there was a real cause of action. That leaves the State of Georgia, a sovereign State, absolutely helpless in the matter as against the machinations of a group of freight bureaus, after the Senate had put its arm around the sovereign State of Georgia to protect it from such a situation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It not only affects the State of Georgia, but, indirectly, affects the whole South. The entire South will be hurt. The Senate of the United States adopted the amendment, and I do not see how the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] could consent to the elimination of an amendment which affects all the Southern States.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Western States are just as much involved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Wyoming will content himself for a few minutes, I shall try to come to the end of the initial discussion of the question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My request of the Senator was designed to illuminate the point which he has made. He said, if I heard him correctly, that the conference report and the bill, as it is now proposed to pass it over the President's veto, does not impair the power of the Supreme Court to rule against conspiracies.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator says that, then may I ask him to interpret to the Senate the reason for the elimination by the conferees of two specific amendments? We have been discussing the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] which was adopted by the Senate. Let me read that amendment so that it may be clear in the RECORD:

> The enactment of this section shall not—
> (a) deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction to hear and determine the case of Georgia versus Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al., Docket No. 11—
>
> And so forth—
>
> or any proceeding for the enforcement of the provisions of any decree entered in such suit;
> (b)—
>
> I interpolate—"shall not"—
>
> change any principle of substantive or procedural law otherwise applicable in the determination of such suit or proceeding, or deprive any party to such suit of any relief to which such party would be entitled but for the enactment of this section; or
> (c) render lawful the performance of any past or future act which shall have been found by the Supreme Court in such suit or proceeding as it relates to the parties to such suit to be unlawful or which shall be prohibited by the terms of any decree entered therein or any supplement thereto or any modification thereof.

That amendment has been completely eliminated. So it seems to us that the attempt which was made by the Senate of the United States to preserve this action already initiated by a sovereign State should not have been affected by the conference report.

Just another quotation, with the Senator's indulgence. This was an amendment which was inserted by the Senate in order to make sure that no conspiracies would be permitted under the Bulwinkle-Reed bill. I read from paragraph (6):

> Nothing in this section and no approval of any agreement by the Commission under this section shall be so construed as in any manner to remove from the purview of the antitrust laws any restraint upon the right of independent action by any carrier by means of boycott, duress, or intimidation.

In other words, the Senate said there should be no approval of any device by which boycott, duress, or intimidation should be applied to any carrier. The conference eliminated that amendment. Is that the way to prevent conspiracy?

Mr. REED. When some useless language is inserted in a bill for political purposes, and accepted by the Senator in charge of the bill at the end of 5 days' debate in order to get the bill through the Senate, and the conferees on the part of the House say, "If you expect us to consider that kind of bunk seriously you are mistaken."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator say it is useless to prevent boycott, coercion, or intimidation, and can it be prohibited when exemption is being granted from the law which enforces it?

Mr. REED. Of course we are not granting any exemption. The constant misstatements of the Senator from Wyoming—I wish he would make them in his own time——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no limitation on debate.

Mr. REED. No; and certainly the Senator from Wyoming exercises his privilege very freely in that respect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator object to being catechised on this subject?

Mr. REED. It would not do any good to object to the Senator from Wyoming utilizing his privilege as a Senator and taking a lot of time in debate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator can substitute personalities for argument, and I have no objection to that, because I know the RECORD will show that personalities cannot outweigh the facts. The facts are that the Senate put in the bill a prohibition against boycott, intimidation, and coercion, and the conferees took it out.

Mr. REED. It is in the law, anyway.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Where?

Mr. REED. I shall call attention to it later. I ask the Senator from Wyoming to permit me to complete my statement, and then make his speech and make his statements, including his misstatements, in his own time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator be good enough to point out my misstatements?

Mr. REED. I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas declines to yield.

Mr. REED. Now let me deal briefly with the history of the so-called Bulwinkle bill. It came up about 4 years ago, and in its original form, as it passed the House, it granted exemption to agreements made between two or more carriers. It did not say what kind of agreements. It did grant exemption from antitrust laws when agreements were submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission and approved by the Commission.

When the bill came to the Senate and went to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, we rewrote the bill. I had an active part in doing so. In our version, when we rewrote it, we defined the subjects which might be the basis of agreement. We named rates, fares, charges, schedules, damages, and various other things. That was the form in which the bill was passed by the Senate. It was presented in the Senate first in the Seventy-ninth Congress, in the year 1946, and did not pass. That was the form, virtually, in which it came up last year, and the Senate passed it.

The House was too restricted in its first version. Here in the Senate—and I accept a share of the responsibility—we perhaps were too liberal in trying to designate too many subjects. So an attempt was made in the form of the bill which is before the Senate today, and was before the conference, to limit the bill purely to rates, fares, charges, and the adjustment of the costs or payments by railroads for using each other's transportation facilities.

Mr. President, that is a part of the reason why the Russell amendment was deleted, and why some of the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming were eliminated. It was in order to bring the bill down to its strictest fundamentals, to limit it to them, and that is its form today. It does not touch anything except rates, fares, and charges. It is not retroactive. It affects only those actions for the future. It provides for independent action on the part of any participant in an agreement, regardless of the action of the conference.

I think that with this statement, Mr. President, I shall yield the floor at this time.

BOYCOTT, DURESS, OR INTIMIDATION PERMITTED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas has yielded the floor without in the slightest degree giving the Senate any explanation at all as to why in his opinion the bill in the form in which it was reported by the conference prevents intimidation, boycott, or duress. He has contented himself with a mere all-inclusive statement that such practices are prohibited by law, but the purpose of the proposed law which the Senator from Kansas is urging upon the Senate is to eliminate from the prohibitions of the antitrust laws the type of agreement which the transportation industry is permitted under this bill to make.

The language is perfectly clear. These organizations may make agreements—and I am quoting from the language of the conference bill—

> Relating to transportation under joint rates or over through routes; and for purposes of this paragraph carriers by railroad, express companies, and sleeping-car companies are carriers of one class; pipe-line companies are carriers of one class; carriers by motor vehicle are carriers of one class; carriers by water are carriers of one class; and freight forwarders are carriers of one class.

So under the bill which we are now asked to pass over the veto of the President of the United States there is authority granted by Congress, not to the railroads to fix rates, not at all, but to an organization of the transportation industry to fix rates, and to deal with matters relating to transportation over every type of carrier that operates in the commerce of the United States. It includes not only railroads, but also express companies, sleeping-car companies, pipe-line companies, motor-vehicle companies, carriers by water, and freight forwarders. So that here the authority is granted by Congress for a combination of all competing systems of transportation in the United States into one single organization, which will then in effect govern the transportation industry of America regardless of the wishes of the individual carriers.

Let us not deceive ourselves. We are not doing what even the shippers believe is being done. We are establishing a private collectivism. We are taking away from the States in their sovereign capacity the right to protect their own citizens, and we are giving to a private organization, privately created, without any semblance of a standard in the law, the power to govern the transportation industry of America.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

GIVES TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY ITS OWN SUPERGOVERNMENT

Mr. HILL. Might it not be well said that by the bill we would be giving them the power to set up a supergovernment of their own?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The truth of the matter, I will say to the Senator from Alabama, is that we are doing precisely that with respect to the transportation industry.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Wyoming if he has ever heard of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, the Senator from Vermont knows very well that I have heard of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would not have thought so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I challenge the Senator to read the bill. If he does, he will see that the bill provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission is given a mandate to approve the type of agreement authorized here.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that is not the fact. That is not correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. There was no evidence. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming, from his remarks that he was aware of the existence of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is a creature of Congress, which can set rules for its operations and standards for its approval, and that is the safeguard of the shippers of the country and of the interests involved with the railroads. I merely wanted to call the Senator's attention to the existence of that body.

DEPRIVES INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION OF POWER TO PROTECT SHIPPERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Vermont is apparently unaware of the effect of the language of the bill, which takes away from the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to protect the shippers of the State of Vermont as well as shippers of the State of Georgia, because the mandate is here given that, unless these agreements fall within certain very narrow categories, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall approve them.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether those categories are protective categories to shippers, or whether they are categories hostile to shippers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. These are categories which serve the shippers; categories of transportation companies which serve the shippers; and we are now giving them the right to govern themselves with relation to transportation under joint rates over all through routes, and for the purpose of this paragraph all carriers are grouped together.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Wyoming that it is not clear to me from what he has just said in what way the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission in defending the rights of shippers are decreased by this legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall show that to the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is important.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to do that. When the bill was before the Senate—

Mr. FLANDERS. I have the bill before me, I may say to the Senator, and shall be glad to be referred to the specific point in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have now before me the bill as it passed the Senate. I am reading from page 2:

Any carrier, party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers—

This Senate language appears—does the Senator from Vermont follow me?

Mr. FLANDERS. I have found the place.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator may now have before him the bill as reported by the conference. Does he?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the bill which is under consideration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. That is what the Senator has before him?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is what I have before me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very good. I now read:

Any carrier, party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers—

The Senate version had this language.

Mr. FLANDERS. But the Senate version is not before us.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me to answer him, he will receive his answer. These words were inserted by the Senate and were stricken out by the conference:

concerning, or providing rules or regulations pertaining to or procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment of—

Those words have been deleted. So the sentence reads:

Any carrier, party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers relating to rates, fares, charges (including the charges as between carriers).

Now I want the Senator to see that the substitution of the words "relating to" for the provision of the Senate bill "concerning, or providing rules or regulations pertaining to or procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment of" is very much broader.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the Senator if the words which he read from the Senate bill were ever in the law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They were in the bill as it was passed by the Senate.

Mr. FLANDERS. The question we have before us is as to whether the bill presently before us diminishes the ability of the Interstate Commerce Commission to protect the interests of shippers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me to lay before the Senate this entire section, I think he will see the point. I proceed:

Relating to rates, fares, charges (including charges as between carriers), classifications, divisions, allowances, time schedules, routes, the interchange of facilities——

Mr. FLANDERS. Excuse me a minute. The words are not exactly the words that I get from the bill which the President vetoed. I do not know the reasons for the differences.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That language of the Senate bill was changed. I have been reading from paragraph 2:

Rules pertaining thereto or procedures for the joint consideration—

Let me go back to the sentence as it is in the conference report:

Any carrier party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers relating to rates, fares, classifications, divisions, allowances, or charges (including charges between carriers and compensation paid or received for the use of facilities and equipment)—

This is much broader than the Senate language—

or rules or regulations pertaining thereto, or procedures for the joint consideration, initiation or establishment thereof, may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement, and the Commission shall by order approve any such agreement (if approval thereof is not prohibited by paragraph (4), (5), or (5), if it finds that, by reason of furtherance of the national transportation policy declared in this act)—

That means the policy of the existing law.

The relief provided in paragraph (9) should apply with respect to the making and carrying out of such agreement; otherwise the application shall be denied.

LANGUAGE IS DECEPTIVE

As I pointed out upon the floor in the original debate, this language is very carefully drawn to appear to be a restraint upon those who make the agreement, whereas in fact it is a restraint upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission "shall" approve these agreements. These agreements may be made by all carriers, not only railroads, but also by pipe lines, and motor vehicles, and freight forwarders, and the like. So here we have a clear purpose to transfer from the Interstate Commerce Commission to the new organization to be set up, the power to make these rates.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I would suggest to the Senator from Wyoming that he read one section with emphasis, and a second section sotto voce.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will raise my voice for the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would like to read that particular sentence with emphasis.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. FLANDERS. I read:

If it finds that by reason of furtherance——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say before the Senator proceeds——

Mr. FLANDERS (continuing):

of the national transportation policy declared in this act, the relief provided in paragraph (9)—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I decline to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. FLANDERS (continuing):

The relief provided in paragraph (9) should apply—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming declines to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Vermont has accused me of attempting to suppress a portion of this language: and that is an accusation which I shall not permit to be made.

I seek to analyze this bill as it is before us. The Commission may prescribe rules and regulations, as I read this bill, only for the manner in which application is made for the approval of an agreement. This is the language of paragraph 2:

Any carrier, party to an agreement * * * may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply for approval of the agreements * * *.

Obviously these rules and regulations have no effect on the making of the agreement or its contents, but only to the manner in which it is to be presented to the Commission.

THIS IS PRIVATE COLLECTIVISM

Mr. President, as I said a little while ago, we are dealing with the establishment of what amounts to private collectivism. This legislation has been proposed because the operating officials of railroads do not wish to compete in rates and services. Railroad managements have repeatedly undertaken to use their traffic associations to suppress competitive effort, and the Attorney General has vigorously attacked such restrictive policies in suits to enforce the antitrust laws.

If the bill as reported by the conferees becomes law, the ground will be cut from under the Department of Justice. Traffic and rate associations will be organized, and the Interstate Commerce Commission will have to approve them. As a practical matter, it will never thereafter be possible for the Attorney General to attack the renewed use of the associations to suppress the competitive impulses of operating officials.

The way in which the bill would operate would be to prevent individual lines and carriers from fixing any competitive rate upon their own lines, for local, State, or either regional or interregional transportation. Under the provisions of the bill a single railroad company would be deprived of the power of establishing competitive rates within its own territory. The books are full of cases in which the trade associations here sought to be confirmed by law have applied duress and intimidation to the individual carriers to compel such carriers to obey the mandates of the collective managers.

In the past it has been frequently stated by the Interstate Commerce Commission that its powers to regulate the railroads and the transportation systems of the country are slight enough at best. Now it is proposed to whittle this away and transfer to the transportation industry itself the power to regulate transportation. But to me this is probably the least significant aspect of the whole bill.

The real meaning of this measure is that if it is enacted it will be a long step toward the abandonment of the competitive system in the American economy. The United States alone of all the great countries in the world has had an antitrust law. The United States alone of all the great countries in the world has declared as a national policy that the door of opportunity shall always be open, and that every enterprise shall be protected from restraints of trade. That is not the European ideology. The European theory has always been that combinations and cartels should be permitted to operate. The result of the cartel system has been the establishment of the totalitarian form of government.

MONOPOLY VERSUS FREE ENTERPRISE

A rather extraordinary development has taken place this year in Great Britain. In Britain the advance of socialism has been the result of the prior policy of Great Britain to allow trusts and cartel associations. Even the Conservative Party in Great Britain has undertaken to indicate some approval of antitrust policy. What amounts almost to an agreement between the Conservative Party in Great Britain and the Labor Party has resulted in the enactment by the British Parliament of the monopoly—inquiry and control—bill. This measure was presented to the House of Commons on March 25, 1948, by the president of the British Board of Trade. Its purpose was to establish an inquiry in order to see what could be done to prevent monopolistic restraints of trade.

BRITAIN AWAKENING TO DANGERS OF MONOPOLY

A distinguished member of the Conservative Party, the Right Honorable Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, published a pamphlet early this year which he entitled "Monopoly." In 10 chapters of this pamphlet Sir David discusses monopoly, including unit integrations of economic power and agreements among smaller companies to maintain prices and share markets. He gives a history of business agreements in England since the Middle Ages, all of which leads up to some specific conclusion. In this pamphlet, in chapter 5, which he calls Dangers of Monopoly, Sir David Maxwell Fyfe outlines six great dangers as he sees them.

The first is that monopoly promotes industrial inefficiency. When all the transportation systems of the United States are privately governed by a private trade association, so that all the different types of carriers are required to obey the provisions of these agreements relating to transportation, then we may be sure that inefficiency will be promoted.

The second great danger that this author recites is that monopoly uses economic power without any standard of responsibility. There is no standard of responsibility in this measure by which the new monopolistic trade associations may operate. We are neglecting completely the public interest.

MONOPOLY'S GROWING POLITICAL POWER AND PROFITS

The third danger recited by the leader of the British Conservative Party is that monopolies have economic power to wield political influence. Can anyone study the history of the progress of this bill without realizing how monopoly exercises political influence? So great is this power that we are striking down the authority of the sovereign States to protect their own citizens and their own industries.

The fourth danger recited by Sir David Maxwell Fyfe is that monopolies make extortionate profits. Who does not know it? In the Eightieth Congress of the United States there has been exhibited over and over and over again the desire of the majority party to protect the right of big business to make extortionate profits and to levy upon the masses of the people a steadily increasing level of prices for the necessities of life.

I know it was said, back at the beginning of this Congress, that if we would only let these industrial giants have their own way prices would go down. In January 1947 I remember well the announcement of Henry Ford II of a reduction in the price of Ford cars. There was a statement by Fowler McCormick, of the International Harvester Co., announcing a reduction of prices. As a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the joint committee which was created to study inflation and what the Congress could do to prevent depression, I sent Mr. Ford a telegram congratulating him on his action in reducing prices, and a similar telegram was sent to Mr. McCormick. But the Congress of the United States took no action. Prices rose. Only a week ago last Sunday Mr. Ford for the second time in the last 12 months announced another increase in the prices of Ford automobiles. His company was forced to abandon the plan to cut prices and join the inflation parade.

While prices have been going up because the Congress of the United States has determined not only not to take action to prevent inflation, but to also allow concentrated organized business to have its own way, as provided in this bill, profits have been rising by leaps and bounds. The National City Bank of New York, one of the greatest and most powerful banks in the United States, as well as in the world, in its letter for June 1947 on economic conditions and Government finance, recites this very interesting and important fact on page 70 of its report:

The net income, after taxes, of the 100 largest manufacturing corporations in the United States in 1940 was $1,875,000,000.

Mr. President, those were the profits after taxes.

PEOPLE SUFFER WHILE CONGRESS FAWNS UPON BIG BUSINESS

From that monthly letter we also learn that in 1945 those profits, after taxes, had increased to $1,943,000,000; but that in 1947, last year, net income, after taxes, had increased to $3,730,000,000. In other words, between 1940 and 1947, net income, after taxes, had practically doubled. Dividends, which in 1940 amounted to $1,197,000,000, in 1947 had increased to $1,668,000,000. This is the story of what happens to concentrated industry when the Congress of the United States pursues a hands-off policy, when the Congress of the United States declines to act in the way it is constitutionally empowered to act to protect the economic interests of the masses of the people.

On the preceding page of its monthly letter—on page 69—the National City Bank lists the 100 largest manufacturing corporations. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this list may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the important thing which I wish to point out is that this list, which gives the total assets of each one of these 100 corporations, as reported by them at the end of 1947, produces the staggering total of $41,600,000,000. In 1947, the 100 largest manufacturing corporations in the United States, out of a total of some 100,000 or more, owned assets aggregating $41,600,000,000. Their total number of employees was about 4,000,000, according to the National City Bank, which said that the assets of those 100 corporations "represented an average investment in assets of $10,000 per employee."

Mr. President, when we consider that stupendous evidence of the concentration of economic power, along with the report which was made by the House Committee on the Judiciary when it asked the House of Representatives to pass the bill amending sections 7 and 11 of the Clayton Act in order to prohibit monopolistic mergers, we see to what degree the concentration of economic power has proceeded in the United States.

Incidentally, let me say that that bill, approved by the House Committee on the Judiciary, has been buried in the House Rules Committee. A similar bill was here in the Senate. It was assigned to a subcommittee for study. The subcommittee filed a favorable report, and then the whole Judiciary Committee tossed the bill back again into the lap of a subcommittee for additional investigation in connection with the bill, introduced by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], respecting monopoly.

In other words, in the House and in the Senate our policy has been not to act with respect to prohibiting monopolistic mergers; and now the Senate of the United States is asked to pass, over the veto of the President, a bill which conveys away a power which ought to reside in the representatives of the people—a power over the transportation systems of the United States.

I was making a comparison of what has resulted from the concentration of economic power, as proven by the National City Bank's figures, when one takes into consideration what the House Committee on the Judiciary said with respect to concentration in other lines. I shall read now from page 3 of the report submitted to the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Iowa, Representative GWYNNE, on June 17, 1947, approximately 1 year ago.

The body has been laid aside in the Rules Committee, and the Congress is now proceeding by an adjournment to draw the curtain of respect over the laid-out corpse of an antimonopoly procedure because the Congress has dedicated itself apparently to permitting concentrated economic power to take over the control of industry. This is what the gentleman from Iowa, Representative GWYNNE, said in his report:

> In copper mining, three companies controlled 78 percent of the United States production in 1937. In lead mining, four companies controlled 87 percent in 1941. In farm implements, six companies controlled 80 percent in 1940. In dry ice, two companies controlled 70 percent in 1941. In rubber tires and tubes, four companies sold nearly 93 percent of all tires sold by the 17 most important tire companies in 1943. In fluid milk and cream, one company, in 1937, sold 56 percent of the total consumed in the District of Columbia, 55 percent in Baltimore, 42½ percent in Pittsburgh, and 32 percent in Philadelphia. In the icecream business, the same dairy company, in 1937, sold 52 percent of the total in Connecticut, 51 percent in Vermont, 49 percent in New Jersey, and 47 percent in both North Carolina and the District of Columbia.

I could stand upon this floor for hours reciting the record, the cold record, of the concentration of economic power by which a managerial system has been erected in this country because Congress has not paid attention and has failed to exercise the power which the Constitution gives it to regulate commerce among the States. We have permitted this drift to go to such an extent that now the transportation companies of the country ask the Congress to override a veto of the President in order that they may in a private collectivism regulate the whole transportation industry.

One after another I have recited the great dangers of monopoly as pointed out by a conservative Britisher. Let me now recite the fifth danger on his list: The maintenance of prices and profits has the effect of frustrating full employment. Here is a measure which is designed to enable the transportation industry to maintain prices and profits. Here is a measure which puts it within the power of the transportation industry, not the railroads alone but all kinds of carriers, to lay a mandate upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve their private government of this industry.

We are the successors of the great statesmen of the past who said they were establishing here a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Instead of that, we have a government of big business, by big business, and for big business. The result is that the resources of the States and cities of the United States are drying up. States and cities no longer are able to support their own school systems because under our economic structure we permit a few concentrated industrial companies to drain the resources of the States and cities into their central power.

DRIFTING AWAY FROM FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY TOWARD RISING TOTALITARIANISM

I point this out because I say it is my solemn conviction that if the Congress of the United States overrides this veto it will be turning the corner away from free competitive enterprise and democratic popular government down the road to socialism and totalitarian power. There can be no doubt in the mind of anybody who has taken even a few hours to study what has been going on in the world that the rise of totalitarianism, the rise of concentrated political power, has been the direct result of the appearance of concentrated economic power. If we have any thought of stopping this trend we had better act now—act now, or it may be too late.

The State of Georgia brought a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States to protect its citizens and its industries. Under the bill, that suit will be thrown out of court. The Congress of the United States is saying to a sovereign State, "You may not further prosecute this case." When that is done to Georgia, it is done to every other State of the Union, including the States of Kansas, Nebraska, and Vermont. There will be nothing left except a basis for the cry which will then arise to expand the power of the Central Government.

The sixth great danger of monopoly described by Sir David Maxwell Fyfe is that prices fixed by agreement allow the survival of firms with financial resources rather than firms which are efficient producers.

Here, Mr. President, is a comprehensive, intelligent, and able analysis of the result of monopolistic practices. I requested the Library of Congress to prepare a brief statement upon the British monopoly—inquiry and control—bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

I make this request, Mr. President, because it seems to me it is of the greatest importance that Members of the Senate should realize that while we here in the United States are taking over the European ideology of cartel arrangements and monopolistic control of industry, the Government of Great Britain is trying to adopt the American system of free competitive enterprise. At the moment we are abandoning free enterprise and competition, the people of Great Britain are attempting to take it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRITISH MONOPOLY (INQUIRY AND CONTROL) BILL (AS OF JUNE 1, 1948)

STAGE OF THE BILL

The British Monopoly (Inquiry and Control) Bill was presented to the House of Commons, March 25, 1948, by Mr Harold Wilson, who is also president of the Board of Trade. Upon the second reading, April 22, 1948, there was lengthy Parliamentary debate; it was referred to committee, considered, amended, and the resolution reported agreed to.

SUBSTANCE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the investigation of monopolies and restrictive arrangements in industry and trade, and to give the Government special powers for dealing with those which may "operate against the public interest" (clause 6).

An independent commission, to be called the Monopoly Commission, with a staff to be provided by the Board of Trade, will be set up to investigate and report on particular industries referred to them by the Board of Trade. If the commission upon investigation establishes the fact that particular industries are engaged in monopolistic practices not previously authorized, the relevant Government department (one of nine) will have new powers to make orders prohibiting the making or carrying out of the agreements in question, boycotts, conditional sales, and preferential terms. These orders would be subject to the approval of both Houses of Parliament.

Conditions to which the act would apply are held to prevail if a third or more of the goods in question is supplied, bought or processed either by one person or by two or more persons who have an arrangement, tacit or expressed, to limit competition in any way in any particular trade. Agreements dealing with wages and employment are exempted.

No criminal proceedings can be brought for breach of an order made under the proposed act, but civil proceedings can be brought, either by the Crown or by any person affected, for an injunction or any other appropriate relief (clause 11).

Subject to security safeguards, cases referred to the commission must be published. Also when the commission has been required to report on the effect on the public interest, its report must be published. In other cases publication is optional. Disclosure of information is restricted to disclosure for purposes connected with the act; and penalties are provided for failure to give evidence or to produce documents.

When the commission has not decided whether the arrangements investigated are against the public interest, the House of Commons may do so by resolution. In such a case the remedies provided may be applied.

Penalties under the proposed act consist of imprisonment for a term of not more than 3 months or a fine not exceeding 100 pounds, or both. In cases of guilt by corporations every officer thereof is to be deemed guilty unless he can prove his lack of consent to and effort to prevent the offense.

Supplemental provisions deal with the payment by Parliament of expenses incurred in putting the act into effect.

Amendment to the bill providing for salaries and other expenses was agreed to after brief discussion.

RECEPTION OF THE BILL

It was expected that the bill would receive approval from all parties. The assumption that it was noncontroversial was based upon the fact that, prior to its introduction, there had been issued a pamphlet written by Sir David Maxwell Fyfe on behalf of the Conservativy Party which advocated measures against monopolies similar to those embodied in the bill.

The expectation was partially fulfilled in that there was general agreement as to the end to be attained. There was, however, opposition expressed as to the means to that end. Both in the lengthy debate in the House of Commons upon the second reading and in the press from time to time since the first reading, the opposition dwelt chiefly upon two principal points, the exclusion of trade unions and the exclusion of nationalized industries from the scope of the bill and the possibility of an attitude of arbitrary prosecution rather than of inquiry in the operations of the commission have been adversely criticized repeatedly.

The effort at a return to the competitive system in trade and industry was welcomed on every hand.

The criticism may be partially summarized in an excerpt from a long account in the London Economist (April 10, 1948, p. 575):

> "The bill, in short does at once too much and too little. The main public service that can be rendered at present is in establishing and broadcasting the facts about monopoly and restriction and their effects. * * * The commission should neither be limited to the instructions it receives from the board of trade nor debarred from entering any field. Nor should there be any restrictions upon its findings. * * *
>
> "But when it comes to a matter of action to be taken on the facts * * * there should be an aroused and articulate public opinion * * * (and) principles of economic justice should be drawn up, so that the enforcing authorities may have something other than their own prejudices to guide them."

In a subsequent comment the Economist (May 1, 1948, p. 705) offers an argument also to the opposition:

> "Sir David's speech * * * and his view that any definition of prohibited practices would involve administrative chaos deserves, at least, respectful consideration. It is arguable, however, that this would be avoided if the prohibitions were few enough and the definitions right enough. Certainly it should be possible to profit by hard American experience and avoid the type of legal drafting which benefits no one except that particularly close corporation, the legal profession."

(Sources: Great Britain. Monopoly (Inquiry and Control) Bill, 1948, No. 67. Great Britain. Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, March 25, April 22, 29, May 3, 1948. The Economist (London), April 10, 1948, p. 574 ff. May 1, 1948, p. 705. The Financial Times (London), April 2, 1948, p. 1; May 4, 1948, p. 4. Manchester Guardian Weekly, April 8, 1948, p. 14; April 29, 1948, p. 4. The Times (London), April 23, May 1–June 4, 1948.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, observe the contradictory things which are happening around us here. The distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], is chairman of the Small Business Committee. That committee has been maintained ever since it was established upon the motion, as I recall, of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. It has been maintained throughout the Eightieth Congress, because the Eightieth Congress believed that it desired to support and encourage small business. It does little good to support small business, Mr. President, to hold hearings and investigations and to read papers, if, at the same time, we undermine the law which prohibits combinations in restraint of trade, conspiracies to establish monopoly, or attempts to establish monopoly. How can we hope to maintain small business while our legislative policy destroys it?

I understand the Small Business Committee, the Small Business Committee of the House, at least, has been authorized to undertake some sort of an investigation during the recess of Congress in order to go among the small-business men of the country and find out how the antitrust law is injuring them. In other words, here is an invitation, apparently, to those who want monopolistic combinations to say that the antitrust law of the United States should be abandoned.

UNDERMINING THE FOUNDATIONS OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Here is this bill, Mr. President. A few days ago the Senate adopted a resolution authorizing a study, which was brought about by the decision of the Supreme Court with respect to the basing-point system. There is every indication that the leadership of this Congress is now trying to go a step further than merely to let things drift, as we have done with respect to increasing prices, and, by positive action, to undermine the very foundation upon which free enterprise exists, namely, the antitrust law.

I desire to make it perfectly clear how broad paragraph 2 of the conference bill is. It not only fails to delineate the area for permissible joint rate collaboration among carriers, but it goes far beyond the field of collaboration on joint rates. The grant of power is so broad as to permit approval of the regulation of the transportation industry by private groups in the field of all rates, whether charged by an individual carrier on its own line or jointly by connecting carriers, or whether regional or interregional. Nor does its delegation stop with mere rate making.

Paragraph 2 of the bill provides for the approval of agreements "relating to rates, fares, classifications, divisions, allowances, or charges—including charges between carriers and compensation paid or received for the use of facilities and equipment—or rules and regulations pertaining thereto, or procedures for the joint consideration, initiation, or establishment thereof." This goes beyond approval of agreements by joint action in considering and determining rates and fares, and includes agreements by joint action concerning not only the rates and fares to be charged, but the services to be performed, and the schedules and timetables to be effectuated, which could reasonably be construed as an agreement relating to rates and fares. As a matter of fact, a reasonable construction of paragraph 2 could include agreements which, without making specific reference to rates or fares, provide for joint action concerning the elimination or extension of services, schedules, and timetables, and other matters relating to rates and fares could come within the scope of mandatory approval by the Commission. This paragraph goes far beyond the field of rates, as is indicated by the express words in the parentheses which include "compensation paid or received for the use of facilities or equipment." Thus, as I have said, Mr. President, the bill comprehends the private control and direction of numerous activities involved in the conduct of carriers in all forms of transportation.

One of the most important omissions is that there is not a word or line in the bill to provide any rule of responsibility for the conduct of the meetings and the negotiations as a result of which an agreement is made. Let me emphasize the significance of that fact. All the agreements which affect rates, fares, equipment, facilities, and services can be made in secret meetings, without supervision, as they are in the process of being constructed. The only thing the Interstate Commerce Commission sees is the final work, the outcome, the result of these deliberations.

It is carefully provided that when the Congress passes laws its procedure shall be in the open. No bill may be passed unless it has been formally introduced upon the floor of either Chamber. It must be printed in the ordinary procedure. It must be sent to a committee for a hearing. The public is given notice. Those who are to be affected are told what it is proposed to accomplish. Before it is finally enacted it must come to the floor. But such is not the case with respect to the great power and authority which we are now extending to the transportation industry to draw up its theory, principle, and structure of self-government, without public supervision, at a time when the agreement is drafted, by anyone representing the public interest. It is true that the agreement must go to the Interstate Commerce Commission for its approval. But the language of the bill clearly states that the Interstate Commerce Commission

shall approve it, unless the agreement contains certain subjects in a narrow category set forth in paragraphs (4), (5), and (6). But these exceptions are insignificant because the exemption from the antitrust law contained in paragraph (9) is so broad that it makes the traditional American policy against restraints of trade ineffective so far as the transportation industry is concerned.

Immunity from the antitrust laws is granted not only to the carriers who participate in the agreement and carry it out but to "other persons." The heart of the Georgia case was that coercion by the individual carriers is inherent in and carried out by an integrated railroad association structure which, assisted by banking and other influences, disciplines and enforces its mandates by economic pressure upon individual carriers.

When such an agreement with this inherent power to prevent an individual carrier from acting independently is approved, as under the bill it must be approved by the Commission, all hope of independent action by any member carrier is destroyed. Paragraph 6 in no way preserves the right of a carrier to withhold any matter from joint consideration or action. The whole purpose of the bill is to provide for procedures for determinations through joint consideration.

If it should be argued that the Commission has the power to deny approval to an agreement on general grounds because of violation of the antitrust law, that contention would be rebutted by the fact that under paragraph 2 the Commission is under a mandate to approve the basic organization agreement on a finding that "by reason of the furtherance of the national transportation policy declared" in the Interstate Commerce Act, exemption from antitrust laws should be granted.

The national transportation policy of the existing Interstate Commerce Act embraces a broad range of general objectives unrelated to the antitrust laws.

Thus, the bill gives an effective exemption from the basic antimonopoly law of this country for practically everything the new organizations may do "relating to rates, fares, classifications, divisions," and so forth, set forth in paragraph 2.

The field in which these agreements may be made without limit or supervision is so broad, as I have already indicated, that it covers all sorts of rates and services with respect to every type of transportation in various types of competing carriers.

SAFEGUARD AGAINST INTIMIDATION ELIMINATED

Here we have the grave possibility that these transportation companies are being empowered to fix joint rates for pipe-line companies, railroads, and motor carriers, all of which must obey the mandate of the association which is to be set up.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention over and over again to the elimination from the bill of the safeguard which was written in by the Senate to prevent the exercise of intimidation by the association over any carrier. The language was:

Nothing in this section and no approval of any agreement by the Commission under this section shall be so construed as in any manner to remove from the purview of the antitrust laws any restraint upon the right of independent action by any carrier by means of boycott, duress, or intimidation.

Why did the authors of the bill desire to eliminate the prohibition against the exercise of intimidation, boycott, or duress upon carriers who might desire to announce competitive rates? This semblance of a safeguard was eliminated, and the reasons for the omission of this and similar safeguards have never yet been explained. They were not explained in the conference report, and no explanation was given to the Senate, although requested by the critics of the bill in the Senate debate.

I am glad to see that my distinguished friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the acting majority leader, the chairman of the Small Business Committee of the Senate, is on the floor. During the absence of the distinguished Senator, who has been laboring in the Interior Department appropriation bill conference, I discussed the fact that while the Small Business Committee goes through the motions of expressing its sympathy with independent private enterprise, we, the Members of the Senate, here upon the floor authorized the establishment of a trade association which will eliminate all semblance of competition in the transportation industry.

If that is eliminated, Mr. President, then the shippers and the people of Nebraska and Wyoming will suffer just as those in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Vermont, and other States are suffering.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator desires to ask me a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the Senator could inform me whether it would be possible to get a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote at some time this afternoon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is very desirous of speaking upon this matter, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] tells me that he wishes to speak upon it, the Sentor from Alabama [Mr. HILL] wants to speak, and I think the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] desires to make some comment upon the measure. I have been talking here to empty seats, so that the Members of the Senate are not receiving the true gospel, and I want to be sure that they do receive it. I am hoping that, now that the lunch period is over, Senators may return to the floor of the Senate and listen to those who may succeed me.

Mr. WHERRY. I was going to ask the Senator if he intended to make his speech all over again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It carries an important message which every Member of the Senate should have.

Mr. WHERRY. Whenever the Senator speaks he makes an interesting address. But does the Senator feel that, if I should suggest the hour of 4 o'clock for a vote, the time between 2 and 4 to be divided, we might arrive at a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would not presume to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement in the absence of the Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from Georgia, and some other Senators.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey, but before yielding, may I say to the Senator from New Jersey that at the beginning of this debate he was given personal credit by the distinguished and able Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] for the elimination from the conference bill of the provision inserted by the Senate to preserve the virility of the suit of the State of Georgia.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I beg the pardon of the Senator from Wyoming. I did no such thing. What I said was that in the debate on the conference report the debate dealt more in detail with the reasons why the House conferees refused to agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I apologize to the Senator. I misunderstood him. Let me say that the Senator from South Carolina also misunderstood him, as did some other Senators.

Mr. REED. What I was trying to say, and what I think I do say, if the Senator from New Jersey will permit me, was that Senators were asking me about the attitude of the House conferees on the Russell amendment, and I said that the Senator from New Jersey had dealt with that aspect of the matter in his part of the debate on the conference report.

Mr. HAWKES. I think the Senator from Kansas made a clear statement, and I accept the responsibility for that, and made a statement on the floor in connection with it.

(Mr. HAWKES thereupon asked and obtained permission to have printed in the RECORD a certain editorial, which appears at the conclusion of the remarks of Senator O'MAHONEY.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks those who are holding conferences on the floor of the Senate to recess their conferences or retire to the cloakroom. It is impossible for even the Chair to hear the speaker and understand what he says.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think we have a reasonable degree of order in the Senate now. I am quite ready to proceed.

Mr. President, I have recited what I conceived to be the dangers of the policy which permits large industrial and transportation units to combine for the purpose of governing their own industries.

I am thinking now of the evil effect of concentrated economic organization, the ideology of business which in Europe led to the establishment of the dictatorial state. This theory of business organization has been condemned uniformly by all American leaders of all parties. A distinguished former President of the United States, and former Chief Justice of the United States, William Howard Taft, was not the least effective of those who condemned monopolistic practices. I remember very well in my studies reading the message which he as President of the United States sent to the Congress of the United States recommending that there be public legislation to provide national charters for the national corporations which carry on the business of the United States. I remember how severely in that very message he condemned the monopolistic practices which have led all over the world to the destruction of free government and to the establishment of dictatorships. We in the Senate and in the House must make the decision whether we desire this country to remain loyal to the tradition of free competitive enterprise, for if we abandon that ideal, be sure it will be lost to the world.

I have no doubt at all that the greatest issue in the campaign of 1948 will be the issue of free competitive enterprise. It is not free enterprise which marches under the disguise of this measure. This is the beginning of totalitarianism; this is the measure that turns the corner.

Almost every great industrial leader condemns the cartel system but that system is the one by which industrial leadership writes its own ticket. Here we are giving into the hands of the transportation industry of the United States the power to write its own ticket.

I have before me a little volume published by the Brookings Institution in Washington in 1947 entitled "The Aluminum Cartel." It was written by Mr. Louis Marlio, who himself was one of the principal officers of that cartel for many years. He tells in this little volume how the cartel was established and what it undertook to do. I read from it as follows:

Unlike previous cartels, the fourth cartel, that is the Alliance Co., adopted the principle of leaving to its members the maximum commercial and industrial freedom compatible with the realization of its objects.

Freedom was permitted to the members only to the degree that it was compatible with the objects of the cartel. Here we have a measure which denies freedom to the individual transportation companies, and makes them subject to what is done and to the decisions which are made by the transportation organization which is to be created.

Regulation was to be imposed only to the extent it proved useful.

Who was to decide what would prove useful? Of course, the managers of the cartel. Who is going to decide what will prove useful in the present case? Again the managers of the trade association which we are allowing the industry to organize in secret session. It will determine—not the representatives of the public—what is useful to do in the transportation industry.

Mr. Marlio continues:

This principle is affirmed in the following clause of the agreement:

"A" shareholders will be free to produce, transform and sell aluminum in all its forms, including raw metal, semifinished products and finished products, without any price agreement, territorial limitations, or any other regulation, except as provided in the present agreement and as may be enforced by ACC (Aluminum Alliance Co.) in accordance with this same agreement.

So here we have an organization which has the power to fix prices and to delimit territory and to control production. And did they do it? Let me read again from Mr. Marlio:

The prices at which aluminum was sold in the Japanese market were somewhat below the prices in London and Paris, in order to discourage the creation of plants in Japan. This did not mean that under the cartel system prices in Japan were lower than they would have been under international competition. It must be remembered that a primary purpose of the cartel was to prevent serious under-cutting in world markets. The result was doubtless a level of prices in Japan somewhat above that which would have prevailed under a system of wholesale dumping by noncooperating producers.

Here was a world-wide organization which frankly undertook to regulate prices and to prevent competition, and made no bones about saying so.

This is the way they divided their business. I read from page 32 of Dr. Marlio's book:

The division worked out as follows: Aluminum Francais, 299 shares, or 21.36 percent; Aluminum Industrie Neuhausen, 216 shares, or 15.43 percent; Aluminum, Ltd., 400 shares, or 28.57 percent; British Aluminum Co., 210 shares, or 15 percent; German group, 275 shares, or 19.64 percent.

FREE GOVERNMENT COLLAPSED IN EUROPE WHEN MONOPOLY TOOK OVER

So the cartel arrangement decided for itself what each participant would enjoy of the world market, and then enforced rules and regulations to prevent competition. That was done in industry after industry, and the result was the collapse of free government in Europe. There is no doubt at all, if past experience of humankind means anything, that if we here in the United States abandon our American tradition of a free economy we shall go the road of those countries which have adopted the cartel system.

There is no evidence before this body that anyone presented himself at the hearings on behalf of the public to endorse this measure. Of course the shippers were represented. The shipping associations were represented. Attorneys for the railroads were there. The transportation companies, the motor carriers, and the pipe lines do not like regulation in the public interest. I can understand their annoyance. But the great danger is that if we now open the door to monopoly by exempting one great industry in all its aspects from the effect of the antitrust laws, there will be no recourse except the establishment of a more powerful Central Government.

When we undertake to destroy the power of a sovereign state to go into the Supreme Court of the United States to protect traditional Americanism and the freedom of its economy, we are laying the foundation for monopolistic control of industry which will lead inevitably, as it has done everywhere, to the destruction of free government. I was never more certain of any statement I have made in all my service in the Senate than I am of this: The approval of this bill, the overriding of the President's veto, means the abandonment of competition as a rule of economic conduct in the United States.

EXHIBIT A

[From the June 1948 Monthly Letter on Economic Conditions—Government Finance, published by the National City Bank of New York]

100 largest manufacturing corporations, based on total assets reported at the end of 1947

[In millions of dollars]

Allied Chemical & Dye Corp	575
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co	202
Aluminum Co. of America	430
American Can Co	250
American Cyanamid Co	207
American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp	153
American Smelting & Refining Co	256
American Sugar Refining Co	133
American Tobacco Co	647
American Viscose Corp	201
American Woolen Co	118
Anaconda Copper Mining Co	637
Armco Steel Corp	249
Armour & Co	421
Atlantic Refining Co	330
Bendix Aviation Corp	123
Bethlehem Steel Corp	949
Borden Co	222
Borg-Warner Corp	151
Burlington Mills Corp	125
Caterpillar Tractor Co	122
Celanese Corp. of America	212
Chrysler Corp	487
Cities Service Co	900
Coca-Cola Co	192
Continental Can Co	207
Continental Oil Co	209
Corn Products Refining Co	146
Crane Co	129
Curtiss-Wright Corp	166
Deere & Co	229
Distillers Corp.-Seagrams	267
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co	1,439
Eastman Kodak Co	360
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co	324
General American Transportation Corp	132
General Electric Co	1,027
General Foods Corp	207
General Motors Corp	2,473
B. F. Goodrich Co	247
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co	408
Gulf Oil Corp	929
Hearst Consolidated Publications	161
Inland Steel Co	244
International Business Machines Corp	184
International Harvester Co	620
International Paper Co	279
Johns-Manville Corp	115
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp	341
Kennecott Copper Corp	541
Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co	366
Mid-Continent Petroleum Corp	116
Monsanto Chemical Co	199
Nash-Kelvinator Corp	138
National Biscuit Co	154
National Dairy Products Corp	277
National Distiller Products Corp	210
National Lead Co	163
National Steel Corp	292
Ohio Oil Co	164
Owens-Illinois Glass Co	162
Phelps Dodge Corp	251
Phillips Petroleum Co	439
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co	207
Procter & Gamble Co	242
Pullman, Inc	197
Pure Oil Co	245
Radio Corp. of America	216
Republic Steel Corp	455
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co	458
Reynolds Metals Co	112
St. Regis Paper Co	133
Schenley Distillers Corp	318
Shell Union Oil Corp	634
Sinclair Oil Corp	591
Skelly Oil Co	129
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	1,263
Standard Brands, Inc	138

[In millions of dollars]

Standard Oil Co. of California	876
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana	1,268
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	2,996
Standard Oil Co. of Ohio	189
Sun Oil Co	242
Swift & Co	437
Texas Co	1,115
Tide Water Associated Oil Co	263
Union Carbide & Carbon Corp	649
Union Oil Co. of California	272
United Aircraft Corp	160
United Fruit Co	419
United States Gypsum Co	132
United States Rubber Co	348
United States Steel Corp	2,163
Walker-Gooderham & Worts	134
Western Electric Co	771
Westinghouse Electric Corp	602
Weyerhaeuser Timber Co	195
Wheeling Steel Corp	158
Wilson & Co	140
Youngstown Sheet & Tube	260

The above list excludes a number of large companies whose statements are not yet available for the 1947 calendar or nearest fiscal year or for the years going back to 1940, including American Car & Foundry Co., Crown Zellerbach Corp., Dow Chemical Co., Ford Motor Co., General Mills, Inc., Phillip Morris & Co., Ltd., Publicker Industries, Inc., Remington Rand, Inc., Singer Manufacturing Co., and J. P. Stevens & Co.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rate Making," from the Washington Post of this morning. In my opinion it is a very clear statement of the problem which will be in front of the country and the transportation systems unless the pending veto is overridden.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RATE MAKING

The President's veto of the Bulwinkle-Reed bill exempting rate agreements by railroads and other common carriers from the antitrust laws should be overridden. For, if upheld by Congress, it would result in serious disruption of rate-making processes that have stood the test of time and meet with the approval of shippers as well as the Interstate Commerce Commission and State regulatory officials. A great deal depends, therefore, upon the action taken today by the Senate on the rejected measure. If it votes to override the veto the chances are that the House, which passed the bill by a very large majority, will follow suit.

In passing the Bulwinkle-Reed bill, Congress sought to remove the confusion and uncertainty that have resulted from a conflict of views regarding the applicability of the antitrust laws to certain kinds of agreements among regulated common carriers. As the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce said in its report on the bill, "a large measure of collective action by and among common carriers is necessary if the national transportation policy is to be effected and if the public is to receive the kind of transportation service to which it is entitled and if rates are to be reasonable and nondiscriminatory." If, as the Department of Justice maintains, rate agreements effectuated through rate bureaus and associations are to be regarded as illegal restraints of competition, the regulatory system under which the carriers have been operating for years will be shot to pieces.

The late Joseph B. Eastman, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, who was also director of the Office of Defense Transportation, was an ardent defender of the existing system of rate conferences. He said some years ago that he did not know how the carriers could comply with the mandates of the law and the orders of the Commission unless they could consult and confer with one another. He further pointed out that such joint action was always subject to protest and review by the ICC if in violation of the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. The bill vetoed last week by the President does not impair any of these existing safeguards against abuse. The carriers will have the right, as at present, to propose rates to the ICC, subject to its approval. And the Commission may suspend any proposed changes on protest or of its own initiative as at present. The bill also protects the rights of a carrier to take independent action regardless of conference decisions. Spokesmen for the Department of Justice have made much of the fact that few protests reach the Commission, citing it as an indication that rate bureaus are in a position virtually to compel individual roads to adhere to collective agreements. However, it can just as well be maintained that the small proportion of protested rate changes is proof that the conference method of rate adjustment works very satisfactorily for all interested parties, roads and shippers alike.

The President's charge that the Bulwinkle-Reed bill represents a departure from the present transportation policy of regulated competition simply does not fit the facts of the case. For the bill does not impair the regulatory powers over rate-making now exercised by the ICC. Nor does it render the carriers immune from the antitrust laws except as to joint rate agreements of the kind they have long been accustomed to enter into with the approval of the ICC.

In the absence of rate conferences tariff schedules would have to be filed by individual railroads and by thousands of motor carriers. The result would be not competition but regulatory chaos. The integrated rate structure would fall apart and the ICC would be overwhelmed by the burden of work thrust upon it by protesting shippers and carriers. Consequently, prompt legislative action is needed to insure preservation of a regulated system of rate-making that an overwhelming majority of transportation officials, regulatory agencies, and shippers consider indispensable and in the public interest.

The pending antitrust cases referred to by President Truman as one reason for vetoing the Bulwinkle-Reed bill may not be settled for some time. Nor is it certain that those suits will result in judicial clarification of the issues raised in the present instance. Incidentally, the pending Georgia and Lincoln, Nebr., suits to which the President was evidently referring in his veto message would not be thrown out of court by legalization of carrier rate agreements, since the roads concerned have been charged with conspiracy to fix rates of a discriminatory nature. Such practices are outlawed by the antitrust laws, whether they are engineered by rate bureaus or other agencies. And the Bulwinkle-Reed bill would not legalize such unlawful antisocial practices. In sum, the national interest appears to require that Congress override Mr. Truman's veto of this important measure.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now propose a unanimous-consent request that the Senate proceed to vote upon the veto at the hour of 4:45 o'clock p. m., 1 hour and 35 minutes of the time to be in the control of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and 45 minutes in control of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. That would bring the vote exactly at 4:45 p. m.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 25 minutes to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the able Senator from Wyoming with reference to the growth of monopoly in this country and how it threatens our American system of democracy. He made a most startling statement; and yet there were very few Senators in the Chamber to listen to him and hear his remarks about what is happening in our country.

THE RAILROAD LOBBY

Mr. President, the support which has been mobilized in favor of this bill among transportation agencies and among shippers and industrial groups must not be permitted to override the public interest in the preservation of healthy competitive enterprise. The public interest is broader than that of any group having a selfish interest in or relationship to transportation. It is the public which pays the freight. The public is interested in the lower rates and in the improvements in service which flow from healthy competition between the carriers.

Shippers are more interested in rate relationships than in rate levels. Indeed, it is charged in the pending antitrust cases that powerful groups of shippers in a number of basic industries have joined with the carriers in private agreements to maintain high uniform rates and to prevent rate reductions which would disturb market relationships favorable to such groups of shippers or which would aid in the establishment of new competition in basic industries. It is also charged in the pending antitrust cases that the private rate bureaus which could be legalized by this bill have in the past been used by combinations of carriers to frustate the will of progressive individual carriers seeking to make rate adjustments which would permit shippers on their lines to compete in distant markets and which would attract new industries to areas where industrialization is essential to the balanced development of our national resources. Such practices, which would be freed from prosecution under the antitrust laws by this bill, are no more in the interest of shippers than of the public generally.

The manner in which support for legislation similar to this bill has been mobilized by the railroads is a matter of record. I refer to the documents and testimony presented to committees of the Congress which describe the organization and functioning of the railroad lobby.

According to the late John J. Pelley, until recently President of the Association of American Railroads, lobbying is one of the primary functions of that association. The chief lieutenant to carry out the lobby activities of the AAR has been R. V. Fletcher, who for many years had been vice president and general counsel of the association. He described the objectives of the general legislative committee of the Association of Railroad Executives, predecessor of the AAR, as being "charged with the duty of assembling and promulgating information relative to legislation affecting railroads, and with the further duty of organizing the States for offense and defense on all matters of legislation, State, and Federal, affecting railroads"—exhibit No. 3448, hearings on Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-fourth Congress.

To accomplish the objective of organization for offense and defense on legislative matters, Mr. Fletcher, as chairman of the legislative committee of the Association of Railway Executives, created a system upon which the present legislative activities of the Association of American Railroads are based, and which was continued under the control of Mr. Fletcher as vice president and general counsel. Senate Report No. 26, paragraph 2, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, on Senate Resolution 71. That system involved the organization within the sphere of railroad organization of a virtual army operating nationally, regionally, and locally, and the maintenance of an alliance with nonrailroad associations to give the railroad lobby, where deemed necessary, a nonrailroad front. The story of the development of this organization and the various intrigues and manipulations in which it engaged is told in detail through documents and oral testimony in the railroad investigation conducted by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce under Senate Resolution 71 Seventy-fourth Congress—Hearings, part 23; Report No. 26, part 2, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

First, a plan was promulgated whereby the various States in the Union were assigned by the association to a particular railroad, as follows:

New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island.

New York Central: New York, Michigan.

Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey: New Jersey.

Pennsylvania Railroad: Pennsylvania, Delaware, Indiana.

Baltimore & Ohio: Maryland.

New York, Chicago & St. Louis: Ohio.

Chesapeake & Ohio: West Virginia.

Norfolk & Western: Virginia.

Seaboard Air Line Railway: Florida.

Atlantic Coast Line: North Carolina, South Carolina.

Louisville & Nashville: Alabama, Kentucky.

Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis: Tennessee.

Central of Georgia: Georgia.

Illinois Central: Illinois, Mississippi.

Texas & Pacific: Louisiana.

Chicago & North Western: Wisconsin.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific: South Dakota.

St. Louis-San Francisco: Missouri.

Missouri Pacific: Arkansas.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific: Iowa.

Great Northern: Minnesota, North Dakota.

Northern Pacific: Montana, Washington.

Union Pacific: Oregon, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho.

Southern Pacific: Nevada, California, Arizona, Texas.

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe: Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy: Colorado, Nebraska.

In addition to carving out the 48 States and assigning each area to a railroad, the plan further provided for the creation in each State of a State railroad association or a State legislative committee to work on national as well as State legislation. The purpose of the associations was to line up the "boys" in a particular State, to line up the support of all influences—citizens, organizations, newspapers, and so forth—which could be brought into play upon Representatives in Congress or Senators; and under the guidance of the national organization, to flood Members of Congress with letters and telegrams favorable to the railroads' point of view on pending legislation. As outlined by Mr. Fletcher in letters written by him to the State organizations:

> In suggesting the organization of railroad associations in each State, I had in mind putting into effect a plan whereby we would be advised as to who are the influential men behind the several Congressmen, and the further thought that we might be able through personal contact or by the careful distribution of literature to influence in a perfectly proper way the judgment of the men upon whom the several Congressmen rely for support and advice. Indeed, I have thought that we might go so far as to get a mailing list which would show the names of the influential citizens of the United States, meaning thereby those who are influential in a political way, so that we might contact those men through our attorneys, employees, and representatives, and in order that we might provide them with such informative publications as are issued by the various railroad agencies and which discuss the railroad question in a careful and conservative manner. I should be glad, therefore, if you could send me with reference to each Member of Congress and each Senator, dealing with each separately for filing purposes, a statement as to who he is, where he lives, what profession he follows, what is his social and political background, and particularly who are his friends, advisers, and sponsors in each of the counties in his congressional district. I understand, of course, that the sentence just before this refers particularly to Members of the House of Representatives. In the same way, however, I should like to know something about the background of the Senators and the persons on whom they probably rely for advice. I appreciate the fact that this is a pretty large order and may require a good deal of inquiry in different parts of the State, but I am seeking to assemble here in Washington a very complete record of each Member of Congress with particular reference to the influences which control him and the persons on whom he relies for support.

In addition to the State associations, the technique was subsequently refined by setting up congressional district chairmen to operate in the congressional districts, and to whom local officials of the railroads would be directly responsible. At the disposal of the district chairmen were placed railroad officials, freight and passenger men, local agents, and local attorneys and surgeons, who were charged with the building up, in their respective congressional districts, of organizations to be called in for assistance, either locally or in Washington, as the need should arise. The railroad officials, employees, surgeons, and attorneys were required to respond to the call of the district chairman as and when requested and the district chairman was given the right to call upon them for any assistance he may need without the necessity of going through individual railroads. This corps of railroad men has been considered by Mr. Fletcher as the real strength of the railroad lobby.

Shortly after the Association of American Railroads was organized and took over the work of the lobby, Mr. Fletcher suggested a further refinement of the methods developed in carrying out the work of legislative offense and defense. Under directions of Mr. Fletcher, the person charged with primary responsibility in each State undertook to assign a particular Congressman to some member of the organization or of the committee, with the request that the person to whom a particular Congressman is assigned endeavor to have him interviewed at home by as many of his influential constituents as can be persuaded to undertake the task. Mr. Fletcher expressed the thought that it would be very helpful indeed if a hundred influential citizens in each district could mention the matter to the Congressman and give him to understand that the measures advocated by the railroads meet with the approval of his constituents and that those matters which the railroads disfavor are not looked upon with approval by the influential men among the Congressman's constituents.

Mr. Fletcher looked upon hearings before the congressional committee in which he or his assistant participated as largely matters of scenery to satisfy the public and that the effective work on legislation had to be done by the lobby personnel sent to operate in Washington. Mr. Fletcher, for example, wrote the general counsel of the Milwaukee Railroad regarding a pending maximum-hour bill in Congress that "he had pulled every string which is accessible to defeat the bill" and that he desired the railroads to select a list of men who would be "particularly influential with Members of Congress and with Senators to come to Washington." Mr. Fletcher desired only such men to come to Washington as are quite well acquainted with the Members, but who sustain such relations to them as would make it unnecessary that Members of Congress would rise in their places and denounce our friends as lobbyists.

"I have no purpose to interfere with sleeping dogs," Mr. Fletcher wrote, "and I shall, therefore, not send out a Macedonian cry for help unless the situation becomes desperate. However, I would like to have the preliminary work done in the way of selecting men who can come to Washington, if necessary, so that if I wire some time next week or a little later that we are driven to the necessity for canvassing the House and Senate, these men would be available for this service."

The traffic department of the Association of American Railroads, which ostensibly would be considered wholly to be concerned with traffic matters has been

engaged in lobbying activities. Under its directions, telegrams have been sent to Members of Congress by citizens and chambers of commerce on the assurance that the Association of American Railroads would make necessary reimbursement for expenses incurred in sending such telegrams.

To give the lobby, where it was deemed desirable, a nonrailroad appearance, organizations supported and maintained by the AAR posed as independent, public organizations, but presented the railroad view under guidance of the railroad lobby. So-called shippers' advisory boards were established within the organizational set-up of the AAR. The shippers' advisory boards are operated under the supervision of the car service division of the AAR, and the district managers of the car service division usually act as secretaries of the shippers' advisory boards. The incidental expenses of the boards are paid by the Association of American Railroads. The members of the shippers' advisory boards pay no dues. These shippers' boards, posing as representatives of the shippers, appear before congressional committees and otherwise support railroad legislation. In a statement made by the AAR authorizing the shippers' advisory boards to pursue legislative activities, it was said:

The boards afford a splendid set-up for handling all questions of this kind. Each important section of the country, and every industrial and agricultural interest in each section have both adequate and localized representation in the board.

Of the personnel of the membership in these boards, there is no need to say anything other than that it represents the leading and most intelligent thought on transportation matters of industry, agriculture, and banking in each territory and throughout the Nation as a whole.

The Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, in making a report on the shippers' advisory boards, said: "Obviously, such a far-flung organization could wield great power and influence in promoting railroad legislation, and it quickly got into action."

Other organizations have been used in the same manner. Such front organizations include taxpayers' associations, security owners' associations, railway-employee organizations, and chambers of commerce. The extent to which the Association of American Railroads control the front organizations is revealed in a letter written by the secretary of the car service division of the AAR to the president of the Security Owners' Association concerning proceedings of a meeting of the Northwest Shippers Advisory Board at which resolutions were passed in favor of a special railroad bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Montana one more minute.

Mr. MURRAY. The letter said:

You will find the discussions in the proceedings leading up to the passage of these resolutions very interesting. The antagonism shown was from a small minority block of barge-line advocates or enthusiasts, which we use as scenery occasionally, and they performed very nobly in this case, although they do not know it.

The purpose of obtaining the passage of resolutions by the shippers' advisory board and their dissemination in Washington was, as stated by the secretary of the car-service division, "to impress them with the fact that these gentlemen represent the largest single block of organized and intelligent public opinion in the Northwest." The chairman of the Senate committee asked the president of the AAR:

The AAR utilized the machinery of the shippers' advisory boards to promote the railroads' legislative program, did they not?

Mr. Pelley answered:

I think the answer to that is yes—wherever it can be done.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States, with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I said when this bill was originally under consideration, an analysis of the bill, made in the light of the facts of record and the reports of the committee, compel the conclusion that through its passage the legislative policy of competitive enterprise in public transportation would be supplanted by a Nation-wide cartel monopoly under the domination of the Association of American Railroads and the traditional railroad bankers. This is so because the bill would, first, effectively repeal the antitrust laws as applied to public transportation.

There should be no misunderstanding as to what we are now doing. We are taking the railroads, the Nation's means of transportation, out from under the antitrust laws. We are putting them into a privileged class, separate and set apart from the class in which we find all other segments and elements of American business and economy. The transportation industry is to be in this special class, entirely exempt from the antitrust laws.

In the second place, this bill legalizes the continuation and extension of control over every phase of a carrier's operations by the Association of American Railroads and the traditional railroad bankers. They are to be insulated from the courts, for, under the bill, the railroads cannot be taken into the courts under the antitrust laws, because the antitrust laws will no longer apply to the railroads. Insulated from the courts, and without fear of hindrance from other agencies of the Government, they would be free to create combinations of carriers on a Nation-wide scale, with power not only to fix rates, but also to determine what part of the rate each carrier shall receive, what time its trains shall arrive and depart, over what routes they may operate, what equipment shall be built and how it shall be used, and what should be done collectively to promote, to use the words of the Interstate Commerce Act, "adequacy, economy, and efficiency of operation or service."

In view of the vast powers thus conferred upon the transportation cartel and the extent of the pressures which it would be able to exert upon otherwise independent carriers, it is clear that no carrier could afford to remain long outside the cartel. In other words, Mr. President, we are so legalizing this railroad supergovernment, we are so confirming the machinery and the operation of the machinery of the Association of American Railroads that no independent carrier could operate. This association, which we today confirm, which brings such tremendous economic power to bear on any independent railroad, could so hold the power of life or death over any independent railroad as to force that railroad to surrender its independence and to become a part of the Association of American Railroads.

Mr. President, this bill would strike a telling blow to private enterprise. We in the United States hold today the last citadel, we constitute the last stronghold, of free enterprise on this earth. Free enterprise is the basis of our whole American life. Without free enterprise we cannot enjoy the other freedoms which we cherish and of which we so proudly boast. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion—these freedoms cannot long survive in a land where economic liberty has been destroyed. Elsewhere throughout the world we see nation after nation moving toward some form of nationalization, some form of socialization, some form of totalitarianism. Even our friends in the British Isles, who, for so long, have held fast to the great principles of individual liberty, are today rapidly moving toward socialization. We have witnessed their socialization of one industry after another.

Only last night the Senate passed a bill appropriating billions of dollars, to be given to nations and peoples across the seas in the hope of holding the frontiers of freedom, in the hope of preserving liberty to men and women. Yet right at home, within 24 hours after the appropriation of those billions of dollars we find this bill before us, a bill which would strike a terrible blow at the free-enterprise system of America.

Mr. President, the bill would undo the public benefits which have resulted or may be expected to result from antitrust suits involving the Pullman monopoly, the western agreement, the investment banking houses of J. P. Morgan & Co., and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., equipment manufacturers, safety and signal monopolies, and rate-fixing combinations dominated by the Association of American Railroads, all of which have been and are adverse to the interests of carriers in large sections of the country. In other words, the benefits which the American people have derived from the antitrust suits which have been brought in the past would now be wiped out, at one fell swoop, by the passage of this bill.

As we know, when the bill was originally before the Senate there was placed in it an amendment specifically stating that nothing in the bill would in any way impair or affect the case which the State of Georgia now has pending in the Supreme Court of the United States against the railroads in the matter of unfair and unjust discriminations in freight rates as they affect Georgia, the people of that State, and the national economy. Yet, we find that when this bill went to conference, that amendment was eliminated from the bill, and there is now no protection in the bill for the suit of the State of Georgia against certain railroads in the matter of unfair and unjust discriminations, but, on the contrary, as we well know, the very purpose of the passage of the bill is to prevent such suits as the suit of the State of Georgia, and to wipe out any other suits which may have been filed against the railroads for unfair and unjust discriminations in the matter of freight rates.

If this bill passes, Mr. President, we may know that the conditions which exist today as to unfair and unjust freight-rate discriminations will continue. Because of such unfair and unjust discriminations, the States of the West, as well as the States of the South, have largely been placed in the status of colonial provinces. They have been denied the opportunities for economic and industrial development which their natural resources and the character and genius of their people entitle them to enjoy. The States of the West and of the South have been thwarted, and, indeed, paralyzed in their economic and industrial development, because of unfair and unjust discriminations in freight rates. This bill would now confirm and freeze this paralysis.

Mr. President, if this bill passes today representatives of the Western States and representatives of the Southern States need no longer protest against unfair and unjust discriminations, because there will be no opportunity to go into court and have those discriminations removed, there will be no opportunity to translate those protests into action, there will be no opportunity to secure relief from discrimination and injustice.

Today we find the railroads organized in the Association of American Railroads, with the control, with the power, with the dictation and the domination under this association in the hands of a few great investment bankers in New York City, largely in the hands of the two great investment banking houses of Morgan & Co. and Kuhn, Loeb & Co.

What this bill would do would be to approve this supergovernment set up in the form of the Association of American Railroads, this supergovernment for the transportation industry of America, this supergovernment controlled by great investment banking houses of Wall Street.

We speak of our democracy, we speak of government of the people, yet what is proposed to be done today if we pass this bill is to take the Government, so far as the transportation industry is concerned, out of the hands of the people and their chosen representatives, and out of the hands of the courts created for the protection of the people, and put it in the hands of these great investment bankers. We would sign and approve the relegation of the States of the West and of the South to a colonial status.

Mr. President, when the case of the southern governors, which was designed to remove unfair and unjust discriminations against the Southern States, and to open the door for the removal of unfair and unjust discriminations against the Western States, as well, was tried before the Interstate Commerce Commission, a witness for the eastern railroads, testifying, as shown on page 832 of the record of the Senate committee on this bill, did not hesitate to make this statement:

Official Territory—

And the Official Territory is the preferred, the privileged, territory of the East—

Official Territory lines have perhaps the most vital interest in interterritorial competitive adjustments of any single group of carriers in the country for the reason that the populous Official Territory provides the markets for a large part of the traffic produced elsewhere in the United States. That territory is hemmed in on the South, the Southwest, and the West by territories, and carriers serving them, all seeking to market their products within the territory served by Official lines.

In that Official Territory, let me say, Mr. President, live more than 70 percent of the people of the United States who constitute more than 70 percent of the purchasing power of the country. It is in that territory that we find the great markets.

The witness continued:

In many instances, such commodities, sought to be marketed within Official Territory, come into direct competition with the commodities produced in that territory. Official lines—

That is, the eastern railroad lines—

therefore, are in duty bound to protect the geographical or other natural advantages possessed by shippers or producers on their lines, and, as a matter of justice and equity, they may not be required to join in such low bases of interterritorial rates as to nullify or neutralize these natural advantages.

What the witness was saying, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 20 minutes allotted to the Senator from Alabama have expired.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Georgia yield me one more minute?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 1 minute more to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for one more minute.

Mr. HILL. I wish to sum up by saying that if the bill is passed over the President's veto we shall have struck a heavy blow to the free-enterprise system which has built and made great our country. By passing the bill we shall have taken the first step leading inevitably toward Government ownership and operation of the railroads, for the people will soon come to realize that if we are to have a monopoly cartel, a supergovernment, controlling the transportation industry, then that supergovernment should be their government, and they will insist that that monopoly cartel be turned over to the Government of the United States, which will mean Government operation and control and ownership of the railroads.

If we pass the bill today, we shall have taken a step toward the socialization and the nationalization of American industry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. JOHNSTON).

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the legislation now pending before the Senate is not anything new. We have been discussing what is commonly known as the Bulwinkle bill, or the Reed bill, for many years. I am glad to say that in the years that have passed we have been successful in keeping such a law as this off the statute books. During all the time the legislation has been pending in Congress the railroads have been crying that they could not operate properly without legislation such as is carried in the bill. But I should like to call to the attention of the people of the United States that the railroads have continued to make rates and have continued to operate under existing law.

I want to make it plain that defeat of the legislation will not prevent the railroads from continuing to operate in the future as they have been operating in the past. So long as they see fit not to violate the antitrust laws they can meet together and enter into agreements respecting rates and operation of their railroads, but such agreements must not violate the antitrust laws or be detrimental to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, in reality, what is being asked of us by the pending bill? We are asked to permit the American Association of Railroads to meet together as a group and decide upon policies, rates, the making of timetables, and everything else that goes into the operation of railroads, and submit their agreements

to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and if the Commission approves them, the railroads will be protected from prosecution, even though they have in fact violated the antitrust laws of the United States. Should the railroads be permitted to hide behind the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or should they, like all other corporations in the United States, abide by the antitrust laws of the United States? That is the question before us upon the reconsideration of the bill which was vetoed by the President.

Mr. President, I commend the President of the United States for vetoing the bill and sending it back to us, thus protecting the people and the shippers of the United States.

Why do I object to the Association of Railroads getting together and entering into agreements such as provided by the bill? I can give the Senate a few reasons why I object.

Hearings were held over a long period of months and years on the pending legislation. In those hearings it will be found that time and time again a certain railroad endeavored to reduce its rates between one city and another city in the United States, but was prevented from doing so—not by any law similar to that represented by the measure which is now before us, but by intimidation. That was the only way that existed at that time by which to keep a railroad from reducing its rates. During the investigation, when the records were explored, it was found that a railroad would be told, "No, you cannot reduce your rates from the one city to the other." The railroad would contend that it thought it advisable to reduce the rates, not only for the advantage which would accrue to the railroad itself, but for the advantage which would accrue to the shippers by a reduction in rates.

Those behind the bill are afraid of what may happen to them because of such records which have been dug up respecting them. They have in the past violated the law. If the pending measure were passed over the President's veto it would result in blotting out any violations of the antitrust law committed in the past, and would, by direct provision of law, give the railroads permission in the future to violate the antitrust laws, and thus penalize the people of the United States because of the shipping rates which would be applied to them.

Do Senators for one moment believe that the Department of Justice of the United States would oppose the bill if the Department did not believe it would result in breaking down the antitrust laws of the United States?

I am warning the Senate and the people that if we pass this legislation it will be only the forerunner of similar legislation exempting one corporation after another in the future.

All during the hearings the Department of Justice kept a close watch upon this legislation. In the minority views on similar legislation in 1946, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and I had this to say:

> This bill would give the railroad, motor-carrier, water-carrier, pipe-line, and freight-forwarder industries the opportunity of obtaining complete exemption from the antitrust laws. If enacted into law, the proposed legislation would cut the antitrust laws from the heart of our economy—the transportation industry. Such legislation would be an opening wedge in entirely destroying the antitrust laws, designed to guard and preserve the American system of free enterprise.

The reason we made that statement was that we wanted free enterprise. But we did not want any combination or group telling people even within the group what they must do, telling them that they cannot reduce rates, even when a carrier may think it is to the best interests of the people to reduce rates.

Reading further from the minority views:

> The obvious purpose of the bill is to deprive the courts of jurisdiction in pending cases instituted by the Department of Justice and the State of Georgia.

In invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that those same cases are still pending in court, and thousands of dollars have been spent to carry the cases forward since this report was written in 1946.

> The Department of Justice, in a suit at Lincoln, Nebr., is seeking to enjoin powerful combinations of railroads—

And it is still seeking to do so—

> is seeking to enjoin powerful combinations of railroads, railroad associations, and bankers from violating the antitrust laws, fixing arbitrary and discriminatory freight rates limiting railroad services, suppressing improvements in railroad equipment and facilities, and preventing the development of modes of transportation competitive with the railroads. The State of Georgia's suit is now being tried in the Supreme Court of the United States—

As I stated a few moments ago, it is still in the courts; it is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States—

> and seeks to enjoin combinations in the railroad industry from fixing noncompetitive and discriminatory freight rates. These important cases, brought to enforce basic laws enacted by the Congress, could become moot if this bill is enacted.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that when this bill was being considered by the Senate an amendment was offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], which was adopted, exempting from the provisions of the bill the cases then pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, and which are still pending there. But after the bill passed the Senate and went to the free conference, someone got hold of the free conferees, and that amendment was wiped out. Do Senators imagine that the railroads had anything to do with that? Do they imagine that the railroads wanted that amendment out? As a result of its being stricken out I fear that all the money spent by the State of Georgia and by the Department of Justice in an effort to uncover what the railroads had done and how they had violated the antitrust laws will have been spent in vain. After the money has been spent, the amendment placed in the bill by the Senate is stricken out.

Reading further from the minority views:

> A dangerous precedent would be set, encouraging other powerful groups to seek legislation immunizing them from established laws and the power of the courts to enforce them.
>
> Cartelization of the transportation industry cannot be isolated from the national economy.

Give me the right to regulate traffic into and out of any commodity, and I can make or break any producer of such commodity, whether it be a textile-manufacturing establishment, a coal mine, or any other kind of business. I can so arrange rates that it would be more profitable to go into that kind of business in another locality.

I have had a little experience along this line. The South has had experience when it comes to discriminatory State rates. That is the reason why I am watching this legislation so closely. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that even when the case was carried through the Interstate Commerce Commission and on through the courts of the United States—which requires years—the Supreme Court said, in a decision a few months ago, that the people living in the South below the Mason and Dixon's line have been charged 10 percent more than they ought to have been charged, and that the people living in the official territory, north of the Mason and Dixon's line, had not been charged enough. They ought to have been charged 10 percent more. That made a differential of 20 percent, which has been in existence for many years.

If we leave it to the shippers of the United States to establish rates and regulations dealing with the making of rates, then we find, as was brought out in the hearings, the big railroads of the United States dominating and controlling smaller railroads and telling them what rates to charge between one locality and another. The people themselves do not even know about it. When these associations get together, there will be no opposition. Proposals will be submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission for approval or disapproval. How easy it is to obtain approval when no one is objecting. After such an arrangement has once been approved, it is put into effect and the people of the United States pay the bill. The consumer, even though he himself may not be shipping anything, pays the bill. That is what I am speaking for at the present time. Of course, rates must be established, but in no instance should the carriers be allowed to fix them in violation of the antitrust laws which are now on the statute books of the United States. Why should they be allowed to violate a criminal statute?

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter which I received from the late Honorable Josephus Daniels. He wrote the letter to me back on June 10, 1947:

> DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing an editorial appearing in today's News and Observer headed, "OLIN JOHNSTON Right."
>
> If we exempt railroads, insurance companies, and newspaper associations—

And, Mr. President, bear in mind that he was a newspaperman—

> as asked by this Congress we might as well, not only repeal the antitrust law, but pass an act to give monopoly the right to rob the people and repeal what we call American freedom in trade.

A stronger statement of the case could scarcely be made than that, Mr. President, as it appears in a letter coming from a former Cabinet officer and a man whom most people will say fought for the rights of the people of the Nation.

The letter closes —

> With high regards, sincerely yours,
> JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Mr. President, he was stating the matter just as I see it.

As I recall the hearings, I remember that the then Governor of Georgia, Ellis Arnall, came before the committee and testified for several days; and in his testimony he begged and pleaded with the Congress not to legislate him out of court. His attorneys in that case came before the committee and testified to the same effect. The attorneys from the Department of Justice pleaded with the committee in the same way, and begged that the committee not legislate them out of court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Then, Mr. President, I close by saying that in my opinion this bill should not be passed; and I warn the Senate that if we let this proposed legislation be enacted, then in the future we shall have other corporations asking to be treated in the way that the railroads are treated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, 28 minutes remain to those who favor sustaining the veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-seven minutes remain, the Chair is advised.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. President, I have not always found myself in agreement with the President of the United States. However, I wish to say that in my judgment the veto message he has submitted in disapproving this bill contains as fine a statement of democratic principles and of true Americanism as has ever been sent to the Congress of the United States by any President. In two paragraphs of the message the President makes an argument, that it is impossible to refute, as to the dangerous consequences of overriding his veto and enacting this bill into law. I wish to read those two paragraphs. I quote now from the President's veto message:

> No legislation giving a major industry immunity from the antitrust laws should be enacted unless adequate alternative safeguards are provided for the public interest. This measure fails to provide such safeguards. Even the limited safeguards incorporated in the bill as originally passed by the Senate are omitted from the bill in its present form. It would require the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve any agreement which it finds to be in "furtherance of the national transportation policy." This is a vague and general standard and is manifestly neither adequate nor appropriate as a criterion for waiving the protection afforded the public by the antitrust laws.
>
> Furthermore the Commission would be placed in the position of applying this general criterion to the basic procedural agreements without being able to foresee fully the nature and effect of the joint actions which would be taken thereunder. Nevertheless the exemption from the antitrust laws would extend to these subsequent actions without the necessity of further Commission approval. It would extend, moreover, even beyond the parties to the basic agreement to any "other persons" who participate in such actions.

Mr. President, since this bill first made its appearance on Capitol Hill some 7 or 8 years ago I have consistently opposed it with every resource at my command. When we in the Congress of the United States proceed to throw around any segment of American industry the cloak of congressional immunity from prosecution for violating the antitrust laws, we are starting a process of destroying free enterprise in this Nation. That would be true, Mr. President, if it were applied to the great automobile industry and if a law were passed which enabled the automobile manufacturing companies to meet together and fix the prices of their products without any regard to competition. But, after all, automobiles are not an absolute necessity to thousands of families in this land.

Mr. President, we should not immunize those who manufacture radios in this country from the effects of violation of the antitrust laws and permit them to agree upon the prices and upon the terms of disposal and distribution of radios in the channels of commerce. But, of course, there are millions of American families who could exist without having a radio.

We are now dealing with an enterprise whose operations directly affect every citizen of the United States and every family in the United States in their every-day living costs and standards; and it is nothing short of criminal to enact this bill and exempt the great transportation industry from any fear of punishment for violation of the antitrust laws, and permit them to enter into cartels and create a monopoly that can directly affect and increase the cost of living of every family in this land by increasing the cost of transportation for the delivery of food and clothing to the consumers.

Mr. President, the legislation is strongly urged here by one of the greatest lobbies that has been assembled in all the history of parliamentary government. We are told that the bill, if passed, would simplify the work of freight and shipping bureaus and of shippers in establishing rates. I freely agree, Mr. President, that the enactment of the bill would simplify the work of freight bureaus, but to no greater degree than immunizing any other industry from the effects of the antitrust laws would simplify the operations of their business. The simplification for which they plead will result in evils which may not be felt adversely for the next 2 or 3 years, but when the conferees on the part of the Senate eliminated from the bill the provision that would have confined the negotiations solely to those directly interested in transportation and permitted any person to sit in on the fixing of rates and conditions of travel, it in the last analysis will turn this important function which should be regulated by Government over to two great banking houses in this country, J. P. Morgan and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., which advance the finances enabling the carriers to exist and to operate.

I have no antipathy to great enterprise as such. I wish to keep alive in the breast of every American youth the hope that he too may accumulate a vast fortune. But I realize, Mr. President, that in the complicated world in which we live it is necessary to impose some restraints and some controls upon those who have gathered into their possession a tremendous part of the wealth that makes these United States, if small business and enterprise are to be permitted to exist, and if the hopes and aspirations of thousands of those who today have not, are to be kept alive and retain their faith that under the American system they, too, may reach the top of the heap and enjoy the distinction of possessing great wealth.

Mr. President, through the control of the shipping bureaus centralized wealth can control to a minute degree the location of future industry in this land. It may determine whether one section of the country shall prosper while another shall lie prostrate. In the past we have seen the result of the manipulations of railroad associations and freight bureaus. We have seen how the so-called Official Territory, has enjoyed great advantages that were denied other sections. It has resulted in a centralization of industry and of wealth in America, not altogether due to the unusual capacity and genius and ability of those who lived in Official Territory, but because when they entered into a business they possessed a 10- or 15-percent advantage in the cost of marketing their products, which denied the right of expansion to industry in other sections of the country. I have nothing against them because of their bigness, but I am opposed to issuing them a license to exploit and to rob one section for the benefit of another section of the country. That is no reflection upon them as being honorable men. I regard the Members of the Senate of the United States as being honorable men, but I would oppose issuing a license to steal even to Members of the Senate of the United States.

As I see it, that is what the measure does to those who might wish to oppose the powers which are granted by the act through rigging the freight structure for the benefit of one section as opposed to another.

Mr. President, representatives of the West and of the South have for years striven earnestly to secure full fellowship as American States and as American citizens by obtaining an equality of opportunity in the application of freight rates. The enactment of the bill will long defer that day when those great sections may hope to have industrial development through a diffusion of the industrial plants of the United States equally to each and every section.

I am opposed to the bill on general principles, because it immunizes the great transportation industry, not only the railroads, but the truck lines, bus lines, and pipe lines, from prosecution under the antitrust laws. That applies also to services such as buying new cars

and other equipment that will enable the stronger to stifle the weak.

I am strongly opposed to this bill because it strikes down the constitutional right of a sovereign State to bring a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States and kills the cause of action that has already been recognized by that Court. Even if I favored the general principle of the bill I would be opposed to action of the Congress taking from the jurisdiction of a co-equal branch of the Government an action at law brought in that Court in good faith and recognized by the Court, and even now in the process of determination. We should not permit this industry, because they feel blowing hot upon their neck the breath of retribution at the bar of justice, to escape the consequences of that decision by denying the Supreme Court jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Georgia, and shall yield to the Senator from Kentucky, such time as they may desire in which to conclude their remarks.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator is very generous. Under the prodding of the Chair, who held up his finger when it was 2 minutes, and 1 minute, I undertook to compact what I was undertaking to say in that brief period of time, and I therefore shall not expand upon my remarks. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Kentucky, in order that he may avail himself of the generosity of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope I may conclude what I have to say within that time, and I thank the Senator from Kansas for his offer. If time runs rapidly, as it frequently does, I may avail myself of it.

I have discussed this proposition several times in the past. I discussed it when the bill was before the Senate. I discussed it in a previous session of Congress when a similar bill was passed. I have not changed my views with regard to it. My views have been strengthened by the President's message vetoing the bill.

I have deplored heretofore and I now deplore the constant effort on the part of Congress to whittle down the jurisdiction of the antitrust laws. Those laws were enacted under the commerce clause of the Constitution, under which we have dealt with railroads, all sorts of transportation companies and organizations, transportation labor organizations, and organizations using transportation facilities for the shipment of their products. The same provision of the Constitution authorizing Congress to regulate commerce among the States is the foundation of all our legislation dealing with that subject, whether it dealt with the railroads themselves or steamboats or other forms of transportation among the States, or whether it dealt with the companies producing commodities shipped over the transportation lines.

I have always contended, and I believe now more firmly than ever, that morally we have no more right to exempt railroads from the operation of the antitrust law because they are railroads and because we have established an Interstate Commerce Commission as an agency of the Congress to regulate rates, than we have to exempt from the operation of the antitrust law corporations which manufacture the products which are shipped over the railroads, because we have established a Federal Trade Commission to deal, in some respects, with violations of the antitrust law by corporations. The Federal Trade Commission, no less than the Interstate Commerce Commission, is an agency of Congress. We have recognized the fact that the Congress could not by law fix rates on railroads. There had to be an agency established by Congress for that purpose. We recognized that the Federal Trade Commission, which has the right to hear and determine controversies arising in business in regard to practices in which businesses indulge, should have the power to issue orders to cease and desist from certain practices. This was done in order to get away from the interminable litigation which cluttered up our Federal courts because one concern would bring a lawsuit against another, involving only a controversy between the parties to the litigation. Then, if a decision were finally rendered by a Federal court, it would be taken as an example of what might be done by other business concerns engaged in similar activities.

It has been customary in the past few years, as I have heretofore reminded the Senate, that when the Supreme Court has a case before it involving a controversy the determination of which might be unfavorable to someone's contention, to undertake to get Congress to reverse the decision of the court in advance, by cutting the ground from under the Court in connection with its jurisdiction to pass upon the question. The same thing occurred with reference to insurance companies, when they were indicted, prosecuted, or brought into court because they were violating the antitrust law. An effort was made to exempt them, because the Supreme Court had a question of that sort before it, involving their guilt as violating the antitrust law, and the Court might render a decision, which it later did render, holding the insurance companies guilty and holding them under the jurisdiction of the antitrust law. But, in order to take time for the forelock, an effort was made in the Congress of the United States to enact legislation exempting those companies from the provisions of the antitrust law.

The same thing occurred when the question of ownership of oil under the tidelands on the coasts of the United States came before the Supreme Court. A decision was imminent. Legislation was sought and, I believe, passed, and was vetoed by the President, which denied to the Federal Government ownership, jurisdiction, or control over the tidelands oil, which may be so necessary in the immediate future for national defense. That legislation, undertaking to reverse the Supreme Court's decision, is still pending in the matter of the ownership of tidelands.

There is now before the Senate legislation dealing, or endeavoring to deal, in the same way with this trio of great interests, the great insurance companies, the great oil companies, and, now, the great railroad companies, in an effort to give the railroads a charter by legislative enactment which would exempt them from the operation of the antitrust law, merely because there is an Interstate Commerce Commission which Congress established in the beginning with jurisdiction to regulate rates. In no legislation have we enacted heretofore, either in the original act to regulate commerce, which was passed in 1887, a whole century after the Constitution was adopted, or in the amendments to that act, including the Transportation Act of 1920, or any other railroad legislation enacted by the Congress, based upon our regulatory powers in regard to transportation companies, have we exempted the railroads, by implication or directly, from the operation of the antitrust law.

In certain sections of the country we have suffered, particularly in my State, because of an artificial and arbitrary division known as the Official Rate Territory, under which differential freight rates were sanctioned by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The result has been that our section of the United States has been discriminated against and, in some respects, stunted because of these differential freight rates. I have stood on the Kentucky side of the Ohio River, where are located wonderful cities dotting the southern bank of that river, and have looked across at the other side and have seen factories on the north side which had an advantage over those located on the south bank of the river, merely because of this artificial and arbitrary division.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume the Senator did not see a great many factories on the southern bank of the river.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I saw where they might have been had it not been for the discrimination under which industries on the southern bank suffered.

The factories on the north bank of the river could ship their products across the river without paying a differential in freight rates, but those which were unfortunate enough to be located on the south side of the river could not ship a pound of their products to the north side without paying a differential in freight rates. Naturally it was a severe handicap, because the Ohio River is a great artery of commerce. It is one of the large rivers of America. I have often said in connection with consideration of the question of improving our waterways, that if improvement in navigation on the Ohio River could not prove itself to be beneficial, I did not believe there was any other river in America the improvement of which would prove to be beneficial or profitable. I think that is a true statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator has referred to railroad rates. I am glad that he is now dealing with the subject of water transportation. It is true that the railroad companies have organized a powerful lobby which has generated a great deal of sentiment, real and synthetic, behind the bill. It is not only railroad transportation, but water transportation, bus and truck transportation, transportation by pipe lines, and every other means of transportation in the United States which will be affected.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator, and I thank him for amplifying my argument in regard to the railroads. We have been generous, if I may say so, to the railroads by allowing them, under the law, to form organizations through which they may control bus and truck lines, and other forms of transportation, especially as feeders. But under this bill, if it becomes law, those subsidiary organizations can enter into combinations in restraint of trade and not be subject to either civil or criminal prosecution.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I thought I might be helpful to my friend—and I underscore the word "friend"——

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a reciprocal trade agreement.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator and I agree unanimously on that feeling. I thought I might relieve the Senator's voice for a few minutes, in view of the mention by my friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] of the words "railroad lobby." I want to give a very concrete illustration, which I think I may have used heretofore; if not, I used it in the committee. It is exhibit A of the tragic situation which confronts us in America when the insidious lobbies really get to work. There are those in this Chamber and in the other body of the Congress who ridicule the term "lobbyist" and say it is like talking about the weather. They dismiss it too lightly. The railroad lobbyists themselves admitted their action in their testimony. A group of railroad lobbyists were under examination before a subcommittee of the Senate a few years ago. Before the subcommittee, under cross-examination, they said:

> Legislative committees?
>
> They snapped their fingers.
>
> We pay no attention to them. They are only scenery. We go back into the hinterlands, the States of the country, where the men come from to Congress, we find how much money they have, we find who controls them, and who has them in their grip, and then we get our men.
>
> Or words similar thereto.
>
> So that is the way they function.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Kansas to yield me further time.

Mr. REED. I shall be very glad to yield the Senator 10 minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, that was an illustration. I could give others ad infinitum, ad nauseam. What has come over the American people and what has come over the American Congress? Have we lost our sense of righteous indignation? Some day the people will put us on the spot, at the bar of political justice, and at that time will ask, "Where were you back in those days when the game was being played on the lower level? What did you do to purify the body politic, to save the people from evil things that were going on in high places?" And you will hang your head. You have a job to do this afternoon by voting to sustain the veto against this Bulwinkle bill, albeit it is sponsored by my friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. Every clean-living and right-living man who loves justice and free government, and who believes in having things done in the open, ought to rebuke this rotten crowd of railroad lobbyists by voting to sustain the veto of the President of the United States, and so come through clean this afternoon.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Kentucky permit me to take a minute or two in my own time?

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will pay me back.

Mr. REED. After the Senator from New Hampshire has made his emotional appeal——

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator has not heard any emotional appeal yet. It is but just beginning.

Mr. REED. All the shipping organizations in the United States of which I have any knowledge, some 950 of them, have filed their approval of the bill with the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TOBEY. That indicates unanimity, and that very degree of unanimity is suspicious, and it ought to excite the common sense of Congress, and cause us to say there is reason to be suspicious of such a degree of unanimity. "There is a reason," as Mr. Post used to say in his advertisements.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that traffic organizations have been importuned to support this bill. I received a long letter this morning from the Ohio Valley Traffic Association urging me to vote for it. But I am not going to do it. I can understand that it is more convenient for traffic officers and traffic organizations to deal with railroads if there are no restrictions. It is more convenient and simpler for them and the railroads to get together and conduct their business without any interference of the antitrust laws. I am not blaming them for lobbying; they have a right to present their views to Congress. But I am amazed that any Member of the United States Senate, who from time immemorial must have had experience with lobbyists, allows himself to be influenced by them.

We hear it constantly said, "I voted against this bill a few days ago, but I have received letters, I have received telegrams, I have received calls, asking me to vote now against my convictions, which were expressed 1 week or 2 weeks ago, now that the bill has come here with a veto from the President of the United States." I would be amazed—I cannot believe it would happen—that anyone who believes this is vicious and wicked legislation, unjust and unfair to the American people, would now change his attitude because someone has called him up on the telephone or written him a sheaf or feed basket full of letters, which have no doubt been inspired by the railroads themselves.

Mr. TOBEY. That is an excuse, and not a reason.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator. That is what I am trying to urge and emphasize. I shall be surprised if it becomes effective, not only surprised, but disillusioned also.

Our forefathers in this very legislative hall thought it wise to protect the American people, after 100 years of inaction by the Congress, because no effort was made to regulate commerce among the States from 1787, when the Constitution was adopted, to 1887, when the first act to regulate commerce was adopted. In the wisdom of our forefathers who sat in the two Houses of Congress legislation was enacted not only to protect the people, but to protect small business against big business, and every amendment of the Interstate Commerce Act has been at the instigation of the victims of business, though they themselves were small business. It has not been the result of the efforts of demagogs or labor leaders or agitators, it has been the victimized business world in this country that has demanded the creation, for instance, of the Federal Trade Commission, and the enactment of the Clayton antitrust law as an amendment of the original antitrust law.

I think we are unwise and even stupid, considering the possibilities of the tendency to which I have referred, if we now sanction the exemption from the provisions of the antitrust laws of these great arteries of trade, not only those which are bound together with steel rails, but busses, steamboats, and every form of transportation, which may or may not be under the control of the railroads which have instigated this legislation.

I have nothing against the railroads. I am their friend. I tried to show that when the question came before me in the other body as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I was a member for 14 years. And during all the time I served on the Commerce Committee in the United States Senate, when matters of this sort came up, I insisted on fair treatment to railroads, to their employees, and to the shippers as well. But there is someone involved here besides railroads, and besides traffic organizations and shippers. The American people, the consumers of our country, are involved in this legislation, and one by one we will be asked to whittle down the restrictions of the antitrust laws until the people will be victims en masse of restrictions and impositions which Congress may hereafter be called upon by an outraged public to undo, retracing its steps, to undo what we are about to do here today if the veto message shall be overridden.

I certainly hope we are not going to override it. I am going to vote to sustain the veto, because I think it is a righteous veto against a vicious principle, as exemplified by a vicious piece of legislation. In saying that, I make no reflection upon anyone who supports the legislation. I concede to the Senator from Kansas and all other Senators as much honesty, integrity, and sincerity as I possess. Nevertheless, we can be very stupid sometimes when we are most sincere.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for just one observation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Although I am sitting over here to listen to the Senator from Kentucky, I point out to the Senator that over yonder is the Republican side of the aisle, my party's side.

Mr. BARKLEY. We welcome the Senator from New Hampshire over on our side any time.

Mr. TOBEY. I came over to listen to the Senator, but over there are my colleagues, in absentia 100 percent. What about the Bulwinkle bill, Mr. Republican Party? Let me talk to you a minute. You, my party, are going to Philadelphia next week to attend a national convention, to make a platform on which to elect a President.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has now gone back to the Republican side. Does he mind if I come over there, too?

Mr. TOBEY. Not at all. I say to my party, in absentia, when you get to Philadelphia, at the meeting of the committee on resolutions, headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and others of my Republican colleagues, there I pray you begin this thing aright. If you want to deserve the acclaim of the people and win the election, there are some things you can do about it. You can and should condemn the killing of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill by the Rules Committee today, striking down a far-reaching piece of legislation in the interests of the people, a bill which has had Nation-wide interest and support, and which passed the Senate twice. You can and should condemn the burying of the education bill which passed the Senate, only to be buried in committee, not privileged to be considered and voted on upon its merits by the representatives in Congress of the American people. You can demand that in the passage of legislation we place first the interests of the people of the United States. Another thing you can do in the platform is to adopt measures against the railroad lobbyists who infest the Capitol, who have tried to get the Bulwinkle bill passed, to throttle free competition and trade in this country, and to nullify the antitrust laws now on our statute books. Having done such things in all sincerity, my Republican colleagues at Philadelphia, you may then come before the American people asking their support, with high hopes of success.

I want to join with you in such appeals and principles but we cannot make such effective by closing our ears and shutting our eyes to human needs. Remember that human life is more important than things, remember that, fellow Republicans at Philadelphia.

So with those brief remarks to my many colleagues now before me, all in absentia, I take my seat with a "God bless you everyone," and the hope that you may see the light and walk in the light as you enter upon your activities next week in Philadelphia.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. REED. I yield the Senator the time he may require.

Mr. BARKLEY. I only wish that the empty benches which have been addressed by the Senator from New Hampshire could speak and vote.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has just addressed the Senate. I think this is the first time he has been in the Chamber today.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is about three times wrong; that is all.

Mr. REED. Well, the Senator did not stay very long when he was in the Chamber, I will say that.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator knows the answer to that. The Senator knows I have heard the Senator from Kansas make the same remarks he made today many times respecting the Bulwinkle bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the seats which are now empty are usually occupied by Senators who have heard over and over again talk similar to that which has been heard in the Senate today, which has no application to the question immediately before the Senate. If the Senator from New Hampshire had been present when the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] was speaking—and as I recall he spoke for about an hour and twenty minutes—he would have observed that there were not more than two or three seats occupied on the Democratic side of the aisle. The subject we are considering today has been discussed more frequently in more different Congresses than any other question since I have been a Member of the Senate, and I came to the Senate some years ago. We have exhausted the subject. None of us can make a speech on the subject without repeating what he has said before. I opened the debate this afternoon and occupied about 30 minutes, including the interruptions which occurred. I only repeated what I had said on numerous previous occasions. The same has been true respecting the whole debate. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] have all repeated today what they have said over and over again in the course of the consideration of this legislation in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not recall any repetition of the facts I placed in the RECORD today. It seems to me the Senator from Kansas is making a misstatement when he says the subject has been hashed and rehashed over and over again. That statement is not quite accurate.

Mr. REED. I did not pay close attention to the entire speech of the Senator from Montana, but I did pay some attention. As I recall he devoted a part of his address—I was tempted to use another term, but I shall not—which I understood was prepared for the Senator from Montana by the Department of Justice, to an attack upon the advisory shippers boards, the regional shippers boards of the country.

Mr. MURRAY. I was discussing the arrangements the railroads had built up with the shippers and other organizations of the various communities to make them a front for the railroads, and also discussing the program they had with reference to contacting the people in the States who might have influence on Senators and Representatives and use that pressure on Representatives and Senators to influence them in their action on this matter.

Mr. REED. I happened to have been chairman of the shippers' board in my territory, the Trans-Missouri-Kansas Shippers' Board, for 15 consecutive years, which is the record for such service in the whole country. At no time was that board ever used, or could it be used and there was never any attempt on the part of the railroads to use that shippers' board for such a purpose. Shippers' boards—and I think there are 15 of them in the country—are regarded universally by economists, industrialists, statisticians, and commercial organizations as among the most useful agencies of the country, by anticipating at least 3 months in advance the probable movement of traffic, as to volume, so that suitable arrangements may be made by the railroads for the equipment necessary to handle the traffic. That is the principal function of shippers' boards. During the 15 years I was chairman of the Trans-Missouri-Kansas Shippers' Board I never received a dollar of salary, nor a dollar toward payment of my expenses. I paid my own expenses. That is the universal practice everywhere. All Senators have to do is to inquire about the board in their own territory and they will find how it functions. The shippers' boards which were attacked by the Senator from Montana are regarded as performing one of the most useful functions in transportation, and they pay their own expenses and receive no salary.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall plead guilty to the Senator's accusation that there has been something repetitious about the remarks which have been made here. For a number of years I have protested against what I believe to be the great injustice and wrong contained in the bill. I propose to continue to do so. If the Senator's theory were adopted, a preacher would deliver one sermon against sin, and then never preach another. This is a continuing struggle, and I do not propose to relax in my efforts nor in my remarks, even though the Senator from Kansas were to prevail here today, because if men do not cry out against evils, soon they will encompass them and engulf them. So, Mr. President, I plead guilty to the indictment that there has been something of repetition in my remarks.

Mr. REED. I do not make any other charge against Senators, including myself, than the charge that what we have said today has been said over and over again before on previous occasions. Criticism has come from several Senators concerning repetition. The statements as to why more Senators have not been present during the debate, which have been made, but not quite so vehemently as made by the Senator from New Hampshire just now, were based on the fact that there has been so much repetition in the debate. They have listened to a discussion of the legislation before. We have placed a limitation on debate at 4:45 today, so I assume discussion will continue until then. If there is any way to advance the time 15 minutes I shall be glad to yield the remainder of my time so it may be done.

In the time that remains I wish to talk sanely about some things in the bill which have been persistently misrepresented. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] indulged in a colloquy earlier today over the fact that the Senator from Wyoming read some sentences of the bill in a loud voice, and then others in not so loud a voice. I think the Senator from Georgia was not guilty of doing such a thing, but I think he was guilty of a mistake in his interpretation and reading of the bill.

The first thing in the bill which the shippers demanded as one of the conditions of their unanimous support was that railroads, pipe lines, water carriers, and motor carriers should not be allowed to participate in agreements between them in these different classes except for the purpose of setting up and maintaining joint rates and through routes. That is the first requirement in the bill. The language is:

> The Commission shall not approve, under this section, any agreement between or among carriers of different classes unless it finds that such agreement is of the character described in paragraph (2) of this section—

Which goes back to a limitation of the agreement concerning rates, fares, classifications, and charges; and unless it is limited to matters between these different groups. It must be limited to matters of joint rates or through routes.

This is the way the bill divides the carriers into classes:

> And for purposes of this paragraph carriers by railroad, express companies, and sleeping-car companies are carriers of one class; pipeline companies are carriers of one class; carriers by motor vehicle are carriers of one class; carriers by water are carriers of one class; and freight forwarders are carriers of one class.

Those different classes of carriers cannot participate in an agreement as between different classes except for one single purpose. That is to set-up joint rates and through routes, which the Interstate Commerce Act imposes upon every class of carrier. It imposes that burden upon them. They must assume it to comply with the law.

There has been frequent reference to a monopoly of transportation—and nothing could be further from the truth—because these different classes were permitted to come together. They have been kept as far apart as possible. Agreements between carriers of different classes are prohibited if they refer to anything else than the establishment of joint rates and through routes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to have the Senator point out anything in the bill which would prevent, say, an investment banking company which owned stock in one of each type of transportation from having a representative in each of the conferences. I concede that they are divided by types, except as to through traffic; and that is the important part. But since representatives of banking houses have been eliminated from the bill, there is nothing to prevent them from having a representative in each type of conference—water transportation, bus transportation, pipe-line transportation, and railroad transportation.

Mr. REED. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that I think it is possible that those interested in the various types of carriers might have representation on the boards of directors. Banks might have such representation. Life-insurance companies which own railroad securities have representation upon boards of directors of railroads. That is also true of investment bankers. While I do not know that it is a particularly desirable practice, on the other hand, I do not see how we are going to prevent those who have heavy investments in the properties and in the financial stake of the various carriers from having some representation which watches over the management.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. REED. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from North Carolina. He may have all the time, within the limit of my time, that he wishes to use.

Mr. HOEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I served with the Committee on Interstate Commerce during the years since I have been a Member of the Senate, until the Reorganization Act took effect. I happened to be a member of the subcommittee which considered the Bulwinkle bill. I have never known any other bill with respect to which there has been so much misinterpretation or misunderstanding as there has been with respect to this measure.

It is noteworthy that every single shipper who came before that committee testified in favor of the bill. Practically every single State utilities commission in the United States favors the bill. No shippers, no representatives of chambers of commerce, no representatives of those who pay the freight bills, came to oppose this measure.

It is opposed on the ground that to some extent it interferes with or nullifies the antitrust laws. It is necessary to have rate bureaus if we are to have rates efficiently fixed for shippers. I do not know how it would be practicable to have the railroads operate and conduct their business in the public interest without having the opportunity for rate bureaus to meet and discuss rates. Any man who establishes a new business or new industry on any railroad line in the United States must of necessity obtain rates for the products of his manufacture in order that he may ship goods to every part of the United States. He cannot get rates unless the railroads can confer on the subject. If he applies to the railroad on which his plant is located in order to get a rate, that road must necessarily take the question up with other railroads in the United States in order to have a rate agreed upon. It is impracticable to take up the question in any other way than through a rate bureau, where representatives of the various railroads meet and discuss rates.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from North Carolina, who is a former governor of his State, that in all the rate-bureau meetings, when rates are up for discussion, shippers participate as freely in the discussions as do representatives of the railroads.

Mr. HOEY. They certainly do. In addition, anyone has an opportunity to object to a rate. Notice is given, so that anyone can appear before the Interstate Commerce Commission and show cause why the rate should not be put into effect. After all this is done, and after the rate is put into effect, it then becomes beneficial to those who wish to use it.

In this connection, let me say that as Governor of North Carolina I joined with other southern governors in instituting three different suits in order to get better freight rates for the South. We succeeded in winning what we call the Classification Rate case. We won straight out the Commodity Rate case. We secured a very substantial reduction, which was of benefit to the Southern States, as well as to people in the western area of the country. Recently, after my term of office expired, we succeeded in winning the Classified Rate case, by which most of the discrimination has been removed.

Mr. REED. All those cases were filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission and tried before the Interstate Commerce Commission; and it was from the Interstate Commerce Commission that the South obtained relief.

Mr. HOEY. That is true. All the relief which the South has ever received by way of reductions of freight rates has come either through the work of the rate bureaus or through the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It has been a slow process. We have not obtained relief quickly. It has required a great deal of time, and we have not yet received all that we should have.

Mr. President, I believe that this method provides the best means by which we can continue to get improvement in our rate structure and obtain some of the benefit of lower freight rates.

I would not take the time to discuss this subject except for the fact that I believe that the purpose of the bill is misapprehended. I certainly believe that in practical operation this system has been beneficial to the entire South, as it has been to the Nation. If it should be

abolished, I do not see how we could go about the practical plan of having rates fixed; and we must have rates fixed before we can use them.

Mr. REED. As the Senator from North Carolina knows, a common carrier may not perform any kind of service for a shipper and collect from the shipper, nor may the shipper pay the common carrier any money for any service rendered, unless the common carrier has a published tariff on file describing the charge which will be made for the service rendered. It is illegal, both for the carrier and the shipper, to do anything else.

Mr. HOEY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a very fine editorial from the Washington Post of this morning.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] had the editorial printed in the RECORD earlier in the day.

Mr. HOEY. Of course I do not wish to duplicate the printing of the editorial. It gives a very clear, full, and fair statement of the functions of this rate-making body.

Mr. REED. It is as able an editorial as I have ever seen.

Mr. President, I wish to read from what was said by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who is also a former Governor of his State, as is the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. The Senator from Florida opened his remarks on May 28 with these words:

> Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly in support of the conference report on Senate bill 110. I believe that no other subject has come up for consideration in the Senate since I have been a Member with respect to which there has been a greater store of misinformation.

That is what the Senator from Florida said, and that is correct. The opponents of the bill have said more things that are not true, that are not germane, and that do not affect the bill, than have been said with respect to any other piece of legislation with which I have had experience during my service in the Senate.

The Senator from Florida stated that every shipping interest in his State was for the bill. That is true of every shipping interest in every other State in the Union.

Let me amplify a little what the Senator from North Carolina said, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a quorum call.

As I stated a moment ago, no common carrier can legally accept a payment for service rendered, nor can a shipper legally pay for the service, unless there is on file a published tariff. That is the first requisite to moving the commerce of the country.

In the beginning—and I am repeating myself; I have said this many times before—each railroad issued its own tariffs. The railroad mileage was limited at that time, and commerce was not so great as it is now. In those days each railroad made its own rates.

Then came the mandatory injunction upon the railroads to establish joint rates and through routes. That was for the purpose of moving traffic without having to unload at the end of any particular railroad. The Congress of the United States in passing the Interstate Commerce Act made in mandatory upon the railroads to do that.

How in the name of heaven 2 or more railroads—and sometimes 30 or 40 railroads are interested in 1 set of rates and 1 set of through routes—could establish joint rates and through routes without having conferences between and among themselves is beyond anyone's understanding. The shippers of the country are at least $99^{99}/_{100}$ percent in favor of this bill, because it would preserve the only method of making freight rates to move the Nation's commerce known to any of us who have had experience with the traffic question and the transportation question. That is why the enactment of this bill is necessary and desirable.

Mr. President, some mention has been made of monopoly in this connection, but that is silly. Some mention has been made of gouging people. The Senator from New Hampshire would have us think that all the shipping organizations and all the people of the country have been misled, but that is quite a reflection upon a great mass of people in the United States. I do not hold that view. The shippers' advisory boards and other shippers' groups, which have been attacked by the Senator from Montana, have been useful.

So the whole argument against this measure represents, as the Senator from Florida has said, more misinformation on this subject than he has heard on any subject since he has been in the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and the remainder of my time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the few minutes available before the appointed time for voting on this question, if Senators wish to request insertions in the RECORD, or if they desire to make some other brief request, I shall be glad to yield for that purpose. Otherwise, we shall have a quorum call.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will it be possible to bring up at this time a matter on the calendar?

Mr. WHERRY. I think not. We are under a unanimous-consent agreement as to the distribution of the time.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Downey	Jenner
Baldwin	Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.
Ball	Eastland	Johnston, S. C.
Barkley	Ecton	Kem
Brewster	Ellender	Kilgore
Bricker	Feazel	Knowland
Bridges	Ferguson	Langer
Brooks	Flanders	Lodge
Buck	Fulbright	McCarthy
Butler	Green	McClellan
Byrd	Gurney	McFarland
Cain	Hatch	McGrath
Capehart	Hawkes	McKellar
Capper	Hayden	McMahon
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Connally	Hill	Malone
Cooper	Hoey	Martin
Cordon	Holland	Maybank
Donnell	Ives	Millikin
Moore	Robertson, Wyo.	Tobey
Morse	Russell	Tydings
Murray	Saltonstall	Umstead
Myers	Smith	Vandenberg
O'Conor	Sparkman	Watkins
O'Daniel	Stennis	Wherry
O'Mahoney	Stewart	White
Pepper	Taft	Wiley
Reed	Taylor	Williams
Revercomb	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson
Robertson, Va.	Thye	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, am I correct in saying that under the unanimous-consent order previously entered, the vote is to be taken at 4:45 p. m.?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to state that immediately following the vote on the President's message vetoing the Bulwinkle bill, another veto message will be laid before the Senate, having to do with the Federal Security appropriation bill, on which we shall get a vote as quickly as possible after the vote on the Bulwinkle bill.

POST OFFICE AT BUNKER HILL, ILL.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment the bill (S. 2759) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a post-office building at Bunker Hill, Ill., and I submit report (No. 1715) thereon. I request immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should only like to say that on March 19, 1948, the town of Bunker Hill, a small community in the State of Illinois, was entirely demolished by a cyclone, as a result of which, among other structures, the post office was demolished.

There having been no opportunity in the last 3 months to acquire suitable space in which to render adequate postal service, both the Federal Works Administrator, General Fleming and the Postmaster General have indicated their very keen desire to have an authorization passed by the Senate, which would permit the rebuilding of the post office at Bunker Hill, Ill., for which the sum of $160,000 is required.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site in Bunker Hill, Ill., and to cause to be erected thereon, at a total cost including administrative expenses not to exceed $160,000, a suitable building for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Bunker Hill, Ill. Plans and specifications for such building shall be approved by the Administrator and the Postmaster General.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $160,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I made an announcement a moment ago, since which time Senators have been coming into the Chamber, leaving their committee work in order to be present to vote on the Bulwinkle bill. I request them not to leave immediately following the vote on that bill, as there is another veto message which will be immediately laid before the Senate, having to do with the Federal Security appropriation bill.

Mr. President, if I am correct on the veto, a vote "yea" is a vote to override, and a vote "nay" is a vote to sustain the veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is correct.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement the hour of 4 o'clock and 45 minutes having arrived, the vote will now be taken. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? The Constitution requiring a yea-and-nay vote, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. STEWART. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], both of whom, if present, would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay," or to sustain the veto.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—63

Baldwin	Byrd	Downey
Ball	Cain	Dworshak
Brewster	Capehart	Ecton
Bricker	Capper	Ellender
Bridges	Chavez	Feazel
Brooks	Cooper	Ferguson
Buck	Cordon	Flanders
Butler	Donnell	Gurney
Hawkes	Malone	Smith
Hickenlooper	Martin	Taft
Hoey	Millikin	Thomas, Okla.
Holland	Moore	Thye
Ives	Morse	Tydings
Jenner	Myers	Vandenberg
Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor	Watkins
Kem	O'Daniel	Wherry
Knowland	Reed	White
Lodge	Revercomb	Wiley
McCarthy	Robertson, Va.	Williams
McMahon	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson
Magnuson	Saltonstall	Young

NAYS—25

Aiken	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Barkley	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Eastland	McClellan	Stennis
Fulbright	McFarland	Taylor
Green	McGrath	Tobey
Hatch	Maybank	Umstead
Hayden	Murray	
Hill	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—8

Bushfield	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
George	McKellar	Wagner
Lucas	Stewart	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas are 63, the nays 25. More than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

In the event the question shall hereafter arise as to the time of the passage of the bill over the veto, the Chair announces the hour to be 4:54 p. m.

SUPPLEMENTAL FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1949—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 714)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have a privileged matter. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the veto message of the President of the United States with reference to House bill 6355.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 6355, "making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

This bill would provide funds for the next fiscal year for the Social Security Administration, the United States Employment Service, and some functions of the Public Health Service. A measure of this kind clearly should not be disapproved by the President except under unusual circumstances and for the most compelling reasons. Such circumstances are presented by the provisions of this bill which would transfer the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency.

I believe that this transfer would be a serious error from the standpoint of the proper location of this important function of government. I believe also that this transfer is clearly substantive legislation which should not be included in an appropriation bill.

Over the past 3 years considerable study has been directed to the proper location of the Employment Service in the Government. It is apparent that a system of public employment offices to secure jobs for the workers of this country is directly related to the major purpose of the Department of Labor, which is "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States." It is equally apparent that it would be far less appropriate to place the Employment Service, together with its auxiliary Farm Placement Service and Veterans' Employment Service, in the Federal Security Agency, which is primarily concerned with matters of health, welfare, and education.

I am, therefore, firmly convinced that because of its intimate relationship to the functions of the Department of Labor the Employment Service should remain permanently in that Department.

To achieve this end, I transmitted to the Congress on January 19, 1948, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, placing the United States Employment Service permanently in the Department of Labor and transferring to that Department the Bureau of Employment Security, now in the Federal Security Agency. This reorganization plan was not accepted by the Congress, principally on the ground that no basic changes should be made in the structure of the executive branch until the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government has completed its studies and submitted its recommendations. This seems to me a reasonable viewpoint.

But in this bill the Congress has acted contrary to its own declared position, and has attempted to effect a far-reaching change in the organization of the executive branch without waiting for the Commission on Organization to report.

In fact this legislation, which is of such paramount importance to the interests of millions of wage earners and employers, and which is plainly substantive in nature, was passed by the Congress entirely without reference to or hearings by the legislative committees concerned with such matters. Neither the House Committee on Education and Labor nor the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was given an opportunity to consider the measure. Instead it was conceived by a subcommittee on appropriations and tacked onto an appropriation bill.

I do not believe that it is in the interest of good government that legislation of such importance should be enacted in such a manner. As I stated in December 1945, in withholding my approval from an appropriation bill which contained substantitive legislation, "a matter of such grave importance as our public employment system deserves not only permanent legislation, but legislation carefully and separately considered. Issues of such a difficult and vital nature should not be dealt with as riders to appropriation bills." I note also that on March 4, 1946, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress recommended "That the practice of attaching legislation to appropriation bills be discontinued."

What makes this matter even more disturbing is that the present bill is another in a series of legislative actions

stripping the Department of Labor of essential funds and functions. Last year the Congress removed the United States Conciliation Service from the Department and drastically slashed the Department's appropriations. To remove the United States Employment Service from the Department would further weaken and demoralize it and reduce the entire Department to such a minor status as to raise seriously the question of the validity of its continuance as a separate Department.

I am convinced, therefore, that the provisions of this bill which would transfer the United States Employment Service represent unwise legislative action, enacted in an unsound manner.

For these compelling reasons I am returning the bill without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 14, 1948.*

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, H. R. 6355, the Supplemental Federal Security Appropriations bill for 1949, provides total appropriations for 1949 of $975,914,700.

Practically the entire sum is for grants to States, including public assistance grants, public employment and unemployment compensation grants, maternal and child-welfare grants and mental health grants.

Millions of people are involved in the funds provided by the bill, as beneficiaries in either the funds paid out or in the service rendered to them from the grants. Federal beneficiaries amount to 2,471,200, and other beneficiaries from funds or services amount to 16,141,000. Pay to Federal employees is in the bill for 14,432, and pay to State employees is in the bill for 100,828.

Under assistance to States, general, of the Public Health Service, 228 Federal employees are involved on the dental health program.

Under mental health activities of the Public Health Service, 1,128 Federal employees and 1,200 State employees are involved, as well as 2,000 other people under the grants.

The emergency health program in Alaska involves 56 Federal employees and 92 State employees.

Under the Social Security Administration, public assistance grants involve 295 Federal employees, 47,000 State employees, and 3,773,000 beneficiaries. These beneficiaries are divided between 2,490,000 for old-age assistance, 1,216,000 for aid to dependent children and 67,000 for aid to the needy blind.

Under the Employment Service, 468 Federal employees are involved, and under the unemployment compensation program, 200 Federal employees are involved; and for the combined program in the States, 48,000 State employees are involved, as well as an estimated 4,000,000 beneficiaries from the service of placement or unemployment benefits.

Under the old-age and survivors' insurance fund, 10,870 Federal employees are involved, and insurance beneficiaries of 2,469,000.

Under the Children's Bureau, 278 Federal employees and 4,536 State employees are involved, and the services resulting are extended to 8,368,000 people.

Under the Commissioner's office, 52 Federal employees are involved, and the total for the Social Security Administration shows 12,163 employees involved.

Under the Office of the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Federal employees are involved in the amount of 550 in the Administrator's office, 159 in Service Operations, and 148 in the general counsel's office.

Another incidental item of Federal beneficiaries is under the program of civilian war benefits, amounting to 200 people.

Mr. President, we are now within 2 or 3 days of the time when the session will end. I think the Members of the Senate know that with respect to some of the provisions in the bill the junior Senator from California, who is chairman of the subcommittee, and was one of the Senate conferees, did not see eye to eye with the House action. But it is my considered judgment that, should the veto be sustained, the next bill that would have to be passed would be essentially the same bill, except that, in my opinion, we would not have as much in the way of funds as we have under this bill.

For that reason, Mr. President, I respectfully urge that the veto of the President be overridden.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does this bill carry the fund for hospital construction?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; that is under the other bill, under the regular bill. This is the supplemental bill.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not care to take the time of the Senate, because we are now in the final days of the session; but I should like to point out that I intend to vote to override the veto, although I do not approve of some of the contents of the bill. As I stated when the bill was passed by the Senate, I do not approve of the transfer as provided in it. I think that such action should await the findings and recommendations of the Hoover Commission, and largely for this reason I opposed the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1. In this particular instance, I was opposed to this kind of action also because it entailed an amendment including substantive matter in an appropriation bill.

At the time the bill was before the Senate I further pointed out that I did not favor, and I still do not favor, the reduction in the appropriation for the Women's Bureau, which is carried in this particular bill. I think this reduction is most unfortunate, and under ordinary circumstances I would be voting against a measure of this kind.

But as I stated before, at this late day in the session, when we are faced with a great many problems still unsolved, I feel it would be entirely out of order for me to vote in opposition to overriding the veto. I agree with the Senator from California that, if the veto shall be sustained, the appropriations as they now stand in the bill would be very likely reduced, and that eventuality would be most unfortunate.

Mr. President, for all these reasons I shall vote to override the veto.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss the veto, except to say what I stated when the bill was before the Senate, when I took a position against the merger referred to by the Senator from New York. I regret very much that it was included in the bill.

I do not wish to take any undue risk of reducing the amount of money involved in the appropriation, and not being on the Committee on Appropriations, I am not in a position to say that I confirm or reject the statement of the Senator from California and the Senator from New York that the amount would be reduced in another appropriation bill. But because the President's veto has called attention to the objections which I urged when the bill was on the floor of the Senate, I feel it to be my duty to vote to sustain the veto of the President, though I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to go any further into the matter.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I desire to take but little of the time of the Senate. I merely want to say that I intend to support the previous action of the Senate on the bill. I do so, however, with some reluctance. In the first place I do not believe the Employment Service should have been taken out of the Department of Labor. In the second place, I regret that the committee found it necessary to make such a substantial cut in the appropriation for the Women's Bureau as practically to make it inoperative. For those reasons I feel considerable reluctance in voting for the bill. However, because the time is short and because there are so many other matters contained in the bill which are of great consequence, I feel I must support the bill.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute. I supported Reorganization Plan No. 1 because I am completely convinced that the sooner the Unemployment Compensation Bureau and the United States Employment Service are together in the same department the better the morale and efficiency in both those agencies will be. From my knowledge of these matters gained both in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and in the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handled the appropriation, I am convinced that the continual turmoil—after all the Employment Service is only in the Department of Labor temporarily—respecting where that agency is going to wind up has seriously impaired the morale and efficiency of the employees of the Employment Service.

Mr. President, I think we have worked out with the House a reasonable compromise which will permit better service in both agencies concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? Under the Constitution, the yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is necessarily absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 72, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—72

Aiken	Flanders	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Fulbright	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Brewster	Hatch	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brooks	Hill	Saltonstall
Buck	Hoey	Smith
Butler	Holland	Sparkman
Byrd	Ives	Stennis
Cain	Jenner	Stewart
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Capper	Kem	Thye
Connally	Knowland	Tobey
Cooper	Lodge	Tydings
Cordon	McCarthy	Umstead
Donnell	McClellan	Vandenberg
Downey	McKellar	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Wherry
Eastland	Martin	White
Ecton	Maybank	Wiley
Ellender	Millikin	Williams
Feazel	Moore	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Conor	Young

NAYS—17

Barkley	Lucas	Murray
Green	McFarland	Myers
Hayden	McGrath	O'Mahoney
Johnson, Colo.	McMahon	Pepper
Kilgore	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Langer	Morse	

NOT VOTING—7

Bushfield	McCarran	Wagner
Chavez	Taylor	
George	Thomas, Utah	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas are 72, the nays 17. More than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Chair announces the time of passage to be 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 3. An act to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators;

S. 1087. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944;

S. 1447. An act to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes;

S. 2251. An act to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States naval hospital, United States naval training center, Great Lakes, Ill.;

S. 2400. An act to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels;

S. 2401. An act to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 2505. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes;

S. 2508. An act relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico;

S. 2675. An act to amend the organic act of Puerto Rico;

S. 2770. An act to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements; and

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3214) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary."

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JACKSON of California, Mr. MALONEY, and Mr. COURTNEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT TO FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2225) to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency, which was, on page 3, line 6, to strike out "1948" and insert "1949."

Mr. BALDWIN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CAPEHART. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. REED, Mr. MOORE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MCMAHON conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION WORK ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 6419, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 25.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: strike out the words "In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 8, 1948" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "House Document Numbered 682, Eightieth Congress;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: strike out the figures "508" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "668"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: strike out the words "his report dated February 19, 1948" and insert in lieu thereof the words "House Document Numbered 643, Eightieth Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: change the period to a comma and add the following: "and the authorization for the

lower Mississippi River project is increased accordingly."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: strike out the words "his report dated August 22, 1947" and insert in lieu thereof the words "House Document Numbered 651, Eightieth Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: on page 10, lines 10 and 11, of the amendments of the Senate, strike out the following "at prices, on terms, and with titles satisfactory to him"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: strike out the figure "65,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following figure "62,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
GEORGE W. MALONE,
EDWARD MARTIN,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
EARL WILSON,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

JUDICIAL CODE AND JUDICIARY

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, on page 7927 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 12 of this year, there appear, among other things, in the course of remarks made by myself, the following two sentences having to do with H. R. 3214:

Extensive hearings were held, at which various controversial matters, and particularly one controversial matter, relating to the Tax Court, were heard. As a net result of the facts so developed, it was concluded by the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee that it was advisable to withdraw from House bill 3214 all provisions by which the Tax Court would be placed under the judiciary.

Mr. President, in making that statement I was in error. As a matter of fact, as a net result of the facts developed at the hearings it was concluded by the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee that there should be retained in House bill 3214 the various provisions by which the Tax Court would be placed under the judiciary.

Subsequently, however, when the matter was presented by the subcommittee to the Committee on the Judiciary, it became obvious that it was impossible to secure the passage on the Consent Calendar of this very important bill if the provisions with respect to the Tax Court were to be retained in it.

Therefore, Mr. President, the members of the subcommittee, uniting with the other members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary who were present, arrived at the conclusion that it was advisable and proper that the provisions with respect to the Tax Court should be withdrawn from H. R. 3214.

Mr. President, the fact is that the subcommittee, of which I had the honor to be chairman, in its own conclusion determined that the Tax Court should be left in the bill. The Committee on the Judiciary itself, with full approval of the three members of the subcommittee, including myself, determined, for the reasons stated, that the Tax Court provisions should be withdrawn. In the interests of accuracy, Mr. President, I desire to make this statement. I may say that the provisions with relation to the Tax Court were withdrawn from the bill as passed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of today and all day tomorrow.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me say for the benefit of Members of the Senate that it is our intention to continue in session until at least 9 o'clock on the farm program bill, which is the unfinished business. The Senator from Vermont has been very patient while privileged matters have been considered. The afternoon has been taken away from him, but I hope that Senators will give this bill their attention so that it may be expedited.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks in support of the farm-program bill which is now before the Senate.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been at work for months on this measure. We have discussed the need for and content of a long-range program with the Secretary of Agriculture, we have held public hearings not only here in Washington but across the country, we have written and rewritten the several sections which we thought should go into a long-range bill, and we have finally agreed upon S. 2318 and respectfully present it to the Senate for consideration.

This is much more than simply another bill. It is a summary of all our experience and study in the farm program field over the last decade. Good legislation grows. This is that kind of legislation. It is the first general agricultural bill which has been before the Senate since we enacted the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. It is specifically related to that and other farm legislation now in effect with a view of rounding out, as far as possible at this time, a coordinated, well-balanced agricultural program.

The bill in its present form is somewhat different from the bill which was introduced by members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on March 15, 1948. In the bill originally introduced there was a provision which would make it optional with farmers to accept the old parity formula or the new parity formula which is now based on the 10-year moving average. After much discussion the committee concluded to stick to one formula rather than two. I understand that an amendment will be submitted to the Senate in an effort to restore the option to growers to take either the present parity formula or the new one provided for in the pending bill. If and when such an amendment is presented, I expect to support it, because it was at my instance that the original bill included that language.

The bill streamlines and continues what we are now doing in the agricultural field. As I have already said, its roots go a long way back. Some of the outstanding legislative items which have concontributed to our agricultural program are worth recalling.

It started with the Agricultural Adjustment and Farm Credit Acts of 1933. It was under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 that farmers first found an opportunity to work together in order to stabilize their prices and bring supplies in line with demand. Then the Congress enacted the Soil Erosion Act of 1935, the act under which the Soil Conservation Service presently operates. There were other acts amending or supplementing these basic acts—for example, the Bankhead Cotton Act of 1934, the Kerr Tobacco Act of 1934, the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act of 1934, and the De-Rouen Rice Act of 1935.

Then the processing-tax benefit-payment provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 were invalidated by the Supreme Court in January 1936. Shortly thereafter the Congress passed the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, which extended the original Soil Erosion Act by the addition of sections 7 to 17, authorizing an agricultural conservation program and shifting emphasis in the agricultural adjustment field from temporary acreage adjustment to soil conservation and improved farm-management practices.

We then started to work trying to write a new Agricultural Adjustment Act. This resulted in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which continued and amended the conservation legislation, authorized the establishment of acreage allotments and marketing quotas on cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and (later) peanuts, authorizing the making of loans by Commodity Credit Corporation on agricultural commodities, and provided for the establishment of four regional research laboratories for the purpose of finding new uses and markets for agricultural products and byproducts.

Let me say at this point, Mr. President, that I participated in the drafting as well as the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. I was fortunate at that time in being appointed a member of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That committee made a tour of the country, and the facts gathered by the committee formed the basis of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

This act, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, was the last piece of really broad-scale agricultural legislation which the Congress has considered and enacted. Meanwhile, there have also

been other acts relating or adding to the agricultural program—the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937, the several acts authorizing further research or increased extension activities, including our most recent act for strengthening work in the research field and giving increased emphasis to marketing work, the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

Much of the legislation I have been talking about centered around our great staple or basic commodities, but the Congress has not forgotten or overlooked the nonbasic or more perishable commodities. Section 32 of Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, appropriated funds for each fiscal year equal to 30 percent of the customs receipts for agricultural purposes; and, following the Supreme Court decision in January 1936, the Congress reenacted and revised all of the earlier marketing-agreement legislation in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

It was under those several acts that our agricultural program was being operated when we found ourselves faced with World War II. To further strengthen the agricultural program and to meet our wartime needs, the Congress passed, and the President approved on July 1, 1941, the so-called Steagall amendment. It was under that amendment and related legislation that the Secretary of Agriculture was directed to support prices for the producers of the basic and specified nonbasic agricultural commodities at various rates, finally at 90 percent of their parity or comparable prices for all of the basic and Steagall commodities except cotton, for which the final rate was 92½ percent of parity. Those supports were to run for 2 years following the actual end of hostilities, and all of us are aware that the termination date of this legislation has now been definitely fixed as December 31, 1948.

Senate bill 2318 streamlines and continues what we are now doing, but it is not in itself a complete farm program. Many of the things we desire in a farm program are provided for by legislation already in effect, and some of them are provided by separate proposed legislation which the Congress must finally pass before adjournment, especially the bill providing a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to say that I understand that my distinguished colleague the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will submit an amendment providing for continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation for at least another year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that is correct. It seems to me that the safe thing to do is to add to this bill an amendment continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation for another year, because although the Commodity Credit Corporation charter bill may be acted on by the House of Representatives and may go to conference, we simply cannot afford to take the risk of having the Commodity Credit Corporation go out of business on July 1.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have understood that the bill rewriting the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which the Senate passed, is now pigeonholed in the House Banking and Currency Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I would not say it is pigeonholed. They are talking of acting on it.

Mr. ELLENDER. At any rate, it is still there.

Mr. AIKEN. But they are talking of amending it to such an extent that I fear it would be difficult for the House and the Senate to get together regarding it during the time remaining in this session.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then I repeat that in order to make our program complete, as it has been in the past, it will be necessary that we revitalize, as it were, the Commodity Credit Corporation, if we are to obtain the support-price conditions which are outlined in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Actually, Mr. President, Senate bill 2318 has two general objectives. The first is that it provides for the coordination of agricultural programs, especially conservation activities, at the national, the State, and the county levels. Second, the bill provides for agricultural commodities a flexible price-support program which takes into account changes in supplies and is specifically designed to obtain fair prices for farm products and assure abundant production. We believe that Senate bill 2318 not only will benefit farmers, but also will aid in stabilizing our national economy at a satisfactory high level.

Title I of the bill is concerned primarily with the coordination and administration of agricultural programs, and especially with the general reorganization and administration of the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service.

To begin with, section 101 provides for combining into a single "Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement" the functions presently assigned to the Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Conservation Programs Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, as well as other functions deemed by the Secretary to be principally related to soil conservation and improvement. This is in line with recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The assignment of the new agency would also include those aspects of the program of the Department which require direct dealing with farmers, except for, first, educational, informational, and demonstrational features, which would be exercised through the Extension Service; second, research and investigational features, which would be carried out through the State agricultural experiment stations; and third, such other functions as would be performed in the States and counties through the State agricultural councils, county and community agricultural program committees, and county agricultural program executive committees. This section specifies that the furnishing of technical service, machinery, and equipment to soil conservation districts and others would be performed directly by the Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement. Regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service are required to be abolished.

In addition to consolidating the Agricultural Conservation Program and the Soil Conservation Service into a single new agency, the chief changes in the existing law or methods of operation required by section 101 are first, the shifting to the Extension Service of educational, informational, and demonstrational work relating to conservation; second, the shifting of the research and investigational work relating to conservation to the State experiment stations; and third, the abolishing of the regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service. Technical assistance, machinery, and equipment to soil and other conservation districts would be supplied directly by the new agency, and the agricultural conservation program, as well as other activities, would be administered or given general direction through the community, county, and State agricultural committees or councils.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I gladly yield.

Mr. THYE. In the consolidation and unification of the educational, informational, and demonstration work under the Extension Service, and the shifting to the State experiment stations of the research and the investigational work relating to conservation, does the Senator believe that such a program coordinates and brings together desirable units, and makes use to the best advantage of all the services available in the State?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my belief.

Mr. THYE. I honestly believe that we shall have a more effective program as a result of the consolidation which will go forward under this program. In the same way that we recognize that new machines constitute improvements in the mechanical field, so in this case we recognize that improvements can be made in an administrative field.

Mr. ELLENDER. There can be no question about that.

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to hear the Senator agree as to that; I am very happy to hear the Senator make that statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, section 102 authorizes the use of funds appropriated for conservation work for educational functions which the Secretary determines should be carried out by the State extension services. The section also authorizes the use of such funds or of funds appropriated specifically for educational or demonstrational functions covered by section 101 (a) to be paid to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii in accordance with the terms of the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, except that there is no requirement for matching such funds. It is expressly provided that these sums shall be in addition to and not in substitution for other extension moneys.

Section 103 provides for the creation of a new division in the Office of Experiment Stations to be known as the "Division of Soil Conservation and Improvement." That is to carry out the plan the Senator has just discussed. Section 104 authorizes the Secretary to allot

funds, other than grants-in-aid funds, which are available for functions to be performed under section 101 (b) to the agricultural experiment stations in the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. That is, sections 103 and 104 provide the mechanics by which conservation research and investigations now carried on by the Federal conservation agencies shall be decentralized to the States and administered.

Section 105 provides for the election by the farm operators within each local administrative area of a community agricultural program committee having three members, and certain alternates. The community committee is to perform within its area functions assigned to it by the Secretary pursuant to section 101 (c), or otherwise, and the local areas now used under the Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act are to serve as the local areas under this section; but the county agricultural program committee may from time to time designate different areas. This section redefines the method of electing community committees and broadens their responsibilities.

Section 106 provides for the creation of a county agricultural program committee which consists of members of the several community agricultural program committees in the county, the agricultural extension agent for the county, and one representative designated by each of the agencies concerned with conservation or other agricultural interests as the State agricultural council may specify, except that such representatives must be at least one less than the total number of community committees. That, of course, makes the committee almost completely controlled by the farmers themselves. Again, this committee is to perform such functions as the Secretary may assign pursuant to section 101 (c), or otherwise. This section creates a county agricultural program committee for which there is no counterpart under present legislation.

Section 107 provides for the election of a county agricultural program executive committee of not less than three nor more than five members as determined by the State agricultural council, and first and second alternate members. The committee is elected by the county agricultural program committee from among its members and through personnel employed by it performs such functions as the Secretary assigns pursuant to section 101 (c). In effect, this section provides for changes in the method of the election of the county committee which now handles the agricultural conservation program.

Section 108 provides for a State agricultural council to consist of 3 ex officio members and 4 elected members plus 1 additional elected member for each full 20 counties in the State or fractional remaining number of 11 or more, except that in any event the number of additional members shall not be less than 2. The commissioner, secretary, or director, as the case may be, of agriculture, the director of the agricultural experiment station, and the Director of the Agricultural Extension Service, or their respective designees, shall be the ex officio members. The election of the regular members is by the chairmen of the county agricultural program executive committees but not more than half of the elected members are to be chosen from among their number.

This section also provides that the State agricultural council shall develop plans to effectuate the purposes of section 7—the section providing for the agricultural conservation or national payments program—of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in each State, shall perform functions assigned to it by the Secretary pursuant to section 101 (c) or otherwise, shall supervise and direct the work of the county committees, and shall with the approval of the Secretary make arrangements with the Agricultural Extension Service for the conduct of educational and demonstrational programs. Provision is made for the council to employ a State administrator and other necessary personnel. This section provides for electing members of the State council whereas presently such members are appointed. They are appointed, as all Senators know, by the Secretary of Agriculture. I understand the distinguished Senator from Vermont proposes further to amend the pending bill so as to provide that the Secretary shall have the opportunity of selecting the State councils from panels elected by the farmers.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Louisiana is referring to a matter which was discussed in the Agricultural Committee meeting yesterday morning, as a result of which an amendment will be offered providing that the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to maintain continuity from the Secretary right down through the grass roots, shall name a State council, but that he shall name it from a list submitted by the farmers of the State through their county agricultural chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is really indirectly done by the farmers themselves, is it not?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The farmers elect the county committees.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. The Secretary may not appoint anyone not nominated and approved by the chairmen of the county committees, who are chosen by the farmers themselves. They submit three names for each one the Secretary has to choose. In this way we feel we are requiring perfect cooperation all the way from the Secretary's office down through to the community committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that plan was submitted by a representative of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I also understand it meets with the approval of the Secretary.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department of Agriculture itself objected to any change in the present method of naming the State committee, but a few days ago they came to the conclusion they were willing to have the farmers of the State submit a list of nominees, from which list the Secretary is required to choose the committee. In that way it is practically farmer-controlled, because the Secretary cannot name anyone not approved and nominated by the farmers of the State.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will agree, will he not, that that is really a compromise between the views of the Secretary of Agriculture and the views of the committee?

Mr. AIKEN. That is a compromise, but it seems to me to be a very healthy compromise.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department was fearful that if the State committees were not at all tied to the Secretary's office, a wide variety of programs might be set up—possibly, if we wanted to go to the extreme, 48 different programs in the 48 different States—which would probably result in wastefulness, at least in some States.

It seems to me to be a very workable and sensible compromise, because the farmers still name their committeemen, and their State councilmen. The farmers nominate them, and then the Secretary goes through the process of appointing them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I yield gladly.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator still discussing section 108?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Has that been changed in any respect?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not as yet.

Mr. AIKEN. There was a meeting of the committee, at which about eight or nine members were present yesterday morning, and it was discussed at that time. We decided upon offering several amendments. This particular amendment, which is the longest, has not yet been printed and brought to our desks, but that is what it provides, that the Secretary shall appoint the members of the State council from a panel submitted by the chairmen of the county committees of each State.

Mr. LUCAS. How many would there be in the panel?

Mr. AIKEN. There would be three farmers in the panel for each one the Secretary appoints. He would have to appoint one out of three selected by the farmers and certified to him.

Mr. LUCAS. That at least is a compromise of section 108 as written in the bill. I have always been concerned about that section, because of what the Senator from Vermont has pointed out. I think I have made my position concerning it known from time to time. I undertake to say the whole authority for the conservation program cannot be lodged in 48 different State councils or 48 different groups, if it is desired to continue to have the kind of national and regional soil-conservation program which seems to be so vital and so necessary to the welfare of all the people.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are all familiar with the views of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and of course his views are in strict accord with those of the Secretary of Agriculture. As the Senator from Vermont will recall, several meetings were held in his office. Representatives of the Secretary's office visited with us and discussed the problem. The suggestion which is incorporated in the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Vermont expects to offer to this bill was really made by a representative of the Secretary's office.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] was a member of the committee. I know there was a representative of the Department of Agriculture present, and we got together on this compromise. I can say it is wholly acceptable to and has been declared workable by the Department of Agriculture. I know that it is acceptable to some farm organizations, although not all have been consulted as yet.

Mr. LUCAS. It would not make any difference to me whether a farm organization agreed or disagreed. I would never agree, as one individual Senator, to permit the soil-conservation program to be divided up into 48 areas and lodge the sole responsibility for its development and administration in the respective States. The responsibility for the development and the broadening of the soil-conservation program rests upon every individual in America, and collectively the citizens of America can discharge that obligation only through the Federal Government. Soil conservation is a national policy. We cannot break it down into States. In my opinion, the formulation and control of the policy must remain with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to another series of amendments which will be offered. The Secretary of Agriculture approves this or that suggestion after consultation with the State council. At the suggestion of the Department we are offering amendments which will authorize him to approve programs and other things upon recommendation of the State council. The Secretary himself said he thought that would be more workable and, in his opinion, along with the other amendment which has just been discussed, would bring the actual carrying out of the operations closer to the people of the States. There seems to be no possibility of a diffusion of effort for the establishment of many diverse programs in the various States.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator recall to what section that amendment would apply? I am referring to the last amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. On page 48, lines 10 and 11, there is an amendment in connection with incentive payments to farmers in each State for soil-conservation practices. The bill provides that they shall be made only for practices approved by the Secretary of Agriculture after consultation with the State agricultural council.

At the suggestion of the Department, we are proposing that it shall read "only for practices approved by the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture upon the recommendation of the State agricultural council."

The Secretary thought that would be more workable.

There is a series of similar amendments to different parts of the bill which will have the same effect.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say, if I may, in the Senator's time, that throughout the hearings my contention has been that we cannot divide the responsibility. We must lodge responsibility somewhere, and that somewhere, in my judgment, is the Secretary of Agriculture. The moment we give, even by inference, any reason for a State group to obtain authority, we are courting a situation whereby the soil-conservation program will be seriously impaired, because we shall have two agencies trying to make a decision on the same question. If this amendment shall accomplish what the able Senator from Vermont intends, I am very happy that there is an agreement with the Agricultural Department upon it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no doubt that it will accomplish what the Senator is now contending for.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Illinois raised the question of whether there could be divided authority between the Secretary of Agriculture and the State council. As the bill is now written, I do not believe there could be any question as to whether the authority was divided. The State council would make a recommendation to the Secretary as to the type of program known to be best suited to the areas of the State, and the Secretary would accept it, execute it, and carry it out. So, rather than having divided authority, we are aiding the Secretary by getting a recommendation from the State council as to type of program.

When we met with the Secretary and the Secretary's assistants, the very fear that the Senator from Illinois recognized and stated was discussed. The reason for the amendment is to clarify the question so that there shall not be any divided authority or responsibility.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is well to bring out these points in the debate to show the legislative intent of the language which is being used in the bill, so that if there be any doubt about it, the Secretary of Agriculture will know how the legislative body feels regarding it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. From my experience in serving on boards of this character, I think this amendment will bring about better coordination than did the old program. The States will have an opportunity to offer a program, and the Secretary can modify it if he so desires. In the past there were frequently long arguments. So here is a chance for the counties and States to initiate their own program and have it rejected or accepted by the Secretary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the duties and functions of the committee or council are spelled out in more detail than is now the case and additional duties are added, such as the development of State plans under section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Section 109 authorizes and directs the Secretary to make payments from available funds to the council and committees set up under the preceding section to cover their estimated administrative costs. It is further provided that these costs may be deducted pro rata from payments or grants-in-aid to farmers as is now being done in administering the current agricultural conservation program. Section 109 further provides that no person shall be a member of more than one council or executive committee established under the act.

Title II of Senate bill 2318 consists of a series of amendments to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in order to further reinforce or supplement the various changes called for under title I.

Section 201 amends section 7 (d) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to provide for approval of State plans by the State councils prior to approval by the Secretary. Provision is also made for the disbursement of funds available for carrying out State plans under the direction of the State councils. These changes give the State councils a voice in the approval of State plans and make the new State councils and local committees proper agencies to administer such plans.

Section 202 extends for two additional years the authority for a national conservation program under sections 7 through 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In line 7 the bill provides:

> No such plan submitted by a State of the United States shall be approved by the Secretary, except after consultation with the State agricultural council created pursuant to the Agricultural Act of 1948.

Do the amendments take care of the situation covered in section 201?

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment proposes that the Secretary shall accept the plan upon the recommendation of the State council. It was at the Department's own suggestion that that change was recommended.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the final arbiter will be the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct; the Secretary must approve all these programs. I think in most States that is being done today. The committees which are established formulate the State programs, and I think the Secretary, for the most part, approves them.

Mr. ELLENDER. That has been the case in the past. The only difference is that under the old plan the Secretary of Agriculture appointed the State committees directly, and under this proposal

they are to be appointed in the manner we discussed a few moments ago.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. My only reason for continuing to stress the point I raised under section 108, as I recall, was to continue to indicate that I think the final authority for these matters must rest in the Secretary of Agriculture, and in the bill it is provided as I just read. If that language is left in the bill, I can readily see how there could easily come about some turmoil and some differences of opinion as to how much consultation, for instance, the Secretary of Agriculture had with the State agricultural council.

What I hope to see accomplished, if we ever pass a long-range bill of this kind, is the prevention of as much friction and as much disturbance between the Secretary of Agriculture and the various State agencies as possible, in order that we may ultimately have the kind of smoothly running program which is necessary.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that is the reason why the Department recommended changing the words to "upon recommendation of" instead of "after consultations with."

Mr. LUCAS. I understand the difference.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department said it would make for much smoother operation.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is an exceedingly wise substitute for the language I have just read.

Mr. AIKEN. That language we propose to ask to have substituted in about half a dozen places throughout the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the language of the bill, with the amendments which will be suggested by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, there is no question, in my mind, that the Secretary will be the final arbiter, and that the plans will originate at the grass roots, as it were—at the community level, the county level, the State level, and on to Washington.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about that, in my judgment.

I now resume my statement about the bill. This authority for a national program is necessary since less than half of the States have enacted legislation providing for State operation of the agricultural conservation program under section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Section 203 amends section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to eliminate the provision for community, county, and State committees and to substitute in lieu thereof the authorization and direction to the Secretary to utilize the new State council and local committees provided for in the bill.

Section 204 amends the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by striking out the provisions of section 8 (e) relating to the provision of practice payments and substituting a new section which subdivision (1) requires approval of conservation practices by the Secretary after consultation with State councils. I understand that language will be changed.

Mr. AIKEN. That will read "upon recommendation of the Secretary."

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly. Subdivision (2) limits payment to those practices which the Secretary after consultation with State councils determines have long-term conservation and improvement value; and subdivision (3) provides for a division of payments among landlords, tenants, and sharecroppers based on the relative value of their contribution to, and benefits from, the practices performed on the farm. This section also eliminates the small payment increases provided for under the current law and further provides for a limit on the amount of payments for conservation practices in the amount of $1,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Louisiana object to interruptions?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not at all.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask a question or two in regard to section 18, and I think it is well that we do this for the RECORD as we go along.

Mr. ELLENDER. What page?

Mr. LUCAS. It is section 204. It says "section 18" in my draft.

Mr. THYE. It refers to section 18 on line 2, page 69.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. I refer to paragraph (c), which reads:

> Payments or grants of aid to farmers in any State, under a State plan or by the Secretary, for soil-building or soil-conserving practices shall be * * * divided among the landlords, tenants, and sharecroppers of any farm, with respect to which such payments are made, on the basis of relative value of their contributions to, and benefits received from, such practices.

Did the committee at any time have any testimony before regarding the administrative difficulty such a standard might create for the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield, I will say that upon the recommendation of the Department those words "and benefits received from" should be deleted, because the Department felt that there would be greater harmony in the operations of the act if those four words were eliminated.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is in the series of amendments which the Senator will offer.

Mr. AIKEN. I mean that they might not be in harmony with the preceding statement. It is difficult to tell what the benefits are.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, section 205 amends section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act relating to the transfer of funds to State and Federal agencies and to State and county committees to conform to the new State and county organization set up under S. 2318.

As I indicated earlier, the second major objective of S. 2318 is to provide for a flexible price-support program for agricultural commodities. Title III, which amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, provides for this flexible program. Again I want to say that these amendments or provisions are not new or untried. Rather, they are based directly upon the legislation and administrative procedures which have been gradually developed and tried out since 1938.

We all know the job which farmers did during the last war. Food production was increased by a third at a time when the fate of the world literally hung upon American food supplies. Support prices authorized under the Steagall amendment and related legislation were the most important devices used in encouraging farmers to meet our wartime goals. We need to continue the authority to use support prices to maintain or increase production of commodities under emergency conditions. S. 2318 does that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, or would he rather complete his statement before he yields?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I gladly yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator, of course, is familiar with the naval-stores industry because he has much of that industry in his own State. I should like to know from the able Senator what provision for price support of that important industry is provided under the terms of the pending measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator from Florida that the products of naval stores are described under the old act as being agricultural products. They would be treated just the same as any other product of agriculture.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to say that I have received several telegrams today from people engaged in that industry in my State who are concerned about those provisions of the bill which they feel would give them less substantial protection than they are given under the present law. I have been working on other legislation and am not familiar with the provisions of the bill which relate to the naval-stores industry. If the Senator would describe in brief the provisions of the bill which relate to that industry I would appreciate it.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no specific language in the bill which relates to this industry, no more than there is for nonbasic commodities. The only crops mentioned are the original five basic crops contained in the act of 1938, plus peanuts which were added later. All the other commodities are treated in the nature of nonbasic commodities.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The definition of "naval stores" which, I suppose are turpentine and resin, was made by the Secretary; that is those products were defined as agricultural products, and under this bill they would be eligible for support up to 90 percent of parity the same as other nonbasic commodities.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the point I was discussing when the Senator from Florida asked me to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that the basic commodities are named in the bill, and then there are a great many others which are called nonbasic commodities. The nonbasic commodities are subject to the provisions of the bill as well as the basic commodities, but not in the same fashion.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. Let us consider wool. Is wool a basic commodity under the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. No, wool is not a basic commodity, because a basic commodity is one which is easily storable, and which is usually produced in exportable quantities. But the bill does provide mandatory support for wool from 60 to 90 percent of parity. The Secretary is directed to support the price of wool so as to encourage production of 360,000,000 pounds annually. In order to encourage such production he would have to support wool at 90 percent of parity, which would mean about a 46 cents a pound support level at the present time.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is treated separately, in a provision of the bill which deals with wool exclusively, and it provides for parity loans and so forth of not more than 90 and not less than 60 percent of parity.

Mr. CONNALLY. My State produces a great deal of mohair, which is a form of wool, as I view it.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it is wool it is covered.

Mr. CONNALLY. We think it is wool. I wanted to ask the Senator if mohair would be eligible for the benefits of this proposed legislation?

Mr. AIKEN. It is my opinion that mohair would be eligible for support as a nonbasic commodity up to 90 percent of parity, in the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. CONNALLY. So that if the Secretary so ruled it would be eligible up to 90 percent of parity?

Mr. AIKEN. If it were proven that it was wool it would have the same support, of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think wool means the wool from sheep. I do not know that it means wool from any other animal. I do not want to mislead the Senator, but I doubt if it would mean wool from any other animal.

Mr. CONNALLY. Some people refer to what is on one's head as being wool. I do not know that that is an accurate description; but, at any rate, it would be a matter for consideration by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly mohair is eligible for support up to 90 percent of parity in the discretion of the Secretary, after he considers the several criteria, one of which is whether he has money enough to do it, of course.

Mr. CONNALLY. So it is the Senator's belief that it is covered?

Mr. AIKEN. Absolutely; that is my belief.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I might add by way of information for the Senator from Texas that as I understand, from the facts developed before the committee, wool, so far as its production is concerned, is at a low peak, so to speak, compared with former years. The bill definitely provides for a goal of 360,000,000 pounds.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, 360,000,000 pounds is the goal. We are producing now only about 300,000,000 pounds.

Mr. LUCAS. So as long as we produce only that amount the parity price is going to stay close to 90 percent, due to the failure to reach the goal we have attempted to achieve.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me add that if this formula does not secure the desired amount of wool necessary for national defense, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to break through the 90 percent limitation and place the support at such a level as will secure any product in quantity essential for national needs.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. The House bill as written does not cover a raise in support level for the product which has just been mentioned even should an emergency exist and stepped up production was necessary to the national interest.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand the House bill contains no provision whereby the 90 percent ceiling could be broken to encourage an increase in production of any commodity in the event of a national emergency. The Senate bill does carry that provision.

Mr. YOUNG. That is something which has been very important many times in the past. For instance 2 years ago, when flaxseed was very scarce in the United States, and selling for six to seven dollars a bushel in Argentina, our only other chief source of supply, and it was necessary to increase production, the Secretary of Agriculture increased the support level to 165 percent of parity, which brought about the production necessary in the United States and saved the American public a great deal of money. Supporting flax prices at $6 a bushel in this instance benefited both the user and producer.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will agree also that the Steagall amendment was passed by Congress for that very purpose; to increase production in nonbasic commodities.

Mr. YOUNG. What I was trying to bring out is that unless this long-range farm bill is passed with such a provision in it, there will be nothing that can be done about it when the bill goes to conference, because the subject is not covered by the House bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that naval stores constitute a nonbasic crop under the bill, but are not one of the nonbasic crops that are specially covered by a special section as well?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. And therefore would come under the provision which fixes the ceiling of price support at 90 percent, but which has no figure below that at which price support begins? Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Florida is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. One further question: Am I also correct in my understanding that the provisions with reference to the computation of parity for naval stores are those which apply to the nonbasic food crops?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, in the bill there is a special formula for the six basic commodities; but with respect to the nonbasic commodities there is a formula provided in the bill which is not rigid, but which is more or less spelled out, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to make a determination. We are talking now about the pending bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding is that under the current law the basic period on which the parity price is figured for naval stores is the period from 1910 to 1914.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Likewise, the 90 percent, which is the maximum permitted under the law, is now applicable to naval stores?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator have any figures showing how the naval stores parity price would be affected by the formula prescribed by this bill for nonbasic commodities, as compared with the way they are affected under the present law?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Vermont has a table in his hand. I shall be glad to yield so that he may give the Senator the exact figures.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have a table furnished by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which shows that under the modernized parity formula the parity price of gum rosin, all grades, would be $5.83 a hundred, as compared with $6 under the old parity formula. However, as I understand, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] proposes to offer an amendment which would include the cost of hired labor in computing the parity formula. If the cost of labor is included, then the parity price of gum rosin under the new formula would be $6.16 a hundred, or 16 cents a hundred more than it is under the present parity formula. There is very little change.

As to gum turpentine, there is a reduction from $1.14 a gallon under the old formula, or the one we are using at present, to 78.8 cents a gallon under the new formula, without wages, or 83.3 cents with wages. But there is a provision in the bill which prevents a sudden drop in the parity price. It cannot drop more than 5 percent a year. Therefore, the drop from $1.14 would be between 5 and 6 cents a gallon under the new parity formula.

Mr. HOLLAND. For the first year.

Mr. AIKEN. For the first year.

Mr. HOLLAND. And thereafter each year until the new parity figure was entirely applicable.

Mr. AIKEN. Assuming that the drop were to continue. However, there is no assurance that it would continue. If back in 1938, 1939, and 1940, turpentine was selling at a low price in comparison with other agricultural commodities, and

we were to substitute the high price of the past 3 years, there is a possibility that the new parity formula would come back up and meet the old.

In fact, we believe that in 2 or 3 years' time most commodities would level off, so that there would be scarcely any difference between computing parity by the method we use today and by the method which is proposed in the bill.

The average parity price of all farm commodities is the same, whether figured by the old formula or the proposed new one. There would be some sharp drops. For example, avocados, which were hardly known in the period from 1910 to 1914, today have a parity value of something like $800 a ton. They have dropped to $200 a ton, because they have come out of the luxury class. I think there are a few other commodities, perhaps, grown in the State of Florida which have dropped, too. There is no use in trying to say that some would not drop. Others would rise. Here we have the case of rosin rising and turpentine dropping somewhat. Probably the Senator from Florida knows why. I do not know. We do not get anything but maple sirup out of our trees in Vermont. But that is the way the computation is made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make one observation, in view of the colloquy between the Senator from Florida and other Senators. If Senators take the position that they require a bill which will give to every commodity, basic and nonbasic, the same kind of parity price which it is receiving at the present time, we shall never get a bill through the Senate, in my judgment. I come from a Midwest section, where we raise corn, wheat, and soybeans. Corn and wheat are taking a terrific lacing in this program at the present time—much more than what the Senator from Florida discusses.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Would the Senator mind if I interrupted to point out that the drop can be only on the basis of 5 percent for a given year? We recognize that we must do that, because there is a drop, so far as the parity formula is concerned, on certain commodities. The reason for that is the extreme low prices in the years 1938 and 1939, which, figured into the flexible 10-year period, cause a drop. Then, as we drop off the year 1939 and pick up the year 1949 in the 10-year period, we immediately commence to restore the balance, and get back closer to the present parity formula. That is the reason for the protection of the 5-percent provision.

Mr. AIKEN. Precisely.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me point out to the Senator from Illinois, since he has mentioned corn, that under the new formula the price of corn would be $1.42 a bushel. Under the old it would be $1.60. So there is a loss of 18 cents a bushel.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from North Dakota wants to discuss wheat.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from North Dakota would like to have a supported price of $5 for wheat. No doubt the Senator from Illinois would like to have a support price of $3 or $4 for corn. But that is not possible. If we go back to prewar years, before the Steagall amendments, the support levels were away down. I believe that the farm organizations are taking a constructive view. They want, as every farmer wants, a long-range program, rather than 1 year of high support followed by a great deal of trouble, and then no support at all. Some time we shall have to get back to peacetime supports at a fair level and this bill does just that. I believe every farmer would rather have long-range assurance of at least $1.82 for wheat than $2.21 for 1 year and no assurance for the future.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out a while ago, the Steagall amendments were adopted by the Congress to increase production. If this bill is not enacted, we shall go back to the old law, which provides a formula of 52 to 75 percent.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out a while ago, the parity formula in this bill is from 60 to 90 percent.

The Senator from North Dakota mentioned wheat. Under the new formula the price of wheat will be $1.82. Under the old it would be $2.21, or a loss of 29 cents a bushel.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Does not the Senator think that under the 5-percent provision, it will be possible for the price gradually to decline and taper down?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; over a period of 5 or 6 years it would be possible to make that difference.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I believe that all the farmers much prefer to have a permanent support level which will give them some assurance of security, even at a lower level, rather than to have a high level for awhile, and then have nothing at all 2 or 3 years from now.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to emphasize the point I made a moment ago, in view of the questions and answers which have occurred on this particular phase of the problem.

Of course some of the producers of basic commodities and some of the producers of nonbasic commodities will have to make a sacrifice. Others will gain by the new arrangement. But we are trying to reach a modernized formula which will enable the farmers to go along year after year without any serious change—in other words, a situation much different from that which would exist under an obsolete formula. Under the present proposal, we shall have an up-to-date formula.

A moment ago, the Senator said that in the event the cost of hired labor was included in the parity formula, the particular product about which he was inquiring would have a better price. Of course, that is what I am afraid we shall have to meet before we finish this bill: First one and then another will try to add to this program some amendment by which a particular commodity in his section of the country will receive the benefit. Sooner or later there may be cheap labor. If that does occur, then should cheap labor be figured into the parity formula, the very persons who wanted to have labor included in the parity formula will say, "Labor is cheap now, so let us take it out of the parity formula."

That is the primary reason labor was not included in the parity formula in the beginning—it was cheap. If it had been included then, there would not have been the parity prices which have existed during all these years; parity prices would have been much lower.

So, as one Senator on this floor, I shall do all I can to defeat any amendment to this parity formula; and I hope every member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will stand by the formula. Let us go through with this parity formula as it is, and not attempt to fool around by adding additional factors at this late date, because when we do that we shall be sure to get into unsurmountable trouble.

There is only one reason anyone would wish to add labor to this formula at the present time, and that is to increase the parity price. Under the method as now proposed, we realize that in our section of the country corn and wheat will be taking a considerable loss, but the farmers there are willing to have that done. We want to operate on a permanent basis, as the Senator from North Dakota so well described a moment ago. Obviously these high prices cannot continue forever. We would like to get back to a normal condition under which it will be possible to go along on a basis of sustained abundance and protection to the American farmer, so that he will know, when he puts in a crop, that he will get a decent price for it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Let me say that the senior Senator from Illinois is entirely correct when he speaks about the question of figuring the labor cost into the parity formula. At the present time, in the inflationary era, the high cost of labor would work to advantage in raising the parity price; but it would work to a great disadvantage in a period of depression, because then it would have a tendency to pull prices down even lower. Certainly, if there is ever a time when parity support of prices is needed, it is in a time of deflation, rather than in a period of inflation, such as we are in now.

I should like to comment in connection with the thought the able Senator from Illinois expressed in regard to the question of a farm program. Certainly no one who is engaged in agriculture would wish to subject the consumer to unreasonable prices because of the price-support program. All that the farmers want is a program giving soundness to the prices of the commodities they raise in relation to the prices of articles produced by other workers or by business. In other words, the farmers simply want an equal chance with the other groups in our economy in order that they may be able to produce the food the consumers must have at all times and in all years.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Minnesota are absolutely correct about the question of the inclusion of the cost of labor in the formula. I recall that approximately 2 years ago an amendment to include the cost of labor in the parity formula was offered on the floor of the Senate. At that time I voted for it. Naturally, it would have boosted the parity-price levels existing at that time. But I voted for it, against the advice of the farm organizations, which had made a very intensive study of the farm program.

I admit now that I made a mistake in doing that, and it would be a mistake now to raise the formula by means of such a provision, for we would only hurt the farmers later, when the cost of labor declines.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield to me at this point, I should like to say that in view of all the changes we are making in this bill at the present time, the Department of Agriculture will have enough to do to administer this program efficiently and effectively in the next few years to come. I undertake to say that the inclusion of hired labor in the formula would make the formula very difficult to administer. If we add another factor to the parity formula, the administration at the other end of the Avenue will find its troubles vastly increased.

I do not wish to disturb the parity formula which has worked so well all these years. The machinery for administering it is now set up, and those who are charged with its administration know exactly what to do; they know all the factors that are involved in it; and the entire operation under the present arrangement is a going and successful concern.

But the moment we add the cost of labor to the parity formula, we upset the apple cart in a way that will make it most difficult for the program to be administered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me at this point, apropos of the statement that the wheat grower is willing to accept a drop in the parity price in order to get on a stable basis, I should like to read a telegram which I received today from Spokane, Wash. The telegram, which is addressed to me, reads as follows:

> Washington-Idaho Wheat Growers League extremely interested in the early consideration and passage of Senate bill 2318, and urge your support to obtain final adoption of the measure.
>
> WALTER R. JOHNSON,
> *President, Washington-Idaho Wheat Growers League.*

In other words, Mr. President, they know that the parity price for wheat will drop at least for the present. Yet, although they are producers of that one commodity, they are willing to accept a lower support level in order to have a permanent and sound program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to commend the vision of the farmers who are looking to the effects of this program over a long period of years, and are not looking just to the support they can receive next year on a particular product.

When we consider the support a particular product will receive for only 1 year, we are not viewing the agricultural situation with sufficient vision. The farmers are willing to accept a parity price for wheat and corn and other commodities under this formula that will cause them some losses, but they are looking at this matter realistically, and not just in terms of the moment. Some Senators and some farmers seem to wish to receive a little profit for another year under a straight 90 percent support price. I emphatically assert that this approach is totally unrealistic, and it will inure to the detriment of the American farmer over a long period of time.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Louisiana for a moment further, let me say that the Senator from Illinois is entirely correct in his statement regarding the importance of this bill because of its effect on a long-range program and because it does not simply ask for a continuation of the 90-percent support price, or the so-called war legislation, for just one more year. If we continue the war legislation, so to speak, for just one more year, it can well destroy any future opportunity for a sound farm program.

That is why I wish to join the Senator from Illinois on this matter and to say that he is entirely correct in his explanation of the importance of providing for this type of program, rather than a mere continuation of some special wartime legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in that connection, let me say that I understand the House has passed a bill extending the so-called Steagall amendment for 18 months. But if prices were to fall in the meantime, and if we did not pass this bill providing for a long-range program, my guess is that we would not be able to obtain—under conditions different from those which exist at this time—the enactment of a bill as favorable as this one to the farmers as a whole. In other words, let the price of wheat go down, let the price of corn and other commodities go down, and it would be more difficult for us to get so favorable a bill approved as the one we can obtain now, because of the fact that the prices for those commodities are fairly good at present.

We also know something about what happened to farm prices and incomes following World War I and again following 1929. On the average farm prices dropped something more than 50 percent within a 12-month period following the fall of 1920. Again, following 1929 farm prices went into the long, disastrous, downward slide which carried into 1933. Farmers need protection against such disasters. S. 2318 supplies such protection. As has been pointed out on two or three occasions, under the plan in the pending bill farm prices cannot fall below their support levels, which in the case of the basic commodities would be between 60 and 90 percent of parity. In 1929, in a period of 12 months, the price of our basic commodities fell 50 percent.

Essentially S. 2318 provides for mandatory supports for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—through loans, purchases, payments, or other operations at not less than 75 percent of the parity prevailing at the beginning of the marketing year when supplies are normal. These mandatory price supports would gradually drop to 60 percent of parity as supplies rose to 130 percent or more of normal, or go to 90 percent of parity as supplies fell to 70 percent or less of a normal supply. In addition, the mandatory support schedule would be increased by 20 percent whenever producers of the commodity voted marketing quotas, except that in no case may the support level be increased above 90 percent of the parity level. But these are minimum floor prices and the Secretary of Agriculture is given discretionary authority to support prices anywhere up to 90 percent of the parity level.

The normal supply of wheat, rice, corn, cotton and peanuts is defined as the sum of the previous year's domestic consumption, plus estimated exports for the current year plus allowances of the following percentages for carry-over: 7 percent in the case of corn, 30 percent in the case of cotton, 10 percent in the case of rice, 15 percent in the case of wheat, and 15 percent in the case of peanuts. The Secretary may also make adjustments for current trends and unusual conditions. In the case of tobacco, a normal supply is defined as a normal year's domestic consumption and exports, plus 175 percent of a normal year's domestic consumption and 65 percent of a normal year's exports as an allowance for a normal carry-over. That of course is made necessary for the reason that tobacco is usually kept and stored for a period of 3 years.

The actual supply for a given year is compared to the normal supply for that year to obtain the supply percentage. For example, let us assume that this bill had been in effect in 1947. In that year the normal supply of wheat might have been about 1,441,000,000 bushels. The actual supply was 1,449,000,000 bushels, so that the supply percentage was about 100 percent. This would call for a minimum support price level of 75 percent of parity. However, the Secretary could have supported prices at 90 percent of parity.

The normal supply of cotton in 1947 might have been about 16,283,000 bales. The actual supply was 17,007,000 bales, or about 104 percent of the normal supply. This supply percentage would indicate a minimum support price of 74 percent

of the parity price according to the schedule set forth on page 79 of S. 2318. But let us suppose the supply of cotton might have been as much as 19,500,000 bales. Then the supply percentage would have been 120 and the mandatory minimum support level would have been 66 percent of parity or in case marketing quotas had been in effect 79 percent. That of course is 20 percent of the 66 added. In either case, however, the Secretary might have gone as high as 90 percent of parity under the discretionary authority provided.

Sections 303 through 306 of the bill specifically define the conditions under which marketing quotas may be voted for corn, wheat, cotton, and rice. In the case of the grains—corn, wheat, and rice—the Secretary shall proclaim and the farmers shall vote on marketing quotas in any year when the total supply exceeds the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 percent, or whenever the average farm price for 3 successive months in the marketing year does not exceed 66 percent of parity, provided the total supply is not less than the normal supply. In the case of cotton, marketing quotas shall be proclaimed and voted upon whenever the total supply exceeds the normal supply by more than 8 percent, or whenever the average farm price for cotton for 3 successive months does not exceed 66 percent of parity, provided the total supply is not less than the normal supply for such marketing year. In the case of tobacco and peanuts, the provisions relating to marketing quotas remain the same as in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 except that section 309, which was reported as an amendment to S. 2318, provides that the Secretary shall proclaim a national marketing quota for each marketing year for each kind of tobacco for which a national marketing quota was proclaimed for the immediately preceding year.

Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 no price supports are available in cases where producers vote down or disapprove marketing quotas. Senate bill 2318, provides, however, that the level of price support for any basic agricultural commodity normally marketed in any marketing year with respect to which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers shall be 50 percent of the parity price of such commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year.

I understand that there is a little disagreement in the Department of Agriculture on that phase of the bill. As I have just pointed out, it provides that in the event marketing quotas are disapproved by the farmers, support prices will be accorded at 50 percent of parity price. That is something new.

With respect to nonbasic commodities generally, the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation or other means available to him, is authorized to support prices of agricultural commodities to farmers through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations at not more than 90 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year or season.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. With reference to perishable commodities, one reason why perishable commodities would have to be handled in an entirely different manner than would nonperishable commodities——

Mr. ELLENDER. I am coming to that.

Mr. THYE. I wanted to be certain that that point was explained and clarified, so that no one would in any way feel he was being discriminated against by unreasonably high support prices.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I shall indicate in a moment, there are no loans made by the Commodity Credit Corporation on perishables, but a commodity may be purchased or dealt in with funds under section 32.

Mr. THYE. Perishable commodities are geographically located in very small areas, and there is no possible way that the producer could be protected except in the way which has been provided.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think my statement will explain it fully.

With respect to these nonbasic commodities, however, there are certain standards or conditions which the Secretary should consider. These are: The supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, the price levels at which other commodities are being supported, the availability of funds, the perishability of the commodity, its importance to agriculture and the national economy, the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation, and the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand.

All these provisions, of course, are specifically written in the bill, as the Senator knows.

We also specifically provide that compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices prescribed by the Secretary may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out at this time that there is an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] for the purpose of offsetting temporary losses in export markets. There were instances last year of a foreign nation suddenly canceling its orders in this country, thereby sharply reducing the market price, had there been no support price. I think that is a very worthy suggestion on the part of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from California, and I think we will accept it. I know of no reason why it could not be accepted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Special provision is made for wool. The price of wool shall be supported at such level, not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of its parity price, as the Secretary may consider necessary in order to encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds. Senate bill 2318 also amends section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 in such a way as to allow the President to take corrective action upon finding that imports are rendering or tending to render ineffective any price-support program, provided, of course, that such action shall not be in contravention of any treaty or international agreement.

Funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation itself will not be used to support prices for perishable farm products, except as such products may be processed into storable form.

That is what I was referring to a moment ago, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota.

However, the measure does recognize that funds must be available to assist producers of perishable commodities and does specifically provide that section 32 funds will remain available to the Secretary of Agriculture until expended in order to meet any future emergency, provided the total at the end of any fiscal year shall not exceed $300,000,000.

Senate bill 2318 also specifies the conditions under which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall sell or not sell the farm commodities owned or controlled by it. Specifically, it is provided that commodities shall not be sold at less than, first, a price reasonably calculated to reimburse it for costs incurred; second, a price halfway between the support price, if any, and the parity price of such commodity; or third, a price equivalent to 90 percent of the parity price of such commodity, whichever is lowest. Exceptions to the foregoing restrictions are allowed in the case of sales for new or byproduct uses; sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil; sales for seed or feed, if such sales will not substantially impair any price-support program; sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality, or of nonbasic perishable commodities where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage; sales for the purposes of establishing claims of certain kinds; sales for export; sales of wool; and sales for other than primary uses. A number of other technical amendments are also included to tie in with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Senate bill 2318 provides for certain revisions in the calculation of parity prices for agricultural commodities. Essentially this revised parity provides for maintaining the same over-all relationship between prices for the things the farmer buys and the prices for things he sells as was provided in the original parity formula—that is, farm prices generally should yield the same purchasing power as prevailed during the period 1909–14. However, several of the farm organizations as well as the Secretary of Agriculture have recommended that the parity prices for the several individual commodities should be revised. This is done by providing that the parity prices of the several commodities shall be so calculated as to bear the same relation to each other as existed in the 10 calendar years immediately preceding the calculation.

Parity prices, according to the present definition are prices for individual commodities which have changed by the same percentage since a specified base period as the parity index. For many important commodities such as wheat, cotton, hogs, beef, cattle, and so forth, the base period is 1910–14, and the parity index is the index of prices paid by farmers for commodities used in farm production and farm family living plus an allowance of interest on farm mortgages and taxes on farm real estate.

Senate bill 2318 retains the 1910–14 period as a basis for the relationship between the general level of prices or rates paid by farmers and the general level of prices received by farmers. However, the price relationships among the prices of agricultural products themselves are determined by the actual prices for these commodities that prevailed in the last 10 years.

Some of the Senators may be interested to know how the general level of prices received by farmers and of prices paid by farmers are determined by the Department of Agriculture. The Department selects a representative period and determines the average quantities of the various products sold during that period. They also collect information on prices received by farmers for a selected list of commodities each month. These different prices for each of the months are multiplied by the average quantities, the same average quantities. The resulting total for each month is expressed as a percentage of the value of the same average quantities at 1910–14 average prices. Since the quantities remain constant the change in the value is a measure of the change in prices. For example, in May 1948 the index of prices received by farmers was 289. In other words, prices were 289 percent of what they were in the base period.

The parity index is obtained in a similar fashion. Prices paid by farmers for a standard list of commodities purchased by farmers for use in production and family living are collected. These prices are averaged together with interest rates and taxes to obtain the index of prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes. In May 1948, this index indicated that prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes, were 250 percent of their level in the base period 1910–14.

The starting point for calculating the revised parity price for wheat according to this bill is the average price received by farmers for wheat during the period January 1938 to December 1947. This price was $1.22 per bushel. The general level of prices received by farmers during that period was 168. The index of prices paid, including interest and taxes, as of March 15, 1948, was 247. This index determines the level of parity prices for that month. Prices during the preceding 10 years need to be increased by the ratio of 247 to 168 to indicate the March 15, 1948, parity price. Or, stated another way, the average price of wheat for the last 10 years can be divided by 168, the index of prices received by farmers for the same period, and multiplied by 247, the parity index reported for March 15.

The revised parity prices provided under S. 2318 would be considerably different than now calculated and published by the Department of Agriculture. However, in order to protect producers against abrupt or sharp changes due to the revision, S. 2318 provides for a transitional parity price where needed. That is, no parity price shall be lowered in any 1 year by more than 5 percent of the parity price as calculated prior to the effective date of S. 2318. It is further provided that the Secretary may, and upon the request of a substantial number of producers shall, hold public hearings with respect to parity prices of particular commodities to consider whether revisions in methods of calculating the particular parity are needed. If so, the Secretary is given authority to put into effect any revision so found to be required.

Parity prices are also used in connection with marketing agreements and in order to assure that the shift to the new revised method of calculating parity causes no unnecessary administrative difficulties, Section 403 provides the necessary amendments to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

The effective date of S. 2318, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1948, is set as January 1, 1949, except for section 402 which shall take effect upon enactment. Section 402 is the section giving the President power to protect any support program from imports which may render ineffective, or materially interfere with, such a program.

In conclusion, let me say that S. 2318 is not a bill to extend price supports for another 6 or 12 or 18 months. S. 2318 is not an endeavor to dodge the farm price issue. It meets it direct. S. 2318 is permanent legislation. It has the full support not only of those of us who have worked upon it but also, I believe, of the American farmers and their representatives. It offers American farmers a fair basis against which to plan for the future and, in so doing, it also goes far toward assuring the American people generally of abundant food supplies over the years ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a statement prepared by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry respecting parity prices. It further explains the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—A COMPARISON OF PARITY PRICES AS DETERMINED IN S. 2318 AND UNDER THE PRESENT FORMULA

The new parity price formula in S. 2318 accepts the prices of individual farm commodities for the 10 immediately preceding years as reflecting the current relative supply of and demand for different farm products better than the price relationships between different farm commodities in 1910–14. However, the period 1910–14 is retained as the base period in showing the over-all relationship between the prices of things farmers buy and the prices of farm products. The period of 1910–14 has advantages as a base period for farm products as a group because no large segment of our economy was badly out of adjustment with other segments of our economy at that time due to the absence of war, depression, or seriously disturbed international trade conditions. On the other hand changes in population, consumption of products, trade, total production, and other factors have had a marked effect in changing the relative demand for different farm products now as compared to the period 1910–14.

Below are given the new (S. 2318) and old parity price computations for the six basic farm commodities of corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco as of May 15, 1948, plus a few examples of nonbasis commodities. In making these calculations the following data were used to tie the new parity formula to the 1910–14 base period: the 10-year average of prices received by farmers for their products (1938–47) was 168 percent of the 1910–14 base period, and the May 15, 1948, index of prices farmers paid for products purchased, including interest and taxes, was 250 percent of the 1910–14 base period. The new parity-price calculation uses the preceding 10-year average price (1938–47) of the individual commodity to determine the current relationship of the commodity to all farm products sold. The old parity-price calculation uses the 1910–14 individual commodity price (unless some other base period has been accepted as in the case of tobacco) to show the price relationships between farm products.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES

Using corn as an example, the calculation of parity under the new parity formula is as follows: The 10-year average price of corn (1938–47) was $0.953. Average prices of all farm products during the last 10 years is 168 percent of the average prices of all farm products during the 1910–14 base period. Thus, $0.953 is divided by 1.68 to show the parity price of corn in 1910–14, which would amount to $0.567. Since the prices of things farmers buy are now 250 percent or 2.50 times as high as in 1910–14, the current parity price of corn would be 2.50 times $0.567 or $1.42.

In calculating the parity price for corn under the old formula, the actual price of corn from 1910–14 is used which was $0.642. Since the prices of things the farmer buys are 2.50 times as high as in 1910–14, the 1910–14 price of corn, $0.642, is multiplied by 2.50 which gives $1.60 as the old parity price of corn.

PARITY PRICES OF BASIC COMMODITIES

Corn (per bushel): New, $0.953 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $0.567 times 2.50 equals $1.42; old, $0.642 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $1.60.

Wheat (per bushel): New, $1.22 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $0.726 times 2.50 equals $1.82; old, $0.884 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $2.21.

Cotton (per pound): New, $0.1808 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $0.1076 times 2.50 equals $0.2659; old, $0.124 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $0.3100.

Peanuts (per pound): New, $0.062 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $0.37 times 2.50 equals $0.091; old, $0.048 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $0.120.

Rice (per bushel): New, $1.44 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $0.857 times 2.50 equals $2.12; old, $0.813 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $2.03.

Tobacco (per pound): Flue-cured, new, $0.336 (10-year average price)[3] divided by 1.68 equals $0.200 times 2.50 equals $0.500; old, $0.229 (present base price)[3] times 2.12[2] equals $0.485; Burley, new $0.340 (10-year average price)[1] divided by 1.68 equals $0.202 times 2.50 equals $0.505; old, $0.222 (present price)[3] times 2.12[2] equals $0.471.

PARITY PRICES OF SELECTED NONBASIC COMMODITIES

Cottonseed (per ton): New, $44.60 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals

[1] Ten marketing years beginning during calendar years 1938–47.
[2] Based on marketing seasons 1934–38.
[3] May 15 index of prices paid August 1934–July 1939 equals 100.

$26.50 times 2.50 equals $66.20; old, $22.23 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $56.40.

Hogs (per hundredweight): New, $12.50 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $7.44 times 2.50 equals $18.60; old, $7.23 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $18.20.

Beef cattle (per hundredweight): New, $10.90 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $6.49 times 2.50 equals $16.20; old, $5.41 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $13.50.

Milk (per hundredweight): New, $2.81 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $1.67 times 2.50 equals $4.18[1]; old, $1.60 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $4.00.[1]

It should be noted that while the parity prices of some products are higher and others lower under the new formula, the average parity price of all commodities will be the same under the old and new formulas. In the change from the old to the new parity formula, the parity price of livestock, livestock products and oil seeds are higher, while parity prices for grain crops are lower. It is because the relationships between prices of individual farm commodities have changed materially since 1910–14 that there is need of revising the parity formula to use current price relationships between individual farm commodities.

A provision in the bill (S. 2318), however, provides that where there is a difference between the two parity prices for a product exceeding 5 percent of the old parity price, that the adjustment to the new parity will not take place at the rate of more than 5 percent in 1 year. The main reason for the lower parity prices for the basic commodities under the new parity formula, except for rice and tobacco, is the low prices for the other products in the years 1938, 1939, and 1940. Insofar as the prices in 1948, 1949, and 1950 may be higher than in 1938, 1939, and 1940 for these products, their parity prices under the two formulas will come closer together in the next 3 years, and the new parity for a product may exceed the old if the 10-year average price of the product becomes relatively higher than those of other commodities. The formula provides for the annual adjustment of dropping the first and adding a new year's price to the 10-year average price of farm products.

It is desirable that the new parity prices for livestock and oil seeds be somewhat higher relative to grain prices because 85 percent of the corn crop and a large part of other grains are normally fed to livestock. This change in the relationship of parity prices for livestock and grains will encourage the feeding of grain which is the most desirable means of utilizing grain when supplies become burdensome.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for his very careful and accurate analysis of the bill, and, too, for his long and splendid work in behalf of the farmers of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. He is very kind.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at this time I call to the attention of the Senate certain amendments approved by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. First there is a series of amendments which were reported and printed on May 25 last, and which I understand automatically become a part of the bill. Then there are other amendments which were approved by the committee yesterday morning, and which were offered last night, but unfortunately they were not printed as committee amendments.

[1] Not adjusted for seasonal trends.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, the committee amendment will be modified by the amendments now offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. If there is no objection, that certainly is the quickest way to take care of the amendments.

There is one other amendment which was not taken up by the committee yesterday, and which I shall offer at this time. It is an amendment which would extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for another year under the Delaware charter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is this a committee amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. No. The committee did not have it prepared in time to act on it yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is offering it in his own right?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, although I am sure the entire committee agrees with the amendment. As I have said, there is some doubt whether the House will get around to acting on the Commodity Credit charter bill in time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will send the amendment to the desk the clerk will state it.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 96, it is proposed to strike out beginning with line 14 down to and including line 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CONTINUED AS AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 404. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1948," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 405. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1949, except that sections 402 and 404 shall take effect upon the enactment of this act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, what is the effect of sections 402 and 404? Is that part of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment is to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for another year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that part of it, but I did not understand the last line, which referred to sections 402 and 404.

Mr. AIKEN. I asked the draftsman to prepare a bill extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for another year, as is, merely so that the country might be safeguarded in the event the House and Senate did not agree upon a permanent Commodity Credit Corporation charter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am heartily in favor of the Senator's amendment extending the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. This was prepared by the legislative draftsman, and I am sure that if it means anything else than what I have stated we shall be glad to have it corrected.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was merely curious. On reading the amendment I find it seems to relate to the entire bill taking effect January 1, the Commodity Credit Corporation part to take effect immediately. I think I understand it now.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is all right. If there is any doubt, we will wait and offer it a little later. If there is no objection, it will save a little time to offer it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I inquire as to whether amendment lettered "A," which was reported on May 25, has been agreed to?

Mr. AIKEN. The amendments reported on May 25, being committee amendments, automatically became a part of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inform the Senator from Georgia that the amendment to which he addresses himself, as modified, has been agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. When was it agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was a modification of the committee amendment, and was made a part of the committee amendment, the Chair is advised.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, Mr. President, the committee has the right to modify its own amendment to the bill; the amendment was in the form of an amendment to the original bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 81, line 3, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

Any price-support operation undertaken with respect to either turkeys or chickens shall be applicable to all chickens, including broilers, appropriate adjustments being made as provided in subsection (e) of this section.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, poultry is one of the nonbasic agricultural commodities which is supported under the Steagall amendment, the act of July 1, 1941, as amended.

But in subsequent directives issued under the authority of section 4 of that act, the Secretary of Agriculture, in authorizing support prices for turkeys and chickens, specifically excluded broilers by name. There is nothing mentioned in the law passed by Congress which would authorize any discrimination against any segment of the poultry industry, and insofar as I have been able to ascertain, this is the only case on record in which the Secretary of Agriculture has seen fit specifically to exclude by name any group of farmers from participating in the program as authorized under the law as passed in 1941.

This amendment does not say that the Secretary of Agriculture must support the price of broilers. It merely states that if and when any price-support operations are undertaken with respect to either turkeys or chickens, it shall be applicable to all chickens including broilers with appropriate adjustments being made as provided in the act itself.

The amendment is being offered by my colleagues the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. O'CONOR], and myself, who represent the major percentage of broiler producers in this country. We have discussed its merits with the sponsor of the agriculture bill, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who has agreed with us that there is no justification for a continuation of this discrimination, since it clearly was not the intent of Congress when it passed the law in July 1941, and I understand that he is willing to accept the amendment on behalf of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the amendment does not require the Secretary to support the price of chickens or turkeys or broilers or any other fowl at any particular level, but simply requires that if poultry is supported broilers shall be included. I personally have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, a perfecting amendment would seem to be required on page 49, line 3. At present subdivision (14) reads:

To encourage producers, processors, distributors, and consumers to enter into marketing agreements.

Consumers are not contemplated as parties under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937. So I am offering an amendment to strike out the word "consumers" and insert after "processors" the word "and", so the language would be "processors, and distributors", omitting the word "consumers."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator's point is well taken, but a similar amendment has just been approved.

Mr. DOWNEY. Was it offered as an amendment by the committee?

Mr. AIKEN. It was in certain clarifying amendments which I offered on behalf of the committee.

Mr. DOWNEY. I will then withdraw my amendment, of course. I am very happy to do so.

There are two amendments sponsored by the Senator from Florida and myself which I offer at this time and ask to have stated. I send the first one to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 49, after lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

(16) to assist in the retention of foreign outlets in order to (a) maintain long-run export demands, (d) prevent short-run demoralization of domestic markets, and (c) maintain productive capacity sufficient to satisfy expected long-run domestic markets plus foreign demand for agricultural products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], for himself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment which I offer on behalf of myself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 77, line 19, of the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out "and (7)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(7) the need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets, and (8)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, with respect to the amendments I will say that both of them would only serve to strengthen the bill. I cannot conceive of anyone having any objection to either one.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I fully concur, and did so at the time the amendment was offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], with respect to turkeys and chickens. In the State of New York we have also a rather large duck industry. I do not want to say that in this case what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, but it seems to me only fair, if turkeys and chickens are to be included in the bill, for ducks and ducklings also to be included. I therefore offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 81, after the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS, it is proposed to insert the following:

That if any support-price operation is undertaken with respect to either chickens or turkeys, the same parity price-support operation shall be undertaken with respect to ducks and ducklings.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator from New York the question whether or not there would be any particular objection to including in the appropriate place in his amendment "and other poultry," because there is an "if" clause in his amendment, that "if any support price," and so forth. Why do we not do this all up at once and insert in the appropriate place in the amendment the words "and other poultry"?

Mr. IVES. That is very agreeable to the Senator from New York, and I ask that my amendment be appropriately modified in accordance with the suggestion made by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment offered by Mr. IVES, as modified by Mr. MORSE, to the committee amendment, was reduced to writing, as follows:

Provided, That if any price support operation is undertaken with respect to either chickens or turkeys, the same parity price support operation shall be undertaken with respect to ducks and ducklings and other poultry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to the committee amendment.

The amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had submitted an amendment to the committee amendment which has been printed and lies on the table, and has been lying on the table for several days, but after consultation with Senators in charge of the bill and members of the committee who have devoted a great deal of work and time to the subject, I have somewhat varied the amendment. It now comes down to two amendments, and I submit them both for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 49, line 7, between the words "revenues" and "for", it is proposed to insert the words "and funds."

On page 2, line 20, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso:

And provided further, That in any fiscal year, if at the end of the preceding fiscal year the sums appropriated under said section 32 and remaining unexpended do not exceed $300,000,000, Commodity Credit Corporation may, as provided in section 302 (a) of this act, carry out any operation to support the price of any such perishable, non-basic agricultural commodity to the extent that the reserve for postwar price support of agriculture established pursuant to the First Supplemental Appropriation Recission Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 8) and other funds appropriated for agricultural price support are sufficient to cover any losses which may be incurred in connection with such operation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have consulted with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on his question. He is quite familiar with the change in the original printed amendment, and I hope he will see fit to accept this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amendment as read referred to page 2, line 20.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is a perfecting amendment, to change language in another section.

Mr. AIKEN. Is this the same amendment which has been printed, which the Senator from Washington submitted?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. It provides, does it not, that the Commodity Credit Corporation may use the funds which are already available to it for the support of prices of nonbasic commodities?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. So far as I am personally concerned, I think the amendment is satisfactory.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I simply wish the RECORD to show that I have checked into this question with members of the committee. I understand that there is no

serious objections to the amendment. I join with the Senator from Washington in saying a word in its behalf at this time. The amendment is vital to the fruit industry from coast to coast and from north to south.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have another amendment which lies on the desk, the effect of which might involve some controversy. I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Vermont.

One section of the bill provides that should the President of the United States find that at some time or other certain commodities from foreign countries may be coming in and flooding the so-called American agricultural market, regardless of the commodity, he may ask the Tariff Commission to make an investigation. For example, in the State of the Senator from Oregon or in my State the situation might involve fruit from Canada, which might glut the market at a certain time. It would not necessarily be an over-all glutting of the market; but particularly in connection with perishable commodities, fruit from other countries might come in and thereby ruin the economy of the fruit industry of a certain section of the country.

The committee has devoted much time and effort in an attempt to solve this problem. It has done so in a very decent way. In effect, it has tried to solve the problem in a long-range agricultural program without violating reciprocal trade agreements. That is a somewhat difficult maneuver. I think the committee has been very successful in its provision in the bill, which does just that.

However, these things happen so quickly that the Tariff Commission often does not act so speedily as we would like. I have before me a compilation of cases involving agricultural commodities which have been placed before the Tariff Commission for study. The compilation is too long to place in the RECORD. The Tariff Commission has been asked to determine whether or not the economy of certain agricultural products was being affected.

Reading through the compilation, I find that the shortest time that the Tariff Commission has required to act with respect to any one product has been from 9 to 10 months. Some of the cases were pending for a very much longer period. I had suggested to the committee that probably the Secretary of Agriculture might be substituted for the Tariff Commission, that he could act more quickly, and therefore we might at least have information. However, I appreciate the problem of trying to tread between giving authority to the President to act upon advice of either the Tariff Commission or the Secretary of Agriculture, and violating our international agreements with respect to reciprocal trade. I wanted the RECORD to show that I hope that under the provisions of the bill, when those representing an agricultural commodity feel that such a thing is happening the Tariff Commission will show a little more speed than it has in the past.

So, Mr. President, I shall withdraw the amendment. If the problem is not solved under the Tariff Commission, I am sure that the committee will be with me in substituting the Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment to the committee amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I call up the amendment to the committee amendment which I have at the desk, and ask to have it stated. I should state that I offer the amendment on behalf of myself, my colleague the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 81, line 8, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

> The price of any kind of Irish potatoes harvested after December 31, 1948, shall be supported at not less than 60 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price for Irish potatoes as of the beginning of its marketing season.

On page 81, line 10, after the word "commodity", insert "(other than Irish potatoes)."

On page 84, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

> (c) Section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1941 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-8), is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the expiration of the period specified in the preceding sentence, the price of Irish potatoes harvested prior to January 1, 1949, shall be supported as provided in this section until the close of June 30, 1949."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this amendment contemplates that the 1940 crop of potatoes shall be supported at the existing parity, up to June 30, 1949, since in the Northern States much of the crop is harvested after January 1, and the only consequence of not having this provision would be that the entire crop, which would amount to at least 100,000,000 bushels, would be dumped on the Government on or before December 31, 1948, while the support price is still in effect. So I think there can be very little dispute about the wisdom of the extension.

The other provision is to take care of the potato crop thereafter at from 60 to 90 percent of parity. The potato producers of the country are quite content to accept the 60-percent provision, believing that it is not an incentive price, and that it will not result in overstimulating the production of potatoes, but will guarantee the producers against losses which might otherwise have a very disastrous effect.

I hope that the chairman of the committee may feel that he can accept this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, ordinarily I should be reluctant to designate any of the nonbasic commodities or fix the level at which they should be supported. It was the expectation of the committee that white potatoes, which will keep during transportation anywhere, would be supported by the Department of Agriculture at 60 to 90 percent of parity, and we had so advised the Department.

It was also the expectation of the committee that that part of the 1948 crop not marketed before January 1, 1949, would be supported at 90 percent of parity, as promised by the Steagall amendment.

As I say, I am somewhat reluctant to open the gates. Nevertheless, if they were to be opened to any commodity, potatoes would undoubtedly be the first to come in.

It is only the remainder of the 1948 crop that would be supported at 90 percent of parity. After the 1948 crop, future crops would be supported at from 60 to 90 percent of parity. That is in accord with the belief of members of the committee.

There is some question as to whether or not 60 percent of parity is an incentive price for early potatoes. If it turns out to be, I shall be very glad to sponsor an amendment to the bill next year, or after it has had a trial, correcting any deficiency of that sort which may develop.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the last statement the Senator from Vermont has made is very helpful to the problem I have in mind. As the Senator knows, he and I have had several consultations in regard to handling of the potato problem under this bill.

I now understand that with the adoption of the Brewster amendment, those of us who have a large constituency of potato growers will be in a position to tell them that this bill will provide them with 60 to 90 percent of parity.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. It is my opinion that the Senator could have so advised them without the adoption of the amendment; but certainly he can so advise them with the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Vermont has told me that several times; but I was not able to persuade the potato growers in my State that that would be the result.

I appreciate the acceptance of the amendment by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I have noticed some considerable skepticism on the part of the potato growers toward the Department of Agriculture, and they were anxious to have this provision written into the law. Although it may not be just the thing to do, I do not know that it will do any harm, if the other 159 agricultural commodity producers do not object. I believe that potatoes are our sixth most valuable field crop.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, and while the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is in the Chamber, I wonder whether the Senator from Vermont will permit me to ask a question concerning the Magnuson amendment, which has just been withdrawn by the Senator from Washington. We are moving at such a rapid rate that it is difficult to keep up with the amendments.

This morning I had another very strong representation made to me—in this instance, by Mr. Klahre, who represents one of the large fruit holdings in my State, at Hood River. He urged upon me the importance of the Magnuson amendment because of the great delays of which the Tariff Commission has been guilty in the past in handling the problems of perishable products. He was very insistent that I do what I could to help secure the adoption of the Magnuson amendment. I told him I would.

I wish to be sure that I understand the situation. I now understand that the Senator from Vermont and also the Senator from Washington are of the opinion that the bill in its present form is such that under it the producers of perishable farm products, such as fruit, will have a quick remedy for and relief in their problems if we permit the procedure to remain in the hands of the Tariff Commission, rather than to transfer it to the Secretary of Agriculture; or at least the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Washington think that under this bill that is worth a trial.

Is that an accurate statement of the Senator's position?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amendment—which was not offered by the Senator from Washington, but which was explained by him—has a great deal of logic behind it and has much merit. If we were not so near the conclusion of this session of Congress, but were nearer the beginning of the session, I might be tempted to try to do more with the amendment, which the Senator from Washington did not offer.

However, we have already adopted to section 22, amendments which have met with the approval of the State Department; and already we are providing in the bill, I believe, means for supporting the fruit growers, both citrus and aciduous, in such a way that we hope the fruit growers of the Northwest will not again or often find themselves in the predicament in which they found themselves last fall.

I think several pieces of legislation which have been passed by the Congress will be very helpful in keeping the fruit growers of the Northwest, as well as the citrus fruit growers, off the rocks, and keep them from becoming so despondent that they destroy their orchards. However, we know that this piece of legislation will come too late to help in connection with the 1947 crop.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the situation in which we find ourselves, and I wish to cooperate in that regard.

Let me ask whether I am correct in my understanding that both the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Washington feel that with the changes already provided in the bill, and with this debate on the floor of the Senate concerning the grievances which the fruit growers of the United States have filed against the Tariff Commission as to its past handling of cases, we now have in the bill procedure by which the Tariff Commission can, if it will, in case there should be a recurrence of the problem which has arisen in the past, give the fruit farmers an expeditious handling of their cases.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct in his assumption; and I assure him that if the Tariff Commission fails to give expeditious consideration to matters of this kind, I shall be glad to join the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Washington in trying to secure greater speed in arriving at such conclusions.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Washington said, Mr. Klahre told me this morning that from 9 to 10 months was the minimum that was taken by the Tariff Commission in handling their cases. Of course, the disposition of perishable fruit cannot wait for any such handling.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator will recall that this body passed, either yesterday or the day before, a measure requiring the Tariff Commission to act within 120 days in certain cases.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, if the Tariff Commission wished to do so, it could act faster than the Secretary of Agriculture could. The Tariff Commission has more facilities and it knows more about the problem; and if it wished to do so, it could act faster on these matters than the Secretary of Agriculture could.

I am sure the Senator from Vermont will join with all of us in taking action if the Tariff Commission does not improve in its handling of these matters. When we come back in January, we shall either see that the Tariff Commission has changed its handling of them, or else someone should clean out the Tariff Commission with respect to these matters.

The Secretary of Agriculture does not have the facilities needed to do the job, and that is why he naturally turns to the Tariff Commission in that connection, for that is the Tariff Commission's job. But the Tariff Commission does not seem to want to do it.

Mr. AIKEN. I am willing to accept the statement of the Senator from Washington at face value; I have no doubt that he is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have not been on the floor for the last few minutes, and I have not heard the amendment fully explained. Does the amendment provide a support price for all types of potatoes, or is it confined to stored potatoes?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the word "storable" is not included. The amendment covers all Irish potatoes, whether early or late.

The Senator remembers that he thought the payment might be an incentive; but I have before me figures bearing on that matter, if they will be of interest to the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Yes, they will be.

Mr. BREWSTER. I took the trouble to obtain these figures on the question of incentive payments:

On the general situation, the figures are very impressive, inasmuch as they show that during the period in which we have been paying 90 percent of parity, the total acreage has declined from 3,599,200 acres, which was the national acreage in 1934, to 3,239,000 acres, which was the acreage in 1943, when Steagall support became effective.

In 1947 the acreage is down to 2,111,900, or a decrease of 1,127,000 acres, or 35 percent in 5 years while we were supporting potatoes at 90 percent of parity.

But I believed that those figures were not adequate, and I wished to know about the early potatoes, which are the ones which have given me concern.

I have before me the figures for the acreage planted to Irish potatoes by seven early-potato States. They show an acreage in 1941, of 490,000; and in 1947, an acreage of 407,000, or a decline of almost 25 percent in the acreage during the period when we were supporting at 90 percent of parity.

Therefore, it seems to me to be clear that a 60-percent-of-parity provision certainly cannot be considered as likely to prove to be an incentive.

Mr. HATCH. Of course, the Senator from Maine is familiar with the conditions existing and the wide publicity which was given to the great piles of potatoes that could not be stored or shipped, and had to be destroyed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. It was very unfortunate publicity for the entire farm program, for the growers and everybody else. What I am interested in is, under the provisions of the bill, will a similar situation be created?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly not, under a 60-percent-parity provision. That is the proposal of the potato growers themselves, who recognize exactly what the Senator from New Mexico points out, and who have no desire to have anything that would be characterized as an incentive payment. They feel confident this would mean that the production of potatoes would be in the hands of the more efficient producers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from New Mexico mentioned the piles of potatoes which were deliberately permitted to deteriorate. In order that there may be no misunderstanding so far as the consumer is concerned, that took place really in the year 1946, and it was the 1946 crop that created such a problem. It was not that the potato producer has planted a greater number of acres, but in general, throughout the Nation, there was about a 25-percent increase in total yield per acre for that particular year. The total increase throughout the Nation brought about a large surplus, and they were not prepared to cope with it. There was some deterioration and some loss. But last year, for instance, the crop year of 1947, whatever potatoes were in surplus, in areas where they were required to be bought to support the price, large quantities of those potatoes were processed

so that they could be properly stored either as potato alcohol or as dehydrated potatoes. So, in general, it was only in the year 1946 that we actually had an embarrassing problem insofar as the price-support program was concerned.

Mr. HATCH. It was an embarrassment so far as the price-support program was concerned.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. AIKEN. I had yielded the floor to the Senator from New Mexico. I think one of the most unfortunate incidents which has happened to our Government in recent years was the piling up of potatoes in the State of Alabama 2 years ago. They were photographed, and the photographs were allowed to be sent all over the world, showing how wasteful we were.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield, I was about to mention the fact that I saw pictures of those potatoes in foreign papers, scattered about as propaganda against our country.

Mr. AIKEN. As a matter of fact, the total cost of supporting potatoes in Alabama for the year 1947 crop was $1,800 for No. 1 potatoes, $82,300 for second-grade potatoes, or only $84,000 in all. It is one of the smaller States, and the matter was very widely publicized.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I know everyone interested in potatoes felt most keenly, and I know all our growers were distressed beyond compare at the wastage of that food. It grew, however, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, from the use of new discoveries incident to the war in the eradication of potato pests. The use of DDT and other insecticides accounted in some substantial manner for the extraordinary production in that year.

I should like to ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the two tables which I have prepared covering the reduction in potato acreage in recent years.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Acreage planted to Irish potatoes in seven early-potato States

[1,000 acres]

	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947
California	39	35	49	64	73	81	62
Oklahoma	27	32	44	27	20	21	15
North Carolina	84	93	110	86	72	83	72
Florida	30.6	28	32.6	33.9	35.4	40.8	29.9
Alabama	54	52	51	57	47	46	37
Texas	58	50	67	56	50	64	43
Louisiana	43	42	55	61	43	42	32
Total	490	498	617	552	484	516	407

In answer to statements that 60- to 90-percent-of-parity support for Irish potatoes would be an incentive to increase acreage:

In 1934, in depression, the national acreage was 3,599,200. Steagall support was effective in 1943 and the national acreage was 3,239,000.

	Acres
In 1944	2,785,600
In 1945	2,700,200
In 1946	2,598,500
In 1947	2,111,900

This indicates a decrease every year in acreage, totaling 1,127,100 acres, or 35 percent in 5 years, during the period when potatoes were supported at 90 percent of parity.

Mr. HATCH. I understand both the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Vermont, as well as the Senator from Minnesota, are convinced that the 60 percent will not prove to be an incentive which would create conditions such as existed before.

Mr. AIKEN. If I may make a statement, I had the impression that 60 percent would prove to be an incentive price for the early-potato regions of the South; it may still be so. However, upon examination of the costs of supporting the potato price for the 1947 crop, I find that three-fourths of the cost was incurred in the States of Maine, New York, and New Jersey. I was rather surprised to find that, because I thought more of the expense was incurred in the South. Virginia was in fourth place. North Carolina came in for a substantial amount. I do not think the Department should be expected to support absolutely unmerchantable potatoes which perhaps would not keep overnight, but if they are potatoes which could reasonably be shipped, but could not be because of the lack of a market or the lack of transportation, which I understand was the case in the famous Alabama potato pile, then it appears to me there might be support. However, if 60 percent proves to be an unreasonable price, I would be willing to agree to try to change it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I shall not delay a vote on the amendment. However, I would say some Senators have had to leave, and I have been asked to suggest the absence of a quorum after the amendment has been voted on.

Mr. AIKEN. Please do not suggest the absence of a quorum until after the amendment is voted on.

Mr. HATCH. It was my intention to suggest the absence of a quorum after that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Maine, for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.
Baldwin	Eastland	Kem
Ball	Ecton	Kilgore
Barkley	Ellender	Knowland
Brewster	Feazel	Langer
Bricker	Ferguson	Lodge
Bridges	Flanders	Lucas
Brooks	Fulbright	McCarthy
Buck	Green	McClellan
Butler	Gurney	McFarland
Byrd	Hatch	McGrath
Cain	Hawkes	McKellar
Capehart	Hayden	McMahon
Capper	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Chavez	Hill	Malone
Connally	Hoey	Martin
Cooper	Holland	Maybank
Cordon	Ives	Millikin
Donnell	Jenner	Moore
Dowpey	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Murray	Saltonstall	Umstead
Myers	Smith	Vandenberg
O'Conor	Sparkman	Watkins
O'Daniel	Stennis	Wherry
O'Mahoney	Stewart	White
Pepper	Taft	Wiley
Reed	Taylor	Williams
Revercomb	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson
Robertson, Va.	Thye	Young
Robertson, Wyo.	Tobey	
Russell	Tydings	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SPARKMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I send to the desk on behalf of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and myself, an amendment which I ask to have printed and to lie on the table for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment which I ask to have printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there is on the desk a series of amendments which I wish to offer to the pending bill. I ask that amendment lettered "L" be stated at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 74, line 15, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out the words "either" and "or."

On page 74, line 16, to strike out the word "without."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to bring the bill somewhat in line with the present requirement, and I am hopeful that the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

I may say that amendment lettered "N", which I also offer, is an alternative amendment to this. If this amendment shall be accepted, then it is not my purpose to offer amendment lettered "N." If this amendment shall not be accepted, then I shall offer amendment "N" and insist upon it.

Under the regulations which are in effect at the present time, cotton, both within and without the United States, is counted in computing the amount of the carry-over, the amount on hand at any one particular time. The effect of the amendment would be to exclude from the calculation cotton outside the United States, and if that is done, then a 30-percent allowance for carry-over will just about bring it in line. If that is not done, then the 40-percent allowance is necessary to bring it in line.

As a matter of fact, the figure that was placed in the bill by the committee is not realistic. It sets the amount of the cotton carry-over, according to the estimate I have before me, at entirely too low a figure.

The purpose of these two amendments is to bring that figure somewhat in line with conditions as they actually exist.

Mr. President, that is about all I care to say about the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I find in the report, on page 6, the language "In the event of national need the Secretary of Agriculture may raise the support price of a commodity above 90 percent of parity." Can the Senator advise me as to the definition of "national need"?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall do the best I can for the Senator from Michigan. That might almost have been written "national emergency," yet national emergency was not exactly what we meant.

It is provided that in the event we as a Nation desperately need certain farm commodities the Secretary may break through the 90-percent ceiling and establish a higher support level in order to get production adequate to meet the needs of the Nation.

We have only one example of that at the present time, and that is in the case of flax. As most all Senators know, the supply of flaxseed and linseed oil has been cut off from the United States. The world supply is very short, and what we can get is totally inadequate. It was necessary for the Secretary to offer a price-support floor of approximately 150 percent of parity to get enough flax planted in order to meet the needs of the United States. It is not expected that the Secretary would exercise the power granted by this provision except in cases which virtually amounted to an emergency.

Mr. FERGUSON. One difficulty we have encountered in the past 15 or 18 years has been that we have lived practically in a state of emergency, and I am wondering, if we leave this provision as wide open as it now is, whether it would be either wise or desirable. I am generally in favor of the bill, but I have several questions like this one upon which I should like to get some information. Particularly I should like to have it in the RECORD for the purposes of construction.

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to reply to the Senator for the record. The committee considered that situation very seriously because we, too, were reluctant to grant any unnecessary power, yet, with the example which we had before us, we did not see any other course to take. We felt that an emergency might arise, or almost an emergency, anyway, when Congress might not be in session. Furthermore, it seems rather cumbersome to attempt to enact special legislation for each such commodity as flax.

I feel that any Secretary of Agriculture would be very reluctant to abuse the power, and it certainly is not the intent of the committee that he should exercise such power in any event short of a national emergency, or what was almost an emergency, but an acute shortage of linseed oil is probably a real emergency.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The emergency provision does not apply wholly to the six farm crops known as basic commodities, Alabama?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. Flax itself is not a basic commodity.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand. Would it be possible to insert some kind of definition, for example, that the supply would have to go below a certain amount before the Secretary could go over the 90 percent?

Mr. AIKEN. No. I think he might have to encourage production in anticipation of a shortage. With the growing shortage in wool throughout the world, it has occurred to me that we might eventually have to make some unusual provision for the production of wool. Of course, that would not be an overnight matter because it is not possible to raise a sheep overnight.

Mr. FERGUSON. My difficulty is that it almost appears to me, as the bill is written, that there really is not a ceiling of 90 percent; it lies solely in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture; and while we use the 90-percent provision in relation to the six basic commodities, we use the floor there, but there is a ceiling in regard to the other commodities and no floor. I am wondering about peanuts, and why there is no provision as to some of the northern crops, why there is no provision for navy beans, for instance, which are grown in Michigan.

Mr. AIKEN. If peanuts had not already been in the list of basic commodities, we probably would not have put them in. To qualify as a basic commodity, the commodity must be produced in exportable quantities, and have long-keeping characteristics. Peanuts are well down on the list of field crops; I think they are eighteenth in value of the field crops which are raised in this country.

A question entered the minds of the committee as to whether we should designate certain crops which should be supported at from 60 to 90 percent of parity, as the basic commodities are to be supported under the requirements of the bill. Then we realized that there were 151 farm commodities which were not basic. We did not know where to draw the line. We expect that important commodities—and I include field peas, beans, potatoes, soybeans, barley, and oats—will be supported at the same rate as the basic commodities, which is 60 to 90 percent of parity. But there are other nonbasic commodities, such as summer squash, which we would not want to support even at 10 percent of parity. Then there are peppers and tomatoes. Producers of various commodities have come to me suggesting that the commodity they produce should be supported. There were mohair producers from Texas, honey producers from Iowa, Minnesota, and other States, and producers of hops. We felt we had to leave such products to the discretion of the Secretary, but it is the belief of the committee that commodities which correspond closely to the Steagall commodities should be supported at a rate of from 60 to 90 percent of parity.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan permit a vote on the pending amendment, and then resume his discussion with the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I have no objection to a vote being taken on the pending amendment. Will the Chair state what amendment is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). The amendment before the Senate is that submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 74, line 15, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out the words "either" and "or"; and on page 74, line 16, it is proposed to strike out the word "without."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in arriving at a formula for determining what the normal supply of any commodity should be, the committee encountered a good many problems. When we came to the question of cotton we had to consider whether we would include the cotton which is produced in America but which is stored overseas. We finally decided to do so. The amendment would exclude the cotton which is stored overseas each year from the determination of normal supply. The net effect of the exclusion would be to raise the support level of cotton possibly 4 or 5 percent, but it would also make it more difficult, in my opinion, for cotton growers to vote quotas than it would be if the amount stored overseas were included in the total supply. About 1,700,000 bales a year are stored overseas. They would be included in the estimated amount of exports which also are computed in the definition of "normal supply." I hope I am getting this correct, Mr. President. We have had a pretty strenuous 2 days' siege here, and I reserve the right to correct my explanation if it is not correct.

Let me go a little further and say in regard to the other amendment, amendment lettered "N" of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that whereas the committee first determined that 23 percent would be a normal carry-over for cotton in this country, we have already changed that to 30 percent. We would not want to accept the 40 percent which is proposed by the amendment. Personally I would not object to accepting the amendment lettered "L." I would object to the other two amendments which have been printed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that I said that if my amendment "L" is accepted I would not urge acceptance of my amendment "N." They are alternative amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. Under those conditions I can accept the amendment for myself, although I would have no authority to accept it on behalf of the committee, because the committee has not acted on it. I will vote for it if it is put to a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama lettered "L" to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I do not insist on my amendment lettered "N." But at the same time, I should like to have my amendment lettered "M" stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 87, line 8, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out "70" and inserting "90."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was the first amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment lettered "L," offered by the Senator from Alabama, was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, my I ask what amendment is offered now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has offered his amendment "M"—"M" as in "Mary."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would not be willing to accept the amendment lettered "M." The amendment would give preferential treatment which is unnecessary. I think the bill, with the amendment which has just been agreed to, gives very good support to the cotton grower, particularly in view of the fact that the revised parity formula would result in increasing the parity price of cottonseed about 20 percent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say that the amendment really has to do with the question of voting marketing quotas.

The effect of this amendment is to provide that cotton producers may vote marketing quotas whenever supplies are "normal" or above and the average farm price of cotton for three successive months does not exceed 90 percent of parity instead of 70 percent as provided by the bill and 66 percent as provided by the committee amendment. Bearing in mind that the proposed definition of "normal supply" for cotton, as modified by committee amendment, provides an allowance of 30 percent for carry-over, cotton producers should not be forced to wait until prices fall to 66 or 70 percent of parity or until they build up a tremendous surplus before voting quotas upon themselves. That is what the effect of the amendment would be.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the desire of the Senator from Alabama to help the poor cotton farmers, but it seems to me that there would be no injustice committed by not accepting this amendment, because I cannot conceive of the price dropping to 90 percent of parity unless the supply got up to that figure, which would permit them to vote quotas on a supply basis. I do not think there would be any injury done by rejecting the amendment. I think we have helped the cotton farmers by accepting the previous amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment "M" offered by the Senator from Alabama to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment——

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the Senator would withhold offering his amendment for a moment. May I inquire of the Senator from Vermont if this would not be a good time to recess until tomorrow? I do not want to interfere with the Senator from Kentucky, however.

Mr. COOPER. I shall be glad to have a recess taken now.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest that the Senator offer his amendment, and have it printed, and that we then recess for today. I am satisfied we will make good headway if we recess now so we may go home and have a good night's sleep.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senator from Nebraska, the Chair will state that the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has already been printed and lies on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that my colleague offer the amendment as it is now proposed, and have it printed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, for my colleague [Mr. BARKLEY] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 80, between lines 22 and 23, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

(5) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the level of price support to cooperators for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas are in effect shall be 90 percent of its parity price as of the beginning of the marketing year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Kentucky for himself and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the committee amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion. The proposal which the junior Senator from Kentucky makes is rather extensive in many respects. I suggest that the Senator from Kentucky make the explanation for the RECORD and thus convey the message to all Members of the Senate, so that tomorrow we may act upon the amendment more intelligently. I hope that I can fully concur with the junior Senator from Kentucky in the proposed amendment, but I know that many Senators will not understand it unless it is explained.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Minnesota suggests that the junior Senator from Kentucky make the explanation of his amendment now for the RECORD.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. May I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky how long he feels it would take him to make the explanation?

Mr. COOPER. Ten minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Kentucky might want a hand in the explanation, too.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if both Senators from Kentucky and the Senator from Minnesota feel that we should have an explanation of the amendment in the RECORD tonight I shall be glad to withhold the invitation to recess until tomorrow until the explanation has been completed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it has been suggested to me that several Senators have left the Chamber, believing that the Senate was about to take a recess. So I shall wait until tomorrow to present my argument on the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed and lie on the table an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I shall propose for the pending measure when it shall have been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Senator from Georgia will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this substitute is identical with the so-called Hope bill for the extension of the present agricultural program. That bill has already passed the House. It also includes an amendment continuing the soil-conservation law and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

FLOOD RELIEF IN THE NORTHWEST

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to report an original bill, and I submit a report (No. 1743) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 (b) (2) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, be further amended by striking therefrom the following words and figures: "Section 4 (a) (1), (2), and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 4 (a) (1) and (2)"; and that section 4 (c) thereof be amended by striking out "$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$45,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on the 30th day of May of this year, Memorial Day, there was visited upon the Pacific Northwest the greatest catastrophe and tragedy in the history of that section. I believe that every Senator has been conscious of that tragedy, which has brought so much harm and suffering to those residing in the area which is commonly referred to—or since the flood has been referred to—as the Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash., area.

I have every right to take for granted what I know to be a fact, that there has been exceedingly great sympathy on the part of Senators for the people of the Northwest country. Almost every Senator has said, either to me, to my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], or to the senior or junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON and Mr. MORSE] that he was hopeful that somehow an answer could be found to help in restoring normalcy to that stricken land. In connection with that subject I have the very happy privilege of introducing the bill which has just been read for the information of the Senate.

In a couple of sentences I should like to give my interpretation, which is concurred in by all Senators from the Northwest and the Pacific coast, as to what the bill actually proposes.

In the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act there is provision for a disaster loan fund. The act provides that $25,000,000 may be expended for disaster relief loans, with a 10-year period of repayment.

Included in the devastated land of the Columbia River area was a Federal city, entirely owned by the Federal Government, consisting of more than 5,000 units of housing, all of which have been totally destroyed and swept away. Therefore, if that city is to be rebuilt, either in its original location—which is not desirable—or at another location withiin the Columbia River area, it will be necessary to extend credits in excess of $25,000,000.

This morning and this afternoon, officials representing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, acting in concert and close cooperation with the Senators from Oregon and a subcommittee of three from the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I was one member, came to an agreement that it would be proper and practicable to take the disaster provision now within the limits of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act and extend its limit to 25 years, rather than 10, and increase the amount of loan money from $25,000,000 to $40,000,000. By that means we can offer an opportunity for financing the reconstruction of every home destroyed by the flood which so recently swept our Northwest country.

Mr. President, this suggestion does not ask for another single dollar of appropriations. It merely means that there will be a reallocation within the moneys presently at the disposal of the RFC, so that the RFC may use for disaster-relief purposes $40,000,000 instead of $25,000,000, and may make extended loans for 25 years rather than 10 years, which would permit of proper amortization and repayment of loans which have been requested for the sole purpose of rebuilding homes which were totally destroyed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be permitted to make loans to those in Coatesville, Ind., and Danville, Ind., whose homes were completely destroyed by a tornado—as completely destroyed as were the homes in the Columbia River Valley?

Mr. CAIN. The bill makes no reference to the Pacific Northwest as a single area of the country. The bill provides for an amendment to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act which would make available disaster credits and/or loans to the people of Indiana were they in distress, or to the people of Kentucky, the people on the east coast, or the people on the west coast.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is proposing to increase the amount which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may loan from $25,000,000 to $40,000,000?

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. What proportion of that will go to Washington, and what proportion will go to the two towns in Indiana which were completely destroyed?

Mr. CAIN. No one could say what proportion of the $40,000,000 will go either to Indiana or Washington, or Oregon, or any other State, for the simple reason that the loans will go to those who legitimately request them, irrespective of the area from which the loan is requested.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator say that the people of Coatsville, Ind., whose homes were completely destroyed by a tornado would be justified in going to the RFC and asking for loans under the terms of the bill, just as the people in the Columbia Valley of Oregon and Washington would be able to do?

Mr. CAIN. Not only today, but in the future, they will be justified in requesting disaster loans; but they would have been justified in going to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for disaster assistance prior to this time.

The tragedy in the Northwest gave to the Banking and Currency Committee and to the Senators generally an opportunity to work for the country, as well as to work for their own distressed areas.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I simply wish to say for the RECORD that those are the facts.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the parliamentary situation is that the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has requested unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill; is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. That is my request.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I simply wish to confirm what the Senator from Washington has just said. I served with him on the committee this morning and this afternoon in the preparation of this bill. We think it presents a logical and effective way to relieve flood disasters not only in Oregon and Washington but in Indiana or wherever flood disasters have occurred or may occur in the future.

As the Senator from Washington has pointed out, under this bill Congress would not appropriate any more money, but would liberalize the proportion of available funds which could be used in flood-control cases, and would extend from 10 years to 25 years the time in which the loans could be used.

I hope no objection will be made to this measure, in view of the emergency now existing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I wish to say that he has been detained at a meeting of the Appropriations Committee, in the Capitol Building, and could not be present for this discussion. But he wishes to have it stated for the RECORD that he joins the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and myself in support of this bill.

In behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon, I wish to thank the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who worked with us long and hard today in drafting this bill, to the end of having this matter handled through the RFC, which, it seems to us under the circumstances, provides the best procedure for the handling of this emergency, and sets a pattern under the disaster section of the RFC for handling similar disaster problems throughout the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I wish to endorse the request for the consideration and passage of the bill at this time, for I think the bill, when enacted, will expedite the giving of relief to the unfortunate people on the west coast. I think this bill constitutes the best solution of their problem.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Washington. I understand that this bill provides for a loan to permit the people to rehabilitate themselves. Is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. Only with respect to their homes, but not as to personal property or services or equipment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I feel that this is a very worthy bill.

I may say that today the Committee on Public Works reported a bill for emergency relief to meet every kind of disaster which may occur in the United States. I know that Senators who are interested in the bill now being discussed, on behalf of the people of their States who have suffered such severe losses in the recent floods, will be glad to know of the general provision which has been made, under the bill reported today from the committee, for emergency relief to meet such situations as that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, permit me to say that, speaking for all of us who come from the Pacific Northwest, we are individually and collectively extremely appreciative of the consideration and thought which have been given to the scope of our problem in the Northwest; and because of what the Senate has found it possible to do, we think that in the future better protection and quicker relief will be afforded to the unfortunate victims of disasters.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN BASQUE ALIENS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 158) for the relief of certain Basque aliens, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to permit Gaspar Ybarzabal, Pedro Ybarzabal, and Antonio Monasterio to reside in the United States as temporary visitors for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof, provided they remain employed in the sheep industry. If any of the above-named aliens fails to maintain his occupation in the sheep industry at any time within 5 years after the date of enactment hereof, he shall be deemed to have remained in the United States for a longer time than permitted and shall be subject to deportation as provided in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended.

If, at the expiration of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof, the Attorney General shall, after due investigation, find that any of the above-named aliens has maintained an employment in the sheep industry during the entire 5-year period, he is hereby authorized and directed to record such alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of his actual entry into the United States if he is otherwise found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas. The Attorney General shall communicate his findings to the Secretary of State, who shall thereupon instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number for each alien so lawfully admitted for permanent residence from the quota of Spain for the first year that said quota is available.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

SANTIAGO SOLABARRIETA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 765) for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to permit Santiago Solabarrieta, of Parma, Idaho, to reside in the United States as a temporary visitor for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof, provided he remains employed in the sheep industry. In the event that the said Santiago Solabarrieta fails to maintain his occupation in the sheep industry at any time within 5 years after the date of enactment hereof, he shall be deemed to have remained in the United States for a longer time than permitted and shall be subject to deportation as provided in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

If, at the expiration of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof the Attorney General shall, after due investigation, find that the said Santiago Solabarrieta has maintained an employment in the sheep industry during the entire five-year period, he is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Santiago Solabarrieta as of December 1, 1924, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and head tax of $8, if he is otherwise found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas. The Attorney General shall communicate his finding to the Secretary of State, who shall thereupon instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Spain for the first year that said quota is available.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE CHILDREN'S FUND

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "Victimizing Children," appearing in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTIMIZING CHILDREN

Whether the quality of congressional mercy toward the hungry children of Europe is to be strained through "cold war" prejudice and fear will be determined by the Senate-House conference on appropriations for the European recovery plan. If the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in cutting from 60 to 20 million dollars the authorization for the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations is upheld, this Government will be in a vulnerable position before the world.

Both its humanitarianism and the honor of its intentions toward the UN would be questioned if the cut were allowed to stand. But its remissness would have a positive implication that would be even more damaging. The fund will be used as a matching basis for other nations' contributions, and the object of setting aside $60,000,000 was to have at our disposal a sufficient fund with which to encourage generosity. Approval of this ruthless slashing, therefore, would be virtual notice to prospective donors that the United States did not care how much they gave.

Certain Senators in the Appropriations Committee who insisted on the cut—some even wanted the fund wiped out—objected to American money being used to feed children in eastern Europe. Such an attitude toward hungry and diseased children seems incredible in a Nation that boasts of its generosity. It is a strange reversal of the legislative attitude of a few years ago when both houses of Congress supported a plan to feed children in countries dominated by the Nazis. Even more recently, when ERP legislation passed both Houses the authorization for the children's fund, attached as a rider to the omnibus bill, went by without opposition. There is diplomacy as well as charity in such ignoring of the iron curtain.

As the one international agency not torn by the "cold war," and operating without regard to race, religion, politics, or geography, the children's fund offers a small beginning toward one world—at least for children. If the people of the United States permit their legislators to inject power politics into this enterprise, they may as well abandon any claim to moral or even democratic leadership.

CANCELLATION BY PERU OF BRANIFF INTERNATIONAL AIRWAYS PERMIT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have written to the Secretary of State with reference to the action of the Republic of Peru in canceling a permit to the Braniff International Airways to operate in Peru, after making an agreement with the Government that it could operate there, and after issuing a permit.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
June 16, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Braniff International Airways, Inc. has its headquarters at Dallas, Tex., in my State, and serves Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Tennessee, Colorado, and Texas.

The United States Civil Aeronautics Board, with the approval of the President, awarded Braniff International Airways a route into South America on May 22, 1946. Before the company could initiate service to South America, it was necessary for the State Department to negotiate bilateral air transport agreements, or to assist Braniff to obtain operating permits with countries of South America. Among the countries to be served was Peru.

On December 27, 1946, the Government of Peru signed a joint air-transport agreement with the Government of the United States, providing for reciprocal rights for air lines to operate between the two countries. This agreement gave permission to Peruvian air lines to operate to the United States.

In accordance with the terms of this bilateral agreement, the Government of Peru issued to Braniff Airways an operating permit providing Braniff with the right to operate between the United States and Peru via intermediate points and to points beyond. Reciprocally, on July 24, 1947, the United States Civil Aeronautics Board granted a foreign air-carrier permit to Peruvian International Airways, giving them the right to fly into the United States and serve Washington, New York City, and points beyond.

The Civil Aeronautics Board in its foreign air-carrier permit stated that Braniff was authorized by the United States to provide service on a route—

From Houston, Tex., through Habana, Canal Zone, and along the west coast of South America, via points including Lima, to the terminal points Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and Buenos Aires, Argentina.

In preparation for the inauguration of this service, Braniff expended some $4,000,000 in providing radio stations and securing employed and trained personnel, and the purchase of aircraft.

Only a few days before Braniff Airways was ready to initiate its first scheduled service as far as Lima, Peru, the Government of Peru suspended the Braniff permit on the claim that Peru had had no previous knowledge that Braniff was going to serve Habana, Cuba, en route to Lima, and thus it would compete with its own air line, Peruvian Airways. My information is that the Government of Peru had full knowledge of the exact route to be operated by Braniff at the time the permit was granted.

The action of the Government of Peru has worked a great hardship upon Braniff Airways and has resulted in a breach of Peru's agreement with the United States and in a breach of the permit with the Braniff Airways. It also may result in preventing the extension of Braniff service to Bolivia, Brazil, and Argentina by reason of blocking the service through Peru.

In view of our heretofore cordial and friendly relations with Peru, it is difficult to understand how it would take such action, which is contrary to its agreement with this Government and to its issuance of the permit to Braniff.

Therefore, I most respectfully urge that you make a protest to the Government of Peru with respect to this matter and that you insist upon a restoration of the permit to Braniff Airways, and observance by Peru of its agreement with the Government of the United States with respect to the joint air-transport agreement of December 27, 1946.

We want to cultivate cordial and friendly relations with the people of Latin-America. International travel and contacts between our respective peoples will have a most salutary effect in bringing about these desirable results. Therefore, I beg to repeat my urgent request that this matter be taken up with the Government of Peru with a view to inducing it to rectify what seems to be an unjustified action on its part.

Sincerely,

TOM CONNALLY.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Rear Adm. Thorvald A. Solberg, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years; and

Lucien M. Grant, Lloyd Harrison, and Roy T. Cowdrey, for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Paul R. Leake, of Woodland, Calif., to be collector of customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif.;

Carl K. Connell, of Cameron, Mo., to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Missouri; and

Fred S. Martin, of New York, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of William T. Sherwood, resigned.

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive H, Eightieth Congress, second session. A convention between the United States of America and Denmark, signed at Washington on May 6, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of evasion in the case of taxes on income; with a reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 10); and

Executive I, Eightieth Congress, second session. A convention between the United States of America and the Netherlands, signed at Washington on April 29, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of evasion in the case of taxes on income; with reservations (Ex. Rept. No. 11).

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it appears that we have concluded the work for today's session of the Senate. I should like to state for the RECORD, inasmuch as several Senators have asked when it is expected to have another call of the Legislative Calendar, that we should like to have the unfinished business concluded tomorrow, if that is possible. If the unfinished business is concluded by the middle of tomorrow afternoon or tomorrow night, I think there will then be plenty of time to have a call of the Legislative Calendar.

However, if debate continues for several days, we shall have to arrange to have a call of the Consent Calendar, because it is very necessary that the Consent Calendar be called once again. When it is called, I think we should recur to the point where the calling of the calendar was stopped when the question of oleomargarine came up to block the handling of the remainder of the calendar, as all of us remember.

Mr. President, with that announcement and observation, and in the hope that Senators will get a good night's sleep, and be ready for work tomorrow, I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 17, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of the ages, everywhere Thou art present except in the hearts of the wicked. As Thou art most holy and most wise, direct our minds beyond all barriers of false imagination and animate our thoughts as to our responsibility in these remaining hours. If we have sought to serve our country relying solely upon ourselves, if we have endeavored to slake our thirst at broken cisterns or veil the flame within, teach us that to know the way we must have the abiding reality of truth. Fill us with the satisfaction born of honest, conscientious toil, realizing the brotherhood of man in the fatherhood of God. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5275. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 631. An act for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.;

H. R. 3214. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 26 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary";

H. R. 4071. An act to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 6318. An act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 299. An act to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas;

S. 580. An act relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon;

S. 1183. An act to continue the Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6481. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. REED, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6772. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6801. An act making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 8, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. REED, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN,

and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) entitled "An act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. MCCLELLAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) entitled "An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LANGER, Mr. ECTON, and Mr. O'CONOR to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. J. Res. 117) entitled "An act providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. CONNALLY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5416. An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6623. An act to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation; and

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Justice.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. National Archives.
5. Office of the Housing Expediter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

YOUTH GOVERNMENT PROJECT

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in my county of Orange, in the great State of New York, we have had for the past several years a youth and Government project, which to my way of thinking, could well be introduced into every county and every high school in our Nation.

Every spring the seniors of all the high schools in the county have a political campaign, in which they hold two-party conventions, write two party platforms, and elect all county officials and one member of Congress.

After the campaign is over the duly elected officials spend 1 day with their prototypes, who are actually in office. During that day they are shown all the workings of the offices such as, county clerk, county treasurer, and so forth.

Today it is my pleasure and honor to have the young man, William Walker, who was elected as a member of Congress with me on the floor of the House. He is visiting Washington and will have a very fair and accurate idea of what a Congressman's day is like.

Mr. Speaker, our Government in recent years has gotten very far away from the people. The fault, in my opinion, rests with the people themselves.

Our form of Government cannot survive and cannot be made to function as it should, unless all our citizens know very thoroughly what their duties as voters and as participants in local, county and Federal Government are.

It is not easy to be a citizen of a free Republic. We have got to learn our duties and for that reason projects such as this youth in government project should be in all our schools.

Our young people should be taught their duties and responsibilities to God and country, and it makes me very proud to think that in my county we may be the pioneers of a new movement that will teach the youth of America what its duties and responsibilities are and through that knowledge this Republic will go on from strength to strength and fulfill its great destiny in the modern world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have an article in my hand in which Mr. Ralph King, of Massachusetts, said there are no better drivers in the State of Massachusetts than the amputees and the paralyzed veterans.

I ask unanimous consent to extend this article as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

STREAM-POLLUTION BILL SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 418) to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes, insist on the House amendments, agree to the conference requested by the Senate, and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DONDERO, AUCHINCLOSS, MCGREGOR, CUNNINGHAM, WHITTINGTON, FICKETT, and BLATNIK.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. SMATHERS (at the request of Mr. GORE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made yesterday at the Democratic State Convention in Indianapolis, and also to extend his remarks on the retirement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

CATHERINE MARTIN

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed sorry that 1-minute speeches are not in order on this particular day.

The House should honor this day. It is the birthday of a fine American woman, the mother of our great Speaker, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR. It is mother Catherine Martin's eighty-sixth birthday. My colleagues join me in compliments and wishes for many happy returns to Mother Martin and Speaker MARTIN.

It is a fine blessing for a man to be privileged to reach the pinnacle of a great distinguished career and still enjoy the living love of his mother. Many are not so fortunate. A few are. Congratulations, Mr. Speaker, and may we all invoke God's continued blessing for you, Mother Martin, and your family.

LT. GEN. LESLIE RICHARD GROVES

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the House passed a bill which was on the Private Calendar, H. R. 5596. There is an identical bill at the Speaker's desk which has passed the Senate, S. 2223, to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Whereas the development of an atomic bomb by the Manhattan Engineer District, United States Army, during World War II represents not only the greatest achievement in weapon production but also one of the greatest achievements in the coordination of science, industry, and management in world history and was also a major factor in bringing that war to an earlier victorious close resulting in the saving of thousands of lives and great stores of resources; and

Whereas this accomplishment has also opened unlimited possibilities for peacetime and humanitarian application and expansion of atomic science for future use for the benefit of mankind; and

Whereas this initial achievement was successfully concluded under the leadership, supervision, and direction of Leslie Richard Groves, as Director of the Manhattan Engineer District, with superior judgment and courage and in accordance with the highest traditions of the United States Army; and

Whereas the said Leslie Richard Groves has requested that he be retired from service as an officer of the United States Army and such retirement has been authorized; and

Whereas the American people and the Congress of the United States deeply appreciate the outstanding and unique service to the Nation and to humanity thus rendered by the said Leslie Richard Groves and desire to express this appreciation by means of official recognition thereof: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to appoint, without confirmation by the Senate, Leslie Richard Groves, Army serial No. O-12043, lieutenant general, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of major general in the Regular Army, such appointment to be effective as of the day prior to the effective date of his retirement from the active list of the Regular Army and such appointment shall entitle him to receive the retired pay of major general of the Regular Army.

SEC. 2. The President is further authorized and requested, without confirmation by the Senate, to place the said Leslie Richard Groves on the retired list with the rank and grade of lieutenant general with honorary date of rank thereof as of July 16, 1945, which date commemorates the first explosion by man of an atomic bomb, at the Trinity site, Alamogordo, N. Mex. Such advancement in grade and rank on the retired list, however, shall not result in any increase in retired pay.

SEC. 3. This act shall result in no permanent increase in the authorized number of major generals on the active list of the Regular Army.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill, H. R. 5596, was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act, as amended:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said Senate engrossed amendment, after the word "certified" insert "by the Governor of the State in which the property is situated and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
MELVIN C. SNYDER,
CARTER MANASCO,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER FERGUSON,
EDWARD J. THYE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 4 may be regarded as perfecting in that they do not make any change in the intent of legislation. Upon this ground the House conferees have receded from its disagreements.

With respect to amendment No. 3, the House conferees have agreed to the same with amendment, the purpose of which is to make sure that the Governor of a State, in which the property referred to in this bill is situated, shall be consulted with respect to the transfer of that property to the State and that the transfer shall be conditioned upon his request for it.

The Senate receded from its amendment No. 5. That amendment, were it to remain in the act, would have excluded from the terms of the act a certain single county in the State of West Virginia. The House conferees contended that an exclusion of this sort inserted in an act, having general application the country over, would be contrary to wise legislative policy.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
MELVIN C. SNYDER,
CARTER MANASCO,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 2239.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not see the ranking minority members of the committee present and I do not know whether they have been consulted or what their attitude on the proposal is.

Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present. I think the Members ought to be here if we are going to transact business of this importance.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for the time being.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 108]

Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ala.	Lusk
Bell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McMahon
Bland	Hart	Miller, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Hartley	Mundt
Buffett	Hébert	O'Toole
Carroll	Hedrick	Peden
Celler	Hendricks	Price, Fla.
Chadwick	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Chelf	Hinshaw	Regan
Chiperfield	Jenkins, Ohio	Robertson
Clark	Jensen	Sabath
Clippinger	Johnson, Ill.	Sarbacher
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Ind.	Scoblick
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Scott, Hardie
Crosser	Johnson, Tex.	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Kee	Smith, Maine
Dawson, Ill.	Kefauver	Stigler
Dingell	King	Stockman
Fellows	Kirwan	Thomas, N. J.
Gallagher	Lane	West
Gossett	Ludlow	Wolcott

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein some telegrams, a speech of Mrs. Roosevelt, Attorney General Clark, a letter from Chaim Weitzmann, and a speech I made at the testimonial dinner given to our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and Mr. Speaker, if this extension exceeds the two pages of the RECORD allowed, I ask that it be printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

POSTAL AND OTHER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' PAY INCREASE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday an effort was made by our minority leader the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] to obtain information from the majority as to what legislation the House would have an opportunity to consider during the week in view of the adjournment of Congress Saturday.

Little satisfaction was given to the membership of the House as to just what legislation we would have an opportunity to consider and pass on before the Congress adjourns. It is recognized that there are many important bills pending before this House that have been voted out by various committees. It is recognized that many highly important bills to the welfare of the people are not going to be considered before we adjourn the Congress. The leadership of the Republican Party must assume the responsibility for this inaction.

In view of the fact that there are so many highly important problems pending that will likely not be considered, I think this Congress should return after the conventions and complete its work.

However, since at this point it is evidently determined that we will not return, I want to insist, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress do something about alleviating the burden of postal and other Federal employees.

It is well recognized that the cost of living has increased tremendously over the past 2 years. Most of the Members of this House, including the leadership on both sides, have taken the position that they see the justification of some relief by granting an increase in pay to these groups. To be fair to these employees, this relief should have been given weeks ago. It is not a matter that should be kicked around for political expediency.

Several weeks ago hearings were held by the committee and they were shown, by many substantial groups, an increase of $800 annually was justified to take care of the increased cost of living. I personally feel that this would have been an appropriate adjustment for the work they are doing and in order that they may continue to give the service that is demanded of them.

Several weeks ago the committee voted out a bill that would give to postal workers an increase of $585 on an annual basis for 14 months, and $468 to classified employes. This bill has been held up in the Rules Committee and the House has had no opportunity of considering it.

I understand that those in position to hold up this legislation are doing so on the basis that it does not meet with their approval. This action, Mr. Speaker, is highly inappropriate in legislative procedure to which I must express my disapproval.

I understand now that the leadership has ordered the committee to consider an additional bill that would provide a permanent increase to postal employees of $450 annually, and a temporary increase of $360 to the other Federal workers whose salaries are fixed by the Classification Act.

This certainly would not be adequate to take care of the increased cost of living imposed upon these employees. Naturally, it would give some relief and I would therefore reluctantly support it. It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, it is arbitrary and ill-considered action, however, and there is ample time yet to permit this House to pass its better judgment on this problem. I join with others in insisting that this opportunity be given.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the farm program.

THE DRAFT BILL—THE HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, Department of South Carolina, is now in session at our State capital, Columbia. This morning I received a telegram from the Department Commander Alfred J. Plowden, Jr., which reads as follows:

American Legion convention in session Columbia today urge you to support draft bill.

It is comforting to know the sentiments of the membership of the American Legion because its membership consists entirely of honorably discharged veterans of World War I and II. I believe that those of us who have served in the armed forces are probably in a better position to determine whether or not under all of the circumstances it is necessary for us to pass the pending bill providing for selective service. I readily acknowledge that there are many who seriously disagree with the terms of the pending bill or with any other measure providing for compulsory military training. The people of my district know and have known for several years that I favor adequate military strength. Thus far, in spite of unprecedented inducements and advantages, voluntary enlistments have proven insufficient. I believe it is imperative, in view of world conditions, that we pass the bill we have before us today in the interest of national security. My reply to the above-mentioned telegram is as follows:

Appreciate telegram sent by American Legion convention in session in Columbia endorsing and urging prompt passage of pending draft bill. I have consistently supported this measure in view of grave international situation. I shall continue to urge the enactment of this too long delayed provision so necessary to preserve national security.

Mr. Speaker, I hear, though unofficially, that the Rules Committee does not plan to give the House an opportunity to pass upon the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill or any other bill making provisions for and adding encouragement in the housing program. This morning I received a telegram from my district from Hon. Bruce Littlejohn which reads as follows:

Spartanburg County Post, No. 5093, Veterans of Foreign Wars, urge favorable action T-E-W housing bill before adjournment.

Mr. Littlejohn is not only the liaison officer of the local post of Veterans of Foreign Wars; he is speaker and presiding officer of the House of Representatives of South Carolina.

While I do not approve of all the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, I am strongly in favor of the enactment of some law without delay that would facilitate the building of houses so sorely needed for many of our citizens, especially veterans. My reply to the aforementioned telegram is as follows:

Having signed the discharge petition, I naturally am urging immediate favorable action by the House on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill without further delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an essay written by a constituent of his, Miss Hamilton, of Hughes, Ark.

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Peace and More" by Paul Breese, of Ontario, Calif.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PLUMLEY, JOHNSON of Indiana, PLOESER, SCRIVNER, ENGEL of Michigan, SHEPPARD, THOMAS of Texas, HENDRICKS, and ANDREWS of Alabama.

SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLIED AVIATION CORP.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp. with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$108,753.13" and insert "$234,195.20."

Page 1, line 8, after "sustained", insert "under contract NO–S–92657."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PLOESER, JENSEN, COUDERT, CLEVENGER, MAHON, WHITTEN, and GORE.

FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LEONARD W. HALL, HALE, MILLER of Connecticut, CHAPMAN, and PRIEST.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 40 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

Mr. CANNON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is the last major appropriation bill of the session. Twenty minutes on a side is rather restrictive. Might I suggest that general debate be confined to the bill, and time saved in that way?

Mr. TABER. How would an hour do?

Mr. CANNON. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, then, that general debate be confined to the bill and consume not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6935, with Mr. HOPE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents a total appropriation of $485,200,000 approximately. It carries contract authorizations of a little over $300,000,000. These contract authorizations are for the purpose of construction work in various places where the amounts called for payments cannot be made this coming fiscal year. That is, they will extend over. There are a few items of minor importance, including some deficiencies of an ordinary character. There is $25,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture to pay the bill for the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. There is an item for forests, roads, and trails.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the sympathetic consideration that the chairman and the committee gave this request for additional appropriations for forest highways. We are pleased to see that the committee has allowed a total amount of $15,000,000 for that item. Let me say here as I indicated at the committee hearing that these roads are in a deplorable condition. We know that this appropriation is needed badly. We want to tell the chairman we are very pleased with the splendid cooperation we have received at the hands of the committee.

Mr. TABER. There is an item of $32,000,000 for construction for the Army, mostly outside the continental limits of the United States. There are $6,000,000 for emergency flood control in the Oregon-Washington territory to fix up a group of dikes that were destroyed by the unprecedented floods up there. There is an item in the Navy for $47,000,000 for public works, most of which are of an emergency character, and all of which are required for the proper development of our defenses. There is also contract authorization for $50,000,000.

There are some deficiency items for the Post Office Department. In the State Department, we have provided for the continuation of the surplus property operation abroad and have provided reasonable amounts for the operations of the State Department, War Department, Navy Department, and transportation of that surplus property.

There was little controversy in the committee on the bill.

Unless there are some questions at this point, I will reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it was a privilege to be present this morning at a meeting in honor of the American and foreign representatives attending the 1948 session of the World Assembly of the Moral Rearmament Association, sponsored by our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. I am certain that all who had the opportunity to meet representatives of practically every nation on the globe and hear their timely addresses were profoundly impressed. Neither money nor power of arms alone can rehabilitate the world or achieve complete and lasting peace. The speakers emphasized convincingly the indispensable necessity of moral rearmament in the equation and I venture to express the hope that our host on this occasion, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] will give us the benefit of at least a part of the program by including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the notable addresses by the distinguished speakers in attendance this morning.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is the last appropriation bill of the session and the Congress. It is the inevitable catch-all bill into which are thrown last-minute deficiency appropriations which must suffice until another Congress—or at least another session—convenes.

Such bills are made up of routine items the need for which could not have been foreseen and for which emergency provision must be made before adjournment. But a feature of this particular bill, as in the last deficiency bill, is the number of replacement items providing funds which should have been included in the annual supply bills. They are to make up deficiencies occasioned by the failure to appropriate sufficient funds on the original estimates. Throughout this Congress arbitrary cuts have been made in estimates and the amounts thus sequestered advertised as savings and retrenchments when it was evident that the activities involved could not be effectively operated without them.

The refusal to appropriate the $800,000,000 required for tax refunds is a classic example. The saving of the

$800,000,000 was widely publicized as a retrenchment and it was claimed that the burden of the taxpayers of the United States would be correspondingly lightened. Of course, as everyone knows, we not only had to put the $800,000,000 back, but we have had to appropriate a good deal more and the Government has been put to inconvenience, and the time of the committee and the Congress has been taken up with the additional hearings and other complications involved in processing these additional estimates and appropriations.

Likewise, in the drafting of the pending bill we have been compelled to consider estimates and hold hearings on items which should have been carried in the annual supply bills.

For example, in this bill we are including amounts which have been cut from former bills and which are replacements of amounts requested in previous estimates, as follows:

In the Department of Justice, salaries and expenses in the field, $38,000.

Salaries and expenses of marshals, $80,000.

Fees of witnesses, $50,000.

Immigration and Nationalization Service, $2,390,000.

Eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, $25,400,000.

In the Post Office Department: Printing and binding, $25,000.

Damage claims, $40,000.

Rural delivery service, out of the $1,125,000 provided in this bill $500,000 were cut from the estimate last year, and the $500,000 is a restoration.

Foreign mail transportation, $2,000,000.

Balances due foreign countries out of an estimate of $5,000,000, $250,000 is restoration.

Manufacture and distribution of stamps and stamped paper, $570,000 restoration in an estimate of $758,000.

Post Office stationery, equipment, and supplies, $194,000.

Vehicle service: Out of an appropriation of $2,564,000; $732,000 is restoration.

Public buildings: Out of an appropriation of $230,500,000; $88,200 is a restoration.

As a matter of fact, one bill, the Post Office bill, was so heavily cut on estimates undoubtedly necessary for its reasonable operation, that the Department will close the fiscal year 1948 with a deficit of $310,000,000 or more.

During the hearings on the deficiency bill an estimate was reached for reconversion of unemployment benefits for seamen for an addition in the fiscal year 1949, reconversion employment benefits, $1,530,000. The original estimate was for only $5,000,000; so I asked if the item was another restoration of an amount previously requested, and when told that it was not, that the amount previously requested had been appropriated in full, I withdrew the question.

Thereupon the chairman, contrary to the practice and procedure of both the committee and the House, insisted that it be included in the record. The correct practice is indicated by the unbroken precedents of the committee and by the law of the House as indicated in Hinds' Precedents, volume V, sections 6971 and 7024; Cannon's Precedents, volume VIII, section 3468, and in the Procedure of the House of Representatives, page 316. I refer to the incident in detail in view of the fact that a transcript of the proceedings has been circulated on the floor of the House.

Whether or not the question was included is immaterial. It merely indicated at least one item which was not a restoration. At the same time it served to emphasize the other items which were restorations and the consistent policy of the committee in arbitrarily cutting estimates and representing the reductions as savings and then subsequently restoring them in deficiency appropriations.

There are two provisions in this bill, Mr. Chairman, in which I trust the House will concur. I am constitutionally opposed to legislative riders on appropriation bills. If there has ever been instances in which a contravention of this rule is justified, in which the end justifies the means, it is in these two provisions, the paragraph repealing the Penalty Mail Act of 1944, and the paragraph reenacting the contract-renegotiation provisions of the National Defense Act of 1942.

Under misguided zeal, some 4 years ago, largely sparked by the contention that the departments were sending out an undue amount of printed matter and otherwise abusing the privilegé of free distribution of Government publications, we passed a law providing that they should expend for such purposes only the amount appropriated each year for postage.

From the beginning it was evident that the intended reform was a costly mistake, and I have repeatedly urged the legislative committee to consider the evidence adduced by the Committee on Appropriations with a view to repealing the law. The legislative committee has taken no action. But the inconvenience and expense involved in the administration of the law, without compensating advantage, is now so patent that in the pending bill we include a provision repealing the law.

Experience has demonstrated increasingly that the departments were not sending out an undue amount of printed matter, but, on the contrary, that their distribution of public publications has been well and adequately administered. On the other hand, evidence presented before the committee showed it was costing a large amount of money—a quarter of a million dollars a year in one department alone—to enforce this law, with no corresponding benefits whatever. I trust the recommendation of the committee will meet with the approval of the House.

We are also including in this bill, under title IV, section 401, another provision under which we propose to reenact a provision originally enacted in the sixth supplemental national defense bill for the renegotiation of contracts, with special view to regulating contracts for the manufacture of war material or material contracted for in connection with national defense. In every war and in times of other national calamities there have been those who sought to capitalize national disaster and to coin the blood of our soldiers into personal profit, and, although a majority of contractors have patriotically endeavored to serve the Nation by producing such materials at a fair and reasonable profit, conditions have been so unsettled in time of war that it was impossible to estimate in advance the ultimate cost of production. To regulate the few who seek to profiteer and to assist the many who seek to produce at a reasonable cost, we recommend the reenactment of the negotiation provision.

This law in its original form was passed in a bill which I reported to the House on April 21, 1942—the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, section 403—which became Public Law 528 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. Conditions now warrant its reenactment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. We have often talked about taking the profits out of war. I doubt whether we can ever do that although I certainly favor minimizing them as much as possible. However, does the gentleman believe the reenactment of this renegotiation plan will tend to do that so that we can get 100 cents on the dollar for what we spend in our national defense effort?

Mr. CANNON. What the gentleman says is eminently true. There is a possibility that we cannot eliminate all of the unwarranted profits in time of war. But, certainly, as the gentleman indicates, in the enactment of this legislation we are taking the most direct and immediate step that can be taken with that in view.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak for just a few minutes on the two legislative provisions in the bill.

PENALTY MAIL

First, with respect to penalty mail. As the gentleman from Missouri has said, we include a paragraph which provides for the repeal of the penalty-mail payments by the various departments and agencies of the Government. I think, however, I should clear the record on what has happened.

The legislative committee has acted on this matter, for it reported to the House the repealer in bill H. R. 6406 on the 2d of June 1948, accompanied by House Report 2151. That bill was passed by the House of Representatives on June 8, 1948. So the matter has had the consideration of the legislative committee and the House. The only reason for incorporating it in this appropriation bill is that it was thought that H. R. 6406 might not receive consideration in the other body due to the shortness of time. But the action of including penalty-mail provisions here is consonant with and supports the action of the legislative committee of the House and the House itself.

DEVELOPMENT OF RENEGOTIATION

With respect to the renegotiation paragraph, as the Members of the House who were here during the war know, I have followed this renegotiation matter from the time when I initiated it by an amendment to the sixth supplemental defense bill back in the spring of 1942, which introduced the word "renegotiation" into the Federal statutes.

I am happy to say that only 2 or 3 days ago, this week, the Supreme Court, by a unanimous decision, as I understand, upheld the constitutionality of the wartime Renegotiations Act. Under that act something over $10,000,000,000 was recovered for the United States Treasury besides other large savings in forward pricing and the advantages to national morale by avoiding some of the profiteering that marked World War I. Our wartime renegotiation statute expired with the end of 1945.

A few weeks ago, when we had before us the supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 6226, which established the 70-group air force and provided money for activating it, I felt that we should again call upon the process of the renegotiations statute in order to protect the Government against undue profits in the rapid expansion of aircraft procurement, and particularly, perhaps, in the procurement of new types for which there was not sufficient cost experience.

So in the consideration of that bill I prepared and proposed an amendment for the reactivation and incorporation of the renegotiation statute in that bill. The amendment was adopted by the House.

When the bill went over to the other body the paragraph which we had adopted in the House was expanded into a section which became section 3 of Public Law 547 of the Eightieth Congress, which carries with it a statement that it shall be cited as the Renegotiation Act of 1948. That section made the Renegotiation Act of 1948 applicable to the money in that bill and to moneys merged with the funds in that bill. In order that the terms of the new statute may be available for convenient reference in connection with section 401 of the pending bill, with permission of the House I shall include its text in my remarks at this point:

[From Public Law 547, 80th Cong., approved May 21, 1948]

SEC. 3. (a) All contracts in excess of $1,000 entered into under the authority of this act, obligating funds appropriated hereby, obligating funds consolidated by this act with funds appropriated hereby, or entered into through contract authorizations herein granted, and all subcontracts thereunder in excess of $1,000 shall contain the following article:

"Renegotiation article: This contract is subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1948 and the contractor hereby agrees to insert a like article in all contracts or purchase orders to make or furnish any article or to perform all or any part of the work required for the performance of this contract."

(b) Whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense excessive profits are reflected under any contract or contracts or subcontract or subcontracts required to contain the renegotiation article prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized and directed to renegotiate such contracts and subcontracts for the purpose of eliminating excessive profits. He shall endeavor to make an agreement with the contractor or subcontractor with respect to the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and to their elimination. If no such agreement is reached, the Secretary shall issue an order determining the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and shall eliminate them by any of the methods set forth in subsection (c) (2) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended. In eliminating excessive profits the Secretary shall allow the contractor or subcontractor credit for Federal income and excess profits taxes as provided in section 3806 of the Internal Revenue Code. The powers hereby conferred upon the Secretary shall be exercised with respect to the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued under all such contracts and subcontracts by the contractor or subcontractor during his fiscal year or upon such other basis as may be mutually agreed upon; except that this section shall not be applicable in the event that the aggregate of the amounts so received or accrued is less than $100,000 during any fiscal year.

(c) For the purpose of administering this section the Secretary of Defense shall have the right to audit the books and records of any contractor or subcontractor subject to this section. In the interest of economy and the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall, upon request of the Secretary of Defense and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made available to the extent determined by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making examinations and audits under this section.

(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any of the contracts or subcontracts specified in subsection (i) (1) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, and the Secretary of Defense in his discretion may exempt from the provisions of this section any other contract or subcontract both individually and by general classes or types.

(e) Agreements or orders determining excessive profits shall be final and conclusive in accordance with their terms and except upon a showing of fraud or malfeasance or willful misrepresentation of a material fact shall not be annulled, modified, reopened, or disregarded, except that in the case of orders determining excessive profits the amount of the excessive profits, if any, may be redetermined by the Tax Court of the United States in the manner prescribed in subsection (e) (1) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, except that such redetermination shall be subject to review to the extent and in the manner provided by subchapter B of chapter 5 of the Internal Revenue Code.

(f) The Secretary of Defense shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register regulations interpreting and applying this section and prescribing standards and procedures for determining and eliminating excessive profits hereunder using so far as he deems practicable the principles and procedures of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, having regard for the different economic conditions existing on or after the effective date of this act from those prevailing during the period 1942 to 1945. In any case in which the contract price of any such contract or subcontract was based upon estimated costs, then the Secretary of Defense shall determine the difference between such estimated costs and actual costs and shall, in eliminating excessive profits, take into consideration as an element the extent to which such difference is the result of the efficiency of the contractor or subcontractor.

(g) The powers and duties hereby conferred upon the Secretary of Defense may be delegated by him to any officer (military or civilian) or agency of the National Military Establishment.

(h) Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any information, records, or data required of him under this section, or who knowingly furnishes any such information, records, or data containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

(i) This section may be cited as the Renegotiation Act of 1948.

Since passage of that bill, H. R. 6226, we have considered and passed in the House two appropriation bills which go into the field of large procurement. Both the Army and the Navy appropriation bill this year carry vast sums of money for the procurement of heavy ordnance, for the development of new types of equipment.

So, here again we have the same problem as during the war, the rapid expansion in procurement, and the development of new types of equipment for which there is no cost experience. Members of the committee have agreed that these should be brought under the provisions of the Renegotiation Act of 1948.

Obviously it would be neither practicable nor desirable for a contractor to be working at the same time on two contracts for identical planes, one subject to negotiation and the other not. Nor should development projects in new types be on a cost-plus basis without adequate opportunity for the Government to pass upon properly allowable costs.

Again, in the pending bill, we have some large funds for procurement of material and equipment and also for offshore construction. There are funds in this bill for the construction of large facilities in Alaska and in Guam. Everyone knows that where you are dealing with construction in Alaska and in Guam any bid must be something in the nature of a guess. Either you have to have cost-plus contracts, which open the door to vast waste and huge expenditures, or you must have some procedure such as the Renegotiation Act so that the final payment can be based upon audited and determined proper costs.

So, for this bill, again, I prepared and the committee has included a paragraph, which is section 401 of the bill, which applies the Renegotiation Act of 1948 to the funds in this bill and to contracts entered into hereafter. When we come to the consideration of that section of the bill I shall offer a minor amendment which defines subcontracts, on the suggestion of counsel, which we think is wholly in keeping with the spirit of the act.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I congratulate the gentleman and the committee on reincorporating this provision in the law. I favored it during the war. In October 1939 I was naive enough to believe that we might take the illegitimate profits out of war, which at that time seemed approaching, and I introduced a bill to

that effect, but without avail. I hope this will accomplish what the gentleman hopes for during our national defense efforts or any future emergency.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We certainly hope so. It must be remembered that the excess profits tax which followed the Renegotiation Act during the war has been modified, so that we do not have the protection of that now. Hence, it is doubly important now to have this renegotiation section in this bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the other members of the subcommittee to the item for the General Accounting Office on page 9.

Salaries: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Salaries," $450,000.

May I point out that the reduction of $230,000 in the budget estimate is a matter of more far-reaching importance than the dollars concerned would indicate. The subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is chairman, and of which I happen to be a member has been conducting executive session investigations for several weeks into the overpayment by the Government during the war of transportation charges by the railroads, since the passage of the 1940 Transportation Act. The evidence has been amazing as to the amount of overpayments as a result of the elimination of the preaudit that existed prior to 1940. Already, as a result of an accelerated audit, the General Accounting Office has recovered $250,000,000, and discovered $104,000,000 more that the railroads owe, and this was not the result of a complete reaudit, as a complete reaudit is now underway. It is safe to say that with a thorough reaudit, and this amount of $680,000 is very important in that respect, tens of millions of dollars more will be discovered to be recoverable from the railroads or other persons who were paid transportation charges by the Government.

It is in connection with that that I want to call the attention of my friend from New York that we of the subcommittee feel very strongly, and I think express the views of all Members on both sides that this is an item of extreme importance which cannot be stressed too strongly.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I think that what the gentleman has said is true. It is a matter of great importance, and we regard it in that way. We had our hearings with the general counsel. They already have some funds with which they are operating on this. It is extremely difficult for them to get the type of help they need to do the job. After our hearings we felt that this was all the money that they would be able to expend effectively on this job. We have always been very liberal with the General Accounting Office. Last year they had an unexpended balance at the end of the year of $2,300,000. They have had an unexpended balance of over $400,000 every year. Frankly, I believe that if we carried no money for this, they would have enough in their appropriation to take care of their job. But even so I do not believe they could spend on this job more than $450,000 which we have carried here. That was the basis on which we proceeded. I think they will have plenty of money to proceed with. If I had any idea that they would not, I would be in favor of the full amount. It is not with any idea of slowing it down, but it is with the idea of what it is possible for them to do.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman from New York that his observation that it is hard to get trained employees is correct. There is no question about that. The evidence has disclosed how difficult it is to get trained rate experts and specialists. It is amazing to me that some of our universities and colleges have not surveyed that field with a view to affording their students an opportunity to be educated in that field, because there is a demand for them, not only in Government, but in private industry. It takes years to make a trained rate expert. It was a revelation to me; in fact I was amazed when I heard the evidence as to how difficult it is to get trained men. What the gentleman from New York said in that respect is absolutely correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. It seems to be that the only source of trained help, really good trained help, is that group that formerly were employed by the railroads on railroad freight rates.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is true.

Mr. TABER. That is the situation we are up against.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the Government is up against the situation where their good men are being taken away from them by the railroads by paying them higher salaries. There is that difficulty. However, I did not rise with the intention of offering any amendment but to get the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], representing the views of his subcommittee. Am I safe in saying that the subcommittee recognizes the importance of this reaudit?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely.

Mr. McCORMACK. And would I be correct in stating that the fact that $230,000 has been deducted from the estimate is not due to any lack of appreciation on the part of the committee as to this reaudit being made as quickly as possible, and when they come before the subcommittee or satisfy the Committee on Appropriations in the future that they can get the trained help, the necessary and justifiable appropriations will be made?

Mr. TABER. Anything that is needed to carry on this work effectively will be supported by this committee, I am sure.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand that the reaudit to which the gentleman refers is to save the Treasury from the result of overcharges?

Mr. McCORMACK. The reaudit is in connection with money paid from 1940 on by the Government, and to collect back overpayments made for transportation charges. Already there has been $250,000,000 recovered, and $104,000,000 more discovered that was overpaid, because by the Transportation Act of 1940 we wiped out the preaudit by any agency, and all the railroads had to do was to present their vouchers or their bills of lading and they were paid. Naturally, they sought and received the higher amount.

Mr. MURDOCK. In that case, this reaudit of wartime transportation charges is as important as the renegotiation of wartime contracts, for the protection of the Treasury from overcharges.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very important, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has clearly indicated that he and the members of his subcommittee appreciate that fact. We members of the Committee on Expenditures, who realize what the picture is, are very glad to hear that, because we feel that for every dollar spent in connection with this matter, the Government will receive back at least a hundred dollars in overpayments that have been made.

My purpose, Mr. Chairman, in addressing the committee is to call attention to the item on page 9 of the bill under the heading "General Accounting Office" providing an additional amount of $450,000 for salaries for the fiscal year 1949. The report of the Appropriations Committee shows that this represents a decrease of $230,000 below the amount of $680,000 requested by the General Accounting Office. Hearings before the committee show that the amount requested is for the purpose of conducting during the fiscal year 1949 a reaudit of certain transportation accounts which were audited during the period October 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947. On the basis of a test reaudit conducted by the General Accounting Office, it is estimated that $100,000,000 will be found in overpayments to carriers as a result of the complete reaudit, in addition to the $250,000,000 already collected and placed in the Treasury and over $100,000,000 further already stated as overpayments but not yet collected. This reaudit activity is now being carried on by the General Accounting Office with existing funds, but in order to continue it during the fiscal year 1949, the Office will need a supplemental appropriation. It was explained to the Appropriations Committee that the amount of $680,000 would provide for 110 examiners and 54 lower-grade people in the Transportation Division, as well as 50 employees in the Reconciliation and Clearance Division engaged in handling accounts.

The Expenditures Committee Subcommittee on Procurement and Buildings has conducted extensive inquiries into the audit by the General Accounting Office of wartime transportation payments, and I am satisfied that the Comptroller General by the reaudit is doing all in his power to provide the greatest possible protection to the Government. However, the number of people available to carry on this activity is limited. The Comptroller General has estimated that the minimum amount he will need to conduct the activity effectively during 1949 is $680,000. The result of the cut which has been made will be to postpone to a later year the work which could be accomplished during the fiscal year 1949 on this reaudit. The Comptroller General has not been able to make an estimate of how long it will take to do the reaudit job with the employees whom he can obtain if the money is provided. However, if the money requested is not granted in full, the time required to complete the job will necessarily be lengthened. I feel that the House should be on notice of that fact, since the effectiveness of the job will depend partly upon the timeliness of determining and attempting to collect these additional overpayments to carriers which will be found in the reaudit.

The General Accounting Office has been one of the very few agencies which have turned back to the Treasury substantial amounts not needed for current requirements, and even for the fiscal year 1948 it is estimated that $2,000,000 will be so turned back. I, therefore, regret to see a reduction in this item below the amount which the Comptroller General has estimated is needed to carry on an activity which should result in collections of many times the entire amount requested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point out a provision in this bill which I think is important, when you consider the floods in the Columbia River Valley.

I doubt very much if there are any Members of Congress who have not at least had one or two constituents who have said, "You are able to give billions to Europe. Why not a few million to the folks back home?"

I am taking this time to point out the work of the subcommittee on deficiency appropriations, as recorded in this bill. I think it is fundamental, and I think we ought to face it up. I have to. The greatest flood in 54 years has occurred in the Columbia River Valley. More water flows down that single river than any other river, with the exception of the lower Mississippi, and today it is a flood tide, it is receding. At least 44 persons have lost their lives. The damage, of course, is in the millions. The folks out there reading about the Congress appropriating billions to Europe on almost a blank-check basis are wondering where they come out in this matter of Federal responsibility in relief of the Columbia River Valley. I think quite properly they are asking me: "You are giving billions to Europe, where do we come out in this matter?" And I should like to take this time to point out that I think a rather constructive and businesslike approach to the Columbia River relief problem has been at least attempted on the part of Congress.

I want to read from the bill at this time the following language, to which I subscribe, language which I think is sound. It appears on page 6, line 24:

Provided, That no expenditure shall be made with respect to any such catastrophe in any State until the Governor of such State shall have entered into an agreement with such agency of the Government as the President might designate under assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of funds of the government of such State, local governments therein, or other agencies for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe.

Mr. Chairman, this is a Union of sovereign States, this Nation of ours. There are certain designated responsibilities which apply to the Federal Government, which apply to State governments, which apply to county governments. If we would have a bright and brilliant future for our own Nation, we must keep those responsibilities always clear and not confuse them. In the moments of catastrophe there is danger of confusing them. I want to say in behalf of my colleagues from the catastrophe area and for the Appropriations Committee that we have attempted at all times during this catastrophe to keep these responsibilities clear. We knew when this damage occurred that there were already funds which existed and could be drawn upon. Certain public-housing agencies had $25,000,000 available under certain statutes and certain rules of expenditure. We knew that the Public Roads Administration had $6,000,000 which could be applied out in this catastrophe area, and that damage to roads was tremendous. We knew that the RFC had $22,000,000 which could be made available in the form of loans to certain individuals and under certain circumstances. We knew that the Red Cross, not a Federal or governmental agency, had funds and there were other funds which were available.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HORAN. We knew that the President's fund for emergency relief had $38,000 in it. This bill carries an additional half million. I am not sure that that amount is adequate, but if it is not it can yet be made adequate in conference and it should be expended under strict rules.

This bill carries $6,000,000 to be directly applied to the Columbia River damage area by the Army engineers.

Also in this bill are appropriations and contract authorization totaling $15,000,000 for rebuilding of forest roads and trails all over the country. Much of this amount is badly needed right now in the Pacific Northwest for replacing roads and bridges washed out in the national forests by flash floods. Often these roads are the only connection between many communities and the outside world.

The civil-functions bill carries $3,300,000, which can be applied, I understand, at the discretion of the Army Engineers on an emergency basis throughout the Nation. When this bill goes to conference after action on it by the other body, there probably will be about three and a half million dollars made available to the catastrophe area for emergency crop and seed loans. There may be other items made necessary after due examination and proper treatment by the departments and proper request for funds.

Mr. Chairman, I mention this at the present time because the people in our districts are saying, "You are giving billions to Europe; why not a few millions for the folks at home?"

Mr. Chairman, we are doing this thing right with regard to the Columbia River drainage area where a catastrophe has occurred. We are trying to determine what the damages are and what the responsibilities are, what the responsibilities of the Federal Government and the Congress are with regard to that damaged area. It is proper that we should do this. But with regard to the billions for Europe, I submit that we have had some rather reluctant votes in favor of those billions for Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, those billions were not properly justified. I submit that it was under a good deal of international pressure that this Congress acted, and I submit that before we appropriate any more money for work outside the United States we should attempt to justify those appropriations in the same way that we justify the work of relieving a catastrophe at home, specifically and item by item.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. Out in the upper reaches of the Columbia River we also suffered as you did in the lower reaches. As one whose district embraces some of the tributaries of the Columbia River, I want to express the appreciation of our section for the amounts that were put in for flood relief and which are available for us up there.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. By the inclusion of this $6,000,000 in the deficiency appropriation bill for current use in the Columbia River Basin for emergency purposes, we have made a start toward helping out a very serious situation in that area. I thank the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee for granting these appropriations.

Mr. HORAN. I think we all appreciate the action of that committee.

DIGEST OF REPORT FROM L. R. DURKEE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY, PORTLAND, JUNE 16, 1948

Columbia and Willamette are dropping faster than estimated with prospects of 2-foot recession by Saturday. Portland level down to 29.35 and Vancouver stage at 29.6 Tuesday noon. River forecaster Elmer Fisher expects river at Portland to be 28.4 Thursday, 27.9 Friday, and 27.5 Saturday.

Downriver dikes, seriously saturated, described as still critical, but no new breaks reported. Levee repairs on upper Puget Island about completed which will permit faster drainage of flooded acreage below, and

the Columbia slough, filling the Multnomah drainage district northeast of Portland since Friday morning, has been plugged at both ends. Army engineers expressed hope their battle was nearing end.

Flood levels started dropping on the upper Columbia four days ago and in British Columbia the flood control commission announced recessions in the Frazer River Valley.

Known dead attributable to the flood placed at 42, missing at 28.

Red Cross case load in Oregon and Washington numbered 8,523 families Tuesday, homeless families 43,440. It is sheltering 3,533 individuals and feeding 19,354. Peak case load registration expected to reach 12,000 families.

Red Cross emergency relief expenditures so far approximate $600,000 for food, clothing, some shelter, and hay for cattle.

Housing—Dr. J. Bion Phillpson, representing Foley, arrived Monday, visited Vancouver Tuesday with Epstein and Portland Vancouver Housing Authority. Floyd S. Ratchford, Vancouver, said 22 apartment wings at Ogden Meadows would be renovated, work starting today and first families moving in July 1. Rearrangement will provide 43 three-room units, 88 two-room, and 12 one-room units. The buildings were up for sale three days before the Vanport disaster. Bids were returned and the sale canceled. Cost estimate for work is $400,000 to come out of $10,000,000 flood relief fund.

Ten buildings being renovated at Vancouver barracks include four barracks type buildings to be made into 128 three- and four-bedroom apartments, three apartments to house 26 families, and two nurses homes to be developed into 16 apartments. Believe War Assets would make more buildings available at the deactivated army post. About 1,300 evacuees already housed at Swan Island.

Unable yet to get working figure on estimated number of housing units needed. Two hundred eighty-three trailers expected by Thursday at Guilds Lake housing site, under FWA assignment. Been coming in since Saturday from Stockton and 100 due Wednesday afternoon on 50 flatcars from San Antonio. A trailer city is growing on the housing site. Water and sewers ready to be hooked up.

Philipson unwilling to guess number of houses needed, everybody else reluctant to hazard opinion at this time, among the Federal men.

FWA—Large amounts of materials, expendable and unexpendable are converging on Portland by trains, trucks, and vans. Beds, mattresses, and bedding for more than 1,500 families, other furniture, mobile unexpendable equipment out of WAA surplus, are being assigned to various areas of the disaster district. Formal applications for such assistance are being received from towns, counties, and diking districts. The big impact of the movement has not yet arrived but eight carloads of additional furniture including 360 beds, mattresses, chests, chairs, and tables would reach the FWA warehouses on Swan Island by tonight. Twenty-five van loads of furniture and expendable equipment from housing projects and military installations in Texas, Arkansas, New Mexico, and Kansas were expected in Portland by Sunday. An additional 25 van loads of materials and equipment, including furniture, have been loaded at Willow Run, Mich., Ottawa, Ill., and Manitowoc, Wis., for shipment here.

Movement of nonexpendable equipment into the flood disaster areas about Bonners Ferry, Orofino and St. Maries, Idaho, includes 32 Quonset huts in transit from Cincinnati to replace city and county buildings lost in the flood at Orofino. Equipment also includes dump trucks, draglines, a bulldozer, and lumber for rebuilding bridges. Materials were moving into the Kootenai River flood areas from the Ogden Army Depot and WAA warehouses in Spokane and San Francisco, and included 43,000 feet of cable, power shovels and trucks, a suction dredge, pile driver, and steam cleaning unit. Also included were DDT spray and portable sprayers. A water purification system for Bonners Ferry was located at the University of Idaho.

Have assigned a fire pumper truck located by WAA in Portland to the mayor of Clatskanie.

Public Health: Dr. H. M. Erickson, Oregon State health director, and Porter Stephens, in charge of the Portland-Vancouver area for the State sanitary service, report excellent cooperation with USPHS, Department of the Interior, FWA, and other Federal agencies. The present need is for prompt immunization and typhoid vaccine has been received in sufficient quantities. Sanitary engineers have been sent to the flood area from Atlanta, New Orleans, and San Francisco, with Federal entomologists. The environmental sanitation problem will grow as the water recedes, and work of mosquito and fly eradication is already proceeding. In the Oregon-Washington area 10,000 pounds of 40 percent DDT, 400 pounds of 100 percent DDT, and 3,000 gallons of oil are now available.

Interior expects more funds by July 1 for its work on rat control. Col. Roy Bessey, executive director for the Pacific Northwest region, says that mobile and electrical equipment and transportation services have been supplied to flooded areas.

Public Roads, FWA—the Union Avenue cut-off is now serving for emergency travel—busses, milk, vegetables, and other perishables. PRA engineers in Washington, Montana, and Idaho are reporting on the condition of roads, and the State highway departments in Washington and Oregon are taking care of emergency traffic with detours and temporary work, such as sandbagging between Portland and Longview, Wash.

Department of Agriculture: Reports engineering assistance and the assignment of equipment, bulldozers, drag lines, etc., in rehabilitation of irrigation work in Okanogan County, and the Methow and Kittitas Valleys, in Washington, and in northern Idaho. (Don't know about the reported $1,400,000 residue from 1942 act.)

Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Receiving some applications for loans for repair or rebuilding of barns and other farm buildings, William Kennedy, Portland manager, said. RFC has opened offices in Woodland, Rainier, and Vancouver. Two examiners from Cleveland and two from San Francisco, experienced in disaster work, have been assigned to Portland. An anticipated situation of considerable gravity is expected as the flood waters recede.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, during this session of Congress the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Public Lands has held extensive hearings on manganese, chromite, and copper, on stock piling, and on a preliminary review of the conditions and problems of the tungsten and mercury mining industries. Information has been obtained on a number of other minerals and metals.

It has been administration policy to encourage and stimulate development and production of minerals and metals in foreign countries to the exclusion and detriment of the mining industry of the United States. The policies and practices of the State, Commerce, Interior, Treasury, and War Departments, as well as those of the Munitions Board and Bureau of the Budget have been to aid and stimulate foreign production and allow thousands of domestic mines to be abandoned at great loss to this Nation of its strategic and critical minerals and metals resources. President Truman has gone on record in this respect. In one instance, in his message on signing the Stock-Piling Act of the Seventy-ninth Congress, he directed that the buy-American clause be ignored. Again, in his veto message on the Allen bill last year, which would have extended the life of hundreds of copper, lead, and zinc mines, he showed a complete lack of concern in American minerals production.

As a result of administration policy, harmful tariff reductions have been made; foreign cartels have been permitted to dump materials on the domestic market forcing the closing of American mines. American occupation commands have permitted or encouraged currency manipulation in occupied countries to enable the export of materials to the United States at artificially low prices. The American occupation authorities have acted as agents in the sale of foreign materials in the United States at below-market prices. Government purchases of strategic minerals and metals for the national stock pile have been almost entirely from foreign sources.

The United States has substantial resources of manganese, copper, lead, zinc, vanadium, tungsten, and a number of other strategic and critical minerals and metals. Montana offers substantial deposits of manganese and copper, and 75 percent of the domestic chromite resources. The last 2 years of the war found thousands of new mines producing minerals and metals throughout the United States. In order to keep them open and develop our resources, we must pay a price that will permit the payment of American wages and cover the cost of equipment and materials.

In framing and passing the Stock-Piling Act Congress recognized the need of encouraging the exploration and development of these domestic resources and of stimulating domestic production from mining operations which then were active. Congress wrote that policy into the Stock-Piling Act, and implemented it with a "buy American" provision designed to provide domestic producers with adequate prices. However, the intention of Congress has been ignored completely. Approximately 95 percent of the strategic and critical minerals and metals procured by the Munitions Board through the Bureau of Federal Supply has been obtained from foreign sources. The Munitions Board has not procured any domestic copper, lead, zinc, manganese, tungsten, or mercury from domestic mines since the close of the war. This is only a partial list. Only one would-be producer is known to have received a contract for domestic chromite. Some vanadium oxide has been procured from the two substantial companies who monopolize the manufacture of vanadium oxide and ferrovanadiura, but the many ore producers have been by-passed.

Although it is acknowledged that mines in active operation serve as the best stock pile, so to speak, we find that only one small chromite producer remains in operation. Two or three of the larger mercury producers and four or five of the more substantial tungsten producers have continued to operate by mining their high-grade ore at reduced capacity and wasting the low-grade ore. These few mines are expected to close within the next few months. Only one producer of manganese ore, a large mining company, is in operation today. Several hundred copper, lead, and zinc producers have continued in operations since the termination of the premium-price plan last year by robbing their mines of richer ore or by suffering losses in anticipation of the passage of the Russell bill at this session of Congress. These mines also will close within the next few months unless measures are taken to provide them with going prices for their products. This is the present condition of the various mineral and metal mining industries which are so vital to the security and future welfare of this Nation.

It is to be regretted that so few people have the opportunity to gain an insight into the mining situation and that so few are aware of the importance of the minerals and metals. However, should we be forced into a war emergency, public attention would quickly be focused upon the fact that Government indifference and lack of foresight has permitted us to become wholly unprepared and dependent upon foreign nations for the most vital minerals and metals. We will not have time in an emergency to build up our stock piles and make our mines resume production. Mines which close often lose forever the rich resources which they might have uncovered. In any preparation for national defense, an active mining industry should be one of the first requirements. Unfortunately, the administration has done nothing to preserve or stimulate such an industry.

It is the sense of the Committee on Public Lands that the security of the United States can best be provided by using the stock-piling funds for the purchase of materials which are available in the United States. In this manner we will gain not only the immediate increase of our stock piles, but we will also preserve an active mining operation which will be ready to produce immediately and continuously throughout any emergency.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire as to the use of the funds that are appropriated for construction and improvement of buildings. All through this present session the chairman and the members of the committee have expressed their intention that the committee did not wish to have any funds used for the installation of new oil-burning equipment or for diversions from coal to oil, in view of the situation which confronts us, unless it can be clearly shown that it is economically necessary to undertake such construction. I assume that is true in connection with this bill.

Mr. TABER. We want that followed, as far as it can be: There are some emergency items in the nature of experimental developments on the part of the Navy where that rule cannot apply. That is true especially across the sea, in Guam and in Alaska.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman and want now to express my sincere appreciation for his cooperation and that of the chairmen and members of the subcommittees. As I recall it, this guide to spending funds in the bills passed at this session was adopted with but two exceptions. Certainly the members of the committee who have helped develop this administrative guide can never be criticized if we are unfortunate enough to have further shortages in petroleum products. By this action we have clearly provided a standard which must be used by those administering the expenditure of funds appropriated this year. I have no question but that this will be done. But I also want to assure my colleagues that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will follow this closely in connection with its discharge of its responsibilities in formulating and recommending a national fuel policy to meet the needs of this country in connection with its expanding domestic economy and its security. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] announced this morning that the Committee had scheduled continued hearings on the export phase of this problem beginning June 29. Beyond that, the Committee on Rules reported late yesterday House Resolution 595, and I have no doubt but that it will be unanimously voted to enable the Committee to act continuously and effectively throughout the recess to prevent, if humanly possible, any repetition of the difficulties of last winter. That resolution is as follows:

Whereas it appears that current and anticipated shortages of petroleum products threaten the present and future economy and security of the people of the United States; and

Whereas such shortages must be considered in the light of the availability of other fuels and energy resources; and

Whereas, in order to deal effectively with the problem of making petroleum and other fuels available in quantities adequate for an expanding economy and for the security of the United States, it is necessary to formulate sound national policies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it shall be the duty of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to formulate and recommend a national fuel policy adequate to meet the needs of the United States in times of peace and war, including recommendations for a national petroleum policy and the integration of such policy with policies relating to other fuels and energy resources except atomic energy; and for such purposes the committee shall study the current and future fuel supply and demand of the United States and shall study methods of encouraging needed developments to assure the availability of fuels adequate for an expanding economy and the security of the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a report not later than the close of the present Congress. Such report may be made to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof—

(1) is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is in session, has adjourned, or has recessed, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary; and subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member;

(2) may utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies;

(3) may seek information from such sources and conduct its studies and investigations in such manner as it deems advisable in the interest of a full and correct ascertainment of the facts.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman and members of the committee who have worked so long and laboriously on this bill. It is a good bill and covers a number of most essential projects. I am particularly interested in the bill by reason of the inclusion in it of $6,000,000 for disaster flood control and $500,000 for the President's disaster relief fund and also an item of $300,000 to acquire a site and prepare plans and specifications for a new post office building in Portland and the remodeling of the old building on the Hoyt Street site. The post office facilities in Portland are woefully inadequate and for a number of years have resulted in much difficulty in handling the large volume of mail in the Portland area. These funds will permit carrying out the mandate of the bill I recently introduced which was approved and became Public Law No. 457. With these funds immediate action may be taken to secure the site and prepare the plans so that construction work may be authorized at the next Congress.

The tragic flood in the Columbia River area has wrought immense damage not only in my congressional district but for 120 miles up and down the Columbia River and as a result many miles of roads, dikes and public facilities, both of the Federal Government and local communities, have been destroyed. There has been immense loss of private property and thousands of acres of fertile agricultural land have been submerged, whole cities and villages have been wiped out and thousands of farm homes and buildings destroyed any many lives lost. Between 60,000 and 100,000 people have been rendered homeless and over $100,000,000 in property destroyed.

Certainly the Federal Government after spending billions around the world for the relief of peoples in distress can, in good grace, afford relief and protection to our own people who have met with disaster. As I have said before,

we are deeply grateful to the Congress in passing the relief measure for temporary housing. There yet remains to be passed legislation providing for loans for low cost housing for those who have been rendered homeless and for repairing and replacing public property and facilities which have been destroyed. I have today introduced a bill to amend the RFC law.

The purpose of this bill is to alleviate the situation that has recently developed as a result of floods, especially in the Portland-Vancouver, the Spokane, Wash., and the Helena, Mont., areas.

The amount presently available for disaster loans by the RFC is limited to $25,000,000 outstanding at any one time, $21,000,000 of which is now unused. The bill would increase the amount permitted to be outstanding at any one time to $45,000,000 and at the same time would permit the RFC to make disaster loans without regard to the present 10-year limitation on maturities.

The necessity for the enactment of this legislation arises primarily because of the acute housing situation, requiring repair and restoration in the devastated areas.

While it is not specifically provided in the bill for a dollar limitation for loans made for dwelling accommodations, it is urged that the RFC, in the administration of this law, should not exceed $7,500 for any dwelling designed for a single family residence, $12,500 for a 2-family residence, $16,000 for a 3-family residence, or $18,500 for a 4-family residence.

Under the present law maturities for all loans made by the RFC, including disaster loans, are limited to 10 years. This bill would remove this limitation as to maturities, but only with respect to disaster loans. However, it is contemplated that in no situation will a maturity in excess of 25 years be permitted. It is believed the maximum assistance in the devastated areas can be achieved, particularly with respect to the repair and restoration of dwellings, only by the removal of the existing maturity limitation.

I urge early consideration and passage of this bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I request this time to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee what action was taken on the request I submitted for funds for the establishment of an air traffic control tower at Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colo., by the CAA.

Mr. TABER. We have contacted the Department on that matter, and we intended to say in the report that we expect them to do that job with the funds that we have provided here. We feel that they will do it. It was our intention to include that in the report, but through some inadvertence it was left out.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman and I appreciate the action taken by his committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to say at the outset, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services having to do with the authorization of projects for the Army, the Navy, the Air Forces, and the public-works projects throughout the world, that I am happy, and I know the committee is, at the fine treatment that these services received from the Committee on Appropriations. We realize full well, as the result of the debate on the floor of the House yesterday in regard to the selective-service bill, and the debate that will continue today on the same subject matter, how perilous the situation is throughout the world and how important it is for us to utilize every means we possibly can to safeguard the security of the United States of America.

This appropriation bill, as I am given to understand by the naval authorities, with one exception, embraces about all that they could desire. We all realize how important it is to develop these facilities, especially in those most strategic parts of the world where our security would become more imperiled than in any other place, especially in the northern latitudes. There is one item, however, that is not in this bill that we all were very much interested in. We are not blaming the Committee on Appropriations, because we fully realize that the authorization bill has not yet been signed by the President.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it has not yet been signed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We understand that the request for this one appropriation was not submitted to the Committee on Appropriations by the Bureau of the Budget, and I have in mind, of course, the development of the naval air training station at Annapolis. The Committee on Armed Services, especially its subcommittee, has given weeks and months of study to the importance of the development of the aviators' indoctrinizational training of the naval cadets at Annapolis in order that they may be better fitted to carry their responsibilities if we are at any future time thrown into an emergency. Everybody fully realizes the important part that naval aviation played in the most recent war, and the important part that it played in the advances that we made from island to island in the Pacific. We understand thoroughly the tremendous losses that we suffered, but we know also the tremendous losses the Japanese air force, the kamikazes, suffered as the result of the brilliance of our naval aviators.

Naval aviation has now become part of the curriculum of the Naval Academy. It is considered to be of the highest priority, almost at the top of those things that the Navy Department believes ought to be inaugurated and carried out in order that we may fully and adequately train those midshipmen not only as to the operations on the surface of the water and under the sea, but the operations in aviation, and in the air.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that although time does not permit it today, if the Senate Committee on Appropriations, includes this item in the Senate appropriation bill, that we shall have an opportunity here in the House to vote for sufficient money so that we may acquire the land and start the preliminary engineering work. We do not feel that it is necessary to do the construction this year, but we do feel very strongly that we ought to acquire the land and carry out the preliminary investigations and engineering surveys, so that when the new Congress comes in the first of the year we shall be able to go ahead and build these facilities which are so important to the proper training of the midshipmen at the Naval Academy.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe anyone would want to go back and face the mothers and fathers of the naval cadets without starting the purchase of land at Annapolis and making plans for the training of the cadets.

Mr. Chairman, I rise also to ask this Deficiency Appropriations Committee if they will go along with the Senate if the Senate appropriates money in order that dividends on insurance may be made out to the veterans who carry insurance. The Veterans' Administration, as I understand it, has approximately $2,000,000,000 that could be used in the payment of dividends to those who are carrying insurance. They told me and our Committee on Veterans' Affairs they have been holding up the payment of the insurance dividends until the famous Zazov case was settled. The Supreme Court upheld the Veterans' Administration in the Zazov case. So that money may now be paid in dividends to these veterans. They have earned these dividends. I have already demanded they be paid. Any private insurance company would pay them. Certainly the Government should pay them dividends. The accumulated money belongs to the veterans. Our Committee on Veterans' Affairs made an exhaustive study on insurance administration in the Veterans' Administration. Some of the committee's recommendations have been carried out; others should be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and open to points of order and amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the bill? The Chair will not receive points of order after amendments are considered. The Chair hears none.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 3, after line 7, insert the following:

"For payment to James C. Davis, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of *Lowe* v. *Davis* as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $1,289.08, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

"For payment to James C. Davis, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of *Mankin* v. *Davis* as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $2,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

"For payment to Helen Douglas Mankin, contestant, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of *Mankin* v. *Davis* as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $2,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

"For payment to David J. Wilson, contestant, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of *Wilson* v. *Granger* as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $2,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is a routine amendment. The amounts carried in the proposal are undoubtedly due and we accept it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 39, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "or subcontract" and at the end of the paragraph strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and all subcontracts under such contract. For the purposes of the Renegotiation Act of 1948 the term 'subcontract' means any purchase order or agreement to perform all or any part of the work, or to make or furnish any article, required for the performance of any other contract or subcontract."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment merely restores language carried originally in the act of 1944 which was inadvertently omitted in drafting the bill. We accept the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the amendment merely moves subcontracts down to the end of the paragraph and defines the term as it is defined in the former act. The amendment is for the purpose of clarity and was suggested by those who are acquainted with administrative problems.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 14, line 19, after the period, add a new section as follows:

"Rural Electrification Administration, salaries and expenses, for an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for administrative expenses to be available immediately and to remain available until expended, $450,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, that it carries legislation in the words "which will be available until expended."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment provides additional funds for the administrative expenses for the Rural Electrification Administration. It carries the same wording as was carried in the original act providing the funds. It is in accordance with the budget estimate, and it seems to me it is not subject to a point of order. It is not legislation because it is authorized by law.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the words "to be available until expended" make it legislation, and therefore the amendment is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOPE in the chair). The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment in its present form with the language "to be available until expended" is clearly legislation. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 14, line 19, after the period add a new section to read as follows:

"Rural Electrification Administration: Salaries and expenses, for an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for administrative expenses, $450,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is aware of the fact that we put $450,000 in conference in the regular bill. I am not inferring that the entire budget request was agreed to. We agreed to the Senate proposal for an additional $450,000, and that is $450,000 under the budget estimate.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will hear me a moment he will be aware of the situation and of the fact that I am not duplicating anything that will appear in the regular Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is correct in saying that. You are not duplicating, except that it happens that the House first agreed to $5,000,000, the Senate added $450,000, which in conference the House agreed to. This $5,450,000 is however $450,000 under the original budget estimate of $5,900,000. Hence the confusion as to the $450,000 figure.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But our appropriations subcommittee did agree with the Senate on its raise of $450,000. Moreover, the Senators and we agreed that this would replace any request for a deficiency upon this particular item.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the House of Representatives can work its will in a matter of this kind.

Briefly, here is the situation: I frankly admit that perhaps the Members of the House generally are not familiar with all the facts, but one thing can be marked down as a certainty, all the REA co-ops in our districts are aware of the situation. We are in this situation: We have appropriated in recent months for Rural Electrification loans $175,000,000, plus $400,000,000, or a total of $575,000,000. The Congress deserves much credit for this tremendous advancement in the REA program. While we have more than doubled the REA program, we are not going to get the results which we anticipated and hoped for, because while we increased the loan funds by more than double, we did not sufficiently increase the administrative funds, and applications from the local co-ops have to go through the mill here at the Washington office of the REA before action can be secured. The budget estimate was sent up here for $900,000 to take care of the additional administrative expense incident to the huge increase in REA loan funds. This would have increased the amount for administrative expenses from $5,000,000 to $5,900,000. After all, if it requires $5,000,000 to administer a program of $225,000,000, certainly an additional $900,000 is not too much for the tremendous increase of $275,000,000 in REA loans which we have provided for.

I would in the normal procedure have offered this amendment in the Committee on Appropriations, except that in our rush to bring the House to adjournment it did not seem best to follow that procedure. But in collaboration with others interested, particularly the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who helped draft the amendment, I have offered it now. The sum requested, relatively speaking, is not a large sum. It is only $450,000 for additional administrative expenses so that a half-billion dollars in loans can be processed, so that the REA co-ops can get the money, and so that the people living in rural areas can get the lines and the electricity. With a $225,000,000 program costing $5,000,000 to administer, certainly $5,900,000 will not be too much for a program more than twice the size of the program which had been planned.

If we go home and say, "We appropriated the money for REA loans but not the administrative funds to make the loans effective to the farmers," we will be in an unhappy situation. It is true that in the Department of Agriculture conference report on the regular bill, $450,000 is provided. This provides an additional $450,000, the full amount requested by the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. I hope that this matter is perfectly clear, and if it is not clear I would be glad to yield to anybody who desires to make an inquiry about it.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. The objection that has been raised heretofore in the processing of these applications is that the backlog in the office is too great. The place where funds can be used to greatest advantage in expediting the REA program is in the administrative office of the REA.

Mr. MAHON. That is true. The situation is this. Opponents of REA have said: "No, let us not increase the authorization of loans for REA; they have not

expended the money we have let them have." The trouble too often has been that REA officials have not had sufficient funds for administrative expenses. In this amendment we provide the additional sum of $450,000 requested by the Budget for administrative expenses. It is a good amendment and ought to be passed.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The REA at the present time has probably the best loss record of any one agency, less than one-half of 1 percent.

Mr. MAHON. That is right, an excellent record.

Mr. POAGE. How can we expect them to maintain that loss record if we do not give them sufficient money to service these loans?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is right. It certainly seems to me that for the supervision of loans to the extent of $575,000,000 a cost of $5,900,000 is not too much adminstrative expenses and I sincerely trust that the House will take action to provide the funds. We have made a good record in this session in trying to take care of the needs of REA. This amendment will get power lines and electric light to the rural homes faster than they otherwise would get there. That is the reason I am asking your support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can arrive at a limitation of time for further debate on this amendment. I see four Members standing. I suggest 3 minutes apiece.

Mr. RANKIN. Will not the gentleman make it 5?

Mr. TABER. I think 3 minutes apiece ought to be enough.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes, the last 3 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has very well explained the situation. No agency of Government has a better lending record than the REA. No private lending agency with which I have any familiarity has a better lending record. When it comes to losses, the REA has had a minimum of losses. It has made sound, safe loans. It could not do this if it did not have an opportunity to study the loans it makes to local cooperatives. It is necessary for REA to study the needs of every cooperative if it is to maintain the fine record in which we take so much pride.

The truth is that the cost of proper study is greater today than it was in the early days of REA. Then it was possible to build lines almost anywhere with the assurance that they would have customers. Now with a little over half the rural homes served, it takes more study to put the lines where they will serve the people who still need service with a minimum of useless line.

Then it was possible to get all the power that the cooperatives needed from the private power companies, although the companies did charge outrageous prices. Now in many sections, the private power companies simply do not have the power to supply their own needs, much less to supply the power the cooperatives need. REA is having to spend money trying to find adequate and dependable sources of power.

When their work began, there was no problem of equipment and supplies. If you could get the money, there would be a salesman anxious to sell them to you. Now REA has to help the cooperatives locate conductor poles, transformers, and so forth.

And, finally, as these cooperatives become larger and their business more complex, it becomes more difficult and expensive to analyze their income and their business. There is no reduction in REA's duties.

REA has handled your money safely and successfully, without loss to the public. It has rendered a great service with small overhead charges. Why should we break that record and cause the taxpayers the loss of untold millions because of lack of sufficient administrative funds to supervise the loans? It seems to me that anyone who would suggest that it was economy at this time to reduce the relative amount of money and to deny the REA a reasonable amount of money to administer these loans wants it to lose money and wants it to have a bad record here next year. I want to see the REA continue the splendid record it has made in the past. I want it to come up here next year with the same fine record so that we can justify continuation of this fine work.

You cannot expect a continuation of this record if you give this agency less than 1 percent for administrative purposes. You have got to give the REA some more money if you are to expect them to properly handle the great sums you have told them to loan. You gave them $5,000,000 to handle $225,000,000 worth of funds last year. Now you add an additional $350,000,000 in loans and give them an increase of only 9 percent over what they had last year for administrative purposes. That means they must do two and a half times the work they did last year; handle 250 percent of the amount of money they handled last year on only a 9-percent increase in funds for administrative purposes. It is fantastic; it cannot be done by any agency.

Surely we must apply the law of common sense to the administration of these loans. The REA is no different from any other lending agency, your local bank, or other local business institutions. When your local institutions more than double the volume of their business, you expect that their administrative expenses are going to increase at least a great deal more than 9 percent; yet, that is all the increase you are giving REA. We simply ask you by this amendment to give the REA a little less than a million dollars to administer $350,000,000 worth of additional loans. That is less than one-third of a cent for each dollar's worth of business you ask REA to handle. That, my friends, is all we ask. If that is not as low as the administrative costs of any agency you have ever dealt with, then I call on you to name it. I submit you cannot point to another agency in this Government that can handle money at a rate so low and handle it with the efficiency that the REA has handled it. Many of the appropriation bills you have passed have provided 10 to 20 times this percentage for administration.

The budget has asked for this amount. The REA has pointed out that this is necessary if they are to carry out the program we have prescribed for them. If we deny REA these funds, we must expect delay in the processing of the loan applications of your local cooperatives. We must expect such delay that your farm people will not actually get the great benefits we held out to them when we approved the greatest loaning program in history. If you do not give REA the needed funds, then you can expect it to show up with losses next year and in the years to come, and if it does come in here next year with substantial losses, do not charge it up to the REA; charge it up to the refusal of this House to give its agency the straw it needed to make sound bricks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I was responsible perhaps more than any man in Congress for placing the additional $100,000,000 in loan authorizations in the regular agricultural appropriation bill for 1949. This will demonstrate, Mr. Chairman, that certainly I am among the many in this House who are very friendly to the REA. Most of us want that agency to have all the money it legitimately needs.

Let me call attention to the fact that I mentioned previously when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] was speaking. We agreed with the Senate in conference on this point and it was understood by our conferees, in advancing the amount for administrative expenses from $5,000,000 to $5,450,000, that this would be ample and no deficiency would be requested. In adding another $450,000 here, Mr. Chairman, under a deficiency bill we would be breaking faith with the agreement that we of the Appropriations Subcommittee had in conference with the Senate. If I for 1 minute thought REA would suffer because of not enough administrative funds, I would gladly urge the acceptance of Mr. MAHON's amendment. But such is not the case.

There is one more point. The Senate advanced the additional loan authorizations as a reason for giving to the legal department of the Department of Agriculture an additional $50,000, which we in conference, agreed to. REA has a right to be proud of this fine job it is doing and what the other gentlemen have had to say about the splendid record of repayment by the near 1,000 associations has often been called to the attention

of the Congress by me when previous bills were on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question here as to loan authorizations. The question is how much shall we permit REA to expend directly for its expenses of administration. My associates have now had much experience and do not need the same degree of guidance from national headquarters as they did at the beginning of the program. Our REA Boards of Directors have occasionally complained of too much unnecessary interference and too many visits from field men and such. Surely, $5,450,000 will pay for a lot of top administrative work. Remember that REA has also available a good portion of the legal talent of the Solicitor's Office of the Department of Agriculture, for which latter office we are appropriating this year $2,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that we are being very generous with REA, and much as I would like to give these additional funds Mr. MAHON requests, there is always present our responsibilities of providing billions of dollars for our veterans and national defense. We must draw the line somewhere, so that other very essential activities of government can properly be taken care of. I hope that Mr. MAHON's amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, by all means this amendment should be adopted. It would merely provide the Rural Electrification Administration with the funds they need to administer the $400,000,000 we provided for next year and $175,000,000 that we added for the balance of this fiscal year.

The gentleman from Minnesota evidently does not understand that all these projects have to be submitted to the REA in Washington, they have to be scanned and investigated carefully, and ought to be.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I personally understand the situation very well.

Mr. RANKIN. They cannot do this with the amount of funds they have. This battle has been going on for 15 years, and yet with all the progress we have made the United States is not as well electrified today as Japan. Japan has a larger percentage of her farms electrified than we have in the United States.

Germany has a larger percentage of her farms electrified than they do in Minnesota or than we have throughout the whole United States.

Italy, France, Belgium, Switzerland, and Holland have a larger percentage of their farms electrified than we have in the United States.

We have provided $400,000,000 for rural electrification during this fiscal year and $400,000,000 for the next fiscal year, and I submit that it is nothing but good economics to supply the Rural Electrification Administration with sufficient funds to adequately and properly administer these funds, and in order to do so it is necessary that we have this additional $450,000 which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has asked for in this amendment, and which the Rural Electrification Administration says is absolutely necessary in order to enable them to do this work.

You are not wasting money here. This is not like all those billions you are pouring into the sink holes of Europe, Asia, and Africa. This is not like this $300,000,000 you voted to waste in China a few days ago. This is not like the $900,000,000 you are going to spend to send tobacco to Europe. This is money to help electrify the farm houses of your own country. Every dollar of it will come back with interest, and it will add immeasurably to the wealth of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the amendment ought to be carried by an overwhelming majority; by unanimous consent, if you please.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will pass on this item on the basis of fairness and need. The Senate committee, after all the funds that are involved in rural electrification construction had been voted by the House, and after they had the whole picture before them, held hearings on this item. Mr. Wickard, head of this organization, appeared before them, and on page 932 of the hearings he said that about $479,000 out of the $900,000 would be devoted to helping in the engineering and construction work. And that is all they have to do. Now, why should we add to the amount that the Senate committee recommended? On that Senate committee are some who have a record of being amongst the most liberal with REA. So, why should we come out here and raise a figure that the Senate Committee on Agricultural Appropriations put in and which the House, after a conference, agreed to as the amount needed? That does not make sense. It is simply turning over $450,000 more to the bureaucrats to waste. I am willing to let them have what they need, but I do not believe that we should stretch ourselves so as to give them money to waste. You destroy the efficiency of governmental organization when you do that. The interest of REA and its successful administration requires that we refuse to give them more money than they need; more than the Senate Committee on Appropriations determined they should have.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 60, noes 92.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAHON and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 93, noes 137.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS: On page 20 line 6 after the word "expended", insert a new paragraph as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

"The Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized in his discretion to accept in the name of the United States the tract of land comprising the Valparaiso golf course at Valparaiso, Eglin Field, Fla.: *Provided*, That no appropriated funds shall be used for the acquiring or maintenance or upkeep of the golf course now on the said lands or for the maintenance of any recreational activities placed thereon."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The idea of this is simply that it allows funds that have been made out of the profits of an officers' mess at this place to be used for maintaining their golf course. It does not take any money for that purpose out of the Federal Treasury, is that correct?

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. It prohibits the use of any appropriated funds to be used for that purpose, either for the acquiring of the property or its maintenance or operation for recreational facilities. That would all have to be done out of the profits of this officers' mess, is that correct?

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I do not object to it. The amendment is drawn in such language that it is perfectly plain.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] in offering this amendment is again demonstrating the great service that he has rendered as a Member of this body, carrying on right to the end representing the people of his State in his able and effectual manner. All of us who have ever had the honor of serving with him have a most profound respect for our friend from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

His service has been outstanding, constructive, and courageous. We will all respect the reasons which prompted him to voluntarily retire. We regret very much his retirement from the Congress. He retires with the knowledge that his record while a Member will accupy a prominent place in the pages of congressional history.

The very fact that he is offering this amendment in the closing days of the Congress is typical of the type of service that my dear friend has rendered during the years that he has been a Member of this House.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I thank my chairman and other members of the committee for accepting this amendment, and I say "thank you" to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] with whom I have had a very pleasant association.

Unless there are some further questions I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 20, after the Hendricks amendment, at the end of line 6, insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"For construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, $1,500,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this Tennessee-Tombigbee project has been approved by the Army engineers, and by the present Chief of Army Engineers, as well as by his predecessor.

It has been pointed out time and time again that it is the most important project of its kind that has yet been proposed. It is the only place on earth where you can transfer traffic from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense, and such a tremendous saving in transportation costs and distances.

The Army engineers have made their plans. They have drawn their blueprints. They have everything ready to proceed. They are now asking that we provide the money to begin.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended this $1,500,000. That is what I am asking for in this amendment.

I pointed out the other day that this project will cut the water distance from the Gulf of Mexico to our Oak Ridge plant on the Tennessee River where our atomic bombs are made by 786 miles. A bargeload of 14,000 tons going from Mobile to that project would save $30,380 on its fuel bill alone. If it were going into Michigan or into the Great Lakes or upper Mississippi River or upper Missouri, it would save $20,160 on its fuel bill alone.

When I say the upper Mississippi, I mean St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn. This means more to the people who pay transportation costs in the great Mississippi Valley, extending from Pittsburgh, Pa., all the way across, than any other project that has ever been proposed.

If this bargeload went up the Ohio River it would save $22,160 on its fuel bill alone.

At the same time it would have the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic.

Oh, I know there are some men behind the iron curtain of discriminatory freight rates who do not want the people west of the Mississippi River or south of the Ohio to get any relief from these penalties they have paid throughout all the years that have passed and gone. They are willing to paralyze our entire water-transportation system; they are willing to jeopardize, if you please, to that extent, the safety of the Nation. If we were to become involved in a war in the years to come, in which the atomic bomb would be the principal weapon, this would give us not only a short water route but it would give us two outlets from Oak Ridge to the sea. So it would add to the defense of the Nation more than any other expenditure that could be made at this time of anything like the amount proposed.

It seems to me that while you are spending all these hundreds of millions of dollars of lend-lease American money to rebuild the Dnieperstroi Dam in Russia, while you are spending these millions—or should I say billions—to build hydroelectric plants over Europe, while you are spending the hundreds of millions of dollars to be wasted in China, it seems to me that the Congress of the United States might do what we are going to have to do sooner or later, and that is to provide the small amount necessary to begin construction of this waterway, the most important, the most necessary project of its kind that has yet been proposed. Ask any member of the Corps of Army Engineers. Go to General Wheeler, go to General Reibold who has just retired, go to any of those men who know. They will tell you that this is the most important project of its kind they have ever had to pass upon.

You might as well approve this amendment, for I am going to keep this proposition before you until this great project is constructed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the Tombigbee Canal may be a desirable project to construct at some time. The House voted on three different occasions against the authorization of the Tombigbee Canal. Finally it was authorized.

The House Committee did not include it in the civil functions appropriation bill this year. It was suggested in the other body but in conference it was pointed out that the two waterways, the Overton Canal and the Tombigbee Waterway, would together cost $180,000,000.

The Tombigbee Canal cannot be built this week, this year, or next year. It is a long-range proposition.

The Committee on Civil Functions believed that it was much better to put our money on flood-control projects now where immediate results could be obtained, where there was an urgency, where life and property were in danger. The waterway canal which duplicates existing facilities for transportation does not have the urgency that is evident in flood-control projects or is evident in the expenditures we have been called upon to make for increased numbers of aircraft.

When the gentleman says that it means more for national defense than any other money that can be appropriated he is flying in the face of what he himself has said with regard to the importance of a 70-group air force and of doing some of these other things which are done directly in the name of national defense.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No.

I think the Tombigbee Canal has some merit; and some day when we need a public-works program it will be a good time to put some labor on some of these things that do not have immediate urgency, but it ought not to be in this final deficiency bill that the House will vote on this session.

The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOPE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 14, line 19, after the period add a new section to read as follows:

"Rural Electrication Administration. Salaries and expenses. For an additional amount for the fiscal year 1949 for administrative expenses, $450,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 78, noes 148.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 204, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—199

Abbitt	Forand	Morrison
Abernethy	Garmatz	Multer
Albert	Gary	Murdock
Allen, La.	Gordon	Murray, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.	Gore	Norblad
Arnold	Gorski	Norrell
Banta	Gossett	Norton
Barden	Granger	O'Brien
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala	O'Konski
Battle	Gregory	O'Toole
Beckworth	Hagen	Pace
Bennett, Mich.	Hardy	Passman
Bennett, Mo.	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Bland	Harris	Peterson
Blatnik	Harrison	Pfeifer
Bloom	Hart	Philbin
Boggs, La.	Havenner	Pickett
Bonner	Hays	Poage
Brehm	Hedrick	Potter
Brooks	Hefferman	Powell
Brown, Ga.	Hendricks	Preston
Bryson	Hill	Price, Fla.
Buchanan	Hobbs	Price, Ill.
Buckley	Holifield	Priest
Burleson	Huber	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Hull	Ramey
Camp	Isacson	Rankin
Cannon	Jackson, Wash.	Rayburn
Carroll	Jarman	Redden
Case, S. Dak.	Jones, Ala.	Richards
Celler	Jones, N. C.	Riley
Chapman	Karsten, Mo.	Rivers
Chelf	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Clark	Kelley	Rooney
Cole, Mo.	Kennedy	Russell
Colmer	Keogh	Sabath
Combs	Kerr	Sadowski
Cooley	Kilday	Sasscer
Cooper	King	Schwabe, Mo.
Courtney	Kirwan	Sheppard
Cox	Klein	Sikes
Cravens	Latham	Simpson, Ill.
Crosser	Larcade	Smathers
Curtis	Lea	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Ga.	Lemke	Smith, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Somers
Dawson, Ill.	Lucas	Spence
Deane	Lusk	Stanley
Delaney	Lyle	Stefan
D'Ewart	Lynch	Stevenson
Dingell	McCormack	Teague
Domengeaux	McCowen	Thomas, Tex.
Donohue	McCulloch	Thompson
Dorn	McMillan, S. C.	Trimble
Doughton	MacKinnon	Vinson
Douglas	Madden	Walter
Durham	Mahon	Wheeler
Eberharter	Manasco	Whitaker
Elliott	Mansfield	Whitten
Engle, Calif.	Marcantonio	Whittington
Evins	Meade, Ky.	Williams
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Tex.
Fernandez	Miller, Nebr.	Winstead
Fisher	Mills	Wood
Flannagan	Monroney	Worley
Fogarty	Morgan	
Folger	Morris	

NAYS—204

Allen, Calif.	Bradley	Cole, N. Y.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bramblett	Corbett
Anderson, Calif.	Brophy	Cotton
Andresen, August H.	Buck	Coudert
Andrews, N. Y.	Buffett	Crawford
Angell	Busbey	Crow
Arends	Butler	Cunningham
Auchincloss	Byrnes, Wis.	Dague
Bakewell	Canfield	Davis, Wis.
Barrett	Carson	Dawson, Utah
Bates, Mass.	Case, N. J.	Devitt
Beall	Chadwick	Dolliver
Bell	Chenoweth	Dondero
Bender	Chiperfield	Eaton
Bishop	Church	Ellis
Blackney	Clason	Ellsworth
Boggs, Del.	Clevenger	Elsaesser
Bolton	Clippinger	Elston
	Coffin	Engel, Mich.
	Cole, Kans.	Fallon
	Fellows	Kearney
	Fenton	Kearns
	Fletcher	Keating
	Foote	Keefe
	Fuller	Kersten, Wis.
	Fulton	Kilburn
	Gallagher	Knutson
	Gamble	Kunkel
	Gavin	Landis
	Gillette	Latham
	Gillie	LeCompte
	Goff	LeFevre
	Goodwin	Lewis, Ky.
	Graham	Lewis, Ohio
	Grant, Ind.	Lichtenwalter
	Griffiths	Lodge
	Gross	Love
	Gwinn, N. Y.	McConnell
	Gwynne, Iowa	McDonough
	Hale	McDowell
	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGarvey
	Hall, Leonard W.	McMahon
	Halleck	McMillen, Ill.
	Hand	Mack
	Harness, Ind.	Macy
	Harvey	Maloney
	Heselton	Martin, Iowa
	Hess	Mason
	Hinshaw	Mathews
	Hoeven	Meade, Md.
	Hoffman	Merrow
	Holmes	Meyer
	Hope	Michener
	Horan	Miller, Conn.
	Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Md.
	Javits	Mitchell
	Jenison	Morton
	Jenkins, Ohio	Muhlenberg
	Jenkins, Pa.	Murray, Wis.
	Jennings	Nicholson
	Jensen	Nixon
	Johnson, Calif.	Nodar
	Johnson, Ill.	O'Hara
	Johnson, Ind.	Patterson
	Jones, Wash	Phillips, Calif.
	Jonkman	Phillips, Tenn.
	Judd	Pioseer
	Kean	Plumley
		Potts

NOT VOTING—27

Allen, Ill.	Hébert	Regan
Boykin	Herter	Robertson
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Okla.	Scoblick
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Tex.	Simpson, Pa.
Burke	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Lane	Stigler
Gathings	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Gearhart	Mundt	Vursell
Hartley	Peden	West

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnson of Texas for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Stigler for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Kefauver for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

Mr. Peden for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Gathings for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

Mr. Ludlow for, with Mr. Scoblick against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mrs. Smith of Maine against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Bulwinkle.

Mr. Gearhart with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Mundt with Mr. West.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and Mr. McCOWEN changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is consideration of the President's veto of H. R. 6355.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the President vetoed the bill H. R. 6355, which carries nearly $1,000,000,000 of appropriations for functioning of the Social Security Administration, some portions of the Public Health Service and the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor. That is the question before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the rules is not the majority granted the privilege of discussing this message?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws his moving of the previous question it would be in order. Otherwise it is not in order.

The question is on the previous question.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 161, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—238

Allen, Calif.	Coudert	Hand
Andersen, H. Carl	Crawford	Harness, Ind.
Anderson, Calif.	Crow	Harvey
Andresen, August H.	Cunningham	Heselton
Andrews, N. Y.	Curtis	Hess
Angell	Dague	Hill
Arends	Davis, Wis.	Hinshaw
Auchincloss	Dawson, Utah	Hoeven
Bakewell	Devitt	Hoffman
Barrett	D'Ewart	Holmes
Bates, Mass.	Dirksen	Hope
Beall	Dolliver	Horan
Bender	Domengeaux	Hull
Bennett, Mich.	Dondero	Jackson, Calif.
Bennett, Mo.	Doughton	Javits
Bishop	Eaton	Jenison
Blackney	Elliott	Jenkins, Ohio
Boggs, Del.	Ellis	Jenkins, Pa.
Bolton	Ellsworth	Jennings
Bradley	Elsaesser	Jensen
Bramblett	Elston	Johnson, Calif.
Brehm	Engel, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.
Brophy	Fallon	Johnson, Ind.
Buck	Fellows	Jones, Wash.
Buffett	Fenton	Jonkman
Burke	Fisher	Judd
Busbey	Fletcher	Kean
Butler	Foote	Kearney
Byrnes, Wis.	Fuller	Kearns
Canfield	Fulton	Keating
Carson	Gallagher	Keefe
Case, N. J.	Gamble	Kilburn
Case, S. Dak.	Gavin	Kilday
Chadwick	Gearhart	Knutson
Chenoweth	Gillette	Kunkel
Chiperfield	Gillie	Landis
Church	Goff	Latham
Clason	Goodwin	LeCompte
Clevenger	Graham	LeFevre
Clippinger	Grant, Ind.	Lewis, Ohio
Coffin	Griffiths	Lichtenwalter
Cole, Kans.	Gross	Lodge
Cole, Mo.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Love
Cole, N. Y.	Gwynne, Iowa	Lucas
Corbett	Hagen	McConnell
Cotton	Hale	McCowen
	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McCulloch
	Hall, Leonard W.	McDonough
	Halleck	McDowell
		McGarvey

McGregor	Ploeser	Shafer
McMahon	Plumley	Short
McMillen, Ill.	Poage	Simpson, Ill.
Mack	Potter	Smith, Kans.
MacKinnon	Potts	Smith, Ohio
Macy	Poulson	Smith, Wis.
Mahon	Ramey	Snyder
Maloney	Reed, Ill.	Stefan
Martin, Iowa	Reed, N. Y.	Stevenson
Mason	Rees	Stockman
Mathews	Reeves	Stratton
Meade, Ky.	Rich	Sundstrom
Merrow	Richlman	Taber
Meyer	Rivers	Talle
Michener	Ridley	Taylor
Miller, Conn.	Rockwell	Tibbott
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Mass.	Tollefson
Miller, Nebr.	Rohrbough	Towe
Mitchell	Rose	Twyman
Morton	Russell	Vail
Muhlenberg	Sadlak	Van Zandt
Murray, Wis.	St. George	Vorys
Nicholson	Sanborn	Vursell
Nixon	Sarbacher	Wadsworth
Nodar	Schwabe, Mo.	Welchel
Norblad	Schwabe, Okla.	Wigglesworth
O'Hara	Scott, Hardie	Wilson, Ind.
O'Konski	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Wilson, Tex.
Patterson	Scrivner	Wolcott
Phillips, Calif.	Sheridan	Wolverton
Phillips, Tenn.	Seely-Brown	Woodruff

NAYS—161

Abbitt	Fogarty	Monroney
Abernethy	Folger	Morgan
Albert	Forand	Morris
Allen, La.	Garmatz	Morrison
Andrews, Ala.	Gary	Multer
Barden	Gordon	Murdock
Bates, Ky.	Gore	Murray, Tenn.
Battle	Gorski	Norrell
Beckworth	Gossett	Norton
Bell	Granger	O'Brien
Bland	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Blatnik	Gregory	Pace
Bloom	Hardy	Passman
Boggs, La.	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Bonner	Harris	Peterson
Brooks	Harrison	Pfeifer
Brown, Ga.	Hart	Philbin
Bryson	Havenner	Pickett
Buchanan	Hays	Powell
Buckley	Hedrick	Preston
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Price, Fla.
Burleson	Hendricks	Price, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hobbs	Priest
Camp	Holifield	Rains
Cannon	Huber	Rankin
Carroll	Isacson	Redden
Celler	Jackson, Wash.	Richards
Chapman	Jarman	Riley
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Colmer	Jones, N. C.	Rooney
Combs	Karsten, Mo.	Sabath
Cooley	Kee	Sasscer
Cooper	Kelley	Sheppard
Courtney	Kennedy	Sikes
Cox	Keogh	Smathers
Cravens	Kerr	Smith, Va.
Crosser	King	Somers
Davis, Ga.	Kirwan	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Klein	Stanley
Dawson, Ill.	Lanham	Teague
Dean	Larcade	Thomas, Tex.
Delaney	Lesinski	Thompson
Dingell	Lusk	Trimble
Donohue	Lyle	Walter
Dorn	Lynch	Welch
Douglas	McCormack	Wheeler
Durham	McMillan, S. C.	Whitaker
Eberharter	Madden	Whitten
Engle, Calif.	Manasco	Whittington
Evins	Mansfield	Williams
Fallon	Marcantonio	Winstead
Feighan	Meade, Md.	Wood
Fernandez	Miller, Calif.	Worley
Flannagan	Mills	

NOT VOTING—31

Allen, Ill.	Kersten, Wis.	Sadowski
Boykin	Lane	Scoblick
Brown, Ohio	Lea	Simpson, Pa.
Clark	Lemke	Smith, Maine
Gathings	Lewis, Ky.	Stigler
Hartley	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Hébert	Mundt	Vinson
Herter	Peden	West
Johnson, Okla.	Rayburn	Youngblood
Johnson, Tex.	Regan	
Kefauver	Robertson	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. West against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Peden against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Johnson of Texas against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Scoblick for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Youngblood for, with Mr. Vinson, against.

Mr. Mundt for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Additional general pair:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Lane.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot qualify on this vote but I want the RECORD to show that if I had been here I would have voted "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House on reconsideration agree to pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution this must be a record vote. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 286, nays 115, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—286

Abbitt	Cole, Mo.	Hale
Allen, Calif.	Cole, N. Y.	Hall,
Allen, Ill.	Cooper	Edwin Arthur
Allen, La.	Corbett	Hall,
Andersen, H. Carl	Cotton	Leonard W.
Anderson, Calif.	Coudert	Halleck
Andresen, August H.	Cox	Hand
Andrews, N. Y.	Crawford	Hardy
Angell	Crow	Harless, Ariz.
Arends	Cunningham	Harness, Ind.
Arnold	Curtis	Harris
Auchincloss	Dague	Harrison
Bakewell	Davis, Ga.	Harvey
Banta	Davis, Tenn.	Hays
Barrett	Davis, Wis.	Hendricks
Bates, Mass.	Dawson, Utah	Heselton
Beall	Devitt	Hess
Bender	D'Ewart	Hill
Bennett, Mich.	Dirksen	Hinshaw
Bennett, Mo.	Dolliver	Hoeven
Bishop	Dondero	Hoffman
Blackney	Dorn	Holmes
Bland	Durham	Hope
Boggs, Del.	Eaton	Horan
Bolton	Elliott	Hull
Bradley	Ellis	Jackson, Calif.
Bramblett	Ellsworth	Javits
Brehm	Elsaesser	Jenison
Brooks	Elston	Jenkins, Ohio
Brophy	Engel, Mich.	Jenkins, Pa.
Brown, Ga.	Fellows	Jennings
Bryson	Fenton	Jensen
Buck	Fernandez	Johnson, Calif.
Buffett	Fisher	Johnson, Ill.
Bulwinkle	Fletcher	Johnson, Ind.
Burke	Foote	Jones, Wash.
Burleson	Fuller	Jonkman
Busbey	Fulton	Judd
Butler	Gallagher	Kean
Byrnes, Wis.	Gamble	Kearney
Camp	Gary	Kearns
Canfield	Gavin	Keating
Carson	Gearhart	Keefe
Case, N. J.	Gillette	Kerr
Case, S. Dak.	Gillie	Kilburn
Chadwick	Goff	Kilday
Chenoweth	Goodwin	Knutson
Chiperfield	Gore	Kunkel
Church	Gossett	Landis
Clark	Graham	Larcade
Clason	Grant, Ind.	Latham
Clevenger	Griffiths	LeCompte
Clippinger	Gross	LeFevre
Coffin	Gwinn, N. Y.	Lewis, Ohio
Cole, Kans.	Gwynne, Iowa	Lichtenwalter
	Hagen	Lodge
		Love

Lucas	Patterson	Short
McConnell	Peterson	Sikes
McCowen	Phillips, Calif.	Simpson, Ill.
McCulloch	Phillips, Tenn.	Smith, Kans.
McDonough	Pickett	Smith, Ohio
McDowell	Ploeser	Smith, Va.
McGarvey	Plumley	Smith, Wis.
McGregor	Poage	Snyder
McMahon	Potter	Stanley
McMillan, S. C.	Potts	Stefan
McMillen, Ill.	Poulson	Stevenson
Mack	Preston	Stockman
MacKinnon	Price, Fla.	Stratton
Macy	Ramey	Sundstrom
Mahon	Reed, Ill.	Taber
Maloney	Reed, N. Y.	Talle
Martin, Iowa	Rees	Taylor
Mason	Reeves	Thompson
Mathews	Rich	Tibbott
Meade, Ky.	Richards	Towe
Meade, Md.	Richlman	Twyman
Merrow	Riley	Vail
Meyer	Rivera	Van Zandt
Michener	Ridley	Vinson
Miller, Conn.	Rockwell	Vorys
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Mass.	Vursell
Miller, Nebr.	Rohrbough	Wadsworth
Mitchell	Rose	Welchel
Morrison	Russell	Wheeler
Morton	Sadlak	Whitten
Muhlenberg	St. George	Whittington
Murray, Tenn.	Sanborn	Wigglesworth
Murray, Wis.	Sarbacher	Wilson, Ind.
Nicholson	Schwabe, Mo.	Wilson, Tex.
Nixon	Schwabe, Okla.	Wolcott
Nodar	Scott, Hardie	Wolverton
Norblad	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Wood
Norrell	Scrivner	Woodruff
O'Hara	Seely-Brown	Worley
O'Konski	Shafer	Youngblood
Passman		

NAYS—115

Abernethy	Folger	Mills
Albert	Forand	Monroney
Andrews, Ala.	Garmatz	Morgan
Barden	Gordon	Morris
Bates, Ky.	Gorski	Multer
Battle	Granger	Murdock
Beckworth	Grant, Ala.	Norton
Bell	Gregory	O'Brien
Blatnik	Hart	O'Toole
Bloom	Havenner	Pace
Boggs, La.	Hedrick	Patman
Bonner	Heffernan	Pfeifer
Buchanan	Hobbs	Philbin
Buckley	Holifield	Powell
Byrne, N. Y.	Huber	Price, Ill.
Cannon	Isacson	Priest
Carroll	Jackson, Wash.	Rains
Celler	Jarman	Rankin
Chapman	Jones, Ala.	Rayburn
Chelf	Jones, N. C.	Redden
Colmer	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Combs	Kee	Rooney
Cooley	Kelley	Sabath
Courtney	Kennedy	Sadowski
Crosser	Keogh	Sasscer
Dawson, Ill.	King	Sheppard
Deane	Kirwan	Smathers
Delaney	Klein	Somers
Dingell	Lanham	Spence
Donohue	Lesinski	Teague
Doughton	Lusk	Thomas, Tex.
Douglas	Lyle	Trimble
Eberharter	Lynch	Walter
Engle, Calif.	McCormack	Welch
Evins	Madden	Whitaker
Fallon	Manasco	Williams
Feighan	Mansfield	Winstead
Flannagan	Marcantonio	
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	

NOT VOTING—27

Boykin	Kefauver	Regan
Brown, Ohio	Kersten, Wis.	Robertson
Domengeaux	Lane	Scoblick
Gathings	Lea	Simpson, Pa.
Hartley	Lemke	Smith, Maine
Hébert	Lewis, Ky.	Stigler
Herter	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, Okla.	Mundt	Tollefson
Johnson, Tex.	Peden	West

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Peden.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Stigler.

Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Mundt with Mr. Gathings.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Herter with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. CHELF changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ABERNETHY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WINSTEAD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CRAWFORD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to sustain the President.

I do not know why any Member of this House should feel or express surprise that the President felt it necessary to veto H. R. 6355. It is true that this veto attaches, under our law, to the bill as a whole—to the appropriation as well as the organizational features. His veto message, however, as well as his prior conduct, leaves no doubt as to the fact that the bill is unacceptable to him because it would transfer the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency. The President's position on the subject of this transfer had been made abundantly clear long before the bill in question was drafted.

In 1947, and again this year, the President submitted reorganization plans to this Congress, under special legislative authority reposed in him, for the permanent location of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor. These plans were rejected. The principal reason assigned for the rejection of the plan submitted this year was the fact that any basic reorganization of executive functions should await recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government which is presently making a study of such structure. The passage of H. R. 6355, despite Congress' attitude on the reorganization plan referred to, is an act of flagrant inconsistency.

When the President's efforts to achieve a permanent integration of the employment service functions with the labor functions of this Government failed, no course remained open to him but the exercise of his ultimate prerogative of veto in attempting to spare the country the effects of unwise legislation. The responsibility for the present situation which finds one of the major independent agencies of the Government without funds for the coming fiscal year, lies with the proponents and supporters of H. R. 6355—not with the President.

The action of coupling in one measure appropriation provisions with organizational provisions affecting the basic structure of this Government in a manner known to be deeply contrary to the President's wishes is a reprehensible one. That the Chief Executive of these United States refused to yield to the expedient offered him in this legislation is to his lasting credit.

Referring for a moment to the operation of the Employment Service in the Department of Labor. I wonder if even now its history is fully understood.

In the first place, it was not transferred from the Department of Labor pursuant to a superior organizational scheme. The necessities of wartime administration alone prompted its removal. When these necessities ceased, the employment function, as it was expected, was returned by Executive order to its original home in the Labor Department.

It seems clear and simple to me that employment has a good deal to do with labor and that one cannot exist very long without the other.

Prior to the war, the disassociation of employment matters from the Department of Labor would have seemed completely unreasonable. Any suggestion at that time that employment was not a matter of primary concern to the Department of Labor would have aroused storms of indignation. Since the inception of the Employment Service it has spent a number of highly successful years in the Department of Labor. In the face of its worthy record there, in the face of its achievements there, and in the face of well-considered theories of Government organization which decree that its proper location is there, the employment service would again be uprooted by this Congress from its rightful location in a Cabinet department of this Government and shunted over to the Federal Security Agency. The ostensible reason for this move, as I understand it, is to prevent malfeasance of the program under Labor Department administration. Again, I say the Employment Service record in the Labor Department speaks for itself. The expression of the fear of maladministration after numerous years of Labor Department supervision during which any evidence of improper administration is singularly lacking, is not only completely without justification, but also ridiculous.

Before H. R. 6355 is reconsidered, I think it would be well if Congress took a few minutes off and reflected upon its actions in the realm of labor and its attitude toward the Department of Labor. A department of labor is no stepchild in the scheme of a democratic government. It is entitled to occupy a responsible and respected position in this country of all countries where the working man and woman is cast in a particularly important role under our prevailing democratic principles. I think it is time this Congress withdrew its fire from the Labor Department and its officials spent some time evaluating its own motives. The experience of the late Secretary of Labor with this Congress, of which we have intimate knowledge, reflects more eloquently than any words I could choose, the indefensible congressional attitude toward labor matters. When another man assumes the great responsibilities which belong to the office of the Secretary of Labor, I hope he will find the actions of this body toward him and his Department actuated by principle—not prejudice.

Thank God we have a President who has the courage to veto this unfair bill, obviously designed to weaken the Department of Labor by removing functions which properly belong in the Labor Department.

REPEAL THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, the Taft-Hartley law is wrecking the American labor movement. That is clear after a year of operation. That is why I have introduced my bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley law.

The worst is still ahead.

Many union contracts were signed just before the law went into effect on August 22, 1947. That means that there will be a wave of contract renewals coming up in the middle of this summer. Additional hundreds of thousands of union members will find out at first hand what a slave-labor law can do to their organizations.

But enough is on the record already.

The record proves that there is only one thing to do with the Taft-Hartley law. It cannot be amended. It must be repealed, thrown into the ashcan of history along with Hitler's Nazi state and all other efforts of greedy men to break the organizations of free workers.

This conclusion was foreseen a year ago by organized labor. It is supported now throughout the country. In the words of the distinguished minority report of the Joint Congressional Committee on Labor-Management Relations:

> Through the encouragement offered to antiunion employers and through the justified suspicion and resentment engendered among wage earners, the act has laid the basis for industrial unrest.

The report recommends "immediate repeal of the act to avoid the serious injury to our economy which we foresee."

A free and powerful labor movement is the best guaranty of the preservation of democracy. No President in our history ever received more wholehearted support from the bulk of the people than Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is no accident that the bedrock of Roosevelt's support lay with the unions.

Neither is it an accident that in both Italy and Germany when fascism was installed the trade-unions had to be wiped out in the course of only a few months, in order to clear the way for smashing all civil rights.

The unions are labor's first line of defense against starvation. Much more than that, a union organized through the

free choice of workers without help or hindrance from government, is a worker's best guaranty that he can walk in dignity, head high in the face of the overlords of industry.

Pork chops are important, but unions give workers more than pork chops. When the unions are under frontal assault, flank attacks are made by reaction on all civil and economic rights of the people. This is why the CIO was right in saying before the Joint Labor-Management Relations Committee on June 4:

> The antilabor aspects of the Taft-Hartley Act have set in motion other forms of repression on local levels. It is not merely the Federal courts who are engaged in a flood of injunctions. In the State courts as well we find that the issuance of antilabor injunctions limiting and frequently outlawing all picketing is now becoming routine under the stimulus of the Taft-Hartley Act. We find on the State level an increasing resort to use of many of the instrumentalities of government to repress the organizational activities of working people and to break strikes.

Workers in all parts of the world are jealous of their liberties. But a free labor movement is above all the seal of what is really the American way of life, and I do not mean the NAM way of life.

Our fathers came to this country to escape the tyrannies of an Old World and to build free institutions for themselves and their children. Say "America" in any country and one of the first ideas which comes to mind is "production." America's mighty power to produce wealth is not the creation of boards of directors or coupon clippers but above all it stems from free people working under the protection of free unions, able to earn decent wages to purchase the necessities of life in adequate amounts.

When I say free labor I do not mean that American workers have had a paradise on earth which is being taken from them now by the Taft-Hartley Act. From the first day any immigrant ever walked out of steerage he and his children and their children have had to fight for anything they ever won.

We have gone through the horrors of war and the miseries of depression. We have seen our children hungry when there were no jobs. We have seen our sisters and cousins burnt in the filthy sweatshops. We have seen our brothers and uncles pale and worn out under the lash of the corporation conveyor belts. We have seen arrogance and brutality pitted against the workers' efforts to organize to protect themselves and their families.

Through all the hardships and struggles we have gained steadily. We have built great cities and mighty industries for which the money changers take credit. Nothing has been given but much has been won.

Because the workers of America were united and organized, behind Roosevelt, we won the Wagner Act. The Wagner Act, in spite of the high-priced publicity of the National Association of Manufacturers, did not give us anything on silver platters either. It did right a few ancient wrongs. It did set a limit on the lawless repression with which the corporations attempted to hold down the workers who made them rich. And it did make possible the further progress of our Nation.

Free American labor, organized into democratic unions, produced on an unbelievable scale when the call to arms came in the Second World War. From the hands of American workers came the decisive share of the weapons which defeated fascism.

But when the war was over, and labor thought it could rest on its laurels, the corporations and their agents went to work to destroy the Wagner Act.

The elections of 1946 were lost by the people who stayed away from the polls. And as a result, Taft-Hartley was passed.

The Taft-Hartley law does much more than wreck the Wagner Act. What we face today is something worse than the sweatshop and speed-up and hired finks and cops of the 1920's and 1930's. Then at least labor was free to fight although against great odds. No matter what the odds, as long as we can fight we can win.

The Taft-Hartley Act is a straitjacket. It not only puts weapons in the hands of the industrialists, it ties the hands of labor and leaves the unions defenseless.

Here is the way Taft-Hartley has worked:

First. It has put a brake on organizational drives. Unions cannot stand still while vast unorganized groups of workers need their protection. The unorganized areas stand as a welcoming sign for runaway plants. The unorganized areas are a pit of open shops and low wages into which the unions can be dragged.

A few figures show clearly what Taft-Hartley has done to stop organization. Between August 1947 and March 1948 only 950 elections were held. During the same period in the preceding year, 3,500 elections under the Wagner Act were held.

Along the same lines, the rate of filing of petitions for certification was about three times as great in the year before Taft-Hartley as it was after the law was passed.

Second. The Taft-Hartley law has reached into the union halls and interfered in the conduct of internal union business. The affidavit requirements make it possible for the NLRB to dictate in effect who the unions shall choose for leaders. In this connection it is worth noting that many unions which bar Communists from office—for example, the mine workers and the steel workers—have nevertheless held out against compliance with the non-Communist affidavit requirements.

Furthermore, the dodge of noncompliance has been used by some corporations—for example, Remington Rand and the Government Services cafeterias—as a new means of all-out attack on unions, as they used to do with such devices as the Mohawk Valley plan. This is done in spite of the fact that compliance is not and cannot be required by law.

In the words of William S. Tyson, solicitor of labor, in a memorandum of January 23, 1948, to the Secretary of Labor:

> 1. There is nothing in section 9 (f) or (h) which interferes with the right of unions to continue traditional and legitimate trade-union activities without resort to the procedures and remedies provided in the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, if they choose to proceed in this fashion.
>
> 2. Similarly, there is nothing in the act which prevents an employer, if he so desires, from bargaining with an otherwise qualified union, since the filing of affidavits and organizational and financial data is a condition precedent to resort by unions to the Board and not to the practice of free collective bargaining by unions and employers.

Third. The act outlawed the closed shop and is the jump-off point for an attack on all forms of union security. The NLRB is bogged down in a mess of union-shop-election cases. The spokesmen for big business now propose another way out of the difficulty of union-shop elections which have gone overwhelmingly in favor of keeping the union shop: they want to ban union shops altogether.

The hiring hall, which put an end to the day of the crimp on the water front, is also under employer fire with Taft-Hartley as the weapon held over the heads of the maritime workers.

Fourth. The act has interfered in accepted and orderly union practices. Even peaceful picketing has been branded as an unfair-labor practice. Suits involving more than $15,000,000 have been filed against unions for such practices.

Fifth. Most important of all, the act is being manipulated to bar national strikes. Here it must be noted that while the act in itself is bad, it is being diligently enforced by an administration which supposedly opposes it.

The President chose the applause of reactionary Congressmen by saying he would do his constitutional duty of administering the act, rather than the applause of American progressives, which would have been his if he had added that the law must be repealed.

An administration genuinely concerned with protecting the workers' organizations can do much to prevent abuse of labor in the operations of the Taft-Hartley law. There are areas in the law where there is room for interpretation, where the administration could exercise discretion in favor of the worker. This the administration has not done. The law has instead been consistently and exaggeratedly interpreted to favor the employers.

The power to set up a board of inquiry is optional with the President. President Truman on five occasions has not hesitated to declare the existence of national emergencies and set the machinery of Taft-Hartley in motion to rob workers of their strike weapon. Senator Taft himself could not have acted more promptly against the coal miners, the maritime workers, the long-lines telephone operators, or the atomic-energy workers.

The injunction weapon has been used against the miners, the railroad workers, and the maritime workers. In each case the corporations had only to hold fast to a position of no concessions. When the unions had to resort to the strike call—their only weapon after the corporation side refused to yield in any degree—the power of the Government injunction was thrown against them.

There is a note of bitter mockery in the fact-finding report which led to the injunction issued June 11 against the maritime strike set for June 15. The report of President Truman's board concludes with these words:

> And if the status quo can be continued, real and sincere collective bargaining may finally avoid disruption.

To continue the status quo means, of course, to seek an injunction and hamstring the unions by banning a strike. But what kind of "real and sincere collective bargaining" can be carried on when the shipowners know that the workers are powerless to do more than talk about their needs? No union was built with words alone, no union can long be preserved when strikes are outlawed.

The strike is a last resort, an act of tremendous sacrifice on the part of workers, who generally, having no savings, are still willing to go without wages for weeks if need be to win their demands. Strikes cannot be called by so-called "hotheads or agitators." As any union man knows, a strike to succeed at all must be an expression of the collective will of virtually all the organized workers.

By robbing unions of their defensive weapon of the strike and instituting government by injunction, the Taft-Hartley Act has created the first links in the chain of fascism.

By robbing workers of their best defense against inflation—free collective bargaining for better wages and working conditions—the Taft-Hartley Act has laid the basis for reduced purchasing power, lower living standards, and an eventual economic crisis which is bound to shake our economic system.

Along with the Taft-Hartley law, corporate wealth will be used to fight trade-unions and undermine living standards. In depression days ahead those who are profiteering from inflation will be able to sit down on their money bags, while the people are starving and are subjected more and more to attempts at complete economic and political domination by big business.

It will take a vigorous, well-organized new political party—speaking a language politicians understand, the language of votes, to secure the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. The leadership of both the Republican and Democratic Parties has clearly demonstrated that in practice they support this bipartisan antilabor legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a statement before the Rules Committee.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

DISPLACED-PERSONS BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT FILED

Mr. FELLOWS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3566) to amend subsection (e) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

ECA APPROPRIATION BILL SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that the Speaker appoint conferees.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the European relief program appropriation bill?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman conferred with the minority?

Mr. TABER. I have notified the minority leader. I have had his office called and tried to locate him to advise him that I was going to ask to send this to conference.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the request of the gentleman from New York is merely to send the bill to conference.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TABER. The only member of the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations I could contact was the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR]. I spoke to him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 2286, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PURCHASE OF AUTOMOBILES BY CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4007) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that a bill has passed the Senate, now on the Speaker's desk, that is not as broad as this one but a bill which will provide benefits to this group of deserving veterans. May I ask the gentlewoman from Massachusetts if my understanding is correct?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct. The bill, S. 1391, would cost about half as much as the bill now on the House Consent Calendar. As the gentleman knows, I have been trying to get that bill up for consideration and passage for over a year. It takes care of a group of very seriously disabled veterans. There are about 40 amputees in Washington today asking that the bill be passed before the adjournment of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask the gentleman from New Jersey if he would be agreeable to the passage of this bill and substituting the Senate bill?

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that we have a rule that bills allowing benefits of a million dollars shall not be taken from the Consent Calendar and passed. This bill would cost $19,000,000, which would mean that the bill to which the gentleman refers would cost some $10,000,000.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PREVENTING MULTIPLE STATE INCOME TAXES ON SALARIES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 127) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PAYMENT TO SWISS GOVERNMENT FOR DAMAGE INFLICTED DURING WORLD WAR II BY UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1605) to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $12,000,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5318) to provide for the continuation of the transportation services of the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the disposition of its property and other interests, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a very important piece of legislation to be considered on the Consent Calendar, and I think the House ought to have a little more information about it.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there is general agreement all around as to the provisions in this bill. There was quite an extensive study made by the Committee on Small Business of the House dealing with this subject, later by the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Government Corporations, and then by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The only objection that arose at all to the provisions of the bill was eliminated by an amendment, I think offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], and the House has already appropriated funds in the Government corporations appropriation bill, which was concurred in by the Senate, so there is no disagreement. The appropriation took into consideration the provisions of this bill.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. When is it proposed to dispose of this corporation?

Mr. PLOESER. It permits disposal under conditions which would conform to the organic act.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. How is it to be sold? Is it to be sold to private interests for cash or is it to be sold on time payments, or how is it to be sold?

Mr. PLOESER. We leave that practically up to the Department of Commerce to handle. Of course, it will be sold to private interests.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. What has been done with reference to the continuation of this type of service.

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman were familiar with the organic act he would know that the service provided there would have to be continued, and this provides for the continuation of the service on the Mississippi and on the Missouri, with the same type of less-than-bargeload-lot service as is being given now.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Can the gentleman tell me whether this bill has the approval of the American Waterways Association?

Mr. PLOESER. The competitive barge operators? No. Neither do they furnish the same service. Not all oppose this—but some want to kill the service.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I consider this bill of vital importance, particularly to the lower Mississippi Valley, and I do not feel that it should be taken up in this fashion. I therefore object, Mr. Speaker.

CREDIT SERVICE AS A CADET FOR PAY PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 657) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to authorize crediting of service as a cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet for pay purposes, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONVEY CERTAIN LANDS TO HOWARD UNIVERSITY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5509) to authorize Defense Homes Corporation to convey to Howard University certain lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUEL PLANTS ACT OF 1948

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5475) to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

BUILDINGS FOR OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE BUREAU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3907) to authorize construction of buildings for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER JURISDICTION OVER SCHOOL BUILDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5433) to transfer jurisdiction over certain school buildings in Vanport, Oreg., to the Federal Works Administrator and to authorize an appropriation to rebuild a school building in Vanport, Oreg., which was destroyed by fire.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

FUR PRODUCTS LABELING ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3734) to protect consumers, retailers, distributors, manufacturers, dealers, and producers from misnaming, misbranding, improper identification, and deceptive or misleading advertising of fur products and articles made in part or in whole from fur, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. LARCADE, and Mr. BOGGS of Delaware objected.

AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6502) to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

WYANDOTTE TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3685) authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma, through its business committee, to sell and convey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Wyandotte Indian public burial ground in Kansas City, Kans.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this with the chairman of the subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

BASE PERIOD FOR DETERMINATION OF PARITY FOR MARYLAND TOBACCO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5111) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to change the base period for the determination of parity for Maryland tobacco from August 1919 to July 1929 to the period from January 1936 to December 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I voted against this bill in the committee, and I objected to its consideration the last time the Consent Calendar was called. Last Saturday we passed a bill dealing with many crops on which we put support prices of 60 to 90 percent of parity. Tobacco has 90 percent of parity. Now they want to adopt this plan to increase the present support price. I again object.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are required.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I object, Mr. Speaker.

MOUNT VERNON MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5842) to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, Mr. McCULLOCH, and Mr. GRIFFITHS objected.

NATIONAL RESERVE OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6058) to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION OF BOARDS OF VISITORS TO THE MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3657) to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 239) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the committee amendment. I do not know whether or not the Senate bill is identical with the House bill with the committee amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the bill be passed over until we have had a chance to compare the two bills.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would it not be possible to consider the House bill and the committee amendments and then take up the Senate bill, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the provisions of the House bill as passed?

The SPEAKER. That could be done.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be appointed on or before the last day of every year a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 2. Each Board shall consist of seven persons appointed by the President: The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or his designee; three other members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate, one of whom shall be a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or his designee; four other members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. (a) After the date of enactment of this act, the members of each Board shall serve as such during the next succeeding year after appointment and not more than two-thirds of the members of each Board shall be replaced by new members when annual appointments are made in accordance with sections 1 and 2 of this act.

(b) In case of the death or resignation of any member of each Board during the term for which said member was appointed, a successor shall be appointed for the unexpired portion of the term. Said successor shall be appointed by the official, or his successor, who appointed the member being succeeded.

SEC. 4. Each Board shall visit the respective Academy for which it is appointed at least once annually at such time as the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War, as the case may be, shall designate, and each Board or the individual members thereof may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War, as the case may be, officially visit the Academy concerned at other times during the year, in groups or individually, as the members of each respective Board on matters pertaining to the duties of each Board. The Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War, as the case may be, shall notify the Superintendent of the Naval Academy or the Superintendent of the Military Academy, as the case may be, and members of the Board concerned, of the date of the annual visit and any official visit other than that designated as the annual visit.

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be the duty of each Board to inquire into the state of discipline, curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, and other matters relating to the Academy concerned which the Board may decide to consider.

(b) Each Board shall within 60 days after the meeting designated as the annual visit, submit a written annual report to the President regarding its action as such Board, together with its views and recommendations pertaining to the Academy concerned. Any report based on a visit other than the annual visit (except reports of the visitors to the United States naval postgraduate school) shall be submitted by the originator or originators thereof to the President within 60 days after approval of said report by at least a majority of the members of the Board.

(c) Each Board is authorized to call into consultation upon prior approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War, as the case may be, such advisers as it may deem necessary or advisable to effectuate the duties imposed upon it by the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) Each member of each Board shall receive not more than $5 per day and be reimbursed under Government travel regulations for actual expenses of travel while performing duties as a member of either Board.

(b) Advisers called for consultation by either Board in connection with the business of the Board shall be compensated in the same manner as members of the Boards in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to prescribe such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem necessary to effect annual and other visits to the United States naval postgraduate school by either the Board or a committee composed of members thereof, and the Secretary shall prescribe the manner in which reports of said visitors regarding visits to said school shall be prepared and submitted to the President.

(b) Visits to the postgraduate school shall be governed by and conducted in accordance with the provisions of sections 5 (a), 5 (c), and 6 of this act.

SEC. 8. That part of the act of August 29, 1916, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," which relates to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy (39 Stat. 608) and reads as follows: "From and after the passage of this act there shall be appointed every year, in the following manner, a Board of Visitors, to visit the Academy, the date of the annual visit of the Board aforesaid to be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy: Seven persons shall be appointed by the President and four Senators and five Members of the House of Representatives shall be designated as visitors by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, in the month of January of each year. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives shall be ex officio members of said Board.

"Each member of said Board shall receive while engaged upon duties as a member of the Board not to exceed $5 a day and actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. (a) So much of the provision of the act of August 9, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," which provides as follows: "*Provided*, That the act approved May 28, 1908, be amended and reenacted so as to read as follows: That hereafter the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy shall consist of five members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate and seven members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the respective chairmen thereof; the members

so appointed shall visit the Military Academy annually at such time as the chairman of said committees shall appoint, and the members from each of said committees may visit said Academy together or separately as the said committees may elect during the session of Congress; and the Superintendent of the Academy and the members of the Board of Visitors shall be notified of such date by the chairmen of the said committees. The expenses of the members of the Board shall be their actual expenses while engaged upon their duties as members of said Board not to exceed $5 per day and their actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes," is hereby repealed.

(b) The act of May 17, 1928, entitled "An act to provide for the membership of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 597), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Delete section 2 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. Each Board shall be constituted as follows:

"(a) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or his designee;

"(b) Three other Members of the Senate to be appointed by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

"(c) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or his designee;

"(d) Four other Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

"(e) Nine persons to be appointed by the President. The first Board to be appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act shall, with respect to the nine Presidential appointees, consist of three persons appointed to serve for a period of 1 year, three persons appointed to serve for a period of 2 years, and three persons appointed to serve for a period of 3 years. Three Presidential appointees shall be appointed to each subsequent Board to serve for a period of 3 years."

Delete section 3 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. In case of the death or resignation of a member of a Board during the term for which such member was appointed, a successor shall be appointed for the unexpired portion of the term. Such successor shall be appointed by the official, or his successor, who appointed the member who died or resigned."

Delete section 4 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. Each Board shall visit the respective Academy for which it is appointed once annually in April, and each Board or the individual members thereof may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, make such other visits on matters pertaining to the duties of the Board, or for purposes of consulting with the respective Superintendents of the Academies, as the Board or its members may determine to be desirable."

On page 3 in line 12 insert the words "morale and" after the word 'of."

On page 3, in line 13, insert the words "academic methods", after the words "fiscal affairs."

On page 3 in lines 21 and 22 delete the words "(except reports of the visitors to the United States naval postgraduate school)."

On page 4 in line 3 delete the word "War" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "the Army."

Delete section 7.

Renumber sections 8 and 9 as sections 7 and 8, respectively.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota to the committee amendment:

On page 3, line 24, strike out "Nine persons" and insert "Six persons."

On page 4, in lines 2, 3, and 4, strike out "three persons" and insert "two persons" in each place.

Page 4, line 5, strike out "Three Presidential appointees" and insert "Two Presidential appointees."

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and laid on the table.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 239) to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be appointed on or before the last day of every year a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 2. Each Board shall be constituted as follows:

(a) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or his designee;

(b) Three other members of the Senate to be appointed by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(c) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or his designee;

(d) Four other Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(e) Nine persons to be appointed by the President. The first Board to be appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act shall, with respect to the nine Presidential appointees, consist of three persons appointed to serve for a period of 1 year, three persons appointed to serve for a period of 2 years, and three persons appointed to serve for a period of 3 years. Three Presidential appointees shall be appointed to each subsequent Board to serve for a period of 3 years.

SEC. 3. In case of the death or resignation of a member of a Board during the term for which such member was appointed, a successor shall be appointed for the unexpired portion of the term. Such successor shall be appointed by the official, or his successor, who appointed the member who died or resigned.

SEC. 4. Each Board shall visit the respective Academy for which it is appointed once annually in April, and each Board or the individual members thereof may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, make such other visits on matters pertaining to the duties of the Board, or for purposes of consulting with the respective Superintendents of the Academies, as the Board or its members may determine to be desirable.

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be the duty of each Board to inquire into the state of morale and discipline, curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, academic methods, and other matters relating to the Academy concerned which the Board may decide to consider.

(b) Each Board shall, within 60 days after the meeting designated as the annual visit, submit a written annual report to the President regarding its action as such Board, together with its views and recommendations pertaining to the Academy concerned. Any report based on a visit other than the annual visit shall be submitted by the originator or originators thereof to the President within 60 days after approval of said report by at least a majority of the members of the Board.

(c) Each Board is authorized to call into consultation upon prior approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, such advisers as it may deem necessary or advisable to effectuate the duties imposed upon it by the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) Each member of each Board shall receive not more than $5 per day and be reimbursed under Government travel regulations for actual expenses of travel while performing duties as a member of either Board.

(b) Advisers called for consultation by either Board in connection with the business of the Board shall be compensated in the same manner as members of the Boards in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 7. That part of the act of August 29, 1916, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," which relates to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy (39 Stat. 608) and reads as follows: "From and after the passage of this act there shall be appointed every year, in the following manner, a Board of Visitors, to visit the Academy, the date of the annual visit of the Board aforesaid to be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy: Seven persons shall be appointed by the President and four Senators and five Members of the House of Representatives shall be designated as visitors by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, in the month of January of each year. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives shall be ex officio members of said Board.

"Each member of said Board shall receive while engaged upon duties as a member of the Board not to exceed $5 a day and actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. (a) So much of the provision of the act of August 9, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," which provides as follows: "*Provided*, That the act approved May 28, 1908, be amended and reenacted so as to read as follows: That hereafter the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy shall consist of five members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the

Senate and seven members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the respective chairmen thereof; the members so appointed shall visit the Military Academy annually at such time as the chairman of said committees shall appoint, and the members from each of said committees may visit said Academy together or separately as the said committees may elect during the session of Congress; and the Superintendent of the Academy and the members of the Board of Visitors shall be notified of such date by the chairmen of the said committees. The expenses of the members of the Board shall be their actual expenses while engaged upon their duties as members of said Board not to exceed $5 per day and their actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes" is hereby repealed.

(b) The act of May 17, 1928, entitled "An act to provide for the membership of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 597), is hereby repealed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 239 and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 3657, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 3657, was laid on the table.

NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6494) to provide that personnel of the National Guard of the United States and the Organized Reserve Corps shall have a common Federal appointment or enlistment as Reserves of the Army of the United States, to equalize disability benefits applicable to such personnel, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this bill with officials of the National Guard Bureau and the National Guard Association. While there are some benefits contained in the bill that might be advantageous to the National Guard, there are other provisions which are detrimental and therefore I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4365) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

JUDGES IN TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1052) to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I asked the gentleman to yield as I am without the privilege of raising any objection or reserving the right to object, and have only the right to speak the point of view of the people of Hawaii when a measure of this character is presented. This is a very small bill, and involves the salaries of only 12 judges in the Territory of Hawaii. If the will of the House had prevailed, and the Territory of Hawaii had been made a State, this obligation would have been assumed by the people of the Territory very willingly. The bar association of our Territory is unanimously in favor of making these increases in pay and feels that the failure to do so is a great injustice to our judges and will work an injury to our judiciary. In the event that we are made a State we will pay these salaries. We have always been generous in the matter of salaries for our public officials. Insofar as this is so completely a problem involving the people of the Territory, and insofar as we are quite willing when the opportunity is given us to pay these salaries, I appeal to you in a sense of fair play, Judge HOBBS, to withdraw your objection. Otherwise the bill will be lost.

S. 1052 would increase the salary of the chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii from $10,500 a year to $15,500 a year, and the salaries of the two associate justices from $10,000 a year to $15,000 a year.

It would also increase the salaries of the six judges of the First Judicial Circuit of the Territory of Hawaii from $7,500 a year to $12,500 a year, and of the three judges of the Second, Third, and Fifth Judicial Districts of the Territory of Hawaii from $7,000 to $12,500 a year.

The Bar Association of Hawaii, which embraces all of the practicing attorneys of the Territory, is unanimously and aggressively in favor of this legislation. It not only filed a brief in support of the legislation but arranged for witnesses who had come all the way from Hawaii to appear before the House to urge its enactment.

The inadequacy of the salaries of the present supreme and circuit courts of Hawaii was so marked in the opinion of the members of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii that in the session of 1945 additional compensation in the amount of $3,000 a year was voted to the members of the supreme court and the circuit judges. This money was appropriated from the revenues of the Territory under condition that as soon as the Federal Government raised these salaries that it would be discontinued.

The Legislature of Hawaii acted in the belief that this action should be taken to meet an emergency and that Territorial funds should not be provided for the compensation of these judges as a normal practice. The Territory believes that so long as appointment of these judges is the responsibility of the Federal Government it should not be expected to pay their compensation.

Although the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the judges in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, and Alaska were included in Public Law 567, the judges of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and the judges of the circuit courts of Hawaii were omitted.

The omission of the judges of the supreme and circuit courts of Hawaii was either through inadvertence or because there was a separate piece of legislation pending which did not become incorporated into Public Law 567 relating to compensation of judges of the United States appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The enactment of S. 1052 will remedy the injustice done to the judges of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and the circuit courts of Hawaii and permit Hawaii to preserve and foster a strong and competent judiciary.

When the Congress omitted the judges of the supreme court and circuit courts of Hawaii from the provisions of Public Law 567, it departed from a traditional relationship and ratio that had been established and maintained ever since annexation of Hawaii in 1898. It has been the settled policy of the Congress to fix the compensation of the district judges of Hawaii and the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii at nearly an equal level. Thus in 1900, judges of both courts received annual compensation of $5,000. In 1926, the compensation of United States district judges including judges of the district court for Hawaii were increased to $10,000 per annum; 2 years later the salaries of the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii were similarly advanced, the chief justice receiving $10,500 per annum and the associate justices $10,000.

The duties and responsibilities of the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii are certainly no less than those of the judges of the district courts of the United States District Court for Hawaii. In fact the decisions of the Supreme Court of Hawaii on local questions are binding upon the Federal courts.

The Bar Association of Hawaii, in a brief filed with the House Judiciary Subcommittee, makes this statement:

Hawaii, as was remarked by Senator Colium in the debates on the organic act "is an old country and an old government." It is proud of its judicial system and its judges have been historically highly respected and fairly well paid. As far back as 1870 the compensation for the chief justice was fixed at $10,000 per annum. Prior to the adoption of the organic act, the salary of the chief justice was fixed at $12,000 per annum and each of the two associates at $10,000 per annum and after the establishment of the Republic of Hawaii the compensation of the chief justice and the associate justices was fixed at $12,000 and $10,000 per annum respectively and that of the circuit judges of the first circuit was fixed at $8,000.

It will be noted that with the adoption of the Hawaiian Organic Act, the salaries of the judges of the supreme court and circuit courts were more than cut in half. This no doubt was to bring the judges in Hawaii to a parity with district judges in the several States who in 1900 received $5,000 per annum. The compensation of the chief justice was fixed at $5,500 per annum and the associate justices at $5,000 per annum.

In view of the foregoing history it is little wonder that the Bar of Hawaii is exercised over the matter of the compensation of our Territorial judges.

The question of the salaries of these judges was not passed on by the judicial conference of the senior circuit judges as these courts do not come within the field of the responsibilities of the conference. The Administrative Office of the United States Courts is responsible for these judges only to the extent of placing in the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary appropriation bill the item necessary to cover the salaries of the judges. The total item for this purpose for the fiscal year 1948 was $96,500 and the fiscal year 1949 is $106,500.

Henry P. Chandler, in a letter to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee on this subject, makes this statement:

The increase in the salaries of United States district judges has definitely strengthened the desire in Hawaii for a corresponding increase in the salaries of the justices of the supreme court of that Territory. The increase provided for in the salaries of the justices of the supreme court would, in turn, call for an increase in the salaries of the circuit judges, if the two are to be kept in correspondence. In recognition mainly of the higher cost of living in the Territories, there is very generally in effect a differential of 25 percent in the salaries of Government employees in those areas. This difference is urged with considerable justice in support of higher salaries of the judges in Hawaii whose salaries are fixed by law. I am informed that according to the Consumers Price Index, prepared and reported from time to time by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, the cost of living in Honolulu in March 1945, which is the latest date for which the comparison was available, on the basis of 100 percent for Los Angeles, was 125 percent, or 25 percent higher. It would seem, however, that in any consideration of the salaries of the Territorial judges of Hawaii their total compensation from both the United States and from the Territory should be taken into account.

A letter was addressed to the House Judiciary Committee on June 27, 1947, by Douglas W. McGregor, the Assistant to the Attorney General. This related to H. R. 854. The latter is identical with S. 1052 except that the salary provided for judges of the circuit courts is $12,500 instead of $10,000 as provided in the House bill.

In his letter Mr. McGregor said:

Question has been raised as to whether the entire cost of operating these courts should not, in fact, be borne by the Territorial government in view of the local nature of the business handled by them, and an analogy is drawn to the situation in the District of Columbia where a certain percentage of the expenses of the courts is reimbursed to the United States from District of Columbia funds.

Your attention is invited to one other phase of this entire question. Sentiment has recently increased in favor of granting statehood to the Territory of Hawaii, and a measure of such import (H. R. 49) has received favorable consideration by the House Committee on Public Lands. Should statehood be granted to the Territory of Hawaii the questions involved in the bill here under consideration would be largely resolved. In such event it is presumed the expenses of operation of courts of purely local character would be borne by the local government and not by the Federal Government.

Whether this bill should be enacted involves a question of legislative policy concerning which this Department prefers not to make any suggestion.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

The answer to the proposal that these salaries be met by the Territory has already been presented.

The situation with reference to legislation providing statehood for Hawaii has now changed. The bill passed by the House providing statehood for Hawaii was referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The committee on May 8 voted to defer action on the measure. The committee's action means the present session of Congress probably will adjourn without taking any action on this legislation.

Failure of this Congress to enact the legislation increasing the salaries of the judges of the Territory would be a great injustice and injurious to the general welfare of the judiciary.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Is it not the purpose of this bill to bring the salaries of the judges affected up to that of other judges doing comparable work in the administration of United States law?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes; it is. The standard of compensation is that given the United States district court judges. When their salaries were increased to $15,000, our feeling was that our supreme court judges should go to the same figure. They get $10,000 at the present time.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman and to the House that nothing is further from my thought than to be unfair, and I am perfectly sure that one of the last places on earth where I would be unfair, were I to be so in any event, would be the lovely islands of Hawaii, particularly when represented by the distinguished gentleman who is the representative of those Islands at this time. I simply wish the House to be informed, however, that these are not Federal judges. These are Territorial judges. They were put upon the Federal pay roll because of the financial condition of the islands at the time of annexation. The problem that affects my attitude in this matter more than anything else is that there is grave doubt as to the situation that confronts the House in considering this bill.

First, if it be true that immediately upon granting of statehood to Hawaii this would cease, and Hawaii would assume the full burden of paying the salaries of said judges, then that is one thing which I submit would militate against approval of this bill when Hawaiian statehood may become a fact tonight, since the President of the United States has recommended it, the House has passed the statehood bill by an overwhelming majority, and all that is necessary is for the Senate's consent. But suppose that does not happen. Then, I submit that if you will read this bill carefully, as I have, you will see that nothing like that is stated in the bill, and for all time to come, insofar as the bill provides, the Federal Government will be saddled with the payment of the salaries of the 12 judges of the named courts in Hawaii, as well as our own judges exercising Federal jurisdiction that were taken care of in my act of 1946. Both of the Federal judges in Hawaii are already drawing that increased pay. So these other 12 judges at some $15,000 each ought not to be put upon the Federal pay roll permanently whether or not statehood ensues. If this bill does go through it will mean a big question mark, and it will be the first time in the history of the United States that any such risk has been run. We have gloried in the record of the distinguished gentleman representing these islands. I have no animus in the matter, but I do feel it my duty under the circumstances to ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice until the matter of statehood, at least, has been decided.

Please let me read the bill in question:

S. 1052

An act to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii

Be it enacted, etc., That the following salaries shall be paid to the several justices and judges hereinafter mentioned, namely:

To the chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, $15,500 per year, and to each of the associate justices thereof, $15,000 per year.

To each of the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, $12,500.

SEC. 2. All of said salaries shall be paid in equal monthly installments.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first month next following its approval.

This is the letter I wrote on the date indicated:

JUNE 10, 1948.

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: In compliance with my promise, I went into the questions which trouble me arising out of the Senate bill 1052, increasing the salaries of certain Hawaiian judges, and I have restudied them in the light of the memorandum you submitted to me yesterday morning. Also in compliance with that promise I telephoned your office yesterday afternoon after I had been unable to find you on the floor or in the Capitol. I was told by your secretary, who was most gracious, that you were engaged in an important conference and could not be reached, so I left a message for you with her that still I was unable to change my attitude toward this legislation, as much as I regretted not being able to "go along."

May I clear up some points as to which there seems to be misapprehension as evidenced by the memoranda which have been submitted in support of the bill?

1. Public Law 567 did not omit the judges of the supreme and circuit courts of Hawaii inadvertently. The courts these judges serve are Territorial, not Federal. Herewith enclosed I beg to hand you a copy of Public Law 567, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 31, 1946. You will notice that it covers and increases the salaries of the judges of the several district courts of the United States, of Hawaii, and fixes their increased compensation at the rate of $10,000 per year, just as was fixed thereby for all other district courts exercising Federal jurisdiction.

2. Public Law 567, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, was designed to cover only judges exercising Federal jurisdiction, or, as we commonly refer to them, "title III judges." It was not intended to cover Territorial judges any more than it was intended to cover judges of State courts. Until the passage of the Reorganization Act the Judiciary Committees had no jurisdiction to propose legislation for Territorial courts nor their judges. This jurisdiction was in and exercised by the Committee on Territories. The only other bill similar to S. 1052 that has ever been handled by the Judiciary Committee of the House was the bill aimed at including the Territorial judges of Hawaii in the retirement system applying to Federal courts. This bill was adversed by our committee on the same theory which now applies to S. 1052.

3. The only exceptions to the rule I am following in this case are those caused by Senate amendments and not by any action of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

4. The Department of Justice did not and has not approved nor recommended the passage of S. 1052 nor its House counterpart.

5. Neither the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges nor the Administrative Office of the United States Courts had any jurisdiction with reference to the subject matter of S. 1052, since that bill relates exclusively to judges of Territorial courts; hence neither of these organizations nor the Bureau of the Budget has approved nor recommended this proposed legislation.

6. It is easy to understand and appreciate the attitude of the bench and bar of Hawaii toward the remedial legislation proposed by S. 1052. It should be borne in mind, however, that if Hawaii becomes a State, it would have to bear every cent of the cost of its State courts, including the judges, and these courts that are now Territorial would be by statehood converted into State courts. The President of the United States has recommended statehood for Hawaii, and the House passed the bill making Hawaii the forty-ninth State of our Union by an overwhelming majority. Should the Senate join in the enactment of the House bill, there would be no necessity whatever for the enactment of S. 1052, increasing the salaries provided for Territorial judges, who would then have become extinct.

Cordially your friend,

SAM HOBBS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6635) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDING PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6732) to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in poliomyelitis and other diseases, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this legislation came to the House from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am hopeful that I may have the attention of the objectors if their mind is open. Unfortunately it would seem from the remarks that have been made, not for the record, but for my hearing at least, that the mind of at least one objector is not open.

It is difficult for me to conceive how any individual who has given even the slightest consideration to this bill would make any objection to it. This House during this session of Congress has made a splendid record in its effort to do those things that would be helpful in promoting the public health of this Nation. We have passed a bill that would set up a heart research institution, and a dental institute. We have already done so with respect to cancer. In numerous ways we have strengthened and built up the Public Health Service. We now have before us a bill that touches our very hearts. It deals with that type of dread disease that has come into many homes. It is a disease that may strike overnight. To see the victims of polio handicapped as they are so frequently touches the heart of every human being. To see a child who has been afflicted with polio creates in us a desire to help. It creates a feeling of thankfulness that our own little ones have not felt its devastation, and a prayer for those who have.

This bill permits the Surgeon General to study the question with the thought in mind that after such study and survey there might be with his approval set up an institute for research in this disease that strikes our little ones, and even older persons so frequently, and so often creates epidemics. I do hope that no one will object to the consideration of this bill. Think of those in whose interest we seek to provide this helpful service. Think of those whom we seek to help and those whom we seek to guard against the ravages of this disease. I hope in the interest of these that the objectors and other Members of the House will permit this bill to go through the House today, so that this worthy bill may have the attention of the Senate at this session of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey that the bill go over without prejudice?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6657) to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GOODWIN. I object.

AIR PARCEL POST

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6773) to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COURT REVIEW OF ORDERS OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1470) to provide for the review of orders of the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and of certain orders of the Secretary of Agriculture made under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

THREE-JUDGE DISTRICT COURTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2271) to incorporate into the Judicial Code the provisions of certain statutes relating to three-judge district courts, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COMMISSION TO HEAR AND DETERMINE THE CLAIMS OF CERTAIN MOTOR CARRIERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1260) to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. BYRNES of Wisconsin, DAVIS of Wisconsin, and SCRIVNER objected.

TRAINING OF AIR-TRAFFIC-CONTROL-TOWER OPERATORS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3) to provide for the training of air-traffic-control operators.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the minority side has no report on this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this is a Senate bill and comes under a Senate report which accompanies the bill in House Report No. 2207. It is a bill introduced by the Senator from Nevada, Mr. MCCARRAN. I trust the gentleman will not object.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, we have no report on this side.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the gentleman like to hear what the bill does?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. It authorizes a program for air-traffic-control-tower operators, both civilian and governmental. In connection with the training program, it authorizes the Civil Aeronautics Administrator to conduct studies and researches as to the most desirable qualifications for air-traffic-control-tower operators. This bill provides that the Civil Aeronautics Administrator shall propose a budget in connection with it in the

next budget presentation. It makes no appropriation at the present time. We find it very difficult indeed to secure competent control-tower operators and you know how important that is to air traffic in your own home cities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 302 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding a new subsection (d) to read as follows:

"(d) (1) The Administrator is authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress, to train civilian and governmental air-traffic-control-tower operators or to conduct programs for such training, including studies and researches as to the most desirable qualifications for air-traffic-control-tower operators. Such training or programs shall be conducted pursuant to such regulations as the Administrator may from time to time prescribe, including such fees as the Administrator may deem necessary or desirable. Such training or programs may be carried out by the Administrator either through the use of his own facilities and personnel or by contracts with educational institutions, or other persons.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to lease or accept loans of such real property, and to purchase, lease, exchange, or accept loans of such personal property and facilities, and to repair, maintain, and operate such property and such facilities, as may be necessary or desirable for carrying out the provisions of this section.

"(3) For the purpose of carrying out his functions under this section, the Administrator is authorized to exercise all powers conferred upon him by any other provisions of this act and to appoint and fix the compensation for instructors, airmen, medical and other professional examiners, and experts in training or research without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to contracts with educational institutions and other persons for the use of aircraft, control towers, or other facilities or for the performance of services authorized by this section.

"(4) Any executive department or independent establishment is hereby authorized to cooperate with the Administrator in carrying out the purposes of this section, and for such purposes may lend or transfer to the Administrator, by contract or otherwise, or if so requested by the Administrator, lend to educational institutions or other persons cooperating with the Administrator in the conduct of any such training or program, officials, experts, or employees, aircraft, control towers and other property or equipment, and lands or buildings under its control. For the purposes of this section, the Administrator shall have the power to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, equipment, facilities, and information of any State, Territory, or political subdivision, or any agency thereof.

"(5) Any executive department or independent establishment is hereby authorized to detail personnel of such executive department or independent establishment to be trained as provided herein at Government expense: *Provided*, That no such personnel shall lose their individual status or seniority rating in the executive department or independent establishment merely by reason of absence due to such training.

"(6) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALARIES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES IN PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2508) relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have no reports on any of the bills following on the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I will have to ask for a short explanation on each of these bills. I would like to have an explanation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the pay of certain employees who are on the pay roll in Puerto Rico representing the Federal Government and also for the annual salaries of the chief justice and associate justices of Puerto Rico, whose salaries remain at $6,000 under the organic act passed by the Congress many, many years ago. This is a bill to somewhat alleviate the economic pressure under which these public officials find themselves in that their salaries cannot be increased by reason of the fixation of the organic act.

The committee has unanimously approved the bill and feels that these increases are justified.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask if those are Territorial judges or Federal judges?

Mr. CRAWFORD. These are the salaries of the chief justice and associate justices of Puerto Rico whose salaries were fixed by organic act.

Mr. HOBBS. They are Territorial judges?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. HOBBS. Not Territorial judges.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Insular possessions.

Mr. HOBBS. Well, whatever they are.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (1) of section 40b of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 793b (1)) is amended by striking out "$7,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000 to be paid out of funds appropriated by Congress for such purpose."

SEC. 2. Section 50 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, secs. 797 and 798) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 50. Except as otherwise provided in this or any other act, the salaries and office expenses of all officials of Puerto Rico, including deputies, assistants, and other help, shall be such and be so paid out of the revenues of Puerto Rico as shall from time to time be determined by the legislature of Puerto Rico and approved by the Governor; and if the legislature shall fail to make an appropriation for such salaries, the salaries theretofore fixed shall be paid without the necessity of further appropriations therefor. Until otherwise prescribed as provided by this section the annual salary of the Governor shall be $10,000; in addition to which he shall be entitled to the occupancy of the buildings heretofore used by the chief executive of Puerto Rico, with the furniture and effects therein, free of rental; and the annual salary of the head of each executive department shall be $6,000.

"Notwithstanding the foregoing, the annual salary of the chief justice of the supreme court shall be $10,500, and the annual salary of each associate justice of the supreme court shall be $10,000. All of said salaries of the chief justice and associate justices shall be paid in equal monthly installments.

"Where any officer, during such time as his salary is fixed by this act, is required to give a bond, the premium thereof shall be paid from the insular treasury."

SEC. 3. So much of section 34 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 838) as reads "Except as otherwise provided in this act, no law shall extend the term of any public officer, or increase or diminish his salary or emoluments after his election or appointment, nor permit any officer or employee to draw compensation for more than one office or position." is amended to read as follows:

"Except as otherwise provided in this act, no law shall extend the term of any public officer, permit any officer or employee to draw compensation for more than one office or position, or increase or diminish the salary or emoluments of any senator or representative during the term for which he is elected or appointed."

SEC. 4. Section 31 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 820) is amended by striking out "That members" and inserting in lieu thereof "Until otherwise prescribed pursuant to section 50 of this act, members."

SEC. 5. Section 20 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 786) is amended by inserting after "$6,000" the following: "or such other sum not less than that payable to the head of any executive department as may be prescribed pursuant to section 50 of this act."

SEC. 6. Section 22 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 779) is amended by inserting after "$5,000" the following: "or such other sum as may be prescribed pursuant to section 50 of this act."

SEC. 7. The third and fourth sentences of section 38 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 750) are amended to read as follows: "The public service commissioner shall devote his entire time to his duties as such commissioner. Until otherwise prescribed pursuant to section 50 of this act—

"(a) the salary of the public service commissioner shall be $6,000 a year, and

"(b) the compensation of the associated members shall be $10 for each day's attendance at the sessions of the commission, but in no case shall they receive more than $1,000 during any 1 year."

SEC. 8. This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2675) to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain briefly what this bill does?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The purpose of this bill is to exempt Puerto Ricans, who were collectively naturalized as citizens of the United States, from the expatriation provisions of section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

Now, we have this situation with respect to Puerto Rico. When we took over Puerto Rico some 50 years ago they went ahead under the jurisdiction of the United States until the organic act was passed, at which time Puerto Ricans were made citizens of the United States and naturalized. Then in 1940 there was an act passed which provided that if Puerto Ricans who had, prior to that time become naturalized citizens of the United States under the act of Congress should leave Puerto Rico, for instance to go to Brazil, and remove themselves from Puerto Rico for a period of 5 years, let us say, that they would lose their citizenship. That was the 1940 act. This bill seeks to remedy that situation; that Puerto Ricans, who are citizens of the United States, may leave Puerto Rico for a period of 5 years, and still retain their citizenship as citizens of the United States, and the committee has felt that they should thus be protected.

Mr. CARROLL. Was this bill unanimously reported?

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand, the bill was reported unanimously by the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs.

Mr. CARROLL. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (39 Stat. 951) is amended by inserting the following new section:

"SEC. 5b. Section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 804 (c)), shall not be applicable to persons who acquired citizenship under the provisions of sections 5 and 5a of this act." This amendment to be retroactive to October 13, 1945.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSERVATION OF FRESH WATER AT END OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 618) requesting the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report on the feasibility from the standpoint of national defense and other beneficial purposes of the conservation of fresh water at the northerly end of San Francisco Bay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, after hearing the explanation on H. R. 750, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the proper conservation and use of the waters arising in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Basins of California constitute an invaluable resource to the State of California and the Nation; and

Whereas the development of the major portion of the central part of the State of California depends upon the wise utilization and conservation of those waters; and

Whereas there are needs for further freshwater supplies in the Delta area of the Sacramento River down to San Francisco Bay; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior has made a portion of the investigation necessary to ascertain the best means to provide fresh-water supplies for reclamation, domestic, and municipal purposes in this area; and

Whereas any means to conserve and utilize fresh water in the Delta and upper bay areas would have to be coordinated with the operation of Shasta Dam, Keswick Dam, Friant Dam, the Contra Costa Canal, and other facilities of the Central Valley project, and pertinent features of future development in the Central Valley, such as the Monticello Reservoir of the Solano project, such features being constructed and operated, or planned, by the Bureau of Reclamation; and

Whereas the San Francisco Bay area and the territory adjacent thereto are of high strategic importance to any adequate defense of the Pacific Coast; and

Whereas the conservation and use of such fresh waters is important to the maintenance of defense facilities in this area, such as Mare Island Navy Yard, Hunters Point Navy Yard, Risdon Naval Plant, Oakland Naval Air Base, Oakland Supply Base, Stockton Annex Navy Supply Depot, Benicia Arsenal, the Presidio Military Reservation, Fort Winfield Scott, Fort Mason, the Army transport docks, Fort Barry, Fort Baker, United States Army Signal Department, Stockton General Depot, United States Army Moffett Air Field, United States Bombardment Base Mather Field Air Force, Fairfield-Suisun Air Base United States Air Force, Sacramento-McClellan United States Air Field, Merced Air Field United States Air Force; and

Whereas because of the huge shift of population to California unparalleled in the history of this Nation, even with normal precipitation it will be impossible to meet the demands of the civilian population, let alone the military and defense and power facilities required for their support unless the limited water supplies are utilized to the fullest possible degree; and

Whereas it is estimated that some 37,700,000 acre-feet of fresh water from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers are now wasting into the Bay of San Francisco annually; and

Whereas it is imperative that necessary steps be taken at the earliest practicable moment to conserve fresh water for semiarid California in the interest of the economy and the development of the area and of the national defense: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to investigate and report upon the feasibility and the justification of means to conserve, maintain, and utilize the fresh waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and other possible water supplies at the northerly end of San Francisco Bay and in the Delta area, and in this connection to consider the water requirements and facilities required to provide water supplies to lands which are now irrigated, or may be reclaimed, and for domestic, municipal, and defense purposes in the affected area, and any other features deemed pertinent, desirable, and justifiable, all to be contained in a report with appropriate recommendations to be forwarded to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior as soon as practicable.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 2, strike out "is hereby authorized and directed to" and insert "should."

Page 3, line 15, strike out section 2.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report on the feasibility from the standpoint of national defense and other beneficial purposes of the conservation of fresh water at the northerly end of San Francisco Bay."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURCHASE OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR HOME AND OTHER SITES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5555) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the same situation obtains here as with respect to H. R. 750. Therefore, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended by the act approved July 14, 1945 (59 Stat. 467; 43 U. S. C. sec. 682 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, is authorized to sell or lease to any person or organization described in section 3 of this act a tract of not exceeding five acres of any vacant, unreserved public lands, public lands withdrawn by Executive Orders Nos. 6910 of November 26, 1934, and 6964 of February 5, 1935, for classification, or public lands withdrawn or reserved by the Secretary of the Interior for any purposes, which the Secretary may classify as chiefly valuable for residence, recreation, business, or community site purposes, in reasonably compact form and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, at a price to be determined by him, for such use: *Provided*, That no land may be sold hereunder unless it has been surveyed. No person or organization shall be permitted to purchase or lease more than one tract under the provisions of this act, except upon a showing of good faith and reasons satisfactory to the Secretary.

"SEC. 2. No tract shall be sold for less than the cost of making any survey necessary to describe properly the land sold. Patents for all tracts purchased under the provisions of this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of the oil, gas, and all other mineral deposits, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.

"SEC. 3. A lease may be issued or a sale made under this act to any of the following: (a) An individual who is a citizen of the United States, or who has filed his declaration of intention to become a citizen as required by the naturalization laws; (b) a partnership or an association, each of the members of which is a citizen of the United States or has filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen; (c) a corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof, and authorized to do business in the State or Territory in which the land is located; (d) a State, Territory, municipality, or other governmental subdivision.

"SEC. 4. Any employee of the Department and scientific positions in the headquar-

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reserva-

and welfare; to secure the national de-

"SEC. 4. Any employee of the Department of the Interior, stationed in Alaska, notwithstanding such employment, may, in the discretion of the Secretary, purchase or lease under this act one tract for residence purposes in the Territory of Alaska."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "purposes", insert "if he finds that such sale or lease of the lands would not unreasonably interfere with the use of water for grazing purposes nor unduly impair the protection of watershed areas."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES TRAVEL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6136) to amend the act to encourage travel in the United States, approved July 19, 1940.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 773), entitled "An act to encourage travel in the United States, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to encourage, promote, and develop travel within the United States, its Territories and possessions, providing such activities do not compete with the activities of private agencies. For the purpose of performing the functions prescribed by this act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior a bureau, to be designated the 'United States Travel Bureau,' which shall be under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior. The chief administrative officer of the United States Travel Bureau shall be a Director, suitably qualified by education and experience relating to travel promotion and development, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. There shall also be in the United States Travel Bureau such additional employees, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, as shall be required to execute properly the functions prescribed by this act. The Secretary is authorized and directed to take such action, through the United States Travel Bureau, as he may deem appropriate to carry out the intent and the provisions of this act efficiently and in the public interest. In the administration of this act, the Secretary may also utilize the facilities or services of any other agency of the Department of the Interior."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of said act of July 19, 1940, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: Page 1, line 10, after "of", insert "public or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6895) to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we have an explanation of the purpose of this bill?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, a year ago this Congress lifted the ceiling on salaries of employees who are trained scientists so the War and Navy Departments may employ as many as 45 men who are trained in science, and can pay as high as $15,000 per year if they desire to do so. They have filled only six of these positions. That legislation applied only to the War and Navy Departments. This bill assigns 10 of those positions to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, so that they can employ men at salaries of more than $10,000 a year if they see fit to do so. This is a very important piece of legislation for the reason that the National Advisory Committee is presently engaged in some very highly technical research and needs scientists.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. As I understand, this bill provides for employing up to 10 of these professional men at salaries in excess of $10,000, but what salaries will they get?

Mr. REES. I am glad to explain. It should be explained. Those who testified on behalf of the agencies told us they will pay salaries of about $12,000, but they may have to pay one or two of the men as high as $15,000. These trained men whom they need can go into industry, as the gentleman well knows, and earn higher salaries than $15,000. They say that a number of these men are leaving the Government. The most valuable men are leaving the Government and going into private industry.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas whether full hearings were held on the bill?

Mr. REES. Full hearings were held. Dr. Alfred M. Richardson, who is president of the National Academy of Science, and who is familiar with the problem, called our attention to the fact that we are spending millions of dollars in research presently in connection with our defense program. Compared to that sum, the small amount involved in this bill is infinitesimal.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Was the committee unanimous in its report?

Mr. REES. The committee was unanimous. The chairman of the committee, as the gentleman knows, happens to be one of those who have always tried to hold the ceilings down just as much as could be done within reason, but he is convinced, and every member of the committee was convinced, that this proposed legislation is necessary at the present time and ought to be passed. I do appreciate the gentleman's interest in this matter. It appears to be a case of necessity.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am sure the gentleman and I are equally interested in economy. I thank him for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments", approved August 1, 1947, is hereby amended to read as follows: "That (a) the Secretary of the Army is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, within the Department of the Army, not more than 30 positions, and the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, within the Department of the Navy, not more than 15 positions, in the professional and scientific service, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions, relating to the national defense, military and naval medicine, and any and all other activities of the Department of the Army or the Department of the Navy which require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel.

"(b) The Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, not to exceed 10 positions in the professional and scientific service, each such position being established in order to enable the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to secure and retain the services of specially qualified personnel necessary in the discharge of the duty of the committee to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution.

"(c) The rates of compensation for positions established pursuant to the provisions of this act shall not be less than $10,000 per annum nor more than $15,000 per annum and shall be subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act of August 1, 1947, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, respectively, shall submit to the Congress, not later than December 31 of each year, a report setting forth the number of positions established pursuant to this act in the Department of the Army, in the Department of the Navy, and in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, respectively, during that calendar year, and the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent, together with a statement of the functions performed by each. In any instance where the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics may consider full public report on these items detrimental to the national security, he is authorized to omit such items from his annual report and, in lieu thereof, to present such information in executive sessions of such committees of the Senate and House of Representatives as the presiding officers of those bodies shall designate."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION BILL OF 1948

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6007) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity,

and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, this seems to be a very important bill. We passed it in the House once but the President vetoed it. I think it is too important to be brought up by unanimous consent. I therefore object.

FOREST SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2028) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I had intended to object to the consideration of this bill because of the committee amendment inserting section 12. My understanding is that this committee amendment will be withdrawn. May I ask the author of the bill, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF] if that is correct?

Mr. GOFF. I am authorized to state for the chairman of the committee that if consent is given to the consideration of the bill we will withdraw the committee amendment to which the gentleman refers, that is, the one inserting section 12.

Mr. ROCKWELL. With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of existing law and without regard to section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), but within the limitations of cost otherwise applicable, appropriations of the Forest Service may be expended for the erection of buildings, lookout towers, and other structures on land owned by States, counties, municipalities, or other political subdivisions, corporations, or individuals: *Provided*, That prior to such erection there is obtained the right to use the land for the estimated life of or need for the structure.

SEC. 2. That so much of the act of June 30, 1914 (38 Stat. 415, 429, 16 U. S. C. 504), as provides: "That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may procure such seed, cones, and nursery stock by open purchase, without advertisements for proposals, whenever in his discretion such method is most economical and in the public interest and when the cost thereof will not exceed $500:", is hereby amended to read as follows: "That the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not apply to any purchase by the Forest Service of forest-tree seed or cones or of forage plant seed when the amount involved does not exceed $10,000, nor to any purchase of forest-tree nursery stock when the amount involved does not exceed $500, whenever, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, such method is in the public interest."

SEC. 3. The provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not apply to purcheses by the Forest Service of (1) materials to be tested or upon which experiments are to be made or (2) special devices, test models, or parts thereof, to be used (a) for experimentation to determine their suitability for or adaptability to accomplishment of the work for which designed or (b) in the designing or developing of new equipment: *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 may be expended in any one fiscal year pursuant to this authority.

SEC. 4. That section 205 of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, approved September 21, 1944 (Public Law 425, 78th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 205. The Forest Service by contract or otherwise may provide for procurement and operation of aerial facilities and services for the protection and management of the national forests, with authority to renew any contract for such purpose annually, not more than twice, without additional advertising."

SEC. 5. That section 1 of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1132; 16 U. S. C. 572), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1. (a) The Forest Service is authorized to cooperate with, or where the public interest justifies, assist public and private agencies, organizations, institutions, and persons in performing work on land in State, county, municipal, or private ownership, situated within or near a national forest, for which the administering agency, owner, or other interested party deposits in one or more payments a sufficient sum to cover the total estimated cost or the depositor's share thereof, for administration, protection, improvement, reforestation, and such other kinds of work as the Forest Service is authorized to do on lands of the United States: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be liable to the depositor or landowner for any damage incident to the performance of such work.

"(b) Cooperation and assistance on the same basis as that authorized in subsection (a) is authorized also in the performance of any such kinds of work in connection with the occupancy or use of the national forests or other lands administered by the Forest Service.

"(c) Moneys deposited under this section shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund, which is hereby made available until expended for payment of the cost of work performed by the Forest Service and for refunds to depositors of amounts deposited by them in excess of their share of said cost: *Provided*, That when deposits are received for a number of similar types of work on adjacent or overlapping areas, or on areas which in the aggregate are determined to cover a single work unit, they may be expended on such combined areas for the purposes for which deposited, in which event refunds to the depositors of the total amount of the excess deposits involved will be made on a proportionate basis: *Provided further*, That when so provided by written agreement payment for work undertaken pursuant to this section may be made from any Forest Service appropriation available for similar types of work, and reimbursement received from said agencies, organizations, institutions, or persons covering their proportionate share of the cost shall be deposited to the credit of the Forest Service appropriation from which initially paid or to appropriations for similar purposes currently available at the time of deposit: *Provided further*, That when by the terms of a written agreement either party thereto furnishes materials, supplies, equipment, or services for fire emergencies in excess of its proportionate share, adjustment may be made by reimbursement or by replacement in kind of supplies, materials, and equipment consumed or destroyed in excess of the furnishing party's proportionate share."

SEC. 6. That so much of the act of August 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 446, 462; 16 U. S. C. 490), as provides: "That hereafter deposits may be received from timber purchasers in such sums as the Secretary of Agriculture may require to cover the cost to the United States of disposing of brush and other debris resulting from cutting operations in sales of national-forest timber; such deposits shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund, which is hereby appropriated and made available until expended, as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, to pay the cost of such work and to make refunds to the depositors of amounts deposited by them in excess of such cost.", is hereby amended to read as follows: "Purchasers of national-forest timber may be required to deposit the estimated cost to the United States of disposing of brush and other debris resulting from their cutting operations, such deposits to be covered into the Treasury and constitute a special fund, which is hereby appropriated and shall remain available for three fiscal years following the year of deposit: *Provided*, That any deposits in excess of the amount expended for disposals shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts, forest-reserve fund, to be credited to the receipts of the year in which such transfer is made."

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture, under such regulations as he may prescribe and at rates and for periods not exceeding 30 years as determined by him, is hereby authorized to permit the use by public and private agencies, corporations, firms, associations, or individuals, of structures or improvements under the administrative control of the Forest Service and land used in connection therewith: *Provided*, That as all or a part of the consideration for permits issued under this section, the Secretary may require the permittees at their expense to recondition and maintain the structures to a satisfactory standard.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to furnish persons attending Forest Service demonstrations, and users of national-forest resources and recreational facilities, with meals, lodging, bedding, fuel, and other services, where such facilities are not otherwise available, at rates approximating but not less than the actual or estimated cost thereof and to deposit all moneys received therefor to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost thereof is paid, or a similar appropriation current at the time the moneys are received: *Provided*, That such receipts obtained in excess of $10,000 in any one fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, subject to such conditions as he may prescribe, to sell forest-tree seed and nursery stock to States and political subdivisions thereof and to public agencies of other countries, at rates not less than the actual or estimated cost to the United States of procuring or producing such seed or nursery stock, moneys received from the sale thereof to be credited to the appropriation or appropriations of the Forest Service currently available for the procurement or production of seed or nursery stock at the time such moneys are deposited: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may exchange with such public agencies forest-tree seed and nursery stock for forest-tree seed or nursery stock of the same or different species upon a determination that such exchange is in the interest of the United States and that the value of the property given in exchange does not exceed the value of the property received: *Provided further*, That no nursery stock shall be sold or exchanged under this section as ornamental or other stock for landscape planting of the types commonly grown by established commercial nurserymen.

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 7 of the act of August 23, 1912, as amended (31 U. S. C. 679), appropriations for the protection and management of the national forests shall be available to pay for telephone service installed in residences of seasonal employees and of persons cooperating with the Forest Service who reside within or near the national forests when such installation is needed in protecting the national forests: *Provided*, That in addition to the monthly local service charge the Government may pay only such tolls or other

charges as are required strictly for the public business.

SEC. 11. Whenever such action is deemed to be in the public interest, the Forest Service is authorized to pay from any appropriation available for the protection and management of the national forests all or any part of the cost of leasing, seeding, and protective fencing of public range land other than national-forest land and privately owned land intermingled with or adjacent to national-forest or other land administered by the Forest Service, if the use of the land to be seeded is controlled by the Forest Service under a lease or agreement which in the judgment of the Chief of the Forest Service gives the Forest Service control over the land for a sufficient period to justify such expenditures: *Provided*, That payment may not be made under authority of this section for the seeding of more than 1,000 acres in any one private ownership: *Provided further*, That payment may not be made under authority of this section for the seeding of more than 25,000 acres in any one fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the period of any lease under this authority may not exceed 20 years.

SEC. 12. Appropriations of the Forest Service available for fire protection on the national forests or for cooperation with State and other agencies in fire protection may be expended for the procurement of printed material needed to conduct campaigns for the prevention of forest fires: *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriation for "National-forest protection and management," and not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriation for "Forest-fire cooperation" may be transferred in any one fiscal year to the appropriation "Printing and binding, Department of Agriculture," for such purposes.

SEC. 13. That section 5 of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1133; 16 U. S. C. 555), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Where no suitable Government land is available for national-forest headquarters, ranger stations, dwellings, or for other sites required for the effective conduct of the authorized activities of the Forest Service, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to purchase such lands out of the appropriation applicable to the purpose for which the land is to be used, and to accept donations of land for any national-forest or experimental purpose: *Provided*, That such lands may be acquired subject to such reservations and outstanding interests as the Secretary determines will not interfere with the purpose for which acquired: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $25,000 may be expended in any one fiscal year pursuant to this authority."

SEC. 14. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated—

(a) such sums as may be necessary for the acquisition of parcels of land and interests in land in Sanders County, Mont., needed by the Forest Service to provide winter range for its saddle, pack, and draft animals;

(b) not to exceed $15,000 for the acquisition of additional land adjacent to the present site of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.; and

(c) not to exceed $25,000 for the acquisition of one helicopter landing site in southern California.

Land acquired under this section may be subject to such reservations and outstanding interests as the Secretary of Agriculture determines will not interfere with the purpose for which acquired.

SEC. 15. That section 6 of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1133; 16 U. S. C. 557), is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "*Provided*, That when a transient without permanent residence, or any other person while away from his place of residence, is temporarily employed by the Forest Service and while so employed becomes disabled because of injury or illness not attributable to official work, he may be provided hospitalization and other necessary medical care, subsistence, and lodging for a period of not to exceed 15 days during such disability, the cost thereof to be payable from any funds available to the Forest Service applicable to the work for which such person is employed."

SEC. 16. Appropriations of the Forest Service chargeable with salaries and wages shall be available for payment to temporary employees of the Forest Service for loss of time due to injury in official work at rates not in excess of those provided by the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C., 751 and the following), when the injured person is in need of immediate financial assistance to avoid hardship: *Provided*, That such payment shall not be made for a period in excess of 15 days and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission shall be notified promptly of the amount so paid, which amount shall be deducted from the amount, if any, otherwise payable by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission to the employee on account of the injury, the amount so deducted by the Commission to be paid to the Forest Service for deposit to the credit of the Forest Service appropriation from which the expenditure was made: *Provided further*, That when any person assisting in the suppression of forest fires or in other emergency work under the direction of the Forest Service, without compensation from the United States, pursuant to the terms of a contract, agreement, or permit, is injured in such work, the Forest Service may furnish hospitalization and other medical care, subsistence, and lodging for a period of not to exceed 15 days during such disability, the cost thereof to be payable from the appropriation applicable to the work upon which the injury occurred, except that this proviso shall not apply when such person is within the purview of a State or other compensation act: *Provided further*, That determination by the Forest Service that payment is allowable under this section shall be final as to payments made hereunder, but such determination or payments with respect to employees shall not prevent the United States Employees' Compensation Commission from denying further payments should the Commission determine that compensation is not properly allowable under the provisions of the Employees' Compensation Act.

SEC. 17. (a) Section 2 of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1132; 16 U. S. C. 571); the second proviso in section 1 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 699; 16 U. S. C. 581); and section 1 of the act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 387; 16 U. S. C. 573), are hereby repealed.

(b) The second proviso in section 13 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961, 963), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Section 1: At the end of the section, strike out the period and substitute in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "including the right to remove any such structure within a reasonable time after the termination of the right to use the land."

Section 3: Immediately preceding the period at the end of the section, insert the following: "and not to exceed $10,000 on any one item or purchase."

Section 4: Strike out "(Public Law 425, 78th Cong.)" and substitute in lieu thereof: "(58 Stat. 736, 16 U. S. C. 579a)".

Section 5: In the first line of subsection (a) insert after the word "authorized" a comma and the following: "where the public interest justifies,"; strike out the same words where they appear in the second line of that subsection, and also strike out the comma after the word "with" in that line.

Section 6: In the new language of this section, after the words "shall remain available" (p. 6, line 5), strike out the words "for three fiscal years following the year of deposit" and insert in lieu thereof the words "until expended."

Section 7: In the last line of this section, after the word "structures", insert the words "and land."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Following section 11 insert a new section, numbered 12, as follows:

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture, when in his judgment such action will be in the public interest, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, may require any grazing permittee of a national forest to make deposits of money, in addition to payments for the use of the range, to cover the cost to the United States of (1) artificial revegetation, including the collection or purchase of necessary seed, (2) construction and maintenance of drift or division fences and stock-watering places, bridges, corrals, driveways, or other necessary range improvements, (3) control of range-destroying rodents, or (4) eradication of poisonous plants and noxious weeds, on such national forest in order to protect or improve the future productivity of the range: *Provided*, That such deposits shall constitute a special fund, without fiscal year limitation, to be available to cover the cost to the United States of such artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous or noxious plants: *Provided further*, That whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that any portion of any deposit is in excess of the cost of doing said work, such excess shall be transferred to Miscellaneous Receipts, Forest Reserve Fund, as a national-forest receipt of the fiscal year in which such transfer is made."

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this committee amendment be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Section 12 et seq.: Change the section numbers to conform to the above amendment.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the previous amendment inserting a new section 12 was withdrawn, it is unnecessary to change the section numbers. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Section 14, in subsection (b), strike out "$15,000" and insert "$50,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4330) to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until such time as the President shall determine and proclaim that a German Government capable of representing its own nationals in the United States and its Territories and possessions has been established, and under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, the Department of State is authorized to perform consular functions for German nationals within the United States and its Territories and possessions, and to collect fees and make charges for services rendered: *Provided*, That any money so received shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING TWO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6822) to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of Ohio). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the author of the bill how long this continues these two additional Secretaries of State?

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, up to 1946 we had four Assistant Secretaries of State. At that time we appointed two additional Assistant Secretaries of State for what was in effect a term of 2 years. This term will expire on December 31, 1948. I do not think it requires argument to show that at the present time our foreign relations and the work of the Secretary of State with reference thereto is fully as complex and voluminous as it was at that time. All this bill does is to extend that time for 1 year further.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman inform the House whether these Secretaries are concerned with the Voice of America?

Mr. JONKMAN. Of course, it falls within the province of one of these Secretaries, but, if this bill is not passed, it would not be certain as to which two Assistant Secretaries of State would be eliminated. There would have to be a general reshuffling so as to have the work now done by six Assistant Secretaries of State done by four Assistant Secretaries of State.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, insofar as this is only for a period of 1 year and recognizing that the affairs of the State Department are in a horrible mess, I withdraw my reservation of objection in the hope that in another year things will improve.

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of December 8, 1944 (58 Stat. 798), is hereby amended by deleting the words "not to exceed 2 years" and inserting in lieu thereof, the words "not to exceed 3 years."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6698) to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill if the course of instruction is paid for by the Philippine Republic or by the United States.

Mr. TOWE. By the United States.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Why should the United States be paying for their instruction now that they have been given their independence?

Mr. TOWE. We have done it on other occasions. We have men at both Academies.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is that the custom of the United States, to pay for it, as well as the Philippines?

Mr. TOWE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw the reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to permit, upon designation of the President of the United States, not exceeding four Filipinos at a time, one for each class, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md. The Filipinos receiving instruction under authority of this act shall receive the same pay, allowances, and emoluments, to be paid from the same appropriations, and, subject to such exceptions as may be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, shall be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as midshipmen at the Naval Academy appointed from the United States; but such persons shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Navy by reason of their graduation from the Naval Academy.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "time", strike out "one for each class."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECREATIONAL PARK ON THE GROUNDS OF UNITED STATES NAVAL HOSPITAL, GREAT LAKES, ILL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2251) to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States naval hospital, United States Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States naval hospital, United States Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., for the convenience and pleasure of the patients of that hospital.

SEC. 2. The site of the recreational park and its construction shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy. The construction of the recreational park and all work performed in connection therewith shall be without cost to the United States.

SEC. 3. Upon completion of the recreational park the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to accept it as an unconditional gift to the United States from the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT MOULTRIE MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2912) providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed without compensation to the State of South Carolina, that portion of land constituting the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation, together with the buildings and other improvements thereto, and the rights and appurtenances thereto belonging or appertaining, determined by him to be surplus to the requirements of the War Department.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain the provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency to exist, upon the determination by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have a right without paying compensation to reenter upon such property and use the same or any part thereof for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency.

SEC. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that if the State of South Carolina shall, at any time, cease to use the property so conveyed for public purposes, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "War" and insert the words "the Army."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "War" and insert after the word "Department" the words "of the Army."

Page 2, line 4, strike out the words "War or" and insert "the Army."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "Navy," insert "or the Secretary of the Air Force."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACKSON BARRACKS MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3479) providing for the conveyance to the State of Louisiana of that portion of the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has there been any inquiry made of the Veterans' Administration as to whether any of this property might be used for veterans' hospitals?

Mr. ELSTON. We did not hear of any objection on the part of the Veterans' Administration. There was nothing before our committee indicating that the Veterans' Administration could use this property for hospital purposes.

Mr. BROOKS. I hardly think they are suitable for that purpose, in any event.

Mr. ELSTON. I think not.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed without compensation to the State of Louisiana that portion of land constituting the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation situated in Orleans Parish, La., together with the buildings and other improvements thereto, and the rights and appurtenances thereto belonging or appertaining, determined to be surplus to the requirements of the War Department.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain the provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency to exist, upon the determination by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have a right without paying compensation to reenter upon such property and use the same or any part thereof for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency.

SEC. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that if the State of Louisiana shall at any time cease to use the property so conveyed for military purposes, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 4. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that the action of the Governor of the State of Louisiana in receiving the property described herein on behalf of the State of Louisiana shall be subject to the power of the Legislature of Louisiana to rescind the donation and stipulations made pursuant thereto, as required by section 64 of Act 164 of the Regular Session of 1940, as amended, acts of the Legislature of Louisiana.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "War" and insert "the Army."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the word "War" and, after the word "Department", insert "of the Army."

Page 2, line 6, strike out the word "War" and insert "the Army."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "War" and insert "the Army."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "War" and after the word "Department", insert "of the Army."

Page 2, line 4, strike out the word "War" and insert "the Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of Louisiana of that portion of the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT NEW YORK NAVAL SHIPYARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6709) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York a perpetual easement in, over, and upon a twenty-nine one-hundredths acre parcel of land at the New York Naval Shipyard.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to grant to the city of New York without cost to said city, and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may consider appropriate, a perpetual easement for public-highway purposes in, over, and upon a parcel of land containing twenty-nine one-hundredths acre, more or less, lying between the New York Naval Shipyard, Hudson Avenue and York Street in the Borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, metes-and-bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY JUSTICE IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5937) to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have this bill explained.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is for the purpose of providing for the administration of military justice in the United States Air Force. A similar bill has passed the other body. I might say to the gentleman that the only purpose in asking for the passage of this legislation is to take care of the situation that exists in the Air Force by reason of the opinion of the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force to the effect that if this legislation is not passed some habeas corpus proceedings might be brought by new enlistees.

Under the National Security Act, and an administrative order issued thereunder, the Air Force, for a period of 2 years beginning July 26, 1947, was vested with the same authority exercised by the Army in court-martial cases, except as to cases on appeal.

The purpose of this bill is to establish in the United States Air Force the office of the Judge Advocate General of the United States Air Force. The Judge Advocate General shall be an officer with the rank of major general. That does not mean a new general is to be created. It will simply result in the assignment of a major general from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Air Force.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman is not trying to set up a separate military judicial system for the Air Corps?

Mr. ELSTON. Not at all; and I might say to the gentleman that the Secretary of Defense has already appointed a committee with a view to having that committee recommend a uniform system of military justice for all the services.

Mr. CARROLL. Is this bill recommended by the Judge Advocate of the Army?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes; and by the Secretary of Defense. The primary purpose of this bill is to permit the Air Force to handle its own cases including those on appeal until a uniform system is set up, and to remove any doubt as to the legality of any proceedings in the Air Force.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think we need three systems of military justice in the three services, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force? I thought there was to be a major consolidation with unification of the services, that whereas we have heretofore had two systems of military justice, one for the Navy and one for the Army, that there would be one that applied to all the services. It now appears that there is to be a third system of military justice, this time for the Air Corps, and instead of having unification we are having an expansion and an increase. Does the gentleman think there should be three systems of military justice in the service?

Mr. ELSTON. I do not permanently. I asked the same question, I might say, when we began hearings on the Army justice bill. There is a difference between the systems in the Army and the Navy. It would not be possible for the Army system to apply in all respects to the Navy. Since our hearings were completed and after the passage of the Army bill, the Secretary of Defense indicated he intended to appoint a committee for the purpose of recommending to the next Congress a unified bill that will be applicable to all the services.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is the author of the bill which was passed in the House setting up the system of military justice in the Army. That bill was debated for several days. This is a highly important bill. Does the gentleman think this type of bill should be passed on the Consent Calendar?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes; I think as far as this bill is concerned it should because I consider it simply stopgap legislation until a unified plan can be prepared.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to empower the Secretary of the United States Air Force to administer military justice under existing law over its own personnel to the same extent as the Army and the Navy. The bill specifically provides that the Articles of War shall be of equal force and effect with respect to the United States Air Force as they presently apply to the United States Army, creates the Office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, with the rank of major general, and provides for designation of the United States Air Force officers as judge advocates.

The responsibilities and duties of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, and judge advocates, United States Air Force, will be identical with those of the Judge Advocate General of the Army and members of his department, respectively.

Following the passage of the National Security Act of 1947 the Secretaries of Defense, Army, and Air Force agreed that, since military justice is a judicial function, the establishment of such functions in the United States Air Force should be by congressional action, rather than by means of a transfer order of the Secretary of Defense under the National Security Act.

Pursuant to the foregoing agreements, the air judge advocate assumes all judge advocate functions within the Air Force, relative to military justice, except appellate review and confirmation of sentences. Staff judge advocates, trial judge advocates, defense counsel, members of the court, and convening authorities are Air Force personnel appointed by Air Force officers. In spite of the fact that the Air Force personnel are accomplishing more than 90 percent of the judge-advocate duties in the Department of Air, the Department of the Air Force ceases to have any further responsibility or authority over a general-court-martial case after findings and sentence of the court. The record of trial is forwarded directly to the Department of the Army for appellate review in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Army and, when required by statute, for confirmation by the Secretary of the Army.

At the present time there are a total of 46 active court-martial jurisdictions of the United States Air Force in the United States and overseas. A recent summary, covering a 6 months' period, revealed that the Air Force was processing court-martial cases at the following rates per thousand: General-court-martial cases, 0.45; special-court-martial cases, 2.03; summary-court-martial cases, 4.52.

In furtherance of the agreement of the Secretaries that the Air Force would assume complete responsibility for the administration of military justice in the Air Force, 60 former officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army have been transferred to the United States Air Force, and an additional 125 qualified lawyers were commissioned in the Air Force for the performance of military-justice functions, all of whom had wartime experience in judge-advocate duties. In addition, approximately 158 Reserve officers are now performing judge-advocate duties with the Air Force on extended active duty. While it is not considered that this is an adequate number of legally qualified personnel to properly perform the legal duties, including military justice, in the Air Force, the ratio compares favorably with that maintained in the Army and the Navy.

The Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, is responsible for the maintenance and enforcement of discipline within the entire Air Force, and the Air Force submits that this total responsibility should not be subjected to policies and supervision of a sister service. The Air Judge Advocate is the military legal adviser to the Chief of Staff, and in the discharge of his duties relating to the administration of military justice, it is considered advisable to recognize his professional position.

At the direction of the Secretary of Defense a committee consisting of representatives of the Army, Navy, and Air Force has been formed for the purpose of making a thorough study of the many problems involved in attempting to make more uniform the administration of military justice in the three services. It is certain that no legislative recommendations can come from this committee before the convening of the Eighty-first Congress. In the meantime a reasonable doubt has arisen as to whether or not the Department of the Air Force has jurisdiction over transferees into the Air Force and those who may subsequently be drafted into the Air Force. While there is substantial opinion that the Department of Air will have adequate jurisdiction over such personnel, it is considered advisable to remove all doubt by the enactment of the present legislation rather than perpetuate the possibility that the Department of Air will find it necessary to defend its jurisdiction in habeas corpus proceedings.

Favorable consideration of the proposed legislation by the Committee on Armed Services making the Articles of War equally applicable to the Department of Air is not intended to indicate an approval of the present Articles of War. This committee of the House of Representatives have previously expressed themselves on this subject through the passage of H. R. 2575, a bill for the revision of the Articles of War and the improvement of military justice. It is considered that nothing less than the provisions of H. R. 2575 will provide an adequate system of military justice. Therefore, the present legislation is considered to be stopgap legislation which will legalize beyond doubt the present activities of the Air Judge Advocate and subordinate personnel until such time as the Congress shall enact legislation for an improved and unified system of justice, equally applicable, insofar as the basic differences of the services will permit, to all of the armed services.

The Secretary of Defense endorses the legislation upon the above-stated basis. It is not anticipated that the enactment of the legislation will result in any additional cost to the Government, except for minor administrative costs for clerical personnel in the Office of the Air Judge Advocate.

The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Air recommend the enactment of the proposed legislation, as is evidenced by their respective letters which were made a part of our report on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill; as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the United States Air Force the office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force. The office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall be occupied by the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, with the rank of major general, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among qualified officers of the United States Air Force, for a term of 4 years. The Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall be charged with supervising the administration of military justice in the United States Air Force and the performance of such other legal duties as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

SEC. 2. The Articles of War and all other laws now in effect relating to the Judge Advocate General's Department, The Judge Advocate General of the Army, and the administration of military justice within the United States Army shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force with respect to the personnel hereof, and all references in such laws to the Department of the Army (War), the Army of the United States and its components, the Secretary of the Army (War), The Judge Advocate General, Assistant Judge Advocates General, and officers of or assigned to the Judge Advocate General's Department shall be construed for the purposes of this act, as referring to, and vesting like authority, duties, functions, and responsibilities in, the Department of the Air Force, the Air Force of the United States and its components, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, and officers of the United States Air Force designated by the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, as judge advocates, respectively: *Provided*, That until the expiration of the transfer period prescribed by section 208 (e) of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong.), the jurisdiction conferred hereby may be exercised with respect to personnel of any component of the Department of the Army who may be under the command and authority of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

SEC. 3. Any officer of the United States Air Force who shall have served as The Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall, upon retirement, or if recalled to active duty from the retired list upon release from active duty, be advanced on the retired list to the highest active-duty grade held while so serving and shall receive retired pay computed upon such higher active-duty grade.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to prevent the prosecution, punishment, mitigation, or other action, by the United States acting through appropriate officers of either the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force as to any offense made punishable by the Articles of

War committed prior to the date of this act by any person subject to military law, and either of those departments may enforce or mitigate any penalty, forfeiture, fine, or liability, heretofore adjudged against such person.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, line 8, after the word "retirement", strike out the balance of line 8, all of line 9, and the word "duty" on line 10.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON: On page 3, line 7, after the word "served", insert the words "not less than 4 years."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate bill, S. 2401, an act to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the United States Air Force the office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force. The office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall be occupied by the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, with the rank of major general, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among qualified officers of the United States Air Force, for a term of 4 years. The Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall be charged with supervising the administration of military justice in the United States Air Force and the performance of such other legal duties as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

SEC. 2. The Articles of War and all other laws now in effect relating to the Judge Advocate General's Department, the Judge Advocate General of the Army, and the administration of military justice within the United States Army shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force with respect to the personnel thereof, and all references in such laws to the Department of the Army (War), the Army of the United States and its components, the Secretary of the Army (War), the Judge Advocate General, Assistant Judge Advocates General, and officers of or assigned to the Judge Advocate General's Department shall be construed for the purposes of this act, as referring to, and vesting like authority, duties, functions, and responsibilities in, the Department of the Air Force, the Air Force of the United States and its components, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, and officers of the United States Air Force designated by the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, as judge advocates, respectively: *Provided*, That until the expiration of the transfer period prescribed by section 208 (e) of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong.), the jurisdiction conferred hereby may be exercised with respect to personnel of any component of the Department of the Army who may be under the command and authority of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

SEC. 3. Any officer of the United States Air Force who shall have served not less than four years as the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall, upon retirement, be advanced on the retired list to the highest active-duty grade held while so serving and shall receive retired pay computed upon such higher active-duty grade.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to prevent the prosecution, punishment, mitigation, or other actions, by the United States acting through appropriate officers of either the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force as to any offense made punishable by the Articles of War committed prior to the date of this Act by any person subject to military law, and either of those departments may enforce or mitigate any penalty, forfeiture, fine, or liability, heretofore adjudged against such person.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent the proceedings by which the bill (H. R. 5937) was passed were vacated and that bill laid on the table.

SUMMARY TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT TO PROTECT NATIONAL SECURITY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1561) to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary termination of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] explain the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time, I have studied this bill. I think it is a dangerous bill to the right of civil-service employees, and I am constrained to object.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5861) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to convey to the State of Oklahoma, without consideration and on behalf of the United States, the southeast quarter and the east half of the southwest quarter of section 9 and the northeast quarter and the east half of the northwest quarter of section 16, township 3 north, range 23 east, of the Indian meridian, Le Flore County, Okla., for the purpose of constructing a dam.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ORGANIC ACT OF 1944

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1087) to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (Public Law 425, 78th Cong., 58 Stat. 739, 740), as amended by Public Law 563, Seventy-eighth Congress (58 Stat. 925), is further amended by inserting after the words "to cooperative associations" the words "and municipalities"; and by inserting after the words "said cooperative associations" a comma and the words "and municipalities to the extent that such indebtedness was incurred with respect to electric transmission and distribution lines or systems or portions thereof serving persons in rural areas."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAINTENANCE OF MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES AT FULL STRENGTH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4984) to provide for the maintaining of the corps of cadets at the United States Military Academy and the regiment of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy at full strength, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306; 10 U. S. C. 1091d), is amended to read: "When on the date of admission of a new class the total number of cadets is below the number authorized, the Secretary of the Army may, in his discretion, bring the corps of cadets to full strength by appointing qualified candidates recommended by the academic board: *Provided*, That at least two-thirds of the existing vacancies shall be set aside for the appointment of qualified recommended alternate candidates nominated by the Vice President, Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, Delegates and Resident Commissioners, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Governor of the Panama Canal, and not more than one-third of the existing vacancies may be filled by the appointment of qualified recommended candidates, other than those for whom two-thirds of the existing vacancies are reserved: *Provided further*, That any appointment made under this section shall be an additional appointment and shall not constitute an appointment otherwise authorized by law."

SEC. 2. When upon the admission of a new class to the United States Naval Academy the total number of midshipmen is less than the number authorized, the Secretary of the Navy may bring the regiment of the midshipmen to full authorized strength by appointing alternates and candidates recommended by the academic board who have been found to be qualified as provided by law, at least two-thirds thereof from among alternates qualified for appointments allowed under section 1 of the act of December 20, 1917 (40 Stat. 430), as amended, upon the nomination of Members of Congress and not more than one-third thereof from among candidates and alternates, other than those nominated by Members of Congress, qualified for appointments authorized under section 1 of said act of December 20, 1917, and other provisions of law: *Provided*, That any appointments made hereunder shall be in addition to and not in lieu of appointments otherwise authorized by law.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "discretion", insert "and within the capacity of the facilities of the Military Academy."

Page 2, strike out line 15 to 25, inclusive, and lines 1 to 6, on page 3, and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. When upon the admission of a new class to the United States Naval Academy, as determined on July 1 of each year, the total number of midshipmen is less than the number authorized, the Secretary of the Navy may, within the capacity of the Naval Academy, upon recommendation of the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, appoint additional midshipmen to be admitted in such class in such number to best meet the needs of the naval service, but not to exceed the authorized strength of the brigade of midshipmen, from candidates holding alternate appointments or other candidates recommended and found to be qualified by the academic board, at least two-thirds of those so appointed to be from among candidates holding alternate appointments allowed under section 1 of the act of December 20, 1917 (40 Stat. 430), as amended, upon the nomination of Members of Congress, and not more than one-third of those so appointed to be from among candidates other than those holding such alternate appointments: *Provided*, That any appointments made pursuant to this section shall be in addition to and not in lieu of appointments otherwise authorized by law."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the maintaining of the Corps of Cadets at the United States Military Academy and the Brigade of Midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy at full strength, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS FOR CIVIL WORKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6751) to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor flood-control improvements.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the officer of the Corps of Engineers assigned to duty as Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of civil works, including river and harbor and flood-control improvements, shall, while assigned to such duty, have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier general: *Provided*, That this position shall not be charged against the authorized strength of general officers of the Regular Army: *Provided further*, That the pay and allowances, mileage and travel allowances of the officer holding such position shall be paid from the appropriations for the work or works upon which he is engaged.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT OR NEAR HIDALGO, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4367) authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Hidalgo, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge and originally designed approaches thereto across the Rio Grande, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Hidalgo, Tex., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject further to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and also subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge: *Provided*, That the construction of the bridge herein authorized shall not be undertaken until after an agreement regarding such construction shall have been effected between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Mexican States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Texas needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its originally designed approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State of Texas.

SEC. 3. The said Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with any laws of the State of Texas applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act to any public agency, or to an international bridge authority or commission, is hereby granted to the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, or legal representatives; and any such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF A BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT OR NEAR RIO GRANDE CITY, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5252) to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., authorized to be built by Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, by an act of Congress approved July 31, 1946, is hereby extended until July 31, 1949. Construction of such bridge shall be commenced on or before such date and shall be prosecuted with reasonable diligence until same is completed.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6079) establishing a procedure by which the Administrator may assure veterans full educational and training opportunities commensurate with the tuition charges by educational and training institutions, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REVOLVING FUND FOR PURCHASE OF NATURAL FIBERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2376) to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied area and sold.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING USE OF OLEOMARGARINE BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6334) to authorize the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. H. CARL ANDERSEN, HULL, SMITH of Wisconsin, MURRAY of Wisconsin, and CLEVENGER objected.

RATES OF PAY FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS AT FIELD INSTALLATIONS OF VETERANS' FACILITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6656) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THE WEST VIRGINIA PLAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6439) to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of adopting the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the

construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans of World War II and to the feasibility and desirability of adopting, developing, and extending such plan throughout the United States. Such investigation and study shall include, among other matters, the following aspects of the West Virginia plan:

(1) Financial arrangements by corporations, labor unions, and cooperatives for the acquisition of land and for the construction of housing facilities for their employees and members who are veterans of World War II;

(2) The use of production-line methods in the construction of such housing facilities.

(3) Acquisition of housing facilities by veterans under contracts of sale with corporations, labor unions, and cooperatives;

(4) Individual loans to veterans by banks and building and loan associations and the guaranty of such loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; and

(5) The operation of the West Virginia plan generally in West Virginia and other States where such plan, or a similar plan, has been used.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall report to the Congress, at the earliest practicable date, the result of his investigation and study of the West Virginia plan, together with such recommendations as he deems advisable.

SEC. 3. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized, in carrying out his functions under this act, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and independent agencies of the Government of the United States.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 6, strike out all of section 4.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2505) to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act, entitled "An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments", approved August 1, 1947, is amended, to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are respectively authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, within their respective departments, not more than 13 positions each, and the Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 6 positions, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions, relating to the national defense, military and naval medicine, and any and all other activities of the National Military Establishment which requires the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel: *Provided*, That the rates of compensation for positions established pursuant to the provisions of this act shall not be less than $10,000 per annum nor more than $15,000 per annum, and shall be subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress, not later than December 31 of each year, a report setting forth the number of positions established pursuant to this act in the National Military Establishment during that calendar year, and the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent, together with a statement of the functions performed by each. In any instance where the Secretary may consider full public report on these items detrimental to the national security, he is authorized to omit such items from his annual report and, in lieu thereof, to present such information in executive sessions of such committees of the Senate and House of Representatives as the presiding officers of those bodies shall designate."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6641), to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "If an annuitant who elected to name a survivor annuitant pursuant to this paragraph died prior to April 1, 1948, such survivor annuitant shall receive, beginning as of April 1, 1948, the annuity provided for survivor annuitants by this paragraph."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 158) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance on November 19, 1948, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING PENSIONS TO CERTAIN PERSONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 451) to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

GRATUITOUS INSURANCE FOR CERTAIN PERSONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4159) to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa, the Veterans' Administration is against this bill as they say it would go to any time in the future.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from New Jersey that this bill undertakes to correct an injustice with respect to a small group of Army and Navy cadets who were taking flight training, a few of whom were killed on authorized flights during the war and found themselves without the customary national life insurance with the premium paid by the Government. There are only a very few cases involved. The information that was obtained from the Veterans' Administration was that the reason these men had been classified as cadets rather than as flying cadets was perhaps partly due to an oversight in one of the departments or perhaps because of excessive paper work.

Mr. KEAN. The Veterans' Administration says that this would apply, respectively, to any time in the future.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Any time in the future, if they were so listed? As a matter of fact, this applies only to a group of men who were taking flight training but had not been so classified during the war.

Mr. KEAN. Does it not apply to men in the future?

Mr. LECOMPTE. If they were having flight training.

Mr. KEAN. Why should we give preference to those?

Mr. LECOMPTE. We gave all flight trainees war-risk insurance with the premiums paid by the Government, but there were a few who, because of the classification, were not brought under the same coverage.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I am very much in sympathy with the general purpose of this particular bill, but it provides that payments be made to the parents of the deceased without regard to dependency. I have no objection to that if it were the general rule, but that is more than we did for the men who were killed during the war and who had not taken out insurance.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. It provides the same order of payment as in the other cases.

Mr. MACKINNON. The order is the same but the dependency requirement is not present in this bill. I have in my district the case of a boy in the early days of the war was on duty on a destroyer in the Far East, who died in a hospital at Surabaya, in Java, and he had absolutely no opportunity to take out insurance. I have gone into the matter very carefully, and the Veterans' Administration will not pay any insurance to his parents, because they were not dependent upon him. Yet, by this language here they would be forced to pay that to the parents of these few individuals, many of whom did not die in actual service, regardless of dependency.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It applies to no one in the world except those who died in training in the Army or in the service.

Mr. MACKINNON. Yes, but I am talking about dying in actual battle.

Mr. LECOMPTE. War-risk insurance applies to all soldiers and seamen who carried the insurance, whether they died in camp, in combat, or in the hospitals.

Mr. MACKINNON. Yes, but what we are talking about is gratuitous insurance provided in instances where the men did not have an opportunity to make application therefor. That is the identical situation you are covering here, and which is covered with respect to other men who were in the position as was the boy in my district, who had no opportunity at the start of the war, and who was injured immediately. Under the general law applicable to these situations those boys who were on actual duty in the Pacific when the war started, and who were killed, get no insurance money at all unless their parents were dependent upon them. But this bill would make payments to this small class of parents regardless of dependency, and I cannot justify that discrimination against those who were killed in the early days of the Pacific war.

I therefore object, Mr. Speaker.

AMENDING THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4435) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 302 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"GENERAL

"SEC. 302. (a) The Administrator is authorized and directed to designate and establish such civil airways as may be required in the public interest. The Administrator is authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress, (1) to acquire, establish, and improve air navigation facilities wherever necessary; (2) to operate and maintain such air navigation facilities; (3) to arrange for publication of aeronautical maps and charts necessary for the safe and efficient movement of aircraft in civil air navigation utilizing the facilities and assistance of existing agencies of the Government so far as practicable; and (4) to provide necessary facilities and personnel for the regulation and protection of air traffic."

SEC. 2. Section 302 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out subsection (c) of such section and by inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection:

"ACQUISITION AND DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY

"(c) The Administrator, on behalf of the United States, is authorized, where appropriate to carry out this section, (1) to accept any conditional or unconditional gift or donation of money or other property, real or personal, or of services; (2) within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress therefor, to acquire by purchase, condemnation, lease, or otherwise, real property or interests therein, including easements through or other interests in air space; and (3) for adequate compensation, by sale, lease, or otherwise, to dispose of any real or personal property or interest therein, so acquired. Any such acquisition by condemnation may be made in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 1, 1888 (40 U. S. C. 257; 25 Stat. 357), the act of February 26, 1931 (40 U. S. C. 258a–258e; 46 Stat. 1421), or any other applicable act of Congress."

SEC. 3. Title III of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding thereto a new section as follows:

"POWER TO CONDUCT HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS

"SEC. —. In the conduct of any public hearings or investigations authorized by this act or by Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Administrator or any duly designated examiner shall have the same powers to take evidence, issue subpenas, take depositions, and compel testimony as are vested in members of the Board and its duly designated examiners by section 1004 of this act. Actions of the Administrator or his examiners in such cases shall be governed by the procedures specified in section 1004, and be enforced in the manner provided therein."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 302 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'GENERAL

"'SEC. 302. (a) The Administrator is authorized and directed to designate and establish such civil airways as may be required in the public interest. The Administrator is authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress, (1) to acquire, establish, and improve air-navigation facilities wherever necessary; (2) to operate and maintain such air-navigation facilities; (3) to arrange for publication of aeronautical maps and charts necessary for the safe and efficient movement of aircraft in civil air navigation utilizing the facilities and assistance of existing agencies of the Government so far as practicable; and (4) to provide necessary facilities and personnel for the regulation and protection of air traffic. In exercising the authority granted in this subsection, the Administrator shall give full consideration to the requirements of national defense.'

"SEC. 2. Section 302 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out subsection (c) of such section and by inserting in lieu thereof the following subsections:

"'ACQUISITION AND DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY

"'(c) The Administrator, on behalf of the United States, is authorized, where appropriate to carry out this section, (1) to accept any conditional or unconditional gift or donation of money or other property, real or personal, or of services; (2) within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress therefor, to acquire by purchase, condemnation, lease, or otherwise, real property or interests therein, including, in the case of air-navigation facilities (including airports) owned by the United States and operated under the direction of the Administrator, easements through or other interests in airspace; and (3) for adequate compensation, by sale, lease, or otherwise, to dispose of any real or personal property or interests therein, so acquired. Any such acquisition by condemnation may be made in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 1, 1888 (40 U. S. C. 257; 25 Stat. 357), the act of February 26, 1931 (40 U. S. C. 258a–258e; 46 Stat. 1421), or any other applicable act of Congress.'

"SEC. 3. Title III of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'POWER TO CONDUCT HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS

"'SEC. 309. In the conduct of any public hearings or investigations authorized by this act or by the Federal Airport Act, the Administrator or any duly designated examiner shall have the same powers to take evidence, issue subpenas, take depositions, and compel testimony as are vested in members of the Board and its duly designated examiners by section 1004 of this act. Actions of the Administrator or his examiners in such cases shall be governed by the procedures specified in section 1004, and be enforced in the manner provided therein.'

"SEC. 4. Section 601 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding thereto a new subsection as follows:

"'DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

"'(c) The Civil Aeronautics Board, subject to such terms, conditions, and limitations as the Board may specify, is empowered to delegate to the Administrator the power or authority to prescribe rules, regulations, and standards under this title and to perform functions authorized under section 702 of this act. The Board may modify, suspend, revoke, or terminate such power or authority so delegated by it to the Administrator and may prescribe by rules and regulations such provisions and procedures for review of actions taken by the Administrator under authority delegated hereunder as it may deem necessary and appropriate in the public interest. Except as specifically provided in the rules and regulations of the Board, the filing of a petition for review shall not excuse any person from complying with the action of the Administrator nor operate in any manner to stay the enforcement of such action: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed as amending, modifying, or repealing any provision of the Administrative Procedure Act.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS OF SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4962) to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the dependent unremarried widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion

and the Philippine Insurrection, who is barred from the receipt of pension because her marriage to the veteran occurred subsequent to December 31, 1937, but who is otherwise entitled to such pension under the act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 362; 38 U. S. C., 364a), as reenacted by the act of August 13, 1935 (49 Stat. 614; 38 U. S. C., 268), shall be entitled to pension in her own right under said act, as amended, under the conditions specified therein (except date of marriage) and at the rate authorized by section 4 of the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 611, 79th Cong.), as amended by the act of July 30, 1947 (Public Law 270, 80th Cong.), and to the additional pension provided for children under the act of May 1, 1926, as amended, provided she married the veteran 10 or more years prior to his death and lived with him continuously from the date of marriage to the date of his death except where there was a separation which was due to misconduct of or procured by the veteran without the fault of the widow: *Provided*, That if pension has been granted to a child or children of the veteran, the widow shall not be entitled to the pension authorized by this section until the pension to the child or children terminates, unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and when these conditions are fulfilled and the pension is granted to the widow, payment of pension to such child or children shall cease; except that in the event the amount being paid to such child or children is less than the amount authorized to the widow by this act, then the difference between said amounts will be paid to the widow: *Provided further*, That no pension shall be payable under this section to a widow under 60 years of age.

SEC. 2. Payment of pension as provided in section 1 shall be effective as of the date of the death of the veteran, if application is filed within 1 year after the death of such veteran, otherwise as of the date of receipt of application in the Veterans' Administration, and in no event prior to the date of the enactment of this act. Pension under section 1 hereof shall not be paid to the widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, who has remarried either once or more than once since the death of the veteran, and upon the remarriage of such widow her pension shall be terminated. The penal and forfeiture provisions of laws and regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration providing pensions for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, shall be applicable to the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOSPITALIZATION OF SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5464) to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

AMENDING THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6868) to amend section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, with respect to widows of certain deceased Coast Guard personnel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 253 (b)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The widows of deceased Coast Guard personnel who died while on active duty during the period from November 1, 1941, to January 1, 1946, both dates inclusive, other than widows of deceased temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve, shall be entitled to medical advice, out-patient treatment, and hospitalization in like manner as dependents of active-duty personnel of the Coast Guard."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6860) to amend the Federal Airport Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in view of the brief title of the bill, would the author of the bill or a committee member explain the purposes of this legislation.

Mr. HINSHAW. During the war the military services created certain damage upon municipal airports. This bill authorizes the assaying of the damages done, and when so accomplished, it becomes a contractual obligation of the United States to repair the damages.

Mr. DEANE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 17 of the Federal Airport Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Reimbursement shall be made to public agencies, as provided in this section, for the necessary rehabilitation or repair of public airports heretofore or hereafter substantially damaged by any Federal agency. The Administrator is authorized to render such assistance as he deems necessary to public agencies in the preparation of requests for reimbursement for the cost of rehabilitation or repair of public airports, under the control or management of such public agencies, which have been substantially damaged by any Federal agency and, upon receipt of such a request from a public agency, the Administrator is further authorized, on behalf of the United States, to consider, ascertain, and determine, in accordance with regulations he shall prescribe pursuant to this section, the actual or estimated cost of such necessary rehabilitation or repair for which such public agency is entitled to reimbursement from the United States.

"(b) Such amount as may be found by the Administrator to be the actual or estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair shall be certified by the Administrator to Congress, which certification shall include a brief statement of the character of the damage upon which the request for reimbursement is based and of the work performed or to be performed to accomplish such rehabilitation or repair. In the event that, upon completion of such rehabilitation or repair, it is determined that the actual cost thereof, as approved by the Administrator, exceeds the amount of the estimate certified to Congress by him, the Administrator shall certify to Congress the amount by which such actual cost exceeds such estimate including in such certification a brief statement of the cause of the variation between the estimated and the actual cost of such rehabilitation and repair. Certifications made hereunder by the Administrator shall be deemed contractual obligations of the United States, payable as hereinafter provided.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Administrator to make payments as provided for in this section to public agencies, either upon completion of the rehabilitation or repair involved, or as such rehabilitation or repair progresses, it being the purpose of this subsection to authorize the Administrator to make payments to public agencies, out of funds appropriated pursuant to this section, as reimbursement for the cost of such public agencies of work performed in accomplishing rehabilitation or repair prior to final completion of such work and at such time or times as may be determined by the Administrator, after consultation with the public agency involved: *Provided*, That no such payment made by the Administrator shall be in an amount which, together with all previous payments made to reimburse such public agency for the cost of such rehabilitation or repair, shall exceed the estimated cost of the work then performed. If the Administrator shall determine at any time that the aggregate of such payments exceeds the actual cost of the work then performed the United States shall be entitled to recover such excess. In the event the estimate of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of an airport as certified to Congress by the Administrator exceeds the actual cost of such rehabilitation or repair, the amount of such excess shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Appropriations made pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until June 30, 1953, unless sooner expended.

"(d) No request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair to a public airport submitted pursuant to this section shall be considered by the Administrator unless such request has been submitted to him within 6 months after the occurrence of the damage upon which the request is based, except that in case of a request relating to damage caused by operations of a military nature during time of war, such request may be submitted within 6 months after the date of termination of such war unless the airport is under the control and management of the United States at the time of termination of such war, in which event the request may be submitted to the Administrator within 6 months after the transfer of such control or management of the airport to the public agency involved."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOPPAGE OF WORK ON CERTAIN COMBATANT VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6049) to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso of title III of the Second Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946, under the heading "Increase and replacement of naval vessels" (60 Stat. 227), in the discretion of the President shall not apply to the following vessels: *Kentucky* (BB66), *Hawaii* (CB3), *Wagner* (DE539), *Vandiver* (DE540), *Castle* (DD720), *Woodrow R. Thompson* (DD721), *Lansdale* (DD766), *Seymour D. Owens* (DD767), *Hoel* (DD768), *Abner Read* (DD769), *Seaman* (DD791), *Unicorn* (SS436), and *Walrus* (SS437).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6049) was laid on the table.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT ADAPTABLE FOR AUXILIARY MILITARY SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6501) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for too large an expenditure of money to be considered on the Consent Calendar. I ask unanimous that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING BENEFITS OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5715) to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of subsection (c) of section 1 of the civil service retirement act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "This subsection shall become effective as of July 1, 1945."

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to reduce the annuity or in any way to affect the rights of any person who is receiving an annuity under the provisions of the amendment to section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, made by the act approved August 8, 1946 (Public Law 638, 79th Cong).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out lines 3 to 6 inclusive and insert the following: "That subsection (c) of section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: 'Provided, That any officer or employee so separated between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947, both dates inclusive, who is living on the date of enactment of this proviso, shall be considered as having been separated as of the date of such enactment, except that no credit for service under this act shall be allowed for the period following actual separation.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN WILD ANIMALS AND BIRDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1447) to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand this bill, it provides for humane housing in connection with the importation of foreign wild animals and birds. I am not going to object to its consideration. However, I think we should give some thought to the consideration of providing humane housing for the one-third of our Nation who are ill-housed. A bill has been reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency providing for public housing. That bill is now fouled up in the Rules Committee. I want to be kind to these foreign wild animals, and I shall not object to the consideration of this bill, but at the same time I urge that the Rules Committee bring out that housing bill so that we can be kind to our people who are ill-housed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 241 of the Act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 391), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 241. (a) The importation into the United States or any Territory or district thereof, of the mongoose, the so-called 'flying foxes' or fruit bats, the English sparrow, the starling, and such other birds and animals as the Secretary of the Interior may from time to time declare to be injurious to the interests of agriculture or horticulture, is hereby prohibited; and all such birds and animals shall, upon arrival at any port of the United States, be destroyed or returned at the expense of the owner. Nothing in this subsection shall restrict the importation of natural-history specimens for museums or scientific collections, or of certain cage birds, such as domesticated canaries, parrots, or such other birds as the Secretary of the Interior may designate. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to make regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this subsection and subsection (b).

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such requirements and issue such permits as he may deem necessary for the transportation of wild animals and birds under humane and healthful conditions, and it shall be unlawful for any person, including any importer, knowingly to cause or permit any wild animal or bird to be transported to the United States, or any Territory or district thereof, under inhumane or unhealthful conditions or in violation of such requirements. In any criminal prosecution for violation of this subsection and in any administrative proceeding for the suspension of the issuance of further permits—

"(1) The condition of any vessel or conveyance, or the enclosures in which wild animals or birds are confined therein, upon its arrival in the United States, or any Territory or district thereof, shall constitute relevant evidence in determining whether the provisions of this subsection have been violated; and

"(2) The presence in such vessel or conveyance at such time of a substantial ratio of dead, crippled, diseased, or starving wild animals or birds shall be deemed prima facie evidence of the violation of the provisions of this subsection."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5807) to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 625 (a) of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1040), is amended by inserting before the last sentence thereof the following: "In the case of any project on which construction has begun between August 13, 1946, and the date of the approval of the State plan, the Surgeon General, with the concurrence of the State agency, may waive compliance with any requirement of this subsection, if he finds that the purpose of such requirement has been fulfilled."

SEC. 2. Section 631 (1) of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "(including, in the case of projects on which construction has begun after August 13, 1946, and before approval of the State plan, costs incurred before such approval)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That is the last eligible bill on the Consent Calendar.

O'SULLIVAN DAM

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, after consulting the majority and minority leaders, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 795, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 202) to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the dam known as South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project shall hereafter be known as O'Sullivan Dam, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under the name of South Coulee Dam shall be held to

refer to such dam under and by the name O'Sullivan Dam.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to change the name of the Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "South Coulee" and insert "Potholes" and on line 7 strike out "South Coulee" and insert "Potholes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to change the name of the Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

ASSISTANT TO THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2770) a bill to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements. That bill is identical to the bill on the Consent Calendar No. 769, H. R. 6751, which was just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the officer of the Corps of Engineers assigned to duty as Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of civil works, including river and harbor and flood-control improvements, shall, while assigned to such duty, have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier general: *Provided*, That this position shall not be charged against the authorized strength of general officers of the Regular Army: *Provided further*, That the pay and allowances, mileage and travel allowances, of the officer holding such position shall be paid from the appropriations for the work or works upon which he is engaged.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby the House bill, H. R. 6751, was passed were vacated and that bill laid on the table.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not a long one but it is an important one. The bill will make the rank of Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements that of a brigadier general. It will give this position the same rank as held by the assistant in charge of Army construction. It will give proper recognition to the office of the assistant engineer who handles the great flood-control and river and harbor program.

The official who serves as assistant engineer in charge of river and harbor and flood-control projects has a vast responsibility imposed upon him. He is required to handle hundreds of millions of dollars in projects annually and his work takes him into every department of the Government and every State in the Union. He is required to deal with Cabinet members and the highest officers in Army, Navy, and diplomatic corps. Heretofore he has been a colonel and it has been difficult for a colonel to carry on his work and deal with officials so much higher in rank than the one he enjoys.

In addition to this, the bill is important because it creates an additional incentive for young engineers to remain in river and harbor and flood-control work. These young men now have the incentive of working up to a position of more importance with the engineers department. They know that when they handle their work competently they may be rewarded proportionately for the fine type of service rendered.

Mr. Speaker, my heart is in this great program of flood control. When a small matter such as giving this additional rank and importance to the position of assistant engineer can mean so much to the program of flood control and rivers and harbors, I cannot be otherwise than most enthusiastically for the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks with two additions in two instances, one at that point in the RECORD where Consent Calendar No. 725, S. 1052, was under consideration, the addition being the bill itself, S. 1052, and a letter which he wrote to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HEFFERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the platform of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous material in connection with certain remarks he made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters from the Union Trust Co. I am informed by the Public Printer that this material comprises two and a quarter pages and will cost $159.75.

The SPEAKER. Without objection and notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3214) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary," with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out: "13. Tax Court ____ 271"

Renumber items 15 to 23, inclusive, as follows:

Old No.	New No.
15	13
17	15
19	17
21	19
23	21

Page 5, section 48, in the eleventh line, immediately after "Fort Worth,", insert "Jacksonville."

Page 28, section 118, in first line of subsection (b) under heading "Middle District", strike out "Blair," at end of line; in second line of subsection (c) under heading "Western District", insert "Blair," immediately before "Butler."

Page 35, section 127, in second paragraph of subsection (a), immediately after "Alexandria,", insert "Newport News."

Page 38, section 133, at bottom of page, after "Indiana", under—

"Northern ---------- 1"

insert—

"Southern ---------- 1"

Page 44, strike out, near bottom of page, "Chapter 13—Tax Court" and all that follows thereafter to bottom of page.

Page 45, strike out all of this page.

Page 46, at top of page, after "Chapter," in chapter heading, strike out "15" and insert "13."

Page 48, near top of page, after "Chapter", in chapter heading, strike out "17" and insert "15."

Page 49, after "Chapter", in chapter heading, strike out "19" and insert "17."

Page 51, after "Chapter", in chapter heading, strike out "21" and insert "19."

Page 55, at top of page, after "Chapter", in chapter heading, strike out "23" and insert "21"; section 451, second paragraph, fifth and sixth lines thereof, after "Customs Court," strike out "the Tax Court"; section 451, fourth paragraph, after "Customs Court," strike out "Tax Court."

Page 56, in third line from bottom of page, after "Columbia", insert "and"; in second line from bottom of page, strike out "and the Tax Court of the United States."

Page 64, near top of page, strike out

"57. Tax Court---------- 911"

In item 59, strike out "59" and insert "57."

Page 64, section 603, in second line of section 603, immediately after "salary of", strike out "$9,376.50" and insert: "$7,500."

Page 66, section 605, second paragraph, fourth line, after "Customs Court", insert "and"; and after "Claims" strike out "and the Tax Court."

Page 67, in third line from top of page, after "Appeals", strike out "the Customs Court, the Tax Court, and all other courts of the United States established by act of Congress" and insert "and the Customs Court."

Page 67, section 631, in subsection (a), fourth line, immediately after "parks" insert "Big Bend, Crater Lake."

Page 68, section 632, in the fifth line, strike out "civil actions and."

Page 74, section 752, after last line on page, insert "The chief judge of a district court having five or more district judges may also appoint an assistant secretary."

Page 76, after last line on page, insert "furnished in criminal or habeas corpus proceedings to persons allowed."

Page 78, section 792, in subsection (c), third line, immediately after "findings of fact", insert "and recommendations for conclusions of law."

Page 81, commencing near top of page, strike out the chapter heading "Chapter 57—Tax Court" and all that follows thereafter down to but not including "Chapter 59—General provisions applicable to court officers and employees"; near middle of page, after "Chapter" in chapter heading, strike out "59" and insert "57."

Page 82, strike out:

"Each clerk of court and his deputies, and each employee of the Tax Court designated in writing for that purpose by the chief judge of such court, may administer oaths and affirmations and take acknowledgments."

And insert:

"Each clerk of court and his deputies may administer oaths and affirmations and take acknowledgments."

Page 84, near top of page, strike out

"97. Tax Court---------- 1621"

Page 86, near middle of page, strike out "1294. Tax Court decisions", immediately following the above, renumber item "1295" as "1294."

Page 87, near middle of page, strike out "§ 1294. Tax Court decisions" and the three lines following immediately thereafter; at middle of page, strike out "§ 1295" and insert in lieu thereof "§ 1294"; in line following immediately thereafter, preceding "Appeals", strike out "(a)"; strike out the last six lines on this page.

Page 92, lines 11 and 12, after the word "courts", strike out "including the district courts for the Territories and Possessions of the United States" and insert "together with the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone and the District Court of the Virgin Islands."

Page 97, section 1402, in subsection (b), first line, after "Any", strike out "tort claim action" and insert "civil action on a tort claim."

Page 104, section 1504, after "district" in second line, strike out "court in tort claims cases" and insert "courts in civil actions based on tort claims."

Page 105, section 1583, in third line, immediately after word "same", insert a comma; in fourth line, immediately after word "chargeable", strike out the comma and insert "and."

Page 105, near bottom of page, strike out the chapter heading "Chapter 97—Tax Court" and all that follows to bottom of page.

Page 106, strike out the first two lines on this page.

Page 107, near bottom of page, strike out "1696. Tax Court; service."

Page 108, preceding chapter 115, strike out "§ 1696. Tax Court; service" and the two lines following immediately thereafter.

Page 115, under chapter 119, strike out "1826. Payment of Tax Court witnesses."

Page 116, below middle of page, strike out: "§ 1826. Payment of Tax Court witnesses" and the seven lines following immediately thereafter.

Page 120, at middle of page, strike out "1930. Tax Court."

Page 125, near middle of page, strike out: "§ 1930. Tax Court" and the seven lines following immediately thereafter.

Page 130, section 2072, add the following sentence at end of last paragraph: "Nothing in this title anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 130, section 2073, add the following sentence at end of last paragraph: "Nothing in this title anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 133, at bottom of page strike out: "167. Tax Court procedure---------- 2551"

Page 134, at top of page, renumber items 169, 171, and 173 as follows:

Old No.	New No.
169	167
171	169
173	171

Page 134, preceding section 2241, in analysis of sections under heading of chapter 153, strike out "2244. Finality of determination; rehearsing" and insert "2244. Finality of determination."

Page 136, section 2244, strike out all of section 2244 and insert:

"§ 2244. Finality of determination.

"No circuit or district judge shall be required to entertain an application for a writ of habeas corpus to inquire into the detention of a person pursuant to a judgment of a court of the United States, or of any State, if it appears that the legality of such detention has been determined by a judge or court of the United States on a prior application for a writ of habeas corpus and the petition presents no new ground not theretofore presented and determined, and the judge or court is satisfied that the ends of justice will not be served by such inquiry."

Page 137, section 2253, in first line of section strike out "circut" and insert "circuit."

Page 138, section 2254, strike out all of section 2254 and insert:

"§ 2254. State custody: remedies in State courts.

"An application for a writ of habeas corpus in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall not be granted unless it appears that the applicant has exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State, or that there is either an absence of available State corrective process or the existence of circumstances rendering such process ineffective to protect the rights of the prisoner.

"An applicant shall not be deemed to have exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State, within the meaning of this section, if he has the right under the law of the State to raise, by any available procedure, the question presented."

Page 143, section 2401, strike out all of subsection (b) of section 2401 beginning "(b) A tort claim" and concluding "final disposition of the claim." and insert:

"(b) A tort claim against the United States shall be forever barred unless action is begun thereon within 1 year after such claim accrues, or unless, if it is a claim not exceeding $1,000, it is presented in writing to the appropriate Federal agency within 1 year after such claim accrues. If a claim not exceeding $1,000 has been presented in writing to the appropriate Federal agency within that period of time, suit thereon shall not be barred until the expiration of a period of 6 months after either the date of withdrawal of such claim from the agency or the date of mailing notice by the agency of final disposition of the claim."

Page 147, section 2414, in first line, strike out "final" and insert "Payment of final."

Page 150, section 2503, in line 12, immediately following the word "Commissioner", insert "and when directed by the court his recommendations for conclusions of law."

Page 155, strike out all of this page.

Page 156, strike out all of this page.

Page 157, commencing at top of page, strike out all preceding the chapter heading "Chapter 169—Court of Customs and Patent Appeals procedure"; in the chapter heading "Chapter 169—Court of Customs and Patent Appeals procedure" strike out "169" and insert "167."

Page 158, near top of page, in the chapter heading, after "Chapter", strike out "171" and insert "169."

Page 161, near top of page in the chapter heading, after "Chapter", strike out "173" and insert "171."

Page 161, preceding section 2671, in analysis of sections under heading of chapter 173, strike out "2676. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure applicable", and renumber items "2677" and "2678" as items "2676" and "2677", respectively.

Page 161, preceding section 2671, in item 2679 of analysis of sections under heading of chapter 173, strike out "2679. Attorneys' " preceding "fees" and insert "2678. Attorney."

Page 161, preceding section 2671, in analysis of sections under heading of chapter 173, renumber items "2680" and "2681" as "2679" and "2680", respectively.

Page 162, third line of page, immediately preceding "actions", insert "civil."

Page 162, section 2674, in fourth line of section 2674, strike out "for punitive damages" and insert "for interest prior to judgment or for punitive damages.

"If, however, in any case wherein death was caused, the law of the place where the act or omission complained of occurred provides, or has been construed to provide, for damages only punitive in nature, the United States shall be liable for actual or compensatory damages, measured by the pecuniary injuries resulting from such death to the persons respectively, for whose benefit the action was brought, in lieu thereof."

Page 163, sections 2676–2678, strike out all of section 2676 and renumber sections 2677 and 2678 as follows: section 2677 as section 2676, section 2678 as section 2677.

Page 163, section 2679, in catch line, strike out "2679" and insert "2678", strike out "Attorneys' " and insert "Attorney"; in fourth line of section, strike out "2678" and insert "2677"; in sixth line of section, strike out "attorney's" and insert "attorney."

Page 163, section 2680, in catch line, strike out "2680" and insert "2679."

Page 164, section 2681, in catch line, strike out "2681" and insert "2680."

Page 165, strike out all of section 2, consisting of first six lines on this page, and insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) The Chief Justices of the United States Courts of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and the Court of Claims, and the presiding judge of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, in office on the effective date of this act, shall be the chief judges of their respective courts.

"(b) The provisions of title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, of the United States Code, set out in section 1 of this act, with respect to the organization of each of the several courts therein provided for and of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall be construed as continuations of existing law, and the tenure of the judges, officers, and employees thereof and of the United States attorneys and marshals and their deputies and assistants, in office on the effective date of this act, shall not be affected by its enactment, but each of them shall continue to serve in the same capacity under the appropriate provisions of title 28, as set out in section 1 of this act, pursuant to his prior appointment: *Provided, however*, That each circuit court of appeals shall, as in said title 28 set out, hereafter be known as a United States court of appeals. No loss of rights, interruption of jurisdiction, or prejudice to matters pending in any of such courts on the effective date of this act shall result from its enactment.

"(c) The sum of $7,500 specified in this act as the salary which the Assistant Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall receive, and the sum of $7,500 specified in this act as the salary which each commissioner whom the Court of Claims may appoint shall receive, shall each respectively be that basic compensation on which shall be computed and paid the additional basic compensation mentioned in section 521 of the act of June 30, 1945 (ch. 212, 59 Stat. 301), as amended by the act of May 24, 1946 (ch. 270, sec. 6, 60 Stat. 217).

"(d) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the provision of section 14 of the act of July 1, 1944 (ch. 358, 58 Stat. 663), are not hereby repealed."

Page 173, near bottom of page, insert:

"Sec. 36. Section 1141 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The circuit courts of appeals and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction to review the decisions of the Tax Court, except as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code, in the same manner and to the same extent as decisions of the district courts in civil actions tried without a jury; and the judgment of any such court shall be final, except that it shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari, in the manner provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.'"

Page 173, near bottom of page, insert:

"Sec. 37. Section 6 of the act approved August 7, 1946 (ch. 864, 60 Stat. 903), is amended to read as follows:

"'Sec. 6. Whenever any claimant under this act is dissatisfied with the action of a department or agency of the Government in either granting or denying his claim, such claimant shall have the right within 6 months to file a petition with the Court of Claims or, if the claim does not exceed $10,000 in amount or suit has heretofore been brought or is brought within 30 days after the enactment of this amendatory act, with any Federal district court of competent jurisdiction, asking a determination by the court of the equities involved in such claim; and upon the filing of such a petition, the court, sitting as a court of equity, shall have jurisdiction to determine the amount, if any, to which such claimant and petitioner may be equitably entitled (not exceeding the amount which might have been allowed by the department or agency concerned under the terms of this act) and to enter an order directing such department or agency to settle the claim in accordance with the finding of the court; and thereafter either party may appeal from the decision if it was rendered by a district court or petition the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari if it was rendered by the Court of Claims, as in other cases. Any case heretofore brought in a district court under this section may, at the election of the petitioner to be exercised within 90 days after the enactment of this amendatory act, be transferred to the Court of Claims for original disposition in that court.'"

Page 173, near bottom of page, insert the following section:

"Sec. 38. The provisions of this act shall take effect on September 1, 1948."

Page 173, at bottom of page, renumber "Sec. 36" as "Sec. 39", and in the first line, immediately after the word "Statutes", insert "of the District of Columbia, Revised Statutes of the United States."

Page 178, near top of page, strike out:

De.....	281	275–281, 286, 287, 289–290, 295–300	36	1164–1169	28	411, 412, 413, 415–417, 418, 423, 424, 430–434, 441–443

And insert:

De.....	281	275–281, 286, 287, 289, 290, 295–300	36	1164–1169	28	411, 412, 413, 415–417, 418, 423, 424, 430, 431–434, 441–443

Page 186, in list of acts on this page, strike out:

1939—Feb. 10	2	1100–1105, 1110–1121, 1130–1133, 1141–1145, 3741, 3744, 3745 (b) (c) (d)	53	168–168A, 460, 461	26	1100–1105, 1110–1121, 1130–1133, 1141–1145, 3741, 3744, 3745 (b) (c) (d)

Page 187, in the list of acts on this page, strike out:

1942—Oct. 21..	619	V	594	(a)	56	937	26	1100

And the column headings immediately above and below such line.

Page 188, in the list of acts on this page, strike out:

1944—Feb. 25..	43	V		503	58	72	28	1114

And the column headings immediately above and below this line.

Page 189, in acts for year 1945, strike out:

1945—May 3..	106	I	I (part)	59	[34] 127	28	1102, note
Do.....	108	II	213	59	134	28	530a

And insert:

1945—May 3..	108	II	513	59	134	28	530a

Page 189, in acts for year 1946, strike out:

1946—July 5	541	IV (part)	----	60	[42] 477	28	295a
Do.....	541	IV (part)	----	60	[43] 478	28	412a

And insert:

1946—July 5..	541	II (part)	----	60	[41] 460	28	604a
Do.....	541	IV (part)	----	60	[42] 477	28	295a
Do.....	541	IV (part)	----	60	[43] 478	28	412a
Do.....	541	IV (part)	----	60	[43a] 478, 479	28	374b

Page 189, in the list of 1946 acts on this page, strike out:

July 31....	704	I	60	716		28	1102 (c) 5, 243, 241, 290, 301, 324
					D. C. Code		11-202, 11-203

And insert:

July 31..	704	I (part)[43a]	60	716		28	5, 243, 241, 290, 301, 324
					D. C. Code		11-202, 11-203

Page 189, strike out the ruled line at the end of the schedule of repeals and insert:

1947—May 15....	52	1–4	61	94, 95	16	152a–152d
Do.....	57	------	61	95	16	463c–5

Date	Statutes at Large: Chapter	Statutes at Large: Title	Statutes at Large: Section	Statutes at Large: Volume	Statutes at Large: Page	U. S. Code: Title	U. S. Code: Section
1947—July 9..	211	II (part)	----	61	[44] 290	28	604a
Do..	211	IV (part)	----	61	[45] 303	28	295a
Do..	211	IV (part)	----	61	[46] 304	28	412a
Do..	211	IV (part)	----	61	[47] 304, 305	28	374b
Do..	211	IV (part)	----	61	[48] 306	28	530

Date	Statutes at Large: Chapter	Statutes at Large: Section	Statutes at Large: Volume	Statutes at Large: Page	U. S. Code: Title	U. S. Code: Section
1947—July 11..	226	----	61	310	28	184
July 23..	300	1, 2	61	409	28	374c, 374d
Aug. 1..	446	1	61	722	28	931

United States Code

Title:	Section
17	101 (f)
17	102
17	103
17	110
17	111

Page 189, in footnotes at bottom of page, strike out all of footnote No. 38.

Page 189, in footnotes at bottom of page, after and underneath footnote No. 46, insert:

"[46] Third proviso in paragraph commencing 'Fees of witnesses', said proviso ending on page 461."

After and underneath footnote No. 48, insert:

"[48] The two provisos in the paragraph commencing near the bottom of page 478 and ending on page 479."

Page 189, bottom of page, after and underneath footnote No. 50, insert:

"[50] All of this section except the words: 'That the following salaries shall be paid to the several judges hereinafter mentioned in lieu of the salaries now provided by law, namely:', the words 'To each of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States at the rate of $15,000 per year', and the words 'That all of said salaries shall be paid in monthly installments'. All of the foregoing quoted words shall remain in full force and effect."

"[52a] Third proviso in the paragraph commencing 'Fees of witnesses' appearing on this page.

"[52] First proviso in the paragraph headed 'United States Customs Court' appearing on this page.

"[52a] Only the following words in the sixth full paragraph appearing on this page: '$5 per day, not exceeding three days for any one term of court.'

"[54] The two provisos in the paragraph commencing near the bottom of page 304 and ending on page 305.

"[55] All of the second paragraph appearing on this page."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 3214, to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary," which, in my opinion, represents one of the most important improvements in the structure of the Federal statutory law since the adoption of the United States Code more than 20 years ago, was prepared by a group of experts under the supervision of Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary and its law revision counsel with the active cooperation and advice of an outstanding group of judges and lawyers. This bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and as it passed the House, transferred the provisions relating to the Tax Court for the Internal Revenue Code to the Judicial Code. After hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee at which testimony was adduced revealing a controversy between bar associations and accountants groups as to whether the right of accountants to practice before that court should be preserved, the bill was amended by the Senate Judiciary Committee to eliminate Tax Court provisions. Your committee being apprehensive that a controversy of this nature might cause undue delay and interfere with final action on the bill at this session accordingly has authorized me to request unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's table and concur in the Senate amendments. We believe, however, that the Tax Court provisions should be incorporated in the Judicial Code at the earliest date.

H. R. 3214 includes a provision designed to eliminate the effects of the decision of *Dobson* v. *Commission* (320 U. S. 489). The hearings in the Senate make absolutely clear the purpose of this provision, but it seems desirable to enlarge upon the brief statement in the Senate committee report with respect to that provision so that there can be no question about the intent of Congress.

Section 36 of the bill, as it passed the Senate, removes all traces of the Dobson decision. Prior to the decision in that case the statutory provision for review of

Tax Court decisions by circuit courts of appeal had always been construed to grant the same scope of review over Tax Court decisions as over decisions of United States district courts. This meant that questions of law were fully reviewable and questions of fact were subject to the same sort of limited review as is available in review of district court decisions. However, in the Dobson decision, the Supreme Court created new rules as to the scope of review as to questions of law and fact, although the point had not been raised by counsel.

The present bill amends the law that is interpreted in the Dobson decision and restores to the circuit courts of appeal the power to review Tax Court decisions in the same manner and to the same extent as decisions of the district courts in civil actions tried without a jury. The bill does not attempt to define what is a question of fact or what is a question of law or to answer any of the other complicated questions which would be involved in spelling out de novo the complete scope of review. There is no necessity to do this. It is sufficient that whatever the scope of review over civil actions—whether tax cases or nontax cases—coming from the district courts, the same scope of review should exist over cases coming from the Tax Court.

At a meeting of the full Committee of the Judiciary on June 15, the following expression of views with respect to the Senate amendments was unanimously agreed upon for insertion in the RECORD.

VIEWS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY WITH RESPECT TO SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 3214

In order to insure and expedite final action on the bill, H. R. 3214 to revise, codify and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary", the Committee on the Judiciary authorizes the chairman of subcommittee No. 1 to take from the Speaker's table the bill with the Senate amendments and request unanimous consent to agree to said amendments.

Many of the Senate amendments are intended to eliminate from the bill all provisions relating to the Tax Court. Under the existing law those provisions are set out in title 26 of the United States Code, the Internal Revenue Code, and the bill, H. R. 3214, as agreed to by the House, transferred these provisions from the Internal Revenue Code to the Judicial Code. It is the belief of the Committee on the Judiciary that the transfer of these provisions constituted more of a change in form than in substance. The Tax Court of the United States is already a court in both name and fact, exercising purely judicial functions, but its housekeeping administration needs clarification. However, rather than to jeopardize final action upon the bill at this late date, the committee agrees to the Senate amendments eliminating those provisions from the bill. It is hoped that the judicial code will be amended early in the next Congress by incorporating the desired clarification.

THE RULE IN THE DOBSON CASE

Section 1294 of title 28 of the United States Code, set out in H. R. 3214 as it passed the House, relating to appeals from the Tax Court, provided that Tax Court decisions shall be subject to review by the courts of appeals in the same manner and to the same extent as decisions in the district courts in cases tried without a jury. That section accomplished the much-needed correction of the effects of the rule laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of *Dobson* v. *Commissioner* (320 U. S. 489 (1943)). In that case, the Supreme Court held that the review of the Tax Court decisions by the circuit courts of appeal should be a very limited review because of some peculiar characteristics of the Tax Court. Accordingly, in the Dobson decision, the Supreme Court construed section 1141 of the Internal Revenue Code in such a way as to reduce the right of review in either the taxpayer or the Government in the great majority of Tax Court cases.

Section 1141 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for court review of Tax Court decisions. From the time this appellate review was established by the Revenue Act of 1926 until the Dobson decision in 1943, there had been no suggestion that the review of the Tax Court decisions was any more limited than the appellate review of decisions of the United States district courts. It was assumed by the courts that, on appeal from the Tax Court, questions of law were fully reviewable and questions of fact were subject to the same sort of limited review that prevailed on appeals from United States district courts. The Supreme Court in the Dobson case, however, created a new rule of law which would not permit even law questions to be reviewed unless they were clear-cut questions of law, and which would not permit any worth-while review of decisions of fact. In effect, it was an abdication by the Supreme Court, on behalf of itself and the circuit courts of appeal, of judicial authority conferred upon the courts by Congress.

Section 1294 of the Judicial Code set out in H. R. 3214, as passed by the House of Representatives, remedied the effect of the Dobson decision. In view of the elimination of the Tax Court provisions from the bill in the Senate, and the consequent elimination of section 1294, the Senate has substituted an amendment to section 1141 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code with the same result intended by section 1294. This provision, which is section 36 of the bill as it passed the Senate, restores to the circuit courts of appeal the power to review cases coming from the Tax Court in the same manner and to the same extent as they have power to review other cases—whether tax cases or nontax cases—coming from a district court in a case tried without a jury.

It will be noted that the bill does not attempt to define what is a question of law or what is a question of fact, or to answer any of the other complicated questions which would be involved in spelling out de novo the complete scope of review. The distinction between questions of law and questions of fact is one well-established in the law, and one with which lawyers and judges have long been familiar. Without the necessity of here defining it or answering any of the other difficult questions involved in defining the scope of review, it will suffice to say that whatever the scope of review over cases—whether tax cases or nontax cases—coming from a district court, the same scope of review should exist over cases coming from the Tax Court.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the motion is to agree to the Senate amendments rather than to request a conference with the Senate. The House, by an overwhelming vote, approved the transfer of the Tax Court from the executive to the judicial branch of the Government. Our position is impregnable from the standpoint of logic and constitutional intent, yet because of certain incidents in the peculiar history of this splendid court, it is classified technically as an agency of the executive branch. No one can question the fact that it is a court legislatively established as prescribed by the Constitution. The amendment to which we are asked to agree defeats the action of the House in approving its transfer to the department where it logically belongs. Our concurrence with the Senate perpetuates one of the strangest anomalies in the Government. This is an ideal time to accomplish the transfer, and I am keenly disappointed that it must be postponed. I recognize that the members of the House Judiciary Committee are reluctant to take any action that would jeopardize the passage of H. R. 3214 by insisting on the transfer of the Tax Court, and I must bow to their decision. I am confident, however, that steps will be taken to secure consideration of this transfer in separate measures, and I shall join the committee members in urging favorable action thereon when presented with the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, let me again state my conviction that no court has a finer personnel or more distinguished record than the present Tax Court of the United States. Due recognition of this service should not be postponed indefinitely.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. Reed of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorandum expressing the views of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to certain of the Senate amendments.)

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 117, providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the amendment of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. JACKSON of California, Mr. MALONEY, and Mr. COURTNEY.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-four Members are present; not a quorum.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 112]

Bell	Johnson, Okla.	Regan
Bloom	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Boggs, La.	Kee	Sabath
Brown, Ohio	Kefauver	Scoblick
Busbey	King	Shafer
Clark	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Clippinger	Ludlow	Smith, Maine
Cox	Lynch	Smith, Va.
Crawford	Manasco	Spence
Flannagan	Morton	Stigler
Fogarty	Mundt	Stratton
Hartley	O'Toole	Thomas, N. J.
Herter	Patman	West
Holifield	Peden	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REQUEST CONCERNING HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell us about how long we are going to continue tonight? I want to know whether I can get home tonight in time to get here tomorrow morning.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know about that. I may be able to advise the gentleman later.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, then I will object in order to find out.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 117.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

MOTION CONCERNING HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 6401, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment to section 4, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York, as a committee amendment:

On page 4, line 3, after the word "Act", insert a colon in lieu of the period, and insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this act until the President proclaims not earlier than 75 days after the date of enactment (1) that an insufficient number of persons is on active service in the armed forces to maintain an adequate national defense, and (2) that a sufficient number of such persons cannot, in his judgment, be attained by voluntary enlistment and by voluntary request for call to active duty. Immediately upon the issuance of such proclamation the provisions of this act authorizing the induction of persons into the armed forces and the ordering of persons into active service without their consent shall be effective, but no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this act prior to 90 days after the date of its enactment."

Page 5, line 2, strike out the words "and 23" and substitute the word "Section" for the word "Sections."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I believe those who could hear the reading of the amendment will understand it very clearly. In effect, it puts off the invocation of the act for 75 days from the date of enactment, and leaves it to the President alone to invoke the act, depending upon whether enlistments at that time have met the demands of the armed forces.

I might say that this amendment was adopted by the full Committee on Armed Services about 2 weeks ago, and notification of the adoption of the amendment was transmitted to the Rules Committee. It was by unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Was a similar amendment adopted in the other body?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The amendment was defeated in the other body by a substantial vote.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am wondering, since the gentleman is offering the amendment to defer the drafting for 90 days after the act goes into effect, and the President indicates it is necessary, why would it not be well to extend it another 90 days and accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], which would make it effective January 30?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It is an entirely different amendment. That amendment also calls for a concurrent resolution of the Congress. We might as well not enact this bill today. As soon as we get back in January we would have to take it up again. I am here in behalf of the committee amendment unanimously adopted in the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I might suggest that if there is such a great emergency you should not wait 75 days. Either there is an emergency or there is not. You are attempting to smooth it over by saying, "We have got 90 days; we can wait." Now, do we have 90 days or not?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. We have 75 days before the President can invoke any provision of this bill, during which time he cannot call any member of the Reserves, without his consent, or can anybody be inducted. That is simply and clearly what this amendment provides. It was unanimously adopted in the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then I wanted to ask the gentleman if there is any emergency at this time which makes it so necessary to get the draft into effect. We have been told all along that we could not delay; that we should move quickly. If that is true, why insert an amendment that will hold it up for 90 days?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may not be expressing my personal opinion. I agreed with the committee to the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. You are sugar-coating it just a little, in other words.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. It is not quite clear to me. Is the effect of this amendment to place the burden upon the President to activate this program?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It is true it places the burden directly on the President of the United States at the time this period runs out, rather than on the Congress.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Is it not a fact that this does not place any more burden on the President than the other provision of the bill which requires the President to issue a proclamation as to when the draftees will have to register, and also to issue the proclamation when the doctors have to go into the service?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The President must issue proclamations in any case.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is not this in substance the same amendment that was proposed in another body, which was rejected there, an amendment which was intended to place the burden on the President?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It was defeated in the Senate by a substantial margin.

Mr. CARROLL. Is the gentleman now stating to this body that the other body has abandoned their position in refusing to place the onus upon the President rather than this Congress which should assume its own responsibility under this important piece of legislation?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is a matter for each man's own judgment. The committee is offering this as a committee amendment which was unanimously adopted.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not fair to say that assuming this measure is enacted by the Congress and becomes law, then, of course, the mechanics of the act will begin to take effect and in the time which is covered by this amendment it is conceivable that the situation in the world might be so altered or changed that those who have the first responsibility in respect to the conduct of our foreign affairs, and even the Commander in Chief, might see a reason for not putting the act into effect.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No one could hope for a clarifying of certain things more than I.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD to the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Strike out all of section 23 and insert: "This act shall be effective on the same day that a tax bill becomes effective which will tax all corporations 100 percent of all profits and earnings in excess of the average annual profits and earnings of such corporations engaged in the manufacture of war materials or any other service connected with the war effort and/or the Selective Service Act of 1948."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Now that we are considering the drafting of young men we had better start talking about drafting industry and dollars and do something about it.

An amendment somewhat similar to this was offered in the Senate and it was held to be germane in that body.

I feel that if this emergency which supposedly confronts us at the present time is of such a grave nature that we have got to pass this bill then we had better go all the way and do the job now while we have the chance to consider this matter calmly.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this amendment is germane to this particular proposal because like the Andrews amendment it sets a beginning date as to the time when this law should go into operation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair calls attention to the fact that the amendment as presented would strike out all of section 23. This section is not now under consideration and for that reason a motion to strike it out would not be in order at this time.

The Chair may also say, however, as to the point raised by the gentleman from New York that the amendment proposes to make the effectiveness of this act contingent upon an unrelated matter and therefore would not be germane to the pending amendment.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, section 23, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, is stricken from this bill. Because of that I was forced to offer this amendment—voluntarily of course—to the amendment which he had offered so that it would be inserted in the right place.

Mr. Chairman, we are considering today a proposal to draft young American men through a selective service law into the armed forces of the United States. I offered my amendment because of my way of thinking nothing is more important than a man's life and if we are going to ask a man to serve, and perhaps die in the service of his country, then I feel we have just as much right to demand that a man's money or business can be drafted also.

Other Members have spoken on this floor in favor of selective service who said they were officers in the Army Reserve and who stated they were going back into camp this summer. I want to speak as one who served as an enlisted man in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

I have a pretty good idea what these boys are going to be up against and I would like to speak on their behalf for a change. Boys who will be called under this act will enter the services as enlisted men and they are the ones who will be most affected by this measure. I offered my amendment because to my way of thinking nothing is more important than a man's life. If we are going to ask a man to serve and perhaps die in the service of his country, then I feel we have just as much right to ask that a man's money or business be drafted also.

One thing which has disturbed me in all our wars, is that we have consisteptly refused to take the profit out of war. We have seen this country spend the blood of its best young men and at the same time, we have in every war in which we have been engaged, noted how our huge corporations made tremendous profits. The cost of the last war was $336,000,000,000 plus a million casualties in killed, wounded, and missing. At the same time these enormous sacrifices were being made the corporations in this country made the huge profit of $56,000,000,000. That profit-taking spree has been accelerated and continued down to the present time.

This Congress should, in my opinion, have taken immediate action on my amendment because we all know if this amendment had been adopted, that we were expressing very forcibly the wishes of the great majority of the American people. If we are going to draft our manpower, as this bill contemplates, then I say let us also draft the money—the high excess profits which have been one of the results of wars and which will be needed to pay for part of the twenty-one billion needed to carry on our military program for 1949. If we are to put our boys back in uniform, let us put our corporations under the same military discipline. If this is a world crisis we have to win, I feel we should go all out in the matter of preparation for it. Selective service itself is just a piecemeal approach to a problem which I feel has been exaggerated. If we are really in difficulty, my suggestion would be to adopt this amendment so that we can be prepared thoroughly for the difficult days which lie ahead.

No democracy has a right to draft men for any immediate danger which is not great enough to justify and compel drafting dollars at the same time. The military can increase their power immeasurably through selective service and UMT. Wall Street and industry can be assured of huge profits through maintenance of a huge military establishment with its demands for goods and services. Both are powerful in Washington at this time and both can gain advantages from whipping up a war scare.

If the talk of the military is not a bluff, let them prove it by submitting industry to the draft, which they seek for living human beings. Not a man should be forced into uniform unless we are sure every dollar is enlisted too.

Corporations should be satisfied with normal, peacetime profits in time of war or national emergency. No one should complain about their dollars being drafted if we pass this measure to draft our young men. Now is the time to stand up and be counted on this vital issue of dollars versus men because what we do in this House today may well decide our future for generations to come.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that in the suggested amendment offered by the Committee on Armed Services it is trying to put a little sugar-coating on this bitter pill so it will be a little easier for you to swallow. I think the committee and this Congress will be dodging their responsibility if they say that the President must declare that an emergency exists, and then proceed to put the machinery into

operation 75 days after the act passes, and it allows 90 days for the individuals who are going into the armed service.

We have been led to believe by the military that there is a grave emergency existing. We read in this bill that at the "earliest possible practical date" this conscription bill shall be put into effect. I submit if the Armed Services Committee are going to keep faith with this Congress they have no right to put in here machinery that is going to delay it until 4 or 5 days before the election. That is what it does.

Why do you put this sugar-coated provision in here? Do you think someone might swallow it a little easier? It would be far better to adopt the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] which provides that there must be a speed-up in our induction machinery—better pay for the enlisted man and then the President and the next Congress must take action by January 30, 1949—that amendment should be adopted. Then the Congress can have an opportunity to review the situation in the world.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If the emergency does not exist now, what is the excuse or the reason for this bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is what I would like to know. The committee says that the emergency does not exist now.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is what we have been told over and over again; that the emergency is not here. If it is not here, what is the reason for this bill?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Should it not also be pointed out that under the Shafer amendment the Army is required to take specific steps to get volunteer enlistments before the bill goes into effect, whereas under this amendment there is no such provision for any such action on the part of the Army.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct. As I understand under the Shafer amendment there will be an increase of 10 percent in the pay of the enlisted men and the military must take some certain, definite steps to get enlistments in the Army, which they have not been doing up to this time.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Dr. MILLER, how can we talk about adjourning here on Saturday and at the same time drafting these boys into the service on the basis of a great emergency existing? If an emergency exists, then we ought to stay right here and work with it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In this amendment the committee tells us that the emergency no longer exists.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. I have been led to believe that a great emergency does exist which necessitates the passage of the very type of legislation that is before the House. Frankly, I had intended to vote for this bill because I believed, in good faith, that an emergency did exist. But, if it does not exist, and the committee by this amendment admits that it does not exist, I see no reason for the law at all. Why not just let it go along until the Congress can determine that an emergency does exist?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Certainly I think the committee weakens the bill when they tell us there is an emergency existing, and then come in with machinery that puts the responsibility on the President, dodging our responsibility, mind you, by saying, "Well now, we think there ought to be, but you tell us, Mr. President, when it ought to be. You put it into effect."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has raised a very pertinent question here. I am a little surprised to hear that the Committee on Military Affairs has unanimously agreed on the amendment postponing the operation of this act.

I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] a question. As I understand the amendment, it postpones the operation of this law for 75 days, at least, and then it is 90 days before any man can be drafted; is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It postpones the induction of the men; that is right. In the meantime it simply defers for 75 days the date on which the President would be required to make his proclamation.

Mr. BARDEN. In doing that the committee unanimously reached the conclusion that there was no such emergency existing as to jeopardize this country or the safety of this country for 75 or 90 days; is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is correct, but while there may not be an international crisis today there is an intense manpower need. We do not know what the lack of these men is going to mean if it goes on.

Mr. BARDEN. The committee gave all that consideration at the time it adopted this committee amendment unanimously, did it not?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is right.

Mr. BARDEN. And by so doing your committee unanimously agreed that no real emergency exists, but you have kind of salved over the situation, and now you are going to give the Army 75 days to try to recruit men, are you not?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No, we are going to give 75 days more to the President to decide whether it is really needed, to see if we can get them, to see if there is any improvement in the situation.

Mr. BARDEN. And to see whether or not the Army has been able to recruit the needed men, is not that right?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. As far as I personally am concerned, I think we ought to invoke the act immediately, today, at midnight.

Mr. BARDEN. But the gentleman did not vote that way on this amendment, did he?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No.

Mr. BARDEN. Does not the gentleman feel that a little added inducement would enable the Army to recruit more men in the next 75 days, that is, to offer the men a little bit better pay from sergeant down?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No, I do not think that will make much difference. However, if selective service goes into effect today voluntary enlistments would automatically go up in all the services. Studies made throughout the war showed that that immediately takes place.

The gentleman asked me how I voted. How did he vote on the 70-group air force?

Mr. BARDEN. I voted for it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is what I thought.

Mr. BARDEN. I would vote for it again. The only thing I want to do is see that it is made active and available.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I have a very high regard for the gentleman's opinion, and when he voted for the 70-group air force and the House voted overwhelmingly for it, 349 to 3, I believe. Where are you going to get the men to implement ground forces to support the 70-group air force? You all wanted the 70-group air force and now the question is of developing a program to support with ground forces the proposed Air Force set-up.

Mr. BARDEN. I would get the men to implement the Air Force the same way you are going to get the planes for them to fly. I would pay them to go into the Air Force, just as you will pay the men in the factories to build the airplanes they are going to use. You would force the men to go into the ranks as privates at $75 a month, but the very same gentlemen, sitting right there, will appropriate billions to pay the men who make the airplanes, and pay them at the rate of $2 an hour or better.

Mr. GAVIN. The same thing goes for the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. That is my answer to the gentleman's question. Voting for the Air Force has no bearing on this issue.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman was glad to endorse the legislation, so I say the same principle applies to him.

Mr. BARDEN. Of course, I agree with the gentleman about an enlarged Air Force. But why not be as fair to those taken in the Army as those who build the planes?

Mr. GAVIN. When the 70-group air force was being considered, and the Secretary of National Defense said that we needed a rounded-out service and that 55 groups would suffice for the time being, the gentleman wanted a 70-group air force. Now you have it. How are you going to implement it?

Mr. BARDEN. I am going to implement it by being fair to the men who operate and keep up the planes and offer sufficient pay inducement and incentive that we will get sufficient voluntary enlistments.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman has not offered any suggestion as to how it should be done.

Mr. BARDEN. I am going to implement it by paying the men and being fair to them. The gentleman knows it is not fair to force them into the service without fair compensation—and if fair compensation and inducements are offered you will get sufficient men without the draft.

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to this bill. After listening to the many arguments for and against it, and after careful reflection, I believe that the opponents of the bill have made out a strong case against it.

They have proved to my satisfaction that there is no need at this time for an increase in our military manpower. The voluntary system of enlistments would suffice if the Army had not raised its peacetime standards too high, and if certain reforms were made within the armed forces. It might be pointed out that the true unification of the armed services as provided by Congress during the first session of the Eightieth Congress would go further toward strengthening our national security than any draft law. Action on the part of the Defense Establishment to carry out the intent of Congress in this respect is long overdue. Until this is done, I do not advocate passage of any legislation placing the lives of the youth of the Nation at the disposal of men who cannot even resolve the differences caused by the old feuds and petty jealousies among the services. It would be worse than futile—it would be a betrayal of the trust which the American people showed when they voted us into office.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I apprehend that the revival of the draft would be regarded by other nations as an aggressive act on the part of the United States and proof of lack of faith in the methods of international cooperation which we have been advocating. It would tend to accelerate the armaments race and so bring us one step nearer to the third world war. A weapon is a dangerous thing to possess even when one does not intend to use it. An army of young men at the disposal of men trained to use them in warfare could be disastrous in time of peace.

I am also opposed to the draft on economy grounds. The cost of this program would be heavy. And it would inevitably be followed by an increase in the tax burden. The expenditure of billions for defense will mean a reduction in the levels of living of the American people as well as the impairment of public services of which the Nation is in great need.

I concede the necessity of the draft in time of war, Mr. Chairman, but to impose it in time of peace would be contrary to our priceless American heritage of human liberty. It would be a step in the direction of the complete militarization of the country. It would exalt the military over the civil branches of the Government. What real assurance have we that the draft will not be expanded in the future and that the safeguards proposed at this time will not be abandoned?

This program may well be regarded as an effort to cover up the mistakes of our foreign policy. In my opinion, we have not yet exhausted all the other ways of dealing with the Soviet Union. It is a confession of moral bankruptcy and acknowledgment to the world that a system of government based upon the freedom and dignity of the individual has been tried in time of crises and found lacking. We must remember that our democratic traditions are supposed to function in time of stress as well as in times of peace and plenty.

But the arguments against this bill, Mr. Chairman, which seem most convincing to me are those which relate to its impact upon the young men of America. Hundreds of thousands of young men, recently graduated from our high schools and colleges, are now making good in business and the professions. Others are in the midst of their college work. Passage of this bill would mean that their education and business careers would be interrupted with incalculable results. The diversion of thousands of young men from industry will cause a decline in our industrial production and a corresponding economic loss to the Nation. Other young men will be taken from the farms and service trades which depend upon their work. Are we forgetting so soon that at the time of the last peacetime draft, the youth of the country were sent to fight and die on foreign soil even though we were promised "again, and again, and again" that such a thing would not happen?

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the many labor, farm, religious, educational, and civic organizations whose leaders have opposed this bill. And for all these reasons I intend to vote against it.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, it is quite clear to me that the chairman and other members of the Armed Services Committee evidently have been subjected to great pressure since yesterday's adjournment. I do not want to appear to be too critical but in view of the almost complete reversal of the committee's position by presenting the amendment under consideration, I feel it is my duty to comment on the situation which now confronts us.

First, however, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee to explain to the Members of the House the difference between the bill which the House has under consideration and the bill recently passed by the Senate concerning the same subject matter. In short, I want to know the difference, if any, of the date when selective service is to operate.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The difference between the Senate bill and ours is that under the Senate bill the process would start immediately.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, under the terms of the bill passed by the other body, the act becomes operative immediately.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. And according to this bill, 75 days would elapse before this selective-service law becomes effective.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. In about 90 days, because it is presumed that it will take from 75 to 90 days to get the thing in operation.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, the committee's position on the pending amendment is clearly a retreat on their part from the position which they have heretofore taken. I suppose the committee is fearful that this legislation will not pass and therefore is sugar-coating the pill. This amendment is a callous attempt to shift the responsibility from this body to the executive branch of the Government, in which the President of the United States will be called upon to activate this program. If we accept this amendment this is notice to the people of our Nation that we are reluctant to meet the issue which now confronts this body—head-on. This amendment is in the nature of a defense mechanism; it is an attempt to shirk a duty which so clearly belongs to the legislative branch of this Nation.

There is no doubt that all of us have given a great deal of study and attention to this perplexing problem. It is an especially difficult situation to meet in an election year. For my part, it is a subject to which I have given weeks and months of study in the hope that somewhere along the line I would gain enough information to reach a proper conclusion. As a result of intensive study, I have come to the conclusion that it is in the interest of this Nation and of the peace of the world to have a strong national-security program.

I shall confess, frankly, the dangers involved in the passage of this type of legislation, but as I weigh them against the possible dangers that confront us if we do not act now, it seems to me there is no alternative unless we are prepared to gamble with the peace of the world and the future of our own Nation.

As I look back upon my service and acquaintance with the Members of the Eightieth Congress, I cannot help but believe that we have enough courage—enough personal courage—to face our individual responsibilities—not only representing people in our particular congressional districts, but that we shall have the courage to assume our responsibilities as Members of Congress in representing that which is good for the whole Nation. How can we in good faith, how can we avoid the indictment

of political cowardice if we accept this

do not want to incite the other nations of

leader in the United Nations and in the

so much time yesterday, and apparently

is exactly the same period of time, be-

with this bill, there should be no objec-

of political cowardice if we accept this amendment, an amendment which is purely political in its nature and is designed to shift our responsibilities upon the President of the United States? The responsibility is with this body and not with the President.

There is nothing new in this amendment. As this same legislation was being debated just a week or 10 days ago in the Senate of the United States, an effort was made to enact the same amendment which would have the same effect of shifting responsibility upon the President in the drafting of the young men of this Nation. I cannot recall just how many voted for the amendment, but it is sufficient to say that it was rejected with a substantial majority.

I call upon you to assume your individual responsibility as members of a legislative body of a great democracy. Do not run away from this issue for fear of facing your people at home. If you are in favor of this legislation, vote for it. If you think selective service is not necessary at this time, vote against the bill; then go back home to meet your people and look them in the eye, giving them your honest opinion. Let every tub stand on its own bottom. Certainly conscientious Members of the House should not try to shift their responsibility to someone else for political advancement. Do not try to put the burden upon the President of the United States.

Every Member here owes it to his people at home, and to the people of the Nation, and to the men who are going to be drafted into the service of this Nation, to stand up in a forthright and courageous manner on this important issue.

As I followed the debate in the Senate of the United States when a similar bill was under consideration, and as I have heard the debates before the House, one would be led to believe that we are discussing different bills. The truth is that the basic principle of both bills is the same. However, during the debates before the other body there seemed to be none of the fear and reluctance to face the issue that has been characteristic of this debate so far. In the Senate, as they proceeded from section to section of the bill, there was intelligent questioning—careful, calm, considered, mature judgment being exercised. Great emphasis was placed upon the future and security of this Nation and the peace of the world.

In the Senate debate the leaders talked about building up the Reserve components and the National Guard. On the other hand, in this body so far little light has been thrown upon that latter subject, although that is one of the most important aspects of the bill. In the other body there was intelligent probing by many Members, seeking the best means and the best manner to build up the forces of this Nation in order to implement a program for peace. There was little talk about the threat of war and almost every Member who spoke upon the floor of that body laid particular stress upon the point that selective service legislation is not a war measure, and that in the passage of this type of legislation this Nation was not threatening the other nations of the world; that we do not want to incite the other nations of the world to believe that this is a war measure. Again and again it was emphasized that in the light of recent events and the conditions existing in the world today that this measure had become an imperative necessity for our national security and for the peace of the world.

It is significant, Mr. Chairman, that at the conclusion of 5 days' deliberation, able men of different political philosophies voted in favor of legislation which is almost identical with the bill we have under consideration. The vote of that body was 78 for the bill and 10 against.

Mr. Chairman, as a veteran of two wars, I know something about the problems of the men in service, the problems of the families who have men in service, and the devastating effect of war. My record is known to all who care to read of my stand on the military hierarchy in general, and the possible danger of the military reaching so dominant a position in our national life.

I am bitterly opposed to war and have advocated and will continue to advocate the strengthening of the United Nations and any world cooperation program that will bring us peace. Nothing would please me more than to be able to vote against this type of legislation but in view of all the circumstances, and in view of the advice of leaders whose duty it is to know, and in view of the action of the Senate of the United States, I feel that I cannot in good conscience vote against this measure, pitting my limited knowledge against the overwhelming weight of the judgment and decisions of others whose knowledge and experience is far superior to mine.

So that the record may be crystal clear, I want it distinctly understood that I do not subscribe to the theory or the philosophy of a permanent, continuous, compulsory military program, nor am I in favor of a tremendous Reserve program except insofar as it is necessary to replenish and replace a reasonable Regular Military Establishment. Were it not for existing world conditions I would not, under any circumstances, cast my vote to compel any American to serve in the military forces of this Nation. Let the record show also, that in the event the international tensions have eased at the expiration of this act, I shall vote to abolish any system of compulsory military training.

Speaking also for the record, I should like to point out that in my opinion this body has the cart before the horse. Only the urgent necessity of the occasion compels my favorable consideration of this type of legislation. The failure of this Congress to act on other important measures imperils the security of this Nation. For example, the total disregard of the leadership of this body of the problems of inflation threatens not only our own national economy but our national security and eventually the cause of world peace itself. This piecemeal treatment of basic problems may well lead us along the path to economic chaos. I cannot emphasize too strongly that an economic bust in this Nation will imperil our national security and certainly will destroy whatever position we hold as a leader in the United Nations and in the search for world peace. The leadership of this body is either ignorant of or deliberately avoids proper treatment of problems which affect millions of our people. I refer to the increase in the cost of living, housing, Federal aid to education, and similar measures which concern the welfare of the people.

I have stated my position on this measure in order to demonstrate that there is no need for one to be fearful or apprehensive as to the soundness of his decision when he goes home to face his people, if he has a sincere and abiding conviction that he is acting in the national interests and acting in the interests of world peace.

And so I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that the committee's amendment will be rejected and that we, as Members of this great body, shall cast our votes honestly and courageously, and will not be a party to any political plot which seeks to throw the burden upon the President of the United States.

Under the Constitution, it is our duty to make the laws. It is the duty of the President of the United States to execute the laws which we make. In a Presidential election year, if we attempt to shirk our duty you may be assured that such action will not fool the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry, but we are working under pressure as we are now running into the last 3 days of this session of the Congress. It seems best that we limit ourselves accordingly.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I do not believe it involves anything fundamental in connection with the bill. This is one bill coming before the Congress that was written by your committee. This bill was not written in any Government department. The bill went through a number of committee prints before it was ever brought to the House. Several of those committee prints contained provisions similar to the one that is now offered as a committee amendment. When the bill was offered it contained another provision. No one has mentioned it in the debate. The bill as reported by the committee had exactly the same time lag in it as is provided in this amendment.

Section 23 of the bill, on page 49, as it is pending here, provides that no person shall be inducted under this act within 90 days after the date of its enactment. This amendment does the same thing, except that if, within a period of 75 days, voluntary recruitment is sufficient, then the President would not have to put it into effect, if he did not see fit to do so.

Now, we are attempting in this bill, by many provisions, to secure voluntary enlistments and to augment the Reserve components—I agree with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]; I wish we could get down to discussing those provisions in the bill—we have had to spend

so much time yesterday, and apparently we are going to do the same thing today, listening to opponents to any measure of this sort; attempting to perfect it. Frankly, I am a little suspicious of opponents of a bill perfecting it; but that is the situation with which we are confronted.

In this bill we attempt to channel into the armed forces by voluntary recruitments and into the Reserve components, just as many men as we can.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I sought to have the gentleman from Colorado yield, but he declined to do so. If I understood him correctly, he said he was against this bill. Possibly his opposition to this amendment is because it would make it more difficult for him to vote against the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. I understood the gentleman to say that he could not in good conscience vote against the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I thought my remarks were very clear, that I was not opposed to this bill. But whether or not I would be for it or against it, I would have the courage to cast my vote based upon my convictions, and based upon the debates held here.

Mr. KILDAY. I understood the gentleman to say that he wished in good conscience he could vote against the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sorry, but I misunderstood what the gentleman from Colorado said.

Mr. KILDAY. The point about placing the burden on the President is apparent, but not real. The entire bill provides that the President must issue his proclamation for the date of registration. The President must issue a proclamation for the quotas to be inducted. He has to do everything to put this bill into effect. So that all you do by this amendment is to make it clear that the machinery is here in a stand-by position. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are parts of the executive department of the Government and operate under the President. They know how many they have, how many they need, how many they expect to get. When they reach the point where they feel they will not get all they need, they inform the President and he issues a proclamation. At the same time, if they do secure adequate numbers by voluntary enlistments, then they will not have the inductions. That is what we want—to get as many as we possibly can by voluntary enlistments, and to channel as many as possible into the Reserve components.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. Under this amendment could the President make any invocation until 75 days shall have elapsed?

Mr. KILDAY. He could not. Under the provisions of the bill nothing could happen for a period of 90 days. So it is exactly the same period of time, because he must issue his proclamation no earlier than 75 days, and the inductions could not become effective in less than 90 days. So the time lag is exactly the same.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Would not the gentleman agree that if the amendment is adopted, the provisions of the bill are not held in abeyance—are not in a stand-by position?

Mr. KILDAY. It will take 90 days.

Mr. COLE of New York. As a matter of fact, the mechanics of the bill start in motion when the bill is signed by the President. Men will be required to register, and it is assumed that it will require 90 days for the registration. So there is no delay and no postponement.

Mr. KILDAY. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. The only thing that is postponed is the induction. The registration begins and even the classification.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object. In fact, I intend to offer a substitute.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman's limitation is merely to this one amendment?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes, I merely ask for a limitation on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER to the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Strike out the words "75 days" and insert "150 days."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I still believe in American ideals. I have announced on and off the floor of this House that I am for a draft; and, if you please, I am for universal military training.

I trust that this bill when it comes to final passage will be in such form that I can vote for it. I also hope that in the true spirit of our country this bill and national security are not going to be made a political football.

The 75-day provision contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would require this proclamation to be made upon the eve of a national election. If no politics are being played with this amendment and with this bill, there should be no objection to changing that time to 150 days so that it will come after the election instead of before.

I urge, therefore, that the Committee accept my amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska rise?

Mr. BUFFETT. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I submitted a consent request to the House limiting debate and based the time estimate on the number of Members standing seeking recognition. They should be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. But unless a Member seeks recognition the Chair is not going to call any Member to speak.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORRIS. If a number of those originally desired to be heard do not now desire to be heard will the rest of us have as much as 5 minutes apiece? That is all I want, but I do want that much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair took down the names of those Members who were on their feet at the time the consent request was submitted and the Chair is endeavoring to divide the time equally between them.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHAFER. Was the limitation in the request submitted by the gentleman from New York to his own amendment only?

The CHAIRMAN. The consent agreement was that all debate on his amendment conclude in 30 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. That would not include any amendment to the amendment or any substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not.

The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, either there is an emergency now on which this Congress should act or there is not an emergency. It has to be either one or the other.

Here we have a situation that involves the most important issue that mankind has ever had before it, the issue of compulsion versus freedom. Certainly there should not be any attempt to cut off debate on the most important issue before Congress: Compulsion or freedom.

I can remember 2 years ago when this House in a moment of overexcitement

passed a conscription bill. Most of you remember it. Most of you also remember that 48 hours after that conscription bill was passed most of the Members of this House deeply regretted it.

That was when the President came in and wanted to draft strikers into the Army.

Now we have another proposal that would regiment the people of our land. The amendment that would put this draft off for 90 days is a device of psychological terrorism. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, it is below the dignity of this House to use one of the favorite Nazi tricks, the device of psychological terrorism, on the youth of America.

Mr. Chairman, I have one further word for my Republican colleagues. We have seen the administration throw the Atlantic Charter into the wastebasket, we have seen the administration throw the four freedoms into the wastebasket, we have seen them break one pledge after another.

Now what pledge did the Republican Party make to the people 2 years ago when we were elected to a majority in this House? Let me read it to you:

Neither the war nor any other excuse shall be justification for fastening regimentation permanently upon the American people.

Here in this House is a Republican majority elected on the pledge to end regimentation. Now that same Republican majority is going to turn around and completely repudiate its commitment to the American people.

My mind goes back to when the Republican Party was started. It was started on the glorious promise to set men free, to bring freedom to all people of America.

I can think of nothing more tragic than for this Republican Congress to reverse that tradition and surrender the freedom from the people.

Could there be any worse betrayal for our party to make, a party that rose to greatness on establishing freedom for all the people of this country?

Would it not be a tragedy for our party to turn around now and take away the freedom of its young people, those who cannot protect themselves?

It would be much more just if we were to pass a law drafting men from 40 to 50, those who would make better policemen abroad because of their age and experience.

But, no, we are going to take the 19- and 20-year-olds and send them over to Germany and Japan to teach those people about freedom.

Is there anything more ridiculous than that? Is there anything more fantastic than to deprive the young men of their liberty, on the pretense of sending them to Japan or Germany to teach those people about freedom and liberty?

Does anybody think this kind of hypocrisy, this kind of double talk, is going to fool the people of America or of the world?

Mr. Chairman, you will not save this country from communism, by hypocrisy, and double dealing.

If there is an emergency, then the advocates of this measure should ask an immediate draft. They have exposed the hollowness of the whole scheme by amending the bill to delay the draft for 3 months or more.

The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION IS NOT THE ANSWER TO THE PROBLEM OF OBTAINING WORLD PEACE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we are faced today with a bill which calls for the enactment of peacetime conscription of young men into the armed forces for a period of 2 years.

This bill calls for a revolutionary change in a policy of American democracy which has existed for 165 years. That policy has declared heretofore that no citizen of the United States shall be forced into military service during peacetime. Our constitutional fathers specifically repudiated peacetime conscription for military service. Enforced military service in Europe was one of the strongest factors in the prolongation of tyrannical monarchies and one of the chief reasons for early migration to America.

For 165 years we have carried on in the American tradition. During that time we have fought several great wars. We have never suffered military defeat, although our military forces drew their personnel from a citizenry of nonregimented, nonprofessional military class, and was based primarily on volunteer troops. It is true that we have supplemented our volunteer troops in wartime with conscripted personnel, but we have never departed in peacetime from our traditional position of a volunteer regular military force.

We have proven in every war worthy of mention that armies of free men can outwork and outfight the nations whose armies were based on conscripted slave workers and soldiers.

I cite as examples the defeat of Germany in World War I. A Germany that practiced peacetime conscription and trained her citizens in the militaristic Prussian method for conquest by war. The free armies of England, France, and the United States defeated Germany.

Again in World War II, the armies of Japan, Italy, and Germany were professionally trained through peacetime conscription of their soldiers, and yet they went down to defeat under the genius and initiative of citizen soldiers drawn from the free democracies of the United States, Great Britain, and our allies—none of whom practiced peacetime conscription.

What has happened to cause us to consider reversing the American tradition which has proven successful, and now causes us to embrace the Prussian theory of militarism contained in this bill?

In my opinion, we are falling victim to the propaganda of the professional militarists of the late war, generals and colonels and majors who see their wartime jobs disappearing and know that their return to civilian life will mean a reduction in pay, privileges, and authority. We are also falling victim to the propaganda of the war munition and matériel manufacturers, whose wartime profits have ceased.

We are also absorbing the propaganda of the people who say that war with Russia is inevitable, who in their hysteria of fear have turned their backs on the United Nations and returned to militaristic nationalism as the formula for a peaceful world. Such a formula is madness, it means an armament race which will cost us $17,500,000,000 in the next fiscal year, and $21,000,000,000 the second fiscal year, and more thereafter. These amounts are based on testimony before the Armed Services Committee. Even this cost might be absorbed, although extremely inflationary and dangerous, if militaristic nationalism was the answer, but it is not the answer to the problem of obtaining a peaceful world.

It is a return to the discredited methods which have caused all our wars. Intense nationalism plus military rearming on the part of competing nations has always been the formula for war.

If we embark on this course we turn our back on all our hopes of achieving world peace through the United Nations. We confess that we have no faith in the glorious concept of peace for mankind through international law, through peaceful negotiation under rules of justice and equity. Peace obtained by majority decision of nations sitting in calm tribunals, rendering judgment in light of the rules of international justice and the great spirited and moral precepts.

I do not believe that we are ready to desert the principles of the United Nations and discard the hope of world peace contained therein for the discredited law of the nationalistic jungle.

And yet that is the meaning of peacetime conscription. It is the first step toward militarism. It lays the foundation for a permanent military caste in the United States. We lay the foundation for a complete reversal of our former concept of democratic government, that is, the concept that the civilian shall dominate our society and the military shall be subservient to the civilian. It is the nose of the camel under the tent, the body of the camel will follow and the owner of the tent will be ejected.

Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why peacetime conscription of our boys from 18 to 26 should not be adopted. One of the most important reasons is that the war of the future will not be fought by mass armies. The military leaders of today are planning for the wars of yesterday when they advocate peacetime conscription to build mass armies.

They are ignoring the capacity for immediate destruction contained in atomic bombs. Long wars are a thing of the past, future wars will be decided in days. Great centers of population and industrial production will be destroyed in days, not by months and years of long-range, old-style bombing.

Destruction will be so complete that occupation will be both unnecessary and unprofitable.

Complete defense against aircraft or air missiles which are atomic-armed is impossible, as proven by the testimony of our greatest military leaders, and yet anything short of complete defense is useless. Why? Because one aircraft carrying a modern atomic bomb can eliminate any modern industrial center from the war effort.

We are, in this bill for peacetime conscription, helping to perpetuate the military concept of World War II. We are duplicating the shortsighted judgment of the military leaders of the postwar I period, who court-martialed Billy Mitchell because he said the next war would be an air war.

We are building a Maginot line not of concrete and steel, as France did after World War I, but we are building a Maginot line of the bodies of our 18-year-old boys. Their bodies and all the obsolete methods of past wars will not protect us against atomic destruction.

Mankind cannot afford the luxury of another war. A war which will be decided by atomic and bacteriological methods, so destructive that civilization cannot withstand the shock.

There is only one hope for world peace, and that hope lies in the application of the principle of righteousness in the United Nations. This we can do only through the help of Almighty God. May we realize that the arm of flesh will fail us before it is too late. Let us bend all our energies, our statesmanship, and our resources to making the United Nations work.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I gave you some information that was presented before the Ordnance Association in Detroit last week showing very conclusively that we do not have balanced arms or ammunition available to equip six and one-half divisions. Just a few minutes ago when the appropriation bill, H. R. 6935, was before us, there passed without comment, because of the extreme rush, consideration of the stock pile appropriation, and on page 17 of the hearings on the bill H. R. 6935 you will find that Mr. Thomas J. Hargrave, Chairman of the Munitions Board, testified before the Committee on Appropriations that in 2 years of effort since the enactment of Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress they have actually accomplished about 10 percent of the objectives on stock piling; that we are now literally behind the eight ball, and on that basis it will take probably 10 years to achieve our objective on stock piling. I would like to know what you are going to say to your constituents when you explain to them when you go back home that you have just gone that far in the matter of providing your boys with adequate weapons, in providing them with a 10 percent stock pile to provide more modern weapons in case the war should strike. I think it is very untimely to resort to the manpower draft first and in that way get the cart before the horse. I regret very much that we have failed so miserably in providing an adequate national defense on every other front, and yet we hysterically reach out now for the drafting of men in peacetime. Unlike the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], I have no hesitancy in facing my constituents and telling them frankly and straightforwardly that I am opposed to the draft in peacetime. I have told them that for 27 years. I was sent to my congressional district by the War Department as a teacher of military science and tactics. My people know where I stand and I do not have to stutter about it. I think I have a thorough understanding of what is sound national defense, and I would hate terribly to see Congress place the draft for military service in peacetime ahead of the common-sense provision of the supply of arms that our boys need, and of the stock piles we need for the modernizing of equipment that will be needed in any future war.

For the better information of Congress in the consideration of the issue here under consideration I quote the questions asked of Mr. Hargrave by the gentleman from New Jersey, Hon. GORDON CANFIELD, member of the Appropriations Committee, and Mr. Hargrave's replies:

NEED FOR SPEEDING UP PROGRAM

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Hargrave, the goal for the completion of these stock piles is the end of the fiscal year 1951. Do you believe that this program should be speeded up in the light of the current international situation?

Mr. HARGRAVE. I believe it should: Regardless of the present situation, I have always believed that the stock piles should be materialized within the 5-year period, which is the original goal. Actually, we are very considerably behind the 8 ball now, so far as the quantity of the stock pile is concerned. Actually I believe we have built up about 10 percent of our objective in 2 years, two full years of the operation of the stock piling, and on that basis it would take considerably longer than a 10-year period. However, I will say that our accelerated rate has gone up very much during the first half of the fiscal year 1948.

Mr. MACK. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HARGRAVE. And I think that acceleration will be continued.

Mr. CANFIELD. Has the Board received any instructions from higher authority to accelerate this program?

Mr. HARGRAVE. None that I know of.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SHAFER for the committee amendment:

"SEC. —. (a) No person shall be registered or inducted under this act before January 31, 1949, and no person shall be registered or inducted under this act on or after January 31, 1949, unless the President and the Congress (by law enacted on or after such date) find that the requisite manpower strengths of the armed forces have not been attained and maintained by an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign.

"(b) (1) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign. For the purposes of such campaign and notwithstanding any other provisions of law—

"(A) the base pay of enlisted men on active duty in the armed forces of the United States is hereby increased by 10 percent;

"(B) the passing mark on the Army General Classification Test shall not exceed 70 points;

"(C) original enlistments in the armed forces for periods of 2 years shall be accepted from among all age groups suitable for military service, with such enlistment privileges as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, which shall be the same or similar to the enlistment privileges now provided for enlistments for periods of more than 2 years; and

"(D) reenlistments in the armed forces for periods of 1 or 2 years, at the option of the person so enlisted, shall be accepted with such reenlistment privileges as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, which shall be the same or similar to the enlistment privileges now provided for reenlistments for longer periods.

"(2) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each consult with, and make a monthly report to, the Joint Committee on Voluntary Enlistments with respect to the methods and results of the intensified voluntary enlistment campaign carried on pursuant to this section.

"SEC. —. (a) There is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Voluntary Enlistments (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee"), to be composed of five members of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and five members of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(b) The joint committee shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of the voluntary enlistment campaign required by section 23 of this act and shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable, not later than January 2, 1949.

"(c) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places within the United States during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the joint committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

"(d) The joint committee shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it deems advisable."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan that it is not germane to the amendment for which it is offered as a substitute. It very obviously contains subject matter the provisions of which are not even contemplated by the bill, let alone the committee amendment for which it seeks to serve as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SHAFER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I believe, is germane because it has to do with the drafting of men into the United States Army or the delaying of the drafting of men into the Army. The amendment just offered dealt with giving them extra time so far as putting the legislation into effect.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is offered as a substitute for an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]. The amendment for which it is offered as a substitute is limited to certain things. It relates wholly to the time of induction and the determination that a sufficient number cannot in the judgment of the President be obtained by voluntary enlistment and by voluntary requests for call to active duty. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] goes far beyond the scope of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] and proposes to create a joint congressional committee and deals with other matters beyond the scope of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Chair is constrained to rule that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is not germane as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will my amendment be germane at a later time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is hardly in a position to pass on that at this time. The Chair will consider that when the amendment is offered. That will depend partly on what it may be offered as a substitute for; whether it is offered as a direct amendment to the bill; its relation to the matter concerned at the point that it may be offered; and upon the condition of the bill at the time it may be offered.

The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be read for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANSFIELD) there were—ayes 145, noes 38.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of California: On page 6, after line 16, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"No persons shall be inducted under paragraphs (1) and (2) above until and unless the President shall find and so advise the President pro tempore of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, not before 3 months after the date of enactment of this act, that insufficient numbers of doctors of medicine, dentists, veterinarians, optometrists, osteopaths, and pharmacists have volunteered for service in the armed forces to maintain the ratio specified in said subsections. Upon such advice to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the authority in said subsections to induct persons into the armed forces shall become effective immediately."

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear first of all that I am definitely supporting this legislation. I voted for it as a member of the committee. I intend to support it, whether or not my amendment is adopted.

The amendment which I now offer was also offered in committee, and I think, primarily due to a misunderstanding, it was defeated by a rather close vote.

The amendment does not prevent, if necessary, the drafting of doctors, veterinarians, or any of the others mentioned in the amendment, but it does give the voluntary system with respect to those classifications an opportunity to work.

I should like to call to the attention of the members of the committee the fact that never in the history of the country have we found it necessary to draft doctors.

During World War II, through the Procurement and Assignment Service that was set up by the medical profession itself, we were able to obtain all the doctors necessary to properly care for the health needs of the men in the service. I think that at this time, in the passage of this legislation, it would be unwise, indeed, for us to provide for the drafting of doctors if they can be obtained through the Procurement and Assignment Service and by voluntary means.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I will state to the gentleman that as far as those at this table are concerned, we do not have any objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. If the other table will agree to my amendment I will revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say that as far as I am concerned I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. If I am to understand there is no objection on the part of the committee, I will not proceed further.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. Has the committee made any endeavor to find out how many medical men are now in the Reserve Corps?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think the committee has that information available; but there are not sufficient doctors now in the service to take care of the expanded needs of each branch of the armed forces.

Mr. FENTON. If the committee had seen fit to make inquiry up until yesterday they would have found that there are now in the medical reserve corps of the Army 14,162 physicians, and in the Navy 14,450, or a total of 40,960 already in the Reserve Corps.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am sure the gentleman agrees with me, then, that the drafting of doctors at this time is not necessary.

Mr. FENTON. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I am glad the gentleman has offered this amendment. It is, of course, a departure from all previous practices to drift doctors. We have always been able to get all the medical services, not only doctors, but all the rest of the professional services on a volunteer basis. I feel that the gentleman's amendment is a good amendment and I expect to support it.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Like my colleague from California I too have been in contact with doctors all over my State of Tennessee. They are ready to offer their services whenever they are needed.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. They have always done so throughout the history of our country.

Mr. JENNINGS. And they ought not to be drafted.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. I wish to say to my colleague that I am entirely in support of his amendment. The medical profession in my district likewise supports his amendment.

I wonder if the gentleman who is a member of the committee could tell us what you are going to do with 1 veterinarian for every 2,000 men. I thought they had gotten rid of all the horses in the Army.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think they have, but the term veterinary, as far as the armed forces is concerned, is out of date.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the additional number of physicians who will be needed if this bill goes into effect?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I cannot answer the gentleman, but he will find that information in the hearings.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in response to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] with regard to the veterinarians, the title "veterinarian" is obsolete. These veterinarians are really food inspectors.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman feel that an amendment should be offered on page 5 as well, correcting the age limit 45, that it should be changed? Why discriminate against doctors, why draft doctors up to age 45?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. No, I do not think that age limit ought to be changed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Why should you discriminate against the doctor?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I do not think we are discriminating against the doctors. They will come in on a voluntary basis under the terms of my amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, you are, because that will still be in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state to the gentleman from Connecticut that the Chair has examined the gentleman's amendment and is prepared to state that it is not in the nature of a substitute, but may be offered after the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is disposed of.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut: On page 5, strike out all of page 5 and down to line 16 on page 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just adopted is fine as far as it goes, but it certainly does not deal with this whole question whether or not we should draft into the service doctors, veterinarians, pharmacists, osteopaths, and others associated and affiliated with the medical profession. I may say at the outset that I have no personal interest in any doctor. No relative of mine is a physician. But no Member of the House has a higher regard for the medical profession and those who work with that profession than does the gentleman now addressing you.

The medical profession over the years has demonstrated that it has been ahead of our Army and Navy. It has always been ready for any national emergency and ready for the call of the Army and Navy. In 1917 the medical profession and the hospitals went out and organized medical units and then they had to sit around week after week waiting for orders to bring them to active duty. The same thing was true in preparation for World War II. The medical profession was ready. In my own State, and I am sure the same situation prevailed in other States, the medical profession had to set up committees to go around and urge some of the doctors who were badly needed at home to stay at home. They all wanted to leave and go into the armed services.

I am sure we do not want to pass any section of this bill that will cast any reflection on the patriotism of the medical profession or write any language in the bill that the medical profession feels does cast a reflection on their patriotism. I would remind you that a physician may be called into service under the terms of this bill and I admit that with the adoption of the Anderson amendment there would be very few inducted, certainly in the older age brackets. But take a doctor who is 36, 38, or 40, you call him into service in peacetime to simply serve a 2-year enlistment in the Army and you will ruin that man's practice. He is willing to do that in time of war. He is willing to leave his practice for 1, 5, or 6 years, but we are asking something of the medical profession under the terms of this bill that we do not ask of any other profession in the United States. This is true as to all doctors, osteopaths, veterinarians, and so forth, who are over age 26.

I hope the committee will strike out this whole section and permit the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy to get the doctors as they have up to this date, through the Officers Reserve Corps and through the procurement initiated and carried on by the medical profession itself.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will receive serious consideration and that it will be adopted.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment because never before in the history of our country have the doctors and dentists been charged with failure to respond to service when called.

This bill calls for the registration of doctors up to 45 years of age in contrast to all other male citizens up to 31 years. It therefore creates an assumption that medical men are lacking in patriotism and that they are singled out, specifically, as far as age is concerned.

I believe the records will show that the medical profession was the first to create a Reserve corps in the Army. Physicians leaving active service usually join the Reserve Corps. The Navy continues its service in the Reserve Corps indefinitely; the Army allows retirement from the Reserve Corps after 5 years. And, the records will further show that in the last two wars great numbers of physicians applied for commissions long before these wars were actually declared.

I am well experienced and very familiar with the work done by my profession in World Wars I and II—both in the field and in the hospitals. As a battalion surgeon of infantry in 1917–18 and 1919 I know, personally, of their accomplishments.

As a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House during all of World War II, I naturally took a great interest in the work of my profession. As a matter of fact I visited in 1944, along with other members of that committee, the European theater of war. It was gratifying to me and my colleagues to hear day after day of the magnificent job the medical men were doing—and when I say medical men I mean also to include the Medical Corps—enlisted personnel and officers.

The members of our committee will forever remember what our great Army chiefs told us about the Medical Corps—Yes, Generals Eisenhower, Bradley, Patton, Clark, and dozens of other high ranking officers gave glowing accounts of the high type of work done by the medics.

My colleagues, the medical profession was the first to be prepared for the emergencies in 1917 and 1941. We not only volunteered as individuals but we prepared medical units for the field and organized many hospital units. I saw many of those hospital units in action in 1944—what a grand job they did.

Our national medical association—the AMA, our various State medical societies, our country medical societies working together and cooperating with the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission recruited 60,000 physicians for the armed services in World War II—60,000 physicians for an Army and Navy of 14,000,000—and they did a swell job.

On the basis of an armed service of a little over 2,000,000 and a ratio of 5 doctors per 1,000, there will be needed about 10,000 physicians. And you will easily get them, I am sure, by the same methods used in the past. But to place a stigma upon the patriotism of the present crop of physicians is unfair and I believe not justified.

At the close of World War II the medical profession set up another committee, called the Council on National Emergency Medical Service, which has been actively surveying the field and preparing for any new emergency or war. This committee or council has interviewed the authorities of our armed services in each branch for the purpose of determining in what way it can most effectively serve, and, in accordance with instructions, has stimulated the creation of a similar council in each State. The medical profession through these councils is preparing to meet not only the immediate demands of the armed services but also the problems that will arise among the civilians if and when they are exposed to an atomic explosion and the problems caused by invasion or an epidemic.

Yes, the medical profession is ahead of important groups in preparedness such as industry, transportation, and fuel.

Our medical schools have in their curricula appropriate courses to handle problems arising from atomic and biologic warfare and are cooperating with the Atomic Energy Commission as well as the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service.

At the present time the Army has 14,162 physicians in the Officers Reserve Corps and 5,508 dentists in the Officers Reserve Corps. In the Navy there are 14,215 physicians in the Naval Officers Reserve Corps and 7,075 dentists.

My colleagues, the medical profession will serve its country—draft or no draft—as it always has done. I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, under the agreement that we have, I deeply regret that we will have to be confined to 5 minutes. Therefore I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the statement has just been made that we must not draft these young men into the armed services without making very sure that they will have proper medical care. That is a wholly justified statement. But where is there a shred of evidence in the history of the United States that there were ever any men in our armed forces who did not have proper medical care voluntarily provided by members of the medical profession themselves? We did not have to draft a single doctor in the last war or in World War I. The medical profession itself provided more than enough. Doctors volunteered as individuals. They organized medical units for field service and hospital units at bases. Most were organized and ready months before the service called them. In addition the profession regulated itself by providing specialists where needed. It persuaded those of its members to go who had least obligations here at home, and who could render the greatest service in the armed forces. With remarkable success it tried to spread around those left at home, persuading men to go into those rural areas whose doctors had volunteered and left people without medical care.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me wholly unnecessary and utterly unjustified officially to stigmatize as unpatriotic the very professions that had the best record of volunteering of any groups in our whole population. They have not only done a superb job of being ready ahead of wars in the past; they are preparing for any future war right now. They have organized reserve units. They are voluntarily training their members and those of the nursing profession to take care of victims of possible atomic warfare and bacteriological warfare and every conceivable new type of injury that might be developed in another war.

So for us to single out for drafting up to 45 years of age the members of these professions which in the past, have rendered such outstanding service and have the highest percentage of volunteering, seems to me unnecessary, unjustified, unfair to the professions, and most of all unfair to the public.

What man is going to take his children or his wife to that doctor over whose head hangs the threat of being called at any moment into the armed services for 2 years? Just about the time that she will be ready to have her baby, Uncle Sam may call him up.

How will it be possible for him to build up his practice if he is likely to be pulled out at the age of 40 and taken into the service for 2 years? How can he establish himself when he gets back?

It is bad for the doctors, but far worse for the public itself to have all the healing professions in our country thrown into chaos and uncertainty.

In our country today there are about one and a half doctors for each one thousand of population. This bill authorizes the armed services to draft five for each thousand men. What patients require most of the doctors' time in civilian life? Three groups, the children, the aged, and women. The average for our civilian population including those who have the highest rate of illnesses is only one and a half doctors per one thousand. Yet here we are to take five for each thousand of young able bodied, carefully selected men who have been innoculated and vaccinated against diseases, fed vitamins and special foods, given maximum protection and in peacetime need the least medical care and not the most.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted. Physicians, nurses, dentists and the other professions have a high sense of duty. They have never failed this country in the past. They never will in the future. It will be better for all concerned, and especially for the civilian sick, to eliminate this unnecessary subsection 4 (c).

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The Committee may be interested in the statement, that the Navy sent out their recruiting officers to recruit dentists. Two thousand and seven hundred dentists signed up, expressing willingness to go into the service as of now, but as of this minute not one of the 2,700 has been taken; not one of them will be taken until this bill becomes law. They are waiting until this proposed legislation does become law before they will accept the 2,700 dentists who are pleading to enlist in the services. You see, it might hurt the chances of passage of this bill if these dentists were permitted to enlist and no shortage existed. I just thought you might be interested in knowing this fact.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do this just to call attention to the fact that there are 5,000 doctors that would come in the first category. The commitee took this into very careful consideration. There are 5,000 doctors, trained at Government expense, in the Army or the Navy——

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Just a moment.

Those men have no prior service. They are in the first category that would be drawn. In the first year that would just about meet the need.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. How many of those 5,000 are 45 years of age?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. None of them, but the 45-year-old men are in the last category, and very few of them would ever be taken except in a supervisory way.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then, why do you have the draft age up to 45?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Simply to have them listed so we will know who they are.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Under present bill, all men up to 31 have to register and are eligible to be drafted, are they not?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No; they are not eligible for drafting. They are registered from 26 to 31. The registration figures are for one specific reason. Dr. Bush, of the Bureau of Scientific Research and Development, wanted to get an accurate estimate of the men who were in the service and to know where those men are in scientific fields and what they are doing. It is merely for the Bureau of Scientific Research and Development. That was the only reason for registering men from 26 to 31.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman know, from his work on the committee all during the last war, that the medical profession itself sorted out pretty well those of its members who ought to go into the service and could best be spared from the community needs, and succeeded in getting them to volunteer first?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is true.

Mr. JUDD. Then, why are you afraid the medical profession will fall down this time?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I am particularly anxious to get the first category that are provided in this bill.

Mr. JUDD. And so in the medical profession.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Well, I am not so sure. I know one thing, that numbers of the medical profession are very anxious to have jobs in certain hospitals that are taken care of today by men in the service.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we do not adopt this amendment. We have gone far enough in adopting the Anderson amendment, in my opinion. Under that amendment the President will have the right to set up a priority system. That is the procedure under which we procured doctors in World War II. At the present time we have 8,150 doctors in

the Medical Corps. That includes the Air Force also. The number of doctors required for this expanded program is 11,350. So we will be short 2,100 doctors with the expanded program. The Navy also in their program at the present time have 2,750 doctors. That is based on 5.76 to each 1,000, which is a little more than this bill at this time carries. Under the expanded program the Navy will require 3,850 doctors and will be short 1,100 doctors.

This will make a total of 3,300 doctors short under the expanded program.

The 5,000 the chairman of the committee just mentioned are ASTP students with no prior service, and under this bill will be obligated to serve exclusive of the Anderson amendment. So you have a pool there of 5,000 students who have received practically all of their training paid for by the Government and should render some service. So the picture is not as bad as one would believe it to be. I know that at the present time that all of the medical schools in the country want doctors released. I have a wire today urging me to try to get a doctor out of the service to teach in a medical school. We are also faced with a situation in many parts of the country where there is a shortage of doctors.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. I am sure the gentleman is very fair. The gentleman, of course, is in favor of the Reserve Corps.

Mr. DURHAM. Certainly.

Mr. FENTON. Does the gentleman know there are now in the Army Reserve Corps 14,162 physicians and in the Navy Reserve Corps, 14,250?

Mr. DURHAM. I am glad to hear the doctor say that. I am not familiar with the exact number in the Reserve Corps. I am very much in favor of the Army and I hope it will be further extended.

Mr. FENTON. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman also has been very fair in his past deliberations on the Military Affairs Committee and he knows that the Committee on Procurement and Assignment in the last war did a very fine job.

Mr. DURHAM. A very excellent job. That is why I supported the Anderson amendment.

Mr. FENTON. And we certainly should leave it in the same hands to procure our physicians.

Mr. DURHAM. That is exactly what we have done if I understand the effect of the Anderson amendment.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. In view of the very excellent record that the medical profession made in the last world war, does the gentleman think it necessary to call our medical men to register up to 44?

Mr. DURHAM. I do not see anything wrong with having them register up to that age when you leave it up to a board like the one we operated under in the last World War. We need surgeons as well as doctors, and you do not get surgeons at age 25, you get them from age 35 to 40. You cannot run this on the basis of an age schedule like you can your ground forces and many other things because you have got to have these specialists who do not finish their training as specialists until they are much older.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair is advised that two or three Members wish to revise and extend their remarks at this point. The Chair will entertain such requests at this time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can come to an agreement in the matter of limiting debate on this amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not yield to the gentleman for that purpose if this comes out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It will not be taken out of the gentleman's time.

The Committee will rise informally to receive a message.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker resumed the chair.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 110) entitled "An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2239) entitled "An act to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4051) entitled "An act to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. REED, Mr. MOORE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MCMAHON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6419) entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 6355) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, and passed by the House of Representatives on reconsideration of the same, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 9 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in this section of the bill you are taking a left-handed slap at the physicians, the osteopaths, the veterinarians, and other men who in past wars have rendered an unusual service to our country. I was rather interested when the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] stated there were 6½ doctors in the armed services for each thousand and he thought that these boys ought to have the very finest care they can get. The bill calls for 5 per 1,000. I would remind the gentleman that in civilian practice we have 1 physician to 800. He ought to be interested in seeing they get proper care before they go into the armed services.

May I also call your attention to the fact that the civilian population is made up partly of old men, women, and children, and expectant mothers, while the military services are made up of strong, healthy young men, who do not need these services. I am amazed at the gentleman that he would want to raise this to 6½ per 1,000, and that is what his words were. The bill provides for 5 per 1,000. He ought to be interested in seeing that they get pretty good care before they get into the armed services.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman realizes that the doctors and dentists who were in the service also cared for the children and the dependents in the service, which is not counted in the 5 to 1,000. Overseas they looked after civilian employees. You have to have a doctor on every ship of any size, you have to have a doctor at every military post regardless of size and organization, all of which makes necessary a higher percentage than you have in civilian life. I do not see how the gentleman is going to avoid that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There are a number of civilians who were taken care of by the medical men in the military. I am going to offer an amendment to reduce the number of physicians to 2 per 1,000. The physicians have always been loyal in every war. They had a Reserve Corps ready to serve and right now in the Army and Navy Reserves there are more than 40,000

physicians who have signified their intention of rendering a service to the armed services if and when called. The gentleman is aware of the fact that there are about 5,000 ASTP students and the Army authorities tell me they are going to call those 5,000 under Executive order.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Those Reserve doctors cannot be called back to active duty without their consent. Many served in World War II.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There is an Executive order calling these 5,000 I am speaking of into the service now.

May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that if there is another war the atomic bomb will cause more damage to the civilian population than to many of the soldiers. You take the atomic bomb, bacteriological warfare and the other things that could occur to the people of this country and you are not going to have sufficient doctors at home to take care of them.

Now, this bill provides a ratio of 5 to 1,000. I live in a county of 4,000 people and we have two doctors. Under this bill, with the military ratio, we would have to have 20 doctors. I do not see why they should be so hoggish and want all of the professional material.

Mr. Chairman, I think this section ought to be stricken from the bill in order to keep from putting a stigma upon the physicians, dentists, and veterinarians of this country that they are not willing to serve their country.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Just to keep the record straight, there were 10,000 ASTP students, not 5,000. I believe the record will show 10,000.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Five thousand of them are not eligible physically.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. In order to follow the logic of this thing through, would it not be just as proper to draft all of the old hotel chefs?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes. The gentleman asks, Why not carry this to a logical conclusion and draft all the old hotel chefs up to 45 years of age so the men will have good food in the Army.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. Why not follow the logic still further and draft all Members of Congress who want this legislation?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, I would not go quite that far.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] has pointed out that under this bill the Army plans to draft 1,238 veterinarians into peacetime service. I was amazed to learn this in view of the desperate shortage of trained veterinarians which now exists in this country.

Members of the veterinary profession are badly needed for civilian field work all over the country; they are needed by the Federal, State, and local governments for food inspection; they are needed for important research work—including research on foot-and-mouth disease, which now threatens American livestock.

Veterinary colleges in this country have not been able to train enough veterinarians for all civilian requirements. There are only 10 such colleges now, and, although 3 more are being added, it will be years before this will have any great effect on the situation.

I earnestly believe that the Army should give further consideration to their plans for the drafting of such a large number of veterinarians.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether my remarks are properly addressed to this amendment or to the one which the gentleman from Nebraska says he is about to offer. Of course, if this amendment carries, that will dispose of the issues embraced within the gentleman's proposal.

I say what I am about to say with the utmost charity and feeling of gratitude toward the Medical Corps of the Army. They are a fine group of men, and there are many splendid physicians and surgeons among them. To them I personally owe a deep debt as regards my own good health and possibly my life. But, in all frankness, it was my experience in the Army that they had too many doctors. Wherever I went, the doctors, with few exceptions, certainly were not working as hard as doctors in civilian life.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Apropos of the position taken on this amendment, I would like to remind the gentleman, and I know he knows, that in the theater in which he and I served one of the very finest hospitals, the Twentieth General Hospital, was entirely composed, from the commanding officer down through the doctors and the nurses, and practically all of the orderlies by voluntary enlistment from the University of Pennsylvania Hospital.

Mr. KEATING. That is perfectly true. Not a conscript doctor among them. And a fine outfit they were, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would like to subscribe to what the gentleman is saying about the number of doctors in the service. I was in the other theater of war, and it seemed to me that when we were not in battle we had more doctors than we had use for. While my service was not as broad or extensive as that of the gentleman from New York, wherever I did serve I always found that to be the case.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my friend from Florida for his observation. I know the gentleman's service was effective wherever he served, and I am interested to learn that his experience was the same as mine. I really feel, gentlemen of the Committee, that this amendment should carry. Nothing has been adduced in argument or in the record which I have read which convinces me that this compulsory service of doctors and other professional men is necessary. Its passage will work a great hardship on our civilians in many parts of the country where there is a serious shortage of doctors.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think something might well be said at this point also about what is going to happen to the morale and the skill of those doctors and dentists and veterinarians who are called into the service against their will.

Mr. KEATING. That is right. The gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman agree that if the original form of the bill were to go through it would probably create a very bad situation so far as the civilian needs are concerned?

Mr. KEATING. I think it would. I think that is borne out by what the gentleman from Nebraska told us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MEADE].

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out that in some sections, if not in all parts of this country, there is a great shortage of civilian care on the part of the medical profession. I have in my district a county of over 10,000 people without one single physician to care for those people. In all other counties in my district there is a shortage of physicians. During my service in the Navy, after the war was over, I noticed that we had more doctors than we could even find good billets for.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the gentleman have any idea as to what the proportion of doctors to men are in this bill as compared to what they were during the war?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. It looks to me about the same.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that obviously you need more doctors when you are actually in a shooting war than you do when you are entering the service?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Of course, we take the cream of physicians crop into the service due to this draft and due to the high physical standards required.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. Are not these 5,000 doctors that come under this first category subject to call now with or without their consent, if they have not already served?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. These 5,000 young men who were trained by the Army and Navy are still subject to call. It was part of the contract during their training period, and they will be called as needed and are being called as needed.

Mr. MORTON. Without this legislation?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Without this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 4, line 23, strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twelve."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment on the desk similar to the one just offered by the gentleman from New York. I withdraw my amendment, and shall support his amendment.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to reduce the term of service of the draftees to 12 months. Coming after the amendment to strike out completely the drafting of doctors, it would seem to me wholly in order to reduce the period of service of a drafted boy to a period of 1 year instead of 2 years, having in mind that in France and England and all the other countries of western Europe there is no country that drafts its boys for more than 1 year, and they all select them from the age groups of 19, 20, and 21.

I call your attention to the fact there is on the Speaker's desk a bill from the other end of the Capitol which drafts these boys for 2 full years. When a 2-year bill meets a 1-year bill in direct collision, the result may very well be an 18-month bill, so I think both the Members who favor a 1-year term of service and those who favor an 18-month term of service should support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there will come of age each year 1,140,000 boys. If this bill passes and we reduce the ages to make it from 19 through 21 as I propose to do in a later amendment, the Army will begin with three classes, and each additional year they will acquire another 1,100,000 men. If our generals and if our Secretaries have not the ability to operate an army with such a draft, together with the voluntary system, then let us get some generals with the ingenuity, ability, and intelligence to manage it.

The argument is made that it will be more expensive to take our boys for 1 year rather than for 2 years. Perhaps it will be. But for my part, I would rather pay the additional expense, and I would rather spare the boy and his family and the community the burden of two full years of service. I do not have to belabor the fact that 2 years taken out of a boy's life at his most formative period is far more serious to his future life and the development of a career.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. While it might be more expensive to the Army, it would be a great deal less expensive to the boys who are selected and put into the service.

Mr. COUDERT. Precisely.

Mr. Chairman, one further point that will be made against this is that a 1-year term of service is inefficient. Perhaps it is less efficient. I have no doubt that the generals would like to have a 7-year term of service. The old professional armies of Europe were composed of 7-year men. Perhaps they were better soldiers for some purposes—they were certainly better parade ground soldiers. They also complain, I understand, that this will make it a little more difficult to serve the occupied areas. Well, gentlemen, the military occupation is a police operation. It is a token garrison operation, and if it takes a little more trouble to send the 1-year man over there and turn them around and send them back, I would much rather do that than impose a wholly unjustified and harsh 2-year term on a handful of individuals.

Mr. Chairman, a third point. Liability to the draft should certainly be based upon a broad democratic foundation. A 2-year draft based upon figures that the Department of Defense now relies upon will mean a limited number of men only. A 1-year period will double the number serving and extend the foundation.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at the outset that I expect to support the draft bill. I do think, however, it could be improved in several particulars. This is one particular. You remember in 1945 we had almost 12,000,000 men under arms. At that time the recruiting sergeants and the recruiting officers were literally beating the drums everywhere saying that we needed more men. We were figting then, of course, in World War II, which encompased the whole world. If we get into another war, obviously it will not be any less in diameter; it will not be any less in intensity, nor any less in magnitude. The bill we are now considering takes into the service 2,500,000 men, one-sixth of those that we had in 1945. Therefore, obviously this bill is not designed to take in enough men to do us any good in the event we actually get into a shooting war. It is not designed to do that. It seems to me the purpose of it is to make those countries that are stamping out freedom throughout the world realize that we are getting ourselves ready and that we will go forward to resist aggression and totalitarianism.

The men who will be drafted under this bill will not be the colonels or the majors or the lieutenants. They will be the privates, the privates first class, and the sergeants. They will be the boys who are the orderlies for the colonels. They are the boys who will drive the jeeps and do the cooking and the baking. They are the boys who will do the police duty. They will also be given basic training. They will learn to shoot mortars, BAR's, flame throwers, and rifles. They can learn all that within a period of 1 year. There is no sense in keeping those boys in the service for 2 years to learn what they can get within 1 year. It is not fair to those young men to take them at the most formative period in their lives, as has been said, and keep them for over 1 year when to keep them is not necessary. What will they do the second year? They will pick up cigarette butts, wash down the barracks, and take long wasteful week ends.

Another thing, if they say it cuts down national defense, it cannot possibly be so, because under this bill, if we limit the time to 1 year, instead of training 2,500,000 we will train 4,010,000. So, if the purpose of the bill is to increase national defense, by this amendment we increase the number of trained men 100 percent.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I gladly yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Will you please tell us where you are going to get those 4,000,000 men? Are you going to take veterans or married men? There simply are not that many eligible in the pool.

Mr. SMATHERS. If the gentleman is going to ask me a question, I assume he will let me answer it. Under this bill the provisions of it will supply you with the number of men you need. As I understand from the chairman, you need only about 200,000 men. Certainly, we have enough men becoming eligible every year and within the provisions of this draft to meet the needs for each year.

Mr. KILDAY. Your figure is 600,000 rather than 200,000.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman know that under the figures of the Department of Defense, 1,140,000 young men turn 18 each year?

Mr. SMATHERS. So, obviously, if this bill is designed to increase national defense, it will do it by 100 percent, if we lessen the time that each man serves. Its clear that these men can get their basic training in 1 year.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is correct as to the number who will become 18, but he is not correct as to the number who will become eligible for military service. Our experience has been throughout selective service that you lose about 50 percent.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would like to add one other thought. That is the problem of morale. Young men can serve for 1 year and do a good job and feel like it has been a democratic process,

and that they have done their duty but if you take him for 2 years and keep him overseas, doing nothing but walking post he will get discouraged. He does not like the Army, he does not like the country. He does not like anything. Obviously, it is much more democratic to broaden the base of this bill and have more men serve and make each individual sacrifice less.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. Gladly to the able gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am in agreement with the gentleman on this 1-year proposition. I want to call to his attention the fact that in the last war we took men out of civilian life and trained them to be finished fighter and bomber pilots in 9 or 10 months. We took men out of civilian life and sent them through officer's candidate school in 3 months, and they came out and made good officers. I just cannot see the need for giving these men 2 years' service.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I well understand what prompts the amendment. The facts are that it does not gibe with the situation and the number we have in the available pool. The committee took into consideration the exemptions that it wanted to make, with the result that the effective pool is right down to hardpan now, on the basis of 2 years' service.

Of course, it is clear that if men go into the service they must be trained. In case of service overseas, in Japan or Germany or other places, they must be transported. They must be brought back home when they are discharged. Then, if you take a man into service for a year, he is certainly out of the picture. In the induction pool there are today 1,300,000 men.

In the first year the Army will need 250,000 new men to go from 540,000 to 790,000. That takes no account of the attrition that is going on in this year, men we are going to lose on short-term enlistments, enlistments longer even than 1 year. Every time you enlist a man for a year or 18 months you are going to face the same situation a year or 18 months later, you are going to have men going out every month.

The Navy will need 33,000 more to go from 437,000 to 460,000, plus 100,000 more to replace men leaving the Navy.

The Air Force needs 56,000 men to go from its present strength of 397,000 to 413,000, plus 166,000 to replace men leaving the Air Force, making a total of 222,000 for the Air Force.

The Marines need 10,000.

All this adds up to a total need of 903,000 men in the next year, during the coming fiscal year.

There will be 349,000 more men in the services to raise their strength, combined, from 1,466,000 on July 1, 1948, to 1,795,000 on July 1, 1949. This will leave 555,000 more men to replace the many leaving the services during the year.

Even if you got these men by enlistment rather than by induction it takes longer to train men in the Air Corps than in any other service. We have voted for a 70-group air force. It is going to take thousands of trained men to man that air force. The Air Force is not taking any enlistment under 3 years.

If the period of service is cut in half, twice as many men will be needed. Twice as many men will be needed under a 1-year period than under the proposed bill. There are simply not that many men in the pool under the bill as now drafted and we have endeavored to set up exemptions and deferments with the result that the pool is just about equal to the number of men that will be needed in the next fiscal year, considering the increase in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the replacements that will be necessary to fill the spaces created by those who drop out who had short-term enlistments. It just would not work with the pool. I want to remind you that according to the House bill we defer all fathers, we defer all those who have dependents, we defer all those under 18 years of age. Only in the 19–20 year group do we have a big pool, because after you get into and past the 21-year group you get into the group that saw service during the past war. We defer all members of the National Guard, we defer all members of the Reserve Corps, and all men who had 12 months' service in this war. The Senate bill does not do that.

The House defers all men who had 12 months of service in the past war or even 12 months' Federal service since the war provided they are now in the National Guard or Reserve Corps.

This amendment does not jibe with the facts and will leave us in a hopeless situation.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no easy road to peace. Witness the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. There is no happy way in which men can defend their country. There is no happiness in the heart, I am sure, of any man in this House when he reaches into the home, into the life of the people and asks them to serve their country.

I did not have anything to do with the mess that the world is in today. Perhaps if 15 or 20 years ago this Congress had had the courage to realize the cost of peace we would not be faced with this unfortunate position today.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because it will render useless both the 12 months of training of the soldier, the money it has cost the taxpayers, and the time of the Army.

This is not a training bill. It is, we hope, an opportunity to have military strength which, we pray God, we may never need, rather than military weakness in time of need. I, too, wish that the service of TEAGUE, WILLIAMS, and 16,000,000 other people, approximately, could have saved the House this terrible responsibility. But unfortunately, that is not true. I sincerely hope that no American will ever be called upon to engage in combat, for I know the dirty, nasty business of war; consequently, I shall accept my responsibility and ask young America to invest 2 years of their lives if necessary in the future of the world. If there is to be a future perhaps it will be decided by the courage and the foresight of this Congress.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Does the gentleman know of any country in history where conscription has prevented it from getting into war?

Mr. LYLE. I know of no period of western civilization in which there has never been a war.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I want to subscribe to the very worthy sentiments which the gentleman is expressing. If the gentleman says that what we need is more manpower, 1 year's training will give us twice as much manpower as the present set-up. That is one of the reasons for the amendment.

Mr. LYLE. This is not a training bill; this is a service bill. The training bill is still in the Rules Committee.

Mr. SMATHERS. Can the gentleman tell me of any new land that the United States intends to occupy other than what it is occupying right now?

Mr. LYLE. I join with the gentleman in the prayer that we never occupy one single bit of land that does not belong to America; but, if necessary, I want an army equipped, first, to defend my country, and, second, to occupy that which is necessary to defend my country.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the gentleman maintain when it took 12,000,000 men to defend us in World War II that 2,000,000 men can do it in world war III?

Mr. LYLE. I am assuming if this bill is passed and if we meet our responsibility and meet the challenge that is ours today and develop a striking, effective combat force, we will not have a war.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman says this is not a training bill. If this is not to train our young men to fill a niche in the defense of our beloved Republic and to help preserve it, what is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. LYLE. The purpose of it is to build up the dwindling ranks of the Army.

Mr. BREHM. Then it is a training program?

Mr. LYLE. Necessarily, training is involved in it because these men will be given 12 or 13 weeks of basic training before they are assigned to a unit.

Mr. BREHM. It is either a training program to help defend America or it is preparation for war. It must be one or the other. The gentleman says it is not

a training program, so we must deduce then that it is a direct preparation for war. Basic training can be obtained in 13 weeks or less, why 2 years if it is not for general training provisions?

Mr. LYLE. I hope not, I sincerely hope not.

Mr. BREHM. That is the only logical conclusion to be drawn from the gentleman's statement.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does not the gentleman think that this amendment is a determination of whether we will have a strong army or a weak one?

Mr. LYLE. I think if the pending amendment is adopted, the whole bill is useless.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to limit the period of service to 1 year. This ominously broad bill is disturbing many people throughout the Republic. It is disturbing many in this Congress. It has been said that if your draft these young men for only 1 year that it will not work; that you will take the heart out of the program; that you will ruin the service. Oh, how many times have we heard that? How many bills have passed this Congress, gone into effect, and worked, when we have been told on this floor that the departments involved say, "It will not work; we cannot do it that way." This is a measure that reaches out into some families and takes a young man to serve in the armed forces while it passes by other families. On one hand it takes a young man to serve for 2 years. I maintain that 1 year is long enough. What harm can come from trying 1 year? What mistake can be made at this time in trying it for 1 year?

Mr. Chairman, it has been pointed out that if this period of service is for 1 year it will result in having more men trained to serve their country. It will be more uniform; it will treat the boys and families alike if they are drafted for only 1 year. It will make a lasting difference in the educational, business, and family plans of many young men. It will enable them to hang onto the things which they hold dear to a far greater degree than if they are taken for 2 years. A boy may be able to serve a year without completely destroying his educational and life plans. With 2 years taken out of his life the danger is much greater.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to one other thing. We have talked about the available pool and that there would be certain exemptions and deferments. Do you realize that the number of deferments can and will be cut down if the draft is only for 1 year?

This is not, as has been pointed out, purely a training program. I am inclined to think that this country ought to have some sort of a training program. However, we are embarking upon a matter of selective service. This proposal is to draft boys for twice as long as did the Selective Service Act of 1940. It should be reduced to 1 year. You are voting for a law that is going to reach into some homes where there is a young man and it is going to pass by others. Why should you have it for 2 years? Let us try 1 year.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Is it not true that if it is ineffective for 1 year, that then we are to believe that the whole UMT program proposed before this was under a false argument?

Mr. CURTIS. That is right. I refuse yet to bow to the departments and bureaus of government which always advance the stock argument that any change in their proposals will render those proposals unworkable. Let us try it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON as a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]: Page 4, line 23, strike out "24" and insert "18."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simply to give you a choice between 24 months, 18 months, and 12 months. It has been urged that 12 months is probably too short, when you take off the time that is to be spent in boot or basic training. If you are going to have a training program along with a program that makes up the deficit of the services, we may need not only a time for training but also a time for duties other than training, that is, field duty and occupation duty. So to be worth while to the Army, we are now arguing between something that may defeat the entire program, 12 months, on one hand, and 24 months on the other, and the 24 months may defeat the younger generation. As a compromise, I am offering 18 months.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman really wants, and I am sure he does, to give the House an absolute choice, would it not be better to permit a vote on the 12-month provision before we have a vote on the 18-month provision? If that is not the choice of the House, we still would have an opportunity to vote on the 18-month provision.

Mr. FULTON. No; I am sorry that I cannot agree.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in one-half hour.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the number of Members who have indicated a desire to speak on this amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the action just taken limiting debate to 30 minutes be vacated and that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be fixed at 50 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, are we going to have an opportunity to vote tonight on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That is within the control of the Committee.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I might state that with the adoption of the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] it will be my plan, once this amendment is voted up or down tonight, to move that the Committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How long will this last limitation of time give each Member who wants to speak on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not counted all the Members standing but has noted the names of the Members and will divide the time accordingly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Might we know so that we might prepare our addresses?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida Mr. SIKES.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, let us be sure that we understand what this bill is for. It is not a training bill. We are not seeking a big backlog of trained men. We are not making gestures to other powers. We are filling the gaps in our armed services. This is a general service bill. We are at least a quarter of a million men short of the number of men who are needed for the efficient operation of the armed services today. Voluntary enlistments have failed to provide those men, despite inducements never before equalled. We have to have enough men to carry on the essential operations of the services and enough to insure an adequate measure of national security. Selective service is a democratic method of selection and it appears to be the only way to get essential men. I think we should remember that. Half of the men in the services roughly are overseas today. Let us see what we would do if we were to cut the period of service to 12 months for inductees. I think everyone realizes that it would be a waste of time to send a 12-month man overseas. It takes approximately 4 months to induct a man and to give him his basic training. After you have given a man 4 months of training, you have not made a soldier out of him. He is still a kid

who has learned something about wearing the uniform, military courtesy, and how to handle a gun. He does not know anything about the complex unit training which must be taught today. After 4 months of basic training he does not know how to conduct himself in a combat organization. If he were called on to do so to protect his country at that period he would be but little more than cannon fodder. If you give him another 4 months in unit training before you send him overseas you have just about enough time to stage him and ship him and then turn around and stage him and send him home from overseas.

This is a highly inefficient and a costly procedure. It is of little value to the services. But more than that, much more than that, it would not permit rotation of the men who are now overseas. A 12-month draft would virtually condemn men who are overseas to remain there. Certainly that is neither fair nor desirable. They too have loved ones at home. They too want to be at home.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered to my amendment, for a very simple reason. I say to those Members who want 18 months' service that the only possible chance they will have of getting 18 months' service is to vote for the original amendment putting a 1-year period in the House bill. We are only one-half of this Legislature. There is on the Speaker's table another bill from another body providing for 2 years. When a bill with a 2-year provision meets a bill with a 1-year provision in headlong collision, 18 months may be the result.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it true to say that your real objective is 18 months, and the way to get 18 months is to vote for your amendment?

Mr. COUDERT. My real objective is 1 year, but I have no illusions that we are likely to get anything better than 18 months.

Mr. JUDD. But if somebody has an objective of 18 months, the way to get it is to vote for your amendment?

Mr. COUDERT. Precisely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with this 12-month amendment. If it is true that it is impossible to train men to fight in 12 months, then a whole lot of fellows who did not know how to fight just finished whipping the devil out of Japan and Germany, because a whole lot of them were not in the Army 12 months.

As I said a while ago, pilot training in the United States Army, one of the highest of the technical-training divisions, only consists of 9 or 10 months. The same is true of navigation and bombardier training. It took only 3 months during the war to make an officer out of a man, to take him out of civilian life and make a second lieutenant out of him and send him overseas. The success of a military-training program depends on the manner in which the time of the trainee is applied. If he is kept in the Army for 2 years under this program, I venture to say that much of it will be wasted in such chores as picking up cigarette butts. That is what I fear if you do not vote this 12-month amendment. As a matter of fact, I think it is not entirely impossible that they could concentrate this training and make it in 6 months.

I hope that the 12-month period is voted in order that we can make sure that these boys will get sufficient training and yet not have them going around these various Army posts doing nothing and having nothing to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 2 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Coudert amendment.

A great deal has been said on the floor of this House about the necessity of having a 2-year training period. I never thought I would stand in the well of this House and hear such a proposition come before the American Congress. I have lived a great part of my life in conscript countries. It has been said today that in the conscript nations of Europe 1 year of training is considered enough.

We had a great deal of talk here about our lack of preparation and why we did not have bigger and better armies. Has anyone ever stopped to think that this Nation has never lost a war? As the gentleman from Mississippi has just very accurately said, we have no apologies to offer for our armies of freemen. They have always done the job. They always will.

We have heard talk today about 1 year being too short to train a man and send him abroad in the army of occupation. I submit to you that we do not want to send these young men over to take their places as armies of occupation. It is bad for the morale. They are not doing a good job now with these young recruits in Germany and Japan. Ask any Army officer who comes back from there.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the lady yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Three hundred thousand of them are overseas now. It is very difficult to find a way of rotating them home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. One year's training out of the university career of many of these young men is certainly enough. If it is enough to build up the conscript armies of Europe, it is enough to build up our armies, becase we have a bigger pool from which to draw.

What are we trying to do?

Are we trying to compete in numbers with the Soviet Union? Then we are wasting our time and our breath. You cannot outbreed Russia. But freemen—will win; they won at Marathon; they have won all through the ages, and they will win today.

Let us do this in the American way. Let us not try and imitate conscription as it has been carried out in Europe, as it is carried out under a totalitarian regime. That is not what we want for our boys, for our young people. We do not want them to go over there and act as policemen at the age of 21. That is not good training for any man. That is the best way in the world to build up the bullying instinct that is in a great many of us. No; let the occupation be taken care of by the seasoned men who have been in the service. Even they will not do too good a job and they are not too good for it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that the gentlewoman from New York, myself, and many other Members have received letters from constituents who have been in the service and are seeking to get back in? We send the letters to the War Department, but never seem able to get those men back in the service.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The gentleman is entirely correct; and I state again that I think the Army has raised their standards too high on purpose because the military want a conscript army.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the 12-month amendment. I personally am opposed to breaking up or interfering with the education of our young men.

An amendment has been suggested to make the length of training 18 months. If you adopt such an amendment you might as well go to 2 years because you are going to interfere with 2 years of the boys' college work; but I am heartily in favor of the 12-month training period.

It is rather surpising to hear these remarks that training cannot be accomplished in 12 months. We have heard so much about UMT. They wanted the boys in for only 6 months. They have been trying to tell everybody that a 6-month period would be sufficient for UMT. Now they say 12 months is not enough.

On Sunday afternoon I talked to about seven college boys and I want to tell you members of the committee that we have really disturbed their college life. I have never heard so many questions such as: "What are you going to do with us? What is the best thing for us to do? Should we go into the Army today? Should we enlist now? We do not know what to do. We cannot study."

Mr. Chairman, the damage has already been done. I hope the 12-month amendment is adopted, so that their education will be interrupted for only 1 year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment providing for

a 12-month period of training. I have listened pretty carefully to a number of World War II veterans who have spoken in support of the 1-year training period. I am impressed with the statements of these men, our own Members who are combat veterans, men who were right on the firing line. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who not only saw service but is badly crippled for life, has made a very convincing argument in favor of this 1-year amendment. He calls particular attention to the fact that these boys will get all necessary training in a period of 6 months, as far as training is concerned, and the military will have plenty to do to keep them occupied the remainder of the time. Attention is further directed to the fact that if this is a matter of training, then under the amendment, more men would have training than if the period of training is 2 years. Furthermore, the training would be equalized among more men who may be inducted under this proposed legislation. More than that, the young men who are called would not be required to sacrifice so much of their time from their regular pursuits. The chairman of the committee in charge of this measure has indicated there is no immediate demand. He has offered an amendment that postpones the effective date of this act for 75 days plus 60 days. He also says the requirement of the Army program is for approximately 200,000 men and that other components have all the men they need.

As I understand the program, it is intended that older men who are in the Regular Army will be expected to do whatever is required in the way of occupation forces in foreign countries. Most of the men inducted under this measure will be from 19 to 21 years of age. I am inclined to go along with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] when he says that boys, after they are inducted, should be given plenty to do in the way of training. In other words, kept busy in training that is worth while. Mr. Chairman, another thing that ought to be observed is that in countries where they have conscripted men in the armies for years, and have more or less militaristic governments, the period of training in many of these countries is for 1 year. I do not believe, just because some of our military leaders want a 2-year period of training, that should be the compelling reason why we should follow their advice. If our country were in immediate need for a large armed force, the situation would be different. I am for adequate security. I voted for the big air force and for all appropriations for our defenses—Army, Navy, and Air Corps. I believe 1 year of intensive training for inductees is not only adequate but more practical and more equitable.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad once in my life to stand before the Congress and tell why I am against all of these proposals of sending your boys and my boys to war. I had two of them myself. I went through all of this. When the Congress of the United States says something about war it is bad. It is bad because we invite trouble.

Mr. Chairman, why should we draft anybody? I would like to ask someone to get up here and tell me why we should draft anybody to go to war? We are a peace-loving people, we can maintain peace if the State Department and the rest of the people who are apparently running this country will tell us why we should draft a single, solitary soul in this country to go to war. They talk about 6 months. Well, I was just as good a soldier in 6 months as I was in a year. Anyone who takes the intensive training of the Army, Navy, or anywhere else will be a good soldier if he has got it in his heart. If he has not, he will not be a good soldier.

Mr. Chairman, why does not someone get up here and tell me why I should draft my neighbor's boy and his daughter and somebody else to go to war? If they can tell me, I will vote with them. If it is in defense of my country, I will go myself, old as I am, but do not tell me that you have to draft anybody to go to war in this country. If we need it, let the President of the United States call for volunteers and he will get them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the duty before us is to keep an eye on the objective. It is a very unpleasant thing to have to draft men in time of peace, but if the purpose of it is to fill an active need in our armed services right now, economy indicates we should not reduce the period of training to a point where we would defeat the very purpose we are seeking. I am sorry to have to disagree with some of the gallant and eminent members who have spoken. We must remember, for one thing, that the intense training the gentleman from Mississippi and others went through in the last war was under the tremendous incentive of a fighting war. You cannot train men as fast as that in time of peace as I have learned from hard experience. The expense of training a recruit is great, both on account of other men required to train him and because of the need of taking care of him. His service should be long enough so that by the time he is ready to do a job he is not almost ready to quit. It does not seem to me fair to give up a sound scheme because somebody's boy may not have to go at all.

Mr. Chairman, we have to think of the real objective, which is to meet a present need.

We are about to act on a measure to draft our young men in time of peace. The only sound excuse for such a departure from our previous national policy is the belief that our safety and that of the freedom-loving nations of the world is at stake.

The weight of the evidence that has been presented to the Congress is to that effect; that the personnel of our armed services, particularly in the case of the Army, is inadequate, and the needed numbers cannot be secured by voluntary enlistments. Obviously we cannot take the appalling risk of again being unprepared to defend ourselves, while our potential enemies are armed to the teeth. That chance we must not take—even if the claims that our military leaders are exaggerating the situation have some foundation. This Congress cannot afford to repudiate the judgment of the overwhelming majority of our generals, admirals, and other military experts—not to mention our own fine Committee on Armed Services. If we cannot have confidence in them, we better get a whole new set of technical experts.

Yes, we will undoubtedly do what the admirals and the generals recommend. I hope, however, that the Pentagon planners will take heed of signs of dissatisfaction that are developing on many sides. I hope they will not be misled by this vote into believing that the Members of this body are satisfied or will, in the end, be tolerant of their inept and disinterested handling of the programs of the civilian components of the Army and Air Force. The National Guard and Organized Reserves have been badly neglected. During recent debates here in the House, Member after Member has voiced his dissatisfaction in this regard.

In reporting the military functions bill just the other day, the Appropriations Committee said on page 16 of its report:

> The committee was not impressed with the presentation of the needs for the funds requested or with the manner in which this program is apparently being conducted. Too many men are encouraged to enlist in the Reserves and then hear nothing further from such enlistment.

Those of us who are in close touch with the Reserve and National Guard affairs know that there is much disappointment and discontent in their ranks.

These are some of the manifestations of which the G2's and public relations experts better take note. The Pentagon planners and the high Army brass will be very badly fooled if they take the vote on this bill as a vote of confidence in the way they are handling the problems of the civilian components. I trust they will not be so misled. The fine soldiers and flyers that make up the National Guard and Army and and Air Corps Reserves are entitled to more understanding leadership. The Navy is doing much better in that regard. The Congress and the country want sound national preparedness with a minimum of expense and regimentation. This can only be accomplished by developing the volunteer civilian components to a maximum extent. It cannot be done if they are treated as unwelcome stepchildren of the regular establishments.

I hope the people of the country, as a whole, will also take to heart the situation that is confronting us.

Here we are drafting and spending billions on the armed services within less than 3 years after victory in the greatest war of all time. The pace is getting very fast. If democracy is to succeed our citizens must all work at it. It is a dangerous disregard of duty for an individual to fail to register, or to vote. The lack of interest shown in some localities in recent primaries is a danger signal. This country needs now, as never before, the best available leadership at each level of government.

We do not draft people to vote. It is a service, however, for which all good citizens should willingly volunteer. Manpower is not only needed on the farms and in the factories and the armed services—it is needed at the polls.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, the step that we are asked to take is a serious one. It is in violation of the traditions of this Nation. It is aping the military clique of Hitler, as well as bygone ages. Peacetime conscription is foreign to America. It is un-American and it has no business here. It is an armament race which always has and always will end in disaster. Where are the Caesars, the Alexanders, the Napoleons, and Hitlers today? What became of their military machines and their nations? History tells us.

The fact remains that we are told by the militarists that we were unprepared in the last two wars, but yet we won the wars that others started, and we can do it again, if necessary, without destroying ourselves first.

This bill is unconstitutional, but what is the use of talking about constitutionality when the Executive controls the courts? This bill has been brought here by the military clique during the closing days of Congress. This is unfair to the Members of this body and unfortunate for America. Why this rush? Before we enact this bill we should at least discuss it with our masters, we the people, during the coming election. Involuntary servitude is not national defense. Selective service is not voluntary.

We are all for national defense, but to destroy ourselves is not national defense. Just what is national defense? Is it huge bodies of men, right face, column right, column left, and to the rear march, or are these performances obsolete? We must not repeat the blunders that the Army made when they court-martialed Billy Mitchell for telling them that its methods of war were obsolete. Time has proven that Billy Mitchell was right and the brass hats were wrong.

Future wars will be fought from the air. They will be fought not only with explosives, but also by spreading disease germs. The fighting forces in the future will consist largely of aviators, technicians, electricians, biologists, scientists, and mechanics.

These can best be trained in our high schools, colleges, universities, National Guard, and ROTC. I believe some such program was adopted by the American Legion a year ago in San Francisco. Many retired Army and Navy officers, and some generals and admirals still in the armed forces, agree that this would be the best national defense. There are other matters of far greater importance to our national defense than to take teen-age youngsters out of their homes and place them in voluntary service in military camps, where, to say the least, the morals are none too high.

As part of our national defense, we must stock-pile necessary metals. We must stop the depletion of our natural resources. We are in far greater need of a stock pile than we are for teen-age youngsters. The testimony before my Subcommittee on Mines has brought out this deplorable fact, that in case of war we would be out of manganese in 1 year, and completely out of chromium in 6 months.

You cannot manufacture steel without manganese, nor stainless steel without chromium. We have had members of the Munitions Board and National Resources Board before us, and they all admitted the deplorable condition which we are in, in case of war. This not only in regard to these two metals, but many others. They all admitted that something should be done, and it was up to Congress to do it.

Yet some of the Members that sponsored this un-American bill have and are opposing real national defense—the Russell bill. They have succeeded temporarily in blocking that bill from coming up for a vote. In place of this brass-hat bill, we should now be debating the Russell bill. Are we afraid of real national defense? Do we wish to embark and sail unknown seas—involuntary servitude—selective service?

There is a woodchuck in the wood pile. Someone is trying to prevent real national defense. Let us stop shadow boxing. We are in a dangerous and precarious condition because we lack a stock pile of essential and necessary metals. Our national defense has been neglected and blocked in this Congress.

The public has a right to know the situation. Secretary Krug stated before the Appropriations Committee that our stock pile was nil. The testimony before our subcommittee shows that it is even worse than nil.

If those back of this un-American bill want real national defense, then they should assist us in getting the Russell bill—in getting a stock pile—in place of throwing monkey wrenches into the machinery.

In place of taking teen-age youngsters from their homes and placing them in military camps, we should see to it that in case of war our armed forces have the implements with which to defend themselves and their Nation. Here is a real emergency. We should see that we have a sufficient stock pile.

In place of passing this bill and taking the teen-age youngsters from their homes, education, and work, to waste a year or two in outmoded and obsolete training, we should pass the Russell bill.

I realize that the brass hats say that they are going to educate these youngsters. Let me ask the fathers and mothers of these youngsters and the Members of this Congress, Do you wish to duplicate our educational system? Do you wish to have the brass hats educate your youngsters in their way of thinking? If you do, then you had better say goodby to your liberty.

I am for national defense, but real national defense and not the kind that is proposed in this bill, which to say the least is questionable national defense.

Real soldiers are not teen-age drafted boys, but men who wish to make the Army their life work. These can be gotten in sufficient number and more than we need if the Army and Navy removes some of the uncalled-for and unnecessary restrictions. Through the ages the best soldiers and fighters were not perfect physical specimens.

I am informed that some 45 percent of the men offering to enlist have been rejected. Some because they are slightly flat-footed, although they can run faster and shoot straighter than the officers who reject them.

Our admirals, generals, and enlisted men of the Army and Navy have made a splendid record on all battle fronts. We are justly proud of them. But the Army and Navy Departments here in Washington are just bureaucracies. They are just as fallible as other bureaucracies. They are everlastingly asking for more money and more men.

Both the Army and Navy Departments are in a rut. In place of following their dictates blindly, let us protect our Nation, and our youth. Let us get them out of the rut and bring them up to date.

It costs billions to continue the selective draft, whereas stock pile would cost less than $80,000,000 a year. Yet there are those who object to the stock pile, and say that it costs too much, and then blindly support this un-American involuntary selective service in peacetime. They are among my erring friends who have voted billions for grafting, foreign politicians, and inefficient, and in some cases, corrupt foreign governments.

Why an armament race? What has happened to the 52 peace-loving nations? What is wrong with the UN, which was to bring about permanent peace? Thus, and thus alone, can our liberties be preserved and our form of government be protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall take the first minute, at least, of my time to try to save the time of the committee tomorrow. At the proper time tomorrow the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] will introduce an amendment concerning the exemption of certain wartime merchant seamen. I know from experience what the first reaction is going to be. They got too much money; they got twice what the armed services did, and all that sort of thing which I have been listening to for years. It is not the truth.

Yesterday I put into the RECORD on pages 8370 to 8372 tables submitted by the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission showing the facts. I ask that you who have that feeling look at those tables, study them over, and then do not raise that particular bogey unless you want to have it knocked down quickly by the figures. Perhaps we can save some time if you will just do that.

Insofar as this particular amendment is concerned, I hope that we do not stand for the 18 months. I should like to see a clean-cut vote on the 12 months one way or the other. If we adopt the 12 months we will probably get 18, but let us not pussyfoot; let us vote for the 12 months and see where we stand.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SARBACHER. I would like to add my voice to that of the other World War II veterans of the Eightieth Congress and say that as an ex-member of the Marine Corps I am strongly in favor of the 1-year period and shall support this amendment wholeheartedly. It was proven beyond doubt in my judgment during the past war that this is an adequate training period.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] made a very eloquent appeal to this body a few minutes ago. The words that she spoke should be echoed from coast to coast. She is a mother and was speaking for the mothers of America.

I want to tell this Committee briefly about the number of individuals rejected by the armed services. It took me about 2 months to find out how many men were actually being rejected; young men who came to the service saying, "I would like to get into the Army, the Navy, or the Air Corps." It is interesting to note that the Air Corps and the Navy and the Marine Corps have all the men they want, but do you know how many they rejected of those who volunteered to come in? Fifty-three percent. What did the Army do? I searched the records several weeks ago, as well as letters from the armed services. They rejected 37 percent of all the boys that applied to them for voluntary service. They wanted to get in. Why were they rejected? Because the Army saw fit to raise the standards higher than they had been during the draft days. I am not sure that they wanted them in the Army. I think they wanted to convince the Congres. that they could not get them. That standard should be lowered. The men who want to go into the Army on a voluntary basis should certainly be permitted to go in.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this amendment for 12 months. I think it is the horse-sense approach to it. I think it is time for this Congress, as we say in Nebraska, to use a little common horse sense. There is no need of making this 24 months, 2 years. A war is not on. If war breaks out, there would be no difficulty in this country getting men who had served before, in all groups and classes, to come to the defense of their country. So I say to you, Mr. Chairman, you ought to support this amendment for 12 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I think I am patriotic. I believe I love my country and its security no better than you do but as well. But for the life of me I cannot see any logic or reason in declining to accept this amendment of 12 months instead of 2 years.

You heard one of the members of the Committee on Armed Services, in answer to a question propounded to him as to what they would do during these 12 months, "Is it a training program or is it something else," finally answer that they would receive 13 weeks of basic training. What is the idea of keeping them there 2 years instead of 1 to do something else, I do not know what? There might come a war, and it would last about 90 days. The bombing that would be done either in this country or in other countries that might be our enemy countries would end the whole thing in less than 6 months. The trouble we are in in talking about this draft bill on this occasion is that we are trying to prepare for a war upon the basis of using the weapons and the men in the manner we did in 1860, or prior even to the first war. I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, we are here debating the method of raising the personnel for the most expensive game in which man has ever participated, and that is, war and the preparation for war.

I have come to the conclusion in my own mind that it is less costly to this country from every standpoint to have men voluntarily inducted into the military service, regardless of the dollar cost, than it is to incur the cost of bringing them into the service through conscription or enforced service or selective draft. Therefore, I am going to support this amendment. I have great admiration for the gentleman from New York who has offered this amendment. I find myself in agreement with him on many things, and that adds diginity to this amendment.

I understand the Shafer amendment will be offered again, and if it comes up I shall vote for that amendment. Unless this bill is very materially altered from its present form, I shall vote against the bill because I so terribly detest the bringing into our life and our ideals and institutions of the great forces which are here proposed.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that two or three Members who have time are not here, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a debatable motion. It is always within the discretion of the gentleman handling the bill to move that the Committee rise.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, under the arrangement entered into limiting debate on this amendment, will the Members who were scheduled to be recognized be recognized when the Committee resumes its deliberations?

The CHAIRMAN. They will be recognized, if the Committee should vote to rise, when the Committee meets again.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. My understanding is that all those gentlemen whose names are on the list will be recognized immediately tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The statement of the gentleman from New York is correct.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COUDERT. Did not the gentleman from New York agree that there would be a vote on this amendment tonight?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from New York can speak for himself as to that.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. My recollection is that I moved that the Committee continue debate on this amendment for 30 minutes, which motion was agreed to. After which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] asked unanimous consent that the time be extended to 50 minutes, which was agreed to, and also to vacate the proceedings by which the motion was agreed to to limit debate for 30 minutes. That was all that there was in that agreement.

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS of New York) there were—ayes 79, noes 94.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ANDREWS of New York and Mr. SMATHERS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 76, noes 139.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good time for the committee to vote on the amendment.

Vote down the 18-month amendment and vote for the 12-month amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for 2 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time. I think it is time to vote now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] for 2 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] for 2 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia for 2 minutes.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment and I expect to vote against this bill.

The gentleman from Minnesota a while ago said that if they had consulted history they would not have proposed to induct doctors into the Army. I would suggest that if the committee

had considered history at all this bill would not be on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, it seems rather tragic that after 160 years of glorious history, after demonstrating on two occasions a military might that surpassed anything in all history, a superiority in manpower and equipment that amazed the world, our leaders are now ready to forsake a system that made all this possible and accept a system that has never prevented a war, has never won a war, a system that had kept Europe in turmoil for centuries and has brought it to the depths of despair and financial and economic collapse.

Every page of history cries out against this damnable thing—peacetime conscription.

Peace or the will to fight is built in the moral fiber and the hearts of men, and not in statute books.

Fortitude in war has its roots in the morality of peace, for courage is not a chance gift of nature like an aptitude for games.

A man of character in peace is a man of courage in war. And character is a habit—the daily choice between right and wrong. It is a quality which grows and the bearing of an army provides an index to the character of the Nation.

In the long run a nation finds that its strongest defense lines are back in the homes and schools of this Nation where character is built. That is what gives free people the power to win and hold their freedom. In this we have the greatest defense.

It is ironical that this Congress appropriates billions for relief all over the world and the proposal before us, certainly of questionable value, will consume $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 annually, and we have nothing for aid to education.

Here you present a proposal that strikes at the very heart of a system that has created our strongest defense—the character, courage, and creative genius of our people.

All America rebels against regimentation. Every red-blooded American youth has an inherent hatred for compulsion. It is not the way of free people. It is un-American.

General Foch, generalissimo of the Allied armies in World War I said: "A nation has the kind of army it deserves."

His own beloved France in two decades offers an example by giving us the two extremes.

In 1914 France had a stable government and was economically sound. Her people were imbued with a patriotic fervor that gave her an army that received the admiration of all the world. How different in 1942.

France, after a decade of New Dealism under Premier Blum, became completely demoralized—morally, economically, and financially. This decadence was reflected in her armies which were literally trampled under foot by the German hordes. What a tragedy, and they had peacetime conscription.

Later in 1942 and 1943 we found the conscription armies of the United Nations waiting. Waiting for what? They were waiting for the production and armed might of the United States—the product of free enterprise and a free people; factors that won this war.

In the name of God and humanity do not destroy the greatest asset we have—the genius of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may revise and extend his remarks.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] for 2 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] for 2 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] to close the debate on the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object. He cannot do it under the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may not do that, but the gentleman from Georgia may claim his time and yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the Chair instruct the Members how to proceed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I realize the situation that confronts me now. On the other hand, I do not feel that I would be justified in not taking the time inasmuch as I was charged with the obligation of handling the bill on behalf of the minority. So I hope I may have the attention of the membership.

I have been very much interested in noticing how many are voting for this amendment and against the bill. Again I realize the situation as it exists tonight.

I have also been interested in noticing that those who spoke in favor of the 12-month amendment very carefully avoided referring to the bill by the title which it bears: The Selective Service Act of 1948. They have insisted in referring to it as training rather than as service.

The bill comes before us because the armed forces are not up to strength, cannot be and have not been brought up to strength by voluntary enlistments and some form of compulsion is necessary.

I have no complaint with any man who votes against the bill. I do not impugn his motives or his patriotism. I am sure that each is voting in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience. I do sincerely wish, however, that members of this committee would face the facts and vote for the bill or against the bill rather than to vote for amendments that will kill the bill. Each is responsible to his own conscience. If the present parliamentary manner satisfies your conscience, well and good.

Another thing I want to mention is the reference to 4,000,000 men that are going to be trained. There are not 4,000,000 in the pool.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the pool will not furnish that many men. What it means if you take them for 12 months is that those who have voluntarily enlisted for a period of 3 years remain overseas without any replacements. Those who are overseas stay there. There will be no replacement of those men. You do not want to take these men without training. We have said these men were to be trained. You want them to receive the same sort of basic training that the men received before. If you do that it means you are going to have a training period of 110 days; then if you make any sort of specialist out of him he is going to take an additional training period of 98 days. He is going to get, unless you do not want him to have it, 12 days' leave at the end of his training period.

It has been figured over a period of many years, and it always applied in the Regular Army, that a man was not sent overseas who had less than a full year of service. At the present time it is regarded that 15 months is the minimum of service remaining a man should have before he is sent overseas.

Mr. Chairman, this is a service bill. If you do not intend it to be that, just be frank, be honest, and vote against the whole bill and not resort to the device of attempting to kill it by inserting a period of 12 months of training. The situation is clear. The matter is up to you. Those of us on the committee have studied the matter and have analyzed the period of training necessary in order to secure some service out of these men, and we have brought you our recommendations.

I hope that there are enough Members here who will serve the best interests of the Nation by voting "no" on this amendment, that it will be defeated.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, at the Clerk's desk I have an amendment to reduce the period of service to 18 months. I therefore support, of course, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. There may be great practical force in the argument made by the gentleman from New York that his amendment should be supported in order to obtain in conference a compromise on 18 months, in view of the action taken in the other body requiring a 2-year period of service. Indeed, the gentleman has indicated that is his objective. For that reason, and with that understanding, I shall also support his amendment in the likely event that the substitute fails.

Despite the great amount of thought and study I have given to this measure, it is not yet entirely clear to me how I

shall vote at the conclusion of the debate. It depends to a considerable degree on the extent to which this bill may be perfected by amendment here.

In due course I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], designed to require that every effort be made to secure voluntary enlistments before imposing conscription.

If a bill is passed, however, and whether or not my conscience shall eventually dictate support or otherwise, it is my hope, in the best interests of my country, that the measure finally adopted will be designed and worded in the manner most likely to achieve the underlying objective of strengthening our national defense.

It therefore seems important to me for us to bear in mind with regard to the precise issue now before us, that this is not a measure to provide for a program of universal military training but is a so-called selective-service bill to meet what is said, admittedly with much justification, to be in the nature of an existing emergency or, as others have phrased it, a period of tension.

The young men to be inducted under this program are to serve in the Army, not simply as trainees, as envisioned in the UMT measures, but as soldiers. In other words, if this bill passes they will be required to perform overseas duties and any and all required functions of a Regular soldier.

There is much merit, therefore, in the argument that if the bill is accepted it is not militarily or economically sound to shorten this period to 1 year. In fact, such a result would virtually preclude the possibility of any service for any inductees beyond the continental limits of this country.

On the other hand, if a 3- or 4-month training period be subtracted from the total, provided the period of service is made 18 months, it still leaves a possible period of more than 1 year's service overseas if the requirements of the Army are such that this disposition is considered militarily necessary.

The training programs to which the gentleman from New York has referred, in the various European countries, are more closely parallel to such a program as is envisioned within UMT legislation than a draft measure like that before us. One year, in my judgment, is too long for a training period, but is too short for service as a soldier. Two years, on the other hand, strikes me as unnecessarily long for a compulsory period of service as a soldier. For that reason, 18 months impresses me as a reasonable compromise. If, in order to achieve this period of time, it is necessary to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from New York, I bow to the exigencies of the situation.

Therefore, although I still reserve judgment on the final action which I shall take on this legislation, I shall support both of these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Fulton substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMATHERS) there were—ayes, 156, noes 88.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include extraneous matters in my remarks made earlier in the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I file a privileged resolution for printing under the rules.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order if the gentleman withdraws his request?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR NAVIGATION, FLOOD CONTROL, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DONDERO, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 113]

Angell	Hartley	Mundt
Arnold	Hedrick	Murdock
Banta	Heffernan	Murray, Tenn.
Barrett	Herter	Norrell
Bates, Ky.	Hess	Norton
Boggs, Del.	Hinshaw	O'Hara
Boggs, La.	Hobbs	Patterson
Boykin	Holifield	Peden
Brown, Ohio	Jarman	Preston
Buffett	Jenkins, Pa.	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Jensen	Regan
Camp	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson
Clason	Johnson, Tex.	Rooney
Clevenger	Jones, Wash.	Sasscer
Cooley	Kearney	Schwabe, Okla.
Cox	Keogh	Scoblick
Dawson, Ill.	Kerr	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson, Utah	Kilburn	Smith, Maine
Deane	King	Smith, Va.
Delaney	Kunkel	Smith, Wis.
Dingell	Lane	Spence
Dirksen	Lanham	Stefan
Dolliver	Lea	Stigler
Ellis	Ludlow	Stockman
Ellsworth	Lusk	Thomas, N. J.
Evins	Mack	Thompson
Fenton	Macy	Tollefson
Fernandez	Manasco	Van Zandt
Folger	Meade, Ky.	Vinson
Garmatz	Miller, Conn.	Welch
Gathings	Mills	West
Gore	Morrison	Whitaker
Goreki	Morton	Youngblood
Griffiths	Muhlenberg	
Gross	Multer	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-nine Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MAKING IN ORDER CERTAIN MOTIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 685, Rept. No. 2383), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That during the remainder of this week it shall be in order for the Speaker at any time to entertain motions to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1, rule XXVII; it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of this week for the majority leader or the chairman of the Committee on Rules to move that the House take a recess, and said motion is hereby made of the highest privilege; and it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of this week to consider reports from the Committee on Rules as provided in clause (2) (b), rule XI, except that the provision requiring a two-thirds vote to consider said reports is hereby suspended during the balance of this week.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 110) entitled "An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

AMENDMENT TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 710)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the message of the President.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 110, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, because it would permit an important segment of the economy to obtain immunity from the antitrust laws, and would do so without providing adequate safeguards to protect the public interest.

This bill would authorize exemption from the antitrust laws for any carrier acting in concert with one or more competing carriers in the establishment of rates and related matters, if the Interstate Commerce Commission approves the procedural agreements under which such action would be taken. The Commission would be required to approve these agreements, if it should find that exemption from the antitrust laws would be in "furtherance of the national transportation policy."

Under this bill private carrier associations and rate bureaus, free from the restraints of the antitrust laws, could exercise broad powers over most forms of domestic transportation, including railroads, trucks and busses, water carriers, pipe lines, and freight forwarders. Carriers could agree privately among themselves upon the rates to be filed with, or withheld from, the Interstate Commerce Commission. Acting through these bureaus, groups of carriers could exercise a powerful deterrent influence upon the filing by an individual carrier of proposed rates which might benefit the public.

The exercise by private groups of this substantial control over the transportation industry involves serious potential harm to the public. Transportation rates affect the cost of goods as they move through each phase of production—from raw materials, through finished products, to the consumer. Power to control transportation rates is power to influence the competitive success or failure of other businesses. Legislation furthering the exercise of this power by private groups would clearly be contrary to the public interest.

My disapproval of this bill does not signify opposition to carrier associations as such, or to all of their present functions. Many of their activities are useful and desirable. However, this legislation is not necessary for the continuation of such activities.

No legislation giving a major industry immunity from the antitrust laws should be enacted unless adequate alternative safeguards are provided for the public interest. This measure fails to provide such safeguards. Even the limited safeguards incorporated in the bill as originally passed by the Senate are omitted from the bill in its present form. It would require the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve any agreement which it finds to be in furtherance of the national transportation policy. This is a vague and general standard and is manifestly neither adequate nor appropriate as a criterion for waiving the protection afforded the public by the antitrust laws.

Furthermore, the Commission would be placed in the position of applying this general criterion to the basic procedural agreements without being able to foresee fully the nature and effect of the joint actions which would be taken thereunder. Nevertheless, the exemption from the antitrust laws would extend to these subsequent actions without the necessity of further Commission approval. It would extend, moreover, even beyond the parties to the basic agreement to any "other persons" who participate in such actions.

Even though transportation rates are subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the public interest nevertheless demands that the general national policy of maintaining competition continue to be applied to the industry. Our present transportation policy contemplates a pattern of partial regulation, within the framework of which the pressures of competition will remain substantially effective. Regulation cannot entirely replace these competitive pressures. It can guard against some of the potential abuses of monopoly power, but it cannot be an effective substitute for the affirmative stimulus toward improved service and lower rates which competition provides. By sanctioning rate control by groups of carriers, this legislation would represent a departure from the present transportation policy of regulated competition. This, I believe, would be a serious mistake, with far-reaching effects on our economy.

Antitrust cases are now before the courts challenging some of the very activities which would be covered by this bill. Pending judicial clarification of the issues raised in these proceedings, it would be inappropriate to provide the immunity proposed by this bill.

I have repeatedly urged upon the Congress the necessity for a vigorous antimonopoly program. This bill would be inconsistent with such a program.

For these compelling reasons, I find it necessary to withhold my approval from the measure.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread upon the Journal and the message and the bill printed as a public document.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the veto message be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, may have until midnight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am calling a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency to convene at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning in the Banking and Currency Committee room. I take this time to notify members so that they will all know that we will meet on the housing bill, H. R. 6959, at that time.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. JACKSON of California submitted a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the constitution of the International Labor Organization instrument of amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to the Florida delegation be vacated, in view of the lateness of the hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FORT MOULTRIE MILITARY RESERVATION

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings whereby the bill (H. R. 2912) providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the military needs of the War Department, was passed on the Consent Calendar this afternoon, be vacated, and that the bill be considered at this time for the purpose of offering a clarifying amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed without compensation to the State of South Carolina, that portion of land constituting the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation, together with the buildings and other improvements thereto, and the rights and appurtenances thereto belonging or appertaining, determined by him to be surplus to the requirements of the War Department.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain the provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency to exist, upon the determination by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have a right without paying compensation to reenter upon such property and use the same or any part thereof for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency.

SEC. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that if the State of South Carolina shall, at any time, cease to use the property so conveyed for public purposes, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "War" and after "Department" insert "of the Army."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "War or" and insert "the Army."

Page 2, line 5, after "Navy", insert "or the Secretary of the Air Force."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON:

On page 1, line 3, strike "war" and insert "the Department of the Army."

On page 1, line 4, after the word "to", insert "the Board of Township Commissioners for Sullivans Island, as trustee for."

On page 1, line 10, strike "War", delete the period after the word "Department", and insert "of the Army."

On page 2, section 2, lines 3, 4, and 5, strike "to exist, upon the determination by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy", and insert "and when any of the armed services shall determine."

On page 2, section 3, line 12, after the word "the", insert "Board of Township Commissioners for Sullivans Island, as trustees for the."

On page 2, section 3, line 14, strike "use" and insert "retain fee simple title to", and in the same line strike "for public purposes", and insert "or cease to be used in the public interest."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to include in his remarks made in Committee of the Whole some extracts from hearings before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, has there been any general authority granted to Members to extend their remarks in reply to the President's charges against Congress?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot answer that question. Does the gentleman want to extend his remarks?

Mr. MACKINNON. I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include some extracts.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. Michael J. Ryan.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, while Members were denied the opportunity of speaking in defense of President Truman's veto and to the previous question having moved, the President's veto of H. R. 6355 once again gave us the opportunity to reflect upon and reconsider the action taken by this House to carve up the Department of Labor. By substantive legislation in the form of an appropriation rider it transfers the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a form of legislative process which the Congress itself in the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946 renounced. This, Mr. Speaker, is a usurpation by the Appropriations Committee of the proper functions and prerogatives of the legislative committees. This action, Mr. Speaker, is a repudiation of sound and deliberate legislative processes.

The question of transferring the United States Employment Service to the Federal Security Agency has been long and carefully deliberated upon by the appropriate legislative committees. In 1947 the President submitted Reorganization Plan No. 2, which provided for the permanent retention of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor where it properly belongs. That plan was rejected by the Congress on the grounds that the unemployment compensation and employment service programs which were closely interrelated should be administered in the same department of Government. In January of this year, consistent with the expressed desire of the Congress that both of these programs be administered in the same governmental agency, the President submitted Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, which, if it had been adopted, would have achieved this objective. This time it was rejected by the Congress because it was considered appropriate to await the report of the Hoover Commission which is making a study of the entire executive branch of the Government. Every Member of this House who spoke against Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, advocated that no action be taken to effect any transfer within the executive branch of the Government until Congress had had an opportunity to study the report of the Hoover Commission. Every Member of the Senate who spoke in opposition to that plan took precisely the same position. A prominent candidate for Republican nomination sounded the keynote on the floor of the Senate during the consideration of that plan and I quote from his statement:

> My own conclusion is that until we have a more comprehensive study of the whole Federal Government, and until we have a comprehensive reorganization plan, we ought to leave things as they are. The report of the Hoover Commission, I understand, is proceeding and is expected to be made by the first of next January, where it will be before the Congress.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, after full and deliberate consideration by both Houses of the Congress the verdict was to retain the status quo.

Hard upon the heels of this decision by the Congress, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] as chairman of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriations Subcommittee submitted to this body H. R. 6355 which provides for the transfer of the United States Employment Service to the Federal Security Agency, a provision which flies in the very teeth of the position taken by the Congress only a few weeks previously. This gentleman on June 11, 1946, himself made the following statement with respect to the proper location of the United States Employment Service and I quote from page 6684 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date:

> Mr. KEEFE. I have told you about the transfer to the War Manpower Commission of the Apprentice Training Service and the United States Employment Service. These services by administrative action have now been sent back to the Department of Labor so that we now have in the Department of Labor section of the (Appropriations) bill the Apprentice Training Service and the United States Employment Service again back in the Labor Department where they very properly belong.

Since that date there has not been a single development which should make the gentleman from Wisconsin undertake to change his mind.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Appropriations Committee in its consideration of this bill, quite properly deleted the appropriation rider transferring the Employment Service out of the Department of Labor, and the Senate itself sustained its former position to await the report of the Hoover Commission. I regret, therefore, that the conferees in their desire to reach an early agreement restored the appropriation rider.

Under the provisions of this bill, the United States Employment Service will be reduced from a bureau to a division in the Bureau of Employment Security, where once again its effectiveness will become seriously impaired and where its job-finding functions will be subordinated to the payment of unemployment compensation. I think we should bear in mind that it was precisely this organizational arrangement which the Congress intended to prohibit when in section 604 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 it provided that the agency administering the United States Employment Service shall administer that service as a separate operating entity. With its identity as a bureau lost, with a single appropriation for unemployment compensation and employment service activities both on the Federal and State levels, it is a foregone conclusion that the Employment Service will be unable to operate as a separate entity.

Four years ago with its eyes hopefully or frantically watching the ballot box, the majority pledged itself to consolidate in the Department of Labor all major labor functions. The action which the majority party has taken to transfer the Employment Service out of the Department of Labor completes its repudiation of its party pledge—or is this just another case of promises glibly made and just as glibly broken? If this veto is not sustained, not a single labor function will remain in the Department of Labor. Its dismemberment will be complete.

The Hoover commission report will be presented to the Congress within 10 days after it reconvenes in January 1949. In light of the position recently taken by this Congress that no action should be taken to transfer or reshuffle any functions in the executive branch of the Government, the President's veto will be sustained.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Red Lake-Clear Water River project and include letters, communications, and newspaper articles.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HERTER, for 2 days, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 580. An act relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5275. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer;

H. R. 5883. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6628. An act to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1274. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Wilkinson County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins;

S. 1275. An act conveying all right, title and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Warren County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans;

S. 1303. An act for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson;

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Hou Chung Chay;

S. 1409. An act for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki;

S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation;

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations; and

S. 2237. An act to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 17, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1652. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1653. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transfer of certain real property at Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y., to the custody and control of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1654. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments; without amendment (Rept. No. 2370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; without amendment (Rept. No. 2371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 2617. An act to include certain lands in the Carson National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Sixteenth report regarding investigation of Viers Mill Village veterans' housing project; without amendment (Rept. No. 2373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORTON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6734. A bill to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces, the merchant marine, and on war transfer by employees in the field services of the Post Office Department; with amendments (Rept. No. 2374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5355. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1243. An act to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyances; without amendment (Rept. No. 2377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. BOLTON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory; without amendment (Rept. No. 2378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment; with amendments (Rept. No. 2379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MALONEY: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 2380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III; with amendments (Rept. No. 2381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 685. A resolution making in order to suspend the rules, motions, for a recess and the consideration of reports from the Committee on Rules; without amendment (Rept. No. 2383). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6952. A bill to amend section 26 of the Shipping Act of 1916; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 6953. A bill to provide a voluntary participation annuity plan for widows, minor children, and certain named beneficiaries of members of the uniform services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 6954. A bill providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 6955. A bill to designate as "Citizenship Day" each general election day and regular primary election day on which the people elect Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, Members of Congress, or candidates for President, Vice President, or Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 6956. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 6957. A bill for the establishment of the National Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 6958. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 6959. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 6960. A bill to amend section 26 of the Shipping Act of 1916; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 6961. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6962. A bill to provide for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. R. 6963. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6964. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 6965. A bill to create a General Property Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6966. A bill to restore the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 6967. A bill to create a Veterans' Life Insurance Board; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 6968. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 430. Joint resolution relating to assignment of a section of the 50-megacycle band of radio frequencies for frequency modulation (FM); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. J. Res. 431. Joint resolution extending to January 1, 1950, certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. Res. 684. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of part 2 of the final majority report of the Joint Committee on Housing, entitled "Statistics of Housing"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 6969. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 6970. A bill for the relief of Thomas Nicholas Epiphaniades and Wanda Julia Epiphaniades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 6971. A bill for the relief of Erich Neugebauer, Audrey Neugebauer, and Moonyeen Neugebauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 6972. A bill for the relief of John L. Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2101. By the SPEAKER: Petition of National Youth Assembly Against Universal Military Training, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2102. Also, petition of Ricardo A. Richards and others, St. Croix, V. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appeal for the maintenance of the islands by granting money necessary for upkeep, especially for the continuance of the Virgin Islands Company; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2103. Also, petition of New York Teachers Chapter, American Veterans Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill and urging its immediate passage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2104. Also, petition of New York Area Council, American Veterans Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the defeat of the draft and universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 15, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou gracious benefactor, whose blessings are abundantly adequate for all our needs, may this moment of prayer be for each of us a cleansing of heart and a consecration to those desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy.

Grant unto us the mind and the mood of the Master as we face the tasks and responsibilities of this day. May we never be recreant in any duty and may there be nothing in our character and conduct of which we shall be ashamed when the sun has set or at the eventide of life when Thou dost call us to Thyself.

When we stand at the crossroads and are in doubt which way to go, may we hear and heed Thy voice saying unto us: "This is the way, walk ye therein," for Thy ways are ways of pleasantness and Thy paths are paths of peace.

Hear us in the name of the Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 16, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 239) to provide for

a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 202) to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2029. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2912. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army;

H. R. 3479. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of Louisiana of that portion of the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army;

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4436. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4952. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 4984. An act to provide for the maintaining of the corps of cadets at the United States Military Academy and the brigade of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy at full strength, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5352. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5555. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended;

H. R. 5715. An act to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55;

H. R. 5807. An act to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act;

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 6136. An act to amend the act to encourage travel in the United States, approved July 19, 1940;

H. R. 6439. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of adopting the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans;

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948;

H. R. 6695. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

H. R. 6698. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 6709. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York a perpetual easement in, over, and upon a twenty-nine one-hundredth acre parcel of land at New York Naval Shipyard;

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State;

H. R. 6860. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act;

H. R. 6868. An act to amend section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, with respect to widows of certain deceased Coast Guard personnel; and

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

DRAFT OF PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO EXISTING APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 182)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for the Treasury Department, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY (S. DOC. NO. 180)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Military Establishment—Department of the Navy, amounting to $3,294,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DISPLACED PERSONS PROGRAM (S. DOC. NO. 181)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for expenses in connection with the immigration of displaced persons, amounting to $4,000,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

SETTLEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to aid the settlement and development of Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CONVENTION OF TWO COST-PLUS-A-FIXED-FEE CONTRACTS BY MARITIME COMMISSION, ETC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report concerning the conversion of two cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts between the United States Maritime Commission and the Permanente Metals Corp. to a fixed-price basis, and the subsequent settlement of the fixed-price contract (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND AFFILIATED COMPANIES, U. S. COMMERCIAL COMPANY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, volume 8 of an audit report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations, dealing exclusively with the activities of the U. S. Commercial Company, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the office of the Architect of the Capitol, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

The petition of Albert E. Swanson, of Murrysville, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing increased pay for Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Telegrams in the nature of petitions from the Washington State Grange Executive Committee, of Spokane, Wash., and the Chamber of Commerce of San Jose, Calif., signed by Russell E. Pettit, manager, praying for the adoption of Senate concurrent resolution 59, relative to negotiations with the Canadian Government concerning the construction of railroads in Alaska and the establishment of reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Rosa L. Ellis, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to legislation providing increases in pensions paid to widows and orphans of veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Department of New Jersey Philippine-Pacific War Veterans, Hawthorne, N. J., favoring the enactment of House bill 4073, to restore to the Philippine veterans some of the benefits lost to them under the Recession Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Texas State Democratic Convention, assembled at Brownwood, Tex., relating to State ownership of certain submerged lands; ordered to lie on the table.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from the International Institute of Metropolitan Detroit, Detroit, Mich., signed by Alice L. Sickels, executive director, remonstrating against the appointment of Senator COOPER and Senator MCGRATH as conferees on the part of the Senate on the bill providing admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 4963. A bill to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; without amendment (Rept. No. 1747).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1995. A bill for the relief of George Bailey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1748);

S. 2299. A bill for the relief of Ella L. Browning; without amendment (Rept. No. 1749);

H. R. 915. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 1750);

H. R. 1780. A bill for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1754);

H. R. 2395. A bill for the relief of the Cypress Creek drainage district of the State of Arkansas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1751);

H. R. 4103. A bill for the relief of Charles M. Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1752); and

H. R. 6186. A bill for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1753).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2605. A bill for the relief of the widow of Robert V. Holland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1744).

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2482. A bill to amend sections 2, 4, and 8 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended, and section 5 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222; 16 U. S. C. 715), as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 1756); and

S. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to continue until December 31, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation services to, from, and within Alaska; with amendments (Rept. No. 1755).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2879. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Yannopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2880. A bill relating to the basis of computing compensation and insurance payable to certain veterans of World War I;

S. 2881. A bill relating to the basis for computation of compensation and insurance payable to certain veterans of World War I; and

S. 2882. A bill relating to the basis for the computation of compensation payable to the widows and children of certain veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) introduced Senate bill 2883, to restore the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2884. A bill for the relief of Constantin E. Aramescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDENBERG (by request):

S. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution approving an Agreement Relating to the Resolution of Conflicting Claims to German Enemy Assets and Authorizing the President to enter into the agreement or other agreements similar in character with certain countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to correct an act, H. R. 5071, "To extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma," so as to provide for the proper distribution of proceeds accruing to the United States from leases of the oil and gas deposits in the lands affected by that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

STATUS QUO IN RESPECT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYMENT TAXES AND SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to restore the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage, and I request that a statement in explanation of the bill, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Alabama will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2883) to restore the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HILL

The bill which Senator SPARKMAN and I have introduced repeals sections 1 and 2 of House Joint Resolution 296 which was passed over the President's veto on June 14. House Joint Resolution 296 contained two major provisions: (1) a provision defining the term "employee" for social-security purposes so as to apply "the usual common law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship" (secs. 1 and 2 of the resolution); (2) to provide $5 a month additional to needy aged and blind persons and $3 additional for dependent children, in section 3.

The bill does not affect in any way whatsoever the latter provision for increasing the payments to needy aged and blind persons and dependent children. The provision increasing the Federal contribution to the needy aged, blind, and dependent children will inure to the benefit of over 3,000,000 persons now on the rolls. This is a highly meritorious provision, and, as a matter of fact, does not go far enough in our opinion in increasing payments to needy persons, which payments are most inadequate.

The sole purpose of the bill which we have introduced is to repeal those sections of House Joint Resolution 296 which had the effect of rendering uncertain, or jeopardizing or excluding, social-security rights to many thousands of persons who should be covered. We have long favored a broadening of the coverage and the liberalizing of the benefits of the program.

Under the terms of the United States Supreme Court decision in the Silk case, which was decided by the Supreme Court on June 16, 1947, the Social Security Administration and the Treasury Department were directed to apply a very liberal interpretation of the term "employee" for social-security purposes. The intent of House Joint Resolution 296 was to give a narrow and restrictive interpretation to the term "employee" which would have the effect of adversely affecting thousands of persons in building up rights under the social-security program. We believe that it is legally sound and administratively feasible to have a liberal interpretation of the term "employee" along the lines laid down by the United States Supreme Court. The bill which we have introduced would restore the status quo which existed prior to the enactment of House Joint Resolution 296, namely, that of applying the rule of law laid down by the United States Supreme Court.

We very much hope that Congress will act with expedition to assure the social-security rights of the thousands of persons adversely affected by sections 1 and 2 of House Joint Resolution 296.

FEDERAL AID TO STATES—TRAINING FACILITIES FOR NATIONAL GUARD AND NAVAL MILITIA—AMENDMENT

Mr. BALDWIN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1085) to provide Federal aid to the States for the construction of armories and similar training facilities for the National Guard and Naval Militia, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

INCREASE OF RATE OF COMPENSATION OF HEADS AND ASSISTANT HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1537) to increase the rate of compensation of heads and assistant heads of executive departments and of other officers, which was ordered to lie on the table.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAPEHART (for Mr. JENNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. JENNER to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART also (for Mr. JENNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. JENNER to the bill (S. 2795) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies over-burdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 8, line 17, insert the following:

"To provide emergency aid for the repair, restoration, or reconstruction of public facilities owned by Federal or local public agencies damaged or destroyed by any flood, tornado, fire, or other catastrophe respecting which the President has heretofore made a determination under Public Law 233, approved July 25, 1947, including administrative expenses therefor, $75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to repair, restore, or reconstruct facilities owned by Federal agencies and make grants to local public agencies including counties, cities, towns, districts, and other local public entities, to assist them in defraying the cost of repairing, restoring, or reconstructing such public facilities: *Provided further*, That no grant shall be made to any local public agency unless the Administrator determines that such agency needs the grant and cannot otherwise defray such cost without creating an excessive tax or debt burden: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to limit or in any way affect the existing authority of any Federal department or agency."

Mr. RUSSELL also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6935, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

JOSIAH W. BAILEY

[Mr. TYDINGS, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public service of Josiah W. Bailey, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN THOMAS

[Mr. TAYLOR, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public service of John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRO AMERICA—ADDRESS BY LOUISE HAWKES PADELFORD

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Pro America, by Louise Hawkes Padelford, at the national board meeting of Pro America, June 11, 1948, at Evanston, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY'S PROGRAM TO COMBAT CANCER—ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "American Cancer Society's Program To Combat Cancer," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, president of the New Jersey division, American Cancer Society in Chattanooga, Tenn., March 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATES' RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY W. S. ATKINS

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. W. S. Atkins, of Hope, Ark., at the Southwest Arkansas States' Rights Meeting held at Hope, Ark., on April 20, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TOMORROW'S NO HOLIDAY—ADDRESS BY ALEX H. WASHBURN

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a commencement address entitled "Tomorrow's No Holiday," delivered by Alex H. Washburn at the Wyoming Seminary, Kingston, Pa., on June 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

BILLIONS FOR DEFENSE, NOT ONE CENT FOR TRIBUTE!—EDITORIAL FROM THE DENVER POST

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Billions for Defense, Not One Cent for Tribute," published in the Denver Post of June 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE "NEW" TRUMAN—ARTICLE BY BARNET HOVER

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The 'New' Truman," written by Barnet Nover, and published in the Denver Post of June 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ECONOMIC TEST: WILL WE ACT IN TIME?—ARTICLE BY LEON H. KEYSERLING

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Economic Test: Will We Act in Time?" written by Leon H. Keyserling, and published in the New York Times magazine of June 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION OF ERP APPROPRIATIONS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to insert in the RECORD an editorial, entitled "ERP in Conference," published in the June 17, 1948, issue of the Baltimore Sun, which appears in the Appendix.]

EUROPEAN RELIEF—INTERVIEW WITH JOSEPH P. KENNEDY

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview with Joseph P. Kennedy regarding European relief appropriations, published in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., June 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY BURR MCCLOSKEY AT JOHN BROWN MEMORIAL MEETING

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Burr McCloskey, general secretary of the United Labor Party of America, at Perkins Woods, Summit County, Ohio, on April 4, 1948, at a public meeting called to memorialize John Brown, famed abolitionist, which appears in the Appendix.]

NECESSITY FOR AN ADEQUATE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shipping Raid," published in the Washington Post of June 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—LETTER FROM CHARLES B. SHUMAN

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated June 10, 1948, from Charles B. Shuman, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, expressing appreciation of the work of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH PROBLEMS—REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think it is fitting before the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress for me to make a brief report to the Congress as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Subcommittee on Health has been very active during both sessions of the Eightieth Congress. While there have been many bills covering various aspects of the health problem considered by the Committee, our principal attention has been directed to a consideration of the over-all health problem of the United States and the suggestions that have been made from time to time and incorporated in messages of the President of the United States in recommending the establishment of some form of compulsory health insurance for all our people.

The most important investigation undertaken by the committee during the hearings held in both sessions of the Eightieth Congress have been concerned with this very controversial issue of compulsory health insurance. Because of the fact that the subcommittee was unable to arrive at any definite conclusions with regard to this matter, the committee unanimously reported a resolution known as Senate Resolution 249, providing for a continuation of the study of national health problems by the committee and a report to the next Congress not later than March 15, 1949.

This matter is of such importance that I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the full report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare accompanying Senate Resolution 249. Let me note in incorporating this report that it contains a reference to the poll made by the committee of the governors of the 48 States in order to obtain their views on the correct approach to this problem, and it also contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the Brookings Institution which was invited by the chairman of the subcommittee to make a report on this matter.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1571) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 249) to provide authorization for the Subcommittee on Health of the said committee to continue its study of the health problems of the Nation and of legislative proposals relating thereto, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that it do pass.

The resolution is as follows:

"[S. Res. 249, 80th Cong., 2d sess.]

"*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is hereby authorized and directed through the Subcommittee on Health of the said committee to—

"(a) continue its study of the health problems of the Nation and of legislative proposals relating thereto which have been referred to the said subcommittee which study shall be primarily concerned with ascertaining the full extent and nature of existing national health problems and the action, if any, which the Federal Government should take in relation to said problems;

"(b) consult, in the course of such study, with Federal agencies administering health and related programs, with such other legislative committees of the Senate as are concerned with related matters, and with such other agencies, organizations, or persons as the subcommittee may desire to consult;

"(c) report to the Senate not later than March 15, 1949, the results of the study, together with such proposed legislation, if any, and such other recommendations as the subcommittee may deem desirable.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, through the said Subcommittee on Health, is authorized to sit and act at such times and in such places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress; to employ such consultants, clerical, and other assistance; to procure such printing and binding; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures, within the limits below set forth, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of .25 cents per hundred words.

"(b) The expenses incurred under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

BACKGROUND SUMMARY OF WORK OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH

The Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare concluded on June 1, 1948, a series of extensive hearings on major bills containing proposed health legislation. These hearings have continued intermittently over a period of more than a year during this Congress. Earlier hearings on corresponding measures were held during previous Congresses. A large number of witnesses representing many different organizations, groups, and individuals, and presenting different and often widely divergent views, were heard during this time. The resultant record of the direct testimony and other evidence available to the subcommittee is voluminous; it is likewise fundamental in its broad implications, as well as in its bearing on ways and means of dealing with health problems.

During the present Congress to date, a total of 27 bills on proposed health legislation have been referred to the Subcommittee on Health for consideration. Of these, S. 545, introduced by Mr. TAFT, for himself and others, and S. 1320, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, for himself and others, are comprehensive proposals containing, among their many provisions, various measures for dealing with the controversial question of medical care for individuals. Owing to the comprehensiveness and importance of these two major proposals, and because their provisions affect, overlap, or duplicate the contents of a majority of the remaining bills before the subcommittee, it was fitting that this subcommittee should devote the greater part of its available time to the consideration of these comprehensive measures. Hearings on S. 545 and S. 1320 were convened on 26 different days during this Congress. Hearings also have been held on the following bills: S. 1290, providing for grants-in-aid to the States to assist in the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment, of physical and mental defects and conditions; S. 720 and S. 2215 providing for the support of research, training, and control in diseases of the heart and circulation; S. 678, providing certain medical supplies and services to individuals; and S. 2341, authorizing an increase in the annual appropriation for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory for research in tropical diseases. Scope of proposed legislation under consideration of the subcommittee also includes measures for the expansion and maintenance of local public-health units (S. 2189); for the training of medical, dental, nursing, and public-health personnel (S. 1455 and S. 2588); for the construction of nursing homes for aged persons (S. 2640); and others.

During this Congress to date, the bills reported to and passed by the Senate include: S. 176, providing for research, training, and control in dental diseases; S. 1454, providing for the promotion of Public Health Service commissioned personnel and for other administrative matters; and S. 2215, providing for research, training, and control in diseases of the heart and circulation. The provisions of these bills clearly fall within the province of, and they further support, established, long-range operations of the Federal Government in the public-health field. A majority of the other basic proposals under consideration by the Subcommittee on Health, however, involve serious differences of opinion with respect to their proper place in the over-all approach to health problems, and with respect to the proper role of the Federal Government in relation thereto. Most of these proposals must be considered in relation to other health measures, existing and proposed, rather than piecemeal.

FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES UNDERLYING THE CONSIDERATION OF POSTPONED HEALTH LEGISLATION

The problems involved in the consideration of health legislation are numerous and frequently complex. Yet, certain fundamental issues have emerged from the findings of the subcommittee which require further investigation and study, as a prelude to any broad recommendations governing health legislation. First, the question as to whether a serious national health problem actually exists is a debatable issue. Evidence available to the subcommittee on this matter is quite conflicting and further inquiry into the subject is deemed necessary. The issue involves consideration of (1) the state of the health of the population, (2) the distribution of the Nation's medical, hospital, dental, and other health services, and (3) whether or not the majority of the population has access to such services.

Second, there is a fundamental question as to whether, and to what extent, it is necessary for the Federal Government further to expand its operations in the field of health. Available evidence raises many questions as to the desirability, as well as the necessity, of wide-scale Federal intervention, particularly in the field of medical care for individuals.

Third, the basic issue involved in the provision of medical and certain other health services for individuals, in the event of further Federal expansion in this field, rests in the question of methods or systems to be employed. The two major proposals under consideration by the subcommittee, S. 545 and S. 1320, differ very fundamentally as to method. The former is essentially a grant-in-aid system to assist the States in developing their own health programs. It is predicated on the assumption that individuals and families able to pay for their own medical and other health care will do so, either through voluntary participation in existing prepayment plans or by direct payment of fees for services. Wide latitude is given the States in working out plans for providing required health services for persons unable to pay the costs. On the other hand, the basic medical-care provisions of S. 1320 call for the adoption of a system of compulsory health insurance, under which all employed persons would be taxed to support a central health fund. The Federal Government would have general supervision of the system, including necessary regulatory procedures and control of the central fund. The issues raised in consideration of such a compulsory system are multitudinous and extremely controversial. Moreover, such issues frequently extend far beyond the conditions directly associated with determinable health problems, involving and affecting, as they do, the form and functioning of the economic system, the operations and responsibilities of the respective levels of government, and the whole question of the rights of individuals.

Fourth, it is apparent that individual measures in proposed health legislation must be considered in proper perspective rather than individually. It is further apparent that health legislation as a whole, enacted and proposed, must be considered in relation to other broad welfare programs of government. The fundamental issue here is that of ascertaining the long-range effects of such proposals as compulsory health insurance and wide-scale grants-in-aid programs, assuming they were to be adopted and their resultant tax levies and regulatory requirements were added to those already existing. Very little light has been shed on this whole question; yet it is of the utmost importance to further deliberation on proposed health legislation.

Fifth, there is a basic question as to the proper administrative organization for dealing with health functions. Regardless of whatever specific health programs might be adopted by Congress, the organizational issue will have to be faced. Health programs and related functions of the Federal Government are now widely scattered throughout the various governmental departments and agencies, with an accompanying lack of full coordination. Present proposals before the committee involve organizational questions, although none of them cut across all the major departmental lines involved. There has been reported for consideration of the Senate during this Congress a bill (S. 140) providing for the creation of a new executive department to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security. Passage of this bill, or any similar proposal, would affect the ultimate consideration and perfection of pending health measures.

Furthermore, the entire organization of the executive branch of the Government is now being studied by the Commission specifically created for that purpose by Public Law 162, which was passed during the first session of this Congress. This Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government is giving detailed consideration to the existing Federal functions and organizational structure concerned with health and related matters. The Commission undoubtedly will make a number of fundamental recommendations affecting health and welfare administration when it reports to the Eighty-first Congress in January 1949. Since the Federal Government already is engaged in health and related activities to an extent much greater than may be generally realized, it is entirely fitting that the Subcommittee on Health should have the opportunity of availing itself of the Commission's recommendations on the organizational question.

Finally, it is a matter of fact, although frequently overlooked in testimony before the subcommittee, that health does not exist in a vacuum. Instead, health is the

net result of the working of a very considerable range of environmental, personal, and other interrelated factors. Legislation providing medical care alone, for example, will not necessarily guarantee the prevalence of good health. Should there be also an extension of the present Federal public-health program?

ORIGINAL EVIDENCE MADE AVAILABLE TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH

In addition to the extensive hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Health, the inquiry into proposed health legislation has led to the recent production of certain original information on the subject which, it is believed, merits the careful consideration, not only of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare but of all Members of Congress and the public as well. This information deals, on the one hand, with the preferences of the State governors in regard to national health proposals and, on the other hand, with the results of a fundamental analysis of the issues underlying such proposals by the Brookings Institution. The basic import of this evidence, high lights of which are outlined below, is such that it necessitates considerable rethinking and re-evaluation of proposed health legislation.

PREFERENCES OF STATE GOVERNORS

In August 1947, copies of the two principal national health proposals under consideration, S. 545 and S. 1320, were submitted to the respective State governors. The proposals were submitted on behalf of the Subcommittee on Health by its chairman, and the governors were requested to indicated their views and preferences as limited to a choice between the two major proposals. Replies were received from 40 of the 48 governors, a summary of which follows:

Classification of replies:	Number of governors
Favored S. 545 (with or without qualifications)	25
Favored S. 1320	0
No preference indicated	10
Not in favor of either S. 545 or S. 1320	5
Did not report	8
Total	48

Although this report of preferences of the governors clearly indicated their general disapproval of S. 1320, and thus of compulsory health insurance as therein provided, the reports were in no sense overwhelmingly favorable to the provisions of S. 545. While 25 governors expressed preference for this grant-in-aid measure over S. 1320, most of them did so with considerable reservation as to provisions of the bill. Perhaps equally significant was the fact that 5 governors expressly disapproved both of the proposals, while 10 did not elect to indicate any preference. Analysis of the detailed reports indicates that it is not unlikely that a much larger number of the governors than did would have indicated disapproval of both bills had such an alternative choice been included in the inquiry.

This inquiry was neither designed nor intended as a full-blown survey of the problem and its results are obviously of limited application. Nevertheless, the broad implications of the governors' reports cannot be ignored; namely, that in general the State governments, which they represent, do not appear to be confronted with health problems sufficiently serious at this time to demand either wide-scale intervention by the Federal Government or the introduction of revolutionary methods for dealing with the problems that do exist.

FINDINGS OF THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

In view of the controversial nature of the principal issues before the committee, a very real need has existed for a competent and expert analysis of the problem by a disinterested organization. Accordingly, in May 1947 the Brookings Institution was requested by the chairman of the subcommittee to undertake such an analysis. The long-established reputation of this public service institution as an independent research foundation is well known in Congress and elsewhere. The Brookings Institution accepted the assignment as a public service to Congress and on February 17, 1948, transmitted an advance summary of their conclusions and recommendations to the subcommittee. Subsequently, the full context of the report, which was published by the institution in April 1948, was made available to the committee. The broad conclusions and recommendations are as follows:

CONCLUSIONS

1. Probably no great nation in the world has among its white population better health than prevails in the United States. A few small homogeneous countries, such as New Zealand with respect to its white population, are slightly ahead of the United States as a whole, but certain States of the United States with larger populations equal them.

2. It is apparent that the United States under its voluntary system of medical care has made greater progress in the application of medical and sanitary science than any other country. This progress is now reflected in low mortality and morbidity rates of infectious diseases and in increased life expectancy. There is every reason to believe that these trends will continue unabated under our present system of medical care.

3. The nonwhites in the United States have materially poorer health than the whites, but the evidence does not indicate that this condition is primarily or even mainly due to inadequacy of medical care.

4. The advances in health among both the whites and the nonwhites that have been made in the United States in the past four decades do not suggest basic defects in the American system.

5. Although the statistics resulting from the administration of the Selective Service Act—the so-called draft statistics—have been widely used to show bad health among the American people and the need for revolutionary changes in arrangements for medical care of individuals, they are unreliable as a measure of the health of the Nation and cannot be used to show the extent of the medical needs of the country as a whole.

6. Present medical care in the United States compares favorably with that which existed in other leading nations prior to the Second World War.

7. The conditions in extremely poor rural areas that lack the resources to support adequate public services, such as health work, education, and highways cannot be satisfactorily solved by subsidies. This problem calls for a radically different approach, either bringing in new or improved economic activities or getting the people to more favorable and administratively less expensive areas. This condition has been accentuated by the emigration of youth from these areas to urban communities.

8. The United States has some individuals and families not possessed of the resources to enable them to pay for adequate medical care. In the future, as in the past, provision must be made for them through public funds or philanthropy. The evidence suggests that many of them are elderly, impaired, or underendowed or are widows or deserted women or their dependents. It is doubtful that they could be effectively covered by compulsory insurance because they would lack the means to attain and maintain an insured status. The large majority of American families have the resources to pay for adequate medical care if they elect to give it a high priority among the several objects of expenditure. The issue is not whether they can afford medical care but whether they should be compelled by law to pool their risks and to give payment for medical care a top priority. The major alternative for people with ability to pay is to leave them free to determine for themselves what medical care they desire and whether they will pool their risks through voluntary arrangements.

9. Compulsory health insurance would necessitate a high degree of governmental regulation and control over the personnel and the agencies engaged in providing medical care. This field of regulation and control would be far more difficult than any other large field previously entered by the Government, and past experience with governmental regulations and control in the United States causes doubt as to whether it encourages initiative and development.

10. The problem of eliminating politics from Government administration is extremely difficult. It does not seem probable that politics could be eliminated from Medical care supplied under a governmental system.

11. Compulsory insurance would inject the Government into the relationship between practitioner and patient. A real danger exists that Government actions would impair that relationship and hence the quality of medical care.

12. The administration of compulsory insurance would require thousands of Government employees for accounting, auditing, and inspection and investigation.

13. The cost of medical care presumably would increase because of (a) administrative expenses; (b) the tendency of insured persons to make unnecessary and often unreasonable demands upon the medical-care services; and (c) the tendency of some practitioners and agencies to use the system for their own financial advantage.

14. The adoption of compulsory insurance would not immediately make available adequate medical service for all, because there are not at present the facilities nor a sufficient number of trained and experienced physicians, dentists, and nurses to meet the demand which would result from compulsory insurance.

15. Proposals for compulsory insurance provide for payment of practitioners under one or all of three methods: (a) Fee for service, (b) per capita, or (c) salary. Use of the fee-for-service device represents the minimum degree of socialization, but it is administratively difficult. Administrative difficulties would probably result in the adoption of the per-capita system which represents a higher degree of socialization or even in the salary system which represents practically complete socialization. It seems questionable whether a country which once embarks on compulsory insurance can turn back but must attempt to remedy defects by more complete Government control and administration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. For the present, in our judgment, the National Government would be wise to leave to the individual States the question of whether compulsory health insurance is to be adopted or whether the provision of professional services is to be left in the realm of free enterprise. It seems highly probable that in many communities the intelligent cooperation of consumers and practitioners will develop satisfactory arrangements that remain subject to their own control without National Government administration. It seems highly improbable that this experimentation—possible under our Federal form of government—will ultimately develop a single pattern that is applicable to all sections of the country and is desired by a large majority of the people. If such a pattern should develop, it will doubtless then be adopted with a great degree of unanimity. If compulsory insurance should be adopted now by a narrow vote in the Congress, large numbers of persons who are opposed to it would start with a hostile attitude toward the whole undertaking.

2. For the time being the National Government and many of the State governments may well devote their resources and energies to:

(a) Research and developments in the fields of public health.

(b) Health education at the school level.

(c) Teaching of preventive medicine.

(d) Assisting in the acquisition of physical facilities and training of personnel.

(e) Providing systematic care for the indigent and the medically indigent.

3. From the standpoint of public relations, governments might be well advised to leave adult educational campaigns for the control and prevention of disease to the national, State, and local voluntary organizations, which have been able to enlist the active cooperation of leading laymen in most sections of the country. It must be remembered that good health is not exclusively a matter of medical care; it also impinges upon causative factors that are nonmedical, such as food, shelter, vice and crime, transportation, and industry. Its maintenance depends also upon the intelligence, interest, and cooperation of individuals, families, and local communities.

These recommendations are not widely at variance with those of the majority of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, arrived at in 1932 after a comprehensive study. The report of the committee says:

"• • • (The) majority of the committee does not endorse the recommendation which would make health insurance a legal requirement for certain sections of the population. These members realize that such a step may ultimately be necessary and desirable in some States, but they believe that for most States and probably for almost all of them at the present time, it is much more desirable (a) to encourage voluntary measures for protection against wage loss during sickness, and (b) to develop voluntary insurance for medical care in conjunction with group practice, with hospital service and with the related measures recommended on the preceding pages. They are of the opinion that the difficulties of these plans can be controlled by a combination of professional and community effort, and that these plans hold the promise of steady extension in scope of service and in proportion of the population served. These members believe that the various payment plans (aside from compulsory insurance) if fully carried out, would: (1) Largely solve the problem of hospital costs which constitute about 50 percent of the average family expenditure for the care of sickness; (2) provide adequately for many rural areas in which serious deficiencies of facilities exist at present; (3) make more nearly adequate provision than exists at present for the indigent and for the care of certain diseases of public importance; and (4) provide, through voluntary cooperative insurance • • • medical service to a majority of the 70,000,000 people living in industrial communities and in cities."[1]

The years since 1932 have witnessed:

1. A great growth in voluntary insurance both for hospitalization and for medical services.

2. State experimentation with compulsory health insurance in Rhode Island and California.

3. A growing willingness on the part of practitioners to cooperate in the development of prepayment plans and other devices to enable patients who so desire to regularize their payments for medical care.

4. A profound change in the amount and distribution of the earnings of the American people. This change greatly reduces the number who cannot afford adequate medical care if they desire to purchase it.

[1] Medical Care for the American People, the final report of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, October 31, 1932, p. 130.

The experience of the United States since 1932 seems to have demonstrated the wisdom of these recommendations of the majority of the members of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care. It would seem unwise at this time to substitute for these developments a system of compulsory health insurance by national law which would have the unfortunate tendency to freeze policies and eventually retard medical progress.

The import of these conclusions and recommendations to the work of the committee is apparent. Although the Brookings Institution has raised serious questions as to the necessity and practicability of governmental expansion in the field of medical and other health services by the imposition of a national, compulsory system, the Institution has outlined certain functional areas in which problems exist and which should receive full recognition in the course of the committee's consideration of the problem. The Brookings report fills a gap heretofore existing in the evidence available to the committee; it represents a concise and fundamental contribution which bears directly on the basic issues involved in the consideration of proposed health legislation.

CONCLUSION

In view of the considerations outlined hereinabove, it is the opinion of the committee that continued study of health problems, and proposed legislation relating thereto, is prerequisite to the formulation of basic recommendations in this field. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare therefore unanimously report Senate Resolution 249 without amendment and recommend its approval.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in addition to the foregoing report which accompanied the resolution for the continuing study of these national health problems, it seems to me fitting at this point in my remarks to add a summary of all the bills by number and title, reported to and passed by the Senate of the Eightieth Congress up to and including June 15, 1948. In this summary we have set forth the scope and objectives of the various measures so passed.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF HEALTH BILLS PASSED BY SECOND SESSION, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

1. S. 1454: Amending the Public Health Service Act in regard to matters of personnel and administration. The provisions of this bill were necessary in order to aid the Public Health Service in overcoming its personnel problems. The bill provides for revision of its promotion system and modifies the authority of the Service to make original appointments at advanced grades. It also authorizes expenditures necessary for keeping its commissioned officers trained in the latest developments in medical and related scientific and public-health fields. Through passage of the bill and its subsequent enactment into law, Congress has placed the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service on a parity with the Army and the Navy as regards rates of pay and of promotion and other personnel matters.

2. S. 176 and H. R. 6726: Providing for the creation of a National Institute of Dental Research. The committee reported and the Senate approved S. 176 during the first session of the Eightieth Congress. H. R. 6726, passed by the House, contained the same major provisions of S. 176 except for improvements made necessary owing to the lapse of time between passage of the two bills and exclusion of provisions for construction of physical laboratory facilities. The Senate amended the bill by adding the stricken provisions providing research facilities, and it was accepted in that form by the House. The bill establishes in the Public Health Service a National Institute of Dental Research for the purpose of improving the dental health of the people through the conduct of researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions. The bill also provides that grants may be made to other public and private agencies in order to assist and foster such researches and other activities. It also provides for training of personnel in matters relating to dental diseases and conditions. It calls for the coordination of all such research and activities and the useful application of their results with a view to the development and prompt use of the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases. There is a vast backlog of needed dental care. This backlog far exceeds the man-hours of available dental skill that can be devoted to meeting it. Only by finding new and improved techniques of prevention and treatment through research can we hope greatly to improve the dental health of the Nation within the foreseeable future.

3. S. 2215: Providing for the creation in the Public Health Service of a National Heart Institute. This bill, passed by both Houses of Congress during this session of the Eightieth Congress, provides for research and control relating to diseases of the heart and circulation. The purpose of the measure is to improve the health of the people through the conduct of researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the causes, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of diseases of the heart and circulation, and to assist and foster such researches and other activities by public and private agencies, and to promote the coordination of all such researches and the useful application of their results. The bill also provides for training technicians and physicians in matters relating to heart diseases, and it calls for assistance to States and other agencies in promoting the use of the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of heart diseases. The basic facts concerning the incidence of diseases of the heart and circulation present a clear-cut problem of serious proportions. The fact that deaths from cardiovascular diseases have accounted for more than one of every three deaths in the United States each year for the last decade, ranking first among the causes of death, indicates the serious nature of the problem. Passage of S. 2215 gives full recognition to the problem and places needed emphasis on research and control in diseases of the heart and circulation.

4. S. 1969: Amending the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 to provide for the training of Filipinos in public-health methods. This bill authorizes an extension of the time during which Filipinos may be trained in this country in public-health methods. This measure is important to the administration of public-health services in the Philippine Islands as a part of the reconstruction program.

5. S. 2341: Authorizing an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory. This bill provides authorization of adequate funds for operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory for research in tropical diseases. This public-service institution, established in 1928, provides laboratory facilities located in the Tropics and conducts research and control activities in tropical diseases in the Republic of Panama.

6. H. R. 4114: Amending the Public Health Service Act to permit expenditures for operating purposes of the Public Health Service. The bill incorporated into basic law certain

authority previously authorized annually in the appropriations for the Public Health Service. Passage of the bill clarifies the basic authority of the Public Health Service and strengthens the Public Health Service Act.

7. H. R. 6339: Amending the Hospital Survey and Construction Act so as to restore to eligibility to participate in Federal grants for hospital construction those States which would cease to be eligible because of their inability to comply with provisions of the act on July 1, 1948. This bill enables any State to participate under the program after July 1, 1948, if and when such State enacts appropriate enabling legislation.

8. H. R. 6289: Providing for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients in St. Elizabeths Hospital. This bill authorizes residents of the District of Columbia to be admitted and treated at St. Elizabeths Hospital on a voluntary basis. Passage of the measure represents a progressive step in procedures governing the treatment of patients in mental health institutions.

9. Senate Resolution 249: Providing authorization for the subcommittee on health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to continue its study of the health problems of the Nation and of legislative proposals relating thereto.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in addition to the report and summary I have presented, I would finally like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the bill providing for the setting up of a National Science Foundation, which passed both the Senate and House last year, and which was vetoed by the President, was reintroduced early this year, and, in an amended form to meet some of the President's objections, was duly passed by the Senate on May 5 and sent to the House. This measure is still pending in the House, and it is my sincere hope that before Congress adjourns it may become law.

The science bill is designed to aid research in the basic sciences, and among the basic sciences the medical sciences are included, and therefore it is of vital importance in the consideration of our national health.

In closing these few remarks as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I want to pay a special tribute to the interest and diligence of the members of the subcommittee with whom it has been a great honor and privilege to work. The committee is composed of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], besides myself as chairman.

I also wish to pay special tribute to all the Members of the Senate who contributed to the development of the National Science Foundation bill, and particularly to those who joined with me, first, in the introduction of the bills introduced in both the first and second sessions of the Congress, and then in following through the difficult negotiations to iron out the differences and arrive at common conclusions. This group included the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I wish particularly to express my appreciation for the cooperation given by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

INCREASES OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That any person entitled to compensation at wartime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in part I, or paragraph I (c), part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and restored with limitations by Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 percent, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

(a) has a wife but no child living, $30;
(b) has a wife and one child living, $50;
(c) has a wife and two children living, $65;
(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $80;
(e) has no wife but one child living, $20;
(f) has no wife but two children living, $35;
(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $50;
(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $25 for each parent so dependent.

(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 percent, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

SEC. 2. The additional compensation for a dependent or dependents provided by this act shall not be payable to any veteran during any period he is in receipt of an increased rate of compensation or of subsistence allowance on account of a dependent or dependents under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That he may elect to receive whichever is the greater.

SEC. 3. The administrative, definitive, and penal provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and veterans' regulations thereunder, as amended, shall be for application under this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment.

Also to amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CONNALLY conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCREASE IN RATES OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN WIDOWS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2825) to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the following rates of compensation are hereby established for surviving widows, children, and dependent parents of deceased veterans of World War I or World War II whose deaths are the result of service in such wars, or the results of contingencies provided for in the United States Code, title 38, sections 501a, 501a–1, and paragraph 4, part VII, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended:

Widow but no child, $75; widow with one child, $115, with $20 for each additional child (subject to apportionment regulations); no widow but one child, $50 with $20 for each additional child (total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $75; dependent mother and father, $40 each.

SEC. 2. Such compensation shall not be diminished by reason of other benefits allowed by other provisions of law.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or veterans' regulation, for the purpose of payment of compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, one parent whose annual income does not exceed $1,800, or two parents whose annual income does not exceed $3,000, shall be deemed to be dependent. In determining annual income any payments made by a parent for expense of last illness of the veteran and such expense of burial of the veteran as exceeds the amount of the allowance authorized by Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, shall be excluded and any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered nor shall life-insurance payments from any other source, including income therefrom in an amount less than $3,000 received in any 1 year, be considered.

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective on the first day of the second month following the date of its enactment: *Provided*, That no compensation shall be reduced or discontinued by the enactment of this act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CONNALLY conferees on the part of the Senate.

BOARDS OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL AND MILITARY ACADEMIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 239) to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That there shall be appointed on or before the last day of every year a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 2. Each Board shall be constituted as follows:

(a) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or his designee;

(b) Three other Members of the Senate to be appointed by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(c) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or his designee;

(d) Four other Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(e) Six persons to be appointed by the President. The first Board to be appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act shall, with respect to the nine Presidential appointees, consist of two persons appointed to serve for a period of 1 year, two persons appointed to serve for a period of 2 years, and two persons appointed to serve for a period of 3 years. Two Presidential appointees shall be appointed to each subsequent Board to serve for a period of 3 years.

SEC. 3. In case of the death or resignation of a member of a Board during the term for which such member was appointed, a successor shall be appointed for the unexpired portion of the term. Such successor shall be appointed by the official, or his successor, who appointed the member who died or resigned.

SEC. 4. Each Board shall visit the respective Academy for which it is appointed once annually in April, and each Board or the individual members thereof may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, make such other visits on matters pertaining to the duties of the Board, or for purposes of consulting with the respective Superintendents of the Academies, as the Board or its members may determine to be desirable.

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be the duty of each Board to inquire into the state of morale and discipline, curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, academic methods, and other matters relating to the Academy concerned which the Board may decide to consider.

(b) Each Board shall, within 60 days after the meeting designated as the annual visit, submit a written annual report to the President regarding its action as such Board, together with its views and recommendations pertaining to the Academy concerned. Any report based on a visit other than the annual visit shall be submitted by the originator or originators thereof to the President within 60 days after approval of said report by at least a majority of the members of the Board.

(c) Each Board is authorized to call into consultation upon prior approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, such advisers as it may deem necessary or advisable to effectuate the duties imposed upon it by the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) Each member of each Board shall receive not more than $5 per day and be reimbursed under Government travel regulations for actual expenses of travel while performing duties as a member of either Board.

(b) Advisers called for consultation by either Board in connection with the business of the Board shall be compensated in the same manner as members of the Boards in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 7. That part of the act of August 29, 1916, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes", which relates to the Board of Visitors of the United States Naval Academy (39 Stat. 608) and reads as follows: "From and after the passage of this act there shall be appointed every year, in the following manner, a Board of Visitors, to visit the Academy, the date of the annual visit of the board aforesaid to be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy: Seven persons shall be appointed by the President and four Senators and five Members of the House of Representatives shall be designated as visitors by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, in the month of January of each year. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives shall be ex officio members of said board.

"Each member of said Board shall receive while engaged upon duties as a member of the Board not to exceed $5 a day and actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. (a) So much of the provision of the act of August 9, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purpoes," which provides as follows: "*Provided*, That the act approved May 28, 1908, be amended and reenacted so as to read as follows: That hereafter the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy shall consist of five members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate and seven members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the respective chairmen thereof; the members so appointed shall visit the Military Academy annually at such time as the chairman of said committees shall appoint, and the members from each of said committees may visit said Academy together or separately as the said committees may elect during the session of Congress; and the Superintendent of the Academy and the members of the Board of Visitors shall be notified of such date by the chairmen of the said committees. The expenses of the members of the Board shall be their actual expenses while engaged upon their duties as members of said Board not to exceed $5 per day and their actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes" is hereby repealed.

(b) The act of May 17, 1928, entitled "An act to provide for the membership of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 597), is hereby repealed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the amendments of the House are technical in character. I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATION RIDERS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States persists in its irresponsible, pernicious, and objectionable practice of attaching riders to appropriation bills. The veto message of the President of the United States, which was overridden yesterday by the Congress, is discussed in an important editorial published in the Washington Post of today. I hope every Senator will read the editorial because sooner or later it seems to me the Congress of the United States must begin to follow a consistent policy of legislation, which the appropriations committees have not been doing for some time in the past.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may appear in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATION RIDERS

It was high time for a President of the United States to challenge, through his veto power, the pernicious practice of tacking legislative riders onto appropriation bills. If there was politics in Mr. Truman's message returning the billion-dollar social-security measure, it was politics of the best sort; it served to dramatize for the country an issue far greater than the issue involved in the provision of funds for an important Federal agency. The action of Congress in overriding the veto roughshod was politics of the worst sort; it was dictated more by a desire for adjournment than by any consideration of the national interest.

One need not even take into account the merits of the legislation which Congress attached to the social-security appropriation to agree with President Truman that it is not "in the interest of good government that legislation of such importance should be enacted in such a manner." It was enacted, as he said, "entirely without reference to or hearing by the legislative committees concerned with such matters." And what is even more disquieting is the plain fact that it was enacted designedly in such a way as to make extremely difficult, if not actually to nullify, exercise of the President's constitutionally conferred veto power. It took rare courage as well as statesmanship for Mr. Truman to run the hazard of leaving the Social Security Administration without funds.

What Mr. Truman did was, as he called it, "unusual," but it was not unprecedented. In 1879 and 1880, during the administration of Rutherford B. Hayes, an attempt was made by Congress to impose its will on the President through just this technique of appending legislation to a vital appropriation. President Hayes denounced it as involving "a radical, dangerous, and unconstitutional change in the character of our institutions," destroying the constitutional distribution of powers among the coordinate branches of the Government. He had this to say on the subject:

"To say that a majority of either or both of the Houses of Congress may insist on the approval of a bill under the penalty of stopping all of the operations of the Government, for want of the necessary supplies, is to deny to the Executive that share of the legislative power which is plainly conferred by the second section of the seventh article of the Constitution. It strikes from the Constitution the qualified negative of the President."

In the controversy of that time, President Hayes persisted in vetoing the obnoxious bills until his opponents on the Hill, who could not manage to muster the votes necessary to override him, were at last compelled to yield and separate the appropriations from the riders. President Truman, unfortunately, has not had such support even from the members of his own party. But it is not impossible that he will win it from the country if Congress continues to behave so irresponsibly. Taking the fight between himself and Congress to the people, he is justified in saying, at least on this particular issue, that he has done, as he put it, his "damnedest." And this is something the people of the United States are prone to respect.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] for himself and his colleague [Mr. BARKLEY] to Senate bill 2318.

Mr. COOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. COOPER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Ives	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Cain	Kilgore	Stennis
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Chavez	McCarthy	Taylor
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McFarland	Thye
Cordon	McGrath	Tobey
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Umstead
Dworshak	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ecton	Martin	Wherry
Ellender	Maybank	White
Fezzel	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	Williams
Flanders	Morse	Wilson
Fulbright	Murray	Young
Green	Myers	
Gurney	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to propose a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow, June 18, 1948, the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Order 1504. I might state that that is the calendar number where we left off when the oleomargarine bill was under consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does that mean that the calendar will not be called today?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. The reason I make the request now is that several Senators have asked me when the calendar is to be called. It was my idea not to have a call of the calendar until we conclude consideration of the farm legislation. It now appears that there will be considerable debate and discussion of the pending bill. I felt that Senators would like to know definitely when the calendar will be called.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, would the Senator mind repeating his request? I was engaged in conversation.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow, June 18, 1948, the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Order No. 1504. That is the bill following the oleomargarine bill, where we left off the last time the calendar was called.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under that order would a motion be in order to proceed to the consideration of a bill if objection were lodged against it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would not.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make a further announcement. It is our intention to remain in session tonight until as late an hour as necessary to conclude consideration of the unfinished business.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, what will be done with appropriation bills?

Mr. WHERRY. As fast as appropriation bills are ready, I shall ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to help us out in getting them passed so that they may go to conference.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. If I may have the attention of the acting majority leader, I did not object a moment ago when the decision was being made to wait until tomorrow for a call of the calendar. However, I think we should understand that if we wait until tomorow to call the calendar, there is hardly any possibility that there could be a conference in case of disagreement between the two Houses on any measure passed on the call of the calendar. I am very much interested in a certain bill, with respect to which there may be disagreement between the two Houses on the Senate committee recommendation. I have heard other Senators make the same point. I wonder if we could not reconsider that decision and find some time during today to call the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, so that there will be a possibility of conference in case of disagreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the constructive observation made by the Senator from Florida; but of course his argument would also apply to the farm bill. I have taken this question up with the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who has been most patient about displacing the farm bill for other legislation.

The difficulty arose because we did not complete the call of the calendar when it was called day before yesterday. In the meantime we have considered a number of privileged matters. We are now back on the farm bill. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Florida did not make objection. If the distinguished Senator will allow us to proceed, I am sure that conferences can be arranged, and that there will be an opportunity for the conferees to report back, even though we must remain in session late Saturday night. I am sure that bills which go to conference will have a chance.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder if we could not leave it to the discretion of the able acting majority leader to take up the calendar before the close of this day, after the disposition of the farm bill, if there is an opportunity. I mention that for this reason: I am told that in case of disagreement a long time is required, in the present state of congestion in the Printing Office, to get the printed reports necessary to make a conference possible. So we would at least have the intervening hours in which the Printing Office could prepare the necessary papers in case of disagreement between the two Houses.

Mr. WHERRY. I took that question up with the Printing Office. While we might gain a little time, yet very little time would be gained if we were to call the calendar late tonight. It is my definite opinion that unless a miracle happens, consideration of the agricultural program will continue until pretty late tonight. If the bill should go over, it will be temporarily displaced under the unanimous-consent order. I believe that is about as fair a compromise as we could get between the distinguished Senator from Vermont and Senators who are interested in other bills on the calendar.

Mr. PEPPER. I did not have in mind a call of the calendar preceding consideration of the farm bill; but I did want the acting majority leader not to commit himself and the Senate to the assumption that there would not be a call of the calendar if the situation permitted it during the day.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is better to have a set time. Then Senators may know when the calendar will be called. Furthermore, only bills which meet the approval of the Senate will be passed. One Senator may object to a bill, which will cause the bill to go over. A bill which passes the Senate unanimously should not have much difficulty in conference. I believe that the print-

ing item would be a minor consideration, even if the call of the calendar could not be reached this afternoon.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to make a further observation. Yesterday I talked with the clerk of one of the House committees. He told me about the congestion in the Printing Office. He stated that there could not possibly be a conference on a disagreement between the two Houses unless a certain number of hours intervened, so that the Printing Office would have an opportunity to print the reports.

Mr. WHERRY. I am just as sure as I am of anything that consideration of the farm bill will not be concluded until late this evening. So far as conferences are concerned, I think they would be held tomorrow morning in any event. The Senator has offered a very constructive criticism in connection with the matter of printing. However, I believe that if we are permitted to proceed we can accomplish the purpose for which the calendar is called; and I believe that most of the conferees will cooperate in every way.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a matter of no great moment to me when the calendar is called; but I am sure the Senator is taking into consideration the fact that if the calendar is not called before tomorrow morning, it will mean the death of any Senate bill on the calendar, whereas if the calendar were called today, there might be a chance of its enactment.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator say that it would mean the death of any Senate bill on the calendar?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would mean the death of any Senate bill to which there was the slightest objection, if the calendar were not called until tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. We shall encounter that difficulty whenever it is called. I am quite satisfied that if we proceed under this order, consideration of bills on the calendar will be as greatly expedited as though we had a call of the calendar tonight.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I suggest that if we proceed with the business before the Senate, we shall probably have time to work on the calendar before the day is over.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I know that many Senators are busy today in committees, and I cannot expect that too many will be present at all times during the discussion of my amendment. However, I hope that Senators who come from tobacco-producing States will remain, while my distinguished colleague [Mr. BARKLEY] and I discuss this amendment.

The amendment proposed by my colleague and myself reads as follows:

(5) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the level of price support to cooperators for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas are in effect shall be 90 percent of its parity price as of the beginning of the marketing year.

The effect of the amendment is to remove tobacco from the list of commodities which will be subject to the price-support table found on page 79 of the pending bill, which table has been characterized as a flexible or moving price-support plan, in which the level of support afforded to a specific commodity varies, and to give tobacco a definite, fixed support price equal to 90 percent of its parity price.

I know that this amendment will provoke, very naturally and rightfully, certain questions. It will be asked, Why should tobacco be treated differently than other agricultural commodities? Why should tobacco be guaranteed a fixed, firm support price equal to 90 percent of its parity price, when the support price of other commodities ranges between 60 and 90 percent of parity?

Mr. President, my colleague and I ask—and I know we shall be joined by others who are familiar with the problems of tobacco—that this amendment to the pending bill be adopted because the conditions under which tobacco is produced, its limited use as a raw, unprocessed product, and—and this is most important—the conditions under which it must be marketed, operate to make its sale entirely different from that of every other agricultural commodity.

It is my contention, and one which I believe is supported by the facts, that the unusual conditions under which tobacco is produced and marketed, when coupled—and this is the most important fact in the argument—with the usually limited field of buyers, operate to give a dominant bargaining position to the limited field of buyers representing the major tobacco companies, and to deprive the producer of tobacco of a free market, in the sense that a market is enjoyed by the producers of other agricultural commodities. We contend that in this limited market, the buyer pays a price which is not necessarily or always related to the law of supply and demand, but is fixed by the maximum amount the buyers must pay to get the tobacco, which in reality is the support price. For this reason we argue that the support price should be fixed at 90 percent of parity. If it means a lower percentage, prices will decline as the support price declines.

Mr. President, tobacco is a cash crop. A year's labor, nearly all of which is hand labor once the seed is sowed in the tobacco bed, is required to cultivate and market the crop. I doubt that Senators who do not live in tobacco-producing States realize that it takes a year, and sometimes more than a year, to cultivate a crop of tobacco from the time the seed is sowed in the tobacco bed, until the tobacco is sold upon the market.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has long been a common saying in the tobacco-growing areas that it takes 13 months out of every 12 to grow a crop of tobacco.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; it is very true that there is a common saying in our State that it takes 13 months out of every 12 to produce a tobacco crop. In the production of a tobacco crop, practically every process is by hand labor—hard, back-breaking labor.

Due to the peculiar characteristics of tobacco, it must be sold in the year in which it is produced. Other crops can be held waiting for a good market; but tobacco must be sold in a short marketing season of 3 or 4 months, in the year in which it is produced. This is true because of inadequate marketing facilities and because the tobacco would deteriorate substantially.

Moreover—again different from other crops—tobacco cannot be marketed except as tobacco. The producer of corn or wheat can market his crop by feeding it to cattle or hogs, but the tobacco producer must sell his crop as tobacco, and nothing else.

Furthermore, when the tobacco grower is ready to sell his crop, he cannot take it to his county seat and find there several buyers, but he must take it to the place where a tobacco warehouse is located, and there it must be auctioned and sold in a strange language—familiar to you from radio programs—to one of a limited group of tobacco buyers, representing the large tobacco companies.

Unless the representatives of the tobacco companies are there, the tobacco producer cannot sell his crop. In Kentucky and other tobacco-producing States warehouses are not built merely to accommodate the producers of tobacco; they cannot be built unless prior to their building there is an agreement, or a strong reason to believe that the large tobacco companies will send their representatives to the market. Tobacco warehouses have been built in my State and, I am sure, in other States, for the purpose of accommodating the tobacco producers of the section, and then never used, because representatives of the large tobacco companies would not send their buyers to the new warehouse.

The tobacco farmer must take his crop to the place where the representatives of the great tobacco manufacturers of tobacco will come to buy his crop. Unless the representatives are there, the tobacco farmer cannot sell his tobacco. The farmer who has spent a year in back-breaking toil to produce a crop of tobacco, which is his cash crop and his principal source of income, and who has hauled it, 50 to 100 miles to a warehouse, knows that he must sell his tobacco to one of the few buyers, or else lose his year's labor. Can it be doubted that the buyers know that the farmer must sell or lose the work of a year?

I do not wish to base my argument upon unjustified criticism or attack upon the great tobacco companies who are the principal buyers; they perform a valuable service. Nevertheless I must emphasize the dominant position they hold in the tobacco market against the single producer of tobacco. In 1941 the buying methods of the several large tobacco companies were subjected to inquiry in an action brought by the Department of Justice alleging violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. In that prosecution, the defendants—the American Tobacco Co., the Liggett & Myers

tured tobacco was 16.3 percent. These
was 133,000,000 pounds, or 9½ percent of

Tobacco Co., the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., American Suppliers, and certain subsidiaries—were charged with having conspired to violate the Antitrust Act. The defendants were convicted in the United States District Court in Kentucky; the case was appealed to the circuit court of appeals, where it was affirmed, and in 1945 the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed the action of the lower courts in finding these companies guilty of conspiring to monopolize in the tobacco field. The opinion of the Supreme Court, rendered by Mr. Justice Burton, contains a table which demonstrates the dominating position of these great tobacco companies as purchasers of tobacco. There are listed nine companies that are the principal purchasers of tobacco at the markets which I have described. I quote from the opinion in the case of *American Tobacco Co. v. United States* (66 S. Ct. 1125), respecting the table:

> The first table shows that, although American, Liggett, and Reynolds gradually dropped in their percentage of the national domestic cigarette production from 90.7 percent in 1931 to 73.3 percent, 71 percent, and 68 percent, respectively, in 1937, 1938, and 1939, they have accounted at all times for more than 68 percent, and usually for more than 75 percent, of the national production. The balance of the cigarette production has come from six other companies.

The point I make is that the thousands of small tobacco growers in the tobacco-producing States, arriving at the warehouses with their tobacco, find there as the only purchasers of their tobacco, three representatives of three great companies, representing at least 68 to 75 percent of the cigarette industry, and sometimes a few others. One count of the indictment in the case to which I have referred stated in part as follows:

> Said unlawful monopolization has had the effects, among others, of permitting a few companies to attain control of a bottleneck in a great industry—

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the point.

Mr. STENNIS. I desire to raise the point of order that it is impossible for a Member of the Senate who is trying to hear and understand the argument being presented by the Senator from Kentucky, and who is seated within 12 or 14 feet of the speaker, to hear and understand what is said. I do not want to be personal, but persons at the rear of the Senate Chamber who are presumed to have the privilege of the floor are abusing that privilege by conversing, not only to my disturbance but also to the disturbance of other Senators. I desire to raise a most serious point of order, that the membership of the Senate are entitled to sit under conditions which enable them to follow the debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's point is well taken. Those at the rear of the Chamber will either be seated or retire. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

Mr. COOPER. I thank my good friend the Senator from Mississippi. Repeating, the indictment, in part, stated:

> Said unlawful monopolization has had the effects, among others, of permitting a few companies to attain control of a bottleneck in a great industry, through which a major farm commodity on which several million are dependent, must pass on its way through the hands of jobbers to retailers, to the many millions who use tobacco products • • • of enabling those few companies to abuse their resulting strategic and dominant position by making the income of growers of leaf tobacco lower than it would otherwise have been.

I do not say or imply that these tobacco-products companies are now in violation of the antitrust laws as they were held to be at that time. I merely emphasize that nothing has happened since that time to equalize the bargaining position of the sellers with the buyers. I point out that in a market of this kind, limited as it is to a few powerful buyers, each of whom cannot fail to be familiar with the practices of the others, the effects described in the opinion of the Supreme Court would be substantially the same, without any agreement or conspiracy among the buyers.

I should like to ask those who are interested in other crops, such as corn, wheat, and cotton, What would they think if the thousands of people who produce those crops were forced and required to sell them to nine companies? Would they believe that they had a free market? Would an individual producer in some remote section of our farming sections have equal bargaining power with their representatives? If it can be visualized that the thousands of small producers of tobacco must channel their crops through this bottleneck, dominated by a few powerful companies, it should not be difficult to see that a tobacco market is not a free market in the common sense of the term.

I urge the opinion, which is one shared by my constituents, who know every phase of tobacco growing, buying, and selling, that the Federal Government offers through its parity and support-price program the only substantial assurance the tobacco growers have that they will receive a reasonable price for their product. I realize it is difficult for Members of the Senate who do do not live in tobacco-producing States and who are not familiar with tobacco to understand this problem. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is made up of the sincerest and most sympathetic friends of agriculture I have ever talked to in my life, yet they would be required to admit that the tobacco problem is unfamiliar to them.

Tobacco buyers know that to supply their needs they must bid at least as high as the support level. By the same token they need not bid prices substantially above the support level. The net result is that the price paid to a producer will follow the support price.

I may be asked whether I have proof that this situation obtains. I think there is proof. I point first to the close relationship of actual prices paid to farmers to support prices during the past 2 years.

In 1947 the average price received by burley tobacco growers was 48.3 cents a pound, which was 20 percent in excess of the support price of 40.3 cents. In 1946 the average price was 39.7 cents a pound, or 15 percent above the support level of 33.5 cents a pound. I wonder how many other farm commodities have been selling so relatively close to their support levels of 90 percent of parity. I do not think there are many.

A second evidence that the price which the representatives of the large tobacco companies pay to the farmer is tied closely to the support price is indicated by the failure of tobacco to reflect in like degree to other farm products the inflationary influences of the past few years, which brought wide advances in practically every other farm product.

The average price received for the 1947 crop by growers of burley tobacco, which variety is a major component in the manufacture of cigarettes, was 48.3 cents a pound, or only 18 percent more than the price of 39.4 cents paid for the 1945 crop, the last crop sold under OPA price control. It is unnecessary for me to remind the Senate of advances of 50 to 100 percent and more in prices of other farm commodities over the past 2 years. This small increase in price was given to growers in the face of unprecedented demand for tobacco products.

Sales of cigarettes have increased almost uninterruptedly over a period of years. Between 1920 and 1930 cigarette sales nearly doubled, from 67,000,000,000 to 119,000,000,000. Between 1930 and 1940 sales rose about 60 percent, to 191,000,000,000. On top of this prodigious growth, sales more than doubled again during World War II to reach 414,000,000,000 in 1945. A glance at the sales of the leading tobacco companies will show that they have had the major share of the benefits of this spectacular record of industry growth. Certainly this unprecedented demand has not been reflected in an increase in price paid to the men and women who harvest a crop whose production requires 12 months.

Out of the total value of consumer expenditures for tobacco products the Federal Government and State governments take, in taxes, 43 percent; the producer takes 15½ percent; the remainder goes to the great tobacco companies. If the Senate will remember that sufficient tobacco to manufacture 414,000,000,000 cigarettes and other tobacco products must go from thousands of producers through a bottleneck of buyers representing from 6 to 10 major tobacco companies, it will have a clear understanding of the dominating influence of the buyers, which brings about in part this disparity between producer and processor.

We assert that the support price should be maintained at 90 percent of parity in order to give the individual grower some equality of bargaining power against the buyer. It may be asked, and rightfully so, if fixing the support at 90 percent will result in higher prices to the consumer. I do not believe it will. I am informed by the burley growers of my State that manufactured tobacco products are priced almost without reference to the cost of leaf tobacco. Statistics given me by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics are eloquent proof of that position.

In 1947 the retail value of 1 pound of tobacco converted into manufactured product was $2.51. The farm value of 1 pound of tobacco was 39½ cents. The farmer's share in the pound of manufactured tobacco was 16.3 percent. These figures are those of a year when 90-percent parity was in effect, and its maintenance certainly should not increase consumer prices.

Another question which will be asked is, "Will the maintenance of a 90-percent support price for tobacco make it probable that at some time in the future the Commodity Credit Corporation will be required to take in loans large quantities of tobacco and make large outlays of money?" I point out, first, that the demand for and sale of tobacco are not diminishing; they are expanding at home. As Europe recovers there will undoubtedly be a revival of large tobacco exports. Before the war a large volume of tobacco was exported which represented a considerable proportion of the total production of tobacco. I think it is reasonable to believe that as conditions improve foreign demand will increase. The expanding consumption of tobacco products at home and abroad makes overproduction unlikely.

In 1939, 22 percent of the flue-cured tobacco was exported; 39 percent of fire-cured dark tobacco was exported; 2½ percent of burley tobacco was exported.

Tobacco is now, and has been for several years, under an effective quota system which limits production. If tobacco were not under a quota system and there were a high support price, it would be probable that overproduction would follow, resulting in a heavy financial burden upon the Government. But I point out that for several years there have been effective marketing quotas for tobacco which have limited the production of individual tobacco growers and prevented overproduction.

The committee report states as follows:

> It has been demonstrated that fixed price supports for farm products without reference to supplies of products, have encouraged the producer to continue to expand production without regard for the demand for his products.

That comment could not apply to tobacco, because its production is limited by quotas which are fixed with regard to supply and demand. If there should be overproduction this year, or any year, the marketing quota can and should be reduced and the penalties applied by the bill to noncooperators would become effective to prevent overproduction. The best evidence of the effectiveness of the quota system in limiting production is found in its record. It has been in effect since 1938, with the exception of the year 1939. At present there is a comparatively small amount of tobacco in loan. During 3 of the 8 years in which it has been in effect the tobacco manufacturers absorbed the entire burley crop requiring no recourse whatever to Government loans. In 3 of the remaining 5 years amounts ranging from 1.6 percent to 6.2 percent of the crop went under loans, which were rapidly liquidated, with no loans in the immediately succeeding year. In 1947 only 5.1 percent of the crop went under loan, and this amount should be absorbed by the market during 1948. In only 1 year, 1946, was any substantial proportion of the burley crop taken under loan. It was 133,000,000 pounds, or 21 percent of the crop.

Mr. President, sometimes when the question of the effectiveness of the quota system is raised, it is argued that in the year to which I have just referred it was necessary to take 21 percent of the crop in loan. But during the war tobacco growers had been encouraged to expand production, to supply the needs of our armed forces, and of our allies. It was the inducement to produce tobacco extended by the Government during the war years that resulted in the overproduction in 1946.

About 50 percent of the large takings of 1946 has been sold under the quota system with actually no loss. With tight acreage control, a safeguard is provided against the necessity of large support buying at any time except under extraordinary conditions such as those caused by war or collapse of export markets, which cannot be anticipated.

It is true that the collapse of export markets, upon which certain types of tobacco depend, resulted in accumulation of these varieties. At present 335,000,000 pounds of these types, costing $127,000,000, are held under loan. But the size of these accumulations has little reference to the percentage of parity at which support was provided. Government loans on these export varieties would have been necessary at any support price. The exercise of quota control, however, combined with revival of exports, will correct this situation in time.

Mr. President, I should like to address myself for a few moments to the importance of tobacco, to the economy of many States. It is of vital importance to the tobacco-producing States. The total value of the crop in 1946 was $1,045,633,000. I do not have the figures for 1947, but I know the value was much larger in that year.

In 1946 its value, in terms of percentage of the total cash farm income of eight of the largest producing States, was as follows: North Carolina, 58 percent; Kentucky, 36 percent; South Carolina, 26 percent; Connecticut, 20 percent; Virginia, 18 percent; Tennessee, 13 percent; Georgia, 12 percent

I should like to have inserted in the RECORD a statement giving the names of the States, the total cash farm income, the value of the tobacco, and the percentage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

State	Total cash farm income	Tobacco	Percent
North Carolina	$753,193,000	$436,761,000	58
Kentucky	439,366,000	159,512,000	36
South Carolina	316,493,000	83,697,000	26
Connecticut	126,475,000	25,663,000	20
Virginia	360,600,000	63,023,000	18
Tennessee	399,579,000	52,844,000	13
Georgia	408,106,000	48,493,000	12

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it is well known that tobacco is one of the great revenue producers of the Nation. Federal and State tax receipts from tobacco in 1947 amounted to $1,482,535,000. I point out that that is larger than the total price paid to the farmers in 1946. The Federal tax receipts increased, from the year 1939 to 1947, from $608,000,000 plus to $1,237,000,000. State tax receipts increased, from 1939 to 1947, from $58,000,000 plus to more than $244,000,000. I send to the desk a statement of Federal and State tax receipts from tobacco and ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal tax receipts from tobacco products

Fiscal years:	
1939	$608,518,000
1941	698,065,000
1943	923,853,000
1946	1,165,519,000
1947	1,237,768,000

State tax receipts from tobacco products

Years ending June 30:	
1939	$58,970,000
1941	106,294,000
1943	140,761,000
1945	145,451,000
1946	199,392,000
1947	244,767,000
Total Federal and State tax receipts 1947	1,482,535,000

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I repeat, the percentage of Federal and State taxes of the total consumer expenditure for tobacco products represents approximately 43 percent of the consumer expenditures. I repeat, also, that out of these great consumer expenditures the producer's share is only 15.6 percent.

I should like to say that Senators from States whose agricultural economy is based upon corn or wheat or cotton know the importance of maintaining the price stability of those products. Similarly, the economy of my State and of other tobacco-producing States depends upon the price stability of tobacco. Tobacco is the great cash crop of those States. Sales are made in the late fall and winter and the farmer receives his money at a time when it is needed for the payment of taxes, interest, and debts. There is no other crop in those States which can take its place.

The farms are of small size. The average farm in Kentucky contains about 80 acres. It follows that it is not possible to engage in large grazing operations, or in the production of corn, wheat, or cotton upon a farm of that size.

The farming of these comparatively small farms is based upon tobacco production. Last year tobacco sales represented 52 percent of the farm income of my State.

If tobacco prices are driven down it is not usually possible to shift from tobacco to some other crop in an effort to recoup income lost when tobacco prices are reduced. Farmers can not shift from one type of tobacco to another type. I believe there are 28 types of tobacco, and the soil conditions of a particular State or a particular section of a State are suited for the growing of one or two types of tobacco. It is not possible, or at least profitable, to shift from flue-cured to burley, or from burley to fire-cured tobacco, or dark air-cured tobacco. Each type is related to the qualities of the soil.

Now, Mr. President, this amendment which I offer should be agreed to.

First. Because the growing and marketing conditions of tobacco are peculiarly different from those of other crops.

Second. The amendment should be agreed to because the market of tobacco growers is limited, and dominated by powerful buyers.

Third. These powerful, dominant buyers are able to fix a price, not based upon demand, but upon the support price which we create.

Fourth. I point out that the adoption of the amendment will not increase consumer prices.

Fifth. The record of Government loans on tobacco indicates that the quota system has worked, and that support for tobacco at 90 percent of parity has not imposed heavy financial burdens upon the Federal Government.

Finally, I insist that the tobacco quota system is itself a control of overproduction, and the flexible support system is not needed to control tobacco production. Upon this ground my colleague Senator BARKLEY and I are justified in asking that the amendment be adopted.

Before I close I should like to say that for some weeks I have been discussing tobacco problems with the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. The committee afforded the tobacco growers and industry every opportunity to present their case. Growers from my State and other States presented the case so clearly to the committee that the committee incorporated in the bill practically every provision other than 90-percent support which the growers requested.

The committee, its able chairman, Senator CAPPER, the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] deserve great credit.

I have been very much interested in the long-range farm bill. I believe that this is the time for Congress to enact legislation which will assure a permanent farm program and stability of income for the farmers of the Nation. I am sure that the committee and the Members of the Senate will take into consideration the peculiar and unusual position of tobacco. I now ask the Senate to adopt the amendment which I have offered, guaranteeing to tobacco growers a permanent support price of 90 percent of parity.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, returned by the President of the United States, with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 631. An act for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.;

H. R. 2239. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; and

H. R. 3214. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary."

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] for himself and his colleague [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I presume the proponents of the amendment would have the right to conclude the argument upon it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thought probably the senior Senator from Kentucky desired to speak now. I can very quickly give the reasons why the amendment should not be adopted, and if the Senator from Kentucky so desires, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. AIKEN. Needless to say I am opposed to the amendment. The junior Senator from Kentucky has given quite a severe indictment against the monopoly control of the tobacco buying. I believe I can agree with most of what he said on that subject, because when I was a small boy my father always raised tobacco, and I know how completely the tobacco producers were at the mercy of the tobacco buyers. The committee had that in mind when writing the bill.

I am somewhat surprised over the amendment which the Senators from Kentucky have offered, because the support had under S. 2318 is already more favorable to tobacco than any other commodity. I would not have been surprised if some Senator had perhaps criticized the committee for writing a bill to provide as high a level of support as we have provided. The reason we have done so is that we know how completely the tobacco grower is at the mercy of the buyers, and particularly foreign government monopolies. England and France can knock the props out from under the price of tobacco in the United States any time they see fit to do so. For that reason I have been willing to maintain a high level of support for tobacco. That does not mean that we guarantee cost-plus in any way. But tobacco is one commodity, and wool is another commodity, which will receive somewhat higher support prices under the bill than they are receiving under the present law.

I should like to point out that in the bill we changed the parity formula, and as a result of changing the parity formula the parity price of burley tobacco, which for the 1947 crop is 44.8 cents a pound under the present formula method of computing parity, would increase to 48.8 cents a pound under the proposed formula.

Under the present law the 1947 crop of burley tobacco is supported at 90 percent of 44.8 cents a pound, which is 40.32 cents a pound.

Under Senate bill 2318 it would be supported at 84 percent of 48.8 cents a pound, or 41 cents a pound. Therefore the pending bill would provide a level of support of 41 cents a pound for burley tobacco. It gives about the same increase also to flue-cured tobacco.

Flue-cured and burley tobacco are two farm commodities which will fare better under the pending bill than they fare under the present law. I think that next year the support level will increase still further, and possibly for 2 or 3 years; but in the long run, of course, tobacco will have to assume its relationship to other agricultural commodities. It may stay high for many years. It may stay high for 20 years. No one can foresee that. But for the next 2 or 3 years the support price for burley tobacco, for flue-cured tobacco, for fire-cured tobacco, and I think all kinds of tobacco, will be a little higher than under the present law.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in saying that the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky is the A amendment which seeks to make mandatory a 90 percent of parity price at the beginning of the marketing year?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. The amendment requests special privilege for a single agricultural commodity.

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly the point I want to raise. Why should the Senate undertake to adopt amendments of this kind which select particular commodities and give them preference over every other commodity in the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senate should not adopt any such amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, if this is to be done for tobacco it will be the beginning of more or less of a substitution of the Steagall theory of price support for all basic and nonbasic commodities on a 90-percent mandatory provision, which is right in the teeth of the long-range program which the Senator has been discussing.

Mr. AIKEN. It would mean the start of the break-down of the program before the program got under way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would not the effect of the amendment be to place tobacco on a special list so that it would not be necessary to take into consideration the amount of tobacco on hand, as must be done in connection with other commodities?

Mr. AIKEN. It would leave no restrictions other than those which are in force today.

Mr. FERGUSON. And there would not be a lowering and a raising of the support price compared to parity if the amendment went into effect. The support price would stay at one point.

Mr. AIKEN. As compared to parity.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the proposed amendment it would remain at 90 percent of parity. And let me point out that any special privilege given a single commodity would mean that something would have to be taken away from some other commodity under the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. That would be true because of the cost that may be involved. Is that not correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. I think tobacco is entitled to some special consideration because the price is governed so largely by foreign government monopolies, and domestic buyers are no slouches when it comes to organizing to hold the price down. What the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] said about that is exactly correct. For that reason the tobacco producers are entitled to a good support level. They would receive a splendid support level under Senate bill 2318, and the support would continue for some years into the future under the provisions of the act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hesitate to consume the time of the Senate, but I am joint author, with my colleague, of this amendment, and I am very much interested in seeing it adopted.

My colleague has given a graphic picture of the process of producing tobacco, which does not apply to any other crop. I do not know whether he was actually raised in a tobacco patch. I was. From the time when I could shoulder an ax or pull one end of a cross-cut saw, my father took me to the woods and we cleared the land which we proposed to cultivate in tobacco the following summer.

I have facetiously referred to the old saying in the tobacco section that it requires 13 months out of every 12 to grow a crop of tobacco. That grows out of this situation: The farmer who is going to produce tobacco must, early in the winter, make what is called a plant bed. That is a bed in the earth, produced by the burning of logs, brush, or wood in some form, so as to kill all vegetation and plant life which might choke the growth of the tender tobacco plant when the seed is finally sown and the plant comes up through the ground. That requires the clearing of land. It requires the laying off of a bed, the size of which the farmer himself determines. When I was a boy on the farm it required the piling of logs, augmented by brush from trees, and the building of fires to burn out the vegetation. It required the pulverization of the soil by hoe, rake, pick, and every other utensil that would break up the ground into very fine particles.

Then the seed must be sown. Before the seed come up, canvas must be put over it so that insects and bugs will not eat the plants after they have come up through the ground. Then the plants must be pulled one by one from the plant bed and transferred to the field. In the meantime the soil of the field must be carefully prepared by the same process of pulverization, except that there is no fire to kill out the vegetation which might compete with the growth of the tobacco plant.

When there is a rainy season, or when the ground is moistened, at the proper time the plants are drawn from the bed by hand and are set out into the field by hand. A horse-drawn vehicle has been invented by which tobacco may be planted a row or two at a time. There is a little attachment permitting the soil to be moistened at the time the tobacco is planted, so that it will not suffer from dry weather. However, the average farmer does not possess that sort of equipment.

The plant must then be hoed by hand. It must be plowed with a team and plow. Every process, every step taken in the production of tobacco, is a hand process. There is no machinery by which it can be handled like wheat. There is no machinery like the cotton picker, by which it can be harvested. There is no machinery corresponding to the corn planter.

The tobacco must be cut by hand, each stalk by itself. The stalk is split with a knife, and it is then cut off and hung up. If it is a burley crop, it is hung in the field or in an open barn where it is cured by air. If it is dark fired, it is hung in a barn, packed as closely as possible so as to retain the smoke and heat, and it must be cured by a fire built under the tobacco as it hangs in the barn for several days. It frequently requires an all-night process of watching the fire and the tobacco for a week or 10 days until it is cured. If it is flue-cured tobacco, it requires the same process of firing, but the smoke and heat go through the flue, and the tobacco is cured in that way. There is no machinery by which tobacco can be successfully produced. So it is really a hand-grown, hand-cultivated, hand-processed crop from beginning to end.

When it is hung in the barn and has been cured either by air or fire, or by the flue-cured process, which is really a fire process, it must be stripped. Every leaf of tobacco must be pulled from the stalk by hand. There is no machinery by which that can be done. The leaves are tied together in what is called a "hand," which is made up from 6 to 10 leaves, with the butt ends together. Then they are wrapped with another leaf which has been folded into a little wrapper about as wide as my two fingers. Then it is bulked and hung back in the barn until dried out. In dry weather, frequently it is bulked down in the barn or warehouse so that it may retain its moisture in bulk, thereafter to be hauled to market. It is frequently prized into a hogshead. All this is a long process. It is very difficult. That is what gives rise to the expression that 13 months out of every 12 are required to grow a crop of tobacco and market it.

All my life I have been familiar with the growth and marketing of tobacco. My father was a farmer, largely a tobacco farmer. I have seen the process by which sales take place. I can remember the time when tobacco buyers, representing the companies which were processing or rehandling tobacco, or speculating in tobacco, would send their men around on horseback to every barn and take samples out of the barn and make an offer for the tobacco. The situation finally reached the point where the territory was divided, so that no competitor went into a given territory to compete with someone else. When the buyer came along and sampled the crop and offered the farmer a certain price, if he did not take that price no other buyer would come around. The buyers had an arrangement under which they would not go across the road to buy a farmer's tobacco if it were in the territory of a competitor to whom that farm had been allocated. All the farms in the territory or county were allocated.

That gave rise to the organization of farmers to hold their tobacco, if possible, until they could get a decent price. It has given rise to the organization of cooperative marketing associations.

No doubt Senators have heard the auction system exemplified over the radio. The tobacco auctioneer or chanter goes through the tobacco warehouses looking at one basket and another, and offering a price which no one can understand until the tobacco is knocked down, and the producer is informed by a slip of paper how much he gets. The farmer cannot understand the chant of the auctioneer. I cannot imitate it. I would not attempt to do so. A few years ago there was a Member in the House of Representatives from Kentucky who could imitate it.

Senators will remember the final wind-up of the auctioneer on the radio program, in which various prices are announced, none of which can be understood. Finally the tobacco is knocked down, and the announcer says, "Sold, American." The Member of the House to whom I refer imitated the chant, and finally wound up by saying, "Stolen by American." That was his interpretation of the chant, and that is frequently the case.

I am giving these facts because tobacco occupies an entirely different status from that of any other crop in America. The production and marketing of tobacco is all hand work, from beginning to end. Unless the farmer belongs to a cooperative, and the cooperative is able to take the tobacco and hold it until either the big corporations—the Big Four—are willing to buy it, or the Government will make a loan upon it to enable the cooperative representing the farmers to hold it, he has no voice in the price which he receives for his crop. That has been one of the great troubles in regard to tobacco; it applies to other crops also, but not to such an extent to many others as it does to tobacco, because the market for tobacco has always, in spite of indictments and convictions, been restricted, and it is now restricted. The farmer has no real voice in that market. Of course, he can refuse to sell the tobacco, but he is not guaranteed that he ever will be able to sell it again or will be able to get a better price for it, unless he is a member of a cooperative, which can hold his tobacco for a better price. There is one cooperative for the burley tobacco producers, one for the dark-fired tobacco producers, and perhaps one for the flue-cured producers.

It has been said that we are asking a special privilege for tobacco. It may be true, but what we are asking for tobacco is that the status quo for it be preserved; in other words, 90 percent of parity. The parity price may be a fluctuating figure from 1 year to another because it depends entirely on the fluctuations in the prices farmers have to pay for what they buy.

I say to my friend the Senator from Illinois that if the tax is taken off tobacco, and if tobacco is put on the same basis as wheat, corn, and other products, then we shall take our chances in

the market. But today tobacco is taxed, as my colleague has shown. From tobacco taxes $1,400,000,000 goes into the Treasury of the United States and to some of the States. That is more than the farmers get for the entire crop they grow, even after all the labor they devote to growing it, as has been described here.

So, inasmuch as tobacco is a great revenue producer for the Treasury of the United States, and is the only crop that pays such taxes, we believe tobacco should receive the treatment we provide for in the amendment. Of course, all of us realize that tobacco is a luxury, in a sense, and we so regard it, but to the American farmer who digs it out of the ground it is not a luxury; to him it is a necessity.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to my able friend the Senator from Kentucky that the only point I raised a moment ago in respect to this amendment to the committee amendment is that it does place tobacco upon a preferred list, so far as the provision for 90 per cent of parity is concerned. Tobacco is not on such a list at the present time. Under the pending measure, tobacco, corn, wheat, and all other basic commodities are on the same basis, so far as the guaranty of a certain percentage of parity is concerned. If the amendment now proposed is made a part of the bill which is enacted into law, the result will definitely be to give to tobacco a preferred status as compared to other commodities. That is the only point I make.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate what the Senator from Illinois has said about that matter. But we are seeking to preserve the status quo in respect to tobacco, because today the support price is 90 per cent of parity, and that parity is a fluctuating figure.

According to the table in the bill—which is about as inexplicable and as difficult to understand as a table of logarithms in a book of mathematics—no farmer could determine what he would be able to receive as the support price.

Mr. LUCAS. The only point I make in connection with the position I took a moment ago is that if we accept the proposed amendment, we shall begin to strike out the provisions of the bill in piecemeal fashion. On the other hand, I understand that later the Senator from Georgia will offer an amendment which will seek to displace this bill with a bill which is on all fours with the law under which we are now operating; and of course that bill will include tobacco and other commodities.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that the substitute to be proposed by the Senator from Georgia is practically the House bill, which will extend for 2 years the present arrangement of support prices.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that will include tobacco and other commodities on the basis of the present support-price figures.

We are asking for the adoption as a part of this bill of this amendment affecting tobacco because we genuinely feel that the tobacco producers should receive such treatment in view of the peculiar situation of tobacco, and since it has been singled out from among all the agricultural commodities in the United States for heavy taxation, which bears down on the price received by the producers, because the buyers say, "We cannot give you more than this, inasmuch as we have to pay an enormous tax," and there is even a tax 18 cents a pound on the tobacco in the loose leaf, tobacco which has not already been processed and that is three times as much as the growers of that particular type of tobacco got for it in years gone by.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The only reason I asked the Senator to yield is that he referred to a table in the bill which gives some explanation of how the parity figure is reached. That table is to be found on page 79 of the bill. The only reason why the table is set forth in the bill is in order to give specific information as to what parity prices would be paid, depending upon the carry-over or the surplus of a certain commodity.

For instance, if we were to take 70 percent of a given commodity—that is, 70 percent of 100 percent production—the result would be 90 percent parity; but if the carry-over plus the production of the commodity for the year resulted in a figure of 130 percent of a normal crop, then the parity would be only 60 percent of the so-called 100 percent. The only reason why the scale or the schedule has been set forth in the bill is in order to permit anyone to realize, as he looks at the bill, that what the bill contemplates and attempts to do is to bring about an increase of production in the case of a crop that is in short supply, and a decrease of acreage in the case of a crop that is in long supply. In that manner we would have a flexible arrangement which would encourage self-control in the field, and not necessarily have to require the exercise of control of acreage by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we already have a quota system, which has been in effect and is in effect now, under the present Agricultural Adjustment Act and the parity system and the support prices. We have a quota system which really is an acreage system designed to prevent the creation of surpluses beyond the amount that can reasonably be absorbed by the market from year to year; and it has worked successfully. The farmers have been satisfied with it. Because they have been satisfied with it, they have voted by more than two-thirds, which the law requires—in fact, they have even voted by as high as 90 percent—to retain the quota system, because it has been successful, and they are in favor of it because it helps them and keeps down the unnecessary unsalable surpluses of their crops.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the difficulties and hardships of the American tobacco grower. I was at Owensboro, Ky., a few years ago, and I went into an auction house where they were selling tobacco which had been brought in by the various farmers and carried there and put into what they call baskets, and graded; and the buyers were walking up and down between the baskets and were bidding on them by the chanting system to which I referred a moment ago. One farmer had brought in a load of tobacco. He turned it over to the warehouse. When he sold it and paid the warehouse charges and paid the commissions on that load of tobacco, he owed the warehouseman 50 cents. He went into the warehouseman's office, and the warehouseman said to him, "You owe me 50 cents. After getting all you got for the tobacco and paying all your charges, you still owe me half a dollar." For a whole year's work which he had put into tobacco and sold, he owed the warehouseman a half a dollar. When he was told of the deficit, he said, "I haven't got a half dollar with me; in fact, I haven't got a half a dollar anywhere." "Well," the warehouseman said, "Just bring me a chicken tomorrow and I will accept that in full payment for the half dollar you owe me." So the next day the farmer came into the office with two chickens. The warehouseman said, "I only asked you to bring one chicken. Why did you bring two?" "Well," he said, "I brought another load of tobacco today, and I thought I might as well pay you with this chicken, because I am sure the same result will come about." That really is a true story. It sounds ridiculous, but it is the truth, because I happened to be in the town and in the warehouse where this had taken place.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In what year was that?

Mr. BARKLEY. That was about 7 or 8 years ago.

Mr. THYE. I was going to say that in the Middle West, though we were not engaged in the production of tobacco, we experienced something similar to that in connection with livestock and grain commodity prices. I have known of sheep and cattle being shipped to market, and, when all the expenses were paid, there was a deficit.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that.

Mr. THYE. I do not know that chickens were used to pay the deficit. Those were in the depression years, which the Senator and I so well remember, and I pray God we shall have the intelligence as Members of this legislative body to enact the type of legislation that will prevent a condition that calls upon American producers to accept such a price that he must bring in a chicken with which to settle the deficit resulting from the attempt to market his product. That idea is embodied in the pending legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Minnesota, and I have been one of the most active men in both Houses of Congress since I have been here in trying to promote legislation to prevent that very thing. I voted for the McNary-Haugen bill when it was passed.

Mr. THYE. I compliment the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I voted for and advocated every agricultural measure that gave any hope whatever of rescuing American agriculture from any such situation as that. I know that what I have said about tobacco also was true of wheat and corn, and that people in the West were burning corn as fuel rather than accept the price offered for it. The same is true of wheat and other things. Cattle were down to 3 and 4 cents a pound, and hogs were down to 3 and 4 cents a pound—less than the cost of producing them. I am familiar with all that. I am in favor of an over-all long-term agricultural bill. I doubt very much if we are going to get one at this session, because I do not know what the House is going to do. The House committee has not even considered it, and I am told they are not going to. It may be necessary to extend the present situation for 2 years. We will meet that problem when we get to it. But I do say that if we seek here to preserve tobacco on its present support basis rather than have a flexible sliding scale running from 60 to 90 percent, which no farmer can ever figure out for himself——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the bill tobacco cannot go below 84 percent, and the new parity program raises the parity price of tobacco so that 84 percent of the new parity price amounts to just a bit more than 90 percent of the present parity price.

Mr. BARKLEY. That all depends.

Mr. AIKEN. No, these are the figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Statistics, and that is all it depends on.

Mr. BARKLEY. The growers of tobacco do not believe that this over-all bill which, in effect, includes tobacco with all other crops is the same as what they now have. They can depend upon what they now have. They know what it is. Moreover, they know that they want to keep the quota system by which they may keep down the unsalable surplus, which has to be figured in on the parity or the support price.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator perhaps is not aware of an amendment which was added to the bill providing that the quota system shall be retained regardless of the supply until such time as the growers themselves vote it out of existence. So they cannot lose by the quota system unless they want to lose by it. They cannot get less for their products. We have come as near to fixing a 90 percent support for tobacco as it is possible to do without violating all the ethics of legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. We do not think we are violating any of the ethics of legislation by the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. No; I do not think anyone is violating the ethics of legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not believe we are, when we ask that special circumstances be taken into consideration in regard to the production and sale of tobacco and the taxation of tobacco. If the tax is taken off, we will go along with wheat and corn and cotton and rice and everything else.

Mr. AIKEN. How much more money would the grower receive if the tax were removed?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know. The buyer would be robbed of the excuse which he has always utilized in driving down the price to the farmer, the excuse that he is required to pay a heavy tax on tobacco.

Mr. AIKEN. I am old enough to know that tobacco buyers were tobacco buyers just the same before we had the taxes, or before the taxes were so large.

Mr. BARKLEY. But they could not use that as an excuse. They could not use the Federal Government as an excuse for driving down the price of tobacco. Every time we have increased the Federal tax on tobacco the buyers have used that as an additional reason for not being able to pay more for tobacco.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator, when we find a tobacco buyer without an excuse, we shall find him losing his job.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be, but we do not want to multiply his excuses.

Mr. AIKEN. But this is not a question of the iniquities of tobacco buyers. It is a question of a support price for tobacco. The producers of all types of tobacco are given just a little better support under the Senate bill 2318 than they would receive under a 90-percent support of the old parity price.

Mr. BARKLEY. They do not think so, I may say to my friend from Vermont, and I do not think so.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not question that. I know people have told different stories. I know both Senators from Kentucky have tried to tell them the story "as is," and some of them came here and got the story from the committee itself, but I know they have been confused. I think they have been deliberately confused, though I am not——

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not exactly sure what the Senator means by "as is." I do not think they have been deliberately confused. I have no way of knowing whether somebody has deliberately confused them, but I know the anxiety and uncertainty that exists. I know that the protests which have come to me have come from actual producers and not from the rehandlers or warehousemen or buyers, or from anybody other than the farmers themselves, who dig the tobacco out of the ground; and they are very intelligent men.

Mr. AIKEN. I questioned one of the witnesses. I may say the principal witness who testified for the group of tobacco growers before the committee called me up after we reported the bill and thanked me and the committee for having been so fair to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the committee, I want to say in all fairness, improved the bill as it affected tobacco; there is no question about that. The tobacco growers asked, I think, for about five changes in the bill; three were made. We thank the Senator and the committee for that concession; but if there had not been some improvement made, an intolerable situation would have been created. I do not think the Senator from Vermont himself realized at the time he introduced the original bill the effect it would have upon the tobacco growers of the country.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator readily went some distance in correcting the original bill, but we contend he did not go far enough.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Kentucky think the burley tobacco growers would be better off if they received 90 percent of the present parity price than they would be under the pending bill? And does the Senator from Kentucky think the tobacco growers would be better off if quotas had to be voted every year?

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course they would not.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have now a 3-year period for quotas. It was 1 year, and we changed it to 3.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the pending measure, we might have a 30-year period, so long as conditions remain so drastically different.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not questioning the time for quotas. This not only affects burley tobacco, but it affects dark-fired tobacco and all other types of tobacco.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe the American tobacco grower would be better off, better satisfied, and, in the long run, better served by a definite figure of 90 percent of parity, whatever that parity might be, than under a fluctuating rate from 60 to 90, because it is bound to fluctuate below 90 oftener than it is to fluctuate up to 90.

Mr. AIKEN. If I may ask the Senator another question, does he know of any tobacco growers, outside the State of Kentucky, who are protesting against the situation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not acquainted with tobacco growers outside the State of Kentucky.

Mr. AIKEN. I would say that so far as the committee knows, there are no protests of any nature from other States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder if the Senator has in his State, which is a great tobacco-producing State, anything like the situation which is becoming more and more a threat to the tobacco growers in my State of Florida, that is to say, the farmers try to get enough graders to come and grade the product, and then the Government will say, "We will not send graders there for any length of time unless there are enough buyers from the big companies to buy the crop." Then the farmers get after the buyers, and they say, "We will come if the graders are there." It is like the old western statute which was passed by a State legislature and which provided that when two trains meet neither shall stop until the other has passed.

That represents the progress which has been made in connection with the situation. I do not know whether anything can be done about it, but it seems

to me that it should be made clear that there should be enough graders at every market to accommodate the farmers who have their tobacco there; and if the buyers enter into some kind of an agreement, or in some way or other deny a fair market to the tobacco growers, it is time for the Government to step in and see if there cannot be a fair market provided for the tobacco growers.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have had the same experience as that to which the Senator from Florida has referred with regard to buyers and graders. During the war there was a shortage of graders, because many graders who qualified for grading tobacco went into the service. Year before last there was a shortage of approximately 25 in the number of graders available. The Department of Agriculture did the best it could to allocate those graders over the different sections, according to the season, for the marketing of tobacco. But there was a shortage. The buyers did say, and now say, what the Senator has said. But there has been some improvement. They always say they will not send buyers in unless there are graders there. But there is now an association of buyers which meets and decides where markets are to be opened.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. Last year we brought the matter to the attention of the Department of Justice and asked for an inquiry, because the association decided, as the Senator has said, where they wanted the markets to be opened.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know of one situation in my State in which farmers had to haul their tobacco 110 miles to the nearest market. We tried to open a market within a reasonable distance, so that the farmers would not have to travel halfway across the State in order to find a market. The Department of Agriculture was able to send a number of graders into the section and open a market. Even then some of the buyers among the "big four," as we call them, refused to come in. Others said, "We will send buyers if the other fellow will." But the other fellow would not. The result was that the farmers did not have a fair market. Notwithstanding court decisions, indictments, and Department investigations—regardless of all that, the buyers find ways in which to deny farmers the facilities to which they are entitled in order to market their tobacco within a reasonable distance and with a reasonable amount of competition.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I brought the matter up because I wanted the RECORD to show attention to the matter by the Senate. I hope the Department of Agriculture will regard this discussion today, and that if they feel legislation is necessary to protect the tobacco growers who are prevented from having a market because of such conspiracies as have been mentioned, they will recommend legislation to correct the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no complaint to make against the Department of Agriculture, or against the tobacco section of that Department.

Mr. PEPPER. Neither have I.

Mr. BARKLEY. But they have no power to compel anyone to go to a market, even when they have sent the graders there. All they can do is to try to exercise some influence by persuasion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the facts as presented by the able Senator from Kentucky do not show a real violation of the antitrust law and that, therefore, the proper remedy is one of prosecution rather than passing a new law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not necessarily. Of course, to prove conspiracy is a difficult thing. The Department of Justice brought a lawsuit in Lexington, Ky., against four or five companies. They were indicted and were fined heavily. I am not sure whether anyone was imprisoned as a result of the trial.

Mr. COOPER. They were all fined.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did they pay the fines?

Mr. BARKLEY. They paid the fines. The Department of Justice has been in process of investigating whether these new methods constitute a violation of law. But it is a long, tedious process to gather evidence against a great combination——

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or to try to bring an indictment under the antitrust law. But, regardless of that, I think it is a problem which should address itself to legislation to see if we can find some way in which we can protect the farmers.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator wholeheartedly. I think that if the Attorney General finds they are exercising new methods of applying monopolistic control he should give us the facts so that we can consider new legislation with which to attack the problem.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know to what extent the Attorney General has been able to gather facts to submit to Congress, but I know the matter has been investigated. I think that when the Department of Justice can make concrete recommendations to the Congress it will be done.

Mr. COOPER. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Michigan suggests that there should be a prosecution if the facts are as we have stated. To support an indictment of conspiracy an actual agreement to violate the law must be shown. I have in no way implied that any tobacco company is today violating the law, and have no reason to so believe, but nevertheless the dominating position of the tobacco companies still influences and affects the price paid growers. There are about 10 companies whose buyers purchase practically all of the tobacco sold. These companies have been in business for years. Each knows that the farmer must sell his tobacco to one of them. Each knows the farmer cannot keep his tobacco another year and that if he does not sell to one of them, he cannot sell at all. It does not make much difference whether or not they make agreements.

I should like to ask my colleague, who has had much more legislative experience than I, whether he knows of any other agricultural commodity whose value represents over a billion dollars and whose sale is limited to 8 or 10 companies.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know of any other agricultural commodity, whether cotton, corn, wheat, rice, potatoes, or any other product, that is marketed under the restrictions and restraints which surround the marketing of tobacco.

Mr. President, I do not wish to occupy the floor longer. I hope, for the reasons which my colleague and I have offered, and others we could offer by trespassing too long on the time of the Senate, that the amendment will be agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF TWO POLITICAL PARTIES ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, because I am trying to present in chronological order the records to which I shall refer, I respectfully ask that I be not interrupted until I have completed my presentation, at which time I shall be glad to yield if Senators desire to have me do so.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I happen to know something of the nature of the remarks the Senator is about to make. I know they are most important, and that every Senator should hear them. Would the Senator be willing to yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TYDINGS. A large number of Senators are now at lunch.

Mr. THYE. I raise a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate the suggestion, but I prefer not to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland declines to yield.

Mr. THYE. My only reason for raising the point is that we were told by the majority leader here this morning that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] had stood by and stood aside for legislation that had come before the Senate for several days, and he asked the Members of the Senate if they would not please permit the Senator from Vermont to proceed with his farm legislation until it was completed today. I am alarmed, as I look at the chart the Senator from Maryland has had placed before the Senate, on which I read "Airplane expansion, etc., April 3, 1939," and from that date on. If the Senator's remarks relate to agriculture or the farm bill, then I withdraw my parliamentary point or objection, but if not, I hope the Senator from Maryland will permit the agriculture legislation to be considered in the Senate for the remainder of the afternoon, or until such time as we can take action on the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TYDINGS. I refuse to yield. I may say that if the Senator from Minnesota had not interrupted me I probably would have been well on toward half through what I have to say, and what I shall say I deem of importance, and it is not long. I shall begin again at the beginning and hope that I will not take too much of the Senate's time.

Within the next 5 months the people of the United States will select a President, Vice President, the Members of the House of Representatives, and approximately one-third of the United States Senate, who will begin their terms of office in January 1949.

In order that the record of the two parties in the Congress—that of the Democratic Party and that of the Republican Party—may be available in concise form for our citizens, I have had prepared the votes of the Democrats and Republicans in the Senate and the House by political parties on major legislation which has come before the Congress for decision from January 1, 1939, to date, insofar as that record deals primarily with international relations, preparation for war and war itself, and matters which are more or less related to the international field.

I shall present this record without partisan comment insofar as I can. I shall name the law, describe it briefly, and set forth the dates upon which the Senate and House voted thereon, and the result of the vote by parties.

The first vote was on April 13, 1939, on H. R. 3791, in the Seventy-sixth Congress. That bill provided for more national defense by increasing the number of serviceable airplanes to 6,000, exclusive of those awaiting salvage and authorized $300,000,000 therefore; it likewise provided for civilian flying schools and for the inclusion of 1,000 Reserve officers in the Regular Army other than the Air Corps and 3,000 to the Air Corps, and so forth. The vote upon this measure was as follows:

Airplane expansion, etc., Apr. 3, 1939

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	57	3	233	1
Republican	17	4	130	14

Next, construction of additional Coast Guard cutters and seaplanes, June 2, 1939:

	Senate [1]	House	
		Yea	Nay
Democratic		199	12
Republican		62	79

[1] No record vote.

Next was acquisition of strategic and critical materials, June 7, 1939:

	Senate		House [1]
	Yea	Nay	
Democratic	48	1	
Republican	4	12	

[1] No record vote.

Next was the repeal and rewriting of certain provisions of the Neutrality Act of 1935, which are briefly explained as follows:

Public Resolution 54 (H. J. Res. 306), Seventy-sixth Congress, the Neutrality Act, repealed and rewrote the provisions of the Neutrality Act of 1935, as amended (U. S. C. Supp. IV, 22; 245a–245i), and repealed the Spanish Embargo Act (50 Stat. 3). However, such repeal did not affect the validity of proclamation No. 2237, of May 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 1834), or certificates of registration or licenses. The act provided:

Whenever the President or Congress shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens, he shall issue a proclamation naming the belligerent states involved, and it shall thereafter be unlawful ($1,000 fine, 5 years' imprisonment, or both): (1) To export, or attempt to or cause to be exported, arms, or ammunition to any such state; (2) for any person ($50,000 fine, 5 years' imprisonment, or both) to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds or securities of, or make a loan or extend credit to, any such state, political subdivision, or agent thereof (however, if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect our commercial interests, he may except normal peacetime commercial transactions, but he must make public every 90 days all such exceptions); (3) to export or transport, or to attempt to or cause to be exported or transported, any articles or materials to any such state (except under regulations prescribed by the President), until all interest therein shall have been transferred to some foreign government or national; and (4) to solicit or receive any contribution for or on behalf of any such state (except medical aid, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, subject to approval of the President). No citizen shall travel on any vessel of any belligerent state except at his own risk. The foregoing provisions shall not apply to American republics.

Upon similar findings, the President may place restrictions on the use by submarines or armed merchant vessels of a belligerent state of the ports and territorial waters of the United States, and he may require foreign or domestic vessels, believed about to carry fuel, men, munitions, or supplies to a belligerent ship, to give bond not to make such deliveries.

The act continued the National Munitions Control Board and required (a) munition makers, and so forth, to register with the Board—registration fee, $100; (b) importers and exporters to obtain licenses for shipment of munitions. Applicants for a license shall set forth a description of such exports, with credit or payment terms. The Board shall make an annual report to Congress upon questions connected with the control of trade in munitions of war, including a list of all persons required to register or obtain licenses. Whenever the President finds that there exists a state of war between foreign states, the Board shall make public all information herein provided and make a similar report each 90 days.

The vote on this was as follows:

Neutrality Act of 1939, Nov. 4, 1939

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	64	32	191	35
Republican	8	15	8	180

The next was to build up the Navy and Navy aircraft, as follows—Public Law 629 (H. R. 8026) Seventy-sixth Congress:

It increased by 167,000 tons the authorized composition of the Navy in under-age vessels as established by the act of May 17, 1938 (52 Stat. 401), making the increased category totals as follows: Aircraft carriers, 254,500 tons; cruisers, 479,024 tons; and submarines, 102,956 tons.

It increased the number of naval airplanes to 4,500 and the number of nonrigid lighter-than-air craft to 18 and authorized the President to acquire or to construct 75,000 tons of auxiliary vessels.

The vote upon it was as follows:

Increases size of Navy, increases naval aircraft, June 14, 1940

	Senate [1]	House	
		Yea	Nay
Democratic		195	6
Republican		110	28

[1] No record vote.

The next is facilities to expedite the national defense, July 31, 1940:

	Senate [1]	House	
		Yea	Nay
Democratic		209	0
Republican		82	98

[1] No record vote.

Following that was the ordering of Army Reserve components, and so forth, into active military service, August 27, 1940:

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	49	4	213	6
Republican	29	2	124	27

Next was the Selective Training and Service Act, 1940, September 16, 1940:

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	40	17	211	33
Republican	8	10	52	112

That was the Draft Act passed in 1940, which prepared the country for the induction of new men.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot yield until I conclude my statement. Then I shall be glad to yield.

After this, there was the lend-lease bill, Public Law 11 (H. R. 1776), Seventy-seventh Congress.

Lend-lease bill: For the benefit of any foreign nation whose defense the President deems vital to the United States he may authorize any Government department or agency—to the extent to which funds are available or contracts are authorized by Congress—to manufacture or

procure, to the extent to which funds are made available therefor or contracts are authorized by Congress, defense articles; to lend, lease, and so forth, defense articles of a value not exceeding $1,300,000,000, and only after consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army or the Chief of Naval Operations—value is to be determined by heads of departments concerned, and defense articles procured from funds hereafter appropriated shall not be disposed of under this authority—to outfit, inspect, repair, to the extent to which funds are made available therefor or contracts are authorized by Congress, defense articles; to communicate any defense information concerning defense articles loaned, leased, and so forth; and to release for export defense articles upon conditions deemed satisfactory by him. The powers so conferred shall not be exercised after June 30, 1943, or after the passage of a concurrent resolution of both Houses before that date, except that the terms of contracts entered into before July 1, 1943, may be extended to July 1, 1946.

It also authorized the Secretaries of War and Navy to acquire arms, munitions, and implements of war produced in such countries designated above whenever the President deems such acquisition necessary to the national defense.

This act shall not be construed as authorization for the convoying of vessels by United States naval vessels, nor for the entering of American vessels into a combat area in violation of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

The President shall report to Congress the operations under this act at least once every 90 days. Nothing in this act shall be construed to change existing law relating to the use of the land and naval forces; except insofar as such use relates to the manufacture, procurement, and repair of defense articles, the communication of information, and other noncombatant purposes enumerated.

The voting was as follows:

Lend-Lease Act, Mar. 11, 1941

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	49	13	236	25
Republican	10	17	24	135

Next taken up was the lend-lease appropriation, March 27, 1941, Public Law 23 (H. R. 4050), Seventy-seventh Congress.

Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941: To enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act the following is appropriated: $1,343,000,000 for ordnance; $2,054,000,000 for aircraft; $362,000,000 for tanks, trucks, and so forth; $629,000,000 for vessels; $260,000,000 for miscellaneous military equipment and supplies; $752,000,000 for facilities and equipment for the production of defense articles; $1,350,000,000 for agricultural, industrial, and other commodities; $200,000,000 for testing, repairing, reconditioning and so forth, defense articles for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States; $40,000,000 for necessary services and expenses not specified; and $10,000,000 for administrative expenses. In all, $7,000,000,000 to remain available until June 30, 1943.

The vote was as follows:

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	49	3	231	6
Republican	17	5	104	45

Next acted upon was the ship seizure bill, Public Law 101 (H. R. 4466), Seventy-seventh Congress.

Empowered the President to purchase or requisition any foreign vessel lying idle in United States waters which is necessary to national defense. Authorized the Maritime Commission to charter any vessel to private operators; to provide insurance and reinsurance; to repair, reconstruct, or recondition any vessel; to pay a fair price for vessels purchased.

It authorized the Secretary of Commerce to waive compliance with law relating to masters, officers, crew, and crew accommodations.

The vote was as follows:

Ship-seizure bill, June 6, 1941

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	48	4	212	19
Republican	10	15	61	101

When the Selective Service Act was passed the bill contained the provision that it would be the law until 1945. It also contained the provision that those who were drafted into the armed services were to have one full year's training. The first class of inductees became available for the armed services about November 1940. This class would thus have completed its full year's training and be eligible for discharge in November 1941, according to the original Selective Service Act.

The Military Establishment recommended in July 1941 that when the first year of training had expired the law be amended so as to keep those who would have served their year in the service indefinitely. After hearings the matter came before the Congress for a vote. Various propositions were offered to keep those who had completed a year's training in the services; first for an additional 6 months, then a proposal to keep them in the service for an additional 12 months, and finally a proposal to keep them in training for an additional 18 months. These three propositions were acted upon only in the Senate. The vote on the 12 months' extension was as follows:

12-month extension of selective service, Aug. 6, 1941

	Senate	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	11	39
Republican	10	10

The next vote was as follows:

18-month extension of selective service, Aug. 7, 1941

	Senate	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	37	14
Republican	4	13

With the 18 months' extension adopted by the Senate, the measure then came up for final passage in the Senate, with the following result:

Extension of selective service, passage Aug. 7, 1941

	Senate	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	38	16
Republican	7	13

When the measure went to the House of Representatives, the first record vote there upon it was on a motion to recommit. Upon that motion the vote was as follows:

Extension of selective service—vote to recommit, Aug. 12, 1941

	House	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	64	198
Republican	132	22

The vote to recommit having failed for lack of a majority, the matter then came up for final passage in the House with the following result:

Extension of selective service, passage Aug. 12, 1941

	House	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	182	65
Republican	21	133

The House, however, did adopt certain amendments to the bill as it was passed by the Senate. Thus, as the final House version was in some respects different from the final Senate version of this bill, the matter next went to a conference of the two Houses, where the disagreements on certain provisions were reconciled and adjusted. When the matter came out of conference, the provision to extend the year's training, which many men were just completing, for an additional 18 months remained in the bill, and with other disagreements reconciled, the matter was referred by the conference back to each House for final adoption. There was no record vote on the conference report on the extension of selective service in the House. The final vote in the Senate was upon the adoption of the conference report, providing for the extension of selective service. The vote was as follows:

Extension of selective service—adoption of conference report, Aug. 14, 1941

	Senate	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	31	9
Republican	6	9

The next bill to be acted upon was the Property Seizure Act, to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States, and the vote, just a few weeks before Pearl Harbor, was as follows:

Property Seizure Act, Oct. 16, 1941

	Senate [1]	House	
		Yea	Nay
Democratic		215	10
Republican		25	123

[1] No record vote.

Following this, there was Public Law 282 (H. R. 5788), Seventy-seventh Congress, the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1942, which appropriated $5,985,000,000; $1,190,000,000 for ordnance, $685,000,000 for aeronautical materials, $385,000,000 for armored equipment, $850,000,000 for vessels, $155,000,000 for military and naval equipment, $375,000,000 for acquisition and operation of manufacturing facilities, and so forth, $1,875,000,000 for agricultural, industrial, and other commodities, $175,000,000 for testing, repairing, and so forth, of defense articles, $285,000,000 for necessary services and expenses in carrying the Lend-Lease Act, and $10,000,000 for administrative expenses.

The vote on this was as follows:

Second supplemental defense appropriation, second lend-lease appropriation, Oct. 28, 1941

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	43	4	229	8
Republican	15	8	97	56

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. As I said in the beginning, I prefer not to yield until I finish the chronological outline.

Mr. TOBEY. The statute of limitations has run against these things.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am coming up to date. The chronological outline runs right up to this minute. This is a 10-year record, as I stated in the beginning. The statute of limitations never is outlawed while the American people can go to the polls.

Next was the repeal of the Neutrality Act (Public Law 294 (H. J. Res. 237)) Seventy-seventh Congress:

That section 2 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (relating to commerce with states engaged in armed conflict), and section 3 of such act (relating to combat areas) are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (relating to the arming of American vessels) is hereby repealed; and during the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, the President is authorized, through such agency as he may designate, to arm, or to permit or cause to be armed, any American vessel as defined in such act. The provisions of section 16 of the Criminal Code (relating to bonds from armed vessels on clearing) shall not apply to any such vessel.

The vote on this was as follows:

Repeal of the Neutrality Act of 1939, Nov. 17, 1941

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	43	15	210	21
Republican	6	21	89	113

Three weeks later, the Japs made their sneak attack on Pearl Harbor and the United States quickly declared war on the Axis Powers and became one of the active belligerents in the world struggle.

As the war drew to a victorious close in 1945, the United States took a leading part in preparing for the war's aftermath. Meetings were held, attended by representatives of the leading nations of the world, seeking to prepare in advance for the financial, economic, and political rehabilitation of the nations of the earth, when war should finally end. Following the surrender in Europe and before the Japanese surrender in Asia, the Bretton Woods Agreement Act came before the Congress for action. This act dealt primarily with the creation of an agency intended to strengthen world financial and currency systems. The vote upon this measure was as follows:

Bretton Woods Agreement Act, July 31, 1945

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	41	2	205	0
Republican	19	14	138	18

Following the surrender of the Japanese in 1945, another great agency came to the fore upon which much preliminary work had been done. This agency was known as the United Nations, and in the idealism which it espoused, the hopes of a great many people for the future of mankind were reposed. This agency, representing the nations of the earth, except the defeated countries, banded together to solve the world's problems without recourse to the battlefield.

On December 20, 1945, the question came up in Congress as to whether the United States, which had taken the lead in the creation of the UN, should become a participating member of it. The vote upon this question was as follows:

United Nations Participation Act of 1945, Dec. 20, 1945

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	41	1	193	0
Republican	23	6	150	14

In July 1946, the proposition was laid before the Congress as to whether or not a loan should be made to Great Britain, involving several billion dollars. After full discussion and debate in both Houses, the bill providing for the loan was adopted, the vote thereon being as follows:

Loan to Great Britain, July 15, 1946

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	29	15	111	5
Republican	17	18	70	61

The Republican Party divided. In the Senate the majority of the Republicans were against the loan to Great Britain, and in the House the majority of the Republicans were for it.

During the early part of 1947, the next matter to come up dealing with foreign affairs was whether or not this country would give aid to Greece and Turkey. In Greece civil war had been going on, and Turkey was reported to be near economic collapse. Much of the civil war in Greece was stated to have its chief support from countries dominated by Russia and by Russia herself to aid the Communists in Greece then engaged in trying to overthrow the Greek Government by force. It was likewise stated that Turkey might collapse unless given some immediate support and thus might fall into the hands of Communist-dictated countries, in which event not only would the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal be threatened with further encirclement, but access to the great oil fields to the east thereof might be denied to the United States and other foreign countries. It was stated that if this occurred our own supply of oil might prove insufficient to carry the Nation through a period of great emergency. The matter came to a vote, with the following result:

Aid to Greece and Turkey, May 22, 1947

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	22	7	160	13
Republican	35	16	127	94

The next great question to come before the Congress dealing with international matters was whether or not the

Marshall plan proposed by our Government for the economic assistance of the 16 democratic countries of western Europe should be adopted. The bill authorizing this assistance involving many billions of dollars, came before the Congress for a vote on April 3, 1948, with the following results:

Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Apr. 3, 1948

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	38	4	171	61
Republican	21	13	158	11

Prior to that time, however, on March 12, the Taft amendment reducing funds for this foreign assistance from $5,300,000 to $4,000,000,000 was voted upon by the Senate, as follows:

Taft amendment (Foreign Assistance Act of 1948) to reduce the funds from five and three-tenths billions to four billions, Mar. 12, 1948

	Senate	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	8	32
Republican	23	24

The above record of the political parties deals only with the Democratic and Republican vote in the Congress. It does not record or present the votes of those allned with other parties, such as the American Labor, Farmer-Labor, and the like.

When a man who has held public office presents himself to the people for reelection or for election to some other office he is bound more or less by three principal considerations: First, his own vote and record on matters that have come before him and upon which he has been recorded; second, the vote and record of the party to which he adheres, and its position on public questions which have been decided by legislative bodies; third, what the party to which he belongs proposes to do on policies, measures, and propositions which are currently, or likely to be, before the people for consideration.

In the above tabulation and record, individual votes, of course, are not shown. Only the party vote is shown on major international and semi-international questions that have come before the Congress in the last 10 years.

I have had this record prepared, for it tends to form a general pattern of the basic cleavage, in many respects, between the major decisions of the Democrats and Republicans in the fields covered.

At this particular time in the affairs of our own Nation, when men are to be elected to high office, it may be of help to those who wish to use the past as at least a partial yardstick to guide them in voting for candidates to pass on the measures now pending or likely to be presented for determination.

Mr. President, I have tried to present this tabulation without argument for or against the vote on any particular measure, in as nonpartisan a way as I could, but simply to compile the facts for the consideration of the Congress and the country.

Now I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the same spirit with which the Senator from Maryland has presented these most enlightening records for the information of the American public—information which it certainly is entitled to have—I should like to place in the RECORD at this point a tabulation dealing with a matter which as vitally affects our international affairs as do any of the measures the Senator from Maryland has mentioned.

I have in mind the record of the two parties on the reciprocal trade agreements program, on which the Senate voted just the other day, and to which the statute of limitations does not apply. I believe I do not see the Senator from New Hampshire in the Chamber at the moment, but I could not help but be reminded that in some experience with the law in New Mexico I have never heard the statute of limitations raised except by those who are the most guilty.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before the Senator reads the tabulation, I should like to add a sentence for the purpose of clarification, namely, that the record I have prepared and have presented here today, for obvious reasons is not current. It does not include the votes, as I recall, from the 1st of May, or sometime in May, to date, because matters have been in such a state of flux on many of these questions that I did not have time to get the last minute news on them.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I shall now read a tabulation appearing in an article relative to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The article appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of April 28, 1948. Mr. Richard L. Stout wrote the article, which is entitled "Tariff Trends—An Intimate Message From Washington." Let me say I am sure Mr. Stout carefully checked the figures. The tabulation appearing in the body of his article is as follows:

The Hull trade program has come before Congress five separate times with its original enactment and four continuations. Here is the Senate vote on these five occasions:

1934: Democrats for, 54; against, 5; Republicans for, 5; against, 28.

1937: Democrats for, 56; against, 9; Republicans for, 0; against, 14.

1940: Democrats for, 41; against, 15; Republicans for, 0; against, 20.

1943: Democrats for, 41; against, 8; Republicans for, 18; against 14.

1945: Democrats for, 38; against, 5; Republicans for, 15; against, 16.

Here is the similar House record:

1934: Democrats for, 269; against, 11; Republicans for, 2; against, 99.

1937: Democrats for, 278; against, 11; Republicans for, 3; against, 81.

1940: Democrats for, 212; against, 20; Republicans for, 5; against, 146.

1943: Democrats for, 193; against, 3; Republicans for, 163; against, 26.

1945: Democrats for, 205; against, 12; Republicans for, 23; against, 140.

Mr. President, just this week the Senate had three very significant votes on amendments to the same act. Those amendments were prepared and submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. The first amendment provided for a 3-year extension of the act without amendment; the second provided for a 2-year extension of the act without amendment; and the third provided for a 1-year extension of the act without amendment. I ask unanimous consent to have the votes on those three amendments included at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the votes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Barkley 3-year amendment: Democrats for, 40; against, 1. Republicans for, 1; against, 47.

Barkley 2-year amendment: Democrats for, 40; against, 1. Republicans for, 2; against, 46.

Barkley 1-year amendment: Democrats for, 40; against, 1. Republicans for, 3; against, 45.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his very worth-while contribution to the statistics of the polemics on which democracy rests. As he has done, so I have tried to present the data to the Senate without any desire to criticize either party or any individual for the votes cast, but simply so there will be in one place a factual record which will speak for itself. Obviously it will please some and will displease others, in every case.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Maryland has performed a most worthy service, but I did not want his remarks to conclude without inserting the statistics for the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 16 and 23 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 40 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of

Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disability who have dependents, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. MATHEWS, Mr. RANKIN, and Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2825) to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. MATHEWS, Mr. RANKIN, and Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; and

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta;

S. 1087. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944;

S. 1447. An act to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes;

S. 2223. An act to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes;

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency;

S. 2251. An act to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States Naval Hospital, United States Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.;

S. 2400. An act to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels;

S. 2401. An act to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 2508. An act relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico;

S. 2675. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

S. 2770. An act to fix the rank of the assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements; and

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 2023. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 2912. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army;

H. R. 3479. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of Louisiana of that portion of the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army;

H. R. 4984. An act to provide for the maintaining of the corps of cadets at the United States Military Academy and the brigade of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy at full strength, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6698. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines; and

H. R. 6709. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York a perpetual easement in, over, and upon a twenty-nine one-hundredths acre parcel of land at New York naval shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4320. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.; and

H. R. 5252. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 4435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6136. An act to amend the act to encourage travel in the United States, approved July 19, 1940;

H. R. 6360. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act; and

H. R. 6868. An act to amend section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, with respect to widows of certain deceased Coast Guard personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Subsequently, Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6860) to amend the Federal Airport Act, reported it without amendment.

H. R. 4962. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 6439. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of adopting the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans;

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; and

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments; to the Committee on Finance.

Subsequently, Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance, to which were referred the foregoing joint resolutions, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon, as follows: House Joint Resolution 428, Report No. 1745; and House Joint Resolution 429, Report No. 1746.

H. R. 5555. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5715. An act to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; and

H. R. 6695. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to authorize the creation of ten professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5807. An act to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948; and

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State; ordered to be placed on the Calendar.

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NAVY DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 6772, making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6 and 12.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 37, 38, 39, 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$360,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$230,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$209,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$450,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$585,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$132,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,965,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,207,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$69,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$305,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$38,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,532,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,208,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,012,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,385,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,046,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,087,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$32,611,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The Committee of Conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 16, 23 and 40.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
E. V. ROBERTSON,
M. E. TYDINGS,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOE HENDRICKS,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6772, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 17, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate No. 16 and 23 to the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concurred therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 40 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 112. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for contracts with any person, firm, or corporation to make or cause to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any employee within the Navy; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when in the judgment of the Secretary, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary, be advantageous to the national defense."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 40.

The motion was agreed to.

CONVEYANCE TO OKALOOSA COUNTY (FLA.) OF A PORTION OF SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLA.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 3735, to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey, subject to the limitations and conditions hereinafter enumerated and such others as he may prescribe, to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, for recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all or any part of that portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, extending one mile east from Brooks Bridge on United States Highway 98 near the town of Fort Walton, Florida, except for a strip of land six hundred feet wide (three hundred feet east and three hundred feet west from center line of road leading to radar site "Dick"), extending from Highway 98 to the mean low water level of the Gulf of Mexico, and two miles west from said bridge, and to all or any part of that portion of said Santa Rosa Island which lies east of the new channel at East Pass (consisting of two small islands), said property being under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army. Such conveyance shall be made upon payment by said county of a sum which shall be 50 per centum of the fair value of the property conveyed, based upon the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for sale regardless of its former character or use, as determined by the Secretary, less such portion of the price originally paid by said county for said island, prior to its conveyance to the United States, as the Secretary shall determine to be fair and equitable"; and the Senate agree to the same.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
HARRY F. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
CHARLES R. CLASON,
CHARLES H. ELSTON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 4071, to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment on page 2 of the bill.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
CLYDE M. REED,
E. H. MOORE,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
BRIEN MCMAHON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
LEONARD W. HALL,
ROBERT HALE,
WILLIAM J. MILLER,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

CHANGE THE NAME OF POTHOLES DAM TO O'SULLIVAN DAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 202) to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam, which were, in line 3, strike out "South Coulee" and insert "Potholes"; in line 7, strike out "South Coulee" and insert "Potholes," and to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to change the name of the Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam."

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMENTS BY FEDERAL JUDGES TO JURIES—ADDRESS BY B. M. McKELWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has come to my attention through my friend, former Senator John A. Danaher, a very interesting statement made some time ago by the distinguished editor of the Washington Evening Star, Mr. B. M. McKelway. In the statement Mr. McKelway discusses, from the standpoint of a layman, the controversy as to whether or not a judge should instruct jurors in Federal courts. It is a very interesting address.

Mr. McKelway has explored the problem of the balance on the Federal judiciary also, showing that through the years the Democratic administration has been in power the very few Republicans who have been appointed. This is a matter which has engaged the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and particularly my attention, during the Eightieth Congress. I believe Mr. McKelway's comments will be of interest to lawyers and laymen alike, whether or not they agree with his conclusions. We lawyers have a tendency to get into a rut, and it is a very healthy experience to get the expression of a keen layman on the important subject of checks and balances in the judicial system, because that question dates away back to the time of King John, when the King himself was supreme and when his subjects required of him and got from him a proviso that a man should be judged by his peers. The question is as to what that means.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. McKelway's address be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chief Justice, honorable judges, ladies, and gentlemen, Dr. Samuel Johnson's observation about the woman preacher is somehow applicable to the position in which I find myself today, with this assignment to elucidate the topic: "Should a judge be permitted to comment on the evidence in instructing a jury?"

Dr. Johnson said the woman preacher reminded him of a dog walking on its hind legs. The question was not whether the woman preached well. The remarkable thing was that she did it at all.

As a layman, I beg your indulgence and throw myself on your mercy. I am in the situation common to all the laymen with whom you come in professional contact. In other words, I am in trouble. What can an uninformed layman do with a subject which seems to baffle even the judges?

I accepted the invitation to participate in this discussion, however, with obedient alacrity. A judge extended the invitation and centuries of Anglo Saxon discipline under law have made it instinctive, on the part of a layman, to jump when the judge speaks.

My acceptance did lead me into some reflective speculation as to the motives which might be involved in having a layman present and speaking in this group.

And against the layman's wishful thinking to the contrary, the anecdote concerning Gen. Ulysses S. Grant rudely intruded itself—the story of the staff member who, otherwise unassigned, was always on hand for meetings of the staff. General Grant explained that there was a good reason for having him there. For if this man, General Grant said, could understand what was being talked about, then anybody could understand it. If the judges and the lawyers ever wish to bring their colloquies out into the open, so to speak, it might be a good idea to find out if an ordinary layman can understand what they are talking about.

The subject under examination here today, as Justice Holtzoff has told us, has been under more or less continuous discussion in the United States for 150 years. It became an issue in North Carolina when there were only three judges serving the people of that new Commonwealth. Even in those early days the woods were full of lawyers and they outnumbered the judges.

The lawyers were able to change the common-law rules brought over from the old country regarding the judge's right and even his duty to comment on the evidence. As the tide of civilization swept westward the lawyers, moving with the tide and still outnumbering the judges, got the change written into the statutes of most of the States. And here we are, today, still debating it. It is an interesting anomaly that, while it is the layman's interests which are mostly at stake, the debate is restricted almost entirely to the lawyers and the judges.

It is time that laymen began to participate in the discussion. But I fear that most laymen are like the lady juror, one of several jury members whom I requested one of our reporters to interview. His question was, "Madame, would you mind telling me whether you think a judge should or should not comment to the jury on the evidence?"

"Mister," she replied, "I ain't never give it no thought."

Neither had I. I had never "give" it no thought. But the more thought I gave it,

and the more references I consulted as to what others had thought, the more interested I became and the more anxious I became that other laymen should learn to know something about the two sides to this controversy.

I believe my own would be the reaction of any layman who, through his jury service or otherwise, gives some attention to the machinery which handles the business of the courts. That is why I am a believer in the movement, with which Chief Justice Laws has identified himself, of bringing more laymen into the discussion of possible methods of improving the administration of justice. There is an adage that "familiarity breeds contempt." But if there is an exception to prove that rule, surely it applies in the case of the layman's familiarity with the processes of justice. Far from inviting his contempt, it is my belief that familiarity with the functioning of his courts would kindle within the layman more of that reverent regard for the majesty of undefiled justice which I believe to be the common attribute of good men who are learned in the law.

I was interested in the answer of jurors, serving in a criminal and in a civil case under trial in the district court in Washington, in response to this question, "Do you think that the judge should or should not comment on the evidence?"

The replies seem to follow a pattern. But I shall read them to you, temporarily withholding my own comment on the evidence they present.

Civil-case jurors:

Retired male Government employee, "I think it is very helpful."

Male Government employee, "It helps to clarify things."

Woman Government employee, "I do like to have the judge make his comment, within limitations. A slight summary. And just what is expected of the jury."

Male Government employee: "I think he should say something about the evidence. I was pleased by the way the judge told us about what the law meant. I think the jury should be instructed as to what procedure to follow in the jury room. In our case, it was chaos after we began deliberating on the verdict because a couple of men wanted to explain their views in detail. I would like instructions on how the poll should be taken. I believe they should give us some kind of printed instructions about how we are supposed to proceed."

Male real estate and insurance broker: "I think the judge should be more explicit. There were several questions involved and the jury didn't know what to do. When there are legal terms, the judge should explain them. The judges know what the legal terms mean. But they are new to us. We don't understand some of them."

Male auditor, Bureau of Internal Revenue: "I have never served on but one case. I think some comment from the judge on the evidence is necessary. Of course, it should be impartial."

Woman juror: "Mister, I ain't never give it no thought."

Male inspector of engineering materials for the Government: "I think the judge should give us instructions in the case, stating them clearly and in an unbiased way."

Woman Government clerk: "I think it is a great help for the judge to comment on some of the evidence. He knows the law and everything like that. He should comment both for and against. It seems to me there were little leads from the judge, to sort of direct your thinking."

Housewife: "I don't think he should favor either side. I think he should give an impartial résumé."

Male Government statistician: "I think that the judge, having the knowledge of law he has, should instruct the jury as to what should be considered as evidence. I think he should give, in his charge, the meat of the evidence."

Criminal-case jurors:

Male Government engineer: "If I don't understand the case, I would like for the judge to give me instructions on it. I think it is necessary for the judge to give general instructions on evidence, impartially."

Male assembly clerk for electrical supply company: "I think the judge should give us some advice as to how to go about it."

Male receptionist with a furniture company: "That is a hard question. I think it is necessary for the judge to give general instructions on the evidence, impartially."

Male Government clerk: "I approve of his commenting on the evidence as it is presented."

Order dispatcher for electric company: "I think it helps a jury to have the judge instruct them as to what they can do and what they can't do. I think it is a good thing for him to comment on the evidence. He makes it clearer."

Radio repairman: "On some of the evidence, actually, it might be necessary for him to comment. He should explain what the indictment is and what the law is. I think if he talks too much he will put too much weight on one side or the other."

Automobile mechanic: "The evidence would be understood better if he commented on it. I think the judge would make it more clear by commenting on it. I would like for the judge to outline the law in the case."

Machinist: "I think the judge ought to give us advice on the evidence."

Male Government research clerk: "A lot of times we don't know what it means after we get in the jury room. I mean the indictment. We didn't know what one meant."

Assistant group chief, Government Printing Office: "I think it is a good point, having the judge comment on the evidence. We are laymen and often it is very confusing. We ought to be allowed to take notes. There should be paper and pencil issued, so we can take notes. When the judge comments on the evidence, I don't think he should let us know, by the way he stresses things, and raises or lowers his voice, what he may think of the case."

Our first conclusion, from the evidence presented by these jurors, is that our juries, in Washington, are overweighted by Government employees. But we are all overweighted by Government employees. That may be dismissed, therefore, as irrelevant—though not immaterial.

Our second conclusion is that the jurors who were questioned did not have a very profound understanding of the significance of the question. I wonder, as a layman, how often jurors fail to understand the significance of questions during a trial. Is it not the duty of a judge to assure himself that the jury does understand the significance of the questions and the answers?

But our third and most important conclusion is that here, in these spot answers, hurriedly given by 21 jury men and women fresh from their experience in the courtroom, you find the thread which forms the basic fabric of the topic under discussion here today.

We find all the jurors leaning heavily on what the judge says. Without this guidance from the one man in the court on whose advice they feel they can rely, there is the dread of misunderstanding the facts concerning which the juror is desperately anxious to base a fair judgment.

And along with all this there is that shrewd, American awareness, shown by some of these jurors, of the possibility that the judge himself might be partial—and that a condition of his right to comment on the evidence is the impartiality of his comment.

You note that one juror touched on a point which, I find, runs through much of the literature on this subject. This juror expressed the opinion that the judge, in commenting on the evidence, should not let the jury know, "by the way he stresses things, and raises or lowers his voice," what he may think of the case.

That, of course, is a well-known method of conveying, to the jury, exactly what the judge does think of the case. I heard, not long ago, a highly respected member of the bench, a scholarly exponent of the noblest principles of justice, repeat for my edification, in pantomime and by modulations of the human voice, his comment on the evidence to a recent jury. He used, and most effectively, his shoulders, his hands, his eyebrows, his eyes, and the level of his voice. By such means he pleaded the case with such convincing eloquence that I found myself siding with him completely on the point he wished to make in relation to the evidence.

He had commented in that fashion to the jury because he believed so profoundly that by doing it he was serving the ends of justice.

I am not passing on the substance of what he conveyed to the jury. But I am calling attention once more to that juror, the 1 out of 21 whom we questioned, who had noticed—from his brief experience in court—that "by the way he stresses things and raises or lowers his voice" in commenting on the evidence a judge can tell the jury what he thinks of the case.

There, of course, in the hands of a judge who is without conscience or is motivated by some purpose not related to the ends of justice, lies a danger.

But in the juror's instinctive doubt as to the propriety of what the judge might do, lies a strong safeguard against that danger.

If the jury system possesses the merits which most of us are inclined to acknowledge, surely it must be strong enough to resist the undue influence of an occasional unprincipled judge. Otherwise, our juries are made of putty. While I have heard criticism of the jury system, most vigorously asserted by the lawyer who has just lost a case, I have never heard jurors criticized on the ground that they are spineless.

In my lay opinion, the more that the judge can do to assure a lay jury's comprehension of the facts which affect a fair judgment of the issue; the more guides that he can furnish, out of the wisdom of his experience and his knowledge of the laws of human nature, the more apt we are to have just verdicts from the jury. On the other hand, the more rigid the rules which gag a judge in his relationship with the jury, the greater the danger that justice will miscarry.

I have read cases where Federal judges were caught far off base in their comments on the evidence, such comment being a reflection on the attitude of the judge himself, rather than the rule which sanctioned his comment. But in reading some of the cases where State judges have been reversed for trespassing on ground forbidden to them, I have been impressed by what seemed to me to be the benefits to the jury of the comment for which the judge was held to be in error. As to a law that supposes that justice is best served by keeping the judge silent while some smart lawyer pulls the wool over the eyes of the jury, I agree with Mr. Bumble: "If the law supposes that, the law is an ass."

I believe it is correct to say that our Federal judiciary, which operates under a broader latitude than is permitted in most of the States, has achieved a more impressive reputation for even-handed justice than many of our State courts. I also believe that any attempt to interfere by legislation with the freedom these judges enjoy, in working for an impartial judgment by the jury on the pertinent facts, would be a step backward, just as the removal of such legislation in some of the States is considered a step forward.

I wonder if the matter does not boil down, in the end, to the amount of confidence we have in our judges. I find from my conversations with lawyer friends that there are some of them who, agreeing in principle with the advantages of judicial comment on the evidence as a means of clarifying the jury's understanding, are not willing to accept application of this principle in the case of some judges.

I am inclined to believe that if all State judges were chosen for life or for periods sufficiently long to insure for them something of the cloistered status of our Federal judges, the rules on comment in the State courts might more rapidly conform to those in the Federal courts. The latitude we permit our judges is at least a partial reflection of our confidence in the judges.

Prohibitions against comment on the evidence in State courts may have been based originally on some fear of judicial tyranny. But there is such a thing as tyranny at the hands of the people, swayed by momentary passions from which many of our State courts are not very well insulated. It is not difficult to understand the factors which may undermine confidence in judges who are forced, at intervals, to leave the bench and go into the hustings and appeal, not only to the intelligence but to the emotions, of the voters who decide their fate.

Of the three branches of our Government, our Federal judiciary enjoys the greatest confidence of the people because of the tradition of its isolation from politics.

That, at least, is the tradition which we cherish as a principle.

But is that tradition well served by the tendency to appoint to the Federal bench only those who wear the party label of the party in power?

I say only those. Here is the record of the appointments to the Federal bench in the continental United States since 1933:

Supreme Court, 9 Democrats and 2 Republicans.

Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, 8 Democrats and 1 Republican.

The 10 circuit courts, 46 Democrats and 2 Republicans.

The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, 3 Democrats and no Republicans.

Court of Customs, 6 Democrats and 2 Republicans.

Court of Claims, 4 Democrats and no Republicans.

District courts in the United States, 146 Democrats and 2 Republicans.

The total comes to 222 Democrats and 9 Republicans. Of the judges appointed since 1933 and now sitting as members of the Federal judiciary in the continental United States, 191 of them are Democrats and 6 are Republicans.

I understand the practical realities of politics, under which Federal judicial appointments have been regarded for many years as the plums of the party in power. I do not think that a party label should assume any great importance in considering a man for the Federal bench whose temperamental and intellectual qualities fit him for that high responsibility.

What I am talking about is the confidence we enjoy, as a tradition, in the nonpolitical complexion of the Federal judiciary and the supreme importance of maintaining that confidence in the minds of the laymen.

And as a layman I submit that the tradition suffers some injury when we find that 222 out of the 231 Federal judges appointed since 1933 have been Democrats, that of this group only 6 out of the 197 now sitting are Republicans.

You remember the preacher who was praying for rain during a drought. As he was about to close his prayer, he remembered what happened to his bottom land during a spring freshet. And he added: "But, Lord, please be reasonable."

With that plea, to the powers that be and are to be, I bring to a close this layman's comment.

DEFENSE OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S INTEGRITY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article appearing in the June 2 issue of the Kansas City Star, entitled "Truman Integrity Defended in Review of Milligan Book." This review is written by Mr. Jerome Walsh, a prominent member of the Missouri Bar who was requested to review this book by the Missouri Bar Review, official publication of the Missouri Bar Association. I shall not discuss the article itself, but I should like to read these brief paragraphs:

In his reflections on the fortunes of life and politics, he returns again and again to the subject of "luck." Mr. Truman was "lucky"; he has been the "luckiest of men." Not-so-old-timers in Missouri will have little difficulty in recalling Mr. Milligan's well-nigh suicidal despair in running a poor and undistinguished third, behind Truman and Lloyd Stark, in the race for Senator in the 1940 Democratic primary.

He can reflect—

Referring again to the author—

that with half-truths, distortions, gossip, inference, indirection, hearsay, and outright untruth, he has impeached the character of Missouri's first President, a man about whose character few Democrats in Jackson County have ever said an unkind word, a man to whom even the Republican Kansas City Star accords respect and good will.

That ends the quotation. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN INTEGRITY DEFENDED IN REVIEW OF MILLIGAN BOOK—FOLLOWING RECAPITULATION OF THE PENDERGAST STORY, TECHNIQUE OF CONDEMNATION BY INFERENCE IS USED TO CAST FALSE SUSPICION ON THE PRESIDENT, SAYS JEROME WALSH

(This is a review by Jerome Walsh of The Inside Story of the Pendergast Machine by the Man Who Smashed It (formerly Missouri Waltz), by Maurice M. Milligan. The book was published by Charles Scribner's Sons in April. The review appears in the May issue of the Kansas City Bar Bulletin. Walsh, a lawyer here, was a candidate in 1946 for the Democratic nomination for Representative in the Congress from Jackson County's Fifth District.)

Mr. Milligan's book is of special interest to members of the Missouri bar, not alone because it retells the story of the crack-up of one of the most potent political machines in the history of the Republic but because a Missourian of stature is stood up and counted in its pages.

Indeed, it is this last aspect which has given the book a wide sale, which attracted prior to publication a flurry of excited newspaper comment and stimulated some planners of campaign strategy to a pitch of anticipation and delight.

A THOROUGH DOCUMENTATION

The activities of few bosses have been as thoroughly documented as have those of Pendergast. In Tom's Town, William M. Reddig told the story recently and well. Mr. Milligan's book, almost altogether derivative, recooks the same cabbage. It is hardly a scoop.

But Mr. Milligan's book is something more than the story of the Pendergast dynasty. It is primarily an assault upon the integrity and reputation of the President of the United States, a Missourian who happened to live in Jackson County during the period of machine rule.

It is an assault, furthermore, that is being delivered in an election year, when campaign material, however factual, brings premium prices and when those willing to author it may expect to obtain a full measure of acclaim from the organization and newspaper apparatus of the party opposed to the President in power.

For the first 212 pages, then, the Milligan book is the standard recapitulation of the Pendergast story, a compendium of old newspaper clippings, photographs, and Milligan musings and speeches, none of which are either very startling or reflect any insight more profound than the newspaper editorials of the time.

"SEEN SAID BEFORE"

In these pages, Mr. Milligan informs us that, like Calvin Coolidge's preacher, he is against sin; he is against gambling, vote frauds, dope, and, presumably, whisky. Although opposition to these ills has been expressed occasionally before, three-fourths of Missouri Waltz is devoted to conveying the impression that Milligan discovered them all, personally.

The reader musing through the rather turgid prose of these early pages may well tend to wonder why all the fuss and feathers. It is the last 60 pages, however, that give him a run for his money.

For it is in these pages that an effort is made to link Harry Truman with every species of sin that flourished during the regime of Pendergast. He is linked by inference, never directly. He knew Pendergast personally; his start in politics was at the suggestion of Tom's nephew, Jim; he received the support of the Pendergast organization in his campaigns for county judge and for the United States Senate.

He must be assumed, therefore, to be party to every nefarious and venal deed that the henchmen of Pendergast perpetrated, from Johnny Lazia to Matthew S. Murray, from Jimmy Needles to Edward Schneider.

QUALIFIES AN ATTACK

Ghosts were voted by the thousands by Pendergast lieutenants, who, jostling each other for power and influence, sought the boss' favor by returning fantastic majorities in their precincts. If ghost votes were cast for Mr. Truman, he personally was involved in the conspiracy. No, Mr. Milligan never goes quite that far.

Indeed, the final section of the book—the fireworks section entitled "An Evil Heritage"—begins with a statement made by Milligan in 1944, when in answer to a reporter's inquiry, he said:

"At no time (during the investigation conducted by the district attorney's office) did the finger of suspicion ever point in the direction of Senator Truman."

To the thousands of Jackson Countians who have known Harry Truman since his boyhood, this statement is both pompous and superfluous, although Mr. Milligan indicates that he should be credited with a a gracious and courteous gesture in making it.

AIMED AT THE VOTER

But despite this flat statement that Mr. Truman was never involved in the machine's depredations—and the utter absence of any evidence linking him with a single dubious deed in those years of universal corruption—the entire weight of the book is an effort to establish in the mind of the voting reader the suspicion that the involvement was no less real for being indirect.

Thus, Milligan threads the name of the President through accounts of the bloody municipal election of 1934. The name of the President crops up next door to mentions of Pendergast's concrete company; it appears in the same paragraph with the names of Charles Carollo, Otto P. Higgins, John Pryor, and others who wound up with prison terms.

By inference and juxtaposition, Mr. Truman is brought to emerge as some kind of vague partner of convicted traffickers in political corruption. Never, however, are direct statements made to this effect. It is by indirection—one of the cheapest devices in the textbook of scurrility—that Mr. Milligan attains his ends.

SUSPICION BY INFERENCE

His technique is never to lay these sins directly at the President's door, but to lay them at the door of the man down the street and then to brand the President for living in the general neighborhood.

It is inconceivable that as an attorney and a member of this State's bar, Mr. Milligan would permit the introduction of evidence of this quality either in a court of law or in the court of his own thinking. Indeed, his wholesale use of it violates some of the basic principles of jurisprudence.

It was to eliminate this kind of base gossip and hearsay, rumor, and innuendo arising from personal rancor, that the rules of evidence were developed to become such a proud and integral part of our common-law heritage.

Apply the gossip technique to anyone. Apply it even to Mr. Milligan, since he, apparently, sanctions its use and vilifies a President with it. For example, the story has made the rounds for years that following the release from prison of Tom Pendergast, Mr. Milligan paid a personal nighttime visit to the boss' Kansas City home, where the erstwhile satrap was living alone, aged and friendless.

EXCUSES FROM A SLUR

I have not the slightest idea as to whether there is a word of truth in this story. Yet, here is the alleged fact of the visit, set up in cold type and, as thus set, it is a suggestion that will, of course, bring aches to the Milligan bones and call forth, no doubt, a hurried and sanctimonious denial, suggesting, as it does, that the nocturnal visit was for some sinister purpose.

I have no wish to bring groans from Mr. Milligan or to bruise in any way the well-muscled Milligan ego. Yet let him consider carefully, as he smarts under the heedless and callous aspersion, admitted under his very own rules of evidence, that innuendo and hearsay can rot out the good name of any man alive, even a Maurice Milligan with his screen of old newspaper clippings and his protective toga of the Milligan myth.

Boiled down, then, the whole book is predicated upon the assumption that anyone who knew Pendergast, anyone who received the support of the Pendergast organization in attaining elective office, must somehow share personal responsibility for every act of crime and boodle that was committed during the Pendergast regime.

SUPPORT BY PENDERGAST

Let those who are willing to accept this thesis apply it consistently. Let them apply it to Lloyd C. Stark, hailed far and wide as Missouri's clean-up Governor, who broke with Pendergast but who, prior to the break, sought and was elected to office by Pendergast's organized support.

Let them apply it to James A. Reed, whose lifetime of office-holding was made possible by votes delivered by the Pendergast organization.

Let them apply it to great and honorable judges of our courts, to Senator Harry B. Hawes, to Bennett Champ Clark, to Mr. Milligan's own respected brother, Jacob L. (Tuck) Milligan, who, running for Congressman-at-Large in 1932, was willingly helped to office by Kansas City votes—some of which, no doubt, were ectoplasm, but none of which are repudiated by the author.

No word can be said in defense of bossism. It is the kind of hidden sore, however, which is revealed in its true dimensions only when some monstrous cataclysm, such as the Kansas City collapse, bursts upon public notice.

ACCEPTED IN BEST CIRCLES

Pendergast himself moved among the business and professional men of his city as an accepted and respected equal, whose handshake and nod was a flattering unction to chamber of commerce presidents, newspaper publishers, professional and commercial leaders of all kinds, whose attendance at church and intoning of the ritual was punctilious and sincere.

The hands of these sturdy gentry, pillars of society, were lifted high in horror when the extent of civil corruption became manifest following Pendergast's departure for Leavenworth. Yet, by Milligan's standards, these hands were soiled, too; they had touched the hand of Pendergast and had received favors from the boss and his satellites.

To say that Harry Truman had the support of the Pendergast organization in his campaign for public office is to say simply that without organized support it is impossible to get elected even to the office of constable in our American democracy.

LOOK TO THE MACHINES

The late President Roosevelt, whom even Mr. Milligan seems to revere, freely and openly solicited the strength of the Hague, Kelly-Nash, and Pendergast organizations.

For the previous decade or so, Republican leaders had contested for the favor of the Vare-Pew organization in Pennsylvania. McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt had their Mark Hanna and Boise Penrose. Even Lincoln, saint that he was, strove to maintain friendly relations with the vote-purveying pharaohs of his party.

To say that any of these men became thereby tools or serfs of these organizations is to lapse into Milliganla, a mental ailment marked by double talk and an excessive display of piety upon the part of the afflicted.

Only a native of Jackson County can fully appreciate the often uproarious unconscious burlesque that marks this book.

Only a native of Jackson County could recall with what splendid fire Milligan—the archangelic foe of bossism—openly endorsed the Pendergast-supported candidate for mayor of Kansas City in 1946, the ebullient Robert K. Ryland, who, be it said to his credit, scorned to attempt to hide his allegiance. Surely, this act of Milligan's constitutes a paradox that should discredit his book up and down the land.

DEFEATED BY MR. TRUMAN

But, of course, it is for a definite purpose that Mr. Milligan is so ineffably lofty. If there is a single continuing theme in this book other than the author's profound respect for Maurice M. Milligan, it is his bitterness at Harry Truman, a bitterness almost pathological in its intensity.

In his reflections on the fortunes of life and politics, he returns again and again to the subject of luck. Mr. Truman was lucky; he has been the luckiest of men. Not-so-old timers in Missouri will have little difficulty recalling Mr. Milligan's well-nigh suicidal despair in running a poor and undistinguished third, behind Truman and Lloyd Stark, in the race for Senator in the 1940 Democratic primary.

That the voters of Missouri should thus repudiate him, choosing in his stead another Missouri country boy whom he had always regarded as a rival, was a disappointment of a kind that better men than Maurice Milligan have found bitter to swallow. Yet, in this book, he has found a special balm for his wounds, and the acclaim accorded it by the Republican press, hot for campaign documents, must fall musically on his ears.

He can reflect that with half-truths, distortions, gossip, inference, indirection, hearsay, and outright untruth, he has impeached the character of Missouri's first President, a man about whose character few Democrats in Jackson County have ever said an unkind word, a man to whom even the Republican Kansas City Star accords respect and good will.

SLAUGHTER PURGE CITED

"My observance of boss rule, renewing and flourishing under countenance from a President of the United States and his executive assistants, has dictated the writing of this book." Thus does Mr. Milligan begin an account of the primary election of 1946, when the President sought the aid of the Democrats of the county in defeating Congressman Roger C. Slaughter, a Democrat.

Everybody knows that Slaughter had opposed the bulk of measures submitted to Congress by the President, a condition peculiarly embarrassing to Mr. Truman in view of the fact that Slaughter hailed from his home county.

Mr. Truman's request that the voters of Jackson County defeat Slaughter is hailed by Milligan as an act very nearly tantamount to high treason. Yet there is plenty of precedent for this participation by a President in a local election. The late Mr. Roosevelt attempted it unsuccessfully almost a score of times. So did Woodrow Wilson, who stumped the country asking the defeat of opponents of the League of Nations. Other examples could be cited.

DEFEAT WAS ESSENTIAL

In this writer's view, the elimination of Slaughter from Congress was essential to the President's program. I agree that the question of who would become Slaughter's successor was a secondary matter. I myself was one of the candidates, and in the heat of the race the rumor became widespread that if I withdrew I would receive huge rewards.

However, for personal reasons, I made the difficult decision to stay in and fight it out—and lost. Here occurs another of Mr. Milligan's bitter inferences, namely, that somehow Mr. Truman must take personal responsibility for the vote frauds that developed in this contest.

The duties of a President are manifold. Someone should point out to Milligan that they do not yet include the personal supervision of local elections.

Mr. Milligan spends pages making appointment as United States district attorney appear to be the net result of the most intensive screening of numerous candidates by the Attorney General of the United States. I think I can comment on this section from personal experience. In 1932 Senator-elect Bennett Champ Clark graciously proffered me his recommendation for appointment as United States attorney—an offer then equal to actual appointment. Personal reasons caused me to decline.

REASON FOR SUPPORT

During the 13 months between this offer and Mr. Milligan's ascension, Clark endeavored with might and main to secure the appointment of Carl L. Ristine, whom the Attorney General of the United States, Homer Cummings, opposed, thus finding himself on this issue in complete accord with Pendergast. Mr. Milligan simply was not in the running. His only claim on Clark, without whose support he had no chance, was Clark's affection for Mr. Milligan's brother, Tuck, who on the basis of that affection, was himself endeavoring with might and main to secure Milligan's appointment.

The situation remained static until Clark, finally seeing his support of Ristine to be hopeless, made a deal with Cummings whereby Milligan, the lesser horn of this political dilemma, was finally given the post, but only on condition that Ristine receive, as he ultimately did, an appointment as Assistant

Attorney General at compensation substantially exceeding Milligan's.

The most glaringly misleading treatment of the facts by Milligan is that concerning the Union Station massacre and his participation in the investigation of that crime. As a constant spectator of the Kansas City scene, I read with awe Mr. Milligan's account of his participation in the massacre affair which occurred June 16, 1933. At the time, Mr. Milligan, not yet appointed, was still residing in Ray County and, like the rest of us, learned of the crime through the press—in his case, doubtless through the columns of the Ray County News or the Cooperative Farmer. The vagaries of politics had not yet launched him on either a political or a literary career. After the Clark-Cummings compromise, another of Missouri's famous compromises, resulting in his appointment, he assumed the duties of his office at a time when this case was already 9 months old.

JOIN IN SOLVING CASE

From his account, one would think that J. Edgar Hoover had vacated his office and could not be encouraged to resume it. Until, of course, he heard of Milligan's appointment, after which they joined together and, with Hoover in a minor role, proceeded to crack the Kansas City massacre.

At page 132 he says, "My office asked for the return of Adam Richetti to Kansas City to stand trial for participation in the Union Station massacre." Mr. Milligan is confused. He sent no capias, for Richetti was brought back on a writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum and taken by Milligan before a Federal grand jury where he failed to break Richetti. Following this waterhaul, Richetti was handed as good riddance to the Missouri authorities.

Mr. Milligan says: "Richetti was brought to trial, convicted, and duly executed, paying his debt to society for his part in the Union Station massacre." Either Mr. Milligan is employing his standard method of inference and wants his readers to believe that it was he who prosecuted and personally hanged Richetti, or, if he is not doing so, surely he will not object to my pointing out, for the mere sake of historical accuracy, that he had no part in Richetti's prosecution and execution and that the same was accomplished solely by the State courts.

TENACITY IS LAUDED

But full and complete credit must be given Milligan for the tenacity he exhibited in taking on the Pendergast octopus. The let-well-enough-alone type of man and mind might have taken an easier course. However, for cleaning up the vote situation in Kansas City, credit should be accorded the new permanent registration law enacted by the legislature in 1937. Credit certainly has to be given in large measure to his two capable assistants who many times carried on the fight when Mr. Milligan was elsewhere.

Randall W. Wilson, a courtroom strategist of rare ability, did practically all of the heavy duty trial work. Sam C. Blair, now judge of the circuit court for the fourteenth judicial district circuit, in his brilliantly unique manner briefed the law, drafted the indictments, mapped the strategy and supplied the brain power that sparked the Milligan rise to fame.

In addition, Mr. Milligan is entitled to complete recognition for the part he played in the T. J. Pendergast income-tax prosecution. He sent Mr. Pendergast to the penitentiary, but the great gap in this book, and I think it is a gap in Milligan's record, is his recounting of the capitulation of McCormack, who finally informed on Pendergast and made his conviction possible.

This capitulation came, says the author, only after he had threatened officials of the various fire-insurance companies which furnished the bribe money by representing that he had the means to embarrass them if they did not force McCormack to inform. Thereupon, they speedily pressed McCormack to tell his story.

QUESTION ON MOTIVE

What Milligan actually said to these men, and on the basis of what, the book leaves entirely to conjecture. But it also leaves something else—and that is this question: What strong motive did Milligan appeal to in these men to work on McCormack so as to avoid for themselves embarrassment? The clear import is that he had facts enough to make them sweat if they refused to help him make Pendergast sweat.

Actually, one wonders on the basis of Milligan's own peculiar application of the rules of evidence, if he should not have gone on with his prosecutions instead of stopping cold on Pendergast. In any case, and whatever the unrevealed facts are, he has left himself, these officials, his record, and his book, in a position which, to say the least, is equivocal.

In this connection, Mr. Milligan says that on the morning of the Pendergast plea he refused to release to the press copies of a written statement of facts he was to present to the court "until I had seen the defendant enter the courtroom and heard with my own ears the plea of guilty."

It is true, as he relates, "I presented my findings of fraud and tax evasion at the request of Judge Otis * * *" and that he "eschewed oratory and dramatics" in doing so.

A LENGTHY STATEMENT

His statements in this respect are the facts, but in doing so, he put on an unheard of performance by a lawyer in a case of that or any other magnitude. He read that statement to the court! It was some 15 pages in length, and had been prepared and written for him by Sam Blair. Lawyers of parts just don't do that. Milligan rarely, if ever, said anything in the courtroom extemporaneously and relied exclusively on Blair for the preparation of his arguments to juries and statements to the courts which, if he did not actually read, he had beforehand committed to memory.

This book offers a sketchy refresher course of the Kansas City story, but to either the literature or the trustworthy record of our time it adds nothing but its own vainglory.

THE RIZLEY-MOORE BILL AND THE ACTIVITIES OF LELAND OLDS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, continued shortages of fuel oil in the New England and North Atlantic States are almost certain. The ability of the domestic oil industry to supply the military petroleum requirements has been seriously impaired. In my opinion, these domestic and military shortages will necessarily result from the defeat of House bill 4051, commonly referred to as the Rizley-Moore gas bill, by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which previously had passed the House by a vote of 4 to 1. This legislation has been the object of a well-planned and well-executed propaganda program of the Red element in the United States under the leadership of Leland Olds of the Federal Power Commission. It has been the victim of the gullibility and dishonesty of a few politicians and of the misunderstanding of some Members of the Congress who have not had the time or opportunity to study the issues involved.

The Natural Gas Act, as originally passed, provides that the Federal Power Commission shall regulate the interstate transportation of natural gas and the sale thereof for resale for ultimate consumption. The Power Commission, however, under the leadership of Leland Olds, former Chairman of the Commission and a long-time member, has expanded the jurisdiction of the Commission to regulate the production and gathering of gas in the field contrary to the plain language of the Natural Gas Act, which excludes "the production and gathering of gas" from the jurisdiction of the Commission. A New Deal court has sustained the Commission. Such policy has caused the natural gas pipeline companies serving large consuming areas to cease exploration for gas reserves, and has caused independent producers to refuse to sell gas to interstate pipe lines except at substantially increased prices and subject to the condition that if the Commission regulates the transaction in any way, the contract of sale is void and the seller may discontinue the delivery of gas. This state of affairs has almost terminated the building of any further interstate pipe lines from the southwestern gas fields to the consuming areas of the North and East.

It means that the 165,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of known gas reserves of the Southwest, which is equivalent to about 27,500,000,000 barrels of oil on a fuel heating basis, will not be made available to relieve the fuel-oil shortage suffered by the people of New England and the North Atlantic States during the past several winters. These reserves of gas, likewise, will not be available to relieve the strain on the fuel-oil demand for industrial and military uses.

The interstate pipe lines are now paying as high as 12 cents for gas in the field because of the Federal Power Commission's policy. This is well over 100 percent increase since the establishment of the Commission's policy. It is taking about $150,000,000 a year out of the pockets of the consumers as extra tribute to the Power Commission policy.

The bill which was killed by the Senate committee would have amended the Natural Gas Act clearly to exclude the Commission from asserting jurisdiction over the activities of producing and gathering natural gas and the facilities used for such purpose. The amendment would have released the gas reserves of the Southwest for sale and transportation to the suffering consumers of the North and East. The plentiful supply of gas thus made available would have made competition keen, and the price of gas to consumers would have, as a natural consequence, gone down, as is always the case when any commodity is made plentiful. The people and the military forces have been denied this additional supply of petroleum products because of the activity of Leland Olds of the Power Commission.

I think the people of this country are entitled to know just who Leland Olds is. Prior to Mr. Olds' appointment to the Federal Power Commission, he was an associate editor of the Federated Press. The Federated Press was a Communist organization for the purpose of gathering and feeding news and propaganda to other Communist publications, including the Daily Worker. Other coeditors

of the Federated Press were Carl Haessler, an outstanding and notorious member of the Communist Party in America, who has a record of conviction for the evasion of the draft laws during World War I. The executive board of the Federated Press at and during the time Mr. Olds was a writer and coeditor included such active Communists as Earl Browder and William Z. Foster and John W. Edelman. The Federated Press was represented in Washington by Laurence Todd, who at the same time represented the Tass Agency, the official press organization of the Soviet Union. Over a period of 10 years the Daily Worker carried a column under the byline of Leland Olds, condemning the capitalistic system.

During these years as coeditor of the Federated Press, Leland Olds was a recipient of grants and awards of money from the American Fund for Public Service, commonly known as the Garland Fund. The Garland Fund was set up in 1922 by young and rich Charles Garland, and was dedicated to the advancement of communistic-front organizations in America.

In 1925, Mr. Olds was awarded $3,640 from the fund. In 1926, he received another award of $3,000. In 1928, he received a gift of $3,600 from the fund. During the same time, the Federated Press received grants totaling $76,000. The Daily Worker was also a recipient of advances from the Garland Fund. The communistic magazine known as the New Masses, was founded in the United States with the financial aid of the Garland Fund. During this period, Earl Browder and William Z. Foster as members of the executive board of the Federated Press were Mr. Olds' bosses.

In 1938, Leland Olds was temporary chairman of, and made the keynote speech to, the American Labor Party at its national convention in New York on October 3 of that year. In this speech Mr. Olds asked the question:

> How can I escape war and find peace?

He concluded with:

> The old parties—

> That means the Democratic Party as well as the Republican Party—

> cannot answer this fundamental question of the people because their organizations are still based upon selfishness.

According to the New York Times of October 4 of that year, Mr. Olds in this keynote speech also said:

> The Labor Party was born because the President could not count upon the machinery of his own party to support his efforts.

According to the Times, Mr. Olds also said:

> Millions of men and women knew that neither the Republican nor Democratic Parties could be depended upon to enable Franklin Delano Roosevelt to continue to lead the Nation into the promised land of security, equality, love, and peace. The Labor Party is the response to the political awakening that is shaking the foundations of the old political machines which, while giving lip service in their platforms to the needs of the people, were in reality willing tools of the financial power that ruled America and made its democracy a sham.

In view of Mr. Olds' philosophy and his previous official connections with communism, it is not strange that he has used his office as a member of the Federal Power Commission to hinder the industrial development of this country and impede the efforts of the oil industry to supply the domestic and military petroleum requirements. It is not strange that he has enlisted the aid of left-wing columnists and radio commentators.

The purpose of Mr. Olds' effort to defeat the bill is to continue to impose his devastating philosophies upon the American people as a member of the Federal Power Commission. Mr. Olds has filed a report with the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate and has testified before one of its subcommittees that he believes the gas reserves of the Southwest should be locked up and that the population of the North and East should be forced to move to these areas as a matter of social advancement, in order to use these gas reserves for industrial purposes. He has stated that he does not believe that gas should be permitted to be competitive with coal and oil. Mr. Olds has said, as a step in effectuating a managed economy in this country, the Commission should determine where, when, and for what purposes gas may be used.' Mr. Draper, the fourth member of the present Commission, has gone along with Mr. Olds because of his subservient position to those who backed his nomination. Mr. Olds also had the support and help of the President of the United States in propagandizing the public and defeating the gas amendment.

Two members of the Commission, Mr. Wimberly and Mr. Smith, filed a report with the committee disagreeing with the Olds philosophy and have urged upon the Senate Committee that the Natural Gas Act should be amended in order to relieve the fuel shortages of the North and East.

Mr. President, I have made this statement concerning the proposed gas amendment, known as the Rizley-Moore bill (H. R. 4051), and the activities of Leland Olds, in order that the attention of the Members of Congress and the public may be focused upon the character of individuals who still hold important positions of trust and responsibility in this government.

IMPORTANCE OF AN ADEQUATE MILITARY MANPOWER ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I request a quorum call, I want to make a short statement in regard to another matter. It is not my intention to indulge in any partisan argument with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I am perfectly willing to let his speech speak for itself, but I may say that if the Senator from Maryland were on the floor at this time, I am sure he would agree with me that in this critical hour of America's history there must be no partisan difference of any nature whatsoever on the question of protecting the security of the Nation. Reading the newspapers today and listening to conversations in the cloakroom raise a question as to whether in the hours immediately ahead, before adjournment Saturday night, we may be confronted with a holding-up process by way of a filibuster in connection with a military manpower bill. Speaking only for myself, Mr. President, but, I feel, also for a great majority of this body on both sides of the aisle and a great majority of the American people, so far as I am concerned I shall take the position that we should remain here, no matter how many days it may require, until we pass a military manpower bill that will protect the security of the Nation in this great hour of crisis. I am convinced that if, as the result of any parliamentary maneuvering we adjourn without the passage of such a bill, such action would be heard the globe around. It would carry with it some serious implications as to our intention and power to enforce the peace.

I want to say this as one who proposed what he believed to be some reasonable amendments to the draft bill when it was before the Senate. The Senate took action which resulted in the adoption of some and the defeat of some of my amendments. I shall take the same position I should take if I were a member of the conference committee considering the bill. The Senate by majority vote having spoken, I would defend the bill as passed by the Senate. Hence, I serve notice here and now that, as one Member of the Senate, I shall support any attempt to prevent prolonged debate in the nature of a filibuster on manpower legislation in the Senate of the United States between now and adjournment. In fact, I shall take the position that we must remain in session until we break any such parliamentary maneuver as that if it should develop.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bricker	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stennis
Connally	Lucas	Stewart
Cooper	McCarthy	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Taylor
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McKellar	Thye
Dworshak	McMahon	Tydings
Eastland	Magnuson	Umstead
Ecton	Malone	Vandenberg
Ellender	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
Green	Morse	Williams
Gurney	Murray	Wilson
Hatch	Myers	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] on behalf of himself and his colleague, the senior

Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. COOPER and Mr. BARKLEY asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota, the Senator from Kansas, and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

The Senator from California is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] would vote "nay."

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] are necessarily absent on official business.

I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who would vote "yea," if present, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—41

Baldwin	Holland	O'Conor
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chavez	Kilgore	Revercomb
Connally	McClellan	Robertson, Va.
Cooper	McFarland	Russell
Downey	McKellar	Smith
Eastland	McMahon	Sparkman
Ecton	Magnuson	Stennis
Fulbright	Malone	Stewart
Hatch	Maybank	Taylor
Hayden	Moore	Tydings
Hill	Murray	Umstead
Hoey	Myers	

NAYS—40

Aiken	Dworshak	Langer
Ball	Ellender	Lucas
Brewster	Ferguson	McCarthy
Bricker	Flanders	Martin
Bridges	Green	Millikin
Brooks	Gurney	Morse
Butler	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Cain	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Cordon	Ives	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kem	Taft
Thomas, Okla.	Wherry	Wilson
Thye	White	Young
Vandenberg	Wiley	
Watkins	Williams	

NOT VOTING—15

Buck	George	McGrath
Bushfield	Jenner	Reed
Byrd	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Feazel	McCarran	Wagner

So the amendment of Mr. COOPER, on behalf of himself and Mr. BARKLEY, to the committee agreement, was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER in the chair). The question is on the motion by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. AIKEN. On this motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] who is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The Senator from Masschusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] are necessarily absent on official business.

I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—42

Baldwin	Hoey	O'Conor
Barkley	Holland	O'Daniel
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Connally	Kilgore	Revercomb
Cooper	McClellan	Robertson, Va.
Downey	McFarland	Russell
Eastland	McKellar	Smith
Ecton	McMahon	Sparkman
Fulbright	Magnuson	Stennis
Green	Malone	Stewart
Hatch	Maybank	Taylor
Hayden	Murray	Tydings
Hill	Myers	Umstead

NAYS—38

Aiken	Ferguson	Saltonstall
Ball	Flanders	Taft
Brewster	Gurney	Thomas, Okla.
Bricker	Hawkes	Thye
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Tobey
Brooks	Ives	Vandenberg
Buck	Kem	Watkins
Butler	Langer	Wherry
Cain	Lucas	Wiley
Cordon	McCarthy	Williams
Donnell	Millikin	Wilson
Dworshak	Moore	Young
Ellender	Robertson, Wyo.	

NOT VOTING—16

Bushfield	Knowland	Reed
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Wagner
Feazel	McGrath	White
George	Martin	
Jenner	Moore	

So Mr. BARKLEY's motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SALTONSTALL obtained the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the vote which has just been cast. I realize that this vote, giving special privilege to a single agricultural commodity, and possibly to be followed by votes which will give special privilege to other commodities, may be the start of the break-down of this bill. It is very apparent that many Members of the Senate are not in a mood to enact any long-range legislation on this subject.

I think it is a most ridiculous spectacle for the President of the United States to be traveling thousands of miles around the country advocating the enactment of this bill, as he did by name in Los Angeles only the other evening, and then have only three or four members of his own party support him in the Senate. I think it is a sorry spectacle to see a great party disintegrate to that extent, to see how little regard they have for the opinions of their leader.

I should like to call attention to what those votes mean. I suppose the Senators who supported the amendment expect that Congress is merely going to pass the stopgap bill of the House of Representatives, and it is possible that may be done. Let us see what that would mean. Let us see what would happen to citrus fruits, for instance. Under the stopgap bill, a few millions of dollars will be available for the purchase of citrus fruits. However, under this bill there would be between $300,000,000 and $400,000,000 available for the purchase of fruits and vegetables and other nonbasic commodities to support the price, if necessary.

The House bill extends the support price for wool for only 1 year, and that is meaningless. The Senate bill, which we are asked to vote on, and on which the members of the committee have worked for months, in trying to put it into shape and get it ready for passage, would give perpetual price support to wool.

Mr. President, I think it is just too bad that while the President of the United States is traveling over the country advocating a long-range farm program that his party here in Congress is doing everything within its power to prevent any program for the benefit of the farmers of the United States from being enacted.

I wish to say that there is one group that will be very happy over the defeat of a long-range farm program bill, and that is the group of men whose names appeared in the newspapers this morning as being indicted for failure to register as lobbyists. I know what interests certain persons have in killing this bill, and I know the opposition that has labored against it in the Cotton States. Let me state what happened. Some of the men whose names were in the newspapers this morning have been very interested in this bill—one of them, at least. If this bill passed, it would temporarily reduce the parity price of cotton. In the long run, it is the best bill the cotton growers of the country have ever had offered to them. But what would happen if this bill passed?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. No; I decline to yield now.

Mr. President, what would happen, I repeat, if this bill passed? The result would be that the speculators who have bought futures in cotton would take a licking. So they are going to be extremely happy as a result of this vote, which starts toward breaking down this long-range agricultural program bill on which we have worked for months and months, and which ought to become law, and for which the farmers of the United States have been hoping for more than 10 years.

I wish to express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] who voted for this measure.

Mr. President, political tactics have been practiced here, which may sacrifice the general welfare of the farmers of the United States for years to come.

The stopgap bill will not support the wool growers to any appreciable extent. It will not help the citrus fruit growers or the apple growers. The citrus fruit growers of Florida can look forward again to getting from 5 to 15 cents a box for their grapefruit next winter, whereas if the Senate bill passed they should get a decent price.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. AIKEN. Now let them say what they like.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to offer two brief amendments in the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself and then I shall be glad to yield the floor. The amendments are offered to page 82 of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I want to know whether the Senator will yield to me for a moment. I should like to comment——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I regretfully decline to yield, because I have declined to yield to Senators on the other side of the aisle.

I should like to complete my statement, and then yield the floor.

Mr. President, in the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself, I offer the two technical amendments to section 302, on page 82 of the bill. I understand that the amendments are acceptable to the Senator from Vermont, who is in charge of the bill. So I offer the amendments at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts offer the amendments en bloc?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, they are offered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 82, line 3, after the word "determined," it is proposed to insert: "by the Secretary after reasonable public notice and public hearing with records of said hearing and a finding thereon by said Secretary available to the public."

On page 82, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "in the national interest" and insert "in the interest of national security."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts, which are to be considered en bloc.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the business before the Senate be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been stated, and it will be stated again.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts, which are to be considered en bloc.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I simply state that these are technical amendments to make sure that before the Secretary of Agriculture undertakes to exercise certain powers given him by this section, there shall be a public hearing, and that notice of such public hearing and of his findings shall be given before he exercises that power.

The second amendment changes the words "in the national interest" to the words "in the interest of national security."

I understand that the amendments are acceptable to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], with whom I have discussed them.

Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. THYE, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at the moment. I desire to comment on the remarks of the Senator from Vermont, and I will not yield at the moment.

Mr. President, I am sorry that the usually calm and self-possessed Senator from Vermont has permitted himself to become overexcited as a result of the adoption of the amendment upon which the Senate just voted. I am especially sorry he took advantage of the adoption of the amendment to inject politics into the consideration of the over-all agricultural legislation. I am sure that when the Senator finds a calmer moment, which he will do, he will not feel that the Senator from Kentucky and his colleague who sits on the other side of the aisle were playing politics when we offered the amendment or that the Senate was playing politics when it adopted it, or that it destroys the bill, or that it is inimical to the interests of any other grower or of any other crop or of any other product of any kind in the United States.

It is true the President has recommended long-range agricultural legislation, and he may have endorsed yesterday or any other day, in principle, the legislation which the Senate is now considering. But certainly the President of the United States by any endorsement he might give to this legislation did not expect us to take it without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i" or without any amendments to it; otherwise the amendments already adopted and accepted by the Senator from Vermont would vitiate the legislation according to that standard.

Mr. President, we argued the amendment in good faith. We presented the facts with respect to the special situation which surrounds tobacco and which everyone recognizes. The adoption of an amendment on that one subject had no effect whatever on any other product, any other crop, or any other part of the United States from an agricultural or economic standpoint. I do not know what the chances may be of securing over-all legislation. If there is a defeat of over-all legislation it will not take place in this body as the result of the adoption of the amendment just voted on.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, does he mean he is opposed to the amendment which is to be offered by the Senator from Georgia, which would defeat a long-range program?

Mr. BARKLEY. If I am convinced when the time comes to vote on that amendment that we cannot obtain long-range legislation, I shall vote for it, because it will be necessary to extend the present law beyond the 31st of December, in order to have any price support at all.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will yield further, I might say that perhaps I was wrong in not pointing out to the Senators on the other side, before they voted, just what they were doing to their States in helping to break down a long-range

program. I supposed they all knew what they were doing. If they did not, they misunderstood.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sure that those who voted against the amendment at least thought they knew what they were doing.

Mr. AIKEN. I also assume that both Senators from Kentucky knew what they were doing when they offered the amendment which has now been adopted, which actually reduces the support on tobacco if S. 2318 is not enacted.

Mr. BARKLEY. We were taking our chances on that.

Mr. AIKEN. I desire to say, too, for the benefit of both Senators from Maryland that the long-range bill would increase the parity price of Maryland tobacco approximately 16 or 18 cents a pound.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not suppose any Senator representing a tobacco-growing State would weep very copious tears if an increase in the price of his product were vouchsafed by reason of legislation. What I wanted to say was that if the legislation providing an over-all program is not enacted, it will not be on account of the amendment the Senate has just adopted; it will be for other reasons. The fact that the legislation is only brought here now, at the end of the session, may have made some contribution to the inability of the two Houses to get together on it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the legislation has been here for 6 weeks.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee in the House has not considered the legislation, and I am advised will not consider it at this session.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in all fairness?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. First, I should like to say the legislation was brought to the Senate on the 15th of May. Next, I should like to say that, regardless of what the House does now, the House committee had an appropriation of $25,000 made available to them last fall that they started and took their first step in the direction of long-range agricultural legislation before the Senate committee started; and that the House committee held considerably more hearings than did the Senate committee. I am sure most members of the House committee are familiar with the legislation which we are acting upon here now, and would be ready to act upon it on short notice if it came to the floor of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know, but I am told by members of the House committee they will not consider the legislation without holding further hearings. We know the difficulty which will be encountered concerning this bill if we adjourn Saturday. I have done what I could to cooperate with the majority in bringing about an adjournment, because I think if we sit here until after the convention, or if we sit here between the conventions, or after the two conventions, the entire time of the Congress will be taken up with political bickering and political legislation and political oratory, and I do not want that to be brought about. I want to finish what we can finish and adjourn the Congress, and I have tried my best to cooperate with the leaders on the other side to bring about an adjournment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would permit me to say that the House committee started holding their hearings on the long-range program before the Senate committee began. We had a joint hearing of the committees to hear the Secretary of Agriculture. The House has held more hearings than the Senate, and admittedly they may not have been as fruitful.

Mr. BARKLEY. Be that as it may, this is Thursday before the contemplated adjournment on Saturday. They have not reported any proposed legislation of this character, and I am advised they will not do so; but that is not our responsibility.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The situation is most regrettable. I frankly say to the senior Senator from Kentucky and the junior Senator from Kentucky that I have a great respect and admiration for both of them. My reason for asking to be recognized now is not on the basis of criticism. The Senators could offer the amendment, and if they succeeded in having it adopted it would show they had more friends than those of us who opposed the amendment had. I desire to refer to the question now in order that Senators may understand how thoroughly the committee went into the study of the entire subject, and into the development of the thoughts embodied in this particular long-range agricultural bill. The committee held hearings all over the Nation, and came forth with recommendations which are embodied in the bill, as they got them from the producer groups of the Nation.

In order that the senior Senator from Kentucky may fully appreciate how much thought we gave to the matter and how we attempted to be fair in every sense in dealing with all the price structures—and that is why I say it is regrettable that Senators must in a way break it up into little pieces and have special prices in the parity formula for certain commodities, I should like to say to him that if we had wanted to be technical we could have raised the question for the dairy producer in this same manner: During the war years the Congress, through the Commodity Credit Corporation and the marketing organization of the Department of Agriculture agreed that, in order to keep the price of different products down so that the consumer would not have to pay excessive prices, they would pay to the producer a daily feed subsidy payment. They also paid to the processor a subsidy payment. That held the price of milk down to the producer. When we commenced to figure parity, none of us quarreled about having subsidy prices included. We said, "We will take what the producer actually receives per hundred pounds for milk and per pound for butterfat," and if we had wanted to be technical and had asked for special consideration to firm up the price to the producer by use of the subsidy, we would have found that in the case of milk the parity price in the formula would have been, without subsidies figured in, $4.12; with subsidies figured in, $4.35. That would have made a difference of 23 cents higher per hundred pounds.

On butterfat, without subsidies figured in, it would have been 65.2 cents; with subsidies figured in, 69.7 cents; a difference of 4.5 cents per pound of butterfat.

We did not argue the fact that a subsidy had been given the producer. We might have said it was a subsidy to the consumer, rather than to the producer. We took it on the basis of what the farmer had received. That is why it is so regrettable, to me, to see ourselves involved in an argument which might well destroy the chances of the passage of the bill. Furthermore, it gives an opportunity to another group to say, "Give me a special privilege, because you recognized the tobacco people and gave them a special privilege in parity insofar as their commodity is concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not care to consume the time of the Senate in arguing and rearguing the merits of the amendment which has been offered. In all our legislation on agriculture we have placed tobacco in a special category because it occupied a special situation. But I shall not go into that. What I want to refute is the idea that because we have adopted one amendment, in the exercise of our judgment, with reference to a product which contributed before the war one-eighth of the entire revenue of the Government, we have destroyed agricultural legislation. There is no excuse for any such red herring to be drawn across the fabric of this legislation because we have adopted one amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I want to make a brief observation to the able Senator from Vermont who is in charge of the bill, if I may have his attention. I am sure the Senator is conversant with the old adage which says "Whom the gods destroy they first make mad." I am sure the distinguished Senator from Vermont will not succeed in the persuasion of his colleagues as to the merits of his bill by rebuking and reproving those who may happen to vote a certain way. If the able Senator so departs from his usually genial manner of persuasive arguments as to follow that false policy, I think he will share the responsibility for the ill fate which may overtake the measure which he is sponsoring.

Mr. President, we voted a short time ago. I was not aware that it was customary in the Senate for Senators to have to explain to their colleagues the discretion which they employed upon the Senate floor. So far as concerns the advice which was given by the able Senator from Vermont to my colleague and to me, that we would have to explain to our people, I will say that it has been customary for Senators to explain to their own people, but not to feel the necessity of explaining to others. We felt in this matter that there was a justifiable distinction for this particular amendment. We consulted about it, we

thought about it, and we considered the small number of buyers. We were debating a few moments ago the limited market which exists, with almost the power of conspiracy that the few purchasers have over the market, and I felt justified, on account of the peculiar facts pertaining to the matter, in voting for the amendment offered by the able Senators from Kentucky. If I do not err, I think almost every Senator from the tobacco area voted the same way, certainly with no ill will, and, in my case, certainly with no indisposition toward the final passage of the bill itself.

I want to say to my distinguished colleague that I am proud to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and it is my intention generally to support the bill. I do not intend to support the substitute. But the Senator must make it plain, in my humble judgment, what the bill does, and the strength and merit of it, and by his persuasion and by his argument convince his colleagues, rather than to attempt to intimidate them by his rebuke and stern reproval, which are so out of character with the genial and able Senator from Vermont. I am sure his offense will not be repeated.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky. He has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have the highest regard and respect for the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and I speak only out of respect for my friend and colleague the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

I have stated repeatedly that I intended to support the pending bill. Before I offered the amendment for myself and my colleague, I notified the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and several of the members of that committee, of my intended action. Last night it was announced that the amendment would be the pending business today and that I would discuss its provisions at 11 o'clock, and ample notice and opportunity was given every Member to study its provisions.

Today, upon the commencement of debate I admitted, as my colleague from Kentucky later admitted, that the amendment did give special consideration to tobacco with respect to support price. In our arguments we presented the reasons which we believed justified its adoption and I can say that we presented the arguments against it. Every Member had an opportunity to make a decision upon the amendment. I can say for myself, and I know I would have the confirmation of other Senators on this side of the aisle, that I did not urge anyone of the majority to vote for the amendment, other than upon its merits. I am sure that those who voted for it did so upon the basis of their conviction as to its merits.

During the course of the debate I said that I would vote for the farm bill so ably advocated by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and I intend to vote for it. I agree with my colleague from Kentucky that the amendment which we presented does not affect adversely the bill. It is fair in its terms, because it deals with a special problem. If the majority—and I speak to my own side—vote for the farm bill, it will be passed. We cannot shift the responsibility to the minority. If we want to vote for the farm bill, we will vote for it, and it will pass.

I simply make this statement out of respect and affection for my colleague and in justice to all of those who supported the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to thank my colleague. I have said all I want to say except that I hope other Senators will not be frightened by the fear which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has sought to inject into their hearts by the adoption of one amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he yields the floor?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to state for the RECORD the changes in the parity of different types of tobacco which the present law provides and which the present bill would provide. It would increase the parity price of burley and flue-cured tobacco between 3½ and 5 cents a pound. I leave that latitude because the figures I have are for March 15.

It would increase the parity price of Maryland type 32 tobacco approximately 19 cents a pound.

It would increase the parity price of Pennsylvania seed-leaf tobacco approximately 3.6 cents a pound.

It would increase the parity price of Connecticut wrapper tobacco from 98.9 cents a pound to $1.63 a pound, which is almost 60 or 70 percent.

The reason for the lesser change in the flue-cured and burley tobaccos is that some years ago the flue-cured and burley tobacco growers came to Congress and secured a different base period. In S. 2318 we offer a proposal to put tobacco parity prices in the order in which they should be, namely, a slight increase of approximately 10 percent for burley and flue-cured tobacco, an increase of approximately 40 percent for Maryland tobacco, and an increase of 60 to 70 percent for the northern Connecticut-type wrapper tobacco.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Vermont, is it correct or not that the Maryland tobacco farmers have not heretofore shared in any support program?

Mr. AIKEN. The Maryland tobacco farmers' support prices and parity prices have been completely out of line with burley and flue-cured.

Mr. TYDINGS. That was not my question.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether they have ever shared in the support program.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator will find that the Maryland tobacco farmers have not come in under the support program, which has been in effect for a long time, and they are asking for it now only because it has become the settled policy of the country. The point is that they have "taken it on the chin" when times are bad and shared in the prosperity of the country when times were good. This is the first time they have ever been in the support program, so far as I know. I wish to bring out that, therefore, there could not be any decrease in their benefits, because heretofore they have not had any.

Mr. AIKEN. I would say that I think one reason why they have not shared in the support price is because of the inequitable parity price which they have received.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; they asked particularly, when this program was first initiated, to be excluded rather than included under it.

Mr. AIKEN. Then they probably will not be very happy now to get 10 or 12 cents a pound less support than they would under Senate bill 2318.

Mr. TYDINGS. This year, I understand, the price was so low that with the rest of the country receiving the benefits of support prices, they feel they must come in as a matter of self-defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted en bloc by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate that the distinguished Senator from Vermont has labored long and ably upon the pending bill. I appreciate that his desire has imbued him with such confidence in the bill, including all its provisions, that he very probably is acting under his own convictions when he insists upon the Senate passing his bill without dotting any "i's" or crossing any "t's," but I say respectfully to the Senator from Vermont, if he will be kind enough to give attention to what I am saying now, that in my humble judgment he far transcends the bounds of ethics and of proper conduct on the floor of the Senate when he questions the sincerity of conviction and the reliance upon their conscientious convictions of Senators who happen to differ with him and with his judgment upon one phase of the bill.

It so happens, Mr. President, that I am strongly in support of the bill in general. I so advised the distinguished Senator from Vermont only this morning. That did not indicate by any means that I did surrender or that I should surrender my convictions upon every aspect of the bill, and upon each and every amendment which might be proposed to it.

I wish to say briefly to the Senator from Vermont that I have no feeling because of his accusations, because I suspect he has been led astray by his zeal. I join in the expressions given by my able colleague to the effect that the statements by the Senator from Vermont are entirely out of character. I have never heard him heretofore question the good faith or the soundness of conscience of any of his colleagues.

Be that as it may, let me say that in my judgment this bill itself makes distinctions between various branches of agriculture which existed in the judgment

of the committee or a majority of the committee, and which I think are justified. For instance, it makes distinction between basic commodities and nonbasic commodities, and it proceeds to accord different treatment to them. Likewise it makes distinctions between certain other commodities and the wool which was mentioned a few minutes ago by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. It makes distinctions between other nonbasic commodities and a certain agricultural commodity, potatoes, covered by an amendment which has been accepted by the committee.

If there are Senators present who, because of their experience, feel that there is yet another distinction which should be made, and stand up here to be counted in order that that distinction may be made in the bill, it is the humble opinion of the junior Senator from Florida that they should not be questioned for the soundness of their conviction merely because they state it and support it by their votes upon the floor of the Senate.

I join my able colleague in saying that, so far as he and I are concerned, we are quite willing to make our report and to render our account to our own constituents whom we represent. But let me say that while we are making our report and rendering our account to that large number of our constituents who happen to be producers of citrus fruit, I think we will be able to say to that considerable number of our people who produce tobacco that we have stood up for them, and for what we regard as their rights, and for equitable treatment for them, just as we have stood up for the larger group who happen to represent the great and growing citrus industry in the State of Florida.

So far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, he was born under an orange tree, he has always represented the citrus fruit producers of his State, he represented them in the city of Washington on citrus matters before he became chief executive of his State, the citrus industry has been his first love and major love in agriculture, and he has been very happy to note the treatment accorded to growers of citrus fruit in this bill. He is supporting the bill, and is supporting the treatment which is accorded them under the provisions of the bill.

Notwithstanding that is the fact, he feels that he also owes a duty to those in his State, and to the people elsewhere in the United States, who produce another agricultural commodity, namely, tobacco, and when in his experience and in his judgment he feels they are entitled to the treatment which is proposed by an amendment, he has the right to support that amendment without having his judgment questioned and the sincerity of his convictions assailed by another Senator who knows far less about the tobacco industry than do the Senators from the States where tobacco is produced.

Insofar as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, let me say to the Senator from Vermont that but a few months ago, in common with other Senators from the tobacco belt, I learned of a distressing incident, showing the strangle-hold which a relatively small number of buyers, representing the processors of tobacco, have upon the growers who produce tobacco. In a little town in our State, Jasper, in Hamilton County, there was organized a new market, with the approval of the United States Department of Agriculture, which had placed in that market graders to serve it. It was understood that there would be an adequate number of buyers there, but the buyers chose not to be there, and after a few days' operation, as my distinguished colleague will recall, we were advised that, not because that county had not produced a large volume of tobacco, much more than enough to support a market, not because the United State Department of Agriculture had not sent its graders there, because it had, but merely because the tobacco companies of the United States and elsewhere who have buyers at the markets saw fit, in their sole judgment, not to allow their buyers to come there, that market was closed, and the growers of that community were put to great expense, and a near disaster was visited upon them.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I wish to speak with complete approval of the position taken by both of the distinguished Senators from Kentucky in differentiating the tobacco industry from any other agricultural industry of which I know. Not only is the reference to the buyer situation, which was so ably portrayed by both the distinguished Kentucky Senators, accurate, but their statement on the question of the nonfluctuating volume of tobacco produced is likewise accurate. Under the law now in effect the acreage which is planted to tobacco is controlled under a quota system which has been approved by the growers by an overwhelming percentage, and under which no grower who fails to keep within his quota under his allotment of acreage can have his tobacco supported by the price support system set up by the United States Government. There is not any large fluctuation, therefore, in the amount produced.

I fully and entirely agree with the conclusions stated by the junior and the senior Senators from Kentucky that that situation, bringing about as it does a more or less level production of tobacco, has to be differentiated very greatly from that of other agricultural industries.

Let us take the case of the citrus industry, in which the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and myself are particularly interested, and which I think is equally a cause for concern to the Senators from Texas, from Arizona, from California, and perhaps from other States. Let me remind the distinguished Senator from Vermont that when we are talking about citrus we are talking about a crop which is produced on trees that were planted before the Senator was born, before any of us here in this body were born, because there are citrus trees in the Mediterranean area, for instance, now yielding fruit, which are over 500 years old. There are citrus trees in a grove belonging to my family, planted by my father with his own hands in 1881, and they are yielding more now than they have ever yielded at any time since they were planted. It is simply idle to talk about comparing production of trees like that, and on unlimited acreage, with production in an industry where the annual acreage quota is parceled out, man to man and farm to farm, in all the producing areas.

I am going to close in a moment. I want to say to the Senator from Vermont that I resent with all my being his charge that Senators who do not happen to agree with him are not following the convictions of their own consciences. So far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, if he had not taken this position, if he had not voted for what he thought was equity for his tobacco producers, he could not have followed the Senator from Vermont in his support of the bill as against the substitute measure, the House measure, which I understand is to be presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], because in the judgment of the junior Senator from Florida it is so manifestly clear that unless there is a firm price-support system, not a fluctuating one, in the tobacco field, the tobacco growers are the ones who are going to suffer, and suffer badly. I, for one, without questioning the judgment of the Senator from Vermont and all who agree with him, merely want to say that I do not believe they have sufficiently considered the differences between the tobacco industry and these other great agricultural industries which are covered and protected by the bill.

So far as I am concerned, I would vote for the substitute measure, much as I want this bill and strongly as I will support it, rather than to see a relatively small but important group, so far as our State is concerned, mistreated and placed in such a situation that they can be hurt from year to year and at any time by the machinations of a group of buyers not constituting more in number than the fingers of my two hands.

So, Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from Vermont will realize that he has been led too far by his zeal, and will offer apology, as he should, to those whose judgment happens to differ from his, and who have stood up for what they thought was right, and who should not be questioned as to the soundness or sincerity of their convictions by the Senator from Vermont or by anyone else on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I want to say just a word in support of the position taken by the Senator from Vermont, that special amendments like the one just adopted will kill the bill. The whole theory of the long-range farm bill is to get back to a stable peacetime support program, and away from the Steagall Act which provided for wartime supports to encourage great production in the long-range bill.

In the case of corn the support levels are reduced from $1.60 to $1.42 a bushel. In the case of wheat the support levels are reduced from $2.21 to $1.82 a bushel, a drop of 39 cents a bushel. I have accepted this lowered support on the theory that a farmer would much rather

have a permanent support on a fair level rather than high levels for 1 year and probably in the end have no supports at all.

Whenever a crop such as tobacco is singled out for special support higher than other commodities in peacetime, and then lower the supports of all other products of the great Middle West, then I for one will have to vote against this bill and in favor of the House bill if amended. I will not vote to provide special legislation for one agricultural commodity as against all the others.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say in regard to the remarks of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], that the Senator from Vermont at no time intended to question the motives of any Senator across the aisle, nor does he question the right of any Senator on either side of the aisle to vote as he thinks he ought to on any question. I was simply making a statement of fact; that is, that the vote to give special legislation to one agricultural commodity in the proposed agricultural program is a vote to start tearing down the entire program itself.

I also wanted to point out to the producers of every State what the effect would be of doing away with Senate bill 2318 and the provisions it contains. I wanted to point out to the citrus growers of Florida that, if that bill is killed and they have to operate only under the stop-gap bill, they are going to get only the support they have received this year, which has been totally inadequate, and they will not be able to take advantage of the greatly increased support which Senate bill 2318 would have given to the citrus and the apple growers.

I desire to make one more statement of a fact of which I assume the Senator from Florida was not aware when he voted. If S. 2318 is defeated as a result of the adoption of this amendment, then the level of support to the tobacco growers of Florida and every other State will be lower than it would be under S. 2318. I have already pointed out that Senate bill 2318 provides an increase in the parity price of all types of tobacco, varying from about 10 percent in the case of burley and flue-cured tobacco, up to something like 60 percent in the case of Connecticut seed-leaf tobacco.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I was very sorry to see the political aspects of this vote, only three Members on the Democratic side voting to sustain the committee's position on the long-range program, and only three or four on the Republican side voting against it. We have tried our best to keep this long-range agricultural program out of politics, and we have been successful up to now. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who is now on his feet, will agree that at no time has politics entered into the writing of the bill. It is unfortunate that it should creep in at this time. But if it must be a political issue, thank God I am on the right side of it. If the Democrats want to kill the long-range agricultural program, I do not know any reason why any farmer should vote the Democratic ticket this fall. I noticed the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] voting for this amendment, which, if carried further, can only spell disaster to the wool growers of his State. I noticed the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] voting against the amendment and for his sheep growers.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am intensely interested in this bill, as the Senator well knows. I am certainly interested in building a long-range agricultural program which will be acceptable to the farmers and the voters of the country.

I should like to know from the Senator what the impact of the amendment which has been adopted will be in relation to the farmers of my section so far as concerns partity prices on corn, wheat, or any other product which is raised. What will be the impact of the amendment upon those commodities?

Mr. AIKEN. When special advantages are given to one commodity, they must necessarily be taken from some other. The wheat growers and corn growers of the Senator's State never have protested in the least against this bill, which reduces the parity prices of their products.

If there is any commodity to which the bill gives special advantages, it is tobacco. I have explained the reason why. The tobacco grower is at the mercy of foreign government monopolies, which can break his prices unless we fix a floor below which they cannot go. So in the bill we have given what amounts to 90 percent parity to the tobacco growers of the country for an indefinite time. That means 90 percent of parity figured according to the present parity formula, or as good support as they are getting now. By the terms of the bill we would give much better support to Maryland tobacco and to the cigar-type tobacco than they now receive.

Mr. WHERRY. If the amendment remains in the bill, a special parity will be granted to tobacco which does not proportionately go to the producers of any other commodities, such as corn and wheat.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. Special additional advantages are given to the one commodity which had the greatest advantage given any commodity in Senate bill 2318.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the amendment which my colleague and I offered, and which the Senate adopted, reduces the parity price for tobacco below what is carried in the bill, how could that possibly affect any other commodity in the United States agricultural picture?

Mr. AIKEN. This is only a start.

Mr. BARKLEY. No, it is not a start.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not unaware of the purposes which exists in the breasts of some in this country to destroy the long-range farm bill. It can be done by one means or another.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator accusing me of trying to do that?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not; but the surest way to destroy any program is to start giving special privileges to this commodity, that commodity, and the other commodity simply because there are votes enough to do it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that statement is totally unfair.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we are on the regular order. The unfinished business is the agricultural bill. The Senator from Vermont has the floor, and he can yield to whomever he pleases, for any question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is protecting the right of the Senator who has the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The only reason I demanded the regular order was that I wanted to determine to whom the Senator from Vermont would yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the regular order is Senate bill 2318, the long-range farm program bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry if I disturbed my good friend from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I wish to make one observation which I think is pertinent to the colloquy which is in progress. I believe that anyone who understands the bill must agree with the proposition that in the event the bill should be passed as is, with the amendment which was offered by the able Senators from Kentucky, tobacco would receive preferential treatment. Anyone who does not agree with that simply does not understand the bill. There can be no question about it. I am assuming, of course, that no other commodities will come in for preferential treatment, and that the same mandatory 90-percent parity will not be demanded for other commodities.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, let me pay a tribute to the minority leader [Mr. BARKLEY]. He has done a great job in behalf of the tobacco amendment. I seriously doubt that my good friend from Kentucky realizes what has been done by the adoption of this amendment. I say that with the utmost sincerity.

It so happens that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Illinois were members of the subcommittee which helped to write the bill. We went all over the country and held hearings. We tried to keep the issue as nonpartisan as possible, and we succeeded. Yet, strange as it may seem,

we were the only three members on this side who voted against the amendment.

I did so knowing that once we permit one commodity to have preferential treatment under the bill, as has been done in the case of tobacco, then there is no reason why I should not offer an amendment to give the corn producers of my State the same kind of treatment. There is no reason why the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] should not offer an amendment to do the same for the wheat producers of his State. So we shall go down the line of basic and nonbasic commodities, and give them all preferential treatment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What was it that happened yesterday with respect to potatoes? Something was done in regard to potatoes, putting them in a special classification. Some preference, priority, or favor was granted in the case of potatoes. I do not know just what it was, but it seems to have affected the situation so far as the author of the substitute is concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Vermont can explain what happened to potatoes, if anything. I was not in the Chamber at the time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether it happened on the floor or not.

Mr. LUCAS. I am speaking now about a basic commodity which has been under the Agricultural Adjustment Act from the very beginning, namely, tobacco. The corn producers and the wheat producers have taken a terrific lacing in this bill, so far as the reduction of parity is concerned. However, I believe that the farmers in my section have vision enough to look far down the road on this agricultural program. They are attempting to get a stable program. We know that prices cannot continue high forever. What we shall do, if we are not careful, is to fool around and get no program at all—not even a continuation of the support prices they have had. That is what some folks want. I do not refer to the Senator from Kentucky, but there are some who want to kill the farm program and go back to 1938, or even farther back than that, if they can. I undertake to say that this attempt on the part of the Senator from Vermont and others who worked for months on the farm bill with the Department of Agriculture and with all segments of agriculture and other interested groups in this country represents a pretty good approach to a long-range farm program.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the hard work and the sincere effort devoted to the solution of this problem by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the Senator does.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have great respect for that committee, and I have been sympathetic with it. The tobacco grower has occupied a special situation in the Agricultural Adjustment Act all along.

Mr. LUCAS. Not on the question of parity.

Mr. BARKLEY. He was given a different base period, because of the conditions which exist in the tobacco industry.

Mr. LUCAS. He was entitled to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. When the bill was originally introduced, it was utterly impossible for tobacco to live on an equitable basis under it. The tobacco growers from all over the country came to Washington and went before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and asked for five changes in the provisions of the bill as originally introduced by the Senator from Vermont. Three of those changes were made. Two of the changes were not made. Now because my colleague and I have submitted an amendment asking for a fourth change, which was requested by the tobacco growers, are we to be castigated and accused of not knowing what we are doing, simply because we have asked for what the tobacco growers have asked for? They know more about what they need than anyone else does. Because we in the Senate vote to adopt as a part of the bill what the tobacco growers ask for, I do not think we should be held up to contumely and ridicule for doing what they ask for. We are trying to represent them in a fair way.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not castigating the Senator from Kentucky, and I do not expect to do so. I complimented him.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said I did not know what I was doing.

Mr. LUCAS. No, I said the Senator did not know what he was doing if he contends that tobacco has no preferential treatment, providing the bill is adopted as is, with the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it would seem that the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Vermont do not agree. The Senator from Illinois says we have given tobacco special treatment by this amendment. The Senator from Vermont says that we have injured tobacco by the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me repeat that it is impossible to take a basic commodity such as tobacco and make it mandatory that it shall receive 90 percent of parity, regardless of how much is produced, and then say that corn and wheat shall receive from 60 percent to 90 percent of parity, depending on the amounts that are produced.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator does not contend that the parity price of tobacco will have the slightest effect on corn or wheat.

Mr. LUCAS. No; but that is not the point. The Senator does not want to reach the point, it seems.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from Illinois mean that after we adopt the tobacco amendment, we have to adopt amendments for corn and wheat?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. That does not follow.

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly what will follow. Now that tobacco is to have 90 percent of parity, it will be only fair to provide 90 percent of parity for corn and wheat, which is exactly what is provided under the Steagall amendment. Under it there is provision for practically 90 percent of parity for all basic commodities—and now that must be done under this bill, once the tobacco amendment has been adopted, if Senators wish to be fair. But if we make such a provision in this bill for all basic commodities, then we go back to the arrangement to which the Senator does not want to go.

I do not want to destroy the long-range farm program, but under the circumstances that will be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it is perhaps a waste of time to talk further about what we have done, but it seems that other Senators are not willing to drop the subject. So I say that all we are doing is what has been done all along with respect to tobacco, because tobacco occupies a special situation which is not recognized in this bill without the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. In the bill we recognize tobacco as being a commodity which needs special treatment. As the Senator has ably pointed out, tobacco gets a better deal under this bill. But I do not seem to be able to make myself understood.

I am saying that when one commodity is set aside and treated specially, and when the producers of that commodity are told, "We will give you 90 percent of parity, and we will guarantee it to you," but when the wheat growers and corn growers and the producers of other basic commodities and the producers of nonbasic commodities are told that they will not get that much, but will get a lower support price, depending on the amount of the commodity produced and the amount of the carry-over, then it is obvious that equal treatment is not provided. Certainly I cannot see that it is. If it is, then my name is not SCOTT LUCAS.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say with respect to the amendment just adopted that the amendment guarantees the tobacco grower 90 percent forever or for as long as the amendment remains on the statute books. Senate bill 2318 guarantees tobacco, in a sense, preferential treatment which would amount to a slightly higher support level for the next 2 or 3 years than the support level which will be available to tobacco growers under the present support-price program. However, there is no knowledge but what that might drop in future years. The Senator from Kentucky wants tobacco to be guaranteed 90 percent of parity forever. Certainly that is unfair to the producers of other commodities.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to have the Senator from Kentucky realize—inasmuch as I think he said he was not familiar with the potato amendment—that what the potato producers asked for was to be put in the 60-to-90-percent-of-parity class. So there was no discrimination at all in their favor. They are to have only the same provision that the producers of wheat, corn, and so forth will have.

Mr. BARKLEY. What was the status of the potato growers until that provision was adopted?

Mr. BREWSTER. They had been outside the provision allowing from 60 percent to 90 percent of parity; they had been under the Steagall amendment provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose they wished to get 90 percent of parity.

Mr. BREWSTER. The potato producers had it all the time, under the Steagall amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. But that was to expire, I believe.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes, on December 30.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think I have no more to say, except to stand by what I have said: namely, that the amendment just adopted is harmful, and may mean the destruction of the long-range farm program. If the program is destroyed, those responsible for destroying it should be held accountable for their actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the two amendments submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts, which are to be considered en bloc.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished and affable Senator from Vermont has twice honored me this afternoon with a reference to me in the castigation he has delivered against those who did not agree with him upon the last amendment. I hope he will not be angry with me throughout the day. I hope his sentiments will not last out the day, if indeed they last through the day.

It seems to me that the debate we have listened to since the vote on the motion to lay on the table was taken is a demonstration of the correctness of the rules of procedure in the Senate. I should like to read to the Senator from Vermont the rule which I think he has slightly, at least, violated today.

Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont spoke with such virility and in such a tone of voice that all of us listened to him. I know that I am not in the passion he was in, but I hope he will accord me the courtesy of listening to me now.

I was pointing out to the Senator from Vermont that when he delivered his rebuke to the Members of this body who voted to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the tobacco amendment was adopted, he was speaking in such a timbre of voice that everyone here listened to him, and I hope he will listen to me for just a moment while I say to him that I believe the debate which has taken place here illustrates the sound judgment of those who wrote the rules of debate under which the Senate is supposed to proceed. I doubt very much whether the Senator from Vermont had this rule in mind when he accused those of us who voted with the Senators from Kentucky of voting against our consciences.

This is the rule of debate, and is a part of rule XIX:

> No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

I suggest to the Senator from Vermont that when he said, as he did upon this floor a few moments ago, that those of us who voted in support of the motion of the Senators from Kentucky were voting against our consciences and for purely political motives, he was violating that rule. I forgive the Senator that violation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator, just when did the Senator from Vermont say the Senator from Wyoming was voting against his conscience?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator in his statement—and the RECORD would show it I am sure—was speaking in such fashion that he probably does not remember his words now.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Wyoming remember them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator designates those who voted this way as having voted from mere political motives and against convictions.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Vermont accused the senior Senator from Wyoming twice of having voted against the wool growers of Wyoming.

Mr. AIKEN. I think he voted against their interests.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is entitled to that opinion, but the RECORD shows the vote that was cast was a vote on a tobacco amendment. That can be a vote against the wool growers or against the growers of any other commodity, only if the Senator from Vermont intends to attempt to punish Senators who did not agree with him.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Wyoming contend that when all but three Democrats vote on one side of a question and all but three Republicans vote on the other side, the question is wholly nonpolitical?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator I can never judge what the political motives of Senators may be on a divided vote.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is very astute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very generous. I am merely expressing the hope the Senator's anger will not last out the day. I am pointing out to him that in all legislation, a vote in favor of one agricultural commodity is not a vote against another, unless the Senator in charge of the bill feels so deeply about it that he will attempt to punish the growers of another commodity because of the vote the Senate has cast, evidently not in the manner he desired.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know what the Senator from Wyoming means by punishment, but if the bill is defeated by a vote of all but three of the Democrats, the Senator from Vermont will do everything within his power to defeat the election of a Democratic administration this fall. If that is punishment, the Senator will have to make the most of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Vermont intend to do that, anyway?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator from Vermont my belief is, regardless of what may be the decision of the Congress upon the pending bill, and regardless of the vote of any Democratic Member of this body upon the bill, the Senator from Vermont will be supporting the Republican ticket. I certainly do not cast my vote here upon the bill or upon any amendment to it in the hope of inducing the Senator from Vermont to support the Democratic ticket.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course the nonpolitical attitude of the Senator from Wyoming is well known. I am sure nobody in the country would accuse him of being politically minded. I certainly do not accuse him of casting his vote from political motives. I am sure he voted according to the dictates of his conscience, just as did the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Oklahoma, and the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. There must be consciences enough to go around on the other side of the aisle. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad the Senator has finally made that acknowledgment. As I say, I hope he will not continue to hold his resentment against us to such an extent that he will vote against another commodity should an amendment be offered by one of those who did not vote with him.

Of course, I have no reason for giving any explanation whatever for any vote I may cast here to any other Member of the body. I am content to make my explanations of my votes to my own constituents. But I may say to the Senator from Vermont, that on numerous occasions he has indicated his belief in certain economic principles in which I also believe. The Senator has indicated on numerous occasions that he is an opponent of monopolies and restraints of trade and the great concentration of economic power which has made it necessary for us to have farm legislation. The Senator from Vermont knows very well that the industrial powers of this country have, on occasion after occasion, in year after year, denied to the agricultural group the equal break to which they are entitled. I am ready to compliment the Senator from Vermont here or anywhere and every day for the great fight he is making on behalf of agriculture, but I am sure he knows, as I know, there is probably no agricultural commodity produced in the United States which is more the victim of monopolistic control than is tobacco. I may add my explanation to the Senator, though I need not make it, that I voted with the Senator from Kentucky because I believed the tobacco processors have a stranglehold upon that agricultural product.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe the tobacco processors can keep a stranglehold upon the tobacco growers under the provisions of Senate bill 2318? Does he believe the bill treats the tobacco growers unfairly?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, not at all; I did not say so.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator voted against its provision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quarreling with us because some of us voted against what he is pleased to call special treatment for tobacco. I justify my vote to the Senator and to anybody else who may be interested, upon the ground that I believe the situation is such that the tobacco growers are entitled to the consideration given in the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should merely like to make this comment: The Senator from Arizona does not come from a tobacco-growing State, nor does the junior Senator from Arizona use tobacco. Therefore, the junior Senator from Arizona was not trying to get a smoke out of the vote. But I may say that the votes of some of us have created more smoke than I have seen created by tobacco for a long time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am content to say that the process of legislation is always a process of give and take, and eventually of compromise. Nobody ever gets what he would like to get, particularly upon a difficult and detailed bill, such as the one under consideration, which has been reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I want to make it clear to the acting chairman of the committee and to all the members of the committee who have participated in the work upon the pending measure that I am appreciative of the labors they have performed. I hope their work will be crowned with success. I shall vote to support the bill, but I hope that the members of the committee will not adopt a defeatist attitude and act as though the adoption of a single amendment by a majority vote of the Senate will result in killing the legislation. It need not kill it. One vote upon one amendment will not decide the fate of this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], which are being considered en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let us now test the issue. I offer the following amendment:

On page 81, line 8, I propose to insert, after the word "pounds" and before the period the words "of shorn wool."

That is a simple amendment intended to make it clear, which I think it was intended to be, that the 360,000,000 pounds of wool referred to in subparagraph (c) of section 302 is shorn wool. Wool is a commodity the production of which in the United States historically has been far less than the consumption. In only one year in the entire recent history of this industry has the United States produced more wool than it has consumed. That was in the depth of the depression.

The average percentage of domestic production of the amount consumed in the United States is less than 50 percent. In recent years the production of wool has been steadily declining, but the basis for wool was established in a year when the price of wool was the lowest in its history, and the result has been that, although the average price of all agricultural commodities has increased 146.9 percent, the price of wool has increased only 12.1 percent.

There are two types of wool—shorn wool and pulled wool. Pulled wool is only a comparatively small part of the total.

The average production of wool has been approximately 400,000,000 pounds. In 1932 it was 442,000,000 pounds. In 1933 it was 438,000,000 pounds. In 1936 it was 419,000,000 pounds. In 1940 it went up to 434,000,000 pounds. It fell off in 1947 to 310,000,000 pounds.

So that, as a matter of making an adjustment to fit the facts, I am urging this amendment so it will be made sure that the purpose of the bill is to support the price of wool at not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of its parity price of January 1, so as to maintain an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool, which is less than 33⅓ percent of the entire consumption of wool in the United States.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, may I add to the words of my colleague and point out what I think is very important, that while the production of wool in the United States has decreased, the consumption has increased to a very great extent. At the time the production of wool in the United States was 450,000,000 pounds, which was referred to by my colleague, consumption was approximately 600,000,000 pounds, making it necessary to import approximately 150,000,000 pounds. During the war the consumption of wool increased to more than 1,000,000,000 pounds. While it was anticipated that that increase would drop with the end of hostilities, that has not proved to be the case. As a matter of fact, the consumption of wool today in the United States is approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds, and production is probably not more than 300,000,000 pounds. Anticipating the importation of approximately 700,000,000 pounds of wool each year, it is very necessary that the domestic wool grower should be given every possible encouragement on a long-term basis to bring the production up at least to what it was some years ago, when it reached the figure of 450,000,000 pounds.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have a table which shows the production of wool on a grease basis, the consumption, and the percentage that the domestic production is of the total consumption for the years 1918 to 1947. This table bears out what the Senator has just stated, that consumption has been increasing in the United States. For example, in 1934 the consumption in the United States was 381,400,000 pounds. That was the only year in the whole period when production exceeded consumption, which was in the depression period. Since that time consumption has been gradually rising, until in 1941, for the first time, it exceeded 1,000,000,000 pounds. The record in 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946 has been well over 1,000,000,000 pounds.

I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wool shorn and wool pulled from domestic fleeces in the United States, and the annual mill consumption of apparel shorn and pulled wools, 1918–47

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Production (grease basis)	Consumption (apparel class) grease basis	Percent domestic production is of total consumption
1918	296.0	676.0	43.8
1919	318.4	563.7	56.5
1920	293.8	510.9	57.5
1921	290.2	597.4	48.6
1922	270.4	640.4	42.2
1923	272.7	603.1	45.2
1924	282.0	518.0	54.4
1925	300.0	526.2	57.0
1926	318.9	524.1	60.8
1927	339.5	551.1	61.6
1928	366.7	511.9	71.6
1929	382.2	554.7	68.9
1930	414.0	447.9	92.4
1931	442.4	545.2	81.1
1932	418.1	439.8	95.0
1933	438.4	572.2	76.6
1934	429.4	381.4	112.6
1935	427.5	748.4	57.1
1936	[1]419.4	666.4	62.9
1937	[1]422.3	579.5	72.9
1938	[1]424.4	514.0	82.6
1939	[1]426.2	673.8	63.2
1940	[1]434.0	683.3	63.5
1941	[1]453.3	1,011.6	44.8
1942	[1]455.0	1,101.6	41.3
1943	[1]444.0	1,134.3	39.1
1944	[1]411.8	1,055.9	39.0
1945	[2]378.4	1,057.9	35.8
1946	[2]341.7	1,122.5	30.4
1947	310.1	915.0	33.9

[1] Revised.
[2] Preliminary, estimated.
Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say in regard to wool and the amendment which has been offered, that the committee considered that the wool situation, not only in the United States, but in the entire world, is approaching the crisis stage. There is an acute and growing shortage. Production in the United States has been constantly dropping, until last year it dropped to approximately 308,000,000 pounds of both pulled and shorn wool. The indications are—and the Senators from Wyoming will correct me if I am wrong—that it will drop below that figure this year. The committee felt that encouragement should be given to the wool industry, in the interests of national security. Not only did the growers advocate it, but representatives of the wool trade appeared this year with the growers and advocated a substantial support level for the price of wool. The committee felt, in choosing 360,000,000 pounds as the amount which should be produced in this country, we were taking a 10-year average production, and it appears to the committee that it will take several years to reach that total production.

In the bill the Secretary is instructed to support the price of wool at such level as will encourage production of 360,000,000 pounds. Inasmuch as the production at present is only 300,000,000 pounds, it would appear necessary to guarantee a

90-percent support price in order to approach that amount of wool production, even over a period of several years. We felt we were generous. If we had felt that 400,000,000 pounds should be the goal, we would have put it in, but we realized that the question of production exceeding 300,000,00 pounds would not arise for many years.

In regard to the stopgap bill which has been passed by the House, so far as I can see, it affords no lasting protection to the wool grower. It extends the present support price of 42.6 cents a pound until June 30, 1950. Senate bill 2318 would result in a support level of something over 46 cents a pound, which would probably increase about 2 cents for next year.

What I wish to point out is that the House extends the present support level on wool until June 30, 1950. That means that the support level on wool is extended for 2 years for Texas, Arizona, and Oklahoma wool, because the growers in those States can get the wool to the market by June 30, but the wool produced up in the mountains of Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho, would get support for only 1 year, and that would undoubtedly be a year of high prices, when they will not need it, because they cannot get the sheep shorn and the wool to market by the last of June. So, so far as the House bill goes, it is utterly worthless to the wool growers, in my opinion. Perhaps I should not say "utterly worthless," it might conceivably be of benefit to the southern wool growers in the year 1950.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to say that I quite agree that the bill which is now before the Senate is far superior to the mere continuing measure passed by the House, and I certainly hope that it is the bill which will prevail. I believe what the Senator has said is true of the wool growers not only, but of the producers of all agricultural commodities affected by the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Wyoming evidently understands the difference between the two bills very well, and realizes that one gives long-time protection to the wool grower and a long-time support level, and that the other gives practically nothing at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The other would operate just as a stopgap bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I should like to say, in connection with the subject under discussion, namely, the great necessity of a long-range program, that the cause of the reduction in the production of wool over the years from 450,000,000 pounds to less than 300,000,000 this year is that the sheep which grow the wool have been reduced in number from some 51,000,000 to probably around 30,000,000, and it is necessary to have a long-range program to encourage the sheepman, the wool grower, to increase his flocks up to 50,000,000 again in order to get the full production of wool in this country, and in doing so to enable the proper use to be made of the range in the western part of the country for the grazing of sheep.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absense of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Ives	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Cain	Kilgore	Stennis
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Chavez	McCarthy	Taylor
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McFarland	Thye
Cordon	McGrath	Tobey
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Umstead
Dworshak	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ecton	Martin	Wherry
Ellender	Maybank	White
Fezel	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	Williams
Flanders	Morse	Wilson
Fulbright	Murray	Young
Green	Myers	
Gurney	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the committee amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say in regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming that the amendment will make no difference in the support price of wool. It simply sets a little higher objective as the ultimate production, which would amount to probably 40,000,000 pounds a year more. Personally I do not find the amendment objectionable. I have no right to speak for the committee, because it has not voted on the amendment, but, so far as I am concerned, it is not an objectionable amendment, and will not result in any increase, or change in fact, in the support level of the price of wool.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives which will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 4435) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the administrator, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill. A similar bill is on the Senate Calendar, Order No. 1508, Senate bill 2466. Objection was made to the Senate bill when it was reached on the calendar by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. The Senator's objection has been met by the preparation of two amendments which I propose to offer to the House bill. In the interest of expedition of the matter I hope the Senate will pass the House bill with the amendments, and that it may go to conference immediately. I ask for immediate consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4435) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, would the Senator from Maine explain what the bill provides?

Mr. BREWSTER. The bill provides for the acquisition of rights in order to permit our airports to function more efficiently. It is a routine bill. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] objected to certain words in the bill, and he and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] have agreed on the language of the amendments which I now offer to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 4, after the word "airspace", it is proposed to insert "immediately adjacent thereto and needed in connection therewith."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 11, after the word "Congress" and before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That in the case of condemnations of easements through or other interests in airspace, in fixing condemnation awards, consideration may be given to the reasonable probable future use of the underlying land."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4435) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HAWKES, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill 2466 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, one of the good things this Congress has done was to pass the bill creating a National Heart Institute. Congress thereby joined with the millions of Americans who are insisting that an effective attack be launched on heart disease—America's No. 1 killer.

But, Mr. President, the Congress has not yet appropriated the funds needed if the Heart Institute is to become a reality. Unless we do so before adjourning we will be guilty of inadvertently perpetrating a fraud on the public. The people know we have passed the heart bill. They think it means something. Let us be sure, before we adjourn, that it does mean something.

I am confident that my colleagues, the members of the Appropriations Committee, fully intend to take the necessary action to make available such funds as the National Heart Institute can use effectively. I am mentioning the matter merely to preclude any possibility of its being overlooked by reason of the great pressure of work now confronting us and the haste at which we are moving.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to include in the record at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent and pertinent editorial from the New York Times of June 16. And in this connection too I want to inform the Members of the Senate of the results of a just-completed Gallup poll on this subject. I am informed that 80 percent of the American people have indicated that they are willing to pay increased taxes if that is necessary to finance an appropriation of $100,000,000 to fight heart disease. I am sure that the Institute will need but a tenth of that amount. And I am sure that we will want to appropriate it. Let us make sure we do not forget.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONEY FOR HEART ILLS

Both Houses of Congress have passed a bill which would establish a National Heart Institute to combat diseases of the heart and circulatory system through research, the training of physicians, and other means. Even if the President signs the measure, which harmonizes with his views on social security, we have no more than a declaration of good intentions in the absence of a specific appropriation. Fifteen million dollars is needed at once to do for heart diseases what is now being done for infantile paralysis and cancer. If Congress provides the money before it adjourns 9,000,000 who know that they have heart trouble will soon receive better medical care and the lives of 600,000 graver cases will be extended.

Because they account for most deaths, diseases of the heart should long ago have been more systematically studied than they are. Our negligence must be attributed chiefly to lack of funds. This year the United States Public Health Service can spend less than $1,000,000 on diseases of the heart and the circulatory system, unless Congress comes to the rescue. The Biblical accusation that the life of a sheep is apparently worth more than that of a man seems to be justified when we learn that the Department of Agriculture will spend nearly $30,000,000 this year on animal and plant diseases, and that 10 times more is to be spent on hoof-and-mouth disease in cattle, black spot in chickens, and even thrips on gladiola than on diseases of the human heart.

Assuming that the President will sign the National Heart Institute bill, Congress should provide immediately the $15,000,000 required for research, better hospital facilities (there are only 200 beds for cardiac cases in research clinics and only 909 special beds for cardiac convalescents), and for special courses that physicians wish to take. Less than $3,000,000 in private and Government funds is available, a pathetically inadequate sum when we consider that, as the average age of the population rises there will be more reports of deaths from heart failure, and that 60,000,000, most of whom have slight heart defects of some kind and who are unaware of their condition, may be laid low at any moment. There is no question that the public will approve a congressional appropriation which cannot but promote the physical and economic welfare of nearly a third of the population.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter in behalf of the long-range farm legislation, written to me by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
June 14, 1948.

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: I have been concerned for some time over the long-range farm legislation which has been before the Senate for several months. As you know, I am a member of the Agriculture Subcommittee which drafted this legislation after extensive hearings last fall. The subcommittee, as well as the whole Agriculture Committee, has spent a considerable amount of time in studying this matter. The Aiken bill, S. 2318, is truly a bipartisan attempt to deal with the long-range problems confronting American agriculture.

Since the bill was reported to the Senate last month I have been worried that action would not be taken on it. The late date which we have now reached compels me to beseech you to do everything possible to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate. I understand the House of Representatives has already passed stopgap price-support legislation. This is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. I feel that now is the time for the Congress to do something about the problems of our farmers. The Senate Agriculture Subcommittee studied this problem very carefully. Testimony was obtained from approximately 300 witnesses in all sections of the United States, as well as from farm leaders and officials of the Department of Agriculture here in Washington. We think we have a good bill. This view is shared by Republicans and Democrats alike. It simply does not seem right to me that this Congress should neglect our farmers, and I do not believe that the problems of American agriculture should become the basis for political bartering in an election year. The whole matter of long-time farm legislation is too vital for that. I do not want to see the American farmer subjected to this sort of thing. I do not believe that the stopgap legislation is enough, as this simply delays action on this vital matter for another year and will allow the entire subject of long-time farm legislation to become an issue in the fall political campaign. There have already been indications that it will. It has been said that now is not the time to enact a long-range farm program because of inflated prices and abnormal farm conditions. I think now is the time to consider this problem, because for once in history the farmer is receiving an equal share of the national income. I want to see him continue to enjoy this prosperity and favorable position in the economy pattern. Adoption of the long-range farm program as outlined in the Aiken bill will go a long way toward accomplishing this. If you will inspect the parity and price-support provisions of this measure, you will note that provision is made for adjustments in the support-price scale as conditions vary; hence, every assurance is given that prices will not be supported on too high a level. The 10-year moving average accomplishes this.

I sincerely hope that, as Republican leader of the Senate, you will give this matter the highest priority so that an arrangement may be worked out with the House of Representatives to give the farmers the best possible long-range farm program in the short time remaining.

Sincerely yours,

HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire at this time to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute, provided all the amendments to the committee amendment have been considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to the committee amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know that there are any further amendments, except those proposed by the Senator from Georgia, which are printed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall offer those at a later time.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know of any others.

Mr. RUSSELL. I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment. I do not ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, offered by the Senator from Georgia, will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment to the amendment was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed through any instrumentality or agency within or under the

direction of the Department of Agriculture, by loans, purchases, or other operations—

(a) To support prices received by producers of cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts marketed before June 30, 1950, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such commodity for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which the crop is harvested. The price support authorized by this subsection shall be made available as follows:

(1) To cooperators at the rate of 90 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year;

(2) To noncooperators at the rate of 60 percent of the rate specified in (1) above and only on so much of the commodity as would be subject to penalty if marketed.

All provisions of law applicable with respect to loans under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall, insofar as they are consistent with the provisions of this subsection, be applicable with respect to loans or other price-support operations authorized under this subsection, and the provisions of Public Law 163, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall continue in effect.

(b) To support until June 30, 1950, a price to producers of commodities with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture by public announcement pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 1, 1941, as amended, requested an expansion of production of not less than 60 percent of the parity or comparable price therefor nor more than the level at which such commodity was supported in 1949, except that Irish potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs shall be supported at 90 percent of the parity or comparable price. The comparable price for any such commodity shall be determined and used by the Secretary for the purposes of this subsection if the production or consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for the commodities referred to in (a) hereof. In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support.

(c) Sections 1 and 3 of the act approved August 5, 1947 (Public Law 360, 80th Cong.), are amended by striking out in each section the date "December 31, 1948" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1950."

(d) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture (other than those referred to in subsecs. (a), (b), and (c) hereof) shall be carried out so as to bring the price and income of the producers of other agricultural commodities not covered by subsections (a), (b), and (c) to a fair parity relationship with the commodities included under subsections (a), (b), and (c) to the extent that funds for such operations are available after taking into account the operations with respect to the commodities covered by subsections (a), (b), and (c). In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support.

SEC. 2. From any funds available to the Department of Agriculture or any agency operating under its direction for price support operations or for the disposal of agricultural commodities, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to use such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as added by section 31 of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 773), reenacted by section 1 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 246), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

"(b) If, on the basis of such investigations and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 percent of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during a representative period as determined by the President: *And provided further*, That in designating any article or articles, the President may describe them by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other bases as he shall determine.

"(c) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States.

"(d) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that changed circumstances require such modifications to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) Any decision of the President as to facts under this section shall be final.

"(f) No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party."

SEC. 4. Section 8 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 6, sec. 590h (a)), is amended (a) by striking out "January 1, 1949" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1950"; and (b) striking out "December 31, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1949."

SEC. 5. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1945 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1950."

SEC. 6. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1949, except that sections 3 and 5 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

Also to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes."

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Georgia, I should like to offer an amendment to the substitute. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. One page 3, line 1, of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, after the word "hogs", it is proposed to insert "ducks."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said that the tobacco amendment has played ducks and drakes with his bill, and has already accepted the duck amendment to the committee amendment, I shall accept the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I thank the able Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 1, of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, after the word "chickens", it is proposed to insert "(including broilers)".

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment is agreeable to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is no question about a broiler being a chicken, so I am glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I trust that the substitute may be considered in an atmosphere of calmness, and without the spirit of recrimination which was in evidence earlier in the day.

Mr. AIKEN. I assure the Senator from Georgia that I shall be calm.

Mr. RUSSELL. Without the substitute being read in full, I will state that it embodies a bill which has passed the House, known as the Hope bill, for the temporary extension of the agricultural program, to which has been added language extending the soil-conservation privilege to the States to set up State programs for a period of 2 years, as well as an extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation for a period of 2 years.

Mr. President, I believe in the committee system of the Senate. I realize that no parliamentary body can function effectively save through the work which is done by committees. I am always most reluctant to undertake to offer any substitute for a measure which has received careful study and scrutiny on the part of a standing committee of this body. I would not do so now, Mr. President, were I not convinced that it is necessary to make sure that the Congress does not adjourn and go home without any farm program, leaving chaos in the field of agriculture on every farm in the United States, unless we adopt the substitute which has been proposed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. As I have read the Senator's amendment, primarily it would continue the legislation enacted as a wartime measure to increase the production of certain commodities which were essential during the war period. Does not the Senator's amendment propose a continuation of wartime legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is absolutely correct. The reason I say that the long-range program is a short-sighted program and should not be adopted by the Congress is that it is sought to throw us back prior to the war years. Today we are faced with a demand for agricultural commodities which is equal to any that was ever made upon the farmers of the Nation during the war years. We have a European recovery program for which billions of dollars are being appropriated, and the farmers of the United States are being called upon to feed the world. Yet we see this bill brought in by the committee, undertaking to throw us back to the period of decreased production, and to remove any incentive whatever to the American farmer to produce the food and fiber which are absolutely essential if the Marshall plan is to succeed.

No stronger argument could be made for the substitute than that it recognizes, as the committee bill does not, that the demand on the American farmer will continue for at least a period of five more years.

One of the fatal weaknesses of the committee bill, as I see it, in addition to its complexities and ambiguities, is the fact that it undertakes to throw agricultural production in this country back to prewar years. Not only do the demands from Europe on the American farmer make it essential that we carry on a program of increased production, but the American people are today eating 18 percent more food than they were eating before the war. Yet the committee bill would have us go back to the prewar period——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will permit me to finish the sentence I shall be glad to yield. The committee bill would have us go back to the prewar period, when we were undertaking to stifle rather than encourage production.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The Senator says that the committee bill proposes to throw agriculture back to the prewar period. The committee bill does no such thing; and the Senator, I am sure, is quite well aware of the fact that it does not, because it does not affect the parity price, or the 90 percent of parity, until such time as there are actual surpluses in the commodity, and when surpluses occur, the price factor comes in, and the relationship of the carry-over will have its reflex effect in a decrease in the parities paid. If the Senator thinks that he and all other producers can go on indefinitely accumulating surpluses in any agricultural commodities, and still have parity figured at 90 percent indefinitely, I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that public opinion will not follow him, even if that be his idea, because the consumer would be compelled to support by taxation a parity payment even when surpluses would make it almost impossible to obtain Treasury appropriations to finance such a program. I think the Senator knows that to be so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know of no such thing, and neither does the Senator from Minnesota. I should like to have the Senator point out where we have any great surplus of agricultural commodities at the present time.

Mr. THYE. I wish to say again to the Senator, when the surpluses occur, then the flexible support price will be figured in. But until there are surpluses the parity will remain at 90 percent. When there are great surpluses, then, of course, it will be desirable to reduce the parity price, in order to have greater production in other fields of commodities, rather than to pile surplus upon surplus in one commodity.

That is why the support-price arrangement was conceived and developed, namely, in order to have a stable economy in agriculture, and not encourage high production in certain commodities merely because mechanically they can be produced easily and readily and often very cheaply.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator admits there is no surplus at the present time. He says that the Aiken bill contains provision for a flexible loan value so that if a surplus accumulates it will fast disappear.

I say the farmers of the United States are not simple enough to produce if there is likely to be a surplus, if they know the loan value of their commodity is to be reduced. The farmers of the United States will understand how the pending bill will operate. Why have they broken all records of production in the past? It is because they knew they were protected in their production.

But now, with these so-called flexible, escalator loan values running up and down, what farmer will take the risk of producing more bountiful crops of any kind? The farmers certainly will decrease their production. The committee bill is sure to cause decreased production in the United States at a time when our requirements and demands are greater than they ever have been in the past.

I have heard Senators argue time and again that the American people would not stand for these parity values. Mr. President, the present parity values are not hurting the consuming public in the slightest degree. Practically every commodity which would be under the parity values provided by this bill is selling above parity today. So the consuming public is not being hurt; not only is the public not being hurt, but it is being helped—in that the Commodity Credit Corporation has earned in excess of $100,000,000 in dealing with these commodities in a way which the Senator says will cause the American people to kill any farm support.

Mr. President, if farm support is killed, it will be because those in this body who claim to represent the farmers and who declare their undying allegiance and love of the farmers in campaign years, do not have the courage to stand by the farmer and see that he is recognized as an American citizen and is entitled to a square deal, along with every other citizen of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Question came up as to whether the American public would stand for taxation to maintain a farm program at parity. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator if it is not a fact that one of the few great prophecies made by the Republican Party, and for which the Republican Party took credit 2 years ago, was that enormous profits would be made by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the able management of Mr. C. C. Smith; and I ask if it is not

also correct that more than $100,000,000 was made for the taxpayers by the Commodity Credit Corporation alone, under the direction of Mr. C. C. Smith.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there is no question of that, and I am sure the Senator from Minnesota is aware of it.

I have just stated that the Commodity Credit Corporation made a profit of more than $100,000,000 in dealing with the present parity system which this bill proposes to reduce—and at a time when we are crying for more production from the American farmer.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In speaking about the profits made by the Commodity Credit Corporation, in order that we may understand that the Government is not making money through one of its corporations or agencies, and in order that the public may know definitely in what manner the Commodity Credit Corporation made a net profit of $138,505,000, it should be pointed out that it was because the Commodity Credit Corporation happened to have a large inventory of cotton and corn at the outset of the war; and because of war demands and war needs and wartime inflation, profits accumulated as a result of the sale of what the Commodity Credit Corporation had on hand prior to the war or at the outset and during the first years of the war.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, we still have a period of inflation as great as that which occurred during the war. Indeed, it is now much greater than it was then. Certainly, for that reason to say that the farmer has caused inflation of the economy, when he is subject not only to all the vicissitudes of inflation, but also to all the ravages of insects and crop disease, does not make sense. Certainly the farmer is entitled to the protection of existing law, which is what will be provided if the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator spoke of fluctuation. That is exactly what this bill provides, namely, fluctuation between 60 percent and 90 percent of parity, which will result in enriching the gamblers in commodities. If Senators think there was an investigation of this subject a few years ago, they should wait, if the committee bill is enacted, and see what will happen as a result of the developments in October and November next year, for not only will the gamblers estimate the crops, but they will undertake to estimate the surpluses; and then there will really be speculation and gambling, if that is what is desired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not propose by my vote to submit the farmers to that hazard.

Mr. President, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am not leveling any attack at the committee bill. My statements were provoked by the questions asked by the Senator from Minnesota.

I do not think the question before the Senate at this time is between the Aiken bill and the House bill. As I view the situation, the question is between the House bill and nothing; because if we do not pass the House bill, but, instead, pass the Aiken bill and send it to conference, knowing that the House committee has held long and extended hearings on this entire question, and that the House has decided that due to the unnatural conditions which obtain in the American economy we should carry on with the wartime legislation for the time being, it is obvious that the House will not readily yield to our position. We know that after the House has considered this matter thoroughly from all angles, it will not readily yield and accept this radical innovation in agricultural legislation.

Much has been said of the great study which has been given this matter by the Senate committee. As a Member of the Senate who is proud of this body, I always support the Senate committees if I may consistently do so. But, Mr. President, the House committee also gave this subject study. The House committee also traveled the length and breadth of the land, and the House committee held hearings and examined any number of witnesses. The House committee reached the conclusion that, because of the great uncertainties which exist today and the great demands on the American farmer to increase his production, and also due to the uncertainties of the financial situation in the United States, it would be the part of wisdom to continue the existing law for a period of 18 months; and in this case I heartily subscribe. I take that position because of the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, for whom I have the greatest affection, who stated here the other evening, in effect, that it was a case of having either the committee bill or nothing, so far as the continuation of farm legislation was concerned.

Mr. President, for my part, I will not be bound by a choice between nothing and the committee bill, or the Aiken bill, when I know that the Senate can continue the present farm program for 18 months merely by adopting the substitute proposed by me, which already has been passed by the House of Representatives.

So, with me, it is a choice between the House bill or nothing; and when that choice is presented to me, I am glad to seize upon the House bill in order that the farm program will be protected for the next 18 months, the Commodity Credit Corporation extended for a period of 2 years, and the provisions of the Soil Conservation Act preserved, rather than to take the adamant position that the other branch of Congress must yield to this new bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. What the Senator has just said disturbs me. I am not on the committee, and I am very anxious, as is the Senator from Georgia, that some farm legislation be enacted. But the Senator has just stated that the Senator from Vermont says it is a choice between his bill and nothing. The Senator from Georgia has told us that in his considered judgment it is a choice between continuation of the present support plan and nothing. If both the distinguished Senators are correct, we may wind up in this session by having a choice between two nothings.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the whole matter is in the lap of the Senate at the present time. If the Senate wishes to assure beyond peradventure that the present farm program will be continued unimpaired and in full effect for 18 months, the Senate can adopt the substitute, and the program will be continued.

Mr. President, I hear a great deal about a long-range program, and I am all in favor of having a long-range and permanent farm program. I do not believe we shall ever have a permanent farm program in the sense that any one bill we may pass in one year will apply to any condition that might arise in agriculture over a period of 3 or 4 years. Any program that we call a permanent program we shall be compelled to amend from time to time. But certainly under the circumstances that confront us today it is not the part of wisdom to cut down the loan rates, to reduce the parity values of every farm commodity which is produced in the country, because when that is done, production will be discouraged at the very time that the entire world is looking to the United States of America for food and fiber to enable them to exist and to have wearing apparel. No one can escape the conviction that the reduction in the parity price, the reduction in the loan value, will discourage production on American farms.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. A few minutes ago the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] secured acceptance by the Senator from Georgia of a certain amendment affecting broilers and ducks. However, the amendment at the desk reads in terms, not of the substitute bill of the Senator from Georgia, but the substitute bill of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], which was withdrawn. I should like to have a correction made, so the amendment will relate to the correct bill. If the Senator will permit me, we can combine the Ives-Williams amendment and the Morse amendment, the latter involving the words "and other poultry," which was accepted yesterday afternoon on the Aiken bill, and add it to the Russell substitute bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be permitted to insert the words as suggested by the Senator from Oregon at the proper place in the substitute. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. MORSE. That is satisfactory. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I want to say first we are confronted here with a condition, not a theory. We are within 3 days of the end of the session. Is it wise to gamble with a matter which is important not only to the farmer but to the Nation and to the world, to gamble with a new and revolutionary bill of this kind? I submit, with all respect that the bill is far too complicated and too far reaching to be considered under conditions existing in the Senate today. It is a type of bill that should be given the undivided attention of the Senate for a period of a week or 10 days to enable

all Members of the Senate to familiarize themselves with the complete change in our farm program which it proposes. Here we have it before us, when the Senate is under unprecedented pressure, when the bill will be discussed for 20 or 30 minutes and then be laid aside for a veto message. The minds of Senators will then be directed to the veto message until its consideration is concluded; we return to the farm bill and undertake to explain another paragraph of the bill, and then there will come in another conference report, and the farm bill will be laid aside again. I say in all fairness—and it is no reflection on the Senate, because we would be miracle men if it were otherwise—that very few Members of the Senate thoroughly understand the pending bill and realize its full import. I have had some little experience in the past with agricultural legislation. I was not privileged to be a member of the committee and to attend the hearings and to see the bill written up, but I have undertaken to read the bill on two different occasions. Mr. President, I assert without fear of successful contradiction that it is as involved and complicated a piece of legislation as has ever been submitted to the Senate. It would require not hours but days and weeks of study fully to recognize all the implications of the measure.

I am sure Senators do not realize all that is in the bill. We have heard a discussion here of tobacco and tobacco parity and the various phases of the 10-year moving average, and of the new parity program. But very little consideration has been given to the complete reorganization of the Department of Agriculture that is carried in the bill, and the great powers that are vested in whoever may be the Secretary of Agriculture under the terms of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know that the Secretary of Agriculture agrees with the reorganization program?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Secretary of Agriculture, or any man whoever hoped to be Secretary of Agriculture, did not agree with the reorganization program, he should be shot because it vests the greatest powers in him that any Cabinet member has ever possessed. But if the Congress lightly deals out these powers and deprives itself of authority over appropriations, I think we would be plain stupid.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I do not read the bill the same way the Senator does. The truth of the matter is the powers of the Secretary, in comparison with those he has now, are reduced under this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will find where the Secretary of Agriculture has power to allot the appropriation——

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will show me in the bill where we give him more power, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to do it, if the English language means anything. In title 1, page 49, if the Senator will look he will find where the Secretary of Agriculture is directed by the bill to "establish an agency to be known as the 'Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement,' to exercise all functions of the Secretary and of the various bureaus within the Department of Agriculture which, (1) prior to the enactment of this act, were assigned to" various branches of the Department as it exists at present, "or (2) the Secretary deems to be principally related to soil conservation and improvement or to those aspects of programs of the Department of Agriculture which require direct dealings by the Department with farmers."

That language gives the Secretary the power himself to say which bureaus within the Department shall do that.

We fought here for weeks over a bill giving the President of the United States power to reorganize the departments of the Government, and we required him to come back to the Congress before his reorganization order should become effective. When he submitted his reorganization orders, the Congress knocked about half of them in the head. But in this bill we give the Secretary of Agriculture power to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, and he does not have to report to the Congress or anyone else. It is just as clear as it can possibly be. Of course, the Secretary of Agriculture would be in favor of it. There has never been any Cabinet member who has ever possessed one-half the power that would be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture under the terms of this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Where would the Senator vest that power?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would keep it in the Congress of the United States. I am urging the Senate not to insist upon the passage of this bill, but to give Congress time to reorganize the Department of Agriculture. The Congress is not the creature of the Department of Agriculture; the Department of Agriculture is the creature of the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. That was the argument made all the way through in connection with the tariff policy.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Illinois can find any consolation in that analogy, let him lave his soul in it and enjoy it, because there is no analogy whatever between this bill and the establishment of a tariff policy. I am surprised that the Senator would resort to such an argument.

Mr. LUCAS. I am surprised at the Senator from Georgia for making that kind of an argument, when he voted last week on a similar proposition.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no similarity at all, and no one but the Senator from Illinois would think there was any similarity.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the Senator's opinion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only does the bill give the Secretary power to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, but it also gives him other powers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I maintain that instead of giving the Secretary authority to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, the bill directs the Secretary to reorganize it and tells him how he shall do it. I do not think that is any additional grant of power. It is a restriction on the power of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Vermont can find any limitation in the language on page 49, line 24, which permits the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer agencies which he deems to be principally related to soil conservation and improvement, or to those aspects of programs of the Department of Agriculture which require direct dealing by the Department with farmers, I should like to know what the limitation is. It seems to me it leaves the powers of the Secretary wide open as to those agencies.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will read further, paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) state how the duties of the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture are to be divided.

Mr. RUSSELL. It excepts certain agencies, but I have never before known Congress to give any Cabinet member power to select each bureau in his department and say whether it is related to a particular program.

I also want to point out that in section 102 (a) there is no question that the permanent power is given the Secretary to allot the appropriations made by Congress. Heretofore, in the consideration of appropriation bills, the Secretary has been required to submit budget estimates, minute in detail, as to how each dollar was to be expended, and Congress decided whether it would appropriate this item or that item for approximately 1,850 activities of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from Georgia point out any place in the bill where the Secretary will be absolved of the necessity of making reports and pointing out what he wants the money for when he comes before the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. He is not absolved, but after he receives the money he can allot it as he pleases.

Mr. AIKEN. Can he not do that at this time?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; he cannot. He cannot allot money in that way. But this bill would give him authority to do it.

Mr. AIKEN. No; only as he transfers certain functions from one agency to another under the direction in the bill. What this bill does is to abolish two agencies within the Department of Agriculture and instruct the Secretary to establish one to take the place of the two. The reason for that—and it is being done at the request of the Department of Agriculture—is that things have not always been harmonious between the two agencies, although they have not quite arrived at a very acute stage as yet. It appears that those two agencies, dealing with the problem of soil improvement, should be united at the national level. It will make for more efficiency and more economy in government, in my opinion, and result in the expenditure of a larger percentage of appropriations made by Congress on the actual work for which the money was appropriated.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the bill should ever become law, I would devoutly share the hope that the Senator from Vermont is correct, but I find absolutely nothing in the bill which would justify that hope.

Mr. AIKEN. I am saying it for the record.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but I was reading the Senator's bill. The Senator has said for the record that there was nothing in it to permit the Secretary to allot appropriations, and I shall therefore read section 102 (a) of the bill, on page 52——

Mr. AIKEN. Before the Senator begins reading, I do not have the amended copy of the bill before me at the moment, but I call his attention to the fact that the words "heretofore or", in line 3, have been stricken out, so that any sums hereafter appropriated——

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I would not worry much about the money that has been heretofore appropriated. It would read this way:

Any sums hereafter appropriated, other than as grants-in-aid—

I ask the Senators to listen to this, because it is an important matter—

and available for functions which the Secretary determines to be functions required by section 101 (a) of this act to be exercised through the Extension Service and cooperating agencies in the several States and in the Territory of Hawaii, to the extent that such funds are available at the time the Secretary makes such determination, and (B) any sums appropriated specifically for functions covered by section 101 (a), shall be paid to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii in the same manner and subject to the same conditions and limitations as the additional sums appropriated under the act entitled—

And then it quotes the title of the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Act.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary has to allocate these funds according to an act of Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. I am coming, now, to paragraph (2) on page 53 of the bill:

The remainder of the sums so appropriated—

That is, when he gets away from that which the Congress has specifically appropriated—

and available in each fiscal year shall be paid to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii, without any requirement that equal sums be provided from any other sources, in the same proportions as the sums appropriated for such fiscal year pursuant to section 23 of the act entitled—

That being the general research act.

I assert that the Secretary can move agencies and, under this bill, he has a great deal of control over the funds. The same thing is true of section 104.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary can utilize funds only in accordance with the regulations laid down by Congress. Either the principal sums or the remainders have to be appropriated pursuant to law. He has no additional powers there.

Mr. RUSSELL. It certainly seems to me that he has, when he has the power, under section 101, to determine which of the agencies he deems to be principally related to soil conservation and improvement or to those aspects of programs of the Department of Agriculture which require direct dealings by the Department with farmers, and so forth. If he has no authority to transfer bureaus under that language, I do not know what the language means.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the able Senator from Georgia believe there should be a consolidation of the soil-conservation program and the agricultural-conservation program into a single program and agency, as suggested under section 101?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I think there should be a consolidation. I am not sure that the provision in section 101 is the best way to do it, however, because I think it is vague and indefinite.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator feels that should be done, whom would he delegate as the appropriate administrative agency or authority to carry out that reorganization?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not delegate it at all. That is the point I have been making all the way through, that I am opposed to the delegation of the power to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senator would keep it right here in the Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. I most certainly would.

Mr. LUCAS. And have the rules and standards prescribed by Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. We have gone very far afield in the delegation of power to the executive branch of the Government in the past few years, but this is the first time, to my knowledge, that such substantial power has been proposed to be delegated to a Cabinet officer without at least requiring a report back to the Congress as to what he had done. The bill does not even require a report. When we have delegated the power to the President to reorganize the departments, we have made provision for a report to Congress and provision for veto if Congress desired, but under this bill we are asked to delegate power to the Secretary of Agriculture to reorganize the department. The bill does contain some standards, but the standards are not sufficiently far-reaching. I think the Congress should take time to work out a permanent agricultural program on which the Congress would legislate, not one the Secretary of Agriculture would legislate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows how difficult that is, and he knows we have tried it times without number. When the Congress tried to reorganize some department it never did succeed. In the final analysis, we have to delegate the power to someone along the line to do the work. Congress has not the time to do it, and Congress cannot do it. I can agree with the Senator that whoever would do the work should perhaps make a report to Congress, but here is a situation in which we are trying to coordinate agencies in the Department of Agriculture under one separate agency, yet the Senator makes an argument that that should not be done, as provided in this bill, but that the Congress should do it itself. If the position of the Senator should prevail there would never be any reorganization of the executive departments of the Government so long as he and I were in the Congress, because Congress cannot do it, and the Senator knows Congress has not the time to do it.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a very harsh indictment of the parliamentary system to say that the Congress does not have the capacity to reorganize the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. I can go even further than that. If the Senator thinks it is a severe and harsh indictment, let me say that I have never seen Congress yet appoint a committee to reorganize any part of the executive branch that did any constructive work on it and brought back a report. They have talked about it and used it as an argument when there was a desire to kill some proposal, but I have never seen any constructive, actual work done by a committee of Congress that has accomplished anything in the way of reorganizing the executive departments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not intend to stress this particular phase of the pending bill, and would not have done so had not the Senator from Illinois challenged me to show where the bill delegated any power to the Secretary of Agriculture. I answered with the flat statement that the bill delegated too much power to the Secretary of Agriculture, and I was going to pass on to the Senator from Illinois the challenge to show it did not delegate power. Now the Senator from Illinois takes the position that the power which is delegated is necessary to be delegated.

Mr. LUCAS. The bill gives the Secretary no more power than he has at the present time, except power to reshuffle a few clerks in the department under his jurisdiction at the present time.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does more than reshuffle a few clerks. I recognize the difficulty in passing a reorganization act, because I have been a Member of the Senate about as long as the Senator from Illinois has, and I have seen these bills come up time and again, and I would not dispute that the Congress cannot reorganize all the departments of the Government at one time, in one bill. For that reason I have consistently voted for bills to delegate to the President of the United States power to reorganize the executive departments. But I have never voted for a bill giving the President authority to reorganize as he saw fit, and in all the reorganization bills Congress has never granted such power to a President. It was not granted to President Roosevelt; it was not granted to President Truman. We have granted them power to propose reorganization plans, but we have always retained a veto power in the Congress. To my knowledge this is the first time it has been proposed that Congress should delegate carte blanche power to a Cabinet officer to shuffle around a hundred or two hundred bureaus as he sees fit without being required to submit a report to Congress so that it may see what he has done in the matter. I do not intend to vote for any such power as that. I did not intend to labor the point, however.

If our legislative system is no good, Congress should be the last to admit it and we should at least leave it to those outside Congress to say we are incapable. I submit that if Congress has the time to perfect a long-range bill, we can adopt a long-range program that will bring about what is so much desired. That is incidental to my main argument, however, and I did not intend to go into it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought the Senator was about through with that aspect of the discussion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To clarify the matter in my own mind, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Let us assume this is a good bill, but in the situation as it now exists, do I understand correctly it is the Senator's belief that, even though we pass the bill as is, he does not think there is assurance that the House will accept it, and therefore he thinks we will have no bill at all? Is that the point the Senator makes?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have stated heretofore that in my opinion the issue was between the substitute bill or no bill, because if the committee bill passes, it has been stated the House would not go into it without hearings, and frankly I would not blame them for not accepting such a complicated bill as this.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who stated that?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is against the rules of the Senate to quote any Member of the House of Representatives on the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Several Members of the House have told me that they had ample time to consider this bill if it is substituted for their bill and goes to conference. It is just a question which Member of the House one is talking to. I know some Members of the House who are insistent on a stop-gap program only. I know other Members who are equally anxious to have a long-range program adopted. I cannot see that any time would be lost by the adoption of the long-range bill and putting it into conference with the House. We certainly cannot accept the House bill as it is if we want to save the Commodity Credit Corporation after July 1. We must go to conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. The substitute I have offered provides for a continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator think it would not be necessary to go to conference?

Mr. RUSSELL. In my judgment the House would accept the substitute bill with the amendments, without the slightest question.

Mr. AIKEN. There is some reason to believe that the House would accept the Senate long-range bill if they had a chance to vote on it, as they certainly will have, if we put it in very good shape, as I think will be done.

I admit I became impetuous this afternoon, and if I said anything which hurt the feelings of any Senator I am truly sorry for it. The tobacco amendment, while very disappointing to me, does not spoil the bill completely. The wool amendment which was adopted will have no effect upon the bill, so far as I know.

I am very anxious to have the House have an opportunity to vote on the long-range bill in the event we do not agree in conference. We would make every effort to do that first, in any event. I feel that this bill would have a very good chance of passing the House. So let us send them the best bill possible, let us get the best possible bill we can. We have no time to lose in adopting a long-range bill. It is true prices are generally high now, and carry-overs are small. That is just the time to get a good bill on the statute books.

Let me point out that word has come to me from the Department of Agriculture that since January 1 exports of agricultural commodities to other parts of the world have been 15 percent below the exports of agricultural commodities in the previous year. We are going to have increased stocks, we are going to have increased supplies of grain. Before we know it, if I read conditions correctly, only a major calamity, such as a drought, will prevent us having a surplus supply of grain. So we have written into the bill provisos which make it more profitable to feed those grains. I will not go into the bill because the Senator, I am sure, knows what I mean. But a good, long-range bill enacted at this session is not hopeless.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may, I should like to pursue this matter further, because I do not understand thoroughly what goes on in the parliamentary situation which exists at the end of a session, as the Senator from Georgia does. Let us assume we pass the bill tonight, and that it goes to the House tomorrow. Both Houses must agree on the conference report before we adjourn Saturday night; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what bothers me. It seems to me it ought to be possible to ascertain which of the views expressed by the two Senators is correct. I am speaking along the line the Senator from New Mexico followed a moment ago. There are two very distinguished Members of the Senate, each one giving us a more or less opposite view of what will happen if we adopt one form of bill or the other. That is something which concerns me deeply, because it would be disastrous if we should end up with no bill at all. I do not know how we can resolve the situation, although perhaps it would be possible to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure some bill will be enacted. Personally I think we would get a good long-range bill sooner if we did not pass a stop-gap measure, because if we were to do so there would be a tendency to let the matter slide again next year, and then we will again find ourselves in another election year; whereas if we do not have any bill at all we would have to do something the first of next January. I do not anticipate any such condition as that coming about. I feel that when we get together with the House conferees we can reach a fair agreement. Those who will be on the conference committee of the Senate have twice met with several Representatives who will be on the conference committee of the House. I think we all understand our problem. I think it is unfortunate that the House has concentrated its study to one feature of agriculture, which is the land-use policy, whereas the Senate has concentrated on a support-price program. The Senate committee felt that a support-price program should come first, in order to insure our farmers against a collapse which we know can come suddenly. I do not look for a collapse in the immediate future, but we never can tell. As I said the other day, the time to patch a roof is when the sun is shining so the roof will be ready when the rains come. I hope we can take the bill to conference with the House conferees, and I feel sure that we can work out a much better bill than the House is offering us now, and, perhaps than the bill which we have here.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish I could share the belief expressed by the Senator from Vermont, but the bare facts simply do not bear out his statement. If we accept the bill already passed by the House there cannot be any question about having a continuation of the program. If we pass the Aiken bill it will mean throwing the whole matter into the lap of chance as to whether we will ever get a law or not.

Mr. AIKEN. May I point out that if we accept as it is the bill passed by the House there is no question that we will have to spend from fifty to seventy-five million dollars, or more, during the next year to buy eggs which we do not need in this country. There will be no question but that the wool growers of Texas will get a support price for 2 years, and the wool growers of Montana will get a support price for only 1 year. There are a few other deficiencies in the bill which should be ironed out. If we send the Senate bill to conference, then we will have all the material of both the House and the Senate bills before the conferees for consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator has made a statement about eggs. The Senator, I believe, stated now that we would lose from fifty to sixty million dollars on eggs if the House bill were to be passed. He has come down some $40,000,000 since night before last, when he said we would lose $100,000,000 on eggs. I was surprised to hear that statement, because I had never heard of any great loss on eggs. Therefore, I checked with the Commodity Credit Corporation to find out about the egg losses.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator has the same figures I have. They will show that since 1944 the Commodity Credit Corporation has bought, through the support-price program, about $161,000,000 worth of eggs, and has also made purchases of four-hundred-and-some-odd million dollars' worth of eggs, I suppose largely for overseas shipments. Those are eggs which we are not likely to need. I do not think we are going to be exporting eggs by the hundred million dollars' worth from now on. I agree with the Senator that it has not all been a total loss, but we have had to buy, if my memory serves me correctly, since 1944, $161,000,000 worth of eggs to support the price of eggs at 90 percent of parity.

which is continued during the next year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How much loss was there?

Mr. RUSSELL. There has been a loss over the entire program, as I understand, of approximately $18,000,000. The Corporation has dealt in hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of eggs.

Mr. AIKEN. It is difficult to tell what the loss is, because so many of the eggs have been used for cooperative purposes, such as European relief.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator from Georgia tell me why milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs were picked out to be supported at 90 percent of parity?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I do not know exactly why that was done. I have before me the report of the House committee, which I can read if the Senator desires. I believe it deals at some length with that subject.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to know why these particular products were selected.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can tell the Senator why I am in favor of support of those products. I do not know why the House is in favor of support for them. I am in favor of support for them for the same reason that I am inclined to favor the most attractive features of the Aiken bill, and that is because the parity base heretofore of dairy products and of meat has been unfair to the producers of those commodities, and it has been below a fair parity price for meat and some other commodities. I would favor support of the products in question because it would give them a more equitable treatment under the terms of the bill. The reason so many are supporting the Aiken bill is because it is fairer to the meat producers and to the dairy products producers than is the existing law.

Mr. LUCAS. The present price of pork is up to 90 percent of parity. The Senator's amendment provides that "milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs shall be supported at 90 percent of the parity or comparable price." How can the Senator justify support of the four products I have just mentioned? There will be no way of controlling the number of chickens produced or controlling the amount of eggs produced. Broilers have been added, and every other kind of chicken is included.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Senator speaking of my taking in milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs, as well as broilers, when the Senate has voted to include innumerable amendments in the long-range-farm-program bill? The bill has been rewritten on the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Georgia is not answering my question. I think he should answer it because it is tremendously important to find out just why we have to guarantee the prices on these four products.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator read the items again?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, I will. The Senator will find the language on the top of page 3 of his amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I mean the commodities.

Mr. LUCAS. This is the language, beginning at the bottom of page 2 of the Senator's amendment:

Except that Irish potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs shall be supported at 90 percent of parity or comparable price.

I can understand how Irish potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, should be supported. That is the 1948 crop. It comes in late perhaps. But it is a little difficult for me to understand how the Senator can support these other four products, milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs, and guarantee 90 percent of parity price.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator know what parity is for butterfat, which is a product of milk?

Mr. LUCAS. That does not have anything to do with the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. It should have, because I am pointing out the significance. As of March 15, 1948, the parity for butterfat was 65 cents a pound. Under the 10-year average of the Aiken bill the butterfat formula is 65.2 cents a pound. So the two measures go hand in hand so far as the two products are concerned. The Senator having been a member of the committee, I assumed that he would have known that.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator assumes many things when he wants to get away from the real point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I gave the Senator the facts.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know why the Senator should continuously castigate me and indirectly infer that I do not know anything about this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure that the Senator was trying to help me by asking the question he just asked. I know that he is attempting to assist me in my explanation of the substitute.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is tremendously important to find out the facts. I propose to offer an amendment to the Senator's amendment——

Mr. RUSSELL. I asked the Senator what the parity price was under this bill, and he said he did not know.

Mr. LUCAS. It does not make any difference to me what the parity price is. The Senator from Illinois is not in favor of guaranteeing the price of any commodity, regardless of what the parity price is, at 90 percent, when other commodities, basic and nonbasic, have a sliding scale up to 90 percent of parity. There is a reason for it. If the Senator wants to know the real reason, he can go back to the House of Representatives and he will find that there was plenty of logrolling between the milk and dairy producers and the egg producers, in order to get 90 percent of parity.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may be true; but the strange fact remains that under the bill of which the Senator from Illinois is a co-author, the parity price on butterfat, which is the base of milk products, is higher than it is in this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course it is higher, but it is flexible. Tomorrow, or next year it may not be higher; but the Senator would guarantee 90 percent. There is no flexibility in his formula. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course there is not; and that is why I am opposed to the Senator's bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to explain the parity figures. I think he has read them correctly; but in figuring the parity prices for milk products and butter under Senate bill 2318 the Bureau of Agricultural Economics failed to include the subsidy which was paid to the dairy farmers during the war. That resulted in bringing down the parity price of butter and milk very considerably. It is my opinion that in figuring the parity price for dairy products under Senate bill 2318, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics should include the subsidy which was paid directly to the farmer. I do not believe that it should include the subsidy which was paid directly to the processor, because there is no way of telling how much of it went back to the farmer. But that is the reason why the figures which the Senator reads for parity for dairy products under Senate bill 2318 are so low. I do not know what the actual parity would be. I believe that the figures which the Senator has, show that the parity price of milk would increase from about $3.80 to $4 if we adopted the proposed parity formula. But if the subsidy were included, as it should be, in computing parity under the new formula, the parity price for milk would be about $4.36 a hundred. It would add materially. In other words, the dairy farmer was penalized because part of his price was received in the form of a subsidy, and the Department of Agriculture, in computing parity under the proposed formula, failed to include the amount which was paid him as a subsidy.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator from Vermont is correct. I have always felt that dairy products and meat were entitled to some new basis for their parity formula. They have been discriminated against heretofore.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. But this bill corrects the discrimination.

The Senator from Illinois says that there was logrolling in the House committee. Some of the House Members felt that the Senator from Illinois had undertaken to outbid them in this bill, because he would increase the parity price of dairy products considerably above the level which obtained under the old system.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Would the Senator include cattle?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. There is not much difference with respect to cattle.

The Senator from Vermont will bear me out when I say that there would be very little difference in the parity price of meat. It would be lower under the

House bill and under the old program than it would be under the new bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. The parity price would be higher under the bill of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not seem to make myself clear to the Senator from Georgia. What I am objecting to is guaranteeing a 90-percent parity price for any commodity, which is what the Senator would do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course I would.

Mr. LUCAS. It does not make any difference how many eggs are produced in this country; the Government must support the price. If it costs the Government $100,000,000, we must go to 90 percent of parity on eggs. If the Government loses $100,000,000 on chickens, it does not make any difference. There is no limitation on the number of eggs or chickens that can be produced, and the Government must stand the loss, regardless of what it is. The Senator will not disagree.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois makes a very fine attack on the whole agricultural system. We are not going to have any farm program that is worth a tinker's damn to the farmers in keeping up prices that will not occasionally run into losses on some commodities. If the Senator wants to bring the parity loans down to 40 percent, we shall not have any losses, but the program will not be worth a thing to the farmer because it will not support his prices.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator talks about destroying the farm program. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that this kind of an amendment is the very thing which will ultimately destroy the farm program in public opinion. We cannot continue to do what we are doing at the present time under the 90-percent-of-parity formula, supporting the parity formula for potatoes, chickens, and eggs, and having the Government go in the red to the tune of millions of dollars, without ultimately losing the support of the American public for any farm program in this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator point out where the losses have been incurred?

Mr. LUCAS. We lost on potatoes. We lost on eggs last year.

Mr. RUSSELL. On the over-all program we made more than $200,000,000. Of course the Senator can point to a few Irish potatoes or eggs, with respect to which we lost money; but on the over-all program the Commodity Credit Corporation made more than $200,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that that is exactly what happened; but as the Senator from Vermont pointed out a moment ago, if we continue with the 90-percent guarantee, some of these days we shall get a wheat crop or a cotton crop which will result in a surplus which will attack the Treasury of the United States to the point where we shall not have any farm program thereafter, just as surely as I am standing on this floor. That is why the Senator from Illinois has been working all this time trying to get something that is basic and fundamental on the statute books rather than a continuation of the temporary support program, attempting to give to the farmer everything that we can possibly give him. We have not lost anything up to this time; but just as surely as we get a surplus, if we ever get what we had back in 1932 or 1933, under this kind of program ultimately there will not be enough money in the Treasury to take care of the losses. If we continue to paint the picture to the American public that we are supporting a program of this kind, to the degree that regardless of what any individual produces in the way of eggs, chickens, potatoes, or what not, we will take care of him and support prices, finally, I do not care how much we make, we shall destroy the faith and confidence of the people in the farm program.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are limitations on what can be produced. This bill does not permit unlimited production. Neither does the basic law under which the program operates. Even with the acreage we have had, there has been excess production of a few commodities. But in looking at a little pile of potatoes which cost the Government a few thousand dollars we lose sight of the wonderful achievements of the American farmer and the incentive provided by the present system. We are not yet out of the woods of the war. Senators argue eloquently about the cold war, and the necessity of carrying out the Marshall plan. We must feed and clothe the people of Europe. The demands for production on the American farmer are as great today as they were during the war. Yet it is proposed to strike down the program which has successfully brought about this great production, in the name of a long-range program and in the name of saving the taxpayer, when up until now the taxpayer has not been hurt, and he will not be hurt by an 18-month extension of the present program to give us an opportunity to study a long-range program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure that the Senator from Georgia will agree that no one is better qualified to speak on the effect of the various programs on the farmer than is the farmer himself. During the course of the hearings which the Senate committee conducted on the pending bill there appeared before the committee the Secretary of Agriculture, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the master of the National Grange, the Washington representative of the Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and a representative of the Farmers Union. They all appeared before the committee and advocated a sliding scale of supports based upon a modernized parity which, in turn, was based upon a 10-year moving average. We had the unanimous support of the farm organizations for what we propose today, namely, to modernize the parity formula so as to bring the various agricultural commodities into proper relationship to each other, and then to support the price of the various commodities on a sliding scale, and I believe most of them suggested 60 to 90 percent for the basic and more important commodities.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have heard the Senator from Vermont make that statement at least once or perhaps twice in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; it is in the RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL. Perhaps I have heard the Senator say that three times. I am not prepared to challenge it, because I was not on the committee. Let me ask a question: Were the 30 or 40 amendments which the Senator has accepted to the bill explained to the witnesses who testified and spoke as the Senator from Vermont has indicated?

Mr. AIKEN. Probably 30 amendments have been adopted to the bill, but I can explain how that happened. After the bill was all ready and was reported, it was submitted to the Department of Agriculture, so that the Department might go over the bill with a fine-tooth comb and find out where "t's" were not crossed and "i's" were not dotted, and might suggest amendments which would make the bill operate more smoothly.

I wish to say that in connection with the 3-page bill which the Senator from Georgia is offering as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment—leaving out the section 22 amendment—after the House committee reported that bill, it reported 13 other amendments besides those which were adopted on the floor. So I think we have less amendments per page in our bill than there are in the House bill or the Senator's substitute.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is getting away from his argument that the Senate should take this bill—in other words, the committee amendment—without question because it has been approved by the farm leaders, for it seems that the Senator rewrote his bill after it was said to please the farm leaders.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senate should accept this bill, on which the committee has worked for more than 9 months. If we were to wait for each Member of Congress to work out this bill in the same way the committee has worked it out, I am sure we never would be ready to vote on a long-range farm program.

If the Senate did not have confidence in its Committee on Agriculture, I think the Senate should not have given it an appropriation and should not have instructed it to do this work, which we now have presented to the Senate in the form of a bill. It is technical work; it is complicated work. If I had not been working with it for 9 months, I know I would not understand much that is in the bill.

I do not think it is a perfect bill. No doubt we shall have to amend it within 2 years, and probably within 1 year, after it is enacted into law, because experience will develop weaknesses in it, just as

experience develops weaknesses in any other long, complicated bill. But this bill is the best we can do, and I do not know how we could improve upon it, even if we were to work for a few weeks longer.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. TYDINGS, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not mind yielding for questions, but I do not like Senators to intersperse long speeches in my remarks.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me on the point just made by the Senator from Vermont——

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well; I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. On the point just made by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. President, let me say that it is true that the witnesses to whom he referred endorsed the principle of a long-range farm program; but the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, offered numerous and serious objections to the bill as drawn. Mr. Kline, of the Farm Bureau Federation, presented 10 pages of testimony suggesting changes. Mr. Goss, of the National Grange, offered numerous suggestions. Mr. Charles Holman, of the Milk Producers Association, offered numerous suggestions. Someone representing the peanut industry offered numerous suggestions. All through the nearly 500 pages of testimony—and it was not easy to analyze, because there was no index and no table of contents, when the hearings were published, and we simply had to dig into the testimony as best we could—there were so many suggestions and so many criticisms that finally the committee simply struck out every line of the 46 pages of the original bill, and framed another bill. But, after framing another bill and after debate had started on it, the committee brought in 10 pages of amendments—10 pages of amendments to a 50-page bill, which means about a 20-percent change. Even then, I may not have counted all the amendments. There have been numerous amendments, such as those relating to chickens, potatoes——

Mr. AIKEN. And ducks and other fowl.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. So we have reached the point where the committee has abandoned the first bill, and has brought out another bill, and then has proposed changes amounting to at least 20 percent in the second bill, and then has added numerous other changes.

Frankly, although I am trying to find out what has been done, I do not know what is in the bill now.

Mr. AIKEN. Could the Senator suggest a better way?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I think a much better way would be to adopt, as a temporary measure, the substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia, and continue the support program. Certainly in a few months or in a year if the Senator thinks the support price is too high, he can bring in a long-range bill, which we shall have time to study and understand.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator point out one section of the bill to which the Department of Agriculture objects?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. There are numerous pages of testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture, of course.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator asks the question, will he yield in order that I may propound a unanimous-consent request in regard to a time for voting?

Mr. TYDINGS. The matter I have in mind will not delay the presentation of such a request.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not mean to delay the Senator, of course.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall take only 2 minutes or so. I have waited some time to get the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; excuse me.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether it is a fact that the acceptance of his substitute is the pending question, also whether it would be in order to offer a small amendment, in the nature of a perfecting amendment, to the substitute.

Mr. RUSSELL. An amendment either large or small would be in order.

Mr. TYDINGS. With the permission of the Senator from Georgia, I should like to offer a 5-line amendment to his amendment. The amendment I offer deals only with Maryland tobacco. I believe it provides for less than is provided by the Senate bill; but as the Representative in Congress from the tobacco section of my State says, this is an amendment which would have been put in the House bill if the circumstances had permitted its consideration there.

I should like to offer it at this time as a perfecting amendment to the substitute, so that, regardless of whether either the substitute or the committee amendment is adopted by the Senate, the tobacco situation will be taken care of.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the fact that the Senator's perfecting amendment to my amendment provides for less than the treatment accorded by the Senate bill will not influence the vote of the Senator from Maryland on this measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. My perfecting amendment to the Senator's amendment provides less, but only slightly less.

Mr. President, to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Georgia, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in Mr. RUSSELL's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

Except that for the purpose of computing the parity price for Maryland tobacco the base period shall be the period August 1936 to July 1941 in lieu of the period August 1919 to July 1929.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland to my amendment establishes a parity figure below that contained in the committee amendment, the so-called Aiken bill, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. TYDINGS. I took the amendment to the Senator from Vermont, and he himself told me that I would be better off under his bill than under the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as it would be perfected by the amendment I have now offered to it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think there is no question about that, although I am not sure what the parity price under the amendment would be.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, before the Senator from Georgia accepts the amendment to his substitute, I should like to know what the parity base will be under the substitute as thus perfected. If we accept one parity base for Maryland tobacco and another parity base for Virginia tobacco, and a different base period——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, heretofore Maryland tobacco has had no base period for its parity except 1909–14.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; and my amendment would simply put the treatment accorded to Maryland tobacco in line with the treatment accorded to Kentucky tobacco, North Carolina tobacco, and Virginia tobacco.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Of course, I am glad to have Maryland tobacco receive treatment that is in line with the other.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not made a profound study of the matter, but I am advised by those who know that this amendment to the Senator's substitute amendment will put Maryland tobacco in a position comparable to that of burley tobacco and flue-cured tobacco.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I continue to be disturbed about the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves in view of the lateness of the hour, and the question of whether we are going to have any farm legislation at this session. I have a suggestion to make to the two contending forces, if such they be. While I know that ordinarily parliamentary rules would not permit it, yet it could be done by unanimous consent. My suggestion would be——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will permit me to interrupt him, I attempted a couple of minutes ago to propound a unanimous-consent request. At that time the distinguished Senator from Maryland said he would like to continue. I told him I would wait, and I think I stated that when he concluded we should have a quorum call.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I may finish my suggestion first, it will take but a moment. I was going to suggest, if Senators could not agree, that under a unanimous-consent agreement we let the substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia pass as a separate bill and vote on the Aiken bill, sending them both to the House.

Mr. AIKEN. No, absolutely no. That would be the end of the long-range program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am afraid that is a confession.

Mr. WHERRY. Now, let me try.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Would there be a possibility of arranging an hour, at which time we could vote on the substitute and on any amendments that might be offered to it, and then proceed to vote on the final passage of the bill as amended?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not even made the request. I am making an inquiry.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely suggest that I certainly intend to speak on the robbery of the cotton farmer.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to cut off any Senator at all; that is not the thought, but I should like to suggest an hour for a vote. I would suggest any time—8 o'clock, 9 o'clock, or 10 o'clock. If Senators would merely indicate when they think they may conclude, I would make a proposition to Members of the Senate first on the substitute or any amendments offered thereto, which could be gotten out of the way. If the substitute carries there would be no more votes; if it does not carry, we can begin voting and finally vote on the bill. I would be glad to make it any hour. I will suggest any hour that is agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Georgia or the Senator from South Carolina, and the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska I will agree to any hour that my distinguished friend from Georgia agrees to.

Mr. WHERRY. Fine. Now we are making headway.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I doubt that. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know how many Senators might desire to speak on the substitute. I know the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] wishes to speak, and the senior Senator from South Carolina wishes to speak. I want to expedite the sessions of the Senate in every way I possibly can. I have undertaken to do it on every occasion.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. It is very fine.

Mr. RUSSELL. But I think this is without any question the most important bill we shall have before the Senate during the remainder of the session. I would not know now what time to fix for a vote, in view of the limited knowledge I have of the number of Senators who may wish to address themselves to the subject.

Mr. WHERRY. I have respect for the Senator from Georgia, and I may say there is not a Member of the Senate who has cooperated more wholeheartedly with the junior Senator from Nebraska in working out unanimous consent requests than has the Senator from Georgia, or the Senator from South Carolina. I would respectfully ask Senators to take an inventory on the possibilities. This is the first time I have made a suggestion. We do not always get an agreement on the first request. I ask Senators to analyze the situation, and if they feel that later on, within as short a time as possible, they can agree upon a time, I shall be glad to submit the request. I thank the Senator for his consideration.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield in that connection?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. There are certain phases affecting the prospects for agreeing on the general program which I should like to discuss in connection with what I think would be the wisdom of accepting now the substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia. I am convinced from what House Members tell me—and I am pretty close to them, having served with them for 14 years—that the proposal of the Senator from Georgia is all they are going to take. May I ask the distinguished acting majority leader when he wants to cut down on the time some of us may desire to take?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to cut down the time of any Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. What does the Senator plan to bring up next tonight?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is a rather difficult question to answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. BALDWIN and several other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely remind the Senate that we are getting to the closing moments of the session. There are several pieces of legislation which are very important. For one thing, the conference report on the Interior Appropriation bill will probably be ready by 8:30 or 9 o'clock.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How about oleomargarine? That would be a good bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator from Arkansas say something? [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think I had best decline to yield further at this time and proceed with my remarks. I decline to yield further. I have been on the floor for more than an hour, and have not been able to occupy to exceed 30 minutes of my own time, so I want to wind up my remarks.

Mr. President, I have undertaken to deal with two phases of the question; first, the fact that it is necessary to adopt the pending substitute if we are to have any assurance whatever that we shall not be deprived of a farm program after the last of December this year. In the second place, I have undertaken to show that the reorganization feature of the pending bill bestows too great legislative powers upon the Secretary of Agriculture.

My third objection to the bill is the fact that it is complicated and so confused as a result of the amendments which have been adopted, and because of the complete change it proposes in the parity program, that it is a lawyer's or a professor's dream. It is so complicated that only a lawyer of great experience in agricultural legislation or a professor who had dealt with matters of agricultural economy could hope possibly to understand it. We are told we should modernize parity. I believe the bill constitutes a revision of the present parity program. As I stated a few moments ago, I know that the present formula is unfair to meat, dairy products, cottonseed, and other commodities, for that matter. But I submit that the 10-year moving average is not a modern basis for computing a parity program.

During 7 of the 10 years, the Nation has been at war. We had ceilings on many agricultural commodities, which held down the prices of those commodities. In the case of other agricultural products we subsidized them and their production, running their values up to 250 or 300 percent of parity. Yet the pending bill proposes to lump them all together and strike an average under the guise of modernizing the parity formula in accordance with present-day conditions.

Any modernization of the parity formula, Mr. President, should be based upon a free market, not upon the restraints and controls of a war period or the encouragement lent to certain commodities during a war period. The so-called modernization is unfair to a great many commodities which were held down by controls during the war. It gives an undue advantage to others which were puffed up through subsidization to where they brought from 250 to 300 percent of parity.

Mr. President, the old parity farm program is at least understood at the present time. It permits every commodity to stand on its own legs. It does not depend upon the fluctuations of any other commodity. The proposed 10-year moving average, in my opinion—and I regret that my opinion is in conflict with that of so many experts on agriculture—is violative of plain common sense. We have the great basic commodities, wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, but other commodities are brought in through the proposed 10-year moving average. Here is the parity line. One commodity will be 5 percent above parity, and another will drop 10 percent below. If we raise the one below parity we increase the one above parity just as much as we raise the one below parity. Because of the way the formula is weighted, a commodity such as flaxseed oil, of which a very small

amount is produced in this country, in spite of the fact that we have expended millions of dollars to encourage its production, would have just as much weight under the parity formula and would affect the price of all other agricultural commodities as much as would wheat, cotton, corn, and dairy products.

I submit that it is absolutely absurd to consider that a commodity such as grapefruit, important though it is, could when it fluctuates, change the price of wheat, as would be the case under the 10-year moving average.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the parliamentary situation is that the committee bill is still open for amendment, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Chair can answer that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to send to the desk three amendments which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the period on which the formula rests is not a normal period. In establishing the old parity period, an earnest study was made to find the time when all the segments of American business, industry, and finance were on a comparable basis. We finally found it in the period from 1909 to 1914, inclusive. That is the period on which parity was based. Of course the parity period changes with the passing years. Seven of the 10 years on which the parity period is based by the pending bill were war years, when the prices of some commodities were depressed by controls and the prices of other commodities were encouraged to advance through the payment of subsidies.

Mr. President, it is not, I submit, a fair exchange. A 10-year moving average, in my opinion, is not the proper way to go about a revision of the parity program. The basic idea of the committee bill may be sound. I am frank to say that I do not thoroughly understand its approach to the problem, and I am convinced from the debate which has taken place on the floor that I am far from being the only Member of the Senate who does not understand it. There have been times when even those who should have the most intimate knowledge of it were not completely informed.

I say, again, Mr. President, that those who desire to do so can take the responsibility for pulling down the prices of wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, or rice, as this bill would pull them down. The bill makes a substantial reduction in the parity prices of those commodities, and of a great many more. Not only does it bring down the parity price—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. If no legislation on the subject is passed at all, would the present law as to parities remain in force?

Mr. RUSSELL. The present law fixing parity would remain in force, but we would not have the loan values that my amendment seeks to continue. The parity program would be the same, but commodity loans that provide a floor for farm prices would not be in existence.

Mr. CONNALLY. In other words, we would have a law but would have no money to carry it out?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. The farmer could not get price support for his commodities.

So, Mr. President, not only does the bill reduce the parity price, but it reduces the loan value of the great basic commodities from 90 to 75 percent. There are those who say that the farmer is anxious to have his loan rate reduced. Those who wish to do so can delude themselves with that idea. I do not propose, by my vote, to bring about a reduction of 25 percent in the amount available for loans for farmers on these great basic commodities, as this bill proposes to do. The bill, if enacted, will undoubtedly bring about a great reduction in farm income. It will deprive the farmer of the benefit of a loan at a time when he needs it the most.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that some farmers want the loan rate reduced?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said that a great many farmers and farm organizations are supporting his bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is there anything to prevent farmers from borrowing less money than the maximum?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing to prevent that at all.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did the Senator from Georgia ever hear of a farmer borrowing less than the maximum?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, and I do not think I ever shall.

Mr. President, I am opposed to discouraging production, as this bill will do. It will fail the farmer in his hour of need, when there are surpluses and prices have been beaten down. It will decrease the value of the farmer's commodities.

I shall not commit myself to any program of this kind, in this shotgun fashion, in the closing hours of the Congress, when our minds are absorbed in innumerable details regarding other legislation. That is no reflection on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have a great regard for the membership of that committee. I am proud of the fact that at one time I served as a member of that committee, and would be a member of it today, but for the fact that reorganization made it impossible for me to continue as a member of it. But, Mr. President, a committee of the Senate has to be an advisory body to the Senate. Merely because we appropriated a few thousand dollars to enable the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make a study, I, as one Senator, am not bound to accept the recommendation which the committee imposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I regret that I have not been able to be present all the time the Senator from Georgia has been discussing the subject. I know he is well informed in regard to this question. He spent years in studying farm problems. Am I correct in my information that the aid to citrus fruit growers would be substantially the same under the continuation of the present program as under the terms of the new bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is any question about that. The benefits of the citrus producers would be substantially the same.

Mr. McFARLAND. How about potatoes?

Mr. RUSSELL. The same with potatoes. Under the substitute the benefits would be greater as to wheat, corn, and cotton.

Mr. McFARLAND. In Arizona we are interested in a great many of these products, but we are very substantially interested in the cotton program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Cotton, of course, would fare much better, and so would wheat and corn. The basic commodities would fare much better under the substitute amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. In Arizon we are interested also in potatoes.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the case of potatoes there is no substantial difference.

Mr. McFARLAND. We grow grain in Arizona. As I understand the Senator, we would fare much better under the old program with reference to grain.

Mr. RUSSELL. The wheat parity is reduced by the committee bill, and the loan would be reduced in times of surplus.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, to sum up, we have not the time to give this bill the study to which it is entitled. I favor a long-range agricultural program, but it should not be adopted in such a way as to discourage production at a time when the American farmer is still being called upon to produce not only for our consumption at home, but to feed and clothe the world.

This bill would eventually reduce the farm income of the country. It would deny the farmer the benefits of legislation which has been enacted for him over a long period of years. To adopt the substitute which I propose would enable us to wind up the discussion of farm legislation for the time being without gambling on the fate of the complicated committee bill in a conference between the two Houses. We could come back at the next session of Congress and start early in the session, without the pressures of the present time, and work out a fair and equitable long-range farm program which would do violence to no farmer or group of farmers, or the consuming public of the United States.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On June 10, 1948:

S. 825. An act for the relief of Ern Wright;

S. 1055. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irma M. Pierce and Charles Z. Pierce;

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Jack O'Donnell Graves;

S. 1486. An act to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of separation from the Government service in the case of persons improperly removed from such service;

S. 1588. An act for the relief of E. W. Strong;

S. 1729. An act for the relief of Gudrun Emma Ericsson;

S. 1886. An act for the relief of William M. Looney; and

S. 2277. An act to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes.

On June 11, 1948:

S. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to amend section 303 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes."

On June 12, 1948:

S. 1641. An act to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Air Force, Regular Navy, and Marine Corps, and in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes; and

S. 1941. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John F. Compton, formerly John Crazy Bull, a patent in fee to certain land.

On June 14, 1948:

S. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

S. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution providing for appropriate observance of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of Washington and Lee University.

On June 15, 1948:

S. 1987. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Preston Bench project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws; and

S. 2137. An act to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes.

ACCEPTANCE OF CONSTITUTION OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION INSTRUMENT OF AMENDMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 117, providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:
>
> "SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—
>
> "(a) such sums, not to exceed $1,091,739 per annum, as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization, as apportioned by the International Labour Conference in accordance with Article 13 (c) of the Constitution of the Organization; and
>
> "(b) such additional sums, not to exceed $95,000 per annum, as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization, including—
>
> "(1) salaries of the representative or representatives and alternates and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light and cost of living allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and
>
> "(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946, Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that Act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).
>
> "SEC. 3. No person shall serve as representative, delegate, or alternate from the United States until such person has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."
>
> And the House agree to the same.
>
> ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
> H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
> TOM CONNALLY,
> *Managers on the Part of the Senate.*
>
> DONALD L. JACKSON,
> FRANKLIN J. MALONEY,
> WIRT COURTNEY,
> *Managers on the Part of the House.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

REPORT ON VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, from June 1 through June 4 a series of hearings on the Voice of America programs were held jointly by a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, under my chairmanship, and the investigations subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan. These hearings were held pursuant to a resolution offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana authorizing an investigation of the radio-broadcast operations of the State Department under Public Law 402. As you know, prior to the introduction of the resolution, the Senator from Indiana called to the attention of the Senate certain objectionable material contained in a program called Know North America which was sponsored by the Voice of America.

The immediate purpose of these first hearings was to determine the responsibility for the criticized broadcasts, to the end that the vitally important service that should be rendered by the Voice of American program be strengthened and protected against future mistakes or misuse.

The investigation to date and hearings so far conducted establish the fact that a great deal of the material in the Know North America series was erroneous and in very bad taste. The excerpts quoted by the Senator from Indiana were representative of many other equally untrue and ill-chosen passages.

The single, predominate conclusion resulting from the investigation so far made is that foreign broadcasts sponsored and financed by the United States Government must be made on a quality basis. Our Government cannot continue to be responsible for disseminating trash. Neither the Congress nor the public will tolerate preventable mistakes which have the grave effect of holding the United States up to calumny and ridicule. The series of programs called Know North America were a serious blunder which tended to destroy any value which the other South American broadcasts may have had. Instead of promoting a better understanding of the United States in other countries and increasing mutual understanding, this series of broadcasts presented a false picture of the United tates to the detriment of the United States.

The final and unmistakable responsibility for this blunder rests with the Department of State. It not only failed adequately to supervise the contents of these programs in a reasonable manner, but it also failed to make even a cursory check to determine if the policies of the Government were being carried out. No check was made prior to, during or after the broadcasts to prevent this or similar blunders.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My recollection is that the Appropriations Committee last year, in acting upon appropriations for the Department of State, deducted from that Department's estimates the

sums which were recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of supervision. Moreover, the law, as passed, distinctly instructed the State Department to abandon these broadcasts under the supervision of the State Department, and required that they should be carried on by private companies. When the Congress tells the Department of State it may not conduct its own programs, that the work must be delegated to private companies, and then takes away the money with which to employ the personnel to supervise the programs, it is very difficult for me to understand why the Department of State should be held responsible. It is true that these programs were not supervised, but the operation of the State Department was hamstrung by the action of Congress.

Mr. SMITH. I will say to the distinguished Senator that we shall continue our hearings and bring out all the facts. Although the funds of the State Department were reduced, I do not think the State Department or the National Broadcasting Co. have adequately carried out their responsibility.

An important collateral responsibility for the failure of these programs rests with the National Broadcasting Co. Its employees failed to appreciate their grave obligation to produce a program that would bring credit to the United States. The fact that the National Broadcasting Co. may have thought that the State Department was monitoring these programs does not excuse their failure adequately to check on the contents thereof over a long period of time. The attempt on the part of both the State Department and the National Broadcasting Co. to advance, if not as a cause at least as an excuse, the thought that there was a divided responsibility under the provisions of the legislation does not stand analysis. What actually existed was a dual responsibility which, if it had been exercised properly by both, should have doubled the supervision and have greatly lessened the possibility of such previous errors. The position taken that the criticized passages were only a small portion of the entire program and that the scripts in their entirety were of good quality is not, even if true, a material factor since one false or incorrect statement may ruin the entire effect of the program and undo all the good which may have been done by other broadcasts.

The firm purpose of the Voice of America program is to present the truth about the United States in terms understandable to the particular country to which the information is directed. This is a vitally important service that must be continued at this critical time. Congress has made it clear on many occasions that an honest, accurate and fair appraisal of our democracy and of our people presented in an enlightened and intelligent manner is the most effective way to compete with the perversions of Soviet propaganda. We want to stress again as we have done in the past that the responsibility—the complete responsibility for carrying out the will of Congress in an intelligent and enlightened manner rests with the State Department. No confusion in this regard should exist and this is especially true insofar as it relates to present and future broadcasts.

It should be clearly understood that the remarks I have just made are not intended as a condemnation of the whole Voice of America program. The idea and the general policies laid down by the Congress are sound. It is my hope that the blunders which have already occurred should not be magnified out of proper proportion because of the inexcusable administrative blunders in this instance.

On the other hand it would be equally unwise to minimize the errors of the past by blandly concluding that mistakes are bound to happen. Therefore our immediate recommendation is this: Those who accept the responsibility for speaking for America must be made to feel this responsibility. Those who accept the responsibility for speaking for America must be made to know that the stakes are high and that their blunders hold our country up to ridicule and disgrace. Our committees have stressed this recommendation to the State Department and we have their assurance that this will be done. We have the assurance of the State Department that enlightened and vigorous care will be given to qualify production in the field of radio broadcasts.

I desire to make it clear that the committees place no part of the blame for this unfortunate occurrence on Secretary Allen. The incidents subject to criticism occurred prior to his assuming his duties on March 30 as head of the Information Service. We are confident that under his able leadership these errors will be corrected.

It is the considered judgment of the two committees that the continuation of our investigation is essential. For this reason we will not file a report at this time but will continue an investigation and study of the Voice of America. At a future time we plan to file a joint report which will summarize the work done by the committees and we hope will report a great many vitally needed improvements.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, speaking as chairman of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I wish to state that our subcommittee is in agreement with the views and recommendations made by the Senator from New Jersey concerning the Voice of America broadcasts. The problems of adequately and intelligently portraying the story of the American way of life to foreign radio audiences is of utmost importance. Radio broadcasts to other peoples of the world sponsored by our Government must not contain half-truths, untruths, or worthless or silly information. The American public and the Congress has a right to expect that these broadcasts will be presented in an intelligent and enlightened manner. It is inexcusable for the State Department and the private broadcasting companies, with a large grant of public funds available to produce inferior programs.

I am firmly convinced that these overseas broadcasts must be programs of the highest quality. There appears to be too much stress placed on quantity; very little on quality. If such quality cannot be obtained in our broadcasts, they will likely do more harm than good. However, I am convinced of the necessity for such a program, if it is administered properly.

In order that we may be certain that in the future these broadcasts will be handled in an intelligent manner, I believe that the matter should receive the continued surveillance by the Congress. The need for continuing our investigation is demonstrated by examples of other broadcasts which went out over the air in Voice of America programs. Representatives of the National Broadcasting Co. and the State Department attempted to point out that this particular series of Know North America broadcasts was a single instance of bad judgment. That does not appear to be the case. Our staff, after examining transcripts of other State Department broadcasts, found that in another series of programs there was one on the city of Rochester, N. Y. This program portrayed the visit of a tourist to the city of Rochester. The narrator discussed the various aspects of Rochester, N. Y., and suddenly, about halfway through the program, he discovered that they were passing the Mayo Clinic.

I am sure that the present occupant of the chair [Mr. THYE] would know that the famous Mayo Clinic was in Rochester, Minn., and not in Rochester, N. Y., but the narrator portrayed it as being in Rochester, N. Y.

Thereafter, they carried out an elaborate reenactment of a scene of entering the Mayo Clinic and inspecting the buildings and watching the work of the clinic. This scene at the Mayo Clinic is supposed to have taken place in Rochester, N. Y. I cannot comprehend that responsible people, in a program which attempts to accurately portray the United States, could have made such a factual blunder.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was this script written by the staff of the broadcasting company?

Mr. FERGUSON. By the staff of the broadcasting company.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And it was not supervised by the State Department?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. In another program designed for European consumption we found that there was a regular gossip column type of broadcast concerning Hollywood. Recently this program broadcast a detailed description of a Hollywood wedding ceremony and the expensive wedding party of an oft-married movie star and the equally oft-married spouse. It is difficult to understand how a detailed description of such a lavish and expensive affair could promote better understanding of, or good will for, the United States.

Mr. President, these two additional cases merely illustrate the need for a continuing investigation. It is, therefore, the conclusion of both committees that we should continue to investigate and

study other programs which are being beamed overseas. We will attempt to find out whether these programs are actually reaching the peoples to whom they are directed, and whether they have the intended effect on the listeners. Furthermore, we shall continue to examine the quality of these broadcasts and, if need be, shall report further to the Senate.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, before undertaking to discuss either the Aiken long-range bill or the Russell substitute for temporary support prices, I wish to make a few general observations on the problems confronting farmers and those dependent upon agriculture for a living, who constitute about one-fifth of our entire population.

I wish to give to the Senate the estimate of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics about probable prices for this year and probable prices for next year, because I hope that what I have to say on that subject will have some bearing upon whether or not we should proceed at this late hour in the session, and with so little opportunity to know what is in this long-range program, and how it will affect our farmers.

Mr. President, what we do in the way of a long-range program, if it should be adopted by the Congress, will have a very vital effect, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has just said, upon the future of agriculture in this Nation.

In driving Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden the angel with the flaming sword announced to them a fundamental principle of future life for all mankind: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." Notwithstanding our remarkable progress in the physical sciences there is no alchemy by which man's three essential needs—food, clothing, and shelter—can be produced without labor. Either we sweat or someone sweats for us if we are to eat bread. The progress of civilization has been characterized by an effort to solve that problem either through the invention of labor-saving devices or the shifting of the burden to the shoulders of others.

Of all human needs food is the most essential. There has never been a period of recorded history in which many people did not go hungry and in which some did not die from starvation. In the Far East, hunger has been a perpetual problem. In the land of Goshen, normally flowing with milk and honey, famine during seven lean years was averted only by the prophetic vision of Joseph. In his African Game Trails, Teddy Roosevelt tells about natives falling on some wild animal he had killed and making a hearty meal of "blood and guts." And an ancient prophet of conservation tells us that the sands of the desert have covered once proud cities which nurtured a race that was unmindful of the good earth that fed it.

Western Europe to which we and a large portion of the world are indebted for the Christian religion, a system of law based upon reason and justice, literature, art, and science—in a word what we regard as modern civilization, has failed for several centuries to produce a food supply adequate for its needs. Domestic production has been supplemented by imports from colonial possessions and by the exchange of industrial products for food.

Many factors enter into our greatness, not the least of which has been our ability to produce not only an adequate food supply for ourselves but likewise a surplus for export to others. If the time ever comes when we shall be unable to feed ourselves it will be the harbinger of the day when we shall cease to be the most powerful Nation in the world.

During my 31 years of public service, which commenced in the State senate in January, 1916, my chief ambition and my major objective have been to make some contribution in Virginia and in the Nation to the preservation of our soil and our renewable natural resources and the reestablishment of farming as a satisfying as well as remunerative manner of life. As a State legislator I worked for improved roads that would take our farmers out of the mud, and for rural schools that would release the vigorous minds of rural children from the bondage of ignorance. I supported tax reforms that lifted State taxation from farm lands and transferred the burden of building and maintaining farm roads from the localities to the State. For 10 years as a member of the Tax Committee of the House of Representatives I worked for tax legislation that would give due recognition to the fact that for 100 years the per capita cash income of the farm group was far below that of the nonfarm group. And during my 15 years of service in the Congress I have supported the entire legislative program of the Farm Bureau Federation including the Hull reciprocal trade agreements program to recapture foreign markets for our surplus tobacco, cotton, wheat, apples, and to a lesser degree other farm products, lost to us by an international trade war started by the enactment in 1930 of the Smoot-Hawley protective tariff. And for 12 years as chairman of the House Select Committee on Wildlife Conservation I endeavored to convince some 20,000,000 sportsmen in the United States that the future of hunting and fishing was definitely linked to the conservation of our fields and forests. During that period I insisted that the CCC camps and the Soil Conservation Service include the conservation of wildlife resources in their programs of conserving timber and land, as a means of bringing the farm group and the nonfarm group closer together and improving the recreational opportunities of both.

Since 1939 the net income of farmers, before taxes and before living cost rises are deducted, has increased 83 percent. That is a greater increase than has been enjoyed by any other single group in the Nation, and has given rise to the charge that farm prices are unreasonably high and constitute a major factor in the current inflation equation. The charge is not well founded. Between 1930 and 1939 the farm dollar was exchanged for the industrial dollar at a discount, leading some to believe that they had a vested right to purchase their food below the cost of production. Farm prices have risen more than other prices but they started in 1939 at a much lower level. Notwithstanding recent gains, the current per capita net income of our farmers is only 46 percent of that of the nonfarm group, and the purchasing power of the nonfarm group is above the prewar level of 1939. Our Nation is now consuming 12 percent more food than in 1939 and is consuming better food. If consumption of food at present prices was at the level of 1939 the percentage of the average income spent for that purpose would be 3 percent less than it was in the 1930–39 period. And the nonfarm group may have forgotten but our farmers will never forget that in the depression year of 1932 the net cash income of our farmers was only 23 percent of that of the nonfarm group. Nor will they forget that between May 1920 and January 1922 the cash income of farmers fell 60 percent. During the 1930 to 1938 depression thousands of farmers lost their land completely in foreclosure sales, while other thousands were able to retain their land by the sale of the fertility of its topsoil.

That is a situation which from the standpoint of future national defense as well as economic stability must not be permitted to recur. One-third of our topsoil is gone—exhausted or washed away—and we have an average of only 6 inches left. Our population will continue to increase and those now acquainted with the advantages of good food will always want it. We, plus Canada and Argentina, are the only three nations in the world with a surplus of food grain for export, and there will always be an export demand. Last but not least, the claim made by Thomas Jefferson more than 100 years ago, that our democracy can best be preserved through the preservation of the economic independence of our farmers, was never truer than it is today.

The depression which commenced in 1930 and lasted 8 years should have demonstrated to our industrial workers the extent to which full employment for them was dependent upon the purchasing power of the one-fifth of our population dependent upon agriculture. Sixty millions are now employed in industry and their output is 90 percent above the prewar level. In the years that lie ahead exports totaling not less than $10,000,000,000 and sustained purchasing power of the farm group will be required to furnish employment for 60,000,000 industrial workers.

In the Bible there are recorded prophecies which came true 600 years after they were made. If there be any living man who can prophesy with assurance what will happen even 6 months from now I do not know him. The best that any of us can do is to make a well-informed guess. Since those who work in our Bureau of Agricultural Economics are better informed than I on factors that

will influence the future of agriculture I shall give the Senate today its guess on the current outlook. Senators will, of course, observe that in making its guess the Bureau inserts an abundance of ifs, buts, and other qualifications.

The Bureau anticipates that the level of farm prices for 1948 will be about the same as the record level of 1947 and that income from farming will show only a slight decline, but both will be increasingly subject to fluctuations resulting from uncertainties in the foreign situation.

Employment, production, and incomes, which underlie domestic demand, set peacetime records in 1947 and only a sharp break, which is not expected now, could cause a big drop in domestic demand for farm products within the next year. But the possible results of inflationary pressure must not be overlooked. With prices continuing to rise and speculation increasing, our economy would become increasingly sensitive to shocks from such sources as shortages of basic materials, work stoppages, shifts in consumer spending and sudden changes in foreign balance. If these resulted in a further price boom followed by a reaction, the farmer would be a principal sufferer, just as he was after World War I. Farm product prices fall fast while interest on indebtedness, taxes, and many other elements entering into the cost of farming drop more slowly when a collapse occurs.

Foreign needs for American raw materials, including farm products, remain so critical that United States exports in 1949 will be limited almost entirely by the supply of dollars available.

We must remember that in 1946 the United States exports were more than $8,000,000,000 in excess of our imports. Even after deducting $3,000,000,000 of exports paid for by direct grants of public or private United States aid, that meant that foreign nations had to draw on their current earnings or reserves to the extent of more than $5,000,000,000 to pay for our export balance.

During 1947 we were exporting at the rate of $11,000,000,000 a year in excess of our imports. United States merchandise exports, particularly agricultural products, have declined this year from the 1947 record level. The value of agricultural exports in the first quarter of 1948 was lower than in any quarter of 1947 and about 13 percent below the 1947 quarterly average of $983,000,000. The European recovery program will tend to support agricultural exports during the remainder of 1948 but may not maintain them at first-quarter levels.

Foreign purchasers probably will not earn exchange much faster next year than in 1947 and their holdings of dollar assets and gold to make up the balance continue to be reduced. So, except to the extent that we find ways of increasing our import trade, the measure of our exports in 1949 will be largely the amount of Marshall-plan aid that is authorized.

The influence of this situation on farm-product prices is evident when we consider that in 1946 the physical quantity of our agricultural exports was about two and a half times the 1940 level and the value was nearly five times the 1935–39 average. In 1947 the quantity was 5 percent above 1946 and higher prices made the value still higher. This year, however, the quantity is substantially lower to date and if current prospects for crop production abroad are realized, foreign takings of United States farm products will be reduced perhaps 15 to 20 percent below last year's record of $3,900,000,000.

Wheat exports, which accounted for about one-third of the total value of agricultural exports in 1947, will be considerably less than last year's record but exports of cotton, tobacco, and fruits, which declined last year, are likely to be increased.

Before the war, cotton and tobacco made up about two-thirds of the value of our agricultural exports and food the rest. Since the war, the proportions have been reversed. The action of Britain in stopping exports of American tobacco last year to save dollars gave us a sample of how seriously the market for nonfood products may be affected by policies adopted by foreign countries in meeting their exchange problems.

Considering the outlook from a price angle, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics says there should be little change from 1947 levels in 1948 and prices should remain high enough generally to assure farmers a profitable return for a maximum production. At the same time the agency predicts that prices paid by farmers will average as high or higher in 1948 than in 1947 so that the parity ratio will remain about the same.

Here is the price picture, as the Bureau sees it, for some specific classes of farm products in 1948:

Livestock and meats: Total cash receipts to farmers for sales of meat animals probably will be a record or near-record despite prospect that total marketings will be the smallest since 1942.

Dairy products: Average prices about the same or higher than in 1947.

Poultry and eggs: At least as high average prices for eggs in 1948 as in 1947. Prices of turkeys and chickens will tend to remain strong because of shorter meat supplies and high consumer incomes.

Oils and fats: European demand will remain strong because poor crops have increased food needs and fats and oils are fairly inexpensive sources of calories. Prices in the United States will remain high as long as these conditions continue. Prices to farmers for the 1947 peanut crop were the highest in 37 years of record, due largely to the export demand for oils. Some decline is expected but levels would have to drop about 50 percent to reach support levels and such a drop is regarded as unlikely to occur within the next few months.

With respect to wheat, corn, and feed grain it is likely that prices in 1948–49 will continue well above support levels.

Fruits: Prices in 1948 probably will be about the same as in 1947 although demand may be slightly weaker.

Potatoes: Demand in 1948 probably will be about as strong as in 1947. Prices early this year were higher than last winter and exceeded support prices.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia is making a most able and excellent address on the agricultural situation, and there are so few Senators present to listen to him that I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the Senator's permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Suggestion is made of the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Ives	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Cain	Kilgore	Stennis
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Chavez	McCarthy	Taylor
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McFarland	Thye
Cordon	McGrath	Tobey
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Umstead
Dworshak	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ecton	Martin	Wherry
Ellender	Maybank	White
Feazel	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	Williams
Flanders	Morse	Wilson
Fulbright	Murray	Young
Green	Myers	
Gurney	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, today we have heard much discussion about tobacco. Before the war, exports of flue-cured tobacco were half of production; in 1946–47, they were nearly 40 percent of a record crop. Reduced exports are to be expected, because of exchange problems, but this may be offset to some extent by domestic use which is expected to continue at peak levels. Cigarette manufacture will set a record. Because of the large production of flue-cured tobacco for the last 2 years, stocks have increased, and in view of prospects for demand, supplies would have been excessive in 1948–49 if production had not been cut substantially. Supplies of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco also are larger than a year ago, and would have been burdensome if reduction of allotments had not assured lower production in 1948.

Without undertaking to prophesy price trends for next year, I do wish to endorse several factors mentioned by the Bureau as having a possible influence thereon. That the farmer would be a principal sufferer if the present boom should turn next year into a deflation

is undoubtedly true. Using wholesale prices for 1926 as 100, wholesale prices advanced 27 percent more in 6 years after the commencement of World War I than in a similar period since the commencement of World War II. The former inflation was followed by a deflation which was most injurious to our farmers. With $110,000,000,000 of currency and bank check money in the hands of consumers no one can accurately predict at what exact point enough consumers would be priced out of the market to end the current boom. We know that the margin between purchasing power and prices is rapidly narrowing. The best antidote for our inflation is increased production, especially in such items as steel, coal, fertilizer, automobiles, electrical appliances and housing.

For the long pull with respect to export markets for farm products, the 102 multilateral trade agreements signed last year at the Geneva Trade Conference is an encouraging trend for the American farmer, notwithstanding the fact that the scheduled tariff reductions in many of them will not become immediately effective, although our reductions in the 15 agreements to which we are a party became immediately effective.

In this connection I would like to reiterate the view I expressed in connection with the recent discussion of extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act as to the vital importance of this program to our economy.

To a large extent modern wars have been trade wars. If it be true, and I believe it is, that economic chaos is the spawning bed for communism and that desperate men are willing to exchange ballots for bread, what contribution to a lasting peace would be our help in the economic rehabilitation of the countries of western Europe if after rehabilitation we refuse to trade with them? In two disastrous world wars we have found that war is indivisible. Most of us are convinced that peace is indivisible; that the economic welfare of democracy elsewhere in the world is of major concern to us; and that President Roosevelt was right when he said in 1937: "Our frontier is on the Rhine."

While export markets are available to industry and agriculture alike and particularly valuable to such farm crops as tobacco and cotton, it must be borne in mind that our domestic market has been and always will be our principal market. Any worth-while farm program, therefore, must have as its major objective appropriate adjustments to the domestic market. It is already apparent, for instance, that we are producing more tobacco and more peanuts than we can profitably sell. Some of the land now devoted to those crops must be shifted to other types of production. On the assumption that domestic prices will fall before production costs go down more efficient use must be made of machinery, gas engines, and electric power. I do not know the current figures but a few years ago the average farm in Virginia contained only 50 acres. The owner of such a farm cannot afford to buy and operate the machinery he needs.

Agriculture has become industrialized and to successfully compete, the modern farmer must have modern equipment. I am told, for instance, that 34 years ago 32 minutes of man-labor were required to produce a bushel of corn. Today, only 6 minutes. This tremendous saving in time has been brought about mostly by improved power machinery, plus the improved varieties of seed, disease control, and better use of fertilizers. But from 1913 to 1915 only 29 percent of the cost of corn production was cash outlay. Today it is 68 percent. Tractors, machinery, fuel oil, and the necessary reserve for depreciation on machinery make up 33 percent of the cost of producing corn today as compared with only 6 percent some 20 years ago.

During the past quarter of a century the problems of farm production have to a large extent been solved. We have not achieved the ultimate in efficient farm production because some do not apply known principles, others cannot finance the purchase of necessary equipment, and still others do not yet enjoy the benefit of rural electrification. But the farm problem which has not been solved and which merits our best attention and best efforts is how to make farming a more satisfactory manner of life, how to combine with the vigor and independence of farm life the social and cultural advantages of city life. For more than half a century the trend has been away from the farm to the big industrial centers. Agriculture is so vital to the future of this Nation that we cannot afford to keep losing our brightest and most energetic boys and girls because farm life is distasteful to them. Farm families must have more money to invest in better housing and in the amenities of life. Work on the farm for the boy, work in the home for the girl, need not be ill-paid drudgery. We must seek to develop in rural sections better elementary schools and make available to farm boys and girls in secondary schools and in colleges training in the arts and sciences of modern life as well as in scientific agriculture. We must give support to Ruritan Clubs which seek to develop the social activities and the community spirit of their respective neighborhoods.

In these several ways we can lay foundation stones for the perpetuity of our democracy. We start with the fact that every farmer knows that there is no substitute for work. We start with the fact that every farmer believes in a system of private enterprise under which superior brains, character, and energy may expect a superior reward. It is not an eleemosynary system nor one that guarantees anyone anything. Communism guarantees the essentials of food, clothing, and shelter, but delivers those essentials at a low level and at the price of chains and slavery. Our farmers know that our system of private enterprise is one in which they may take some hard knocks, but in doing so they build strength, character, and self-reliance, and over and above all else they are free. The best collateral for the loans we have made in the past and the loans we shall make in the future to the British people is that they love personal freedom. The best monument that we can build to the memory of those who died in two world wars for our freedom will be to make farming in America a satisfying manner of life. "Let us never forget," said Daniel Webster, "that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. When tillage begins other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of civilization."

Of course, Mr. President, entertaining the sentiments I have expressed on the general problems involved in farming and in agriculture generally, I believe in a long-range program, but I regret very much, with all due deference to the distinguished Senators who are sponsoring the Aiken bill, that I do not feel prepared to vote tonight on that bill, because, frankly, I do not know what is in it. I have studied the hearings, but the hearings were on a different bill. There were about 500 pages of hearings, and nearly all the witnesses had some suggestions or some criticisms to make of the first bill which was introduced. That bill was completely eliminated, and we have another bill of 96 pages. So far as I know, there have been no hearings on it, and I am sure the bill has not been sent over the country for study and comment, because I have not heard or received any comment from anyone in Virginia about what is in the new bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator speaks of the new farm bill. Is the Senator speaking of the Aiken bill?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Of the new Aiken bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a fact that we are required to pass a farm bill providing for acreage reduction due to the policy of the Republican Party in enacting the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, raising the tariff barriers so high that foreign countries could not get dollar exchange with which to purchase American farm products? The Republicanism tariff policy, which has impoverished American agriculture, which has drained off the wealth from American agriculture and siphoned it into eastern industrial areas, is what caused this bill to be brought forth. Because of those tariff walls foreign countries do not have exchange with which to buy the food and fiber they need.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I have taken some time this evening—I hope not too much time—in discussing that very problem, and in undertaking to demonstrate that for 100 years the per capita income of the farm group has been lower than that of the nonfarm group, and that foreign markets have always been essential to our farmers because we produce more than we consume. I called attention to the fact that 40 percent of our cotton at one time was exported, from 40 to 50 percent of our tobacco, 20 percent of our apples, from 10

to 15 percent of our wheat. We have always needed the foreign markets, and of course if in the long run we do not receive imports from other countries from which they can obtain dollar exchange, they cannot buy from us. Our exports are running at the present time $5,000,000,000 more than our imports, and those exports are being financed to no small extent by loans and gifts. We know we cannot keep that up indefinitely. But I did want to say before I ended—and I have already spoken longer than I had planned to speak—just a word or two as to why I preferred action at this time on the Russell substitute to action on the new and amended Aiken bill.

As I said, the amended Aiken bill may be a wonderfully fine bill, but the first bill was certainly not a good one. I pointed out that practically all the witnesses criticized it, and the committee abandoned it in toto. Then after the proponents had brought out the new bill, on which there was no testimony, they themselves have offered 10 pages of amendments—I counted, I believe, 47 amendments in the 10 pages; I might have missed some—and I could not help but think, when the distinguished Senator from Vermont was reminding us on the Democratic side that a Democratic President had just praised his bill in a speech made in California, that while he was doing so the President's Secretary of Agriculture was pleading with the Senator from Vermont to make changes in his bill, and, as I understood him yesterday, most of these 47 changes were made at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture because he was not satisfied with the form in which the bill was drawn.

So, Mr. President, there is my problem. A bill consisting of 96 pages has been brought before the Senate. When debate began on it 10 pages of amendments to the bill were adopted. Then when Senators on the floor indicated they were not satisfied, the sponsors of the bill accepted an amendment relating to potatoes, another amendment relating to apples, another relating to chickens, and the Senate adopted an amendment affecting tobacco, and, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] says, an amendment dealing with ducks was put in the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Dead ducks.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I had overlooked that amendment. I guarantee, however, that with the possible exception of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who drew both bills, and who agreed to the various amendments, and who prepared other amendments, there is not another Member of this distinguished body who could stand on the floor tonight and without reference to numerous notes tell us what is now in the bill and what it means. I note, for instance, the bill starts off in the first part of it to abolish all local committees of the Production and Marketing Association. It is proposed to combine production and marketing with soil conservation and have an entirely new setup. That might be wise; I do not say it is not wise; I merely say that I am not prepared to vote, in effect, in the dark on taking a step such as that. There are 2,500 individuals in the production and marketing units of Virginia who handle acreage control, price support, and things of that kind. We have soil-conservation districts and men who are engaged in that work. We have the Extension Service, and men engaged in that work.

There is one thing I have noticed in the new bill, which apparently is in the right direction, and that is that it provides that in the future all educational work shall be under the supervision and direction of the Extension Service. I think that is a good provision.

I am not condemning the bill, Mr. President, because it would not be fair for me to condemn something I do not understand. I have tried to understand and have a little knowledge of what I am called upon to vote on. If I did not have to vote on the measure one way or another it would be a good thing; but I am obliged to vote, and being obliged to vote I want to say that I prefer to vote for what I know about, and I do know about the existing plan. Under the amendment of the Senator from Georgia that plan is to be continued in substantially its present form for 2 years. Perhaps the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will accept an amendment to make it less than 2 years, because June 30 is not a good time to end a support program. But I do know what that program means, Mr. President. It continues 90 percent of parity for certain basic products and a lower percentage for others.

Mr. President, I have given the Senate the statistics which were furnished me today by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics that prices for this year, and so far as it could tell, well into next year, will run about as they are now, and the Bureau cannot anticipate that any major crop will fall below parity. If that be true, and since Congress will reconvene next January, why should we try tonight to adopt a long-range permanent program which we have never had before, which we do not understand, from which we may not be able to get away once we adopt it, and which, as the Senator from Georgia has said, may result, when our farmers are asking for bread, in handing them a stone. The safe, the prudent thing to do is to continue the present support program for the farmers for a limited period, and then when Congress meets next year, if the bill, as amended, is the answer to the farmers' prayer for permanent support for agriculture, we can receive the testimony of experienced witnesses and know what we are doing.

Mr. President, I discussed this matter for a long time with my good friend, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, with whom I served in the House. He told me, "We will not take your Aiken bill." Then I discussed the matter with Representative HOPE, of Kansas, whom I have known for many years, who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House. He said, "We will not take your Aiken bill." Then the former chairman of the committee, and now the ranking minority member, Representative JOHN FLANNAGAN, of Virginia, came over to the Senate floor and told me, "The House will not take the Aiken bill." In view of that, does my distinguished friend, the Senator from Vermont, mean to say to us, "We are going to adjourn Congress without any relief for farmers at all?" The House will not take this bill. Will the Senator from Vermont, in view of that situation, say, "We are not going to take the House bill," thus winding up in a deadlock and leaving the farmers between the upper and the nether millstones? I hope that is not the Senator's position.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the House will not take the Senator's bill, in view of the fact that there are so many Members of this body who want to help the farmers, but do not want to take a leap in the dark, I hope the Senator will join with us in putting through in the present session the House provision for a temporary continuance of the support program, and let us leave alone the long-range program which may come up for action next January.

Mr. MAYBANK obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska for any questions he may wish to propound.

Mr. WHERRY. There was some discussion a while ago with reference to what the Senate might take up next. I am not sure why that question was asked, but I should like to say that, if it makes any difference in the matter of obtaining unanimous consent, I should like to propound to the proponents and the opponents of the pending measure the following question: If they feel that ample debate has been had on the pending bill, or can be had by a certain hour—and I would suggest not later than 8 o'clock—can we then conclude the debate, and begin voting on the pending amendment in the nature of a substitute, and any amendments thereto which are germane, and then proceed to vote on final passage? Do the proponents and opponents of the measure feel that such an agreement can be entered into?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Since I was the one who made the request, and since the Senator from Nebraska says he does not know why I made it, I should like an opportunity to explain why I made it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska to propound some questions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to submit my unanimous-consent request, I think we shall not have to argue. I shall be glad to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement that, immediately following the vote on all the amendments and the bill now under discussion, if we can agree on an hour, the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1387, Senate bill 2589, which is a bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission. The idea is that it would expedite matters if we could take up this other legislation tonight. I do not want to cut off debate. If there are Senators who feel that we should continue the debate on the pending bill, I would not want to shut off debate at all. But I feel that if the proponents and the opponents could agree on an hour—say 8 o'clock, or whatever hour is reasonable, if it is early enough—we could then proceed immediately to take up the Atomic Energy Commission bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say to the distinguished acting majority leader and to the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] that I am in thorough agreement with their desire to bring up the Atomic Energy Commission bill. I have a long speech on oleomargarine, in addition to my extemporaneous speech on cotton, which I shall be glad to place in the RECORD. In deference to my good friends from Nebraska and Iowa I do not wish to delay the proceedings.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the Senator's cooperation.

Let me now submit a suggestion to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Calendar No. 1387, Senate bill 2589, is a bill to provide for the extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission. Consideration of that bill would be a part of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there is on the calendar Senate bill 1949, a bill providing for an increased salary payment to postal employees. I believe that the bill has great merit. I should like to have the assurance of my distinguished friend from Nebraska that we can get some action on that bill before the Congress adjourns.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I had the floor, and I yielded to my friend from Nebraska. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut stated that there was a bill on the calendar providing for an increased salary payment to postal employees. That bill provides for more than a salary increase for postal employees, does it not?

Mr. BALDWIN. I believe not. Senate bill 1949 provides for an increase in salary payment to postal employees.

Mr. MAYBANK. Postal employees only?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am in thorough accord with the wish of my friend from Connecticut. However, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is the sponsor of a bill in behalf of navy yard workers. There are also other bills of that nature which should have consideration.

Mr. BALDWIN. I concur in the statement of the Senator from South Carolina. I believe that all the salary-increase bills should be considered before we adjourn.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, they should be.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am in this position: If we are to adjourn on Saturday, we cannot guarantee which bills will receive consideration. However, I think I can assure the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that that is one of the pieces of legislation which will be brought before the Senate in time to get action in both Houses. I cannot guarantee that. I cannot guarantee anything. We can expedite the business of the Senate if we can obtain unanimous-consent agreements and reach a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not understand what time had been suggested.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not suggest a definite time. I had in mind perhaps 7:20, 7:30, or 8 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is now 25 minutes past 7. We could not very well turn the clock back. I would agree to vote on the substitute and conclude the debate thereon by 8:30, the time to be evenly divided. But there are three amendments which I intend to propose; and in the event the substitute should not be accepted, I should like to have 3 or 4 minutes briefly to explain those amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sure there will be no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request to vote on all pending amendments at 8:30?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had reserved the right to object. I want to understand exactly what I am agreeing to before I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit me to suggest a unanimous-consent agreement which I think is in keeping with his wishes?

I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 8:30 the Senate proceed to vote on the pending question, which is the substitute for the committee amendment; and that thereafter the Senate proceed to vote on any amendments which are germane to the bill. I am satisfied that the distinguished Senator from Georgia will have no difficulty in obtaining 5 minutes on each amendment to explain his amendments so that Senators may know what they are voting upon. Then we can proceed to a final vote on the bill.

After a final vote on the bill has been had, a part of the unanimous-consent request is that the unfinished business be made Senate bill 2589, Calendar 1387, a bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it would be agreeable to vote at 8:30 on the pending substitute, with the understanding that the three amendments which I intend to propose shall not be debated for longer than 10 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Vermont. At the conclusion of the vote on the amendments the Senate would vote on final passage of the bill, and would then proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2589, Calendar 1387, the bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission. I would agree to that.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator wish to limit amendments to those which are germane to the subject matter?

Mr. RUSSELL. Under my suggestion, no amendments would be offered save the three to which I refer, which have already been printed and are lying on the table.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I make the further request that no amendments which are not germane shall be offered to the Atomic Energy Commission bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let us not get so far out that I do not know what I am doing. I have no objection to that request.

Mr. MAYBANK. I submit the request, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. I have an amendment which I should like to present. May I have 5 minutes to discuss it?

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. If a rule as to germaneness of amendments is to be adopted, I should like to modify it to this extent, that any amendment which may be proposed may be debated for not longer than 10 minutes, the time to be divided equally between the author of the amendment and the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have a number of amendments to present to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me suggest that if the time is evenly divided, there will be half an hour for each side.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the vote this afternoon, it is very possible that the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be accepted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I decline to yield further. The Senator from Illinois has suggested that the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois might make possible the acceptance of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia will be adopted, because it would benefit the cotton farmers, the cotton ginners, the cotton buyers, the cotton workers, and everyone except the New Orleans and New York Cotton Exchanges and the Chicago Board of Trade.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I am trying to ascertain the request which has been made by the distinguished acting majority leader. As I understand, the request applies to amendments to the substitute amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. The unanimous-consent request is to vote on the substitute at 8:30, and thereafter to allow 10 minutes for each amendment which may be proposed to the bill, and that the time be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to inform the Senator from Nebraska that if the substitute amendment is adopted, that will preclude the offering of any other amendment, inasmuch as then there will be a substitute bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Chair is entirely correct. For that reason I stated in my unanimous-consent request that in the event the substitute amendment be rejected, the rule as to amendments will apply.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I so amend my request, certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request to vote on the substitute amendment at 8:30 p. m.?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I may agree to the request, because I think it is proper. But I wish to state, as I started to say a moment ago, that in view of the vote which was had this afernoon on the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, it seems to me there is a possibility that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment might prevail. Mr. President, I have some amendments which perhaps the Senator from Georgia will agree to; they are amendments which I believe would help his substitute amendment. That is what I wish to discuss. Even at this late hour I do not wish to be barred from discussing those amendments, because it seems to me that the matters to which they relate are important.

We have heard a great deal about what is contained in the so-called Aiken bill, but we have not heard very much about what is contained in the Russell amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if that is the case, there is no possibility of obtaining a unanimous-consent agreement, I assume. I assumed that if the substitute amendment were adopted, that would bring all these matters to an end. However, if the Senator from Illinois wishes to have more than 10 minutes on each of his amendments——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it might not take me more than 10 minutes on all of my amendments, but I wish to be able to discuss them with the Senator from Georgia when I have an opportunity to obtain recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LUCAS. I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, let me make another request. I ask Senators please to be patient, for I am trying to expedite the handling of this matter. Will the Senator from Georgia agree to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, if it is modified so as to provide for a vote at 9 o'clock, so that it will be agreed that the vote on the amendment in the nature of a substitute will be had at 9 o'clock, and that between now and then the amendments to the substitute may be offered? At that time we certainly should be able to vote on the substitute if it is amended.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me propound a further inquiry. Is it the intention of the acting majority leader to have the Senate take up the atomic-energy bill tonight and conclude action on it tonight?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have action on it concluded tonight, if possible; but if not, we would make it the unfinished business, and carry it over until tomorrow.

Of course we have already arranged to begin to call the calendar when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well, Mr. President; if the Senator is agreeable to having the vote taken one-half an hour later than the time first proposed in the requested agreement, I shall have no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, I submit the request as it has been stated by the Senator from Georgia, except to have the hour for voting 9 o'clock instead of 8:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request as now presented?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the agreement. I assume that the time will be equally divided.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. As I understand, the situation under the agreement, we shall have half an hour and the other side will have half an hour on the amendments. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the time will be divided equally between now and 9 o'clock, and that at least 30 minutes will be allowed to the Senator from Illinois for his amendments, and that that time also will be equally divided.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, we have half an hour.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

REPEAL OF THE OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in connection with the oleomargarine situation, I have prepared somewhat lengthy remarks, and I now ask consent to have them printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the Eightieth Congress seems bent on proving once again that in this democracy the will of the people does not always prevail and even the will of an overwhelming majority of Congress can be thwarted by a few.

The people have made it abundantly clear that they want the Federal antimargarine laws repealed. I do not refer merely to the Gallup poll which showed that 69 percent of the people of this country favor repeal while only 15 percent oppose it and which also revealed that a majority of the farmers of this country favor repeal. I refer to the thousands of letters from housewives and workingmen and merchants—from individuals all over the United States—which, week after week and day after day, have poured into the offices of Members of the Senate and the House asking that these discriminatory laws be removed from the statute books. I refer to the testimony in the House and Senate hearings on this subject by official representatives of organizations of wholesale and retail grocers, settlement houses, hospitals, farmers, veterans, labor, women's groups, consumers, and many others—all overwhelmingly in favor of repeal. I refer to hundreds of editorials from newspapers in every State in the Union, weeklies and dailies, large and small which, regardless of whether they are conservative or liberal, Republican or Democrat, have united in demanding an end to these vicious laws.

Congress has made its attitude abundantly clear, too. Nearly 2 months ago, the House passed H. R. 2245, sponsored by my distinguished fellow South Carolinian, Representative MENDEL RIVERS, the bill to repeal all the Federal taxes and license fees on margarine, by a vote of 260 to 106. During the very thorough debate in the House on this issue more than a dozen amendments were offered which would have modified or diluted the repeal measure. Every one of them was voted down. The House had, earlier, demonstrated its attitude when 218 Members took the rare step of signing a petition to discharge one of their most respected committees—the Agriculture Committee—from further consideration of H. R. 2245 after that committee had followed its traditional practice of tabling all margarine tax repeal measures.

Republicans and Democrats, northerners, westerners, and southerners, representatives from States with large dairy interests as well as those from States with cotton and soybean interests, and representatives from large urban and small-town areas, too, all joined to make the position of the House unmistakably clear—the House of Representatives wants these antimargarine laws repealed.

When the bill came to the Senate this body was so zealous for repeal that it overruled its distinguished President and by a vote of 47 to 30 referred H. R. 2245 to the Senate Finance Committee in order that the measure might have prompt consideration there so that we might be able to act on it before this Congress adjourned. The Finance Committee held full hearings on H. R. 2245. Both sides had every opportunity to state their positions, clearly and fairly. And what was the result?

The Senate Finance Committee reported H. R. 2245 favorably, with one strengthening amendment. The vote was 12 to 0. I want to emphasize that point, for as you know, there are Members on the Finance Committee from States with large dairy interests, and yet there was not one single vote on that committee against the antimargarine laws.

The attitude of the whole Senate on this issue was further demonstrated on Tuesday of this week when this body voted 57 to 26 to bring up H. R. 2245 for consideration.

I think the record shows convincingly that for every Member of the Eightieth Congress who favors retention of the Federal antimargarine laws there are two or more who favor repeal. I do not believe that even the most avid supporter of the butter lobby's position would deny that statement.

Yes, the people favor repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws—overwhelmingly. The Eightieth Congress favors repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws—overwhelmingly. And yet—it would appear—those laws are not going to be repealed.

Why? I think we are entitled to ask that question and I think the people of this country are entitled to an answer.

We are told that the Senate doesn't have time to consider the question, that Congress must adjourn this week.

I am not satisfied with that answer and I don't think the people of this country will be satisfied with it.

This is legislation by the clock and it is the wrong way to legislate. The leadership of the Congress should be reminded that we are the servants of the people and not independent entrepreneurs. We are, to state it bluntly, hired to represent the people here and to carry on their business here. We have an obligation to the people who sent us here to finish our job before we quit.

I do not delude myself that what I say now will change the minds of the GOP leadership. If they decree it, I suppose we shall quit this week without action on H. R. 2245 and other important matters. And apparently they are determined to decree it.

But even if we quit this week there is no proper reason for not considering H. R. 2245. I know that there are Members who have threatened to filibuster this bill. But these same Members are among those most eager to adjourn Saturday night. Let them talk then, until the one desire—to quit—overcomes the other—to defeat by talk—this margarine tax repeal measure. We will at least learn then how strongly these Members believe in the absolute necessity of quitting now whether the business of the Senate is completed or not.

I don't believe there is any such necessity, although I am as eager as anyone here to go home. But I don't want to leave until we finish our job. And one of our jobs is to repeal the Federal antimargarine laws.

It is said that there are more important measures to consider than H. R. 2245. In one sense that may be true. Europe will not go hungry, Government bureaus will not be deprived of funds, our foreign trade will not suffer—if we fail to act on H. R. 2245. But the importance of this measure should not be minimized. This is not just a bill to remove a few Federal taxes and license fees. That is not insignificant in itself, but it is only a part—the smaller part—of the real issue.

That issue is one of principle and of justice—and it strikes at the fundamental concepts upon which this country was founded and upon which, with a few unfortunate deviations, it has flourished for 160 years. How many tributes have been paid to our free-enterprise system during all these years! How many glowing tales of achievement under a system of free American markets where initiative and skill were justly rewarded and where the economic privileges and royal franchises of European oligarchies were no more! Our proudest boast from childhood has been that we Americans believed in fair play.

But for margarine—for the industry, for the farmers who grow the ingredients of margarine, for the hundreds of thousands of wholesale and retail merchants who sell it, enterprise has not been free. Margarine has entered the market shackled and restricted. The initiative and skill which produced margarine, and has steadily improved it, has been impeded at every step. Butter, its competitor, has been granted economic advantages unique in our Federal legislative history. And "fair play" has been only a mockery as far as margarine is concerned.

No other American product is discriminated against by the Federal Government in this way. For a hundred years before 1886, when the first Federal antimargarine law was enacted, we had avoided the economic sins of our European forebears. We had never before erected an internal tariff against one American product for the alleged protection of another. Indeed, one of the chief differences—one of the great progressive improvements of the constitutional system over the earlier Articles of Confederation—was that it opened the way for free trade within the 13 States. No longer could Virginia impose import duties on the products of Massachusetts or Pennsylvania on those of the Carolinas. Largely as a result of this free internal trade system, greater economic and industrial progress was achieved in this country in a few generations than had ever been achieved before in the long history of man.

It is little wonder then that those who proposed the first Federal antimargarine law proposed in 1886 were apologetic on this point. They admitted, in the words of Senator Miller of New York—who sponsored that measure in the Senate—that this was "a new species of legislation" in this country.

Mr. President, it was a "new species" and it was a shameful one for it had as its frank and avowed purpose—admitted freely over and over again—the crippling or the destruction of one legitimate American industry for the benefit of another and competing American industry. I could fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with these admissions of the butter lobby and its spokesmen as to the true purpose of the antimargarine laws. But I shall not take the time. It is all there for you to see in the RECORD. I shall mention only a few samples. Senator Miller said that he wanted the bill to protect the dairy industry of New York and he wanted it even if it went so far as to "exterminate the rival industry, if necessary." Other Congressmen repeated this view. In 1902, when the original law was amended to place a prohibitive 10 cents a pound tax on artificially colored margarine, the testimony of the butter interests before the House Agriculture Committee was so shockingly barefaced on this point that it provoked the chairman of that committee, Representative WADSWORTH, of New York, and six other members, to issue a minority report in which they said:

"We do not believe that Congress ought to ruin one American industry to benefit another. And that is just the object sought by these men by their own confession. * * * The minority believes it to be class legislation of the most pronounced kind and it would establish a precedent which, if followed, would create monopolies, destroy competition, and militate against the public good."

In 1932, when—the earlier laws having failed to destroy the margarine industry—the butter interests secured another amendment applying the 10 cents per pound tax to naturally colored yellow margarine, Senator Townsend, who led the fight for that amendment in the Senate, admitted what none can doubt: "The record of the proceedings of Congress," he said, "will convince any reader that the intent of the enactment was to protect the dairy interests."

That is still the intent of the antimargarine laws. It has not changed one iota. As late as 1941 the Dairy Record, a magazine representing the dairy industry, said: "The dairy industry * * * must never rest until the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine have been outlawed in this country." And testimony of the butter interests in the recent Senate hearings included a demand from John Brandt, president of the Land O' Lakes Creameries, for an increase in the taxes of margarine. "That," said Mr. Brandt, "is the only way to do the job."

I suggest that the job is already being done on the American people and the American economic system. It is not a pretty job. It smells to high heaven. As A. L. M. Wiggins, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, told the Finance Committee, these laws are not revenue laws or even regulatory laws. They are "punitive instruments."

This is the situation, then, beyond quibble or question: 62 years ago Congress passed legislation designed to protect one American industry at the expense of another—to give an advantage in the competitive market to butter over margarine. This punitive legislation has survived until today—penalizing one domestic industry for the benefit of another, one group of American farmers for the advantage of another, one group of consumers—the low income group—while another group—those who can afford butter—was left untouched.

I doubt that there is anything that Congress could do today more important than removing this odious precedent, this gross corruption of our basic principles, from our statute books. If this precedent were followed, cotton could with justification demand discriminatory taxes on rayon; leather could rightfully ask for punitive taxes on plastics; lard could justify a claim to similar protection from shortening, and so on, almost without end. If it were followed we would soon find ourselves back in the chaotic economy of the days of the Articles of Confederation or of some of the European states in more recent times. We would Balkanize our economic system.

Now, not next year, is the time to remove this dangerous precedent from our laws. This is primarily a question of principle and of our devotion to the ideals of government and economics to which we pay such constant lip service. The excuses that have been given for not acting now on this issue merely lend credence to the charge of insincerity. We can prove our sincerity only by repealing these laws.

I referred to the statement of the Under Secretary of the Treasury that the antimargarine laws were "punitive instruments." This, it appears, has been the view of the Treasury Department, which is charged with their enforcement, for many years.

Whom do they punish, Mr. President? They punish the 5,000,000 American farm people who grow cotton—and whose cottonseed is, in many cases, their only unmortgaged crop. The discriminatory burdens on margarine are burdens on these needy farmers and their families, for margarine is the largest and most favorable market for their cottonseed oil.

During 1947, 53 percent of all the fats and oils used in margarine came from cottonseed. Thirty-two percent, almost one-third of all the cottonseed oil produced, went into margarine. During the first 4 months of 1948 margarine has consumed approximately 40 percent of the available cottonseed oil.

No one can say how much more margarine would be sold or how much more cottonseed oil would be used by the margarine industry, if the antimargarine laws were repealed. But we can all agree that it would be considerable.

Every day, therefore, that we delay action on H. R. 2245 we deprive these needy people of their rightful access to a free market.

Who else is affected by these punitive laws? I think it would be far easier to say who is not—if there are any who have escaped? Certainly, the 600,000 farmers who grow soybeans—and their families—are directly harmed by the antimargarine laws. For margarine constitutes the second largest market for soybean oil. During 1947, according to official Government statistics, 37 percent of all fats and oils used in margarine came from soybeans. Soybean farmers and their families were able to buy more of the good things of life because this market existed in margarine but they were deprived of part of their

rightful return from their crops by the discriminatory burdens imposed upon margarine by the Federal Government. How much more the margarine market would mean in cash income to these farmers if these burdens were removed is again a matter of conjecture, but we know that it would probably be significant.

These taxes and license fees imposed on margarine are particularly punitive with regard to wholesale and retail food dealers. Less than 1 retail food unit in 2 in this country handles any margarine at all and only 1 in 100 handles yellow margarine. The reason is simple: The retail dealer must pay an annual license fee of $6 a year in order to sell uncolored margarine; if he sells yellow margarine he must pay $48 a year. In addition, he must keep records and file reports and comply with various burdensome regulations on the handling and sale of the product—all under penalty of heavy fine or imprisonment for violations.

The burdens are multiplied for the wholesaler who handles margarine. He must pay an annual license fee of $200 to sell the uncolored product; $480, if he sells yellow margarine and there is a multitudinous list of regulations with which he must comply. Testimony before the Senate Finance Committee revealed that it costs the average wholesale establishment between $60 and $100 a month for clerical help alone to keep abreast of margarine law requirements. There are 11 separate reports which must be made every month by the wholesaler under oath. There are, in addition, seven separate records which must be kept available for inspection at all times. There is a fine of $50 to $500 or imprisonment for 30 days to 6 months for each violation of the requirements as to any of these 18 records and reports. The wonder is not that so few wholesalers handle margarine under these conditions but that any at all can be found to brave the mass of license fees, records, reports, and threatened penalties imposed for the sole purpose of restricting, crippling, and punishing the margarine industry.

Who else is victimized by these "punitive instruments"—the antimargarine laws? The American people—or at least the 80 percent of them that, according to a recent survey, now use some margarine. Thirty million American families are consumers of margarine. Many of these are recent converts having abandoned butter when it skyrocketed in price. Some of them use only a little margarine. By far the largest consumption is by low-income people who cannot afford butter—even for special occasions. Since the taxes imposed upon margarine are inevitably passed on to consumers, their burden falls heaviest upon those who are least able to bear it. But the burden is not limited to the amount of the taxes and license fees. This is only a small part of it.

The contribution of the antimargarine laws to the high cost of living has been most damaging to the American people in their effect on competition within the industry. The taxes, license fees and regulations imposed on margarine have resulted in restricting its manufacture and distribution. They have discouraged the investment of new capital in the margarine industry and at every level, manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, they have restricted competition. Such restriction, of course, tends to keep prices higher. Again, it is the consumer—especially the low-income consumer—who pays.

Repeal of the antimargarine laws would, in the long run, increase competition within the margarine industry and would inevitably tend to bring about reduced prices to consumers.

But the burden on consumers is by no means wholly economic. The antimargarine taxes and license fees are levied on the health of the people, too. No one—unless he is completely blind to the truth—questions the nutritional values of margarine today. It is comparable in every way to high quality butter. The expert testimony from nutritional experts, medical groups, laboratory scientists, and others is overwhelming on this point. And yet the antimargarine laws prevent margarine from filling the table fat needs of the American people—needs which butter cannot fill. Twenty years ago, in 1927, the combined consumption of butter and margarine in the United States was 20.4 pounds per person. Last year it was 16.2 pounds per person, which means that on an average the American people got 4 pounds less table fat last year than in 1927. But even the 1927 level was low from a desirable nutritional standard. The Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics recommended an annual per capita consumption of butter alone of 35 pounds as "an adequate diet at moderate cost." And yet, despite increasing margarine consumption in recent years, the table-fat deficit in the diet of the American people is rapidly growing. The reason is not hard to find. Butter production dropped nearly one-third between 1936 and 1946. Margarine, because of the restrictions imposed upon it by law, could not fill the gap. Yet the gap should be filled if we are to achieve our health goals as a people.

This Congress, if it adjourns without passing H. R. 2245, will be prolonging this nutritional deficit. It will be preventing the margarine industry from properly filling the vital health needs of millions of our people—especially among the low-income groups.

There are special groups of less fortunate people who are particularly affected by the antimargarine laws: the sick in hospitals, the aged in old-folks homes, the children in orphanages, and all others in institutions of this kind. The Federal antimargarine laws impose a tax of $600 per year on restaurants, boarding houses, hospitals, and all other institutions, not publicly owned, which mix yellow coloring into margarine. Under the law they are regarded as manufacturers. As a result, many of these institutions, operating on a limited budget in this inflationary period, have been serving bread dry or with an occasional bit of apple butter or jelly to sick and unfortunate people. Most of these institutions cannot afford to buy butter and, due to the Federal antimargarine laws, they do not buy margarine, either. It is understandable then why the American Hospital Association, representing 4,000 hospitals and 85 percent of the Nation's general-hospital beds, and the National Federation of Settlements, representing 211 settlement houses in 25 States, suggested repeal so strongly in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee.

Yes, the antimargarine laws are punitive laws—they punish the millions of American farmers in 44 States who grow the ingredients of margarine. They punish the hundreds of thousands of wholesale and retail merchants who either handle or would otherwise handle margarine. And they punish the American people who consume margarine—more than a hundred million of them—the sick and the well, the very old and the orphans.

I should like for the apologists for these laws and those who are demanding that Congress adjourn before it acts to repeal them to tell us just what crime any of these groups have committed to deserve the punishment of these punitive laws. I think we would discover that in this case, the punishment does not fit the crime or the perpetrators of the crime. For the guilty are not the cotton or soybean farmers or the distributors of margarine or the American people. The crime was committed by those who enacted this vicious, un-American legislation, and it is being committed today by those who seek to retain it.

Today the butter lobby and those who struggle to maintain the antimargarine laws have lost their best weapon—the lack of knowledge of the American people as to the issues involved. Since the Fiftieth Congress enacted the first antimargarine laws nearly a hundred bills have been introduced for their modification or repeal. Not one of those bills ever reached the floor of the House or Senate. For the most part the debate on the issues was restricted to the cloistered confines of committee rooms—and even there only a handful ever reached the hearing stage.

In 1917, in 1944, and again this year—margarine amendments were introduced in the Senate to the general revenue bills. I am proud that I had a part in those efforts in 1944 and March 1948. I introduced amendments on both occasions. I believe those earlier efforts paved the way for the progress we have made this session. The amendments were beaten chiefly, I think the record will show, not on their merits but because it was contended that they were not germane to the revenue bills. Of course, all of us who voted for those amendments would have preferred a clear-cut decision on the margarine issue without connecting it with the revenue bills, but we could not obtain consideration by the Senate of such bills. We still cannot obtain that consideration.

But one thing we have gained as a result of this year's campaign to repeal these laws. The debate in both House and Senate, the full hearings by committees, the hard-fought but sure progress of the repeal bill has been thoroughly publicized at every step by press and radio. The American people have learned the true facts for the first time about the antimargarine laws. Congress, too, has had a better opportunity to ascertain the merits of the case.

"Give the people light and they will find their own way"—the masthead of a great newspaper chain reads. The people have gotten the light at last on margarine, and so has Congress. The only problem is to persuade Congress to find its way to repeal the antimargarine laws.

The results of this popular education must be dismaying to the butter lobby. They have lost the votes and they have lost the arguments. All that is left to them now is delay.

In conclusion, I want again to urge this Eightieth Congress to act now to repeal the Federal antimargarine laws. This is not a new issue. Margarine has been waiting for 62 years for justice. I cannot accept the idea that injustice must be endured longer simply because it is venerable. That is all the more reason to put an end to it as soon as possible.

Nor, as we have seen, is this a trivial issue. It strikes at the heart of our economic concepts and political principles.

And once again, I urge this Congress to finish its job before it quits. The American people have a right to expect that.

If we adjourn now, without acting on the bill to repeal the antimargarine laws, do not console yourselves with the delusion that the people will forget or will not care. Do not for a moment doubt that those thousands upon thousands of individuals who have written this Congress demanding repeal will be indifferent. The American housewife has a good memory and she knows what she wants—she wants this bill passed. And she wants it passed now. Nor will those newspaper editors—hundreds of them in every State in the Union—who have fought so earnestly for the repeal of the antimargarine laws let inaction on our part pass unnoticed. They will all remember what we do here now on this bill—and they will still remember in November.

Justice is never a small thing—never a thing that can be put off or delayed with impunity. It has been denied the margarine industry and those who grow the ingredients of margarine and consume margarine for more than half a century. I call on the leadership of the Senate to call up the bill to repeal the antimargarine laws—to call it up now—and to put an end once and for all time to this disgraceful blot on our legislative history.

impunity. It has been denied the margarine industry and those who grow the ingredients of margarine and consume margarine for more than half a century. I call on the leadership of the Senate to call up the bill to repeal the antimargarine laws—to call it up now—and to put an end once and for all time to this disgraceful blot on our legislative history.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am very happy to have this opportunity to address the Senate while the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is in the chair and presiding, because the Senator from Minnesota was one of the members of the committee, together with my good friends the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and others, who chose Columbia, S. C., as the place at which to hold the cotton hearings. We were delighted to have the distinguished Senator from Vermont and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, together with the other members of the committee, there with us last fall. I wish to state how grateful I was that the cotton hearings were held in my State, and that the witnesses from North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and other States attended those hearings. I also wish to say that, as all of us know, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who now occupies the chair, well understood the views of the farmers and others in our section of the country in regard to the matters there under consideration, as did the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the distinguished Senator from South Carolina desire to have me suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MAYBANK. No; in view of the limited time, I would not wish to have the Senator do so, although I appreciate his thoughtfulness. As the Senator knows, I have submitted for printing in the RECORD the speech I had intended to make.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I wish to say that the Senator from South Carolina is a very distinguished cotton expert, who probably knows more about the cotton business and the problems of the cotton farmer than does any other Member of this body. I know the Senator will make a very able speech, and one which will be most informative, and one from which great value will come to the cotton growers of the country. So I hoped the distinguished Senator would permit me to have a quorum call, so that a large number of his colleagues could hear him speak.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator; but in view of the limited time, although I appreciate the thoughtfulness of my distinguished friend, I shall proceed now.

Mr. President, I was raised with cotton. I have planted cotton; I have ginned cotton, I have exported cotton, as the Senator from Mississippi well knows; and I was a member of a firm that perhaps knows more about cotton than does anyone else in this city, including the Department of Agriculture, except Will Clayton, and he left yesterday.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, let me say that what the Senator has said is entirely true. Certainly the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has accomplished more for the cotton growers of his State and of the South than has any other person who has sat in the Senate. The Senator from South Carolina and the late Senator Bankhead are two of the ablest agricultural statesmen who ever sat in this body. The Senator from South Carolina has a very distinguished record, and I know that his service here has been of great benefit to the farmers of the South. I certainly congratulate him; and I shall stay here to hear his speech, because I know he will make a worth-while contribution to this discussion.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say that the late Senator Bankhead and I for years served on the Banking and Currency Committee, and in those days we wrote many laws. I always admired and revered him. We talked together about many things. As the Senator from Mississippi has indicated, Senator Bankhead consulted me about some things.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss the cotton situation. I do not wish it thought for a moment that I am opposed to this agricultural bill because of cotton alone. I appreciate and understand what the distinguished Senator from Vermont went through in the course of the long hearings which were held throughout the country last year, along with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who now occupies the chair, and the other members of the subcommittee. I am grateful for all they have done, and I appreciate it. I am not here to—perhaps I may say fly-blow any bill; that is not my purpose. However, in view of the fact that it is expected that the Congress will adjourn on Saturday, certainly there is in this bill too much that has not yet been considered—and certainly many parts of the bill should be thoroughly considered before allowing it to pass hastily.

I thoroughly agree with what my distinguished friend the Senator from Georgia said in his colloquy with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who now is presiding; he described the bill as a measure to reduce production. I really believe that. I do not know the wheat situation as the distinguished Presiding Officer knows it; I do not know the dairy situation as the distinguished Senator from Vermont knows it; but I do know the cotton situation.

I have great respect for the Secretary of Agriculture. He is a career man, having come up the hard way. He deserves full credit. However, if he approved the reduction in cotton parity from 90 to 75 percent, then he would approve wide-open gambling in the United States, and everybody running a gambling house ought to open a bucket shop at the crossroads in Carolina, Mississippi, Georgia, and Oklahoma.

Mr. President, there are more than 50 grades of cotton. There are more than 50 different staples. It is possible to have a surplus in one while having a deficit in the other. I know, of course, that parity is based on Middling fifteen-sixteenths Scotland. Everybody knows that, and everybody knows how parity is established. But the fluctuations between Middling inch, inch and a sixteenth, inch and a quarter, and what we call buzz-fuzz cotton, five-eighths or seven-eighths cotton, will bring only terrible headaches and problems that the Department of Agriculture could never solve. Cotton grading, cotton ginning, cotton stippling is an art for which the Department of Agriculture through its appropriations does not have sufficient money to employ adequate personnel.

The large firms in New York and New Orleans—I have no unkind remarks for them—estimate the cotton crop. Mr. President, do you know what is to be done under the pending bill? They estimate the cotton crop in August, September, and October, creating fluctuations in the market that keep the cotton world going round, that keep the market going up and down. Under the pending bill they would be in a position to make an estimate of surplus under the law that will change parity on cotton from 90 percent to 75 percent. In other words, the big firms in this country are being given the right under the law to say what the surplus of cotton may be or the surplus of wheat or any other commodity. Mr. President, you know more about wheat than I do. I know cotton. I was raised with cotton.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am listening with great attention, as I always do when the distinguished Senator from South Carolina addresses himself to any agricultural question, particularly as it pertains to any phase of cotton from the time it is planted, through every stage of its development, the ginning, the marketing, the milling, and the exporting, because, as the Senator says, he has spent his life in that business.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is all I have ever done.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is recognized here as being probably the greatest expert in the Congress for many years on that question. The Senator must know that if the bill will affect the speculation and the estimates to which he refers, with respect to cotton, with which he is so familiar, its effect will also be felt on other commodities.

Mr. MAYBANK. I certainly agree.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are all handled in a similar way.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. While the Senator is an expert on cotton and is more intimately informed as to it, his experience with cotton would be very helpful in arriving at a firm conclusion as to the effect it would have on other commodities of other farmers.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the

Mr. EASTLAND. We see that here

want low prices, so that their money will

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the kind remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia. Having planted cotton, having grown it, having financed the growing of it, having bought and sold cotton, and having been also, as the Senator knows, before coming to the Senate, a cotton broker, I know what the bill would do. It would open the door wide between 75 percent and 90 percent. Who is to determine the surplus? The Department of Agriculture? Certainly. They make the crop estimates on wheat, corn, cotton, and other commodities, but the private firms in New York, New Orleans and Chicago—with due respect and appreciation of those cities—make the estimates, and the boys at the cross roads go down to the bucket shop and come out with empty pockets. The poor farmer is taken for a ride.

I have been in the Senate since 1941. I was on the committee which considered the commodity credit bill. I was on the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency with the late John Bankhead. I knew the Steagall-Bankhead group. I worked with them. I say, Mr. President, we have done pretty well. Through the Commodity Credit Corporation we have made, to this time, about $200,000,000 on commodities. Of course, the war came along. But do you realize, Mr. President, that in 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944 even with the war, cotton was below parity?

I may be talking too much about cotton. I realize one should not be sectional.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. As a matter of principle, if a farmer is entitled to 75 percent of parity, why is he not entitled to 90 percent? If it is right to give him 75 percent, if we are going into that field, why do we not remove all discrimination against him and place him on an equal basis?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Mississippi is eminently correct. I voted for 95-percent parity, as did the Senator, when former Senator Bankhead brought the bill in here, which was, if I remember right, in 1943.

Mr. EASTLAND. I was one of the authors of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. So was I. We joined in sponsoring the bill. If the farmer is entitled to 75 percent, he is entitled to 90. But, Mr. President, the gamblers will be operating between the 75 percent and the 90 percent.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me finish this sentence please. It opens up the cotton market and also the wheat markets to the gamblers as they were opened up to the gamblers in the twenties.

I saw it. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. A Democratic administration has given the farmers, on basic commodities, a support price of 90 percent parity. Now we are facing a Republican Congress with their age-old animosity and prejudice against the man who tills the soil for a living.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. We see that here the farmer is being taken for a ride. In an election year, his support price is reduced.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, it will be reduced. The price of wheat, corn, cotton, and everything else will be reduced.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The argument is made for the passage of the Aiken bill now, that if we wait it might not be passed, the farmer might not get anything next year, and that in all probability there will be a Republican Congress, a stronger Republican Congress than the present one, and as a result, the whole program will expire and the farmer will get no support price. So we are rushing to give him a half loaf at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the farmer receives no support price, the city dwellers will receive no support; and the farmers support the city dwellers.

Mr. EASTLAND. The facts are as shown by this bill, that the Republican Party is against the farmers. It is for big business, Wall Street, and great monopolies.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator knows that for 2 years we have been supporting only legislation that would benefit big business, and that the man in overalls, in the shop and on the farms, can get no consideration from this Congress, or from a Government controlled by the party which dominates this Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly the one- and two-gallus boys are left at the cross-roads. As the Senator from Mississippi well knows, we can see them picking cotton until Christmas time, in order to get what? To get a stick of candy from the corner store.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator from South Carolina think we are headed back now, drifting back into economic and political isolation, as we did after the First World War, and that we are confronted with another Republican administration similar to that of Warren G. Harding? Are we not going back to 25-cent cotton and 25-cent wheat, and will not those policies give communism the greatest boost it can receive?

Mr. MAYBANK. I cannot deny the argument of the Senator from Mississippi. If we pass this bill and reduce the cotton farmer's parity from 90 to 75 percent, we are taking 15 percent of his income, which is low enough as it is, in Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Arkansas. The cotton farmer buys the bread and manufactured goods; he works from sunup to sundown and spends his money. When we injure the cotton farmer, we injure the wheat farmer and the corn farmer.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator overlooks this fact, that we have in this country persons of great wealth, who do not have their wealth invested in commodities or in property, but who keep it in cash in order to loan it. Therefore they want low prices, so that their money will be more valuable. That is the group of persons who control the Republican Party.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly. The Senator from Mississippi is correct. I can go into any bank in Mississippi, North Carolina, or South Carolina and borrow 90 percent on a cotton-warehouse receipt.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. We are turning the situation over to the private bankers.

Mr. EASTLAND. This bill will reduce the support prices which a Democratic Administration has given to agriculture to pull it out of the hole. We are getting right back to the days when the county newspapers in Iowa and the Midwest were filled with notices of sales of farms through foreclosure of mortgages.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator a question——

Mr. MAYBANK. May I make one remark before the Senator asks his question? I am appreciative of the Senator's being here. I was happy that he was able to accompany my distinguished friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], to South Carolina to attend the hearing, at which everyone was in favor of 90 percent parity.

I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina and also the Senator from Mississippi what amendment is being discussed by them?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Russell amendment.

Mr. THYE. I did not understand that.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am sorry the Senator did not understand that.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Minnesota did not want to hear the record of his own party. I see that he is fleeing from the Senate Chamber.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I want to repeat that commodity credit under the Bankhead-Steagall bill, which was not passed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but by the Committee on Banking and Currency, saved more than $200,000,000 for the taxpayers. Many expenses were paid outside of that sum. The profits in cotton alone were more than $100,000,000. Had it not been for 90 percent of parity, and had it not been for the production of cotton, General MacArthur's success would not have been as great as it was. I think the Senator from Mississippi will agree with me in that statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. In all seriousness, I should like to make this statement to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. The solution of the farm problem is in taking down trade barriers and expanding world commerce. There are today millions of hungry people. There are millions of ill-clad people. Those people are willing and able to work and produce the wealth needed in the United States if we would remove the barriers of

trade so that they could buy the surplus production of the United States.

Mr. President, that would be the greatest contribution to world prosperity that could possibly occur.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. But instead of following such a program, we are following a program of acreage-reduction, a program to shut off the production of wealth and, in the last analysis, to spread poverty over the world. Consider the case of Japan. There is a little group of islands in the Pacific Ocean, approximately the size of the State of Montana. Only one-seventh of the area is suitable for cultivation. Seventy-seven million persons live there, under the Japanese flag, without resources. The only chance they have to live is to be able to buy raw materials in the markets of the world, process them in Japan, sell the products thus produced in world markets, and live off the profit that is acquired.

Mr. MAYBANK. They could sell the products to countries in the Pacific, such as Java, Indonesia, and other countries.

Mr. EASTLAND. In other words, they could live from their labor.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. If we do not reduce trade barriers and take goods from Japan, what will Japan do? There is only one thing she can do, and that is to affiliate herself with the nations under the hammer and sickle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to say to my friend from Mississippi that we must remove the trade barriers. I do not think it is necessary for Japan to ship anything to this country, under the rule of the Army government. The Senator from Mississippi and I agree that the Japanese should be benefited and helped by this country, so that Japan might, in turn, trade with the Orient, with the Dutch, French, and other colonies. As a matter of fact, Java was the largest purchaser of Japanese textiles before the war. There are 50,000,000 people there. I do not think it is necessary to bring any textiles into the United States, because we have more than we need at the present time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am a cotton grower, but I think we should look beyond self-interest and what will benefit our own people and our own sections. We should look to the welfare of this Nation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 minute. I appreciate what the Senator from Mississippi says, and I feel as he does. I know as well as he does that prior to the war the Japanese were the second largest purchasers of American cotton. In a short period of time they were the largest purchasers, and they helped the farmers by purchasing their cotton.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, first I send to the desk an amendment to the substitute bill offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. This amendment reduces to 1 year the proposed extension of the farm support program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, one of the most unpopular things to discuss when a program of this character is before the Senate is how much it will cost the taxpayer. It is impossible to estimate what the pending bill will cost, so I am going to review the costs for the past few years during which a similar program has been in operation.

We find that in recent years, under a similar program, the Government has spent, in the support of American agriculture, $8,573,600,000 for the improvement of soil, soil conservation, triple A payments and other programs. All of this was spent apparently for the purposes of increasing production on the farms.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a chart showing how this money was distributed during recent years.

Mr. President, during the same years in which the Government was spending this $8,500,000,000 to increase the production on the farms, we find that the Government at the same time spent $2,080,300,000 to dispose of surplus agricultural products. In other words, in a support program, to make agriculture more profitable, during this period, the Government spent $2,080,300,000. I have a break-down of that in the chart, which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHART No. 1.—*Detailed break-down of totals shown under the headings "Agricultural adjustment, soil and water conservation, and related programs" and "Diversion, distribution, and consumption of agricultural commodities"*

[NOTE.—Amounts for years 1932 to 1948 adjusted for comparability with the appropriation structure in the 1949 budget estimates]

[Amounts in millions of dollars]

	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	Grand total
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources						469.0	429.1	494.0	555.1	461.3	494.6	444.5	400.0	302.5	355.7	314.2	228.0	4,948.9
Parity payments								212.0	225.0	211.7	211.7	5.4	170.3					1,036.1
Payments for agricultural adjustment					295.2													295.2
Agricultural adjustment program financed from advances on account of processing taxes (sec. 12 (b), act of May 12, 1933)			428.6	641.5	165.7													1,235.8
Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Administration (sec. 12 (a), act of May 12, 1933)		100.0																100.0
Sugar Act							40.0	54.4	47.9	47.9	47.9	47.4	63.9	52.5	48.4	52.5	55.0	558.8
Soil erosion control program (SCS)	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	6.3	22.6	22.1	21.3	21.3	18.6	25.4	23.8	23.8	29.6	34.5	44.7	39.0	334.4
Land utilization program (title III, Farm Tenant Act)							9.6	12.0	6.3	2.4	2.7	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.6	1.6	41.5
Payments to counties from submarginal land program (permanent)																0.2	0.2	.4
Water conservation and utilization projects (Wheeler-Case Act)										0.5	1.5				1.2	0.7		3.9
Flood control							0.5	7.0	3.0	2.0	1.0					2.1	3.0	18.6
Total agricultural adjustment, soil and water conservation, and related programs	0.4	100.4	428.9	641.8	467.2	491.6	501.3	801.6	858.6	744.4	784.8	522.6	659.3	385.9	441.0	417.0	326.8	8,573.6
Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities (sec. 32, act of Aug. 24, 1935) (permanent, annual, and reappropriations)					92.1	109.1	125.1	144.0	205.5	235.5	222.5	175.3	97.1	119.3	114.3	100.5	44.0	1,784.3
National school-lunch program:																		
Direct appropriation																6.0		6.0
Expended from sec. 32 funds									[12.4]	[15.3]	[23.1]	[15.3]	[30.0]	[57.5]	[57.5]	75.0	65.0	140.0
Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products, act of May 26, 1934 (Jones-Connally Act)				150.0														150.0
Total diversion, distribution, and consumption of agricultural commodities				150.0	92.1	109.1	125.1	144.0	205.5	235.5	222.5	175.3	97.1	119.3	114.3	181.5	109.0	2,080.3

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, here we have a situation where the Government was spending $8,500,000,000 to increase production and an additional $2,000,000,000 to hold the prices of agricultural commodities up, I find that another Government agency spent $5,519,301,617 in subsidies to hold the prices of agricultural products down. I ask unanimous consent to have the chart showing these figures inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Direct subsidies paid by the Federal Government of the United States, 1937–47: Selected data

[Notes.—Amounts for years 1932 to 1946 adjusted for comparability with the appropriation structure in the 1949 budget estimates]

Program	Paying agency	Why subsidized	How subsidized	Paid to—	Total cost to June 30, 1947
Beef production	CCC	To encourage feeding of cattle to heavier weights.	Payment on live weight sold for slaughter of cattle meeting certain requirements as to minimum weight, minimum sale price, and minimum duration of feeding.	Feeder	$96,904,458
Beans, dry edible	do	To permit increased grower returns	Payment at specified rates per hundredweight of cleaned beans.	Dealer	12,965,533
Cheese, Cheddar	do	To offset cost increases and to encourage greater production.	Purchase and resale at a loss of 3½ cents per pound.	Manufacturer	67,634,784
Corn ceiling price adjustment.	do	To induce movement of corn from corn-producing areas to the East and Southeast.	Payment of 5 cents per bushel to sellers of yellow corn who sell in carload lots to feeders or feed producers in the East and Southeast.	Corn seller	1,535,579
Dairy production	do	To increase producer returns, thus offsetting increased costs and encouraging greater production.	Payment on deliveries of whole milk and butterfat, differentiated seasonally and, in addition, regionally for whole milk.	Dairy farmer	1,206,263,457
Flaxseed	do	To enable flaxseed importers to use domestic flaxseed and pay support prices for it.	Reimbursement of processors for part of the increased costs.	Processor	593,704
Fruits for processing	do	To permit increased grower returns and offset increases in processing costs.	Purchase of fruit and resale of civilian quantities at a loss.	Packer	74,768,496
Milk, fluid	do	To permit an increase in producer returns and encourage production.	Purchase and resale arrangement on all fluid milk.	Handler	38,126,083
Peanut butter	do	To roll back retail prices to September 1942 level.	Payment of 4.5 cents per pound to manufacturer	Manufacturer	19,557,383
Peanuts, c	do	To maintain adequate production at prices in line with other edible oil sources.	Purchase of peanuts and resale to crushers at a loss.	Crushers and shellers	6,205,449
Shortening	do	To roll back prices of vegetable shortening.	Payment of 0.4 cent per pound of vegetable oil in standard shortening and 0.2 cent per pound of hydrogenated vegetable shortening.	Manufacturer	1,916,284
Soybeans	do	To permit increased grower returns and encourage production of oil.	Purchase of soybeans at support prices and resale at a loss to processors at differentiated prices based on processor efficiency.	Processor	59,012,027
Sheep and lamb production.	do	To encourage feeding of lambs to heavier weights and to increase returns to producers.	Payment on live weight sold for slaughter, varying seasonally and by weight classes for lambs. Flat rate per hundredweight on sheep regardless of season or weight class.	Owner at time of sale to slaughterer.	43,238,152
Sugar	do	To permit increased grower returns, offset increased shipping, handling, and processing costs, and generally to encourage maximum production.	Purchase of Puerto Rican and Cuban sugar and resale at a loss (or without payment of normal import duty). Direct payments to growers and importers of Hawaiian sugar. Payments, through the processors, to growers of domestic beet and cane. Payments to all processors of sugar beets to offset increased costs, and to marginal processors to cover deficits.	Various levels	118,119,163
Vegetables for processing	do	To permit increased grower returns and offset increases in canning costs.	Payment at specified rates per dozen cans of major products.	Canners	86,369,626
Vegetables, frozen	do	To permit increased grower returns and offset increases in processing costs.	Payment at specified rates for frozen peas, corn, and snap beans.	Processor	3,660,216
Wheat for feed	do	To permit utilization of wheat for feed primarily for dairy cattle in certain feed-shortage areas.	Wheat for feed is sold at feed value equality with corn.	Feeder or feed supplier.	238,412,510
Livestock	RFC	To roll back retail ment prices to September 1942 levels, and to permit increased returns to livestock producers.	Payment on live weight slaughtered differentiated by kinds of animals, and in the case of beef grades, deductions made in beef subsidy by the amounts individual slaughterer's live-cattle costs in any given month fall below or exceed costs based on "stabilization range" prices.	Slaughterers	1,547,148,000
Flour	do	To permit increased grower prices, in accordance with minimum legal requirements.	Payment equal to difference in any given month between average actual wheat costs paid by the industry and the average price of wheat reflected by the flour ceiling.	Millers	348,431,000
Butter	do	To roll back prices to September 1942 levels.	5 cents per pound payment to creameries	Creameries	181,615,000
Copper, lead, and zinc	do	To obtain high-cost output of copper, lead, and zinc without raising ceiling prices on the major part of the output.	Premium prices paid for production above quotas.	Producers	249,970,000
Petroleum transportation, compensatory and just-ments.	do	To maintain a steady and adequate flow of petroleum and petroleum products to the Atlantic coast area (requiring substitutes for normal tanker transportation) without exceeding existing price ceilings.	Compensation to petroleum companies for extra transportation costs.	Oil companies	353,232,000
Maritime operating subsidy.	Maritime Commission.	To compensate United States lines for higher operating costs as compared to foreign lines.	Payments based on differential between foreign and domestic operating costs.	Steamship lines	49,288,195
Construction differential subsidy.	do	To compensate for the difference between United States and foreign shipyards in construction costs.	Payments to shipowners based on difference in construction costs between United States and foreign shipyards.	Shipowners	251,363,000
Apple freight equalization	CCC				3,227,713
Barley for feed	do				6,994
Cocoa	do				101,939
Coffee	do				7,217,524
Corn for alcohol	do				4,400,000
Corn purchase and shelling	do				3,619,864
Corn importation	do				2,108,372
Hay for dairymen	do				2,498,942
Millfeed price support	do				138,118
Vegetable oils and meals	do				6,903,524
Pear freight equalization	do				142,237
Phosphate fertilizer	do				89,344
Pork purchase	do				330
Wheat for alcohol	do				22,700,000
Coffee	RFC				51,840,000
Miscellaneous RFC subsidies, largely transportation.	do				275,180,000
Total					5,519,301,617

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, most of this $5,500,000,000 was spent to hold down the prices of agricultural commodities. There are included in it some subsidy payments which were made to support other industries, but over $4,500,000,000 was spent to hold down the cost of agricultural commodities to the consumer during the period in which the Government was spending through another agency over $2,000,000,000 to hold the prices of the same commodities up.

Another thing that is misleading about this proposal is the argument that if Congress does not pass some kind of an extension measure at this time the farmers are left without any suitable agricultural program. That argument is not true, because in the event no agricultural program shall be passed, there will still be left on the statute books the same programs which were in effect prior to the war; in other words, the Triple A Act will still be in effect, as passed in 1938; the soil-conservation programs will continue; the law which authorized expenditures of section 32 funds—customs receipts—for the support of agricultural products will remain in effect; and when the European recovery program measure was passed, under section 11A we authorized an additional subsidy on agricultural commodities, and that will be in effect for the duration of our foreign-aid program. All of them without any further action whatever on the part of the Congress at this time will remain in effect. Therefore, when it is said that failure of the Congress to act will leave the farmers without any agricultural relief it is without foundation.

The program which we are asked to extend now is the same as that which was passed by Congress in 1941, at the beginning of the war, as a wartime measure; at that time Congress stated that that measure was to last two years after the war ended. As we know, the President of the United States did not declare hostilities over until December 31, 1946. Therefore this program would run for two more years, to give the farmers a chance to adjust themselves, until the end of this year, 1948. In other words, the program dying this year is a program which every farmer in the United States knew was supposed to die 2 years after the war ended, so there was no reversal of policy on the part of Congress.

I believe Congress should adopt a long-range farm program. It would be folly for us ever to place ourselves in a position where we could revert back to the wholesale bankruptcies of farmers similar to what happened in the thirties, but I think it is equally as bad for the farmer to pass legislation which is economically unsound and in the long run will do him more harm than good. The program which is set up under this bill actually guarantees a margin over cost of production thereby encouraging unbalanced production which will inevitably lead to economic collapse. By using the formula under the Aiken bill we find that despite all the confusion of defining parity—a clear definition of which no one can give—after it is all summed up it boils down to the fact that the final answer on the parity price is 150 percent of the last 10-year average.

In other words, if we take the sales price which the farmer has been getting for any farm product for the last 10 years, and add 50 percent to it, we have the parity of that product as defined in the bill. If we take all the farm products and figure them on that basis, we will come within 1 percent of the same result as the committee formula. Therefore, when it is proposed that we support cotton or tobacco or any other commodity at 90 percent of parity what is proposed in effect is that we guarantee to the farmers a support price of that product equal to 35 percent more than the average price of that commodity for the past 10 years.

I say that is economically unsound. If the support price is 75 percent of parity, which is claimed to be the average, we will still be supporting that agricultural product at 12½ percent more than the average market price for the same product during the past 10 years.

The lowest provision in the formula of this bill is that it can go down to 60 percent of parity. In that event we will then be guaranteeing to the farmers 90 percent of the average price they received for that product during the past 10 years, and under no circumstances, if this bill shall be passed, can the support price drop below that figure.

I have heard of many Senators worrying about the cost of living, yet under this bill the support price of beef will be raised 20 percent above the previous support price. Milk will be raised about 4 percent. Cottonseed will be raised $10 a ton. We are only kidding ourselves when we say that the passage of this bill will not have the effect of increasing the cost of living to consumers.

Mr. President, I think the best thing Congress can do, in view of the fact that we are in the closing days of the session, and do not have time to work out a sound program, is to defeat this measure. It is my considered opinion that a farm-support program should never exceed the cost of production. To enact a law which in effect guarantees a margin of profit encourages overproduction and necessitates a continuation of the ridiculous practice of a Government agency actually destroying edible foods in order to stabilize markets.

Furthermore, the enactment of this legislation means the regimentation of the American farms. This is inevitable because of the production and marketing controls required under this planned agricultural program.

Under this bill our farm program can be planned and directed from the minute details of acreage planted and the kind of products and livestock production that farmers can legally produce by a Government agency which will be manned by men who have never operated a farm but learned their farming out of books.

This is not in accordance with our free-enterprise system, and I believe our American farmer would rather retain his freedom and independence.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. In the course of the few remarks I shall make in opposition to the amendment, I propose also to discuss some of the major objectives of the so-called long-range agricultural program.

The Senator from Illinois has reached a very definite and firm conviction that the time has come when the Congress of the United States must enact a farm program which is permanent and stable. We have been operating under the so-called Steagall amendments, which placed support prices under basic and nonbasic products just prior to the time the United States entered into the war. It was primarily a war measure designed to accomplish an enormous production of basic and nonbasic commodities which were essential to the winning of the war. No one can deny that that legislation, which was passed under a Democratic administration, at that time stimulated production and did achieve the objective for which the legislation was enacted.

It is no trick to receive high prices for everything that is produced in the United States in a great emergency. The trouble with a great many people, when thinking of a farm program, is that they forget what has happened to the farmers of this country in the past as a result of huge surpluses of commodities that were piled high and dry in every section of the country with no outlet for those commodities.

The basic reason for the enactment of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1935 was the enormous surpluses that we produced in 1931, 1932, and 1933, with no possible chance of disposing of those surplus products at a decent price. The program under which we are operating at the present time has not resulted in the loss of any money. The able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said this afternoon that the Commodity Credit Corporation can show a profit of around some $200,000,000 on the over-all transactions that we conducted under the operation of the present program.

What I object to in the substitute amendment offered by the able Senator from Georgia is that it seeks to continue to place a support price under certain nonbasic commodities regardless of the amount of surplus that may be produced in the United States. I am thinking about eggs and potatoes; I am thinking about raisins and prunes; I am thinking about citrus fruits and other nonbasic commodities under which, in my opinion, the farm program at the present time cannot justify its activities. It is true that we have lost only a small amount of money compared to the entire investment as a result of this type of support. But I know, and Senators know, and the country knows the sorry spectacle that was presented with respect to potatoes and eggs. That subject has been discussed on the floor of the Senate many times. The average individual who would be compelled to support the farm program cannot understand why we have to do what we are asked to do with respect to some of these nonbasic commodities.

As I said this afternoon, in order to support a farm program we must have the confidence of the taxpayers of America. Every new spectacle of the kind we

have seen in the past has a tendency to defeat the great basic purpose of the farm program which takes care of so many commodities in the United States.

Furthermore, if we continue to guarantee a support price of 90 percent upon nonbasic commodities, I undertake to say that with all the modern machinery we have, with all the farm equipment we have, with all the scientific discoveries that are being made in America at the present time, the time will come when we will have a surplus in many of these basic commodities of which we may not be able to make proper disposition. When that time comes, if it should come, and we have a support price of 90 percent on everything, there is not going to be enough money in the Treasury to pay off, Mr. President.

I am attempting in my limited way to look far ahead respecting this program, and the farmers in my section of the country are looking at this program with vision. They are not stationary out there; they are attempting to look on into the future and to see what may happen to them in 5 or 6 or 7 years from now. If we obtain a permanent, stable farm program on a basis of parity of from 60 to 90 percent, depending upon the crop produced and the carry-over, we will not have any trouble in sustaining a farm program so far as the American people are concerned. On the basic commodities we can, under the law, have quotas and acreage allotments, and in that way control, if necessary, these surpluses, but on the nonbasic commodities there is no control. That is where we shall ultimately get into trouble so far as the expenditure of money is concerned.

The committee worked hard and long on the bill. For years we have been talking about a long-range program. I regret that this bill has not come before the Senate until the last days of the Congress. It certainly has not been the fault of the able Senator from Vermont and his committee, because they have tried hard to get the bill before the Senate so that Members of the Senate might discuss it at length and understand it.

I am satisfied that members of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives are just as familiar with the provisions of this bill as are members of the Senate committee. If this bill can be passed by the Senate tonight and sent to the House of Representatives, I am satisfied that we can get a long-range farm program before this session ends. This Congress should not adjourn, and the farmers of the Midwest are expecting that it will not adjourn, until they get the kind of a farm program that has been laid down in the bill.

The bill is supported by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Farmers' Union, the Grange, and other leading agricultural organizations. While perhaps they have not agreed on all the details with respect to the reorganization plan under title I and title II, so far as the parity formula and the support prices are concerned, that question has been gone over in detail with the leading agricultural men of the country, and they all agree upon the parity formula which has been laid down in the bill.

Mr. President, time moves on. Nothing in this world is static. Unless Members of Congress move with the times in connection with parity, they are not doing their duty, as I see it. The parity formula of 1909 to 1914 is outmoded, and all the experts agree that it is. What we are trying to do is to have a 10-year moving average for the parity formula which will keep us up to date all the time, because as 1948 moves on and out of the picture so far as activity is concerned, the 10-year moving average takes in 1949. That is the only way we can keep the formula up to date.

In order to do that the farmers of the Midwest were willing to make a tremendous sacrifice. My dear friend from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] talks about the cotton farmers being robbed under this bill. The cotton farmers do not lose anything under this bill compared with what the wheat farmers and corn farmers in my section of the country are losing so far as the question of parity is concerned.

We have taken care of that loss in the bill by providing that the decrease may amount to not more than 5 percent each year. It will require wheat producers 4 or 5 years, and corn producers 2 or 3 years, finally to get down to parity under the bill.

Notwithstanding that, we are willing to go along. We know that the dairyman, the poultry raiser, the cattle raiser, and the hog raiser get a better deal. We know that the man who raises peanuts gets a better deal. Other basic and nonbasic commodities—especially nonbasic commodities—are helped as a result of this parity formula. The only thing it does is simply to change the time. The factors and equations, and all the other elements in the present parity formula, remain just the same.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] should be defeated. The Senate should pass the long-range bill tonight and send it to the House. I am satisfied that if Members of the House of Representatives are responsive to the demands of American farmers they will pass a long-range farm program on all fours with what we find in Senate bill 2318.

In conclusion let me say that when this bill goes to the other side of the Capitol and conferees are appointed, I want the Senator from Vermont to understand that the amendment which we adopted this afternoon should be taken out of the bill. We cannot leave that amendment in the bill without giving the tobacco growers preferential treatment. There is no good reason why one group of commodity producers should receive a guaranty of 90 percent of parity, leaving producers of 127 or 128 other basic and nonbasic commodities on a basis of 60 to 90 percent. It is not fair. It is not right. If the bill should come back with that provision in it, the Senator from Illinois could not support the bill.

Mr. President, that is about all I have to say upon this important measure. During all the time I have been in the Congress, approximately 13 years in the House and in the Senate, I have been on the Agriculture Committee. I happen to own farm lands on the prairies of Illinois. I know something about the agricultural program and the problems we are up against.

My prayer is that as long as we are a nation we shall never be confronted with what we faced back in 1931, 1932, and 1933. Those were the darkest days in the history of agriculture in all our time as a nation. We have come a long way since that dark hour by reason of constructive and objective legislation. But we are now acting for the moment. We are on a temporary basis; and the sooner the Congress of the United States can get away from this temporary program the better off we shall all be.

It seems all right for the moment to say, "For one more year I am going to get 90 percent of parity on everything I produce. I am not willing to take a chance on a flexible formula over a long period of years. I am going to get my pound of flesh just as long as I can." I sincerely and earnestly fear that the time will come when that kind of a program will fall of its own weight and break down to the point where the American people will not support any farm program at all. I hope the time will never come when there is dissatisfaction to the point where the people of the country will not support a program which is meaningless and futile so far as protecting the American farmer is concerned.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is half an hour left. I do not know whether the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] or the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] wish to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 15 minutes. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has 15 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is very little that I can add to the very clear reasons given by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] for adopting a long-range program now and not being content with a stopgap affair which gives a high level of support to a few commodities. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that if we continue the high level of 90-percent support, which will cost our Government a large amount of money to maintain, the time will not be far distant when the American people will rise up and say they will no longer have any farm price-support program. In my opinion, that would be a catastrophe, because, above all things, we must continue to maintain the production of farm commodities. It is true that probably there will be some surpluses of certain commodities within the next few years; but in the over-all picture we must maintain an adequate production of food and fiber, sufficient to enable our industries to carry on and to supply the consumers of the United States with the commodities they need, at reasonable prices.

The proposal to have a long-range program should not be mistaken as being a proposal to have a grab bag. It should not be mistaken as an attempt to see how much we can get in a short time for the producers of certain commodities. So I think it most unfortunate that the amendment relative to tobacco was adopted today.

Other than that, Mr. President, all I have to say is that at this time, when there are relatively few surpluses in the commodity field, we should develop this long-range program, so that our farmers will be assured that if in the future they produce enough to meet the needs of the country they will not be faced with ruin and bankruptcy, if at some time they happen to produce a little more than is needed. I think the time to develop such a program is now, so that the plan will be ready when needed.

Mr. President, before closing my remarks, I wish to say a few words about the subcommittee which developed the bill which now is before the Senate. I have said before, and I repeat, that I never worked with a more cooperative body of men than the members of the subcommittee and other members of the full committee who helped to develop this plan. The members of the subcommittee were the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. Let me say that all of us worked together. We met with the farm people of the United States. We think we know what the farm people want in the way of a farm program. They are not unreasonable. With few exceptions, they are not asking for more than they are entitled to. They are not asking for cost-plus or even for a guaranty of receiving cost. They ask for a floor which will protect them from ruin if they produce enough to meet the needs of the country.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the Senator from Vermont will agree with me that wherever we went in holding those hearings, the farmers themselves, almost to a man, showed that they understood the farm program almost as well as any member of the subcommittee did. In other words, it was amazing, to me, to discover the number of farmers who are wide awake and know exactly what is going on here in Congress with respect to agricultural legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Illinois never spoke truer words than those. All over the United States the farm people know what is going on. They know farm problems and they know what is needed to maintain a prosperous agriculture and adequate production so that consumers will be supplied with their needs and will not be forced to pay exorbitant prices for their food. Almost everywhere we went we found the farm people very solicitous that the consumers in the cities not be overcharged.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to have the RECORD show at this point that the Senator from Vermont has worked zealously, conscientiously, and well on this program. He has devoted to it practically all his time and energies for almost a year. He has brought forth, I know, under the circumstances, the very best bill he could for the farmers.

Mr. President, not only is the Senator from Vermont highly conscientious, but today he is the agricultural leader of the Nation. I congratulate him for the fine work he has done on this bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator very much for his kind words.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that when he refers to this program as the best program which could be obtained, I wish to say that it is the best program which could have been conceived. I should like to say that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who presided over the subcommittee at all its hearings, and who proceeded to get the views of the farmers in regard to the agricultural program, has been able to develop what now is embodied in Senate bill 2318; and I repeat that it is not simply the best program which could be developed under the circumstances, but it is the best possible program which could have been conceived as a long-range program to replace the so-called war emergency legislation which was enacted in the form of the Steagall amendments.

So I, too, wish to commend the Senator from Vermont for the splendid job he has done.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I do not desire to become involved in a partisan discussion on that subject with the Senator from Minnesota. My sole purpose was to compliment the Senator from Vermont.

As the Senate knows, I have a very high regard for the Senator from Vermont. I know he is conscientious. I know he is one of the most able Members of this body. I know he has rendered invaluable service to agriculture, not only from a sectional viewpoint, so far as Vermont is concerned, but from a national viewpoint, for he has had the interests of the entire country at heart. If there is any Member of this body who has the national viewpoint and who attempts to do what is best for all the people of the United States, certainly it is the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I congratulate him, and I am happy to be associated with him in this body.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank both the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Minnesota for the remarks they have made. I appreciate them very much indeed.

Mr. President, I wish to say that this bill seems to have acquired the name of the Aiken bill, but as a matter of fact it is the bill of all those who worked on it. It is no more the Aiken bill than it is the Lucas bill or the Thye bill or the Wilson bill or the Thomas bill or the Ellender bill or the Bushfield bill or the Young bill, or the bill of any of the other Senators who worked on it. It is the committee bill. It is the bill which has been developed as a result of the request which the Senate made of our committee. We have done the job as well as we could. We think we have done a good job, we may as well admit it. No trace of partisanship has entered into our deliberations in connection with the formulation of this bill.

Mr. President, I hope the bill will pass the Senate unanimously tonight, and I hope the Senate will reject any proposed substitutes or further amendments. I do not agree with those who say that the House will not accept the bill. The House certainly will not turn down a long-range farm bill for the United States, when the entire Nation is demanding it. If by any chance the bill should be rejected, I do not wish it to be said that the Senate was responsible for blocking what I think is the best long-range farm program which ever has been presented to this body.

Mr. President, let us pass this bill; let us pass it unanimously, so that we can carry the spirit of nonpartisanship right through to the enactment of the bill.

I have nothing more to say on this subject, Mr. President. I believe the Senator from Georgia has 15 minutes' time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for 15 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I know of little that can be added to the statement I made in support of the substitute earlier in the day. I wish again to emphasize that the substitute presents the one certain opportunity for the Senate to assure the continuance of a farm program next year without interruption.

A great many bugaboos have been created by the discussion against the substitute. It has been stated it would cost a great deal of money. That charge is not sustained by the facts. The records of the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation will show that under the program in existence at the present time, which by the substitute will be continued for a period of 18 months, approximately $200,000,000 has been earned over and above losses sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The most important thing involved in the entire discussion is the assurance that we shall have a farm bill in operation continuously until the next Congress shall have a fair chance to consider the subject. The committee bill with all its complexities, with its entirely new approach to the problem is understood by few Senators. It has never been applied. It leaves discretion in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture that can cause it to work out in a manner not even envisioned by its own sponsors.

The substitute covers all agricultural commodities.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have only a few minutes, but I will yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, when the able Senator from Georgia said the Secretary could work out a schedule that was not even now anticipated by the authors, or something to that effect, I merely wanted to ask the question: In what manner could the Secretary work out a schedule which has not been conceived by those who have labored in the preparation and in the formulation of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the point I was making was that the bill leaves so much to administration that while the Senator, as he is a member of the committee, may know what the bill contains—and I am willing to concede that he does—yet time and again I have seen the Senate pass bills on the theory they meant one thing, only to find when they reached the administrator that they meant something entirely different.

The bill leaves great discretion in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, not only as to the complete reorganization of the Department, which has scarcely been mentioned in the course of the discussion, but also as to the amount of loans he will allow for the various commodities. He has a great deal of leeway between 60 and 90 percent in some cases, as to the amount of loan that shall be made available to the producers of certain commodities. It is venturing into an entirely new field without, as I insist, adequate consideration, and certainly the other body will have no chance whatever to consider the bill other than to hear it read to them after the conferees agree, if they accept it.

On the other hand, we have a program that has been tried and has proved effective. It is in operation tonight. The farmers of the country understand it; the Members of the Senate know how it is applied; the Department of Agriculture has had experience in dealing with it. It enabled us to produce food and fiber with which to win the greatest war in history. If we continue it in effect, it will enable us to fulfill our commitments under the Marshall plan to the people of Europe. If we pass a new bill, fixing a different standard and destroying the incentives to production, we shall find it necessary perhaps to double the appropriations for the Marshall plan in order to meet the commitments in pounds of food and pounds of clothing promised to those who have joined with us in this great international undertaking to restore stability and preserve democracy on the face of the earth.

Mr. President, the point has been belabored at great length that one of these days, if we continue to extend this small measure of justice to the American farmer, the American people will rise up in their might and strike down any farm bill at all. What are farmers? Are they not, too, citizens of the United States? Are they not, too, American people? I submit that that kind of argument is merely carrying out the old idea that the farmer is a class aside, to himself, and is entitled to scant recognition and should appreciate any crumbs which happen to fall from the congressional table when we are enacting laws for the benefit of all the people.

The idea that the farmer is getting rich is as wild and visionary a thought as has ever been advanced in the Congress. It is impossible for the farmer to get rich when more than 30 percent of the farmers, even today with high prices, have a total income, including the use of the house in which they live, the fuel and the water they use, that amounts only to $600 a year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator made reference to the threat that the American people might strike down the farm program, and that if we undertake to place a floor under farm prices, the American people may at some time rebel against it. I wonder, if they were ever to rebel against such a program, if they would not at the same time rebel against the Government's fixing of prices, minimum wages, and also granting collective-bargaining rights to the laborers in industry.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I was just coming to that. Here is a farmer of whom it is said that if he is guaranteed a loan of 29 cents a pound for his cotton, the American people will rise up in their might and deny him any rights whatever and will abolish all legislation for the benefit of the farmer. It has been established beyond any peradventure, and it has never been challenged, that it takes 1 hour of labor at 29 cents an hour to produce 1 pound of cotton; and yet with all the benefits of minimum wages-and-hours and of collective bargaining and an industrial pay roll which has increased threefold since 1940, it is said the farmer is going to be victimized by the American people.

The farmer is an American citizen. Senators on this floor are supposed to represent him as well as all other constituents. If the farmer is injured as a result of continuing the program for a short period of time with the pitiful benefits it accords him, it will be the fault of those on this floor who have been sent here by the votes of the farmers. The farmers of this country, Mr. President, are not asleep. If Senators propose to be intimidated, and if the alleged American people of whom the farmer is not a part undertake to grind under foot those who till the soil I respectfully predict there will be some changes made, and there will be other Senators here who will be willing to see that the farmers enjoy at least a small modicum of the unparalleled prosperity which is now sweeping the country. It is high time that the farmer should be permitted to share in it at least to the extent of 90 percent of parity on his basic commodities. That will be assured by the substitute.

Thirty-seven years have passed since the beginning of the period on which parity is based. In those 37 years, for 11 years only have farm prices been at or above parity. In 26 of those years farm prices have been below parity. More than a third of a century has passed, and the farmer has enjoyed only 11 years of parity. To argue on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President, that to enable him to have 90 percent of parity will cause the repeal and the abolition of all farm laws, is, to me, simply not worthy of serious consideration.

Mr. President, whatever else may be said regarding the committee bill, there is no question that it works radical changes, if not revolutionary changes, not only in the Department of Agriculture, but in the farm program. I do not like a policy which provides for tying together in one lump all farm commodities in arriving at parity. It is much more fair to have each commodity stand on its own feet, with the same standard to be applied in fixing the parity price. Under the 10-year moving average, the smallest commodity which is admitted to the list of those to be entitled to the meager benefits of the bill would have as much weight in fixing the parity price as the other commodities, such as dairy products, which represents millions of dollars. It is not sound, right, or fair. I care not how many economists may support the policy, it cannot possibly work out and be a success.

Those Senators who wish, may vote for the committee bill. They may vote for a measure that fails the farmer in his hour of need, because when there is a surplus and his prices are depressed, his loan value is depressed along with it. That is not the proper concept of farm relief legislation. Such legislation should be of benefit to the farmers and be of help to them when they need help. But an entirely opposite philosophy is adopted by the committee bill. Prices go down and the loan value goes down with them, so that the farmer, at the very time when he needs help to enable him to buy the things he needs, to pay his debts, and to keep his children in school, finds that this bill has failed him because it has brought down the loan value in proportion to the surplus which is on hand. Therefore it does not sustain him in his hour of need.

The substitute which I propose contains proper safeguards to see that there is not overproduction. Senators have referred to the fact that there is no protection in the substitute bill against overproduction. It is written into the substitute in two different places that the Secretary of Agriculture has the right to prescribe the regulations under which loans may be advanced.

Mr. President, the Senators who so desire may go home and tell the farmers that they have passed a great farm bill for their relief. But when the farmer finds that his loan values have been reduced 20 percent, I doubt if he will think he has been helped. When he finds that there have been drastic changes in the Department of Agriculture and that the years he has devoted to the study of what constitutes the parity formula have been all for naught and the formula is no longer applicable, I doubt whether the farmer will think he has been greatly benefited.

A number of commodities are afforded no protection whatever by the committee bill. They had protection under the Steagall amendment. They have protection in the substitute bill. The producers of those commodities have no recourse whatever under the committee bill. By the adoption of the substitute bill we shall end any discussion of a farm program in this session of the Congress. We shall put it beyond the power of any man or set of men to kill the farm program in the last days of the session because of the congested condition of the calendar. We shall be able to return in January and approach the problem in the calm atmosphere of the early days of the legislative session, not when we must be considering what will happen to the draft bill.

Mr. President, the course of wisdom and prudence is for the Senate to adopt the substitute which I have proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to discuss my amendment. I ask that the reading of it be dispensed with. If the Senators will turn to page 51 of the bill it will be found that my amendment strikes out the provision for the abolishment of regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. President, the effect of this amendment would be to retain the regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service for greater economy and greater efficiency in the conservation program. We have made quite a point here about improving efficiency and promoting economy in government. It is most puzzling, therefore, to note that this bill would upset a proven administrative structure that has favorably stood the test of time and considerable study.

I recognize that in some instances over the past years the regional office has been an excessive and expensive feature of administration in other Government programs. I recognize, also, that there are some people who object to regional offices as a matter of general principle, because they do not like the idea. Because one set of regional offices has been bad, however, does not mean that all the rest are bad. If that were true we might as well draft a general provision abolishing all regional offices wherever they exist throughout the Government.

As a matter of fact, the well-run regional office is now generally recognized by businessmen to be a necessary and money-saving device in the conduct of any large nation-wide operation. That is true in government as well as in the business world. The regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service have been among the most efficiently run offices in the Federal Government. To abolish them would increase the cost of carrying on the conservation program and would reduce the efficiency of the program.

The organization of the Soil Conservation Service is established along lines well proven by American business. The pattern is similar to organizations such as insurance companies, public utilities, oil and manufacturing companies, as well as some long-established Federal agencies.

The Soil Conservation Service has Washington, regional, State, and field offices, as do many of the Nation-wide business firms which have their home offices, regional offices, district offices, and dealers.

For example, Mr. Mooch, director of business management for the Chrysler Corp., states that:

> The automobile business is, as a general rule, operated on the same basis by all companies. In our particular case we have 18 regions, each in charge of a regional manager. These are further divided into districts which are in charge of a district manager. It would be a very impractical operation to try to handle all of the detail of our dealer customers from a central office.

Another example is the John Deere Farm Implement Co., a national business firm dealing with farmers and ranchers. K. W. Anderson, manager of product research, Deere & Co., has this to say about their organizational set-up:

> At the present time we have 15 regional branches in the United States, four in Canada and a separate export division. Each is in charge of a general manager. The people of Deere & Co. have adhered to a policy of decentralization since the beginning of its operations over 110 years ago.

The American Bell Telephone Co. is an example of a national public utility. It has a national over-all policy and financial headquarters in New York. Scattered over the country, geographically located, are subsidiary operating companies with complete authority within delineated territorial lines. The Soil Conservation Service organization parallels this organization very closely.

Mr. R. I. Nowell, second vice president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, explains their organization on this basis:

> We have operated under a regional organization since about 1930 when our administrative problems first became complicated. We have 10 regional offices. It would be physically impossible for us at the home office to deal directly with all of these field men. Similarly, a State organization would be much too small and numerous for effective and efficient handling. The overhead involved in a State organization would be prohibitive if men of the desired caliber were employed.

The Federal Reserve System, drawing heavily upon the business judgment of the American bankers, was established for practical administration and efficient operation to flow through 12 strategically located districts or regions.

These and many more business firms have a regional type of organization because it is more economical and efficient. The Soil Conservation Service has a regional organization for similar reasons. According to a statement made by the budget officer of the Department of Agriculture to the House Appropriations Committee during the hearings on the 1948 budget, the Soil Conservation Service has one of the most economical administrative organizations of any bureau in the Department of Agriculture. According to the data presented, 94 percent of the funds of the Soil Conservation Service went to the field for technical assistance and work with the farmer and rancher.

Careful studies indicate clearly that it would cost substantially more to administer the conservation program if it were handled directly through 48 State and 3 Territorial offices rather than through the 7 regional offices now used. In fact, these studies indicate that at least 363 more people would be required in the Washington and State offices to do the work being accomplished under the present regional organization. To abolish these seven regional offices would automatically increase the number of people required to do the work in offices. This, in turn, could result in a reduction of the number of technicians working directly with farmers and ranchers.

In any event, I seriously question the wisdom of including an administrative restriction of this kind in broad, long-range farm legislation. No evidence is shown to support the proposal, and, in my opinion, it should be deleted.

I think it is a mistake to take out the regional offices at this time. I had quite an argument with reference to the matter. I talked myself out of an opportunity of presenting the amendment, because it is approximately 9 o'clock, when a vote will be had. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] knows the story better than I do. I shall not call for a vote upon it, but will ask the Senator from Vermont, in view of the fact that the amendment is not in the House bill, to take it up in conference and do his level best to see that it is brought to the attention of the conferees in the hope that they can work out the best solution possible. I ask the Senator whether he will do that for me.

Mr. AIKEN. I have 2 minutes left, I believe.

The provision of the Senate bill abolishes regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service because only 10 percent of the funds are spent in those offices. While we require the abolishment of the offices, we do not prevent the reestablishment of regional offices where needed, but the committee felt that States as large as Texas or California could well deal with the Washington office.

I shall call the matter to the attention of the conferees as requested by the Senator from Nebraska, and will see that the question has the full consideration of the conference committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield. I have a half minute left, I think.

Mr. LUCAS. This is one of the matters I had on my program which I overlooked. I want to associate myself with the Senator from Nebraska on this question, because the elimination of the regional offices will increase substantially the size of the State and national offices. In my opinion, it will cause greater expense if we eliminate them, and we shall have less efficiency.

Mr. AIKEN. I will say to the Senator that the matter will be considered by the conferees.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I know the Senator from Vermont is familiar with Public Law 163, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and particularly with section 2 of the act dated July 28, 1945, for which relationship is established between the support prices of fire-cured tobacco and flue-cured tobacco.

Mr. AIKEN. The same relationship will exist under Senate bill 2318.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate under the agreement has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Holland	Russell
Buck	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Johnston, S.C.	Sparkman
Cain	Kem	Stennis
Capehart	Kilgore	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Wherry
Feazel	Martin	Wiley
Ferguson	Maybank	Williams
Flanders	Millikin	Wilson
Fulbright	Morse	Young
Green	Murray	
Gurney	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the two Senators from Maryland to the Russell amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia accepts the amendment to his amendment. The question is on the substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia as modified.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President I have an amendment at the desk which I ask to have stated. It is an amendment to be proposed to the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 18, after the word "until" it is proposed to strike out "June 30, 1950", and insert in lieu thereof "December 31, 1949."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia further modifies his substitute by the acceptance of the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as modified.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], who is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea" if present, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—27

Barkley	Hatch	Murray
Bricker	Hayden	O'Conor
Buck	Hill	O'Daniel
Byrd	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson, Va.
Connally	Kilgore	Russell
Eastland	McClellan	Spaikman
Ecton	McFarland	Stennis
Feazel	McKellar	Tydings
Fulbright	Maybank	Umstead

NAYS—55

Aiken	Hawkes	Revercomb
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Ball	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brewster	Holland	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Stewart
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Cain	Kem	Taylor
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Thye
Cooper	McCarthy	Tobey
Cordon	McGrath	Vandenberg
Donnell	McMahon	Watkins
Downey	Magnuson	Wherry
Dworshak	Malone	Wiley
Ellender	Martin	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	Wilson
Flanders	Morse	Young
Given	Myers	
Gurney	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Knowland	Reed
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Wagner
George	Moore	White
Jenner	O'Mahoney	

So Mr. RUSSELL's substitute amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment, was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the committee amendment, as amended. The committee amendment is still open to amendment.

The Chair would like to state at this point his understanding of the unanimous-consent agreement. The Chair's understanding is that 10 minutes of time is available on each amendment to the committee amendment; 5 minutes being available to the author of an amendment, and 5 minutes to the opposition. General debate has been concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to call up my amendment "K" which has been printed and lies on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, between lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

(1) (A) The "parity price" for any agricultural commodity, as of any date, shall be—

(i) that price for the commodity which will give to the commodity a purchasing power with respect to articles that farmers buy equivalent to the purchasing power of such commodity in the base period; and which will also reflect current interest payments per acre on farm indebtedness secured by real estate, tax payments per acre on farm real estate, costs of all farm labor (on the basis of the national average and including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm, computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor), and freight rates, as contrasted with such interest payments, tax payments, farm labor costs, and freight rates during the base period; or

(ii) the alternative parity price for the commodity determined as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph,

whichever is higher. For the purpose of clause (i) of the preceding sentence the base period shall be the period August 1909 to July 1914 in the case of all agricultural commodities except tobacco, the period August 1919 to July 1929 in the case of all kinds of tobacco except burley and flue-cured, and the period August 1934 to July 1939 in the case of burley and flue-cured tobacco.

On page 71, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "(1) (A) The 'parity price'" and insert in lieu thereof "(B) The 'alternative parity price'."

On page 71, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "(B)" and insert in lieu thereof "(C)."

On page 72, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "(C)" and insert in lieu thereof "(D)."

On page 72, line 7, before the word "and", it is proposed to insert the following: "costs of all farm labor (on the basis of the national average and including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm, computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor),."

On page 2, line 9, after "rates", it is proposed to insert "costs."

On page 72, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "(D)" and insert in lieu thereof "(E)."

Beginning with line 14 on page 72 it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 4 on page 73.

On page 73, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "and (E)."

On page 73, lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to strike out "subparagraphs (A) and (E)" and insert in lieu thereof "subparagraph (A)."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Having failed in my effort to get a good bill at one bite, I desire to offer my amendment "K" to undertake to improve the pending bill. The amendment does two things. First, it includes in the parity formula all farm labor. The Senate has had that issue before it heretofore and has voted to include farm labor in the parity formula.

The amendment does another thing. It adopts the original provision of the Aiken bill, as introduced, providing the basis on which farm loans are made. The Aiken bill as originally introduced—and it will be found in the matter that is stricken out—allowed two bases for these loans, one of them being the existing parity formula, and the other being the new parity formula which is established by this bill, whichever is the higher. If Members of the Senate do not desire to have a lower loan rate, this amendment gives them an opportunity to meet their wishes in the Aiken bill, because it provides that the loan rate shall be based upon either the new parity formula established by the bill, about which there has been so much discussion and controversy, or on the old farm parity formula, including farm labor, whichever shall be higher.

I think that is a perfectly fair proposal. I regret that the committee saw fit to strike the provision from the original bill. This amendment proposes to reinstate it. I do not care to attempt to discuss this question in the 5 minutes allowed me, but I do wish to say that if we are to pass this bill we should do what we can to get a fair parity formula while we are at it. Farm labor and the labor of the family on the farm should be taken into account in computing a parity formula. The Senate has voted at least twice in the past to bring that factor into the parity formula. Now that we are adopting a long-range program, one that will be permanent from now on into the endless reaches of eternity, while the opportunity is afforded us, we should correct this error and vote to put farm labor into the parity formula.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the net effect of this amendment be to increase the cost of labor or decrease it, or will it have any effect whatsoever upon the cost of labor?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not affect the cost of labor. It merely brings that element of cost, whatever it may be, into the computation of the parity formula.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is it based on an average?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is based upon an average, established by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. They establish every year the average cost of farm labor of certain types.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So they set the price of farm labor.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; they ascertain what has been paid for farm labor. They do not fix the price of farm labor. This is not a price-fixing amendment. It merely brings into the parity formula the element of the cost of labor, just as the cost of what the farmer buys, what he pays in taxes, and the interest on his mortgage are all included in the parity formula.

No one can deny that labor is an essential element in the cost of production of agricultural commodities. This amendment recognizes that fact—not only hired labor, but labor of the farmer's family. If we are to adopt a long-range program, it would be very unfair to the farmers of the Nation to leave out this important element in the cost of production which all farmers have to pay.

Mr. President, I have not the time in 5 minutes to go into this question at any great length; but if the long-range bill is to be approved, this amendment will strengthen it immeasurably. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. This is the most far-reaching amendment any one can imagine, if one really does not understand what is in it. We were told by the Senator from Georgia that we discussed a bill this afternoon with many features in it that were not understood. Here is an amendment which would require a long time to discuss. It is far-reaching and important. It should not under any circumstances be accepted after 10 minutes of debate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot yield. I have only 5 minutes.

When the parity formula was enacted by Congress many years ago labor, as one of the factors, was considered by the best minds of agriculture at that time. At that particular moment labor was cheap. If Congress had put labor into the parity formula as one of the factors at that moment, we would have denied the farmer the parity prices he obtained at that time for many years thereafter.

As prices rose and as labor became more costly, and when the element of labor, figured into a parity formula, would give the farmer a better price for his produce, the same individuals who denied labor a place in the formula in the beginning then wanted it. They now want it, in order to give the farmer more money for his products.

Of course labor is an element. No one denies that labor is a factor, but it was not considered in the beginning. We should not consider it now. If the time should ever come when labor would again be cheap, the same group who now want labor included would be saying, "Let us take labor out, because labor is cheap, and the farmer will get more if we take it out." It is a dangerous thing with which to tamper.

Furthermore, it is administratively impossible to do what this amendment would attempt.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I cannot yield. I regret it.

When we talk about including farm operators and members of the family of farm operators engaged in work on the farm, and computing all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor, think what that would do. In discussing hired labor alone in the committee hearings, we discovered it was difficult to determine how such a provision could be administered. Now it is proposed to include everyone in the family in the formula. We never could get around to administering the law in a way that would be efficient and honest. It would be a case of guesswork from beginning to end.

Mr. President, this is no time to tamper with the parity formula, which has worked so well for the American farmer all these years. Practically every important witness, including Mr. Kline, of the American Farm Bureau Federation said, "Leave the parity formula as it is."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I cannot yield. I am sorry.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yielded when requested to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will have more time. I did not interrupt him. He knows that we are operating under a 5-minute limitation.

Mr. President, if there was ever an amendment which should be voted down, this is the one.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time is exhausted.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "K" offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Ives	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnston, S.C.	Smith
Cain	Kem	Sparkman
Capehart	Kilgore	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tobey
Dworshak	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McMahon	Umstead
Ecton	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Feazel	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Flanders	Millikin	Williams
Fulbright	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	
Hatch	O'Conor	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to amendment lettered "K" offered by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, is it in

Kem Morse Thye
Kilgore Murray Tydings
Langer Myers Umstead
Lucas O'Conor Vandenberg
McCarthy O'Daniel Watkins
McClellan Pepper Wherry
McFarland Reed Wiley
McGrath Revercomb Williams
McKellar Robertson, Va. Wilson
McMahon Robertson, Wyo. Young
Magnuson Russell
Malone Saltonstall
Martin Smith
Maybank Sparkman
Millikin Stennis
Stewart
Taft
Taylor
Thomas, Okla.
Tobey

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges Knowland Thomas, Utah
Bushfield Lodge Wagner
Capper McCarran White
George Moore
Jenner O'Mahoney

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment lettered "K" was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], who is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea" if present, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—68

Aiken	Hawkes	Revercomb
Baldwin	Hayden	Robertson, Va.
Ball	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bricker	Holland	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Sparkman
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Butler	Johnston, S.C.	Stewart
Byrd	Kem	Taft
Cain	Kilgore	Taylor
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Thye
Connally	McCarthy	Tobey
Cooper	McClellan	Tydings
Cordon	McFarland	Umstead
Donnell	McGrath	Vandenberg
Downey	McKellar	Watkins
Dworshak	McMahon	Wherry
Eastland	Magnuson	Wiley
Ecton	Malone	Williams
Ellender	Martin	Wilson
Feazel	Maybank	Young
Ferguson	Millikin	
Flanders	Morse	
Fulbright	Murray	
Green	Myers	
Gurney	O'Conor	
Hatch	O'Daniel	
	Pepper	
	Reed	

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, is it in order to request the yeas and nays on this question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entitled to do so, if he wishes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—23

Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Byrd	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson, Va.
Connally	McClellan	Russell
Downey	McFarland	Sparkman
Ecton	McKellar	Stewart
Fulbright	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Murray	Umstead
Hill	O'Daniel	

NAYS—59

Aiken	Chavez	Flanders
Baldwin	Cooper	Green
Brewster	Cordon	Gurney
Bricker	Donnell	Hatch
Brooks	Dworshak	Hawkes
Buck	Eastland	Hickenlooper
Butler	Ellender	Hoey
Cain	Feazel	Holland
Capehart	Ferguson	Ives
Kem	Morse	Thye
Kilgore	Myers	Tobey
Langer	O'Conor	Tydings
Lucas	Reed	Vandenberg
McCarthy	Revercomb	Watkins
McGrath	Robertson, Wyo.	Wherry
McMahon	Saltonstall	Wiley
Magnuson	Smith	Williams
Malone	Stennis	Wilson
Martin	Taft	Young
Millikin	Taylor	

NOT VOTING—14

Ball	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lodge	Wagner
Capper	McCarran	White
George	Moore	

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment lettered "K" to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered "J" to the committee amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 72, line 6, after the comma, it is proposed to insert the following: "costs of all farm labor (on the basis of the national average and including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm, computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor)."

On page 72, in line 9, after "prices", it is propose to insert "costs."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the amendment does not call for a loan value at a high rate of parity or under the 10-year moving average. It is confined solely and exclusively to the question of whether or not the farmer and those engaged in agricultural pursuits shall be allowed some consideration for the tremendously high cost of labor that goes into agricultural production today. The Senate may, if it chooses, vote down my amendments, but the amendments are fair, they are just, and the cost of production is the element that goes into every other commodity sold on the American market today.

Mr. President, I merely want to say a word or two in reply to the Senator from Illinois, who was not kind enough to yield. He said this amendment would disturb the parity formula when the bill of which he is the sponsor wipes out the parity formula we have always known and writes a completely new formula. I am trying to perfect that formula by protecting the farmers and those engaged in agriculture in what they have to pay in farm wages today.

He stated that the amendment was administratively impossible. When we discussed the matter here once before, and the Senator from Illinois was opposing the proposal on the floor, the Senate was dealing with the farm problem more calmly than it is this evening. When the Senator from Illinois rose on that same question, he said it could not possibly be determined what element of wages went into the cost of production in farming and into the parity formula. He then proceeded for the next 15 minutes to read a speech which had been prepared in the Department, which set forth in great detail the exact changes which would be brought about in parity if farm wages were included, and said it would put farm products so high that wages should not be included.

There is nothing administratively impossible about the proposition. It is fair and just and equitable, and I would ask that Senators consider it squarely on its merits.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I regret, Mr. President, I obviously do not in 2 minutes have the time to yield, unless by unanimous consent my time may be extended. If that is not granted, I shall be unable to yield to the able Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish the Chair to put the request to the Senate?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator wishes me to yield——

Mr. THYE. No.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. Mr. President, since I have been in the Senate I have been identified in every way I could with an effort to raise the wages of working men and women. I have been identified with every minimum-wage bill with which I could associate myself. In the past, minimum-wage legislation has been restricted to nonagricultural labor, and every time we talk about extending minimum-wage laws to agricultural labor, where the need is greater than it is even in the industrial field, we are told it cannot be done. I know it never will be done unless somehow we find a formula by which the cost of the labor the farmer hires, the money the farmer spends for wages, is included in the price he gets for his commodity; that is, in this instance, into the parity formula.

I say, Mr. President, the need is greatest among farm labor for a decent wage level. We will never get such a level unless the farmer can in some way or other be protected by having included in the price he gets for his commodity in the market place the good wages he pays his working men and women in the field. I believe it is a salutary step forward. It is a principle of equity and fairness to the farmer laborers, to put them on a parity eventually with the industrial labor of the Nation. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THYE. If farm labor were figured in the parity formula under the bill, it would have this effect: During an inflated era, when prices were high, parity would be raised by the inclusion of farm labor possibly as much as 5 percent. For the effect in a depressed era in agriculture, when prices are low, suppose we go back to the early 1930's. If we then figured the hired farm wage into the parity formula, it would have had a tendency to lower the parity and possibly would have brought parity several points below the actual parity that would have obtained if the farm labor were not figured into the formula.

It was for that reason the economists, the Department of Agriculture, and finally the committee, made the decision that they would accept the formula which did not include farm labor.

I think the able Senator from Georgia will agree that in figuring the formula for parity in the high inflationary prices we have today, we certainly would not want to increase the cost by including farm labor in the parity. But in the event we had a low, depressed condition, a return to agriculture that would be comparable, in other words, to what it was in the early 1930's, we certainly would want every factor to help lift the parity or the price structure of the agricultural economy at that time.

For that reason, I think, Mr. President, if we should adopt the amendment offered by the able Senator from Georgia it would be a mistaken attempt to aid the farmer. I would not do one thing that would injure agriculture in any way.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. The able Senator from Georgia had his moment of time, and I must beg that I be permitted to use my moments of time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yielded to Senators all afternoon.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, each and every member of the committee sat through many, many hours of public hearings on the entire question this past fall and during the winter months of the second session of the Eightieth Congress, and studied every phase of the entire farm program. I know that every committee member who served on that subcommittee, and even the entire Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, will agree with me that every figure we received from the economists was accompanied with advice against writing into the parity formula the cost or hire of labor, including family labor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator has time, will he yield for a moment?

Mr. AIKEN. How much time have I left, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator can yield now if he will. He has 2 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say what the Senator from Minnesota has said is true, that including the cost of hired labor and family labor in the parity formula would increase the entire price of farm commodities during periods of inflation or periods such as we are going through now, about 5 percent. If, however, the time came when labor became more plentiful and cheap, the effect of including the cost of labor would be to lower the parity prices of farm products below what they would normally be. The committee took this into consideration in fixing the levels of the bill at which farm commodities should be supported. Had we expected that farm labor would be included in the formula, we then would have so arranged the bill that the level of support would have been somewhat lower, but we took into consideration in fixing the level at which farm commodities would be supported the fact that the cost of farm labor or the value of the family labor, which is very difficult indeed to figure, should not be included in the computation of the parity program for farm commodities.

I believe that the bill is very well balanced as it is, and I do not believe it would be advisable to adopt any amendment which would have the effect of raising parity prices on an average of 5 percent.

Tht PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "J" offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

On this amendment I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] would vote "nay," if present.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—28

Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Downey	Kilgore	Sparkman
Eastland	McClellan	Stennis
Ecton	McFarland	Stewart
Ellender	McKellar	Taylor
Feazel	Maybank	Umstead
Fulbright	Murray	
Hayden	O'Daniel	

NAYS—51

Aiken	Hatch	Reed
Baldwin	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Brewster	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bricker	Holland	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Taft
Buck	Kem	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thye
Cain	Lucas	Tobey
Cooper	McCarthy	Tydings
Cordon	McGrath	Vandenberg
Donnell	McMahon	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Flanders	Millikin	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young

NOT VOTING—17

Bridges	Jenner	O'Conor
Bushfield	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Wagner
Chavez	Magnuson	White
George	Moore	

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment lettered "J" was rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment lettered "I," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 72, line 6, after the word "buy" and the comma it is proposed to insert "wages paid hired farm labor," and on page 72, line 9, after the word "prices", insert the word "wages."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the amendment just rejected by the Senate recognized the labor the farmer does on his farm, the labor the farmer's wife does in the field, and the labor his children do on the farm, in computing the parity index. That has now been eliminated by the vote just taken, and is not before the Senate for further consideration. The amendment which is now proposed merely asks that wages paid hired farm labor, in other words, the cash taken out of the farmer's pocket and paid to farm labor, shall be considered in computing the parity formula,

Mr. President, the Senate may vote again that wage costs have nothing to do with costs of production, and should not be considered in what a farmer should receive. I appreciate the fact that the Senate has given me a record vote on the two votes which have heretofore been had. I have learned a bitter lesson in regard to the 5-minute rule by what has transpired up until now. The very able Senator from Minnesota, in discussing the last amendment voted on, said that this was a period when farm wages were high, and that therefore the prices of commodities would be run up too high if we included all farm labor.

Mr. President, I merely wish to call attention to the fact that the bill which the Senator from Minnesota sponsors as a coauthor contains this provision in arriving at what is parity:

The general level of prices for articles and services that farmers buy.

That is in the committee bill. The general level of the prices for what the farmer buys is considered in arriving at the proper parity under the committee bill. The prices of what the farmer buys today are certainly inflated. No one would deny that the cost to the farmer of the things he purchases are approximately what they were in 1940. If they go down, under the parity formula in the pending bill the farmers' parity will go down with them.

Mr. President, this amendment recognizes that farm wages are at an all time high, and that the wages should be considered—this refers to out-of-pocket wages paid by the farmer—in arriving at a proper parity formula.

I submit that the cost of farm wages, the amount the farmer or the ranch owner or the plantation operator reaches in his pocket and pays out to the hands employed on his place, is as much a cost of production as anything else the farmer has to purchase, and that it is unfair and unjust to adopt this long-range program without taking into consideration farm wages actually paid out of pocket by the farmer in the computation of parity.

The amendment would have the effect of increasing parity a little; that is quite true; it might increase parity of wheat 2 or 3 cents a bushel, and corn a like amount. But the bill would lower the parity on wheat by 25 or 30 cents a bushel, it would lower the parity on corn, and would lower the parity on cotton by 4 cents a pound. This small amount should be restored to the parity value because, while Senators may blind themselves to it if they will, what the farmer actually pays out of pocket for labor is just as essentially a part of the parity formula as the purchase of a tractor, or the purchase of a truck, or of any other commodity the farmer may need in the planting or making of his crop.

The Senate has denied the farmer the right to take into consideration his own wages, it has denied him the right to take into consideration the labor of his children in the field with him. I implore the Senate at least to permit him to have recognition in the parity formula, as an element of what constitutes a fair base, the labor cost he pays out of his own pocket.

Mr. President, in the great civilization in which we live today wages have advanced in all lines in the past several years. The level of industrial wages has increased some three or four times. The cost of farm labor has greatly increased. No one complains when there is a slight increase in the price of a commodity. For example, when Mr. Lewis gets a high wage rate for his coal miners, the price of coal rises a few cents a ton, and no one expects anything else. But the farmer is expected to pay the present high wages out of pocket and have the parity held down to an unfair and unjust level.

I say, Mr. President, that if we are to write a long-range farm program, it is unjust, it is unfair, it is unsound and un-American, to eliminate from the program the wages which are actually paid out of pocket by the farmer in computing what is a fair parity for the product which he has for sale.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. I will make the question very short. I have voted with the Senator from Illinois on the previous amendments, but I have always believed the wages paid out by a farmer were a farm cost, and I wish the Senator would explain to me what the word "services" in line 5, page 72 means, and why wages paid out in cash are not included under "services."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not propose to discuss that question at all. I propose to answer the Senator from Georgia under the 5-minute rule.

The same arguments made a moment ago in opposition to the other amendment submitted by the Senator from Georgia are apropos to the amendment he now offers.

On page 72 of the bill, paragraph (C) reads as follows:

(C) The "parity index," as of any date, shall be the ratio of (i) the general level of prices for articles and services that farmers buy, interest on farm indebtedness secured by farm real estate, and taxes on farm real estate, for the calendar month ending last before such date to (ii) the general level of such prices, rates, and taxes during the period January 1910 to December 1914, inclusive.

Mr. President, that is the parity formula which has been in existence almost from the very beginning. Yet I recall taxes were added, and that was used as a factor in the consideration of the parity formula.

It is strange that in offering the amendment which was proposed as a complete substitute for the bill offered by the Senator from Vermont the Senator from Georgia did not see fit to change the parity formula. He was content with the amendment he offered without any change in the parity formula whatsoever.

If the Senator was so interested in farm labor as he has contended here all along, it would have been reasonable to have proposed such a change in the parity formula and had it adopted for the period of the next 18 months.

No, Mr. President; the same old argument has been made year after year since the cost of labor has become so high. What we would be doing if we added this as a factor or a part of the equation making up the parity formula would be adding 5 percent to the present parity price. Instead of having a 90-percent parity, we would be giving the farmer a parity of 95 percent.

Mr. President, after all, I undertake to say that the farmers of America are not asking for this change; at least, the farmers of the State whence I come are not asking for it. The farmer is satisfied with the deal he has received under the present parity formula. The farmer of America is better off today than at any time in all his history, under the parity formula we have been operating through the Department of Agriculture all these years. This is no time to change it now, to cause all the administrative confusion which would result from adding the cost of hired labor. I make the same argument I made before against the amendment, and I ask that it be rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time on the amendment has expired, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is detained on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

On this amendment I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] would vote "nay" if present.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—29

Barkley	Hayden	Murray
Byrd	Hill	O'Daniel
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Downey	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Eastland	Langer	Russell
Ecton	McClellan	Sparkman
Ellender	McFarland	Stennis
Feazel	McKellar	Stewart
Fulbright	Magnuson	Umstead
Hatch	Maybank	

NAYS—53

Aiken	Gurney	Revercomb
Baldwin	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Ball	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Brewster	Hoey	Smith
Bricker	Holland	Taft
Bridges	Ives	Taylor
Brooks	Kem	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Kilgore	Thye
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Cain	McCarthy	Tydings
Capehart	McGrath	Vandenberg
Chavez	McMahon	Watkins
Cooper	Malone	Wherry
Cordon	Martin	Wiley
Donnell	Millikin	Williams
Dworshak	Morse	Wilson
Flanders	Myers	Young
Green	Reed	

NOT VOTING—14

Bushfield	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarran	Wagner
George	Moore	White
Jenner	O'Conor	

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment lettered "I" was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer my amendment No. 2, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 51, line 14, after the period, it is proposed to strike out beginning with the words "The Secretary" and the remaining lines on the page, and to insert the following:

CONSERVATION SURVEY

(d) In order to effectuate the purposes of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall, as rapidly as practicable, make a conservation survey of the Nation's present and potential agricultural lands, and he is authorized to analyze, publish, and distribute information concerning such survey and to provide land use capability maps to landowners and operators applicable to their units of land and to assist them in interpreting and analyzing such maps. On the basis of this conservation survey, maps shall also be prepared delineating those lands suitable for cultivation, those primarily suitable for the production of forests and forest products, those primarily suitable for range livestock production, those primarily suitable for wildlife purposes, and shall specify in addition those lands potentially suitable for intensive agricultural use through irrigation, drainage, clearing, or otherwise, and this survey shall be utilized by all agencies of the Federal Government in the development of agricultural lands within their jurisdiction.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I propose this amendment because we need an accurate inventory of our present agricultural land and our potential agricultural land. We need to know how much land we have. We need to know how much and where our land reserves are that are not now being used. We need to know what their quality is, and what and how much they would produce if it becomes necessary to use them. It is important to know how much land we have. Of the 1,142,000,000 acres of land now in farms in this country, we need to know how much of it is good, how much of it is just fair, and how much of it is poor. We should know its quality and its condition, what conservation measures and other attentions the land needs to maintain its fertility, and its productive capacity while in use.

This is a logical first step in undertaking to assure the Nation of a supply of food, fiber, and other raw materials that can come only from land that is properly used and protected. The survey proposed in this amendment would show the best use for each piece of land and it would indicate the treatment required on each farm in order to prevent erosion damage and to maintain its productivity. It is the only sound basis on which we can develop and direct any long-range agricultural program. It will be valuable for each individual farmer as he works out a soil-conservation program for his own farm and as he plans his own production year after year.

No well managed enterprise, either private or public, would try to conduct its business without this much of an inventory of its basic assets. We are spending a lot of time and hundreds of millions of dollars of public funds on various agricultural programs without an adequate inventory of the land that is basic to every agricultural program. The land is the source of most of the raw material upon which this Nation is dependent. Therefore, we have a need to obtain the essential information about the land as a basis for conserving it and as premise for planning our farm programs.

I have checked with authorities in the Department of Agriculture, and the information that I have received would indicate that it is both possible and feasible to undertake such an inventory and that it could be completed in about 5 years.

Mr. President, because of the lack of time, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the statement I had intended to make be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. WHERRY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What is a conservation survey, and what features are shown? The conservation survey is a detailed record of physical land conditions on each farm. It shows variations in such features as the kind of soil, slope of the land, erosion damage, and present land use. This information is recorded on a map, usually on an aerial photograph, and shows all features of the land that affect its capability for use and its needs for management.

What is a land-use capability map? The land-use capability map is a map that shows what the land can do and what it needs for permanent production. Detailed information obtained in the conservation survey about soil, slope, erosion, and other land features is boiled down into eight classes to show specifically the land suitable for cultivation, grazing, forestry, and wildlife, and the intensity of treatment needed to protect the land.

How much land has been surveyed? Two hundred and seventy-five million acres of land have already been surveyed in this way. Other surveys that have been made will be utilized by supplementing them with additional information in order to make them adequate as a basis for developing farm and ranch conservation plans.

What will be the cost in making such a land inventory? The cost of making this farm-land inventory will be about 5 cents per acre. This cost is less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the value of farm land.

At 5 cents an acre for 1,142,000,000 acres in farms, the cost would be over $57,000,000, but much of the land has already been surveyed—it is estimated that it will cost about $40,000,000 to complete such a survey of all the land in farms.

Who will use the information obtained from the survey? It provides essential information about the land for making farm conservation plans on individual farms and ranches, and will provide it in time to carry out soil-conservation practices with the greatest efficiency.

The survey gives information that is essential in planning a long-range agricultural program. It would serve as a basis for determining the acreages of land suitable for specific uses and the treatment needed to protect the land in those uses.

It will provide information for flood control, drainage, irrigation, and other similar activities.

What does the individual farmer get out of this survey? The farmer gets a map of his farm that shows him the best use for each field and aids him in selecting the practices needed to protect and improve his land. Specifically, the map of each farm that the farmer gets will show field and pasture boundaries, streams, roads, building sites, the eroded or steep lands that are now in cultivation that should be put in grass or trees, the wet areas that can be improved by drainage, the location of waterways, the fields that need terracing and strip cropping, the soils that are best adapted to special crops like alfalfa, tobacco, or peanuts, etc.

What is the difference between a soil survey and a conservation survey? The soil survey classifies and maps soils showing how they differ in color, texture, structure, and other features as they occur in their natural state.

The conservation survey is a practical inventory of the land conditions on a farm-by-farm basis. It shows, in addition to the kind of soil, the amount of slope, the erosion that has occurred, and whether the land is cultivated, is in grass or trees. It provides the necessary information to plan and apply practices and measures to conserve the soil.

What is a land capability map? It is a map of a farm, colored so as to show the different kinds of land; that based on the information from the conservation survey, together with knowledge of the climate, indicates what the land needs, and what it can best produce while in continuous use.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the amendment should be taken to conference.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have not read the amendment. I have not seen anything before but the heading of it. I should be willing to accept it and take

it to conference with the understanding that it does not bind the Senate conferees if there is something in it which we would otherwise oppose. I do not think there is.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I think the Senator will agree with me and I am satisfied the Senate conferees will agree with me, that the amendment should be included in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The amendment to the committee amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment No. 3 and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

LAND SURVEYS AND DEVELOPMENT TIMETABLE

(e) Prior to the first request for an annual appropriation for purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and submit to the Congress a preliminary land conservation and development timetable showing the current rates and extent of land damage in the United States, the dates practicable for the completion of the conservation survey, and a specification of the land treatment in his opinion deemed necessary, including estimated costs thereof. On completion and analysis of the conservation survey of the Nation's land, the Secretary of Agriculture shall revise the land conservation and development timetable accordingly and shall submit it to Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this amendment simply provides a timetable for the conservation program which we have just asked the Senator from Vermont to take to conference. I think it is necessary if we are going into the conservation program. It seems to me that we should not only make an inventory of the land, but should also have some sort of timetable showing us how fast we can proceed with conservation methods. Also there ought to be some idea of whether or not we are going too fast.

Mr. President, in view of the late hour and the limitation on debate to 5 minutes to each side, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I propose a conservation timetable in order that we may begin to apply some real business principles to the conservation job in the United States. Everyone agrees now that we have a conservation job to do and everyone agrees that it ought to be done right. What we have all failed to find out, so far, is just how big the job is—and how much time we have to do it in.

The way we are going now we could go on and on with these soil-conservation programs until doomsday. The way we are going now I cannot tell whether we will have the land of the country conserved by the year 2,000 or by the year 3,000. I am convinced, however, that if we keep up this unbusinesslike approach to the job we shall come face to face with the fact, one of these days, that there is not much land left to conserve.

I am convinced of another thing. The conservation job ahead of us has some size that can be determined. Maybe every last acre in the country needs conservation work. Maybe three-quarters of our land needs the work—or two-thirds. I do not know what the percentage may be, but I am sure there must be one. Only we do not know today the size of the job we are trying to deal with.

We have been going at conservation blindly. We have not only failed so far to find out how big the job is, we have failed to find out how fast we must do the job. I know that if land is wearing out fast, you can't loiter along and take 20 or 30 years to protect it. Any businessman who handled his machinery and equipment that way would be driven to the wall. On the other hand, I am sure that there is much land in the country that is not being damaged very fast. Some of it is not being damaged at all. We do not know how much of our land is being damaged fast; how much is being damaged slowly; or how much is free from damage. This is most unbusinesslike. How can we hope to deal intelligently with this highly important matter if we do not know either the size of the job or how much time we have to do it?

We ought to take steps to find out these facts. Then we ought to provide a conservation program especially designed to meet the needs—doing what needs to be done each year—and then finishing the job.

I am told that we have some preliminary information along this line. I am told that approximately one-quarter of all our cropland is being damaged at a very serious rate. The trained conservationists in the States and in the Federal Government say that this land will suffer permanent damage unless it is given sound conservation treatment within the next 10 to 15 years. They call this a critical rate.

Another quarter of our cropland, I am informed, is being damaged at a slower rate, but still fast enough to cause us grave concern. This land will suffer a permanent loss in its ability to produce unless it is given conservation protection within about 20 years.

Our conservation program should be operated on a schedule. We ought to know how much we need to do each year in order to protect the vital soil resources of the country, and then we ought to do it. With such a schedule—I call it a conservation timetable—we can go ahead with some real assurance that we are dealing effectively with the job. We can proceed with some assurance that the money we are appropriating for soil conservation is actually getting the job done—so much every year.

The conservation job in the United States can be scheduled ahead, just as businessmen schedule their operations ahead. With a conservation timetable we can get the conservation job done surely and on time. It would be the most practical and economical way of getting it done. Without a timetable we shall have to go along appropriating huge sums of money year after year, never knowing whether we are actually meeting the needs of the Nation, and indulging in a hit-or-miss flirtation with one of the most serious problems facing the country.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Vermont to accept the amendment and take it to conference and see whether or not the conferees will accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a point of information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator raising a point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to find out something. I wish to find out what happened to the previous amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska. I did not hear the Chair say anything about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announced that it was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. If I have any time left.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 3 minutes.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator explain what is meant by a timetable?

Mr. WHERRY. I mean a schedule showing how fast we should go with conservation methods annually. I think we should go as fast as we can, but I think we should proceed over a period of years according to a timetable and make our appropriations annually on that basis to cover all the land—not too fast and not too slow. I think we are going at the program hit or miss. I think the amendment should be taken to conference to see if a timetable can be worked out

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska calls for a tremendous job on the part of the Department of Agriculture. I suppose it is a job which should be done. Whether now is the time to do it, I do not know. I am willing to take the amendment to conference. If it is left in the bill, there will still have to be an appropriation, and I doubt if it will be possible to obtain an appropriation for this purpose between now and the end of the session.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. If I have any time left.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 1 minute.

Mr. BUTLER. I have some comments on the bill relating to the subject of conservation which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUGH BUTLER, OF NEBRASKA, ON S. 2318

Mr. President, in my judgment it is very unfortunate that we are forced by circumstances to take action on such an important matter so late in this session and under such trying and confusing conditions. I have a fear that many of the decisions we are making may not be wise decisions. This is a very complicated bill. It will have far-reaching effects on every farmer in the country. It deserves more careful and extended consideration than it is receiving.

Thus far, almost all the debate has centered around the new parity formula and the new proposals for price supports contained in the bill. Yet these provisions relating to farm prices are not the only important changes provided for in the bill. In titles I and II of the bill, a wholesale reorganization of the administrative agencies handling the agricultural program is provided. These titles would have far-reaching effects on the administration of the soil-conservation program, on the payments for conservation practices, and on other programs, if these should be enacted in their present form. Yet they have received almost no discussion during the course of the debate. There is real danger that they may be enacted into law without any real consideration by the Congress.

I do not believe such far-reaching changes in the organization of the Department should be enacted at the present time without much more thorough consideration by the Congress. In fact, I have considered preparing an amendment or amendments striking out all those sections of the bill which would reorganize the administrative framework for the programs. I finally decided not to offer such amendments at this time, since I realize it would be out of the question to ask the Senate to give them detailed consideration at this late hour. In any case, I feel fairly confident that the House will refuse even to consider these proposed administrative changes. Before the final vote is taken, however, I want to record a protest against these changes in the conservation program and other programs, so that it cannot be said there was no opposition to them.

Mr. President, very briefly I want to mention at least a few reasons why I believe this wholesale revision of the conservation program would be most unwise. First of all, we have not had time to give the implications of the new plan fair consideration. I believe that is obvious. We should not attempt to reshuffle the principal bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, the State and County Committees, and all the rest of the Department without giving very careful thought to every aspect of the proposed change.

Second, we already have at work a Commission—the Hoover Commission—which has been hard at work for some time on a general investigation and study of the organization of the entire Government, with a view to recommending changes and improvements in our methods of operation. I understand that the Hoover Commission is going very thoroughly into the various problems of the organization and administration of the farm programs. It seems that it would be foolish to try to legislate such changes at this time, when the Hoover Commission, early next year, may report recommendations along entirely different lines. I believe I am just as well aware of the need for certain changes in the methods of conducting these programs as are the sponsors of this bill. I do not believe, however, that this is the time or the way to make those changes.

Third, the effect of this bill apparently will be to place control over the soil-conservation program in the hands of county and State committees, rather than in the hands of the soil-conservation districts. I do not believe that would be wise. I am not sure it would even be practical. The sponsors of the bill seem to forget that the soil-conservation districts were authorized and created by action of each of the 48 States. This district set-up should not be wiped out, as proposed in this act. It is doing an excellent job for conservation at the present time. Personally, I do not see why the soil-conservation districts should be changed at all. They are one of the most successful elements of our agricultural program.

There are other reasons why no such drastic organizational changes should be made at this time. I will not try to give them in detail. I hope I have said enough to show why this proposal should not be rushed through in such a hasty fashion. I sincerely hope that the House will refuse to be stampeded in this matter, and will insist that these questions be put over for more thorough study.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2318) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in order to expedite the legislative process, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 6248, which is the stopgap bill which was passed by the House; that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6248; and that the House bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the language of Senate bill 2318, as amended, the bill which has just gone to a third reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 6248, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes.

Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 6248?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, House bill 6248 will be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of Senate bill 2318 as amended.

The amendment is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Agricultural Act of 1948".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby recognized that a sound national economy requires that each segment of the population be maintained as an efficient producer and a constant consumer of goods and services, and it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide for a coordinated program, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with agencies in the several States, and designed—

(1) to restore, develop, conserve, and wisely use our basic resources of soil, water, forests, and wildlife habitat in order to assure an abundant production of all agricultural products necessary for the general well-being of all our people;

(2) to develop a means of supporting agricultural income on a flexible basis relative to prices and production so as to foster desirable shifts in agricultural production and aid in stabilizing the national economy;

(3) to improve methods of marketing, facilitate distribution, and increase utilization of agricultural commodities in both domestic and foreign markets;

(4) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts to the extent necessary to provide an orderly, adequate, and balanced flow of such commodities in interstate and foreign trade through price support, marketing quotas, diversion to various economic uses, and other means;

(5) to assist consumers in obtaining adequate and steady supplies of high-quality farm products at fair and equitable prices;

(6) to assist low-income families and school children in maintaining an adequate diet, particularly in periods of underconsumption and unemployment;

(7) to obtain full cooperation and coordinated action of land operators living on the farms in restoring, developing, conserving, and wisely using our basic resources of soil, water, forests, and wildlife habitat;

(8) to provide more adequately for the coordination and expansion of Federal and State soil surveys and other investigations, experimentation, and research pertaining to the conservation, restoration, and development of our natural agricultural resources, and for the publication of the results of such studies;

(9) to assure that payments to farmers in each State for soil-conservation practices shall be made only for practices approved by the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture upon the recommendation of the State agricultural council (hereinafter provided for);

(10) to provide for the fullest development and the most efficient employment of rural human resources;

(11) to provide more fully for adult education through cooperative agricultural extension work as the recognized educational and demonstrational medium for reaching farm people and others in regard to agricultural information, policies, and programs;

(12) to provide for the full development of personal initiative and local responsibility in the development and administration of programs for the maintenance of a progressive agriculture;

(13) to provide for the adaptation of agricultural programs to the different and changing needs of regional and local communities;

(14) to encourage producers, processors, and distributors to enter into marketing agreements for the supplying of adequate quantities of selected farm products at a reasonable and assured price;

(15) to continue the use of certain revenues and funds for judicious support of prices of highly perishable products, including fresh fruits, vegetables, milk, and eggs, in facilitating distribution of such products for diet improvement of low-income families and school children, in stimulating improved nutrition, and in encouraging the exportation of such products; and

(16) to assist in the retention of foreign outlets in order to (a) maintain long-run export demands, (b) prevent short-run demoralization of domestic markets, and (c) maintain productive capacity sufficient to satisfy expected long-run domestic markets plus foreign demand for agricultural products.

TITLE I—REORGANIZATION

DECENTRALIZATION OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 101. The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the "Secretary") shall establish an agency, to be known as the "Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement," to exercise all functions of the Secretary and of the various bureaus and agencies within the Department of Agriculture which (1), prior to the enactment of this act, were assigned to the Soil Conservation Service or to the Agricultural Conservation Programs Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration, or (2) the Secretary deems to be principally related to soil conservation and improvement or to those aspects of programs of the Department of Agriculture which require direct dealings by the Department with farmers; except that, subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary—

(a) the educational, informational, and demonstrational features of such functions shall be exercised, in the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, through the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agencies performing cooperative agricultural extension work;

(b) the research and investigational features of such functions shall be exercised in the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico through the agricultural experiment stations in cooperation with the Secretary acting through the Office of Experiment Stations; and

(c) such functions, except as provided by clauses (a) and (b) of this section, shall within the continental United States be performed at State and county levels, insofar as the Secretary may deem practicable, by the State agricultural councils, the county and community agricultural program committees, and the county agricultural program executive committees, all hereinafter provided for.

Except as provided in clauses (a) and (b) of this section, the furnishing of technical assistance, and machinery and equipment to soil-conservation districts and others, as heretofore performed by the Soil Conservation Service, shall be performed by the Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement in cooperation with the State agricultural councils established pursuant to this act and the soil-conservation districts established by State laws. The functions assigned pursuant to this section to the State agricultural councils and the agencies performing cooperative agricultural extension work shall be closely coordinated by the secretary and by such councils and agencies.

Conservation survey

(d) In order to effectuate the purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, as rapidly as practicable, make a conservation survey of the Nation's present and potential agricultural lands, and he is authorized to analyze, publish, and distribute information concerning such survey and to provide land use capability maps to landowners and operators applicable to their units of land and to assist them in interpreting and analyzing such maps. On the basis of this conservation survey, maps shall also be prepared delineating those lands suitable for cultivation, those primarily suitable for the production of forests and forest products, those primarily suitable for range livestock production, those primarily suitable for wildlife purposes, and shall specify in addition those lands potentially suitable for intensive agricultural use through irrigation, drainage, clearing, or otherwise, and this survey shall be utilized by all agencies of the Federal Government in the development of agricultural lands within their jurisdiction.

Land conservation and development timetable

(e) Prior to the first request for an annual appropriation for purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and submit to the Congress a preliminary land conservation and development timetable, showing the current rates and extent of land damage to the United States, the dates practicable for the completion of the conservation survey, and a specification of the land treatment in his opinion deemed necessary, including estimated costs thereof. On completion and analysis of the conservation survey of the Nation's land, the Secretary of Agriculture shall revise the land conservation and development timetable accordingly and shall submit it to Congress.

APPROPRIATIONS AVAILABLE FOR FUNCTIONS TO BE PERFORMED AS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK

SEC. 102. (a) (A) Any sums hereafter appropriated, other than as grants-in-aid, and available for functions which the Secretary determines to be functions required by section 101 (a) of this act to be exercised through the Extension Service and cooperating agencies in the several States and the Territory of Hawaii, to the extent that such funds are available at the time the Secretary makes such determination, and (B) any sums appropriated specifically for functions covered by section 101 (a), shall be paid to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii in the same manner and subject to the same conditions and limitations as the additional sums appropriated under the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and all acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," approved May 8, 1914 (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 341–343, 344–348), except that—

(1) not more than 2 per centum of the sums so appropriated and available in each fiscal year shall be available for paying expenses of the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture; and

(2) the remainder of the sums so appropriated and available in each fiscal year shall be paid to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii, without any requirement that equal sums be provided from any other sources, in the same proportions as the sums appropriated for such fiscal year pursuant to section 23 of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935, as amended (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 343d–1).

(b) The sums paid pursuant to this section shall be in addition to and not in substitution for sums appropriated under such act of May 8, 1914, as amended and supplemented, or sums otherwise appropriated for agricultural extension work. Allotments to any State or the Territory of Hawaii for any fiscal year as provided by this section shall be available for payment to such State or the Territory of Hawaii only if such State or the Territory of Hawaii complies, for such fiscal year, with the provisions with reference to offset of appropriations (other than appropriated funds allotted pursuant to this section) for agricultural extension work.

DIVISION OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 103. The Secretary shall establish within the Office of Experiment Stations an organizational unit to carry out the functions assigned to him by section 101 (b) of this act. Not more than 5 percent of any Federal funds made available for research projects supervised by such organizational unit shall be available for its expenses.

APPROPRIATIONS AVAILABLE FOR FUNCTIONS TRANSFERRED TO EXPERIMENT STATIONS

SEC. 104. The Secretary is authorized to make available from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated, other than as grants-in-aid, for functions which pursuant to section 101 (b) are to be exercised through the agricultural experiment stations in the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico such sums as he may deem appropriate for allotment to such agricultural experiment stations. The sums so allotted shall be in addition to and not in substitution for sums otherwise appropriated for the work of such agricultural experiment stations.

COMMUNITY, COUNTY, AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

Community agricultural program committees

SEC. 105. The farm operators within each local administrative area of the continental United States hereinafter provided for shall elect annually from among their number (1) three members of a community agricultural program committee, designating one of such members to be chairman, and (2) first and second alternates. In any county in which only one such area is situated five members and two alternates shall be elected for the community agricultural program committee for such area. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the committee between annual elections shall be filled for the unexpired terms by the first and second alternates in that order, or if there are no alternates available, by an election by the farm operators. Vacancies occurring in the chairmanship of the committee between annual elections shall be filled for the unexpired term by election by the committee from among its members. No member shall be elected for four full consecutive terms. The committee shall perform within its area the function assigned to it pursuant to section 101 (c) of this act and such other functions as the Secretary may assign to it. The local administrative areas designated by the Secretary and serving on the date of enactment of this act as units for administration of programs under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act shall serve as local administrative areas for the purposes of this section, but each county agricultural program committee may, with the approval of the State agricultural council, from time to time designate different local administrative areas within its county for the purposes of this section.

County agricultural program committees

SEC. 106. In each county there shall be a county agricultural program committee consisting of—

(1) the members of the community agricultural program committees in the county;

(2) the agricultural extension agent for the county, who shall have no vote; and

(3) one representative designated by each of such agencies concerned with soil conservation, grass conservation, drainage, irrigation or other agricultural interests as the State agricultural council may specify, but the number of agencies so specified shall be at least one less than the number of members provided for by clause (1).

The county agricultural program committee shall perform within its county the functions assigned to it pursuant to section 101 (c) of this act and such other functions as the Secretary may assign to it. It shall meet at such times as it may specify, or upon call of the chairman of the county agricultural program executive committee for its county.

County agricultural program executive committees

SEC. 107. The elected members of each county agricultural program committee shall elect annually from among their number (1) not less than three and not more than five, as determined by the State agricultural council, members of a county agricultural program executive committee, designating one of such members to be chairman, one to be vice chairman, and one to be secretary, of such executive committee, and (2) first and second alternates. Vacancies occurring among the members of such executive committee between annual elections shall be filled for the unexpired terms by the first and second alternates in that order, or, if there are no alternates available, by election from among their number by the elected members of the county agricultural program committee, and at such election first and second alternates again shall be elected. Vacancies in the offices of chairman, vice chairman, and secretary occurring between annual elections shall be filled for the unexpired terms by election by such executive committee from among its members. No member shall be elected for four full consecutive terms. The executive committee shall, through personnel employed by it, perform within the county the functions assigned to it pursuant to section 101 (c) of this Act and such other functions as the Secretary may assign to it.

State agricultural councils

SEC. 108. (a) For each State of the United States there shall be a State agricultural council consisting of the ex officio members hereinafter specified who shall have no vote, four farmer members, and as many additional farmer members as may be specified in accordance with the provisions of this section; but the number of additional farmer members so specified shall not exceed the greater of (1) two, or (2) one for each full 20 counties in the State, plus and if the number of counties in the State is not evenly divisible by 20 and exceeds by more than 10 the multiple of 20 which it least exceeds. The Commissioner (or Secretary or Director, as the case may be) of Agriculture, or his designee, the Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, or his designee, and the Director of the Agricultural Extension Service, or his designee, for such State shall be the ex officio members.

(b) The farmer members shall be appointed by the Secretary from among farmers nominated, by majority vote, by the chairmen of the county agricultural program executive committees of the State, three nominations being submitted for each appointment to be made. Not more than two of the three nominations for any appointment shall be from among the number of such chairmen. The farmer members first appointed after the enactment of this Act shall be appointed for three-, two-, and one-year terms in as nearly equal groups as may be possible; and their successors shall be appointed for three-year terms. Farmer members shall be subject to removal by the Secretary at any time. Vacancies occurring among the farmer members shall be filled for the unexpired terms by appointment by the Secretary from among the farmers nominated, but not appointed, at the time of the last regular appointment prior to the occurrence of such vacancies. No farmer member shall be appointed for any term which, with any previous periods of service by him as such a member, would exceed five years during any six-year period.

(c) The number of additional farmer members, if any (not exceeding the maximum number prescribed by the first sentence of this section), to be appointed first after the enactment of this Act shall be specified by the ex officio members of the State agricultural council. The number of additional farmer members thereafter to be appointed shall be specified by the State agricultural council. Should the number of additional farmer members at any time be increased as provided by this section, the additional farmer members so added shall be appointed for such terms that the number of terms expiring in succeeding years shall, as nearly as may be possible, be equal. Any decrease, as provided by this section, in the number of additional farmer members shall be made by allowing terms to expire without appointing successors in such manner that the number of terms expiring annually after the decrease has been completed shall, as nearly as may be possible, be equal.

(d) The State agricultural council shall develop plans to effectuate the purposes of section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in its State, shall perform the functions assigned to it pursuant to section 101 (c) of this Act and such other functions within its State as the Secretary may assign to it, shall supervise and direct the work of the county agricultural program and executive committees in its State, and shall otherwise cooperate with the Secretary in the planning and carrying out of soil-conservation programs in its State. It shall elect from among its number a chairman, vice chairman, and secretary, shall employ, on an annual basis, a State administrator, and may employ such other personnel as it may deem necessary to carry out its functions. In carrying out the functions assigned to it, and subject to the approval of the Secretary, it may enter into arrangements with (1) the Agricultural Extension Service in its State for the conduct of educational and demonstrational programs, and (2) State agricultural councils of other States for cooperation on matters of mutual interest. Federal grants-in-aid for programs administered by the State agricultural council shall be disbursed by the appropriate agency of the State only pursuant to direction by the State agricultural council. Any grants-in-aid or other funds allocated to a State for programs administered by the State agricultural council may be withheld or recalled by the Secretary if he determines that such council is not faithfully administering the programs assigned to it.

Administrative expenses

SEC. 109. The Secretary is authorized and directed, from any funds made available for the purposes of the acts in connection with which State agricultural councils, county or community agricultural program committees, or county agricultural program executive committees may be utilized, to make payments to such councils or committees to cover the estimated administrative expenses incurred or to be incurred by them in carrying out the functions assigned to them under such acts. All or part of such administrative expenses of any such council or committee may be deducted pro rata from the Soil Conservation Act payments, parity payments, or loans, or other payments or grants-in-aid under such acts, unless payment of such expenses is otherwise provided by law. The Secretary may make such payments in advance of determination of performance. The administrative expenses covered by such payments shall not include compensation for services of members of State agricultural councils and of community and county agricultural program and executive committees except (subject to approval by the Secretary) as follows:

(a) Each farmer member of a State agricultural council shall be entitled to compensation, at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary, for time actually spent by him in the work of the council pursuant to its direction; and

(b) Each member of a county agricultural program executive committee shall be entitled to compensation, at such rate as may be fixed by the appropriate State agricultural council, for time actually spent by him in the work of the committee pursuant to its direction and subject to the approval of the State agricultural council.

Subject to such limitations as the Secretary may prescribe, such council and committee members shall also be entitled to their reasonable expenses incurred in serving as such members. No such member shall, out of any amounts paid by the Secretary, be paid for performing any services in addition to his services as member for any such council or committee, but a member may resign as member in order to accept employment by a council or committee, and a member of a community agricultural program committee may be paid for services performed at the request of the county agricultural program, or executive committee, or the State agricultural council. The Secretary shall make such regulations as are necessary relating to the selection and exercise of the functions of such councils and committees, respectively. A county agricultural program executive committee may, except as may be disapproved by the Secretary, accept, in addition to the amounts paid to it by the Secretary, funds from other public agencies to be utilized for agricultural purposes.

Membership limited to one council or committee

SEC. 110. No person shall be a member of more than one council or executive committee established pursuant to this act. Appointment of any chairman of a county agricultural program executive committee to be a member of a State agricultural council shall cause the offices he holds as a member of a community agricultural program committee, a county agricultural program committee, and a county agricultural program executive committee to become vacant.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

UTILIZATION OF LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS IN STATE PLANS

SEC. 201. Section 7 (d) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"No such plan submitted by a State of the United States shall be approved by the Secretary, except upon the recommendation of the State agricultural council created pursuant to the Agricultural Act of 1948; and unless by its terms such plan provides—

"(A) that any sum to be allocated by the Secretary to carry out the plan shall be disbursed by the appropriate agency of the State only pursuant to direction by the State agricultural council, and

"(B) that (i) the State agricultural council, and (ii) the community and county agricultural program committees and county agricultural program executive committees created pursuant to the Agricultural Act of 1948, shall, respectively, if authorized by the State, be administering and participating agencies as provided in clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection".

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL-PAYMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 202. Section 8 (a), as amended, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended (a) by striking out "January 1, 1949" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1951", and (b) by striking out "December 31, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1950."

UTILIZATION OF LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS IN NATIONAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 203. Section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Subject to the limitations provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have power to carry out the purposes specified in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 7 (a) by making payments or grants of other aid to agricultural producers, including tenants and sharecroppers, in amounts determined by the Secretary upon the recommendation of the respective State agricultural councils to be fair and reasonable in connection with the effectuation of such purposes during the year with respect to which such payments or grants are made, and measured by (1) their treatment or use of their land, or a part thereof, for soil restoration, soil conservation, or the prevention of erosion; (2) changes in the use of their land, including the development of suitable wildlife habitat in carrying out the purposes of section 1 of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080); (3) their equitable share as determined by the Secretary, of the normal national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption; or (4) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, of the national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption and exports adjusted to reflect the extent to which their utilization of cropland on the farm conforms to farming practices which the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a); or

(5) any combination of the above. In arid or semiarid sections, (1) and (2) above shall be constructed to cover water conservation and the beneficial use of water on individual farms, including measures to prevent runoff, the building of check dams and ponds, and providing facilities for applying water to the land. In determining the amount of any payment or grant measured by (1) or (2) the Secretary shall take into consideration the productivity of the land affected by the farming practices adopted during the year with respect to which such payment is made. In carrying out the provisions of this section in the continental United States, the Secretary is directed to utilize the State agricultural councils and community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees created pursuant to the Agricultural Act of 1948. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall, as far as practicable, protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers; is authorized to utilize the agricultural extension service and other approved agencies; shall accord such recognition and encouragement to producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative association as will be in harmony with the policy toward cooperative associations set forth in existing acts of Congress and as will tend to promote efficient methods of marketing and distribution; shall not have power to acquire any land or any right or interest therein; shall, in every practicable manner, protect the interests of small producers; and shall in every practical way encourage and provide for soil-conserving and soil-rebuilding practices rather than the growing of soil-depleting crops. Rules and regulations governing payments or grants under this subsection shall be as simple and direct as possible, and, wherever practicable, they shall be classified on two bases: (a) Soil-depleting crops and practices, (b) soil-building crops and practices. Notwithstanding any other provision of law in making available conservation materials consisting of seeds, seed inoculants, fertilizers, liming and other soil-conditioning materials, trees, or plants, or in making available soil-conserving or soil-building services, to agricultural producers under this subsection, the Secretary may make payments, in advance of determination of performance by the producers, to persons who fill purchase orders covering approved conservation materials or covering soil-conserving or soil-building services, furnished to producers at not to exceed a fair price fixed in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, or who render services to the Secretary in delivering to producers approved conservation materials, for the carrying out, by the producers, of soil-building or soil-conserving practices approved by the Secretary.

"Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purchase in advance of the program year for which the appropriation is made of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or other plants, or any other farming materials or any services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in programs under this act, as amended; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local government agency for fertilizers, seeds, lime, trees, or other plants, or other farming materials, or any services, furnished by such agency; and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or part of the cost incident to the delivery thereof."

SEC. 204. The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended—

(a) By striking out the first word of section 8 (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to the provisions of section 18 of this act, payments";

(b) By striking out the proviso contained in section 8 (e); and

(c) By adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 18. Payments or grants of aid to farmers in any State, under a State plan or by the Secretary, for soil-building or soil-conserving practices shall be—

"(a) made only for such practices as may be approved by the Secretary upon the recommendation of the State agricultural council;

"(b) made, except with respect to farms designated as demonstration or experimental farms, only for practices which the Secretary, upon the recommendation of the State agricultural council, determines have long-term conservation and improvement value; and

"(c) divided among the landlords, tenants, and sharecroppers of any farm, with respect to which such payments are made, on the basis of relative value of their contributions to such practices in such manner as may be provided by the Secretary upon the recommendation of the State agricultural council.

"Beginning with the calendar year 1949, the total payments for any year to any person, under all State plans and otherwise under this act, not including payments made with respect to demonstration or experimental farms, shall not exceed $1,000; but programs under this act may provide that, at the election of the owner of any farm, soil conservation or improvement practices taken with respect to such farm in any year which have long-term effect may form the basis for payments in such year and not to exceed the succeeding 4 years with respect to such farm."

SEC. 205. Section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. All funds available for carrying out this act shall be available for allotment to the bureaus and offices of the Department of Agriculture and for transfer to such other agencies of the Federal or State Governments as the Secretary may request to cooperate or assist in carrying out this act, and for payments to State agricultural councils or county or community agricultural program committees or executive committees to cover the estimated administrative expenses to be incurred by any such council or committee in cooperating in carrying out this act: *Provided*, That the Secretary may prescribe that all or part of such estimated expenses of any such council or committee may be deducted pro rata from the payments or grants made to the members thereof: *And provided further*, That the Secretary may make such payments in advance of determination of performance."

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

DEFINITIONS OF "PARITY PRICE," "CARRY-OVER," "NORMAL SUPPLY," AND "TOTAL SUPPLY"

SEC. 301. Section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended—

(a) By striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) (A) The 'parity price' for any agricultural commodity, as of any date, shall be determined by multiplying the adjusted base price of such commodity as of such date by the parity index as of such date.

"(B) The 'adjusted base price' of any agricultural commodity, as of any date, shall be (i) the average of the prices received by farmers for such commodity, at such times as the Secretary may select during each year of the 10-year period ending on the 31st of December last before such date, or during each marketing season beginning in such period if the Secretary determines use of a calendar-year basis to be impracticable, divided by (ii) the ratio of the general level of prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities during such period to the general level of prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities during the period January 1910 to December 1914, inclusive.

"(C) The 'parity index,' as of any date, shall be the ratio of (i) the general level of prices for articles and services that farmers buy, interest on farm indebtedness secured by farm real estate, and taxes on farm real estate, for the calendar month ending last before such date to (ii) the general level of such prices, rates, and taxes during the period January 1910 to December 1914, inclusive.

"(D) The prices and indices provided for herein, and the data used in computing them, shall be determined by the Secretary, whose determination shall be final.

"(E) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), the transitional parity price for any agricultural commodity, computed as provided in this subparagraph, shall be used as the parity price for such commodity until such date 'after January 1, 1949, as such transitional parity price may be lower than the parity price, computed as provided in subparagraph (A), for such commodity. The transitional parity price for any agricultural commodity as of any date shall be—

"(i) its parity price determined in the manner used prior to the effective date of the Agricultural Act of 1948, less

"(ii) five percent of the parity price so determined multiplied by the number of full calendar years which, as of such date, have elapsed after January 1, 1948.

"(F) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A) and (E), if the parity price for any agricultural commodity, computed as provided in subparagraphs (A) and (E) appears to be seriously out of line with the parity prices of other agricultural commodities, the Secretary may, and upon the request of a substantial number of interested producers shall, hold public hearings to determine the proper relationship between the parity price of such commodity and the parity prices of other agricultural commodities. Within 60 days after commencing such hearing the Secretary shall complete such hearing, proclaim his findings as to whether the facts require a revision of the method of computing the parity price of such commodity, and put into effect any revision so found to be required.

"(2) 'Parity,' as applied to income, shall be that gross income from agriculture which will provide the farm operator and his family with opportunities for living equivalent to those afforded persons dependent upon other gainful occupation. 'Parity' as applied to income from any agricultural commodity for any year, shall be that gross income which bears the same relationship to parity income from agriculture for such year as the average gross income from such commodity for the preceding 10 calendar years bears to the average gross income from agriculture for such 10 calendar years."

(b) By amending paragraph (3) (A) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(A) 'Carry-over,' in the case of corn, rice, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be the quantity of the commodity on hand in the United States at the beginning of such marketing year, not including any quantity which was produced in the United States during the calendar year then current."

(c) By amending paragraph (3) (B) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(B) 'Carry-over' of cotton for any marketing year shall be quantity of cotton on hand within the United States at the beginning of such marketing year, which was produced in the United States prior to the beginning of the calendar year then current, plus the quantity on hand within the United States at the beginning of such marketing year which was produced outside the United States."

(d) By striking out paragraph (10) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(10) (A) 'Normal supply' in the case of corn, cotton, rice, wheat, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be (i) the estimated

domestic consumption of the commodity for the marketing year ending immediately prior to the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (ii) the estimated exports of the commodity for the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (iii) an allowance for carry-over. The allowance for carry-over shall be the following percentage of the sum of the consumption and exports used in computing normal supply: 7 percent in the case of corn; 30 percent in the case of cotton; 10 percent in the case of rice; 15 percent in the case of wheat; and 15 percent in the case of peanuts. In determining normal supply the Secretary shall make such adjustments for current trends in consumption and for unusual conditions as he may deem necessary.

"(B) 'Normal supply' in the case of tobacco shall be a normal year's domestic consumption and exports, plus 175 percent of a normal year's domestic consumption and 65 percent of a normal year's exports as an allowance for a normal carry-over."

(e) By amending paragraph (16) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(A) 'Total supply' of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be the carry-over of the commodity for such marketing year, plus the estimated production of the commodity in the United States during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins and the estimated imports of the commodity into the United States during such marketing year.

"(B) 'Total supply' of tobacco for any marketing year shall be the carry-over at the beginning of such marketing year plus the estimated production thereof in the United States during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins, except that the estimated production of type-46 tobacco during the marketing year with respect to which the determination is being made shall be used in lieu of the estimated production of such type during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins in determining the total supply of cigar filler and cigar binder tobacco."

PRICE SUPPORT

SEC. 302. (a) Section 302 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary, through the Commodity Credit Corporation (except as provided in subsection (c)) and other means available to him, is authorized to support prices of agricultural commodities to producers through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations. Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amounts, terms, and conditions of such price-support operations, and the extent to which such operations are carried out, shall, in the case of operations carried out by Commodity Credit Corporation, be determined by the Corporation with the approval and subject to the direction of the Secretary, and, in the case of operations carried out by other means, be determined by the Secretary. In making such determinations, consideration shall be given to (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which other commodities are being supported, (3) the availability of funds, (4) the perishability of the commodity, (5) its importance to agriculture and the national economy, (6) the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation, (7) the need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets, and (8) the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand. Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices prescribed by the Secretary may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support. The Secretary shall in all cases give consideration to the practicability of supporting prices indirectly, as by the development of improved merchandising methods, rather than directly by purchase or loan.

"(b) (1) Price support shall be made available to producers of any basic agricultural commodity at levels determined as hereinafter provided in this subsection. On the basis of the latest available statistics of the Department of Agriculture as of the beginning of each marketing year for each such basic agricultural commodity, the Secretary shall, with respect to such marketing year and such basic agricultural commodity—

"(i) estimate the total supply;

"(ii) determine the normal supply; and

"(iii) determine the percentage which the estimated total supply is of the normal supply (such percentage being referred to herein as the 'supply percentage').

"(2) The level at which the price of such basic agricultural commodity for such marketing year shall be supported for cooperators (other than cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) shall not exceed 90 percent of the parity price of such commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year or be less than the percentage of its parity price as of the beginning of such marketing year determined from the following table:

"If the supply percentage is:	The level of support shall be not less than the following percentage of the parity price:
Not more than 70	90
More than 70 but not more than 72	89
More than 72 but not more than 74	88
More than 74 but not more than 76	87
More than 76 but not more than 78	86
More than 78 but not more than 80	85
More than 80 but not more than 82	84
More than 82 but not more than 84	83
More than 84 but not more than 86	82
More than 86 but not more than 88	81
More than 88 but not more than 90	80
More than 90 but not more than 92	79
More than 92 but not more than 94	78
More than 94 but not more than 96	77
More than 96 but not more than 98	76
More than 98 but not more than 102	75
More than 102 but not more than 104	74
More than 104 but not more than 106	73
More than 106 but not more than 108	72
More than 108 but not more than 110	71
More than 110 but not more than 112	70
More than 112 but not more than 114	69
More than 114 but not more than 116	68
More than 116 but not more than 118	67
More than 118 but not more than 120	66
More than 120 but not more than 122	65
More than 122 but not more than 124	64
More than 124 but not more than 126	63
More than 126 but not more than 128	62
More than 128 but not more than 130	61
More than 130	60

"(3) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section—

"(A) the minimum level of price support to cooperators for any basic agricultural commodity shall be 120 percent of the minimum level determined from the foregoing table, if acreage allotments are in effect at the beginning of the planting season for such commodity, or if marketing quotas are in effect at the beginning of the marketing year for such commodity; but in no case shall the level of price support for any commodity be increased thereby above 90 percent of its parity price as of the beginning of the marketing year; and

"(B) the level of price support for any basic agricultural commodity normally marketed in any marketing year with respect to which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers shall be 50 percent of the parity price of such commodity as of the beginning of such marketing year.

"(4) The level at which the price of corn shall be supported for cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area shall be 75 percent of the level at which the price is supported for cooperators in the commercial corn-producing area with respect to corn.

"(5) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the level of price support to cooperators for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas are in effect shall be 90 percent of its parity price as of the beginning of the marketing year.

"(c) The support price for any nonbasic agricultural commodity shall not exceed 90 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year or season in the case of a commodity marketed on a marketing-year or seasonal basis, and as of January 1 in the case of any other commodity. Any price-support operation undertaken with respect to either turkeys or chickens shall be applicable to all chickens, including broilers, appropriate adjustments being made as provided in subsection (e) of this section: *Provided*, That if any price-support operation is undertaken with respect to either chickens or turkeys, the same parity price-support operation shall be undertaken with respect to ducks and ducklings and other poultry. The price of wool shall be supported at such level, not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of its parity price as of January 1, as the Secretary may consider necessary in order to encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool. The price of any kind of Irish potatoes harvested after December 31, 1948, shall be supported at not less than 60 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price for Irish potatoes as of the beginning of the marketing season. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not carry out any operation to support the price of any nonbasic agricultural commodity (other than Irish potatoes) which is so perishable in nature as not to be reasonably storable without excessive loss or excessive cost, but any such operation may be carried out by the Secretary through other means available to him such as those provided by section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended: *Provided*, That the Secretary in carrying out programs with respect to perishable and nonperishable commodities under section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, and section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, may utilize the services and facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation (including but not limited to procurement by contract) and make advance payments to it: *And provided further*, That in any fiscal year, if at the end of the preceding fiscal year the sums appropriated under said section 32 and remaining unexpended do not exceed $300,000,000, Commodity Credit Corporation may, as provided in section 302 (a) of this act, carry out any operation to support the price of any such perishable, nonbasic agricultural commodity to the extent that the reserve

for the postwar price support of agriculture established pursuant to the First Supplemental Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 9) and other funds appropriated for agricultural price support are sufficient to cover any losses which may be incurred in connection with such operation.

"(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, price-support operations at levels in excess of the maximum level of price support otherwise prescribed in this section may be undertaken whenever it is determined by the Secretary after reasonable public notice and public hearing with records of said hearing and a finding thereon by said Secretary available to the public that price support at such increased levels is necessary in order to increase or maintain the production of any agricultural commodity in the interest of national security.

"(e) Appropriate adjustments may be made in the support price for any commodity for differences in grade, type, staple, quality, location, and other factors. Such adjustments shall be made in such manner that the average support price for such commodity in each marketing year will, on the basis of the anticipated incidence of such factors, be equal to the level determined as provided in this section for such marketing year.

"(f) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) A 'cooperator' with respect to any basic agricultural commodity shall be a producer on whose farm the acreage planted to the commodity does not exceed the farm acreage allotment for the commodity under this title, or, in the case of price support for corn to a producer outside the commercial corn-producing area, a producer who complies with conditions of eligibility prescribed by the Secretary. For the purposes of this subsection a producer shall not be deemed to have exceeded his farm-acreage allotment unless such producer knowingly exceeded such allotment.

"(2) A 'basic agricultural commodity' shall mean any of the commodities cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts of a crop harvested after December 31, 1948.

"(3) A 'nonbasic agricultural commodity' shall mean any agricultural commodity other than a basic agricultural commodity.

persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity; (F) sales for export; (G) sales of wool; and (H) sales for other than primary uses."

(b) Section 381 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is repealed.

(c) Section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1941 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-8), is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the expiration of the period specified in the preceding sentence, the price of Irish potatoes harvested prior to January 1, 1949, shall be supported as provided in this section until the close of June 30, 1949."

MARKETING QUOTAS

Corn

SEC. 303. (a) The first sentence of section 322 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"Whenever in any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"(1) that the total supply of corn for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 percent; or

"(2) that the total supply of corn for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for the marketing year so ending, and that the average farm price for corn for three successive months of the marketing year so ending does not exceed 66 percent of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than November 15 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and marketing quotas shall be in effect in the commercial corn producing area for the crop of corn grown in such area in the next succeeding calendar year and shall remain in effect until terminated in accordance with the provisions of this title."

(b) Sections 322 (b) and 322 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to section 322 of the Agricultural

Cotton

SEC. 305. The first sentence of section 345 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"Whenever during any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"(1) That the total supply of cotton for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 8 percent; or

"(2) that the total supply of cotton for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for such marketing year, and that the average farm price for cotton for three successive months of such marketing year does not exceed 66 percent of parity,

the Secretary shall, not later than November 15 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and marketing quotas shall be in effect with respect to cotton during the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year."

Rice

SEC. 306. The first sentence of section 355 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"Whenever during any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"(1) that the total supply of rice for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 percent; or

"(2) that the total supply of rice for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for such marketing year, and that the average farm price for rice for three successive months of such marketing year does not exceed 66 percent of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than December 31 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and, during the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year and continuing throughout such marketing year, a national marketing quota shall be in effect with respect to the marketing of rice by producers."

SEC. 307. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended—

Tobacco

SEC. 309. Section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary shall proclaim a national marketing quota for each kind of tobacco for which a national marketing quota was proclaimed for the immediately preceding marketing year, and shall proclaim a national marketing quota for Virginia sun-cured tobacco for each marketing year for which a quota is proclaimed for fire-cured tobacco, and, beginning on the first day of the marketing year next following and continuing throughout such year, a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the tobacco marketed during such marketing year."

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SECTION 32 FUNDS

SEC. 401. Section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 612c), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The sums appropriated under this section shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available for the purposes of this section until expended; but any excess of the amount remaining unexpended at the end of any fiscal year over $300,000,000 shall, in the same manner as though it had been appropriated for the service of such fiscal year, be subject to the provisions of section 3690 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 712), and section 5 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purpose' (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 713)."

SEC. 402. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as added by section 31 of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 773), reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 246), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the President has

gation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 percent of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during a representative period as determined by the President: *And provided further*, That in designating any article or articles, the President may describe them by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other bases as he shall determine.

"(c) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States.

"(d) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section.

available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk or its products in the marketing area to which the contemplated marketing agreement, order, or amendment relates. Whenever the Secretary finds, upon the basis of the evidence adduced at the hearing required by section 8b or 8c, as the case may be, that the parity prices of such commodities are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, the available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk and its products in the marketing area to which the contemplated agreement, order, or amendment relates, he shall fix such prices as he finds will reflect such factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest. Thereafter, as the Secretary finds necessary on account of changed circumstances, he shall, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, make adjustments in such prices."

(c) Section 8c (17) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended by striking out "and section 8e."

(d) Section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is repealed.

(e) Section 4 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting after the section designation the subsection designation "(a)" and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) Any program in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by this act, on the effective date of section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1948 shall continue in effect without the necessity for any amendatory action relative to such program, but any such program shall be continued in operation by the Secretary of Agriculture only to establish and maintain such orderly marketing conditions as will tend to effectuate the declared purpose set out in section 2 or 8c (18) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by this act."

"(2) A 'basic agricultural commodity' shall mean any of the commodities cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts of a crop harvested after December 31, 1948.

"(3) A 'nonbasic agricultural commodity' shall mean any agricultural commodity other than a basic agricultural commodity.

"(g) No producer shall be personally liable for any deficiency arising from the sale of the collateral securing any loan made under authority of this section unless such loan was obtained through fraudulent representations by the producer. This provision shall not, however, be construed to prevent Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary from requiring producers to assume liability for deficiencies in the grade, quality, or quantity of commodities stored on the farm or delivered by them, for failure properly to care for and preserve commodities, or for failure or refusal to deliver commodities in accordance with the requirements of the program.

"(h) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at less than (1) a price determined on a pricing basis for its stocks of such commodity on hand, which makes due allowance for grade, type, quality, location, and other factors and which is reasonably calculated to reimburse it for costs incurred by it with respect to such stocks; (2) a price halfway between the support price, if any, and the parity price of such commodity; or (3) a price equivalent to 90 percent of the parity price of such commodity, whichever price is the lowest, except that the foregoing restrictions shall not apply to (A) sales for new or byproduct uses; (B) sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil; (C) sales for seed or feed if such sales will not substantially impair any price-support program; (D) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or of nonbasic perishable commodities where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage; (E) sales for the purpose of establishing claims against the commercial corn producing area for the crop of corn grown in such area in the next succeeding calendar year and shall remain in effect until terminated in accordance with the provisions of this title."

(b) Sections 322 (b) and 322 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to section 322 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended," approved July 26, 1939 (53 Stat. 1125), are hereby repealed.

(c) Section 322 (d) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended (1) by striking out "(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a)", and (2) by striking out "September" and inserting in lieu thereof "March."

Wheat

SEC. 304. (a) Section 335 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by striking out the first two sentences thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Whenever in any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"(1) that the total supply of wheat for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 percent; or

"(2) that the total supply of wheat for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for the marketing year so ending, and that the average farm price for wheat for three successive months of the marketing year so ending does not exceed 66 percent of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than July 1 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and, during the marketing year beginning July 1 of the next succeeding calendar year and continuing throughout such marketing year, a national marketing quota shall be in effect with respect to the marketing of wheat."

(b) The first sentence of section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by striking out "June 10" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 25."

31 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and, during the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year and continuing throughout such marketing year, a national marketing quota shall be in effect with respect to the marketing of rice by producers."

SEC. 307. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended—

(a) By inserting in section 328 after the words "outside the commercial corn-producing area" the following: "or imported";

(b) By inserting in section 333 after "for such crop" the following: "and imports";

(c) By inserting in section 343 (a) after "August 1 of such succeeding calendar year" the following: "and imports";

(d) By striking out sections 359 (d) and 359 (e);

(e) By striking out of section 364 "committee utilized for the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended", and inserting in lieu thereof "county agricultural program executive committee provided for by the Agricultural Act of 1948."

(f) By striking out of section 385 "or loan" and inserting in lieu thereof "loan, or price support operation."

UTILIZATION OF LOCAL ORGANIZATION IN CARRYING OUT THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

SEC. 308. Section 388 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 388. In carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary is directed to utilize the State agricultural councils and community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees created pursuant to the Agricultural Act of 1948; and the local administrative areas and local and county committees referred to in this act shall be the local administrative areas and the community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees provided for by the Agricultural Act of 1948."

SEC. 402. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as added by section 31 of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 773), reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 246), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

"(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investi-

mation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(c) Any decision of the President as to facts under this section shall be final.

"(f) No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party."

PARITY—OTHER STATUTES

SEC. 403. (a) Section 2 (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Through the exercise of the powers conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture under this title, to establish and maintain such orderly marketing conditions for agricultural commodities in interestate commerce as will establish, as the prices to farmers, parity prices as defined by section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938."

(b) Section 8c (18) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended to read as follows:

"(18) The Secretary of Agriculture, prior to prescribing any term in any marketing agreement or order, or amendment thereto, relating to milk or its products, if such term is to fix minimum prices to be paid to producers or associations of producers, or prior to modifying the price fixed in any such term, shall ascertain the parity prices of such commodities. The prices which it is declared to be the policy of Congress to establish in section 2 of this title shall, for the purposes of such agreement, order, or amendment, be adjusted to reflect the price of feeds, the

with respect to prices for agricultural commodities and products thereof, shall hereafter be deemed to refer to parity prices as determined in accordance with the provisions of section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by this act.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CONTINUED AS AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 404. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 405. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1949, except that sections 402 and 404 shall take effect upon the enactment of this act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 3, as follows:

YEAS—79

Aiken	Hatch	Myers
Baldwin	Hawkes	Pepper
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Holland	Russell
Brooks	Ives	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cain	Kem	Stennis
Capehart	Kilgore	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Fennel	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Flanders	Maybank	Wilson
Fulbright	Millikin	Young
Green	Morse	
Gurney	Murray	

NAYS—3

Ecton	O'Daniel	Williams

NOT VOTING—14

Bushfield	Capper	Jenner
Byrd	George	Knowland
Lodge	O'Conor	Wagner
McCarran	O'Mahoney	White
Moore	Thomas, Utah	

So the bill (H. R. 6248) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for a coordinated agricultural program."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2318 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that House bill 6248 be printed showing the amendment of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following additional reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 4330. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1759); and

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1760).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 4367. A bill authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1761); and

H. R. 5252. A bill to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1762).

By Mr. REED, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6329. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1758).

By Mr. GURNEY:

From the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6771. A bill making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1763).

From the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 6698. A bill to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines; without amendment (Rept. No. 1766).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 6039. A bill to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1764); and

H. R. 6707. A bill to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1765).

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 263), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending March 31, 1949, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under the resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—PRELIMINARY REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (S. REPT. NO. 1757)

Mr. IVES, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted, pursuant to section 102 (g) (2) (D) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, a preliminary report on United States relations with international organizations, which was ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 17, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta;

S. 1087. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944;

S. 1274. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Wilkinson County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Cellins;

S. 1275. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Warren County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans;

S. 1303. An act for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson;

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Hou Chung Chay;

S. 1409. An act for the relief of Mariceto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu;

S. 1447. An act to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki;

S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation;

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations;

S. 2223. An act to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes;

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency;

S. 2237. An act to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act;

S. 2251. An act to authorize the Army and Navy union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States naval hospital, United States Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.

S. 2490. An act to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels;

S. 2401. An act to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 2508. An act relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico;

S. 2675. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

S. 2770. An act to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements;

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; and

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2885. A bill for the relief of Walter Gustav Bejeuhr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BREWSTER introduced Senate bill 2886, to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940 by authorizing the execution of executive travel agreements to expedite international travel, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF ALIEN REGISTRATION ACT OF 1940 RELATING TO EXECUTION OF EXECUTIVE TRAVEL AGREEMENTS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940 by authorizing the execution of executive travel agreements to expedite international travel, and for other purposes, and I request that a statement explaining the purport of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement presented by the Senator from Maine will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2886) to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940 by authorizing the execution of executive travel agreements to expedite international travel, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. BREWSTER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BREWSTER IN EXPLANATION OF BILL

Mr. President, the bill S. 2886, which I have just introduced, seeks to give the President permissive authority to negotiate Executive travel agreements with friendly foreign governments of nonquota countries to permit travel to and from the respective signatory countries, by native-born nationals and resident nationals for the preceding 18 years, upon presentation of a passport, travel card, or other document showing identity and nationality.

When such agreements have been concluded, the bill provides that such nationals of the countries with whom the agreements have been executed may enter the United States for business or pleasure for a period of 3 months without having to obtain a visa as provided in section 30 of the Alien Registration Act of 1940. One 3-month extension may be granted by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization upon proper showing.

In addition the bill permits the 350 offices of the Immigration and Naturalization Service throughout the United States to accept applications for and issue passports within the United States under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I want particularly to point out the following points in connection with this bill:

1. The bill relates only to travel for business or pleasure.

2. The waiving of the visa requirements for business or pleasure travel is confined to native-born nationals and resident nationals for the previous 18 years, thus excluding those who may have either recently acquired nationality in a nonquota country or who seek to come to the United States without a visa via a country with whom an agreement is concluded.

3. Such agreements can be negotiated solely with nonquota countries. That is, countries with respect to which the United States has no immigration quota.

4. The power to conclude such agreements is permissive.

5. Persons traveling under such agreements are required to return to the country to which they owe allegiance before seeking permanent residence in the country visited.

6. Passports would be available to our citizens with greater dispatch by decentralizing their issuance. Their issuance would continue to be subject to regulations issued by the Secretary of State, but no longer would all applications for passports be forwarded to Washington, as is now the case.

The purpose of this bill is to enable the United States to assume its place as a leader in promoting international business and pleasure travel as well as international trade. Trade and travel should be considered together and as necessary supplements to each other.

The world is looking to us to take constructive steps to bring about a lasting peace through understanding and good will. Dollars loaned or given to foreign countries will not alone, in my opinion, bring about the result we all so earnestly seek. We must take steps, consistent with present-day world conditions, to encourage the free movement of proper persons for business and pleasure to and from friendly countries. During the war obviously certain additional security safeguards were necessary for persons entering the United States. Moreover, I realize that, as a practical matter, additional requirements should be imposed upon quota countries to insure maximum results from our immigration policies.

Department of Commerce estimates indicate that potentially approximately $1,600,000,000 annually may be expected to be spent abroad by United States nationals if our current rate of national income continues over the next 5 to 10 years. The creation of such dollar exchange in customer countries will directly contribute to the maintenance of our trade and prosperity.

Government and business have agreed that if foreign travel of United States nationals is fully developed, approximately fifteen to seventeen billion dollars in exchange could be created in 10 years. In short, nearly as many dollars may be expected to be spent by our tourists abroad during this 10-year period as will be provided under the Marshall plan. And these very dollars may be used by these countries to maintain our export trade, thereby assuring not only our own but the world economy. Herein lies the reason why both Government and industry are so anxious to do everything possible to realize this goal by permitting and encouraging our people to travel abroad.

Prosperity depends to a large extent on world trade. An essential prop to world trade is travel, since travel results in dollars abroad and dollars abroad mean world trade.

The wisdom of promoting and facilitating world travel as a means of promoting a sound world economy has been recognized already by the Congress when they inserted section 117 (b) in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as follows:

"(b) The Administrator, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall facilitate and encourage, through private and public travel, transport, and other agencies, the promotion and development of travel by citizens of the United States to and within participating countries."

As stated, this provision relates solely to our citizens traveling to and within the participating countries. Moreover, all of these participating countries are quota countries and our Government feels that visa restrictions from such countries to the United States should be maintained in order not to undermine our quota system through evasion.

There does exist however, an area in which this country should feel obligated to take constructive action to facilitate travel by eliminating visas and that area relates to the nonquota countries. It is fully appreciated that the very mention of abolishing any visa arouses fear and suspicion in the minds of those who think solely in terms of control. Just as our exports and imports must be balanced however, so must the relative merits of control and development. Both aspects must be studied on their merits and reconciled, rather than sole concentration on either. Thus the question is presented just what is a visitors visa supposed to do and does it accomplish what it was designed to accomplish?

Let us examine the effectiveness of the visitors visa regime from the standpoint of protecting the United States from undesirable aliens:

(a) It is generally conceded by security officers that any country desiring to send subversive elements into the United States may readily do so. The visa regime is therefore of little protection. This statement is based upon the following:

1. During both wars it was general experience that alien agents came fully documented. Means for producing spurious documents are ready at hand to any such country or person.

2. Any country desiring to introduce such elements may do so by the use of the diplomatic passport and visa.

3. Once an alien is admitted into the United States, he may move freely throughout the country. The visa itself does not aid in tracing his movements or controlling his activities.

It is purely a rubber stamp on the passport, which passport performs the function of identification. The passport not only identifies the individual officially as a national

of a particular country but carries with it

of the United States supports the view that

from the Committee on Appropriations

of a particular country but carries with it commitment on the part of that country to receive back that individual.

It is clear that the real security of this country against undesirable aliens lies in the border check itself in the first instance, but secondly, and primarily, in the enforcement force provided to keep track of aliens and eject them at such time as they overstay their welcome or engage in activities inimical to the best interests of the country. Too much emphasis on this point cannot be given. This is the heart of the security problem and not an ineffective, duplicate document that burdens down the Foreign Service.

It may well be asked what is needed. It is clear that the individual presenting himself at the border must be identified. The passport does this without the visa. It is also clear that there should be some system whereby a follow-up can start on individuals entering the United States temporarily at or shortly after the time of the end of their legal permission to be in the United States. This can readily be done by the use of a simple three part entry card filled out at or prior to the time of entry without charge, cost, delay, or red tape, two parts to be retained by the immigration authorities, the third part stamped and returned to the visitor as evidence of his legal entry. This third part will be surrendered at the time of his exit. Matching these cards in a central office would determine precisely who and how many are overstaying, and affords the enforcement authorities an effective means for follow-up.

In summary, for purpose of enforcement, we will have the identification of the individual through the passport, with a commitment to take him back by the country issuing it; we have an adequate border check; we have increased border facilities; we will have a means for checking out the individual and a means for following up on those individuals who do not check out on time.

As a necessary supplement to the program just described, which my bill contemplates, I feel it most desirable to greatly expedite the issuance of passports to our citizens in the United States. In time of peace, I can see no reason why applications for passports, which can now be filed conveniently by our citizens with the clerks of all courts of record, need then be forwarded to one central office in the State Department in Washington for approval and issuance. This is bureaucracy at its worst. Our citizens are deserving of service by their Government within 24 hours after they apply for a passport.

I believe the over-all control of the issuance of passports should properly remain the function of the Secretary of State but I also feel that use should be made of the 350 field offices of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in order to expedite the issuance of passports in the United States These offices have had the authority and responsibility since 1906 for determining nationality so why should they not also issue the document identifying an American as an American? My bill would make this possible and would thereby reduce the average length of time presently required to issue a passport to a citizen from approximately 2 weeks to the desired time.

It should be clearly understood, that what the proposed legislation contemplates with respect to visas is entirely in accord with what the State Department says is the policy of our Government. In April 1947 at the meeting of experts on passports, visas, and frontier formalities called by the United Nations, which meeting was held in Geneva, the United States delegates proposed that the conference recommend that entrance and transit visas should be abolished by countries having no quantitative immigration restriction.

Ambassador Austin, in March of this year in reply to the Secretary General of the United Nations stated that the Government of the United States supports the view that there should be a distinction made between countries which have, and those which do not have a quota system for immigrants so far as the question of abolishing nonimmigrant visa requirements is concerned. This letter specifically states: "The United States has recommended that entrance and transit visas should be abolished by countries having no quantitative immigration restriction."

If this Government recommends to other countries who have no quota system for United States citizens, that they abolish entrance and transit visas, we should do likewise with respect to those countries from which we have no quota restrictions.

The proposed legislation would enable our stated policy to be carried out, on a permissive basis, with respect to nonquota countries. As a result of our announced policy with respect to nonquota countries our State Department should feel obligated to take such action.

If we take the lead in abolishing the requirements of visas by means of bilateral agreements with such non-quota countries, there can be little doubt that other countries, who followed our lead in requiring visas, would again follow our lead and abolish their requirements.

I feel that we should not advise other countries what to do and do nothing ourselves, but should take the lead in removing the visa requirement for persons traveling for business or pleasure between such non-quota countries and our own country. This is the purpose of the bill I have introduced and although I realize this bill is introduced near the close of this Congress I do so in order that reports may be obtained during the recess and I sincerely hope that the Government departments who are called upon to report on the bill will not attempt to cloud the issue by needless discussion of immigration, quota systems, etc., but will comment constructively upon the merits of the bill as an attempt to stimulate travel among friendly nonquota countries by removing what is recognized as a totally unnecessary peacetime requirement.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, the Chair now lays before the Senate, Senate bill 2589, Calendar No. 387.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2589) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, which is the bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6771, the National Military Establishment appropriation bill, 1949. It is very necessary that this bill be passed tonight, so that it can go to conference tonight.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the bill presently before the Senate is the appropriation bill for the Military Establishment—not for the Navy, but for the Ground Forces, the Department of the Army, and the Air Force.

As the bill came from the House of Representatives, it provided appropriations amounting to $6,509,939,000.

The Senate Appropriations Committee recommends additions to the bill in the amount of $329,737,052. Moreover, there will be offered as a committee amendment, although it does not appear on the face of the report, an amendment which requires $76,000,000 in cash and $75,000,000 in contract authority. This additional cash would make a total increase of $405,737,052 over the amounts carried in the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. President, I now ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations in the subcommittee print was, under the heading "National Security Resources Board," on page 4, line 25, after the word "purchase", to insert "(including one at not to exceed $3,000)"; on page 5, line 3, after "(28 U. S. C. 921)", to insert "a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150)"; and in line 9, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of the Air Force—United States Air Force", on page 6, line 19, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$884,486,000" and insert "$896,986,000"; in line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$312,500,000"; and on page 7, line 8, after the word "storage", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

And provided further, That after June 30, 1948, in carrying out the provisions of subsection (b) of section 14 of the act of May 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 219), with respect to the Department of the Air Force, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall so determine the number of civilian employees (including the full-time equivalent of manmonths of part-time employment) that the number shall not exceed 75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force," on page 7, line 23, after the word "services", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$825,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 25, after the word "Force", to strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$7,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Army—Office of the Secretary of the Army—Contingencies of the Army," on page 8, line

21, after the word "purposes", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$32,900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Inter-American Relations, Department of the Army," on page 10, line 12, after "United States", to strike out "$650,000" and insert "$850,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Finance Department—Finance Service, Army," on page 11, line 8, after "(Public Law 248)", to strike out "$2,300,000,000" and insert "$2,320,942,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 2, after the word "shall", to strike out "not."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 23, after the word "Department", to strike out "$28,000,000" and insert "$29,868,630."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 12, after the word "Army", to strike out "$2,478,800,000" and insert "$2,501,610,630."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps—Quartermaster Service, Army," on page 20, line 5, after the word "personnel", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$8,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to offer an amendment on page 21. Is it in order to offer that amendment at this time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not in order to do so until consideration of the committee amendments is concluded.

The clerk will continue with the reading of the committee amendments.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 8, after the word "irrigation", to strike out "$95,000,000" and insert "$105,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 18, after the word "reasons", to strike out "$200,000,000" and insert "$235,000,000, and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary of the Army may, prior to July 1, 1949, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $25,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 3, after the word "sites", to strike out "$110,000,000" and insert "$118,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 4, after the word "Army", to strike out "$913,000,000" and insert "$966,503,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation Corps—Transportation Service, Army," on page 26, line 23, after the word "station", to strike out "$400,000,000" and insert "$420,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Signal Corps—Signal Service of the Army," on page 29, line 14, after the figures "$50,000,000", to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$155,787,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical Department—Medical and Hospital Department," on page 31, line 12, after the word "Department", to strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$75,126,163."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers—Engineer Service, Army," on page 32, line 11, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$160,000,000" and insert "$170,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 19, after the word "for", to strike out "$250,000,000" and insert "$280,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 8, after the word "Army", to strike out "$410,000,000" and insert "$450,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department—Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army," on page 35, line 17, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$560,000,000" and insert "$665,000,000"; and in line 20, after the numerals "1948", to insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary of the Army may, prior to July 1, 1949, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $75,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Chemical Corps—Chemical Service, Army," on page 37, line 3, after the word "ranges", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$27,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance and operation, United States Military Academy," on page 39, line 14, after the words "in all", to strike out "$5,279,000" and insert "$5,600,000"; and in line 18, after the word "the" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "United States" and insert "Treasurer of the United States Military Academy."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Guard," on page 40, line 5, after the word "facilities", to strike out "the hire (at a rate not exceeding $1 per diem) of passenger automobiles" and insert "the purchase (not to exceed 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles"; and on page 41, line 9, after the word "supplies", to strike out "$240,000,000" and insert "$238,113,759."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 3, to strike out:

No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for pay, allowances, or traveling or other expenses of any officer or enlisted man of the National Guard who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay (where retirement has been made on account of physical disability or age) from the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as barring the continuance of adjutants general in a federally recognized status without pay under this act.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

No appropriation in this act shall be available for the pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the National Guard for periods of active duty, training, drills, instruction or other duty for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, 80th Cong.), who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay (where retirement has been made on account of physical disability or age) from the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this provision shall be so construed as to prevent the application of funds herein contained to the pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the National Guard who may waive or relinquish said pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay for the periods of active duty, drill, training, instruction, or other duty for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, 80th Cong.): *Provided further*, That adjutants general who may be drawing such emoluments may be continued in a federally recognized status without pay under this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Organized Reserves," on page 44, line 22, after the words "in all", to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$125,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 9, to strike out:

No appropriation made in this act shall be available for pay, allowances, or traveling or other expenses of any officer of the Organized Reserves who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

No appropriation in this act shall be available for pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Organized Reserves for periods of active duty, drills, training, instruction, or other duty for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, 80th Cong.), who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this provision shall be so construed as to prevent the application of funds herein contained to the pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Organized Reserves who may waive or relinquish said pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay for the periods of active duty, drills, training, instruction, or other duty for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, 80th Cong.).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reserve Officers' Training Corps," on page 49, line 11, after the word "colleges", to strike out "$21,000,000" and insert "$21,175,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army," on page 51, line 1, after the word "competitions", to insert "including not to exceed $5,000 for Olympic rifle and pistol competitions of the calendar year 1948"; and in line 14, after the word "Army", to strike out "$175,000" and insert "$303,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Departmental salaries and expenses—Salaries, Department of the Army," on page 54, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$37,500,000" and to insert "$39,172,326"; in line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$600,000,000" and insert "$691,700,000"; in the same line, after the word "That", to strike out "$644,525,000" and insert "$737,897,326"; in line 8, after the word "whole", to strike out "without regard to the appropriation from which paid" and insert "and to transfer funds for their pay from any appropriation to the appropriation normally charged therewith"; and in line 19, after the word "contractors", to strike out "or to the use of funds for (a) water transportation of personnel and supplies, or (b) laundry services" and insert a semicolon and "(7) in connection with construction activities, or (8) for laundry services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Department of the Army," on page 55, line 2, after the word "each", to strike out "$2,200,000" and insert "$2,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions—Military functions, Department of the Army," on page 55, line 22, after the numerals "1942", to insert "for such printing and binding, communication and other services and supplies as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 3, after "April 6", to strike out "1941" and insert "1914."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 24, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947"; and in line 12, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 23, after the words "to the", to strike out "War Department or the Military Establishment" and insert "Department of the Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 14. During the fiscal year 1949, paid occupancy of the hotel on the grounds of the United States Military Academy on a rental basis by personnel of the services mentioned in the title of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 or by their dependents shall not deprive such personnel of money allowances for rental of quarters.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 11, to change the section number from "14" to "15", and in line 22, after the word "matériel," to strike out the period, insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That after June 30, 1948, in carrying out the provisions of such section 14 with respect to the Department of the Army, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall so determine the number of civilian employees (including the full-time equivalent of man-months of part-time employment) that the number shall not exceed 176,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 23, to change the section number from "15" to "16."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, after line 14, to insert a new section 17, as follows:

SEC. 17. Funds appropriated for the agencies of the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available, contingent upon the enactment into law by the Eightieth Congress of S. 2655 or similar authorization for the voluntary enlistment of persons between the ages of 18 and 19 years, and subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, for all expenses necessary for and incident to the recruitment and service of such persons, pending and in anticipation of a supplemental appropriation by the Congress to provide funds for such expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 3, to change the section number from "16" to "18."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer and which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 34, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

Military construction, Army: For construction, installations and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations and facilities, as authorized by the act of June 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims under the act of July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), and pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (28 U. S. C. 921); $76,000,000, to remain available until expended; and in addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $75,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be used for the construction of family quarters for personnel of the Army at a cost per family unit in excess of $14,040, except that when such units are constructed outside the continental United States the average cost per unit of all such units constructed shall not exceed $20,800.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this is in accordance with the public-works program contained in a bill passed by the Senate about June 3. It is in accordance with the supplemental estimate sent to the Senate under date of June 3. I ask that the supplemental estimate and the explanation appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the estimate and explanation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $121,000,000 and contract authorization in the amount of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949 for the National Military Establishment, Department of the Army—military functions, in the form of an amendment to the budget for the said fiscal year, as follows:

National Military Establishment—Department of the Army—Military functions—Corps of Engineers

Budget page	Heading	Original estimate	Change to—	Increase
676	Military construction, Army		($121,000,000)	$121,000,000

Preceding the head "Acquisition of Land, Act June 26, 1940," insert new language and an estimate of appropriation, as follows:

"Military construction, Army: For construction, installations, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations and facilities, as authorized by the act of ———, 1948 (Public Law —), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims under the act of July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), and pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (28 U. S. C. 921); $121,000,000 to remain available until expended; and in addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $60,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be used for the construction of family quarters for personnel of the Army at a cost per family unit in excess of $14,040, except that when such units are constructed outside the continental United States the average cost per unit of all such units constructed shall not exceed $20,800."

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Budget page 707: Delete section 10 and renumber the remaining sections accordingly.

The foregoing estimate of appropriation will be necessary to implement the authority expected to be provided under the provisions of S. 1676 now in conference, and is transmitted at this time since it is considered essential for the national defense that the projects for which this appropriation is recommended be undertaken at an early date. Section 10 of the general provisions contains dollar limitations on family housing and is no longer required, since these limitations are superseded by space limitations contained in S 1676 for all housing authorized.

I recommend that the foregoing supplemental estimate be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,
FRANK PACE, JR.,
Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator have any further committee amendments?

Mr. GURNEY. There are no further committee amendments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be read by the clerk for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, after line 21, it is proposed to strike out the following proviso: "*Provided*, That none of the money appropriated in this act shall be used for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes for other than cooking purposes, except to supply an expressed preference therefor or for use where climatic or other conditions render the use of butter impracticable."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the proviso, which is in my opinion a further example of legislation carried in similar appropriation bills since 1931, prohibits the Army from purchasing oleomargarine. I think the least the Senate can do in view of the fact that we are apparently going to be prevented from voting on total repeal of the oleomargarine tax is to remove the restriction.

It is just one of the many restrictions which have been imposed upon this product during the past few years. It is a curious thing.

I do not propose to go into the complete history of the action of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, because the Senate is familiar with it, but as a further evidence of the sentiment of the Congress, I may cite a bill, H. R. 6334, to authorize the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces, which the Committee on Armed Services of the House reported June 9, 1948. It is a legislative approach to the abolition of restrictions on the purchase of margarine by the armed forces. I desire to read a few sentences from the report of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, with regard to the restriction on margarine. The purpose was to repeal it by legislative action, whereas here, the Appropriations Committee is seeking to perpetuate it, I think, by means of legislation written into an appropriation bill. I would have made a point of order against the pending measure, except that the proviso was in the bill as it came from the House.

From page 2 of the committee report of June 9, 1948, where the basic issue involved in the proposed legislation are very simple and can be reduced to the following questions—that is, as to repeal of the restrictions—I read the following:

1. Is the nutritive value of oleomargarine equal to or superior to that of butter?

This question was answered by several experts who testified that there is no difference in the nutritive value of these two products with respect to digestibility or other factors, provided that oleomargarine is fortified with vitamin A.

2. The second question is whether oleomargarine is equally acceptable from the psychological standpoint, bearing in mind such factors as the food habits of consumers.

In answer to this question representatives of the services testified that there is no past experience upon which they can base any opinion as to the troop acceptability of oleomargarine, for the simple reason that it could not, heretofore, be substituted for butter. On this point, however, one witness with experience as an officer in World War II testified that in his opinion the personnel under his command would have been equally satisfied with oleomargarine. He pointed out, in this connection, that many of his men had come from homes where oleomargarine was already being served in lieu of butter.

A very important consideration brought to light during the hearings was the fact that during World War II personnel in many forward areas were forced to do without butter because of unavailability due to transportation, storage, and refrigeration problems which either made it impossible to procure butter at all in those areas or which rendered such butter as was received unfit for human consumption because of rancidity and deterioration. In the absence of authority to serve oleomargarine as a substitute, troops were forced to rely upon other less satisfactory table spreads such as marmalade, jams, et cetera. These, while possessing nutritive values of their own, were in no way comparable because they did not furnish the fats and other ingredients which are contained in both butter and oleomargarine.

That statement seems to me a complete condemnation of a racket which has been going on for 60 years. In the Senate there are many gentlemen who on every occasion express great concern for the men in the services, and yet the report from which I have read states that because of the restriction the men were deprived of butter, not only because it turned rancid under certain conditions, but, note, because it was illegal to furnish them with margarine. It seems utterly indefensible and ridiculous from every point of view that the men simply had to do without margarine and had to use marmalade or jam or something of the sort.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GURNEY. I was merely about to suggest that the dairy business is possibly not a racket.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The tax on margarine is a racket. That is what I had reference to. I do not think the Senator misunderstood what I had in mind.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I listened to what the Senator read, but I cannot see in the pending bill anything that prohibits the Army from buying oleomargarine to be furnished the men as a table spread. They can buy it for cooking uses without any restriction. They can buy it for table spread if the men say they want it. They can also buy it whenever climatic or other conditions render the use of butter impractical. I think the Senator has misread the language.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows very well that the report, which, as I said at the beginning, is a report of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, is not from the Department of Agriculture or from any other agency. It is from the Armed Services Committee. In the Senate, the Armed Services Committee is sponsoring the bill. The Senator knows very well as a practical matter that the Army has bought no margarine, interpreting the provision as a restriction on the purchase of margarine. They have not bought any, and have had none available. In the report of the committee, from which I just read, it is stated as to past experience on this point:

In answer to this question, representatives of the services testified that there is no past experience upon which they can base any opinion as to the troop acceptability of oleomargarine, for the simple reason that it could not heretofore be substituted for butter.

There is no question about that.

I do not think the Senator means to leave the impression that there is any choice in the matter.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to say to the Senator, as representing the committee, that I do not have authority to accept the amendment for the committee. As for myself, personally, coming from a dairy section, the State of South Dakota, I could not accept it, anyway, because I helped former Senator La Follette some years ago to retain this provision in the bill. At that time the plea was made, which had general support on the floor of the Senate, that butter was better for the veterans in the hospitals, and over a period of years the amendment has been carried each year in appropriation bills. I know that the Army and Air Force are operating very nicely under the provision in the current year's act, and it has been in the acts during the war years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, I recognize the fact that the Senator, coming from South Dakota, would have that view. But if this is so acceptable, why does not the majority permit the Senate to decide the real essence of the whole question in connection with the bill now on the calendar? The Senator knows that some are afraid to permit it to come to a vote, because they know positively that the tax will be repealed. This is only one aspect of the many restrictions which have been foisted upon this country during the past 62 years.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. In 1942 Congress declined to permit the Army to buy corned beef from Argentina, and, as a result, the Army did not get the corned beef it needed and which it asked for in 1942. Is not that a parallel case?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for that contribution. I think the two cases have similar aspects.

Mr. President, I read further from the report:

A third question considered by the committee, in addition to the factors of comparative nutritional value and psychological acceptability, was whether or not oleomargarine is protected by the same pure-food standards as butter. Testimony was received to the effect that all standards having to

do with purity, cleanliness, and sanitation are equally applicable to oleomargarine.

Mr. President, that is the entire statement, certainly as to the restrictions on the packages in which the two articles are sold and as notice of what is used in the two articles. Actually, the restrictions on oleomargarine are much more severe than are those on butter. Butter is one of the very few articles which does not have to carry a label showing it is artificially colored or stating its contents, how many vitamins, and so forth, all of which has to be done in connection with oleomargarine.

This point I want particularly to call the attention of the acting majority leader and some of his colleagues, because this is something which has been so close to their hearts during the past 2 years. This is the fourth point:

4. A final question pertinent to the problem is that of the comparative cost of the two products. Testimony was received to the effect that approximately ten to eleven million dollars per year could be saved by the armed services, assuming the complete substitution of oleomargarine for butter.

After all the talk of economy, particularly by some of the representatives of the butter-producing States, in order to perpetuate this restriction, they are perfectly willing to waste $10,000,000 or $11,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for the purpose of preventing the utilization of a product which the armed services are very anxious to have.

There are only two more paragraphs summing up the matter. I read from page 3 of the report:

In view of the fact that there is no difference in the nutritional value of the two products; in view of the fact that oleomargarine is an equally pure and sanitary product; in view of the fact that substantial savings can be effected through its use; and in view of the fact that there is no evidence from which it can be inferred that it would not be equally acceptable to troops, it is the view of this committee that the services should be permitted to use oleomargarine as they see fit.

I call that last sentence to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] in reply to his implication that there was no restriction.

I read further:

The authority to exercise such discretion will enable the services to furnish an equally nutritious and, to many people, an equally palatable and acceptable product under circumstances where it would be impossible to furnish butter. A great deal of testimony was received bearing on the relative keeping qualities of the two products. While butter on the one hand is subject to rapid deterioration and must be kept under refrigeration at all times, oleomargarine can be preserved for weeks at room temperatures.

I hope that some of the great backers of butter will take that particular statement to heart, since it comes from the committee and is a statement with which they have often taken issue. I read further from the report:

Even if it be assumed, therefore, that troops would prefer butter, if given a choice between the two products, it is equally logical to assume that they will welcome a high-quality substitute, such as oleomargarine, when conditions are such as to preclude the use of butter.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable to me that the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate would lend itself to the perpetuation of this restriction, in view of the action by the committee of the House on House bill 6334. The Senate and the country well know that there is a large majority, more than 2 to 1, in the House of Representatives in favor of the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine. The votes which have been had in this body, one of which was 47 to 30, and later a vote on the motion to consider the bill, which was a vote of 57 to 26, conclusively prove, in my opinion, that a majority of 2 to 1 in the Senate would like to repeal this tax. In spite of that fact, the leadership of the Senate refused, and has refused up to this time, to bring that bill up for a vote. They are perfectly willing to bring up a measure which has no particular background or history, one in which there has not been the interest which has been evidenced in the oleomargarine bill. I had expected that the committee would accept this very mild restriction, in view of the fact that it would deny a vote on the bill which would repeal the tax on oleomargarine.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, does the acting majority leader wish me to yield to him?

Mr. WHERRY. We have had two votes. If the Senator from Arkansas wants to have another one, the sooner the better.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am just about to conclude. I thought the Senator was indicating a desire for me to yield to him.

Mr. WHERRY. No. I am satisfied, Mr. President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator is satisfied, I hoped this amendment would be accepted, but since it has not been accepted, I ask that the Senate accept my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6771) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. REED, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate, as in executive session, now proceed to the consideration of matters on the Executive Calendar, and that the nomination of Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to get some information as to when that nomination may be taken up and considered.

Mr. WHERRY. That depends on when the Executive Calendar is called again. I cannot answer the question directly, but we intend to have other executive sessions. I trust the minority leader will agree to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not saying I am not going to agree to it, but under my privilege to reserve the right to object, I wish to say that this nomination is here from the committee on the same basis with other nominations. I do not think this nominee should be discriminated against because she happens to be a woman. The committee considered the nomination carefully and reported it, and I hope it will not go beyond another call of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to please the distinguished minority leader. I always want to comply with his requests. I cannot answer when the nomination will come up again.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should also like to add that, presenting this nomination from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I do hope it may have appropriate consideration. It was ordered reported, as I recall, by a vote of 8 to 0. I will say, in justice to this side of the aisle, that the great majority of those votes were by Republicans. I am happy that the distinguished minority leader joins us in this, and I certainly hope that this nomination may receive the consideration to which it is entitled by its presence here and by its presentation on the calendar by the overwhelming action of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Maine. I did not know there was any partisanship in the committee in voting to report this nomination. I did not know there was any opposition to it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not saying there is any prejudice. I am merely trying to get the Executive Calendar approved without any difficulty, and I ask unanimous consent that the lady's nomination go over without prejudice until another call of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. There will be another call of the Executive Calendar, will there?

Mr. WHERRY. I hope so. If we get along all right, I do not see why there should not be. We certainly intend there shall be a call of the Executive Calendar, and we intend to have the Legislative Calendar called.

Mr. BARKLEY. I intend to do what I can to see that the Senate gets along all right. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I inquire of the distinguished acting majority leader whether or not a motion would be in order at an appropriate time to take the nomination up?

Mr. WHERRY. It certainly would be. Any Senator can make a motion to take up the Executive Calendar. I am asking unanimous consent, however, and if I get unanimous consent, a motion would not be in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I did not quite understand what the Senator from Maine said a moment ago about a majority of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce voting to report Miss Hennock's nomination being Republican. I merely desire to keep the record straight and say that there were no Democrats against the confirmation of this very excellent nomination of the President.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I made no such statement. I said that the overwhelming majority of the votes in favor of reporting the nomination were by Republicans, calling attention to the fact that there were only two Democrats present. This is not to reflect on the Democrats at all, but I did want it to be clear that the Republican members of the committee had shown at least as great an interest, and I wanted to have the record clear to show that there was no partisanship or prejudice in the consideration of the nomination.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I merely wanted to have the record straight that there was no opposition on the part of the Democratic members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to this nomination.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that there was no opposition to the appointee by Republicans and no opposition by Democrats, who is opposed to the nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think we are making a mountain out of a mole hill. I went to the minority leader, if the Senator wishes to know the facts, and talked to Senators on the other side and asked if they would agree to have the Executive Calendar called provided this nomination would go over without prejudice. No one is indicating any prejudice against the consideration of this nomination, but in order to expedite matters I should like to have the unanimous-consent request granted. I did not want to put any obstruction in front of the nomination. If I cannot get unanimous consent, I should like to have the Senate recess.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. This lady whose nomination is being discussed comes from the State of New York, and I wish to have it definitely understood that there is no objection on the part of New York.

Mr. CAPEHART. I make a motion that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I want it made clear, if the Senator from Nebraska will yield——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield for the purpose of a motion to recess or adjourn. I shall be glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not objected, and I do not intend to object, to the Senator's request, and I hope it will not be objected to, but I thought it was fair to get some sort of indication as to what we might expect with reference to this nomination.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the minority leader knows the reply to the question better than I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I knew the reply better than the Senator, I would not be asking him.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has had more experience here than any man in the Senate, and he knows what the Senate will do. I cannot guarantee what it will do.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do say that whoever objects to this nomination—and it is not on the part of the Senator from Nebraska, as I understand—if there is any Senator in this body who objects to considering the nomination, it should be revealed who he is; let him stand up and say so.

Mr. WHERRY. If I may make an observation, I hope Senators will not get irritated tonight. Senators have all been so wonderfully cooperative.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I think that if Senators would all sit down and there were a little order, it might be helpful. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order. This is not a riot. The Senator from Nebraska will proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the President pro tempore, who is so ably directing the Senate. I wish to comply with the rules.

I hope Senators will give unanimous consent, without any further ado about this matter, and let us soon take a recess and get a good night's sleep, and when we return we probably will not have any argument over this nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair inquire whether the unanimous-consent request would permit the consideration of the two routine treaties, which are simply double taxation treaties.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. The only thing I asked to go over was this one nomination, without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank all Senators.

Mr. HAWKES subsequently said: Mr. President, with reference to the nomination of Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, I wish to associate myself with what was said by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] with regard to the nomination, and also by the minority leader [Mr. BARKLEY].

The nomination has the approval of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. It has the approval of many prominent Republicans in New York State. It has the approval of some of the most distinguished members of the bar who have been friends of mine for many years.

I did not take this nomination lightly. I called on the telephone and talked with those prominent gentlemen. They all give this lady a clean bill of health, and recommend her very highy. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce voted 8 to 0 in favor of her confirmation. It is my earnest hope that, regardless of the party with which she is associated, her nomination may have the approval of the Senate at a subsequent executive session.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from New Jersey for his very fair attitude in regard to this matter.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to call the Executive Calendar. The first treaty will be passed over. The clerk will state the second order of business.

CONVENTION WITH DENMARK RELATING TO DOUBLE TAXATION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive H (80th Cong., 2d sess.), a convention between the United States of America and Denmark, signed at Washington on May 6, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with a reservation. The convention was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND DENMARK RELATING TO TAXES ON INCOME

The President of the United States of America and His Majesty the King of Denmark, desiring to conclude a convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, have appointed for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Mr. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

His Majesty the King of Denmark:

Mr. Henrik Kauffmann, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Denmark to the United States of America.

who, having communicated to one another their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes referred to in this Convention are:

(a) In the case of the United States of America:

The Federal income tax, including surtaxes.

(b) In the case of Denmark:

The national income tax, including the war profits tax.

The intercommunial income tax.

The communal income tax.

(2) The present Convention shall also apply to any other taxes of a substantially similar character imposed by either contracting State subsequently to the date of signature of the present Convention.

ARTICLE II

(1) As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense includes only the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Denmark" means the Kingdom of Denmark; the provisions of the Convention shall not, however, extend to the Faroe Islands; nor do they apply to Greenland.

(c) The term "permanent establishment" means a branch office, factory, warehouse or other fixed place of business, but does not include the casual and temporary use of merely storage facilities, nor does it include an agency unless the agent has and exercises a general authority to negotiate and conclude contracts on behalf of an enterprise or has a stock of merchandise from which he regularly fills orders on its behalf. An enterprise of one of the contracting States shall not be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the other State merely because it carries on business dealings in such other State through a bona fide commission agent, broker, or custodian acting in the ordinary course of his business as such. The fact that an enterprise of one of the contracting States maintains in the other State a fixed place of business exclusively for the purchase of goods or merchandise shall not of itself constitute such fixed place of business a permanent establishment of such enterprise. The fact that a corporation of one contracting State has a subsidiary corporation which is a corporation of the other State or which is engaged in trade or business in the other State shall not of itself constitute that subsidiary corporation a permanent establishment of its parent corporation.

(d) The term "enterprise of one of the contracting States" means, as the case may be, "United States enterprise" or "Danish enterprise".

(e) The term "enterprise" includes every form of undertaking whether carried on by an individual, partnership, corporation, or any other entity.

(f) The term "United States enterprise" means an enterprise carried on in the United States of America by a resident of the United States of America or by a United States corporation or other entity; the term "United States corporation or other entity" means a partnership, corporation or other entity created or organized in the United States of America or under the law of the United States of America or of any State or Territory of the United States of America.

(g) The term "Danish enterprise" means an enterprise carried on in Denmark by a resident of Denmark or by a Danish corporation or other entity; the term "Danish corporation or other entity" means a partnership, corporation or other entity created or organized in Denmark or under Danish laws.

(h) The term "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or his authorized representative; and in the case of Denmark, the Chief of the Taxation Department of the Ministry of Finance (Generaldirektøren for Skattevaesenet) or his authorized representative.

(2) In the application of the provisions of the present Convention by one of the contracting States any term not otherwise defined shall, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning which such term has under its own tax laws.

ARTICLE III

(1) An enterprise of one of the contracting States shall not be subject to taxation in the other contracting State in respect of its industrial and commercial profits unless it is engaged in trade or business in such other State through a permanent establishment situated therein. If it is so engaged such other State may impose its tax upon the entire income of such enterprise from sources within such other State.

(2) In determining the industrial or commercial profits from sources within the territory of one of the contracting States of an enterprise of the other contracting State, no profits shall be deemed to arise from the mere purchase of goods or merchandise within the territory of the former contracting State by such enterprise.

(3) Where an enterprise of one of the contracting States is engaged in trade or business in the territory of the other contracting State through a permanent establishment situated therein, there shall be attributed to such permanent establishment the industrial or commercial profits which it might be expected to derive if it were an independent enterprise engaged in the same or similar activities under the same or similar conditions and dealing at arm's length with the enterprise of which it is a permanent establishment and the profits so attributed shall, subject to the law of such other contracting State, be deemed to be income from sources within the territory of such other contracting State.

ARTICLE IV

Where an enterprise of one of the contracting States, by reason of its participation in the management or the financial structure of an enterprise of the other contracting State, makes with or imposes on the latter, in their commercial or financial relations, conditions different from those which would be made with an independent enterprise, any profits which would normally have accrued to one of the enterprises but by reason of those conditions have not so accrued, may be included in the profits of that enterprise and taxed accordingly.

ARTICLE V

(1) Income which an enterprise of one of the contracting States derives from the operation of ships or aircraft registered in that State shall be exempt from taxation in the other contracting State.

(2) The present Convention shall not be deemed to affect the arrangement between the United States and Denmark providing for relief from double income taxation on shipping profits, effected by exchanges of notes dated May 22, August 9 and 18, October 24, 25, and 28, and December 5 and 6, in the year 1922.

ARTICLE VI

(1) Dividends shall be taxable only in the contracting State in which the shareholder is resident or, if the shareholder is a corporation or other entity, in the contracting State in which such corporation or other entity is incorporated or organized.

(2) Each of the contracting States reserves, however, the right to collect and retain the tax which, under its revenue laws, is deductible at the source with respect to such dividends, but the tax shall not exceed 15 percent of the amount of dividends derived from sources within such State by a resident, corporation or other entity of the other State, if the recipient has no permanent establishment in the contracting State from which the dividends are derived.

(3) It is agreed, however, that the rate of dividend tax at the source shall not exceed five percent if the shareholder is a corporation controlling, directly or indirectly, at least 95 percent of the entire voting power in the corporation paying the dividend, and if not more than 25 percent of the gross income of such paying corporation is derived from interest and dividends, other than interest and dividends received from its own subsidiary corporations. Such reduction of the rate to five percent shall not apply if the relationship of the two corporations has been arranged or is maintained primarily with the intention of securing such reduced rate.

ARTICLE VII

Interest on bonds, securities, notes, debentures, or on any other form of indebtedness derived from sources within one of the contracting States by a resident or corporation or other entity of the other contracting State not having a permanent establishment in the former State shall be exempt from tax by such former State.

ARTICLE VIII

Royalties and other amounts derived as consideration for the right to use copyrights, patents, designs, secret processes and formulas, trade-marks and other like property (including rentals and like payments in respect of motion picture films) derived from sources within one of the contracting States by a resident or corporation or other entity of the other contracting State not having a permanent establishment in the former State shall be exempt from taxation in such former State.

ARTICLE IX

(1) Income from real property (not including interest derived from mortgages and bonds secured by real property) and royalties in respect of the operation of mines, quarries, or other natural resources, shall be taxable only in the contracting State in which such property, mines, quarries, or other natural resources are situated.

(2) A resident or corporation of one of the contracting States deriving any such income from sources within the other contracting State may, for any taxable year, elect to be subject to the tax of such other contracting State, on a net basis, as if such resident or corporation were engaged in trade or business within such other contracting State through a permanent establishment therein during such taxable year.

ARTICLE X

(1) Wages, salaries, and similar compensation and pensions paid by one of the contracting States or by any other public authority within that State to individuals residing in the other State shall be taxable only in the former State.

(2) Private pensions and life annuities derived from within one of the contracting States and paid to individuals residing in the other contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State.

(3) The term "life annuities" as used herein means a stated sum payable periodically at stated times during life, or during a specified number of years, under an obligation to make the payments in consideration of a gross sum paid for such obligation.

ARTICLE XI

(1) Compensation for labor or personal services, including the practice of the liberal professions, shall be taxable only in the contracting State in which such services are rendered.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) are, however, subject to the following exceptions:

(a) A resident of Denmark shall be exempt from United States tax upon compensation for labor or personal services if he is temporarily present in the United States for a period or periods not exceeding a total of ninety days during the taxable year and the compensation received for such services does not exceed $3,000 in the aggregate. If, however, his compensation is received for labor or personal services performed as an employee of, or under contract with, a resident or corporation or other entity of Denmark, he will be exempt from United States tax if his stay in the United States does not exceed a total of 180 days during the taxable year.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (2) (a) of this Article shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to a resident of the United States with respect to compensation for personal services otherwise subject to income tax in Denmark.

(3) The provisions of this Article shall have no application to the income to which Article X (1) relates.

ARTICLE XII

Gains derived in one of the contracting States from the sale or exchange of capital assets by a resident or corporation or other entity of the other contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State if such resident or corporation or other entity is not engaged in trade or business in such former State.

ARTICLE XIII

Students or apprentices, citizens of one of the contracting States, residing in the other contracting State exclusively for purposes of study or for acquiring business experience, shall not be taxable in the latter State in respect of remittances (other than their own income) received by them from abroad for the purposes of their maintenance or studies.

ARTICLE XIV

A professor or teacher, a resident of one of the contracting States, who temporarily visits the territory of the other contracting State for the purpose of teaching for a period not exceeding two years at a university, college, school or other educational institution in the other contracting State, shall be exempted in such other contracting State from tax on his remuneration for such teaching for such period.

ARTICLE XV

It is agreed that double taxation shall be avoided in the following manner:

(a) The United States in determining the income taxes, including surtaxes, of its citizens, residents, or corporations may, regardless of any other provisions of this Convention, include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed all items of income taxable under the revenue laws of the United States as if this Convention had not come into effect. The United States shall, however, subject to the provisions of section 131, Internal Revenue Code, deduct from its taxes the amount of Danish taxes specified in Article I of this Convention.

(b) Denmark, in determining its taxes specified in Article I of this Convention, may, regardless of any other provision of this Convention, include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed all items of income subject to such taxes under the taxation laws of Denmark. Denmark shall, however, deduct from the taxes so calculated the United States tax on income coming within the provisions of Articles III, IX, X (1), XIII and XIV of this Convention and on earned income earned within the United States, but in an amount not exceeding that proportion of the Danish taxes which such income bears to the entire income subject to tax by Denmark. Denmark will also allow as a deduction from its taxes an amount equal to 15 percent (five percent in the case of dividends covered by Article VI (3)) of the gross amount of dividends (reduced by the United States tax applicable to such dividends) from sources within the United States.

ARTICLE XVI

(1) The citizens of one of the contracting States shall not, while resident in the other contracting State, be subjected therein to other or more burdensome taxes than are the citizens of such other contracting State residing in its territory. As used in this paragraph,

(a) the term "citizens" includes all legal persons, partnerships, and associations created or organized under the laws in the respective contracting States, and

(b) the term "taxes" means taxes of every kind or description whether national, Federal, State, provincial or municipal.

(2) It is agreed that section 25, paragraph 5, of the Danish law No. 391 of July 12, 1946, prescribing an addition of 50 percent of the capital increment tax on corporations in cases where more than 50 percent of the entire stock capital is owned by a single shareholder residing outside Denmark, shall not be applicable when the shareholder in question is a resident of the United States or a United States corporation or other entity.

ARTICLE XVII

The competent authorities of the contracting States shall exchange such information (being information available under the respective taxation laws of the contracting States) as is necessary for carrying out the provisions of the present Convention or for the prevention of fraud or the administration of statutory provisions against tax avoidance in relation to the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. Any information so exchanged shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any person other than those concerned with the assessment and collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. No information shall be exchanged which would disclose any trade secret or trade process.

ARTICLE XVIII

(1) The contracting States undertake to lend assistance and support to each other in the collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention, together with interests, costs, and additional to the taxes.

(2) In the case of applications for enforcement of taxes, revenue claims of each of the contracting States which have been finally determined may be accepted for enforcement by the other contracting State and may be collected in that State in accordance with the laws applicable to the enforcement and collection of its own taxes.

(3) Any application shall include a certification that under the laws of the State making the application the taxes have been finally determined.

(4) The assistance provided for in this Article shall not be accorded with respect to the citizens, corporations, or other entities of the State to which application is made, except as is necessary to insure that the exemption or reduced rate of tax granted under the present Convention to such citizens, corporations, or other entities shall not be enjoyed by persons not entitled to such benefits.

ARTICLE XIX

The State to which application is made for information or assistance shall comply as soon as possible with the request addressed to it except that such State may refuse to comply with the request for reasons of public policy or if compliance would involve violation of a trade, business, industrial or professional secret or trade process.

ARTICLE XX

Where a taxpayer shows proof that the action of the revenue authorities of the contracting States has resulted in double taxation in his case in respect of any of the taxes to which the present Convention relates, he shall be entitled to lodge a claim with the State of which he is a citizen or, if he is not a citizen of either of the contracting States, with the State of which he is a resident, or, if the taxpayer is a corporation or other entity, with the State in which it is created or organized. Should the claim be upheld, the competent authority of such State may come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

ARTICLE XXI

(1) The provisions of this Convention shall not be construed to deny or affect in any manner the right of diplomatic and consular officers to other or additional exemptions now enjoyed or which may hereafter be granted to such officers.

(2) The provisions of the present Convention shall not be construed to restrict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit or other allowance accorded by the laws of one of the contracting States in the determination of the tax imposed by such State.

(3) Should any difficult or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, or its relationship to Conventions between one of the contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE XXII

The competent authorities of the two contracting States may prescribe regulations necessary to interpret and carry out the provisions of this Convention. With respect to the provisions of this Convention relating to exchange of information and mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, such authorities may, by common agreement, prescribe rules concerning matters of procedure, forms of application and replies thereto, conversion of currency, disposition of amounts collected, minimum amounts subject to collection and related matters.

ARTICLE XXIII

(1) The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

(2) Upon the exchange of instruments of ratification, the present Convention shall have effect.

(a) in the case of United States tax, for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January of the year in which such exchange takes place;

(b) in the case of Danish tax, for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of April of the year in which such exchange takes place.

(3) The present Convention shall continue effective for a period of five years and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the contracting States at the end of the five-year period or at any time thereafter, privided that at least six months' prior notice of termination has been given and, in such event, the present Convention shall cease to be effective.

(a) as respects United States tax, for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January next following the expiration of the six-month period;

(b) as respects Danish tax, for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of April next following the expiration of the six-month period.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Danish languages, the two texts

having equal authenticity, this 6th day of May, 1948.

For the President of the United States of America:

[SEAL] G C MARSHALL

For his Majesty the King of Denmark:

[SEAL] HENRIK KAUFFMANN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair may be permitted to make a brief statement, both the treaties, Executive H and Executive I, are routine treaties to protect against double taxation. They follow the form which has been established in connection with treaties with other countries on the same subject.

The text of the treaty as originally submitted did include other matters which proved to be controversial, and the other matters have been eliminated by reservation. Both treaties were in charge of the able junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Chair will recognize the Senator from New Jersey if he feels that there is anything that should be said on the subject.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, there is very little that need be said. The controversy over these treaties was taken care of under the French treaty which was ratified at the last executive session, as I recall. We provided the same protection to our interests we voted into the French treaty. There were one or two controversial paragraphs in the treaties, and because it was important that the treaties should be reported and ratified at this session, we eliminated the controversial features and put them to one side, and we are submitting the treaties with the controversial features omitted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification, with the reservation, will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive H, Eightieth Congress, second session, the convention between the United States of America and Denmark, signed at Washington on May 6, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income subject to the following reservation:

The Government of the United States of America does not accept article XII of the convention relating to gains derived from the sale or exchange of capital assets.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the reservation to the resolution of ratification.

The reservation was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification with the reservation. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification, with the reservation, is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

CONVENTION WITH THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS RELATING TO AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the Convention, Executive I (80th Cong., 2d sess.), a convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes, signed at Washington on April 29, 1948, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with reservations. The convention was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON INCOME AND CERTAIN OTHER TAXES

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, desiring to conclude a convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes, have appointed for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The Government of the United States of America:

Mr. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, and

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands:

Mr. E. N. van Kleffens, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of the Netherlands,

who, having communicated to each other their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes which are the subject of the present Convention are:

(a) In the case of the United States: the Federal income taxes.

(b) In the case of the Netherlands:

(i) for the application of the provisions of the Convention other than Article XX, the income tax and the Netherlands taxes credited against it, the corporation tax and the Netherlands taxes credited against it, the property tax, and the tax on fees of directors and managers of corporations; and

(ii) for the application of Articles XX to XXVIII inclusive (except Articles XXIV and XXVII), the capital accretions tax and the extraordinary capital tax.

(2) The present Convention shall apply also to any other taxes of a substantially similar character imposed by either Contracting State subsequently to the date of signature of the present Convention, or, by the government of any overseas part of the Kingdom (in the case of the Netherlands) or overseas territory (in the case of the United States) to which the present Convention is extended under Article XXVII, subsequently to the date of the notification of extension.

(3) In the event of appreciable changes in the fiscal laws of either of the Contracting States the competent authorities of the Contracting States will consult together.

ARTICLE II

(1) In the present Convention, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense means the States, the Territories of Alaska and of Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Netherlands" means only the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Europe.

(c) The term "United States corporation" means a corporation, association or other organization or juridical entity created in the United States or under the laws of the United States or of any State or territory of the United States.

(d) The term "Netherlands corporation" means a corporation, association or other organization or juridical entity created in the Netherlands or under the laws of the Netherlands.

(e) The terms "corporation of one Contracting State" and "corporation of the other Contracting State" means a United States corporation or a Netherlands corporation, as the context requires.

(f) The term "United States enterprise" means an industrial or commercial enterprise or undertaking carried on in the United States by a citizen or resident of the United States or by a United States corporation.

(g) The term "Netherlands enterprise" means an industrial or commercial enterprise or undertaking carried on in the Netherlands by a citizen or resident of the Netherlands or by a Netherlands corporation.

(h) The terms "enterprise of one of the Contracting States" and "enterprise of the other Contracting States" means a United States enterprise or a Netherlands enterprise, as the context requires.

(i) The term "permanent establishment", when used with respect to an enterprise of one of the Contracting States, means a branch, factory, or other fixed place of business, but does not include an agency unless the agent has, and habitually exercises, a general authority to negotiate and conclude contracts on behalf of such enterprise or has a stock of merchandise from which he regularly fills orders on behalf of such enterprise. An enterprise of one of the Contracting States shall not be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the other Contracting State merely because it carries on business dealings in such other Contracting State through a bona fide commission agent, broker or custodian acting in the ordinary course of his business as such. The fact that an enterprise of one of the Contracting States maintains in the other Contracting State a fixed place of business exclusively for the purchase of goods or merchandise shall not of itself constitute such fixed place of business a permanent establishment of such enterprise. When a corporation of one Contracting State has a subsidiary corporation which is a corporation of the other Contracting State or which is engaged in trade or business in such other Contracting State, such subsidiary corporation shall not, merely because of that fact, be deemed to be a permanent establishment of its parent corporation.

(j) The term "competent authority" or "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or his duly authorized representative; in the case of the Netherlands, the Directeur-Generaal der Belastingen or his duly authorized representative; and, in the case of any part or territory to which provisions of the present Convention are extended under Article XXVII, subsequently to the date of the notification of extension.

(3) In the event of appreciable changes in the fiscal laws of either of the Contracting States the competent authorities of the Contracting States will consult together.

ARTICLE II

(1) In the present Convention, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense means the States, the Territories of Alaska and of Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Netherlands" means only the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Europe.

ARTICLE III

(1) An enterprise of one of the Contracting States shall not be subject to taxation by the other Contracting State in respect of its industrial or commercial profits unless it is engaged in trade or business in the other Contracting State through a permanent establishment situated therein. If it is so engaged the other Contracting State may impose the tax only upon the income of such enterprise from sources within such other State.

(2) Where an enterprise of one of the Contracting States is engaged in trade or business in the other Contracting State through a permanent establishment situated therein, there shall be attributed to such permanent establishment the industrial or commercial profits which it might be expected to derive if it were an independent enterprise engaged in the same or similar activities under the same or similar conditions and dealing at arm's length with the enterprise of which it is a permanent establishment, and the profits so attributed shall, subject to the law of such other Contracting State, be deemed to be income from sources within such other Contracting State.

(3) In determining the industrial or commercial profits from sources within one of the Contracting States of an enterprise of the other Contracting State, no profits shall be deemed to arise from the mere purchase of goods or merchandise within the former Contracting State by such enterprise.

(4) The competent authorities of the Contracting States may lay down rules by agreement for the apportionment of industrial or commercial profits.

ARTICLE IV

Where an enterprise of one of the Contracting States, by reason of its participation in the management, control or capital of an enterprise of the other Contracting States, makes with or imposes on the latter enterprise, in their commercial or financial relations, conditions different from those which would be made with an independent enterprise, any profits which would, but for those conditions, have accrued to one of the enterprises, may be included in the taxable profits of that enterprise.

ARTICLE V

Income of whatever nature derived from real property and interest from mortgages secured by real property shall be taxable only in the Contracting State in which the real property is situated.

ARTICLE VI

(1) Income which an enterprise of one of the Contracting States derives from the operation of ships or aircraft registered in that State shall be taxable only in the State in which such ships or aircraft are registered. Income derived by such an enterprise from the operation of ships or aircraft not so registered shall be subject to the provisions of Article III.

(2) The present Convention shall be deemed to suspend, for the duration of the Convention as between the parties to which this Article applies, the provisions of the arrangement effected by exchange of notes between the United States and the Netherlands, dated September 13, October 19, and November 27, 1926, providing for relief from double income taxation on shipping profits.

(3) In the event that the application of this Article is extended to the Netherland Indies in accordance with Article XXVII, the exchange of notes between the United States and the Netherlands, dated March 8, May 23, and November 8, 1939, relating to the applications to the Netherland Indies of the arrangement referred to in paragraph (2) of this Article, shall be deemed to be suspended for so long as this Article continues to be applicable with respect to the Netherland Indies.

ARTICLE VII

(1) The rate of United States tax on dividends derived from a United States corporation by a resident or corporation of the Netherlands not engaged in trade or business in the United States through a permanent establishment shall not exceed 15 percent: *Provided*, That such rate of tax shall not exceed 5 percent if such Netherlands corporation controls, directly or indirectly, at least 95 percent of the entire voting power in the corporation paying the dividend, and not more than 25 percent of the gross income of such paying corporation is derived from interest and dividends, other than interest and dividends from its own subsidiary corporation. Such reduction of the rate to 5 percent shall not apply if the relationship of the two corporations has been arranged or is maintained primarily with the intention of securing such reduced rate.

(2) Dividends derived from sources within the Netherlands by a resident or corporation of the United States not engaged in trade or business in the Netherlands through a permanent establishment shall be exempt from Netherlands tax.

(3) Either of the Contracting States may terminate this Article, by giving written notice of termination to the other Contracting State through diplomatic channels, on or before the thirtieth day of June in any year after the first year for which the present Convention becomes effective. In such event this Article shall cease to be effective on and after the first day of January in the year next following that in which such notice is given.

ARTICLE VIII

(1) Interest (on bonds, securities, notes, debentures, or on any other form of indebtedness), other than interest referred to in Article V of the present Convention, derived from sources within the United States by a resident or corporation of the Netherlands not engaged in trade or business in the United States through a permanent establishment, shall be exempt from United States tax; but such exemption shall not apply to such interest paid by a United States corporation to a Netherlands corporation controlling, directly or indirectly, more than 50 percent of the entire voting power in the paying corporation.

(2) Interest (on bonds, securities, notes, debentures, or on any other form of indebtedness), other than interest referred to in Article V of the present Convention, derived from sources within the Netherlands by a resident or corporation of the United States not engaged in trade or business in the Netherlands through a permanent establishment, shall be exempt from Netherlands tax; but such exemption shall not apply to such interest paid by a Netherlands corporation to a United States corporation controlling, directly or indirectly, more than 50 percent of the entire voting power in the paying corporation.

ARTICLE IX

Royalties for the right to use copyrights, patents, designs, secret processes and formulae, trade marks, and other analogous property, and royalties, including rentals, in respect of motion-picture films or for the use of industrial, commercial, or scientific equipment, derived from sources within one of the Contracting States by a resident or corporation of the other Contracting State not engaged in trade or business in the former State through a permanent establishment, shall be exempt from tax imposed by the former State.

ARTICLE X

A resident or corporation of one of the Contracting States, deriving from sources within the other Contracting State royalties in respect of the operation of mines, quarries, or natural resources, or rentals from real property, may elect for any taxable year to be subject to the tax of such other Contracting State, on a net basis, as if such resident or corporation were engaged in trade or business within such other Contracting State through a permanent establishment therein during such taxable year.

ARTICLE XI

A resident or corporation of one of the Contracting States not engaged in trade or business in the other Contracting State shall be exempt from tax in such other State on gains from the sale or exchange of capital assets.

ARTICLE XII

Dividends and interest paid by a Netherlands corporation shall be exempt from United States tax except where the recipient is a citizen, resident, or corporation of the United States.

ARTICLE XIII

A Netherlands corporation shall be exempt from United States tax on its accumulated or undistributed earnings, profits, income or surplus if it can prove to the satisfaction of the competent authorities of the United States that individuals who are residents of the Netherlands (other than citizens of the United States) control, directly or indirectly, throughout the last half of the taxable year, more than 50 percent of the entire voting power in such corporation.

ARTICLE XIV

(1) The United States income tax liability for any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1936, of any individual (other than a citizen of the United States) resident in the Netherlands, or of any Netherlands corporation, remaining unpaid on the effective date of the present Convention, may be adjusted on a basis satisfactory to the United States Commissioner of Internal Revenue: *Provided*, That the amount to be paid in settlement of such liability shall not exceed the amount of the liability which would have been determined if

(a) The United States Revenue Act of 1936 (except in the case of a Netherlands corporation in which more than 50 percent of the entire voting power was controlled, directly or indirectly, throughout the latter half of the taxable year, by citizens or residents of the United States), and

(b) Articles XII and XIII of the present Convention, had been in effect for such year. If the taxpayer was not, within the meaning of such Revenue Act, engaged in trade or business in the United States and had no office or place of business therein during the taxable year, the amount of interest and penalties shall not exceed 50 percent of the amount of the tax with respect to which such interest and penalties have been computed.

(2) The United States income tax unpaid on the effective date of the present Convention for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1935, and prior to the effective date of the present Convention in the case of an individual (other than a citizen of the United States) resident of the Netherlands, or in the case of any Netherlands corporation, shall be determined as if the provisions of Article XII and XIII of the present Convention had been in effect for such taxable year.

(3) The provisions of paragraph (1) of this Article shall not apply

(a) unless the taxpayer files with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue within a period of 2 years following the effective date of the present Convention a request that such tax liability be so adjusted and furnishes such information as the Commissioner may require; or

(b) in any case in which the Commissioner is satisfied that any deficiency in tax is due to fraud with intent to evade the tax.

ARTICLE XV

(1) Wages, salaries, and similar compensation, and pensions and life annuities, paid either directly by, or from funds created by, one of the Contracting States or the political subdivisions or territories thereof to individuals in the other Contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the latter State.

(2) Private pensions and life annuities derived from within one of the Contracting States and paid to individuals in the other Contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State.

(3) The term "pensions" as used in this Article means periodic payments made in consideration for services rendered or by way of compensation for injuries received.

(4) The term "life annuities" as used in this Article means a stated sum payable periodically at stated times during life, or during a specified number of years, under an obligation to make the payments in return for adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth.

ARTICLE XVI

(1) A resident of the Netherlands shall be exempt from United States tax upon compensation for labor or personal services performed within the United States if he is temporarily present within the United States for a period or periods not exceeding a total of 183 days during the taxable year and his compensation is received for labor or personal services performed as a worker or employee of, or under contract with, a resident of the Netherlands, or a Netherlands corporation, carrying the actual burden of the remuneration.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) of this Article shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to a resident of the United States deriving compensation for labor or personal services performed within the Netherlands.

ARTICLE XVII

Professors or teachers, residents of one of the Contracting States, who, in accordance with agreements between the Contracting States or between teaching establishments in the Contracting States for the exchange of professors and teachers, visit the other Contracting State to teach, for a maximum period of two years, in a university, college or other teaching establishment in such other Contracting State, shall not be taxed by such other State with respect to the remuneration which they receive for such teaching.

ARTICLE XVIII

Students or business apprentices of one Contracting State residing in the other Contracting State exclusively for purposes of study or for acquiring business experience shall not be taxable by the latter State in respect of remittances received by them from abroad for the purpose of their maintenance or studies.

ARTICLE XIX

(1) Notwithstanding any provisions of the present Convention (other than paragraph (1) of Article XV when applicable in the case of an individual who is deemed by each Contracting State to be a citizen thereof), each of the two Contracting States, in determining the taxes, including all surtaxes, of its citizens or residents or corporations, may include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed all items of income taxable under its own revenue laws as though this Convention had not come into effect.

(2) As far as may be in accordance with the provisions of the United States Internal Revenue Code, the United States agrees to allow as a deduction from the income taxes imposed by the United States the appropriate amount of taxes paid to the Netherlands, whether paid directly by the taxpayer or by withholding at the source.

(3) As far as may be in accordance with the provisions of Netherlands law, the Netherlands agrees to allow a deduction from Netherlands tax with respect to income from sources within the United States, in order to take into account the Federal income taxes paid to the United States, whether paid directly by the taxpayer or by withholding at the source.

ARTICLE XX

(1) All persons who left the Netherlands between April 30, 1939, and December 31, 1945, inclusive (other than persons who were citizens of the United States at the time of leaving the Netherlands or Netherlands subject who by reason of their function as governmental officials in established service reside abroad and the members of their family living with them), and who are deemed to be taxpayers under the provisions of Netherlands law relating to the capital accretions tax or the extraordinary capital tax, and who became residents of the United States (according to the income tax law of the United States) during that period, and who did not return to the Netherlands on or before December 31, 1945, to resume residence in the Netherlands (according to the income tax law of the Netherlands), shall be taxable by the Netherlands:

(a) Under the law relating to the capital accretions tax, only in respect of accretions arising from their property situated in the Netherlands (as defined in that law in the case of nonresidents) and from their activities in the Netherlands;

(b) Under the law relating to the extraordinary capital tax, only in respect of their property situated in the Netherlands (as defined in that law in the case of nonresidents).

(2) All persons who left the Netherlands between April 30, 1939, and December 31, 1945, inclusive, and who were citizens of the United States at the time of leaving the Netherlands, and who are deemed to be taxpayers under the provisions of Netherlands law relating to the capital accretions tax or the extraordinary capital tax, and who became residents of the United States (according to the income tax law of the United States) on or before December 31, 1945, shall be taxable by the Netherlands:

(a) under the law relating to the capital accretions tax, only in respect of accretions arising from their property situated in the Netherlands (as defined in that law in the case of nonresidents) and from their activities in the Netherlands;

(b) under the law relating to the extraordinary capital tax, only in respect of their property situated in the Netherlands (as defined in that law in the case of nonresidents).

(3) The provisions of this Article shall be deemed to be effective as though the present Convention had entered into force on the effective date of the Netherlands law relating to the capital accretions tax or the extraordinary capital tax, as the case may be.

ARTICLE XXI

The competent authorities of the Contracting States shall exchange such information (being information which such authorities have in proper order at their disposal) as is necessary for carrying out the provisions of the present Convention or for the prevention of fraud or the administration of statutory provisions against legal avoidance in relation to the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. Any information so exchanged shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any person other than those concerned with the assessment and collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. No information as aforesaid shall be exchanged which would disclose any trade, business, industrial or professional secret or trade process.

ARTICLE XXII

(1) The Contracting States undertake to lend assistance and support to each other in the collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention, together with interest, costs, and additions to the taxes and fines not being of a penal character.

(2) In the case of applications for enforcement of taxes, revenue claims of each of the Contracting States which have been finally determined may be acceptd for enforcement by the other Contracting State and collected in that State in accordance with the laws applicable to the enforcement and collection of its own taxes. The State to which application is made shall not be required to enforce executory measures for which there is no provision in the law of the State making the application.

(3) Any application shall be accompanied by documents establishing that under the laws of the State making the application the taxes have been finally determined.

(4) The assistance provided for in this Article shall not be accorded with respect to the citizens, corporations, or other entities of the State to which application is made, except as is necessary to insure that the exemption or reduced rate of tax granted under the convention to such citizens, corporations or other entities shall not be enjoyed by persons not entitled to such benefits.

ARTICLE XXIII

(1) In no case shall the provisions of Articles XXI and XXII be construed so as to impose upon either of the Contracting States the obligation

(a) to carry out administrative measures at variance with the regulations and practice of either Contracting State, or

(b) to supply particulars which are not procurable under its own legislation or that of the State making application.

(2) The State to which application is made for information or assistance shall comply as soon as possible with the request addressed to it. Nevertheless, such State may refuse to comply with the request for reasons of public policy or if compliance would involve violation of a trade, business, industrial or professional secret or trade process. In such case it shall inform, as soon as possible, the State making the application.

ARTICLE XXIV

Where the action of the revenue authorities of the Contracting States has resulted or will result in double taxation contrary to the provisions of the present Convention, the taxpayer shall be entitled to lodge a claim with the State of which he is a citizen or subject or, if he is not a citizen or subject of either of the Contracting States, with the State of which he is a resident, or, if the taxpayer is a corporation, with the State in which it is created or organized. Should the claim be upheld, the competent authority of such State shall undertake to come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

ARTICLE XXV

(1) The provisions of the present Convention shall not be construed to restrict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit or other allowance accorded by the laws of one of the Contracting States in the determination of the tax imposed by such State.

(2) Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, the competent authorities of the Contracting States shall undertake to settle the question by mutual agreement.

(3) The citizens or subjects of one of the Contracting States shall not, while resident in the other Contracting State, be subjected therein to other or more burdensome taxes than are the citizens or subjects of such other Contracting State residing in its territory. The term "citizens" or "subjects" as used in this Article includes all legal persons, partnerships and associations deriving their status from, or created or organized under the laws in force in, the respective Contracting States. In this Article the word "taxes" means taxes of every kind or description whether national, federal, state, provincial or municipal.

ARTICLE XXVI

(1) The authorities of each of the Contracting States, in accordance with the practices of that State, may prescribe regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of the present Convention.

(2) With respect to the provisions of the present Convention relating to exchange of information and mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, the competent authorities may, by common agreement, prescribe rules concerning matters of procedure, forms of application and replies thereto, conversion of currency, disposition of amounts collected, minimum amounts subject to collection, and related matters.

ARTICLE XXVII

(1) Either of the Contracting States may, at the time of exchange of instruments of ratification or thereafter while the present Convention continues in force, by a written notification of extension given to the other Contracting State through diplomatic channels, declare the desire of the government of any overseas part of the Kingdom (in the case of the Netherlands) or overseas territory (in the case of the United States), which imposes taxes substantially similar in character to those which are the subject of the present Convention, that the operation of the present Convention, either in whole or as to such provisions thereof as may be deemed to have special application, shall extend to such part or territory.

(2) In the event that a notification is given by one of the Contracting States in accordance with paragraph (1) of this Article, the present Convention, or such provisions thereof as may be specified in the notification, shall apply to any part or territory named in such notification on and after the first day of January following the date of a written communication through diplomatic channels addressed to such Contracting State by the other Contracting State, after such action by the latter States as may be necessary in accordance with its own procedures, stating that such notification is accepted in respect of such part or territory. In the absence of such acceptance, none of the provisions of the present Convention shall apply to such part or territory.

(3) At any time after the expiration of one year from the effective date of an extension made by virtue of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this Article, either of the Contracting States may, by a written notice of termination given to the other Contracting State through diplomatic channels, terminate the application of the present Convention to any part or territory to which the convention, or any of its provisions, has been extended. In that case, the present Convention, or the provisions thereof specified in the notice of termination, shall cease to be applicable to the part or territory named in such notice of termination on and after the first day of January following the expiration of a period of 6 months after the date of such notice; provided, however, that this shall not affect the continued application of the Convention, or any of the provisions thereof, to the United States, to the Netherlands, or to any part or territory (not named in the notice of termination) to which the Convention, or such provision thereof, applies.

(4) For the application of the present Convention in relation to any part or territory to which it is extended by notification given by the United States or the Netherlands, reference to "the United States" or to "the Netherlands" or to one or the other Contracting State, as the case may be, shall be construed to refer to such part or territory.

ARTICLE XXVIII

(1) The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

(2) The present Convention shall become effective on the first day of January in the year last preceding the year in which the exchange of instruments of ratification takes place. It shall continue effective for a period of 5 years beginning with that date and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the Contracting States at the end of the 5-year period or at any time thereafter, provided that at least 6 months' prior notice of termination has been given, the termination to become effective on the first day of January following the expiration of the 6-month period.

Done at Weshington, in duplicate, in the English and Dutch languages, the two texts having equal authenticity, this 29th day of April, 1948.

For the Government of the United States of America:

[SEAL] G C MARSHALL

For the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands:

[SEAL] E. N. VAN KLEFFENS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification, with the reservations, will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive I, Eightieth Congress, second session, the convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes, signed at Washington on April 29, 1948, subject to the following reservations:

(1) The Government of the United States of America does not accept article XI of the convention relating to gains from the sale or exchange of capital assets.

(2) The Government of the United States of America does not accept article XIII of the convention relating to United States taxation of the undistributed earnings, profits, income or surplus of a Netherlands corporation.

(3) The Government of the United States of America does not accept article XIV of the convention relating to settlement of unpaid United States income tax liability unless there be eliminated therefrom, (a) references now appearing therein to article XIII and (b) any language which might prevent the taxation by the United States of capital gains, if any, taxable under the revenue laws of the United States for the respective years in which such gains were realized.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the reservations to the resolution of ratification.

The reservations were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification with the reservations.

[Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification, with the reservations, is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Klahr Huddle, of Ohio, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Burma, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America on the Kashmir Commission of the Security Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Claude G. Bowers, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Chile, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Latin America established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, February 25, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at the top of page 3, under Diplomatic and Foreign Service, appears the name Edward T. Barnard, and the next name is that of Jules E. Bernard. I wonder if there is a misprint; whether the second name should be Bernard or Barnard?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not have any knowledge of that. The Chair doubts, however, whether there is a misprint.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the

Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Thorvald A. Solberg, to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Fred S. Martin, of New York, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, William T. Sherwood, resigned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carl K. Connell to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Missouri, to fill an existing vacancy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul R. Leake to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the nominations this day confirmed.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Armed Services certain junior nominations in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, 700 in number, and ask for their immediate consideration without their going to the calendar. The nominations are routine. I make this request in order to save printing the names in the calendar. Such a request has been customarily made in order to save the expense of printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be received.

Without objection, the nominations will be confirmed, and the President will be notified.

Mr. GURNEY. I failed to say that the nominations have all been approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

ILLINOIS POSTMASTERS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question respecting a number of postmaster nominations, in view of the fact that many postmasters have been confirmed tonight. It is my understanding that some 38 or 40 postmaster nominations in Illinois have been approved by the Civil Service Committee, and I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is present and can tell me why those postmasters do not appear on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from North Dakota is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that my colleague from Illinois has objected to these postmasters, and he is present. I should like to know whether that is true or not.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I may say to my colleague that I know nothing about the nominations of postmasters that are not on the calendar. I was asked if I approved them and I said I did not know who they were. I do not know who they are and to that extent I have not approved them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I want to submit resolutions respecting each and every one of these postmasters. The purpose of the resolution is to discharge the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from further consideration of the nominations of the postmasters to whom I refer. The first one is Monroe A. Lawson, of Clay City, Ill. Mr. Lawson is a disabled marine veteran of World War II, having been wounded on Saipan.

He was the only applicant for the office and the only eligible certified by the Civil Service Commission from an open competitive examination.

He has served as acting postmaster since October 1946, and is unanimously endorsed by the Clay City Chamber of Commerce, and was recommended by the Republican Congressman from that district.

Personally, the Senator from Illinois does not know whether this gentleman is a Democrat or a Republican, and it would not make any difference, because he is a veteran, and is No. 1 on the eligible list, and the only one on the list.

Mr. President, why that individual cannot be confirmed by the Senate of the United States at this session will be a little difficult for me to understand, and it will be a little difficult for many people in Illinois to understand—people who will know more about it as time goes by.

I submit the resolution, and ask that it lie over for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be filed and will lie over for the day.

Mr. LUCAS. The second nomination is that of Charles H. McGough, to be postmaster at Secor, Ill. Mr. McGough was the first man on the eligible register established by the Civil Service Commission as the result of an open competitive examination.

He is a disabled veteran of World War II, and is not serving as acting postmaster.

Some other individual is serving as acting postmaster while this disabled veteran of World War II, who was the first man on the eligible list, waits for his commission because of someone here in the United States Senate who refuses to approve him or who refuses to report out his nomination.

Mr. President, to me this is indefensible and it is unbelievable that an Illinois boy who went out to fight for his country, and is disabled, and is No. 1 on the list, should not be confirmed. There is nothing that anyone can do about it under the law. He must be ultimately accepted whether anyone likes it or not, because under the law no one can be chosen over him. I do not know what his politics is, but I know that he is a disabled veteran, and I know that he is waiting for this job, and that he cannot get it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Chair's pardon.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield if the Senator from Nebraska wants to ask me a question.

Mr. WHERRY. How does the Senator know that the nomination in question will not be reported from the committee?

Mr. LUCAS. I hope it will.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the Senator really begging the question?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not begging the question very much because unless the nomination is reported from the committee within 48 hours he will not be confirmed. There would not be any action in this matter if it were not for the fact that the Senator from Illinois has taken the floor and proceeded to take the action he is now taking.

Mr. WHERRY. The chairman of the committee is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. I have asked the chairman about this.

Mr. WHERRY. The chairman has done quite well in the matter of reporting nominations, and the Senate has confirmed every nomination which has been placed on the Executive Calendar, with the exception of one, during the executive session today.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is something of a record. Only one nomination on the calendar has been put over today. I have taken the position that when the Senate acted on the Executive Calendar all nominations on the calendar should be confirmed.

Mr. LUCAS. I have tried to get these nominations on the Executive Calendar. Obviously they cannot be confirmed until that is done.

Mr. WHERRY. I am satisfied that if the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service were present he could give the Senator satisfactory answers respecting these postmasters.

Mr. LUCAS. He cannot give me satisfactory answers respecting the individuals I have mentioned, because there is nothing that can be done about these postmasters except confirm them or turn them down.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I cannot answer the Senator respecting the postmasters in question, but I will say there is a meeting of the committee scheduled for tomorrow morning, when nominations for postmasters will be considered, and I hope these nominations may be reported then.

Mr. LUCAS. Recently I called the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], a member of the committee, on the phone and he told me that some 33 nominations for postmasters had been reported favorably by the committee, that there was no objection to them, and since that time nominations from one State after another have been placed on the Executive Calendar, but the Illinois postmasters are not on the calendar, and time is running out in this Congress. Action must be taken quickly if the nominations are to be confirmed before the session is ended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There are three nominations of postmasters from Illinois on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; there are three from Illinois. This is somewhat of an anomaly. I went before the committee and appealed to the committee to have the three postmasters from Illinois placed on the calendar, and the committee voted practically unanimously to place them on the calendar while I was there; and, lo and behold, they are now on the Executive Calendar. The reason I appeared was because some slight objection had been raised to these three. Lo and behold, they are on the calendar. But these other postmasters, to whom there is no objection, have not been placed on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps if the Senator went before the committee again he would succeed in having them placed on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought they would be placed on the calendar in view of the favorable report by the Committee on Civil Service. I had every reason to believe they would be on the Executive Calendar as a result of favorable action by that committee. I relied upon my good friend from South Carolina. He told me what had been done. He was very joyful about it. He thought all the postmaster nominations had been reported.

Next is the nomination of Glen W. Seaton, of Glen Carbon. Mr. Seaton is a disabled veteran of World War II. He was first on the eligible register set up by the Civil Service Commission from an examination. He is now serving as acting postmaster and is married.

Next is the nomination of Frank C. Spengler, to be postmaster at Shannon, Ill. Mr. Spengler was No. 1 on the register established by the Civil Service Commission from an open competitive examination. He is a disabled veteran of World War II, and has been serving as acting postmaster at Shannon since December 1946.

The next is the nomination of Mr. Russell E. Snyder, to be postmaster at Hull, Ill. Mr. Snyder was No. 1 on the eligible register established by the Civil Service Commission. He has been acting postmaster at Hull since June 1946, and is a disabled veteran of World War II. He ought to have a little opportunity to get a job as postmaster at Hull, Ill. It is not a very big job, but it is worth while to him.

The next nomination is that of William K. Armstrong, to be postmaster at Chandlerville. Mr. Armstrong is now serving as acting postmaster. He is a veteran of World War II, having enlisted in January 1942. Served overseas for more than 2 years. He was a classified postal employee who was promoted through noncompetitive examination. Served as clerk in the Chandlerville office from 1941 to 1942, when he enlisted in the Army. Went back to his job in the post office in 1946 when he was discharged. His services have been entirely satisfactory.

This is stack No. 3, consisting of veterans and veterans' widows who were first on the eligible register, or the only eligibles. I do not wish to read all of these. I call attention particularly to Daniel J. Boyd, who is nominated to be postmaster at Blue Island, Ill. Mr. Boyd was the only eligible certified by the Civil Service Commission as the result of an open competitive examination. He is a veteran of World War II and is serving as acting postmaster. His services in this capacity have been highly satisfactory.

Most of these are World War II veterans. Two are widows. One of these is the nomination of Harry A. Osman, to be postmaster at Cypress, Ill. Another is the nomination of Fred H. Popp, Jr., to be postmaster at Dundee, Ill.; another, the nomination of Lester A. Binder, to be postmaster at Hinckley, Ill.

Another is the nomination of C. Lincoln Guernsey, to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, Ill. He is another veteran. These are all veterans.

Mrs. Helen F. Gleich is the widow of a veteran of World War I.

Next is stack No. 4, consisting of veterans who were second or third on the register. I will not take the time of the Senate to read the list.

Mr. WHERRY. Why does not the Senator file them en bloc?

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to file them by stacks.

Stack No. 5 consists of nonveterans who were classified postal employees promoted to the postmastership.

Stack No. 6 consists of nonveterans who were either first on the eligible register or the only eligibles. There are quite a few of those.

Stack No. 7 consists of veterans who were second or third on the eligible register.

In conclusion, I hope that my able friend the acting majority leader will try to prevail upon the committee to report these nominations. In all seriousness, these are some of the most meritorious cases I have ever considered since I have been considering postmasters in all the years I have been in Congress. I sincerely hope that this Congress will not adjourn without the Senate confirming these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions to discharge the committee will lie on the table.

The nominations referred to by Mr. LUCAS are as follows:

Monroe A. Lawson, to be postmaster at Clay City, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 54).

Charles H. McGough, to be postmaster at Secor, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 55).

Glen W. Seaton, to be postmaster at Glen Carbon, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 56).

Frank C. Spengler, to be postmaster at Shannon, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 57).

Russell E. Snyder, to be postmaster at Hull, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 58).

William K. Armstrong, to be postmaster at Chandlerville, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 59).

Arthur E. Maloney, to be postmaster at Mooseheart, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 60).

Daniel J. Boyd, to be postmaster at Blue Island, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 61).

George A. Frazer, to be postmaster at Hamilton, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 62).

Harry A. Osman, to be postmaster at Cypress, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 63).

Fred H. Popp, Jr., to be postmaster at Dundee, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 64).

Lester A. Binder, to be postmaster at Hinckley, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 65).

Russell M. Shoaf, to be postmaster at Homer, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 66).

C. Lincoln Guernsey, to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 67).

Helen F. Gleich, to be postmaster at Menard, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 68).

James T. Malley, to be postmaster at Mounds, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 69).

Jerry Volny, Jr., to be postmaster at Northfield, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 70).

William H. Watson, to be postmaster at Prospect Heights, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 71).

Andrew J. Rogers, Jr., to be postmaster at Cordova, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 72).

John C. McKinstra, to be postmaster at Freeport, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 73).

Richard R. Atkins, to be postmaster at Kinmundy, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 74).

Adam A. Munsterman, to be postmaster at Nameoki, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 75).

Joseph J. Holloway, to be postmaster at Elmhurst, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 76).

Leland Adams, to be postmaster at Deiterich, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 77).

Albert J. Buehler, to be postmaster at Chestnut, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 78).

Francis L. Weghorst, to be postmaster at South Pekin, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 79).

Herbert M. Bowman, to be postmaster at Thompsonville, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 80).

Mrs. Ruth Sartain, to be postmaster at Fithian, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 81).

Beatrice Reck, to be postmaster at Winslow, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 82).

Margaret Carlson, to be postmaster at Bureau, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 83).

Ray B. Brockhouse, to be postmaster at Chapin, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 84).

Eula McCawley, to be postmaster at Chesterfield, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 85).

Louis Sloter, to be postmaster at Crescent City, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 86).

Mary E. McCarl, to be postmaster at Kinderhook, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 87).

Ralph D. Waddell, to be postmaster at Latham, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 88).

Joseph O. Brown, to be postmaster at Long Point, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 89).

George M. Farrell, to be postmaster at Marseilles, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 90).

Daniel F. Pembroke, to be postmaster at Monticello, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 91).

S. Jay Thomas, to be postmaster at Oregon, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 92).

Emmett P. Hayes, to be postmaster at Rochelle, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 93).

Orville L. Glasford, to be postmaster at Trivoli, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 94).

Mabel H. Green, to be postmaster at Alvin, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 95).

John W. Bosaw, to be postmaster at New Haven, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 96).

Charles J. Murphy, to be postmaster at Oak Park, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 97).

Besse M. Hewitt, to be postmaster at Steward, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 98).

THE HOUSING PROGRAM—IMPORT DUTIES ON PLYWOOD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make brief comment on two matters which I seek to have inserted in the RECORD.

I have been advised that the so-called housing bill which is under consideration in the House has had added to it today an amendment which seeks to eliminate import duties on plywood.

Mr. President, that amendment would play havoc with the plywood industry in the Pacific Northwest. In my opinion that amendment is just another reason why it would be much better to have no housing bill at all than the monstrosity which apparently is coming out of the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared in regard to the effect of such an amendment on the plywood industry of the Pacific Northwest.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Douglas fir plywood industry employs in direct production of plywood approximately 10,000 workmen in the States of Washington, Oregon, and California. There are 35 complete fir plywood plants and 5 green fir veneer plants now in production. There are 7 fir plywood plants under construction which will be in operation by the end of 1948. There are 7 plywood plants projected. All of these plants should be in production in 1949 so that during 1949 there will be a total of 49 plywood plants in operation. It is expected that by the end of 1948 there will be 50 fir plywood plants and by the end of 1949 there will be 60.

In 1947 the fir plywood industry produced at the rate of 29,000,000 square feet a week. The present production is 36,000,000 square feet per week. New plants coming into production within the next 4 months will increase the production to 40,000,000 square feet per week by this fall. New plants coming into production during 1949 will bring in an additional 4,000,000 square feet per week so that production in 1949 will be 44,000,000 square feet per week, or an increase of 65 percent over 1947.

The Douglas fir plywood industry pays an average wage straight time of $1.62½ an hour. The Canadian plywood industry pays an average wage straight time of $0.92½ an hour. There is approximately the same differential between the cost of Canadian peeler logs and domestic peeler logs.

Log cost and labor represent 52 percent of the American mill price of softwood plywood. Therefore, assuming that the other costs of the Canadian manufacturers are equal percentagewise to the American manufacturers, which is certainly not the case, the Canadian manufacturer by his lower wage and lumber costs can produce plywood for 45 cents on a dollar less than the American producer.

HARDWOOD PLYWOOD

The production of hardwood plywood in the United States is approximately 1,000,000,000 square feet surface measure. The principal species are birch and gum. Birch plywood is produced in the Lake and Northeastern States, gum in the Southeastern States. The principal import from Canada is birch plywood on which there is a 25 percent duty. At the present time there is sufficient United States production of hardwood plywood to meet all requirements. Hardwood plywood is not construction material. Canadian birch plywood is presently selling in the United States at less than it costs the United States mills to produce it. The average wage in the United States Plywood Corp.'s plant in Wisconsin is $1.10 an hour straight time, in its Canadian plant at Woodstock, Ontario, it is 83 cents an hour. Birch logs cost $140 in the United States per thousand and in Canada $130 per thousand. Therefore there is an advantage to the Canadian producer of 24 percent in labor costs and 9 percent in log costs or a total in these two items of 33 percent.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last item on which I want to comment is an editorial published in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Teachers' Pay." I make this comment not only as a Member of the Senate, but as president of the Home and School Association of the Alice Deal School in Washington, D. C. In the capacity of president of that association, I have worked this year with parent groups in this city in regard to the plight in which the school teachers find themselves in the District of Columbia.

I not only heartily endorse every word of the editorial on teachers' pay in this morning's Washington Post, but I wish to say that in my opinion the Congress of the United States should set an example for school districts throughout the Nation in regard to teachers' pay. We are not giving to the teachers in the District of Columbia the economic support which I think is justified by the great trust which they have thrust upon them, namely, the training of future citizens of this country. This is a sad reflection on the Congress of the United States. I do not believe that we should adjourn this session without increasing the pay of the teachers in the District of Columbia a minimum of $500 per teacher. I do not know how the taxpayers' money could be better spent so far as a sound return to the Nation is concerned, than by way of an increase in teachers' pay.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial referred to printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHERS' PAY

The praise due Representative GEORGE BATES for initiating congressional action toward a pay increase for District teachers must be qualified on account of the niggardliness of the increase which he has suggested and which the House has approved. A raise of $200 for the year—not quite $4 a week—is certainly, as Dr. Regis Boyle put it, "withering, so far as morale is concerned." It would do almost nothing to enable teachers to cope with the increased cost of living, to restore the dignity of their profession, or to arrest the dangerous drift away from the schools into more remunerative callings.

Among the 20 largest cities in the United States, Washington, according to Superintendent of Schools Hobart Corning, ranks fifteenth on the basis of the average salary paid to teachers in its public-school system. The average teacher salary here is $3,398—in a city where, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, costs are higher than in any other major city in the country. Washingtonians will never secure adequate schooling for their children by a pauperization of the teachers in their schools.

The District's teachers deserve at the very least a pay increase equal to that granted Federal workers. If the pending Federal pay legislation is enacted, some of the janitors in school buildings may be getting more pay than the classroom teachers. Parsimony could be given no more uneconomic form than to exclude teachers from equal benefits. We hope that Congress will act, before its adjournment, to give teachers a pay increase commensurate with their desperate need and with the vital importance of the duties they perform.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2589.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2589) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

ORDER OF BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Chair state the unanimous-consent agreement relative to the calling of the calendar tomorrow morning?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. When the Senate meets tomorrow it will meet under a unanimous-consent agreement to proceed with the call of the calendar of bills and other measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1504, where the previous call of the calendar concluded.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. At the conclusion of the call of the calendar tomorrow, will the Senate then proceed immediately to the consideration of Senate bill 2589, providing for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the understanding of the Chair.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 18, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 17 (legislative day of June 15), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert Alexander, of the District of Columbia.

Charles R. Enlow, of Kansas.

William Kling, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Samuel I. Katz, of Tennessee, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Arthur R. Scroggins, East Tallassee, Ala., in place of J. D. Hilyer, deceased.

J. Ponder Livingston, Eutaw, Ala., in place of J. J. Harkness, deceased.

James C. Mattox, Guin, Ala., in place of J. N. A. Hulsey, deceased.

James D. Jackson, Horton, Ala., in place of J. T. Mabrey, transferred.

Felton Jones, Kennedy, Ala., in place of Tom Dorroh, transferred.

Marvin T. Davis, Letohatchee, Ala., in place of W. L. Adams, deceased.

Pauline B. Sandlin, Magnolia Springs, Ala., in place of J. W. Sandlin, deceased.

John W. Roney, Newville, Ala., in place of L. J. Brannon, retired.

Charles H. Eddins, Jr., Peterman, Ala., in place of Marguerite Helton, resigned.

Oscar Day, Jr., Oakman, Ala., in place of L. W. Richardson, transferred.

ARKANSAS

Orval E. Faubus, Huntsville, Ark., in place of Hugh Murphy, transferred.

Charles L. Duncan, Murfreesboro, Ark., in place of H. M. Austin, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Harry Bergseid, Bell, Calif., in place of C. L. Boren, retired.

Edythe Burgett, El Segundo, Calif., in place of Clyde Burgett, deceased.

Cleo A. Mollring, Galt, Calif., in place of M. B. Bradford, resigned.

Oscar Ditmanson, Lodi, Calif., in place of C. M. Jones, deceased.

Walter J. Degregori, Los Banos, Calif., in place of B. A. Wilson, retired.

Raymond R. Dingle, Middletown, Calif., in place of F. R. Carpenter, resigned.

Puella E. Forbes, Orcutt, Calif., in place of R. A. Osborn, resigned.

Harry H. Lauritzen, Rio Vista, Calif., in place of J. I. Piscus, resigned.

William E. Krenning, San Diego, Calif., in place of D. M. Stewart, retired.

CONNECTICUT

John G. Coffin, Ridgefield, Conn., in place of J. L. Walker, deceased.

Mary T. Doyle, Thomaston, Conn., in place of F. C. Flynn, deceased.

FLORIDA

Myrtle Clare Booth, Cantonment, Fla., in place of M. C. Booth, transferred.

Earl L. Williams, Lady Lake, Fla., in place of L. R. Estell, retired.

Grady A. Warren, Lake City, Fla., in place of O. K. Holmes, resigned.

Evan D. Mixon, Ruskin, Fla., in place of J. P. Linder, resigned.

GEORGIA

Norwood W. Miley, Hahira, Ga., in place of W. H. Massey, deceased.

Jack Herring, Ochlochnee, Ga., in place of S. W. Bulloch, resigned.

Claude Rountree, Thomasville, Ga., in place of B. C. Blanton, deceased.

Evander L. Raulston, Trenton, Ga., in place of W. H. Brock, retired.

ILLINOIS

Fred D. Knaus, Arcola, Ill., in place of J. F. Spellman, resigned.

William A. Goetz, Bethany, Ill., in place of H. L. Bone, transferred.

Gilbert R. Gish, Buda, Ill., in place of R. V. Westervelt, resigned.

Pearl H. Collins, Catlin, Ill., in place of R. O. Huffman, transferred.

Donald L. Doan, Claremont, Ill., in place of J. H. Leathers, deceased.

Marie Little, Dallas City, Ill., in place of Claude Shaffner, retired.

John J. McCaughey, Gurnee, Ill., in place of W. K. Kimball, retired.

Hazel M. Wolf, Sidney, Ill., in place of F. R. Drews, removed.

INDIANA

Lloyd B. Helms, Centerville, Ind., in place of P. L. Helms, transferred.

Harry G. Thompson, Danville, Ind., in place of Bertha Higgins, resigned.

Marion L. Garstka, New Haven, Ind., in place of D. A. Blaising, transferred.

IOWA

Estelle M. Burroughs, Albion, Iowa, in place of B. E. Fraley, retired.

Vernon L. Dinges, Avoca, Iowa, in place of Harry Eckhardt, deceased.

George R. Lewis, Elliott, Iowa, in place of Mable Kinney, deceased.

Raymond J. Gilday, Fort Dodge, Iowa, in place of P. T. Vaughan, retired.

Marjorie B. Cochran, Quasqueton, Iowa, in place of G. B. Garrison, retired.

KANSAS

Harry C. Brooks, Fort Scott, Kans., in place of J. M. Miller, retired.

Harry Lang, Jetmore, Kans., in place of F. R. Wilson, resigned.

Richard D. Wiley, Sedgwick, Kans., in place of J. A. Wiley, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Leland G. Rubarts, Dunville, Ky., in place of O. L. Ellis, retired.

LOUISIANA

Miles K. Hartsell, Rodessa, La., in place of M. K. Hartsell, transferred.

MAINE

Howard Mills Martin, Kennebunk Port, Maine, in place of W. F. Goodwin, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Francis A. Crowley, Boston, Mass., in place of P. J. Connelly, retired.

Malcolm W. Chase, Princeton, Mass., in place of R. J. Gregory, deceased.

Thomas J. Gilgun, Winchester, Mass., in place of V. C. Ambrose, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Elias William Lyons, Armada, Mich., in place of M. E. Shaw, resigned.

Frank A. Prais, Belleville, Mich., in place of E. T. McGlothlin, resigned.

Woodrow L. LaLonde, Felch, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Darwin H. Van Houten, Sixlakes, Mich., in place of Ward Gibbs, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Joseph F. Ruzek, Hayfield, Minn., in place of Earl Stanton, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Charles C. Provine, Big Creek, Miss., in place of J. H. Seale, deceased.

Ray Bickham Ball, Smithdale, Miss., in place of D. R. Butler, retired.

Owen O. Odom, Steens, Miss., in place of S. L. Brewer, deceased.

MISSOURI

Maude E. Coburn, Arbyrd, Mo., in place of H. K. Bridges, resigned.

Robert G. Simpson, Herculaneum, Mo., in place of G. S. Manning, resigned.

Jacob E. Fry, Stover, Mo., in place of E. J. Fry, retired.

NEBRASKA

Robert K. Corn, Papillion, Nebr., in place of G. P. Miller, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Sesto A. Ferretti, Alpha, N. J., in place of R. B. Sokolowski, deceased.

Stanley John Ryba, Burlington, N. J., in place of R. P. Hughes, retired.

George T. Albrecht, Dover, N. J., in place of Irving Washburn, retired.

Edward J. Breen, Edgewater, N. J., in place of Emery Benoit, retired.

John V. Snow, Hillsdale, N. J., in place of J. S. Hains, deceased.

Joseph Carroll Bransfield, Wildwood, N. J., in place of P. J. Shortt, retired.

William M. Danridge, Wortendyke, N. J., in place of Nora Loughman, resigned.

NEW YORK

Edward Warner, Point Pleasant, N. Y., in place of E. R. Chaffer, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Evelyn J. Sutton, Dillsboro, N. C., in place of E. B. Monteith, retired.

George H. Ross, Wadesboro, N. C., in place of F. M. Mills, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Byron P. Pulles, Stanton, N. Dak., in place of I. D. Thue, deceased.

OHIO

Ida U. Smeltz, Attica, Ohio, in place of R. W. Senn, resigned.

Herbert N. Dunfee, Jacobsburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Michael J. Gaughan, Leetonia, Ohio, in place of H. D. Arnold, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Phil Lee Brown, Cherokee, Okla., in place of H. C. Forde, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

John F. Nally, Carbondale, Pa., in place of P. P. Kelly, retired.

Ruth B. Nyquist, Dagus Mines, Pa., in place of S. P. Veoni, transferred.

Richard P. Albright, Kulpsville, Pa., in place of E. M. Stover, retired.

Luther E. Kunkle, Mount Wolf, Pa., in place of L. A. Strayer, deceased.

Kenneth W. Hoag, Ralston, Pa., in place of L. S. Mansuy, resigned.

William H. Rufe, Jr., Sellersville, Pa., in place of Alexander Alexander, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Gerome H. Stafford, Jr., Latta, S. C., in place of Houston Manning, resigned.

Edmund R. Kaminer, Lexington, S. C., in place of J. H. Fox, retired.

George C. Aycock, Pinewood, S. C., in place of R. J. Aycock, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Earl J. Pierce, Burke, S. Dak., in place of M. E. Smith, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Lawrence J. Bullington, Atwood, Tenn., in place of C. W. Younger, resigned.

D. Naomi Brewer, Madison College, Tenn., in place of R. B. King, resigned.

Russell E. Rankin, Union City, Tenn., in place of E. A. Jones, resigned.

TEXAS

Benjamin F. Sullivan, Jr., Bangs, Tex., in place of L. G. Porter, resigned.

Robert A. Smith, Decatur, Tex., in place of R. T. Rieger, resigned.

Thomas G. Sandel, Huntsville, Tex., in place of L. B. Baldwin, resigned.

Robert J. Quinlivan, Idalou, Tex., in place of Baxter Orr, deceased.

Harold Voss, Post, Tex., in place of P. S. Bouchier, transferred.

Miller J. Sweedan, Sweetwater, Tex., in place of A. G. Lee, resigned.

UTAH

Riley W. Goodfellow, Bountiful, Utah, in place of J. H. Rampton, resigned.

Ted R. Mower, Fairview, Utah, in place of N. S. Brady, transferred.

VIRGINIA

Carroll E. Burgess, Blairs, Va., in place of C. B. Roach, resigned.

Grace P. Hiehle, Mount Vernon, Va., in place of E. J. Monroe, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Douglas P. Salisbury, Chewelah, Wash., in place of H. S. Storms, resigned.

Gladys M. Pearson, Olalla, Wash., in place of M. C. Nelson, retired.

Richard K. Morley, Stevenson, Wash., in place of W. H. Lamm, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Clara Marie Hess, Farmington, W. Va., in place of R. B. Mapel, deceased.

Mary L. Vance, Whitmans, W. Va., in place of Nellie Nix, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Oswald L. Weber, Cedarburg, Wis., in place of G. J. Armbruster, resigned.

Clarence Keith Hammond, De Soto, Wis., in place of Anna Loftus, resigned.

Hazel M. Pfeil, Granville, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 17 (legislative day of June 15), 1948:

UNITED NATIONS

J. Klahr Huddle, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Burma, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America on the Kashmir Commission of the Security Council of the United Nations.

Claude G. Bowers, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Chile, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Latin America established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, February 25, 1948.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William E. DeCourcy to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Haiti.

Harold H. Tittmann, Jr., to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Peru.

To be Foreign Service officers of the class of career minister

Charles E. Bohlen
Herbert S. Bursley
Richard P. Butrick
John M. Cabot
North Winship

To be consul generals of the United States of America

Leo J. Callanan
Carlos J. Warner

To be consuls of the United States of America

Ray L. Thurston
George T. Colman
William C. Burdett, Jr.

To be Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Julius C. Holmes

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Ellis M. Goodwin
Howard P. Jones
S. Shepard Jones
Edwin M. J. Kretzmann
George S. Roper
Harold R. Spiegel

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Charles H. Abbott
Elmer H. Harrelson
Henry L. T. Koren
Eugene L. Padberg, Jr.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Edward T. Barnard
Jules E. Bernard
William T. Carpenter, Jr.
Miss Eileen R. Donovan
George Hubert Maness

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Richard M. Connell
Joseph B. Costanzo
Woodruff Wallner

To be Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Albert E. Carter

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

D. Chadwick Braggiotti
Richard I. Phillips

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

John P. Gardiner
Peyton A. Kerr, Jr.
Robert C. Martindale
Charles Nelson Spinks
Carroll M. Terry

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

William C. Brister
Harry W. Johnstone
Maurice S. Rice
Robert W. Tucker
Joseph A. Todd
David G. Wilson, Jr.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Milton Barall
Joseph Chase
Leon B. Poullada
Richard M. Scammon

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Willard Allan
Russell O. Heater
Paul R. Hughes

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Thorvald A. Solberg to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Fred S. Martin to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Carl K. Connell to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Missouri.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Paul R. Leake to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

To be rear admirals

Capt. Lucien M. Grant
Capt. Lloyd Harrison
Capt. Roy T. Cowdrey

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

APPOINTMENTS IN THE COAST GUARD

To be lieutenant, to rank from December 1, 1943

Arthur E. Mueller

To be lieutenants (junior grade), to rank from January 1, 1947

George W. Miller
Ralph W. Niess
Mark P. Mitchell
Frederick N. Lattin
William O. Schach
Robert B. Long
Robert G. Schwing
Hubert W. Cocklin
James J. Hill
Robert D. Winship
Alvin N. Ward
Risto A. Mattila
William D. Ball, Jr.
James A. Dillian
William C. Brown
Robert I. Price
George T. Richardson
Frank C. Anderson
Robert J. Healy
Frances A. Tubeck
Robert L. Kallin
John P. Obarski
Gerald G. Brown
Winford W. Barrow
Clifford P. Peistrup
Robert E. Williams
William R. Banks
Stanley B. Russell
Joseph B. O'Hara
Marc Welliver II
Willis N. Seehorn
Leslie J. Williamson
Martin W. Flesh
Eugene E. McCrory
David R. Rondestvedt
James C. Heffernan
Jesse G. Magee
Kevin L. Moser
Jack D. Lyon
Douglas H. Clifton
Allen C. Pearce
David G. Walker
William D. Ebright
David C. Porter
Abe H. Siemens
James H. B. Morton
Robert R. Hagan, Jr.
Paul A. Tansen
David D. Fritts
Laurence M. Newkirk
Spencer M. Higley
Herbert J. Lynch
William G. Donaldson
Leslie M. Greig
Christopher S. Changaris
Mario J. Cataffo
Meindert P. Boon
Casimir S. Rojeski
James R. Iversen
Philip M. Hildebrandt
Norman L. Scherer
Charles W. Berkman
Paul W. Welker
John J. Barry

To be lieutenants (junior grade), to rank from January 15, 1947

George A. Choquette
Leroy B. Smith
George A. Gyland
John Kruszewski
Floyd L. Hartson
Jacob C. Sorensen
Earl G. Hamilton
Lloyd S. Sadler
Loren V. Perry
Franklin H. Schonewolf
Clemons C. Pearson
Elmer Winbeck
Charles W. Smith
Nathan Vanger
Alton F. Pinkham
Erriest W. Payne
Axel R. Mattson
Marvin H. Twiford
Charles B. Martinson, Jr.
Leland O. Wilkie
Orville C. Hinnen
Byron M. Wineke
Adam Stanzak
Paul A. Berg
Olaf T. Sturdy
Thomas B. Prather
James G. Cowart
Carl D. Eubanks
Ronald S. Krueger
Mart L. Jackson
Sterling M. Anderson
Harry S. Raleigh
Leo J. A. King
William S. Bishop
Henry J. Pfeiffer
Thomas C. Pennock
Hugh E. McCullough
Alvin J. Boxwell
Willard E. Carlson
Hugh J. LeBlanc
David T. Haislip
Stanley L. Waltzfelder
Harold D. Muth
James C. Boteler
Richard L. Huxtable
John Vukic

To be lieutenant commanders, to rank from December 1, 1942

Ferdinand Lederle

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

To be captains in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective June 3, 1948

Henry W. Hemple
Casper M. Durgin
Oliver S. Reading
Francis L. Gallen
John A. Bond
Cornelius D. Meaney
Augustus P. Retti

To be captain in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective August 1, 1948

Earl O. Heaton

To be captains in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective September 1, 1948

William M. Scaife
Robert F. A. Studds
Henry C. Warwick

To be captain in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective October 1, 1948

Benjamin H. Rigg

To be commanders in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective June 3, 1948

Ronald R. Moore
Ralph W. Woodworth
Leo C. Wilder
Henry E. Finnegan
Charles M. Thomas
Charles Pierce
Thomas B. Reed
Jack C. Sammons
Robert W. Knox
H. Arnold Karo
Edgar H. Bernstein
George L. Anderson
Isidor E. Rittenburg
Kenneth G. Crosby
Glendon E. Boothe
Earle A. Delly
Leonard S. Hubbard
Philip C. Doran
Hubert A. Paton
Walter H. Bainbridge
Carl I. Aslakson
Paul A. Smith
John C. Rose
Riley J. Sipe
Samuel B. Grenell
Frank G. Johnson
William M. Gibson
Ralph L. Pfau

To be commanders in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective December 1, 1948

Alvin C. Thorson
Joe C. Partington
Ector B. Latham

To be lieutenant commanders in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective June 3, 1948

A. Newton Stewart
Max G. Ricketts
Clarence A. George
Robert A. Earle
Harry F. Garber
Karl B. Jeffers
John Laskowski
Ross A. Gilmore
Gilbert C. Mast
Fred A. Riddell
Ira R. Rubottom
Maurice E. Wennermank
Fred Natella
Jeremiah S. Morton
Robert A. Marshall
Edward B. Brown, Jr.
John C. Ellerbe
Maurice A. Hecht
John C. Tribble, Jr.
James C. Tison, Jr.
Edmund L. Jones
Kenneth S. Ulm
Clarence R. Reed
William C. Russell
Junius T. Jarman
Herman C. Applequist
William F. Deane
Edgar F. Hicks, Jr.
John C. Bull
Arthur L. Wardwell
Emmett H. Sheridan
Raymond H. Tryon, Jr.
Chester J. Beyma
Joseph E. Waugh
Dorland H. Konichek
Philip A. Weber
Paul Taylor
Horace G. Conerly
Charles F. Chenworth
Charles A. Schoene
William N. Martin
Harold J. Seaborg
Fair J. Bryant
Charles W. Clark
Glenn W. Moore

To be lieutenants in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective June 3, 1948

Don A. Jones
David M. Whipp
Francis X. Popper
Howard S. Cole
Harry D. Reed

To be lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective December 16, 1948

Raymond M. Stone

To be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective July 5, 1948

Hubert W. Keith, Jr.

To be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective July 6, 1948

Walter B. Hamstrom

To be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective July 12, 1948

Dale E. Fisher

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Henry W. Kassel
Edward K. Reid

To be scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Malcolm J. Williams
Jerry W. Carter, Jr.
John C. Eberhart

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948

Lee C. Watkins
William P. Ossenfort
Joseph O. Dean
Ivan W. Steele
Kenneth R. Nelson
Vane M. Hoge
Frank F. Thweatt, Jr.
Gilbert L. Dunnahoo
Eddie M. Gordon
Ralph Gregg
Edwin G. Williams
Gerald M. Kunkel
Harold D. Lyman
Frederick W. Kratz
John D. Lane, Jr.
Donald J. Hunt
Chapman H. Binford
John A. Trautman
Joseph A. Bell
Edward C. Rinck
Gordon A. Abbott
Sidney P. Cooper
George W. Bolin
Waldemar C. Dreessen
Noka B. Hon
Otis L. Anderson
Claude D. Head, Jr.
Mason V. Hargett
Cassius .'. Van Slyke
Thurman H. Rose
Victor H. Vogel
Thomas B. McKneely
William G. Workman
Robert K. Maddock
Alfred B. Geyer
Robert H. Flinn
Roy E. Butler
Leland J. Hanchett
Richard C. Arnold
Austin V. Deibert
John L. Wilson
Leslie M. Smith
Llewellyn L. Ashburn
Oliver C. Williams
B. Oliver Lewis
Clifton K. Himmelsbach
John W. Oliphant
Seymour D. Vestermark
Hollis U. Maness
Leroy E. Burney
Charles R. Mallary
Michael J. Pescor
Don S. Cameron
George H. Hunt
Harry Eagle
Dean A. Clark
Norvin C. Kiefer
Myron D. Miller
George L. Fite
Arthur W. Newitt
H. van Zile Hyde
Robert H. Felix
Walter P. Griffey

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948

Virgil J. Dorset
John R. McGibony
Robert F. Martin
Herman E. Hilleboe
Theodore L. Perrin
Harris Isbell
David J. Zaugg
Howard D. Fishburn
Rolla R. Wolcott
James F. Lane
John N. Bowden
Ralph B. Hogan
Waldo B. Edwards
Vernon B. Link
Norman H. Topping
James A. Grider, Jr.
Byron J. Olson
Harold R. Sandstead
Clarence A. Smith
Richard H. Smith
John A. Lewis, Jr.
Dale C. Cameron
Leo D. O'Kane
Jack L. James
Leon S. Saler
Thomas A. Hathcock, Jr.
Robert C. Dunn
Randall B. Haas
Charles G. Spicknall
Vernam T. Davis
Harold T. Castberg
Terrence E. Billings
James R. Shaw
James Watt
Edgar B. Johnwick
Lawrence W. Brown
Francis J. Weber
Thomas R. Dawber
Theodore F. Hilbish
Michael L. Furcolow
George E. Tooley, Jr.
Robert L. Zobel
Thomas F. Crahan
Raymond F. Kaiser
Glenn S. Usher
James V. Lowry
Harold M. Graning
Karl Habel
Francis T. Zinn
Robert T. Hewitt
Robert R. Smith
Murray A. Diamond
Max R. Kieselbach
Weldon A. Williamson
Robert D. Wright
Joseph S. Spoto
Aaron W. Christensen
John P. Turner
Waldron M. Sennott
Benjamin Highman
Curtis G. Southard
Daniel J. Daley
James J. Griffith
John B. Vander
Albert L. Chapman
George K. Massengill
Michael B. Shimkin
Lloyd S. Rolufs
Dorland J. Davis
Joseph C. Sturgell
Robert A. Hingson
Robert L. Griffith
Kenneth W. Chapman
James K. Shafer
Benno K. Milmore
John D. Porterfield
John T. Wright
Benjamin Wolfman
Allen B. Eschenbrenner
Ralph W. McComas
William J. Brown
Louis Jacobs
Bryan A. Dawber
Carl L. Larson
James A. Smith
Glen E. Ogden
George F. Ellinger
David B. Wilson
John F. Oesterle
James L. Southworth
Joe M. Chisolm
Clarence L. Hebert
Leslie W. Knott
Robert J. Anderson
William H. Stimson
William S. Baum
Albert N. Sarwold
William G. Budington
Kenneth M. Endicott
Samuel S. Spicer
James B. Donaldson
Jesse D. Harris
Malcolm J. Ford
Donald W. McNaughton
Edwin N. Hesbacher
James A. Finger
Robert Lincoln Smith
George E. Parkhurst
Arnold B. Kurlander
Stanley E. Krumbiegel
Gabriel P. Ferrazzano
Emerson Y. Gledhill
Clarence B. Mayes
Mark E. Myers
Daniel MacKillop
Ray H. Vanderhook
William J. McAnally, Jr.
Nunzio J. Carrozzo
Carl Enna
W. Clark Cooper
Robert W. Black
Clarence Kooiker
Harold J. Magnuson
Jack C. Haldeman
Walter S. Mozden
Paul C. Campbell, Jr.
David E. Price
Charles L. Williams, Jr.
Charles C. Shepard
James L. Baker
Wayne W. Carpenter
Selwyn H. Drummond
Timothy J. Haley
Michael J. Clarke
Linden E. Johnson
James M. Hundley
Russell I. Pierce
Luther L. Terry

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948

Richard H. Linn
Clarke W. Mangun, Jr.
Leland C. Burrill
Warfield Garson
Willie G. Simpson
Keith F. Farr
Norman C. Morgan
Robert E. Staff
John W. Smillie.
Sidney Krohn
William P. Ramey
Leo J. Gehrig
Robert Leslie Smith
Arthur E. Mikil
Stuart H. Nartel
David S. Citron
Leonard T. Kurland
Robert B. Shelby
Carl A. Boswell
William A. Himmelsbach
Thomas A. Burch
John G. Robinson
Andrew L. Hoekstra
Gordon B. Wheeler
Alan D. Miller
Charles L. A. Wehr
Louis B. Thomas
Leon T. Atlas
Harry E. Halden III
Martin M. Cummings
Robert B. Dorsen
John C. Wyre III
Albert V. Myatt
Frederic D. Regan
Gove Hambidge, Jr.
Lewis Francis Kirkland C. Brace
Hans R. Huessy
Terrell O. Carver
Milton J. Miller
John H. Miller
Elroy G. Burgwald
Carl R. Reed
Carroll D. Savage
John P. Lombardi
Vincent E. Price
Frederick G. Germugh, Jr.
Daniel Shapiro
Robert H. Dysinger
Robert B. Neu
John J. Antel
Heinz R. Weisheit
Roy P. Lindgren
Edmund V. Cowdry, Jr.
Gleb A. Nedzel
Alton Meister
Clyde H. Dabbs, Jr.
Robert S. Weinhaus
W. Burton Haley
Ralph T. Behling
Marion F. Graham
LaVere G. White
Lindsay K. Bishop
Howard W. Halfman
Robert E. Greenfield, Jr.
Eugene A. Vaccaro
Clarence A. Velat
James R. Green
Maurice W. Peterson
Charles C. Griffin, Jr.
Robert D. Dooley
John S. McMillin
Kenneth W. Horne
Robert M. Farrier
Stuart M. Seesoms
James B. Dukes
Francis P. Nicholson
Robert A. Mattingly, Jr.
Robert C. Rodger
Luther E. Smith
Joseph Leighton
Sheldon Dray
Donald Harting
Cornelius J. O'Donovan
C. Brooks Fry, Jr.
Robert E. Westfall
M. Lawrence Brockmyer
Donn G. Mosser
Henry D. Smith
Robert P. Ralls
Henry C. Savage
A. McCheaney Evans
John L. Lightburn
Virgil Hanson
Raymond N. Brown
Raymond G. Halvorson

To be senior dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948

David Cooper
Fritz R. Jackson
John A. Hammer
James F. Lewis

Thomas L. Hagan
Leonard R. Etzenhouser

IOWA

Harvey H. Bozeman, Mascot.

The following-named officers for appoint-

wide for the disposition of certain records

Thomas L. Hagan — Leonard R. Etzenhouser
Ray P. Breaux
James S. Miller — Mark E. Bowers
Gordon G. Braendle — Joseph J. Dunlay
John M. Francis — Walter J. Pelton
Charles B. Galt — Robert H. Moore
Robert A. Scroggie — Frank E. Law
Leland E. Weyer

To be dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948

Charles H. Wright, Jr. — Clovis E. Martin
Howard J. Woodbridge — Donald J. Galagan
Francis A. Arnold, Jr. — Joseph E. Unsworth
William W. Calhoun, Jr. — James O. Blythe, Jr.
George E. Waterman — Fred D. Lewis, Jr.
William C. Neal — Francis J. Walters
Joseph G. Yount — Vernon J. Forney

To be senior assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948

Richard P. French
Joseph W. Fridl
Charles P. White

To be senior sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel) effective July 1, 1948

Ellis E. Tisdale — James H. Le Van
Omar C. Hopkins — Franz J. Maier
Vincent B. Lamoureux — Maurice LeBosquet, Jr.

To be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948

Walter N. Dashiell — Ralph Porges
Mark D. Hollis — James G. Terrill, Jr.
Frank E. DeMartini — Richard T. Page
Vernon G. MacKenzie — John S. Wiley
Gordon E. McCallum — August T. Rossano, Jr.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948

William W. Payne
Frank A. Butrico
Henry J. L. Rechen

To be engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948

Joseph E. Flanagan, Jr.
Lucian E. Renes

To be senior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948

Donald E. Wenschhof
Robert E. Jones
Henry L. Verhulst

To be senior scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948

Heinz Specht
G. Robert Coatney

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective July 1, 1948

Anne K. Buck — Jennie H. Rakich
Mary F. Callan — Janine A. Dziejowski
Dorothy L. Connors — Anne Woudema
Rita A. Arst — C. Vistula Lancaster
Vivian L. Gibson — Virginia L. Roberts
Roberta C. Brave — Ruth I. Webb
Margaret M. Cahalan — Alice M. Driscoll
Mildred K. McDermott — Nelle F. McCarthy
Mary B. Krause — Elaine Felt
Mary C. Larkin — Pauline M. Gronas
Emilie S. Wilson — Ann M. Zidzik
Mary E. Evans — Elsie M. Pinkham
Florence J. Ullman

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Ted Bauer, Benton.
Winifred Hughes, Broughton.
Joseph J. Smaron, Posen.

INDIANA

John Edgar Sachs, Evansville.
Lawrence S. Miller, Grimth.

IOWA

Baird Jennings Okey, Dayton.
Harold A. Lofgreen, Montezuma.
Wilda Stephenson, Packwood.

KENTUCKY

Orland C. Seeley, Corbin.

LOUISIANA

Bernard Buras, Buras.

MARYLAND

Patrick J. Byrne, Berwyn.
Donald N. Canada, Glen Echo.
William Paul Graham, Mardela Springs.
Ruby C. Williams, Prince Frederick.
Dorothy M. Phillips, Shady Side.

MASSACHUSETTS

Grace S. Whippee, Barre.
Lawrence J. O'Brien, East Bridgewater.
Daniel G. Dowd, North Amherst.

MICHIGAN

Edward J. Murphy, Kawkawlin.
August M. Huotari, Mass.
Emanuel W. Rupprecht, Reese.
Glenn W. Herzog, Romulus.
Robert M. Engemann, Rothbury.
Max P. Frederick, Sandusky.
August L. Babel, Traverse City.
Henry A. Gready, Walled Lake.
Frank M. Forteika, Wellston.

MINNESOTA

Joe W. Cain, Alpha.
Henning O. Mickelson, Carson Lake.
Harold V. Nelson, Clitherall.
Frank A. Heidemann, Courtland.
Elmer H. Haugland, Hazel Run.
Orville L. Bahl, Holloway.
Arthur M. Eykyn, Lamberton.
Edward J. Bach, Lismore.
Helene A. Ingstad, Marcell.
Joseph W. Henning, Miltona.
Lawrence H. Wegner, Raymond.
Leo L. Panneck, Taunton.

MISSISSIPPI

Edward M. Commander, Ackerman.
Conway F. Dickey, Alligator.
Marvin C. Miller, Blue Springs.
Josephine R. Brown, Bolton.
John H. Henderson, Carthage.
Charles D. Bragg, Crawford.
Jennie S. Catching, Georgetown.
James H. Boyette, Goodman.
Odessa C. Cockerham, Gunnison.
Dickson L. Hall, Hollandale.
Claude W. Johnson, Kilmichael.
Valley L. Carpenter, Morgan City.
William H. Baldwin, Natchez.
Kay Eakin, Pattison.
Barney W. Burnett, Rienzi.
Norman Terrence Poore, Jr., Tunica.
Nola W. Long, Whitfield.

MONTANA

Alfred E. Heikkila, Roberts.
Winnie M. Rife, Roy.

NEW JERSEY

John F. Leahy, Sea Girt.

NEW MEXICO

Calixto Garcia, Central.
Donna A. Klepper, Jal.

NEW YORK

Doris D. Smith, Hemlock.
Helen M. Woodin, Poughquag.
Sister M. Leontine, Stella Niagara.

NORTH CAROLINA

John Lynn Jones, Clarkton.
Charles L. Ray, Flat Rock.
Thomas E. Bivins, Hillsboro.
Grady R. Hemphill, Julian.
Robert R. Kesainger, Nags Head.
John L. Kearns, Sesgrove.

OREGON

Thomas O. Palmer, Albany.

TENNESSEE

George W. Sexton, Dover.
Jefferson C. Roberts, Jr., Hilham.
Harvey H. Bozeman, Mascot.
Paul F. Brooks, Portland.
Y. Z. Pate, Rutherford.
Vernon A. Poole, Savannah.

VERMONT

Susie M. Eastman, East Hardwick.
Andrew P. Morrison, Springfield.

VIRGINIA

A. Biedler Heltzel, Harrisonburg.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of First Lt. Vincent William Bezich and other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 14, 1948, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of First Lt. Vincent William Bezich on page 8395 and ending with the name of First Lt. Frances Mildred Davison on page 8403.

IN THE AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Harry M. Berry — Phillip E. Hodge
Tommy F. Butler — Thomas M. Knoles III
John D. Gowgill — John R. Newton, Jr.
Raymond Goss, Jr. — Richard N. Rusk

IN THE NAVY

PERMANENT APPOINTMENT IN THE SUPPLY CORPS OF THE NAVY IN THE GRADE HEREINAFTER STATED, AND TO CORRECT THE SPELLING OF THE NAME AS PREVIOUSLY NOMINATED AND CONFIRMED

Lieutenant

Werner, Sherwood H.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENT IN THE SUPPLY CORPS OF THE NAVY IN THE GRADE HEREINAFTER STATED

Lieutenant

Gardiner, Charles V.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

Francis J. McQuillen — Ben Z. Redfield
Luther S. Moore — Clifford H. Shuey
Harry S. Leon — Edward J. Dillon
Charles J. Schlapkohl

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Ross S. Mickey — Henry Aplington II
Robert G. Owens, Jr. — Francis X. Beamer
Homer Sterling — George F. Waters, Jr.
Kenneth E. Martin — Richard I. Moss
John A. White — Lloyd G. Coutts

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Bennet G. Powers.
Martin E. W. Oelrich.
Jack F. McCollum.

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Ralph E. Britt — Donald V. Anderson
Delmar M. Persinger — Donald T. Rohrabacher
James B. Carpenter, Jr. — John P. Lanigan
George H. Hazel
Bernard McShane — Henry W. Hise
Maurice H. Clarke — Robert Floeck
Robert A. McCabe — Frank S. Krasniewicz
Richard J. Morrisey — Griffith B. Doyle
Jack R. Munday — John S. Reamy
Frank C. Thomas — Alton P. Trapnell

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Austin O. DeVol, Jr. — Woodrow B. Lewis
Jack W. Temple — Joseph A. Mitchell
Herbert A. Nelson — Tolbert T. Gentry
Warren R. Young — Neil Dimond
Sylvestus W. Holtzclawe — Henry D. Menzies
Malcom C. Hagan
Anton N. Fassino — George G. Abadie
Elery G. Poppe — John L. Shearer
Walter P. Dean — George C. Henshaw
Robert G. Hayton — Walter L. Redmond
Ardell Ebel — Robert H. Barrow
William C. Doty, Jr. — Alvin J. Jensen

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Winslow E. Lewis — John K. Aller
Joseph S. Hall — Francis J. Field
Robert H. Piehl — Robert W. Barnes
Byron G. Genung — Jonee L. Helms
Cleon E. Nesbitt — Ermine L. Meeker
Frank R. DeNormandie — Ollie B. Porter
James C. Barr — Ernest C. Hargett
John A. Waters — James B. Oliver, Jr.
Raymond O. Ball — Allen B. Clark

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Harold E. Haught
Robert W. Wells

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Francis Finnegan, O. P., St. Dominic's Catholic Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most just and merciful God, look down with favor upon these Thy lawmakers. Enlighten their minds and strengthen their wills, that they may, in all times and places, do good and avoid evil, that they may always be in conformity with Thine adorable will. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2759. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a post-office building at Bunker Hill, Ill.; and

S. 2877. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta; and

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. National Archives.
6. Federal Security Agency.
7. Interstate Commerce Commission.
8. Veterans' Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2821) entitled "An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CONNALLY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2825) entitled "An act to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CONNALLY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that he will receive requests for extension of remarks only. No 1-minute speeches.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper items.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House today for 10 minutes, after any other special orders which may have been entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 114]

Bell — Clark — Dirksen
Boykin — Curtis — Domengeaux
Brown, Ohio — Dawson, Ill. — Douglas
Carroll — Dingell — Eberharter
Fenton — King — Scoblick
Fuller — Lane — Simpson, Pa.
Grant, Ala. — Ludlow — Smathers
Gwinn, N. Y. — Lusk — Smith, Maine
Harness, Ind. — Macy — Stigler
Harris — Meade, Md. — Stockman
Hartley — Mitchell — Teague
Havenner — Morrison — Thomas, N. J.
Hébert — Norton — Welch
Hendricks — O'Toole — West
Herter — Peden — Whitaker
Hinshaw — Regan — Wilson, Ind.
Jenkins, Ohio — Rivers — Wood
Johnson, Okla. — Robertson
Johnson, Tex. — Sadowski

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION ACT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the consideration of the veto message on the bill S. 110.

The question is, Will the House on reconsideration agree to pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] is recognized.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, this matter has been debated on several occasions in the House. It is an issue with which everyone is familiar. I do not think any good purpose would be served by having extended debate on the matter.

Preliminary to that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put that request later.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I object. I demand the regular order.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the consent request.

The SPEAKER. The request is withdrawn.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House on reconsideration pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 297, nays 102, answered "present" 1, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—297

Abbitt — Blackney — Chapman
Allen, Calif. — Bland — Chelf
Allen, Ill. — Boggs, Del. — Chenoweth
Allen, La. — Boggs, La. — Chiperfield
Andersen, H. Carl — Bolton — Church
Anderson, Calif. — Boykin — Clark
Andresen, August H. — Bradley — Clason
Andrews, Ala. — Bramblett — Clevenger
Andrews, N. Y. — Brehm — Clippinger
Angell — Brophy — Coffin
Arends — Brooks — Cole, Kans.
Arnold — Buck — Cole, Mo.
Auchincloss — Buckley — Cole, N. Y.
Bakewell — Buffett — Cooper
Banta — Bulwinkle — Corbett
Barrett — Burke — Cotton
Bates, Mass. — Burleson — Coudert
Battle — Busbey — Courtney
Beall — Byrnes, Wis. — Cravens
Bender — Canfield — Crawford
Bennett, Mich. — Carson — Crow
Bennett, Mo. — Case, N. J. — Cunningham
Bishop — Case, S. Dak. — Curtis
Blackney — Chadwick — Davis, Tenn.

Davis, Wis.	Jensen	Plumley
Dawson, Utah	Johnson, Calif.	Potter
Devitt	Johnson, Ill.	Potts
D'Ewart	Johnson, Ind.	Price, Fla.
Dirksen	Jones, N. C.	Priest
Dolliver	Jones, Wash.	Rains
Domengeaux	Jonkman	Ramey
Dondero	Judd	Reed, Ill.
Donohue	Kean	Reed, N. Y.
Doughton	Kearney	Rees
Eaton	Kearns	Reeves
Elliott	Keating	Rich
Ellis	Keefe	Richlman
Ellsworth	Keogh	Riley
Elsaesser	Kerr	Rizley
Elston	Kersten, Wis.	Rockwell
Engel, Mich.	Kilburn	Rogers, Fla.
Engle, Calif.	Knutson	Rogers, Mass.
Fallon	Kunkel	Rohrbough
Fellows	Landis	Rona
Fenton	Larcade	Russell
Fisher	Latham	Sadlak
Fletcher	Lea	St. George
Foote	LeCompte	Sanborn
Fuller	LeFevre	Barbacher
Fulton	Lemke	Sasscer
Gallagher	Lewis, Ky.	Schwabe, Mo.
Gamble	Lewis, Ohio	Schwabe, Okla.
Garmatz	Lichtenwalter	Scoblick
Gary	Lodge	Scott, Hardie
Gathings	Love	Scott,
Gavin	Lucas	Hugh D., Jr.
Gearhart	Lusk	Scrivner
Gillette	McConnell	Seely-Brown
Gillie	McCowen	Shafer
Goff	McCulloch	Short
Goodwin	McDonough	Sikes
Gore	McDowell	Simpson, Ill.
Graham	McGarvey	Simpson, Pa.
Grant, Ala.	McGregor	Smathers
Grant, Ind.	McMillen Ill.	Smith, Kans.
Gregory	Mack	Smith, Ohio
Griffiths	MacKinnon	Smith, Va.
Gross	Maloney	Smith, Wis.
Gwinn, N. Y.	Manasco	Snyder
Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa	Stanley
Hagen	Mason	Stefan
Hale	Mathews	Stevenson
Hall,	Meade, Ky.	Stratton
Edwin Arthur	Merrow	Sundstrom
Hall,	Meyer	Taber
Leonard W.	Michener	Taile
Halleck	Miller, Conn.	Taylor
Hand	Miller, Md.	Teague
Hardy	Miller, Nebr.	Thompson
Harless, Ariz.	Mills	Tibbott
Harness, Ind.	Mitchell	Tollefson
Harrison	Morrison	Towe
Harvey	Morton	Twyman
Hays	Muhlenberg	Vail
Hébert	Mundt	Van Zandt
Hedrick	Murray, Tenn.	Vorys
Heselton	Murray, Wis.	Vursell
Hess	Nicholson	Wadsworth
Hill	Nixon	Walter
Hinshaw	Nodar	Weichel
Hoeven	Norblad	Whitaker
Hoffman	Norrell	Whittington
Holmes	O'Konski	Wigglesworth
Hope	Passman	Wilson, Tex.
Horan	Patterson	Wolcott
Jackson, Calif.	Peterson	Wolverton
Jamison	Philbin	Woodruff
Jenkins, Ohio	Phillips, Calif.	Worley
Jenkins, Pa.	Phillips, Tenn.	Youngblood
Jennings	Pioeser	

NAYS—102

Abernethy	Douglas	Jones, Ala.
Albert	Durham	Karsten, Mo.
Barden	Eberharter	Kee
Bates, Ky.	Evins	Kefauver
Beckworth	Feighan	Kelley
Bloom	Fernandez	Kennedy
Bonner	Flannagan	Kilday
Brown, Ga.	Fogarty	King
Bryson	Folger	Kirwan
Buchanan	Forand	Klein
Byrne, N. Y.	Gordon	Lanham
Camp	Gorski	Lesinski
Cannon	Gossett	Lyle
Carroll	Granger	McMillan, S. C.
Celler	Hart	Madden
Colmer	Havenner	Mahon
Combs	Hedrman	Mansfield
Cooley	Hobbs	Marcantonio
Crosser	Holifield	Miller, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	Huber	Monroney
Dawson, Ill.	Hull	Morgan
Deane	Isacson	Morris
Delaney	Jackson, Wash.	Multer
Dingell	Jarman	Murdock
Dora,	Javits	Norton
O'Brien	Preston	Spence
O'Hara	Price, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.
Pace	Rankin	Trimble
Patman	Redden	Vinson
Pfeifer	Richards	Wheeler
Pickett	Rooney	Whitten
Poage	Sabath	Williams
Poulson	Sheppard	Winstead
Powell	Somers	Wood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cox

NOT VOTING—30

Bell	Ludlow	Rivers
Blatnik	Lynch	Robertson
Brown, Ohio	McCormack	Sadowski
Harris	McMahon	Smith, Maine
Hartley	Macy	Stigler
Hendricks	Meade, Md.	Stockman
Herter	O'Toole	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, Okla.	Peden	Welch
Johnson, Tex.	Rayburn	West
Lane	Regan	Wilson, Ind.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Herter with Mr. Harris.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Stockman with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Macy with Mr. West.
Mr. McMahon with Mr. Regan.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Sadowski.

Mr. FERNANDEZ changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WHITAKER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER CERTAIN MOTIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of this week it shall be in order for the Speaker at any time to entertain motions to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1, rule XXVII; that it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of this week for the majority leader or the chairman of the Committee on Rules to move that the House take a recess; and that it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of this week to consider reports from the Committee on Rules as provided in clause (2) (b), rule XI, except that the provision requiring a two-thirds vote to consider said reports is hereby suspended during the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Indiana was good enough this morning to state to me generally, and I think rather fully, the bills that the Speaker would in all probability recognize for suspension. They are all agreeable to me except one. Since the action of the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning, and the high-handed manner in which that committee acted in not allowing a Member of the minority, as I understand, to even make a motion or say anything, I could not agree to this request, if it involves a bill of the far-reaching significance as the so-called housing bill.

If that is to come in the list I shall be constrained to object, and if I did not there would be another who would.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, there is, of course, a resolution, as the gentleman knows, which can be called up; and I propose to call it up if this request is objected to. If that course becomes necessary, then of necessity we will say something about the adoption of the resolution; but I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Texas that in 1938 when he was then the majority leader, occupying the position I now hold, an identical resolution was presented. The question arose as to what legislation might be brought out. At that time the so-called reorganization bill was under consideration and there was a question as to whether or not that kind of measure should be considered under suspension. In response to a request from the then minority leader, the now eminent Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], as to what the program might be, the gentleman from Texas, being then the majority leader, replied:

I am not ready to answer right now as to the full program for the remainder of the session, I may say very candidly to the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. That was a very frank statement, the kind the gentleman from Texas always makes, and I am certain that if I had named in the list as highly controversial a matter as the so-called housing bill, that the then minority leader, now Speaker, would have pursued the course I am pursuing at this time.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know about that, but I am sure the gentleman from Texas knows that there are outstanding now 10 to 12 rules, most of them on very important questions that we are trying to clear by Saturday night. Obviously, resort to suspension must be had.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think the gentleman is correct about that, and I wish to say to him also that it is my desire very much for a sine die adjournment on Saturday or earlier because I always go on the theory that it is a good thing for the country to adjourn a Republican Congress at any time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SUSPENSIONS AND RECESSES MADE IN ORDER FOR WEEK

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 685 making in order motions to suspend the rules, motions for a recess, and the consideration of reports from the Committee on Rules, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of this week it shall be in order for the Speaker

at any time to entertain motions to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1, rule XXVII; it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of this week for the majority leader or the chairman of the Committee on Rules to move that the House take a recess, and said motion is hereby made of the highest privilege; and it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of this week to consider reports from the Committee on Rules as provided in clause (2) (b), rule XI, except that the provision requiring a two-thirds vote to consider said reports is hereby suspended during the balance of this week.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York to submit a request.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it require a two-thirds vote to pass this resolution?

The SPEAKER. No; a majority vote is all that is required.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 6705, the Department of the Interior appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bills H. R. 5888 and S. 418 may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that this matter might have been disposed of by unanimous consent. However, I cannot quarrel with the attitude of the gentleman from Texas in his objection to the unanimous-consent request. Since that objection has been made, there is no alternative except to proceed with debate on this resolution.

The gentleman from Texas spoke of one piece of legislation. I may suggest to the House that there are a number of rules pending from the Rules Committee dealing with matters of considerable importance, such as the fuel-policy matter from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a rule to amend the rules of the House in regard to striking out remarks from the RECORD, the Virgin Islands Corporation bill, revision of the Internal Revenue Code, the matter relating to motor carriers' claims, the matter of the extension of the terms of the Atomic Energy Commission, the bill pertaining to extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the matter of pay raise for postal employees and postage rate increases, and a bill to increase Federal salaries generally, and the air parcel-post bill.

There are also many other matters of considerable consequence on which rules have not been granted that many Members have urged upon me as important that action be taken on them as expeditiously as possible.

There are some bills from the Veterans' Affairs Committee which fall in that category, and there are some bills from the Foreign Affairs Committee that also come within that category. There are a number of bills from the Armed Services Committee, one of them having to do with the allowance and longevity pay for service in the academies, and another having to do with a revolving fund for the purchase of cotton and wool fibers for export to Japan, about which many Members have spoken to me.

Mr. SHORT. I hope the distinguished leader will not overlook the Russell bill that would give us some lead, zinc, and manganese. That is most essential.

Mr. HALLECK. That is another matter in which many Members are interested.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all understand that every effort is being made to adjourn the Congress by Saturday night or earlier. I cannot quite agree with the reasons expressed by the gentleman from Texas for that adjournment, because this has been a very, very good Congress. When we get through with the program, as we expect to complete it this week, I am sure the people generally throughout the country will applaud us for what we have accomplished.

Under the rules of the House, if an adjournment resolution were passed now providing for adjournment on Saturday, suspensions would be in order for the rest of the week. I do not know how many of these matters may be called under rules or may be called under suspension of the rules. But, as to that, certainly at the moment no one could expect me to make a definite determination. The whole effort here is to expedite the business of the House on a fair basis.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand, the rule only provides for this week.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. If Congress should go over another week, then it would not apply to next week.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. I might say to the gentleman from Mississippi that that is a restriction that has not heretofore been found in similar resolutions that you people on that side of the aisle used when you were in the majority and had the primary responsibility for the program.

I think probably the best argument that could be made for this resolution was made in 1938 when a similar resolution was offered and presented by the then chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York, Mr. O'Connor. In that presentation, Mr. O'Connor said:

Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution brought in toward the close of a session of Congress.

Its purpose is to expedite the business of the House. It provides that suspensions shall be in order on any day instead of on the first and third Mondays or during the last 6 days of the session. It has been impossible for some years to fix those last 6 days of a session, because the adjournment resolution usually comes in an hour or two before the actual adjournment.

The resolution also provides for recesses of the House rather than adjournment. The chief purpose this servea is to save, in the morning, the reading of a long Journal of the previous day's proceedings. Unfortunately, it also dispenses with the morning prayer.

The third purpose the resolution serves is to permit rules to be brought up on the same day they are reported rather than lying over for 1 day.

These provisions are all directed toward expediting the business of the Congress so we may reach that greatest of national holidays, the day Congress adjourns.

The present Speaker of the House was the minority leader, and he was trying to be fair about it, as we always were in those days and as you gentlemen are now. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] said:

This resolution is generally reported when we are about to adjourn. The House, I am sure, would like to have some assurance upon the point before we grant this additional power to the Speaker and to the leadership. Can the gentleman from New York tell us whether we are going to adjourn this week, or next week, a month from now, or 2 months from now?

In substance the answer of the gentleman from New York, Mr. O'Connor, was that he could not tell them very much about it.

Then the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] raised the question as to whether or not they might be given a little information as to what major legislation was to be considered before adjournment, and the answer of the gentleman from New York was:

I think the gentleman knows that, if he reads the daily press.

I have endeavored to be a little more helpful than that. Yesterday and today I outlined a number of possible suspensions that might be called. Of course, I do not know exactly why the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], being a newspaper man himself, said this, but he said:

We do not believe all we read in the newspapers.

Then I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] got into the discussion, too. But the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] yielded himself 5 minutes, and he said this:

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much the gentleman from New York does not seem to have very much information as to the future legislative situation. I had hoped we might get some information, because we ought to have it before adopting this important resolution. I am going to pause to see if the majority leader might not want to take the House into his confidence as to what we might expect.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] then replied:

I will after tomorrow.

Then the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] said:

Why not now?

And the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] said:

I am not ready to answer right now as to the full program during the remainder of the session, I may say very candidly to the gentleman.

Of course, that was a candid statement. I think that could not be misunderstood.

Then the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], recognizing the position in which he found himself, said:

I am sorry Members of the House cannot get information before we read it in the newspapers and before passing a resolution which is going to give tremendous power to the House administration; but, of course, you on that side have merely a 4-to-1 majority and can do what you wish. In all fairness, though, the House should have this information before a resolution of this sort is called up.

Whereupon, after a rather perfunctory debate, the question was put, and on a division, which did not even go to a roll call, the resolution was adopted.

All I am pointing out is that there is nothing new in this procedure. It is well established. By this resolution we seek only to expedite the consideration of business before us. There are a number of measures here in which every Member has a great interest. The whole country has an interest in them. We can move forward to the accomplishment of the program if we follow the practice that has heretofore been followed and adopt this resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the real issue here is the housing bill. Let there be no deception about that fact. The real issue involved in the consideration of this resolution today is whether or not Congress is going to pass the housing bill, because if this resolution is adopted there will be no housing legislation, and I make that prediction. If the House leadership wanted to and if they stated they would do so, they could bring up the bill reported out of the committee, which is the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, under a suspension. They could have done that last Monday, the last suspension day, and they could do it now if they wanted to. But we know that this resolution is designed to bring up the meaningless Wolcott bill, the purpose of which is to prevent the passage of decent housing legislation by Congress before adjournment. The intention is to pass the bill under suspension, if they can, and send it over to the other House, with that bill over there and with the Senate bill over here. I predict that they will not even move or take steps to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert this bill, and then send it to conference.

The resolution under consideration today is entirely different from the resolutions in the past. We never were in this predicament where there were so many big or major measures pending. The ordinary resolution permitting the Speaker to recognize for suspensions is entirely different from the present situation. There are from 8 to 12 major pieces of legislation now pending, according to the statement of the majority leader. The intention is to bring them up under suspension of the rules, denying the opportunity of amendment in any one of those cases of major legislation, and taking away from the minority even its inherent right to a motion to recommit.

The gentleman from Indiana proceeded upon the theory that what was done in 1938 was wrong. Certainly our beloved Speaker now at that time as minority leader took the position that it was wrong. Because it was wrong then it is claimed that it is all right for the Republican leadership to do something wrong now. I never knew that two wrongs made one right, assuming that the contention of the gentleman from Indiana that it was wrong in 1938 is correct. But the situation in 1938 was entirely different from what it is today. There were not a dozen pieces of major legislation waiting to be acted upon under suspension of the rules.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Of course we have had the resistance of the Executive, and we have had all of these vetoes which have delayed the work of the Congress. The legislation that this Congress has passed has been so meritorious that you voted to override the veto of a President who is the leader of your own political party.

Mr. McCORMACK. If you had not put up bum legislation to the President, you would not have had these vetoes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana says that this is a very good Congress. That is a matter of judgment. I respect my friend's right to think so. We have a perfect right to our own opinion. There has been a 40-percent increase in the cost of living to the people of America during the past 2 years, and nothing has been done by the Congress and nothing is going to be done. Still he says that it is a very good Congress. There are lobbies of all kinds operating here, not only through the corridors, but actually in committee rooms. A record that supports everything that President Truman has been saying has been made, not only during the Congress, but during the present week by the Republican Party in control of this body. Only yesterday a very distinguished Republican outside of this body criticized the very action that was taken on the housing bill. What is the housing situation? What has happened? The other body passed a bill. It went to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House. Against the efforts of the Republican leadership, a bill was reported out substantially the same as the bill passed by the other body. Then it went to the Committee on Rules. We know what happened. It comes back this morning after being introduced yesterday in committee stripped of any important features. They met, and at 2 minutes past 10 the bill was reported out. The chairman said, "Put down on the record that it was at 9:59." Not a Democrat was permitted to offer a motion to amend the bill. That is what happened only this morning. This resolution is designed primarily to consider the housing bill under suspension of the rules so that amendments will not be permitted and a motion to recommit cannot be made.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will this procedure under suspension of the rules also make in order matters which would normally be subject to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means—in other words, you have no way of challenging a point of order against the housing bill which incorporates a great tax advantage for the rich?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is absolutely correct. Nothing can be done under the procedure on suspension of the rules. Yet the gentleman from Indiana says that this is a very, very good Congress.

President Truman had a little something to say about that the other day at Los Angeles; and he made a fair statement. I quote:

I made this trip to tell you the facts. If I am wrong, you have a chance to attend to me later on. If I am not wrong, you ought to attend to somebody else.

That is fair. That "somebody else" is the Republican Party.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, he challenged the passage of the so-called Taft-Hartley labor bill, for which 108 Democrats voted and against which 67 Democrats voted. I wonder if he was slapping some of the Members on your side of the aisle.

Mr. McCORMACK. So the gentleman is relying on that as justification for the Republican vote, is he? Well, the gentleman cannot get away with that.

How many Republicans voted for the Taft-Hartley bill?

Mr. HALLECK. All but 11.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. All but 11. So the gentleman proceeds upon the theory that because a number of Democrats

voted for it he is going to absolve the Republicans from their wrongdoing in voting for legislation that is repressive of and punitive to labor.

Now, we have the issue presented here, the issue that the people of the country will know that dictatorial exercise of the rules is being made in order to prevent Members of Congress from having an opportunity to pass upon one of the most important bills that has come before any Congress, and to pass upon it under the rules of the House. If you brought in a closed rule, giving us a motion to recommit, at least you would be preserving the right of the minority to make its record. That is the purpose of a motion to recommit, to enable the minority to make its record before the country, under its right to make a motion to recommit.

So this resolution in relation to the housing bill presents to the people of the country, more pointedly than anything could do, the situation that exists and that this Republican-controlled Congress has been nothing but an against-the-people Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am unwilling to make a matter of party politics out of this resolution.

On yesterday, the resolution came before the Rules Committee on application for a rule and the committee very promptly granted it. It did so because it recognized that the resolution would expedite the consideration of pending matters. There is nothing new in it. It is what has been done in Congresses heretofore.

The point has been made that the purpose of the resolution is to avoid a record vote on the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] who just yielded the floor, probably expresses the views of most Members on this side of the aisle but not for all. That entire question was submitted to the Rules Committee on yesterday and the day before and it was made perfectly clear and perfectly plain that the adoption of that bill would commit this country to socialized housing forevermore.

The Wolcott bill, which has been referred to and which it is said will be called up in the event the pending resolution is adopted, is the old bill stripped of the public-housing features in the original Taft bill and I am assured that it does more for veterans than the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which puts emphasis on public housing rather than housing for veterans.

As far as I am concerned, my sense of obligation to myself and to my country compels me to make clear the position that I take on that proposed legislation. I am opposed to committing this country to socialized housing, and that is what you do if you take that bill.

Let me make this statement: If the pending resolution is voted down, the advocates of the Wolcott bill, the new bill to which reference was made, can still bring that question before the House, because they can go to the Rules Committee now and get a rule and the bill could be called up tomorrow under the rule.

It is true that with a procedure of that kind a record might not be obtained as to how Members of this House stand on the question of socialized housing, but so far I have no hesitation in making clear my position and I hope all Members on this side who have appealed to me as a member of the Rules Committe to hold that bill in the committee would feel the same way about it, and if presented with the issue they will be courageous enough to declare their position on this question.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. Is it not also that stricken out of that bill is the rediscount feature on GI loans and also aid for the building of farm homes?

Mr. COX. I just have this to say on the question of housing: I am interested in providing housing for veterans. There is pending in the House the Rogers bill, the veterans' homestead bill, which bill would be acceptable to me and which I would like to see adopted. I will go as far as any others in doing something for the veterans. They have an especial claim upon the country to the satisfying of which we should give our attention. Certainly providing housing for them, to which nobody objects, should not be conditioned upon doing something that is opposed by a majority of the membership of this House at the same time. The two questions should be divided.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very sincerely to agree with my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], who has just discussed in some detail the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. That bill has been the subject of discussion in the press, on the radio, and elsewhere for many years, and I think the House of Representatives should know just exactly what is transpiring in the Committee on Banking and Currency, insofar as any effort is being made in that committee to solve the most pressing social problem which is facing this Nation today from the standpoint of the veterans and from the standpoint of our civilian population. The House shall know how inadequately we have faced that issue.

The bill that was reported out by the House committee this morning after the House was in session strips the proposed legislation not only of public housing but strips it of every provision for doing a single solitary thing about the slums in the cities. It strips the bill of every provision to aid the veterans, to aid the farmer, and to aid the low-income groups. We had a veterans' homestead provision incorporating the principles of the Veterans' Homestead Act written into this legislation. That is stricken.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am sorry, I have but a few minutes.

Not even sections dealing with certain matters that should be noncontroversial such as housing research are left in the bill. Can anyone tell me why any reasonable man who knows that there are 3,000,000 veterans living doubled up—that there are 2,000,000 others living in single rooms and rooming houses—should object to a research program on the technique of housing construction so that we can improve our methods?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I refuse to yield.

It has been argued that this is socialism. Mr. Speaker, I say that if this is socialism, then the Socialists have made some of the most amazing converts of any party in the history of this Nation. Let me name some of them: Senator Taft, of Ohio; Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan; Governor Dewey, of New York; Governor Warren, of California. Are they Socialists? They favor the T-E-W bill. They are the principal Republican candidates for President.

Let me name a few others: The American Bar Association. Is that a Socialist organization? The organs that speak for the Protestant Churches in America, all divisions of the Protestant Church. Are the Protestant Churches embracing socialism? The organs which speak for the Catholic Church in America. Is the Catholic Church embracing socialism? The governors of this country almost unanimously have endorsed the general housing bill, and practically every mayor of every major city in the United States has endorsed it. So I say that if that be socialism, make the best of it. Of course it is not socialism. It is an honest attempt to solve a pressing problem.

And I may add that every major veterans' organization in America are proponents of the legislation: The AMVETS, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and the other agencies who speak for the men who fought to preserve this country have not, I am sure, adopted socialism, but they are for the T-E-W bill. And why are they for it? Because 15,000,000 young Americans went out to make it possible for you to sit here and debate in the American democratic tradition today.

Mr. DINGELL. One hundred and forty-nine Members signed a petition.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. One-hundred-forty-some-odd Members of this Congress have signed a discharge petition for this legislation. Have they embraced socialism? Mr. Speaker, I say to you with the greatest feeling of sincerity with which I have ever spoken on the floor of this House, that there has never been a measure that has more bipartisan support than the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, why does this legislation have this universal support? Because all over America, in the cities and in the rural areas, people who think about housing know that the major problem facing any family, aside from food and clothing, is a place in which to live. I say to you that the sorriest thing this Eightieth Congress is doing is playing politics with the veterans, with the people who are living in the slums of this country, sending out the message all over America that as this Congress closes its doors on Saturday night, while we have made a show, while we have tried to convince someone we have done something, and while we have brought up the bugaboo and the red herring of socialism, we have done nothing to solve the major social and economic problem facing this Nation.

I venture to say it will be a campaign issue and I hope it will be and I for one as a Democrat shall attempt to make it everywhere on every stump because it is the most important issue facing America. You can yell socialism from now until the time the sun sets next week but it will not alter one iota the fact that this Congress is doing nothing for housing except to satisfy the most greedy, the most selfish, lobby that we have ever seen operating in this body.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does not the gentleman believe the shortage of housing has done more to increase the rate of divorce and juvenile delinquency, and is today the greatest moral issue in this country?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think the fact that all the religious institutions and organizations in America have endorsed this bill is evidence enough that slums and the housing shortage have contributed to the divorce rate, to juvenile delinquency and crime, and to the other evils our body politic is suffering from.

I wish there were some way we could bring before this House the measure the committee voted out 14 to 13, with every Democrat voting for it, and when you talk about socialism that means every Democrat and three members of the Republican Party have voted for socialism. I shall, therefore, vote against the pending resolution.

In conclusion I include an editorial from the New York Times of this morning:

HOUSING: A PARTY TEST

There is no more desperate and basic need in this country than that for housing. This need has been estimated by backers of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, which passed the Senate by voice vote on April 22, at 1,500,000 dwelling units a year for the next 10 years. We owe these homes particularly to our veterans and to young people just coming of marriageable age. If we believe in the American home we have to believe in the living space that makes it possible.

The T-E-W bill tackled this problem from all sides, putting its major emphasis on encouragement to private industry, with low-interest loans and low-cost insurance. But Senator TAFT and his colleagues, who are certainly no Socialists, included a provision for the construction, during the next 5 years, of 500,000 low-rent public housing units. The whole cost of the program to the Federal taxpayer would be about $150,000,000 a year. If we don't owe our veterans and other young people this much help, what do our fine words about youth mean?

In the lower House it has begun to seem that they do not mean much to some Members. By a parliamentary technicality, the main T-E-W provisions were tacked to a bill by Representative WOLCOTT, of Michigan, who is no friend of public housing. Over Mr. WOLCOTT's stormy protests the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which he is chairman, reported the amended bill out by a vote of 14 to 13 a week ago. It then went to that cemetery of so many good bills, the Rules Committee.

Yesterday that committee, with its Republican chairman and majority, voted to table by 6 to 2. Thus, by its power to suppress the measure, it is in effect legislating, for the Banking Committee is now compelled to amend, wreck, or forget the housing bill. This abuse of power does not seem to us fair to our young married people or to the democratic system. We believe it is time the House Republican leaders, who soon will be asking for votes, saw the light. The Republicans will hardly dare go before the country without at least a pretense of housing legislation; many of them, like Senator TAFT and the present Senate majority, are willing to do all they can to meet the crisis.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

(Mr. COMBS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I want to preface what I am going to say by saying that I would not intentionally injure the personal feelings of any Member of this House. I prize the friendships that I have on the other side of the aisle, as well as on this side, and appreciate the fine character of the men and women who compose the membership of this House. It seems to me that in recent days we have gotten into a sort of hysteria in which we forget some fundamentals. In our haste to adjourn we have invoked procedures and permitted ourselves to submit to procedures that could not be justified in any representative legislative body. It has been suggested that the limitation of time makes it necessary to consider bills under suspension of the rules, which, of course, will allow only 40 minutes of debate at most and permit of no amendments whatever. There is no reasonable excuse for this situation. In the first place, we have been in session for many months, during which time full consideration could have been given to such important legislation as housing, Federal employees' pay legislation, selective service, long-range farm legislation, and many others. In the second place, more than 6 months remain of the Eightieth Congress. Like the balance of you, I would like to go home—I have been there only once, and that for a period of 4 or 5 days, since January. But our duty is to consider and pass needed legislation and we should do that even though it requires us to remain here all summer and all the fall.

Now, with regard to the alleged housing bill reported out by the majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning in lieu of the bill passed out by the same committee previously, but upon which the Rules Committee refused a rule. Let me say, in all kindness with reference to this new bill, that to call it a housing bill is a misnomer. It is nothing of the kind. The bill for which it is to be offered as a substitute contains provisions providing for the building of Federal housing, for slum clearance in our great cities and centers of congested population. That provision has been stricken out. It would not have meant so much down where I live in the wide open spaces but it would have meant a lot to the people of our great cities where vast areas of slums exist and to the people of low income who are forced to live two, three, and four families in miserable shacks. Many of those who live in them are ex-servicemen, their wives and children, who have no other place to go. This new bill condemns them to remain where they are. Oh yes, it holds out an offer of housing for them, but how? Free enterprise will come in in the form of some fellow or a syndicate with plenty of cash and build tenement houses. All semblance of rent controls will shortly expire. And for a period of 5 years, under the provisions of this bill, the owner of such tenements not only will be permitted to charge all the traffic will bear but it actually gives a tax rebate of 10 percent per year, over and above the tax bill already passed, on the profits derived. Yes, they will build their big housing projects which the ex-servicemen and others must occupy in this time of housing shortage, and then get a tax rebate over a period of 5 years in order that they may put more of the income extracted from the misery of these people into their pockets.

In the bill for which this was substituted are provisions to give the farm people of our country the benefit of FHA loans to build homes and improve their farms. That is stricken out by this bill. The Rules Committee refused to grant a rule because it is said such provisions are socialistic. Yet the bill merely would have extended to 7,000,000 farm people the same privileges of Government loans in building homes that city dwellers have enjoyed under FHA for 14 or 15 years. Incidentally, the House bill omitted, and I think properly, the provision for a grant of funds to certain persons of low income and merely extended loan privileges to farm people. The bill we are to consider under suspension of the rules denies the rural people of America these privileges.

Talk about farm people being socialistic. I learned as a boy on the farm and as county agricultural agent in the years gone by that farmers are the most independent-minded and individualistic of any group. The very fact that they are self-employed and control their own farm operations, live at home and board at the same place, is conducive to the spirit of liberty and independence. The simple truth is that the farmers of America constitute one of the greatest bulwarks of free, independent Americanism in this country today. Yet you would brand them as socialist-minded because they want the provisions of the bill that have been scuttled. And by this bill you will refuse them a dime of help, in the form of a loan, to improve their own living conditions.

But the new bill not only does that—it also strikes out those provisions of the first bill which gave to the GI's the benefit of a secondary market through RFC for GI loans. Without such provision of a secondary market the farm GI's can get no benefit from the loan provisions of the GI bill. Why, the farm boys, ex-servicemen, who live in the region I represent have not been able to borrow a dime under the provisions of the GI bill to purchase land, build a home, or improve a farm. It was intended when the GI bill was passed that all ex-servicemen would share equally the benefits, but such has not been the case. Some of us have made repeated efforts in this House during the present Congress to have the rediscount provision for farm GI's restored. During consideration of an amendment, which I offered a few weeks ago to the RFC extension bill, which would have restored the rediscount privileges it was promised by the chairman of the committee in opposing my amendment that this would be taken care of in the bill which has now been scuttled. It is omitted completely from the new bill and a phony provision inserted which provides only for certain secondary mortgage privileges which, in fact, mean nothing in actual practice.

Do you want to support such a bill? Listen. I could not support a bill which does such rank injustice to people who are forced to live in slums, to the farm people, and to the ex-servicemen of our Nation.

But in addition to that, I will not support it because of the means that have been used to scuttle a real housing bill and bring this thing before us as a substitute. I may say in this connection that the way the housing bill has been scuttled is but the climax of a series of behind-the-scenes maneuvers by which one important committee after another of the House has been completely ignored by the refusing of rules on important bills or bypassed through the usurpation of their prerogatives by the Appropriations Committee. In some instances, as in the case of the housing bill, some bills meeting the wishes of the controlling group have been forced out of committee under what amounted to an ultimatum that it was this or nothing. The other day when an article appeared in the newspapers indicating that three Members of the majority party had had the courage to defy the ultimatum and vote their convictions I think it sent a thrill throughout America. It was a sort of reassurance to millions of our people that the Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives, would reassert the independence of its Members and their right to consider, debate, and pass upon legislation vital to our people. What a shock those same people must have gotten this morning.

Let me tell you there is something more at stake here today than a housing bill. The faith and confidence of the American people in the ability and courage of their Representatives in this House is at stake. I have sat here many times while some excited Member expressed fear that some "ism" would take over this country and change the form of our Government and thus destroy our freedom. I reflected then that our real security rests upon the solid foundation of the common sense and patriotism of the American people and their attachment to the Constitution and the form of government under which we live. However, our liberties will be in danger when, and only when, our people lose their faith in the institutions of government. It will be only when they lose faith in their elected Representatives and in the system of representative government, our ability and willingness in the Congress to face forthrightly and to solve the great problems of government that seriously affect them.

They have not lost such faith. They still have the ballot and the opportunity to choose Representatives who will face issues with courage.

I would vote against this rule and against the bill it is intended to force through this House if for no other reason than to express my protest against a system and a procedure that will deny to 435 Members of this House the right to consider, deliberate, and debate so important a measure.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regretted having to object to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. My objection could have been removed by his just saying one word, and that was "housing."

I have been here a good while, and I have seen cooperation by the minority with the majority and I have seen it when it was otherwise. If the gentleman from Indiana does not think I have cooperated with the majority pretty well, I might some of these days give him a real demonstration of how to lock the wheels of progress in the House of Representatives. I can do it for 3 hours any day that I choose, and that is at the beginning of the session.

I do not think there has been a time when we have ever passed a rule like this or gotten unanimous consent that the Speaker might recognize to suspend, when anybody raised the question of a bill of as major importance as the housing bill. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] will say to me now, or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] will say to me now that they will not move to suspend the rules on the housing bill but will bring in a rule, closed or otherwise, even giving us the paltry privilege of offering one motion to recommit, there will be no vote against this resolution on my side of the House.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say the housing bill is not before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McCORMACK. That does not answer the question.

Mr. RAYBURN. It could get there pretty fast, and the gentleman knows it. But I do think we are stretching the thing a long way when we are willing to agree that other bills of importance, but not controversial, that would take a great deal of time, can come up under suspension of the rules. I do think you are denying to the American people through their Representatives the right to pass the housing bill that will get houses built.

As to this talk about its being socialistic, where is CLARENCE BROWN, Mr. TAFT's manager. Mr. TAFT happened to father a bill known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It is my understanding that my good friend from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] yesterday before the Committee on Rules for the second time denounced the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as socialistic. I really believe that is the first time I ever heard that great conservative Senator accused of fathering socialistic legislation.

You are going to do this, and in doing it you will in all probability adjourn this Congress without passing any housing bill at all. If you as a party can take that, we will and can make it an issue between now and November.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, having deprived myself of time by mistake, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is almost unbelievable to what extent the Republicans will go to defeat construction of housing and price control, enlarged social security, Federal aid to education, and other legislation which they solemnly promised in the 1946 campaign would be enacted into law. The resolution before us to provide a rule for a so-called housing bill is an illustration of the outrageous collusion on the part of the Republican leadership and its betrayal of promises to enact legislation to provide low-cost homes and homes at reasonable rentals to the American war veterans and to citizens of low and moderate income.

It is deplorable that the avaricious combination of contractors, real-estate operators, and banking-investment brokers, operating through one of the shrewdest and most heavily financed lobbies ever to infest this Capitol, should control the action of the Republican majority of this Congress. This lobby, with the help of the National Association of Manufacturers, has expended, as reported, over $5,000,000 in its campaign to defeat a real housing bill, a bill which has been endorsed by every church and farm organization, by the American Legion, and all other veterans' organizations. This resolution makes it possible

to bring in a fraudulent housing bill which is not in the interest, or for the benefit, of millions of home-seeking veterans and other citizens.

The rule was not even considered or acted upon under the regular procedure and in a meeting of the Committee on Rules. I charge a most outrageous scheme and collusive action has made it possible to consider the rule and makeshift housing bill. On a few minutes' notice at a night session of the House the committee reported the worst gag rule in the history of the Congress. The rule permitted the bill to be considered under a so-called suspension of the rules that provides only 20 minutes to each side to discuss the bill and no amendments may be offered. It is unthinkable that the Republican leadership should have invoked this drastic procedure to consider subject matter of legislation of such vital importance, which has been batted around and upon which the Committee on Banking and Currency has procrastinated and withheld action for nearly 2 years. It is one of the most shameful legislative actions that has ever been perpetrated, with a total disregard of the rights of the membership, in my many years of service in the House.

Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting for the country to know that more than 2 years ago the Joint Housing Committee of the Congress conducted hearings in all the large cities throughout the United States; spent $100,000 in its investigations; obtained testimony from 32 governors, from nearly all the mayors of the large cities, and from hundreds of representatives of civic, religious, educational, veterans', labor, welfare, and other organizations, including local housing authorities, in every section of the country. With this mass of testimony, covering every phase of the existing shortages and need of housing in all sections of the United States, the joint committee, after months of deliberate and careful consideration, recommended the passage of the generally known Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. Although the Senate passed this bill in 1946 and again in 1947, this reactionary House kept the bill in the House Banking and Currency Committee until a few days ago. During the nearly 2 years that the Republican majority of that committee kept the bill bottled up, the Democratic members made many efforts to have the bill reported, but it was not until a few days ago, as I have stated, that they succeeded. This was only possible by unanimous vote of all the Democrats and two Republican members of the committee who, under terrific pressure from constituents at home, finally voted with the Democrats. By a vote of 14 to 13 the chairman of the committee was directed to request the Committee on Rules to grant a rule for consideration of the bill. The chairman, contrary to the instructions of a majority of his committee, instead of urging that a rule be granted on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, actually opposed the granting of such a rule. The Rules Committee, with the unanimous vote of its Republican members, voted against the reporting of a rule for the consideration of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. That is the story as to how the Republicans killed this meritorious housing bill.

It was interesting to note that while the Committee on Rules was still holding hearings for a rule on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. WOLCOTT, hurriedly introduced in the House this makeshift bill which was, and is, to all intents and purposes, entirely devoid of provisions to provide low-cost housing and rental homes for our veterans and low-paid workers, for housing research, for slum clearance, for rural housing rehabilitation, and for public housing. One can come to no other conclusion than that the introduction of this new bill by Chairman WOLCOTT was for no other purpose or reason than to attempt to "pull the wool" over the eyes of the American people and lead them to believe that the Republican Congress was passing a real housing bill. In fact, the only provision left in the new Wolcott bill was that which provided for secondary mortgages, which the mortgage investment bankers gave advance notice they would not handle unless they were guaranteed against loss in such transactions. And the main provision in the Wolcott bill was such a guarantee.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how you Republicans will have the temerity or nerve to face your constituents when you return to your respective districts. How can you explain your failure to the ex-servicemen and their families who, for years, have been unsuccessfully seeking decent places in which to live, in refusing to pass a bill to provide them with low-cost or reasonable rental homes within their financial reach.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]; the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]; the gentleman from Texas, the former Speaker of the House [Mr. RAYBURN], have most impressively and convincingly proven beyond any question of doubt the need for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, and have revealed the unfair tactics of the Republican majority in stifling the consideration of the most important provision in the bill that would afford decent housing for our veterans and other citizens.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] charged that the bill is socialistic and stated that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and other gentlemen on the Democratic side did not express the views of the Democrats. I am constrained to say to the gentleman from Georgia that if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] does not express the views of all the Democrats, surely the gentleman from Georgia does not. This is something the gentleman from Georgia cannot refute. With particular reference to his opposition to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, it is difficult for me to understand his position because only a few days ago, according to an article appearing in the Albany (Ga.) Herald he sent a telegram to Mr. Hudson Malone, executive director of the Albany Housing Authority, part of which I quote:

> You may assure all interested that I will do everything in my power to see that a rule is granted promptly for House consideration. The House's version of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill now in the Rules Committee will have my strongest support with the hope that it will be passed before adjournment.

In view of this telegram I cannot understand why the gentleman from Georgia should charge that this bill is socialistic in character.

Mr. Speaker, I have explained the antagonistic Republican record on housing and now I shall call attention to its record on other legislation.

THE DEPLORABLE—YES, MISERABLE REPUBLICAN RECORD

The Republican majority leader, Mr. HALLECK, in answer to President Truman's statement that this last Congress was the worst in history, replied that this is and has been a good Congress. Yes, it has been a good Congress for the special and vested interests and for the privileged and wealthy, but a most miserable and regrettable one for the common people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record of this Congress:

First. You Republicans passed the drastic and infamous Taft-Hartley Act to enslave labor by even reviving the use of injunction, and followed with the passage by the House of the Mundt-Nixon bill, designed to further restrict, yes, to actually destroy organized labor.

Second. You wiped out all price controls and gave big business the right to voluntarily—among themselves—fix prices on all necessities of life and, taking advantage of this unprecedented privilege, instead of reducing prices and the high cost of living in accordance with your and their promise to the people in 1946, the cost of living has increased by 40 percent since you came into power.

Third. You gave railroads the right to fix and increase rates in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act and to the detriment of the American shippers and consumers, notwithstanding that during the war they overcharged the Government nearly $2,000,000,000 in freight rates.

Fourth. You passed three so-called tax-reduction bills in the interest of war profiteers, black and gray marketeers, and profit-gouging big business, giving billions of dollars in hand-outs to the wealthy corporation executives for whom Congress has already repealed excess-profits taxes, while giving penny tax reductions to the majority of low and middle income-tax payers. Yes, you Republicans can take full credit for passing a tax-reduction bill for the greedy, not for the needy.

Fifth. You extended but emasculated the Rent Control Act by permitting an increase of 15 percent in rents.

Sixth. You voted away our oil reserves valued at billions of dollars to the big oil producers, who overcharged the Government $2,000,000,000 for oil supplies during the war and robbed the American consumer of millions by unjustifiably increasing the prices of their products.

Seventh. You appropriated sixty millions for the eradication of hoof-and-mouth disease in cattle in Mexico, but failed to appropriate 1 cent for a health-insurance program for the American people and reduced the appropriations for school lunches for our needy children.

Eighth. You passed a sugar bill, not in the interest of the American consumer, but in the interest of the Sugar Trust.

Ninth. You passed a wool-support price bill to enable the Wool Trust to import foreign wool at low prices and at the same time permitted manufacturers to charge the consumer higher prices for all manufactured woolen products.

Tenth. You passed a Government war-housing disposal bill that enabled real-estate operators to make millions, but which forced thousands of veterans and other worthy tenants to either pay higher rentals or vacate their homes.

Eleventh. You passed an Employers' Liability Act to limit the venue in certain cases that will operate in the interest and to the benefit of employers and deny fair rights to employees.

Twelfth. You passed a Credit Controls Act encouraging installment buying, which is adding to the present juicy profits of business that operates against the people with low incomes, who, due to the increasingly high prices in the last 18 months, have been obliged to withdraw $4,000,000,000 from their saving accounts, sell 25 percent of their Government bonds, and give up 23 percent of their life-insurance policies.

Thirteenth. You passed a bill to exempt the packers who have been gouging the American people from paying for inspection of their meat products, which adds an additional eleven million in taxes on the backs of the taxpayers.

Fourteenth. You passed an act to extend old-age and survivors' social security, but instead of broadening the act to provide such benefits for twelve to fifteen million more citizens, you have actually deprived 750,000 people of benefits determined by the Supreme Court; and instead of increasing these social-security benefits by $25 a month, you increased them by a measly $5.

THE "PUBLIC BE DAMNED" RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, what a sorry "public be damned" record is that of the Eightieth Republican Congress. I have called attention to some of the legislation you Republicans have enacted, not in the interest of but against the interest of the average people, and now I wish to direct attention to your failure to enact legislation to relieve the distressed middle class, the white-collar workers, the pensioners, and low-paid wage earners. You took no action to curb high prices and stop the inflationary spiral.

As I have frequently stated on the floor of the House, in 1946 you Republicans solemnly promised that prices would be reduced and the then existing shortages eliminated if the OPA were repealed. You promised that your so-called free enterprise would reduce the already high prices.

To force the repeal of the OPA, the packers went on strike and refused to slaughter, which created a shortage of meat and meat products and skyrocketed the prices, notwithstanding that there were plenty of cattle and hogs in the pens ready for slaughter. Unfortunately, with the repeal of the OPA, the misled American people failed to realize that the packers and industrialists were preparing to still further increase the cost of living—as they are today doing with a vengeance.

Nevertheless, you did destroy the OPA, as well as eliminate the priorities on material for home construction, and after 18 months prices not only have not been reduced but have risen, and are still going outrageously higher and higher. You have disregarded the increasing danger of inflation, as did the hoarders, profiteers, speculators, and industrialists in 1920–21, and to a still greater degree in 1928–29, when, under Mr. Hoover, the Wall Street speculators unloaded stocks and bonds amounting up to $50,000,000,000 and withdrew the money from the country banks on various pretenses, even using the small bankers in the cities as their agents to dispose of most of the worthless securities.

In 1929, after these speculators unloaded all their worthless securities and withdrew all the money possible from legitimate channels, they pulled the chain that brought about the greatest economic crash in the history of the world. Today you are again emulating this damnable practice of 1928–29 and I fear within 3 or 4 years—if this devastating inflation is not arrested and you should come into full power—the inflated balloon will explode and another financial crash and panic will engulf us.

The Republican Congress ignored its mandate from the people and listened only to the avaricious big business combines to help them grab up foreign holdings, prepare for war, curb labor, suppress civil liberty, shamefully manipulate and continue to further increase the already high prices, and to further increase the greatest profits in history at the distressed people's expense.

The Republicans refused to consider legislation which would have raised the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour, although the present 40-cent wage minimum is today worth about 23 cents in purchasing power. According to a report issued by the Federal Reserve Board in June of this year, corporation profits in 1948 are "likely to be larger" than in 1947, when they broke all previous records and reached $17,000,000,000 after all taxation and other deductions for reconversion and expansion. In the last 4 years wages of the average American wage earners rose 26 percent, but the cost of living in that period has tripled the increase in wages, or reached 68 percent. Since 1944 corporation profits have increased 116 percent—from an annual rate of $10,000,000,000 to $21,600,000,000. These figures prove that the industrial royalists, whose interest you serve, are exploiting the people, are reaping huge profits, and are responsible for the continuous increase of the cost of living.

The Republican Congress, despite its 1944 platform, failed to pass any civil rights legislation. Bills to outlaw lynching, end the poll tax, and set up a permanent fair employment practices commission were buried by the Eightieth Congress.

In 1944 the Republican platform further pledged support to "extension of the existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance to all employees not already covered," strengthening of Federal-State health programs, "and the stimulation by Federal aid of State plans to make medical and hospital treatment available to those in need." And what is your record of the Republican Congress on such legislation? Bills to extend social security coverage and benefits, as recommended, died in the congressional committees, although the cost of living has risen 70 percent since present social security rates were set and the average old-age pension today is $25 a month. The Republican Congress did, however, as I have mentioned, pass a bill removing 750,000 workers from social-security coverage. Yes, the Republican Congress followed the orders of the National Association of Manufacturers and big business to make certain that the social-security pay-roll deductions that were to help these deserving workers be not increased progressively according to law, but be added to corporations' already fat profits.

The national health insurance bill was buried deep in congressional committees and the bill for Federal aid to education never saw the light of day in the House Committee on Education and Labor; likewise a bill to improve unemployment insurance also died in committee.

The failure of the Republicans to consider these bills in the interest and welfare of the people can only be construed as a flagrant disregard of their platform pledges and evidence that the Republican Party, as ever, serves only the special and vested interests.

Notably among your failures to legislate in the interest of the people was your action in filibustering to death the bill to repeal the oleomargarine tax demanded by the housewives; the emasculation of the Foreign Trade Agreements Act which has contributed so greatly to the increase of our exports, which took the tariff out of politics, but which now endangers our world-wide foreign trade structure; instead of passing a bill as you promised to reduce the cost of maintaining the displaced-persons camps in the American zone of occupation, to permit the entry of 400,000 unfortunate displaced persons that could be absorbed into the families of their relatives, and some of whom could even be employed to relieve the house servant shortage, you passed a bill which reduces the number to 212,000 and which shamefully discriminates against and limits the entry of displaced Catholics and Jews.

THE COUNTRY MUST AVOID ANOTHER REPUBLICAN CRASH

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in years gone by have succeeded in misleading the people by untrue statements regarding panics, but these are the actual facts:

The first panic in our memory originated in 1892–93 during the administration of Republican President Benjamin Harrison. Then followed the panic of 1907, under the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt, when the banks issued only script instead of money to their depositors, and the depression of 1920 during Warren G. Harding's Teapot Dome administration. From 1929 to 1933, under the administration of President Herbert Hoover, the Nation struggled through the greatest financial crash and panic in history. During this period banks failed on every corner; factories and plants were closed; people were obliged to live in dugouts and shacks; 18,000,000 jobless people walked the streets and highways, hungry, disillusioned, embittered, except for the few that were employed for $1 a day; home owners and farmers were losing their homes. After these Republican-made panics it remained for Democratic Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt to effect the rehabilitation of the havoc and destruction wrought by the preceding Republican administrations, put the people back to work, and restore the country's financial structure and confidence.

History repeats the Republican method of deception in misleading the American people. In 1920, with no issue to go before the people, the strategists of the Republican Party, under the leadership of Republican Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and with the cooperation of their big interest sponsors, made the League of Nations the issue in the Presidential campaign, which resulted in the unwarranted defeat of the first world-organized plan to create and promote peace and understanding among the nations of the world, and ultimately led to the rebuilding of a militaristic Germany and was directly responsible for the Second World War. And whom did we find behind the scenes in the nomination and election of President Harding but Senator Boise Penrose and the Pennsylvania gang, ably supported by Pennsylvania's Joe Grundy and his National Association of Manufacturers, defeating former Illinois Governor, Frank Lowden, and Gen. Leonard Wood.

In 1928 another Pennsylvania leader, Senator William Vare—successor to Boise Penrose—joined hands with Mr. Joe Grundy, the high-tariff advocate and NAM representative, who finally occupied a seat in the Senate, and nominated and elected the British purchasing agent, Herbert Hoover.

Today we find the special-interest forces, headed by Pennsylvania's Joe Grundy, the Pews, and others of their hue, working with the tariff barons and the National Association of Manufacturers, the banking clique of J. P. Morgan, Rockefeller, du Pont, Dillon, Read, and other Wall Street bankers, ready to nominate a man on the Republican ticket who will be subservient to their dictates. These special-interest forces are vitally interested in rebuilding Germany because of their vast holdings in the I. G. Farben cartels and other German combinations and, as reports indicate, they are preparing for world war III in the same manner they prepared for the Second World War.

All through the years the Pennsylvania crowd, under the banners of Mark Hanna, Foraker, Dalzell, Penrose, Vare, and Grundy, has a black record of corruption, and even today the disclosures in Philadelphia show that the Republicans continue, as they have for years, in corruptive control of that city. But Philadelphia is not alone dominated by such Republican forces. Other cities and States as well feel the corruption hand of Republican bosses.

In that connection, unfortunately, my own State of Illinois, under a Republican administration, has been deprived of millions of dollars through failure of proper sales-tax collection returns to the State, which, together with hundreds of thousands of dollars illegally collected as political tribute from State employees, have been shamefully diverted for political campaign purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from again referring to the high cost of living that is today plaguing our country and give below a comparison of prewar and present-day prices:

	Prewar prices	Present prices
Homes	$5,000	$10,500–$15,000
Automobiles	100	1,700–2,500
Men's clothing	18–25	50–75
Men's, women's, and children's shoes	2–6	4–15–18
Furniture, household appliances, and furnishings		(1)

[1] 150 percent higher.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding all these exorbitant prices on commodities, the greatest necessity of life—food—has led the field in price rises. Here is a tabulation on a few food items of prewar prices as compared to present-day prices:

	Prewar prices	Present prices
Steak	$0.40	[1] $1.10–$1.19
Bacon	.33	.73
Chuck roast	.23	.71
Smoked ham	.28	.71
Leg of lamb	.32	.75
Lamb chops	.42	1.09
Lamb breast	.11	.38
Veal cutlets	.44	1.08
Pork chops	.30	1.06
Cheese	[2] 0.10–.15	[2] 40–.75
Butter	.42	[2] 98–1.00
Quart of grade A milk	.13	.21
Eggs	.28	.64
Bread	.08	.16
Coffee	.22	.51
Canned fruits and vegetables	.10–.15	.19–.30

[1] Per pound.
[2] Per dozen.

Mr. Speaker, when will there be an end to these continuously rising prices? We all know an end to price rises will come in due time, but will it be soon enough to save the low-wage earners, the white-collar workers living on fixed small incomes, and the people living on meager pensions, who are the ones that are suffering the most as a result of these unwarranted price wars.

THE PEOPLE HAVE HAD ENOUGH OF THE REPUBLICANS

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the Republican leaders seem to feel they can fool and mislead the people in 1948 as they did in the 1946 campaign, when they feed them with reckless promises, distorted propaganda, half-truths, and untruths. But in this campaign the people will have before them the actual performance record of the Eightieth Republican Congress. The memory of the people will not be so short-lived as to forget your 1946 promises and to realize the stark truth that you have betrayed them. Do not think they have forgotten when President Roosevelt was elected banks were failing on every corner; factories and plants were closed; nearly 18,000,000 jobless people walked the streets and the highways; that farm mortgages were being foreclosed and home owners were losing their homes. They will not forget the famous "hundred days" following Roosevelt's election when new legislation flowed out of a Democratic Congress to meet the dire emergency. Banks reopened. Factories flung wide their doors and started their motors humming. The working people gradually went back to work.

Now, 15 years later—despite your criticism of the New Deal—we have 62,000,000 people at work. Business is booming, and the country is enjoying the greatest prosperity in history. Today our national income is $210,000,000,000, as compared to the thirty-eight to forty-two billion in 1932 and 1933. Measured by every index, our prosperity is so great that our only just cause for anxiety is the danger of a run-away inflation and the high cost of living. And what does the record show since you Republicans took control of both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States? It shows that you have done everything possible to encourage inflation in the name of so-called free enterprise, which, however, is not free, because it is controlled by your trusts and combines whom you are serving.

You like the idea of a big boom that is bound to go bust.

There are always some smart operators ready to make a killing out of human misery, unemployment, deflation, depression; and you have made yourselves the errand boys for those cruel profiteers, your friends, the Wall Street manipulators, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the special and vested interests who, through the greatest horde of lobbyists ever to infest the Capitol, have forced you to do their bidding.

Notwithstanding all the insincere promises, the misrepresentations, the scare campaigns, and the ballyhoo of the Republican 1946 campaign, the fact remains that the Republican Party has miserably failed the people and the Nation. They have failed to adopt any constructive plan or policy or to adopt positive

legislation to meet real needs. However, the nearest approach to combat the high cost of living was the advice of one of the Republican Presidential candidates that the people should produce more and eat less.

Everything the Republicans have done has been repressive and negative. They have been busy in this Congress in turning the clock back—in repealing the OPA and weakening many of the beneficial laws in the interest of labor. The Republicans were able to do nothing but disparage what the Democrats have done, and although you control 90 percent of the press, magazines, and a majority of the radio stations, the American voters will not be lulled to sleep or misled as they were in 1946 when only 33 percent of them voted. They now realize they owe it to themselves and to their country to vote and register their protest and resentment against the Republican betrayal and record.

The Democrats have really made a splendid, most constructive record. I repeat: They can point with pride to the highest employment in all history, to the largest national income, and the greatest prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything further about this matter, but in view of some of the arguments that we have heard here, I would just like to reiterate that, after all, this is a procedural matter. It is identical with the practice that has been followed all through the years. In 1938 the Republicans were concerned about the so-called reorganization bill. Many Democrats were concerned about it. There was a question at that time with respect to the calling up of that bill when a similar resolution to that now before us was presented.

As I pointed out in my opening statement, there are rules outstanding on this that may be called up or the bills may be considered under suspension of the rules. I do not know what additional rules may be granted. Undoubtedly, there will be suspension of the rule before the week is out on many matters that involve considerable controversy. The opportunity, of course, is always present to vote on that controversy. However, this is not the time to debate any of these measures. We might, in debating many measures in which a great many Members are interested, and in which a great many people in the country are interested, have very considerable differences of opinion on both sides of the aisle. But let us stick to the original fundamental proposition. By adopting this resolution we are doing what previous Congresses have done all through the years. We are simply doing what the rules of the House contemplate, and we are doing what the rules provide. It is designed to expedite the business of the House. That is the only issue here. There is no other issue to be debated.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240, nays 160, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—240

Allen, Calif.	Gearhart	Michener
Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Miller, Conn.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillie	Miller, Md.
	Goff	Miller, Nebr.
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	Mitchell
Andrews, N. Y.	Gossett	Morton
Angell	Graham	Muhlenberg
Arends	Grant, Ind.	Mundt
Arnold	Griffiths	Murray, Wis.
Auchincloss	Gross	Nicholson
Banta	Gwinn, N. Y.	Nixon
Barden	Gwynne, Iowa	Nodar
Barrett	Hagen	Norblad
Bates, Mass.	Hale	O'Hara
Beall	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Konski
Bell	Hall, Leonard W.	Passman
Bender	Halleck	Patterson
Bennett, Mich.	Hand	Phillips, Calif.
Bennett, Mo.	Harness, Ind.	Phillips, Tenn.
Bishop	Harvey	Ploeser
Blackney	Hébert	Plumley
Boggs, Del.	Herter	Potter
Bolton	Heselton	Potts
Bradley	Hess	Ramey
Bramblett	Hill	Reed, Ill.
Brehm	Hinshaw	Reed, N. Y.
Brophy	Hoeven	Rees
Buck	Hoffman	Reeves
Buffett	Holmes	Rich
Burke	Hope	Riehlman
Busbey	Horan	Rizley
Butler	Hull	Rockwell
Byrnes, Wis.	Jackson, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	Jenison	Rohrbough
Carson	Jenkins, Ohio	Roe
Case, N. J.	Jenkins, Pa.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Jennings	Sadlak
Chadwick	Jensen	St. George
Chenoweth	Johnson, Calif.	Sanborn
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ill.	Sarbacher
Church	Johnson, Ind.	Schwabe, Mo.
Clark	Jones, Wash.	Schwabe, Okla.
Clason	Jonkman	Scoblick
Clevenger	Judd	Scott, Hardie
Clippinger	Kean	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Coffin	Kearney	Scrivner
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Seely-Brown
Cole, Mo.	Keating	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Keefe	Short
Corbett	Kersten, Wis.	Simpson, Ill.
Cotton	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Knutson	Smith, Kans.
Cox	Kunkel	Smith, Ohio
Crawford	Landis	Smith, Va.
Crow	Larcade	Smith, Wis.
Cunningham	Latham	Snyder
Curtis	LeCompte	Stefan
Dague	LeFevre	Stevenson
Davis, Wis.	Lemke	Stockman
Dawson, Utah	Lewis, Ky.	Stratton
Devitt	Lewis, Ohio	Sundstrom
D'Ewart	Lichtenwalter	Taber
Dirksen	Lodge	Talle
Dolliver	Love	Taylor
Domengeaux	McConnell	Tibbott
Dondero	McCowen	Tollefson
Eaton	McCulloch	Towe
Ellis	McDonough	Twyman
Ellsworth	McDowell	Vail
Elsaesser	McGarvey	Van Zandt
Elston	McGregor	Vorys
Engel, Mich.	McMillen, Ill.	Wadsworth
Fellows	Mack	Weichel
Fenton	MacKinnon	Whittington
Fletcher	Maloney	Wigglesworth
Foote	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Fuller	Mason	Wolverton
Fulton	Mathews	Woodruff
Gallagher	Merrow	Youngblood
Gamble	Meyer	
Gathings		
Gavin		

NAYS—160

Abbitt	Garmatz	Morris
Abernethy	Gary	Morrison
Albert	Gordon	Multer
Allen, La.	Gore	Murdock
Andrews, Ala.	Gorski	Murray, Tenn.
Bates, Ky.	Granger	Norrell
Battle	Grant, Ala.	Norton
Beckworth	Gregory	O'Brien
Bland	Hardy	O'Toole
Blatnik	Harless, Ariz.	Pace
Bloom	Harris	Patman
Boggs, La.	Harrison	Peterson
Bonner	Hart	Pfeifer
Brooks	Havenner	Philbin
Brown, Ga.	Hays	Pickett
Bryson	Hedrick	Poage
Buchanan	Heffernan	Powell
Buckley	Hendricks	Preston
Bulwinkle	Hobbs	Price, Fla.
Burleson	Hollifield	Price, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Huber	Priest
Camp	Isacson	Rains
Carroll	Jackson, Wash.	Rankin
Celler	Jarman	Rayburn
Chapman	Jones, Ala.	Redden
Chelf	Jones, N. C.	Richards
Colmer	Karsten, Mo.	Riley
Combs	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Cooley	Kefauver	Rooney
Cooper	Kelley	Sabath
Courtney	Kennedy	Sadowski
Cravens	Keogh	Sasscer
Crosser	Kerr	Sheppard
Davis, Ga.	Kilday	Sikes
Davis, Tenn.	King	Smathers
Dawson, Ill.	Kirwan	Somers
Deane	Klein	Spence
Delaney	Lanham	Stanley
Dingell	Lea	Teague
Donohue	Lesinski	Thomas, Tex.
Dorn	Lucas	Thompson
Doughton	Lusk	Trimble
Douglas	Lyle	Vinson
Durham	Lynch	Walter
Eberharter	McCormack	Wheeler
Engle, Calif.	Madden	Whitaker
Evins	Mahon	Whitten
Fallon	Manasco	Williams
Feighan	Mansfield	Wilson, Tex.
Fernandez	Marcantonio	Winstead
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Wood
Flannagan	Mills	Worley
Fogarty	Monroney	
Forand	Morgan	

NOT VOTING—30

Andresen, August H.	Johnson, Tex.	Rivers
	Lane	Robertson
Bakewell	Ludlow	Smith, Maine
Boykin	McMahon	Stigler
Brown, Ohio	McMillan, S. C.	Thomas, N. J.
Cannon	Macy	Vursell
Elliott	Meade, Ky.	Welch
Folger	Meade, Md.	West
Hartley	Peden	Wilson, Ind.
Javits	Poulson	
Johnson, Okla.	Regan	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Peden against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Johnson of Texas against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Meade of Maryland against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Lane.

Mr. McMahon with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Folger.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. West.

Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Regan.

Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. McMillan of South Carolina.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Admiral Swanson relative to the remarks he made yesterday regarding the number of dentists who had attempted to enlist in the Navy.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6772) "making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6 and 12.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 37, 38, 39, 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$360,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$330,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$209,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$450,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$585,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$132,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,965,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,207,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$69,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$305,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$33,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,532,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,206,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,012,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,385,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,046,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,087,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$32,611,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The Committee of Conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 16, 23, and 40.

CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOE HENDRICKS,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
E. V. ROBERTSON,
M. E. TYDINGS,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 appropriates $7,500,000 for Miscellaneous Expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2 allows $3,250,000 of the appropriation for Miscellaneous Expenses to be used for the payment of claims instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 appropriates $42,255,000 for Research, Navy, as proposed by the Senate instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4 appropriates $9,245,500 for Operation and Conservation of Naval Petroleum Reserves as proposed by the Senate instead of $245,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5 appropriates $465,000 for the Naval Observatory as proposed by the Senate instead of $450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6 appropriates $3,500,000 for the Hydrographic Office as proposed by the House instead of $3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7 appropriates $13,200,000 for Training and Education, Navy, instead of $13,000,000 as proposed by the House and $13,741,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates $1,400,000 for General Expenses, Bureau of Naval Personnel instead of $1,250,000 as proposed by the House and $1,570,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9 appropriates $125,436,000 for Naval Reserve as proposed by the Senate instead of $125,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10 appropriates $360,000,000 for Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, instead of $350,000,000 as proposed by the House and $370,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 appropriates $230,000,000 for Ordnance and Ordnance Stores, Navy, instead of $210,000,000 as proposed by the House and $248,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12 strikes out language proposed by the Senate relating to services performed in quarters of female officers and enlisted women and in residences of naval attachés.

Amendment No. 13 appropriates $209,000,000 for Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, instead of $200,000,000 as proposed by the House and $218,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14 appropriates $4,875,000 for operation of housing projects under the appropriation Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15 corrects the total amount appropriated for Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17 appropriates $450,000,000 for maintenance, under Aviation, Navy, instead of $440,000,000 as proposed by the House and $470,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18 adjusts a total.

Amendment No. 19 appropriates $145,744,000 for pay of enlisted personnel in the Marine Corps as proposed by the Senate instead of $144,862,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20 appropriates $15,313,000 for pay and allowances of the Marine Corps Reserve, as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21 adjusts a total.

Amendment No. 22 appropriates $132,000,000 for General Expenses, Marine Corps instead of $130,000,000 as proposed by the House and $134,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24 appropriates $3,965,000 for Salaries, Office of the Secretary, instead of $3,641,000 as proposed by the House and $4,289,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25 appropriates $1,207,000 for Salaries, Office of Naval Research, instead of $1,152,000 as proposed by the House and $1,262,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26 appropriates $69,000 for Salaries, Office of Naval Records and Library, instead of $60,000 as proposed by the House and $78,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27 appropriates $305,300 for Salaries, Office of Judge Advocate General, instead of $294,300 as proposed by the House and $316,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28 appropriates $1,225,000 for Salaries, Office of Chief of Naval Operations, instead of $1,125,000 as proposed by the House and $1,325,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29 appropriates $38,000 for Salaries, Board of Inspection and Survey, instead of $36,000 as proposed by the House and $40,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30 appropriates $4,532,000 for Salaries, Bureau of Naval Personnel, instead of $3,570,000 as proposed by the House and $5,194,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31 appropriates $6,206,500 for Salaries, Bureau of Ships, instead of $5,715,000 as proposed by the House and $6,702,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32 appropriates $3,012,600 for Salaries, Bureau of Ordnance, instead of $2,757,600 as proposed by the House and $3,267,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33 appropriates $4,385,000 for Salaries, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, instead of $3,960,000 as proposed by the House and $4,810,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34 appropriates $1,046,200 for Salaries, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, instead of $970,200 as proposed by the House and $1,122,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35 appropriates $2,087,500 for Salaries, Bureau of Yards and Docks, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,175,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36 adjusts the total for Salaries, Navy Department at $32,611,100 instead of $30,111,100 as proposed by the House and $35,111,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37 appropriates $1,100,000 for Contingent Expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39 strike from the bill language proposed by the House to forbid employment of members of labor organizations which are not in compliance with the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

Amendment No. 40 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 41 corrects a section number.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 16 authorizes the use of the appropriation, Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, for expenses incident to transferring offices of the Navy Department between buildings as the seat of government. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 23 authorizes the balances of the appropriation Increase and Replacement of Naval Vessels to be used for the employment of personnel in the Bureau of Ships and the Bureau of Ordnance during the fiscal year 1949 in such sums as the Secretary may determine. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 40 relates to the use of funds for making time-measuring studies, payments of premiums and rewards, and work done in naval establishments. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOE HENDRICKS,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PLUMLEY (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a very brief statement, and perhaps we can save a great deal of time. I would like to ask the ranking minority member of this subcommittee if this report is not unanimous and if we have not agreed on every single item in it. I would like to further ask him if he knows of any objections to be made by anyone on his side. I know of none to be made on my side.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's inquiry, there was no objection expressed to me in the conference. There was harmonious agreement on the part of all parties concerned.

Mr. PLUMLEY. That being so, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 17, line 14, insert ": *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for any expenses incident to transferring offices of the Navy Department between buildings at the seat of government."

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLUMLEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 24, line 2, insert ": *Provided*, That of the balances remaining of appropriations under this head, there shall be available during the fiscal year 1949 such sums as the Secretary may from time to time determine to be necessary for the employment of personnel in the Bureau of Ships and the Bureau of Ordnance in connection with the construction of vessels which have been heretofore authorized under this head."

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is the the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLUMLEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 33, line 3, insert:

"SEC. 112. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for contracts with any person, firm, or corporation to make or cause to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any employee; no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person or persons having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any

Government plant; and no moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when in the judgment of the Secretary, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary be advantageous to the national defense."

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLUMLEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 112. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for contracts with any person, firm, or corporation to make or cause to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any employee within the Navy; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when in the judgment of the Secretary, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary, be advantageous to the national defense."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I include a table showing the House and Senate action and the conferees' agreement on the naval appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949. I feel that the conferees have arrived at a very fair figure. It is, in terms of dollars, almost an even compromise between the House and Senate figures. The bill carries a grand total in continuing and annual appropriations of $3,749,059,250 which is $63,111,000 below the amount of the Senate bill and $62,326,000 above the amount passed by the House. The final action is a reduction below the total budget estimates of $187,679,450.

Action by Congress on Navy Department estimates, 1949 (excludes funds for construction of aircraft)

Appropriation title	Budget estimates	House action	Senate action	Conference agreement
Office of the Secretary:				
Miscellaneous expenses, Navy	$12,417,000	$8,000,000	$7,500,000	$7,500,000
Contingencies of the Navy	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Research, Navy	53,198,000	45,000,000	42,253,000	42,255,000
Operation and conservation of naval petroleum reserves	[1]9,245,500	245,500	9,245,500	9,245,500
Exploration of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4	14,600,000	14,600,000	14,600,000	14,600,000
Expenses, island governments and liberated occupied areas	2,500,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000
Penalty-mail costs, Navy Department	2,500,000			
Naval Observatory	504,100	450,000	465,000	465,000
Hydrographic Office	3,942,000	3,500,000	3,700,000	3,500,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	110,816,600	86,045,500	92,015,500	91,815,500
Bureau of Naval Personnel:				
Training and education, Navy	13,745,000	13,000,000	13,741,000	13,200,000
Welfare of naval personnel	2,510,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Officer candidate training, Navy	12,900,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
General expenses, Bureau of Naval Personnel	1,640,000	1,250,000	1,570,000	1,400,000
Naval Reserve	129,724,350	125,000,000	125,436,000	125,436,000
Naval Academy	5,085,000	5,020,000	5,020,000	5,020,000
Naval Home	382,000	380,000	380,000	380,000
Total, Bureau of Naval Personnel	165,486,350	159,050,000	160,547,000	159,836,000
Bureau of Ships: Maintenance, Bureau of Ships	377,443,000	350,000,000	370,000,000	360,000,000
Bureau of Ordnance: Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy	266,860,000	210,000,000	248,000,000	230,000,000
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts:				
Pay and subsistence of naval personnel	(1,215,912,000)	(1,215,912,000)	(1,215,912,000)	(1,215,912,000)
Pay and allowances	1,111,116,000	1,111,116,000	1,111,116,000	1,111,116,000
Subsistence	104,796,000	104,796,000	104,796,000	104,796,000
Retired pay, Navy	78,520,650	78,520,650	78,520,650	78,520,650
Transportation and recruiting of naval personnel	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	229,630,000	200,000,000	218,000,000	209,000,000
Transportation of things, Navy	94,818,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000
Fuel, Navy	70,800,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000
Total, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	1,723,480,650	1,676,432,650	1,694,432,650	1,685,432,650
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery: Medical Department, Navy	40,343,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Bureau of Yards and Docks: Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks	171,772,000	150,000,000	150,375,000	150,375,000
Bureau of Aeronautics:				
Aviation, Navy	(617,268,000)	(575,000,000)	(605,000,000)	(585,000,000)
Aeronautical instruments	27,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Maintenance and operation	480,268,000	440,000,000	470,000,000	450,000,000
Research and development	110,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000
Total, Bureau of Aeronautics (except construction of aircraft)	617,268,000	575,000,000	605,000,000	585,000,000
Marine Corps:				
Pay, Marine Corps	200,405,000	199,492,000	201,287,000	201,287,000
Retired pay, Marine Corps	8,519,000	8,519,000	8,519,000	8,519,000
Pay of civil force	(2,318,000)	(2,178,000)	(2,178,000)	(2,178,000)
Office of Commandant	1,170,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Supply Department	1,148,000	1,078,000	1,078,000	1,078,000
General expenses, Marine Corps	133,205,000	130,000,000	134,700,000	132,000,000
Total, Marine Corps	346,447,000	340,189,000	346,684,000	343,984,000
Navy Department salaries:				
Office of the Secretary	4,343,900	3,641,000	4,289,000	3,965,000
Office of Naval Research	1,280,000	1,152,000	1,262,000	1,207,000
Office of Naval Records and Library	80,000	60,000	78,000	69,000
Office of Judge Advocate General	345,000	294,300	316,300	305,300
Office of Chief of Naval Operations	1,330,000	1,125,000	1,325,000	1,225,000
Board of Inspection and Survey	40,000	35,000	40,000	38,000
Office of Chief of Naval Communications	570,000	550,000	550,000	550,000

Action by Congress on Navy Department estimates, 1949 (excludes funds for construction of aircraft)—Continued

Appropriation title	Budget estimates	House action	Senate action	Conference agreement
Navy Department salaries—continued				
Office of Naval Intelligence	$1,220,000	$980,000	$980,000	$980,000
Bureau of Naval Personnel	5,360,000	3,870,000	5,194,000	4,532,000
Bureau of Ships	6,850,000	5,715,000	6,702,000	6,208,500
Bureau of Ordnance	3,314,000	2,757,600	3,267,600	3,012,600
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	4,550,000	3,960,000	4,810,000	4,385,000
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	1,123,000	970,200	1,122,200	1,046,200
Bureau of Yards and Docks	2,179,200	2,000,000	2,175,000	2,087,500
Bureau of Aeronautics	3,645,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Total, Navy Department salaries	36,492,100	30,111,100	35,111,100	32,611,100
Contingent expenses:				
Contingent expenses, Navy Department	1,175,000	1,000,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Printing and binding, Navy Department	2,885,000	2,655,000	2,635,000	2,635,000
Total, contingent expenses	4,060,000	3,655,000	3,735,000	3,735,000
Total annual appropriations	3,850,468,700	3,620,463,250	3,745,900,250	3,682,789,250
Continuing appropriations:				
Shipbuilding:				
Construction of ships	64,800,000	56,800,000	56,800,000	56,800,000
	[1](14,300,000)	[1](14,300,000)	[1](14,300,000)	[1](14,300,000)
Ordnance for new construction	11,470,000	9,470,000	9,470,000	9,470,000
	[2](1,700,000)	[2](1,700,000)	[2](1,700,000)	[2](1,700,000)
Total, shipbuilding	76,270,000	66,270,000	66,270,000	66,270,000
	(16,000,000)	(16,000,000)	(16,000,000)	(16,000,000)
Total annual and continuing appropriations	3,926,738,700	3,686,733,250	3,812,170,250	3,749,059,250

[1] Includes supplemental request in amount of $9,000,000 not acted on by the House.
[2] Transfer from I RNV (construction and machinery).
[3] Transfer from I RNV (armor, armament, and ammunition).

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BARRETT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the DAV.

AUTHORIZING PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR NAVIGATION, FLOOD CONTROL, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, both the conference report and statement are available to the Members.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 25.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the words "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 8, 1948." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "House Document Numbered 632, Eightieth Congress;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the figures "568" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "668"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the words "his report dated February 19, 1948" and insert in lieu thereof the words "House Document Numbered 643, Eightieth Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Change the period to a comma and add the following: "and the authorization for the Lower Mississippi River project is increased accordingly."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the words "his report dated August 22, 1947" and insert in lieu thereof the words "House Document Numbered 651, Eightieth Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 10, lines 10 and 11, of the amendments of the Senate strike out the following "at prices, on terms, and with titles satisfactory to him"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the figure "65,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following figure "62,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE A. DONDERO,
EARL WILSON,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
GEORGE W. MALONE,
EDWARD MARTIN,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

As the bill passed the House the following projects were included under Title I, Rivers and Harbors:

Items (sec. 101, unless otherwise indicated)

	Doc. No. (80th Cong.)[1]	Cost, new work	Annual maintenance
Beals Harbor, Maine	H. 553	$85,700	$1,000
Cape Porpoise Harbor, Maine	H. 555	41,500	1,500
Buzzards Bay to Buttermilk Bay, Mass.	H. 552	18,300	500
Falmouth Harbor, Mass.	H. 560	35,000	4,000

[1] H. indicates House document; S. indicates Senate document.

Items (sec. 101, unless otherwise indicated)—Continued

	Doc. No. (80th Cong.)	Cost, new work	Annual maintenance
Taunton River, Mass.	H. 196		$1,000
Provincetown Harbor, Mass.	H. 600	$760,000	1,000
Point Judith Harbor of Refuge, R. I.	S. 15	176,000	7,000
Westcott Cove, Conn.	H. 379	21,000	1,200
Greenwich Harbor, Conn.	H. 272	82,000	5,000
Rockhall Harbor, Md.	H. 273	40,000	2,000
Channel from Kent Island Narrows to Wells Cove, Chester River, Md.	H. 380	16,400	1,000
Cambridge Harbor, Md.	H. 381	77,000	2,000
Honga River and Tar Bay, Md.	H. 580	31,600	2,000
Brambles Cove, Lower Machodoc River, Va.	H. 420	28,600	1,000
Deep Creek, Warwick Co., Va.	H. 601	153,000	8,200
Norfolk Harbor, Va., southern branch of Elizabeth River.	H. 545	1,750,000	82,800
Stumpy Point Bay, N. C.	H. 422	32,500	3,000
Inland Waterway, Beaufort to Cape Fear River, including waterway to Jacksonville, N. C.	H. 421	196,000	3,000
St. Andrew Bay, Fla.	H. 559	80,000	12,000
Galveston Harbor, Galveston Channel, and Houston ship channel.	H. 561	5,057,000	219,500
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi, Tex.	H. 560	2,250,000	100,000
Grand Traverse Bay, Mich.	H. 546	316,200	3,500
Dunkirk Harbor, N. Y.	H. 632	390,000	
Pillar Point, Halfmoon Bay, Calif.	H. 644	4,500,000	43,800
Nogo River and Harbor, Calif.	H. 586	190,000	4,000
Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.	H. 650	70,000	3,000
Umpqua Harbor and River at Winchester Bay, Oreg.	S. 154	34,500	500
Channel at Charleston, South Slough, Oreg.	H. 646	349,300	4,500
Coos and Millicoma Rivers, Oreg.	S. 121	310,000	19,000
Skipanon Channel, Oreg.	S. 93	114,500	
Smith River, Oreg.	S. 94	95,100	11,500
Grays Harbor, Wash.	H. 635	3,605,700	103,700
Baltimore Harbor, Md. (sec. 102).			
Modification of Neches-Angelina Rivers project, Texas (sec. 103).			
Total		20,887,900	652,200

List of projects added to title I of the bill by Senate amendments to which the House concurred:

Items added (sec. 101)

	Doc. No. (80th Cong.)	Cost, new work	Annual maintenance
Winyah Bay, S. C.		1 0	
Gulfport Harbor, Miss.		$406,900	$38,000
Harrison County, Miss., shore protection.	H. 282	1,133,000	
Mississippi River at Fort Madison, Iowa.	H. 661	58,200	1,000
Port Wing Harbor, Wis.	H. 668	17,000	700
Oswego Harbor, N. Y.		7,838,000	28,600
Bayou Carlin, La.		15,000	
Total		9,450,100	137,900

[1] Modification of previously authorized project at saving of $12,000.

Title II—Flood control

List of projects in bill as passed by House:

Items (sec. 203)

	Document No. (80th Cong.)	Estimated cost
Arkansas River and Tributaries, Ark. and Miss.	H. 645	$40,000,000
Special provision re approaches to certain highway bridges across the Arkansas River.		250,000

Title II—Flood control

List of projects in bill as passed by House:

Items (sec. 203)—Continued

	Document No. (80th Cong.)	Estimated cost
Rock River at South Beloit, Ill.	H. 112	$100,000
Henderson River, Ill.	H. 245	1,320,000
Mississippi River in vicinity of Aitkin, Minn.	H. 560	1,080,000
Redstone Creek, Pa.	H. 201	1,015,000
Ohio River at Rosiclare, Ill.	S. 125	200,000
Tonawanda Creek, N. Y.	S. 46	565,000
Genesee River (Canaseraga Creek), N. Y.	H. 206	165,000
Clinton River (Red Run), Mich.	H. 628	1,010,000
Reno Beach-Howards farm area, Ohio.	H. 554	330,000
Santa Clara River, Calif.	H. 443	4,660,000
Gila River Basin, Tucson, Ariz.	H. 274	2,590,000
Mississippi River below Cape Girardeau, Mo.	H. 627	7,700,000
Total		22,875,000

List of projects added to title II of the bill by Senate amendments to which the House concurred:

Items added (sec. 203).

	Document No. (80th Cong.)	Authorization in bill
Lackawaxen River, Pa.	H. 113	$6,150,000
Wilkes-Barre-Hanover Township, Pa.		250,000
Central and southern Florida	H. 643	16,250,000
Special provision re approaches to certain highway bridges across the Arkansas River, Ark.		[1] 100,000
Bradens Bend, Okla.		1,000,000
Red River of the North, N. Dak., Minn., and S. Dak.		2,000,000
Miners Bend, Nebr. and S. Dak.		3,000,000
Detroit Reservoir, Oreg. (power features).		
L'Anguille River, Ark.	H. 631	2,000,000
Rio Grande, N. Mex.		3,500,000
Total		34,300,000

[1] In addition to $200,000 included in bill as passed by House.

The following is an explanation of each of the Senate amendments, some of which cover minor amendments:

AMENDMENT NO. 1, WINYAH BAY, S. C.

Item adopts new project as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project by a cut-off 27 feet deep and not less than 400 feet wide across the base of the point to the present turning basin in Sampit River and a branch channel 27 feet deep and not less than 200 feet wide from the upstream end of the cut-off downstream to existing and prospective terminals on the sharp bend at Georgetown in lieu of the intercepted reach of the authorized channel that follows the river along the Georgetown City water front, and maintenance of the intercepted reach of the river to a depth of 18 feet and width of 400 feet.

Estimated cost to United States for construction: Construction of the proposed plan will present a saving to the United States of $137,000 over that of the existing authorized project.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 2, GULFPORT HARBOR, MISS.

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project for Gulfport Harbor, Miss., to provide for a depth of 30 feet in the anchorage basin, a channel 30 feet deep and 220 feet wide from the basin across Mississippi Sound to Ship Island bar, and a channel 32 feet deep and 300 feet wide across Ship Island bar to deep water in the Gulf of Mexico, generally in accordance with the plan of the district engineer.

Estimated cost to the United States for construction: $496,900.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 3, HARRISON COUNTY, MISS., SHORE PROTECTION

Item adopts new project as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Adoption of a project by the United States authorizing Federal participation toward the structural repair of the Harrison County sea wall and its protection by the construction of a beach, 300 feet wide, from Biloxi lighthouse to Henderson Point, a distance of about 24 miles. In addition, local interests will accomplish reconstruction of drainage facilities and comply with the following: (1) Adopt the afore-mentioned plan of improvement including repairs and alterations; (2) submit for approval by the Chief of Engineers detailed plans and specifications and arrangements for prosecuting the entire improvement prior to the commencement of such work; (3) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way for accomplishment of the work; and agree to (a) maintain the sea wall and drainage facilities, and the beach by artificial replenishment, during the useful life of these works as may be required to serve their intended purpose; (b) hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages that may arise either before, during or after prosecution of work; (c) remedy water pollution that would endanger public health; and (d) assure perpetual public ownership of the beach and its administration for public use only.

Federal participation in first cost for construction: $1,133,000.

Total estimated first cost for construction: $2,368,000.

Annual maintenance charges to the United States: None; all to be assumed by local interests.

House conferees concur with an amendment to insert the document number.

AMENDMENT NO. 4, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT FORT MADISON, IOWA

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project for the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., to provide for (1) a small-boat basin and harbor of refuge at Fort Madison, Iowa, to be secured by constructing a breakwater and dredging the protected area and entrance channel to a project depth of 5 feet and (2) a dredged approach channel 9 feet deep to a site for a river-borne freight terminal at Fort Madison; both improvements to be accomplished in general accordance with the plans of the district engineer.

Estimated cost to United States for new work: $41,200 for the small-boat harbor, and $13,000 for the commercial harbor.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 5, PORT WING HARBOR, WIS.

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: That the existing project be modified to provide for abandonment of the extension of the return pile revetment at the inner end of the east pier, the construction of the revetment on the east bank facing the entrance, and the inner channel with a depth of 18 feet. It is also recommended that it be further modified to provide for two inner channels 8 feet deep, extending easterly and southerly 1,170 and 840 feet, respectively, from an irregular-shaped turning basin 15 feet deep at the inner end of the piers.

Estimated cost to United States: $17,600.

House conferees concur with an amendment inserting "568" in lieu of "558" as the document number.

AMENDMENT NO. 6, OSWEGO HARBOR, N. Y.

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended modification of existing project: (1) A breakwater approximately parallel to shore extending easterly from the existing east arrowhead breakwater, 10 feet above low-water datum for 2,300 feet and to 12 feet above low-water datum for 2,600 feet; (2) removal of approximately 1,020 feet of the inner end of the existing east arrowhead breakwater; and (3) a channel 250 feet wide extending easterly and terminating in an irregularly shaped basin at the easterly end of the harbor, all to a project depth of 18 feet in earth and 19 in rock; all generally in accordance with the plans of the district engineer and with such modifications as in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers may be deemed advisable.

Estimated cost to United States for new work: $7,838,000.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 7, INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY FROM THE CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER TO THE ANCLOTE RIVER, FLA.

The item adopts a new section which modifies the existing project to the extent that the Secretary of the Army is authorized to utilize, at and in the vicinity of Venice, any of four routes described in the Act, the existing route being included in the list. The item provides that the cost to the United States shall not exceed the cost of the original route.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

Change in section number.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 9, BAYOU CARLIN, LA.

This item authorizes the Chief of Engineers, in the prosecution of the existing project, to protect the piers of the railway bridge crossing at Delcambre, La. Estimated cost, $15,000.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

Provides for the printing of river and harbor laws relating to rivers and harbors passed since June 25, 1938, for the use of the Department of the Army.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 11

Item provides that not to exceed $5,000 annually of the funds appropriated for rivers and harbors shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation and for the payment in amounts approved by the Chief of Engineers of the expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meetings of the Congresses and of the Commission. This provides an increase of $2,000 over the amount provided under existing law.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 12

Item provides that the dam site known as Foster Creek Dam on the Columbia River, Wash., shall hereafter be known as the Chief Joseph Dam.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 13

Provides for change in section number.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 14

Item provides for a preliminary examination and survey of Quilcene Bay Harbor, Wash.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 15

Provides for a change in section number.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 16, LACKAWAXEN RIVER, DELAWARE RIVER BASIN, PA.

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for construction of an earth-fill dam 94 feet high on Dyberry Creek 2.7 miles above the mouth to control a drainage area of 65 square miles and provide a reservoir with a capacity of 20,800 acre-feet; construction of an earth-fill dam 102 feet high on the Lackawaxen River, just above Prompton which would create a reservoir with a capacity of 19,200 acre-feet; and the removal of the three small dams at Honesdale. (Removal of these dams has been accomplished by local interests.)

Estimated cost to United States for construction: $12,150,000.

The sum of $6,150,000 is authorized to be appropriated for partial accomplishment of this project.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 17, WILKES-BARRE AND HANOVER TOWNSHIP, PA., SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

Item adopts new project as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Raising a low portion of the embankment at Wilkes-Barre and additional 2 feet by embankment or low concrete wall for a distance of 7,400 feet between Old River Road and Union Street.

Estimated cost to United States for construction: The project has been completed at a cost of $3,538,000. The cost of the additional work proposed is $250,000.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 18, JAMES RIVER BASIN, VA.

Item provides that preparation of plans or construction shall not be undertaken on the Gathright Reservoir and the Falling Springs reregulating dam on Jackson River, Va., heretofore authorized, until completion of review of the project to determine the desirability of its construction at the present time, and a finding of the proper local contribution on the basis of benefits to be derived for water supply, pollution abatement, and other conservation purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 19, CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for levees, channel works, and control structures at lake outlets in the St. Johns and Kissimmee areas; for increased levee protection around Lake Okeechobee and enlargement of its outlets, the Caloosahatchee and St. Lucie waterways; for enlargement of existing drainage canals, and the construction of new canals and levees and pumping plants, for control of water in the Everglades area; and levees and channel work for protection of the area along the east coast.

Estimated cost to United States for construction: $171,041,000.

Amount authorized to be appropriated for partial accomplishment of said plan by this amendment, $16,300,000.

House conferees concur with an amendment inserting the document number.

AMENDMENT NO. 20, ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

This item provides that the second paragraph under the heading "Arkansas River Basin" in the Flood Control Act of 1946 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Engineers is authorized to provide in the Canton Reservoir on the North Canadian River one hundred and seven thousand acre-feet of irrigation and water supply storage (including approximately sixty-nine thousand acre-feet for irrigation and thirty-eight thousand acre-feet for municipal water supply for Enid, Oklahoma, to be utilized in accordance with section 8 and section 6, respectively, of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (Public, 534, Seventy-eighth Congress)), upon the condition that when siltation of the reservoir shall encroach upon the flood control authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946, and the authorization for appropriation for the Arkansas River Basin is hereby increased accordingly."

AMENDMENT NO. 21, APPROACHES TO CERTAIN BRIDGES ON ARKANSAS RIVER

The bill as passed by the House contains a modification of existing projects for flood protection on the Arkansas River which were authorized by section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944. That modification is intended to reestablish the general distribution of Federal and local participation in the first cost of alterations to highway bridges and approaches at Morrilton and at Van Buren-Fort Smith, as set forth in House Document No. 447, Seventy-eighth Congress. The present estimated cost of these alterations is $571,000. United States Highways 64 and 71 are strategic highways and State Highway No. 9 is a secondary Federal-aid road. Due to changes in design of the structures, channel changes caused by floods, and the emergency nature of accomplishing these alterations in a satisfactory manner at an early date, the committee believes that a Federal contribution to the modifications on a basis of approximately 50 percent is desirable and, therefor, recommends that the figure in the House bill be raised from $200,000 to $300,000.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 22, BRADENS BEND, ARKANSAS RIVER

Item adopts as an emergency measure, a plan for bank protection and control works at Bradens Bend, Okla., at an estimated cost of $1,000,000. The right bank of the Arkansas River has been actively sloughing into the stream since 1900. Active bank caving is now taking place downstream from the existing riprap. The branch line of the Kansas City Southern Railroad has been abandoned because of the bank caving, and United States Highway No. 271 relocated out of the area since it was severed. There now remains about 3,500 feet between the present bank line of the Arkansas River and the Poteau River. An existing draw between the Poteau and Arkansas Rivers would provide a pilot channel for the Arkansas River to change its course into the Poteau River, forming a double channel and isolating upward of 7,300 acres of high quality cultivated farm land comprising 45 farm units. This would have a detrimental effect on construction of the authorized navigation project at a later date.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 23, RED RIVER OF THE NORTH DRAINAGE BASIN, MINN. AND N. DAK.

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for channel clearing, enlargement and realinement and construction of levees and flood walls along certain sectors of the main stem and of its major tributaries in Minnesota and North Dakota and construction of a multiple-purpose reservoir with the dam at mile 58.6 on the Otter Tail River, Minn.

Estimated cost to United States for construction: $9,038,000.

House conferees concur.

The sum of $3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for partial accomplishment of this project.

AMENDMENT NO. 24, MISSOURI RIVER IN VICINITY OF MINERS BEND, NEBR. AND S. DAK.

Item adopts as an emergency measure the following project:

Plan of recommended improvement: The proposed project consists of a system of dikes and revetments to control erosion and prevent loss of farm lands from caving banks in Ponca and Miners Bends on the Missouri

River over a distance of about 9 miles. Construction of about 6 miles of revetment and 5,000 linear feet of dikes is contemplated. The project ties into the bluff line in Ponca Bend well above the critical area.

Estimated cost to the United States for construction: $3,000,000.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 25, SOUTH PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, COLO., WYO., AND NEBR.

Item adopts new project as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for the construction of the following works of improvement: (a) Reservoir at the Chatfield Dam site, (b) Continuous levee system along the South Platte River, between the Chatfield Dam site and St. Vrain Creek, (c) Channel improvements along South Platte River below St. Vrain Creek, (d) Channel improvement and related works at Boulder, Colo., and (e) Levee and appurtenant works at Erie, Colo.

Estimated cost to the United States for construction: $49,432,000.

Senate recedes.

AMENDMENT NO. 26, DETROIT RESERVOIR, ON NORTH SANTIAM RIVER,, WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN

Item provides for the installation of generating facilities at the Detroit Dam and the construction of a reregulating reservoir. The Detroit Reservoir is one of the elements of the system of flood control and multipurpose reservoirs in the Willamette River Basin. It is advantageously located with respect to a power market area, and a major transmission network exists in that vicinity. The needed additional power-generating capacity in the Pacific Northwest is critical and will become more acute in the next few years. The proposed power installation would generate 443,100,000 kilowatt-hours annually which would have a value of $1,657,000. The ratio of benefits to costs is 1.57 to 1.0.

The total estimated Federal cost for the installation of power facilities including a reregulating dam at Detroit Reservoir is $19,030,000. Additional monetary authorization for this work need not necessarily be included in the bill since the available monetary authorization for the comprehensive plan for the Willamette River Basin, for which appropriations have not yet been made, is sufficient to cover the initial items of work on the installation of power facilities which might be undertaken in the near future. Approval of the inclusion of power, however, is urgently needed to permit this work to go ahead.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 27, 28, AND 29

These amendments rearrange the House language on the project for the West Tennessee tributaries under Lower Mississippi River by inserting a subsection, (a), and the following: "and the authorization for the Lower Mississippi River project is increased accordingly".

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 30, DEVILS SWAMP PROJECT AT EATON ROUGE, LA.

House conferees concur with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the item insert the following: "and the authorization for the Lower Mississippi River project is increased accordingly".

AMENDMENT NO. 31, L'ANGUILLE RIVER, MO. AND ARK.

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: The plan of improvement provides for clearing, enlargement, and realignment as required of L'Anguille River below mile 108, Brushy Creek below mile 6, and First Creek below mile 8, to convey flood flows at stages sufficiently low to facilitate drainage of areas outside the first bottoms of the flood plain above the limit of Mississippi and St. Francis Rivers backwater.

Estimated cost to the United States for construction: $5,100,000.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 32, RIO GRANDE BASIN

Item adopts project covering the construction of reservoirs, floodways, rehabilitation and miscellaneous work, as follows:

Project [1]	Federal	Non-Federal	Tota
Chamita Reservoir	$30,933,000	.....	$30,933,000
Jemez Reservoir	7,201,000	.....	7,201,000
Rio Grande floodway	11,525,000	$181,200	11,707,000
Bluewater floodway	200,000	[2] 75,200	275,200
Rehabilitation work	18,233,000	.....	18,233,000
Miscellaneous work	1,325,600	.....	1,325,600
Total	69,518,000	256,200	70,328,849

[1] Based on December 1947 prices.

[2] $75,000 is a cash contribution and $200 is lands and damages.

Local cooperation: Local interests are required to give the customary assurances in connection with flood-control projects covering lands, damages, and highway and highway-bridge alterations for channel and levees in addition to maintaining and operating all levees in the Bluewater floodway. They must also contribute in cash $75,000 to the cost of constructing a culvert which is part of the Bluewater floodway project. Total estimated non-Federal cost is $256,200.

The plan will provide for the development of the water resources of the Rio Grande Basin and the flood-control phase of the plan covered in this report will provide improvements essential to the economic welfare of the inhabitants of the basin. The ratio of average annual benefits to average annual costs is 1.2 to 1.

The plan has been coordinated among the Federal and State agencies concerned and all are in agreement. Construction of the entire plan would be a joint undertaking of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior. The committee is of the opinion that flood and sediment control in the Rio Grande Basin is essential for protection of the valley lands. Sedimentation of the stream bed has raised ground-water levels in the valley and caused abandonment of large agricultural areas and increased damages from floods. The comprehensive plan worked out by State, Federal, and local officials would reduce flood damages and permit continued use of a large area for agricultural and other purposes. Approval of the plan with small authorization to construct emergency features and prosecute plans for certain remaining items is believed desirable and the committee so recommends.

The sum of $3,500,000 is authorized to be appropriated to be expended by the Department of the Army for partial accomplishment of this plan.

House conferees concur, with an amendment in lines 19 and 20, page 23, striking out the words: "at prices, on terms, and with titles satisfactory to him."

AMENDMENTS NOS. 33 TO 38, INCLUSIVE

These items provide for the making of preliminary examinations and surveys at the following localities:

Two Mile Creek, Oregon.

Aroostook River and tributaries, Maine.

Beaver Creek, Lincoln County, Oregon.

Skinner Creek, at and in the vicinity of Mannsville, New York.

Steinhatchee and Fenholloway Rivers, Florida.

River Rouge and tributaries, Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 39

This amendment increases the amount authorized in the House bill for carrying out improvements authorized under title II of the bill from $35,000,000 to $65,000,000.

House conferees concur with an amendment striking out "$65,000,000", and inserting in lieu thereof "$62,000,000."

GEO. A. DONDERO,
EARL WILSON,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—

"(a) such sums, not to exceed $1,091,739 per annum, as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization, as apportioned by the International Labour Conference in accordance with Article 13 (c) of the Constitution of the Organization; and

"(b) such additional sums, not to exceed $95,000 per annum, as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization, including—

"(1) salaries of the representative or representatives and alternates and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light and cost of living allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and

"(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946, Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that Act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).

"SEC. 3. No person shall serve as representative, delegate, or alternate from the United States until such person has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

And the House agree to the same.

DONALD L. JACKSON,
FRANKLIN J. MALONEY,
WIRT COURTNEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate joint resolution authorized the appropriation annually of such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of members and for participation by it in the International Labor Organization. The House amendment authorized to be appropriated annually such sums, not to exceed $550,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, as may be necessary for payment by the United States of its share of the expenses and further provided that "the annual United States quota of contribution to the total budget of the Organization shall not be greater in proportion than the United States quota of contribution to the total budget of the United Nations." The House amendment further authorized the annual appropriation of such additional sums, not to exceed $95,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization. The amendment agreed to in conference follows the House provision except that (1) the amount authorized to be appropriated for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization is limited to $1,091,739 per annum in conformity with the appropriation bill recently passed by both Houses and this limitation is made applicable to all fiscal years, (2) the requirement quoted above as to quota of contribution is eliminated, and (3) the limitation of $95,000 on the authorization for the payment of expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization is made applicable to each fiscal year.

The House amendment provided that no citizen of, or resident in, the United States shall participate in any session, conference, or meeting, or other work of the International Labor Organization or of any subordinate committee or organization thereof, without the consent of the Secretary of State. The amendment agreed to in conference omits this provision. However, the House provision requiring investigation as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of any person serving as representative, delegate, or alternate from the United States has been retained.

DONALD L. JACKSON,
FRANKLIN J. MALONEY,
WIRT COURTNEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARITAL DEDUCTION, FOR ESTATE-TAX PURPOSES, IN CASE OF LIFE INSURANCE OR ANNUITY PAYMENTS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 429) relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 812 (e) (1) (G) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to life insurance with power of appointment in surviving spouse) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(G) Life insurance or annuity payments with power of appointment in surviving spouse: In the case of an interest in property passing from the decedent consisting of proceeds under a life insurance, endowment, or annuity contract, if under the terms of the contract such proceeds are payable in installments or are held by the insurer subject to an agreement to pay interest thereon (whether the proceeds, upon the termination of any interest payments, are payable in a lump sum or in annual or more frequent installments), and such installment or interest payments are payable annually or at more frequent intervals, commencing not later than 13 months after the decedent's death, and all amounts payable during the life of the surviving spouse are payable only to such spouse, and such spouse has the power to appoint all amounts payable under such contract (exercisable in favor of such surviving spouse, or of the estate of such surviving spouse, or in favor of either, whether or not in each case the power is exercisable in favor of others), with no power in any other person to appoint to any person other than the surviving spouse any part of the amounts payable under such contract—

"(i) such proceeds shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (A), be considered as passing to the surviving spouse, and

"(ii) no part of such proceeds shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (B) (i), be considered as passing to any person other than the surviving spouse.

"This subparagraph shall be applicable only if, under the terms of the contract, such power in the surviving spouse to appoint, whether exercisable by will or during life, is exercisable by such spouse alone and in all events."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this joint resolution shall be applicable with respect to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1947.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this proposal is intended to correct an inequity in the Revenue Act of 1948 whereby insurance proceeds left with the insurer at interest, or settlement under endowment and annuity contracts are denied the marital deduction. Insurers have received requests from a large number of policy holders to rearrange their insurance proceeds to comply with the law, and it is causing confusion among millions of policy holders.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CLAIMING CREDIT OR REFUND WITH RESPECT TO WAR LOSSES

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 423) providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That if a claim for credit or refund under the internal-revenue laws relates to an overpayment on account of the deductibility by the taxpayer of a loss in respect of property considered destroyed or seized under section 127 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to war losses, for a taxable year beginning in 1941 or 1942, the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 322 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code shall in no event expire prior to December 31, 1949. In the case of such a claim filed on or before December 31, 1949, the amount of the credit or refund may exceed the portion of the tax paid within the period provided in section 322 (b) (2) or (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, whichever is applicable, to the extent of the amount of the overpayment attributable to the deductibility of the loss described in this section.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 117]

Andresen, August H.	Kee	O'Toole
Bell	Kefauver	Peden
Blackney	Keogh	Ploeser
Bland	Kerr	Plumley
Brown, Ohio	King	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Kirwan	Regan
Celler	Lane	Rivers
Combs	Lewis, Ohio	Robertson
Elliott	Ludlow	Shafer
Fellows	Lusk	Smathers
Fogarty	Lyle	Smith, Maine
Granger	Lynch	Stigler
Hartley	McMahon	Thomas, N. J.
Jennings	Macy	Welch
Johnson, Okla.	Meade, Md.	West
Johnson, Tex.	Michener	Wilson, Ind.
	Morton	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INCREASING COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, with amendments of the House thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Messrs. KEARNEY, MATHEWS, ALLEN of Louisiana and RANKIN.

INCREASING RATES OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH COMPENSATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2825) to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes, with amendments of the House thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Messrs. KEARNEY, MATHEWS, RANKIN, and ALLEN of Louisiana.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States and for other purposes.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighteen Members, including the Speaker, are present, a quorum.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6401, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 4 of the bill is still pending. Are there any further amendments?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems best to make a short announcement for the possible information of a great many of the Members of the House.

In the first place, I would like to say that I quite understand the situation. I have been in the House long enough, I think, to at least have a reasonable understanding of the present situation and the views of both those in favor of this bill and those opposed to it.

It is not my doing that this bill comes up on the closing days of the Congress. If I had had my way, it would have been up a month ago, with ample time, 2 or 3 days, for debate. I would not be disposed to rush the consideration of this bill under the 5-minute rule, were it not for the fact that it comes up at the very close of the Congress.

As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I have tried to conduct it in a way that was fair to all Members on the majority side. I think even though some of them have opposed me on this measure, they will say that they have been reasonably fairly treated. I think the same is true, if you would ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], on the minority side. It has been my disposition to be that way in the House under the 5-minute rule.

This is a very important bill. It is not a pleasant bill for Members to vote on, but it is a bill that has a great deal to do with the security of this Nation, looking to the future, as we see it, for the next 2 years.

Thirty-three members of the Armed Services Committee heard all the testimony. They are informed, and a preponderant majority of that committee having heard all the testimony, reported this bill favorably. I do not say that they are more correct in their viewpoint than you, but at least they are better informed in the premises than the average Member of the House.

It is true that on yesterday, on an amendment providing for 1 year, a great many men, who were opposed to the bill completely, spoke for the 1-year amendment. They spoke of how fine it would be for the young men of this country to have 1 year's training in the Army—the very gentlemen who opposed universal military training and assisted in blocking the consideration of that bill by the Congress.

I hold nothing against anybody. Personally, I am not concerned with the views of anybody here. It is a fact that this large committee reported this bill favorably, and the Senate of the United States has acted upon it. The President of the United States suggested it. It is true that one of the candidates on the Republican ticket, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. TAFT, voted for this bill. It is true that the Governor of New York, Mr. Dewey, in a press release—and I congratulate him upon the guts it took to do it—stated that he was in favor of the bill; and so is the young former Governor of Minnesota, Mr. Stassen.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. Has the President of the United States said anything about the draft on his trip out West?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Whether he has or has not, he made a speech for it. I think the public generally expects the Congress to vote on this issue.

This morning, the Speaker of the House who has been a long-time friend of mine, a man in whom I have confidence, asked me to hurry this bill as fast as I could, to go as long as I could, and try to pass this bill tonight. That is my intention. If in attempting to do that I seem to ride over somebody it is not ANDREWS personally that does it. I am chairman of a committee charged with consideration of an important measure for the security of this country whether you believe it or not. There is my friend, and he has been a friend of mine, who at this time opposes this bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. You would not think it, but I campaigned at his invitation in his district although I will admit he did not allow me to speak at the meeting, but it was a very pleasant evening I spent with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. Now he may attempt to do all sorts of things. He may try to block a vote on this bill, as he represents a party which is diametrically opposed to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw it. Let the gentleman from Texas proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, we went through an experience last night. I know exactly what happened. I know that I was ignominiously defeated; but I do not believe it was in accordance with the majority view of the House. To those of you who found it convenient or comfortable to be in your homes or in your offices last night when we were voting on a most important issue, I say to you, I hope that you enjoyed the diversions in which you were interested.

I do not regard this bill as just another bill. I do not think that this is like adding a few million or subtracting a few million from an appropriation bill; I think that this bill is one of the fundamental things involving the security of this Nation. I voted for the Marshall plan, for ERP or ECA, whichever you want to call it, and I think this is just as important as that.

I know there is a filibuster on here. I admire the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] because they are unalterably opposed to this bill and say so. I cannot say that I admire those of you who resort to the expediency of gutting amendments in order to defeat this bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. No. I know the gentleman is opposed to the bill, that he thought when he voted for the 70-group air force that he would avoid the necessity of voting on this. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

I realize we have just had a roll call to develop a quorum, but I doubt very sincerely if there is a quorum present since the Speaker counted last.

There is here an effort to prevent the consideration of this bill. Let every Member of this House atone to his own conscience. I think that this is a necessity. I think that it is entitled to consideration on its merits; and those of you who will resort to devices to avoid that vote, may your conscience not trouble you.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT:

Pages 6 and 7, strike out all of subsection (e) beginning on line 22, page 6, and extending through line 23, page 7.

Page 8, line 19, after the number "1940", strike out the remainder of the line and the word "more" in line 20.

Page 28, line 24, strike out the words "prior to September 2, 1945."

Page 9, strike lines 4 through 23, inclusive.

Strike out all of page 10.

Strike out lines 1 through 4, page 11.

Page 13, line 20, strike out the words "less than ninety" and insert in lieu thereof the words "no prior."

Page 13, line 21, strike out the words "days' continuous."

Page 13, line 22, strike out the comma after the word "States" and the words "exclusive of periods of active training duty."

Page 48, strike out lines 8 through 11, inclusive.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (interrupting reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the remainder of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to exempt veterans of World War II. If the Clerk had read the entire amendment, he would have read a combination of deletions, and it is for that reason I asked unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The language of the bill before us provides that those veterans of World War II who had up to 12 months of service would be included in the draft, except the holders of the Purple Heart, citations, members of Reserve components, and those who are not physically qualified, and so forth.

Let us keep in mind yesterday we spent hours talking about doctors, also students between the ages of 19 and 25. This amendment concerns 613,000 young men who left their homes, their jobs, and their education—some volunteered, while others were drafted into the service. When you deduct the number of veterans of World War II who hold the Purple Heart; also citations, and the number who are physically disqualified, you shrink the number of 613,000 to a mere 50,000. Therefore this amendment will exempt only 50,000 veterans of World War II who are not at the moment exempt under the language of the bill.

I ask you, is it fair for us, the Congress of the United States, to apply another draft to a veteran who has been drafted already or to one who volunteered in the last war? The responsibility of fighting this country's wars, the responsibility of military service, is a responsibility that belongs to every young man who is physically qualified. By exempting the veterans of World War II you will simply be passing the responsibility of military service to the shoulders of those who have not served their country already.

The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars appeared before our committee in support of this amendment. The committee by a marginal vote defeated it and it is for that reason that the amendment is offered at this time.

In conclusion let me mention again there are only 50,000 veterans of World War II involved. Let us exempt them by adopting this amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would eliminate from the bill those provisions requiring veterans with limited service to serve in Reserve components?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The veterans of World War II.

Mr. KILDAY. World War II, yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Who have less than 12 months of service.

Mr. KILDAY. The bill as drawn would require one with less than 12 months service to enter a Reserve component. Were the gentleman's amendment adopted those men would be totally exempt under the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, the gentleman's argument in support of his amendment was not in consonance with the terms of the amendment. The gentleman will agree that what we are attempting to do here is to channel into the reserve components those men who have served more than 90 days and less than 12 months. Do I understand the gentleman to mean if one has served more than 90 days and less than 12 months that he is to be exempt entirely?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. My amendment provides that all men of World War II who had less than 12 months' service shall be exempt from the provisions of this bill.

Mr. KILDAY. In other words, as to those who were in the service, but had no combat service—in very rare instances they may have had combat service—the gentleman would exempt all of them?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. Then what would become of our reserve components?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to make reply to the genial gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]. I have nothing but the fondest regard for him and I have a great deal of respect for him. I think that he has been working for this kind of legislation most assiduously and in all earnestness. I disagree with him, but nevertheless I respect him.

However, I do not think that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] was playing fair with this House when he sought to arouse the political prejudices of the membership on both sides of the House in order to corral votes in support of this measure. His attempt was so obvious that even a blind man could see it when he tried to lump together the opposition of the gentlemen on his side of the aisle and the opposition of some gentlemen on this side of the aisle with my opposition and that of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I prefer to complete my statement and then I shall yield.

Then the gentleman from New York went a step further and in order to arouse political prejudice, he stated that this measure is being diametrically opposed by the party which I have the honor and the distinction to represent in this House. We have been here long enough, gentlemen, and we know that time and time again that Members, who have an extremely opposed political philosophy may vote for or against a proposition for different reasons. There are some Members of this House who oppose this measure for pacific reasons. There are other Members of this House who oppose this measure because they feel that it is not necessary. There are others who oppose this measure because they conscientiously believe that if a system of voluntary enlistment were properly encouraged, that it would fulfill the alleged need. Those gentleman are just as much in earnest in their opposition to this measure as the gentleman from New York is in earnest in support of this measure, and those gentlemen are just as sincere in the reasons that they attribute in opposition to this measure as the gentleman from New York is in support of this measure.

As for me and as for the party I represent, we have no apology to make for our opposition. We oppose it because it is another step in the direction of war for profits and resultant depressions. How ironical it is that on the very day

when this Congress has placed the seal of doom on public housing you open the flood gates of militarism in support of an imperialist foreign policy. Yes; in support of Wall Street domination of the world. Today, you refused to house the veterans and you refused to house the youth of this country, and now, on this very same day, you announce here a program of rushing through legislation to house them in the Army.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Not at this time.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman does not intend to yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do intend to yield, but the gentleman knows I want to complete my statement. Then I shall ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute for the purpose of yielding to the gentleman from Texas. I am not trying to evade any question.

We look upon this legislation as part of a program, a program that has carried this Nation of ours into Europe, in support of reaction in Turkey and fascism in Greece, and into China in support of its Hitler and I say that that program is not in defense of the interests of the American people, it is in defense not of America, but of an expansionism of the same monopoly capital that has today ruthlessly crushed all hopes of housing legislation in this House. This conscription is part of a program that is in the interest of the exploitation of the people of the world, not in the interest of the common people who reside in your districts but in the interest of those who have made war time and time again in this world. I repeat again that we are in no danger of attack from the Soviet Union. We are under attack from the big trusts that are raising prices daily, refuse Americans housing, that are enslaving and exploiting labor, destroying the liberties of our people and now seek to militarize our youth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I say this before I yield to the gentleman: That if I believed, and the new party which I represent believed, that this were not in the interest of imperialism, that it were really in the interest of the defense of the common people of this Nation, particularly that one-third that you refuse to house today by your action, then I would support it.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. In enumerating those who are opposed to the bill, I notice the gentleman did not refer to the Wallacites and those who are for appeasing Russia. The gentleman agrees that they are opposed to the bill, does he?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not know where the gentleman has been, but I have been speaking of the position of the new party. We do not agree that we are appeasing anyone. We say that those who support this legislation are appeasing those elements in this country that are driving this Nation to war for profits and depression. Appeasement comes from them and not from us. In opposing this bill we are defending the best interest of our Nation and we are fighting in the very defense of the common people of this Nation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is very ironical also that, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] said, there is before the Committee on Rules today an extremely fine housing measure just for veterans alone, the best housing measure for veterans that I have ever seen. I refer, of course, to the veterans' homestead housing bill (H. R. 4488) which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I am hopeful that we will get a rule or a suspension to pass that bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] said that before the Rules Committee yesterday it was a fine measure, that it did not interfere in any way with his bill or with any other bill. He told me the same thing; 29 Members introduced the bill with me. It was reported unanimously out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is not talking about the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will proceed in order.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will proceed to talk about the bill, and the gentleman may like what I have to say regarding the bill or regarding some 50 disabled veterans who are here in the gallery and outside the House Chamber, single amputees and double-leg-and-arm amputees, some in wheel chairs. Many are sitting on the floor. There are no chairs. They cannot stand. Not one of those men said anything about the draft today. I believe firmly all those men would rather have a draft if it is going to save more men from being disabled and be a protection to the United States. Grievously disabled as they are, they are not complaining today about their disabilities. Most of them are discharged. Some of them now have automobiles. It is a matter of rehabilitation. Those who now have cars came from different parts of the United States to help others to secure this legislation. They know what cars have done for them in rehabilitation, in enabling them to secure jobs, and to get them GI training in schools and colleges.

They are here asking for a bill which includes the blind and other amputees, and those who are not included in the bill which passed 2 years ago and was enacted again last year. Similar groups in hospitals cannot get cars because they must be discharged before they can apply for cars. That bill expires June 30.

Mr. Chairman, I was never so shocked in all my experience in Washington since 1913 as when there was an Independent Offices appropriation bill being considered, including appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. A rule was secured in order to waive all points of order. There was much legislation in that appropriation bill. There were provisions contained in that bill affecting civilians. Yet, when I tried to offer an amendment inserting the provisions of the Senate bill, S. 1391, providing automobiles, a point of order was made against it as being legislation in an appropriation bill. That provision would have helped badly disabled combat casualties.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking the Rules Committee for a rule. I have asked the Speaker and floor leaders to allow the bill to come up under suspension of the rules. I do not believe there is a Member who would vote against the measure if once it gets to the floor. During that debate that day, Member after Member said in speaking, "There is nothing we would not do for the disabled." They did not live up to those brave words. This is a small thing to do for the combat disabled. It is a bill that the Senate passed unanimously over a year ago, a bill that our Committee reported over a year ago, and which is ready for action. I am positive, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress cannot adjourn without taking care of these amputees and these blind men who are not protesting against the draft. It may mean that there will be even more disabled, but in the minds of some, and in their minds, it means that if we did not have a large enough Army and Navy, there would probably be more disabled men in the end. You all do honor to the disabled, as I do, and I know that you will all act for them. This Congress which has spent billions for foreign relief and rehabilitation cannot refuse to authorize the comparatively small sum of $8,000,000 to provide cars for these grievously disabled veterans who are our first and primary charge.

During the frantic war days we promised to rehabilitate them. See that we fulfill that promise before adjournment 2 days off—before it is too late after adjournment.

No Member can go through the hospital amputee, paraplegic, and blind wards and say, "No, I did not help you," without shame.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the so-called Van Zandt amendment close in 17 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the so-called Van Zandt amendment close in 17 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, it has been difficult for me to understand exactly the purport or import of the gentleman's amendment.

Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Under subsection (2) on page 5, in inducting persons, pursuant to paragraph 1 of this subsection, the President shall induct in the following order of priority:

The first deals with the Medical and Dental Corps; the second with those who participate in Army specialty training; and the third those who are less than 35 years of age.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yesterday the House struck from the bill the entire provision that applies to doctors.

Mr. FOLGER. I understand that, but what change does your amendment make with respect to 3, 4, 5, and 6 on page 6?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I might reply to the gentleman that all of page 6, down through line 17, has been deleted from the bill.

Mr. FOLGER. Does that mean that none of these people who have been in the service are exempt from the draft?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It means that no doctors——

Mr. FOLGER. I am not talking about doctors, but others who have been in the service, who are less than 35 and have had less than 90 days' service.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The language the gentleman refers to relates only to doctors and no one else.

Mr. FOLGER. Now, what about your amendment?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. My amendment affects the language beginning on page 6, line 22, and deletes throughout the remainder of the bill all requirements of draft on the part of honorably discharged veterans of World War II, who had 12 months', or less, service. In other words, they cannot be drafted in accordance with the provisions of this bill.

Mr. FOLGER. Your amendment, then, takes them out from under the authority of this bill?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, it means that they will have no obligation, no matter how short their service may have been, to enter the National Guard or the organized Reserves?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. In other words, a man who served 60 days would be exempt from all liability for service. A man who served less than 12 months would be exempt from further liability, whereas our bill provides that if he had had less than 12 months he must go into the Reserves or the National Guard. The bill passed by the Senate, if he had less than 18 months. It would eliminate from the bill all of those provisions which we had hoped would accelerate enlistments in the Reserve components. Is that correct?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, as I interpret the intent of the Committee on Armed Services in writing in this language as it now stands, it is to help build up the citizen Organized Reserves in the country who, in the last analysis, in the face of any major emergency, must be relied upon to defend the country. We cannot in a major emergency, rely upon a standing army or a standing professional air force or a standing professional navy. We must go to citizens, as we have done in every contest in which we have taken part.

The purpose here, to my mind, is perfectly legitimate. It does not inflict a hardship upon these veterans of World War II who had less than 12 months' service. It does not compel them to go into active service; rather it invites them, instead of going into active service, to join a unit of the National Guard or the Naval Reserve or the Marine Reserve or the Air Force Reserve and thus build up those elements with men who already have had some training in World War II. A man might have had only 2 or 3 months' service in World War II and never have left the training camp. They are good men. It is no reflection on them at all. They are now in their early twenties. It is fair to say that they have not suffered, but they can be of great use to the country if they are encouraged to go into the Organized Reserves. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says, I recollect, that there are 50,000 of them. That is a very important number for the Reserves. It would greatly help the National Guard if some of these World War veterans of short service would join up. It would be a great incentive for others to join and would help recruiting and help the efficiency of the National Guard.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GOFF. I heartily agree with what the gentleman says regarding the Reserves and National Guard. It is true also that these men of short service have received substantial benefits from the Government.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Indeed they have. They have enjoyed the GI bill of rights if they had over 90 days of service.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Also, it should be pointed out that in the case of the veterans covered by the gentleman's discussion it would not interfere with their vocation or education. It would just be extracurricular service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at all; not at all. They could live at home—live like ordinary citizens.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. This would supplement the short period of service they had in the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman feel that by the passage of this amendment it would supplement enlistments in the National Guard?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would be very helpful to the National Guard if this provision were retained, in my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because I am supporting anything that will strike from this bill any of those parts which together comprise the biggest tissue of lies ever forced upon the American people in peacetime. On Saturday I made a public statement that this bill was so important, regardless of what happened to other legislation, I was determined that we were going to have free and ample time to discuss it; and when the committee brought out a 3-hour-debate limitation I again, day before yesterday, emphasized that if there was any gag placed on the 5-minute rule I would oppose it even if it meant that no other business would be transacted in this Congress during this session.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I will not.

The gentleman from New York has limited 7 speakers to 17 minutes. That is gagging this legislation.

Therefore, as of this minute I will object to every unanimous consent for the balance of this Congress. As of this minute there will be no unanimous-consent requests agreed to on this floor. You might as well pack your bags up and go home.

Also I am very happy to say——

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. Not unless I get extra time.

Mr. KILDAY. Time has been fixed. It is not under my control.

Mr. POWELL. That is right.

I would like to say that the saying that the opposers of this bill are members of a party diametrically opposed to the bill marks another cheap subterfuge, another cheap trick to brand those of us who are not members of the American Labor Party, but who are honestly opposed to this bill.

The gentleman from New York, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, knows better than anyone else here, because the witnesses appeared before him, that the vast majority of the religious leaders of this Nation, Protestant and Catholic, are opposed to this bill. He does not call Cardinal Daugherty a Wallaceite, does he? Does he mean to imply that the Reverend Ralph Sockman, of the Methodist Church, must be an American Labor Party member because he is opposed to this bill? Does he mean to imply that Chancelor Graham, of the University of North Carolina, who is the national president of the Council Against Conscription, is a leftwinger because he is opposed to this bill? No.

There are plenty of us on both sides of this House opposed to this bill who take our place along with Communists or pacifists, or anyone opposing this slavery. Thank God, we recaptured enough of our manhood late yesterday to rise up and defeat the brass-hat dictatorship of this House and put into this bill some

things that we believed was honest by reducing the draft to 1 year. I have faith enough in this recaptured manhood to believe that when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], brings his amendment before us we are going to pass it and, therefore, kill this Army-Fascist-dictatorship control of our national life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW].

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I am quite surprised to hear for the first time someone expressing an interest in the Reserves. The gentleman from New York says that if we strike this out of the bill it will vitally affect the Reserves. Now, I do not believe that remark, because I have been a part of the Reserves since 1925. Anyone who is a veteran of World War II will gladly join the Reserves if the Regular Army will make it available to him.

We have been out of this war for over 2 years, almost 3 years, as a matter of fact, and the handling of the Reserve organization by the Army is a crime.

May I call your attention to the minority report. General Evans, head of the Reserve Officers' Association, testified before the committee that he had been working for 3 years trying to get somebody to do something for the Reserves. He testified further that he had been told by a member of the Regular Army that they were not interested in building up either the Organized Reserves or the National Guard, because they were going to get UMT and the draft.

Mr. Chairman, may I say as a member of the Reserve organization, as one man who served during the last war, and I am still a colonel in the Ordnance Reserve, that if we were to run into an emergency I assure you I would be ready to go tomorrow. I say that all members who are eligible for the Reserve will be glad to join if it is available, if the Army will take an interest in it and build it up.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think any man should be subject to two drafts. The first draft was on account of an emergency. There is no question about that. No one can claim differently.

Now, in connection with this draft I would like to know what the emergency is. Has anyone told us on this floor yet what it is?

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment to strike out the veterans of World War II from this draft and I hope it will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the attacks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] on Members who are opposed to this bill. Those insulting insinuations cannot intimidate an honest man.

Today is the anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill where American patriots started this Nation on its road to glorious achievements. I wonder if on that anniversary we are going to pass a bill that will fasten militarism upon the American people for all time to come?

I want to say to the gentleman from Texas and all the rest of you that no man in this House has fought communism any harder than I have. No man in this Congress has done more to turn the spotlight of merciless publicity onto Communist activities in this country than I have.

No man has taken more of their abuse than I am taking even today, because I am opposed to communism and everything for which communism stands. It is atheistic anarchy dedicated to the destruction of our Christian civilization. I am opposed to it and will do everything in my power to prevent its fastening itself upon the American people.

Is any Member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs present? If so, were you present and did you hear General Marshall this morning make the statement that there was no danger of war at this time, or words to that effect? If so, why do you not stand up here and give us General Marshall's statement? Why do you not tell the American Congress what General Marshall said?

The sponsors of this legislation are carrying on the same old tactics that were carried on after World War I. I was here then, and I heard that debate. They attempted then to fasten militarism upon the American people; and that is what this means. You will never live to see us get rid of it if this bill is passed and becomes law.

Not only that, but you are getting ready to draft these men to fight the battle of the UN, that unpredictable, international organization congregated up here in New York that is trying to get rid of the United States and force upon us a world government. Do not forget that. And, do not forget that the mothers and the fathers and the young men of this country are going to know that and they are going to ask you why when you go home.

Yesterday the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] made one of the most intelligent statements I have heard on this measure.

Oh, they say, "You voted for the 70-unit air force."

Certainly we did. But you want to subordinate that air force to a vast army dominated by men who probably are more interested in promotion than anything else.

If you want to defend this Nation, put that 70-unit air force into effect and, as the gentleman from North Carolina said, promote these men in the Air Force, raise their pay to where they can afford it, give them the power to employ the technicians necessary, and with the atomic bomb they will not only protect this Nation, but I dare say with America in that condition no world power would start a war in which we would likely be involved.

I have on my wall today a picture of a steel mill in Nagasaki after the atomic bomb was dropped on that city. It is simply a twisted mass of steel girders.

But they say, "Oh, we have to have ground forces." Yoy did not have to have ground forces in Nagasaki or Hiroshima, because it was even dangerous for anybody to go there for days and weeks and probably months after the bomb was dropped. But this young man, this soldier boy from my home county, took a picture of a steel mill a mile from where the bomb fell. As I said, it is a twisted mass of steel girders. No, we are living in an atomic age, and if we will take advantage of it, build and maintain the 70-group air force we have voted, and provide it with the funds to employ the necessary technicians, we will not need to wreck the Republic in this way.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to cover just about two points in regard to this matter that I think are rather significant so that you may consider them for what if anything you might think they are worth.

I will read hurriedly here, and then make a comment concerning the same, a statement that was made by the minority in the committee report, as follows:

> General Evans, the executive director of the Reserve Officers' Association, told the Armed Services Committee that the Army had done "very little" to help the Reserves, had done "nothing" to furnish equipment, and did not contact or "put in units" the members of the Reserve. General Evans said—
>
> "I am not talking about procurement. All I am urging and begging and what I have been doing for 3 years is to have somebody do something with what we have now."
>
> General Evans agreed that, "there would be no need for a draft, UMT, or anything else if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and the Reserves, having made a sincere, earnest, and determined effort to build them up."
>
> In the Senate hearings, General Evans said:
>
> "There is an apparent policy which exists in the Pentagon today which says we will do very little with the Reserve program until the National Guard program is 100-percent organized. It cannot be 100-percent organized in the manner in which it is supposed to be, completely, until the passage of universal military training."
>
> General Reckord of the National Guard told our House committee that General Marshall in 1944 directed him, as chairman of the Joint General Staff Committee, to set up the National Guard and the Reserves "based on the fact that Congress would give us UMT."
>
> General Evans backed this up by saying he had heard the statement made that the Army leaders "felt that they need not build up either the Organized Reserves or the National Guard because they were going to get UMT or the draft."

The situation is simply this. It is as plain as the nose on your face, and here is the record showing it, that the Army has made no real effort to try to bring the Army up to the standard necessary, by the voluntary system. They just have made no effort along that line, yet they ask us to depart from the traditions of this country and to become a military conscription Nation like the European nations, before having done their part in attempting to get what they say is necessary by the voluntary method.

Let us examine another statement. I am a member of a Protestant church but I am not a Baptist. In my thinking, however, the Baptists are good folk. The Northern Baptists passed a resolution not long ago in their convention, meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., May 28, 1948, and in the resolution they said this significant thing, and I believe they are telling the truth because they are good people:

> Whereas the determination of our international relations is now so much in the hands of military men that the Army and Navy Bulletin of January 18, 1947, stated, "Today the Army has virtual control of foreign affairs * * * the chain of control in diplomatic hot spots both in the execution of basic policy and in the formulation of ad hoc arrangements lies almost totally in the hands of the military authorities."

The Army and Navy Bulletin has the audacity to tell us that. Everybody knows it, it is as plain as day what is going on, but here they publish the fact that the foreign policy of our Government has been turned over to the Army. Are we going to go a step further and make it a cinch that you and I as representatives of the people no longer represent their interests along that line? I am afraid that is what we are doing today, if we take this step, and perhaps some others that will follow it. We cannot continue to do these things and properly represent our people and protect our people, in my judgment.

You may say that we need this program to have a big backlog of men. I tell you that if we get into another war all of us will have to get into it, every one of us. The civilians will be in it, and those who served in the last war will be in again. We already have a backlog of about 10,000,000 trained men. There is no crisis at this time the proponents do not even claim there is. These gentlemen, honest and sincere men, good American citizens, brainy men, who sit back here on both sides on the committee have made no showing that there is any such crisis in this country as would justify this kind of legislation. They just have not made such a showing. So let us defeat this bill. It just is not any good. All right, let us kill it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the Chairman advise the Committee how many amendments are proposed to be offered to section 4?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can advise the gentleman from New York that there are 14 amendments to section 4 at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on section 4 and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to be generous, as I know that some of these amendments are going to be accepted by the Committee. Therefore, I move that debate on section 4 and all amendments thereto close at 3:30.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. FOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. FOWELL. I just want to say I am very happy that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has become magnanimous.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is quite a devastating week, as I heard some Member say. We have to make decisions here that call for considerable courage. I have prayed a little bit about this bill and about this decision that I have to make. The conclusion I have come to is definite and clear, and I want everybody to know it. I am against this bill. Why am I against this bill? I will tell you. A little over 50 years ago when I was just a young fellow, the Standard Oil Co. laid a pipe line through our farm. In those days the ditches were all dug by hand, and hundreds of men slept in our barns and our sheds. For weeks and weeks and for a good while after that, those fellows went through there from time to time attending to their jobs and inspecting the line and one thing or other. Foreign immigration was at high tide in those days. I talked with some of those men over a period of years, as did my father. There was one reason why nearly every man had come to America, and that was to escape militarism in Europe. I am afraid that we are embarking here on a program in which our young people, my grandchildren and your grandchildren, will have nothing to look forward to but the military in the years to come. By the gods, I will not be a party to anything like that until I am convinced that an honest effort has been made to keep our armed forces properly filled by other means or until an emergency arises that makes it necessary. I do not believe it is right from any angle. I want to suggest something else. In computing our manpower, I find that in the age group from 19 through 25, we have an estimated pool of only 1,300,000 qualified physically fit men. At the same time we have a pool in that same age group of 1,686,000 physically unfit men who I think ought to be taken into consideration. I have heard a great many remarks made about Russia and China and their great war pool, and the great manpower pool that they have. I wonder why this Government which wants to do everything for everybody in the world does not take this IV–F group, these physically unfit people and put those, at least who are redeemable and can be made strong, into camps and give them a year's training or a year of physical building up? Has it ever occurred to you that those fellows stay at home and that they are the ones who get married and raise families that many of them are physically unfit to raise and physically not qualified to support those families after they have brought them into the world. I believe we could make a definite contribution to our manpower, to our strength, and be a greater potential threat to any aggressor nation if that is what we want to do, by building up our own manpower rather than creating a situation here where maybe some day our sons and daughters will try to go to another country to get away from the military here. When that time comes, they will have no country to go to, just as the millions who came to this country fifty and more years ago, had no other country to go to.

I am giving you some food for thought. I am going to everlastingly be against it until I am convinced that the Army is dealing honestly with us and that there is an emergency arising that makes it necessary.

So far, even the proponents of this legislation have not claimed that an emergency exists that would warrant putting the selective service act into operation in peacetime. The whole program is something new and unheard of during our long history.

The fact is that the Army is the only branch of our armed service which has urged the passage of this bill. The Army has created a scarcity of manpower by raising the physical requirements to the point that many men who would volunteer for service cannot pass the physical tests. The recruiting service, on the other hand, has admittedly made little or no effort to maintain the required number of men in the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When the time for debate was limited, were not those on their feet at the time to be given time?

The CHAIRMAN. There was no such request made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the customary procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. It was not done in this case.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: Page 4, line 21, after the word "birth", strike out the period, and insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no person who, after he has attained the twenty-first anniversary of the date of his birth, and who subsequent to July 1, 1949, becomes a member of a Reserve component mentioned in subsection (D) of this act, shall thereafter, without his consent, be inducted for service under this act, so long as he remains a member of such Reserve component."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to say it is my expectation to vote for this bill. I do not offer this amendment with any idea of destroying the legislation, defeating it, or delaying it. I believe that this amendment, if adopted, will strengthen the defense of America, because I have a great deal more confidence in the component Reserve units than some of the members of the committee seem to have. I believe that our National Guard is a very effective and a very important part of our national defense. I fear that we have

not given enough attention to this important element of our armed forces. I also fear that this bill does not give enough attention to the rights of the individual young man who is called upon to make sacrifices for his country.

I think it is the unquestionable right of the Government and the people collectively to call upon any citizen to make sacrifices to see that his country is perpetuated, and that, as I understand it, is the purpose of this legislation. But it seems to me that any necessary sacrifice should be divided as equitably as possible.

Under this bill, as it is now written, any young man is subject to draft for seven long years. Any young man who becomes 19 years of age may be drafted that year. He may be drafted when he is 20, when he is 21, but it may happen that he will not be drafted. He may be 24, and he is still subject to draft. He may be 25 and still be subject to the draft. Until he attains the age of 26 years, he is still subject to being taken by the scruff of the neck and haled from his civilian avocation and placed in the armed services of the United States. With that prospect confronting him, how can he expect to establish a home? How can he expect to establish a business? How can he expect to receive the kind of consideration for employment at the hands of private industry or at the hands of the United States Government, if you please, to which he is entitled?

It seems to me that in all fairness to these boys whom we are calling upon to protect us, that we should in turn make some sacrifices in order to give them a square deal. Why should we hold a sword of Damocles over their heads for seven long years? Why should we not say to the armed forces of the United States: "When Johnny Jones becomes 19 years of age, if you need him, go out and take him. We give you that power. When he is 19 or 20, or until he is 21, you may still go out and grab him, no matter what he is doing, but when he has held himself in readiness for 2 years, and you have not called him, he shall have the opportunity to secure his future by joining and serving in a Reserve unit.

We say that it is the duty of that boy to serve his country, if he is needed. The amendment recognizes that duty, but surely if he is not needed there should be no desire to impose any useless burden on anyone. If the Army does not call a boy for two full years, it is pretty plain that they do not need him. If he is not needed, let him go with no strings on his future. When that boy gets to be 31 years old we should at least be fair enough to that boy to say that if he is still willing to serve his country, although his country has not called him, if he is willing to join a Reserve unit, if he is willing to join a National Guard unit, where he will probably do the Nation just as much good as he would in the standing Army, then he could be sure that he was not going to be called out unless we went to war. Then he could found a home, he could safely go into business or seek a job without any handicap. At least then he can have some security, at least when he is 21 he will not then be faced with an uncertainty as to his future if he makes a home or establishes himself in business.

The amendment provides very carefully that he cannot join this Reserve component during the next year. The purpose of that is to give the armed services a year in which to get those 330,000 young men who the committee told us did not serve in World War II but who were subject to draft and who were never called. This makes it certain that the Army shall have the opportunity to go out and get those boys that it did not call during World War II who were eligible. Under this amendment you still have the opportunity to call these boys who were not called during the recent war. On the contrary, all of these men would be subject to the draft unconditionally for the next year, and if they did not join the Guard, they would remain subject to draft until they reached 26. It would, however, give the younger boys a little protection and security so that they will not be tied up with uncertainty for a very important part of their lives. The young men of America should and will cooperate with their Government and with the armed services, but just as surely the Government and the armed services owe a high duty to cooperate with the young men who are asked to sacrifice a part of their lives. The Government should not ask for useless sacrifices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order that I may calmly ask the gentleman from Texas a question or two.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential motion at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I stay on my feet will I get recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will be recognized in due time.

The gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to ask the gentleman from Texas, does his amendment defer induction?

Mr. POAGE. Not at all; it leaves induction just as it is at present in the bill until the boys are 21. When they become 21 they may join a Reserve component or they may at their option remain subject to the draft. It is recognized under the amendment that if a man joins a Reserve component after he becomes 21, and as long as he remains in that Reserve component he is deferred.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The Reserves are deferred under the provisions of the bill; also the National Guard.

Mr. POAGE. Except a boy has to join up before he is 18½. He gets no protection under the bill by joining the National Guard after he is 21.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Eighteen and one-half years is the figure.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman from Texas says that if the young man joins the National Guard or the Reserve Corps he should be deferred. We are giving the young man up until the time he is 18½ years to join the National Guard of his own State, or the Reserve Corps up until that age, and following that age, he is deferred under this act up to the ceiling limits of the Reserve or the National Guard.

I think there is no one single feature that will do more to build up the National Guard and the Reserve Corps than that one thing.

Mr. POAGE. You give the boy a 6-month period of time while he is still a high-school boy, while he is 18 to 18½, before he has felt the responsibilities of life, before he has been faced with the realities of making a living for himself—you give him that 6 months during which to make up his mind; but after he is 21 and takes on responsibilities you give him no such opportunity.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. After he is 17. He can come into the Guard at 17.

Mr. POAGE. But that is still younger. You require him at those tender years to make a vital decision that will involve his whole life. I am asking that you give him the same opportunity after he has assumed the responsibilities of manhood at 21. Surely there is little to be gained for the country to keep every man between 21 and 26 in a state of uncertainty, and especially when that uncertainty can be removed and the National Guard can be strengthened at the same time. Surely the chairman of the committee would want to create as little hardship as possible.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested this morning in picking up the paper to find in big, black headlines, "Left-Wing Filibuster Aims to Kill the Draft." I want to know if there is anyone in this House who would ever say that I was a left-winger? I have never known the time when I felt that anybody could say that I was anything but a right-winger and so far to the right they thought I could not even get in the middle of the road. If there are any left-wingers here who are against this bill, they cannot be against it any more than I am. So the fellow who wrote that big newspaper headline is just off the beam.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman, one of the left-wingers.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman. I just want to say to the gentleman he is suffering from guilt by association as contained in the Mundt bill.

Mr. RICH. Oh, no. I have never been a New Dealer and I hope that I never will be. I have been against the New Deal and the squandering that has been going on under the New Deal ever since it started. Just look at the mess they got the Nation into.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will get this Nation into a very bad situation. If this bill is passed, we will have a military

Government for a certainty. This is only the beginning of completing the wedge that is going to cause our country to suffer the ills of a military dictatorship.

Now, let us see what happened to countries that had a military dictatorship.

Ask yourself the following questions:

First. Did military training in Germany keep Germany from going to war?

Second. Did conscript military training keep Hitler from invading Poland, Holland, Denmark, Belgium, Norway, France, Russia, north Africa, and so forth?

Third. Did conscript military training in Japan keep Japan out of war?

Fourth. Did conscript military training keep Japan from attacking Pearl Harbor?

Fifth. Did conscript military training help Germany and Japan to win World War II?

Sixth. Did conscript military training in France keep France from being invaded?

Seventh. Has conscript military training in Europe kept the peace, prevented wars, and saved lives?

Eighth. Did the countries having conscript military training lose less men than the United States without military training?

The following is the answer to question 8:

Men killed in World War II

Countries without military training:	
United States	392,000
British Empire	353,000
Countries with universal military training:	
Germany	2,100,000
Russia	3,500,000
Japan	1,200,000
China	1,300,000

Source of information: United States figures—U. S. War Department and U. S. Navy Department.

The British Empire figures are official.

All others from Government reports, information services and publications with a semiofficial status.

Casualties in World War II

Countries without universal military training:	
United States	1,068,000
British Empire	980,000
Countries with universal military training:	
Germany	9,500,000
Russia	13,000,000
Japan	5,750,000
China	3,178,000

Source of information: United States figures—U. S. War Department and U. S. Navy Department.

The British Empire figures are official.

All others from Government reports, information services and publications with a semiofficial status.

Our military leaders admit there is no defense against the atomic bomb and little against chemical warfare except a powerful air force.

I have read a very fine editorial in the February 14 issue of Labor, part of which follows:

This newspaper is for defense which will insure our land against any attack, but believes peacetime conscription will weaken instead of strengthen us.

In that opinion, we are supported by all history, and by many able army and navy officers who dare not speak out publicly, because they have been "muzzled" by a few "brass hats" at the top, and by the administration.

No one can point to any country which was ever saved by conscription. On the contrary, France, Germany, Japan and other countries which long had it have gone down to ignominious defeat. Free Uncle Sam has emerged the victor in every clash with nations which regimented their citizens in time of peace.

Labor believes this country should maintain the strongest Air Force and Navy in the world, and an adequate professional Army, trained to perfection in the use of modern weapons, instead of a "mass Army" of ill-trained conscripts.

Peacetime conscription has destroyed democracy in every land where it was tried. It starts with drafting boys, but inevitably expands to conscription of workers and women, until the whole nation is militarized.

All these steps are already being proposed. The whole program will come "as sure as shooting," once we take the first step.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 6, noes 30.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Page 6, line 17, after letter "(d)", insert the number "(1)" in parentheses, and after line 21 insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) Any enlisted member of any Reserve component of the armed forces, may during the effective period of this act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standard prescribed by the head of the department concerned; and *Provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such Reserve component."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply provides that any man in the Organized Reserve who may wish to volunteer, whether he be in the Navy, Marine Corps or any other Reserve, may apply to serve the same period of time prescribed within the provisions of the act, and that his application shall be accepted. In other words, it just gives a man an opportunity to volunteer. There are tens of thousands of young men in the Organized Reserves. Unless this amendment is passed, where they want to volunteer, there is no certainty of their application being accepted. I have talked to the members of the committee and the committee is in favor of this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. There is no objection on this side to the amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If you had passed some of the amendments you are now putting on this bill and told the War Department about it a year ago, you would have had all the men you wanted, and you would not have to go out and conscript anybody. The trouble with the Army is that they have just prohibited the people from enlisting, and now you want to go out and do the thing in this country that was never done before, and that is, taking young men and throwing them into the Army against their will. It is about time that the members of the military committee woke up to see just what the Army has been doing.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that any man serving in the Organized Reserve may volunteer for service, and if he does, that his application must be accepted.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CROW. Is it not a fact that, under the present law, he can enlist in the Organized Reserve?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under the present law, he may enlist in the Organized Reserve, and under the provisions of this bill, he may do so, but if he is a member of the Naval Organized Reserve or the Marine Organized Reserve and makes application for active duty, his application shall be approved if he meets the physical qualifications.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I will say to my good friend from Massachusetts that there has never been a time when he could not volunteer. This could be accomplished without his amendment. However, there is some question about the Navy and the Marine Corps, and the committee will be glad to accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAFER:

On page 4, line 3, after the word "act", insert a colon in lieu of the period and insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no person shall be inducted under this act before January 31, 1949: *Provided further*, That no person shall be inducted under this act on or after January 31, 1949, unless the President shall first find that the requisite manpower strengths of the armed forces have not been attained or maintained by an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are hereby authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign. For the purposes of such campaign and notwithstanding any other provisions of law (a) original enlistments in the armed forces for periods of 2 years shall be accepted from among all age groups suitable for military service, with such enlistment privileges as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, which shall be the same or similar to the enlistment privileges now provided for enlistments for periods of more than 2 years, and (b) reenlistments in the

armed forces, for periods of 1 or 2 years, at the option of the person so enlisted, shall be accepted with such reenlistment privileges as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, which shall be the same or similar to the enlistment privileges now provided for reenlistments for longer periods, and the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Air Force are further directed to report to the Congress before January 31, 1949."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. SHAFER. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. VINSON. I will reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I say that the chairman would have made no point of making a point of order against the amendment. He has discussed the amendment with the gentleman from Michigan and made it perfectly clear that he did not intend to make a point of order against it.

I call the attention of the Clerk to the fact that the amendment should now be offered to the proviso adopted by the committee yesterday deferring the induction for 75 days. It is the proviso at the top of page 4.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not understand that any statement was made that the gentleman is opposed to the point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I make no point of order against the amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. But the gentleman from Georgia has made a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has reserved the point of order.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure my good friend and colleague from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will not insist on his point of order after I have explained my amendment. In fact, I do not believe his point of order would hold.

What this amendment does is to postpone the induction of youths under this bill until January 31, 1949, in order to provide the armed services with sufficient time to attain manpower objectives through voluntary enlistments rather than by conscription.

The proposed amendment has the virtue of directing the secretaries of the respective services to initiate an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign, specifying that during such campaign the services shall accept 2-year enlistments and 1- and 2-year reenlistments. The amendment further provides that the services must report the results of such a campaign to the Congress by January 31, 1949. Then if the President determines that manpower requirements have not been attained he shall proclaim such and order the induction of men if he deems the situation requires such action.

Many members feel that an intensified recruiting campaign, such as provided in this amendment, will provide sufficient manpower without resorting to conscription. The provision allowing 1- and 2-year reenlistments would be especially beneficial, it is thought. Many Members feel that the services should have concentrated on reenlistments in the past. It costs nothing to train men who desire to reenlist. If such men are accepted for less than 3 years, as has been required, it is believed, that thousands and thousands of dollars in training costs would have been saved.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, extends the time for the enactment of this legislation only a few short weeks beyond the date the committee has recommended. The fact that the committee unanimously decided to amend this bill to extend the enactment date 90 days is adequate evidence that this is not an emergency measure. In fact, nowhere in the hearings can anyone find testimony of any of our defense officers to the effect that there is an emergency or that war is imminent. That being true, let us use conscription as we have in the past—as the last resort. My amendment will provide this.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, upon further examination of the amendment, I withdraw my point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I have no intention of making a point of order against the amendment. I want to be reasonable and calm in the busy, closing days of this session. I want to make factual statements to you. I do not believe the majority of the Members on my side of the aisle want to throw this subject open to the new Congress in January with all the hurly-burly. Admitting also that there may be a Republican President, I do not think they want him to deal with that at the outset.

So far as the recruiting program is concerned with reference to the point system of qualification, 170 points are the maximum and 80 points is the passing mark showing the young man's adaptability to learning. It is not a question of intelligence, you will realize. As you have possibly heard, I failed in the test given to me in the Committee on Rules by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. Of course, he only gave me the 6 most difficult questions out of the 150 questions. There was very little choice. He failed to give me the other questions. The average man coming into the service only has to get 31 of those 150 questions correct to qualify. If the 80 point mark were lowered to 70 in the last 2 or 3 years of an enlistment, the Army would only get 1,000 more men per month. That is all they would get by lowering it to 70. Statistics showed all during the war, and have shown since the war, that within this group, when they did lower it from 80 to 70, were most of the courts-martial cases, most of the cases of men getting hurt, and most of the cases of those who were not good soldiers.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is a good newspaperman. They get the kind of men that are not good in your print shop.

I do not believe this amendment should be adopted.

Yesterday the House, by an overwhelming vote, showed that it was in favor of deferring the action on this bill, assuming it is passed, for 75 days. All this amendment provides is to throw it into January, to a new Congress, at the first start-off of business, to a new President, with something more about the recruiting question. One million three hundred thousand men have been enlisted since the war—the most remarkable record of enlistments in the history of any country.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If you leave this to the new Congress, you will not need to worry about what the new Congress will do. If you pass this bill, you will have a new Congress. Just remember what the people of this country will do. That is one reason why you do not want to run again.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Now, I understand the gentleman's point of view.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] has expired.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted to me during general debate, I endeavored to assemble consecutively from the record of the committee hearings the evidence which has convinced me, as a member of the committee, that this bill is not necessary. But I was unable to complete my statement, and I have taken this time in order to recapitulate my arguments.

All of the Members of this House ought to be familiar with the reports made by the publicity and propaganda subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, following their investigation of the participation of Federal officials of the War Department in publicity and propaganda relating to universal military training. For the purpose of this RECORD, I want to read the subcommittee report which was transmitted to the Attorney General with a letter. The report ends with the following statement:

> Your committee reports its firm conclusion that, on the basis of the evidence at hand, the War Department, its personnel, and civilian employees have gone beyond the limits of their proper duty of providing factual information to the people and the Congress, and have engaged in propaganda supported by taxpayers' money to influence legislation now pending in the Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I cannot yield. My time is short.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That was a unanimous report.

Mr. HAVENNER. That report was unanimous, and it was signed by the following Members: Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS, Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Hon. HENRY J. LATHAM, Hon. CARTER MANASCO, and Hon. J. FRANK WILSON.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I cannot yield now. I do not have time.

To sum up my previous statements, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the failure of the National Military Establishment to make any adequate provision for an efficient Reserve and National Guard in the postwar period, the arbitrary restrictions imposed by the Department of the Army upon the voluntary recruitment system, the amazing refusal of the military high command to comply with the mandate of Congress to transfer millions of men to a Reserve status after World War II—and, mind you, the specific direction of Congress was deliberately evaded and disobeyed by the Army in that respect—and the improper expenditure of tax funds by the War Department on propaganda in support of universal military training, clearly demonstrate that the insistent demand from military sources for the enactment of this bill is not based upon any grave emergency which imperils our national security, but is the culmination of a long-term, carefully conceived campaign to compel the Congress to approve some kind of compulsory military service at this time.

Mr. Chairman, the real purpose of this bill is not our national defense. If I believed that such a fateful step were necessary for that purpose I would vote for it willingly, as I voted for the Selective Service Act of 1940; but I am convinced that the purpose of this legislation is to transform the traditional free democratic society of America into a disciplined state and to impose upon our liberty-loving people a system of military control for all time in the future.

And I want to point out again what I said the other day, Mr. Chairman, that the American people have been deceived into the belief that this is a temporary measure and yet the record is full of forthright statements from every spokesman for the National Military Establishment that the purpose is to continue this draft, if it is enacted, indefinitely until we have universal military training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. We have a number of amendments at the desk. I want to be fair to those who have offered the amendments. At my suggestion debate was limited on this section to 3:30. In fairness to those who offered the amendment I believe it would be well for the Chair first to recognize proponents and opponents of real amendments. There should be an opportunity afforded to consider the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that he is in a position to close debate on any amendment any time he so wishes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from New York for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have here several of these posters that were given to me by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]. They are at the desk. I hope the Members will look at them. They indicate that the Army has never made a worth-while effort to get men to enlist. We know very well that during the war General Hershey paid no attention whatever to the Tydings amendment. He admitted to me personally that he wanted the men and he was going to get the men, and we all know that he was doing it regardless of any law the Congress wrote.

The Army can get the men they want if they go about it the right way but not when they put out things like this. Here is a picture of a desert scene with the words "Ready, Aim, Fry" on it. Now, who is going to enlist when promised that he will "fry" if he does.

That might well be the impression that the average young man, taking a glance at the poster as he walked by, would get.

True enough, there is a lot of small print on it that tells a different story, but they put it in small print and a fellow comes along, takes a look at the picture, he does not stop to read the print.

But let me tell you another reason I believe the Army is not following a course to encourage enlistments. The officers and the men of the Army are just as honest and just as moral as those of any other group, but let me give you a little sidelight on what they do sometimes and how the high command stands back of some of their practices. Just a few years ago there came down from the Midwest a young lady and, like tourists who come here on a sight-seeing trip, she went down to the War College. There she met one of those handsome officers all dressed up in his fine clothes and brass buttons and he courted her as Army officers sometimes do, impetuously and vigorously, and they got married. And later on, lo and behold, she discovered that he had a wife in Washington, and so it was necessary for her Congressman to do what he could. The result—the first wife down here obtained a divorce so that the second marriage—and they were remarried. That situation was called to the attention of the officers down here, and what was their answer? "Oh, well, we do not try to regulate the private morals of our officers." Fine, was it not?

Nor is that the whole story.

The second wife finally obtained a divorce. In the meantime she had learned, and the Army officers had been advised, that the officer she married, in addition to having a wife when he entered into the second marriage, had stolen the papers and the medals which he was wearing from a brother officer who had been lost in the First World War. He was parading under an assumed name. He was carried on the Army rolls under an assumed name, but the Army did nothing about it. He finally left the service.

There is a provision in the statutes which states than an officer may be disciplined for conduct unbecoming a gentleman, but it seems, in some instances at least, in two of which I have personal knowledge and the records, to be a dead letter.

Now, there is a certain group of, shall we say, old-fashioned mothers who are not anxious to see their boys put under what they term "evil influence." They have little, if any, patience with instructors who ridicule and poke fun at boys and young men who have respect for women and treat them as they want their mothers and sisters to be treated.

Let me give you a little story of the record of an officer who is here at Fort Belvoir and who is acting as an instructor for the youth of our land.

He was married; his wife had a child. She obtained a divorce. He married again, and again there was a divorce or annulment. Then shortly thereafter—and he is still a young man—he concluded he would get married again. His second divorce was obtained in October of 1943—on the 14th I think it was. On the 15th of October he made application for a marriage license in the Ninth District Court at Rapides Parish, La., and took oath that he had not been previously married. Now the young lady he was marrying for his third wife was a Catholic, and on the 16th day of October 1943, he was united in marriage by Chaplain L. J. Matuszewski, reputed to be a Catholic priest.

On the 11th day of October 1943, in his deposition to obtain a divorce from his second wife, he testified positively that he had been married on September 27, 1936. On the 15th day of October he subscribed and swore to a statement that he had not been previously married. He admitted that that statement was not true, but states that the clerk who granted the license filled it in hastily and so the inspector general concludes that there is no basis for the assumption that the officer deliberately made a false answer.

The situation was called to the attention of those in command and to the attention of the personnel officer and of General Royall. What was the answer? The answer, in substance, was that inasmuch as the third wife, who is a Catholic, learned prior to her marriage to the officer that he had been married before, there really was no harm done. The fact that he deceived the priest and that he lied under oaths seems not to have been considered as anything reprehensible.

The officer's Army record shows that he claimed legal residence in Alabama, but that having lived in Indiana for a little more than a year he thought himself justified, when he wanted to obtain a divorce in Indiana, in giving Indiana as his place of residence, and so the inspector general concludes that no onus is attached to this officer who, according

to the record, lied on two occasions, and that there is nothing to indicate that his conduct was unbecoming that of an officer.

Well, that may be the view of the inspector general, but the old-fashioned mothers of America just do not condone that kind of conduct and they just do not think that that kind of an officer is one who should instruct their boys as to Army life.

No one would condemn the Army or any group or class for the misdeeds of a very few. On the other hand, when specific instances, substantiated by indisputable evidence, are called to the attention of the Army officers, they are in duty bound to clean up the bad spots.

The Army knew about General Meyers, but it did nothing about it until the mess became so bad that something had to be done.

The officer in Michigan who, while drunk, shot his chauffeur, was demoted, but he was never adequately punished.

The Navy had a stinking mess down at Annapolis, but it promptly cleaned it up.

Just why those in charge at Fort Belvoir should continue to cover up repeated infractions of their own rules, as in this particular case they have, and why they should assign to instruct young men an officer who does not deny that he did, under oath, fail to tell the truth, whose only defense, according to his own statement, is that he did it inadvertently, is something the average citizen cannot understand.

There are other reasons why the Army is not getting the number of enlistments that it desires. American boys are subject to a peculiar disease—if it may be termed a disease. Sometime between the years of 15 and 20 many of them have an attack of what is known as big head. Some of us never get over it. The Army seems to have a larger percentage of those who never recovered than some other groups. The charge has often been made that altogether too many Army officers are snobs. Of the merit of that charge I know nothing. During the war I do know that General Hershey's group, charged with the conscription of men, paid little attention to the law—I refer now to the Tydings amendments—the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carries plenty of evidence showing specific violations of the intent of Congress and the law as written.

I do know that many a fine young man, desirous of enlisting and fighting for his country, was grievously disappointed, disillusioned by the petty, unnecessary duties imposed upon enlisted men. The young men of America, convinced of the need, will enlist, fight, and if need be, die, in defense of their homes and their country. They are, however, impatient—and thank God for that—of needless arbitrary discipline imposed merely to keep a man busy. Strange as it may seem to those in high authority, the average young man cannot, without necessity, be molded like a piece of clay or putty into a machine which snaps to attention, salutes and bows the head to an individual whose only claim to obedience and respect is that he has rank.

If those in charge of recruiting men for the Army will take a few lessons in human nature; will get out in civilian life for say 6 months; earn a livelihood as do millions of other Americans; familiarize themselves with the thoughts and the ways of civilians, they will be more than successful in their efforts to get the youth of America into the Army of which, after all, we are all extremely proud.

It is disheartening and discouraging to see a few who, for want of a better name, may be called "brass hats," do so much to injure the service in the eyes of the people who furnish them food, clothing, and shelter.

I would suggest to the Committee on Military Affairs, either revise that definition of gentlemanly conduct or take some action in reference to some of these fellows who are teaching these young boys.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan about the morals and what not of the officers of the Regular Army. I would like to pose the question, How did they become officers of the Regular Army? The vast majority of them became officers because some Congressman nominated them to West Point.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. KILDAY. I imagine that you have appointed some of those who are in trouble. Mine are not in trouble.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I never did appoint any of those, and thank God I have not been that unlucky. But these are old gray-haired men passing upon their conduct. Does the gentleman contend that they were not all right when they went in? They are what they are now because your institutions made them that way.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. May I point out those officers did a whale of a good job in winning the war.

Mr. KILDAY. Why, certainly they did. There is no question about that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr KILDAY. I do not yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will tell you about those officers.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is not interested in perfecting this bill, he is not interested in whether there is a necessity existing in the United States today for this sort of proposal. The gentleman is interested in talking about such things as he spoke about a while ago. I am not interested in the extrasexual affairs of Army officers. Maybe the gentleman is. I am a family man.

Now, to get back to the amendment. What does it do? It provides that there shall be no inductions before January 31, 1949. I congratulate those of you who are opposed to this bill; but those of you who are seeking an easy way out, just vote for this amendment.

There has been a great deal of talk here about things which are not included in this amendment. They were included in the amendment offered yesterday.

Let us get an idea of the thinking of the gentleman from Michigan who offered this amendment. On yesterday he had in the amendment that the pay of the enlisted personnel of the Army shall be increased 10 percent. What would that have meant? In the last appropriation bill for the pay for the enlisted personnel of the Army there was $2,300,000,000. If you increase that 10 percent, then you would have an increase of $230,000,000 based on the present personnel of the Army. An incentive? Of course not. They are in the Army. They are bound by contract to stay in the Army, and under the thinking that he had at that time you would have had here an additional $230,000,000 for the people already in the Army.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentlemen from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I observe at this point that that is not included in the amendment that I have offered today.

Mr. KILDAY. I so stated.

Mr. SHAFER. And I see no reason why the gentleman should discuss the amendment that I offered yesterday which I explained to the House was offered hurriedly because I did not have a chance to give it much study.

Mr. KILDAY. I so stated when I began to discuss the amendment. But it shows the knowledge that the gentleman has, the research that he has made, and how firmly implanted he is on the situation which exists in the armed forces.

You are either for the bill or you are against the bill, and postponing it until January 31 serves no purpose. Now, the committee came in here yesterday and offered an amendment which took everything out of this amendment that would be of any substance. Somebody here wanted to place the responsibility on the President, and we did that yesterday, so that the substance of the amendment is gone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take 5 minutes at this time, because I hope to speak briefly before we close the debate on this measure. But, I rise at this moment to corroborate the testimony that has been given here by the very able gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER]. Only day before yesterday, in Denver, Colo., Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans, of Washington, D. C., director of the Reserve Officers Association, gathering in annual convention, said in this interview—and I want you all to listen closely:

Our military leaders have been sitting for 3 years watching a highly trained, combat-hardened reserve force disintegrate. The Navy has done something but not enough. They all have lost the cream of the enlisted men of World War II who joined the Reserves for a 3-year hitch. The average Reserve officer is disgusted, his morale is way down. We have no real Reserve force which could be rallied for national defense in an emergency.

That is not a pacifist talking. That is a general who is the director of the Reserve Officers' Association of this country. Listen further to this article. Melvin Maas who for 18 years served in this House, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and a colonel in the Marine Corps in this last war, a great American speaks:

Melvin Maas, former Minnesota House Member and a colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve, declared, "In the last war, 98 percent of the fighting was done by civilians. Yet in peacetime today, less than 2 percent of the armed forces' budget is devoted to civilian defense activities."

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, these are only one of the objections to this bill:

First, the shameful and disgraceful treatment the Army has dealt out to the Reserve Corps.

Second, the way they have ignored our National Guard, which the major general who is director of the National Guard, says the enactment of this bill will annihilate and destroy. And remember, these are generals speaking to you.

Third, their refusal or unwillingness to provide proper and adequate housing for old sergeants and enlisted men with families.

Fourth, their refusal to accept enlistments for 1 year or 18 months, insisting on taking men for only 3, 4, or 5 years.

Fifth, their raising the standard, or the points, from 59 in wartime to 80 now, where, I repeat, only a classical scholar in Greek and Latin or a Philadelphia lawyer could pass.

The Army has been turning down a third of all applications for enlistment. The Navy and the Air Corps have been turning down more than 50 percent, because they can get all they need through the volunteer system.

These five things are sufficient proof that this bill is totally unnecessary, yet here we are seriously contemplating saddling upon the American people control of the youth of this country, the old European creed of peacetime conscription, outworn, outmoded, and discredited, which has led every Nation that has followed it down the road to war and inevitable ruin. Shall we now transplant the Prussian philosophy from Potsdam to the Pentagon?

What in the world is the matter with us? We passed the 70-group air force recently and we passed two other bills 2 months ago in this body. We have not had time enough yet to feel the effects of that legislation, that is, the legislation for inactive duty pay and secondly for retirement. Both those acts will stimulate volunteer enlistments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, regardless of what my good friend the gentleman from Missouri has just stated, an examination of the hearings will disclose that Major General Reckord, the Chief of the National Guard, representing the National Guard in a full and open statement before the Committee on Armed Services said that the passage of this bill would be the passage of the single greatest measure ever passed through Congress for the benefit of the National Guard.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I hold in my hand a letter signed by Milton A. Reckord, who is the Adjutant General for the State of Maryland and the head of the National Guards of the United States, in which he approves the draft bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman from New York try to fix some time when we can vote on the Shafer amendment?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] suggested that the sooner his amendment was voted on the better it would be.

Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of other Members who have amendments here and wish to be heard on them, I move that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 65, noes 53.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are 19 amendments on the Clerk's desk. This one amendment has taken so much time, I would like to ask whether we will be allowed to be heard on our amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he sincerely hopes that the Committee will get to all the amendments in time so that Members may be heard.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I understand that debate will close at 3:30 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CROW. The 10 minutes allowed on this amendment will expire at 20 minutes after 3, and that will give us 10 minutes to consider 19 amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as a number of Members have sought to speak on the so-called Shafer amendment, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Shafer amendment. It simply provides that when this draft bill is enacted, that it does not go into effect before January 31, 1949, and not then unless the Congress and the President approves it.

This delay will give the Army officials about 6 months' time to see if by putting on a real drive they can get the extra 230,000 men they need as volunteers. If they fail and world conditions get worse we can then in the next session quickly, if necessary, put the act into effect.

If world conditions during this time grow suddenly worse the President can call the Congress to meet in a special session and we can in a few days approve the legislation and quickly begin inductions.

During the 6 months two things can and may happen to make it unnecessary: They may be able to secure enough volunteers; more important, more peaceful world conditions may develop, making it entirely unnecessary to fasten military conscription on this country.

It would be unwise and a great mistake to enact the draft in peacetime unless it is absolutely necessary for the defense of our country.

I hope the House will approve this amendment. I do not believe world conditions are such that we cannot delay the actual operation of the draft for these few months. It may save billions of dollars and will prevent the disturbing of the plans of our young men, their schooling, and so forth.

I do not believe the Members of the House are justified in defeating this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the Shafer amendment.

Opposition to any measure relating to selective service stems from three groups with which I can find little common ground on which to meet.

First, of course, are those misguided—indeed, thoroughly reprehensible—Americans, who, from ulterior motives, are opposed to any effort to strengthen our national defenses, and, in fact, seek to weaken them. Their subservience to a foreign power and venal subordination of the interests of their own country subjects them to the justified condemnation of every patriotic American. To find one's self in agreement with them on any issue is abhorrent to one's better instincts.

A second group who opposes the measure are sincere pacifists who do not believe in war, even when a country is attacked by an aggressor, and who therefore contend that no step whatever should be taken to protect our Nation militarily, that international disarmament is the only solution to the ills which beset the world, and that our Nation should set a good example by taking the first step toward such disarmament. While entirely distinguishable from the first category and thoroughly patriotic in their motives, the proponents of this position are, to my mind, utterly unrealistic in this, perhaps, wicked world.

All who sincerely desire peace pray that the day may come when men may be made to realize the utter futility of war

as a method of settling international disputes and may resolve, by joint action, that all nations should embark upon a systematic program of disarmament. But so long as naked aggression stalks the world, so long as there are those in high places in governments, who, through wicked lust for power, seek to dominate less powerful nations, it seems but simple common sense that our country maintain a strong national defense.

A third group which I have observed opposes any such legislation, is composed of those who look upon any effort to secure and train additional military personnel as part of a pattern for a greater participation by this country in world affairs. They argue that we should withdraw into our shell, attend to our own knitting, abandon the position of world leadership which, by choice or chance, is ours, and that thereby we can dispense with a large part of our military and naval forces and, as a corollary, will need not more, but fewer men. Conceding to this group also the utmost sincerity and devotion to their country's welfare, I feel them likewise to be misguided in their objective and short-sighted in their viewpoint. With their position, my conception of national responsibility and ultimate welfare does not square.

Nevertheless, in addition to these groups of our citizens, finding, mayhap, their spokesmen in this body, there are many others who have what might be called a conditional opposition to any form of compulsory peacetime conscription. For myself, it is my firm belief in a strong national defense and my deep conviction that only therein lies the surest road to an enduring and just peace, which raises in my mind a conflict, in the face of an inherent revolusion against attaining this objective through the imposition of a compulsion on our youth, our family life, our economy, and our innate sense of freedom.

A difficult decision is before us. I have wrestled with the problem. I have prayed to God for guidance in its solution.

Having voted for a large number of defense measures, having supported various foreign-aid programs, having enjoyed the high privilege of voluntarily serving my country in the armed forces for several years, I approached the problem before us sympathetically, and certainly with an open mind. My mind is still open, though my sympathy with this legislation considerably dimmed.

A basic premise in my thinking on the issues before us is my emphatic conviction that every possible effort to secure the required strength for our forces by voluntary means should first be exhausted before we resort to compulsion. Generally speaking, volunteers make better soldiers. That, however, is secondary. My primary objection is based upon a fundamental belief that the conscription of our youth as soldiers in peacetime is foreign to American traditions and has never led to anything but grief, and frequently, ruin, where tried.

Parenthetically, it should be pointed out that these remarks are directed toward the drafting of soldiers, not necessarily a mere training program for our youth. We must not lose sight of the fact that we are not here considering a universal military training bill, but a peacetime draft of young men for general military duties.

Many of the sincere proponents of this measure will say that we are not now at peace; that a "cold war" is going on, waged against our country with relentless fury and great resourcefulness. I cannot accept the concept that we are at war. Indeed, in the testimony of these hearings our leaders in government were asked several times whether we are confronted with a situation of national emergency. They disclaimed it. They termed the present a "period of great international tension." No doubt it is that.

We all hope and pray that this tension may be speedily and permanently relieved. In the international picture, however, with the claims and counterclaims of one nation against another and with clashes of creed and race raising ugly heads from one end of the world to the other, it seems almost too much to hope that there will not continue what may properly be described as a "period of great tension" for an indefinite length of time in the future. I seriously question whether, unless this rises to the dignity of a true emergency, our Government is justified in using it as a basis for imposing a program of compulsion upon the youth of our land.

This is not to say that a draft law should never be enacted unless this Nation is at war. Much has been said in the debate about a parallel to the year 1940, when a draft was instituted for the first time in our peacetime history, and in the year 1941 when, by a margin of one vote, this draft law was extended. I have searched this record in vain for a statement on the part of any of our national defense leaders to the effect that we are now faced with a crisis comparable to that then presented. If I were convinced by anything in this record or in the debate—indeed, if the chairman or any members of the Armed Services Committee, or any other Member, can produce satisfactory evidence that my Nation stands in immediate peril, that a true emergency now exists, I shall have no hesitancy in voting for immediate conscription. Upon evidence, however, not generalities nor hysteria, I shall make my decision.

To a large extent, of course, we must rely upon our military and naval advisers for an estimate of the requirements of our national defense. We are told that the Army on March 1 was about 129,000 below its authorized strength and that it was losing men in the first months of this year at a rate of 6,000 to 8,000 a month above its enlistments. Unless this tendency is checked, it will result in a shortage at the end of the year of around 200,000 men, we are informed.

There is no pressure on the part of the Navy or the Air Force for the passage of this bill. They have been able to keep up their strength through voluntary methods. In this connection a strange sentence appears in the majority report, at page 3, where it says:

> The Air Force expects to meet all of its needs through voluntary recruitment but this expectation appears optimistic to the committee—at least, in the absence of a selective-service law.

One wonders whether an equal degree of skepticism existed in the minds of the committee regarding the confidence on the part of the Army that it could not obtain its requisite strength through voluntary methods.

We are asked here today to embark upon a radical departure from fundamental American traditions. There are those who sincerely and ably argue that this is a course which we should have long since pursued. I should not want to close my mind to the possibility of being convinced regarding the soundness of that argument. To date, however, I remain unconvinced.

Until I am completely satisfied that every effort has been made by the Army to obtain voluntary recruits sufficient to provide reasonable military strength, I am not prepared to place in the hands of the military the weapon of compulsion. It is my belief that by the amendment now before us, buttressed by other amendments which I hope will be offered and passed, a sincere, intensified effort may be made to met the necessary manpower requirements of the Army.

The amendment contemplates that new enlistments be taken for a 2-year period, which should draw many men now unwilling to sign up for 3 years. Reenlistments must be accepted for a 1- or 2-year period, which I know, from several personal experiences in my own congressional district, will cause many men to decide to continue on, whereas they would be unwilling to do so under the rigid 3-year requirement now in force.

It is my hope that an amendment will be adopted later to require the Army to reduce the unnecessarily high aptitude qualifications. I favor an increase in basic pay, at least for enlisted personnel. Steps should be taken to implement our legislation to provide better housing for married enlisted men.

Nor should the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force consider this amendment, if written into law, as limiting them to the specific steps outlined therein, to obtain voluntary enlistments. They are directed by it to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign. That means action, not lip service. It means pursuit of this objective indicating the will of Congress, with the same devotion to duty and to their country which our military leaders so eloquently displayed in time of war.

I share the regret voiced by my good neighbor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], over wholesale and indiscriminate criticism of the great soldiers who now occupy high position in military and naval circles. Only a short time ago they were national heroes. Their achievements in the recent war are perhaps unmatched in all military history. Although no more nor less infallible than Congressmen, they are men of great ability and unswerving loyalty. If they will sincerely devote their unusual energy and talents to a program to obtain voluntary enlistments, calling upon the civilian population for aid in this intensified campaign, there is every reason to anticipate that it may never be necessary to put into actual effect the provisions of such a law as that now before us.

Only if the Army fails in the successful pursuit of this mission, should we recruit a conscript force. That is the motivating purpose of this amendment.

It is so vital to the crucial issue before us that there are many, I am sure, who feel as I do, that we will support it and will find great difficulty in voting for the measure, without such a provision incorporated in it.

In providing for the adequate defense of our Nation, we must not weaken the central pillar of our strength, which is our freedom.

Let us, by the passage of this amendment, first exercise compulsion on the United States Army to acquire volunteers, before employing compulsion to force conscripts into the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated here, neither the Navy nor the Air Force have any particular direct need for this bill. However, just as the Army is in favor of it, so are the Navy and the Air Force in favor of it as a matter of mutual support. Why does the Army need men? It needs them because our boys do not like to serve in Korea or in Europe. They dislike that service very much indeed. But more than that, I do not believe the Army has put on a satisfactory recruiting program. I have looked at these copies of recruiting posters which have been presented to us informally on this floor. They are made to frighten a boy from enlisting in the United States Army instead of encouraging enlistment. It seems to me that the public-relations section of the recruiting service could do a great deal better than that. I believe in view of the lack of emergency, as has been stated, that the so-called Shafer amendment has merit.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, during the past several months I have received many letters from constituents on the draft bill. I know this is true of other Members of Congress, too.

There are those who favor the draft and there are those who are opposed to it. Frankly, I respect the opinions of all on this important legislation.

Those who say that we should not pass the bill during peacetime have a good argument; however, we are still technically at war. The President has not asked Congress to declare the war officially over. It is obvious, then, that the Chief Executive has evidence that the international situation is rather perilous.

We cannot ignore the possibilities of a third world war. We cannot then say we just do not want to do anything about it. We most certainly are a big part of this world.

I am of the opinion that Russia is still reaching out for world domination. This makes the international situation more critical.

As a nation which is involved in perilous world conditions, what are we going to do about it from a protection standpoint? The answer, as I see it, is to remain strong as a nation, which after all we must be if we are to sustain our liberty and freedom.

I am a firm believer in the volunteer enlistment system for a strong Air Force, Army, and Navy. I favor the proper appeals from the volunteer angle to those interested in joining our defense forces. We must fight to preserve our democratic way of life. There should be no doubt in any nation's mind that we will fight to protect it.

It comes down to this, then, that our best line of action is one of preparedness. We should, in the face of this, train our boys for self-defense as we teach our children to protect themselves against danger. At the same time there should be safeguards in this act against evil. There should also be in the law a provision to protect our youth against the loss of educational opportunities. I am supporting every amendment offered for such. I am supporting the Shafer amendment, which to all purposes provides for an intensified volunteer enlistment campaign before this bill becomes effective.

The needs of the armed forces demand the kind of action contained in this measure.

We do not want to witness another Pearl Harbor, but we must be prepared against such an attack. It is an unpleasant thing to think of, but should another Pearl Harbor come to our shores we must have more security than we had on December 8, 1941.

For these compelling reasons I shall cast my vote in support of this measure with the amendments which I have previously mentioned.

It is not legislation of aggression, but that of security.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW].

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I am only taking this minute so that I can talk on one amendment which is at the desk. It looks as though I will not get to say anything at all.

I am asking to add a new paragraph on page 4, between lines 8 and 9. This paragraph appears in the bill that was passed by the other body. It simply requires that before any man can be inducted they must furnish proper shelter, sanitary facilities, water supply, heating and lighting facilities, medical care, and hospital accommodations.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. CROW. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. HOLIFIELD moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the enacting clause deleted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have waited on this floor now for 3 days and since 10 o'clock this morning in order to be allowed to speak for 5 minutes on this bill. I believe that the Shafer amendment should be agreed to. In view of the fact that we are being precluded from full debate on the important matter which is before us; in view of the fact that the Shafer amendment has not been adequately discussed, I have offered a preferential motion so that I might be recognized by the Chairman for 5 minutes. The Shafer amendment is the most important amendment that can be presented to this bill, in that it allows the American tradition which has been established for 165 years to be extended for 7 more months. That is what it amounts to. For 165 years this Nation has grown and prospered on the theory of volunteer armament and no conscription in peacetime. It is true we have resorted to conscription in wartime, and I have voted for such a bill. I am not a pacifist, although I hate war with all my heart. I have voted for every defense measure that has been presented in this House in the last 6 years. I am not a Wallaceite. The Wallace party is running a candidate for Congress against me in my district, trying to defeat me. I consider that I am a traditional American; an American who believes in the Constitution and the principles thereof; the principles which, once established, caused the greatest wave of immigration to this country that the world has ever known, from countries which employed the method of peacetime conscription; countries which have gone to rack and ruin and to defeat in military competition with free nations, because they depended upon conscription of their military personnel.

I call to your attention, and I challenge the committee to show me a Nation, which has been able to perpetuate itself, which employed peacetime conscription. As an example, I point to Germany in World War I. Peacetime conscription brought Germany to her knees, defeated by free nations. She failed. Conscripted soldiers did not defend her borders. When the battle became hot the German conscripts wilted and surrended to free troops.

In World War II, Italy, Japan, and Germany had had 25 years of peacetime conscription to build up their defenses, to militarize their nations; to goosestep their nations; to regiment their industries. Yet they fell before the onslaught of free men from free democracies, who outproduced, who outworked, and who outfought these slave labor and slave soldiers of the nations which practiced peacetime conscription.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will not yield now.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman does not intend to yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. The gentleman has had unlimited time on this floor, due to the fact that he is a member of the committee. This is the first time that I have been able to obtain 5 minutes during this day's debate.

The Army has not proved its good faith in trying to get volunteers. The Navy

embarked on a volunteer program and in March of this year it had to stop its volunteer program because it received in March 19,000 applications and its quota was only 15,000. The Air Force is turning men down every day.

I have letters on my desk of boys wanting to go back into the Army, having served in World War II, and they are being refused.

The Shafer amendment insures that the armed forces will make an honest attempt to obtain volunteer enlistments for the Army in the next 7 months and then the President, can inaugurate the draft.

The Shafer amendment would supersede the amendment that was adopted with committee approval, which puts upon the President of the United States 2 weeks before the November election the political handicap of pulling the trigger on the draft.

I maintain that such cowardice on the part of Congress is inexcusable. Congress should have the nerve to take the responsibility of deciding whether we need a draft or not.

The original Shafer amendment put the responsibility on the President and Congress jointly. The pending Shafer amendment removes the responsibility of Congress concurring with the President.

I regret that this deletion occured and although I shall support the pending amendment, I regret this return to the political cowardice I have mentioned. The present amendment postpones the action of the President from 90 days to 7 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this motion made by the gentleman from California to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out. In substance what this motion does is kill the bill.

I can well understand the viewpoint, the honest viewpoint of the ones who do not approve this bill, but my mind goes back a few years, back to 1938, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, when we saw the specter arising across the sea of Hitler, Mussolini, and the war lords of Japan, and we saw Admiral Leahy appear before the Committee on Naval Affairs and recommend an expansion in the fleet of only 20 percent. We saw immediately an outburst of opposition in the committee and all over the country. After many many days of hearings we reported out a bill recommending this 20 percent expansion. That bill was reported on the floor of the House and when the vote was counted, 100 votes had been cast against that bill even though it had been 16 years since we had built any battleships of any size or number; and yet, Mr. Chairman, it was these very ships that were authorized on the floor of the House as a result of the recommendation of the Naval Affairs Committee in 1938 that won the battle of the Philippines in the recent war.

Then we come into the year of 1940 after Hitler had overrun northern France and the Lowlands and had reached Dunkerque and the Channel ports, before we had risen to the point where we felt that in the interest of our own security we ought to enact the draft. The Selective Service Act was passed late in that year.

Then we come to September of 1941 and the question before the House then was whether we should extend the draft giving those boys a better training who were already in and to build up a stronger Army. We had already called the National Guard in; and, Mr. Chairman, we heard then as we are hearing today the same voices in opposition to the extension of the draft that we are hearing in opposition to this bill today; and the bill passed by only one vote.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a similar situation today insofar as our future security is concerned, that demands action. Why do I say that? As a member of the Committee on the Armed Services I inquired of some of the witnesses, of course, as to how they felt about world conditions. Let me just repeat the question that was asked of Dr. Karl J. Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who was a member of the President's Committee To Investigate the Need of a Universal Military Training Program, whether or not in his opinion the situation today is as critical insofar as our own future security is concerned as it was in 1938, 1940, and 1941. And what was his answer?

"In many ways," Dr. Compton says, "I think the situation may be more serious now than it was then."

Then Dr. Walsh, another member of the President's committee, had something to say. He said that the menace is greater today than it was in the periods I mentioned before.

The Committee on the Armed Services of the House has given this matter very thorough consideration. We are interested, of course, in the security of our country and in the peace of the world. If it were not for that feeling on our part we certainly would not recommend the passage of this legislation today. We know the specter of communism that exists throughout the world. We know that it is a world movement and sooner or later it may involve the security of this great Nation of ours.

I hope the motion will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 22, noes 80.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, in support of the Shafer amendment, I desire to read from page 2 of the committee report:

> The Navy is able to maintain its present strength of 397,000 by voluntary enlistment.

I quote again from page 3:

> The Navy modified its physical standards for both the Navy and Marine Corps during fiscal year 1948.

Mr. Chairman, no one can say that the Navy and Marine Corps are now or ever have been inferior to the Army in fighting ability. Yet they have gotten their quota by voluntary enlistments through reducing the physical requirements. If the Army had done the same thing this bill would not now be before us.

In adopting the Shafer amendment it will compel the Army to do what the Navy has done and is now doing and by next year we will know whether or not we will need this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] told us of three Reserve generals who are, he claims, opposed to this legislation. Every one of those men support this bill. They did criticize the activities of the War Department with reference to the National Guard and the Reserves, but they are for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have made a study of the recruiting efforts of the Army and I am convinced that the Army has made an honest and intelligent effort to recruit men during the last year; yet with the money at its command and considering its widespread activities in recruiting all over the United States, the Army lost 135,000 men between July 1, 1947, and March 1, 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the committee itself offered an amendment to extend the period of induction of men for 90 days after the passage of this bill. Now, that is evidence in my mind that no emergency does exist. Secretary Marshall said, I believe, today, that there is no real immediate danger of war. There is no emergency existing. Now, why should we not extend this until January 31, 1949, so that the Congress can again investigate the matter? If the armed forces, after a real effort to get men, fail, then the Congress can review the situation and take proper action. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is constructive; it requires the armed forces to put on an intensive recruiting program, something they have not done. I shall offer an amendment to reduce the examination point to 70—it is 80 now, and during the draft it was 56 points. I sincerely feel that these amendments will make for a better bill. It will draw support to the bill. I urge the committee to adopt both amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I minute to discuss the amendment now pending is not enough. Certainly there has been no reason given why this amendment should not be adopted. The greatest reason why it should not be adopted is the attitude taken by the leaders of this committee to have this law passed. I want to tell you that we are in bad shape in this country and we are in bad shape because the Army has got such a hold on a lot of people in this Congress that they are afraid to do anything that the Army does not want them to do, and you wait until they get the same hold on the people of this country that they have on some of the members of this committee, and then this country is going to be in the grip of the United States Army.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he wants to send my boy and girl and my family to war without any reason?

Mr. RICH. I do not want to send your boy to war. I do not want to conscript anybody's boy. I think it is un-American. I think you will get all the boys you need if the country is in danger, and you will not have to worry about that. The boys will volunteer when they know that the United States is in danger. That is the reason I am against the bill. It is not necessary—this bill in particular is not necessary. Our people will join our Army to protect our Nation when the Nation is in danger. They always have done so and they always will do just that. No one has stated we are in such danger. Let the United Nations do their work in preventing war; you set them up for that purpose. You have given billions of dollars to prevent war. This is a red flag in front of a wild bull trying to start the third world war. Stop, think, pray, look, listen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri raises a question in regard to the National Guard and the Army recruiting program. We spent last year $35,000,000 for a recruiting program, and I suppose we could have spent more if we could have gotten it out of this Congress. It was probably our fault. It cost $140 per man to get those recruits. Now, that is the picture. Now the picture with regard to amount expended for Reserve components 1948 and for request for 1949. The estimated expenditure in 1948 for the National Guard was $104,000,000, for the Air National Guard $45,000,000, for the Army Organized Reserves $277,301,000, for the Air Force $4,014,000, and for the Navy, including Marines, $159,530,000.

This year, fiscal 1949, the budget requests are $154,216,000 for the National Guard, for the Air National Guard, $70,784,000.

Organized Reserves: Army, $52,000,000; Air Force, $73,000,000; Navy, including Marines, $364,146,000.

Sure we have not done enough but it is not altogether the Army's fault.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOLIFIELD) there were—ayes 123, noes 72.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SHAFER and Mr. ANDREWS of New York.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 135, noes 90.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

Amendment to H. R. 6401 offered by Mr. REES: On page 6, following subsection (d) insert:

"(e) The passing requirement for the general classification test shall be fixed at 70 points or less. The monthly requisitions on the President under this act by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force shall not exceed the number of men required after consideration of the actual number of voluntary enlistments during the 3 months preceding that month in which the requisition is made."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee, debate ceases at 3:30 o'clock on section 4, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment is to fix the ceiling at 70 points on general classification tests and limiting the draft to the number needed over voluntary enlistments. One of the things that has been discussed during the debate on this measure is that the Army has been fixing these points too high. I call attention to the fact that the recent war was fought on a basis of passing grade of 59 in the classification text. Furthermore, our Army prior to the war was smaller than the Army that is being asked for today. It was passed on a 59 mark for entrance.

It has been charged and there is good reason to believe that the Army has injured the volunteer system because of the requirements now being made. The reason there are so many rejections is because the Army requires a mark of 80 points. The passing test of 80 is unnecessariily high. General Eisenhower, in testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, at page 1001 of the Senate hearings on universal military training, said, and I quote:

> My memory is sometimes tricky, but I thought I had directed, before I left as Chief of Staff, to drop, for the Ground Forces at least, the figure back to 70, and I thought there is where it was, so we could fill up certain places where we could do this.

If the passing mark were lowered to the figure where General Eisenhower thought it should be fixed, at 70, the Army, in my judgment, could get the additional 300,000 men required under this legislation by voluntary enlistment. If not, they can come a whole lot nearer doing it than now, and thereby cut down the demand for draft legislation. Even at 70 the requirements are so much higher for a so-called peace army than the military required for an active fighting force.

The last draft bill passed by Congress contained the provision:

> *And provided further*, That the monthly requisitions on the President under this Act by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall not exceed the nun ber of men required after consideration of the actual number of voluntary enlistments during the 3 months preceding that month in which the requisition is made (title 50, U. S. Code No. 308 (a)).

The purpose was to prevent unnecessary drafting of men. If the Army's requirements were filled by voluntary enlistment, it was not necessary for them to draft men, and it was not the intent of Congress that men should be drafted unnecessarily. The language of the proposed amendment is taken from this act.

Coupled with a required ceiling of 70, I believe it would be effective in materially reducing the need for the drafting of any men. It seems to me that courses of training in our colleges and the extension of the Reserve Corps and the expansion of the National Guard would further relieve the demand on the part of the Army for the drafting of men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

All time has expired on this section.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROW: On page 4, between lines 8 and 9, add the following paragraph:

"No person shall be inducted for such training and service until adequate provision shall have been made for such shelter, sanitary facilities, water supplies, heating and lighting arrangements, medical care, and hospital accommodations, for such persons, as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to public and personal health."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 6, line 21, after the section, strike the period and insert "*Provided*, That during the life of this act there shall be in the Army, including the Air Force, and in the Navy, including the Marine Corps, a ratio to total active strength of not to exceed 2 doctors of medicine and 2 dentists per 1,000 men; 1 osteopath per 5,000 men; 1 veterinarian per 2,000 men; and 1 pharmacist and 1 optometrist per 3,000 men."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLGER:

On page 3, line 17, after "between the ages of", strike out "nineteen" and insert "twenty-one";

And in line 19, strike out "nineteen" and insert "twenty-one."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carlina [Mr. FOLGER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, selective service in time of peace is in direct conflict with the philosophy of our American democracy. This is the second time in the life of our Nation this Congress has considered selective service when we were at peace.

In 1940, after Hitler had successfully annexed Austria, by force, taken over Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Lowlands, and France and we could see the war clouds shifting in our direction a selective service and training act was passed by this Congress. In the face of loud complaints from many of the pacifist groups the country recognized the danger which threatened our very lives. The war has been fought and won at a terrible sacrifice, but technically, Mr. Chairman, we are still at war, the national emergency not having yet been terminated, and even more important, the peace has not been achieved.

I do not like selective service. I do not believe any militaristic government can long prevail. I do not like to have to vote for selective service, in time of peace or war, but we must recognize the cold facts and act accordingly.

This is a selective-service act to provide the personnel necessary to win the peace as we have won the war. It is not a selective training program. It is not a universal military program. It is a program, I repeat, to provide adequate personnel to assure this Nation that we intend to back up the peace in an effort that we believe will avoid another terrible and devastating world conflict. It is a program for a period of 2 years, a time in which we fervently hope that peace will come to a troubled world.

If this legislation is needed at all, it is needed now. Postponing it until January 31 is further endangering the peace, in my opinion.

It makes little difference whether it becomes necessary for the President to declare a day within a certain time for it to become effective. It is a responsibility that must be accepted by both the legislative and executive branches of our Government.

It is not so important from the national welfare whether we have the personnel inducted for a period of 1 year, 18 months, or 2 years. The question before the Nation today is: Are we willing to show the world that we are going to stand solidly on a program for peace or will we relegate ourselves into a pacifist and hopeful attitude as we did after World War I?

This amendment postponing the effectiveness of this act to January 31 is all-important. We have heard the old adage that "Nero fiddled while Rome burned." Mutilating this legislation to make it wholly ineffective is worse if it is possible than its actual defeat. If we fail to back up our program for peace, we are sowing the seed of world war III.

How easy it is to lapse into a coma. How easy it is to become complacent. It was so after the First World War. We demobilized after this world war in good faith and the forces that would ally themselves with Russia are joining with forces who fail in my opinion to recognize the truth to defeat this program as all other programs, if we win the cold war and ultimately have a durable and just peace.

Why is it necessary to have selective service? We only have to go back to the actions of this country for the past three years for testimony as to our intentions. We have a lot of action in the interest of peace unparalleled in history. On the other hand, Russia has deliberately failed to cooperate in reaching a peaceful settlement but on the other hand through aggression not only thwarted the peace but has actually taken over many nations and endeavoring to force its own totalitarianism on other freedom-loving peoples.

It is a recognized fact that the international situation over the past several months has seriously deteriorated. Specific, aggressive, and dangerous action on the part of the Soviet Union makes it mandatory that we respond to these dangers.

We only have to look to their actions in Greece and threats on Turkey, the Communist coup d'état in Czechoslovakia, the excessive pressure on Finland immediately thereafter, the threat in Scandinavia and the severe and annoying restrictions on our American occupation forces in Berlin, Vienna, and Trieste.

Therefore, we have given the Army an assignment. We have given it a mission to carry out. It cannot adequately carry out this mission unless it has adequate personnel. When I was in Europe with our committee last year, the Army was undermanned in every occupation zone. I say we should bring about our giving them sufficient strength and personnel to carry out the mission to which we have assigned them.

This mission, I repeat, is to bring about peace, the kind of peace that will endure. Without it, it will be only a few years, I believe, until we would be called upon again to expend our resources, our economy and millions of youth again.

Let us not sell the Nation short. We have been given by divine providence a position of leadership. Let us not by inaction permit our own house to be destroyed. If this were a permanent program it would be an entirely different question at this time. It is a limited program for a specific purpose. We are facing today and will for the next few years and until the peace is attained the fears that I have entertained during these hectic years we have gone through, and that is we were willing to sacrifice, produce, and fight to preserve freedom, but are we willing to pay the price to preserve the peace that will sustain the freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 4? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. (a) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; members of the Reserve components of the armed forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President, residing in the United States, and who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for service under section 4 (b).

(b) (1) No person who has been awarded the Purple Heart or who has served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of 12 months or more in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service on active duty with the armed forces or the Coast Guard, or in the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall without his consent be liable for induction for service under this act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

(2) No person who, for service in the armed forces between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, has been authorized to wear any badge, award, or decoration, or other authorized evidence of exceptional valor in the face of the enemy, bravery in combat, or continued service in combat, as determined under regulations prescribed by the President, shall without his consent be liable for induction for service under this act, but shall be required to register under section 3.

(3) No person who has served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of 90 days or more but less than 12 months in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service on active duty with the armed forces or the Coast Guard, or in the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall without his consent be liable for induction for service under this act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, if—

(A) the local board determines that he is regularly enlisted or commissioned in an organized unit of a Reserve component of the armed force in which he served, or in a Reserve component (other than in an organized unit) of the armed forces in which he served in any case in which enlistment or commission in such organized unit is not available to him; or

(B) the local board determines that enlistment or commission in a Reserve component of the armed force in which he served is not available to him.

(c) For the purposes of computation of the periods of active duty referred to in subsection (b) of this section, no credit shall be allowed for—

(A) periods of active duty for training purposes;

(B) periods of active duty in which the service consisted solely of training under the Army specialized training program, the Army Air Force college training program, or any similar program under the jurisdiction of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard;

(C) periods of active duty as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or United States Coast Guard Academy, or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, or in a preparatory school after nomination as a principal, alternate, or candidate for admission to any of such Academies; or

(D) periods of active duty in any of the armed forces while being processed for entry into or separation from any educational program or institution referred to in paragraphs (B) or (C).

(d) (1) Persons who, on the effective date of this act, are members of the federally recognized National Guard, the federally recognized Air National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast Guard Reserve, and the Public Health Service Reserve, and are not on active duty, shall, so long as they continue to be such members, and perform service for which they are entitled to receive pay throughout the year for attendance at drill or equivalent duty, be exempt from service by induction or call to active duty under the provisions of this act, but not from registration.

(2) Except as provided in subsection (b) and except as hereinafter provided, no person who shall become a member of a Reserve component after the effective date of this act shall thereby be exempt from registration or service by induction or call to active duty under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That persons who, prior to attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months, are appointed to or enlisted in an organized unit of any of the Reserve components of the armed forces mentioned in paragraph (1) of this subsection, which participate in scheduled drills and training periods throughout the year, shall, so long as they continue to be members of any of such components, be exempt from service by induction under the provisions of this act, but not from registration.

(e) (1) Any person who, on the effective date of this act, is enrolled in the advanced course, senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or is a member of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and has entered upon the junior or senior year, or is a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, shall be deferred from induction for service under this act until the completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long thereafter as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall be required to register under section 3, but after completion or termination of the course of instruction may be ordered to active duty without his consent as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection.

(2) Within such number as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, on or after the effective date of this act, is selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or who is appointed a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, or is a member of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and who is selected for enrollment or continuance in the course after the effective date of this act, and who agrees, in writing, to accept a commission if tendered and to serve, subject to call by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, not less than 3 years on active duty after receipt of a commission, shall be deferred from induction for service under this act until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long thereafter as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall be required to register under section 3.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this act except paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of this section, the President is hereby authorized to order into the active service of the armed forces of the United States, for a period not to exceed 24 consecutive months each, members of any or all reserve components of the armed forces of the United States without their consent who prior to the effective date of this act have had less than 90 days' continuous active service in the armed forces of the United States, exclusive of periods of active training duty: *Provided*, That with respect to ordering members of the National Guard of the United States into the active service of the United States, the consent of the Governor of the State or Territory concerned, in each case, and for the District of Columbia, the consent of the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard, shall first be secured: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not be construed as repealing or abridging any existing law which authorizes the ordering of members of reserve components into active service.

(f) Fully qualified and accepted aviation cadet applicants of the Army, Navy, and Air Force who have signed an agreement of service shall, in such numbers as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense, be deferred, during the period covered by the agreement but not to exceed 4 months, from induction for service under this act, but shall be required to register under section 3.

(g) The Vice President of the United States; the governors of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and all other officials chosen by the voters of the entire State, Territory, or possession; members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the several States, Territories, and possessions; judges of the courts of record of the United States and of the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia shall, while holding such offices, be deferred from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States.

(h) Regular or duly ordained ministers of religion and students preparing for the ministry under the direction of recognized churches or religious organizations, who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction in recognized theological or divinity schools or who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction leading to their entrance into recognized theological or divinity schools in which they have been preenrolled, shall be exempt from service (but not from registration) under this act.

(i) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (g) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board.

(2) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment, by age group or groups, from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States, of those persons whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may, upon finding that it is in the national interest, terminate the deferment by age group or groups of any or all of the persons so deferred.

(j) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act prior to his graduation from such school or institution, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest. The induction of any such person shall not be postponed under this subsection beyond the date so determined.

(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of higher learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act after the beginning and prior to the end of one of his academic years, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed (A) until the end of such academic year or (B) until he ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier.

(k) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant service (which for the purposes hereof includes training for combatant duties) in the armed forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially sociological or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code. Any such person claiming such exemption from combatant service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, if he is inducted into the armed forces under this act, be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or shall, if he is found to be conscientiously opposed to

participation in such noncombatant service, be deferred. Any such person claiming such exemption from combatant service because of such conscientious objections shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal, the appeal board shall refer any such claim to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. The Department of Justice shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the persons concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommend to the appeal board that (1) if the objector is inducted into the armed forces under this act, he shall be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or (2) if the objector is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, he shall be deferred. If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall, in making its decision, give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice together with the record on appeal from the local board. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant service because of conscientious objections is sustained shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors.

(l) No exception from registration, or exemption or deferment from service, under this act, shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

(m) No person shall be relieved from service under this act by reason of conviction for a criminal offense, except where the offense for which he has been convicted may be punished by death or by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year.

(n) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment made or denied under subsection (i) of this section may, within 10 days after such deferment is made or denied, be submitted for review and decision to the appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the President, and such decision shall be made public.

(o) When one or more members of a family were killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the armed forces of the United States between September 8, 1939, and September 2, 1945, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, and the sole surviving son of such family is inducted for service under the terms of this act, he shall be assigned to noncombatant service, as defined by the President, and shall not be assigned to service outside the United States (as defined in this act).

Mr. COLE of New York (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that section 5 be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: On page 21, after line 23, insert the following new section 6, and renumber the following existing sections accordingly:

"SEC. 6. (a) Under policies established by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army, the United States Navy (including the Marine Corps), and the United States Air Force from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age for enlistment periods of not less than 3 years: *Provided*, That the total number of aliens who may be enlisted pursuant to this section shall not exceed 100,000 at any one time. Persons enlisted pursuant to this section shall, upon completion of 3 years' honorable service in one or more of the armed forces of the United States, be eligible, subject to such qualifications and examinations as may be prescribed, for naturalization in accordance with the provisions of section 324 of the act approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1149; 8 U. S. C. 724), and other provisions of applicable law.

"(b) Provisions of law prohibiting the payment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall neither apply to aliens who enlist in the Regular Army, the United States Navy (including the Marine Corps) or the Air Force, under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section nor to their dependents or beneficiaries.

"(c) So much of section 2 of the act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat. ch. 179, 216; 10 U. S. C. 625), as amended, as reads '; an ' in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States, or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army,' is hereby repealed."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane and call attention to the fact that it proposes to amend the naturalization laws.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York would make a point of order against this amendment. I point out the fact that a similar amendment has been accepted by the upper body. If it is in order in the upper body, it certainly should be in order in the House.

It might be interesting to the gentleman to know that from 1941 to 1945 approximately 117,000 noncitizens were accepted into the armed services, which, I believe, established a precedent for accepting aliens into the armed services.

With my amendment, and under policies established by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, would be authorized to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army, the United States Navy—including the Marine Corps—and the United States Air Force from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age for enlistment periods of not less than 3 years, provided that the total number of aliens who were enlisted pursuant to this section would not exceed 100,000 at any one time. Persons enlisted pursuant to this section would, upon completion of 3 years' honorable service in one or more of the armed forces of the United States, be eligible, subject to such qualifications and examinations as would be prescribed, for naturalization in accordance with the provisions of section 342 of the act approved October 14, 1940, Fifty-fourth United States Statutes, page 1149, Eighth United States Code, page 724, and other provisions of applicable law. Therefore, I contend that this amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that all the gentleman's amendment does is add another way of getting men for the armed forces of the United States; therefore it is pertinent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has suggested that in view of the fact a similar amendment was adopted in another body it should be permitted here. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the House of Representatives has a rule on germaneness which does not apply to a certain other body. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania includes a proviso which affects the naturalization laws by establishing a new basis for eligibility to citizenship. A bill proposing to amend the naturalization laws would be beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Armed Services. Under the rule which has been adopted no immunity was granted to Members to offer amendments which are not germane; consequently, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 14, line 24, insert after "religion" the words "Christian Science readers and practitioners."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, and on behalf of the committee, I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately prior to the reading of section 5.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like at this time to discuss one matter that has been repeated here many times today. I refer to the question, What is the emergency, if any, that calls for this legislation?

The words used by witnesses who appeared before the committee were that there was international tension. In my humble opinion there is a distinct emergency in which the United States of America is involved today.

What is it? The war ended in August 1945. Three years have gone by, yet in that period only one treaty of peace has been signed. Why? Because one power, one of our allies in the late war, has continuously obstructed all efforts at peace.

Furthermore, that country has overrun 10 or 12 countries by penetration, by subversive methods, and by all kinds of means contrary to the will of the people in those small countries. We do not know but what this is going to continue, and the result is that there is fear, terror, uncertainty, and hopelessness on the part of most every country in the world which was affected by the war. We are the one country, I believe, that has the capacity and the leadership to help bring stability to the world. We are the ones that pioneered and carried through the organization of the United Nations, though it has been feeble and ineffective to date. I believe that the American public is thoroughly sold on the idea that we must find some way to have selective security or the world will lapse back into the days of the Dark Ages. That is why I am so disappointed in what has been going on here today in emasculating this bill. Twenty-eight or twenty-nine members of our committee listened diligently to the testimony of the various witnesses. It appealed to our judgment that the bill before us today, which was supported by the executive department, was a step moving in the direction of world stability. In other words, if we show a determination that we are going to have peace if we have to fight for it, then perhaps we will bring peace about. You know, you can drift into a war, and if we drift along the way we are drifting, that is exactly what we might do. But you cannot drift into peace. You must have a program. You must work it out diligently. You must use every conceivable effort, including your military strength, to bring about the peace that the soldiers of the war fought for and that the people of the United States and the world want and are entitled to.

I say to you that there is an emergency that calls for the show of American strength and American determination. This is only one part of the picture. Just think of it. Over 3 years have gone and the people all over the world are living in hopeless confusion and disappointment due to the fact that the stability, the tranquillity, the peace, the opportunity that they thought would be theirs when the war ended, has not been realized. That is the chaotic, uncertain, indefinite and hopeless situation that I believe American strength can furnish the leadership to terminate. We can, by our leadership, bring stability to the world. We can bring collective security to the world, but we cannot do it by drifting along like this. If you do not like this bill, for heaven's sake kill it, but do not try to smother it by worthless, useless amendments. That is exactly what is going on in this House today. Members have announced it in the Chamber and some have announced it in the press that they want to smother this bill; they want to kill the bill; they do not care how they do it, or what combination of devices is used. That is what disappoints and shocks me tremendously. To me it indicates a failure to look realistically at the world today. It seems to me to fail to grasp the serious challenge to peace and the strategic position of the United States to furnish the leadership for world peace.

This bill has the thought and all shades of political opinion behind it. It has the support of people of both parties. It has the support of the different agencies of government involved. It has the support of practically every prominently mentioned candidate for the Presidency. I say to you, if you think that we should take an affirmative stand for peace, I do hope that you will not further emasculate or try to kill this bill by amendments or delays.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I have never been confronted with a more difficult vote than the one I am to cast at the conclusion of this debate. Our people have been traditionally opposed to any law drafting young men for military service in peacetime. In the early days of our history we were thousands of miles from any enemy. Surrounded by the oceans, our national security required only the ability to fight off an invader. Indeed, in Revolutionary days, a Paul Revere could ride horseback through his local community and call the men and boys to arms. That was adequate national defense in those times.

We have gone a long way since 1776. National defense of that day would not be any more effective now than the ox team would be in meeting current problems of transportation. We won the Revolutionary War under that system.

Then came the Spanish-American War, and again methods of warfare had changed. The great World War I followed and we know that war could not have been successfully terminated had we used Spanish-American War technique. Then came World War II. Conditions were again entirely different and we could not have hoped to win World War II by relying upon the methods which were so successful in World War I.

Today we are living in still another era. Our geographical position is no longer a guaranty of safety. Our ships, our airplanes, and our military forces are everywhere in the civilized world. These are the circumstances that confront us in 1948.

Of necessity, our foreign policy has also changed. Whether we like it or not, we must accept conditions as they are and not as we wish they were. The superdreadnought, the submarine, the airplane, the atomic bomb, and all the developments and inventions that go with them, are realities. We find ourselves in the position of world leadership. We must either abandon that leadership and our ideals, and supinely place our country at the mercy of communism and aggressor nations, or we must be sufficiently prepared to meet force with force.

We have provided for the greatest and most invulnerable air force in all history. The money has been authorized. The job we have before us today is to provide the personnel to carry out that policy; in short, to staff our military forces. Our air bases and our defense units are useless unless there are adequate men to man them. If these forces can be provided by the voluntary method, then that should be done. We are told by every student of the situation, who because of experience and responsibility should speak with accuracy, that the way the matter now stands we will not have the necessary number of voluntary enlistments.

The purpose of this bill is really to provide a second line of defense; that is, the draft will not function or call men to service unless the voluntary system fails. This bill sets up the machinery and gives notice as to what will happen in case of necessity. No one will be drafted if adequate volunteers enlist. The committees of Congress and the agencies of government charged with our national defense have been studying this problem ever since the shooting stopped in World War II. No Congress likes to pass a draft law but it seems clear that unless there is such an incentive to additional enlistments, the draft is the only way out.

I agree that world war III is not inevitable. I cannot agree that we are not faced at the moment with a potential war. There is a real emergency confronting us. War is at our gates and Congress is not measuring up to its responsibilities if it lives in a twilight zone between peace and war and does not prepare for all eventualities. Briefly, we are confronted with a condition and not with a theory, and with facts that we do not like. We will get nowhere by thinking entirely in retrospect. We must courageously face the future. No one wants war, and no one wants the draft. Stern reality must not yield to political expediency when the roll is called today.

Our form of government and the freedom and liberty of our constitutional guaranties are in the balance. Right or wrong, a bipartisan foreign policy has been approved overwhelmingly by the Senate and the House. This bill is a requisite step to implement that policy provided, of course, that voluntary enlistments do not measure up to requirements. This is not a Republican measure or a Democratic measure. It has the support of all candidates for the Presidency, with the exception of Henry Wallace. The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and most other veteran groups are backing this draft bill. It will not be permanent law and terminates in 2 years. The fact that these veterans, who know that war is hell, and who have borne the brunt of battle in recent wars, are here demanding action by the Congress should have great weight.

We all want peace and I am persuaded that under world conditions we cannot have peace by appeasement. I believe in the United Nations, but realize its difficult task. With the prevailing veto power, Russia can call the numbers and, especially so long as this condition obtains, our country must be on guard and prepared at all times, if our way of life is to continue.

Mr. Chairman, I have had numerous messages urging me to vote for the draft because it is accepted as a national security necessity at the moment. Many of the same people are opposed to universal military training. I have had very few messages in opposition to this bill. I have not promised my constituents to vote for or against a draft now. I have

written to all of them: "I shall give this matter the best consideration possible in the light of the information which is available to me at the time of the vote. After conscientious and prayerful consideration, I shall do that which I sincerely believe to be in the best interest of my country and I am sure that you would not want me to do otherwise."

In conformity with this promise and with full realization of what this law will mean, I am forced to the conclusion that our national security requires that this temporary draft law be on the statute books, ready for use if and when voluntary enlistments fail to meet requirements. I shall, therefore, vote for the bill.

NOTE.—The draft bill passed the Senate by a vote of 78 for to 10 against, and the House by 283 for to 130 against. The conference report passed the House by 259 for to 136 against.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that we are living in a "twilight zone" between war and peace. The war clouds are still hovering over us and the sun of peace has not yet risen. It appears to me that in the condition in which we now find this world and particularly our great Nation we should give serious consideration and we should give prayerful consideration to what we are now about to do. We are in a period the like of which this Nation has never before passed through. If we are to preserve this democracy we must use statesmanship. We must throw away politics, we must throw away unfair reasoning, in order that we may arrive at a program that will preserve this democracy and that will preserve this Nation. Our national security is the paramount issue.

I, for one, with a great deal of misgivings, am going to support this bill. I hate to do it, but I think this is a duty of patriotism. I think this is the time, if you will consider the status in which we find ourselves today, compared to the other nations of the world, when you can conscientiously do but one thing, and that is, get this Nation prepared.

What is the situation? There is a nation that for 3½ years has thrown every obstacle it can in the way of peace, in the way of getting back to normalcy, in the way of doing away with confusion and chaos and getting back to order and rehabilitation. She has thrown every obstacle in the way of the United Nations she could, using the veto power 23 times. Today that nation has a standing army of some 4,000,000 men, ready at any moment, if the occasion arises, to overrun Europe, yet this Nation, the leader of the world today, can do nothing. Why? We do not have even normal military strength to take care of our defense.

I deplore the fact that some gentlemen here refer to our military leaders as brass hats. God knows they contributed something to the winning of this last war. When they were over there on the battlefields they were great fellows. But now there are a number of men in this Congress who refer to them ironically as brass hats. It is not fair to them. If it comes to the matter of leadership in another war, will they be brass hats? If they have to lead us through another conflict, are these men who are here referring to them as brass hats going to volunteer? Are they going to say to these generals, "Here is my advice to you; I want to cooperate with you"? No; they are not going to do that, but they will criticize. That is the greatest contribution they can make.

These are serious times. The only thing you have heard argued here so far is the sacrifices our boys would be making, and they would be making sacrifices to go in the Army. But I think this is a step toward peace. It is not a step toward war. Unless we take this step we might get into war.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer several committee amendments containing some clarifications.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

On page 9, line 4, strike out the word "No" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Any."

On page 9, line 10, after the word "shall", strike out the remainder of the sentence and insert "be exempt from induction for service or call to active duty under this act, but not from registration."

Page 13, line 14, after the word "except", insert "subsection (4) (a) and."

Page 20, line 24, delete the words "between September 8, 1939, and September 2, 1945," appearing in lines 24 and 25.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time as a matter of fairness to the Committee on Armed Services, as I try always to play the game upon the square.

I have lived with the defense of this Nation for many years. I have served under the Stars and Stripes for more than four decades—through two great wars and many times of national crisis—and this Nation has been good to me and mine. I have studied the rise and fall of nations in connection with their military establishments and some years ago I reached the conclusion that compulsory military service in time of peace on a permanent basis has not been beneficial to any state, but rather has been instrumental in its downfall.

The strength of a nation in its struggle for self-preservation is dependent, in the end, more upon its industrial, financial, and moral strength than on its military might at the outbreak of hostilities, providing that it has sufficient force immediately available to withstand the first shock of war. We do not lack that strength now; in fact, with forces now in being and which will be presently available, we greatly exceed the minimum which will assure safety.

The whole history of the United States cries out the truth of these assertions. We, a Nation of free and unregimented people, time after time, have risen in the glory of our freedom, produced the sinews of war, called out our people, and gone on to victory. No other nation on earth has such a record of success on the fields of battle—on land, and sea, and in the air. And now we are asked to abandon freedom and accept conscription and regimentation—military domination—in time of peace. Why? Because of the aspirations of an everexpanding Military Establishment to expand even more? Because of the determination of certain political or industrial leaders to become lords of the earth? I do not know the answer but I do know that every grain of common sense I have cries out against this saddling permanently upon a free people of the very system which I believe has been instrumental in destroying those who have practiced it.

I have stood for every move to build up the national security of this Nation. I have and do support a large Army and a large Navy and a large Air Force. I have intended to support the current bill on the basis of the temporary need of these measures due to the existence of an emergency or a crisis. I have intended to support it even though I told the people of my district and my State, prior to the election in 1946, that I was thoroughly opposed to the institution of conscription as a national policy. But now I learn that even the advocates of this measure do not claim that either an emergency or a crisis exists—merely that we are in a state of tension, which I conclude will continue indefinitely.

I conclude also that while the current bill limits this selective service to 2 years, this time limit means nothing, and that once fastened upon the American people, the tentacles of this destructive system will be fixed in our body politic far into the future—perhaps until we collapse in ignominy.

Mr. Chairman, all history shows that heretofore the state which has controlled the seas has been able, in the end, to dominate the world. Now, a new factor has come into the scope of war: the power of ships of the air. Exactly how this will affect the status of sea power—exactly how sea power and air power will be combined in the future—no one of us can tell. But, Mr. Chairman, we now have the greatest Navy in the world by a vast margin and we shall have the world's best Air Force when our 70-group establishment is completed. I do not believe that the Army can prosper through becoming a reservoir of conscripts. I believe it can prosper by affording better conditions of service, by more liberal promotions into noncommissioned forces, by better efforts of recruiting, by recognizing that it is not going to get a draft and so must stand on its own feet through voluntary service—perhaps by emulating the Navy or Air Force in these matters. The difference of opportunity between the enlisted men of the Army and enlisted men of the Navy has been notorious for years. From what I understand, the Air Force is at least equaling the Navy in this respect and I suggest the Army do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, I have searched my conscience in the matter of this legislation. I have deeply considered my duty to my constituents and to the people of the United States and I have concluded that I cannot support this bill, that I cannot have any part in making conscription an established part of the American way of life.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: On page 21, line 6, after section 5, insert the following new sections, to be numbered 6 and 7, respectively, and renumbering the existing sections 6 through 23 accordingly.

"SEC. 6. (a) Under policies established by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army, the United States Navy (including the Marine Corps), and the United States Air Force from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age for enlistment periods of not less than 3 years: *Provided*, That the total number of aliens who may be enlisted pursuant to this section shall not exceed 100,000 at any one time.

"SEC. 7. So much of section 2 of the act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat., ch. 179, 216; 10 U. S. C. 625) as amended, as reads '; and in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States, or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army', is hereby repealed."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman care to state in what particular the amendment is regarded as not germane?

Mr. KILDAY. The bill is the Selective Service Act of 1948, and does not contain any provisions similar to those contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair calls attention to the fact that the bill is entitled "A bill to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes." The bill carries sections relating to enlistments and other means of increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States.

The Chair has examined the amendment and believes that the amendment is clearly within the scope of the bill.

The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, it might be said that the idea for this amendment was originated by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Senator LODGE. However, I had been thinking of introducing a similar amendment as part of the Selective Service Act, so I anxiously awaited the action that would be taken by the Senate on the Lodge amendment.

The Lodge amendment was carefully debated in the Senate and many suggestions were made on the Senate floor to change the amendment. However, it was, with but little change, passed and the debate appears in the RECORD for Tuesday, June 8, pages 7294 to 7302.

During the debate Senator LUCAS stated, and I quote:

I wish to say, before concluding, that it seems to me this amendment is highly meritorious. Like the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I sincerely hope the amendment may be taken to conference, where serious study can be given with a view to attempting to incorporate in the bill something along the line of the amendment the Senator from Massachusetts has suggested.

Therefore, in the preparation of my amendment I conferred with all interested executives in an effort to carefully prepare this amendment, which, if accepted, even though modified, I trust will meet with the approval of both Houses when the bill goes to conference.

Another reason why I offer this amendment is that during the years 1941 to 1945 we had 117,000 aliens in the services of the armed forces.

This amendment is designed to authorize the enlistment of a limited number of aliens in the armed forces of the United States.

The act of 1894 prohibits the enlistment of aliens, other than those who have taken out first papers, in time of peace. This is suspended during the continuance of the present technical state of war, but the Secretary of the Army has declined to utilize this technicality as a basis for embarking upon any extended project without congressional sanction. In addition, there are certain provisions of appropriations acts limiting payment of salaries, and so forth, to aliens. Most of these have been suspended during the war, but may be revived at any time.

Now as far as availability of aliens is concerned for enlistment, it might be said there are a considerable number of Polish ex-servicemen; and in Britain alone it is estimated there are about 110,000 of these men. How many are in the United States and British zones of Germany who could be enlisted in our armed forces, I am unable to say. But I understand there are thousands of these stateless men and that a great many are being used by our forces for civilian guard duty.

There are also a great number of males from the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—and some from Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, who are most reliable and are potential soldiers. Many of these men have basic military training and are well qualified to serve in our Army.

Senator GURNEY, in the debate on the Selective Service bill in the Senate, said and I quote:

All students of our military policy have been seriously disturbed over the fact that our forces are scattered thinly all over the globe with only a pitifully small number of reserves available in the United States to support the overseas forces.

It is evident the need is apparent.

I might explain that the Lodge amendment would authorize only the Secretary of the Army until June 30, 1950, to accept not to exceed 25,000 enlistments in the Regular Army whereas my amendment would authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, under policies established by the Secretary of Defense, indefinitely to accept enlistments in the Regular Army, the United States Navy, and the Regular Air Force provided the total number of aliens who may be enlisted shall not exceed 100,000 at any one time.

The Lodge amendment would establish a maximum age of 35 years, whereas my amendment would contain no such restriction.

The Lodge amendment would set a minimum enlistment of 5 years, whereas my amendment sets one of 3 years.

The Lodge amendment makes no mention of naturalization, whereas my amendment spells it out and insures an alien after completion of 3 years' honorable service of becoming eligible for naturalization.

The Lodge amendment would suspend until June 30, 1950, the present prohibition on original enlistment of aliens which is now effective in time of peace, whereas my amendment would repeal the prohibition.

These are the basic facts of my amendment and I regret that I had to modify my original amendment on the naturalization section so that it could be considered.

Now in order to foster Americanization and build citizenship, the aliens enlisted would be assigned generally to regularly established units of the Army, Navy, and Air Force rather than creating special battalions or regiments, and so forth of any national groups.

Last Friday, June 11, we passed a bill to take into this country some 200,000 displaced persons who will enter this country without making any contribution to its welfare and without much consideration except for a preliminary examination and a screening.

It is evident, Mr. Chairman, in this debate that is taking place on the floor of the House, that there is a need to supplement our overseas forces with enlistments. Everyone here seems to be talking about a training bill rather than selective service to build up our armed forces. Here we have a potential group of men who are stateless, who are anxious to enlist in the service of the United States, who understand the characteristics and the language of the countries they would serve in; who are potential soldiers and would do a fine job for us; in fact, we are using them right now in a civilian status. I think this amendment bears sufficient importance for us to have the opportunity to tap this reservoir of manpower which is available immediately to supplement our forces wherever the need may be, and I sincerely hope that the Members of the House will give it very serious consideration and support.

I am sorry I had to modify my original amendment because of the fact I felt that if a man was willing to serve for the United States for a period of 3 years that he would be eligible for citizenship and these men are all prospective citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I still feel that we should be able to enlist aliens in the armed forces, particularly for service in other countries, and who, after a 3-year period of service and honorably discharged, and who are found qualified for citizenship, would be admitted as citizens.

This would give these prospective citizens something to work for; and during the 3-year period we would indoctrinate them with the fundamentals of our American way of life and citizenship. If after rendering this honorable service, they are found qualified, they would be in far better physical and mental condition than any dispaced person who is now to be admitted.

Certainly there is no better way to demonstrate a right to United States citizenship than for these stateless enlistees to render such a service to the United States and earn this right.

I sincerely hope it will have the wholehearted support of the entire membership of this House.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to read a letter which came to me a few days after adoption of the Senate amendment. This letter is written by an American citizen whom I do not know. He states:

> History is replete with examples of the hiring of foreign mercenaries. I do not know of one instance where this policy was attended with success, but I do know that it has often been a typical move of decadent governments.
>
> The defense of the United States should rest exclusively upon the people of this country—people who have been reared in American surroundings and who, if called upon to fight, will be fighting for their own homes in the United States. To sprinkle aliens at the squad level among the troops of the Regular Army would be to introduce a policy that can lead only to disaster. National pride alone, I would think, would call for the defeat of this particular provision of the pending bill.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I deplore the fact that during the last few days I have observed there are many who would destroy this bill. I am in favor of the bill. I am not too far removed myself from the draft age. I think any young American who believes in America, who believes in his country, should be willing to serve for 2 years in the armed services of this Nation, particularly to preserve the peace of this world.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest a few moments ago to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY], and I also listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] yesterday and again today. These gentlemen stated that nations like Germany, Japan, Italy, and France that depended upon military conscription went down in defeat. But they did not tell you that these nations had military conscription for lust, for aggression, to keep Hitler and Mussolini in power personally. That is what they had conscription for—to rape the world, to loot the world, for conquest.

Mr. Chairman, let us draw this distinction. We are proposing this conscription in peacetime to protect the peace of the world. Air power is peace power, United States naval power is peace power, a good American Army is a peace force.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am sure the gentleman realizes that conscription in Europe came after the French Revolution and had nothing whatever to do with Hitler, Mussolini, or any other dictator of the modern era.

Mr. DORN. I thank the kind lady; but nevertheless the fact remains that these men did maintain large armies for conquest, for lust, to rape the world.

Mr. Chairman, we are proposing this measure for peace.

I listened the other day with a great deal of interest to the gentleman representing the Twenty-fourth District of New York, the Bronx, and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. I thought as they spoke that on that very night in their districts you would find policemen on duty, with uniforms on, wearing a pistol, if you please, not to shoot down people, not to commit murder, but to protect the peace of the homes in that community, to protect the wives and children of that district while they were serving in the Congress down here. So it is with adequate American preparedness. This bill is not for war, conquest, or aggression, but it is for happiness, peace, and tranquil relations among men and nations. Let us this day fight for peace in a time of peace. That is a better policy than fighting for victory in a time of war.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman has seen fit to point out the fact that the police officers in my district wear pistols. What do they wear in the gentleman's district? Powder puffs or what?

Mr. DORN. They also wear pistols. And I would like to say also that in New York you have a State highway patrol, you have a State police system, you have the Federal Bureau of Investigation, you have units of the National Guard, all to protect the people of your community in New York City and preserve peace. And it is further a fact that in nearly every State of this Union the sheriffs are authorized to deputize citizens, if necessary, to protect the people in the communities; in other words, a draft.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Are any of those men drafted, or does the community pay them?

Mr. DORN. I just answered the gentleman's question, that if necessary, in time of an emergency, they can deputize every able-bodied citizen to protect the people in that community. Yes; they are paid.

Mr. BUFFETT. The Committee on Armed Services voted unanimously that there was no emergency, did they not?

Mr. DORN. I do not know about that; I do not think they did. But this is a time of uncertainty. All of us would admit that Russia has a 4,000,000 standing army.

Mr. BUFFETT. And they have had that for 20 years, too, have they not?

Mr. DORN. Yes; but not as strong as it is today. They are increasing their strength daily, while this Nation is becoming impotent, just as the gentleman's party helped it to become impotent after the last war.

Mr. BUFFETT. What would the gentleman rather have, 4,000,000 men or the atomic bomb?

Mr. DORN. That question is beside the point.

Mr. BUFFETT. No; it is not.

Mr. DORN. Yes; it is. What we need is to implement the delivery of the atomic bomb with modern types of aircraft, and you have to have some men in order to do that.

Mr. BUFFETT. We heard this morning that the Air Corps was turning men down all the time.

Mr. DORN. The Air Corps is not all that is necessary. You need all the components of the Army at full strength. What we need is a peace force today. I hope we will give it to our Nation and to the world.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a good deal of regret that I find myself in disagreement with my friend from Pennsylvania. With the possible exception of this one particular item he and I think very much alike on the question of national defense.

I do not think I can add very much to what has been said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, on this question. But here it is proposed that we employ 100,000 foreigners, aliens, to help defend the United States. I confess that I cannot enthuse over such a proposal, first, from the practical standpoint, which is of the less importance. From a practical standpoint I can imagine the babel of tongues that would prevail in the armed forces of the United States and practically every unit stationed abroad if we had foreigners added to it, speaking four, five, and six different languages. I can visualize the captain of a company of infantry in Germany having to employ interpreters in order to transmit his orders to the enlisted men.

But, more important than that, have we come to the point when we must employ 100,000 foreigners to defend us? Are we to establish a precedent here that will prevail and perhaps become more and more influential as the years go by that the easy way to defend America is to hire defenders, no matter where they come from? It does not present a pretty picture. If you will read history you will remember the utter contempt that was suffered by the British Government, the Lord North ministry under George III, when they hired Hessians. It left a scar that still is visible.

I hope this House will not start any such system as this. To my mind it is un-American.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take any time on this bill, for I am supporting the bill, and I am going to vote for it. It may be that in this instance I may be voting for more than is immediately necessary for my country's safety, but I would rather be safe than sorry. I would rather err on the side of safety. I was put to the same test on the Selective Service Act shortly before Pearl Harbor. For a time I was the only one from our entire Michigan delegation favoring its passage. Later, upon my entreaty, I was joined by my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], while 15 Members from my State opposed the bill and made a grave error. You remember that at that time the same people who opposed peacetime conscription before Pearl Harbor asked the same question you heard yesterday in this well, "Who is going to attack the United States?" Within a few months thereafter the Japs attacked us. I am not speculating on who might be foolhardy enough to attack us. I am going to vote to stack our buckshot and be ready. I must vote thus, Mr. Chairman, as long as there are pyromaniacs abroad playing with matches. I had one son in the service as a result of my vote prior to World War II. If need be, I will put into uniform another lad now nearing his seventeenth birthday. The safety of my country demands this of me. I have no choice in the matter. I trust, Mr. Chairman, I may contribute something to this bill which is pertinent and proper in respect to the proposal of my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]. I think it would be well to permit many of these individuals who served in the Polish Army, for example, to enlist in our armed forces and after such service to become citizens of our beloved country. There are other groups and nationalities, of course, who are worthy. But I want to deal with the valiant Polish soldiers left high and dry in Europe today. They served from the first day until the last. You cannot compare those people with mercenaries. You cannot liken them to the unprincipled Hessians, as somebody has whispered. These are the men who have served their country on the Allied side through the Battle of Poland, above and underground, the Battle of France, and the Battle of Britain. They fought in Narvik; they held Tobruk for 8 months. They battled at Anzio. They left 4,000 of their dead as evidence of their bravery and courage at Monte Cassino. They went the entire length of the Italian boot. Again, they fought in France, Holland, and Germany, and, like Moses, they were then denied the privilege of entering their own homeland, for which they fought and died and where they lost their all.

Those people are as opposed to communism as they are to nazism. They would rather fight a Communist or a Nazi than attend a banquet. These are the kind of people America is made of. These men are heroes in a wholesale lot. They deserve every consideration. They would be a great and a valuable asset to the United States. Permitting them to come into the country after having served a hitch in the United States Army would be a mighty valuable thing for the people of this country. Their service in Germany today would for a certainty add strength and safety to our armed forces and to our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. NODAR].

Mr. NODAR. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, today I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the permission of the House Un-American Activities Committee, a report which it furnished on my request concerning the political background of a group of people who play important roles on the editorial staff of the Queensbridge Home News, a small newspaper distributed free of charge among the residents, numbering several thousand families, of the Queensbridge Federal housing project of Long Island City in my constituency.

This news sheet is the official publication of the Queensbridge Tenants League and the writers in question are officers of that league. The report on their background speaks for itself. I do not believe that they are truly representative of the kind of people who live in Queensbridge, and I do not think that the views they are propagating are representative of the thinking of the majority of the tenants.

However, I feel that the facts about these people should be made known, so that the tenants of the housing project themselves can decide on the basis of the facts whether or not they want this kind of person to speak in their name. It is only fair to point out at this time when many of us in Congress are making a desperate fight for constructive housing legislation, we are hampered by the knowledge that people with backgrounds such as these can gain such control and influence over the tenants in these projects built by public funds. This information can only hinder the adoption of any new Federal housing legislation. None of us are willing to spend public money to house and benefit those with un-American sympathies.

I have had a personal investigation made to be sure that the persons identified in the Un-American Activities Committee report are the same as those listed as officers of the Queensbridge Tenants League. I can verify that although their addresses have now been changed to Queensbridge from their previous residences, they are in fact the same people, who, as the committee states, have engaged in Communist Party and Communist-front activities in some cases.

I believe this information warrants the study and consideration of the Congress as well as by the loyal American tenants of the project.

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 1, 1948.

For: Hon. ROBERT NODAR, Jr.

Subject: Jeannette Devausney, Max Diamond, Edward Fodor, Molly Greenberg, Mortimer Greenberg, Miriam Sayer, and Queensbridge Home News.

Jeannette Devausney, chairman of the school committee for the Queensbridge Tenants League, wrote a letter to the Daily Worker, Communist Party organ, complaining about the school situation in the Queensbridge housing project and commenting upon articles by Joseph North which had appeared in the Daily Worker. (See Daily Worker, March 12, 1948, p. 8.)

Max Diamond, according to the Daily Worker of March 12, 1942, was a speaker for the International Workers Order. In the report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities of June 25, 1942, it was stated: "Our committee has found unanimously that the International Workers Order is a front of the Communist Party. The organization is headed entirely by outstanding avowed members of the Communist Party, such as William Weiner, Max Bedacht, Herbert Benjamin, and Louise Thompson." (See report 2277, p. 19.) Attorney General Francis Biddle, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 24, 1942, on page 7688, called it "One of the strongest Communist organizations." The Special Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the International Workers Order as a Communist front in its report dated January 8, 1940. In a list of organizations compiled by Attorney General Clark pursuant to Executive Order No. 9835, and released by the Civil Service Commission on December 5, 1947, the International Workers Order was cited as being a subversive organization.

Max Diamond is listed as being a member of the editorial staff of the New York Teacher News, which is the official publication of the Teachers Union of New York (New York Teacher News, February 7, 1948, p. 2.) According to the New York Times of September 24, 1943, page 25, the New York Teachers Union received its charter from the Congress of Industrial Organizations as Local No. 555 of the New York District of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America. It was previously affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers as Local No. 5, but was expelled on charges of being Communist dominated at the August 1941 convention of the American Federation of Teachers. The State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, which the Teachers Union joined, later merged with the United Federal Workers of America at a convention held in Atlantic City during the week of April 23–27, 1946, and became the United Public Workers of America. In Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities regarding communism in the CIO, the committee stated they had found Communist leadership strongly entrenched in both the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America and the United Federal Workers of America. (See report 1311, pp. 18–19.)

Edward Fodor was listed as being the chairman of the sixteenth assembly district branch of the Communist Party by the Daily Worker, May 4, 1940, page 3, column 8.

Edward J. Fodor, according to the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, was candidate for Congress from the Eighteenth District, New York County, in 1940, for the Communist Party. (Daily Worker, August 5, 1940, p. 5, column 5.)

In the committee's printed lists of the signers of Communist Party election petitions, compiled from the original petitions, the following names are found:

1. Edward J. Fodor, 58 East Ninety-eighth Street, New York, New York State petition, 1940.

2. Molly Greenberg, 1245 Findlay Avenue, Bronx, N. Y., New York City petition, 1939–40.

3. Mortimer Greenberg, 18 Hart Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., New York City petition, 1939–40.

4. Mortimer Greenberg, 4010 Vernon Boulevard, Queens, N. Y., New York State petition, 1940.

5. Beatrice Laupheimer, 721 Walton Avenue, Bronx, N. Y., New York State petition, 1942.

Miriam Sayer, under the auspices of the Communist Party of Queens County, N. Y., signed a statement to Borough President Burke protesting the denial of the use of the Lost Battalion Hall for the Communist Party election rally. (Daily Worker, December 5, 1946, p. 5.)

We were unable to find any reference to the other members of the editorial board and staff of the Queensbridge Home News, namely, Emilia Mitrand, Jean Sobek, Ruth Kaufman, Meta Goodman, Helen Fodor, Edna Horn, Jean Maria, Muriel Wharton, and Elsie Felipe. We were also unable to find any mention or reference of the Queensbridge Home News in the files of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of California to the amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: Insert "*Provided, however*, That such aliens shall be assigned duty on foreign occupation service only, for the period of their enlistment, except for such domestic service within the United States as may be determined necessary for adequate schooling or instruction."

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking not only in support of my amendment to the amendment, but also in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]. As to whether or not there is an emergency now existing in the world, I think one might better direct that inquiry to those now domiciled in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Bessarabia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, or any one of the formerly free lands in the world who had their freedom at one time and in whose parliamentary bodies you could probably have heard very much the same kind of debate as is now going on in this great Chamber. So far as hiring mercenaries is concerned, I think that any argument based on that count does not hold water. As a matter of fact, this great Chamber is distinguished by the picture of a man who might well have been called by some a mercenary. His name was Lafayette. His picture hangs at the left of the Speaker's chair. There are other great names that come to mind, such as those of Pilsudski, Kosciusko, Steuben, and literally scores of other foreign-born men in our Nation's history who have rendered great service to this country, not because of a few paltry dollars that they may have received as payment for their services, but because they believed in the dignity of the human being and his right to live in freedom.

Have we ever before employed the services of any mercenaries in our national history? We certainly did use the services of many thousands of Philippine Scouts. We certainly made allies and agents out of all of the members of all of the partisan movements during the war. We not only paid them money, but we gave them arms and ammunition. Certainly the thousands upon thousands of aliens who were inducted under Selective Service were, to a certain extent and quite literally, mercenaries as the term is being here employed today. I do not think actually that the employment of a hundred thousand men—able-bodied soldiers—who have been driven out of their homes and off their soil, who have made every possible sacrifice in their efforts to retain their freedom, independence, and liberty—I repeat I do not think that the employment of these men could be termed the employment of mercenaries. When they fight for us, as they would under the provisions of this amendment, they would fight equally for their own homes, for their own human dignity, and for the right to sometime return to the lands that were theirs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment to the amendment, and to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, like my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. JACKSON], I, too, rise to speak in favor of the amendment proposed by our amiable colleague of Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]. However, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] has now offered an amendment to the Gavin amendment providing that the aliens to be enlisted, be enlisted for the purpose of duty outside the United States except for such time that might be required for training purposes in the United States, and I am in fullest accord with this suggestion.

Both sponsors have foremost in mind the enlistment into our ranks of men who served in the uniform of Poland as our allies in the global war as also other of our allies such as the Czechs and others mentioned in the vigorous statement by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] in behalf of his amendment to the Selective Service Act of 1946.

The portrait of Lafayette here in the House Chamber was pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] and other so-called foreigners were mentioned by him to substantiate the fact that this is not the setting of a precedent for having aliens in our forces. May I also reiterate to the Committee that an alien soldier, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, of Poland, fought for our freedom and died in the battle of Savannah. May I also remind the Committee that another alien of Polish extraction, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, also fought with our Colonial troops and founded the Military Academy at West Point. These men are among the first foreigners in our armed forces and there were many outstanding aliens on our side throughout the history of our Nation. If only the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who spoke in opposition a few minutes ago, would stop and reflect upon the history of the United States instead of the history of early Britain, he will readily associate the names, the heroic exploits of many non-United States citizens who helped win our battles. The record is self-sufficient in denying any need for interpreters to issue orders to available men like the former Polish soldiers who, shoulder to shoulder with our forces and our allies, fought throughout Africa and Europe. Oh, Mr. Chairman, there is so much that can be said along these same lines in favor of these worthy amendments but the time limitation restricts me. We need trained soldiers for our occupation forces; here is an opportunity for immediate replenishment with soldiers who know intensely the meaning of loyalty and freedom. I urge the adoption of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SADLAK) there were—ayes 24, noes 53.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVIN) there were—ayes 24, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can arrive at some idea of how much more time will be required on section 5.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on section 5 and all amendments thereto and all amendments to amendments close at 5:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on section 5 and all amendments thereto and all amendments to amendments thereto close at 5:30.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to advise the Committee that there are approximately 20 amendments at the desk. There are remaining approximately 55 minutes under the order just entered. The Chair would suggest that, without objection, the proponents of amendments will be recognized for 2 minutes in support of their amendments, and one speaker in opposition to the amendment.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUBER: Page 21, line 2, strike out all after the comma down through the period in line 6 and insert "The sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this act."

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that there is nothing controversial or complex about this amendment. It simply provides that where one or more members of a family were killed in action or died in line of duty during the last war that the sole surviving son shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this act.

I feel that if we were in actual war and it were necessary to scrape the bottom of the barrel it might be necessary to induct the sole surviving son. But under these circumstances, while we are still at peace, I see no reason why we cannot allow these parents who made so costly a sacrifice to have the solace and consolation of having their one remaining son at their side to carry on the family name. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I intended to offer the identical amendment just offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER]. I am glad to support the amendment and hope that the committee will accept it. The bill as presently presented provides for the assignment to noncombatant service within the United States of the sole surviving son of any family who lost one or more persons during the fighting in World War II. This amendment will give such persons complete exemption from the bill. I believe that that is the least we can do for these families. There is no point in taking such a boy away from his family for noncombatant service. If the boy wants to serve he will enlist. On the other hand, if he or his family have any other desires they should be respected, and the boy given complete exemption.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the author of this amendment whether this is the surviving son amendment?

Mr. HUBER. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say that this was my own original amendment to the bill. I have no objection to the amendment. The committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] to offer an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin: On page 18, line 7, strike out all wording on lines 7 and 8 following the comma and insert "or who are recognized by the officials of their church or synagogue or sect as having given a definite and acknowledged intention of entering into full-time religious work, shall be exempt from service (but not from registration) under this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is largely by way of clarification. It pertains principally to those individuals of the Protestant or Jewish Church who are studying for and intend to enter the ministry. I am a Catholic myself. Most people who enter into the studies for the priesthood in the Catholic Church enter into regular religious preparatory schools of instruction, but it is my understanding that many individuals who enter into the Protestant and Jewish ministry take a regular formal course such as any student might take and do not enter into the regular ministry until after they have completed their college education; but they take the college course with the view of entering the ministry and have made arrangements with their church leaders to that end. I think there will be something in the way of discrimination against people in that category if we do not adopt this amendment, discrimination against people who in good faith enter a regular college having made arrangements with their church superiors to enter into religion thereafter.

My amendment merely takes care of those who have made arrangements with officials of their church, synagogue, or sect to enter into the ministry. Under this amendment they would be exempt as are those who enter regular institutions.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. This amendment, of course, would make clear the fact that those who are in schools studying for the ministry would be exempt from the draft, but it would also make clear that those in the Catholic religious orders, for instance, known as lay brothers, should also be exempt; and that has always been our intention, and it is now in this Selective Service Act that they should be exempt.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. KILDAY. I think the gentleman's amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] for 2 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I understand that today on the floor a very distinguished gentleman made the statement that in our Foreign Affairs Committee executive session this morning Mr. Marshall made the statement that there was no danger of war.

Under the rules of the House and the committees an executive session is supposed to be sacred. I have always tried to follow that rule. I am not going to say anything about what Mr. Marshall said in the committee, but I can tell you what he did not say. He did not say that there was no danger of war.

In addition to that, I called him up this afternoon and he empowered me to make the statement that in his judgment it seems to be quite clear that recessions—in other words, that is a diplomatic phrase which means backing away—from our present line of action for the security of the United States would be most unfortunate and might lead to what we are trying so hard to avoid—that is, war.

That is the position of Secretary Marshall that he empowered me to present to the House at this time and to say once again he did not make the statement before our committee that there was no danger of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDS: Page 10, line 3, after the comma after the word "served," insert the words "provided such unit is reasonably accessible to such person without unduly interrupting his normal pursuits and activities, including attendance at a college or university in which he is regularly enrolled."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, so far as this side of the aisle is concerned, and I feel quite sure the same is true of the gentlemen on the other side, we have no objection to the amendment and will accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCK:

On page 9, after line 3, insert:

"(2) That, except as otherwise provided in this act, no person who served honorably on board any vessel (i) in the United States Army Transportation Corps, or (ii) owned by, chartered to, or operated by, or for the account of the United States Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, in areas which the Maritime War Emergency Board determined to be hazardous and subject to enemy activity, for a period of 18 months or more, between September 16, 1940, and September 2, 1945, shall, without his consent, be liable for induction for service under this act except that such exemption shall terminate upon a declaration by the Congress after the date of enactment of this act that a state of war or national emergency exists."

On page 9, line 4, change "(2)" to "(3)."

On page 9, line 19, change "(3)" to "(4)."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is both simple and meritorious, and it also promotes the national defense. I hope it will be accepted by the Committee.

Except on declaration of war or national emergency, this amendment exempts from liability for induction merchant seamen who served 18 months between September 1940 and September 1945 in areas which the Maritime War

Emergency Board determined to be hazardous.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman who has contributed more to the upbuilding of the American merchant marine than any other Member in this House.

Mr. BLAND. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would only exempt from induction into the armed forces men whose contribution to our recent war effort was so outstanding that special provision was made for their exemption from military service during the recent war and during the immediate postwar period.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. BLAND. Since that is the purpose of the amendment and since I am heartily in favor of the pending bill, I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman kindly explain the mechanics by which these individuals are singled out, and their heroism and outstanding service identified, as against another boy who worked alongside of them but who was not picked out.

Mr. BUCK. The Maritime War Emergency Board classified every seaman as to whether his service was hazardous or not. Every man who served in the merchant marine can be sufficiently certified as to this point.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. The Merchant Marine Commission granted certificates of outstanding wartime service which was accepted by the selective-service boards throughout the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all recognize the importance of the merchant marine service during the period of the last war. It presented many hazards to the persons involved. But, I think the question of recognizing civilian service during World War II and placing such service alongside of those who were in the armed forces is a question that the Congress has disposed of in the past. If we are going to recognize one class of civilians who served in the last war I think we should recognize other groups. Let us not forget the civilian employees of the State and War Departments who were in London during the war raids and were constantly subjected to V–I and V–II bombs. Let us not forget the members of the American Red Cross who served in the last war or the war correspondents.

Let us think of the members of the FBI. Let us think of the civilian employees in the Office of Strategic Services who exposed themselves to extreme dangers behind the enemy lines, and let us think of the State Department employees who were interned in foreign countries at the outbreak of the last war. If we are going to recognize one group, let us go all the way down the line. For that reason I oppose this amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman is an outstanding Member of Congress who has served in both world wars, and who has been very much interested in veterans' legislation throughout all of these years. This proposition has been presented to the Congress and has been considered by Congress on several occasions as to whether service by the men who served in the merchant marine would be classified as military duty. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would not agree that the Congress has always taken the position that service on merchant vessels, even during wartime, should not be classified as military duty?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUCK moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I utilize this device to obtain time on an amendment for the introduction of which I have been constantly on the floor for the past 2 days. Now, when time comes to consider the amendment I am given 2 minutes to present it, and that notwithstanding the fact that we have had frequent 5-minute speeches both yesterday and today when no amendments were even pending.

This amendment recognizes that seamen aboard ships sunk from under them in the icy waters of the North Atlantic or aboard torpedoed tankers, necessitating their jumping overboard into pools of burning oil, have already risked their lives for their country just as fully as men in front-line trenches. As a matter of fact, the casualties, proportionately, among the men of the American merchant marine who served in the hazardous waters covered by this amendment were greater than among the men of the armed services.

A second feature of this amendment is that it will contribute to the national defense. In both world wars the bottleneck was ships and men to man the ships. If this amendment is adopted, the trained seamen who will be needed in the event of another emergency will be available to man ships rather than be landlocked in Army camps. We would be contributing to the defense of the Nation by keeping these merchant seamen available for use on merchant ships when and as emergency arises.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAVENNER. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is just a matter of simple justice, and is thoroughly meritorious. I know the men who served in the merchant marine during this war were serving in an essential arm of the national defense, so recognized by the Congress. The mere fact that the Military Establishment has prevented them from getting their due recognition in various matters of legislation is no reason why the gentleman's amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. Does the gentleman think the veteran is so narrow that he does not want to recognize bravery in other men?

Mr. BUCK. I never thought so.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I object to the withdrawal of the motion, and ask recognition in opposition to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, there are none of us who would say that the merchant mariner did not do a good job during the war. However, I feel that this amendment should be defeated for what I believe to be a fundamental reason. At the outset of the war the merchant mariner could have been taken into the armed forces. He could have been taken into the Navy or the Naval Reserve. But he and the unions which represented him objected most violently, and there are Members here of the former Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which handled maritime affairs, who can confirm that.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield for a correction.

Mr. BRADLEY. After extensive hearings, we found that President Franklin Roosevelt was the one who directed that the men should not be taken into the Navy.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes, I never knew Mr. Roosevelt to be too violently opposed to unions.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I think it proper to say that I have twice served in the merchant marine as an ordinary seaman, once in 1920, and once during this war, on a so-called tanker run to Bristol, known as the high-octane run. I have also had an opportunity to examine the files of the War Shipping Administration and the resolutions of all of the unions at the time they were asked whether or not they would be willing to be taken in as part of the armed forces. In every case with suspicious unanimity all those resolutions were adopted, along the same line, and in every case they decided that they were proud of their civilian status, as they put it. They refused to accept discipline, they refused to accept the wearing of a uniform. For that reason, they having had their opportunity to become a part of the armed services and having rejected it, and being unwilling to assume the responsibility of serving in the armed forces of this country, I am not in favor of this amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The question before the Committee is whether or not the Committee shall rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out. The gentleman is not talking on that, he is talking about something else.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out opens up the whole bill.

The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. KILDAY. I agree with what the gentleman has said. They had their choice. They chose to be civilians, and they served at a rate of pay far in excess of service personnel. I wish those of you who may be inclined to vote for this amendment would ask some member of the Navy who served as a member of the armed guard aboard one of these ships, serving there at regular service pay with these civilian crew members who were drawing many times a month what he was, what he thinks about this amendment.

This is the difficulty about this situation. If we recognize the merchant mariner as a veteran of the last war, there is no end to which we must not go. He is going to get the advantages of the GI bill of rights, he is going to get veterans' benefits, and he is going to get everything else. I do not say he should be deprived of that, but I do say that those things have been granted on the theory that a man serving in the Army at low service pay had lost a great deal of what he would have otherwise made in a civilian occupation. These men did not. If you bring them in under the veteran set-up, there must be a reevaluation of what they have lost compared with what the men who went into the service lost. You cannot do it here on the floor of the House. If that is going to be done—and I do not have anything to say against the service of these men because many of them served wonderfully. But if you go into this, you are starting to recognize the merchant mariner as a veteran, and you are going to have to give him all of the veterans' benefits. When you do that you must reevaluate the situation and make sure that he is not getting a tremendously lot more than the boy who fought in the Battle of the Bulge.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr BURLESON. Is it not a fact also that they will be drawing other veterans' benefits besides seamen's pay and retirement and so forth?

Mr. KILDAY. The merchant seamen received many more times what a veteran received for his service in the armed forces of the United States while he was on active duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 12, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have four amendments at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish the Clerk to report them together?

Mr. POWELL. No, Mr. Chairman. Do I have equal time on each of the amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman at this time to offer one amendment on which he will be recognized for 2 minutes.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: Page 8, line 16, insert a new section as follows:

"(b) No person who does not desire to serve in a unit of the armed services because of segregation shall be taken for induction."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I present this amendment to you because, as I have intimated before on the floor within the past few days, it is in accord with the platform promise of the Republican Party of 1944. I have never read that platform promise for the RECORD. I have only referred to it. I will read it now so that it will be a part of the RECORD here today.

In 1940, and again in 1944:

We pledge an immediate congressional inquiry to ascertain the extent to which mistreatment, segregation, and discrimination against Negroes in our armed forces are impairing morale and efficiency, and we pledge the adoption of corrective legislation.

In view of the fact that the Armed Services Committee, representing the Republican majority of the House, is determined not to put anything into this bill guaranteeing a minimum of their platform pledge, I think it is important, therefore, that since they have broken their word to the 15,000,000 Negroes to whom they gave their word, that there ought to be something here to protect those people from the hypocrisy of the Republican Party.

This amendment would do this. I respectfully urge you Representatives that in all fairness to your conscience this amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWELL) there were—ayes 7, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. For how long will I be recognized on my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized for 2 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. LECOMPTE. May I say that since the motion was made there has been a preferential motion debated and considered which took up time that was not originally planned for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes that, but the motion that was entered was not a motion for fixed debate for a certain period of time but to close debate at a certain definite time by the clock.

Mr. LECOMPTE. But there has been some time taken out on the preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Unfortunately, that is true, but that does not come within the order of the Committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LECOMPTE: Section 5, (D) strike out all of (d) (1), page 11 and in lieu thereof insert the following: "Persons who on the effective date of this act, or who, prior to the date they are ordered to report for induction for service under this act, are members of the federally recognized National Guard, the federally recognized Air National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve Corps, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast Guard Reserve, or the Public Health Service Reserve, and are not on active duty, and who serve therein for a total period of 6 years, during which they satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, shall be exempt from service by induction under the provisions of this act, but not from registration."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, the chief purpose of this amendment is to protect the strength of the National Guard. Down through the years the National Guard and the other organizations mentioned have been vital to the defense of our country. In effect, all this amendment does is to give an opportunity to young men to enlist in the National Guard between the time of the enactment of this act and the time of reporting for duty. I believe the National Guard should have a chance to recruit and bring the guard up to strength during that period. Down through the pages of history the National Guard has covered itself with glory and the men of the guard have poured out their blood on every battlefield. We have been told repeatedly that there are not less than 100,000 young men coming of age in the United States each month. If that is the case, there is certainly no great scarcity of manpower. I believe we will serve our country if we protect the strength of the National Guard.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the authorized strength of the National Guard is 250,000. The limitation on the guard and other organizations in the country is 350,000. This bill today protects all men who are in the National Guard. It permits all young men to enlist in the National Guard up to the date of enactment of this act, and hundreds of them are doing it. It also protects all young men up until they are 18 years and 6 months old who enlist in the guard, and thereafter be deferred. It permits veterans with

less than 12 months' service to to enlist in the National Guard and be deferred.

Also available to the guard are all other veterans not liable to the draft.

From these figures it is clear that the Guard has a tremendous pool from which to enlist more than its requirements. With the threat of induction facing the young-age group and the veteran with not more than 12 months' service, the problem will not be how to get more people in the guard but how to decide who will be admitted, and thereby escape induction. To enlarge this group could only aggravate a problem already serious, and seriously deplete the pool for this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. As I understand the amendment, it merely holds out to the person who is apprehensive that he will be drafted the opportunity to enlist in the National Guard and that the period of enlistment is for 6 years, whereas the period of service under the bill is only 2 years. I think the gentleman's amendment is stronger than the committee bill.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It does hold out an inducement for them to enlist in the National Guard for 6 years in preference to going into the Regular Army for 2.

I do not know why the committee cannot accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS of New York) there were—ayes 53, noes 9.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] to offer amendments. The Chair is advised the gentleman has two amendments pending and would like to have them considered together. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE:

On page 12, lines 22 and 23, strike out the word "continuance" and insert after the word "or", the following: "elect to continue."

On page 13, line 3, strike out the word "continuance" and insert after the word "or", the following: "elects to continue."

Page 13, line 7, strike out "not less than 3 years" and insert "for the same period of time as is required of an inductee under the terms of this bill."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes in support of his amendments.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of the committee will indicate that he is willing to accept these amendments, as I understand the committee is, I will not take my time.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. CROW. Does the gentleman intend to strike out the word "continuance" on page 13, line 2, or the word "selected"?

Mr. TEAGUE. I wish to strike out the word "continuance."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I have discussed the amendment with members of the committee on this side and as far as we on this side are concerned we will be pleased to accept it.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this side of the aisle feels the same way. I wish, however, the gentleman from Texas would make a short statement of explanation.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in our colleges which have the senior ROTC, the War Department allocates to those colleges contracts which generally determine the number of men to take the last 2 years of ROTC training. In many schools like Clemson, VMI, VPI, Texas A. and M., and others, there are more men who desire to take military training than the colleges have contracts and, therefore, they cannot take all who elect to take this training. This amendment permits those men to take military training as part of their college work and to complete their course. These men may receive a Reserve commission although they have not received pay for their training. I do not know about all of those schools, but, for example, in Texas A. and M. this year about 200 more men took military training than the college had contracts for.

Mr. Chairman, in order to make proper provisions for those completing the basic course of ROTC in our colleges and who are eligible for advanced work in the senior division, I believe it advisable to provide deferment to them if they take the advanced ROTC course as an elective subject when sufficient contracts are not available at the college to take care of the demand of the students. These men taking the course as an elective will receive the same training as those under contract but will not receive the 80 cents per day subsistence nor will they receive the $83 uniform allowance.

The same provisions of section 5 (e) (2) would apply to these men such as signing for 2 years of active duty upon completion of the course if a commission is tendered to them. These officers would render very valuable service as training officers of our inductees and in established units as they would have been trained along with the officers taking advanced work in the senior division.

The Reserve Section of the Department of the Army advises me that a man taking the entire ROTC course and meeting all the prescribed requirements such as having attended summer camp, would be tendered a commission in the Reserves. In the past 3 years there have not been a sufficient number of eligible applicants to fill the Reserve officer quota.

I offer an amendment which is at the desk. I would like to explain the necessity of making ample provisions in the Selective Service Act of 1948 to continue and to expand the present Reserve officers' training program of the Army, Air, and Navy. Section 5 (e) (2) on page 12 of the bill provides deferment to those in the senior division of the Reserve training program and requires 2 years of active duty for these men upon graduation. However, those who enter the senior division of Reserve officers' training after enactment of this bill are required to serve 3 years on active duty upon graduation. I am very much concerned about the effect this will have on our entire training program to require an additional year of service for this latter group.

Mr. Chairman, we should not penalize this group of future officers in training under the Reserve officers' training program as we can produce first-class officers by this method for only about $2,100 per officer whereas it requires an expenditure of something like $45,000 to train a young man to be an officer at West Point or Annapolis.

Most of us realize the importance of having a strong reserve force and to keep this force large and strong we must add to it ever year by encouraging full participation in our military program in colleges and universities. I urge the Members to accept this amendment to require only 2 years of active duty for all graduates of the ROTC program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: Page 15, line 17, after the word "activity" insert "in study, research, or medical, scientific or other."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment just puts into the House bill, in order to show the desire of the House to have it in the bill, the language which is now in the bill of the other body. The President will be empowered then to defer young men who are engaged in special study in research, engineering, or medical activity instead of leaving it open in the general words used in the House bill entitling to deferment for "other endeavors."

I respectfully submit to the committee that this amendment ought to be accepted. In this age when scientific and atomic means are the vital preparations for national security, and when in the last war we used up men who were scientists and prospective scientists, we should forward rather than retard the effort to preserve and effectively utilize this national resource by giving the President the necessary instructions as to our desires. My amendment leaves it in his authority but expresses the will of the Congress.

We must be wise in mobilizing a military force. Every man should be husbanded for his maximum contribution to the Nation. Scientific brains are difficult and expensive to train, and take special aptitudes. I believe the maximum contribution to the Nation is to let these young men complete their studies and not to interrupt them and divert them for a considerable time to other duties. I ask that the committee accept this amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, the provisions of this bill as far as it affects scientists were adopted after consultation with the head of the Bureau of Scientific Research and we followed very fully their recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ISACSON:

On page 21, line 6, add the following new section 6 and renumber the sections that follow accordingly:

"SEC. 6. No member of the armed forces shall be discriminated against in any manner because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion by (1) any officer or employee of the United States, of any State or any governmental subdivision thereof, of any Territory or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, (2) any other member of the armed forces, (3) any common carrier, (4) any hotel or other place of public lodging, (5) any restaurant or other place engaged in the business of serving food or drink to the public, (6) any place of public amusement, or (7) any business or service engaged in commerce.

"(b) The penalty provisions of section 12 of this act shall be applicable to any violation of this section by any person enumerated in (1) or (2) of subsection (a), by any firm, company, or business enumerated in (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), or by any officer or employee, of any such firm, company, or business acting in the scope of his employment."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with certain rights and consequences which flow from the induction of Negroes into the armed forces of the United States. I submit that there are other sections in this bill which deal with the same subject, and it is therefore germane. I might also add that the amendment was considered in the Senate and was held to be germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Whatever action was taken in another body does not control the action of this body.

The Chair is prepared to rule. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON] clearly goes beyond the scope of the bill. It purports to impose sanctions on persons who are not members of the armed forces, such as common carriers, and other classes. Therefore, the Chair holds that the amendment is not germane and sustains the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROW: Page 8, line 5, after the semicolon, add the following: "Cadets, in recognized senior and basic ROTC colleges and schools, this to include Army, Navy, and air ROTC colleges and schools."

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the purpose of this amendment is to exempt the cadets at our recognized military colleges from the effect of this draft. I am talking particularly about colleges like VMI and Pennsylvania Military College, where they have actual military training all through their college years. I graduated from PMC myself.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would confer the same consideration on State colleges where military science and tactics are taught as the bill does at West Point and the Naval Academy?

Mr. CROW. No; I do not believe that is correct, unless the State college is a recognized ROTC college.

Mr. VINSON. If it is recognized, it is then given the same benefit as the bill gives to the midshipmen and the cadets?

Mr. CROW. That is right, if they are entitled to a commission when they graduate from that school. They get military training that would qualify them for that purpose. I do not think they should be required to register under this bill. My reason for that is this: The basic men taking the course are not exempt. At the end of the second year you are not going to have any men going into the third or fourth class years. They will all be drafted.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman's ability and his interest in good legislation. I wonder, however, if he has studied the language of subsection (e) on page 12 which I think largely does what the gentleman is seeking to do.

Mr. CROW. I might say to the gentleman that I have an amendment to strike out that section completely, because I think the cadets in the ROTC should not be subject to this draft.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I believe that under the terms of section 5 (i) (1) there is a provision that the President may determine certain classifications which he could defer by order; is that correct, may I ask one of the gentlemen on the committee?

Mr. KILDAY. In section 5 (i) (1) that power is granted to the resident.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is that for the purpose of permitting the President to exempt persons such as those who are engaged in study to become scientists and technicians?

Mr. KILDAY. It is a general provision under which persons in critical occupations would be deferred. Then there is a second sentence in that same provision which would take care of those who are studying. At one time the committee thought of setting out in words the categories of essential personnel who should be deferred, and deferred while they were continuing their education, but when we got to that point we found it was not possible for us to sit down and pick out all of them in advance. Some might have been overlooked. We hoped this would take care of all of them.

Mr. HINSHAW. In the consideration of the National Science Foundation bill by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce it was found there is a very great shortage in the United States of qualified scientists and technicians in the scientific fields. We need those men worse than we need soldiers. I trust that the language of the bill will permit the President of the United States to order the exemption of persons who are bona fidely, and by certification of the heads of the institutions in which they are studying, training to become scientists. We are 15,000 men short in the scientific field. Even Britain in her dire distress of the recent war had the good sense to exempt scientists and highly qualified students of science from military service. It is more important to the defense of the United States today that we fill the voids in the ranks of our scientists than that we employ men of that type of mind to fill the ranks of foot soldiers. I trust that the advisers to the President appreciate the facts in the matter and that they will advise him accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS, of Florida: Page 18, line 1, strike out beginning on page 18, line 1, "(2) any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of higher learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act after the beginning and prior to the end of one of his academic years, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed (A) until the end of such academic year or (B) until he ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of higher learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act prior to his graduation from such college, university, or similar institution of higher learning shall upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom or (B) until he attains the twenty-second anniversary of his birth or (C) until he ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest, provided such person agrees in writing to serve in the armed forces of the United States for a period not to exceed 1 year subject to call by the Secretary of the Army,

the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment only provides the same treatment for the boys who are still in college as this bill gives the boys attending high school. In other words, you cannot induct a boy attending high school until he graduates or becomes 20 years old or quits school. I have just applied this to the boys who are in college. In other words, if a boy starts his college career and wants to complete it, this just says that if he is inducted, upon request his induction will be deferred or postponed until he finishes his schooling, becomes 22 years of age, or ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is earliest.

That takes care of this situation. Most high-school boys are through high school by the time they are 20 years of age. The general average of the ages of the boys who enter college is 18 or 19.

This amendment provides that they may complete their courses provided that they enter into an agreement as provided in another section where they take ROTC training, and provided they agree in writing that as soon as the Secretary of War, Navy, or Air Force calls them for service, then they will serve for 1 year. That is the only thing it provides. It simply prevents a boy being interrupted in trying to get a college education. So what are you going to do by that? You are going to give that boy an opportunity to get an education, and at the same time you are going to save the Government a lot of money, because the minute they take these boys away from school and they serve 1 or 2 years, the Government is going to be called upon to send them back to school, just as they do with the boys now, and possibly this Government will do it. But if you let them complete their education now, or up until the age of 22 years, they pay for their own schooling, no preference is shown and no discrimination, for all must serve the same length of time in Army forces. Just an opportunity to educate himself at his own expense before entering in his country's service.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee gave considerable consideration to the subject matter of the gentleman's amendment. High school students are not to be taken into the armed forces until they graduate. All college students are exempt providing they are in the ROTC, otherwise they are deferred until the end of the college year. The bill is a very narrow bill, covering all those who not only may be inducted, but those who may enlist or want to enlist. The committee thought that if we went so far as to exempt all college students, it would be committing a highly preferential action which would benefit only the sons of wealthy men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, the following is an excerpt from a letter received from the commander of one of the Reserve units in my district:

It so happens that at present I am the commanding officer of the Howitzer Company, Second Battalion, Three Hundred and Ninety-eighth Parachute Infantry Regiment, One Hundredth Airborne Division, which is the Reserve outfit assigned to Webster County. We got a bunch of ambitious boys here and signed up 72 enlisted men and 3 officers, making us the largest outfit in the whole State, bar none. On second thought, I believe we are the largest in the division, which covers West Virginia, Kentucky, and part of Ohio or Indiana.

Here are our gripes:

1. According to information from higher-ups, we signed up some Navy and Marine veterans, and some new recruits, mostly 17 years of age. So far, however, these men have not been assigned a serial number, have not been recognized in any way, and do not know their status. What's more, they have not been issued any uniforms, and must attend any formation in Navy blues, Marine uniform, or civvies, as the case may be.

2. The Army has plenty of uniforms, equipment, and arms rotting in storage, but we cannot get any. We are supposed to have in our outfit all the weapons in the whole State, but they are inadequate for even our one company, to wit, 5 M1 rifles, 11 carbines, 8 obsolete 1917 Enfields, 2 pistols. In addition we practically stole from an exhibit, one BAR, three magazines, and two mortars. No uniforms at all have been issued. No equipment at all has been issued. We received five rounds of ammunition (carbine) per man during all of last year and up to date.

3. We get no pay for training. The boys have been turning out on their own time, with patriotism as their only incentive, with one exception: a week-end contact camp in Charleston this March.

4. The Army does not have enough money to let us train our men here, with expense ridiculously low by comparison, but has enough money for the officers to attend five contact camps in the last year; we officers had two week-end camps at Fort Knox this past year, but the men could not go; there is a 12-day summer camp at Fort Bragg in July, for officers only. What we want to know is: Should the Army finance vacations for a lot of brass or use the same money training the enlisted men at home? The officers of our outfit here are refusing to go where our men cannot go.

5. We have to beg storage and training space from the county court and from the sheriff. Although requested, the Army has done nothing to rent training space for us—and an ideal space is available.

6. The Army has done nothing to rent or lease us space for a range. Finally a local citizen, himself a veteran of World War I, gave me a lease on land suitable for a range, for use of our outfit. Now the Army will do nothing to help us develop it.

7. We had two unit instructors, Maj. Daniel Gallagher and later Maj. Mack C. Shelley, both of whom had plenty of initiative and were a big help to us. Now these men have been absorbed into the limbo of West Virginia military district headquarters in Charleston and we have no commissioned unit instructor at all.

We would like to ask that you take two steps for us:

1. Prod the Army high brass into establishing policy and taking direct steps to remedy the defects we complain of, except where such defects are caused by insufficient legislation.

2. Where lack of legislation is the cause, push action in the House that will cure the defects we complain of.

Mr. Chairman, under the law, Congress had established a policy that all the men in the armed forces, after their release following World War II, were to be transferred to the Reserve organization for a period of 10 years. This provision of the law was deliberately ignored by the Army. No explanation has been given for this action, nor can an explanation be given. One is led to the inescapable conclusion that the Army did not want a large or an active Reserve.

The hearings on H. R. 6401 disclose that General Marshall, in 1944, told General Reckord of the National Guard that the National Guard and the Reserve should be set up on the basis of a universal military training program.

I believe all recognize the fact that the world is in an unsettled condition; the United Nations is not functioning; post-war problems have not been settled; peace treaties have not been written; and it is necessary for this Nation to be strong until the various problems are settled.

We must be strong from both a military and an economic standpoint. From a military standpoint, we must have an active, strong Reserve, an active, strong National Guard, and an adequate Regular Army—all organized into combat teams and groups. We must maintain our strength from an economic standpoint. Current revenues will have to meet current expenses. With the size of our present national debt, we cannot afford deficit spending. For this country to go over the brink in that respect would be more disastrous in many ways than anything any foreign power might be able to do to us.

We are now considering H. R. 6401, providing for the conscription of young men between the ages of 19 and 26 into the armed services. We have no right to draft them unless there is a very real emergency and the Army cannot get them in any other way.

Up to the time this bill was presented, I thought that we could tolerate peacetime conscription, provided it gave us the military strength we needed and was within our ability to finance. After studying the bill, it is hard to imagine a worse draft bill, from the standpoint of the interest of all components of the armed services, this bill will virtually eliminate the National Guard and emasculate the Reserve force. Instead of building up those organizations, upon which we must depend if we are to have a healthy, strong national-defense program, it goes a long way to destroy them.

Maj. Gen. E. A. Walsh, president of the National Guard Association, in a telegram dated May 3, 1948, stated:

The enactment of H. R. 6401 as now drafted will mean the complete dissolution of the National Guard of the United States by June 1950. The security of the Nation cannot be assured by destroying its reserves. If there is a possibility of war, the measures proposed are utterly inadequate. If there is no possibility of war, then the measures proposed are excessive.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate and I have read in the report where it is stated this bill would strengthen the Reserve and the National Guard, but upon examination of the provisions of the bill itself I find that no recognition is given to enlistment of a man in the Reserve or National Guard where he serves two or even three enlistments. If such a provision was contained in the bill, thousands or even tens of thousands of our young men would go into the Reserve and National Guard and be trained in their home locality by Reserve officers and National Guard officers. Such training, of course, would be under the supervision and direction of the Regular Army.

The proposed legislation makes a young man who is attending college and who may be taking ROTC work subject to the draft and 2 years of service. The only attempt to make any provision for the Reserve is that after a man has served 2 years he is given the option to join the Reserve until he is 35 years of age or stay in the Army for 3 years.

The Army has not changed its position on a civilian Reserve, and until it does so the Reserve will probably receive no better treatment than that indicated in the letter to which I have referred.

I will freely admit that I am friendly to the Reserve and friendly to the National Guard. I am likewise friendly to our Regular Army. We need all three—all three need to be strong. Our program for national security and national defense should be so coordinated and organized that the strength of all three is simultaneously built up. H. R. 6401 fails to accomplish that very essential purpose and therefore it should be rejected and a program written which will accomplish that objective.

Again we must look at this matter from the standpoint of whether or not we can finance it. We will have approved already for expenditure this year over $17,000,000,000 for our armed services. The enactment of this legislation will build our total military budget for 1949 to over $21,000,000,000. This is more than we can expend without either raising taxes or going into the red. We will accomplish nothing by a collapse of our economy.

I have urged and still urge providing adequate air power. The Congress has taken the necessary action to accomplish that purpose. We should put additional emphasis on the stock piling of strategic materials. Very little, if anything, has been accomplished in that all-important program.

A system of registering of our young men on arriving at the age of 18 years should be established.

We must build up our Reserve and National Guard and train a specialized Regular Army. All must be accomplished within our financial ability. The Reserve and National Guard can be trained at a fraction of the cost as proposed in H. R. 6401. The training can be identical, it is only a question of locale of training. If a well-balanced program for the civilian and professional components of the Army was worked out, I believe the Regular Army would get all of the men it needs through voluntary enlistments. If not, then in that event, conscription could be placed in effect, provided the world situation warranted it.

If a conscription program is to be placed into effect, then that program should include the conscription of the necessary men for the Reserve Corps, the National Guard, and the Regular Army. A balanced program will include all three. A large professional Army cannot and will not give the Nation the security it needs. That security will come only through the organization and training of the civilian components of the armed services.

This proposed legislation will not give this Nation the security we need and will not give our Nation a well-balanced defense program. To adopt it as an expediency, in my judgment, is not sound. Rather must the legislative branch of the Government insist upon the Army carrying out the policy established by the Congress in building up the civilian reserve components, instead of a large professional Army. The Army has failed to follow this clear, defined policy. I have spent some 20 years in the active service of the National Guard and the Army of the United States, over 5 years of that service was during World War II. I believe position action is indicated at this time, but that action must be to build a sound and strong national defense and we will not have such a defense without a strong and well-trained civilian reserve.

From a national defense standpoint this bill should be sent back to the Committee on Armed Services and there the program should be revised and reformed to build up simultaneously the Reserve, the National Guard, and our Regular Army.

Mr. Chairman, if this is done we will get the men we need without conscription.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROW:

On page 14, after the new section (g) add a new section (h), as follows:

"(h) (1) The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are authorized and directed to accept enlistments for periods of 1 year in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, or the United States Marine Corps, and the Air Force of the United States, respectively, from among qualified male persons between the ages of 18 and 19. *Provided*, That no person who is enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection (h) shall be permanently assigned to duty at any place outside of the continental limits of the United States; and no person who is enlisted under the provisions of such subsection in the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, or the Air Force of the United States shall be assigned to duty at any naval or air force installation which is located on land outside of the continental limits of the United States.

"(2) Each person who hereafter is enlisted under the provisions of subsection (h) (1) above and who meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces shall, upon discharge from such enlistment under conditions other than dishonorable, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States and shall serve therein for a period of 6 years or until sooner discharged. Each such person shall so long as he remains a member of such Reserve component, be liable to be ordered to active duty only in time of war or national emergency as declared by the Congress and shall not be subject to any further service under this act."

Reletter latter paragraphs correctly.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely adds to the bill, what I believe is a very good provision which is found in the bill as passed by the other body. Nothing in this bill authorizes an 18-year-old boy to enlist. Under the bill he has to wait until he is 19 years of age, and then he is drafted. I have a son. My son is not going to be drafted. I myself would rather have him go out and enlist. I think if the committee wants to get more men into the armed services, this provision will do it. It will give men 18 years of age the authority to enlist. After that person has served 1 year, he will go into the Reserve Officers' Corps for a period of 6 years, after which he is exempt from the provisions of this act.

I think the committee should accept the amendment. I hope it will.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I should like to say, solely for myself, but as a member of the committee, that I highly approve of the amendment which the gentleman has offered.

Mr. CROW. I thank the gentleman. I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. This would just about cut the pool of men in half. The total pool, 18 to 19, is 640,000, estimated. The total group, 19 through 25, would be 660,000. So, in effect, this amendment would just about cut the pool of available men for occupation forces in half.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW].

The question was taken; and, on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS of New York) there were—ayes 54, noes 43.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. SIKES and Mr. CROW to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 86, noes 67.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to be offered to section 5, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. No bounty shall be paid to induce any person to enlist in or be inducted into the armed forces of the United States: *Provided*, That the clothing or enlistment allowances authorized by law shall not be regarded

as bounties within the meaning of this section. No person liable for service in such forces shall be permitted or allowed to furnish a substitute for such service; no substitute as such shall be received, enlisted, enrolled, or inducted into the armed forces of the United States; and no person liable for service in such forces under section 4 shall be permitted to escape such service or be discharged therefrom prior to the expiration of his period of such service by the payment of money or any other valuable thing whatsoever as consideration for his release from such service or liability therefor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS: On page 21, after the period in line 21, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) Any person who registers as required by the terms of this act, or any person who hereafter voluntarily enlists in the armed forces of the United States under the terms of this act, shall be afforded an opportunity to state in writing over his signature whether he has a preference to serve only in a unit all of the enlisted personnel of which are of his own race. Such opportunity shall be afforded at the time of registration in the case of those registering under the requirements of this act, or upon enlistment in the case of those who are not in the service on the date this act takes effect. Any such person who expresses such preference shall thereafter, upon induction, be assigned only to units of a type consistent with his preference. The right to express and the effect of expressing any such preference shall be clearly explained to each person who hereafter registers under this act or who enlists in the armed forces of the United States under the terms of this act. As used in this section the term "unit" means a group of persons serving in the armed forces who (1) share the same housing, messing, or sanitary facilities, or (2) participate jointly in recreational or social activities. For the purposes of this subsection, an individual's race shall be determined in accordance with the more detailed classification as to race used by the Bureau of the Census in connection with the taking and preparation of statistics of the Sixteenth Census of the United States. Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the assignment of any individual who belongs to a race comprising less than 1 percent of the population of the United States to units containing enlisted personnel of the most numerous race in the United States, if the Secretary of the armed force concerned has determined that it is impracticable to organize units all of the enlisted personnel of which are of such individual's race.

"(b) Any commissioned officer of the armed forces who knowingly and willfully denies to any person his right to express a preference upon enlistment as provided by subsection (a) or assigns any person after induction to any unit in violation of the provisions of such subsection shall be guilty of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman and shall be subject to trial and punishment under the appropriate article of war or article for the Government of the Navy."

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment, I have no intention to weaken this bill or to delay its passage or to destroy it. As a matter of fact, I will probably support this measure on final passage. It appears that the draft is necessary in order to maintain the military strength that we must have in order to preserve our national security. But let me remind you that this is a very serious business that we are about today. Peacetime conscription is not a typical American institution and we only resort to it in times of dire emergency when our country is facing a crisis such as it faces today, and such as it faced in 1940.

Many times on the floor of this House I have heard the distinguished minority leader, I have heard the distinguished majority leader, I have heard other distinguished Members of the House, and, in fact, the President of the United States, talk about maintaining and preserving the dignity of the individual in this country. We hold that to be the democratic way and this amendment does that very thing. Remember that every man you draft into this Army under the pending bill is an individual. He is not just another soldier. He is a man with a life, a soul, and a mind of his own. It is our duty to provide as much for his comfort and as much for his convenience as we possibly can in order to preserve and to bolster the morale of the men in the armed services. This is a debt that we owe to him.

This amendment does not compel segregation in the armed services for those who do not want it, but it does for those who do want it. As a matter of fact, it applies to the Negro just as much as to the white man, and if they have pride in their own race they will insist on being assigned to units composed of members of their own race.

You are going to draft a lot of men out of the South into this Army. These boys are not going to be satisfied, they are not going to be happy, and they are not going to do their best work in an army in which they are not segregated because, thank God, they are proud of their race and believe in protecting and preserving the integrity of their race. Be not deceived—those from the North feel the same way.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Is it not true that the Negro boy from the South will be just as anxious to be in a camp where segregation is practiced as the white boy?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course he will. Under my amendment, if a man does not care about being in a segregated unit, it gives him an opportunity to be in a nonsegregated unit merely by failing to express a preference, but for the boys who do want to be in a segregated unit it provides that right. That is the American way—to give them freedom to choose their associates.

There is a sound basis for this amendment, and I would like to read to you some statements that General Eisenhower made before the Committee on Armed Services of the other body on the subject of segregation in the United States Army:

It has been the problem, of course, that has been with the Army ever since it has been with the country. We must never forget that in a very definite way the Army is merely one of the mirrors that holds up to our faces the United States of America. It has never been easy to solve because you have certain incontrovertible facts that you must walk right up to.

One of them is that there is race prejudice in this country, and when you put in the same organization and make live together under the most intimate circumstances men of different races, we sometimes have trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. General Eisenhower said further:

I personally have always stood since that time for organizing the Negro down to include units no larger than platoons. It does create certain social problems on a post, because you always have men that do not like to mingle freely between the races, and therefore if you have a dance for your soldiers, you have a problem.

And listen to this:

Now, if you are going to go further, here is the problem you run into, Senator. In general, the Negro is less well educated than his brother citizen that is white, and if you make a complete amalgamation, what you are going to have is in every company the Negro is going to be relegated to the minor jobs, and he is never going to get his promotion to such grades as technical sergeant, master sergeant, and so on, because the competition is too tough.

If, on the other hand, he is in smaller units of his own, he can go up to that rate, and I believe he is entitled to the chance to show his own wares.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had 30 minutes to talk on this amendment, because I sincerely believe there can be no conscientious opposition. It is my firm belief that the adoption of this amendment will strengthen rather than weaken the bill. It will bring about a better Army, a more satisfied Army, and will provide for higher morale among the members of our armed services.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I was interested in what the gentleman read from General Eisenhower's statement. Of course, that was all for the present system that exists in the Army of having races in their own units. So there is not in that anything that would indicate that there would be a departure from the present system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would agree that it is not as bad as it might be, but the gentleman knows, they do not segregate them in the armed forces. He knows that.

Mr. KILDAY. So the gentleman has raised a question that does not exist.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, certainly, it exists.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] insist on his point of order?

Mr. DURHAM. I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 24, noes 88.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining sections of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. POWELL objected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. (a) The selection of persons for service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe from the persons who are liable for such service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided*, That in the selection of persons for service under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the classifications of any prior registration or classifications; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations.

(b) Quotas of men to be inducted for service under this act shall be determined for each State, Territory, possession, and the District of Columbia, and for subdivisions thereof, on the basis of the actual number of men in the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, and the subdivisions thereof, who are liable for such service but who are not deferred after classification, except that credits shall be given in fixing such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who are in the armed forces of the United States on the date fixed for determining such quotas. After such quotas are fixed, credits shall be given in filling such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who subsequently become members of such forces. Until the actual numbers necessary for determining the quotas are known, the quotas may be based on estimates, and subsequent adjustments therein shall be made when such actual numbers are known. All computations under this subsection shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

Mr. COLE of New York (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 7 be considered as read.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: At the end of line 12, page 23, add the following and number the succeeding sections accordingly:

"SEC. 8. (a) The training under this act shall be administered and carried out on the highest possible moral, religious, and spiritual plane.

"(b) It shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, cantonment, or training or mobilization place, where training under this act is being given, as the Secretary of National Defense may determine to be necessary to the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of such persons who are receiving training under this act and shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins, to establish or keep houses of ill fame, brothels, bawdy houses, or places of entertainment which are public nuisances, or other like facilities detrimental to the health and morals of persons who are being trained under this act, or to receive or permit to be received for immoral purposes any person in any vehicle, place, structure, or building used for the purpose of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution within said distance determined by the Secretary of Defense or to knowingly rent, lease, or permit the use of any property for such purposes. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating any of the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both.

"(c) The sale of or dealing in, beer, wine, or any intoxicating liquors by any person in any post exchange, canteen, ship's store, or Army, Navy, or Marine transport or upon any premises used for military or naval purposes by the United States is hereby prohibited. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take appropriate action to carry out the provision of this subsection."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that the provisions thereof are not germane to the provisions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that the committee in charge of this bill approved practically all of the amendment I am submitting under what is known as the Towe bill. The remainder of this amendment was enacted by Congress in 1901.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that the Towe bill was a training bill and had no military obligation. This bill is to build up an Army.

Mr. REES. That is an interesting observation from a very distinguished member of the committee. I see no real difference. Why not be practical. Is it not a fact that these boys under this bill are to go into training? I just do not see how you can say my amendment was needed for the 18-year-old boys you proposed to put into training camps and then suggest it is not needed for the 19-to-21-year-old boys under this bill.

This measure has been talked about as a training bill, so a large group of young men could have training in the armed forces, in event they may be called later on. It is also mentioned as a sort of preparation bill, not for immediate emergency but in the event of an emergency later on. You also refer to it as an Army bill. My understanding is that you are putting these men in training for a year, or 2 years, we do not know what decision will be finally made. The House, by a definite decision, has said by its vote it should be 1 year. You may overrule the decision of the House and bring back a bill for 2 years' service. If this is a training bill, 1 year is enough. It has already been stated that even in European countries the period of service in peacetime is 1 year.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield again to the distinguished chairman of the committee who approved this language in the Towe bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I understood the gentleman from Kansas was opposed to the Towe bill.

Mr. REES. That is not the question presently under consideration. Neither is the Towe bill. Please do not sidestep the issue. If the committee was for the proposal, then he should be for it now. In fact he should recommend it in this bill. We are presently talking about one feature of this legislation. If you are going to approve this bill, I think the chairman ought to accept this amendment and permit it to remain in the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the gentleman support the bill if this provision is in it?

Mr. REES. I am not sure of that. I do not know what this bill will look like when this House is through with it. I am interested in putting safeguards in it where they are needed. There are a good many Members of this House wondering about this measure. The gentleman, in his opening presentation, seemed to indicate there may be an emergency. He wants the bill passed right away. Later he, himself, proposed an amendment that, as I understand it, says in substance the bill will not become effective until about the 1st of November of this year. I refer to the extra 90-day period of extension approved by the distinguished chairman. I am informed another amendment will be offered to postpone the effective date until January 1949.

In any event, I want this protective language in this bill. If you are going to have the bill enacted into law, it ought to have this important amendment in it. This amendment ought to have the support of the Members of the House. There should be no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is interested in hearing the observations of the gentleman from Kansas on the point of order. The gentleman from Kansas is now speaking on the merits of the amendment.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how a point of order could lie against this proposed amendment. It is within the broad scope of this legislation. Certainly, if you can pass a law to take these boys from their homes in peacetime without their consent, then you can provide for protection in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard briefly on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear from the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, in another section of the bill on page 37, it is specifically stated that there may be a determination of the location of the camps. It seems to me this is directly along the same line.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from North Carolina rise?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas a question and call his attention to a matter which I think has something to do with making his amendment germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman to engage in debate on the merits of the amendment, but the Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman discuss the point of order.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, that is what I am addressing myself to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina will state his observations.

Mr. FOLGER. In speaking of training, the bill states, *"Provided further,* That the number of persons who are serving on active duty for training purposes." If this is not a training bill, I do not know what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] rise?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas is germane to the purpose, intent, and policy of the bill. The bill proposes, not a system of volunteers but a plan of induction for taking young men from their homes and placing them in military-training camps. Certainly it is within the jurisdiction of the Congress, where it invokes conscription for the assembling of great masses of young men in military-training camps, as this bill specifically provides, to prescribe the circumstances and conditions under which they shall be trained. I think it is significant, as has been mentioned, Mr. Chairman, that this same committee, in reporting out the so-called universal training bill, carried identically almost word for word the language of this amendment, showing that there is a policy and a need for setting up the circumstances under which these young men shall be trained. This amendment states that when these men are taken from their homes and from the moral influence of their own parents and are concentrated in military-training camps, there shall be thrown around them some degree of protection comparable with that which they enjoyed in their own homes before they were taken into service.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas is germane to the purposes, the policy, and the provisions of the program to be set up.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] rise?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a brief observation.

Mr. Chairman, the bill contains a provision with reference to medical service to protect the health of these inductees. By the same token, the gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment to protect the health of these men. If the reference to medical service was germane, then the provision with reference to these surroundings is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard further?

Mr. REES. Just one thing further, Mr. Chairman:

Page 37, paragraph 9, it will be observed that authority is given to determine the location of such additional temporary installations as he may deem essential; to utilize and enlarge existing installations; to construct, install, and equip; and to complete the construction, installation, and equipment of buildings, structures, utilities, and appurtenances, including the necessary grading and removal, repair, or remodeling of existing structures and installations; giving all the authority with respect to the location of these camps. It seems to me that well within the provisions of this act can be included the provisions of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CASE of South Dakota.) The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] has made the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is not germane to the bill. Several of the Members who have spoken have called attention to other provisions in the bill. The Chair must remind the Committee that the provisions in the bill as reported by the committee were made in order by a special rule adopted by the House of Representatives. There may be provisions in the bill which would not be germane if offered as an amendment by individual Members, but are in order in the bill because they were made in order by the rule adopted by the House.

So every amendment offered must stand on its own bottom as to whether or not it is germane.

The Chair invites attention to the fact that the amendment includes such language as "It shall be unlawful to maintain certain institutions," and further on says, "Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating any of the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor" and so forth. In that respect it seems to the Chair that the amendment goes beyond the provisions of the bill, imposing penalties and sanctions on persons outside the armed forces.

Therefore, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified by striking out beginning with the words "Any person, corporation, partnership"——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests that the gentleman prepare the amendment and offer it in the regular way.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: At the end of line 12, page 23, add the following, and number succeeding sections accordingly:

"SEC. 8. The training under this act shall be administered and carried out on the highest possible moral, religious, and spiritual plane.

"(b) It shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, cantonment, or training or mobilization place, where training under this act is being given, as the Secretary of National Defense may determine to be necessary to the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of such persons who are receiving training under this act and shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins, to establish or keep houses of ill fame, brothels, bawdy houses, or places of entertainment which are public nuisances, or other like facilities detrimental to the health and morals of persons who are being trained under this act, or to receive or permit to be received for immoral purposes any person in any vehicle, place, structure, or building used for the purpose of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution within said distance determined by the Secretary of Defense or to knowingly rent, lease, or permit the use of any property for such purposes.

"(c) The sale of or dealing in, beer, wine, or any intoxicating liquors by any person in any post exchange, canteen, ship's store, or Army, Navy, or Marine transport or upon any premises used for military or naval purposes by the United States is hereby prohibited. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take appropriate action to carry out the provisions of this subsection."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, this great committee which brought this present legislation before the House saw fit at one time to approve it. It was part of the bill that was submitted by this committee.

Now, the only slim excuse that is given by one of the distinguished Members is that since the other bill was a so-called training bill for 18-year-old boys and older, that there is a difference with regard to training boys 19 years old and over. If they were right after giving consideration to that particular feature of the bill, if they were right in their judgment then they cannot reverse their judgment now and still be right, as I see it. In any event, we have this matter before this Committee for consideration.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. In just a moment. It is a matter for this Committee to determine. The legislation is here, whether or not you are willing to protect these boys who are in these training camps as provided under the terms of this amendment.

In 1917 the Congress passed an act which was a great deal more severe than

this as far as that is concerned, in an attempt to protect the boys in these training camps.

This is an extremely important amendment and you are going to find out I think that it is going to be difficult to explain why you are not willing to protect these boys in these various camps throughout the country when you have a chance to do so. This is not a question of whether you believe in drinking or not, this is a question of whether you believe in protecting the boys against a number of things included in this proposal.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Florida, who I am sure is familiar with this amendment, sympathetic to it, and I know he is for it.

Mr. SIKES. I am sure my distinguished friend wants to be fair and I would like to tell him that I am in sympathy with the purpose he has in mind.

Mr. REES. That helps a great deal. I do appreciate his support.

Mr. SIKES. I wish the gentleman would point out, however, that in the training bill where the language the gentleman has sought to incorporate in this bill is already included the training program is set up for many hundreds of thousands of boys and young men most of whom are fresh out of high school. They will be in special encampments, not in military camps. They will not be in the service and the committee sought to establish safeguards around them which it did not feel were absolutely necessary to be included in a service bill which would bring in a relatively much smaller number of people and induct them into units already in existence.

I bring that up for the information of the gentleman. I am in sympathy with what he is trying to do.

Mr. REES. The committee thought there was something to be gained playing one against the other. I do not see anything especially different in the need to protect these young men in either instance.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Can the gentleman explain to the Committee that the second paragraph of his amendment goes much further——

Mr. REES. Yes; that is right.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just a moment—goes much further than the original bill.

Mr. REES. I might explain to the Committee that that particular paragraph was passed by the Congress in 1901.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And was repealed.

Mr. REES. No, not repealed. There was a tax act passed by Congress in 1933 in which an interpretation was given but not to the extent that it was repealed. I will explain that later. It is still on the statute books. The gentleman can look and find it for himself.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it not a fact that the gentleman's amendment would prevent a soldier of the United States getting a glass of beer in Germany?

Mr. REES. Oh, I do not think so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course it would.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the report of the President's Commission on Universal Military Training entitled. "A Program for National Defense."

That report made certain recommendations with regard to the responsibility of Congress toward trainees. It seems to me that if those recommendations are good with respect to trainees, then they are just as important with regard to men who come under the provisions of this bill. I quote from those recommendations:

> We must admit at once that a serious moral problem is presented by the very removal of a boy of 18 from the normal influences of his home, church, school, and local community, and his comparative isolation in a camp with large numbers of other men under an entirely new and different environment.
>
> • • • • • •
>
> We believe the key to this problem lies in the following directions:
>
> • • • • • •
>
> (7) Limitation of the opportunities for the purchase by trainees of any alcoholic beverages, including beer, through (a) prohibiting the sale thereof to them on any military, naval, or other camp reservation, or in any post exchange, ship's store, or canteen, (b) declaring "off-limits" to trainees all taverns, taprooms, and similar facilities whose principal business is selling alcoholic beverages, (c) soliciting the assistance of local communities in this program, and (d) making it a Federal crime knowingly to sell such beverages to any person in training.

The ages of trainees, as defined in the Towe bill—H. R. 4278—are from 18 up to 20.

The Towe bill contains a paragraph on alcohol—page 7:

> (3) No person, corporation, partnership, or association, or agency shall sell, give, or in any way supply any intoxicating liquors to any trainee in training in the National Security Training Corps. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association or agency violating any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both.

In H. R. 6401 you are drafting 19- and 20-year-olds. Both of these ages would be protected by law in their own States against the sale of alcoholic beverages. If you draft boys under age, you owe them all the protection which the President's Commission recommended for trainees, whom your own bill defines as 18- and 19-year-olds.

Furthermore the draft bill as it passed the Senate—S. 2655—has in it a provision for enlisting 18-year-olds voluntarily and training them along with the Regular Army. Should this provision prevail—and we hope the House conferees will resist it—you would have trainees, exactly the class for whom the President's Commission recommended all these safeguards, to protect.

With regard to the third section of my amendment and to which the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has seriously objected, this is the text of the law now in section 1350, title 10, United States Code, passed by Congress in 1910, dealing with the Army and is as follows:

> No. 1350. Sale of intoxicating liquors: The sale of or dealing in beer, wine, or any intoxicating liquors by any person in any post exchange or canteen or Army transport or upon any premises used for military purposes by the United States, is prohibited. The Secretary of War is directed to carry the provisions of this section into full force and effect. (February 2, 1901, ch. 192, No. 38, 31 Stat. 758.)

This law was nullified by the Army's accepting the definition of Congress in a tax law passed in 1933, to the effect that 3.2 beer was nonintoxicating. The theory is that the 1933 law being of later date, superseded the 1901 act as above quoted, so the act was never repealed, but an interpretation placed by the Treasury Department nullified it. I should also add that the 1901 law applied only in areas actually being used for military purposes.

There is also the acute problem of the immediately surrounding territory. In the absence of prohibitory statutes, various kinds of taverns and unnecessary joints of that kind have sprung up in the immediate vicinities of these places.

The 1917 law gave authority to set up zones in the phrase "in or near military camps." I am informed that zones 5 miles in width were set up around the camps under this authority and the courts upheld them against cases brought by irresponsible tavern keepers.

In this connection, it might be well to remind you of the statement made by General Marshall regarding these taverns which were hastily built in the neighborhood of World War II draft camps almost before the camps themselves were in existence, and to the detriment of organizations like the YMCA and the Salvation Army and the WCTU and other organizations which were trying to set up recreation centers and "cookie jars" there: Here is what General Marshall, now Secretary of State, said:

> Here we have on the one side a sordid business for the accumulation of money, and on the other the interest of every parent in the United States who has a son in the Army, not to mention the responsibility of the War Department to develop an Army of the highest quality. This situation must be brought under control before it grows serious.

Unfortunately it was not brought under control, and the sordid business, to which General Marshall directs attention, flourished to the detriment of the men and boys in the Army camps, as well as their families. This was not the fault of the boys. It was the fault of men and women who failed in their duty to provide decent protection against an unnecessary, sordid situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. PACE. In support of the amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Was not the gentleman from Georgia recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked for what purpose the gentleman rose. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] was on his feet, but the Chair did not see him. When the Chair saw him he gave prior recognition to the chairman of the committee.

The gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, those who have attended the meetings of the House for the last few days will be compelled to confess that there are serious misgivings on the part of many Members as to the advisability of the pending legislation. I find that the same is true in every part of this country. The mothers and fathers all over this country are concerned. I do not think they object to their boys' serving their country when really needed, but they are concerned about the circumstances under which they will be trained and under which they will serve. When a boy volunteers for the armed service with his parents' consent, regardless of age, then he and the parents accept the conditions as they find them.

It is quite different under legislation of this character, where without the consent of the father or mother, a representative of the Government comes and knocks on the door and tells them: "I want your boy 12 months or 2 years; I am going to take him out from under the moral influence which you have exercised over him for the last 19 years; I am going to throw him into camp with all kinds, from all sections."

If it were my boy, and that is the only way I can look at the boys of other fathers and mothers, it seems to me I would ask: "Well, are you going to try to help carry on the training that I have given him? Are you going to try to protect as far as you can the moral principles which I taught him? Are you going to try to keep him away as much as you can from the temptations that I have tried to guard him against?"

Is that so bad? Is that wrong when we are here about to vote to go and take that son? The least we can do is to throw up such safeguards as reasonable practices will permit.

We are asking no more in the adoption of this amendment than has been done in the past. It has been proven to be practicable, and the most I can say is if you write this amendment into the bill, when it becomes law there will be at least a little consolation to those mothers and fathers whose sons must go to training, whose sons must meet new surroundings and, on the whole, the mothers and fathers of this Nation, in my opinion, will find more acceptable the action of the Congress which is now contemplated.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, when I made my motion there were four Members seeking recognition. I wish to modify that request to permit those four gentlemen to speak for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there were five Members standing.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Then I will modify my motion that they be permitted to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Then I withdraw the motion.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRYSON. Has it not been the rule, when such a motion was put, that the time would be equally divided between the Members standing?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the motion to close debate in 5 minutes, and there were five Members standing when the gentleman was recognized on the amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I appreciate the statement just made by the Chairman, but I do think that, if the Chairman will let his mind go back, he will recognize the fact that he had already said to the gentleman from Georgia that he might be recognized, so that the motion made by the gentleman from New York actually applied to the time subsequent to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that at the time he recognized the gentleman from Georgia for 5 minutes there was no objection made.

The Chair will state that those Members who desire to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point may do so at this time.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I will support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. It would do much to relieve the concern of the parents of the young men who might be drafted under the bill now before the House. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has stated the situation. I will not repeat his arguments. I add the following: Germany was a nation which made liquor freely available to the young men in her armies; we have twice defeated Germany. Italy subscribed to similar principles, and the attitude of that nation toward vice included legalization, and state-supervised bordellos; and Italy has twice within my lifetime come out rather badly in armed competition with the clean-living young men of America. France's code on the issues involved in this amendment might possibly coincide with the opinions of Members who will vote against it, and we have twice had to put American men into uniform to save France. Finally, the protections desired by this amendment were the protections given the soldiers of the United States in World War I, and while I may be slightly prejudiced on that subject, I thought the American soldiers did pretty well in World War I, in competition with soldiers from nations which would not approve of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. I say again, Mr. Chairman, that I will vote for the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that time on this amendment has been limited to 5 minutes, 1 minute for each of only 5 Members. I make this brief observation. I have tried over the years to assist many veterans in the preparation of their claims for disability compensation. Many times it has been heartbreaking to receive a report from the Veterans' Bureau that the claimants disability was due to misconduct and under the law no compensation can be paid.

It is my wish that we protect the men trained under this program if possible from ever facing such a tragic situation as I have referred to. I urge the adoption of the Rees amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, we are advised that this is to be the last week of activity prior to adjournment or recess. In view of this, I am particularly interested in knowing what is to become of the National Land Policy Act, H. R. 6054. This bill, as you know, calls for a policy of permanent conservation of all our basic agricultural land and water resources.

We have listened to much talk on the necessity for sound conservation and I am sure that we are more or less agreed that it is really needed. However, unless this talk is reduced to action our national resources will continue to face steady depletion. Without an adequate program of conservation our food production resources face the constant threat of dwindling below that standard which guarantees the physical and economic well-being of all the American people. When we stop to realize the enormity of this fact, the importance of such a program is forcefully brought to our attention.

I have been in touch with most of the groups who are interested in conservation in my own State of Rhode Island. Without exception they are strongly in favor of a National Land Policy Act. The Rhode Island Wildlife Association, which is composed of groups and individuals vitally interested in all aspects of conservation, had this to say about the bill:

> The history of the development of every nation is written in the landscape. • • • Not until this Nation adopts a policy based on the wise use of our living resources will we be able to begin to check the forces of our own destruction. Our soil is the source of our very existence; it is the basis of our whole social and economic structure. • • • We firmly believe that H. R. 6054 recognizes these truths and furnishes the necessary measures to erase the writing on our landscape. It provides the requirements for a sound policy for wise land use necessary to stabilize national economy and to insure our future welfare.

The Rhode Island Federation of Garden Clubs, the Federated Rhode Island Sportsmen's Clubs, the Association of Soil Conservation Supervisors, as well as hundreds of individuals who are aware of the urgent need for conservation are all strongly in favor of such a bill.

Why, then, in the face of all this necessity should the Republican leadership refuse to take direct action. The hearings on this bill have been completed but to date nothing is being done toward bringing the bill out. I, personally, would like to have the opportunity to vote for this bill here on the floor and I am sure that the majority of you hold the same thought. I am afraid that we are not going to have that opportunity, however, for it is my opinion that this bill is going the way the rest of the beneficial legislation has gone under the leadership of this Congress.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rees amendment to throw around these young men to be drafted in the service under this bill the best moral, physical, and spiritual protection possible. The fathers and mothers of these young men want their boys protected, as much so as possible, from the pitfalls that are thrown their way. They want their sons to come back from the camps as clean and strong as when they went away. We are living in a day when our young men are subjected to temptations and evils which many of us escaped in part and everyone knows that evil men and women prey upon these young men in camps.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the least we could do in enacting this legislation is to try to minimize the opportunity which such evil men and women might have to debauch these young men. We owe that to their parents. We owe that to the young men. We owe that to our Nation.

The evils which this amendment seeks to prevent are destructive and do not help in building the finest manhood and character. Men meeting the great issues of life in this hour of destiny need the strongest bodies, the clearest minds and resolute hearts to cope with a world situation making this legislation necessary.

Many of these young men will come from homes of the highest Christian teaching. Is it not the obligation of the Nation to clothe them with every protection possible? I regret, Mr. Chairman, that debate was shut off on such an important question. But let me appeal to you to take the proper steps to do something about this problem now. I hope the committee will give this great question the proper consideration. This amendment should have your approval.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not one of the Members of Congress who has resorted to weakening amendments in an effort to pass a selective-service act. It has been my intention all along to vote for the pending bill, H. R. 6401. I sincerely hope and earnestly urge that protection be thrown around the young men who are to be called from their homes to military duty by minimizing or eliminating the temptations so often thrust upon them to become users of intoxicating drinks. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], is certainly in the right direction. And I call upon each of you to support that feature of this extremely important and too long delayed measure so vitally needed for the preservation of our free Government.

This amendment—the Rees amendment—would reenact provisions of law which were enacted in 1917 and operative in World War I. The law of 1917 provided that the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army is authorized to make such regulations governing the prohibition of alcoholic liquors in or near military camps and to the officers and enlisted men of the Army as he may from time to time deem necessary or advisable: "*Provided*, That no person, corporation, partnership, or association shall sell, supply, or have in his or its possession any intoxicating or spirituous liquors at any military station, cantonment, camp, fort, post, officers' or enlisted men's club, which is being used at the time for military purposes under this act, but the Secretary of War may make regulations permitting the sale and use of intoxicating liquors for medicinal purposes. It shall be unlawful to sell any intoxicating liquor, including beer, ale, or wine, to any officer or member of the military forces while in uniform, except as herein provided. Any person, corporation, partnership or association violating the provisions of this section or the regulations made thereunder shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Articles of War, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both."

Under this law of 1917, the Secretary of War did fix zones of about 5 miles in width for both alcohol and vice (which was included in another section of the 1917 law). As a result of this policy adopted both by Congress and by the War Department, Secretary of War Newton D. Baker said, such a physically sound Army was produced as never before had been known in the history of the world.

When World War II was about to break upon us, even before the draft camps themselves were built or finished, taverns and honky-tonks moved into their immediate neighborhood. Gen. George C. Marshall, then Chief of Staff of the Army, was greatly concerned. He said:

> Here we have on the one side a sordid business for the accumulation of money, and on the other the interest of every parent in the United States who has a son in the Army, not to mention the responsibility of the War Department to develop an Army of the highest quality. This situation must be brought under control before it grows serious.

Great efforts were made to obtain the voluntary cooperation of local communities. Some communities took this responsibility seriously, and after a number of them had voted dry and the chairman of Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senator Morris Sheppard, of Texas, who had piloted the draft bill safely through, had introduced a bill to reenact legislation similar to that of 1917, the brewers made a specious effort to clean up some of these taverns—those in the vicinity of communities that had voted dry or were preparing to vote dry. But many communities not only failed to cooperate but actually cooperated with the taverns in exploiting the draftees. And the brewers went about from camp to camp and staged beer parties, with the consent of camp commanders.

A bill introduced in the House by the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee which set up a zone for vice similar to that provided for in the 1917 legislation passed the Senate, after having passed the House, on June 30, 1941, and was signed by the President a few days later and became law. All this time we were not at war. It was not until December 7, 1941, that the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor. But Congress continued to temporize with the Sheppard bill and the Senate finally sent it back to committee.

Meanwhile, in May 1941 the Brewers Digest joyfully announced:

> One of the finest things that could have happened to the brewing industry was the insistence by high-ranking Army officers to make beer available at Army camps. • • •
>
> The opportunity presented to the brewing industry by this measure is so obvious that it is superfluous to go into it in detail. • • •
>
> Here is a chance for brewers to cultivate a taste for beer in millions of young men who will eventually constitute the largest beer-consuming section of our population.

The brewers got their chance, and presently they were using up our scarce tin making tin cans to ship beer in badly needed space on planes over to countries where there were plenty of alcoholic beverages, but no milk and no airplane parts and tank equipment, the latter of which

were badly needed by some of our young men in uniform in the north African campaign and elsewhere. They tied up freight traffic to ship Milwaukee beer to Maryland and New York and Pennsylvania which had beer of their own, and later on the War Food Board had trouble with them when they insisted on using up grain and rice that were needed for food.

The public and Congress were told that the purpose of putting beer in the camps was to keep the young men in them so that they would not be drinking in worse places, or drinking stronger beverages. But, when they found Congress was not going to interfere with the beer, presently the Army began giving shots of whisky to fliers returning from training flights or combat missions.

Either the camp beer led to the drinking of stronger alcoholic beverages in those places it was supposed to keep our soldiers out of, or the beer itself was not so harmless as it was represented to be, because we now hear that the Veterans' Administration has a hospitalization problem connected with alcoholism in World War II veterans that is going from bad to worse. A Washington dispatch published in the Chicago Daily News on November 21, 1947, stated:

ALCOHOLICS BURDEN VETERAN HOSPITALS

WASHINGTON.—Veterans' Administration hospitals are being burdened seriously, and, in most cases, needlessly, with alcoholics.

Thousands of ex-servicemen who drink excessively because they enjoy whisky—not because of physical or mental complications—occupy beds needed for men with more legitimate ailments.

There are 17,000 veterans awaiting hospitalization, though not all of them require it immediately.

The alcoholics are legitimate patients in the sense that the large increase in their numbers has caused VA to recognize alcoholism as an "official disease."

Dr. Paul R. Hawley, VA medical director, who says the problem "is increasing by leaps and bounds," estimates that VA will treat 10,000 alcoholic cases this year.

There were 6,459 last year and 3,529 in 1945.

About two-thirds of this year's cases, Dr. Hawley estimates, will be uncomplicated—those without any demonstrable mental illness; the rest do have an accompanying mental disease.

All are classified as neuropsychopathic cases.

The average cost to VA of maintaining one such patient is $8.70 a day. Thus the expense of caring for the two-thirds group, who stay anywhere from 5 to 30 days, runs into thousands of dollars.

Only a comparative few of the alcoholic cases have a service-connected mental disability, according to Dr. Hawley.

VA hospitals are finding that the great majority of the patients entering with cases of uncomplicated alcoholism stay only long enough to sober up and then demand their release. They cannot be detained against their will, so VA can do little for them.

Using standard treatments for the more serious alcoholic cases that may be hospitalized as long as a year, VA tries hard to help them. But Dr. H. J. Tompkins, assistant chief of the neuropsychiatric division, points out that there is no known cure.

As for the two-thirds group, who refuse lengthy treatment, Dr. Hawley lays much of the blame for their numbers on local communities. He contends that the latter are not doing enough to help their alcoholics reform.

As soon as they find an alcoholic is a veteran, they ship him to a VA hospital.

Also, Dr. Hawley charges, too many judges are giving alcoholic veterans a choice between treatment in a VA hospital and a jail sentence.

So then this is the picture of the actual results of putting beer in our camps in World War II. Sick veterans, who could be helped, are being crowded out of veterans' hospitals by the great and ever-increasing number of alcoholics who came out of that policy in World War II.

By reason of the circumstances hereinabove referred to many of our church and educational officials as well as parents and other individuals, have protested against compulsory military training since they fear the safety of young men to be inducted because of the great temptations to drink.

We are spending thousands upon thousands of dollars which will soon run up into millions and millions. And our actual reserve of battle-trained men upon whom we might have to fall back in case of actual total war, is not so strong as we thought. Because we did not take any proper precautions to protect them against the saboteurs who are as bad as or worse than the Communists—the brewers, distillers, and tavern-keepers who persuaded somebody high up in authority to let them put beer in our camps.

Now we are again being asked to draft young men, many of whom will be only 19 and 20 years old. If this bill is accepted and becomes law, we will also be setting up training camps for 18-year-old volunteers right along with the Regular Army. We can take time by the forelock and avoid a repetition of those conditions which so aroused our citizens, and for which we are now paying so dearly, by providing in this bill proper protections against what General Marshall called "a sordid business for the accumulation of money."

If we do not do this, how many of these young men, on whom we are relying to form our permanent Reserve force, will be capable and ready for duty when and if the real call comes?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, there should be no question about the adoption of the first two paragraphs of the amendment. They will give assurance to the families of young men inducted into the services that Congress expects the military authorities to make a sincere effort to maintain as decent and wholesome an environment as possible around the camps. The proponents of the amendment do not expect the authorities to do more than reduce to a minimum the hazards to health and morals that are incident to military service, but the families, and the men themselves, are entitled to that degree of protection. Individual character is not maintained by external controls. Men must be fortified from within, but our official action in recognizing the evils enumerated in the amendment and equipping the Department to deal with them will inspire greater confidence in this legislation.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], I believe it is germane because we are duty-bound in the drafting of the young men of our country to provide them with that which is necessary to maintain mental and physical well-being. It certainly becomes our obligation to make sure that the camp surroundings are such that will not injure the morals of these young men. Therefore such restrictions provided for in this amendment are essential and therefore germane. It also gives solace and consolation to the parents of these young men in knowing that a guiding hand is constantly at their side as a result of this amendment. We must never forget that these boys become our charges and we must look at the whole picture as if all these boys were our own sons. When one looks at this picture from this viewpoint one cannot help to vote for this amendment, for all of us surely are interested in seeing that these boys are returned home as pure and innocent as they have left.

Insofar as the restriction on the sale of beer is concerned, I believe it is going too far. A glass of beer with meals or as a refreshing drink during off hours does no harm but serves at times a useful purpose. I therefore am in favor of deleting this paragraph from the proposed amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I inquire as to whether or not this amendment may be divided and an opportunity given to the members of the committee to vote separately with respect to the first paragraph and separately with respect to the second paragraph.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the parliamentary inquiry. The request comes too late, Mr. Chairman. The amendment has been considered as a whole, and the request to separate it should have been made earlier.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that under the rules of the House a division of a question may be asked for at any time, if the question is divisible, before the vote.

The Chair has examined the amendment and notices that it is in three paragraphs labeled subparagraph (a), subparagraph (b), and subparagraph (c), each one of them being substantive in form, and each one of them could be voted on separately, if it is so demanded.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask that a separate vote be taken on the second paragraph as contrasted with the third paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman so demands.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The first paragraph is not part of my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman demands, a separate vote can be taken on the second paragraph. The vote will come on the first paragraph first.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. Do I understand that we are now limited to 5 minutes or less on this very important amendment dealing with the welfare and the morals of the boys of this country?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, that is not a matter within the control of the Chair. The committee, by vote, has determined the amount of time to be allocated on this particular amendment.

The question is on the first part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each portion of the amendment be again read by the Clerk before it is voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) The training under this act shall be administered and carried out on the highest possible moral, religious, and spiritual plane.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the first portion of the amendment.

The first portion of the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second portion of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) It shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, cantonment, or training or mobilization place, where training under this act is being given, as the Secretary of National Defense may determine to be necessary to the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of such persons who are receiving training under this act and shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins, to establish or keep houses of ill fame, brothels, bawdy houses, or places of entertainment which are public nuisances, or other like facilities detrimental to the health and morals of persons who are being trained under this act, or to receive or permit to be received for immoral purposes any person in any vehicle, place, structure, or building used for the purpose of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution within said distance determined by the Secretary of Defense or to knowingly rent, lease, or permit the use of any property for such purposes. Any person, corporation partnership, or association violating any of the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the second portion of the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PHILLIPS of California and Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 98, noes 3.

So the second portion of the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the third portion of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

(c) The sale of, or dealing in, beer, wine, or any intoxicating liquors by any person in any post exchange, canteen, ship's store, or Army, Navy, or marine transport or upon any premises used for military or naval purposes by the United States is hereby prohibited. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take appropriate action to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would that language pertain to the camps and the soldiers already over in Europe?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has heard the amendment read. The Chair cannot interpret the amendment for the gentleman.

The question is on the third portion of the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN) there were—ayes 57, noes 55.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers, Mr. ANDREWS of New York, and Mr. REES.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 54, noes 72.

So the third portion of the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. POWELL moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the enacting clause stricken out.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, in speaking on this preferential motion, I wish to indicate in closing a few things.

First, we are not going to have a vote here today. This brings our debate under the 5-minute rule to an end. There is not going to be a vote because we will ask for the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill. Therefore, I am asking that all those who supported the amendments which I compiled shall withdraw them except the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], who is going to advocate the abolition of the poll tax for members of the armed forces; the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] has an FEPC amendment; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON] an antidiscrimination amendment.

Let us not feel that because we have passed the Shafer amendment that it will be in the final bill when it is returned from the other body. The conferees have already planned to take it out.

Finally, I would like to announce that I have the pledge of a couple of men in the other body that they will filibuster the conference report on Saturday. Senator WHERRY has just announced that if there is a filibuster the Senate will adjourn, nevertheless, even if the draft bill is not reported out. Therefore, I am happy to announce that the probability now is that there will be no draft. If such is true I will be very happy. At any rate I wish to thank all my colleagues who supported me so ably. It was a great fight. The brass hats thought they could ram this down our throats. We licked them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ISACSON: On page 22, line 18, after the period, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That there shall be no segregation or discrimination on account of race or color or religion."

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, both Democrats and Republicans have admitted on this floor today that the armed forces of the United States are practicing discrimination, segregation, and Jim Crow against the Negro people.

It has been argued that General Eisenhower supports segregation and Jim Crow. Well, I do not.

The amendment that I have offered will end, once and for all, the practice of racial discrimination, of segregation, and of Jim Crow in the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there are some in whose hearts there are festering sores of bias and bigotry and prejudice.

There are some whose souls deny the brotherhood of men, regardless of race or color or religion, and their equality before God. There are some whose minds, in some distorted manner, cling to the false and unscientific Nazi doctrine of white supremacy, of the inferiority or superiority of certain races.

My amendment cannot purify such hearts. My amendment cannot cleanse such souls. My amendment cannot improve the minds to which I have referred. A long process of education and reeducation is necessary for that purpose.

What my amendment can do is to establish by force of statute and by force of law that bias and bigotry be not translated into the practice of discrimination or segregation or of Jim Crow in the armed forces of the United States.

Very soon the two old parties will convene in convention, and when they convene in convention there will be a great to do made about a plank in their platform to end discrimination. Similar planks have existed in the past, in both the Democratic Party platform and the Republican Party platform. The place to enact a real plank against discrimination—the place to enact a real plank against segregation—the place to enact a real plank against Jim Crow is not in the halls of a convention, but right here on the floor of Congress where it will have meaning and where it will be enacted into the law of this country.

If the Democrats and Republicans do not vote for my amendment—let them not flock to Philadelphia and mouth their hypocritical protestations against

discrimination, and with tongue in cheek, support a meaningless resolution against discrimination.

Now is the time and this is the place to end discrimination and Jim Crow.

This is the time and the place to stand up and be counted.

Yes, soon, on the streets of New York and in the cities of this Nation, Democratic and Republican politicians will by vying with each other in phony pious protestations of their friendship for the Negro.

You have seen it happen before. You will see it happen again. Once more the political candidates of the Democratic and Republican Parties will try to outshout each other that their very best friend is the Negro.

They cannot promise too much for the Negro—just before election time. They seem to think that the Negro, like themselves, will forget those promises as soon as the votes are counted.

But the Negro people want performance, not promise.

They want action on my amendment which will eliminate discrimination, segregation, and Jim Crow; and assure them full civil rights.

The armed services of the United States discriminated against Negroes before the war. They discriminated all through the war. They are still discriminating.

When the Governor of one of our States—New Jersey—under the provisions of a new constitution, attempted to abolish segregation in the National Guard, the Secretary of the Army, Kenneth C. Royall, wrote to him that "for the present" the Jersey National Guard could have nonsegregation but that in the Regular Army and all other National Guard units the old Jim Crow policy would continue "in the interest of national defense."

National defense of what? Do Mr. Truman's Cabinet officers believe that democracy can be defended with a policy borrowed from Adolf Hitler's book? And does Mr. Truman himself believe that? If he does not, why does not he make his orders stick? He has the authority of Commander in Chief of all the armed forces. He could abolish Jim Crow overnight, as the New Jersey Governor did, if he really wanted to.

The answer is that the President of the United States is talking double-talk. He is bidding for Negro votes on the one hand, and on the other quietly assuring the white-supremacy boys that there is no need for alarm because nothing drastic is going to happen.

Now let us compare Mr. Truman's policy of strong talk and weak action with the Democratic platform of 1944, upon which he was elected:

> We believe that racial and religious minorities have the right to live, develop, and vote equally with all citizens and share the rights that are guaranteed by our Constitution. Congress should exert its full constitutional powers to protect those rights.

Fine words. But the Democratic Party had its tongue in its cheek when these words were written and adopted. There was an election coming up then, too.

When the Republican politicians sat down to write their platform in 1944, they went the Democrats one better. Here is what the Republicans said:

> We pledge an immediate congressional inquiry to ascertain the extent to which mistreatment, segregation, and discrimination against Negroes who are in the armed forces are impairing morale and efficiency, and the adoption of corrective legislation. We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.

That statement proves either that the Republican Party cannot remember a pledge for more than 2 years or that the pledge was phony when it was written, or both. For the fact is that the Republicans have controlled Congress since 1946, and where is the permanent FEPC? Where is the corrective legislation to end discrimination in the armed forces?

The Republicans have done no better than the Democrats, because there is no real difference between them.

Last December Grant Reynolds, chairman of the Committee Against Jim Crow in Military Training and Service, went to Washington with a distinguished delegation of Negroes to ask that Jim Crow provisions be stricken from the universal military training bill.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee told the delegation that he was in favor of "limited segregation, in keeping with Army policy."

Mr. Reynolds commented:

> If this is a sample of Republican thinking, then it is well that Negroes know it now.

Mr. Reynolds was right. You can search the Republican record from now until election day, and you will find nothing to show that the Republican Congress has tried to carry out its platform pledge. That pledge was a lie when it was written.

Let me now cite an example of Democratic double talk that affects the lives of the entire Negro population of New York City.

In June 1946 the Department of Justice took what seemed to be a very brave step. It filed a complaint against some of the biggest banks and insurance companies of the Nation, charging them with conspiring to keep New York Negroes in ghettoes—and very high-priced ghettoes, too—by refusing mortgage loans to Negroes and by putting pressure on landlords to keep Negroes or Spanish-speaking tenants out of so-called white areas.

These un-American activities were undertaken, the Department charged, through the Mortgage Conference of Greater New York. The members of the conference included such leading banks as the National City Bank, the Chase National Bank, and the Manufacturers Trust Co., and such big insurance companies as Mutual and Prudential.

It may have been only a coincidence that the complaint was filed just a few months before the congressional election of November 1946. J. Francis Hayden, head of the Antitrust Division's local office, promised that the case would come to trial by last fall.

But 20 months have now passed. The case has not come to trial. The attorney in charge said recently that it may not be possible to act before early summer, or perhaps later. This delay is very gratifying to the mortgage conference—whose attorney, incidentally, is none other than A. A. Berle, Jr., the head of the so-called Liberal Party in New York—but it is bad news for the Negroes who are jammed into the worst and most expensive housing in the city.

Even New York City can hardly be proud of its record on Negroes. In many ways we are following the pattern of the South.

How often do you hear the voice of a Negro telephone operator?

How often is your check cashed by a Negro bank teller?

Where, outside of Harlem, do you find Negro pharmacists, Negro hotel clerks, Negro secretaries, Negro insurance agents, Negro mechanics, and Negro teachers?

How many railroads employ Negro ticket agents?

Few of the white people in New York know what most of the Negroes know—that Jim Crow trains leave Pennsylvania station every day. There are Jim Crow sections on all of the reserved-seat trains to the South.

It took Billy Rose to tell New York that when Negroes go to the box offices of the legitimate theaters, there are no orchestra seats available. And anybody knows that Negroes are not wanted at the tables of the better restaurants.

Mayor O'Dwyer could do something about these conditions if he wished to. He evidently finds it more expedient to play the role of the double-talking Democrats.

A couple of years ago the Research Institute of America made a survey that "flabbergasted" a lot of big sales executives. The researchers investigated the buying habits of a cross section of Negroes in Washington, Baltimore, and Philadelphia. Then they compared the preferences of the Negroes with the preferences of white families in two other cities, Milwaukee and Omaha.

It came as quite a shock that the Negroes used more Maxwell House coffee than any other brand, more Gold Medal flour, more Aunt Jemima pancake mix, more Red Heart dog food, more Colgate's toothpaste. In Washington the favorite soap among Negroes was Ivory, in Baltimore Octagon, and in Philadelphia Fels Naptha. The most popular cigarette was Camels, the most popular liquor blended whisky—though it turned out that Negroes drank just a little more Scotch per capita than the whites did.

Evidently it had never occurred to the great geniuses of American merchandising that there is no real difference between Negroes and whites—except that the Negroes have always got a raw deal from the whites and the two old political parties.

I find no evidence today that either the Democratic or Republican Party can recognize the simple truth that the Negro deserves equal treatment.

I look above me as I speak to you and I see the drab grayness of the ceiling of this Chamber. Then I turn to my right and hanging on the wall I see the beautiful painting of the Father of our Country, George Washington. That portrait is not composed of just one color; that portrait has red, and blue, and green, and gray. It has all the pigments, and the shades, and the tints of which an artist is capable. When all those colors were put together there was achieved a masterpiece, a portrait, a painting of which we are all proud.

So with our Army and so with our civilization—it takes a combination of all colors in complete harmony to achieve perfection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in spite of the harsh words and, to my mind, the unjust accusations and insinuations made by the gentleman from New York, I will concede——

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not at the moment. I will ask the gentleman something in a minute.

I concede his sincerity, his loyalty to this country, and his lofty purpose; but I think he does not know just what will happen if we follow through on the theories he seems to be supporting.

The gentleman spoke of that portrait of Washington which hangs on the wall to my right. He called attention to the many colors shown and how all blended together into a beautiful whole, and I assume from his illustration that he believed that, if there was a mingling of the blood of the black, the brown, the yellow, and the white races, the result would be something admirable, beautiful, desirable, and an improvement upon the human beings who now populate the earth.

But one or two things he forgot. One was that the background in the portrait and which sets forth the majestic figure of the father of his country so well was not a mixture of colors, but that the various colors each retained its own characteristics, reflecting light and shadow in its own way.

Taken as a whole, with each color playing its part, the result is magnificent. It is magnificent and beautiful and satisfying to the eye because the artist had the power of selection and the ability to apply each in its proper place.

Had all of those colors been put in one pile on the artist's palette and then, with a wide sweep of the arm, thrown against the canvas, the result would have been something like what we will get if ever the practice of a mingling of the blood of the races prevails in this or any other land.

Nor was there in that commanding figure of Washington a blending of the blood of various separate and distinct races.

The gentleman referred to Washington and to the Negroes who fought side by side with him through the eight long years of bloody war. He made no mention of the fact that in Washington's day and in Washington's household the Negro was a slave.

He made no mention of the fact that for many long years the opportunity of the Negro to do other than serve was denied him, that his ambition was throttled, that he was treated many times kindly but nevertheless always as an inferior.

The gentleman said nothing of that bitter war wherein the blood of hundreds of thousands of white men was shed to make the Negro free. He said nothing of the cost the white man paid in that war to throw open the gates of opportunity to the Negro.

He said nothing of the fact—perhaps he did not know—that in my home, in my town, in my district and State, schools, churches, places of public amusement, bathing beaches, and means of transportation are open to people of all races and creeds—that there is no discrimination—yet he would deny freedom of choice to conscripted men and by law force one upon another by his amendment.

I would be the last to deny to the Negro, or to any other man, equality of opportunity. In my humble opinion, because white men were responsible for bringing Negroes to this country, the Negro should be given, on every possible occasion, in every possible way, more than equality of opportunity—and that because it was so long denied him.

In my humble judgment, however sincere the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON] may be, the thing he advocates will lead ultimately not only to the destruction of this Republic but to the destruction of our race—I mean the human race as it exists today.

The gentleman wants, does he not, not only equality of opportunity, but he is talking about the intermingling of the races?

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, but just for a question. That is what you want, is it not?

Mr. ISACSON. I asked——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, are you or are you not?

Mr. ISACSON. I asked the gentleman to yield for a question, not for him to ask me one.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I yielded to the gentleman to ask him a question. You answer that question. I will ask it again. My question is whether or not you are for the intermingling of the races.

Mr. ISACSON. The intermingling of races is a personal matter for the individuals concerned and not the proper subject for legislation. Now, will the gentleman answer a question for me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you make it short.

But before you ask that question, let me call attention to the fact that your answer to my question is proof of the unsoundness of the position you take in offering this amendment.

Your statement just made is that, in your opinion, whether the members of the races intermingle is a personal matter, the decision of which rests with the individual. I agree with that particular statement. That is, the right of the individual to choose his own associates is the foundation of the argument which I make.

But the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON] would deprive the individual of his personal choice, deny him preference. It would take all of the drafted men regardless of race or color and force them to live and fight together in one unit.

If the question were left to me I would say let the men who are drafted decide as individuals whether they prefer to fight with black, brown, yellow, or white buddies. Or, if they so elect, let us have mixed companies or regiments or divisions, where those who prefer to march shoulder to shoulder with others in a unit made up of all races or more than one race will have that privilege.

In Michigan it is the law that there shall be no discrimination in transportation. We get along fairly well, but I think the ideal situation would be, for example, on the trains, if we had one coach for the Negro, one for the white, and one where all races, colors, and creeds could, if they desired, ride together. Then each would have an opportunity to select his own companions, and certainly, under that kind of situation, no one would be forced, at least to any great extent, to travel with people who to him were objectionable. We have on all trains separate accommodations for smokers and nonsmokers.

Now for your question.

Mr. ISACSON. The gentleman, on page 8394 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I hold in my hand, made the statement:

> While perhaps the brown or the yellow or the colored race has been advanced in some way by association and intermarriage and interbreeding with the whites, the over-all result and the average on the whole has been lower and downward.

My question is: Is there not implied, is there not implicit in this statement the Nazi idea of white supremacy and the inferiority of the other races?

Will you answer that question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I will if you will sit down.

I in no way subscribe to the Nazi idea of the supremacy of any race. Each race is endowed with certain characteristics. In each, certain traits and ambitions exist and each follows its own pathway down history's corridors. The result, whether it be good or bad, is open for all to read.

It is not my purpose nor my desire to sit in judgment—to dogmatically state that one race is superior, another inferior.

The answer to the forced and indiscriminate intermingling is that wherever you have indiscriminate crossing of strains or species, whether it is of plants, flowers, fruits, animals, or human beings, the ultimate result has always been to advance perhaps to a slight degree the merit of some species, but to make less desirable the larger number.

Mr. ISACSON. Are you saying that the white race is the upper race and the colored is the lower?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

Mr. ISACSON. Answer that question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have answered.

Mr. ISACSON. Is the white the upper race and the colored the lower?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, sit down.

Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I am talking about facts.

Mr. ISACSON. Why do you not answer the question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I claim no superiority for the white race. I make no charge that any other race is inferior—as to what is good or bad, as to what is desirable or undesirable each individual and each nation must judge—no people has been more caustically criticized and ridiculed than white Americans. The Chinese, I am told, because of our impatience and energy, think we are a nation of fools. The fact is that from our standpoint and judged by our standards, the white race for some reason or other, I do not know what it is, it is not due to anything the individuals of the white race have implanted in themselves, it may be due to something that God planted there, but the fact is they have made greater advancements along the lines we think worth while than any other race—advancements in what we call civilization, in the establishment of governments which endure, in mechanical inventions, in a freedom to hold each his own religious views, to follow his own way of life.

Nowhere at any time, from the days of the Garden of Eden right down to the present moment, at least so far as we know, have any people ever had and been permitted to enjoy to as great a degree any of the things which we at least consider desirable, as do we here in America.

We have no way of knowing whether the black, the brown, the yellow, or the white race was first upon this earth. We may assume that they were created at approximately the same time; that each has had equal opportunity in his own land to do the things he wished to do. As to which was the better way, as to which reached the more desirable end, the individuals of each race must judge for themselves.

The picture the world over is open to all and, from the standpoint of the white race, it may be said, if it is not presumptuous or offensive, that the white race is better satisfied with what it has done, is doing, proposes to do, than it is with the pathway pointed out by any other race or any member of any other race.

In what I have said or propose to say, there is no claim from me that the white race is the superior race. My position and my contention is that there should be no forced intermingling of the races; that each should have equal opportunity to enjoy all the rights created, all the privileges granted, by our Constitution.

My contention is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON] violates that conception of liberty and freedom of individual choice which he just a few moments ago insisted should be left to each individual.

Mr. ISACSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I have said I did not care to yield. If the gentleman wants to observe the rules of the House he will not continue to interrupt.

Mr. ISACSON. Are you refusing to yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is my point, and anyone who will read the theory of Mendel will find that the monks established the soundness of the theory I have called to your attention by experiment; they demonstrated the correctness of that theory by the crossing of flowers, fowls, and animals. They did not try human beings. You can breed upward, yes, by selection, but where you force indiscriminate intermingling, that is bad, unwholesome, and destructive.

As I said the other day, God He made us white, He made us black, He made us brown, He made us yellow and neither you nor I can do anything about it except to give equality of opportunity to all.

No, I do not subscribe to the theories nor the practices advocated by Hitler, by the Nazis, nor by the Communists. Nor do I subscribe to the more recent theory of Morgenthau.

Apparently, because Hitler persecuted and murdered the Jews, Morgenthau called for, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, and, motivated by revenge rather than the practice of a policy which Hitler should have followed, would have us ape Hitler and exterminate the Germans.

We should be able, if we are intelligent beings, to have a choice as to whether we shall live at peace with our neighbors or whether we shall have continual war.

The people of middle Europe, many races, many creeds, are crowded together. Each clings to its own ideas, its own practices, its own religion. Each is intolerant of others, and the result has been fighting and war all down through the centuries.

The fighting and the warfare may be due to the fact that people with different views, different desires and aspirations, are forced to live together, become impatient and intolerant.

In my humble judgment, forcing our drafted men, where they are of different races, have different ways of life, to live together day and night, where each irritates the other, is not conducive to an effective military force.

Throughout our history, Americans have always been charitable, tolerant, considerate, of those individuals who were their neighbors and who were less fortunate, either from a material or an educational standpoint. It has always been an American characteristic to give a helping hand to the so-called underdog.

The soundness of that view is illustrated here in Congress every day when opportunity arises. Every Member of this House knows that most of our legislation is based, not upon strict equality of treatment, but upon helping him who needs it most. The poor man's income tax is always assessed on a lower percentage basis than that used to fix the tax of the higher income groups.

For my own part, I would give not only to the Negro but to the individuals of every race who have not made in every way as great an advancement as has the white race not only an equal opportunity, but I would give to him a better opportunity. I would give to the one less able to pull the load, whether it was in the industrial or the educational field, the longer end of the lever, and that regardless of color, creed, or race.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous censent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that a serious proposal such as the one advanced in the amendment offered by my colleague from New York [Mr. ISACSON] should receive the treatment which has been accorded it by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. The gentleman from Michigan indulged in the same treatment of a serious proposal when he dealt with a similar amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. It is perfectly all right to try to be smart-aleeky about this proposition, it may bring about a laugh, and certain gentlemen on the floor of this House may enjoy it; but I do not believe serious or decent Americans, confronted with the serious problems of today, enjoy that sort of conduct. I do not believe that such conduct and those statements are in keeping with the best democratic traditions of either this Nation or of this House.

The doctrine that has been advanced here by the gentleman from Michigan is a doctrine of insult to the various races that compose this great Nation. When he speaks of an inferior race, what is it? When he speaks of a superior race, what is it?

Contemporary history has demonstrated conclusively that only Nazis, those who imposed on this world the most barbarian rule ever conceived by man or devil, were capable of talking of superior races or inferior races or of denouncing the intermingling of races.

In the Bible it is said that God made man in his own image. That is the essence of all democracy. That is the essence of civilization as we know it and as we try in our small way to live it. That democratic principle was carried out in the Declaration of Independence when the men who conceived this Nation and this Republic and its democratic institutions said that all men are created equal. They did not say that all men are created equal except Negroes.

They did not say that all men are created equal except Jews. They did not say that all men are created equal except people of races whose skins are not white. When they said that all men are created equal, they put no exceptions in that declaration.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I decline to yield. I am trying to make a serious effort here and in all earnestness, and I am speaking from my heart.

They placed no exception in that Declaration of Independence, and it is only when men in this Nation have attempted to place exceptions in that proposition that democracy has been negated.

What is the proposition that is advanced by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON]? It is a very simple one. It is one that would apply the Christian doctrine, that Biblical doctrine, to the armed forces. It is one that would apply the fundamental doctrine of democracy of our Declaration of Independence to the armed forces of these United States. When bombs are dropped and bullets are exploded from guns, they do not differentiate between white and black. They mow them down equally. When sacrifices are made for this country, there is no choice for either black or white; the sacrifices are made by both. Yet here you say that there must be discrimination and there must be denial of equality to those men whose skin happens to be black. America revolts against that. America's revolt against that will be stamped by the events of today and tomorrow.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I think there is nothing more important today than that the minority groups in our country feel that they are an integral part of the community and the Nation. If they are made to feel that there are walls between them and the majority in the community, they may become receptive to those influences which tend to divide a nation. In time of war, the Negro has been a part of our Army and he has served magnificently. When you measure his contribution in terms of his limited opportunity for education and in terms of the discrimination and segregation that he has suffered in his home community, his service and devotion to the defense of his country is surpassed by no one.

The Negro soldier fought in World War I and World War II for a liberty that he only partially enjoys. The injustice of calling men to fight for freedom while subjecting them to humiliating discrimination within the fighting forces is at once apparent. Furthermore, by preventing entire groups from making their maximum contribution to the national defense, we weaken our defense to that extent and impose heavier burdens on the remainder of the population.

I made a study when I first came to Congress of the record of the Negro soldier in this world war. I made it because on the floor of the House I heard some speeches that deeply disturbed me. So, I went to the trouble of going to the War Department, to the Navy Department, to the merchant marine, and to the Air Force, and gathered the materials that they had. This had never been done before in this country. There was no official record of the contribution that the Negro soldier had made in time of war.

I put a research woman to work on this material for several months. Then, while Congress was on vacation and others rested, I sat down and for weeks closeted myself with this wealth of loose material gathered from all branches of the service in order to compile it. I worked to get it into orderly form so that the Nation would have a record for all time in the official document of this country of the participation of the Negro soldier in the defense of our country and in the cause of freedom for all men.

The Army so appreciated this record that they have used it many, many times since. The documentation of the Negro soldier's contribution in World War II is to be found today in the libraries of the country.

I wish I could tell you of the Negro soldiers who have been wounded and are now in hospitals who wrote asking for that record. I wish I could tell you what it has meant to them that a Member of Congress said only, "Well done." I did not dress up the record, I did not give any opinions of my own. I just culled the facts and put them where they could be kept for all time.

Through our Army we export democracy wherever that Army goes. How can we—a democratic people—tell our story to the world unless we practice true democracy in the ranks of the men who represent us?

This is not, as the committee has said, a bill to meet an immediate emergency of war. It is a bill to bring up to authorized strength the number of men we need in the armed forces to meet our commitments in the occupied territories. If we send out an Army in which there is segregation, what do we tell the other peoples of the world? What are we saying?

Aside from the injury we do to the promotion of democracy in the world, what do we do to ourselves as a Nation when we go into a community and draft men into an Army where discrimination and segregation are condoned? What do we do to these drafted men when discrimination and segregation are allowed to continue here at home? How does a drafted man who is asked to defend liberty in the world feel when he cannot get a meal in a public eating place, when he cannot go to a theater—when he hears of Negroes who are not permitted to enter colleges and universities?

How does a wounded Negro veteran feel when he may have to be hospitalized some place far from home—away from his family and friends? Hospitals, too, practice segregation and discrimination. Segregation and discrimination breed suspicion, sullen distrust, hatreds, and widespread violence.

I could go on for hours with wicked and specific cases of discrimination and segregation. What are we doing to this group of citizens in our country who represent 14,000,000 people?

Congress has never passed legislation requiring a segregated Army. The policy is purely administrative. But the President's Committee on Civil Rights specifically recommends unequivocal legislation to end the pattern. Said the committee's report:

> Legislation and regulations should expressly ban discrimination and segregation in the recruitment, assignment, and training of all personnel in all types of military duty. Mess halls, quarters, recreational facilities, and post exchanges should be nonsegregated. Commissions and promotions should be awarded on consideration of merit only. Selection of students for the Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academies and all other service schools should be governed by standards from which considerations of race, color, creed, or national origin are conspicuously absent. The National Guard, Reserve units, and any universal military training program should all be administered in accordance with these same standards.

In the last war a very small proportion of Negroes were used in combat duty. Negroes with doctor-of-philosophy degrees from our major colleges left the Army with the rank of private or sergeant after being used as truck drivers and gravediggers. A large amount of bitterness felt today is among the educated and intellectual Negroes who were drafted into the armed services and then relegated to labor battalions where none of their training was utilized.

I give you another thought: It is nonsense when the gentleman from Michigan talks about the superiority of the white people and cites as his example the fact that their governments have survived the longest of any governments in history. What about the Chinese? Does he consider that they are white people? I do not know what he considers they are. They have survived quite a long time in the world. What about the people of India? Are they white people? I do not know what the gentleman from Michigan considers the Indian people. They have survived quite a long time, too. India and China both have handed down cultures which have contributed much to the progress and enjoyment of man everywhere.

This is a very serious matter we have before us. It is not a matter to be disposed of lightly. I know there are problems. You in the Southern States have your problems. But the question of national unity goes further than the problems of the Southern States. The question of national unity is a problem of the 48 States of the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. On that, Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 18, noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 8. (a) Any person inducted into the armed forces under this act for service, who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes his period of service under section 4 (b) shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect upon the completion of such period of service, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. The Secretaries of Army, Navy, or Air Force shall furnish to the Selective Service System hereafter established a report of separation for each person separated from active duty. In addition, each such person who is inducted into the armed forces under this act for service shall be given a

physical examination upon separation and, upon his written request, shall be given a statement of physical condition by the Secretary concerned: *Provided*, That such statement shall not contain any reference to mental or other conditions which in the judgment of the Secretary concerned would prove injurious to the physical or mental health of the person to whom it pertains.

(b) In the case of any such person who, in order to perform such service, has left or leaves a position (other than a temporary position) in the employ of any employer and who (1) receives such certificate, (2) is still qualified to perform the duties of such position, and (3) makes written application for reemployment within 90 days after he is relieved from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year—

(A) if such position was in the employ of the United States Government, its Territories, or possessions or political subdivisions thereof, or the District of Columbia, such person shall be restored to such position or, if such position no longer exists, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay;

(B) if such position was in the employ of a private employer, such employer or his successor in interest shall restore such person to such position, or, if such position no longer exists, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so;

(C) if such position was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that such person should be restored to such position or, if such position no longer exists, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

(c) If any such person is not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such period of service, but is qualified to perform the duties of some other position, then, in the case of paragraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b), he shall (and in the case of paragraph (C) of subsection (b) it is hereby declared the sense of Congress that he should) be employed at such other position as may provide the nearest possible similarity in seniority, status, and pay.

(d) Any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) or of subsection (c) shall be considered as having been on furlough or leave of absence during his period of service in the armed forces, shall be entitled to all promotions, increases in pay, vacation rights not otherwise regulated by law, and accumulations of seniority to which he would have been entitled had he been working for the employer during his period of service in the armed forces, shall be so restored without loss of seniority, shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence in effect with the employer, and shall not be laid off or discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration.

(e) In case any private employer fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of subsection (b), subsection (c), or subsection (d), the district court of the United States for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business shall have power, upon the filing of a motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading by the person entitled to the benefits of such provisions, specifically to require such employer to comply with such provisions and to compensate such person for any loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action: *Provided*, That any such compensation shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such provisions. The court shall order speedy hearing in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar. Upon application to the United States district attorney or comparable official for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business, by any person claiming to be entitled to the benefits of such provisions, such United States district attorney or official, if reasonably satisfied that the person so applying is entitled to such benefits, shall appear and act as attorney for such person in the amicable adjustment of the claim or in the filing of any motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading and the prosecution thereof to specifically require such employer to comply with such provisions: *Provided*, That no fees or court costs shall be taxed against any person who may apply for such benefits: *Provided further*, That only the employer shall be deemed a necessary party to any such action.

(f) In case the United States Government or any of its Territories or possessions, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of subsection (b), subsection (c), or subsection (d) of this section and section 9 (b) (4), the United States Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed, upon finding that such failure or refusal is in violation of the said provisions, to require specific compliance with such provisions and to require compensation to any person entitled to the benefits of such provisions for any loss of salary or wages suffered by reason of failure to comply with said provisions, less any amounts received by him through other employment or from unemployment compensation, including readjustment allowances. The United States Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to issue rules and regulations giving full force and effect to the provisions of this act governing restoration, and such rules and regulations shall have the force and effect of law; and it shall be mandatory for the agency concerned to take such corrective action as the Commission recommends: *Provided*, That where any agency refuses to take the corrective action recommended by the Commission, the district court of the United States for the district in which the person entitled to such benefits was employed shall have jurisdiction, upon the filing of a motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading by such person so entitled, to require specific compliance with the recommendation of the Commission and the provisions of subsections (b), (e), and (d) of this section by, and to enter judgment against, the United States Government or any of its Territories or possessions, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, to compensate such person for any loss of salary or wages suffered by reason of failure to comply with said recommendation and provisions, less any amounts received by him through other employment or from unemployment compensation, including readjustment allowances: *Provided further*, That any such compensation directed to be paid by the Commission or the court shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such recommendation or provisions, and shall be paid by the head of the governmental agency concerned out of appropriations currently available for salaries and expenses of the agency, and such appropriations shall be deemed available for such purposes. No fees or court costs shall be taxed against any person who may apply for such benefits. The court shall order speedy hearings in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar.

(g) The Director of Selective Service shall establish adequate facilities to render aid in the replacement in their former positions of persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty in the armed forces of the United States.

(h) Any person who, subsequent to the effective date of this act and while it remains in effect, enters upon active service in the armed forces of the United States and is released under honorable conditions from such active service shall be entitled to all the reemployment benefits and other rights of this section, except that the 90-day period prescribed in section 8 (b) shall commence (1) in the case of enlisted personnel, from the date of termination of the first enlistment (excluding extensions thereof) entered into subsequent to the date of enactment of this act; (2) in the case of officer personnel, from the date of the third anniversary of reporting for active service subsequent to the date of enactment of this act; and (3) in the case of officer and enlisted personnel who are discharged or released from active service prior to the afore-mentioned dates, from the date relieved from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year.

(i) As between two or more persons entitled to be restored to the same position under the provisions of this act or of any other law relating to similar reemployment benefits, the person who left such position first shall have the prior right thereto, without prejudice to the rights of the other person or persons to be restored to a position of like seniority, status, and pay with the employer, if such position exists and is not occupied by a person having greater seniority.

SEC. 9. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an agency to be known as the Selective Service System, and a Director of Selective Service who shall be the head thereof.

(2) The Selective Service System shall include a national headquarters, at least one State headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, and the local boards, appeal boards, and other agencies provided for in subsection (b) (3) of this section.

(3) The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 per year.

(4) The functions of the Office of Selective Service Records (established by the act of March 31, 1947) and of the Director of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System and the Director of Selective Service, respectively. The personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System. The Office of Selective Service Records shall cease to exist upon the taking of effect of the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That, effective upon the termination of this act, and notwithstanding such termination in other respects, (a) the said Office of Selective Service Records is hereby reestablished on the same basis and with the same functions as obtained prior to the effective date of this act, (b) said reestablished Office shall be responsible for terminating any other outstanding affairs of the Selective Service System, and (c) the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Selective Service System shall be transferred to such reestablished Office of Selective Service Records.

(b) The President is authorized—

(1) to prescribe the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act;

(2) to appoint, upon recommendation of the respective governor or comparable executive official, a State director of the Selective Service System for each State, Territory, and possession of the United States and in the District of Columbia who shall represent the governor and be in immediate charge of the State headquarters of the Selective Service System. The President may order to active duty with their consent and assign to the Selective Service System those officers of the Selective Service section of the State headquarters and headquarters detachments of the federally recognized National Guard of the United States and members of other Reserve components, and may employ such number of civilians as may be necessary for the administration of the national and of the several State headquarters of the Selective Service System.

(3) to create and establish within the Selective Service System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and such other agencies, including agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out its functions with respect to the registration, examination, selection, assignment, delivery for induction, and maintenance of records of persons registered under this act, together with such other duties as may be assigned under this act, and shall provide for the classification of registrants under this act on the basis of availability for service. He shall create and establish one or more local boards in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto of each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia. Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President from recommendations made by the respective governors or comparable executive officials: *Provided*, That an intercounty local board consisting of at least one member from each component county or corresponding subdivision may be established for an area not exceeding five counties or political subdivisions corresponding thereto within a State or comparable jurisdiction when the Director determines, after considering the public interest involved and the recommendation of the governor or comparable executive official or officials, that the establishment of such local board area will result in a more efficient and economical operation, such intercounty local board within its area to have the same power and jurisdiction as a local board has in its area. No member of any local board shall be a member of the armed forces of the United States, but each member of any local board shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States residing in the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which such local board has jurisdiction, and each intercounty local board shall have at least one member from each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto included within the intercounty local board area. Such local boards, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, shall have the power within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized, all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, service under this act, of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local boards shall be final, except where an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. There shall be at least one appeal board for each State. Appeal boards within the Selective Service System shall be composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States and who are not members of the armed forces. The decision of such appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal unless modified or changed by the President. The President, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from service under this act, and the determination of the President shall be final. No person who is a civilian officer, member, agent, or employee of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, or of any local board or appeal board or other agency of such Office or System, shall be excepted from registration or deferred or exempted from service, as provided for in this act, by reason of his status as such civilian officer, member, agent, or employee;

(4) to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, agents, and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That the compensation of employees of local boards and appeal boards may be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided further*, That any officer on the active or retired list of the armed forces, or any Reserve component thereof with his consent, or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this act (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards established or created pursuant to section 9 (b) (3)) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer in the armed forces or Reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States;

(5) to utilize the services of any or all departments and any and all officers or agents of the United States and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and subdivisions thereof and the District of Columbia and volunteer welfare organizations in the execution of this act;

(6) to purchase such printing, binding, and blank-book work from public, commercial, or private printing establishments or binderies upon orders placed by the Public Printer or upon waivers issued in accordance with section 12 of the Printing Act approved January 12, 1895, as amended, and to obtain by purchase, loan, or gift such equipment and supplies for the Selective Service System as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, with or without advertising or formal contract;

(7) to prescribe eligibility, rules, and regulations governing the parole for service in the armed forces, or for any other special service established pursuant to this act, of any person convicted of a violation of any of the provisions of this act;

(8) to procure such space as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and Public Law 26, Eightieth Congress, approved March 31, 1947, by lease, pursuant to existing statutes. The provisions of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended by section 15 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517; 40 U. S. C. 278a), shall not apply to any lease entered into under the authority of this act;

(9) to determine the location of such additional temporary installations as he may deem essential; to utilize and enlarge existing installations; to construct, install, and equip; and to complete the construction, installation, and equipment of buildings, structures, utilities, and appurtenances, including the necessary grading and removal, repair, or remodeling of existing structures and installations; and, in order to accomplish the purpose of this act, to acquire lands, and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, for temporary use thereof, by donation or lease, and to prosecute construction thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended.

(10) to utilize, in order to provide and furnish such services as may be deemed necessary or expedient to accomplish the purposes of this act, personnel of the armed forces and of Reserve components thereof, with their consent, and such civilian personnel as may be necessary, notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of the act of May 24, 1946, entitled "Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946" (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.), with respect to the maximum limitations as to the number of civilian employees.

(c) The President is authorized to delegate any authority vested in him under this act, and to provide for the subdelegation of any such authority.

(d) In the administration of this act, voluntary services may be accepted.

(e) The Chief of Finance, United States Army, is authorized to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent of the Director in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(f) The Director is authorized to make final settlement of individual claims, for amounts not exceeding $50, for travel and other expenses of uncompensated personnel of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, incurred while in the performance of official duties, without regard to other provisions of law governing the travel of civilian employees of the Federal Government.

SEC. 10. Under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President, all funds appropriated for operation and maintenance under this act are also available for the payment of actual and reasonable expenses of emergency medical care, including hospitalization of registrants who suffer illness or injury, and the transportation, and burial, of the remains of registrants who suffer death, while acting under orders issued under the provisions of this act, but such burial expenses shall not exceed $150 in any one case.

SEC. 11. Any member of the Selective Service System or any other person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying out any of the provisions of this act, or the rules or regulations made or directions given thereunder, who shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform such duty, and any person charged with such duty, or having and exercising any authority under said act, rules, regulations, or directions who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making, of any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical or mental examination, deferment, induction, enrollment, or muster, and any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certificate regarding or bearing upon a classification or in support of any request for a particular classification, for service under the provisions of this act, or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant thereto, or who otherwise evades registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this act, or who knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this act, or of said rules, regulations, or directions, or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect or refuse to perform any duty required of him under or in the execution of this act, or rules or regulations made pursuant to this act, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere in any way by force or violence with the administration of this act or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or who conspires to commit such offense, shall, upon conviction in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment, or if subject to military or naval law may be tried by court martial, and, on conviction, shall suffer such punishment as a court martial may direct. No person shall be tried by court martial in any case arising under this act unless such person has been actually inducted for the service prescribed under

this act or unless he is subject to trial by court martial under laws in force prior to the enactment of this act. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this act, and such cases shall, upon request of the Attorney General, be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing.

SEC. 12. (a) Nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99), in section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 119 (e)), or in the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 9 of the act of August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148), entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended, shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this act or the regulations made pursuant thereto, as an uncompensated official of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant or noncombatant training because of conscientious objections.

(b) All functions performed under this act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) except as to the requirements of section 3 of such act.

SEC. 13. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 604 of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1191), nor the provisions of section 4 of the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, 80th Cong.), all of the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, including specifically article IV thereof, shall continue in effect and be applicable as to all persons in the armed forces of the United States including all persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this act, until such time as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, is repealed or otherwise terminated by subsequent act of the Congress: *Provided*, That wherever under any section or provision of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, a proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction has been authorized or provided with respect to military service performed while this act is in force by any person inducted into the armed forces under this act, such section or provision shall be deemed to continue in full force and effect so long as may be necessary to the exercise or enjoyment of such proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction.

SEC. 14. With respect to the persons inducted for service under this act there shall be paid, allowed, and extended the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other enlisted men of like grades and length of service of that component of the armed forces to which they are assigned. Section 3 of the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, 80th Cong.), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following: "Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148), as amended." The act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148), is hereby made applicable to persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this act.

SEC. 15. Nothing contained in this or any other act shall be construed as forbidding the payment of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation to persons inducted or enlisted into the armed forces of the United States for service under this act, or to members of the Reserve components of such forces now or hereafter on any type of active duty, who, prior to their induction, enlistment, or commencement of active duty, were receiving compensation from such person, firm, or corporation.

SEC. 16. Any person inducted into the armed forces for service under this act shall, during the period of such service, be permitted to vote in person or by absentee ballot in any general, special, or primary election occurring in the State of which he is a resident, whether he is within or outside such State at the time of such election, if under the laws of such State he is otherwise entitled so to vote in such election; but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require granting to any such person a leave of absence or furlough for longer than 1 day in order to permit him to vote in person in any such election.

SEC. 17. (a) The President is empowered, through the Secretary of Defense, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such product or material as may be required by the armed forces, and which is of the nature and kind usually produced or capable of being produced by such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry.

(b) Compliance with all such orders for products or material placed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be obligatory on any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof and shall take precedence over all other orders and contracts theretofore placed with such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any plant equipped for the manufacture of arms or ammunition or parts of ammunition, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the armed forces, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any manufacturing plant, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense shall be capable of being readily transformed into a plant for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or parts thereof, or other necessary supplies or equipment for the armed forces, who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the manner of the execution of orders, or who shall refuse to manufacture the kind, quantity, or quality of arms or ammunition or the parts thereof, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the armed forces, as ordered by the Secretary of Defense, or who shall refuse to furnish such arms, ammunition, or parts of ammunition, or other supplies or equipment for the armed forces, at a reasonable price as determined by the Secretary of Defense, then, and in either such case, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, is hereby authorized to take immediate possession of any such plant or plants, and through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the armed forces to manufacture therein such product or material as may be required for the armed forces, and any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, failing to comply with the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

(c) The compensation to be paid to any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for its products or material, or as rental for use of any manufacturing plant while used by the United States, shall be fair and just: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to render inapplicable existing State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, and employment standards of the employees in such plant.

SEC. 18. (a) Every person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of this act upon publication by the President of a proclamation or other public notice fixing a time for any registration under section 3.

(b) It shall be the duty of every registrant to keep his local board informed as to his current address and changes in status as required by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President.

(c) If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(d) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal, amend, or suspend the laws now in force authorizing voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, except that, whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in such forces, and their Reserve components, may be suspended by the President to such extent as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense.

SEC. 19. When used in this act—

(a) The term "between the ages of 18 and 31" shall refer to men who have attained the 18th anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the 31st anniversary of the day of their birth; and other terms designating different age groups shall be construed in a similar manner.

(b) The term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, shall be deemed to mean the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(c) The term "armed forces shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard (when during World War II it served, or when in the future it shall serve, under the Department of the Navy).

(d) The term "district court of the United States" shall be deemed to include the courts of the United States for the Territories and possessions of the United States.

(e) The term "local board" shall be deemed to include an intercounty local board in the case of any registrant who is subject to the jurisdiction of an intercounty local board.

(f) The term "Director" shall be deemed to mean the Director of the Selective Service System.

(g) The term "organized unit" or a Reserve component shall be deemed to mean a unit in which the members thereof are entitled to receive pay for attendance at not less than 24 drills or training periods throughout the year.

SEC. 20. (a) Except as provided in this act, all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby suspended to the extent of such conflict for the period in which this act shall be in force.

(b) All of the provisions of this Act, except the provisions of sections 1, 2, 4 (b), 4 (e), 8, 9 (a) (4), 14, 20 (b), and 22, shall become inoperative and cease to apply 2 years after the date of enactment of this act, except as to offenses committed prior to the termination date.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 21. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to amend any provision of the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 495).

SEC. 22. The Congress declares, in accordance with traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the civilian components of the armed forces, as an integral part of the first-line defenses of the Nation, be at all times maintained and assured. To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever the Congress shall determine that troops are needed for the national security in excess of those of the regular components of the armed forces, and those in active service under this act, the civilian components of the armed forces, or such part thereof as may be necessary, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

SEC. 23. No person shall be inducted under this act within 90 days after the date of its enactment. Otherwise this act shall be effective upon its enactment.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining sections of the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 26, lines 6 and 7, after "be" in line 6 and running into line 7 strike out "laid off or."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment on this side of the aisle.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, so far as we are concerned on this side of the aisle, we accept the amendment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, there is one phrase in H. R. 6401 that has not received the consideration by the Congress its importance deserves. Superficially it appears to be unimportant. Carefully analyzed it becomes apparent that it may be destructive of one of the most valuable rights of an employment relationship.

Section 8 (d) of H. R. 6401 provides that a person who leaves a position to enter the armed forces pursuant to the provisions of these bills and is subsequently restored to such position shall not be laid off or discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration.

Except for the phrase "laid off or," this same language was contained in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. It is pertinent to ask why this new phrase was inserted.

Under the 1940 act the Director of Selective Service urged upon employers and veterans that discharge without cause included lay-offs. This interpretation of the law came to be known as the doctrine of superseniority. It was vigorously supported by Selective Service until it was repudiated by the Supreme Court in the case of Fishgold against Sullivan Dry Dock & Repair Corp. In the course of its opinion the Court said:

Thus when Congress desired to cover the contingency of a lay-off, it used apt words to describe it. If it had desired to enact that, so long as there was work, no restored veteran, regardless of seniority, could be temporarily laid off during the year following his restoration, when the slackening of work required a reduction in forces, we are bound to believe that it would have used a word of the kind which it had itself recognized as being descriptive of that situation.

In effect, the Supreme Court said that if Congress had intended that returned veterans must not be laid off within 1 year, it would have said so.

The new legislation includes lay-offs within the statutory prohibition. The bills generally use language which has a commonly accepted meaning in employment relations and we must assume that the term "lay-off" must be accepted to have that meaning. If it does, then Congress by enacting the proposed legislation without change will have established the unjust and inequitable principle of superseniority. Why is it unjust?

Millions of veterans of World War II have now returned to private employment and have reestablished their places within the framework of established seniority systems. It is unthinkable that Congress could intend to enact legislation which would place these veterans of the shooting war in an employment status inferior to that of men to be inducted under the pending legislation. That would be the effect of the creation of "super-seniority rights." It would mean that when an employer must reduce his forces he may not lay off an employee who was restored to his position under this legislation for 1 year, even though it required him to lay off veterans of the last war who have greater seniority.

The sponsors of this legislation may argue that the added phrase "laid off or" is not intended to establish superseniority. If this is true, then there appears to be no reason for its inclusion. The only basis for such an argument would be that the new legislation does not refer to all lay-offs but only to those which are without cause. What constitutes cause? The term "discharge without cause" is one commonly used and understood in employment relations; but the term "laid off without cause" is unheard of and without any understood meaning. By the use in this one instance of language which is foreign to the terms used in employment relationships, Congress may deprive veterans of World War II of their means of livelihood even though they have already endured heavy financial sacrifice in the service of their country.

There is no reason why persons inducted under this legislation should have greater rights to their jobs than the veterans of the last war. There is no excuse for tampering with language which is just and fair and reasonable and which through numerous court decisions now clearly describes the rights of veterans. At best, the phrase "laid off or" is confusing, ambiguous and out of place. In view of the history of the 1940 act, it is more probably an attempt to put over on Congress the doctrine of superseniority.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER on page 41, line 22, after the word "act", strike out the period, insert a colon and the following:

"(a) Before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of this act shall be issued by any governmental agency exercising authority conferred hereunder, other than intra-agency administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of its activities or interagency rules governing relations with other agencies of the Government, a draft thereof shall be submitted to the President of the Senate for the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House for the House of Representatives.

"(b) The draft of such proposed regulation or order shall be immediately assigned to the Committee on Armed Services in the Senate and to the Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives for study, to consider whether such rule or regulation is made in comformity with the spirit, intent, letter, and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of powers herein granted is proposed. Such regulation or order may be approved or disapproved by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either. In the absence of action by either committee approving or disapproving such regulation or order, it may go into effect not earlier than the 15th day following, but not including, the date of the receipt of the draft of such proposed regulation or order by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. If sooner approved by either committee, it may go into effect immediately upon such approval. Disapproval of such regulation or order by either committee shall suspend its issuance; *Provided*, That in the event of conflicting committee actions, the earlier action shall govern.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, are authorized to sit and act during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of Congress."

Mr. SCRIVNER (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the amendment be considered as read, and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD. It was printed on page 8391 of the RECORD on Tuesday. It was presented to the Committee on Armed Services for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, as I have just stated, this amendment was presented to the Committee on Armed Services for consideration in connection with this and other similar legislation. It was printed in full on page 8391 of the RECORD of Tuesday so that the Members might all have an opportunity to read it and study it. The amendment may be a little long. But after some of the remarks made here today about the men who will administer this legislation, then

certainly you will want something like this in the bill. Why does this come about? You will all recall that during the war under the Selective Service Act and under the direction of the Selective Service Director, General Hershey, there was in that act an amendment called the Tydings amendment which specifically set out in very simple language what deferment should be granted to farm labor. We all remember that the Director did not pay much attention to the language in the bill or the edicts of Congress, and upon at least two occasions it was necessary to call Director Hershey before committees of the House and tell him again that we meant what we said. The second time it had no effect at all, and we found ourselves in the position of being compelled to enact a law to override and wipe out a regulation made by the Director of Selective Service, which was contrary to the spirit, letter, intent, and purposes of the act. If anybody knows what this bill means, and what our intent is, certainly the Committees on Armed Services know. If the regulations made thereunder are in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent, and purpose of the act it will take a very short time for this committee or any subcommittee thereof to make that determination. If they are not, then they should not take effect. Then this committee and the committee in the other body should then say, "Mr. Director, that regulation is not in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent, and purposes of this act, and therefore we say, 'No.'" If no action is taken by either committee within 15 days, then it is considered that the Committee on Armed Services have read it over and that it is all right.

There should be no delay. A good regulation would not be hard to sell and committee approval could be almost immediately obtained. It is only the poor ones, the ones in which sometimes they seek to usurp some power here and make unusual use of it that would be blocked. I could show you any number of cases, not only Selective Service, but OPA, and every agency of Government that has to do with the administering of laws we pass, by regulation. There will be the argument made that then Congress is taking on a judicial garb. But these regulations have the force and effect of laws—why should we not consider them? I would prefer to have Congress act as legislator and interpreter of that legislation than I would have any bureau downtown or any bureaucrat acting not only as judge but also as legislator and also as administrator. They are acting in a triple character. I will trust Congress, but not the bureaucrat. At this late hour, I will say quite frankly that I am not optimistic about the adoption of this amendment. However, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the House should have the opportunity—if it sees fit—to regulate the regulators.

In order to expedite time, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Of course, this is an attempt to bring back to Congress the administration of the law that we are passing. Under our system of government we have a division of powers, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. The Congress has all that it can possibly do in passing laws, and cannot possibly administer those laws. This is an attempt to bring into the Congress the administration of laws that we have passed.

Now, we complain bitterly at times about the executive assuming some of the powers of the legislative branch of the Government. Here we are attempting to do exactly the thing we complain about the executive department doing. I think if we attend to our own business we have all we can possibly do.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCRIVNER) there were—ayes 27, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have a number of committee amendments that are purely clarifying.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that they be reported en bloc and considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments en bloc, without objection.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 41, line 21, change the number "50" to "60."

Page 32, line 6, after the word "each" insert "headquarters in each."

Page 49, delete section 22 and insert in lieu thereof a new section 22, as follows:

"SEC. 22. The Congress declares in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both ground and air, as an integral part of the first-line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured. To this end it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the Ground Forces and the Air Forces, and those in active service under this act, the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, or such part thereof as may be necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists."

Page 49, strike out section 23 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 23. This act shall be effective upon its enactment."

Page 48, strike out lines 8 through 11, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof a new subsection (g) as follows:

"(g) The term 'organized unit' when used with respect to a Reserve component shall be deemed to mean a unit in which the members thereof satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services which, through inadvertence, I am sure, he failed to answer before. My question relates to lines 19 to 24 on page 8 and to lines 14 to 20 on page 9 of the bill.

Due to some news report apparently a good many young men who have served for 12 months or more after September 16, 1940, in the armed forces, but also after September 2, 1945, are confused as to whether under the bill they may now be drafted.

The question is: Will that service relieve them from service under subsection (b) of section 5 of this bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. September 2, 1945, refers only to the Allied forces.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, if a man served after September 16, 1940, and up to now, for 12 months or more, he is covered by the provisions of subsection (b) of section 5 of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Under the provisions of this bill he is exempt.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps you have not beheaded this monstrous and queer animal, but certainly you have dehorned it, you have torn the very heart out of it, until I suspect there are few Members in this House who know that is going to be in the bill. You have passed amendments sugar coating a bitter pill in an election year to make the medicine more palatable, but I warn you now when this bill goes to conference if we unfortunately pass it here, again I shall be very much a lone wolf as often I have been—providing I am one of the conferees and I am not sure of that yet, and it will be thrown back into your laps with all its sugar-coating and its nice trimmings.

The only way to get rid of this is to defeat it. I want you all to bear that in mind.

Who really wants this bill? The military wants it. Generals and admirals—and I do not criticize them. They have a vested interest. In peace time they are interested in pay and promotions, many stars and much braid, and to command great bodies of men. I do not think we would be any different in their position.

Do the churches of America want this, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish? No.

Does education want it, the colleges and universities? No.

Do the farm organizations of America want it? No.

Does organized labor want it? No.

Do the fathers and mothers want it? No.

Does the youth of America want it—this uncertainty in any form that you pass peacetime conscription? No, they do not want it.

And when you get back to campaign among your people—oh, yes, emergency. While you are back there wanting to be reelected the Congress has recessed for 6 months.

An emergency! You have taken my boy Joe from the farm and Bill from the factory, and we were depending on his support and help here. You take him out of the college, the university. This is a great emergency. The fact that the committee itself wanted to extend the time 75 or 90 days, it makes no difference which, is a frank confession that there is no emergency.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. If there is such a great emergency how come that the President is out on the west coast?

Mr. SHORT. Well, I was coming to that.

You, my colleagues, will be told, "You Congressmen voted an emergency, now you are back shaking our hands, but you are taking our boys."

The President is riding across the country at the taxpayers' expense in a political campaign under the cry of emergency.

Oh, emergency! Emergency! How many crimes have been committed in thy name?

Mr. Chairman, I feel sorry for the draft boards of this country that will be forced to draft 250,000 men out of more than 2,000,000 and when we get back here in the new Congress we do not know whether we will be or not. But when we come back we are going to get letters from Bill Smith and Joe Jones saying, "Why did you not take my neighbor's boy instead of taking mine?"

Members of Congress, think it over; think it over. God help you to use a little of the common sense which the good Lord and your parents gave you. Kill this bill. Bury it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EBERHARTER: Amend H. R. 6401, on page 43, line 1, by inserting after the period the following: "Section 22 (b) (relating to exclusions from gross income) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out 'January 1, 1949' wherever occurring therein, and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1951.' Section 10 (b) of the act of August 8, 1947 (Public Law 384, 80th Cong.), entitled 'An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II' is hereby amended by striking out 'January 1, 1949' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1951'."

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I make a point of order against the amendment. It has to do with the revenue laws and should be considered by the Ways and Means Committee. The amendment may be very meritorious but it is clearly out of order on this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, first I make the point of order that the point of order of the gentleman comes too late.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, no. I was on my feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that the gentleman from Minnesota was on his feet as was the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Chair was endeavoring to recognize either of the gentlemen.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for a minute or two on the point of order.

Section 14 of the bill provides for the pay and allowances of the members who will be inducted under this bill. My amendment has reference to their pay and allowances and merely seeks to maintain the same rate of pay as is now in existence for the men in the armed services whose rate of pay will be changed in January next.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Committee on Armed Services should support this amendment. I want to call attention to the fact that the only purpose of the amendment is to maintain the same salaries and allowances that the men are now receiving under the terms of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair has examined the text of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]. Clearly the amendment proposes to legislate on the Internal Revenue Code which is legislation that would be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Therefore the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

PAY OF SERVICEMEN SHOULD NOT BE SUBJECT TO INCOME TAXES

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, under existing law, these men who would be drafted—who would be called upon to sacrifice 2 years of civilian life to the military service of their country, with all this means in disruption of their education, careers, and personal plans—would, after January 1, 1949, be subject to Federal income taxes, and would have withheld by the finance officer a portion of their monthly base pay.

Imagine what a contribution to morale that will be to the men drafted in the next few months who would for a short time receive their full pay and allowances. Then, after next New Year's eve, they will be told that their Uncle Sam is making a cut in their pay by the amount of the income-tax liability. Mr. Chairman, that is a hang-over they will long remember—even those who strictly abstain from intoxicating beverages.

And the soldiers and wives who have voluntarily undertaken the military life, either temporarily or as a career, may very well feel that their Government has broken faith. The articles of partnership under which they began their service will have been broken, and it is only to be expected that they will be sorely discouraged by this breach of faith. At the present time, compensation received for active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States below the grade of commissioned officer or commissioned warrant officer is excluded from gross income for Federal income-tax purposes.

Section 14 of H. R. 6401 provides that persons inducted for service under the act—

Shall be paid, allowed, and extended the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other enlisted men of like grades and length of service of that component of the armed forces to which they are assigned.

Mr. Chairman, this section, dealing with the pay and allowances of servicemen, should, in my opinion, be amended to insure that the existing modest pay and allowances of these servicemen, as well as the servicemen who have volunteered, are not diminished by application of the Federal tax laws.

I have prepared an amendment, which I shall offer at the proper time, to amend section 14 of H. R. 6401 to continue for another 2-year period the existing exemption of the military pay of noncommissioned military personnel. And, Mr. Chairman, it seems only fair that, pending the completion of a study now under way by the Advisory Committee appointed by the Secretary of Defense on the revision of the scales of military pay and allowance of both enlisted men and officers, the existing tax treatment should be continued for officers as well as enlisted men for another 2 years. Accordingly, my amendment would continue for another 2 years the existing tax exemptions and exclusions, under which enlisted men are fully tax-exempt on their military pay, and officers have the benefit of a special exclusion of the first $1,500 of their military pay.

The following table summarizes the base pay and taxes of enlisted men, effective January 1, 1949, unless my amendment is adopted:

	Base pay		Total tax per year	Monthly withholding
	Per month	Per year		
Private	$75	$900	$37	$2.80
Private, first class	80	960	44	4.00
Corporal	90	1,080	63	5.10
Sergeant	100	1,200	82	6.90
Staff sergeant	115	1,380	108	8.10
Technical sergeant	135	1,620	141	11.70
Master sergeant	165	1,980	197	16.50

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANDIS: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"No person shall be required to register, and no person shall be inducted, under this act until such time as the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States Delegate to the United Nations organization unanimously agree that everything possible has been done by the Government of the United States to secure the abolition of compulsory military service in all the major nations."

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that this bill is unconstitutional. I want to quote from Daniel Webster in the House of Congress on December 9, 1814:

Where is it written in the Constitution, in what article or section is it contained that you may take children from their parents and parents from their children and compel them to fight the battles of any war which the folly or the wickedness of government may engage in?

Mr. Chairman, this bill is an attempt to exercise the power of forcing the freemen of this country into the ranks of

the Army. It is in no way connected with the militia, nor, included within any of the powers which Congress possesses over them. We have the power to enact laws for the organization and discipline of the militia. We can call into service any portion of the militia of the States and govern them during the continuance of such service.

The services of the men to be raised under this bill are not limited to repel invasion, suppress insurrection or execute the laws; but for the general objects of war. The administration asserts the right to fill the ranks of the Regular Army by compulsion.

I know Congress has the power to raise and support armies. Congress also has the power to borrow money. How is it to exercise this power? Is it confined to voluntary loans? Congress might resort to forced loans, if you can have peacetime compulsory military training, if you resort to forced loans in America, and if you make men work, then you have a dictatorship.

I would like to quote once more from Daniel Webster. The same situation exists today as it did in 1814.

It is time for Congress to examine and decide for itself. It has taken things on trust long enough. It has followed Executive recommendation till there remains no hope of finding safety in that path. What is there, sir, that makes it the duty of this people now to grant new confidence to the administration, and to surrender their most important rights to its discretion? Of what merits of its own does it rest this extraordinary claim?

Compulsory military service would result in greater restrictions over the lives and activities of our people, would impose heavy burdens on them, causing greater taxes and profound changes in their way of life. Compulsory military service has long been customary in many European states and elsewhere, but has been contrary to American tradition since the founding of our Republic. It has never prevented war in Europe or elsewhere, but on the contrary, cause suspicion and fears to grow between nations and inclines the rulers of men to war rather than to peace.

An agreement between the nations of the world to eliminate systems of compulsory military service would itself be greatly conducive to that restoration of peace which is so profoundly desired by all the plain peoples of the world, and would release their energies and resources for rebuilding their war-devastated countries. World-wide abolition of compulsory military service in no way precludes the maintenance of national or international military forces adequate for safeguarding national or collective security.

Therefore, before the United States adopts peacetime compulsory military service, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States Delegate to the United Nations organization, should be urged to work unceasingly for an immediate international agreement whereby compulsory military service shall be eliminated from the policies and practices of all major nations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the Landis amendment and the oft-repeated quotation from Daniel Webster, I want to say that while Daniel Webster was recognized as a great constitutional lawyer his interpretation of the constitutional powers and obligations were given more than a century ago. I believe they do not apply with the same force today as when originally given. The Constitution is a growing thing and the pronouncements of the greatest constitutional lawyer stating his views a hundred-and-thirty-odd years ago may not be a correct interpretation. I respect Daniel Webster as the great expounder of the Constitution in his day and for his time, but that is not to say that he would have the same views today, or, if he did, that such would be the correct view today.

As an instructor of our youth in civic obligations and duties, I have always believed and taught the following, as is a quotation from an elementary textbook which I prepared more than 20 years ago. It will be seen from the quotation that my view differs materially from the view of Daniel Webster as quoted by the gentleman from Indiana. The quotation is as follows:

The Constitution (the State and the Federal combined, or either alone) is very powerful, both to give and to take away, to protect and to require. It saved a young New England hobo, alone and friendless, from prison when he was wrongfully accused of stealing automobile tires. It took a student from a quiet home in Arizona and called upon him to give up his life on the battlefield of France.

Mr. Chairman, I have had little to say in this debate on renewing Selective Service—perhaps too little—but I have had plenty to think, and they are heart-piercing thoughts. I do not believe, and I cannot believe, that our national security is hazarded by any possible foe today as much as it was hazarded in 1940 when war had actually broken out and the flame of World War II had started. I know that some regard the danger greater. If I thought that the situation today is anything like comparable, or that our risk was as great now as in 1940, I should be equally willing now as then to take every possible step toward insuring national security. In my opinion there is no military force threatening us today with conquest and enslavement as there was pushing abroad in the world in 1940. Without doubt there is a foe to hazard us, but it is a foe that cannot be met in this way by the passage of this bill. We must ward off this foe in an effective way.

It seems that we lack consideration. I cannot search the heart of my colleagues, but I have sad and painful memories of 1940 and 1941. At that time, as now, I feared militarism and hated the very thought of peacetime conscription, but I voted for the Selective Service Act in 1940 and did it because I felt that the very safety of my country depended upon it. I had two sons who donned the uniform of our country, and I thought and hoped it was only for a period of one years' training, as it was then universally considered—and then what? Those votes will stand forever in our memories, burned in with white heat.

On August 12, 1941, a bill was brought into this chamber to extend the term of service and to authorize the President to send our men overseas, if need be. That vote I shall never forget. Before the vote was taken that day I went to the majority leader's desk and I asked my Democratic colleague in charge of the bill: "My God! Is this bill necessary?" Said he: "John, I have a son in uniform. If I knew that the passage of this bill today meant his death in battle, even so I must vote for it for our national safety." The vote was taken. There were 203 yeas and 202 nays. There are many who believe that the successful outcome of the recent war hinged on that vote. All I know is that it was a cruel vote. I voted "yea" on that roll call. I do believe that the very safety of my country depended upon that vote, but it has cost my family untold anguish and my own flesh and blood paid the price of that conviction.

Is the situation today comparable? If I could feel that it is, or be convinced that the danger to America from abroad is as great, my vote would be the same today as on August 12, 1941. I feel confident the danger from abroad today is exaggerated but we cannot be sure, we cannot know, and we cannot jeopardize our country. And in addition to our sworn constitutional duty—our patriotic duty—we have international commitments we must carry out and an obligation to those now abroad carrying out those obligations. It is with a heavy heart and a sense of duty that I shall vote for this bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened now for many, many weary hours to the debate on this bill. I came here hoping I would be able to have my conscience appeased and be able to support some type of legislation. As matters now stand I could not under any circumstances support the legislation pending before this House, and I am going to vote against it. I am going to vote against it because I would not dare go back home and face the people I represent and say I voted for a bill in the shape this bill is in at the present time.

I am acting under no illusions about it because the committee is letting almost every Member of the House offer his favorite amendment to this bill, to make him feel good and weight it down with a lot of sugar-coating, as the gentleman from Missouri said. You know and I know that when this bill comes back from conference, if we pass it, it will come back stripped of all these amendments, and it will be the bill the Committee on Armed Services wants. I for one do not intend to vote for a bill under those circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here 10 years now. I was here in 1938, 1939, and 1940. I remember the debates and the fights in the well of this House during those years when we were in session until 2 o'clock in the morning and 1 o'clock in the morning. I cast those votes, the same as many of you did during those years, and you are still here and so am I. When they called me an isolationist and called me a Hitlerite, as they will call you a "Communistite" or something else if you do not go along with everything that they ask for, why, I survived. The people I represented said they wanted me to vote honest convictions. My majority jumped from 17,000 to 26,000 to 40,000 in the face of that sort of behavior. I want you to know I have just come back from my people, and have attended a State convention of the people of the my State. You will face the issue if you vote for this bill. You will face those people when you go back home. When you vote for the kind of bill that is submitted here today with an amendment that the committee unanimously submitted, even though the chairman stated in the well of the House that he himself was opposed to the committee amendment, what kind of a bill do you expect to get back from the conference?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Does the gentleman think we have reached the point where we want to transplant the Prussian philosophy from Potsdam to the Pentagon?

Mr. KEEFE. I am not thinking of transplanting the Nazi philosophy. What I am thinking of is the American philosophy and the maintenance of the American philosophy.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has stated the problem before the House absolutely correctly. The committee has accepted many amendments, knowing that they will be thrown out in conference. The bill that is passed by the House will not be the bill that will come back from the conference. The whole thing is a subterfuge and I do not think we should be a party to it.

Mr. KEEFE. In the interest of trying to get something done instead of carrying on this spectacle here in the House on this bill, why not bring this bill to a vote? Everybody knows how they are going to vote on this bill. Why carry on this silly thing of presenting all these amendments and having the bill sugar-coated? Let us vote on this bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the Chairman advise the Committee how many amendments are on the Clerk's desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that eight amendments are on the Clerk's desk at this time. And 2 more have just been added, making 10.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the bill and all sections thereto and all amendments thereto close at 8 o'clock.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 8 o'clock, 10 minutes to be reserved for the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REED of New York and Mr. PLOESER) there were—ayes 112, noes 45.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if I do not have the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had been recognized but yielded to the gentleman from New York, so the time has come out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I was assured it was not coming out of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I specifically stated in the parliamentary inquiry that the time was not to be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. COOLEY. Otherwise, I would never have yielded the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman at this time under the agreement reached.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the ruling of the Chair on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, have listened with great interest to this debate. Rather substantial and persuasive arguments have been made, both by the proponents and opponents of the pending measure. While I had not intended to speak or to say on the floor of the House anything further than that which I have already said concerning the pending bill, I feel constrained to do so, since listening to the speech of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. As he spoke I was mindful of another day, March 12, 1940, when the selective service bill was before the House and when the gentleman from Missouri entertained exactly the same views as he entertains at the present time. He was just as vociferous and perhaps far more eloquent than he is today in his denunciation of the bill providing for selective service, upon which a final vote was taken on August 12, 1940. I wonder now what would have happened had his views prevailed on August 12, 1940, when selective service was continued by the bare margin of one single vote. We all know that had the gentleman's views prevailed at that time our armed forces would have been completely demoralized and our Nation would have been defenseless when the Japs struck Pearl Harbor only a few short months later. I might even say, "Isolation, isolation, oh, what crimes have been committed in thy name."

The gentleman from Missouri asks who was for this bill. He said the churches are not for it; the colleges and universities are not for it; the mothers and fathers are not for it; the farm organizations and labor organizations are not for it. Certainly none of these organizations are for war. I might ask the gentleman who and what organization in America is for war. The fact remains that we had a war and glorious and gallant victories were won. The institutions of America were saved, and brave men died on crimson seas and on the altars of freedom throughout the world.

If this were only a peacetime military conscription bill and I so regarded it, I would certainly not vote for it or give it the benefit of my support, but, gentlemen, we are not living in normal times. Our armed forces are not at home on American soil. The documents of peace have not been drafted. Only the cease-fire order has been issued. We are certainly not too far removed from at least the possibilities of conflict. Our armies are scattered throughout the world and American men are in distant lands. Certainly the young men of America do not want to abandon the vocations and avocations of private life and to be inducted into the armed services and to cross the seas and to serve and to suffer the hardships of military life in the distant outposts in different parts of the world, where the Stars and Stripes have been planted.

While I appreciate the inconvenience and the burdens of military service even at this hour, even after the victories have been won and men have by the millions been maimed and murdered, I am not unmindful of the blood that has been shed and of the lives that have been lost in the cause of freedom. We are not now about to draft men from their peaceful pursuits merely for the purpose of training them for combat. If this were merely a training bill, perhaps 6 months would be sufficient. If this were a draft bill preparatory to war, perhaps even 2 years would be long enough. In time of war men were inducted for the duration, and only God knew how long that would be. The men we are now about to bring into the services will stand guard in the graveyards of the living dead, where their brethren fell on foreign shores, and where they rest tonight beneath the Stars and Stripes in the cemeteries of the world. Yes; cease-fire orders have been issued, and the men now going into the service will not be shot and maimed and murdered unless the victories won on the battlefields of the past are imperiled. While we are thinking about the effect that this will

have on the youth of America, let us contemplate the lives of those who died in the uniforms of their country. Yes; let us realize that the world is far from peace.

I am thinking now, ladies and gentlemen, not only of those Americans who sleep in the graveyards of the world, but of those Americans who tonight are separated from their homes and loved ones and who stand watch on distant battlefields. Yes, I am thinking of those 5,000 American boys in Trieste and of the 10,000 in Berlin, and of the other thousands of boys who served their country in Vienna, of those who served mid the shambles of Tokyo and Yokohama, and of those who tonight are looking on the gray ashes of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, who want to come home to their mothers and fathers, to their loved ones, their wives and their sweethearts. Who is going to relieve them if we do not provide replacements?

Just last fall I traveled through the countries of Europe and about a year ago I went with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], a very pleasant and charming companion, into other parts of the world. Yes, and I have visited our troops in the islands of the Pacific, and I can tell you that I did not see a single American boy who did not want to come home. How can they come home if we do not furnish the necessary replacements?

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] asks who is for this bill. My answer to him is that every military man in America—in the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps, in the National Guard and the Reserve Corps. Yes; every man from the Commander in Chief down to the last private who is now on duty across the sea. Yes; every man who has faith and confidence in those to whom we actually entrusted the destinies of this Nation in the cruel hours and in the uncertain months of a great conflict in which our Nation's greatest victories were won. Can it be possible that all of these men are warmongers? Is this great Armed Services Committee of ours so dumb that they would be duped and misled? If I were not convinced that this bill were necessary and absolutely essential to the safety and security of my Nation, I would oppose it.

We were told—and I still believe—that the Selective Service was the democratic way of raising an army. The rich and the poor, the black and the white, the high and the low, from all walks of life, wore the same uniforms and they fought for the same righteous cause. We are now told that American patriotism can be bought for a price. The opponents of this bill say that if we will pay men enough they will volunteer for the armed forces. We are told that the dollar sign will attract men and that in pursuit of proper pay they will be willing to abandon their homes and firesides and flock into the services, to be shipped across the sea and to serve in foreign lands.

I am willing to provide adequate and substantial pay for every man who wears the uniform, but is it worth more to serve in the postwar period, when the shooting is over, than it was to serve when the world was on fire and human blood was running in rivulets and making crimson the seven seas? The fighting men of America never went on a strike and they never failed to fight because of the lack of pay. I am willing now to increase the pay, but I am not willing to increase it merely for the purpose of attracting men in the armed services. Can the Nation ever in war or peace afford to pay the members of our own forces according to their own talents. Those of professions bled and died with those in the lowly walks of life in times of war, and this has always been true, and I am sure that it ever shall be true. The rich and the mighty, the weak and the poor all rally to the standards of freedom when our way of life is challenged. By the method we are now about to employ the men to be drafted will come from the homes of the rich and the poor alike, and they will serve together, to the end that the victories which have been won shall not be lost, and the men who have died shall not have died in vain.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED of New York moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. REED of New York. It is perfectly obvious to me and to every man in the House that I offer this amendment to obtain time. It will be the first time that I have taken the floor on this bill so I have no apology to make. I will probably take no more time than this 5 minutes.

I know something about the American boy. I have worked with them and I have trained them over a great period of years. I know something of their ideals when they come under proper influences at home and go to the right kind of colleges and schools.

I think the most important thing about this whole conscription bill is this: First, that it is not necessary; and, next, it is taking the boys at a very formative age and destroying certain ideals that have been inculcated in them under proper home influences and school influences. You cannot tell me that if a boy is taken for 2 years or even for 1 year and put under Army control, as this bill proposes, that his whole outlook on life and his whole attitude toward this Republic will not be changed.

I knew a boy before this last war who came from a fine American home, trained in the best American tradition, he was drafted, taken from school, and was killed in the service. He excelled in his classes and in athletics, was a fine oarsman. When he was killed some of his buddies got together and went up to Canada, where the tragedy took place, to see if they could find something he had left that they might bring back to his parents in their distress. What did they find? They found this little document up there entitled "My Guide," and they took it back to the old folks in Pennsylvania. Let me read it to you:

MY GUIDE

To respect my country, my profession, and myself. To be honest and fair with my fellowmen, as I expect them to be honest and square with me. To be a loyal citizen of the United States of America. To speak of it with praise and act always as a trustworthy custodian of its good name. To be a man whose name carries weight with it wherever it goes. To remember that success lies within myself, in my own brain, my own ambition, my own courage and determination. To expect difficulties and to force my way through them; to turn hard experience into capital for future struggles.

To steer clear of dissipation and guard my health of body and peace of mind as a most precious stock in trade.

Finally, to take a good trip on the joys of life, to play the game like a man; to fight against nothing so hard as my own weakness, and to grow in strength a gentleman, a Christian.

There is America! Preserve that part of America. Do not take them into the Army during the formative age of their lives.

This bill should be killed here and now.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. In answer to our good friends, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] who pointed out that I led the fight against the extension of the draft that carried by only one vote, we were told then that this was a peace measure, this would insure peace. I told you that it was another step leading us inevitably into war.

Well, the fact of the matter is, they got the draft law that was going to keep us out of war and insure peace. They repealed the arms embargo, they repealed the Neutrality Act, they armed merchant vessels, and all of the rest of it. They carried every measure they wanted; and we were not kept out of war, and today the whole world finds itself in wreck and ruin.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining time be divided among those who have amendments on the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

The question comes up, Shall you implement the foreign policy of the United States by real action and by having a force that will be respected wherever our boys may be? Or shall you immediately at the close of this debate abdicate everything and side with people who have been

called isolationists and probably yet proudly wear the badge? Or shall you take the challenge as the United States did early in 1941, when this House of Representatives, by a vote of one person, decided to continue the draft?

I was one of those fellows who registered in the draft for World War II and later volunteered, but I had no such resentment the way these people talk here. And, believe you me, while in the Navy I was glad to serve and proud to be with those fellows. I did not think that we were rising then to our opportunities and our responsibilities when we had many people in the country saying: "Just sit down and fold your hands; Hitler will take care of himself; so will Tojo; so will the Emperor."

It did not work out, and Pearl Harbor happened. I am not one of those who wants to push militarism, but I do want to defend the United States of America, and I want our forces to be protected wherever they are.

You are not playing fair with the boys at Trieste, as the gentleman from North Carolina said, unless you give them adequate backing. You are not playing fair with the people who are clear out in Yokohama and Tokyo, Berlin and Vienna, unless there are replacements for them. You are not playing fair with the boys wherever they may be away from this country unless you give them more than a token force and a token backing by those of us in civilian life.

I hope the preferential motion will be voted down.

May I finish by saying that wherever our Army is, I want to see them well taken care of. I want to see our foreign policy well implemented.

In closing, may I ask the Armed Services Committee why our occupation policy in Japan is so fixed that the Coca-Cola Co. gets twice the number of yen when it changes its dollars into occupation currency as the missions of our churches and our educational associations? Why are they given the first priority by the State Department and the occupation forces when our people who are the missionaries and educators have to pay $1 for 50 yen? What is it that the Coca-Cola Co. has? What is this inside track? What is the inside track that the other commercial firms have over the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish charities so these worthy church activities have to pay the highest rate of exchange there is?

If we are going to have a draft policy, we better straighten out some of the Army occupation policies. I would like to see the Armed Services Committee and State Department look into this portion of the Japanese occupation, and let the American people know the full facts. This discrimination against our churches and charities should be changed at once.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the preferential motion.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: Page 44, line 2, after the period, insert "*Provided*, That no person inducted into or enlisted in the armed forces for training and service under this act during the period of such service as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator, or Member of the House of Representatives shall be required to pay any poll tax, or other tax, or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair has examined the amendment. It seems to deal entirely with persons who are inducted or enlisted in the armed forces under this act. The Chair holds that the amendment is germane and overrules the point of order.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this was a part of the Selective Service Act that was passed during the Second World War. The other body incorporated it in the bill that it acted upon favorably only last week. I am sure you all understand it. It provides that any person who is inducted under this law is not subject to a payment of a poll tax or any other tax during his period of service.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 106, noes 35.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments I have on the desk be read successively and that we consider them together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLOESER: Page 44, line 11, after the period, insert "under any such program of national procurement, the President shall recognize the valid claims of American small business to participate in such contracts, in such manufactures, and in such distribution of materials, and small business shall be granted a fair share of the orders placed exclusively for the use of the armed forces or for other Federal agencies now or hereafter designated in this section. For the purpose of this section a business enterprise shall be determined to be 'small business' if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of its employees does not exceed 500, and (3) it is independently owned and operated."

Page 46, after line 10, insert the following:

"(d) (1) The President is empowered through the Secretary of Defense to require all producers of steel in the United States to make available to individuals, firms, associations, companies, corporations, or organized manufacturing industries having orders for steel products, or steel materials required by the armed forces, such percentages of the steel production of such producers, in equal proportion deemed necessary for the expeditious execution of orders for such products or materials. Compliance with such requirement shall be obligatory on all such producers of steel and such requirement shall take precedence over all orders and contracts theretofore placed with such producers. If any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refuses to comply with such requirement, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to take immediate possession of the plant or plants of such producer, and, through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the armed forces, to insure compliance with such requirement. Any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refusing to comply with such requirement shall be deemed guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

"(2) The President shall report to the Congress on the final day of each 6 months' period following the date of enactment of this act the percentage figure, or if such information is not available, the approximate percentage figure, of the total steel production in the United States required to be made available during such period for the execution of orders for steel products and steel materials required by the armed forces, if such percentage figure is in excess of 10 percent."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, these amendments fit in with the committee amendments which are part of the bill, and part of the draft legislation in World War I and World War II. So far as I am concerned, we will accept the amendments.

Mr. VINSON. There is no objection on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS: On page 44, line 11, after the period add a new subsection to read as follows:

"SEC. . (a) Every contract entered into by the United Sttaes for the supplying of goods or services to be used by, for, or in connection with any person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces of the United States under the provisions of this act shall specify, as a condition thereof, that the company or individual with whom the contract is made shall not discriminate in the employment of any person, or in the terms and conditions of employment of any person, because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion, and shall specify that a breach of such condition shall result in the termination of such contract. It shall be the duty of every contracting officer making a contract on behalf of the United States for the supplying of such goods or services to terminate immediately any such contract when he is satisfied that the condition prescribed by this section has been breached.

"(b) No member of the armed forces or person in the employ of the United States shall procure any goods or services to be used by, for, or in connection with any person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces of the United States under the provisions of this act from any company or individual which discriminates in the employment of any person, or in the terms and conditions of employment of any person, because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment goes far beyond the realm of this legislation. It reminds me of the Englishman shingling his house. He said there was such a fog that the first thing he knew he had shingled 15 or 20 feet out on the fog. This amendment goes so far from the purposes of this legislation that I cannot understand why anybody would offer it who knows anything about the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is germane. Section 17 (a) deals with procurement and purchase of materials. The amendment simply specifies what kind of contracts must be entered into in the procurement of materials.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the amendment and is inclined to believe that under the broad purposes of the bill the amendment is in order. It seeks to effectuate portions of the declaration of policy and relates to persons and duties within the scope of the bill. The Chair accordingly overrules the point of order.

Under the order of the Committee heretofore entered, the last 10 minutes were to be reserved to the members of the committee. Therefore, the Chair is unable to recognize the gentlewoman for debate in support of her amendment.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California.

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I offer would require fair-employment practices of any company or individual selling goods or services to the Government under any selective-service program.

Mr. Chairman, when we draft men to serve in the Army—even though the draft is not necessitated because of a war emergency—we propose to put this Nation on a war basis.

President Roosevelt issued an Executive order before our entrance into World War II reaffirming a policy of full participation in the defense program by all persons, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, and directing certain action in furtherance of said policy.

Executive Order 8802 read in part:

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to encourage full participation in the national defense program by all citizens of the United States, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, in the firm belief that the democratic way of life within the Nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its borders; and

Whereas there is evidence that available and needed workers have been barred from employment in industries engaged in defense production solely because of consideration of race, creed, color, or national origin, to the detriment of workers' morale and of national unity;

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, and as a prerequisite to the successful conduct of our national defense production effort, I do hereby reaffirm the policy of the United States that there shall be no discrimination in the employment of workers in defense industries or Government because of race, creed, color, or national origin, and I do hereby declare that it is the duty of employers and of labor organizations, in furtherance of said policy and of this order, to provide for the full and equitable participation of all workers in defense industries, without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin;

And it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. All departments and agencies of the Government of the United States concerned with vocational and training programs for defense production shall take special measures appropriate to assure that such programs are administered without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin;

2. All contracting agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all defense contracts hereafter negotiated by them a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any worker because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The need for unity and justice is as great today as it was when President Roosevelt issued his Executive order.

The Republican platform included an unequivocal endorsement of permanent FEPC legislation. I regret that the leadership of this Congress has not seen fit to allow FEPC legislation to come out of committee so that the House and Senate might vote on it.

FEPC has met the fate of all other needed social legislation—housing, price control, health, old-age pensions, education, and anti-poll-tax and antilynch legislation.

The Republican leadership now has the opportunity to at least support and pass this amendment which will guarantee fair employment practices in those plants which will supply materials for the men who will be drafted under this bill.

That is the very least that can be done for the Negro soldier.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. DOUGLAS) there were—ayes 28, noes 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MITCHELL: On page 48, line 10, after the word "act", insert these words "or at such earlier time as may be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress for that purpose."

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order heretofore entered, the committee reporting the bill was entitled to 10 minutes. The chairman of the committee has advised the Chair that he would be content with 5 minutes. It is now 5 minutes before 8 o'clock, so the chairman of the committee is entitled to the remaining time to close debate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], a member of the committee, for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. According to the clock I am looking at, there are only 3 minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I understood according to the agreement that the committee had 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advised the gentleman from New York that he had 10 minutes remaining before the 10 minutes had begun to run. The Chair understood the chairman to say that he would be content with 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I understand that I still have 5 minutes remaining myself. I then yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] and 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], who has a very important announcement to make about the court-martial bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that he has consumed part of the time of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the motion was carried to close debate at 8 o'clock, is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. There are only 2½ minutes left until 8 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina will proceed.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. There will be an opportunity to vote on amendments when the time has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to try to lecture the House, as the gentleman from Missouri has done. We in the House who were here in 1939 and 1940 remember the many lectures we received. What we are facing here is something realistic. It is realistic because most of you Members have voted for a budget for 1949 of $17,500,000,000.

Initial 1949 budget request	$10,600,000,000
Supplemental 1949 request	3,200,000,000
Amount shown in United States Budget for UMT	800,000,000
Initial 1949 budget request and supplement for stock piling	700,000,000
Additional amount for new aircraft approved by Congress	800,000,000
Additional amount required to implement H. R. 6401	1,700,000,000

Which makes a total of $17,500,000,000.

You gentlemen here in the Congress have voted for this. You have voted for the material. You have voted for those supplies. You have voted for everything except the personnel to carry out this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

In accordance with the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] for the balance of the time, 2 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. There are not 2 minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is keeping time by the clock at the back of the Chamber.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, in general debate I indicated that at the conclusion of the reading of the pending bill, I would offer the military justice bill as an amendment. Since it is not essential that it be offered in order that it become a part of the bill we are now considering, I will, in the interest of saving time at this late hour, not offer the military justice bill as an amendment. It is not necessary for the reason the other body has adopted the military justice bill as it was written by the House as an amendment to the Senate bill. If I were to offer the bill, which is 47 pages long, as an amendment at this time, and unanimous consent were not obtained to dispense with reading it, the reading clerk might have to read the entire bill. Furthermore it would then be open for amendment as each section would be read.

We can save all of this time because when the House conferees meet in conference with the Senate conferees, if this bill is passed, the House conferees can simply agree to the Senate amendment. The same result will be accomplished as if we attached the military justice bill to the pending bill at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] has expired.

All time has expired under the order heretofore entered.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point in the order in which they are handed in.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know at this point what has happened to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, the question has been asked, "What emergency makes this action necessary?"

Mr. Chairman, it is common knowledge that the emergency which compels this action is that we have a President who has so mismanaged our foreign affairs since the close of World War II that he has not only come close to losing all for which World War II was fought but has also brought us close to the brink of another war. For a strong President diplomacy is sufficient but a weak President needs a big Army. That is the emergency and I do not believe we are going to improve permanently our prestige among foreign nations until we permanently improve our President. That is the necessity for this legislation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would provide that by concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress the bill if enacted into law could be terminated without consent of the President at any time.

A BANKRUPT FOREIGN POLICY REQUIRES MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, since 1919, as a member of the American Legion I have urged adequate national defense for this country. I contend today that world conditions require a strong defense system. The question before the House turns upon the method we ought to use in order to secure the manpower to equip such a system. I am unalterably opposed to drafting men for military service in time of peace. So far in this debate there has been no showing of need for a 2,000,000-man peacetime Army. Nor has there been a showing that it is impossible for the armed services to recruit a sufficient number by voluntary enlistment. In fact the record shows that mental and physical standards have been raised to such a high degree that four out of five boys are being rejected. Further, there is no evidence in the record to show that we need 2,000,000 men in the services except a statement in the majority report that it is necessary "in order to provide the Nation with minimum adequate security" and then the committee fails to prove its contention.

I am quite certain, Mr. Chairman, that we can build an adequate defense for this country, first, by adopting and promoting a sensible recruiting program and, second, by placing the responsibility for a strong Reserve system upon the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves, with proper pay schedules for each group. It is in the American tradition that in time of emergency this country relies upon civilians—a civilian Army—to defend our homes and institutions. Let us not depart therefrom.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is much more important than the drafting of our young men for military service, important as that is. As I see it, the President and the State Department are here confessing that our foreign policy is a bankrupt institution. We are here considering a call for soldiers who will be trained to fight an enemy somewhere in the world. A call such as that comes when diplomats fail—when our State Department seeks to bolster its position by a show of force. Passage of this bill means that troops will move at the command of the President.

Our foreign policy, Mr. Chairman, started in a tail spin at Teheran; it was accelerated at Yalta, and it crashed at Potsdam. Today we are reaping the evils of a bankrupt foreign policy which the unfortunate Mr. Marshall inherited from his predecessors. He is doing his best but it is not enough in view of the international debacle.

We were told, Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the European recovery program that it was imperative that we vote the requested billions as that was the only alternative to many more billions for increased armament. The ultimatum was: Take ERP or a large standing Army, Navy, and Air Corps. But here we are today, Mr. Chairman, after having voted for the European recovery program, asking for that huge defense force, notwithstanding. Does that make sense? Who lied? Who fooled the American people—or did they? Not only is the President asking all these things but he will soon enter into military alliances with the 16 European countries. This is now our foreign policy—a world WPA, military alliances, and military conscription.

We are engaged in a power program to augment our futile foreign policy and if continued it will lead us to the same identical place where other countries have gone which embraced the principle of force and that is: straight to destruction. If we adopt this legislation we must follow through and approve economic controls, manpower controls, and the regimentation that goes with dictatorial power. There will be no escape from that kind of situation. We need only look to the history of empires to discover that they lead down blind alleys and the enslavement of their people. Is that what we fought two world wars for? Is this the liberty and freedom we hear so much about from official Government papers?

Mr. Chairman, we must turn from the wild embrace of force and build a strong constructive foreign policy by strict adherence to principles that have made this country the greatest, most productive on earth. We must seek peace by reliance upon law—international law—and not upon the whim, the will or capriciousness of individuals. Leagues of nations, world government, or united nations do not hold out hope for a peaceful world as we now realize.

The way to a just and lasting peace must come through individuals who will at all times under all circumstances say "and my neighbor."

The Bible has this to say, Mr. Chairman, about my theme:

Not by might, nor by power, but by My spirit, saith the Lord God of Hosts.

Might is only temporary, but the spirit remains forever.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that we cannot obtain the increased armed strength we need without a draft law.

To me the most amazing thing about this long debate is that no one is seriously challenging our need for increased manpower in our armed forces. Section 2 of the bill states the increased numbers needed for adequate armed strength. They are: Army, 837,000; Navy and Marine Corps, 666,882; Air Force, 502,000; total, 2,005,882. Amid the avalanche of amendments in the past few days it is

significant that not one was offered to reduce these increased numbers. Where did these numbers come from? Why, from the despised and derided brass and braid, our generals and admirals, who recently had something to do with winning two wars at once. Why did no one challenge these figures by amendment? Because none of us except expert military men know exactly how to figure our manpower needs to fit our security problem. Why did we all accept without formal challenge these estimates that are over four times our prewar peacetime strength? Because we all know that, whatever this is now, this is not peacetime. Members have misquoted Secretary Marshall as having said there is no danger of war. Of course, he did not say this. I venture to say no Member of Congress thinks this. No Member in his right mind would vote to sustain the largest Navy on earth, to build a 70-group air force, if he thought there was no danger of war. During this debate many Members have tried to measure this danger in words, the danger from Soviet aggression. The acts of this House speak louder than the words of any Member our collective measure of the degree of danger: we have voted for a great Navy, a 70-group air force, a modern Army, and have accepted without amendment an increase to over 2,000,000 men for these forces. This is not a peacetime force. This is not peacetime conscription we are considering.

This force will require about 800,000 new men next year, to replace expiring enlistments and provide the necessary increases. The Army say they cannot obtain them by recruiting alone. If I thought, as some of my colleagues do, that the Army was deliberately sabotaging its own recruiting program, deliberately jeopardizing our national defense to put over the draft or UMT, I would immediately demand the court martial of the responsible officers on charges of treason; I would certainly vote against any appropriations at all to be handled by such traitors. I do not believe these charges. I know the weaknesses of our military men; they make mistakes, they are often inefficient and wasteful, but whenever I have tested them they have been trying hard to get physically sound recruits with at least a fifth-grade mentality. I have checked on generals, captains, and recruiting sergeants, and they cannot get enough recruits now. In 1940 and 1941 and during the war I thought volunteering had nothing to do with the draft. In the last 2 years I have realized that I was wrong and that the possibility of being drafted stimulates volunteering. I do not blame our boys and young men. They have grown up during a period when their country used selective service in time of need, and they naturally think that if there is need for them their Government will put selective service in force. It is quite possible that, with the draft law on the books sufficient volunteers will be obtained, but they will not be obtained otherwise. It is interesting to note that those who approve volunteering and oppose the draft here and all over the country are not taking the lead in any recruiting drives.

The same patriotic spirit is necessary to make either conscription or volunteering work, for conscription, to be successful, must be largely voluntary, and recruiting, to be successful, must have an element of popular compulsion behind it. Our young men will respond willingly as soon as we set up a fair selective service system; we must first discharge our responsibility by voting whether we believe they are needed or not.

We must do more than prepare to wage war. We must continue to wage peace. There is pending in the House a bill to strengthen the United Nations. In paragraph 5 of section 1 of that bill we say the policy of the United States must provide for pressing for agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter, and for agreements to achieve universal control of weapons of mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces, under adequate safeguards to protect complaining nations against violation and evasion.

We should enact that bill. First, however, we must prepare to lead through strength. We must enact this draft law.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I said I would vote for this bill if the Shafer amendment were adopted.

The Shafer amendment provided that no person should be registered or inducted under this act until January 31, 1949, and then only after the President, with the concurrence of the Congress, should find that sufficient voluntary enlistments had not been provided by an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign.

The amendment went on to say that this intensified campaign was to begin at once:

(a) The base pay of enlisted men was to be increased 10 percent for all grades.

(b) The passing mark on the Army Classification Test was to be reduced 10 points.

(c) Two-year new enlistments were to be accepted for all age groups suitable for military service, with enlistment privileges at least similar to those now provided for longer term enlistments.

(d) One-year and two-year reenlistments were to be accepted, with proportionate payment of any reenlistment incentives, and other privileges similar to those now provided for longer term reenlistments.

Regular monthly reports and consultation on the methods and results of the intensified campaigning were to be furnished by the armed forces to a special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee established for that purpose.

The Shafer amendment was passed, but it has been changed in two major respects: The base pay of enlisted men has not been increased; and Congress has passed the buck to the President to make the final decision as to the need for a peacetime compulsory draft.

I cannot vote for the bill in its present form.

Many men are dropping out of the Army today because they cannot support their families on Army pay and because they cannot find homes for their families near Army barracks.

High prices and housing are contributing factors to the shortage of manpower in the Army. We are indeed asked to pay a high price for the failure of this Congress to pass adequate housing legislation and for its failure to check inflation.

Moreover, if a draft is to be passed—and I am willing to vote for it when the need has been irrefutably proved—Congress should review the volunteer program of the Army itself. Congress should itself determine whether or not a peacetime draft is necessary. In a matter of such great importance I do not believe we can refuse to shoulder this responsibility which is rightfully ours. Indeed, to seek to do so is to play the cheapest of political tricks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, under the request of the gentleman from New York, would it be possible for me to insert my remarks in the RECORD at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the imposition of a peacetime draft on the people of the United States. I am disappointed that the Congress did not adopt my amendment to the measure now under consideration which would have drafted excess profits at the same time we drafted boys for the armed services. Why do we think it right to draft our manhood and wrong to draft the profits which will follow as a result of this military program? Surely, if an emergency exists which calls for the drafting of our youth, no one should expect to make excess profits out of such a crisis. Everybody in this Chamber knows that my amendment represented the wishes of the great majority of our citizens. The way to stop wars is to take the profits out of war.

It has been said that we do not have time to enact a tax measure such as I have proposed. My answer is that we have plenty of time because we have the remainder of this year to enact such legislation. We do not need to adjourn on June 19, and we should not, because we have this and too much other unfinished business before us.

We have just finished a war. What did our victory—I use the word advisedly—cost us? On one side we have a total cost of $336,000,000,000 in cash, plus the dead, the wounded, and the missing; on the other, the huge profits made by our large corporations, which exceeded $56,000,000,000 in cash plus the power to dominate the lives, the welfare, and the security of our people.

What will this selective-service program mean to us? It will mean more power and money for the armed forces than they ever dreamed of having in peacetime in this Republic.

The cost of selective service and UMT to our spirits, our psychology, and our ideals will be staggering. Arnold Toynbee, the great historian, has shown that whenever the most powerful nation in any civilization has turned militaristic, it has after a brief burst of glory collapsed. That has happened 16 times to

the 16 major civilizations of the earth during the past 6,000 years. The danger we face in turning from personal independence and initiative to mass conscription is plain for all to see.

What will be the cost of this program? As I understand this measure, $2,149,000,000 would be expended for the training equipment and the initial machinery setting the program in operation, and $3,900,000,000 for reequipping the 25 divisions of the Army. These items are in addition to the $11,000,000,000 budget appropriation, the $3,400,000,000 supplementary appropriation, and the $822,000,000 Air Corps appropriation. Thus, the military budget for 1949 is seen to be more than $21,000,000,000. And yet we refuse to draft excess profits!

To indicate just how much money this is let us take just three billion of the twenty-one billion dollars and see what our Government could do with it in useful purposes for the people of the United States.

With $3,000,000,000 the United States Government could do the following things each year:

First. Construct one 10-room, modern school building in every county in the United States, a $50,000 library in every county and a $150,000 hospital in every county.

Second. Employ 10 doctors and 10 nurses full-time for schools and public-health services in every county.

Third. Purchase 10 modern school busses in every county, maintain 1 psychiatric clinic in every county and provide 10 full-time recreational workers in every county.

Fourth. Bring all schools of the counties up to a reasonable standard of efficiency, provide free education for 3,000,000 children under 18 not now in school, pay all expenses of a 3-year post-graduate course for 10,000 students each year and erect a $750,000 trade and technical school in each congressional district.

Fifth. Pay 1 year's expenses of 900,000 boys at college or technical schools.

Sixth. After all these expenditures have been made the Government would have $15,300,000 left over the first year. In subsequent years, as the counties caught up with their needs in buildings, buses, and so forth, not more than $2,000,000,000 a year would be required.

It is my belief that the passage of the selective service bill of 1948 would be one of the most tragic errors which could be committed by the Congress. Let us look at the implications of this bill from the perspective of an enlightened American citizen. We believe that this radical departure in American history—the imposition of peacetime military conscription and the expanded military program of which it is a part—will be interpreted by all nations of the world to mean that this country expects war. And so the fateful game of threat and counterthreat, bluff and counterbluff continues. The bill provides another lap in the spiraling armaments race which will bring the world crashing down on our heads.

This program is based on the hopeless assumption that the world is irrevocably divided into two power blocs, and that consequently we must abandon all semblances of peaceful relations with the other half of the planet. Less than 3 years after the completion of the most devastating of all wars, this program gives support to the charge that the United States has rejected the notion of world cooperation in favor of the long outmoded fallacy that military preparedness, advisable as it may be, can guarantee peace. The United States must not turn its back on cooperation and the United Nations as a means of insuring peace.

The proposal to establish selective service and eventually UMT in this country is another useless but highly dangerous attempt at insurance. It is useless because it would train millions of young men in the techniques of fighting the last war. It is dangerous, not only because it is provocative, but because it would train the young men of this Nation to think in terms of war rather than in terms of peace and to accustom themselves to authoritarian command rather than to the independent spirit of free citizenship.

I am not suggesting that we should be so foolish as to disarm ourselves unilaterally. We did that once, with disastrous results. We must remain strong in scientific research, in polar aviation, and wherever strength would count in an atomic war, until we can bring about universal disarmament. But I am suggesting that we make it much clearer than we have to date that we desire to disarm, and that we look to the United Nations to take over the job of policing the world—as I have constantly urged through the creation of an international police force—at the earliest possible moment. I am suggesting that we stop thinking in strategic terms which are now meaningless. And, above all, I would like to suggest that we, as responsible public officials, think more about how to prevent the next war and less about what we should do if war comes. The greatest danger of an atomic war is the widespread acceptance of its inevitability.

It is my belief that we would be remiss in our duty to the common people of this country if we did not point out the grave effects of the system of conscription on our political institutions. We must emphasize again that this is a permanent system. Let no one be deceived into the belief that this proposal for peacetime conscription is intended to be a temporary measure merely because the bill contains an expiration date. On the contrary, the record of the hearings before the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress is replete with forthright statements from authorized spokesmen of the National Military Establishment that this program is designed to remain in effect indefinitely until universal military training is adopted as the permanent law of the land. We must then anticipate the growing importance of the military bureaucracy in political affairs.

We do not shirk our obligation to expose what we consider to be the effect of this new pressure group on the processes of American democracy. Any increase requested in the appropriations for the Military Establishment, any extension of the term of service, any proposal to increase the scope and numbers of the vast military hierarchy, will have the support of a Nation-wide organization. It would be a long step away from democracy to create a Nation-wide bureaucracy, financed from public funds, and under the domination of the Military Establishment, which through its influence in elections could decide the limits of its own activities. There is, I believe, no more sinister indication for the complete submergence of American political and economic democracy than the permanent system of military training provided by this bill.

In my judgment, the United States should not begin a permanent peacetime conscription policy. No spokesman of the national defense establishment has suggested to the committee that we are today facing a crisis comparable to the 1940 situation when the draft was instituted for the only time in our peacetime history.

The considerable degree of hysteria prevalent today is in large measure due to the propaganda efforts of the armed services themselves. As pointed out by the Harness committee report, Secretary Royall admitted that the Army was spending large amounts of the taxpayers' money to obtain a permanent system of conscription. The proponents of conscription imply that the United States is helpless and unprepared. On the contrary, the inescapable facts are quite different. We have the greatest Navy in the peacetime history of the world; we have a splendid Air Force; we have the leading position in the field of ultramodern weapons of destruction, the atomic bomb, bacteriological warfare, and other developments almost too terrible to contemplate. And, finally, our industrial position is incomparably superior to any possible combination of other nations.

We have taken all steps necessary to provide the United States with an adequate defense against any enemy. The most modern weapons, the greatest Air Force and Navy in the world, the possession of the newest and most effective atomic bombs, and a modernized ground and service force backed by the productive resources and manpower of the United States are a formidable defense.

The men needed to complete our Ground Forces can be secured, just as those of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force are being kept at peak requirements, through voluntary enlistments. Backed by a Reserve force and a National Guard brought to full strength, the Army will be of such size and quality as to meet all our defense requirements. Ample evidence is available to prove that no compulsory peacetime draft is needed to build up the Army to required strength.

I do not believe that we are warranted in taking such a fatal course through the passage of H. R. 6401. America is populated by many peoples, most of whom came to the New World to escape the tyranny of the Old—to escape this very Prussianism which it is now proposed to fasten upon these United States for all time. Millions of Americans have fought

and died to avoid just such slavery as it is now proposed that we legislate into existence. The compulsory peacetime draft will wreck the institutions upon which America is founded.

I am opposed to the measure before us and shall vote against it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment on the Clerk's desk, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a similar request.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: Page 48, line 24, insert the following new section and renumber the succeeding sections accordingly:

"SEC. 21. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Commitee on Military Policy (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of 18 members, as follows: (1) Three members who are members of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, two from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (2) two members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (3) two members from the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman; (4) two members from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (5) three members who are members of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, two from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (6) two members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (7) two members from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (8) two members from the Education and Labor Committee of the House, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee.

"A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(b) It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the military policy of the United States with respect to (1) its capability to enable the United States to discharge its international responsibilities; (2) the dominance of civilian control in the military policy; (3) the training and orientation in citizenship of the personnel of the armed forces; and (4) the participation of personnel of the armed forces in the foreign and domestic affairs of the United States, and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration of the military policy of the United States.

"Upon request the committee shall aid the several standing committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over the military policy of the United States and shall make reports to the Senate and House of Representatives from time to time concerning the results of its studies together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable. The Director, at the request of the committee, shall consult with the committee from time to time with respect to the actions of the committee.

"(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

"(d) The committee is authorized to appoint and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians and organizations thereof, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman."

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The Clerk has read sufficient to demonstrate clearly that the amendment is not germane and there is no use taking up time to read any more of that stuff into the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. I believe the Clerk should read through this paragraph. It is not in order to interrupt in the middle of the reading of the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I do not need any advice from that source.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

(The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane and not in order on this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment appoints a watchdog committee to do the one thing that the American people want to see done, and that is to see that the civilian and not the military are dominant in the military policy of the United States. It is germane to the bill also because it seeks to provide for the coordination of the military and the foreign policy of the United States, and for the training of selectees not alone in military matters, but in citizenship and the purposes for which they are being called upon to serve.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman's amendment, in my opinion, is very unheard of. It is the first time I ever heard of a congressional commission being set up with the appointments to which the Speaker of the House did not have anything to do.

Mr. JAVITS. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the committee proposed in my amendment is set up exactly as the Joint Committee for the European Recovery Program was set up according to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair has examined the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York. The subject matter of the gentleman's amendment proposing the creation of a special congressional committee comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules which, of course, makes the amendment not germane and not in order.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAND: On page 47, line 19, subsection (c), strike out all of lines 19 to 23, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The term 'armed forces' shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard, but the provisions of this act relating to induction shall not apply to service in the Coast Guard while the Coast Guard is operating under the Treasury Department."

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I am including the following statement in the RECORD as a matter of legislative information, and as a basis for subsequent action by the Congress. I want to emphasize that the statement was not made to the House prior to the consideration of the amendment to which it refers, nor was any statement made, because at the time the amendment was offered, the House had forbidden all debate on all pending amendments so that the amendment was voted upon without a word of explanation in support of it. Under the circumstances, it is remarkable that it received as many votes as it did.

The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations concerned with the Coast Guard, and a Member who is thoroughly familiar with the problems of the Coast Guard, and other Members were prepared to support this amendment had the opportunity been afforded.

Following the defeat of the amendment, I submitted a memorandum to the conferees in a last effort to save the United States Coast Guard from the great injury done to it by the bill passed by the House. In the event that the conferees do not correct this blunder, my statement is herewith included in the

RECORD for the basis of further legislative action correcting this unfortunate situation. The explanatory statement follows:

Section 19C of the House bill reads as follows:

"The term 'armed forces' shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard (when during World War II it served, or when in the future it shall serve, under the Department of the Navy)."

The effect of this language is to deny that the Coast Guard is an "armed force" in time of peace.

In fact, the Coast Guard has been an armed force since the eighteenth century, and in law it is specifically defined as an armed force.

Fourteen United States Code 1 provides that:

"The Coast Guard shall be a military service and constitute a branch of the land and naval forces of the United States at all times."

The adoption of the language presently in the House bill will be accepted as an expression by Congress that the Coast Guard is not part of the military forces of the United States. This will have the following results:

1. It will throw into endless confusion all legislation which deals with the Coast Guard as an armed force (and I know of no legislation which does not so regard it).

2. It will have a serious effect on the morale of the present personnel.

3. It will seriously affect voluntary enlistments in the Coast Guard.

Fearing these consequences, the Secretary of the Treasury, on May 3, proposed an amendment as follows:

"The term 'armed forces' shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard, but the provisions of this act relating to induction shall not apply to service in the Coast Guard while the Coast Guard is operating under the Treasury Department."

On the same date, May 3, 1948, the Secretary of Defense replied to the Secretary of the Treasury in full as follows:

"I have your letter concerning the definition of the term 'armed forces' in the selective-service bill.

"It seems to me that the reasons you have advanced for including the Coast Guard, along with the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force, are persuasive. In view of the fact that the House committee voted this morning to report out its bill on this subject, H. R. 6401, I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of your letter, together with a copy of this reply, to Senator GURNEY for his consideration in connection with the final preparation in the Senate of the Senate bill.

"Particularly in the light of the language of 14 U. S. C. 1, I do not see that there can be any real question concerning the propriety of including the Coast Guard in the manner in which you have suggested."

The bill was not changed, and it came to the floor with the incorrect language used. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, I conceived it to be my duty to offer the amendment in behalf of this service. I presented the amendment in advance to both the majority and minority managers and their staff, together with a memorandum explaining its purpose, in the not unreasonable hope that the committee would accept the amendment, but they did not.

I remained on the floor continuously during the consideration of the Selective Service Act awaiting the opportunity to present the amendment, which did not occur until the final moments of consideration of the bill since the amendment was germane to page 46. The Committee of the Whole finally limited debate on all remaining amendments to 20 minutes, with the result that eight amendments, including this one, were left on the Clerk's desk without any opportunity for explanation, debate, or discussion. I, nevertheless, offered the amendment, which was read without explanation, and inevitably defeated, since few understood its purpose.

In my opinion, the language remaining in the House bill and not amended, as suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury and agreed to by the Secretary of Defense, will do a great and unwarranted and undeserved injury to one of our five armed forces.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], the able and hard-working chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, has offered his amendment. It is most important that it be adopted and that the Coast Guard be considered a component part of our military forces at all times, in peace as well as in war. I need not tell the House of the fine record made by the Coast Guard in World War II. In accordance with the law, the Coast Guard was then a part of the Navy, as it is in every war. With the return of peace, the Coast Guard reverted to its status in the Treasury Department, for the enforcement of laws and the protection of life and property. But despite the fact that it is under the Treasury, it has a military function and is part of the military services, for title 14, chapter 1, section 1, United States Code, provides:

The Coast Guard shall be a military service and constitute a branch of the land and naval forces of the United States at all times.

In keeping with its motto, Semper Paratus, the Coast Guard is always prepared for military action, and to maintain a status of military readiness. It is vital to our national security that this be recognized, which this amendment will do.

Appearing before the Treasury Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee a few weeks ago, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder said:

In the event of a national emergency the Coast Guard would again operate as part of the Navy. I have already spoken of the duties performed by the Coast Guard in World War II—duties which were assigned to that service because of its experience and special skills. Should war come again I have no doubt that the Coast Guard would be called upon to carry out the same difficult and necessary tasks. The services that the Coast Guard provides to this country in peacetime would overnight become vital war duties. In addition, national defense plans call for the Coast Guard assuming in time of national emergency additional roles, particularly with respect to our port and harbor facilities. All of these considerations make it imperative that Coast Guard vessels and establishments be manned by the requisite numbers of officers and men, and that the plant and equipment of the service be maintained in good working condition.

Congress just this week appropriated the necessary funds to permit the Coast Guard to carry out its duties; funds which will permit the service to maintain a full state of military readiness. But funds for such purpose are worthless without the men: men to perform the normal duties of the Coast Guard and carry out the assignments Coast Guard has received, under the mandates of Congress, from the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, such as the maintenance of ocean weather stations, which this House approved yesterday, the operation of loran stations and high-frequency direction finders, and the establishment of other aids to navigation as well as protection against sabotage. Our highest military authorities have decided that of all military branches, Coast Guard alone is equipped and prepared to perform these important and necessary defense and security functions. Congress has granted the funds and authority, but without this amendment it may not be possible to get the men to do the job. The Coast Guard feels that the bill as presently written will have an adverse effect on recruitment. Capt. A. C. Richmond, the very able and competent Chief of the Planning and Control Staff of Coast Guard, and possessor of an outstanding war record, made this statement before the appropriations subcommittee last month, in answer to a question:

The selective service bill, as now being considered by the House, might have a very bad effect on the recruitment program for the reason that the committee, in reporting it out, and I believe feeling that they were doing the Coast Guard a favor, changed the original definition of armed forces therein to include the Coast Guard, but in such a way that it appears that the Coast Guard is not a military service in peacetime. The net result might be, if that is enacted in that form, men will be reluctant to enlist in the Coast Guard because they might be afraid of being charged with the epithet of "draft dodgers."

Captain Richmond said further:

It seems to me that an expression of opinion by the Congress, even though it is only a definition for a specific act, that in peacetime we are not a part of the armed services might have an undesirable effect.

Nothing would be more unjust than to call a man enlisting in the Coast Guard a "draft dodger." It would be not only unjust but untrue. To define the Coast Guard as anything but a military service at all times would be contrary to existing law. To deprive the Coast Guard of the requisite number of men to carry out the national defense functions assigned to it by Congress and other branches of the service would be to endanger the national security. This amendment would eliminate a possible injustice, would be in keeping with existing law, and would make possible the recruitment of manpower for the promotion of our national defense and security.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is so important that I must ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAND) there were—ayes 48, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk introduced at the request of a member of one of our hard-worked draft boards.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 35, line 11, after the semicolon add the following: "Each member of civilian local boards and civilian appeal boards may be paid for services rendered under this act a compensation of $1 per hour for each full hour over 16 hours in each calendar month that he is actually present at the office of the board and wholly engaged in the duties prescribed by this act for members of civilian local boards and civilian appeal boards, in no case to exceed $6 per day and $100 for any single calendar month; the determination of the amount and time of payments shall be made by the State director, whose decision shall be final, upon submission of sworn statements by the members claiming such compensation in such form and at such times as the State director shall direct."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I give my support to this bill. It is a proper and necessary step for the prevention of war, and a wise and a prudent safeguard for our country if it is ever attacked by a foreign aggressor. Failure to enact it before adjournment would be a national and international calamity. I have always believed in the wisdom and propriety of Polonius' advice to his son, Laertes:

Beware of entrance to a quarrel; but being in, bear't that the opposed may beware of thee.

UNIVERSAL HOPE FOR UNIVERSAL PEACE

The fondest hope of the human race is that there may come an endless era of universal peace, the fulfillment of the scriptural prophecy that men will "beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks." For centuries, idealists have dreamed, poets have sung and saints have prayed that there would dawn a day—

When the war drum throbs no longer
And the battle flags are furled
In the parliament of man,
The federation of the world.

That prayer is in the hearts of millions of men and women whose homelands have been seared by the flames and riven by the plowshare of war; mothers and fathers in every American State, whose sons have left the crimson dew of their lifedrops on the battle-stained soil of other lands. It is a sublime ideal, a beautiful dream, and there might be hope for its realization if human nature were susceptible to change. The stark truth is that human nature has changed little, if any, as the human race has staggered through centuries of recorded and unrecorded time.

We saw the ideals of peace, of which Woodrow Wilson was the inspired voice, blasted by partisan prejudice and personal hatred. We witness now a dire threat by the narrow, selfish, ambitious Soviet power to the efficacy of the United Nations as an instrumentality of peace. The forces of reaction and isolation at home attempt to administer a lethal potion to the reciprocal trade program, which is the basis of our best hope for international good will. No, human nature does not change, and until the hearts and minds of men composing nations can be purged of such attributes of character as intolerance, prejudice, hatred, selfishness, cupidity, greed for power and lust for conquest, in one fateful hour the most solemn covenant may become a mere scrap of paper and the most fraternal treaty dissolve into a rope of sand.

"A RESPECTABLY DEFENSIVE POSTURE"

The only language which totalitarian peoples understand and ambitious dictators respect is the language which, when translated literally, means the irresistible power of invincible armed force. Long before the time of either Frederick the Great or George Washington, a philosophical German named Clausewitz wrote a book in which he correctly described war as a special form of politics, a violent means of political expression. Independently, and separated as widely as the poles in ideologies, both the father of Prussian militarism and the Virginia farmer who became the father of this Republic comprehended and interpreted war in accordance with Clausewitz' definition. Frederick founded the ambitious, aggressive, grasping, ruthless, truculent militarism that drenched Europe with blood and tears under the iron hands of Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm, and the slimy, grisly, unspeakable Hitler. George Washington's concept of the Clausewitz philosophy found expression in what he called a "respectably defensive posture," a citizen soldiery organized and trained in the art and science of war, a citizen militia drilled and trained in time of peace as the surest preventive of war and the most dependable bulwark in the event of attack.

WASHINGTON'S WISE COUNSEL

Washington's own countrymen have for the most part ignored his sage counsel. The next war was in 1812. American land forces were ignominiously defeated. Detroit was surrendered in disgrace without the sound of a gun. The city of Washington was captured and the National Capitol was burned. President Madison's escape to the Virginia woods—was obliged, literally, to "take to the tall timber"—and the queenly Dolly Madison saved the White House silver. Practically the only bright record on land in that war was made by citizen soldiers from States that had heeded the wisdom of George Washington, who adjured his countrymen to prepare in time of peace against the danger of future war. The militiamen from Kentucky marched behind Gov. Isaac Shelby and Col. Richard M. Johnson to fight under Gen. William Henry Harrison, and end at the Battle of the Thames the reign of terror of the redoubtable Tecumseh. The militiamen—citizen soldiers—from Kentucky, went down the Kentucky, the Ohio, and the Mississippi to New Orleans; fought beside the Tennessee Militia; under the leadership of "Old Hickory" Jackson, humble veterans who had gained martial renown under the Iron Duke; and defeated on the heroic plain of Chalmette, the last attempt, until the ambitious rise of Hitler and Stalin, at foreign domination of American soil. The hills and valleys of old Kentucky echoed with the victory song:

There stood John Bull in martial pomp,
And here was Old Kentucky.

FIRST WORLD WAR

Little Switzerland, the freest country in Europe, model land of liberty and democracy, did adopt George Washington's recommendation that was unheeded by his own country, and provided military training for every able-bodied citizen. When the flames of war swept over Europe in 1914, little Switzerland placed in the field in 4 days a trained, equipped citizen army of 300,000 men, and through 4 years of devastating war maintained her neutrality without the firing of a gun or the tread of a hostile footstep on her land.

In that war not an American-made airplane ever flew over a German line. Less than 500 American-made field guns ever reached the battle front. Thousands of the rose and expectancy of America's young manhood went into battle; marched to death as to a picnic; fought amidst entanglements of barbed wire; fell in the bloody inferno of No Man's Land—thousands of our bravest and best—who did not know how to load the French rifles our Government placed in their hands. Then the United States disbanded its armed forces, and sank its battle fleet, while the Japanese tore up their blueprints, of which they retained copies.

There are those who apparently still think they can build a Chinese wall around America; that America can withdraw like a terrapin in its shell; or, like an ostrich, hide its head in the sand. Some seem to believe that we can piously proclaim that we do not want war and be safe from attack. Others know that we ought to have the greatest air force in the world; the most invincible Navy on the oceans of the earth; the authorized legal strength of our armed forces; and ought to train America's young manhood, not as a part of the Regular Army, but as a part of their educational equipment as American citizens, according to a program supported by the great organizations of American servicemen and their women's auxiliaries, recommended by the President's patriotic commission,

and urged by the President in an able address to the Congress; but they do not want this Congress to vote on it. They do not want us to meet our solemn responsibility as Representatives of a great free people who believe in preparedness and self-defense.

LITTLE BOY BLUES

Our earnest hope and fervent prayer ought to be that these little boys that prattle at our knees, these Little Boy Blues, wearing their little soldier suits and their little sailor suits, these Little Boy Blues with their little toy swords and their little toy guns, may never have to march to a carnival of carnage. We ought to make sure that never again will an American mother's son charge into battle without knowing how to load his rifle.

DEFENSIVE PREPAREDNESS; NOT OFFENSIVE MILITARISM

If the United States had maintained a trained, well-equipped citizen soldiery since the turn of the century we would never have been involved as a belligerent in either world war. Surely a generation that has lived through two world wars ought to have learned a lesson. Some know all of those things but think it is indiscreet, inexpedient, and unwise for them from the standpoint of personal or party politics, to advocate such a preparedness program in election year. I have never known the meaning of the word "discreet" or "expedient" in the performance of my duties during more than 20 years as a national legislator. As a consistent, constant advocate of adequate preparedness as the best insurance against war—defensive preparedness, not offensive militarism—I have said on probably a thousand rostrums since the First World War that there ought to be emblazoned in the corridors of every public building in America, inscribed on the walls of every schoolroom in America, and, I would now add, engraved on the desk of every Congressman in both House and Senate, George Washington's words of wisdom:

One of the most effectual means of preserving peace is to be prepared for war.

Let us not daily or doubt, falter or fail, in this hour of our country's need.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, today we are faced with the critical and far-reaching issue of a peacetime conscription in the United States. We must consider deeply the individual rights of a free people, and we must, for just as strong a reason, carefully weigh the absolute essentials of a constant defense and the future security of our people and our country.

It is fundamental that our armed forces should be improved and modernized to the extent that our country may be adequately and continually defended from any type of attack.

Is peacetime conscription required at this time for an adequate and modernized system of national defense for our country? That is the question. Let us look at the available facts. If there are any undisclosed facts they should be bared to the Congress now.

In reading from the committee report on page 4, I find that we now have approximately 1,211,818 men in our armed forces as of March 1, 1948—469,496 in the Army, 351,181 in the Navy, 317,102 in the Air Force, and 74,039 in the Marines.

We now have the largest and strongest Navy in the world, in fact, our Navy is at least equal to the strength of the combined navies of all the rest of the world.

From the hearings on this proposed legislation and from the committee report, the facts show that our great Navy can be adequately manned without peacetime conscription. This Congress has recently passed legislation to increase our Air Force to a 70-group corps. Again I am unable to find facts to show that peace-time conscription is required to man this mammoth and modernized force.

I am very well aware that our armed forces need many infantrymen as a part of a modernized Army. Air bases and beachheads are vital to our national defense. We must never ignore the major necessity of our foot soldiers.

The facts disclose that the duties of the Infantry do not carry as much glamor and appeal to our young men who wish to volunteer as do the Navy, Marines, and the Air Corps. It is a fact, that under present Army requirements and inducements we have been unable to secure ample enlistments for the Army. The testimony reveals that the Army needs some 300,000 men to carry out our present program of defense. Since the facts reveal that we do not need peacetime conscription for an adequate and modernized Navy and Air Corps, the issue boils down to one simple question: Should we, at this time, have conscription to increase our Infantry? That is the issue gentlemen. May I ask two questions at this point?

Is there any immediate danger of our country being attacked by any foreign power? Is there any other alternative to secure 300,000 additional men for our Army than by selective service? It is true that no man can be sure of the answer to the first question. Gentlemen, I do not believe that our country is in any immediate danger of war nor that any country is immediately capable of waging war against us. The evidence before us does not disclose a national emergency. I further believe, very firmly, that our Army enlistments could be sufficiently encouraged to meet current quotas under our modernized program. Army enlistment requirements should be liberalized and attractive inducements should be offered to Army volunteers.

Regimentation of our people, in time of peace, is a very dangerous Government policy. We in America have strived to forego such practices. Our citizens have always taken pride in their individual rights as set forth in our great Constitution. Only in case of a national emergency should these rights be infringed by forcing our young men into the Army.

Therefore, gentlemen, I am constrained to vote against military conscription, at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 671, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill will have to be laid aside until the engrossed copy can be provided.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 239. An act relating to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and postgraduate school; and

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HAWKES, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6772) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment numbered 40 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Army.
2. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of Labor.
6. Department of the Navy.
7. Department of State.
8. Post Office Department.
9. Federal Security Agency.
10. Federal Communications Commission.
11. Housing and Home Finance Agency.
12. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3735. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4071. An act to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Army.
3. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of Labor.
6. Department of the Navy.
7. Department of the Treasury.
8. Department of State.
9. National Archives.
10. Office of the Housing Expediter.
11. Federal Security Agency.
12. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
13. Veterans' Administration.
14. War Assets Administration.

WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DONDERO submitted a conference report and statement on S. 418, an act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JENSEN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2759. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a post-office building at Bunker Hill, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2877. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committe on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 631. An act for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.;

H. R. 2239. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; and

H. R. 3214. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary."

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3. An act to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators;

S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta;

S. 1087. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944;

S. 1447. An act to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes;

S. 2223. An act to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes;

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency;

S. 2251. An act to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States naval hospital, United States naval training center, Great Lakes, Ill.;

S. 2400. An act to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels;

S. 2401. An act to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 2505. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes;

S. 2509. An act relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico;

S. 2675. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

S. 2770. An act to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements; and

S. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPIE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2744. An act to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 3889. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases;

H. R. 5275. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer;

H. R. 5883. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6028. An act to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6628. An act to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6758. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

RECESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 10 o'clock a. m. tomorrow, Friday, June 18, 1948.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1655. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to aid the settlement and development of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1656. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting certifications by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of claims of the cities of Nantucket, Mass.; and Buffalo, N. Y.; and Greensboro-High Point Airport Authority, of Greensboro, N. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1657. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dated June 17, 1948, covering refunds and credits of internal-revenue taxes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 718); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1658. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dated June 17, 1948, covering refunds and credits of internal-revenue taxes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 719); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1659. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dated June 17, 1948, covering refunds and credits of internal-revenue taxes for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1943 and 1944 (H. Doc. No. 720); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6465. A bill to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey; without amendment (Rept. No. 2386). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks; without amendment (Rept. No. 2387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DEVITT: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; without amendment (Rept. No. 2388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6959. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 6958. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill., without amendment (Rept. No. 2390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on survey and study of the postal service; without amendment (Rept. No. 2391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 2392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; without amendment (Rept. No. 2395). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2747. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company; without amendment (Rept. No. 2396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2186. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 6973. A bill to appropriate $800,000 for the construction of a building at Knoxville, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACK:

H. R. 6974. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 6975. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6976. A bill to create a National Economic Commission, to establish procedures for the formulation and achievement of national economic goals for the making of voluntary agreements in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Res. 686. Resolution providing for the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 687. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate the murder of George Polk; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. Res. 688. Resolution paying tribute to the Members of the House of Representatives, employees, Press and Radio Gallery; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. Res. 689. Resolution to establish a select committee to be known as the Committee on Housing; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 6977. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 6978. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 6979. A bill for the relief of the P. S. Cook Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6980. A bill for the relief of Tamara Boks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2105. By the SPEAKER: Petition of New York Teachers Chapter, American Veterans Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2106. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. Isaac De Haan, Corsica, S. Dak., and 14 others, urging the defeat of any legislation proposing the establishing of a universal military training program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2107. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 17 members of the Winfield Township WCTU, of Butler County, Pa., opposing the Towe bill, H. R. 4278, or recommending prohibiting the sale of beer to trainees, especially those under the age of 21 years; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2108. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted at Twenty-third Annual Convention of Central Retail Feed Association, Milwaukee, Wis., favoring a change to the hundredweight system for grain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2109. Also, resolution adopted by Upper Mississippi Valley Water Use Council at its meeting held in Dubuque on June 4, urging Congress to adequately support the United States Geological Survey's program of water investigations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2110. Also, resolution adopted at Twenty-third Annual Convention of Central Retail

Feed Association, Milwaukee, Wis., endorsing legislation to bring into the open all groups whose aim is to overthrow our constitutional form of government; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

2111. Also, resolution adopted at Twenty-third Annual Convention of Central Retail Feed Association, Milwaukee, Wis., endorsing all legislation which is designed to keep the Commodity Credit Corporation from competing with private business; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 15, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, in these days when men freely judge and condemn each other, remind us all of the Great Assize before which we must all someday appear.

Thou knowest whether we have been voices or merely echoes, whether we have done Thy will or our own or, worse still, have done neither.

Teach us, O Lord, that only Thy "Well done" will afford peace and everlasting happiness.

May we strive for that rather than the approval of men, which is but for a little while. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 17, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. TIBBOTT, Mr. SCRIVNER, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, and Mr. NORRELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3. An act to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators;

S. 2505. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6419. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6772. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate, the calendar will now be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1504, House bill 5832.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tobey
Dworshak	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McMahon	Umstead
Ecton	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Feazel	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The clerk will state the first bill on the calendar.

DONATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

The bill (H. R. 5882) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes was announced as first in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when this bill was reached on the last call of the calendar, I objected to it. I understand there is a possibility of good in it. I should like to ask for the RECORD an explanation of the bill. The bill was reported by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is not present at the moment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over temporarily and placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have the bill go over until the Senator from Connecticut comes to the floor. I simply desire an explanation for the RECORD, and then will probably withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. BALDWIN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask that the Senate return to consideration of House bill 5882, Calendar No. 1504, which, when reached on the calendar, was passed over.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this is the bill I asked to have passed over on the last call of the calendar. It would appear that agencies of the Government, if they undertake to dispose of surplus property even if for worthy purposes may sooner or later be found to be yielding to pressure to give away material belonging to the agency, even though some other agency of Government wants to purchase it at the same time. I should like to know if it is the understanding of the Senator from Connecticut that agencies of the Government having such surplus property will take pains to ascertain that the material which they propose to give away is not needed by some other agency of Government before completing the transaction or giving away the material.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the bill uses the word "obsolete" so I assume that with the use of that word there is implied that the material which the Government agency would give away to educational institutions would be material that could not be used either by that agency or by any other Federal agency. Certainly it was our purpose that the uses to which the Government could put the property would have been exhausted before it would be turned over to an educational institution.

Mr. AIKEN. With that explanation, Mr. President, I have no objection to passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5882) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. It is a fact also that there will be need for this housing next year as well as this year.

Mr. CAIN. There is a very pressing need for the property in question at the present time, and the American universities can quite properly continue to have a fine use for the property for several years in the future.

Mr. WATKINS. Does this apply to private schools as well as public schools such as State universities where these buildings have been placed?

Mr. CAIN. It so happens, I have been informed, that the buildings in question are only situated on the property of public institutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on the last call of the calendar I asked that the bill go over. In the meantime I have had a careful examination made of the bill and its effects. I find that it will not conflict or interfere with other pending legislation on the calendar, and that adoption of the bill would have a beneficial effect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington wish to offer amendments to the bill?

Mr. CAIN. An amendment was previously offered. I have a copy of the amendment, and ask that it be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington offers an amendment to House bill 5710.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is this amendment represented by Calendar No. 1546, Senate bill 2076?

Mr. CAIN. It is Senate bill 2076. The amendment in fact I may say to the Senator from Kentucky is Senate bill 2076.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. It is offered as an amendment just as it was reported from the committee and is on the calendar?

Mr. CAIN. Word for word.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under those circumstances, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point and the reading of it will be waived.

The amendment is as follows:

SEC. 5. The Defense Homes Corporation is authorized to convey, without reimbursement therefor, to Howard University, a corporation organized pursuant to an act of Congress, all of its right, title, and interest in certain lands in the District of Columbia, together with the improvements constructed thereon and the personal property used in connection therewith, and commonly known as Lucy Diggs Slowe Hall, 1919 Third Street Northwest, and George Washington Carver Hall, 211 Elm Street Northwest: *Provided*, That no employee of the United States or of the District of Columbia who, on the date of approval of this act, is a tenant of either Lucy Diggs Slowe Hall or George Washington Carver Hall shall, unless quarters were assigned to such tenant on a transient basis or on the sole basis that the tenant was enrolled at an educational institution, be evicted from such halls within 4 years after the approval of this act, except where such tenant commits a nuisance or otherwise violates any obligation of tenancy.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to discharge the indebtedness of the Defense Homes Corporation to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in an amount equal to the Defense Homes Corporation's net investment in these properties as of the date of transfer, as determined by the President of the Defense Homes Corporation, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to discharge the indebtedness of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Treasury in like amount as of the same date.

SEC. 6. The right, title, and interest in any lands, together with the improvements constructed thereon, which are conveyed pursuant to the authority granted by section 5 hereof, shall revert to the United States upon a written finding made by the President prior to July 1, 1963, that the property is needed by the United States in connection with a national defense emergency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington is agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5710) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2076 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CAIN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CAIN, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. FULBRIGHT conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED ALCOHOL PLANTS

The bill (H. R. 6096) to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for production of products from agricultural commodities was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MATERNITY LEAVE FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 784) to provide maternity leave for Government employees was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL and Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service, but I have noted with great interest and admiration the fight which has been made by the able chairman of that committee [Mr. LANGER] in behalf of the bill to which objection has just been made, to grant maternity leave to women who are Government employees.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this is a humane measure. Surely the Government of the United States should not lag behind many private enterprises which grant such relief to their women employees.

I do not know what may be in the minds of Senators who objected, but I hope the Senator from North Dakota will find a way to bring this measure to a vote in the Senate. I do not know of anything that is a greater expression of governmental leadership in humane legislation than this bill. I commend the Senator from North Dakota for his fight. I hope he will be able to obtain consideration of the bill and that it will be possible for the Senate as a whole to vote on the measure.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I can assure the distinguished Senator from Florida that when I come back in January this will be the first bill I shall reintroduce.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am one of the Members of this body who asked that the bill go over. The reason I feel that the bill is not practicable is that under the present law an employee is now granted 26 days annual leave. In addition, he is allowed 15 days sick leave, making a total of 41. This bill proposes to allow 60 days additional leave as maternity leave, making a total of 101 working days out of each year. The average number of working days a month in the Government service is 20. That means that in a maternity case a Government employee can have 5 months of the year off with pay. I do not feel that it is practicable for any Government agency to operate if it allows 5 months off with pay every time an employee has a child.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6116) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "by", to strike out "July 31" and insert "April 30"; and on page 2, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "August 9, 1948" and insert "April 30, 1949."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2279) to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO CHEYENNE, WYO., FOR PARK PURPOSES

The bill (S. 2820) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public park and golf course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, there is before the Committee on Finance House bill 5734, which is the same as Senate bill 2820, Calendar 1601. I move that the Senate Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 5734, and that the Senate immediately proceed to consider the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate Finance Committee is discharged from the further consideration of House bill 5734, a bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understand that Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has an amendment to offer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That the city of Cheyenne shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property, to be determined by the Veterans' Administration."

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I realize that time does not permit us to oppose this amendment. What the amendment does is to call upon the city of Cheyenne to pay 50 percent of the appraised value of this land, which the city of Cheyenne originally gave without cost to the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration is unable to utilize or improve the land, and the city of Cheyenne has agreed to make improvements by making a park around the veterans' hospital in Cheyenne, or on the outskirts of Cheyenne.

It seems hard on the city that it should have to pay for land which it is going to improve for the benefit of the veterans. However, it is impossible to get this bill through without accepting the amendment, so I will accept the amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it is with reluctance that I have decided not to object to the amendment. It is apparent that it is an amendment which the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming would prefer not to accept, but which he feels impelled to accept under the circumstances. Let me say that we are establishing no precedent so far as the Senate Committee on Finance is concerned, and at the first opportunity for debate on the subject, there will be plenty of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2820 will be indefinitely postponed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6759) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I give notice of my intention to move to bring this bill up at the earliest possible moment.

The bill (S. 1333) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3934) to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to venereal disease rapid treatment centers, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

DEPORTATION PROCEDURES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2755) to amend the act of June 11, 1946, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator who objected withhold his objection temporarily so that an explanation may be made?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to do so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, this is an immigration bill, under the general immigration and naturalization laws. It has been indicated that in dealing with cases for deportation there may be some question about the proper procedure under the Administrative Procedures Act. The purpose of this bill is to permit the Immigration and Naturalization Service to have its own employees conduct the first hearing and make recommendations in deportation cases, rather than have the cases held up for the full process under the Administrative Procedures Act. Unless this bill is passed several thousand cases will be held up for hearing, and no action can be taken on them. The purpose of the bill is simply to expedite the hearing. I do not think it has any other effect.

Mr. President, I have made the explanation. If the Senator wishes to persist in his objection, I cannot stop him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 2755?

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1988) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources was announced as next in order.

Mr. DONNELL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS IN PARK COUNTY, WYO.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1821) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let the bill go over.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his objection for a moment, I should like to make an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho withhold his objection for that purpose?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I explained this bill at the previous call of the calendar, at which time the distinguished Senator from Oregon asked to have an opportunity to consider the bill. He has since examined it, and has now removed any objection that he had to it.

This bill provides for a conveyance of 80 acres of land in section 36, township 58 north, range 100 west, from the United States of America to the State of Wyoming. Section 36 is one of the school sections which were reserved for the support of the public schools when Wyoming was admitted to the Union.

In 1915 the State of Wyoming issued an oil and gas lease on the 80 acres of the east half of the northeast quarter. Development proceeded on that 80 acres, oil was produced there, and royalties in excess of $19,000 have been paid.

The Government of the United States sued the State and its lessee; and on June 2, 1947, the United States Supreme Court, disregarding the rights created in Wyoming by the Congress, as well as the equities in Wyoming under the surveys, decided that the United States should have ownership.

Section 3, article IV of the Constitution still provides that Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the property belonging to the United States. Wyoming as a matter of right and justice is entitled to the entire section. However, under the circumstances, in order that it may recognize its long-existing lease and contract, Wyoming now is willing to accept the 80 acres. This bill is for the purpose of conveying those 80 acres to the State of Wyoming.

I hope the Senator will not object. A similar bill has been passed by the House, and is now on the calendar. It is House bill 4462, Calendar 1685, which I would ask to have substituted for the Senate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the Calendar.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2686) to establish the Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, to provide for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes, and for other

purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the author of the bill whether it authorizes an extensive program and what the cost of the program under the bill is likely to be. I take it that the bill carries out the action of the House of Representatives, in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill this year, in setting up a separate administration for the Navajos.

Mr. WATKINS. The purpose of the bill is to expedite the administration of the affairs of the Navajo and Hopi Indians. They are in a deplorable condition, as the public has been informed in recent months by the press of the country. We have found that by reason of the red tape and ruts in which the Indian Bureau has been involved in recent years, it has been almost impossible to get under way a program to rehabilitate the Indians. This bill would change the administration of the affairs of this group of Indians, and would provide a new administrator for them.

These Indians are the most primitive Indians we have in the country. More than 60,000 of them are there in one group, and they require special attention and treatment.

This bill would authorize an appropriation of $25,000,000 for educational purposes, and also would authorize an appropriation of $250,000 for relief. The bill provides for the transfer of the administration of these Indians from the Indian Bureau to a special administrator who will be required to live on the reservation and direct its affairs, and he would be given the power to exercise all the functions and activities which the Indian Bureau as now constituted is authorized to exercise regarding them.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that the $25,000,000 for education would be for operating expenses, or would it be for building new schools?

Mr. WATKINS. The bill provides for a comprehensive program to take care of the Indian children who are not now in school. There are 14,000 of them, as the Senator probably will remember, who are not now in school, although our treaty with the Indians calls for a school teacher for each 30 pupils and a school room. We have not kept our treaty obligations.

Mr. BALL. The testimony before the committee was that it is very hard to keep them in one place long enough to send them to school.

Mr. WATKINS. More than 30,000 of these Indians will, of necessity, have to be transferred from the reservation to other places to live.

Mr. BALL. Do I correctly understand that the $25,000,000 to be authorized under the bill will be for the purpose of building new schools? It will not be for annual operating charges; will it?

Mr. WATKINS. No; it will not be for annual operating charges. It has to do not only with buildings on the reservation itself, but with buildings in white communities where probably many of the Indians will have to go to make a living and to establish homes in the future.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say I think it is true that the tribal council has requested this type of program and has asked that the bill be passed.

Mr. WATKINS. They have requested in substance this type of program.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, under this proposed legislation, will the Bureau of Indian Affairs lose all jurisdiction over this particular Indian tribe?

Mr. WATKINS. The Indian Bureau will lose all jurisdiction; the tribe will be placed under a special administrator.

These Indians have special problems. We hope the Indian Bureau then will spend its time in liquidating the affairs of the Indians in the United States, and will go out of business in 10 or 15 years.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Of course, they are not doing that very rapidly, because in the recent Interior Department appropriation bill the Bureau of Indian Affairs had an appropriation approximately double the appropriation for that agency only a few years ago; and in the bill we approved a few days ago there was provision for an appropriation of approximately $10,000,000 for the Navajo Tribe.

I am just wondering whether we are going to continue to give millions of dollars to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the relief of the Navajos, and then under this new agency provide additional millions of dollars for those Indians.

Mr. WATKINS. No; we shall transfer all matters and functions relating to this group of Indians to the new Administrator, and we hope that will make it possible for the Indian Bureau to go out of operation in a few years.

The purpose is to make the Indians American citizens, with all the rights and liabilities of citizens, as soon as possible. This Administrator will have that special job and will not have anything else to do.

Mr. DWORSHAK. How long has the Indian Bureau had charge of the Navajos?

Mr. WATKINS. For more than 60 years—ever since the Navajos were conquered by our armies and were placed on the reservation.

Mr. DWORSHAK. And yet now they are in such dire straits that it is necessary to have a new agency to take care of them.

Mr. WATKINS. The committee is convinced that it will be better to have a new administrator for them, so that the Indian Bureau will not go on forever handling their affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

SALE TO THE CROW TRIBE OF INTERESTS IN ESTATES OF DECEASED CROW INDIAN ALLOTTEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2352) to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 3, after line 10, to insert:

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior with the consent, in writing, of the tribal council representing the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation, is hereby authorized and directed to sell and convey to the Board of County Commissioners of Comanche County, Okla., for public purposes, to wit: A site for a county hospital for said county upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe—ten acres from the north one-half of section 30, township 2 north, range 11 west, Indian meridian, and more definitely described as follows:

The southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of said section 30, township 2 north, range 11 west, Indian meridian: *Provided*, That out of the proceeds of such sale the sum of $1.25 per acre shall be credited to the general fund of the United States Treasury and the balance shall be deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the tribal fund of Indians of the said Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees, and to provide for the sale of certain lands to the Board of County Commissioners of Comanche County, Okla., and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6457) to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MRS. PEARL SCOTT LOUKES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2551) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "northeast", to strike out "quarter of the" and insert "quarter," and on page 2, line 2, after the figure "3", to strike out "all of", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes, for the following-described lands in the State of Montana: The southeast quarter, section 12, township 7 south, range 27 east; lot 4, section 7, township 7 south, range 28 east; the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter, section 11; the west half of the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter, section 16; lots 1, 2, and 3, northeast quarter, east half of the northwest quarter, the east half of the east half of the west half of the northwest quarter, section 17, lots 1, 2, and 3, section 18, township 7 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian, containing approximately 628 acres.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMPROVEMENT OF POST OFFICE, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The bill (H. R. 5750) to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEASE OF LAFAYETTE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The bill (S. 2706) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to lease for commercial purposes for periods not exceeding 10 years and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the public interest, such space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building, as was leased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for commercial purposes on July 30, 1947, the date title to such building was transferred from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the United States of America by section 306, title III, Public Law 268, Eightieth Congress. The rentals received pursuant to this act may be deposited into a common fund account or accounts in the Treasury, and notwithstanding the provisions of the act of June 30, 1932 (40 U. S. C. 303b), shall be available to pay the cost of maintenance, upkeep, and repair of the space so leased and for the establishment of necessary reserves therefor: *Provided*, That except for such necessary reserves, the unobligated balances of rentals so deposited into the Treasury shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts.

ISSUANCE OF PATENTS FOR CERTAIN LANDS

The bill (H. R. 6090) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3190) to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill contains a large volume of amendments. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? This is a long bill, containing 475 pages.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I assure the distinguished Senator I shall not take much time, and that we shall not spend much time on the bill.

The House has sent to the Senate the revision of title 18. It was my privilege and duty to appoint a very distinguished subcommittee to go over the matter. The subcommittee was headed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

The purpose of the bill is to codify and revise the laws relating to Federal crimes and criminal procedure.

With the amendments proposed by the committee the bill includes all pertinent laws to January 5, 1948, and is made effective September 1, 1948.

The bill makes it easy to find the criminal statutes because of the arrangement, numbering, and classification. The original intent of Congress is preserved. A uniform style of statutory expression is adopted. The new Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure are keyed to the bill and are reflected in part II of title 18.

Obsolete and executed provisions are eliminated. Uncertainty will be ended and there will no longer be any need to examine the many volumes of the Statutes at Large as the bill, upon enactment, will itself embody the substantive law which will thus appear in full in the United States Code.

It is one of the constructive things we have been endeavoring to accomplish, and I think the bill accomplishes it. I should like to see the amendments adopted en bloc. If any further specific information is desired, I shall ask the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri to explain it, but I think, in view of the fact that the work has been gone into by some of the best experts in codification in America, in conjunction with the House committee, the committee has proposed a number of amendments, most of which are insubstantial, some of which are substantial. They will necessitate, I assume, if we pass the bill, a conference with the House. I hope the measure can be disposed of without a great deal of debate. As I said, it is along the line of bringing together the Federal criminal statutes into one place, so as to avoid the necessity of going from one volume to another in order to ascertain what the criminal law of the Nation is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc?

There being no objection, the amendments were considered and agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Page 3, following "13. Laws of States adopted for areas within Federal jurisdiction." insert: "14. Applicability to Canal Zone."

Page 5, line 4, after "States" insert: ", except the Canal Zone."

Page 8, after line 15, insert:

"§ 14. Applicability to Canal Zone.

"In addition to the sections of this title which by their terms apply to and within the Canal Zone, the following sections of this title shall likewise apply to and within the Canal Zone: 6, 8, 11, 331, 371, 472, 474, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 485, 488, 489, 490, 499, 502, 506, 594, 595, 598, 600, 601, 604, 605, 608, 611, 612, 703, 756, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 915, 917, 951, 953, 954, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 1017, 1073, 1301, 1364, 1382, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1546, 1584, 1621, 1622, 1761, 1821, 1914, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2199, 2231, 2224, 2235, 2274, 2275, 2277, 2384, 2385, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 3059, 3105, 3109."

Page 91, strike out "610. Contributions by national banks or corporations." and insert: "610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations."

Page 104, strike out lines 4 to 21, inclusive, and insert:

"§ 610. Contributions by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations.

"It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

"Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"For the purposes of this section 'Labor organizaiton' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exist for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

Page 117, line 8, strike out all after "receiver," down to and including "System," in line 15.

Page 118, line 18, strike out all after "care." down to and including "institution," in line 23.

Page 134, line 19, after "both" insert:"; or if he negligently suffers such person to escape, he shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

Page 158, after line 12, insert: "While any foreign government is a member both of the International Monetary Fund and of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, this section shall not apply to the sale or purchase of bonds, securities, or other obligations of such government or any political subdivision thereof or of any organization or association acting for or on behalf of such government or political subdivision, or to making of any loan to such government, political subdivision, organization, or association."

Page 367, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive, and insert: "The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the States, of all offenses against the laws of the United States.

"Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

Page 415, line 10, after "Zone," insert "District of Columbia."

Page 415, after line 17, insert:

"Nothing in this title, anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 416, after line 21, insert:

"Nothing in this title, anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 448, lines 24 and 25, strike out "the Revised Statutes (1 U. S. C., sec. 1)" and insert: "Title 1 of the United States Code."

Page 456, strike out lines 3 to 21, inclusive.

Page 456, line 22, strike out "19" and insert "18."

Page 457, line 3, strike out "20" and insert "19."

Page 457, strike out lines 8 to 15, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 20. This act shall take effect September 1, 1948."

Page 457, line 16, strike out "22" and insert "21."

Page 463, about middle of page, strike out:

"July 3.....	128	4, 5	40	755, 756	16	705, 706"

Page 467, below middle of page, strike out:

"June 20.....	634	4	49	1555	16	705
Do.....	635	1, 2	49	1557	22	248"

And insert:

"June 20.....	635	1, 2	49	1557	22	248"

Page 470, after

"June 8.....	178	1, 2, 3	50	234, 235	18	241, 241a, 242"

insert:

"July 31.....	329	9	50	516	31	804b"

Page 471, at the end of the schedule of repeals on this page, insert:

"1947—						
Apr. 16	20	.....	61	52	18	411
May 16	73	.....	61	97	18	744b-1
June 21	111	.....	61	134	18	244
June 23	120	301	61	150	2	251"

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will presently name the conferees.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I have been credibly informed that the House will accept our amendments. In view of that information, I ask that the action taken to rescind on my motion to appoint conferees in respect to the bill (H. R. 3190) be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The bill (S. 2764) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky offers an amendment which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 14, after the word "buy", it is proposed to strike out "July 31, 1949", and insert "April 30, 1949."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I request an explanation of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the bill proposes to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act. That section, among other things, authorizes the Alien Property Custodian to return property to an alien if he deems that the alien was a persecutee. It has developed that some of these persons to whom property would be returned are dead, and there are no known heirs. In such case I assume the property would escheat to this country.

The bill provides that the President may designate approved organizations under certain limitations and conditions, and that such organizations may receive the property of a deceased persecutee alien and use it for the benefit of the group to which the persecutee belonged. I think it is a very humane measure. It was introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(h) The President may designate one or more organizations as successors in interest to deceased persons, who, if alive, would be eligible to receive returns under the provisos of subdivision (C) or (D) of subsection (a) (2) hereof. An organization so designated shall be deemed a successor in interest by operation of law for the purposes of subsection (a) (1) hereof. Return may be made to an organization so designated (a) prior to July 31, 1949, or 2 years from the vesting of the property or interest in question, whichever is later, if the President or such officer or agency as he may designate determines from all relevant facts of which he is then advised that it is probable that the former owner is dead and is survived by no person eligible under section 32 to claim as successor in interest by inheritance, devise, or bequest; and (b) after such later date, if no claim for the return of the property or interest is pending.

"No return may be made to an organization so designated unless it files a claim on or before January 1, 1952, and unless it gives assurances satisfactory to the President that (i) it will use the property or interest returned to it for the rehabilitation and resettlement of persons who suffered substantial deprivation of liberty or failed to enjoy the full rights of citizenship within the meaning of subdivisions (C) and (D) of subsection (a) (2) hereof, by reason of their membership in the political, racial, or religious group of which the former owner was a member; (ii) it will transfer, at any time within 2 years from the time that return is made, such property or interest or the equivalent value thereof to any person designated as entitled thereto pursuant to this act by the President or such officer or agency; and (iii) it will make such reports and permit such examination of its books as the President or such officer or agency may from time to time require.

"The filing of a claim by an organization so designated shall not bar the payment of debt claims under section 34 of this act."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 33. No return may be made pursuant to section 9 or 32 unless notice of claim has been filed, (a) in the case of any property or interest acquired by the United States prior to December 18, 1941, by August 9, 1948, or (b) in the case of any property or interest acquired by the United States on or after December 18, 1941, by April 30, 1949, or 2 years from the vesting of the property or interest in respect of which the claim is made, whichever is later: *Provided*, That return may be made to successor organizations designated pursuant to section 32 (h) hereof if notice of claim is filed by January 1, 1952."

PHILADELPHIA NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The bill (S. 2080) to provide for the establishment of the Philadelphia National Historical Park, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This bill is identical with Calendar No. 1764, House bill 5053.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask that the House bill be substituted for Senate bill S. 2080, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the substitution of the House bill for the Senate bill and its present consideration?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5053) to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2080 is indefinitely postponed.

CODIFICATION OF TITLE 3 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

The bill (H. R. 6412) to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN ARMY EQUIPMENT TO NEW MEXICO MILITARY INSTITUTE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2698) to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "authorized", to insert "upon the request of the institution"; in line 7, after the word "institution", to insert "to Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., to Norwich University, Norwich, Vt., and to Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va."; on page 2, line 1, before the word "together", insert "except those used in the remount breeding program"; in line 3, after the word "by", insert "each of the"; at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "military institute" and insert "institutions"; and in line 5, after the word "purposes", to insert "*Provided*, That the receiving institution in each case agrees to arrange for the proper pension and old-age care of the donated horses."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized, upon the request of the institution, to transfer without reimbursement, to the New Mexico Military Institute, Roswell, N. Mex., a tax-supported State institution, to Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., to Norwich University, Norwich, Vt., and to Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va., all horses, except those used in the remount breeding program, together with their records and equipment, property of the United States Army, located at and utilized by each of the said institutions for military training purposes: *Provided*, That the receiving institution in each case agrees to arrange for the proper pension and old-age care of the donated horses.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2860) to provide for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from lynching and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CONNALLY and other Senators. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS IN PARK COUNTY TO WYOMING

The bill (H. R. 4462) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, this bill is identical with Calendar No. 1661 (Senate bill 1821) to which the Senator from Idaho made objection. The Senator now advises me he withdraws his objection. I ask for the consideration of House bill 4462.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill H. R. 4462?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I originally objected to the bill. I have gone into the matter with the Senator from Wyoming and I find that what the bill is designed to do is to correct what amounts to an error in a survey line, which, after all, is an error on the part of the Federal Government. Therefore, I shall not object.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1821 is indefinitely postponed.

STAMPS TO COMMEMORATE THE THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ANNAPOLIS, MD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 223) to authorize the issue of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance in May 1949 a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

The bill (S. 2816) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this bill is identical with Calendar 1811, House bill 5861. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the House bill in lieu of the Senate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5861) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2816 is indefinitely postponed.

TRANSPORTATION BY VESSELS OF CANADIAN REGISTRY BETWEEN HYDER, ALASKA, AND POINTS IN UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 4690) to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRACY MARILUCH

The bill (S. 2050) for the relief of Gracy Mariluch was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Gracy Mariluch, of Paris, France, whose brother is an American citizen, shall be deemed, for the purpose of the immigration laws, to have been born in France rather than in Spain where her parents were temporarily residing at the time the said Gracy Mariluch was born.

FRANTISEK JIRI PAVLIK OR GEORG PAVLIK

The bill (H. R. 1409) for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALFONSO FELICE

Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1301) for the relief of Alfonso Felice, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "Felice" and insert "Felici"; on page 1, line 8, to strike out "Felice" and insert "Felici"; and, beginning in line 10, after the words "United States", to insert "upon the payment of the visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that said quota is available."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed not to issue orders and warrants of deportation in the case of Alfonso Felici, any previous or existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of the approval of this act, Alfonso Felici should be deemed to be lawfully admitted as a resident of the United States, upon the payment of the visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactmept of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that said quota is available.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Alfonso Felici."

MRS. HARRY A. LIGHT

The bill (H. R. 4587) for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDMUND HUPPLER

The bill (H. R. 4047) for the relief of Edmund Huppler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The bill (H. R. 5886) to amend sec. 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSE BABACE

The bill (S. 1872) for the relief of Jose Babace was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel any deportation proceedings which might arise in the case of Jose Babace (Irigoyen), Minden, Nev., legally admitted but who has remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and this alien shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of his actual entry on the payment of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

ENGEBERT AXER

The bill (S. 2054) for the relief of Engebert Axer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General of the United States shall record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Rev. Engebert Axer, Society of Jesus, as of September 26, 1937, the

date on which he was originally admitted to the United States as a student.

DR. CHUNG KWAI LUI

The bill (S. 2360) for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Dr. Chung Kwai Lui as having entered the United States in 1936 for permanent residence, upon the payment by her of the visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced, in the case of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui. The Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Chinese quota for the first year that a quota number is available.

WISIA PARYZENBERG

The bill (S. 2075) for the relief of Wisia Paryzenberg was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to cause to be issued to Wisia Paryzenberg, of Warsaw, Poland, the orphan niece of Dr. Joel Mosko, of Denver, Colo., a visa permitting her immediate entry into the United States for permanent residence as a nonquota immigrant. Upon the issuance of such visa, the said Wisia Paryzenberg shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, notwithstanding any provision of the immigration and naturalization laws.

MILO JURISEVIC ET AL.

The bill (S. 2235) for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, the aliens Milo Jurisevic; Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, wife of the said Milo Jurisevic; Svetozar Jurisevic and Radmila Jurisevic, son and daughter, respectively, of the said Milo Jurisevic and the said Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, all of Fresno, Calif., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, on October 23, 1946, to the United States for permanent residence.

BASQUE ALIENS

The bill (S. 1973) for the relief of certain Basque aliens was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Jose S. Algarra de Carlos, Domingo Asisin Hualde, Patricio Asisin Hualde, Cipriano Aznarren Udi, Gracian Azparren Gazcue, Pedro Aspiros Echechuri, Anastasio Barbarena Elzegaray, Melchor Burusco Domench, Pedro C. Cemborain Garmendia, Angel Dufur Iturri, Bernardo Dufur Iturri, Primitivo Egoscue Seminario, Modesto Elgorriaga Exposito, Felipe Errea Huarte, Esteban Erro Inda, Ambrosio Esnoz Recalde, Lino Goicoa Arozerena, Alberto Ibarregui Iriberri, Pablo Inda Sagardoy, Felipe Itturri Castilla, Francisco Jorajuria Andiazarena, Joaquin Juanarena Dufur, Francisco Larrea Ibarrola, Manuel Lecumberri Barber, Silvestro Martinez Exposito, Serpio Mendiguia Lerumbe, Jose Moulian Mendia, Jose Narvarez Berendiain, Antonio B. Nuin Exposito, Jose Ochandorena Petricorena, Jose M. Ochandorena Petricorena, Primitivo Olondriz Echeverria, Mateo Pedroarena Barberena, Leandro Urritia Villanueva, Pedro Valencia Llorente, Prisco Villanueva Montoya, Marcelino Villanueva Urrutia, Salvador Viscay Oroz, Demetrio Zubiri Uriz, Pedro M. Recalde Iribarren, Celestino Arczarena Elizagaray, Jose Betelu Zubiriaga, Dionisio Betelu Zubiriaga, Fermin Jorajuria Andiazarena, Thomas Iriarte Lerindegui, Miguel Redin Equiza, Miguel Inda Juandeaburre, and Jose Zubiri Coni, as of the respective dates of their lawful temporary entry into the United States in 1944, if they are found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas: *Provided*, That if the Attorney General finds that Cipriano Aznarren Udi is otherwise entitled to the benefits of this act, he is authorized and directed to accord him such benefits, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, insofar as it relates to illiteracy. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number for each alien named herein from the quota of the appropriate country for the first year that the said quota is available.

GROWERS FERTILIZER CO.

The bill (H. R. 1930) for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM R. RAMSEY

The bill (H. R. 2551) for the relief of William R. Ramsey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DENNIS STANTON

The bill (H. R. 2732) for the relief of Dennis Stanton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUMNER COUNTY COLORED FAIR ASSOCIATION

The bill (H. R. 2918) for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE CLEVE WILLIAMS

The bill (H. R. 2372) for the relief of George Cleve Williams was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETROL CORP.

The bill (H. R. 3499) for the relief of Petrol Corp. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM J. BURNS INTERNATIONAL DETECTIVE AGENCY

The bill (H. R. 4441) for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2650) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officials, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2851) to authorize temporary increases in the salary rates of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE, ETC.

The bill (H. R. 5047) to grant a cost-of-living increase in the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia was considered ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASED PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS AND CHILDREN OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENTS

The bill (H. R. 6295) to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CAIN subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. I inadvertently failed to hear the call of Calendar 1711, House bill 6295. May I ask what was done with that bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was passed.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to inquire if that bill can be reconsidered for the purpose of my asking that it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has a right to enter a motion if he wishes to do so.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which House bill 6295 was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

REIMBURSEMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR SPECIAL POLICE AND FIRE ASSIGNMENTS

The bill (H. R. 6452) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia" was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6087) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia" was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INSANITY PROCEEDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 6598) to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia" was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF BARBERS IN THE DISTRICT

The bill (H. R. 4635) to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia" was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRACTICE OF CHIROPRACTIC IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 6327) to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6454) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, some time ago Congress passed an act which provided for an increase in retirement allowances for members of the FBI. There were two reasons behind that action. One was to keep young men in the service, and the other was to provide for a little extra retirement pay for those who have hazardous occupations. This particular bill would extend the same privileges to the Narcotics Division of the Treasury Department and, I think, also to those who have to deal with immigration and who are in a position of hazard. The annuity would be based upon 2 percent of the employee's average salary for 5 years next preceding his retirement, multiplied by the number of years of service not to exceed 30 years. If we are to keep men in the Federal service to perform these particularly hazardous jobs, we have to appeal to a group of younger men. After 20 or 25 years' service they frequently must seek other employment because of their physical condition and age. They are not really suited to deal with some of the tough customers with which they have to deal.

Mr. BALL. The Senator's explanation of the bill is satisfactory, and I agree that it is a much-needed measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROSE MARY AMMERATO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2729) for the relief of Rose Mary Ammerato, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 4, to strike out "$5,000" and to insert "$3,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ANTHONY ARANCIO

The bill (H. R. 700) for the relief of Anthony Arancio was considered, ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

RUDOLPH MAXIMILIAN GOEPP, JR.

The bill (H. R. 3062) for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr., was considered, ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

HIRO HIGA AND KANA HIGA

The bill (H. R. 912) for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa was considered, ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

VITO ABARNO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2009) for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

KAM FONG CHUN ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 911) for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF SUNDRY VETERANS OF ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 333) for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, veterans of World War II, was considered, ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF PARKING LOTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 421) to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EFFECTUATION OF LOAN AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND UNITED NATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. J. Res. 212) to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds of the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I offer two amendments to the joint resolution and ask that they be considered en bloc. In this connection, I wish to point out that the two amendments authorize the construction of the buildings to proceed through the borrowing of not to exceed $25,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Unless this amendment is incorporated in the bill, it will undoubtedly be impossible to proceed this year with the undertaking.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from New York.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 9, after "sec. 4.", it is proposed to insert "(a)"; after line 15 to insert:

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $25,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution and of the loan agreement referred to in section 1 in such manner, and in such amounts, as the President shall determine, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest, for advances made by it hereunder from funds made available for the purposes of this joint resolution and of the loan agreement set forth in section 1.

And on page 3, line 4, after the word "Congress", to insert the words "or the making available of funds as provided in section 4 (b) hereof."

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, or the making available of funds as provided in section 4 (b) hereof, to bring into effect on the part of the United States, the loan agreement, set forth below, between the United States of America and the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., on March 23, 1948, with such changes therein not contrary to the general tenor thereof and not imposing any additional obligations on the United States or relieving the United Nations of any obligations, as the President may deem necessary and appropriate:

LOAN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

It is hereby agreed by the Government of the United States of America and the United Nations as follows:

(1) Subject to the terms and conditions of this agreement, the Government of the United States will lend to the United Nations a sum not to exceed in the aggregate $65,000,000. Such sum shall be expended only as authorized by the United Nations for the construction and furnishing of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in its headquarters district in the city of New York, as defined in the agreement between the United States of America and the United Nations regarding the headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., on June 26, 1947, including the necessary architectural and engineering work, landscaping, underground construction and other appropriate improvements to the land and approaches, and for other related purposes and expenses incident thereto.

(2) Such sum, or parts thereof, will be advanced by the United States through the Secretary of State, to the United Nations upon request of the Secretary General or other duly authorized officer of the United Nations and upon the certification of the architect or engineer in charge of construction, countersigned by the Secretary General or other duly authorized officer, that the amount requested is required to cover payments for the purposes set forth in paragraph (1) above which either (a) have been at any time made by the United Nations, or (b) are due and payable, or (c) it is estimated will become due and payable within 60 days from the date of such request. All sums not used by the United Nations for the purposes set forth in paragraph (1) will be returned to the United States through the Secretary of State when no longer required

for said purposes. No amounts will be advanced hereunder after July 1, 1951, or such later date, not after July 1, 1955, as may be agreed to by the Secretary of State.

(3) All sums advanced hereunder will be receipted for on behalf of the United Nations by the Secretary General or other duly authorized officer of the United Nations.

(4) The United Nations will repay, without interest, to the United States the principal amount of all sums advanced hereunder, in annual payments beginning on July 1, 1951, and on the dates and in the amounts indicated, until the entire amount advanced under this agreement has been repaid as follows:

Date	Amount
July 1, 1951	$1,000,000
July 1, 1952	1,000,000
July 1, 1953	1,500,000
July 1, 1954	1,500,000
July 1, 1955	2,000,000
July 1, 1956	2,000,000
July 1, 1957	2,000,000
July 1, 1958	2,000,000
July 1, 1959	2,000,000
July 1, 1960	2,500,000
July 1, 1961	2,500,000
July 1, 1962	2,500,000
July 1, 1963	2,500,000
July 1, 1964	2,500,000
July 1, 1965	2,500,000
July 1, 1966	2,500,000
July 1, 1967	2,500,000
July 1, 1968	2,500,000
July 1, 1969	2,500,000
July 1, 1970	2,500,000
July 1, 1971	2,500,000
July 1, 1972	2,500,000
July 1, 1973	2,500,000
July 1, 1974	2,500,000
July 1, 1975	2,500,000
July 1, 1976	1,500,000
July 1, 1977	1,500,000
July 1, 1978	1,500,000
July 1, 1979	1,500,000
July 1, 1980	1,500,000
July 1, 1981	1,500,000
July 1, 1982	1,000,000

However, in the event the United Nations does not request the entire sum of $65,000,000 available to it under this agreement, the amount to be repaid under this paragraph will not exceed the aggregate amount advanced by the United States. All amounts payable to the United States under this paragraph will be paid, out of the ordinary budget of the United Nations, to the Secretary of State of the United States in currency of the United States which is legal tender for public debts on the date such payments are made. All sums repaid to the United States will be receipted for on behalf of the United States by the Secretary of State.

(5) The United Nations may at any time make repayments to the United States of funds advanced hereunder in excess of the annual installments as provided in paragraph (4) hereof.

(6) The United Nations agrees that, in order to give full effect to section 22 (a) of the agreement regarding the headquarters of the United Nations referred to in paragraph (1) above (under which the United Nations shall not dispose of all or any part of the land owned by it in the headquarters district without the consent of the United States), it will not, without the consent of the United States, while any of the indebtedness incurred hereunder is outstanding and unpaid, create any mortgage, lien, or other encumbrance on or against any of its real property in the headquarters district as defined in said agreement. The United Nations also agrees that the United States, as a condition to giving its consent to any such disposition or encumbrance, may require the simultaneous repayment of the balance of all installments remaining unpaid hereunder.

(7) The effective date of this agreement shall be the date on which the Government of the United States notifies the United Nations that the Congress of the United States, with the approval of the President, has made available the funds necessary to be advanced in accordance with the provisions of this agreement.

In witness whereof, the Government of the United States of America, acting by and through the United States Representative to the United Nations, and the United Nations, acting by and through the Secretary General, have respectively caused this agreement to be duly signed in duplicate at Lake Success, N. Y., on this 23d day of March 1948.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WARREN R. AUSTIN,
United States Representative to the United Nations.

For the United Nations:

TRYGVE LIE,
Secretary General.

SEC. 2. Sums advanced to the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2) of the aforesaid loan agreement shall be disbursed by the United Nations for the purposes for which such sums were advanced within 90 days after their receipt from the United States. Any funds not so disbursed within that period shall be returned to the United States through the Secretary of State within 30 days thereafter.

SEC. 3. So long as the headquarters district is used as the seat of the United Nations, nothing in this resolution shall be deemed to limit the control and authority of the United Nations over such district as exercised pursuant to Public Law 357, Eightieth Congress: *Provided, however,* That in the event such district is, for whatever reason, no longer used as the seat of the United Nations, the United States shall, in addition to any rights it enjoys under paragraph (6) of the aforesaid loan agreement and section 22 of the headquarters agreement (Public Law 357, 80th Cong.), be entitled to recover from the land and buildings in the headquarters district, in advance of all other creditors of the United Nations, any indebtedness incurred under the loan agreement which is then outstanding and unpaid.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $65,000,000 to accomplish the purposes of this joint resolution. Amounts received in repayment of such loan shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $25,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution and of the loan agreement referred to in section 1 in such manner, and in such amounts, as the President shall determine, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest, for advances made by it hereunder from funds made available for the purposes of this joint resolution and of the loan agreement set forth in section 1.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in House Concurrent Resolution 75, passed unanimously by the House of Representatives December 10, 1945, and agreed to unanimously by the Senate December 11, 1945, invited the United Nations "to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States"; and

Whereas the General Assembly on December 14, 1946, resolved "that the permanent headquarters of the United Nations shall be established in New York City in the area bounded by First Avenue, East Forty-eighth Street, the East River, and East Forty-second Street"; and

Whereas, pursuant to authorization of the Congress in Public Law 357 of the Eightieth Congress, the Agreement Between the United Nations and the United States of America Regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations was brought into effect November 21, 1947, defining the rights and obligations of the United States and the United Nations with respect to the above-mentioned site; and

Whereas plans have been prepared for construction on said site of permanent headquarters of the United Nations to cost not more than $65,000,000, and the United Nations is ready to proceed with such construction as soon as financing can be provided; and

Whereas the present temporary headquarters of the United Nations are inadequate for the efficient functioning of the organization and retention of its headquarters in the United States can be assured only by the erection of adequate permanent facilities; and

Whereas, owing to the current critical dollar shortage, the other member nations are not able to provide in cash at present their respective shares of the cost of constructing the permanent headquarters; other methods of borrowing the necessary funds have been found impracticable; and the permanent establishment of the headquarters of the United Nations in this country will result directly and indirectly in substantial economic benefits to the United States from the expenditures of the Organization and its member nations; and

Whereas, in view of the foregoing considerations, the United States representative at the seat of the United Nations, in response to an inquiry of the Secretary General of the United Nations regarding the possibility of a United States Government loan, informed the Secretary General, with the authorization of the President, by note dated October 29, 1947, that the President would recommend to the Congress the authorization of a loan from the United States to the United Nations for the construction of the headquarters in an amount not exceeding $65,000,000; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations, by resolution of November 20, 1947, authorized the Secretary General to negotiate such a loan with the appropriate officials of the United States Government, expressly recognizing that such loan would require the approval of the Congress; and

Whereas the United States Representative to the United Nations has negotiated and signed, on behalf of the United States an agreement with the United Nations in the form set forth below, providing for an interest-free loan of not more than $65,000,000 from the United States to the United Nations to be repaid in annual installments, and said agreement is, by its terms, to become effective on notification to the United Nations that the Congress, with the approval of the President, has made available the funds necessary to be advanced in accordance with the provisions of the agreement: Therefore be it

MRS. LORAINE THOMSEN

The bill (H. R. 4590) for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen was considered ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES W. ADKINS AND MARY CLARK ADKINS

The bill (H. R. 2849) for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DOUGLAS L. CRAIG

The bill (H. R. 4452) for the relief of Douglas L. Craig was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH M. HENRY

The bill (H. R. 2734) for the relief of Joseph M. Henry was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JENNESS C. THOMAS

The bill (H. R. 371) for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISS ROSELLA M. KOSTENBADER

The bill (H. R. 1642) for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GERALD S. FURMAN

The bill (H. R. 4518) for the relief of Gerald S. Furman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH LEE CREGG

The bill (H. R. 564) for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUBREY F. HOUSTON

The bill (H. R. 2889) for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM C. REESE

The bill (H. R. 3937) for the relief of William C. Reese was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN WATKINS

The bill (H. R. 6224) for the relief of John Watkins was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HORACE J. FENTON

The bill (S. 2504) for the relief of Horace J. Fenton, former associate professor at the United States Naval Academy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Horace J. Fenton, formerly an associate professor at the United States Naval Academy, the sum of $100 per month for the remainder of his life, beginning with the month in which this act is approved, chargeable to such appropriations as may be made for the payment of retirement annuities to civilian members of the teaching staff of the United States Naval Academy and post graduate schools.

SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS

The bill (H. R. 6089) to amend the act of July 6, 1945, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The bill (H. R. 4917) to provide benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) to authorize the issuance of a special series of a stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TOBEY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

THOMAS A. HANLEY

The bill (H. R. 2552) for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUARDIAN OF ROBERT LEE THREATT

The bill (H. R. 1910) for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF DAVID JEFFERSON JANOW, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 2431) for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH R. PENDLETON

The resolution (S. Res. 256) to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 2834) for the relief of Elizabeth R. Pendleton was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2834) entitled "A bill for the relief of Elizabeth R. Pendleton," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims pursuant to section 151 of the Judicial Code, as amended; and such court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such section and report to the Senate, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

MRS. MARY H. OVERALL AND THOMAS I. BAKER

The bill (H. R. 3427) for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADNEY W. GRAY

The bill (H. R. 581) for the relief of Adney W. Gray was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAPT. CARROLL C. GARRETSON

The bill (H. R. 3261) for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK A. CONSTABLE

The bill (H. R. 2269) for the relief of Frank A. Constable was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE

The bill (S. 2869) to amend the act of December 8, 1944, authorizing the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This bill is identical with Calendar No. 1810, House bill 6822, and without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of that bill.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6822) to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2869 is indefinitely postponed.

TRANSFER OF LAND AT BROWNSVILLE, TEX., TO THE INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION

The bill (S. 2691) authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is hereby authorized to accept by transfer without reimbursement or exchange of funds, and to assume permanent custody and control over, in connection with the lower Rio Grande flood-control project under the jurisdiction of said United States Section, that portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, described as follows: Tract 1, Fort Brown—A tract containing two hundred and forty-one and six one-hundredths acres in the Espiritu Santo Grant in Cameron County, Tex., out of and a part of the Fort Brown military reservation as shown on map recorded in volume 8, page 23, of the Map Records of Cameron County, Tex.; tract 2 borrow area.—A tract containing seventeen and four-tenths acres in share No. 19 of the Espiritu Santo Grant, Cameron County, Tex., conveyed to the United States of America by deed from Carrie M. Combe, individually and as independent executrix of the estate of Frederick J. Combe, deceased, recorded in volume 322, page 352, of the Deed Records of Cameron County, Tex.; both of said tracts being shown on drawing No. 4311-RC-12, San Benito, Tex., January 15, 1947, of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, United States Section, designated "Flood Control Project—Lower Rio Grande, Tex.—Fort Brown Military Reservation" and on field notes attached thereto, which drawing and field notes are on file with said United States Section, and with the War Assets Administration, said property having heretofore been declared surplus to the War Assets Administration; and the War Assets Administration, or other Federal agency in responsible charge, is authorized and directed to transfer said property to the said

United States Section without reimbursement or exchange of funds.

SEC. 2. There shall likewise be transferred to said United States Section, in connection with the transfer of said land, that certain building thereon situate known and numbered as warehouse building 252.

SEC. 3. The improvements on said land, except warehouse building 252, may be sold by the War Assets Administration under its existing authority, for use on the premises where now situated, subject to the provision that such use shall be in conformity with the terms and conditions of licenses to be issued therefor by the Secretary of State under the authority of the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 906, 22 U. S. C., sec. 277e), and provided that such licenses shall not be inconsistent with the primary purpose of flood control and the use of said land as a floodway, as determined by the Secretary of State. Any such improvements not sold for use on the premises may be sold by the War Assets Administration for removal from the premises within 1 year from the date of sale. To the extent that any such improvements are not sold under the provisions hereof within a period of 1 year from the effective date of this act, title thereto shall remain in the United States, and jurisdiction and control thereover shall vest in the said United States Section.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of State shall, in order to assure beneficial public use of this land not inconsistent with the primary purpose of flood control, grant a license or licenses to the city of Brownsville, Tex., under the authority of the act of August 27, 1935, to use portions of the lands transferred to the United States Section under this act for municipal parks, golf courses, museums, athletic fields, including stadiums, and other public purposes not inconsistent with the primary purpose of flood control and with the use of said land as a floodway, as determined by the Secretary of State and subject to such terms and conditions as may in the opinion of the Secretary of State be necessary to protect the interests of the United States: *Provided*, That application is made by the city of Brownsville for such license or licenses within a period of 1 year from the effective date of this act: *Provided further*, That such license or licenses shall not be inconsistent with those granted under section 3 hereof for the use of the improvements therein specified: *And provided further*, That except for this provision granting to the city of Brownsville a preferential right for 1 year to be granted a license or licenses, nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying or impairing the authority of the Secretary of State over said lands under said act of August 27, 1935.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES FEES

The bill (H. R. 6293) to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STAMP COMMEMORATIVE OF THE ROUGH RIDERS

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 305) authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of Rough Riders of the Spanish-American War was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

SURVIVOR ANNUITIES

The bill (S. 2740) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may I ask my colleague whether he conferred with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] about this bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; I did not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may explain that the Senator from Maryland introduced this bill, and I was talking to him a moment ago, just before he had to go to a conference, and I volunteered to state his position on the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield, there is on the calendar order of business 1812, a similar bill, which has been reported by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I am advised that the House will probably accept the Senate version of the bill, and I was about to suggest that House bill 6641 be taken up for immediate consideration, and then I shall offer the Senate bill as a substitute for the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6641) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I move that the bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the text of Senate bill 2740.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: "Any such annuitant who died during the period beginning on February 29, 1948, and ending on April 30, 1948, leaving a surviving wife or husband, shall be deemed to have made the election authorized in the foregoing proviso and to have named such wife or husband to receive an annuity as provided in such proviso, but no such annuity shall become due or payable to such wife or husband prior to April 1, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 270 will be indefinitely postponed.

E. BREVARD WALKER

The bill (H. R. 4644) for the relief of E. Brevard Walker was considered for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES D. SIGLER

The bill (H. R. 1220) for the relief of James D. Sigler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICHARD T. CHARETT

The bill (S. 617) for the relief of Richard T. Charett was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mary Signorile, of Stamford, Conn., mother of Richard T. Charett, minor son of Lucien Charett, formerly of the United States Marine Corps Reserve, the sum of $1,140, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for payment of the amounts which would have been payable on behalf of the said Richard T. Charett under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 for the period of his father's active service in the Marine Corps, if timely application for payment of such amounts had been made: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contracts to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

WINONA MACHINE & FOUNDRY CO.

The bill (H. R. 1779) for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALAMO IRRIGATION CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2049) for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That interest which accrued on said note from August 7, 1946, to June 17, 1947, in the sum of $1,193.50 is hereby waived and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause the proper entries to be made in the accounting records of the Department of Agriculture to effect such waiver.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

MEDICAL CARE FOR PHILIPPINE VETERANS

The bill S. 2861 was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senators will withhold their objection a moment, I may say that this bill was introduced at the request of Mr. Emmet O'Neal, the American Ambassador to the Philippines. It relates to hospital care for Philippine veterans who are members of the United States Army. For a long time there has been a question as to how far Filipino veterans of the United States Army should be permitted to participate in the GI bill of rights, and in general the benefits have been denied to them. That question has arisen partly because it was felt that it was difficult to identify a good many of the guerrillas and the bill originally introduced covered a great many different fields. The bill now under discussion has been cut down to one field of assistance for these Filipino veterans, that is, in the field of hospitalization.

There is no question that large numbers of Filipinos were wounded, and this program will provide approximately 3,000 beds in the Philippines for the care of Filipino veterans. It seems to me they are clearly entitled to such care.

There cannot be any question that there may be benefited some guerrillas who were not regular members of the Army, because after all many more than 3,000 Filipino veterans were wounded. There is no question that from the time action started, on Bataan, many thousands of them were wounded, and many thousands of them require hospital care for injuries actually suffered in the battles of the United States against Japan. It seemed to the committee that the very least we could do was to provide a hospital program for these veterans. They were full-fledged members of the United States Army. They fought for the United States. At the time they fought they were American citizens who were members of our Army, but they have since been excluded by reason of the place of their domicile, and by reason of the fact that it was not considered wise to make the provisions made for American veterans applicable to them; so they have been denied hospital service. Pictures were exhibited to the committee showing the squalid conditions in the hospitals where these veterans are.

I feel that anyone who has investigated this situation would be willing to have the $10,000,000 used for this purpose, which represents a very small fraction of the total veterans' hospital program in the country for the care of these men who fought for the United States.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, section 3 of the bill authorizes grants of $22,500,000.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; $22,500,000. I thought it was $10,000,000.

Mr. CORDON. Section 4 provides for payment for a period of not to exceed 5 years for such reimbursement to the Republic of the Philippines, and then provides that the total sum of the grants shall not exceed $3,285,000 a year.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. It was thought that by the end of 5 years we might make some arrangement with the Philippine Government to have them take over the hospitals in some general settlement. For the time being, the hospitals will be operated at a cost of $3,000,000, and $22,500,000 is for the construction of three or four new hospitals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2861) to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment on page 2, line 24, after the word "made", to insert "for a period not to exceed 5 years", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to assist the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for veterans, as defined in section 2 of this act, who are in need of hospitalization for disabilities, determined by the Veterans' Administration under laws which it administers to be connected with the service described in such section, the President is authorized, subject to the provisions of this act, to furnish aid in the form of grants to the Republic of the Philippines (a) for the construction and equipping of hospitals in the Philippines to be used exclusively for such medical care and treatment, and (b) for expenses incident to such medical care and treatment in either the hospitals so constructed and equipped or other hospitals in the Philippines.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of section 1 of this act, the term "veterans" means persons who served in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the service of the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941, including among such military forces organized guerrilla forces under commanders appointed, designated, or subsequently recognized by the Commander in Chief, Southwest Pacific Area, or other competent authority in the Army of the United States, and who were discharged or released from such service under conditions other than dishonorable.

SEC. 3. Any grant for the construction and equipping of a hospital may be made prior to or following its completion: *Provided*, That the total of such grants shall not exceed $22,500,000.

SEC. 4. Grants for expenses incident to hospitalization may be made for a period not to exceed 5 years to reimburse the Republic of the Philippines for moneys expended for such hospitalization: *Provided*, That the total of such grants shall not exceed $3,285,000 for any fiscal year.

SEC. 5. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations and impose such conditions on the receipt of financial aid as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act; and he may delegate in whole or in part the authority conferred upon him by this act to any officer or officers of the United States.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES

The bill (S. 2795) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be temporarily passed over until we reach House bill 6527, Calendar No. 1765. That bill will be reached in a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. House bill 6527 can be taken up at this time in lieu of Senate bill 2795 if the Senator desires to have that done.

Mr. TAFT. Then, Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6527 instead of the Senate bill.

The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to object, but I should want to speak on the amendment. There is an amendment to the Senate bill.

Mr. TAFT. I was about to move to strike out all after the enacting clause in the House bill and to insert in lieu thereof Senate bill 2795, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio wish to insert the Senate bill, as amended, in lieu of the House text?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, I offer the Senate bill, as amended, as an amendment to the House bill, and in lieu of the House text.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent to strike out all after the enacting clause of House bill 6527, and to insert the text of Senate bill 2795, as reported with amendments from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am in favor of the purposes of the bill, but the Senate committee adopted an amendment to which I am very much opposed. The situation in my State is as follows. I only cite one outstanding case: At Grand Prairie, Tex., there were, during the war, two large aviation plants constructing airplanes. Workers flocked in from everywhere. The community received school aid from the Federal Government by reason of the increase in population resulting from the war work. Recently, however, the Navy has acquired the properties of the former airplane companies and the plants have been reactivated, and workers are coming in there to work in the plants. Because the property belongs to the Navy the city authorities can derive no taxes from the property for the maintenance of their schools. So we think that is a comparable case to the war situation, because it is a Government activity, it is Government property, it is free of taxes, and we think that school district should be included within the terms of the bill. But under the amendment of the Senate committee it would be excluded. There would be no aid for a situation of that kind. This is an outstanding case, and unless the amendment is rejected the schools in that area will not be able to operate more than 4 or 5 months in the year.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the committee feels very strongly that we should not begin to extend again the business of paying for public schools because of some Federal installation had in peacetime. During the war, because of the tremendous emergency and the great number of camps which were established, as well as the various kinds of plants which were built, we undertook to aid local school districts with Federal money to a certain extent.

The attempt which was made in the language which the committee struck out was that if the Federal Government undertakes a new project, if the Federal Government opens up a new airport, if it starts a new Federal institution within a State, it shall pay the expense of the school districts in the neighborhood which are in some way affected by the tax situation. Certainly I do not think any such general policy should be

adopted through the Federal Works Administration. After all every State comes here begging the Federal Government to establish airports, or erect war plants, and it seems to me that if they want them, and it involves some expense to them, yet there is as against that the tremendous economic advantage which they derive from the establishment of such plants and airports, so the States themselves ought to provide for the payment to the school districts. We have wanted to cut off this program which has dragged on from year to year, which was left over from the war situation, but now it is proposed to open it up again and say that new Federal institutions installed shall begin to pay the cost of the school districts of the neighborhood. Of course the Navy pays for the education of the children of the naval personnel; it pays for the education of the children of its contractors, but when it comes to paying for the education of children of persons who gather around and open stores and generally build up the community, it seems to me the Federal Government should not be involved in any such new program. So the committee feels that the Senate bill should not be amended by reinserting the original provision.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no argument with the Senator about the general policy. I think we ought to get out of this thing as soon as we can. But in the situation I mentioned it is not a case of a new project being established at all. It was a war project, and the Government extended aid to the schools. Now instead of remaining with the Army, the Navy takes over title to the property.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I ask the Senator from Texas where the project is about which he is speaking.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is at Grand Prairie, Tex., which is near Dallas. Two tremendous airplane factories were built there during the war.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I make a comment on that?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. In the town of Stratford, Conn., during the war there was a plant making aircraft. That plant employed 8,000 workers. Most of those workers with their families came into the community to work in the plant due to the war situation, and we were going along very nicely with this aircraft development. The town of Stratford and the State of Connecticut did not ask one nickel from the Federal Government to help with the school program.

Now the Chance Vought Co., which builds aircraft, is going to move to Dallas, Tex., and thus take one of the main industries out of our community and move it to Texas, and the State of Connecticut will be asked to contribute to Federal funds to maintain schools for that particular purpose. Mr. President, I shall vote for the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has 2 minutes left.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yielded to the Senator from Connecticut for a question, and we have listened to an oration from him.

Mr. BALDWIN. The question, Mr. President, is whether substantial justice is involved in a situation of that kind.

Mr. CONNALLY. Except for this particular amendment there is no change in the bill. Under the other provisions of the bill aid is given to schools all over the country. In the case I cited the property involved is Navy property. It is owned by the Navy. The Navy pays not one dollar in taxes to the community. Under the bill, if the amendment is defeated, the expenses of education would not be paid by the Government; it would simply mean that the town of Grand Prairie will continue to levy its taxes and attempt to maintain its schools. But it is fair and sound that the Government should contribute something for the maintenance of these schools, because by the ownership of this Federal property engaged in war work—it may be in peacetime, but it is war work—the Navy is carrying on its activities.

I appeal to the Senate to reject the amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in my own State there is a perfect illustration of this problem, involving a new project started since the war. The Army Air Corps is building a $25,000,000 air base in a very small town in northern Maine, at Limestone. It has taken almost half of the geographical area of the town, a town of three or four thousand inhabitants. Obviously it is utterly impossible for this community to furnish schooling for the vast number of children who will come there during the 2 years of the construction period. Following that, when it is determined how much of an Army installation will be there—there may be two or three thousand school children—I assume that the project will be worked out on some equitable basis as between the Federal Government and the town. But in the intervening year or two certainly that little community cannot build the school houses and provide the facilities. It is a perfect illustration of the complete equity of the Federal Government being authorized to take care of a situation such as that.

I hope that those responsible may devise some way in which the problem can be met. If it is not met it will be most unfortunate for everyone concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 2795?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2795) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "that" to strike out "(a)"; on page 2, line 5, after "facilities" to strike out the comma and "or (b) have become overburdened with defense-incurred school enrollments as the result of the reactivation or expansion of any defense establishment or the operation of any new defense establishment"; and in line 12, after the words "the sum of" to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to make, in the same manner as heretofore authorized, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, contributions for the operation and maintenance of school facilities to local school agencies requiring assistance that are still overburdened with school enrollments caused by war activities and the transition from war to peacetime conditions and have received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, Federal contributions administered by the Federal Works Administrator for the operation and maintenance of their school facilities.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out this act, including administrative expenses therefor, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, not to exceed the sum of $5,000,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments to the Senate bill. Therefore the first question submitted to the Senate will be in connection with Senate bill 2795. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 7, after the word "that", it is proposed to strike out "(a)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the comma after the word "facilities," and down to and including the word "establishment" in line 8.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 12, to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas asks for a division. On which amendment does the Senator from Texas desire a division?

Mr. CONNALLY. On the amendment on page 2, beginning in line 5.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Announcement of the vote has been made. Is there objection to returning——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, that was the vote on the first amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has announced, in both cases, that the amendments of the committee have been agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. I called for a division.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair now asks the Senate if it has any objection to reconsideration of the vote by which the first committee amendment was agreed to, for the purpose of a division? The Chair hears none.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote on the other committee amendment will stand.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer. First I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senate still considering Senate bill 2795?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is undertaking to perfect Senate bill 2795 before substituting it for the text of House bill 6527.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is an amendment in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An amendment is in order.

Mr. CAPEHART. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. JENNER] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana on behalf of himself and his colleague will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 12, before the period it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That of the amount herein authorized to be appropriated not less than $14,500 shall be available for contributions to the Charlestown Township School (Pleasant Ridge School), Charlestown, Ind."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall be obliged to oppose this amendment. We could have a great list of special schools if we were to start enacting special legislation for individual school districts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] for himself and his colleague [Mr. JENNER].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to substitute the amended text of Senate bill 2795 for the text of House bill 6527, after striking out all after the enacting clause in the latter bill. Is there objection to the consideration of House bill 6527?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments.

INFLATION INCREASES COST OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think this is about as good an opportunity as any other to invite the attention of the Senate to the underlying cause of these increasing demands upon the Federal Treasury for expenditures for local purposes.

Every Member of Congress knows that bill after bill is presented, and bill after bill is passed, increasing the expenditures of the Federal Government to take care of functions which ordinarily are performed by local government or State government.

The primary reason for this is the fact that Congress has chosen to do nothing whatever about the continued concentration of control over our economy in the hands of a few large industrial and commercial groups.

Another cause is the fact that the Congress has deliberately chosen to do nothing about inflation. I hold in my hand a copy of the Journal of Commerce, published in New York, issue of yesterday. The lead story is devoted to an interview given the day before by President Charles E. Wilson, of the General Electric Co., at a press conference, in which Mr. Wilson undertook to explain why, in his opinion, it has become necessary for the General Electric Co. to increase its prices. Only a few months ago the General Electric Co. filled the newspapers of the country, with expensive advertisements announcing a reduction of prices on some products.

I sought at that time to bring about some action by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to look into the method by which the management of concentrated business fixes the prices the public must pay. My efforts to date have been altogether unsuccessful. Now prices are rising again. And Congress is about to adjourn.

According to the New York Journal of Commerce, Mr. Wilson, at his press conference announcing the rise, pointed to what he called two outstanding facts:

1. The company has been hit by an additional $72,000,000 annual bill in the form of higher wages, salaries, materials, and transportation costs, which is being only partially offset by the price rises.

2. The company can hold the line at these new levels only providing expenses, including the costs of parts and components bought from suppliers, don't skyrocket further.

Then the story goes on as follows:

Mr. Wilson made it plain that about the only hope he now saw for resuming the price-cutting trend lay in the direction of technological improvements in production and in distribution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article in the New York Journal of Commerce may be printed at length in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, from the article which I have just read, it would appear that we can depend only on technological improvements for any fight against inflation, according to Mr. Wilson.

However, I think Mr. Wilson is wrong. It is my conviction, from the information at my disposal, that the profits of the General Electric Co. and of other industrial giants are so great that they can absorb all or most of the increased wages which are necessary if their employees and the masses of the people are to be enabled to continue to purchase the products of industry at steadily rising price levels.

This contention I think is supported by a very interesting article appearing in the United States News and World Report for June 18, on concentration of buying power. As everyone knows, the United States News cannot be regarded as a radical publication. Mr. David Lawrence, whose opposition to radicalism is well known, is the editor of this very valuable weekly magazine.

The article to which I refer shows that 14 percent of the people whose incomes were $5,000 or more received, in 1947, 40 percent of the total money income received by all individuals, before taxes. Even more striking than that is the fact that, according to this article, the top one-fifth of the population received 48 percent of the income, and the top three-tenths received 60 percent. Of course that means that seven-tenths of the people, the vast majority, received only 30 percent of the total money income in 1947. It is this disproportion, this maldistribution of income, which lies at the basis of all economic unrest. This is the underlying fact which makes it absolutely essential that the Congress of the United States take some action to prevent continued rise of prices. Unless it is stopped it will destroy the market upon which General Electric and all the other industrial giants depend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the United States News article on concentration of buying power be published in the RECORD immediately following the article from the New York Journal of Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, under the 5-minute rule there is not time for me to discuss this matter as fully as it should be discussed. I am having prepared an analysis of the income and profits of the General Electric Co. I shall seek another opportunity to lay the results of that analysis before the Senate.

I shall do this because I believe that this Congress should not adjourn without taking positive and constructive action to prevent the continuing increase of prices, of which the announcement by General Electric this week is only a single instance. Congress is neglecting its duty to the masses of the people by its failure to do anything about inflation.

It is absurd for Congress to allow itself to be driven to increase Government spending as we do by this bill, reported by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] because we fail to do anything about inflation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

EXHIBIT A

GE LIFTS PRICES AS WAGE-LINE FIGHT COLLAPSES—"THIRD ROUND" DECIDES ISSUE AFTER PROLONGED EFFORT TO TURN SPIRAL

(By Shelly Pierce)

A general upward revision of prices is being placed into effect by General Electric Co., Charles E. Wilson, president, announced here yesterday.

Behind that announcement lies a story of a desperate and losing battle by industry to stem the rising tide of inflation by holding the wage line and cutting prices. Such industrial giants as United States Steel, Westinghouse, and General Electric spearheaded the drive.

And yesterday's General Electric announcement confirmed the fears, which had been expressed in many quarters, that the effect of the "third-round" of wage rises would be too much. Speculation was stimulated as to how long Big Steel could hold out against

the demands of the CIO for a reopening and upward revision of its wage contract.

REASONS FOR MORE

Two outstanding facts were spotlighted by Mr. Wilson at the press conference announcing the rise:

1. The company has been hit by an additional $72,000,000 annual bill in the form of higher wages, salaries, materials and transportation costs, which is being only partially offset by the price rises.

2. The company can hold the line at these new levels only providing expenses, including the costs of parts and components bought from suppliers, don't skyrocket further.

Mr. Wilson made it plain that about the only hope he now saw for resuming the price-cutting trend lay in the direction of technological improvements in production and in distribution.

The price increases announced by Mr. Wilson wiped out partially, and in some cases completely, the two major price reductions announced earlier this year.

IRREGULAR ADVANCES

In a few cases, the advances will exceed the amount of the original announcements.

Fractional horsepower electric motors will remain at a price level 5 percent below the 1947 price, for instance, by virtue of the withdrawal of one of the two 1947 cuts of 5 percent each. Switch gear and distribution transformers have had the price cuts withdrawn.

Certain radio models are higher. For example, a table model television set is now priced at $325 compared with $299.50 earlier this year. But an AM-FM table-model radio remains unchanged at $69.95 compared with $89.15 in December 1947. All standard washing machines are $10.20 higher. But in a long list of such items as electric ironers, toasters, coffee makers, vacuum cleaners, and the like, no changes at all have been made.

It was stressed by the General Electric head that the upward revision of prices will not take the form of a uniform across-the-board percentage rise. Every line, he explained, will be separately considered and prices adjusted in terms of the effect of higher labor, material, and transportation costs. New schedules for certain products have been determined and already put into effect; others are undergoing analysis.

COST FACTORS

Reemphasizing the reluctance with which he announced the collapse of the GE hold-the-line price policy, Mr. Wilson detailed the factors which made it impossible to go on. The recent 8-percent wage rise (9 to 15 cents an hour) was the biggest factor. It was estimated that new wage and salary increases will add more than $50,000,000 a year directly to labor costs.

And it was in giving this figure that Mr. Wilson significantly underscored the fact that the price changes announced and now being computed do not provide for still higher costs which may arise from wage demands upon GE suppliers.

In addition to the wage rises, Mr. Wilson said, there has been added to GE costs some $22,000,000 a year by virtue of higher transportation costs and higher prices for the things that GE buys from its suppliers.

Though Mr. Wilson did not name the motor companies (which announced third-round rises), it was plain that he had them in mind when he expressed the keenest regret over his company's failure to sell at lower prices and resist wage demands.

SOUGHT WIDER MARKET

"We were fighting for a price level that would encourage the widest possible market," he said. "We wanted to provide the needed facilities for more jobs and to reduce the cost of living for everyone.

"Unfortunately, not every segment of industry was able to hold the line and we are now faced with the necessary adjustments due to the cost of doing business.

"During the past several months we have exerted our best efforts within our organization in the communities in which we operate and with other companies and industries to fight inflation with increased production, expanded facilities, and lowered manufacturing costs," he said.

LED MOVE FOR CUTS

The action of General Electric in revising prices now is particularly significant in view of the fact that the company through Charles E. Wilson, president, took the lead in efforts to reverse the inflationary spiral by effecting two price reductions earlier this year. Mr. Wilson said that industry must take the initiative in the matter.

General Electric's efforts to stabilize the price level follow similar attempts early in 1947 by the Ford Motor Co. and the International Harvester Co.

FIRST PRICE CUT

The first price reduction announced by General Electric went into effect January 1 and it ranged from 3 to 10 percent, and averaged better than 5 percent. It was estimated that it would result in savings to consumers of better than $50,000,000 a year. It covered a number of appliances in popular demand such as refrigerators, radios, and television receivers and electric ranges. Prices were also cut on components which were supplied to other manufacturers in order to encourage price reductions on their finished products as well.

The company left a loophole for a reversal of its new policy a that time, however. Mr. Wilson's announcement stated that the company expected to maintain the lower prices unless the company is faced with further increases in labor costs, the situation which has now occurred.

SECOND REDUCTION MADE

Another price reduction was announced effective April 16. This was a 5-percent cut in prices of fractional horsepower motors, switch gear, conventional transformers, lightning arresters, feeder regulators, cut-outs, and power capacitors. It was estimated that these reductions would save customers about $10,000,000 a year on a $200,000,000 volume.

The company's annual report said that during 1947, as a consequence of the continuing upward spiral of wages and prices generally, and notwithstanding the fullest possible utilization of advantages offered by large volume, technological improvements, and modern plant facilities, it was impossible for the company to absorb all of the higher operating costs.

EXHIBIT B

CONCENTRATION OF BUYING POWER—TENTH OF FAMILIES WITH THIRD OF INCOME

(Income still is concentrated in the hands of relatively few United States families. Big pay raises won by millions of workers have not produced any real leveling of incomes. Official survey shows this. In 1947, 10 percent of families had 23 percent of total personal income. That is where the big market is to be found for durable goods.)

The big pay increases won by millions of workers in 1947 failed to produce the marked leveling of incomes that many expected. Buying power, as measured by the distribution of personal incomes, still is massed in the hands of relatively few families.

A new Nation-wide sampling survey of "spending units"—households in which incomes and expenses are pooled—makes this clear. This survey is the third annual sampling of consumers, made for the Federal Reserve Board by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center.

As shown by part II of that study, just made public, here is what happened to income distribution in 1947:

High-income people still make up only a small portion of the population, but they account for a major part of the national total of personal incomes.

Above $5,000 of annual income, as the chart on this page shows, there were only 14 percent of the 48,400,000 spending units in 1947. This 14 percent of the people got 40 percent of the total personal income.

In 1946, the survey showed that spending units with more than $5,000 of income made up 10 percent of the population and got 31 percent of the income.

Above $7,500 of income, there were 5 percent of the spending units in 1947. This 5 percent got 24 percent of the personal income.

In 1946, the group above $7,500 of income made up 4 percent of the spending units. This group got 20 percent of the total personal income that year.

Middle-income people, in spending units with $3,060 to $4,999 of income, accounted for 27 percent of the population and 31 percent of the income in 1947.

In 1946, people in this income group made up 25 percent of the population, and got 33 percent of the income.

Low-income people, in spending units with less than $3,000 of income, were by far the most numerous group. At this income level, there were 59 percent of the spending units in 1947, and they got 29 percent of the total personal income.

In 1946, this group contained 65 percent of the total of spending units, and accounted for 36 percent of the income.

Concentration of income is shown even more strikingly when the population is divided into tenths that are classified according to income received.

The top tenth consists of spending units with more than $5,700 of income. These received 33 percent, or almost exactly one-third, of the total personal income in 1947.

The second tenth—those with $4,200 to $5,700 of income—got 15 percent of the total in 1947.

The third tenth—the spending units with $3,500 to $4,200 of income—received 12 percent of the total in 1947.

Here, then, are 30 percent of United States families or spending units getting 60 percent of the personal incomes earned by the whole population. This 30 percent represents 14,520,000 spending units. The remaining 33,330,000 spending units divide up to 40 percent of the personal income.

The relative share of each tenth of the population from top to bottom was almost exactly the same in 1947 as in 1946.

Thus, even though many families in the lower and middle brackets moved up into higher brackets in 1947, the relative distribution of income among the whole population remained just about unchanged.

Moreover, as the survey report points out, millions of workers, including many who moved into the upper-income bracket, found that their income gains barely kept pace with the rise in the cost of living. This suggests that the market for high-priced goods may not be so broad as might be inferred from the bare figures on income increases.

Income changes in 1947, as reported by the survey, showed this:

About 24,000,000 spending units, or half the total covered by the survey, earned more money in 1947 than in 1946. Only about 9,000,000 earned less.

Personal earnings increased about $20,000,000,000.

The number of spending units earning as much as $5,000 a year increased by about 2,500,000 during 1947. There was a similar reduction in the number below $3,000. Because they are rounded, the official percentage figures on the changes at each income level do not produce exactly these totals.

Despite these shifts, there still were six households with less than $5,000 for every-

one with more than $5,000. There were three times as many below $4,000 as above $4,000, and nearly half again as many below $3,000 as above $3,000. Only one out of 20 spending units had as much as $7,500 of income in 1947.

The top 2,400,000 spending units made twice as much money as the bottom 17,400,000 units.

Occupational groups varied widely in the amount of their pay increases in 1947 over 1946.

This is shown by what happened to the median income of spending units headed by persons in the various occupations. Median income is the middle income for each group—in other words, half earn more than the median, half less. Changes in the median for each group are shown in the chart below.

Business executives, managers, and self-employed persons, got the biggest gains. The median rose from $3,700 in 1946 to $4,500 in 1947. In this group, 45 percent got more than $5,000, and only 30 percent got less than $3,000.

Professional people just about held their own. The median for both 1946 and 1947 was $4,000. Forty percent got more than $5,000, and 27 percent got less than $3,000.

Clerks and salesmen got a $300 gain in median income, from $2,600 to $2,900. In this group, 15 percent earned more than $5,000, and 52 percent earned less than $3,000.

Skilled and semiskilled workers advanced from a $2,700 to a $3,000 median income. Nine percent got more than $5,000.

Unskilled workers got an increase in median income from $1,600 to $1,800. Almost none received more than $5,000, and 86 percent earned less than $3,000.

Farm operators, on the basis of cash income only, had a median of $1,500 in 1947, a $200 advance over 1946. In cash, 8 percent of the farmers got more than $5,000, and 79 percent got less than $3,000. However, this does not accurately picture the condition of farmers, as their nonmoney income is not included.

The big market for new automobiles, new houses and other high-priced goods appears, on the basis of current income, to be among business and professional people.

More than half the spending units headed by these two groups are in the upper 24 percent of the population, which commands 53 percent of the total of personal income.

Professional persons merely held their own in 1947, so far as median income was concerned, yet they still rank next to the business group.

Business executives seem to be the ones who are riding out this period of high living costs most comfortably. Median income of the managerial and self-employed group rose $800 in 1947. The top median increase for any other occupational group was only $300.

This suggests that the most concentrated buying power is to be found among the 50 percent of business managers and self-employed persons whose 1947 earnings were above the $4,500 median for the whole group.

Other points that should be noted in appraising the market outlined by the consumer survey are these:

Median income for all spending units in 1947 was $2,550. It was $2,300 in 1946 and $2,020 in 1945.

Pay increases were reported for 1947 by three-fifths of all spending units with incomes above $3,000. Forty-five percent of those between $1,000 and $3,000 got increases. Only one-quarter of those below $1,000 got raises.

Big gains in income were reported most frequently in the group between $5,000 and $7,500. In that group, 26 percent said they had at least 25 percent more income in 1947 than in 1946. In the group from $4,000 to $5,000, 23 percent had increases of more than one-fourth. The same report was made by 18 percent of those above $7,500, which also was the average for all units.

Big losses in income were reported least frequently by high-income groups. Among those over $5,000, only 4 percent suffered as much as a 25-percent decrease in income last year. Out of the whole number of spending units, 8 percent had decreases of that amount.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or post-war national-defense-incurred, enrollments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming interrupted the Chair's recital of the rather complicated order in connection with House bill 6527 and Senate bill 2795.

Without objection, the arrangement will be perfected as indicated in the previous announcement. That is to say, without objection, House bill 6527 is amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of Senate bill 2795 as now amended.

The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2795 is indefinitely postponed.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI HOME LOANS

The bill (S. 2790) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio, who is in charge of the bill, whether this bill will be necessary if a housing bill is passed.

Mr. TAFT. It seemed wise to have this bill passed. The most serious check on housing today apparently is the piling up of GI loans in the banks. This bill provides a secondary market for GI housing loans. There is such a provision, on a rather more elaborate scale, in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; but we are not certain whether that bill will be enacted.

I think this particular feature is the most important feature, certainly to veterans, of that bill.

We think this bill should be passed and at least be available for passage by the House if the general housing bill, which probably will go to conference, is not agreed upon or if this particular feature of it should be eliminated. This feature is not in the bill which the House is proposing to pass.

So it seems wise to pass a separate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment, on page 1, beginning in line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 511. (a) The Administrator is authorized under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consistent with this act, to purchase, at a price equal to the unpaid principal plus accrued interest, hereinafter referred to as "par," any real estate loan guaranteed under section 501 or 502 of this title: *Provided*, That, (1) such loan is offered to the Administrator for purchase within 5 years of the date of its orcgin by the lender to whom the evidence of guaranty was originally issued, (2) the original amount of any loan hereafter made shall not exceed $10,000, (3) the loan shall not be in default at the time of purchase, and (4) the seller shall enter into an agreement with the Administrator that at the option of the Administrator the seller will service the loan in return for a service charge at such rate, not in excess of 1 percent per annum of the unpaid balance, as may be provided in such agreement: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may sell any loan purchased under this section at a price not less than par, with the primary right of repurchase reserved to the original mortgagee.

And insert:

SEC. 511. (a) The Administrator is authorized under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consistent with this act, to purchase at a price equal to the unpaid principal plus accrued interest, hereinafter referred to as "par," any real-estate loan guaranteed under section 501 or 502 of this title: *Provided*, That (1) such loan is offered to the Administrator for purchase within 5 years of the date of its origin by the lender to whom evidence of guaranty was originally issued; (2) the original dollar amount of loans purchased from any seller pursuant to this section shall not exceed 66⅔ percent of the aggregate original dollar amount of all loans eligible for purchase pursuant to this section which such lender has originated, nor more than 66⅔ percent of the original dollar amount of the loans originated by such lender during any one calendar year; (3) the original amount of the loan shall not exceed $10,000; (4) the loan shall not be in default at the time of purchase; (5) no loan financing the purchase price of a dwelling on which construction is begun subsequent to August 1, 1948, shall be eligible for purchase unless such dwelling has been built and inspected in conformity with minimum construction standards prescribed by the Administrator; (6) the Administrator shall refuse to purchase any loan which in his judgment does not reflect acceptable credit or security standards in its origination; (7) loans made after August 1, 1948, shall be eligible for purchase only if made on standard forms prescribed by the Administrator; and (8) at the option of the Administrator, the seller shall enter into an agreement with the Administrator that the seller will service the loan in return for a service charge at such rate, not less than one-half of 1 percent nor more than 1 percent per annum, as may be provided in such agreement. The Administrator may sell any loan purchased under this section at a price not less than par, without recourse, and upon such terms and conditions, including restoration of the guaranty, as the Administrator may determine.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is hereby further amended by inserting immediately after

section 510 thereof the following new sections:

"SECONDARY MARKET

"SEC. 511. (a) The Administrator is authorized under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consistent with this act, to purchase at a price equal to the unpaid principal plus accrued interest, hereinafter referred to as 'par,' any real-estate loan guaranteed under section 501 or 502 of this title: *Provided*, That (1) such loan is offered to the Administrator for purchase within 5 years of the date of its origin by the lender to whom evidence of guaranty was originally issued; (2) the original dollar amount of loans purchased from any seller pursuant to this section shall not exceed 66⅔ percent of the aggregate original dollar amount of all loans eligible for purchase pursuant to this section which such lender has originated, nor more than 66⅔ percent of the original dollar amount of the loans originated by such lender during any one calendar year; (3) the original amount of the loan shall not exceed $10,000; (4) the loan shall not be in default at the time of purchase; (5) no loan financing the purchase price of a dwelling on which construction is begun subsequent to August 1, 1948, shall be eligible for purchase unless such dwelling has been built and inspected in conformity with minimum construction standards prescribed by the Administrator; (6) the Administrator shall refuse to purchase any loan which in his judgment does not reflect acceptable credit or security standards in its origination; (7) loans made after August 1, 1948, shall be eligible for purchase only if made on standard forms prescribed by the Administrator; and (8) at the option of the Administrator, the seller shall enter into an agreement with the Administrator that the seller will service the loan in return for a service charge at such rate, not less than one-half of 1 percent nor more than 1 percent per annum, as may be provided in such agreement. The Administrator may sell any loan purchased under this section at a price not less than par, without recourse, and upon such terms and conditions, including restoration of the guaranty, as the Administrator may determine.

"(b) For the purpose of this section the Secretary if the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Administrator such sums as he may request from time to time between the effective date of this section and the expiration of the period of time in which loans may be offered for purchase pursuant to the terms of this section. Such sums, together with all moneys received by the Administrator under this section, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States in a special deposit account, to be disbursed through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department. On sums so advanced by the Secretary of the Treasury, less those amounts deposited in miscellaneous receipts under subsection (d) hereof, the Administrator shall pay semiannually to the Treasurer of the United States interest at the rate or rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the deposit.

"(c) In order to make such sums available to the Administrator the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use, as a public-debt transaction, the proceeds of the sale of any security hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended are hereby extended to include such purposes.

"(d) The Administrator shall from time to time cause to be deposited into the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, such of the funds in the special deposit account referred to in subsection (b) hereof, as in his judgment are not needed for the purposes hereof, and after the last day on which the Administrator may purchase loans under this section, he shall, with due allowance for outstanding commitments, cause to be so deposited all sums in said account, and all moneys received thereafter, representing the repayment or recovery of the principal of obligations purchased pursuant to this section. Interest collected by the Administrator in excess of the amount payable by the Administrator to the Treasurer pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, together with any miscellaneous receipts or credits the disposition of which is not otherwise provided for herein, shall constitute a reserve for payment of losses, if any, and expenses incurred in the liquidation of said loans. Without regard to any other provisions or limitations of law or otherwise except the provisions of this title the Administrator shall have authority in carrying out the functions hereby or hereunder vested in him to exercise any and all rights of the United States, including without limitation, the right to take or cause to be taken such action as in his judgment may be necessary or appropriate for or in connection with the custody, management, protection, realization, and liquidation of assets, to determine the necessary expenses and expenditures and the manner in which the same shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for and audited, to invest available funds in obligations of the United States, to make such rules, regulations, requirements, and orders as he may deem necessary and appropriate, and to employ, utilize, compensate, and delegate any of the functions hereunder to, such persons and such corporate or other agencies, including agencies of the United States, as he may designate.

"INCONTESTABILITY

"SEC. 512. Any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator shall be conclusive as to the eligibility of the loan for guaranty or insurance under the provisions of this title and as to the original amount of such guaranty or insurance, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from establishing, as against a holder, defenses based on the fraud or material misrepresentation of such holder, and except that the Administrator shall not, by reason of anything contained in this section, be barred from establishing, under regulations in force at the date of such issuance or disbursement, whichever is the earlier, defenses to payment of any part of the guaranty or issuance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO PROVIDE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4816) to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment, on page 2, in line 3, after the words "less than", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $100,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendment; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ANDREWS of New York, Mr. SHORT, Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. BATES of Massachusetts, Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. KILDAY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HOPE, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin, Mr. FLANNAGAN, Mr. COOLEY, and Mr. PACE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 239. An act to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4071. An act to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; and

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to change the name of the Potholes Dam in the Columbian Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, together with a message from the House insisting upon its amendment and requesting a conference with the Senate thereon:

That (a) this act may be cited as the "Selective Service Act of 1948."

(b) The Congress declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

(c) That Congress further declares that such armed strength, to be adequate, requires an increase at the earliest practicable date in the number of persons on active service in the armed forces to not to exceed the manpower strengths authorized in section 2 of this act.

(d) The Congress further declares that if at any time such requisite manpower strengths are not attained and maintained by voluntary means, the national security requires that they be provided through a system of compulsory selective service.

(e) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of such service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selection as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, th enumber of persons on active service in the Army of the United States is hereby authorized to be 837,000; in the Navy, including the Marine Corps, the present statutory authorized strength of 666,882; and in the Air Force of the United States, 502,000: *Provided*, That the number of persons provided for in this section shall be construed to mean the daily average number of persons in the armed forces during the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the number of persons who are serving on active duty for training purposes only and the number of officer candidates shall be excluded in computing the number of persons within these authorized strengths or on active service.

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and of every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 31, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, except those aliens who have not declared their intention to become citizens thereof, who is between the ages of 19 and 28 at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 19 after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this act, shall be liable for service in the armed forces of the United States. The President is authorized from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the armed forces of the United States for service in the manner provided in this act such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain manpower strengths of the respective armed forces not to exceed those authorized by section 2 of this act: *Provided*, That no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this act until the President proclaims not earlier than 75 days after the date of enactment (1) that an insufficient number of persons is on active service in the armed forces to maintain an adequate national defense, and (2) that a sufficient number of such persons cannot, in his judgment, be attained by voluntary enlistment and by voluntary request for call to active duty. Immediately upon the issuance of such proclamation the provisions of this act authorizing the induction of persons into the armed forces and the ordering of persons into active service without their consent shall be effective, but no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this act prior to 90 days after the date of its enactment: *Provided*, That no person shall be inducted under this act before January 31, 1949: *Provided further*, That no person shall be inducted under this act on or after January 31, 1949, unless the President shall first find that the requisite manpower strengths of the armed forces have not been attained or maintained by an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are hereby authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment camaign. For the purposes of such campaign and notwithstanding any other provisions of law (a) original enlistments in the armed forces for periods of 2 years shall be accepted from among all age groups suitable for military service, with such enlistment privileges as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, which shall be the same or similar to the enlistment privileges now provided for enlistments for periods of more than 2 years and (b) reenlistments in the armed forces for periods of 1 or 2 years, at the option of the person so enlisted, shall be accepted with such reenlistment privileges as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, which shall be the same or similar to the enlistment privileges now provided for reenlistments for longer periods, and the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Air Force are further directed to report to the Congress before January 31, 1949.

No person shall be inducted for service under this act unless and until he is acceptable to the armed forces for such service and his physical and mental fitness for such service has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

No person shall be inducted for such training and service until adequate provision shall have been made for such shelter, sanitary facilities, water supplies, heating and lighting arrangements, medical care, and hospital accommodations, for such persons, as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to public and personal health.

Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be members of the Army of the United States; persons inducted into the naval forces of the United States pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be members of the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, as appropriate; and persons inducted into the air forces of the United States pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be members of the Air Force of the United States.

No person, without his consent, shall be inducted for service under this act except as otherwise provided herein, after he has attained the 26th anniversary of the day of his birth.

(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of this section shall serve for a period of 12 months, unless sooner discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

(c) No persons shall be inducted under paragraphs (1) and (2) above until and unless the President shall find, and so advise the President pro tempore of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, not before 3 months after the date of enactment of this act, that insufficient numbers of doctors of medicine, dentists, veterinarians, optometrists, osteopaths, and pharmacists have volunteered for service in the armed forces to maintain the ratios specified in said subsections. Upon such advice to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the authority in said subsections to induct persons into the armed forces shall become effective immediately.

(d) (1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of 19 and 26 shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section.

(2) Any enlisted member of any Reserve component of the armed forces may, during the effective period of this act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *And provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such Reserve component.

(e) The passing requirement for the General Classification Test shall be fixed at 70 points or less. The monthly requisitions on the President under this act by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force shall not exceed the number of men required after consideration of the actual number of voluntary enlistments during the 3 months preceding that month in which the requisition is made.

(f) Each person who hereafter is inducted, enlisted, or appointed and serves for a period of less than 3 years in one of the armed services and meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a Reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, shall be transferred to a Reserve component of the armed forces of the United States and shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component until he attains the age of 35, or until the expiration of a period of 5 years after such transfer, or until he is discharged from such Reserve component, whichever occurs first, and shall be subject to such additional service as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law for such component: *Provided*, That any person who completes at least 24 months of service in the armed forces under subsection (b), and who thereafter serves satisfactorily on active duty in the armed forces under a voluntary extension for a period of at least 1 year, which extension is hereby authorized, or in an organized unit of any Reserve component of any of the services for which he is entitled to receive pay for attendance at drill or equivalent duty for a period of at least 36 consecutive months, shall, in time of peace, be relieved from any liability under this subsection to serve in any Reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any such persons, while in a Reserve component of such forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such forces in accordance with other applicable laws.

SEC. 5. (a) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; members of the Reserve components of the armed forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by

the President, residing in the United States, and who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for service under section 4 (b).

(b) (1) No person who has been awarded the Purple Heart or who has served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of 12 months or more in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service on active duty with the armed forces or the Coast Guard, or in the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall without his consent be liable for induction for service under this act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

(2) Any person who, for service in the armed forces between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, has been authorized to wear any badge, award, or decoration or other authorized evidence of exceptional valor in the face of the enemy, bravery in combat, or continued service in combat, as determined under regulations prescribed by the President, shall be exempt from induction for service or call to active duty under this act, but not from registration.

(3) No person who has served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of 90 days or more but less than 12 months in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service on active duty with the armed forces or the Coast Guard, or in the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall without his consent be liable for induction for service under this act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, if—

(A) the local board determines that he is regularly enlisted or commissioned in an organized unit of a Reserve component of the armed force in which he served, provided such unit is reasonably accessible to such person without unduly interrupting his normal pursuits and activities, including attendance at a college or university in which he is regularly enrolled or in a Reserve component (other than in an organized unit) of the armed force in which he served in any case in which enlistment or commission in such organized unit is not available to him; or

(B) the local board determines that enlistment or commission in a Reserve component of the armed force in which he served is not available to him.

(c) For the purposes of computation of the periods of active duty referred to in subsection (b) of this section, no credit shall be allowed for—

(A) periods of active duty for training purposes;

(B) periods of active duty in which the service consisted solely of training under the Army specialized training program, the Army Air Force college training program, or any similar program under the jurisdiction of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard;

(C) periods of active duty as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or United States Coast Guard Academy, or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, or in a preparatory school after nomination as a principal, alternate, or candidate for admission to any of such academies, or

(D) periods of active duty in any of the armed forces while being processed for entry into or separation from any educational program or institution referred to in paragraphs (B) or (C).

(d) (1) Persons who on the effective date of this act, or who, prior to the date they are ordered to report for induction for service under this act, are members of the federally recognized National Guard, the federally recognized Air National Guard, the Officer's Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the National Reserve Corps, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast Guard Reserve, or the Public Health Service Reserve, and are not on active duty, and who serve therein for a total period of 6 years, during which they satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, shall be exempt from service by induction under the provisions of this act, but not from registration.

(2) Except as provided in subsection (b) and except as hereinafter provided, no person who shall become a member of a reserve component after the effective date of this act shall thereby be exempt from registration or service by induction or call to active duty under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That persons who, prior to attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months, are appointed to or enlisted in an organized unit of any of the reserve components of the armed forces mentioned in paragraph (1) of this subsection, which participate in scheduled drills and training periods throughout the year, shall, so long as they continue to be members of any of such components, be exempt from service by induction under the provisions of this act, but not from registration.

(e) (1) Any person who, on the effective date of this act, is enrolled in the advanced course, senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or is a member of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and has entered upon the junior or senior year, or is a midshipman, United State Naval Reserve, shall be deferred from induction for service under this act until the completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long thereafter as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall be required to register under section 3, but after completion or termination of the course of instruction may be ordered to active duty without his consent as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection.

(2) Within such number as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, on or after the effective date of this act, is selected for enrollment or elects to continue in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or who is appointed a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, or is a member of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and who is selected for enrollment or elects to continue in the course after the effective date of this act, and who agrees, in writing, to accept a commission if tendered and to serve, subject to call by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, for the same period of time as is required of an inductee under the terms of this bill on active duty after receipt of a commission, shall be deferred from induction for service under this act until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long thereafter as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall be required to register under section 3.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law or of this act except subsection 4 (a) and paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of this section, the President is hereby authorized to order into the active service of the armed forces of the United States, for a period not to exceed 24 consecutive months each, members of any or all Reserve components of the armed forces of the United States without their consent who prior to the effective date of this act have had less than 90 days' continuous active service in the armed forces of the United States, exclusive of periods of active training duty: *Provided*, That with respect to ordering members of the National Guard of the United States into the active service of the United States, the consent of the Governor of the State or Territory concerned, in each case, and for the District of Columbia, the consent of the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard, shall first be secured: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not be construed as repealing or abridging any existing law which authorizes the ordering of members of Reserve components into active service.

(f) Fully qualified and accepted aviation cadet applicants of the Army, Navy, and Air Force who have signed an agreement of service shall, in such numbers as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense, be deferred, during the period covered by the agreement but not to exceed 4 months, from induction for service under this act, but shall be required to register under section 3.

(g) The Vice President of the United States; the governors of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and all other officials chosen by the voters of the entire State, Territory, or possession; members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the several States, Territories, and possessions; judges of the courts of record of the United States and of the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia shall, while holding such offices, be deferred from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States.

(h) (1) The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are authorized and directed to accept enlistments for periods of 1 year in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, and the Air Force of the United States, respectively, from among qualified male persons between the ages of 18 and 19: *Provided*, That no person who is enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection (h) shall be permanently assigned to duty at any place outside of the continental limits of the United States; and no person who is enlisted under the provisions of such subsection in the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, or the Air Force of the United States shall be assigned to duty at any naval or air force installation which is located on land outside of the continental limits of the United States.

(2) Each person who hereafter is enlisted under the provisions of subsection (h) (1) above and who meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a Reserve component of the armed forces shall upon discharge from such enlistment under conditions other than dishonorable, be transferred to a Reserve component of the armed forces of the United States and shall serve therein for a period of 6 years or until sooner discharged. Each such person shall so long as he remains a member of such Reserve component, be liable to be ordered to active duty only in time of war or national emergency as declared by the Congress and shall not be subject to any further service under this act.

(i) Regular or duly ordained ministers of religion, Christian Science Readers and practitioners, and students preparing for the ministry under the direction of recognized churches or religious organizations, who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction in recognized theological or divinity schools, or who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction leading to their entrance into recognized theological or divinity schools in which they have been preenrolled, or who are recognized by the officials of their churches or synagogue or sect as having given a definite and acknowledged intention of entering into full-time religious work, shall be exempt

from service (but not from registration) under this act.

(j) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (g)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such services shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board.

(2) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment, by age group or groups, from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States, of those persons whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may, upon finding that it is in the national interest terminate the deferment by age group or groups of any or all of the persons so deferred.

(k) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act prior to his graduation from such school or institution, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest. The induction of any such person shall not be postponed under this subsection beyond the date so determined.

(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of higher learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act after the beginning and prior to the end of one of his academic years, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed (A) until the end of such academic year or (B) until he ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier.

(l) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant service (which for the purposes hereof includes training for combatant duties) in the armed forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially sociological or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code. Any such person claiming such exemption from combatant service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, if he is inducted into the armed forces under this act, be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or shall, if he is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, be deferred. Any such person claiming such exemption from combatant service because of such conscientious objections shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal, the appeal board shall refer any such claim to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. The Department of Justice shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the persons concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommended to the appeal board that (1) if the objector is inducted into the armed forces under this act, he shall be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or (2) if the objector is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, he shall be deferred. If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall, in making its decision, give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice together with the record on appeal from the local board. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant service because of conscientious objections is sustained shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors.

(m) No exception from registration, or exemption or deferment from service, under this act, shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

(n) No person shall be relieved from service under this act by reason of conviction for a criminal offense, except where the offense for which he has been convicted may be punished by death or by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year.

(o) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment made or denied under subsection (i) of this section may, within 10 days after such deferment is made or denied, be submitted for review and decision to the appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the President, and such decision shall be made public.

(p) Where one or more members of a family were killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the armed forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, the sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this act.

SEC. 6. No bounty shall be paid to induce any person to enlist in or be inducted into the armed forces of the United States: *Provided*, That the clothing or enlistment allowances authorized by law shall not be regarded as bounties within the meaning of this section. No person liable for service in such forces shall be permitted or allowed to furnish a substitute for such service; no substitute as such shall be received, enlisted, enrolled, or inducted into the armed forces of the United States; and no person liable for service in such forces under section 4 shall be permitted to escape such service or be discharged therefrom prior to the expiration of his period of such service by the payment of money or any other valuable thing whatsoever as consideration for his release from such service or liability therefor.

SEC. 7. (a) The selection of persons for service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from the persons who are liable for such service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided*, That in the selection of persons for service under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations.

(b) Quotas of men to be inducted for service under this act shall be determined for each State, Territory, possession, and the District of Columbia, and for subdivisions thereof, on the basis of the actual number of men in the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, and the subdivisions thereof, who are liable for such service but who are not deferred after classification, except that credits shall be given in fixing such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who are in the armed forces of the United States on the date fixed for determining such quotas. After such quotas are fixed, credits shall be given in filling such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who subsequently become members of such forces. Until the actual numbers necessary for determining the quotas are known, the quotas may be based on estimates, and subsequent adjustments therein shall be made when such actual numbers are known. All computations under this subsection shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

SEC. 8. (a) The training under this act shall be administered and carried out on the highest possible moral, religious, and spiritual plane.

(b) It shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, cantonment, or training or mobilization place, where training under this act is being given, as the Secretary of National Defense may determine to be necessary to the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of such persons who are receiving training under this act and shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins, to establish or keep houses of ill fame, brothels, bawdy houses, or places of entertainment which are public nuisances, or other like facilities detrimental to the health and morals of persons who are being trained under this act, or to receive or permit to be received for immoral purposes any person in any vehicle, place, structure, or building used for the purpose of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution within said distance determined by the Secretary of Defense or to knowingly rent, lease, or permit the use of any property for such purposes.

SEC. 9. (a) Any person inducted into the armed forces under this act for service, who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes his period of service under section 4 (b) shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect upon the completion of such period of service, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. The Secretaries of Army, Navy, or Air Force shall furnish to the Selective Service System hereafter established a report of separation for each person separated from active duty. In addition, each such person who is inducted into the armed forces under this act for service shall be given a physical examination upon separation and, upon his written request, shall be given a statement of physical condition by the Secretary concerned: *Provided*, That such statement shall not contain any reference to mental or other conditions which in the judgment of the Secretary concerned would prove injurious to the physical or mental health of the person to whom it pertains.

(b) In the case of any such person who, in order to perform such service, has left or leaves a position (other than a temporary position) in the employ of any employer and who (1) receives such certificate, (2) is still qualified to perform the duties of such position, and (3) makes written application for reemployment within 90 days after he is relieved from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year—

(A) if such position was in the employ of the United States Government, its Territories, or possessions or political subdivisions thereof, or the District of Columbia, such person shall be restored to such position or, if such position no longer exists, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay;

(B) if such position was in the employ of a private employer, such employer or his successor in interest shall restore such person to such position, or, if such position no longer exists, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so;

(C) if such position was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that such person should be restored to such position or, if such position no longer exists, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

(c) If any such person is not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such period of service but is qualified to perform the duties of some other position, then, in the case of paragraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b) he shall (and in the case of paragraph (C) of subsection (b) it is hereby declared the sense of Congress that he should) be employed at such other position as may provide the nearest possible similarity in seniority, status, and pay.

(d) Any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) or of subsection (c) shall be considered as having been on furlough or leave of absence during his period of service in the armed forces, shall be entitled to all promotions, increases in pay, vacation rights not otherwise regulated by law, and accumulations of seniority to which he would have been entitled had he been working for the employer during his period of service in the armed forces, shall be so restored without loss of seniority, shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence in effect with the employer, and shall not be discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration.

(e) In case any private employer fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of subsection (b), subsection (c), or subsection (d), the district court of the United States for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business shall have power, upon the filing of a motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading by the person entitled to the benefits of such provisions, specifically to require such employer to comply with such provisions and to compensate such person for any loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action: *Provided*, That any such compensation shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such provisions. The court shall order speedy hearing in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar. Upon application to the United States district attorney or comparable official for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business, by any person claiming to be entitled to the benefits of such provisions, such United States district attorney or official, if reasonably satisfied that the person so applying is entitled to such benefits, shall appear and act as attorney for such person in the amicable adjustment of the claim or in the filing of any motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading and the prosecution thereof to specifically require such employer to comply with such provisions: *Provided*, That no fees or court costs shall be taxed against any person who may apply for such benefits: *Provided further*, That only the employer shall be deemed a necessary party to any such action.

(f) In case the United States Government or any of its Territories or possessions, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of subsection (b), subsection (c), or subsection (d) of this section and section 9 (b) (4), the United States Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed, upon finding that such failure or refusal is in violation of the said provisions, to require specific compliance with such provisions to require compensation to any person entitled to the benefits of such provisions for any loss of salary or wages suffered by reason of failure to comply with said provisions, less any amounts received by him through other employment or from unemployment compensation including readjustment allowances. The United States Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to issue rules and regulations giving full force and effect to the provisions of this act governing restoration, and such rules and regulations shall have the force and effect of law; and it shall be mandatory for the agency concerned to take such corrective action as the Commission recommends: *Provided*, That where any agency refuses to take the corrective action recommended by the Commission, the district court of the United States for the district in which the person entitled to such benefits was employed shall have jurisdiction, upon the filing of a motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading by such person so entitled, to require specific compliance with the recommendation of the Commission and the provisions of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section by, and to enter judgment against, the United States Government or any of its Territories or possessions, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, to compensate such person for any loss of salary or wages suffered by reason of failure to comply with said recommendation and provisions, less any amounts received by him through other employment or from unemployment compensation, including readjustment allowances: *Provided further*, That any such compensation directed to be paid by the Commission or the court shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such recommendation or provisions, and shall be paid by the head of the governmental agency concerned out of appropriations currently available for salaries and expenses of the agency, and such appropriations shall be deemed available for such purposes. No fees or court costs shall be taxed against any person who may apply for such benefits. The court shall order speedy hearings in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar.

(g) The Director of Selective Service shall establish adequate facilities to render aid in the replacement in their former positions of persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty in the armed forces of the United States.

(h) Any person who, subsequent to the effective date of this act and while it remains in effect, enters upon active service in the armed forces of the United States and is released under honorable conditions from such active service shall be entitled to all the reemployment benefits and other rights of this section, except that the 90-day period prescribed in section 8 (b) shall commence (1) in the case of enlisted personnel, from the date of termination of the first enlistment (excluding extensions thereof) entered into subsequent to the date of enactment of this act; (2) in the case of officer personnel, from the date of the third anniversary of reporting for active service subsequent to the date of enactment of this act; and (3) in the case of officer and enlisted personnel who are discharged or released from active service prior to the afore-mentioned dates, from the date relieved from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year.

(i) As between two or more persons entitled to be restored to the same position under the provisions of this act or of any other law relating to similar reemployment benefits, the person who left such position first shall have the prior right thereto, without prejudice to the rights of the other person or persons to be restored to a position of like seniority, status, and pay with the employer, if such position exists and is not occupied by a person having greater seniority.

SEC. 10. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an agency to be known as the Selective Service System, and a Director of Selective Service who shall be the head thereof.

(2) The Selective Service System shall include a national headquarters, at least one State headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, and the local boards, appeal boards, and other agencies provided for in subsection (b) (3) of this section.

(3) The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 per year.

(4) The functions of the Office of Selective Service Records (established by the act of March 31, 1947) and of the Director of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System and the Director of Selective Service, respectively. The personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System. The Office of Selective Service Records shall cease to exist upon the taking of effect of the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That, effective upon the termination of this act, and notwithstanding such termination in other respects, (a) the said Office of Selective Service Records is hereby reestablished on the same basis and with the same functions as obtained prior to the effective date of this act, (b) said reestablished Office shall be responsible for terminating any other outstanding affairs of the Selective Service System, and (c) the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Selective Service System shall be transferred to such reestablished Office of Selective Service Records.

(b) The President is authorized—

(1) to prescribe the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act;

(2) to appoint, upon recommendation of the respective governor or comparable executive official, a State director of the Selective Service System for each headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States and in the District of Columbia who shall represent the governor and be in immediate charge of the State headquarters of the Selective Service System. The President may order to active duty with their consent and assign to the Selective Service System those officers of the Selective Service section of the State headquarters and headquarters detachments of the federally recognized National Guard of the United States and members of other Reserve components, and may employ such number of civilians as may be necessary for the administration of the National and of the several State headquarters of the Selective Service System;

(3) to create and establish within the Selective Service System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and such other agencies, including agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out its functions with respect to the registration, examination, selection, assignment, delivery for induction, and maintenance of records of persons registered under this act, together with such other duties as may be assigned under this act, and shall provide for the classification of registrants under this act on the basis of availability for service. He shall create and establish one or more local boards in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto of each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia. Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President from recommendations made by the respective governors or comparable executive officials: *Provided*, That an intercounty local board consisting of at least one member from each component county or corresponding subdivision may be established for an area not exceeding five counties or political subdivisions corresponding thereto within a State or comparable jurisdiction when the Director determines, after considering the public interest involved and the recommendation of the governor or comparable executive official or officials, that the establishment of such local board area will result in a more efficient and economical operation, such intercounty local board within its area to have the same power and jurisdiction as a local board has in its area. No member of any local board shall be a member of the armed forces of the United States, but each member of any local board shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States residing in the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which such local board has jurisdiction, and each intercounty local board shall have at least one member from each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto included within the intercounty local board area. Such local boards, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, shall have the power within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized, all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, service under this act, of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local board shall be final, except where an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. There shall be at least one appeal board for each State. Appeal boards within the Selective Service System shall be composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States and who are not members of the armed forces. The decision of such appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal unless modified or changed by the President. The President, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from service under this act, and the determination of the President shall be final. No person who is a civilian officer, member, agent, or employee of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, or of any local board or appeal board or other agency of such Office or System, shall be excepted from registration or deferred or exempted from service, as provided for in this act, by reason of his status as such civilian officer, member, agent, or employee;

(4) to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, agents, and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That the compensation of employees of local boards and appeal boards may be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided further*, That any officer on the active or retired list of the armed forces, or any Reserve component thereof with his consent or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this act (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards established or created pursuant to section 9 (b) (3)) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officers in the armed forces or Reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States;

(5) to utilize the services of any or all departments and any and all officers or agents of the United States and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and subdivisions thereof and the District of Columbia and volunteer welfare organizations in the execution of this act;

(6) to purchase such printing, binding, and blankbook work from public, commercial, or private printing establishments or binderies upon orders placed by the Public Printer or upon waivers issued in accordance with section 12 of the Printing Act approved January 12, 1895, as amended, and to obtain by purchase, loan, or gift such equipment and supplies for the Selective Service System as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, with or without advertising or formal contract;

(7) to prescribe eligibility, rules, and regulations governing the parole for service in the armed forces, or for any other special service established pursuant to this act, of any person convicted of a violation of any of the provisions of this act;

(8) to procure such space as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and Public Law 26, Eightieth Congress, approved March 31, 1947, by lease, pursuant to existing statutes. The provisions of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended by section 15 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517; 40 U. S. C. 278a), shall not apply to any lease entered into under the authority of this act;

(9) to determine the location of such additional temporary installations as he may deem essential; to utilize and enlarge existing installations; to construct, install, and equip; and to complete the construction, installation, and equipment of buildings, structures, utilities, and appurtenances, including the necessary grading and removal, repair, or remodeling of existing structures and installations; and, in order to accomplish the purpose of this act, to acquire lands, and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, for temporary use thereof, by donation or lease, and to prosecute construction thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended;

(10) to utilize, in order to provide and furnish such services as may be deemed necessary or expedient to accomplish the purposes of this act, personnel of the armed forces and of Reserve components thereof, with their consent, and such civilian personnel as may be necessary, notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of the act of May 24, 1946, entitled "Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946" (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.) with respect to the maximum limitations as to the number of civilian employees.

(c) The President is authorized to delegate any authority vested in him under this act, and to provide for the subdelegation of any such authority.

(d) In the administration of this act, voluntary services may be accepted.

(e) The Chief of Finance, United States Army, is authorized to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent of the Director in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(f) The Director is authorized to make final settlement of individual claims, for amounts not exceeding $50, for travel and other expenses of uncompensated personnel of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, incurred while in the performance of official duties, without regard to other provisions of law governing the travel of civilian employees of the Federal Government.

SEC. 11. Under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President, all funds appropriated for operation and maintenance under this act are also available for the payment of actual and reasonable expenses of emergency medical care, including hospitalization of registrants who suffer illness or injury, and the transportation, and burial, of the remains of registrants who suffer death, while acting under orders issued under the provisions of this act, but such burial expenses shall not exceed $150 in any one case.

SEC. 12. Any members of the Selective Service System or any other person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying out any of the provisions of this act, or the rules or regulations made or directions given thereunder, who shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform such duty, and any person charged with such duty, or having and exercising any authority under said act, rules, regulations, or directions who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making, of any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical or mental examination, deferment, induction, enrollment, or muster, and any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certificate regarding or bearing upon a classification or in support of any request for a particular classification, for service under the provisions of this act,

or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant thereto, or who otherwise evades registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this act, or who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this act, or of said rules, regulations, or directions, or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect or refuse to perform any duty required of him under or in the execution of this act, or rules or regulations made pursuant to this act, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere in any way by force or violence with the administration of this act or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or who conspires to commit such offense, shall, upon conviction in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment, or if subject to military or naval law may be tried by court material, and, on conviction, shall suffer such punishment as a court martial may direct. No person shall be tried by court martial in any case arising under this act unless such person has been actually inducted for the service prescribed under this act or unless he is subject to trial by court martial under laws in force prior to the enactment of this act. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this act, and such cases shall, upon request of the Attorney General, be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing.

SEC. 13. (a) Nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99), in section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 119 (e)), or in the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 9 of the act of August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148), entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended, shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this act or the regulations made pursuant thereto, as an uncompensated official of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant or noncombatant training because of conscientious objections.

(b) All functions performed under this act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) except as to the requirements of section 3 of such act.

SEC. 14. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 604 of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1191), nor the provisions of section 4 of the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, 80th Cong.), all of the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, including specifically article IV thereof, shall continue in effect and be applicable as to all persons in the armed forces of the United States, including all persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this act, until such time as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, is repealed or otherwise terminated by subsequent act of the Congress: *Provided*, That wherever under any section or provision of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, a proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction has been authorized or provided with respect to military service performed while this act is in force by any person inducted into the armed forces under this act, such section or provision shall be deemed to continue in full force and effect so long as may be necessary to the exercise or enjoyment of such proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction.

SEC. 15. With respect to the persons inducted for service under this act, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other enlisted men of like grades and length of service of that component of the armed forces to which they are assigned. Section 3 of the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, 80th Cong.), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following: "Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148), as amended." The act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148), is hereby made applicable to persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this act.

SEC. 16. Nothing contained in this or any other act shall be construed as forbidding the payment of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation to persons inducted or enlisted into the armed forces of the United States for service under this act, or to members of the Reserve components of such forces now or hereafter on any type of active duty, who, prior to their induction, enlistment, or commencement of active duty, were receiving compensation from such person, firm, or corporation.

SEC. 17. Any person inducted into the armed forces for service under this act shall, during the period of such service, be permitted to vote in person or by absentee ballot in any general, special, or primary election occurring in the State of which he is a resident, whether he is within or outside such State at the time of such election, if under the laws of such State he is otherwise entitled so to vote in such election; but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require granting to any such person a leave of absence or furlough for longer than 1 day in order to permit him to vote in person in any such election: *Provided*, That no person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces for training and service under this act shall, during the period of such service, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, be required to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 18. (a) The President is empowered, through the Secretary of Defense, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such product or material as may be required by the armed forces, and which is of the nature and kind usually produced or capable of being produced by such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry. Under any such program of national procurement, the President shall recognize the valid claim of American small business to participate in such contracts, in such manufactures, and in such distribution of materials, and small business shall be granted a fair share of the orders placed, exclusively for the use of the armed forces or for other Federal agencies now or hereafter designated in this section. For the purposes of this section, a business enterprise shall be determined to be "small business" if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of its employees does not exceed 500, and (3) it is independently owned and operated.

(b) Compliance with all such orders for products or material placed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be obligatory on any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof and shall take precedence over all other orders and contracts theretofore placed with such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any plant equipped for the manufacture of arms or ammunition or parts of ammunition, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the armed forces, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any manufacturing plant, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense shall be capable of being readily transformed into a plant for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or parts thereof, or other necessary supplies or equipment for the armed forces, who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the matter of the execution of orders, or who shall refuse to manufacture the kind, quantity, or quality of arms or ammunition or the parts thereof, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the armed forces, as ordered by the Secretary of Defense, or who shall refuse to furnish such arms, ammunition, or parts of ammunition, or other supplies or equipment for the armed forces, at a reasonable price as determined by the Secretary of Defense, then, and in either such case, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, is hereby authorized to take immediate possession of any such plant or plants, and through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the armed forces to manufacture therein such product or material as may be required for the armed forces, and any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, failing to comply with the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

(c) The compensation to be paid to any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for its products or material, or as rental for use of any manufacturing plant while used by the United States, shall be fair and just: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to render inapplicable existing State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, and employment standards of the employees in such plant.

(d) (1) The President is empowered, through the Secretary of Defense, to require all producers of steel in the United States to make available, to individuals, firms, associations, companies, corporations, or organized manufacturing industries having orders for steel products or steel materials required by the armed forces, such percentages of the steel production of such producers, in equal proportion deemed necessary for the expeditious execution of orders for such products or materials. Compliance with such requirement shall be obligatory on all such producers of steel and such requirement shall take precedence over all orders and contracts theretofore placed with such producers. If any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refuses to comply with such requirement, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to take immediate possession of the plant or plants of such producer and, through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the armed forces, to insure compliance with such requirement. Any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refusing to comply with such requirement shall be deemed guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

(2) The President shall report to the Congress on the final day of each 6-month period following the date of enactment of this act the percentage figure, or if such information is not available, the approximate percentage figure, of the total steel production in the United States required to be made available during such period for the execution of orders for steel products and steel materials required by the armed forces, if such percentage figure is in excess of 10 percent.

SEC. 19. (a) Every person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of this act upon publication by the President of a proclamation or other public notice fixing a time for any registration under section 3.

(b) It shall be the duty of every registrant to keep his local board informed as to his current address and changes in status as required by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President.

(c) If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(d) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal, amend, or suspend the laws now in force authorizing voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, except that, whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in such forces, and their Reserve components, may be suspended by the President to such extent as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense.

SEC. 20. When used in this act—

(a) The term "between the ages of 18 and 31" shall refer to men who have attained the eighteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the thirty-first anniversary of the day of their birth; and other terms designating different age groups shall be construed in a similar manner.

(b) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, shall be deemed to mean the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(c) The term "armed forces" shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard (when during World War II it served, or when in the future it shall serve, under the Department of the Navy).

(d) The term "district court of the United States" shall be deemed to include the courts of the United States for the Territories and possessions of the United States.

(e) The term "local board" shall be deemed to include an intercounty local board in the case of any registrant who is subject to the jurisdiction of an intercounty local board.

(f) The term "Director" shall be deemed to mean the Director of the Selective Service System.

(g) The term "organized unit," when used with respect to a Reserve component, shall be deemed to mean a unit in which the members thereof satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 21. (a) Except as provided in this act, all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby suspended to the extent of such conflict for the period in which this act shall be in force.

(b) All of the provisions of this act, except the provisions of sections 1, 2, 4 (b), 4 (e), 8, 9, (a) (4), 14, 20 (b), and 22, shall become inoperative and cease to apply 2 years after the date of enactment of this act except as to offenses committed prior to the termination date.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 22. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to amend any provision of the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 495).

SEC. 23. The Congress declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both Ground and Air, as an integral part of the first-line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.

To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the Ground Forces and the Air Forces, and those in active service under this act, the National Guard of the United States, both Ground and Air, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

SEC. 24. This act shall be effective upon its enactment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it has been decided to have a meeting of the conferees at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Did the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Idaho objects?

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota can make a motion to that effect.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if that motion carries, will it displace the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is purely a privileged matter, and does not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield, on condition that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the motion debatable to exceed 5 minutes, under the rule which we are operating?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This matter is entirely outside the Consent Calendar, and the motion is debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. It is a privileged matter, and the motion is debatable, just as any other motion would be?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. I know that all Members of the Senate are anxious to have the call of the calendar completed. I assume that it will be finished in an hour. That still will allow us to start the conference at 2 o'clock, possibly.

So I ask the acting majority leader if it will be satisfactory for me to withdraw my motion until the end of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that until action is taken on a motion, that is the privilege of the one who makes the motion. Such a course is perfectly agreeable to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is in control of his motion, and he can withdraw it if he wishes to do so.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, temporarily I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is withdrawn.

Does the Senator from Idaho withdraw his objection?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to cooperate.

CARL PIOWATY AND W. J. PIOWATY

The bill (S. 2524) for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty are hereby relieved of liability for the payment of (1) any indebtedness, including interest, arising out of war crop advances made by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, to the said Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; (2) any promissory notes evidencing such indebtedness made by the said Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty to the Regional Agricultural Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia; and (3) any judgments, including attorney's fees and court costs, obtained by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, against the said Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty upon any such indebtedness or any such promissory notes. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause any such promissory notes or other evidences of such indebtedness to be canceled and to cause the acknowledgment of satisfaction of any such judgments.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940 AS AMENDED

The bill (H. R. 6507) to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2754) to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to make it plain that this bill is being called because it was put at the end of the calendar at the last call. Therefore it is not a bill in order in serial number, and the Chair wishes to be sure the Senate understands what has been called.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, are there any other bills of the same character coming along?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent agreement was based upon the fact that the Senate would not go further back than Calendar No. 1504. If consideration of the bill which has just been called constitutes a violation of that agreement, I shall be forced to object, regardless of whether any other Senator objects, because there are other Senators who wish to have measures previous to Calendar No. 1504 considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair completely agrees with the viewpoint of the Senator from Nebraska, and recognizes the validity of his objection.

Therefore, under objection, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

POSTHUMOUS CITIZENSHIP FOR VASO B. BENDERACH

The bill (S. 2662) conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach was announced as next in order.

INDIAN RESERVATIONS IN ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in speaking under the 5-minute rule, I wish to say that I desire to have the Senate return to Calendar No. 1421, Senate Joint Resolution 162. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will reserve the right to object, and will permit me to speak for 5 minutes on this matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. The Senator is speaking under the 5-minute rule, anyway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator repeat his request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to Calendar No. 1421, Senate Joint Resolution 162, to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington wish to be recognized for 5 minutes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. President, several bills which were passed over at the last call of the calendar are not controversial. Some of them were passed over at the request of certain Senators who since have discussed the matter further, and now do not intend to object. In other words, there is unanimous agreement as to some of the bills.

However, it seems now that because someone got mixed up with oleomargarine and butter, the Senate will give priority to other bills which were placed on the calendar later than the bills to which I have referred, which were reported practically unanimously.

If the Senate is going to take up and pass other bills on the calendar, I see no reason why the Senate cannot go back to the bills I have in mind. They are important, and their consideration will take only 15 or 20 minutes. As a matter of fact, if any priority is involved, the priority should go to the bills which were placed on the calendar ahead of the bills being called today.

I want the RECORD to show that Senate Joint Resolution 162 involves the whole economy of Alaska, and I want the RECORD to show where the objection comes from.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Washington to proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1421, joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162).

Mr. MAGNUSON. I still have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington has the floor for two mbre minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have the floor for 2 or 3 minutes, I think.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I see no reason for propounding a unanimous consent request for the consideration of bills not objected to which have been on the calendar for weeks and months, and should have priority. There is no reason why the Senate should not take up important bills behind the bill where the call of the calendar started today. I want the RECORD to show and I desire to know where the objection comes from, to Calendar 1421, Senate Joint Resolution 162, which affects the whole economy of Alaska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I reserved the right to object, and I feel, because I did so, I should have 5 minutes at this time on the bill, to answer the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico objects to what?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In order to inform the Chair, so he may be satisfied, I am objecting to the motion of the Senator from Washington. I hope the President understands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico objects. The Chair understood the Senator was objecting to the Senator from Nebraska having the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, is the objection to my request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico objects to the request of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is a bill that everyone agrees to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. The clerk will call the next bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the next bill, after which the Chair will recognize the Senator from Nebraska.

VASO B. BENDERACH

The bill (S. 2662) conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach was recognized as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I merely want the RECORD to show that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is making an objection to the consideration of Calendar 1421, Senate Joint Resolution 162. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The responsibility will be placed where it belongs.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. Now, that is the answer I would make to the Senator from Washington, in the event he needs an answer. I want to say further we have had the finest cooperation in the Senate and the reason we started with the consideration of Calendar No. 1504, House bill 5882, was because we left off at that number, and because everybody agreed to it in the unanimous-consent order. It is impossible now to go back, regardless of what the bill may be, without violating the confidence under which the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into. I know the Senator from Washington is aware of that, and will cooperate with me. If we should go back of Calendar No. 1504, after Senators had relied on the agreement, the procedure would be unfair.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. The Senator had his 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to have 5 minutes more.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield to the Senator. We cannot go back beyond Calendar 1504 without violating the agreement under which the unanimous consent was entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of Calendar 1768, Senate bill 2662?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, of course I understand the position of the Senator from Nebraska. I understand the necessity for propounding unanimous-consent requests, but I also understand the reason we do not go back to certain bills which are important is because the Senator desires to close on Saturday night.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no. That is a very unfair statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a very, very unfair statement. When the unanimous-consent request was entered into, 3 days ago, I believe, the Senator was absent on business; of course, official business.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator could have objected to it then, had he been present, but the Senator knows he has cooperated with the Senator from Nebraska many times, and that there are others who would like to do the same thing he desires to do. But it is impossible to do that and continue to enjoy the confidence the leadership must maintain and must have with every Senator, if certain rights are to be preserved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator knows I discussed the matter with him. I cannot see the Senator's reason. I said to the Senator, "Why can we not go back to bills that are noncontroversial?" The Senator replied, "If we go back to those bills, we might get back to controversial bills, and we have got to close here Saturday night."

Mr. WHERRY. The bill is controversial.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Those are his exact words. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may be allowed to go back on the calendar to the consideration of noncontroversial bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington has made his request. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator objects. A bill has been called by the clerk. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill S. 2662?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2062) conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Vaso B. Benderach, a Yugoslav flier, who served honorably with the Fifteenth Air Force of the United States, and who died on May 7, 1948, while a patient at Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

STEFAN MAGURA AND MICHAL MAGURA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2709) for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the date "1948", to insert "upon payment of visa fees and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stefan Magura and Michal Magura, of Donora, Pa., who were admitted into the United States on temporary visas, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of April 29, 1948, upon payment of visa fees and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for Czechoslovakia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HERMAN A. BENNINK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1982) for the relief of Herman A. Bennink, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "act", to insert "and any period of residence of the said Herman A. Bennink outside the United States which is occasioned principally by his specialized study in Holland of the growing of American corn shall be deemed to bring the said Herman A. Bennink within the provisions of section 406 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (relating to loss of nationality by naturalized citizens), Herman A. Bennink, a naturalized citizen of the United States temporarily residing in Apeldoorn, Holland, shall not be considered to have lost his United States citizenship by reason of any period of residence outside the United States prior to the date of enactment of this act, and any period of residence of the said Herman A. Bennink outside the United States which is occasioned principally by his specialized study in Holland of the growing of American corn shall be deemed to bring the said Herman A. Bennink within the provisions of section 406 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARIS U. YEADON

The bill (S. 2382) for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence and relating to admissions at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (c)), which excludes from admission into the United States "persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude," shall not hereafter be held to apply to Claris U. Yeadon (nee Claris U. Davis), the wife of Cecil S. Leadon, an American citizen. If she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, an immigration visa may be issued and admission granted to the said Claris U. Yeadon under this act upon application hereafter filed.

GHETEL POLLAK KAHAN ET AL.

The bill (S. 411) for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 10 years old) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 10 years old), as having entered the United States on August 21, 1945, for permanent residence. The said Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 10 years old), shall not be subject to deportation by reason of such entry.

GEORGE HANIOTIS

The bill (H. R. 4199) for the relief of George Haniotis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD NATIONAL STEAMSHIP COS.

The bill (S. 1691) for the relief of First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos. was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this is one of the 1,200 bills considered by the committee, and my recollection of this particular bill is that it was referred to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and on his suggestion, a thorough study was made. The purpose of the bill is to confer authority upon the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the three different steamship companies the balance of sums deposited by them in 1920. The bills have gone back and forth several times, as I remember. The committee considered the report of the Senator from Nevada, which is rather an exhaustive report for the Judiciary Committee to make on claims. I personally have not become thoroughly acquainted with the facts, because of the numerous bills we have had to consider. I believe possibly the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] may have some of the facts. The purpose of the bill is to confer authority upon the Secretary of the Treasury to pay back the balance of certain sums deposited by the three companies when, under the law in 1920, they were building ships for the Government, and it is found that in equity and justice they are entitled to these sums.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that the claim has been pending since 1920?

Mr. WILEY. It has been pending back and forth. It was in the Court of Claims. It has been in the courts. A complete recitation of the facts is found in the report.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Treasury Department approve the claim?

Mr. WILEY. My recollection is that some department did not approve it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a reply, before asking that the bill go over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. SMITH. The matter was brought to my attention, and I introduced the bill. I have made an extensive study of the matter and have asked that a statement be prepared so the Senate would

(b). The second sentence of subsection (g)

or less agree that once we open up that

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina,

understand a little more of the detail of it. I regret that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is not present, because he attended all the hearings.

Let me state that the purpose of the proposed legislation is to confer authority on the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $384,256.26 to the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos., which sum represents the balance due out of a deposit made in the year 1920 with the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Over a period of years, four separate congressional committees have investigated the merits of this claim and have recommended remedial action thereon. In addition, the claimants have diligently pursued their remedies, both before administrative bodies and in the courts. In one instance it was necessary to take a collateral matter relating to the claim to the Supreme Court of the United States for a final, favorable determination.

The administrative agencies concerned have at various times interposed defenses to recovery by these claimants, and as the claimants have successfully met and overcome each ground of defense, the executive department has come forward with new defenses not previously raised.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. Let me finish the statement, and then I shall be glad to yield for a question.

The Congress, recognizing the evident merit of the claim, submitted the case to the Court of Claims for a finding of fact and with special instructions as to the matters of fact to be developed. As a result of this proceeding, and based on the report to Congress, it was made clear that all of the defenses raised by the Government in previous years were without merit and it was so stated by the Court of Claims. This court, however, contrary to the instructions from the Congress, of its own volition, raised a new point and rendered judgment on the case on the theory that it was a matter of res adjudicata.

The Committee on the Judiciary, having taken all the afore-mentioned facts under consideration, are of the opinion that the companies are entitled to the refund in the amount stated in the bill and have so recommended to the Senate.

It will be noted that no allowance has been made for interest or other compensation to the companies for the long withholding of moneys rightfully theirs over a period of years by the Government.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator, in view of his statement that four separate committees have examined this matter, and recommended action, whether the amount involved in the pending bill is the amount involved in the preceding bills.

Mr. SMITH. That is my understanding, although I am not familiar with all the details. The report of the committee shows the facts in answer to the Senator's question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ROBERT E. GRAHAM

The bill (H. R. 2193) for the relief of Robert E. Graham was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EAST COAST SHIP & YACHT CORP., OF NOANK, CONN.

The bill (H. R. 6184) for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DIMITRI PETROU

The bill (H. R. 4881) for the relief of Dimitri Petrou was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK, KY.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2096) to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942, relating to Mammoth Cave National Park, in the State of Kentucky.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, since the bill went on the calendar there has been a conference with interested parties, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] proposes an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided*, That no part of this authorization be used for road development or construction until after all the lands within the maximum boundaries, as authorized by the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636), have been acquired by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL MEMORIAL PARK

The resolution (H. J. Res. 427) correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROHIBITION OF MAILING OF CERTAIN PROPAGANDA

The bill (S. 2339) to prohibit the mailing of propaganda disseminated by agents of foreign principals, unless the source of such propaganda is identified therein, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever knowingly places or causes to be placed in any post office, or station thereof, or street or other letter box of the United States, or authorized depository for mail matter, to be sent or delivered by the post office establishment of the United States, any newspaper, magazine, pamphlet, circular, or other publication, published by or for any agent of a foreign principal, which does not have printed on the first page thereof in legible English characters the statement, "This publication is published by ——, an agent of ——, registered with the Secretary of State under the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States and for other purposes', approved June 8, 1938, as amended.", shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both. The first blank space within the quotation marks in the preceding sentence shall be filled with the name under which the agent of a foreign principal is registered with the Secretary of State and the second blank space shall be filled with the name of the foreign principal of such agent. As used in this act the term "agent of a foreign principal" has the same meaning as it has when used in such act of June 8, 1938, as amended.

SEC. 2. All matter the deposit of which in the mails is made punishable by the first section of this act is hereby declared to be nonmailable.

RECLASSIFICATION OF SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

The bill (S. 2677) to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection (d) of section 16 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 39, sec. 866 (d)), is hereby amended (1) by inserting "(1)" after "(d)"; (2) by striking out the words "and air mail field railway post offices" wherever such words appear in such subsection; and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Clerks assigned to air mail field railway post offices shall be promoted successively to grade 11; and after 3 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 11 shall be promoted to grade 12; after 5 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 12 shall be promoted to grade 13; and after 7 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 13 shall be promoted to grade 14. Clerks in charge of air mail field railway post offices with one to four employees and of tours in such air mail field railway post offices shall be of grade 15. Clerks in charge of air mail field railway post offices with 5 to 19 employees shall be of grade 16 and clerks in charge of tours shall be of grade 15. Clerks in charge of air mail field railway post offices with 20 or more employees shall be of grade 17 and clerks in charge of tours shall be of grade 16 and clerks in charge of crews within tours shall be of grade 16: *Provided*, That in air mail field railway post offices having 20 or more employees there shall be appointed for each clerk in charge, including clerks in charge of tours and crews, a clerk of one grade lower than the lowest grade clerk in charge in each organization and such clerks shall act as clerks in charge during the absences of the clerk in charge for whom designated: *Provided further*, That in air mail field railway post offices with 19 or fewer employees and having 2 or more clerks in charge regularly assigned a relief clerk in charge may be appointed in grade 15."

(b) The second sentence of subsection (g) of section 16 of such act of July 6, 1945 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 39, sec. 866 (g)), is hereby amended to read as follows: "Assistant chiefs of sections in offices of division superintendents and clerks in charge of units in offices of regional superintendents of Air Mail Service, and in offices of chief clerks, shall be of grades 16 or 17: *Provided*, That all clerks in charge and those clerks designated to act as clerks in charge during absences of clerks in charge, in offices of division superintendents, regional superintendents Air Mail Service, chief clerks, class A runs, and terminal railway post offices, shall be required to progress through the automatic grades to and including grade 9 before being eligible to receive the salary provided herein for the various grades of clerks in charge and clerks who will act as clerks in charge: *Provided further*, That clerks in charge and clerks designated to act as clerks in charge during absences of clerks in charge in transfer offices and air mail field railway post offices, and clerks in charge assigned to class B runs, shall be required to progress through the automatic grades to and including grade 11 before being eligible to receive the salary provided herein for the various grades of clerks in charge and clerks who will act as clerks in charge."

REFUND OF TAXES TO BREWERS ON BEER LOST IN BOTTLING OPERATIONS

The bill (H. R. 6808) to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the House, in February, I think, passed a bill to relieve churches of excise taxes on musical instruments, especially church organs. Since the bill was passed, I called it to the attention of the chairman of the Finance Committee. I have repeatedly written him about the bill since then, and I have personally conferred with him. I should like to take this occasion to ask the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee how it is that his committee has found an opportunity favorably to report to the Senate a bill to relieve brewers of the Nation of an excise tax, but has found no time to report to the Senate a bill to relieve churches of excise taxes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, there is certainly no desire on the part of the Senate Committee on Finance to discriminate against any church in connection with the tax on church organs, or otherwise. This bill, in substance, takes off a tax on something which does not enter commerce. That is the purpose of the bill. It relieves against taxes on a product which does not enter into commerce, and, therefore, there is no just ground for the tax.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Does the Senator from Colorado take the position that there is a just ground to tax church organs now, when the tax was imposed, I think unintentionally, as a war emergency tax?

Mr. MILLIKIN. A tax exists on church organs which go into commerce. The chairman of the Finance Committee has repeatedly stated that he would like to eliminate all the excise taxes, or reduce many of them; but I think all of us more or less agree that once we open up that subject there are a great many amendments ready to pop up.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. May I ask the Senator why we cannot put a rider on any tax bill, if that is the only reason the committee did not report a bill relieving church organs of taxes?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe the reason why riders are not put on tax bills is because of a sense of restraint on the part of the Members of the Senate to realize that there is a large field of excise taxes which do injustice, and which ought to be eliminated or reduced when the opportunity presents itself.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I call attention to the fact that I felt that every Member of the Senate would feel so deeply concerned over the welfare of our churches that a bill would be brought out to relieve the churches of the tax on organs. I thought that a decent sense of restraint would apply to the tax on church organs. I have been assured by numerous Members of the House, and even by Members of the Senate, that an amendment would be accepted in conference. I think we are all in favor of repealing the tax on church organs.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We are besieged by all sorts of requests to repeal excise taxes. We receive them from trunk and suit case manufacturers, telegraph companies, and various other companies. I think the Senator is to be congratulated on his sense of restraint in the matter. Once we enter upon this field, we will get into a completely uncontrollable situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am thoroughly sympathetic with the Senator's attitude in regard to this subject, but the Committee on Finance has felt that when we get into the field of excise taxes there is no way by which to limit it. We on the committee are all besought to relieve excise taxes on jewelry, furs, leather goods, and many other articles. In the first place, we have no way to consider that subject in the Senate until the House acts on a revenue bill. There is no way to prevent these amendments coming in on the floor, but the committee has felt it would be better to wait until we get the subject of excise taxes generally before us before attempting to relieve any one item from the excise tax.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I can understand the situation, but I thought it would be very well for the RECORD to show it so that the public would understand why it was that we could give tax relief to breweries, and were not in a position to do it for others.

Mr. BARKLEY. That comparison is not precisely accurate. This is a bill which refunds taxes already paid on the products of breweries which are wasted in the process of bottling, so that they never get into commerce, and therefore should not bear the tax.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do not wish to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina if there is any explanation which could be made that might satisfy the Senator at this time?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not think so, on this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the bill will go over.

INTERNAL REVENUE TAX ON IMPORTED BEER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6162) an act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the word "shall," to strike out "also be subject to the war excise tax prescribed in section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code", and to insert "during the continuance of the war-tax rate on fermented malt liquors prescribed in section 1650, be subject to tax at such rate in lieu of the rate hereinbefore prescribed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CHECKAGE OF PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

The bill (S. 2180) to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the term "Reserve components" as used in section 6 of the act approved February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 27; 34 U. S. C. 410b), shall include officers on the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve established by section 309 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended (34 U. S. C. 855h).

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective from February 21, 1946.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS WITH SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6633) to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "Secretary", to insert "after receiving the written approval of the Attorney General as to the titles, leases, and other mutual conveyances connected therewith"; and on page 6, line 11, after the word "Navy", to strike out "and not used and occupied, or if in the event that said Navy shall fail to occupy and actually use said lands for such Navy purposes as are necessary in the maintenance of said United States Navy base within said Eleventh Naval District, then and in that event said lease shall terminate, be canceled and be of no further effect, and the

city shall have the right to immediately reoccupy the lands so abandoned or the use of which by said Navy has ceased: *Provided*, That if and when any waterfront parcel covered by this lease shall no longer be required for naval purposes, its use by another branch of the armed services for purposes requiring water frontage shall be permissible hereunder." and"; and to insert "and shall cease to be used for a period of 2 years by any branch of the armed services of the United States for military or naval purposes, then and in that event, the said lease shall terminate, be canceled, and be of no further effect, and the city shall have the immediate right to reoccupy said lands."; and."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DELAWARE RIVER BRIDGE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2867) to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, on page 2, line 20, to strike out the proviso, as follows: "That the tolls for the use of any such bridge or bridges in any such project may be applied by said Commission, if and to the extent permitted by its contract with the holders of its bonds, to the payment of all or a part of the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating any bridge or bridges now operated by said Commission free of tolls"; and on page 3, line 5, after the word "tolls", to strike out "or the rates of tolls shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide funds not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of such bridge or bridges, and any bridge or bridges now operated by said Commission free of tolls", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1935, be, and the same is hereby, amended and supplemented by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(e) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this section or of any other act of the Congress, the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey is hereby authorized (1) to fix and charge tolls for transit over any bridge heretofore or hereafter constructed by it across the Delaware River in accordance with the provisions of the original compact or agreement between said Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and said State of New Jersey which is set forth in section 9 of said act approved August 30, 1935, as amended, with the consent of Congress by the compact or supplemental agreement which is set forth in the act approved August 4, 1947; and (2) to unite or group any such bridges into a single project for financing purposes and to continue to fix and adjust the tolls for the use of the bridges in such project and pledge such tolls in accordance with the provisions of said original compact or agreement as so amended: *Provided, however*, That after the cost of any such bridge or of the bridges in any such project shall be amortized, such bridge or bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, 22 years ago a bridge was constructed across the Delaware River between Philadelphia and Camden. The increased traffic requires the erection probably of another bridge. This bill merely grants authority to do that work. It relates entirely to financing, because it will be a toll bridge, self-liquidating.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AID TO THE BLIND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6818) to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have no desire to object to passage of H. R. 6818. Earlier in the session, I introduced legislation to amend the Social Security Act to provide more adequately for the blind persons of our Nation. I am thoroughly sympathetic with the purpose of this bill, and at this late day I have no wish to jeopardize prompt action upon it. It is my sincere regret, however, that the bill is so limited in scope.

The present law deters blind people from becoming self-supporting because it requires that the amount of income earned apart from the social-security benefits be deducted from the aid received. H. R. 6818 improves this unfortunate provision, but H. R. 6818 must not be considered an adequate solution to the problem of assuring the blind that they may engage in satisfying and appropriate work without limiting their income by doing so. Of the 65,000 persons under the Federal program, it is estimated that only 300 to 400 will gain from the provisions of this bill which permits a blind person to earn $40 per month without reducing his benefits from the social-security program.

When I introduced S. 2590, I felt that a substantial revision in the method of determining social-security payments to the blind should be made. Although I am in favor of H. R. 6818, I still feel that the law should be further liberalized either by the formulas in my bill or by the method which study will show to be most workable, fair, and liberal.

This measure is a short step in the right direction, and I would not imperil the chance of passing it by seeking to amend it when time is so short and human hours are at a premium. I do want to make it very clear for the record, nonetheless, that at the earliest opportunity I intend to press for further liberalization in the law so that blind persons may have every encouragement to be self-supporting.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I do not wish to object to the bill. As the distinguished Senator from New York has said, it is a step in the right direction. I also introduced a bill earlier in the session which would be more liberal, and which I hope may be enacted at the next session. I hope the pending bill will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISASTER RELIEF

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2831) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I do not object to the consideration of the bill, but as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I may say that it has been called to my attention that the Committee on Public Works has reported an amendment which turns over the administration of emergency aid to the Secretary of National Defense. The Secretary of National Defense has a very limited office staff—in fact, it is too limited even to do the work connected with the national defense. The Committee on Armed Services is considering that subject, and it would be very unwise to impose on the Secretary of National Defense at this time the additional burden which the amendment of the committee would require. I hope the bill may be passed, because I think it has merit, without the amendment transferring the duties from the Public Works Agency, headed by General Fleming, to the Secretary of National Defense, Mr. Forrestal.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, being conscious, like the Senator from Massachusetts, of the very understandable attitude of the Secretary of Defense, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], agreed to offer an amendment which would leave to the President the function of coordinating Federal activities and the selection from within Federal agencies of the particular agencies which in his opinion were best qualified to undertake any disaster work and relief work. He has agreed to offer an amendment which would leave to the President the function of coordinating Federal activities and the selection from within Federal agencies of particular agencies which in his opinion are best qualified to undertake any disaster work and relief.

Mr. President, I offer amendments to change the phrase "Federal Works Administrator" in the title of the bill, and the phrase "Secretary of National Defense" as it is found in several instances throughout the bill, to the phrase "President of the United States."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendments offered by the Senator from Washington, as he has just stated them.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 10, before the word "activities", it is proposed to insert "relief."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Washington what the amendment he has just offered would accomplish.

Mr. CAIN. The amendment just offered by the Senator from Washington would charge the President of the United States with the responsibility which was originally assigned to the Federal Works Administrator under the committee bill. The President of the United States in his discretion can select either the Federal Works Administrator or the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Commerce, or the Department of Defense, as he sees fit.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Washington feel that this amendment would authorize the President to designate any other agency of Government to carry out this work?

Mr. CAIN. The bill is so written that whoever is charged with the responsibility of designating particular agencies and selecting others would have that authority, and it necessarily follows that this amendment will give to the President the authority which was intended for the Secretary of National Defense.

Mr. AIKEN. With that understanding I think the bill is all right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as I understand, this is an authorization bill.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We expect to offer to the Congress today or tomorrow the bill containing appropriations to carry out this authorization or similar authorizations in disaster areas.

Mr. CAIN. That is the understanding of the junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly hope this bill be passed. As I understand this is the only measure we now have which, if passed, will provide some Federal machinery to help in carrying on the work of clearing up and emergency repairing of the damage resulting from the present floods in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and will also provide machinery for giving emergency aid elsewhere in the event disasters result from hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, or other natural disturbances. The provisions of the bill are limited to 1 year because the committee realized that there was not time to work out the program carefully, but it was thought we should give power to the Federal Government to gather the supervision of all its relief activities under one head, and then to authorize the contracting of up to $10,000,000 worth of obligations to meet the cost of immediate relief activities. Without trying at all to go into the permanent reconstruction, this measure will give some Federal assistance not only where it is needed so badly now, but in other places later, if needed during the year.

Last fall in Florida we found that after the terrible flood that occurred, there was needed some machinery through which the various Federal agencies could find unified leadership and could tie together their extremely worth-while activities, personnel, and facilities, and at the same time be supplied with funds to meet the emergency needs.

The bill represents considerable study. It is not in the form we want to make permanent, but it will provide some constructive machinery to operate in this field for the limited period of 1 year.

I hope the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next committee amendment was, on page 3, line 3, to strike out:

(c) reconstruct, repair, restore, or replace facilities owned by Federal departments and agencies, for which purposes funds are not otherwise available; and

(d) make grants to States and local public agencies, including counties, cities, towns, districts, and other local public entities, to assist them in defraying the cost of emergency protection work, and the cost of repairing, restoring, reconstructing, or replacing public facilities owned by them: *Provided*, That no such grant shall be made to any local public agency unless the Administrator determines that such agency needs the grant and cannot otherwise defray such cost without creating an excessive tax or debt burden.

And insert in lieu thereof:

(c) make grants to local public agencies, including counties, cities, towns, districts, and other local public entities, to assist them in defraying the cost of emergency protection work, and the cost of temporary repair, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of public facilities owned by them and necessary for public health and safety and maintenance of vital public services: *Provided*, That no such grant shall be made to any local public agency unless the Governor of the State certifies and the Secretary of National Defense determines that such local agency needs the grant and cannot otherwise defray such cost without creating an excessive tax or debt burden.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 12, after the word "this", to strike out "section" and insert "act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 23, after the word "this", to strike out "act; and" and insert "act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 24, to strike out "(e) To prescribe rules and regulations for the administration of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 9, after the word "hereunder", to strike out "in order" and to insert "to the extent necessary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 23, to strike out:

(b) In addition to any such appropriation, authority is hereby granted to the Federal Works Administrator to enter into contracts or otherwise to incur obligations, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, for the purposes of this act in amounts not to exceed in the aggregate $10,000,000 at any one time.

And insert:

(b) Authority is hereby granted to the Secretary of National Defense to enter into contracts or otherwise to incur obligations, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes in amounts not to exceed in the aggregate $10,000,000, for the purposes of this act when funds appropriated therefor have been exhausted or are determined to be inadequate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 10, to insert a new section 7, as follows:

SEC. 7. The authority contained in this act shall remain in effect until June 30, 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2831) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the coordination of emergency and relief activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas, and for other purposes."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, Senate bill 2831 has just been passed. I am very glad it was passed, because it is a measure which was reported within the last few days after consideration had been given to it by the Committee on Public Works. It was found, as is shown by the report, that a measure of this kind was urgently needed in order to meet an emergency. The measure does not provide, however, for permanent relief or permanent construction, but its purpose is to meet those needs which arise suddenly throughout the country by reason of natural disasters. I will say that not only will it be of value in assisting in disasters of the nature described, but of disasters of any nature. The bill will be in effect for only 1 year. I am very glad indeed that the report of the Committee on Public Works has been approved by the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from West Virginia, who is chairman of the Public Works Committee of the Senate, and to his colleagues on that committee, and I say it in behalf of the Senators from both Washington and Oregon, that we deeply appreciate the fine and wonderful cooperation which the Senator's committee has given to us in respect to this bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to thank the Senator from Oregon and to say that the measure will be helpful no doubt to the Northwest, but it is a bill which covers the whole country.

MOORE DRYDOCK CO., OF OAKLAND CALIF.

The bill (H. R. 4516) for the relief of the Moore Drydock Co., of Oakland, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

G. C. HEDRICK

The bill (H. R. 1733) for the relief of G. C. Hedrick was considered, ordered to

a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OTTO KRAUS, RECEIVER

The bill (H. R. 2696) for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHESTER O. GLENN

The bill (H. R. 1076) for the relief of Chester O. Glenn was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO WASHINGTON COUNTY, ARK.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2849) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark., which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the word "directed", to insert "subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe,"; and on page 2, after line 16, to insert a new paragraph as follows:

The deed shall reserve to the United States all interest in and to any oil, mineral, or fissionable material in said land, and shall provide for reversion to the United States if the land ceases to be used for hospital purposes.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed, subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe, to convey by quitclaim deed to Washington County, Ark., without consideration, the following-described tract of land, which is a part of the lands of the Veterans' Administration hospital, Fayetteville, Washington County, Ark.:

A part of the southeast quarter of northeast quarter of section 9 and a part of the southwest quarter of northwest quarter of section 10, township 16 north, range 30 west, fifth principal meridian, more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the southwest corner of southeast quarter of northeast quarter of said section 9, running thence north two hundred feet; thence east five hundred and thirty feet; thence north fifty degrees eighteen minutes east two hundred and thirty-four and eighty-three one-hundredths feet; thence east seven hundred and forty-four and seventeen one-hundredths feet to the center of said United States Highway Numbered 71; thence south two degrees two minutes west along center of said United States Highway Numbered 71 three hundred and fifty and twenty-four one-hundredths feet; thence west one thousand four hundred and forty-two and forty one-hundredths feet to the place of beginning, containing nine and eighty one-hundredths acres.

The deed shall reserve to the United States all interest in and to any oil, mineral, or fissionable material in said land, and shall provide for reversion to the United States if the land ceases to be used for hospital purposes.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5040) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6634) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJUDICATION OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3999) to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military order, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 3, after the words "jurisdiction to" to strike out "adjudicate" and insert "determine according to law"; on the same page, line 7, after the word "otherwise" to strike out "and is substantiated in such manner as the Attorney General may prescribe,"; on the same page, line 10, after the word "limitation" to insert "as to amount"; on page 2, line 13, after the word "therefrom" and the period, to strike out "Existence or intervention of other causes affecting the damage or loss, including action or nonaction by the claimant or his representatives, shall be considered by the Attorney General in determining the amount of relief that will be fair and equitable according to the facts as they appear in each case."

On page 3, line 3, after the word "or", to strike out "who is otherwise resident in a foreign country" and insert "by and on behalf of any alien who on December 7, 1941, was not actually residing in the United States;"; on the same page, line 15, after the word "amended;", to strike out "and"; on the same page, line 18, after the word "mental", to strike out "suffering" and the period, and insert "suffering; and"; on the same page, line 19, to insert "(5) For loss of anticipated profits or loss of anticipated earnings"; on page 4, line 1, after "(b)", to strike out "Any relative evidence having probative value shall be considered by the Attorney General in his inquiries."; on the same page, in line 10, after the word "General.", to strike out "Any person appointed to examine witnesses may be authorized by the Attorney General to issue subpenas, to procure attendance of witnesses or production of documents, and to appoint an officer to serve the same."

On the same page, line 19, after the words "proof of", to strike out "service, as shall be the returned receipt or telegraph receipt when service is by registered mail or telegraph, respectively. On request the" and insert "service. The"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "shall", to strike out "dispose of" and insert "adjudicate"; on the same page, line 14, after the word "name", to insert "and address"; on the same page, line 17, after the word "case", to insert "and the reasons for each adjudication."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3999) was read the third time and passed.

REFUND OR CREDIT TO BREWERS OF CERTAIN TAXES

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to order No. 1782, House bill 6808, for the purpose of offering an amendment which is agreeable to the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. MILLIKIN] and agreeable to the Senator who objected to the bill when it was reached on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I simply wish to say that the agreement will confine itself to that amendment, and that I shall object to anything else that comes up in connection with the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If any Member tries to extend the bill I shall vote against such endeavor myself, but I cannot believe any Member will take the position that he wants to tax the church or to prevent the church from receiving the relief it seeks, by trying to place some other amendments on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a few moments ago I objected to this bill. I do not agree to the bill at the present time, but I do want to relieve church organs from the imposition of further taxes. For that reason I am withdrawing my objection at this time, with the understanding that there will be no further amendments.

Mr. MAYBANE. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that since there was objection to the bill insofar as the liquor interests were concerned, I did not object, although I had intended to because objection had already been made. While I regret to see the tax exemption of church organs as an amendment to this bill, I am a coauthor with the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, and hope that the bill will pass. After all, churches need tax relief far more than some others. I had hoped we could have passed a separate bill but we have no chance at this late time in this session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 6808?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6808) to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia on behalf of himself and other Senators. Because of the explanation already made, without objection the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point without reading.

The amendment was as follows:

On page 3, after line 7, to insert:

"SEC. 5. That section 3404 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to manufacturers' excise taxes on musical instruments) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(d) Musical instruments, but the tax imposed by this section shall not apply to musical instruments sold for the use of any religious or nonprofit educational institution for exclusively religious or educational purposes. The right to exemption under this subsection shall be evidenced in such manner as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may prescribe by regulations.'

"SEC. 6. Section 3443 (a) (3) (A) (i) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits and refunds) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(i) resold for the exclusive use of any State, Territory of the United States, or any political subdivision of the foregoing, or of the District of Columbia, or, in the case of musical instruments embraced in section 3404 (d), resold for the use of any religious or nonprofit educational institution for exclusively religious or educational purposes;'.

"SEC. 7. The amendments made by sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be applicable with respect to sales made after the date of enactment of this act."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

ELLEN HUDSON, ADMINISTRATRIX

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2726) for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$7,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson, deceased, the sum of $7,500, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Walter R. Hudson as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle, near Pittman, Nev., on April 4, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUTHER BROS. CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6428) to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss, if any, sustained by Luther Bros. Construction Co., of Fort Worth, Tex., under Reclamation Bureau contract No. 12r-15757 arising out of or attributable to the alleged failure of the Government to supply materials as provided for in said contracts.

SEC. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to the Luther Bros. Construction Co.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JAMES & PHELPS CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2705) to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the district court of the western district of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss, if any, sustained by James & Phelps Construction Co., Oklahoma City, Okla., Reclamation Bureau contracts No. 12r-15920 and 12r-15994 arising out of or attributable to the alleged failure of the Government to supply materials as provided for in said contracts.

SEC. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to the James & Phelps Construction Co.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is as follows: This contracting company had a contract to build a portion of an irrigation dam at the so-called Altus-Lugert irrigation project. The name has since been changed to the W. C. Austin project. Because of the failure of the Government to furnish both steel and concrete during the war, the work could not proceed. Under the contract, the Government was to furnish certain commodities. It did not furnish those commodities. The commodities could not be obtained. The purpose of the bill is to reimburse the contractor for the loss. As I understand, the bill is so drawn that the reimbursement may not exceed a certain amount. The amount to be allowed is yet to be determined, in the event that something is to be allowed. This is similar to another bill which passed the Congress a few days ago.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I understand, the bill only confers jurisdiction upon the district court to hear and determine the claim.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GABEL CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1734) for the relief of Gabel Construction Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss and damages, if any, sustained by Louis E. Gabel, an individual, trading as Gabel Construction Co., of Orlando, Fla., under contract No. NOY-9336 of the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Department of the Navy arising out of or attributable to the alleged delay in supplying materials as provided for in said contracts: *Provided*, That the jurisdiction conferred by this section shall be confined to questions of fact.

SEC. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to Louis E. Gabel, trading as Gabel Construction Co.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, ETC.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2756) to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEM and Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in the interest of saving time on this subject, I should like to make an explanation, if the Senator will withhold his objection for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad to do so.

Mr. MALONE. The bill as drafted is designed to supplement the existing Stock-Piling Act (60 Stat. 596, 50 U. S. C., sec. 98 et seq.) by stimulating the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals for stock-piling purposes in the interest of national defense, and to establish a mine

incentive payments division within the Department of the Interior. It is the opinion of the committee that more metal is required immediately for stock-piling purposes and that a long-range conservation development and exploration program is vital to the national defense and security of this country.

The committee is deeply concerned over the reported shortages of strategic and critical metals in the military stock pile.

Mr. President, I defer to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] for further explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I think it is a matter of common knowledge in the Senate that, practically speaking, we have no stock piles of many strategic materials. We are now at the mercy of importations with respect to many of those materials. During the war we found that that was a very risky procedure.

I have managed on the floor of the Senate within the past year several bills to remove the duty from importations of certain minerals and metals—for example, zinc and lead. That points up the whole purpose of this bill. It emphasizes our critical domestic shortage of certain strategic materials, including the ones I have just mentioned.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Let us bring this bill into perspective with what we are doing in other fields. We are in process of passing draft legislation. We have already made enormous commitments for the maintenance and enlargement of our Military Establishment. We are making extraordinary expenditures in our foreign affairs in the hope that what we are doing along those lines will be an antidote to war.

All the things we are doing are perfectly futile unless they have the support of domestic stock piles and developed mineral resources. In an emergency, with our foreign supplies shut off, we could not move a wheel; we could not get our planes up; we could not make artillery or other armaments; we could not support these programs to which we are committed unless we have the necessary stock piles and developed mineral resources. We cannot rely on foreign imports.

This is a very modest bill intended to stimulate exploration, and to make it worth while to explore and develop strategic materials. I earnestly hope that Senators who objected to the bill will, in the interest of the national defense, and in the light of the emergencies which confront us, withdraw their objection, so that we may build up an adequate domestic supply of minerals and metals, not only useful for our military purposes but, I respectfully suggest, vital to our peacetime economic development.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is it not a fact that if these strategic metals and minerals were imported into the United States, we should be taking metals and minerals away from foreign countries where they are needed in our program to help them rehabilitate their economies and get on their feet?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It would have exactly that effect.

Mr. McFARLAND. This is the only way in which we can get a stock pile of strategic metals and minerals without hurting our own industry or the industries of foreign countries.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, so far as the amount of money involved in the bill is concerned, it would be entirely inconsequential compared with the loss of only a few ships carrying to us strategic materials in the event of another war, which I hope we shall not have. We learned that lesson during the last war, when ships carrying metals and minerals which we needed in this country were torpedoed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding that this metal subsidy is proposed in order to permit the continued exploration and development of known or probably known ores within the United States. As I understand, the subsidy is not to be spent to give those who already have well developed mines additional profits, but it is to be used for the purpose of increasing exploration and development of other mines in the country, mostly smaller mines. As I understand, the additional product to be derived as a result of this subsidy is to be used for stock piling, for the purpose of enhancing the security of the Nation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is entirely correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, am I entitled to recognition under the 5-minute rule? If so, I wish to say that although I do not know which Senator made objection to consideration of the bill, I still hope that the objection may be withdrawn and that action may be taken on the bill.

I shall take only a moment or two to quote from an editorial appearing in the June 15 issue of the Denver Post. The editorial says in part:

The United States still has huge underground reserves of strategic minerals but most of them are in the form of low-grade ores which are expensive to mine and to treat.

Marginal mines cannot operate profitably at present metal prices. Those prices are set in competition with higher-grade ore deposits in foreign countries. The United States needs all the metal it can get from abroad as well as all the metal it can produce at home.

Yet in the United States 13,000 mines have gone out of production since 1930. Colorado had 313 operating lead and zinc mines in 1939. Today it has only 70. Fifty-two Colorado mines closed in the last half of 1948 following the termination of the wartime premium-price plan for metals.

The failure of Congress to pass the Russell bill or some similar measure, will be a serious blow to the West. The greatest damage, however, will be to the Nation's long-range defense plans.

Mr. President, I certainly hope that the Senator who made the objection will permit this bill to be passed.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATEGIC ERROR

Congressional proposals to stimulate the mining of strategic minerals have become casualties of the rush to adjourn. In spite of pleas by Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Republican, of Colorado, the autocratic House Rules Committee has refused to put the Russell premium-payment program for metals on the calendar for the few remaining days of the expiring session.

It seems strange that after voting billions for various defense purposes Congress would not find either the time or the inclination to vote a few million dollars to assure the country of an adequate stock pile of the metals it would have to have if another war broke out.

The Stock Piling Act of 1946 has failed to fulfill its purpose. One reason is that it forbids the stock piling of metals which are in short supply for civilian consumption.

The United States still has huge underground reserves of strategic minerals, but most of them are in the form of low-grade ores which are expensive to mine and to treat.

Marginal mines cannot operate profitably at present metal prices. Those prices are set in competition with higher-grade ore deposits in foreign countries. The United States needs all the metal it can get from abroad as well as all the metal it can produce at home.

Yet in the United States 13,000 mines have gone out of production since 1930. Colorado had 313 operating lead and zinc mines in 1939. Today it has only 70. Fifty-two Colorado mines closed in the last half of 1947 following the termination of the wartime premium-price plan for metals.

The failure of Congress to pass the Russell bill, or some similar measure, will be a serious blow to the West. The greatest damage, however, will be to the Nation's long-range defense plans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to concur in what the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has said with respect to the need for lead in our national defense. We are passing a draft law, which is a very drastic act, indeed, so we know something about the need for national defense. However, we need lead, not only for national defense but for our national economy. As a matter of fact, four factories of the National Lead Co. are forced right now to close their doors because they do not have enough lead to permit them to proceed with production. Not only that, but it is suggested that lead be withdrawn from the manufacture of ethyl gasoline and from the manufacture of batteries. Those are both important considerations to this country.

So I sincerely hope that the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] will withdraw his objection, in view of the great need for lead in the national defense, and also the need for lead for our domestic purposes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the

RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a brief statement on this question.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The production of the strategic and critical metals and minerals from the mines of Colorado was necessary to furnish the sinews of war. The same is true of the mines of all the Western, Middle Western, Central, and Eastern States. A large percentage of these mines operated under the premium price plan, which was used during the war to get out greater production of war metals. On no other basis could they have operated.

The Eightieth Congress enacted legislation during its first session to continue this program to supply the metals necessary to meet the industrial requirements of the Nation. At the time, this legislation met the approval of Congress. Unfortunately the President felt that there was no immediate emergency, and also that there were certain objections to the legislation which justified a veto.

However conditions have changed to such an extent that it is obvious that legislation of this nature is vital for the national defense.

In my book a stock pile of critical metals is the most vital part of our national defense and the need for building a reserve of strategic and critical metals for the purpose of meeting any emergency which may confront America must not be lightly set aside. Large appropriations have been approved by Congress for this purpose, but in spite of these appropriations, the stock pile of metals is very low—so low that in the national interest it is highly desirable that we enact legislation to stimulate the production, exploration, and conservation of our strategic and critical ores.

Conditions in the mining industry in my State are such that I feel there is a real need for this legislation today. For example, although the National Lead Co. advises me that it is shutting down four plants by reason of the shortage of lead. The second largest lead mine in Colorado has, within the last month, been forced to shut down. I refer to the Imperious Mining Co., at Creede, Colo. Ores which netted $1 to $3 a ton prior to the war are now mined at a loss to the company of from $2 to $5 a ton. Numerous examples of recent shut-downs of mines producing those metals which are needed, not only for stock-piling purposes, but for industrial requirements, could be given.

Illustrations of the benefits received under this plan are numerous and I desire here to cite only one. In Gunnison County, Colo., is located the Akron mine of the Callahan Zinc & Lead Co., Inc. It would still be an abandoned camp were it not for the benefits derived from legislation such as this. During the administration of the program a prosperous community has developed. There was a very large outlay of capital by the company which resulted in an operation contributing 700 tons of lead concentrates, and 1,300 tons of zinc concentrates per quarter to our peace and security requirements. Without this legislation this community may revert to a ghost town and the Nation lose vital supplies of lead and zinc.

Out of 313 mines receiving benefits in Colorado only 70 are in operation today, and many of these are depending upon Congress to reenact this legislation. This situation prevails throughout the mining camps of other States, and it is well for Congress to realize that in refusing to pass this legislation it is sounding a death knell to the independent small producing segment of the mining industry which, unfortunately, has the opposition of the big low-cost producers such as the St. Joe Lead Co., at Bonne Terre, Mo., and the Kennecott Copper Corp., which has a strangle hold on the copper industry with fabricating plants in Connecticut.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on the point on which the able Senator from Colorado has spoken, I wish to say that my attention has been called to the very critical shortage of lead in the United States.

I wish to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado whether this bill, if enacted, will increase to any appreciable extent, the supply of lead in the United States for commercial uses.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, in my opinion the bill would increase the production of lead to a most appreciable extent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Within what length of time would that increase be obtained? Can the Senator tell us?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say if the administrative set-up provided for in the bill gets under way promptly, mines that have the prospect of successful exploration or development would commence to get busy at once.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand the situation, the bill is not in any sense a subsidy to going concerns or large companies, but in fact is to stimulate production from what are known as marginal mines—the small mines—and also to increase interest in the operation of new mining properties. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The emphasis of the bill is on the encouragement of exploration and development by small mines. Under the formula proposed in the bill, the benefits might reach beyond that; but I repeat the principal emphasis is on the smaller operations.

Mr. President, let me ask the Senator to yield long enough to permit me to make a statement.

If the Senators who have objected will not withdraw their objection, I wish to serve notice now that those of us who are interested in this bill will press to bring up the matter for debate, and we shall ask for, let us say, an hour's time, with an agreement to vote at the end of an hour.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for making that statement. The Finance Committee went over this bill rather thoroughly and there can be no question as to the need to stimulate the production of strategic and critical ores and metals and minerals in the national defense. This should be done now. We should not pursue the same course that we pursued prior to Pearl Harbor, in reference to the stock piling of critical materials needed for national defense.

This bill is most important, and I am happy that the Senator is taking the position of preparing to have the bill called up at the proper time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been made, the bill is passed over.

The clerk will call the next measure on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. CAPEHART and other Senators. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Has House bill 4044, Calendar No. 1802, been passed over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] would like to have whatever Senator objected to consideration of the bill withhold the objection so that an explanation of the bill can be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky wish to be heard?

Mr. COOPER. I should like to be heard, if there is a chance of persuading the distinguished Senator from Indiana to withdraw his objection.

This bill has been for several months the subject of a great deal of work by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and also by the full Judiciary Committee.

After World War I a Mixed Claims Commission was established to consider and determine claims asserted by citizens of the United States against enemy countries and alien funds held by the Alien Property Custodian. Almost 3 years have passed since the close of World War II, yet there is no agency of the United States constituted to receive claims of citizens of the United States against Japan and Germany, although approximately $260,000,000 of enemy funds are held by the Alien Property Custodian.

This bill proposes the establishment of a commission to which certain types of claims can be immediately referred for determination, and which is directed to recommend to the Congress procedures for receiving, hearing, and determining all types of war claims. The commission would consist of three members, and it would be required to make a first report to the Congress, not later than 6 months after its organization, setting out its recommendations as to the types and amounts of claims which should be considered by it, the priorities which should apply in the payment of claims, and suggested methods of administration and payment.

The bill does not provide for the immediate payment of any claims other than those which I shall now discuss.

The subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee agree that there are three groups which should receive immediate consideration. The first group—some 1,308 in number—is that group of workers who were induced to go to Wake Island, Guam, and other possessions of the United States to construct military installations. They were captured, and those that lived were treated as internees or prisoners of war. The bill provides that they shall be paid under the contractor's cost-plus contract with the Government the amounts which were promised them in their contracts, excluding overtime. In addition, death and

disability benefits are made available under the amended Longshoremen's Act. It is estimated these charges would amount to approximately $2,500,000.

The second group is made up of approximately 13,000 American citizens who were interned in the Philippine Islands and other possessions of the United States.

American citizens in other sections of the world were advised or directed to return to this country by the State Department before the war. Members of this group inquired if they should return from the Philippines to the United States.

They were not told to return, and lulled into security. They were caught when the war with Japan commenced, and for nearly three and a half years lived under most miserable conditions, but gave strength to the people of the Philippines. This bill would give them some relief. Each person over 18 will receive $50 a month and each person under 18 will receive $20 a month for the term of their detention. It is estimated that $20,000,000 would be required.

A third group is comprised of the 29,000 American soldiers who were captured by the Japanese and who were subjected for 3 years to brutal and barbarous treatment in contravention of the laws of war. The committee took complete testimony. General MacArthur's Chief of Staff, General King, testified that it was the design of the Japanese high command to starve these troops. We provide that if the Commission shall determine that the Japanese violated the terms of the Geneva Convention, which Japan announced it would observe, and which guaranteed certain standards of food, that for such violation the Japanese, out of the alien funds, shall be charged $1 a day for the violation. It is a small item in proportion to their injuries, and this item is estimated to cost $40,000,000. None of these claims will be paid from tax revenues of this country. They will be paid out of the Japanese and German funds held by the Alien Property Custodian. These people have waited too long and should have this inadequate measure of consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator from Kentucky. I was a member of the subcommittee, which spent many weeks on the bill. We held hearings in Albuquerque, N. Mex., beginning as far back as last December. The hearings were conducted there, for the reason principally that most of the men involved came from the New Mexico National Guard, which participated in the horrible death march from Bataan. All the bill does is to set up a means of procedure whereby the former prisoners of war, internees, contractors' employees and our own American soldiers would have some slight recompense from the Japanese funds amounting to some $270,000,000, now impounded by the Alien Property Custodian.

What we are doing is almost niggardly. We are for instance under the bill giving to the American soldiers who spent from 36 to 40 months under the most horrible conditions ever imposed by one man on another, in Japanese prison camps, compensation at the rate of $1 per day for their subsistence. That would be what it would have cost the American Government had they been in the American Army. We provide that a commission shall be set up similar to the Mixed Claims Commission which was created after World War I, with whom claims may be filed over and above the amounts received under the bill for maltreatment in violation of the Geneva Conference while in Japanese prisons.

The bill has been carefully considered for some weeks by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is not perfect. The beneficiaries of the bill have waited a long time. The contractors' employees should get what they would have been paid had they remained at work instead of being confined in Japanese prisons. We also provide that civilian internees shall have a right to file claims again, over and above the provisions of the Geneva Conference. For instance, if a civilian were kept in an internment camp in Japan and a Japanese guard gouged out his eyes, it is provided that a claim may be filed for the destruction of the claimant's sight, in violation of the Geneva Conference. I could stand on the floor of the Senate for 2 or 3 hours reciting horrible instances of things that would nauseate Senators. It cannot be realized that one human being could treat another the way the Japanese treated our soldiers. The Japanese have $270,000,000 in this country. I think people within the specified groups are entitled to file claims for at least some slight recompense, to be paid out of that amount. I hope no one will object to the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am sure the senior Senator from Indiana would not have objected to the bill if he had understood it. I know the senior Senator wants to do what is right by everyone. I am satisfied he wants to do his share at least to bring about some kind of equity to the men, especially military personnel, who went through the agonies of the damned and who suffered at the hands of the Japanese while in prison.

If the senior Senator from Indiana wants to have it on his conscience, it is all right with me. I know boys in my State who had hot wires driven clear through their feet. I know boys in my State who had nails driven into their heads. I know boys in my State who are blind. They are all former military prisoners of war. They are not only in my State but also in Illinois. In a little town just out of Chicago, in Peoria, in St. Joseph, Mo., in Salinas, Calif., and elsewhere these men can be found. I wish the senior Senator from Indiana would go there and see the agony of those youngsters. Now, because the Committee on the Judiciary dares to advocate the establishment of a Claims Commission through which those boys would receive a little recompense, there are objections to the bill. I am sure if the Senator from Indiana would only go with me, I could take him to 200 of the men within a day, in the city of Albuquerque.

We pass laws here subsidizing industry, subsidizing the farmer, authorizing money for the relief of Europe, but those who suffered in the Philippines must wait; the bill must be subject to an objection.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. There are other phases of the bill than those to which the Senator referred, which caused me to object. I was about ready to suggest I should like to talk to the author of the bill and see if it could not be sent to the foot of the calendar for later consideration. However, since the Senator has taken it upon himself to make a speech directed at me, in very strong terms, I am not so sure that I wish to do that. I was not objecting to the phase of the bill to which the Senator refers, but there are other phases of it which I wish to have explained. There is to be another call of the calendar tomorrow, I hope, and I am sure I shall have no objections. If the Senator will only have a little patience and allow the bill temporarily to go to the foot of the calendar, I think we can get it straightened out.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree to that.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not know until now that it was a sin to object to a bill, or at least to request an opportunity to look into it, if there was some question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know it is not a sin to object to a bill, but I do think it is a sin to object to a bill that is meritorious without knowing what the bill contains.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

The bill will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I hardly dare trust myself to speak on this subject. However, the horrors and injuries which my colleague has related are not one-tenth of the story.

I rise to express my thanks to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who took their Christmas holiday period last year to go to Albuquerque, where they heard the most horrifying stories they had ever heard in their lives, stories more horrible than any man had ever heard before. I trust no man will ever hear them again.

I express my thanks and appreciation to the distinguished and able committee which has performed this work and has reported the bill. Tomorrow I hope I may include my thanks to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] for withdrawing his objection and permitting the bill to pass.

ESTATE OF L. L. McCANDLESS

The bill (H. R. 915) to confer jurisdiction upon the district court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLA L. BROWNING

The bill (S. 2299) for the relief of Ella L. Browning was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ella L. Browning, Bar Harbor, Maine, the sum of $3,552.50, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for damages to a swimming pool and stone terrace wall situated at Pointe d'Acadie, on Mount Desert Island, in connection with experimental work with ordnance materials conducted by the United States Navy at Bald Porcupine Island, Hancock County, Maine, in and after 1943, while such Bald Porcupine Island was occupied by the Naval Establishment under lease (NOy (R)-33877) executed by said Ella L. Browning, on September 15, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

HAWAIIAN DREDGING CO., LTD.

The bill (H. R. 6186) for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD NATIONAL STEAMSHIP COS.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 1774, Senate bill 1691, for the relief of First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos. I have conferred with all of the Senators who raised objections and asked to have the bill go over, and I think that now we are in the clear to have the bill passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1691) for the relief of First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Jersey if he talked with the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SMITH. I did not know the Senator from Minnesota had an objection.

Mr. WHERRY. It may be that I have the wrong Senator in mind. Perhaps it was the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Vermont now assures me that there is no objection to consideration of the bill by any Senator who made objection at the time it was first called on the calendar. I have conferred with every Senator who I was told by my aide had objected. They have withdrawn their objections.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment will be stated.

The amendment was, on page 2, in line 14, after the words "Fleet Corporation," to strike out "and (b) an amount on account of interest equal to the interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum upon the aforesaid sum from January 5, 1921, to the date of payment of the aforesaid sum; and (c) an amount on account of interest equal to the interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum upon the sum of $250,000 from January 5, 1921, to October 7, 1935, this being the date on which this sum was returned to the companies by the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, a successor of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, jointly or severally to the First National Steamship Co., the Second National Steamship Co., and the Third National Steamship Co., corporations organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, as the balance of the refund to said companies and as reimbursement and compensation to said companies the sum total of the following amounts, namely: (a) The amount of $364,256.26, being the balance on account of certain sums deposited by or on behalf of those companies in the year 1920 with the United States Shipping Board and/or United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation and on account of certain further sums expended by said companies for and on behalf of the United States Shipping Board and/or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation in the year 1920 in connection with the vessels *Independence*, *Hoxie*, and *Scottsburg*, then owned by the United States Government and/or the United States Shipping Board and/or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALARIES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOL TEACHERS, ETC.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 1708, Senate bill 2850, for the reason that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who had objected, has authorized me to say that he has withdrawn his objection. He thought the bill was a teachers' pay raise bill, which it is not. It is simply designed to correct certain inequities which developed through the operation of the teachers' bill passed by the Congress in 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2850) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officials, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That article II of title I of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved July 7, 1947, be and the same hereby is amended by striking out the following words and figures:

"CLASS 13—PRINCIPALS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS WITH 18 OR MORE ROOMS, AND PRINCIPALS IN AMERICANIZATION SCHOOLS

"A basic salary of $4,300 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of $5,300 per year is reached."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"CLASS 13—PRINCIPALS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND PRINCIPALS IN AMERICANIZATION SCHOOLS

"A basic salary of $4,300 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of $5,300 per year is reached."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (ap) of section 6 of title III of said act is hereby amended by inserting the following at the end of said paragraph: "No longevity increases for placement as provided in this paragraph shall be granted to any probationary or temporary teacher, librarian, research assistant, counselor, or instructor in the teachers colleges appointed after June 30, 1948, to group C in salary classes 1 to 8, inclusive, in article I of title I, unless credit for such increases is based upon approved teaching or other service rendered after the master's degree had been conferred upon the appointee: *Provided*, That this limitation on placement credit shall not apply to appointments made from current eligible lists effective on July 1, 1948."

SEC. 3. Section 6 of title III of said act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph to be lettered "(ar)" and to read as follows: "Every permanent and probationary teacher, librarian, research assistant, counselor, and instructor in the teachers colleges in the employ of the Board of Education on June 30, 1947, who either possessed a master's degree on June 30, 1947, or shall have received a master's degree during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and whose salary during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, was less than $3,500, shall be entitled to receive in lieu thereof a salary of $3,000 per annum plus longevity increases for placement in group C in salary classes 1 to 8, inclusive, in article I of title I, of $100 for each year of like service in the public schools of the District of Columbia acceptable to and approved by the Board of Education, including military leave and educational leave with part pay, subsequent to probationary appointment and prior to July 1, 1947, but for not more than the fifth year of such service, to be effective as of July 1, 1947, or on the first day of the month immediately following the date on which the master's degree was conferred, whichever is later, and shall be entitled to receive annual increases thereafter in accordance with the provisions of sections 5 and 7 of this act. The provisions of this paragraph shall not operate to reduce the amount of annual compensation of any teacher, librarian, research assistant, counselor, or instructor in the teachers colleges, below the amount of annual compensation received by him during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948."

SEC. 4. (a) Paragraph (b) of section 21 of title V of said act is hereby amended to read as follows: "After the effective date of this act, the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of the public-school teachers in the District of Columbia,' approved August 7, 1946, shall apply to permanent employees of the Board of Education whose salaries are fixed by this act, and all references in said act to the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended, shall be interpreted to apply to this act. Nothing in this subsection shall require the recomputation of the annuity of any person retired under the act of August 7, 1946, prior to the effective date of this act, or of any person retired prior to the effective date of the act of August 7, 1946, whose annuity is computed in accordance with the provisions of that act."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The

(b) This section shall be effective as of July 1, 1947.

SEC. 5. This act, except as otherwise provided herein, shall become effective on July 1, 1948.

GEORGE BAILEY

The bill (S. 1995) for the relief of George Bailey was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George Bailey, of Indianapolis, Ind., the sum of $115.12, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for loss or damages on account of property damage and minor personal injuries to Mrs. George Bailey, sustained as a result of a collision wherein his vehicle was struck by an Army vehicle in Indianapolis, Ind., on November 30, 1945, driven by an enlisted man in the Army of the United States not acting within the scope of his office or employment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 1666, Senate bill 2686.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall object if we return to all the bills which have been passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is at the mercy of the Senate in that respect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

CHARLES M. DAVIS

The bill (H. R. 4103) for the relief of Charles M. Davis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 1802, House bill 4044.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

The bill (H. R. 6860) to amend the Federal Airport Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENSIONS FOR CERTAIN WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The bill (H. R. 4962) to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CYPRESS CREEK DRAINAGE DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

The bill (H. R. 2395) for the relief of the Cypress Creek Drainage District of the State of Arkansas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARITAL DEDUCTIONS FOR ESTATE-TAX PURPOSES

The resolution (H. J. Res. 429) relating to the marital deductions for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life-insurance or annuity payments, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CLAIMING CREDIT FOR REFUND IN CONNECTION WITH WAR LOSSES

The resolution (H. J. Res. 428) providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WIDOW OF ROBERT V. HOLLAND

The bill (S. 605) for the relief of the widow of Robert V. Holland was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force shall cause to be paid, out of funds appropriated for pay of the Air Force current at the time of payment, to the widow of Robert V. Holland (ASN O-32325), late a major in the United States Air Force, who died on December 5, 1947, such sum as would otherwise have been paid to said widow as a death gratuity under the act of December 17, 1919, as amended (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 903), had the said Robert V. Holland died while in a pay status and while holding the rank of major on the date of his death.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION TO ALASKA

The resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to continue until December 31, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the present act will expire on June 30 unless some action is taken. If it does expire, we shall have a critical situation existing with respect to Alaska shipping. However, if the Senator from South Carolina wishes to object and wishes to eliminate Alaska shipping, it is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wonder if there is any objection to the joint resolution being placed at the foot of the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will go to the foot of the calendar.

AMENDMENT TO MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING STAMP ACT OF MARCH 16, 1934

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2482) to amend sections 2, 4, and 8 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 2, beginning in line 5, to strike out:

And (3) by inserting before the last period in such subsection the following proviso: "*Provided*, That in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior not to exceed 25 percent, at any one time, of the total of the areas acquired in accordance with the provisions of this act, may be administered primarily as wildlife management areas not subject to the prohibitions against the taking of birds, or nests or the eggs thereof, as contained in section 10 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222; 16 U. S. C. 715i), as amended, except that no such area shall be open to shooting when the population of birds frequenting such areas or in the migrations utilizing such areas is on a decline and no newly acquired or newly established area shall be open to shooting until the same has been fully developed as a management area, refuge, reservation, or breeding ground."

On pages 2 and 3, to strike out sections 4 and 5, as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 8 of said act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and he may cooperate with the appropriate officials and agencies of any country which is a party to a treaty with the United States for the protection of migratory birds in the development and protection of such birds and their habitat, in such manner as he may deem advisable, including but not limited to the grant of funds to carry out such cooperative efforts."

SEC. 5. Section 5 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929, as amended, is further amended by inserting the words "wildlife management and" immediately before the words "inviolate sanctuaries for migratory birds" as they appear therein.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended, is further amended by striking the figure "$1" as it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$2."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended (1) by deleting the words "Not less than 90 percent shall be available", and (2) by inserting the words "wildlife management and," immediately before the words "inviolate migratory-bird sanctuaries" as they appear therein.

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 4 of said act is amended by deleting the words "The remainder shall be available."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend sections 2 and 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451, 16 U. S. C. 718 (b)), as amended."

CANNON VALLEY MILLING CO.

The bill (H. R. 1780) for the relief of Cannon Valley Milling Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATUE OF COMMODORE JOHN BARRY

The resolution (H. J. Res. 297) to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS RIO GRANDE

The bill (H. R. 5252) to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION OF SECRETARY OF STATE TO PERFORM CERTAIN FUNCTIONS

The bill (H. R. 4330) to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE

The bill (H. R. 4367) authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co. and assignees to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. EASTLAND. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN REGULAR ARMY OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6039) to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 2, line 10 to insert:

The President is further authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint in the Regular Navy one officer in the permanent grade of admiral from among any officers on the active list of the Regular Navy who served in the temporary grade of admiral from February 4, 1944, to the present date, and commanded a major combatant unit of the United States Fleet in the Pacific Treater of Operations during all or any part of the Second World War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6707) to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the laws requiring retirement of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers because of age shall not apply to officers of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59). The President may, in his discretion, upon the request of the officer concerned, restore to the active list of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force any officer of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force on the retired list who was appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59).

Officers appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59), shall not be counted within the limited number of officers authorized to be serving on active duty in grades above lieutenant general as provided in section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.) unless they be serving as Chief of Staff or in command of any territorial or tactical subdivision of the Army or the Air Force.

SEC. 2. In addition to the number of officers authorized to serve after July 1, 1948, on the active list in the grade of General in the Army and Admiral in the Navy pursuant to sections 504 and 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, officers now on the active list of the Army in the grade of general whose dates of rank in such grade are between March 8, 1945, and April 15, 1945, inclusive, and of the Navy in the grade of admiral whose dates of rank in such grade are prior to April 4, 1945, may, at the discretion of the President, be continued in such grades until July 1, 1950, unless sooner retired and the total number of officers authorized by these sections to have the grade, rank, title, pay, and allowances of vice admiral or admiral and lieutenant general or general, is temporarily increased accordingly: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section in no way affect the status of the officer who may be serving as Chief of Staff in the Army on the effective date of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INSTRUCTION AT NAVAL ACADEMY OF CERTAIN PERSONS FROM THE PHILIPPINES

The bill (H. R. 6698) to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, apparently the call of the calendar has been concluded. I should like very much if such an order could be entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The call of the calendar has been concluded; and, for the record, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2589) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION TO ALASKA

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 1817, Senate Joint Resolution 219.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I shall have to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina objects.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have been requested to object until the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is back on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the call of the calendar has been concluded, and I think I shall make a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is such a motion in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not in order under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will not the Senator from South Carolina reserve his objection?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An objection has been made and not withdrawn. Is there any other bill any Senator wishes to have the Senate return to?

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I do not wish to have the Senate return to the consideration of the bill, but at the time Calendar No. 1507, Senate bill 2644, was called, it went to the foot of the calendar, and I now ask that I may be permitted to speak 5 minutes regarding the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entirely correct in his statement. The Senator asked that the bill be passed to the foot of the calendar, and the Senator from Maine is now recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this is a measure reported as a result of the studies of the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board. The bill has been on the Calendar for some time, and there are at least one or two Senators who have some question regarding it, so that I shall not ask for its further consideration at this time. I did wish, however, to explain its purpose to the Senate, with the earnest hope that before the Senate recesses or adjourns there might be opportunity for its consideration.

Mr. President, under the present procedure the development of new types of transport aircraft is utterly impossible so far as private agencies are concerned. At the close of the war, with the optimism which prevailed, certain airplane manufacturing companies and air lines went forward, at an expense of 25 to 40 million dollars, with the development of the so-called prototype plane. They literally lost their shirt. The Government lost its shirt, because the Government was subsidizing the air lines.

It became perfectly evident to those studying this problem that there would be no further development of this type of aircraft unless some form of government development were undertaken, and what is provided in this bill seemed the most practical way.

I may point out that our English friends are now developing an 8-engine jet-type transport aircraft, presumably with our funds, which, if successful, will supersede all current aircraft in overseas work, and long-range craft.

Nothing comparable has been or can be undertaken by any private agencies in this country, because of the expense involved, and the utter hopelessness of coming out even. They could go forward and simply increase their demands upon the Government through the means of the existing postal subsidy, but they fully concur with the representatives of Congress that such a course would not be wise.

Therefore, Mr. President, this bill was developed, with the full cooperation of all Government agencies concerned and of all private agencies concerned, as the only practical means of proceeding. At the present time the Export-Import Bank has under consideration, and I understand possible commitment, a loan of $30,000,000 to the BOAC, or the British Overseas Airlines, for the purchase of 25 Constellations, which will exceed those possessed by any American company, and enable them literally to sweep the skies in this latest type of transport. Meanwhile they are evolving new types.

I am not quarreling with this procedure, although I think it is extremely unfortunate, but I am saying that if the progress of American aviation in this field, both for military and civilian transport, is not to be halted, something must be done. Under the proposal, the prototype will be developed by the Government, and as far as further developments are concerned, it is anticipated that several thousand of these planes would be purchased by private industry, would be used in private industry, and would be instantly available in the event of any national emergency.

This is why it seems so wise that we should proceed in the way suggested, and I hope that before the next 24 hours are passed, we may get an opportunity for the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is not asking to have the bill taken up now?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over.

CLOTURE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, am I entitled to 5 minutes under the rule?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is nothing before the Senate at the moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Am I entitled to time on the bill of the Senator from Maine?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes. The Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall take this 5 minutes of the Senate's time because it may be the last time for some hours I shall have opportunity to discuss the matter. At least according to the public press, it has been widely proclaimed or advertised that the Senate is to have the public's business blocked by a form of filibuster which in turn would hold up vital national-defense legislation.

I merely wish to point out to the Senate that very early this year, and last year, as a matter of fact, I introduced a proposed change of the Senate rules so that the Senate would be able to guard itself to a reasonable degree against a filibuster of the kind threatened. That resolution was not reported out of the Rules Committee, but a more moderate resolution was, one which had been submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], which left the cloture rule as it is today, except that it provided that it might be applied to motions as well as measures.

Because neither of those measures has been acted upon, the Senate today finds itself in such a position that not even by a two-thirds vote can it apply cloture against a filibuster, unless it is a filibuster on a bill, and not merely on a motion.

It seems to me that in the closing days of a session of the Congress, when representative government itself is on trial, this power to block vital legislation of interest to the national defense, to completely obstruct the legislative processes of government, is too much power for any responsible person to want, and far too much power for any irresponsible person to have.

I certainly hope that at the earliest opportunity in the next meeting of the Senate, either later this year or at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress, the Senate of the United States will proceed to amend its rules so that we will not be subject to this type of a situation.

NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to Calendar No. 1666, Senate bill 2686, for further consideration. I understand the Senator who objected no longer objects and is willing to have the measure considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of Calendar No. 1666, which the clerk will again state by title.

A bill (S. 2686) to establish the Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, to provide for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with the following amendments:

On page 4, strike out lines 4 to 23, both inclusive.

On page 5, strike out lines 1 and 2.

On page 5, line 5 change "Sec. 6" to read "Sec. 5".

On page 6, strike out lines 3 to 23, both inclusive.

On page 7, line 3, change "Sec. 8" to read "Sec. 6".

On page 7, line 16, change "Sec. 9" to read "Sec. 7".

On page 8, line 11, change "Sec. 10" to read "Sec. 8".

On page 8, line 18, change "Sec. 11" to read "Sec. 9".

On page 8, strike out lines 22, 23 and 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate to be appointed by the Chairman thereof, and two members of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Chairman thereof."

On page 10, line 14, change "Sec. 12" to read "Sec. 10".

On page 10, line 14, after the figure "12" insert the following: "(a)".

On page 10, line 19, after the period insert the following: "(b) There is also hereby authorized to be appropriated $250,000 per annum for the relief of the dependent children, the blind, aged, sick, and disabled among the Navajo and Hopi Indians who are needy."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress recognizes the peculiar problems of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, growing out of social, political, and geographic conditions which make the planning and development of a program of rehabilitation for these tribes separate and distinct from that of any other Indians. Recognizing further that the reservations of these Indians have insufficient resources to adequately support more than approximately half of their population, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to bring about the assimilation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians into the general population under conditions which will permit the termination of Federal administration of their affairs at the earliest practicable date. To that end, and in order to carry out existing treaties with these Indians and to fully assure the recognition of their rights under the treaties, the provisions of this act are enacted.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NAVAJO-HOPI ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of the Interior as agency to be known as the Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration") at the head of which shall be an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 a year. The Administration shall be separate and apart from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Commission of Indian Affairs and shall exercise its powers and duties under the direct supervision of the Secretary of the Interior. The principal office of the Administrator shall be on the Navajo Indian Reservation.

(b) The Administrator may, in accordance with the civil-service laws, appoint in the Administration and in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923 fix the compensation of, a deputy administrator and such other officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions vested in the Administration, but so far as he deems it advisable may obtain personnel for that purpose by transfer from the Bureau of Indian Affairs of personnel in excess of the needs of that Bureau in the light of the transfer of functions to the Administration under the provisions of this act.

TRANSFER OF POWERS, DUTIES, AND FUNCTIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, all powers, duties, and functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs with respect to the administration of laws relating to Indians are, so far as they relate to the Navajo and Hopi Indians, transferred to and shall be exercised by or under the direction of the Administration and the Administrator.

(b) All records and property (including office equipment) of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all personnel used primarily in the exercise of such powers, duties, and functions are hereby transferred to the Administration for use in the exercise of such powers, duties, and functions.

(c) The unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for use in the exercise of such powers, duties, and functions are hereby made available to the Administration for such purpose.

TRANSFER OF HEALTH ACTIVITIES TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

SEC. 5. (a) All powers, duties, and functions, of the Secretary of the Interior, the Office of Indian Affairs, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relating to the conservation and improvement of the health, including sanitation, of the Navajo and Hopi Indians and to the maintenance and operation of hospitals, clinics, other medical relief activities, and preventive programs on the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations are hereby transferred to and shall be exercised by the Public Health Service and the Surgeon General under the direction of the Federal Security Administrator.

(b) All personnel, records, and property (including office equipment and living quarters) of the Office of Indian Affairs used primarily in the exercise of such powers, duties, and functions are hereby transferred to the Public Health Service for use in the exercise of such powers, duties, and functions.

(c) All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for use by the Office of Indian Affairs in the exercise of such powers, duties, and functions are hereby made available to the Public Health Service for such purpose.

PROGRAM FOR REHABILITATION OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIANS

SEC. 6. The Administrator shall at the earliest practicable date prepare and submit to the Joint Committee hereinafter provided for a program for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians in accordance with the policies and purposes of this act. In order to carry out that purpose, he shall proceed immediately to make surveys of existing educational, economic, and welfare facilities, highways, and water supply, and submit a report and recommendations for a long term economic, industrial, and cultural program of rehabilitation on or off the Navajo-Hopi Indian Reservations indicating the possibility of State participation in the program.

EDUCATION

SEC. 7. The Congress recognizes that education is one of the most important and difficult aspects of the Navajo-Hopi problems. Pending the development of a general rehabilitation program, the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator shall utilize to the fullest extent the provisions of existing law for the purpose of improving the educational opportunities of the Navajo-Hopi Indians and in addition thereto the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contracts with any State for the construction, either on or off the Navajo-Hopi Reservation, of additional school buildings and the furnishing of additional school facilities for the development of a suitable program for child and adult education and on-the-job training. The Secretary of the Interior shall have full authority to enter into arrangements with any such State in order to bring any educational facilities so authorized within the State educational systems, so far as that may be practicable.

ORDERS, RULES, AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 8. All orders, rules, and regulations of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relating to the powers, duties, and functions transferred under this act which are in effect on the date of transfer are hereby continued in effect until modified, superseded, or rescinded by the agencies to which such transfers are made.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "committee"), to be composed of two members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate to be appointed by the chairman thereof, and two members of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the chairman thereof. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

(b) It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the programs for the administration and rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and to review the progress achieved in the execution of such programs. Upon request the committee shall aid the several standing committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over any part of such programs, and shall make a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, from time to time, concerning the results of its studies, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable. The Administrator, at the request of the committee, shall consult with the committee from time to time with respect to his activities under this act.

(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

(d) The committee is authorized to appoint and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and organizations thereof, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out any program for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians developed under the provisions of this act or under other law, including the sum of $25,000,000 for surveys and for the immediate development of an educational program.

(b) There is also hereby authorized to be appropriated $250,000 per annum for the relief of the dependent children, the blind, aged, sick, and disabled among the Navajo and Hopi Indians who are needy.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of Calender 1802, House bill 4044, to which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] objected.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection, since the bill has been explained to me by the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of Calendar No. 1802, House bill 4044, which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert the following:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "War Claims Act of 1948."

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the War Claims Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and to be composed of three persons to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. At least two of the members of the Commission shall be persons who have been admitted to the bar of the highest court of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia. The members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 a year. The terms of office of the members of the Commission shall expire at the time fixed in subsection (d) for the winding up of the affairs of the Commission.

(b) The Commission may, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys, and employees, and may make such expenditures, as may be necessary to carry out its functions. Officers and employees of any other department or agency of the Government may, with the consent of the head of such department or agency, be assigned to assist the Commission in carrying out its functions. The Commission may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the Government, utilize the facilities and services of such department or agency in carrying out the functions of the Commission.

(c) The Commission may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions, and may delegate functions to any member, officer, or employee of the Commission. The Commission shall give public notice of the time when, and the limit of time within which, claims may be filed, which notice shall be published in the Federal Register. The limit of time within which claims may be filed with the Commission shall in no event be later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this act.

(d) The Commission shall wind up its affairs at the earliest practicable time after the expiration of the time for filing claims, but in no event later than 3 years after the expiration of such time.

JURISDICTION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 3. The Commission shall have jurisdiction to receive and adjudicate according to law claims as hereinafter provided.

EMPLOYEES OF CONTRACTORS

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any person specified in section 101 (a) of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942, as amended, or by the legal representative of any such person who may have died, for the amount by which (1) the total sum which would have been payable to such person by his employer (not including any payments for overtime), if such person's contract of employment had been in effect and he had been paid under it for the entire period during which he was entitled to receive benefits under section 101 (b) of such act, exceeds (2) the entire amount creditable to such person's account for such period under the provisions of such section plus any amounts paid to such person by such employer for such period or recovered by such person in any legal action against such employer based upon such person's right against such employer for such period under the contract of employment, including payments in settlement of the liability of the employer arising under or out of such contract. No claim shall be allowed to any person under the provisions of this section unless such person executes a full release to the employer and to the United States in respect to the liability of the employer arising under or out of the contract of employment, except liability for workmen's compensation benefits under the act of August 16, 1941, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1651 and the following), or detention of other benefits paid under the act of December 2, 1942, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1751 and the following). Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified by the Commission to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act.

(b) (1) The Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to cancel any obligation to the United States of any person specified in section 101 (a) of such act of December 2, 1942, to pay any sum which may have been advanced to or on behalf of any such person by the Department of State for the purpose of paying the costs of food and medical services furnished to such person during his period of internment by the Imperial Japanese Government or for the purpose of paying transportation or other expenses of repatriation.

(2) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any person specified in section 101 (a) of such act of December 2, 1942, for the repayment of any sum which may have been paid by such person to the Department of State in settlement of any obligation of the type referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection. Any claim allowed under the provisions of this paragraph shall be certified by the Commission to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act.

(c) Section 102 (a) of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the proviso in such subsection and by substituting the following: "*Provided*, That the total compensation payable under this title for injury or death shall in no event exceed the limitations upon compensation as fixed in section 14 (m) of such act as such section may from time to time be amended except that the total compensation shall not be less than that provided for in the original enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That any amendment to such act, the effect of which is to increase the amount of benefits payable for injury or death, shall be applied in the administration of this section as if the amendment had been in effect at the time of the particular injury or death and the compensation (except funeral and burial expenses) in any case previously determined shall be adjusted accordingly in respect to the beneficiary entitled thereto under the act."

INTERNEES

SEC. 5. (a) As used in this section, the term "civilian American citizen" means any person who, being then a citizen of the United States, was captured by the Imperial Japanese Government on or after December 7, 1941, at Midway, Guam, Wake Island, the Philippine Islands, or any Territory or possession of the United States attacked or invaded by such Government, or while in transit to or from any such place, or who went into hiding at any such place in order to avoid capture or internment by such Government; except (1) a person who at any time voluntarily gave aid to, collaborated with, or in any manner served such Government, or (2) a person who at the time of his capture or entrance into hiding was (A) a person within the purview of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, and as extended; or (B) a person within the purview of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942, as amended; or (C) a person within the purview of the Missing Persons Act, as amended; or (D) a regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of any military or naval force.

(b) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by, or on behalf of, any civilian American citizen for detention benefits for any period of time subsequent to December 6, 1941, during which he was held by the Imperial Japanese Government as a prisoner, internee, hostage, or in any other capacity, or remained in hiding to avoid being captured or interned by such Imperial Japanese Government.

(c) The detention benefit allowed to any person under the provisions of subsection (b) shall be at the rate of $50 for each calendar month during which such person was at least 18 years of age and at the rate of $20 per month for each calendar month during which such person was less than 18 years of age.

(d) The detention benefits allowed under subsection (b) shall be allowed to the person entitled thereto, or, in the event of his death, only to the following persons:

(1) Widow or dependent husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

(2) Widow or dependent husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or dependent husband and the other half to the child or children in equal sheres; and

(3) Child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or dependent husband.

(e) Any claim allowed under the provisions of subsection (b) shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act, and shall be payable by the Secretary of the Treasury to the person entitled thereto or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one.

(f) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the provisions of titles I and II of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942, as amended, are extended and shall apply with respect to the injury, disability, or death resulting from injury of a civilian American citizen occurring while he was held by or in hiding from the Imperial Japanese Government, to the same extent as if such civilian American citizen were an employee within the purview of such act of December 2, 1942, as amended.

(2) For the purpose of determining the benefits extended and made applicable by paragraph (1)—

(A) the avcrage weekly wage of any such civilian American citizen, whether employed, self-employed, or not employed, shall be deemed to have been $37.50.

(B) the provisions of such act shall be applicable whether or not any such civilian American citizen was employed;

(C) notice of injury or death shall not be required; and limitation provisions with respect to the filing of claims for injury, disability, or death shall not begin to run until the date of enactment of this section; and

(D) the monthly compensation in cases involving partial disability shall be determined by the percentage the degree of partial disability bears to total disability and shall not be determined with respect to the extent of loss of wage earning capacity.

(3) The following provisions of such act of December 2, 1942, as amended, shall not apply in the case of such civilian American citizens: Section 101 (b), section 104, and section 105.

(4) Rights or benefits which, under this subsection, are to be determined with reference to other provisions of law shall be determined with reference to such provisions of law as in force on January 3, 1948.

(5) The money benefit for disability or death shall be paid only to the person entitled thereto, or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one, and shall not upon death of person so entitled survive for the benefit of his estate or any other person.

(6) The benefit of a minor or of an incompetent person who has no natural or legal guardian may, in the discretion of the Federal Security Administrator, be paid, in whole or in such part as he may determine for and on behalf of such minor or incompetent directly to the person or institution caring for, supporting, or having custody of such minor or incompetent.

(7) No person, except a widow or a child, shall be entitled to benefits for disability with respect to himself, and to death benefits on account of the death of another.

(8) If a civilian American citizen or his dependent receives or has received from the United States any payments on account of the same injury or death, or from his employer, in the form of wages, or payments in lieu of wages, or in any form of support or compensation (including workmen's compensation) in respect to the same objects, the benefits under this section shall be diminished by the amount of such payments in the following manner: (A) Benefits on account of injury or disability shall be reduced by the amount of payments to the injured person on account of the same injury or disability; and (B) benefits on account of death shall be reduced by the amount of payments to the dependents of the deceased civilian American citizen on account of the same death.

(9) This subsection shall take effect as of December 7, 1941, and the right of individuals to benefits shall be held to have begun to accrue as though this subsection had been in effect as of such date.

PRISONERS OF WAR

SEC. 6. (a) As used in this section, the term "prisoner of war" means any regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the military or naval forces of the United States who was held as a prisoner of war for any period of time subsequent to December 7, 1941, by any government of any nation with which the United States has been at war subsequent to such date.

(b) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any prisoner of war for compensation for the violation by the enemy government by which he was held as a prisoner of war, or its egents, of its obligation to furnish him the quantity or quality of food to which he was entitled as a prisoner of war under the terms of the Geneva convention of July 27, 1929. The compensation allowed to any prisoner of war under the provisions of this subsection shall be at the rate of $1 for each day he was held as a prisoner of war on which the enemy government or its agents failed to furnish him such quantity or quality of food. Any claim allowed under the provisions of this subsection shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act.

RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 7. The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any religious organization functioning in the Philippine Islands and affiliated with a religious organization in the United States, or by the personnel of any such Philippine organization, for reimbursement of expenditures incurred, or for payment of the fair value of supplies used, by such organization or such personnel for the purpose of furnishing shelter, food, clothing, hospitalization, medicines and medical services, and other relief in the Philippines to members of the armed forces of the United States or to civilian American citizens (as defined in section 5) at any time subsequent to December 6, 1941, and before August 15, 1945. Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act.

REPORT WITH RESPECT TO PERSONAL INJURY AND PROPERTY CLAIMS

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall inquire into and report to the President, for submission of such report to the Congress on or before February 1, 1951, with respect to war claims arising out of World War II, other than claims which may be received and adjudicated under the preceding sections of this act, and shall present in such report its findings on—

(1) the estimated number and amount of such claims, classified by types and categories; and

(2) the extent to which such claims have been or may be satisfied under international agreements or domestic or foreign laws.

(b) The report of the Commission shall contain recommendations with respect to—

(1) categories and types of claims, if any, which should be received and considered and the legal and equitable bases therefor;

(2) the administrative method by which such claims should be considered, and any priorities or limitations which should be applicable; and

(3) any limitations which should be applied to the allowance and payment of fees in connection with such claims.

(c) The Commission shall include in such report—

(1) such other recommendations as it deems appropriate; and

(2) such proposals for legislation as it deems appropriate for carrying out the recommendations made in such report.

(d) Such report, with accompanying evidence, shall be printed as a public document when received by the Congress.

(e) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to imply that the Congress will enact legislation—

(1) adopting any recommendations made under this section with respect to the consideration or payment of any type of claim; or

(2) making any moneys, including moneys remaining in the War Claims Fund after the making of payments from such fund provided for by this act, available for the payment of such claims.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 9. Not later than 6 months after its organization, and every 6 months thereafter, the Commission shall make a report to the Congress concerning its operations under this act.

REMUNERATION FOR SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH CLAIMS

SEC. 10. No remuneration on account of services rendered or to be rendered to or on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the Commission under this act shall exceed 10 percent (or such lesser percent as may be fixed by the Commission with respect to any class of claims) of the amount allowed by the Commission on account of such claims. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere, pays or offers to pay, or promses to pay, or receives, on account of services rendered or to be rendered in connection with any such claim, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more 12 months, or both, and, if any such payment shall have been made or granted, the Commission shall take such action as may be necessary to recover the same, and, in addition thereto any such claimant shall forfeit all rights under this act.

HEARINGS WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS

SEC. 11. The Commission shall notify all claimants of the approval or denial of their claims, and, if approved, shall notify such claimants of the amount for which such claims are approved. Any claimant whose claim is denied, or is approved for less than the full allowable amount of such claim, shall be entitled, under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe, to a hearing before the Commission or its representatives with respect to such claim. Upon such hearing, the Commission may affirm, modify, or revise its former action with respect to such claim, including a denial or reduction in the amount theretofore allowed with respect to such claim. The action of the Commission in allowing or denying any claim under this act shall be final and conclusive on all questions of law and fact and not subject to review by any other official of the United States or by any court by mandamus or otherwise, and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer for payments in accordance with such action.

AMENDMENTS TO TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

SEC. 12. (a) The fourth sentence of section 34 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, is amended by striking out "those of other natural persons who are and have been since the beginning of the war residents of the United States and who have not during the war been interned or paroled pursuant to the Alien Enemy Act;".

(b) The Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 39. No property or interest therein of Germany, Japan, or any national of either such country vested in or transferred to any officer or agency of the Government at any time after December 17, 1941, pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be returned to former owners thereof or their successors in interest, and the United States shall not pay compensation for any such property or interest therein. The net proceeds remaining upon the completion of administration, liquidation, and disposition pursuant to the provisions of this act of any such property or interest therein shall be covered into the Treasury at the earliest practicable date. Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or otherwise affect the operation of the provisions of section 32 of this act or of the Philippine Property Act of 1946."

WAR CLAIMS FUND

SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby created on the books of the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the War Claims Fund. The War Claims Fund shall consist of all sums covered into the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended. The moneys in such fund shall be available for expenditure only as provided in this act or as may be provided hereafter by the Congress.

(b) The Federal Security Administrator is authorized and directed to estimate and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total amount which will be required to pay all benefits payable as a result of the enactment of section 5 (f) of this act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, subsequent to payment of all claims certified for payment pursuant to sections 4, 5, and 6 of this act, transfer from the War Claims Fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount so certified by the Federal Security Administrator. No benefits shall be payable as a result of the enactment of section 5 (f) of this act until such time as such sum is so transferred.

(c) The Federal Security Administrator is authorized and directed to estimate and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total amount which will be required to pay all additional benefits payable as a result of the enactment of section 4 (c) of this act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the War Claims Fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount so certified by the Federal Security Administrator.

(d) The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total amount of all obligations canceled pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (b) (1) of this act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the War Claims Fund to the general fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the total amount so certified.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the War Claims Fund, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions under this act.

PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RELIGIOUS ORDERS

SEC. 14. In any case in which any money is payable as a result of the enactment of this act to any person who is prevented from accepting such money by the rules, regulations, or customs of the church or the religious order or organization of which he is a member, such money shall be paid, upon the request of such person, to such church or to such religious order or organization.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION TO ALASKA

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Senate Joint Resolution 219, Calendar No. 1817.

I ask for immediate consideration of that measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana has asked immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 219, which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to continue until December 31, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I previously objected to the measure. I now withhold objection so the Senator from Indiana may make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, all I wish to say is that the bill would extend the provisions of Public Law 12, which expires on June 30, 1948. Unless the law is extended it will, in my opinion, create chaos with respect to Alaskan shipping at a time when we ought to strengthen our Alaskan facilities rather than weaken them. The bill is primarily an extension of Public Law 12. It does not in any way change the substance of Public Law 12. It is a bill on which the committee held extensive hearings. The committee gave much thought and much time to it. It was almost the unanimous testimony of those who came before the committee that the law should be extended as provided by the bill. Such extension was recommended by the Maritime Commission and by other agencies and individuals. I cannot understand why anyone should object to it.

I am glad to yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, following the objection which was raised to Senate Joint Resolution 219 by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], he informed me and other interested Senators that he had entered an objection in the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. Because of the importance of the passage of this legislation to Alaska and to the Pacific Northwest in general, I was authorized by my colleagues to endeavor to find the Senator from North Dakota, and find him I did, in fact, in the restaurant, where he was very willing to discuss his objection. The Senator from North Dakota told me that he had been approached during the course of this morning by an attorney from the Maritime Commission who wanted the Senator from North Dakota to object to the legislation. I said, "That sounds very unlikely. It ought to be impossible, because the bill was authored more by the Maritime Commission than by anyone else." The Senator from North Dakota believed he had remembered correctly that the gentleman who had come to him was an attorney, and that the basis of the attorney's objection to the bill was that the Governor of Alaska was in opposition to the bill.

At just about that moment there appeared on my right a Mr. E. L. BARTLETT, who is the Delegate from Alaska, and I was thus able to introduce the Senator from North Dakota to the Delegate from Alaska. Mr. BARTLETT, and the Senator from North Dakota said to Mr. BARTLETT, "Are you not in opposition to the bill, as I have been told that you were?" Mr. BARTLETT said, "I was. The Governor was opposed to it. We wanted a different bill, but we would like very much to have this bill in the absence of getting everything we wanted and thought we were entitled to."

The Senator from North Dakota then asked a point-blank question of Mr. BARTLETT: "Can you speak for the Governor, for I still understand that the Governor does not want this bill in any way, shape, or form?"

Mr. BARTLETT's reply, as I best remember, was, "I am not qualified to speak for the Governor of Alaska."

The Senator from North Dakota, out of his willingness and desire to be of cooperative benefit to his associates, said, "Just as soon as I can I will put through a telephone call myself to try to determine from the Governor of Alaska if it is true, as stated by this representative of the Maritime Commission, that the Governor of Alaska is in opposition to a piece of legislation which you tell me the Delegate from Alaska and the Senators from the Pacific Northwest and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Maritime Commission and the shippers up and down that coast have been in complete and absolute agreement on for quite a long time.

As one Senator in company and in concert with my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I know that he agrees with me, that we hope, and hope deeply, that there is no slightest vestige of truth in the assertion made to the Senator from North Dakota that the Governor of Alaska is in opposition to the willingness and desire of people in the United States to be of real service to his Territory.

I am most grateful to the Senator from North Dakota for inquiring of the Governor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to join with my colleague from Washington in this matter. I also cannot help but remark that here is a measure that affects the economy of the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. Shipping is not what we would like to have it up there, but there have been arrangements made by the Maritime Commission to continue the present agreements from June 30. The bill would extend that authority only to February 28 of next year, when the Maritime Commission's authority expires, and Congress will have to look at the whole maritime picture.

Alaskan shipping could actually become chaotic if the bill does not pass before June 30. The committee has considered the matter. We have heard testimony. The subcommittee was unanimous in its report. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was unanimous in its report. The Governor of Alaska and the Delegate from Alaska presented certain amendments. Those amendments were not adopted. Now they favor the bill. They would like to have their amendments agreed to.

Mr. President, it is a fine legislative procedure when a committee makes a study of the whole situation as it affects the economy of all of the Pacific Northwest, and reports a bill, that an attorney from the Maritime Commission comes into the picture and makes a statement which would raise objection to the bill on the floor I cannot help but make such a comment now, because passage of the bill means so much to the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. With the permission of my senior colleague, I should like to address a question in this connection to the Senator from North Dakota, because we do not want, intentionally or otherwise, to do the Maritime Commission an injustice. The Senator from North Dakota told me that he recalled specifically that the attorney who came to him this morning, though he could not recall his name, was an agent from the Maritime Commission. It is difficult for me to believe or understand that, but obviously I can believe that the Senator from North Dakota meant exactly what he said on the basis of what was said to him. I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota will take another look at his memory as to who this individual was who came to him this morning.

Mr. LANGER. I may state to the distinguished Senator from Washington that what I told him was exactly the truth. I had not heard about the bill until after the call of the calendar had begun. I was called out of the Chamber by a gentleman who said he was an attorney for the Maritime Commission and he said that the bill, in his opinion, was not a good bill for the interests of the people; that the Governor of Alaska was opposed to it, as were some other individuals. I told the Senator from Washington that I would get in touch, by telephone, with the individuals to whom the gentleman from the Maritime Commission referred.

Mr. CAIN. My question was asked in order to be fair to the Maritime Commission, because it is the Commission's bill, and it would be reprehensible for an agent of the Maritime Commission to approach the Senator from North Dakota or any other Senator with such a suggestion.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest the Senator speak in his own time. I have only 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has only one-quarter of a minute remaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then I suggest that the Senator from Indiana ask for the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Governor of Alaska came before our committee and asked that the bill be extended for 5 years.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Instead of the temporary period provided in the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana has no further time on the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do I have no time at all left? I used only a minute of my time to speak.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator spoke and yielded to the Senator from Washington, and the 5 minutes allotted to the Senator from Indiana have expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I consider that this maritime measure is important and that it should be passed. I regret that objection is made. If there is one thing the people in Alaska need, it is proper transportation. I do not know what will happen to Alaska if this bill does not pass.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator wish to answer that question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want the Senator to know that the Delegate from Alaska is seated at the rear of the Chamber. I have talked with him and with the Governor of Alaska. They both approve the bill. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will accept the word of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and of the full committee, and of the Maritime Commission, the junior Senator from Washington, and myself, rather than that of some unnamed agent from the Maritime Commission.

This is vitally important to everyone in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington has already spoken on this joint resolution.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, was objection made to the joint resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection was made.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 16, 1948:

S. 1025. An act to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska;

S. 1037. An act to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho;

S. 1249. An act authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes;

S. 1302. An act to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes;

S. 1551. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of unimproved land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I.;

S. 1675. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen;

S. 2201. An act supplementing the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain bridges across streams, rivers, and navigable waters which are wholly or partly within the State," approved April 7, 1938;

S. 2215. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the heart and circulation, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes;

S. 2455. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by limiting the liability of certain persons not in possession of aircraft;

S. 2456. An act to provide safety in aviation and to direct a study of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms and other atmospheric disturbances;

S. 2553. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.; and

S. 2593. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia a right-of-way for public-highway purposes in certain lands at Pungo, Va.

On June 17, 1948:

S. 153. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida;

S. 1504. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 891), as amended by the act of November 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 1036);

S. 1520. An act to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 891), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects;

S. 2479. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; and

S. 2496. An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory;

S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes;

S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the civil service retirement and disability fund;

S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 5508. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans; and

H. R. 6318. An act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4435) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. REES, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, and Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3566) to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2825) to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 84, 101, 125, 150, 151, 152, 178, 190, 199, and 231 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, 189, 211, 212, and 214 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 199) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (House Rept. No. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an Advocate of Overthrow of Government by Force and Violence, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

REPORT ON ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY (H. DOC. NO. 724)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 75, enabling the United States to render financial, technical, and material aid to the Governments of Greece and Turkey, I submit herewith the third quarterly report on the activities and expenditures of funds under the authority of this act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

REPORT OF OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

REPORT COVERING WORK OF THE JUVENILE COURT (H. DOC. NO. 725)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the juvenile court during the fiscal year 1946–47.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. Doc. No. 184)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the legislative branch, amounting to $2,689,400, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. Doc. No. 185)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, amounting to $849,730, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. Doc. No. 186)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, amounting to $6,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, TREASURY DEPARTMENT, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. Doc. No. 187)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation in the amount of $1,100,000 and authorizations in the amount of $7,500,000 for the Housing and Home Finance Agency; supplemental estimates of appropriation in the amount of $15,000,000 for the Treasury Department; and supplemental estimates of appropriation in the amount of $3,500,000, and loan authorization in the amount of $25,000,000, for the Department of Agriculture, all for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 188)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, amounting to $245,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 189)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $5,275,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (S. Doc. No. 190)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Labor, amounting to $2,000,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 191)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $1,000,000 fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 192)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, amounting to $1,500,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 193)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $35,000,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 194)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, amounting to $2,000,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 195)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, amounting to $6,730,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (S. Doc. No. 196)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, amounting to $453,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD AND CITY OF NEW YORK

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, and the annual report of the city of New York covering operations of Foreign-Trade Zone No. 1, during the calendar year 1946 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 6695. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1767).

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution relative to negotiations with the Canadian Government concerning the construction of railroads in Alaska and the establishment of reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements; with amendments (Rept. No. 1768).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6935. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 18, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 3. An act to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators;

S. 239. An act to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 2505. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; and

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 2887. A bill for the relief of Adolf T. Von Ehrenbilt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 2888. A bill for the relief of Rev. Jeno Kunos, and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2889. A bill to incorporate the Twenty-ninth Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2890. A bill for the relief of Albert Vita Sciama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2891. A bill for the relief of the heirs of John W. Mitchell; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 2892. A bill for the relief of Tanju M. Ergil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2893. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Buira Sarrate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. KEM introduced Senate Joint Resolution 235, authorizing a study of certain matters looking to the better protection and preservation of migratory birds and game mammals, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS AND GAME MAMMALS

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution providing that the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a study and report to the Congress, through the Secretary of the Interior, respecting the administration and enforcement of conservation laws and regulations of the Republic of Mexico and the Dominion of Canada, designed to implement the treaties and conventions presently existing between such nations for the protection and preservation of migratory birds and game mammals.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 235) authorizing a study of certain matters looking to the better protection and preservation of migratory birds and game mammals, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION OF APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN POSTMASTERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 264), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the last paragraph of Senate Resolution 81, Eightieth Congress, agreed to June 17, 1947 (authorizing an investigation of the appointment of postmasters), is hereby further amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "January 15, 1949."

JOHN THOMAS

[Mr. REED, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1946, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public services of John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

VICTORY AND PEACE—ADDRESS BY JUDGE J. F. T. O'CONNOR

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Victory and Peace delivered by United States District Judge J. F. T. O'Connor at the Coliseum in Los Angeles, May 31, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WYOMING PLAN FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him and certain letters and other material pertaining to the Wyoming plan for veterans in the economic development of the West, which appears in the Appendix.]

WELCOME TO WONDERFUL WISCONSIN—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Welcome to Wonderful Wisconsin," prepared by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—LETTER FROM EDWARD A. O'NEAL

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding the accomplishments of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, from Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, retired president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHARLES O. ANDREWS

[Mr. HOLLAND, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a tribute prepared by him to the life, character, and public service of Charles O. Andrews, late a Senator from the State of Florida, and a number of other statements and articles in tribute to the late Senator, which appear in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL GUARANTY OF RIGHT TO WORK—EDITORIAL FROM DETROIT FREE PRESS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Guaranty of Right To Work Called Basic American Need," published in the Detroit Free Press for May 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ON SPAIN BY DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING

[Mr. O'CONNOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on Spain, by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of The Americas, and World Affairs, which appears in the Appendix.]

DOCTORATE OF LAWS FOR SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, recently the degree of doctor of laws was conferred upon my esteemed and distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Arizona (Mr. HAYDEN) by the University of Arizona. Knowing that Senators will be happy to know of this honor accorded to the Senator from Arizona, I desire to place in the body of the RECORD the citation and grant of the degree, together with the remarks of John D. Lyons, Jr., dean of the Law School of the University of Arizona, in the course of his presentation of the senior Senator from Arizona at the academic ceremonies.

I wish to add, Mr. President, that this is an honor well and amply earned by my colleague. I have now worked with him

in the United States Senate for a period of 7½ years. Our associations have been most pleasant, and I have always considered it an honor and a privilege to be his colleague. Unfailingly kind and considerate of the views of others, he is always willing to be helpful in every way possible. He is a tireless worker and a man of great ability. He is loved by all who work with him.

Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I present this citation, grant, and the statement of Dean Lyons, to be placed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks.

Without objection, the citation and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Office of the President
Tucson

SENATOR HAYDEN—DOCTOR OF LAWS

Specialist in legislation affecting the Nation's natural resources. Honored citizen and highly respected public official over a period embracing half a century. Devoted statesman whose distinguished public career has been dedicated to the service of the State of Arizona.

I am pleased to confer upon you the degree of doctor of laws, with all the rights, privileges, and honors thereunto appertaining, and as evidence of this to present you with this diploma and invest you with the hood of this degree.

CITATION OF CARL HAYDEN BY JOHN D. LYONS, JR., DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF LAW, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS PRESENTATION FOR THE HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS CONFERRED AT THE FIFTY-THIRD ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA ON MAY 26, 1948

Mr. President, it is my very great privilege to present as a candidate for the honorary degree of doctor of laws one whose long and distinguished public career has been dedicated to the service of the State of Arizona.

A native son, he was born at Hayden's Ferry, now the city of Tempe, and educated at the Tempe Normal School and Leland Stanford University. Thereafter he embarked upon a life of public service which at the close of his present term of office will have embraced half a century, the whole period of our statehood, and a decade of Territorial history.

His fellow citizens have honored him, and honored the democratic process, by electing him successively to the offices of town councilman, county treasurer, sheriff, first Member from Arizona in the United States House of Representatives, and more than a score of years ago, to the United States Senate, where he has since served, and now serves, with notable distinction.

His services to the State have been various and unsurpassed. Particularly as a specialist in legislation affecting irrigation and Federal highways he has played a major role in the reclamation of her fertile acres and in opening her scenic, climatic, and industrial treasures to new citizens and visitors from over the world.

It has been said that a man is not honored by what he receives, he is honored by what he gives. In this high sense he of whom I speak is honored indeed. For though he has received at the hands of the citizens of his State the highest public trust within their power to bestow, he has returned to them the utmost in ability, integrity, and devotion. We hail him as a wise and devoted legislator, and the very prototype of the citizen of a democracy.

Upon recommendation of the faculty of the college of law, the general faculty of the university, and the board or regents of the university and State colleges of Arizona, I present the United States Senator from Arizona, Hon. CARL HAYDEN.

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE—ESSAY CONTEST CONDUCTED BY DREW PEARSON

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, every time I rise nowadays I feel apologetic if in any way I waste the time of the Senate or abuse my privilege of free speech on this floor.

At a time like this, when there are vital questions still to be solved and vital work still to be done, I feel that each one of us should be most considerate with regard to the exercise of the personal rights and privileges which are ours, where individual action on our part affects other Members of the Senate and also the Members of the House of Representatives.

I hold in my hand eight very brief statements which are of considerable consequence. They are statements to which Members of both Houses of the Congress may well direct their attention when the opportunity to do so is available. These are the prize-winning essays in the recent contest which was conducted by Mr. Drew Pearson on the subject of how to make democracy live. I understand that more than 125,000 persons participated in this contest and that 152 prizes were awarded. These eight brief essays are well worth reading. Every one of us can obtain a real inspiration from any one of them.

The names of the winners are as follows:

Russell Mitcheltree, of Scarsdale, N. Y.
Mrs. Martha Pitman, of San Jose, Calif.
Perry LeFevre, of Orangeburg, N. Y.
Leonard M. Skinner, of Washington, D. C.
Rev. Alfred G. Fisk, of San Francisco, Calif.
The special veteran's award was granted to Mr. Robert P. Cork, of Greenwich, Conn.
The special college student award was made to Walter H. Mitchell, of Athens, Ga.
The special high school award was made to Miss Carol Breckenridge, of Redwood City, Calif.

Mr. President, I have spoken to the other Senators in whose States these prize winners live; and all of them—the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]—join me as I make this presentation of these particular essays for printing in the RECORD. In presenting them, I again call not only the attention of the Senate, but also the attention of the House of Representatives, to the fact that they are well worth the reading by every American.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Russell Mitcheltree, Scarsdale, N. Y.)

We, the people, can make democracy live, by living for democracy. First, let me—this man, this woman—cherish human freedom. Then let me, by word and example, inspire others to follow democratic ways.

As a citizen of my community, let me respect individual worth regardless of race, creed, color, position. Let me grant each person all his rights—religious, political, social, economic. Let me protect these rights—if need be, with my blood. Working for others, let me work well. Employing others, let me pay well. Applying good will at democracy's roots, I shall nourish life, liberty, happiness.

As a citizen of my country, let me faithfully practice my citizenship, not lose democracy by default. Let me advance these principles of welfare: That government is not a master, but an ever-progressing ally of man in his quest of food, health, home, education, security. That good public servants should be supported and unfit be replaced. That minorities must be heeded, lest unchecked power turn tyrant. That I am personally responsible for making democracy succeed, on election day and every day.

As a citizen of the world, let me help my country to help mankind. Untainted by selfish interest, let us aid any nation threatened or exploited. Being rich in God's plenty, let us feed the hungry. Being strong, let us lead earth's peoples to prosperity and peace.

Thus doing our duty at home and abroad, with justice, wisdom, courage, kindness, we shall win men's hearts and make democracy live.

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Mrs. Martha Pitman, San Jose, Calif.)

I can help make democracy live because the best citizen is not the one who knows most but the one who cares most. Being a mother, I can teach my children to care about people, about those values essential to a democracy.

If I show my child that his rights and possessions are respected, if I teach him to take his turn and do his share, if I make him feel loved and valued for himself, I'll be teaching him to believe in the inalienable rights of all people.

I will not train my child in blind obedience born of fear, for that makes dictators possible. I will expect only the conformity suitable to his age. I will not demand acceptance of all my opinions. I will tolerate the stress and strain of disagreement in order to encourage that free expression of ideas which enriches group life, and in order to further the self-discipline required for democratic living. My child can become truly democratic only by practicing that way of life.

By my example I will seek to show my child that democracy is worth all that it costs. I will obey the laws, even those I dislike. I will pay my taxes without evasion. I will be fair to people who differ from me in race, religion, or political philosophy. I will study my Government in order to vote intelligently. I will take time to serve my community.

If we parents care enough, we can make democracy live.

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Perry LeFevre, Orangeburg, N. Y.)

Democracy is a way of life for the individual before it can be truly embodied in a government. Its root idea is the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as ye would have them do unto you." To the degree that each of us embodies this principle in his own life to that degree we can make democracy live. It is our decision and our responsibility. In practice it will come to something like this:

Because I want to be treated as an individual, not as a member of a particular race or class, I will treat others as individuals.

Because I want to be free to worship, to speak and write, to choose my own job, to have a voice in the government of my community and Nation, and to criticize that government, I will strive that others may have that freedom.

Because I want to have my rights and liberties protected by law against those who would deny them to me I will work that others may have this same protection.

Because I want a fair chance in getting an education and in developing my talents I will try to help others to have this opportunity.

Because I want others to recognize my right to follow the dictates of my conscience I will recognize that right for them.

Because I want others to share the responsibility for maintaining these freedoms I, too, will work, strive, and give in order to do my part to make democracy live.

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Leonard M. Skinner, Washington, D. C.)

To make democracy live I must begin with myself. Democracy can live only as cooperative individuals work together to give it life. My coworkers must be men of good will, judged by merit alone, not by creed, race, or nationality. I must develop an awareness of and respect for their opinions.

My home must be a democratic one. Each of its members learns to share fairly its responsibilities as well as its privileges. Husband, wife, and children must have time and opportunity to work with democratic organization within the community. Our home should be provided with current reading material dealing with events and issues of the day. At least a part of our radio listening time should be tuned to public affairs discussions.

My city and county governments, so little understood and so neglected, must be purified and strengthened by the zeal of its citizens for a good administration. Let no local election occur without our knowledge of candidates' records and the issues at stake. Then let us have the energy and intelligence to actually vote our convictions and encourage others to do likewise.

My interest in democracy, however, must not be narrow and provincial. My State, my Nation, and my United Nations need my interest and support. I must study the issues and write them my views, protest what I believe to be wrong, commend what I believe to be right.

I can hope, work, and pray for a revitalized democracy, and I can make it begin with myself.

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Rev. Alfred G. Fisk, San Francisco, Calif.)

Democracy, like good music, does not need argument, it needs rendition. The best way to make democracy live, is to live it.

People are too much concerned about democratic rights; too little about democratic responsibilities. But the rights imply duties, and become empty unless practiced. Democracy is not a fact; it is a task. To make it live, we must:

1. Vote in every election—using our best intelligence, studying propositions and candidates.

2. Exercise our right of petition, letting our legislators and officers of Government know our convictions.

3. Promote community meetings for democratic discussion of civic and world problems.

4. Work through "good government" leagues—exercising eternal vigilance that political performance match profession.

5. Do an honest day's work. Parasites or shirkers fail in their responsibility to a democratic society.

6. Treat every man in personal relationships as an equal—without prejudice and without exploitation.

7. Finally, democracy—like peace—is indivisible. The world cannot long continue half democratic and half totalitarian. To make democracy live here at home; our Nation and we as individuals must use our influence that it live throughout the world.

Democracy begins with the individual; it ends with the world. Each of us, you and I, your next-door neighbor and mine, must practice democracy. We must build little islands of functioning democratic life. The islands will grow and touch other islands, merging into greater units, becoming continents, becoming finally the world. If you and I, the last and least citizen, live democracy day in and day out, democracy will live.

SPECIAL VETERAN'S AWARD

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Robert P. Cort, Greenwich, Conn.)

When a man's car breaks down, he doesn't stand around and talk or indulge in wishful thinking. He fixes it.

When a man's democracy is not functioning as it should, mere talk and wishful thinking will have no more effect than it would have on his car. He must do something about it. And since democracy is a joint enterprise, he must arouse his fellow citizens to the urgency of the particular repair job that needs to be done.

To keep our democracy in good working repair—a dynamic, satisfying way of life—every citizen must first of all keep informed on all government developments, local, State, national, international. He must carefully weigh this information with no prejudice in mind other than the goal of "the greatest good of the greatest number."

Finally, he must go into action. By example and precept, he must strive to overcome that deadly enemy of democracy—the spirit of "let George do it."

There are many ways of going into action. He must take his voting privilege seriously and, if need be, assist others to register and vote. Having voted, he must feel responsibility for keeping his elected administrators and lawmakers informed of his considered opinions. He should contribute, in his own way, to public weal, whether it be through schools, scouts, philanthropies, forums, and the like; or even running for office to expose an intrenched gang of incompetents.

In short, the way to make democracy work is to work at it.

SPECIAL COLLEGE STUDENT AWARD

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Walter H. Mitchell, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.)

Democracy is fundamentally a system of human relations. It is a way of life—a way in which people treat and deal with each other.

It means recognition of the fact that we can expect only as much freedom as we are willing to grant. It means insisting that the other fellow gets his rights just as you get yours. The loss of even one human right endangers all.

Democracy means rule of the majority—but due regard for minority opinion. It means freedom of expression, for if decisions are to be based upon majority opinions the people must know and analyze differing opinions.

For every right there is always a corresponding duty. The right of free speech demands respect for the rights of others. It carries a responsibility for speaking the truth. The precious right to vote carries with it the duty to vote, and to vote intelligently. It is the duty of the individual to keep himself informed because the degree of good government we get depends upon the amount of information we have on which to base our decisions. It is our duty to take a constructively critical attitude toward democracy. Our greatest danger lies in complacency.

With belief in the dignity and worth of the individual and with faith in the ability of men to govern themselves, we, the people, can surely make democracy live.

SPECIAL HIGH-SCHOOL AWARD

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Carol Breckenridge, Redwood City, Calif.)

As I read of the struggles to establish our form of government, I resolve to do my best to preserve it. I shall try never to become too complacent. Active, intelligent voting is one of the fundamental duties of all who want to make democracy live. An informed interest should govern my choice of candidates for public office. After election I should write my Congressman in order to let him know how I wish to be represented.

Quite apart from this active participation in making democracy live is another phase of obligation, more subtle, but equally important. It is building up within myself a deeper appreciation of the Bill of Rights and a willingness to make myself worthy of my Government. No system of representative government can be better than the people whom it represents. Therefore, I shall resolve to use my glorious freedom of speech to express only those ideas which will help all mankind, and never abuse it by using words to gain selfish or unworthy aims.

Each individual thinks often of his privileges, but now is the time to think often of one's duties and responsibilities in maintaining our Government. No one is immune to the process of making our democracy live.

MASSMAN CONSTRUCTION CO.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 2192, for the relief of the Massman Construction Co., and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of Massman Construction Company, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask that the message from the House of Representatives on Senate bill 2655 be again laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair again lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives insisting upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be the following: The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a moment on the motion.

In my opinion, this measure is mandatory on the Congress, because of its importance to the national defense. In my opinion, if any debate in the nature of a filibuster now takes place on this simple motion to name conferees, it is not in accord with the best customs of the Senate, the House, or the Congress. If the measure were to be debated on its merits, that would be a different question. It has been debated on its merits. The Senate has spoken. If conferees are appointed and the conference recommendation comes back to both Houses, and there are decisions of the conferees which are not to the liking of any Member or group of Members, no matter what the size of that group, the merits of the question can again be debated. But to use a parliamentary maneuver to stop the naming of conferees is clearly outside the high ideals which the American people hold for the doings of their Congress.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I am entirely in sympathy with the point of view of the Senator from South Dakota as he has expresed it. In this connection I point out to him the words of wisdom given us by the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] half an hour ago with reference to Senate rules which make such a thing possible. The Senate has made its own bed, and now it must lie in it. I think we need a few horrible examples of filibusters by one, two, three, or four men crammed down our throats to bring the Senate and the country to the realization of the crudeness, rudeness, and wickedness of the Senate rules, and the rules of Congress in general, which allow one, two, or three men to set aside and nullify the democratic processes and keep the representatives of the people from voting on these issues.

Therefore, while I am in sympathy with the remarks of the Senator, we have made our bed, and now we must lie in it. If we want to rectify these things, let us take the bull by the horns and adopt adequate rules, as recommended by the Senator from California and others, and clean house. In that way we can retain the respect of the people.

[Manifestations of applause from the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Demonstrations in the gallery are not allowed under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I hope my motion will be agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A conference report is a privileged matter; is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then at this time I desire to call up the conference report on House bill 3566, which is at the desk, and to ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The motion made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] was that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the draft bill, agree to the request of the House for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate. Is not unanimous consent required to set aside that matter, for the purpose of having the Senate take up a conference report?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, unanimous consent would be required for that purpose.

Is the Senator from West Virginia requesting that the motion be laid aside, and that the conference report be taken up?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask that the conference report on House bill 3566 be taken up at this time, and that the pending motion be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask what the conference report relates to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is the conference report on House bill 3566, which amends the immigration laws with respect to reports by the Attorney General upon extension of stays of aliens who are in this country under temporary permits. The conference report has been agreed to by the House of Representatives, and has just been sent to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say I am inclined to think that I shall not object to this particular request to lay aside the motion of the Senator from South Dakota and take up the conference report referred to. But I think it is only fair to point out that I am not going to sit here and have the danger of a filibuster on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota hanging over our heads and in effect placing us in a position—in fact, we actually are in such a position at the present moment, if I interpret the situation correctly—of conducting business in the Senate of the United States by way of sufferance.

We have to face the issue as to whether we are going to go ahead with the appointment of conferees on the draft bill. It is my judgment that there is nothing else that is more important today than meeting this issue, which deals with the national security of our Nation. I speak as one who as a member of the Armed Services Committee was not in complete agreement with every section of the bill as reported to the Senate from the committee; but I sought to have the bill amended in certain respects. I was successful as to some of those amendments, and unsuccessful as to others; but the majority of the Senate ruled as to the type of draft bill which the Senate wished to send to conference; and I intend to support the majority of the Senate in doing all I can to see to it that the draft bill goes to conference, and that we receive from the conference the best military manpower legislation possible, in order to meet what I consider to be a great emergency need confronting our Nation at the present time.

Mr. President, I wish to say now, as I said briefly the other day, that the action we take on this matter will be heard around the globe, and there are millions of people in friendly countries who will look to see whether we are going to keep faith with the promises we have clearly made, it seems to me, and whether we intend to enforce the peace and give the peoples of the world who are making a fight for freedom an opportunity to have success in that fight.

Therefore, although I shall let this one piece of business be transacted, I wish to state that it is the last piece of business I shall allow to be transacted until we meet the question as to whether we are going to agree to have the requested conference on the draft bill which, in my judgment, pertains to the very security of our Nation. It seems to me that now is the best time and this is the best place to fight that battle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I appeal to the Senator from Oregon about this matter. I wish to say here that it was our plan, if I may state it now, to have the Senate adopt two or three conference reports as to which there is no controversy, and also agree to a request for a conference. One of those matters relates to a road bill. I think it will take us only 10 minutes to complete action on the supplemental independent offices appropriation bill, which must be passed and go to conference.

Then I would be agreeable to continuing under the program of having debate on the motion to agree to the requested conference.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, does the conference report relate to the displaced persons?

Mr. REVERCOMB. This is not the report on the displaced persons bill.

Mr. President, it has just been brought to my attention that the conference report which has been under discussion was agreed to by the Senate on the 15th instant, although it has just been agreed to by the House of Representatives.

Therefore, I withdraw the request.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure";

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems;

H. R. 4272. An act to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from South Dakota that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the draft bill, Senate bill 2655; agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT OFFICES, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to propose one further unanimous-consent request, if I may do so. I feel it is very necessary that the supplemental independent offices appropriation bill be considered at this time.

So I ask unanimous consent that the pending business, to wit, the motion of the Senator from South Dakota relative to having the Senate agree to the requested conference on the draft bill, and so forth, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6829.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—let me inquire whether the proposed action, if taken, would result in the displacement of the business now pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not under the terms of the request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. Will he explain to me just what procedure has to be followed in regard to the conference report to which he has referred in order to have it finally disposed of?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have referred to the supplemental appropriation bill for the independent offices, which is ready for consideration and passage by the Senate. This will be the first time the bill has been considered by the Senate. It is the appropriation bill.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator does not refer to a conference report, then?

Mr. WHERRY. No. I shall later ask unanimous consent for the consideration of other conference reports. They can be taken up at any time, for they are privileged matters.

But this is the last appropriation bill which must be considered, and I thought it wisest to have the Senate consider it now, before entering into prolonged discussion of the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MORSE. If we do not consider the bill now and if we get into a prolonged discussion of the motion of the Senator from South Dakota, we may find ourselves in a position tomorrow or tomorrow night when there will not be time even to take action by way of a conference on the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I hope I can at least demonstrate, in a very short period of time, that I can adjust myself to new facts as I discover them.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I am not going to object to this one.

Mr. WHERRY. That is wonderful.

Mr. MORSE. However, I am beginning to say I do not like the idea of having to work under the sufferance of what apparently amounts to a threatened filibuster being held over my head.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Oregon. I assure him I shall cooperate with him in every way to expedite action on the question, after the appropriation bill is disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to make a 5-minute preliminary statement to explain the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let us have a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. We do not need it. Let us proceed to the consideration of the committee amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Atomic Energy Commission," on page 3, line 14, after the word "periodicals", to insert "(not to exceed $8,000)"; in line 15, after the word "expenses", to insert "(not to exceed $1,842,000)"; and in line 16, after the word "authorizations", to strike out "$501,850,000" and insert "$521,850,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EASTLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cooper	Hawkes
Baldwin	Cordon	Hayden
Ball	Donnell	Hickenlooper
Barkley	Downey	Hill
Brewster	Dworshak	Hoey
Bricker	Eastland	Holland
Bridges	Ecton	Ives
Brooks	Ellender	Jenner
Buck	Feazel	Johnson, Colo.
Butler	Ferguson	Johnston, S.C.
Byrd	Flanders	Kem
Cain	Fulbright	Kilgore
Capehart	Green	Knowland
Chavez	Gurney	Langer
Connally	Hatch	Lucas

McCarthy	O'Conor	Taylor
McClellan	O'Daniel	Thomas, Okla.
McFarland	O'Mahoney	Thye
McGrath	Pepper	Tobey
McKellar	Reed	Tydings
McMahon	Revercomb	Umstead
Magnuson	Robertson, Va.	Vandenberg
Malone	Robertson, Wyo.	Watkins
Martin	Russell	Wherry
Maybank	Saltonstall	White
Millikin	Smith	Wiley
Moore	Sparkman	Williams
Morse	Stennis	Wilson
Murray	Stewart	Young
Myers	Taft	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Housing Expediter," on page 5, line 10, after the word "Expediter", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

And provided further, That as to cases involving the functions transferred to the Office of the Housing Expediter by Executive Order 9841, section 204 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be considered as remaining in full force and effect during fiscal year 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have had a conversation with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and he states he does not object to returning to the item of $521,850,000, the total appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission. I ask the Senator if that is correct?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 3, line 16, after the word "authorizations", to strike out "$501,850,000" and insert "$521,850,000" was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote on the amendment will be reconsidered, and the amendment will be considered to be pending at the moment before the Senate. Does the Senator wish to be recognized?

Mr. McMAHON. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the chairman of the subcommittee, asking him to explain to me, if he will, where the $28,000,000 cut has been made in the appropriation. The Senator stated the House cut the appropriation $48,000,000 and according to the report the Senate committee has increased it $20,000,000, leaving a net reduction of $28,000,000. I should like to ask the Senator how that was arrived at by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. REED. The budget estimate for the Atomic Energy Commission was $550,000,000. The House bill provided $501,850,000. The Senate committee appointed a subcommittee. The full committee, after considering the matter, recommended that the House figure be increased by $20,000,000. In addition to doing that, we removed some restrictions which had been imposed upon the Atomic Energy Commission in the matter of the use of its funds. With the removal of the restrictions and allowing more flexibility to the Commission in the use of its funds, it was the opinion of the subcommittee and the full committee that the Atomic Energy Commission could perform all of its functions with the amount allowed.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that in the House it was suggested that the appropriation for basic research should be reduced by approximately 14 percent. Did the subcommittee or the full Senate committee have any deliberations upon that action?

Mr. REED. We are trying to let the Atomic Energy Commission use its funds with the utmost flexibility and in the way it deems best. We have not undertaken to reduce the funds in any particular category by any particular percentage.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator that although I am on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I cannot vouch for every dollar in the request for an appropriation. I do know, however, that its budget estimates were arrived at as a result of the Commission conferring with the advisory board provided for by statute under which it operates. The budget was arrived at as a result of conferences between the Advisory Board, the industrial concerns which operate the project, and the Commission itself.

I was disturbed by the House report which had an amazing line in it to the effect that they did not want to interfere with the amount of research, but they thought that the amount of research could be well reduced on items other than those which cover basic research and research for peaceful purposes. Apparently there is a belief in some quarters that we can have research for weapons, for instance, and research not for weapon purposes, and can put them in different categories. Of course the Senator from Kansas knows, I am sure, after listening to the testimony, that that is impossible.

I protest against an uninformed, unconsidered, and what I consider, to be a reckless exercise of power to reduce a budget estimate for an agency of this character, which is as vital, if not more vital to national defense, than any other item in our defense. I cannot help but think of the appropriation which went through the Senate in the naval appropriation bill. It contained $125,000,000 for one airplane carrier. I am informed that that is only a down payment. Before it is fully equipped the amount will be approximately $200,000,000.

I certainly think that this reduction, which unfortunately has been confirmed in part by the Senate Appropriations Committee, is to be very much deplored.

I will say, in conclusion, on my own responsibility that there is no one in this Congress who has considered the budget who has approached the matter with an eye to carrying forward a program which the people in charge of it say is absolutely necessary to our national defense.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator that I heard much of the discussion concerning the Atomic Energy Commission. I was present when this matter was discussed. The House cut the amount for the use of periodicals down to $50. The Commission last year spent $8,000 for periodicals. The Senate committee restored that amount. The Commission asked for $1,842,000 for travel, and we gave them that, or very nearly that much. The House reduced the appropriation $48,000,000. The Senate restored $20,000,000 of that amount and eliminated many of the restrictions concerning the use of the funds. The Atomic Energy Commission told us that if those restrictions were released and they were given more freedom in the use of their funds, it would help them and would make it less expensive for the Government, in the long run. So, we felt, that by reducing the restrictions and restoring half of what was eliminated by the House we were giving them practically all the money they could use and all they had asked for. The restrictions are very much less, and the funds are within $28,000,000 of what they asked for. In other words, they have the funds appropriated to use for research, housing, and every other incidental administrative expense, without the restrictions under which they have operated in the past few years. As one member of the committee who supported the chairman in connection with the question, I felt we were giving the Commission all they could use or were entitled to use, and that they would be satisfied with the result.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I do not wish to embarrass the committee or any Senator who is a member of it, but I should like to know how long the budget was considered in the Appropriations Committee. What was the total length of time given for consideration? I do not think it was over 2 hours, was it?

Mr. REED. Oh, yes. There were 2 days of hearings at which all the witnesses were heard. The Atomic Energy Commission, in addition to the cash appropriations is given general contract authorization for $400,000,000, which is the full amount of contract authorization which the Commission requested. That appears on page 12 of the committee's report.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to quote a sentence from the House committee report:

> The committee also believes that an adjustment can be made in the item for research in the nonweapon, nonbiological, and nonmedical phases of the research and development program.

In other words, as I read it, they must cut down on basic research out of which possibly new and great discoveries will come forth, and concern themselves only with atomic weapons. With that spirit and that belief, I certainly cannot find myself in agreement. I therefore move that the committee amendment be amended by striking out "$521,850,000" and inserting "$550,000,000" in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "$521,850,000," and insert "$550,000,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States Maritime Commission," on page 5, line 20, after the word "Commission," to strike out "$68,360,775" and insert "$69,360,775."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,600,000" and insert "$11,600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 18, after the numerals "1948", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the Commission may expend amounts to acquire the vessels *Mariposa* and *Monterey* and materials and equipment in conjunction therewith on hand or committed for and expend the amounts necessary to complete the vessels, if required for the development and maintenance of the commerce of the United States and for use of the United States in time of war and national emergency, from any amounts available within this limitation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 16, after the name "New York", to strike out "Pass Christian, Miss."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of that committee amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there was estimated by the Bureau of the Budget this year for maritime training the sum of $6,868,000. The House increased that somewhat. In the course of the hearing of officials of the Maritime Commission Admiral Smith, its chairman, appeared and I asked him:

> Did you agree with the Budget on the estimate it made originally?
>
> Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator REED. That you can get along on that?
>
> Admiral SMITH. We can if we leave Pass Christian out of the picture. It was damaged last September by the hurricane. • • • I was not present when that was discussed before the House committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, Pass Christian was not included by the budget. The Maritime Commission, through its chairman, says they can get along without the school. It is not now in operation. It will take $600,000 to open it up and place it in operation. The cadets at Pass Christian have been transferred to the main cadet school at Kings Point, N. Y., and they are getting along reasonably satisfactorily, I should say.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the House hearings show that the Maritime Commission did request this school. The distinguished Senator from Kansas says that the cadets have been transferred to Kings Point, N. Y., where they are getting along all right. That is a school which cannot be operated the year round. The school at Pass Christian is a school which can be.

Mr. REED. I beg pardon; the Senator from Mississippi certainly does not mean to say that the Kings Point Academy cannot be operated the year round.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the testimony of Representative Boggs, from Louisiana, before the House committee. Further, on a per capita basis the school at Pass Christian can be operated more cheaply than any other school.

Mr. President, let me state what is involved. A few years ago the United States Government bought a fine hotel on the Gulf Coast of Mississippi named "Inn-By-The-Sea." It was one of the nicest hotels in the southern part of the United States. That hotel was converted into this school. A hurricane occurred last fall which damaged the property. The estimates show that it will take about $75,000 to repair the buildings. The buildings are permanent structures, and the Government today has an investment there of $2,000,000. It is proposed that we junk that investment, when we should operate the school, because, the hearings show, it can be operated more cheaply on a per capita basis than any other school of the Maritime Commission.

Mr. President, in the southern part of the United States, on the Gulf of Mexico, there is the second port of this country, the port of New Orleans, which is served by this school. The great port of Houston, Tex., is served by this school. The great port of Mobile, Ala., is served by this school, and the State of Florida is served by this school.

It seems to me that this part of the Gulf coast area is entitled to this institution, and that it is very poor business on the part of the American Government to junk an investment of $2,000,000 and turn it over to the War Assets Administration where it would be sold in all probability for 30 or 40 or perhaps 50 thousand dollars. It is poor business to junk that school in order to operate a school where it will cost more money per capita to give the students the same training they would get on the Gulf coast, in an area where the climate is ideal, and where all the facilities are available.

Mr. President, I do not ask the Senate to act on my statement alone, but to reject the amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we get along with one Army cadet school at West Point, N. Y., we get along with one naval cadet school at Annapolis, Md. Whoever said it was not possible to operate the Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy in New York the year round clearly did not know what he was talking about. I was chairman of the Board of Visitors this year. We went to Kings Point last month, spent a couple of days there, and went over the whole training program. The cadets who were at Pass Christian before the hurricane have been transferred to New York, and we have one successful operating merchant marine cadet school.

I do not want to see this property junked, any more than does anyone else. Our committee and the Board of Visitors this year—and, incidentally, there were more Democrats on it than Republicans—are not quite happy about the whole program, and we are holding a further meeting of the Board of Visitors as soon as we are relieved from the present pressure.

The Maritime Commission chairman testified that the Pass Christian School was not necessary, the Bureau of the Budget did not include it in its estimates, and we have provided in the bill the exact amount of money the Bureau of the Budget estimated was necessary for the training school.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator stated that the person who said that the Kings Point School was not operated the year round did not know what he was talking about. The testimony before the House committee appears on page 726 of the hearings on the supplemental independent offices appropriation bill for 1949. I quote from the testimony of Representative Boggs:

> There is a very good reason for this economy. The school—

Speaking of the Pass Christian school—

> operates the year round with outdoor activities. They can get out on the Gulf of Mexico and Bay St. Louis and perform the necessary maritime functions in the dead of winter. They cannot do that at Kings Point.

Mr. REED. The Senator certainly is not undertaking to say it is not possible to operate the school at Kings Point the year round. Of course, the climate is more severe in New York.

Mr. EASTLAND. They cannot get out on the sea at Kings Point the year round, and the object of the school is to get maritime training, which can be done on the Gulf Coast.

Mr. REED. The Pass Christian school has been limited in its use heretofore, I think, to the first year of training only. The Kings Point school has a complete course. The Pass Christian institution has been operated on the basis of 1-year students, the first year student course, if my recollection serves me correctly.

The only question is whether or not we wish to spend $600,000 to use a school that is not necessary. The Maritime Commission has testified it can get along without it, and it was not included by the Budget in the estimate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Maritime Commission has recommended an appropriation for this school. The recommendation is in the House hearing, and I submit it is certainly the part of economy to make the appropriation. Here is a $2,000,000 investment which can be put back into its original shape for $75,000, and then we will have a school that will cost less to operate than any other maritime school in the country. If this amendment shall be defeated, and the Pass Christian activity carried on, the Government will actually save money. I

cannot see the point in taking a meat ax and deliberately striking down an installation for no good reason whatever. The program is one which will actually save money to the Treasury. I ask the Senate to reject the committee amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. We have a situation in which the Maritime Commission has asked for a continuation of this school. We have a situation in which the facts show that certainly it is far easier to have a continuous year-around training of all types and kinds at Pass Christian than at the other school. We have the undisputed evidence that the per capita training cost at Pass Christian is less than at any other institution.

No survey has been made and no special inquiry has been made to review those facts. We are called upon now more or less to adopt a change of policy in the few fleeting minutes of the last dying hours of this session of the Congress. This school, as I understand, has one of the very finest records in the Nation, and maritime training was something that came to the rescue and filled in the breach in a most wonderful way during the war. I understand that splendid training has been continued. I believe that if it had not been for the act of God, or the circumstance of a storm which partly damaged this place and requires some repairs, that this matter would never have come up, or that the appropriation for the Pass Christian station would not have been stricken out. The comparatively small sum of $60,000 is required to salvage a $2,000,000 physical equipment.

What is now proposed to be done by the amendment is not based on a complete investigation, not on any determination to change the policy or change the kind of training, not on any rule of necessity. I submit that it is not on the basis of a rule of reason that in the few remaining hours of the present session of Congress, it is proposed to delete appropriations for this school from the bill. I hope the Senate will seriously consider the matter and give due credit to the splendid record made at Pass Christian, and the wonderful advantages that exist there.

As has previously been said, the station serves the ports all the way across from Texas to Mobile, Ala. I hope the Senate will not be too hasty in its action. I hope we will consider the matter seriously, and, in view of the very fine record that has been made, and the very fine service being rendered, the Senate will permit this station to continue. As I understand, $60,000 is required for repair, and of course then there will be another amendment providing $620,000 for operations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice on page 8 of the bill that aside from the Pass Christian School there is one at Kings Point, N. Y., and another at Sheepshead Bay, New York, N. Y., one at St. Petersburg, Fla., and one at Alameda, Calif. Did the committee give consideration to those various schools?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. For instance, how does the one at Sheepshead Bay compare with the one at Pass Christian?

Mr. REED. The Sheepshead Bay School is quite a different school and operated for different purposes than the Pass Christian School. The Sheepshead Bay School is what is called a refresher school, where short courses are taken by men already in the service.

Mr. ELLENDER. Which of the schools named conduct the same classes of teaching as at Pass Christian?

Mr. REED. The Kings Point.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that is principally to supply the port of New York?

Mr. REED. Oh, no; that is a United States school.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, but it is located there, I suppose, because of the port of New York?

Mr. REED. I suppose it was located near the largest port of the United States so that its cadets could have the advantage of actual training and contact with shipping.

Mr. ELLENDER. Nearby?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does the Alameda, Calif., school compare with that of Kings Point?

Mr. REED. That is a very similar school.

Mr. ELLENDER. That, I presume, is located near San Francisco and San Diego?

Mr. REED. I am not very familiar with the Alameda school.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows, does he not, that the port of New Orleans is the second largest in the country?

Mr. REED. It is a very large port.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it is the second largest in the country. Why would it not be advantageous to have a school developed there so as to train the seamen as is done at New York and on the Pacific coast?

Mr. REED. In answer to the Senator from Louisiana I will say that we are able to train all our Army officers at one academy, that at West Point, N. Y. We are able to train all our naval officers at Annapolis, Md. I do not know of any reason why, by the same token, we cannot train all our merchant-marine officer force at Kings Point, N. Y.

Mr. ELLENDER. Following that argument then, why not strike out all the others and leave just one at Kings Point, N. Y.

Mr. REED. I am not sure that in the end when we come thoroughly to overhaul the matter of merchant-marine training something of that kind may not be done. We are not proposing that now. The Pass Christian School is not in operation. Its buildings were damaged. The Bureau of the Budget did not increase the amount, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission says they can get along without it. That is the situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand from the record that the Maritime Commission has recommended it. Is that not true?

Mr. REED. I do not know, but they did not recommend it to our committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think it is shortsighted on our part to eliminate the Pass Christian School for the present. Why not keep it in operation so that later on, if it is the intention of the Congress to have but one school, Pass Christian might be selected for the reasons assigned by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in reference to the position of the Maritime Commission with respect to the continuation of the school and its work at Pass Christian, Miss., permit me to say that on page 726 of the House hearings there appears a copy of a letter addressed to Hon. James H. Webb, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C., under date of May 7, 1948, just a little over a month ago. The letter was written to Mr. Webb by Hon. W. W. Smith, Chairman of the Maritime Commission. Among other things Chairman Smith had this to say about the Pass Christian School:

> Your attention is invited to the fact that there have been material changes in the international situation since the Bureau of the Budget acted upon our request for the restoration of the cadet school at Pass Christian. The President has approved a program for building additional vessels which will require additional trained personnel for their operation. Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan, in an eight-page statement given before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in its survey of the status of the American merchant marine relative to the world situation presently facing this country, declared that those responsible for the administration of our readiness program are conscious of the necessity of scrutinizing closely the present condition of our merchant marine in order to determine what its shortcomings may be from the standpoint of national security.

Then Chairman Smith proceeded to say:

> In order to carry out, during fiscal year 1949, an appropriate program in the operation of the cadet school at Pass Christian the Commission recommends that the following additional budget provisions should be made:

For a class of 200 midshipmen on a 10-month basis (Sept. 1, 1948, to July 1, 1949)	$500,000
For restoration of the physical establishment	100,000
Total	600,000

There is the recommendation, Senators, of the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, speaking for the Commission a little more than 30 days ago.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course it is our policy to build up and maintain a merchant marine. It is necessary for the defense of the country. Is not this installation of great benefit to the port of Mobile, in the Senator's State?

Mr. HILL. The installation is of great benefit, of course, to the port of Mobile, the port of New Orleans, and other ports.

Mr. EASTLAND. I was about to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] if the installation is not a great benefit to the port of New Orleans.

Mr. ELLENDER. I so stated a moment ago in answer to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. EASTLAND. It could not be filled if it were necessary to send to the State of New York for personnel.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that the State of New York is thousands of miles away from the Gulf area. The Maritime Commission recommends continuance of the operation of this school. Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan emphasizes the importance of the merchant marine of the United States to our national security. He emphasizes also the importance of closely scrutinizing the entire question before any action is taken which would in any way be detrimental or harmful to our American merchant marine.

This question came before the House Committee on Appropriations. We know how thoroughly the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations study all questions before them. The subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations held hearings on this subject. It did exactly what the Secretary of the Navy said should be done. It scrutinized this proposal. After the hearings, and after consideration of the facts, the committee recommended continuation of the school.

Why should the Senate, without any opportunity to examine the question fully, overrule the Maritime Commission, the House Committee on Appropriations, and the House of Representatives, without any basis for such action?

What I am pleading with the Senate this afternoon to do is to permit this item to remain in the bill, where it was placed by the House. Then, as the distinguished chairman of the Senate subcommittee has suggested, at some later date the entire program of the Maritime Commission cadet training can be gone into. We can look into the entire situation. But there is no opportunity to do that today. On the other hand, we know that the training at the Pass Christian School is the lowest in per capita cost. We know that because of the wonderful climate, year-round training can be carried on in a way that it cannot be carried on at other training places. We know that the Government has between $1,500,000 and $2,000,000 invested in properties there. If those properties are closed down and turned over to the War Assets Administration, what will that mean? It will mean that they will be sold for probably nothing more than salvage value, which will not amount to a bagatelle. We ought to preserve this property and continue the training. We ought to carry on this program, as the House decided, and as the Maritime Commission has recommended, at least until we have had an opportunity to study the entire subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The argument made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is that the hurricane has closed the school. The cost of restoring it to its original shape is only incidental and minor. The real question at issue is that the school is operated more cheaply, and the men are trained more cheaply than at any other place. We are running off after a minor item, to pick up a dime and put it in our pocket while throwing dollars away with the other hand. It is not economy. It is bad business.

Mr. HILL. If we reject the action of the House, and, without having gone into the subject, proceed to adopt the committee amendment, we shall be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 8, line 16. [Putting the question.]

Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. HILL addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The "ayes" have it, and the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a point of order. The Senator from Louisiana was seeking recognition.

Mr. PEPPER. So was the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote just announced be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico asks that the vote just taken be reconsidered. Without objection——

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did not hear any Senator vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it is fair to say that the Senator from Florida was on his feet as the Chair was putting the question. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed is reconsidered, and the Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Chair is very kind. The Senator from Louisiana was also seeking recognition. I wonder if I may yield for a moment to the Senator from Louisiana, because I am looking up an item in the record.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I had asked for recognition in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senator from Kansas to a few paragraphs from a letter addressed by W. W. Smith, chairman of the Maritime Commission, to Hon. HALE BOGGS, a Member of the House, in which he states specifically:

> The Maritime Commission believes that this school should be restored and continued in operation. There has been a change in the international situation which in our opinion makes its operation more than ever necessary. This change has occurred since the matter was considered by the Bureau of the Budget.
>
> Since the hurricane damage occurred, we have maintained a small staff at Pass Christian to salvage as much of the loss as possible. It was necessary to maintain the staff, in any event, for maintenance and custody until a disposition of the property was determined. This staff has accomplished repair work to the extent that only $100,000 additional funds are now necessary to complete the work. Since it would require several months to complete the work and since our next class of cadet-midshipmen is scheduled for admission on September 1, 1948, we would have only 10 months' operation during the fiscal year 1949 and this would require $500,000, so that if the school is to be restored and operated during that fiscal year, an appropriation of $600,000 will be necessary. This information will be made available to the House Committee on Appropriations if that committee so requests.

That letter was dated May 6, 1948. Under date of April 9, 1948, I personally addressed a letter to Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, chairman of the subcommittee on independent offices of the House Committee on Appropriations, which, in a measure, gives my views on this question. I stated to him as follows:

> MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIGGLESWORTH: This is with reference to a proposal to appropriate moneys for the restoration and maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet School at Pass Christian, Miss., which is currently being considered by your subcommittee. I should appreciate it if you would consider this letter as a statement of my views in the matter and include it with other testimony which will be considered by the members of your subcommittee.
>
> The facility at Pass Christian is located between two major seaports, New Orleans and Mobile, and it is only about 300 miles distant from Houston and Galveston. It can be easily reached by land, sea, and air. The climate there is ideal for year-round training and is considered superior to the areas where northern installations are situated. This school is the only one of its type located in the South, and we are anxious it be restored on a permanent status.
>
> Young men who have been trained as cadet-midshipmen proved conclusively their capability to serve efficiently and effectively in the United States Navy, and I understand that about 45 percent of the strength of the United States Merchant Marine Naval Reserve is made up from graduates of the Cadet Corps.
>
> We feel that the added stress that is being placed now on national defense and adequate training should make it imperative that this facility be restored and maintained, and we in the Gulf States are very hopeful that your subcommittee will be able to take favorable action in this matter.

Mr. President, as I indicated a moment ago, we intend to build up our merchant marine. In order to have an effective merchant marine, it is necessary to train cadets. As I stated a moment ago, I notice that near the great port of New York there are two schools; there is one on the California coast; and on the Gulf coast we have five large ports, including New Orleans, the second largest port in the country. I think we are deserving of a school of that type.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate sustain the House in voting on the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the able Senator from Kansas relative to the amendment.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACTIVITIES IN PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a conference report on Senate bill 418.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Nevada whether he contemplates requesting having the Senate take action on the conference report at this time, or is he simply presenting the report.

Mr. MALONE. I do not insist on action at this time.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say that if the Senator is asking for action on the conference report now, in view of the objection of the Senator from Oregon a while ago, and in view of the fact that he is not now on the floor, I would feel constrained to object to a request for action on the conference report at this time.

Mr. MALONE. I do not ask for action on it at this time; I simply submit it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator the subject of the conference report?

Mr. MALONE. It is the stream-pollution conference report.

So, Mr. President, I submit the report.

The conference report submitted by Mr. MALONE, and ordered to lie on the table, is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) entitled "An Act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes" having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 12, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "hereinafter declared to be a public nuisance."

Page 2, lines 13 and 14, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "such interstate waters and tributaries thereof" and insert the following words "surface and underground waters."

Page 9, line 11, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$200,000" and insert the figure "$250,000."

Page 11, line 25, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$20,000,000" and insert the figure "$22,500,000."

Page 12, line 25, of the amendment of the House, after the words "study of" insert the word "water", and strike out the word "of" after the word "pollution."

Page 13, line 1, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "interstate waters."

Page 13, line 2, of the amendment of the House, before the word "pollution" insert the word "water", and after the word "pollution" strike out the words "of interstate waters."

Page 14, line 17 through line 23, of the amendment of the House, strike out all after the words "Sec. 9 (a)" and insert the following: "Five officers may be appointed to grades in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service above that of senior assistant, but not to a grade above that of director, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act. Officers appointed pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year shall not be counted as part of the 10 per centum of the original appointments authorized to be made in such year under section 207 (b) of the Public Health Service Act; but they shall for all other purposes be treated as though appointed pursuant to such section 207 (b)."

And the House agree to the same.

GEO. W. MALONE,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
TOM PICKETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Kansas for a moment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the Senators who have spoken on it. I have agreed to accept an amendment, as follows: To insert in the bill the sum of $75,000 to be used in the repair of the Pass Christian buildings which were destroyed or damaged by a hurricane. That amount is reported to the committee as being sufficient to put the property in usable condition. Then we shall leave for further consideration the question of operation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Kansas modifies the committee amendment accordingly.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that amendment pertains only to Pass Christian; does it?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Kansas kindly tell us what was the House appropriation for the whole maritime training fund?

Mr. REED. The budget estimate for maritime training was $6,868,000. The appropriation for this year was $7,320,000. As the House passed the bill, it provides for an appropriation of $8,131,080.

The Senate committee adopted the Budget figure, and has used the Budget figure, which will be increased by $75,000 because of the agreement just made.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator please tell us what reductions will be necessary because of reducing the figure from $8,131,080, as approved by the House, to $6,868,000, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Senate committee? For example, one of the schools is at St. Petersburg, Fla. There are many other of these training schools. I wonder what the plan or pattern is and what the reason for the action of the Senate committee is.

Mr. REED. The main reason, and the subject of most of the consideration, was the fact that the Budget estimated a certain sum as necessary and sufficient, and the committee has worked under that proposal. Of course, to that sum should be added the amount of the agreement just made.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I realize there are many times when the committee follows literally the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, and there are other times when the committee is not very much persuaded by the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. I think it has generally been the policy of the Congress to wish to see for itself what are the issues in connection with an appropriation, and to determine for itself what the need is and what the merit is, without slavish, obeisant regard to what the Bureau of the Budget may recommend.

I should like to have the Senator from Kansas tell me how much of a reduction in the training program of the Maritime Commission will be caused by the proposed cut from the House figure of $8,131,080 down to $6,868,000, the latter amount being considerably lower than the appropriation and expenditure for the present year.

Mr. REED. I cannot tell in just what schools and to what extent reductions will be made. Obviously it is impossible to operate as extensively if the appropriation is made as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, instead of as passed by the House. Of course, a larger amount would permit more extensive operations.

How the proposed decrease will affect St. Petersburg, the Senator from Kansas cannot undertake to say. Certainly it will not close down St. Petersburg.

Mr. PEPPER. Then I am afraid we shall have to decide for ourselves whether it will be wise to make a reduction in the amount as voted by the House, or whether we shall say that the amount of the appropriation shall be $6,868,000 simply because the Bureau of the Budget recommends that amount.

The Senator has already said there was no accurate weighing of this program and no determination of where cuts should be made or why.

Mr. President, we have ships laid up in various parts of the United States, and they are available for emergency war use. The Congress is now in the midst of the consideration of a draft bill. We have made colossal expenditures for national defense purposes. Expenditures for maritime training are as much a part of national defense expenditures as any other expenditures we are making, because we cannot fight a war and have a secure country unless we have an adequate merchant marine; and we cannot have an adequate merchant marine unless we have sufficient men to man the ships; and of course they cannot effectively man the ships unless they are trained for that task.

We now have under consideration the maritime training program. I am afraid that the significance and importance of the maritime to the national defense program has not been fully appreciated.

If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to recall to his mind that last year, had it not been for the House of Representatives, many of these maritime training schools would have been closed. It was only because of the determined fight made by the House of Representatives that, for example, we were able to retain the splendid maritime training school at St. Petersburg, Fla. It would have been closed a year ago if our distinguished committee had been the one to determine whether it should survive or should not survive.

So, when this year the House, again in recognition of the importance of this maritime training program, has tried to provide for sufficient men to man the ships that are stored and also the ships that are being built, we now find that our committee says, "We have simply taken the Budget recommendation, and that is what we are offering to the Senate." When the committee says that, I say that if the House of Representatives—which has been a friend of this program and has made a careful study of it, as the record shows, and has heard the maritime people, who have given their reasons for the continuation of this program without curtailment—recommends a larger appropriation, then I see no reason, simply because the Bureau of the Budget recommends a smaller amount, for us to follow slavishly the Budget recommendation.

It is my opinion that we should support the amount as carried in the bill as passed by the House, and that we should provide for that figure in the bill. I shall address myself to that subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to my able colleague.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to ask my colleague if it is not true that the cut made by the Senate committee in the appropriation as passed by the House is a cut of more than 20 percent in the amount of the appropriation for the training program.

Mr. PEPPER. It is.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not also true that the European recovery and relief measures which have been passed by the Congress require, among other things, the return to commission and to active work of many ships of the Maritime Commission which have been lying idle.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct. The Senator is absolutely correct. Mr. President, in the RECORD, Admiral Knight, appearing before the House committee, testified they would need these men, need them trained, in order to man the ships we are building and those which are tied up today awaiting an emergency. What sort of forethought and foresightedness would we execute and exhibit here if we built the ships and then did not have trained men to operate them? How would it be possible to have a merchant marine and depend upon drawing in men who were not known to be qualified to man these ships to meet the emergency? Why have ships and not have the men to man the ships? Obviously it is a blow at our national security and our national defense, if we do not sustain a program of this minimum financial proportion that may be so meaningful to the security of the country should an emergency occur.

Mr. President, my colleague and I, in our State, and I am sure other Senators in some other States where these different schools are located, have visited the training schools. If they never saw a ship, what the Maritime Commission is doing in making the young men better Americans would justify every dollar of the investment. The young men volunteer. They come into the schools. They are given training in the manning of ships in maritime operation. At the same time, they are given character building; they are given health building; They are better Americans. I never saw a finer group of young men than I have seen in the training schools, who are training themselves to be able to man the merchant marine of America.

Mr. President, there have been many times in our history when we have been short-sighted in our maritime policy. There have been times when we have let our merchant marine shrink to nothing. There have been times when American goods could not be carried in American bottoms, and we were dependent even for the movement of our fighting men upon the ships of our Allies. We have seen the fallacy and the folly of such policies as that in the past few years. Fortunately before World War II we started to build up our merchant marine again. I am afraid there have been some who have been willing to let it disintegrate too rapidly. But what does it mean to have the ships if we do not have the men? And, Mr. President, if we are to have men, we want trained men to man those ships. It is said we had men in the merchant marine during the war. Yes; we had 125,000 of them I believe. They have scattered to the four winds of the country and of the world, and we are not going to call back the old soldiers again; we are training new men to make secure the defense of the country.

The total program as recommended by the House of Representatives for all these schools, for all attributes of the program, would cost only $8,133,000. Yet this cut, as my able colleague has pointed out, means a diminution of 20 percent. That will mean boys will have to go home from the training school. They will not be able to learn the tasks they came there to skill themselves in.

I sincerely hope and believe it is wise policy, Mr. President, I believe it is a sound contribution to the national security, I believe it is good judgment, I believe it is a good investment, to follow again this year as we reluctantly did last year the lead of the House of Representatives, which made a special study of the program, having taken prolific testimony on the subject. They tell us that $8,133,000 is needed. I hope the amended committee amendment will not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended. Without objection, it is agreed to. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Chair does not mean that he has disposed of the question to which I was addressing myself without a vote, does he?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point.

Mr. STENNIS. We had agreed on the Pass Christian matter. My inquiry is, Does the amendment now under consideration affect it?

Mr. REED. It does not.

Mr. PEPPER. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hayden	Pepper
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Ives	Russell
Buck	Jenner	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cain	Kem	Stennis
Capehart	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Taylor
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McGrath	Thye
Dworshak	McMahon	Tobey
Eastland	Magnuson	Tydings
Ecton	Malone	Umstead
Ellender	Martin	Vandenberg
Feasel	Maybank	Watkins
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
Flanders	Moore	White
Fulbright	Morse	Wiley
Green	Murray	Williams
Gurney	Myers	Young
Hatch	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas a question. There is some little confusion apparently about the over-all appropriation and the amount for the restoration of the buildings at Pass Christian.

I think we all agree that in some appropriate manner there will be $75,000 added to the amount of the committee amendment, will there not, to take care of the restoration of the buildings at Pass Christian?

Mr. REED. There was quite a bit of confusion and I did not clearly understand the Senator's question.

Mr. PEPPER. I merely wished to be sure that we were clear about what the procedure was. The able Senator from Kansas had agreed with the Senator from Mississippi and others interested in Pass Christian School that he would consent to a $75,000 addition, I assume to the amount recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the restoration of the damaged buildings at Pass Christian.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. In order to accomplish that I suppose the Senator would amend the $8,133,000 figure and add $75,000 to it.

Mr. REED. Seventy-five thousand dollars, added to whatever figure is in the bill. I do not recall the exact amount.

Mr. PEPPER. Add $75,000 to the figure in the bill?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. That can be voted upon after we determine the larger question or it can come first, whatever the Senator from Mississippi may prefer.

Mr. REED. It has been accepted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there are two problems. One is the operation of the schools, and the other is the restoration of the building. Merely to restore the building does not mean the school will be there, of course. I am sure, if we carry this program forward as we should, what should be done is to add $75,000 to the amount agreed upon for the program. If we agree upon the larger amount, then $75,000 for construction should be added. If we agree to the smaller amount, the same addition should be made to restore the school.

Mr. REED. If the amendment of the Senator from Florida is defeated, as I hope it will be, that will not affect the agreement.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. President, a few Senators have just entered the Chamber. Is it the pleasure of the Senate to have a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to have about 3 minutes to state the case.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I do not know that I have the floor. I think the Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. I was saying, before some of the Senators came into the Chamber, that the House of Representatives had made a careful study of the question of the maintenance of the maritime training program. Not only did the House committee make a study, but it took lengthy testimony. I have a great many pages of the testimony here. The House Committee on Appropriations went into detail in connection with the maritime-training program. The House approved an appropriation of $8,133,000 for the entire training program.

With all respect to the Senate Appropriations Committee, when the matter came before that committee the committee took only half a page of testimony. They merely asked the officers regarding the budget estimated. The Budget had recommended $8,686,000. Of course the Maritime Commission spokesmen had to say that they agreed to the Budget figure. They could not say anything else. But they did not say that it was an adequate figure, or that that was the figure which should be allowed.

The question is whether we should take the House figure of $8,133,000, or whether we should take the Budget estimate, with only half a page of consideration and testimony given to the whole subject.

Mr. President, this is a national-defense program. Hundreds of our ships are laid up all over the country for use in an emergency. It is short-sighted not to train the men to man those ships. That is what the program is intended to do. We are making a 20-percent reduction in the training program, which I submit is a danger to our national security and a very serious blow at the efficacy of the whole maritime program and the effectiveness of the maritime strength of the Nation. That is the reason I am contending, Mr. President, that the House figure of $8,133,000 should be preserved and that the Senate committee amendment reducing the amount 20 percent should not be adopted.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I shall take only about 2 minutes, and then I should like to have a record vote.

The subcommittee and the full committee met the Budget's full figure. The Budget rejected some recommendations of the Maritime Commission, but in this bill we gave the full Budget figure for maritime training.

In addition, when Admiral Smith, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, was before our committee, I asked him:

> Did you agree with the Budget on the estimate it made originally?

His answer was, "Yes, sir."

I then asked him, "Can you get along on that?"

And he answered in the affirmative. That is found at page 80 of our hearings.

The Senator from Florida is talking about a common seaman school, not an officer school at all, down at St. Petersburg, Fla. They now have a 6-months' course, and probably they can get along with a 3-months' course. The young men go to that school when they are out of jobs.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will sustain its committee on the vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss this amendment, but I do desire, in the closing hours of the session, to call to the attention of the Senate the serious lack of common seamen in the United States. The situation is so bad that we were required, at the last session, to pass a law waiving the prohibition against employing alien seamen to serve on American ships. Many of our ships have to be manned with alien seamen. There is not an officer demand, but there is a demand for common seamen. Whether the school is the answer or whether apprenticeship is the answer, I do not know, but few of our young men are taking to the sea. I do hope we are cognizant of the situation. I am going to vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 4, in the committee amendment, to strike out "$6,868,000" and insert "$6,943,000, of which $75,000 shall be available for restoration or repair of buildings at the training station at Pass Christian, Miss."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that is the committee amendment as amended. I understand the Senator from Florida has moved to substitute some other figure.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; we are merely opposing the committee amendment. The committee amendment would make the cut from the House figure of $8,133,000 to $6,686,000. We are merely opposing the committee amendment. The question is on the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—61

Aiken	Green	Revercomb
Baldwin	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Ball	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bricker	Hill	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hoey	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Stennis
Buck	Jenner	Stewart
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Byrd	Kem	Thye
Cain	Knowland	Tobey
Capehart	McClellan	Umstead
Connally	McGrath	Vandenberg
Cordon	McMahon	Watkins
Donnell	Malone	Wherry
Dworshak	Martin	White
Eastland	Millikin	Wiley
Ecton	Moore	Williams
Ferguson	O'Conor	Young
Flanders	O'Mahoney	
Fulbright	Reed	

NAYS—19

Downey	Lucas	Pepper
Ellender	McFarland	Sparkman
Feazel	Magnuson	Taylor
Hatch	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Morse	Tydings
Holland	Murray	
Johnston, S. C.	Myers	

NOT VOTING—16

Barkley	Kilgore	O'Daniel
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Wagner
Chavez	McCarran	Wilson
Cooper	McCarthy	
George	McKellar	

So the committee amendment on page 9, line 3, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I ask that the clerk read the language now in the bill, including the agreement reached respecting Pass Christian, so that we may be sure that it is taken care of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 3, it was proposed to strike out "$8,133,080" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,943,000, of which $75,000 shall be available for restoration or repair of buildings at the training station at Pass Christian, Miss."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the junior Senator from Kansas if he desires to have restored in line 16 on page 8, the three words which were stricken out "Pass Christian, Miss."?

Mr. REED. I am glad the Chair called attention to that. The words were stricken out. They should be restored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the light of the amendment just agreed to, the words should be restored. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment on page 8, line 16, was agreed to, is reconsidered, and without objection, the words "Pass Christian, Miss." will be restored.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration," on page 15, line 10, after the word "character", to strike out:

> For the purpose of this proviso, training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly in connection with his business or occupation in which he is now engaged or for which he is training shall not be considered avocational or recreational.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, in line 14, after the language stricken, to insert the following:

> For the purpose of this proviso, education or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly and related aviation courses shall not be considered avocational or recreational when the veteran certifies that he has selected aviation education or training for use in connection with his existing or contemplated business, occupation, or education.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask the junior Senator from Kansas if he will not accept a minor amendment in the committee amendment on page 15, line 17, after the word "certifies" to insert the words "under oath." The reason I ask the Senator whether he will accept that amendment is because there are two schools of thought as to this matter. Some believe the Veterans' Administration has been too strict in construing the language of the existing law, and in its requirements as to those who may take this aviation course, and believe that it should be more liberal. Others believe to the contrary. Those who think it should be liberalized have suggested the language now in the amendment. But if a certificate should be taken as the basis of a man's right to take a course like this, the suggestion has been made that the certificate ought to be under oath.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Rhode Island asks that on page 15, line 17, in the committee amendment it be amended by inserting after the word "certifies" the words "under oath."

Mr. REED. There will be no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island to the committee amendment on page 15, line 17.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 22, after "part VII," to insert "and payments authorized by part IX."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 8, to strike out:

SURPLUS-PROPERTY DISPOSAL

Effective August 31, 1948, the War Assets Administration shall cease to exist as an agency of the Government, and its affairs, functions, and responsibilities shall thereafter be disposed of and liquidated in accordance with the following:

(1) All right, title, and interest in surplus real property and all right, title, and interest in notes, mortgages, and contracts of sale or lease in connection with surplus real property shall be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to be held and disposed of by such Corporation in accordance, except as provided herein, with the terms of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

(2) All aircraft and aircraft parts shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force to be held and disposed of by such Department in accordance, except as provided herein, with the terms of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

(3) All personal property (other than aircraft and aircraft parts), except such as may be necessary to the liquidation of the War Assets Administration or the exercise of the functions transferred herein shall be transferred to the Bureau of Federal Supply, Treasury Department, to be held and disposed of by such Bureau in accordance, except as provided herein, with the terms of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

(4) Except as necessary to the administration of the functions herein transferred to the Department of the Air Force, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Bureau of Federal Supply, all administrative property, records, and accounts of the War Assets Administration shall be transferred to the Treasury Department for liquidation of the affairs of the War Assets Administration;

(5) Such administrative property, records, and personnel of the War Assets Administration as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary to the administration of any of the functions herein transferred shall be transferred to the agency to which such function is transferred: *Provided*, That the right to retention in employment by the Government of the personnel so transferred shall be neither greater nor less than such right would have been had the War Assets Administration continued as an independent agency of the Government;

(6) The provisions of section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1945 (Public Law 263, 79th Cong.) shall apply to the transfers effected by this paragraph in like manner as if such transfer were a reorganization of the agencies and functions concerned under the provisions of that act;

(7) Priorities and preferences provided for in the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall not continue beyond August 31, 1948, as to the disposal of personal property but shall continue as to the disposal of real estate;

(8) The agencies herein authorized to dispose of surplus personal property may, after August 31, 1948, transfer any of such property without charge to any other agency of the Government if such property, by such transfer, can be put to public use by the transferee agency;

(9) The agencies herein authorized to dispose of surplus property shall proceed with due diligence and use all reasonable means within the purview of this act and the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to accomplish such purpose at the earliest practicable date and shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the end of each month as to progress made;

(10) The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may authorize the abandonment, destruction, or donation to public bodies of personal property herein transferred to their respective agencies which has no commercial value or the estimated cost of care and handling of which would exceed the estimated proceeds from its sale;

(11) The Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall not apply to property of the Government which has not been declared surplus under the terms of such act as of the date of enactment hereof and any such property determined to be surplus shall be disposed of in accordance with the terms of other existing law.

For administrative expenses in connection with the functions herein authorized to be administered by the War Assets Administration, the Treasury Department, the Department of the Air Force, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to be available for the same purposes as the appropriation for salaries and expenses, War Assets Administration, fiscal year 1948, and whenever in such appropriation the title "War Assets Administrator" appears it shall be construed to include his successor as to any of the functions herein transferred, $50,000,000, from the special fund account in the Treasury as provided for in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, to be allocated as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may determine: *Provided*, That the sum herein provided may be obligated during the period ending August 31, 1948, with respect to the War Assets Administration, and during the period ending March 31, 1949, with respect to the other agencies involved.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION, SPECIAL FUND

Salaries and expenses: There is hereby appropriated from the special fund account in the Treasury as provided for in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, not to exceed $90,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949 for necessary expenses of the War Assets Administration established by Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1947; for allocation or reimbursement by the War Assets Administrator to Government agencies designated by the Administrator as disposal agencies by or pursuant to law, and for payment to Government agencies designated by the Administrator for rendering special services in connection with the disposal of surplus property, in such amounts as shall be approved

by the Bureau of the Budget; and for allocation or reimbursement to owning agencies for the care and handling (including pay and allowances and subsistence of military and naval personnel) of surplus property subsequent to the filing of a declaration of surplus covering such property with a disposal agency designated by the Administrator, or, if the Administrator prescribes procedures whereby declarations of surplus are made at approximately the time of disposal or removal, subsequent to notice by the owning agency to the disposal agency that property has been determined to be surplus and is subject to such procedures, such funds to be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; fees and mileage of witnesses at rates provided by law for witnesses attending in the United States courts (28 U. S. C. 600c); payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and other special services and reports by contract without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, including real estate brokers and appraisers at rates of pay or fees not to exceed those usual for similar services; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), (not to exceed $73,000); acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; printing and binding; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration; procurement of supplies, equipment, reports, and services in connection with the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, upon determination by the Administrator or by any official designated by him for this purpose that such method of procurement is necessary; purchase and procurement of reports of experts or consultants or organizations thereof; advertising, including radio time; maintenance, operation, and repair of aircraft in the Territories and possessions in connection with disposal activities and, in the continental limits of the United States in connection with the disposition of aircraft air airports; acquisition of buildings, lands, leaseholds, and other interests therein, and temporary use thereof for the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property; payments to States, or political subdivisions thereof of sums in lieu of taxes accruing against real property declared surplus to the Administration by Government corporations; advance of funds to Administration cashiers and collection officials upon furnishing bond, for the purpose of handling cash transactions and making change at surplus property sales: *Provided*, That any employee of the War Assets Administration is authorized, when designated for the purpose by the Administrator, to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit, when such instrument is required in connection with the performance of the functions or activities of the War Assets Administration: *Provided further*, That the Administration may procure by contract or otherwise and furnish to governmental employees and employees of Government contractors at the reasonable value thereof food, meals, subsistence, and medical supplies, emergency medical services, quarters, heat, light, household equipment, laundry service, and sanitation facilities, and erect temporary structures and make alterations in existing structures necessary for these purposes, when such employees are engaged in the disposal of surplus property, or in the preparation for such disposal, at locations where such supplies, services, equipment, or facilities are otherwise unavailable, the proceeds derived therefrom to be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other law to the contrary, the War Assets Administrator shall establish and maintain a priority for the benefit of small business in the purchase and disposal and distribution and use of surplus real and personal property. The War Assets Administrator shall implement this small-business priority by appropriate regulation, and the relative order of this priority with respect to other priorities established by the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall, with respect to personal property follow disposals to veterans and States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, and with respect to real property, follow disposals to former owners, as provided for in the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended: *And provided further*, That section 15 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law and in furtherance of rapid absorption of surplus personal property into the domestic economy, and of disposition of surplus personal property in a manner to preclude insofar as possible financial expense to the Federal Government in the care, handling, and disposition of such property the Administrator may authorize without regard to priorities or preferences disposals of such property in such manner and quantities as he deems requisite to the best interests of the economy and the Government in effecting rapid and inexpensive disposals of surplus personal property, securing the most appropriate fair value under the circumstances, and affording to the extent he deems feasible an appropriate opportunity for the acquisition of such property in accordance with the existing provisions of this act."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want Senators to have a clear understanding of what we did respecting surplus property disposal. The House terminated on August 31 the War Assets Administration so far as the disposal of surplus property was concerned, and it divided up the functions among four different agencies, the Treasury Department, I believe the Public Works Administration, the Department of Commerce, and perhaps one other.

There was unanimous opposition in our committee, and everyone who appeared before our committee was opposed to that proposal, so we have restored the previously existing situation. The House gave the War Assets Administration $50,000,000 to continue until August 31. We have added $40,000,000, making a total of $90,000,000, which met the requests of the War Assets Administration. It is our thought that we should carry on as we are doing now until we get further along in the disposal of property.

The War Assets Administration has always complained of the slowing down in its work of sale and distribution of property by virtue of the many priorities. By the time they got down to the priorities, frequently their buyer was gone. So we have removed those priorities, except that we leave a priority for veterans, for States, and for small business.

Also, in the matter of personal property only, we have given the Administrator some discretion when he can sell personal property at a fair price to the Government and get rid of it. It is highly important that we go along as fast as we can in cleaning up the surplus-property situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that the committee was of the unanimous belief that to split up the War Assets Administration at this time would only result in maladministration and loss to the Government?

Mr. REED. That was our opinion, and the basis of our action and recommendation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So the committee amendment is an amendment which is designed to save money to the Government and to prevent inefficient handling of what remains of war surpluses?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator whether or not in his judgment it would be desirable to have a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment?

Mr. REED. I think not. There was no opposition. As a matter of fact, the opinion in the subcommittee, the full committee, and I believe in the Senate, is either unanimous or almost so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like the RECORD to show that there was no dispute in the Senate Appropriations Committee, and that we are unanimous in the opinion that the Senate amendment represents the efficient and economical thing to do.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 18, beginning in line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions," on page 28, line 6, after the numerals "1949," to insert "and shall be available for examination of appropriation estimates in the field."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I see that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has entered the Chamber. The Senator and I join in offering an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. We have discussed this amendment with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and I think there is no objection.

Mr. REED. It will be accepted, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky on behalf of himself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new heading and a new paragraph to read as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Rural Electrification Administration, fiscal year 1949, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1949, $450,000, such sum to be in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for such fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I ask the Senator in charge of the bill if he will accept it and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 19, after the date "1946", it is proposed to insert the following: "*And provided further*, That such authority to make allowances shall, in the case of vessels of the C–4 type, include authority to make allowances for the cost of converting such vessels to vessels of such other types as the Commission may deem to be desirable for the purposes of the domestic or foreign commerce of the United States or the national defense, in an amount not exceeding 75 percent of the purchase price of such vessel, and in addition to expend out of the moneys herein appropriated for new ship construction, reconditioning, and betterment, such amounts as may be further necessary to accomplish such conversion: *Provided*, That the purchaser shall repay the amount so expended in accordance with the provisions of section 509 of title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and any other provisions of said title to the extent applicable."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Maritime Commission has on hand a number of vessels of this type. It is a unique type, not suitable for either freight or passenger service, as the vessels are now.

Last year when we were handling this bill a desire was expressed on the part of people in the Great Lakes section to get one of these vessels up into the Great Lakes. In last year's bill we inserted a provision which would permit the Maritime Commission to make such adjustments and changes as would accomplish that purpose. This year the question did not arise in the committee. It arose afterward.

I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, to be inserted as he indicates, and take it to conference to see what we can do with it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the amendment constitute legislation on an appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that it is an item of appropriation to carry out the existing law. In other words, it is an item within the general provisions of the bill.

Mr. McMAHON. If I correctly understand, Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas stated that this suggestion was made to him last year in the form of a bill.

Mr. REED. No. When we considered the bill last year we wrote into the bill a similar provision, so far as the Senate was concerned. Last year we had considerable discussion of the methods of disposing of these vessels through the Maritime Commission, and we placed such a provision in the bill.

Mr. McMAHON. How much will this operation cost?

Mr. REED. We are to be paid for the vessels. It will not cost us anything.

Mr. McMAHON. It will not cost the Treasury anything?

Mr. FERGUSON. It will cost the man who buys the vessel. The money will be put up by the Maritime Commission, and then repaid, and the Maritime Commission will get out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the Chair announced his ruling, he was misinformed as to the full nature of the amendment. Upon an examination of the amendment the Chair is of the opinion, and so rules, that the point of order raised by the Senator from Connecticut is well taken.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope the point of order will not be pressed, because this will be a means for the Maritime Commission to sell one of these vessels for at least half a million dollars. The money to be put up by the Maritime Commission will be repaid, over and above the half million dollars for the vessel. Representatives of the Maritime Commission explained in the testimony that the Commission has on hand a number of these vessels. I do not now recall the exact number, but I think it is either 14 or 17. There is no market for them unless something like this can be accomplished.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Connecticut will not press the point of order. The Maritime Commission has a number of these vessels. I do not know the exact number, but the Commission has a number of them on hand, and anything it can get for them at this time is of advantage to the United States Treasury, and not of disadvantage.

Last year a desire was expressed by people in the Great Lakes area to get one of these vessels up there. Those interested were going to pay half a million dollars, or three-quarters of a million dollars for it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have just looked at the record. The number, instead of being 14, is 44.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Connecticut not to press his point of order. There would be no advantage to anyone in doing so. It would be a disadvantage to the Treasury, in that we would not be able to get rid of one of these vessels which are lying idle and unsalable.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Kansas whether they are to be sold under the provisions of statutory law, or whether this amendment relaxes that law in any degree.

Mr. FERGUSON. This provision would relax the law only so far as concerns allowing the Commission to put the vessel back in shape so that it could be used. The sum to be paid by the Commission for that purpose would be charged to the vessel.

Mr. RUSSELL. In addition to the statutory limit of sale?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. This would cut the statutory limit to the extent of the amount necessary to repair the vessel. The Maritime Commission would get the statutory limit less the amount it cost to repair the vessel. However, in this case it would get at least half a million dollars.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, why does not the concern to which the Maritime Commission proposes to sell the vessels buy them as is and itself make the repairs?

Mr. FERGUSON. This is one of the cases in which that cannot be done.

Mr. McMAHON. Why not?

Mr. FERGUSON. It would cost about $2,000,000 to put the vessel in shape and take it where it is to be used.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator's proposal is that we authorize the Maritime Commission to spend $2,000,000; is it?

Mr. FERGUSON. No, it would cost the company $2,000,000, and the Government $1,000,000, making the total $3,000,000.

Mr. McMAHON. So the proposal is to spend about $1,000,000 to put the ship in shape. After it is put in the shape the purchasers want it to be in, how much will the Government receive?

Mr. FERGUSON. $500,000, plus what the Government pays for putting the ship in condition.

Let me read the language of the act which applies:

Provided further, That hereafter the Commission may make allowances to the purchasers of vessels for the cost of putting such vessels in class, such allowance to be determined on the basis of competitive bids, without regard to the provisions of the last paragraph of section 3 (d) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946.

The difficulty is that under the words "putting such vessels in class", although money can be spent for that purpose today, that will not suffice in this instance, because in this case it is desired to make a new kind of vessel out of the ship, so that it can be used on the Great Lakes. That presents a distinction from the work involved in putting a vessel in class. There is a distinction between putting a ship in class and reconverting a ship.

Mr. McMAHON. What is meant by "putting in class"?

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, "putting in class" means to bring a ship from its present condition up to the standard required under the Maritime Commission Act for operating it in the same category for which it was built.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether it is perfectly clear from the terms of the amendment that it applies to only one vessel.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is all—to 1 out of 44.

Mr. McMAHON. Very well, Mr. President, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 6829) was passed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REED, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CORDON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MCKELLAR conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2281. An act to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes;

S. 2554. An act to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes; and

S. 2706. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Ave. NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2376) to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6633) to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. PHILLIPS of California, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, and Mr. THOMAS of Texas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5904. An act to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6501. An act to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6465. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey;

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department; and

H. R. 6959. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 129) providing for a joint committee composed of members of the Senate and the House Public Lands Committee to make an investigation of our island possessions in the Pacific and trust territories, and report back recommendations for legislation providing for civil government.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 213) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee, current Congress, relative to investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating and as to whether there is a necessity for a change in either the procedure or basic law, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the motion of the Senator from South Dakota that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, and for other purposes; that the Senate agree to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that no other business is permissible except by unanimous consent, until the pending business is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so undertands.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the pending business is the motion, are we ready to vote on the motion?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand that the Chair has ruled that no other business can be taken up at this time except by unanimous consent. I was about to move to call up the conference report on the displaced persons bill.

Under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that at this time that conference report may be considered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the so-called draft bill, agree to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I intend to speak on this motion. At the time when I announced my intention of doing so, I was taken to task by several Senators who said that I would have to answer for my actions. I am perfectly happy to answer for my actions to anyone concerned, especially the people of the United States. They have a vital stake in the matter now being discussed.

Mr. President, we are considering a fundamental change in our American way of life. Never have we had peacetime conscription. The question is whether our Nation is to be militarized or whether it is to remain a great, free nation, as it has been for, lo, these many years, in fact, since our country was founded.

If speaking out against military conscription and against the militarization of our country carries any blame with it, I am perfectly willing to accept it; but I believe such opposition will be considered a credit to anyone who opposes such a move. I am happy to accept any blame, because I feel it will redound to my credit that I oppose this measure. As a member of the new party that is appearing on the American scene, I am happy to accept responsibility for trying to delay or defeat this peacetime conscription measure. If the two old parties want the responsibility of instituting peacetime military conscription, they are perfectly welcome to it, so far as I am concerned and so far as the new party is concerned.

I hold in my hand a brochure prepared for the Senate Appropriations Committee, Mr. President. It is a rather elaborate affair. It is getting a little dog-eared now, for I have been quoting from it at length; but it is on slick paper, and it is full of maps, diagrams, charts, and

what have you. It was prepared by the Office of Naval Intelligence. I do not believe anyone would contend or could contend that the Office of Naval Intelligence is a "red" outfit of any kind or a Communist-front organization or anything of the sort.

This brochure was not for public consumption. I do not believe it is top secret, or anything of that sort; but it was not released to the press. It is very interesting. Of course, it was meant for the eyes of Senators alone, and the ordinary person was not supposed to see it. Let me read the first paragraph in this book or brochure. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, or it may have been the Finance Committee—I am not certain about that, at the moment—was considering the question of strategic stockpiling; in other words, the accumulation of materials which are scarce in this country. The proposal was that such materials be accumulated so that we would have them on hand in case of an armed conflict. Here is what the brochure has to say in the first sentence:

Realistically—

That means, "Let us not kid each other; this is just between the Navy and the Senators; let us be perfectly frank about this business." That is what that means—

Realistically, all wars have been for economic reasons.

That means that all wars have been fought because somebody expected some material gain from the wars. The last two world wars were fought for economic reasons. The German cartelists and militarists started those two wars in the hope of conquering the world militarily, so they could exploit it economically and become rich. This is what is said here:

To make them—

We will read the preceding sentence again, in order to get the sense of this:

Realistically all wars have been for economic reasons. To make them politically and socially palatable—

"Palatable" is the word, Mr. President. That means so it will taste good, "just like what it ain't"—a sort of cod-liver-oil preparation with vanilla extract in it.

To make them—

Meaning wars—

politically and socially palatable—

So the suckers will like them.

Ideological issues have always been invoked.

What is said there, Mr. President, is that you just cannot get common folks to fight for colonies, for markets, for raw materials, for sources of cheap labor. You just cannot get them rolled up enough to fight; so what is to be done about it? "Ideological issues have always been invoked."

Mr. President, you cannot get folks mad enough to fight for Standard Oil investments in Saudi Arabia; it just will not work. So what is done? Well, to get the common people mad enough to fight a war, they are told the Catholics are going to get them if they don't watch out. If the people live in a Catholic country, they are told that the Protestants will get them if they do not watch out, or that the Jews are going to get them, or the Mohammedans, or at any rate somebody is going to get them. That seems to get folks mad enough to fight. If they think somebody is going to tear down their church or burn their capitol building or something like that, that makes them mad enough to fight. Well, the statement goes on to say, here:

Any possible future war will undoubtedly conform to historical precedent.

Any war that may come will be fought for the same reasons I have enumerated here—for markets, raw materials, profits, cheap labor, Standard Oil investments in Saudi Arabia—something along that order.

Mr. President, I should like to remind my listeners that Russia has very little reason to fight a war for economic reasons. It says here all wars are fought for that reason, and that any future war will be fought for that reason. Russia has much territory. Russia has many people. Russia has great quantities of raw materials. Russia does not want any markets, because Russia does not want to sell anything, it does not have a profit economy. All the Russians want to do is to produce things to be consumed at home. So the Russians do not have that compulsion to fight wars. Nobody gets rich from war in Russia. They shoot profiteers over there, or did until recently. They have now abolished the death penalty in Russia, which is quite a forward step I would say. Of course we continue to hear about all the people that are getting killed or who are going to get killed in Russia. Possibly it was merely said they were going to abolish it; I do not know.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, please?

Mr. TAYLOR. May I yield without prejudice to my rights to the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may.

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Several Senators, I may say to the Senator from Idaho, have inquired as to how long we may run tonight. I am not making this inquiry for any other purpose than to enable me to begin to line up the program. Could the Senator tell me how long he feels he might speak on this subject?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not "feel" right now, I must say to the Senator from Nebraska. I have no idea. I have been thinking this thing over and I cannot arrive at a conclusion in my own mind just what to do. If I thought I could talk long enough so that the folks would have to go up to Philadelphia and just drop the whole business, I would talk that long, but that is quite a way off. I understand they do not have to leave until Monday morning or Sunday night, or some time along there. I doubt very much if I could hold out that long. I think the Lord is on my side, but even he might not sustain me for that length of time. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to a further question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for another question.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator were in my place, what would he tell inquiring Senators about the session tonight?

Mr. TAYLOR. I would pass the buck to TAYLOR, if I were the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield further, I may say I cannot pass the buck any longer, so I may just as well tell all those who are here, and state for the RECORD, anyway, that we expect to stay here late tonight, in view of the Senator's statement—and possibly later than that. We merely want Senators to be prepared.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Nebraska could not be speaking to the Senator from Idaho, could he?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator will be here, too, will he not?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know. I say I have been unable to make up my mind just what to do here. The Senator sees that there is much talk about rules and about abusing privileges and one thing and another, unless it is to the advantage of someone to circumvent a rule. But early in the afternoon, shortly after I made an announcement of my intention to speak, I got a hunch, for no good reason—nobody said a word to me; it just dawned on me—that the conferees were not waiting for any authorization, they were conferring. I made inquiry. I am afraid that is what has happened; they have gone into conference without any authorization from the Senate. Some time when I collapse or decide to quit, they will bring the motion to hold a conference out of one hip pocket, and when that is agreed to, they will bring the conference report out of the other hip pocket, and the whole thing will be over. Of course, my scheme had been to talk this afternoon and make them postpone their conference until tomorrow, when I would be rested up and could begin again. I might then last until the Philadelphia convention forced a cessation of things here and moved hostilities hence. But we shall have to make up our mind later about how long we are going to talk. There are some things I want to say about this, anyhow.

I was talking about the quotation from the brochure prepared by the Office of Naval Intelligence for the Senate Appropriations Committee which was considering the question of strategic stock-piling. It says:

Realistically, all wars have been for economic reasons. To make them politically and socially palatable, ideological issues have always been invoked.

As I said, Mr. President, you cannot get folks mad enough to fight about markets or materials and cartel involvements all over the world; so ideological issues are raised. As I said, those issues may be with respect to Catholicism or Protestantism or the Jewish question, or Mohammedism—anything to scare the people with something of that kind.

In this connection, Mr. President, it is the same ideology that Adolf Hitler used. He used communism as his bogeyman and was going to defend the world against it. The Germans formed their Axis, and one thing and another. We are using the same old Hitler bogyman—Russia. Watch out, or the Communists

will get you. That does not seem to scare people sufficiently, so every few days, for the past year or two, we have had a new crisis, on paper. I remember the first crisis was when we had to help the Turks and the Greeks. No one got very excited about it, so there was a new crisis brought up. There was an invading army coming down from Yugoslavia which would take over Greece in short order, if we did not get there in time. Of course that army evaporated into thin air. There was a certain date before which we had to pass a bill, or the world would find itself in chaos. We passed the bill, and they finally received their money.

I remember there was some talk about the Russians being in Iran. They were there originally as part of the war strategy. They overstayed their welcome, and the matter was called to the attention of the United Nations. Without even a verbal shot being fired, the Russians packed up and went home. They left the oil there, incidentally. If they were out to conquer the world, I think they would have remained there. I think if I were a Russian and wanted to conquer the world, I would have stayed there. But the Russians went home.

Maybe it does not mean anything; maybe it is not significant. It was a victory for the United Nations that the Russians went home. They did not want to be condemned by this great new organization.

I remember when they were trying to stir the Russian-Iran situation to a crisis pitch. It was said there was an army coming down from Russia. It was mechanized; it had tanks and everything. It was coming right into Iran, according to the big headlines. But that was the last we ever heard of it. The headlines dropped them, and they evaporated somewhere, and never showed up again.

Of course, Mr. President, the press of America is in this propaganda, hook, line, and sinker. They are controlled by the big fellows who expect to profit from the armaments program, so they are glad to blow up these phoney scares. The latest scare we had was the submarine scare. There were submarines everywhere; the place was overrun with them. I was in California at the time the scare started. One paper had a headline reading "Submarine sighted off coast." One submarine was seen close to shore. The others had been over on the other side of the Pacific, but this newspaper found a submarine right close to the shore. After the banner headline clear across the top of the page, it narrowed down to one column, which said: "Thought to be a United States submarine maneuvering."

We are told that Russia has a big land army, and it would appear that it is going to march right across the ocean, and land in the United States. Russia does not have any ships to speak of, so I do not know how her army could get here.

Hitler burned down the Reichstag, blamed it on the Communists, and got the folks really scared. In this country we have one crisis after another. I think it will turn out like a vaccination for smallpox. We have so many crises we will become immune one of these days, and then the Red scare will not work any more. A new crisis is brought up and no one pays any attention to it, like the boy who hollered "wolf" once too often. But that is still their line—"The Communists will get us." Russia is devastated, but fact is not taken into consideration. If they do not get us mad enough to fight through that means, they will produce some day a document saying that the Russians are short of women and they are going to take all our women back to Russia. Then I suppose everyone will be mad enough to fight. If I believed that, I would be mad enough to fight. But I am not sucker enough to fall for that propaganda. We will hear that some of these days, mark my words.

We are getting ready to fight somebody—not "someone" anymore, but Russia. Even our Air Secretary comes to Congress and says that we have planes that can bomb the heart of Russia and return. No longer is it a question of who is the enemy or a potential enemy. It is made plain that it is Russia.

We are getting into an armament economy, turning over a large portion of our productive capacity to the manufacture of guns, tanks, airplanes, spears, and everything else, I guess. The funny part of it is, Mr. President, that we have hundreds of atomic bombs, and recently I learned from very high authority that if 250 of our present-day atomic bombs were exploded there would be no place on earth that would be habitable. We already have it in our power to kill everyone on earth. All we have to do is to detonate atomic bombs in one place, and the whole world will become so radioactive that no one can live.

Yet we are asked to draft our boys and put them into uniform. As I said the other day, I cannot see what difference it makes whether they die in uniform or in their B. V. D.'s. It does not make much difference. We are going to die, anyway. We have the bombs. I do not believe anyone will be able to stop the explosions of them when once we get started. So it strikes me that this draft business is pure idiocy.

If I knew what the conference report contains I might cease and desist. It is all ready, I suppose. If I thought the Senate had accepted the House amendment not to draft anyone until next January, that would be all right, because next January I believe we shall have a Congress elected on a platform opposing peacetime military training, and we can repeal the law before it ever gets started. But inasmuch as I do not know what has been put into the conference report, I shall have to go on and talk for a while.

Mr. President, I have here a copy of today's Washington Star, which contains an article written by Mr. David Lawrence, who is a rather conservative columnist. In fact, he publishes a magazine for businessmen to read. His article deals with the question of conscription. He says:

> Delay in draft law unlikely to weaken diplomacy of United States.

We have been told that if we did not draft our boys, Secretary Marshall would be in a weak position. Of course I think he is in a weak position anyhow. He has been, ever since he became Secretary of State. He had no business being Secretary of State in the first place. He was a good general and he should have remained that.

I quote again from David Lawrence, the headline:

> Administration failure to show its need leaves Congress hesitant.

In other words, he says that they have not proven or shown conclusively that we need a draft law, so the Congress is not very excited about passing one. He proceeds:

> Outwardly the controversy over what kind of a draft bill to pass could be mistaken for a conflict of interest between isolationists and internationalists or between advocates of preparedness and opponents of larger armament.

I am not an opponent of adequate preparedness, Mr. President, but I am opposed to militarizing this Nation, and the scale at which we are going at it now can result only in the militarization of this country. It is sort of like dope, the more you get the more you want. You see, they start building all these billions of dollars' worth of guns, then the profits of the industrialists depend on guns, the wages of the workers depend on guns, then they are for the armament program, and it is more difficult to stop it. Every factory that is opened up to producing armaments makes it that much more difficult ever to get out of the armament business, ever to make a really sincere effort to try to attain peace in the world, because it becomes a vested interest. I am opposed to militarizing this country, getting it into the predicament into which Hitler got the German people, because people's morale and their moral sense of right and wrong become dulled after awhile. They realize that their livelihood depends on guns, and they have to rationalize around until they convince themselves that they must have the guns so that they can make more guns to make more profit, and there you go.

David Lawrence goes on to say:

> But no such definitions or cleavages can be justified. The truth is that the President and the Secretary of State have failed to make out a case for the need of peacetime conscription. This means that just ahead of a national election Members of Congress of both parties are hesitant to vote for a draft.

I had not noticed that, Mr. President. I wish it were true. They voted for it, and they will vote for anything nowadays if you just put a little antired label on it.

To return to David Lawrence:

> This may be called plain politics, but it is at the same time the manner in which the electorate reacts irrespective of partisanship. There are as many Democrats as there are Republicans who fear the consequences of a draft bill on the attitude of voters.

Many of them are going to be surprised about the consequences of a draft bill in the attitude of the voters. I promise them that.

> It isn't as if there were a war in progress into which America might suddenly be drawn. The threat of war with Russia has been dramatized again and again but without conviction.

That is David Lawrence I am quoting. He proceeds:

> The House of Representatives, during its debate on the draft bill, tossed around one report that the Secretary of State did say war was possible and another that he said there was no pressing emergency. Whatever he said was said in an executive session and serves only to underline how uninformed the American people are as to what is the nature of the military crisis that confronts them.
>
> The diplomatic relations between Russia and the United States have, of course, been strained but the Russian "peace offensive" successfully disseminated the impression that war isn't likely in the immediate future. The American Government's rejoinder to the "peace offensive" was weak and clumsy, and hence the draft bill suffered.
>
> Much more important as an influence in retarding the draft law from being passed in the form desired by the armed services was the propaganda attributed to the supporters in Congress of the 70-group Air Force. Over the protests of the President and his Secretary of Defense, Congress appropriated more money than was requested in order to put into being a 70-group air force.

I may say, Mr. President, that practically every appropriation bill that has come through the Senate the last few days, when so many appropriation bills have been coming through, practically every one that was of a military nature the Senate increased over what the House appropriated. In the past the Senate has been known as the conservative body, as the body more cautious, at least more careful, what they put their name to. It used to be said that the House of Representatives would pass legislation which they knew was unconstitutional, which they really did not want passed. They would pass it so that they could go out and talk to the folks at home about what they had voted for, and they had confidence that the Senate would reject the legislation, or modify it, and make it constitutional, would be more careful and more thorough in their approach. They cannot say that any longer. The Senate "ups" the ante on every item for guns and greater expenditure of the people's money in the European recovery program. Any place they can spend it they are all for spending more.

I now go back to David Lawrence:

> The explanation heard in the corridors of the Capitol was that by voting more planes there would be no need of a draft. As a sheer matter of exchange, many Members were willing to spend more dollars than to vote to tear up the lives of the younger generation and interrupt their schooling and their working careers with 2 years of military service.

Those are the words of David Lawrence, not mine, Mr. President, "tear up the lives of the younger generation." I think that is well put.

> As it turns out, Congress voted the 70-group Air Force and still has been confronted with a demand for a draft bill. Many Members have hesitated to go along with the peacetime conscription because they honestly believe an air force can do everything.

I believe so, too, Mr. President. In fact, we do not even need an air force. All we need is some bombs, just put them out on a high hill and explode them all, and we have them licked, everybody dies. Of course, we die, too, but we do not get licked. Everybody is dead, so we do not need even an air force.

I should certainly prefer appropriating money for a 70-group air force than to draft the boys.

David Lawrence continues:

> They have been told by some overenthusiastic airmen that both an army and a navy is relatively inconsequential and that, if only enough airplanes are provided, American security will be assured.

While we are on the subject of airplanes, I think one of the most statesmanlike proposals that has been made in America for a long time was made by Henry Wallace at the Madison Square Garden meeting a while back, when he offered the suggestion that our airplane factories should be taken over and operated by the Government, because, as Mr. Wallace pointed out, they are not an economic proposition in peacetime. They cannot survive and make profits. The object of private industry is to make profits. The airplane factories cannot do so without orders for military planes, and, of course, when they depend on orders for military planes they will spend a great deal of their money in hiring experts and lobbyists to keep the war hysteria stirred up and try to secure more orders for military planes to manufacture. That being the case, I think the proposal made by Mr. Wallace certainly should be adopted.. It would go a long way toward lessening the pressure for war crisis which can only result in war eventually.

Mr. Lawrence in his article continues:

> Now, the ground forces feel themselves in need of a draft law to supply the enormous numbers of men needed to handle the installations and mechanical work at the bases where airplanes take off and land.
>
> While the armed services have each been eager to get their necessary appropriations, it does seem nevertheless that not a very strong case has been made for the draft—at least one strong enough to convince Congress, many of whose Members still feel that a mild draft law with a deferred date will accelerate recruiting and bring the necessary personnel into the armed services long before the actual need for war service will arise.

I understand the House measure contains a provision which would defer the draft until next January. That would make it nonsensical for us to pass a draft law now, because we would be passing a law which would take effect during and impose on the prerogatives of the next Congress. The next Congress will convene in the coming January.

The House bill also contained an amendment, if I have been correctly informed, directing someone, I do not know who, to put on an all-out campaign to induce young men to volunteer. I am all for that, Mr. President. Whatever men we need, let us pay them for their service. We do not draft policemen to police Washington, D. C., or Podunk, back home. If we cannot obtain policemen for $1,200 a year we pay them $1,500, or if we cannot obtain them for $1,500 a year we perhaps raise their pay to $2,000 or $2,400. We hire policemen and pay them what they are worth. But when we want soldiers to protect us in peacetime, lo and behold, we will just yank the boys off the street and say, "Get into uniform. Some of us are busy, and we will select you."

I return to David Lawrence and read:

> Since war isn't regarded as imminent, a draft law that takes effect after election isn't likely to weaken the diplomacy of the United States. For the important fact psychologically is that there is to be a peacetime draft.

Of course what Mr. Lawrence wants us to do is to pass a draft law and keep it lying around so as to scare the boys by the threat that we are going to draft them if they do not watch out, and if they do not enlist. It would be perfectly dishonest, of course, to pass a draft law and put it into effect in peacetime.

Mr. President, there have been a number of political speeches made on the floor in the last few days. Yesterday the Chamber was well decorated with charts and one thing and another which were placed all about the room. It was the most attractive decoration of the Chamber I have seen. The charts showed how folks voted on various measures—the Democrats and the Republicans. An interesting thing about it was that most of the votes were cast back yonder when Roosevelt was President. Those who presented the charts were not very proud of the votes taken since Roosevelt passed on. It is not the same old Democratic Party that it used to be when he was its leader. That is why I decided to go with Henry Wallace. As I said at the time I did so, I did not leave the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party simply left me. I still believe in the same things I believed in when I was elected on a pledge to support Franklin D. Roosevelt but the Democratic Party has left those principles, so I will stay with those principles even though it is necessary to organize a new party to fight for those principles.

Since other folks have set forth their party platforms, have stated what they believe in, we may as well have the benefit of the record and show what the new party believes in.

First and foremost we believe in keeping the peace. Inasmuch as we have looked and have seen that we have enough bombs to kill everyone in the world, including ourselves, we fail to see the percentage in starting a war. No one is going to win. We are all going to die if a war were to come. In fact I think it would be much more sensible if, instead of spending billions of dollars to draft our boys, and to build tanks—and we are going right on building atomic bombs—we should locate some big caves, perhaps the Mammoth Cave, and put lead doors on the openings into it so the radioactivity could not come in, and if there was any way in the world to purify atmosphere, to take radioactivity out of it—I do not know whether there is, but I guess there is not—we might install machinery to blow fresh air, decontaminated air into the Mammoth Cave, and then select about a half a dozen young couples who have just gotten married, and set them up to housekeeping in Mammoth Cave so when all of the rest of us are killed, they can hold out there for a few years, whatever time it will be until the earth will become decontaminated, and then they can emerge and

proceed to repopulate the earth. That would be a more sensible course to pursue.

Incidentally it would be very gratifying to me if that were done, because doubtless some couples would be chosen from the largest name groups; which would be the fairest thing to do, and they would probably begin with the Browns, the Smiths, the Joneses, and I think the Taylors would get in about sixth, someplace along there, so the name of "Taylor" would be perpetuated after the fracas was all over. I do not set myself up as a candidate for the job, however.

We were saying that the new party does not believe there is any percentage in getting into a war, and that we should keep the peace. We do not believe that there has been a genuine effort made to get along with Russia. Quite the contrary. It is our conviction that the cartelists, the monopolists, and the militarists have taken over the control of the country and that many of them actually want war, and they feel that the Russians do not have the bomb, I guess, and that we can drop 240 bombs, if not 250, and maybe whip the Russians and rule the world and exploit its people.

There are others who want to remain generals and admirals and majors and colonels and monopolists and cartelists, and profit. They want to keep up the war tension so they can go ahead with the armament program. So we do not feel that a genuine effort to keep the peace has been made by arriving at an understanding with Russia. Therefore we contend that the election of Henry Wallace would be practically the only sensible way for us to reach an agreement with Russia, because Henry Wallace is the only man of sufficient stature to aspire to the Presidency of the United States, who has not fallen for the lure of cheap publicity to be gained in the reactionary press by denouncing Russia every day of the week, and trying to blame all our troubles on communism. You can name any prospective candidate you want to and they are all in on this propagandist scare against Russia and denouncing Russia. How does anyone expect them to make an about-face and save face, Mr. President? They cannot do it. Henry Wallace has held himself above those things. It is not because Henry Wallace loves Russia. We see that propaganda everywhere. Henry Wallace would not trade one spadeful of the soil of Iowa, where he was born, for all the ground in Russia. I am confident of that. I know him pretty well. But he has been big enough to resist the temptation to climb on the red smear bandwagon. Believe me, Mr. President, it took some pretty serious thinking on my part to make up my mind to go with Henry Wallace. I knew what the result would be. I was elected to the Senate over what most people would have considered insurmountable obstacles. It is fine to be a Senator. It is the best job I ever had, anyway I look at it—from the standpoint of salary, prestige, or anything else. It is wonderful.

But I have three boys. They must be educated. When I am out of the Senate I do not know what I shall do. I spent my earlier life in the theatrical profession. I cannot go back to it. One cannot drag three small boys around the country. They must go to school. So I do not know what will happen to me when I am out of the Senate.

For that reason it was pretty serious when Mr. Wallace asked me to join in this great effort to save the world from extinction. That is what it amounts to. If I had not thought so, I might not have gone with him. But I felt that that was the issue that was involved; that we were being taken toward a war which could mean only, in all probability, the end of life on this planet. So I joined Henry Wallace. There are more important things than my political security, my political future, or my economic security.

Those things are the welfare of everyone's sons, including my own. That is why I am opposed to the draft bill. It just does not make sense. It only adds to the danger of war. As I have said, we can kill everyone anyway, so why draft the boys and take us along this militaristic road?

However, for the benefit of those who are convinced that we must fight Russia, let me say that I believe that we would be much better off with Henry Wallace as President if it ever came to a showdown and we did have to fight Russia. I am not conceding for a moment that we are going to have to fight Russia. I do not believe we will. At the present time there are millions of American people—and I am one of them—who are not convinced that an honest effort has been made to seek a rapprochement with the Russians. But if we were dragged into a war with Russia this country would be very much divided. There would be a lack of enthusiasm for any such efforts; and that is very important. Napoleon said that morale is to numbers as 3 is to 1. It would be very important that we have a united country in case of war.

If Mr. Wallace were to become President, and he made an all-out effort to reach an agreement with the Russians and failed, then the people of America would know that everything possible had been done in a genuine spirit of cooperation and with a real desire to get along with the Russians. Then the common people would be behind any such effort if it had to come about. We do not have to worry about the monopolists, the cartelists, and the military men. They do not like Wallace, but they would be all for a war even with Wallace running it. So I think the best hope of the American people for peace and the best hope of coming out best is the election of Henry Wallace. I do not know how we are going to come out best in a war; but at least we could all die united under Henry Wallace, in case we got into a fracas.

So for war or peace, I am convinced that Henry Wallace is the best man for the job. Of course, Mr. Wallace's detracters say that he is a "screwball," a seer, and one thing and another. It is said that he could not stand up to Stalin, that Stalin is a smart fellow. Perhaps Stalin is smart, but I contend that Henry Wallace himself is pretty smart.

Henry Wallace was the greatest Secretary of Agriculture we ever had. He did more for the farmers of America as Secretary of Agriculture than was ever done for them before or since. Aside from that, Henry Wallace has done more for the farmers by developing his hybrid corn than has any other person who ever lived in all history. His hybrid corn, with its fabulous yields, has put millions of dollars of actual cash money into the pockets of American farmers during the past few years.

But the hybrid corn which Henry Wallace perfected is like a mule. It will not reproduce. You have to buy the seed from Henry every year. I contend that any man who can figure out a scheme like that is no fool. I never heard of Joe Stalin figuring out anything half that smart. At the same time, it is a very humanitarian thing. Henry has become well-to-do from it, and at the same time it helps the farmers. In fact, Henry Wallace is a successful man by any standard—even the one most commonly applied in these great United States, the one of financial success.

Henry Wallace is a success financially. He is a great scientist. Some will try to prove that he is crazy because he has hobbies, like throwing the boomerang. Throwing the boomerang is no crazier than chasing a golf ball all over. It is smarter, in fact. You do not have to chase the boomerang. You do have to chase the golf ball. Henry Wallace is a good boomerang thrower. One day he threw one which hit a Hearst reporter, and it looked like an accident.

I believe that Henry Wallace can and will reach an honorable agreement with the Russians. We are not for peace at any price. Our detractors will say that we are groveling cur dogs, and this, that, and the other thing. Nothing like it at all. We believe that this can be done honorably, and that the Russians will be glad to go home and stay at home, if we will go home and stay at home, and if they have reason to believe that we will stay home. At the present time, with all our preparations for war, how can the Russians have any confidence that we would go home or stay at home? There are many reasons why they should want to stay at home. They have vast resources. They live better in peacetime than they do in wartime, due to the nature of their economy. They would like to develop their country. So I am convinced that we can have peace honorably, and that is the main objective of our new party.

What will we do on the domestic front? Whenever it has been suggested that we take care of the old people or build schools or hospitals, the argument has always been raised, "We cannot afford it. It will bankrupt the Nation." Is not that funny, Mr. President? But now we can appropriate billions and billions and billions of dollars for armaments, and billions and billions and billions of dollars for Europe, and no one worries as to whether or not it is going to bankrupt us. It is, but people do not seem to worry about it, because they are getting profits out of it, and they do not worry about anything so long as they are getting profits. Their philosophy is to let the next generation take care of the mistakes they make. If they can only get their hands in the old profit bag and get theirs now, they are satisfied. So they no longer say, "We cannot do these things because it would bankrupt the country." When we start our program for domestic betterment of this great Nation and it is said, "You are going to bankrupt the country," we are going to say "Nuts! We saw what you spent for armaments."

We will call off the armament program as soon as we reach an agreement with the Russians. They will have to call theirs off, too, but, of course, we shall be just as well off relatively if they have no guns and we have none. In fact, we shall be a great deal better off, because then we shall have a few months to live while we get ready. As it is now, everyone can be killed without notice. It is very bad. There is no peace of mind.

The other day I read that our mental hospitals are becoming filled with crazy people. They are all going "nuts" because they do not know what day the bombs are going to drop on them. We should stop spending all these billions of dollars for armaments, and should use some of that money—not all of it—to make ours a better country in which to live.

For instance, suppose we were to use a few of those billions of dollars to have a health program, under which we would build hospitals and would train doctors and would make it possible for poor sick people, or sick people who are poor, whichever way one wishes to state it, to call in a doctor and have a checkup before they get sick, and thus stay well. Certainly it would be better to have such preventive methods used rather than to have people wait until they were really sick before they called a doctor. Would not that be better than this fool draft law which I have been discussing? After all, it takes healthy people to be good soldiers. We found that out in the last war. We could hardly get enough boys to carry the guns that had to be carried. Many of the young men of our country were found to have had rickets or some other disease or trouble which made it impossible for them to carry guns and serve as soldiers.

Mr. President, I remember that when I was in California not long ago I saw piles of oranges 10 feet high and half a mile long—not one pile, but many piles. If someone had taken one of those oranges, he would have been arrested and charged with stealing. Yet we have had many children in our country suffering from rickets. We must not allow that to occur any longer, or else our people will go Communist or something worse.

These big fellows realize that; but instead of seeing to it that the people have enough money with which to buy the things they need and require, they propose an armaments program. They suggest that billions of dollars be used to buy guns. Of course, when great quantities of guns are made, other articles will be scarce: Frigidaires and automobiles, for instance, will be scarce. That is the whole idea behind this armaments plan. Those who are behind it are not afraid of Russia; they know Russia is not able to attack anyone. They are simply using Russia as a bogeyman.

But the new party would have a health program, and would use some of the money—which otherwise would be spent for guns—for the welfare of the people of America. Mr. President, would not that be a good idea? After all, the guns will be useless after the earth is blown up by the 250 atom bombs.

Mr. President, do you not think it will be better to have more schools and better schools and increase the salaries of the school teachers, so that they can live decently and so that the teaching profession will attract our average citizens? What a sad spectacle the situation today is, Mr. President. Almost everyone makes more money than the school teachers do. Not long ago I was in Nevada. There is a great deal of gambling out there. The girls running the gambling tables have to be quick at figures, of course, so as to be able to figure up the percentages. It seems that nearly every one of the girls running the gambling tables in Las Vegas and Reno is a former school teacher. Think of that. That is a sad commentary on present-day America—dissipating our wealth all over the world; spending billions of dollars for armaments that are absolutely useless, because we have enough bombs to kill everyone, in the first place.

Do you not think it would be a good idea to do as the new party advocates? Instead of spending money on useless armament projects, and thus degrading mankind, as they must, with their promise of destruction and the destruction of the morale of the people, do you not think it would be much better to build homes—homes for veterans, at least? Let us not draft any more of our young men until we build homes for the veterans of the last war. The only way they will get homes will be to have the Federal Government build the homes.

Incidentally, Mr. President, where are the homes? Where is the housing bill? Some Members of Congress are greatly worried about drafting the boys, but they are not worried about the housing bill. They have kicked that around and kicked it practically to death, and I guess it has been finished before now.

But, single-handed, I am trying, to stop this despicable business of militarizing our Nation.

The new party would build homes, not only for veterans, but for all Americans who need homes. Only a fraction of the money which is being spent so lavishly and so hopelessly for armament and for so-called aid to fascism all over the world would be required for the building of homes which our new party advocates.

Mr. President, how about some legislation for civil rights?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I am wondering whether the distinguished Senator will permit a vote on the motion to disagree to the amendment of the House to the draft bill, agree to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and for the appointment of conferees, and then let the conferees work out whatever provisions they might work out, and report to the two Houses. Then the Senator of course could use his own judgment as to whether the conference report would be acceptable.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Nebraska does not have to beat about the bush. Let him find out what the conferees have agreed upon, and write it on a piece of paper, and bring it around here and let me look at it, and if it is O. K., I will agree to let the conferees be appointed, so as to make it official.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is quite an assignment. Of course it is not possible.

I respectfully submit to the distinguished Senator that when the conference report comes back, if the provisions of the report do not meet with the approval of the Senator from Idaho, certainly there will be ample time for him to continue the speech he has already begun, but the procedure I suggest would give us the authority to have the conference report presented as quickly as possible.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what I do not want to have done.

Mr. WHERRY. An additional reason for making this request is that there are five conference reports which should be adopted. One is on the highway bill, another is on the Interior Department appropriation bill, another is on the displaced persons bill, and there are several others. I believe that between the time when a vote would be taken on the motion to disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the requested conference, and to appoint the conferees on this measure, and the time when the conference report would be presented, there would be ample time to consider the other conference reports.

Thereafter the Senator would have the same opportunity he has now, but we would have expedited the transaction of the work before us, and of course thereafter the Senator could continue to make the speech he is making now. I think that is a very fair proposal, and it should command the Senator's utmost consideration.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have no objection to having any measure except the draft bill considered. If Senators wish to lay aside the draft bill temporarily, and take up and pass everything else on the calendar, that will be entirely satisfactory to me, and I shall vote "aye."

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the Senator from Idaho overlooks the fact that until the vote is taken on the motion to agree to the requested conference and appoint conferees, officially there can be no conference on the draft bill. If it were not for the fact that when the conference committee returns with its report, the distinguished Senator will have the same opportunity that he has now, I would not even make the suggestion to him, because I have always cooperated with the distinguished Senator; I think he will agree with me as to that.

I am simply making this suggestion in order to expedite matters generally.

The Senator's speech could be continued or resumed the moment the conference report came back. If the provisions of the conference report are not acceptable to the Senator, of course he can speak in the same way that he is speaking now. In the meantime, the conferees will have concluded their deliberations and we could also have considered and agreed to the other conference reports.

So I submit the request to the Senator. I think it is a very fair proposal, and does not in any way prejudice or take away the rights the Senator has now to oppose whatever is submitted by the conference.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that my object in talking now is to split my remarks into two segments.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the split has already been made.

Mr. TAYLOR. But not enough of a split.

I had in mind talking now; and it was my hope that when, later, the conferees were appointed, they would not be able to get their conference report back until morning. But I think they have "pulled a fast one" on me. I am afraid they have already conferred. As I have said, if anyone wishes to sneak to me a copy of their report, or the main provisions of it, and let me look at it, I may decide to call this off. But until then, I think I shall proceed for a while.

Anyway, I have not gotten into the RECORD all the program of the new party, and I want to get all of it in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was busy. Did the Senator make a proposition? If so, I did not hear it.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I did not proposition anybody. I want to say I have the highest regard for the Senator from Nebraska. In fact, he is such an estimable gentleman I wish he would join the new party. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I tried to accomplish something anyway. I hope the Senator will consider it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Nebraska should make clear what he said.

Mr. WHERRY. I say, I hope the Senator will consider the matter as he proceeds. I am satisfied, I may say with all respect, that the Senator would not be prejudicing his rights, he would have the same opportunity to continue his speech after the conference report comes back, if the conference report comes back. Even though the conference report might not be satisfactory in all its phases, it might appeal to the Senator in such a way that he would feel he could accept it. Until the conference report comes back, I submit the Senator has to anticipate what may happen.

Mr. TAYLOR. My statement was that the Senator from Nebraska was such an estimable gentleman I wish he would join the new party. The Senator perhaps did not hear me say that, for he replied, "I tried." [Laughter.] I simply did not want him to be left on a spot here.

I was discussing civil rights. Nothing has been done, when there are millions of Americans who live from day to day all their lives in an inferior status. They are not Americans; they are second-class citizens. All over this country I have been traveling back and forth, and I wish that people who have race prejudice in their hearts and who feel that Negroes must be kept in an inferior position could have traveled with me and have met the Negroes I have met.

Indeed, Mr. President, in many places I have stayed in the homes of Negroes, for the good and sufficient reason that in many places rooms will not be rented to Mr. Wallace or myself, because we are sympathetic with the Negro people; much less will rooms be rented to anyone whose skin is a little dark.

A very strange thing happened last fall, I believe it was. There was a Negro gentleman who put on a turban, one of those Hindu turbans. He toured all over the South, being received with high honors, bowed to and scraped around, simply because he wore a turban. It was not known that he was a Negro. People thought he was a Hindu. You see, they cannot tell by looking at people, so I suggested, I do not see why they do not just put turbans on all Negroes and let it go at that, and they would all be entitled to equal rights.

But we met some wonderful people, Negroes, all across the country, smart, intelligent, educated. It only goes to show what could be done if all Negroes had equal opportunity. Of course the demagogues get up and say, "Well, I don't want my daughter to marry a Negro." Well, no one is suggesting that anybody's daughter or anybody's son marry a Negro. We merely want them to have equal opportunities at jobs, equal opportunities to get a meal, to go into a place and eat, and just be treated like everybody else; that is all. I do not think that would cause any more intermarriage or mixture of the races than goes on now. But we would have a civil rights program.

The new party would have a civil rights program. In fact, we believe in equality for all Americans. We have several Negroes running for Congressional seats. We have down in Georgia a Negro candidate for the United States Senate. The new party would repeal the Taft-Hartley law and enact sensible labor legislation. Incidentally we ought to have $1 an hour as a minimum wage, which is another thing we advocate.

The new party would take care of our old people with just a few of the dollars we are spending for guns now. We are not suggesting any new appropriations; we would just divert some of these billions that have been appropriated for guns and for European recovery—which they do not need. We would see that our old people under present conditions have at least $100 a month. They should have that much, and we are for it, and we would see that they got it. The new party would formulate a farm program to work through the United Nations. There was a world food program figured out here, and we spurned it, we would not have anything to do with it. We would not make friends by that action, either. Some of the other nations thought very poorly of us. But we would figure out a farm plan, working through the United Nations. In fact, the new party plans to work through the United Nations always, every time there is a possibility to build up the United Nations. We are for it 100 percent. We would work through the United Nations in figuring out a farm program that would not only give our farmers a decent return on their labor and investment, but even more important I believe to the farmers—I have talked to many of them, I was raised on a farm—even more important, at least as important as the fact he would get a decent monetary return, then through the United Nations we could figure it out so the farmer would always know that every mouthful of food he raised went to feed some hungry person somewhere in this hungry world, because there are people all over the world, millions of them, who never have a full belly. We would correct that condition to the best of our ability, while helping our farmers at the same time.

Then of course, Mr. President, we want to assure the American people there would be no Mundt-Nixon bill, there would be no curtailing of civil liberties, anybody's right to speak or to say anything he thought, so long as he did not advocate violent overthrow of the government. If I had my say about it I would see that there was a town hall built in every community in America that does not have one, with a Federal charter, a stipulation, "built by the Federal Government," and anybody could use that hall, just pay for the lights and the heat and a little depreciation, and use it to say anything he pleased at any time he pleased, and be assured of full police protection. That one thing, Mr. President, would do more to head off any foreign ideologies or foreign subversive schemes than any other thing I can possibly think of. As long as we let people blow off steam, and as long as one fellow can go to the community hall tonight and advocate communism, if he wants to, or socialism, and another fellow, the next night, can go there and advocate a certain kind of capitalism, or anything he wants to advocate, so long as they do not advocate changing our government by force and violence, that is the greatest safety valve of all.

Of course people have to have something to eat, a minimum, at least. They must have opoprtunities to educate their children, and must have a fairly decent place in which to live. Those things are minimum requirements, which any government, under any way of life, must provide for if it expects to survive. We could do all of the things I have mentioned, and there would still be billions of dollars kicking around, which we are now spending for guns. We could make substantial payments on our national debt. It is important that the national debt be reduced and paid off as rapidly as possible, because the burden of interest is unbearable. However, instead of paying off the debt, we are spending billions for guns for Europe and are reducing taxes. Of course almost all of the reduction in taxes goes to the benefit of persons with a great deal of money. It is almost criminal, in fact. They do not want the debt paid off. It is the

biggest racket they ever had. So let the debt remain large. Reduce taxes. We could make substantial payments on the debt, and then, after that, out of the billions of dollars being squandered everywhere, we would have enough left to have a real tax reduction. We could see that the common folks received the most of it, the ones who need it the most. They do need it, desperately, Mr. President. Prices are all out of proportion to the amount of wages which workers are receiving. They receive a wage increase, and then the producers raise the prices of their articles sky high, or out of all proportion to the actual cost of the wage increase, and the workers are worse off than they were before. Today I saw an advertisement in a newspaper of a 1949 Ford automobile for $1,995. That is almost $2,000 for a Ford automobile. The Ford Co. used to apologize if it charged $700 or $800.

Another thing which the new party would like to make plain is this: We believe that the Jewish people are entitled to a home land in Palestine, and we would be foursquare on that proposition, instead of shilly-shallying, backtracking, or double-crossing, as we have been in our foreign policy. In fact, this bipartisan foreign policy of ours should be ashamed to go by the name of foreign policy. We control the United Nations because we are dishing out billions of dollars all over the earth to phony cardboard Fascist governments, and we control the votes of the United Nations. Along came Palestine, and we were in favor of partition. Everyone agreed, including the Russians. Then the Arabs kicked up a little bit, so Mr. Forrestal, a representative of the oil companies, said, "We cannot afford this. Our oil is in danger." So we called off partition. Then we wanted a trusteeship. We did not ask the United Nations to figure out a new plan; we just figured out a trusteeship. We wrote it up and handed it to them and said, "Debate this a reasonable length of time, and the answer is "Yes." So they did that. We told the Jews not to set up a State, that we would not approve of it. But they established it anyway, and there was a fait accompli. So Mr. Truman, without even telling our representatives at the United Nations, recognized Palestine in 10 or 15 minutes. Our delegate to the United Nations was left standing there when word came over that the United States had recognized Palestine. The other delegates asked him, "Has your Government recognized Israel?" He said, "I do not know what my Government is doing." He was right. The whole world laughed right in the faces of our representatives.

Never has the prestige of this country fallen so low as it is at this time. I can assure the Senate that with the new party, under the leadership of Henry Wallace, the people will know where we stand. There will be no shilly-shally and double talk, one thing today and another thing tomorrow. Mr. Wallace is a forthright man.

Mr. President, many people are opposed to the draft bill. I have seen many of them across this great Nation. I have here a clipping from the New York Times of March 19, 1948, which says:

Cardinal Dougherty calls peacetime UMT menace to health and morality of youth.

The article goes on to say:

Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, ranking prelate of the Catholic Church in this country, declared today he is unalterably opposed to peacetime universal military training.

The spiritual leader of a million Catholics in the Philadelphia Archdiocese stated the following reasons:

"First, it is against the traditions of this country.

"Second, where it is in existence is precisely where most wars have taken place."

Of course, Mr. President, that is a fact. All the countries of Europe have military training, and they were always getting into wars because they were always ready for war. Then it remained for us to go in and settle the proposition. We won, after all the countries with military training got the stuffing kicked out of them. We are now trying to follow their example, and it does not make sense.

The article continues:

Said training would remove young men, at a critical age, from their home surroundings and safeguards.

That is a true statement, Mr. President. The most terrible thing about it is that it will take young men out of school, and once they are out of school they seldom return. They will not return unless we provide many inducements, similar to those in the GI bill of rights.

The article continues:

It would throw them, with all their inexperience and without adequate safeguard, into frightful temptations calculated to undermine their morality and physical health.

Of course that has been proven, also, Mr. President. I have a very good friend in Idaho who had a boy who joined the Army. The boy was a little wild, to be sure, and when he got away from home and was over in Germany it was not long before he was shipped back in a box, feet first. He had drunk some wood alcohol, and that was his finish. His father had managed to keep the boy under control as long as he was home, but when he got away from home he did not last long.

I read further:

Experience shows that even military officers are frequently corrupt and a bad example to those under them.

This is Cardinal Dougherty speaking. I hasten to say, lest some Senator jumps up and calls me a Communist.

Here is what the Cardinal says:

Venereal disease would rise in a frightful degree and break down the health of future fathers of families.

No one can deny that. Past experience has proved it to be so.

The expense of universal military training would involve annually millions, if not billions of dollars to be paid by the taxpayers.

There seems to be no need in this country of universal military training, which is boosted most by soldiers, particularly Army officers, who covet promotion and higher salaries.

Of course that is true, Mr. President. Army officers want to remain officers. They want to be promoted. All we have to do in order to appreciate their position is to try to put ourselves into their position. Suppose we had spend our lives becoming Army officers, and all of a sudden peace should break out. That is the way it is being referred to in the papers now, Mr. President. They say there is danger that peace might break out. But suppose peace broke out and the Russians and this country agreed that there would be no more war. Would not those Army and Navy officers be in terrible shape? They would be wore off than I would be if I were out of politics. They do not know another thing in the world except being generals. No wonder they want to remain generals.

Cardinal Dougherty goes on to say:

Finally, the chances are that hereafter battles will be fought in the air, rather than on foot; and in that case large armies will not be needed.

As I say, this article was written in March 1948, so it may be that Cardinal Dougherty had not heard yet that we have hundreds of atomic bombs, and that the war would not be fought in the air, if all we had to do was to set off our bombs and wait for everyone to die.

Cardinal Dougherty also observed that "certain groups are opposed in conscience to war and consequently to preparations for war"; and this is not only true of Quakers but also of many mothers of other religious beliefs.

Of course they are opposed to it, Mr. President, if we can just get word to the American people, if we can tell them how utterly stupid this whole business of preparing great armies, costing millions of dollars for tanks and arms of one kind and another, when we have the bombs just to end it all, how silly it is. I am afraid there are going to be a lot of folks who vote for this draft who will not be back here next fall, and then we will vote to repeal it.

Mr. President, I have said that I think it is possible for us to get along with Russia. Recently, when we had our peace scare, when the Russians took us at our word, when Gen. Bedell Smith, our Ambassador to Moscow, delivered that note, the Russians took us at our word and said they wanted to discuss this matter to talk about peace. We assured them we did not mean it, that we were just kidding, just being polite. At that time there were several accounts in the press, none of them played up, they were played down, in fact, over on the second or third page, telling about what happened in Russia when it looked as if we might have some peace talks.

Here is an article to which I wish to call attention though it does not deal with this particular matter. I had these articles printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that is why I am quoting from the RECORD. This is a dispatch from Moscow by Eddy Gilmore, Associated Press correspondent. He is a very reliable correspondent. He had been in this country some time, and he had just gone back to Moscow. This is what he had to say on returning to Moscow:

Returning to the Soviet Union from the United States one is struck by the absence of

war talk among the Russian people. One simply doesn't hear any.

He does not say that there is very little war talk; he says one is struck by the absence of war talk in Russia. "One simply does not hear any." That is pretty strong language, a pretty broad statement. How different that is from what we hear in this country. The papers day in and day out are hammering away at us that we may have war most any day. Prominent men make inflammatory statements, average citizens take it up, of course, as they are wont to do when their leaders make such statements. The average citizens say, "We had better fight those Russians." Get in a taxicab or a barber chair and you can hear statements like that all too often.

Mr. Gilmore proceeded to say:

In Berlin the United States press department told me I'd better take a Russian-speaking American officer from the liaison section with me to the Soviet airdrome to catch the plane.

"We'll give you a military escort, too," they said.

You see, all they can think of is military, military. He continues:

Showing up at 2 a. m. I was met by a liaison officer who said if it was all the same to me he wouldn't go along into the Soviet sector.

I told him I spoke Russian and it wasn't necessary.

With a German chauffeur, four suitcases, a typewriter, and a small dog I had purchased for my little daughter, I set out. Halfway to the Russian zone we were overtaken by American military police.

"We will escort you," said one of the men.

"Why?" I asked.

"Well, you never can tell," said the man.

About 100 yards from the Soviet zone the military police car halted.

"This is as far we go," said the man next to the driver. "We'll wait here. If your driver doesn't come back, we'll know you and he have had it."

This was not cheerful talk for so early in the morning.

I am still quoting Eddy Gilmore.

About 200 yards down the road in the Soviet zone was a road block. A young Russian soldier stepped out and held up his hand.

"Where to?" he asked.

I told him.

"Got any documents?"

I told him, "No—just an American passport with a Soviet visa." He examined them by the headlights.

"What about documents for the jeep and driver?" he asked.

"Don't have any. Yesterday was Sunday."

"Oh, well," said the guard, "I guess everything is all right."

This certainly was not very ominous.

At the airport gate it was the same story. Again I got through with no trouble.

Mr. President, I am constrained to stop here and comment. He got into Russia with little or no trouble, yet we know that statements have been made recently that we are appropriating "Fund X," unspecified millions of dollars, for fifth-column activities in Russia and in nations friendly to her. Yet they let Mr. Gilmore right through.

Mr. President, if the Russians stated publicly that they were going to do such a thing as that we would be scared to death. We would not let Eddy Gilmore back into this country even after he had been to Russia. But they let him in with no great trouble. He continued:

"Here's your ticket," said the official. "We are not charging you for the dog. He can ride free."

There were 11 Soviet officers behind me. One suggested I should accompany him to have some tea.

After tea we discovered there was some vodka.

"To the friendship of our countries," said a young major returning to Moscow from an assignment in Berlin.

"To peace between our countries always," I proposed. All 11 officers drank the toast at once.

Here is the final paragraph in this article from Moscow by Eddy Gilmore:

Despite the Berlin tension in the American headlines and war talk, I heard not one word of that in Moscow. I'll wait 24 hours, I said to myself, and talk to more Russians. This I've done. Not one has mentioned war or the possibility of it.

Yet, Mr. President, we are being fed war propaganda. The situation is so serious, to hear people tell it, that we have to draft our boys and provide billions for armaments. This is the greatest crime that was ever perpetrated upon humanity, the misleading of the American people into the idea that they have to fight Russia. There are millions of them coming to accept that idea. When they become indoctrinated enough, they cannot be stopped.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] said recently, the American people cannot continue indefinitely hating someone without doing something about it. When we are told we are in grave, imminent danger of attack from Russia, the people cannot continue in that strained way forever. They will insist on doing something about it sometime.

I have here another article which bears the date line Moscow on the day the exchange of notes took place, when it looked like there was some hope that we might have peace. The article was published, I believe, in the Washington Star of May 11. The date line is Moscow, and this is what it says:

Russians crowded five and six deep in front of newspaper bulletin boards today to read a Russian-American exchange of notes which they hoped might lead to better relations.

Did anyone see anything like that in America? I did not. Did anyone see people crowding 5 or 6 feet deep in front of a bulletin board to read the good news that maybe there was a chance that they were going to have peace? Well, they did in Russia. They must really want peace over there. I continue reading:

Laboring men in overalls, shawled mothers with babies in their arms, white collar workers and Army officers stood patiently awaiting their turn to read the three full columns of a Tass Agency dispatch on the exchange. As they read they nudged each other and made such comment as "Good eh! Good."

For the first time in months many of them beamed at those among them who obviously were foreigners.

That is something people understand.

An elderly subway construction engineer said "Molotov will get together with you folks yet. You just see."

Well, unfortunately Mr. Molotov has not gotten together with us yet, so that Russian who wanted peace—he did at least, whether Molotov does or not—his hopes are not going to be realized, Mr. President.

No, I believe it is possible to get along with Russia. If you do not think so you might just as well go out and start digging your own grave with an automatic device to dump the dirt in upon you after you get in, because that will be our fate if we continue with this "get tough" foreign policy. If war comes we will all be killed at once, and there will be no one to bury us.

Mr. President, I should like to know why all the rush to jam this legislation through when nothing has been done about housing, nothing has been done about civil rights. There are many, many things which should have been done which have been left undone. Nothing has been done about a minimum wage. We are spending billions of dollars for useless armament.

Out in the Northwest they tightened up on everything else, spending less money for all good things. Out in the Northwest big floods have practically washed our country away. I have been agitating for a Columbia Valley Authority since 1938. Do Senators know what they called me because I wanted a Columbia Valley Authority like the TVA, to develop our Northwest, to prevent the possibility of these floods which have just cost us millions and millions, and many lives? Do Senators know what they called me because I wanted a Columbia Valley Authority? They called me a Communist. I was called a Communist before I began to run with Wallace. Since I have run with him is not the first time I have been called a Communist. I have been called a Communist for years, and it used to worry me a great deal, because I was not a Communist, and had not even read any Communist literature. Of course, after I had been called a Communist for a while my curiosity was aroused for that reason, and I started to study up on the subject, to see what it was all about.

The people called me a Communist in 1938. At that time I ran for Congress, and I was called a Communist because I wanted to develop our resources. I denied the charge. In every speech I made I said I was not a Communist. I denied the charge indignantly and righteously. I was defeated. I came fourth in a field of nine candidates in the primary.

In 1940 I was nominated to be United States Senator, and people began calling me a Communist again. They had not paid much attention to me until I received the nomination, because no one thought I would receive it. After I received it, however, they began calling me a Communist again. All the political experts told me I must jump on that charge, I must deny it. I did jump on it, and I was defeated again by 14,000 in the general election.

In 1942 I was again nominated to be United States Senator, and people again began calling me a Communist, and the political advisers said: "Don't let them get away with that. That is murder."

So I again denied the charge that I was a Communist. In every speech I made I told the people I was not a Communist, but again I was defeated.

In 1944 I again ran and was nominated to be United States Senator. Again people had not expected me to receive the nomination, but after I received it they began calling me a Communist again, and the political smart boys said: "Do not let them get away with that. Jump on that charge. If you do not, it will ruin you." I said: "The 'H' with them. I am not going to pay any attention to them. I am just going to tell the people what I am. If they want to think I am a Communist, it is just too bad." I did not even mention the charge. People just yelled "Communist" at me at the top of their voices, but by golly I was elected, Mr. President.

So we are not going to worry about this Communist smear in the new party. That is all those who are against us have to say about us. We have all the truth on our side.

We say it is idiotic to appropriate millions of dollars for useless armament when we can destroy the world with the atom bomb we have. It is even foolish to continue making more bombs, Mr. President, because if we explode the bombs we have, we will all be dead. So why make any more. Why not quit making more of them now that we have the ultimate, the acme, here in this country. We can rub out Europe with the bombs.

Then there is the Marshall plan; yes; the Marshall plan. That is the biggest fake that was ever perpetrated on the American people. I have before me a clipping from the New York Times, and the headline of the article is: "Europe feels pangs of overproducing."

In other words, they have surpluses over there, so in order to help them out we start dumping our own on them. That is a fine idea—appropriate $6,000,000,000 to dump some surpluses on them when they have overproduction of their own. Of course they are hard up. The people do not have any money. So we will send them free stuff. That will be better. Over there goods are manufactured, but the people do not have any money with which to buy what is manufactured, so the result is they must shut down their plants. We have gone crazy. If the Marshall plan is the best plan we can figure out the capitalists might just as well move out and private enterprise will be on the way out. If we cannot figure some way under private enterprise and capitalism, whatever you want to call it, so that it can distribute the good things we can produce, what good is it to continue to produce?

I think we can figure out these things. We can figure out a way to keep a large part of our private economy. We may have to socialize the monopolies. They are bigger than the Government. They run the Government. We may have to socialize them. We may have to socialize the rails, communications, and steel. Look at steel, Mr. President. We have had a steel shortage for years, and not a thing has been done about it. Everything is dependent upon steel, yet it is kept scarce. Steel should be socialized. It is a monopoly. It is a basic industry. Too many genuine little enterprise undertakings depend upon steel for us to permit steel to be monopolized and kept scarce. The people should own it.

I mentioned rails. Coal is a joke. It is basic. We must have coal. Whenever there is a strike, what happens? The Government takes over—a fake—and runs up a flag, but the same boys continue to draw the profits. The same boys operate the industry. A couple of colonels move in and take a bottle of Old Taylor with them, and that is the extent of the occupation. Let us be honest about these things. We need some socialization in this country if we are to keep any private enterprise at all. But if we do not, if we let scarcities persist, there will be no private enterprise. Right now little-business men are in terrible shape. Anyone who has a sheet-metal-working shop is in tough luck. He cannot get sheet metal, and he must close up. Does anyone suppose that that makes him love private enterprise, when he is put out of business? No, sir.

We are in favor of real private enterprise, for a modest-sized establishment, especially when a man owns his own business and actively manages it. We could arrive at some just yardstick to determine when an industry should be publicly owned. We have that task to do, or we shall have another depression, starvation in the midst of abundance, and communism. That is what Henry Wallace and I want to head off. Those who claim to be the best friends of private enterprise, those who call Henry Wallace and GLEN TAYLOR Communists, are the worst enemies of private enterprise, and actually, in practice, the very best friends of communism.

It is said that the Communists are going to support Wallace and TAYLOR. The pink ones, the ones who are about the color of this pad on my desk, may do so. Incidentally, that pad is a Senate pad. I did not order it especially. It was placed on my desk. I think that ought to be investigated. It is very pink. The pink Communists, the ones who really believe in democratic processes, may vote for Wallace and TAYLOR, and probably will. But the real red Communists, the ones who want revolution, will not do so. I have stated this on the floor of the Senate previously, but it will bear repeating, because perhaps some others will read it in the RECORD: The real red Communist will vote for the most reactionary candidate he can find. Of course he would probably be a Republican. So the real Communists will be voting Republican.

I told this story on the floor of the Senate about a year ago, but it will bear repeating: Before I came to the United States Senate I worked in a war plant. That was the last job I had before I came here. I worked as a sheet-metal mechanic in a war plant. I worked at a bench. I was not a foreman. I was merely a mechanic. There was a fellow working with me who was a welder. He was a nice fellow. He had a little country place, with a small acreage. His wife lived there, and he would go back home over the week end. He would tell me about the little acreage he had, with walnut trees, orange trees, and one thing and another on it. We argued politics. He hated Roosevelt. That was in 1943, before Roosevelt was elected for the fourth term. He would cuss Roosevelt. I would say, "Denny, how can you talk that way? Roosevelt is the best friend the workingman in America ever had. He saved us at a time when we were on the verge of chaos."

He would reply, "No; that Roosevelt—blah, blah, blah—the blankety-blank so-and-so." As I say, the Presidential election was coming up. This welder who worked with me said: "I hope that TAFT is nominated on the Republican ticket. That is the man I am for." I would say, "Denny, how can you be for a man like TAFT? You know his record. He is a conservative and a reactionary."

Since then, of course, the Senator from Ohio has been called a Communist, but that was because he wanted to build houses for the people. However, I could not convince my coworker. He was for TAFT; and if he could not have TAFT he wanted BRICKER. We would argue frequently. I would say, "You cannot mean that. You work for wages. Those fellows are not your friends."

Finally, after we had argued for several weeks, one day he laid down his welding torch and spit out a chunk of tobacco. He was a big red-faced Irishman, a very fine appearing man. He looked at me, grinned, and said, "Do you know why I am for TAFT and why I hate Roosevelt?" I replied, "No; I have not been able to figure it out. It really has me worried." He said, "Well, sir, I am a Communist. We were just ready for a revolution, and that so-and-so Roosevelt came along and spoiled it all. He patched things up and ruined the revolution. If we can just elect that fellow BRICKER we will have a revolution inside of 2 years."

So that is where the Communist vote will really go—to the most reactionary candidate the Communists can find. Indeed, if I were a Communist I would follow that line of reasoning. It makes sense. If you want a revolution, that is the way to get it. Do not vote for Wallace and Taylor, because we will do as Roosevelt did. We will patch up the machine and make it work—perhaps we can make it work even better than Roosevelt did.

Mr. President, this bill should be subjected to the most searching examination of any bill that has ever passed a peacetime Congress. It should be considered by the country, by the people throughout the country, who have not had time to express themselves in connection with the sudden move to substitute the peacetime draft for the earlier proposal of universal military training. That is the principal reason why I am opposed to the passage of the bill at this time. I think it should be fought out in the campaign. Let those who run for office say, "I am for the peacetime draft," or "I am opposed to the peacetime draft," and let the people decide on that basis.

Hardly any Member of this body was elected on the platform of voting for a peacetime draft. We had just got out of

the war when this Congress was elected. We had no thought of drafting men again. But things have moved fast since Mr. Roosevelt left us, and here we are again. So I believe that this bill should go over so as to let the people determine whether or not they want to elect a Congress pledged to vote for the draft. In that were done, I should not object. I do not object to what the people want, if I am sure they are getting what they want. That is all right; but from what I have seen in traveling around the country, I have not found very much sentiment in favor of a peacetime draft. One can always find young men who will say, "If they need me, I am ready to go." But the issue to be fought out here is, "Do we need them?" I would be ready to go if I thought I were needed. If we were in danger, or were attacked, I would be perfectly happy to go to war—I would not be happy; I would be perfectly willing to go. Let us put it that way. I would be glad of the opportunity to serve my country. Naturally, I would not be happy to walk off and leave my family. But the question is, "Is it necessary?" I come back to the argument which I mentioned before, that with the bombs we presently have we can kill everybody. What sense does it make after that to have any more preparations for war?

Another issue which should be fought out before the people is the question of equality in the armed services. As it is now, Negroes are segregated in the armed services. They are told that they are going out to fight for freedom; yet there is no freedom, no equality. They are made mess boys, cooks, stewards, and waiters, and placed in the most dangerous positions. On board ship they are down below, in the kitchen or somewhere else, and when the ship is torpedoed they have no chance to get out.

I think this whole matter should be gone into very thoroughly. The President's commission to study the proposition recommended that segregation in the armed forces should be abolished, and that everyone should be treated equally. But that makes no difference at all to the committee; they report a bill which contains nothing at all to stop segregation. The able and courageous Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] fought valiantly here for equal-rights amendments and antidiscrimination amendments to the draft bill. After the various amendments have been made, and particularly after the proposed amendments to ban discrimination have been rejected by both Houses, I thing this question of segregation should be gone over again at this time.

I wish to speak of three main points in considering the draft legislation.

The first is that the proposed draft legislation presented to the Senate, by failing to provide against segregation and discrimination, does violence to the principles of Americanism and even to the principles on which such legislation must be based.

The second point is the objection to the draft as a peacetime instrument of policy in the United States.

The third point I should like to discuss is based on the simple facts of our international position, which in my estimation render a draft law unnecessary, and in fact make it necessary for us in the interest of peace to refuse to enact such a law.

Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has resolutely opposed all the amendments, offered on this floor by the Senator from North Dakota—amendments which I have supported—to end discrimination and segregation in the armed forces. The chairman of the committee has even gone so far as to oppose his own majority leader on the proposed amendment to bar the payment of poll taxes by inductees. From reading the RECORD of the debate and the vote on that issue, I would gather that there was some kind of gentleman's agreement among the leaders of both parties not to press for any amendments which would protect the civil rights of Negro inductees. One might also gather the impression, from the fact that the Senate approved only one of the amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota, that the Members of this distinguished body could squeeze out approval of a ban on the payment of poll taxes, but could not find the necessary degree of approval to eliminate the terror of lynching or the vast, subtle terror of discrimination against the members of the armed forces who happen to be of another color. I do not know how to argue any better the merits of those antidiscrimination amendments, which have been turned down by the Senate; but in turning down those amendments, the Senate and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee have done violence to any system of draft or of military training which has ever been urged in recent times. It is the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the Members who participated in the gentleman's agreement to vote down the antidiscrimination amendments, who are introducing new and extraneous matter into the subject of military training—not the few Senators who support antidiscrimination as a part of the system of military training.

I see that the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has been appointed to ride herd on me while I occupy the floor here. He is a very likable gentleman, and his wife is a very lovely lady. My wife is very fond of her.

By way of diversion, let me recall that recently when I spoke, the junior Senator from California rose to his feet and very heatedly denounced me as a tool of Stalin, or something to that effect. I should like to read what I said after he got through denouncing me.

Since that time, of course, we have been on excellent terms. I may say for the benefit of anyone who is listeninng that that is one of the good things about the United States Senate: A Senator may call another Senator a tool of Stalin, or almost anything else—although that is the worst thing that a person can be called nowadays—but later both Senators will meet in the cloakroom and will not even mention the incident, and will go on as if it never occurred. Of course, that is a good thing.

The strange thing about all this, Mr. President, is that although I have made several speeches here, and although on many occasions Senators have risen to denounce what I have said, they have never denounced anything specifically. They have said that my speech sounded as if Stalin wrote it, or something of that sort; but they never say that what I said is not a fact, or that they would like to argue with me about some report on Russia, or they do not say that what I said must be a lie. They never say anything of that sort. They simply say that I sound like a Bolshevik—they say that in general terms. Sometimes after I have finished speaking, Senators will enter the Chamber and will denounce me, even though they did not hear what I said. Sometimes they say that although they did not hear what I said, it must have been bad.

When the Senator from California denounced me, I said:

I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, what could be more polite than to thank someone for denouncing you?

Then I said:

I may say that his remarks will probably rate a great deal more attention than anything I have had to say here today.

In other words, I said that his denunciation of me for denouncing our foreign policy would get more attention than all the facts I had cited and all the statements I had made about what a rotten foreign policy we have had and about how the American people are being duped and deceived.

It has previously been pointed out on this floor that under the European recovery program, $10,000,000 of the taxpayers' money is to go to the newspapers for their work in selling the Marshall plan to the people of America, so it is no wonder that the newspapers favor the Marshall plan, and it is no wonder that they are against me when I oppose the Marshall plan; and, of course, it is no wonder, under those circumstances, that the newspapers give the Senator from California a "break" in the press when he denounces me.

I had some of my office force look through the newspaper accounts to see what the press had to say about my speech that day. The Senator from California took about 2 minutes to denounce me, whereas I talked for quite a while and presented a great many facts and figures and charges.

Let me read excerpts from some of the newspaper accounts.

Here is an article which appeared in the New York Times:

KNOWLAND BLASTS TAYLOR IN SENATE—TAYLOR ASSAILED FOR TRUMAN BLAST

Senator KNOWLAND, Republican, of California, denounced TAYLOR—

And so forth. Here is another:

KNOWLAND TURNS WRATHFUL BLAST AT TAYLOR JIBES

Senator KNOWLAND, Republican, of California, today—

And so forth. It would be nice to be on the other side, Mr. President, where you can just get up and denounce a guy for 1 minute, and you get all the headlines. In the position I occupy, of trying to tell the people the truth, you can talk until you are black in the face—I would not want that to happen and be discriminated against [laughter] but you can talk until you are blue in the face, let us say—we will compromise on blue—and you do not get a word—just the folks who denounce you get all the publicity. They get into the papers all they had to say, but you do not get any.

Republican hits blast at Truman—Senator KNOWLAND sees TAYLOR'S attack aid to Kremlin.

I wonder what this one is. Oh, this one gets off the subject a little bit. I will save these and quote from them a little bit later, here. I have been looking for these; I lost them; they got mixed up with KNOWLAND. I will put those aside. But I have a great many more here, showing how the press treats a thing like this. Somebody will probably get up and denounce me when I am through today, and they will steal all the thunder. Here we are, getting back, now:

KNOWLAND DENOUNCES TAYLOR FOR SLURRING TRUMAN, FORRESTAL

Senator KNOWLAND, Republican, California, today wrathfully denounced—

Another headline:

TAYLOR assailed by Senators for aid to Kremlin—Denounced by KNOWLAND and McMAHON for attack on Truman and Forrestal.

McMAHON got in on that one a little bit. That is the Herald Tribune. Here is one from the Des Moines Register:

GLEN TAYLOR calls names, receives a stiff rebuke.

Well, thank the Lord, I got my name in the paper that time.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND replies—

And so forth. I got my name in the other one. This, from the Oregonian:

Senator castigates TAYLOR for criticism of Truman.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, California, Wednesday wrathfully denounced Senator GLEN TAYLOR * * *

This, from the San Francisco Examiner:

Senator KNOWLAND raps TAYLOR—Speech assailing Truman branded Kremlin aid.

The Philadelphia Inquirer:

Blast at Truman stirs Senator row.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND wrathfully denounced TAYLOR for slurring Truman, Forrestal.

I do not know what paper that is, it is a Washington Associated Press dispatch.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

KNOWLAND backs Truman against Taylor attack.

Is it not funny, Mr. President? Just the other day, because I took Mr. Truman to task for his poor handling of our foreign policy and for his militaristic collaboration with Republicans and the pouring of our money down rat holes, giving it away all over the world, Senators got up and denounced me. "He is our President, right or wrong. We are standing foursquare behind our President." But then Mr. Truman goes out West, and they give him some spurs, and he says, "Let me at Congress." And then Congress calls him all sorts of names. The same boys called me names the other day because I did not like what Harry was doing, and now they are trying to see who can outdo each other, and see who can call Truman the worst names. They even called him a gamin. I do not know what that means, but it must be awful.

The St. Louis Democrat:

KNOWLAND blasts TAYLOR for aid to Kremlin.

Well, I guess I am giving aid to the Kremlin. I do not want us all to get killed, Mr. President, and that is a kind of favor, to help everybody live. Of course, I cannot help them without helping us. That is the bad part of it, the way a lot of people look at it we are all going to live together, and we are all going to die together, so when I speak for peace, it is for everybody.

The Los Angeles Examiner:

TAYLOR scored by KNOWLAND—Attack on Truman stirs California Senator.

My, how the attacks will fly on Truman pretty soon, when they really get into the campaign.

Here were some clippings I saved a while back. This was when a New York school wanted to bring its pupils down here on a vacation, and they could not come because they had some Negro pupils—honor students—who had won a trip. They could not come to Washington because there was no place for them to eat down here, and they could not find any place to sleep in the Nation's Capital. They would be discriminated against. So our little children got their first lesson in discrimination when they planned to make a trip to the capital of the greatest democracy on earth.

The New York Herald Tribune writes about it, saying it is a national disgrace—which it is. I am teaching my children that there is no difference between people; some just happen to be born with one color of skin, some with another, and that they are not to treat people differently on that account. The sad part of it is that here in Washington the schools are segregated and there is nothing I can do about it. It is being driven home to my children that there is some reason—something the matter—because the colored children go to one school and they go to another. In Idaho we do not have that problem; all children go to the same schools. I am opposed to it, and just as soon as I can get around to it I am going to introduce legislation to see if something cannot be done to end discrimination at least in the Nation's Capital. But perhaps I had better read the article before I read the editorial. It says:

Washington race segregation cancels New York schoolboys' trip.

Hotels bar 4 Negroes who are among 51 honored for safety patrols.

All will see the Yankee game instead of visiting the Nation's Capital.

A Washington sightseeing tour by 51 outstanding New York schoolboys, including 4 Negroes, was called off yesterday by Dr. William Jansen, superintendent of schools, because of segregation practices in the Nation's Capital. Dr. Jansen decided to keep the children home on learning that it would be impossible in some instances for schoolmates to dine together in Washington.

Can you imagine that, Mr. President? Here these school children came down to the Nation's Capital, or had planned to, and then for them to go to eat, and have somebody say, "No, you stay back, you stay out, you cannot come in. You have got to go some place else to eat," would be a fine thing.

He said, in the statement canceling the trip:

The youngsters will go to the ball game instead, after receiving medals today as previously planned from Mayor William O'Dwyer. The boys, 8 to 14 years old, picked as high-caliber school safety patrolmen for public and Catholic parochial schools, were going to Washington for the week end as guests of the Automobile Club of New York, an affiliate of the American Automobile Association. To honor them and 15,000 other patrolmen, Mayor O'Dwyer proclaimed today School Safety Patrol Day. The automobile club tried for the last 2 weeks to obtain a hotel reservation, but without success, according to William J. Gottlieb, president. He said he called repeatedly and was told that it is not the custom to put up Negro and white guests together, so the club's board of directors voted Wednesday to propose a local program. Dr. Jansen, who consulted about it, agreed and issued the statement. Naturally, a representative—

I do not know whether I have the rest of this particular clipping or not, but anyhow he said that they naturally could not come to Washington. Here it is:

A special citation was to have been given by Truman today.

They were going to see the President and have a big day, but they had to call it all off and stay in New York.

I want to say this for New York, whatever else anybody else may say about it. As a child, I know, out West I thought of New York as just the hellhole of iniquity. I thought if you went there you just had to keep your hand on your hip pocket to keep from getting your wallet picked out. That was where all the city slickers were. But those people in New York City certainly have a greater appreciation of what it means to live in America than people any place else in our country, for the simple reason that so many of them have come from foreign countries where our freedoms are unknown, so they are very tolerant up there. They do not have segregation, discrimination, and one thing and another.

The New York Herald Tribune had an editorial regarding this regrettable incident. It said:

Another shameful reminder arises of the custom of segregation in the Capital of the United States. Fifty-one New York school boys from 8 to 14 years old were going to Washington to see the sights. Picked out as honor members of school safety patrols, they were the guests of the Automobile Club of New York. This was a tribute to merit.

The article goes on to say that one can imagine their joy and elation, their excited anticipation of Washington.

But what happened, Mr. President? Forty-seven of the schoolboys were completely acceptable in the National Capital, but four of them were not allowed to stay at the same hotel as their classmates,

or eat with their friends, attend theaters, or go other places together.

The article goes on to say:

They are Negroes. In Washington the color of a boy's skin sets him vastly apart. Segregation is the rule in our Capital. The whole trip had to be called off. We think it is about time that Washington, our National Capital, lifted itself above the regional as a national district, as a world capital. It belongs to all the people. Segregation is not an all-American custom. Discrimination does not belong in the District of Columbia. The humiliation of these poor New York school boys was a national disgrace.

Yes, Mr. President, a Negro cannot go into the Senate restaurant and eat, here in the Capital of what we are happy to call the greatest democracy on earth. We forget that a great majority of the people on this earth have colored skins, and that when we discriminate we make more enemies in 5 minutes than all the Marshall plans—of course, the Marshall plan is making enemies, too, but even if it is as good as it is said to be, we, when we discriminate, make more enemies in 5 minutes than the Marshall plan could make, if it were good, in a hundred years. As soon as I can find the time I shall do something about discrimination in the Nation's Capital. I do not want my children to be brought up to feel that they are better than someone else because their skins are a different color. I do not believe that in the Capitol Building itself there should be discrimination. If I cannot end it in any other way, I will hire a Negro to work in my office and will take him to the restaurant to eat. If he is not permitted to eat in the restaurant, we will set up a card table out in the hall and dine there every day, just to call attention to the rottenness that goes on in the Capital of the United States. It is time something should be done about it. We shall not accomplish anything by adopting planks in party platforms.

Mr. President, speaking of the Republicans coming back here, they may come back if I can talk long enough to stop this draft bill. They will have a nice, shiny, new platform, inflated with a lot of things that have no business being there. They will make promises to the Negro people. What will they do if they come back and go into session? They will have to do something about their platform. They cannot say to the Negroes, "We are going to end discrimination if you vote for us," because the Negroes will say, "Listen, brother, you went back; why didn't you do something about it then?" They will come back from Philadelphia with a new platform in their pockets.

The new party has done something. Henry Wallace has gone down South, where there were never mixed meetings before, and has held mixed meetings. The police came and tried to make the people segregate, and they just said, "Make us." They did not make them. I did not come off quite as well as did Henry. I got put in jail. But I am going back where I came from, and we will hold meetings, and the police will either put us in jail, or we will continue to hold meetings. That is the only way we can do anything about these things. It did not even soak in on me, Mr. President, for a time. To be sure, the Negroes in Idaho all live in one community. There are not very many. There are approximately 500. Four hundred of them are in Pocatello, the city in which I live. I never thought to look into the matter to see whether the Negroes had to live in one community, or whether it was their choice, because it was a small problem in Idaho. The significance of the question is not realized until we see many Negroes and what goes on in America in connection with them. I am glad I found out how poorly treated they are. They constitute a great segment of our population. The new party will do something about it before the election, by calling attention to the situation, apprising Americans of what goes on.

The best argument against segregation, for anyone who has not given it serious thought, is to put yourself in the other fellow's place. There is a play on Broadway concerning an old southern planter, in fact, a southern Senator. By some freak of magic the southern Senator is turned black, and he finds out what it is like to have a black skin. He changes his mind about a great many things, in short order. All we have to do is to put ourselves in the other fellow's place and imagine how we would like it if we went along the street and could not get anything to eat because our skin was not the right color. I think that is all we have to do in order to realize that it is not right. Any right-thinking person, who claims to be a Christian, certainly, or who claims to be just a decent person, cannot favor such things going on in this country. They must be changed. Both the old parties have promised changes for many years. They write the same things in their platforms every time. I do not think the southern Democrats had anything to be worried about when Mr. Truman issued his statements on civil rights. I think it was only a little campaign propaganda. But the boys have got so used to jumping on anything like that, they could not resist the temptation. They started jumping on the statement, and the little boys back home saw what was going on, and they started jumping, too, and the situation got out of control. It got beyond them, and they found themselves in a very embarrassing position. They went out and do not know how to get back in. But they will be back in the Democratic Party, Mr. President, because they knew all along that no one meant it; they were only talking for the consumption of the Negro people. The new party means what it says, and it will do something about the matter. The Negroes believe us, and we shall get their votes. In fact, we shall get the votes of many people who are disgusted with many things.

Both of the old parties must shoulder responsibility for the Taft-Hartley law. There were about as many Democrats as Republicans who voted for that vicious bill. I said at the time that it would be used to break the unions, and they are being broken at this time. Both the old parties have to take responsibility for all that has been done, which is not much. Much that they have done has been bad. They must also take the responsibility for a great many things that have not been done in this Congress.

Just the last couple of days they have had two or three votes of that nature. The American people were greatly surprised in 1932 at the strength of Roosevelt. They are going to be more surprised at the strength of Henry Wallace in 1948.

Mr. President, a while ago I started reading some material I had prepared on this question of civil rights, and I shall continue with it. I got sidetracked.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the acting minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, would have us believe the opposite. But let us examine the facts. They argue that the Committee on Armed Services rejected proposals for ending discrimination and segregation in the armed forces and having done so, the Senate must abide by that rejection. I do not question the wisdom of the members of the committee—but I must state flatly that their judgment is completely wrong.

The draft legislation arose first from the attempt to impose universal military training for the youth of the country. Since this proved to be highly unpopular, the Congress moved to combine a degree of universal military training with a new proposal for a draft. The basic document on which the whole program rests is a report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training. Let us go to that document and see what it has to say on the subject of discrimination in the armed forces.

The President's Commission states in its report that the fundamental principles of a program of military training are:

First, that is must be universal in its application.

Second, it must provide equality of privilege and opportunity.

Third, it must be a responsibility of the American people as a whole, rather than the exclusive or even principal responsibility of the military authorities.

I ask that Senators examine these fundamental principles, as set forth by the distinguished civilians, headed by President Compton of the Massashusetts Institute of Technology, who made this report. Every single one of these principles—the report calls them "fundamental" principles, and I stress the word "fundamental"—fairly cries out for the end of discrimination and segregation in the armed services.

Discrimination and segregation violates every one of these fundamental principles. The Commission says that a program of military training must be universal in its application to all persons of a given age or status, and the obligations which it imposes on each must be substantially equal. The Commission says that it is of the essence of democracy that the obligations of citizenship should not be exclusively those of persons who choose to consider them, but they must be shared commonly by all without favor or discrimination.

I am quoting from the report of the Commission. That is what they had to say about a draft law. Those who drafted the law have not gotten one of the good recommendations of this Commission. All they did was say "The Commission recommended a draft," so they drew a law. But they did not put anything of the myriad restrictions, guaranties of freedoms, anything the Commission recommended at all. So when I speak, I am speaking not only against the silly idea of drafting our boys in peacetime when we are all going to die anyhow—it does not make any difference whether one has on a uniform or not—I am also speaking to prevent further insults, further hurt being done to certain of our American citizens whose skins are off-color. I at least will not inflict upon them the compulsion of serving in the armed establishment where they have to submit to flagrant discrimination, where they are made flunkies and bus boys. We will at least leave them out in the open, where they do not have to go and be discriminated against if they want to keep away from it.

How does the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee propose to square a ban on discrimination in the armed forces with that essential principle of democracy? How can the obligation to serve be equal if some men are to be set aside and given a moral quarantine? How can the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Air Force justify its numerous clauses against Negroes, its attempts to keep Negro enlistments within a definite low number—sometimes to zero in number in some branches—and expect there to be equality in obligation?

I charge that it is not we who demand an end to discrimination who are raising extraneous issues but the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle who are parties to the gentleman's agreement who are raising extraneous issues by fighting against the ban on discrimination and segregation.

I come now to the second principle advocated by the President's Commission as "fundamental" to any program of military training. That principle is that a program of training must provide equality of privilege and opportunity for all those upon whom this obligation rests. The first principle was equality of obligation. The second principle is equality of opportunity and privilege. Let me quote directly from the report of the Commission:

Neither in the training itself, nor in the organization of any phase of this program, should there be discrimination for or against any person or group because of his race, class, national origin, or religion.

How quick they are to quote this committee when they see we need a draft, and how conveniently they have forgotten all the other recommendations which would have made this some semblance at least of an American proposal.

Segregation or special privilege in any form should have no place in the program.

Those, Mr. President, are the words of the President's committee to investigate the necessity of a draft. They are not my words.

To permit them—

That is, segregation and special privilege—

To permit them would nullify the important living lesson in citizenship which such training can give.

Imagine, Mr. President, what will happen to boys from out in my part of the country, Idaho, where we do not have segregation, where we have very few Negroes in fact, but where boys are not brought up to believe that someone else is inferior to them, or to believe like Hitler taught his boys that they belong to a superior race. The boys from my part of the country do not have any of that feeling. Then they are drafted into the Army and there it is drilled into them—"These Negroes are not as good as you are. They will wait table on you, shine your boots, carry out your slop cans," and one thing and another. "You are something special, son. You are a little better than they are." The young boys in the Army will get that idea, and it is awfully hard to get it out of them. It is sort of pleasant, if they do not think too deeply on the subject, to enjoy this feeling of superiority to someone else. It is terrible to think that such boys are going to be drafted into the Army and inculcated with such beliefs. They have got to stay where they are put in the Army. If they do not like what is told them, that others are inferior to them, that this boy whose skin is black must do menial service, that the white boy must let the colored boy wait on him while he sits down to eat, there is nothing they can do about it.

I return to the report:

Nothing could be more tragic for the future attitude of our people, Mr. President, and for the unity of our Nation than a program in which our Federal Government forced our young manhood to live for a period of time in an atmosphere which emphasized or bred class or racial differences.

There it is, Mr. President. The same committee that recommended the draft also recommends these other things. But now, Mr. President, we have a draft, and we have none of these other things in the bill, none. The Commission has placed its finger on the heart of the program before us. It explicitly condemns segregation and discrimination. It goes further than mere condemnation, however. It insists that an integral part of the program of military training must be nonsegregation and nondiscrimination.

I deeply regret, Mr. President, that we must continue to use so many negative words to express such a positive concept. But I do not have the time now to fence about words. The important thing is that the Commission which made a complete survey of the problem tell us that no program could be worth while unless equality of privilege and opportunity matches equality of obligation.

Here, Mr. President, we ask—we insist, we do not ask, that the boys serve. We tell them they must serve, and then we segregate them, and discriminate against some of them, give them the menial jobs, the bad jobs, the tough jobs. We place a mark upon them even if they have been raised in a colored community and have been kept away from actual evidences of segregation. Now we force them to subject themselves to that kind of treatment when we have the opportunity in this draft law to start breaking down these prejudices. Superstitions is what they are, Mr. President.

The Senate Armed Services Committee denies this proposition absolutely and unequivocally. They tell us in effect, Mr. President, that a ban on segregation and on discrimination is superfluous, is a luxury, something added, something new. But if we are to take the Commission's report at face value, the very opposite is true. The committee which removes the ban on segregation and discrimination is removing the heart of the program. It is destroying one of the essentials of the program as propaganda by various groups to gain the adherence of the American people.

Whom are we to believe, Mr. President, the members of the Armed Services Committee who insist on segregation and discrimination, or the members of the President's Commission who tell us that segregation must go in any democratic army? It is a fundamental test of our democracy. It is not a question of believing one set of authorities over another. It is a question which we must answer as Democrats, with a small "d", I hasten to add, and if we answer that question in the light of our history as a Democratic Party there can be but one answer for the Members of all parties—no army that serves a democracy can be anything but a fully democratic army.

Perhaps it is not the intention of the Senate to establish an army for a democracy and built on democratic lines to serve democratic purposes. In fact, Mr. President, I have come to have serious doubts about the intentions of some people in this country toward our democracy, when I see them even considering a bill like the Mundt bill; when I see them start us down the road of an armament economy like Hitler did; when I see them carelessly throwing charges against Russia, propaganda, day in and day out, as Hitler did; when I see the Congress overwhelmingly pass the Taft-Hartley law over a veto even; when I see a loyalty order, under which people can be dismissed from Government service without even charges being filed against them, just some vague statement made that for unknown reasons which cannot be revealed their services are terminated.

When I see all these things certainly I begin to wonder a little bit about democracy in this country, whether some people really believe in it or not. Anyone who criticizes the bipartisan foreign policy is branded as a Red, as a stooge of Stalin, and one who makes such a brash charge can secure all the headlines, while the charges made and documented against our foreign policy receive no attention whatever.

I do not know what is going to be done. Something has to be done about the press of this country, Mr. President. We now insist that the radio give both sides of every argument. We have got to have a law of some kind to see that the press does the same thing, because there is no other way to get the truth to the people.

They are getting bilked and hoaxed, and a great disservice is done to them by the Marshall plan, under which billions of dollars are given away supposedly for buying good will, when really, Mr. President, what we are doing is buying ill will.

Actually the American taxpayers are paying for the enmity of all the rest of the world, enmity which they are buying with this Marshall plan money because, as I read the other day from the New York Times, the statement was made flatly that Europe feels pangs of overproducing. The article went on to say that they are destroying food in Holland, that in Italy they are destroying fruit—Italy with the lowest standard of living in Europe.

Factories are being closed down or slowed down over Europe. Even in Germany goods are piling up in warehouses. Yet after knowing those facts, the Senate goes ahead and appropriates $6,000,000,000, raising the House $1,000,000,000. The Members of the House are getting kind of scared.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am afraid I cannot yield without prejudicing my rights to the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, under the rules of the Senate, I think there is no question but that the Senator can yield for a question, but I am going to ask that the rules be strictly enforced and that there be question and answer, and not a speech.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the unwarranted statement made by the Senator from California, I decline even to ask a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am very sorry. I should like to yield to the Senator from North Dakota. I think he is the most courageous Senator on the floor when it comes to speaking his mind and saying what he thinks, regardless of the "red smear" which is going on. He says what he thinks at any time he feels like it. The Senator from North Dakota is a great man.

The only way to judge greatness, I have found in the Senate, is to judge a man by how much guts he has, not how much knowledge he has, because there are many smart men here who do not have the courage to vote their convictions. They know that they are voting wrong. I have seen them do it. A man like that, no matter how much brains he has, is not a great man. I say that a man is great who votes his convictions, regardless of what the consequences may be to himself. By that standard the Senator from North Dakota is the greatest man in the United States Senate at the present time. Of course, we never include ourselves when we are speaking of these things.

The Senate Armed Services Committee—we might as well go ahead with the Marshall plan, so long as we were talking about that. The Marshall plan is certainly a fake and a "phony," but can anyone get the press to print it when he says things like that?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is busy.

Mr. LANGER. A short time ago the Senator mentioned factories being torn down. I ask the distinguished Senator from Idaho whether that includes fertilizer factories?

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not know about them being torn down to so great an extent. They are simply closing them and not operating them, because they have overproduction, which, of course, is underconsumption. But they are probably tearing down fertilizer factories. I do not know what they are doing. If the Senator can think of anything that is crazy, and asks me, I will say that they are probably doing it, because the Marshall plan is the ultimate of nonsensical asininity.

We are appropriating billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to ship goods to Europe when the United States News and World Report, a conservative publication edited by David Lawrence, tells us that there is overproduction in Europe, and that goods are spoiling in warehouses. Yet we appropriate billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to send more goods to Europe. If they have not sense enough to distribute what they have, I do not believe that we should send them any more. If they have so much that they are closing their factories and not distributing their products because the people do not have the money, is that any reason why we should be suckers and send them the money with which to buy their own goods, so that they will not starve to death? That is the height of something or other. But it is going on, Mr. President.

I am beginning to think that the reason for the Marshall plan is this: I have repeatedly charged that our cartelists, our big monopolist, and the militarists are in cahoots to take up where Hitler left off. They feel that they can do what he failed to do, namely, conquer the world and exploit it.

The Marshall plan is part of their scheme to try to get control of the economy of the world without fighting, if they can. The plan has two objects. One is to remove potential surpluses from the American market. We were just on the verge of having plenty of everything in this country at reasonable prices. They had to figure out something to stop that, so the Marshall plan was devised. The taxpayers are buying goods and paying for them, and we are shipping them to Europe. In that way it is not easy for our people to buy, and that keeps prices up. The people pay for the samples sent abroad, and prices are kept up at home, so that we must pay $3,000 for a $1,500 automobile that we cannot get. That is some scheme, is it not, Mr. President? We tax the American people to ship goods to Europe, which makes them scarce at home, so that the people must pay two prices for what they can buy at home.

The American worker has already paid for the Frigidaire which is not in his house, because it or some other product made of the same material has been shipped to Europe as a sample of what our cartelists have to ship. We are sending free samples to Europe, where surpluses already exist. Of course, European industrialists cannot compete with our free goods, so they are going to have a hard time getting money. That allows our boys to get the markets, because the factories over there are closed. We give the Europeans free samples to show them what we have to sell, and the European industrialists cannot get their factories started.

If that makes friends, I do not know much about human nature. But that is the way the Marshall plan is working. It is helping reaction in every corner of the globe. In any place where we cannot find any scoundrels in business, we set them up in business so that we can help them. We are losing friends all over the world.

At the same time we are heading straight toward war, with our anti-Russian propaganda. That must be kept going, because the minute that stops, the whole plan collapses; the armament program collapses; the Marshall plan collapses; the people will not appropriate the money for all this tomfoolery, and the whole scheme collapses. It all depends on anti-Russian propaganda. But the newspapers are doing a good job. We just got through giving them $10,000,000 for it. I suppose another appropriation will come along pretty soon, because newspaper publishers are not suckers. They will not keep it up forever. They have learned that they can get paid for it. They will start easing off one of these days and we shall have to appropriate more money for them. That may operate to end the racket, because the people will become angry and will not appropriate the money, and the newspapers will not print the propaganda unless they get paid for it, so it may be a good thing that that is happening.

We had to have the Marshall plan because we were faced with abundance here at home. That would not solve the problem, so we had to have an armament program, to take workers out of useful production and put them in useless production. We tax the people to pay for armaments. That makes profits for the boys. It keeps everything scarce, so that the people can be charged two prices for automobiles, washing machines, and other things that are manufactured for them.

The Marshall plan is the most colossal hoax ever perpetrated on a people. The only reason it is possible is that no longer is there a free press in America such as we once had, in which editors could sit down and write their honest-to-God opinions. There are so few editors nowadays who can write what they think that it is pitiful. A publisher is a big-business man, and he tells the editor what to write. Let us not kid ourselves. The policy extends even to small newspapers in Idaho. I used to say that there were 11 daily newspapers in Idaho, and that they were all against me but one.

which was neutral. As I say, I used to say that. I cannot say it any more. Since I joined Henry, they are all against me.

The last time I was in Idaho I went to see the editor of the once neutral newspaper. He had always been pretty friendly.

He said, "GLEN, I was with you on the Greek proposition, when it was proposed to appropriate money for the Greeks. I was with you because I thought it should have been handled through the United Nations. But I wrote a couple of editorials about it."

Mind you, Mr. President, this was in a town of 10,000 people. This editor said, "I wrote a couple of editorials about it, and three of my best advertisers came in and told me that I had better cut it out." They saw what the Marshall plan would do for them. It would keep things scarce, and keep the boom booming. They told this editor that he had better cut it out; and he said to me, "I cut it out."

I did not blame him. But we must stand up somewhere and fight. I know many persons who feel that they ought to be in this fight with me—particularly on this vital issue, although I did not have that in mind when I spoke. What I had in mind was that they feel that they should be with Henry Wallace and GLEN TAYLOR in this fight, and they are not there because of economic considerations. They sneak around and hand us $50 for the campaign, and say, "We are with you, boys, keep up the good work. But if I come out openly for you, our business will suffer."

We need them worse than we need the $50. We need a few people with intestinal fortitude and leadership to stand up and be counted. There are many of them, but they are afraid to be counted. That is understandable, because all over the country people are losing their jobs because they come out openly for Henry Wallace. College professors, ministers of the Gospel—it is getting so that we can hardly get a preacher to pray for us at all, anymore, at our Wallace-Taylor meetings, because they lose their jobs. That has happened time and again.

In one town those who were planning the meeting went through the entire telephone book trying to find a preacher to pray for us when the meeting was opened. The only one they could find who would pray for us was a Russian Orthodox minister. All the rest of the ministers were afraid to pray for us. But that Russian Orthodox minister was not afraid of being smeared as a "Red." He was willing to pray for us; but we did not have guts enough to let him do it, so we had to go without being prayed for.

Mr. President, very often we make arrangements with ministers to open our meeting with prayer; but they they call up, shortly before the meeting, and say, "I am sorry, very sorry; I am mortified and humiliated; I am tremendously embarrassed; but I cannot come to open your meeting. I hope you will understand." Of course we understand, because the situation is that their influential parishioners put the heat on them and tell them they had better not come to pray for our group or else they will lose their jobs. Mr. President, that is some Christianity, is it not? Ministers are not allowed to come to open our meetings with prayer and to pray for our poor benighted souls. One would imagine that if we are as bad as we are said to be, all the ministers would be encouraged to come and pray for our souls, but that is not the case.

Even the labor leaders are against us. Never was a group of people so sold out as is the group of laboring people in this country, Mr. President. The labor leaders are afraid of the Red smear. They want to protect their $25,000-a-year jobs. The bug has got them. So we have the sorry spectacle of the labor leaders being afraid to support a party that they know is their party. The workers are flocking to our party, but the leaders are like a lot of hens that have hatched out ducklings and do not know what to do about it. Mr. President, there will be more new labor leaders hatched out in the next year or two than there have been in many, many years.

But, Mr. President, the rank and file of labor are with us, and many of the labor leadership are openly flouting the mandates of the hierarchy, and are attending our meetings and are joining us.

Many others are joining us, too. As I have said before, doctors, dentists, ministers, businessmen, and many others are openly advocating our party and are making statements in favor of us, even though they know that by doing so they may lose their jobs. It is easy to see why so many people are now joining us and are openly declaring themselves in favor of our new party, because anyone who thinks at all and realizes the danger the United States is in with this armament economy, and this drive toward war, and this foreign policy that has lost us all our friends, and the Marshall plan that is supposed to get us new friends, and the bipartisan coalition that is bankrupting our Nation by profligately throwing away our substance all over the world—when people see those things, they are very eager to join our new party. In fact, many people are so disgusted with just one of those things, that that is enough for them. But anyone who gets to the bottom of it all and sees how messy the whole business is, will, very naturally, if he has any fortitude, come out in favor of Henry Wallace, because the new party is the only one that is opposed to those things. The other parties just try to outdo each other in hollering, "Me, too!" when they say they are opposed to Russia; and they draw up fancy platforms about helping the Negro and everyone else, but they do not do anything about helping any of them.

Mr. President, South America has even gone by the board; we have even lost our friends in South America. Mr. Roosevelt had what he called the good neighbor policy down there; he made many friends there, and the South Americans were feeling very kindly toward us. But now we have lost them all. Sumner Welles says so. Every expert says so. What a fiasco the Bogota Conference was. We told the South Americans that we were going to appropriate half a billion dollars to loan to them, and so we expected them to get up and cheer. But they just sat there. It made Marshall awfully mad because they did not get up and cheer when he told them that we were going to loan them some money. But they are just too smart for us. They see us giving away billions of dollars in Europe, and they wonder why we should not give them a few dollars also.

Then we tried to get the South American countries to pass laws and even to change their constitutions so as to protect our investors, so that our businessmen could invest their money there and be sure they would get it back again. The Mexican representative rather told us off. He said they were happy to have us invest our money in Mexico if we wanted to do so, but he said they did not need any laws to protect our investors. He said that what they needed were laws to protect their people from our investors. Mr. President, when I read that statement in the newspapers I was delighted. I like anyone who stands up on his hind legs and says what he thinks. I sent that man a telegram—or perhaps it was a cablegram; I am not sure which it was—and in it I said, "Congratulations, sir. I admire anyone who stands up for his own rights. I want you to know that not all Americans are imperialists, and I want you to know also that there are millions of Americans who still believe in the good-neighbor policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt."

In reply, he sent me a very long telegram. I have been so busy recently that I have not had time to get it translated, so as to find out what he had to say. If my secretary is around here, I will tell him to get that telegram and have it translated, so that I can read it and see what he had to say. But it must have been good; he would not have made it so long if he had been saying anything bad.

But that is the situation. We are losing our friends right and left—even such friends as Canada—because of our arrogant, imperialistic policies of exploitation. All over the world that is going on—the use of the Marshall plan as a guarantee of profits for our monopolists and cartelists abroad. The foreign currencies are no good, so our monopolists and cartelists go abroad and use promises of business to come to inveigle those foreign businessmen into giving our fellows an interest in their businesses—a controlling interest, many times; and then we do business in foreign currencies. But when it comes time to cash in, in dollars, that cannot be done, because the foreign countries have no dollars. So our taxpayers cough up through the Marshall plan to pay the representatives of our monopolists and cartelists in good, old, hard American dollars, or at least in greenbacks. You see, I come from the West, and in the West we see lots of silver dollars. It seems strange, after being here in the East, to return to the West and see a complete change from greenbacks to hard dollars.

Mr. President, if we hired people to think of Rube Goldberg devices by which we could lose friends and deinfluence people, we could not do a better job than

it was possible to shoot fewer people and

There being no objection, the article

when he participated in four prewar Greek

we are doing with this Marshall plan, and our get-tough foreign policy, and our backing of Fascists and reactionaries all over the world, and our scuttling of the United Nations. We were the first ones to really deal a serious blow to the United Nations. I pointed out earlier in my talk how the Russians went into Iran, as part of the war strategy, and how they overstayed their welcome. The matter was brought to the attention of the United Nations and the Russians went home. They did not even wait for a verbal blast by the United Nations; they went home because they did not want to be condemned by this great new Organization set up to keep peace in the world; so they went home. That was really the first problem the United Nations had to deal with. One time at bat, and they scored a hit. It was not long after that until the Englishmen and Frenchmen were in Syria and Lebanon. They held those countries as protectorates from World War I. They were supposed to go home and give those people their freedom, but they, too, overstayed their welcome, and do not forget that. We can always remember the bad things the Russians do, but the Englishmen and Frenchmen stayed in Lebanon and Syria, when they were supposed to get out. That was brought to the attention of the United Nations, and England and France almost fell over each other to see who could get out of the Near East first, from Syria or Lebanon. They did not want to be the first ones slapped down by the United Nations. People still respected the United Nations then, because it was new and its potentialities were unknown. So that was the second and third time at bat for the United Nations, second and third hits. That is pretty good—three times at bat, and three hits.

Then along came the Greek proposition. The country was in chaos in a struggle between left wing elements and monarchial adherence. In between was a big group, by far the biggest group of Greeks who were democrats, moderates, believing in some socialism probably, but they wanted a democratic form of government. They did not want communism, and they did not want a king. But, instead of asking the United Nations to go in and seal the border and hold free elections, we said, "We will handle this; just get out of the way, United Nations. This is Uncle Sam who is going to take over now." The Englishmen bowed out of Greece. They could not afford to stay there. They knew they would make "suckers" out of us and that we would take on those countries. So we went on into Greece. I opposed it at the time. I said the United Nations should handle the matter. We were told "The United Nations cannot handle this. The United Nations is an infant in swaddling clothes." I remember hearing that statement on the floor. Of course an infant only grows by being fed and by being allowed to exercise. So I said, "The United Nations could handle it." Many arguments were raised against it; it was said the United Nations did not have any money. Well, I said, "We are going to spend the money anyway, so why not give it to the United Nations and let them spend it? They are in Greece, and if it turns out well, it will help the United Nations; if it turns out bad, we will not be to blame."

I may say, Mr. President, that there was a high official of the United Nations in Washington at that time. I cannot name him because the poor sucker would probably lose his job. We run the United Nations, as I have said. He would probably get fired if I stated in the Senate that he was here. But he is a big shot in the United Nations, suffice it to say. We heard he was down here, so I called him and asked him if another Senator and myself, or two other Senators and myself, could see him and talk to him about this Greek proposition. He said, yes, we could see him, but to come into the place one at a time and by separate doors. He did not want anybody to know we had been there seeing him. He was afraid. So we went there and sneaked into the place to see him, like Bolsheviks with a bomb in each hip pocket. We asked him about the Greek problem, "Can you handle it?" He said, "We have got to handle it. If we do not, if they take it away from us, it will practically be a death blow to the United Nations." So we asked him questions. We said, "They are saying you have not got any soldiers up there." He said, "That is right, but where there is a will there is a way." He said, "We can get enough soldiers to seal that border, picking up a few here and there from the small nations, if need be. We would not have to arm them, we would not have to clothe them; all we would have to do would be to feed them and just put an arm band on them saying, 'United Nations,' and nobody would shoot one of them any more than anybody would think of shooting a Canadian mounted policeman or a Texas ranger." They just do not do that, because they know what would happen to them, and that is the way it would have been with the United Nations. That is the way he explained it. I said, "I will go back and tell those fellows up there that you can handle it." He said, "No, you cannot quote me. If they ever found out I had seen you, I would lose my job." So we had to come back here and listen to these folks saying, "Well, they have not got any money, have not got any soldiers, the United Nations is weak and impotent," and all this and the other.

So the Greek proposition was put through, appropriating some $500,000,000. I think it was supposed to be $200,000,000 for food and other products useful to the people and $100,000,000 for guns. At the time, we said it would turn out to be more guns than butter, and sure enough they hardly got them working when they started changing the ratio from day to day, taking a little of the butter money and putting it over into the gun department. It finally wound up about four bits for bread and $3.50 for guns. That is about the way it wound up. Anyway, we spent $300,000,000 in Greece, and when the thing came up to be done over here, a while back, and we were asked to give them another $175,000,000, I thought, that will take a week of debate anyhow, because it took about 10 days last year, on the first installment. On the floor, here, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the famous bipartisan architect of chaos, here, was asked on the floor of the Senate how many guerrillas there were when we appropriated $300,000,000, and said "13,000." He was asked "How many guerrillas are there now, a year later, after we have spent $300,000,000?" He said, "26,000." We spent $300,000,000, and there are twice as many guerrillas now as there were when we started. I thought it would take a week to debate this thing anyhow; so I went to New York.

I will tell you, Mr. President, where I went and why I went. I went to New York to address a meeting welcoming the Russian Ambassador to this country. Nobody else of any consequence at all in the United States would appear on the platform with him. They were afraid they would be smeared red, so I decided I would go up and welcome the Ambassador. I am talking for peace and I wanted to get along with Russia. I figured the least I could do was let him know that at least there was one American above the rank of a garbage collector who would speak to him. So I went up and spoke on the same platform with him. Incidentally I figured out an idea to sort of help relations a little bit. To help out the program, I had made arrangements for a little girl at the Russian Embassy to record a Russian song in Russian, and my son 12 years old recorded Home on the Range, and then we gave the little girl that record and she gave us the Russian record. My boy learned the Russian song and the little Russian girl learned Home on the Range. Each one sang the other country's song at the dinner. They made a big hit. But I guess those kids will be put in concentration camps as soon as things are fixed the way some people want them.

I thought it would take a week, at least, to debate the new contribution to Greece and Turkey. I went to New York to make a speech, and the measure was brought up and passed in 3 hours, without even a roll-call vote. We gave away $300,000,000. There were 26,000 guerillas compared to 13,000 the year before. That did not affect the situation at all. I never saw so much confidence in spending money as that which I have seen exhibited in this Congress in the past few months. The only rule we have here is to bring prosperity to all the world. We like to give folks things which, in many cases, they do not need and do not want.

We went ahead in Greece. It was the most serious blow that had been suffered. That was the beginning of the decline of the United Nations. It went from bad to worse. The Greek episode is the most despicable chapter in American history. We can hardly pick up a newspaper without seeing in it every day that hundreds of Greeks have been lined up and shot. It got so bad that even the British protested—those old experts at shooting people. Of course it was not because we were shooting people, but that we were shooting too many. They did not like our bad technique. They figured out how

it was possible to shoot fewer people and get better results. We should let them handle that shooting business for us in Greece. All the liberal-minded Greeks are being killed. The leader over there has become so bold that the other day he had one of our newspaper men shot. I hold no brief for the press, but I like the newspapermen themselves, and do not want them to get shot. God knows they suffer enough for writing the stuff they have to write, without being shot. But they are being shot in Greece for writing things that they do not want them to write. That is worse than Hearst treats them.

In Greece a newspaperman by the name of George Polk was recently murdered. He was no Communist, Mr. President. In fact, I think he was sort of a conservative man. He wanted to tell the truth. Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President. The press tells the truth some of the time; the only difficulty is that it has so much junk mixed with it that it is like trying to eat mush and milk and keep them separated. It is difficult to find out what is the truth. Polk wanted to get the truth, so he made arrangements to go up and see for himself. He soon began receiving threatening telephone calls from the police, calling him a Communist, and saying that he was going to be shot if he did not watch out. He disregarded the threats. He was a good newspaperman, in every sense of the word; he would go any place he thought he should go. He was the sort of fellow who, if he thought he ought to be for Wallace, would be for him, regardless of the consequences. He never came back, Mr. President. His body was found floating in the harbor at Saloniki. The police conducted an investigation. They immediately announced that the Communists had killed him, in spite of the fact that Polk had written letters to Drew Pearson, and there were many reasons to believe that he had been killed by the Fascists or the Nazis. His wife is not permitted to leave Greece. Other persons are being held there because they may know too much.

Mr. President, if it had been the Communists who had killed him they would have been only too glad to have the whole thing spread out for the world to see. But because of the scoundrels we are dealing with over there, in this black chapter of American history, the whole thing is hushed up. They can even get away with the murder of an American newsman who has tried to tell the full truth. The truth is, Mr. President, that there are many people, not only in Greece, but in other places, who do not want the American people to know the truth. I do not know what will happen. I guess George Polk will go down as a sort of George Hill of the newspaper game. That will be about the end of the matter. Poor George, I knew him well!

Mr. President, I have an article here regarding the murder of George Polk, and I ask that it be printed as part of my remarks at this place in the RECORD. Let the folks read about it and see what a rotten deal poor George got.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Frontpage magazine for June 1948]

THE MURDER OF GUILDSMAN GEORGE POLK

On May 16, 1948, the body of George Polk was washed ashore at Salonika, Greece. Polk, a member of the Newspaper Guild of New York and Middle East correspondent for the Columbia Broadcasting System, had been shot in the back of the head and his hands and feet were bound with twine. He had been reported variously as missing for a week, as in the water for a week. He was in Salonika attempting to arrange a meeting with Markos Vafiades (General Markos), leader of the Greek guerrillas.

The Greek police immediately began questioning suspected Communists. An unnamed Government official said "we are 1,000 percent sure that Communists killed Polk." Public Prosecutor Christos Moustakis, in the words of the Associated Press, said "police excluded the possibility Mr. Polk had been slain by right-wing extremists." Not a single rightist was interrogated.

An open and shut case, evidently. Perhaps. But against whom?

On May 20, 1947, Seymour Freidin of the New York Herald Tribune, who had been outspokenly critical of the Greek Government, was suddenly and without explanation refused permission to board a Greek airliner at Athens for Crete. Freidin reported from Athens the next day that "pro-government elements of the press and political quarters charged, without attribution, that this correspondent was a Communist." Commented Freiden: "This type of intimidation has been employed by government quarters in the past, in the hope of whittling correspondents critical of the government down to size."

One week later Robert Vermillion of the United Press was attacked as an "American journalist of the Communist creed" by the Greek War Minister George Stratos, after Vermillion described a visit to the Greek guerrillas.

On March 5, 1948, Homer Bigart of the Herald Tribune was denounced by the Royalist newspaper Ethnikos Kiryx as an "instrument of Moscow." The paper demanded censorship of all foreign correspondents. Bigart had criticized the wholesale executions by the government of former resistance fighters.

William L. Shirer, noted radio commentator, summarized the situation in a newspaper article on February 22, 1948: "Our correspondents in Greece work under great difficulties. * * * The Greek Government obstructs their work in dozens of ingenious ways. It stoops to having agents spread malicious slander about correspondents whose stories displease it.

"I am surprised that the President and the Congress are not more concerned about * * * tactics which the Greek Government has used in an attempt to prevent American newspapers and radio from publishing and broadcasting the truth."

Radio, Shirer noted, was a specific target of the Greek attempts at suppression. On December 21, 1947, the Athens Government announced that thereafter all radio scripts of the American correspondents would have to be submitted and approved before they could go on the air.

Just where did George Polk fit into this chronicle of struggle between the Greek Government and American newspapermen who found it less than perfect? In December 1947 Polk wrote a comprehensive article for Harper's magazine, summarizing his impressions of Greece. He described Napoleon Zervas, the former Minister of Public Order and a power in the royalist-dominated government, as a "professional gambler and unscrupulous politician" whose activities, "public and private, are even more sinister than when he participated in four prewar Greek political revolutions." Polk cited a secret American official document as noting the "dictatorial and Fascist tendencies" exhibited by Zervas in his "ruthless campaign against the opponents of the Government, no matter what their political convictions."

Polk dealt mercilessly and in detail with the fantastic abuses of the Greek economic system, which mainly favors special individuals.

On December 22, 1947, Polk wrote a letter of protest to the Herald Tribune against a series of articles on Greece by Maxwell Anderson in that paper. Anderson had reported that he heard virtually no charges of outright injustice against the Greek Government. Responded Polk: "Greeks continually complain of outright injustice on the part of their extremely corrupt and inefficient Government; of outright injustice in the distribution of food, the imposition of taxes, the levying of their soldier sons into military service, arrest of persons without constitutional processes of law, the failure to release from concentration camps may persons now held."

So much for Polk on the Greek Government. How did the Government feel about him?

The Harper's article drew a protest to CBS from Greek officials in the United States. A month later, when Polk in a broadcast referred to some Greek cabinet ministers as "semifascists," the Greek Minister of Information in the United States, Nicholas Lely, demanded radio time to answer him. Lely's statement and a rebuttal by Polk were carried by CBS.

At that time—September 1947—Polk was "resented in high places in the Athens government," according to an article by Marquis W. Childs in the New York Post of May 19, 1948. Wrote Childs: "Polk told me of the effort to smear him as a Red or pink. He realized he had made enemies because of his criticisms of the failures and stupidities of the Athens government."

On February 3, according to CBS commentator Edward R. Murrow, Polk "in a private letter said there were a number of vague hints that somebody is likely to get hurt." More recently, Polk wrote Drew Pearson that he was having great difficulties with the Greek government who did not want him to interview the guerrillas. And less than 3 weeks before his death, Polk told Constantine Argyris of the Christian Science Monitor that he had received telephone calls denouncing him as a Communist and declaring: "We are going to kill you."

It may be pure coincidence—but Polk was slated to return to the United States very soon. His visit would have coincided with that of Dwight Griswold, chief of the United States mission in Greece, who left Athens May 16 to report to Washington on the further needs of the Greek Government. Comments Marquis Childs: "Rumors persist of a new build-up to be launched from Athens and Washington—a build-up of the need for United States troops in Greece. What Polk might have said and written when he returned to the United States could have interfered with that build-up." Or, as Murrow put it, "George Polk probably knew more about Greece than any other American reporter there. He was coming home. He was murdered. It may be that he knew too much."

Obviously, the Right had reason to fear Polk. But does it seems logical that the Greek Communists, whose newspapers are suppressed and whose radio cannot reach overseas, would assassinate a man who was trying to report their story?

Indispensable to this account is the role played by official representatives of the United States in Greece. On May 2, 1948, Mr. Griswold joined the Rightist press of Greece in attempting to discredit Homer

Bigart. He wrote a lengthy letter to the

nopolists and Hitler's monopolists. We

Mr. President, I have here an editorial

which might allow antisegregation and

lawed the poll tax respecting the soldiers.

ment, we suppose you'd call it—to table

Bigart. He wrote a lengthy letter to the Herald Tribune, challenging Bigart point after point. This evoked a response by Constantine Poulos, veteran Middle East correspondent of the Overseas News Agency, who termed Griswold's letter "an obvious attempt to shake the confidence of the newspaper and its readers in the correspondent." In conclusion, Poulos wrote: "We may be sure that Mr. Griswold's letter, already published in the Athens press, will serve to encourage the extremists."

All this leads to two unmistakable conclusions:

(1) A full investigation of the murder of George Polk by a qualified team sent out from the United States, is necessary, and at once. It is utterly unrealistic to expect that the police of Salonika will do an honest and thorough job. The entire Greek police force is notoriously loaded with former members of the Nazi-organized Security Battalions. It is fantastically Rightist in membership, and is led by Royalists; it can hardly be expected to bring in findings damaging to the Right. The Greek Prime Minister, Sophoulis, has offered the assurance that every effort will be made to solve the case—"if it was not an accident." An accidental bullet hole in the base of the skull!

The investigation cannot be carried out by American representatives on the spot, because they have demonstrated their incapacity for forthright action and their essential lack of sympathy with the correspondents.

An American citizen, and a representative of our free press, has been murdered. It is the responsibility of our Government to uncover the entire story. Every aspect of the matter must be explored, including Polk's recently completed manuscript of a book on the Middle East and any light that might be contributed by Mr. Griswold on his return.

(2) There must in future be full guarantees of protection for United States correspondents overseas, in line with the United States backed resolutions at the UN's "Freedom of the Press" conference in Geneva. The Greek government must be made to cease encouraging its Royalist press to incite acts of violence. Correspondents must be permitted to go where the story is, without hindrance or censorship and with adequate protection.

The United States is quick to defend the interests of its businessmen abroad. Are its newsmen, the eyes and ears of the country, less important? They are the real American ambassadors; they report direct to the people. The murder of George Polk is in every sense a gesture of contempt for the American people; it must not pass unnoticed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the situation is becoming pretty bad when we are losing all our friends all over the world. The Russians fear and distrust us. When it is considered who is running the country, it is enough to drive them frantic with fear. It is a well-known fact that between World Wars I and II our boys learned the cartel business from Hitler's boys, and helped to finance Hitler in his rise to power, with the understanding that he would fight Russia. One of the men who was helping to finance Hitler in order for him to fight Russia is now our Secretary of National Defense, former president of Dillon, Read, a Wall Street financial house which helped to finance Hitler. Our Under Secretary of the Army is Mr. Draper, a former vice president of the same firm. He was very active in making arrangements between our monopolists and Hitler's monopolists. We were going to decartelize Germany. Mr. Roosevelt established a program and people were appointed to carry it out. They went over after Mr. Roosevelt died, but most of them came home and said they could not do much decartelizing. All the men with any pride and sincerity of purpose came home. One of them is a member of our new party. He lives in Maryland. He said he wanted a little honest government, so he joined the new party.

The decartelizing of Germany has been called off. Mr. Draper recently went to Germany to get the matter straightened out. There is a man by the name of Hawkins in charge of the decartelization in Germany. He is Mr. Draper's son-in-law. Mr. Draper set up the cartels in the first place, and now his son-in-law will decartelize them. So the matter is in good hands.

The Russians see what type of people have control of our country, a stranglehold on it—Admiral Lahey, Fascist sympathizer, the President's right hand officer in the White House; Mr. Dulles, and all these people who are running this bipartisan foreign policy. As I say, they have all tried to outdo each other by seeing who could say the most vitriolic things about Russia. All we ever heard about it is the Red fifth column in this country, how they have tried to subvert our Government. Perhaps they have, I would not argue the point, but I cannot remember one prominent American who has ever been subverted by the Reds, any Cabinet member, general, anybody of any particular consequence at all. But the western capitalists, the big money boys of the West, financed the fifth column activity in Russia between the wars so successfully that we all remember that along about 1937 the Russians had to take most of their generals and cabinet members out and shoot them. They had been subverted with promises of bribes and promises of power to come when the Communist government was overthrown. If they had been that successful in this country we would have some reason to be excited and worried. But they have not been.

What do we find? In this country there is a great witch hunt, and the newspapers are whooping it up day in and day out, all our prominent citizens making statements about Russia, that we have to have bombs to bomb Russia. And what do we find about Russia? If we can believe Eddy Gilmore of the Associated Press, there is no war propaganda in Russia, none, none at all. If we can believe the other article I read, the people over there want peace, they are willing to stand many feet deep in front of a bulletin to read about peace, or any possibility about peace.

Mr. President, if it is being a tool of Joe Stalin, as the able Senator from California accused me of being a while back, because one gets up and tells these truths, even if they never go any further than the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or the gallery, or the Senate, if it is being a Red if you let the American people know they are being lied to deliberately, deceived, duped—if it is being a tool of Stalin, all right, I am willing to accept the charge.

Mr. President, I have here an editorial from the New York Post. The headline on it is, "November Casualty." It is a tribute really to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. It mentions the fact that he brought into question the sincerity of his party in their extravagant promises to the colored people and the meagerness of their delivery on those promises. It says:

> The Republican Party doesn't keep its promises.

Of course, if they had just put the Republican and the Democratic parties in, they would have had something. The Republicans do not, nor do the Democrats. That is why I am a new-party man right now.

> "The Republican Party doesn't keep its promises," Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, charged angrily on the Senate floor when his colleagues killed one after another of his civil rights amendments to the draft bill.

No, they have no qualms at all, Mr. President. It is miraculous. They will sit right here and vote down these civil-rights amendments one right after another, and then they will just hurry up to Philadelphia, as soon as I get through talking, and write some more platforms, some more planks, telling the Negroes what they are going to do for them. Then, if they have to come back here next week, if I hold them up, they will come back and make some more promises.

> Back in 1944, when there was another election to be won, the GOP platform promised legislation to end discrimination in the armed forces.

Of course they did. So did the Democrats, for that matter. Let us be honest about it.

> But events have shifted and swept yesteryear's pledges away. The Republicans now know that they need produce only token legislation to outdo the Democratic record. Accordingly, they have come across with one small amendment which bars levying a poll tax on soldiers.

Mr. President, the irony of that amendment, the one which provides that they cannot levy a poll tax on soldiers, is that there are only two States which have a poll tax on soldiers, if I am not mistaken. They have all gotten so gentlemanly that they do not have a poll tax on the soldiers. But this amendment in itself does not allow the boys to vote unless the State sets up the machinery for them to vote. So the whole amendment is just a fake and a farce, just a scheme to try to fool somebody, that is all.

The article further says, speaking of the Republicans:

> Apparently they plan to point to this pitiful gesture as proof positive that they are the friends of the American Negro.
>
> We're not convinced. And we'll bet that the voters aren't, either.

They are not, Mr. President, nor are they convinced that the Democrats mean it. They do not believe Mr. Truman means it when he talks about civil rights. The New York Post editorial proceeds:

> It is a matter of record that the Republicans approved drastic gags to limit debate which might allow antisegregation and antidiscrimination measures to get a foothold on the Senate floor. When cloture wouldn't work, the GOP went even further by sanctioning three motions to shelve "the pending question" which stopped discussion instantly.
>
> The excuse offered for these steamroller tactics was simple: The southern Democrats threatened to filibuster if any serious attempt was made to attach a Negro bill of rights to the draft legislation. The Bourbons, if they ever got started, could drone on uninterruptedly until the scheduled June 19 adjournment.

Is it not so, Mr. President? My goodness, how excited they get when the southerners are going to filibuster on anti-lynch or anti-poll-tax bills. They get worried about it. So they ditch the whole business and say, "We will have no part of those southerners, they are tough customers."

You did not know my father came from the South, did you, Mr. President?

Anyhow, they steer clear of southerners. I do not believe they are any more afraid of them than they are of me, but the bill they do not like is a bill to benefit common people, an antidiscrimination bill, to give everybody equality, something good. They are not anxious to pass that kind of stuff. They seize any excuse they can find to dodge it—and the excuse is that the southerners will filibuster, and that is a good excuse, and they dodge it. But GLEN TAYLOR, Henry Wallace's Vice Presidential candidate, does not want the boys of America drafted. He wants a good thing, he wants the country to stay free, not be militarized. So that is out. They cannot do that at all. They are not afraid of him. They will break his filibuster, you bet your life. They will not compromise with him at all. So they will just sit it out. But they will not have any trouble with the southerners. They will not bring up anything they do not like. I have a good notion to help the southerners the next time they have a filibuster.

Let us get back to the New York Post editorial:

> Ostensibly in the interests of coaxing some necessary and long-neglected legislation out of the Senate, the party leaders apparently decided not to provoke the lily-white statesmen into their act.
>
> But it's interesting that when Senator TAFT, with an eye to future campaign oratory, decided that the Republicans had better adopt at least one civil-rights measure, he was able to squeak the anti-poll-tax amendment through the Senate.

Mr. President, it is disgraceful that the anti-poll-tax amendment should be the one picked out of all seven amendments the Senator from North Dakota offered. They picked that one amendment, the anti-poll-tax amendment, which does not affect the soldiers of any but two States, and in those two States the provision will have no good effect unless the States enact enabling legislation of some kind. So what was done about the poll tax does not mean a thing. Mr. TAFT can go out and talk now about how they outlawed the poll tax; that the soldiers can no longer be charged a poll tax, and a lot of Republican spokesmen will forget that it was only the soldiers who were covered by that legislation; that they just outlawed the poll tax respecting the soldiers. Yes, they will go out and talk about it, and then the southerners can go down South and talk about how they stopped anything in the equal-rights program going through the Senate. They can say, "True, they got a little antipoll tax through which does not affect anybody, but we sure held them up."

So it was a happy thing for everyone concerned, the Republicans are happy, and my lovable southern colleagues are happy.

Let us see what the New York Post further had to say:

> Rather makes you wonder if the Senate couldn't have been induced to approve most of Langer's measures—

Sure, Mr. President, I wonder if they could not have been induced to approve most of them—

> if only the GOP had made a determined effort to live up to its 1944 campaign promise.

Yes, Mr. President, it is going to be awfully tough on them to come back here after the convention. I just cannot see them doing it. If they do they are going to have to deliver. They will go to Philadelphia and write some new, fancy promises, and they will have to deliver on them; so if I should have to talk here for 2 or 3 days it would be awfully embarrassing to them. I do not think I will make it, but I might.

The Post continued:

> We'll never know. And neither will the boys who may be forced to serve in the Jim Crow outfits of our mighty democracy's defense army.
>
> The Republican's tactics may have been tawdry. Yet the turncoat antics of so-called "liberal" Democrats, who have no known allegiance to the for-whites-only rule south of the Mason-Dixon line, deserve equal censure.
>
> With the exceptions of Senator HARLEY KILGORE (Democrat, West Virginia), and Henry Wallace's running mate, GLEN TAYLOR (Democrat, Idaho)—

I apologize, Mr. President, I had not read the editorial before—honestly I had not. I did not know that my name was in it. Someone handed it to me and I placed it on the desk. I hate to brag on myself, but I appreciate this recognition, however, by the New York Post. We will read that over again:

> With the exceptions of Senator HARLEY KILGORE (Democrat of West Virginia), and Henry Wallace's running mate, GLEN TAYLOR (Democrat of Idaho), the Democrats voted solidly with the Republicans to discard LANGER's proposal that the draft bill contain a ban on race discrimination.

There is the record, Mr. President. There is the answer. There is the reason why the Negro people are not going to be fooled by the promises of tweedledum and tweedledummer any more.

The editorial continues:

> And Senator SCOTT LUCAS, Democratic whip even had the effrontery to denounce TAFT's belated move to write the anti-poll-tax ban into the bill. LUCAS baldly stated that TAFT had upset a previous agreement—a "gentleman's agreement."
>
> A gentleman's agreement, Mr. President.
>
> LUCAS badly stated that TAFT had upset a previous agreement—a gentleman's agreement, we suppose you'd call it—to table all civil rights amendments. Thirty Democrats voted against the anti-poll-tax measure.
>
> The Democrats may have been dutifully following the lead of their party standard bearer, Harry Truman.

I think they were, Mr. President. That is what I said a while ago. I think the southerners just got way off base when they got all excited about Harry's message. He just did not mean a thing by it, and I think there was nobody more surprised than Harry when the southern boys started jumping down his throat, and they got him on a spot where he could not back down and they could not back down. Of course, now they are all coming back and sneaking in the back door of the tepee, sort of. I am afraid that is the fact.

The Senator from North—or South—you are South, are you not? You are from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Is the Senator from Idaho yielding to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir. I was just addressing the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. He was remonstrating in an undertone that they were not going back into the tent, but if anybody wants to bet me, I will bet that the southerners will be back in there with Harry before this thing is over.

I read further from the New York Post:

> The Democrats may have been dutifully following the lead of their party standard bearer, Harry Truman. The President is apparently so anxious to gain his party's nomination that he is refusing to antagonize the Southern delegates by ordering the end of racial discrimination in Government agencies and in the armed services.

What about that, Mr. President? Mr. Truman a while back told them to cut out segregation in the armed services. He told them to do so a couple of times. No one did a thing about it. I wonder whatever became of that order.

The Post continues:

> Once the President implied that he would. But that was before leading Democrats talked seriously about replacing him with another candidate, one more acceptable to all wings of the party.
>
> Civil rights is becoming a casualty of our November elections. We would hint to the Democrats, Senators, and Harry Truman alike, that there may be another casualty close to home, unless they challenge the Republicans' meager performance and come through with a record which will convince the voters that Democrats don't consider some citizens "second class."

Well, there is no challenge from the Democrats or the Republicans on civil rights.

The only assurance respecting things that really matter to the American people—the question of actually keeping alive, Mr. President, the question of civil rights, of equal rights, of nondiscrimination, the only chance that labor has to survive which is as an organized entity, the only chance the old people have of getting a square deal, the only chance the soldiers have of getting homes—witness what is going on in the Senate today,

the scuttling of the housing program—the only chance the United Nations has to survive, the only chance Israel has of getting a square deal, the only assurance that the monopolists and the cartelists will get what is coming to them—the only guaranty or assurance of any of these things is a victory for the new party in November and the election of Henry Wallace as President of the United States.

Mr. President, we all remember that awhile ago when Mr. Truman—it was not Mr. Truman, either; it was Gen. Bedell Smith, our Ambassador to Moscow—they are all generals. Look them up. We find generals from Patagonia to Korea, all the way across the world. Our Ambassadors everywhere are generals. At any rate, Mr. Bedell Smith delivered a note to Molotov telling him how tough we were, how powerful we were, but that if they wanted to talk things over the door was always open. Mr. Molotov said, "All right; let us talk."

Our diplomats and statesmen hastened to explain that the last sentence in the note, to the effect that the door was always open, was simply diplomatic finery. It did not mean any more than the President's message on civil rights. We had not meant a thing by it. The door was not really open. We were still tough, and might become tougher, and did not even want to talk about it.

How did the newspapers over the world report the occurrence? People all over the world were very much thrilled and happy that we were offering a chance to make peace in the world, but we told them, "No; we do not even want to talk about it. The door is not open at all." I believe that the handling of our foreign policy—and, remember, it is a bipartisan foreign policy—is the most disgraceful chapter in all American history. Never has there been such stupidity in such high places.

This is what the New York Herald Tribune of May 14 had to say:

French people still hope for cold-war truce. Mix-up on United States-Soviet talks causes disappointment. London press pessimistic.

(By Walter Kerr)

PARIS, May 13.—The excitement caused by the Moscow radio's report of possible negotiations between the United States and Soviet Union died down in Paris today, leaving most Frenchmen disappointed, but still hopeful that something may come of it.

Mr. President, we threw cold water on the hopes and aspirations of the whole world.

This is the way the Washington News reported it. The headline says, "Truman chills Reds' reception of peace offer."

The second heading over the article is:

Truman ignores peace bid.

How the President of the United States has the nerve to tell the people that if they will only reelect him he will keep the peace by becoming tougher with everyone, I do not see. I have never heard of keeping the peace by becoming tough with anyone. A man must be pleasant with his neighbors if he wants them to be pleasant with him. He cannot swagger around like a big bully and expect his neighbors to love him.

Returning to the article about the French people—

No one any longer anticipates bilateral talks in the immediate future, but most newspaper commentators still call for some sort of an arrangement that could bring an end to the cold war.

The French people are not happy about the cold war. They do not feel so cock-sure about it. They do not have atom bombs. They are right in the middle, so to speak. They have no ocean to protect them. They are not so happy about our cold war.

While the excitement was on it was hot, and it is now known that French Foreign Minister Georges Bidault reacted sharply and angrily before a full explanation was laid before him. Private citizens tired of the cold war feel a little let down by the turn of events.

I suppose they were. I know that I was. I thought to myself, "At last those fellows are getting a little sense. They are realizing that war means the end of all of us, so they are going to be a little more moderate. They are going to see if we cannot come to an understanding." My hopes rose, and then they were dashed, just as were the hopes of the good people of Europe.

The heading on the next article is "Pessimism in London."

LONDON, May 13.—Confusion and pessimism marked comment today on the 3 days of exchanges between Moscow and Washington.

The London Times said the hope of a Soviet-American conference for the discussion of differences has been dashed. It blamed both the United States and Russia for what it called a bewildering episode. Russia, it said, had a right to believe that Ambassador Walter Bedell Smith meant something more than a conventional expression when he told Soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov that the door was always open to discussion. But instead of rushing to the radio with an announcement that she had accepted a bid to negotiate, Russia should have inquired quietly just what the Americans had in mind, said the Times.

That was the reaction abroad when we withdrew our offer to talk things over. Everyone was disappointed, and I am sorry to say that the Russians came off better than we did in the explanations, charges, and countercharges which ensued.

It seems that Mr. Truman has little regard for Gallup polls, when he refuses to talk with the Russians. The Gallup poll of May 1 says:

Majority in favor of world peace parley.

Do you think it would be a good idea or a poor idea for President Truman to call an international meeting with Stalin and heads of other nations to work out more effective plans for peace? A good idea, 63 percent; poor idea, 28 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

That is the result of the Gallup poll.

Let us see what the reaction was to our action when we recognized Israel on such short notice. The press had this to say:

United States action shocks delegates to UN. Many are resentful because of unexpected shift from backing of trusteeship.

As I have said, we had given them this trusteeship. We told them to talk it over awhile, and then come back with the right answer, "Yes." But then we kicked the pegs out from under them by recognizing Palestine. They did not like it.

I have before me an article by George Barrett; I believe the article appeared in the Washington Post. It says:

UNITED STATES ACTION SHOCKS DELEGATES TO UN—MANY ARE RESENTFUL BECAUSE OF UNEXPECTED SHIFT FROM BACKING OF TRUSTEESHIP

(By George Barrett)

Anger, incredulity and shock, mixed finally with relief, made the General Assembly session at Flushing Meadow last night the most stirring United Nations meeting to date as a result of the United States recognition of the new state of Israel.

Delegates, officials and the small crowd of visitors were dumbfounded by reports of the Washington announcement and few believed it at first.

Press bulletins flashed the news to the corridors and the story raced through the Assembly hall shortly after 6 p. m. while the delegates were still voting on the Jerusalem trusteeship resolution. The first reaction was that someone was making a terrible joke, and some diplomats broke into skeptical laughs.

However, even before Dr. Philip C. Jessup of the United States was able to make the news official in a statement, the delegates were slowly beginning to believe it. Dr. Guillermo Belt, of Cuba, referring to an earlier indication that the Soviet Union would recognize the new Jewish state, commented sarcastically that apparently Russia knew more about what was going on in Washington than the United States delegation did.

MANY DELEGATES RESENTFUL

There was considerable resentment among many of the delegations over the way the United States had pushed so vigorously for a trusteeship agreement in United Nations debates while apparently intending all the time to approve partition by recognizing the new state of Israel.

This feeling soon began to give way in some delegations to one of relief that the United States had at last come out firmly after what many of them believed was a long display of indecision.

Most of the remarks heard around the corridors were too caustic to be attributed to the authors.

Imagine that, Mr. President. The representatives of the United Nations made such remarks that they could not even be printed in the newspapers—such remarks about our foreign policy, about our vacillation, our wiggling and waggling, back and forth.

I read further from the article:

One delegate asked another for the United States position on Palestine and was told by another diplomat that he did not know because he had not seen an announcement for 20 minutes.

Imagine that—making fun of us to that extent, saying that they did not know what our foreign policy was, because they had not seen a dispatch for 20 minutes.

I read further:

During the Assembly debate Prince Faisal al-Saud, of Saudi Arabia, the chief Arab delegate, sat alone in a corner of the public lounge, with his aides reporting to him from time to time. He refused to comment on the United States recognition move, but he turned to an aide and exclaimed: "So what!"

Sir Carl Berendsen, of New Zealand, remarked tartly that he was "Just dizzy; that's all; just dizzy."

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, head of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, was surprised and delighted by developments.

"This is marvelous," he said of United States recognition. "This is what we've been praying for."

Of course, there were many Jewish people who were delighted at that particular moment, but they should have waited until several days later, for things have not been so good for the Jews over there since then, and goodness knows what will happen to the Jews before these matters are straightened out.

I read further:

It had been a long day of confusion for most of the delegates, who began their Political and Security Committee session at Lake Success, then hurried to the 5 p. m. plenary meeting of the Assembly.

Mr. President, let me refer now to an article which I quoted a while ago. The article is entitled "Britain Intercedes for Doomed Greeks." Mr. President, it caps the climax when the British have to ask us please not to shoot so many poor Greeks. Of course, I always save newspaper artifcles such as these, because some of these things sound so fantastic that people will not believe them unless you are able to show them the newspaper accounts. For instance, no one ordinarily would believe that the British are trying to keep us from shooting so many poor Greeks. Many people do not read the newspapers very carefully; so many people will say, "Oh, the British are so bloodthirsty that they would not intercede to help the Greeks." So we have to show such people articles such as this one in order to let them know what really is happening.

Mr. President, the Turks did not help us during the war, but we have given them great quantities of guns. My earliest recollection of the Turks is that when I was a kid, I was told about the Turks' massacring the Armenians, and I thought the Turks must be terrible people. But we have gotten too bloodthirty for the Turks, Mr. President. I never thought I would live to see the day when that would happen; but we have sent the Turks so many guns, that the other day they sent us a note in which they said, "Please, if you do not mind, we have gotten enough guns, and now we would like something to eat."

Mr. President, I read now an article by William Philip Simms, entitled "Palestine Pendulum"— a very appropriate name for what is going on with respect to our policy in regard to Palestine.

Mr. Simms says:

The United States is doing so many flip-flops on Palestine and in the foreign field generally that both Embassy Row and Capitol Hill are dizzy and bewildered.

Mr. President, this bipartisan foreign policy of ours is a strange, strange thing; and it is a wonder that both the Republican and Democratic Parties have adhered to it for so long. Either the Democrats or the Republicans could have gotten out from under this foreign policy of ours long ago, and could have left the other side with the darnedest hot potato that anyone ever saw. But they are loyal, Mr. President; I will say that. They refuse to get out from under.

The article further says:

White House, State Department, our Foreign Relations committees of Congress, delegation at the United Nations and envoys abroad each seems to be functioning separately without often knowing what the others are doing.

Of course, Mr. President, he gives them credit for seeming to be functioning and operating. Of course, that implies that something is going on, that someone has some idea of what is going on. Personally, I think it is just a madhouse. I read further:

President Truman's recognition of Israel, the new Jewish state in Palestine, for instance, seems to have caught the State Department, our delegates at Lake Success and the world in general wholly by surprise.

Shortly before the White House acted, State Secretary George Marshall was quoted as having advised both Arab and Jewish leaders in Palestine to avoid hasty action when the British mandate expired at midnight on May 15. Specifically he warned them against any "political change"—that is, against proclaiming sovereign states.

Midnight in the Holy Land is 6 p. m. Washington time. Israel was proclaimed independent at 6:01 p. m. Friday, our time. At 6:11 p. m., President Truman approved recognition and it was made public a few minutes after.

It was 10 minutes later.

I read further:

At the State Department reporters began to ask questions. The answer was invariably: "No comment." The lid had been clamped on—it is said, by Secretary Marshall.

That is a pretty good scheme: If you cannot think of anything to say, and are at an utter loss, just keep your mouth shut, I guess.

I read further:

At Lake Success it was even more embarrassing. Report of the White House action circulated around the General Assembly table from mouth to mouth. Presently Francis B. Sayre (deputy in the absence of his chief, Warren R. Austin) was asked for a fill-in. Blushingly he had to admit that all he knew was what he had seen on the ticker.

American policy on Palestine has been swinging like a pendulum for a long time. Everyone has complained about it—British, Arabs, Jews, the UN, and others alike.

In 1946—to go back no further than that—an Anglo-American committee presented the Morrison plan for partition of Palestine into Jewish and Arab provinces within the British mandate. Jews, Arabs, and the United States turned it down.

In 1947, a special UN committee proposed partition into independent states. This had such strong backing from the American delegation that some characterized it as a scandal. Washington was charged with using pressure to put partition across.

Then, last March, the United States took the opposite stand. It announced against partition. The move came as a bombshell. In fact UN members called it just that. Zionists seemed stunned. Some wept. Dr. Chaim Weizmann, former head of the World Zionist organization and now first President of Israel, denounced the trusteeship plan which the United States now favored as an impossible solution.

State Secretary Marshall is believed to have engineered the switch. Fear of what might happen to world peace if independent Jews and Arabs started war before the UN had either the strength or the organization to handle it is thought to have influenced him. At any rate, he openly expressed his approval of the shift, describing it as only an "interim measure" to be taken "without prejudice" to any eventual political settlement.

So great was the opposition in this country, and in the UN, however, that of late the United States has stressed it less and less, putting major emphasis on a truce between Arabs and Jews until some all-round settlement satisfactory to all could be devised.

Which is where matters stood last Friday at 6 p. m. Then, at 6:01 came another Palestine bombshell. Coming on top of the Smith-Molotov incident of only a week ago, British, French, and other friends of the United States are more than taken aback. As one foreigner at Lake Success expressed it:

"If this sort of thing keeps up, we may be pardoned if we begin to wonder soon who makes American foreign policy and who can really speak for it."

That is what Mr. William Philip Simms thinks of our foreign policy. It is really something; Mr. President.

The Washington News wrote an editorial about Mr. Truman's handling of our foreign policy. I think it is legitimate to discuss all these things in order that all may understand why they should not vote for a draft now at this time. It is necessary for them to understand all the other silly things that have gone on before they will believe how silly the present bipartisan coalition that is ruining this country can really be. So these things are all pertinent to building up the testimony on tall fronts. Under the heading, "Irresponsible," the editorial says:

President Truman's handling of American recognition of the new state of Israel was irresponsible. Regardless of the merits of the policy, the method was inexcusable.

The President made a momentous decision affecting the security of the United States, the fate of the United Nations, and the peace of the world, without sufficient consultation with the State Department, the defense establishment, and our allies.

What moved the President we do not know. Whether he was thinking of Jewish votes in the November election, as his critics charge, or whether he was trying to beat Russia to a decision which she has not yet taken, or whatever his motives, he made his sudden move in the most costly manner.

He left the State Department demoralized, the Defense Department unprepared, our UN delegation helpless, and our foreign allies feeling they had been double-crossed.

Less than 24 hours before proclamation of the state of Israel, which was followed in 21 minutes by Truman recognition, the Israelite foreign minister-designate announced that Secretary Marshall had warned the Jews against such a step. The White House now claims that Secretary Marshall and Undersecretary Lovett were notified of the Truman change in policy in advance—how long in advance is not said. Other State Department officials and our UN delegation, representing American policy on Palestine, knew nothing of it.

Our delegate in the Palestine session of the UN had to confess he had no information. He had to telephone Washington to find out, and then belatedly confirm the fact to the UN to the accompaniment of general ridicule.

The London and Paris governments, with which President Truman was supposed to be working for a peaceful Palestine settlemen within the UN, were not informed; nor were our ambassadors abroad who were negotiating.

Foreign governments are saying that the United States cannot be trusted and that American diplomats cannot be believed when they represent American policy.

When the President kicks in the teeth America's allies, not to mention his own official representatives—

I think he ought to, Mr. President. I think he is very smart, kicking all these folk in the teeth. They seem to like it. The Republicans come right back for another helping of bipartisan baloney. Let him kick them around. It says:

When the President kicks in the teeth America's allies, not to mention his own official representatives, he is injuring our closest foreign relations at a time of world peril. If it were necessary to turn the entire Moslem world against us and jeopardize our defenses in the Middle East and north Africa, it certainly was not necessary to insult the British and French Governments—the two largest Christian powers in the Moslem world, upon whose friendship we are now even more dependent.

We are not here discussing the merits of recognition of Israel. But in any case no major American foreign policy, much less a reversal, should ever be decided suddenly and without careful preparation at home and abroad. By violating that rule of government and of common sense, President Truman has brought ridicule and reproach upon America.

If the President had taken his position openly and stood for it consistently, he would have won respect at least. As it is, he has earned distrust for his country.

I have here an article by Eleanor Roosevelt, Mr. President. I am sorry to say that it is hard to keep up with Mrs. Roosevelt lately. We cannot tell on which side of an issue she will be. One day she will condemn Russia and the next day she will condemn us, over the same issue, practically. But, nevertheless, she does have a good argument on this particular issue of the note which Mr. Bedell Smith delivered to Mr. Molotov. She says, "Why should we have to deny we want peace?" That is the heading which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Monday, May 17. The article is dated New York, Sunday. She says:

I am not quite sure I feel very happy over the barrage we have felt it necessary to put out to deny Soviet accusations that we were making a move for peace.

That is the way I felt about it, Mr. President. Why should we feel compelled to deny that we were even open to talk the matter over at all?

Mrs. Roosevelt goes on to say:

I thought whatever was said, we were the ones who felt the need for further conversations. As a matter of fact, most of us knew the U. S. S. R. couldn't make any one, except their own people, believe that. Perhaps their own people needed a little encouragement.

Nevertheless, why should we feel it necessary to deny so vehemently that we intended to make a move for peace when heaven knows everything that we do in these days is directed toward that end? We do not want the Russians to think that we are afraid of them and are coming hat in hand to beg for more conversations.

But I can't see why we have to deny that we try to bring about better understanding between us.

In fact, Mr. President, very few people approved of our stand when the Russians said they wanted to talk peace. If I recall correctly, I believe Walter Lippmann and nearly all the other experts on foreign affairs said we made a terrible mistake in stating to all the world that we did not even want to talk about peace, and that it was only an accident. I think Sumner Welles commented on how terribly incompetently the whole matter had been handled.

Mr. President, I was mentioning awhile ago our foreign policy based on the United Nations and wanting to work through the United Nations. The New York Times of May 6, 1948, quotes Sir John Boyd Orr, noted Britisher, as saying:

Full stomachs are the answer to communism, but the United States won't or can't understand this. The United States talks about Russian misuses of the veto, but the United States itself has vetoed, and therefore destroyed, a world plan to feed the world without a blueprint, and we were ready to go ahead. Then America said, "No."

Yes, Mr. President, some people are forever berating Russia and never saying anything about what we do. It is just too ridiculous. None of us is perfect. If we would just realize that we should give the Russians credit for the decent things they do, if they were only publicized widely, the situation would be much improved. We have been told that there is no war propaganda in Russia. That was the statement of Eddy Gilmore. If we would let the people know such things, and then go to the Russians in good faith and tell them we will be glad to go home and stay there, if they will do the same, and that we would be glad to get rid of our weapons if they will do the same, we could do all of those things with no appeasement.

I was recently in Detroit. It was on the day after the exchange of notes, and there was an editorial in the Detroit Free Press, which is quite a famous newspaper. The heading of the editorial is as follows:

Shall we drift into war because we lack leadership?

Of course, Mr. President, we have the leadership of a bipartisan coalition, presumably the best brains of both old parties. But if they have not made a mess of things I never saw one. If we had leadership we might do something sensible. In November, of course, the American people will choose Henry Wallace as their leader, and then we will get on the right track, establish peace in the world, and work out a sensible program at home, using a few of the billions of dollars we have appropriated for guns to make this a better country in which to live.

But to get back to the editorial in the Detroit Free Press, there is a picture of Mr. Stalin seated at a table. Across from him is Uncle Sam, with his silk hat on the table, but there is no head protruding from the figure of Uncle Sam. On his brief case are the words, "Blundering United States diplomacy. No head."

That is correct. The bipartisan policy has no head. If we elect Henry Wallace we might make the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] our Secretary of State.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield for a question, but not for the acceptance of the proposal.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator in favor of the pay raise?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I might take the job.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, there is a caption under the cartoon in which Uncle Joe is pictured as trying to talk to a headless Uncle Sam regarding our foreign policy. The caption is:

Even Joe must be slightly confused.

I guess he is. The article says:

This newspaper confesses complete bafflement over American policies in relation to foreign affairs.

Who does not, Mr. President? Who is not completely baffled? The article goes on to say:

Stark tragedy faces a might nation that is without guidance.

Too true. It goes on to say that our leaders are dealing with the destinies of the human race, and we must needs stand by helplessly in a terrior of contradiction.

That is correct, Mr. President. We are likely to get into war by using this technique of scaring people and trying to get an armament economy fastened on the Nation, trying to get the Marshall plan to dump our surpluses abroad. We are liable to be scared right into war, and that means the end of life on this planet, of course.

Mr. President, I want to make it plain that this is a quotation because somebody is likely to jump up and call me unpatriotic, a stooge of Stalin, or something, so I want to make it plain that this is quoted. It says:

General George C. Marshall is a valiant old soldier whose years have been spent in selfless service to his country but he is not trained in the arts of diplomacy.

I have said that before, and folks thought I was almost a traitor even to question General Marshall's fitness to be Secretary of State. It continues:

To add to the fused confusions, he is not master of the State Department, but must wait on the opportunistic vagaries of President Truman, who is thinking of precinct votes instead of the single universal issue that confronts all mankind.

And so we have before us this utterly mad contention:

If we make a gesture of peace toward Russia it will be taken as a sign of weakness, so we must not do that.

On the other hand, if Russia makes such a gesture, then we must reject it because the rulers of Russia are not to be trusted under any circumstances.

That is what we have been told, Mr. President. The Detroit Free Press points out how ridiculous it is, how it can only end in disaster, because there is no way out. It continues:

This makes war inevitable because it makes it impossible for the two mightiest powers on earth ever to get together.

We here present the three major problems this Nation has before it with the Soviet Government's position a major factor in each issue.

1. There is the movement to bring about a meeting of minds between Moscow and Washington.

2. There is the Palestine question with Russia and the United States alone going along parallel lines.

3. There is the ending of the efforts in the United Nations to bring about understanding on the regulations of atomic energy. And with that failure the sudden announcement by Washington of far mightier weapons of war in connection with the atom.

Mr. President, we have much better weapons now.

The subhead is "Russia and the Wallace letters." The article states:

Henry Wallace is, to our way of thinking, an utterly naive man in whom erratic emotions have entirely supplanted balance.

I read that because I want to go on and read the rest. They say he is "nuts" and then they agree with him.

His foreign policy, as outlined at his recent appearance in Olympia, is unrealistic as the play fantasies of a little child.

Nevertheless, we do not believe that Henry Wallace's habit of living in a dream world constitutes reason for rejecting the response which his letter to Joseph Stalin has produced.

You see, they say Henry is crazy, and then they say, "Well, by golly, his letter to Stalin got an answer, and we think we ought to do something about it." They will forgive you for saying Henry is crazy, because if you mention Henry nowadays and do not say he is crazy at the same time, the Un-American Activities Committee puts you on its list, and the free press does not want to get on the list, so they say Henry is "nuts." Then they say he is all right. The article continues:

True, the exchange can be attributed to political maneuvering in a campaign year. Wallace wrote his letter as a private citizen—but a private citizen endeavoring to get himself elected President.

I just do not believe that. I believe Henry Wallace is absolutely sincere. If he thought it would best serve the interests of this country for him to get out of this race, anything he thought would be for the best, he would do it; but he thinks, and I think, and millions of other people think, that the only way for our country to get out of this morass of confusion and false policy is to elect Henry Wallace President of the United States. He would be perfectly willing to give it up if he thought it would be the best thing.

I read further from the article:

Stalin's amicable reply could be a shrewd Kremlin maneuver on behalf of the Wallace candidacy. By making it appear that the Wallace letter laid a cornerstone for international accord, canny old Joe Stalin doubtless can help Wallace's nonvestigial political chances.

And the Kremlin certainly would be extremely elated to have Henry Wallace in the White House. Any enemy of the United States would.

Of course, that statement, Mr. President, is absolutely unwarranted, that any enemy of the United States would want Henry Wallace in the White House. But, as I say, they have to say these bad things about him because they are saying that perhaps he is not crazy after all. I read further:

All these things are realized, but we can't go on forever looking for a hidden-ball trick and turning down all overtures. At some point we must sit down with the Russians and discuss formulas for living and letting live.

In other words, they say that Henry is right, after they have called him all the names they can think of.

The only alternative is eventual war. We can't exist forever in a diplomatic stalemate—the fancy camouflaging name for which is "cold war."

What we fear is that the point is rapidly passing where any chance remains for sitting down across the table from the Russians and making an honest effort to wipe out the oppressive, constant threat of a shooting war.

That is right, Mr. President; the Detroit Free Press is absolutely right in that. The time is passing, the time will eventually come when there will be no turning back. We will have gotten so tough that we will just have to go on being tough. Our people will be sold on the idea that anybody who speaks kindly of the Russians or to the Russians is a traitor, and there will be no hope then of ever getting along with the Russians.

The article continues:

Worse, as we drift on and the administration fumbles and postures, we are losing both world confidence and world respect.

Events are making us and not the Russians the obdurate ones; the ones who shout "No" to every proposal. No propaganda skill is necessary to make our antics appear to dash all hope that peace can be realized.

This is a very severe indictment of this bipartisan foreign policy that is being so blithely accepted and promulgated and continued by the press of both the old parties. It says:

All you have to do is to tell the unornamented story. Over the rest of the world it can't help but make us look like the badies and the Russians the goodies—to borrow film studio terminology.

Though it was kept from Americans many months—

Mind you, Mr. President—

Though it was kept from Americans many months—

The Americans do not get the truth any more unless it suits somebody's purpose to let them find it out; just like they are not finding out the truth about this newsman who was murdered over in Greece. They have hushed it all up because they are afraid that we will find out the truth, and get mad at the Greek Fascists we are supporting and might not give them any more money. So they hush the whole matter up.

Though it was kept from Americans many months, as far as back as last January the Russians made diplomatic approaches. Contact was arranged through Robert Murphy, our political adviser to Gen. Lucius Clay in Germany.

Statements were made that these overtures had been made. Our State Department denied it flatly. Later it comes out that it did happen. They just lie to us. The people in charge of our country, the bipartisan coalition, have no responsibility to the democratic traditions of this country at all, Mr. President. They keep information from us and let us have it to suit their purposes.

The editorial continues:

They (the Russians) sought a meeting between Premier Stalin and President Truman and were willing to stage it on neutral ground—in Stockholm. It was even hinted that such a conference might cancel what Russia considered the necessity for steps it has since taken in Czechoslovakia and Finland.

There you are, Mr. President. In other words the Russians told us, "We want to talk things over; we would like to arrive at a peaceful settlement with you; but if you will not talk to us we are going to have to take certain measures in Czechoslovakia and Finland." And we said, "Well, we are not going to talk. We do not care what you do." So Russia did what she did, and then we are flabbergasted and profess great surprise and shock at what happened.

What the Detroit Free Press is saying—not what I am saying, Mr. President—is that we sold out Czechoslovakia and Finland. If we had been willing to sit down and discuss these differences, and call off the cold war, there might have been a chance of stopping what happened there.

The editorial continues:

Secretary Marshall rejected the whole proposition, and it is even rumored that Murphy found himself in bad for having made even preliminary moves toward the accord.

Is not that a sad commentary on the state of affairs in the handling of American foreign policy? If some well-meaning fellow even sounds out somebody on the possibilities of peace he is ostracized and made a villain, and probably will lose his job. We do not even want to talk peace to anybody. We are just tough. We have got the atom bomb with which we can kill everybody in the world. We have got all the oil, and are doing fine.

The editorial continues:

Then only last week, it was revealed that our Moscow diplomat, Ambassador Walter Bedell Smith, had delivered to the Kremlin a note which outlined our position, and in so many words told the Russians that we stood ready to meet with them at any time.

Like Murphy, Smith found his action promptly disowned and discredited. When the Russians accepted it in what ought to have been accepted as good faith, official Washington promptly steamed itself up over what it said was a breach of protocol.

They said it was not cricket for the Russians to publish Bedell Smith's note. I guess they forgot that just a little while ago we printed a lot of secret papers, and it was said that it was the first time in all history that one nation had printed secret documents about another nation that was supposed to be friendly to it at the time. But we printed them and broke all precedents. Yet we got all excited because the Russians would print a note we sent them telling them that we would be glad to talk peace. I do not see what is secret about that.

Russia has published the contents of Smith's note and the Kremlin answer.

That is all it was.

In the midst of this artificially induced heat, State Department spokesmen spouted balderdash about the Russians having misunderstood what we meant. They couldn't have. Here are Ambassador Smith's words:

"As far as the United States is concerned, the door is always open for full discussions and the composing of all differences."

Mr. President, I think this discussion of foreign affairs, our refusal to discuss peace terms with the Russians to end the cold war, are very pertinent to this question of the draft. If we could make peace with the Russians there certainly would be no need for this idiotic draft. There is no need for it any more, because we have enough atom bombs to kill everybody in the world, so I do not see that it makes any difference whether we draft them first or kill them first.

The editorial continues:

If Stalin wasn't thoroughly confused and suspicious after that incident, he was a minority of one.

That is right. The whole world wondered what in the world was going on here.

All the rest of the world assuredly was (confused).

Now, taking the Wallace letter as his springboard, he has made another overture. And it ill behooves the Government of this country to remain aloof because it is easy to cite possible ulterior motives.

That is right. Simply because Henry Wallace thought it up they figure it cannot be any good. When they think that, they ought to think about hybrid corn, Mr. President. Wallace thought that up, and it is pretty fair.

It can't help but be known to readers of this page that we have no friendship for Henry Wallace—

No; after reading the first of the article we gather that—

that as a public figure we regard him as being of such light weight that he wouldn't register on an apothecary's scale.

That is pretty light. I read an article recently by, I believe, Mr. Reston, of the New York Times, published in the Times magazine pointing out some fallacies of our foreign policies, and even Mr. Reston, who is a conservative through and through, felt impelled, after he had gotten a few paragraphs into his article, to devote a paragraph to denying that he was a Communist, saying that he was not a Communist.

And so it is. If you are going to write anything about Henry Wallace and suggest that he has any good sense at all, then you have got to write two paragraphs for every one in praise of him, saying that he is idiotic completely, but something happened here, and Wallace had a fool idea which worked out pretty good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir. I am just trying to find my place. All right; here we go. The editorial says:

But in the matter of our relationships with Russia and the prospect of bettering them, Henry Wallace is, after all, a private citizen. And if any private citizen in this Nation—no matter what his own standing or competence—wrote a letter that brought a diplomatically favorable response from the Kremlin that would urge that the opportunity this afforded be seized upon.

Naturally, it is necessary to go into any negotiations with our eyes open.

The whole purpose of any diplomatic parleying is to obtain your own ends. And only the hopelessly innocent will suppose that the opposition isn't equally selfish.

The process is not one of attaining clean, complete victory for either side, but somehow to adjust the claims and aspirations so that there will be no need to set armies marching. Compromise has to be accepted.

Nor is honest compromise anything like appeasement. It is a measure to avoid war by creating a reasonably equitable even if not perfect condition. Yet the administration and our diplomacy persists in only one task—that of ferreting out darksome explanations for why the Russians should want to make a try for mutual understanding.

Never give them credit for one honest motive—one sincere wish to bring about peace in the world. Just keep plugging on the old propaganda that the Russians are no good at all. If Eddy Gilmore writes an article saying that there is no war propaganda in Russia, put it over on the third page somewhere.

Better men would make the try and desist only after they discovered the trick—if there was one to be discovered.

That makes sense. That is exactly the program Henry Wallace has in mind—to try sincerely, all out—to reach an agreement with the Russians. After that there is plenty of time to fight. We have not tried.

They would be willing to subscribe to the belief of Benjamin Franklin that "there never was a good war or a bad peace."

For, by their every act and word, the mouthpieces for the White House—

I interpolate to say the bipartisan mouthpieces in our foreign policy—

make it apparent that they believe the only solution of our relations with Russia is to maintain two armed camps.

We cannot do that forever, worse luck.

Not only is life in an armed camp uncomfortable. The perpetuation of two of them makes war inevitable. When nations have differences to settle and one of them refuses to talk it over—to show even the beginning of good will and high purpose—the ultimate means of settlement can't be anything else but battle.

Our Washington leadership prefers to invite that rather than concede that Henry Wallace has been the instrument for giving us still another opening to make peace with the Soviet.

They finally got around to saying it. After condemning Henry to keep themselves in the clear, so that they would not lose all their advertisers, they become pro-Wallace. After taking him over the coals, they finally say:

Our Washington leadership prefers to invite that rather than concede that Henry Wallace has been the instrument for giving us still another opening to make peace with the Soviets.

If the men in the Kremlin are feeling dizzy, we don't blame them. More, we thing they probably share their dizziness with most of America.

Henry Wallace surely is not the only one who is dizzy, if he is, trying to keep up with our foreign policy.

RUSSIA AND THE PALESTINE ISSUE

The world may share a sense of bafflement when it contemplates the United States and Russia, acting through the United Nations, as the apostles of peace in an effort to force a truce upon Israel and the Arabs.

It is not so unusual, perhaps, that power powers should be seeking a peaceful settlement, as it is a strange contradiction that they should select the UN as the vehicle.

The United States made the first move, asking the Security Council to intervene to the extent of demanding that both the Jews and Arabs cease firing within 36 hours and rest on their arms in the positions each now holds.

Out of the big five members of the Security Council, only Russia gave immediate approval and support to the American proposals.

We have, as a result, the picture of the two greatest and most powerful nations on the earth which have long made the UN the battleground for their own cold war, joining hands and standing alone in favor of a principle which none of the other member nations have so far accepted.

That, however, is not the only contradiction in the situation.

Last Friday, President Truman rushed his announcement of this Nation's recognition of the new state of Israel.

It was done without reference to the United Nations to which the whole problem of Palestine had been previously referred.

On each point which this country had placed before the UN, beginning with the question of partition, President Truman has reversed himself by resorting to ex parte measures, completely bypassing UN.

And now, after following the same course, and after Israel's independence has become a recognized fact, the administration in Washington seeks peace in Palestine through an appeal to the Security Council.

Considering our wavering, our emotionalism, and our side glances toward political expediency, it is not to be wondered at that the other member nations treat our new proposals cooly and wrap themselves protectively in a wait-and-see attitude. It must be as puzzling to them as to see Russia and this country, allied within the Security Council, working together for peace.

With dissension between Russia and the United States within the UN having all but wrecked that organization; with a clique of vocal Members of the United States Senate demanding in effect that Russia be expelled from the UN, it is proper to ask what machinery we now have to enforce our demands for an armistice in Palestine.

Mr. President, recently there has been a rash of resolutions introduced in the Senate, presumably to strengthen the United Nations. I started it in 1945, shortly after the atomic bombs had fallen, on October 24, 1945. I decided that the United Nations, in view of the atom bomb, was inadequate, so I introduced a resolution calling upon the Senate to go on record as asking the President to call a meeting of the United Nations with the object of changing the United Nations into a federated world government, a real republic patterned after what ours used to be like. I say "used to be like" advisedly, Mr. President.

I went around trying to persuade Senators to act with me as sponsors of the resolution. They would read it and say, "That is a good idea. It is the only solution. We must have something strong." I would say, "Do you want to sponsor the resolution with me?" They would say, "No. It is a good idea for you, but not for me."

I am afraid that one thing most Senators fear more than anything else is being called an idealist—getting out on a limb a little ahead of the parade. Most of them are like a gentleman in the French Revolution. He saw the mob going down the street. He looked out the window and said, "There goes the mob. I am their leader. I must follow them."

I do not feel that way. I drafted the resolution. I could not get any Senators to sponsor it with me, so I introduced it on October 24, 1945.

Last year I decided to introduce another resolution, not quite as broad, merely strengthening the United Nations to make it possible for them to enact, interpret, and enforce world law. I took that around and showed it to some people—not to Senators. They said, "Wait; we want to get you some cosponsors on this resolution."

So I waited from about March to July, and kept on asking what was going on, all the time. Finally, after an endless amount of work, they got several Senators to act as cosponsors of the resolution. Of course, they simply took my resolution and presented it as their own—these cutsiders—and got other Senators to act as cosponsors. Those who presented it to the other Senators were afraid that if they presented it with my name on it, that would ruin its chances, because, after all, ain't I a friend of Joe's? Then after they got those Senators to endorse it, they let me put my name on the bottom of it.

Then they decided they would go see Secretary of State Marshall about it. After seeing him, they came back with it; but by that time the insides had been cut out of the resolution, and there was nothing left of it but the beginning and the end, and it meant nothing at all by that time. However, they introduced it.

So I went ahead and introduced a good resolution, and I got some sponsors for it in short order.

Now they have introduced another group, this year; but this year these resolutions are not designed to strengthen the United Nations. They are not designed to keep peace in the world. These new resolutions are part of the bipartisan scheme just to kick Russia clear out of the family of nations, out of the United Nations, out of everything. The resolution that was passed here the other day was a sorry thing. We argued first that it was simply arming us to fight Russia, but we were assured that was not the case at all, but that it was a good resolution.

How did the press play it up the other day? They knew the truth; you cannot fool them. They said, "Senate Authorizes Arms for Europe." They knew what it was.

Mr. President, there are many people who pay lip service to the United Nations, but do not really care anything about the United Nations. They are in favor of destroying it, because the cartelists and the monopolists and our home-grown Junkers, the militarists, see the profits to be made by prolonging this cold war and making it possible to ship goods all over the world—free samples by which our industrialists will get markets. It is simply terrible the way the United Nations has been kicked around, until now it is almost dead.

In fact, today it is not possible to obtain the appropriation of money for the building of the headquarters of the United Nations. I almost wish the money for the headquarters would not be appropriated; I wish the headquarters would be taken to Switzerland or some other country. I think the United Nations would have a better chance there than in the United States, with all the saboteurs that we have in this country, who try to undermine the United Nations. I think the United Nations would be better off in some other country, where war is more real to the people, and where they have a genuine desire to have peace. I was greatly put out about the failure to appropriate money for the United Nations headquarters until I began to think that the United Nations might have a better chance to succeed if it were located in some other country where not so many lobbyists would be around.

But to go back to the editorial in the Detroit Free Press, it says:

Do the other nations expect that America and Russia—the new-found friends on the Israel issue—will send forces into Palestine to police that unhappy land and to enforce peace?

Of course, our boys will not permit the Russians to send any forces into Palestine. Our boys will not permit the Russians to do anything. They make the Russians stay out. They treat the Russians like Negroes are treated in this country; they discriminate against them. The editorial also says:

Let the matter be proposed and see how long Russia and the United States continue to hold hands.

It was proposed, and the whole thing was blown up, of course. We would not have anything more to do with partition when the Russians agreed to it; that made it bad right away. The editorial further says:

Will moral suasion alone be resorted to? What foundations have Russia and this country laid which would make a moral appeal reasonable?

The United Nations up to now has been largely ineffective because of the failure of Russia and the United States to compose their own differences.

Mr. President, I should like to say here that all the differences between us and Russia on the United Nations and all the failures of the United Nations have not been because of the use of the veto by Russia. Great Britain and ourselves have made the Russians veto one issue after another. We did it deliberately; we tried to think of things that we knew the Russians would have to veto. Mr. President, that is not my statement; it is the statement of Sumner Welles, the foremost writer on foreign affairs in this country, and certainly no bowling liberal.

He said the other day that the failure of the Security Council was not due to any Soviet veto, but was due entirely to the cynical approach to the matter by Great Britain and, more particularly, he said, by the United States.

Mr. President, I like to quote such statements, because then if someone calls me a tool of Stalin—just because I tell the truth—I can give the source.

The editorial further says:

Under the circumstances can it be hoped that they—

Meaning Russia and the United States—

can now work together to solve the problems of the rest of the world?

Here is another part of this editorial:

RUSSIA AND THE ATOMIC BOMB

In embracing the Wallace proposals as a means of achieving accord between this Nation and Russia, Marshall Stalin declared that one of the objectives would be a general reduction of armaments and outlawing the atomic bomb.

And simultaneously with his statement comes the announcement that the United Nations' Atomic Energy Commission, which has been seeking a mutually acceptable basis for atomic control, has given up the job as hopeless, and closed up shop.

And if that is not enough for one day, the White House announces a whole new arsenal of atomic tricks, with more powerful weapons developed by this country in its tests at Eniwetok.

It boils down to this: For months the UN has been seeking some means to control atomic energy on an international level so that it could not be used for purposes of warfare.

The Commission began its work in the first place on the assumption that the United States, the only power to possess the atom secret, was willing to put it away for keeps if other countries—particularly Russia—would not stock pile atomic weapons when it had developed the formula for making them.

A provision, laid down by this country, required all atomic development facilities, our own included, to be open to international inspection.

Thus the United States made a gesture of its good intentions.

They were rejected by Russia, and now, as the UN Atomic Energy Commission goes out of business, Stalin talks of his desire for disarmament and outlawing the bomb.

Is this just a bid for empty talk which will lead us nowhere but into another impasse?

Is it a device by which Russia seeks to step outside of the UN to obtain a concession which she was unable to get through that organization?

The United States made what all the world outside of Russia could have interpreted as a sincere desire to cooperate and to eliminate from the minds of all men the fear of the most deadly, the most destructive and diabolical instrument ever devised.

And then, as a token of how much we meant it, the administration declares that we have gone beyond anything that was demonstrated at Nagasaki and Hiroshima. We have refined the atomic weapon, presumably to the point where the original bomb is now almost obsolete, and President Truman declares a new program of development in the light of achievements at Eniwetok.

We have questioned the sincerity of the Russians. Who is to blame if our own professions of good will and good intent also are brought under suspicion?

And, finally, just to make the puzzle a little harder, it can be pointed out that the collapse of the Atomic Energy Commission occurred within the framework of that same United Nations in which Russia and the United States are now joined in a policy designed to end the war in Palestine.

Peace, we have both decreed, must descend on Israel and the Arabs.

But we can no longer talk within the UN-AEC about peace between ourselves.

The atom race just goes on.

Yes, Mr. President, the atom race just goes on, to extinction. As I said earlier, we have within our power enough bombs

to destroy life on this planet, to make all

ganda" broadcast No. 57, May 17, 1948

Professor MILLER. Mr. Gaeth, a country

to destroy life on this planet, to make all the world uninhabitable.

Here is a very pertinent article by Scott Nearing. Scott Nearing is one of America's really great men. He has devoted himself unselfishly to a study of our economic and political problems. The article reads:

AS OTHERS SEE US

The people who are saying hard things about Soviet foreign policy would gain a better understanding of the situation if they would put the shoe on the other foot.

If the Soviet Union:

1. Possessed the secret of the atomic bomb and
2. Were doing its best to keep it from us, meanwhile
3. Building up a stock pile of the bombs.
4. Maintaining an army larger than ever before in its history and
5. A navy larger than all the other navies of the world combined,
6. Proposing to introduce universal military training in time of so-called peace,
7. Allowing her army and navy officers to talk openly of attacking us before we should have time to recover from our war effort and perhaps learn to make our own atomic bombs,
8. Carrying on a press and radio campaign to foment suspicion and hostility toward us,
9. Seizing and holding military bases along both our frontiers (Iceland, Greenland, the islands of the Pacific),
10. Sending naval expeditions into northern waters for special training in Arctic warfare,
11. Maintaining its most powerful naval unit near our shores (eastern Mediterranean), and armed forces along our frontier (Germany, Italy, Trieste, Greece, China, Korea, Japan),
12. Wielding South and Central America into a military bloc and standardizing Latin American, British, and Russian war equipment; and if
13. The Greek Catholic Church were offering to lead a holy war against us; and if
14. Marshal Stalin arranged and officially sponsored a public ceremony at which a former British prime minister, who had twice tried to overthrow our Government and our economic system, was highly honored and, in his address, urged an alliance between our two most powerful rivals—

What would we think of Generalissimo Truman and Foreign Commissar Marshall if they did not work night and day to see that the United States had friendly governments in every capital from Canada to Argentina and if they did not move heaven and earth to discover the secret of the atomic bomb?

Let us try to see ourselves as others see us.

Surely, Mr. President, that is a very good admonition at this time in history when relations are so strained.

Mr. President, due to the fact that there is no order in the Chamber and no attempt made to keep order, I shall talk to myself from here on out. [Laughter.]

Here, Mr. President, is a feature written by Arthur Gaeth, a well-known radio commentator. He is one of the very few liberal radio commentators left, for the simple reason that most of them have been kicked off the air. Mr. Gaeth is still there, because he works for the United Electrical Workers. They have a radio program on which he broadcasts. That is why he is still on the air. That is why he can be liberal and is liberal. "Let the People Speak" is the title of his radio program, and this particular one is entitled "War Hysteria and Propaganda," broadcast No. 57, May 17, 1948. He said:

ARTHUR GAETH. Hello friends, in Moscow. Premier Stalin answered the open letter Henry Wallace read at a Madison Square Garden rally late Friday. Said Stalin: "The letter was one of the most important political documents of recent times." The main thing is that Mr. Wallace in his letter makes an open and honest attempt to get a concrete program for peaceful settlement. Stalin said Russia is ready to negotiate the settlement of differences between the two countries if the United States is willing. For a week now that Ambassador Smith-Molotov exchange of ideas has been in the frying plan. Only today Walter Lippmann wrote critically that the State Department ought to think out carefully how it intends to conduct its diplomacy before it tries to engage in it. A few days ago in the New York Times, James Reston's article maintained that the existing stalemates between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could not be broken merely by demanding that the Russians break them. Secretary Marshall's insistence that the UN, so often bypassed, do it also came in for comment.

The United Nations probably never could have come into being had not Harry Hopkins gone personally to Moscow to secure agreement on two issues plaguing the big powers. Max Lerner wants to know what we are trying to avert—war or peace.

There is the United Press article in many of your newspapers tonight, "United States seeks a balance of power before entering Red talks." It states the United States wants to restore the balance of power in Europe and, therefore, slammed the door when Molotov put his foot into it. The article concludes that while the people of the world are tired of constant war talk and want and believe the Russians and Americans can get together, our State Department is not willing to negotiate at present because it thinks the Russians have the advantage.

It's war hysteria produced by propaganda which is plaguing the people of the world, and particularly us here in America. We are preparing to invest up to $15,000,000,000 a year for quite some time—but what about peace endeavors?

Back in the 1930's, when the great prophet and world historian, H. G. Wells, was still alive, he described the pattern which was leading to World War II. Big business and finance in Great Britain and the United States, said Wells, were afraid of socialization of their own industries. They were even frightened by change, so they embarked on a propaganda program against it. They decided to rebuild Germany to the tune of billions. They recognized Hitler, closed their eyes to his actions, figured he was their stooge; but, gangster that he was, he shook down the bosses, hoping to take over. And he almost did. If Wells were alive today he would probably embellish on the old pattern, redrawing the position of Russia and pushing Great Britain out, with the United States of America going it alone—but for Germany there would be the same role. And there would be power politics, a great hysteria and propaganda game going on, financiers and militarists playing their roles. For world war III is in the making unless many people soon get a lot of sense.

Here in New York, Prof. Clyde R. Miller, of Teachers College, has long been a student of propaganda. He has just written a new pamphlet for the commission of propaganda analysis of the Methodist Federation for Social Action. It is all about propaganda. I transcribed an interview with Professor Miller. When I asked him how less than three short years after the most destructive war known to humanity we have gotten ourselves into the mental state for another war, he replied:

Professor MILLER. Mr. Gaeth, a country doesn't get itself into that state; the people in the country are gotten into that state by certain propagandists who operate through government, press, radio, church, schools, labor unions, patriotic groups, other groups, channels through which propaganda flows.

Mr. GAETH. Now, are we really in great danger or are we the subjects of extensive propaganda at the present time? What are the techniques being used on us?

Professor MILLER. Well, Mr. Gaeth, I think we are in great danger and chiefly because we are the unconscious subjects of propaganda which we don't even know is propaganda.

Mr. GAETH. Well now, what are these propagandists actually aiming at; what are they trying to do to us?

Professor MILLER. I don't know. I have several theories or ideas. There may be three or four aims involved. One of them may be the actual aim of preparation for war against Russia with the continuous day-after-day drumming up of a war hysteria against Russia. Number two—that may not be the real aim, that may be only the apparent aim—the real aim may be to give Congress and the people the reason for supporting compulsory military training and the renewal of the draft so that we will have millions of young men being trained in the Army and the other armed forces. And the purpose for that may be the fear of a coming depression, Mr. Gaeth. And you recall the last depression hundreds of thousands of young fellows wandered about the country and there was a good bit of confusion and chaos. This time it may well be that these young fellows are disciplined by the Army and to be called back into the Army to preserve law and order amongst themselves and amongst others. Then there is the third reason and that may be that this war hysteria is being whipped up simply to make it possible for a Democratic candidate or one of the Republican candidates to ride into office on the basis of its being almost treasonable not to vote for a man who wants the fullest preparation for a war in a time of apparent great danger.

Mr. GAETH. Now, when I stated that it would seem that the basis for going to war was much more a propaganda one than an actual one, that we really didn't have all the reasons for going to war held out for us, Professor Miller replied:

Professor MILLER. Well, I can't help but agree with you on that, Mr. Gaeth.

Mr. GAETH. Now, Professor Miller, what are the dangers of such name calling as the Russians and we Americans are engaging in?

Professor MILLER. Well, the danger of such name calling is very simple. The use of violent words directed by one person against another frequently can cause violent action. Now, if that is true of a few individuals hurling bad names at one another, it can also be true of the peoples of two nations or the propagandists of two nations whipping up hysteria amongst their peoples, breaking out in violence, in war.

Mr. GAETH. In other words, if we are driving for peace we don't use war technique and war propagandists to produce a peaceful state of affairs?

Professor MILLER. Right—if we are driving for peace we would use the methods of the peace maker and not the war maker if we really are sincere in the drive for peace.

Mr. GAETH. But then I wanted to know how we can sift the chaff from the wheat, what test could be applied to propaganda to determine whether we were being misled, and Professor Miller answered:

Professor MILLER. Well, first we ought to know what propaganda is. And I have tried to set that forth in a little booklet I did for a Methodist group, the Methodist Federation for Social Action, recently. And what is propaganda—it is nothing more or less than an attempt to persuade someone to do something. And it can be good or bad, depending on what you think is good or bad. I think the United States Constitution is good, and the Declaration of Independence is good, and the great ethics in all religions is good, and I think that good health is good, and propaganda that would persuade people to live up to those ethics and obligations and to have good health, I would say, would be good propaganda.

Secondly, we ought to know how propaganda works. It works both at the brain level and what you might call the spinal cord level. At the brain level, if I am a propagandist and I am trying to persuade you to do something, I attempt, if I am an honest and rational person, to martial relevant facts and opinions; and if you are a rational person you attempt to weigh those and come to a conclusion that is based upon those relevant facts and opinions. That is all open and above board and you are conscious of the process and so am I. Now, at the spinal cord level, we react to certain words and phrases such as "Communist" in America or "Capitalist" in Russia as bad words, and we are conditioned automatically to reject and condemn any person or program thus labeled.

Mr. GAETH. Now, when I asked if we Americans had a basis or a set of standards for judging good or bad propaganda, Professor Miller replied:

Professor MILLER. I think we in America are very fortunate, because we have in this country three things—first, we have the various religious groups, and their ethics make a common denominator of righteousness; secondly, we have the Declaration of Independence which is a wonderful ethical statement; and thirdly, we have our United States Constitution which implements that Declaration of Independence with concrete rights and obligations. Now, you wouldn't want any better standard for measuring propaganda than the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution. And, incidentally, you wouldn't want any better standard of government than those.

Mr. GAETH. A song may help us see the Red scare in a new light; the lyrics are by my friend E. Y. Harburg whose Broadway musical Finian's Rainbow has played to packed houses for more than 500 performances. This music is the old folk tune Molly Malone. Now here is comely Betty Sanders with her guitar presenting E. Y. Harburg's The Red Herring:

Miss SANDERS (singing The Red Herring):

"I'll sing you a ditty about Munich's fair city
Where a poor paperhanger hung out long ago,
Till he got an idea, a bright panacea,
Selling herring, red herring, alive, alive-o.

"With Goebbels and Goering he sold that red herring
To Quisling, Laval, and the boys in the know.
Europe fell like a sparrow beneath that wheelbarrow
Filled with herring, red herring, alive, alive-o.

"Now this red herring master soon met with disaster,
His wits were a-blitzed and his Fritz was laid low,
But his red-herring notion leaped over the ocean
And landed in Wall Street, alive, alive-o.

"Now Wall Street is bloomin', they sold it to Truman,
A nice little crisis for raisin' the dough,
The dough that will cure up the ills of all Europe,
Red herring, red herring, alive, alive-o.

"Now taxpaying millions are shelling out billions
For herring that Goering had sold long ago,
But American fellers have developed their smellers
And they'll bury that herring, alive, alive-o."

Mr. GAETH. Thank you, Betty Sanders, nicely done. And when war hysteria and propaganda aims to raise our temperatures we'll think of "the Red herring."

Next week I will deal with a crisis from within—three members of the Yale faculty will discuss the Mundt bill.

And now good night until next week at this same time.

In his broadcast Mr. Gaeth asked: "What are we trying to avert, war or peace?" I think that is a very pertinent question, Mr. President. What are we trying to avert in this country, war or peace? It looks as though we got more excited when it seemed we were going to have peace with the Russians than we do when it appears we are going to have war.

I might have sung that little ditty, Mr. President, but I expect it would have been absolutely against the rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, that is a pretty good example of what is going on in America. They just scare the people silly with this red herring, telling them that the Communists are going to get them, so they can pass most any sort of legislation. Honestly, the poor folks remind me of the sheep of Australia. There is some kind of a bird there that lights on the backs of the sheep and picks out their kidneys and they die. They are so dumb they do not know what is going on. The poor people of America have no way of knowing what is going on. The newspapers and magazines and radio are just full of propaganda against Russia, and all for this armament program, saddling an army on the people, just like the one Hitler had, just exactly, all these programs for them to give up the right of free speech and assembly, telling them that if they do not, the Communists are going to get them. The poor folks are just beside themselves, do not know what to do, so they just continue to work on them.

Mr. President, I was following a prepared statement awhile ago when I got sidetracked. I do not believe I had finished it. I have the statement right here now. I was telling about the President's Commission to look into the necessity for the draft. They turned in their report, and the only thing the Senate Armed Services Committee accepted was the draft, and that was the small part of the report. They said we needed a draft, but they told of all the other things we needed to go with it—assurances that there would be no discrimination, and things of that sort. But we have none of those things as it is now before the Senate.

They have asked me to permit them to appoint conferees, but one of my colleagues gave me a note a moment ago which said, "The conferees are ready to report." They do not care about whether they are appointed or not; they have gone ahead and held their conference, and, as I said earlier in the day, whenever they get the floor they will pull a request to appoint conferees out of one pocket and the conference report out of the other pocket. I will take awhile longer on the strength of that.

The ablest propagandists for military training, of course, have been, not the military themselves, but the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training.

Mr. President, as long as there is order in the Chamber I shall try to talk so people can hear me. When there is not order, I shall talk to the reporter.

I hasten to add that I have not seen any of these distinguished gentlemen who wrote the report in the forefront of those demanding that their principles, on which I have just touched, be retained intact in the military version of the draft we have before us. It does seem that, inasmuch as they wrote this report, they would be speaking up in behalf of their findings, and insisting that something be done about it, not just letting it go by the board by default, as they have been doing. These were able, representative American citizens who prepared this report of the President on the draft. But they are distinguished propagandists for all that, and they put out a fine report, very well set up, placed on sale throughout the country in a cheap edition for everyone to read. They have lent their names to an endeavor and enterprise of great seriousness.

This distinguished commission tells us that military training programs would have a great number of benefits. In their summary they list 12 such benefits. I assume these benefits accrue even more to the draft which would lengthen the time of service of our young men. After all, if the benefit of 6 months' or a year's training are so great, the benefits of 2 years' training should be either four or twice as great, perhaps even greater for the smaller number involved.

Let us consider these benefits in the light of the committee's insistence that segregation and discrimination must be a permanent part of the system. The first benefit offered by the Commission is that training would shorten the time in which our effective fighting force could be mobilized in case of war.

But segregation and discrimination, by barring the full use of one-tenth of our eligible people, acts in a contrary direction. Instead of shortening the time for mobilization, segregation and discrimination act to lengthen the time, because it introduces the factor of selecting men not on the basis of their ability to fight but on the color of their skin or perhaps the language they have used at home or even their religion.

The second alleged benefit is that it would give our young men the essentials of military training that would be the basic prerequisites for technical, specialized, or unit training in an emergency; and training saves lives. That is a curious argument about the need for a specialized army which I shall not discuss here. But it is important to note that this means training is supposed to fit men to move into higher and more specialized training, which all competent military authorities agree is necessary for modern warfare.

But the Army and Navy and Marine Corps and Air Force insist that this does not apply to all men, but only to some men. If there are Negroes, for example,

who are highly qualified for such spe-

types and extent of discrimination will de-

is applied in actuality to Negroes. We

history to write if he does not get on

tary have taken over. They really are

is such as to confirm us in asserting civil-

who are highly qualified for such specialized training, the military tell us and this bill writes into law, that they shall not be permitted to move freely across the barrier of segregation and discrimination into positions of training where they are of most use. Yes, indeed, as the Commission says, "training saves lives"—but only training of part of our manpower, not the training of the full complement of the manhood of America.

The third alleged benefit of training, according to the Commission, is that it would make possible an effective National Guard and Organized Army, Navy, Air, and Marine Reserves capable of rapid absorption into the professional Military Establishment in time of war. But again, if we apply the test which the military demands that we apply by their dictatorial ukase on segregation and discrimination, the effectiveness of the National Guard and the Reserves is reduced by so much as the armed forces practice segregation and discrimination. Again, the alleged benefit is destroyed or nullified by discrimination and segregation. As we have seen from the exchange of correspondence between the Secretary of the Army and the Governor of New Jersey, the Army intends to abide by the pattern of segregation in the National Guard, despite the President's order to abolish segregation and discrimination. This means the Army will see to it that the effectiveness of the National Guard will be reduced, if the Army can help it, by all those practices of segregation which bar the complete and wholehearted use of all men in the interests of a feudal obsession with caste.

The fourth alleged benefit from military training is that it would improve the efficiency, quality, and alertness of the Regular forces in peacetime. But if the committee, at the insistence of the military mind, inserts the qualification of segregation and discrimination, instead of improving efficiency it will be lowering the efficiency of the Regular forces. Instead of improving the quality and alertness of the Regular forces, it will cause their deterioration. What other result can there be from a system which creates false tensions between different groups of men, which seeks to keep men in the servitude of a lower caste, which places a premium on men acting in accordance with a feudal code? Alertness, efficiency, and improved quality of workmanship, whether in peacetime pursuits or in the armed forces, comes with freedom. Is that not our boast to the world—that we can outproduce the world because our people enjoy the blessings of freedom? But segregation and discrimination, upheld at the insistence of the military men, limits and curtails that freedom and by so much reduces the capacity of all men to function at their best.

The fifth alleged benefit, according to the Commission, is that it would help produce qualified Reserve officers in numbers that would assist in meeting the officer requirements of the Regular services and the civilian components and to staff the forces needed after M-day in any future crisis. I am quoting the Commission's report exactly. We all know that this is nonsense when it is applied in actuality to Negroes. We all know that Negroes are systematically kept from officer positions, by the order of the highest men in the armed forces. Let me quote some figures on the Army's policy toward admitting Negroes to the position of officers.

In 1940, when the Selective Service Act was passed, there were 4,451 Negroes in the Army but only 5 commissioned officers and 11 warrant officers. According to a War Department release of November 1, 1947, out of a total Negro Army strength of 58,437, there is a total of 937 Negro officers, and only 111 of that number are commissioned in the Regular Army. There are nine senior ROTC units. As late as 1940 not a single one of the more than 500 Negro Reserve officers had been called up for duty.

The Army places effective barriers in the way of Negroes becoming and remaining officers. Now the Navy is probably worse. The Marine Corps does not have any Negro officers. What is the effect of this practice on the alleged benefits which the Commission finds? Where is the alleged benefit of additional trained Reserves if the military mind refuses to train these men as officers and refuses to use them once they are forced to train them?

We have a good, objective story about the practical effect of this barrier of segregation and discrimination. The Gillem report of the Army, issued by the War Department on April 27, 1946, on utilization of Negro manpower in the postwar Army policy, has made a study of Negro performance in wartime. There were many fantastic and garbled and defamatory stories about the part played by Negroes during the war.

The Gillem Board investigated some of these instances. I do not know the facts myself, and I am a little suspicious about the findings of a board heavily weighted by the narrow military mind in a field which requires the utmost care and special training in social and sychological problems, a field that the Army does not particularly train for. But in any event, the Gillem Board has this to say in its summary:

From the evidence presented by the most experienced commanders, the Board cannot fail to conclude that the results obtained by all units are in direct proportion to the leadership demonstrated. The failures of Negro units have in almost every case been attributed to the lack of leadership qualities of junior officers and noncommissioned officers. Leadership, therefore, must be stressed and the development of all attributes which contribute to this must be the prime objective of those responsible for the training of the postwar Army.

This is one of those fine after-the-fact recommendations, a fine statement of principle and objective. But the very military men who make this kind of recommendation—and the recommendation boils down simply to giving Negroes full access without discrimination or segregation to training for officerhood—are the same men who insist on preventing that full access to training from becoming a reality. They throw out the window their own experience.

I submit, Mr. President, that the record of the military mind in this instance is such as to confirm us in asserting civilian authority and independent judgment over their actions. I further submit, Mr. President, that the Armed Services Committee has failed the Senate in submitting to the dictates of the military prejudice when they removed the ban on segregation and discrimination from this bill. The Armed Services Committee might well post in its committee room the famous remark attributed to Clemenceau, the Tiger of France, that the business of war was too important to be left to the military. Certainly the record of the military in this field is so bad that one cannot trust their judgment. They have done everything to violate the principles which make for a good and efficient army, and they will continue to do so.

I do not think I need to burden the Senate with more than a brief consideration of the other alleged benefits supposedly coming from military training, according to the Commission. Senators can, if they will, read them. I merely ask that in reading these alleged benefits each Senator ask himself whether the ban on segregation and discrimination will increase those benefits or lessen them. I am confident that any candid examination will reveal that segregation and discrimination nullify all of those alleged benefits.

The Commission finds a benefit from military training in inculcating spiritual and moral ideals in support of American democracy. These would be nullified by segregation which inculcates the ideals of Hitler's master race, not democracy.

The Commission says it would establish a pool of young, physically fit, and trained Reserves for future mobilization, and provide a large trained group in every community to deal with civil defense. But this is utterly refuted by segregation—for segregation makes for two pools, not a large pool, and diminishes the strength of our people instead of increasing it. And segregation means that civil defense, too, I presume, would have to proceed by setting up one alarm system for whites and another for Negroes, with separate bombproof shelters for both groups, and all the other double bookkeeping that goes on in a discriminated and segregated army ordering a civilian economy.

But the real jokers are the benefits alleged by the Commission of helping to channel qualified young men into programs of scientific and vocational training in fields important to national defense. In peacetime the Navy excluded Negroes from naval service except as messmen. I can see young college-trained Negroes—where they have been fortunate enough to get the peacetime training—being channeled into the important field of serving on tables in the Navy and thus contributing best to our national defense. I can see the embryo Negro scientists who are made to serve in sanitary companies enjoying the feeling that their talents were being used to best advantage. As the representative of the National Association for Colored People said to the Senate committee:

So long as Congress leaves the military with unfettered discretion to discriminate as it may please in training and service, the types and extent of discrimination will depend as a practical matter upon the will of the officers who are administering or supervising particular programs. This Congress should not permit it.

Negroes with talent and ability are specifically excluded by the brass hats of whatever echelon from many important functions where their abilities are much needed. They are excluded entirely from becoming pilots in the Air Transport Command even today. When the Army badly needed 10,000 meteorologists and weather observers, the Army nonetheless specifically excluded all qualified Negroes from this much-needed service. Even when the need is overwhelming, it is apparently never overwhelming enough for the brass hats to overcome their encrusted prejudices. The Army's excuse was that it already had seven Negroes in this field and that number was enough.

I submit, Mr. President, that this record convicts the military not only of undemocratic tendencies, but perhaps even more fatally, of incompetence. We cannot afford to trust men with such mentalities, men who will place their prejudices ahead of the democratic ideal, men who will set their own ideas against the orders of their Commander in Chief in this field, men who would rather perpetuate their ancient abuses than to run the most efficient Military Establishment they can.

I submit, Mr. President, that this bill, by cutting out the ban on segregation and discrimination, by cutting its cloth to the fit of the military mind, stands convicted on this one point alone and does not deserve the support of any Member of the Senate concerned with the strengthening and preservation of our democracy.

On April 3 America's illustrious historian, Dr. Charles A. Beard, sent a solemn warning to the Senate Armed Services Committee, which begins on page 1053 of the report of the hearings. I wish that all America might heed his warning at this late hour. Dr. Beard calls this step the most momentous step in the history of the Republic. I quote from the statement of Dr. Beard.

The statement of Dr. Charles A. Beard was read by Dr. Charles C. Tansill, of Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. Mr. President, bear in mind that Dr. Beard is one of the foremost historians in the United States, if not our foremost historian. He should know something about what he is talking about. He has spent a lifetime studying these things.

Here is what Dr. Beard had to say about this question of a peacetime draft, speaking through Dr. Tansill. Dr. Tansill said:

Dr. TANSILL. I have been asked by Prof. Charles A. Beard to read his statement this morning. This is his statement:

"I regret that the state of my health at the age of 73 prevents me from appearing before this committee in person to protest against efforts, amid war alarms, to fasten on our country military conscription as a fixed national policy."

Those are the words of our foremost historian, Mr. President. He probably can see that there will not be much more history to write if he does not get on the job here pretty quick.

He goes on to say:

Universal military training, so-called, represents an attempt to implant in the United States a well-known curse of the Old World. I have studied it on the ground there and in the melancholy history of the nations brought to ruin or servitude under its degrading influence, gross and subtle.

This system of conscription would violate every liberty to which our Nation has been dedicated since the foundation of the Republic.

Mr. President, it is said that those who study history generally are able to look into the future fairly well. Dr. Beard has spent his life at studying history, I suppose, and he says we do not want military training.

I read further:

It would destroy the freedom which our ancestors, having fled from the despotism of Europe, established for themselves and their posterity on American soil.

Mr. President, that is what I am fighting for tonight: to maintain the liberties for which the founding fathers fought. What I am fighting against here, tonight, is the European ideology, the idea that you can draft men and make them fight, and that they will fight with their hearts in what they are doing.

I read further:

It would create a monstrous military bureaucracy drawn from the upper and middle classes.

That is true, Mr. President. The Army is starting to do that now; it is getting very snooty about who will be accepted as volunteers into the Army. Those who volunteer have to pass tests almost as difficult as the tests that are given to the young men who wish to go to West Point. The Army now wants none but the very best. Of course, in order to pass those tests, a young man must have been well educated, and of course the ones who are the best educated come from the upper brackets. So that makes the Army an elite profession, as it was in Germany under the Junkers, with all their polished boots and fancy uniforms. Probably that is the next thing we shall have over here. Dr. Beard further says:

It would enslave the sons of the plain people—farmers, industrial workers, and all other laborers who toil with their hands for a living.

Charles Beard knows what he is talking about; he is one of our foremost historians. He has studied all the European systems which included conscription, and he knows what conscription does to people. He is trying to warn us.

Mr. President, I warrant that there are not a dozen Senators who have read this statement of Dr. Beard's, aside from those who were at the committee hearings. Yet we presume to act, even without preparation, with no understanding of what we are doing to our American way of life, to our traditional freedoms.

Dr. Beard further says:

It will exalt the military above the civil, and thus would work for the overthrow of the first principles upon which the Constitution of the United States is based.

Of course the military is exalted above the civil now, Mr. President. The military have taken over. They really are running our country. We still have some forms left; we still can talk here in the Senate all we please, but the military go ahead and do as they please. We in Congress appropriate $100,000,000 for Turkey; but, lo and behold, the military spend a billion dollars in Turkey. They have things figured out so well, now, that they simply use the surplus. When we in Congress appropriate only $100,000,000, the military buy a billion dollars' worth of material and declare it surplus, and then sell it for $100,000,000.

So they can do anything they please, anywhere in the world. Mr. President, the military has become very, very powerful.

Dr. Beard further says:

In its insinuating and insidious course, it would serve the cause of those leaders in military and civil life who exalt the Executive above the legislative and are now claiming that the President has a right to make war at his own discretion, without any declaration of hostilities by the Congress—under the new dogma that the best defense is secret offense.

Mr. President, everything Dr. Beard says is true. Today the military are attempting to enslave us on the pretext that we are too dumb to know what is going on. Even the Senate does not know what is going on. There are just a few persons who know what is going on in the United States in the way of national defense activities.

Dr. Beard further says:

This ominous tendency of our days I describe at length in my book on President Roosevelt and the coming of the war, 1941. Owing to my inability to give a review of it in person, I respectfully direct attention to the last chapter (pp. 582 ff.) and I have requested my good friend, Dr. Charles C. Tansill, professor at Georgetown University, to present these supplementary views to the committee.

The people of the United States are now called upon by high civil and military authorities in Washington to take the most momentous step in the history of the Republic.

Mr. President, that statement comes from Dr. Charles Beard, our most eminent historian. He says this is the most momentous step in the history of the Republic. Yet there were those, today, who criticized me because I chose to talk at this time. Some said that I was abusing the democratic privilege. Mr. President, it is they who are selling us down the river. Our democracy soon will be gone. I am the one who is defending our democratic privileges, in a last-ditch fight against those who would have us go the way of Europe, of fascism or nazism.

Dr. Beard then says:

They are called upon to make conscription of young men, or, to use more pleasant words, universal military service, a permanent policy in peacetime as well as wartime.

As I have said, Mr. President, once these things are fastened upon us, whether it be the armament economy into which we are moving or whether it be peacetime conscription, once they are fastened upon us, we shall not be able to get rid of them. There are too many

vested interests tied up and associated with these things, and then our freedoms will be gone forever. Dr. Beard then says:

The subject has been argued, for and against, in thousands of pages, but the arguments thus far presented miss the main point in the dispute. Nor is there any evidence in the brief for the affirmative filed by President Truman's Commission on Universal Service that the authors of that document made any serious study of this point or were indeed competent to discuss it out of comprehensive knowledge.

It is this neglected main point that makes the step, if taken, the most momentous step in the history of the Republic—a radical departure from all peacetime life and experience in the United States since 1776.

It is a sad commentary, Mr. President, that in spite of the testimony of this great historian, this man who has no ax to grind, no motive except to warn his fellow Americans, there is but one voice raised in the United States Senate against the enslavement of the American people, against the abandonment of all the free institutions we have known down through the years, the things for which our fathers and our grandfathers have fought. He says:

The universal liability of all able-bodied men to defend their country was recognized by the founders of the Republic and still stands as an acceptable principle. This is, then, not the main point in the controversy.

The country is to be defended to the last ditch against foreign enemies. That, too, is an accepted principle—by all save extreme pacifists. Whether a huge conscript army would be the most effective instrument of defense in an age of atom bombs and guided projectiles is debatable. In fact, grave doubts as to its effectiveness in our age are warranted by the knowledge that military men are prone to prepare for the next war mainly in terms of experience in the last war. But in the argument over conscription this is not the main point.

The main point in the argument before the country is: The menacing impacts of universal military service on every branch of civil life, on all civil liberties, on all the virtues that make America precious to the people, on every aspect of American civilization.

It will be said this is a vague statement that cannot be proved; and besides, we are assured to the contrary by President Truman, high military men, and the President's Commission on Military Service.

With all due respect for such eminent personages, there is higher authority to give us instruction on consequences of universal military service and the huge military establishment which inevitably accompanies it. This authority is the long experience of the nations which have made universal service an instrument of permanent policy.

It will be replied by the exponents of the new course, the American people are different from all other peoples and so they will preserve their civil liberties intact and all other values of American life under a regime of universal military service.

With respect to those who reject experience with universal military service and proceed on the pleasing theory that Americans are a chosen people immune to its dangerous consequences, there is an authority on the other side of the argument more worthy of consideration.

It is the authority of the framers of the Constitution, to whom we are indebted for our form of Government, which survived the storms of 160 years. The one thing on which they all agreed was that historical experience with military establishments, ancient and modern, had demonstrated their peril to civilian life, economy, and liberty.

One of the framers of the Constitution, preeminent for knowledge of human experience with military establishments, James Madison, summed up their convictions, as a warning to their fellow citizens and to posterity, in the words:

"The veteran legions of Rome were an overmatch for the undisciplined valor of other nations and rendered her mistress of the world. Not less true is it that the liberties of Rome proved the final victim to her military triumphs; and that the liberties of Europe, as far as they ever existed, have, with a few exceptions, been the price of her military establishments. A standing force therefore is dangerous, at the same time that it may be a necessary provision. On the smallest scale, it has its inconveniences. On an extensive scale, its consequences may be fatal. On any scale, it is an object of laudable circumspection and precaution. A wise nation will combine all these considerations; and, whilst it does not rashly preclude itself from any resource which may become essential to its safety, it will exert all its prudence in diminishing both the necessity and danger of resorting to one which may be inauspicious to its liberties." (The Federalist, No. 41.)

Mr. President, that is a pretty stringent warning. I know that there are Senators here who knew they should not vote for this bill. They voted for it because of the Red smear, just afraid that if they did not, somebody would say they were traitors, selling out their country. Well, that might be right, Mr. President, but we are selling out our country by voting for a measure like this. We shall lose to native Fascists all the freedoms that they warn us we are going to lose to foreign Communists.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] broke in at this point in the testimony and had something to say to Mr. Beard. We shall skip that, and go on with Mr. Beard's testimony:

There, in James Madison's admonition, is an imperative warning against the menace of military establishments, against their everlasting danger to civil liberty. Since Madison's time the experience of many great nations with universal conscription and huge military establishments has furnished additional evidence to confirm the instruction provided by the framers of the Constitution. Surely, in the first principles of the Constitution and in the experience of all countries which have had or now have universal conscription, we have better guidance than in all the rhetoric employed by contemporaries who know little or nothing about universal service as historical experience or at first hand.

To indicate what will be found when Europe's experience with universal military service is examined, I give the following brief description of a common soldier's career under the regime as operated in Germany before World War I—before Hitler's "refinements" had been invented. This description is drawn from specific sources of information for the authenticity of which I can vouch.

1. The influence of the army on this common soldier's life began as soon as he entered the first grade of the elementary school. In a short time a wooden stick was placed in his hand, and along with his classmates he was taught the goosestep. The teacher, a former soldier himself, took advantage of every occasion to praise the military virtues, and the textbooks used for instruction confirmed the praise. Not a breath of criticism or objection was ever allowed in the classroom or on the playground. Boys who gave any hints of opposition were warned and marked.

Mr. President, that is just as it is in the Senate. Anyone who opposes the militarization of the country is a marked man; he is branded as a Communist. So some of us are afraid to speak up. It is too bad.

The one thing constantly hammered into the head of every boy was his duty to render his obligatory military service, without raising any questions whatever, and to render it in the spirit of abject obedience to military authorities.

Mr. President, that is a disgusting situation. I have three sons. If this country were in danger I would expect them, when they are of age, to defend it, but, by the heavens, I hate the prospect of their being bossed around in peacetime in a military conscripted peacetime army.

As the time approached for the induction of this German boy into the military training service, he was not free to leave the country. The only way he could have escaped it was to run away secretly by hook or crook, or to secure a forged passport by bribing the proper officials. As he was a poor boy, whose parents had no money or special privileges, he had to stay in his country and take what came. In other words, the boy in a working class or farming family could seldom, if ever, escape the clutches of the military authorities by fleeing to some foreign land.

That is not a pretty picture of future America which Mr. Beard is painting for us.

As soon as this boy was inducted into training service, he was given a small record book in which were entered certain facts about his early life, and then from time to time other facts about his conduct in the service. This book he had to keep always at hand and show it on demand when questioned by his superiors.

Our own War Department is already moving in the direction of requiring just such a record. In its form on officer qualifications (AGO No. 0857) a complete personal history is compiled for each officer and I am certain records of the same nature will be maintained for all enlisted men. In time this will develop into the same detailed inquisition into the private life of every citizen as it did in Germany.

While in training service this boy was subjected in all matters to strict military law, which provided forms of punishment for breaches of duty. In addition, there were innumerable ways in which any officer, high or low, could punish him for trivial or other acts not mentioned in the military law and make life miserable for him during the entire period of his original training service, and later while he was in the various stages of Reserve service and called up at specific times for supplementary training.

During the period of his original training service, the soldier's life and activities were regimented down to the last detail. All newspapers, magazines, books pamphlets, and other reading matter available to the privates were censored by officers. The mere possession of any printed matter not officially approved was dangerous and might send the soldier to the guardhouse for days, to live on bread and water. Every package of food, cigarettes, or other objects sent to the boy by his parents or friends had to be opened in the presence of an officer and if it happened to be wrapped in a piece of a newspaper banned by the military, the private was penalized for the very act of receiving it.

Imagine, Mr. President. That is what the Senate is trying to vote on America.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer has endeavored to keep the Chamber in order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, it is of very little consequence to me. I shall be happy to try to speak out and be heard if order is maintained. If it is not, I shall not exert myself.

I continue quoting from Mr. Beard:

Even when on furlough during the original training period, the soldier was ever under the watchful eye of the military. On his arrival home, he had to report his whereabouts immediately to the head of his military district so that he could be reached at any moment. Before leaving home on his return to service he had to report again to the head of his district and give him the details of the return journey to the barracks.

After this German private had finished his original training period, his record book was duly signed and he was allowed to go home. When he sought employment, his prospective employer might ask for his record book. This act on the part of the employer was not required by law, but he was "on the safe side" in inquiring into the applicant's military record. At all events an "unsatisfactory" military record could make it difficult for a man to secure employment after he had completed the first stage of his military training.

If we say all these military controls over our people will not happen here, let me answer that such authority over private lives of our people is already proposed by an official report and endorsed by the military.

I quote paragraph 7 on page 35 in the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training as follows:

"Universal training would involve the maintenance of an appropriate selective-service system adaptable to rapid conversion to wartime needs. It would make possible also a continuous inventory of military skills, aptitudes, and leadership qualities, which could be used advantageously in making military assignments in wartime. This inventory would be especially helpful if a check were maintained on the whereabouts, subsequent training, skills, occupation, and dependency status of those who complete their basic training. A selective-service machinery, actively functioning in peacetime, would be a decided military asset in wartime."

Completion of the original training service did not free the young man from military control. His after life, until he reached the age of 45, was divided into two periods. For the first period, he was in the reserve, or reserves, and for the second, in the Landwehr, or militia. During each of these periods he had to report at stated times for supplementary military training.

A particularly obnoxious feature of the German military reserve system was the Kontrolversammlung, or muster of reserves. This control meeting was an assembly at which the men of a country or smaller unit who were in the reserve or Landwehr had to appear for inspection and instruction by a military officer. On the day of this meeting all of these men were under military law and jurisdiction and any one of them who committed a misdemeanor during the day could be severely punished under military law.

If to this description of a young man's career under the system of universal service in Germany were added a description of the way in which the military system affected the daily affairs of all German people—family life, education, employment, amusements, intellectual pursuits, and civil liberties—it would be seen immediately that the whole of German society was subdued to its weight. To imagine that the American people would escape the major effects of this militarism, if universal military service were permanently established in the United States, is to indulge in daydreaming and self-deception.

If the President and the military leaders force conscription upon the American people, they will find that instead of gaining in national security, they will have destroyed the real essence of American strength—the spirit of a free people which has twice brought us victories over conscripted armies.

It is almost unbelievable, Mr. President, that the Senate has failed to heed this warning of Mr. Charles Beard, this famous historian. He continued:

Hence, before the Congress of the United States subjects the country to "universal service" under military administration, it should establish a commission on experiences with universal conscription, for the purpose of inquiring into what it has meant in other countries and will mean here, in all probability, if adopted. Such a commission should include only men and women who can read the necessary foreign languages and have an extensive knowledge of military history. Such a commission should hear not only military officers, educators, pacifists, and people of that kind always eager to testify. It should also hear what men and women who have had experiences with universal military service have to say about its impacts on individual family, and social life in general. There has been enough "big talk" about the subject. The time has come to get down to the brass tacks. For Congress to act without having command of this knowledge is to betray its trust, despite all the clamor and all the Gallup polls.

But if Congress is unwilling to create such a commission of its own and have an inquiry made by persons competent to make it, then there is one thing that the Members of Congress are themselves especially fitted to consider before peacetime conscription in any form is permanently placed on the backs of the American people. Members of Congress represent the States and communities of the Union and are intimately acquainted with their constituencies. By numerous addresses recently made in the two Chambers, Republicans and Democrats alike have made it evident that they are alarmed by the highly centralized power already assumed by the National Government over the States and communities.

Even those Members of Congress who are not experts in military affairs know very well that a special centralization of power over life and property must come if a huge body of young men is conscripted and placed under the control of professional military officers. Members of Congress know that power once brought into being grows on the meat fed to it, is never satisfied with what it gets but demands more and more, resents restraints imposed on it, and ever strives to become sovereign in its own right. If Members of Congress rightly fear civil centralization and the growth of an independent civil bureaucracy, they have far more reason for fearing military centralization and a military bureaucracy, based on the control of the Nation's youth—physical, moral, and intellectual control—by professional military officers whose tenure is permanent and survives all passing Senators, Representatives, and Presidents.

Mr. President, how we can bow our necks and go ahead with this thing after testimony like that was given before the committee, after it appeared in the volume of testimony for all to read, how we can still go ahead and blithely bring an end to the era of freedom that has been America, is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator will recall that earlier in the evening I propounded a query as to whether or not the distinguished Senator might let us vote on the motion, and he would then have another opportunity, of course, to continue his speech on the conference report when it came in. Does the Senator feel that he would be receptive to the propounding of that question again?

Mr. TAYLOR. I should be happy to quit if I thought the conference report would not be brought in until morning, but if they have it in their hip pocket, I am going on and talk.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, I cannot advise the Senator about what will happen with the conference report. What I am suggesting to him once again is that no matter when it comes back, he might continue his speech without prejudice to his right to make any argument he might wish to make. I am not in any way trying to cut the Senator off. If the Senator desires to continue, it is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I will talk a while longer.

(Applause in the galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the occupants of the galleries that demonstrations of any character are not permitted. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, after the hearings of the Senate Armed Services Committee were closed abruptly, with many other organizations waiting to give testimony against the peacetime draft, the House Armed Services Committee held hearings which brought out much evidence that is recent and pertinent to the question before the Senate.

On Tuesday, April 20, Dr. Alonzo Myers, who is chairman of the department of higher education of the National Education Association gave very damaging testimony which all should hear. Dr. Myers testimony is at hand and I wish to read from it to let the Nation know that the proposed draft bill is unnecessary.

The testimony begins on page 6464 of the House Armed Services Committee hearing, and Dr. Myers testified:

My name is Alonzo F. Myers; I am chairman of the department of higher education of the National Education Association. I am, however, testifying today in behalf of the national council against conscription, of which I am a national cochairman.

When selective service was proposed by the President last month it was with such fanfare and atmosphere of crisis that there were many Americans who thought war was imminent. Since then we have been assured by Secretary of the Army Royall that war is not imminent and by Secretary Forrestal that we are in a tension—not a crisis.

We have had no evidence that Russia is planning by military invasion of other nations to precipitate a war with the United States. Although she had vastly superior numbers on hand and within calling distance, Russia permitted a token force of

American soldiers to bar her from the Berlin railroad station. Moreover, recent political developments seem to indicate that Russia is not thinking in terms of immediate war. The new treaty between Russia and Finland wherein the Soviet accepted the more moderate treaty draft of the Finns rather than risk a possible conflict is a straw in the wind. And the comparatively quiet Italian elections seem to indicate that western Europe will have a chance without war to wage the economic and political struggle against communism.

In support of this reasoning we can turn to the statement of General Clay: "The present conflict in Germany 'is a political one and not a military one.'" (New York Times, March 26, 1948.)

We can also turn to General Bradley's testimony, March 25, before the Senate Armed Services Committee. He pointed out that if selective service should pass and the size of the Army should be increased, the Army would not increase American strength in Europe but would actually withdraw 3,000 men.

Since any attack upon the United States must come either through the air or via the sea, we believe that the Air Force and the Navy, whose task is to intercept any aerial or naval attack, must be the first lines of defense as well as the major vehicles of offense in the early stages of a war. The fact that the Secretary of Air and the Secretary of Navy told this committee that they did not need selective service in order to get recruits for the Air Force and the Navy, seems to us to destroy completely any case for a peacetime draft. We want, therefore, to examine very closely the Army's request for an increase in strength as well as their request for a draft.

We do not believe that the Army is justified in asking an increase beyond its authorized strength.

1. In support of this we want to quote from the recently concluded Senate hearings. Lt. Gen. W. S. Paul, in a statement on April 2, said that "the Army holds to the view that the proposed present increase in strength is not a mobilization for war, but merely an increase in the strength of the active force in order to permit the Army to carry out its global commitments." But when you examine the proposed deployment of Army forces, according to General Bradley, only 13,000 additional combat troops and 1,000 service troops would be sent overseas if the Army increased its strength by 240,000 men and got a peacetime draft. This is only a token increase overseas and does not in our opinion justify a draft. The bulk of the increase, or 226,000 men, would remain in the United States to swell Army ranks here.

2. We have not been impressed with the argument that the Army must maintain a balance with the Air Force in peacetime. Both Secretary Royall and General Bradley, for example, told the Senate committee that if the Air Force were increased to 70 groups, the Army must provide only an additional 15,000 service troops to support the Air Force.

The proposed Ground Forces increase, even if adopted, would not provide enough additional combat troops for Air Force support to permit a balanced operation against Russian troops in Europe and Asia in the early stages of a war. The Air Force can swing into immediate action in the event of war, whereas ground troops would have to be augmented by millions beyond the proposed increase if the Army were to attempt to meet the onslaught of Russian ground forces in Europe or Asia. No matter how well balanced with the Air Force the Army is, we do not see how the Army can, in the early stages of a war prior to all-out mobilization of manpower and of industry, to which they must look for a steady and adequate flow of supplies, actually maintain or take bases anywhere in the Russian orbit.

While we do not want to overemphasize this, we do believe there is some truth to the newspaper accounts which have implied that prestige and jealousy among the various branches of the armed forces may account somewhat for the desire of the Army not to be out of balance with the Air Force. The New York Times of April 14 described the situation as follows:

"The unification of the country's armed services, achieved after many years, had not lessened a whit the rivalry between them. • • • The necessity of maintaining absolute balance between the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, urged by Secretary Forrestal, was overemphasized for the sake of keeping peace among the three services."

An earlier report of the New York Times appearing in the March 16 issue described decisions made at the Key West meeting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as follows:

"On the other hand, the discussion apparently revealed that many of the service traditions and preconceived notions of warfare • • • still were important factors in trying to reach agreed decisions."

Business Week for April 10 said of the Key West conference:

"The conference was highly publicized, but you must read between the lines to find out what really was decided. Instead of an integrated defense program that would subordinate land and sea power to the requirements of the air age, the Joint Chiefs of Staff came up with this deal: If a dollar is spent to enlarge our air power, the Army and Navy must each get a dollar, too."

They are getting them, Mr. President. Senators have never seen appropriation bills which have come to the Senate for the Army or the Navy or the Air Force trimmed; they always have been "upped" substantial percentages. They are really getting the dollars.

As a further indication of the problem, Hanson Baldwin on April 15 wrote:

"The Air Force believes that Russia can be defeated, if war should come, with atomic and other bombs by planes operating from bases secure by distance. Many of its leaders believe no attempt should be made to establish bases which might be overrun by Russian ground forces but that bombing should be conducted from bases 2,000 to 2,500 miles away.

"The ground forces and the Navy do not believe that atomic bombing alone would defeat Russia, even if atomic bombs were used in a war—which is by no means certain. They hold that intermediate or close-up bases would be necessary, in any case, for effective bombardment and that these must be seized and defended and supplied by seaground power.

"This—in oversimplified fashion—is the basic cleavage between the services. The consequential cleavage—quite probably a subconscious one—is as follows: General Bradley emphasized today Russia's ground strength. His estimate of 170 Russian divisions • • • is not accepted by some of the other services without qualifications. They hold that most of these divisions are organized in cadre form only and that Russia probably has only 40 to 60—perhaps a few more—full-strength divisions.

"On the other hand, the Air Force's estimates of Russian air power are extreme. • • • Estimates of Russian military strength by the services thus differ widely, with each service subconsciously tending to emphasize the arm with which it is particularly concerned. Nor has Central Intelligence Agency, supposedly the coordinating agency of all intelligence services and now smarting under the shame of Bogota, been able to reconcile these differences."

3. General Bradley told this committee that selective service must stay in operation until universal military training is passed. He said: "If our Reserve units were filled up with men with proper training, we believe we could reduce the size of our Regular Army. And it might get it down to a point where it could be maintained by voluntary enlistment." This is, of all arguments, the least convincing because the Army has over a million volunteer Reserves whom it has deliberately neglected. The April 10 Collier's contained an article by a Reserve officer, Does the Army Want the Reserves? It stated:

"1. As of September 30, 1947, only 186,998 of the 509,255 Reserve officers had been assigned to units, and even this figure was misleadingly high. Of the 189,998 total, over 80,000 were, according to General Evans, assigned to pools, not to real, functioning military units.

"2. The 631,039 ex-GI's who signed up with the Reserves have been even more neglected. Merely 71,668 of them have been given assignments, and again, a large proportion of these went to pools.

"3. Not one Reserve unit has been given adequate equipment, although millions of rifles, artillery pieces, and other material are lying idle or being shipped overseas."

Mr. President, the boys who run the Army are actually, I believe, the biggest finaglers anywhere. We talk about the old Army game. They really play it. They insist on new equipment every day of the week. They will not even use the old equipment. They are sending it to Turkey or somewhere else, and letting the Reserves in this country train with broomsticks or sit around twiddling their fingers.

"4. Just 6,418 Reserve officers and 1,199 enlisted reservists received any sort of field training from the Ground and Service Forces during the first quarter of the 1948 fiscal year, the last period for which figures are available."

I presume the generals, captains, majors, and colonels were too busy entertaining the boys who were going to vote for them. They did not have any time to train any Reserves.

"5. To date, the Army has not formulated any real long-range program for Reserve training. The Army Ground Forces have not even issued a directive on training policies. At the most recent muster, only 28,000 reservists were enrolled in the Army's correspondence courses."

Since General Bradley stated that "if our Reserve units were filled up with men with proper training we believe we could reduce the size of our Regular Army," we believe Congress should forthwith make use of the Reserves and reduce the size of the Army. The Army failure to use Volunteer Reserves ought not to justify the constant pressure the Army is putting on the citizens of the country and on Congress for a compulsory system.

While we are discussing the Reserves, Mr. Chairman, it would be well for the committee to recall the testimony given last July by General Collins, Deputy Chief of Staff. He said, "Our analysis in the War Department indicates we would have the need of a force of about 1,750,000 men available as an M-day force in the event we ever have to fight a major war again." He used this as an argument for UMT. May I point out that if the Army were to train its Volunteer Reserves it would have, together with the National Guard and its Regular force, more than the 1,750,000 men required for M-day. This seems to us to be an argument against authorizing an increase in the Ground Forces and an argument against a peacetime draft.

Mr. President, I depart from my reading of the testimony to say that the Army has shown conclusively, to anyone who wishes to look into the question, that it does not want volunteers. What it wants is this iniquitous peacetime draft, so that the military can get their hooks into us and keep us forevermore. Then they will really have things their way.

4. A fourth reason against giving the Army an increase at this time is the fact that the Army is using uniformed personnel to do civilian jobs. The March 25 Chicago Tribune states:

"More than 50,000 Army, Navy, and Air Force men in uniform are sitting behind desks performing clerical and administrative tasks which could be done at less cost by civilian clerks, a Government personnel expert asserted today. These thousands of desk jobs handled by GI red-tape artists could be done more efficiently and economically by girl clerks or other well-trained civilians whose pay is far less than the cost of maintaining a soldier or a sailor."

The Washington Post of March 19, 1948 says

"Military people were brought in and told to do the civilian jobs • • • Thousands of jobs such as hospital attendants, firefighters, guards, skilled trades, and even typists and file clerks were filled by military men. It certainly isn't economy as it will cost more in the long run to have a military person in a civilian job." The Post goes on to say that Congress is responsible for the cut in civilian personnel.

While we are speaking of military personnel who are filling unnecessary civilian posts, we might as well speak of military personnel being siphoned off from essential work to man the Fort Knox showcase to which thousands of civilians are being brought annually to be propagandized for UMT. These, plus other uniformed men who occupy public relations and propaganda jobs to sell UMT, could be put on genuine military duty if the Army desperately needs men.

Our next point, Mr. Chairman, deals with the question of Army personnel and recruiting. The people of this country have been led by Army spokesmen to believe that the Army is over a hundred thousand men below its authorized strength. This is only a partial truth. The authorized strength of 670,000 is a ceiling set by Congress beyond which the Army should not go. The actual strength each year is recommended by the President in his budget message and finally set by Congress through the appropriation voted. The Army has been granted enough money to support 560,000 men, which means that the Army is under the recommended strength by about 18,000, and not by about a hundred thousand. And what is more important, during the early part of this fiscal year the Army did maintain a strength of 560,000 or better.

The President in his budget message this year asked for money for 560,000 ground troops for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948. Even if he had asked for the full 670,000 permitted by Congress, we believe it would be possible to get these men by the volunteer method, as we hope to show in a moment.

The first suggestion for improvement of Army recruiting has to do with the problem of reenlistment. General Bradley told the Senate committee that the Army expects this year to lose 240,000 men whose terms expire. If this is correct, it means that almost half of the Army's present strength have decided not to reenlist. We believe much of this is due to dissatisfaction with the Army as a result of conditions which could be corrected. The Army has failed to meet the demands of veterans for a drastic revision of its court-martial system. Many enlisted men have found from bitter experience that justice means one thing for officers and another thing for enlisted men. Likewise, the Army has failed to implement the recommendations of the Doolittle Board. Many men object to the officer caste system. A former editor of Stars and Stripes, in an article in Life magazine, wrote:

"The lord-and-master overtones of the present officer-and-enlisted man relationship are at best an archaic hold-over from several hundred years back. The good officer does not need it to enforce discipline and will almost invariably mellow the distinctions. In too many cases these zealously guarded distinctions protect the inefficient and inferior officer more than they contribute to Army discipline." He went on to speak of the off-limits and out-of-bounds signs for enlisted men which caused deep resentment.

If the Army were to meet these important demands of veterans there would undoubtedly be more men who would want to reenlist. We have two other suggestions at this point. Why doesn't the Army accept short-term reenlistments for a year, as they did in 1945 and 1946? And why doesn't the Army follow General Paul's suggestion about housing? He was quoted in the October 11, 1947, New York Times as having said that he believed the manpower picture would improve materially if more decent housing could be assured in the Army. If the Army had put into housing the millions of dollars spent on propaganda for UMT, including the expensive Fort Knox experimental unit, they would have done something concrete to solve their manpower problem.

With respect to new enlistments, everything we said about improving the Army would help. In addition, we want to call attention to the statements of the Army recruiting chief that the Army has been turning down "about 50 percent of those who apply for enlistment," because the Army has raised its requirements from a 70- to an 80-grade in the Army general classification test (New York Times, September 10, 1947).

Army spokesmen in the Senate hearings maintained that they did not want to lower the grade from an 80 to 70 because every man should be a specialist in some function. However, an official Army pamphlet entitled "The Fort Knox Experiment," which was reprinted in the Senate hearings, refers to "the 70 minimum which is usual for Army enlistment." And General Eisenhower on April 2 told the Senate committee: "My memory is sometimes tricky, but I thought I had directed before I left the Chief of Staff, to drop for the Ground Forces at least, the figure is back to 70, and I thought there is where it was so we could fill up certain places where we could do this."

Out of about 60 jobs in the Army, we are informed that at least 15 can be performed by men in the 70- to 80-grade group. These include such jobs as longshoreman, amphibious truck driver, amphibious tractor driver, duty soldier I, duty soldier II, duty soldier III, cook, section hand.

General Paul is quoted in the Senate hearings as saying about the Army general classification test that, "The standard score is not an IQ and does not involve the notion of mental age." The Army's tables submitted to the Senate committee compare the years of education with the scores made on the Army general classification test. They reveal that only 9 persons with more than 16 years of education and only 105 persons with more than 12 years of education, and 1,593 with more than 10 years of education have failed to get an 80 AGCT grade, whereas only 148 persons with less than a fourth-grade education were able to get more than an 80 score. The problem seems to be one of education and not necessarily a matter of intelligence. The question should be asked: "Since the Army conducted literacy training and other education during the war and would do so if universal military training passes, why doesn't it do so now and accept men with lower educational standards?"

Another disturbing thing about Army testimony is the Army's insistence on getting the best young men of the Nation to go into the Army. A nation cannot remain strong if the Army takes the best and disregards the needs of the civilian population. For example, as Hanson Baldwin points out, the Army has about 1 doctor for every 88 men and 1 dentist for every 451, and the Air Force 1 doctor for every 190 and 1 dentist for every 832. Yet the country as a whole has a ratio of only 1 doctor to every 768 persons and 1 dentist to every 1,900. We believe Representative A. L. MILLER was right when on April 8 he said: "Why should not the military be required to take its share of the average men and women."

That is a fact, Mr. President. If the military get so snooty that they take just the cream of the crop, who will pay to keep the military going? Who will run industry for us if we put the elite in uniform, just to suck off the wealth? We had better think about that.

I read further:

In the hearings before this committee General Bradley stated that the Army didn't want men between a 70- and 80-grade because there are more guardhouse people and troublemakers among them. In our judgment this is in no sense a justifiable statement, even if true. Before accepting it we urge this committee to find out exactly what proportion of men in the 70 to 80 group were committed to the guardhouse and why. The Army has so many minor regulations that it would take a good memory to obey all of them. However, I do not believe that people of less education are more criminal or immoral in their actions. The fact that a man cannot answer certain mathematical questions or explain the meaning of certain words, as the AGCT requires, in no sense should involve a prejudgment as to criminal tendencies.

We also believe that the Army's attention should be called to their claims that military training improves citizenship and reduces crime. If they can make these claims, as propaganda to get the public to accept UMT, then they ought to make good on these claims in the Regular Army. If the Army doesn't want these boys because they violate rules or laws, why does it claim that only 6 months of military training under UMT will give these same boys such good discipline and citizenship training that the crime rate would be reduced?

Still another way that the Army could get more men is to eliminate the quota restrictions on qualified Negroes and Puerto Ricans. It is quite as unjust to keep qualified Negroes from joining the Army as it would be to impose quotas on any other section of the population.

The Army could permit enlistments for an 18-month term and conceivably for a 1-year term. While a 1-year term would not be so profitable to the Army as a longer term, there is no reason why the Army could not combine a short-term enlistment with a 3-year enlistment in the National Guard or the Reserves. Every argument the Army has used in behalf of UMT could be used to justify such a program. If the Army won't accept this suggestion because too much time would be required to train these short-term recruits or because they won't be specialists, then the Army must recognize the validity of a considerable number of arguments against universal military training.

Having made these suggestions, Mr. Chairman, may I add that the Army's volunteer recruiting has improved considerably. Since no publicity so far as I have been able to discover, has been given to these figures, possibly because it would not help the draft

clause, it is well to note that the Army recruited in January 18,203 men, in February 16,633, and in March 21,930, or a total of 56,813 in the first quarter. The first week of April they got 4,485, which probably means at a monthly rate of 18,000 to 18,000. Since most of these recruits are for terms of 3 years or more, it is obvious that the voluntary system could easily support an army of about 670,000 men, especially if some of the recruiting suggestions we made should be adopted.

I am greatly concerned about the way in which the Army is trying to foster a program of peacetime conscription in America. General Bradley's plea for UMT last week is a good example of emotionalism. He said:

"The youth of America have a stake in this. Most of them are not going into the Regular services but if war should come most of them will have to go to war. Giving up a training program means they go to war the next time unprepared, mentally, physically, and with no training. Picture your own son or somebody else's, 18 or 19 years old, enlisted in a National Guard unit and moved off in a week or two to Alaska or Greenland or some other spot. Picture him going into combat. The alternative is not 70 groups or UMT. The 70 groups are not going to give that boy the lead time he needs in training."

My goodness. That is touching, Mr. President, all that essay on our poor boys, the sad fate they are going to meet if they are not properly trained. I do not think it will make much difference to them whether they were trained or not when they get shot, or more especially, when the atom bombs are dropped. They do not have to drop them. They just set them off some place. They could kill everybody in the world. The boys are not going to worry much about whether they were trained or not. They know how to die.

The general did not reveal that most of the youths who go to war would not be combat troops, that out of 14,000,000 in the armed forces during this past war only 1,500,000 were combat troops. He implied that National Guard units might be moved to a combat zone in a week's time, yet didn't reveal the Army's low opinion of the guard, which kept most of them out of combat zones until 1943, though they were mobilized in 1940 and 1941. Nor did he reveal that the failure of the guard and the Reserves to have adequate training is the Army's fault for not making weapons and training personnel available to them.

It is increasingly clear that the Army wants a permanent compulsory training and service system in America, regardless of whether we are at peace or war. So far as I have been able to discover, the Army has not suggested a time limit on selective service. At one point in the Senate hearings "possibly the decade" was mentioned as the length of the draft. At another point Mr. Forrestal implied that we would change the proposed program when she (Russia) withdraws to her own borders and is content with a national rather than an international effort to govern. Mr. Forrestal also told the Senate committee that when "the long-term program [universal military training] is adequately functioning, we should be able in a more peaceful world to curtail or eliminate the short-term program [selective service]." Secretary Royall made it equally clear in his Army Day speech when he said, "I see no safe way of ending selective service until we build up a trained Reserve by universal military training."

Oh, Mr. President, these boys are certainly determined to saddle militarism upon America, and I am equally determined that they shall not do it.

In other words, indefinite peacetime conscription is desired, whether it is called selective service or universal military training.

It would be far better for this country to remember what it is that has made America strong, lest we automatically accept the path which Germany and Japan and other nations have trod. The Wall Street Journal of April 7 stated the case well:

"The question we as a people have to decide is not whether the United States should be strong. In this parlous world we must. The question for decision is how we may best be strong. President Truman and his military advisers think the way to military strength is through a huge standing army and an armament industry geared now for war. They think the way to be strong is to go now on a war footing, to draft both men and resources now for some coming battle. That is ever the answer of military men. * * * Since battles are fought with men and guns, getting a lot of them seems the obvious way of preparing for war. But troops and guns, and even skill at tactics, do not guarantee victory. They are a necessary adjunct to military victory; they win battles. But they can also lose wars if in acquiring them a nation pays too high a price.

"The priceless ingredient in our society is the discovery that the freeman is a greater asset to his community than the slave. From that has come a productivity unequaled in history and it is that productivity, the efficient use of resources, that has made us strong. Now what the administration proposes is this."

When they speak of the administration, they should make it the bipartisan coalition, because they are all for it.

"That we drain off more than a million and a half of our industrial capacity into making goods that add nothing to our future productive power; and that we bind our energies with continued oppressive taxation and with regulations and controls by an omnipotent government. This is to make us strong.

"Possibly we could stand this for a while, as a healthy man can for a long time fight a sapping disease. A champ starting from perfect physical pitch can abuse his body for a long time and still be better than the next man. But in the end if we abuse our heritage it will make us weaker, as it did Germany and Japan, as it will Russia, too, if she stays on a permanent war basis. A nation, like the strongest man, needs a rest to recuperate its strength.

"We need to be prepared. We need a well-knit, skilled armed force to offer initial protection from sudden aggression and to form the nucleus of a mightier force if war should come. But we should beware lest too great a faith in arms exhaust the inner strength that is now, and always has been, our real source of power."

Finally, Mr. Chairman, our own people, as well as other people, will not believe that permanent or even temporary draft legislation is a peace measure. The history of conscription both here and abroad is such that it has never prevented war. And for this country to establish it now means placing even more power in the hands of the National Security Council whose secret discussions cannot be challenged until it is too late. It means strengthening the hand of those military strategists whom the Chicago Tribune of March 8 describes as "fostering a military doctrine that the President should lead the Nation into war against a potential enemy to keep it from striking the first blow without waiting for congressional declaration of war."

We believe rather that America should adopt a course which would unmistakably lead to peace. The Detroit News of April 9 editorially recommended such a course. Writing before the Italian election the editor described the foolishness of our present policy as follows:

"The Italians above all want peace, and the Communist Party has been wooing the voters in the terms of that yearning. The commie line has explained our interest in the election as concerned with making Italy an American stooge for purposes of a planned war against Russia. The Defense Department seems to have done its untimely best to lend an air of truth to that version of American intentions. It should be added that the News repeatedly has (advocated) * * * an American challenge to Russia to outlaw war, effectively and finally, by agreeing to a universal, supervised disarmament. The problem is to prove American devotion to peace in a manner so convincing that not even the most suspicious and ill-informed European could doubt it. The disarmament proposal would do just that."

Mr. President, here is some more of Mr. Alonzo Myers' testimony. He said:

I am a professor at New York University, being chairman of the department of higher education of the National Education Association.

I do not want to be quoting Mr. Baldwin all the time. I have quoted from him several times tonight, but he happens to be one of those professional writers on military matters who has watched this military game a long time, much longer, and with better preparation, than many of us. Mr. Baldwin has written an article in the New York Times for Sunday, May 9, 1948, on the Army's study about Hitler and the power of his army in 1939. He comments on a recent army study called foreign logistical organizations and methods, and compares it with some of the fine statements made by Churchill in his memoirs. The report deals with German production of aircraft before and during the war. It is clear from this report and Mr. Churchill's memoirs how much the military men of both this country and England overestimated German war production before and even during the war. This is Mr. Baldwin's comment:

In other words, Germany's great advantage in the immediate prewar and early war years was not in production output, and our estimates of Germany's production figures, including official intelligence estimates and some made from these figures by this writer, were greatly exaggerated.

I should like to read further from Mr. Baldwin's article on this subject, Mr. President. He has this to say:

German industry and German aircraft production facilities—contrary to official and popular impression—were not by any means fully mobilized for war when Hitler invaded Poland in 1939, according to a comprehensive official study and report prepared for the Secretary of the Army.

The report, a staff study made under the direction of Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson, was published for limited circulation last October, and is entitled "Foreign Logistical Organizations and Methods." Its facts, compiled carefully from German records, modify, supplement, and at times take sharp issue with some of Winston Churchill's contentions, as expressed in the British war leader's historical memoirs now appearing in the New York Times.

The report reveals, for instance, that in 1938 Germany produced only 3,350 combat aircraft, or 5,235 aircraft of all types, including trainers and noncombat types. In 1939, when Britain was producing 8,000 military aircraft of all types, combat and noncombat, Germany produced only 4,733 combat planes, or 8,295 of all airplane types, including civil aircraft. In the same year the United States turned out 2,141 military aircraft and 5,856 of all types, military, and civil.

Not until 1944, when the United States produced more than 96,000 planes, did German industry reach production peaks. In that year, despite prior and continuing intensive bombings, the Reich manufactured almost 40,000 planes of all types, nearly five times its 1939 production.

OTHER PRODUCTION SMALL

The same trend, of small production at the start of war but of immensely increased production during the war, particularly after the German invasion of Russia and the induction of Dr. Albert Speer as German economic dictator, is applicable, the report notes, to tanks, trucks, and other military matériel. Germany was not prepared in 1939—contrary to democratic assumption—for a long war or for total war; her economic and industrial effort was by no means fully harnessed; her factories were not producing war matériel at anything like top capacity.

These conclusions are at sharp variance with some of Mr Churchill's statements.

Speaking of the years 1934–35 and his struggle to awaken Britain to the need of rearmament, Mr. Churchill wrote that "a disaster of the first magnitude had fallen upon us. Hitler had already obtained parity with Great Britain. Henceforward he had merely to drive his factories and training schools at full speed, not only to keep his lead in the air but steadily to improve it * * * quantity was henceforth beyond us."

Later, in discussing the Munich settlement, Mr. Churchill writes:

"It is probable that in this last year before the outbreak, Germany manufactured at least double, and possibly treble, the munitions of Britain and France put together, and also that her great plants for tank production reached full capacity. They were therefore getting weapons at a far higher rate than we."

But the staff survey shows that in 1934, when Mr. Churchill first commenced to express his concern, Germany produced only 840 combat aircraft, 1,968 of all types, and that up until 1940, at least, Germany's production did not markedly outstrip Britain's. The difference was, however, that Germany's production was specifically applied to military aircraft and especially to fighters and bombers; Britain was producing fewer than 100 fighters a month in September 1939 and only a handful of heavy bombers. Much of her production was of training or commercial types, whereas German production had built up to 500 combat planes a month.

The same lack of German preparedness for total war or for a long war is revealed throughout the Army Department report.

In the last 4 months of 1939, after war had started, Germany produced 247 tanks and self-propelled guns, the British 314 tanks. But in 1943, after blitzkrieg had become attrition war, the German tank production mounted to 12,063, compared with the British home production of 7,476; and in 1944, despite bombing, German tanks and armored vehicle production was 27,340.

In 1939 Germany built 101,745 trucks and her truck production decreased slightly to 92,959 in 1943. But Britain built 112,500 heavy-wheeled vehicles in 1940.

In other words, Germany's great advantage in the immediate prewar and early war years was not in production output, and our estimates of Germany's production figures, including official intelligence estimates and some made from those figures by this writer, were greatly exaggerated.

As the Army study notes, "the full extent of military armament (by Germany) by 1939 has often been exaggerated."

"The total production of all tanks up to September 1939 had provided the German Army with about 3,000 tanks, of which only 300 were medium tanks," the report continues. "When Germany attacked Poland, the army had three Panzer divisions with only 600 tanks in reserve. * * * In the German ordnance industry no new gun plants were constructed before 1939. * * * The Army had sufficient ammunition in 1939 to last 6 weeks; the Air Force had bombs enough for 3 months' operations at the rate of expenditure experienced in Poland. * * * When the Polish invasion began, Germany had 1,000 frontline (serviceable) bombers and 1,050 fighter planes. (These latter figures agree fairly closely with Mr. Churchill's estimates.) Up to the outbreak of war, the German submarine industry had delivered just 53 submarines to the German Navy.

AMMUNITION RESERVE SMALL

The actual armament performance achieved by September 1939 is not too impressive. Germany was able to put more than 100 divisions into the field in the Polish campaign, but only 3 were armored and none were completely motorized. She had almost no reserve stocks of ammunition and equipment. * * * But the equipment which was available was utilized to the full in the kind of campaign which Hitler himself conceived as the only type which the German Army would have to wage—short decisive action against one military opponent at a time. * * * But Hitler was not economically prepared for the new kind of war he now had to fight (the war of attrition which replaced the war of blitzkreig after the Germans failed to capture Moscow in 1941). Hastily he took steps to enlarge the industrial base of his military might. But it was too late."

This revealing study—while it stands in sharp comparison to some of Mr. Churchill's estimates and to other estimates—does not invalidate the Churchillian contention that Britain should have started to prepare long before she did, and that Munich cost the Allies Czech divisions, strategical position, and other assets more important than the time gained.

But it also shows that military strength is considerably more than production figures; in fact, Germany won her initial great victories with a production output smaller than the combined production output of her opponents. Organization for war, concepts of war, sound strategy and tactics, good training and administration are all important ingredients of military strength and Germany had developed these. Germany was, on the whole, quite well prepared in 1939 for blitzkrieg war against individual opponents, but certainly not for total war against a great coalition, which is the kind of war she got.

Incidentally we might say, Mr. President, that in spite of all Hitler's preparation, in spite of all he could do, along came America, which had never had conscription, and laid him in the shade.

Mr. President, I do not think it is fully realized how much of our policy is determined by the military, instead of by civilian authorities. From the start to the finish, we are furnished with military opinions, not political opinions, and not opinions that reflect a well-rounded view of the whole situation.

Take for example, the matter of Germany and Japan, to which I have referred. Here the military are in complete command. So we depend entirely on the military and the men they appoint for all information and advice on how to handle those countries. We also depend on them for the policy. Just how trustworthy this is may be gathered from a little quotation from a civilian military expert, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, the respected military expert of the New York Times. Writing on June 8, 1948, in the New York Times, Mr. Baldwin speaks of the relaxation of tension in Washington from the February and March crisis atmosphere, and then goes on to say:

In some measure that crisis was made in Washington, but it stemmed in part from some very alarmist cables from Gen. Lucius D. Clay, United States military governor in Germany, who, in common with others, expected the Russians to march in weeks or months. There was little tangible foundation for any such belief then, and there is even less now, although some officers still talk vaguely of trouble after the harvest is in and of mysterious troop movements.

What shall we think of men who keep sending us in alarmist information from day to day that causes crises to arise back home? How can we trust them with more important information and policy?

I have not begun to speak in any detail about the big Army apparatus of propaganda and publicity to get the draft adopted. When a civilian organization wants to get a bill passed in Congress, its members come meekly into the Senate and House committees and are always afraid they are going to be thrown out by the nape of their necks. But when the Army comes into a Senate committee, they send in their best generals with all their brass glittering, and their stars shining and decorations gleaming—who can stand up against them?

But what about the nature of their arguments? That is a lot more important than the dress they wear or the influence they may have. I should like to quote this little piece from Hanson Baldwin about Mr. Forrestal's testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Mr. Baldwin points out that the Defense Secretary failed to put into adequate perspective the exact state of the American Military Establishment today and he kept for a secret session of the committee some facts of major importance to the public opinion on this subject.

Mr. Baldwin's article further points out that the continued stress on American "weakness" is for domestic consumption, to influence the Congress and the public and to stampede them into accepting what the military think is necessary for the country.

I should like to quote a few little excerpts:

IT'S NO TIME FOR SECRECY

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Secretary of Defense James Forrestal's presentation last week of the service expansion program was on the whole a reasonable and persuasive argument for greater military strength.

But the testimony before the Senate Armed Forces Committee suffered from one instance of sensationalism, one of exaggeration, and a recurrence of the old service differences. The Defense Secretary failed, moreover, to put into adequate perspective the exact state of the American military

establishment today, and he deferred to executive session some facts of major importance to the formulation of a sound public opinion about our military program.

MISLEADING THE PUBLIC

For the last 18 months—and increasingly in the last 6 months—Congress and the public have been told repeatedly by our military leaders of our "weaknesses." Secretary of State George C. Marshall stressed this "weakness" more emphatically than any other Government spokesman when he recently described the United States Army as a "hollow shell," an amazing statement by a Secretary of State in a time of crisis when the foreign policies he is espousing require the backing of military force.

Such statements obviously are intended for domestic consumption. There are some real weaknesses in our Military Establishment—notably the Army's shortage in manpower and in a strategic reserve, and our very small plane production—but the Army, Navy, and Air Force have elements of great strength and are by no means a "hollow shell."

The stressing of our weaknesses was aimed at Congress and the American people, both usually in a complacent and wishful-thinking mood until the moment of danger. But such exaggeration usually backfires. This has.

On the one hand the obvious retort of the citizen in this country is an inquiry into the intellectual capacity and administrative efficiency of our military leadership if $10,000,000,000 and $11,000,000,000 defense budgets can buy us only a "hollow shell." The other and far more important effect is abroad. The continued harping upon our military weaknesses has played directly into the hands of the Communists.

Communism is waging a campaign of fear in Europe; it is encouraging the flight of capital from Europe by a subtle spreading of rumors, fostering of unrest and the dissemination of reports that Russian troops will be in western Europe within the next few months. Communism stresses Russian strength, emphasizes American weaknesses. Secretary Marshall's "hollow shell" statements and similar exaggerations are grist to the Communist mill.

Mr. Forrestal did something but not enough to correct this distortion last week; he could have emphasized more than he did our military strengths.

POSSIBILITY OF WAR

There was another omission in his presentation. In the last 3 months the opinion of our leaders appears to have shifted radically. At the beginning of the year Washington seemed more or less unanimous that war in the near future was unlikely.

The President's speech advocating resumption of the draft and UMT shows a sudden reversal of this opinion. Washington now appears to feel that war in the near future is a distinct possibility and that Russia may use military force to gain her ends. The reasons for this shift in opinion have not been made clear.

Have there been Russian or Yugoslav troop movements? Is Russia mobilizing? Mr. Forrestal hinted at possible answers when he asked the committee to hear in executive session the strengths and deployments of the armed forces of other countries.

Yet if a whole shift in Government opinion, a major development of policy and the biggest peacetime military expansion program in our history are to be based, even in part, on such strengths and deployments, surely the American people are entitled to the evidence. The situation is far too serious for secrecy or for anything less than direct candor.

Nor did Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan help the cause with his abrupt and sensational announcement that submarines not belonging to any nation west of the iron curtain have been sighted off our shores.

That just turned out to be a blank, outright falsehood. The submarines off our shores, of course, were way up off the Aleutians. They happened to be our shores, but they are as close to Russia as they are to us. It turned out to be a distortion of the truth to scare the American people.

AIR FORCE RESENTMENT

The Secretary did not elaborate. But anonymous naval officers amplified the report. "Off our shores," it appears, was in at least one instance in mid-Pacific.

I am quoting Hanson Baldwin. He is no wild-eyed alarmist.

This is pretty flimsy evidence upon which to build a defense program.

Secretary of the Air Force W. Stuart Symington added to the excitement and confusion by disagreeing with a previous statement of his colleagues that the Eurasian "heartland" could not be reached from North America by any existing bombers. It soon developed, however, that Mr. Symington meant that our B-29's "could bomb any part of Russia and return to American bases" only by refueling in the air, presumably from B-36 tanker planes. What Mr. Symington did not explain, however, was that neither the technique nor the logistics of large-scale midair refueling operations have been solved, and that the refueling planes must also have a base of operations.

And behind his statement, it quickly developed, was Air Force resentment that it was not to get a larger share of the expanded budget presented by Mr. Forrestal.

All of which "is a hell of a way to run a railroad."

That is an old joke which I heard years ago. I have forgotten what it was about, but I remember the gag line which Mr. Baldwin uses.

Mr. President, on April 21, General Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, testified before the House Armed Services Committee. In order to show what they learned over on the other side, I wish to read a few brief selections from that testimony:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. ELSTON.

Mr. ELSTON. If the President decided before that the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1940 should not operate, how can the services give us any assurance now that the President will not take a similar provision with respect to this act?

Mr. BROOKS. That is the point exactly.

Mr. SHORT. You know the road that is paved with good intentions and where it leads.

What has the Department done and is doing now to help the Reserves?

General EVANS. Very little.

Mr. SHORT. In furnishing you equipment?

General EVANS. Nothing.

Mr. SHORT. Nothing. That is what I thought. Nothing.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to ask you this: What is the status of the Reserve at the present time?

General EVANS. I am speaking now of the Reserve of the Army and Air, Mr. Brooks. Three years have gone by. There is not an adequate troop basis which gives a man a wartime assignment. There are not adequate units. People are not assigned to units. The enlisted men—some six-hundred-odd thousand—that were taken, veterans all of World War II—have not been contacted. They have not been put in units. Their enlistments run out this year. We will lose nearly all of them. So you can rather quickly see that it is a rather pitiful state that the Reserves are in.

Mr. SHORT. General, the only time they call you is when they are in war and they need you to win it.

General EVANS. Unfortunately.

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. General Evans, we want to find a legal way to have them carry it out, when we write it in the law.

General EVANS. Exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Instead of relying on promises of the military.

General EVANS. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Up to now they have not done very much for you, as Mr. SHORT pointed out.

* * * * *

General EVANS. There are two things. It is true we have 600,000 on paper; but they have not been contacted. They have not been put into units. They have not been given any training. Their enlistment is going to run out, and because of lack of interest they are not going to reenlist. So, you are going to lose them.

Mr. BATES. Probably because they have not been given anything to do.

General EVANS. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Have those bills that the House passed cleared the Senate yet?

General EVANS. No; not the retirement bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They are still pending; are they not?

General EVANS. The retirement bill is still pending in the Senate. It comes up before the Senate committee sometime next week, I believe.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Until you get organized units and equipment, those kinds of bills are worthless because they have nothing to apply them to.

General EVANS. That is right, Mr. JOHNSON. I am not talking about incentive. I am not talking about procurement. All I am urging and begging and what I have been doing for 3 years is to have somebody do something with what we now have.

Mr. BATES. You want to do the same with the Army that we are now doing with the Naval Reserve?

General EVANS. Exactly.

Mr. BATES. Give them something to do. Build the unit. Train them and equip them.

General EVANS. That is right.

Mr. BROOKS. You say the Army Reserve program has broken down?

General EVANS. Completely.

* * * * *

Mr. SHORT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It has been testified that the Air Force had all the men that they need, or can get them. We know there is a long list trying to get in who cannot get in. The Navy can get theirs through voluntary recruitment.

Now, we propose to spend millions of dollars in registering millions of men to get 240,000 for the Ground Forces.

My contention, General, is that if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and our Reserves, having made a sincere, earnest, determined effort to build them up, we would not have this legislation here.

General EVANS. I agree with you thoroughly.

Mr. SHORT. There would be no need for a draft, UMT, or anything else.

General EVANS. I agree with you thoroughly.

Mr. SHORT. Good. I am glad to get it in the record.

Mr. KILDAY. Not UMT, General?

General EVANS. Yes; I would almost go that far, Mr. KILDAY.

Mr. KILDAY. You would go that far?

General EVANS. Yes.

There it is. This general admits that the Army has not tried to get men. He says that it could if it wanted to; but it did not. It wanted universal military training or the draft, so the Congress has voted the draft.

Mr. President, on April 23, the Reverend E. Paul Weaver, of Huntington County, Ind., appeared before the House Armed Services Committee and gave a remarkable statement of reasons why America should not adopt a peacetime draft. Rev. Dr. Weaver's testimony begins on page 6584 of the House Committee hearings. I think that the Senate should consider this testimony, especially since the Senate Armed Services Committee refused to let Dr. R. L. Holland present an oral testimony in behalf of the Indiana Committee for the Prevention of Compulsory Military Training in Peacetime. The roster of that committee is found in the Senate armed services hearings, together with the splendid statement of that committee, which was signed by 150 outstanding leaders of the State of Indiana. I wish to read from Rev. Dr. Weaver's testimony. Parts of this testimony were carried in most of the papers of the country. I quote:

Mr. Chairman, I am E. Paul Weaver, of Huntington County, Ind. I am a rural pastor. I am not here today, however, to represent any church group or its position in regards to selective service. I am here as the authorized representative of the Indiana Committee for the Prevention of Compulsory Military Training in Peacetime. The complete statement which every member of our organization has signed and the list of 150 principal members of our committee is found on pages 834 to 838 of the Senate hearings, which with your kind permission I should like to have entered into the record at this point.

Briefly I might state that our Indiana committee is composed of the State-wide leaders of the following organizations: The Indiana Farm Bureau, the Indiana Grange, the State WCTU, the Indiana Congress of Parent-Teachers Associations, the Indiana Council of Churches, the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Disciples Church, and others; four leading Jewish rabbis of the State, the presidents of 11 colleges of the State of Indiana, and many other prominent citizens of the State and officers of other organizations. In addition to the 150 names found in the report of the Senate hearings, we have local chapters in many of our counties.

Since military spokesmen have made clear the interrelationship of selective service and universal military training when they spoke of being willing to give up selective service if universal military training were passed, we believe that both forms of a peacetime draft ought to be rejected.

First, I should like to demonstrate that evidence before the country and the committee at this time does not conclusively prove that it is now necessary to depart from our historic American policy of a voluntary peacetime Military Establishment.

1. The Air Force does not need selective service: Secretary of Air Symington told this committee on April 13: "We do not feel that selective service is necessary in order to get the people * * * for the Air Force." General Spaatz added: "I have no doubt in my mind but what the Air Force will get sufficient recruits to maintain the Air Force proper on a voluntary-enlistment basis."

2. The Navy doesn't need selective service: Secretary of Navy Sullivan told this committee on April 13: "We believe that the way our enlistments have been running we probably will be able to do it (without selective service) * * *." Admiral Denfeld, in reply to a question on whether the Navy could get its strength without a draft, said: "I think you can get it if the present situation continues."

3. As we consider the Army's case for selective service, we must bear in mind the fact that Secretary Royall testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 25 that "war is not imminent." To that we must add the fact that the Italian elections turned out rather worse for the Communists than most Americans anticipated.

Italy went anti-Communist without the help of selective service, even though Mr. Truman certainly implied in his message to Congress that only a peacetime draft would back up our foreign policy.

Now that the elections in Italy are over and no crisis requiring drastic military action is on the horizons, there should be less reason for enlarging the Army. If the United States is not planning to launch an aggressive war there doesn't seem to be any reason to put men in the Army beyond the number needed for our present commitments. The Army spokesmen in the Senate hearings indicated that if the Army were increased by 240,000 men only 14,000 additional troops would be sent overseas. This doesn't seem to justify a draft.

Furthermore the Army is rejecting enlistments because it has raised its standards of admission.

The Army has tried to justify its rejecting men whose grades in the Army general classification tests are between 70 and 80 on two grounds. First, that the ability of men to learn is registered by the test and also that men who get less than an 80 score are unable to learn well enough to be in the Army.

Actually, of course the Army knows that men who make less than an 80 score do learn well enough to be in the Army. General Paul, for example, in a statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee admitted that the Army now has men of prior service with good records whose score is between 70 and 80. An Army officer who signs his name Maj. K. S. V. wrote a letter to the Infantry Journal which appears in the March 1948 issue. In it he gives 12 reasons why the Army is not getting enough recruits. The one the major emphasized was the intelligence requirements. He claimed that many good noncommissioned officers in the Army would not now be able to get in if they had to pass the present standards. He recommended lowering the score and stated that all of the old-timers he had consulted before submitting his letter to the editor agreed that it was most urgent to lower the present intelligence requirements. General Paul's statistics submitted to the Senate Armed Services Committee also reveal that 1,593 persons with more than 10 years of education failed to get an 80 score. Yet the fact that these men were able to advance through 10 grades of school is an indication that they have ability to learn.

During the war and until early 1947 the Army accepted men with a 70 grade. General Dahlquist testified before the House Armed Services Committee the military has not to any perceptible percentage changed in any way since World War II with respect to mechanization, electronics, etc. The general added "we are getting more gadgets, but gadgets do not necessarily take higher intelligence. The greatest intelligence needed by any soldier is needed by the man who alone with the rifle is a complete army." Now, General Dahlquist really meant this, he was talking about ordinary horse sense or judgment which is quite different from the book-learning skills or other skills. Furthermore, riflemen were needed a lot more in past wars than they will be in future ones as war becomes more mechanized. If an 80 score was not required for riflemen in past wars it ought not to be required now. And if mechanization does not necessarily take higher intelligence what is the justification of raising the standard for men who serve in a mechanized army.

The second argument Army spokesmen have used to justify rejecting men with a 70 to 80 score is the one used by General Dahlquist that they will have greater numbers in our guardhouse and greater numbers in developmental battalion.

Statistically, it is true that more men with lower grades end up in the guardhouse than do men with higher grades. This, however, is not because men with lower grades are more immoral or because they have criminal tendencies. It is because the brighter criminals, the men who are a little more clever, cover up a bit more and don't get caught so often.

I was impressed with the statement before this committee made by the prominent educator D. Alonzo Myers. He asked this committee to find out exactly what proportion of men in the 70 to 80 group were committed to the guardhouse and why. He pointed out that the Army has so many minor regulations that it would take a good memory to obey all of them.

General Hershey told this committee that about 12,000 paid personnel and close to 175,000 unpaid draft-board personnel would be required to operate selective service. Now General Hershey didn't reveal whether 175,000 experienced draft-board personnel who served for 5 years during the war are going to work without pay during peacetime when there is obviously no emergency. Evidently General Hershey doesn't expect that they will, for the Chicago Tribune of April 8 reports that he has asked National Guard headquarters in each State to assign men for training in draft procedures. Not only will General Hershey have to find thousands of new men and persuade them to work without pay, but he is apparently already planning to insure military control over selective service through the National Guard whose appropriations for example are recommended by the Army.

General Hershey tried to justify using over 150,000 men to draft 240,000 men by saying that the draft would encourage 600,000 others to enlist. This is pure double talk. The Navy and Air Force say they can rely on volunteers. The Army needs only 240,000 additional men and is recruiting now at the rate of about 225,000 men a year without the heat of a draft. (See recruiting figures in Myers testimony.) General Hershey cannot take credit for encouraging 600,000 to enlist. He would be nearer the truth if he would say that he is hoping to use almost 260,000 men to draft about 200,000 men.

It seems clear to many of us that the Army is not utilizing the Enlisted Reserves in a manner that will prepare them for an emergency. General Evans of the Reserve Officers Association testified before this committee yesterday. "It is true that we have 600,000 men on paper, but they have not been contacted and they have not been given any training." He added, "All I've been urging for 3 years is to have somebody do something for the Reserves."

In the April 10, 1948, Colliers, Donald Robinson has discussed this problem under the subject Does the Army Want the Reserves?

PROPOSALS FOR POSITIVE ACTION

1. Urge Congress to pass at once the Landis resolution which was originally proposed by Speaker MARTIN which resolves "That before the United States adopts compulsory military service, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States delegate to the United Nations organization, Warren R. Austin be, and hereby are, urged to work unceasingly

for an immediate international agreement

a course in an attempt to defeat a totalli-

more attractive to the average young man.

fore going into combat. The News added.

Truman draft because they have read the

per for propaganda activities supporting

for an immediate international agreement whereby compulsory military service shall be wholly eliminated from the policies and practices of all nations."

2. Inasmuch as the Air Force and Navy can get their recruits by American voluntary methods, I suggest that Congress appoint a committee to investigate and find out:

(1) Why the Army is not able to get sufficient men by voluntary enlistments.

(2) Why the rate of reenlistment for the Army has sunk so low.

(3) Whether the Army is using its existing manpower and reserves. If not, why not?

3. Let Congress tell those concerned to cease propagandizing our Nation for universal military training and selective service, and to make our American democracy work.

Mr. President, Reverend Weaver, whom I have just been quoting, also gave a speech at Elkhart, Ind., on May 20 over radio station WTRC. It has much good information in it and reveals some of the errors of the current arguments in favor of the peacetime draft. From Reverend Weaver's radio talk at Elkhart I quote the following:

There is one thing that all of us have in common. All of us love America. My ancestors came to these shores just about 200 years ago, because America appeared to them as a land of freedom and great promise. I was reared in these great traditions. I believe in the American way of life. All of us love America. If we did not love this country we should not be so deeply concerned that it should not go down the path that would lead to its self-destruction.

Recently I have returned from our Nation's Capitol where for 2 weeks I studied carefully the testimony being presented to the House Armed Services Committee. I have seen the clever trick that is being played in an attempt to get Congress to provide for permanent compulsory military training. When it became evident that Congress would not pass UMT temporary selective service was demanded in the President's address on March 17. On the 18th of March when Secretary of Defense Forrestal testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee he appeared to be so surprised by the request of the President that he had no plan to offer the committee (p. 43, SASC hearings). However, by April 12 when Secretary Forrestal testified before the House Armed Services Committee the following conversation occurred:

"Mr. HÉBERT. I understood you to say that selective service is merely a temporary measure?

"Secretary FORRESTAL. Yes, sir.

"Mr. HÉBERT. Which will be on the books so long as you do not have UMT; is that correct?

"Secretary FORRESTAL. Yes, sir; that is right.

"Mr. HÉBERT. Then it will be as temporary as some of those buildings on Constitution Avenue which were erected during World War I and which are still there—if we do not have universal military training?

"Secretary FORRESTAL. That is my opinion." (House Armed Services Committee hearing, p. 6114.)

Let no one be confused. The program calls for permanent peacetime conscription and regimentation. Its advocates want all they can get. They will start with a little if they cannot get all at the first attempt. After studying the situation carefully I am convinced that the program calls for more than permanent peacetime conscription for military service. It follows its logical course to conscription of labor and regimentation of capital and industry, in fact regimentation of all life. If we should follow such a course in an attempt to defeat a totalitarian dictatorship abroad we should inevitably find ourselves the victims of just such a system here in the America that we love.

I live in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana. We in the Fifth District are happy to have as our Representative the Honorable FOREST HARNESS, who loves our American way of doing things. I have found Mr. HARNESS to be a statesman of unusual courage. If our American way of life is preserved by this Congress, all America will be in debt to Mr. HARNESS and his investigations of the agencies of the Federal Government which have been using our money to control the thought of this Republic. His investigations of the War Department's "illegal and improper" propaganda activities for UMT helped to turn the tide from the way of regimentation.

If we felt that peacetime conscription were really necessary to our security, I know that Congress would pass a law to that effect without hesitation. I talked with dozens of Congressmen. I know that they feel that they are not getting the truth from the administration. I predict confidently now, contrary to the predictions of so many, that neither UMT nor the proposed Truman draft will pass in this session.

Well, it looks to me as though the Reverend Weaver got some bum steers when he made that prediction that they would not pass in this session—probably a case of wishful thinking.

Just yesterday I received my copy of the minority report of the House Armed Services Committee and signed by Congressmen SHORT, BISHOP, HEFFERNAN, PHILBIN, and HAVENNER. It is a masterful summary of the case against the Truman draft.

It is not only the Truman draft; it is a bipartisan draft. They are all for it.

The responsible officers of the Air Force testified that they felt that even for a 70-group program the Air Force does not need selective service. Likewise on the same day, April 13, the men responsible for our Navy testified that they felt that the Navy can get its men without selective service.

On March 31, 1947, the Army grades were raised to 80. At the present time the Army is turning down almost 50 percent of the men applying for service, although they must admit that men with grades under 80 did spendid jobs during the war. In fact men with grades of 59 were used. The Army claims that men with grades under 80 make up an unusual percentage of the men in the guardhouse.

Dr. Alonzo Myers, an infantry captain of World War I, told the House Armed Services Committee that "The Army has so many minor regulations that it would take a good memory to obey all of them." (House Armed Services Committee hearings, p. 6472.)

It was pointed out in the minority report of the House Armed Services Committee that "the Army has deliberately refrained from making all-out efforts to utilize voluntary recruitment methods. Just as little interest has been shown in supporting the Reserve Establishments as long as the Army feels that universal conscription is obtainable, so the Army has been unwilling to pursue energetically the problem of making Army service more desirable to the average potential soldier.

I think, Mr. President, if we once and for all told them they were not going to get a draft, they would get busy, hustle around, and recruit the men.

Many believe that if the Army would reform its system according to the suggestions of the Doolittle report, Army life would be more attractive to the average young man. The minority report also stresses the observation that—

"To date the record of the Army in refusing to build up either the Organized Reserves or the National Guard borders on a national scandal. The testimony before our committee established clearly that the Army has followed a policy of deliberately ignoring the Reserves as a means of exerting pressure to get universal military training."

The argument that hooks more people in favor of peacetime conscription and UMT than any other is the story that has been fed very cleverly to our Gold Star Mothers. It has also been fed to the patriotic organizations as gospel truth. I should like to have the people examine this clever fiction very carefully.

The proponents of a regimented society argue that if we had UMT and/or peacetime conscription those Gold Stars would not be there. They say that the reason that we lost so many boys is that we did not have UMT. "If only we had had UMT," the conscriptionists sigh. What is the truth?

The relative casualty lists disprove this fiction. Here are the casualty lists of soldiers killed in World War II according to General Marshall's estimates:

Countries with peacetime conscription: USSR lost 7,500,000 (1 for every 22 inhabitants); Germany lost 2,850,000 (1 for every 25 inhabitants); Japan lost 1,506,000 (1 for every 46).

The Nation without UMT and/or peacetime conscription: The United States of America lost 295,904 (1 for every 500 inhabitants). (These figures do not include civilian deaths by bombings.)

Of course we would come out better than anyone else in that respect.

Mr. President, I might say to the folks who expect to attend the Philadelphia convention that they had better be putting on their thinking caps, because we are just going good here. I am beginning to realize that Saturday night is not so far away. I understand that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] may rally around after a bit, and we can run this right through, without a stop, until midnight Saturday, without any strain whatsoever. So the boys may as well go home and get busy and figure out what they are going to do.

I resume reading:

During the war the Army insisted upon a teen-age draft together with an unfulfilled promise to parents that boys would be given adequate training.

In October 1942, Congress was asked to lower the draft age to 18. The United States News of March 9, 1945, stated "The Senate wrote in a provision that youths of 18 and 19 could not be sent into combat without receiving a year's training. That provision was killed by House and Senate conferees after they were assured that draftees would be given all the training necessary to make good fighting men. Gen. George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, appealed to Congress to "trust our judgment and our insistence that we fight only with properly trained units, to see that each soldier has adequate training before he enters combat."

The New York Times reported on December 9, 1944, "Because of a large increase in the percentage of youth that are being drafted, the Army has changed its policy and is now sending 18-year-old soldiers overseas as infantry and as armored force replacements, Robert P. Patterson • • • disclosed today." The United States News of March 9, 1945, also indicated that Secretary Patterson had said in general that all men would get about 8 months' training before going into combat. The News added, "Even then the names of 18-year-olds were showing up in casualty lists. Boys who had been graduated from high school in June were being reported killed and wounded in December."

Mr. President, these military boys do not think much of their plighted word. They are a kind of cold-blooded, hard-hearted lot.

I hope that every Gold Star Mother realizes that the Army had inducted approximately 8,000,000 men. According to General Marshall's last biennial report only 1,500,000 of these were combat troops. We know that there were millions of men in the Army over 20. If the Army had kept faith with the parents would they have sent the 18-year-olds into combat?

Of course they did not keep faith, Mr. President. Young boys were killed and wounded a few months after they were inducted into the Army. At this moment there is a fine establishment in Tennessee or Kentucky where there is a show place, to indicate what they would do with the UMT. If they once get the law passed and get the boys into the service they will not treat them that way any more.

I hope that the decision to send our 18-year-olds into combat while the Army had millions of more mature men was not made by men who have been endeavoring to sell UMT to America for almost 30 years.

The Reverend Weaver is speaking wishfully again, Mr. President.

The Army has tried to create the impression that if the United States had had UMT, the casualties could have been prevented. This is attempted in both the War Department pamphlet of January 1947 and the UMT bill H. R. 4278. Most of us who think soberly will realize that these 18-year-old boys who were sent into combat had just finished high school. They would not have had UMT even if UMT had been the practice of America.

It does not seem to be honest to blame the casualties of the last war upon the absence of peacetime conscription. The Nation's leading military analyst, Hanson Baldwin, in the January 5, 1945, New York Times, discussed this question. He assigned the blame for the casualties of the Battle of the Bulge at least partly to inferior equipment. He attributed this situation to the "conservatism and traditionalism in the Army mind, complicated organization in the War Department," etc.

The Gold Star Mothers who have seen through this clever ruse at transferring the blame for the loss of their sons, are among the most ardent opponents of UMT and the peacetime draft. At the Indiana State pastors' conference in January 1948, a lady collecting all the material about peacetime conscription available, looked up with tears in her eyes as her Gold Star was noticed.

She remarked, "Yes; I have another son who is only 15." She does not want to turn that boy over to the same group that took away his older brother. It would be most ironical if, after the older brother has offered his life to defeat the regimented militarism of Japan, we left MacArthur behind there to root out that militarism and peacetime conscription and set up a democracy, while we in America proceeded to set up a system of militarism complete with universal military training and peacetime conscription.

Millions of people who deeply love the American way of life are opposed to universal military training and/or the proposed Truman draft because they have read the following statement:

"It is clear to anyone who even stops to think that in case of a coming war the entire Nation would have to take up arms; that therefore millions would be driven toward the enemy with bad, insufficient, or half-finished training. One must nevertheless not forget that the shortage of trained soldiers could easily lead, at the beginning of a war, to losing that war.

"The Army educates them only to be reliable, decent members of the community, men who in the hour of need and danger will feel themselves united in loyalty with the Nation, and should fate confront them with the sternest ordeal, will defend the freedom of their people with bravery and honor."

That statement was made not by a loyal American but by Adolph Hitler in Mein Kampf when he was trying to sell his Nazi youth movement to the German people.

It sounds just like what is being done to us now, and it is exactly the same thing, indeed. Those who are party to this effort are just as remiss in their duty to the American people as those who saddled militarism on the Germans were to their people.

The Reverend Mr. Weaver proceeds:

When I testified before the House Armed Services Committee on April 23, I was asked, "What do you suggest we should do to stop Russia?"

To that question I replied, "I think we must not follow the method of Russia; but we must approach Russia with some positive action. We cannot defeat communism, which is an idea, with guns. We must learn that. You cannot stop an idea with a gun. You drive it in further. But you can stop an idea with a more powerful idea, and the more powerful idea is the Christian ideal of democracy. Jesus Christ taught respect for the human personality, and our Government today has lost it. It is time that we find it again. If we have the ideal of a Christian democracy which our ancestors had, we will defeat communism not only in America, but we will stop it in Russia. The "iron curtain" is not so high but what Russia will hear of the democracy which is working in America. But if we fail to make it work here, they will have a good, fertile bed for their ideals here in America."

I still agree with that statement. We must make our democracy work. We must reaffirm our faith in the American way of life. We must say "No" to every effort at unnecessary regimentation. UMT and the "Truman draft" are only a beginning. When my hostess requests, "Will you keep your fork, please," I know there is something more coming. In the case of UMT and the Truman draft there is also something more coming. I would warn us solemnly, "It will not be pie and cake." God helping us we can yet resist these steps toward regimentation and these efforts at Federal thought-control.

That is the end of the radio address delivered by Rev. Mr. Weaver.

The Senate and the country might also be interested in the methods of propaganda used by the military to get over their ideas on the draft and UMT. I quote from the report of the Publicity and Propaganda Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives made on July 24, 1947, almost a year ago.

The committee concludes in its report that the War Department is using Government funds in an improper manner for propaganda activities supporting compulsory military training.

I was interested in noting that one of the people—the paid propagandists of the Army—used was a woman who went around to various women's group and also contacted the former Supreme Court Justice Owen Roberts. Mr. Roberts is known as head of an organization lobbying for UMT. I find it interesting that Mr. Justice Roberts lobbies on the one hand for universal military training and the draft, and on the other for some form of world government. I had not thought we should work for government that will be imposed by arming the world.

Here are the quotations from the committee of which I spoke a moment ago:

This report summarizes our hearings on this phase of the inquiry, to date, and presents the conclusions arrived at, following careful evaluation of the testimony and documentary evidence presented by, and relating to, the War Department.

The use of Federal funds for the purpose of influencing legislation before Congress is unlawful under section 201, title 18, of the United States Code. We have, therefore, brought these matters to the attention of the Department of Justice, with a request that the Attorney General, at once, initiate proceedings to stop this unauthorized and illegal expenditure of public moneys. A copy of the chairman's letter to the Attorney General is made a part of this interim report.

This, our second report, deals exclusively with the activities calculated to build up a federally stimulated public demand upon Congress for enactment of legislation for universal military training. The activities (which we shall hereinafter more fully set forth) have been those of civilian employees of the War Department, as well as the personnel of the United States Army.

• • • • •

Another of the War Department's civilian consultants was Mrs. Arthur Woods. Mrs. Woods, a former lieutenant colonel in the WAC, also traveled throughout the country at Government expense, speaking on behalf of universal military training. She was particularly interested in influencing women and parents of the country on the virtues of compulsory military training. The purposes of the activities of Mrs. Woods can, perhaps, best be shown in a letter written by her to Miss Linnea Woolf, 164 East Thirty-third Street, New York 16, N. Y.

The letter of this lady appears in the report. However, I shall not take the trouble to read it.

Now, Mr. President, I think I shall turn over the chore to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], whom I eulogized earlier in the evening, and for whom I have a great admiration and high regard. Later I shall resume. I am entitled to another speech on this same matter. At this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Eastland
Baldwin	Cain	Ecton
Ball	Chavez	Ellender
Barkley	Connally	Feazel
Brewster	Cooper	Ferguson
Bricker	Cordon	Flanders
Bridges	Donnell	Fulbright
Brooks	Downey	Green
Butler	Dworshak	Gurney

Hatch	McGrath	Smith

amendments of the Senate to the bill

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

several years when the latter was President pro tempore of the Senate. We

that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate num-

Hatch	McGrath	Smith
Hawkes	McKellar	Sparkman
Hayden	McMahon	Stennis
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Stewart
Hill	Malone	Taft
Hoey	Martin	Taylor
Holland	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Ives	Millikin	Thye
Jenner	Morse	Tobey
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Tydings
Johnston, S. C.	Myers	Umstead
Kem	O'Conor	Vandenberg
Kilgore	O'Daniel	Watkins
Knowland	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Langer	Pepper	Wiley
Lucas	Revercomb	Williams
McCarthy	Robertson, Va.	Young
McClellan	Russell	
McFarland	Saltonstall	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1260. An act to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers;

S. 2186. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes";

S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act;

S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks;

S. 2743. An act providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians;

S. 2794. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations; and

S. 2861. An act to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1969) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov;

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5716) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Bessie Schwartz.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2878) to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5734) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. RANKIN, and Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5355. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 6402. An act to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission;

H. R. 6657. An act to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

H. R. 6800. An act to amend sections 3108 and 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6958. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill.

The message notified the Senate that Mr. BROOKS had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, vice Mr. DURHAM, excused.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. TOBEY, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2894) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

GEN. MATT WHITAKER RANSOM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR UMSTEAD

[Mr. UMSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Gen. Matt Whitaker Ransom, delivered by him at Jackson, N. C., on August 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOSIAH W. BAILEY

[Mr. UMSTEAD, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a tribute prepared by him on the life, character, and public service of Josiah W. Bailey, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WALLACE WHITE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the approach of Congress' recess brings to mind the fact that many of the distinguished men who grace this Chamber will shortly bid adieu to the United States Senate, in which they have rendered such noble and faithful service. At this time, I should like to briefly pay tribute to a man who is a friend of all of us, a guide, an inspiration, a devoted public servant of his native State and his Nation, a man who has served in this body since 1931 with success and distinction.

I am referring, of course, to the senior Senator from Maine, the Honorable WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

If you look in the Congressional Directory and read the long series of achievements of WALLACE WHITE in the House of Representatives, where he was first elected to the Sixty-fifth Congress and where he served until the Seventy-first Congress, in the Senate, in many international conferences and in numerous other capacities, the layman can only get a limited picture of what WALLACE WHITE means to us and has meant to us during all these years. You would have to know him personally, as we have known him, to realize the strength that he possesses that is, nevertheless, gentle, the humor with which he is so richly endowed, but which is always in such good nature, the leadership which he has constantly exercised, both as minority and majority leader of the Senate, but about which he has always been so modest.

It is difficult for any man to try to sum up in a few moments the devoted work of a lifetime by a dear friend. We can recite the facts, but it is hard to convey all of the sacrifices, all of the patience, all of the endless devotion which went into each of the activities of our dear friend.

We can recall that WALLACE WHITE served as an employee of the Senate for some years prior to his service in the Congress. For example, he served as assistant clerk to the Committee on Commerce for a couple of years when the chairman of that committee was the Honorable William P. Fry. He also served as Secretary to Senator Fry for

several years when the latter was President pro tempore of the Senate. WALLACE WHITE continued in that capacity until November 1903.

On April 2, 1917, 4 days before America's declaration of war in the first world conflict, WALLACE WHITE was sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives. In the House, he served as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, of the Committee on Woman's Suffrage, of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

In September 1930, following his unbroken service in the House of Representatives, he was elected United States Senator, in which post he has been successively reelected. In this Chamber, he has served with distinction on the Civil Service, Claims, Commerce, Education and Labor, Post Office and Post Roads, and other committees. In May of 1935, he was appointed to the Committee on Foreign Relations and he has served on numerous other Senate groups.

With the advent of the GOP's control of the Congress, Senator WHITE, who had served as acting Republican floor leader following the death of Senator McNary, was elected majority leader of the Senate.

We in the Senate know how popular WALLACE WHITE has been with all his colleagues and with all those who have come in contact with him.

Without fanfare, without histrionics, he has performed his duties selflessly and faithfully.

In whatever capacity he has served, as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee and ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, or as floor leader, he has gained the respect and admiration of his associates on both sides of the aisle.

To say that WALLACE WHITE's departure from the Senate will leave a gap that will be hard, if not impossible, to fill, is an understatement. To say, however, that we will look to him for continued public service and continued guidance is merely to state the obvious.

WALLACE WHITE has deserved the rest and relaxation which are so much his due but which have been denied him during all these strenuous years in public service. We know, however, that he will continue to be a source of inspiration and direction to all his fellow citizens of Maine and to all of his associates here in the Senate.

As he has paid tribute to other great men who have graced this Chamber, so now we pay deserved tribute to him and wish him good luck and Godspeed on all his future ventures.

PROMOTION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House; agree to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, quite a number of the Members of the Senate, members of the Appropriations Committee, have been working on appropriation bills all evening. They must return to committee rooms to deal with more appropriation bills. House conferees are waiting in the conference rooms. I am very hopeful that all Members of the Senate will agree to the appointment of conferees on Senate bill 2655. I especially ask my colleague from my neighboring State of North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to allow the appointment of conferees.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I will wait until I secure the floor in my own right.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 5888, to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my understanding is that it requires unanimous consent temporarily to displace the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the motion of the Senator from South Dakota be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed with the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5 and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Change the figure "400,000,000" to read "$450,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Page 2, line 4, of the amendments of the Senate, strike out the words "one fiscal year" and insert in lieu thereof the words "two fiscal years"; page 2, line 12, of the amendments of the Senate, after the word "year", insert the following ", including any funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Page 2, strike out all of subsection (a) under 2 (a); and on page 3, line 8, strike out "(b)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered nine, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Page 4, line 8, of the amendments of the Senate, change the figure "$20,000,000" to read "$17,500,000"; Page 5, line 19, change the colon to a period, and strike out the remainder of the paragraph through line 9, on page 6; and the Senate agree to the same.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
JOHN S. COOPER,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
E. G. ROHRBOUGH,
J. GLENN BEALL,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
A. J. ELLIOTT,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

STREAM POLLUTION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REVERCOMB. At this time I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate take up for immediate consideration the conference report on Senate bill 418, which is a bill dealing with the removal of pollution from streams and with the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

INCREASE OF COMPENSATION PAYABLE TO SURVIVING CHILDREN OF CERTAIN DECEASED VETERANS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report on Senate bill 2825, a bill to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2825) to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: That paragraph IV of part I of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided in part I, paragraph I hereof, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified next below:

"Widow but no child, $75; widow with one child, $100 (with $15 for each additional child); no widow but one child, $58; no widow but two children, $82 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $106 (equally divided) (with $20 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $60 (or both), $35 each."

"SEC. 2. Subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Any veteran or the dependents of any deceased veteran otherwise entitled to compensation under the provisions of part II of this regulation or the general pension law shall be entitled to receive the rate of compensation provided in part I of this regulation, if the disability or death of such veteran resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, or (2) while engaged in extra-hazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, or (3) while the United States is engaged in war.'

"SEC. 3. Paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided for in part II, paragraph I hereof; shall be entitled to receive compensation at 80 per centum of the rates specified for such dependents in paragraph IV, part I hereof, as now or hereafter amended.'

"SEC. 4. The increases provided by this Act shall be effective from the first day of the second month following the passage of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes"; and the House agree to the same.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
HUGH BUTLER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report is agreed to.

INCREASE OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 2821, to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendent, as follows: "That any person entitled to compensation at wartime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in part I, or paragraph I (c), part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and restored with limitations by Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 per centum, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

"(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

"(a) has a wife but no child living, $21;

"(b) has a wife and one child living, $35;

"(c) has a wife and two children living, $45.50;

"(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $56;

"(e) has no wife but one child living, $14;

"(f) has no wife but two children living, $24.50;

"(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $35;

"(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $17.50 for each parent so dependent.

"(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 per centum, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

"SEC. 2. That any person entitled to compensation at peacetime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in paragraph II, part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, except paragraph I (c) thereof, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 per centum, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

"(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

"(a) has a wife but no child living, $16.80;

"(b) has a wife and one child living, $28;

"(c) has a wife and two children living, $36.40;

"(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $44.80;

"(e) has no wife but one child living, $11.20;

"(f) has no wife but two children living, $19.60;

"(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $28;

"(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $14 for each parent so dependent.

"(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 per centum, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

"SEC. 3. The additional compensation for a dependent or dependents provided by this Act shall not be payable to any veteran during any period he is in receipt of an increased rate of compensation or of subsistence allowance on account of a dependent or dependents under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That he may elect to receive whichever is the greater.

"SEC. 4. The administrative, definitive, and penal provisions of Public Law Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Veterans Regulations thereunder, as amended, shall be for application under this Act.

"SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
HUGH BUTLER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report is agreed to.

STREAM POLLUTION

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I again ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the

immediate consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 418, which is a bill dealing with the removal of pollution from streams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. AIKEN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire of my distinguished colleague from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] if there is any objection at this time to permitting a vote on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to appoint conferees on the military bill? I appeal to him to let us vote. When the business of the Senate continues, and the report is made, my distinguished colleague will have ample opportunity to debate the issue as to whether or not he wishes to approve the conference report.

I know that the Senator can do as he chooses, but it would expedite the work of the Senate if the motion could be voted upon. He could make his speech on the adoption of the conference report, which would be almost the immediate order of business.

I appeal to the Senator to permit us to expedite the work of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have another matter which I deem of such great importance that I decline to accede to the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska at the present time, because I wish Senators to hear what I am about to say. I want all to hear who can possibly remain.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota wishes to make a speech. He has a perfect right to make the speech. I will assure the Senator that there will not be a recess, but that we shall proceed with the business of the Senate, and that before this session is concluded tonight the conference report will be submitted, on which the speech is to be made. It would greatly expedite the work of the Senate if that could be done. I appeal to the Senator to let us vote on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota. Then the Senator from North Dakota will have ample opportunity to make the speech which he is about to make. We will guarantee that the session will continue if he will do that for us.

Mr. LANGER. I assure my distinguished friend that I deeply regret that I cannot do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska if a continuation of the present condition, which has existed on the floor of the Senate for the past several hours, is not almost certain to result in the death of many important measures which we would like to consider at this session, including that of increasing the pay of postal employees, and the bill with relation to the classified employees in the Federal service?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senate adjourns, as has been scheduled, it is almost a certainty that some of the legislation which the Senate would and should consider will be jeopardized if we cannot expedite the business of the Senate. Just which measures might suffer, I could not say. I will say, however, that if we could expedite the work of the Senate tonight, I am confident that the pay bills could be passed. I see no objection to them. I think they could be ironed out satisfactorily.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator believe that this situation is helping the chances of those bills?

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry to say that it is not. On the other hand, I want the distinguished Senator from North Dakota to know that he has a perfect right to make a speech on any subject he wishes. I shall not ask him again at this time to permit us to vote on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make only one statement.

The other day when the postal bill was called up, I suggested that I thought that because of the increased cost of living an increase in pay should be granted to postal employees. My statement was misunderstood by some. I wish to say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Nebraska that I believe other Government employees should likewise have an increase in pay.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I express to the distinguished Senator my approval of the statement he has made. We are all interested in the pay bill. It was our intention to make it the next order of business on the Legislative Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I was going to ask the distinguished acting majority leader if he had considered the possibility of asking that some of these other important measures might be brought up.

I think the pending question is on the motion to agree to a conference on the draft bill and to appoint conferees.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. In the last few minutes I have seen other conference reports brought up, and the able Senator did not seem to object to their consideration.

Now we have pending some very vital legislation, and I am sure there would be no objection to bringing it up. For instance, there is the housing legislation, the legislation pertaining to pay raises for postal and governmental employees generally, and perhaps other measures.

I wonder whether the acting majority leader has given consideration to the possibility of asking the Senator from North Dakota to defer his remarks until those matters are disposed of.

I am sure the Senator from North Dakota would not object to the disposition of the measure for pay increases for postal employees, as well as other measures of similar character.

I wonder whether we can gain some time by disposing of some of these other vital matters, and asking the Senator from North Dakota to defer his remarks until they are disposed of, and then return to the draft measure.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, wil the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I might suggest that the unfinished business presently before the Senate is the bill for the extension of the terms of members of the Atomic Energy Commission; and I shall yield for privileged matters only because I have no other choice. But the moment the privileged matters are disposed of, I shall resist any effort to superimpose any other proposed legislation of similar standing or to bring it before the Senate in place of the bill for the extension of the terms of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I see no reason why the acting majority leader, in his discretion, could not include that in the request he might make, and I am sure the Senator from North Dakota would not object to it. I understand that the Senator from North Dakota expects to address himself to the draft measure. I assume that the Senator from North Dakota is not objecting to the consideration of any other subjects.

Mr. LANGER. I am not.

Mr. PEPPER. So it is up to the acting majority leader to determine whether he wishes these other matters to be proceeded with in the Senate or to have them kept behind the Draft Act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to make my own position on this matter clear.

I have not objected to the consideration of the miscellaneous matters which have come up that are not in any degree of a controversial nature.

But I wish to call attention again, although I am sure the Senate is already well advised as to this, that we have before us one of the most important bills which this Congress has had to consider, a bill which vitally affects the national defense of the Nation. For 8 hours a filibuster has been conducted against it in an effort to prevent the Senate of the United States from performing its constitutional duty.

I believe there is nothing more important than to proceed to a determination of the question whether the Senate of the United States can function or whether the Senate of the United States cannot function.

For that reason, I shall object to the consideration of any other business until that matter has been disposed of.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am in the same category with the able Senator from California in the belief that the rules of the Senate should be modified so that a majority of the Senate may determine what business shall be pending before the Senate and when the Senate shall vote upon any particular matter.

Senators will recall my introduction of resolutions to that effect and my appearance before Senate committees dealing with that subject. But the Senate has not chosen to adopt our viewpoint on that matter, and that is not the rule of the Senate at the present time.

The present rules of the Senate allow unlimited debate, except if cloture is invoked, and allow any Senator to speak twice in any single legislative day upon any pending question. That includes the right of the Senator from North Dakota to speak as long as he cares to speak.

Mr. President, that being the situation at the present time, the acting majority leader will, unhappily, no doubt, have to make the decision as to whether he is to allow the desire of the Senator from North Dakota to speak—which is perfectly within the rights of the Senator from North Dakota, under the rules of the Senate which the Senate has declined to change—and to obstruct all other desirable legislation, or whether the Senator might be requested to defer his remarks—and he has indicated that he is willing to do so—and have the Senate take up these other matters, so that they could be considered.

So, if the pending discussion of the Senator from North Dakota obstructs the other matters, I am not at all sure that the Senator from North Dakota will be the only one responsible.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is there a conference report ready to be laid down?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Nebraska will release the floor, the Chair will call attention to a bill received from the House of Representatives, the title of which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6465) to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no further use in asking anyone to yield. The answer to the Senator from Florida has already been made. The Senator from California feels that this draft measure is the most important legislation before the Senate, and that it should be determined, and it will have to be determined under the rules we now have.

I should like very much to expedite the consideration of all legislation. Here we are in the closing hours of this session of the Congress. We could accomplish a program and end the session of Congress without any difficulty if we could just obtain full cooperation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield to the Senator from Kentucky as soon as I finish making the statement.

If we could get a vote on the motion to appoint conferees on the draft bill, we could proceed, and the Senator from North Dakota could make his speech on any business which comes up. I want to have the Senate proceed just as harmoniously as it is humanly possible to do, and I make an appeal that we may have a vote on the present motion to have a conference on the draft bill, and then proceed with the other work of the Senate. The Senator from North Dakota could still make his remarks; he could oppose the draft bill when it comes back before the Senate in the form of the conference report. Certainly my suggestion is a fair one. Certainly what I suggest is the only thing to do under the present rules.

In a moment I shall yield to the minority leader; and while he is speaking, I am going to ask my distinguished colleague from North Dakota to consider my suggestion very seriously, and to realize that I hope with all the hope within my power that he will permit us to proceed with this important subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska object to the consideration of the matter which has just been referred to?

Mr. WHERRY. I did not object, but I understand that the Senator from California will object.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished acting majority leader in asking the distinguished Senator from North Dakota to permit the draft bill motion to be acted upon. It really would seem to discredit the Senate of the United States, in the last hours of what we hoped would be this session, to have to witness the utter futility of this body in the matter of legislation. Although I have cooperated with the other side as fully as I could to bring about the completion of the program and to adjourn today, I wish to say that so far as I am concerned, I myself will not vote either to adjourn or recess the Senate in the midst of this atmosphere of futility and impotence. I will vote to stay here all day today and all tonight and all day tomorrow and all tomorrow night and all every other day and all every other night, to end this futility.

(Manifestations of applause in the galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must advise those in the galleries that it will be necessary to have the galleries cleared if there are other demonstrations, for the rules of the Senate do not permit demonstrations by the occupants of the galleries.

The Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to state that if any Senators feel that they can force the Congress to adjourn because of the pendency of any measure or any number of measures, they are reckoning without their host.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield as soon as I finish making my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. PEPPER. Does it require the consent of the Senator from Nebraska in order to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, until I finish this observation, I do not intend to yield to anyone for any purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield, and he has perfect right to decline.

Mr. WHERRY. I decline to yield until I finish this observation. I shall be fair. I shall let any Senator talk who wants to, when the time comes for him to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Florida as soon as the Senator from Nebraska finishes.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall gladly yield until the Senator gets through with his observation.

Mr. WHERRY. That is fine. I thank the Senator.

We have about four important pieces of legislation that can be passed here I think without any difficulty. I agree with the Senator from California, however, that the most important issue before the Senate is the pending motion to send the draft bill to conference. Until that can be settled we shall all have to take the position of the distinguished minority leader and remain here until it is settled. I can see no other way out of it.

I appeal to the logic, I appeal to the reason of Senators, that inasmuch as the conference report will come back here, speeches can be made on it, and I will guaranty so far as the motion is concerned, there will be no motion to recess or adjourn made until the conference report is made to the Senate of the United States. I can see no reason at all why we cannot vote on the appointment of conferees. A Senator may talk about rules, he may talk about anything he pleases. Until we are in a frame of mind that we can have that kind of cooperation, Senators will not get any place in a program, unless we can do that very thing. That is all there is to it.

I should like to finish this session—it means something to me—in a spirit of harmony. This country is faced with some of the greatest issues it has ever faced in its history, and for the Senate to continue in a cooperative and harmonious way means a lot not only to the legislation that is passed but to our domestic and foreign relations.

I hope the distinguished Senator from North Dakota will yield on this one thing, that we may vote upon the appointment of conferees; then, when the conference report comes back, he can make his speech on it. When we get that out of the way, we shall proceed to the orderly work of the Senate. I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I propound the parliamentary inquiry, in view of the objection which was indicated by the able Senator from California, which was evidently regarded by the distinguished acting majority leader as preventing him from bringing up any other measure except the draft. I propound the parliamentary inquiry whether or not it requires unanimous consent to make a motion to displace the pending motion and consider something else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; of course it does not.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course not. It does not require unanimous consent. Then the acting majority leader by a majority vote of the Senate and upon his motion could displace the pending question and bring up any other measure he may care to bring up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would observe, however, in that connection that that would only make confusion worse confounded.

Mr. WHERRY. That is right.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would that be possible? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Nebraska has no more to say, before the Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota, the Chair will state the question before the Senate, so there will be no doubt about it on this new day which has dawned since the quorum call was made, or just before it. The motion was made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] that the Senate disagree to the House amendment and agree to the conference asked by the House, and the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed as follows: The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. LUCAS. Question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate has just been stated.

(Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!")

(At 1:45 a. m., June 19, the Senate was still in session. The proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 18 (legislative day of June 15), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, the United States special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the third session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held from October 18 to November 10, 1948:

George V. Allen, of North Carolina.
Milton S. Eisenhower, of Kansas.
Luther H. Evans, of Texas.
Waldo G. Leland, of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick, of New York.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the third session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held from October 18 to November 10, 1948:

Frank Capra, of California.
William H. Hastie, of the District of Columbia.
Mrs. Kathleen N. Lardie, of Michigan.
W. Albert Noyes, Jr., of New York.
George F. Zook, of Virginia.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Frank C. Squire, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term of 5 years from August 29, 1948. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES MINT

Gilroy Roberts, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be engraver in the United States Mint at Philadelphia, Pa., to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Cleon A. Summers, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma. Mr. Summers is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 5, 1948.

Timothy T. Cronin, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin. Mr. Cronin is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Thomas N. Curran, of Maine, to be United States marshal for the district of Maine. Mr. Curran is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires June 29, 1948.

Alfred J. Plowden, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina, vice Norris M. Thomas, term expired.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Oliver W. Gaines, United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the rank of captain in the Navy.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Clinton C. Cook, Buckner, Ark., in place of C. C. Stokes, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Clive B. Hubbell, Challenge, Calif., in place of H. P. Mulock, resigned.
Catherine C. Schultz, Colfax, Calif., in place of A. D. Scanlon, retired.
Sidney A. Coleman, Kentfield, Calif., in place of N. A. Coleman, retired.
John E. Mixer, Midway City, Calif., in place of W. L. Watts, resigned.

COLORADO

William D. Pinkerton, Fort Collins, Colo., in place of Roy Maxwell, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Kenneth V. Mason, Albion, Ill., in place of J. R. Wick, transferred.
G. Stewart Allen, Crete, Ill., in place of D. W. Helme, deceased.
Evans R. Pratt, Morrison, Ill., in place of J. W. Wilson, resigned.
Frank C. Niemeyer, Stockton, Ill., in place of J. D. Cotter, resigned.
Wilbur K. Reader, Thomson, Ill., in place of M. J. Sheridan, resigned.

IOWA

Edward P. Domayer, Dyersville, Iowa, in place of L. C. Smith, retired.
John R. Bahne, Eldora, Iowa, in place of J. J. Fowler, deceased.
Mattison L. Swaney, Garner, Iowa, in place of C. O. Roe, resigned.
Robert M. Klingman, Wadena, Iowa, in place of C. S. Flower, resigned.

KANSAS

Frank L. Robinson, Eskridge, Kans., in place of J. O. Warren, transferred.
Gordon N. Carlisle, Leoti, Kans., in place of G. V. Downs, transferred.
John F. Buche, Mulberry, Kans., in place of Albert Cameron, deceased.

LOUISIANA

K. C. Peterson, Zwolle, La., in place of E. C. Leone, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Thomas P. Hallinan, Chicopee Falls, Mass., in place of A. E. Roberts, retired.

MICHIGAN

Samuel Somora, Sr., Baroda, Mich., in place of M. D. Hartman, resigned.
Horace J. Lickly, Dexter, Mich., in place of L. W. Rector, transferred.
Bruce A. Lee, Millington, Mich., in place of R. P. Lee, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Raymond B. Sullivan, International Falls, Minn., in place of W. V. Kane, resigned.
Robert P. Fritzke, Saint Clair, Minn., in place of M. E. Rohrer, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Temple G. Broadus, Purvis, Miss., in place of A. M. Avery, transferred.

MISSOURI

Ida M. Brunnert, Argyle, Mo., in place of F. P. Wulff, deceased.
Walter H. Bruens, Hermann, Mo., in place of George Petrus, resigned.
Tom J. Molloy, Joplin, Mo., in place of L. L. Travis, retired.
Sylvester Welch, Parnell, Mo., in place of E. J. Echterling, resigned.

NEVADA

Josephine Roberts, McGill, Nev., in place of E. S. Christensen, resigned.
Ray E. Hepworth, Wells, Nev., in place of E. C. Smith, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Carl J. Dagostine, Socorro, N. Mex., in place of L. M. Fay, resigned.

NEW YORK

Robert Q. Sullivan, Gainesville, N. Y., in place of J. J. Hickey, transferred.

NORTH CAROLINA

Belle Q. Cable, Fontana Dam, N. C., in place of M. T. Calahan, resigned.
Frederick A. Bruton, Mount Gilead, N. C., in place of J. H. Ledbetter, deceased.
A. Garland Pierce, Southern Pines, N. C., in place of P. F. Buchan, deceased.
Gilbert A. Holt, Troy, N. C., in place of G. W. Stuart, resigned.
Maurice E. Walsh, North Wilkesboro, N. C., in place of J. C. Reins, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Roy R. Just, New Salem, N. Dak., in place of Carl Jahnke, retired.

OHIO

Robert W. Garrison, Frankfort, Ohio, in place of D. F. Briggs, Jr., transferred.
John B. Fanto, Lowellville, Ohio, in place of L. B. Milligan, deceased.
William J. Gallehue, North Hampton, Ohio, in place of M. K. Lehman, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Claude L. Hostetter, Clinton, Okla., in place of I. J. Loewen, deceased.

Clarence W. Phillips, Coyle, Okla., in place of G. E. Wandell, retired.

Alfred V. Koehler, Manchester, Okla., in place of B. E. Stone, resigned.

Robert Anderson, Sperry, Okla., in place of R. T. Holbert, deceased.

Oscar Renz, Weatherford, Okla., in place of J. M. Crabtree, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Grant M. Barrall, Wapwallopen, Pa., in place of C. D. Everard, transferred.

SAMOA

William F. Robison, Pago Pago, Samoa, in place of D. J. McMullin, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

George A. Curry, Elk Point, S. Dak., in place of T. H. Ryan, retired.

TEXAS

Lance A. Leggitt, Lakeview, Tex., in place of J. D. Durham, transferred.

Jesse B. Strickland, Novice, Tex., in place of M. R. Howard, resigned.

Irvin L. Hergert, Perryton, Tex., in place of M. R. Coffee, resigned.

John O. Bier, Plainview, Tex., in place of J. C. Terry, retired.

VIRGINIA

James L. Hale, Chilhowie, Va., in place of E. B. Sanders, transferred.

WASHINGTON

Rival S. Moore, Long Beach, Wash., in place of C. D. Mitchell, transferred.

WEST VIRGINIA

Henry E. Chapman, New Martinsville, W. Va., in place of J. O. Eakin, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Ruby C. Bahr, Fairchild, Wis., in place of R. R. Hoffman, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 17, 1948)

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Lord and our God, again we wait in the shadow of Thy holy presence, in which all alarms have been hushed. We entreat Thee to teach us the best way to see, the best way to reason, and the best way to act in serving society and the State.

Give to the Congress a great measure of moral courage as it meets all pressing needs; grant that its achievements may bear the mark of a patriotic and convincing faith and that its decisions may become prophecies of a better tomorrow. In our Master's name and for His sake. Amen.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the following title:

H. R. 6771. An act making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. REED, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6248. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) entitled "Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CORBETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two essays.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Red River of the North project and include letters, reports of hearings, communications, and newspaper articles.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast by Jack Bell entitled "Communism."

Mr. LOVE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Wheeling Intelligencer of June 17.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one a quotation from the State Department and statements appearing in the Washington Star, and in the other an analysis of the Marshall plan in two instances.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in two to include an editorial and in the third an address by the Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, one concerning the Palestine question, and in the other to include a letter he is sending to some of his constituents.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in each to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. DOUGHTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed yesterday by the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the services of the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman of the committee.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written by him to a constituent.

Mr. PETERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and statement.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several clippings from various periodicals.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include an editorial from the Montana Standard of Butte, Mont.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one a newspaper article.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some telegrams.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the thirtieth observance of Lithuania's independence day. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $301.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I was granted permission to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram from President Truman, the speech of Dr. Frank Kingdon, sundry newspaper articles and pieces of correspondence, and the speech of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], in connection with a testimonial dinner recently given the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] in New York City. I understand that only a portion of this material was included in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that I again be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD as indicated, and that anything inserted in the RECORD in the previous extension be included in this insertion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, our friends and colleagues from Florida, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE] will leave Congress at this session. They have both made very capable, conscientious legislators and Representatives. It has been my pleasure to serve with both of them during the entire length of their service. They have both fully cooperated with the Florida delegation in matters relating to the entire State and the national welfare. They have both been on the alert to represent the best interests of their respective districts. Great districts with diversified interests, they have been well represented in a critical period requiring hard work.

The Florida delegation, while small in number, has worked together as a team. These two, our friends and colleagues, have been an important part of that team, Representative HENDRICKS having served on the Post Office and Post Roads and on the Appropriations Committees, and Representative PRICE on the Post Office and Post Roads, Naval Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees.

Personally, and as chairman of the delegation from Florida, I rise to express my warm personal friendship and deep appreciation to them for their fine public service. We will miss them and we wish for them success and happiness in their future undertakings.

If I may depart for a moment from the use of formal language, I will say "Good luck, Little JOE. Good luck, EMORY. You both have made a good record. You will be missed."

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a prize-winning essay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the prize-winning essay in the contest conducted by Drew Pearson on Democracy was written by Rev. Alfred J. Fisk, of San Francisco. It is as follows:

Democracy, like good music, does not need argument; it needs rendition. The best way to make democracy live, is to live it.

People are too much concerned about democratic rights; too little about democratic responsibilities. But the rights imply duties, and become empty unless practiced. Democracy is not a fact; it is a task. To make it live, we must:

1. Vote in every election—using our best intelligence, studying propositions and candidates.

2. Exercise our right of petition, letting our legislators and officers of government know our convictions.

3. Promote community meetings for democratic discussion of civic and world problems.

4. Work through "Good Government" leagues—exercising eternal vigilance that political performance match profession.

5. Do an honest day's work. Parasites or shirkers fail in their responsibility to a democratic society.

6. Treat every man in personal relationships as an equal—without prejudice and without exploitation.

7. Finally, democracy—like peace—is indivisible. The world cannot long continue half democratic and half totalitarian. To make democracy live here at home, our Nation and we as individuals must use our influence that it live throughout the world.

Democracy begins with the individual; it ends with the world. Each of us, you and I, your next-door neighbor and mine, must practice democracy. We must build little islands of functioning democratic life. The islands will grow and touch other islands, merging into greater units, becoming continents, becoming finally the world. If you and I, the last and least citizen, live democracy day in and day out, democracy will live.

HOUSING

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, all signs now point to this—the housing bill as proposed by the Republican leadership will contain no provision for slum clearance, no public housing, no veterans housing, no farm housing. The public interest is plainly ignored.

The legislative machinery is well lubricated to push through a bill minus these provisions. Has the leadership completely overlooked the disastrous effects of present housing conditions on our people? Thousands of families are forced to live in disease-ridden slums; other thousands compelled to crowd into one, two, or three rooms, with attendant unsanitary conditions. Children must spend much of the time out of doors for there is no room at home, thus fostering juvenile delinquency. Thousands of houses, even in our modern cities, have no inside toilets, running water, or electric lights. How now will this situation be relieved? Not by the Republican controlled Congress, I assure you.

Social justice will be attained some days for these people. The Nation will not and cannot permit such uncivilized conditions to exist. How about the health rate and death rate under such conditions? Do not the leaders recognize that our manpower strength is dependent upon healthful living conditions? Perhaps if all of our people could live under proper conditions of health and sanitation there would be no need to worry about communism. Much of our social unrest can be traced directly to slums, filthy and poorly constructed homes, and unsanitary conditions in and surrounding those homes. How long will it be until some united and earnest effort is made to eliminate all of such conditions? That is the question to be answered by the Republican leadership of the House. The people will answer it for them if no answer is forthcoming.

DEFENSE OF ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the primary importance of Alaska in the plan of national defense is not properly appreciated even today. We are in effect making the same mistake we did in the years preceding the assault by Japan. Perhaps we are compounding that mistake. Then the United States did nothing at all to prepare this highly strategic area against aggression from Asia. Now we are doing just enough to make Alaska a more tempting prize than ever. Since the close of World War II we have done far too little. We can only hope that we will not be too late in taking those prudent steps which sound common sense advises must be taken without delay.

A defenseless Alaska imperils the entire United States. If our air bases in the Territory were seized by an enemy power every major city in the United States would be open to attack. The industrial East could be bombed at will, as could Detroit and Chicago and the great cities of the Pacific Northwest.

In some ways it might have been better that we did nothing in Alaska than

to do the little we have accomplished in the last 3 years. Alaska now stands as tempting bait. Properly fortified, it could be an almost impregnable bulwark against attack from Asia and could provide the spring board from which a major offensive action could be launched.

There is imperative need not only for carrying out without further delay the program outlined by the Department of National Defense, but for enlarging that program. For months on end last winter construction work at the vital Alaska defense centers was halted because of lack of funds. Buildings needed now and which could have been completed and in use now are only skeletons because workmen had to be laid off when Army funds ran out. We cannot afford to gamble in that fashion.

Neither can we afford to concentrate all our efforts upon installations at Fairbanks and Anchorage. The Air Force has in Arctic Alaska only one field. It is located at Nome. Once seized by an enemy power it could be used as the base from which to launch crippling attacks upon our installations at Anchorage and Fairbanks. There is almost literally nothing to keep an enemy from across Bering Strait from entering Alaska in any numbers he chooses.

NEED FOR ARCTIC BASES

It ought to be a matter of high national policy to ring the Arctic with suitable defenses. In any event this would be desirable and even necessary. It becomes all the more so because of the possibility of the existence in the Arctic of an oil field of considerable dimensions. It is a matter of public record that the Navy is exploring the vast Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. Although no official announcement to that effect has been made, there is high hope that underneath the Arctic tundra, heretofore held valueless, may be discovered one of the great oil pools of the world. If oil is found there Alaska will be more than ever a prize. Now, aside from the small force based at Nome, there is no protection at all along the entire Arctic coast.

Construction there will take time; it will proceed under difficulties. We should not overestimate those difficulties. We should not rule out the Arctic as a land so hostile and forbidding in climate and terrain that men and machinery cannot operate there. It can be done. It has been done. On the Soviet side of Bering Strait great advances have been made in many fields. It would be foolhardy for us to fail to note this fact. It would be foolhardy for us to make assumptions which might prove false under the stress of war. Nations have perished because of their failure to be hardheaded and realistic. We must not commit any such mistake.

SIBERIAN DEVELOPMENT

I have said that the Soviet Government has not been remiss in proceeding actively with the development of Soviet Siberia. What has been accomplished there is simply astounding. In these latter days, of course, we do not know everything that is being done but the record is clear that a great industrial empire is rising across Bering Strait and that huge cities and great farming areas are growing up. This is in startling and sad contrast to our continuing neglect of Alaska.

Alaska is a rich land. I need not elaborate on that here. It has magnificent resources of ocean and land sufficient to support a great and prosperous population, yet its area of over 586,000 square miles contains fewer than 100,000 people. What is the situation in Siberia? There were to be found 14,000,000 persons in 1944 and it is estimated the population has increased by several million since then. In 1944 along the trans-Siberian railway there were seven cities with a population of more than 100,000 persons. It is obvious that in event of war producing urban and rural populations would be of major value militarily. In Alaska we have done far too little—in fact, we have done practically nothing—to implement the national defense by attracting a civilian population to Alaska. The need for such action has been repeatedly emphasized by President Truman and by spokesmen for the armed services. The President was aware of the national interest when in his special message to Congress last month he urged adoption of an integrated program to provide for far wider utilization of Alaska resources by a far greater number of people.

The map shows why the United States cannot contemplate the loss of Alaska without contemplating at the same time the possibility—even the probability—that disastrous blows would be struck at the heart of this Nation.

PROXIMITY TO UNITED STATES

From Fairbanks, Alaska, it is 4,100 miles to Moscow. But it is only 2,790 miles from Fairbanks to Chicago, 3,270 to Washington, and 3,255 to New York. The distance from Fairbanks to Seattle is only 1,525 miles. Thus, it follows that while United States aircraft would in event of war be too far removed for direct strikes at the principal cities of Europe, the Alaska bases, once captured by an enemy power, could be turned against us with devastating effect. Bombers are now in use which can fly 8,000 miles with a load of 5 tons of bombs. Thus, no important city in the United States is removed from bombing range of Alaska. The urgency of the situation grows even more apparent when it is realized that until about 2 months ago there were no combat troops in Alaska at all. Now, some combat troops—numbering about 10,000—have been sent to Alaska for training purposes. This is a step forward, but does not meet the needs of the situation. Combat troops should be stationed permanently in Alaska in numbers sufficient to insure, insofar as such insurance can be provided, that the Alaska bases could be held even under a lightning attack. On February 1 of this year we had only 7,500 Army forces and 8,700 officers and men of the Air Force stationed in Alaska. These included Army elements stationed in the Aleutian Islands—and, as a matter of fact, those spread throughout the length and breadth of Alaska. Army troops are the service type and are largely for the support of the Air Force.

Construction is tremendously expensive in Alaska. The cost of erecting buildings has been a matter of proper concern to the appropriate committees of this Congress. Perhaps some savings could be effected. It has been suggested that gains might be registered if construction were by means of competitive bidding instead of by cost-plus contracts. However that may be, it can be fairly stated that no matter what the present-day costs are the money must be spent. It must be spent in greater volume than has been the case during the last 3 years. To do otherwise leaves Alaska defenseless and thus the Nation under constant threat. I suggest that if sufficient money is not immediately available and if time does not permit it is better to have temporary housing so combat troops can be stationed in Alaska in suitable numbers than to leave Alaska unarmed. First things must come first.

GENERAL TWINING CONCERNED

In a recent magazine article, Lt. Gen. N. F. Twining, commander in chief of the United States Army in Alaska, called attention to the needs and problems of Alaska when he wrote:

Alaska and the Aleutians must be retained as the forward bastion of our defense. Bases for long-range heavy-bomber units must be developed, inasmuch as Alaska is primarily a theater for long-range, heavy-bomber operations. These bases must be adequately staffed, even though there is a current overall shortage of personnel that seriously affects all planning for the peacetime Air Force.

No effort to conquer the problems presented by Alaska can be too great. The late Gen. Billy Mitchell said, "Whoever holds Alaska will hold the world." To fail to develop this potential would leave a critical gap in our national defense. Alaska retains a defense value that is both psychological and real. Alaska has been United States territory for 80 years. Americans anywhere would be as quick to resent an aggressive attack on Alaska as they were on Pearl Harbor, or as they would be on any part of the continental United States. Such an attack on Alaska would be certain cause for war.

The average concept of Alaska and the Arctic is continuous cold, icebergs, glaciers, Eskimos, and generally uncomfortable living conditions. The people of the United States should be informed of the fact that this is not an accurate picture. While it is true that winter months are in some areas severe and really Arctic, it is also true that occasionally temperatures and conditions exist which are experienced as far south as the middle United States.

Students of geopolitics have long been familiar with the teachings of Sir Halford Mackinder, who reasoned that whichever nation dominates a certain land mass (which he called the heartland) lying partly in Europe and partly in Asia, would be able eventually to control the whole world. More recent geopolitical theory speaks of two heartlands—the one designated by Mackinder, and another in North America. The shortest distance between the two "heartlands" of the world is across the Arctic regions. Our Arctic frontier has become, therefore, our primary defense consideration. Alaska, the northernmost portion of our Nation, thus assumes a place of primary importance in the strategy of national security.

Referring to some needs of the moment, General Twining wrote:

Logistical requirements in Alaska are many. Pipe lines are greatly needed. The existing railroad must be improved. New railways and highways are needed. Alaska has less than 3,000 miles of highways and roads in an area twice the size of Texas. These 3,000 miles would be called secondary roads in the continental United States. They could not sustain any major operation.

ALASKA UNPREPARED

My good friend Paul Herring, of Kodiak, Alaska, in a talk made before the Rotary Club of that community not long ago dealt in facts when he said:

With all the rough talk that we are making in the diplomatic world today are we prepared to back it up if war should be forced on us tomorrow? Of course, we are not in a position to answer this question for the rest of the world but our first and immediate concern is for Alaska, and our answer to the above question is a positive and emphatic "No; we are not prepared!" It is a fact that it would take no more than two or three thousand paratroopers properly equipped to descend upon and capture or destroy every military or naval establishment in Alaska today. This could be accomplished in 24 hours or less.

Paul Herring's statement was made before combat troops were sent to Alaska for training. Despite their presence, scattered as they are and numerically weak, it follows that no major thrust would be required by an enemy to take over Alaska.

William L. Baker, editor and publisher of the Ketchikan, Alaska, Chronicle, recently wrote five enlightening articles concerning the lack of preparation in Alaska in a military way:

Geography has placed Alaska in a position—

Wrote Mr. Baker—

to make it a probable battleground in any war between the two great remaining powers of the world.

There are no Maginot lines; no allies to hold the foe while we prepare.

A high officer in the Army Air Forces admitted to me recently that the construction program won't be completed at the present rate of progress for 8 to 10 years, and at that time it will be worthless. "How," he asked, "can we start building underground facilities when we don't get enough money to maintain a handful of air bases and to build houses for our personnel?"

The Bering Sea today is the hemisphere's frontier, and it boasts not a single first-class airfield along its thousand miles of coast line.

WE MUST ACT NOW

Maj. Gen. J. H. Atkinson, commander of the Air Forces in Alaska, in an address made before the Veterans of Foreign Wars encampment at Seward last month was quoted as having said:

The Army is not in Alaska to fan the flames of war, but Alaska is the strategic outpost, and the Army must guard against the area taking on a false sense of security.

Aside from the immediate strengthening of military forces General Atkinson called for improved railroads and highways, proper housing, adequate port, dock, and warehouse installations and modern airports.

All of us can hope and pray that existing tensions will be wiped away and that this troubled world may have a long period of peace. But since none of us can peer into the future clearly we cannot leave everything to hope. We must make prudent preparations for that which might occur. The desire of the American people for peace will never, we hope, again be accompanied by a lack of preparation for defense against an aggressive power. Since we must prepare and since man's inventive genius has narrowed time and space, we must make it sure and positive that our own land cannot be seized from us to provide the base for an attack on these States.

I recall that my distinguished predecessor as Delegate to Congress, Judge Anthony J. Dimond, called on the Nation in the early 1930's to fortify Alaska from the aggression he feared even then from the Japanese. He urged that a hundred million dollars be spent on naval fortifications in the Territory. His pleas went unheard. Not one penny was appropriated. Had that work been done then, it is highly unlikely the Japanese could ever have seized the outer Aleutians. They were dislodged at tremendous cost in money and American lives. Before the war, Delegate Dimond urged, too, that the Army garrison in Alaska, numbering then less than 300 officers and men, be expanded. But nothing was done. So when war did come, defenses which should have been built long before had to be constructed speedily at much greater cost and with much less efficiency than would have been the case otherwise. Had the Japanese desired to, they could have captured Alaska just as easily as it can be taken now.

We cannot afford to make the same mistake twice. We must realize and we must never forget that Alaska is the first and most important line in this Nation's defense. With it, bases would be ours to insure victory. Without it, we could be defeated. We must act and act now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] may extend his remarks in the RECORD regardless of the limit of cost reviewing the work of the Committee on Ways and Means, which he feels will be useful to each Member of the House. The cost will be about $450.

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in regard to the work of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that each member of the Committee on Ways and Means may extend his remarks with reference to the work of Mr. KNUTSON as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the several requests are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Housing, a Party Test."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes today, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, one concerning rural electrification and the other to include a letter concerning national park concessions.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the need for a strong merchant marine.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a timely editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therewith certain editorial and newspaper articles.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Samuel B. Pettengill.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I suggest this motto for self-styled liberals and progressives, "Never do yourself anything you can get the Government to do for you."

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY FUNCTIONS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6771),

making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGEL of Michigan, CASE of South Dakota, TIBBOTT, SCRIVNER, KERR, MAHON, and NORRELL.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States and for other purposes, which was requested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The Clerk will read.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for the reading of the engrossed copy.

The bill was read the third time by title.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PHILBIN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PHILBIN moves to recommit the bill (H R. 6401) to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

The roll call is automatic.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members; and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 125, nays 283, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—125

Allen, Ill.	Bloom	Clevenger
Andersen, H. Carl	Bolton	Clippinger
Andresen, August H.	Bradley	Cole, Mo.
Arnold	Brehm	Crosser
Banta	Buffett	Crow
Barden	Busbey	Cunningham
Beall	Butler	Davis, Wis.
Bender	Carson	Dawson, Utah
Bishop	Celler	Delaney
Blatnik	Chenoweth	Dolliver
	Chiperfield	Donohue
	Church	Doughton
Douglas	Klein	Rees
Elliott	Knutson	Rich
Ellis	Landis	Rockwell
Elsaesser	Lemke	Rooney
Feighan	Lewis, Ohio	Sabath
Folger	Love	Sadowski
Gallagher	McCowen	Schwabe, Mo.
Gillie	McCulloch	Schwabe, Okla.
Granger	McGarvey	Scoblick
Grant, Ind.	McGregor	Scott, Hardie
Griffiths	Madden	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
Gross	Maloney	Shafer
Gwynne, Iowa	Mansfield	Short
Hagen	Marcantonio	Simpson, Ill.
Harness, Ind.	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Kans.
Havenner	Mason	Smith, Ohio
Heffernan	Miller, Conn.	Smith, Wis.
Hill	Miller, Nebr.	Snyder
Hoeven	Mitchell	Somers
Hoffman	Morris	Stanley
Holifield	Murray, Wis.	Stefan
Horan	Nicholson	Stevenson
Hull	Nodar	Stratton
Isacson	O'Hara	Twyman
Jenison	O'Konski	Vail
Jenkins, Ohio	Pfeifer	Vursell
Johnson, Ill.	Philbin	Welchel
Johnson, Ind.	Powell	Welch
Jones, Wash.	Rankin	Youngblood
Keefe	Reed, Ill.	
Keogh	Reed, N. Y.	

NAYS—283

Abbitt	Dirksen	Jones, Ala.
Abernethy	Domengeaux	Jones, N. C.
Albert	Dondero	Jonkman
Allen, Calif.	Dorn	Judd
Allen, La.	Durham	Karsten, Mo.
Anderson, Calif.	Eaton	Kean
Andrews, Ala.	Eberharter	Kearney
Andrews, N. Y.	Ellsworth	Kearns
Angell	Elston	Keating
Arends	Engel, Mich.	Kee
Auchincloss	Engle, Calif.	Kefauver
Bakewell	Evins	Kelley
Barrett	Fallon	Kennedy
Bates, Ky.	Fellows	Kersten, Wis.
Bates, Mass.	Fenton	Kilburn
Battle	Fernandez	Kilday
Beckworth	Fisher	King
Bell	Flanagan	Kirwan
Bennett, Mich.	Fletcher	Kunkel
Bennett, Mo.	Fogarty	Lanham
Blackney	Foote	Larcade
Bland	Forand	Latham
Boggs, Del.	Fuller	Lea
Boggs, La.	Fulton	LeCompte
Bonner	Gamble	LeFevre
Boykin	Garmatz	Lesinski
Bramblett	Gary	Lewis, Ky.
Brooks	Gathings	Lichtenwalter
Brophy	Gavin	Lodge
Brown, Ga.	Gearhart	Lucas
Bryson	Gillette	Lusk
Buchanan	Goff	Lyle
Buck	Goodwin	Lynch
Buckley	Gordon	McConnell
Bulwinkle	Gore	McCormack
Burke	Gorski	McDonough
Burleson	Gossett	McDowell
Byrne, N. Y.	Graham	McMahon
Byrnes, Wis.	Grant, Ala.	McMillan, S. C.
Camp	Gregory	McMillen, Ill.
Canfield	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mack
Cannon	Hale	MacKinnon
Carroll	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mahon
Case, N. J.	Hall, Leonard W.	Manasco
Case, S. Dak.	Halleck	Mathews
Chadwick	Hand	Meade, Md.
Chapman	Hardy	Merrow
Chelf	Harless, Ariz.	Meyer
Clark	Harris	Michener
Clason	Harrison	Miller, Calif.
Coffin	Hart	Miller, Md.
Cole, Kans.	Harvey	Mills
Cole, N. Y.	Hays	Monroney
Colmer	Hébert	Morgan
Combs	Hedrick	Morrison
Cooley	Herter	Morton
Cooper	Heselton	Muhlenberg
Corbett	Hess	Multer
Cotton	Hinshaw	Mundt
Coudert	Hobbs	Murdock
Courtney	Holmes	Murray, Tenn.
Cox	Hope	Nixon
Crawford	Huber	Norblad
Curtis	Jackson, Calif.	Norrell
Dague	Jackson, Wash.	O'Brien
Davis, Ga.	Jarman	Pace
Davis, Tenn.	Javits	Passman
Dawson, Ill.	Jenkins, Pa.	Patman
Deane	Jennings	Patterson
Devitt	Johnson, Calif.	Peterson
D'Ewart	Phillips, Calif.	Phillips, Tenn.
Dingell	Rogers, Mass.	Pickett
	Rohrbough	Ploeser
	Ross	Plumley
	Russell	Poage
	Sadlak	Potter
	St. George	Potts
	Sanborn	Poulson
	Sarbacher	Preston
	Sasscer	Price, Fla.
	Scrivner	Price, Ill.
	Secly-Brown	Priest
	Sheppard	Rains
	Sikes	Ramey
	Simpson, Pa.	Rayburn
	Smathers	Redden
	Smith, Maine	Reeves
	Smith, Va.	Richards
	Spence	Riehlman
	Stockman	Riley
	Sundstrom	Rivers
	Taber	Rizley
	Talle	Rogers, Fla.
	Taylor	
	Teague	
	Thomas, Tex.	
	Thompson	
	Tibbott	
	Tollefson	
	Towe	
	Trimble	
	Van Zandt	
	Vinson	
	Vorys	
	Wadsworth	
	Walter	
	Wheeler	
	Whitten	
	Whittington	
	Wigglesworth	
	Williams	
	Wilson, Tex.	
	Winstead	
	Wolcott	
	Wolverton	
	Woodruff	
	Worley	

NOT VOTING—22

Brown, Ohio	Lane	Stigler
Cravens	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Hartley	Macy	West
Hendricks	Meade, Ky.	Whitaker
Jensen	O'Toole	Wilson, Ind.
Johnson, Okla.	Peden	Wood
Johnson, Tex.	Regan	
Kerr	Robertson	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice.

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Macy with Mr. Peden.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Stigler.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. West.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Mead of Kentucky with Mr. Lane.

Mr. GILLIE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SHAFER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BEALL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HOEVEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MCGARVEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 282, nays 131, answered "present" 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—282

Abbitt	Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ga.
Abernethy	Battle	Bryson
Albert	Beall	Buchanan
Allen, Calif.	Beckworth	Buck
Allen, La.	Bell	Buckley
Anderson, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Bulwinkle
Andrews, Ala.	Blackney	Burke
Andrews, N. Y.	Bland	Burleson
Angell	Bogga, Del.	Byrne, N. Y.
Arends	Boggs, La.	Byrnes, Wis.
Auchincloss	Bonner	Camp
Bakewell	Boykin	Canfield
Barrett	Bramblett	Carroll
Bates, Ky.	Brooks	Case, N. J.

Chadwick	Harvey	Nodar
Chapman	Hays	Norblad
Chelf	Hébert	Norrell
Clark	Hedrick	Norton
Clason	Hendricks	O'Brien
Cole, Kans.	Herter	Pace
Cole, N. Y.	Heselton	Passman
Colmer	Hess	Patman
Combs	Hinshaw	Patterson
Cooley	Hobbs	Peterson
Cooper	Holmes	Phillips, Calif.
Corbett	Hope	Pickett
Cotton	Huber	Ploeser
Coudert	Jackson, Calif.	Plumley
Courtney	Jackson, Wash.	Poage
Cox	Jarman	Potter
Cravens	Jenkins, Pa.	Potts
Crawford	Jennings	Poulson
Crow	Johnson, Calif.	Preston
Cunningham	Jones, Ala.	Price, Fla.
Curtis	Jones, N. C.	Price, Ill.
Dague	Jonkman	Priest
Davis, Ga.	Judd	Rains
Davis, Tenn.	Karsten, Mo.	Ramey
Dawson, Ill.	Kean	Rayburn
Deane	Kearney	Redden
Devitt	Kearns	Reeves
Dingell	Keating	Richards
Dirksen	Kee	Riehlman
Domengeaux	Kefauver	Riley
Dondero	Kelley	Rivers
Donohue	Kennedy	Rizley
Dorn	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Fla.
Durham	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Eaton	Kilday	Rohrbough
Eberharter	King	Ross
Elston	Kirwan	Russell
Engel, Mich.	Kunkel	Sadlak
Engle, Calif.	Lanham	St. George
Evins	Larcade	Sarbacher
Fallon	Latham	Sasscer
Fellows	Lea	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Fenton	LeCompte	Scrivner
Fernandez	LeFevre	Secly-Brown
Fisher	Lesinksi	Sheppard
Flannagan	Lewis, Ky.	Sikes
Fletcher	Lichtenwalter	Simpson, Pa.
Fogarty	Lodge	Smathers
Foote	Lucas	Smith, Maine
Forand	Lusk	Smith, Va.
Fuller	Lyle	Spence
Fulton	Lynch	Stanley
Gamble	McConnell	Stockman
Garmatz	McCormack	Sundstrom
Gary	McDonough	Taber
Gathings	McDowell	Talle
Gavin	McMahon	Taylor
Gearhart	McMillan, S. C.	Teague
Gillette	McMillen, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.
Goff	Mack	Thompson
Goodwin	MacKinnon	Tibbott
Gordon	Mahon	Tollefson
Gore	Manasco	Towe
Gorski	Mathews	Trimble
Gossett	Meade, Md.	Van Zandt
Graham	Merrow	Vinson
Grant, Ala.	Meyer	Vorys
Gregory	Michener	Wadsworth
Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Calif.	Walter
Hale	Miller, Md.	Wheeler
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mills	Whitten
Hall, Leonard W.	Monroney	Whittington
Halleck	Morgan	Wigglesworth
Hand	Morrison	Williams
Hardy	Morton	Wilson, Tex.
Harless, Ariz.	Muhlenberg	Winstead
Harris	Multer	Wolcott
Harrison	Mundt	Wolverton
Hart	Murdock	Woodruff
	Murray, Tenn.	Worley
	Nixon	

NAYS—131

Allen, Ill.	Case, S. Dak.	Folger
Andersen, H. Carl	Celler	Gallagher
Andresen, August H.	Chenoweth	Gillie
Arnold	Chiperfield	Granger
Banta	Church	Grant, Ind.
Barden	Clevenger	Griffiths
Bender	Clippinger	Gross
Bennett, Mo	Coffin	Gwynne, Iowa
Bishop	Cole, Mo.	Hagen
Blatnik	Crosser	Harness, Ind.
Bloom	Davis, Wis.	Havenner
Bolton	Dawson, Utah	Heffernan
Bradley	Delaney	Hill
Brehm	D'Ewart	Hoeven
Brophy	Dolliver	Hoffman
Buffett	Doughton	Holifield
Busbey	Douglas	Horan
Butler	Elliott	Hull
Cannon	Ellis	Isacson
Carson	Elsaesser	Javits
	Feighan	Jenison
		Jenkins, Ohio
	Jensen	Mason	Schwabe, Mo.
	Johnson, Ill.	Miller, Conn.	Schwabe, Okla.
	Johnson, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.	Scoblick
	Jones, Wash.	Mitchell	Scott, Hardie
	Keefe	Morris	Shafer
	Keogh	Murray, Wis.	Short
	Kerr	Nicholson	Simpson, Ill.
	Klein	O'Hara	Smith, Kans.
	Knutson	O'Konski	Smith, Ohio
	Landis	Pfeifer	Smith, Wis.
	Lemke	Philbin	Snyder
	Lewis, Ohio	Phillips, Tenn.	Somers
	Love	Powell	Stefan
	McCowen	Rankin	Stevenson
	McCulloch	Reed, Ill.	Stratton
	McGarvey	Reed, N. Y.	Twyman
	McGregor	Rees	Vail
	Macy	Rich	Vursell
	Madden	Rockwell	Welchel
	Maloney	Rooney	Wood
	Mansfield	Sabath	Youngblood
	Marcantonio	Sadowski	
	Martin, Iowa	Sanborn	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Welch

NOT VOTING—16

Brown, Ohio	Meade, Ky.	Thomas, N. J.
Hartley	O'Toole	West
Johnson, Okla.	Peden	Whitaker
Johnson, Tex.	Regan	Wilson, Ind.
Lane	Robertson	
Ludlow	Stigler	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnson of Texas for, with Mr. Ludlow against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Peden.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Stigler.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Whitaker.

Mr. CELLER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DOMENGEAUX changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. POWELL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 671, the Chair lays before the House the Senate bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substitute the House bill H. R. 6401, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of New York moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 2655 and insert the provisions of H. R. 6401, as amended.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill S. 2655, with a House amendment, insist on the amendment of the House, and ask for a conference with the Senate, and that the Speaker appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution, House Resolution 690, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House insist upon its amendment to S. 2655, ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes, and that the Speaker immediately appoint conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] desire to use any of his time?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If this resolution is agreed to, when the bill goes to conference will the conferees have a right to agree to the Senate bill, without coming back to the House for instructions?

The SPEAKER. The Chair, of course, cannot anticipate what action the conferees would take or what action the Senate might take.

Mr. RICH. Suppose the House conferees agree to everything that the Senate wants, without having the amendment containing the provisions of the House bill in the legislation, would they not be required to come back here?

The SPEAKER. Of course, the gentleman understands that whatever the conferees do, they must report back to the House for further action. Their recommendations must be supported by the House later.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. The last I could hear about the motion was: "And with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole." I understand several amendments were adopted in the Committee of the Whole. I wish to know if the Shafer amendment will be a part of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The so-called Shafer amendment is a part of the House amendment to the Senate bill; that is right.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the time allotted to me except to point out that the House has voted by substantial majorities certain amendments. I think the Managers on the part of the House at the conference should feel duty bound to insist on the amendments the House voted into this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I merely wish to repeat what I said in general debate yesterday: I know I am going to be a lonely figure, I am going to be alone. My hands are tied, but I will fight over there. And then they will bring it back and throw it into your laps. I hope that you have enough conscience, and courage, and conviction to rise up and vote on that conference report when it is returned to you.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman from New York wants to do so, he can offer a motion to instruct the conferees to stand by the House bill.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. As I remember it, an amendment was adopted by the committee in anticipation of the Shafer amendment. Will it likewise be in the bill?

The SPEAKER. All the amendments adopted in the House will go to the conference.

Mr. FOLGER. All right. They will have a scrap over there.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, is a motion to instruct conferees to stand by the House amendments in order at this time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that such a motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I ask for this time only to say that whenever the gentleman from Mississippi comes to the rescue and aid of the gentleman from New York, Mr. Marcantonio, the days of miracles are not over.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, may I say that the gentleman from New York is in need neither of being rescued nor of a miracle.

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to say that if the gentleman wishes to do so, as soon as the previous question is ordered it is in order to offer a motion to instruct conferees. That is the rule of the House that has always been followed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inform the gentleman from Mississippi that there is no previous question to be ordered, that the House is now considering under a suspension of the rules House Resolution 690, which carries the following provision:

That the House insist upon its amendments to the bill of the Senate, S. 2655, ask for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Speaker immediately appoint conferees.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It has always been the rule and it is the rule now.

The SPEAKER. But this is under a suspension of the rules and it would not be in order after the adoption of the pending resolution to offer such a motion.

Mr. RANKIN. Then it is changing the rules of the House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the resolution passed?

The question was taken and, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ANDREWS of New York, SHORT, COLE of New York, BATES of Massachusetts, VINSON, BROOKS, and KILDAY.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the House bill was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE DAY

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the gentleman from Indiana can tell us what the program is for the remainder of the day or at least some of it.

Mr. HALLECK. I can at least give enough to start us off, which will keep us busy for some time.

As I understand it, there are several conference reports ready for action and probably they should be disposed of first. Then it is proposed to call up some measures under suspensions and they will be called up approximately as follows:

First. A bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Second. The housing bill.

Third. Increase in postal pay and rates.

Fourth. Air parcel post.

Fifth. The so-called revolving fund matter which has to do with cotton and wool for export to Japan, which bill is from the Committee on the Armed Services.

There are five measures. Other measures may be called up under suspension during the day if we have time and if other matters do not intervene.

THE HONORABLE FRANCK R. HAVENNER, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to announce that a black blot upon the records of a former committee of the House of Representatives has been officially erased during the present session of Congress. On June 15 the Committee on Un-American Activities, by unanimous vote, ordered that testimony attacking the reputation of Representative FRANCK R. HAVENNER, of California, which was given at a secret meeting of a subcommittee of the old Dies committee, held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, be expunged from the records of the committee.

Thus a regrettable chapter in the history of the so-called Dies committee has been obliterated by official action.

During the summer of 1940, while the Seventy-sixth Congress was in session and while Representative HAVENNER, a Member of that Congress, was at his post of duty here in the National Capital, he received information that an attempt would be made to give certain derogatory testimony concerning him before the Dies committee. Mr. HAVENNER informs me that he went to see the chairman of the committee, Representative Dies, of Texas, and inquired whether there was any truth in this report. Mr. Dies replied that he had heard nothing about it. Mr. HAVENNER then requested Chairman Dies to notify him if anyone attempted to give any testimony concerning him before the committee, in order that he might appear before the committee and exercise his right as a Member of Congress to testify in his own behalf. Dies assured him that this would be done.

After talking to the chairman, Mr. HAVENNER visited Representative Dempsey, of New Mexico, the ranking member of the Dies committee, and Representative Voorhis, of California, also a member of the committee, and made the same requests of them. Both also assured Representative HAVENNER that they would notify him immediately if they learned that any testimony concerning him was to be heard by the committee.

Now comes the most amazing feature of this regrettable episode in congressional history.

Not until more than 4 years had elapsed did Representative HAVENNER learn that, shortly after his conversation with Chairman Dies, a meeting of a subcommittee of the Dies committee, which was not public, was held in Beaumont, Tex. At that meeting, which was attended, as Mr. HAVENNER states, only by one member of the committee, the secretary of the committee, Robert E. Stripling, and the then investigator for the committee, James H. Stedman, a witness named John L. Leech testified under oath that it was his understanding that Representative HAVENNER had been and was at that time a member of the Communist Party.

The first time that Congressman HAVENNER knew that this meeting had been held on July 16, 1940, and that damaging testimony concerning him had been taken under oath, was when political advertisements, containing excerpts from the testimony given by the witness Leech were printed in San Francisco newspapers in October 1944, during Mr. HAVENNER'S campaign for reelection to Congress.

Mr. HAVENNER never received any notification from Mr. Dies or from any other member or employee of the committee, or from anyone else, that this meeting was to be held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, and he was never given any opportunity to appear before the committee to refute this damaging testimony.

The record of the subcommittee hearing, which was not a public meeting, held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, was kept on the secret file of the committee for more than 4 years and was never officially released by the Dies committee for publication.

Just how the supporters of Mr. HAVENNER'S opponent in the 1944 campaign for Congress learned about the secret subcommittee meeting and obtained the record of its proceedings for publication has never been officially disclosed.

When Mr. HAVENNER was returned to Congress in January 1945, he took the floor of the House of Representatives and denounced the testimony of the witness Leech as perjury in its entirety. On that occasion every member of the old Dies committee who was present arose and stated that they had never heard of the secret subcommittee meeting held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, and had never known anything about the testimony concerning Mr. HAVENNER until he made his speech on the floor of the House.

When Mr. HAVENNER had concluded his statement, many Members of the House of Representatives voluntarily arose and expressed their confidence in Mr. HAVENNER'S patriotism and integrity.

Not a single Member of the House attempted to condone this testimony given in an attempt to smear their fellow Member, and many Members denounced it as an outrageous proceeding.

I participated in the discussion on the floor of the House on that occasion, and, in the course of my remarks, I said:

There should be an investigation of the conspiracy to smear a gentleman who was a former Member of Congress and who is a Member of Congress today. The gentleman from California is the one who happened to be in that position today, but it might have been any other Member of this House.

If that testimony was false it means that there was a conspiracy among certain individuals in California to smear the gentleman for a particular purpose. It seems to me to be a matter of interest to each and every Member of the House and I think, speaking as an individual, if anything is done that the committee should go further and if they do find falsehoods, look into them. They will find falsehoods, for the gentleman has denied that the statements were true. They should investigate the conspiracy because it concerns every Member of this body.

As far as the gentleman himself is concerned, I have served with him, and I believe I speak the sentiments of every Member of this body. The gentleman may differ with me on this or that question, or differ with some of us who serve with him, but because we differ on public questions does not mean that we are not good Americans; it means simply a difference in our individual conscience and our individual judgment as to the best interests of the country. We may disagree as to judgment, but every man here has a love of America and is actuated by the same high patriotic motives as the gentlemen from California, who enjoys the confidence of every Member on each side of the aisle, as far as I know, who serves with him. I rise particularly to make this contribution because the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] enjoys our respect and confidence and because we recognize that he is both honorable and trustworthy.

The conviction which I expressed in these remarks back in 1945 that this whole unsavory affair indicated that there had been a conspiracy to misuse the privileged authority of a congressional committee in order to defame a Member of Congress is strengthened by certain information which Representative HAVENNER has recently given me. He states that with the permission of Chairman THOMAS he talked with the clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Stripling, who was present at the secret subcommittee meeting of the Dies committee down in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940.

Mr. HAVENNER asked the clerk of the committee who had arranged to bring the witness, Leech, whose home was in Los Angeles, out to this secret meeting in Beaumont, Tex., to give perjured testimony against a Member of Congress. The clerk, Mr. Stripling, replied that it was the duty of the investigator, James H. Stedman, to produce witnesses for the committee hearings. When Mr. HAVENNER asked to see Stedman, he was informed that the former investigator had not been employed by the committee for several years. Congressman HAVENNER inquired where Stedman was located, and was informed that after he left the committee he was employed by the Honolulu Oil Co., in Los Angeles, and was still in the employ of that company.

The President of the Honolulu Oil Co. is Mr. Albert C. Mattei, a gentleman who has been very active in Republican politics in northern California for many years. Congressman HAVENNER states that Mr. Mattei has been the chief financial and political supporter of every Republican candidate for Congress who has run against HAVENNER since our colleague was first elected to this House back in 1936. Mr. Mattei was the chief financial and political backer of Mr. HAVENNER'S Republican opponent for Congress in 1940, when the secret subcommittee meeting of the Dies committee was held down in Beaumont, Tex. Mr. Mattei was again the chief financial and political backer of Mr. HAVENNER'S opponent for Congress in 1944, when the defamatory perjured testimony taken at the secret subcommittee down in Beaumont, Tex., first saw the light of day in a political advertisement designed to defeat Mr. HAVENNER as a candidate for Congress.

And now it develops that when former Investigator Stedman, who is reported by the clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities to have produced the witness who gave the defamatory perjured testimony against Congressman HAVENNER at the secret subcommittee meeting down in Beaumont, Tex., severed his connection with that committee, he was employed by the Honolulu Oil Co., of which Mr. Mattei is the president.

I leave this astounding sequence of facts to the judgment of Congress and the American people.

Congressman HAVENNER is one of the ablest Members of the Congress, sincere, courageous, a fighter for the people, and loyal to the best interests of the people, he is a credit to the people of his district. Congressman HAVENNER is a great American.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1948

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, JOHNSON of Illinois, MURRAY of Wisconsin, FLANNAGAN, COOLEY, and PACE.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include recommendations.

Mr. RUSSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Felix Morley appearing in Human Events. This article proves again how far we have gone toward the totalitarian concept of government in our State Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. RUSSELL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Missouri Bismarck Gazette.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an address by Herman W. Steinkraus, president of the Bridgeport Brass Co.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter. In one of these instances it may exceed the limit under the rules, and due to the press of business in the Government Printing Office they have been unable to furnish me an estimate. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the reqest of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two resolutions adopted by Henry H. Houston II Post, No. 3.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas (at the request of Mr. PLUMLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this morning I voted for the bill to provide for a temporary draft but I did so with considerable skepticism and reluctance. The wisdom of peacetime conscription in a free country is always open to serious challenge. It is a dangerous power to extend in time of peace except upon the most stringent and limited terms. In my judgment, its necessity can only be justified on the need for sufficient military manpower to adequately defend our country against attack from any potential aggressor. I base my support of this measure on the fact that the President, as Commander in Chief, and our military experts have advised us that our manpower in the armed forces is inadequate for this purpose and that it cannot be obtained by voluntary procedures.

The evidence is abundant that our Military Establishment has not given the voluntary system of induction a fair trial. But it is not difficult to understand that a voluntary system can never be successful when the men in charge of such a program condemn it in advance and doom it to failure. As long as military men have that attitude, there is little or no chance for a voluntary program to succeed.

It should be definitely understood that this legislation is temporary and limited in duration to the period needed to fill our basic minimum manpower requirements. Such a system has no place in a free government in peacetime except upon that limited basis. So I have supported this legislation, Mr. Speaker, because it is temporary in nature and because I think that we must be adequately prepared to defend ourselves against outside aggression and thus be able to insure the preservation of our country and the safety of our people. But I definitely want to be on record as opposing the use of peacetime conscription as a means of implementing our foreign policy. If I thought we were putting additional men in uniform for the purpose of sending them to the far-flung corners of the earth, to settle other peoples' problems or fight other nations' wars, then I would be irrevocably opposed to it. The average American has no objection to being called at any time to assist in the defense of his country. The real fear of our potential soldiers is the constant uncertainty of whether their services will be used in the defense of this country or whether they will be sent to some distant land to become involved in the settlement of disputes which have nothing to do with our national security or defense. No one can blame an American soldier for wanting some assurance that he will not again be sent to foreign battlefields. If Congress does not give him that assurance, to whom can he look for it? Those who have conducted our foreign policy since the beginning of the last war have made one tragic blunder after another. This policy has been costly in dollars. Let us pray that it will never again be costly in American lives.

Mr. Speaker, this country cannot afford another global war. The last one cost over $360,000,000,000 and left us with a national debt of over two hundred and fifty billion. Another such war would not only impoverish and bankrupt this Nation, it would completely destroy our freedom and the system of government which protects it. It would annihilate the only republic on the face of the earth where human rights and dignity come ahead of the state. We can never again afford to risk this priceless heritage by engaging in another global war.

No single nation can shoulder the social, economic, and military problems of the rest of the world and expect to survive. The United States cannot do it and survive. Yet, step by step we are trying to assume that responsibility. Day by day in ever increasing numbers other nations are saddling us with their social, economic, and military burdens. If we do not soon discontinue this kind of program we will eventually find ourselves in the same desperate situation as those we are seeking to save.

Our foreign policy and our military power should be dedicated wholly and solely to the preservation of our own national security and welfare. If we use the military and economic prestige of the United States for these purposes we will be in a better position to help maintain world peace, without endangering the solvency or stability of our own Government—and without engaging in other people's wars.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, in time of great national peril we must depend chiefly on able and loyal military and naval leaders for our security. It is more important today than ever before that the United States be assured that its future requirements for well-qualified and highly trained officers shall be adequately met.

Not long ago my attention was called to an editorial entitled "A Challenge to Service Schools," which summarized the criticisms directed at the United States Military and Naval Academies because of their short enrollments and unfilled vacancies. Under existing procedure, in a large measure the fact that there are unfilled vacancies in classes at the Academies may very well be the responsibility of Congress itself.

I sent the editorial in question to the Secretary of the Army with a request for his comments. His letter constituted so excellent a statement of the position of the Department and the Academy authorities that under the leave which has been granted I include its text together with a further exchange of letters between us. They are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., November 10, 1947.

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. REEVES: In further reply to your letter of October 6, 1947, I would like to outline the principal reasons, as they appear to the Department of the Army, for the present understrength at West Point.

Your letter refers to the article in the Atlantic Monthly, written by Ralph Lee Smith, a former midshipman at the Naval Academy. I know that you did not expect me to comment directly on this article, but I do wish to comment briefly on references to it in the editorial in the Kansas City Star, since it might be inferred that the complaints of this former midshipman about instruction and traditions might apply to the military academy.

The Army has maintained vigilant interest in the instruction at West Point, and has not relied solely on its own judgment thereof. In 1945 the Secretary of War appointed a board to criticize the proposed curriculum and the transition from the 3-year to a 4-year course. The board was composed of Dr. Karl T. Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dr. James P. Baxter III, president of Williams College, and several distinguished general officers of the Army, including Lt. Gen. Troy H. Middleton, comptroller of Louisiana State University. In their report, the consultants commented most favorably upon the methods of instruction, the progressiveness of the teaching staff, and the modern equipment in the academic department. The program of physical education and intramural athletics drew their praise. The general conclusion was that the academic program at the academy was thoroughly sound and provided the balanced and liberal education in the arts and sciences directed in the Department of the Army's statement of the academy's mission. The curriculum has been broadened to cover recent developments in nuclear physics and electronics, and the course in leadership increased to 4 years. Additional professors have been authorized by Congress, and appointed. The ratio of instructors to students has been maintained at a level permitting individual instruction. Daily recitations by each cadet reveal either proficiency or deficiency in each phase of instruction, thus eliminating mediocre efforts in midterm and cramming for final examinations. Weekly standings posted on bulletin board and monthly reports to parents keep both informed of the cadet's progress.

Tradition has ever been part of military service, and properly so. That it is an important factor in the life of the West Point cadet is undeniable. The honor code, developed and adhered to by generations of cadets, is the outstanding tradition at the Military Academy, and, with others, has served to inculcate in these young men the acceptance of "duty, honor, country" as a personal code. This spiritual indoctrination is no less important than the technical, cultural, and physical development of cadets. Civilian schools have their traditions and customs; and if those at the Military Academy demand more of the student in fortitude, self-control, and determination, it only reflects the striving for an ideal of character, courage, self-denial, forthrightness, and physical stamina that is expected of the Regular Army officer. These traditions place all cadets on a common footing, regardless of personal fortune or social background. They serve to identify weaklings and reveal to themselves and to the authorities those who are unable to conform to group living under strenuous circumstances, or who are temperamentally incapable of submission to authority.

The reasons, in the opinion of the Department of the Army, for the decrease in the number of applicants for admission to the Military Academy and the consequent understrength in the Corps of Cadets, are set forth below under six main headings.

1. American economic conditions: Inflated earnings increase the attraction of civilian pursuits, while rising living costs decrease interest in an education that involves an obligation to serve many years at relatively low fixed incomes. Because of high earnings throughout the war years, many parents who would otherwise be eager to obtain West Point appointments for their sons, with education at Government expense, have accumulated sufficient money to pay for a civilian education.

2. The apathy of the public toward military service: The apathy of the public toward military service that became apparent as soon as actual combat was over has adversely affected the number of applicants for West Point, just as it has affected the success of the recruiting program. It is reflected in a slight increase in resignations from the Military Academy as well as in a decrease in the number of applications for admission. I understand the understrength at the Military Academy has a parallel at the Naval Academy, and that the reasons therefor are believed to be similar to those affecting the Military Academy. History has repeated itself, inasmuch as the Military Academy and Naval Academy had similar experiences following World War I. A large proportion of the young men within the age limits for admission to West Point have already had Army service, and their attitude toward a military career has been shaped by their war experiences.

3. GI bill of rights: Many men within the age limits for admission to the Military Academy are entitled, by reason of military service, to the education benefits of the GI bill of rights. They have unlimited choice of subjects and wide selectivity of schools, without obligation for military service after graduation. This applies particularly to students who had completed one or more years at a civilian college or university prior to entering military service and for which they would not receive credit upon admission to the Military Academy. The advancement of science makes specialized study more essential to the successful engineer, nuclear physicist, doctor, and other professional men, and in the public mind renders a military education less attractive than formerly. While the curriculum at West Point has been broadened to include new developments in science, this fact is not completely known to the general public. Students with serious scientific ambitions do not see sufficient opportunity for West Point graduates to pursue specialized scientific studies at advanced technological schools.

4. Opportunities for obtaining Regular Army commission by other methods: Legislation recently passed by Congress increased the commissioned officer strength of the Regular Army to 50,000. It has been necessary, within a short period of time, to devise procurement methods to fill this increase. Many men who would be qualified and normally interested in attending the Military Academy have had an opportunity to obtain a Regular Army commission through these methods. While no figures are available as to the actual number of possible candidates for the Military Academy who were eliminated by the above cause, there is every reason to believe that the number was substantial. It is not unnatural that these men interested in a military career as commissioned officers should choose these other methods, which permit them to receive their Regular Army commission quickly and often in a higher rank than the second lieutenant's commission they would receive after four strenuous years at the Military Academy.

5. Increase in foreign service assignments: The duties imposed upon the Army by postwar conditions require much greater amounts of foreign service, often in very undesirable areas throughout the world. This is very distasteful to many men, in considering their future. Prior to the war, the years spent by an officer on foreign service covered a relatively short period of his career and usually were spent in areas which permitted him comfortable living and climatic conditions.

6. Hold-over of appointments of 1947 until 1948: Every year some Members of Congress notify The Adjutant General of their intention to carry their vacancies over to the following year, which is done either to reserve appointments for certain individuals or for lack of suitable applicants. There was a marked increase in hold-overs from 1947 to 1948, as compared with previous years, but no break-down as to the reasons therefor is available. The Congressmen do not always specify the reason, but where reasons are given, they generally indicate a decrease in applications or lowering of qualifications of applicants, thus reflecting the factors mentioned in previous paragraphs.

It is believed that the shortage that existed in the class entering the Military Academy in 1947 was brought more plainly to public attention because of the contrast of the present shortage to the abundance of applications for attendance at the Military Academy during the war years. During that period, there was never a dearth of candidates, available vacancies being applied for by many more times the number of men than could possibly be admitted. As a result, the Department of the Army was flooded with applications and the competition was keen. During the war years, the operation of the Selective Service System served to swell the number of applicants for the Military Academy. Under a ruling made by Selective Service in 1942, candidates holding appointments to the Military Academy were not liable for induction during the pendency of such appointments. New appointments for unsuccessful candidates could be obtained for each succeeding year that the applicant was within the age limit for admission. Many faced with the necessity of military service, sought appointments in a sincere desire to qualify for commissioned service. However, hundreds of others are believed to have taken advantage of this opportunity for deferment as a means of avoiding or postponing induction and possible exposure to hazardous duty. This painful fact was brought clearly to light when the suspension of the draft brought with it a complete reversal of the motivating interest in obtaining appointments. This was also reflected in the number of resignations from the Academy, and in declinations of appointments.

It is desired to present certain information relative to resignations at the Military Academy. In the years from 1921 to 1945, inclusive, resignations from the Military Academy were a minor factor in the number of vacancies, averaging only 29 a year. Immediately following both world wars, however, resignations jumped to a high figure, contributing in large measure to the total number of vacancies. Following are figures for the 2 years following each war:

1919: One hundred and forty resignations, or 10.5 percent of the authorized strength of 1,334.

1920: One hundred and two resignations, or 7.6 percent of the authorized strength of 1,334.

1946: One hundred and eighty-two resignations, or 7.3 percent of the authorized strength of 2,496.

1947: One hundred and fifty-two resignations, or 6.1 percent of the authorized strength of 2,496.

In 1921 and 1922 resignations dropped to a very low figure, possibly as a result of the depressed economy of that period. It is believed that resignations from the Academy in 1948 and 1949 will decline from the 1946–47 figures, but in view of existing economic and political conditions, an accurate forecast is impossible.

In reply to your question about legislation authorizing the filling of vacancies, section 2 of the act of Congress approved June 3, 1942, authorizes the filling of vacancies occasioned by the nonuse of appointments, whether through failure to pass entrance

examination or otherwise. Section 2 provides:

"When on the date of admission of a new class the total number of cadets is below the number authorized, the Secretary of War may bring the corps of cadets to full strength by appointing qualified alternates and candidates recommended by the academic board, two-thirds thereof from qualified alternates and one-third thereof from qualified candidates (competitors): *Provided*, That any appointment made under this section shall be an additional appointment and shall not constitute an appointment otherwise authorized by law."

The only candidates who are eligible for consideration are those who have been found mentally and physically qualified in connection with an appointment held for admission on the first week day of July of the year concerned. No application is necessary for consideration by the academic board since all candidates who are fully qualified but who are not entitled to admission under the terms of their appointments are rated relatively according to general merit. The academic board, in determining the general merit, studies the records of these candidates and makes its selection based upon consideration of the academic grades and other pertinent factors which affect the qualifications of the various candidates to become officers of the Army. In spite of the provisions of section 2, it was impossible to fill all vacancies in 1947. It was found on July 1, 1947, after all other admissions were authorized, that the corps of cadets was operating at a strength of 2,227, or 260 less than its authorized strength. However, since there were only 14 qualified competitors left on the lists of competitive candidates, only that number of competitors and only 28 alternates (thereby maintaining the one-third, two-thirds ratio) could be admitted under the provisions of the law cited. Therefore, 227 vacancies remained unfilled (269 less 42). Action was recently taken by the Department of the Army to authorize the nomination of four candidates instead of three for each vacancy for enlisted men of the Regular Army and National Guard. Similar action had already been taken for all other sources of admission under which the number of nominations for each vacancy were limited. This will increase the number of qualified competitors, thus making the provisions of section 2 more effective in filling any vacancies which may exist in an entering class in the future.

Your interest in the United States Military Academy is greatly appreciated. If there is any further information you desire, I shall be happy to obtain it for you.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army.

NOVEMBER 22, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Under date of November 11 my secretary acknowledged receipt of your excellent letter of November 10, written in reply to my inquiry of October 6, 1947, concerning the reported understrength at the Military Academy at West Point.

You have answered my question completely. Much of the information and many of the comments which you included are particularly illuminating and would be of considerable interest to other Members of the House and to the public as well. For that reason I would like to include the text of your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I shall not do so unless it is agreeable to you. Do you have any objection to its publication?

* * * * *

During almost 4 years of service in the Army in World War II my observation and association with officers of the Regular Establishment gave me a high regard for the Academy and its traditions, and in my present position I feel keenly the responsibility to strengthen and encourage public interest and confidence in its work.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1947.

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. REEVES: Thank you for your letter of November 22, 1947, expressing your high regard for the United States Military Academy and its traditions, with which I most heartily agree.

I would be very glad to have the letter to which you refer published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I would also appreciate the publication of your letter of November 22, 1947.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I have voted to recommit the draft bill to committee because this is the only means by which I can at this time express my disapproval of those amendments which have so weakened the effectiveness of the bill. I would prefer to give the committee another chance at a better bill. I recognize that this is not going to be done.

We are going to have to take the bill as it is. I will vote for it as the best we can get.

It is my judgment that the passage of an effective Selective Service Act is of more importance as a demonstration of the national determination to defend our way of life than any measure we have so far considered.

In the present state of the world we will be ill advised to adopt any measure which falls short of adequacy, and do anything which may be less than enough to accomplish our purpose, whether it be the enactment of measures of domestic import, of foreign aid, or of national defense.

Last night I looked across the Mall at the floodlights playing on the figure of Armed Freedom atop the Capitol Dome. The artist had given arms to Freedom, well knowing that unarmed she could not long be free. There seemed to be light enough on Armed Freedom but less was shed over either House. Perhaps there is a moral in this somewhere.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a short letter from the American Tariff League.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1948, I inserted in the RECORD an article from the May issue of ATL Topics, the magazine published by the American Tariff League. Portions of this article were read to the House to point out that the Gearhart antireciprocal trade extension bill passed by the House earlier in that week bore a striking resemblance to certain recommendations made by the Tariff League in the secret, star-chamber sessions of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tariff and Reciprocal Trade.

The article stated:

> This temporary program parallels, in some instances the proposals for a long-range program, providing for flexible rate-setting by a new governmental commission, with opportunity for review by Congress, but not requiring congressional action, offered by ATL President H. Wickliffe Rose at the recent House Ways and Means Subcommittee hearings, and contained in the new ATL Declaration of Principles and Program for World Trade.

From this statement, as well as from comparing the unmistakable effect of the House bill in killing the Reciprocal Trade Act with the long-standing high-tariff hostility to the Reciprocal Trade program of the American Tariff League, it seemed a warrantable conclusion that the Tariff League should be claiming the credit which I inferred from the ATL article. Moreover, Mr. H. Wickliffe Rose, president of the American Tariff League, appeared to assume some responsibilities of authorship when he told the Senate Committee on Finance that "because H. R. 6556 incorporates some of the basic principles proposed in our declaration and because to that extent we believe it is in the right direction toward a sound, long-term program and policy, we approve the bill as a whole for an interim measure."

Mr. Chairman, I am in receipt of a letter dated June 11, 1948, from Mr. Richard H. Anthony, secretary of the American Tariff League, which states that the American Tariff League does not claim credit for H. R. 6556. In accordance with the request contained in the letter, under unanimous consent, I insert it at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

THE AMERICAN TARIFF LEAGUE,
New York 18, N. Y., June 11, 1948.

Congressman HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN EBERHARTER: Our attention has been called to a statement made by you on May 28 in the House of Representatives and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, beginning on page 6884. The title which, I assume, is intended to summarize the views of the speaker, is "American Tariff League Claims Credit for the Gearhart Bill."

This league does not claim credit for H. R. 6556, the bill in question, and we do not think that the article in our May issue of ATL's Topics, from which you quoted, can be properly construed in that way. You apparently have so construed it, however, and so we must categorically deny that your conclusion is the correct one.

The only part taken by the league in regard to pending legislation was the appearance of the president of the league, Mr. H. Wickliffe Rose, at hearings held by the House Ways and Means Subcommittee and the Senate Finance Committee. At both appearances he offered the league's "Declaration of Principles and Program for World Trade," which is briefly summarized in the

ATL Topics article you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Copies of that declaration were left by Mr. Rose at the time of his appearance before the House Ways and Means Subcommittee for every member of the full committee. You should have received one as a matter of course, and, to be sure that you have one, an additional copy is enclosed. I hope that you will want to give it careful study. It envisions a long-term program, and does not refer to any bill in either House of Congress.

You will remember that H. R. 6556 was not before the House Ways and Means Subcommittee at the time of the hearings the first week in May. Hence, Mr. Rose could not have addressed any remarks to that particular bill. However, when he appeared before the Senate Finance Committee on June 3, the hearings were on the subject of H. R. 6556, and in reference to that bill, Mr. Rose, as part of his testimony, made the statement which appears on pages 296–297 of the printed hearings entitled "Extending Authority to Negotiate Trade Agreements," as follows:

"The proposals in this declaration are directed to a long-term program and policy on tariff, in the belief that its adoption will foster world trade, peace, and prosperity. We do not expect you to analyze it in detail today, and we know that there is not time to prepare legislation for its complete adoption in this session of Congress.

"Consequently, we agree that it is practical to pass an interim extension of the Trade Agreements Act for 1 year, as in H. R. 6556, in order to give Congress the opportunity to study and develop a long-term program and policy.

"Furthermore, because H. R. 6556 incorporates some of the basic principles proposed in our declaration and because to that extent we believe it is in the right direction toward a sound, long-term program and policy, we approve the bill as a whole for an interim measure. Under this or any other act of Congress, however, we see nothing to be gained by the United States through additional international tariff bargaining agreements."

Mr. Rose's statement on H. R. 6556 is the full extent to which any league action has been taken thereon. We believe that an opportunity should be afforded the league to deny that it claims credit for H. R. 6556. In the interest of fair play, would you be willing to insert this letter in the RECORD?

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ANTHONY,
Secretary.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, one of the Members of the House in emphasizing his position on this legislation, has quoted the words of George Washington when he said, "One of the most effectual means of preserving peace is to be prepared for war."

I believe in full and complete preparedness. It is absolutely necessary in view of the position that we find ourselves in today that we have adequate defenses. Not only with respect to manpower, but just as important we must have adequate air power, atomic power, together with the latest and most modern equipment that can be produced. We are living in a blundering, bleeding world and we are disappointed to find this country and the world at large so far from reaching an understanding of peace among the peoples of the various nations.

It is fundamental that our armed forces should be improved and modernized so that our country may at all times be adequately defended from any type of attack. As I understand it, the question involved today is whether peacetime conscription is required for an adequate and modernized system of national defense.

Those in charge of this legislation have given us to understand quite definitely that the need for additional men in the armed forces is not immediate. The House Committee on Armed Services in charge of the bill approved an amendment to this legislation to extend the enforcement of the draft for a period of at least 90 days following the effective date of the act, so that the bill as presently submitted and approved could not become effective until November of this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, according to the committee report and according to the facts submitted by the sponsors of this legislation, we have 1,211,818 men in our armed forces as of March 1, 1948. Four hundred and sixty-nine thousand four hundred and ninety-six are in the Army; 351,181 are in the Navy; 317,102 are in the Air Force; and 74,039 in the Marines. We now have the largest and strongest Navy in the world. In fact, our Navy is more than equal the strength of the combined navies of all the rest of the world. We are advised by those in charge of this legislation that the Navy has more enlistments than they need. In fact, our committee tells us that the Navy does not request or need peacetime conscription.

This Congress recently passed legislation to increase our Air Force to a 70-group corps. This is even larger than was requested by the Department of Defense. It is larger than was requested by the President. I was glad to support the authorization as well as the appropriation for the 70-group Air Force. In fact, I think the Air Force is the strong arm of our defense.

I want to pay tribute to the infantrymen who I think do not receive the credit to which they are entitled. It is not a glamorous job. We must not ignore the necessity of the men in the Infantry. It is a fact that the Infantry does not carry the appeal that we find in the Navy, the Marines, or the Air Force.

The first question involved I think is with respect to the immediate need of 300,000 additional men in order to bring the armed forces up to the strength that the Department of Defense has suggested. They tell us that the need is not immediate, but that in 3 or 4 months from now the authority of conscription may be required. I believe that only in case of a national emergency should we resort to a policy of registering two or three million men for conscription. Now, I call your attention to the fact that prior to World War II and during that period, a test of 59 points was the mimimum requirement. Since that time the requirement has been jumped to 80 points. I am told that if the requirement for induction were reduced to 70 points, and incidentally I have secured an amendment to the present bill to make such provision, there are a good many men who would join the armed forces if given an opportunity to do so. It has been pointed out the draftee, under this bill, will not have a choice of services. He will go where the Army assigns him.

Furthermore, the Army, instead of encouraging and building up the extension of the Reserve Corps for hundreds of thousands of men, have permitted it to dwindle and have disappointed and discouraged a good many men who would otherwise have joined the Reserve. It is unfortunate, too, that those in charge of the Regular Army of our country do not encourage the enlargement and the advancement of the National Guard, which after all was the backbone of the infantry organizations during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported every appropriation to increase our defenses all the way up and down the line and if this committee had made a real showing with respect to the need of the conscription of men for the armed forces, I should be glad to support this legislation. I regret that in view of the showing that has been made by those who propose this legislation, that I am unable to support it. And do not forget that if and when the need for conscription of men is shown, I will be one of the first to support it. Incidentally, I am inclined to agree with Members of this House who have spoken before me who believe that if the time comes for the need of the conscription of thousands and millions of men to defend our country against a foreign foe, we should at the same time conscript the wealth of our country as a part of that program. May it never be said again that our country produced millionaires who made profits from munitions of war, either directly or indirectly, while our young men were sacrificing their lives in the defense of their country.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if what I hear regarding the so-called housing bill is true then I must vote against passage. I will not be guilty of the betrayal of the trusting millions among our people or perpetrating a hoax upon our deserving veterans who while promised solution of the housing shortage now face years of slum existence as a reward for their unfaltering patriotic service. I have been watching this bill and the arduous road over which it was compelled to travel. In the Committee on Banking and Currency the other day it seemed certain that the coalition of 11 Democratic and 3 Republican Members saved the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and restored the people's confidence in the integrity of the Congress. This morning however, I learn that the whipping received by the 3 Republican Members who joined in righteousness their Democratic colleagues has inclined them to

once again follow the wrong course toward ease and error. I shall not have the opportunity to discuss the iniquities of the Wolcott bill when presented to us later this afternoon. I shall not blame the Republican leadership for this because time grows short but I must place the blame upon the leadership of the party in control for encouraging—yes, for forcing the Republican members of the committee to reconsider their vote, reversing their position, and reporting the husk of what might have been a real housing bill. The Wolcott bill raises the cry of socializing housing, but nothing is said about the socializing support of Government given to builders in guaranteeing loans, in the taking over, specially, of Government-built housing at an accelerated depreciation in order to reduce taxes and thereby increase the financial return to the investor. I must oppose the bill if it does not contain the public-housing provision to which the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman WOLCOTT, is uncompromisingly opposed. To meet any standard slum clearance rural housing, too, must be included. All these features involve the family life of our country and upon this family life the Government is founded. Anything that imperils family life undermines and endangers our country.

The public-housing feature in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to which the real-estate lobby so strongly objected and which has been wiped out in the Wolcott proposal dooms to the slums the widow and the children who unfortunately having lost their husband and father cannot meet the rentals charged while the breadwinner lived. The subsidized rental property intended by the T-E-W bill was condemned and stricken from the Wolcott bill as socialistic. Seemingly there is no concern about the widow and orphaned children of a citizen, and he may have been a veteran, when they are forced to give up their old home for an alley slum all because of the death in the family. The Wolcott bill preserves the slum for the use of the unfortunate upon the pretense that it is socialistic to render aid to helpless future citizens. What little might be saved to the Treasury of the United States will be paid out a thousandfold due to delinquency in health and morals, which thrive in the slums and which will require the construction of asylums, hospitals, and prisons.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure"; and

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the Act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAIN, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. FULBRIGHT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) entitled "An act for the relief of the Massman Construction Company."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 333. An act for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, veterans of World War II;

H. R. 371. An act for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas;

H. R. 564. An act for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg;

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Anthony Arancio;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Adney W. Gray;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado;

H. R. 912. An act for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of James Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand III;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp. of Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 1642. An act for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader;

H. R. 1779. An act for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn.;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor;

H. R. 1930. An act for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation;

H. R. 2193. An act for the relief of Robert E. Graham;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of George Cleve Williams;

H. R. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;

H. R. 2551. An act for the relief of William R. Ramsey;

H. R. 2552. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley;

H. R. 2732. An act for the relief of Dennis Stanton;

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Henry;

H. R. 2889. An act for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston;

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr.;

H. R. 3261. An act for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson;

H. R. 3427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 3499. An act for the relief of Petrol Corp.;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 4047. An act for the relief of Edmund Huppler;

H. R. 4199. An act for the relief of George Haniotis;

H. R. 4441. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency;

H. R. 4452. An act for the relief of Douglas L. Craig;

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 4518. An act for the relief of Gerald S. Furman;

H. R. 4587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey);

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen;

H. R. 4695. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4644. An act for the relief of E Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.;

H. R. 4690. An amend the act of July 20 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 4881. An act for the relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 4917. An act to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5734. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H. R. 5750. An act to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 5866. An act to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 6089. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134);

H. R. 6090. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title;

H. R. 6096. An act to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa; Kansas City, Mo.; and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.;

H. R. 6224. An act for the relief of John Watkins;

H. R. 6293. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives;

H. R. 6327. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette;

H. R. 6412. An act to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President";

H. R. 6452. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States;

H. R. 6507. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6598. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939;

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State;

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor;

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations.

PRINTING OF THE DEMOCRATIC WAY AND THE TOTALITARIAN WAY AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 678) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the volume entitled "The Democratic Way and the Totalitarian Way" prepared under the joint auspices of the United States Commissioner of Education and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress be printed as a House document.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, after "printed", insert "with illustrations."

Line 5, after "document", insert a comma and the following: "and that three thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on House Administration."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF GEN. JOSE GERVASIO ARTIGAS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the bill (S. 2591) to provide for acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States the bronze statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, as a gift from the people of Uruguay, and erect the same on a suitable site to be selected by the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, in a public park or other federally owned property in the District of Columbia. Such statue shall not be erected until the plans and specifications for the pedestal and landscaping have been submitted to and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. The preparation of the plans and specifications for the pedestal and landscaping and the erection of the statue shall be under the supervision of the Director of the National Park Service.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including the design and construction of a suitable pedestal for such statue, the landscaping of the adjacent area, and the necessary plans therefor.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 686) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $15,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF STATISTICS OF HOUSING

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 684) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed additional copies of part numbered 2 of the final majority report of the Joint Committee on Housing entitled "Statistics of Housing," for the use of the said joint committee, the cost of which shall not exceed $500.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 672) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 403, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee not to exceed $100,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 4, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$20,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ON THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES AS AN ADVOCATE OF OVERTHROW OF GOVERNMENT BY FORCE AND VIOLENCE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 199) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 11,000 additional copies of the report (H. Rept. No. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an Advocate of Overthrow of Government by Force and Violence, of which 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies shall be for the House document room.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 2, strike out "eleven thousand" and insert "six thousand."

Line 6, strike out "ten thousand" and insert "five thousand."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVELYN RICHARDSON

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 677 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Evelyn Richardson, widow of J. Frederick Richardson, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said J. Frederick Richardson.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment on page 2 of the bill.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

LEONARD W. HALL,
ROBERT HALE,
WILLIAM J. MILLER,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
CLYDE M. REED,
E. H. MOORE,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
BRIEN MCMAHON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate made two amendments to the bill. One amendment inserted at the end of the bill a new section 3 amending section 303 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so that the penalty provided therein would apply only to violations which were willful or resulted from gross negligence. The other amendment modified the title of the bill because of the new provision added by the first amendment.

The committee of conference recommend that the Senate recede from both amendments.

LEONARD W. HALL,
ROBERT HALE,
WILLIAM J. MILLER,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a conference report on the so-called Miller bill?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. What was done in conference with the so-called Moore amendment?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. The Senate receded and concurred and the so-called Moore amendment was stricken out of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, S. 2341, to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory," approved May 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 491), is amended by striking out "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "not to exceed $150,000."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pnuematic-tube systems, and for other purposes, with amendments of the House thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. REES, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, and Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee.

AMENDING VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5508) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "legally."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF STAMP COMMEMORATIVE OF ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2739) to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during 1949, a special 5-cent air mail postage stamp, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMINATING RETIREMENT SYSTEM OF OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2692) to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, which was approved by the committee on June 17, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence after the first proviso of the second paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 12, sec. 481), is amended by deleting the comma after the words "whose compensation" and striking out the words "including retirement annuities to be fixed by the Comptroller of the Currency" and deleting the comma following those words.

SEC. 2. (a) The United States Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain the amount of the gross assets in the retirement fund of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Comptroller of the Currency is authorized and directed to cause to be transferred all such assets to the Secretary of the Treasury to be entered on the books of the Treasury Department to the credit of the civil service retirement and disability fund.

(b) In the case of each officer or employee who is a member of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the United States Civil Service Commission shall cause to be credited to his individual account in the civil service retirement and disability fund an amount equal to such employee's accumulated contributions and interest standing to his credit on the books of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency at the time of its termination: *Provided*, That in the event that such amount is in excess of the amount which would have been to his credit had he made the contributions required for allowable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 22, 1920, as amended, currently during the same period of time for which he has creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, plus interest thereon, such excess amount shall be applied to any other deposits or redeposits required of such employee under sections 7, 9, and 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, covering periods of allowable service for which said employee did not have creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, or, if he has no such additional allowable service, the excess shall be repaid to such employee in cash: *Provided further*, That no part of said sum credited to such employee's individual account shall be applied to any period of allowable service prior to August 1, 1920, or to periods of honorable service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, for which periods no deposit shall be required, as provided by section 9 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; nor shall deposits be required for any periods of time prior to June 1, 1936, for which such employee has creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, in excess of the amount of such employee's accumulated contributions plus interest standing to his credit on the books of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency at the date of its termination.

SEC. 3. (a) In the case of an officer or employee who, prior to the effective date of this act, shall have been retired on annuity under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Comptroller's office, the annuity shall be paid out of the civil service retirement and disability fund and shall be increased effective on the first day of the third month following the month in which this act is enacted by 25 percent or $300, whichever is the lesser: *Provided*, That each such annuitant may, prior to the effective date herein prescribed, elect to retain his or her present annuity in lieu of the increased annuity provided by this subsection and name his wife or her husband to receive upon his or her death one-half of his or her present annuity but not to exceed $600 per annum during the remainder of the life of such surviving wife or husband and upon the death of such survivor no further annuity shall be due or payable: *Provided further*, That the amount payable in the event of the death of the annuitant either to his nominated beneficiary or estate, in the form of a lump-sum payment or survivor's annuity, shall not be less than the amounts which would have been payable under the applicable rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Comptroller's office.

(b) In the case of any officer or employee who was a member of the retirement system of the Comptroller's office and who, prior to the effective date of this act, terminated his employment with that office and elected to receive a deferred annuity at age 65, under the applicable rules and regulations of the retirement system of that office, such annuity shall be payable out of the civil service retirement and disability fund beginning at the age of 62 years. Otherwise his rights shall be determined and the annuity computed as though this act had not been enacted.

SEC. 4. In the case of any officer or employee or former officer or employee of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency who withdrew his accumulated contributions from the retirement fund of that office upon leaving its employ, said officer or employee or former officer or employee of such office shall be entitled to the same allowable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to which he would have been entitled if he had never been a member of the retirement system of the Comptroller's office, subject, however, to the payment of the deposits required under said act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

SEC. 5. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins at least 30 days after the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 6771

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 6771.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. I there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6705) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 30, 34, 35, 42, 46, 54, 61, 62, 70, 78, 79, 80, 93, 96, 118, 135, 144, 147, 170, 172, 173, 185, 186, 202, 226, and 243.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 39, 44, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 67, 68, 69, 71, 87, 88, 89, 94, 95, 99, 104, 108, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 145, 148, 153, 158, 160, 162, 165, 167, 168, 169, 171, 174, 175, 176, 179, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 204, 205, 207, 208, 210, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 228, 229, and 230, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$1,115,842"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "not to exceed $50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$160,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment inser; "$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "purchase of one passenger motor vehicle;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$215,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "eight"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,888,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided further*, That not exceeding eight per centum of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That interest heretofore collected by Bonneville Power Administration from sales of electric energy generated at Grand Coulee Dam on the unamortized balance of investment allocated to power in Grand Coulee Dam shall be covered into the reclamation fund forthwith: *Provided further*, That, awaiting legislation, said interest shall not be allocated during the fiscal year 1949"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said

amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That none of the appropriations made in this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel assigned to regional offices of the Bureau of Land Management in excess of the average total number of all personnel assigned to such regional offices during the fiscal year 1948"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Salaries and expenses, district offices: For expenses of district offices at Billings, Montana, and Portland, Oregon, only, including printing and binding, $200,000: *Provided*, That any unobligated balances of 1948 appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be available for payment to employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from service or furlough from active duty by reason of reduction in force under the appropriation 'Salaries and Expenses, District Offices'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,334,115"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,242,015"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$755,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate nmbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,411,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$3,154,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$183,875"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$36,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$167,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "two hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "purchase of not to exceed one hundred and twenty-five for replacement only in fiscal year 1949, and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "hire,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", at rates for individuals not in excess of $100 per diem (not exceeding $100,000)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That not exceeding $48,000,000 of appropriations available for expenditure by the Bureau of Reclamation during the fiscal year 1949 shall be used for administrative personal service and other personal services"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the total number of employees in the Bureau of Reclamation holding a permanent, temporary, or other appointment in grades CAF-9 and P-3, or above, shall not exceed three thousand five hundred at any one time during the fiscal year 1949"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ", and in addition thereto the Commissioner of Reclamation is authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$147,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,293,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$57,985"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,298,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,780,175"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,200,810"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$230,437"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$814,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$220,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$447,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$169,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$101,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$292,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$217,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,645,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$337,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$206,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$93,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$57,212"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 123: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$77,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 124: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$104,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,470,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$212,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 130: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Central Valley project, California: Joint facilities, $1,750,000; irrigation facilities, $30,876,900; irrigation distribution systems, $1,000,000; power facilities, surveys, $20,000, Shasta power plant, $1,000,000, Keswick Dam, $1,700,000, Keswick power plant, $1,000,000; switch yards, Shasta, Keswick and Tracy pulping plant, $3,250,000; transmission lines, Shasta to Delta (Tracy) via Oroville and Sacramento, $500,000, Shasta Dam to Shasta substation, $250,000; substation, Contra Costa, $12,000; in all, $41,358,900, no part of which shall be available for examination and surveys in connection with power facilities in any State other than the State of California: *Provided*, That the unobligated balance on June 30, 1948, of funds heretofore appropriated for this project shall be classified under and combined with these amounts and shall be expendable only for the specific purposes set forth in this paragraph, subject to determination by the Comptroller General:"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$42,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 133: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,611,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 134: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$140,367,050"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 136: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$54,786,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 137: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate Canyon Ferry Reservoir at a higher maximum normal pool elevation than three thousand seven hundred and sixty-six feet, unless and until new land in Broadwater County, Montana, equal in acreage to the irrigated land to be inundated in Canyon Ferry Reservoir above elevation of 3,766 feet is provided with facilities for irrigation; or for or in connection with the acquisition or installation of the power facilities or transmission facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out

by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"ALASKAN INVESTIGATIONS

"For engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water-power resources of Alaska, $150,000, which shall be available for, but not restricted to, services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rations and quarters for field parties while away from inhabited communities in which such facilities are available."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 149: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Not exceeding eight per centum of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis, except for projects or items the estimated construction cost of which does not exceed $200,000, and only then in cases where the Bureau of Reclamation finds the lowest bids to be excessive."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 155: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 155, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$540,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$592,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 161: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 164: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 164, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$602,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 166: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,027,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "eighty, of which thirty shall be"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 180: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$765,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$665,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 184: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$790,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$137,954"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 200: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,147,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 201: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 201, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$510,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 203: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 203, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 206: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 206, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 209: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 209, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,312,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 213: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 213, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "not exceeding 35 per centum of the amount allocated to any State shall be available for the construction of buildings: *Provided further*, That the requirement of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, that not exceeding 20 per centum of the amount allocated to any State shall be available for the construction of improvements is hereby waived with respect to unobligated balances on June 30, 1948"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 215: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,123,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 216: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 216, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "sixty-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 217: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 217, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 218: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 218, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "hire (in Alaska),"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 219: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 219, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2.00"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 225: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 227: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 227, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 232: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 232, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 233: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 233, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Board on Geographic Names, $150;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 234: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 234, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 235: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 235, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 236: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 236, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 237: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 237, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 238: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 238, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 239: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 239, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 240: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 240, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,375"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 241: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 241, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 242: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 242, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "unless a higher rate is otherwise authorized by law or"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 84, 101, 125, 126, 150, 151, 152, 178, 189, 190, 199, 211, 212, 214, and 231.

BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1, 2, and 3, relating to the Office of the Secretary: Permits employment of such personnel outside the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $1,115,842, for such office, instead of $965,842, as proposed by the House, and $1,250,000, as proposed by the Senate; and permits the use of $50,000 for the Division of Power, instead of $75,000, as proposed by the Senate, and a prohibition against the use of any funds for such purpose, as proposed by the House.

No. 4, relating to the Office of the Solicitor: Appropriates $250,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $220,225, as proposed by the House.

No. 5, relating to salaries and expenses, Division of Territories and Island Possessions: Appropriates $160,000, instead of $146,800, as proposed by the House, and $185,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 6 and 7, relating to the Oil and Gas Division: Authorizes the purchase of four passenger vehicles, as proposed by the Senate, instead of two, as proposed by the House; and appropriates $325,000, for such division, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the House, and $350,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 8, relating to salaries and expenses, soil and moisture conservation operations: Appropriates $2,800,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,700,000, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 9 and 10, relating to contingent expenses, Department of the Interior: Appropriates $215,000, instead of $205,730, as proposed by the House, and $230,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 11 and 12, relating to expenses, power transmission facilities: Provides funds for expenses in connection with the supervision of contracts executed prior to June 30, 1948, as proposed by the Senate, instead of "1947", as proposed by the House; and provides for terminal leave payments to employees on furlough from active duty, as proposed by the Senate.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Nos. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, relating to Bonneville Power Administration: Appropriates $21,125,700, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $20,920,760, as proposed by the House; provides that $3,231,800 shall be available for operation and maintenance and administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House; authorizes the purchase of eight motor vehicles, instead of five, as proposed by the House, and ten, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the Administrator to contract for "services", as proposed by the Senate; provides contract authorization in the sum of $11,888,500, instead of $10,209,290, as proposed by the House, and $12,046,500, as proposed by the Senate; restores the House provision relating to force account work amended to allow eight per centum of funds appropriated for construction for such work, in lieu of the Senate proposal; and restores the provision of the House relating to the disposition of interest collected by Bonneville Power Administration from sales of electric energy generated at Grand Coulee Dam on the unamortized balance of investment allocated to power, amended to make such provision effective during the fiscal year 1949. The use of funds or of contract authorization for the Lebanon and Coos Bay substations mentioned on page 8 of the House Report and on pages 3 and 4 of the Senate Report has been disapproved by the conferees. The conferees approve the table of allocations as submitted by Bonneville Power Administration appearing at page 1540 of the Senate hearings with the following changes:

	Cash	Contract authorization
(1) Changes in amounts recommended for use on 230,000-volt facilities to maintain schedules coordinated with installation of new generating capacity (groups I, IA, and IB)	−$40,860	+$929,210
(2) Olympia-Shelton-Port Angeles line (item IA-3)		−25,000
(3) Olympia-Shelton line No. 2	−9,000	
(4) Beverly Park-Snohomish circuit No. 1	+170,000	
(5) Beverly Park-Snohomish circuit No. 2		+54,000
(6) Forest Grove-McMinnville-Salem line (item IB-9)	−70,000	+70,000
(7) Canby substation (14-14)	−25,000	
(8) Spokane-Colville-Spirit line (item IIA-2)	−52,000	−50,000
(9) Cottage Grove-Drain facility (item IC-4)	−50,000	+50,000
(10) McKinley-Gold Beach interconnection	+50,000	+280,000
(11) Idaho Panhandle (Sand Point-Bonners Ferry)		+161,000
(12) Columbia-Ellensburg line (item IIC-2)		+180,000
Recommended adjustments in construction program	−26,860	+1,619,210
Recommended increase in operations and maintenance limitation	231,800	
Net changes from House bill	+204,940	+1,619,210

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28: Appropriates $1,000,000 for salaries and expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $1,100,000 as proposed by the Senate, and $900,000 as proposed by the House; and strikes out the word "only" following the words "District of Columbia" as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,562,565, as proposed by the House, for management, protection, and disposal of public lands; authorizes the purchase of 15 motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 10 as proposed by the House; and provides that no part of the appropriations in the Act shall be used for salaries of personnel in regional offices in excess of the average total of such personnel during the fiscal year 1948, in lieu of the House provision eliminating such regional offices; appropriates $500,000 for revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, Oregon, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $469,300 as proposed by the House; strikes out the provision of the House prohibiting the transfer of activities to the field, as proposed by the Senate; and inserts the provision of the Senate relating to the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, instead of the proposal of the House.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

No. 29: Appropriates $200,000 for salaries and expenses, District Offices, in lieu of $600,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum recommended provides $110,000 for a District office at Billings, Montana, and $90,000 for a similar office at Portland, Oregon, for special activities and functions applicable to those areas.

No. 30: Appropriates $2,400,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,200,000

as proposed by the Senate for salaries and expenses, reservation administration. The conferees approve the recommendations contained on page 15 of the House Committee report (No. 2038) with reference to maintenance of the agencies and subagencies in Oklahoma and the keeping of the enumerated records at such agencies and subagencies.

No. 31: Appropriates $125,000 for maintenance of law and order instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 32 and 33: Appropriates $4,118,962 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,518,762 as proposed by the House, for the Alaska Native Service and inserts the word "vessels" in such item as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 34 and 35: Appropriates $907,900 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,907,900 as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the contract authorization of not to exceed $3,350,000 proposed by the Senate amendment for construction and maintenance service, Navajo and Hopi Service. In connection with these decreases, the conferees wish to point out that the proposed increase was submitted in a supplemental estimate which went to the Senate and on which the House had no opportunity to hold hearings or give consideration. For this reason the conference committee decided that the request for additional funds and contract authorization should be deferred.

No. 36: Appropriates $4,334,115 for agency services of the Navajo and Hopi Service, instead of $3,748,615 as proposed by the House, and $4,584,115 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase of $585,500 in the House bill, $56,500 is provided for purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, $29,000 for education, and $500,000 for welfare work. Conferees request that the Indian Bureau submit a report to the Congress early in the next regular session on conditions as to the general welfare of the Navajo and Hopi Indians.

No. 37: Corrects a total.

No. 38: Appropriates $755,000 for maintenance of buildings and utilities instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House and $810,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 39 and 40: Appropriates $10,100,000 for education of Indians, instead of $9,574,709 as proposed by the House, and $10,376,000, as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase in the House bill, $200,000 is provided for education of Navajo students, $125,000 is for State educational contracts and $15,000 for equipment at the Anadarko Arts and Craft Building, Oklahoma.

No. 41: Appropriates $900,000 for management, Indian Forest and Range Resources, instead of $711,587 as proposed by the House, and $950,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 42: Restores the House provision relating to a revolving fund for loans to Indians, in lieu of the Senate amendment.

Nos. 43, 44, 45, 46, and 47: Relating to construction, irrigation systems; appropriates $2,600,000 for Colorado River, Arizona, instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $2,700,000 as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $190,000 for payment to the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of March 7, 1947, and $60,000 for miscellaneous small projects instead of $25,000, as proposed by the House, and $90,000 as propcsed by the Senate; restores the provision of the House limiting personal services in the District of Columbia to not exceeding $12,500; and corrects the total of such items.

Nos. 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 59: Relating to construction of building and utilities: Appropriates $622,500 for such work in Alaska, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $222,500, as proposed by the House; appropriates $125,000 for buildings, and so forth, Celilo Falls, Oregon, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $79,000 for sewage works, as proposed by the Senate, and $75,000 for water supply as proposed by the Senate, instead of $35,000 as proposed by the House, at the Cherokee, North Carolina reservation; appropriates $213,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $85,000, as proposed by the House, for construction of school buildings for the consolidated Chippewa Indians, Minnesota, as authorized by Public Law 231, Eightieth Congress; appropriates $35,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,000 as proposed by the House, for a school building at Walker, Minnesota; appropriates $750,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, for a tubercular sanatorium at Galen, Montana; appropriates $80,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House, for a building for the Hunter School District, Sawyer County, Wisconsin; appropriates $250,000 for a school building for the school district of Roosevelt, Utah, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $200,000 for school building in Owyhee, Nevada, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $300,000, as propcsed by the Senate; appropriates $300,000 for miscellaneous repairs and improvements, instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House, and $400,000 as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total appropriation for such items.

No. 60: Appropriates $2,500,000 for roads, Indian reservations, instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,894,400, as proposed by the Senate; the conferees have approved work to be prosecuted on the Ethete Road, Wyoming, and have also approved the provision in the House report recommending $150,000 for road construction on the Sprague River Road on the Klamath Indian Reservation. In connection with the latter item, it is understood that the states will match these amounts equally, thus providing a total of $300,000 for this work.

Nos. 61 and 62, relating to the Klamath Agency, Oregon, tribal funds: The amendments restore the provisons and amounts in identical form as provided in the House bill.

Nos. 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68: Appropriates $138,875 for support of Menominee Agency and pay of tribal officers, instead of $162,250 as proposed by the House, and $215,500 as proposed by the Senate; and adjust the amounts available to provide $36,500 for relief of such Indians, $5,500 for compensation and expenses of attorney; limits to $10,000 the amount available for salaries and expenses of certain Menominee representatives, as proposed by the Senate; and provides for the appointment of a recreational director, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 69: Inserts the language of the Senate providing a total of $197,000 for support of the Osage Agency, in lieu of the language of the House providing a total of the same amount for such purpose.

No. 70: Appropriates $50,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $73,000, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of tribal council officers in a travel status.

No. 71: Appropriates $82,880 for compensation and expenses of attorneys, instead of $62,080, as proposed by the House. The proposed increase of $20,800, covering compensation under approved contracts, was submitted to the Senate after the bill had passed the House and into which the House conferees have not had an opportunity to examine.

Nos. 72, 73, 74, 76, and 76: Relating to industrial assistance, tribal funds: Appropriates $350,000, instead of $277,500 as proposed by the House, and $422,500, as proposed by the Senate, and adjusts such total amount to provide $167,500 for the Menominee Indians, Wisconsin, $20,000 for the Nez Perce Indians, Idaho, $50,000 for the Standing Rock Indians, North Dakota, and $75,000 for the Blackfeet Indians, Montana.

Nos. 77 and 78: Authorizes the purchase of 200 passenger motor vehicles, instead of 100 as proposed by the House, and 250 as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 79 and 80: Permits the use of funds for salaries and expenses, reservation administration, for the hire of aircraft, instead of limiting such use to maintenance and operation as proposed by the House.

Appropriations for Indians in Oklahoma: The conferees are in agreement with the provision and recommendations set forth on pages 17 and 18 of the House Report on the bill, House Report No. 2038, which breaks down the appropriations available to the State of Oklahoma into miscellaneous items covering schools, agencies, hospitals, and so forth. Where the conferees have increased amounts for activities above the amounts allowed in the House bill, it is the understanding of the conferees that such funds shall be distributed proportionately in order that Indians in Oklahoma will receive their equal share of the increases.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Nos. 81, 82, and 83, relating to administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of one hundred and twenty-five motor vehicles, instead of three hundred, as proposed by the Senate; provides for the hire of aircraft, and eliminates authority for acquisition of aircraft from other government agencies; and inserts a limitation of $100,000 to the Senate provision relating to the employment of consultants.

No. 84: Reported in disagreement.

Nos. 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, and 91, relating to salaries and expenses: Appropriates $3,600,000, instead of $3,161,472, as proposed by the House, and $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the transfer of $7,800,000 for work to be performed for the benefit of specific projects, instead of $6,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $8,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House restricting the use of funds for salaries of personnel engaged in obtaining power contracts with customers already supplied, with the understanding, however, that the conferees are in general agreement with the objectives set forth in such amendment, and it is directed by the conferees that the Bureau curb activities of the nature which have given rise to the widespread opinion that its employees have been unduly aggressive in offering the extension of services which are often in direct or implied competition with existing private facilities. In connection with amendments 88 and 89, relating to the prohibition against the use of funds for certain employees without certain qualifications, the House has accepted the Senate amendments making the date effective "after January 31, 1949", and requiring that such employees have five years' engineering and administrative experience, instead of ten years' experience, as proposed by the House. In connection with amendment No. 90, the conferees have restored the provision of the House amended to fix such limitation of funds available at $48,000,000, instead of $45,341,615, as proposed by the House. In connection with amendment No. 91, the conferees have recommended restoration of the House provision amended to limit the number of such employees to 3,500, instead of 3,251, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 92, 93, 94, and 95, relating to general investigations: Appropriates $3,500,000, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the proposal of the Senate to make such funds available until expended,

and inserts the word "construction", as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, and 107, relating to construction, from the reclamation fund: Appropriates $1,000,000 for the Santa Barbara County project, California, Cachuma Unit, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,700,000, as proposed by the Senate, and restores the provision of the House authorizing a contract authorization, amended to allow $1,600,000, instead of $1,500,000, such funds being provided for construction of tunnel and conduit and acquisition of right-of-way; appropriates $1,525,000 for the Boise project, Idaho, Payette division, instead of $1,400,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,650,000, as proposed by the Senate; eliminates the provision of the House requiring completion of the Lewiston Orchards project, Idaho; increases the limitation on the amount available for surveys, Minidoka project, Idaho, to $147,500; reports the contract authorization for the Palisades project, Idaho, in technical disagreement; appropriates $1,293,000 for the Tucumcari project, New Mexico; appropriates $57,985 for the Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas; appropriates $1,980,000 for the Provo River project, Utah, as proposed by the House; appropriates $1,298,650 for the Yakima project, Washington, Roza division; appropriates $1,780,175 for the Riverton project, Wyoming; and corrects the total of such items.

Nos. 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, and 124, relating to operation and maintenance: Authorizes the use of $2,645,380 from power revenues for the Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California; appropriates $230,437 for operation of the Central Valley project, California, and $814,400 from power revenues; appropriates $220,000 for the Boise project, Idaho; authorizes the use of $447,500 from power revenues for the Minidoka project, Idaho; authorizes the use of $175,500 from power revenues in connection with the North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming; appropriates $101,250 for the Deschutes project, Oregon; appropriates $292,500 for the Owyhee project, Oregon; appropriates $217,000 for the Klamath project, Oregon-California; authorizes the use of $1,645,000 from power revenues for the Columbia Basin project, Washington, and strikes out the provision of the Senate authorizing the payment of tuition for children of employees; appropriates $337,500 for the Yakima project, Washington; authorizes the use of $206,250 from power revenues for the Kendrick project, Wyoming; appropriates $93,700 for the Riverton project, Wyoming, and authorizes the use of $57,212 from power revenues on such project; and appropriates $77,200 for the Shoshone project, Wyoming, and authorizes the use of $104,800 from power revenues on such project.

Nos. 125 and 126: Reported in disagreement.

Nos. 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, and 134, relating to construction from the general fund: Appropriates $2,470,000 for the Gila project, instead of $2,240,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,700,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $22,125,000 for the Davis Dam project, Arizona, instead of $18,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $22,884,300, as proposed by the Senate; with the understanding that funds available for the construction of transmission lines shall be used only for backbone or main transmission lines now under construction or under contract; appropriates $212,000 for the Parker Dam power project, instead of $190,000, as proposed by the House, and $234,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $41,358,900 for the Central Valley project, California, instead of $40,000,400, as proposed by the House, and $42,467,400, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $42,500 for the Kern River project, California, instead of $40,000, as proposed by the House, and $45,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $20,225,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, instead of $19,750,000, as proposed by the House, and $20,700,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $14,611,650 for the Hungry Horse project, Montana, instead of $8,100,000, as proposed by the House, and $15,115,500, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total of such items.

No. 135: Appropriates $990,000 for the Fort Peck project, Montana, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,980,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 136, 137, and 138, relating to the Missouri River Basin: Appropriates $54,786,650 for this project, instead of $52,767,500, as proposed by the House, and $56,275,800, as proposed by the Senate; restores the provision of the House amended to provide that new land in Broadwater County, Mont., shall be provided equal to the acreage to be inundated in Canyon Ferry Reservoir; and restores the language of the House relating to construction of power facilities amended to cover the acquisition or installation of the power facilities or transmission facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana; and inserts the proposal of the Senate that no part of the appropriation may be used for surveys, etc., in connection with the Glendo project, Wyoming, to a greater capacity or other purposes than set forth in Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, without specific authorization of Congress.

A break-down by projects of the amounts approved by the conferees is as follows:

Unit location	Amount approved by conferees
Phase A, units selected for construction:	
Angostura, S. Dak	$3,120,000
Bostwick, Nebr.-Kans	2,600,000
Boysen, Wyo	6,000,000
Belle Fourche, Wyo	550,000
Cannonball, N. Dak	580,000
Canyon Ferry, Mont	2,950,000
Cedar Bluff, Kans	1,750,000
Frenchman-Cambridge, Nebr	7,505,000
Glendo, Wyo	850,000
Grand River, S. Dak	1,560,000
Heart River (Heart-Butte and Dickinson Dams), N. Dak. (Including $1,893,850 for Heart-Butte Dam and $412,300 for Dickinson Dam)	2,306,150
Kortes, Wyo	4,085,000
Lower Marias, Mont	450,000
Missouri-Souris, Mont.-N. Dak	287,500
Moreau River, S. Dak	847,750
Narrows, Colo	1,650,000
Powder River, Wyo.-Mont	850,000
Region 6 headquarters, Montana	5,000
St. Francis, Colo.-Kans	1,700,000
Transmission lines (see table)	4,250,350
Yellowstone pumping, Montana-North Dakota	565,000
Operation and maintenance during construction	42,500
Subtotal, phase A	44,504,250

Unit location	Amount approved by conferees
Phase B, units being prepared for construction:	
Bad River, S. Dak	$9,250
Bighorn pumping, Wyoming	20,000
Columbus, Nebr	175,000
Grand Island, Nebr	412,500
Hardin, Mont	500,000
Jefferson River, Mont	62,500
Lower Marias, Mont	300,000
Middle Loup, Nebr	255,000
Missouri-Souris, Mont.-N. Dak	700,000
Montana pumping, Montana	210,000
North Dakota pumping, North Dakota	42,500
Oahe-James River, S. Dak	360,000
Owl Creek, Wyo	200,000
Rapid Valley, S. Dak	47,250
Shoshone extensions, Wyoming	150,000
South Dakota pumping, South Dakota	26,000
Sun River, Mont	40,000
Tongue River, Wyo	65,100
White River, S. Dak	35,000
Wind River, Wyo	16,500
Subtotal, phase B	3,846,600
Phase C, continuing work on the general plan of development:	
Big Horn Basin, Wyo.-Mont	56,000
Cheyenne River, S. Dak	24,500
Clarks Fort, Wyo.-Mont	4,200
Garrison diversion, North Dakota	54,600
Helena Valley, Mont	21,000
Judith River, Mont	10,500
Kansas Basin, Colo.-Nebr.-Kans	280,000
Little Missouri, N. Dak	10,500
Lower Platte Basin, Nebr	490,000
Milan, Mont	5,600
Niobrara Basin, Wyo.-Nebr	140,000
North Platte Basin, Colo.-Nebr.-Wyo	126,000
North Republican, Colo.-Nebr	3,800
South Platte Basin, Colo.-Wyo.-Nebr	210,000
Three Forks, Mont	299,600
Upper Marias, Mont	35,000
Wilson, Kans	70,000
General:	
Power studies, region VI	21,000
Reports staff, region VI	70,000
Subtotal, phase C	1,938,300
Phase D, cooperation with Corps of Engineers	77,500
Other Department of Interior agencies:	
Bureau of Land Management	390,000
Bureau of Mines	150,000
Fish and Wildlife Service	425,000
Geological Survey	3,305,000
National Park Service	185,000
Office of Indian Affairs	165,000
Subtotals, other agencies	4,620,000
Grand total, Missouri River program	54,786,650
Region VII:	
Transmission lines:	
Gering-Sidney	343,000
Sidney-Sterling	314,000
Sterling?North Platte	54,000
Gering-Hot Springs	175,400
Cheyenne-Sterling	139,850
Casper-Gering	451,100
Fort Randall-O'Neil	195,300
Glendo-Lusk	102,700

Unit location	*Amount approved by conferees*
Region VII—Continued	
Substations:	
Sterling	$52,700
Sidney	163,500
Ogallala	24,000
Pine Bluffs-Kimball	50,000
O'Neil	67,700
Guernsey	2,700
Caspar subadditions	180,000
Goring subadditions	245,450
Bridgeport	79,050
Lusk	42,000
Alliance, Chadron and Hot Springs	128,100
Total, region VII	2,810,550
Region VI, transmission lines and substations:	
Williston-Garrison	720,850
Williston substation	102,700
Beulah substation	102,700
Heart River-Heart Butte	277,050
Boysen lines	56,750
Canyon Ferry lines	2,700
REA and pumping	177,050
Total, region VI	1,439,800
Grand total, transmission lines and substations	4,250,350

Nos. 139, 140, and 141, relating to investigations, Colorado River development fund: Appropriates $900,000, as proposed by the Senate, and inserts the word "construction" in connection with estimates of costs of projects, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 142, relating to the Boulder Canyon project, operation and maintenance: Strikes out the proposal of the House in connection with payment of tuition of children of employees, and inserts the proposal of the Senate.

No. 143, relating to construction, Boulder Canyon project: Appropriates $1,700,000, instead of $1,600,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,728,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 144: Appropriates $4,000,000 for the All-American Canal, as proposed by the House, instead of $4,242,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 145: Strikes out the proposal of the House relating to a moratorium or stop order by the President in connection with the use of appropriations for flood control or reclamation.

No. 146: Restores the provision of the House relating to Alaskan investigations amended to include the words "as a basis for legislation".

No. 147: Restores the provision of the House relating to contract hold-backs.

No. 148: In eliminating this provision from the bill the conferees are in agreement that new legislation shall be passed at the earliest opportunity providing for the disposal of the interest collected on sums invested in power and municipal water features on reclamation projects, and with the understanding that interest heretofore or hereafter collected on such investment in power or municipal water features of any such reclamation project constructed or operated under the authority of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 shall not be allocated during the fiscal year 1949.

No. 149: Restores the provision of the House relating to force account work amended to limit such restriction to eight per centum and excepts certain projects or items not in excess of $200,000.

No. 150: Reported in disagreement.

No. 151: Reported in disagreement.

No. 152: Reported in disagreement.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

No. 153 authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 166 passenger motor vehicles (of which 146 are for replacement only) as proposed by the Senate, instead of the purchase of 146 for replacement only as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 154 and 155 appropriates $4,350,000 for topographic surveys, instead of $3,563,498 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $540,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia instead of $505,000, as proposed by the House, and $573,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 156 and 157 appropriates $2,625,000 for geologic surveys, instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $2,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $592,500 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia instead of $585,000 as proposed by the House and $600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 158, 159, and 160 appropriates $3,496,700 for gaging streams as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,034,800 as proposed by the House, of which $2,361,900 is to be available only for work in cooperation with States or municipalities as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House, and of which not to exceed $300,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia instead of $265,000 as proposed by the House and $350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 161 and 162 appropriates $300,000 for classification of lands, instead of $243,400 as proposed by the House and $325,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $65,725 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate instead of $56,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 163 and 164 appropriates $603,950 for printing and binding, instead of $477,950 as proposed by the House and $700,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which $450,000 is for engraving and printing geologic and topographic maps instead of $325,000 as proposed by the House and $547,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 165 appropriates $690,000 for mineral leasing as proposed by the Senate, instead of $675,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 166 adjusts the total recommended for all items under salaries and expenses to $13,027,000, instead of $11,456,998 as proposed by the House and $13,924,950 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF MINES

Amendment No. 167 provides, as proposed by the Senate, that not to exceed $16,000 of the appropriation for control of fires in inactive coal deposits may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Amendment No. 168 provides that not to exceed $150,000 of the appropriation for coal-mine inspections and investigations may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate, instead of $145,000 for such purpose as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 169 provides that not to exceed $25,000 of the appropriation for anthracite mining investigations may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 170 and 171 appropriates $9,750,000 for synthetic liquid fuels as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,250,000 as proposed by the House, of which not to exceed $100,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the House, instead of $140,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 172 and 173 appropriates $300,000 for coal investigations as proposed by the House, instead of $200,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $45,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the House, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 174 inserts, as proposed by the Senate, the word "construction" in the text of the language of the appropriation for mining experiment stations in order to clarify the purposes for which the appropriation may be used.

Amendment Nos. 175 and 176 correct errors in spelling.

Amendment No. 177 makes the appropriations for the Bureau available for the purchase of not to exceed 80 passenger motor vehicles (of which 30 are for replacement only), instead of the purchase of not to exceed 60 for replacement only as proposed by the House and the purchase of not to exceed 100 (of which 94 are for replacement only) as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 178 is reported in disagreement.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Amendment Nos. 179 and 180 appropriates $765,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of $737,818 as proposed by the House and $800,000 as proposed by the Senate, including $100,000 for printing and binding as proposed by the Senate instead of $87,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 181 appropriates $665,000 for regional offices, instead of $615,290 as proposed by the House and $715,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 182 appropriates $3,750,000 for administration and protection and so forth of national parks, instead of $3,658,163 as proposed by the House and $3,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 183 appropriates $1,625,000 for administration and protection of national monument, historical and military areas, instead of $1,556,464 as proposed by the House and $1,690,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed that not to exceed $20,000 of the total appropriation recommended may be used for administration of the Fort Sumter National Monument.

Amendment No. 184 appropriates $300,000 for recreational areas, instead of $273,495 as proposed by the House and $350,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed that not to exceed $20,000 (additional) of the total appropriation recommended is for Lake Texoma, Tex., and Okla.; for additional work at this area.

Amendment No. 185 appropriates $60,000 for the Travel Division as proposed by the House, instead of $75,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 186 appropriates $10,000 for administration and protection of recreational demonstration areas as proposed by the House, instead of $15,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 187 appropriates $790,000 for salaries and expenses, National Capitol parks, instead of $774,150 as proposed by the House and $815,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 188 appropriates $137,954 for investigations and studies of the recreational resources and the archeological remains in the river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin), instead of $122,954 as proposed by the House and $152,954 as proposed by the Senate. The total appropriation recommended includes funds for archeological work in the Fort Gibson Reservoir area, Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 189 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 190 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment Nos. 191, 192, and 193 appropriates $4,762,350, as proposed by the Senate, for construction and maintenance of roads and trails and construction and repair of buildings and utilities, instead of $5,162,350 for such purposes as proposed by the House; provides that $3,110,000 of such amount shall be allocated for roads and trails as proposed by the Senate, instead of

$3,210,000 as proposed by the House; and further provides that $1,652,350 of such amount shall be allocated for buildings and utilities as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,952,350 as proposed by the House. The amount recommended is $400,000 below the appropriation proposed by the House, of which $100,000 is applicable to roads and trails for Alaska and $300,000 is applicable to physical improvements for Alaska.

Amendment No. 194 makes appropriations of the National Park Service available for the purchase of not to exceed 40 passenger motor vehicles (of which 28 are for replacement only) as proposed by the Senate, instead of the purchase of not to exceed 30 for replacement only as proposed by the House.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Amendment No. 195 appropriates $270,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $247,470 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 196, 197, and 198 appropriate $1,879,525 for propagation of food fishes as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,800,525 as proposed by the House, including not to exceed $2,000 for purchase of certain specified land as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,500 as proposed by the House; also effects a minor change in language in conformity with the change in the total.

Amendment No. 199 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 200 appropriates $1,147,500 for investigations respecting food fishes, instead of $1,025,000 as proposed by the House and $1,224,500 as proposed by the Senate. The amount recommended is $122,500 above the bill as passed by the House for the following purposes: (1) $15,000 for operation of fishery research vessel, Albatross III; (2) $50,000 for Alaska fishery research (exclusive of construction of laboratory); (3) $20,000 for investigation of damaged oyster beds in Mississippi and Louisiana; and (4) $37,500 for studies of soft-shelled and hard-shelled clams.

Amendment No. 201 appropriates $510,000 for commercial fisheries, instead of $495,000 as proposed by the House and $525,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 202 appropriates $1,000,000 for investigation, exploration, and development of Pacific fisheries as proposed by the House, instead of $1,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 203 appropriates $60,000 for Alaska fur-seal investigations, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $69,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 204 corrects a typographical error.

Amendment No. 205 appropriates $225,000 for enforcement of the Alaska game law as proposed by the Senate, instead of $175,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 206, 207, 208, and 209 appropriates $1,212,500 for maintenance of mammal and bird reservations, instead of $1,210,000 as proposed by the House and $1,340,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not exceeding $7,500 (instead of $5,000 proposed by the House and $10,000 proposed by the Senate) may be used for the repair, painting, and maintenance of dwellings and the buildings and facilities on the Chinsegut National Wildlife Reservation. The total amount recommended for this appropriation also includes $100,000 (instead of $125,000 proposed by the Senate) to repair flood damage in certain areas due to excessive run-off of water during the spring of 1948.

Amendment No. 210 appropriates $150,000 for river basin studies as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 211 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 212 (relating to a total) is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 213, relating to the special fund for Federal aid in wildlife restoration restores the provision in the House bill limiting expenditures for construction from State allocations for fiscal year 1949 to 35 per centum of any such allocation, amended to make the restriction applicable only to construction of "buildings", and waiving a similar restriction carried in the 1948 appropriation act with respect to unobligated balances on June 30, 1948, from State allotments for fiscal year 1948.

Amendment No. 214 (relating to a total) is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 215 authorizes the use of not to exceed $1,123,000 under the various appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service for departmental personal services, instead of $1,113,862 as proposed by the House and $1,130,112 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 216 makes funds available for the Fish and Wildlife Service available for the purchase of not to exceed 65 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, instead of 50 as proposed by the House and 86 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment Nos. 217 and 218 makes funds available for the work of the Fish and Wildlife Service available for the purchase of not to exceed 3 aircraft, instead of 2 as proposed by the House and 5 as proposed by the Senate; and permits the hire of aircraft by the Service, as proposed by the Senate, amended to restrict such hiring to the Territory of Alaska.

Amendment No. 219 sets at $2.00 the maximum per man per day commutation of rations of vessel employees of the Service, instead of $1.50 as proposed by the House and $2.50 as proposed by the Senate.

GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 220 appropriates $64,500 for salaries and expenses, offices of the Governor and the Secretary, Territory of Alaska, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $62,785 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 221 appropriates $448,000 for care and custody of persons legally adjudged insane in Alaska as proposed by the Senate, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 222 and 223 appropriates $10,442,400 for construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, trails, and so forth, Territory of Alaska, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,500,000 as proposed by the House; and authorizes contractual obligations in the amount of $13,904,000 for such purposes, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 224, 225, 226, 227, and 228, relating to the Alaska Railroad: appropriates $17,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House; authorizes contractual obligations of $12,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,700,000 as proposed by the House; provides that not to exceed $12,000 of the appropriation shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $6,575 as proposed by the House and $15,000 as proposed by the Senate; retains the limitation of $8,500 as proposed by the House (the Senate had proposed $9,000) on the annual salary to be paid out of this appropriation to anyone other than the general manager of the Railroad and one assistant general manager; and provides that not to exceed $22,500 of the Alaska Railroad funds shall be available for printing and binding, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House and $25,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 229 appropriates $25,900 for salaries and expenses, offices of the Governor and the Secretary, Territory of Hawaii, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 230 appropriates $213,000 for salaries and expenses, Government of the Virgin Islands, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $205,050 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 231 is reported in disagreement.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment Nos. 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, and 240 amend section 4 of the general provisions by providing that appropriations in the bill for the several bureaus and offices shall be available for expenses of attendance of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of members of societies or associations concerned with their work in not to exceed the following amounts: Office of the Secretary, $850 (House $600; Senate $1,100); Oil and Gas Division, $100; Board on Geographic Names, $150 (Senate, $300); Bureau of Land Management, $1,000 (House, $300; Senate, $2,500); Bureau of Indian Affairs, $1,250 (House, $1,000; Senate, $1,500); Bureau of Reclamation, $6,750 (House, $6,000; Senate, $7,500); Geological Survey, $4,750 (House, $2,000; Senate, $7,500); Bureau of Mines, $5,000 (House, $4,000; Senate, $5,000); National Park Service, $1,250 (House, $1,000; Senate, $1,500); Fish and Wildlife Service, $2,375 (House, $1,750; Senate, $3,000); and soil and moisture conservation operations (all bureaus), $500.

Amendment No. 241 authorizes not to exceed a total of $875,000 of the appropriations contained in the bill to be available for compensation of employees engaged in personnel work, instead of a limitation of $750,000 proposed by the House for such work and $1,000,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 242 inserts language proposed by the Senate in the provision which limits per diem rates for services of experts to $35 under certain conditions, so as to provide that such rate shall apply "unless a higher rate is otherwise authorized by law"; the language permitting the Director of the Budget to approve rates up to $50 per day is also retained in the bill.

Amendment No. 243 restores to the bill certain rescissions, aggregating $560,197, as proposed by the House.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 84, relating to authorization for Bureau of Reclamation to make payments to school districts for instruction of dependents of employees and contractors on reclamation construction projects: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 101, providing a contract authorization of $2,000,000 for construction on the Palisades project, Idaho, under the Bureau of Reclamation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 125, providing funds for rehabilitation and betterment of existing reclamation projects: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

The proposal of the Senate is a new program not heretofore undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation. The conferees on the part of the House will insist that each project be authorized by basic legislation and that such legislation be enacted before additional funds are provided.

Amendment No. 126, relating to a total: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 150, providing for the transfer of certain land at the Grand Island Army Air Field to the Bureau of Reclamation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 151, providing for the transfer of certain unexpended balances of property management funds from the War Assets Administration to the Bureau of Reclamation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 152, providing for the transfer of a certain parcel of land from the

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

the work will go forward and this disgraceful situation which has existed for

Amendment No. 152, providing for the transfer of a certain parcel of land from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Bureau of Reclamation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 178, providing authority for the transfer of a certain parcel of land from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Interior: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 189, providing funds for acquisition of lands by the National Park Service: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment

Amendment No. 190, providing a contract authorization for construction of certain parkways, National Park Service: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 199, clarifying the language of an appropriation as to its availability for construction of certain fish cultural facilities, Fish and Wildlife Service: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 211, providing for purchase and operation of wildlife management areas in California: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

This is a cooperative effort for which the State of California has arranged by legislative action for an appropriation of $9,000,000 over a three year period. A special act has been passed by Congress, (Public Law 534, 80th Congress), which provides for this special situation. The conferees do not intend by approving this special situation that the action shall be regarded as a precedent.

Amendment No. 212, adjusts a total: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 214, adjusts a total: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 231, appropriating to meet deficits of municipal governments of the Virgin Islands and authorizing them to make purchases for certain of their public institutions through the Federal Bureau of Supply: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 84, 101, 125, 150, 151, 152, 178, 190, 199, and 231 be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 84: Page 39, line 20, insert "payments (not to exceed the average per pupil cost in the State where construction is in progress) to school districts as reimbursement, while projects are actually under construction, for the instruction of dependents of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation and of contractors engaged on such projects: *Provided*, That a tuition charge of $25 per semester shall be charged and collected by the Bureau of Reclamation for each such dependent attending such schools.

Amendment No. 101: Page 44, line 14, insert:

"Palisades project, Idaho, the Commissioner of Reclamation is authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $2,000,000."

Amendment No. 125: Page 48, line 24, insert:

"REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT

"For rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects, $1,500,000: *Provided*, That, at the discretion of the Secretary, repayment may be scheduled after the completion of repayment of existing obligations of the water users' organizations concerned."

Amendment No. 150: Page 61, line 11, insert:

"The War Assets Administration or other Federal agency having ownership or custody thereof or interest therein is hereby directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation without exchange of funds, the following-described lands, together with improvements, buildings, facilities, equipment, and interest."

Amendment No. 151: Page 62, line 20, insert:

"The War Assets Administration is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation unexpended balances of funds available for maintenance and protection of transferred property under the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act of 1947 (Public Law 478, 79th Cong.) to reimburse the Bureau of Reclamation for expenditures made for the maintenance and protection of the Yuma Army Air Base and such transfer shall be made hereafter for the maintenance and protection of the Yuma Army Air Base, pending its final disposition as contemplated in the Interior Appropriation Act of 1948 (Public Law 247, 80th Cong., 1st sess.)."

Amendment No. 152: Page 63, line 7, insert:

"The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, all of its right, title, and interest in and to a certain building and improvements under Defense Plant Corporation project, Plancor 1437, constructed on the War Relocation Center at the Heart Mountain Division of the Shoshone project, Wyoming."

Senate amendment No. 178: On page 81, line 5, insert the following:

"The Department of the Army is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior, for the use of the Bureau of Mines, without compensation therefor, full jurisdiction, possession, and control of a parcel of 10 acres, more or less, from that portion of Fort Douglas Military Reservation in the county of Salt Lake, State of Utah, which lies immediately north of the site of the Bureau of Mines Intermountain Experiment Station and is situated between a line beginning at a point 400 feet north of the northwest corner of the United States Bureau of Mines property granted by deed from the University of Utah May 21, 1938, said point being on the south curb of Fort Douglas Boulevard and running thence south 320 feet to the east-west boundary line between the University of Utah and Fort Douglas; thence east 604⅛ feet to the north-south boundary between the University of Utah and Fort Douglas; thence south along said north-south boundary 480 feet to a line on the south boundary (extended) of the United States Bureau of Mines property above mentioned; thence east 262 feet; thence north 952⅛ feet to the south curb of Fort Douglas Boulevard; thence westerly along said south curb of Fort Douglas Boulevard to the point of beginning, said enclosure embracing 10 acres."

Senate amendment No. 190: On page 86, line 16, insert the following:

"Parkways, National Park Service: The Secretary is hereby authorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts, not exceeding a total of $2,680,000, for the construction of the Blue Ridge, Natchez Trace, George Washington Memorial, and Foothills Parkways."

Senate amendment No. 199: On page 90, line 2, after the word "thereto" insert the following: "and not to exceed $35,000 for the construction and operation, in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), of fish cultural facilities on lands owned by the State of South Dakota."

Senate amendment No. 231: On page 106, strike out lines 12 to 18, inclusive, and insert:

"Municipal governments: For expenses of the government of the Virgin Islands in excess of current local revenues for the fiscal year 1949, municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, $194,400, and municipality of St. Croix, $325,800; in all, $520,200, to be paid to the respective municipal treasuries in monthly installments; and the said municipal governments are hereby authorized to make purchases for their hospitals, schools, and other public institutions, through the Bureau of Federal Supply of the Treasury Department."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 84, 101, 125, 150, 151, 152, 178, 190, 199, and 231, and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 126: On page 50, line 3, strike out "$30,605,997" and insert "$37,308,855."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$34,132,439."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 189: Page 85, line 23, insert:

"Acquisition of lands: For the acquisition of privately owned lands or interests therein within the authorized boundaries of established areas under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including expenses incidental thereto and personal services in the District of Columbia, $200,000, to remain available until expended, of which $150,000 shall be available only for lands within Colonial National Historical Park; Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial and Gettysburg National Military Parks; Manassas National Battlefield Park; Badlands, Dinosaur, George Washington Birthplace, Joshua Tree, Petrified Forest, and Scotts Bluff National Monuments; and Big Bend parcel of land adjoining Big Bend National Park necessary to connect the park road system with State Highway No. 227, Glacier, Grand Canyon, Great Smoky Mountains, Kings Canyon, Lassen Volcanic, Mesa Verde, Mount Rainier, Olympic, Rocky Mountain, Sequoia, Yosemite, and Zion National Parks."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out lines 13 and 14 of said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(parcels of land adjoining Big Bend National Park necessary to connect the park road system with State Highway 227)."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 211: Page 96, line 13, insert:

"California wildlife management areas: For the purchase or rent, and development, maintenance, and administration of wildlife management areas in the State of California, as authorized by the act of May 18, 1948 (Public Law 534), $300,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 211, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$250,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 212: Page 96, line 19, strike out "$9,226,979" and insert "$10,257,309."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 212, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$9,928,509."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 214: Page 97, line 16, strike out "$9,226,979" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,257,309."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 214, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$9,928,509."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. As the gentleman knows, I am very much interested in the development in the Missouri River Basin, particularly in the Republican Valley in Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado. In that area the Bureau of Reclamation is not only carrying on construction for irrigation, but for flood control also. I appeared before the gentleman's committee and also the Senate committee, urging the full budget amounts for these projects.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Nebraska has been most diligent, not only this year, but throughout the years that I have served on this committee. I am sure that everyone on that committee knows about the problems of the Republican Valley and we are interested in the early completion of Frenchman-Cambridge project, the Bostwick and all the rest of them.

Mr. CURTIS. The amounts carried in the conference report for these projects is an increase over what we started out with, but it is not yet quite up to the budget estimates.

Mr. JENSEN. May I say that the committee has gone over these figures very carefully? We have taken the testimony of the engineers as well as the Bureau of the Budget. We want these projects to go forward at an efficient and economical rate, and we believe that the figures finally agreed upon will do that.

Mr. CURTIS. I am glad to have the assurance of the Chairman of the committee that this irrigation and flood control work will go on at an efficient rate.

Mr. JENSEN. We have taken into account the amount of money that the projects were able to use last year, and all the other factors, and if what has been done proves to be erroneous I can assure you that this committee will be willing to look into the matter when and if such a time comes. And may I say further to the gentleman from Nebraska that he has been most diligent in presenting the needs and wants of his district before this committee, and that because of his efficient work, more flood-control and irrigation projects are under construction in his district than perhaps in any other congressional district in the country?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. When this bill was passed by the House it contained adequate provision for the improvement and rehabilitation of Bedloe Island. May I ask the gentleman whether that provision is undisturbed in the conference report?

Mr. JENSEN. It was not disturbed. The $500,000 for the improvement and rehabilitation of Bedloe Island, on which the Statue of Liberty is located, is in the bill exactly as the House approved it and I am happy to state that the work will go forward and this disgraceful situation which has existed for the past 16 years or longer will be taken care of in the proper manner. I want to thank the gentleman from New York for the great interest he has taken in that great symbol of our freedom.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman for his helpfulness in this matter.

As chairman of the subcommittee charged with the National Park Service appropriation, the able gentleman from Iowa (Mr. JENSEN), recognized the need for correcting the disgraceful conditions which have prevailed on Bedloe Island for years, and which have sullied the Statue of Liberty. He felt that this shrine of Americanism merits surroundings of beauty, rather than ugly decrepitude. He therefore included in the bill a sum sufficient for a proper job of rehabilitation, and was diligent in protecting that sum against any attempt at deletion.

All patriotic Americans are indebted to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. JENSEN) for this fine accomplishment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I note a small increase in the appropriation for the Missouri River Basin program. Was that increase proportionately applied to the several projects phase A and phase B?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, generally speaking, they were.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I note also that in the report on the appropriation with reference to the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation, it is referred to as the Standing Rock Indians of North Dakota. The Standing Rock Reservation is about equally in South Dakota and North Dakota. Is this $50,000 for the Standing Rock Indians of North Dakota, or does it apply to the entire reservation?

Mr. JENSEN. Apparently the amendment covers only those in North Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let us get that clear.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SCHWABE) handles the Indian problems of this committee. I wish the gentleman from Oklahoma would comment on that.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. In reference to this particular item I do not think there was ever any question but what the item was taken as it was presented to us.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I suggest that the agency headquarters happens to be across the line in North Dakota, but the reservation is almost equally in both States.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. My understanding is it applies to all of the interested parties, regardless of their status of residence.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To the Standing Rock Reservation?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Rather than to the North Dakota members.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That is right.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will permit, that all applies to Alaska; not to

Mr. DURHAM. Under the appropriation to carry out the Bureau of Mines

titled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified next below:

title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HAGEN. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the new Alaska Indian Service sanatorium and hospital for the care of the tuberculous will be located in southwestern Alaska?

Mr. JENSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HAGEN. Further, may I ask the gentleman this question: During the hearings I appeared before the committee and urged that the hospital be located in the Matanuska Valley at or near Palmer. The chairman of the subcommittee has been there and I should like to ask him if he does not agree that Palmer would be a very suitable location for this hospital.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it would be a very suitable location. However, of course, it is not up to this committee to designate the placing of the hospital, but it is a very beautiful valley and I think it would be a good place for the hospital if the authorities felt so inclined. I certainly would be glad to see it at Palmer.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include an editorial appearing in the Anchorage Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. There has been some discussion of locating the sanatorium at Anchorage as well as Palmer. I should like to suggest that because of the great concentration of Government work and development at Anchorage, the housing shortage is constantly becoming more acute, and the labor supply is short, Palmer in the Matanuska Valley is less than 50 miles from Anchorage and if the sanatorium were located in that vicinity, there would be convenient access to Anchorage. Furthermore there are many important advantages of having the institution located in the Palmer area. As we all know, the Matanuska Valley is the center of the largest farming community in Alaska which means the sanatorium would be conveniently located with reference to farm produce.

Construction of a great new airport will probably start at Anchorage this year, there will be considerable road work, the Army will continue its activities, and thus it would seem it would be the sensible thing to construct the tuberculosis sanatorium elsewhere where the competition for living quarters, workmen, and so forth would not be so great.

I should like to insert an editorial from the Anchorage Daily News dated Wednesday, May 26, 1948.

THE OBVIOUS PLACE

Ever since the Joint Appropriations Subcommittee began its deliberations on a bill calling for the building of a 400-bed hospital in Alaska, as the first step in a move designed to alleviate the growing incidence of tuberculosis among the native Indians, there has been a great deal of pressure exerted to bring the hospital to Anchorage.

With the bill due to be reported out of committee on Thursday there seems to be a growing fervor to bring more pressure to bear for its location here. Normally we would be inclined to feel the erection of such an institution in the nearby Anchorage area, a sound proposition for the city.

However, we feel there are several points which should be given full consideration before exerting pressure for its construction here. We realize the cost of the structure will total some $5,000,000 and that the annual pay roll will amount to approximately $1,000,000, but one of the biggest hurdles for this area would be to find the necessary land that would meet the requirements of the Office of Indian Affairs who will administer the activities of the hospital.

In the meantime Palmer residents have been spurred on by their interest in the project to the extent that several tracts of land have been offered free to the Government. Needless to say, the Government will not bypass such an offer if the various tracts made available meet their needs.

It seems to us that Palmer offers other advantages which Anchorage cannot meet, such as the nearby availability of garden fresh foodstuffs which are required in the treatment of tubercular patients. Important, too, is the fact that such an institution would provide part time work for many of the homesteaders in the Matanuska Valley.

And there can be no doubt but that Anchorage would also profit in the long run, as much of the funds needed to run the hospital would ultimately be spent here, as would salaries.

But more important than just the bringing of more money to Anchorage is the long-range view—the necessity for development of the territory as a whole. If Alaska is to prosper, it will never occur if Juneau, Fairbanks, and Anchorage keep running to the pot with a gravy spoon.

We say, let's help Palmer get the hospital.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. How much is contained in this bill for the construction of the Natchez Trace?

Mr. JENSEN. We have a contract authorization of $2,680,000 which the conferees will recommend for parkways. There is no cash in this bill earmarked for that particular parkway. The Park Service has in excess of a $5,000,000 carry-over. We are also recommending a contract authorization in the amount of $2,680,000. So, they have sufficient funds, I am sure, to take care of most of the needed construction on parkways.

Mr. RANKIN. They ought to begin to use it. These parkways ought not to just be used to furnish jobs for individuals. They ought to go ahead and do this work.

Mr. JENSEN. We certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I shall insist on it from now on.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, it is rather apparent that a lot of pushing has not been done because of the great carry-over they have. But, they promised us they would go forward and get this work done. That, of course, is an administrative function of the Department.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I note here that the Senate has decreased the amount for the construction of roads and trails in the national parks.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will permit, that all applies to Alaska; not to the mainland.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. I note here that the Senate has stricken out the language with reference to regional offices as written in, in the House for the Bureau of Land Management, and I note this language in the conference report:

That none of the appropriations made in this act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel assigned to regional offices of the Bureau of Land Management in excess of the average total number of all personnel assigned to such regional offices during the fiscal year 1948; and the Senate agree to the same.

Will the gentleman explain that language to me?

Mr. JENSEN. The purpose of that amendment is to keep the Department from expanding other than in district offices where the tract books are supposed to be, so that we can get these thousands of leases adjudicated, some of which may be from two and a half to six years old. I might say to the gentleman that the job of the Bureau of Land Management is now the baby of the Congressmen from the West who objected to getting this thing straightened out according to the House version so that we could get these leases adjudicated. But, they seem to think that they should have the say, and so it is now their baby. If we do not get these leases expedited, they will know exactly who is going to be held responsible.

Mr. BARRETT. This amendment will not prohibit automatic increases in pay for these people?

Mr. JENSEN. No.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. The chairman will remember our colloquy with regard to the Lower Marias and the Montana pumping. I gather that part of the funds for these two projects are in the conference report carried up to phase A.

Mr. JENSEN. $450,000 of the Lower Marias was carried up to phase A, but the Montana pumping has not been changed from phase B to phase A. It is still in phase B.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The House put in a provision which I greatly question. What became of the amendment that provided that the Commissioner of Reclamation must be an engineer?

Mr. JENSEN. The House agreed to the Senate version of that provision.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Under the appropriation to carry out the Bureau of Mines program in regard to synthetic fuels, the budget requested how much, and how much was finally allowed in this appropriation?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FENTON) will answer that. He is in charge of the mines and mining section of this bill.

Mr. FENTON. In the conference the Bureau of Mines got every nickel they asked for.

Mr. DURHAM. That is good.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 724)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 75, enabling the United States to render financial, technical, and material aid to the Governments of Greece and Turkey, I submit herewith the third quarterly report on the activities and expenditures of funds under the authority of this act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
June 18, 1948.

INCREASING THE RATES OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH COMPENSATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2825) to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2825) to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: That paragraph IV of part I of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided in part I, paragraph I hereof, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified next below:

"'Widow but no child, $75; widow with one child, $100 (with $15 each additional child); no widow but one child, $58; no widow but two children, $82 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $106 (equally divided) (with $20 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $60 (or both), $35 each.'

"SEC. 2. Subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Any veteran or the dependents of any deceased veteran otherwise entitled to compensation under the provisions of part II of this regulation or the general pension law shall be entitled to receive the rate of compensation provided in part I of this regulation, if the disability or death of such veteran resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, or (2) while engaged in extra hazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, or (3) while the United States is engaged in war.'

"SEC. 3. Paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided for in part II, paragraph I hereof, shall be entitled to receive compensation at 60 per centum of the rates specified for such dependents in paragraph IV, part I hereof, as now or hereafter amended.'

"SEC. 4. The increases provided by this Act shall be effective from the first day of the second month following the passage of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes."

And the House agree to the same.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
HUGH BUTLER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 2825) to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The substantial differences in rates between the House amendment and the proposed conference substitute are noted in the following schedule:

	Existing law	H. R. 3748	S. 2825	Conference agreement
Widow but no child	$60.00	$75	$70	$75.
Widow with 1 child	78.00	115	94	$100 (with $15 for each additional child).
Widow with 2 children	93.60	135	112	
Widow with 3 children	109.20	155	127	
Widow with 4 children	124.80	175	142	
Widow with 5 children	140.40	195	157	
No widow but 1 child	30.00	60	58	$58.
No widow but 2 children	45.60	70	82	$82 (equally divided).
No widow but 3 children	57.60	90	106	$106 (equally divided) (with $20 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided).
No widow but 4 children	69.60	110	120	
No widow but 5 children	81.60	130	146	
Dependent mother or father	54.00	75	54	$60.
Dependent mother and father, each	30.00	40	30	$35.

The House bill placed an annual income limitation to $1,800 for one parent or $3,000 for two for use in determining dependency. It also excluded life-insurance payments from any source in an amount less than $3,000 received in any one year. The conference agreement eliminates this provision. It was pointed out that complaints were made that the criteria in the Veterans' Administration regulations for determining dependency of parents were not liberal enough to meet present-day requirements. Accordingly, the conferees agreed that the Veterans' Administration should survey such regulations with a view toward revision to meet current needs.

The Senate bill provided that widows and orphans of peacetime veterans should receive 80 percent of the rates specified for wartime cases. No provision of this character was contained in the House bill. The House managers agreed to accept it.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 2825, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The conferees on S. 2825, providing increases for widows and dependents of veterans who lost their lives in the service of their country have reached, in my opinion, a reasonable compromise.

The rates for widow but no child, $75; widow with one child, $100—with $15 for each additional child; no widow but one child, $58; no widow but two children, $82—equally divided; no widow but three children, $106—equally divided (with $20 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $60, or both, $35 each.

These figures mean a slight increase over the House bill rates for orphans and a slight increase for widows and widows with one or more children over the Senate bill rates.

The House managers have agreed to accept the Senate amendment providing 80 percent of wartime compensation for widows and dependents of peacetime veterans.

The House receded from its section providing an increase of income limitation for parents. However, the conferees agreed that the present Veterans' Administration formula is antiquated and in serious need of revision. It was agreed that unless the Veterans' Administration revised their formula to fit existing economic conditions, legislation to accomplish this purpose would be enacted in the next session of the Congress.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "That any person entitled to compensation at wartime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in part I, or paragraph I (c), part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and restored with limitations by Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 per centum, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

"(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

"(a) has a wife but no child living, $21;

"(b) has a wife and one child living, $35;

"(c) has a wife and two children living, $45.50;

"(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $56;

"(e) has no wife but one child living, $14;

"(f) has no wife but two children living, $24.50;

"(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $35;

"(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $17.50 for each parent so dependent.

"(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 per centum, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

"SEC. 2. That any person entitled to compensation at peacetime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in paragraph IV, part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, except paragraph I (c) thereof, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 per centum, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

"(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

"(a) has a wife but no child living, $16.80;

"(b) has a wife and one child living, $28;

"(c) has a wife and two children living, $36.40;

"(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $44.80;

"(e) has no wife but one child living, $11.20;

"(f) has no wife but two children living, $19.60;

"(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $28;

"(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $14 for each parent so dependent.

"(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 per centum, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

"SEC. 3. The additional compensation for a dependent or dependents provided by this Act shall not be payable to any veteran during any period he is in receipt of an increased rate of compensation or of subsistence allowance on account of a dependent or dependents under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That he may elect to receive whichever is the greater.

"SEC. 4. The administrative, definitive, and penal provisions of Public Law Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Veterans Regulations thereunder, as amended, shall be for application under this Act.

"SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment."

And the House agree to the same.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
HUGH BUTLER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The substantial differences in rates between the House amendment and the proposed conference substitute are noted in the following schedule:

Totally disabled	H. R. 5588	S. 2821, wartime	S. 2821, peacetime	Conference agreement	
				Wartime	Peacetime
Wife, but no child	$30	$15.00	$12	$21.00	$16.80
Wife, 1 child	70	25.00	20	35.00	28.00
Wife, 2 children	65	32.50	26	45.50	36.40
Wife, 3 or more children	80	40.00	32	56.00	44.80
No wife, 1 child	20	10.00	8	14.00	11.20
No wife, 2 children	35	17.50	14	24.50	19.60
No wife, 3 or more children	50	25.00	20	35.00	28.00
Dependent parent or parents, each	25	12.50	10	17.50	14.00

The conference agreement also provides that if and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 percent, the amount of additional compensation shall be in an amount having the same ratio to the amount specified in the above schedule under heading of "Conference agreement" as the degree of disability bears to the total disability.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 2821, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The conferees agreed on 70 percent of the House rates on this bill which would increase the compensation received by veterans who are 60 percent or more disabled and who have one or more dependents.

The House accepted the Senate provision providing for 80 percent of wartime rates for peacetime veterans—a provision which was not included in the original House bill.

I think we have reached a reasonable compromise and the best that could be done under existing conditions. I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is in control of the time. Does the gentlewoman yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I agreed not to take any time in order to have the bill come up promptly and be sent to the other body. So I have not yielded any time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has control of the time.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, our first duty is to the disabled veterans.

You have heard a good deal of demagoguery about my attitude on the Negro question. I got through the committee a bill to establish a Negro veterans' hospital in Virginia because the real Negroes wanted it. It would give them an opportunity to supply their own doctors and nurses and to show what they can do. This outfit which calls itself the Association for the Advancement of the Colored Race has interfered with it in the other body, although it passed the House without opposition.

The one Negro in America whose name stands out as a representative of his race is Booker T. Washington. I am going to read you a telegram I received from his daughter this morning about this hospital. The telegram is from New York. It is as follows:

Hon. JOHN RANKIN,
Washington, D. C.:

This is to express my deep appreciation to you for your tireless efforts in trying to get a veterans' hospital at my father's birthplace for our people. I am praying that you might yet find a way for this bill to get through the Senate, since it has passed the House.

PORTIA WASHINGTON PITTMAN.

That is Booker T. Washington's daughter. They want this hospital, and the white people of the South want them to have it.

It will furnish them an institution where they can be to themselves, where they can have their own doctors and their own nurses. We have one such hospital at Tuskegee, Ala. I was chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation for 16 years, and I saw to it that they got what they needed. They have done a good job. We have one established in Mound Bayou, Miss., for the same purpose.

These Negroes came here asking for this one in Virginia, and the House voted unanimously for it.

Yet it is being held up in the Senate because of the pressure being used by an outfit, that I regard as a Communist-front outfit, that is doing infinite harm to the Negroes of this country.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I heartily agree with the gentleman that the colored doctors have done a remarkable job, as well as the colored nurses.

Mr. RANKIN. The passage of this bill would be to the best interest of both the Negro veterans and the white veterans in Virginia and adjoining States. It passed the House unanimously, and I feel sure it would pass the Senate unanimously, if the Members of that body are permitted to vote on it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 3 OF THE STANDARD TIME ACT OF 1918

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H. R. 6318, an act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out all after "*Provided*", over to and including "time" in line 4, page 2, and insert: "That common carriers within such portion of the State of Idaho may conduct their operations on Pacific time."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERSTATE BOUNDARY COMPACT BY AND BETWEEN THE STATES OF MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, AND WISCONSIN

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 206 consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the following interstate boundary compact by and between the State of Michigan, the State of Minnesota, and the State of Wisconsin:

A COMPACT

Entered into by and between the State of Michigan, the State of Minnesota, and the State of Wisconsin, States signatory hereto.

The contracting States solemnly agree:

1. That the boundary between the State of Michigan and the State of Wisconsin in the center of Lake Michigan be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked A-B-C-D-E-F-G on the map, exhibit A, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

Starting at point A, a point equidistant from either shore on the line which is the eastward continuation of the boundary line between Wisconsin and Illinois or latitude 42°29'37" north;

Thence to point B, a point equidistant from either shore on the line drawn through the Port Washington fog signal and storm signal and the White Lake storm signal, on a true azimuth of 354°12'00", a distance of 61.55 statute miles;

Thence to point C, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Sheboygan Coast Guard storm signal, fog signal, radio beacon, and Little Stable Point Light, on a true azimuth of 03°01'15", a distance of 22.18 statute miles;

Thence to point D, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Twin River Point Light and fog signal and Big Sable fog and light signal, on a true azimuth of 10°04'30", a distance of 30.33 statute miles;

Thence to point E, a point equidistant from either shore on a line from Baileys Harbor inland light and Point Betsie fog signal, radio beacon, and distance finding station, on a true azimuth of 17°09'55", a distance of 54.20 statute miles;

Thence to point F, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Pilot Island Light and fog signal and Sleeping Bear Point Light, on a true azimuth of 33°29'10", a distance of 17.24 statute miles;

Thence to point G, the point determined by the United States Supreme Court decree of March 12, 1936, which is a point 45,600 meters from the center of Rock Island Passage on a bearing of south 60° east, on a true azimuth of 49°34'10", a distance of 15.66 statute miles.

The latitude and longitude of the named control points are as follows:

Point A—Latitude 42°29'37"
Longitude 87°01'15"
Point B—Latitude 43°22'50"
Longitude 87°08'50"
Point C—Latitude 43°42'00"
Longitude 87°07'20"
Point D—Latitude 44°07'55"
Longitude 87°00'45"
Point E—Latitude 44°52'50"
Longitude 86°41'10"
Point F—Latitude 45°05'20"
Longitude 86°29'30"
Point G—Latitude 45°14'10"
Longitude 86°14'55"

2. That the western boundary of the State of Michigan in the waters of Lake Superior and the eastern boundary in the waters of Lake Superior of the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked M-N on the map, exhibit B, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

Starting at point M, the point where the line through the middle of the main channel of the Montreal River enters Lake Superior,

Thence in a direct line to point N, the point where a line drawn through the most easterly point of Pigeon Point and the most southerly point of Pine Point intersects the international boundary, on a true azimuth of 23°27'24" and a distance of 108.86 statute miles.

The latitude and longitude of the named control points is:

Point M—Latitude 46°34'05"
Longitude 90°25'05"
Point N—Latitude 48°00'50"
Longitude 89°29'00"

3. That the boundary between the State of Minnesota and the State of Wisconsin in the center of Lake Superior be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked A-B-C-D on the map, exhibit B, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

Starting at point A which is the midpoint on the line M-N described in paragraph 2, supra:

Thence to point B, the midpoint in a direct line between the mouth of Cross River, Minn., and the lighthouse on Outer Island in Wisconsin, on a true azimuth of 272°17'10", a distance of 33.15 statute miles;

Thence to point C, the midpoint in a direct line between the lighthouse on shore at Two Harbors, Minn., and the light on the lakeward end of the Government east pier at Port Wing, Wis., on a true azimuth of 235°27'40", a distance of 49.60 statute miles;

Thence to point D, the midpoint in a direct line at right angles to the central axis of the Superior entry between the tops of the eastern ends of the pierheads at the lakeward ends of the United States Government breakwaters at the Superior entry to Duluth Superior Harbor, on a true azimuth of 259°50'20", a distance of 26.43 statute miles.

The latitude and longitude of the named control points are as follows:

Point A—Latitude 47°17'30"
Longitude 89°57'00"
Point B—Latitude 47°18'35"
Longitude 90°39'15"
Point C—Latitude 46°54'10"
Longitude 91°31'25"
Point D—Latitude 46°42'39.875"
Longitude 92°00'24.571"

4. All azimuths are measured clockwise from true north.

5. That this compact shall become operative immediately upon its ratification by any State as between it and the other State or States so ratifying. Ratification shall be made by act of the legislature of the ratifying State.

6. That immediately upon ratification of this compact by all three States, each State will appoint two members to a Joint Survey Commission to survey and mark the boundaries defined in this compact by establishing and perpetuating monuments at the reference points on shore by means of which the control points of said boundaries are located. The expense of marking the Lake Michigan boundary shall be borne jointly by the States of Michigan and Wisconsin; the expense of marking the boundary line described in paragraph 2 above shall be borne equally by the States of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin. The expense of marking the Lake Superior boundary between Minnesota and Wisconsin shall be borne jointly by the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

In witness whereof:

I, Kim Sigler, Governor of the State of Michigan, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Governor, and pursuant to the provisions of Act No. 267, of the Public Acts of 1947, approved June 27, 1947, which ratifies paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 of the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Michigan and have caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Michigan.

Done at the city of Lansing, in the State of Michigan, this 3d day of February, in the year of our Lord, 1948.

[SEAL] (S) KIM SIGLER,
Governor.
(S) F. W. ALGER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

In witness whereof:

I, Luther W. Youngdahl, Governor of the State of Minnesota, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Governor and pursuant to the provisions of chapter 589, Laws of Minnesota for the year 1947, approved April 26, 1947, which ratifies the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Minnesota, and have caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Minnesota.

Done at the city of St. Paul, in the State of Minnesota, this 30th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1947.

[SEAL] (S) LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
Governor.
(S) MIKE HOHN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

In witness whereof:

I, Oscar Rennebohm, Acting Governor of the State of Wisconsin, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Acting Governor, and pursuant to the provisions of chapter 222, Laws of Wisconsin for the year 1947, approved June 12, 1947, which ratifies the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Wisconsin and have caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Wisconsin.

Done at the city of Madison in the State of Wisconsin, this 22d day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1947.

[SEAL] (S) OSCAR RENNEBOHM,
Acting Governor.
(S) ROBERT C. ZIMMERMAN,
Assistant Secretary of State.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or in any manner affect any right of the United States.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELEGATION OF CERTAIN POWERS BY CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD TO THE ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4435, an act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 4, after "airspace", insert "immediately adjacent thereto and needed in connection therewith."

Page 3, line 11, after "Congress", insert ": *Provided*, That in the case of condemnations of easements through or other interests in airspace, in fixing condemnation awards, consideration may be given to the reasonable probable future use of the underlying land."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman explain this amendment that has to do with the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which makes changes which may affect our responsibility as far as appropriations are concerned.

Mr. HINSHAW. This bill was reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously and was passed by the House. I am sure it is satisfactory to the gentleman from Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. If there is to be much discussion about this, the request will have to be withdrawn.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has explained the amendment to me, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 3566, an act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3566) to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 5 of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the below quoted language appearing in lines 9 to 20:

"If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or if a case is reported less than ninety days prior to the close of the session, then during the next session of the Congress, the Congress passes a resolution stating in substance that it favors the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or if a case is reported less than ninety days prior to the close of the session, then during the next session of the Congress, the Congress does not pass such a resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law."

And insert in lieu thereof the below quoted language:

"If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it favors the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. If prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress does not pass such a concurrent resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law."

And the Senate agree to the same.

FRANK FELLOWS,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
EMANUEL CELLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, H. R. 3566, to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the House bill strikes out all after the enacting clause and rewrites section 1 of the bill with amendment. The House agrees to the Senate amendment of section 1 of the bill providing for congressional review of the Attorney General's recommendations in deportation cases submitted to the Congress under section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 but insists on its amendment that the Congress shall have an opportunity to review these cases, not only in the session in which they are presented but also during the session next following, if so desired. To this amendment the managers on the part of the Senate agree.

The managers on the part of the House agree to the Senate amendment striking out section 2 of the bill.

FRANK FELLOWS,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
EMANUEL CELLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPLACED PERSONS BILL

Mr. FELLOWS submitted the following conference report on the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) entitled "An Act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That, this Act may be cited as the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

"SEC. 2. When used in this Act the term—

"(a) 'Commission' means the Displaced Persons Commission created pursuant to this Act;

"(b) 'Displaced person' means any displaced person or refugee as defined in Annex I of the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization and who is the concern of the International Refugee Organization.

"(c) 'Eligible displaced person' means a displaced person as defined in subsection (b) above, (1) who on or after September 1, 1939, and on or before December 22, 1945, entered Germany, Austria, or Italy and who on January 1, 1948, was in Italy or the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna or the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria; or a person who, having resided in Germany or Austria, was a victim of persecution by the Nazi government and was detained in, or was obliged to flee from such persecution and was subsequently returned to, one of these countries as a result of enemy action, or of war circumstances, and on January 1, 1948, had not been firmly resettled therein, and (2) who is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission into the United States for permanent residence, and (3) for whom assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Commission have been given that such person, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment and that such person, and the members of such person's family who shall accompany such person and who propose to live with such person, shall not become public charges and will have safe and sanitary housing without displacing some other person from such housing. The spouse and unmarried dependent child or children under twenty-one years of age of such an eligible displaced person shall, if otherwise qualified for admission into the United States for permanent residence, also be deemed eligible displaced persons.

"(d) 'Eligible displaced person' shall also mean a native of Czechoslovakia who had fled as a direct result of persecution or fear of persecution from that country since January 1, 1948, and (1) who is on the effective date of this Act in Italy or the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna, or the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria, and (2) who is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission into the United States for permanent residence, and (3) for whom assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Commission have been given that such person, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment and that such person, and the members of such person's family who shall accompany such person and who propose to live with such person, shall not become public charges and will have safe and sanitary housing without displacing some other person from such housing. The spouse and unmarried dependent child or children under twenty-one years of age of such an eligible displaced person shall, if otherwise qualified for admission into the United States for permanent residence, also be deemed eligible displaced persons.

"(e) 'Eligible displaced orphan' means a displaced person (1) who is under the age of 16 years, and (2) who is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission into the United States for permanent residence, and (3) who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of both parents, and (4) who, on or before the effective date of this Act, was in Italy or in the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna or the American zone, the British zone or the French zone of either Germany or Austria, and (5) for whom satisfactory assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Commission have been given that such person, if admitted into the United States, will be cared for properly.

"SEC. 3. (a) During the two fiscal years following the passage of this Act a number of immigration visas not to exceed 202,000 may be issued without regard to quota limitations for those years to eligible displaced persons as quota immigrants, as provided in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That not less than 40 per centum of the visas issued pursuant to this Act shall be available exclusively to eligible displaced persons whose place of origin or country of nationality has been de facto annexed by a foreign power: *Provided further*, That not more than 2,000 visas shall be issued to eligible displaced persons as defined in subsection (d) of section 2 of this Act.

"(b) Upon the issuance of an immigration visa to any eligible displaced person as provided for in this Act, the consular officer shall use a quota number from the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in section 12 of the Act of May 26, 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 212), for the fiscal year then current at the time or, if no such quota number is available for said fiscal year, in that event for the first succeeding fiscal year in which a quota number is available: *Provided*, That not more than 50 per centum of any quota shall be so used in any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That eligible displaced orphans may be issued special nonquota immigration visas, except that the number of such special nonquota immigration visas shall not exceed three thousand.

"SEC. 4. (a) Any alien who (1) entered the United States prior to April 1, 1948, and (2) is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, and (3) is a displaced person residing in the United States as defined in this section may apply to the Attorney General for an adjustment of his immigration status. If the Attorney General shall, upon consideration of all the facts and circumstances of the case, determine that such alien is qualified under the provisions of this section, the Attorney General shall report to the Congress all of the pertinent facts in the case. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the end of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it favors the granting of the status of permanent residence to such alien the Attorney General is authorized, upon receipt of a fee of $18.00, which shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the account of miscellaneous receipts, to record the admission of the alien for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's last entry into the United States. If prior to the end of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress does not pass such resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law: *Provided*, That the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to this section shall not exceed 15,000. Upon the grant of status of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this section, the Secretary of State shall, if the alien was a quota immigrant at the time of entry, reduce by one the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in Section 12 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, for the fiscal year then current or the next succeeding fiscal year in which a quota number is available, but not more than 50 per centum of any quota shall be used for this purpose in any given fiscal year: *Provided further*, That quota deductions provided for in this section shall be made within the 50 per centum limitations contained in section 3 (b) of this Act.

"(b) When used in this section the term 'Displaced Person residing in the United States' means a person who establishes that

he lawfully entered the United States as a non-immigrant under section 3 or as a non-quota immigrant student under subdivision (e) of Section 4 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended, and that he is a person displaced from the country of his birth, or nationality, or of his last residence as a result of events subsequent to the outbreak of World War II; and that he cannot return to any of such countries because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinions.

"SEC. 5. Quota nationality for the purposes of this Act shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 160–161; 8 U. S. C. 212) and no eligible displaced person shall be issued an immigration visa if he is known or believed by the consular officer to be subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws, with the exception of the contract labor clause of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875–878; 8 U. S. C. 136), and that part of the said Act which excludes from the United States persons whose ticket or passage is paid by another or by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government, either directly or indirectly; and all eligible displaced persons and eligible displaced orphans shall be exempt from paying visa fees and head taxes.

"SEC. 6. The preferences provided within the quotas by Section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 155–156; 47 Stat. 656; 45 Stat. 1009; 8 U. S. C. 206), shall not be applicable in the case of any eligible displaced person receiving an immigration visa under this Act, but in lieu of such preferences the following preferences, without priority in time of issuance of visas as between such preferences, shall be granted to eligible displaced persons and their family dependents who are the spouse or the unmarried dependent child or children under twenty-one years of age, in the consideration of visa applications:

"(a) First. Eligible displaced persons who have been previously engaged in agricultural pursuits and who will be employed in the United States in agricultural pursuits: *Provided*, That not less than 30 per centum of the visas issued pursuant to this Act shall be made available exclusively to such persons: *And provided further*, That the wife, and unmarried dependent child or children under twenty-one years of age, of such persons may, in accordance with the regulations of the Commission, be deemed to be of that class of persons who have been previously engaged in agricultural pursuits and who will be employed in the United States in agricultural pursuits.

"(b) Second. Eligible displaced persons who are household construction, clothing, and garment workers, and other workers needed in the locality in the United States in which such persons propose to reside; or eligible displaced persons possessing special educational, scientific, technological or professional qualifications.

"(c) Third. Eligible displaced persons who are the blood relatives of citizens or lawfully admitted alien residents of the United States, such relationship in either case being within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the rules of the common law.

"SEC. 7. Within the preferences provided in section 6, priority in the issuance of visas shall be given first to eligible displaced persons who during World War II bore arms against the enemies of the United States and are unable or unwilling to return to the countries of which they are nationals because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinions and second, to eligible displaced persons who, on January 1, 1948, were located in displaced persons camps and centers, but in exceptional cases visas may be issued to those eligible displaced persons located outside of displaced persons camps and centers upon a showing, in accordance with the regulations of the Commission, of special circumstances which would justify such issuance.

"SEC. 8. There is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Displaced Persons Commission, consisting of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term ending June 30, 1951, and one member of the Commission shall be designated by him as chairman. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of $10,000 per annum. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to enable the Commission to discharge its duties. Within the limits of such funds as may be appropriated to the Commission or as may be allocated to it by the President, the Commission may employ necessary personnel without regard to the Civil Service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and make provisions for necessary supplies, facilities, and services to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this Act. It shall be the duty of the Commission to formulate and issue regulations, necessary under the provisions of this Act, and in compliance therewith, for the admission into the United States of eligible displaced orphans and eligible displaced persons. The Commission shall formulate and issue regulations for the purpose of obtaining the most general distribution and settlement of persons admitted under this Act throughout the United States and their Territories and possessions. It shall also be the duty of the Commission to report on February 1, 1949, and semiannually thereafter to the President and to the Congress on the situation regarding eligible displaced orphans, eligible displaced persons and displaced persons. Such report shall also include information respecting employment conditions and the housing situation in this country, the place and type of employment, and the residence of eligible displaced orphans and eligible displaced persons who have been admitted into the United States pursuant to the provisions of this Act. At the end of its term the Commission shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress.

"SEC. 9. Every eligible displaced person, except an eligible displaced person who shall have derived his status because of being the spouse or an unmarried dependent child under twenty-one years of age of an eligible displaced person, who shall be admitted into the United States shall report, on the 1st day of January and on the 1st day of July of each year until he shall have made four reports to the Commission, respecting the employment, place of employment, and residence of such person and the members of such person's family and shall furnish such other information in connection with said employment and residence as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe: *Provided*, That if such person enters the United States within 60 days prior to either the 1st day of January or the 1st day of July, the first report need not be made until the next date on which a report is required to be made. Such report shall be made to the Commission during its term and thereafter to the Attorney General. Any person who willfully violates the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not to exceed $500, or be imprisoned not more than 6 months.

"SEC. 10. No eligible displaced person shall be admitted into the United States unless there shall have first been a thorough investigation and written report made and prepared by such agency of the Government of the United States as the President shall designate, regarding such person's character, history, and eligibility under this Act. The burden of proof shall be upon the person who seeks to establish his eligibility under this Act. Any person who shall willfully make a misrepresentation for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as an eligible displaced person shall thereafter not be admissible into the United States. No eligible displaced orphan or eligible displaced person shall be admitted into the United States under the provisions of this Act except in pursuance of the regulations of the Commission, but, except as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, the administration of this Act, under the provisions of this Act and the regulations of the Commission as herein provided, shall be by the officials who administer the other immigration laws of the United States. Except as otherwise authorized in this Act, all immigration laws, including deportation laws, shall be applicable to eligible displaced orphans and eligible displaced persons who apply to be or who are admitted into the United States pursuant to this Act.

"SEC. 11. After June 30, 1948, no preference or priority shall be given to any person because of his status as a displaced person, or his status as an eligible displaced person, in the issuance of visas under the other immigration laws of the United States.

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to immediately resume general consular activities in Germany and Austria to the end that the German and Austrian quotas shall be available for applicants for immigration visas pursuant to the immigration laws. From and after June 30, 1948, and until July 1, 1950, notwithstanding the provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended, 50 per centum of the German and Austrian quotas shall be available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, or Yugoslavia and who, on the effective date of this Act reside in Germany and Austria.

"SEC. 13. No visas shall be issued under the provisions of this Act to any person who is or has been a member of, or participated in, any movement which is or has been hostile to the United States or the form of government of the United States.

"SEC. 14. Any person or persons who knowingly violate or conspire to violate any provision of this Act, except section 9, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $10,000, or shall be imprisoned not less than two or more than ten years, or both."

And the House agree to the same.

FRANK FELLOWS,
E. WALLACE CHADWICK,
ED GOSSETT,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
FRANK L. CHELF,
Managers on the Part of the House.
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation to the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

In a free exchange of opinions and arguments the conferees endeavored to compose the numerous differences of the measures passed by their respective Houses.

The compromise bill would admit into the United States for permanent residence up to a maximum of 220,000 displaced persons, and it is the confident expectation of the conferees that the enactment of this legislation will be regarded by other countries and particularly by the members of the International Refugee Organization as an inducement to further recognition of their obligations to accept a relative share of the displaced persons. This legislation has proceeded upon the assumption that other nations will soon accept for resettlement a proportionate number of displaced persons, and that by doing so they will cooperate with the United States in expediting the closing of the camps and terminating the emergency.

It is further the consensus of the conferees that the language of the proviso to section 3 (a) of the bill providing for a special priority for displaced persons "whose place of origin or country of nationality has been de facto annexed by a foreign power" has been used exclusively for the purpose of the definition of a certain class of eligible displaced persons and that it cannot and shall not be understood or interpreted as implying any recognition on behalf of the Government of the United States of the territorial status in eastern Europe.

The main differences between the House amendments and the bill as agreed to in conference are noted below, except for changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and clarifying changes made in order to perfect the legislation.

The "cut-off" date of December 22, 1945, for certain of the displaced persons has been agreed upon as representing the concept that persons displaced from their countries of origin during the war should be offered now immediately resettlement opportunities.

The consent of the Senate conferees has been obtained for the 15,000 displaced persons residing in the United States to be offered the opportunity to obtain the status of permanent residents subject to final approval by the Congress of recommendations made in that respect by the Attorney General.

The special preference accorded to persons engaged in agricultural pursuits is prompted by the desire for general basic distribution of persons admitted pursuant to the bill and also because the housing situation is much less acute in the rural areas.

The special preference granted under section 3 (a) is prompted by the fact that nationals of countries and provinces made de facto parts of the U. S. S. R. represents the real "hard core" of the displaced persons in view of the fact that their repatriation is highly improbable because of the political situation prevailing in their countries and places of origin.

The Senate conferees agreed to two House amendments (a) admitting up to 2,000 recent refugees from Czechoslovakia provided that they are at the date of the enactment of the bill in the zones specified therein, and (b) admitting nonquota up to 3,000 eligible displaced orphans provided that satisfactory assurances have been given that such orphans if admitted into the United States will be cared for properly.

The Senate conferees have also agreed to those sections of the House amendment which provide that all visas issued under the bill, except visas issued for eligible displaced orphans, should be properly charged to quotas, as established by the existing law.

The House conferees have agreed to an amended version of a section of the Senate bill which would make 50 percent of the German and Austrian quotas available from and after June 30, 1948, and until July 1, 1950, for persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, or Yugoslavia.

The various differences between the measures passed by both Houses pertaining to the administration of the bill were composed so as to insure the proper enforcement of the law, a suitable resettlement of displaced persons all over the United States, its Territories and possessions, and by preserving all safeguards with respect to exclusion of subversives and by providing for proper assurances that new immigrants shall not become public charges.

The managers on the part of the House believe that this is the best displaced persons bill upon which the conferees could agree and that if any legislation upon this subject is to be enacted, it is incumbent upon the House to give its approval to the compromise bill as reported.

FRANK FELLOWS,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
E. WALLACE CHADWICK,
FRANK L. CHELF,
ED GOSSETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. I wish an opportunity to speak briefly on the conference report. Also the gentleman from Maine desires to speak on the conference report. Will I have the right to do so without making a reservation of objection?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will have 1 hour on the conference report which he may yield. The Chair expresses the hope, however, that he will not be too liberal in his yielding.

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not, nor will I take up any time of the House, but I am asking that the gentleman from Maine will explain whether or not the amendment I placed in the bill with reference to bringing Czechs into the United States is still in the bill.

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The conference report is not much longer than the statement. The Clerk will read the conference report.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Will I be deprived of making a motion to recommit the conference report—not desiring to take up any time—if I consent to the reading of the statement in lieu of the report?

The SPEAKER. That motion will be in order after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is rather late for anyone to criticize the displaced persons bill or the final conference report. To attempt amendments now or to refuse its acceptance would mean the death of the bill and all that it seeks to accomplish for the relief of the hopeless people who yearn for the day when at least some among them will be saved.

The bill should have been more liberal according to my viewpoint, but the rule of the majority decreed against expansion of its provisions and said it should be confined within rigid limits. I accept the dictum of the House and now accept the conference report. I believe the displaced persons' bill will prove itself so that we might expect Federal relief later. Meantime more than 200,000 unfortunates, including 3,000 orphans, 2,000 refugee Czechs, and others will be permitted to come to our shores. I regret more than I can ever say, how much I deplore the injection or the consideration of religious bias or intolerance in connection with such a bill. Such references have no basis in our American legislative system. I deplore it and abjure any contact with it. My only hope is that this bill, after having served a good purpose, will lead to further and final relief of the distressed.

The report has weaknesses not to be condoned, but its total virtues outweigh its gross deficiencies.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

(The Clerk began reading the conference report.)

Mr. MICHENER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understood, there was no objection to reading the statement in lieu of the report. The report is technical and just consumes time on a matter that is difficult to understand.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he did not put the request.

Mr. MICHENER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the technical report be dispensed with and that the statement be read in lieu thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls for the regular order. It will either be the reading of the full report or the statement. The Chair is not depriving any one of his opportunity later to find out what is in the bill or to get time from the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is what I want to find out, whether or not we are going to have time for somebody to explain the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will have 1 hour. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WALTER (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

and brought in this conference report?

camps. I believe fully that it will be

Mr. MASON. As one who served as

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has had a long, hard road; the hills have been steep and difficult to climb. Your committee has met and after several days has agreed. Except for two of our conferees we have signed the report.

I am not going to discuss the House bill. You are all familiar with that. I will discuss very briefly the salient features of the conference report.

The number, for example, is the same except for a ceiling of 3,000 orphans. So I can say that the number, 220,000, has been accepted.

The bill as reported by the Senate contained a provision that 50 percent of the 200,000 should be farmers. We have agreed upon 30 percent. You know, I come from a State where they trade sometimes.

In the bill reported by the Senate was a provision that 50 percent of the 200,000 should come from east of the Curzon Line, namely, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Eastern Poland. That has been reduced to 40 percent.

A provision that 15,000 be charged to the quota of those people who are in this country and have no place to go, has been accepted provided the House and Senate concur in the Attorney General's finding after his investigation, which is the same provision as will be found in 3566, the conference report on which has just been accepted.

The 2,000 Czechs, which were covered by an amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], have been accepted.

The ceiling on the orphans has been put at 3,000. According to the best figures available there are 3,000 orphans. In the House bill there was no limit on age. We agreed to 16 years in this report.

In this conference report also will be found the provision which appeared in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN], providing that certain men and women of German ethnic origin who had to flee to Germany after the Potsdam agreement may be allowed to come to this country by having assigned to them 50 percent of the German and Austrian quotas over a 2-year period, if they qualify under all the immigration laws. This has nothing to do with the displaced person problem, as such. It is an amendment to the immigration law, permitting, to the extent indicated, the quota charge against Germany and Austria rather than their land of national origin.

It has nothing to do with the 200,000, however. It does give some relief to these people for a 2-year period only.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman feel that some difficulties will be encountered in view of the fact that the International Refugee Organization Charter specifically excepts those people from consideration as displaced persons?

Mr. FELLOWS. Does the gentleman mean without that?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. FELLOWS. I think so. I think we will have further trouble along the line. So we have accepted that provision, and that provision was offered, I think, by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

The real bone of contention is this date December 22, 1945. The House bill had the cut-off date of April 21, 1947. We felt that that was a fairer date, taking into consideration all of the circumstances. But we could not and have not changed the date of December 22, 1945, the effect of which is this: That the people who fled Poland after 1945—the exodus beginning somewhere in July 1946—will not be considered when they come to choose or applications are made for those people who are coming in under this so-called DP bill. We figure it is a matter of some 100,000.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, while I voted against this bill, I think this is the best that anyone could devise. There is no abler or finer man in this House than the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] and I think we should adopt this conference report.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. As one who served with the chairman all during this proceeding, from the day we began the hearings on the 4th day of June 1947, on the so-called Stratton bill, down to the close of the conference last night, I want to say this in justice to our chairman that no one has been more tolerant or more willing to hear all of the facts or has rendered more able assistance than has the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS]. In my judgment, no man could have done better. My own opinion is that this is a much better bill than the so-called Stratton bill. I do not think it is as good a bill as we had prepared in the House. But we either had to take the report that we did take or lose everything. Having spent the months that we did on this matter, I signed the report in the honest belief that we were doing the best thing for all the people of this country and for the people in the displaced-persons camps.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I say in relation to him that we would not be here today with this report or any bill whatsoever were it not for the efforts and the ability of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I also want to say that I think that this particular piece of legislation will be marked as one of the constructive pieces of legislation coming from this Congress. May I ask the gentleman also whether or not he was able to keep in the bill the inclusion of miners as one of the labor categories that would be recognized?

Mr. FELLOWS. I am very sorry. We did, however, agree on this: The word "miners" was stricken out, and then with the help of men like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], and two or three others, we were able to incorporate the words, after the divisions were set up, section 6 (b), providing for eligible displaced persons, "household, construction, clothing and garment workers and other workers needed in the locality of the United States in which such person proposes to settle." That is the best we could do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That, it seems to me, would embrace miners.

Mr. FELLOWS. I think so, too. That was our idea of it.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. As the gentleman knows, I have been exceedingly interested in this whole problem for some time, and I want to join my colleagues from Pennsylvania in paying a very high tribute to the statesmanlike quality exhibited by the gentleman from Maine in his handling of the bill. The conference report does not do everything that we would have liked, but I believe it is a fine piece of work even as it stands, and I shall support the conference report.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman. I signed this report. Without this there would be no legislation, and legislation is needed. Under this bill, although it does not perhaps satisfy everybody—it does not satisfy me—we are going to receive into this country some 220,000 of these people which will, I think, solve the question of the displaced-persons camps, will rid Europe of this cancer, and at the same time help us rehabilitate Germany.

I do not like a lot of it, and I can see that many people would disagree. It is much more restrictive than the so-called Fellows bill, because it provides, to start with, for 30 percent farmers. It also provides that 40 percent must come from east of this line. Among the 30 percent farmers will be included their wives and children. This is the best solution we could get, and in my judgment it is not wholly unfair, although I would prefer the date of April 21, 1947.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Without any criticism of the gentleman, because I think he tried very hard and really did a splendid job, and that there is any bill at all I think is attributable to the gentleman from Maine, is it not a fact that there still remains in this conference report the mortgaging of the quotas to the extent of 50 percent?

Mr. FELLOWS. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. If that is so, have we not taken the worst features of the Senate bill and the most onerous features of the House bill and put them together

and brought in this conference report? I say that without any criticism, because, as I said before, the gentleman from Maine has moved heaven and earth and has done a terrific job.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman for the compliment, but my answer would be that that is largely a point of view, of course. Much of this I would have preferred to eliminate if I could have done it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am very much interested in the statement the gentleman is making. I hope he takes enough time to make his statement complete, because this is a big proposition. As I understood the gentleman's statement with reference to the farmers, the conference report provides that 30 percent of the 20,000 shall be farmers.

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman also said something about the farmers' families.

Mr. FELLOWS. Of course, the wife of the farmer is going to be catalogued as a farmer, and I suppose his son is also. They will come within the 30 percent.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes. I presume all those above the quota age will be counted in the quota?

Mr. FELLOWS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The children naturally would come in without being considered in the quota?

Mr. FELLOWS. I think they are all charged to the quota.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Maine and the members of his committee for preserving in the bill my amendment which permits 2,000 Czechs to come into this country. I have looked over the conference report on the Senate side and I know that you had a tremendous task to perform in order to bring out the best bill that could possibly be brought out. I compliment the gentleman and the members of his committee, and again express my deep appreciation for the preservation of the amendment I had in the bill.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. I congratulate the chairman on the work he has done, and appreciate the fine attitude evidenced by the gentleman from New York, that he took this so well, because a lot of us that voted for this bill gagged quite a bit in voting for it.

My question is, What now is going to be done with the DP camps? Are we going to do away with them?

Mr. FELLOWS. Of course, we cannot compel other nations to do these things, but we do ask and urge that they be done. The best information we can get is that if we will give them this bargaining proposition so that they can use it around the table, we can close these camps. I believe fully that it will be done, because everybody connected with it is just as anxious as the gentleman and I that that question be solved.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I was off the floor and came in just this minute. There are two points I should like to have cleared up.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Have you increased the quotas in the conference report to something like 220,000? That is, instead of 202,000?

Mr. FELLOWS. No; we had 220,000 in the House bill, H. R. 6396, and there are 220,000 here.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact, there are 15,000 already here.

Mr. FELLOWS. That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM. And 3,000 orphans and 2,000 Czechs?

Mr. FELLOWS. That is right.

Mr. VURSELL. That is my understanding. Now are all the children counted in the 220,000?

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes.

Mr. VURSELL. Are they counted as citizens?

Mr. FELLOWS. Orphans are especially exempted from the operation of the quota.

Mr. VURSELL. And not more than half of the 220,000 came come in in any 1 year?

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not say that, because that is a matter of shipping. They say now "not over 200,000."

Mr. VURSELL. They will be not over that in any 1 year; is that correct?

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not think we have to worry about that, because it will not be until next fall until this thing is set up.

Mr. VURSELL. That is probably true, but I just wanted to know.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. CHADWICK. If the gentleman will permit me to revert to the very concise statement of his own views and his own motives which preceded the colloquy which we just heard. In order to save the time of the House, I desire to be associated not merely with the very effective result of the gentleman's leadership, but with the line of thought and the persuasions which induced him to take such action. He expressed better than I could possibly express them the views which I entertained, not only in Committee and in the House, but in the Conference Committee, and which caused me to sign this report on the part of the managers of the House with confidence that we have been able to make a contribution in a field which touches not only practical economics but the strongest motivations of humanity.

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman has made a fine statement, and I thank him.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. MASON. As one who served as the ranking Member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House for 10 years, I want to say that the gentleman and his committee have done a magnificent job. It is not exactly as I would have it, of course, but it is a magnificent job, and I want to give him full credit for it.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I want to agree with the gentleman from Maine, our able chairman. This is the best we could get under the circumstances. I can speak my own sentiments, and I think I can speak the sentiment of all those who served with the House conferees to the extent that we wholeheartedly favored the so-called Fellows bill, because in our honest estimation and sincere belief, it was fair and it was a more equitable approach to and solution of the problem. However, we had a gun barrel at our heads. That gun barrel was the element of time. The legislative sands in our congressional hourglass are running out. I repeat, it was either this compromise or nothing. Of course, there are features in the report that we did not want—one or two items almost gagged me to swallow but we have done the best we could, believe me. I want to congratulate our chairman and commend him upon his untiring efforts and his loyalty and devotion to this most difficult problem; truly, he has done a wonderful job. I know because I sat by him and watched him for three long days during sessions of the conference of the House and Senate. We did not capitulate—we did not surrender our principles. We did not raise any white flag—had it not been for the time element and immediate adjournment slapping us in the face I would have hung the jury until Gabriel blew taps on his trumpet. I would have never compromised. I would have demanded the Fellows bill. But my colleagues, 200,000 poor, miserable, pathetic people were hanging in the balance, their fate was in our hands—with this upon my conscience and in my heart—I therefore reluctantly signed the conference report—for it was better than no bill at all.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. The question has been asked me by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] as to the disposition of these displaced persons who have come to this country. Would the gentleman care to answer that question as far as he can at this time?

Mr. FELLOWS. Of course, they are taken care of in that part of the country where that type of worker or professional person is required and can be assimilated in the community. These people who come here can be settled in the part of the country and in a community where their services or professions can best be utilized.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is this the best we

This conference report should be voted

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. Am I correct in believing that in the House bill there was a provision by the terms of which these people would be admitted in accordance with the proportion that existed in the various camps by racial or religious groups?

Mr. FELLOWS. That is true.

Mr. DEVITT. Is that provision retained in the conference report?

Mr. FELLOWS. It is not.

Mr. DEVITT. Was there not a provision in the House bill giving preferential treatment to farmers?

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes, but this is really preferential in the sense that the 30 percent has to be farmers. In our bill we set out farmers, doctors, dentists, and so forth, but in this bill 30 percent farmers have the preference.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Of course, it stands to reason that all who come here will stay here because there is no place to which they can be sent if they violate our laws.

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes. They will come in anyway, only they are coming in at present under provisions that do not screen—under the provisions that do not require that this group or that group or any other group have a fair share. There have been 32,000 already brought in, and there has been no plan as to the manner of doing it. This will not add a single, solitary person that will not be here anyway in the next 5 or 6 or 7 years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The parliamentary debates in the Australian Parliament in the last few days shows conclusively that Britain will have to move 10,000,000 people out of England during the next few years. If 10,000,000 are to be moved out of England, we might as well get clear that pressure will be put on this country to take a great many of them.

Mr. FELLOWS. May I say this, in submitting our original displaced persons legislation, the committee felt it offered you an elegant garment—a "creation," if you will—which clothed a delicate situation suitably, adequately, and becomingly. Each nationality and group received fair consideration. The fact that one or another had perhaps had preferential treatment in the past might have explained but could not have excused any other procedure on our part.

This conference report now offered for your action represents something less than I hoped, and better than I feared. If, as I believe, we are faced with a problem requiring solution, this is one offered by the Senate and House conferees, and the only one to be hoped for. This conference report is not the bill that passed the House, but is a compromise between the position of the Senate and this body. This legislation will permit admission of 220,000. I believe some legislation is necessary. I believe it should be adopted.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is this the best we can do?

Mr. FELLOWS. Indeed it is. It is this or nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. ROSS. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the statement of the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for all of the reasons urged by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I will vote in favor of his motion to recommit this conference report, and will vote against the adoption of the report if the motion to recommit fails. The bill in its present form is worse than no bill. It is viciously discriminatory. It is hard for me to believe that, in a country that fought nazism so successfully, and is now attempting to stop communism, any Member of Congress can consider voting in favor of a bill that would grant priorities to prospective immigrants who were part and parcel, if not the backbone, of the Hitler regime during its worst days. Rather than to give them priorities in seeking admission to this country, Congress should bar them forever. No bill is better than a bill in the form now before us.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when we had before us for consideration a few days ago the Fellows bill which provided for the bringing into this country of 202,000 foreigners without much regard as to who they are or where they come from, we were told that we must pass that bill or some great calamity might befall us. Many of us refused to be persuaded. They said many times that the Fellows bill represented a great amount of labor done by many members of the Judiciary Committee and that it was the best possible bill that could be worked out. They said that they would oppose all amendments to the Fellows bill and they did their best in that respect, but some amendments were made. They accepted those amendments and still claimed the bill was the best that could be made.

The Fellows bill went to conferees and now it comes back changed beyond recognition. Some of the conferees say the changes are terrible. But those who said that the original Fellows bill should not be changed are now advocating this conference report claiming that it is absolutely necessary that we pass it and that it will solve the problem.

This only proves that this method of trying to solve this problem is absolutely wrong. This displaced persons problem is a matter of relief. It is not an immigration problem and should not be solved by the Immigration Department. It should be solved by the United Nations. This conference report should be voted down.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker there is one aspect of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] which gives me concern. I have every respect for his views, and I recognize that the position he takes is consistent with his whole approach to the question. But when he suggests that some of the rest of us, who in association with him shared the responsibility of the conference on behalf of the House, were in any way less attached to our House bill than he, or less alert in its support, he both misappraises the realities of the then situation and underestimates his colleagues' contribution.

There was no "abject surrender" of anything which was practically obtainable. The distinguished Senators who sat with us had a right to their views, and it was obvious that they proposed to adhere to certain of them. At one stage of the negotiation, the gentleman from New York gave the strongest possible evidence of sharing this view; he joined us and the Senate conferees in what was at very least a tentative meeting of the minds.

Subsequently we all reviewed the basis of this honestly intended attempt at agreement the next day, at the request of my friend from New York; recognizing that he had misjudged the effect of the formula upon one group of displaced persons. But that neither he or we had misjudged the mettle of the Senatorial conferees became increasingly clear in that very discussion.

The gentleman gives his case away as it seems to me, when he admits that he prefers even now no bill to the present bill; that was the real alternative with which we were confronted. Five of us on the contrary preferred to save the bill; we wanted to get started with the DP problem, and to give immediate relief to more than 200,000 human beings, even if in so doing we missed keeping some individuals (a substantial number, in fact), who were certainly also entitled to sympathetic consideration. The House has intentionally failed these unfortunate individuals at no point. Our bill included them, but in the last resort we thought it better to postpone their hopes than completely to disappoint the hopes of so many more of their equally deserving companions in misery.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the conference report now under consideration which would admit 220,000 displaced persons to this country. As has been emphasized in this debate, the Senate and House conferees have determined that this is the best bill which could be agreed upon.

I have strongly advocated the passage of legislation which would provide for the admission to the United States of a fair share of the unfortunate and homeless displaced persons of Europe. I have felt for some time that it was not only our moral obligation, but that it would also be economically sound for us to take the lead in providing a haven for these persons who were made homeless through no fault of their own.

I supported and would have preferred the so-called Fellows bill as enacted by

the House, and I think it is unfortunate that the provisions contained in the House bill did not prevail. However, since it appears it is a question of taking this measure now before the House or nothing at all, I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield to nobody in my affection and regard for the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS], and in my affection and regard for all Members who were managers on the part of the House, but I do nevertheless feel that there was a surrender by them too quickly, and that this bill is not a compromise. It is an abasement. It is a complete surrender, because the Fellows bill which was universally, throughout the length and breadth of the Nation, recognized as a fair bill, has been utterly and completely scuttled and sabotaged. In its place we have the Revercomb bill with slight modifications which was universally condemned as highly discriminatory, racially and religiously.

The House rejected the Revercomb bill which my colleague of the House conferees now asks you to accept.

I had hoped that the members of the conference, as far as the House was concerned, would have stood by their guns and insisted upon the Fellows bill, and not hoisted the white flag as quickly as they did and accept almost in toto the Revercomb bill, which was generally objected to by all well-known commentators and editors, by all religious organizations interested, and by every fair-minded man and woman who examined it. It was not a case of this bill or nothing at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Were we not told by the managers on the part of the Senate after we had consulted for two whole days that if we did not make the recession there would be no bill, that they were prepared to walk out?

Mr. CELLER. I do not like to have a gun held at my head in that fashion. That is what was done. The Senate conferees said to us: "Stand and deliver."

I was not going to quail, I am too long in this business to shiver before any Member of the other body who tried to bulldoze me in that fashion. It would have been far better if we had no bill at all and allowed the present situation to stand with the President's directive of December 21, 1945, concerning the DP's and the normal operation of the quota law.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Is not the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania the same kind of statement one always hears in a conference with the Senate, the usual statement made by every conferee who yields?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman from Maine will yield me five additional minutes I will yield. Otherwise I must proceed with my explanation.

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Did not the gentleman agree with the rest of us that we would accept the proposition made by the Senate; and then did not the gentleman come forward and say that his conscience would not permit him to go along with it?

Mr. CELLER. That is not the exact situation. I will reflect the exact situation.

The Members on the part of the House offered several compromises to the Senate conferees which they turned down with all emphasis. They were adamant and most intransigent and unyielding save that two of their number, the distinguished Senators from Michigan and West Virginia, HOMER FERGUSON and HARVEY KILGORE, were most understanding and aware of the human side of the problem. Then in the interest of getting something harmonious, I said I would accept the cut-off date Senator REVERCOMB demanded, with the Baits originally constituting a 50 percent chunk of the 200,000 quota reduced to 40 percent and the preference for farmers reduced from 50 percent to 30 percent. But overnight I discovered that what I had accepted was an abject and unwarranted surrender and that the officials of the State Department told me that the so-called cut-off date, which was demanded, namely December 21, 1945, would make the act utterly unworkable in that there was a paucity of records on that date and that most of the more unfortunate DP's had come into the camps after that date. They would be excluded.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Just let me finish, then I will gladly yield.

The experts of the State and Justice Departments told me December 22, 1945, as a cut-off date, would make the act utterly unworkable and that it would deliberately discriminate against the Jews who crowded into the DP camps after that date. Many of these pillaged and plundered Jews had fled from Poland after the Kielce pogrom which had occurred July 3, 1946. They would be denied any relief by the Revercomb bill and the conference report, now before us. We had set in the Fellows bill a cut-off date as of April 21, 1947; you must remember that the cut-off date December 22, 1945 was only a few months after the shooting stopped and there were 8,000,000 people wandering hither and tither with no place to rest their weary heads and there was no developed procedure in the camps, there were no records. There was naught but confusion. The date April 21, 1947, was the date the camps were ordered closed by General Clay with agreement of the International Refugee Organization. It is utterly impossible to enforce and administer this bill as envisaged by this conference report if you use the cut-off date of December 21, 1945. Furthermore you deliberately proscribe Jews. Only about 6,000 Jews can be helped out of the 200,000 by this conference report.

Furthermore, those who are most deserving, those who fled from religious and racial persecution, those who suffered most, those who were the most hopeless, helpless, and homeless, the Jews—six million of whose coreligionists were martyred—came into these camps after the date set by this conference report.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. The stand-and-deliver attitude of the Senate produces a bill in which we are not merciful. There is not an ounce of humanity in it. A situation developed in the conference where a certain gentleman on the other side of the Capitol because of his proscriptive attitude sought to bend the House conferees to his proscriptive viewpoint. I refused to yield as did the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]. We refrained from signing the report. Even the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] said publicly they signed the report "with reluctance."

I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FELLOWS. Is it not a fact that the gentleman himself agreed on the date of December 22, 1945, with the proviso, of course, that the other provisions were changed—50–50?

Mr. CELLER. I do not deny that, but we were still in conference and you cannot tell me that while we are still in conference the provisions of the whole bill cannot be opened and reopened and again reopened for reconsideration. I had only tentatively agreed to certain provisions. There were many questions and differences still unresolved and unsettled.

After the night of the second conference I consulted with those who were in position to know, the Immigration Service and the State Depaartment, and I was told that that cut-off date was highly unfair, utterly unjust, and deliberately discriminatory. After such—shall I say newly discovered information—I reopened the question of cut-off date. I had that right. No one shall gainsay me that right. If there is injustice I am not going to allow protocol to stand in the way of stamping it out.

Now, see what you have done in this conference report. You are going to admit not deserving people, you are going to help not the displaced persons in the main. You are going to help whom? The Volkdeutsche. You are going to take for 2 years the combined quotas for Germany and Austria, and you are going to issue an engraved invitation to the Volkdeutsche to come in to the extent of 50 percent of those combined quotas. You will thus admit 27,000 of them.

Who are the Volkdeutsches? You ought to know something about them. They were the advance guard who fertilized the field for Hitler's Panzer divisions. They were the natives, citizens, and subjects of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, Hungary, Rumania, of German ethnic origin. They were what Hitler called the Herrenvolk. They were like the German-American Bunds in the United States who turned against the Allies. These Volkdeutsche did all in their power to make it easy for Hitler's advance. Hitler's capture and overrunning of Czechoslovakia and Poland was

made far easier for him because of the fifth column work that was done by these Volkdeutsches. Fritz Henlein was one of them. Others come to mind readily. If Hitler were alive today he could qualify. He was born in Austria of German ethnic origin.

Are we going to forget so soon the purpose of which this recent war was fought? Are we going to admit these people against whom our veterans fought, bled and died, and went through the valley of the shadow? I cannot subscribe to this kind of procedure. This is the uttermost injustice.

You must in good conscience, and if humanity is your guide, if decency is your guide, reject this report if only because of the admission of these Volkdeutsche. These Volkdeutsches are not DP's. They are not in DP camps. They have no relation to the solving of the DP problem. They should have no place in this conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. May I say to the gentleman that I agree with him. I went through the DP camps and the only way you can distribute the admission of these people fairly is according to the elements now in the camps. The dating back is distinctly a discriminatory act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not want to make a speech, but I would like to know specifically who we bring in under this bill, without covering all the history of it.

Mr. CELLER. The lady should read the report.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. We have not the report. We are going to vote soon. We want to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. The lady had that explained. I want to go into other matters.

Let us see what else happens in this bill.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. What effect will our participation in the International Refugee Organization have on this section permitting these Germans who are not displaced persons to come in?

Mr. CELLER. It will have a very deleterious effect, because the International Refugee Organization deliberately said these Volkdeutsches were not displaced persons and the International Refugee Organization would have nothing to do with them. Why? Because they were the ones who sought to balk and sabotage the efforts of the Allies.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield just for a question?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is the gentleman preaching the doctrine of hate?

Mr. CELLER. I am not preaching the doctrine of hate, but I do not want to reward my enemies, I do not want to bring in those who did everything in their power to make it impossible for the allied effort to succeed.

I would rather have the gentleman who just interrogated me speak of "mercy." I would remind him as I would remind those plumping for the Revercomb formula the remarks of Matthew:

> Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.

I ask gentle consideration, I ask mercy for those who have suffered tortures of the damned just because they were born of a certain race but yet prayed to your God and mine.

I also ask for fair judgment and remind you of James, who said:

> For he shall have judgment without mercy that showeth no mercy and mercy rejoiceth against judgment.

Beyond all that, see what else is done by this conference report? There was a rape by Russia of the independent Republics of Latvia, Esthonia, and Lithuania. This report gives the imprimatur to Russia's rape and "annexation" of those Republics. It says in so many words that there is recognized the de facto annexation by Russia of these three independent Republics made independent as the result of the First World War, and beyond that recognizes the annexation by Russia of that part of Poland east of the Curzon line. They do that in order to bring in to the extent of 40 percent of the quota of 200,000 the so-called Balts and Poles east of the Curzon line. Whoever heard that a committee of conference should indicate what the foreign policy of the United States should be? We never recognized that annexation by Rusisa of those Republics, but if we pass this bill we have the temerity—and I say "temerity"—to tell Russia "You have a free hand; you can do anything you d—— please with those republics."

Now, the State Department has violently objected to this indirect recognition given to Russia's action.

This bill, I want you to know, gentlemen—and you are going to hear from the people back home—is not without religious significance; it is not without racial preference. You cannot keep religion out of it no matter what you try. Hitler did not keep religion out of his cunning calculations and the victims of his cunning and mania are in these camps. Those people who first felt the scourge of Hitler, those who were the greatest victims of Hitler's sadism, those who perished to the extent of 6,000,000 in the crematoria and in the suffocation chambers, and who were held to languish and die behind the barbed wire, namely those of the race of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are caught between the upper and the nether stones of the report's discrimination. Yes, you say, "Come in, you 28,000 Volksdeutsche." What do you say to those of the Jewish faith because of this cut-off date? You say, "We will only take in of the 200,000, 6,000 Jews." Think of it—only 6,000 Jews of the quota of 200,000 are admissible under the conference report.

I am making a special plea for my people. Why should I not? They have suffered immeasurably. Their fate was and still is like one on a sea without a shore. Where can they go?

I have before me the Fulton House Foreign Affairs report containing the passengers from the ship manifests of some of the refugee ships that went to Canada and to Brazil and to Venezuela and to other countries. You will find among those listed Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Greek Catholics, Baptists, and Orthodox, but not a single Jew was taken by any of those nations out of these DP camps. We, too, are now saying, "No, we do not want the people of the race of Isaac and Jacob and Abraham; let them go hang; let them be liquidated. Let them die in the camps." Palestine is closed to them by the cease-fire order. We do not know what their future will be as to Palestine. They are apparently unwanted everywhere save in Palestine and even there the barriers are up. Should not the great United States at least show the way for others and take a fair share of these Jewish DP's? The conferees would say "No." I say "Yes."

We do not dissipate the DP problem by adopting the legislation agreed upon by the conferees. The problems of maintaining the camps will still be with us, military personnel will still have to be assigned to DP centers, the necessities of life will still have to be provided for the remaining DP's. Enlightened self-interest, at the very least, should prompt a better solution.

Moreover, the fact that 30 percent preference is to be given to farmers makes the whole situation ridiculous. In the United States camps 17.5 are farmers, in the British camps, the percent is 35.1, and the French camps hold 39.1. The result will be that we will empty the British and French camps before we empty our own.

It must be remembered, also that ours is a mixed economy which demands not only farm labor but plumbers, latherers, doctors, dentists, nurses, domestics, garment workers, carpenters, and so forth. No adequate consideration was given to these needs.

NO LAW BETTER

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the displaced persons bill as finally shaped by this conference report is a noxious mess which defies digestion.

It is compounded of large portions of fear, hate, and suspicion, faintly flavored with shame.

I cannot vote for this bitter gruel of legislation.

No law at all is better than this, and I shall vote to send the report back to conference.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on this bill immediately preceding the ordering of the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. CELLER moves that the conference report accompanying S. 2242 be recommitted to the committee of conference.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 40, noes 75.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 133, nays 266, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—133

Albert	Griffiths	Multer
Allen, La.	Hagen	Murray, Tenn.
Angell	Harrison	Norton
Bakewell	Havenner	O'Brien
Battle	Heffernan	O'Toole
Beckworth	Herter	Pace
Bender	Heselton	Paseman
Blatnik	Holifield	Peterson
Bloom	Huber	Pfeifer
Boggs, Del.	Isacson	Philbin
Bolton	Jackson, Wash.	Pickett
Brehm	Javits	Poage
Brown, Ga.	Jenkins, Ohio	Potts
Bryson	Judd	Powell
Buchanan	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Buckley	Kean	Price, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Kearney	Rankin
Carroll	Keating	Reeves
Celler	Kefauver	Richards
Colmer	Kelley	Riley
Cooper	Kennedy	Rooney
Courtney	Keogh	Sabath
Cravens	King	Sadowski
Crosser	Kirwan	Sarbacher
Davis, Ga.	Klein	Shafer
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Sikes
Delaney	Lanham	Smathers
Dewitt	Lewis, Ohio	Somers
Dingell	Lodge	Spence
Donohue	Lucas	Stanley
Douglas	Lynch	Stratton
Eberharter	McCormack	Taylor
Elsaesser	McCulloch	Teague
Elston	McDonough	Thomas, Tex.
Evins	McGregor	Twyman
Fallon	McMahon	Van Zandt
Feighan	McMillen, Ill.	Vinson
Fogarty	MacKinnon	Walter
Forand	Madden	Welch
Fulton	Mahon	Wheeler
Gallagher	Marcantonio	Whittington
Gathings	Mason	Williams
Gearhart	Miller, Calif.	Winstead
Gore	Morgan	
Grant, Ala.	Morris	

NAYS—266

Abbitt	Beall	Burleson
Abernethy	Bell	Busbey
Allen, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Butler
Allen, Ill.	Bennett, Mo.	Byrnes, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bishop	Camp
	Blackney	Canfield
Anderson, Calif.	Bland	Cannon
Andresen, August H.	Boggs, La.	Carson
	Bonner	Case, N. J.
Andrews, Ala.	Boykin	Case, S. Dak.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bradley	Chadwick
Arends	Bramblett	Chapman
Arnold	Brooks	Chelf
Auchincloss	Brophy	Chenoweth
Banta	Buck	Chiperfield
Barden	Buffett	Church
Barrett	Bulwinkle	Clason
Bates, Mass.	Burke	Coffin
Cole, Kans.	Hinshaw	Norrell
Cole, Mo.	Hobbs	O'Hara
Cole, N. Y.	Hoeven	O'Konski
Combs	Hoffman	Patman
Cooley	Holmes	Patterson
Corbett	Hope	Phillips, Calif.
Cotton	Horan	Phillips, Tenn.
Cox	Hull	Plumley
Crawford	Jackson, Calif.	Potter
Crow	Jarman	Poulson
Cunningham	Jenison	Price, Fla.
Curtis	Jenkins, Pa.	Priest
Dague	Jennings	Rains
Davis, Tenn.	Jensen	Ramey
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Rayburn
Dawson, Utah	Johnson, Ill.	Redden
Deane	Jones, Ala.	Reed, Ill.
D'Ewart	Jones, N. C.	Reed, N. Y.
Dirksen	Jones, Wash.	Rees
Dolliver	Jonkman	Riehlman
Domengeaux	Kearns	Rizley
Dondero	Kee	Rockwell
Dorn	Keefe	Rogers, Fla.
Doughton	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Mass.
Durham	Kilburn	Rohrbough
Eaton	Kilday	Ross
Ellis	Kunkel	Russell
Ellsworth	Landis	Sadlak
Engel, Mich.	Larcade	St. George
Fellows	Latham	Sanborn
Fenton	Lea	Sasscer
Fernandez	LeCompte	Schwabe, Mo.
Fisher	LeFevre	Schwabe, Okla.
Flannagan	Lemke	Scoblick
Fletcher	Lesinski	Scott, Hardie
Folger	Lewis, Ky.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Foote	Lichtenwalter	
Fuller	Love	Scrivner
Gamble	Lusk	Seely-Brown
Garmatz	Lyle	Sheppard
Gary	McConnell	Short
Gavin	McCowen	Simpson, Ill.
Gillette	McDowell	Smith, Kans.
Gillie	McGarvey	Smith, Maine
Goff	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Goodwin	Mack	Smith, Va.
Gordon	Macy	Smith, Wis.
Gorski	Maloney	Snyder
Graham	Manasco	Stefan
Granger	Martin, Iowa	Stevenson
Grant, Ind.	Mathews	Stockman
Gregory	Meade, Ky.	Sundstrom
Gross	Meade, Md.	Taber
Gwinn, N. Y.	Merrow	Talle
Gwynne, Iowa	Meyer	Thompson
Hale	Michener	Tibbott
Hall, Leonard W.	Miller, Conn.	Tollefson
	Miller, Md.	Towe
Halleck	Miller, Nebr.	Trimble
Hand	Mills	Vail
Hardy	Mitchell	Vorys
Harless, Ariz.	Monroney	Vursell
Harness, Ind.	Morrison	Wadsworth
Harris	Morton	Welchel
Hart	Muhlenberg	Whitten
Harvey	Mundt	Wigglesworth
Hays	Murdock	Wilson, Tex.
Hébert	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Hedrick	Nicholson	Wolverton
Hendricks	Nixon	Woodruff
Hess	Nodar	Worley
Hill	Norblad	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—31

Bates, Ky.	Hartley	Rich
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Ind.	Rivers
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson
Clevenger	Johnson, Tex.	Simpson, Pa.
Clippinger	Kerr	Stigler
Coudert	Lane	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	Ludlow	West
Engle, Calif.	Mansfield	Whitaker
Gossett	Peden	Wilson, Ind.
Halk, Edwin Arthur	Ploeser	Wood
Regan		

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Whitaker.

Mr. HART, Mr. SASSCER, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. BELL changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ANGELL, Mr. BENDER, and Mr. EBERHARTER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF TEMPORARY HOUSING

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5710) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 6, after line 5, insert:

"SEC. 5. The Defense Homes Corporation is authorized to convey, without reimbursement therefor, to Howard University, a corporation organized pursuant to an act of Congress, all of its right, title, and interest in certain lands in the District of Columbia, together with the improvements constructed thereon and the personal property used in connection therewith, and commonly known as Lucy Diggs Slowe Hall, 1919 Third Street NW., and George Washington Carver Hall, 211 Elm Street NW.: *Provided*, That no employee of the United States or of the District of Columbia who, on the date of approval of this act, is a tenant of either Lucy Diggs Slowe Hall or George Washington Carver Hall shall, unless quarters were assigned to such tenant on a transient basis or on the sole basis that the tenant was enrolled at an educational institution be evicted from such halls within 4 years after the approval of this act, except where such tenant commits a nuisance or otherwise violates any obligation of tenancy.

"The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to discharge the indebtedness of the Defense Homes Corporation to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in an amount equal to the Defense Homes Corporation's net investment in these properties as of the date of transfer, as determined by the President of the Defense Homes Corporation, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to discharge the indebtedness of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Treasury in like amount as of the same date.

"SEC. 6. The right, title, and interest in any lands, together with the improvements constructed thereon, which are conveyed pursuant to the authority granted by section 5 hereof, shall revert to the United States upon a written finding made by the President prior to July 1, 1963, that the property is needed by the United States in connection with a national defense emergency."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN ARMED FORCES

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr.

BROOKS] may be excused as a conferee on the bill, S. 2655.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] to fill the vacancy.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

PROVIDING FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACTIVITIES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 418) to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) "An Act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Housea as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "hereinafter declared to be a public nuisance".

Page 2, lines 13 and 14, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "such interstate water and tributaries thereof", and insert the following words "surface and underground waters".

Page 9, line 11, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$200,000" and insert the figure "$250,000".

Page 11, line 25, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$20,000,000" and insert the figure "$22,500,000".

Page 12, line 25, of the amendment of the House, after the words "study of" insert the word "water", and strike out the word "of" after the word "pollution".

Page 13, line 1, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "interstate waters".

Page 13, line 2, of the amendment of the House, before the word "pollution" insert the word "water", and after the word "pollution" strike out the words "of interstate waters".

Page 14, line 17 through line 23, of the amendment of the House, strike out all after the words "SEC. 9. (a)" and insert the following: "Five officers may be appointed to grades in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service above that of senior assistant, but not to a grade above that of director, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act. Officers appointed pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year shall not be counted as part of the 10 per centum of the original appointments authorized to be made in such year under section 207 (b) of the Public Health Service Act; but they shall for all other purposes be treated as though appointed pursuant to such section 207 (b)."

And the House agree to the same.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
TOM PICKETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GEO. W. MALONE,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The first two amendments apply to Sec. 2 (a), lines 4, 5, and 6, on page 18 of the bill. The language substituted more clearly defines the authority of the Surgeon General with respect to the preparation and adoption of comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of surface and underground waters.

The amendment to Sec. 5 (line 3, page 25), increases by $50,000 the maximum individual loan which may be made under the Act.

The amendment to Sec. 7 (line 16, page 27), increases by $2,500,000 the maximum authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Security Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, for the purpose of making loans under Section 5 of the Act.

The purpose of the amendments to Sec. 8 (b) (lines 16, 17, and 18, page 28), is to expand the service of the Public Health Service station authorized to be erected at Cincinnati, Ohio, in connection with research and study of water pollution and the training of personnel in work related to control of water pollution.

The amendment with reference to Sec. 9 (a), (lines 10 to 16, page 30), substitutes a new Sec. 9 (a), which is required for the purpose set forth in the following letter:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, Zone 25, May 14, 1948.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reference to S. 418, which your Committee reported out, with amendments, on April 28, 1948.

Section 9 (a) of S. 418 as reported authorizes additional appointments to be made at higher grades in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service pursuant to section 208 (b) of the Public Health Service Act to assist the Service in carrying out its new or expanded activities under S. 418. Since our letter of January 19, 1948, to you on this bill, however, the Congress has enacted Public Law 425, which amends the provisions of the Public Health Service Act in several respects, primarily in the matter of appointment and promotion of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service. As a result of Public Law 425, the authority to make additional appointments at higher grades in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, formerly contained in section 208 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, is now contained in section 207 (b) of that Act, in a somewhat revised form. In order, therefore, to accomplish the purposes for which section 9 (a) of S. 418 was intended, the following is suggested in lieu of such section 9 (a):

(a) Five officers may be appointed to grades in the Regular Corps of the Service above that of senior assistant, but not to a grade above that of director, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act. Officers appointed pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year shall not be counted as part of the 10 per centum of the original appointments authorized to be made in such year under section 207 (b) of the Public Health Service Act; but they shall for all other purposes be treated as though appointed pursuant to such section 207 (b).

The short time available for necessary action on the amendment suggested by this letter has not permitted us to obtain advice from the Bureau of the Budget as to the relationship of this amendment to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

J. DONALD KINGSLEY,
Acting Administrator.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
TOM PICKETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES CODE, TITLE 18

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3190) to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, following:

"13. Laws of States adopted for areas within Federal jurisdiction."

Insert:

"14. Applicability to Canal Zone."

Page 5, line 4, after "States" insert, ", except the Canal Zone."

Page 8, after line 15, insert:

"§ 14. Applicability to Canal Zone."

"In addition to the sections of this title which by their terms apply to and within the Canal Zone, the following sections of this title shall likewise apply to and within the Canal Zone: 6, 8, 11, 331, 371, 472, 474, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 485, 488, 489, 490, 499, 502, 506, 594, 595, 598, 600, 601, 604, 605, 608, 611, 612, 703, 756, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 915, 917, 951, 953, 954, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 1017, 1073, 1301, 1364, 1382, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1546, 1584, 1621, 1622, 1761, 1821, 1914, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2199, 2231, 2234, 2235, 2274, 2275, 2277, 2384, 2385, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 3059, 3105, 3109."

Page 91, strike out

"610. Contributions by national banks or corporations."

And insert:

"610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations."

Page 104, strike out lines 4 to 21, inclusive, and insert:

"§ 610. Contributions by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations

"It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

"Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer or any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"For the purposes of this section 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exist for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

Page 117, line 8, strike out all after "receiver," down to and including "System," in line 15.

Page 118, line 18, strike out all after "care," down to and including "institution," in line 23.

Page 134, line 19, after "both" insert "; or if he negligently suffers such person to escape, he shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

Page 158, after line 12, insert "While any foreign government is a member both of the International Monetary Fund and of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, this section shall not apply to the sale or purchase of bonds, securities, or other obligations of such government or any political subdivision thereof or of any organization or association acting for or on behalf of such government or political subdivision, or to making of any loan to such government, political subdivision, organization, or association."

Page 367, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive, and insert "The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the States, of all offenses against the laws of the United States.

"Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

Page 415, line 10, after "Zone," insert "District of Columbia."

Page 415, after line 17, insert:

"Nothing in this title, anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 416, after line 21, insert:

"Nothing in this title, anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 448, lines 24 and 25, strike out "the Revised Statutes (1 U. S. C., sec. 1)" and insert "Title 1 of the United States Code."

Page 456, strike out lines 3 to 21, inclusive.

Page 456, line 22, strike out "19" and insert "18."

Page 457, line 3, strike out "20" and insert "19."

Page 457, strike out lines 8 to 15, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 20. This act shall take effect September 1, 1948."

Page 457, line 16, strike out "22" and insert "21."

Page 463, about middle of page, strike out

[July 3..... | 128 | 4, 5 | 40 | 755, 756 | 10 | 705, 706]

Page 467, below middle of page, strike out

[June 20..... | 634 | 4 | 49 | 1556 | 10 | 705
Do..... | 635 | 1, 2 | 49 | 1557 | 22 | 248]

and insert:

"June 20..... | 635 | 1, 2 | 49 | 1557 | 22 | 248"

Page 470, after

"June 8..... | 178 | 1, 2, 3 | 59 | 234, 235 | 18 | 241, 241a, 242"

insert:

"July 31..... | 339 | 9 | 59 | 516 | 31 | 804b"

Page 471, at the end of the schedule of repeals on this page, insert:

"1947—

Apr. 16	39	.....	61	52	18	411
May 16	73	.....	61	97	18	744b–1
June 21	111	.....	61	134	18	244
June 23	120	304	61	165	2	251"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FREEDOM DAY

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day, and ask for its immediate consideration. I have consulted with the leaders on both sides.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to issue a proclamation designating the 1st day of February of each year as National Freedom Day for the purpose of commemorating the signing by President Abraham Lincoln, on February 1, 1865, of the joint resolution adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, proposing the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill which has been reached on the Consent Calendar today will authorize and request the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day and invite the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and thanksgiving. As you all know, on February 1, 1865, President Abraham Lincoln signed the joint resolution, which had previously been adopted by the Congress, proposing the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution.

I should like to repeat for you at this time the immortal words of that amendment: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." These words are the foundation of our form of government with its emphasis on the freedom of the individual and the human liberties which belong to every citizen of the United States. It is therefore with pride in our free Nation that I introduced this resolution at the first session of the Eightieth Congress. Since that time I have been striving to obtain approval of the legislation.

I wish to thank the members of the Judiciary Committee and, in particular, the members of the subcommittee which handled the resolution, headed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], for the interest and cooperation they have displayed in reporting the legislation, also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK].

I should like to pause here to pay tribute to the founder of National Freedom Day, Maj. R. R. Wright. It is regrettable that Major Wright is not with us today to realize the fulfillment of his long years of hard work and inspiring efforts. Born in slavery, Major Wright rose to prominence as a great American and occupied an unequalled position in the hearts of his fellow Americans. The story of Major Wright is truly the story of America, for in no other country today is it possible for a citizen to achieve such outstanding success. His success, however, would not have occurred had the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution not been approved. Since its signing is one of the cornerstones in the foundation of our American traditions, I am proud that we have today passed the resolution commemorating its inception.

PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLY OF GOVERNMENT HEADSTONES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4272) to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out all after "cemeteries," down to and including "costs," in line 14 and insert "The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized and directed to compile a list of the names of all members of the armed forces of the United States who died while serving in such forces in the overseas theaters of operations on or after September 3, 1939, and whose bodies have not been recovered or identified or have been buried at sea. Upon the compilation of such list of names and other appropriate data, the American Battle Monuments Commission and the Secretary of the Army are authorized and directed to provide for the inscribing of each such name and pertinent

data with respect to the individual on the wall of a chapel or other appropriate memorial erected by the American Battle Monuments Commission or by the Department of the Army. In determining the particular chapel or other memorial on the wall of which any particular name shall be inscribed, the Commission and the Secretary shall follow the general rule of having the name inscribed upon the wall of that chapel or other memorial which is appropriate in view of the circumstances under which the deceased died in the service of his country."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY FUND FOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3218) to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

After line 10, insert:

"SEC. 2. The term 'unusual or emergency conditions,' as used in this act, shall be construed to mean canal bank failures, generator failures, damage to transmission lines; or other physical failures or damage, or acts of God, or of the public enemy, fires, floods, drought, epidemics, strikes, or freight embargoes, or conditions, causing or threatening to cause interruption in water or power service."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOLL BRIDGE OVER DELAWARE RIVER

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6465) to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1935, be, and the same is hereby, amended and supplemented by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(e) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this section or of any other Act of the Congress, the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey is hereby authorized (1) to fix and charge tolls for transit over any bridge heretofore or hereafter constructed by it across the Delaware River in accordance with the provisions of the original compact or agreement between said Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and said State of New Jersey which is set forth in section 9 of said Act approved August 30, 1935, as amended with the consent of Congress by the compact or supplemental agreement which is set forth in the Act approved August 4, 1947; and (2) to unite or group any such bridges into a single project for financing purposes and to continue to fix and adjust the tolls for the use of the bridges in such project and pledge such tolls in accordance with the provisions of said original compact or agreement as so amended: *Provided, however*, That the tolls for the use of any such bridge or the bridges in any such project may be applied by said Commission, if and to the extent permitted by its contract with the holders of its bonds, to the payment of all or part of the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating any bridge or bridges now operated by said Commission free of tolls: *And provided further*, That after the cost of any such bridge or of the bridges in any such project shall be amortized, such bridge or bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of tolls shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide funds not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of such bridge or bridges, and any bridge or bridges now operated by said Commission free of tolls."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 20, strike out the words "that the" and all of lines 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, and lines 1 and 2 on page 3 through the word "further."

Page 3, line 5, after the word "tolls", strike out the remainder of the page.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLA.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 3735, an act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see page 8937 of today's RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, with an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the provisions of H. R. 6263, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,—

TITLE I—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER

SEC. 1. This title may be cited as the "Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act."

SEC. 2. Creation and purposes: For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, of assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as "agricultural commodities"), and of facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States, within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general direction and control of its Board of Directors.

SEC. 3. Offices: The Corporation may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 4. General powers: The Corporation—

(a) Shall have succession in its corporate name.

(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) May sue and be sued, but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district courts of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation may intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit against the Corporation shall be allowed unless it shall have been brought within 4 years after the right accrued on which suit is brought. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) shall be applicable to the Corporation.

(d) May adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

(e) Shall have all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the United States with respect to the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding.

(f) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(g) May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary in the conduct of its business. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements.

(h) May contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of plants and facilities for the physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control. Except as provided in section 16, the Corporation shall not have power to acquire or lease any such plant or facility or to acquire or lease real property or any interest therein, except that it may rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business.

(i) May borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation: *Provided*, That the total of all money borrowed by the Corporation, other than trust deposits and advances received on sales, shall not at any time exceed in the aggregate $4,750,000,000. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

(j) Shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

(k) Shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

(l) May make such loans and advances of its funds as are necessary in the conduct of its business.

(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 5. Specific powers: In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 841), the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

(a) Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

(b) Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

(c) Procure agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

(d) Remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

(e) Increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

(g) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

In the Corporation's purchasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

SEC. 6. Existing statutes applicable to the Corporation: The Federal statutes applicable to Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall be applicable to the Corporation. Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall cease to be an agency of the United States as provided in section 7 (a) of the act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 713 (a)).

SEC. 7. Capital stock: The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $100,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. Such subscription shall be deemed to be fully paid by the transfer of assets to the Corporation pursuant to section 16 of this act. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-4), as amended, at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

SEC. 8. Funds: The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred or allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

SEC. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall consist of five members. The Secretary of Agriculture, or his nominee, shall be a member of the Board and the remaining members shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The chairman of the Board shall be selected by the Board. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of 5 years, except that the terms of the first Board shall be shortened to provide for replacement or reappointment of its members in number as nearly equal as practicable in each year. The power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States. The Corporation may provide, by its bylaws, for the compensation to be paid the directors: *Provided*, That the compensation paid any director shall not exceed in the aggregate $10,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not receive additional compensation for their services on the Board. Employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not comprise, in the aggregate, more than one-half the members of the Board.

SEC. 10. The executive staff: Responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the business of the Corporation shall be vested in a staff of executive officers, headed by a chief executive appointed by the Board and responsible to the Board. The executive staff shall include a controller. Members of the executive staff shall devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation. The Board shall define the authority and duties of the members of the executive staff, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as it may determine, require that such of them as it may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds of any officer or employee. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 661).

SEC. 11. Cooperation with other governmental agencies: The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation, be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

SEC. 12. Utilization of associations and trade facilities: The Corporation may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis, committees or associations of producers, producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations, and trade facilities.

SEC. 13. Records, annual report: The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the Secretary of Agriculture a complete report as to the business of the Corporation, a copy of which shall be forwarded by the Secretary of Agriculture to the President for transmission to the Congress.

SEC. 14. Interest of Members of the Congress: The provisions of section 1 of the act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U. S. C., 1940 ed. 22), shall apply to all contracts or agreements of the Corporation, except contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 15. Crimes and offenses.—

FALSE STATEMENTS; OVERVALUATION OF SECURITIES

(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself or another, money, property, or anything of value, under this act, or under any other act applicable to the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than 5 years, or both.

EMBEZZLEMENT, AND SO FORTH; FALSE ENTRIES; FRAUDULENT ISSUE OF OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (iii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in, or receives directly or indirectly any money profit, property, or benefits through any

transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any immediately following the date upon

though it was active during the war is

transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine or not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

LARCENY; CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE

(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

GENERAL STATUTES APPLICABLE

(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts and agreements, employees, and operations: *Provided*, That such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That sections 114 and 115 of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 204, 205) shall not apply to contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 16. Transfer of assets of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation: The assets, funds, property, and records of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, are hereby transferred to the Corporation. The rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, in respect to any contract, agreement, loan, account, or other obligation shall become the rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities, respectively, of the Corporation. The enforceable claims of or against Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall become the claims of or against, and may be enforced by or against, the Corporation.

SEC. 17. Dissolution of Delaware corporation: The Secretary of Agriculture, representing the United States as the sole owner of the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, is hereby authorized and directed to institute or cause to be instituted such proceedings as are required for the dissolution of said Corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware. The costs of such dissolution of said Corporation shall be borne by the Corporation.

SEC. 18. Effective date: This title shall take effect as of midnight June 30, 1948.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAW

SEC. 201. Section 8 (a) of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., supp. V, title 50, sec. 938), is amended by striking out "before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated" and by inserting in lieu thereof "on or before December 31, 1950."

SEC. 202. Section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., supp. V, title 15, sec. 713a-8 (a)), is amended by striking out "the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated" and by inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1950."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, under the Government Corporation Control Act, no wholly Government-owned corporation is continued beyond June 30 of this year, unless it is incorporated as a Government corporation.

Under that law, the Commodity Credit Corporation would expire on June 30, 1948. The bill that is before the House reincorporates the Commodity Credit Corporation and continues the life of the Corporation in perpetuity. There is no limitation on the life of the Corporation contained in the law. However, each and every one of the functions of the Commodity Credit Corporation is limited in respect to the length of time in which that function may be administered by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The act provides for the creation of this Government-chartered Corporation with a board of five appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate. Their terms are for 5 years. The Board appoints a chairman who presumably will be the Secretary of Agriculture.

A section of the bill provides that not more than a majority of the board shall be within the Department of Agriculture, so that there will be at least three members appointed independently of the Department of Agriculture, but, of course, within the executive establishment. We have created this Corporation within the executive establishment.

The Corporation has a capital of $100,000,000 with certain assurances and guaranties in the law that any impairment of this capital shall be restored by the Treasury under an authorization for an appropriation for that purpose.

The borrowing power of the Corporation is limited to the same amount as at present, $4,750,000,000.

I neglected to say that this is now a Delaware corporation.

As I have said, the Commodity Credit Corporation is the agency for the administration of certain very important functions. They come within the following classifications: The price-support program, the supply program, the foreign-purchase program, the commodity credit program, the loan program for agricultural conservation purposes; and, of course, the subsidy program which, although it was active during the war, is now in process of liquidation.

A few days ago we passed an agricultural-support program. Title 2 of the bill now under consideration provides for the continuance of the price-support program. One of the amendments I have offered is that title 2 of this bill be stricken because we have already legislated upon the same general subject. The above, I think, in principle, is the bill.

In substance and in summary, this bill continues the Delaware corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, as a federally chartered corporation, and we are assured that the programs which I have mentioned will be continued if the Commodity Credit Corporation is continued and if the Congress, of course, supports those programs.

I reiterate that although there is no limitation upon the life of the Corporation, there is a limitation upon the period in which each and every one of these programs may be administered.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no objection to the passage of this bill.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has exercised a most useful function. It has been the means by which agricultural prices have been supported, and it has done a good job in that respect. Unless it is reincorporated under the Federal Corporations Act it will die on the 30th of this month. It is necessary to pass this legislation in order that its useful functions may continue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Commodity Credit Corporation is the agency through which price support and stabilization policies are effectuated.

The price-support bill, which we passed Saturday, is useless without the Commodity Credit Corporation as a vehicle to carry out the purpose of the support program.

This bill provides a permanent Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation. This action by Congress is made necessary because of the provisions of the Government Corporations Control Act, enacted in 1945, which requires all Government corporations to obtain a Federal charter from Congress on or before June 30, 1948, in order to continue to function as Government corporations.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was organized pursuant to an Executive order of the President issued on October 16, 1933, and was incorporated as a Government corporation under the laws of Delaware. It has continued to function down to the present time under a Delaware charter that has been amended at various times. Congress, from time to time, also has enacted specific legislation governing the extent and character of its lending and price-support operations and providing various limitations and safeguards with respect to these operations of the Corporation.

For several years, I have advocated legislation to make permanent the setup of the Commodity Credit Corporation. For the reasons I have just given, it is

imperative that Congress act now to provide the Corporation with a Federal charter. I feel very strongly that in doing this, Congress should provide a permanent charter, and not deal with this matter on a temporary year-to-year basis or even on a 2- or 3-year basis.

At this point, it is important to distinguish clearly between the question of providing a permanent charter for the Corporation and the question of what levels and for what period of time the Corporation is to support farm prices. Regardless of whether price-support legislation is to be developed in a long-range farm program or whether a temporary extension of existing price support legislation for 1, 2, or 4 years is to be provided, the Commodity Credit Corporation will be needed permanently and it will need a permanent charter under which to operate.

The consuming public has a vital stake in maintaining the Commodity Credit Corporation and its successful functioning in carrying out the price-support functions and ever-normal granary features of the national farm program. Had it not been for the successful operations of the Corporation in carrying out these programs, food prices to consumers would be much higher than they are.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has, during the past 15 years, become a keystone of our over-all farm program. It has helped us establish and maintain fair prices and incomes for our farmers. It has assisted us in maintaining an adequate supply of foods, feed, and fiber—even during the war years, when many farmers found that manpower, machinery, fertilizer, and other production needs were scarce or nonexistent. It has given us flexible authority to meet emergency farm problems as they have arisen.

In view of the vital service the Corporation has rendered to American agriculture, I say that the Corporation should be continued as a Federal agency—a permanent Federal agency—with authority to move promptly and decisively.

The Corporation under the Delaware charter was authorized, among other things, to engage in buying, selling, lending, and other activities with respect to agricultural commodities. Those are broad powers. Congress, however, has kept a firm control over the Delaware Corporation and would continue to keep a firm control over the Federal Corporation. That is why Congress is faced today with two important questions with respect to the Corporation: First, should Congress grant a Federal charter, and, second, should that charter give the Corporation the authority it needs to deal decisively with farm problems. Of course, the answer is "Yes."

Unless Congress is going to repeal the basic agricultural laws, there will be a continuing need for the Corporation to operate. Therefore, it is just good common sense to provide a permanent charter for the Corporation. This will be reassuring to farmers. Some of the laws which require the use of the Corporation in order to effectuate congressional price-support policies are already permanent statutes, but without the Corporation to make good on these policies, the statutes would be of no value.

This does not mean that Congress from time to time cannot change the rules, powers, duties, and limitations under which the Corporation operates. The fact is, Congress has done this in the past by various statutes all during the period under which the Corporation has operated under a Delaware charter. Congress, of course, can revoke the proposed charter at any time it desires. Hence, there seems to be no valid reason why Congress should not provide a permanent charter for the Corporation.

It is also important to provide adequate powers with sufficient flexibility to enable the Corporation to carry out its statutory responsibilities. The Corporation is charged by law with providing mandatory commodity loans and price supports at various levels. It is vitally important that the Government be prepared to make good on its commitments to farmers in these basic statutes, if the confidence of farmers in the integrity of their Government is to be preserved. Therefore, the Corporation must be clothed with adequate powers to discharge these responsibilities effectively. The proposed charter is an improvement on the Delaware charter; its powers are not as sweeping in scope, but nevertheless they appear to be adequate and they are better defined than in the old charter.

This is one issue upon which farmers everywhere are united. They realize the vital necessity for continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation. The American Farm Bureau Federation, which is the largest and most representative of the farm organizations and which represents more than one and one-quarter million farm families in 45 States and Puerto Rico, strongly urged a permanent charter for the Corporation. I fully agree with their views of this matter. It is vitally important that Congress act now so that farmers will be assured that their Government is not going to let them down.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the drive to destroy the rights of farmer cooperatives in the United States continues unabated. As in the past, the drive is spearheaded by an organization known as the National Tax Equality Association. It is being aided and abetted by other groups, including the National Associated Businessmen. Their latest move, Mr. Speaker, is the attempt which is now being made to stampede the resolution committees of the Democratic and Republican Parties for a proposed platform plank against farm cooperatives. They have undertaken a Nation-wide drive to obtain a million signatures in behalf of their mischievous program. A recent circular issued by the National Tax Equality Association illustrates the means they are using to obtain these signatures. It states in part as follows: "You will probably receive petitions sent out by other organizations. Use them. This is one case where duplication can be made to pay dividends—in more and more signatures." It looks like the National Tax Equality Association will be satisfied with all the petitions they can obtain even if some of them are duplicates. This should be ample warning to both major parties to scrutinize most carefully the petitions which will be presented to them.

Another tactic of the National Tax Equality Association is its attempt to smear the cooperatives as "Red" and "communistic." Nothing could be more ridiculous or further from the truth.

Farmer cooperatives are among the strongest foes of communism in any of its forms. Cooperatives are strongest in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and England, and in none of these countries has communism been able to gain the slightest foothold.

In the United States there are more than 5,000,000 members of farmers marketing and purchasing cooperatives, many farmers belonging to more than one association. Well over half of all the farmers in the United States are stanch members of cooperatives, and I have never heard of anyone but the National Tax Equality Association and its affiliates who has conceived that the American farmer was a Communist.

It is pertinent to inquire as to just who are these persons and these organizations who are spearheading the drive to strike at the very heart of the cooperative groups of farmers throughout the Nation. Who are these persons and organizations who would have the Republican and Democratic Parties repudiate the major contributions that farmer cooperatives have made in bringing health and prosperity to American agriculture and thereby to our whole Nation?

What are the selfish motives of those persons and individuals who would have us forget the prostrate condition of American agriculture only a few short years ago and the success of farmer cooperatives in making our system of free enterprise work on American farms?

The full story of the identity and financing of this giant anticooperative endeavor is not known to the public because of the conscious effort of its sponsors to obscure it. I do know that the parent organization organized in 1943 with the demonstrated objective of crushing the successful operation of farm cooperatives is the National Tax Equality Association, with headquarters in Chicago, Ill. I do know that Mr. Ben C. McCabe, chairman of the board and formerly president, attempted to hide the true nature of the NTEA when he told the House Ways and Means Committee on November 25, 1947, that:

> NTEA is devoted solely to research and educational activities and no deviation from these limitations is permitted either by the association's charter or by vote of its board of directors.

In order to try to retain its professed character of a research and educational organization, the NTEA has sponsored other organizations through which to channel to the public and to the Congress its propaganda advocating the overthrow of co-ops.

Up to about the first of this year, the NTEA had the United States Business Organizations, Inc., as its Washington agent to carry the frontal attack against

for a conference, and after the conferees

Credit Corporation furnishes the ma-

the Board of Directors of the Corpora-

record as being greatly disturbed by the

cooperatives. Karl S. Dixon, as executive vice president of the United States Business Organizations, was the $12,000-a-year man until a few months ago in Washington spearheading the drive against cooperatives. Now I understand Dixon is back in Chicago and, as vice president of the National Tax Equality Association, is taking an active part in contacting trade associations, chambers of commerce, business firms, and private individuals to get signatures to the anti-cooperative petition for presentation at the Republican and Democratic Conventions.

Is not this sufficient to indicate that NTEA has departed far from the research and educational activities professed by Mr. Ben McCabe?

Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee, of which I am a member, conducted extensive hearings during 1945 and 1946 on the subject of cooperatives. On page 42 of the report submitted to the Congress by the committee on April 9, 1946, we made the following findings and recommendations:

There is substantial evidence to show that the cooperative movement operates as a very successful means of combating monopolistic concentrations and, as such, is a very healthy addition to the American economy.

There is no evidence to show that cooperatives have been granted a type of preferential financial treatment by the Federal Government that has not likewise been made available to and accepted by other forms of business enterprise, including banks, savings and loan societies, manufacturers, distributors, and other types of private enterprise operating for the principal purpose of making profits. An examination of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other Federal financing agencies gives proof that thousands of private firms operating for profit have sought and enjoyed the benefits of such agencies' financial assistance in a manner comparable to that received by cooperatives from the Farm Credit Administration and its allied financing groups.

In 1947 the same committee conducted further hearings on this subject. During the course of these hearings, a request was made on August 22, 1947, by the gentleman from Texas, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, a member of the committee, for the National Tax Equality Association to submit a complete statement of its receipts, contributions, and disbursements for the past 2 years. The gentleman from Texas, Representative PATMAN, pointed out that certain cooperatives had been asked by the committee to submit their full records and that every one of them had fully complied with the request. Although this information was requested of the National Tax Equality Association, to date they have failed to submit to the committee any of the information called for in the hearings.

A recent estimate made after a survey of the records of the Clerk of the House of Representatives shows that almost a million dollars a year is being spent by the National Tax Equality Association and its affiliates. Yet we have no record of who is contributing these vast sums of money to destroy farmer cooperatives. I think that it is time we find out who is behind this campaign.

Farmers in my own district in Washington have grown tired of the baseless charges which have been leveled at them during the past 4 years by such organizations as the National Tax Equality Association and the National Associated Businessmen. Farmer cooperatives pay all the local, State, and Federal taxes which are paid by other businesses which operate in the same manner. Cooperatives pay property taxes, sales taxes, social-security taxes, stamp taxes, and income taxes if they make any profits. Members of farmer cooperatives pay a tax on every cent of income which comes to them from patronage refunds paid by their own associations. Cooperatives are taxed in exactly the same manner as are partnerships and individual businesses.

I would like to remind the leaders of both political parties that the farmers of this Nation will not stand by and permit the representatives of organized greed and wealth to deny them their right to organize and operate their own farm business enterprises. From the depths of economic depressions and personal hardships, the farmers of this Nation have built their own cooperative organizations to insure to themselves and their families the just financial returns from their toil and labors.

I am sure that the millions of farmers of this Nation will not allow a selfish few to destroy the cooperatives which farmers have struggled to build up over a quarter of a century.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we witness in the consideration of this bill the Congress legislating in accordance with the rules of both branches, and with the intent of Congress to get legislation enacted into law as quickly as possible. We have a situation here where a bill has passed the other body and the House committee has reported out a bill. If the House bill was brought up and passed, it would go over to the Senate, and we will have the situation of a bill passing the Senate over in the House and a bill passing the House over in the Senate, and no final action taken. In order to expedite legislative procedure and to get legislation enacted into law, where there is a sincere purpose to legislate, where a bill has passed one body and the other body has reported out a bill from the committee, the proper thing to do is to strike out all after the enacting clause and to substitute the bill of the body in which the bill is pending, in this case the Senate bill pending in the House, with the House passing the committee differences between the two bills. That means that there is complete legislative action to its final conclusion. When that is done the bill goes back to the Senate, and the Senate can agree to the House amendments insofar as there is a disagreement between the Senate bill and the bill as it passed this body. It goes back as a Senate bill with the House bill including all after the enacting clause. If the Senate decides not to concur, then they can ask for a conference, and after the conferees have discussed the matter, a conference report is brought in. If, in the first place, the Senate agrees to the House action, that is the end of it, and the bill, after engrossment and final action and signature by the presiding officers of both bodies, goes to the President. The same happens after a conference report is agreed to by both branches.

We are now witnessing the regular way of legislating, where there is a sincere desire to legislate. As to the housing bill, I am wondering if my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is going to take the same course. The housing bill will come up soon. There is a Senate bill now on the Speaker's table. I wonder if my good friend from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is going to, when he moves to suspend the rules, take the Senate bill and strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the House bill, whichever one he is going to propose, and I assume it is the last bill he reported out.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman should know, for the very simple reason that there is no Senate bill at the Speaker's table.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a Senate bill over here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is in committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is immaterial. It does not have to be on the Speaker's table. The bill has passed the other body. The Speaker could recognize to suspend the rules. It would not have to be reported out of committee. The bill is in committee, but it has passed the other body, so that is immaterial. The gentleman could move to suspend the rules and call up the Senate bill, and then strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the House bill. That would be the orderly way, just as he is doing now. May I ask my friend from Michigan if it is the intention to do so?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is not the intention to do so.

Mr. McCORMACK. That being so, it is not the intention of the Republicans, as far as the House is concerned, to have any real housing legislation enacted in this session of Congress, because if they did intend to do so, they would take up the Senate bill, strike out all after the enacting clause, and substitute the House bill, and then it would immediately go to conference. If they did that, then we would support it in order to get it into conference. The frank answer of my friend from Michigan is, again, what I said yesterday, a powerful message to the people of the country that everything that President Truman has been saying on his trip West about the Republican-controlled Congress is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that this bill is being brought up under suspension of rules which does not permit amendment. This is a very important measure. The Commodity

Credit Corporation furnishes the machinery through which the price-support programs on agricultural commodities are carried out. Without the Commodity Credit Corporation, it would be impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the mandate of Congress that prices on certain agricultural commodities be supported.

There are two very serious defects in the bill as it now stands. One of them is that the bill prohibits the Corporation from acquiring or leasing any plant or facility for warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, or from acquiring or leasing real property or any interest therein except the rental of office space. The bill also contains a provision reading as follows:

In the Corporation's leasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

These provisions which severely restrict the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation would, in my opinion, make it very difficult for the agency to carry out the duties imposed on it by law. However, I shall not detain the House with a detailed discussion of these points because my time is limited and this particular matter will be discussed by the able gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] a little later in this debate.

The provisions of this bill to which I particularly wish to call attention and to discuss in some detail are those which provide for setting up the Board. Section 9 of the bill provides that the Board of Directors shall consist of five members, one of whom shall be the Secretary of Agriculture or his nominee, and the remaining four to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than one-half of the members of the Board could be employees of the Corporation or any Department or agency of the Government. The Secretary of Agriculture is divested of the authority which he has previously had, of general supervision of the Corporation.

This means that three members of the Board of Directors must be appointed from outside the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Government, and that the control of the operations of the Corporation would be in the hands of the appointed members. What would occur under those circumstances is that, while the Secretary of Agriculture would have the responsibility for carrying out the provisions of law relating to support prices, under the terms of this bill he would lack the authority to do so effectively. It would simply be another case of what we already have too much of in the Federal Government—that is divided authority. Under the arrangement provided in this bill the Board could, if it desired, adopt policies and carry out programs to which the Secretary was opposed. Congress and the President would have to look to both the Board of Directors of the Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the Congress does not give the Secretary of Agriculture full power over this board, how can we hold the Secretary of Agriculture to account for the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. HOPE. There is no way that we can do so.

The principal purpose in putting the Commodity Credit Corporation in the Department of Agriculture, where it has been since 1939, was to get away from the division of authority and to assure that the activities of the Department and those of the Commodity Credit Corporation which are so closely related, would be coordinated and integrated.

At present the officers of the Commodity Credit Corporation are officials of the Department of Agriculture who are also in charge of departmental programs relating to the production and marketing of agricultural commodities. The programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation are necessarily closely related to the others of the Department of Agriculture. They are tied in with programs which involve section 32 funds. Price supports are tied in closely with production goals. The programs of the Corporation at the State and county levels are carried on largely through committees of farmers who are also responsible for other departmental activities. If the Corporation were under the control of a separate Board which had no knowledge of these activities and no part in them, there would without question be a tremendous amount of overlapping and confusion, and there would always be the possibility of conflicting programs.

Another factor which, it seems to me, should be taken into consideration is that there is no way by which members of the Board appointed from outside the Department of Agriculture could devote full time to the affairs of the Corporation. I mean by that that there is no necessity for full-time directors to pass on the matters which would ordinarily come before the Board.

It would be expected, I presume, that the members of the Board would be men who were acquainted with and experienced in the buying and selling of agricultural products. There is nothing in the bill which requires that they divest themselves of outside interests in those activities before becoming members of the Board. I believe that most men who are qualified for a position on the Board would not feel that they could afford to divest themselves of conflicting private interests. If they did not do so, they and the Board would certainly be subject to criticism. Thus, in practical operation, it would probably turn out that members of the Board will be those with conflicting private interests or persons without adequate experience to conduct such important business activities.

The provisions of this bill to which I have alluded are matters of deep concern to farmers everywhere. Some of our leading farm organizations have gone on record as being greatly disturbed by the provisions now contained in this bill. I have here in my hand a letter from Mr. Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, reading as follows:

JUNE 15, 1948.

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPE: We sincerely hope the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be amended to eliminate the divided responsibility under which the Secretary is charged with the duty for supporting commodity prices, but with means for carrying out this duty under the control of a board not responsible to him. We believe that the bill should also be amended to eliminate those sections which would channel all operations through the grain trade who might easily wreck the Corporation's essential stabilization operations or make them prohibitively expensive.

Sincerely yours,

A. S. GOSS,
Master, the National Grange.

I also have the following telegram from Mr. John J. Riggle, assistant secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives:

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives:

Urge that H. R. 6263, Commodity Credit Corporation bill, be amended to eliminate divided authority between Secretary of Agriculture to support farm prices and handle surplus and the independent Board to direct affairs of Corporation, and to provide for Corporation to own real and personal property necessary to handle surpluses of farm products which normal channels of trade do not handle at or above support levels.

JOHN J. RIGGLE,
Assistant Secretary, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

The American Farm Bureau Federation has stated its position in the following wire, signed by Roger W. Fleming, director of its Washington office:

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE:
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge support amendment to H. R. 6263, Federal charter CCC, eliminating restrictive grain-trade provisions, and substituting language requiring CCC, in buying, selling, and other operations, to use normal trade channels insofar as practicable. Because of congressional mandates on loans, price support and other operations control of Corporation should be left with Secretary of Agriculture.

ROGER W. FLEMING,
Director, Washington Office, American Farm Bureau Federation.

If this bill had been brought up under such circumstances that amendments were permitted, I would offer the following amendments, which, if adopted, would cure the serious defects to which I have referred:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "its Board of Directors" and insert in lieu thereof "the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as 'Secretary')."

Page 8, line 12, strike out section 9 in its entirety and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. Directors: (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'), subject to the general direction and control of the Secretary, who shall be a director and serve as Chairman of the Board. The

Board shall consist of four members (in ad-

The SPEAKER. The time of the gen-

inite assurance in the bill. I would like

(1) by striking out "$165,000,000" in sub-

arately from other dwellings in such project.

ing a preference under subsection (b) in

Board shall consist of four members (in addition to the Secretary), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum and shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that (i) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (ii) the terms of office of members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of 1 year, and one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, and one at the end of 4 years, after the date of enactment of this act. In addition to their duties as members of the Board, such appointed members shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum, except that any such member who holds another office or position under the Department of Agriculture, the compensation for which exceeds such rate, may elect to receive compensation at the rate provided for such other office or position in lieu of the compensation provided by this section.

"(b) Vacancies in the Board, whether arising from failure of the President to nominate or the Senate to confirm the original or subsequent members of the Board, so long as there shall be four members in office, shall not impair the powers of the Board to execute the functions of the Corporation, and a majority of the members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the Board."

Page 9, line 13, strike out section 10 in its entirety and substitute the following:

"SEC. 10. Personnel of Corporation: The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as he may determine, require that such of them as he may designate be bonded, and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 661)."

Since it is not possible under this procedure to offer amendments, I have inserted them in the RECORD, with the hope that when this bill goes to conference, the conferees may agree upon provisions which are substantially the same as those contained in the amendments above-quoted.

As indicated in the beginning of my remarks, I regard this matter as one of the greatest importance to the agricultural producers of this country.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. Because of the unusual parliamentary situation, has the gentleman from Kansas any information as to how these matters may be handled in conference if this bill is passed by this body?

Mr HOPE. We have a Senate bill, and I understand that the Senate bill will be substituted for this bill, and that everything after the enacting clause will be stricken out of the Senate bill, and the subject matter of the House bill inserted. That would get the bill into conference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree 100 percent with what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] had to say about the divided authority which is created by the provisions of this particular bill. Whether we are Democrats or Republicans, regardless of who is Secretary of Agriculture, if we in Congress want to hold that official responsible for Commodity Credits operations, we must give to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to make decisions. I sincerely trust, as Mr. Hope has stated, that this subject will be considered in confidence.

There is another defect in this particular bill. If you will turn to Section 5 of H. R. 6263, you will see a mandatory provision there in which it is required that practically all operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in regard to the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities shall utilize—note the word "shall"—the customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

What does that amendment mean? May I say first that the gentleman from Michigan has very kindly agreed that an amendment will be placed in this particular paragraph after the word "shall", which will not make this particular section mandatory. But under this particular section if left in the bill as it is, the Commodity Credit Corporation alone with other things could not purchase commodities directly from producers. It could not sell commodities directly to farmers. It could not extend the price support to farmers through purchases in areas where dealers are not willing to participate in the program. Frankly it would render ineffective entirely the great sealing program that we have had in effect throughout the Middle West in corn especially and other grains.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan and the committee for their willingness to accept this amendment, which will not make this section workable.

I am also disturbed about page 24, line 22. The language as written there practically says to the Commodity Credit Corporation: "You cannot utilize the 22,000 or more small steel-grain bins which you have had as extra storage space. We can plainly see that in case of a glut on the railroads or in the terminal markets the present language would mean that it would be practically impossible to carry out a grain-sealing program. Here, again, I am glad that the gentleman has agreed to an amendment, which does not go as far as I would like to see it, but nevertheless it does help a great deal. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has been very helpful in getting the matter adjusted.

Will the gentleman state what, in his opinion, his particular amendment to that section on page 4, line 22, would do? Would it assure the right of the Commodity Credit Corporation to own personal property? There is no such definite assurance in the bill. I would like a definite assurance that the Corporation can own these 20,000, or more, steel tanks, if needed, to carry out its functions as the vehicle for price-support programs.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I am in a position to assure the gentleman—surely, I would state it is my understanding—that there is no limitation upon the amount of personal property which the Corporation may own. There is a limitation which applies only to leases and real estate, and, as the gentleman says, they will be authorized under this amendment to continue existing leases.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, this is another measure to guarantee continued high prices and high cost of living.

I read two of the specific powers granted the Corporation as set forth on page 6 (a): "Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations." Then, having bought the commodities, subsection (d) permits the Corporation to "remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities." It buys the commodities in section (a), and pours kerosene on them in section (d).

Members who want a continuation of the high cost of living should vote in favor of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1322, as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 107, noes 13.

So two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING ACT OF 1948

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Housing Act of 1948."

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 101. (a) Section 1 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "titles II, III, and VI" wherever appearing in said section and inserting in lieu thereof "titles II, III, VI, and VII."

(b) Section 2 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended:

(1) by striking out "$165,000,000" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000,000";

(2) by striking out "$3,000" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,500";

(3) by striking out the first proviso in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $10,000 and having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure in order to provide additional housing accommodations for two or more families:".

(4) by amending the last sentence of subsection (b) to read as follows: "The Administrator is authorized to prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to secure to veterans of World War II and their immediate families occupancy priority with respect to any additional housing accommodations referred to in the first proviso of this subsection."

(c) Section 5 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The Administrator shall make an annual report to the Congress not later than the 1st day of April in each year of his activities during the preceding calendar year under this title and titles II, III, VI, and VII of this act."

TITLE II—DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED PERMANENT WAR-HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 201. For the purposes of this title—

(1) The term "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

(2) The term "Lanham War Housing Act" means the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

(3) The term "war housing" means any interest, owned by the United States and under the control of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in (A) housing (other than temporary housing) acquired or constructed under the Lanham War Housing Act, under the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941 (Public, No. 781, 76th Cong.), as amended, under the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941 (Public Law 9, 77th Cong.), or under the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 375, 78th Cong.), and (B) such other property as is determined by the Administrator to be essential to the use of such housing.

(4) The term "veteran" means (A) any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty, or (B), during the present war, any person in the active military or naval service of the United States.

(5) The term "dwelling" means a war-housing building designed for residential use of one or more families.

(6) The term "dwelling unit" means a dwelling, or that part of a dwelling, which is designed for residential use of one family.

SALE OF WAR HOUSING

SEC. 202. (a) All war housing (except mortgages, liens, or other interests as security) shall, subject to the provisions of this title, be sold for cash as expeditiously as possible and not later than December 31, 1949. Wherever practicable each dwelling in a war housing project shall be offered for sale separately from other dwellings in such project. Any mortgage, lien, or other interest in war housing held by the Administrator or acquired by him pursuant to a contract entered into prior to February 26, 1947, may, subject to the provisions of this section, be sold for cash.

(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the price to be paid for war housing sold under this title shall be a price not less than the reasonable value thereof at the time of the offer for sale as determined by appraisal made by an appraiser or appraisers designated by the Federal Housing Commissioner.

(2) The price to be paid for any mortgage, lien, or other interest as security sold under this section shall be a price not less than the unpaid principal (plus accrued interest thereon) of the obligation with respect to which the mortgage, lien, or other interest as security is held.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (a) and (b), the sale of war housing under this title shall be with or without warranty and upon such other terms and conditions as the Administrator deems proper.

TRANSFER OF WAR HOUSING TO THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 203. Notwithstanding the provisions of this title or any other provision of law, the Administrator may, in his discretion, transfer to the jurisdiction of the appropriate department in the National Military Establishment any war housing situated within the proximate vicinity of any permanent Army, Navy, or Air Force Establishment if the transfer of such war housing was requested on or before April 15, 1947, by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

PREFERENCES

SEC. 204. (a) Preference in the purchase of any dwelling designed for occupancy by less than five families shall be granted to veterans and their families and to occupants over other prospective purchasers of such dwelling in the following order:

(1) A veteran and his family who occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold.

(2) A veteran and his family who do not occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold but who intend to occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be purchased; but if the dwelling is designed for occupancy by two, three, or four families, equal preference shall be granted to a private corporation, association, or cooperative society which is the legal agent of veterans and their families who intend to occupy the dwelling purchased by such corporation, associations, or society.

(3) A nonveteran who occupies a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold.

(b) In the case of any war housing project where it is not practicable to offer each dwelling for sale separately from other dwellings in the project and in the case of any dwelling designed for occupancy by more than four families, preference in the purchase thereof shall be granted to any private corporation, association, or cooperative society which is the legal agent of veterans who intend to occupy the war housing purchased by such corporation, association, or society.

(c) The Administrator shall give such notice in such manner as he deems reasonable to enable prospective purchasers who have a preference under this section in the purchase of war housing to exercise such preference. Any prospective purchaser having a preference under subsection (a) in the purchase of any dwelling may apply for the purchase of such dwelling (1) if the preference is under paragraph (1), within 30 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale, (2) if the preference is under paragraph (2), within 60 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale, and (3) if the preference is under paragraph (3), within 90 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale. Any corporation, association, or society having a preference under subsection (b) in the purchase of any war housing may apply for the purchase of such housing within 180 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale.

SALES WITHOUT PREFERENCE

SEC. 205. If any dwelling or war housing project is not sold to a purchaser who is granted a preference under section 204 and who applied within the time prescribed in subsection (c) of such section, such dwelling or war housing project shall be sold as provided in this title without regard to any preference granted under section 204 and without regard to any restrictions contained in any other law as to whom war housing may be sold.

TITLE OF PURCHASER

SEC. 206. A deed or other instrument executed by or on behalf of the Administrator purporting to transfer title or any other interest in property under this title shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with the provisions of this title insofar as title or other interest of any bona fide purchasers for value is concerned.

VALIDITY OF CONTRACTS

SEC. 207. Nothing in this title shall be deemed to impair or modify any contract entered into prior to February 26, 1947, for the sale of property, or any term or provision of any such contract, without the consent of the purchaser or his assignee, if the contract or the term or provision thereof is otherwise valid.

DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS

SEC. 208. Moneys derived by the Administrator from the disposition of war housing under this title shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 301. Title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"CREATION AND POWERS OF THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"SEC. 301. (a) The Administrator is further authorized and empowered to provide for the establishment of a Federal National Mortgage Association (hereinafter referred to as the 'association') which shall be authorized, subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Association—

"(1) to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, which are insured after June 19, 1948, under section 203 or section 603 of this act, or guaranteed under section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended: *Provided, however*, That—

"(A) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by Federal, State, or municipal instrumentalities;

"(B) no mortgage may be purchased for an amount exceeding 98 percent of the unpaid principal balance thereof, plus accrued interest, at the time of purchase;

"(C) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase if the original principal obligation of the loan exceeds or exceeded $10,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage or other lien securing the loan;

"(D) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase unless offered by the original mortgagee prior to any other sale thereof;

"(E) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by any one mortgagee (i) if dated prior to June 19, 1948, and (2) if the unpaid principal balance thereof, when added to the aggregate amount paid for all such mortgages purchased by the Association from such mortgagee, exceeds 25 percent of the original principal amount of all such mortgage loans made by such mortgagee after June 19, 1948.

"(2) to borrow money for any of the foregoing purposes through the issuance of notes or other such obligations as hereinafter provided.

"(b) the Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and established pursuant to the provisions of this title as in effect prior to June 1, 1948, shall be the Association referred to in subsection (a) of this section. The Board of Directors of the Association shall consist of not less than five persons to be appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the Acting Chairman in the case of a vacancy in the office of Chairman, from the Directors, officers, or employees of such Corporation, and the officers shall be appointed by the Board of Directors from the Directors, officers, or employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(c) The Association created under this section shall have succession from the date of its organization unless it is dissolved by order of the Administrator as hereinafter provided, or by act of Congress, and shall have power—

"(1) to adopt and use a corporate seal;

"(2) to make contracts;

"(3) to sue and be sued; complain and defend, in any court of law or equity, State or Federal;

"(4) to conduct its business in any State of the United States, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, and to have one or more offices in such State, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, one of which offices shall be designated at the time of organization as its principal office;

"(5) to do all things as are necessary or incidental to the proper management of its affairs and the proper conduct of its business.

"(d) The Association shall have a capital stock of $20,000,000 and paid-in surplus of $1,000,000, subscribed in full by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(e) The Association, for the purpose of al. actions by or against it, real, personal, or mixed, and all suits in equity, shall be deemed a citizen of the place in which its principal office is located.

"(f) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation, except the Association organized under this section, shall hereafter use the words 'Federal National Mortgage Association' or any combination of such words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $100 or imprisonment not exceeding 30 days, or both, for each day during which such violation is committed or repeated. The provisions of section 5243 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the Association created under this title.

"OBLIGATIONS

"SEC. 302. The Association is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any time notes or other obligations in an aggregate amount not to exceed (1) 40 times the amount of its capital and surplus, and in no event to exceed (2) the current unpaid principal of mortgages held by it and insured under the provisions of titles II and VI of this act and guaranteed under section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, plus the amount of its cash on hand and on deposit and the amortized value of its investments in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"INVESTMENT OF FUNDS

"SEC. 303. Moneys of the Association not invested in first mortgages or in operating facilities shall be kept in cash on hand or on deposit, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States; except that the Association shall keep and maintain such reserves as it may deem necessary.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 304. The Association, including its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, mortgage loans, income, and stock, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Association shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

"MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

"SEC. 305. The Association shall have power to deal with, rent, renovate, modernize, or sell for cash, with a view to assuring a maximum financial return to the Association, any property acquired by it as a result of foreclosure proceedings or otherwise.

"LIQUIDATION

"SEC. 306. The Administrator shall have power to terminate the existence of the Association and order its liquidation and the winding up of its affairs whenever the Administrator determines, in his judgment, that the need therefor no longer exists. The Association shall make a report of its activities to the Administrator in January and July of each year for the preceding 6 months' period, which report shall be transmitted to the Congress, together with the Administrator's recommendations thereon."

SEC. 302. Nothing in the amendment made by section 301 of this act shall limit the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to service or sell any mortgage purchased prior to the date of the enactment of this act, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgage with respect to which a commitment to purchase was made prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

TITLE IV—TAX INCENTIVE FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL RENTAL HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS

SEC. 401. (a) The Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 124 thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 124A. Amortization Deduction for Rental Housing.

"(a) General rule: Every taxpayer, at his election, shall be entitled to an amortization deduction for a period of 60 months with respect to any necessary rental housing facility defined in subsection (d). Such amortization deduction shall be an amount, with respect to each month of such period within the taxable year, equal to the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of the facility at the end of such month divided by 60 plus the number of months (including the month for which the deduction is computed) remaining in the 60-month period. Such adjusted basis at the end of the month shall be computed without regard to the amortization deduction for such month. The amortization deduction above provided with respect to any month shall be in lieu of the deduction with respect to such facility for such month provided by section 23 (l) (relating to exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence), but shall be allowable only if a deduction under section 23 (l) would otherwise be allowable for such month with respect to such facility. The amortization deduction shall be allowable only to the taxpayer to whom a certificate is issued under subsection (e) with respect to such facility; and, if such certificate is revoked by the Federal Housing Commissioner for any violation of the conditions and specifications contained therein, the deduction shall not be allowable for any month ending after a violation upon which such revocation is based. The 60-month period shall begin as to any such facility at the election of the taxpayer, with the month following the month in which the facility was completed, or with the succeeding taxable year.

"(b) Election of amortization: The election of the taxpayer to take the amortization deductions and to begin the 60-month period with the month following the month in which the facility was completed shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for the taxable year in which the facility was completed. The election to take the amortization deduction and to begin such period with the taxable year succeeding such year shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for such succeeding taxable year.

"(c) Termination of amortization deduction: A taxpayer which has elected under subsection (b) to take the amortization deduction provided in subsection (a) may, at any time after making such election, discontinue the amortization deductions with respect to the remainder of the amortization period, such discontinuance to begin as of the beginning of any month specified by the taxpayer in a notice in writing filed with the Commissioner before the beginning of such month. The deduction provided under section 23 (l) shall be allowed, beginning with the first month as to which the amortization deduction is not applicable, and the taxpayer shall not be entitled to any further amortization deductions with respect to such facility.

"(d) Definitions: As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'necessary rental housing facility' means any rental housing facility with respect to which a certificate under subsection (e) is issued to the taxpayer.

"(2) The term 'rental housing facility' means—

"(A) any dwelling unit or units held by the taxpayer for rental purposes, the construction of which is begun at any time on or after July 1, 1948, and before the close of July 1, 1950; or

"(B) any dwelling unit or units held by the taxpayer for rental purposes provided by the alteration or remodeling of an existing structure if such alteration or remodeling is begun at any time on or after July 1, 1948, and before the close of July 1, 1950, and if such dwelling unit or units are in addition to the number of dwelling units contained in such structure prior to such alteration or remodeling.

"(3) The term 'dwelling unit' means any dwelling unit containing its own kitchen and bath facilities.

"(4) The adjusted basis of any necessary rental housing facility shall include only so much of the amount otherwise constituting such adjusted basis as is properly attributable to the construction, or to the alteration or remodeling, covered in the certificate issued under subsection (e). In no event shall the basis of the land on which such facility is located be included in such adjusted basis.

"(e) Issuance of certificate: (1) The Federal Housing Commissioner is hereby authorized to certify as necessary any rental housing facility (A) which is or will be located in an area in which he finds there is a shortage of rental housing and (B) in which the dwelling units are or will be of such character and will be rented at such rentals as will, in his judgment, tend to relieve such shortage. Such Commissioner is authorized, upon any violation of the conditions and specifications contained in a certificate issued by him, to revoke such certificate.

"(2) An application for such certificate shall be filed with the Federal Housing Commissioner prior to the commencement of the construction, or alteration or remodeling, of the rental housing facility, and such certificate shall be issued only to the person filing such application.

"(3) The Federal Housing Commissioner is hereby authorized, from time to time, to prescribe forms and regulations with respect to such certificates.

"(f) Life tenant and remainderman: In the case of property held by one person for life with remainder to another person, the deduction shall be computed as if the life tenant were the absolute owner of the property and shall be allowable to the life tenant."

(b) Section 23 (t) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(t) Amortization deduction: The deduction for amortization provided in sections 124 and 124A."

(c) Section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out "of emergency facilities."

(d) Section 190 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after "emergency facilities" the following: "or necessary rental housing facilities."

(e) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 2. Section 3403 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The tax imposed by subsection (b) shall not apply in the case of trailer coaches of the housing type (including parts or accessories therefor sold on or in connection therewith or with the sale thereof) sold prior to July 1, 1950, and after the close of the month in which falls the date of the enactment of this subsection."

TITLE V—GI HOME LOAN INCONTESTABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 501. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section 510 thereof the following new section:

"INCONTESTABILITY

"SEC. 511. Any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the loan for guaranty or insurance under the provisions of this title and of the amount of such guaranty or insurance, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from establishing, as against the original lender, defenses based on fraud or material misrepresentation, and except that the Administrator shall not, by reason of anything contained in this section, be barred from establishing, by regulations in force at the date of such issuance or disbursement, whichever is the earlier, partial defenses to the amount payable on the guaranty or insurance."

TITLE VI—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 601. (a) Section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out "$5,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,950,000,000 except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased to not to exceed $6,950,000,000";

(2) by striking out "April 30, 1948" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1949";

(3) by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding a comma and the following: "and that, of the total authorization provided in this subsection, not less than $800,000,000 shall be made available for the insurance of mortgages on rental properties under section 608, and not less than $200,000,000 shall be made available for the insurance of mortgages on multifamily dwellings under section 603, on which commitments for insurance are issued subsequent to March 31, 1948."

(b) Section 603 (b) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting "unless insured under paragraph (2a) of this subsection," before "involve" in paragraph (2), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(2a) if insured under this paragraph, involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Administrator shall approve) in an amount not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 95 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the value, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance, of a property, urban, suburban, or rural, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That mortgages shall be insured under this paragraph only if the Administrator determines that such insurance of mortgages would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities for families of moderate income: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may by regulation provide that the principal obligation of any mortgage eligible for insurance under this paragraph shall be fixed at a lesser amount than $6,000 where he finds that for any section of the country or at any time a lower-cost dwelling for families of lower income is feasible without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability: *And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages insured under this paragraph the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property in cash or its equivalent, at least 5 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the value of the property, or shall be the builder constructing the dwelling in which case the principal obligation shall not exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the value of the property;".

(c) Section 603 (b) (3) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) of this subsection or not to exceed 30 years from the date of the insurance of the mortgage in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2a) of this subsection".

(d) Section 603 (b) (5) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(5) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any one time, or not to exceed 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that in certain areas or under special circumstances the mortgage market demands it."

(e) Section 603 (c) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out in the next to the last sentence the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

SEC. 602. Section 604 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting between the first and second provisos in the last sentence the following: *"Provided further*, That with respect to mortgages which are accepted for insurance under section 603 (b) (2a) or under the third proviso of section 608 (b) (3) (B) there may be included in the debentures issued by the Administrator, on account of the cost of foreclosure (or of acquiring the property by other means) actually paid by the mortgagee and approved by the Administrator, an amount not in excess of two-thirds of such cost or $75, whichever is the greater:".

SEC. 603. (a) Section 608 (b) (3) (B) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"And provided further*, That the principal obligation of the mortgage shall not, in any event, exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located: *And provided further*, That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph (B), a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporation, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members, may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 95 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed and not exceeding 95 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the project on the basis of the cost prevailing on December 31, 1947, for projects of comparable quality in the locality where such project is to be located; and".

(b) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(C) not to exceed $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use: *Provided*, That the Administrator may increase this amount to $9,100 where in his discretion cost levels so require."

(c) The next to the last sentence of section 608 (b) (3) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The mortgage shall provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe, and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, or not to exceed 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that in certain areas or under special circumstances the mortgage market demands it."

SEC. 604. Section 609 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended:

(a) By striking out all of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding purchase contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator providing for the purchase and delivery of the houses to be manufactured, which contracts shall provide for the payment of the purchase price at such time as may be agreed to by the parties thereto, but in no event, shall the purchase price be payable on a date in excess of 30 days after the date of delivery of such houses, unless not less than 20 percent of such purchase price is paid on or before the date of delivery and the lender has accepted and discounted, or has agreed to accept and discount, pursuant to subsection (l) of this section a promissory note or notes, executed by the purchaser, representing the unpaid portion of such purchase price, in which event such unpaid portion of the purchase price may be payable on a date not in excess of 180 days from the date of delivery of such houses."

(b) By striking out all of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost, exclusive of profit, of manufacturing the houses, which are the subject of such purchase contracts assigned to secure the loans, less any sums paid by the purchaser under said purchase contracts prior to the assignment thereof. The loan shall be secured by an assignment of the aforesaid purchase contracts and of all sums

payable thereunder on or after the date of such assignment, with the right in the assignee to proceed against such security in case of default as provided in the assignment, which assignment shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Administrator; and the Administrator may require such other agreements and undertakings to further secure the loan as he may determine, including the right, in case of default or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses then owned and in the possession of the borrower. The loan shall have a maturity not in excess of 1 year from the date of the note, except that any such loan may be refinanced and extended in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe for an additional term not to exceed 1 year, and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum (or not to exceed 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that special circumstances demand it) on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time."

(c) By adding at the end of subsection (f) the following new sentence: "The provisions of section 603 (d) shall also be applicable to loans insured under this section and the reference in said section 603 (d) to a mortgage shall be construed to include a loan or loans with respect to which a contract of insurance is issued pursuant to this section."

(d) By adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(i) (1) In addition to the insurance of the principal loan to finance the manufacture of housing, as provided in this section, and in order to provide short term financing in the sale of houses to be delivered pursuant to the purchase contract or contracts assigned as security for such principal loan, the Administrator is authorized, under such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe, to insure the lender against any losses it may sustain resulting from the acceptance and discount of a promissory note or notes executed by a purchaser of any such houses representing an unpaid portion of the purchase price of any such houses. No such promissory note or notes accepted and discounted by the lender pursuant to this subsection shall involve a principal obligation in excess of 80 percent of the purchase price of the manufactured house or houses; have a maturity in excess of 180 days from the date of the note or bear interest in excess of 4 percent per annum (or in excess of 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that special circumstances demand it); nor may the principal amount of such promissory notes, with respect to any individual principal loan, outstanding and unpaid at any one time exceed in the aggregate an amount prescribed by the Administrator.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to include in any contract of insurance executed by him with respect to the insurance of a loan to finance the manufacture of houses, provisions to effectuate the insurance against any such losses under this subsection.

"(3) The failure of the purchaser to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of any note or notes executed by the purchaser and accepted and discounted by the lender under the provisions of this subsection shall be considered as a default under this subsection, and if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the lender shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance, as provided in subsection (d) of this section except that debentures issued pursuant to this subsection shall have a face value equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan plus interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of default to the date the application is filed for the insurance benefits.

"(4) Debentures issued with respect to the insurance granted under this subsection shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date application is filed for the insurance benefits and shall bear interest from such date.

"(5) The Administrator is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this subsection, in addition to the premium charge authorized under section (h) of this section, such premium charge shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the original principal of such promissory note or notes and shall be paid at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(j) To further carry out the purposes referred to in subsection (a) the Administrator is authorized to insure loans to finance the manufacture of housing equipment used on the job site in the actual construction of housing (including advances on such loans) in the same manner and under the same conditions applicable with respect to loans eligible for insurance under subsection (b): *Provided*, That to the extent the proceeds of the loan are used for the purchase of equipment, plant, or machinery the principal obligation shall not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of such equipment, plant, or machinery.

"The other provisions of this section insofar as they are applicable shall apply in like respect and effect to loans insured under this subsection."

SEC. 605. Section 610 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Administrator is further authorized to insure or to make commitments to insure in accordance with the provisions of this section any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any of the so-called Greenbelt towns, including projects known as Greenhills, Ohio, Greenbelt, Md., and Greendale, Wis., developed under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, and any mortgage executed in connection with the first resale, within 2 years from the date of its acquisition from the Government, of any portion of a project or property which is the security for a mortgage insured pursuant to the provisions of this section."

SEC. 606. Title VI of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding after section 610 the following new section:

"SEC. 611. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under other sections of this title, and in order to assist and encourage the application of cost reduction techniques through large-scale modernized site construction of housing and the erection of houses produced by modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Administrator as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"(2) cover property, held by a mortgagor approved by the Administrator, upon which there is to be constructed or erected dwelling units for not less than twenty-five families consisting of a group of single-family or two-family dwellings approved by the Administrator for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That during the course of construction there may be located upon the mortgaged property a plant for the fabrication or storage of such dwellings or sections or parts thereof, and the Administrator may consent to the removal or release of such plant from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may approve; and

"(3) involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(A) not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the completed property or project, exclusive of any plant of the character described in paragraph (2) of this subsection located thereon, and

"(B) not to exceed a sum computed on the individual dwellings comprising the total project as follows:

"(i) $8,100 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each single-family dwelling, and

"(ii) $12,500 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each two-family dwelling.

"With respect to the insurance of advances during construction, the Administrator is authorized to approve advances by the mortgagee to cover the cost of materials delivered upon the mortgaged property and labor performed in the fabrication or erection thereof; and

"(4) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, or not to exceed 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that in certain areas or under special circumstances the mortgage market demands it. The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"(c) Preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for veterans of World War II and their immediate families and for hardship cases as defined by the Administrator shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(d) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 608 shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

TITLE VII—EQUITY INVESTMENT AIDS

SEC. 701. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new title:

"TITLE VII—INSURANCE FOR INVESTMENTS IN RENTAL HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME

"AUTHORITY TO INSURE

"SEC. 701. The purpose of this title is to supplement the existing systems of mortgage insurance for rental housing under this Act by a special system for insurance designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing at rents within the capacity of families of moderate income. To effectuate this purpose, the Administrator is authorized, upon application by the investor, to insure as hereinafter provided, and, prior to the execution of insurance contracts and upon such terms as the Administrator shall prescribe, to make commitments to insure, the minimum annual amortization charge and an annual return on the outstanding investment of such investor in any project which is eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided in an amount (herein called the 'insured annual return') equal to such rate of return, not exceeding 2¾ percent per annum, on such outstanding investment as shall, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, be fixed in the insurance contract or in the commitment to insure: *Provided*, That any insurance contract made pursuant to this title shall expire as of the first day of the operating year for which the outstanding investment amounts to not more than 10 percent of the established investment: *And provided further*, That the aggregate amount of contingent liabilities outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure made pursuant to this title shall not exceed $1,000,000,000.

"ELIGIBILITY

"SEC. 702. (a) To be eligible for insurance under this title, a project shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The Administrator shall be satisfied that there is, in the locality or metropolitan area of such project, a need for new rental dwellings at rents comparable to the rents proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project.

"(2) Such project shall be economically sound, and the dwellings in such project shall be acceptable to the Administrator as to quality, design, size, and type.

"(b) Any insurance contract executed by the Administrator under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the project and the investor for such insurance, and the validity of any insurance contract so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an investor from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such investor.

"PREMIUMS AND FEES

"SEC. 703. (a) For insurance granted pursuant to this title the Administrator shall fix and collect a premium charge in an amount not exceeding one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year for which such premium charge is payable without taking into account the excess earnings, if any, applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment. Such premium charge shall be payable annually in advance by the investor, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Administrator under this title at par, plus accrued interest: *Provided*, That, if in any operating year the gross income shall be less than the operating expenses, the premium charge payable during such operating year shall be waived, but only to the extent of the amount of the difference between such expenses and such income and subject to subsequent payment out of any excess earning as hereinafter provided.

"(b) With respect to any project offered for insurance under this title, the Administrator is authorized to charge and collect reasonable fees for examination, and for inspection during the construction of the project: *Provided*, That such fees shall not aggregate more than one-half of 1 percent of the estimated investment.

"RENTS

"SEC. 704. The Administrator shall require that the rents for the dwellings in any project insured under this title shall be established in accordance with a rent schedule approved by the Administrator, and that the investor shall not charge or collect rents for any dwellings in the project in excess of the appropriate rents therefor as shown in the latest rent schedule approved pursuant to this section. Prior to approving the initial or any subsequent rent schedule pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall find that such schedule affords reasonable assurance that the rents to be established thereunder are (1) not lower than necessary, together with all other income to be derived from or in connection with the project, to produce reasonably stable revenues sufficient to provide for the payment of the operating expenses, the minimum annual amortization charge, and the minimum annual return; and (2) not higher than necessary to meet the need for dwellings for families of moderate income.

"EXCESS EARNINGS

"SEC. 705. For all of the purposes of any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, 50 percent of the excess earnings, if any, for any operating year may be applied, in addition to the minimum annual return, to return on the outstanding investment but only to the extent that such application thereof does not result in an annual return of more than 5 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year, and the balance of any such excess earnings shall be applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment: *Provided*, That if in any preceding operating years the gross income shall have been less than the operating expenses, such excess earnings shall be applied to the extent necessary, in whole or in part, first, to the reimbursement of the amount of the difference between such expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and such income, and, second, to the payment of any premium charges previously waived hereunder.

"FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

"SEC. 706. With respect to each project insured under this title, the Administrator shall provide that, after the close of each operating year, the investor shall submit to him for approval a financial and operating statement covering such operating year. If any such financial and operating statement shall not have been submitted or, for proper cause, shall not have been approved by the Administrator, payment of any claim submitted by the investor may, at the option of the Administrator, be withheld, in whole or in part, until such statement shall have been submitted and approved.

"PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

"SEC. 707. If in any operating year the net income of a project insured under this title is less than the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return, the Administrator, upon submission by the investor of a claim for the payment of the amount of the difference between such net income and the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return and after proof of the validity of such claim, shall pay to the investor, in cash from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, the amount of such difference, as determined by the Administrator, but not exceeding, in any event, an amount equal to the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return.

"DEBENTURES

"SEC. 708. (a) If the aggregate of the amounts paid to the investor pursuant to section 707 hereof with respect to a project insured under this title shall at any time equal or exceed 15 percent of the established investment, the Administrator thereafter shall have the right, after written notice to the investor of his intention so to do, to acquire, as of the first day of any operating year, such project in consideration of the issuance and delivery to the investor of debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year. In any such case the investor shall be obligated to convey to said Administrator title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and, in the event that the investor fails so to do, said Administrator may, at his option, terminate the insurance contract.

"(b) If in any operating year the aggregate of the differences between the operating expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and the gross income for the preceding operating years, less the aggregate of any deficits in such operating expenses reimbursed from excess earnings as hereinbefore provided, shall at any time equal or exceed 6 percent of the established investment, the investor shall thereafter have the right, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, to convey to the Administrator, as of the first day of any operating year, title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and to receive from the Administrator debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(c) Any difference, not exceeding $50, between 90 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year in which a project is acquired by the Administrator pursuant to this section and the total face value of the debentures to be issued and delivered to the investor pursuant to this section shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Administrator to the investor from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund.

"(d) Upon the acquisition of a project by the Administrator pursuant to this section, the insurance contract shall terminate.

"(e) Debentures issued under this title to any investor shall be executed in the name of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Administrator, by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. Such debentures shall be dated as of the first day of the operating year in which the project for which such debentures were issued was acquired by the Administrator, shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the insurance contract was executed, but not to exceed 2¾ percent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year and shall mature on the 1st day of July in such calendar year or years, not later than the fortieth following the date of the issuance thereof, as shall be determined by the Administrator and stated on the face of such debentures.

"(f) Such debentures shall be in such form and in such denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and may include such provisions for redemption as shall be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be issued in either coupon or registered form.

"(g) Such debentures shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, shall be payable out of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, which shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed, as to both the principal thereof and the interest thereon, by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the Housing Investment Insurance Fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or the interest on any debentures so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon, to the extent of the amount so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such debentures.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real and other property by the United States, the Administrator shall have power, for the protection of the

Housing Investment Insurance Fund, to pay out of said Fund all expenses or charges in connection with, and to deal with, complete, reconstruct, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, make contracts for the management of, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash, in whole or in part, any project acquired pursuant to this title; and, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator shall also have power to pursue to final collection by way of compromise or otherwise all claims acquired by, or assigned or transferred to, him in connection with the acquisition or disposal of any project pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract for hazard insurance, or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of any project acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such purchase or contract does not exceed $1,000.

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 709. The investor, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, may terminate, as of the close of any operating year, any insurance contract made pursuant to this title. The Administrator shall prescribe the events and conditions under which said Administrator shall have the option to terminate any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, and the events and conditions under which said Administrator may reinstate any insurance contract terminated pursuant to this section or section 708 (a). If any insurance contract is terminated pursuant to this section, the Administrator may require the investor to pay an adjusted premium charge in such ambunt as the Administrator determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges which such investor otherwise would have been required to pay if such insurance contract had not been so terminated.

"INSURANCE FUND

"SEC. 710. There is hereby created a Housing Investment Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Administrator as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. For this purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Administrator such funds as the Administrator shall deem necessary, but not to exceed $10,000,000, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, inspection and other fees, service charges, and any other income received by the Administrator under this title, together with all earnings on the assets of such Housing Investment Insurance Fund, shall be credited to said fund. All payments made pursuant to claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, cash adjustments, the principal of and interest on debentures issued under this title, expenses incurred in connection with or as a consequence of the acquisition and disposal of projects acquired under this title, and all administrative expenses in connection with this title, shall be paid from said fund. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all approved claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, and, in the event said fund fails to make any such payment when due, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the investor the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Moneys in the Housing Investment Insurance Fund not needed for current operations under this title shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of said fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed by, the United States. The Administrator may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under this title. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 711. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Administrator under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 712. The Administrator may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title, including, without limiting the foregoing, rules and regulations relating to the maintenance by the investor of books, records, and accounts with respect to the project and the examination of such books, records, and accounts by representatives of the Administrator; the submission of financial and operating statements and the approval thereof; the submission of claims for payments under insurance contracts, the proof of the validity of such claims, and the payment or disallowance thereof; the increase of the established investment if the investor shall make capital improvements or additions to the project; the decrease of the established investment if the investor shall sell part of the project; and the reduction of the outstanding investment for the appropriate operating year or operating years pending the restoration of dwelling or nondwelling facilities damaged by fire or other casualty. With respect to any investor which is subject to supervision or regulation by a State banking, insurance, or other State department or agency, the Administrator may, in carrying out any of his supervisory and regulatory functions with respect to projects insured under this title, utilize, contract with, and act through such department or agency and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 713. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

"(a) 'Investor' shall mean (1) any natural person; (2) any group of not more than 10 natural persons; (3) any corporation, company, association, trust, or other legal entity; or (4) any combination of two or more corporations, companies, associations, trusts, or other legal entities, having all the powers necessary to comply with the requirements of this title, which the Administrator (i) shall find to be qualified by business experience and facilities, to afford assurance of the necessary continuity of long-term investment, and to have available the necessary capital required for long-term investment in the project, and (ii) shall approve as eligible for insurance under this title.

"(b) 'Project' shall mean a project (including all property, real and personal, contracts, rights, and choses in action acquired, owned, or held by the investor in connection therewith) of an investor, designed and used primarily for the purpose of providing dwellings the occupancy of which is permitted by the investor in consideration of agreed charges: *Provided*, That nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting the inclusion in a project of such stores, offices, or other commercial facilities, recreational or community facilities, or other nondwelling facilities as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or desirable appurtenances to such project.

"(c) 'Estimated investment' shall mean the estimated cost of the development of the project, as stated in the application submitted to the Administrator for insurance under this title.

"(d) 'Established investment' shall mean the amount of the reasonable costs, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, carrying out all works and undertakings for the development of a project and shall include the premium charge for the first operating year and the cost of all necessary surveys, plans and specifications, architectural, engineering, or other special services, land acquisition, site preparation, construction, and equipment; a reasonable return on the funds of the investor paid out in course of the development of the project, up to and including the initial occupancy date; necessary expenses in connection with the initial occupancy of the project; and the cost of such other items as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the development of the project, (1) less the amount by which the rents and revenues derived from the project up to and including the initial occupancy date exceeded the reasonable and proper expenses, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, operating and maintaining said project up to and including the initial occupancy date, or (2) plus the amount by which such expenses exceeded such rents and revenues, as the case may be.

"(e) 'Physical completion date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which the Administrator determines that the construction of the project is substantially completed and substantially all of the dwellings therein are available for occupancy.

"(f) 'Initial occupancy date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which 90 percent in number of the dwellings in the project on the physical completion date shall have been occupied, but shall in no event be later than the last day of the sixth calendar month next following the physical completion date.

"(g) 'Operating year' shall mean the period of twelve consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date and each succeeding period of twelve consecutive calendar months, and the period of the first twelve consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date shall be the first operating year.

"(h) 'Gross income' for any operating year shall mean the total rents and revenues and other income derived from, or in connection with, the project during such operating year.

"(i) 'Operating expenses' for any operating year shall mean the amounts, as approved by the Administrator, necessary to meet the reasonable and proper costs of, and to provide for, operating and maintaining the project, and to establish and maintain reasonable and proper reserves for repairs, maintenance, and replacements, and other necessary reserves during such operating year, and shall include necessary expenses for real-estate taxes, special assessments, premium charges made pursuant to this title, administrative expenses, the annual rental under any lease pursuant to which the real property comprising the site of the project is held by the investor, and insurance charges, together with such other expenses as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of the project, but shall not include income taxes.

"(j) 'Net income' for any operating year shall mean gross income remaining after the payment of the operating expenses.

"(k) 'Minimum annual amortization charge' shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment, except that, in the case of a project where the real property comprising the site thereof is held by the investor under a lease, if (notwithstanding the proviso of section 703 (a) hereof) the gross income for any operating year shall be less than the amount required to pay the operating expenses (including the annual rental under such lease), the minimum annual amortization charge for such operating year shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment plus the amount of the annual rental under such lease to the extent that the same is not paid from the gross income.

"(l) 'Annual return' for any operating year shall mean the net income remaining after the payment of the minimum annual amortization charge.

"(m) 'Insured annual return' shall have the meaning ascribed to it in section 701 hereof.

"(n) 'Minimum annual return' for any operating year shall mean an amount equal to 3½ percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(o) 'Excess earnings' for any operating year shall mean the net income derived from a project in excess of the minimum annual amortization charge and the minimum annual return.

"(p) 'Outstanding investment' for any operating year shall mean the established investment, less an amount equal to (1) the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge for each preceding operating year, plus (2) the aggregate of the excess earnings, if any, during each preceding operating year applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization in accordance with the provisions of section 705 hereof."

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

SEC. 801. Section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$1,500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000,000,000."

SEC. 802. Section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(h) The Corporation may subscribe for the nonassessable stock of the Federal National Mortgage Association: *Provided*, That the total face amount of stock so subscribed for and held by the Corporation shall not exceed at any one time $20,000,000."

SEC. 803. The import duties imposed under paragraph 405 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on plywood shall not apply with respect to imports entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning with the day following the date of enactment of this act and ending with the close of June 30, 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Obviously, no quorum is present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 121]

Andrews, N. Y.	Keefe	Robertson
Brown, Ohio	Kerr	Simpson, Pa.
Case, S. Dak.	Lane	Smith, Maine
Celler	Ludlow	Stigler
Clippinger	Macy	Taber
Dawson, Ill.	Morton	Thomas, N. J.
Engel, Mich.	O'Toole	West
Hartley	Peden	Wigglesworth
Havenner	Powell	Wilson, Ind.
Johnson, Ind.	Preston	Wood
Johnson, Okla.	Regan	
Johnson, Tex.	Rivers	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a highly controversial measure. The interesting thing about this particular legislation which is presented to the House, is that the controversy concerning the measure is not what is in the bill but that which is not included in the bill. The bill which is presented to the House today is a housing measure, supported and passed by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, and establishes procedure to alleviate the critical housing shortage which exists in America today.

Those portions of the bill which have been eliminated are the controversial sections of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. So the bill is presented today on the issue whether or not the bill shall be passed by the House, or whether or not it shall be defeated because the so-called controversial issues in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill are not included therein.

In order that we may understand the issue more clearly, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill contained three main segments. The first segment was in general provisions which are in this bill today. Those had to do with the expansion of credit and the establishment of devices to assist the construction of homes for veterans and others in the country who are in need of housing.

The second provision is the slum-clearance provision, which is controversial. But the most highly controversial provision of the legislation, of course, is the public-housing feature.

The issue which has been presented by the proponents of the public housing feature of this bill is this: They say, first, there is a critical housing shortage in the country today, and, secondly, that we need housing for the poor of the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is my point that this bill, so far as the public housing feature is concerned, does neither. It neither takes care of the critical housing feature nor does it house the poor. Of course, as the gentleman from Louisiana said yesterday, the bill does have the support of a great many organizations.

I sat upon the committe day after day and week after week, listening to the testimony of people representing these organizations. They came before our committee and said, "There is a critical housing shortage in America today. There are people living in conditions which are not safe or sanitary. Therefore, we should alleviate that condition."

So what? So we should pass the public housing measure.

I want, in my brief time, to analyze that particular position. The real issue, as I see it, is not whether there are poor people in the country who require housing. The real issue is not whether there are slums in the country which should be cleared and rebuilt. The real issue is the method by which these things may be done. That, Mr. Speaker, is the issue which I challenge the proponents of the public housing bill to talk about today. Not talk about the fact that we have poor people in the country who should be helped; not talk about the critical housing shortage, but talk about the method by which they say we should approach this particular problem.

What is that method? There are a large number of families whose average income is $150 per month. The question is, Shall the Government build homes for a select few of those people, and then pay a portion of their rent? That is the real issue in connection with the public housing feature of this program.

I oppose the public housing program because I believe it is discriminatory. I believe it grants a privilege to a select people in the country.

The program suggested by the public housing proponents provides a discrimination as to areas within the United States. How does it provide for discrimination as to areas? Let us look at the record and see what has happened under the program as it has been conducted in the past. As you know, there are a number of housing programs in existence. Four States, for instance, in the United States, have the most housing units in the country. It is rather interesting to note of two out of the four States one is Texas and the other is Florida.

The State of Missouri, with two great industrial cities, has no housing units. Fifteen States have no public housing units. Miami, the playground of the rich, stands high in the number of housing units in any city. Peoria has almost twice as many as has Chicago.

Thus, we see the helter-skelter discriminatory distribution of public housing. Why is it that the people of St. Louis who are in exactly the same circumstances as the people of Miami, are not treated with the same consideration? It is because of the administration and method of distribution provided for in the public-housing law.

The law permits discrimination between persons. It gives to a select few a privilege not afforded a great number of similarly situated persons. Pete Smith is permitted to live in a nice apartment at low cost, but his neighbors, John

Jones, Joe Doakes, and many others are not afforded this privilege. These other folks have low incomes, but they will pay taxes to contribute to Pete Smith's rent.

Pete Smith has been selected by an administrator, not because he is the poorest, but because he is able to pay the amount of rent required and is just one of the needy among all of the applicants.

The occupants of slums are not, by the public-housing legislation, automatically placed into the new homes. Their dwellings may be demolished and, in many instances, the record shows that they are moved to further and worse slums and other more fortunate people are granted admission to the public-housing units.

Discrimination and privilege, and even political expediency is permitted by the public housing law which our committee considered.

The Government grants assistance to the needy. It aids in education and the building of roads. In all of these programs, however, the money available is distributed to all of the States so that all persons similarly situated may receive at least some benefit. Here, for the first time, it is proposed to ignore the needs of a great majority and grant benefits to a select and privileged few.

The motives of those great organizations and well-meaning people who want to solve the critical housing shortage and who want to provide decent housing for low-income people cannot be questioned. I do, without fear of contradiction, however, state that these people have not carefully analyzed the operation of the public housing law proposed by the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

There are others, however, who have no interest in maintaining private enterprise, initiative, and the American approach to problems such as these. These people would regiment our citizens, control them by a bureaucracy in Washington, all under the guise of humane activity. It is with this latter group that I part company. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am opposing the public-housing feature of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and am supporting the present measure which will provide homes for veterans, homes for the young people of our Nation, and maintain our Republic.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we recently fought a war that cost us not less than $350,000,000,000, and the best blood of the youth of our country. We achieved a victory, but we have not yet achieved the peace we fought for. Probably the greatest domestic issue that now presents itself to the American people is housing, to house the men who fought our battles and who came home and had no place to live. That is a question that deserves the greatest consideration.

In our committee we have always had friendliness, kindliness, and sportsmanship. I have an admiration and affection for our chairman, but this bill seemed to do something to him that I have not seen heretofore. We prepared a bill and voted it out and we went before the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee made a proposition that I have never heard made to a legislative committee in all the long years I have been here. They told us that if there were some members of the committee who would stultify themselves and change their vote we might get a rule. I am glad to say no Democratic Member accepted that invitation and the rule was tabled. Then in the evening we got a notice to appear at 9 o'clock the next morning in the Banking and Currency Committee, and at that meeting the bill which you are now considering was read rapidly. When the reading was completed, although Members were asking for recognition, no one was recognized to offer a substitute, no one was recognized to offer an amendment, no one was recognized to make a point of order that the House was then in session and the bill could not be reported according to the rules of the House; but the bill was arbitrarily reported out. The rules of the House and the democratic processes were thrown out of the window.

You have heard a good deal of talk about socialism in the housing bill. The exercise of arbitrary power anywhere in a republic by the elected officials is more dangerous than socialism; and that is the bill you have here today, all of the provisions in which the people of America had expressed the greatest interest were taken out of the bill: Low rent housing for the veterans, which we greatly need, and many other desirable provisions are out of the bill; and they bring back here a bill that will have no effect, it seems to me, upon the housing problem of the American people except to give special and unconscionable privileges to a favored few.

I have done everything I could to assist in passage of legislation that would result in more housing for our veterans and other citizens, but I am confident this bill will not accomplish that purpose. S. 866, which has been passed by the Senate, is now on the Speaker's table and after the passage of this bill it could be taken from the table, everything stricken out after the enacting clause, and the provisions of the House bill inserted; and the Senate bill as so amended, passed by the House. This bill would immediately go to conference and would expedite the final passage of a bill. As the Chairman says, he will not adopt this procedure I feel confident we will have no housing bill at this Congress that will in the least degree solve the problem that is presented.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL].

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with misgivings and uncertainty that I approach the necessity of making a decision as to how to vote on this housing bill. In my opinion, this bill in its present form is incomplete without the public housing provisions. The very group most in need of assistance in order to obtain adequate and decent housing, namely the lowest income group, will not participate in the benefits of this bill. As the report of the Joint Congressional Committees on Housing has said: "The committee does not see how, as a matter of simple justice, it can recommend a housing program which would aid all groups of our citizenry except the very one which is most in need of aid."

Many of my colleagues have raised the contention that for the Government to undertake to assist in providing public housing for the lowest income group is socialism. It seems that whenever anyone suggests the utilization of Government resources for those most in need, he is branded a Socialist. It certainly is not socialism for the Government to plan a mere 500,000 living units over a period of 10 years when the need is so great and the shortage so acute. When we needed guns, tanks, planes, and ships during the war, the Government provided them and provided them hurriedly. We need decent, habitable living quarters for the lowest income group of our population today, and the Government should assist. Private enterprise is not interested, and venture capital is unwilling to provide houses for those most in need. It therefore seems indispensable for Government to implement and augment the inadequacies and deficiencies of private enterprise. This is not socialism. It is democracy in action—not a static democracy heedless of the less fortunate, but a live democracy that concerns itself with the welfare of its people. Socialism, communism, and delinquency are nourished in poverty and nurtured in squalor. Their seeds do not find root in wholesome, clean, and habitable living conditions.

In what way is it socialism to provide housing assistance to the lowest income group, but not socialism to assist others who are better able financially to provide themselves a home? In what way is it more socialistic to seek to assist those most in need of assistance than it is for the Government to guarantee repayment of loans to those who lend money with real estate as security?

The bill as passed by the Senate with the public housing provisions contained therein has been years in the making. It has been discussed and debated in the Houses of Congress, in the press, in periodicals, on the air, and in public forums. Extensive committee hearings have been held in all sections of the country. I sincerely regret that the Members of this House will not have the opportunity to vote on public housing as embraced in the Senate bill.

Senator TAFT, who perhaps knows as much about this subject as anyone, has said that there are 6,000,000 homes which are slum dwellings, in which children should not be reared. It is abundantly clear, both on the record of performance and from the testimony of witnesses before congressional committees, that private housing for our lowest income group cannot be provided by private industry with building costs, labor costs and material costs as high as they are at the present time, because they cannot earn a reasonable return on their investment and at the same time charge rentals which members of the lowest income group can afford to pay. Why is it proper for the United States Government to guarantee a mortgage loan on a private house, and fail to guarantee a reasonable return on private investment made to build low-cost housing?

In my own city of St. Louis, a recommendation which has the support of representative citizens of all groups and of all parties and of all classes has been made by the antislum commission of the city of St. Louis, that a bond issue be authorized in the amount of $16,000,000 which sum will be used to acquire slum property to raze it, and to turn over the land to private individuals for the construction of low-cost housing. The authorization of this bond issue will appear on the ballot at the next general election. Without congressional authorization for public housing, such projects as this cannot possibly succeed.

The members of the antislum commission of St. Louis in their report stated, with reference to the need for Federal aid:

> It does seem likely that the necessities of the case and the needs of the cities cry aloud for relief.

The individuals who prepared this report are not socialists, but industrialists, businessmen and labor leaders in my community. Their report virtually has the support of all enterprising civic groups in St. Louis. In my sincere belief it is indeed unfortunate that the courageous citizens who have undertaken such a project cannot obtain the support of Congress to overcome what is rapidly becoming our number one national problem—adequate housing for all groups and classes of the American people.

In the area of the city covered by this report of the antislum commission, it was found that 58 percent of the present structures have no baths, 25 percent have outside toilets, and 10 percent are without any running water.

Another gloomy picture appears in the St. Louis Veterans' Service Center. Since January 1, 1946, a total of 14,297 applications for homes for World War II veterans have been received. During that period only 8,847 units have been registered with that office. Typical listings of residential units appeared last month. Of 126 listings received last month, only 35 would accept children. One hundred nineteen of the 126 units were merely furnished rooms. Not a single listing in more than 5 months contained a private bath. The record shows that the housing director of the veterans' service center in St. Louis has been unable to provide one apartment or flat during 1948.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing figures impress me with the dire need of adequate legislation in the housing field. The only complete answer and solution to the problem would be the enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as passed by the Senate. Since the Members of the House will not have an opportunity to vote on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, it is with reluctance that I cast my vote in favor of the pending legislation before us. Since there is no alternative, I shall vote for this bill rather than nothing at all.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

HOUSING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill should be defeated for the reason the House has already passed a bill to extend title VI, which is in the Senate now and has been there for months; the House has already passed what is known as the Fanny May bill or the Federal National Mortgage Association. It is in the Senate right now. Any other part of this bill that is desirable could be put on by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has some very undesirable parts in it. Members who understand this bill will not vote for it unless they vote for something that I believe is against their convictions. I refer to the fact that in title IV of this bill the tax incentive for production of additional rental housing accommodations provides a tax bonus—I repeat, a tax bonus—to people to build rental houses, including hotels, penthouses, apartment hotels, any kind of a rental-housing unit. For that they will get a tax bonus. That will cause certain people to have an advantage. They can pay higher prices and get a tax bonus. It will increase the price of building materials. Do you want to increase the price of building materials? It will increase the price of housing in this country.

In addition to this skyrocketing of prices it has another great disadvantage. There is a petition on the Clerk's desk now with 167 names on it to bring out a certain bill—the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Up until a few years ago 145 names were sufficient on the theory that that when one-third of the Members of the House want a bill considered they should be given an opportunity to consider that bill. Notwithstanding that the Rules Committee tabled an application for a rule that was pending before it to consider that bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Congress appropriated $100,000 and set up a joint housing committee of the House and Senate, which committee went all over the country conducting hearings and spending that $100,000, the Committee on Banking and Currency heard testimony on housing since December 5, 1945, and presented a bill to the Rules Committee which it turned down flatly because we would not agree to take out certain things that we want in that bill which the testimony proved to us conclusively should be in the bill.

Now, we are asked to consider a bill here under a gag rule. It is not brought up in a way that you can get legislation. A few minutes ago we had the Commodity Credit Corporation Act up for consideration and the chairman of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, moved to take up the Senate bill, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the House Commodity Credit Corporation bill, all because he wanted action, he wanted to expedite it. Why does he not do that now? Why does he not take up the Senate bill S. 866, strike out all after the enacting clause and send this bill to conference where it can be ironed out? The absence of any action in that direction and the failure to do that is an indication to me that an effort is not being made to expedite this legislation. So, if you pass it like it is it will be an excuse as to why housing legislation cannot pass. So, the thing to do, Members of the House, is to kill this bill. It is not needed; it is objectionable. It is a millionaire's bonus bill, that is what it is. I repeat, it is a millionaire's bonus bill. It is a tax bonus to the rich to skyrocket prices. I hope you will vote against this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, as a proponent of the T-E-W bill, I would like to serve notice that we will continue unremittingly in our efforts to enact into law the so-called hotly disputed issues which, nevertheless, found favor with the majority of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. These are the titles on governmentally aided housing research, slum clearance, and urban redevelopment, federally assisted low-rent housing, and rural housing.

Veterans and other citizens regard the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill passed by the Senate, S. 866, as the key to whether or not Congress will authorize a comprehensive attack on the drastic housing shortage. The country will take our action on the bill before us now as being a refusal to make such a comprehensive attack. This may be unjustified, but it is the fact. The confidence of the people concerned with the need for housing would have been immediately established by passage of S. 866 in the House. This confidence would itself have done much to stimulate the broadest housing program for all classes of the population. The real difficulty is one of costs. Although there are likely to be over 900,000 home units built this year, both for rental and for sale, they are generally way out of reach in price of the veteran of modest income and of the ordinary citizen whom the housing shortage hurts the most. In fact, the gravest danger of this construction is that it will flood the market with high-priced housing and bring on a housing-market debacle interfering with all construction. The passage of S. 866 would have given us a balanced housing program and preserved an active and prosperous housing market for years, as indeed the economic conditions require that it should be preserved. There is little question that the House will pass the bill before us, but to those who have worked so long and so hard for the T-E-W bill I say that they are right, and the work must continue, as before long the whole Congress will see that what it has done is not enough and that a general housing program by the enactment of the omitted titles of the T-E-W bill is essential if we are to lick the housing shortage.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote "present" on this bill because I cannot and will not abandon the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield

compete with him unless a tariff com-

tariff matters, the Banking and Currency

Every major veterans' organization in

more than 40,000,000 people heard Presi-

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the final section of this bill. It would remove the present tariff on plywood for a period of 1 year. This section suddenly appeared on this housing legislation without notice or warning, without hearings, and from a committee which has no right to submit legislation on the subject of tariffs. Before any such legislation is reported to the House or enacted, the American plywood industry should have the right to state its case. It should have the right to show, as it easily can, that our plywood production increased 25 percent in 1948 and that 65 percent increase in production above the 1947 figure is anticipated in the year 1949; that there are 41 plywood plants in Oregon, Washington, and northern California, which number will be increased to 50 by the end of this year and will total 60 by the end of 1949. There will be ample American-produced plywood for American building needs. It would be a crime against a great American industry which employs thousands upon thousands of people, to break its financial back in this way without allowing fair and ordinary consideration of the facts involved. If this section is enacted into law such action in the haste of the closing hours of this session will be in direct violation of the fundamental principles of our legislative system.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Oregon who preceded me, I am opposed to the concluding section of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this housing bill (H. R. 6955) contains in its last provision—section 803—a proposal for the removal of all tariffs on plywood for 1 year.

The present tariff on fir plywood is 40 percent ad valorem. Section 803 of this bill proposes to remove this tariff entirely for the next year.

Not a minute of hearing has been given to the plywood industry upon how this proposal would affect this industry or its tens of thousands of employees.

To rush this tariff-removal proposal through without an opportunity for any member of a great industry to be heard is not right, not just, and not fair.

What will the effect of this removal of the tariff on Canadian and Mexican plywood be? Some of the makers of plywood in my district tell me the result well may be that they will have to close their plants. They cannot compete, without a tariff, against the cheaper wages and cheaper costs of Canadian and Mexican plywood manufacturers.

In Canada the average wage in the plywood industry is 92½ cents an hour. In our plywood mills of Oregon and Washington the average wage is $1.62 an hour, or 65 percent higher than in Canada.

The cost of logs in Canada also is about 65 percent cheaper than in the United States.

How can an American manufacturer of plywood paying a 65-percent higher wage than a Canadian manufacturer compete with him unless a tariff compensates for the differences of wages in this country and abroad? He cannot.

The American plywood manufacturer has been doing a good job in increasing production to meet increased building needs. No industry has done a better one.

In 1947 the weekly production of plywood in the two States of Oregon and Washington was 29,000,000 square feet a week.

At the present time the weekly production is averaging 36,000,000 square feet weekly or an increase of almost 25 percent above last year.

It is now estimated that by the end of this year the output will be 40,000,000 square feet weekly and by 1949 will be 44,000,000 square feet weekly.

At the present time nine new plywood plants are under construction in the two States of Oregon and Washington. Five of them are expected to be finished and in operation by the end of this year and the four others are scheduled to go into operation next year.

If we remove this plywood tariff will the men who are pouring new capital into building new plants go ahead with these new projects? I doubt it. If we enact here a law that says to American plywood manufacturers that the Congress is going to compel Americans who pay wages of $1.62 an hour, wages to compete with Canadian producers where the wages are only 92½ cents an hour, and with Mexican producers where wages are much less than in Canada, we are going to put a brake on the risk capital going into plywood factories. In the long run that will do more harm to housing than it will do good.

Section 803 of this bill proposes to open our doors to the free import of Canadian plywood. But Canada at the same time has an embargo on logs. Our plywood manufacturers cannot get a single log out of Canada, even if they want to. They cannot ship those logs out of Canada even if they own timber in Canada. Canada will not permit them to ship these logs over the border into the United States. If Americans who own timber in Canada want to cut that timber into plywood, they have to go up to Canada and build their plywood mills in Canada.

The great unfairness in this whole proposal is that the plywood industry, which would be disastrously affected by this free-trade policy, has not been given a single minute of time before any committee of Congress to tell its side of the story. We are denying this industry its traditional right to its day in court.

Sometime ago, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] introduced a bill into Congress proposing to do just what section 803 of this housing bill proposes to do. It was very properly referred to the Ways and Means Committee, which handles tariff-making matters. I talked to five or six members of the Ways and Means Committee. They all assured me that before any action was taken on the Grant bill that the plywood industry would be given an opportunity for a hearing.

That was fair.

But, now a new committee, a committee which never heretofore has handled tariff matters, the Banking and Currency Committee, steps into the picture. This committee, without giving Members of Congress or members of the affected industry a chance to be heard or to tell its side of the story, presents this section 803 which may wreak great damage to an industry that employs tens of thousands of workers. That is not fair to this industry. It is not in keeping with the American tradition of fair play.

Before any great and far-reaching reform to our tariff system is made, the industry or industries affected ought to have a chance to be heard. They ought to get their day in court.

Furthermore, if Canadian plywood is to be admitted duty free into the United States we at least ought to insist that Canada remove the embargo against Canadian logs being permitted to cross the border into the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD].

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I am likewise opposed to this provision of the bill which would remove all import restrictions on plywood. There is no person in this House more anxious than I am to see the housing situation alleviated but certainly by taking the restrictions off of only one of the hundreds of items which go into building a house, we are not going to accomplish that purpose. If this House were considering removal of restrictions on all building materials in short supply, that would be, indeed, a totally different story, but here we are acting on only one small segment of the building material industry. As such it is objectionable to me. I realize that under the status of this bill that it cannot be here amended but I earnestly request the conferees to consider these objections during the conference meetings and to there remove this particular clause.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill as it is the only vehicle which we have to do anything about housing in this Congress I am one of those that had hoped we would have had a chance to consider some of the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill that provide for slum clearance, subsidized housing, and so forth. I do not know whether these provisions are sound or not, as I have not had the opportunity to study them. But I would have welcomed the opportunity of listening to a debate on these provisions by the members of the committee who listened to the evidence.

However, this bill and others do provide some very substantial benefits that will aid veterans and will, I believe, stimulate the building of houses. It is very significant that in 1946 when the Government was building houses we only had 437,800 houses built. But in 1947 when private enterprise got into full swing we completed 835,100 houses and the trend for the first 5 months of 1948 indicates that we will exceed that total.

Of course, the most sound system is one where each person needing a house is able to buy it and not rely on the

Government to furnish him a house. Those of us who have gotten our homes in that way realize the satisfaction of buying and owning our own home, no matter how small it may be. We are hoping that especially those who served us during the war and who made us secure through their sacrifices may be able to get help from the provisions of this act and obtain a start on a home of their own.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to protest the high-handed action of the leadership of this House in bringing about the defeat of the comprehensive Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

The sell-out to the real-estate and building lobbies that have swarmed over this Hill for the past 2 years, is complete—public housing for the benefit of veterans and civilians in the low-income groups is gone—slum clearance to rid this country of the slums that are a stench in the nostrils of every American, has been put aside.

I am voting against this so-called housing bill as a protest against the betrayal of the veterans of this country who have waited in vain for 3 years for Congress to act on housing. They will have to go on waiting due to the action of the House this day.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who favored the T-E-W bill, I shall vote for the passage of the Wolcott bill with the hope that it may go to the Senate and that through that method it may reach a conference committee. There are numerous features in the bill which do not meet with my approval, but unless it is passed by the House there will be no opportunity for action at this session.

THE SUPPOSAT FOR THE BILL

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the House had reason to believe that it would have an opportunity to vote on the comprehensive Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Instead we are confronted by the Republican leadership with a bill which makes a mockery of our efforts to enact a housing program.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has behind it the united support of hundreds of national and local public interest groups, veterans' organizations, and labor unions whose combined memberships total tens of millions of American citizens. Let us start with the veterans of World War II, who perhaps more than any other segment of our population have felt the pinch of insufficient housing. We in Congress have made all sorts of extravagant promises to these veterans. But have we enacted any legislation to aid the veteran who does not earn enough to buy the $12,000 and $13,000 houses that private enterprise is building today, or the veteran whose income is too small for the pitifully small amount of rental housing on today's market?

Every major veterans' organization in the country sees in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill the promise of decent homes. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans Committee, the Jewish War Veterans, American Veterans of World War II, Catholic War Veterans, and Disabled American Veterans endorse and vigorously support this measure. The American Legion approves the public housing provisions of the bill. Just last March more than 1,300 delegates representing these and several other national organizations met in this city. Many of you were visited by veteran delegates whose only objective was to secure passage of the bill that would mean decent homes at prices they could afford. This is surely an objective no Member of Congress can afford to ignore.

The National Conference of Catholic Charities has been in the vanguard of the fight for better housing. The Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady, secretary of the conference, has consistently taken issue with those who brand all advocates of public housing as Communists or Socialists. He points out that—

> Those of us who are committed to private enterprise would like to see private capital provide housing for all the people, but so far as I am aware, private capital has never presented a feasible plan for reaching this objective.

People from all over the country have gone on record in support of public housing. Leading professional and occupational organizations have taken a positive stand in favor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Among these are the United States Conference of Mayors, the National Institute of Law Officers, the American Institute of Architects, and the American Municipal Association. Mayor George W. Welsh, Grand Rapids, Mich., president of the Conference of Mayors, made this splendid endorsement of the federally aided public-housing program:

> The improvement in health, happiness, and good citizenship of the families rehoused has been dramatic. Public housing has served families of low income and has not competed with private homebuilding. But much remains to be done and all of us must dedicate ourselves to the task of seeing to it that this great program is continued.

Time will not permit me to list the hundreds of organizations which have gone on record in favor of public housing. However, you all recognize these groups: The National League of Women Voters, the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Council of Jewish Women, and the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Such organizations as the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the National Federation of Postal Clerks, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, the American Association of Social Workers, the American Public Health Association, and the Family Service Association of America, all support the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

What other segments of America endorse the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill? Last month the National Conference of Family Life met here in Washington. Nine hundred delegates from 125 national organizations, whose membership totals more than 40,000,000 people, heard President Truman say that the housing shortage is the most pressing problem for American families. Calling for passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, the President said that the problem was a vital one that prevented millions of veterans from finding homes for themselves, their wives, and children.

At this same conference, Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, said:

> In my opinion one of the great disruptive factors in American family life is our lack of decent housing. Slums are the curse of our society. No one of our big cities is without them, but they are not confined to metropolitan areas. * * * They are the national disgrace of the most gifted, richest, and most powerful nation on earth. They are festering sores in our social structure.

Certainly none of us can deny that Eric Johnston is representative of private enterprise. However, he recognizes that on the issue of decent homes, private and public enterprise must join forces. He advocated a course of action that is implemented by the T-E-W bill, when he further said:

> I would like to see industry move in on the housing front in a forceful, determined way. There is no doubt in my mind that if the industrial leaders of this country wished to do so they could bring about, in cooperation with the widely used organizing power of the state, a housing program which would meet our needs and stimulate private construction at one and the same time.

The housing committee of the National Conference on Family Life concluded its sessions with a ringing endorsement of the T-E-W bill.

Less than a month later, in a letter to my distinguished colleague from New York, Representative JACOB JAVITS, Mr. Eric Johnston again took the occasion to urge passage of the T-E-W bill which has been called socialistic and the forerunner of communism by these myopic leaders of the opposition forces. Mr. Johnston said:

> If there ever was a "must" bill, this is it. It has been a "must" bill for a long time. It is a "must" bill today. It should be taken up and passed by the House with all possible expedition. It would be a tragedy, in my judgment, if this bill were to be sidetracked or defeated at this session. This bill fills a need which must be met in the interest of all the people of America.

There are other open-minded supporters of a free-enterprise system who stoutly defend federally aided public housing.

Last year, Jerome M. Ney, chairman of the board of the American Retail Federation, testified before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I have the honor of membership on this important committee. Mr. Ney himself operates several retail stores, the principal one being the Boston Store Dry Goods Co., of Fort Smith, Ark. No one could be more typical of private enterprise than this merchant. This is what Mr. Ney said about the T-E-W bill:

> Let's put good sense ahead of emotion. A substantial portion of the Nation's families at the bottom of the income pyramid simply cannot afford adequate housing. We agree with Senator TAFT that subsidized public housing, at least for a time, is the only sensible answer to this problem.

Mr. Ney is another one of those enlightened American businessmen who scoff at the socialism label tied to public housing by those who rant the loudest and say the least. He declared that:

We cannot agree that this type of public housing contains the threat of socialism in the housing industry. On the contrary, we believe that the greatest threat to private enterprise in housing is the failure to meet the housing problem head-on.

This intelligent American went on to say:

I can think of no other sphere in which there is a greater need for the advocates of private enterprise to display enlightened self-interest and the qualities of initiative, imagination, daring, and energy which have made our Nation great. I can think of no other area where blind emotion and unenlightened selfishness can cause private enterprise to fail more miserably and more quickly than in housing.

Permit me to pursue this vein a bit further. I am proud that among the realtors of America there are some wise men who regard the T-E-W bill as the answer to the Nation's housing shortage. Mr. William Reinhart, of Philadelphia, berates the lobbyists who would condemn our low-income citizens to shack homes. Mr. Reinhart boasts of the fact that he has been a Philadelphia realtor for more than 40 years. He has been a director of one of the largest Federal savings and loan associations in Philadelphia and is chairman of that city's housing authority.

Perhaps there are some fellow realtors who regard Mr. Reinhart as a traitor to their business. What does Mr. Reinhart think of the T-E-W bill? In writing to Members of Congress last week, he said:

I wish to say to you that I believe that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill provides the best method of meeting our present housing shortage.

To illustrate just how absurd are the lobby's charges that public housing lacks the support of private enterprise, let me tell you what an executive of one of the Nation's largest insurance companies said last year. George S. Van Schaik, executive vice president and head of the mortgage loan department, New York Life Insurance Co., declared:

If and when certain segments of the population are in an income group where they cannot pay an economic rent for safe and decent shelter, then there should be provided adequate standard housing so subsidized as to bring it within the grasp of those who qualify for it.

Substantial public support for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill comes from community leaders throughout the country. These are the people who have an intimate knowledge of and a sympathetic understanding of the human problems caused by poor housing. These are the priests, the pastors, the rabbis, the social workers, the doctors, the lawyers, and other local and national figures who have waged an unceasing fight for better housing.

Last year more than 100 New York organizations joined forces in behalf of the T-E-W bill. For these people, decent housing for low-income families is not socialism or communism or an infringement of the rights of private enterprise. Three vice presidents of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Committee of New York were Rt. Rev. Charles E. Gilbert, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York; the Very Reverend Msgr. E. Roberts Moore, archdiocesan representative of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York, and the Reverend Dr. David De Sola Pool, representative of the Synagogue Council and the New York Board of Rabbis.

It seems obvious to me that even the most obstinate of my colleagues must realize by now that support for public housing comes from so large a segment of our population that we can no longer afford to ignore its opinions.

In contrast to this overwhelming support, the opposition to public housing comes principally from four or five national organizations representing the real-estate interests, the property owners, the home and apartment house builders, and their various affiliates throughout the country. These are the people who say to the Government, "Leave us alone, and we'll build all the houses the country needs." But, alas, they cannot build for the great mass of veterans, or for the store clerk or the factory worker and still show a profit. The so-called spokesmen for the opposition maintain that they have the best interests of the Nation at heart. Yet one well known lobbyist for the real-estate interests, Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, had the brazen effrontery to write the following in his official journal, Headlines, for June 9, 1947:

Today the great threat to democratic institutions, to the republican form of government, and ultimately to freedom itself lies in our big cities. They are populated for the most part with the mass-man, devoid of intelligence, devoid of civic responsibility.

Does Mr. Nelson believe that those Members of Congress who conscientiously represent millions of Americans in urban areas will applaud the following conclusion:

Our one hope of survival as a free country is that rural and semirural areas still dominate most of the State legislatures through their representatives and still dominate the House of Representatives in Washington. Our best hope for the future is to keep it that way.

As a corollary to these devious arguments, these opponents of public housing have seized upon a convenient shibboleth. Anybody who believes that the Federal Government should be concerned with decent housing for low-income families is immediately labeled a Communist and/or a Socialist. Mr. Nelson himself last year tagged Senator ROBERT TAFT, one of the bill's three sponsors, as a follower of the Communist Party line. He later apologized publicly to the Senator, but still continued to smear other supporters of decent housing who openly fight for their beliefs.

Public housing has recently been labeled, "The key to socialism." But public housing is not the key to socialism or communism or any other alien ism. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, with its various aids to private enterprise, will open the door to a new and better life for the thousands of our fellow citizens now living in slums and broken-down tenements. The T-E-W bill means decent homes for our veterans who are getting tired of empty promises and who find little comfort in the advertisements featuring twelve- and thirteen-thousand-dollar homes for "GI's only." We cannot continue to shut our ears to the pleas for decent homes for America's low-income families. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is the answer to these pleas. After all, do we represent only the real-estate interests, the property owners, the home and apartment builders, or do we represent all of America, including the ill-housed?

THE REPUBLICANS HAVE FAILED TO SOLVE THE HOUSING PROBLEM

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress has failed to solve the Nation's No. 1 social problem—the need of 15,000,000 families for 15,000,000 houses in which to live. Among these 15,000,000 families are many veterans who fought to preserve our Nation in World War II. During the war, we promised them a new and shining world, awaiting their return. We promised them jobs, cars, homes, furnishings, and all the comforts of a high standard of living.

That was when Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini threatened the national life of our Democracy. The veterans did the job we asked them to do. They defeated the dictators. Our American way of life was saved. The veterans sacrificed years of their lives, suffered a million casualties and over 300,000 lost their lives.

They have been home 3 years. What have we done to make good on our promises? The record is shameful. We have welched on our promises. We as a Nation have lied to them and let them down. Congress protected the people from inflation during the war by price control and rationing. It was not pleasant, but it was fairly successful. Its success can be measured now, by the inflation disaster which has occurred since OPA was killed.

Since June 1946, the last month of OPA, the cost of food has increased 42.8 percent. The over-all cost of living has increased more than 27 percent.

The cost of building supplies has skyrocketed and the new homes we promised the veterans have become so expensive they cannot buy them. A six-room house that sold in 1940 for five or six thousand dollars is now priced at twelve to fourteen thousand dollars. The ordinary wage-earning veteran cannot buy and pay for a home on today's inflated price level.

Why has this situation developed?

First, because Congress killed price control in June 1946 and took the brakes off of inflation. Congress listened to the propaganda of the profit hogs, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the real-estate lobby.

Second, Congress has consistently failed to pass housing legislation to solve the housing problem. While Congress has placed the credit of the Government behind the real-estate and builders' lobby to build high-priced homes, they have failed to encourage slum clearance, public housing for the lowest income group, and the building of medium-priced homes on a basis which the average wage earner could buy and pay for. This great class of veterans and nonveterans are completely priced out of the market.

It is common knowledge that over 40,000,000 taxpayers earn less than $3,000 per year. I submit to you a fact which is acknowledged by any intelligent person, these people cannot buy and pay for $12,000 to $15,000 homes out of this modest yearly wage. After income-tax deductions and the expense of today's inflated food, clothing and other commodity prices, people in the $3,000 per year or less income bracket cannot make the large monthly payments necessary to carry such a debt burden.

We are faced then with a situation which forces millions of fine American citizens to "double up" in crowded, substandard dwellings. The social impact of this housing deficiency contributes to divorce, sickness, crime, and juvenile delinquency.

Society has to pay the cost either way. Why not then try the preventative way?

Federal assistance in slum clearance, and low-income bracket rentals of decent modern homes in clean and healthy surroundings, will in my opinion, pay for itself in the reduction of our present crime and charity costs. Although the cry of "socialism" has been raised by the real-estate and builders' lobby, whose only thought is the perpetuation of their present guaranteed profit set-up under title 6 of the FHA, we are not deceived by this ancient "red herring."

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, against which they protest so loudly and bitterly, a bill which calls for slum clearance and Federal aid in low-income rental construction, is no more socialistic than title VI. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has been endorsed by the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS, the Catholic and Protestant church groups, and all the great American labor unions. It bears the name of the most conservative Republican candidate for the Presidency, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT.

The real-estate and builders' lobby are strong for a $2,000,000,000 guaranty of mortgages under title VI, FHA. Let us analyze this extension of Federal credit for the benefit of a private business group. What does it do?

First, the Government guarantees the builder 90 percent insurance on his mortgages. In other words, the builder is guaranteed that he will receive 90 percent of his capital back from any house he builds. It removes the risk from his business by protecting his capital investment, with taxpayers' funds. It also guarantees him a profit and interest on his profit equity, by protecting the banks in the discount of mortgage paper.

And yet, there are the people—the real-estate and builders' groups—who yell "socialism" when the Government proposes aid for the low-income people.

They are perfectly willing for the Government to use tax funds to fill their pockets with inflated building profits, but they scream "socialism" when people who cannot afford their high-priced houses have an opportunity for release from the shacks and tenement slums.

As far as I am concerned, my position is clear. I intend to do all in my power to provide decent homes for the people of my district and the Nation. Charity begins at home, and the need of an American family for a decent home in which to rear their family transcends the selfish desires of hypocrites who benefit by Federal mortgage guaranties in their private business. These people remind me of the dog in the manger—while they are enjoying the profits guaranteed by Federal credit, they wish to deny the unfortunate people who cannot afford to pay their inflated profit prices the right to live in decent homes erected by the Federal credit aid.

I shall support the efforts of free enterprise to fill the need for additional houses, but when free enterprise refuses or cannot profitably meet society's need, then and then only, I shall discharge what I conceive to be Federal responsibility for the welfare of the common people, who do the work and fight the wars of our Nation.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am disgusted with the action of this Congress on many things, but I am particularly disgusted with the manner in which it is proceeding to consider the housing bill. The tactics leading up to the consideration of the bill before us are not the tactics of a representative form of government. They are the tactics of special privilege. They are clearly the tactics of the real-estate lobby.

During the final days of the first session of the Eightieth Congress an appropriation of $100,000 was made for the Joint Housing Committee to study the problem of housing. This committee toured the country from one end to the other and submitted a report recommending legislation to meet this critical problem. The other body a few weeks ago passed legislation known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, which embodied most of the recommendations of the committee that investigated housing. The measure then went to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House. Extensive hearings were held, but no new testimony was developed. Finally the committee was forced to report a bill to the House similar to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, and many of us hoped we would see the enactment of a comprehensive housing program. Our hopes were short-lived, because the Committee on Rules declined to permit the matter to come before the House. Instead of a comprehensive program of housing, we are today offered a weak substitute—something the real-estate lobby will permit the House to consider. Housing legislation in this Congress must first be cleared through the real-estate lobby before the elected representatives of the people have a chance to vote on it. This bill has the approval of the real-estate lobby. That is the only reason it was permitted to come before the House. It is good for the lobby. It will make the lobby stronger. It will make the lobby richer, but it is not going to provide the thousands of homes and rental units we need so badly at prices people can afford to pay. It is not going to help metropolitan centers like St. Louis wrestling with the problem of slums. The cities of America are eager and willing to assume their share of the obligation in clearing blighted areas, but they cannot do it alone. In my own city a large bond issue has recently been suggested as a means for eliminating some of the blighted areas. This will give St. Louis an excellent start, but still desperately needed is a program of low-cost public housing to provide houses for those whose homes in the present tenements will give way for this new development. Private industry can and perhaps will meet the bulk of our housing needs, but it is not interested in trying to help the millions whose incomes are so low they are unable to afford standard new housing or standard rental units.

Also desperately needed is a program of housing that will provide for the thousands of veterans and others with homes and rental units at prices they can afford to pay. Practically every house of rental units being built today is in the high-price brackets. We need low-cost housing—and when I say "low cost" I mean just that—not 10- and 15-thousand-dollar homes.

The Republican housing bill before us is going to be just about as effective in solving our housing problems as the Republican anti-inflation bill was in solving the problem of inflation. As many of you will remember, 6 months ago we passed a law against inflation. It is Public Law 395, which many call the "HTGB" law. That stands for "hope things get better." We have all been hoping very vigorously for the past 6 months, but we have not been able to hope down the cost of living one cent. Instead of improving, inflation is worse and prices are higher.

The housing bill before us today is in theory similar to the anti-inflation law. It is little more than a hope that the housing problem will be solved. We are going to "hope up" houses and "hope down" the cost of living. It is important that we hope the right way on the right thing and do not become confused. It would be a sorry day if we should start to "hope down" houses and "hope up" prices. The anti-inflation law and the housing bill we are considering today are the tweedledum and tweedledee of the Eightieth Congress. They are both fakes.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I shall support H. R. 6959, a bill to amend the National Housing Act, because I sincerely believe some housing legislation is better than none at all.

Although H. R. 6959 does not include the public housing provisions which I favor at this time, it does possess many meritorious features for the veterans, who are in need of rental housing.

I shall, of course, continue to favor and press for the enactment of the public-housing section embodied in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The public-housing section of the T-E-W which has been urged by Pennsylvania's able Governor James Duff, the mayor of the city of Philadelphia, Bernard Samuels, and

practically every veteran and civic organization in the country. Again, Mr. Speaker, I will support this legislation and hope that we may be able to take positive action toward the T-E-W before this Congress adjourns.

NEED FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the democratic free enterprise system is the greatest political and economic institution ever devised by man. It has given us under justice the highest standard of living in the world. Through an unparalleled productive process the cost of goods has been brought within the means of an ever greater number of people. No one would contend, however, that ours is a perfect economy. Housing is one part in which there has been a conspicuous lack of success. Instead of bringing good housing to a greater number of families we find today that the gap between the cost of decent housing and the ability of families to pay is greater than ever. Senator FLANDERS of Vermont in his report for the Joint Committee on Housing said:

We, the American people, have long been unable to supply our own housing needs. For half a century the housing industry has barely provided enough new homes to accommodate our population increase. It has failed to replace depreciation and protect our capital investment in housing.

Today, our economy is operating at a high level. Admittedly, as a Nation we are in prosperous times, despite the fact that much of the gain has been wiped out by sharp price increases. The average family income in urban places is in excess of $3,000—and yet, according to the Census Bureau, there are more than 5,000,000 urban families with incomes below $2,000 and 3,000,000 with incomes less than $1,500.

What does an income of $1,500 or even $2,000 mean today? In a study by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, it was shown that in June 1947 it took an average 4-person urban family $3,240 per year to maintain itself at a minimum adequate standard of living. This ranged from a high of $3,458 in Washington, D. C., to a low of $3,000 in New Orleans. These figures will be even higher in view of the price increases which have occurred since last June.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of what appears to be plenty, we have millions of people—including many, many veterans who fought for better—living in shacks and slums which are a disgrace to the American way of life. These human beings, Mr. Speaker, are living in places—no one could call them houses or homes—in which it would be unlawful in most States to keep farm animals. Of course, the reason for the enactment of State laws for the protection of farm animals is clear. Kept in filthy surroundings, the animals which give us meat and milk would contaminate and destroy us.

But what about human beings? Are we as much concerned about the way the slums contaminate our cities? I say to you—if we do not destroy our slums, they will destroy us. Oh, I know some of you are thinking that if we would only pass sanitary housing laws in our States and cities similar to those we have for animals, that the problem would be met. There is a very important difference, however. Every bottle of milk, every pound of meat we buy, has included in the price an amount sufficient to keep the animals under sanitary conditions. The cost of cleanliness for farm animals is borne by all the people.

We do now, in many cities, have laws to protect housing. There is only one trouble. They cannot be enforced to any great extent. If they were, the cost of housing to the people who live in the slums would be so great that it would rob them of necessary food, clothing, and medical care. I know that some of you are probably thinking of the much publicized Baltimore plan—a plan which has been misrepresented by the real-estate lobby as being the solution to the slum problem. Listen to this editorial from the Baltimore Sun:

Baltimore's housing-law-enforcement drive is an excellent one and deserves wide recognition. The city can blush with fitting pride at the publicity given its efforts by the home builders. But no one should assume that Baltimore is doing anything more than making a few dilapidated buildings a little more inhabitable. Housing-law enforcement is not slum clearance, and nothing will make it so.

The solicitor of the city of Pittsburgh testified before the Joint Senate-House Committee on Housing:

In the city of Pittsburgh during the last couple of years we had committee upon committee from the hill district come to us and say health conditions were so intolerable—the plumbing, the ordinary, decent facilities were such it was unsafe to live there. They have asked the city to force the landlords to keep these properties in condition so they can live there. The result of a 2-year effort in that direction—and I think it bears on the basic problem you are considering—all the landlords who have property in the slum area are just milking those properties of all they can get and are not putting any money into repairs. These properties are so old that rehabilitation is impossible, and none of these private industries, who have milked the property and put nothing back in it, have made any effort to solve the problem.

We have a problem of human beings who have nowhere to sleep. When a building gets into such condition that there is fear of killing the people in the building and killing the passersby in the street, we condemn the building and tear it down, but in any way where our inspectors find they can still stay another month, another 2 months, we cannot be so soulless as to forget the needs of our people and put them out on the street, just to penalize the landlord. We would be glad to padlock the houses and penalize the landlord, but we cannot penalize our citizens.

We can enforce our sanitary laws for farm animals, because we, all the people—not the animals—pay for their decent surroundings. As I have already pointed out, the people living in the slums cannot afford to keep themselves in absolute minimum food, clothing, and medical care—let alone pay any more for housing.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, as proven to us over and over again by city officials, health and law enforcement officers, judges, welfare workers, and the clergy, the danger to our society of contamination from the slums is even greater than that from tubercular cattle.

The slum is the breeding place of physical and social disaster. How can children be brought up in the slums to their full potentialities as American citizens?

The children first encounter the cops when they are playing in the streets and get chased, or when they are having a ball game in a narrow alley and a home run crashes through a window. To them, the law means torment and oppression—not justice and protection.

The children never have a chance of growing up in their homes. Their lives are ones of constant escape from the mean surroundings. Where do they turn? The dreary beer joints, the dingy poolrooms and dance halls. Yes; and the houses of prostitution. These are their places of escape.

I could go on and on, with volumes of unquestioned testimony, as to the direct relationship of the slums to health, to juvenile delinquency, to infant mortality, to crime, to mental disorders—testimony given in city after city and by county officers in rural areas. But why must I do this? There cannot be a single Member of this body who does not know these plain facts. The only question, as I see it, is whether we will do something—or nothing.

What we must do is clear. We must rid the Nation of its slums and see that ultimately every American family lives in a dwelling which he can, in decency and dignity, call a home. I freely admit that we cannot do this all at once. It will take years to accomplish. The 500,000 public-housing units provided in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill together with what we have already accomplished, is a good start.

I do not see how in common decency and humanity we can pass any bill without the slum-clearance and public-housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Seven congressional committees over the Seventy-eighth, the Seventy-ninth, and Eightieth Congresses have come to the same conclusion. Twice the Senate has enacted slum-clearance and public-housing legislation. Mr. Speaker, we are a Congress dedicated to the welfare of all the people—and we must act in the interest of all the people. With all the earnestness I have, from the bottom of my heart I ask this body to set us on the road toward a good America—an America with homes fit for Americans.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the housing situation is one of our most vexing problems, I regret that the housing legislation we are now considering is woefully inadequate as a means in remedying present conditions.

For the past several years, family life in America has been shadowed by the lack of suitable living quarters for millions of our citizens. This fact has been continually called to our attention by the newspapers of the Nation, even though it has been common knowledge to all of us.

I have made frequent inquiries during the Eightieth Congress in an effort to obtain information as to when we would have the opportunity to consider housing legislation. Each time I made such an inquiry I was assured we would get a housing bill that would satisfy the needs of the American people.

The Senate considered and passed its version of housing legislation. Yet, the dying days of the Eightieth Congress were upon us and still the House had no opportunity to consider this pressing problem of the shortage of housing facilities.

These delaying tactics, although they may have been sincere, aroused many of us to the realization that delay meant disaster; and to avoid the spectacle of the Eightieth Congress failing to present a solution to the housing problem, I joined many other Members of the House in signing the discharge petition placed in circulation for the purpose of making certain that we would take action on the Nation's housing problem before adjournment.

Today we are being asked to consider a housing bill, which, while it contains some necessary provisions, is far from satisfactory. This bill does not go far enough in seeking a solution to the housing problem.

I am sure there are many of you who are as disappointed as I am in being denied the opportunity to discuss and amend the present bill. Instead of liberalizing its provisions, we have been given but one choice—either to vote for or against the bill. We have no other alternative, despite the fact that we know deep in our hearts that this bill will not accomplish the objectives of a real housing bill. It is simply a question of casting a negative vote and be accused of being against some of the necessary and desirable features in the bill, or voting for the bill and realizing that we are calling a job finished that is only half done.

Under the circumstances, like many of you, I have no choice but to vote for this bill; but in so doing, I assure you it is a vote cast with great reluctance. It was my fervent hope the past several months that we could perfect a real housing bill that would convey to the average American citizen that we meant business in our efforts to cope with the housing situation.

While we try to point with pride to the activity in the building industry and quote figures on the number of housing units being made ready for occupancy, families continue to live doubled up simply because the average citizen cannot afford to pay housing prices, since they are far beyond his means.

Thousands of veterans are camping out or living in trailers because they have not the income to permit them to raise their families in a typical American frame house.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat my assertion that I am voting for this bill with marked reluctance. It is said "a half loaf is better than none," but this is not true with respect to providing a solution to America's most critical problem—the housing situation.

It is too great a problem to attack with halfway measures, and I regret that we can be charged with short-sightedness in trying to solve the housing shortage in a half-hearted manner.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I regret that under suspensions of the rules Members of the House are precluded from offering amendments to this phony housing bill. If we were operating in a democratic manner this afternoon I would offer an amendment to change the title of this monstrosity to read "The Pent Housing Act of 1948."

We have before us today a choice between two housing bills—H. R. 6959, and S. 866, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Normally, of course, we would have expected a Senate-passed bill to be reported out with such amendments as the committee felt desirable. However, on an analysis of the provisions of H. R. 6959 I can well understand why it was not deemed appropriate to report these provisions out as an amendment to S. 866. For it certainly would be a travesty to consider the provisions of H. R. 6959 as an amendment of the provisions of S. 866. In fact, it would be a travesty to consider it as a housing bill at all.

In analyzing the provisions of H. R. 6959, I think that the approach that would be most helpful and significant would be from the point of view of who would be helped by it. Or to put it more succinctly—who counts under its provisions.

Obviously, under H. R. 6959, it is not the farmer who counts. For the bill provides absolutely no aids whatsoever to meet the farm housing needs of our rural population. Not only are the modest provisions in S. 866 completely omitted but there is no attempt whatsoever to provide even the semblance of an alternative program.

Obviously, also, our low-income families do not count. As in the case of the farmer, H. R. 6959 makes this crystal clear not so much by the fact that the S. 866 provisions were omitted as by the fact that H. R. 6959 does not bother to include provisions of any nature whatsoever for the relief of our families and their children who through no fault of their own are now consigned to living in slums.

Obviously, also, under H. R. 6959 our moderate-income families do not count either. While the bill does condescend to include the yield insurance program, it does not contain, except in a drastically modified and aborted form—and even then only on a 9-month basis—the necessary programs to extend FHA mortgage insurance to meet the needs of families of moderate income—and this is true both in connection with home ownership and rental housing. Likewise, H. R. 6959 completely and cavalierly ignores the necessary long-range research programs contained in S. 866 which are effectively designed to help reduce construction costs and so help bring home ownership and rental housing costs within the reach of the pocketbook of our middle-income families.

It is further clear, Mr. Speaker, that H. R. 6959 is wedded to the premise that our local communities do not count. Certainly, no one would deny that one of the most serious threats to both the social and economic welfare of our communities today, large and small alike, is presented by the extensive slum conditions and blight that our communities have found themselves completely unable to cope with. Again, H. R. 6959, in distinct and disheartening contrast with S. 866, contains absolutely no provision to give our cities and towns the aids they need in this connection.

And if it is any solace to our farmers, and our low-income families, and our moderate-income families, and our communities, if they do not count under H. R. 6959, neither does the veteran. It is very interesting to note in this connection that the very first two titles of H. R. 6959, as does also its title VI, contain provisions purporting to give special preferences to veterans that are not contained in S. 866.

But what kind of help is it to the millions of our veterans who need housing aid to provide, as does title I of H. R. 6959, for an occupancy preference in connection with any additional dwelling accommodations that may happen to be provided by remodeling of dwellings with FHA title I loan insurance?

What kind of aid is it to our veterans to provide—as does title II of H. R. 6959—for first preference to veterans in the disposition of permanent war housing when such preference has been in operation by administrative action since last August? What kind of aid is it to the veteran to authorize FHA to use its title VI program to insure mortgage loans on veterans' cooperative projects up to 95 percent of long-term value, when nonveterans can get a loan of 90 percent of necessary current costs?

Clearly these provisions in H. R. 6959 pay only lip service to the needs of our veterans. Yet, in return for these paltry aids, H. R. 6959 would deprive the low-income veteran who, under S. 866 would have first preference to the low-rent housing provided by that bill, of all hope for decent housing. Likewise, H. R. 6959, in return for its paltry aids, would deprive the veteran, who would get preferential treatment under the farm-housing title of S. 866, to give up his hopes for obtaining decent housing.

Even so, Mr. Speaker, the real tip-off as to how definitely the veteran does not count under H. R. 6959 is not its paltry and shabby provisions supposedly in aid of the veteran. The fact is that the necessary effect of the provisions of H. R. 6959 would be to deprive the veteran even of those aids he now has under existing law. I say this because H. R. 6959 while providing a secondary market program for FHA-insured loans, specifically refuses to provide such a program for GI first-mortgage home loans. I say this because, while H. R. 6959 authorizes an increase in interest rate on FHA-insured loans if required by the mortgage market, specifically refuses to authorize such an increase in connection with GI home loans.

Mr. Speaker, if a secondary market is necessary in connection with the FHA program where the Government insures 100 percent of principal, why is it not necessary in connection with GI home loans where the Government guarantees

only 50 percent? If an increase is necessary in connection with the interest rate on FHA-insured mortgages, why is not an interest-rate increase equally necessary on GI home-loan mortgages? And let me ask this very pertinent question that surely did not escape the sponsors of H. R. 6959. What financing institutions will, if H. R. 6959 is enacted, care to make a GI loan when it has no secondary market protection and has to be made at a 4-percent-interest rate when they will be able under H. R. 6959 to make loans under the FHA program with secondary market protection and at an interest rate 25 percent above what it can get on the GI loan? There can be only one conclusion drawn from the provisions of H. R. 6959—that they represent a deliberate attempt to sabotage the GI home-loan program.

So then, Mr. Speaker, under H. R. 6959 the farmer does not count, the low-income family does not count, the moderate-income family does not count, the local community does not count, and the veteran does not count. Who then does count?

First of all, there is the speculative builder, for H. R. 6959 would continue the FHA title VI program for another year under which the Government takes the risks and the builder takes the profit. I, too, believe that an extension of title VI is necessary, or perhaps I should say, a necessary evil. But it is one thing to provide for an extension to that title in combination with other programs which will restrict its inflationary effects and facilitate a transition from the program of emergency aids to a stabilized permanent program of housing as S. 866 does. It is quite another thing to provide for an extension of the title VI program on a basis where the primary beneficiaries are the speculative builders and the high-income families.

Who else counts? Pretty clearly also those in the high-income-tax brackets. The best indication of this is the program contained in H. R. 6959 providing for an especially high depreciation allowance on rental housing which plan would be beneficial only to those in the very high income brackets. Likewise, the 1-percent increase in interest rates provided in the bill as compared with the one-half of 1 percent increase authorized in S. 866 would not, I take it, be particularly distasteful to those who have the money to invest. And, of course, it would be the high-income families that would benefit because it would be for them that housing could continue to be produced.

Finally, of course, it is the lobbies who count under H. R. 6959—the lobbies who have so brazenly succeeded in stifling any decent housing legislation for 4 years now and who have had the audacity to make clear before the Banking and Currency Committee that they distrust the Congress because it may desire to consider the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, we have a choice between a bill that is a housing bill, and a bill that is no housing bill at all. We have a choice between a bill that is designed to provide help to those who need the help and a bill which would help those who need help the least. Let us put an end to the mockery and enact S. 866.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill is one of the most important legislative proposals introduced in the House during the entire life of the Eightieth Congress. It is important for two reasons. The first reason is found in the magnitude of the need in America for decent housing. The current housing shortage, the millions of substandard homes, and the slum conditions existing in most large cities, makes housing the No. 1 social problem in the United States. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill is also significant in that it presents a positive and constructive Federal program to correct the present acute housing shortage, and to meet America's long-run housing requirements.

I will use the few minutes at my disposal to discuss the general housing situation in the United States, and to present facts and figures to prove conclusively that Congress is obligated—in the interests of the general welfare—to approve the T-E-W housing bill. For the purpose of analysis, it is necessary to divide the housing problem into two categories: First, the immediate or emergency housing shortage; and, second, the long-run housing problem in the United States. I will begin by discussing the immediate critical housing shortage.

THREE MILLION NEW HOMES NEEDED IMMEDIATELY

All official reports indicate that America needs to build 3,000,000 new homes at once in order to place a roof over the heads of our people. Although World War II ended over 3 years ago, the housing shortage remains most critical—there are just not enough homes available to provide shelter for all the families in the United States. According to a recent estimate of the Housing Expediter, there are nearly 3,000,000 American families who are unable to find homes of their own, and are therefore forced to live doubled up with relatives and friends. The situation becomes doubly tragic when you realize that about 40 percent of these homeless families belong to veterans of World War II.

This shortage exists in nearly every metropolitan area throughout the 48 States. It is especially acute in a number of cities in my district. In Duluth, for example, there are several thousand families without homes, and it has been estimated that 20 percent of all GI families are now living doubled up with other families. Hibbing needs 800 additional housing units in order to shelter its population—a required increase of 16 percent over its present housing facilities. In Virginia, Minn., where 1 family out of every 8 is living with relatives or friends, there is a need for 500 new homes.

This lack of adequate housing prevails all over the country, and at the present rate of private home construction, it will take about 4 years for the housing supply to catch up with demand. It is upon the basis of this evidence that I maintain that Congress should enact into law the T-E-W housing bill. This bill would stimulate the building industry and speed up home construction right now when our people need additional housing so desperately.

GENERAL HOUSING CONDITIONS ARE DEPLORABLE

The general housing situation in the United States may be characterized as being most deplorable. This conclusion is supported by the evidence presented in the various housing surveys, and is backed up by the weight of authority. According to the 1940 housing census, there are some 37,000,000 dwellings in the country. Of these 37,000,000 homes, some 7,000,000, 19 percent, need major repairs; 17,000,000, 46 percent, had no private baths; 8,000,000, 22 percent, had neither gas nor electricity; 11,000,000, 30 percent, had no refrigeration; and nearly four and one-half million had neither central heating nor stoves.

Although the condition of city homes throughout the country is somewhat above the national average, yet we find two-fifths of all nonfarm dwellings are definitely substandard—38.3 percent of them either need major repairs or lack running water and other sanitary facilities. On the other hand, housing conditions in rural areas are decidedly worse than in the cities. Less than 50 percent of the 6,500,000 farm dwellings in the United States have electric lights, and only 25 percent of them have running water. According to the former Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, about two-thirds of all rural homes are substandard, and some 25 percent of them are beyond repair.

As a Member of Congress from Minnesota, I regret to report that the housing situation in Minnesota follows the national pattern. Only 75 percent of Minnesota's city homes have central heating, and less than 52 percent of them have refrigeration. Ten percent of these homes need major repairs at the present time, and about the same proportion lack running water. Rural housing in Minnesota, according to a University of Minnesota agricultural survey, follows the national rural housing parallel. Only 12 percent of the farm homes in my State have running water, less than 20 percent of them have central heating, less than 10 percent of them have refrigeration and 27 percent of farm homes need major repairs today.

A FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAM IS NEEDED

Mr. Speaker, the conditions which I have described are real—they picture the deplorable state of American homes in which we, who are citizens of the richest Nation in the world, are forced to live. They also emphasize the crying need for the Federal Government to take concrete action to meet the housing needs of the American people. This need has been estimated by the national authority as at least 15,000,000 homes to be constructed during the next 10 years—12,600,000 homes to eliminate urban substandard housing, and to provide for our increasing population, and at least 2,500,000 new homes to establish minimum housing standards for our farm population.

Of course, the real-estate lobby and other selfish interests will tell us that a Government housing program is neither necessary nor practical. They will argue that the housing field is not the proper sphere for Government activity, and that "if private enterprise is only left alone, then the private building industry will provide all the homes necessary." But these calamity howlers ignore past experiences and the lessons of history. They forget that the rate of private construction follows the general business trend, and that while construction increases during boom periods, it falls during depression years. They ignore the fact that the private construction industry has never been able to build more than 900,000 new homes during any 1 year, and that the 1910–40 average was less than 500,000 homes per year. Even during 1947 only about 800,000 new housing units were constructed by private enterprise—at this rate it will take about 4 years to alleviate the current housing shortage.

I am not condemning the private construction industry itself for the present housing situation. But I do maintain that private enterprise cannot provide decent housing for all Americans by its own efforts, and that it needs the assistance of the Federal Government in order to do the job. This is the underlying assumption of the T-E-W bill—to provide Government financial assistance to help the private building industry construct decent homes for all Americans.

T-E-W HOUSING BILL IS MUST LEGISLATION

I am convinced that the T-E-W housing bill offers the only practical and constructive solution to America's housing needs. To furnish our people the new housing units needed to correct the present housing shortage, the bill would, if enacted into law, result in the construction of several million homes within 2 years. By providing for the construction of 15,000,000 homes during the next 10 years, it offers a plan of meeting our long-run housing needs.

In brief, this is what the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill—(S. 866 as passed by the Senate—provides: First, the authorization of $2,000,000,000 for mortgage-insurance and FHA loans to finance rental housing and private-owned homes during the next year through long-term, low-interest loans; second, the authorization of Federal funds to construct 500,000 public low-rent housing units during the next 5 years; third, the authorization of $50,000,000, in RFC loans to finance the manufacture of prefabricated homes; fourth, the authorization of $268,000,000 in loans and grants to improve substandard farm homes, with additional funds being made available for financing new farm homes and to eliminate rural slums; and, fifth, the authorization of Federal funds to finance city slum-clearance programs.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the T-E-W housing bill, as passed by the other body, provides a broad and constructive program to meet the housing requirements for America. It will provide 15,000,000 new homes during the next 10 years. It will furnish low-rent public housing for those who cannot pay rents at inflated rates. It will eliminate farm slums by furnishing funds to raise rural housing standards and build several million new farm homes. It will go far to eliminate city slums through its slum-clearance program. In my opinion, this program which the bill sets forth is the only logical answer to the housing problem in the United States.

THE COST OF FAILURE

My economy-minded colleagues tell us that America cannot afford to spend a few billion dollars for additional American homes. I say that we cannot afford not to build enough homes to furnish decent and healthy homes for all our people. Few people realize the important role that housing plays in the physical and social well-being of the Nation, nor do they realize how much less juvenile delinquency, disease and crime there is in modern housing projects as compared to slum areas.

I will mention a few statistics to prove my point. For example, the pneumonia death rate in slum areas is three times as great as it is in normal residential areas, the infant mortality rate is six times as great, and the tuberculosis rate is ten times greater in the slums than in areas where decent housing prevails. I might also mention that the crime rate in slum areas is five times greater than in the better residential areas. Although city slum areas contribute but a small part of the cities' real-estate revenues, the cost of police protection, fire protection, health and other local government services, is much greater in slum areas than in other parts of the city.

In other words, bad housing and slum conditions mean that society pays a terrific price in terms of disease, crime, and other social costs. It means that our veterans cannot find homes for their families, and that our entire population must endure the inconveniences and threats to their health which substandard housing represents. I say that America must accept the goal of a minimum standard of housing for all its people, and that the Federal Government must take the lead in achieving this goal. The cost of failure to do this is too high, and we cannot afford to pay the social costs.

CONGRESS FAILS THE PEOPLE

When the other House finally passed S. 866 on April 22, all supporters of decent housing for America were overjoyed. We were further encouraged when the House Banking and Currency Committee reported favorably on a similar housing bill last Friday, June 11, after a 14 to 13 vote. These events seemed to indicate that at long last relief for the 40 million ill-housed Americans was in sight, and that there was a good chance that Congress would enact into law the kind of housing legislation that the people need and want.

But our hopes for decent housing were short-lived—we had not taken into account the reactionary, antisocial attitudes of the Republican leadership, and the influence of the real-estate lobby upon the policies of the majority party. For yesterday's developments make it clear that the GOP leadership is not interested in any kind of housing legislation, and is now resorting to every parliamentary trick and device to block action upon the T-E-W housing bill. This is the only possible interpretation of the high-handed action of the House Rules Committee in refusing to permit this important measure to come to the floor for debate. This explains why the committee now comes forward with this emasculated housing bill (H. R. 6959) as a substitute for genuine housing legislation.

In sponsoring this so-called housing bill H. R. 6959, my Republican colleagues claim that it is a substitute for the T-E-W housing bill. An examination of its provisions, however, show that this claim is deceitful and that the bill is a fraud and a sham. All the major provisions of the T-E-W housing bill—the public housing, slum clearance, urban development, veterans' housing, and housing research features have been eliminated from this measure now under debate. This bill does nothing more than increase the authorization for FHA mortgages for the benefit of the real-estate interests and includes a few minor changes in existing law such as permitting the sale of war housing and modification of housing credit terms.

This bill is only acceptable to the selfish real-estate lobby—certainly the common people of America and the veterans who are now living in slums, shacks, trailers, or crowded into spare rooms and sleeping porches have no reason tc rejoice. This bill cannot furnish our Nation with the homes we need and want. The Republican majority, in sponsoring this measure, is attempting to convince the people that the GOP is interested in housing legislation without doing anything constructive about the housing problem. In doing this, the Republicans are guilty of political fraud—they are breaking their pledges to the veterans, and they are betraying the welfare of the people in favor of selfish real-estate interests.

I refuse to become a part of this gigantic hoax—I will not support this measure that represents a sell-out of the common people whose housing needs are being neglected.

I call upon the Members of the House to vote down this sham so-called housing bill, H. R. 6959, and demand that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, as passed by the Banking and Currency Committee, be brought up for consideration and final vote.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the last section of H. R. 6959 removes for 1 year the duty on imports of plywood. I am strongly opposed to this provision because I feel that it will result in discrimination against the plywood industry. If the duties were removed it would make it impossible for the plywood industry of my State to compete with foreign plywood industries because of the great disparity in costs. Furthermore, the suspension of the duty is unnecessary and inadvisable in view of the domestic industry's increased and increasing production to meet domestic requirements. It is estimated that where heretofore the

industry production was 29,000,000 feet per week it has currently been increased to 35,000,000 feet per week. When new plants now being constructed are completed it is estimated that the production will be 40,000,000 feet before the end of this year. This should relieve any existing shortages of plywood for housing purposes.

Under the suspension of rules I appreciate that the bill cannot now be amended. It is my hope that this section of the bill will, therefore, be removed in conference.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the housing bill now under consideration.

As I have indicated for some time, and as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] well knows because of my conversations with him, I favor the enactment of housing legislation embodying the principle incorporated in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I can agree somewhat with the position of the gentleman from Michigan with respect to relying upon private industry to build the great majority of homes which are needed so badly. However, I would call to his attention, and I would like to emphasize that Federal aid to States and municipalities to construct decent living quarters for persons in the low-income groups and in slum areas is nothing new.

It appears that the bill before the House, which unquestionably has much merit, will be the only housing measure to come before the House. It does not look as if we will have an opportunity to vote on the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, nor does it look as if there would come before the House the Rogers bill, the Veterans' Homestead Act, which was approved unanimously by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This is regrettable. Both of these measures are worthy of consideration by the Congress.

Notwithstanding the fact that private industry is now building houses in unprecedented numbers, unless private builders are able to construct habitable living quarters which can be rented at reasonable rates, then the Congress must at the next session meet this issue and enact necessary legislation to provide such homes.

The veterans throughout the country living in temporary makeshift housing projects want decent homes in which to live—I know whereof I speak because in my district there are probably more veterans in these projects than in any other district in the United States. Unless homes are forthcoming, these veterans will look to the Congress at the next session for the immediate passage of adequate legislation which will provide sufficient housing.

MILLIONAIRE BONUS HOUSING BILL WITHOUT HOUSING

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill should not be called a housing bill. It might better be called the millionaires' bonus housing bill, without any housing. It is a subsidy bill for the real-estate interests, with tax exemptions and bonuses that have no place in this bill. There is not a word in the bill that will even tend to clear a single slum area or build a single multiple dwelling for the housing of low-income groups.

The manner in which this bill is foisted upon this Congress is a travesty upon our American traditions.

A bill providing for public housing and slum clearance, both rural and urban, and for housing research, was reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee by a majority vote, and the committee chairman instructed to obtain a rule from the Rules Committee to bring the matter before the House for consideration and action. Instead of following the instructions of the Banking and Currency Committee, its chairman urged the Rules Committee to prevent consideration of the bill. When the Rules Committee by a vote of 6 to 2 acceded to his request he then conceived the idea of foisting this bill upon the Congress.

The bill was introduced on the 16th of June. At 8 o'clock that night some of the members of the committee were advised of an executive session to be held at 9 o'clock the following morning, and other members did not get notice until after 9 o'clock on June 17 that the committee was meeting in executive session to consider this bill. Although at least a half dozen members of the committee sought recognition for various purposes, including the offering of amendments to the bill, the chairman could hear and see no one except the member with whom he had arranged in advance to present a motion to vote the bill out. The motion was entertained and forced through without permitting anyone to say a single word about the bill. Not only was no discussion called for, but none was permitted. And now we are asked to pass this bill under a suspension of the rules of the House, permitting a total of 40 minutes of debate, 20 minutes of which are controlled by the chairman of the committee and without any right to offer a single amendment to the bill or a motion to recommit the bill. Those tactics alone warrant the defeat of a motion to suspend the rules and to pass the bill.

In my district, city, and State the public-housing and slum-clearance provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill are not political issues. They have the almost unanimous support of every person in every walk of life, regardless of their political leanings.

Borough President John Cashmore, Mayor William O'Dwyer and Governor Thomas E. Dewey, have all indicated their all-out support for those provisions. Every veteran, religious, and fraternal group in my State favors the enactment of such legislation. Yet a small handful of men in this Congress are preventing the Congress from considering and acting upon those measures, and are arrogating to themselves the powers of a dictator.

If there was merit in their opposition, and if they genuinely felt they were right, they would have no hesitancy in letting this Congress debate the issues and vote upon them. The entire Republican Party, unfortunately, must be compelled to bear the consequences of this ill-considered action on the part of its leadership in this House.

The American public is too smart to be fooled by the passage of a bill labeled a housing bill, that is not a housing bill, that is nothing more nor less than a rich man's subsidy bill and which denies the American public the relief to which it is entitled.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress with the purpose of assisting, in every way possible, in the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. For 2 years, week after week and month after month, I have been meeting and conferring with other Members of this body, who also are interested in the passage of a proper housing bill. It therefore comes as a grave disappointment to me that we have only this type of a housing bill before us.

Many of us have had intimate knowledge of the powerful forces lobbying against the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill but having set ourselves to the task, we were able to overcome their influence in the Committee on Banking and Currency, where this legislation has been sleeping for the past 3 years.

Just a few days ago a majority of the Banking and Currency Committee—yes, all of the Democrats and three Republicans—reported a bill incorporating the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill out of that committee. The forces blocking this legislation for 3 years were given a tremendous set-back. That fine housing bill then proceeded in the normal manner to the Rules Committee, where we had every reason to expect that in the normal course of events a rule would have been granted and the bill soon would have been brought forth on the floor for debate and vote. How foolish we were to expect that the opponents of this measure would cease their fight. Their activity increased, and great pressure was brought to bear upon the Rules Committee itself. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. WOLCOTT, of Michigan, the chief opponent to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, led the fight in the Rules Committee against the majority report of his own committee.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the opponents were successful for I am reliably informed that by a vote of six to two, the Rules Committee refused to grant this splendid housing bill a rule, and back it went to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Another amazing part of this story is that the chairman of that committee, the same Mr. WOLCOTT, then brought forth his own bill and submitted it to the committee for consideration. This bill is the bill which has the approval of the powerful lobby of which I have just spoken. As Mr. Wolcott, the chairman, presented this watered-down housing bill to his committee, the Democratic members were prohibited from amending or objecting to the present bill in any manner whatsoever. The debate on this measure reveals that the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee refused to recognize any of the Democratic members during the entire session of that committee. Hence we have the bill before us in its present form.

But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. Does the present bill come to us through the Rules Committee? Does it come to us under a rule permitting the membership of this great body either to amend it on the floor of this House or as a last resort to move to reconsider this measure? The answer is clearly "no." The answer is "no," Mr. Speaker, because the chairman of that committee and the Republican leadership who support this legislative maneuver do not want the people to know where they stand on the vital items which have been stricken out of this bill now under consideration. They do not want to go on record as showing where the Republican Party stands or each Republican Member of this House stands on the questions of rural housing, slum clearance, and public housing.

So, here we are again, Mr. Speaker, voting an important measure under a suspension of the rules which neither permits an amendment nor a motion to reconsider. In my opinion this is the rankest kind of political cowardice.

I can appreciate a difference of opinion on this important subject and I do not condemn those who may not agree with me, but I have an utter contempt for any individual who is unwilling to record his stand for the information of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against this procedure in the hope that the leadership of this body will be compelled to bring forth the housing bill recommended by a majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Clearly, if this present bill is voted down, there is ample time for the Republican leadership and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to do one of two things. As I have indicated, they may again present to the Rules Committee the bill which was first reported out by a majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency or, and of equal importance, they may take the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill which was passed recently by the Senate and is now in the Committee on Banking and Currency. I repeat, there is ample time for either of these bills to be presented to this body before adjournment, should the pending measure be voted down.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation want a housing bill. They are entitled to a housing program. If given an opportunity the Members of this body will join with the Senate of the United States in giving them a housing program. Only political and legislative chicanery will prevent the enactment of adequate housing legislation.

The present bill is a fraud and a subterfuge. It adds nothing to a program for housing legislation. Actually, the important provisions of this bill already have been passed by this body. These other housing bills now are resting in the Senate. The reason for that is that the Senate has incorporated most of their provisions in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which was passed by the Senate with a substantial majority. It is that bill of which I have spoken which now rests in the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. Speaker, there has been entirely too much talk about socialism in connection with the housing bill. Everyone of any intelligence knows that Senator TAFT, whatever else he may be, is not a Socialist. Certainly Governor Dewey is not a Socialist. In fact, most of the outstanding leaders of this Nation are in favor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Therefore, let us stop this childish talk about the danger of traveling along the road to socialism. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to your attention that a proper housing program can lend strength to the moral fabric of this Nation. The lack of proper housing facilities not only has cost this Nation billions of dollars in the suppression of crime, juvenile delinquency, etc., but great moral problems have arisen from the increase in divorces which, too, has a bearing on the problem of juvenile delinquency.

And fundamentally, there is that problem of satisfying the needs of our people and overcoming the bitter resentment of veterans—two or three millions of them who have been looking for homes now for almost 3 years.

If this pending measure passes, those of us who have worked so hard and so long can only hope that the Republican leadership in the Senate of the United States may strike from this bill all below the enacting clause and include the original provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, eventually reporting the same to this body for a record vote. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility rests with the Republican leadership and unless a proper housing program is forthcoming from this Congress, it will be an issue you will have to meet again and again in the coming campaign.

HOUSING BILL A FRAUD

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, this so-called housing bill is a fraud on the American people which alone is enough to insure defeat for the present Republican majority in Congress at the hands of an aroused country.

Furthermore, the ignominious methods used in jamming the bill through the House prove the utter and cynical bankruptcy of the Republican leadership.

The malodorous deal is proof irrefutable that there is no Republican Party, but only a collection of factions struggling for the privilege of outraging public interest.

The House Republican faction has disowned the Senate leadership flagrantly, publicly, and maliciously, by the instrumentality of this bill. The political implications are obvious, and to Democrats hilarious.

But to 12,000,000 Americans seeking shelter at prices within their reach, this farce is rank tragedy.

The bill makes it impossible for a private real-estate operator to lose money.

It makes it equally impossible for the ordinary ex-GI or common citizen to gain a decent place to live.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to socialized housing in this country, and I shall support this bill which, in my opinion, will be a great aid to private construction.

The improvement of our critical housing situation should not be crippled by a nationalized building program.

This legislation increases mortgage insurance authority by $1,600,000,000, which should encourage increased building by individuals and help thousands of veterans as well as other individuals to finance their own homes.

Since the Eightieth Congress removed controls from building materials some 835,000 dwelling units were completed in 1947, which is almost double the number constructed in 1946. Three hundred and fifty-six thousand homes were started the first 5 months of this year and every indication points to the construction of 1,000,000 homes this year which will be an all-time record.

I am sure that this legislation will be particularly helpful in the solving of our housing problem.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the proposed housing bill does not include any provision for low-rent public housing or slum clearance. As a matter of simple justice, I cannot be satisfied with a housing program which would aid all groups of our citizenry except the very one most in need of it. On July 24, 1947, the Congress, by Concurrent Resolution No. 104, created a Joint Committee on Housing with instructions to conduct a thorough study and investigation of the entire field of housing. This committee was composed of seven Members of the House and seven of the Senate, appointed from the respective Committees on Banking and Currency. This committee during the summer, fall, and early winter of 1947 conducted hearings in all the principal cities from Boston, Mass., to San Francisco, Calif. I recall attending the hearing held at Boston and the one in New Haven, Conn. Volumes of testimony have been taken concerning the situation and hardly a week passes that one does not receive the printed record of the proceedings held in some city in this country. The joint resolution provided that this committee should report to the Congress not later than March 15, 1948, the result of its finding, and on that day, the gentleman from New York, Hon. RALPH GAMBLE, chairman of the committee, submitted a final majority report, which is a matter of record. In this report certain conclusions and recommendations were made, and I particularly call attention to recommendation No. 13, reading as follows:

Provision should be made now for Federal aid to local communities to enable them to undertake the clearance of their slums and blighted areas so as to make such areas available for redevelopment with the active participation of private enterprise. For this purpose, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator should be authorized to undertake a program of loan and subsidy assistance to communities. This program should be wholly distinct and separate from the low-rent public-housing program. The subsidy should be on a capital-grant basis and should involve a sharing of the net costs of slum clearance between the Federal Government and local communities on a 2-to-1 matching basis. As an initial program, the Administrator should be authorized to make, over the next 5-year period, $1,000,000,000 in loans, repayable with interest, and $500,000,000 in subsidy commitments, at the rate of $100,000, a year. Such a program should be authorized immediately in order to make possible the preparatory steps necessary in connection with such a program.

And recommendation No. 14, reading

has been so serious in our communities generally, and that the pressures upon our State

It has been suggested most sincerely

some $6,000,000,000. It has been right-

I want to elaborate on that. The only

signed to subsidize the big investor, as

And recommendation No. 14, reading as follows:

Provision should be made for assistance to local communities under the United States Housing Act of 1937 for the provision over a period of the next 5 years of a maximum of 500,000 units of low-rent public housing for families of low income with (1) additional safeguards written into the act to increase local responsibility, make sure that tenancy is restricted to low-income families, and avoid any competition with private housing; (2) preference to the families of veterans and servicemen for a period of 5 years; (3) revision of the applicable cost limitations, which have not been revised since the original act of 1937, so as to bring them in line with current housing costs; (4) shortening the period for the payment of annual contributions from 60 years to 40 years; (5) an increase of the rate of maximum Federal contribution by 1 percent per annum of development cost, which increase will be more than compensated for by the shortened period over which Federal contributions can be paid; (6) provision that, in the event of a major default by a local authority in its contractual obligations, the Public Housing Authority may take over a low-rent housing project until such default is cured, and may continue to pay annual contributions not in excess of the original amount contracted for; and (7) revision of the present $800,000,000 borrowing authorization of PHA to make it clear that amounts repaid are available for relending.

(It is believed that with the aid of the financing amendments recommended above it would be possible for local authorities to sell bonds to private investors covering substantially the entire cost of low-rent projects and at a substantial saving in interest costs as compared with the cost of borrowing from the Government. The reduction in interest rate, estimated to be approximately one-half of 1 percent per annum, would permit more rapid amortization of bonds, and combined with the shorter period during which bonds are outstanding, should result in a very great decrease in total interest costs.)

Attention was called to the undisputable fact that in the spring of 1947 there were 2,800,000 families living doubled up with other families, the vast majority forced to accept unsatisfactory living arrangements because of the acute housing shortage. An additional 500,000 families are living in temporary housing, trailers, rooming houses, and other makeshift accommodations. The committee stressed the urgency of the housing shortage and the necessity for prompt and effective action by the Congress. The note of urgency so deeply pervaded the local hearings held by this committee that no summation or analysis of these hearings would possibly be considered an accurate reflection of them without clear-cut emphasis of this fact. This was true whether the testimony was with respect to our northern, southern, eastern or western communities; our urban or rural areas; the needs of our veterans, minority groups, or our people generally; or the needs of our low-income or middle-income families.

The committee also recognized that this problem was one that could not be solved by State and local governments alone, and that Federal financial assistance to our communities was imperative, and stated as follows:

This note of urgency, struck over and over again throughout the course of the hearings, indicates clearly that the housing situation has been so serious in our communities generally, and that the pressures upon our State and local governments to act have therefore been so great, that there can be little doubt as to the intense desire and determination of our local communities and officials to assist in meeting the housing problem to the best of their abilities. They are especially concerned with two major problem areas—the clearance and redevelopment of slums and blighted areas and the provision of decent housing for low-income families now living in slums. Nevertheless, these matters are entirely beyond their control and beyond their financial capacities. Senator Wagner's report summarizes the ample evidence attesting these facts. It is clear that we cannot deal effectively with these deep-rooted phases of the housing problems without adequate Federal financial assistance to our communities for such purposes. It is clear also from the overwhelming evidence that these phases of the housing problem are of such magnitude and seriousness that adequate solutions depend on treating them as part of the housing problem.

Whether it be with respect to Boston, or New York, or Jacksonville, or Birmingham, or Cleveland, or Chicago, or Louisville, or Seattle, reports from source after source have been almost monotonously similar. The well-being of our local communities is threatened by the excessive fiscal and social costs of our slums and blighted areas. The hearings and studies of this committee have served only to corroborate the evidence of survey after survey made over the years, national and local alike, that the bad-housing areas, the social-problem areas, the areas of relatively high municipal costs, and the areas of relatively low returns, are practically identical.

The committee concluded that—

Local self-government is a cherished part of our democratic process. From this fact, however, it is entirely specious to argue that the problems of housing for families of low income and slum clearance must be the responsibility of our localities alone, with the Federal Government in the role of an onlooker. The simple fact is that it is largely because these special problems have proved so entirely beyond the capacity of our local governments that the situation has become as acute as it has.

This joint committee also concluded that it was evident that the home-building industry is providing homes which only the higher income families can afford and seems to indicate that the only feasible solution of this question is by the Federal subsidy.

In Connecticut we have a particularly severe housing problem because of our greatly increased population, particularly in the former defense industrial areas, and this is particularly true in New Haven in my congressional district. Thousands of persons who came to Connecticut to be employed in defense industry during the war remained as they liked our State so well. During recent months in Connecticut, the problem has rapidly become even more serious. In 1946 an estimated 25,000 new housing units were needed. The need today is estimated at some 40,000. In New Haven alone, there are some 1,400 families who are seeking shelter in low-rent housing units. While private industry has done a great job, at the same time it is evident that it is now providing homes which only the higher income families can afford and this seems to indicate that the only feasible solution to this question is by Federal subsidy.

It has been suggested most sincerely that federally financed low-rent housing and slum clearances are "socialistic." I cannot agree. If this is so, then the majority of the Members of Congress comprising the Joint Housing Committee have gone socialistic. I doubt very much if it will be accepted by the veterans and the persons who are without a roof over their heads at the present time. Nor do I believe that they will be very much impressed by the argument of the excessive cost of such a program. In this connection we have recently embarked upon a program for the relief and rehabilitation of the peoples of 16 foreign nations wherein we will build shelter for them and even furnish them with tobacco and it has not been suggested that this is socialistic or that it is un-American.

I shall vote for the Wolcott bill, not because I am satisfied with it, but so that we may have a housing bill that will go to the Senate for conference in the hope that as a result thereof, the conferees may agree on a housing bill which will establish a long-range housing policy, and relieve the intolerable conditions which now prevail.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr Speaker, certain groups in this country have been demanding enactment of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. I could not support that measure in the form that it reached the House for the reason that it is based on socialistic principles.

Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to lend my support, however, to the Wolcott bill, H. R. 6959, which in my opinion will meet the pressing demands for housing in the American way. Clearly, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill would put Government in the housing business to the detriment of private enterprise which has a building record unsurpassed in the history of this country. The basis for the Taft bill is, in my opinion, socialistic in that the Government would take over and superimpose itself upon private building if the building industry fails to meet a given situation which would arise in the minds of the bureaucrats administering the program.

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely interesting to note that private enterprise last year built 835,100 units and it is estimated that it will build more than a million units this year. When the Government was in the building business under the so-called Wyatt housing program and controlled all of the items that went into housing and with several billions of dollars from the Government it produced only 437,800 units. It is a further fact that when the Government had the power to command the channeling of every inch and every ounce of building materials that went into the home-building field its record for building homes was a miserable one. It cannot be said that private enterprise in the building field has failed. In fact it has an unbelievable record of achievement; it is building many homes today.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the provisions of H. R. 6959 the bill contains provisions which make it possible to build houses to meet a continuing emergency without calling upon the Government to finance public projects to the extent of some $6,000,000,000. It has been rightfully said that a Government housing program would be expensive for the taxpayers, it would raise the cost of houses where the so-called little man could not purchase them, and it would certainly add to the inflationary spiral.

And further, Mr. Speaker, if we are to adopt the principles of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which are based upon a socialistic principle that Government must step in when private enterprise does not meet a situation, it is reasonable to believe that once Government monopolized the building field it would be justified to move into any field where shortages occur on the theory that private enterprise had failed. Today there is a shortage in automobiles. Is it contended that Government should step in and take over the automobile industry of this country? There is a shortage of coal. Does the same principle apply there? Many other instances might be cited but certainly we have not reached the point in this country where we must resort to socialism; when government steps in to meet production shortages. Such a program is un-American. In effect, the Wolcott housing bill says to the building industry of this country: "Go ahead and do this job; we will lend whatever assistance we can in the field of financing, but the job is yours." The general purposes of the bill are designed to meet the needs for low-cost housing, rental housing, and continuance of veterans' preference under title 6 of the National Housing Act, and in the disposition of Government-owned permanent war housing. Further, it provides a secondary market for insured FHA mortgages and GI guaranteed home loans.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and meets the problem in the good old American way.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there are two real and cogent objections that must be lodged against this bill being brought in today in this comprehensible way. In the first place, the methods being used to gag and bind not only a legislative committee of this Congress, but the entire membership by forcing this bill through without amendment, without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t," and to deny the legislative Representatives of the people of America even to stand up and be counted on such a vital issue as housing alone would be reason enough for defeating this bill.

The dictatorial methods, used by the Republican leadership, and the usurpation of authority belonging to a legislative committee by the Republican controlled Rules Committee, should be enough to defeat this use of the most vicious form of "gag" rule being practiced on the House in bringing this legislation to the floor under rules suspension.

That should be enough to defeat this bill, but even a greater and more compelling reason for defeating it is the plain fact that it is a complete phony, as far as housing legislation is concerned.

I want to elaborate on that. The only thing in this bill that will actually and genuinely help get houses for the millions in this country who are crying desperately for a place to live is title VI of FHA. Title VI has passed this House long ago and has been pending in the Senate since March 24 of this year. The bill can be passed by the Senate today or tomorrow and become law. That extends $2,000,000,000 worth of FHA insurance under title VI, which the chairman of the committee will admit has been the most useful instrument of getting housing. The other portion of this bill is the sale of Lanham war permanent housing, which also passed the House and has been pending in the Senate since June 19, 1947. So almost three-fourths of this bill, the part that will get housing, has already been passed by the House.

It is not going to do any good to pass it two times or three times or four times through the same House. It has to go through the other House before it becomes a law.

The main issue before the House is the question of what Federal aids are going to be given to the housing, Federal aids in the nature of a subsidy, if you please.

By dictation of the Republican leadership of the House and by dictation of the Republican control of the Rules Committee of the House they have decided that the poorest and most underprivileged class of people in the United States, the people who hopelessly live in America's slums, cannot get any subsidies to improve their housing conditions, even under a locally managed program administered by the cities themselves.

So they have killed out all the subsidies to these underprivileged people—those for decent farm housing and veterans—but have left in the bill the subsidies for the people who are best able to pay their own way—these investors.

There is not one dime of subsidies that will reach the underprivileged but there are millions if not hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of subsidy that will go to the rich investors. Let me elaborate.

This bill contains the best worked out tax dodge I have ever seen come before this Congress. If you are a wealthy man, you can insure a $500,000 apartment house built under FHA insurance up to 90 or 100 percent of its actual cost. Thus the wealthy investor is protected by this insurance at about 100 percent. Then what tax advantage do you give on that $500,000 house? Get this clear. You write off $250,000 of depreciation on the $500,000 investment in 5 years under tax exemptions for fast depreciation. That is in the report. Have you ever seen a better tax dodge than that? This is what the Treasury says it amounts to. If you have an income of $500,000 a year you have a tax dodge of better than $41,000 a year, $210,000 in the 5-year period, out of Uncle Sam's pocket. Subsidies? No subsidies for the underprivileged people in the slums but a nice fat subsidy for the "barefoot" millionaires that are looking for a way to beat Uncle Sam's tax. You get 100-percent insurance on your investment and then a write-off of 50-percent depreciation during 5 years.

This bill also contains a so-called yield-insurance provision, further designed to subsidize the big investor, as well as guaranteeing him against loss. No subsidies for the slum dweller, but always for the investor.

One of the strangest and most unusual procedures, however, is contained in the so-called FHA mortgage support market under the Federal National Mortgage Association. For several years this agency furnished a secondary market, where holders of mortgages could sell them, at par, to the Government corporation. The operation has netted a big profit to the Government.

But under this strange section, for the first time I believe in our history, the Congress is deliberately depressing the market on Government-insured mortgages. Instead of offering a secondary market for FHA or GI loans at par, this bill announces to the world that they are only worth 98 cents on the dollar. They will not be purchased by the Government for what the Government insurance says they are worth—for Congress under this bill says they are worth to us only 98 cents on the dollar.

Already this hastily conceived and ill-considered move has caused a wholesale withdrawal of investors from the home mortgage market—as well as threaten many builders with bankruptcy.

The net effect of this 98 cents on the dollar provision is the same as if the Federal Reserve banking system announced tomorrow that it would support the Government bond market at only 98 cents on the dollar. Do any of you think that the market would not immediately decline to the figure that Government itself set?

Thus it will be with this provision, which wrecks, instead of helps, the market for Government-insured FHA title VI loans.

Other provisions of this same section, changes without notice, financial aids which builders have for the past two or more years relied upon to build large-scale housing projects.

Conscientious builders, who heeded the Government's plea for large-scale production of housing, now find themselves faced with bankruptcy because the bill here denies them access to a ready Federal market.

This bill provides that unless a mortgage was insured after June 19, these Government-guaranteed mortgages cannot be marketed. With the confusion created by the introduction of this bill existing in the mortgage market, insurance companies and other investors have stopped buying title VI mortgages. Why should they, when the Congress is depressing the value of their mortgages by legislative action?

And so these builders, who relied on our good faith in building these houses, now find themselves heavily indebted to banks on short-time interim financing for construction, without a market to rely on when the house is completed.

This is a dangerous provision and one that you will live to regret. Already it has set the housing program back heavily—and if this bill becomes law, will further retard home financing.

In addition, it is certain to force up by 1 or 2 percent the cost of financing

these veterans' homes because of the uncertainty that has already been created.

In the bill killed by the Republican leadership yesterday, and on which you in the House were denied the right to vote upon, provision was made for a secondary market for GI home-building loans under the GI bill of rights. The bill here today strips away this help for the veteran and throws him a crumb.

Only an infinitesimal amount of help is given him on his financing problem—that of being able to have his second-mortgage GI loan eligible for the Federal secondary-market support. This, under the FHA combination loan, amounts to only 10 percent of the cost of his house.

Unless the veteran's house is built in a large community or in a neighborhood acceptable to the FHA authorities, he is denied completely any help on this score. The net effect of striking this valuable veterans' provision from the original bill, as was done in this new bill, is to deny any Government help to the veteran who wants to build on the farm, or in the small rural community. This is completely a housing bill for the cities and the rural people of America are being left out completely from any help in their housing problems.

All in all, this bill is so bad that it should be overwhelmingly defeated. There is still time to enact a general housing bill—one that will help all—the slum dwellers, the farmers, and veterans, as well as investors who ask tax subsidies to build our much-needed housing.

More than $6,000,000,000 in housing insurance has been provided for city dwellers—but the record does not reveal where one house has been so aided on a farm or in the small rural communities.

The issue here today is, whether you want to pass one-sided legislation to help only investors, or whether you want a genuine all-around housing bill.

If this bill is voted down under suspension of the rules, it can be brought back immediately under a rule, and can be open for amendments to correct the glaring defects. The tax dodge can be taken out, and help for farm and slum housing written in. And above all—the Congress can be counted on a roll-call vote so that everyone can see just where every Member stands on providing effective, rather than phony, housing legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I expect to support this bill. I am supporting it because I know that unless this bill passes we will have no housing legislation. There are some things in the bill to which I am opposed. I was one of the most active advocates, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, seeking to bring to the floor of this House a comprehensive bill involving practically all of the main issues relative to meeting the housing shortage. I think the Members of the House were entitled to have these matters thoroughly discussed, so by amendment they could add other provisions to the bill seeking to help solve the housing shortage or strike out any unwise provisions. Public housing and slum clearance have been an issue for some time, and I think the Members on the floor of this House should have an opportunity to settle this issue once and for all. It is regrettable that this bill cannot be amended in any form, under the rule by which it is being considered, nor can a motion be made to recommit the bill, but this is water over the dam, and to vote against the bill, as I have stated, means the end of housing legislation this session, as I see it.

Over in the other House, under the rules of that body a Member may offer an amendment and speak as long as he desires on it, so by voting for this bill there is a chance of getting some bill that would aid in solving the housing problem.

The housing problem affects every family in the United States directly or indirectly, and with the chance of this bill remedying the housing shortage I do not see how I could vote against the bill. I must say that I am certainly against the procedure under which this bill reached the floor of the House. The original Wolcott bill was reported out of the committee by a vote of 14 to 13, and the Rules Committee refused to give a rule. Then the Banking and Currency Committee was reconvened and the present Wolcott bill was voted out by the committee and none of the Democrats were given a chance to offer any amendment.

The present bill extends title VI of the Federal Housing Administration under which more than 40 percent of our housing has been constructed during the last year, and we will at least get this much out of this bill, and if amended in the Senate, it may be perfected to be more effective in solving the housing problem and a chance for the House to express itself on slum clearance and public housing. I think the question of taxes raised in this bill is bad and probably this will be eliminated in the other body or if brought to a conference.

Title III of the bill is not very effective for a secondary market, especially for GI loans. I advocated and introduced the first amendment in my committee in 1946 which became a law creating a secondary market for GI loans in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I offered an amendment to the first Wolcott bill which was adopted, and the entire bill was adopted later on by the committee, and this is the bill that the Rules Committee tabled. I had an amendment prepared yesterday to this effect and intended to offer it when the present Wolcott bill was considered, but I was not given an opportunity to present it. This proposed amendment was fair and equitable. It involved no cost to the Government. It meant that the promises contained in the GI bill of rights could be kept. It was approved not only by the House Banking and Currency Committee in H. R. 6888 but by the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House.

A united veterans' organization was earnestly asking our support of this provision. Are we going to say that the promise made by this Government in 1944 to the men and women fighting for this country is an empty promise? It will be unless a secondary market is created for the GI loans. Since July 1, 1947, when the secondary market was withdrawn, it has been very difficult for the veterans to secure loans to build houses in many places of this country. So I say that in hope of the other body or the conferees of both bodies improving the situation I do not see how I could afford to vote against the present bill. Without it there would be no other chance of any housing bill at this session.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, we have before us a conglomerate collection of previous titles that we have already sent over to the other body. For example, H. R. 5854 and H. R. 3492, and S. 2287—now Public Law 548. A good many Members here today have been led to believe, and a member of the committee who spoke before me has said that in order to have a continuation of title VI you would have to support this legislation, H. R. 6959. We have passed and sent to the other body the bill H. R. 5854 for the sum of $2,000,000,000. In this legislation today the difference between a temporary extension of some $400,000,000 that was cleared through the other side, and which is now a public law, was deducted from the so-called Wolcott bill, H. R. 6959, now under consideration. So do not be deluded into believing that if you do not vote for this bill you will not have an extension of title VI. The other body has had this legislation before it. It has not acted as yet. Just because you happen to vote for this legislation again today does not necessarily mean that they will take up this particular legislation. The gentleman from Oklahoma has pointed out to you the feature known as the fast tax amortization plan. That, of course, is a plan that will be of benefit to speculative builders. The guise is, of course, the offering of an opportunity to dodge the tax. If we were operating under an open rule we could question whether or not it is germane. Then we have another come-on in this legislation known as the yield insurance, which is a come-on for financial institutions or insurance companies to build in a particular price class.

To present this bill as a housing bill is a travesty. It is in reality a bill to offer financial aids to private enterprisers in the building business. It is a boon to home financing, with Government subsidy. Who will benefit by this legislation? Certainly not the farmer—not the communities, not the low-income families—not the moderate income families—not the veteran. The provisions for these groups are shabby and paltry. The bill frustrates one who appreciates the needs of the Nation for an over-all comprehensive housing program. But it certainly appeals to the speculative builders and those in the high income-tax brackets, and especially the real-estate lobby. All the "fat cats" of the industry will benefit. Those who need the help will benefit least, and those who need help the least will benefit most.

It is a shallow gesture at housing legislation and a mockery on this House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a sham and a delusion. To pass it would be a vain and futile thing. To begin with, its principal provisions have already been passed by the House of Representatives and are pigeonholed in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

If we pass it this afternoon, one of two things will happen. It will either be repigeonholed in that committee or it will be brought up on the floor of the Senate where S. 866 will be substituted therefor. So the net result of all the debate, the net result of all the hard work by the joint committee, made up of the House and Senate, seven Senators and seven Representatives, is that the veterans of this country, the people of this country, the farms of this country, and the cities of this country, when this Congress adjourns tomorrow night, will not have any housing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of the Banking Committee and of the Rules Committee for their success in denying to this House the opportunity to vote on a comprehensive housing bill. Last Thursday the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee stated that a majority of this House would vote for a comprehensive housing bill if it was presented to them. He stated that the only hope was that the Rules Committee would refuse to let the House vote on such a bill. He has succeeded in his maneuver.

I think the Members of this House will want to know just what is included in the comprehensive bill which the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Rules Committee have so successfully blocked. Every Member ought to know what the American people think of this bill—in terms of their needs for homes in which to live as Americans should, in which children can get a fair start in life and which will provide the aspirations which all of us must have to make life worth living. I am thinking of the needs of nearly 3,000,000 families who do not have any homes at all, but are crowded in, most of them involuntarily, with their in-laws and other families and of the 500,000 families living in trailers, rooming houses, temporary housing and other makeshift accommodations. I am thinking of the needs of more than 5,000,000 families in cities and surrounding areas, whose homes fall below decent standards for living. I am thinking also of the families on the farms whose homes are shacks which should be replaced or, at a minimum, need major repairs in order to make them livable. I am not even counting the great majority of farm homes which do not have the sanitary facilities which have become so essential for safe living in our cities, even though I deplore the lower housing standards we seem to accept for farm people.

Not even the best housing legislation we could enact is going to solve the housing problem for 10,000,000 families overnight. That is why we must consider legislation that looks ahead into the future, and not try to solve a long-range problem with short-run emergency measures. It is obvious that when you extend the solution of present problems into the future, you are also going to have to take into account the future increase in demand, losses in supply and the deterioration of additional housing to the point where it should be replaced. And finally, in order to bring about a normal relationship between needs and supply, it is important that there is a sufficient amount of housing available for rent or sale to give American families some flexibility within their price range and to make it possible for them to move about without having to be plagued with the difficulties of obtaining housing or being separated for long intervals.

Now what are the facts about housing needs? I know of no better place to turn to than the majority report filed just last March by the Joint Committee on Housing which was created by this Congress to study the housing problem. I think this House should know that while a few members of the committee dissented on a few of its recommendations, there was no disagreement with the findings reached after executive hearings in Washington and 32 other cities, after careful studies by individual members. I should add that these findings corroborated earlier conclusions reached by other committees, particularly the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment in 1945 and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in 1946 and 1947, and that its estimates of need were determined after careful consideration of other estimates from a variety of sources. Data obtained from the Bureau of the Census reports as to population and housing inventory provide the basis of these estimates of need.

Putting aside farm needs for the moment, America will need 15,441,000 new homes by 1960 to provide decent homes for the 39,500,000 families which the Bureau of the Census estimates we will have by that time. That means 1,285,000 homes a year. Discounting the considerable number of farm dwellings that can be rehabilitated, we shall need 200,000 farm homes a year, bringing the total up to 1,500,000 new houses annually.

It will take over 7,000,000 nonfarm homes, or more than 600,000 units a year, just to bring the present supply up to the shelter requirements of American families, and to provide a 4 percent effective vacancy rate. Before the war, real estate people used to think the supply was normal when 5 percent vacancies existed. That is about all we have been doing in this country for the last quarter of a century. Over the long pull, housing construction has just been keeping ahead of the increase in number of families. We have done practically nothing to replace the slums, to replace the losses from fire, demolition, and floods. That is all we will do during the coming years if we do not make a comprehensive attack on the housing problem through effective legislation. If that is all we do, we will have more, instead of fewer slums, for houses wear out every year. As one witness before the Banking and Currency Committee observed, a house begins to deteriorate the minute it is finished.

If we really meet America's housing needs, if we really want to eliminate the slums that imperil the health and morale of several million of our people, we are going to need another 8,000,000 homes during the next 12 years, or nearly 700,000 homes a year, to provide replacements for urban and suburban slum dwellings which are presently, or will become, substandard, for dwellings lost by fire, demolition, and floods and for temporary dwellings, most of them built during the war for only short-time use.

This Congress will be neglecting its responsibility to the American people if it does not create the tools for reaching the larger housing goal set forth in the joint committee's report. We can no longer tolerate, in this Nation, bad housing conditions which are a financial drain on the communities, which sap the energies of the people, which deprive them of the incentives that a wholesome home life provides and which create conditions in which crime and delinquency are bred.

Despite the findings of the joint committee and of other congressional committees, there are still those who say we can solve this housing problem without enacting comprehensive housing legislation. Despite the record of festering urban slums and dreary rural shacks, there are those who say that if Government will just let things alone—except provide a little credit assistance—everything will work out all right.

I am conscious of the record that the private building industry has built up since the war. I hope that private builders will start a record-breaking million homes this year, as everything seems to indicate. I am in favor of the credit aids from the Federal Government which are contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which will help them achieve and maintain that record.

But I see nothing in the present situation that offers the hope that even with these credit aids, the private building industry will be able to achieve and maintain the production necessary to fill the enlarged goals that have been envisioned by the Joint Committee on Housing. Neither does the joint committee.

Let us take a look at the record. The previous peak in home building was reached 23 years ago, way back in 1925, when 937,000 dwelling units were started. Then construction began to slide down, helping to take the whole economy with it, until, in 1933, 93,000 homes, only 10 percent of the peak volume, were produced. Conditions in 1925 were very similar to what they are today. Homes were being built at prices and rents which only a small portion of American families could afford to pay. When that limited demand was filled, and when people who had overextended themselves in a desperate search for homes became unable to meet mortgage payments, home building started down the toboggan slide. The result was that average housing production during the two decades before the war was only 500,000 homes a year, just enough to keep up with the increase in families and not enough to take worn-out and other bad houses out of use and send them to the junkyard.

This example which all of us remember characterizes the history of home construction and this history will not change until one fundamental characteristic of the industry as it existed then and exists today is changed. That characteristic is that not enough people can afford new housing at the prices and rents at which it is made available to permit a sustained production sufficient to meet American needs. There are two ways of assuring enough housing for the American people—one is through a vast public housing program, the other is to bring the costs of private housing down, in relation to incomes, so that there will be enough demand to sustain the high rate of production which America needs. I think our emphasis should be on the latter. I think the Government should utilize its resources fully to help private enterprise get its costs down. I would like to see this filtration theory we hear about work, but it will work only if you pour in enough new houses to crowd out the slums at the bottom.

It is hardly germane to say that the costs of housing have not increased any than other prices, although there is good evidence that building costs, and the selling prices of both new and used houses, have exceeded the general rise in the costs of living and income. What is important is that new houses cost too much today to sustain production at the levels needed, just as they did in the thirties and the twenties.

What is needed is for the home building industry to catch up with the modern industrial parade. It needs to develop mass production methods to serve the mass markets awaiting for it. It needs to have the shackles of outmoded building codes and restrictive practices removed. The Federal Government can help in two principal ways. It can adapt its credit aids to the needs of builders using modern production methods. And it can inaugurate a program of research into new methods, materials, and techniques and to encourage their adoption. The authority would be, and should be, broad enough to permit the Government to cooperate with home building in all aspects of housing, from the improvement of production methods in the factory down to the modernization of building codes. Congress will have ample opportunity to control the extent of these activities from year to year through the appropriations procedure.

I would be amazed at the shortsighted opposition of some of the leaders of the home-building industry to this research program if the same sort of thing had not happened before. It took years of actual experience, for example, before home-financing institutions came to recognize the benefits to their own business of the FHA system of home financing. The Government undertook the mortgage insurance program of the FHA because no single segment of the home-building industry had sufficient resources to assume the risks it involved. The Government will have to assume leadership for a broad research program, because no element of the home-building industry has the resources with which to do the kind of a job that needs to be done. Those who fear the socialization of the housing industry should be the first to support this kind of a program, for the best way to avoid socialization of this or any other industry is to maintain the confidence of the people that private enterprise is serving their needs. This research program will help private enterprise serve the housing needs of the American people.

I am hopeful that with the improved credit aids to private industry and a broad program of research, private enterprise will, in time, be able to take care of the housing needs of most of the American people. But I do not believe that with these aids private enterprise will be able to assume the burdens unaided of clearing out the festering slums in our cities. The changes in methods of production and distribution which we hope to see accomplished will not be sweeping or rapid enough to permit any early solution, by private enterprise, of the problems of low-income families living in urban slums or in the bad housing in our rural areas. Any comprehensive housing program must deal with these problems, too, if it is to accomplish decent homes for all American families. So the modest programs in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill of Federal assistance for slum clearance and public housing and of direct credit and subsidies for the improvement of farm homes are essential parts of that bill. I would like to remind this House that these are modest programs, limited to 5 years, during which private enterprise may demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Congress, whether it intends or will be able to take care of the needs of lower income families.

I have heard it said that the way to clear slums is to get rid of them, but nobody has ever explained to me how private builders are going to be able to buy up slum land at its present costs, remove the old houses, and then replan and redevelop the areas with homes which people can afford to buy. Private builders will do as they always have done, and do their building on raw, inexpensive land. The essence of the urban redevelopment program contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is for the Government to share with local communities the excessive costs of acquiring and clearing slum areas so that the cleared land can be made available, primarily to private builders at prices which represent a fair value at its new use.

Neither has anybody ever explained to me how private builders are going to provide decent homes at prices and rents which present slum dwellers or other low-income families can afford to pay. The people who have talked so glibly about the fine workings of the filtration theory have recently come along with some figures which, assuming certain things happened, purported to show that private enterprise was building for low-income families. I am sure those figures are small comfort to the low-income veteran looking for a place in which to live, or to the low-income family huddled together in a decaying tenement. They certainly are not believed by 90 percent of governors, mayors, and prominent individuals, including a majority of those connected with the home-building industry, who, according to a report issued by the Joint Committee on Housing, said that private enterprise would not be able to provide decent homes for all low-income families within the foreseeable future. If, as opponents of housing legislation attempt to prove, 20 percent of the houses built last year finally were priced at $4,500 or less, they are not in localities of greatest housing need or else they are shacks which are substandard to begin with or soon will be. There are certainly no such numbers of decent homes in Washington or in my home city at that price. A recent Census survey indicates that the average prices at which new homes are being sold today in Washington is $13,000 to $15,000. This is beyond the means of four-fifths of the families in Washington.

There is only one way I know of at the present time to hope that these families will have decent homes in which to live, and that is through public assistance.

The only other argument against public assistance for slum clearance and public-housing programs that deserves serious consideration is that these are problems that the local communities can and should solve. The fact is that most cities cannot afford to take on the additional burden and that the few cities which can will be able to handle only a part of the problem. The governors and mayors who replied to the joint committee questionnaire sent out by Senator WAGNER agreed that the cities and States could not take care of all the needs of low-income families, and only a few thought they could go beyond local tax exemption for public-housing projects. Their judgment is sustained by the report, Coordination of Federal and State Taxes, filed by Senator BRICKER. This report describes the financial strains being imposed upon the cities and States by higher costs of services, by the necessity for making up for wartime postponement of replacements, maintenance work, and new construction, and by the inflexibility of their principal source of revenue, real-estate taxes. It is sustained by the heavy bond flotations of municipalities and by the increase in interest rates on such issues. It is obvious that if we leave the problem of slums and bad housing exclusively to the local communities it will not be solved. I believe that the Federal Government, together with the local communities, has a responsibility for the people's housing needs. I think it has some responsibility of seeing that children start out in life with the equality of opportunity that only decent homes can provide.

So I urge passage of a comprehensive housing bill. We need to retain and improve the financing aids to private industry which this Government has been supplying since the middle thirties. We need to institute a program of research to help private industry do a better job of supplying the Nation's housing needs. And finally we need to provide financial assistance in those areas in which private enterprise is unable to operate. Only by

a program containing all these measures will this Nation be able to work toward a solution of its entire housing problem.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 1 minute, to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RAYBURN).

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I impugn the motives of nobody, but if I were to vote for this bill under these conditions, I would feel that I was perpetrating a fraud upon the American people, for the simple reason that I think I know that this means there will be no housing legislation at this session of Congress. I think we shou'd show our resentment of this procedure and this kind of a bill by voting down this motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think the issues in respect to housing have been crystallized to the point where almost everyone's position is known.

I was a little amazed that the gentleman from Texas, my exceptionally good friend, the minority leader, would make a statement which is in effect that we cannot provide shelter in America through private sources; that the Government has got to build the houses. I do not think my esteemed friend from Texas wants to put himself in the same category of those many witnesses who came before the Committee on Banking and Currency and admitted that the provisions of the bill, which was rejected by the House Committee on Banking and Currency yesterday morning, were socialistic in purpose. The very basis of socialism is that the Government shall take over when private enterprise has failed to meet a demand or a production program. I do not call anyone a Socialist in respect to this legislation. There has been so much loose talk about it, so much demagoguery about it, so much misunderstanding, and so few facts.

However, let me call attention, after making the statement that almost every one of the witnesses for the proponents of this legislation, predicated the necessity for public housing on the ground that private enterprise had failed, although private enterprise had built 835,100 units last year, and this year will build more than a million units, in face of the fact that when the Government did at one time have control over this subject in 1946, the Government, with all the power at its command to channel every inch and every ounce of building materials into the home-building field, produced only 437,800 units.

Now, has private enterprise failed? If private enterprise has not failed, then this House has no business turning this program over to the Government.

There was a very honest-minded, serious, conscientious Socialist who testified before our committee. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] asked him to define the differences, to point out the differences between the different political parties, and he did; and on page 776 of the hearings he said:

The Socialist Party—

Have in mind this is a Socialist, the mayor of Milwaukee, Mr. Zeidler—

The Socialist Party or the Socialists as a whole, and they are well represented all over the world, particularly by that element in the British labor movement, conceive the function of government to be democratic in its essence and feel that wherever there is a basic activity or a basic production method which is not being met or which is not being carried fully by the private-enterprise system, that there it is a responsibility of the community to step in and try to meet that need.

I do not say that this is a socialistic program; the Socialists themselves say that it is a socialistic program.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, I cannot; I am sorry.

The bill which you have before you is a bill which will provide and will assure that every ounce and every inch of available building materials and every minute of available labor will be utilized to the fullest extent in the next 12 months, making possible a program of building more units than have ever been built in a comparable period of time by any country under the canopy of God's heaven.

We should be proud of this Government of ours, and I am; and whatever I have done and whatever those of us who have sincerely since 1939 opposed socialized housing, whatever we have done has been in the interest of preserving the American system. If we have sinned in that respect we have sinned in accordance with and not in defiance of the Constitution of the United States.

A coalition of constitutionalists in this House in 1939—and the gentleman from Oklahoma was one of them then—on this floor by a good substantial majority defeated a rule for the continuance of this program. The principle of this program was before us at that time.

I wish some of your Members who are here now and who voted on that rule would turn to the record before you vote in order that you will not be in the inconsistent position of bravely and conscientiously voting against public housing then and now because you see in it some political advantage voting for socialized housing.

Let us be careful of what we do here. We are setting a precedent, perhaps, we are setting a precedent.

If private enterprise has failed to produce enough houses to justify the Government's taking over, then does the same philosophy apply to the failure of private enterprise to produce enough automobiles, enough shoes, at reasonable prices, enough food at reasonable prices? You have identically the same thing involved.

Is the next step to ask the automobile industry to move aside and let the Government get into the production of trucks and automobiles? Are you going to Brockton and other towns in the New England States and say that because shoes cannot be bought in the United States for less than $10 that the Government must step in and manufacture your shoes? Are we going out on the farms and say to the farmers: "Because you cannot produce enough food at low enough cost, the Government must come in and operate your farms?" In the rural provisions of this bill which we refused to report out of the committee, there was the socialistic provision that the Government should step on to each and every farm which asked for relief under that bill and virtually operate the farm by setting up the standards under which that farm should be operated, the crops that should be put in and so forth.

That, Mr. Speaker, is socialism. I do not care who it is that goes along with it, he has got to answer to the people. He has got to reconcile the position which he takes on this bill with the definition of socialism. I have tried to do so. Now, if there is any doubt at all, let us resolve the doubt in favor of the American form of Government which has resulted in a production effort during the war and since the war which is the envy of every socialistic country in the world.

This bill will make it possible to build houses to meet the emergency. If you had adopted the provision we struck out of the bill on public housing, you would have superimposed a public housing program, a Government project, on top of the present demand, amounting to something like $6,000,000,000 which, of course, would have resulted in further inflationary tendencies, making the cost of houses so high that nobody could possibly afford to buy any houses whatsoever. It was inflationary. Government housing is inflationary. One of the sponsors in the other body said that to permit the spending of $7,000,000,000 at the present time is the most inflationary thing that we could do.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I know the provisions in the bill before us and I think they will do much to help the housing problem. I wonder if the gentleman would not sketch through what those are, very briefly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. You are all familiar with title VI. I am glad the gentlemen who are seemingly opposed to this bill have found so many good things in it that should be enacted into law. The continuance of title VI is one of them. Title VI makes possible the organization of veterans' cooperatives and they may have the financing of the cooperative ventures insured up to 95 percent. We make possible the building of thousands of multiple-dwelling units and apartment houses in cities through accelerated depreciation.

You will understand that we are not robbing the Treasury of anything in that particular provision of the bill because if the houses are not built, then, of course, the Treasury will get no revenue whatsoever incident to the production of the houses. All taxes stem from production. If the houses are built the Government's

revenue will ultimately increase. Without this provision we may expect very little risk capital to venture into the field of multiple-apartment buildings. At today's high prices few builders will take a chance on realizing on their investment. The alternative is Government subsidies which in the end would be very costly to the American taxpayers. With the provision, revenues to the Government will materially increase and we will get the production of much-needed housing in the big-city areas.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the House should pass this bill and houses will be built under it. We want to adjourn tomorrow night and I may say with reasonable certainty that this is probably the only housing bill which we can get through.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Gladly.

Mr. KEOGH. Section 603 (b) of the pending bill amends section 608 (b) (3) (C) of the National Housing Act to permit the Administrator to increase to $9,100 per family unit the amount of the mortgage when, in his discretion, cost levels so require. Will the gentleman express his opinion as to whether this amendment will permit the Administrator to hold that the construction of a family unit in excess of 4½ rooms, for example, to 5½ rooms, will so affect the cost level as to justify increasing the amount of the mortgage to $9,100 per family unit of 5½ rooms in any approved project?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can assure the gentleman that the Administrator may increase the insurance to $9,100 per unit regardless of the number of rooms. We have removed the limit per room and put the limit on a unit basis. In directly answering the gentleman's question, I believe I can give him better than reasonable assurances that, under the example cited, the Administrator would not only be justified in using this discretionary authority but it is our intent that he do so, especially in the case of veterans' rental projects.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 319, nays 90, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—319

Abernethy	Bender	Byrnes, Wis.
Allen, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Camp
Allen, Ill.	Bennett, Mo.	Canfield
Allen, La.	Bishop	Cannon
Andersen, H. Carl	Blackney	Carson
	Bland	Case, N. J.
Anderson, Calif.	Boggs, Del.	Case, S. Dak.
Andresen, August H.	Bolton	Chadwick
	Boykin	Chenoweth
Andrews, N. Y.	Bradley	Chiperfield
Angell	Bramblett	Church
Arends	Brehm	Clark
Arnold	Brooks	Clason
Auchincloss	Brophy	Clevenger
Bakewell	Brown, Ga.	Coffin
Banta	Bryson	Cole, Kans.
Barden	Buck	Cole, Mo.
Barrett	Bulwinkle	Cole, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Burke	Colmer
Beall	Busbey	Cooley
Bell	Butler	Cooper
Corbett	Hull	Phillips, Calif.
Cotton	Jackson, Calif.	Phillips, Tenn.
Coudert	Jenison	Pickett
Courtney	Jenkins, Ohio	Ploeser
Cox	Jenkins, Pa.	Plumley
Cravens	Jennings	Potter
Crawford	Jensen	Potts
Crosser	Johnson, Calif.	Poulson
Crow	Johnson, Ill.	Preston
Cunningham	Johnson, Ind.	Price, Fla.
Curtis	Jones, N. C.	Priest
Dague	Jones, Wash.	Ramey
Davis, Ga.	Jonkman	Rankin
Davis, Wis.	Judd	Redden
Dawson, Utah	Kean	Reed, Ill.
Devitt	Kearney	Reed, N. Y.
D'Ewart	Kearns	Rees
Dirksen	Keating	Reeves
Dolliver	Kee	Rich
Domengeaux	Keefe	Richards
Dondero	Kefauver	Riehlman
Dorn	Kerr	Riley
Doughton	Kersten, Wis.	Rizley
Durham	Kilburn	Rockwell
Eaton	Kilday	Rogers, Fla.
Elliott	Kunkel	Rogers, Mass.
Ellis	Landis	Rohrbough
Ellsworth	Lanham	Ross
Elsaesser	Larcade	Russell
Elston	Latham	Sadlak
Engel, Mich.	Lea	St. George
Evins	LeCompte	Sanborn
Fallon	LeFevre	Sarbacher
Fellows	Lemke	Sasscer
Fenton	Lewis, Ky.	Schwabe, Okla.
Fernandez	Lewis, Ohio	Scoblick
Fisher	Lichtenwalter	Scott, Hardie
Fletcher	Lodge	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Folger	Love	
Foote	Lucas	Scrivner
Fuller	Lyle	Seely-Brown
Fulton	McConnell	Shafer
Gallagher	McCowen	Sheppard
Gamble	McCulloch	Short
Garmatz	McDonough	Sikes
Gathings	McDowell	Simpson, Ill.
Gavin	McGarvey	Smith, Kans.
Gearhart	McGregor	Smith, Maine
Gillette	McMahon	Smith, Va.
Gillie	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Wis.
Goff	McMillen, Ill.	Snyder
Goodwin	Mack	Somers
Gossett	MacKinnon	Stefan
Graham	Macy	Stevenson
Granger	Mahon	Stockman
Grant, Ind.	Maloney	Stratton
Griffiths	Manasco	Sundstrom
Gross	Mason	Taber
Gwinn, N. Y.	Mathews	Talle
Gwynne, Iowa	Meade, Ky.	Taylor
Hagen	Meade, Md.	Thomas, Tex.
Hale	Merrow	Tibbott
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Meyer	Tollefson
	Michener	Towe
Hall, Leonard W.	Miller, Conn.	Twyman
	Miller, Md.	Vail
Halleck	Miller, Nebr.	Van Zandt
Hand	Mills	Vinson
Harless, Ariz.	Mitchell	Vorys
Harness, Ind.	Morrison	Vursell
Harris	Morton	Wadsworth
Harrison	Muhlenberg	Welchel
Harvey	Mundt	Welch
Hébert	Murdock	Wheeler
Hedrick	Murray, Tenn.	Whitten
Heffernan	Murray, Wis.	Whittington
Hendricks	Nicholson	Wigglesworth
Herter	Nixon	Williams
Heselton	Nodar	Wilson, Ind.
Hess	Norblad	Wilson, Tex.
Hill	Norrell	Winstead
Hinshaw	O'Hara	Wolcott
Hoeven	O'Konski	Wolverton
Hoffman	Pace	Wood
Holmes	Pasman	Woodruff
Hope	Patterson	Worley
Horan	Peterson	Youngblood

NAYS—90

Abbitt	Chapman	Gordon
Albert	Chelf	Gore
Andrews, Ala.	Combs	Gorski
Bates, Ky.	Dawson, Ill.	Grant, Ala.
Battle	Deane	Gregory
Beckworth	Delaney	Hardy
Blatnik	Dingell	Hart
Bloom	Donohue	Havenner
Boggs, La.	Douglas	Hays
Buchanan	Eberharter	Hobbs
Buckley	Engle, Calif.	Holifield
Buffett	Feighan	Huber
Burleson	Flannagan	Isacson
Byrne, N. Y.	Fogarty	Jackson, Wash.
Carroll	Forand	Jarman
Celler	Gary	Jones, Ala.
Karsten, Mo.	Miller, Calif.	Rayburn
Kelley	Monroney	Rooney
Kennedy	Morgan	Sabath
Keogh	Multer	Sadowski
King	Norton	Schwabe, Mo.
Kirwan	O'Brien	Smathers
Klein	O'Toole	Smith, Ohio
Lesinski	Patman	Spence
Lusk	Pfeifer	Stanley
Lynch	Philbin	Teague
McCormack	Poage	Thompson
Madden	Powell	Trimble
Mansfield	Price, Ill.	Walter
Marcantonio	Rains	Whitaker

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Javits

NOT VOTING—20

Bonner	Knutson	Rivers
Brown, Ohio	Lane	Robertson
Clippinger	Ludlow	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Martin, Iowa	Stigler
Hartley	Morris	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, Okla.	Peden	West
Johnson, Tex.	Regan	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Ludlow.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Regan.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Morris.

Mr. WOLVERTON and Mr. KERR changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. ENGLE of California changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE HAROLD KNUTSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution offered by me and unanimously adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was offered by the Honorable ROBERT DOUGHTON on June 17, 1948, and was unanimously approved by the Committee on Ways and Means:

RESOLUTION OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Whereas the Committee on Ways and Means during the first and second sessions of the Eightieth Congress has made definite progress in the enormous task of converting the wartime Federal tax structure to a simplified, equitable, and permanent peacetime basis; and,

Whereas extensive hearings and studies on tax revision have been carried on simultaneously with fulfillment of the other responsibilities of the committee in the fields of social security, tariff, and reciprocal trade, customs, and the public debt; and

Whereas the effective coordination of the work of the committee and its subcommittees has been attributable largely to the diligence, persistence, and guidance of our able, courageous, and distinguished chairman, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota; and

Whereas the aforesaid chairman has consistently conducted the deliberations of the Committee on Ways and Means as to provide an amiable atmosphere for the prompt consideration and expeditious disposition of committee business, thereby earning the highest esteem and regard of the members of the committee, regardless of party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means, United States House of Representatives, hereby express our appreciation for the forceful, courageous, tireless, and able statesmanship and service of Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means during the Eightieth Congress, and that an engraved copy of this resolution be presented to the chairman as a tangible token of our gratitude.

TRIBUTE TO HON. HAROLD KNUTSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each member of the Ways and Means Committee may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD in reference to Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives met on June 18, 1948, in the Capitol to pay a well-deserved tribute to the present Chairman HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota. A resolution was introduced by Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, accompanied by appropriate words of praise for the excellent record made by his colleague. The resolution was unanimously and enthusiastically adopted by the committee.

I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation for the many courtesies and kindnesses received at the hands of my chairman. He has now entered the Ways and Means Hall of Fame of the illustrious men who have attained to the chairmanship of this powerful committee of the greatest legislative body in the world, the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

I am inserting at this point a brief historical sketch of the House Ways and Means Committee and the distinguished members thereof who later in life filled other important Federal positions. In some instances the State in which a member was born appears rather than from the State from which he was elected:

BRIEF HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Article I, section VII, of the United States Constitution provides: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

The House of Representatives since the beginning has adopted the system of committees to carry out its public affairs program. In fact, there are a few committees which are as old as the House itself. Historically, some even antedate the United States Constitution.

In May 1785 the Continental Congress had a committee, of which George Washington was chairman, "to consider ways and means to supply these Colonies with ammunition and military stores." This committee of "ways and means" functioned as a select committee up until 1802. As early as 1796, Mr. Gallatin moved that a standing committee on Ways and Means be appointed to watch over the national finances. But it was not until January 7, 1802, that the committee became an organization of the type which we now know.

Originally the Ways and Means Committee considered not only the methods of raising the revenues of the Nation, but the committee also made whatever appropriations were necessary to make the money available for public expenditure. In 1865 the business of initiating appropriations was transferred to the Committee on Appropriations and certain other classes of bills which originally had been considered by the Ways and Means Committee were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The jurisdiction which the Ways and Means Committee now has is extended (outside the consideration of duties on imports and the raising of internal revenue taxes) to such related subjects as: transportation of dutiable goods; the organization and definition of collection districts; ports of entry and delivery; customs unions; reciprocity treaties; seal herds and other revenue producing animals of Alaska; the revenue relations of the United States with Puerto Rico; the revenue bills relating to agricultural products generally; and the tax on future sales of cotton and grain; social security and other activities.

In addition, the committee has jurisdiction over bills relating to the Treasury of the United States and the deposit of public moneys. It also reports the resolutions giving recommendations of Presidents' annual messages to the appropriate committees of the House.

The following list shows former members of the Ways and Means Committee who have risen to the office of President, Vice President, became members of the Cabinet, served as Justices of the Supreme Court, or were elevated to the Speakership of the House of Representatives:

PRESIDENTS

James Madison, Virginia; Andrew Jackson, Tennessee; James K. Polk, Tennessee; Millard Fillmore, New York; James A. Garfield, Ohio; William McKinley, Ohio.

VICE PRESIDENTS

Elbridge Gerry, Massachusetts; Richard M. Johnson, Kentucky; John Tyler, Virginia; Millard Fillmore, New York; John C. Breckenridge, Kentucky; Charles Curtis, Kansas; John N. Garner, Texas.

SECRETARIES OF STATE

James Madison, Virginia; Louis McLane, Delaware; John Sherman, Ohio; William J. Bryan, Nebraska; Cordell Hull, Tennessee.

SECRETARIES OF THE TREASURY

Albert Gallatin, Pennsylvania; George W. Campbell, Tennessee; Samuel D. Ingham, Pennsylvania; Louis McLane, Delaware; Thomas Corwin, Ohio; Howell Cobb, Georgia; John Sherman, Ohio; Charles Foster, Ohio; John G. Carlisle, Kentucky; Ogden L. Mills, New York; Fred M. Vinson, Kentucky.

ATTORNEYS GENERAL

John Breckenridge, Kentucky; Caesar A. Rodney, Delaware; Joseph McKenna, California; A. Mitchell Palmer, Pennsylvania.

POSTMASTERS GENERAL

Cave Johnson, Tennessee; Samuel D. Hubbard, Connecticut; James Campbell, Pennsylvania; Horace Maynard, Tennessee; William L. Wilson, West Virginia.

SECRETARIES OF THE NAVY

Thomas W. Gilmer, Virginia; Hilary A. Herbert, Alabama; Victor H. Metcalf, California; Claude A. Swanson, Virginia.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Jacob Thompson, Mississippi.

JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT

Philip P. Barbour, Virginia; John McKinley, Alabama; Joseph McKenna, California; Fred M. Vinson, Kentucky.

SPEAKERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Theodore Sedgwick, Massachusetts; Langdon Cheves, South Carolina; John W. Taylor, New York; Philip P. Barbour, Virginia; Andrew Stevenson, Virginia; James K. Polk, Tennessee, John W. Jones, Virginia; Robert C. Winthrop, Massachusetts; Howell Cobb, Georgia; Nathaniel P. Banks, Massachusetts; Michael C. Kerr, Indiana; Samuel J. Randall, Pennsylvania; John G. Carlisle, Kentucky; Thomas B. Reed, Maine; Charles F. Crisp, Georgia; Champ Clark, Missouri; Nicholas Longworth, Ohio; John N. Garner, Texas; Henry T. Rainey, Illinois.

(Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

CHAIRMAN, WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

First Congress: Thomas Fitzsimmons, Pennsylvania.

Second Congress: Thomas Fitzsimmons, Pennsylvania.

Third Congress: Thomas Fitzsimmons, Pennsylvania.

Fourth Congress: William Smith, South Carolina.

Fifth Congress: R. G. Harper, South Carolina.

Sixth Congress: Roger Griswold, Connecticut.

Seventh Congress: John Randolph, Virginia.

Eighth Congress: John Randolph, Virginia.

Ninth Congress: Joseph Clay, Pennsylvania.

Tenth Congress: George W. Campbell, Tennessee.

Eleventh Congress: John W. Eppes, Virginia.

Twelfth Congress: Langdon Cheves, South Carolina.

Thirteenth Congress: John W. Eppes, Virginia.

Fourteenth Congress: William Lowndes, South Carolina.

Fifteenth Congress: William Lowndes, South Carolina.

Sixteenth Congress: Samuel Smith, Maryland.

Seventeenth Congress: Samuel Smith, Maryland.

Eighteenth Congress: Louis McLane, Delaware.

Nineteenth Congress: Louis McLane, Delaware.

Twentieth Congress: George McDuffie, South Carolina.

Twenty-first Congress: George McDuffie, South Carolina.

Twenty-second Congress: Gullion C. Verplanck, New York.

Twenty-third Congress: James K. Polk, Tennessee.

Twenty-fourth Congress: Churchill C. Chambreleng, New York.
Twenty-fifth Congress: Churchill C. Chambreleng, New York.
Twenty-sixth Congress: John W. Jones, Virginia.
Twenty-seventh Congress: Millard Fillmore, New York.
Twenty-eighth Congress: James J. McKay, North Carolina.
Twenty-ninth Congress: James J. McKay, North Carolina.
Thirtieth Congress: S. F. Vinton, Ohio.
Thirty-first Congress: James H. Bayley, Virginia.
Thirty-second Congress: George S. Houston, Alabama.
Thirty-third Congress: George S. Houston, Alabama.
Thirty-fourth Congress: Lewis D. Campbell, Ohio.
Thirty-fifth Congress: John S. Phelps, Missouri—J. Glancy Jones, Pennsylvania.
Thirty-sixth Congress: John Sherman, Ohio.
Thirty-seventh Congress: Thaddeus Stevens, Pennsylvania.
Thirty-eighth Congress: Thaddeus Stevens, Pennsylvania.
Thirty-ninth Congress: Justin S. Morrill, Vermont.
Fortieth Congress: Robert C. Schenk, Ohio.
Forty-first Congress: Robert C. Schenk, Ohio.
Forty-second Congress: Henry Dawes, Massachusetts.
Forty-third Congress: Henry Dawes, Massachusetts.
Forty-fourth Congress: William R. Morrison, Illinois.
Forty-fifth Congress: Fernando Wood, New York.
Forty-sixth Congress: Fernando Wood, New York.
Forty-seventh Congress: William D. Kelley, Pennsylvania.
Forty-eighth Congress: William R. Morrison, Illinois.
Forty-ninth Congress: William R. Morrison, Illinois.
Fiftieth Congress: Roger Q. Mills, Texas.
Fifty-first Congress: William McKinley, Ohio.
Fifty-second Congress: William M. Springer, Illinois.
Fifty-third Congress: William L. Wilson, West Virginia.
Fifty-fourth Congress: Nelson Dingley, Maine.
Fifty-fifth Congress: Nelson Dingley, Maine.
Fifty-sixth Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Fifty-seventh Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Fifty-eighth Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Fifty-ninth Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Sixtieth Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Sixty-first Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Sixty-second Congress: Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama.
Sixty-third Congress: Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama.
Sixty-fourth Congress: Claude W. Kitchin, North Carolina.
Sixty-fifth Congress: Claude W. Kitchin, North Carolina.
Sixty-sixth Congress: Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan.
Sixty-seventh Congress: Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan.
Sixty-eighth Congress: William R. Green, Iowa.
Sixty-ninth Congress: William R. Green, Iowa.
Seventieth Congress: William C. Hawley, Oregon.
Seventy-first Congress: William C. Hawley, Oregon.
Seventy-second Congress: James W. Collier, Mississippi.
Seventy-third Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-fourth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-fifth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-sixth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-seventh Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-eighth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-ninth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Eightieth Congress: HAROLD KNUTSON, Minnesota.

Chairmanship of Ways and Means Committee by States and sections

	Congresses
North and Middle West:	
Maine	2
Vermont	1
Massachusetts	2
Connecticut	1
New York	12
Pennsylvania	8
Delaware	2
Ohio	6
Illinois	4
Michigan	2
Minnesota	1
Iowa	2
	43
South and Southwest:	
Maryland	2
Virginia	6
West Virginia	1
North Carolina	11
South Carolina	7
Tennessee	2
Alabama	4
Mississippi	1
Missouri	1
Texas	1
	36
Far West: Oregon	2
Total	[1] 81

[1] During the 35th Cong. J. Glancy Jones (Pennsylvania) was chairman first session; John S. Phelps (Missouri) second session.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN FROM NEW YORK

G. Crommelin Verplanck

Mr. Verplanck was a New Yorker, the son of a clergyman, a graduate of Columbia in law, a man of much travel and a professor of the Evidences of Christianity in the General Theological Seminary before he took to politics. He was a Democrat of the school of Andrew Jackson and made his first appearance in Congress in the term which began in 1823. After that, was out of the House until 1831, when he was returned to the Twenty-second Congress, in which he was chairman of Ways and Means. This term was his last appearance in Congress, but not in politics. He was defeated for mayor of New York in 1834, but seems to have spent most of the remainder of his life in one or another compensated public pursuit, dying as vice chancellor of the University of the State of New York, of which he had been a regent for 45 years.

Churchill C. Cambreleng

Mr. Cambreleng was chairman of Ways and Means in the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Congresses. He was born in Washington, Beaufort County, N. C., October 24, 1786; attended school in New Bern, N. C.; moved to New York City in 1802, where he became a clerk and subsequently engaged in the mercantile business; elected as a Democrat to the Seventeenth and to the eight succeeding Congresses; unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1838 to the Twenty-sixth Congress; appointed United States Minister to Russia by President Van Buren, and served from May 20, 1840, to July 13, 1841; member of the State constitutional convention, 1846; retired from active business pursuits; died at his residence near Huntington, Suffolk County, N. Y., April 30, 1862; interment in Greenwood Cemetery, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Millard Fillmore

Mr. Fillmore was chairman in the Twenty-seventh Congress. He was born in Locke Township (now Summerhill), Cayuga County, N. Y., January 7, 1800; was admitted to the bar in 1823; member of the State assembly, 1829–1831; elected as a Whig to the Twenty-third Congress; elected to the Twenty-fifth, Twenty-sixth, and Twenty-seventh Congresses; declined to be a candidate for renomination in 1842; unsuccessful Whig candidate for Governor in 1844; elected State comptroller in 1847, and served until his resignation in 1849; elected Vice President of the United States on the Whig ticket headed by Zachary Taylor in 1848; became President upon the death of President Taylor, and served from July 9, 1850, to March 3, 1853; unsuccessful Whig candidate for President in 1852 and as the National American candidate in 1856; died in Buffalo, N. Y., March 8, 1874; interment in Forest Hill Cemetery.

Fernando Wood

Fernando Wood was chairman in the Forty-fifth and Forty-sixth Congresses. He was born in Philadelphia, Pa., June 14, 1812; moved with his father to New York City in 1820, was engaged in business as a shipping merchant in 1831, was elected as Tammany Democrat to the Twenty-seventh Congress, unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1842 to the Twenty-eighth Congress, appointed by Secretary of State John C. Calhoun dispatch agent for the State Department at the port of New York, reappointed by Secretary of State James Buchanan and served from 1844 to 1847; unsuccessful candidate for mayor of New York City in 1850; mayor of New York City in 1855–58, 1861, and 1862; elected Democrat to the Thirty-eighth Congress; unsuccessful candidate for reelection to the Thirty-ninth Congress; elected to the Fortieth, and each succeeding Congress, including the Forty-seventh, until his death at Hot Springs, Ark., February 13, 1881, before the beginning of the Forty-seventh Congress; interment in Trinity Cemetery, New York City.

Sereno E. Payne

Sereno Payne was chairman from the Fifty-sixth to Sixty-first Congresses, inclusive. He was born in Hamilton, Madison County, N. Y., June 26, 1843; attended the Auburn Academy and was graduated from the University of Rochester, N. Y., in 1864; studied law, was admitted to the bar in 1866, and practiced in Auburn, N. Y.; city clerk of Auburn in 1867 and 1868; supervisor in 1871 and 1872; district attorney of Cayuga County, 1873–79; president of the Board of Education of Auburn, 1879–82; appointed a member of the American-British Joint High Commission in January 1899; elected as Republican to the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses; elected to the Fifty-first Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Newton W. Nutting; reelected to the Fifty-second and to the 11 succeeding Congresses, and served from March 4, 1889, until his death; had been reelected to the Sixty-fourth Congress; died in Washington, D. C., December 10, 1914; interment in Fort Hill Cemetery, Auburn, N. Y.

(Source: Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774–1927.)

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution of commendation of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, my good friend, HAROLD KNUTSON, is a sincere expression of the esteem in which he is held by all the members of our committee. I appreciate this opportunity to speak from the heart the personal satisfaction that I have enjoyed in serving with the gentleman from Minnesota on the Committee on Ways and Means. When I came to Congress Mr. KNUTSON had already served more than a score of years. He was then a militant leader of the minority, but he has ever been willing to make available to me his kindly and experienced counsel.

When I became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1942, this friendship became firmly cemented in the bonds of day to day association in the disposition of common problems.

Notwithstanding his heavy load of increased respnsibilities during the Eightieth Congress as chairman of the committee, I have felt free to consult and confer with him on any matter pending before the committee—whether on taxes, reciprocal trade, or social security. It is because of this close friendship and constant association that I am so much aware of the diligent, devoted statesmanship and public service of Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON in the interests of the taxpayers of the Nation. I trust that we may share many more happy and fruitful years together on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with those who are paying respect to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

The resolution which was on yesterday passed by the Ways and Means Committee was presented to that committee by the distinguished former chairman, Mr. DOUGHTON. As we all know, he is one of the most highly respected Democrats in this House and is the oldest Member of this House and has the second longest record of service of any Member in the House. Mr. DOUGHTON'S action is significant in view of the further fact that Mr. KNUTSON is the oldest Republican Member in the House from the standpoint of service. Mr. DOUGHTON is serving his nineteenth term and Mr. KNUTSON is serving his sixteenth term. Mr. DOUGHTON served longer as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee than any man in the history of that great committee.

Mr. KNUTSON has been a member of the Ways and Means Committee for a great number of years and his service has been conspicuous. As chairman of the committee he has been very successful in leading this great committee in the preparation and passage of many measures of great importance to the Nation. The Knutson bill which passed in the present session of Congress will go down in the legislative history of Congress as a very important enactment. The bill was well drawn and met with the approval of the Members of Congress and of the country. This is proved by the fact that this bill was passed by the House in spite of the veto of the President. Mr. KNUTSON has shown great organizational ability in the manner in which he has conducted the business of the Ways and Means Committee. He has the respect of all those who serve with him. I concur most heartily in all the sentiments expressed in the resolution.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress draws to a close, the members of the Ways and Means Committee have recognized in a small way the fine service of our chairman the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON.

Yesterday, the committee adopted a resolution of congratulation and commendation of our distinguished colleague, and I take this opportunity to say that I subscribe 100 percent to the expressions contained in the resolution and extend to our chairman my best wishes for good health, a well-deserved vacation, and a return to this great body if it is his wish.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, in order to render the best service to our country while serving as chairman of a committee in the House of Representatives, it is not sufficient to be a patriotic legislator who has the best interest of all the people in mind and who can weigh fairly the pros and cons of bills which may come before him, but it is also necessary to have the executive ability to delegate those duties that can be delegated to other members of the committee—to encourage them to cooperate and to engender in the committee that spirit of fellowship and teamwork which will result in legislation being reported with as much unanimity as is possible among any group with divergent political views. To find such a man is rare.

The record of accomplishment of the Ways and Means Committee during the Eightieth Congress is proof that in its chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, we have a leader with these qualities.

During this past session the committee has been faced with the highly technical matters of tax reduction, tax revision, social security, reciprocal trade, and much other legislation of vital importance to the country. The fact that all bills reported out of the committee which have been voted on by the House have passed by overwhelming majorities is proof of the efficient work of the committee under his able leadership.

May our chairman give many more years of fine service to his country and his district in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to felicitate the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, upon the wonderful record he has made in his thirty-odd years as a Member of the House of Representatives; and especially to thank him for his leadership as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee during the busy and difficult days of the Eightieth Congress.

The work of this great committee during the time this country has been adjusting from a war economy to a reconstruction and peacetime program has been difficult and tedious.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has presided over our work with poise, dignity, and ability. His experience and farsighted statesmanship has guided and sustained us.

As a member of the committee of a different political faith, I appreciate his fairness, his kindness, and his desire at all times to serve his country first.

This veteran legislator and leader is loved and respected by us all.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure, indeed, to join with my colleagues of the Committee on Ways and Means in extending recognition and highly deserved praise of our colleague and good friend, the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, for his outstanding service as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the Eightieth Congress.

This is my first term as a member of the committee and I have been tremendously impressed by the sincere devotion to duty of the members of the committee and the good fellowship that prevails on the committee.

The good fellowship of this committee is exemplified by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, chairman for so many years prior to the Eightieth Congress, whose interest and leadership in the drafting and adoption of the resolution by the Committee on Ways and Means commending the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] speaks for itself.

I am delighted and honored to have this privilege of joining in the recognition and commendation my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] so richly deserves.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to add my voice in commendation of the service performed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It has been a great honor to have had the opportunity to serve on this great committee. It has also been an honor to serve under its distinguished chairman. He has conducted its affairs in a most honorable and fair manner. His direction of the committee has been courageous and statesmanlike. My service with him will always be one of my fondest memories.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining with my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee in the splendid resolution unanimously adopted by the committee honoring our chairman, Mr. HAROLD KNUTSON, It is fine recognition of the services rendered by the chairman in handling the legislation and the work of the committee in such an efficient and fair manner.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee submits for the RECORD its written testimonial to its distinguished chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota. It is a testimonial to the man and to his work—to the outstanding service he has rendered as head of that important committee during the reconstruction days of the Eightieth Congress.

It is an honor and a privilege to serve as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and also to join in this tribute to one of America's outstanding sons.

HAROLD KNUTSON came to these shores as a very young man. The story of his life, of his years of experience in the school of hard knocks is a story that is typically American. HAROLD KNUTSON is a living example of the opportunities that awaited a poor immigrant boy who had the determination, the ambition, and the perseverance to forge ahead in the land of equal opportunity for all.

During his long years of service in the House of Representatives he has represented his people and the people of America faithfully and well. He has served them in many and varied capacities. He has previously served as chairman of two other committees of the House of Representatives. All of that service today is climaxed by his chairmanship of the Committee on Ways and Means. As our beloved friend and fellow Member from New York, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, has pointed out, the chairmanship of the Ways and Means Committee has provided outstanding Americans for service in almost every capacity in the administrative branch of our Government, including six Presidents of these United States. That chairmanship was never in abler hands than it is in the person of Mr. KNUTSON.

It is so fitting and so representative of the unanimity and the nonpartisanship with which problems are approached by that committee that the resolution expressing the tribute of the members of the committee should have been brought forward by the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, the ranking minority member, who himself served so illustriously as chairman of this committee for many, many years.

Twenty-four members of the Committee on Ways and Means serving under our beloved chairman, Mr. KNUTSON, are as one man in wishing for him a long and happy life, and in wishing for the people of America many, many more years of his valiant and illustrious service in the Congress of the United States.

CHAIRMAN HAROLD KNUTSON IS A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a resolution has been presented which reflects the sentiments of every member of the House Committee on Ways and Means. May I say that I believe that our beloved chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, merits every tribute expressed therein.

The story of the life of HAROLD KNUTSON is typical of the American way. He came to this country as a boy from Norway. By hard work, determination, thrift, endurance, and perseverance he made a success in business. In addition, he has served his country in the Halls of Congress for all these many years. It is fitting that he should occupy one of the most powerful positions in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KNUTSON espouses a philosophy that brings hope to every young American. He believes in a government that permits an individual to prepare himself, work, earn, save, and achieve. This philosophy is the hope for the young man who makes his own way. It is the ladder by which he can climb to success. It is the American way. Our beloved chairman is one of the foremost champions of that way.

TRIBUTE TO HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion a Member of Congress must be judged by the ability, the courage, and the resourcefulness with which he represents the people of his district, his State, and his Nation. Although I have differed frequently with my friend, the eminent chairman, and often we have engaged in sharp debate, I can sincerely say that I have never felt, nor have I detected in him, any lingering rancor or resentment.

Our personal relationship has ever been cordial, and in the deliberations of the committee no member has received more fair, courteous, nonpartisan consideration than I.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy for a leader to be ever gracious and kind to those who always agree with him. But it takes a rare quality of statesmanship to be equally considerate of those in opposition.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman KNUTSON has demonstrated these qualities, and I want him and the membership of this House to know that I shall ever admire, respect, and thank him for them.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives yesterday passed a resolution praising the chairman of the committee, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, for the manner in which he presided over our deliberations.

I wish to add my own word of appreciation. As a member of the Democratic minority, I can honestly say that he has upheld the high traditions of the Committee on Ways and Means and has, like his distinguished predecessor, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, presided most fairly and impartially over our many and long sessions. Although a strong partisan Republican, he never in the years of his chairmanship, has permitted his partisanship to blunt his sense of fairness. He has given us, on the minority, a fair deal and a square deal.

The characteristic of Chairman KNUTSON that, in my opinion, is most outstanding is his unfailing sense of humor, no matter how rough the going may be at the time. Many times during heated discussions on some proposed legislation, when the tempers of other members of the committee were on edge, our distinguished chairman and our distinguished former chairman have engaged in humorous colloquy that relieved the tension and brought a new approach to the subject under discussion. I have no doubt that HAROLD KNUTSON'S sense of humor has successfully carried him through many seemingly imponderable difficulties.

I wish him many years of health and happiness.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee in paying tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON. Their tributes have been accurate and generous. I concur in what they have said.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving in this House with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] for 28 of my 30 years of service here. No Member is more familiar with his character, his ability, or his motives in approaching the problems which daily face us. Those who know him best agree that before taking a stand on any question, he first determines whether or not the measure is for the best interests of the people generally throughout the Nation. If he believes it is, he supports it. If he believes it is not, he vigorously opposes it.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is endowed with high intelligence and a degree of patriotism not excelled by any individual. His service has been honorable, and it has been distinguished by an intense desire to represent his constituents in a way every constituency should be represented in this body. I congratulate the people who send him here and trust they will show their appreciation of his fine service by returning him to this House so long as he desires to serve.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, since I have had the honor of serving on the Committee on Ways and Means, it has been my pleasure to serve under two distinguished chairmen—our present chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, and the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina.

I am glad to join with the other members of the Ways and Means Committee in congratulating Mr. KNUTSON upon the outstanding record he has made in his long period of service to his country as a Member of the House of Representatives. His accomplishments and record as a first-generation American should be a beacon light to all American citizens. Particularly do I wish to felicitate him upon his leadership as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. As a member of the committee of a different political faith, I appreciate the difficulties of his task, his fairness, his wisdom, and his desire at all times to serve his country first.

I am delighted and honored to have this privilege of joining in this recognition of Mr. KNUTSON.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in making a statement at this time is to place in the RECORD my hearty approval of the resolution offered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, commending the services of our chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, which has received the unanimous approval of the Ways and Means Committee.

As a new member of the committee, it has been a most interesting experience to serve on this great committee, during the Eighteenth Congress, under the leadership of Chairman KNUTSON.

Members who have served on the committee for a great number of years inform me that not in their memory has the committee accomplished so much in a single session in the way of major legislation. The tax-reduction bill heads the list of numerous bills in the public interest voted out of the committee. This in a very large measure is due to the courageous and able leadership of the chairman. I have found the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] to be eminently fair in his consideration of all questions. He is a stout-hearted fighter for the right; an able statesman and a great public servant. He is the type that built this Republic and is the type that will sustain it.

I wish for my friend and colleague, Chairman KNUTSON, many more years of health, happiness, and service to his country.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, among the many treasured memories of legislative associations, there is none I shall cherish longer than that of serving in the Eightieth Congress under the inspiring leadership of Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The duties of the chairman of this important committee are most arduous. The legislative subjects of taxation, tax revision, tax reduction, the tariff, reciprocal trade and social security are all highly technical and the handling of these and other matters just as involved, through the process of committee hearings, executive committee consideration, report, clearance for House consideration and conduct of debate call for the highest qualities of generalship. HAROLD KNUTSON has demonstrated his possession of these qualities in a high degree.

His distinguished service to the country marks him as a statesman worthy to follow in the footsteps of the illustrious and distinguished gentlemen who have preceded him as chairman of this great committee not the least of whom is his immediate predecessor, the beloved gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON.

I am honored to have the privilege of joining with my committee colleagues in wishing for him a full measure of health, happiness, and success for the future and a triumphant return to further distinguished service in Congress.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly privileged as a member of the Ways and Means Committee to join my colleagues in paying this merited tribute to our distinguished chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON.

Any member of that committee, charged with the duty of preparing tax legislation, must recognize in the chairman one who from a maze of conflicting testimony is able to reach a correct conclusion. Once having reached the conclusion he believes right, HAROLD KNUTSON adheres to it unflinchingly until the final decision.

Early in the Eightieth Congress, our chairman, convinced as he was of the need for income-tax reduction, and believing firmly that the good of his country required it, introduced legislation to accomplish his purpose. Despite the utmost opposition which included two Presidential vetoes, HAROLD KNUTSON, never deviating an iota in principle, led his colleagues in Congress to final passage of his legislation.

His wisdom and courage are already proved—by his courage, perseverance and hard work, he thus raised his own monument in the minds and hearts of all American citizens.

Born in another land, our chairman has proved himself an honored and capable leader of his Nation's destiny. He has the courage and ability to meet the challenge of his times and as chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, has become a guiding light in the government of the greatest Nation in the world.

In all ways fair and impartial as chairman of the committee, HAROLD KNUTSON has endeared himself to both the majority and minority members of that committee, by recognizing the importance and vital part played by the minority in a truly representative Government, while adhering to his belief that the majority party should assume its responsibility. By his fairness he has strengthened representative government as exemplified in our committee. It is this quality which has made him a great leader and brought about the teamwork so essential for efficient committee action where constructive work is required by both the majority and minority of the committee.

HAROLD KNUTSON has proved himself qualified to take a place in the roster of other distinguished chairmen who have preceded him. I consider it a great honor to have worked with him, to have had the benefit of his counsel and cooperation and I look forward to future years in which our mutual associations will continue.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, of all of those who have risen to national prominence in the public service during our times, none is held in higher respect or warmer affection than is Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, present-day chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means. The high esteem in which he is held in the hearts and minds of his colleagues did not come by chance. Under every test to which a legislator can be subjected, he has been found worthy of the trust and confidence of which others have spoken so earnestly.

Because I, as a Member of the House of Representatives for 14 years and of the great Committee on Ways and Means for ten, have had an exceptional opportunity to appraise the works and measure the character of this great and good man, I have no hesitancy in joining the many others who have risen from their seats to honor him on this touching occasion, each one in his turn to proclaim him one of the great legislators of our times, one whose name and accomplishments will ever be written large in the annals of this Republic.

The steadfastness with which he adheres to that which he conceives to be right; the intelligence and driving force which he throws behind that which he considers good; the successes which he has achieved in the promotion of the general welfare, will mark him indelibly as a courageous, fearless, able and very efficient representative of the people. In his effective management of the public business, he commands the admiration of the entire membership, regardless of political affiliation.

But aside from all this, the elements of his character which have won for him so large a place in the hearts of his colleagues, are found in his, the lovable personality of an ingenuous man; his quick sympathy for the weak and oppressed; his helping hand which is ever extended to those who are troubled; his words of encouragement to the despondent; his spontaneous wit and rollicking good fellowship which is so quickly revealed as the dark clouds fade from the once troubled skies and good men can once again make merry. No one is poor who can claim such a man as his friend.

So I, with all of the others, am happy to rise and to salute HAROLD KNUTSON, the genial gentleman from Minnesota. There is not, there could not be, a finer, a better, a more lovable man. May his life be long and full of happiness; his public service, with success and honors great, for, indeed, no one is more deserving of these.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, membership on a major congressional committee entails much work and study. Membership on the great Ways and Means Committee, of which Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, is chairman, is no exception.

A chairman can do much toward making a record for the committee. We believe that HAROLD KNUTSON has set a new high mark in that capacity. Under his leadership the work of the Ways and Means Committee has been most effective and harmonious. In expressing its appreciation the committee on June 17, 1948, assembled in special meeting to tell our chairman our feelings toward him.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere pleasure I take advantage of this opportunity to commend the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, for his constructive work and aggressive leadership, as well as for the fair and impartial manner in which he has conducted the committee. His years of service as an outstanding statesman bears witness to his enterprise and initiative and industry. He has contributed much to the welfare of this Nation, giving a guaranty of a greater and more splendid future for our country.

It has been a real pleasure to work with Mr. KNUTSON, and I hope our paths may cross often in the future. He has my best wishes for his continued health, happiness, and success.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement made by me in presenting a resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means in honor of the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, which was unanimously adopted:

Mr. Chairman, I have served as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means for about 24 years and was its chairman for 14 years. Prior to becoming chairman, I have served on the committee with the following chairmen: Hon. William Green, of Iowa; Hon. William Collier, of Mississippi; and Hon. Charles Crisp, of Georgia, who was acting chairman during the illness of Chairman Collier.

In my opinion our present chairman, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, is the equal of any chairman within my experience in point of ability and the fine service he has rendered as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means since the opening of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. KNUTSON has also extended to me many personal courtesies and kindnesses which I shall always appreciate and I offered the resolution which was adopted unanimously.

expressing our high estimate and profound appreciation of the wonderful record made by Chairman KNUTSON.

Mr. KNUTSON is not only an excellent chairman but a great legislator and an outstanding American citizen who is rendering most unusual service to our Nation.

Mr. KNUTSON. My friends, I am deeply touched by your action. No man is better qualified to bear testimony on the greatness of this wonderful country and the many opportunities it has to offer to those who are willing to work and strive for advancement than am I, who was born in a foreign land.

I well recall, as a small boy, how our beloved mother would gather her brood of little ones about her each night preparatory to being put to bed. Placing her arms about us she offered up the evening prayer and always that prayer included a note of thanksgiving to Providence for having permitted our family to come to this wonderful country where each and every one is free to carve out his own career. I learned at her bedside the great lesson of Americanism, and if at times it may have appeared that I am strongly nationalist it is altogether due to the fact that I love my country and am zealous of her welfare.

George Washington's admonition to us to avoid entangling alliances has ever had the force of a command from on high for me.

Being chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, an honor that had never before come to my great State, carries with it heavy responsibilities, as you well know.

My sainted mother often impressed upon our young and plastic minds that life is like a bank account and we can draw on that account only as much as we put into it. It was a proud moment in my mother's life when I was first sworn in as a Member of Congress, but it was not the pride of position. Rather, it was pride that her son had been placed in a position where he could be of service to others, and during my long tenure here I have always looked upon my position as an opportunity to be of service to others. How well I have succeeded is not for me to say.

As chairman of the great Ways and Means Committee I have tried to be fair and helpful to my colleagues. I am happy to say that except when party issues were involved there has been little partisanship in our deliberations and in our labors. All were animated by the same lofty ideal—to render the best and greatest possible service to the land that we love and which has done so much for each and every one of us.

May I say at this point that the loyal and effective help of my old and most valued friend, Mr. DOUGHTON, has contributed much to whatever measure of success I may have attained as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. His wise counsel has on more than one occasion smoothed the way for reporting necessary legislation. My friend places country above party, which is the hallmark of statesmanship. He has served longer as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means than any other—a fine tribute to a fine gentleman.

Regardless of my future plans I shall ever cherish the memory of the friendships formed while a member of our great committee. To me the recollection of my service here will ever be a cherished memory.

In closing, let me again thank you from the bottom of my heart for the fine cooperation you have always given me. It was your helpfulness that enabled me to carry on and garner whatever success that has been attained. In return I wish for each and every one of you life's richest blessings, peace of mind, good health, happiness, and length of years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. ISACSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a certain article.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to have printed in the RECORD the majority and minority report in the election contest of Wilson versus Granger.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the general subject of the REA and AAA legislation, including his own roll call records, letters, communications, and newspaper articles.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made today on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill and include certain letters and telegrams.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CARROLL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 691, Rept. No. 2415), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized, empowered, and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission with a view to determining whether or not such Commission in its organization, in the selection and appointment of personnel, and in the conduct of its functions and activities, has been, and is, acting in accordance with law and the public interest, including (but not limiting the foregoing authority) a study and investigation of the Commission's licensing and license-renewal activities; the Commission's power and authority, if any, to promulgate and issue its so-called Blue Book and the extent to which, if any, the same has been, or is being, used as the basis or excuse for regulation by the Commission, directly or indirectly, of radio-program content at licensed radio stations; whether the Commission has licensed, or proposes to license, any radio station or stations owned or controlled by persons who are members of, or affiliated with, subversive or Communist-front organizations or who might permit the facilities of such radio stations to be used contrary to the public interest; and whether there has been, or is, any concerted movement or effort to procure the concentration of radio-station licenses, including FM, AM, and television, in the hands of a limited class of persons or concerns rather than a distribution of such licenses on a geographical and equitable basis, as provided by the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at the earliest practicable date, for during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present session of Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, records, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

POSTAL RATE REVISION AND SALARY ACT OF 1948

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be cited as the "Postal Rate Revision and Salary Act of 1948."

TITLE I—ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTMASTERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FIELD SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 101. All postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal service whose rates of

compensation are prescribed by the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended, shall receive additional compensation at the rate of $450 per annum: *Provided*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 25 cents per hour: *Provided further*, That postmasters at post offices of the fourth class shall receive additional compensation at the rate of a sum per annum equal to 25 per centum of their basic annual compensation.

SEC. 102. The provisions of this act shall not apply to skilled-trades employees of the mail-equipment shops, job cleaners in first- and second-class post offices, and employees who are paid on a fee or contract basis.

SEC. 103. This title shall take effect as of July 1, 1948.

TITLE II—POSTAL RATE REVISION

AIR MAIL

SEC. 201. The rate of postage on all domestic air mail as defined in Public Law 730, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall except in the case of postal cards and private mailing or post cards, be 6 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof. The rate of postage on postal cards and private mailing or post cards (conforming to the conditions prescribed by the act entitled "An act to amend the postal laws relating to use of postal cards", approved May 19, 1898 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 39, sec. 281)), when sent by air mail, shall be 4 cents each.

THIRD-CLASS MAIL

SEC. 202. The rate of postage on third-class matter shall be 2 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof, and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof up to and including 8 ounces in weight, except that the rate of postage on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants not exceeding 8 ounces in weight shall be 1½ cents for each 2 ounces or fraction thereof: *Provided*, That upon payment of a fee of $10 for each calendar year or portion thereof and under such regulations as the Postmaster General may establish for the collection of the lawful revenue and for facilitating the handling of such matter in the mails, it shall be lawful to accept for transmission in the mails, separately addressed identical pieces of third-class matter in quantities of not less than 20 pounds, or of not less than 200 pieces, subject to pound rates of postage applicable to the entire bulk mailed at one time: *Provided further*, That the rate of postage on third-class matter mailed in bulk under the foregoing provision shall be 1¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1 cent, except that in the case of books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants the rate shall be 10 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1 cent: *And provided further*, That pieces or packages of such size or form as to prevent ready facing and tying in bundles and requiring individual distributing throughout shall be subject to a minimum charge of 3 cents each.

CONTROLLED CIRCULATION PUBLICATIONS

SEC. 203. Publications containing 24 pages or more issued at regular intervals of four or more times a year, 25 percent or more of whose pages are devoted to text or reading matter and not more than 75 percent to advertising matter, which are circulated free or mainly free, may, upon authorization by the Postmaster General and under such regulations as he may prescribe, be accepted for mailing at the postage rate of 10 cents a pound or fraction thereof, computed on the entire bulk mailed at one time, but not less than 1 cent per piece, provided the copies of such publications are presented for mailing made up according to States, cities, and routes as directed by the Postmaster General: *Provided*, That publications owned and controlled by one or several individuals or business concerns and conducted as an auxiliary to and essentially for the advancement of the main business or calling of those who own or control them shall not be accepted under this section.

FOURTH-CLASS (PARCEL POST) MAIL

SEC. 204. (a) On fourth-class matter (limit of weight over 8 ounces to 70 pounds) the rate of postage except as herein provided for catalogs (limit of weight over 8 ounces up to and including 10 pounds), books, and library books, shall be by the pound as hereinafter provided, the postage in all cases to be prepaid by stamps affixed thereto or as otherwise prescribed by the Postmaster General.

(b) The rate of postage on matter of the fourth class shall be as follows:

(1) On all matter mailed at the post office from which a rural route starts, for delivery on such route, or mailed at any point on such route for delivery at any other point thereon, or at the office from which the route starts, or on any rural route starting therefrom, and on all matter mailed at a city-carrier office, or at any point within its delivery limits, for delivery by carriers from that office, or at any office for local delivery, the postage shall be 10 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and three-fourth cent for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(2) For delivery within the first and second zones, except as provided for in paragraph (1), and except when the distance by the shortest regular mail route from the office of origin to the office of delivery is 300 miles or more in which case the rates of postage shall be the same as for delivery within the third zone, 12 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 2⅒ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 2 cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(3) For delivery within the third zone, 13 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 2⅗ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(4) For delivery within the fourth zone, 14 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 4½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 4¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(5) For delivery within the fifth zone, 15 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 6 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 5½ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(6) For delivery within the sixth zone, 16 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 7½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 7¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(7) For delivery within the seventh zone, 17 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 9½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 9¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(8) For delivery within the eighth zone, 18 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 11½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 11¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(9) On parcels measuring more than 84 inches but not more than 100 inches in length and girth combined the minimum postage charge shall be the zone charge applicable to a 10-pound parcel.

(c) Catalogs and similar printed advertising matter in bound form weighing more than 8 ounces but not exceeding 10 pounds shall be subject to postage rates based on the eight parcel-post zones as follows:

(1) When mailed at the post office from which a rural route starts, for delivery on such route, or mailed at any point on such route for delivery at any other point thereon, or at the office from which the route starts, or on any rural route starting therefrom, and when mailed at a city-carrier office, or at any point within its delivery limits, for delivery by carriers from that office, or at any office for local delivery, the postage shall be 7½ cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound.

(2) For delivery within the first and second zones, except as provided for in paragraph (1), and except when the distance by the shortest regular mail route from the office of origin to the office of delivery is 300 miles or more in which case the rates of postage shall be the same as for delivery within the third zone, 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(3) For delivery within the third zone, 9 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 2 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(4) For delivery within the fourth zone, 10 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 2½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(5) For delivery within the fifth zone, 12 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(6) For delivery within the sixth zone, 13 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(7) For delivery within the seventh zone, 14 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(8) For delivery within the eighth zone, 15 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 6 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(d) Books, permanently bound for preservation consisting wholly of reading matter or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for student's notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books and when in parcels not exceeding 70 pounds in weight, may be sent at the postage rate of 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(e) Books, consisting wholly of reading matter and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books, when sent by public libraries, organizations, or associations not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, as a service to county or other unit libraries or as a loan to readers or when returned by the latter libraries or readers to such public libraries, organizations, or associations shall be charged with postage at the rate of 4 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof, except that the rates now or hereafter prescribed for third- or fourth-class matter shall apply in every case where such rate is lower than the rate prescribed in this subsection for books under this classification: *Provided*, That this rate shall apply only to such books as are addressed for local delivery, for delivery in the first, second, or third zone, or within the State in which mailed. Public libraries, organizations, or associations before being entitled to the foregoing rates shall furnish to the Postmaster General,

under such regulations as he may prescribe,

exceeding $700, $1.20; for registry indemnity

a return receipt or the equivalent is not due

under such regulations as he may prescribe, satisfactory evidence that none of their net income inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual.

(f) To procure the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable of mail matter of the fourth class, special-handling stamps shall be affixed thereto, in addition to the regular postage, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than 2 pounds, 15 cents; matter weighing more than 2 but not more than 10 pounds, 20 cents; matter weighing more than 10 pounds, 25 cents: *Provided*, That, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, ordinary stamps of equivalent value may be accepted in lieu of the special-handling stamps herein specified.

SPECIAL DELIVERY

SEC. 205. To procure the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable and the immediate delivery of mail matter at the office of address, special-delivery stamps shall be affixed thereto, in addition to the regular postage, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than 2 pounds, if of the first class, 15 cents; if of any other class, 25 cents. Matter weighing more than 2 but not more than 10 pounds, if of the first class, 25 cents; if of any other class, 35 cents. Matter weighing more than 10 pounds, if of the first class, 35 cents; if of any other class, 45 cents: *Provided*, That under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, ordinary postage stamps of equivalent value may be accepted in lieu of the special-delivery stamps.

MONEY ORDERS

SEC. 206. A money order shall not be issued for more than $100, and the fees for domestic money order shall be as follows: For orders less than $5.01, 10 cents; for orders from $5.01 up to and including $10, 15 cents; for orders from $10.01 up to and including $50, 25 cents; for orders from $50.01 up to and including $100, 35 cents.

POSTAL NOTES

SEC. 207. (a) The Postmaster General may authorize postmasters at such offices as he shall designate, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, to issue and pay money orders not exceeding $10, to be known as postal notes. The fee for insurance thereof shall be 8 cents each.

(b) Postal notes shall be valid for two calendar months from the last day of the month of their issue; but thereafter may be paid by the Postmaster General or refund may be made in case of loss, upon evidence satisfactory to him, under such regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That no claim for the amount of a postal note will be considered unless filed within 1 year from the last day of the month of issue. Postal notes shall not be negotiable or transferable through endorsement.

REGISTERED MAIL

SEC. 208. (a) Mail matter shall be registered on the application of the party posting the same. The registry fees, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this subsection, shall be as follows: For registry indemnity not exceeding $5, 25 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $25, 35 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50, 40 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $75, 45 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $75 but not exceeding $100, 50 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200, 60 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $300, 70 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $300 but not exceeding $400, 85 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $400 but not exceeding $500, $1; for registry indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $600, $1.10; for registry indemnity exceeding $600 but not exceeding $700, $1.20; for registry indemnity exceeding $700 but not exceeding $800, $1.30; for registry indemnity exceeding $800 but not exceeding $900, $1.40; for registry indemnity exceeding $900 but not exceeding $1,000, $1.50.

(b) For registered mail having a declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid, there shall be charged additional fees (known as "surcharges") as follows: When the declared value exceeds the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid by not more than $50, 2 cents; by more than $50 but not more than $100, 3 cents; by more than $100 but not more than $200, 4 cents; by more than $200 but not more than $400, 6 cents; by more than $400 but not more than $600, 7 cents; by more than $600 but not more than $800, 8 cents; by more than $800 but less than $1,000, 10 cents. If the excess of the declared value over the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid is $1,000 or more, the additional fees for each $1,000 or part of $1,000 on articles destined to points within the several zones applicable to fourth-class matter shall be as follows: For local delivery or for delivery within the first zone, 11 cents; for delivery within the second zone, 12 cents; for delivery within the third zone, 14 cents; for delivery within the fourth zone, 15 cents; for delivery within the fifth or sixth zone, 16 cents; for delivery within the seventh or eighth zone, 18 cents.

(c) For insured mail treated as registered mail having a declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid, there shall be charged additional fees (known as "surcharges") as follows: When the declared value exceeds the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid by not more than $50, 1 cent; by more than $50 but not more than $100, 2 cents; by more than $100 but not more than $200, 3 cents; by more than $200 but not more than $400, 4 cents; by more than $400 but not more than $600, 5 cents; by more than $600 but not more than $800, 6 cents; by more than $800 but less than $1,000, 7 cents. If the excess of the declared value over the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid is $1,000 or more, the additional fee for each $1,000 or part of $1,000 on articles destined to points within the several zones applicable to fourth-class matter shall be as follows: For local delivery or for delivery within the first zone, 8 cents; for delivery within the second zone, 9 cents; for delivery within the third zone, 10 cents; for delivery within the fourth zone, 11 cents; for delivery within the fifth or sixth zone, 12 cents; for delivery within the seventh or eighth zone, 13 cents.

(d) All such fees shall be accounted for in such manner as the Postmaster General shall direct. Mail matter for the official business of the Post Office Department which requires registering shall be registered free of charge, and pass through the mails free of charge.

RETURN RECEIPTS FOR REGISTERED MAIL

SEC. 209. Whenever the sender of any registered mail shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 5 cents at the time of mailing or of 10 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such registered mail, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 26 cents at the time of mailing of any such registered mail, a receipt shall be obtained for such registered mail, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for return receipts for registered mail where the failure to furnish the sender a return receipt or the equivalent is not due to the fault of the postal service.

FEES FOR INSURED MAIL

SEC. 210. The fees for insurance, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this section, shall be as follows: 5 cents for indemnification not exceeding $5; 10 cents for indemnification exceeding $5 but not exceeding $10; 15 cents for indemnification exceeding $10 but not exceeding $25; 20 cents for indemnification exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 25 cents for indemnification exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 30 cents for indemnification exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200. Whenever the sender of an insured article of mail shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 5 cents at the time of mailing or of 10 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 26 cents at the time of mailing of any such insured article of mail, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for return receipts for insured mail where the failure to furnish the sender a return receipt or the equivalent is not due to the fault of the postal service.

FEES FOR COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

SEC. 211. The fees for collect-on-delivery service for sealed domestic mail matter of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate and for domestic third- or fourth-class mail matter shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be as follows: 20 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $2.50; 25 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $2.50 but not exceeding $5; 35 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $25; 45 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 55 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 60 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $150; and 65 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $150 but not exceeding $200. The fee for notifying the sender or his representative of inability to deliver a collect-on-delivery article shall be 5 cents.

RESTRICTION IN DELIVERY

SEC. 212. The Postmaster General, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to collect an additional fee of 20 cents for effecting the delivery by carrier or otherwise of domestic registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail, the delivery of which is restricted to the addressee only, or to the addressee or order: *Provided*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for this service unless request for refund is made and erroneous delivery of the article or articles was made by the postal service or nondelivery of the article or articles was due to some fault of the postal service.

REGISTERED COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

SEC. 213. (a) The fee for collect-on-delivery service for registered sealed domestic mail of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be 55 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $10; 70 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $10 but not exceeding $50; 90 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; and $1.15 for collections and indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200. The maximum amount of charges collectible on any registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery article shall be $200.

(b) When indemnity in excess of $200 is desired, the fee for such registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery mail shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be $1.20 for indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $300; $1.25 for indemnity exceeding $300 but not exceeding $400; $1.30 for indemnity exceeding $400 but not exceeding $500; $1.35 for indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $600; $1.40 for indemnity exceeding $600 but not exceeding $700; $1.45 for indemnity exceeding $700 but not exceeding $800; and $1.55 for indemnity exceeding $800 but not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 214. This title shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the calendar month in which it is enacted.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is the purpose of this legislation to provide a permanent increase of $450 per year in the salaries of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department and to offset a portion of the increased cost by an increase in postal rates.

Title I of this bill is concerned with a salary increase for postal employees. Under the provisions of title I employees paid on an annual basis will receive a $450 permanent increase in their annual salary. Increases are provided for employees paid on an hourly basis in the amount of 25 cents an hour and for fourth-class postmasters of 25 percent. First-, second-, and third-class postmasters will receive the $450 annual increase given other postal employees.

The increase for fourth-class postmasters is provided on a percentage basis because, as you know, for many of these postmasters the return for their services from the Post Office Department is not the major portion of their income. Fourth-class post offices are the smaller post offices which have gross receipts varying from $100 per year to a top of $1,500 per year. Since fourth-class postmasters are paid based upon their gross receipts, you can see that it would be completely out of proportion to increase their salaries on other than a percentage basis.

The committee devoted much time and study to the problem of increased salaries for postal employees. Testimony presented to the committee by postal employees' national organizations stressed the necessity of a salary increase based upon the recent increase in the cost of living.

To offset part of the rising cost of living in the past, postal employees in the field service of the Post Office Department to whom this bill applies have been granted two substantial permanent pay raises. The first was the adjustment in salaries and classifications under Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, amounting to $400 annually for each postal employee beginning July 1, 1945. The second was under Public Law 386, Seventy-ninth Congress, which granted an additional permanent salary increase of $400 a year, effective January 1, 1946.

In connection with its efforts to secure a meeting of the minds between the executive and legislative branches with respect to this problem, the committee requested the Bureau of the Budget and the Postmaster General to submit reports concerning pay-raise legislation.

In his budget message to the Congress in January 1948 the President stated that he was not recommending cost-of-living increases in pay for Federal civilian employees. The President stated:

> The rapid increase in living costs during the last 18 months has placed a serious burden on these groups. Yet, to offset the cost-of-living increase since the last time pay or benefit rates were advanced for each group would add at least $2,400,000,000 to budget expenditures in 1949—apart from increases that would be paid from the trust funds. This large expenditure would add greatly to the inflationary pressure in our economy.

Further, the committee secured a report from the Bureau of the Budget, the right arm of the President, with respect to pay raises for Federal employees, dated July 1, 1947, which stated:

> In view of the recent substantial increases in the base pay rates of Federal employees generally, it appears that these rates for the lower and middle pay brackets are now fairly well in line with salaries outside the Government.

In an additional report, dated February 25, 1948, the Bureau of the Budget stated:

> In reply, you are advised that by reason of the position taken by the President in his budget message of January 12, 1948, on this subject, it is not believed that the enactment of the proposed legislation (salary increases for postal workers) could be considered, at least at this time, as being in accord with the program of the President.

At hearings conducted by the committee, the Postmaster General stated:

> We have to rest upon the President's budget message to the Congress.

As the Members of the House can see, the committee has had little cooperation from the executive branch with respect to working out a fair solution to pay increases for postal employees. Yet, our committee undertook to approach this problem realistically, and title I of this bill providing for a $450 annual increase in the salaries of postal workers is, in the judgment of our committee, the best solution to this problem.

In my opinion—and I am sure this view is shared by the members of the committee—our faithful postal workers richly deserve this permanent increase in their base salaries.

It is true that the cost of the bill will be approximately $211,000,000 annually. However, title II of the bill provides for recovering approximately $125,000,000 of this cost by moderate increases in postal rates and postal services. The $450 increase is probably not as much as the postal workers desire. However, it is a permanent increase; and taking into consideration the fact that the Congress has, within the past 3 years, approved increases amounting to $800 a year, the committee believed the increase is fair and equitable.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, our majority floor leader.

Mr. HALLECK. What is the estimated deficit in the post office for this year?

Mr. REES. I understand the estimated deficit is approximately $375,000,000 at the present time.

Mr. HALLECK. I commend the gentleman and his committee on bringing in a bill that contains in it, in addition to the pay raise, a provision for raising at least a substantial part of the money, because obviously we cannot go on and on having deficits in the Post Office constantly increasing.

Mr. REES. The President in his budget message in January stressed the need for increased postal rates to meet the large deficit, presently running to $375,000,000 annually. I may say, however, that the Post Office Department has suggested much larger increases in rates than are proposed in this legislation. However, our committee tried to be practical about this matter and to be fair to all parties concerned. For that reason we have brought in what we believe to be moderate rate increases in dealing with this problem.

The President in his budget messages in 1947 and 1948 has stressed the need for increasing postal rates to meet the large postal deficit. The Postmaster General on March 23, 1948, recommended to the Congress increases in postal rates which would have raised revenues of $243,970,000. In the opinion of the committee the rates recommended by the Postmaster General are more in some categories than should be imposed upon the users of the mail at this time. The rates contained in title II of the bill provide for increases for the considerably lower amount of $124,225,000. These increases for the categories of mail and postal services included in the bill are as follows:

	Amount of proposed increase
1. Air mail (domestic)	$9,850,000
2. Circulars, printed matter, seeds, etc., in parcels weighing less than 8 ounces (third-class mail)	14,600,000
3. Parcel post	60,500,000
4. Catalogs	2,400,000
5. Books	3,300,000
6. Special handling	300,000
7. Special delivery	3,600,000
8. Money orders	17,500,000
9. Postal notes	1,650,000
10. Registered mail	4,200,000
11. Insurance	3,575,000
12. C. o. d. service	3,300,000

AIR MAIL

At the present time we are experiencing an annual loss of $18,000,000 in handling air mail. As I have stated, increasing the rate on air mail from 5 to 6 cents will increase the revenue by approximately $10,000,000.

THIRD-CLASS MAIL

Third-class mail is circulars, printed matter, seeds, bulbs, and so forth, sent in parcels of less than 8 ounces. A special rate is provided in this classification for seeds and bulbs. Also there is a special rate provided for bulk mailers sending more than 200 uniform items at one mailing. In this bill there is no change of the 1-cent minimum rate charged for these bulk mailings. The increase in this rate comes in the smaller mailings of third-class mail and an increase in the pound rate of 2 cents. The third-class mailers have expressed themselves as being favorable to H. R. 3519 and I believe I can say they have been quite generously treated in this bill.

FOURTH-CLASS MAIL

Fourth-class mail has several subcategories—parcel post, catalogs, books and library books. Fourth-class mail is required to pay its own way according to present law. The Postmaster General, under this law which still remains in effect, is directed to increase parcel-post rates through a procedure involving the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission whenever revenues do not equal expenditures for handling parcel post. We have been experiencing for the past several years a large loss in parcel post and I have brought this fact to the attention of the Postmaster General. It has been his position that since Congress has under consideration a revision in parcel-post rates he is delaying taking proper action under the law. I have noted that the Senate Committee on Appropriations has also brought this fact to his attention and requested that he take action. The loss in parcel post in 1947 was $41,000,000. The rates provided in this bill will increase revenues in parcel post by $60,000,000. We must consider, of course, at the same time, this bill is increasing cost to the postal service so that with the increased rates the revenues from parcel post should approximate the expenditures in this class of mail.

There has also been a lot of controversy whenever the question of book rate increases is considered. In this respect I should like to point out that books are, after all, merchandise, and as a matter of fact they are carried under regular parcel-post rates. Books do not have a high time priority and in the majority of cases, could actually go by freight instead of expensive postal service. For this reason it does not appear that the Post Office Department should be carrying books at a great loss. The proposed increases on books leave them at a flat rate, that is, there is the same charge for sending a book across the country as there is for sending it into the next county. This flat rate is justified because book printing is concentrated in a few areas and it is felt that this does assist in a wide distribution of books. Even with these increased rates on books, we will still be carrying them at less than cost.

Most of the other increases concern postal services. I do not believe there has been as much controversy over increasing these rates as over increasing rates for mail.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, one of the distinguished members of our committee who has worked very diligently in trying to work out this problem.

Mr. COMBS. First I want to say that in my judgment no committee of the House has done its work more conscientiously or more studiously avoided partisanship than the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Our distinguished chairman has been patient and worked hard and every member of the committee, Republicans and Democrats, has worked hard to report out fair, well-considered bills for enactment. It is true, is it not, that a great deal of the deficit of the Post Office Department is occasioned by the fact that we use that Department as an agency to subsidize air mail and even the railroads in the carrying of mail. In other words, the money appropriated for the Post Office Department is not all used in expanding the mail service, but some in subsidies to build air lines and things of that kind.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I think he well knows that our committee has made a strenuous effort to separate those two proposals. We subsidize the air lines through the Post Office when we should subsidize them separately. We do have a policy that has been adopted whereby it is agreed that the air lines shall be supported in order to provide for commerce and national defense.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield again to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it would be well for the RECORD if the gentleman would state the amount of that subsidy. Certainly it does not begin to amount to as much as the over-all deficit in the Post Office.

Mr. REES. As near as it can be figured out, the subsidy amounts to between 15 and 20 million dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I want to state that we are increasing air mail 1 cent. Third-class mail, which includes circulars, printed matter, seeds, and parcels weighing less than 8 ounces, is being increased. With reference to fourth-class mail, which includes catalogs and books, under the law as it now stands the rates on fourth-class mail should be sufficiently high so it will pay its own way. It is the responsibility of the Postmaster General to initiate such rate revision with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. They have failed to act.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Do you propose in this bill to fix rates without having had any hearings on those rates?

Mr. REES. I will say to the gentleman that we held hearings for weeks and weeks on these matters. This bill has been pending in the Committee on Rules for exactly 13 months.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Is that with reference to rates?

Mr. REES. We held hearings and the first-, second-, third-, and fourth-class mail people came in and testified. We have reams of testimony on this.

Mr. GWINN of New York. On rates?

Mr. REES. Oh, yes, indeed. We have them all in. We have full and complete hearings on this. It has been threshed up one side and down the other.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, a member of our committee.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to state that all during the Seventy-ninth Congress, our committee held hearings on the question of increasing rates. We spent about 3 years trying to provide a means of fixing postal rates.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, a former member of the Post Office Committee of the House.

Mr. BREHM. To answer the question of the gentleman from New York, hearings were held on this legislation when I was a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. To tell you the truth, I regret that I am no longer a member of that committee.

Mr. REES. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. The problem has been threshed out over and over again.

I want to pay tribute to the members of our committee on both sides, each and every one of them, for the splendid effort they put forth in trying to reach a solution of this very important problem. Some of the rates included in this bill perhaps ought to be adjusted. However, we did the best we could in an effort to bring equitable legislation to attention. We ask for your approval of this legislation.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, who has for some time been looking into this problem.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised and disappointed to learn that the bill we have under consideration to increase the salaries of postal employees only provides for an annual increase of $450.

The Members of this House know I am just as economy-minded as anyone else and that I try to guard the taxpayers' money very diligently.

The facts are simply these: It has been a disgrace and a shame the lack of consideration that has been given postal employees for many, many years. They are a group whose patriotism has never been challenged. They stuck to their jobs through the war years when it would have been to their advantage to go into war plants where they could have made large salaries. Because of the low wage scale now paid postal employees, they have had to secure work on the outside after hours in order to make enough money to meet their family expenses. In many cases they could not hang on any longer because of the heavy expenses, notwithstanding the fact that they would have liked to retain their positions with the Post Office.

I say to you in all sincerity that if we can send billions and billions and then more billions of dollars to Europe, most of which is squandered and for which we shall never get any return or benefit, the least amount that should be granted the faithful postal employees is an increase of $600 per year.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as has been explained by the able chairman of our committee, this bill does two things: It provides a permanent increase of $450 per year to all postal employees except those employees who are paid by the hour, and to fourth-class postmasters. Those employees who are paid by the hour get a raise of 25 cents per hour. The fourth-class postmasters get an increase of 25 percent in their present compensation.

Second, the bill provides for an increase in postage rates. It affects all classes of rates except second-class mail.

The committee thought those rates for second-class mail should be increased, because at the present time the Post Office Department is losing $160,000,000 on the carriage of second-class mail. But be that as it may, the increase in the other postage rates in this bill will produce about $124,000,000 in additional revenue. The cost of the increase in salaries of the postal employees in this bill will be about $211,000,000 per year. There are approximately 480,000 employees in the postal service. So the revenue brought in by the increase in postage rates in this bill will be about $85,000,000 less than the cost of the increases in salaries.

Let me say in the beginning your committee brought in a bill which provided $585 temporary increase per annum for the postal employees, but the powers that be would not permit that bill to be considered, and we were required to bring in another bill, making the salary increase $450.

This increase is deserved. It is just. It is fair to meet the increased cost of living. From 1923 to 1945 our postal employees had no increases. On July 1, 1945, they were given $400 a year increase. In 1946 they were given another $400 increase. This increase of $450 now is certainly needed to help these employees pay their increased cost of living.

To my mind, there is no more faithful, no more just, no more loyal group of employees in our Government service than our postal employees. There is another bill pending in the House. It is H. R. 6917. It provides compensation to other employees of our Government, other than postal employees. There is a rule on this bill, and I trust that the majority leadership will permit consideration of this measure also.

Mr. Speaker, it would be grossly unjust, unfair, and discriminatory to increase the payments to postal employees and not to increase the pay for other Federal employees.

The Republican leadership has always been fair and considerate, and I implore the Republican leadership to permit this House, before the sun sets this evening, to pass H. R. 6917, increasing the compensation of other Federal employees.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. Is it not true that our distinguished chairman, when he originally introduced the bill, had all Federal employees in one bill, and "the powers that be," to use your expression, required a separation?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is exactly correct.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. I am happy to see these postal rates increased. I thoroughly agree in the gentleman's hope that this Congress will not adjourn until other classified employees, Government workers, are given this much-needed raise.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENNINGS. I wish to commend the very fine work the committee has done in bringing out this bill in behalf of the employees of the postal service, and especially my colleague from Tennessee who has rendered hard and meritorious work in a good cause.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for his kind words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LOVE].

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of legislation providing for a permanent increase of $450 annually to our hard-working and very deserving postal workers.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have received many requests from all parts of the United States asking that the proposed increase should be at least $800. I regret that it is not possible to reach this figure. However, I wish to call to the attention of all postal employees that they will receive a substantial income-tax reduction as of January last. This reduction should amount to about $100 annually to the average letter carrier. Therefore, your raise will, in effect, be approximately $550 for those who pay Federal income taxes.

We have also amended the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase annuity benefits 25 percent, or $300.

In providing a permanent pay raise of $450, a greatly improved retirement system, and a substantial income-tax reduction, I, for one, am not ashamed of what the Eightieth Congress has done for our loyal postal employees.

This proposed legislation will cost the Federal Government approximately $203,000,000. The bill also includes increased mail rates to provide estimated additional revenue of approximately $124,000,000. During fiscal 1947, the United States Post Office Department operated at an approximate loss of $300,000,000. It should be pointed out here, very clearly, that the Post Office Department is one of the few Government agencies that provides revenue. Since our Post Office Department should be considered partly as a great public service to our people and to our Republic, I do not believe that we should criticize it too severely if it does not pay its way in full. What Government agency does pay its way? We should also realize that it costs money to service our vast amount of penalty and free mail. However, a large portion of the United States mails are used strictly for business and commercial purposes. This service should not be donated. Many rates should be increased to help decrease the deficit in the Department and to partially support a deserved increase for the postal employees.

In fiscal 1947, air mail operated at a loss of almost $19,000,000. This bill proposes a rate increase from 5 cents to 6 cents, which would increase revenues by about $10,000,000. Parcel post lost $41,000,000 in 1947 and the proposed rate increase of 28 percent would provide an additional $60,000,000. Money orders lost $32,000,000 and a 50-percent increase would add $17,000,000. COD service lost $6,000,000, and a 20-percent increase proposes revenues of more than $3,000,000.

Third-class mail, including circulars, seeds, and so forth, lost $74,000,000, and an 18-percent increase would provide some $14,000,000. Other rate increases, not including second-class mail, aggregate a total increase of revenue to some $124,000,000.

I repeat, in conclusion, that the United States Post Office should be considered as a great public service and that we should not expect it to operate entirely out of the red. However, insofar as strictly commercial postal rates are concerned, these rates should be increased as in the present bill to eliminate unjustified deficits in the Post Office Department and also to support increases to postal workers.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVE. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. I am heartily in favor of the immediate passage of H. R. 6916 under suspension of the rules and take this opportunity to commend the untiring efforts and persistence of our committee chairman, the likable, distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Much deserving and meritorious legislation has emanated from our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the Eightieth Congress. Predominantly deserving, however, is this bill which will bring some needed economic relief to very loyal and devoted public servants, assure them that their employer is appreciative and make possible the retention of experienced employees

as well as recent appointees who decided to make careers in the post office service. It will also provide an incentive to others who hesitate in making this selection because of the entrance salary. And, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the latter, the eligible registers in every large city post office bespeak the urgent need of a change in this respect or serious difficulties may arise.

I am sure that it is well known that I worked for the passage of a larger increase of these salaries and that I also was active and deeply interested in all Federal workers and shall endeavor to get action on H. R. 6916. Knowing well the mechanics by which legislation is enacted, I urge the acceptance and approval of H. R. 6916.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVE. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I wish to commend the gentleman at this time and to express the hope that it may be possible to bring out the bill for the other Federal employees before the session ends.

Mr. Speaker, last February I appeared before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service through the courtesy of its chairman, and asked for the maximum of $1,000 salary increase which the postal workers of my district requested. I have publicly proclaimed my position again and again and flatly stated these deserving people must have first consideration.

The postal employees that I represent made it plain to me they want a larger raise than we are giving them today. I think they are right.

However, the time is late, the House is adjourning, and this important matter has been held up until the last minute. There is no chance to offer amendments to increase this proposed amount of $450.

Naturally, I am happy that this raise is presented and I gladly support it. I know all the post office people at home will be glad the increase has been brought up.

For some time I was apprehensive over the protests my office received from postal workers each time I returned home. They were honest protests from heads of families who find it difficult to meet the rising cost of living. They were righteous complaints from employees, long faithful to the Post Office Department, who had seen other departments get raises and yet got no satisfaction themselves.

I repeat I am glad to have a part in passing this pay-raise bill today. It is a step in the right direction and spells a measure of justice to our deserving postal workers.

The second part of the bill, I regret I cannot support. It has to do with raising rates of the parcel post. I think they are already too high.

Perhaps it is good politics, but I know many businessmen who will object to having these rates raised. Personally I do not think this rate increase is necessary and I have the right to my opinion. I regret no chance is given here to amend this section or I would certainly try to do so.

The postal pay raise is timely, well-deserved, and necessary. The men I know at home will be grateful and I have looked forward with great anticipation to giving them this lift. I take pleasure in voting for the postal employees' pay raise here today.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I share with the splendid chairman and the outstanding members of the great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service the responsibility of bringing you well-considered legislation in an orderly and democratic manner. We are proud of our record. Unfortunately, we cannot be proud of this bill and, personally, I can accept no compliments from the leadership of the Republican Party for it. It is not a committee bill. We are but the instrument by which the majority policy committee impresses its ideas upon the House in this particular legislation. You, too, have been disfranchised and stripped of the power to offer your ideas as representatives of millions of American people—it cannot be amended. Those responsible for the bill saw to that.

I have always cherished orderly democratic procedure by which the majority may express its will. Such is not the case here, for this is the will of a few. In my judgment the arbitrary use of power by a small group, be it policy or otherwise, which renders a majority of the membership impotent, notwithstanding the character and integrity of the individuals involved, is contrary and harmful to the fundamentals of American representative government. Yet witness such at this hour.

At the beginning of the Eightieth Congress your committee began to study the advisability of increasing Federal salaries for postal workers and others. We held extensive hearings and worked long hours attempting to arrive at justice for the Government and the employee. Many weeks ago your committee recommended favorably the passage of legislation increasing the salaries of postal workers and other Federal workers. The increases recommended were not in the amounts asked, nor were they equal to the increased cost of living. The bills were, however, carefully considered, and while they did not meet with my full approval, they did express the majority opinion of the committee. You have not had and will not have an opportunity to pass upon either of these measures. They lie dormant in the Rules Committee.

More than 14 months ago your committee, after months of careful and deliberate study, recommended postal rate increases. This bill represented the best thought of the members of a committee who had spent months, and many of them, years, studying the problem with no other purpose than the development of a postal system and service that could adequately meet the demands of this great country at rates the people can afford to pay, and with as little loss as possible to the Government. This bill is before the Rules Committee and has been for more than 1 year.

Your chairman and your committee, without political consideration, have attempted to discharge their responsibilities to you and to the people in a useful and helpful manner. I could not praise the committee membership too highly.

Does this bill before you today represent the work and thought of your committee? I regret to say that it does not.

Briefly, I will give you its story. It came as a surprise and a shock to me a very few days ago when it was placed on the doorstep of the committee with word, supposedly from the Republican policy committee—and I do not question its source—which was in the nature of an ultimatum: This or nothing.

It is quite popular, and has been, to use Federal employees as whipping boys. Unquestionably we employ more than are necessary. Unfortunately some are not worthy of their trust and responsibility and do not earn their pay. But I will not join with any demagogic harrangue against the hundreds of thousands of necessary, able, and faithful employees who make possible the orderly functioning of this great Government. They are entitled to the consideration that should be given to every faithful worker of private industry or public service. Hundreds of thousands of Government employees are suffering with millions of Americans as a result of the unprecedented, unchecked, and, assuredly, unfortunate spiral of living costs.

Federal employees must depend entirely upon this Congress for relief. They have no right to strike; they have no right to participate as a body or in groups in politics; they are limited to the interest, thoughtfulness, fairness, and consideraiton of you gentlemen. I feel constrained to compliment the employees, particularly those who have contacted me, for they have been courteous, patient, considerate, and reasonable and they have, under no circumstances, attempted to put pressure upon me, personally or through the mails. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not the bill that should be before the House.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Texas for his very fine statement. I would also like to compliment the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], chairman of the full committee, for reporting out two bills granting pay increases not only to postal employees but to all Federal employees. Had that committee been let alone, all Federal employees today would have had a good substantial pay raise which they all deserve.

Mr. LYLE. And in an orderly manner.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I had not expected to ask the gentleman to yield to me, but I have been very much interested in what he had to say.

Mr. LYLE. I hoped the gentleman would be.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman agree with me that as costs increase in the Post Office Department of necessity and as a part of the over-all budgetary

situation and the Federal Treasury, we have to pay some attention to rates?

Mr. LYLE. For 1 year we have urged the Republican policy committee to permit the consideration of the postal rate increase bill. This bill has been before the Committee on Rules since May 1947. The gentleman is just a year behind the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I join with every Member of this House in a sincere effort to cut the expenses of Government, to reduce the national debt and to help bring about a sound fiscal policy for the Government. No reasonable or thinking man, however, can argue successfully that adequate salaries for Federal employees would be inconsistent with a sound fiscal policy.

All Federal employees are entitled, in my judgment, to increases in salary at this time. There is now a bill, introduced by the great chairman of my committee, ready for consideration but without the blessing of the leadership. It provides for salary increases for classified and other Federal employees. He and the other members of my committee join me, I am sure, in wishing that you might have an opportunity to pass upon it. And with all frankness, Mr. Speaker, if I have the honor of serving on the conference committee between the two Houses, provided there is one, I shall do my utmost to bring back to the House fair increases for all Federal employees. I shall also attempt to divorce postal-rate increases from the salary bill. Postal rates are not properly made in relation to the salaries of postal employees. They cannot be. They should be considered separately and apart.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Why were not the users of second-class mail, who are responsible for the biggest deficit, included in the policy committee's statement?

Mr. LYLE. That is a question the answer to which will be somewhat embarrassing to the policy committee which omitted it from its ultimatum. The answer is, I believe, this: The Post Office Department is calculated to lose $160,000,000 on this class of mail in 1948. In my judgment, nevertheless, they could not face the great newspapers and, perhaps, magazines, which would be affected by a change in second-class mail rates in a year of political campaigns.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. The ultimatum was received notwithstanding the fact that better than 218 Members of this House, making up the majority and the minority, appeared before your committee and asked that this pay increase be granted?

Mr. LYLE. Unfortunately, this present bill failed to take into consideration the ideas of the membership of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the passage of this bill for I have hopes that it may be worked into acceptable legislation before it reaches the President's desk. I could not, in good conscience, refrain from this explanation to the House of the procedure by which it comes to you. Perhaps in frank discussion we may better understand each other and more admirably serve the people who have entrusted us with great responsibilities. We shall, I am sure, always cherish the advice of the leadership of both sides of the House, but seldom shall we, I sincerely hope, subject ourselves to the dictates of either, when by doing so we thwart the will of the majority of the United States Representatives.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of my committee—a committee of which I have been a member only about 2 months—for the splendid work that he has done and is doing. He has always had the interest of the Federal workers at heart; he has had the interest of the postal workers at heart His heart is right, but his hands have been tied by the uncompromising actions of his own party's leaders. I had hoped that a bill would be brought out that would provide for adequate permanent increases for postal employees. I thought it was the duty of Congress to do so. You know, this Congress is in a large part responsible for the chaotic economic conditions which we find prevailing at the present time. I think it is our duty to provide for our Federal employees in order to help them meet the increased cost of living for which we are to some extent, at least, responsible. I cannot say that I am proud of this bill. I concur with my colleague from Texas in that, and I am not proud of the manner in which it was brought about. I contend that this bill should come to the floor under an open rule, giving the Members the opportunity to offer amendments. In this way alone could we formulate a measure that would meet the approval of most of the Members of this House.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Did I understand the legislative history of this particular bill to be that the committee reported out a bill which included both postal as well as other Federal employees, in a greater sum than mentioned in this bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true, but that was done before I became a member of the committee.

Mr. CARROLL. But that was reported out by this committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. I may say that the bills previously reported reflected more nearly the views of the majority of the committee than does this measure. This bill is brought to you as the result of an ultimatum, as the gentleman from Texas told you a few minutes ago, from the Republican Policy Committee. The leadership of the Republican Party dumped it in our laps, and told us to take it or leave it. If we leave it, our postal workers do not get a raise at all.

Mr. CARROLL. They have divided the bill and reduced the salary increase?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is exactly right.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The bill as reported by our committee did not include the other Federal employees. The bill as introduced included postal employees and Federal employees, but the bill as reported out included only the postal employees, and then a separate bill pertaining to Federal employees was reported out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is my contention that the committee wanted to be more liberal. I regret that the high-handed action of the majority leadership has dictated otherwise.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for H. R. 6916 and H. R. 6917, and I urge the Members of the House to pass these bills. I cannot oppose such legislation without denying to hundreds of thousands of faithful Government employees a well-deserved and hard-earned cost-of-living increase in salaries. However, I strenuously oppose the procedure used to bring these measures to you.

Although these bills are very important there were no hearings on H. R. 6916 or H. R. 6917 in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee or in any other standing committee of the House. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee which is presenting these bills to you was not even consulted about their construction.

On June 14 the Republican policy committee issued an ultimatum to our Post Office and Civil Service Committee to the effect that no salary increase bills would be passed unless they were in the form of H. R. 6916 and H. R. 6917. Other measures had already been reported out by our committee dealing with the same issues, which provided increases in salaries for postal workers, increases in postal rates, and increases in salaries for Federal employees—all based upon evidence produced during the hearings. These measures were recommended by our committee after much deliberation and in a general sense reflected the bipartisan views of a majority of the members of the committee. No action whatsoever was allowed on these measures by the Rules Committee.

H. R. 6916 is a combination of these committee bills which were previously reported out, minus very important and integral parts of these same bills. The ultimatum which eliminated vital aspects of this legislation and made substantial reductions in the salary raises usurped the prerogatives and responsibilities of your Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I believe in upholding the basic principle that legislation reported out by a major standing committee should reflect

the considered judgment of this commit-

bills from being brought to the floor of

other food and articles and wearing ap-

ers of our country. It has been proven

categories because I think that the re-

privilege of supporting a bill providing

the considered judgment of this committee, and not the coerced political expediency of an outside partisan policy committee. Mr. Speaker, this procedure is dangerous and alarming. If real democracy is to be preserved we must not resort to such tactics, and I hereby protest vigorously against this action.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my approval of the action that has just been taken by the House in granting a pay increase to postal employees. It was altogether fitting that we do this as our postal employees are among our finest and most conscientious Federal workers. Upon them rests much of the responsibility of maintaining the well-being of our Nation and it is only fair that we recognize and reward their faithful service in a highly justified material way.

It is regrettable, however, that the postal pay bill was considered under a suspension of the rules and it was not possible to have an amendment considered for a general Federal pay raise. I sincerely hope that the Senate will take action in seeing that this amendment is added when the bill is considered by that body. I favor a pay raise for all Federal employees and I will support and vote for legislation that will bring this about.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for H. R. 6916, although the pay increase involved is inadequate to meet the increase in postal employees' cost of living.

I desire to record a vigorous protest against the political maneuvers which have occurred in connection with the presentation of this legislation.

There was ample evidence before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee that postal employees and other Federal workers are in dire need of a salary increase adequate to meet the high cost of living. Witness after witness testified that it was imperative that these employees receive not less than a $800-per-year salary increase. Notwithstanding the overwhelming weight of this testimony, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, for reasons best known to itself, reported out separate bills—one giving the postal employees a salary increase of $585 per year and the other granting all other Federal employees a salary increase in the sum of $468 per year. Even though those salary increases were insufficient, this represented, nevertheless, a reasonable step in the right direction.

The debate on the pending bill discloses a situation revealing a shocking disregard for the welfare of Federal employees and the legislative findings of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Important members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee openly have charged on the floor of this House that the Republican policy committee has used tremendous pressure to keep these bills from being brought to the floor of the House for debate and vote in the form originally presented by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The record now reveals that the bill concerning postal employees has been subjected to a salary cut from $585 to $450 per year. Moreover, the Republican policy committee has refused to consider any pay raise for other Federal employees. In addition to being subjected to this high-handed program, the Membership of this House now is forced to vote on the pending bill under what is known as a suspension of the rules. Many of the postal and other Federal employees do not understand the effect of this legislative maneuver.

Under a suspension of the rules, Members who are in favor of more equitable treatment of both postal and other Federal employees are prohibited from amending the present bill in any manner. In short, we must either accept or reject the bill in its present form.

Further, it is quite apparent to me that there will be no relief for other deserving Federal employees who are suffering from the increase in the cost of living.

There is no doubt in my mind that if the Republican leadership had permitted both bills to advance in the normal legislative process, the membership of this body would have passed the salary increase both for postal and other Federal employees with an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Speaker, the legislative history of these two bills clearly shows that there has been a denial of the democratic process in their consideration. Such action is detrimental to our system of civil service and will not inspire the confidence of Federal employees in the legislative branch of the Government. These employees are entitled to the same rights and to the same protection in meeting the increase in the cost of living as are those workers who are employed in and who have been given wage increases by private industry.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for this bill, but I am not satisfied with it. I favor an increase of $800 for postal service and other Federal employees. The talk of economy comes with poor grace from those who voted and supported our foreign policy. It comes with poor grace for those who saddled $623,000,000,000 of debts and future commitments on our shoulders by voting and supporting the 15 years of global gifts and expenditures.

I feel that this increase is inadequate to maintain the American standard of living. These employees are not able to properly take care of themselves and their families with the present 30-cent dollar that they are getting. The cost of living has gone up at least 200 percent, if not more, since 1937, 1938, and 1939.

For example, on August 11, 1939, in Fargo, N. Dak., a pound of Land O' Lakes butter was 23 cents; eggs were 2 dozen for 23 cents, strictly fresh; a pound-and-a-half loaf of bread was 9 cents; pork loin, 12 cents, bacon, 12½ cents; spare ribs, 8 cents; crisp celery, 5 cents; two heads of lettuce, 13 cents; five bunches of radishes, 5 cents; three bunches of carrots, 10 cents; 3 pounds of coffee, 39 cents; and other food and articles and wearing apparel were on a par with these prices. Compare them with today's prices, and then compare the postal service employees' pay and the Federal employees in lower brackets pay increase with price increases.

I feel that an increase of $800 per year for postal service employees and the Federal employees in the lower brackets is a reasonable increase. I especially suggest to this committee that they should bear in mind that Uncle Sam will again step in and take $160 out of that $800, leaving an actual increase of only $640.

I am not criticizing Uncle Sam, but the old gentleman with the striped trousers and stovepipe hat never misses a bet. He takes from the needy as well as the wealthy.

In addition, may I suggest that since we have given directly or indirectly to foreign nations something like $27,000,000,000 since the war ended, and we are about to give another $17,000,000,000, it is about time that we take care of the people who are at home; people who are still proud of being Americans. Charity still should begin at home even though we have temporarily lost our better judgment.

SWEET CHARITY

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the thousands of people who do the work of our vast Government faithfully and patiently have looked to this Congress for a self-respecting increase in pay which would enable them to live in decency.

I am not speaking now for the postal employees alone as covered in this bill, and for whom I have repeatedly and publicly demanded a salary increase of at least $1,000 a year to meet the fly-away prices which resulted from the scuttling of price controls by the Republican Party.

Other Federal workers face the same inflation.

I was prepared to offer amendments to bring the salaries to a livable level, had the measure been permitted to come up under regular procedure weeks ago, when the bill was just as ready as it is now.

I hope the House failure to provide a cost-of-living increase for Federal employees—and I mean the clerks, the typists, the secretaries, the girls in my own office, the laborers, and the minor executives—will be remedied by the other House.

I hope, too, that the majority leadership can be proud of this stale half loaf of charity. I could not be, were the responsibility mine.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this bill H. R. 6916. I regret the raise is not larger, at least $800 which I supported in the committee. We must vote for this or nothing. I regret that it does not cover all Federal employees in the classified lists. I hope we may be able before we adjourn, to pass such a bill covering all employees. I urge that the raise be raised for such employees to $800 and I appeal to the leadership to present such a bill to the House for passage before we adjourn.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for H. R. 6916 but must say that it is a disgrace of this Congress to throw such a crumb to the postal workers of our country. It has been proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that the postal employees and all other Federal employees really need at least $800 per year.

It has come to the point where we have to vote for a $450 raise or nothing.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a crime committed against the Government workers of America. It marks another one of the many broken promises with which the Republican Party has paved its road to hypocrisy.

First, it does not give the postal workers what they were led to believe they would receive.

Second, it completely destroys the morale of all Federal workers at a time when a raise was desperately needed.

Third, in this campaign year it refuses to raise rates on periodicals because of pressure.

Lastly, an increase in postal rates has no place in the same bill as wage increase.

I repeat, this is a crime. We are constantly driving the workers of our country to the wall. Brutalizing them with the Taft-Hartley law, terrorizing with the Mundt bill, fooling them with a phony housing act, and finally refusing to stop run-away prices and refusing to raise workers' pay.

This sop to the postal workers will not fool them or all Federal workers in November.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 6916, which among other provisions will increase salaries of postal employees. I wholeheartedly favor this particular phase of H. R. 6916.

A few months ago I testified before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in favor of an increase for these loyal Government postal employees—actually I supported a larger increase in salary than this legislation permits, but this is a step in the right direction.

I am extremely pleased to see the rules suspended and its passage expedited by the House of Representatives today. I shall vote for H. R. 6916 and continue to press for the final enactment into law of this much-deserved pay raise for postal employees.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, while I am very glad that some measure to grant well-deserved and urgently needed pay raises to postal workers has been at long last presented to this House for action, it is most distressing that its terms are not more generous. I am of course deeply pained that no general pay raise bill granting increases to other Government employees has been brought before us for action before adjournment.

The chairman of the committee [Mr. REES] whom I greatly esteem, is exceptionally able and conscientious, and his committee is comprised of some of the best men in this House. The distinguished gentleman and his committee have labored long and faithfully on pay raise legislation and I deeply regret that in the pressure of the final business of the Congress, the full program of pay increases for all Government workers has not been submitted to this House.

I cannot express enthusiasm about the principle contained in the bill of binding pay raises to rate increases in certain categories because I think that the results are inevitably to confuse the budgetary position of the Post Office Department, and also place burdens inequitably and disproportionately upon various users of the postal system.

The bill provides some measure of relief, however, and grants substantial increases, which coupled with current tax reductions and an improved retirement system, justifies me in voting for it even though I would desire a better, a more generous bill and a sounder-based, better-devised budgetary arrangement to finance it.

Personally I have worked unceasingly to assist our faithful postal workers and other worthy and loyal Government employees to secure well-merited pay raises. I appeared in their behalf before the appropriate committees of both House and Senate and have worked in many other ways to help secure favorable consideration for them.

Without question the House will pass this measure under suspension of the rules and thereby place its seal of approval upon legislation which, if in some respects inadequate, will nevertheless aid and assist, in this period of skyrocketing prices and inflation, our loyal postal workers who, like all our citizens and particularly our working people, are suffering from current high-price levels. I will vote for the bill.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported legislation now pending in Congress providing adequate pay raises for postal employees and other Federal employees. I filed a bill which so provided. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee has reported out H. R. 6916. This is the only legislation covering this subject upon which the House has the privilege of voting. The bill is considered under a suspension of rules which permits no amendments. The amount of pay raises cannot therefore be changed during the present consideration of the bill. I shall therefore vote for H. R. 6916, although I would have preferred a larger pay increase. The Federal employees are entitled to a raise in pay. I regret that this legislation does not grant them more than it does.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in suport of H. R. 6916 which is a bill to provide additional compensation for the postal employees. These employees have not received the raises and increases in salary that others have. They have been left far behind in their compensation. They are not receiving adequate salary to meet the high cost of living of today. I have followed closely the various bills that have been introduced and open hearings which have been held in the committees. I had hoped that the Membership of the House would be allowed to consider a much larger salary increase than is provided in this bill, as, in my opinion, the raise provided for in this bill is not adequate nor sufficient to meet present conditions.

We, of course, realize that the leadership in the House has the authority to decide which bills will be considered and which will not. They have offered the present bill as the only one for our consideration. Therefore, not permitted the privilege of supporting a bill providing for a larger increase than the present one, I wholeheartedly support the bill under consideration which, while it is inadequate to meet the high cost of living of today, will afford these employees some measure of assistance which they are entitled to and so richly deserve.

It is my understanding that the postal employees have had only two increases in salary since 1925, which increases have been negligible, whereas the cost of living has soared sky high. I hope that if a larger amount of increases cannot be given that this bill will certainly pass. I desire to say now to the Members of this body that I now stand ready to support an amendment which increases to any reasonable extent the amount allowed in this bill. But I fully realize that under the present rules under which we are proceeding no amendments are permissible. Therefore, is is vitally important to pass this bill as it is now or there will be no raise.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that all of the Federal employees are entitled to an increase in their compensation. The Federal employees' raises have in no way kept pace with the raises of other working people. Their remuneration is far behind those in like employment in non-Government work. It is my earnest desire and hope that this Congress will not adjourn until adequate provision has been made for the faithful employees of our Government. Many of them work long hours and ofttimes work overtime, for which they are not sufficiently paid. I desire at this time to lend my voice in support of the salary raise for all Federal employees, and I trust that the present leadership will see fit to allow this bill to go through, realizing that it is entirely up to the leadership of this body to say whether or not these increases will be made, as, under the rules upon which the House is proceeding from now until adjournment, only such matters as are cleared by the House leadership will be considered.

If an amendment was permitted to the pending bill whereby all Federal employees will be given raises, which I am sorry is not allowed, I would earnestly and to the best of my ability support it, and believe that the increase would be such as to be of real help to these people who so richly deserve the additional compensation.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today the Eightieth Congress passed legislation providing for a permanent increase for all post-office employees in the amount of $460 per year.

I want to state publicly that I voted in favor of passage of the bill and I also want to state that I supported this bill, and other bills, providing for even more liberal allowances in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House, of which I am a member.

I think it appropriate to state at this time that if it had not been for the activities of certain members of the committee, particularly the Democratic members, this bill would have been reported out of committee and passed the House long ago. Despite the fact that I was in favor of a retroactive increase, the activities of certain members of the

committee in emasculating the legislation which met my approval and the an-

vated that it is unthinkable not to enable our loyal postal workers to retain that

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill some months ago on the subject of salary

those amounts. They were arrived at

is to uphold the tradition of efficient

these workers' wages into harmony with

committee in emasculating the legislation which met my approval, and the approval of the chairman of the committee and some of the members on the Republican side, alienated some Members of Congress who otherwise would have voted for the bill. Under the circumstances and in view of the difficulties which we have met, I feel that this bill is just, fair, and equitable. Our postal workers are certainly deserving of an increase in salary and I hope and trust that the additional money which they receive will, to some extent, give them the additional incentive which they deserve and will add to their morale.

It is indeed unfortunate that this much-needed and beneficial legislation was not passed by the House long ago and it is equally unfortunate that the bill which was passed did not contain the retroactive feature which I hoped for; but I am pleased that I had the opportunity to vote for an increase in wages for these deserving men and women.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Republican leadership has finally consented to let the House pass upon the bill now under consideration which provides for an increase in the salaries of all postal employees. I heartily approve of this legislation and have been for a number of weeks adding my voice to the voices of other Members of the House demanding action on this bill.

I regret exceedingly, however, that there is not included in this bill a substantial salary increase for the other faithful Government employees included in all of the classifications of the Civil Service. The cost of living has increased for them just as it has for all of us. It is manifestly unfair not to grant them also a reasonable increase in their salary so that they can meet the high cost of living.

I regret too that this bill has tied to it an increase in postal rates, especially in the third- and fourth-class rates. I say this because this means an increase in the cost of those things purchased by those of our people who live in rural communities and who must depend upon parcel post for many of the articles they buy.

It seems to me that if an increase in the postal rates were to be made they should have been made in a separate bill after careful consideration of all of the issues involved. Moreover, I can see no reason why third- or fourth-class mail rates should be raised when no raise in rates for second-class matter is provided. This seems especially strange in view of the fact that the main portion of the deficit from the operation of the Post Office Department comes from the second-class-mail matter.

It is my sincere wish, and, I trust, not a forlorn hope, that a bill raising the salary of our Civil Service employees will be passed at this session of Congress.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I appeared before both the House and Senate Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and advocated a flat and permanent increase of $1,000 for our postal employees. I felt that such an increase was not only justified by reason of the present increased cost of living but also because the general standard of living has been so elevated that it is unthinkable not to enable our loyal postal workers to retain that higher standard.

I was deeply disappointed when I heard that the committee had in the first instance approved a raise of only $585. To my mind that was bad enough but when the bill started to get a tossing around, so that no one knew whether it would ever reach the floor, even $585 became acceptable. But $585 was not to be had for postal employees either, for this bill, H. R. 6916, now comes before us with an increase of only $450.

I appreciate the time spent and effort devoted by the chairman of his committee on this subject, and I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] placing the blame for this reduced amount squarely where it belongs. I am truly sorry for the postal employees who are receiving such shabby treatment but I trust that we may hold out hope for a future increase when a new Congress is elected.

Although I feel that $450 is inadequate I shall support the bill for the reason that no amendment being possible under our present procedure, it is $450 or nothing.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, a wage increase for people holding civil-service positions is long overdue. I am glad this bill to provide more nearly adequate compensation for postal employees has finally been brought up. It deserves the support of every Member of this House.

However, it is regretted that we are not permitted to vote also for increased compensation to other civil servants who also find it virtually impossible to make ends meet. We should no longer delay action which is so sorely needed.

Let me urge every Member of the House to support this measure. In justice to our postal employees we must.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending bill, H. R. 6916, the postal employees salary increase bill may not provide all the salary increase which our postal employees deserve but the increase provided is far better than no salary increase legislation at all during this session. The $450 annual increase for postal employees in the field service is justly deserved. Likewise, the 25 cents per hour increase for hourly paid postal employees and the increase of 25 percent for our fourth-class postmasters is equally meritorious. There are no more loyal, faithful, and efficient employees in our Government service than our postal employees and I am pleased to support this legislation providing the increases for them enumerated. The present day high cost of living, coupled with the faithful and loyal service of our postal employees, makes the passage of this bill highly desirable. I urge support of this salary increase legislation for employees in the Postal Department.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. I do so not because I think it entirely satisfactory, but because it is the only bill presented to us on the question, and I believe the postal workers had rather have this bill than no bill at all. This bill is presented to us under a move to suspend the rules which does not permit any amendment being offered. We must vote the bill up or down as it is written.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill some months ago on the subject of salary raises for postal workers and my bill provided for a raise of $800. I have pushed that bill diligently. The bill presented to us today provides for $450. I do not think that is enough, but this is the bill which the Republican leadership has agreed on and presented to us, and we are presented with the choice of taking it or leaving it. Naturally I am voting for it.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the House leadership has not presented us a bill to also give some increase to other Federal workers. I note from newspaper reports that there is some hope that when this bill gets over to the Senate, an amendment will be offered to include other Federal workers. I hope this is so. It should be done.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, while this bill is not in the sum I would like, and while it is not entirely satisfactory in other respects, I am glad the House leadership has at last decided to let us vote on even this bill. The prospects for this legislation have been rather gloomy at times, and I am glad that the bill was finally presented. I hope it passes unanimously.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we in this House acknowledge the obligation which we owe to the faithful public servants in the Post Office Department. I think it is high time, Mr. Speaker, that we adopt this bill in order to provide them with increased compensation.

Mr. Speaker, these people are working for us. These people serve at our will, and because their pay is determined by us, we should no longer dodge the issue. I suppose this group of Federal employees is the largest group of workers within the country which is denied the right to strike for increased wages and better working conditions. They are entirely at our mercy. Not only is it just that we pass this resolution to increase their small incomes in this day of rising costs of living, but it is our public duty to do so before this session ends.

I regret that the Republican policy committee has not seen fit to include all Federal employees in this bill. It is no more right that postal workers receive this increase than it is that all other Federal workers be given increased compensation. I hope that when this bill goes to conference, if it does, that we in the House are given an opportunity to do the right thing, the just thing, the fair thing, and pay our Government workers salaries commensurate with the high cost of living.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of this committee, I personally was in favor of an $800 permanent increase for all postal workers including postmasters, postal workers, and so forth. I was also in favor of another bill for a pay increase for all Federal employees in the amount of $600.

This committee reported out a bill for an increase of $585 for postal employees, and a bill for a $450 increase for all Federal employees. There was not a dissenting vote, and both Democratic and Republican members of this committee voted unanimously for these two bills in

those amounts. They were arrived at through a compromise in the committee.

It is very apparent that it will be impossible to secure an increase of more than $450, as is provided for in this bill now before the House. Notwithstanding the fact that I favor an increase of $800, I am going to vote for this increase for postal workers for $450 on the theory that when it is impossible to get a whole loaf of bread a half loaf is better than none at all.

I am appealing to the leadership here in the House at this time to bring up the bill providing for a pay increase for all Federal employees of $360. While it is true that I was in favor of a $600 increase, I am going to vote for the $360 increase on the same theory that a half a loaf is better than nothing at all.

I personally want to take this opportunity to commend the various witnesses who appeared before the committee on this legislation, and to thank them for their excellent work and cooperation in this pay-increase legislation.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I feel it only my duty to urge my colleagues' approval of this legislation. I have, as most of you know, repeatedly appeared before the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees to request their favorable action on the various bills providing for a substantial compensation increase to our postal and Federal employees. With particular reference to the postal employees, I submit that this faithful corps of public servants, by their industry and devotion to their work, deserve the gratitude, respect, and admiration of all our people.

The continued newspaper articles and editorials, urging compensation increases for them, is clear and convincing evidence of the practically universal recognition of their salary adjustment needs. They are compelled to pay for their own uniforms, where required, and their 1945 increase has been nullified by our ever-rising living cost.

It is not necessary for me to take your valuable time, at this hour, in recitation of the changing economic conditions which have cut down materially the size of the purchasing dollar in the hands of the wage earners of America; indeed, the committee hearings clearly reveal the existence of economic factors which seriously handicap our postal employees in their struggle to maintain a decent way of life for themselves and their family. There is pressing and urgent need for pay adjustment, to raise the living standards of our postal employees to a more equitable level, and I earnestly exhort you to pass this bill without delay. I regret exceedingly that the provisions debated here prevent the opportunity for considering and approving a more substantial increase.

I would consider myself remiss in my obligation if I did not, at this moment, urge the Members of the Rules Committee to allow us to act upon a wage increase bill, for all our Government workers, before adjournment.

A comparative study of the revised wage scales in private industry with the compensation levels of our Federal employees will emphasize the inequities currently existing. If this Government is to uphold the tradition of efficient service administered by capable personnel, it must offer the employees wages comparable to other occupations of the same nature. The best guarantee against a turbulent America in these critical times, is the extension of a fair living wage to all our workers both inside and outside of Government employ. Our Government workers, who cannot bargain collectively for increased compensation, or strike, must be provided for by congressional action. I again sincerely request the Rules Committee to enable us to consider and approve a bill for a substantial increase to all our Government employees to permit them to meet their personal and family obligations with confidence and a high morale.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this Congress has before it many pressing problems demanding attention, but, in my opinion, and I am confident that this opinion is favored by the majority of my colleagues, none of them are more deserving of our speedy consideration than that of approving a substantial and permanent salary increase for all our faithful and efficient Federal employees.

SALARY INCREASES FOR ALL FEDERAL WORKERS

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to declare my support of this measure which provides a $450 pay raise for the employees of the United States Post Office Department. These workers are certainly deserving of such salary increases, and I am happy to see this legislation finally come to the floor. This measure should have been debated and passed long ago, and would have, had it not been for the obstructionist tactics of the enemy bloc who have stalled on this issue for many months.

The fact that I am going to vote for this bill, however, does not blind me to its deficiencies. For it is my opinion that an increase of $450 is little more than a token increase, and one that is wholly inadequate to affect the ever-increasing cost of living. The following facts will support this position. Under prewar legislation establishing salary schedules for postal employees, the average median salary in 1941 was only $1,902. During the war, the salaries of postal employees were raised about $800—a 40-percent adjustment. The effect of this wartime pay raise brought the average salary for postal workers to about $2,700.

Although this increase appears substantial, it is wholly inadequate for several reasons. In the first place, the cost of living has risen about 60 percent during this period when salaries were increasing by only 40 percent, the effect of which has been a reduction in the real wages of the workers, and a general lowering of their living standards. In the second place, the postal workers' salaries have not kept pace with the wages of industry. During this war period, when postal workers were receiving 40-percent pay raises, the wages in durable-goods industries were increased by 61 percent.

Thus it becomes obvious that a 20-percent salary increase over the average postal salary of $2,700 is necessary for postal workers to maintain their living standards in the face of rising living costs. It is likewise necessary to bring these workers' wages into harmony with industrial wage levels established during the war. Such a 20-percent increase amounts to $540, which is $90 above that which is provided by this bill.

But even this amount is not enough. I wish to remind the House that the industrial wage pattern is changing today, and the automobile workers, for example, are now obtaining another 10 percent pay raise. Using this as a standard, the postal workers deserve an additional $270, bringing the total increase to $810 per year. In other words, it would take this amount to give the postal workers the same take-home pay as they enjoyed in 1941, and to fit the Government's wage policy into the emerging pattern of industrial wage levels.

I also want to go on record as saying that I have favored a $1,000 pay increase for all Federal workers—both postal and classified—for some time, and that I introduced the $1,000 pay raise bill—H. R. 5526—in the House—the same bill which the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] introduced in the other body. I am still convinced that the thousand-dollar pay-raise objective is desirable and equitable, and that it would go far to maintain the efficiency and morale of the Federal service. Although I am supporting this bill, it is my hope that the other House will increase the amount, and amend its coverage to embrace all Federal workers.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year I introduced legislation to increase the salaries of both postal employees and Federal employees generally. These measures called for increases of $800 per employee to offset increased living costs. I shall support the pending bill but must express my keen regret that all Federal employees are not included. To provide increases for one group and not for another is an obvious discrimination. I sincerely hope that the Senate can provide a remedy and extend the salary increase to all Federal employees. All of them deserve this benefit.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see legislation finally come to the floor of the House to provide a long-delayed and much-needed salary increase for postal workers. On April 21, nearly 2 months ago, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported out H. R. 5667, which provided a raise of $585 per year for postal employees. This bill also was retroactive by its terms to April 1, 1948.

I have on several occasions, since that bill was reported out by our committee, urged that the House take action to provide this salary increase.

After much uncertainty and apprehension regarding the fate of that bill, we are today taking final action in the House for salary increases to this group of Federal employees. I am glad that this bill by its terms will be permanent, rather than temporary. I regret that it does not provide a figure which will more adequately take care of the increased cost of living.

I introduced on December 17, 1947, H. R. 4772, which, if enacted, would provide a salary increase of $600 per annum

for postal employees. At the time I in-

ment will receive pay increases under the

stood that I am in favor of an $800

for postal employees. At the time I introduced that bill, based upon a report furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it was my opinion that $600 would take care of the increase in the cost of living. I am disappointed that the raise provided in the bill now under consideration is $150 lower than the figure called for in my bill.

Under all the circumstances, inasmuch as it is a question of supporting this bill or nothing at all, I shall vote for it.

I take this occasion to say, however, that other Federal employees are also entitled to a salary increase to meet the present high cost of living, which they are experiencing just the same as postal employees.

I earnestly urge that legislation to provide such an increase for the other Federal employees be enacted either today or tomorrow, before this present session of Congress ends.

In my opinion the postal-rate increases provided in title II of this bill now under consideration should not be considered along with and as a part of the bill providing a raise for postal employees. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee held extensive hearings regarding postal-rate increases. I am opposed to the increase in air-mail postage, and I am opposed to certain of the parcel-post and third-class mail rate increases. I voted against these rate increases when the postal rate bill was before the committee, and I would vote against these rate increases now if they were being considered on their own merits. They have been attached to this postal employees salary increase bill, and inasmuch as the two items cannot be separated under present procedure, I am voting for the bill as a whole. It is my earnest hope the conference committee may see fit to eliminate that part of the bill which relates to postage rates if this legislation goes to a conference committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported a permanent increase of $800 for all postal workers. I regret that this was not the amount of the increase in the bill we have just passed. However, the $450 raise will help some. I was surprised to learn that this increase is the largest single one ever passed by any Congress for our postal workers.

It is the purpose of this legislation to provide a permanent increase in the salaries of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department and to offset a portion of the increased cost by an increase in postal rates.

Title I of the bill provides an annual increase of $450 in the salaries of postal employees in the field service of the Post Office Department who are paid on an annual basis. Increases are provided in the amount of 25 cents per hour for hourly employees and increase of 25 percent for fourth-class postmasters.

Based upon figures submitted by the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget, the total cost of title I of the bill will be approximately $211,221,797. All of the 479,850 employees in the field service of the Post Office Department will receive pay increases under the provisions of the bill.

The committee devoted much study to this legislation and the hearings lasted from February 25 to March 17, 1948. Testimony presented by the postal employees' national organizations stressed the necessity for an increase in the salaries of postal employees because of the increased cost of living since July 1946. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the present cost-of-living index is 167.5 as compared with the index of 100 in 1939.

To offset part of the rising cost of living, according to the testimony, postal employees in the field service have been granted two substantial permanent pay raises. The first was by adjustments in salaries and classifications under Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, amounting to $400 for each postal employee, beginning July 1, 1945. The second was under Public Law 386, Seventy-ninth Congress, which granted an additional permanent salary increase of $400 a year for the postal employees, effective January 1, 1946.

On the basis of the foregoing, the committee believed that a pay raise of $450 per annum would be ample additional compensation to meet the rising cost of living.

Representatives of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget presented the views of their agencies to the committee. In general, these witnesses stated that in view of the President's budget message which did not include provision for increasing the salaries of Federal employees, they could not at this time recommend additional compensation in the salaries of the employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, from the above it is obvious that a Republican Congress has gone down the line for pay increases to this group of loyal and patriotic Federal workers even though the Post Office Department and the President were opposed to the raise. I applaud this action as meritorious and deserving, notwithstanding this official opposition.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say that I shall support and vote for H. R. 6916 with pleasure and confidence. This is the largest single raise that has ever been granted to the postal employees, and a well merited one. They receive this increase, and they have also received a substantial reduction in income taxes. This entire committee has labored ever since I have been in the Congress to bring forth some such legislation, and I think that we have good reason to be proud of it. I know that the postal employees are glad to have a permanent raise.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I will only have time in the 2 minutes allotted me to make a few brief observations on this bill. First of all I want it understood that I am in favor of an $800 permanent increase for both postal employees and other Federal employees. I also feel that the wages of wage board employees should be increased proportionately. Secondly, I want to point out that I am going to vote for this bill because I have no alternative. It is better that we give our deserving postal employees a few crumbs than to give them no legislation at all. Thirdly, however, I want to state that neither the postal pay legislation nor the postal rate legislation included in this bill is the legislation originally reported out by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

More than a year ago that committee reported out legislation recommending postal rate increases. I personally did not favor that legislation because I look upon the Post Office Department, as I look upon all departments of the Government, as an agency to serve the public and not as a money-making institution. Much less, however, do I favor the manner in which postal rate increases have been added to this bill.

In this bill we are not increasing the rates of these users of the mail responsible for the largest portion of the present deficit in the Post Office Department. On the contrary, the Republican policy committee has chosen to pick on those of least political influence. They have done this unfairly, because they have added to the postal-pay legislation postal-rate-increase legislation, making it difficult for those affected by such rate increases to come in and protest, since they recognize as over 200 Members of this House, testifying before our committee, recognized that there is a dire need for a pay increase for our postal and other Federal employees. It is unfair to tie up a part of our postal rate legislation with a part of our salary increase legislation and bring it back to the committee with the ultimatum that we take this or get nothing. I insist that both the postal-pay legislation and the legislation designed to increase postal rates should have come before the House on their own respective merits.

Lastly, it has been said that neither the President of the United States nor the Bureau of the Budget has recommended this legislation. May I call the attention of the House to the fact, however, that when the President said he did not favor increases in salary legislation, he hinged that statement specifically upon his recommendation that the Congress had to do something to control the spiral of inflation. The President was thinking in terms of the purchasing power of the money received by our Federal employees.

I am quite sure that since the Congress has failed to do anything about the rising cost of living, the President, as does every Member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, recognizes the need for salary increases for our postal and other Government employees. I have no doubt under these circumstances but that he will give his approval to legislation providing for such increases.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this legislation even though it does not give sufficient relief to our postal employees. It is my understanding that we will not, during this session, have an opportunity to vote for an increase in compensation to Government employees, nor will we have an opportunity to vote for the larger amount in increase for postal employees. This I regret but I shall certainly vote that the postal employees receive something, rather than nothing at all for their faithfulness.

I want to quote from a telegram just received from one of the local federation of post office clerks in my district as follows:

Efficient postal service most important during peace or war, under Democrats or Republicans, whether rain or shine.

Gentlemen, none of us would deny that the above is true, for our postal employees have been faithful at all times and rendered efficient postal service.

I appeared before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service months ago and urged that the increase in compensation legislation be reported favorably to the House in order that this body might have an opportunity to stand up and vote thereon.

None of us can deny that living costs have increased. I have been advised that many of our faithful and efficient postal workers must retire from Government service and seek employment with private industry in an endeavor to support their families, if they are not allowed an increase. In many instances the wife and mother has had to seek outside employment in an endeavor to supplement a salary paid her husband as a faithful employee, in order that the family might have, not the luxuries of life, but the necessities.

An increase of $800 would be more in keeping with the increase in living conditions and this amount is what I had hoped to have an opportunity to support.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise rather reluctantly to support this bill. I say reluctantly because I feel that it is entirely inadequate. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held extensive hearings, and with only one dissenting vote passed out a bill authorizing $585 a year increase in salaries for faithful postal workers. They passed out a second bill recommending $468 a year for classified workers in the Federal service. These measures are well merited. We had extensive testimony showing the cost of living and its impact upon faithful public workers. It was definitely shown to us that these people had to supplement their earnings with outside employment, and I submit that is not in the best interests of the Government, or they had to have their wives work.

What happened? These bills were reported from the committee about 2 months ago. They have reposed in the Committee on Rules since that time. They came out of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with only one dissenting vote. They represent a compromise, because many of us felt that $585 was inadequate. They came out with one dissenting vote, a compromise between the majority and minority members of the committee. I submit that is the factual finding of the committee. Then what happened? Two days ago we were given this bill and told that we would have to take $450 or nothing. I cannot vote against the bill because I know the plight of these workers. I know the condition in which they find themselves. So I am constrained to take it. That is why I say to you I very reluctantly recommend the passage of the bill. The faithful public workers of this country asked for bread, and the Republican policy committee handed them a stone—a stone, if you please, covered with the slime of partisan politics.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. HEDRICK. Does not the gentleman believe that with the high cost of living, these postal employees should have at least an $800 raise at this time?

Mr. MILLER of California. I am happy to concur in the thought expressed by my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, Dr. HEDRICK. They should have an $800 increase.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. REES. Of course, we were in the unfortunate, or whatever position you would like to call it, of getting no help from the Bureau of the Budget on this problem. The Post Office Department, as the gentleman knows, did not recommend any of this increase.

Mr. MILLER of California. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, but the Democratic Members of your committee without exception support this raise.

Mr. REES. I understand that.

Mr. MILLER of California. We stand on the record that we support the raise and we now want the raise. We are not going to let you and the Republican policy committee hide behind the President's skirts. You could have followed him, sir, on the matter of retaining controls to hold down the high cost of living. To stop inflation. You could have done that.

Mr. REES. Of course, if you are talking about the OPA, that is something else.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. May I say that all members of our committee worked in harmony, Republicans as well as Democrats, and have done a splendid job, including the distinguished chairman.

When the President's Budget Bureau suggested no Federal pay raise, he requested private industry to make no raises. That all had to do with the problem of inflation. Private industry now has had to raise wages because of the continued raise in living costs.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his pertinent observation.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] for having the courage and showing their interest in getting a pay raise for the postal workers by bringing to the floor of the House permanent legislation providing for a $450 a year increase for them in the face of the opposition of the President, the Budget Bureau, and of this administration, which is now in power in the executive branch. I want to congratulate them. Secondly, I want to say to those Democratic Members who have made a political issue out of this in the debate, that you are fooling no one, and certainly not the officials of the postal organization employees. It is well known that the men in high union positions representing all the workers, are much more pleased with this $450 a year permanent increase than if they had the bill you Members have been talking about providing for $585 temporary increases. Any of them will tell you that, and doubtless most of them have told you Members who are trying to make a political issue out of this, that they are extremely pleased with this bill and would rather have the $450 permanent increase than a $585 a year temporary increase. Why try to deceive the postal workers in your district by the statements you have made in this debate?

Third, let me suggest to you people that you are following the line that you followed on every bill to spend money since I have been in Congress. If you were not so thoroughly imbued with the idea of tremendous appropriations for flood controls along the Brazos River in the State of Texas—the State from which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] hails—and for flood control, and every other expense, and for the spending of billions and billions of dollars, much of it wasted, we would have more money to give to the postal workers.

From the well of this House I said to you people who were so insistent that we have $6,800,000,000 for the first year of the ERP to give to Europe that the postal workers were coming along; that we better save something for them and for Federal aid to education. Yet, you put into the bill every billion and every million possible. Your record has been to increase every appropriation. Your record has been one of such waste and spending that it is a wonder we have any money left to give any raise in wages for the splendid and deserving postal employees of this country.

Let me repeat, were it not for the fight for economy that the Republican Party has made for the past 5 or 6 years, and particularly the last 2 years, you would not have any money with which to raise the pay of these Federal employees.

This Republican Congress in this session has to its credit the enactment of the most liberal employees' retirement bill for all Federal employees in the history of this Government. It means almost countless millions in benefits to them now and in the future. This Congress has passed dozens of bills, all beneficial to postal and Federal employees, and most every one was reported out of our committee.

Let the undisputed record show that during this and the prior session of the Eightieth Congress that more and better legislation has been passed in the interest of postal employees than was ever before passed by any Congress since the beginning of this Republic. No one can dispute this fact.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have supported the pay raise for the hard-working postal workers whose living standards are so seriously jeopardized by the high cost of living, and I am very gratified that the House today will perform at least some part of this act of justice. I advocated a $1,000-per-year pay raise before the House Committee on Civil Service and Post Office and believe that this was needed. The House today is making a start in recognizing that because a man works for his Government does not mean that he is not worthy of his hire. On the contrary the Government should be the first to recognize the need for adjusting wage scales to costs of living because individual initiative of the employee in asking for a raise is so much more difficult with the Government. I hope that the next session Congress will again examine this question with a view toward seeing that its action is adequate to the need

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 6916.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, for keeping his pledge to bring legislation before the House providing salary increases for postal employees and other Federal workers.

The House has just passed by unanimous vote the bill granting a permanent increase of $450 per annum for postmasters and postal employees. I do hope before the Congress adjourns we will pass a similar bill which is pending providing for a temporary increase of $360 per annum for other Federal workers.

Along with a number of my colleagues, I introduced last December bills which would provide an increase of $800 for workers in both of these categories. I believed then—and I still believe—that an increase in this amount would be fair and equitable and necessary in order to bring their income in line with the increased cost of living. It is regrettable that it has been determined that conditions will not permit at this time an increase larger than that which has been approved for postal workers and that which has been proposed for Federal workers.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly urge and sincerely hope that during the congressional recess the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will make a thorough study of the relation of the pay schedules of postal and other Federal employees to the rise in the cost of living since 1940, so that the Congress when it returns next January may provide for additional compensation for loyal and deserving Government workers. I shall strongly support a further increase.

FEDERAL ALCOHOL ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5849) to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, and for other purposes, and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE—WILSON AGAINST GRANGER

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged resolution (H. Res. 692) relative to the contested election case of Wilson against Granger, First Congressional District of Utah, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARDY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include some newspaper articles and other extraneous matter.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

AIR PARCEL POST

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6773) to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the rate of postage on mailable matter exceeding 8 ounces in weight, but not weighing more than 70 pounds nor measuring more than 100 inches in length and girth combined, when carried by air and including other transportation to and from air-mail routes, shall, except as otherwise herein provided, be determined on the basis of the eight postal zones established for fourth-class matter, as follows:

(1) For delivery within the first or second zones, 55 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(2) For delivery within the third zone, 60 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 8 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(3) For delivery within the fourth zone, 65 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 14 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(4) For delivery within the fifth zone, 70 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 24 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(5) For delivery within the sixth zone, 75 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 33 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(6) For delivery within the seventh zone, 75 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces plus 45 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(7) For delivery within the eighth zone, which, with respect to air parcel post, shall include all offices located in continental United States beyond the seventh zone, 80 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof over 8 ounces, plus 65 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(8) For air parcels exchanged between offices in continental United States and offices in Territories and possessions of the United States in either direction, and between offices within such Territories and possessions, the applicable zone rate shown in paragraphs (1) to (6) of this section shall apply to and including the seventh zone: *Provided*, That for offices falling in the eighth zone the rate of postage for air parcels weighing in excess of 8 ounces shall be 80 cents for each pound or fraction thereof.

(9) Mailable matter of light weight in relation to size shall be subject to such surcharge as may be determined by the Postmaster General to be warranted by reason of the extra space and care required in handling and transporting such mail matter.

(10) The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 973), as amended, or any order, rule, or regulation made by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder, as may be necessary for the safe and expeditious transportation by air of mail matter weighing in excess of 8 ounces.

(11) The Postmaster General is further authorized and directed for the period of 2 years, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) to (9), inclusive, of this section, to adjust from time to time the weight limit, size, rate of postage, zone or zones or conditions, or either, in order to promote the service to the public and assure the receipt of revenue from such service adequate to pay the cost thereof.

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized, in the disbursement of the appropriation for domestic air-mail service, to apply a part thereof to the purpose of leasing suitable quarters at public airports for use in the handling and distribution of air mail at a reasonable rental to be paid quarterly or monthly, for a term not exceeding 20 years.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 730, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session), entitled "An act to fix the rate of postage on domestic air mail, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The rate of postage on domestic air mail weighing 8 ounces or less shall be 5 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof: *Provided*, That the rate of postage on air mail of the first class weighing in excess of 8 ounces shall be the rate provided for air parcels but in no case shall be less than 8 cents an ounce or fraction thereof."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the third month following the month of enactment.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, the gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Tennessee for 20 minutes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it establishes initial rates for the carrying of parcels exceeding eight ounces and not exceeding 70 pounds by air. These rates are set up in accordance with the regular eight parcel post zones, and the committee has been assured by the Post Office Department that the rates provided will return to the Department sufficient revenue to pay the expenditures of this new service. Not only will this provide a fine new service to the people of the United States but will as well, utilize more than 20,000,000 ton-miles of space for which we are now paying but which the Post Office Department does not have sufficient volume of mail to use.

This unused space is a result of the practice of the Civil Aeronautics Board in establishing rates to the Post Office Department for carrying air mail based upon plane-mile and minimum-load factors. Under the plane-mile rate which applies generally to the feeder lines, the Post Office Department pays a fixed fee covering every mile a plane of a specific line travels. The air line is required to carry all of the mail presented for carriage by the Post Office Department. Because of the low volume of first-class air mail on feeder line runs, only a small portion of this space is used.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to the floor with the recommendation of the membership of our committee. I know of no objection to it. On two occasions it was objected to on the Consent Calendar, but I am informed by both these gentlemen that now they have no objection and will support this legislation.

If any of you have questions to ask as I proceed I shall be glad to try to answer them. In that way we may expedite consideration of this matter.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 6773, will provide for an air parcel-post service.

The minimum load factor rate applies to the smaller trunk lines. Under this rate the Post Office Department is required to pay at a specific ton-mile rate for a minimum amount of mail whether that mail is carried or not. On a more limited scale this has the same effect as the plane-mile rate and a large volume of space is paid for by the Post Office Department because there is not sufficient mail available to fill this space. This plane-mile and minimum-load factor is where a large part of the subsidy paid to the air lines is hidden.

This procedure permits the ton-mile rates to these respective carriers to be comparable. At the same time by raising the minimum-load factor, different air lines are paid considerably out of proportion to the service performed. I would like to make it crystal clear that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee does not agree with this manner of establishing rates. We have submitted a report, House Report No. 1958, in which it is recommended that the subsidy be separated from the air-mail pay and the Post Office Department be required to pay only for the service performed. However, since it is not within the jurisdiction of our committee to present legislation on this particular phase of our aviation policy, we are forced in establishing our air-mail rates and our air-mail programs to take into consideration the conditions which have grown up under the Civil Aeronautics Board.

It is expedient under the present rates to establish this air parcel-post system and to do it at once—because of the large amount of space which is not being used by the Department for which it must pay, plus the fact that on May 8, 1948, the larger air lines were granted an increase amounting to $5,000,000 annually. Under the new schedule of increases these carriers will receive a reduced ton-mile rate if the volume is increased. It is more advantageous and economical at the present time to establish the carriage of this mail in the manner already provided for regular air mail.

There is a great demand on the part of the public for this service. Coast-to-coast delivery of parcels will be advanced by 2 days. Delivery of parcels on shorter hauls will be advanced proportionately when sent by air. It is estimated that more than 50,000,000 parcels will be sent by air mail annually in order to take advantage of the advance date of delivery. A large portion of these parcels will come from new business which will be developed as a result of this time-saving transportation. Medicines, critically needed by communities, will be sent in this manner. Business experts have told us that this new service will be used for the shipment of packaged flowers, style merchandise, newspapers, and all manner of perishable products. This service will also be used for replacement parts for farm machinery. In many instances this will eliminate delays of 1 or 2 days when these parts cannot be obtained locally and may mean the saving of crops of vitally needed foodstuffs.

In summary, favorable action on this legislation will provide the American public with a desired service and will, at the same time, result in a net saving to the Post Office Department of approximately $10,000,000 annually.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to thank my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] for yielding me 3 minutes. I shall try not to use the full 3 minutes. I have asked for this time for the purpose of telling the House that on January 6, 1945, when I was a member of the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, I introduced the first air parcel-post bill. At that time I put quite an extensive amount of material in the RECORD substantiating the policy of inaugurating an air parcel-post service. This, of course, is a different manner of handling packages from the railway-air express as now handled by the air lines.

Air parcel post will provide a great deal of convenience to many people who have access to post offices but do not have access to railway express offices.

My bill was introduced in the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, January 8, 1945. At that time we were engaged in war and the Post Office Department after consideration of the bill expressed itself as being in accord with the principles of the bill, but in a letter addressed to me they said that during the war the burden of mail on the planes then available was too great to put an additional load on them.

The rates provided for air parcel post in this bill may be a little high. However, the important thing is to establish the principle of air parcel post as a part of our great post-office service. After a year's experience in the new field, a factual record of receipts and expenses will be available. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee can then review the rates and adjust them for the benefit of the public and the United States Post Office Department.

The original bill for air parcel post, H. R. 1173, which I introduced, contained a similar schedule of rates. They were purposely made a little high to prevent a deficit to the Post Office during the first trial year.

At the time I introduced the original bill the Post Office Department asked that my bill be considered after the war-time period was over. I am glad the committee has considered the matter and I am glad to see the bill on the floor at this time.

In addition to the mail privileges which it will give to a lot of American people, it will result also in the employment of a great many additional people in the airplane industry. One of the things that our air lines need at the present time is a stable freight income. This will help, I am sure, and I compliment the committee on bringing this bill forward.

I thank the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] for this time and I hope the bill passes without any objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. R. 6773, not because I oppose the principle of parcel post being carried by air but because of the way this bill has been drawn. It is one of the greatest grabs from the American taxpayer that has ever occurred in the history of our country.

The fact is that parcel post under this bill will be carried according to the air-mail letter rates instead of being carried according to the cargo rates. Here is

the difference: According to the air-mail rates the Government pays 65 cents per ton-mile. According to the air-cargo rates it is 13 cents per ton-mile. The fact remains that due to the fact these big five airline companies have complained that they are suffering a deficit, the Federal Government has agreed to give them this tremendous increase to 65 cents per ton-mile. At the same time these airlines are able to carry cargo at 13 cents per ton-mile. If any one in the House can tell me why there should be the tremendous difference between carrying cargo per ton-mile and carrying air mail per ton-mile I would like to hear them.

Under this bill parcel post could very well fit into air cargo and should be carried, therefore, for around 14 or 15 cents per ton-mile instead of 65 cents that they are going to get.

My other objection to the bill is this: As you know, since the war has ended certain veterans coming back from the war have founded airlines. Not one of them has been given a certificate by the CAB; therefore, none of them are able to operate on a regular schedule. None of them can carry air mail, none of them are eligible under this bill to carry parcel post, only the big five air lines, United, American, TWA, Northwestern, and Eastern. All of the lines started by the veterans will be obliged to carry cargo only.

Mr. Speaker, I had two amendments which I proposed that would remedy this bill. The first one is as follows:

SEC. 4. This bill shall be construed to include the services of the noncertificated air-cargo carriers holding letters of registration from the Civil Aeronautics Board for regular service and air-cargo carriers certificated for the transportation of property.

With that amendment, those veterans' lines would be included under this bill.

The other amendment I would have offered reads:

SEC. 5. The cargo carriers referred to in section 4 shall be compensated for the carriage of air parcel post at rates not to exceed by more than 5 cents a ton-mile the minimum air-freight rates prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Board, this difference to compensate the carrier for the priority to be accorded by it to air parcel post.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that these veterans' air lines are willing to carry this parcel post for 20 cents; yet the big-five air lines are to be given 65 cents. In other words, it is going to cost more to carry this air parcel post by the big-five lines than by the veterans' air lines, and for this reason the bill should be voted down.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to controvert the statements of the distinguished gentlemen from New York and Massachusetts. However, I think it is very needful to bring out some truth. As a matter of fact, when it comes to veterans operating air lines, there are thousands of veterans employed in the scheduled air lines, and there are others who are employed in nonscheduled air lines generally financed by persons other than themselves. It is a matter of employment more than anything else.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that statement is not correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. I deny that. That statement is absolutely correct. The gentleman is misinformed.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am sorry, but I do. I have the whole list here.

Mr. HINSHAW. I know who finances those companies; some of the oil interests and some by other interests.

Mr. KENNEDY. Take Mr. Slick.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Slick is in a different position. I will take it back as far as he is concerned. But there are plenty of others who are so financed.

So far as the carriage of air parcel post is concerned, it is necessary for the Government to deal with the air lines on the basis of a minimum amount of mail to be carried, and space rates turn out to be pound rates. About 60 percent of the available capacity is now being used. It would be a great saving to the Post Office Department over-all to fill up the available space with parcel post. For that reason air parcel post would be a very fine thing. In addition, we are having great difficulty at the present time in keeping our scheduled air lines going, and they are very necessary to the welfare of the people and the national defense. Under another bill, H. R. 6501, we are making special provision for cargo carrier aircraft, to assist in the development of air cargo. The Post Office Department does not want to put this mail in the hands of the nonscheduled carriers because they must actually schedule the transport of mail. Whether it be first-class mail or other kinds of mail, they must know when the planes are to load and when they are due to arrive, so that they can be met. This nonschedule business of carrying mail, whether it is parcel post or not, is practically impossible for the Post Office Department to arrange for.

While I have deep sympathy, as these gentlemen have, for the veterans, and I know that thousands of them are employed in all of the air lines, both scheduled and nonscheduled, I trust that the House will approve of this measure as it is. It is a good measure and should be adopted.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, since I will not be with you in the House in the next Congress, I wish to take a few minutes to express my deep gratitude to my colleagues for your friendship and for the constant spirit of cooperation and fair play you have always shown me during these 9 years I have been privileged to serve in the distinguished body.

While many times we have had our differences on issues, we have always respected and given honest consideration to one another's viewpoint. The work here in the House has been pleasant and inspiring to me; our decisions have been made and our tasks accomplished under the cold light of public scrutiny. This is the most remarkable body of people in the world. Think of it—435 patriotic people from every section of our country meeting to chart a legislative program for our Nation. Every viewpoint and every interest is considered. The end result is a policy and program made by the people through their own Representatives.

During the time I have been here I have served with more than 1,200 Members. I have never had reason to doubt the honesty, good will, or patriotism of any Member—and while we all have honest differences of opinion, I do not believe any Member has ever questioned my loyalty to our country.

The friendships one makes with people from all parts of our country is a great treasure for one serving in this body and I will always remember and cherish my association with you. In spite of the criticism hurled at Congress, I think there is no harder working, more intelligent, or patriotic group of people in the country.

The press endeavors to be fair in reporting our work here in Congress. A free Congress and a free press are the greatest bulwarks of our freedom. I regret though that too frequently the sensational things which occur in Congress make the news, rather than the tedious but most important labor of Members. Some newspapers ferret out this unsensational but necessary effort in making their appraisal of Members. I hope more of them will do so in the future.

Today we are in a critical period of our history. Beset with difficult domestic problems and faced with the fact of world leadership, we have rough and perplexing days ahead. But I know we are going to come through. I have great confidence in this Congress being able to steer the Ship of State through the troubled seas. This body is going to continue to protect the rights of the people. It is going to remain spiritually and materially strong. It is going to carry on a program that will give no ground for the growth of communism or fascism or any kind of ism in our country. Also I have full confidence that the Members of Congress by prayerful patience, sturdy strength, and consistent cooperation with other free peoples will win this struggle with Communist aggression, and will show the way to peace, stability, and order to the end that the world may be saved from a devastation too horrible to contemplate.

In leaving I want you to know that my prayers will always be for you—God bless you—and our great America.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, my service with my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and my association with him and his family, the charming Mrs. Kefauver, the two lovely little daughters and the one handsome son, have been sources of genuine pleasure and personal friendship. The recognition which has been given to the patriotic and courageous service of my colleague stimulates pride in the hearts of his friends and, along with the many personal joys during his service with us, will, I am sure, occasion many pleasant memories and recollections for him as it will for me and his other friends in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Tennessee has made an outstanding record in the House, and the people of his district can well be proud of his service not only to them but to the people of his State and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that other Members desiring to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the services of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] may do so at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is leaving the House of Representatives. He has been a man of stature and a leader among us. The many valuable contributions he has made in helping to carry on the work of Congress will long be remembered. He leaves with my sincerest wishes for a bright and successful future.

I have just read an advertisement by Mr. Ed Crump, of Memphis, which unjustly defames my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

As a member of the Un-American Activities Committee and one of its former chairmen, I wish to state for the record that the forthright stand my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has always taken in defending and preserving the civil liberties of citizens has in my opinion tended to strengthen the fight against un-American activities. The Un-American Activities Committee is faced with a problem of great import and complexity. There are many factors involved—not the least of which is the careful preservation of the rights of Americans under the Constitution. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has always been sympathetic to our committee and his cool and reasonable judgment has been most helpful.

While I am from Georgia it so happens that my district adjoins that of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I know many of the people whom he has represented so well during his 9 years in Congress. They accord him the same high respect as his many colleagues and I do. The gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER, is a fine American true to the ideals of the Constitution. He stands, and has always stood for the principles on which our great democracy was founded. I sincerely hope that the people of Tennessee will not be misguided in their appraisal of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] by the words of a political boss.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as one who came to Congress about the time Representative ESTES KEFAUVER came, I desire to pay tribute to him. Throughout the many years Estes has served in the House, he has been recognized as one of the most able, competent, and conscientious Members in the House. He is known for his hard work and sincere devotion to the principles in which he believes. In many ways, and often, he has demonstrated his courage and initiative. The people of his district have been fortunate to have been represented by so distinguished a person. We, his colleagues, shall miss him as a legislator and as a friend. We are not happy that he is leaving the House; however, we wish him every good fortune in his undertakings.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the retirement from the House of the gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER, will be a great loss, particularly to the Committee on the Judiciary, on which committee it has been my privilege to serve with him. His keen legal mind has been of tremendous help to the committee. Mr. KEFAUVER has been quick to recognize restrictive measures in proposed legislation that might deprive the individual of his constitutional rights—rights which he has worked untiringly to protect, strengthen, and preserve. Mr. KEFAUVER has been ever diligent in his efforts to further the opportunities of the ordinary man. This capable, personable gentleman leaves the House of Representatives, where he has so ably served his constituency and our Nation, with the best wishes of his colleagues, and we, as one, bid him good fortune.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that it has been a distinct pleasure and privilege to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. He has served with marked ability and unusual fidelity to his duties. As a legislator and a good friend, we shall miss him.

May I express to the gentleman the hope, if the great State of Tennessee is to be represented in the other body by a member of the Democratic Party, as seems to be a reasonable, if not desirable prospect to contemplate, that the senatorial crown by action of the electorate may rest upon the brow of our colleague who will carry it with dignity and credit to those who select him.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with other Members of the House in expressing appreciation for the services in this body of our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and in voicing our regret that he is leaving the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has given conscientious and faithful service to the Third Tennessee District, to the State of Tennessee, and to the Nation.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee he has been a close student of legislation and has assisted in the writing of important bills for that committee.

As he leaves the House now, voluntarily, I am sure the good wishes of his colleagues will go with him.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know the gentleman from Tennessee for many years before he became a Member of this House. I observed his activities as a civic leader and outstanding member of the bar of Chattanooga. I know of his high standing in the section of the South with which he has been identified. I appreciate his contribution to the solution of the great problems which have engaged us here. His splendid training as a lawyer, his studious disposition, his kind and generous treatment of those associated with him, and his qualities of progressive leadership have won the admiration of his colleagues and the appreciation of a multitude of American citizens.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that ESTES KEFAUVER is leaving us. He is a man of outstanding ability and has been a pleasant, understanding gentleman to work with. His loss will be deeply felt by every Member of the House.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the people of ESTES KEFAUVER'S district and of the State of Tennessee are losing a most capable, hard-working, and intelligent Representative. During the years we have served here together I have gotten to know ESTES KEFAUVER well. He has come before the Appropriations Committee many times. He always presents his case clearly and forcibly and he knows the facts of his case. I consider him one of the top-notch Members of this body. He is the type of man we need in public service, and I hope he may continue in the upper body.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to serve with my colleague [Mr. KEFAUVER] on numerous unofficial committees. I regret that he is leaving the Congress, for he is a man of high ideals in the best American tradition. In times like these we need able men like Mr. KEFAUVER—men with fearless courage willing to grasp the complex issues before us and grapple with them until they are solved.

ESTES KEFAUVER has earned the high reputation he enjoys among us here by his hard work, sound judgment, and kindly consideration he has always had for the views and problems confronting his fellow colleagues. I wish him the utmost success in the future and want him to know that he will always carry my sincere best wishes with him.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest regret that I say farewell to my friend and colleague, ESTES KEFAUVER. He is a sincere, hard-working American and it has been a great pleasure to be associated with him in Congress. ESTES has established one of the finest records of any man here and has been a real credit to his district, his State, and his country. I hope I have the pleasure of working with him for many years to come.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many other Members share in my regret that so valuable a Member of Congress as my colleague, ESTES KEFAUVER, is leaving us. His work here has earned the respect of all of us. He is a man of clear judgment and outstanding ability. I have enjoyed working with him here in Congress and I look forward to his continued success in the future.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in voicing my sincere regret that he is leaving the House of Representatives after having served so faithfully and ably not only his own district and State, but also the Nation.

He is a man of great ability and is highly regarded not only by the members of his own party, but also by the members of the majority party. He has contributed much in constructive legislation while in Congress.

A year ago it was my privilege to be his guest in Tennessee and to view the great Tennessee Valley Authority projects, for which he had worked so energetically ad capably. He has, as a Member of the House, consistently worked for and with the people of his district and State for legislation beneficial to his people. He has been in Congress a recognized leader of his party, an outstanding Member of the House.

We will miss him, not only as an outstanding legislator, but also as a sincere and lovable friend.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, may I join with the many other Members of the House in expressing my regrets that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER, has decided to leave us and seek the select and rarefied air of that great deliberative body on the other side of this building. Not only will we miss his warm and attractive personality, but the House of Representatives will lose one of its finest minds, its most energetic workers and one of its true and inspirational leaders. The gentleman from Tennessee has earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues here in the House, and by his accomplishments he has earned the right to represent the people of Tennessee in the United States Senate.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us will miss the ready smile and hearty handshake of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. In leaving us he takes with him the best wishes of the membership. He has well represented his district, State, and Nation. Good luck, Estes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, during my 6 years in Congress I have learned to love and admire the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. His ability, his sincerity, and his willingness to work early and late, and his genial disposition, endeared him to his colleagues. We will all miss him in the House, but we look forward to his well-merited promotion in the Congress by service in the Senate of the United States. I am happy to count him as one of my closest friends in the Congress.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my policy to encourage my friends to seek the goal that will bring them the utmost satisfaction and that will provide an opportunity for the personal growth.

In this instance I am glad to know of Representative KEFAUVER's ambition to enter the Senate of the United States, and I do wish for him success in this effort. However, his fine record in the House is something of which he should be very proud. His devotion to the work of the House has earned for him the respect and confidence of every Member.

We shall all feel his absence keenly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many Members who have the highest praise for the invaluable service which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has rendered during his years in the House. His diligence, great ability and excellent judgment has gained him the confidence and respect of all of us, including Democrats and Republicans alike. In addition, his unfailing courtesy has always been refreshing. All wish him good luck and success.

MR. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to state that it has been a great pleasure and a source of inspiration to have had the opportunity to serve with my colleague and associate on the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER of the great State of Tennessee. His devotion to duty, his fair and impartial approach to all bills before our committee are all to his great credit. ESTES has been kind, sympathetic, and understanding upon every occasion that I have sought his friendship, consideration, and support. His ability as an attorney, his judicial mind, and his leadership shall be sorely missed when he voluntarily retires from the House of Representatives.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of genuine regret to me that Mr. KEFAUVER is retiring from the House. It so happens that he and I have been interested in some of our congressional problems and have cooperated one with the other. I have found him to be an earnest, intelligent and sincere legislator—the kind we all appreciate and admire. I hope he will continue in the service of his country.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is an uncommon privilege to serve in this House but a more rare privilege to work with a Member who measures up to the high caliber and is possessed of the sterling character and productive ability of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I remember when first he came to Congress for he made his impression early and well. Never to my knowledge has he failed to devote his intellectual attainments and his inexhaustible energies to the welfare of his constituents and his country. I shall miss him and his sound reasoning. His departure from this Chamber I trust precedes his graduation to the Senate where the Senatorial toga to drape his broad shoulders awaits him. He will contribute to that august body at the other end of the Capitol the same sound reasoning, help and virility that he so unselfishly and generously gave to the House. May the good people of Tennessee and of his district reward him for his patriotic service by promotion to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend and fellow Member, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Estes, as we affectionately know him, leaves this great body voluntarily. We are going to miss him. We will miss his sound counsel and advice.

But, while we grieve at his leaving the House we rejoice in the thought that he is waging a forceful campaign for election to the other branch of this Congress, and we wish him success in his race.

The gentleman from Tennessee has contributed much to the Government of our great country and it is my hope that, in or out of Congress, he will continue his fine service to his fellowman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to say that, among all the outstanding men I have met in this House, none has impressed me more with his sincerity, his ability, his interest in mankind, and his loyalty to his country, his State, and his constituents than the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. We on this side of the aisle are losing a great colleague, a loyal Democrat. The House is losing a faithful servant. He has made a great record here. We have confidence that the high level of public service which he has rendered here will characterize his activities in his new undertakings.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker. I am one of many Members of this House who are genuinely sorry to know that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] will no longer be with us.

All during my tenure of office in this body I have appreciated and admired the distinguished gentleman's ability, and statesmanship. He brought to this body an intelligence and integrity that contributed greatly to the deliberations of this body. It is such men as he that has enabled this body to carry on through the most difficult and critical times in the history of our Nation. His attributes are rare and shared by few. For this reason, I have held him in the highest esteem.

My earnest wish is that he will soon grace the other body, thus bringing to that body the high character and great qualities that he gave to this body.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to learn that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. ESTES KEFAUVER, will not be a Member of this body next year. He has made an enviable record and no man in the House is regarded more highly by this body.

We wish him great success in all his endeavors, and should he become a Member of the other body I am sure the people of Tennessee will be well represented.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, when Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER leaves the House of Representatives we lose one of the most able and outstanding Members of this body. He has been a forward-looking Representative of his people in every instance where their welfare might be in jeopardy. Our good wishes go with him as he leaves our midst.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I hear my friend and colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] state that he will not be with us in the House next Congress. It will be a distinct loss to this body to have him leave it. I regard my friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] as one of the strongest Members here during my membership.

I have never seen or visited the physical plant of the great Tennessee Valley

Authority, but I have gained a favorable impression of it. A large part of my knowledge of TVA and the good impression I have of it has been gained through the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. He has been a great friend and stanch defender of this highly important and controversial development. I know he will continue to support and foster this and every other significant and worthy cause for his State and Nation.

Mr. LANHAM of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it was not until the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] spoke his few brief words of farewell to the House a few moments ago that the realization was brought to me that he would not be a Member of the House during the next session of Congress.

Before I came to Washington as a Member of the Eightieth Congress I did not know ESTES KEFAUVER personally although I had heard much of the splendid record he had made in the Congress. Since coming to Washington I have learned to love, admire, and respect him very much.

Mr. KEFAUVER is recognized by his colleagues as one of the ablest and most progressive Members of Congress; and when I say he is progressive in his thinking and approach to public questions I mean that he is progressive in the true sense of the word and in no sense a radical.

Mr. KEFAUVER is one of a group of the younger and more forward looking Members of Congress who have done a wonderful job in reorganizing and streamlining the Congress. I have read with interest and I trust with profit, his book entitled "Twentieth Century Congress." In that book, which should be read by every Member of Congress, as well as every person in America interested in seeing the Congress work more effectively and speedily in the public interest, Mr. KEFAUVER makes many recommendations and suggestions to speed up the democratic process. I am of the opinion that most, if not all of the things suggested by Mr. KEFAUVER in his book could well be adopted by the Congress in the interest of a more vital and effective functioning of our great democracy.

I have felt especially close to Mr. KEFAUVER because of the fact that he represents a district in the State of Tennessee which adjoins the great Seventh Congressional District of Georgia which I have the honor and privilege of representing. I have been proud to call him my neighbor and friend.

I can say without disparaging in any way the distinguished junior Senator who now represents the State of Tennessee and without passing upon the merit of the other candidate for the Senate from that great State that ESTES KEFAUVER would be a most worthy and able representative of his State in the United States Senate.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important committees in the House of Representatives is the great and dignified Committee on the Judiciary, to which are referred more bills on more varied subjects than any other committee.

In the Seventy-sixth Congress I was assigned to that committee along with the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, of the Third Tennessee District. His keen mind, lofty character, and fine ability were instantly recognized by our chairman, and to him were assigned many of our most arduous and difficult tasks.

He is one of the best-educated lawyers in the House. Progressive in his views on modern problems, yet he is a stickler for the fundamentals and the recognized principles of law and government.

He is stalwart, both mentally and physically, and his 10 years' service to his people and to our country has been magnificent.

His retirement from the House of Representatives will be a distinct loss to his committee and to the whole House. We will miss him greatly.

It is my hope that the people of his great State recognize his meritorious services, and I join his many friends in wishing him happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I know I voice the sentiments of the House of Representatives when I say that we shall miss the long and valued services of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER. However, I am sure that this loss will only be a temporary one because the people of Tennessee will select him to represent them in the United States Senate.

No one has been a more consistent champion of the development of the great resources of the Tennessee Valley than ESTES KEFAUVER. The people of Tennessee are fortunate, indeed, in having such an able advocate in the Congress of the United States.

During his long service on the Judiciary Committee he has gained a reputation as one of the outstanding constitutional authorities in the Congress. He has always fought for and supported those measures which were in the public interest. It was my particular good fortune to have served with him during the past 7 years as a member of the House Small Business Committee. He has been a zealous guardian of the interest of the small-business men in America. He rendered an outstanding service to the country as chairman of the Subcommittee on Business Monopoly in the last Congress. The small-business men of America will not forget his tireless efforts in their behalf.

All of us join in wishing him many more years of public service in behalf of his country.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the other colleagues of ESTES KEFAUVER in paying tribute to this outstanding statesman. Here in Congress, we might be listed as Democrats or Republicans or of any other political faith, but among ourselves we have other standards, such as: Does he fight for what he thinks is right, has he ability, is he fair and honest, and does he respect the beliefs of others? My association with ESTES has convinced me that he qualifies in every respect.

I also must state that TVA is losing in the House one of its great champions.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my other colleagues in expressing my deep regret in saying farewell to my good friend and coworker, the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman KEFAUVER.

I have, through these past 9 years that I have served with him, learned to have a deep respect for his ability, personality, understanding of governmental problems.

His help was tremendous in our effort to reorganize the Congress. The great contributions he made to bring about a better legislative branch will be long remembered. He is a genuine student of legislative government and his understanding has, and I hope will, continue to aid the Congress in improving its machinery and its procedures.

I have followed his voting record closely over these years and have admired and largely concurred with his carefully arrived at and courageous decisions.

The loss of Representative KEFAUVER from this body is a deep blow—one which I hope will be compensated, however, by his service on the other side of the Capitol. We can ill afford to lose such an able Member when the Nation faces such grave problems as it does today.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the proudest term I know is the single word, "American." That word stands for many things in the eyes of the world—for courage, for kindness, for tolerance, for religious liberty, and political freedom.

Among the colleagues with whom I have had the honor of serving in this House who particularly deserve the highest praise for their genuine Americanism is the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

When it would have been easy for him to follow along with blind hysteria, he has stood firm for the American way. He has proved by his votes, even though he knew that they might cost him short-sighted support, that to him it was more important to be right than to seize a temporary advantage.

ESTES KEFAUVER has supported good legislation consistently courageously, and militantly.

He has applied the same qualities in opposing bad legislation.

His voting record in Congress could be taken as a guide for wise representation of his constituency. All of us might do well to measure our own records against his.

He will be missed in this House.

ESTES KEFAUVER is a man, and a Congressman, of whom Thomas Jefferson would have approved.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, during the terms I have served in this House, many Members have come and gone. We have lost valuable Members through death—the whims of politics—and those who have left to follow other pursuits.

I have listened to my good friend and colleague, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, say farewell to those with whom he has so ably served.

Tennessee has contributed many statesmen to our great democracy, and I know of none who gives more promise of emulating the greatest of these than the gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER.

Though he does not return as a Mem-

tions and I am honored and happy to

will be a real loss to the House and to the

Though he does not return as a Member of the House of Representatives, yet he will still be with us in spirit, and the contributions he has made to this body, will long be gratefully remembered.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, as one who has served 10 years in the Congress and who has come to know the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER well, I wish to join with others in paying high tribute to him.

During this session of the Congress it has been my pleasure to serve on the Judiciary Committee of the House along with Mr. KEFAUVER. About one-third of all the bills introduced in the Congress in this session have been referred to the Judiciary Committee. Perhaps more useful and constructive legislation has come from this committee than any other. Mr. KEFAUVER is recognized as one of the most able members of this distinguished committee.

On a purely selfish basis we regret his seeking promotion to the Senate. However, for patriotic reasons we wish him much success in his current campaign. He would make a United States Senator of which all Tennessee could justly be proud.

At this time, however, I wish to refer to only one of the outstanding contributions Mr. KEFAUVER has made to the Congress. I wish to acknowledge with gratitude his sponsorship of electoral reform. Mr. KEFAUVER was one of the first and most effective advocates of a constitutional amendment to change the method by which we elect Presidents. House Joint Resolution 9, reported by the Judiciary Committee of the House without a dissenting vote, and Senate Joint Resolution 200, reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate with but one dissenting vote, currently known as the Gossett-Lodge resolution, was in large part the handiwork of ESTES KEFAUVER. Through effective and able advocacy he has been able to create much support for this proposed amendment in the Congress. In the opinion of many of us, this reform is essential if American democracy is to survive. As a Member of the United States Senate, Mr. KEFAUVER can and will continue his able espousal of this cause. He can and will contribute materially to its early enactment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, like all other Members of the House, I deeply regret the retirement from this body of the able and distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. During his service here he has commanded the respect and high regard of the House. Capable, aggressive, conscientious and forward-looking, he has consistently been a vigorous and able advocate of every principle or measure that he sponsored and a worthy representative of his district. Of gracious and amiable manner he very naturally enjoys many warm friendships among us who will miss his presence in this body.

It is not surprising, therefore, that he has answered the summons of a higher responsibility, the quest for a greater public duty in perhaps a wider field of service. Our very best wishes attend him as he proceeds to achieve his aspirations and I am honored and happy to add my testimony to that of my colleagues in expressing regret upon the departure of such a distinguished Member and conveying to him my own sentiments that good will, good fortune, and success in the future may be his lot. May he enjoy higher flights and happier landings.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I join those who contemplate with regret the departure from Congress of the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER. He has made a great record; a record which is symbolic of the devotion to ideals, the perseverance, and the splendid ability he has shown. His place here will not easily be filled.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to publicly acknowledge my deep appreciation for the privilege of having sat side by side on the House Judiciary Committee with Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. My assignment to the Judiciary Committee followed closely the assignment of Mr. KEFAUVER.

As revealed from the history of the Judiciary Committee of the House, as prepared by our colleague and fellow committeeman the Honorable LOUIS E. GRAHAM, of Pennsylvania, many outstanding men have served there. Mr. KEFAUVER came to us with a splendid educational and practical background, well qualified for the many duties incident to his assignment. Strong of body, alert of mind, eager for work; no other member of our committee has done a better job.

The voluntary retirement of ESTES from the House leaves a vacancy which will be difficult to fill. By reason of his many sterling qualities, a strong bond of friendship prevails throughout the committee's entire membership regardless as to party lines.

I am sure that this humble expression of appreciation and loss by the retirement of Mr. KEFAUVER is shared in by our entire committee. May the Lord add strength and length to his already fruitful life.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Tennessee, Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, voluntarily retires at the end of the Eightieth Congress he will leave behind a most distinguished record of service. He was elected first to the Sixty-ninth and each succeeding Congress by the people of his district by overwhelming majorities.

This decade of service to the people of Tennessee as well as the Nation is a record of painstaking, diligent, and unselfish work.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Tennessee will continue to seek the opportunity to use the service of our sincere, honest, and faithful colleague.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard with regret of the voluntary retirement of Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, from the House of Representatives. During his long tenure he has demonstrated marked ability and has won the respect of his colleagues by his fine service to his people. He has consistently supported the progressive legislation advocated by the Democratic Party during his service. His departure will be a real loss to the House and to the Nation.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that our colleague, Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, is offering his services to the State of Tennessee by reason of being a candidate to the United States Senate.

I have observed Mr. KEFAUVER's work in the House of Representatives for the past 6 years, and in my judgment he is one of the most effective Members of this body. He has been most diligent in carrying out the trust imposed on him by the people in his district in Tennessee, and I am confident if he is successful in his quest for a seat in the Senate, he will serve the people of Tennessee with honor and distinction.

I do not believe there is a Member of the House who is more admired and respected by his colleagues than is ESTES KEFAUVER, or one who has a better record of service to his country and to his State and district.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of genuine regret to Members on both sides of the aisle that our distinguished colleague the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER is retiring from the House. Industry, integrity, and ability have marked his record of service. I have learned to know him well in the decade we have served together in this Chamber, and I entertain for him affectionate regard. May good fortune and happiness attend him all the days of his life.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the closing hours of the Eightieth Congress we are turning our thoughts toward returning home and leaving our tasks here in Washington and at the same time parting with those whom we have been associated with in our committee work and in the Congress. At this time I want to express my regrets that we are not going to have with us on the Committee of the Judiciary one of our very good members who has served in the Congress for the past 9 years.

Congressman ESTES KEFAUVER has been one of our hard-working Members. He was highly respected by the entire membership of the House and his opinions and judgment were eagerly sought on the many intricate problems which came before our committee. He has contributed a great deal toward the fine record made by that outstanding committee. He acted as chairman of the committee investigating the conduct of one Judge Johnson, who as a Federal judge was accused of misconduct. He applied himself very diligently to the work and as a result of the investigation which the committee undertook, the judge resigned from the bench. He was determined to see to it that if there was any malfeasance in office it should be uncovered and the guilty ones exposed. His work has been praised by the entire committee. He has spared no effort to see that justice be done. He is not seeking reelection to the House of Representatives but is a candidate for United States Senator. I wish him well. He has earned any ambition he may seek as a public servant. He has been tested and not found wanting. If elected to the Senate he will give the people of the State of Tennessee excellent representation. His experience

in the House qualifies him for the office and Tennessee will have a very fine and outstanding Senator. I wish him well and hope that he will enjoy good health and many, many years of success and happiness.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, for some time it has been my privilege to serve with ESTES KEFAUVER on the Judiciary Committee of the House. We have worked together on such important matters as the Administrative Procedure Act, the Contract Settlement Act, and many others. Several years ago I was a member of a special committee, of which he was chairman, to consider impeachment proceedings against certain district judges in Pennsylvania.

As a result of this close association I have come to know ESTES very well. In my judgment, he is one of the most able Members of the House. He has an excellent legal mind, which enables him to go at once to the root of any problem. He is one of the hard working Members of the Congress, and possesses executive ability to an unusual degree. He has been very mindful of his obligations to his constituents and to his country.

I shall remember ESTES as a worthy Member of Congress, a sturdy American, and a true friend.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which should have been presented to the Congress long ago. Air parcel post is badly needed in this country. I do not believe that anyone will insist that air parcel-post service should not be inaugurated at this time. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] will agree with that statement. Their opposition to this bill stems out of the fact that the measure provides that air parcel post shall be carried by air-mail carriers. They contend that certain noncertificated cargo carriers should have an opportunity to carry this air parcel post. In my opinion, air parcel post can be carried effectively and efficiently only by regularly scheduled air-mail carriers. I have an interest in these noncertificated cargo carriers. They have appeared before our committee. I have met many of them personally. I appreciate the great fight that they are making in the development of air cargo transportation. They now have an application with the Civil Aeronautics Board for a certificate. The application will be acted upon. If they are given a certificate, then they will be eligible to receive an air-mail contract and can then carry air parcel post.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. The nonscheduled air cargo carriers, the veterans, have had their applications for certificates in for three years, and not one veteran air line has been given a certificate. That is why they want a regular route. The veterans can carry this mail 40 cents cheaper per ton mile than the other carriers.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I will say to my friend from Massachusetts that an application for a certificate is now pending before the CAB.

Mr. KENNEDY. It has been pending for three years.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Hearings have been held upon it. I understand that action will be taken at an early date. I appeal to you to pass this bill. It provides for the carriage of air parcel post by zone rates just like the zone rate for surface transportation. However, the rates are so high that they cannot be in competition with surface transportation, by train, for example. The railroads do not oppose it. The Railway Express Company does not oppose it. It is a service that is urgently needed for the shipment of perishables and medicine, for parts and other articles from one coast to another, and to all sections of the United States.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. The statement was made before that the present certificated air mail carriers are receiving payment for space that is not used.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. KEOGH. And that they will be able to utilize that space for this parcel post.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. KEOGH. The utilization of that space for parcel post will in nowise decrease air-mail payments; will it?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Certainly not.

Mr. KEOGH. If the gentleman will excuse me, did he answer that it will not? Therefore, in fact, they will be paid twice for the same space.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. No, no. Let me tell the gentleman from New York this: At the present time, under the decisions of the CAB, the Post Office Department is paying for 20,000,000 tons that are not being used. Now, if those 20,000,000 tons are used for this new air parcel post, then it will not cost the Post Office Department one single penny for the carriage of the mail for this unused space. Let me tell you furthermore that on all small trunk lines the CAB has fixed a minimum load of 300 pounds. That is what the Post Office Department has to pay for; yet none of these lines carry over an average of 75 to 100 pounds of that 300 pounds. The balance of around 200 pounds can be utilized in the carriage of air parcel post, and it will not cost the Post Office Department one penny to use that space.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I wish the gentleman would permit me to finish first. I have already yielded to the gentleman and cannot yield at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the present bill if enacted into law will provide for the carriage of air parcel post to 400 cities. Two hundred other cities are now waiting for air service. They will also soon receive air parcel post if this bill becomes law. I ask my friends: How can noncertificated, nonscheduled carriers carry air parcel post? Air parcel post should go the same as any other kind of air mail.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the gentleman yield to me to answer that question as to how they can carry it?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. It has to be carried on regular schedules, the same as any other mail. I trust the Members will vote for this bill.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to reply to those who have been defending the independent carriers.

I will say that our committee did give consideration to the problem they have discussed this afternoon. We gave it very careful consideration. As far as the chairman of this committee is concerned, he feels that the CAB has not probably been as fair as it might have been with respect to its treatment of the independent air freight carriers, but what we are discussing this afternoon is the question of the use of a great deal of space, some $10,000,000 worth of space, that is not being presently used. We feel it should be used.

I will say to the gentleman that consideration will be given to their problem. We expect to hold hearings in regard to it and try as far as we can to help them work out their problem. We are in sympathy with their contention, but we have had full hearings on this bill and recommended what we believe to be the best bill considering the circumstances.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. The veterans did present a bill to your committee that would have taken care of these problems, and it was turned down completely.

Mr. REES. Well, they did submit their proposal and the committee did not recommend it.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. If the chairman expresses the thinking of his committee, has he not presented to the House the best argument for deferring action on this bill until that matter can be taken up?

Mr. REES. The chairman is speaking about his own thinking in regard to those people, but he does feel it is utterly improper for us to allow this $10,000,000 worth of space to go to waste. We think it ought to be used. I think the gentleman from New York agrees with me. We are not shutting anybody out. We are trying to use something that we have and have paid for and not presently using.

Mr. KEOGH. Anyone who knows the distinguished gentleman knows the standing he has with his committee.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his forthright statement in behalf of the veteran-operated cargo air lines. I know that he has made a detailed and careful

study of this situation, especially in regard to the apparent inequity that now

(10) The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to make such rules and regula-

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT

and the Congress on this bill, a great ... bers or the representatives of the op- ... 602,591 for the fiscal year 1949. This

study of this situation, especially in regard to the apparent inequity that now exists. I hope the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will look into this situation further at the earliest possible moment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds have voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 2281, being an identical bill with the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the rate of postage on mailable matter exceeding 8 ounces in weight, but not weighing more than 70 pounds nor measuring more than 100 inches in length and girth combined, when carried by air and including other transportation to and from air-mail routes, shall, except as otherwise herein provided, be determined on the basis of the 8 postal zones established for fourth-class matter, as follows:

(1) For delivery within the first or second zones, 55 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(2) For delivery within the third zone, 60 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 8 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(3) For delivery within the fourth zone, 65 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 14 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(4) For delivery within the 5th zone, 70 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 24 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(5) For delivery within the 6th zone, 75 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 33 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(6) For delivery within the 7th zone, 75 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of eight ounces, plus 45 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(7) For delivery within the 8th zone, which, with respect to air parcel post, shall include all offices located in continental United States beyond the 7th zone, 80 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof over 8 ounces, plus 65 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(8) For air parcels exchanged between offices in continental United States and offices in Territories and possessions of the United States, in either direction, and between offices within such Territories and possessions, the applicable zone rate shown in paragraphs (1) to (6) of this section shall apply to and including the seventh zone: *Provided*, That for offices falling in the eighth zone the rate of postage for air parcels weighing in excess of 8 ounces shall be 80 cents for each pound or fraction thereof.

(9) Mailable matter of light weight in relation to size shall be subject to such surcharge as may be determined by the Postmaster General to be warranted by reason of the extra space and care required in handling and transporting such mail matter.

(10) The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 973), as amended, or any order, rule, or regulation made by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder, as may be necessary for the safe and expeditious transportation by air of mail matter weighing in excess of 8 ounces.

(11) The Postmaster General is further authorized and directed for the period of 2 years, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) to (9), inclusive, of this section, to adjust from time to time the weight limit, size, rate of postage, zone or zones or conditions, or either, in order to promote the service to the public and assure the receipt of revenue from such service adequate to pay the cost thereof.

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized, in the disbursement of the appropriation for domestic air-mail service, to apply a part thereof to the purpose of leasing suitable quarters at public airports for use in the handling and distribution of air mail at a reasonable rental to be paid quarterly or monthly, for a term not exceeding 20 years.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public law 730, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), entitled "An act to fix the rate of postage on domestic air mail, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The rate of postage on domestic air mail weighing 8 ounces or less shall be 5 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof: *Provided*, That the rate of postage on air mail of the first class weighing in excess of 8 ounces shall be the rate provided for air parcels but in no case shall be less than 3 cents an ounce or fraction thereof."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the third month following the month of enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS BETWEEN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIF., AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6633) to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the same.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after "Secretary", insert "after receiving the written approval of the Attorney General as to the titles, leases, and other mutual conveyances connected therewith,"

Page 6, line 9, strike out all after "Navy" down to and including "and" in line 21 and insert "and shall cease to be used for a period of 2 years by any branch of the armed services of the United States for military or naval purposes, then and in that event, the said lease shall terminate, be canceled and be of no further effect, and the city shall have the immediate right to reoccupy said lands.'; and."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. PHILLIPS of California, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, and Mr. THOMAS of Texas.

LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to bring to the attention of the House a radio broadcast by Mr. Martin Agronsky over the American Broadcasting System.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to bring to the attention of the House a radio broadcast by a Mr. Martin Agronsky recently over the American Broadcasting Company's network from New York which is so replete with false charges and propaganda against Members of Congress that it cannot go unanswered in all justice to all good Americans both in and out of Congress.

After this broadcast was made, I requested a copy of Mr. Agronsky's broadcast, which I received several days later, and after the gentleman had made several changes in his charges, which I discovered in checking his exact spoken words against the altered copy he sent me. You will note as I read these charges that the gentleman from New York the Honorable JOHN TABER comes in for criticism, but the truth is that at no time has the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] taken part in the subcommittee hearings on this bill for the 1949 fiscal year appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior, nor did he at any time make recommendations to the committee on language or on amounts in the bill, but simply gave his approval to the bill when it came before the full Appropriation Committee of the House, of which he is chairman. Consequently, to the members of the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations, of which I have the honor of being chairman, must go the blame or credit for the bill as reported to the House of Representatives May 26 last.

I invite everybody in America to examine the action taken by the committee

and the Congress on this bill, a great part of which is for the orderly and more rapid development of our 17 Western States.

CHARGES

As the Presidential nominating convention draws near and the Eightieth Congress steps on the legislative gas to meet its June 19 adjournment deadline, it becomes increasingly difficult for the public to see through the obscuring clouds of political oratory exactly what's happening on the floor of the House and Senate to some of the most vital issues affecting our contemporary way of life.

This morning, because it's important that Americans, getting ready to elect a new President and a substantially new Congress, see clearly and very clearly just what that Congress is doing, I want to report in some detail on an obscure piece of legislation. This legislation consists of a series of amendments and riders attached by the House Appropriations Committee under the chairmanship of Republican Representative JOHN TABER to the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior.

ANSWERED

The purpose in his opening statements is to set the stage for an attack upon Republican handling of the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1949 in the House of Representatives. He refers to this bill and amendments as "an obscure piece of legislation" and to the debate upon the bill as "obscuring clouds of political oratory." He indicates that he, as a radio commentator reporting the news, will reveal the facts concerning Republican trickery in passing the bill.

"Obscure" means shaded, darkened, hidden, and remote from observation. Shadowy, mysterious, and unknown are synonyms. Interior Department appropriation bills are not "obscure" in any sense of the word. They are, each year, among the most important annual supply bills enacted by the Congress. During the last 2 years no legislation, including the Marshall plan, has received such exhaustive treatment and careful consideration.

The organization of the Congress under our two-party system prevents "obscure" legislation or "buried," "misleading" amendments from being enacted. The House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, for the newscaster's information, are composed of Republican and Democratic members; their committees and subcommittees are each composed of Republicans and Democrats. The Republicans being the majority party have a majority membership; the Democrats being the minority or opposition party have a minority membership. The House Appropriation Committee is composed of 25 Republicans and 18 Democrats, and the Interior Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee is composed of 4 Republicans and 3 Democrats. The Democratic members attend and are as familiar with the hearings and with the bill as written and reported as are the Republican members. Each member, Republican or Democrat, has equal rights and privileges on committees. All members are entitled to be present at all committee meetings and to be present when a report is accepted or rejected and when a bill is drafted. Nothing can be hidden; nothing can be buried; nothing can be obscured. The Democratic members, or the representatives of the opposition party, have the responsibility to inform their leadership and party members of the contents of any and all legislation. They were informed concerning all details of this bill. They knew what was in it.

CHARGES

These obscure amendments and riders buried under misleading titles and literally rammed through the House in one afternoon's inconclusive debate last week, threatened to destroy the American Government's whole vast system of power and irrigation projects. They're important. They come into effect by passing the Senate, the Reclamation Act of 1902 brought into being by President Theodore Roosevelt, will be completely nullified and the exponents of power and land monopolies throughout this country will reign supreme.

ANSWERED

Amendments to the bill referred to by the newscaster as "obscure amendments" were printed in the report exactly as they have been printed in reports for years. There has been no change in procedure. Every Member of the House of Representatives is familiar with the make-up of a House Appropriations Committee report. His reference to an amendment "buried under misleading titles" is misleading itself. No one who read the report or bill could have missed the provision to which he referred. They might have objected to it, but they could not have missed it. Anyone who even casually read pages 45 to 49 of the committee's report and the bill itself would not have been misled by a mere editing error. He appears to have been the only person misled, for Members of the House—as the debate reveals—were well familiar with all its contents, including the legislative limitation which he claims was buried. Nothing in the bill destroys or threatens to destroy Federal irrigation or power projects. Nothing in the bill "nullifies" any provision of the Reclamation Act of 1902, and the newscaster submits no evidence to bear out these charges. The report of the committee insisting upon a reemphasis of reclamation constitutes one of the foremost steps taken within recent years to assure that the spirit and the letter of the 1902 Reclamation Act is fulfilled.

CHARGES

Now, what the House of Representatives did in approving by a voice vote, with not more than 100 Members present, this obscure bit of legislation was nothing less than practically insuring that the extension of public power shall eventually be brought to a dead stop and that the famous 160-Acre Act, which is aimed at blocking the provision of irrigation water from Government dams to farms exceeding 160 acres in size, shall be nullified.

ANSWERED

He charges that the House action on the Interior Department bill will bring "the extension of public power • • • to a dead stop" but does not support the charges with facts. His comments were obviously written without reference to the House hearings, the committee report, or the House debate. This man suppressed the fact that the Department of the Interior will have more money next year than in any previous year. The House committee would provide the Interior Department with $375,692,591 for the fiscal year 1949. This compares with $262,801,000 in 1948 and $258,985,716 available in 1947. The same is true of the Bureau of Reclamation for which the House appropriated $226,794,897 for use in the fiscal year 1949. This compares with $136,644,738 available in 1948, the previous peak level—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 1, 1948, page 6751.

Of these huge sums, vast amounts were made available for projects in Western States which involve power as well as reclamation. The Bonneville Power Administration received $20,920,000 exclusively for power developments; the Anderson Ranch Dam in Idaho, which is an irrigation and power project, will have $5,100,000 available for all purposes in 1949; $19,495,000 will be available for the Davis Dam project; $41,396,000 for the Central Valley project; $19,750,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project; $8,100,000 for the Hungry Horse project; $3,192,000 for the Fort Peck project; and over $54,000,000 for Missouri River Basin projects. Of the money made available for the Missouri River Basin project, approximately $4,000,000 was earmarked for transmission lines and substations alone. Millions of dollars were made available for the extension of Federal power in Western States. These facts completely answer this commentator's falsification that the "extension of public power" has been brought "to a dead stop." If, after making millions of dollars available for power there is to be no progress, then this broadcaster should argue for a complete and full investigation of Federal power agencies rather than attack the activities and the motives of the House of Representatives.

Nothing in the 1949 Interior Department appropriation bill as it passed the House related to the 160-acre provision of the 1902 Reclamation Act. No recommendation of the Interior subcommittee or of the full Appropriations Committee and no action taken by the House of Representatives in its consideration of the bill blocks or was aimed at blocking the 160-acre limitation in the 1902 act. This reporter's statement to the contrary notwithstanding, it is still the law of the land.

CHARGES

That 160-acre provision of the Reclamation Act was written with Teddy Roosevelt as its champion to prevent the growth of the land monopoly in this country and to insure the protection and existence of small farms. Everyone knows the aims of the Government power project, the basic ones being, of course, that more Americans can get cheaper power and the national power shortage so dangerous to the national defense shall be overcome.

ANSWERED

At this point the newscaster falsely assumes that providing consumers with power is a basic function of the Federal Government. For this information, furnishing consumers with cheap power is not today and has never been a function of the Federal Government, and the Federal Government does not have the authority to build a power project the primary purpose of which is to furnish consumers with cheap electricity, any more than it can set up a grocery store to sell

food. Under the Constitution, as interpreted by the courts, the Federal Government can build reclamation, navigation, and flood-control projects, and, when economically feasible, can install power-generating facilities to produce power as a byproduct. With regards to Interior Department projects, the function of government is to provide reclamation and irrigation, and not power. Water users are interested in cheap water. Cheap power means that water will cost relatively more, for in the West power is supposed to help pay the cost of reclamation. He failed to report the policy statement of the House Appropriations Committee which appears on pages 20–21 of Report No. 2038 on H. R. 6705, Eightieth Congress, second session:

The committee desires to reemphasize its statement in former reports on the bill, that the reclaiming of arid lands by the construction of reclamation projects is and always has been the primary purpose of the reclamation laws. Development of hydroelectric power is incidental to irrigation and is made as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings. This policy should not be departed from without specific legislation by the Congress.

The Bureau of Reclamation should not use its power and authority or funds entrusted to its care to construct power facilities that are not essential to carrying out the purpose of the reclamation laws. It is unsound and against the principles of our form of government to appropriate Government funds for the construction of transmission lines, switchyards, substations, and incidental facilities where private capital is prepared to provide them.

At a time when it is so essential for the Government to stimulate the creation of taxable property, it is the opinion of this committee that private enterprise should be encouraged. Investment of private capital in tax-paying properties is greatly to the advantage of the Government. Public funds should be invested only where necessary to furnish adequate services or facilities that private enterprise cannot provide. Not only in regard to the production and distribution of electric energy, but also in small or big business enterprise, agriculture, professional services, and banking.

CHARGES

Well, what happened? The story starts with the descent on Congress of one of the most able, active, and influential group of lobbyists on Capitol Hill. These are the lobbyists of the private power companies. These gentlemen, the most prominent of whom is Purcell Smith, who makes $65,000 a year for his efforts and earns it—these gentlemen did yoeman work in the House of Representatives and earned their salaries to a fare-thee-well. Their approach, which the House vote indicates won the approval of the House majority, was to concentrate on legislation by appropriation, since they rightly feared the public outcry that would come if they attempted to change in the open the basic laws affecting power- and public-land policy in our country.

ANSWERED

The shopworn technique of using the so-called power trusts as a convenient political whipping boy with the implication that its lobby was able to unduly influence men of sincerity and integrity to vote against their consciences has lost its blackmailing sting by its repetitive use. In fact it has become a political "roar-back" because it will be interpreted by every right-thinking Member of Congress as a reflection upon himself personally and upon the constituents who placed their trust in his integrity.

During the debate on the floor of the House on this bill, I said:

We hear a great deal of talk about some of us being stooges for this or that organization for private utilities, and for other private interests. As I have said many times before, this committee, not a single member of it, Democrat or Republican, is stooging for anybody but the American people, the taxpayers of America—the good people of America. I resent any such accusation to the very limit of my feeling. I know every member of this committee feels the same way. I am sure there is not a member of the committee on either side of the aisle who has any other purpose than to do a good job for the American people and help develop the West in an orderly, businesslike manner. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6598.)

Representative ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, and a minority member of the committee had this to say during the House debate concerning the charge of utility influence and pressure:

I do not charge anyone with being improperly influenced. Indeed I have strong confidence that such has not happened. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6009.)

In the same breath this commentator also charges House leadership with passing legislation in an appropriation bill. This, for a change, was a correct statement. He fails to explain, however, why there was legislation in this bill. I explained the reason:

The reason we found ourselves compelled to put some language in this bill, to which the chairman of the Public Lands Committee has objected, is because of the fact that he, as chairman of that committtee, has refused to act and to do something about bringing out the legislation that would correct those abuses. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6596.)

In other words, this was the only way to obtain legislative action to correct administrative abuses and malpractices within the Department of the Interior, abuses revealed as a result of extensive hearings not only this year but in previous years. Corrective action was in the interest of good administration and efficient government.

CHARGES

To start with, they were immensely aided by the House subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, headed by Republican Representative JENSEN, of Iowa. This committee, in defiance, by the way, of the congressional reorganization act, decided to hold all of its meetings on Interior appropriations in executive session. That means in secret with no members of the press and the executive departments allowed to be present.

ANSWERED

There was no defiance of the Legislative Reorganization Act, an act which the broadcaster obviously did not bother to read. Section 133 (f) of that act—Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946—provides:

All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

Thus it is left to the standing committee whether or not its sessions will be open or executive. The full House Appropriations Committee duly considered the problem and voted to hold executive sessions, not only on this bill but on all appropriation bills, just as it has always done. In reaching this decision the full committee considered only how its task could best be accomplished. The newscaster overlooks the fact that while the hearings were in executive session, members of the minority or opposition party were present at all times and were completely informed as to the detailed contents of the bill and in a position to make their criticisms known at the time the bill was reported. In fact, minority members have the privilege of filing a minority report if they desire, but none was filed.

CHARGES

Attempts by Bureau of Reclamation and Interior officials to get a hearing before this committee were all rejected. Attempts by Mr. Purcell Smith and his fellows to get a hearing were more successful. And here's how that worked. The Congress has already approved a number of appropriations for the Interior Department to increase its transmission lines and substations in various Government power projects in order to widen the access to the public in the various areas to cheap Government power and electricity. A Mr. James Black, the president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., one of the most powerful private utilities in northern California, appeared before one of the Jensen committees executive session—that's secret session—and demanded that this planned extension of Government power in northern California be stopped. The committee, without hearing a word of rebuttal from the responsible interial—interior—officials of the area, or from pro-Government power, farmers and citizens of the area, took Mr. Black's suggestion and approved it, writing into the appropriations bill as a rider that killed the extension of public power in northern California.

ANSWERED

This is irresponsible reporting. All told, there were 183 appearances by witnesses favoring the Interior Department's budget estimate. There were 21 appearances by utility witnesses. No utility witness testified against reclamation. They opposed Federal spending to build duplicating, or uneconomic transmission lines and related facilities.

The printed record of the hearing comprised 4,684 pages, the largest hearing in the history of the Appropriations Committee. The hearing lasted for approximately 12 weeks. Out of this total accumulated record of 4,684 pages, 2,147 pages related to testimony in support of the Department's power and reclamation program. There was in contrast 223 pages of testimony by utility witnesses.

As for the reference to Mr. James Black, president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the committee records show that he appeared and testified on April 7. There is nothing secret as to who appears and who does not appear. Prior to that date the committee heard testimony from the following Department officials:

Michael Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation.

Kenneth Markwell, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation.

Wesley R. Nelson, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation.

A. R. Golzé, Director of Programs and Finance.

A. O. Babb, Chief, Division of Program Operation.

Walker Young, chief engineer.

H. F. McPhail, Director, Branch of Power Utilization.

J. W. Nixon, Director, Branch of Project Planning.

R. J. Newell, regional director, Region I.

Harold Nelson, assistant regional director, Region I.

G. W. Lineweaver, Director, Branch of Operations and Maintenance.

C. W. Hamilton, chief engineer, Division of Power.

Following April 7, when Mr. Black appeared, the committee heard testimony from the following Department officials:

Michael Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation.

Kenneth Markwell, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation.

G. W. Lineweaver, Director, Branch of Operations and Maintenance.

H. F. McPhail, Director, Branch of Power Utilization.

Wesley R. Nelson, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation.

Richard Boke, regional director, Region II.

Ben Creim, power manager, region II.

J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior.

Oscar Chapman, Under Secretary of the Interior.

William A. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

CHARGES

Another specific example of the same exact kind is provided by the case of Mr. J. E. Corette, Jr., who is the vice president of the Montana Power Co. That's the most powerful private monopoly in that State. Mr. Corette told the committee, again in secret session, that he was against the Government's plan to extend the powerful facilities in his State by adding more transmission lines and substations to existing Government facilities, though in this case, too, Congress had already approved this plan and appropriated money for it, the project was also written out of the Interior bill by an obscure amendment. Again no—no witnesses who might disagree with the private power point of view were called.

ANSWERED

Mr. J. E. Corette, Jr., is revealed in the committee's records as having testified on April 6. Consequently the same department officials testified both before and after his appearance as before and after Mr. Black. Department witnesses had ample opportunity to state and restate their position with regard to any and all items.

CHARGES

The same kind of wrecking action was repeated by the committee, usually after hearing testimony from private power representatives only in regard to Government power extension projects already approved by the Congress for every one of the 17 Western States. That's one way the powerful Committee of Appropriations operated through its equally powerful subcommittee.

ANSWERED

Secretary of the Interior, Julius Krug; Under Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman; Assistant Secretary, Girard Davidson; and other top department witnesses were heard last at the suggestion of the committee, a suggestion which met with the Department's full approval. Concerning this, Interior Secretary Krug stated in his appearance before the committee:

I am particularly appreciative of this chance to appear last rather than first, as you suggested at the outset of these hearings. Appearing at the close of the hearings assures that if you have questions of policy or otherwise that I can answer such questions directly. Also, I would like to know before this record is closed that you have all the facts that you want. (House hearings, Interior Department appropriation bill for 1949, 80th Cong., 2d sess., pt. 1, p. 1053.)

Thus, Department officials had the last word.

CHARGES

Here's another way they worked. On the House floor, with Democratic Congressman AL ELLIOTT, of California, as the sponsor, the Appropriations Committee floor spokesman rammed through what amounts to an unconstitutional bill of a'tainder, which requires that Bureau of Reclamation top officials must have 10 years engineering experience. That would force the dismissal of the Bureau's two top officials, Michael Straus, the Commissioner, and the regional director, Mr. Boke. Their crime has been that they have faithfully implemented the provisions of the 160-Acre Act on irrigation in California despite the outraged screams of the great land holding companies in that State.

ANSWERED

The amendment requiring that Bureau of Reclamation top officials must have 10 years' engineering experience was not sponsored by the committee. Although I was in charge of the bill for the committee as chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, I did not speak on the measure one way or another except to ask that debate be limited. Again this subject came up as an amendment to the bill, and consequently was subject to a point of order. Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, the minority whip in the House, raised the point of order that this was legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair ruled that the amendment was a limitation; that it referred to a part of the appropriation bill, and therefore ruled against the point of order.

Reference to the debate indicated that the House acted as it did because certain top employees of the Bureau were not qualified engineers in jobs requiring vast engineering experience, but operated as publicity agents and propagandists in keeping with their backgrounds.

This story teller implies that it is unconstitutional for Congress to establish qualifications to be met by persons holding responsible positions in the Government. Since it was Congress which created the whole reclamation program by passage of the Reclamation Act of 1902, it is both constitutional and proper for the Congress to set up the qualifications of those persons appointed to carry out this program if it desires. By requiring engineering qualifications for certain positions, Congress is giving legal effect to a personnel custom that had been practiced over a long period and proven highly successful. These two men were the first in a long and brilliant professional history of the Bureau of Reclamation to have held such positions without the qualifications prescribed in this amendment.

CHARGES

The committee operated in yet a third way. They inserted into the appropriation legislation a clause which they buried under the completely misleading title of "Alaskan Investigation." That clause provides that the 3-percent interest collected by the Government on its power and municipal-water projects in any profits made on these projects could no longer be used to extend Government irrigation and cheap electricity to consumers. That money must be returned, instead, to the Treasury immediately. What this means is that automatically the cost of Government power and irrigation would be forced up to and even beyond the prices charged by private companies. Thus the whole key power and water basis of Government water projects would be killed. Interior Department officials told me this provision alone would cause a power-rate increase to consumers nationally ranging from 15 to 38 percent.

ANSWERED

Nothing in the bill was buried. The provision to which he objects here was outlined in the committee report. The fact that the provision was in the bill was well known to the minority members of the committee and therefore minority Members of the House were on notice. The public power grave diggers certainly exhumed the body if this provision was buried, inasmuch as it was a major point of discussion.

It is ironical for this broadcaster to argue that if Federal power projects in the West paid 3-percent interest on their money into the reclamation fund with the stipulation that it not be allocated, that this would force the price of Federal power up beyond prices charged by private companies. If this is true—if Federal power is so inefficient and depends so completely upon subsidies—then the Government had better get completely out of the power business and stay out.

CHARGES

There are many more of these obscure amendments written into the Interior appropriations bill. It's worth noting again that all of the hearings during which these amendments were written were held in secret. The committee only released them for scrutiny by the press and Government officials on the morning of the day that it agreed with the House Rules Committee to bring the whole bill on to the House floor for debate.

ANSWERED

The Elliott amendment was not written into the bill in committee but was incorporated into the bill by an amendment offered from the floor. The other legislative limitations and provisions to which the broadcaster objects were made a part of the bill when it was marked up. This was in executive session, and under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, it is required that such action always be taken in executive session regardless of whether the hearings are open or closed. Section 133 (f) of the

Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provides as follows:

All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee, by majority vote, orders an executive session.

CHARGES

Since the hearings covered thousands of pages, it was obviously impossible for those Members of the House who would have fought these wrecking amendments to spot the destructive features. Just to make sure, apparently, that nothing could be done about it anyway, even if they were spotted, the committee rammed through the House on the day of debate a gag rule that forbids points of order being taken and thus killed off any extended opposition debate. They did quite a job.

ANSWERED

Again let it be noted that minority Members were present during all hearings on the bill and at the time the report was presented for reading, and at the time the bill was marked up. They were completely informed at all times concerning its provisions. The House was put on notice to the subject of every provision to which the broadcaster objects.

The bill was debated in the House under a rule forbidding points of order being made against items in the bill as reported. Without this rule one individual out of 435 Members by raising a point of order could thwart the will of the majority and could have prevented long-standing abuses from being corrected. The rule under which the bill was debated did not prohibit amendments being offered. Any objectionable feature of the bill could have been struck out by an amendment and certain features that the House found objectionable were stricken from the bill. It is further to be noted that the amendment to which he takes most violent objection was offered from the floor and was subject to a point of order that was overruled. Further, the rule under which this limitation as to points of order was adopted was submitted to full and complete debate on the floor.

CHARGES

The Senate Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations handled the matter differently and decently. They permitted opponents to testify in open hearing. That brought before that Senate committee a dozen Congressmen, men who had been unable to make their voices heard in their own House and brought denunciations from Republican Governor Warren of California and also from Republican Gov. Sam Ford of Montana.

ANSWERED

The House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee held hearings covering a period of 3 months. At the close of the House hearings Secretary Krug himself stated, "Our people do appreciate the fair and thorough hearings that your committee has conducted during the past 11 weeks. Without exception they have reported that they have had both courteous and attentive consideration and a complete unbridled opportunity to lay the facts before the committee." (House hearings, Interior Department appropriation bill, pt. 1, p. 1053.) Irrespective of what the newscaster reports, not a single Congressman who wanted to be heard in the House was denied that opportunity. Governor Warren of California and Governor Ford of Montana could have appeared had they so desired. Since they did not request time, it is obvious that they did not wish to testify. Contrasted with the opportunity given to any and all witnesses to appear during the House hearings, the Senate Appropriations Committee, in order to accomplish its task and to expedite the enactment of this annual supply bill, found it necessary to limit witnesses, other than department witnesses, to 5 minutes each, and the hearings in the Senate covered 4½ days, compared to 11 and 12 weeks' time in the House.

CHARGES

Now the whole business has such a rotten look to it and the Senate hearings so effectively exposed the rottenness for anyone who cared to listen, that there is some hope that this most successful of all the special interest raids against constructive Government projects will fail. But it needs a lot of publicity still.

ANSWERED

This slur against the processes of the Congress of the United States cannot go unchallenged. It is apparent that this broadcaster has never realized that Government agencies can constitute a special interest group fully capable of raiding the United States Treasury and sticking its hands deep into the pockets of the United States taxpayers. It is hardly rotten for House committees and the House to take every action within its power to protect the interests of the American taxpayers and the solvency of the United States Government and the Nation's credit.

This bill as it passed the House made $375,692,000 available for the fiscal year 1949. This means that the House pared the budget estimate $84,293,000 and prevented a special interest raid of that amount. But, even so, the bill makes $112,876,000 more available for use in 1949 than was provided in last year's bill, an amount which compares with $172,000,000 made available in the fiscal year 1940, the last full fiscal year before the beginning of the national defense program.

CHARGES

The minority whip, JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, said of this legislation and these are his words, "It gives off a strange odor. It's the odor of the power lobby." To the general public the whole rotten business can be summed up in three words for even those with the least sensitive olfactory equipment. And those three words are "It smells bad." And I could sum it up in two words but I have to keep decency in mind.

ANSWERED

Instead of quoting the Democratic minority whip, the broadcaster might have quoted Democrats who are definitely pro-Interior. For example, Representative MURDOCK, Democrat, of Arizona, said:

I want to say to the gentleman how earnestly this subcommittee has worked. I recall coming before this committee late one day and having to wait 2 hours until a dozen other witnesses were heard. But the gentleman and his committee remained long after hours to hear my constituents, for which I want to express my appreciation. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6600.)

Representative KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, and a member of the subcommittee, said:

I • • • want to congratulate the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations and the majority members of that committee. They were very gracious and granted the minority members all the time they wanted to interrogate any witness who appeared before the committee. I am very appreciative of their courtesy. Generally speaking, I think this is a good bill. There are some things in it with which I do not agree and to which I shall call attention. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6602.)

Representative GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, and also a member of the subcommittee, said:

The distinguished gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has labored long and diligently. For many, many weeks we have been sitting long, long hours daily studying the many problems affected by this bill. The distinguished gentleman has been thoroughly fair and considerate of the minority members as well as his colleagues on the majority. • • • We members of the minority have served as a backstop. Our opinions, though they have not prevailed in some of the fundamentals of the bill, have, I think, been taken into consideration. Upon most points in the bill, though in some cases reluctantly, we find ourselves in agreement. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6609.)

Representative JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, said:

It was my pleasure to have the privilege of serving temporarily with the subcommittee in connection with the marking up of a portion of the bill under consideration today. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], painstakingly considered all items of the bill, as did other members of the committee. I know that the chairman did his utmost to give fair and equitable consideration to all matters before the committee. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6616.)

Interior Department appropriation bill, 1949

Amount of budget estimates including supplementals	$474,773,835
Amount of bill as agreed to by conferees	[1] 407,836,497
Bill is under budget estimates	66,936,861
Amount of budget estimates considered by House	$459,970,835
Amount of bill as passed House	375,692,591
House bill under budget estimates	84,278,244
Amount of budget estimates considered by Senate	474,773,835
Amount of bill as passed Senate	422,179,098
Senate bill under budget estimates	52,594,737

[1] And, in addition, contract authorizations totaling $48,947,500.

Total number of witnesses on bill, 424.

Total number of pages of printed hearings, 4,707.

Eleven successive weeks were consumed in hearings, 5 days each week from 10 a. m. to 6 p. m. each day, after which the committee sat in executive session to determine the amounts allowed for the thousands of items in the budget request for the whole Department of Interior functions.

Data in connection with hearings on reclamation.

There were 33 hearings with representatives of the Department covering a period of 17 days.

A total of 44 departmental witnesses were heard, including 27 from the field.

Other witnesses heard in connection with reclamation matters are as follows:

Senators and Members of the House	42
Outside groups	82
Total	124
Total number of witnesses, including departmental representatives	168
Pages of hearings:	
With department	1,149
With Members and outside groups	729
Total number of pages	1,878

Of all the persons appearing before the committee in connection with reclamation matters not a single witness expressed opposition to reclamation in the Western States as such, and I am sure I am correct in stating that of the 42 Members of Congress who appeared, not one appeared in opposition to any project.

A number of REA officials appeared and representatives of municipalities and people from every walk of life who were interested in more funds for reclamation, power, irrigation, and other activities located mainly in the western part of the country. Not a single person was denied a hearing or unduly limited as to time. Many persons were heard on several different subjects and one departmental witness, Mr. Wright, the Southwestern Power Administrator, was heard on three separate occasions.

APRIL 23, 1948, PART 3

Mr. JENSEN. All right; is there anything else?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for letting me appear before you again, and I appreciate your cooperation.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, Mr. Wright, you realize that we have extended a privilege to you that is not customary, by permitting you to come back before the committee the second time. However, because of the complexity of this controversy, the committee felt that you should have an opportunity to discuss the things which you had discussed before the committee on your first appearance, and I want to thank you for coming before the committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. I certainly appreciate it, Mr. Chairman.

MAY 14, 1948, PART 3

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. SCHWABE, do you have any questions?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes. Mr. Wright, of course, we appreciate your being here. This is the third time you have been before the committee in this series of hearings, and this committee, I say without fear of successful contradiction, has given you more consideration and extended you more courtesy than has been extended any other Bureau or group that appeared before us.

Mr. WRIGHT. I appreciate that.

Mr. SCHWABE. This hearing today was due to the fact that you apparently wanted to furnish the committee with information which, I think you utterly failed to furnish at former hearings.

I think that we all know that you are here because you were advised that the committee was not satisfied, that you had made a showing that would justify this committee in appropriating the amount you requested.

We are glad you are here. I personally was the first member of this committee to suggest that you be given this opportunity, and I am glad of it, and happy to have you here.

I want to say, however, that there are some things in this telegram that you sent in that we were not able to understand, and do not understand yet.

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to clear them up.

Mr. SCHWABE. That is the reason we have extended this unusual privilege and opportunity to you of being here today.

Mr. STRAUS. We are now drawing to the close of an outstanding hearing. I have been sitting here keeping statistics during this hearing, and I see that this is the end of the thirty-third session on reclamation alone. Reclamation said, as this hearing opened, it looked forward confidently to a helpful hearing, and that the more thorough the hearing was the greater would be the benefit to the Bureau of Reclamation and to the United States. Expectations have been more than fulfilled by this hearing. I say that now, and I want to say it on the record. I do not want it to inhibit the committee from remembering that we are also asking for money when they go to mark up the bill.

This is the first time that we have brought in such a group of field officials. I want the record to show that I consulted with the chairman of the committee, and that we were glad to bring these officials to Washington. We feel it was very worth while from the point of view of the Bureau of Reclamation as well as from the point of view of the committee and the Congress to have those officials come to Washington. You may be interested in knowing that for the purposes of this hearing 27 field officials came to Washington from the reclamation areas, including regional directors, assistant regional directors, and others. Perhaps 16 or 17 people were here from the Washington office. I am only citing Bureau of Reclamation witnesses at this hearing.

The able clerk, who has educated more Reclamation Commissioners than he has before him at the present time, tells me that during these hearings far larger numbers of witnesses who are not members of the Bureau of Reclamation appeared than appeared on this hearing, which is a hearing on the largest budget that has ever been submitted.

The Bureau of Reclamation alone, the out-of-town regional and field officials, traveled a total of 135,000 miles to make an appearance here. They were glad to do so, and the Bureau of Reclamation was glad to have them do so. I would also like to mention that approximately 1,500 square feet of maps were drawn for this hearing. For the Reclamation Bureau witnesses alone the transcript numbered over half a million words, and I think we had some 700 man-days of time of Bureau employees used in connection with these hearings alone, all of which is considerable. Whatever the cost, the Bureau of Reclamation feels that it is a very good investment and it was glad to make that investment. I think that more information has been submitted to this committee at this hearing than any other hearing that I am familiar with in my 16 years of attending hearings. I think that this has been a better hearing than any hearing that I have attended for perhaps 16 years. This is not a task or a burden only for the Bureau of Reclamation, but the Bureau wants to recognize fully that it is an equally heavy task and a burden on the members of this committee and the Members of Congress that have sat patiently through these long sessions and treated us with such courtesy and understanding and sympathy, and also with an increased knowledge of our problems gained not only during these hearings but during the trip that was made last summer.

In conclusion, I want to say that I would like to thank you on behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation for the way in which these hearings were conducted, and to state that in our opinion these hearings were fine, full, and fair, and we were delighted to participate in them. We look forward to the result of these hearings, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Straus.

In response to that very glowing and interesting analysis of the hearings and the things that go with it, I have only this to say: The three members of the committee, Mr. SCHWABE, Mr. FENTON, and myself, who made the extended trip to the Western States last year said on every occasion where we made stops—we made little talks numbering a little over 100—the purpose of our trip was for one thing, and one thing alone. That purpose was to see with our own eyes and to hear with our own ears the things that were important to the development of the work. We had but one purpose in mind, and when the time came to consider an appropriation for the many and varied projects, not only the Bureau of Reclamation but every branch of the Interior Department, we would give full and careful consideration to the requests of the Department for every branch of that Department, and for every project.

We also stated that we would go into the matters pertaining to each case thoroughly and completely in an attempt to acquaint ourselves and get full information from the officials of the departments and from such other people as would be interested in any matters pertaining to the duties of the Department of the Interior and the Congress of the United States.

We also stated that we felt that up to that time we had done everything we could, and we will continue to do and carry out the promises made to those people.

When we mark up this bill we will stand by our word. Of course, it is customary to mark up this bill in about 3 days, but I can readily see where we will spend not only 3 days but a week, or possibly longer, in going through each one of these items and talking it over among ourselves in executive session, trying as best as we can to determine what is the right and proper figure, as near as humanly possible, to allow for each item.

Gentlemen, I again assure you that we will carry through and that we recognize the responsibility that rests on the shoulders of the members of this committee. I know that you recognize the responsibility that rests on our shoulders in asking for the American people insofar as the expenditures of money is concerned, as it pertains to this committee. Without a doubt, we will reduce some items, and possibly raise a few even over and above the budget requests. After all, we feel that it is the duty of this committee to use its own judgment to some degree, regardless of what the Budget has sent up as a requested appropriation. However, we do not expect to deviate very far from those requests in raising items to any great degree from what the Bureau of the Budget has requested.

I am sure that I speak for all members of the committee, who act pretty much in unison, in the final analysis, when we get into executive session. Of course, we have some pretty hot arguments about certain items in the bill, but we always have. I suppose that we will have those arguments this time. That is merely a difference of opinion, and we try our best to have a meeting of the minds so that when we bring this bill to the floor of the House it will be in such form that the committee will be in as complete accord as possible on each item.

Gentlemen, I want to say that I am very appreciative, and I know that I speak for the other members of the committee when I say that. I believe we are all appreciative of the manner in which you have presented your requests to this committee, and the desires

that you have shown to give us the information that we requested. We shall now live in hopes that some of the things we had been critical of, rightly or wrongly, will be corrected. If we have been wrong, it has been a mistake of the mind, and not of the heart, because we have no ax to grind other than to do a good job for the American people. I am inclined to feel that that is your purpose. While there are certain individuals that would like to take a broadside at the Members of Congress on occasion, after all, we are all human and must live as best we can in peace and harmony so long as we treat each other as friends and neighbors, and we will get along in this great America of ours.

That is all I have. Thank you, gentlemen.

REVOLVING FUND FOR PURCHASE OF NATURAL FIBERS

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2376) to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to issue notes from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed in the aggregate outstanding at any time $150,000,000. Each such note shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the note. Payment of the purchase price of such notes and repayments thereof by the Secretary of the Army shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. The proceeds of these notes shall be used by the Secretary of the Army, or his duly authorized representatives, as a revolving fund for the purpose of (a) purchasing natural fibers (including cotton waste) produced in the United States, and such other materials, including starch, dyestuff, roller leather, and card clothing as may be used in processing and finishing such fibers; (b) transporting such fibers and other materials to occupied areas, making them available for processing, and having such fibers processed in such areas; (c) insuring such fibers and materials and the products obtained from such processing; and (d) selling products obtained from such processing. In the case of wool, mohair, or flax fiber, only those types and grades shall be purchased hereunder as the Secretary of Agriculture, in the light of supplies on hand in the United States, designates as available for export; and stocks held by Commodity Credit Corporation of the types and grades so designated shall be purchased before other purchases are made of such types and grades. For the purpose of this act an occupied area shall be considered as any liberated or occupied area, which is at the time, occupied by United States forces or such an area occupied jointly with another power or powers when it is considered by the Secretary of the Army to be necessary or desirable to include such an area, in order to carry out United States objectives: *Provided*, That a treaty of peace shall not have been ratified and confirmed for such an area.

SEC. 2. Neither the Secretary, nor any duly authorized representative, shall use the fund created by this act for the purchase of any commodity unless, on the date of purchase of such commodity, it appears in his best judgment that within 15 months after such date—

(a) such commodity will be processed, or used in processing operations, in an occupied area; and

(b) So much of the products obtained from such processing will be sold under such terms and for such currencies as will be necessary to cover, in United States dollars, (1) all amounts expended from the fund in connection with such commodity plus (2) an appropriate portion of the interest payable to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of loans made pursuant to this act.

SEC. 3. The proceeds from the sale of products of commodities purchased with moneys from the fund, to the extent of the amounts specified in section 2, shall be returned to the fund.

SEC. 4. Annually after the date of enactment of this act the Secretary of the Army shall make a complete report to the Congress with respect to the status of the fund. At such time as there shall no longer be any occupied area within the meaning of this act, or at such earlier time as the President or the Congress by concurrent resolution shall determine that the fund is no longer required for the purposes of this act, the unobligated balance of the fund shall be repaid to the Secretary of the Treasury; and the Secretary of the Army, as expeditiously as possible consistent with orderly liquidation, (a) shall cause to be sold so much of the commodities purchased with moneys from the fund and products thereof which are then on hand as may be necessary to obtain the amount of any balance then remaining owing to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of loans made pursuant to this act, and (b) shall repay such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 5. Fibers and other materials purchased for processing in any particular occupied area may, if a treaty of peace is ratified and confirmed with respect to such area prior to the processing of such commodities, be processed and sold, or sold, in such manner as the Secretary of the Army may deem to be in the best interest of the United States. If, after purchasing any such commodity with moneys from the fund, it shall appear to the Secretary of the Army that the product of such commodity cannot be sold for as much as the amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) of section 2 of this act the Secretary of the Army may sell such product for a lesser amount; but, insofar as may be possible, no commodities shall be sold for less than the amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 6. So much of the commodities purchased with moneys from the fund for processing in any occupied area and so much of the products thereof as are not required to be sold, and so much of the proceeds obtained from the sale of any such commodities or products as is not required to be returned to the fund shall be used and disposed of by the Secretary of the Army, in such manner as he deems fit, for the benefit of the economy of such occupied area.

SEC. 7. In providing for the performance of any of the functions described in section 1 the Secretary of the Army shall to the maximum extent feasible utilize private channels of trade and is hereby authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations for the efficient implementation of the provisions of this act.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Georgia for 20 minutes.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is offered for the purpose of setting up a revolving fund to aid the textile industries, mostly wool and cotton, in Japan and Germany, countries we now occupy, to aid in their rehabilitation effort.

It is costing the taxpayers of this country today approximately $400,000,000 to help support these people. The purpose of this bill is to establish a revolving fund which may be used from time to time to purchase raw materials for shipment to those countries, under control of the Army and other Government agencies, to be converted into fabrics by the Japanese and German people who work in the mills. This would give employment to people in an industry which represents about 60 percent of their economy.

Before the war Japan furnished a large market for our surplus cotton. That is another purpose of the bill, to help reestablish that market. We have today in this country under control of the Commodity Credit Corporation a large stock of raw wool for which there is apparently no use in this country because it is a kind that our own manufacturers do not use. The bill requires that before any material can be purchased in the open market in this country that CCC stocks will have to be used. That would convert that stock pile into cash and return that money to the Treasury. The bill is meritorious in that respect and has the unanimous support of the Committee on the Armed Services of the House. It was passed in the Senate without a dissenting voice.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words about this bill because it is a very important bill. It is important not only from the standpoint of the industrial rehabilitation of the occupied areas but it also directly affects the pocketbook of every American taxpayer.

What this bill does is to set up a revolving fund under the control of the Secretary of the Army. This fund will be used to finance the purchase of natural fibers produced in the United States—cotton, wool, mohair, and flax fibers. These fibers can then be shipped to Japan, Germany, and other occupied areas where they will be processed by the textile industries of those countries. The finished goods may then be sold either in those countries themselves or exported to other nations. The money borrowed from the revolving fund will then be returned to the fund out of the proceeds of these sales. In this way the textile industries of occupied areas will be provided with working capital which they do not now have and which they need very badly.

I want to make it clear at the outset that this bill does not mean that we are going to give away $150,000,000. This is a business proposition, and we expect that every cent will be repaid to the fund. We expect, moreover, that a substantial profit will accrue from the proceeds of sales over and above what is necessary to repay the fund. These profits may be used by the Secretary of the Army in any manner he sees fit for the benefit of the occupied areas from which they are derived.

Now, let us see why this bill is important to the taxpayers of the United States.

At the present time, we are appropriating approximately $400,000,000 a year to cover the cost of relief shipments of food and other necessities of life to Japan. We have to do this because Japan today cannot feed herself. Japan has always been a deficiency nation. She has never been able to produce more than 80 percent of her total food requirements. Therefore, in order to feed her people, it has always been necessary for Japan to engage in foreign trade in order that she may buy from other nations the foodstuffs to make up her own deficiencies at home. This was true before the war and is still true today. But in order to engage in foreign trade she must produce commodities for which there is a demand in other countries, so that she may have something to offer in exchange in foreign markets for the food she needs at home. Because every inch of Japanese soil is devoted to the cultivation of foodstuffs for home consumption, Japan cannot hope to produce agricultural commodities in large volumes for export. And so, quite naturally, Japan turned many years ago to the development of her manufacturing industries. She had to do this in order to provide herself with purchasing power in international trade; she also had to do this to provide employment for her own people because there is just not enough land in Japan to keep all the Japanese people occupied in agricultural pursuits.

Before the war the cotton and woolen textile industries were the leading manufacturing industries of Japan. Manufactured cotton goods were Japan's principal export products. Japan was the most important customer of the American cotton farmer, and raw cotton and wool were her leading imports. With the textile commodities which she produced, she was able to buy from other nations the foods which she required at home, and also the raw materials to keep these industries operating so that she could produce these manufactured goods for export.

The importance of the textile industry to Japan cannot be overestimated. It accounts today for over 60 percent of the industrial capacity of the entire nation. Yet today, Japan has only 2,000,000 cotton textile spindles operating as against 12,000,000 in 1937. Today there are 203,000 laborers employed in her cotton textile industry. By a process of simple arithmetic it is easy to see that with 12,000,000 spindles—the capacity of the cotton textile industry in 1937—about six times as many people could be employed, or about 1,200,000.

The industrial rehabilitation of Japan is and has been a primary concern of the occupation authorities. Until self-sufficiency is obtained, Japan and other occupied areas will continue to represent a financial burden which must be sustained by the taxpayers of the United States. Under our international obligation to prevent disease and unrest, we must furnish food and other relief supplies to keep the Japanese people alive. These relief costs, which run to nearly $400,000,000 a year, must be met in addition to the purely military costs of occupation. Consequently, we must face squarely the problem of assisting the Japanese people to become self-supporting. Otherwise we will have to continue relief shipments indefinitely.

One of the principal handicaps which has been faced by occupation authorities in their attempts to bring about economic recovery in occupied areas is the lack of a supply of working capital. This bill will provide the means of obtaining that working capital, and I might say that it has been estimated that savings of $300,000,000 in appropriations for Japanese relief could have been brought about in the past if we had had a revolving fund of this type in operation beginning on VJ-day.

The main reason why this working capital is so important is because Japan and the other occupied countries now have no means of financing purchases of raw materials. These countries are bankrupt; their production is virtually at a standstill; they do not have the purchasing power in the form of exportable commodities with which they can enter foreign markets to buy these raw materials. In Japan, in particular, the textile industry will have to shut down unless working stocks of raw cotton and wool are made available immediately. This will mean more unemployment, more relief shipments, and ultimately more money out of the American taxpayer's pocket.

Considerable progress has been made since the occupation began in the rehabilitation of the Japanese textile industry. This progress has been possible because surplus stocks of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation have been made available. This cotton has been furnished on a credit basis with payment being made from the proceeds of sale of finished goods, in very much the same manner as will be done under the revolving fund. These shipments of cotton provided an interim solution to the problem of obtaining working stocks of raw material—a solution, incidentally, which circumvented for a time the difficulties resulting from the absence of working capital. By now these surplus stocks have been exhausted, and a new method of financing must be provided to finance raw material purchases.

Experience under the CCC program has demonstrated that the Japanese textile industry can and will operate at a profit. Under that program, its average net profits per month have been $10,000,000, and there is every indication that these profits will continue if the textile mills can be assured of working stocks.

Some of the Members may ask if there is not a danger that the textiles produced by the mills of Japan will find their way back to compete with our own textile industry. This fear is absolutely without foundation. Testimony was received from representatives of the cotton textile industry who told the committee that they too had formerly shared this fear. But they went on to say that after careful study of the problem they had come to realize that no question of competition was involved, but rather, the question of survival of the Japanese industry. They pointed out that the products of Japanese mills are of a cheaper quality for which there is no demand in the United States, but for which there is a crying need in India, China, the Philippines, and other countries of the Far East. These were the countries in which Japan sold the bulk of her textile exports before the war. These are the countries from which Japan can obtain copra, rice, and other raw materials vital to her recovery. She can also barter these textiles for rubber and tin which we need in this country, and which can in turn be sold to American purchasers in exchange for dollars with which to repay withdrawals from the revolving fund. I might add that the bill provides that this fund can be terminated at any time by the President or by the Congress, by concurrent resolution. Thus, if Japanese industry ever develops to a point where competition becomes a threat, we can call a halt to this program immediately.

I want to say also that there is no danger that purchases of cotton, wool, mohair, or flax under this fund will raise the domestic prices of these fibers. The quantities of these shipments will be insignificant in comparison with those to be made under the comprehensive foreign-aid programs. Moreover, the fibers to be shipped will be those for which there is no demand in this country—short-staple cotton and cotton waste, wools of coarser grades which now lie unused in the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and surplus mohair, of which there are vast stocks still in the hands of domestic producers.

This is a very important bill. It is important from the broad standpoint of our foreign policy. It is important from the standpoint of our taxpayers. It will help materially to put the Japanese economy on a sound basis by restoring her production and by putting her back into normal channels of foreign trade. It is vital from the international political standpoint for the same reason that the foreign-aid programs are so vital. As we all know, there is no better safeguard than prosperity to stem the menacing tide of communism.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I have had some persons question whether or not this program might set up a plan which would compete with the textile industry in this country unfairly. Can the gentleman state whether or not it would do that?

Mr. VINSON. That question was raised when the committee was having

its hearings. We have absolute assurance there will be no importations of textiles which will in any way interfere with American production.

The type of goods manufactured by the Japanese does not come in competition with American production. It will be sold out in the Malays, in China, and in that section of the world.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TOWE. Will the gentleman state for the benefit of the House whether or not the cotton and woolen producers as well as the converters in this country favor or disapprove this measure?

Mr. VINSON. The textile people had their representative before the committee. The wool industry had its representative. The type of wool that is used is not a kind that can be used in our looms here and the type of cotton that will be used is the low-grade cotton. So there is no competition and it is urged by the textile industry. They support this bill to aid the industry in Japan to get on its feet, if you please.

This bill will begin to save us money, it will put people back to work and help them rehabilitate themselves, which is the proper thing to do.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say that I have given considerable attention to this matter and I am convinced that in the interest of our country as well as the Japanese it ought to be enacted into law.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to ask members of the committee how this particular program works in connection with Government relief in occupied areas. Does it supplement it, is it in competition with it, or what?

Mr. VINSON. I may say that as the occupied area of Japan is under the jurisdiction of the Army, the administration of this will be by General MacArthur's headquarters.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We are doing just exactly that with some of these millions of dollars we are sending to Germany and Japan. We are using part of it for that purpose.

Mr. VINSON. This will have the effect of reducing that because they will not have to use any of that money for subsistence of the unemployed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Nearly all of this stuff we are sending over there is being sold to those people. There is rolling around somewhere from seven to nine hundred million dollars in a revolving fund to do this very thing the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. VINSON. It is not for this purpose. It may be for some other purpose. It is not for textile purposes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman feels if this program is carried out as now suggested, by this time next year this Congress should be called upon to appropriate less money for these occupied areas?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. If that could have happened immediately after VJ-day we would have saved a great deal of money.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PROMOTION OF THE COMMON DEFENSE

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2554) to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In enacting this act, it is the intent of Congress to provide a comprehensive and continuous program for the future safety and for the defense of the United States by providing adequate measures whereby an essential nucleus of Government-owned industrial plants and a national reserve of machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment may be assured for immediate use to supply the needs of the armed forces in time of national emergency or in anticipation thereof; it is further the intent of the Congress that such Government-owned plants and such reserve shall not exceed in number or kind the minimum requirements for immediate use in time of national emergency, and that any such items which shall become surplus to such requirements shall be disposed of as expeditiously as possible.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. (a) The term "national industrial reserve", as used herein, means that excess industrial property which has been or may hereafter be sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of by the United States, subject to a national security clause, and that excess industrial property of the United States which not having been sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of, subject to a national security clause, shall be transferred to the Federal Works Agency under section 5 hereof.

(b) The term "excess industrial property," as used herein, means any machine tool, any industrial manufacturing equipment and any industrial plant (including structures on land owned by or leased to the United States, substantially equipped with machinery, tools, and equipment) which is capable of economic operation as a separate and independent industrial unit and which is not an integral part of an installation of a private contractor, which machine tools, industrial manufacturing equipment, and industrial plants are under the control of any executive department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any wholly owned Government corporation and which are not required for its immediate needs and responsibilities as determined by the head thereof.

(c) The term "national security clause," as used herein, means those terms, conditions, restrictions, and reservations, heretofore formulated or as may be formulated under section 4 (2) hereof for insertion in instruments of sale or lease of property, determined in accordance with section 4 (1) to be a part of the national industrial reserve, which will guarantee the availability of such property for the purposes of national defense at any time when availability thereof for such purposes is deemed necessary by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 4. To effectuate the policy set forth in section 2 of this act the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to—

(1) determine which excess industrial properties should become a part of the national industrial reserve under the provisions of this act;

(2) formulate a national security clause, as defined in section 3 (c) hereof and vary or modify the same from time to time in such manner as best to attain the objectives of this act, having due regard to securing advantageous terms to the Government in the disposal of excess industrial property;

(3) consent to the relinquishment or waiver of all or any part of any national security clause in specific cases when necessary to permit the disposition of particular excess industrial property when it is determined that the retention of the productive capacity of any such excess industrial property is no longer essential to the national security or that the retention of a lesser interest than that originally required will adequately fulfill the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection (3) shall require the modification or waiver of any part of any such national security clause when such clause is deemed necessary by the Secretary of Defense to effectuate the purposes of this act; and

(4) designate what excess industrial property shall be disposed of subject to the provisions of the national security clause.

SEC. 5. (a) In the event that any agency charged with the disposal of excess industrial property, after making every practicable effort so to do, is unable to dispose of any excess industrial plant because of the national security clause it shall notify the Secretary of Defense, indicating such modifications in the national security clause, if any, which in its judgment would make possible disposal of the plant. The Secretary of Defense shall consider and agree to any and all such proposed modifications as in his judgment would be consistent with the purposes of this act. If, however, such clause is not modified or the requirements thereof waived pursuant to section 4 (3), or if modified, such plant cannot then be disposed of under such modified clause, the Secretary of Defense shall direct that such plant be transferred to the Federal Works Agency, and such transfer shall be without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any agency charged with the disposal of excess machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment shall transfer custody of such machine tools and equipment as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 4 hereof to the Federal Works Agency, without reimbursement, for storage and maintenance.

SEC. 6. Subject to provisions of section 7 hereof, the Federal Works Agency is hereby authorized and directed to accept the transfer to it of such excess industrial property as is directed to be transferred to it under section 4 hereof and, as and when directed or authorized by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 7 hereof, to utilize, maintain, protect, repair, restore, renovate, lease, or dispose of such property. Notwithstanding section 321 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 303 (b)), any lease may provide for the renovation, maintenance, protection, repair, and restoration by the lessee, of the property leased, or of the entire unit or installation when a substantial part thereof is leased, as part or all of the consideration for the lease of such property.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Defense, with respect to property in the national industrial reserve, is authorized when he deems such action to be in the interest of national security—

(1) to establish general policies for the care, maintenance, utilization, recording, and security of such property transferred to the Federal Works Agency pursuant to section 5 hereof; and

(2) to direct the transfer without reimbursement by the Federal Works Agency of any of such property to other Government agencies with the consent of such agencies; and

(3) to direct the leasing by the Federal Works Agency of any of such property to designated lessees; and

(4) to authorize the disposition by the Federal Works Agency of any such property by sale or otherwise when in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense such property may be disposed of subject to or free of the national security clause provided for in section 5 hereof; and

(5) to authorize and regulate the lending of any such property by the Federal Works Agency to any nonprofit educational institution or training school when (a) the Secretary shall determine that the program proposed by such institution or school for the use of such property will contribute materially to national defense, and (b) such institution or school shall by agreement make such provision as the Secretary shall deem satisfactory for the proper maintenance of such property and for its return to the Federal Works Agency without expense to the Government.

SEC. 8. As and when directed or authorized by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to the provisions of section 7 hereof, the Federal Works Agency shall after the date upon which transfer is directed pursuant to section 5 hereof provide for the transportation, handling, care, storage, protection, maintenance, utilization, repair, restoration, renovation, leasing, and disposition of excess industrial property.

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of any property for the national industrial reserve except from excess or surplus Government-owned property.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of Defense shall appoint a National Industrial Reserve Review Committee, which shall consist of not exceeding 15 persons to be appointed from civilian life who are by training and experience familiar with various fields of American industry, including shipbuilding, aircraft manufacture, machine tools, and arms and armament production. The members of such committee shall serve for such term or terms as the Secretary of Defense may specify and shall meet at such times as may be specified by the Secretary of Defense to consult with and advise the National Military Establishment. Each member of such committee shall be entitled to compensation in the amount of $50 for each day, or part of day, he shall be in attendance at any regular called meeting of the committee, together with reimbursement for all travel expenses incident to such attendance: *Provided*, That nothing contained in sections 41, 109, and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 93, 198, and 203); in Revised Statutes, section 190 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99); in section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (Public Law 395, Seventy-eighth Congress); or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply to such persons solely by reason of their appointment to and membership on such committee.

SEC. 11. It shall be the duty of the committee appointed under section 10 hereof to review not less often than once each year the justification for the retention of property in the national industrial reserve established hereunder and (i) to recommend to the Secretary of Defense the disposition of any such property which in the opinion of the committee would no longer be of sufficient strategic value to warrant its further retention for the production of war material in the event of a national emergency; (ii) to recommend to the Secretary of Defense standards of maintenance for the property held in the national industrial reserve; (iii) to review and recommend to the Secretary of Defense the disposal of that property which in the opinion of the committee could and should be devoted to commercial use in the civilian economy; and (iv) to advise the Secretary of Defense with respect to such activities under this Act as he may request.

SEC. 12. The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress on April 1 of each year a report detailing the action taken by it hereunder and containing such other pertinent information on the status of the national industrial reserve as will enable the Congress to evaluate its administration and the need for amendments and related legislation.

SEC. 13. Section 5 of the act approved August 5, 1947 (ch. 493, 61 Stat. 774), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 14. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the Secretary of Defense and to the Federal Works Administration, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as the Congress may, from time to time, determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary of Defense and the Federal Works Agency to carry out their respective functions under the act.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, S. 2554 is a bill to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity. It is almost identical to a House bill, H. R. 6098, which has been unanimously reported to the House by the Armed Services Committee.

This is one of the most important defense measures to be presented to the Congress in this session. This bill, if passed, will preserve an essential nucleus of industrial plants and manufacturing equipment so necessary to the Nation in the event of an emergency.

The primary purpose of this bill is to establish a method of maintaining plants which cannot be disposed of subject to a national-security clause. This bill provides that after a disposal agency finds that it cannot dispose of any excess industrial plant with the national-security clause, then the Secretary of Defense may direct that such plant be transferred to the Federal Works Agency without reimbursement. Thereafter the Federal Works Agency, subject to the policy and standards established by the Secretary of Defense, shall maintain the plants and equipment in adequate standby condition so as to insure their readiness for use in the event of an emergency. It is contemplated that the Federal Works Agency would be authorized to utilize such facilities for storage purposes or other Government use, which would not affect the basic functions of the plant. Continuing efforts will be made to sell or lease these plants with appropriate security clauses imposed.

Under the provisions of Public Law 364, approximately 100,000 machine tools have been earmarked for the industrial reserve or transferred to the custody of the armed services. The proposed legislation permits the further selection of machine tools and industrial equipment excess to the needs of any Government department to be placed in the industrial reserve. It is estimated that the total industrial reserve of machine tools and equipment may eventually approximate 150,000 to 200,000 items.

It is anticipated that under the proposed legislation, the Federal Works Agency will be called upon to maintain about 60 industrial plants. These plants originally cost about $550,000,000. It will cost about 5 percent of original cost to place these plants in adequate stand-by condition, and thereafter about 1 percent per year for maintenance.

The entire cost of the project for fiscal 1949 will probably be about $36,000,000, and thereafter about $6,000,000 to $7,000,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize the importance of this legislation from a national defense viewpoint. In effect, all we are doing is keeping what we have so that if we are ever called upon to produce war material, we will not have to spend billions for rebuilding or repurchasing that which we already have.

This bill does not in any way impair the operations of private industry or the national economy, and I sincerely hope it will be accepted by the House.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6098) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Chester O. Glenn;

H. R. 1733. An act for the relief of G. C. Hedrick;

H. R. 1780. An act for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.;

H. R. 2395. An act for the relief of the Cypress Creek Drainage District of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 2696. An act for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4516. An act for the relief of the Moore Dry Dock Co., of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 4962. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 5252. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 6186. An act for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 6634. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea;

H. R. 6693. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 6213. An act to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting;

H. R. 6360. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act;

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry;

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; and

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1691. An act for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.;

S. 2706. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building;

S. 2849. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.; and

S. 2961. An act to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3566) entitled "An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6829. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REED, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CORDON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MCKELLAR to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6428. An act to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6501) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in the interest of national security the Federal Government should promote the employment in air commerce in as large numbers as possible of more efficient transport and cargo aircraft; and, to this end, sponsor the design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototype transport and cargo aircraft, intended primarily for commercial use, but adaptable also for auxiliary military service.

SEC. 2. The Civil Transport Aircraft Evaluation and Development Board (referred to hereinafter as "the Board") hereinafter provided for, is authorized and directed—

(a) to survey the national requirements for aircraft types designed primarily for commercial transport and cargo service, but adaptable also as auxiliary military transport for one or more of the departments of the National Military Establishment;

(b) to prepare and recommend, from time to time, the operating and utility characteristics and specifications of such aircraft: *Provided*, That such characteristics and specifications shall be consistent with the requirements of the civil air regulations promulgated by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

(c) to advise the Secretary of the Air Force (referred to hereinafter as "the Secretary") of the Board's findings and recommendations under this section, and to recommend the allotment by the Secretary, from funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, of appropriate sums for design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototypes of each such type of aircraft.

SEC. 3. (a) The Board shall be composed of one representative designated by each of the following agencies: The United States Air Force, the United States Navy, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and such other agencies of the Federal Government, concerned with aeronautics, as the Board may, from time to time, determine.

(b) To assist the Board in carrying out its functions, it is authorized to establish an industrial advisory committee composed of not less than six members appointed by the Board with the approval of the Secretary. Each member of such committee shall serve for a term of 2 years, except that (1) the terms of three of the members first taking office after the enactment of this act shall expire at the end of 1 year, and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds. No member shall be eligible to serve continuously for more than one term unless in the opinion of the Board his reappointment is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act. Members of such committee may be designated without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and shall receive such compensation, not in excess of $50 for each day or part of a day actually devoted to the performance of the duties of such committee, as the Board shall determine. Each member of such committee shall be allowed actual necessary transportation expenses and an allowance not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence when engaged in the performance of the duties of such committee at any place other than his permanent residence or place of business. Nothing contained in sections 41, 109, 112, or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 93, 198, 202, and 203), section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 119), or any other provision of law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply to any such person solely by reason of membership on such committee: *Provided*, That the provisions of the act of July 12, 1870 (R. S. 3679; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 665), as amended, shall not apply to the acceptance of voluntary service by any member of any such committee.

(c) The Chairman of the Board shall be designated by the Secretary from among the members thereof and the Board shall act in accordance with such regulations and rules of procedure as it may, from time to time, prescribe. The Board is authorized and directed to consult with manufacturers of aircraft, and with United States operators of transport aircraft. Members of the Board shall serve as such without additional compensation, but each member of the Board shall be allowed actual necessary transportation expenses and an allowance not to exceed $10 per diem, in lieu of subsistence, when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Board at any place other than his permanent station.

(d) The Board and the Secretary are authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, but without regard to any provision of law limiting the number of civilian personnel which may be employed by the Department of the Air Force, to employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be deemed necessary to assist the Board and the Secretary in carrying out their respective functions under this act: *Provided*, That to the extent possible, consistent with other duties and assignments, the personnel and facilities of the member agencies of the Board shall be used to carry out the duties of the Board.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized and directed, if he concurs in the advice and recommendations of the Board referred to in section 2 of this act, to provide, out of funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, for the design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototypes of each such type of aircraft, by contract or otherwise. Any such contract entered into by the Government shall contain a provision that—

(1) sales of aircraft subsequently manufactured from the design specifications of such prototype or prototypes shall be made at a price allowing a reasonable profit, not exceeding such profit as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and

(2) in determining the fair selling price of such aircraft, except to the extent required by the Secretary, there shall not be included in the cost thereof any development, engineering, tooling, or other costs which have been reimbursed to the manufacturer by the Secretary; and

(3) aircraft subsequently manufactured from the design specifications of such prototype or prototypes shall be sold only to purchasers who, by contract with the Secretary, have undertaken (a) unless required by the civil air regulations to make no changes in the design or standard equipment of such aircraft without first obtaining the approval of the Secretary; and (b) to make, for an agreed sum payable by the Secretary, such changes in the design or standard equipment of such aircraft, not inconsistent with the civil air regulations, as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of section 4 of this act, may enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, with or without legal consideration, with or without performance or other bonds, and, in carrying out such contracts, arrangements, or modifications thereof, may make advance, progress, and other payments without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) Each contract, arrangement, or modification thereof, executed pursuant to this act, shall contain such provisions, consistent with the laws affecting the issuance or use of patents, governing the disposition and use of inventions made thereunder as are appropriate, in the judgment of the Secretary, to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract, arrangement, or modification thereof is executed.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to procure and test prototype aircraft from any manufacturer whose design meets the operating and utility characteristics and specifications recommended by the Board: *Provided*, That, in the event such manufacturer is not in a position to produce promptly the prototype aircraft desired, then the Secretary may procure such prototype aircraft from any other qualified manufacturer.

SEC. 7. Aircraft manufactured from design specifications pursuant to this act shall not be sold directly or by resale to either foreign governments or other foreign users without the approval of the Secretary: *Provided*, That in approving any such sale the Secretary may waive such of the requirements of section 3 hereof as he may deem proper.

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized and directed, if he concurs in the advice and recommendations of the Board with respect thereto, by appropriate contractual conditions or otherwise, to recover, in whole or in part, as deemed to be practicable and expedient, the costs incurred by the United States pursuant to this act. The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress within a period of 1 year following the passage of this act a report setting forth the means and methods which he intends to utilize in effecting such recovery.

SEC. 9. In the event the Board shall recommend the development of a seaplane commercial transport or cargo aircraft and the Secretaries of the Navy and the Air Force concur, the Secretary of the Navy shall be authorized to perform all of the functions with respect to such aircraft as are vested in the Secretary of the Air Force by this act, and the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy such funds appropriated under this act as may be necessary for the performance of such functions.

SEC. 10. As used in this act—

(a) The term "aircraft" shall include engines, propellers, instruments, accessories, and standard equipment for such aircraft.

(b) The term "standard equipment" means all operational features of such aircraft, including, without limitation, standard cockpit arrangement, communications, facilities, and provisions for such items, but excluding commercial equipment.

(c) The term "commercial equipment" means removable furnishings and fittings, not part of the primary structure or the mechanical apparatus of such aircraft, and which is generally installed for the accommodation of passengers, baggage, or cargo.

(d) The term "prototype aircraft" means the initial models of each type, built primarily for static tests, flight performance, and service test.

SEC. 11. The Secretary and the Board shall transmit to the Congress, on the 1st day of January in each year, a report on (1) the progress made in the accomplishment of the purposes of this act and (2) the amounts of the expenditures made or obligated pursuant thereto.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Air Force such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, this bill has received the unanimous approval of all Members of the Committee on Armed Services who were present and who took part in the consideration of it, as well as of those to whose attention it has been brought. It sets forth the policy of the United States that in the interest of national security the Federal Government should promote the employment in air commerce of as large numbers as possible of more efficient transport and cargo aircraft. The purpose of the bill, which has the approval of the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of the Navy, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the Civil Aeronautics Board is to see to it that the latest possible transport designs are available for air-commercial people. At the outbreak of the present war the Government was fortunate and so was the military in having DC-3 planes available in large numbers. The cargo companies are not in a position to develop the new planes, and that being so it is believed that the Air Forces, under the direction of the Secretary and Board, should determine the best type of transport plane for both the military and the commercial people and to see, if possible, if they cannot agree to use that plane in their operations. That, I think, is a sufficient explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. DONDERO submitted conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

CONVEYING SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLA.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CLASON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 3735:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey, subject to the limitations and conditions hereinafter enumerated and such others as he may prescribe, to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, for recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all or any part of that portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, extending one mile east from Brooks Bridge on United States Highway 98 near the town of Fort Walton, Florida, except for a strip of land six hundred feet wide (three hundred feet east and three hundred feet west from center line of road leading to radar site 'Dick'), extending from Highway 98 to the mean low water level of the Gulf of Mexico, and two miles west from said bridge, and to all or any part of that portion of said Santa Rosa Island which lies east of the new channel at East Pass (consisting of two small islands), said property being under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army. Such conveyance shall be made upon payment by said county of a sum which shall be 50 per centum of the fair value of the property conveyed, based upon the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for sale regardless of its former character or use, as determined by the Secretary, less such portion of the price originally paid by said county for said island, prior to its conveyance to the United States, as the Secretary shall determine to be fair and equitable."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHARLES R. CLASON,
CHAS. H. ELSTON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of

the, Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) entitled "An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit the Secretary of the Army to convey a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., to Okaloosa County, Fla., subject to restrictions, without consideration, for public recreational purposes. The Senate disagreed with the provisions authorizing a gratuitous conveyance of the property in question and amended the bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall be permitted to convey the property to Okaloosa County, Fla., but that the consideration for such conveyance should be equal to the fair value of the property conveyed, based upon the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for sale without regard to its former character or use, less such portion of the price originally paid by said county for said land, prior to its conveyance to the United States. The conferees have agreed to an amendment to the Senate amendment wherein the conveyance is authorized upon the payment of 50 percent of the fair market value of the property by Okaloosa County, Fla., to the United States.

Senate amendment No. 2 is merely a clarifying amendment which clearly defines the responsibility, as between Okaloosa County and the Department of the Army, for the maintenance of certain fences which are to be erected pursuant to the provisions of the proposed legislation. Senate amendments Nos. 3 and 4 are only technical amendments which are made necessary by the fact that the Secretary of War has been superseded by the Secretary of the Army.

CHARLES R. CLASON,
CHAS. H. ELSTON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 654) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 318 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, continued by House Resolution 153 of the Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $10,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 213) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,500 copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee during current Congress, relative to investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating and as to whether there is a necessity for a change in either the procedure or basic law.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 676) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by House Resolution 293, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $5,000 additional, including the expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, special counsel, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATIONS OF COMMODITY EXCHANGES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 674) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of the studies and investigations conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 404, Eightieth Congress, not to exceed $10,000 additional, including the expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 655) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the fifteenth report of the Commission of Fine Arts, transmitted by the President to the Congress of the United States on May 27, 1948, be printed as a House document with illustrations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 675) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the Joint Committee on Housing (established by H. Con. Res. 104, Eightieth Congress), for the purpose of concluding its business not to exceed $5,000 including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants since May 15, 1948, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers signed by the former chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF PRAYERS OFFERED BY THE CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 646) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 2,500 copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend James Shera Montgomery, Chaplain of the House, at the opening of the daily sessions of the House, during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, including the current session, be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

After the comma on page 1, line 3, insert the following: "and any acting Chaplain of the House,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FUEL POLICY

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 595) to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to recommend a national fuel policy.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. BUCK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we have an explanation of this resolution?

Mr. RIZLEY. This resolution came from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It gives that committee authority to look into the fuel situation during this summer. It was reported by that committee unanimously and was reported out of the Committee on Rules unanimously.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas it appears that current and anticipated shortages of petroleum products threaten the present and future economy and security of the people of the United States; and

Whereas such shortages must be considered in the light of the availability of other fuels and energy resources; and

Whereas in order to deal effectively with the problem of making petroleum and other fuels available in quantities adequate for an expanding economy and for the security of the United States, it is necessary to formulate sound national policies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it shall be the duty of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to formulate and recommend a national fuel policy adequate to meet the needs of the United States in times of peace and war, including recommendations for a national petroleum policy and the integration of such policy with policies relating to other fuels and energy resources except atomic energy; and for such purposes the committee shall study the current and future fuel supply and demand of the United States and shall study methods of encouraging needed developments to assure the availability of fuels adequate for an expanding economy and the security of the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a report not later than the close of the present Congress. Such report may be made to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof—

(1) is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is in session, has adjourned, or has recessed, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary; and subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member;

(2) may utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies;

(3) may seek information from such sources and conduct its studies and investigations in such manner as it deems advisable in the interest of a full and correct ascertainment of the facts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FUEL POLICY

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 600) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of carrying out the provisions of House Resolution 595, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $35,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, assistants, and other employees, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 4, strike out "$35,000" and insert "$20,000" in lieu thereof.

Line 11, following the word "subcommittee," add the words "and approved by the Committee on House Administration."

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have no way of objecting to these appropriations, of course, since they come from the Committee on House Administration as privileged matters. But just the other day, before several resolutions similar to this passed, I looked up the record with reference to such appropriations. I find that this Congress has already appropriated $1,733,741.52 for investigating committees. I think that that is probably a larger amount than I have ever known to be appropriated in any 10-year period for investigating committees.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Of course, the gentleman knows that a considerable part of that money has not yet been expended. For example, the resolution just read was reduced from $35,000 to $20,000, in accordance with the resolution which was just passed a moment ago.

Mr. RAYBURN. I understand that, but by the time we get through with this session of the Congress, we will probably have appropriated much more than $2,000,000 to pay the expenses of investigating committees. Nearly half of the amount that has been appropriated, the gentleman understands, has not been expended.

I do not say that all this money has been expended, but it has been appropriated.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I do not have the figures with me as to amount that is unexpended. But some of the committees, for example, have already turned back money.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that all this money has been expended. I am just saying that this session of the Congress has appropriated $1,733,741.52 for investigating committees.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to remind the gentleman from Texas that under the Reorganization Act, the responsibility was placed on the regular standing committees of the Congress to conduct continuing surveillance of the operations coming within their jurisdiction. Much of the money has been spent in that way. I might suggest also that my view is that probably the money that has been spent that way is the best money that this Congress has ever spent.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF ISLAND POSSESSIONS IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 129) providing for a joint committee composed of Members of the Senate and the House Public Lands Committee to make an investigation of our island possessions in the Pacific and trust territories, and report back recommendations for legislation providing for civil government, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 11, after "advisable.", insert: "The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words."

Page 4, line 12, after "committee", insert: ", which shall not exceed $50,000,".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is that for the trip down to the Hawaiian Islands to investigate whether that Territory is ready for statehood?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. No. This bill passed the House and has already passed the Senate. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. This in no way refers to the Hawaiian Islands statehood proposition.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, just as a matter of curiosity, we passed the Hawaiian Islands statehood bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Unfortunately, it was not passed in the other body.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I suppose under this resolution the joint committee will keep alive the hope to the people of Hawaii that sometime in the future both branches will act favorably.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I appreciate the gentleman making those remarks, but this resolution has to do with a trusteed area which has been taken over under the United Nations by the United States, and we must necessarily adopt some kind of civil form of government.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not opposed to the resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. I make the observation that certainly this body did everything it could in connection with Hawaiian statehood.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right.

Mr. HOBBS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the distinguished gentleman from Michigan if he is a member of that committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You mean the committee that is to be appointed?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs and Territories, I may be on the committee, but the Speaker has not yet appointed a committee.

Mr. HOBBS. But you are chairman of the committee which is bringing in this request?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. HOBBS. And, in your opinion, it is all right?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. HOBBS. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to promote the general welfare of the inhabitants of the Virgin Islands of the United States through the economic development of the Virgin Islands of the United States there is hereby created, within the Department of the Interior, a body corporate to be known as the Virgin Islands Corporation hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation."

SEC. 2. The Corporation shall have principal offices in the Virgin Islands and in the District of Columbia and shall be deemed, for purposes of venue in civil actions to be an inhabitant of each of these jurisdictions. The Corporation may establish offices in such other place or places as it may deem necessary or appropriate in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 3. The Corporation shall have, and may exercise, the following general powers, in addition to those elsewhere conferred in this act:

(a) To have succession until dissolved by act of Congress.

(b) To adopt, alter, and use a seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) To adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws governing the conduct of its general business, and the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law.

(d) To sue and to be sued in its corporate name.

(e) To determine through its directors the character of and necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to laws applicable generally to Government corporations.

(f) To execute all instruments necessary or appropriate in the exercise of any of its powers.

(g) Whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of the Corporation, to acquire, in any lawful manner, any property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible; to hold, maintain, use, and operate the same; and to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of the same.

(h) When consistent with the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law, to enter into contracts, leases, agreements, or other transactions—

(1) with any person, firm, association, or corporation; and

(2) with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or with any State, Territory, or possession, or with any political subdivision thereof, on a break-even basis, except that such basis shall not apply with respect to the sale of products manufactured or produced by the Corporation: *Provided*, That in no case shall the Corporation contract to undertake an activity for any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or with any State, Territory, or possession, or with any political subdivision thereof, unless the latter is authorized by law to undertake such activity and has funds available for such purpose: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall not undertake any program or activity tending to duplicate concurrently the programs or activities of any other Government agency within the Virgin Islands or extend such program or activity beyond limitations already imposed on such other governmental agencies.

(i) To obtain funds from the Treasury of the United States, for use in the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law, not to exceed a total of $7,775,000 outstanding at any time. For this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to advance to the Corporation out of funds appropriated in advance to the Treasury for this purpose, amounts not exceeding a total of $7,775,000 when requested by the Board of Directors of the Corporation. Appropriations for this purpose are hereby authorized to be made.

(j) To appoint such officers, agents, and employees; to vest them with such powers and duties; to fix and pay such compensation to them for their services as the Corporation may determine, without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and to require bonds for the faithful performance of their duties, the premiums on such bonds to be paid by the Corporation: *Provided*, That persons employed by the Corporation whose compensation is paid on any basis other than a per annum basis shall not be included in making computations pursuant to the provisions of section 607 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall give due consideration to residents of the Virgin Islands in the hiring of its employees and officers.

(k) To use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(l) To have, in the payment of debts out of bankruptcy estates, the priority of the United States.

(m) To accept gifts or donations of services, or of property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, in aid of any of the purposes herein authorized.

(n) To take such actions as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the powers herein or hereafter specifically conferred upon it.

SEC. 4. In fulfillment of its objects, the Corporation, in accordance with annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to applicable provisions of law, is authorized to use its general powers—

(a) to examine, investigate, and conduct research and experimentation in the marketing, distributing, advertising, and exporting of products or resources of the Virgin Islands, and to make known the results of such activities;

(b) to encourage and to promote the investment of private capital in industrial, agricultural, commercial, or related enterprises or activities in the Virgin Islands. Insofar as may be possible without jeopardizing the maximum development of industrial, agricultural, commercial, and related resources for the public good, the Corporation shall formulate its policies so as to encourage and promote the investment of capital owned by residents of the Virgin Islands;

(c) to engage in land-use planning to the end that the most economic and socially beneficial use may be made of the soil of the Virgin Islands, and to encourage and assist private persons and organizations to act in accordance with the results of such planning;

(d) to encourage and engage in the business of providing, whenever adequate facilities are not otherwise available, transportation for persons and property to and from the Virgin Islands, and from place to place in the Virgin Islands;

(e) to encourage, promote, and develop, and to assist in the encouragement, promotion, and development of tourist trade in the Virgin Islands;

(f) to encourage the establishment and development of small farms and small farm communities in the Virgin Islands, and, for that purpose, to construct, equip, improve, administer, operate, and supervise such small farms or communities and to make loans and give other assistance to them;

(g) to make loans to any person for the establishment, maintenance, operation, construction, reconstruction, repair, improvement, or enlargement of any industrial, commercial, agricultural, or related enterprise, undertaking, or activity in the Virgin Islands whenever such loans are not available from private sources: *Provided*, That the total amount of outstanding loans made under authority of this paragraph shall not at any time exceed $5,221,880: *Provided further*, That each person applying for a loan shall be required to furnish adequate security and that the interest on such loans shall not exceed 6 percent per annum; shall be the general policy of the Corporation to establish interest rates on loans that, in the judgment of the Board of Directors, will at least cover the interest cost of funds to the United States Treasury, the operating expenses of the lending division of the corporation, and a risk factor which, over all, should provide for losses that may be expected to materialize on loans;

(h) for any of the purposes or objects herein authorized, and for the further purpose of developing the industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, livestock, fishery, and forestry resources of the Virgin Islands, to establish, maintain, operate, and engage in, upon its own account, any appropriate enterprise, undertaking, or activity:

Provided, That the Corporation shall not undertake any activity not specifically set forth in the annual budget programs: *Provided further*, That in the event an emergency is declared to exist by the Board of Directors during a period when the Congress is not in session, appropriate action in effectuation of the policies or purposes of the Corporation recommended by the Board to meet such emergency may be taken upon the advance authorization of the President of the United States. Such emergency action shall be reported to the Congress upon its reconvening for its approval, and, subject to the appropriation of funds therefore, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to reimburse the Corporation for any losses incurred as a result of such action.

SEC. 5. (a) The Corporation shall issue a receipt as of July 1, 1948, to the Secretary of the Treasury for the value of the property and assets transferred, less the liabilities assumed, under section 9 hereof. Such receipt shall be evidence of the ownership of the Corporation by the United States of America. The amount of the receipt shall be increased or decreased by any subsequent changes in the investment of the United States Government. Any property and assets, the ownership of which hereafter may be transferred to the Corporation without cost, or for consideration clearly not commensurate with the value received, shall be included in the investment of the United States Government at net values approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Any income earned by the Corporation shall be included in the investment and any losses incurred shall reduce the investment. The amount of the receipt shall not include, and interest shall not be paid to the Treasury on funds advanced by or payable to other agencies of the United States Government.

(b) The Corporation shall pay interest on the advances from the Treasury and on that part of the Government's investment represented by assets transferred to the Corporation, but shall not pay interest on accumulated net income or on funds received through appropriations by the Congress to cover losses. The Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the interest rate annually in advance; such rate to be calculated to reimburse the Treasury for its cost.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury sums to cover net losses estimated in advance in the Corporation's budgets submitted in accordance with the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597) and approved by the Congress, to be paid over to the Corporation from time to time as needed.

SEC. 6. The Corporation is hereby authorized to use all its funds and other assets, and all funds and other assets which may hereafter be paid, transferred, or allocated to, or otherwise acquired by it in the exercise of its corporate powers and functions: *Provided*, That no Government funds may be turned over to or administered by the Corporation other than as authorized by this act or the annual Government Corporations Appropriation Acts. The Corporation shall reimburse the civil-service retirement and disability fund for Government contributions to the fund applicable to the Corporation's employees, and the employees' compensation fund, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency, for the benefit payments made to the Corporation's employees, and shall also reimburse other Government agencies for payments of a similar nature made on behalf of the Corporation.

SEC. 7. The Corporation shall pay into the Treasury of the United States the amount of its funds, from whatever source derived, in excess of the current requirements of the Corporation. Such payments shall be applied, first to reduce the balance of the receipt evidencing ownership attributable to advances outstanding under section 3 (i) hereof, after which any payments shall be applied to the remainder of the receipt. The investment of the United States Government in no event shall be reduced to less than $1.

SEC. 8. The property and business of the Corporation shall be managed by a board of nine directors to consist of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Secretary of the Interior or his nominee, the president of the Corporation, the remaining members to be appointed by the President of the United States. The power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States. Not more than five directors shall be of any one political party. The directors shall designate one of their members as chairman of the Board, subject to the approval of the President of the United States. The Board of Directors shall report upon the affairs and activities of the Corporation to the President of the United States through the Secretary of the Interior. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of 5 years, except that the terms of the first Board shall be shortened to provide for replacement or reappointment of its members in number as nearly equal as possible each year. The Board shall meet at least quarterly: *Provided*, That at least two of the meetings in each year shall be held in the Virgin Islands. Directors who are otherwise employed full time by the Corporation, by the Government of the Virgin Islands, by the municipalities of St. Thomas and St. John or St. Croix, or by the United States Government shall not receive additional compensation for their services as directors. All other directors shall receive a fee of $50 a day for each day in attendance at directors' meetings, including travel time. All directors shall receive necessary travel expenses in connection with their attendance at directors' meetings. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. Qualifications for Board membership shall consist of demonstrated ability, attachment to the public interest, impartiality, and diversified experience among the members. The Board shall confine itself to over-all policy-making, directive, and supervisory functions with administrative functions centered in a staff of executive officers (including a controller) headed by a chief executive, responible for the execution of programs and policies adopted by the Board.

SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby transferred to the Corporation the following property:

(1) All property—real, personal, and mixed—now operated by the Virgin Islands Company, on behalf of the United States, except that property now operated by the company for the Department of the Interior conveyed to that Department by revocable permit from the Navy Department under agreement dated January 1, 1948. The value of the property so transferred shall be fixed at the depreciated cost as of June 30, 1947, shown in schedule 1 of the Comptroller General's report on the audit of the Virgin Islands Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, adjusted for all changes from that date to the date of transfer, including depreciation, at rates set forth in said schedule 1.

(2) All the assets and property—real, personal, and mixed, tangible and intangible—of the Virgin Islands Company. The value of the property so transferred shall be fixed at the value shown on the books of the Virgin Islands Company at the date of transfer, subject to any adjustment deemed necessary as a result of the audit required to be made by the Comptroller General under section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945.

(3) All of the United States Government's interest in the property known as Bluebeard Castle Hotel situated in the Island of St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands of the United States. The value of the property so transferred shall be fixed at a value approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(b) The Corporation shall assume and discharge all of the liabilities of the Virgin Islands Company: *Provided*, That the liabilities shall not include the balances of relief grants held by the Virgin Islands Company, which balances are invested in the assets and property embraced by section 9 (a) (2) hereof, and which shall become part of the Government's investment in the Corporation.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Interior, the Under Secretary of the Interior, and the Governor of the Virgin Islands, who are the stockholders of the Virgin Islands Company, a corporation created by ordinance of the Colonial Council for St. Thomas and St. John, Virgin Islands of the United States, are hereby authorized and directed to take such steps as may be appropriate to dissolve the said Virgin Islands Company.

SEC. 11. In lieu of taxes, the Corporation is authorized to make the annual payments into the municipal treasuries of the Virgin Islands directed by section 5 of the act of May 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1372; 48 U. S. C. 1401d), to be made by the Virgin Islands Company: *Provided*, That any valuation for tax purposes made by the Secretary of the Interior shall not be reviewable by any court: *Provided further*, That the annual payments shall not include payments in lieu of income taxes, capital stock taxes, or franchise taxes.

SEC. 12. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 is amended by striking out "The Virgin Islands Company" appearing therein and substituting "the Virgin Islands Corporation."

SEC. 13. This act shall become effective June 30, 1948.

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the "Virgin Islands Corporation Act."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, some 14 years ago, as the result of a terrific and chaotic economic condition in the Virgin Islands, the Government of the United States went into that Territory and established what has been known for the past 14 years as the Virgin Islands Company. Private citizens of that area had practically been thrown into bankruptcy and were forced to discontinue operation of their plantations and their sugar mills because of the terrific losses that had been incurred in the period 1929 to 1933. The Government of the United States outside of the Virgin Islands Company and through the Department of the Interior, Public Works Division, acquired a very substantial acreage where sugarcane and other crops had previously been grown. They purchased two sugar mills and a rum factory which had been owned and operated by private individuals. The Virgin Islands Company, having received grants-in-aid from the Treasury of the United States, leased from the Department of the Interior, Public Works Division, lands and mills which the Department of the Interior had acquired.

During the past 14 years the Virgin Islands Company has been operating those properties under lease. The Virgin Islands Company is the largest employer of direct employees, and, indirectly, through purchasing the products grown by farmers on the island of St. Croix, which is the largest agricultural area of the islands, and thereby becomes the largest employer of people in the Virgin Islands. Its operations primarily constitute the backbone of the economic structure of the Virgin Islands.

Some months ago, as you know, the Congress of the United States adopted the Federal Corporations Act which forces all of these Federal corporations to become organized under the Corporations Act. It is therefore necessary now to reincorporate the Virgin Islands Company before the 30th of June of this year under the new Federal Corporations Act or the Virgin Islands Company must go out of business not later than June 30 of this year.

If the Virgin Islands Company does go out of business on June 30 of this year it forces a tremendous relief program to be initiated by the Government of the United States in order to provide relief for the people of the Virgin Islands because the principal industrial operation of the Virgin Islands will cease to operate.

The best information which I can obtain, and it is certainly reliable, from the Department of the Interior, the Governor and the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. Croix, is that this will call for an immediate job for the Red Cross and cost millions of dollars from the Federal Treasury putting these people on direct relief if these operations, agricultural and industrial, are discontinued. This is a straight proposition without any vacillation whatsoever to refinance the Virgin Islands Company, extend it under the New Federal Corporations Act and let it go along as a direct employer maintaining the principal economic structure of the Virgin Islands.

We are now at the point where we must make a decision whether or not we shall resort to direct relief in place of agricultural and industrial operations or go ahead with the refinancing and reconstruction of the Virgin Islands Company under the new Corporations Act.

If any Member desires to ask questions, I shall be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman tell us what the over-all cost involved in this bill will be?

Mr. CRAWFORD. This bill calls for only $7,750,000 for the combined purpose. Now, let me make this very emphatic: It will take something like $900,000 to refinance the Company and rebuild the mills so that they can operate efficiently, and put in new machinery—new presses for the sugarcane which the farmers grow.

This bill carries, roughly, $4,000,000 as part of the $7,750,000 for the Company to use in making loans to people in the Virgin Islands who are without bank facilities in that the one bank located there which holds the position of a virtual monopoly will not extend commercial loans to the people and let them adventure in their own way. This is necessary if the people of the Virgin Islands are to have money with which to operate or a source from which to get funds so that they can enter into private industry of their own. They must have recourse to the RFC, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or some other Government credit agency, in the absence of the existence of the Virgin Islands Company.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman know what action the other body took on this?

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand, the other body has passed a bill which provides only $500,000 to continue the operation of this Company along with loans that it will have to obtain from the Treasury of the United States for 1 year.

That bring up this question: Just 1 year ago in the closing hours of the session, as a matter of fact, almost at midnight, as the result of our not having acted prior to that time, the Appropriations Committees of the two bodies in conjunction with my efforts and the efforts of other gentlemen of the Congress, mushed through in the last minutes a life rope, you might say, and pulled the Company through, but with the promises that before this time this whole matter would be cleaned up. Now we face the situation where the other body offers to extend it on a shoestring basis for another 6 months until the Congress meets in January, action which will call for an amendment to the Federal Corporations Act exempting this corporation from that act so that it may continue beyond June 30. That is as frank and blunt as I can state with reference to what the other body has done.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman feel the action of the other body is probably better than this bill?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think so. I feel that the responsibility of the Virgin Islands is upon the leadership of these two bodies and that we have not treated those people fairly. It is time for us to give them some answer as to their social and economic condition while we are doing all these things for people scattered all over the world.

This is a bill that I strongly urge and strongly advocate for the favorable consideration of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman tell the House whether the Virgin Islands Company has done anything in the way of rehabilitating those people?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Virgin Islands Company has maintained the social and economic structure of these people during the past 14 years and it has charged up against that a loss of only about $60,000 in direct losses plus depreciation on the agricultural implements and the factory owned by the Department of the Interior during that period.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I think the Congress ought to be informed as to what is going on in the Virgin Islands. Senator BUTLER and myself made a trip to the Virgin Islands during the Christmas holidays. We spent 2 weeks in these islands. A report was made to Congress. It is amazing the amount of waste of the taxpayers' money that is going on in the islands.

You must remember the Seventy-eighth Congress appropriated $10,000,000 for a rehabilitation program, a public-works program, in the Virgin Islands. We have already spent more than $4,000,000 on public works.

Mr. Speaker, I was down there and saw some of those public works. In two of the towns on St. Croix Island, Christiansted and Fredriksted, they had built 3 miles of sewers and have 18 private houses connected with those sewers.

They are wasting the taxpayers' money in a way I am sure you would not approve.

As to the Virgin Islands Company, we looked into that very, very carefully. The present manager I think is a good man. His name is Olsen. He wants to get out of the business of growing sugarcane by those people. He has the earmarks of a good manager. Now, we propose to appropriate over $7,000,000 to continue this Company. Between four and five hundred people are employed by the Virgin Islands Company for a period of about 5 months in the year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman knows very well that the pay roll of the Virgin Islands Company to which the gentleman refers does not include the very small farmer who operates a small piece of land and sells the products of his labor to the mills operated by the Virgin Islands Company and the gentleman further knows that the $10,000,000 referred to by him has nothing whatever to do with the Virgin Islands Company.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It was a work-relief project. I know there are a few small farmers around there who raise cane and send it to the mills. The sugarcane industry cannot be justified.

The Government is also in the rum business. You have to sort of give it away with the other liquor that people drink. They have to buy some of this Government rum in order to get liquor. Now, that molasses is brought over from Puerto Rico.

I admit that the Virgin Islands is our problem. The people have not been very well treated. But I am also here to tell you that the people in the Virgin Islands will not work. They do not work. They like relief. We have carried them on a relief program and as long as they are carried on such a program they will not work. We are establishing an economy and standard of living they cannot support.

Senator BUTLER, myself, and two clerks went over to the island of Tortola, which is about the same size as the island of St. John. It is under England's control. Now, we have more people employed by the Government on the island of St. John than there are in private industries. The biggest employment there is Government employment, with padded pay rolls all the way down the line. I believe the records show that there are 1,100 people on the Government pay roll in the Virgin Islands.

There is an Englishman in charge at the island of Tortola. An Englishman runs that island containing about the same number of people as the island of St. Thomas; he has all of those farmers working making a living, self-supporting, bringing their goods by little boats to the island of St. Thomas and he is running his island with 75 people. That is what the English are able to do.

The Interior Department under Tugwell and other New Dealers have planted a philosophy in these Virgin Islands that the United States must take care of them. These islanders could support themselves just as they do on the English-controlled island of Tortola if we gave them proper management. The Dutch had no trouble when they owned the islands.

I say to my colleagues that the program that we are adopting in the Virgin Islands is absolutely wrong. It is said there are more Virgin Islanders in the United States than there are down in the Virgin Islands. The average age of the worker in the Virgin Islands, according to statistics, is 54. I looked at their school-lunch program. They can raise everything in the Virgin Islands that they need. They can raise potatoes and vegetables, but the food that was used in the school-lunch program did not come from the Virgin Islands. Every bit of it was imported from this country. They had 160 pounds of potatoes for 120 youngsters. The meat, the butter, the vegetables, and the things that they could raise in the Virgin Islands were not raised there. They were imported, because we give it to them. As long as we continue with that program they will never become self-sustaining or self-supporting.

I am in favor of adopting the bill passed by the Senate. The Senate bill will start liquidation of the Company. There is a bona fide offer to buy the Virgin Islands Company for $1,500,000. It ought to be cleaned up. It would be far cheaper for us to put these people under the Red Cross if they insist on being treated as wards, but the program we are now adopting in the Virgin Islands is absolutely wrong. I am certain that these good people of the Virgin Islands want to be respected self-supporting folks. They cannot do it under the present program.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. After being down there did the gentleman think that there was as much agriculture in the Virgin Islands as there is in a good county in Iowa or Nebraska, or even a good township hardly?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, there is not much good land. They could be self-supporting if they went out and worked under proper encouragement from this country.

Mr. LECOMPTE. One good county in the Middle West could produce more than they are producing down there.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Oh, yes. I prefer the Senate bill. We can then in the Eighty-first Congress help to put these people back on a self-supporting basis. We should not continue the Tugwell program of the thirties.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the argument of my good friend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] defeats itself. This $7,060,000 for the Virgin Islands is largely to put the people in industry and largely to start a public works program which is sadly needed. If there are any on relief, that will take them off relief. So, his argument really defeats itself.

I understand from reliable sources that in those islands the water is so bad that it is almost dangerous for anybody to drink it. We owe a duty to the inhabitants of the Virgin Islands. They are our wards. Why force those people to continue drinking this unsanitary water? I understand also that for the past several years there have not been any hospitals built and there have not been any roads built, and conditions down there are deplorable in every respect. When you talk about the pay of these workers on these public works and in private enterprise, they only get about $2 or $3 a day.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, it will be more expensive to deny these Virgin Islanders this $7,000,000 because the entire economy of the country would probably collapse and we would have practically everybody on relief. This is a humanitarian measure. It is not only humanitarian; it is our duty to take care of this situation in the Virgin Islands. The whole world will point to this example how the United States treats its wards down in the Virgin Islands.

I hope that the membership will realize that we ought to pass this measure with an overwhelming vote.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me reemphasize that the $7,700,000 which is carried in this bill is not to be used unless the people of the Virgin Islands to the extent of approximately $4,000,000 of that total apply to this Company for loans in order to go into business and enterprise themselves. This bill is designed for the specific purpose of enabling those people to establish essential industries and get out from under the wing of the Federal Treasury. It is the very purpose that the gentleman from Nebraska advocates, and it does away with the past program.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, it encourages private enterprise and encourages the establishment of small business, and keep these workers working and under more satisfactory conditions. I hope the House will see the justice of this thing and see what our duty is and pass the bill overwhelmingly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am quite familiar with this situation because it happens that most of the Virgin Islanders that are in America live in my district. I do not want to differ too radically with the gentleman from Nebraska, but there are only about 13,000 Virgin Islanders in America and there are 34,000 in the Virgin Islands. Eight thousand of the Virgin Islanders of America live in my district.

Our friend from Nebraska certainly said some things that are true, but they just do not happen to be related. This is not a relief bill. Granted that the $10,000,000 that was appropriated before went down there for relief and was not used correctly, granted that that may be true, this is still not a relief bill. This is to do just what the gentleman from Nebraska wants done. If you read the bill carefully you will find it states:

> For the further purpose of developing the industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, livestock, fishery, and forestry resources of the Virgin Islands, to establish, maintain, operate, and engage in, upon its own account, any appropriate enterprise, undertaking, or activity.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This Company has been engaged in that business. They were chartered for it, but they have not accomplished a single thing. There is no reason to think they will accomplish anything in the future.

Mr. POWELL. This Company has accomplished everything. If it were not for this Company we would still have to spend money down there for the relief and the feeding of the people. This is their livelihood.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The Danes had the islands for over 100 years and they had no trouble. They were quite self-supporting.

Mr. POWELL. Yes; that may be true. Also, if we could get this Company on its feet they would be self-supporting, but we have never put this Company on its feet correctly. If we get this Company on its feet, then they will be able to be self-supporting. You cannot tell people to go out and work and support themselves unless you give them something to do it with; is not that true? In Nebraska you have great farmers, but they have to have something in their hands to farm with.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This is really a relief program, if that is what you want it to be.

Mr. POWELL. No; this is not a relief program at all.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It has been all along.

Mr. POWELL. This is to develop in the people the character the gentleman has been talking about, so they will be able to take care of themselves.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I go to the bank and borrow $500 in order to start a peanut store and a popcorn popper and put

myself in business, the gentleman from

On June 12, 1948:

On June 17, 1948:

laboratory under a cost-plus-fixed-fee

June 8 the employees at a union meeting

necessary. The commission should ex-

myself in business, the gentleman from Nebraska would call that a relief program. That is exactly what it is not.

Mr. POWELL. If the gentleman did not, it would be all right, but if they did it he would call it relief.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is the soundest type of industrial operation on the face of God's green earth. That is what built this country. The gentleman from Nebraska knows this as well as anyone else.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is a relief program when the money is not paid back and you have to put in more and more money to keep the machine going.

Mr. POWELL. Yes, if it does not come back.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is what is going to happen in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What we have been doing in the Virgin Islands is what this bill is designed to take us out of, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. POWELL. We have been spending money in relief. With this, there is no relief. We are giving the people an opportunity. I call for passage without a record vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 132, noes 9.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 10, 1948:

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States;

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the American Turners Society in the United States;

H. R. 1572. An act for the relief of Basque aliens;

H. R. 4236. An act to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service;

H. R. 5155. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to have made by the Public Roads Administration and the National Park Service a joint reconnaissance survey of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal between Great Falls, Md., and Cumberland, Md., and to report to the Congress upon the advisability and practicability of constructing thereon a parkway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5283. An act to provide for the disposal of surplus sand at Fort Story, Va.; and

H. R. 5816. An act to amend the act of April 26, 1947, relating to the establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, and for other purposes.

On June 12, 1948:

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of powers of appointment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2359. An act to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $85,000 to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4721. An act to remove the statutory limit of appropriation expenditures for repairs or changes to a vessel of the Navy;

H. R. 4954. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennwick division of the Yakima project, Washington;

H. R. 5151. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James P. Love a patent to certain lands in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 5553. An act to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended;

H. R. 5587. An act to add certain lands to the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6056. An act to amend an act of Congress approved February 9, 1881, which granted a right-of-way for railroad purposes through certain lands of the United States in Richmond County, N. Y.;

H. R. 6078. An act to amend section 303 (e) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; and

H. R. 6091. An act to withdraw certain land as available land within the meaning of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 (42 Stat. 108), as amended, and to restore it to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii.

On June 14, 1948:

H. R. 669. An act to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy;

H. R. 5680. An act to amend sections 207, 213, 215, 216, 220, and 225, of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended;

H. R. 5728. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5770. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6500. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

On June 16, 1948:

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature;

H. R. 6407. An act to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2389. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley;

H. R. 5134. An act to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational-rehabilitation purposes; and

H. R. 6730. An act to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years.

On June 17, 1948:

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of the Tampa Chapter, No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H. R. 3628. An act to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands; and

H. R. 4032. An act to amend certain provisions of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States.

ANNUAL REPORT, OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

REPORT ON JUVENILE COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 725)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the juvenile court during the fiscal year 1946–47.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

LABOR DISPUTE AT OAK RIDGE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 726)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, it is my duty to report to the Congress concerning the labor dispute which recently existed at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The important facts concerning the dispute may be summarized as follows:

The Oak Ridge National Laboratory is Government-owned. Some 2,350 persons are there engaged in important atomic-energy research, but not directly in production of fissionable materials or weapons.

The dispute was between the Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp. and the Atomic Trades and Labor Council, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The corporation operates the laboratory under a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract with the Atomic Energy Commission. The corporation also operates two other important plants of the atomic-energy installation at Oak Ridge. The council represents some 900 employees who perform maintenance, operating, and service functions at the laboratory.

The recent dispute resulted from the failure of negotiations concerning both wages and working conditions. These negotiations were begun with the predecessor contractor in the latter part of November 1947 and continued with Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp. beginning February 9, 1948.

It is clear that there was a difference in objectives sought by the council and the corporation. On the one hand, the council desired to preserve differentials over the two nearby atomic-energy plants as to wage rates and conditions of employment—differentials which have been in existence in the laboratory since its beginning. On the other hand, the corporation desired uniformity of wage rates and conditions of employment and the elimination of the laboratory differentials.

In a union meeting held Sunday, February 29, the employees voted to strike unless settlement were made by Friday midnight, March 5, and this intention was reaffirmed by another meeting on the night of March 3. Accordingly, on March 5, I issued Executive Order 9934, creating a Board of Inquiry pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act. At my request, both parties agreed to maintain the status quo until March 19.

On March 15 the Board of Inquiry submitted to me its first report. It found the existence of a labor dispute at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and it advised me of the facts of that dispute. It further found that grave danger to the national safety would result if the operations of the laboratory were interrupted.

Thereupon, at my request, the Attorney General on March 19 instituted an action and obtained an injunction in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee. This order enjoined both the corporation and the council, and all persons in active participation with them, from engaging in any strike or lock-out or from interfering with normal continuance of work, or from making any change in terms or conditions of employment other than by mutual agreement.

On March 24 I reconvened the Board of Inquiry. Negotiations between the parties continued, with the assistance of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. On May 18 the Board of Inquiry submitted to me its second report, stating that the position of the parties remained unaltered and the dispute unsettled.

On June 1 and 2 the National Labor Relations Board conducted a secret ballot of the employees to ascertain whether they wished to accept the final offer of settlement as stated and made by the employer. The employees, by a vote of 771 to 26, rejected the employer's last offer. On June 7 the National Labor Relations Board certified to the Attorney General the results of this election. On June 8 the employees at a union meeting took action looking to a possible stoppage if the injunction were lifted and if the employer unilaterally placed in effect the terms proposed in its final offer.

On June 10, pursuant to section 210 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, the Attorney General moved the court to discharge the injunction. The injunction was discharged on June 11.

During this period, the parties continued negotiations, with the assistance of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. On June 15 the parties reached agreement on the terms of a new contract.

All parties to this dispute and the Government agencies concerned complied with all legal and procedural requirements of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

A number of additional facts concerning this dispute are set forth in the first and second reports of the Board of Inquiry. Copies of these reports are transmitted to the Congress with this message.

Both parties are to be commended for achieving settlement of this dispute without an interruption of work.

The dispute at Oak Ridge has raised some question, nevertheless, as to the sufficiency of present collective-bargaining methods in atomic-energy installations.

This question is somewhat different from others which have arisen in the past. On the one hand, it is clear that the national security and the development of the beneficial arts and sciences are bound up with the progress of our atomic-energy program. Thus, every dispute which threatens to seriously impair that program imperils the national health and safety.

On the other hand, it is equally clear that the progress of our atomic-energy program requires the support and drive of broad sectors of the American economy. In order to encourage such support, the Atomic Energy Commission has lodged in its contractors a large measure of responsibility and authority. The progress of the program is equally dependent upon the full and willing support of the men and women who work in atomic-energy plants and laboratories.

Under these circumstances, it is imperative that the most successful techniques of the collective-bargaining process should be adopted for the atomic-energy program.

The objective should be twofold: The parties should continue to enjoy the maximum of voluntary action and freedom of choice; secondly, the public interest must be protected at all times.

I believe that special study should be given to the problem of peaceful and orderly settlement of labor disputes in Government-owned, privately operated atomic-energy installations, such as those at Richland, Wash.; Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Los Alamos, N. Mex.; the Argonne National Laboratory, Chicago, Ill.; and others.

I propose, therefore, to establish a commission, composed of men having expert knowledge in the field of labor relations, to study this problem and to make such recommendations as they may find necessary. The commission should explore the question whether any special legislation should be enacted to protect the national interest without depriving management or labor organizations of the initiative and freedom necessary for the progress of our atomic-energy program. The commission should study ways and means of adapting to the atomic-energy program the best of our experience in the complex field of labor relations. The commission should concern itself also with special aspects of the problem, such as questions of bargaining representation, uniformity of working conditions and wages, and procedures for grievance handling.

The commission should concern itself, in short, with the broad code of conduct which should be observed by management and labor in their relations with each other in this vital program.

In appointing this commission I shall request the advice of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy both as to the membership of the commission and the specific questions to be studied.

I believe that the report of this commission, which should be submitted as soon as possible, will be of great value in guiding contractors, labor organizations, and the Government in this new and vital field. I am confident that this is the best avenue to follow to achieve and maintain that proper balance between freedom and responsibility which is the tradition in all our economic relations, including those between management and labor.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

TO AMEND RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 (b) (2) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, be further amended by striking therefrom the following words and figures: "Section 4 (a) (1), (2), and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Sections 4 (a) (1) and (2)"; and that section 4 (c) thereof be amended by striking out "$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$45,000,000."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out $25,000,000 and inserting in lieu thereof $35,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and

passed, and a motion to reconsider was

the President and voted to support the

programs throughout the Nation are con-

ington, D. C., commonly known as the

passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry," approved June 28, 1947, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1949," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1954."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 1, line 8, strike out "June 30, 1954," and insert "June 30, 1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I placed in the RECORD a report of the investigation staff of the Appropriations Committee referring to certain matters relating to the administration of unemployment compensation and the employment services in the State of Tennessee. The State director of these services published a reply in most of the newspapers of that State. My answer follows:

My attention has been called to an article entitled "Hake's Reply to Charges," appearing in various Tennessee newspapers. Because the gentleman—under pressure—has attempted to brush aside plain facts and truth with falsehoods and innuendoes, I deem it my duty to give the people of Tennessee the facts.

W. O. Hake is the State employment security commissioner for the State of Tennessee. As such he has under his direction State employees who are paid entirely out of funds appropriated by the Congress of the United States. The Unemployment Compensation Division and the Employment Service are both financed out of funds raised by virtue of a tax imposed by Federal law on covered pay rolls. It thus is important that the Federal Government know how these funds are being expended by the States. The Subcommittee on Appropriations in charge of this particular appropriation directed that an investigation be made in the field in various States to determine the necessity for the large appropriation requested. Mr. Hake appeared before my subcommittee, along with a number of other State administrators, on April 2, 1948. His testimony is found in the printed record of the committee hearings. While he was on the witness stand, I made this statement, which appears on page 239 of the hearings:

I would like to say to you that that is one of the things that the investigating staff of the Appropriations Committee is going to make a thorough study of, and they are trained men in the field of investigation. I expect they will come up with some real information to this committee, so that we can get a picture of the situation which we have heretofore had.

Mr. Hake's response was:

I want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for inaugurating that policy. The State men will unanimously welcome it.

Thereafter the Appropriations Committee sent investigators into a number of States, including Tennessee. Their preliminary report indicated serious violations of the Hatch Act. The committee decided to have a further investigation made and sent the chief of the investigating staff, Mr. Lee, to conduct the investigation. I may say that everyone in Washington knows that Mr. Lee is one of the most courageous and outstanding investigators in the Federal service, and the attempt of Mr. Hake to "smear" him is the usual artifice adopted by one who is cornered and caught and who is seeking to distract attention from the real facts.

When Mr. Lee's report came to the committee, I was instructed by the committee to lay it before the Congress and to present the preliminary facts disclosed by the Attorney General of the United States and to the United States Civil Service Commission with a demand that a full and complete investigation be made by the FBI and the Civil Service Commission, and with the further demand that such steps be taken in accordance with law as the facts might indicate to be necessary.

Mr. Hake in his statement in no way denies the facts but resorts to the old trick of the accused when confronted with unassailable documentary evidence by calling me names. Among other things, he states in reference to me:

He is well known as having a fixed hatred of any progressive legislation enacted by the Democratic administrations of the last 16 years. The social-security program appears to be one of his pet hates, and especially the Employment Service.

He further says that the action taken by the subcommittee and the Congress would have emasculated the employment security program and that he, along with other State administrators, testified before my committee against this unwarranted position. I categorically state that such statement can only be properly designated as an unmitigated falsehood. The facts are clear. Judge Hake, in company with other leading State administrators, came before my committee and urged that the Congress adopt the program which I was advocating. His testimony appears on pages 934 to 940 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. I need only to quote this to demonstrate the falsity of Judge Hake's statement. He made this statement to the committee:

As I review it, Congress has done two outstanding things up to the moment: No. 1, last week when it determined that these two programs (unemployment compensation and employment services) should not be separated when they defeated the reorganization plan; and No. 2, this year they did another outstanding job when they decided that the program would not go over to the Labor Department. Then, by inference certainly, they would decide by these two actions that the program should be administered in the Federal Security Agency. I appeared before both committees along that line, and I think now the question is, Congress needs to do something to carry out what they have most decidedly said they want and which is apparently not going to happen from the executive branch of the Government. I think the State administrators are unanimous in their thinking now that the reorganization should be effected yesterday. I mean by that without delay.

In statement after statement appearing in this record, Judge Hake firmly supported me in the very program which he so viciously assails and condemns in his so-called reply. For 3 years now he has appeared before my committee and urged the very thing which has now been accomplished and written into the law. He now says that this action on the part of the Congress would destroy the social-security program. He of all people knows that there is not a single word of truth in such a statement. The full Appropriations Committee accepted with practically no dissent the recommendations which I offered to consolidate in the Federal Security Agency, the unemployment compensation and the employment service activities. The House of Representatives with only 29 dissenting votes approved that program. It then went to the Senate, and the Senate took a contrary view, largely because of the opposition of Mr. Truman. In the conference between the House and Senate, an agreement was reached fully sustaining the reorganization program which I had proposed, and the Senate completely receded from its position. Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, was a member of that conference committee and signed the conference report.

It is interesting to note that the conference report was overwhelmingly adopted by both the House and the Senate, and the bill went to the President. The President vetoed the bill and thereafter on June 16 the House by a vote of 288–113 overrode the Presidential veto. It is also interesting to note that Representatives GORE, MURRAY, PHILLIPS, JENNINGS, COOPER, and DAVIS of Tennessee all supported the position of the writer and voted to override the Presidential veto. Only Representatives PRIEST, COURTNEY, and EVINS voted to sustain the President.

It is also interesting to note that the Senate by a vote of 72–17 voted to override the veto of the President and thus by an overwhelming vote placed its seal of approval upon the action proposed by the writer. It is also interesting to note that both Senator MCKELLAR and Senator STEWART of Tennessee voted to override the President and voted to support the position taken by the writer.

Thus when Judge Hake attempts to indicate in his alleged reply that "Congressman KEEFE's political prestige had thus reached an all-time low and something had to be done to restore it," he is again making a statement which he knows is not in accord with the facts.

It is also interesting to note that while the conference between the House and the Senate was going on, W. O. Hake, Commissioner, sent the following telegram to me and to every member of the Tennessee House delegation:

H. R. 6355 as passed by the House contains a reorganization rider which has been rejected by the Senate. The issue now goes to conference. As administrator of the employment security program in Tennessee, I strongly endorse the position which has been taken by the House. My attitude is shared by the vast majority of State administrators of this program. Reorganization and integration of the Federal level similar to operations now maintained in all States would be most helpful to our State part of the program. Present dual set-up on Federal level leads to irritation, inefficiency, time and money wasted both on the Federal and State level, and should not be tolerated by Congress. I strongly urge that you lend your support to the conference committee in sustaining the House's former action.

Does this telegram and the testimony of Judge Hake before my committee indicate that he opposed the position which I had taken? I repeat that Mr. Hake has evaded the facts and has resorted to abuse and vilification in an attempt to becloud the issue.

He further attempts, in his alleged reply, to stir up political emotions by his intolerant and hate-inspiring references to Mr. Lee and to myself. I happen to know that in making this statement he was doing so under orders from higher-ups in Tennessee, and if he is the man that I have always thought he was, he will let the people of Tennessee know the truth and repudiate his statement.

He attempts to inject into the picture the fact that I am a Republican from Wisconsin and that my political fortunes are "low" and that I have lost caste with my colleagues, and so forth, and so forth. The record of the congressional action and the overwhelming support given me by the Congressmen and Senators clearly demonstrates the falsity of this statement. His own telegram, above quoted, ought to cause him to hang his head in shame for daring to write such a reply, even though he was under pressure from political superiors to do so.

The real truth is that the employees of State government in Tennessee themselves know whether they have been subject to a political shake-down by which 10 percent of 1 month's salary has been taken from them for political purposes. It will not do for Judge Hake to say that these contributions were voluntary. I have many letters in my file that clearly demonstrate the contrary, written by State employees who were forced to contribute against their will because of fear of loss of jobs.

As a Republican from Wisconsin, I am interested in seeing that these two great programs throughout the Nation are conducted in the public interest and that the employees, paid for 100 percent by Federal funds, carry on their jobs in the interests of the people and not be subjected to the political dictation of any political machine. I have served notice that these investigations will continue, and no amount of personal abuse will stop them. This is Federal money that is being used, and to that extent the Congress of the United States has an interest in seeing that Federal law is not violated.

I can assure Judge Hake that so far as it lies within my power I shall see to it that he has his day in court and that all of the facts are presented. I know nothing of the political situation in Tennessee and have no intention of injecting myself into the politics of Tennessee. I believe the good people of Tennessee, however, are no different from the good people of Wisconsin or any other State in the Union and that they will resent efforts to cover up plain facts with a campaign of smear, abuse and vilification.

I have every right to assume that the Department of Justice and the Civil Service Commission of the United States Government will follow through on this investigation and that in due time Mr. Hake and his political associates will have ample opportunity to try to explain away the mass of fully documented evidence that has been gathered by the investigators of the House Appropriations Committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two radio addresses by Father Saloway. I do not know whether this will exceed the limit allowed, but, if so, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING FEDERAL WORKS ADMINISTRATOR TO LEASE PROPERTY AT 811 VERMONT AVENUE NW.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2706) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in a building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., in Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to lease for commercial purposes for periods not exceeding 10 years and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the public interest, such space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building, as was leased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for commercial purposes on July 30, 1947, the date title to such building was transferred from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the United States of America by section 306, title III, Public Law 268, Eightieth Congress. The rentals received pursuant to this act may be deposited into a common fund account or accounts in the Treasury, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U. S. C. 303b), shall be available to pay the cost of maintenance, upkeep, and repair of the space so leased and for the establishment of necessary reserves therefor: *Provided*, That except for such necessary reserves, the unobligated balances of rentals so deposited into the Treasury shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO HEAR AND DETERMINE CLAIMS OF CERTAIN MOTOR CARRIERS

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1260) to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created and established a Motor Carrier Claims Commission, hereafter referred to as the Commission.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall hear and determine, according to law, existing claims against the United States arising out of the taking by the United States of possession or control of any of the motor-carrier transportation systems described in Executive Order No. 9462, dated August 11, 1944 (C. F. R., 1944 supp., p. 70). The settlement of any claim prior to the enactment of this act shall not prevent the Commission from hearing and determining such claim if it determines that the principles of equity as administered by the courts require that such settlement be set aside and that such claim be heard and determined.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall consist of a Chairman and two other members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall each receive a salary of $15,000 per year. At least two of such members shall be learned in the law. Each member shall take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and to discharge faithfully the duties of his office. The members shall hold office until the dissolution of the Commission as hereinafter provided. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments. Two members shall constitute a quorum, and the agreement of two members shall be necessary to any and all determinations for the transaction of the business of the Commission, and if there be a quorum, no vacancy shall impair or affect the business of the Commission, or its determinations.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall appoint a clerk and such other employees as shall be requisite to conduct the business of the Commission. All such employees shall take oath for the faithful discharge of their duties and shall be under the direction of the Commission in the performance thereof.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall meet at such times and places as it may prescribe, shall keep a full written record of all its hearings and proceedings which shall be open to public inspection, and shall have power to establish its rules of procedure.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall receive or demand against the United States aris-

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the

last few days we have been going at a ample jurisdiction, has complete juris- sion to hear the claims of those railroads

SEC. 6. The Commission shall receive claims for a period of 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, and not thereafter. The jurisdiction of the Commission over claims presented to it as provided in section 2 of this act shall be exclusive; but nothing in this act shall prevent any person who does not elect to present his claim to the Commission from pursuing any other remedy available to him. The Attorney General or his assistants shall represent the United States in all claims presented to the Commission.

SEC. 7. Any member of the Commission or any employee of the Commission, designated in writing for the purpose by the chairman, may administer oaths and examine witnesses. Any member of the Commission may require by subpena (1) the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of all necessary books, papers, documents, correspondence, and other evidence, from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing; or (2) the taking of depositions before any designated individual competent to administer oaths under the laws of the United States or of any State or Territory. In the case of a deposition, the testimony shall be reduced to writing by the individual taking the deposition or under his direction and shall be subscribed by the deponent. In taking oral testimony, opportunity shall be given for cross-examination, under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe. Witnesses subpenaed to testify or whose depositions are taken pursuant to this act, and the officers or persons taking the same, shall severally be entitled to the same fees and mileage as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

SEC. 8. The final determination of the Commission shall be in writing, shall be filed with its clerk, and shall include (1) its findings of the facts upon which its conclusions are based; (2) a statement (a) whether there are any just grounds for relief of the claimant and, if so, the amount thereof; (b) whether there are any allowable offsets, counterclaims, or other deductions, and, if so, the amount thereof; and (3) a statement of its reasons for its findings and conclusions.

SEC. 9. (a) When the final determination of the Commission has been filed with the clerk of said Commission the clerk shall give notice of the filing of such determination to the parties to the proceeding in manner and form as directed by the Commission. Such determination shall be subject to review in the same manner as is provided for cases in the Court of Claims upon application to the Supreme Court within 3 months from the date of the filing of such determination with the clerk.

SEC. 10. In each claim, after the proceedings have been finally concluded, the Commission shall promptly submit its report to Congress.

The report to Congress shall contain (1) the final determination of the Commission; (2) a transcript of the proceedings or judgment upon review, if any, with the instructions of the Supreme Court; and (3) a statement of how each Commissioner voted upon the final determination of the claim.

SEC. 11. (a) When the report of the Commission determining any claimant to be entitled to recover has been filed with Congress, such report shall have the effect of, and be paid in the same manner as is provided for, a final judgment of the Court of Claims.

The payment of any claim, after its determination in accordance with this act, shall be a full discharge of the United States of all claims and demands touching any of the matters involved in the controversy.

(b) A final determination against a claimant made and reported in accordance with this act shall forever bar any further claim or demand against the United States arising out of the matter involved in the controversy.

SEC. 12. The Commission shall determine all claims presented to it as expeditiously as possible, and shall make a report to Congress of its progress not later than the fifteenth of April of each year until its dissolution.

SEC. 13. The existence of the Commission shall terminate at the end of 2 years after the first meeting of the Commission or at such earlier time after the expiration of the 6 months' period of limitation set forth in section 6 hereof as the Commission shall have made its final report to Congress on all claims filed with it. Upon its dissolution the records of the Commission shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WALTER. No; I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] to demand the second.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin for 20 minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I shall take only a few minutes to explain this bill which is a very simple one. During the war some 103 trucking companies operating in the Midwest, principally west and south of Chicago, found themselves in difficulty because of strikes. Finding that the strikes could not be settled the Government issued an order taking over the truck lines. Due notice of that seizure was posted and the ODT sent their representatives to St. Paul and thereafter proceeded to operate the 103 lines.

The first thing done by the manager in behalf of the Government was to insist that the trucking companies pay the wages which had been in dispute and which had not been settled between the operators and the truck drivers. Thereafter, the representatives of the Government continued to manage and operate these truck lines and exercise control over them, differing in degree naturally, in the various lines.

It is the claim of the operators of the truck lines which were taken over by the Government that they were damaged by this action, by the seizure of their property, and they make demand on the Government under the due-process clause of the Constitution for the payment of damages.

This bill would simply set up a commission of three members to be appointed by the President to hear and determine the claim of the operators of these truck lines.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BRYSON. Does not the bill carry a House committee amendment reading "to determine such claims, if any there be"?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I may say to the gentleman that some amendments were suggested in the House committee including the one to which the gentleman refers.

The present motion is to pass the bill as it passed the Senate. I would have no objection to the amendment. My only thought in making the motion as I did was to pass a bill which had passed the Senate and avoid the necessity of going to conference. I believe the amendments that were made by the House committee would not substantially affect the bill one way or the other. I would be perfectly agreeable if they could be accepted by the Senate but I fear that if we go to conference the bill will not be passed.

This bill has been the subject of extended hearings in the Senate, and hearings were held by the House committee.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I judge then the gentleman's objection to any amendment is in order to facilitate passage?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct. I am moving that the bill be passed by the House as it was passed in the Senate to avoid the necessity of a conference. As I said before, I personally would have no objection to the House amendments.

Bear in mind that these truck operators will be required to submit their claims to this Commission within 6 months after the law becomes effective, that no person will be entitled to recover a dime unless he proves he was damaged and unless he proves he was damaged in accordance with the rules and decisions made many times under the due-process clause.

I think this is a very just bill and a very simple and easy way to get these claims adjudicated.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. As a matter of fact, the procedure set up in this bill is a substitute for procedure in the Court of Claims, which is cumbersome and the only remedy available to these people right now.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. The effect of this bill is to substitute the Commission for a hearing of the case by the Court of Claims.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct. It is in the interest of economy both for the claimants and for the Government. It follows a policy that was adopted by this Congress and has been used on many occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Members of the House can agree that during the last few days we have been going at a merry clip. I suppose if somebody at some time could devise a means of eliminating the last week of a congressional session or any legislative session, the country would erect a statue to him, and it really should.

I do not criticize the leadership here for the necessity of bringing a lot of these bills up with very little time for consideration. I realize the situation with which they are faced.

But here, Mr. Speaker, is a bill that we should not, if we are going to act in good conscience, consider in this manner. What we are doing in effect is passing an appropriation bill involving at least eight or nine million dollars and the possibility of an amount even in excess of that, with no check on the facts, simply on the basis of turning over to a commission of three men this matter and saying: "You decide what these people are to get, you give it to them by certifying it to the Congress, and the Congress will have no further check."

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Of course the Government can appeal any decision just like in the Court of Claims.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The Government may appeal, that is true; but as far as this Congress is concerned, what it is doing is passing a claims bill in an amount of over eight or nine million dollars. We are doing it here in a hurry without a full discussion of the contentions and the facts in the case.

What does the bill do? I am somewhat in doubt as to what the committee actually desires in view of the fact that the committee some time ago reported a Senate bill with amendments. Now, today, in order to hurry it up and get it through and spend this money, they are saying, "Well, we are going to forget about the precautions that the committee wanted to put in this legislation, we are going to take it from the Senate just as it came to us even though when we were thinking a little slower and probably using better judgment we wanted to have amendments on the bill, we wanted to make some corrections in it."

That is the evidence, Mr. Speaker, of how fast we are trying to move. The bill provides for three commissioners at a salary of $15,000 a year each, and the bill says they shall complete their functions within the next 2 years. In other words, that will be their term of office. But you and I know if they have not determined all of the issues involved in that time, it is going be another 2 or 3 years that these commissioners will continue in their jobs, and draw their salaries, with their staff, plus their expenses.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Is there any indication here that these claimants cannot have recourse to the courts of the United States?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The evidence is that the Court of Claims has ample jurisdiction, has complete jurisdiction over this matter. The proponents of the legislation were not willing to have an ordinary bill which would confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims passed, because they admit—at least some of them do to whom I have talked—that the Court of Claims has jurisdiction. That is not an issue at all as far as being a reason why a commission has to be formed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my position that that certainly is the way this should be handled. We have a court already set up to handle just such cases as this. But here we come in and bypass that court and say that we are going to create some jobs and spend more money. Why? I think the primary reason is the feeling that probably the commissioners will be a little more lenient in the rule of damage that might apply or the amount of proof required.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. Will the gentleman inform the House who are the beneficiaries of this legislation?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There are some 103 carriers, I believe it is, who, during the war, refused to comply with a directive of the War Labor Board increasing the wages of employees. In order to avert a strike the Government took over some of these carriers. There is a question of law even now as to whether the Government did come in and operate and take over all the carriers who are now making claim. I believe it is connected in the case of at least eight of them that they were taken over and operated, but may I also call the attention of the House to the fact that because the Government operated a business and that business did not make money is, in my judgment, no reason for a substantial claim against the Government in that regard. I remember sitting on the War Claims Committee when an order of the Government closed up some gold mines out West by virtue of which severe damage was done. But those people did not have a special commission set up to assess their damages. I believe that those who have a just claim are entitled to be recompensed, and I am not arguing against that at all. But they should go to the duly established courts of this country which we authorized them to do, and there prove their claims and prove their damages and obtain their awards.

I do not believe in the advisability, particularly at this time in the rush of adjournment, of pushing through and ramming through a bill involving as much money as this.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT].

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that during World War I it was necessary for the Government to seize the railroads of this country and to operate them during the entire course of the war. Immediately after the war the Congress set up a Claims Commission to hear the claims of those railroads against the Government. During World War II it was necessary for the Government to seize another segment of the great transportation system of the country; 103 over-the-road truck lines principally situated in the upper Mississippi Valley. They serve an area covering 15 States, and in most instances are the only means of transportation from town to town, especially the smaller towns. Those truck lines were seized in August 1944, under exactly the same statute that the railroads were seized during World War I.

Now, the Constitution of the United States is clear that this Government of ours cannot seize private property without providing just compensation, and that is what this bill seeks to do. It seeks to set up a Claims Commission so that that Commission may determine if any of these carriers are entitled to compensation and, if so, how much compensation.

I think I know of the interest of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] in this controversy. The fact of the matter is that there are some truck lines in the United States which the Government did not seize. As you all know, the trucking business in the United States is a young, growing, vigorous business and very competitive. I dare say that there are some truck lines in the State of Wisconsin that were not seized during the war. From that you may well conclude what the interest of the Members of the House who object to this bill really is.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVITT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Of course, the gentleman knows that extensive hearings were held on this bill in the Senate and before the House committee. Does the gentleman know whether or not the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] appeared before those committees and made known his views at that time?

Mr. DEVITT. The gentleman from Wisconsin did not appear before any of those committees. This bill passed the Senate unanimously after extensive hearings. It was unanimously reported out by the House Committee on the Judiciary. It is a fair, just, and reasonable measure.

As I understood the arguments of the gentleman from Wisconsin, they were two in number. No. 1, he said this bill makes a huge appropriation of some $8,000,000. The fact of the matter is, it does not do any such thing. If he and all of us will read the bill on page 5, section 11, we will find that the payment of these claims, if any are adjudicated by the Claims Commission, is handled in exactly the same way as claims from the Court of Claims.

The No. 2 objection he made to the bill is, why do not these 103 motor carriers go to the United States Court of Claims? I will be very happy to answer that question for the gentleman. Three years ago three of these motor carriers decided to try their cases in the Court of Claims. So they started a lawsuit in the Court of Claims, and that lawsuit has not been

decided even today. The hearing examiner has just finished taking testimony. A motion was made in the course of the hearings on one of these claims asking the court if they would not consolidate all pending cases so that they could all be heard together. The court denied that motion. So the object of setting up this commission is to avoid a multiplicity of suits.

Is it going to be necessary for these loyal Americans who had their trucking lines taken from them during the war to wait for 10, 12, or 15 years before they can have a determination in the United States Court of Claims, which is already overcrowded?

I will tell you another reason why the Court of Claims is an inadequate tribunal to hear these suits. It is because under the statute the Court of Claims has jurisdiction only over claims against the Government that sound in contract or implied contract. Many of the claims of these trucking companies are tort claims, accident claims, and the like.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DEVITT. I think most of us agree that we have been concerned in these years following the war with taking care of many claims under the Contract Settlement Act, among other things, where patriotic citizens came to the fore when an appeal was made to them. I think we should not neglect these honest, patriotic truck owners. The action of the Government in taking over these truck lines was a very precipitous proposition. They had a labor dispute in this 15-State area, and the President of the United States issued an order to the Office of Defense Transportation in which he ordered them to take over these truck lines. A Federal manager was appointed. He seized the truck lines. He operated them. He controlled their activities. He controlled their rate-making. He told them how much they had to pay their employees. These truck owners have legitimate claims against the Government as a result of that operation.

This resolution seeks to set up a commission to hear and determine these claims. It is not expedient to go to the Court of Claims. It seems to me it is a reasonable request of the Congress.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVITT. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us why a commission can review these cases and determine the damages any more expeditiously than the Court of Claims can do it, since the Court of Claims has said that each case is to be considered on its individual merits, its individual facts, which I believe is the contention of the proponents. Does not the Commission have to do the same thing?

Mr. DEVITT. No. 1 is that the docket of the Court of Claims is years behind. No. 2, that the procedure in the Court of Claims, if the gentleman is acquainted with it, is for hearing commissioners or examiners to go out all over the country and take testimony. They come in and present their findings. Those findings have to stand in line until the other business of the court is disposed of. The third reason is that the Court of Claims has no jurisdiction over tort matters.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman complains that there are certain phases of this matter that are not within the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims.

Mr. DEVITT. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yet the proponents of the legislation refuse to accept an amendment which would confer jurisdiction on the court over those phases which they do not have jurisdiction over.

Mr. DEVITT. That may be true. I have no knowledge of any amendments to the bill. I know that extensive hearings were had and that matter did not come up, although careful consideration was given.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the principal objection to this bill made by my distinguished young friend from Wisconsin is in the fact that a commission of three people is to be appointed. Let us for a moment examine the procedure in the Court of Claims. In the Court of Claims, in actions ex contractu, a hearing is fixed by a hearing examiner. He hears all of the facts. The hearing is in Washington or anywhere that witnesses are available so that they may testify. After he prepares the facts and the findings thereon, the record is submitted to the Court of Claims. Our Court of Claims has a docket which would take them 3 years to become current, even if no additional cases were added to it. In order for these people to stay in business, it is necessary that they get relief more quickly.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder, then, if it would not be more advisable for the Committee on the Judiciary to recommend the creation of another branch of the Court of Claims to clear off not only the truck cases but the other cases that you are complaining about which are pending.

Mr. WALTER. May I say to the gentleman that the Committee on the Judiciary has reported many bills for the establishment of new judgeships throughout the Unted States, and for some reason or another, probably because this is 1948, favorable action has not been taken on those bills.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The fact is that Congress adopted this policy years ago, and we can not make over the Court of Claims just to suit somebody's whim.

Mr. WALTER. Of course not.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. We provide in the bill that the Attorney General is authorized to hear these claims which cannot be heard in other places, is that correct?

Mr. WALTER. That is entirely correct. It seems to me in the long run, the Government is going to save money because after all you must bear in mind the fact that whatever claim is paid is going to be paid with interest, and if claimants must wait for years, which I am sure will elapse before the claims are finally disposed of, we are going to pay a very large sum of money in interest.

Now, there is one thing you must bear in mind: There is no intention on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary to make a finding of liability. The question of whether or not the United States is liable in each of these cases is a question of law and of fact, but there is no finding. Therefore, this cannot possibly be construed as a large claims bill, because there must first be a finding that there was a tort, an illegal taking, and after that fact has been determined, then there is the question of whether or not the taking resulted in damage.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have had a great deal of experience in condemnation cases of lands for reservoirs, dams, and so forth. Is there any difference in principle in what you propose than you have in the ordinary court, where the land owner is entitled to a speedy trial and a quick determination of the issues, and interest on the judgment?

Mr. WALTER. Oh, no. It is a well-known method of disposing of matters of this sort, and I think that in simple justice we should approve the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I do this merely to get an official declaration from the gentleman who is now presenting the bill that there is no intention on the part of the Judiciary Committee of the House to admit an illegal taking in any case.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I may say in answer to the gentleman's question that the bill contains no legislative finding. It is my own judgment, after hearing the testimony, that what was done by the Government amounted to a taking. However, I see nothing in the bill that passed the Senate which would foreclose adjudication of that question by the commissioners and by the courts.

Mr. HOBBS. And nothing that would foreclose the necessity of proving an illegal taking on the part of the Government.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. In my judgment, the gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish to say that I am not opposed to this bill. However, I feel it is my duty to say a word or two about the amendments which were adopted by the

subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which heard this bill, and which will not be in the bill if the motion which has been made by the gentleman from Iowa is finally agreed to. It was felt by some of the members of this subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee that the language of the Senate bill might amount to a legislative finding of a taking. I want the RECORD to unmistakably show that it was the unanimous desire of the subcommittee that heard this bill that there be no legislative finding that there was a taking, either legal or illegal. The claims might finally result, notwithstanding what has been said before, even if the taking were legal, because the alleged taking was under the war powers, and of course that taking could be legal.

In the Senate bill, after the word "taking," the committee has written into the bill the phrase "if any."

I repeat, I wish the record to unmistakably show that there has been no legislative finding that there was a "taking," either legal or illegal by the Government.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Under the bill as it is now before us, however, which is the bill as it came from the Senate, there is some question as to whether there has been such a legislative finding, in view of the fact that the amendment that the committee wanted to put in is not presently in the bill.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes; there was some question in the mind of the subcommittee, but I am pleased to note that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] has said that the sponsors of the bill do not consider the language to be a legislative finding that there was a taking, either legal or illegal.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the full 5 minutes, but I think the best argument against the adoption of this bill that has come to us from the Senate came from someone who said he did not oppose this bill at all—from a member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], who pointed out to you that after the House Committee on the Judiciary had held its deliberations on this bill, a majority recommended some amendments that you are not given a chance to vote on here on the floor of the House today. In their haste to get this thing through, the deliberations of the House Judiciary Committee are being disregarded. I have not heard anything said by the three gentlemen who spoke in favor of this bill here in this late evening that dissuades me from the opinion that the creation of this commission for the settling of these claims is utterly wrong in principle. Here we have a great variety of circumstances among a large number of trucking companies who have a variety of claims to present, and the only argument I have heard is this: Now we have got all these claims; the way to settle them is by a commission, so we will get it done quickly.

Every one of these cases is not going to have to be pursued in the courts. Under the usual procedure, the claimants set out to establish one or two claims, then usually the rest can be quickly disposed of.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. I wonder if the gentleman was in the Chamber when I made the statement that this procedure is exactly the same procedure that was used following World War I in the case of the railroads.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I was here and heard the gentleman make that statement. Even if that were true you cannot make one right by the duplication of a wrong; and here you have admitted that the men sent out to investigate this by the Court of Claims have now completed their work; they have filed their reports. Now you are asking this House hastily to set up a procedure that will call for a duplication of the same work.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. No. The statement was that several trucking companies had begun suit and that there was a proceeding in a few cases. They have not concluded them.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. But have there not been investigations completed and reports filed in some of those cases?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. No; the cases are still being tried.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I understood the gentleman from Minnesota to say that some reports had been completed.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct.

I wish the gentleman to understand the situation. Each one of these would be a separate suit and several have been begun. Many months have elapsed, a great deal of testimony has been taken, and nothing has been concluded.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Is it not true that each of these cases is going to have to be dealt with separately even if you do set up this high-salaried commission to hear those claims?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Very true, but the whole situation is this: That you require these people to litigate 103 cases in the Court of Claims that they must wait years for their cases to be reached on the docket, just exactly like the railroads would have had to wait, just like these Japanese claimants would have waited. So as a matter of simple justice and following a policy which was adopted years ago we have created a special commission which will have nothing to do but work on these claims until they get them disposed of, and not longer than a 2-year-limitation period.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Does the chairman of the subcommittee approve of a policy where some of these cases have been partially heard and are now pending before the court, to now set up a separate administrative agency to do the same work in those cases over again?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. No, no; the bill specifically provides that any claimant may come before this Commission or he may go before the Court of Claims and file his case there if he so desires.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. What is the attitude of the administrative agency which had this job to do during the war with respect to the setting up of this Commission? Is it not true that the ODT and the Department of Justice have opposed this proposition?

Mr. DEVITT. May I say to the gentleman that at the time the Government took over these truck lines it told the truckers they were going to be compensated. Now there are some technical objections on the part of the Department of Justice as to whether they were taken over. That is why it has been emphasized by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH]. This bill does not determine the question whether or not they have been taken over. That is something that lies within the province of this Commission.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin), there were—ayes 90, noes 28.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTS-IN-AID TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES IN PROVIDING MEDICAL CARE AND TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2861), as amended, to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman tell us something about this bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from New York that extensive hearings have been had not only by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, but also in the Senate. This is to provide hospitalization for those Filipino veterans who served in the Army of the United States during the war with Japan, those who were not only taken in by order of the President of the United States, but those guerrillas who later became a part of our armed forces under orders of the commander in chief, General MacArthur. At the present time in the three hospitals in the Philippines there are approximately 3,000 disabled Filipino veterans.

Mr. BUCK. What is the annual cost of the bill?

Mr. KEARNEY. The total cost of the bill is about $25,000,000 for the three hospitals.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman says the total cost is $25,000,000?

Mr. KEARNEY. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Why should we pay these costs for the Filipinos? They were fighting for their own independence. Why should we bear this burden?

Mr. KEARNEY. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that these veterans were duly enlisted in the Army of the United States. It is my humble opinion that we not only have a moral obligation but a legal responsibility to those veterans for the reason that they are in the same category as the veterans in our own hospitals in this country. They were soldiers of the United States armed forces, wearing our uniforms and fighting alongside our own men. They are the men of Bataan and Corregidor.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Were they a part of our own Army?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I may say that the former Governor General of the Philippines, also a former distinguished Member of this body, appeared before our committee and testified on behalf of this legislation.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is correct and the gentleman gave our committee a true and complete picture of the situation at present existing in the Philippines with particular reference to the hospital Victoria Luna. We are grateful to him for the complete and true picture as it exists today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to assist the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for veterans, as defined in section 2 of this act, who are in need of hospitalization for disabilities, determined by the Veterans' Administration under laws which it administers to be connected with the service described in such section, the President is authorized, subject to the provisions of this act, to furnish aid in the form of grants to the Republic of the Philippines (a) for the construction and equipping of hospitals in the Philippines to be used exclusively for such medical care and treatment and (b) for expenses incident to such medical care and treatment in either the hospitals so constructed and equipped or other hospitals in the Philippines.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of section 1 of this act, the term "veterans" means persons who served in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the service of the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941, including among such military forces organized guerrilla forces under commanders appointed, designated, or subsequently recognized by the Commander in Chief, Southwest Pacific Area, or other competent authority in the Army of the United States, and who were discharged or released from such service under conditions other than dishonorable.

SEC. 3. Any grant for the construction and equipping of a hospital may be made prior to or following its completion: *Provided*, That the total of such grants shall not exceed $22,500,000.

SEC. 4. Grants for expenses incident to hospitalization may be made for a period not to exceed 5 years to reimburse the Republic of the Philippines for moneys expended for such hospitalization: *Provided*, That the total of such grants shall not exceed $3,285,000 for any fiscal year.

SEC. 5. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations and impose such conditions on the receipt of financial aid as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act; and he may delegate in whole or in part the authority conferred upon him by this act to any officer or officers of the United States.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING LAND IN TENNESSEE TO THE CITY OF JOHNSON CITY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out all after line 23 over to and including line 7, page 3, and insert:

"SEC. 2. The tract of land authorized to be transferred by the first section of this act shall be used by the grantee for fair grounds and recreational purposes; and the deed of conveyance of such lands shall contain (1) the provision that all such property shall be used and maintained for the purposes for which it was conveyed for a period of not less than 20 years, and that in the event such property ceases to be used or maintained for such purposes during such period, or is alienated or an attempt is made to alienate such property during such period, all or any portion of such property shall in its then existing condition, at the option of the United States, revert to the United States; and (2) such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States. The deed shall reserve to the United States the interests in fissionable material as provided in Executive Order 9908, dated December 5, 1947: *Provided*, That Johnson City shall pay 50 percent of appraised value of its property to be determined by the Veterans' Administration."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO PRESCRIBE RATES OF PAY FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS AT FIELD INSTALLATIONS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2794) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 284), as amended (38 U. S. C. 693), is amended by adding at the end thereof a paragraph to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C. 661 and the following), or any other provision of law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to prescribe the rates of pay for the following positions at Veterans' Administration installations in the field: (1) Hospital attendant, (2) dental mechanic, (3) orthopedic mechanic, and (4) positions classified in the crafts, protective, and custodial service pursuant to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That in no case shall the range of rates prescribed for the position be lower than the range of rates prescribed for the same position by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES NAVAL TRAINING STATION, GREAT LAKES, ILL.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6958) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Surplus Property Act, 1944, as amended, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to transfer to the Navy Department without exchange of funds all of the lands at the naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill., which the Navy Department now occupies under revocable permit from the Veterans' Administration, except the portion thereof which lies between the Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railroad and Morrow Avenue, together with all improvements thereon; the specific area hereby authorized to be transferred comprising a parcel lying between the Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railroad and Sheridan Road and a parcel lying north of Morrow Avenue.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING LANDS TO THE CITY OF CHEYENNE, WYO.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5734) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo., with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. RANKIN, and Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6402) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not find myself in agreement with this measure, but under the conditions existing at the present time in regard to the confirmation of this Commission, I feel it is in the best interest of the country to adopt this measure at this time. When the Commissioners took over this project from the War Department in 1946 under the present Atomic Energy Act the primary objective was from a military standpoint. The Commission has met this obligation in its entirety. The recent tests at Eniwetok have proven that this weapon is more powerful and much cheaper than heretofore produced. The research work which has been carried on under the direction of the present Commission for the benefit of humanity is too numerous and much more extensive then I can explain to the Members of this body in the few minutes allotted to me. I have had the opportunity of visiting this operation which today is much larger than the United States Steel Corp. of America and feel that since the Commission has taken over this project that they have done an excellent job. By virtue of the imminent relationship between science and technology the problem is one of great importance to the national welfare. The future development of the physical and biological sciences will be, I hope, in the years to come for the benefit of mankind. In the meantime we must face the fact that we live in a world in which not much progress has yet been made toward achieving stable international relationship. This Commission which has been carrying on this project, in my opinion, carries a heavy responsibility to the American people and their appointments should be carried out under the terms of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. American scientists of which this Commission is composed have shown themselves to be conscientious and discreet in the case of the atomic bomb. I most emphatically say that it has been our good fortune thus far to have had such men to carry out the functions of this important operation. I maintain that the original act should be carried out in regard to these appointments to fulfill the objectives of the 1946 Atomic Energy Act.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I have the same feeling on this bill as expressed by my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. I have a further feeling that it is politically motivated, but I am constrained to go along for the same reason as outlined by my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, may I submit that those who support this bill owe the American people a straight answer to one question:

Have the members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission done a good job?

That is what matters here.

If these men have not done a good job, this House would be faithless to its trust if we voted to continue their tenure for 1 minute.

If these men have done a good job—have safeguarded the leadership in the development of this new force for man's benefit—if they have brought these things to pass, then they are not only fit to serve for the two additional years provided for in this bill, they are fit to serve the terms of variable length which the Congress in accordance with sound policy decreed should be installed in 1948. If these men have done a good job, vote down this bill, so that the wise provisions on tenure of Commissioners in the original Atomic Energy Act may apply.

I say Messrs. Lilienthal, Pike, Strauss, Waymack, and Bacher have done a good job, Mr. Speaker.

I say this out of personal knowledge gained through work as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Armed Services Committee of this House.

Let me enumerate some of the accomplishments recorded by this group of able and devoted men in the 17 months since they assumed charge of this Nation's atomic-energy program.

When they took over the project the most important element in it—the technicians and scientists whose work makes production and new discovery of principles possible—was in disrepair. Men were leaving this service; those remaining were confused and uncertain. On the testimony of the scientists themselves, oft-repeated in recent months, these Commissioners have remedied these conditions. Morale is good and growing better. The technical staff is coming up to strength.

They have set in motion a whole series of programs designed to train more technical men and more skillful technical men for future research and production work.

They have nurtured a current research program which is yielding new knowledge of great importance such as the recent first artificial production of mesons in the large cyclotron at the Radiation Laboratory in Berkeley. They have maintained and enhanced the security of physical facilities and of technical information and have disseminated unrestricted technical information to advance science and industry, as directed in the Atomic Energy Act.

They have guided an unremitting—and successful—drive to step up output of fissionable material. As a matter of fact, in furtherance of this operation there is now under way at Hanford in the State of Washington one of the largest peacetime construction programs ever undertaken by this Nation.

With complete fidelity to their charge to hold paramount the common defense and security, they have provided the means and the encouragement which have resulted in the signal advances in atomic weapons development proved out at the recent tests at Eniwetok Atoll. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I was present at one stage of these tests. In addition I have received from the Commission in executive session of the joint committee, a detailed account of the test result. I know whereof I speak.

Mr. Speaker, in this sphere of weapons development and cooperations with the military services, there are a few additional comments to be made. I have an especial interest here because of my membership on two of the committees most intimately concerned and because of my own experience in the armed forces in the last world war.

This interest of mine has led me to observe these phases of atomic energy operations very closely. I can state categorically that all the evidence is that the Commission and the military services have worked closely together with satisfactory results.

It will be recalled that section 2 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act establishes a Military Liaison Committee and provides that the Commission shall keep this committee fully informed of all matters regarding atomic energy and that the committee shall have authority to take an appeal to the Secretaries of War and Navy and finally to the President if at any time it concludes that any proposed action or failure to act on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission is "adverse to the responsibilities" of the armed services. Let me emphasize that the relationship between the Atomic Energy Commission and the armed services have been so amicable and satisfactory that not a single appeal to the President has been necessary under this provision of the act.

The attitude of the armed services is well represented by the statement of Secretary of the Army Royall when he was asked to comment on the bill introduced by Senator WHERRY to turn the atomic energy program back to the military. In this connection, it should also be noted that there have been several bills introduced from time to time to accomplish this result and that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has never seen fit to take any action on them.

My observations at Eniwetok of the field working relationships between the civilian scientists of the Commission and the men of the three services combined into Joint Task Force 7 for the conduct of the weapons tests provided the final proof that there is complete cooperation—and most fruitful cooperation—between the Commission and the military. This was evidenced further by the statements of General Hull, Captain Russell, and Dr. Froman issued at Honolulu May 18. Note the words of these men:

"(f) Any Filipino who has commenced

and a motion to reconsider was laid on

The Clerk read the Senate amend-

Lt. Gen. John E. Hull, commander, Joint Task Force 7:

It is a tribute to the scientists who were members of the task force that the operation was successful. • • • All of us have been equally impressed with the scientific competence, the technical skill, and the sound judgment of the civilian scientists and technicians assembled for these tests. Our close association has been valuable in many respects and paves the way for continuing and increasing cooperative effort to insure the common defense and security of the people of the United States.

Capt. James S. Russell, United States Navy, test director, Joint Task Force 7:

The support given to the AEC group was complete and without the assistance of military personnel in the technical phases of the operations the test program could not have been carried out.

Dr. Darol K. Froman, scientific director, Joint Task Force 7:

The spirit of cooperation which existed between the military and civilian personnel resulted in the smoothest possible operation. Throughout the whole operation there has not been a single incident which impeded any test or measurement.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Nation stand in the debt of the men comprising the Commission whose leadership has provided such striking results in so many new and strange phases of endeavor. They deserve from this Republic a better reward than is here vouchsafed in this politically motivated bill. The Nation deserves of us much better than the disservice that we would render by enacting this bill which will impede progress in atomic-energy development. Let us rise above partisan considerations; let us take the course of true service to America and speed the progress of this important work by rejecting this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In submitting any nomination to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and the qualifications of the nominee. The term of office of each member of the Commission taking office prior to June 30, 1950, shall expire at midnight on June 30, 1950. The term of office of each member of the Commission taking office after June 30, 1950, shall be 5 years, except that (A) the terms of office of the members first taking office after June 30, 1950, shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, one at the end of 1 year, one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, one at the end of 4 years, and one at the end of 5 years, after June 30, 1950; and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy, occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. Each member, except the chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum; and the Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. No member of the Commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as a member of the Commission."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 679 was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF FREE PASSES TO TIME INSPECTORS OF CERTAIN CARRIERS

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2192) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (7) of section 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "its officers, surgeons, physicians, and attorneys at law," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "its officers, time inspectors, surgeons, physicians, and attorneys at law."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAINING OF FILIPINOS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1969) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have an explanation of the provisions of this bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely perfects the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 with respect to the training of selected Filipinos—some in public health, some in engineering and highway construction, some in fisheries, coastal survey, and in other fields. The original bill authorized the training of a designated number of Filipinos ranging from 10 to 100 in each of these fields. Most of them were to be brought to this country and trained before July 1, 1948. It proved impossible to do it in so short a time. Therefore, this bill extends the time under which it can be done to July 1, 1950. It does not increase the authorization of appropriations in the original act. It allows us to spread the training over a longer period instead of being so hurried and concentrated as to prevent a good job.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. JUDD. There is no appropriation at all in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. JUDD. That was authorized under title III of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. I would have to look up the hearings to get the exact amount in each category, but this does not increase them.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The Philippine Rehabilitation appropriation was in the bill which makes appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, from the subcommittee of which I am the chairman. I assure the gentleman there is no increase in the appropriation. I cannot tell him the entire amount now because I do not have the information before me, but it does not change the situation as far as money is concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman has no idea of what the cost is?

Mr. STEFAN. The money has already been appropriated.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I know; but what is the amount?

Mr. STEFAN. The cost has already been included in the funds that have been appropriated by the House and the Senate for the rehabilitation of the Philippines.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But the gentleman does not know the amount?

Mr. STEFAN. I cannot tell the gentleman what the amount is. It just increases the number of students that are coming and going.

Mr. JUDD. May I say to the gentleman it does not increase the number; it extends the date from July 1, 1948, to July 1, 1950, so a smaller number can be trained each year, approximately 25 a year for 4 years, instead of 50 a year for 2 years. That is the essence of it. It does not increase the total number by a single person.

Mr. STEFAN. And not a cent of money more is required than has already been appropriated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 305 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows: "The Public Health Service may set up demonstrations and establish training centers in the Philippines; may establish and maintain in the Philippines a school or schools for the purpose of providing practical instruction in public health; and may, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, provide not to exceed 1 year of training in public-health methods and administration, through study at appropriate schools or colleges in the United States and supplementary field work and observation of public-health work, to not more than 90 Filipinos, to be designated by the President of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), and not to exceed 5 months of training in such methods and administration, through field work and observation of public-health work, to not more than 10 additional Filipinos, to be so designated."

SEC. 2. Section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended by adding thereto a subsection numbered (f) and reading as follows:

"(f) Any Filipino who has commenced training or instruction prior to June 30, 1950, as provided in this act, shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, be entitled, insofar as facilities are available, to receive the full course of training or instruction as prescribed by the head of the bureau or agency concerned, and funds appropriated under the authority of this act shall be available for such training or instruction. The number of trainees to be trained each year, as prescribed by the several sections of this act, refers to the number of trainees who may be designated each year by the President of the Philippines and not to the total number of trainees receiving training or instruction in any 1 year."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause on page 1 and on page 2 through line 11 and insert the following:

"That section 302 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized, under such regulations as he may adopt, to provide training for not to exceed 10 Filipino engineers, to be designated by the President of the Philippines from the regularly employed staff of the Philippine Public Works Department and the engineer officers of the armed forces of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), in the construction, maintenance, and highway traffic engineering and control necessary for the continued maintenance and for the efficient and safe operation of highway transport facilities.'

"SEC. 2. Section 305 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) To accomplish such purposes the Public Health Service shall at the earliest practicable time survey the health situation in the Philippines, and is authorized to replace, expand, or install such health services and facilities in the Philippines as are deemed essential to preservation of health, and may assist in the rehabilitation and development of a Philippine quarantine service for prevention of introduction of disease from abroad or from one island to another. The Public Health Service may set up demonstrations and establish training centers in the Philippines; may establish and maintain in the Philippines a school or schools for the purpose of providing practical instruction in public health; and may, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, provide not to exceed 1 year of training in public health methods and administration, through study at appropriate schools or colleges in the United States and supplementary field work and observation of public health work, to not more than 90 Filipinos, to be designated by the President of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), and not to exceed 5 months of training in such methods and administration, through field work and observation of public health work, to not more than 10 additional Filipinos, to be so designated. It may replace equipment and supply reasonably necessary additional equipment, utilizing for this purpose, so far as possible, surplus property, and may recommend to the Commission the repair or construction under the provisions of section 304, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, of buildings deemed essential to the rehabilitation of public health and quarantine functions.'

"SEC. 3. Section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilitation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UTE INDIANS

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2743) providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims which the Ute Indians or any tribe or band thereof may have against the United States, and for other purposes, approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209), as amended July 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 593), June 22, 1943 (57 Stat. 160), June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 255), and August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049), is hereby amended by adding to section 3 thereof the following: "The court shall, upon a determination of the material issues or upon consent of the parties, enter a separate final judgment for any value of the surface and a subsequent separate final judgment for any value of the subsurface of the land which the court may determine to be the subject matter of case No. 45585 in the United States Court of Claims entitled "Confederated Bands of Ute Indians versus United States of America." Each of the judgments shall be subject to review in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the act of February 13, 1929 (ch. 229, 43 Stat. 939), as amended by the act approved May 22, 1939 (ch. 140, 53 Stat. 752; 28 U. S. C. 288). Any value subsequently allowed by the court for the subsurface, when added to any value previously allowed by the court for the surface, shall not exceed the court's determination of the value, if any, of the land, surface, and subsurface, valued as a whole. The parties may compromise or settle in whole or part claims for any of the surface or subsurface values involved, and any settlement or compromise shall be reduced to a separate judgment. The services rendered by the attorney or attorneys in obtaining any judgment shall constitute a separate employment and undertaking involving a single set of services and the court shall award separate compensation for the services rendered in obtaining each separate judgment. Nothing in this act shall be construed to reduce or increase fees payable to counsel in accordance with their duly approved and executed contracts or to preclude their continued representation in any case until paid; nor, with respect to any judgment hereunder, shall this amendment impair or limit any claim, right, defense, or offset otherwise applicable."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPORTED FERMENTED LIQUORS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6162) to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor, with a Senate amendment, thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 9, 10, and 11, strike out "also be subject to the war excise tax prescribed in section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code" and insert "during the continuance of the war-tax rate on fermented malt liquors prescribed in section 1650, be subject to tax at such rate in lieu of the rate hereinbefore prescribed."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6800) to amend sections 3108 and 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide a permit and bond system for users of nonbeverage alcohol. It does not make any change in the net rate of tax paid by these users of nonbeverage alcohol upon withdrawal. It has the unanimous support of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3108 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended—

(a) By amending the heading thereof to read as follows: "Withdrawal of Alcohol Tax-free or at Reduced Rate."

(b) By relettering subsection (d) as "(e)" and by inserting after "tax-free" in such subsection the following: "or as provided in subsection (d)."

(c) By relettering subsection (e) as "(f)."

(d) By inserting in said section a new subsection reading as follows:

"(d) For use in production of medicines or medicinal preparations for internal use, food products, flavors, and flavoring extracts: Alcohol may be withdrawn, under regulations and upon payment of tax at the rate of $3 per proof gallon, from any industrial plant or bonded warehouse for the manufacture or production of medicines or medicinal preparations, intended for internal use, food products, flavors, or flavoring extracts, which are unfit and not intended for intoxicating beverage purposes."

SEC. 2. That section 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(m) Same: Withdrawal under permit: Any person withdrawing alcohol under the provisions of section 3108 (d) shall pay special tax as follows: $25 for such withdrawals not exceeding 25 proof gallons a year, $50 for such withdrawals not exceeding 50 proof gallons a year, and $100 for such withdrawals exceeding 50 proof gallons a year."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

LEON NIKOLAIVICH VOLKOV

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 703) for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to suspend the deportation of Leon Likolaivich Volkov for a period of 1 year from the effective date of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICIA SCHWARTZ AND BESSIE SCHWARTZ

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5716) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Bessie Schwartz, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Beatrice Schwartz, who arrived at the port of New York on May 9, 1947, and that they shall, for all purposes under the immigration laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as immigrants for permanent residence, upon the payment of the visa fee and head tax. The Secretary of State is authorized to instruct the proper control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year in which such quota is available."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Beatrice Schwartz."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 77 OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 6657, to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (b) and (f) of section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 11, sec. 205 (b)), be, and are hereby, amended to read as follows:

"(b) A plan of reorganization within the meaning of this section (1) shall include provisions modifying or altering the rights of creditors generally, or of any class of them, secured or unsecured, either through the issuance of new securities of any character or otherwise; (2) may include provisions modifying or altering the rights of stockholders generally, or of any class of them, either through the issuance of new securities of any character, or otherwise; (3) may include, for the purpose of preserving such interests of creditors and stockholders as are not otherwise provided for, provisions for the issuance to any such creditor or stockholder of options or warrants to receive, or to subscribe for, securities of the reorganized company in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as may be set forth in the plan; (4) shall provide for fixed charges (including fixed interest on funded debt, interest on unfunded debt, amortization of discount on funded debt, and rent for leased railroads) in such an amount that, after due consideration of the probable prospective earnings of the property in light of its earnings experience and all other relevant facts, there shall be adequate coverage of such fixed charges by the probable earnings available for the payment thereof; (5) shall provide adequate means for the execution of the plan, which may include the transfer of any interest in or control of all or any part of the property of the debtor to another corporation or corporations, the merger or consolidation of the debtor with another corporation or corporations, the retention of all or any part of the property by the debtor, the sale of all or any part of the property of the debtor either subject to or free from any lien at not less than a fair upset price, the distribution of all or any assets, or the proceeds derived from the sale thereof, among those having an interest therein, the satisfaction or modification of any liens, indentures, or other similar interests, the curing or waiver of defaults, the extension of maturity dates of outstanding securities, the reduction in principal and/or rate of interest and alteration of other terms of such securities, the amendment of the charter of the debtor, and/or the issuance of securities of either the debtor or any such other corporation or corporations for cash, or in exchange for existing securities, or in satisfaction of claims or rights or for other appropriate purposes; and may deal with all or any part of the property of the debtor; may reject contracts of the debtor which are executory in whole or in part, including unexpired leases; and may include any other appropriate provisions not inconsistent with this section.

"The adoption of an executory contract or unexpired lease by the trustee or trustees of a debtor shall not preclude a rejection of such contract or lease in a plan of reorganization approved hereunder, and any claim resulting from such rejection shall not have priority over any other claims against the debtor because such contract or lease had been previously adopted. The term 'securities' shall include evidences of indebtedness either secured or unsecured, bonds, stock, certificates of beneficial interest therein, certificates of beneficial interest in property, options, and warrants to receive, or to subscribe for, securities. The term 'stockholders' shall include the holders of voting-trust certificates. The term 'creditors' shall include, for all purposes of this section, all holders of claims of whatever character against the debtor or its property, whether or not such claims would otherwise constitute provable claims under this act, including the holder of a claim under a contract executory in whole or in part including an unexpired lease.

"The term 'claims' includes debts, whether liquidated or unliquidated, securities (other than stock and option warrants to subscribe to stock), liens, or other interests of whatever character. For all purposes of this section unsecured claims, which would have been entitled to priority if a receiver in equity of the property of the debtor had been appointed by a Federal court on the day of the approval of the petition, shall be entitled to such priority and the holders of such claims shall be treated as a separate class or classes of creditors. In case an executory contract or unexpired lease of property shall be rejected, or shall not have been adopted by a trustee appointed under this section, or shall have been rejected by a receiver in equity in a proceeding pending prior to the institution of a proceeding under this section, or shall be rejected by any plan, any person injured by such nonadoption or rejection shall for all purposes of this section be deemed to be a creditor of the debtor to the extent of the actual damage or injury determined in accordance with principles obtaining in equity proceedings. The provisions of section 60 of this Act shall apply to a proceeding under this section. For all purposes of this section any creditor or stockholder may act in person or by an attorney at law or by a duly authorized agent or committee subject to the provisions of subsection (p) hereof. The running of all statutes of limitation shall be suspended during the pendency of a proceeding under this section: *Provided, however*, That such plan of reorganization shall not affect the existing authority of any State or State regulatory agency relating to service, operations or rates. This proviso shall not be construed as restricting any of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Interstate Commerce Act."

"(f) Upon confirmation by the judge, the provisions of the plan and of the order of confirmation shall, subject to the right of judicial review, be binding upon the debtor, all stockholders thereof, including those who have not, as well as those who have, accepted it, and all creditors secured or unsecured, whether or not adversely affected by the plan, and whether or not their claims shall have been filed, and, if filed, whether or not approved, including creditors who have not, as well as those who have, accepted it. Upon confirmation of the plan, the debtor and any other corporation or corporations organized or to be organized for the purpose of carrying out the plan, shall have full power and authority to, and shall put into effect and carry out the plan and the orders of the judge relative thereto, under and subject to the supervision and the control of the judge, the laws of any State or the decision or order of any State authority to the contrary notwithstanding: *Provided, however*, That such plan of reorganization shall not affect the existing authority of any State or State regulatory agency relating to service, operations or rates. This proviso shall not be construed as restricting any of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Interstate Commerce Act. The property dealt with by the plan, when transferred and conveyed to the debtor or to the other corporation or corporations provided for by the plan, or when retained by the debtor pursuant to the plan, shall be free and clear of all claims of the debtor, its stockholders and creditors, and the debtor shall be discharged from its debts and liabilities, except such as may consistently with the provisions of the plan be reserved in the order confirming the plan or directing such transfer and conveyance or retention, and the judge may require the trustee or trustees appointed hereunder, the debtor, any mortgagee, the trustee of any obligation of the debtor, and all other proper and necessary parties, to make any such transfer or conveyance, and may require the debtor to join in any such transfer or conveyance made by the trustee or trustees. Upon the termination of the proceedings a final decree shall be entered discharging the trustee or trustees, and making such provisions as may be equitable, by way of injunction or otherwise, and closing the case. Upon confirmation of a plan the Commission shall, without further proceedings, grant authority for the issue of any securities, assumption of obligations, transfer of any property, sale, consolidation or merger of the debtor's property, or pooling of traffic, to the extent contemplated by the plan and not inconsistent with the provisions and purposes of the Interstate Commerce Act as now or hereafter amended. The provisions of title I and of section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, shall not apply to the issuance, sale, or exchange of any of the following securities, which securities and transactions therein shall, for the purposes of said Securities Act, be treated as if they were specifically mentioned in sections 3 and 4 of the said Securities Act, respectively: (1) All securities issued pursuant to any plan of reorganization confirmed by the judge in accordance with the provisions of this section; (2) all securities issued pursuant to such plan for the purpose of raising money for working capital and other purposes of such plan; (3) all securities issued by the debtor or by the trustee or trustees pursuant to subdivision (e), clause (3) of this section; (4) all certificates of deposit representing securities of, or claims against, the debtor, with the exception of such certificates of deposit as are issued by committees not subject to subsection (p) hereof. The provisions of subdivision (a) of section (14) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 shall not be applicable with respect to any action or matter which is within the provisions of subsection (p) hereof."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF $50 EACH TO MEMBERS OF RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5355) authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw as much as may be necessary from the fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States arising from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber within the Red Lake Reservation in Minnesota, according to the provisions of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 137), to the credit of the Red Lake Indians in Minnesota, and to make therefrom a per capita payment or distribution of $50 to each of the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of the State of Minnesota, living at the date of the passage of this act, immediately payable upon the passage of this act, under such rules and regulations as the said Secretary may prescribe: *Provided*, That the money paid to the Indians as authorized herein shall not be subject to any lien or claim of attorneys or other parties: *Provided further*, That before any payment is made hereunder, the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians in Minnesota shall, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, ratify the provisions of this act and accept same.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 5 OF LAWS RELATING TO NAVIGATION

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2186) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes", approved May 26, 1908, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 104), is amended (1) by striking out the words "yachts belonging to any regularly organized yacht club of the United States", and inserting in lieu thereof "yachts used and employed exclusively as pleasure vessels and belonging to any resident of the United States", and (2) by striking out the words "belonging to any regularly organized yacht club thereof", and inserting in lieu thereof "used and employed exclusively as pleasure vessels."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2021) authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to the extent and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Board of Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., the provisions of the act of May 27, 1930 (ch. 340, 46 Stat. 391; 18 U. S. C. 744a–h); the act of June 23, 1934 (ch. 736, 48 Stat. 1211; 18 U. S. C. 744i–n); and Executive Order 6917 dated December 11, 1934, shall apply to the industrial employment and training of prisoners convicted by general courts martial and confined in any institution under the jurisdiction of any department or agency comprising the National Military Establishment.

SEC. 2. Transfer by any department or agency comprising the National Military Establishment to Federal Prison Industries, Inc., without exchange of funds is authorized of any property or equipment suitable for use in carrying out the functions and performing the duties covered by any agreement entered into under section 1 hereof.

SEC. 3. In addition to the members of the Board of Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., authorized by section 2 of the act of June 23, 1934 (ch. 736, 48 Stat. 1211; 18 U. S. C. 744j), the President shall appoint an additional member of the Board as a representative of the Secretary of Defense. Such additional member shall serve at the will of the President and without compensation.

SEC. 4. For its own use in the industrial employment and training of prisoners and not for transfer or disposition, transfers of surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 may be made to Federal Prison Industries, Inc., without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING INTEREST OF FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT IN IDAHO

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5416) entitled "An act to promote the interest of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That those provisions of the order of the Secretary of the Interior, dated February 6, 1948, which are based on certain recommendations contained in the Report on Conditions Found to Exist on the Fort Hall Irrigation Project and the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho, dated February 26, 1941, and which are described in the said order as made pursuant to the authority contained in the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), are hereby approved pursuant to the provisions of such Act.

"Sec. 2. During such periods as water for the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project may be available in excess of the present duty

of three acre-feet per acre per annum, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion and under regulations to be prescribed by him, to permit the delivery of such excess water equally to the project lands in an amount not to exceed five-tenths acre-feet per acre per annum, in addition to the present duty of three acre-feet per acre per annum: *Provided, however,* That any surplus water temporarily available in addition to the three and five-tenths acre-feet per acre per annum may be furnished for use on project lands on terms, conditions, and rates to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 3. The Little Indian Unit containing one thousand one hundred eighty-six and thirty-three one-hundredths acres of irrigable land in townships 2 and 3 south, ranges 36 and 37 east, Boise meridian, within the boundaries of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, is hereby made a part of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project and the lands therein shall have the benefit of, and be subject to, all existing legislation applicable to said project to the same extent as other lands of like ownership and character within the project. The Indian-owned irrigable land in the unit shall be charged with its proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $5.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act. The non-Indian-owned irrigable land of the unit shall be entitled to receive only natural-flow water until a full project water right is acquired for said land through the execution by the owner of a contract, or contracts, providing for the repayment to the United States of like per-acre costs as are charged against the Indian-owned land in the unit. Said charges, as to Indian and non-Indian lands, shall be a first lien against the lands, under the Act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210).

"SEC. 4. The net irrigable area of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project is hereby established as forty-seven thousand and forty-four and sixty-three one-hundredths acres of land, more or less. This area includes the forty-six thousand eight hundred and three and seventy-two one-hundredths acres of land, more or less, shown as the irrigable area of the project by the maps and plats in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act, and the two hundred and forty and ninety-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, included in eight additional tracts of land described as follows: (a) An irregular shaped area in the northeast corner of the east half southwest quarter southeast quarter of section 36, township 5 south, range 33 east, Boise meridian, containing one and seventy one-hundredths acres; (b) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall Main Canal in the west half of section 35, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing twenty-eight and seventeen one-hundredths acres; (c) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall Main Canal in the south half of section 14, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing forty acres; (d) a portion of the northwest quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing thirty-three and forty-two one-hundredths acres; (e) Fairview Park in the east half southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter and west half southeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres; (f) the east half northeast quarter northwest quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing twenty acres; (g) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Pocatello lateral in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ninety-seven and sixty-two one-hundredths acres; and (h) the southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter of section 24, township 6 south, range 34, east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres. The above-described tracts of land, together with such lands in the portion of the village of Alameda, lying between the Pocatello lateral and the Oregon Short Line Railroad right-of-way in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, as (notwithstanding their inclusion in the irrigable acreage shown by the maps and plats hereinabove mentioned) have no water right at present, shall be entitled to receive, or to continue to receive, water through pumping operations or by gravity flow, provided the respective owners thereof, within five years from the date of the enactment of this Act, enter into contracts whereby they agree (1) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project construction costs of $18.12 per acre, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act, for such of their lands as do not now have a project water right, (2) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $15.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, for such of their lands as are not now covered by contracts for the repayment of such costs, and (3) to install, maintain, and operate, at their own expense, pumping machinery to lift the water from the project canals or laterals for the irrigation of such of their lands as cannot be supplied by gravity flow. The non-inclusion of the Fort Hall town site within the net irrigable area of the project as hereby established shall not prevent the obtaining of water rights therefor in accordance with the Act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1015, 1025).

"SEC. 5. There is excluded from the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project by the designation of the project area in section 4 of this Act the nine thousand six hundred and seventy acres of tribal, allotted, and non-Indian-owned lands located between Fort Hall and Gibson, Idaho, heretofore authorized to be included in the project by the Act of March 3, 1927 (Ch. 371, 44 Stat. 1398). The construction costs apportioned to the tribal lands so excluded are hereby canceled and the water rights are made available for project use. The water rights for the lands of the several allottees and non-Indian owners within the area so excluded shall not be impaired or affected by reason of such exclusion, but water shall be delivered only at the head of the laterals serving these lands. The respective owners of such lands may make their water rights available for project use, whereupon the construction costs assessed or assessable against their lands with respect to the water rights thus made available shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior. Allottees of lands within the excluded area, or their heirs or devisees, may donate or sell their lands to the tribe or may exchange their lands for assignments of tribal lands within the project area. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, $8,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase by the Secretary of the Interior, in the name of the United States of America in trust for the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation, of one hundred and eighty acres of non-Indian-owned land, with water rights and improvements appurtenant thereto, described as the north half southeast quarter southwest quarter section 13, township 4 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, and south half northeast quarter and north half southeast quarter section 7, township 4 south, range 35 east, Boise meridian, located within the area excluded from the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project by section 4 of this Act.

"SEC. 6. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,995 to compensate the following-named landowners, or their heirs, for work accomplished or for future work necessary in filling, leveling, and otherwise preparing for irrigation the abandoned portion of the old Fort Hall Main Canal within their holdings, in not to exceed the following amounts: Frank E. DeKay, $401; Henry Jensen, $633; Theodore H. Gathe, $654; A. E. Albert, $106; Ezra D. Wilson, $127; J. M. Bistline, $378; Ambrose H. McGuire, $424; Ellen Griffith, $412; C. M. Allen, $116; Olive A. Granden, $184; William Webster, $28; Hiram Faulkner, $114; Willamette Blakeslee, $298; Frank Parker, $99; and Henrietta C. Blakeslee, $21.

"SEC. 7. Pending the construction of a siphon to provide gravity flow water to ninety-six and six-tenths acres of irrigable lands in the southwest quarter section 27, and east half section 28, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, Idaho, which lands have been irrigated by pumping operations over a period of years, the Secretary of the Interior may accept the conveyance by the landowners of the pumping equipment for use of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project and may operate such equipment as a part of said project in order to provide water for the irrigation of such lands; the acceptance of such conveyance being subject to the owners of the lands executing releases to the United States of any and all claims whatsoever due to the pumping operations carried on by such landowners.

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to revise and reform, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine to be fair and equitable in all the circumstances affecting the interests of the United States and the contractors, existing contracts between the United States and the Idaho Irrigation District, the Progressive Irrigation District, and the Snake River Valley Irrigation District in Idaho, which contracts provide for certain payments by the districts to the United States for the benefit of works of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project.

"SEC. 9. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for refunds to Indians, or their heirs, the sum of $1,419.55, representing irrigation assessments of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project erroneously made and collected, as follows: Andrew F. Cutler, $153.80; Alice Sorrell Johns, $168.95; Nettie Stinson LaVatta, $146.62; Earl Edmund Cutler, $159.20; Charles Faulkner, $145.25; Josephine LaVatta Rumas, $155.20; May Phyllis LaVatta Brower, $29.90; Leonard I. Cutler, $135.85; Effie Diggle Houtz, $122.75; Lucy Yandell Spencer, $25; Charles Gerard Cutler, $121.53; and Hattie Sorrell Siler Tillotson, $55.50.

"SEC. 10. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the relocating, rehabilitating, cleaning, and extending of irrigation systems serving the lands irrigated from Ross Fork, Bannock, and Lincoln Creeks, which lands are outside of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, including the construction of a storage reservoir on Bannock Creek. The costs of any work benefiting Indian lands performed pursuant to this authorization shall be apportioned on a per acre basis and collected under laws applicable to Indian irrigable lands on the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project. Operation and maintenance charges against such lands shall likewise be subject to the same laws, rules, and regulations as apply to Indian lands on the Fort Hall project. Any unpaid charges against such lands shall be subject to a first lien as provided in the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210). No expenditure shall be made under this authorization which will benefit lands in non-Indian ownership unless the owners thereof execute contracts providing for the repayment of their proportionate per acre share of the costs of the work assessable against their lands.

"SEC. 11. In order to prevent the accumulation of delinquent project assessments or other charges against the non-Indian-owned lands of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause liquidation of all delinquent assessments or charges by taking such action as may be necessary, including the foreclosure of the Government's lien covering any such delinquent charges or by initiating such other procedure as may be legally available, which action may be taken by him at any time when in his judgment the best interests of the project would be served thereby.

"SEC. 12. All Act or parts of Acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
JOHN SANBORN,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

The text of the Senate amendment was designed to accomplish the same results as the provisions of the bill as it passed the House, hence the conferees adopted the language of the bill as it passed the House. It was agreed that the text of the House bill sets forth more clearly what was intended than what was contained in the Senate amendment.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
JOHN SANBORN,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROLL OF THE INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2878) to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2878) entitled "An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the census roll of the Indians of California provided therein," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
HUGH BUTLER,
ZALES N. ECTON,
J. E. MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2878) entitled "An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the census roll of the Indians of California provided for therein," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The Senate conferees in receding from its amendment restore to the bill the language which it contained when it passed the House.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
F. L. CRAWFORD,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Rudd entitled "Education for the New Social Order," notwithstanding the fact that it is two and one-quarter pages over the regular allowance in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. REGAN (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN), for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, June 17, 18, and 19, on account of illness.

THE DRAFT BILL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express the sincere hope that when the conferees bring back the draft bill that the Members of this body will be as brave as the men we expect to draft under it.

ANCHOR DAM, OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to clear up a matter in connection with the conference report on the Interior appropriation bill.

On the subject of transfer of the Owl Creek unit, Wyoming, Missouri Basin project, from phase B to phase A in the tabulation of the conference committee report, Interior Department appropriation bill, H. R. 6705, on page 8788, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, the Owl Creek unit appears under phase B, units being prepared for construction, with the amount of $200,000 approved by the conferees. It is understood that when the amount of $200,000 was inserted by the House appropriations subcommittee, the intention was to start construction of this development through initiation of work on Anchor Dam. The hearings before the House and Senate committees show that the Bureau of Reclamation has completed preliminary or preconstruction work on Anchor Dam, the major feature of the Owl Creek unit, and the $200,000, if allowed, would be used to initiate construction.

In order that the Bureau of Reclamation may have guidance with respect to the intention of the Congress in connection with the Owl Creek unit, the record should show that it is the understanding of the House that the item "Owl Creek, Wyo., $200,000—amount approved by conferees" on page 8845 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17 should appear under "Phase A, units selected for construction" rather than under "Phase B, units being prepared for construction." I feel sure that this was an oversight on the part of the efficient assistants of the conferees in making up the report and the question is raised at this time so that there may be no misunderstanding of the place this unit has in the Missouri Basin program. Inadvertently, this was not brought to the attention of the committee of which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is chairman, and I therefore desire to ask the gentleman from Iowa what position he and his committee take on this matter.

Mr. JENSEN. Since this matter has been brought to my attention, I can assure the gentleman from Wyoming that the committee will be happy to concur in the Bureau of Reclamation request to bring this project into phase A construction.

A HUNDRED THINGS YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT COMMUNISM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to call to the attention of the Members of the House the answer to the question which I have been asked frequently in the past 48 hours; that is, whether or not you can secure extra copies of this new publication of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

entitled "A Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism."

I am pleased to announce we are making arrangements to have printed 500,000 extra copies of this factual document. They will be distributed to the public through the House document room in the normal manner, which will mean that about 1,000 copies will be available to each of you. If you do not care to distribute those copies in your own districts, perhaps you can make them available to your senatorial colleagues or to Members from other States, where these handbooks are in great demand.

This handbook on communism grows out of 10 years of research by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and its able staff and gives the specific, direct answers to 100 important questions about communism, how it operates in the United States of America and what its purposes are in this Republic.

MONTANA PUMPING UNIT, MISSOURI BASIN PROJECT

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, on the subject of transfer of the Montana pumping unit, Missouri Basin project, from phase B to phase A in the tabulation of the conference committee report, Interior Department appropriation bill, H. R. 6705, on page 8845, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, the Montana pumping unit is included under phase B, units being prepared for construction. This appears to be an error and this unit should be included under phase A. The basis for this inquiry is the statement made on page 6637 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 27 in a colloquy between Mr. D'EWART of Montana and Chairman JENSEN of the House Appropriations Subcommittee. In that colloquy Chairman JENSEN stated "When we marked up the bill we meant to bring a certain portion of this money which we had approached in phase B for the Montana pumping item and also for the Lower Marias, to bring it out of phase B up into phase A, which is construction." The chairman stated then that he had conferred with other members of the committee and "we now recommend that such part of the amount allowed for these projects as may be necessary shall be available for phase A, or, in other words, construction." Since it is the understanding that the Bureau of Reclamation will follow the break-down by projects of the amounts approved by the conferees under the Missouri Basin item, it is suggested that the record should be clarified so as to transfer the item: "Montana pumping, Montana, $210,000—amount approved by conferees" from phase B to phase A.

The first subunit under the Missouri Basin pumping unit will be the N-Bar-N ranch development which will be an important pilot irrigation undertaking in this area. It is hoped that the Bureau of Reclamation will press the construction of this subunit which will have an important bearing on guiding future developments in the Missouri River Basin.

The conferees on the part of the House are to be congratulated on the excellence of their work in maintaining the major part of the results of their able and earnest efforts to advance reclamation along sound lines.

Mr. JENSEN. It is the intention of the committee that that project be advanced from phase B to phase A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I was given permission to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by the Honorable W. Calvin Wells to the Mississippi State Bar Convention.

I am advised by the Public Printer that this exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and that the cost is $301.75. Notwithstanding the cost I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

TOM LINDER, J. E. MacDONALD, AND BOB HARRIS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems strange indeed that the Department of Justice has overlooked so many Power Trust lobbyists, railroad lobbyists, and other big interest lobbyists that have infested this Capitol for the last 6 months, and indicted Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia; J. E. MacDonald, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Texas; and Robert M. Harris, a cotton farmer and merchant, for their efforts to boost the price of cotton, which the farmers sold for about 50 or 60 percent of its normal value last year.

Mr. Harris is a Louisiana planter who is also engaged in the cotton business. He is a cotton merchant; but he seems to be always on the bull side of the market; that is, he is in favor of raising the price of cotton instead of holding it down.

Now, if the time has come with a commissioner of agriculture of a southern State cannot exert his efforts to keep the buyers from beating down the price of cotton and plundering the farmers of the South of untold millions of dollars, I say we have reached a poor pass.

Why not indict some of these lobbyists who are here trying to wreck this country, or trying to ram through legislation that they know is detrimental to welfare of the American people.

Tom Linder and J. E. MacDonald are two outstanding men of the South as far as the cotton farmers of this country are concerned.

They have exerted every effort to see that the southern farmers received a fair price for their cotton, and I cannot see the justice of prosecuting them for such efforts, especially since they have been elected by the people of their respective States for that purpose.

TOM LINDER

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur in what the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi has just said about the indictment of Tom Linder in Georgia. We in South Carolina across the river from Georgia admire the great stand of Tom Linder, of Georgia, in behalf of the cotton farmers and, indeed, of the farmers of every State of the 48 States of this Union. Possibly I am wrong but it appears to me the Attorney General could find plenty of people who should be indicted without bringing charges against a man who is obligated by virtue of his election as commissioner of agriculture to fight for the rights of his people before committees of this Congress and elsewhere. I do not believe Mr. Linder has made this fight for personal gain. I believe the courts will prove this.

Tom Linder has done a good job for the farmers of the South. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that if they are going to indict anyone, why not indict some of these big monopolies, these big trusts, lobbyists for displaced persons and foreign loans here in Washington and not come down into the sovereign State of Georgia and indict the commissioner of agriculture of a great and sovereign State.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include, first, an article entitled "American Taxpayers Finance Communist Students," second, an article entitled "More on State Department Act," and, third, an article from the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. MACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Banking and Currency Committee.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes following any previous special orders for the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish again to remind the House that there is pending before the Rules Committee an extremely fine veterans' housing bill, H. R. 4488, the only bill that will really give housing to the veteran. The bill passed today does not take care of the veterans; it is not a veterans' housing bill. It is a general housing bill. They have to take their chance with everybody else. There is no priority for veterans, as I understand the bill.

In all of our discussions on the question of housing legislation there is one fundamental fact which too many of us overlook. We tend to forget the fact that the housing problem is primarily a veterans' housing problem. We are forgetting the pledges we made to our demobilized veterans that we would do something about their housing problem. The suffering caused by the present housing shortage is not equally distributed—our former GI's are bearing the brunt of it.

There is ample evidence that the average veteran family is already priced far out of the market for new homes. The high rate of home building is an excellent achievement, but let us not delude ourselves that these homes are going to our veteran constituents. They simply cannot afford them.

The general housing legislation we are considering will not improve this situation. Except for the public-housing provisions, which will conceivably prove helpful to only a small segment of veterans in the metropolitan centers, the general housing bill will merely continue a status quo in which the veteran has no real preference.

It is time for us to live up to our pledges and to pass a housing bill which will really help our veterans. I am convinced that H. R. 4488, the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, is that bill. The veterans' homestead bill has the sponsorship of the American Legion and was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is the only legislation I know of which will really give the veteran a break in the housing market.

It will give them homes at much lower cost. Through FWA grants and other features, the bill will reduce housing costs to veterans by as much as 20 percent. Unlike the general housing bill, which would give aid to the bottom 10 percent of our income groups through public housing, and to the top 10 percent through its other provisions, the veterans homestead bill is aimed squarely at the home-seeking veterans in the middle 80 percent.

It will give veterans the tools to master their housing problem through their own initiative. Through homestead associations chartered by the Veterans' Administration, veterans can go ahead in their own communities and build their homes without having to rely on the efforts of others.

It assures veterans of the necessary financing. Through loans from the Veterans' Administration and through provisions which assure the availability of an adequate supply of capital for GI loans, home-seeking veterans can be certain of low-cost financing.

It will solve the rental-housing problem which is plaguing our veterans in urban centers. Homestead associations can begin immediately to build apartment houses which will feature greatly reduced monthly rentals.

It provides the very necessary aid to GI's who need farms. By making low-cost credit available to veterans through the Federal land banks and the Farmers Home Administration, the bill will answer a crying need in our farm communities where veterans are now unable to get the necessary financing to buy a farm.

These are the compelling advantages offered to veterans by the homestead bill. Now as to legislative cost. I have heard opponents of the bill say, "The bill is all well and good, but won't its cost to the taxpayers be prohibitive?" The answer is an emphatic "No."

The great bulk of the funds made available under the Homestead bill will not be expenditures at all, but will be self-liquidating loans which will be repaid to the Government with interest. The only direct cost involved is the $200,000,000 for FWA grants for land development and public utilities, and even this cost will be spread over a number of years. I think that all of us who have helped to develop the Homestead bill can well be proud that it will accomplish so much at so little cost. It certainly seems the least we can do to help our deserving veterans solve their housing problem.

A broken pledge is a terrible thing. Let us keep faith with our veterans and give them this Homestead bill. It is the only way we can make amends for our shameful neglect of the veterans' housing problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include as a part of my remarks an editorial taken from this morning's Washington Times-Herald, which is as follows:

GOOD LUCK, CONGRESS! SEE YOU NEXT JANUARY

As this was written it was pretty nearly in the cards, that Congress will leave here in another 48 hours not to return until January 1949, so here is a sort of vital-statistics round-up on the job it has done.

A FINE RECORD

To begin with, this is the Eightieth Congress since the founding of the Republic. It came into being with the elections of November 1946, and took office on January 3, 1947, for its first session. On July 27, 1947, it recessed and went home to check with the public, returning November 17. This present session convened January 6, 1948, and closes June 19, 1948.

The Eightieth Congress has done an outstanding job, all things considered, and the taxpayers have got more than their money's worth out of it.

So this Congress has a right to its present cocky, cheerful confidence that the taxpayers will call on the Eighty-first Congress for more of the same from just about the same representation in House and Senate when it convenes here on January next.

Looking over the record in detail, we figure the main weaknesses of the Eightieth Congress about as follows:

It leaves the country without universal military training and regardless of whatever so-called draft it turns out in these last hours, this was a terrible mistake.

WEAK SIDE

We live in an age of wars and in such an age there is no substitute for a trained military manpower. A draft, as such, is only a stopgap until UMT can really polish up our fighting Reserves for instant service when needed. The Eightieth Congress laid down on that job, largely because it was intimidated by mothers, college professors, and professional pacifists. To do so was an invitation to national disaster.

The Eightieth also made a boner, we think, in not passing the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. Senator TAFT was able to get this long-range project through the Senate but the House flopped. Here's hoping the Eighty-first Congress puts it into law, and for that matter all the rest of Senator TAFT's lay-out of improvements in social security, education, and public medicine.

Taken all together, these are a program of national self-improvement that the United States of America could use and nobody we know of equals TAFT as a master at designing the laws to carry out such a program.

On the good side, the Eightieth has a really stellar record. First, as to national defense, it has put up the necessary cash by the billions for research and improvements of weapons—lands, sea, and air.

GOOD SIDE

It has forced the Army, Navy, and Air Force to work on a long overdue internal reorganization that will undoubtedly be valuable both to economy and efficiency. It has kept its head about the atom bomb, in spite of many tensions and some real mistakes, such as last year's senatorial confirmation of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Eightieth has also faithfully reorganized its own system of doing business along the lines drawn up by the Seventy-ninth Congress and has started a high-powered Commission to studying the executive branch for reorganization as well. The Commission will report to the Eighty-first Congress next January, and grest hopes are held for better government at less cost.

On taxes, the Eightieth has done about as good a job as anybody had a right to expect, having got through some cut-backs of a modest sort over the Presidential veto, as at least a token of intention, if not as a real return of the people's money to the people.

On labor, there is the Taft-Hartley law working smoothly after all and helping the unions keep out of trouble.

On foreign affairs, the Eightieth yielded to the pressure for the multibillioned ERP gamble, but at least has had the wit to form up a team of its own specialists to watchdog the Executive. Thanks for that, anyhow.

On veterans' needs it has done such a good job that it has won high praise from even Commander Ty Krum, the Times-Herald's editor of veterans' affairs, who has put in many hours of work with Speaker JOE MARTIN.

But, as of this writing, the House was past due on one piece of veterans' legislation that passed the Senate a year ago and that is the bill to provide cars for combat-disabled men of World War II so they can get out and make a decent living. There is still time for the bill to go into law and it should.

POLITICAL PROSPECTS

Considering the record, what is the political outlook for the Members of the Eightieth Congress? How is the country likely to feel about reelecting them?

Well, first it has to be noted that the Eightieth Congress has been a Republican Congress, working upstream against the stubborn, often frantic disruptions of a tail-end Democratic regime headed up by a man who was never elected to the Presidency.

Congress has done its work wonderfully well against the sniping of Mr. Truman's team and has not only won most of its battles but has kept its dignity and prestige.

Of course we could be wrong, but right now it looks like a sure thing to say that the Eighty-first Congress, like the Eightieth, will be organized by the Republican majority

and will also have the satisfaction of working with a Republican President.

Good-bye, Congress. Good luck. Hope most of you come back next January.

Mr. Speaker, if the so-called veterans' amputee car bill that has already passed the Senate does not pass the House, I shall feel that everything that is being said in the House about caring for our disabled veterans is a hollow mockery. These veterans are the combat disabled, the blind and the amputees, among the worst disabled of all of our veterans. It costs very little. The Senate in its wisdom and kindness passed it last year. There is no excuse for not passing this legislation. We have just passed a bill which I myself introduced to build a hospital in the Philippines. We have a legal and a moral obligation to do that. But I remind the House that countless billions have been sent to foreign countries, millions of dollars of automobiles have been sent to foreign countries. This bill costs only a pittance. These veterans are the boys we sent to war. There are a few Members who have been disabled as these boys have been. They know what an automobile can do as a rehabilitation measure.

Mr. Speaker, I feel so strongly about the matter that if by any chance it should not pass, I plan to tour the entire country to see that in the next session it does pass. It cannot fail.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

REDUCING THE COST OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress approaches a close, I wish to say a few words with respect to the work of the Congress in the matter of reducing the cost of government.

Inasmuch as the House has acted on all the appropriation bills, except for a final deficiency bill, I recognize that what I might say at this time will have little, if any, influence on the final record of the Congress in achieving economy. Nonetheless, I feel justified in taking this time in order that the record may be clear, at least insofar as I am personally concerned as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, on what has been accomplished and what we have failed to accomplish.

At the moment no one knows what the final figures will show as to the actual savings realized by this Congress in the various operations of the Federal Government. Indeed, a major question yet to be decided is the amount to be appropriated for the foreign-aid program. I am most hopeful that the views of the House, reducing the amount to be appropriated, will prevail over the views of the Senate, which is insisting upon the full amount.

As is true in every election, there are many factors that prompted the American people to elect this Republican Congress. One of the reasons, and I think a very compelling reason with the majority of the American people, was the fact that the Republicans gave promise of reducing the cost of Government, of eliminating the waste and the extravagance, and of placing our economy on a sound fiscal basis.

This Congress did not break that pledge. As a rough estimate, the Congress has saved approximately $6,000,000,000 in these 2 years of its existence. When one considers the difficulties that have been involved in accomplishing this saving, the determined opposition we faced from the administration, it represents a very substantial achievement. It is because of this saving that we have been able to give our people much-needed tax relief.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I fully appreciate how hard it has been to realize economy. We have had absolutely no cooperation from the executive branch of the Government. And, as has been demonstrated time and again here on the floor of the House, we have had consistent opposition by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle.

It should be borne in mind that the President did not present to the Congress his major budget requests when the Congress opened. It was not until May 26 that our committee received the final budget estimates for the Army and the Air Force, and it was not until June 1 that we received the estimates for the Navy.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have been proceeding under great handicaps in trying to accomplish a thorough job of realizing economy. I appreciate that fact. I know what our committee has been up against. While I do not for a moment detract from what has been accomplished, I wish to say that for myself I believe much more could have been accomplished.

I rise at this time to utter a word of warning, Mr. Speaker. We are rapidly approaching a crisis in Federal expenditures. As I have said on several occasions on this floor, when the various appropriation bills were before us, it is always easier to spend than to save; every proposed expenditure has a political appeal. It is perfectly evident to me, and I believe to the vast majority of the American people, that the only way to cut Government spending is to cut it. It takes political courage, but that is the kind of courage we must have if we are to maintain financial stability.

Let me emphasize this fact: If the fiscal system of the United States weakens, the whole civilized world will follow. The weakening of our financial foundation, upon which our system of free competitive enterprise rests, will do more to serve the enemies of our way of life than any weapon that could be devised. The liberty-loving people of the world are dependent upon our strength. For my part, I do not believe that we can remain strong when the Government, Federal, State, and local, eats up about 30 percent of the incomes of all Americans.

One of the major achievements of this Congress was the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. For approximately a year that Commission has been engaged in a thorough, over-all survey of all the operations of the Government. It will probably make its report when the new Congress assembles. It is a nonpartisan Commission, and it has proceeded in a nonpartisan manner.

The fact that this Commission exists and that it is composed of such outstanding men gives me some hope. It gives me hope that when the new Congress meets we will be in a position to do the kind of a job that should be done toward bringing order out of chaos in Federal operations and expenditures.

Former President Herbert Hoover is serving as Chairman of this Commission. That he and his colleagues recognize the absolute necessity of dealing realistically and thoroughly with this problem of Government expenditures and the need for complete reorganization is evidenced from the following paragraph in a letter he wrote last month concerning the work of his Commission:

That it is imperative is obvious when we consider that the number of persons at 3 years after the First World War who were receiving regular payments from the Federal Government was about 2,200,000, and 3 years after the Second World War it is about 13,400,000. The budget 3 years after the First World War was about $4,000,000,000 per annum, whereas 3 years after the Second World War it is $40,000,000,000. There are insufficient savings left in the hands of the people to repair, maintain, and improve the tools of production and distribution upon which our standard of living depends. These figures obviously indicate the necessity for important structural changes in the Government to secure the maximum efficiency and economy.

But however thorough a study this Commission may make of the subject, however sound its final report may prove to be, it will all be meaningless unless we have in Congress men and women who are determined to carry through an economy program. As I said before, we have accomplished much during this Congress; but speaking for myself, I do not believe we accomplished nearly enough.

It is my conviction that the American people earnestly desire to see our Government on a sound fiscal basis, that they earnestly desire to see the cost of government reduced, that they earnestly desire to be relieved of the burdensome taxes that have been destroying initiative and eating up our productive substance. I hope—I sincerely hope—that when the people go to the polls this November they will elect a truly economy-minded Congress and an economy-minded President.

We greatly need, both in the White House and in Congress, men and women who do not simply talk economy, then vote for an increase in this appropriation and that because it may be politically wise or expedient. We need a determined, courageous economy program. Without such a program, I fear for our national solvency.

We have made a beginning, but it is only a beginning toward restoring sanity and order in Government. I am sure the people will wholeheartedly support an all-out economy program. To such a program I stand committed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4071. An act to amend section 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 6419. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6772. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 239. An act to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; and

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to change the name of the Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 19, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1660. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 18, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Manistique Harbor, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 19, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 721); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1661. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 10, 1948, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Oswego Harbor, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 722); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1662. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 1, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., in the vicinity of Fairfield, N. C., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on November 28, 1944, and also in partial response to resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted on April 20, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 723); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1663. A letter from Charles E. Bohlen, counselor, for the Secretary of State, transmitting lists indicating the dismantling and shipping status of all plants listed for reparation in the French zone and, for all plants other than war plants for which estimates are feasible, their character and capacity, as requested under the second and third questions of House Resolution 365; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1664. A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year ending December 31, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

1665. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to settle and extinguish land claims to the public domain in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1666. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, and the Annual Report of the City of New York covering operations of foreign-trade zone No. 1 during the calendar year 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 678. Resolution authorizing the printing of the volume entitled "The Democratic Way and the Totalitarian Way" as a House document; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2401). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2402). Referred to the Union Calendar.

Mr. BENDER: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 686. Resolution providing for the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 2403). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 684. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of part No. 2 of the final majority report of the Joint Committee on Housing entitled "Statistics of Housing"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2404). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 672. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 403; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2405). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 199. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (H. Rept. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an Advocate of Overthrow of Government by Force and Violence; with amendments (Rept. No. 2406). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on relation of new functions and activities of departments and agencies; to increased civilian employment in the executive branch; without amendment (Rept. No. 2412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 580. An act relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; without amendment (Rept. 2413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota; without amendment (Rept. No. 2414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 691. Resolution authorizing the appointment of a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organizations, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission; without amendment (Rept. 2415). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2416. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2417. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 654. Resolution to provide additional funds for the conduct of the investigation continued by House Resolution 153; without amendment (Rept. No. 2420). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 213. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee, current Congress, relative to investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating and as to whether there is a necessity for a change in either the procedure or basic law; without amendment (Rept. No. 2421). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 676. Resolution to provide further expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by House Resolution 298, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 2422). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 674. Resolution providing for the further expenses of the studies and investigations conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 404, Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2423). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 655. Resolution authorizing the printing of the fifteenth report of the Commission on Fine Arts as a House document with illustrations; without amendment (Rept. No. 2424). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 675. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the Joint Committee on Housing for the purpose of concluding its business; without

amendment (Rept. No. 2425). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 646. Resolution to print the prayers offered by the Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, 1945–48; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2426). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 600. Resolution to provide for the expenses of carrying out House Resolution 595; with amendments (Rept. No. 2427). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 677. Resolution for the relief of Evelyn Richardson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2407). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 692. Resolution relative to the contested election case of Wilson versus Granger, First Congressional District of Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 2418). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 6981. A bill to improve methods of wine production, to correct inequities in the revenue law with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 6982. A bill to provide for the calling of a governors' conference by the President of the Senate; for certain changes in the rules of the Senate and House of Representatives; to authorize certain expenditures consequent thereon; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 6983. A bill to amend section 719 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to borrowed invested capital; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 6984. A bill extending the time to file claims for refund of income taxes paid on certain compensation received for military or naval service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POTTER (by request):

H. R. 6985. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative decisions declaring forfeit veterans' benefits; to the committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 6986. A bill to provide that certain mortages and loans shall not be eligible for insurance or guaranty under the National Housing Act or the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 unless a warranty is provided against structural and other defects in construction of the dwelling involved; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. R. 6987. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 6988. A bill to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6989. A bill to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 6990. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees' overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. J. Res. 432. Joint resolution providing for an investigation of the effect of certain conventions and treaties between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and the Dominion of Canada relating to the protection and preservation of certain species of migratory birds, waterfowl, and game mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 434. Joint resolution to suspend the operation of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940 in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. Res. 691. Resolution authorizing the appointment of a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 693. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6958; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 694. Resolution providing for the further expenses for conducting the study and inspection authorized by House Resolution 120 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6991. A bill for the relief of Hampton Institute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6992. A bill for the relief of the estate of James J. Barnett, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6993. A bill for the relief of Leonid Zankowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6994. A bill for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6995. A bill to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 6996. A bill for the relief of the Montana Engineering & Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 6997. A bill for the relief of Ferd Owen, Berdie Owen, Gilbert Good, Lela Owen Good, Audie Owen, Wayne Owen, Art Owen, Has Owen, Marvin Owen, and Gene Owen, doing business as Owen Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6998. A bill for the relief of Janos and Marianne Mero Somogyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2112. By Mr. SABATH: Memorial of the City Council of the City of Chicago, memorializing Congress to provide appropriations for the operation of air-traffic control towers by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in cities throughout the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2113. By the SPEAKER: Petition of New York Teachers Chapter, American Veterans Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2114. By Mr. BUCK: Petition of Dr. and Mrs. Frank E. Becker, containing 1,215 signatures, including those of 223 residents of Staten Island, N. Y., urging the appropriation by the Congress of sufficient funds for the education and general rehabilitation of the Navajo Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 15, 1948)

(Continuation of Senate proceedings of Friday, June 18, 1948, from 1:45 a. m. on Saturday, June 19, 1948.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, some months ago, while I was absent because of illness in my family, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] took occasion not only to attack me personally at that time but also to attack the conduct of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Tonight I hold in my hand a statement made last evening during the temporary absence of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, in 1933, when the Democrats came into office, the record shows they did not confirm one single postmaster. The record shows further that President Hoover made a personal appeal to President Roosevelt for the single purpose of getting even Walter Newton, his former secretary——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to make the point that the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will please be seated so we can hear the speech by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Even the desperate personal appeal of former President Hoover merely to have one single Democrat, Walter Newton, confirmed as judge was denied.

Mr. President, in contrast, I want to show the fine and splendid cooperative attitude of the Republican Party. I have here in my hand the nominations that were on the calendar for June 15. Postmasters were confirmed for the States of Connecticut, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Vermont, and Virginia. In addition to that, two were confirmed in Iowa.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wanted to ask the Senator about the State of Washington.

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest the Senator from North Dakota retain the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Likewise, on the next day, the 16th day of June, postmasters were reported and confirmed in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is doing the best he can. This is a very important speech.

Mr. LANGER. The postmasters were also reported and confirmed in the States of Minnesota, Mississippi, Vermont, and Virginia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Again, Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I reluctantly make the point of order that the Senate is not in order. We should have order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois suggest that the galleries be cleared?

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President; I do not suggest that. The people are here to see a good show.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the point of order is not well taken, because the show cannot go on if the Senate is not in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from North Dakota has enumerated every State in the Union except the State of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is coming to that. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, so long as I am in this chair as acting majority leader, I shall insist that the rules of the Senate be enforced. I know that the Chair is seeking to enforce them. There are other rules which we can put into effect if we do not have order on the floor of the Senate. Simply because we may not agree with the tactics being used, we should not be ourselves guilty of violating the rules of the Senate. I shall cooperate with the Chair in maintaining order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from North Dakota yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He can yield only for a question, under the rules. We must follow the rules. However, the Chair will continue to recognize the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LANGER. I do not yield for anything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will entertain no more parliamentary inquiries. The Senator will proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during my absence from the Chamber yesterday the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] made what I consider to be an attack upon the distinguished junior Senator from the State of Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. Upon that occasion he introduced various resolutions to discharge the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from the consideration of various post office nominations. In order that it may be clear in the minds of the Senators upon the floor, I wish to read what transpired:

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question respecting a number of postmaster nominations, in view of the fact that many postmasters have been confirmed tonight. It is my understanding that some 38 or 40 postmaster nominations in Illinois have been approved by the Civil Service Committee, and I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is present and can tell me why those postmasters do not appear on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from North Dakota is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that my colleague from Illinois has objected to these postmasters, and he is present. I should like to know whether that is true or not.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I may say to my colleague that I know nothing about the nominations of postmasters that are not on the calendar. I was asked if I approved them and I said I did not know who they were. I do not know who they are and to that extent I have not approved them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I want to submit resolutions respecting each and every one of these postmasters. The purpose of the resolution is to discharge the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from further consideration of the nominations of the postmasters to whom I refer. The first one is Monroe A. Lawson of Clay City, Ill. Mr. Lawson is a disabled marine veteran of World War II, having been wounded on Saipan.

He was the only applicant for the office and the only eligible certified by the Civil Service Commission from an open competitive examination.

He has served as acting postmaster since October 1946, and is unanimously endorsed by the Clay City Chamber of Commerce, and was recommended by the Republican Congressman from that district.

Personally, the Senator from Illinois does not know whether this gentleman is a Democrat or a Republican, and it would not make any difference, because he is a veteran, and is No. 1 on the eligible list, and the only one on the list.

"He is a veteran." I want my distinguished colleagues to remember those words of the Senator from Illinois—"He is a veteran."

Mr. President, why that individual cannot be confirmed by the Senate of the United States at this session will be a little difficult for me to understand, and it will be a little difficult for many people in Illinois to understand—people who will know more about it as time goes by.

I submit the resolution, and ask that it lie over for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be filed and will lie over for the day.

Mr. LUCAS. The second nomination is that of Charles H. McGough, to be postmaster at Secor, Ill. Mr. McGough was the first man on the eligible register established by the Civil Service Commission as the result of an open competitive examination.

He is a disabled veteran of World War II, and is now serving as acting postmaster.

Some other individual is serving as acting postmaster while this disabled veteran of World War II, who was the first man on the eligible list, waits for his commission because of someone here in the United States Senate who refuses to approve him or who refuses to report out his nomination.

I may say to every Senator upon the floor that every nomination that has been approved by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been reported with the exception of a man from Wyoming and one from the State of Illinois. To the others there was some objection by some Senator. In accordance with the rule laid down by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, if any Senator objects, the nomination is not reported. Four from the State of Wyoming were objected to by the distinguished Senator from that State [Mr. ROBERTSON], on grounds that were satisfactory to himself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

The Senator from Illinois continued:

Mr. President, to me this is indefensible and it is unbelievable that an Illinois boy who went out to fight for his country, and is disabled, and is No. 1 on the list, should not be confirmed.

I want Senators to remember that statement also.

There is nothing that anyone can do about it under the law. He must be ultimately accepted, whether anyone likes it or not, because under the law no one can be chosen over him. I do not know what his politics are, but I know that he is a disabled veteran, and I know that he is waiting for this job, and that he cannot get it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Chair's pardon.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield if the Senator from Nebraska wants to ask me a question.

Mr. WHERRY. How does the Senator know that the nomination in question will not be reported from the committee?

Mr. LUCAS. I hope it will.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the Senator really begging the question?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not begging the question very much because unless the nomination is reported from the committee within 48 hours he will not be confirmed. There would not be any action in this matter if it were not for the fact that the Senator from Illinois has taken the floor and proceeded to take the action he is now taking.

Mr. WHERRY. The chairman of the committee is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. I have asked the chairman about this.

Mr. WHERRY. The chairman has done quite well in the matter of reporting nominations,

and the Senate has confirmed every nomination which has been placed on the Executive Calendar, with the exception of one, during the executive session today

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is something of a record. Only one nomination on the calendar has been put over today. I have taken the position that when the Senate acted on the Executive Calendar all nominations on the calendar should be confirmed.

Mr. LUCAS. I have tried to get these nominations on the Executive Calendar. Obviously they cannot be confirmed until that is done.

Mr. WHERRY. I am satisfied that if the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service were present he could give the Senator satisfactory answers respecting these postmasters.

Mr. LUCAS. He cannot give me satisfactory answers respecting the individuals I have mentioned, because there is nothing that can be done about these postmasters except confirm them or turn them down.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I cannot answer the Senator respecting the postmasters in question, but I will say there is a meeting of the committee scheduled for tomorrow morning, when nominations for postmasters will be considered, and I hope these nominations may be reported then.

Mr. LUCAS. Recently I called the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], a member of the committee, on the phone and he told me that some 33 nominations for postmasters had been reported favorably by the committee, that there was no objection to them, and since that time nominations from one State after another have been placed on the Executive Calendar, but the Illinois postmasters are not on the calendar, and time is running out in this Congress. Action must be taken quickly if the nominations are to be confirmed before the session is ended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There are three nominations of postmasters from Illinois on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; there are three from Illinois. This is somewhat of an anomaly. I went before the committee and appealed to the committee to have the three postmasters from Illinois placed on the calendar, and the committee voted practically unanimously to place them on the calendar while I was there; and, lo and behold, they are now on the Executive Calendar. The reason I appeared was because some slight objection had been raised to these three. Lo and behold, they are on the calendar. But these other postmasters, to whom there is no objection, have not been placed on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps if the Senator went before the committee again he would succeed in having them placed on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought they would be placed on the calendar in view of the favorable report by the Committee on Civil Service. I had every reason to believe they would be on the Executive Calendar as a result of favorable action by that committee.

Then all these pending nominations were named in the RECORD, the nomination and the name of the town. I refer to the fact that the distinguished Senator from Illinois referred to his colleague and blamed him because these nominations were not upon the calendar. I wish to take exclusive, total blame, as chairman of the committee, because these nominations have not been reported to the Senate.

A resolution passed by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service provides that where both Senators from a State agree, unless there is some objection on the part of someone, either in the files or otherwise, a nomination must be reported.

Mr. President, as I said before, all the other nominations from every other State except Wyoming and these from Illinois were reported, and I want the RECORD to be clear, I want it to be indelibly clear, as to why they were not reported.

Some months ago the Senate passed a resolution directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to make a full and complete investigation of the entire matter as to how the civil-service law relating to postmasters had been carried out and was being carried out at the time. I made that investigation, and the report is practically ready.

During the course of the investigation being made by my staff, I for a time was absent. Lately I have been going over the report. My going over the report is why I did not report these Illinois nominations.

When the civil-service law was passed the distinguished Senator from Wyoming gave the most eloquent speech upon this floor. He said that the civil-service law was passed to take post offices out of politics, that that was the prime reason for passing it.

I do not think the distinguished Senator from Illinois will deny that his brother is a postmaster. I do not think he will deny that his brother's brother-in-law is a postmaster. So, Mr. President, in this investigation, I wanted to find out whether there was dirty politics in the State of Illinois in the matter of these post offices or whether there was not.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is making my family——

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator spoke in my absence last night.

Mr. LUCAS. I am going to speak some more, too, when the time comes.

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield now.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will yield sooner or later.

Mr. LANGER. I am giving the record.

Mr. LUCAS. I will answer the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator will have every chance in the world when I finish, to answer this record, answer the cold-blooded record if he can, show how veterans were discriminated against in the State of Illinois by the——

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator ought to talk about the cold-blooded record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The Senators will be in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, here it is. Here is the cold, cold, cold record. I do not blame the distinguished Senator for getting excited. I do not blame him at all.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. First of all I want to say that in this entire investigation——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for anything.

Mr. LUCAS. Cannot a Senator raise a question of personal privilege?

Mr. LANGER. I do not yield for anything at all.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to stand here and have my family and the State of Illinois defamed by innuendo and not be allowed to answer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will suspend for a moment while the Chair discusses the matter with the Parliamentarian. [After a brief interval.] There is no rule in the Senate rules or in the precedents of the Senate that would permit the Senator from North Dakota to be taken off his feet on the basis of a question of personal privilege. The only reason for a Senator being taken off his feet is that he has, in violation of the rules of the Senate, referred offensively to a State or to a Member of the United States Senate.

Mr. LANGER. That I have not done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Or impugned the motives of a Senator.

Mr. LANGER. That I have not done.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair's ruling is that the Senator has not transgressed those two narrow rules of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well; if the Senator refuses to yield——

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I will answer at the proper time.

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield further. I have the floor, and I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I said a parliamentary inquiry. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is not in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I make a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is not in order at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To make a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is not in order to make a point of order without the yielding by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Chair rule that the Senator from Washington is not in order to make a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. What have we come to if a Senator cannot make a point of order

in the Senate of the United States? Can a Senator go on and on and a point of order cannot be made regardless of what happens in the Senate? That is the strangest ruling I have ever heard of.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To make the RECORD clear, I make a point of order, and I want the Chair to rule in declining to entertain the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is not in order. The latest precedent on the subject in the Senate, when the matter was fully discussed and the precedent was handed down, which was in line with other precedents of the Senate, was on the 27th day of July 1947.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and make a point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling on the 27th of July 1947 was based on rule XIX of the Senate headed "Debate," reading as follows——

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, on what page does that rule appear?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On page 23 of the Standing Rules of the Senate Manual.

1. When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not procede until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him. No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer; and no Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same day without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate.

Based on that rule and the precedents of the Senate the decision of the Presiding Officer of the Senate on the 27th of July 1947 was that interruption could not be made for a point of order. That was the ruling of the Chair based on the rules of the Senate and the precedents of the Senate.

Of course the ruling of the Chair is subject to an appeal, if the Senator desires to take an appeal, and when the Senator from North Dakota has surrendered the floor the question would again be subject to discussion and appeal could be taken perhaps at that time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I rose to a point of order. I rose in all sincerity because I thought by the ruling of the Chair made just prior to my rising that the Chair suggested that a point of order might lie when any Senator might in some way, by innuendo or otherwise, cast reflection upon a State or upon a Senator. I thought the Senator from North Dakota did cast a reflection upon the State of Illinois and the senior Senator from Illinois. I rose to a point of order. I should like to discuss that matter, but if the Chair will not allow me to make my point of order I must reluctantly, although I do not like to do so, appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is endeavoring impartially to preside over the Senate at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair's ruling is based on the rules of the Senate, on the advice of the Parliamentarian, and on the precedents of the Senate. The Chair is not endeavoring to cut off any Senator from any right he has under the rules of the Senate, but whoever the occupant of the chair is, it is his obligation, at least as the present occupant of the chair sees it, to enforce the rules of the Senate as they are, and as the precedents have determined them to be.

The Chair refers to rule XIX again, which provides as follows:

2. No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

3. No Senator in debate shall refer offensively to any State of the Union.

4. If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall sit down, and not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate.

The last paragraph refers to the two preceding paragraphs relating to imputing to another Senator any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator, or referring offensively to any State of the Union and it is on that basis that the Presiding Officer has made his ruling.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, do I have a right to propound a parliamentary question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled that the Senator does not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Chair rule that I have no right to propound a parliamentary inquiry at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled, based on the rules of the Senate and the precedents of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled that until the Senator from North Dakota has yielded the floor, or unless the Senator from North Dakota gives permission by yielding, a point of order cannot be made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, then the Chair rules that a point of order is not in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order is not in order, and the Senator is out of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for me to read Rule XX of the United States Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield to anyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield, and the Chair respectfully suggests that we proceed in order, and permit the Senator from North Dakota to proceed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what I am trying to do—proceed in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I decline to yield for any purpose in any way, shape, form, or manner.

Mr. President, during the course of investigating these Illinois post offices, and there is a very large number of them in Illinois—I was very often in communication with the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. In view of what was said upon the floor last evening by the senior Senator from Illinois it is going to take me a little time to make my statement. I want to make it unmistakably clear not only to the people of the State of Illinois, but to the people of the entire United States of America, that from no other Senator in this body, so far as veterans are concerned, and particularly disabled veterans, has the Senator from North Dakota received more cooperation and finer help than from the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois. Time and time and time again the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois has asked me to be certain that no veteran, particularly a disabled war veteran, should in any manner whatsoever be discriminated against. The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois warned me, Mr. President, because of the fact that the debate had some months ago showed that in connection with a postoffice in another State there were three candidates, one of whom was a civilian, and two were disabled war veterans. Examination for postmaster was not called for for a long while, although both of the disabled war veterans wanted to take an examination. The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois said to me, "I want you to be certain that that sort of thing does not transpire, not only in my own State of Illinois, but anywhere in the entire country."

So, Mr. President, with the help of the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, I as chairman of the committee have taken exceptional care, and I instructed the entire staff of the committee to be certain that no veteran should possibly be discriminated against.

I believe I can readily understand why the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] was so solicitous with respect to even the most humble veteran in the State of Illinois. It is because the junior Senator from Illinois himself is one of the most distinguished and outstanding veterans of World War I. The brother of the distinguished Senator was killed in the service. He himself was wounded time and again, and decorated with almost every medal and every ribbon that this great country could give him in that war. I can understand his solicitude, because he had been across the water. He had seen the boys over there making sacrifices and undergoing suffering. He saw them in hunger, and in time of want. He saw them offering up their very lives for the United States of America. I say that the distinguished Senator from Illinois can be proud, as I believe every Senator, and the citizens of the great, fine State of Illinois, can be proud, of the record

that this distinguished Senator made

ness report, with a notation "See memo

could obviously apply to someone in the

duly licensed to practice under the laws of

sent him for execution, and where he had

that time it was promised us, or rather

that this distinguished Senator made upon the fields of battle.

I have here every single one of the nominations which I myself held up, and for which I myself take full and complete responsibility. Every single one of these, as anyone can see who cares to look at them, was approved. They were not held up, but were approved by the junior Senator from Illinois. I said to him then, "After making an investigation I may not report them right away." His answer was, "If you, as chairman of the committee, have any objection to a single one of those nominees as a result of your investigation, I want you to know that the people of Illinois do not want a postmaster in any town in the United States who does not meet the qualifications set up by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service." That is the fine cooperation which I have had, Mr. President.

What did the examination in Illinois show? Let us take the town of Cullom, Ill. It is because of what I found in this examination, and the examination in another town which I shall name in just a moment, that on my own responsibility I held up these nominations until I could make a fuller investigation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, what does the examination at Cullom, Ill., show? An examination for third-class postmaster at Cullom, Ill., was held on February 15, 1941, and produced the following eligibles: Jerome W. Kiley, 80.63; Henry E. Altig, 76.25. Then came the veteran we heard so much about last evening. The record shows that he was preferred. He had 75. Under the civil-service rules, when a veteran is within a point and a half, the Civil Service Commission looks into the case very carefully. What took place here? The Post Office Department, for some reason—I will let Senators judge what that reason was—wanted to appoint Henry E. Altig.

The experience of the nominee, Henry E. Altig is as follows: Education, eighth grade graduate. Business experience: 1904 to 1914, odd jobs and farm laborer; 1914 to 1916, store clerk and post-office clerk; 1916 to 1921, farming; from the 22d day of June to the 23d day of April next, oil truck driver; from 1927 to 1933 he operated his own dray line. Senators can imagine what a great businessman he was and how competent he was, when they find in the report that the dray line consisted of one horse and one wagon. From 1933 to 1941 he was maintenance patrolman. On the 19th day of June he was a laborer in the county on AAA.

Now we come to the rating. I want Senators to remember that under the resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Illinois last night he wants the committee discharged from further consideration of the nomination. What does the report show? The rating officer and reviewing officer concurred in a rating of 75 on experience, but later graded 80 on a new experience and fitness report, with a notation "See memo by L. A. Moyer August 5, 1941, R. M. R."

Mr. President, a very significant thing happened. Our committee wanted to get those files, and we could not get them. They refused to give them to us. We sent for them, sent a man to get the files for the committee, but we could not get them.

Then what happened? The record shows further that Mr. Altig received a rating of 72.5 on a written examination, giving him an average rating of 73.75, a 5-point upgrading, which changed his average rating to 76.25. I have here the original sheets.

But it was not enough to grade up Mr. Altig. I state the simple fact that he is a brother-in-law of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. He was rated up 5 points, and a veteran was rated down 10 points. That is the record; here it is.

I want to find out whether among the 38 nominations in Illinois there are cases of other veterans who were marked down and other persons who were marked up—persons who possibly had a little influence.

Mr. President, I may not be chairman of this committee very long; but so long as I am chairman of the committee, it is going to be honestly run, let the chips fall where they may, let me make enemies where I may. The committee is going to be honestly run, and run in an open and aboveboard fashion. When we find the Department refusing to give the record to a properly constituted committee of the Senate of United States, the question arises, whom are they trying to protect? Why were they covering up?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from North Dakota——

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for any purpose whatsoever.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise again to a question of personal privilege. The Senator from North Dakota asked whom were they trying to cover up or protect; and the Senator cannot refer to anyone except the Senator from Illinois in that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I cannot stand here and take these innuendoes much longer. If I do not get some protection from someone, I shall take the matter in my own hands.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is perfectly welcome to do so any time he wishes.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I have the floor, and I wish to proceed quietly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota will suspend while the Chair makes a statement.

In the opinion of the Chair, the statement made by the Senator from North Dakota was not a transgression on either of the two rules which heretofore have been mentioned, for violation of which a Senator can be taken off the floor.

The remark as to who might be responsible for the matter referred to could obviously apply to someone in the Post Office Department or anywhere else in the Government.

For that reason, it is the opinion of the Chair that the remark made by the Senator from North Dakota does not violate either of the two rules referred to.

The Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I come now to another post office. I repeat, that in order to take care of Mr. Altig, after the examination had been taken and after the papers had been marked, Mr. Altig was marked up five points, and a veteran was marked down 10 points; and that action was based—it was the only thing on which they could base it—on business experience. After the veteran was first ranked up, he was later lowered 10 points.

Now we come to another post office. This is the post office in the town of Abingdon, Ill. The postmaster is J. Wilcy Lucas, I believe his name is.

Mr. LUCAS. His name is J. Wiley Lucas.

Mr. LANGER. Very well; J. Wiley Lucas.

In this case an examination for postmaster, second-class office, was held in December 1944. There being no eligible, a second examination was held in March 1946. Only one eligible was secured, the acting postmaster, with a rating of 81.70, including 10 points for being a veteran's widow. She was appointed in that town—which was not Abingdon; but in Abingdon an examination for postmaster, second-class office, was held in August 1945. That examination produced one eligible. The candidate, Mr. J. Wiley Lucas, made a grade of 51.25 on the written test, and he was originally rated 85.21 on experience and suitability, which gave him an average of 68.23—not enough for eligibility. He was later rerated upward by reviewing officers to 89.2 percent on experience and suitability, thus making him eligible with an average of 70.23. Of course, 70 was required to pass.

He was then nominated, and subsequently was confirmed by the Senate. You see, Mr. President, when one eligible failed, no examination was called, although the rules and regulations provide that in such case an examination shall be called. This man failed. But instead of calling a new examination, they rated him upward, so that they could qualify him. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that that was in 1945, about the time when the veterans were coming home.

I have another case in Illinois. This is from the town of Sutter, Ill. On the 3d day of March, at Sutter, Mr. Melvin W. Shrader received from the Post Office Department a letter signed by Mr. J. M. Donaldson, First Assistant Postmaster General, and now the Postmaster General. The letter is as follows:

MARCH 3, 1947.

DEAR MR. SHRADER: Your name has been certified as eligible for appointment as postmaster, and your appointment is now under consideration. Before any further action can be taken, it will be necessary that the inclosed medical certificate, Form 2413, be executed by any doctor of medicine who is duly licensed to practice under the laws of the several States, the District of Columbia, or the Territories or possessions of the United States. When completed, it should be returned to this Bureau for submission to the Civil Service Commission.

Please give this matter your prompt attention and see that the necessary form is properly executed and returned to this Bureau at the earliest practicable date. Further consideration cannot be given your appointment until your medical certificate is approved.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. DONALDSON.

On March 26, 1947, he received another letter, from the office of the Postmaster General, as follows:

MR. MELVIN W. SHRADER,
Sutter, Ill.

DEAR MR. SHRADER: It is a pleasure to notify you of your appointment as postmaster of the above-named fourth-class office. You are without authority to enter upon your new duties until your commission has been issued. This will be done when you have had the enclosed bond and oath of office properly executed and returned to the First Assistant Postmaster General. The enclosed Form 905, oath of office, must be executed by the person you appoint your assistant, after you receive your commission. This form should be carefully filed in your office.

I congratulate you—

Mr. President, this letter was from the Postmaster General, Robert Hannegan, to Mr. Shrader—

upon your appointment. It of course carries with it not only an opportunity for public service, but an obligation to adhere strictly and faithfully to the postal laws and regulations of the Department.

ROBERT HANNEGAN,
Postmaster General.

On March 20 he received another letter. This is from J. L. Bridwell, superintendent of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Government Service Bureau, 1616 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. It reads:

DEAR MR. SHRADER: Your appointment as postmaster has come to our attention and we take this opportunity to congratulate you and wish you a long and a successful career.

On April 29, 1947, he received another letter. This is from Mr. Donaldson, then First Assistant Postmaster General:

Please disregard this Bureau's letter of April 26, 1947, informing you that you had been appointed postmaster at Sutter, as the Department wishes to make a selection from a more complete register of eligibles. The Civil Service Commission has been requested to hold another open competitive examination for postmaster.

You see, Mr. President, Mr. Shrader was a Republican. After he had been appointed, after he had been congratulated by the Post Office Department, and after he had been wished a long term of service at Sutter, Ill., this Republican could not take office. They fired him even before he could qualify. Of course, he took the matter up with his Congressman.

I hold in my hand a letter which I am going to read. Why is it important? I call attention to the time J. Wiley Lucas was raised from 68 and a fraction up to 70.23 so he could qualify. There was no talk then of having an examination so there would be three eligibles. What do we find here, when a Republican had been appointed, where a bond had been sent him for execution, and where he had been congratulated by the Post Office Department? The letter is from the Congressman:

This is in reply to your letter of recent date regarding the shoddy treatment of Mr. Melvin W. Shrader. I took this matter up immediately with members of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee—that is, the Republican members—and they informed me it would not hurt, neither would it help, for me to go down and make a fight on this case.

It would not help him any.

However, I did go down to the Post Office Department yesterday afternoon and spent some time with Mr. Uttley, who is executive assistant to Mr. J. M. Donaldson, First Assistant Postmaster General.

Parenthetically, I may say Mr. Donaldson at present is Postmaster General.

The answer given me was, under the law—

I refer your mind back, Mr. President, to Mr. Uttley, now.

The answer given me was that under the law appointments may be made from any of the first three certified by the Civil Service Commission, that in event there are not three qualified, the Postmaster General may name the appointee even though there be but one or two that qualified, unless someone raises the point and demands that there must be three certified. Mr. Shrader, stood first, Mrs. Lemons, second, in this case. Then an unusual thing happened. My recommendation of Mr. Shrader had been received. Someone in the office failed to check my recommendation for party affiliation.

But, Mr. President, in 1938 we were told if Congress would only pass the Civil Service Act——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator from North Dakota would grant unanimous consent to permit the naming of conferees, with the understanding that he would not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I regret I cannot do that. I am sorry.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is, would the Senator yield on the condition that he might proceed immediately thereafter? It would only take one sentence to name the conferees. The Senator could then proceed.

Mr. LANGER. I very, very much regret that I cannot yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we can not hear. If the Senators would speak a little louder, we would appreciate it. We are interested in the proceedings of the Senate as well as Members on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator declines to grant the consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declined to grant the consent.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as I was saying a moment ago, when the civil service law involving postmasters was passed, the most eloquent speech, according to the RECORD at least—I was not here at that time—certainly the most eloquent speech according to the RECORD was delivered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. O'MAHONEY). The Senator, before becoming United States Senator from Wyoming, had been First Assistant Postmaster General. At that time it was promised us, or rather promised to the people of the country, that if the Congress would pass the civil service law and place postmasters under it, it would take the postmasters out of politics.

Mr. President, if you read the speech by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming you will observe that he covered paragraph after paragraph in his statement to show what it would mean to the Post Office Department if only postmasters were taken out of politics, and if the Post Office, the largest business in the world, were only taken out of politics. In 1938 the civil service law was passed. Yet we have States today where the investigation shows that not a single Republican was appointed. I can cite a town where three men were high on the list, so certified by the Civil Service Commission. They were all three Republicans. Not one of the three was appointed. Another examination was called for. The three high men again were Republicans. No one of the three was appointed.

Finally, among the three eligibles there was one Democrat. That Democrat was appointed.

As I say, Mr. President, I speak only from the record. I want to make it clear that when the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] moved to discharge the committee last evening, making the statements which he did, saying by innuendo that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was discriminating against veterans, there were some other Illinois post offices to which I wanted to refer. But I shall not discuss them tonight. I may discuss them later, because I gather from what the distinguished Senator from Illinois said tonight that he might have something to say when I have concluded. So I shall save those post offices until later.

I want to take up the matter of the draft law. I wonder whether the Members of the Senate really comprehend the feeling of the people of the United States with regard to the measure which we are discussing.

I have here, out of thousands of letters I have received, certain ones from my home State of North Dakota. I want to show the Senate how church after church has written me protesting the passage of the bill. Here is a letter from the Northern District Conference of the General Conference of the Mennonite Church of North America, dated June 9, 1947. That was only a week ago, plus a year, Mr. President, during all this time the attitude of the General Conference of the Mennonite Church of North America has not changed. The letter is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: At the recent session of the Northern District Conference of Mennonites, comprising the more than 5,000 members of some 30 churches in South Dakota, North Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Montana, it was unanimously resolved to make known to the congressional delegations from these respective States that we are definitely opposed to the plan of peacetime military conscription as recommended by the President's special commission on this subject.

It seems to us that this is so utterly foreign to what we in this country have always

felt was our greatest weapon, namely a righteous course in international affairs. It would seem now that we will leave this glorious heritage and substitute for it a policy which will be based on might of arms. Countries which have rested largely on force to maintain themselves in the family of nations have usually fallen while we have prospered. It is our feeling that if our country follows a basically Christian course in the family of nations with emphasis upon fair play, equal opportunity, and righteousness, it will not be necessary to follow in the footsteps of the nations that we so recently destroyed because they followed a course based on selfishness and force.

We trust that you may do what you can to keep our country from this threat to real freedom.

Very sincerely,

WILLARD K. CLASSEN,
President of the Conference.
HENRY M. HARDER,
Secretary of the Conference.

Mr. President, I have some other letters here. Here is one from a Methodist church. It was written on May 20, 1947, on the letterhead of the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church, Chicago, Ill. The letter says:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The universal training proposals must not pass. I am convinced that the American people are opposed to the adoption of peace-time compulsory military training, even when labeled "universal training." We find a deepening conviction that universal military training legislation should not be adopted.

The Methodist Church officially is solidly opposed to the adoption of any form of peacetime compulsory military training, as evidenced by the official actions of various Methodist bodies. The Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church—

Just listen to this, Mr. President—

The Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, with only one abstaining vote among the 33 active bishops—

Thirty-two to one, Mr. President—

adopted a strong and impressive statement in opposition to any form of such universal training. The commission on world peace reaffirmed its opposition at its last meeting. The annual conferences have become most outspoken in opposition. Quite recently the board of education of the Methodist Church, embracing the university and college division, and also the Division of Religious Education, took an incisive and forceful stand in opposition to any form of universal military training. The National Conference of the Methodist Youth Fellowship took action at its last meeting, reaffirming its former opposition, as did the Woman's Division of Christian Service.

All of the above agencies are officially elected by the church, and contain a cross section of all viewpoints.

Let us see who the members of this commission are and whence they come. I will not give the names—well, I might as well read them, to show the outstanding character of these persons.

The members of the commission are: Rev. Earle A. Baker, Cedar Falls, Iowa; Bishop Robert N. Brooks, New Orleans, La.; Rev. Lawrence C. Campbell, Meade, Kans.; Rev. George W. Carter, New Orleans, La.; Rev. Mark Depp, Winston-Salem, N. C.; Miss Georgia Harkness, Evanston, Ill.; Rev. John W. Haywood, Atlanta, Ga.; Rev. Edmund Heinsohn, Austin, Tex.; Mr. Harry N. Holmes, Jackson Heights, N. Y.; Mr. Tracey K. Jones, Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. G. Ray Jordan, Atlanta, Ga.; Bishop William C. Martin, Topeka, Kans.; Mrs. James McGiffin, San Francisco, Calif.; Isaac Morris, Birmingham, Ala.; Rev. William F. Quillian, Atlanta, Ga.; Mr. George S. Register, Bismarck, N. Dak.; Mr. Frank D. Stitz, Dayton, Ohio; Rev. Ralph W. Sockman, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Willard E. Stanton, Moscow, Idaho; Mr. Robert C. Tatum, Beaumont, Tex.; Rev. Ernest F. Tittle, Evanston, Ill.; Rev. Paul Worley, Johnson City, Tenn.; and Mrs. Frank L. Wright, Webster Grove, Mo. There are 33 of them, most of them Methodist Bishops, and the vote against the bill was 32 to 1.

The last sentence of the letter is:

Universal military training proposals should be decisively defeated. Assuring you of our full support in every effort to defeat universal military training proposals, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. BOSS, JR.,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. President, military training might be justifiable in certain cases. I wish to call the attention of all the Members of the Senate—there are so many of them sitting here before me [laughter]—to some of the votes they cast on the amendments proposed to the bill.

Before I do that I wish to make one statement. If there be any Senator who in the very, very, very back part of his cerebellum believes that the rule should be changed which permits even one Senator to give his viewpoint, I call to that Senator's attention the fact, if he wishes to change the rules of the Senate, about which we have heard much tonight, to think of our projecting ourselves 50 years from tonight, and if we then had here in the Senate a reverse condition, where an equal number of Senators wanted to pass a law such as is the law in Sweden today, providing that, in addition to taxes, there should be capital levy of 10 percent, every last Senator disagreeing with the capital levy of 10 percent would be exercising the privilege, under the rules, I am exercising tonight. They would not be in any hurry to adjourn, they would not be criticising the rule. They would be here trying to keep the majority of the Senate from passing a law to levy a capital tax to take 10 percent of what a man has, as is done in Sweden today.

So, Mr. President, I am not at all concerned when some Senators tonight say, "We have a lot of business to do. We are in a hurry to get it done", because what does the La Follette-Monroney Act say, the law which this body adopted only a year and a half ago? Does that say anything about adjourning on the 19th day of June? No, Mr. President, we could run on for over a month yet and still be acting in accord with the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act.

If there be any criticism because some of us may choose to talk, I very respectfully and humbly say that the criticism is not to be directed against any of us who may care to talk, but rather to the leadership which says we are going to quit on the 19th day of June. Mr. President, if you hired a man and paid him to work for you and paid him $15,000 a year, how long would you keep it up if the man quit work on the 19th day of June? [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries must maintain order. Under the rules of the Senate no demonstrations of approval or disapproval are in order. Unless the occupants of the galleries maintain order, the Chair will have to have the galleries cleared.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I go back to the amendments which were proposed to the bill. I offered an amendment, first, providing that in the case of contracts with our Government, the men who made the contracts should not make a greater profit than 10 percent on the capital invested. Is not 10 percent enough? At the time I offered that amendment I showed that in the manufacture of boilers and some other articles the war profiteers made a profit of 2,491 percent. For every dollar they made before the war, during the war they made $2,491.

When I tried to limit the profit to 10 percent, I said, "Oh, well, $249 is enough for every dollar that is invested," but I could not even get a yea-and-nay vote.

The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] offered an amendment to this very bill—and this time we got a record vote, and I am going to take great satisfaction in reading that vote upon the floor of the Senate as the years go by, when some Senator very piously rises and says that somebody is making too much money in war profits. Eleven Senators—I remember the number—voted to tax war profits 100 percent, 11 Senators voted for the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas. Senators are perfectly willing to draft the last drop of blood out of the body of a young boy 19 or 20 or 21 years old, but, oh, we must not tax profits. Let them go ahead and make 2,491 percent. In the list I read, Mr. President, time after time it appeared that there were profits of as much as 500 percent, 600 percent, 700 percent, and there were some profits of over 1,000 percent. Yet, Mr. President, that amendment was defeated. I think every taxpayer in the United States has the right to know that that amendment was defeated, and who voted for it and who voted against it.

One of the great things we treasure in this democratic country of ours is that what we do here is an open book. For example, a few years ago, when the Senate confirmed a nominee or failed to confirm a nominee, action was taken on the nominee in executive session. That practice was changed because the people wanted to know which Senators voted for confirmation and which Senators voted against confirmation.

Mr. President, I want to speak of churches, church organizations, and the very fine men who are at the head of them, bishops, clergymen, who are opposed to the bill almost unanimously. I have in my hand a letter from Rev. J. F. Simpson, President, Dakota Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, which comprises the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming. His letter to me is dated April 6, 1948, and is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: We appreciate the great task which is yours in bringing before

Congress proper recommendations concerning the Selective Draft during this time of world peril.

Am sure you will agree with me when I say that our Nation has a great moral and spiritual problem and unless it is solved we will not be able to successfully wage another war.

The ranks of the Ministry have been depleted for years to come because of the loss of our young men during the recent war.

Our church had a conference of all its general and Conference leaders last week in Marion, Ind., and considered the above question seriously and took official action requesting our Congressmen to give serious consideration for the exemption of young men from Military service who are preparing for the Ministry, also unordained ministers.

Our church and other churches were loyal in releasing key men for the work of chaplains during the recent war. This has caused a serious shortage of pastors.

We will appreciate your influence and efforts to be used in securing proper exemptions for theological students, so that the Church and Nation can continue to have spiritual leadership.

Yet, Mr. President, when in the House the effort was made to exempt doctors and dentists, a terrible fight resulted. I have received letters from such men as the head of one of the leading clinics of North Dakota, with headquarters at Grand Forks, N. Dak., protesting the inclusion in the original draft bill of doctors. I also have received letters on the subject from some of the leading dentists in our State. I have letters from other churchmen.

I have one from Mr. Gordon W. Hewes of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of the University of North Dakota, located at Grand Forks. I will say that the University of North Dakota, located at Grand Forks, is one of the great institutions of the country. Seventy-two miles south of it is the State College of North Dakota, formerly known as the Agricultural College. Those two institutions, Mr. President, have done a marvelous job not only for the United States but for the entire world.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I would rather not yield at this time. I might do so a little later.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I prefer not to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator prefers not to yield.

Mr. LANGER. In the State college there is a man named E. F. Ladd, who is connected with the Pure Food Commission. That man found, for example, that if one bought a can of stuff there was no way of knowing what was inside of it. For example, in a can of apricots there might be found some fluid which was entirely foreign to apricots. So Mr. Ladd obtained the passage in our State of a law requiring the labeling of all cans containing food and other products so that the purchaser could tell to the tiniest fraction all the components of whatever was contained in the can. Those who opposed the law took the case all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States, claiming the law was unconstitutional. Mr. Ladd made so fine a record in the development of paint that if a man in Michigan now buys paint, he will find on the outside of the can of paint a label giving the exact description of the contents. That is due to the efforts of E. F. Ladd.

Mr. President, he was such a distinguished man in his field that when the League of Nations met, officials of the League insisted that Mr. Ladd, of that school at Fargo, N. Dak., be one of the technical advisers, and later they selected him to draw up all the pure food regulations which they were going to place in effect in all the countries which belonged to the League of Nations.

What kind of men has the University of North Dakota, located at Grand Forks, of which Mr. Hewes is head of the department of sociology and anthropology, sent out to help America? In World War I when there was a scandal in the buying of millions of dollars worth of material for the Navy, President Wilson looked all over the United States and finally picked John Hancock, from a little town called Amarado, which perhaps at the outside at that time had 150 inhabitants, and he placed Mr. Hancock in charge of the buying of $2,000,000,000 worth of property for the Navy. He did such a good job that the Army also appointed him to do the same work, and he did buying for the Army. He is one of the few men who today holds rank in both the Army and the Navy of the United States. Today he is a partner of Lehman Bros. of New York, and one of the great advisers of Barney Baruch, the man who acted as adviser to those engaged in the development of atomic energy. Mr. Hancock is a graduate of the University of North Dakota.

President Roosevelt closed the banks and declared a bank holiday, and overnight every single bank in the country was closed except the Bank of North Dakota. I wonder why that bank remained open, of all the other banks in the United States. It was at that time decided that a man was needed who could take care of the closed banks without a scandal arising in connection with his work. So Mr. J. F. T. O'Conner of Grand Forks, where the State university is located, was chosen by President Roosevelt to be comptroller of the currency. I well remember when I was in Detroit talking to some of the officials of the Ford organization. They said they had $164,000,000 in one bank that was closed, and they said that Mr. O'Conner had operated that bank so well that there was not even the slightest claim of any wrong or fraud or corruption in connection with it. He is a graduate of the University of North Dakota.

Mr. President, if today one of the Members of this body should become ill and go to Rochester, Minn., to the Mayo Brothers Clinic, and if after he had been there for weeks and no one knew what was wrong with him, the final, ultimate decision, would rest with a doctor born on a farm in North Dakota, a graduate of the University of North Dakota.

Certainly people who live in Chicago have heard of the Murphy Hospital. A young farm boy born 7 miles east of Casselton, at a town called Mapleton, went to Chicago. After going to the university he became a doctor. He performed the first operation for appendicitis, and is the inventor of the Murphy button, which doctors use all over the country when they perform operations for appendicitis. It has been responsible for saving thousands of lives.

What does the head of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology have to say? His letter is dated March 29, 1948, and reads as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Grand Forks, March 29, 1948.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been told that you have already more or less gone on record against UMT and revival of selective service. This is merely to help you hold fast to this position in the face of the overwhelming force of war hysteria and jingoism that now seems to engulf the country. Frankly, before coming to North Dakota, I had been frequently puzzled by the vague political reports I had heard about this State and its curious progressive-conservative approach to many problems—local, national, and international. Having lived here for 2 years, and having worked and traveled about in various parts of the State, I am beginning to understand the reasons for the political behavior of this State, and of your actions in representing it.

When I lived in California, and when I lived in Washington, D. C., and in Philadelphia, I had assumed that the reason for the so-called isolationism of North Dakota (along with certain other predominantly rural midwestern States) stemmed from what I assumed to be rural ignorance and inability of people in this remote area to perceive the relationships between national and international affairs which more favorably situated urban populations (on the Atlantic coast, e. g.) realized. I now know that the relative immunity of these people to hysterical propaganda is based on intelligence and a kind of realism which is often lacking in urban, industrial areas. Perhaps it simply comes from an occupation which permits the individual to think something out, reasonably and quietly, free from the incessant bombardment of headlines, slogans, and appeals to the emotions.

I was very impressed recently, here in Grand Forks, by two large meetings, one at which several ministers and a physicist (Dr. D. Q. Posin of Fargo), spoke on the menace of a future war to all civilization, and the other a meeting on this campus, to debate UMT-selective service. The questions from the floor were so reasonable, the interchange of opinion so sane, compared to the ranting of the radio commentators and so-called analysts, who predict war in 24 hours every night.

I am also very distressed by the way in which religion has somehow intruded in a big way into discussions of our foreign policy and international problems. If we must fight the Soviet Union because their state is not Christian, why not, just as reasonably, advocate war against the Arab nations, which are certainly, and have been for some 1,400 years, far more diligently anti-Christian than the Russians. To inject religion into a political, economic, and possibly military issue seems to me to place international relations back 400 or more years, when the nations of Europe were engaged in almost incessant wars, in the name of Christian faith.

Finally, you might be amused to learn that the Catechetical Guild of St. Paul, Minn., in a recently published comic-book presentation entitled "Is This Tomorrow" (or some

such title), purporting to show the way in which the Communists would take over America, contains an unflattering reference to the State of North Dakota. The booklet, distributed widely on newsstands, selling for 10 cents, uses the simplified, appeal-to-the-emotions-of-a-child approach, showing communist troopers (wearing United States Army uniforms) at work, etc. In one strip, civilians are shown being herded pell-mell into a line of cattle cars by United States Army troops (somehow taken over by the Reds). One victim says, as he is manhandled into a cattle car:

"They're taking us to North Dakota."

"Yes, to work on a dam for 5 years," says another.

This childish form of propaganda has had a wide distribution. I suppose it is necessary to make North Dakota the equivalent of Yakutsk or Kamchatka, in telling Americans what is in store for us if we do not go right down the line with the Administration's anticommunist drive.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON W. HEWES,
Department of Sociology and Anthropology.

Mr. President, I want to take up some other letters which I have received from North Dakota, so that the Senate may judge just exactly what kind of people are opposed to universal military training. Here is a letter from the president of a State college in North Dakota, the State Normal and Industrial College at Ellendale, N. Dak., which is only a short distance north of the State of South Dakota. The letter is written by J. C. McMillan, president of the college. He says:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: We at the State Normal and Industrial College note with no little concern the continued insistence of the President and some military pressure groups, that compulsory military training legislation be enacted at this session of Congress. What arguments they have presented have been shown to be faulty, irrelevant, inaccurate, or downright misrepresentations, yet they are continually on the radio and in the press.

Dr. McMillan, who signed this letter as president of the State Normal and Industrial College at Ellendale, N. Dak., at the time he wrote the letter, on March 11, 1948, did not realize that the Marshall Plan and universal military training went hand in hand. If he had known about it, if he had known that the New York Tribune, the New York Times, Fortune, News Week, Time Magazine, Life and some radio stations were going to get $10,000,000 out of the Marshall Plan, perhaps he would not have wondered, because he says, "Yet they are continually on the radio and in the press."

President McMillan continues:

The proponents of C. M. T., in other words, are making themselves heard. The opponents are not. That puts a lot of pressure on you men in Washington.

This letter is written you from the faculty council of the State Normal and Industrial College to assure you that the faculty of this college is 100 percent diametrically opposed to compulsory military training and just as strongly in favor of a powerful Army, Navy, and Air Force. We are vitally interested in C. M. T. and will be glad to assist you in any way we can to keep it off the statutes. Let's not surrender to the system our forefathers came to these shore to avoid.

Yours very truly,

J. C. MCMILLAN,
President, Chairman, Faculty Council.

Mr. President, it does not worry me to keep the Senate up at night. It will do Senators good.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield merely for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator decines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. The soldier boys who are going to be drafted if this bill becomes law, as their brothers did a few months ago, will spend days, weeks, and months away from home.

Mr. President, in some countries when a man is elected to be judge, he is put in jail before he is allowed to serve as judge; and sometimes he is kept in jail a week, or sometimes a month, so that he can actually experience what it means to be in jail, before he sentences someone to go there. A letter I read a short time ago suggests that it might be a good idea for the Senators who favor a draft law to draft themselves for a short time and have the actual experience.

Mr. President, it is only a few months ago that I received from the president of one of the North Dakota colleges a pamphlet, which had been sent to that college, stating that in Knoxville, Tenn., a universal military training college had been in operation for 18 months; and that pamphlet, which actually was sent to students at that college in North Dakota, contained statements trying to persuade the students of that North Dakota college to leave there and go to the universal military college at Knoxville, Tenn.

Mr. President, as perhaps you know, I believe in taking direct action; and because we have authority in our committee to investigate personnel, I subpenaed before our Civil Service Committee the men who were in charge of that school or college in Tennessee. Lo and behold, they not only appeared before the committee, but they admitted that they had sent out 5,000 of those pamphlets every week; and they were only similar to other pamphlets which were gotten out in other parts of the United States—pamphlets advocating universal military training.

They admitted that they had been doing that for 18 months. They admitted that the War Department had established this college; and they admitted that they had had one graduating class of 600, and that 6 months later they had had another graduating class of 600, and that in a few days after they were testifying they would have another graduating class of 600—or a total, Mr. President, of 1,800 graduates of a universal military training college, and yet here in the Senate we had not passed a law providing for such a college.

I tried to find out who was responsible. The answer was always the same: Dwight Eisenhower had issued an order directing that the college be established. Testimony to that effect was taken under oath, and transcripts of the testimony are in the files of our committee.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from the Federated Church of Grand Forks, N. Dak. I shall read the third paragraph of the letter:

• • •

DEAR SENATOR LANGER:

I hope that you will maintain opposition to the move toward the restoring of Selective Service as well as continue your opposition to universal military training.

Cordially yours,

HUBERT N. DUKES.

He is a minister of the Gospel.

Mr. President, I wish to read other letters from churches.

I now hold in my hand a letter from the pastor of the Methodist Church at Forest River, N. Dak., the Rev. George G. Finlay. He writes the letter from 1030 Plum Ave., Grand Forks, N. Dak. His letter reads in part as follows:

MARCH 24, 1948.

DEAR SENATOR: We have been considerably perturbed here by a press release of last evening in the Grand Forks Herald concerning a meeting of Senator GURNEY'S committee on the armed services. It was indicated that the committee is presently overwhelmingly in favor of a "limited" draft and of universal military training. Such action seems to me a complete reversal of a traditional American policy, which has been cherished as a safeguard of a democratic attitude and way of life. To reverse a policy so well grounded in reason and history is not a matter of light moment nor for the counsel of hysteria. Can the Senate not provide full and open hearings on this matter before taking decisive action?

Later in the letter he says:

The Farmer's Union and the Grange have both strongly opposed universal military training. My own church, the Methodist Church, has opposed it. Several Roman Catholic bishops have registered their opposition.

Mr. President, I now hold in my hand a letter from the president of the North Dakota Farmer's Union. The letter, which is dated March 22, 1948, reads as follows:

March 22, 1948.

During my attendance at the annual stockholders meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange in St. Paul last week, I listened to the President's address delivered in person to the joint session of Congress. Since that time I have carefully analyzed the text of his address as it was carried in the press. To say that I was shocked at Mr. Truman's interpretation of national emergency and his proposals for action by the Congress is putting it mildly indeed.

We completely disapprove President Truman's interpretation of national emergency and oppose both proposals for universal military training and re-enactment of Selective Service. We are for both rehabilitation and emergency aid for Europe, but we are firmly persuaded that such aid as may be made available by the Congress should be administered through the United Nations and not by unilateral action.

I congratulate you upon your Senate vote on this question. Our blind stampede down the road toward world war III must, in some way, be halted. It is our judgment that the United Nations organization still provides the only basis of hope for world peace. Russia, through her intemperate use of the veto and the United States through by-passing UN with unilateral action, as witness the Greek-Turkish program and the proposed Marshall plan, and our reversal of positions already taken, as witness the question of Palestine partition, has already done much to scuttle the United Nations organization.

We urge you to take every possible opportunity to insist that our Nation use its

strength, resources and influence to lead the world towards a strong United Nations and universal disarmament.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
GLENN J. TALBOTT, *President.*

When a large fine farm organization like that is calling upon one of the two Senators of the State, saying "We urge you to do everything you practically can; when the churches of every denomination in the State state that they are opposed to the bill now under consideration in the Senate, and when, as I shall later read, veterans of World War II are opposed to universal military training, asking me as 1 of the 96 Senators to do everything I possibly can to prevent enactment of the bill, then of course I, as their representative here, naturally will comply with their request to present to every member of this body the fact that the churches of North Dakota and the large farm organization of that State want me to so inform each of the Senators on the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield. I regret I cannot yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Naturally those groups want to have their views known to those sitting upon the floor of the Senate tonight.

Mr. President, I have here a letter from a man who was formerly one of the officers of the Farmers Union of South Dakota, the State president. I believe the Farmers Union of South Dakota perhaps has the second largest group of members in that section of the country, being second only to North Dakota.

Jerome H. Evanson, President of the Jamestown Farmers Union Federal Credit Union, a man who used to reside in South Dakota sent me on January 30, 1948, the following resolution:

At the annual members' meeting of the Jamestown Farmers Union Federal Credit Union, composed of 300 members, held January 30, 1948, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the military is becoming more and more influential in governmental affairs, thereby tending to dominate the civilian life of this country; and

"Whereas we feel that the adoption of peacetime military conscription, would extend that power, and endanger the basic rights of free American citizens: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we vigorously oppose House Resolution 4278, and that we mail a copy of this resolution to our Congressmen, Senators, and chairman of the House and Senate Military Affairs Committee."

JEROME H. EVANSON,
President, Jamestown Farmers Union, Federal Credit Union.

Mr. President, when the head of an organization like that says he is opposed to the measure, and when he says that the 300 members of his organization are likewise opposed to it, I reserve the right to take the judgment of those 300 men against the judgment of two honest men who may be representing the interests of another State, who may yet be mistaken. I feel that a Senator ought to take into consideration the wishes, the feelings, the judgment of the people of the State he represents. Here we have the State president of the Farmers Union, the State president of the credit union making their position known. "Ah!" somebody may say, "they merely sat down at Jamestown and wrote some letters." But, Mr. President, I have here a telegram dated March 20, sent to me from Bowbells, N. Dak., away up in the northwest corner of the State, near Canada, reading as follows:

At a meeting of Farmers Union Local No. 315 sixty members last night voted unanimously to oppose universal military training.

WILLIAM BUTZKREIT,
Secretary.

Sixty farmers meet, 60 taxpayers, and they say to me as their Senator, "We are opposed to universal military training."

In my opinion not one person in a thousand recognizes and knows what the Marshall plan and all these other programs have cost their respective localities. I went to the Congressional Library and said, "I want you to estimate for me what the indebtedness will be for every county in my State." We have a county called Cass. My recollection now is that Cass County's share is $20,000,000. There are some counties that I have clearly in mind, and some cities like Towner, N. Dak., with a population of 1,500, whose share is over $436,000. Wabek's share, as I now recollect, is over $1,200,000.

Tomorrow, Mr. President, I shall put in the RECORD exactly what it has cost every county in my State, and what it will cost them, together with what it will cost some of the leading towns.

Here is a letter, Mr. President, from the Episcopal Church in North Dakota. It comes from St. Matthew's Church, Linton, N. Dak., and from Christ Church, Mandan, N. Dak. It is written jointly to the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and myself. I read:

DEAR SIRS: Greetings! To Senator BILL, whom I know personally; and Senator YOUNG whose recent questionnaire to sample people's ideas on public questions I greatly admire.

Mr. President, what was that questionnaire which the junior Senator from North Dakota, prepared and sent out to approximatey 40,000 voters in our State? If there be any Senator upon the floor who thinks that the people are in favor of universal military training, they should see the reports which were returned by the farmers, the laboring men, the small-business men, and the lawyers of North Dakota.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter from Eldred D. Murdoch, Vicar, 205 Sixth Avenue, Northwest, Mandan, N. Dak., printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINTON, N. DAK., *March 17, 1948.*

Senators LANGER and YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: Greetings! To Senator Bill, whom I know personally; and Senator YOUNG whose recent questionnaire to sample peoples' ideas on public questions, I greatly admire.

I write to urge you men to consider carefully the implications behind this proposed universal military training. I am simply appalled by it.

History teaches that every country that resorted to it has failed, gone down sooner or later into defeat, corruption, or lost.

Every country that has taken it on has done so to be prepared so as to have peace, yet it has always been the nation with zeal and no preparation that has vanquished the one with all the guns.

The instigators of this universal training program know that when Laddie is off in a camp pa and ma buy bonds, and get more patriotic and will then back a war. Without son in the camp no politician would dare vote war, but with ma and pa full of pride he would be doing his duty and what was expected of him.

Appropriate a million, since there is endless sums, and send a hundred thousand mothers to live in or near any Army camp in U. S. A.—have her there Saturday afternoon and evening. Have her knit in the waiting room of a prophylactic station and watch the beardless kids come in until time for her to go to church Sunday a. m. and she would change her mind about how necessary it was to have preparedness. Have her take cookies to the venereal disease wards of the hospitals, have her there at the officer's club to hear the stars—after the radio broadcast is shut off, and to count the empty fifth bottles on the hundred tables and watch the "trained" "invigorated" youth go to the officer's quarters. We could send dad to the Orient and have him see our boys in those places and see the liquor ships hove into port ahead of the milk ship, or even ammunition ship.

Before you vote on any such thing talk to the kids in the colleges, the boys that were there. Talk to the Greeks who have visited Greece since the war, talk to any missionary from China, investigate this thing.

Dr. Fosen of the American Council talked in Bismarck not long ago. He made us feel that all the armies in the world will be of little use comes the next war. It might be an idea to have him address a group of your colleagues. It was really something.

In closing let me say that this seems quite an upset letter, I am upset. I have admired both you men and been proud that neither of you has been led around by party bigwigs or by pressure groups. I know you are investigating this thing too, but I do want you to know that there are some who are terribly against universal military training • • • and this Marshall Plan (if it can be used as a dollar club to make Europeans do what we want them to do politically).

Sincerely,

ELDRED D. MURDOCK,
Vicar.

Mr. LANGER. So we have the Methodist Chuch, the Mennonite Church, the Baptist Church, and the Episcopal Church, who are opposed to universal military training. Now we shall see who else complains.

Mr. President, right across the river from North Dakota is Concordia College, a great Scandinavian school, located at Moorhead, Minn., across the river from Fargo, the largest town in our State. I shall read the first few sentences of the letter:

Peacetime military conscription is contrary to basic American tradition. Years ago Daniel Webster considered it a mockery to speak of conscription in a free country.

Oh, how times have changed! If Daniel Webster were here now he would be called a radical.

In view of this fact, the burden of proof clearly rests on those who would change this long-established tradition.

For your consideration, we respectfully raise the following points:

This letter is from W. E. Lillo, chairman, faculty committee on military conscription. Surely, Mr. President, the Senate will not take the judgment of the military men who make their living out of being in the Army, and say that all these church people of every denomination are wrong, that the members of the faculties of various colleges are mistaken, that the heads of the farm organizations are wrong. The other Senators upon the floor may do so if they want to, but the Senator from North Dakota will not follow them. In the long run, I have found in my experience that usually church people can be pretty much depended upon.

Mr. President, I was talking to the late President Roosevelt one day. I said to the President, "Who really formulated social security? Who really came to you and talked to you about the care of the blind, the physically handicapped, the deaf, the dumb, the crippled? Who helped to figure it out?" He told me that it was a Catholic priest in the city of Washington, Father O'Hara. He said, "He has been of great value in helping to formulate it." He said, "You can always depend upon churchmen. They are not looking for money, honors, or glory. They are out to help the common, ordinary man in the rank and file of this life."

Later on I had the pleasure of meeting Father O'Hara. To my surprise, I found he had been in every State in the United States. He has worked, after he became a priest, 7 weeks in the harvest fields of North Dakota. I found that he had gone West, out into the fruit country in Idaho, over at Wenatchee, picking apples in the State of Washington. He came back here after that trip and helped to write the social security laws of the United States. So when Concordia College, that fine Lutheran institution, joins the Episcopal Church, the Baptist Church, and the Methodist Church of my State, and I receive a letter from the chairman of the faculty committee on military conscription, of the leading Norwegian school in the Northwest, I pay attention to it, Mr. President, because I have found in my experience that you can rely upon such persons. They are not politicians looking for votes. They are not trying to make a lot of money. They are not trying to ingratiate themselves. They are men who are ministers of the gospel.

The letter refers to what was said years ago by Daniel Webster. Daniel Webster used to occupy this desk. He considered it a mockery to speak of conscription in a free country. I wish that Daniel Webster were here today.

The faculty of Concordia College says:

We respectfully raise the following points:

1. We believe that the American way—the voluntary way—of maintaining our armed forces has not been fully tried.

Mr. President, whether you and the other Senators believe it or not, that is the feeling of the average American wherever I have been, that the Army has not fully tried the voluntary system, and here the faculty of Concordia College say so. Be it true or false, the fact is that today that is what the average American believes, and that is what I believe. No one can go through the questions that have been asked of the average GI and come to any other conclusion.

This is what the faculty of the great Norwegian school of the Northwest says:

A. The Army deliberately lifted its passing grade from 70 to 80 in the Army general classification test. Yet, General Eisenhower testified that the grade could be lowered to 70. Why did the Army want to discourage enlistments if it is short of men?

Mr. President, these men are not half-witted, these men are not foolish, these men demand that they be shown the same as any American taxpayer has the right to be shown whether or not a law is correct. So they say:

B. In 1945 and 1946 the Army accepted enlistments for 18 months and reenlistments for 1 year. There were more than 150,000 recruits. Today the Army insists on longer enlistment. Why is it doing this if it is short of men?

C. It has been asserted that the Army is definitely limiting the number of Negro recuits. If this position is true, why is the Army doing this if it is short of men?

D. In Europe are millions of splendid young men who would be glad of the opportunity to serve in the American Army of Occupation. Such a plan has been proposed by Senator Lodge. The Army has made no move to get behind such a proposal. Why this attitude if the Army is short of men?

E. Both the Navy and the Air Force have testified that they can get the men they need without conscription. Only the Army insists that it must use totalitarian methods in order to get men. Why not try American methods? If we want steel we pay the price that will produce steel. If we need oil we pay the price that will produce oil.

Mind you, this is from the faculty of this Norwegian college in the northwest, Concordia College, in the State of Minnesota. This faculty is not being fooled. They say:

If we need oil we pay the price that will produce oil. If we need men why not offer the incentives that will supply men? Is the Army hostile to the American way?

F. Common sense suggests that in tomorrow's war the Air Force would be the line of first defense; the Navy would be second; and huge land armies would be of least importance. Should we violate a basic American principle in order to bolster the least important part of our defense system?

2. We recommend that every young man who volunteers for military service be given the full benefit of the GI bill of rights. We urge that human beings be considered just as important as material goods; that so long as we do not find it necessary to resort to compulsion in order to get the steel and aluminum we need for defense we ought not to resort to compulsion in order to get the young men we need for defense.

Respectfully submitted,

W. E. LILLO,
Chairman, Faculty Committee on Military Conscription.
CONCORDIA COLLEGE, MOORHEAD, MINN.

Mr. President, we have the Episcopal Church of North Dakota, the Presbyterian Church, the Baptist Church, the Mennonite Church, and all the other churches I have enumerated, calling upon the Senator from North Dakota. We have the leading farm organization, the Farmer's Union, calling upon the Senator from North Dakota. We have the Credit Union calling upon the Senator from North Dakota. Somewhere I have also a letter from the Livestock Association of North Dakota calling upon the Senator from North Dakota to do everything he can to defeat this bill.

Mr. President, how I should like to accommodate some of the Senators so that they could pass some of the bills they want to pass and go home and go to bed, but apparently I cannot do it and at the same time do my duty to those churches, to those farm organizations, to the people of my State, who, as is shown by the letters I have already read, ask me to do everything possible to prevent the passage of this iniquitous, terrible, un-American measure.

I have here another letter dated the 19th day of March, 1948. This letter comes from the western part of North Dakota, adjoining Montana. Only the Yellowstone River lies between Montana and North Dakota. Every time I mention the Yellowstone River or think about it I think of the great sacrifice made by Gen. George Custer when he was sent out to fight the Indians because of the fact that he protested against graft in the Army at Fort Yates, N. Dak., a military post. The privilege of selling goods to Indians for just one year brought graft of $11,000, and because George Custer dared come to Washington and tell the truth, because he dared to come here and insist on the impeachment of the Secretary of War, Belknap, he was sent to his death.

He started out from Fort Lincoln in 1776, and went across the prairies. As he and his men rode away, the flags flying and the bands playing, his little woman, soon to be a widow, was left behind. One has only to read that great book "Boots and Saddles" to realize what a sacrifice the wives of those soldiers made in order that that territory might be opened to settlement. What good did it do? George Custer died. They shipped his body down the Yellowstone River.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. MYERS. My purpose in asking the Senator to yield was to say that it is now 4:10 o'clock in the morning, so that it would be known that I was present in the Senate at this time.

Mr. LANGER. I regret it, but I cannot yield.

George Custer's body was shipped down the Yellowstone River. He and his successors freed the great Northwest.

If there is anyone on the floor of the Senate who has not read the speech which Chief Seattle, the last Indian chief in this country, made when he lived in the State of Washington, he should read it. I quote some words from his speech. He said:

The white men know so much more than the Indians, or they pretend they do; yet the Indians build up their herds of buffaloes to the millions, and the white man comes in and destroys them in a few months.

A few years ago the assessed valuation of North Dakota was $961,000,000. That included every horse, every cow, every sheep, every piece of land and every building. Congress a few days ago gave away under the Marshall plan, $6,000,000,000. Therefore, Mr. President, I am not so certain that the Senate realizes the great service that George Custer rendered.

I do not want to get away from the churches and the educators.

Mr. President, may I have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The Senator's point is well taken. The Senator is entitled to order.

Mr. LANGER. Just to show that not only church people are interested in the subject, I read a petition which was sent to me, as follows:

The Honorable WILLIAM E. LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We ask that you use your influence against UMT and selective service and in its stead that you redouble your efforts toward securing a workable system of world government.

The petition is dated Fargo, N. Dak., April 6, 1948, and is signed among others by D. Q. Posin, professor, North Dakota State College, and 15 other citizens, some of whom I know. I know Alfred S. Dale, who was State treasurer of my State. Mrs. Alfred Dale was, I believe, head of the women's Democratic organization of Cass County, the largest county, possibly, in the State of North Dakota. She is certainly a brilliant, well-educated, remarkable woman. She is opposed to universal military training and has said so. So, it is not only the church people, it is not only the leaders of the farm organizations but the rank and the file of the people are opposed to universal military training.

I have another petition sent to me by Mrs. Robert Sense, secretary of the Black Butte local, Bowman, N. Dak. I will read the part of the petition which pertains to universal training:

Whereas the United States of America was founded by people who despised the military system of the Old World, we the undersigned, go on record as opposing universal military training on the grounds that it has been thoroughly discredited in two world wars, and it is outmoded as a means of national defense in consideration of the realization that we are living in an atomic age. Further, it is a betrayal of the traditions of the United States.

We further resolve that this bill is a step toward complete conscripting of American life. Universal military training is the road to war, not peace; it will encourage an armaments race. Further, there can be no real security until war itself is abolished.

Further, this bill for universal military training is the exact opposite of education for democracy, as it is widely advertised by its proponents.

I am hard pressed for time, and do not have the time to read the whole of the petition. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of the petition printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the names of those who signed it. I want to have the names of these farmers, some of whom I know down near New England, N. Dak., some of them the outstanding farmers of that locality, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of the petition and the names signed thereto were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It would damage our young men and waste their lives. It would be a shameful betrayal of our youth.

Further, we oppose placing such a huge and unnecessary tax burden on the American people on the grounds that it would weaken our economy which is already weakened by inflation, and would take money that we so urgently need for hospitals, schools, housing, and living.

We further resolve that passage of this bill would destroy the confidence of the rest of the world which looks to us for hope, and at the same time destroy our last opportunity to prove to the rest of the world that we earnestly want peace.

Rather, we favor spending a small fraction of the amount this proposed program would cost, on a smaller number of continuously and highly trained men who know precisely what atomic and bacteriological warfare mean.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, those who signed the petition are taxpayers. I see on the petition the name of Julius Homling, of Amidon, N. Dak. I see also the name of Clara D. Brown, superintendent of public instruction of Slope County, N. Dak. Those are the types of people who send petitions relating to the draft to Congress. They have a right to be heard, and so long as I am a Member of this body, I shall see to it that no matter how humble the man or woman may be, no matter how poor they may be, if they write WILLIAM LANGER, a Senator from North Dakota, that they want him to oppose something they think is wrong, I shall at least present their petition to the other Members of this body.

I have here a letter from the president of Golden Lake Local, 791, Farmers Union, Mrs. Edwin Fleache. The letter is dated Finley, N. Dak., April 5, 1948. She writes as follows:

FINLEY, N. DAK., *April 5, 1948.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to compulsory military training and the reinstatement of the selective-service law. I am opposed to both of these measures and I urge you to work for their defeat.

I don't think any real effort has been made to come to a mutual agreement with Russia. I believe the Congress and public have been kept ignorant of the real facts of diplomatic relations.

Compulsory military training would be the first step toward war. We fought two world wars to save democracy, and we are farther from that goal than ever. If we fight a third world war it will be the end of the human race. Who then will be left to enjoy the freedoms of democracy?

I feel that the money spent for war preparation could be used for improving our schools, hospitals, and for raising the living standard of low-income people.

Your efforts to represent the common people are commendable and I hope you will keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. EDWIN FLESCHE,
President, Golden Lake Local 791, Farmers Union.

I am opposed to both of these measures and I urge you to work for their defeat. Compulsory military training would be the first step toward war.

Mr. President, this letter from Mrs. Edward Flesche, president of Golden Lake Local 791, of the Farmers Union, is one of the very finest I have received.

Mr. President, I have letters here from churches outside my State. I prefer to confine my consideration to churches inside my State. The population of the State used to be 641,000. Because of the drought it was considerably reduced. Church after church in my State protests this bill.

I now wish to read a letter from the general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association at Grand Forks, N. Dak. I want all the many Senators in the chamber to listen carefully.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield. I am sorry.

This is what is expected of a North Dakota Senator. The general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association of the second largest town in North Dakota writes:

I am writing as one of your constituents to urge you to use all of your energies in opposition to military conscription.

I served as an enlisted man through five campaigns in Europe during the past war—

Here is a man who fought through five campaigns in the last war—

and feel capable and obligated to express an opinion opposing military conscription. I share identical views with Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR of Idaho as expressed in his radio address over CBS on Saturday, April 20.

I will be watching with interest for the views which you express in opposition to military conscription.

The general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association is saying to his Senator:

I am writing as one of your constituents to urge you to use all your energies in opposition to military conscription.

This man is a veteran who served through five campaigns in Europe. His name is Leonard H. Egstrom, and he is general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association of Grand Forks, N. Dak.

Mr. President, it is very easy to sit here and vote "yea," but it is very much harder to say "Nay." The people of my State sent me down here because they had confidence enough in me to know that when I felt in my conscience that it was time to say "No" I would say "No." If I did not say "No" when I believed that a "no" vote ought to be cast, I would have no business in the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

in the middle of the city you will see a life-size statue of that little 18-year-old

N. Dak. As I recall, he is an Evangelical minister of the German Evangelical

Mr. President, I have a letter from the Bruflat Lutheran Church. I shall come

1. The last two World Wars have been won by nations that did not have universal mili-

of universal military training as it is being considered in Congress on H. R. 664 came in

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for any purpose.

I have here a letter from Reverend and Mrs. C. A. Zook, of the Church of the Brethren. He is minister of the Church of the Brethren of Minot, N. Dak. The letter is dated June 22:

I am hoping you will do all you can to down peacetime conscription as I feel it is the wrong thing to do and not a Christian way.

Yours respectfully,

CHARLES A. ZOOK.

I am a minister of the Church of the Brethren.

Here is the letter from his wife:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Will you please use your influence against peacetime conscription? We feel that it is wrong and not the Christian way to insure peace.

Thank you.

MRS. C. A. ZOOK.

From the Church of the Brethren, Minot, N. Dak.

I believe that makes nine churches in my State from which I have received letters. I have some more. Mr. President, we have a very religious State. A few years ago the Saturday Evening Post stated that we were the most religious State in the Union, if churches are any indication of religion. In Trail County, North Dakota, there are a great many churches. The Saturday Evening Post showed pictures of 12 churches in three townships out in the country. There was nothing like it in the entire United States. Those churches were in sparsely settled communities, 12 of them in three townships. We have a very religious people. The record shows that the people of North Dakota are among the most patriotic people in the Union.

It will be remembered that in World War I William Gibbs McAdoo offered a prize. As Secretary of the Treasury he said, "I will give a banner to the county in the United States which will sell the most bonds in the third Liberty Loan war drive per capita. To show the kind of people we have in North Dakota, we have a county in my State named Trail County. At that time 95 percent of the people of that county were Scandinavians, born in Norway or Sweden. Practically every one of them was naturalized. They won that prize in competition with every other county in the United States.

Mr. President, more North Dakota boys were killed per capita in World War I than boys from any other State in the Union. In World War I and in the Spanish-American War more North Dakota men were decorated for bravery than men from any other State in the Union, population considered. In the last war three times North Dakota led in the buying of Liberty bonds per capita. Once Montana beat us by one point. We led in the scrap iron drive. We led in the paper drive.

After World War I, France sent to the United States a commission to pick out the typical American nurse. That commission went to every State in the Union. When they got all through, whom did they select? They selected a little 18-year-old North Dakota girl, Frances Lauder. Today if you go to Paris, there in the middle of the city you will see a life-size statue of that little 18-year-old girl, the daughter of a district judge—sweet, young, 18 years of age. Among all the nurses who went across the water in World War I, she was selected by France, after the war, as a typical American nurse.

Mr. President, on the 17th day of March, in the year when Hiram Johnson ran for the Presidency—and that was the day when he was running in the primary in North Dakota—there was a blizzard of unprecedented viciousness, with a wind of unprecedented velocity. It came up so suddenly that the girls who were teaching in the schools were unable to get the youngsters home. In Oliver County, 8 miles east of Center, a little girl 15 years of age, named Hazel Miner, started home from school with her little brother and little sister. The teacher dismissed the school early. That little girl had a horse-drawn sled. She started out with her little brother and sister in the sled with her. That blizzard was so desperately bad that the horse took the sled off the road, to follow the coulee. Those children never got home. Their folks were living about a mile and a half from the school.

The next day when the children were found, her folks found that that little North Dakota girl had taken off her overcoat and her overshoes and her cap and had placed them around her little sister. She had taken the robe and had placed it around her little brother. Then, without any covering at all except her dress, she lay down to die beside her little brother and sister. Mr. President, those are the kind of people that I am proud to represent here on the floor of the Senate. Those are the kind of people I am going to represent. I shall represent them honestly and fearlessly; I shall represent them no matter what the attitude of any Senator may be, much as I like to have Senators friendly. When the day comes that I cannot represent them, I am going to walk out of the door of this Chamber with my head up and my chest out, and I will walk out as a North Dakotan should walk out of this Chamber if he finds that he cannot do his duty.

When those church people whose letters I have read and the university people whose letters I have read and the heads and members of the great farm organizations whose letters I have read and the petitioners and farmers whose letters I have read, all join in asking me to do my best to keep this universal military training bill from passing, they know they can be sure of one thing—and that is that come what may, BILL LANGER will do his best.

Mr. President, I am not responsible for any other Senator upon this floor. I am only responsible to one person, and that is the man who looks at me when I look in the looking glass. When I go up to the mirror, if the man who gazes back at me has no respect for me, then, indeed, my life will have been a sad, sad failure.

Mr. President, I have here another letter from a minister in North Dakota—Mr. Sterling Wenzel, of Great Bend, N. Dak. As I recall, he is an Evangelical minister of the German Evangelical Church. I read his letter:

GREAT BEND, N. DAK., *May 21, 1946.*

WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate:

DEAR MR. LANGER: May I encourage you to fight against any legislation that will be in favor of peacetime military conscription.

As pastor I can assure you that the people of the church are not in favor of a continuation of the present draft law.

Sincerely,

STERLING WENZEL.

Mr. President, I have received letters from many other ministers in North Dakota and from many ministers in other States.

I now hold in my hand another very interesting letter. Mr. President, in my State of North Dakota, when the young folks are 13, 14, 15, 16, or 17 years of age, they do not loaf around. They keep busy and take care of themselves. When they do want recreation and go to the theater, it is a beautiful sight to see them as they come through the door. There is not a pimple on the face of one of them. Their cheeks are rosy, and they look strong and well, and they are educated.

At our State college at Fargo, a group of them have organized the North Dakota Agriculture College Farmers' Union Cooperative Association, a mutual aid association. I have received a letter from the chairman of the resolutions committee of that association, and I wish to read it to the Senate:

NDAC FARMERS UNION CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Fargo, N. Dak., February 7, 1947.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER: We wish to submit to you a resolution passed at the last meeting of the NDAC Farmers Union Co-operative Association.

Whereas our Nation has always sought to avoid military entanglements and has at all times fought against the antidemocratic principles of peacetime military conscription which is nothing more than an incentive towards future wars; and

Whereas the NDAC Farmers Union Co-operative Association is in full accord with this Nation's democratic ideals of freedom for the individual as opposed to peacetime military conscription; and

Whereas this group believes that a military force sufficient for our Nation's needs can be built and maintained by voluntary enlistments: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the NDAC Farmers Union Co-operative Association meeting February 3, 1947, in Fargo, S. Dak., that our United States Senators and Representatives be urged to take action to prevent peacetime military conscription and in its stead make service in the armed forces an attractive career which will insure a high quality volunteer Army and Navy.

ARNOLD BJORLIE,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee, NDAC Farmers Union Co-operative Association.

It is a great pleasure to receive a letter like that and to realize that many of the boys who sent it are of military age, 18, 19, some of them younger. They are interested in what is taking place here and want to help by giving some of us older men their advice.

Mr. President, I have a letter from the Bruflat Lutheran Church. I shall come to the other one of which Senators apparently are thinking. I have received voluntary letters from all the North Dakota churches. This is from the Lutheran Church at Portland, N. Dak., a Trinity Lutheran Church, of which Rev. I. M. Rotto is pastor. I quote from his letter:

I should like to express to you my firm conviction in regard to the proposed universal training program as recommended by President Truman, and urge you to oppose every measure designed to make our free America a militaristic nation after the pattern of totalitarianism.

To me it seems clear as day that such a measure will defeat its own ends. Excessive energies devoted to military preparation weakens and does not strengthen a nation. I think both world wars have revealed that fact.

Consider also this: Compulsory military training (or by whatever better sounding name it might be called) is surely the first step in the direction which European nations took and which led to their eventual downfall.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Rev. I. M. Rotto, pastor of the Bruflat Lutheran Church, may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I reserve the right to object. The Senator propounded a unanimous-consent request, which I think carries with it the right to object.

Mr. LANGER. I would rather withdraw the request. I withdraw it. Hereafter, I shall simply read entire letters into the RECORD. I am sorry it is necessary to take more time. Let the RECORD show that unanimous consent was refused. It will therefore be necessary for me to take 3 or 4 hours longer than I had expected.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for any purpose whatever.

Mr. HATCH. I have not objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield. The RECORD will show the Senator objected, and we will leave it that way. We shall have to take 4 or 5 hours extra, Mr. President. I was rushing along as fast as I could. I was getting to every one of the churches protesting the pending bill, whose letters I desired to place in the RECORD.

I want to read what the Rotary Club at Grand Forks, N. Dak., wrote.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. The letter is from Mr. C. L. Kjerstad. It is on Rotary Club stationery. I do not know whether he was authorized to speak for the Rotary Club, of which he is secretary-treasurer. He states:

Universal military training: Don't know what your attitude is but I have yet to see a workable plan that I would support.

1. The last two World Wars have been won by nations that did not have universal military training.

2. This is no time to arouse the suspicions of our neighbors.

3. I am a Legionnaire but cannot support their program.

a. Yes; I want preparedness.

b. Military training has little relation to preparedness.

c. Let our high-school graduates go on to school. Did not the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps send their draftees to school as the first step in preparation in this war? Why, we had them on every campus in this and other States?

Most sincerely,

C. L. KJERSTAD.

I very frankly say I do not know whether he had authority to bind the Rotary Club at Grand Forks or not.

Let us see some of the other letters sent to me from North Dakota. There are numerous letters from private individuals. Here is one from a State institution, the North Dakota School of Forestry, which is one of the very finest institutions in the country. It is located at Bottineau, N. Dak., near the Canadian border. It is only a few miles from the International Peace Garden, a great body of land between Canada and the United States. I may say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who I sometimes fear is not interested in peace as much as he ought to be, I want him to know that every day thousands of people from Canada and North Dakota gather in the Peace Garden, which is only a few miles from the North Dakota School of Forestry.

Apparently some of the students attending the school talked with its president. The president is Mr. C. M. Nelson. He wrote me on March 6. I am sorry that I cannot shorten this letter, because of the fact that objection was made to my request for unanimous consent to insert the letter in the RECORD.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I cannot yield. It becomes necessary for me to read the entire letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair point out that the Senator from New Mexico had not made an objection earlier; he had merely stated his desire to reserve the right to object. The Chair should like the RECORD to be clear on that point.

Mr. LANGER. Then I misunderstood him, Mr. President. That will enable me to put into the RECORD many letters which I had thought I should not be able to do, in the course of my speech. I am very grateful to my distinguished friend the Senator from New Mexico, whom I have always found——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry. I cannot yield. But I want the Senator to know that I cherish a great affection for him.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield so that the Senator from New Mexico can return some of the kind things which the Senator is saying?

Mr. LANGER. I cannot yield.

The letter says:

At the annual meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges the question of universal military training as it is being considered in Congress on H. R. 664 came in for considerable discussion. I came away from that meeting fully convinced that this bill must not pass.

This is the president of the North Dakota School of Forestry speaking. It is a school which receives thousands of dollars a year from the Federal Government. It plants millions of trees a year. This gentleman had charge of all the planting. He became so efficient that he was hired to take charge of the entire program.

I cannot see why the War Department feels that it is necessary to conscript 900,000 men each year, in addition to the standing Army, Navy, Marine Corps, National Guard, ROTC, and the Enlisted Reserve Corps as a peacetime policy. The War Department itself and numerous military men have publicly stated that volunteers are preferred to conscripts.

Is it impossible to provide the necessary inducements to secure sufficient volunteers for our peacetime armed services? If it is, then I doubt that conscription is the answer to War Department's manpower problem.

I am convinced that the adoption of universal military training will cause us to develop a Maginot-line philosophy which will be more dangerous to our security than most anything else we could do.

I have some more letters from North Dakota, Mr. President. All of these persons are very anxious to be heard. I have now a letter which I know some of my colleagues are waiting to hear. It is a letter from the Catholic War Veterans. It is a very interesting letter, dated January 28, 1947. I read:

HONORABLE SIR: We wish to advise you—

This is a letter from the Catholic War Veterans. I have read letters from the Episcopal Church, the Methodist Church, the Mennonite Church, and all the other churches which I have named, all opposing universal military training. Here we have the Catholic War Veterans opposing it—

We wish to advise you as to the policy of CWV on the matter of the proposed peacetime training legislation.

We favor complete exploration of the possibilities of the Martin resolution, calling upon all members of the United Nations to outlaw peacetime conscription.

I have here a letter from the northern synod, of the State of Minnesota. I see the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] here. He used to live at Moorhead, Minn., and attended Moorhead College. He also attended the agricultural college, and was one of the great football stars of that institution, playing for many years, and was known all over the State as one of the smoothest, one of the slickest, one of the best and finest quarterbacks in the entire United States. The only reason he did not make the all-American team was that he did not weigh enough. If he had weighed a trifle more, Walter Camp said he would have put him on. I am delighted to know that the Senator is here, because he knows the town of Faribault, and it is very likely that he knows Rev. Victor W. Grupe, secretary of the Northern Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. I suppose

the Senator knows him well and intimately, and would vouch for what the

very grateful to him, and I know very well the Methodist Church people and

they knew that liquor was being handed

to Minnesota and was placed in a very

Mr. President, I want to be very care-

con Street, Boston, Mass. I note that the

the Senator knows him well and intimately and would vouch for what the distinguished man says in his letter. The letter was written on June 3, 1947. Listen to this:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The following resolutions are being sent to you in accordance with the instructions with the therein named group:

"The Northern Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, in annual conference assembled at Faribault, Minn., May 20–22, 1947, herewith respectfully submits to the earnest consideration of Senators and Members of the House of the National Congress from the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, North and South Dakota, and Iowa, the following resolutions:

"'We reiterate our unswerving opposition to compulsory universal military training at any time and in any guise. Holding that the home, the church, and the school are primarily responsible for the upbringing of our youth, and that the military institution by its very nature a system of dictatorship and agency of destruction is morally unfitted for that task, we unreservedly condemn the dragooning of American youth by indiscriminate compulsion into the Military Establishment as abhorrent to the democratic spirit and repugnant to the Christian conscience. A nation, like an individual, that cannot save itself except by losing its character, does not have very much character to lose.

"'We view with grave misgivings the unilateral action of our Government, dishonoring its commitments to the United Nations. We favor increased appropriations for the hungry wherever they may be, we abhor the denial of fundamental freedoms, to be Communist or Fascist dictatorship, but we believe the military bolstering of unrepresentative governments in a game of power politics is a policy of futility that can only lead to confusion and mistrust, fear and hatred, and down the road to war. Let us encourage and increase the establishment of genuine democracy both at home and abroad, let us honestly demonstrate by word and example that our faith is not in tanks and guns and globe-girdling air bases, but in pacific means of settling differences, and so raise up a standard to which honest men the world over may and will repair.'"

Very truly yours,

VICTOR W. GRUPE,
Secretary.

That I repeat, is from the Evangelical and Reformed Church. The Senators will notice that five States—North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, and Nebraska are included. They have all the ministers there together.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield. I should like to yield, but I cannot; I am sorry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator would not relinquish the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would give the Senator a little rest.

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry. I very much appreciate the Senator's offer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

Mr. LANGER. My friend is so solicitous about my welfare, I assure him that if I should grow tired a little he can spell me for 3 or 4 hours, and I shall be very grateful to him, and I know very well the Methodist Church people and the Catholic Church people will be grateful.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Lutheran church.

Mr. LANGER. And the Lutheran church people and all the churches I have named. I am sure the YMCA of Grand Forks, where the distinguished Senator used to go to use the swimming pool when he was a student in North Dakota there, and learned his boxing at the YMCA, at the University of North Dakota. I assure him that I am very grateful to him indeed and later I shall welcome his assistance.

I wish to show how universal this demand is that we do not let this bill pass. I read a letter from the YMCA a little while ago. Here is one from the WCTU, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Mr. President, I say unreservedly that I believe the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is on of the greatest organizations in America. I have been a member of that organization ever since 1917. When I wrote my biography which appears in the Congressional Directory I was delighted to place in it the fact that I was an honorary life member of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Let me say, Mr. President, that in North Dakota we have today, as the Saturday Evening Post said, the very finest capitol in the United States. We started to build that capitol in 1933, and one of the very finest ornaments in that beautiful building is a lovely painting of the lady who was president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the State for some 35 years. She was a woman of such exceptional ability that even at a time when women did not have the vote she organized a campaign, and led it, that threw out of office in North Dakota a Governor who had only one term of office, because he had disgraced, she said, the State of North Dakota by becoming intoxicated and leading a parade down the streets of Winnipeg, Canada, at 1 o'clock in the morning. The people of North Dakota rallied to her and that was the first time in the history of North Dakota that a Democrat was ever elected Governor of the State. I say this is a powerful organization, not only in North Dakota, but all over the country, and I was privileged a few days ago to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Miss Alice Smart, the national legislative representative of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the United States of America. I do not know whether she is a registered lobbyist or not. I do know I meet her on the streets here once in a while, and it is always a pleasure to greet her, because I know that the organization she represents stands for everything that is fine in the lives of young boys and young girls.

I was tremendously impressed with a bill that was introduced, at the behest of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, during the war, which sought to keep young boys and young girls a certain distance from all forts and all canteens, whatever they call the places where they knew that liquor was being handed out or sold. In my State they have done a remarkable job.

I have here also a letter, in addition to those I have received from churches and universities, from the associate professor of religion and philosophy in Wesley College. That college is located at Grand Forks, N. Dak. It is one of the greatest Methodist institutions in the whole world. It is a fine college, and while the enrollment may not be so very large, it is made up of the very finest minds in the whole State.

I have always been interested in that school because it has been financed by a man by the name of Frank Lynch, who later moved out West to San Diego, Calif., who was so impressed with the college, although he was of a different religious faith, that he contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars toward it. This man used to reside at Castleton, N. Dak., and he helped organize this institution.

What does this associate professor of religion and philosophy of Wesley College say? I read his letter:

WESLEY COLLEGE,
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., February 15, 1947.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Senator from North Dakota,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to let you know why I am opposed to universal military training. First, because it is no real but an illusory defense in an atomic age—real defense rests with the UN. Second, it is contrary to our democratic ideals and a long step toward fascism. Third, by arousing the suspicions of other nations it will provoke the very war which it seeks futilely to prevent. Fourth, our imperialists, the big-business interests, are behind it and want the flag to follow the dollar.

Whenever and wherever I get an opportunity I voice my opposition to this measure. Shall it be said of us that we conquered Hitler only to be conquered by Hitler?

A. W. MUNK,
Associate Professor of Religion and Philosophy, Wesley College.

A little while ago I presented to the Senate a number of petitions. I then said it was not only the church people, not only the educators, not only the farmers' unions and the leaders of the farmers' unions, not only the individual locals, whose letters I have already presented, but the individual farmers in North Dakota who are opposed to this measure. I have here a petition addressed:

To the honorable WILLIAM LANGER, WILLIAM LEMKE, MILTON YOUNG, and CHARLES ROBERTSON.

I might say that Mr. LEMKE and Mr. ROBERTSON are Representatives at large from the State of North Dakota.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to peacetime compulsory military training and respectfully petition you to use your influence against any legislation of that kind.

The first one to sign the petition is Walter Troxel, who for years has been a member of the State Senate of North Dakota. Mrs. J. M. Joiner also signed the petition. Her husband is dead. He was a member of the legislature of North Dakota, elected in 1918 and took office in 1919, one of the outstanding men of the State. He left North Dakota and went to Minnesota and was placed in a very important position there by Gov. Floyd Olson, of Minnesota.

In speaking of Mr. Joiner going to Minnesota, I am led to wonder whether the average Senator today is aware of the fact that whenever other States need good men they come to North Dakota to get them. These men who have received fine Christian influences from the time they were little children are much sought after for important posts in other States besides their own State of North Dakota, one of whose daughters has a life-sized statue erected in her memory in Paris.

When Gov. Floyd Olson was elected Governor of Minnesota he wanted a private secretary. He wanted a man whom he could trust with his private correspondence, a man whom he could trust to open his mail. So he came to North Dakota and hired as his private secretary Vincent A. Day. A little later he had some trouble collecting gasoline taxes. He could not find anyone in all of Minnesota who apparently could devise a system which would put a stop to the bootlegging of gasoline and the escape from the payment of State and Federal taxes on bootlegged gasoline. He came to Burke County and there he hired George Griffith to leave North Dakota and come to Minnesota.

Gov. Floyd Olson wanted a tax commissioner, an individual who knew something about taxes, someone who was honest. He looked all over Minnesota but could not find anyone in Minnesota, so he came to North Dakota and hired George W. Wallace, and he was one of the tax commissioners of Minnesota for years.

Governor Olson's State owned considerable timberland around Bemidgi, millions of acres of timberland. He wanted to get someone who knew about the handling of timberland, so what did he do? He hired a North Dakota man to take care of those 3,000,000 acres of timberland.

There are four or five thousand banks in Minnesota. Governor Olson apparently could not find anyone in his State who knew much about banking so Governor Olson, of Minnesota, went to Carson, N. Dak., a town of about 1,100 population, and appointed Robert D. Barry, who ran a little bank in his town. He was appointed bank examiner of Minnesota.

The Governor of Minnesota wanted a chauffeur he could trust to drive his car without running it off into the ditch, a man who would keep sober, a man who would keep his car nice and shiny, a man who would keep his car in a good state of repair. Gov. Floyd Olson apparently felt he could not get that kind of man in Minnesota, so he went to Grand Forks, N. Dak., and hired a man who became a great friend of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], Mose Rosensweig, of Grand Forks, who later changed his name to Rose. He became a close personal friend of Governor Olson. He died and now lies buried within 15 or 20 feet of a very famous and distinguished late Governor of Minnesota.

Mr. President, I want to be very careful not to violate the Senate rules in any way; but I mention what occurred with respect to Minnesota, because it is true.

There lived in my State a man named Nolan, who was convicted of murder. He had killed a traveling man who came to his place. He buried the murdered man in a manure pile. Shortly thereafter his carcass was found there. The murderer was arrested and given a life sentence. This man who was convicted came from the little town of Hansboro, in Towner County. After a while he escaped from the penitentiary. Do Senators know where he was found? Three years later he was found in Arkansas. He was the public printer of the State of Arkansas. I do not know whether he was elected or was appointed by the Governor. I mention that purely to show that even citizens of North Dakota who might be considered of very poor character get into other States sometimes and are advanced to positions of trust and influence and the holding of State office.

So Senators can understand that representing that sort of people as I do in the Senate, I feel very proud indeed when I receive a petition from a large group of individuals such as I have here. The first signer of the petition is a State senator. The petition asks me to do all in my power and to use my influence against any legislation of the kind proposed in Congress.

I have other petitions from churches in other States, which show that it is not only in North Dakota that the churches are up in arms against this measure.

I have a letter from Broadway Tabernacle Church of New York City, address 211 West Fifty-sixth Street. That address shows that the church is right about in the center of the town. The letter is written by Allan Knight Chalmers, Broadway Tabernacle Church, and states:

I was very much impressed with the enclosed leaflet on universal military training and wanted to call it to your attention.

I enlisted as a boy of 18 in the First World War and had 10 months in the front lines in the trenches.

As a veteran, I feel this gives me a basis of judgment about the Army's proposal for compulsory military training, and on another war that could easily come if we do not stop the militarization of our Nation.

I would appreciate your comments on the leaflet and on universal military training if you have time.

He encloses a leaflet entitled "The Army Says."

I might add, in connection with universal military training, that when the Army got out a little pamphlet in Tennessee it was sent to the boys in our colleges. It was one of the most beautiful things I ever saw. I presume it was published at the expense of the taxpayers. It contained beautiful pictures of young boys walking down the avenue arm in arm, under beautiful trees. Apparently it was designed to look as attractive as possible.

While we are on the question of churches, I have a letter here from a church in Boston. This is from the secretary of the Universalist Church of America, with executive offices at 16 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass. I note that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has left the Chamber. If he were here I would ask him whether 16 Beacon Street is not a pretty good address. That is where the executive offices of the Universalist Church of America are located. The letter is signed by the secretary. It reads as follows:

At the recent meeting of the general assembly of the Universalist Church of America, the following resolution was passed in connection with the subject of compulsory peacetime military training:

"Whereas compulsory military training is a denial of the rights of the individual; and

"Whereas it is detrimental to the Christian education of our youth; and

"Whereas it is an historical fact that military conscription has never prevented war; we

"*Resolved*, That the delegates to the general assembly of the Universalist Church of America go on record as being opposed to compulsory peacetime military training; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to Representative JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican minority leader in the House, and to the leader of the opponents of this measure in the Senate."

It is my understanding that you have been very active in opposition to compulsory peacetime military training, and I am, therefore, transmitting this resolution to you for your information.

Sincerely yours,

ESTHER A. RICHARDSON,
Secretary.

Now let us go to the Department of Higher Education. This time we shall not go to New York or Boston. We shall remain in Washington, D. C. The next letter is from the Department of Higher Education of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW. It is signed by Alonzo F. Myers, president. The letter reads as follows:

The enclosed statement, Major Arguments Against Universal Military Training, was developed by a highly competent group on the basis of a thorough and up-to-the-minute study of the problem.

I recommend the statement to you as a careful analysis in opposition to a policy of universal military training for the United States.

I am sorry that I do not have the time to read the analysis entitled "Major Arguments Against Universal Military Training." However, I shall read the headings:

1. Military training will not produce soldiers ready for combat.
2. UMT ignores the specialized nature of modern warfare.
3. Military training will not provide men competent to handle civilian defense.
4. Professional soldiers would be diverted from the regular armed forces to train recruits.
5. Rudimentary military training can be taught much faster than industry can convert to war production.
6. UMT will draw funds from other defense programs.
7. UMT of the Fort Knox Test Tube cannot be reproduced on a national scale.
8. Military training is a recognition of bankrupt diplomacy.
9. UMT will preclude civilian programs needed to strengthen the American people and economy.

10. Military training will mean a reduction in volume and quality of war production.

States of America by the Thirteen Colonies." I pointed out that when the

I read now a letter from Mrs. M. G. Peterson, of Carrington, N. Dak. On

Mr. President, who is responsible for the

of the members of the committee tearing

10. Military training will mean a reduction in volume and quality of war production.

11. UMT will deplete natural resources at a more rapid rate.

12. UMT would obstruct American industrial efficiency.

13. Military training will alter the structure of society.

I am sorry that I have not the time to read the contents, but I have read the headings of the various chapters. I should like to read the entire analysis, but I must rush on, because I have so many other letters which I wish to bring to the attention of Members of the Senate.

The next letter is from Nebraska. It is signed by Mrs. R. L. Burge, president of the Women's League for Universal Peace. The letter is dated April 15, 1948. The writer of the letter has a very intriguing idea. There is a heading which says:

Congressmen and Senators who favor UMT or the draft should join it.

The letter reads in part as follows:

All Congressmen and Senators who advocate and vote for universal military training or Selective Service Act should, as an indication of their sincerity, accompany their ballot with their resignation and with an enlistment as a military private, and subsist on the rations of a private, plus a private's pay; and forfeit all their monetary income.

The human being is the only animal that ask their young to do their fighting, therefore they should be willing do do what they ask of the younger generation.

Mr. President, it is strange how one's memory goes back, when reading a letter. I do not think the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was a Member of this body at the time when the United Nations Charter was under consideration by the Senate. Some time ago I read in a Washington newspaper an article by a columnist who said that he believed the propaganda used in putting over the United Nations Charter was the best job he had ever seen done. I wish to say that I remember that in the 3 or 4 minutes time during which I spoke here in the Senate on the question of the adoption of the United Nations Charter, I quoted Robert La Follette, Sr., who had fought the League of Nations. He said, "If you adopt the League of Nations, it will lead up into perpetual war." So in my speech on the United Nations Charter, I used that expression—that if we adopted the United Nations Charter, it would lead us into perpetual war. I remember that afterwards four or five Senators scoffed at me. Well, Mr. President, we have had it ever since July 28, 1945, when the Senate approved it, and of course the President signed it almost instantaneously. Since that time we have had perpetual war in almost every country except Ireland, Canada, and a few others. Today the countries generally are in worse shape by far than they were at the time when the United Nations Charter was adopted.

When the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in his speech advocating the ratification of the United Nations Charter said, "It is similar to the organization of the United States of America by the Thirteen Colonies," I pointed out that when the Thirteen Colonies organized the United States, none of them had a veto power. Certainly the five largest of the Thirteen Colonies did not have a veto power over the other eight. Mr. President, do you think the other eight Colonies would ever have joined the United States of America if the five largest Colonies had had a veto power?

In connection with the Charter of the United Nations, who fought to retain the veto power? The fight to retain it was led by England and the United States of America.

So I say that my memory goes back to the day when I prophesied that the United Nations would lead us to perpetual war. Only the other day the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], in the course of the debate here listed all the countries that are at war today: India, China, Korea, and practically all the countries of Europe. It is startling to realize how many countries are at war, 3 years after the United Nations Charter was signed.

Mr. President, I have on my desk various other letters from churches. Before I read them, I wish to read another petition from some of the farmers of our State. This petition comes from Bucyrus, N. Dak. One petition which I have received came from near the Canadian line, and another petition came from McKenzie County, near the Yellowstone River in Montana. The petition I now hold in my hand comes from Bucyrus, which is 3 miles from the South Dakota line, and undoubtedly the Senator from South Dakota is acquainted with that town. The petition reads as follows:

We, the undersigned members of the Bucyrus Farmers Union Local, No. 7021, are opposed to universal military training during peacetime.

Therefore we request that you oppose all legislation which will favor such a proposal.

The petition is signed by a great many farmers in that vicinity.

Mr. President, I have also received a card from Mr. and Mrs. Paul Aman, of Richardton, N. Dak. They say:

We are against universal military training.

Mr. Aman is one of the outstanding men in that vicinity.

I have also received a card from Mr. and Mrs. Hunke, likewise of Richardton, N. Dak. They say:

We are opposed to military universal training, and want you to vote against it.

Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that although I am in a hurry to conclude as rapidly as I possibly can, yet I feel it my duty, under the instructions I have received from the churches of North Dakota and the largest farm organizations, headed by the Farmers Union, and from petitions carrying thousands of signatures, to do everything I can to bring to the attention of the Members of this body the attitude of the people of North Dakota on this question of peacetime conscription.

I read now a letter from Mrs. M. G. Peterson, of Carrington, N. Dak. On March 8, 1948, she wrote to me as follows:

CARRINGTON, N. DAK., *March 8, 1948.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: There has been a great deal of discussion in our community about universal military training. I have talked with many people and have found no one in favor of this bill. Surely the money that would have to be spent for UMT could be put to better use for the good of all. You know, Senator, that we could use a great deal of money in this State alone for the betterment of our schools, just to mention one need.

I sincerely hope that you will vote against this bill when it comes up, and do all in your power to get others to vote against it also.

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. M. O. PETERSON.

So, Mr. President, I wish to appeal to the distinguished Senator from Alabama to become active in this fight. I wish to keep this peacetime conscription bill from becoming law.

Here is a letter from the Sutton Farmers Union Grain Co., dated March 10:

SUTTON FARMERS UNION GRAIN CO.,
Sutton, N. Dak., March 10, 1948.
Mr. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: According to today's news UMT is again beating its wings. I just thought I'd write again and restate my views. I believe that peacetime military training harms the boys, often seriously, depletes our resources unnecessarily, and puts too much power in the hands of the military. It will be a sad day for democracy if we get to the place where all of our male youth is trained to click its heels and obey blindly when the overstuffed "brass" sounds off.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR W. DAFOE.

Here is a letter from Hebron, N. Dak., signed by R. A. Ketterling, secretary of the Farmers Union Local. Hebron is a town 75 miles west of Bismarck in a very good farming and dairying section of the State. The letter, dated March 8, is a typical Farmers Union letter. I read:

HEBRON, N. DAK., *March 8, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At our last Farmers Union local meeting, which consists of 40 members, it was unanimously decided that the group was opposed to universal military training.

This universal military training provides no defense. All indications are that the next war will be one of atomic bombs and biological warfare. Carrying a gun will hasten trouble. It will provide no protection for there is no defense for atomic warfare. Neither England nor the United States of America has had peacetime conscription but they have won their wars. France, Germany, and Japan all had compulsory military training. Peacetime conscription will increase taxes and promote military control. We have reached the point where the military are directing instead of supporting this country's policy.

If universal military training becomes compulsory it will be the ruination of our country and the beginning of militarism.

Yours truly,
R. A. KETTERLING,
Secretary.

Mr. President, I have here another petition coming from Marion, near the home town of my distinguished colleague the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], Berlin, N. Dak. The town of Marion is located perhaps 18 miles from the Senator's home town. I quote:

We, the undersigned, are wholeheartedly opposed to the passage of the so-called universal military training bill; we believe it is a step toward a military government and a threat to peace.

That is signed by a group of citizens. I know most of them. Those signing the letter I know are very fine, distinguished taxpayers of that county.

Here is a letter from Agate, N. Dak.

AGATE, N. DAK., *March 19, 1948.*
The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: We, herewith, would like to ask you to exert your influence in opposing compulsory military training as well as a peace draft. We feel that President Truman is being used by the military men in our Government in an effort to plunge this Nation into war, against the majority wish and will of the American people. The money that would be spent arming America could be better used to feed the hungry and raise living standards immediately in the destitute regions of the world.

Very truly yours,
MRS. IVER M. SOLBERG.
IVER M. SOLBERG.

I know Mr. and Mrs. Solberg well. I do not know how they came to be writing from Agate; perhaps they live there. One of the Solbergs was formerly State senator for Williams County, N. Dak. I think this is another Solberg.

Here is a letter from Mrs. B. H. Eggers, of Dickinson, N. Dak.:

In regard to the universal military training, I am definitely against it. We need our boys on the farm.

Here is a letter from her husband:

I am against compulsory military training. Please vote against it. We need our boys on the farm.

Here is a letter from Park River, N. Dak., dated March 18, one of the very prosperous towns in the State:

PARK RIVER, N. DAK., *March 18, 1948.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am opposed to universal military training, even after President Truman's speech.

I believe the voluntary program could be improved and should be given a fair trial before our Nation is forced into a conscription program which is directly opposite to all American traditions.

I ask that you work against passage of a universal training bill.

Yours truly,
(MRS.) ZELLA V. WIDME.

Mr. President, I want to make it crystal clear that 4 or 5 days ago I announced to the press I would take part in no filibuster of any kind or character. I do not propose now to participate in a filibuster. I have brought the attention of the Senate to letters from our churches in North Dakota, also letters from our farm organizations, together with petitions from various other groups. Some may say, "Oh, but you stop legislation." Mr. President, who is responsible for the stoppage of legislation? Every Senator on this floor remembers that at the beginning of the session we were in session only every other day for weeks and weeks. How would a farmer raising chickens like to hire a man by the month to feed his chickens, and have the man feed them only every other day?

How many days did we actually meet in January or February or March? There was not a time when we could not have passed the pay bill. It was not wanted on the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for any purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield, I think I can help him in his hazy thinking.

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry. I decline to yield. I deeply regret it. I am very sorry. I regret that I cannot yield.

I have here the testimony regarding the salaries of Federal Government employees. When was that testimony taken? It was taken on January 15, 16, 17, 24, 26, and 28; February 9 and 10. Where was our Republican leadership then? Tonight they are in a great hurry to get through. At that time our Republican leadership controlled the House and the Senate. Where were those distinguished men who are now in such a hurry to get to Philadelphia?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at this point I can inform him that we would have passed the salary increases if he had not made such a spectacle of himself, as he is doing tonight.

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield. I might say to my distinguished friend from Minnesota that I suggest that he read a letter which I filed. I suggest that he fight for the people of Minnesota as I am trying to fight for the people of North Dakota, so that his conscience might be as clean as is mine. I yield to no man, Mr. President, when it comes to fighting for the common people of this country. The distinguished Senator knew he was violating a rule of the Senate when he made the remark which he made, because he must be familiar with the rules. It is typical, Mr. President. If they cannot control, they try to wreck anyone who dares to stand up. They ridicule him, make fun of him.

I did not make the rules that we have in the Senate. I have not done anything wrong. I have a right to debate. It is my judgment that if a bill were before us today which would wipe out the grain exchanges, other Senators would be standing here making a spectacle of themselves.

O Mr. President, it is easy to criticize. I want it known that I do not care any more tonight than I cared for years as to what any other man thinks of me. That is my business. Looking into the mirror I see the man staring out at me. Surely we could have finished the salary bill. But I did not notice some of the members of the committee tearing their shirts to be there to hear the testimony. WILLIAM LANGER sat there seven-eighths of the time alone. I was not out playing golf; I did not play one game. But I say, Mr. President, that practically nine-tenths of the Federal employees are not receiving enough money. Some of them are not receiving enough to keep body and soul together. That does not worry the Republican leadership. Let them starve! When the testimony showed that some of the families could not buy butter for 3 months, and some did not have meat for over a month, I did not see the Republican leadership worrying about it. When the testimony was undisputed that in order for one of those men to live decently his pay should be raised $1,160, I did not see the Republican leadership worrying about it. If a Senator protests against such a situation, he is accused of making a ridiculous spectacle of himself.

Let some of the Senators who say that go back to their States; let them go to Minneapolis and St. Paul and publicly say "Let the Republican Party carry on its duties."

According to the testimony, if one of the Government employees received an increase of $800 a year, and received it today, he would still be getting $2.10 a week less than he received in 1939, based on what money will now buy.

That is the testimony of the Department of Labor; it is the testimony of the Department of Agriculture.

Let me say, Mr. President, that the failure to pass the pay bill months ago is a disgrace to the Republican Party. The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] over a year ago showed the desperate need of Government employees. I have here, Mr. President, a record of the distinguished Senators who are members of the committee and who attended the meetings. I suggest to the postal employees and to the other Federal employees that they find out about the deep, deep interest of some of the Senators who now criticize a Senator for getting up and daring to fight for the interests of those employees.

Two hundred and ninety-nine million dollars was appropriated the other day just for tobacco for foreigners, $200,000 just for coca-cola for foreigners, under the Marshall plan. These Government employees did not have a raise from 1925 to 1946, and when they got the raise of $300 which I secured for them, 2 weeks later the President abolished overtime, and the record shows they took home less in their envelopes after they got the $300 raise. That is a record that cannot be denied.

Mr. President, Senators are in a hurry all of a sudden. There is a convention about to meet, and I am curious to see the planks of some of the reactionary Republicans. Four years ago they pledged themselves to pass an anti-lynching law, and there it stopped, they are still pledging. I am not going into all the other matters I have discussed at various times, but if you find a party that defaults on one promise, it will default on another.

Four years ago, when they wanted the Negro vote, they promised the Negroes everything. I do not know what they are going to say this time; I am very curious to see. What some gentlemen on this floor do not seem to realize is that the Senator from North Dakota believes that if a party makes a campaign promise, the party should keep it, not come along and say we are going to have a tonnage tax on coal or iron or something and then not impose it, come along and say we are going to raise the income taxes and then not do it.

It is very strange that some of these Senators who are so very, very critical and who are such great Republicans, could not carry their own State for President 4 years ago, and could not carry it 8 years ago. We carried North Dakota, we carried it when Minnesota went Democratic. I carried every county in North Dakota and I did it in spite of the fact that the Governor of Minnesota came to Grand Forks, N. Dak., and was photographed with my opponent. I did it in spite of the fact that $40,000 was raised in the State of Minnesota to defeat me, and that every grain company except the Cargill Elevator Co. contributed. I did it in spite of the fact that Mr. Stassen did all he could to defeat me in North Dakota, and I took a little time out from my own campaign to beat Mr. Stassen in another State, and we did a good job of it.

Oh, no, Mr. President, I may be making a spectacle of myself tonight in the judgment of some Senators, especially from Minnesota, but I challenge them to come to North Dakota and meet me in debate. We will decide up there what the farmers in that locality think about it. He has not heard from the churches of North Dakota asking me to put up this fight. He has not heard from the Farmers' Union asking me to put up this fight. He has not heard from the Concordia College asking me to put up this fight, or from the other churches and people's organizations asking me to put up this fight. I did not have to do it. I could have gone and lain down some place and let somebody else talk. It is not pleasant for me to be here. It is so much easier not to do your duty, sometimes.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I shall not soon forget the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. I learned a long time ago the courtesy of this Chamber. I regret that coming from the Northwest we have a man who did not know the meaning of that courtesy. We have not many men like that who will come into this body from the great Northwest.

Out there, Mr. President, in the great Northwest, over 50 years ago my grandfather started the fight for the people, my father kept it up, and the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce almost wrecked them. But we finally won out.

When one goes through a 50-year fight, Mr. President, he does things that seem incomprehensible to fellows who have not gone through a fight of that character, who have not had to work their way up, who had some machine that picked them up, a machine that was backed by the railroads, the Steel Trust, and the Grain Trust, who just picked them up and said, "You are a nice little boy. You will obey orders. We will take you for United States Senator. We will send someone there to give you a rub-down each night and keep you in shape." The Senator from North Dakota never had that kind of treatment, but when the Senator from North Dakota showed up at a place, he could get some sleep at some fine farmer's home.

I learned one thing, and that was to be honest with the men and women who elected me, and when the hour was the darkest in North Dakota, in spite of all the Minneapolis and St. Paul newspapers—in which I was vilified—could do, in spite of it all, I got the biggest vote for Governor on the 27th day of June 1934 that any Governor ever received in the history of North Dakota.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair.) Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator would not rule my grandfather out from Fort Ransom, would he?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

In this session we have had January, February, March, April, May, and part of June, and last year we had 12 months in which we could have passed a pay-increase bill. Nobody worries about it. So far as the Senate is concerned, I guess, I, as chairman of the committee, did most of the worrying about it. Now it is proposed to hurry the pay-increase bill through Congress. Anyone who proposes to make an appropriate increase is accused of filibustering. A bill is brought in providing $300 increase instead of $700, and when a Senator objects he is accused of making a spectacle of himself on the Senate floor. A small clique of Republican reactionaries say the increase should be $300 or $400. But if a Senator says the increase should be more he is filibustering.

Mr. President, fortunately, when someone says something about me that he may think is very, very bad, his remarks are like water on a duck's back.

Mr. President, delay is indefensible in passing a pay bill. But suddenly it is said that a pay-increase bill is going to be passed. Of course, the bill will not provide much by way of increase, but those who urge the passage now will say, "A half a loaf is better than nothing." Whereas an increase of $1,000 should be given, it is proposed to give $350. The poor Federal worker is so far in debt that even two or three hundred dollars looks like manna from heaven to him when he cannot stall off the banker any longer.

Some of those who are going to be at the Republican National Convention should read the testimony given on the pay bill. Do those who will compose the resolutions committee at that convention believe there should be an adequate pay increase?

Some say that if I had not talked tonight the pay-increase bill would have been passed, the conference on it would have been over, and increases of $350 or $450 would have been made, whereas, according to the evidence, the increases should be $1,160.

Mr. President, I hope the time will come when the Hatch Act will be abolished so far as it pertains to the Federal Government workers. There is no reason why those men and women should not exercise all the rights of full citizenship. Everyone else is receiving a large increase in pay. That is shown from the figures of industrial pay increases. Such increases are much greater than the Government has given its own employees. But no one is worrying about that.

Mr. President, I again come back to the draft bill. Respecting that bill I bring to the Senate the demands of the people of North Dakota that I should put up this fight. I am sorry if the people of North Dakota are different from the people of Montana or the people of Minnesota or the people of South Dakota. But here are the letters from professors in the agricultural college and the university; letters from the school of forestry and the school at Ellendale; letters from Concordia College faculty.

Mr. President, it is a great satisfaction to one who realizes that God Almighty has given him the strength and the courage and the fortitude and the patience and the health so that he can properly represent the kind of people I have in my State.

Mr. President, I would not criticize the votes of any of my colleagues for the world, because I assume that every man who votes on a measure votes according to his conscience, but I noticed when the Committee on the Judiciary 4 or 5 years ago reported a bill which would get the insurance companies out from under the antitrust law after the Supreme Court rendered a decision against them, how quick some were to vote for such legislation. I noticed what happened when the railroads were indicted for fixing rates, how they sought to get around the law, and I have observed that no Attorney General, either a Republican or Democratic Attorney General, up to the time that Tom Clark became Attorney General, had ever put a man in jail for violating the Sherman Antitrust Act. There seems to be one law for the rich and another law for the poor. There is an antitrust law on the statute books and it has been there since 1890. When a GI came home and stole a loaf of bread he went to jail. If a grocer, during OPA raised the price of bread one penny, he went to jail. But, Mr. President, when the great big companies get together and organize a monopoly on bread and milk they do not go to jail. Those behind those big companies were made ambassadors to foreign countries, and there they are, because out of the money they have taken from poor people they were able to raise four or five or six hundred thousand dollars to pay for a campaign for someone to run for President.

Mr. President, I would rather cast my lot, and I have during all the years of my life, with the underdog, with the one who needs a friend.

Mr. President, I return to the question of universal training. I want to call attention in the RECORD to the votes cast on the amendments. Some Senators from the Northwest who have been preaching so much against war profits, when they had an opportunity to reduce them to 10 percent refused to raise their hands and obtain a vote; and when the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] offered an amendment to tax war profits 100 percent, it received very few votes.

I am not criticizing any Democrats. The Democrats started 18 months ago to put the Republican Congress in a hole, and they have done a beautiful job. One cannot help but admire it when they do a fine, efficient job. I am proud of the Republican Party. I am a very insignificant part of it, but, by the Eternal, I am a very vocal part of it. I shall do a great deal of talking out in the Northwest.

We have a peculiar system in the Northwest. We learned the last time that just because one is on the Republican ticket that does not mean that he must support the Republican nominee for President. One can even go to the Republican convention and second the nomination of the man who is nominated for President, and go back to the great Northwest, and instead of being for the Republican nominee he can be for the Democratic nominee, as was so well proved 4 years ago.

I am going back home to support the Republican ticket in my State. I hope to do a good job of it. But I shall get a great deal further by telling the Republicans the truth about this Congress than by trying to salve it over and make excuses for it. I know that in some of the other States that does not make any difference. In some other States the corporations and trusts are strong enough to elect anyone. That cannot be done in North Dakota. The people of North Dakota are too well informed, too progressive. They read too many newspapers. They watch the candidates, and they watch the record. So even if a man wanted to fool them, he could not do so, as has been so ably demonstrated by the people of North Dakota time and again.

There was a time when Art McKenzie gathered a few men around him in a hotel in St. Paul, Minn., and there named the entire ticket for North Dakota. I do not blame some of the Minnesota politicians for being sore at North Dakota. But in 1915 we obtained a divorce, and we wiped the slate clean. North Dakota had grown up. We said that we no longer needed a nursemaid in the person of Minnesota. Up to that time the situation reminded one of a big cow, with her front feet in North Dakota eating grass, and her hind feet in Minneapolis and St. Paul. Those in St. Paul got all the cream. In 1915 we moved the cow into North Dakota—all of her, hind feet, tail, and everything else, and we have had her in North Dakota ever since.

All we get is ridicule. We are not doing so badly in North Dakota. We have managed to get along all right. We have no great amount of bonds or indebtedness. Last year we had the highest income of any group of farmers in the United States. We are getting along well. But we do not want our boys drafted. We have a right to say that we do not want them drafted. When I am asked by the people of my State, by the hundreds of people who have written me letters, by the churches, and by all the other institutions I have enumerated this evening, I will say that I did not propose to let the Senate adjourn without presenting to the Senate the letters which I have received.

Mr. President, I wish to make it plain once more that I have not taken a single moment of time for a filibuster. The letters and petitions which I have presented are from people who are opposed to universal military service. Almost without exception the writers ask me to present them to the Senate. This is the first opportunity I have had to present them to the Senate as a body. My job is done. My work in behalf of those people, so far as this bill is concerned, is completed.

So, Mr. President, confident in the knowledge that the farmers and the common people of my State will understand what I have said here, even if unfortunately some other Senators from the Northwest do not, I am willing to leave it to the judgment of the people who elected me as to whether I have given a faithful portrayal of the feelings of the farmers of the Northwest. Every Senator who cared to do so could have sat here and listened to me tell the attitude of one State of this Union, the great, fine patriotic State of North Dakota.

I thank Senators who remained and listened to me. I wish to make it unanswerably plain that I believe that if the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] knew that something was being voted for that the people of Virginia did not want, he would say so. The same thing is true of the majority of Senators.

With those words, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall take only a few moments of the time of the Senate at this particular part of the early morning.

We have had about 9 hours of discussion which has generally been advertised in the public press, at least, as being a filibuster. We have had relief given to the Senator who is trying to prevent action on this very important national defense legislation, the relief being given by the Senator from North Dakota. Now the Senator who originally spoke, and who was conducting the filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting, is back again on the floor of the Senate.

I think I can say without fear of contradiction that no person denies to the Senator from North Dakota the right to discuss, debate, and vote against this legislation if his conscience tells him to do so. But by the same token, even though the rules of the Senate are so loose that they permit it to be done, I do not believe that morally any Senator or small group of Senators in exercising their right of expression and their right to vote, have a right themselves to deny to 94 other Members of the Senate of the United States, representing 140,000,000 people, the right to vote on legislation which may mean the very safety of this Republic.

Not so long ago we had an Ambassador who wrote a well-known book, the title of which was "Mission to Moscow." Mr. President, I say with all the sincerity I possess that, at some time when perhaps a power might move in Europe to upset the peace of the world, and might endanger the very safety of this Republic, I certainly hope history will not record that this filibuster was in fact a mission for Moscow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. TAYLOR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was on my feet first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thought both Senators were on their feet at the same time.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Chavez	Kilgore	Stennis
Connally	Knowland	Stewart
Cooper	Langer	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Flanders	Martin	Williams
Fulbright	Maybank	Young
Green	Millikin	
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota that a conference be requested and the conferees be appointed. [Putting the question.]

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President! Mr. President! Mr. President!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, recently, a month or 6 weeks ago at least, there was an article in the paper about two American GI's in Germany who chased two Russian officers home, throwing rocks through the barracks windows. The boys were arrested or detained and action taken against them. I have forgotten what, but certain penalties were invoked anyhow. When asked why they did it, the boys stated they "just hated Russia." Well, it is not much wonder

they hate Russia. I quote from an Associated Press dispatch from Frankfurt, Germany, dated November 7, which said:

American soldiers in Germany will begin next week a study of Communist Russia as part of the United States Army's official troop information and education program.

Attendance is compulsory.

The bulletin soldiers will study describes itself as "the story of Mother Russia, of its great cruel history, of the hard men who seized power 30 years ago and have held it ever since."

Officials said the lessons are scheduled as a part of a series of studies entitled "Know Your Neighbor."

It is ironical to note that during the war, when the Russians were fighting actively as our allies, we had courses of study on things connected with Russia, as everybody knows wonderfully well. We all remember that in those days the headlines would refer to our Russian Allies as "the gallant Russians," "the brave Russians," and "the heroic Russians." Then the war came to an end. More particularly, a date that is more significant than the change in relations would be the death of President Roosevelt. The tone of dispatches began to change almost as soon as Roosevelt left us. By the time the war had ended the newspapers hardly ever referred at all to the Russians in favorable terms. It was always, from then on, the "heroes of Stalingrad" who became the "villains of the Kremlin," and they have been hard at it ever since. It is a wonder, Mr. President, we have been able to keep the peace to this date considering the propaganda that is put out by the press against Russia; the radio, to a lesser extent, though there are laws that make the radio give both sides of questions to a certain extent anyhow.

I should like to read into the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Tuesday, April 20, dealing with the Bogota Conference. We have been told by our State Department, those in authority, that the Bogota Conference was a great success. I think it might be well to examine those articles. For that reason, I would like to quote first the article of Walter Lippmann. Across the page is another article by Sumner Welles dealing with the Bogota Conference. I think they are both very significant. The first article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, April 20, in Walter Lippmann's column, Today and Tomorrow. The item is entitled "The Bogota Intelligence," in which he says:

After testifying in a secret session of a congressional committee, Admiral Hillenkoetter, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, allowed himself to be interviewed in order to show that he had warned the State Department of the Bogota uprising. This would not have been edifying even if the admiral had proved his case. But in fact his own evidence disproves his case.

You see Mr. President, when they had this Bogota Conference down there they had a sort of revolution right in the midst of it and some of our Congressmen and various other people were very much put out that our Secret Service agents had not informed them of what was taking place in Bogota. Within the last few days I have read in the papers that Bogota is overrun by foreign secret-service agents; they are just all over the place. The country can hardly be called its own there any more at all, there are so many foreign powers in there finagling for the oil they have. Mr. Lippmann goes on to say:

The key-intelligence dispatch, dated March 23, which he says—

That is, Admiral Hillenkoetter—

which he says was withheld from the State Department by a representative of the Department in Bogota said: "Have confirmed information that Communist-inspired agitators will attempt to humiliate the Secretary of State and other members of the United States delegation to the Pan-American Conference upon arrival in Bogota by manifestations and possible personal molestation." This was in no sense a warning of what happened in Bogota. No attempt was made to humiliate the Secretary of State; there were no manifestations against the Secretary of State upon his arrival in Bogota, and he has not been subjected to personal molestation.

This was in no sense, Mr. President, a warning of what happened in Bogota. No attempt was made to humiliate the Secretary of State. In fact, all the dispatches I read said he was treated very well at all times. There were no manifestations against the Secretary of State upon his arrival in Bogota, and he has not been subjected to personal molestation. The fact is that what Admiral Hillenkoetter predicted did not happen, and what did happen was not predicted by Admiral Hillenkoetter.

Mr. Lippmann goes on to say:

A "warning" that Secretary Marshall was going to be molested can hardly be construed as a warning that there was going to be an uprising against the Colombian Government.

When we stop to think about that, it is not any great wonder that they had an uprising against the Colombian Government. I find, since the uprising down there, that the Government has decreed that industries must provide their workers with shoes. That is a great advance, a great concession. Evidently, up to this time there have been a great many of the Colombians who did not even have shoes to wear. I do not see how anyone can expect people to be very satisfied when they have such a low economic state that they do not even have shoes to wear. So at least out of their uprising they did get an order directing the mostly foreign-owned oil companies to buy shoes for their workers. They are somewhat better off.

The article continues:

It seems reasonably certain, not only from the uprising in Colombia, but from the condition of the conference, before it was interrupted, that the administration, though it had warning of trouble, had not made a successful diagnosis of the trouble. It seems to have fixed its attention on the Communist-inspired agitators, and not on the deep and violent popular unrest which was boiling up just under the surface.

The crucial and difficult part of intelligence work is not in spying and the collection of secret information. It is in the appraisal of the information, most of it not secret at all. The first installment of Mr. Churchill's memoirs in Life magazine is worth studying in this connection. There is a passage in which Mr. Churchill tells us how during the years 1931-34, when he was out of office, he managed nevertheless to appraise far more accurately than the government in office what was happening in Nazi Germany.

During those years he worked closely with three men. One was Prof. Frederick Lindemann, later Lord Cherwell, with Desmond Morton, who was in the British Intelligence, and with Ralph Wigram, "then the rising star of the Foreign Office and in the center of all its affairs." Mr. Churchill had access to the same information, scientific intelligence, and diplomatic, as the government. He did not know any more than did the Prime Minister and the government. Yet he understood what he knew and drew the right conclusions whereas they did not understand and drew the disastrously wrong conclusions.

The moral of this story is that while an intelligence agency can serve a government, it is not a device for relieving statesmen of the task of judging correctly and wisely the course of events.

Let me say, Mr. President, that that is the question involved here, whether the right decision has been made. I am firmly convinced that any decision to saddle peacetime conscription on our country is the beginning of the end of all our traditional freedoms. If I were not firmly convinced of that, certainly I should not be subjecting myself to what I am going through here.

It is a mistake to expect, and foolish of Admiral Hillenkoetter to talk as if we had a right to expect, the Central Intelligence Agency to appraise the situation in Colombia and South America. That was the business of the President and Admiral Leahy, of Secretary Marshall, and Mr. Armour, after they had studied Admiral Hillenkoetter's reports and the State Department's reports. To suppose that an intelligence agency can make these final judgments is in effect to say that the intelligence agency could be not only the eyes and the ears, but also the brains of the Government.

There never was, and there never will be, such an intelligence agency.

The aftermath of the Bogotá explosion shows that it could not have been easy to foresee it. For even by hindsight there is as yet no convincing and consistent story of what happened. That may be due in large measure to the censorship. But I suspect it may also be due to something else, something subtler and more misleading.

That something else is the very human propensity to insist on making the facts fit one's stereotyped preconceptions—in this case to treat a South American revolution as a phase of the Russian revolution, and then to suppose that all revolutionary conditions in the world begin and end in Moscow, that but for Moscow there would be no revolutions.

In an epoch which is as revolutionary as ours this can be a dangerous infatuation. For it concedes to Moscow exactly what Moscow claims and desires: That all the oppressed and discontented masses of mankind.

I think that is a significant statement, Mr. President, in view of what was said on the floor shortly before I started speaking today.

There was the insinuation, the piously expressed hope, that this was not a mission from Moscow. They blame everything on Moscow. If you do not like universal military training, if you do not like to see the American people enslaved to a military machine, if you want the American people to remain free, then you are a stooge of Moscow. That is all they know to say, Mr. President. They cannot argue the matter on its merits, so they insinuate. Anybody who speaks up for the preservation of our traditional way of life is a stooge of Moscow. That has been the cry of Fascist sympathizers, I might say, all over the world wherever they hope to destroy freedom and set up a Fascist way of life.

I may say that, with the Senator from North Dakota, who spoke during the night, I want neither fascism nor communism. We want to preserve the American way of life free from military domination.

Across the page from the article by Walter Lippmann which I have just quoted is another by Sumner Welles. These two gentlemen are conceded to be our foremost experts on foreign affairs at least in the field of newspaper columnists. Mr. Welles' article has this heading:

Bogotá putsch obscured trend—Hemisphere unity is dissolving.

Of course, I have been contending that our good-neighbor policy was being scuttled. For almost 2 years now I have been warning the American people and the Congress that the good will which Roosevelt built up for us in South America was being dissipated by the greed and disregard of the welfare of our South American neighbors by our cartelists and monopolists, who are down there exploiting those people unmercifully, interfering in their internal affairs, telling them how to run their government, driving their government to take drastic action against workers and workers' movements of any kind.

This is the subhead: "Sumner Welles reports bitter feeling against United States before parley was halted; he denounces patronizing attitude toward the Latins." By Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State. This is the body of the article:

Secretary Marshall was right in describing the uprising in Bogotá as an "occurrence that goes far beyond Colombia." But whether the revolt was Communist-inspired, or, what seems more likely, merely Communist-abetted, it has had a tragic impact upon the national life of one of the most truly democratic of the American Republics. It has undoubtedly dealt a blow to the international prestige of the American regional system.

In the long run, however, more harm will result from the fact that public opinion is now going to be so obsessed with a hemispheric Red scare that it will lose sight of the significance of what happened at the conference before the uprising.

The conference provided new evidence that the inter-American system is in real ranger of collapse.

In other words, all the good will that was built up through the good neighbor policy, conceived and put into operation by our great leader Franklin D. Roosevelt, has been dissipated. Mr. Welles says:

For this, Communist intrigues are not responsible. It is due chiefly to our own policies in recent years. The impression of the public here that all is well is being deliberately fostered in Washington.

In other words, when they tell us that we still have the friendship of the Latins they are kidding us. Deliberately fostered is a polite way of saying they are not telling us the truth. If they have told us falsehoods about our relations with South America, it is not the first time we have been deceived by the bipartisan coalition in charge of our foreign policy at the present time. In fact, the Wall Street publication "Financial Age" published an article a while back telling, I do not know for what reason, just to brag, I guess, and let their business clientele see how easy it is to fool the common folks, that our Government sent out two different groups of speakers to sell the Marshall plan. One group went to churches and clubs and told them the Marshall plan was to feed hungry people, especially poor little starving babies. They do not want to forget the babies. Of course, that played on the sympathy of the good church people and tender hearted women's clubs. But they got behind the Marshall plan. Another team of speakers went to businessmen's clubs, chambers of commerce, bankers' associations, manufacturers' associations, and this team of speakers, sent out by the State Department to sell the Marshall plan, told these business people, "Now, don't let anybody kid you fellows. Just don't get exicted by what we are telling these women's clubs and church groups about feeding hungry people. This Marshall plan is really designed to get us markets all over the world."

We might expect something like that of Chiang Kai-shek or some of the other governments we have thought of as being corrupt all over the world, but can anyone imagine our Government being so cynical as to send out these different groups of speakers to say different things to different people to try to sell the Marshall plan to them?

The lengths to which they went to sell the Marshall plan were beyond belief. Of course, the appropriation of $10,000,000 out of the taxpayers' money for certain newspapers for services they rendered in selling the Marshall plan is about the ultimate in unmoral governmental dealing.

Mr. Welles goes on to say:

A State Department spokesman has just declared that the inter-American system "is a stronger * * * system than it was at the end of the war."

Mr. Welles said:

Now such a flagrant misstatement of fact as this not only misleads public opinion but also causes this Government's good faith to be questioned in Latin America.

Of course, when the State Department boys said that our inter-American system is stronger than it was at the end of the war perhaps they did not mean in the strength of the ties of friendship that the South Americans may have for us. Perhaps what they meant was in the number of guns they have down there.

Oh, some few years ago there was agitation for the Congress to appropriate money to arm South America. To my knowledge, Mr. President, unless it was slipped through without debate while I was away from the session sometime, we never did act on that matter of appropriating money for South America for armaments, but to the best of my knowledge they got the guns anyhow. This Army of ours pays no attention to what goes on on Capitol Hill. They just send stuff around and arm people to suit themselves. If they cannot figure it out one way they do another. If they cannot buy the new material, guns, and what not, to give to their stooges and protégés, their Fascist henchmen all over the world, then they declare it surplus and just give it to them if they do not happen to have an appropriation.

The next paragraph of Mr. Welles' article has the subheading "A blessing in disguise?" Now let us see what this blessing in disguise is.

Mr. Welles said in his article:

On the very day of this statement—

That is when he said that our inter-American system is stronger than at the end of the war.

On the very day of this statement, one of the most widely respected statesmen of Latin America said to me, "Bad as it is, the revolt at Bogotá may prove to be a blessing in disguise. It will probably pull us together in taking effective defense measures. And it has at least postponed the open clash between the United States and the other republics which seemed inevitable before the rebellion occurred."

The feeling against this country at the Bogotá Conference was more bitter than at any inter-American meeting since the Habana Conference of 1928.

Is that not a sad thing, Mr. President, that a man of the reliability of Sumner Welles can say now that the feeling in South America is more bitter against us than at any time since 1928—that was before Roosevelt came in? All that good will has been dissipated. Mr. Welles said:

The United States has failed to show any comprehension of our neighbor's most vital problem. It has refused to admit that they have any right to expect the United States to cooperate in a long-range economic program which would relieve their pressing difficulties, and which, by increasing production and promoting industrialization, would help them to raise the living standards of many peoples now illiterate, undernourished, desperately poor, and without sanitation or decent housing.

Is not that a terrible picture to be able to paint of our next-door neighbors right down here, when we are shipping billions of dollars worth of stuff over to Europe? I just read to this Chamber last evening the report that Europe is allowing food to spoil in warehouses, and manufactured goods to accumulate, because they are unable to sell them in Europe, while our poor South American brothers are in such dire straits. But we refuse to help them. We take the more direct, blunt approach of supplying arms to their corrupt rulers to keep the people in subjugation so they cannot protest against their economic conditions. Just send the bosses guns instead of sending the workers some food.

Mr. Welles proceeds to say:

The worst of it is that the peoples of the other Americas are beginning to think that the United States only remembers them when, as after Pearl Harbor, this country urgently needs their help.

Our misconception of the underlying issue was recently illustrated by an editorial in one of this country's greatest newspapers. It complained that when Secretary Marshall had read to the conference the announcement of President Truman's recommendation that the capital of the Export-Import

Bank be increased by $500,000,000 for loans for Latin America the Latin-American delegates listened in stony silence. Their lack of enthusiasm was termed "the last straw."

When folks are starving, our South American neighbors do not appreciate it when we tell them we will loan them some money. When we tell them we will loan them some money and they do not appreciate it, our boys say, "That's the last straw":

This point of view is precisely that of Secretary Marshall and his Cabinet colleagues.

The other American republics had for 3 years been pleading with the United States to join with them in a program which would safeguard the democratic institutions and insure the future welfare of the hemisphere.

The next subheading is "Flatly turned down." Mr. Welles goes on to say:

They had been flatly turned down. Yet they were apparently supposed to jump to their feet with jubilation—like school children granted a holiday—upon hearing an announcement that was in no sense responsive to their needs, and the purport of which had been published a month before.

The economic program for which they ask would involve no excessive burdens. It would imply the obligation of this Government, when private capital is neither available nor desired, to assure its neighbors of the credits and facilities needed over a period of years to help in carrying out a constructive development plan upon which all the American republics would agree.

Such a program would insure economic stability in the new world. By helping to rebuild trade between Europe and Latin America, it would expedite the European recovery which is our major objective. By increasing purchasing power, it would expand the market for our own exports. The adoption of this program would be the surest means of halting communism, which only prospers in those parts of Latin America where living standards are pitifully low.

Of course, that is true most any place. Where people get a decent economic break, communism has very little appeal. Mr. Welles continues:

The Latin-American Republics want no hand-outs. They do consider themselves entitled to the same friendly cooperation in the solution of their vital problems as that which they gave us during the war.

If the people of the United States want to preserve the inter-American system they must wake up to realities. It is only going to survive if we show our neighbors that we have learned that the welfare of the other Americas is essential to the welfare of the United States.

Mr. President, we are in a Presidential election year. Both old parties have failed to take any action to assure that millions of our citizens will have the right to vote.

Here is an article from the Atlanta Journal. It is headed "One thousand eight hundred and thirty-three of Negro voters purged by Laurens County registrars. Talmadge supporters linked to new board which began work in October."

The article goes on to tell how registered voters have been purged from the rolls. They are getting ready down in Georgia to be sure that very few Negro people are allowed to vote. As I have said, the new party has a Negro candidate for the United States Senate down there, and they do not want too many Negroes voting.

This article is written by George Goodwin, Journal staff writer. It reads as follows:

DUBLIN, GA., May 8.—Some 1,833 qualified Negro voters have been purged from the Laurens County registration list. The action by the 3-man county board of registrars cut off more than 75 percent of the 2,477 Negroes who were entitled to vote in the last general election.

The list of those removed included landowners, church officers, and college graduates.

In the past they have been a little considerate. If a Negro was somebody, so to speak, if he had landholdings or something else, they might give him a little consideration; but they are becoming a little more desperate now.

The purge started last October, some 5 weeks after Superior Court Judge R. Earl Camp appointed a new board of registrars. The registrars are E. S. Baldwin, chairman; Marvin W. Watson, and Ancil Chavous.

The registrars continued the purge after both the January grand jury and county attorney had ruled that their actions were illegal.

It seems that the election registrars down in Georgia pay about as much attention to grand juries and county attorneys as the Army pays to the Congress. The Congress can make rulings, but the Army just goes ahead and does as it pleases.

Political control in Dublin and Laurens County centers in Representative W. Herschel Lovett, one of the strongest Talmadge supporters in Georgia and candidate for the State senate. His political followers include Judge Camp, members of the county Democratic committee, the county commissioners, and members of the board of registrars.

In the 1946 general election Laurens County had about 11,000 registered voters. About 2,477 were colored. Since the 1946 election the Negroes are opposed to Mr. Lovett, both in State and local political matters.

REVEALS PURGE DETAILS

Mr. Watson, who was an assistant registrar before his appointment to the three-man board, and Board Chairman Baldwin told the Journal details of the purge.

The board held its first meeting October 5 and decided to go over the entire registration list. They worked 18 days in October and then stopped the purge until January of this year.

They stopped when the county attorney ruled that, according to the State law on the duties of registrars, they could not meet before April 20, 1948. He advised the county commissioners not to pay the board members for any days worked before that time. Registrars are paid $6 per day each. However, the commissioners have paid the registrars for all of their time worked.

Judge Camp said he advised the board members they could not meet before January 1. He said that he considered they could meet legally any time after the first of the year.

CALLED EMERGENCY ACTION

He said he had been told that the old registration list had been lost and that, even if it were not lost, it was somewhat incorrect. He justified the registrars' actions after January 1 as an emergency.

"The registrars had a mammoth task," Judge Camp told the Journal.

Actually, the list had not been lost. It was in the possession of the clerk of the court and another copy was in the hands of the tax collector. Board members said they got the list from the tax collector early in October.

The purge got into full swing in January. Chairman Baldwin said the board worked one district's list at a time. They started with Dublin district, where 1,482 colored voters were registered.

The Georgia code states that the fact that a voter's name is on the registration list as furnished to the registrars by the tax collector is prima facie evidence of his right to vote.

Most of the Negroes stricken had been registered more than 3 years and had voted in 1946. All had been eligible to vote in November 1946.

Nevertheless, they were stricken from the rolls, and so, of course, were unable to vote.

Here is an interesting article which appeared in the Washington Daily News. It is datelined Birmingham, Ala., June 12. The heading is "Negro Girl Scout camp disbands after threat." The article reads as follows:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., June 12.—Authorities today promised to investigate a night raid on a nearby Girl Scout camp by a band of men wearing the white robes and hoods of the Klan.

Two white Girl Scout instructors conducting a leadership-training course for some 20 Negro girls reported that the masked men broke into their tent late Thursday night and gave them 24 hours to get out.

Scout officials said the camp was broken up yesterday to safeguard the lives of the students and instructors.

Deputy Solicitor H. A. Sullinger, of Bessemer, near which the camp is located, promised an investigation to determine if any State laws had been violated.

In New York, Scout officials said the FBI was checking the incident.

Scout officials identified the threatened white girls as Miss Katrine Nickel, of Birmingham, and Miss Elizabeth Ijams, of Knoxville, Tenn., instructors on the Girl Scouts' national staff.

The two girls reported to Scout headquarters that 8 or 10 men in white robes and hoods, who looked like Klansmen, entered their tent late Thursday night.

The girls said the men awakened them, questioned them about camp operations, and rifled their personal belongings, saying they were looking for cards with hammers and sickles on them.

Then the hooded raiders warned them to "get out by tomorrow night," the instructors said.

Miss Nickel and Miss Ijams were conducting the training course for Negro girls from five Southern States at Camp Bray Fletcher, a short distance south of Bessemer. They had separate eating and sleeping facilities, they said.

Scout officials said the purpose of the camp was to train Negro girls in Scout leadership so that they could conduct similar courses for other Negro girls. There are presently no Negro girls in the area to conduct such courses, they explained.

Some Senators become so excited that every speech a Senator makes seems to them to have been written in Moscow, or perhaps written right at home on paper with sickles and hammers on it.

The article states that the hooded raiders explained that they were looking for cards with hammers and sickles on them. Mr. President, what a deplorably sad commentary that is on the state of affairs which exists today in some parts of the United States. In that case the Girl Scouts were trying to train some colored Girl Scouts, so that they, in turn, could train other colored girls in scouting; and hooded men appeared and told them to disband within 24 hours, and said they were looking for cards with hammers and sickles on them. Imagine the hysteria of grown men, presumably, rifling a Girl Scout camp and looking for cards with hammers and sickles on them. It is almost unbelievable.

Mr. President, recently I was in Alabama, and I was arrested for going through the wrong door, it was claimed—a door marked "colored"—into a meeting place. I had first-hand experience with conditions in the South. I was arrested and tried for that offense of going through the wrong door. Of course, I was charged with practically everything on the books—disturbing the peace, assault and battery, resisting an officer in the lawful pursuit of his duties, and one or two other charges. I did not resist anyone; I simply tried to enter the hall as gently as I could, and still be firm and get any place. But I was tried. At the trial, the Honorable Oliver B. Hall, recorder, was the judge of the proceedings. I was found guilty and fined $50 and given a 180-day suspended sentence.

I have before me at this time a copy of the statements made by the judge at the time of my sentencing. There is nothing new about those statements. I have heard the same statements before. Any time the question of dealing with Negroes comes up, almost any person from south of the Mason and Dixon's line can be heard making remarks, very similar to those contained in this speech, about how much they love the Negro.

The court had this to say:

There is one statement there that the counsel I have heard so much about for so long, and I have high respect for, made with reference to the publicity, and that the city of Birmingham, Ala., is on trial tonight before the 47 other States.

I think the trial is not shirked at all. We have our laws and we have our customs and we have our problems.

The way and manner in which we have been solving those problems, and the way we are trying still to solve them, is peculiar to our own State or our own section or our own city, and I think we have made admirable progress in solving those problems.

Here, for instance, a short time ago, in my lifetime, it wasn't anything unusual to hear of lynchings, of unlawful homicides, of executions without trial, etc.

Mr. President, I may say that I was told by the Negroes and others in Birmingham that lynchings were out of style.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I wish to call the Senator's attention——

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I can yield only for a question, I must say. I would be happy to yield; but the rule is being enforced, and I must not yield except for a question.

Mr. President, they no longer have lynchings down South; that draws too much publicity. I am told that just every so often a Negro is shot, but nothing is said about it in the newspapers. That is supposed to be in the line of duty. It has the same effect of intimidating the Negroes, but it does not receive the adverse publicity around about the country.

But to resume with the statement of Recorder Hall:

It has been a long time since I have heard of that. I am proud those things are being wiped out.

There has been a great deal of progress made in the good relations between the races in Alabama and in Birmingham, and it is—progress is being made from time to time.

But we are constantly confronted with some outside influences sometimes that retard that development and retard that progress we have made in those things, and there are spokesmen from other sections of the country coming in here and, for some reason or other, trying to create a discontent among the colored people, and it reacts to their disgrace, reacts to their detriment, reacts to the detriment of society as a whole in trying to create peaceable solutions.

Our solutions have been brought about by men in, and not outside of Alabama, trying to live and let live. There is room in Alabama for two races.

As long as spokesmen from other sections fail to recognize that fact and try to create disruption among the races, they are setting that progress back for generations and doing a disservice to the colored people. They are the ones that suffer. Just last night we had a case in here where a colored man drew a knife on a police officer, and he stated if it hadn't been for the Taylor case, he didn't believe he would have done it.

That is too ridiculous for words.

I read further:

That is the thing that makes it so hard for us to solve our problems and makes it so hard for our relations to continue peacefully.

Now, I have seen numbers and numbers and numbers of cases here in Birmingham where there has been a clash between the colored people and the white, where just a few years ago, in your own memories, there wouldn't have been trials in those cases. There would have been lynchings. So, the progress we have made to eliminate lynchings has been our own progress and not the progress by outside spokesmen.

I want to say now to all parties interested, and to the spectators on this side—

I may say, Mr. President, that the court room was divided by an aisle down the center. There was no physical segregation. The colored people were on the left side as one faced the judge, or on the judge's right side. So he spoke to the colored people. The court room was full—half colored and half white.

Recorder Hall said, then:

I want to say now to all parties interested, and to the spectators on this side, I don't think there is anyone who can say I am not a friend of the colored people.

That is an old saw.

I read further:

I am regarded as such by those friends of mine among the colored people that I know and have discussed it with—

I have gone out and asked them, "Don't you think I am your friend?" And they said, "Yes, sir; yes, sir."

And as for the separation of the races, I have not yet seen a man I call a leader among the colored people that wants to break down the progress we have made—

That is the way they put it. Of course, nobody wants to break down progress. They put it that way, "no leader among the colored people wants to break down the progress we have made."

And they do not want that social equality so many people from the outside quarrel for.

Of course, a measure of social equality would be very helpful, Mr. President, so those people could go into a place to eat, go into any kind of place of business or hotel. What would be even better, and what they want more is economic equality, a chance to hold any kind of a job and be advanced according to their ability and not have the color of their skins enter into the proposition.

He says:

They do not want that social equality so many people from the outside quarrel for. They have told me that.

How silly. Of course they have told him that.

They have said: "We don't any more want to go into your homes and eat with you than you want to come into our homes and eat with us."

Well, Mr. President, I may say that I have gone into colored homes and eaten with those people quite often in the past few months, when I have been out over the country, especially in the South. This recorder, Mr. Hall, goes on to say:

They are proud of their race.

Why, sure.

They have got lots to be proud of and they have got lots yet to do. If we are going to have racial equality, it cannot—

Now listen to this, Mr. President—

If we are going to have racial equality, it cannot be done except by bringing the white man down to the level of the colored man.

He delivered that statement right in the face of half of a courtroom full of colored people—that the white man would have to be brought down to the level of the colored man.

The only way we can raise the standard of the colored man is to hold the standard of the white man high and let the colored man catch up.

First, this is the old argument they put up about socialism along the same line. The slickers who oppose socialism ask the farmer, "Do you want the city fellows to come out here? You will have to divide up your sheep and hogs and things with them. Of course, they know that is not true, but it is a good gag for people that do not think. This statement that you cannot bring a colored man up, the white man has to come down to the level of the colored man—no man is asking those things, or that anybody be put on anybody else's level at all. All they ask is that they be given the same opportunity to seek their natural level, Mr. President, which they do not have at the present time.

He says:

Now, if the people from the outside would let us alone and let the white people keep their pace of advancement, they can live side by side and in harmony in Alabama, and so long as outside spokesmen come in and try to create discontent and try to break down that progress that has been made, so long is the chasm between the races going to get wider and wider instead of closer and closer, and I am speaking this to try to create good relations. When those people

get to where they feel capable of taking on to themselves the civilization created by the white people all over the world, not only in Alabama, that will be realized.

Mr. President, such a statement as that by the white people all over the world creating civilization. There are many civilizations besides the white. In fact, the whites make up only a small fraction of the people on this earth.

Some of the greatest men in America, some of the greatest men in Alabama, have been from the colored people—

They never fail to pay lip service to them—

and in the future they can keep on producing great people if they keep that discontent and enmity out of their hearts.

It seems to me from the case at bar that the whole situation is a publicity play, and if I followed my inclination it would be never to try the case at all but to dismiss it. That is what I would like to see done—to rob it of publicity value, to keep it from reacting to the benefit of other people in some other quarters that have deliberately tried to create a situation where this type of publicity would come on.

The reason I think it was deliberately planned and accomplished, the defendant in this case, after the occurrence, immediately hied away to Washington to make a speech before the United States Senate, and then came on back to appear before the court, riding on an airplane to and from.

That is a serious offense, Mr. President, "riding on an airplane, to and from."

If that is not creating publicity, creating a situation for the publicity that might accrue to him, I cannot see any other reason.

I may say that the whole thing was quite unpremeditated. I went down to address the Southern Negro Youth Conference. I had told them in the beginning that I would not and could not address a segregated meeting. When I got down there the sessions were supposed to start on Friday. They did not get started until Saturday, because they could not find a place to hold their meetings. They would make arrangements for a Negro church. Mr. Bull Conner, the city manager, chief of police, or whatever he is, would call the Negro preacher down to headquarters and tell him that he did not want him letting this outfit meet in his church. Well, in each case the Negro minister would argue about it and say that he had a right to let them use the church. Mr. Conner would then say, "Well, we may not have any legal authority to stop the meeting, but there is always the Klan"—these gentlemen I read about a while ago, who broke up the Girl Scouts' meeting. They did not get their meetings started until Saturday. They started to hold a meeting, some of them sitting on opposite sides of the aisle. It was a little church with one aisle. However, on the platform the colored and white sat together.

The police broke into the meeting that afternoon and arrested several of them and said they were not physically segregated. Then they laid a door down across the aisle about 4 rows from the front of this little Negro church, and nailed it across the single aisle. In that way, to get into either the back section or the section nearest the front door, one had to enter at the front door; to get in the front section, he had to come in at a side door. With only one aisle in the place, they made the door at the front of the building the Negro entrance, and around on the side was the white entrance. When they told me the meeting was segregated, they did not tell me about the physical arrangements. They just told me it was segregated. I told them I would not address the meeting, it was against my principle and against the policies of the new party to address segregated meetings.

They said, "Well, just come down and say 'Hello' to the boys and girls and tell them why you cannot address them. Just put in an appearance, anyhow." I said, "All right." I went down to the meeting in a taxicab, and when I got out in front of the Negro church, some of the Negroes were out there to meet me, and they said, "Senator, this is the Negro entrance. You will have to go around to the side door."

If that had been the white entrance, I would have walked up, gone in, told them what I had to say, and that would have been the end of it. But I would not put myself out and walk around the side of the building to help the police to enforce their insulting segregation laws against the Negro people. So I walked up to the front door and was unceremoniously arrested. So it was not premeditated, Mr. President.

Recorder Hall goes on to say:

Now, we have a distinguished visitor. We are happy to have distinguished visitors wherever they might come from. The defendant is a Senator from the State of Minnesota.

And then a voice in the audience said "Idaho." The court corrected himself and said "Idaho." Then he said:

It is a great State and a great people. He has reached fame and notoriety all over the United States, as well as in his own State, but he comes to Alabama and attempts to obtain publicity by breaking our laws. I have before me a distinguished United States Senator, a member of the highest branch of the legislative department in the United States. For that I honor him and respect him, but I am not trying him on his honor or on his respect here tonight. I have got to try him on the facts. I would say there is no other police recorder in the State of Alabama, anyhow, that has had the distinction of trying a member of the highest legislative group in the land—

"Laughter" is interpolated here—

and it is not, Senator, an altogether pleasant undertaking.

I might say, Mr. President, that this Mr. Hall was a very pleasant gentleman.

It is embarrassing to us, that I know, but it is a duty, and I can't do otherwise, but it is embarrassing just the same.

I came into town Sunday afternoon from a long trip. This case happened before I got here and I found it was in my lap. Embarrassing situations have come up. I have tried cases I hated to try, and this is one of them, but I would like to remind the Senator from Idaho, being temporarily in Alabama, a casting rod is better publicity for a politician than breaking the law [laughter and some applause], and it seems sometimes it is a little more successful.

With those efforts of trying to ease the situation that has created tenseness in the crowd, tenseness on the part of the court, tenseness on the part of the Senator, I threw that in for good measure and I am glad you were able to laugh about it. I am not trying to be a comedian but I am glad we still have sense of humor. As long as we can keep that sense of humor there is no danger of our becoming involved in things that can't be eliminated. I am not rebuking you for that outburst. However, it isn't proper decorum.

Now, I am saying all that for this purpose: to say I believe the defendant is guilty as charged, and I am conscious, at the same time, that in doing that I am probably playing right into the hands of the publicity that was in my opinion deliberately started, but be that as it may I have got to do what I think is right. In doing that I am cunningly jockeyed into a position of thus creating publicity for somebody to use for the benefit of their own purposes.

A United States Senator is supposed to know more about the laws than anybody on earth because they make them. I think, as such, they are chargeable with more knowledge, with more duty to obey them.

We like distinguished visitors here. We have had a few, but very few of them to come equal to this defendant's station in life, but when they do come we are proud of them and welcome them, but when a guest comes in our midst and deliberately sets about to violate our laws, then I don't think it fitting or proper that such conduct should be treated in any light manner. I think the evidence shows a deliberate intent here to violate the law, and if there was that intent the violator necessarily did it premeditatedly.

I realize the case has been exaggerated out of all proportion to its importance, and I am going to go the limit of only justice in setting the penalty. I am not going to set it at the minimum. We have our laws, they may at some time be changed but until that time comes we must obey them.

I find the defendant guilty and set his fine at $50 and 180 days in the city jail.

I understand the Senator has complained about our jail. I am not going to require him to go over there just at the same time, and I am going to suspend the jail sentence, and by that time the campaign for which this publicity was created will be just about over, and if the probation of 6 months has been kept, and there has been no violation of our laws within the jurisdiction of this court, then there will be no invoking of the 180 days suspended sentence, but if, for any reason, any of the laws of this city are violated by the defendant while he is in this jurisdiction during the next 180 days then the suspended sentence will be revoked.

So, Mr. President, I was fined $50 and I drew a suspended sentence of 180 days.

I read a moment ago an article concerning a Klansman invading a Negro Girl Scouts' camp and breaking it up. Here is an article from the Chicago Sun-Times. It says:

Loyalty quiz rocks Oak Ridge scientists.

A loyalty quiz of the scientists down there is being conducted. They will wreck our entire atomic-energy program with their witch hunts. Scientists are not stupid people and they will not stand for having their loyalty questioned all the time, as has been done since the Red scare arose.

The article is dated at Oak Ridge, Tenn. It says:

The most important impression of the loyalty investigation now going on here, under which 2 men have already been suspended and as many as 35 may be hauled up, is that no one finds it anything but distasteful; not unnaturally, the scientists who have been hauled up and those who fear they may be

next to undergo the procedure find it hateful. John C. Franklin, Director of Oak Ridge for the Atomic Energy Commission, winces when the subject is broached, for he knows it may be the end of his great research institute. The board that hears the cases is composed of men who are sunk in gloom over their task. The best they can say is that the law directs that the job be done, and, therefore, they must go ahead and do it.

Is not that a sad situation, Mr. President? We have gone crazy in this country, going around investigating people, and even the investigators feel terrible about it. Their heart is not in it. A few Red-baiters are responsible for the whole business.

The worst of it seems to be that no person at Oak Ridge came to this reporter's attention who thought that any of the men are loyalty risks under any reasonable test that could be devised.

Even the remarks of the men who actually hear the cases indicated that they have not been impressed by the dossiers upon which they must base their search.

It is clear that in an organization as tightly integrated as Oak Ridge, where almost all the technical people live and work in close association, a man whose loyalty was suspect would soon be known to his fellows. The men and women here insist that no such person exists in Oak Ridge.

(The United Press reported from Oak Ridge that the Association of Oak Ridge Scientists and Engineers in a statement Wednesday said that technical personnel at the atomic plant are "seriously demoralized" by the accusations against their colleagues. The association said the charges were "mostly trivial," chiefly based on "unsubstantiated rumors," and some completely false.)

HOW IT'S DONE

At the hearings the suspected worker is furnished a list of charges against him. He may present witnesses and retain counsel, at his own expense, and he is given a transcript of the hearing.

That is better than most Government employees get.

But the men who have been heard believe that most of the charges could have been checked without any trouble before the charging procedure was invoked.

There is some more in this whole business of witch hunting and what not.

Mr. President, I should like to correct the Pathfinder magazine. This is an old publication. I understand it has now come under the domination of Mr. Pew, the famous Republican boss up in Philadelphia. He is using it simply as a campaign propaganda weapon, I guess, because it had a wide circulation all across this Nation. For many years people learned to respect the magazine, but now it is taken over by Mr. Pew, and the respect and confidence which the magazine had built up through the years is prostituted for political use.

In the page Under the Dome, which is printed to simulate a typewriter page—it seems most every magazine has one now, or a similar page, telling all the secret dope—the first item has this to say:

Unless interest in his third party revives, Henry Wallace may give up his crusade and withdraw as a Presidential candidate before the Democratic Convention in July. He thinks his opportunity even 4 years hence is lost, and TAYLOR, his running mate, is pressuring him to drop the fight.

Mr. President, to the best of my knowledge I am convinced that Mr. Wallace has no intention of withdrawing from the race. We have talked it over and can see no possibility of any nominee winning either nomination who would be acceptable. As for the last sentence, that "TAYLOR, his running mate, is pressuring him to drop the fight," that is an outright falsehood, with no basis in fact whatever. I never at any time even suggested to Mr. Wallace that we should give up the fight. So Pathfinder was just talking through its hat, without any reason to say such a thing.

Back in March there appeared an article in the New York Herald Tribune which said: "Purge of Greek leftists called gesture to United States."

We have read in the papers day in and day out about all the Greeks who were being murdered by the government in power, which we are supporting over there, and, as I said last evening, it got so bad that the British had to protest, the French protested, the Norwegians protested, and perhaps others did, too, whose protest I did not see. Anyway, they decided then that instead of shooting the prisoners in great bunches, sometimes hundreds of them at one time, they would bring them out and shoot them only 10 or 20 at a time, and it would not attract so much attention. They did not kill fewer, but they did not kill so many at one time.

This article appeared in March, and it said:

Ex-minister says Athens sees Truman doctrine requiring repressions.

In other words, the Greeks have decided that what we want is for them to kill off all the opposition, that there would be less trouble that way, no difficulty about fighting them, and one thing and another.

The article, which is by Homer Bigart, by wireless to the Herald Tribune, reads:

ATHENS, March 7.—Nicholas Kolyvas, former Minister of Justice, said today that the current wave of mass arrests, deportations and executions was the result of the Greek government's interpretation of the Truman doctrine. It believes, he said, that Washington desires ruthless suppression of the Left as an implementation of President Truman's "containment of Communism" theme.

Mr. President, we have been responsible, with this Truman doctrine, for more misery in Greece than has been visited on that sad people for many, many years, and that is saying a great deal. They have had many trials and tribulations. But we have certainly caused them more grief and misery in the last 2 years than they had had for many years previous to that.

We are ruthlessly, indiscriminately bombing the so-called rebel villages. It got so bad that they had to send their children to Yugoslavia, where they are being taken care of by the Yugoslavs. The Greek Government, the installed government we are supporting, the same government that Adolf Hitler supported, has said that these children were kidnaped, and are in Yugoslavia against their will. But last week there was a series of articles in the New York Herald Tribune, I believe by their Balkan correspondent who had gone to Yugoslavia. He said he saw no evidence that these displaced persons camps for Greeks on Yugoslav soil were military in any way, no military training or preparation was visible, and the people said they had no communication with their homeland at all. The Yugoslavs were just taking care of the children out of the goodness of their hearts.

The correspondent goes on to say:

Mr. Kolyvas, Justice Minister in the Plastiras government at the time of the Varkiza agreement of February 12, 1945, under which the ELAS Leftist resistance force was disbanded, said he say no moral justification for the recent execution of ELAS members for alleged crimes committed during the German occupation. After so long an imprisonment—several were first jailed in the weeks immediately after the Varkiza agreement—it scarcely was humane to march them out and shoot them, he said.

In other words, Mr. President, here we are faced with the sorry spectacle of a country controlled by the United States. They would not do these things if we told them positively not to do them, but here in Greece they take prisoners out of jails and prison camps, where they have been incarcerated since Hitler's occupation. The crimes were committed against Hitler's occupation authorities at our behest. We told them over the underground radio that if they would sabotage Hitler we would be there right away and save them. We got there. Some of them got caught, but we got there before they were shot, and I guess they thought they were going to be saved. But for some strange reason they did not get out of jail. They stayed in jail until just this spring, and then they were taken out of jail finally, but instead of giving them an annuity and a medal for their services to democracy, to the cause of the Allies in the recent world war, we lined these poor wretches up and shot them, Mr. President; killed them for crimes committed against Hitler's occupation.

Of course, no freedom-loving people are going to like an American occupation any better than a Hitler occupation, especially when it is no better, which ours is not, over there in Greece. We are supporting exactly the same people, and they are just as ruthless in suppressing their own people now as they were when they were working for Hitler.

"I suppose I'll be labeled a Communist and a traitor for saying this," Mr. Kolyvas said, "but I believe these convictions should have been reviewed. Remember, some of these crimes were committed in a period of extreme political upheaval, when murder often was regarded as patriotic. At that time, both British and American broadcasts were urging the EAM (National Liberation Front) to neutralize and repress all elements collaborating with the Germans.

"Undoubtedly, there were murders motivated by personal vengeance rather than patriotism, but in a period of anarchy such cases are difficult to clarify.

"For that reason," Mr. Kolyvas said, "the amnesty granted under the Varkiza agreements should have covered all crimes committed during the occupation. In any event," he said, "the present purge is dangerously crude and has already eclipsed most of the fundamental liberties guaranteed by the Greek constitution."

CALLS REGIME REPRESSIVE

In the matter of individual freedom, the coalition government of Liberals and Populists (Royalists)—created last September by Loy W. Henderson, State Department director of Near Eastern and African Affairs—has proved far more repressive than even the predominantly Rightist governments which preceded it, Mr. Kolyvas maintained.

In other words this former Greek officials says that the Government now under our occupation is more severe, more repressive, than it was even under Hitler's occupation.

He said thousands of suspected leftists have been deported without trial, journalists arrested for criticizing the government and civil servants purged for disloyalty without benefit of the right of appeal.

Mr. Kolyvas believes a political formula can still be found for restoring peace. Two weeks ago, he visited his native island of Zante and, at the request of its residents, arbitrated an agreement whereby all political groups agreed to bury the hatchet, disband their armed organizations and live in peace.

Liberal deputies at Athens today denounced as unconstitutional a decree adopted Friday of a parliamentary committee giving to the military council power to drop 60 senior army officers. Most of the officers are liberals, and the liberal deputies hinted they were being discharged for political reasons by the predominantly royalist military council.

Mr. President, what I have been reading concerning what is occurring in Greece is very pertinent to what is happening here in America. We have just read how the government over there has discharged all officers of liberal political leanings. If the peacetime draft becomes the law of America I am confident that this weeding-out process, getting rid of all liberals, will be continued here in America, and eventually the Army will just be a tool of reaction and police organization to see that there is no industrial disturbance of any kind taking place. They refuse to try to evolve some plan whereby the workers of America can be paid enough to enable them to buy the great abundance which they can produce in the sweat of their brow. Labor will not stand for that always. Every time labor gets an increase, the prices increase about twice as much, and labor just gets further behind. Well, when they see that there is potential abundance, so much that we have to figure out a Marshall plan to dump it abroad, on people who already have overproduction of their own, so much that we have to figure some way to curtail production, about the best way they can figure is an armament economy, put great segments of our people to building useless articles, articles of destruction like tanks, airplanes, and guns, and that keeps things scarce so prices stay up. And in order to perpetuate such an unfair state of affairs and not let the workers enjoy the good things they can produce, they will have to have a great army thoroughly disciplined and reactionary in leadership.

I have appointed several boys to Annapolis and West Point, and I always try to select them from the families of workmen and farmers. I figure that the so-called upper classes have had plenty of representation at West Point and Annapolis. But always I have a talk with these boys before they go there, and I ask them to please remember the background from which they came, to remember that these Army officers, these West Point and Annapolis folks are wined and dined and feted, and that they tend to forget that there are any common people in the world at all. They live in a world apart. They lose touch with the common people. So the last word I always say to my nominees to West Point and Annapolis is to urge them to please remember and keep that spark of sympathy for the common people whence they came.

Here is another little article of interest. It is from Istanbul, March 7, an Associated Press dispatch. It is headed: "Turkey wants United States aid to take economic form."

I said last evening that we had sent Turkey so many guns they had had to ask us would we please mind stop sending more, and send them instead something to eat. Here is the article on which I based that statement last night. It says:

Turkish sources said tonight the government would like to change the military character of the American-aid program so that it would concentrate instead on Turkey's sagging economic structure.

Consequently, Turkey was expected to ask that a new American mission come here for an economic survey. It was presumed the Turks hoped such a mission would propose that any additional financial aid to bolster Turkey against possible Russian threats be not wholly military, as was the initial grant of $100,000,000.

Ankara sources who cannot be quoted said the military aid program was drawn up in haste. They said the general staff had no time to consider all the aspects of the program suggested by the first American mission.

At the time stories were going about that Turkey had not asked for aid, that we just went over and insisted that they take it. They insisted that they did not want it, and we had to threaten them to make them take our aid. But we got them to do it. We are too smart for those fellows.

A study during the last few months, these sources said, has convinced the general staff and Cabinet members that both American and Turkish funds could be better utilized if the program was aimed at restoring the country's economy.

Recently the world witnessed one of the most interesting incidents in all history when the President of the United States recognized Israel 10 minutes after the creation of the state was proclaimed. The reports from Lake Success are certainly humiliating to any American who has any pride in being an American—and I suppose that includes all of us. But it was embarrassing after the reports that Warren Austin would resign because he had been so insulted by not even being informed of the fact that we had recognized Israel that many people thought he would have to resign to save face.

Here is an article headed "Austin denies again he'll quit over Palestine. Sudden United States recognition of Israel revives reports; other delegates critical." The article is by Fendall Yerxa, and reads as follows:

LAKE SUCCESS, LONG ISLAND, May 15.—Warren R. Austin, United States representative to the United Nations, issued a flat denial today to widely published reports that he would resign his post because of the Government's Palestine policy.

"If you ask me whether I have resigned, I haven't. If you ask me whether I am going to resign, I am not." Mr. Austin told reporters here before he attended a hastily summoned meeting of the Security Council to discuss the Palestine war.

At the same time, there was silence from the American delegation and caustic criticism from foreign countries in reaction to President Truman's sudden de facto recognition of the new Jewish state of Israel. It was this action, committed without any tip-off to Mr. Austin and his staff, that led to a renewal of reports that Mr. Austin was considering quitting his post.

Of course there was absolutely no excuse for the President recognizing Israel without even informing our delegate to the United Nations. He made up his mind on the spur of the moment, no doubt, to try to get the Jewish vote back, but he could have picked up the telephone. It would have taken him only a minute to call Lake Success and say, "Listen, Warren, I have recognized Palestine." He could have hung up and let it go at that. But he did not even bother to do that, and it put our delegates in a most embarrassing position.

Announcement of United States recognition of the new Zionist state threw the American delegation into confusion when it burst upon the final meeting of the General Assembly special session at Flushing Meadow Park last night. Alternate delegate Francis B. Sayre had to take the podium in the Flushing meeting hall and confess that the Nation's official spokesmen before the world congress did not know what their Government was doing.

The delegation had regained some of its composure today. Reporters seeking an explanation of why the President and State Department apparently left their UN representatives in the dark were deftly parried.

But members of some of the foreign delegations were not so casual about it. Three delegates from one of the western European countries were sharply critical. One of them said he wondered how any country in the world could hereafter place its trust in American foreign policies or the pronouncements of American spokesmen in international parleys.

Mr. Austin, quickly surrounded by reporters when he entered the Lake Success delegates' lounge, was jovial in response to their queries on his reported resignation. He declared that he was puzzled by the reports, and added that they had been circulated recently on three occasions.

When his Government did not have enough confidence in him, presumably, even to notify him that it was recognizing Israel, no wonder there were rumors that he would resign. I suppose it was not a lack of confidence, but merely a lack of coordination.

Mr. President, if some Russian soldiers get into an argument with American soldiers, there is a great to do about it. An incident is stirred up. But just the other day we read in the newspapers that our bombing planes had bombed some Korean fishermen and killed about 14 or 16 of them. If the Russians came over and did that to our Mexican friends I am afraid there would be a terrible hubbub and hullabaloo about it.

Here is an interesting article. While we are sending billions of dollars' worth of goods over to Europe, the heading in this article in PM, dated June 4, is Freak Slump in Britain. It reads as follows:

LONDON, June 4.—High taxes and high prices appeared to be forcing Great Britain into a freak depression today, despite critical shortages of essential consumer goods.

While Commons was bemoaning a proposed 25-percent cut in Britain's slice of Marshall plan aid and its possible effect on the import program, informed sources in the financial district said a buyer's strike was developing in London.

"You can't sell a handbag these days," one store manager said. "People just won't buy. Radio sets are piling up and furniture no longer is in demand."

This easing off of consumer demand was in sharp contrast to the long period of indiscriminate public buying which followed the war. People still want things, apparently, but they just haven't got the money to buy them.

Even the recent relaxation of rationing regulations did little to improve things. Stocks still are piling up in stores all over the country. Informed quarters in the "City," Britain's Wall Street, said the reluctance to buy ranged from luxury items to vacuum cleaners.

COMMONS WORRIED

Despite this situation, however Commons sat all night last night debating the finance bill and worrying about how much money the United States of America is going to allot Britain under the European recovery program. Most of this money will go for imports and raw materials to keep British factories going.

That is a strange thing, Mr. President. We are sending them goods, and yet they find it necesary to have bargain sales to try to get rid of what they have over there.

Mr. President, in the issue of United States News and World Report of May 21, 1948, there is an article about various draft plans. The heading is: "Europe's peacetime draft; comparison with United States plan."

The reports for the article come from London, Paris, and Washington.

The article says:

Peacetime draft, now being debated in the United States, already is under way in all major countries. Service is from 4 months to 3 years.

British youths are called up at 18, Russians at 19, Frenchmen at 20. Most countries defer students, professional trainees, hardship cases. But most men go into reserves until middle age.

Then follows a comparison giving the highlights of the various draft systems in Europe. They are quite interesting.

It says:

If the United States revives the draft, it will be joining all the major nations of the world in building a peacetime conscript army.

Mr. President, if that is any consolation to us—that we are joining all the major nations of the world—I suppose we had better go ahead and pass this bill.

The article then says:

Investigation shows that no major power now depends on volunteers, except the United States. Of 54 countries with military establishments, 48 use some form of compulsory service.

United States plans, before Congress, are to draft nonveterans 19 to 25 for 2 years of service. Youths of 18 also may be called. This issue raises the question of how other countries recruit their armies.

European nations call their youths to the colors at ages generally ranging from 18 to 21. Length of service varies from 4 months to 3 years. Only countries with no draft at all are Germany and Austria, which have no armies, and Eire, which still uses volunteers.

Mr. President, it seems that we did the Germans and the Austrians a great favor when we whipped them. They used to have universal military training, and we did not. Then they got into a war, and we whipped them. Now they do not have any army, so they do not have universal military training; but we have taken on such responsibilities that we are told we must have universal military training. So we have traded places with those folks. They used to be kicked around by the army, but now we have traded with them on that, and we are going to let ourselves be kicked around and receive the same sort of treatment which brought them to such a sad end.

The article further says:

Great Britain calls her young men at the age of 18 for 22 months of service. Progressive reductions in terms of service are to be made for men drafted after June 1, so that those called up in December will serve only 18 months.

After January 1, however, new draftees will serve 12 months, followed by 6 years in the reserves. Not only 18-year-olds, but nonveterans up to the age of 26 will be liable for service. Temporary deferments may be granted to students, apprentices and hardship cases at the discretion of draft authorities.

Mr. President, these draft plans just cannot be worked out equitably. There is "pull" connected with them, no matter what kind of a scheme is adopted. Some boys have to go. Others, who have "ins," are able to escape service.

The article says:

Deferments also are to be granted to doctors and dentists undergoing technical training.

Perhaps that is necessary; but is it fair, Mr. President, simply because a boy is sent to college by his parents to study medicine or dentistry, that he shall be deferred, while some poor boy who did not have the opportunity to receive such an education in the first place has to serve?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question, as I understand the situation. So I am happy to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to ask the Senator if he can advise the Senate how long he intends to speak, so that we may know when the motion may be put to the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is my intention to speak as long as I can hold the floor, and only the Lord knows how long that will be.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator mean he intends to speak as long as he can stand up?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. President, I was giving a résumé of the draft plans in effect in Europe. I feel that if enactment of the proposed law can just be put off a little while, as soon as the Congress has time to go home and talk to the people at home—and the international situation is quieting down now, of course—I do not believe the Congress will enact this proposed draft legislation.

But, Mr. President, once a draft is fastened upon a country, it is almost impossible to get rid of it. It grows like a cancer. As Charles Beard said in the testimony which I read last night, once you get such a system fastened upon you, it strikes down all your liberties, and the country becomes a regimented state, and the people lose their liberties—just as was the case in Germany. Mr. Beard was very bitter against the draft proposal.

Mr. President, I am sorry that I feel compelled to do this; but since we are in the process of losing all our ancient liberties, if I can just postpone this matter a little while, this urge to emulate the countries of Europe, which in the past we have vanquished with our free country, I think the urge for the adoption of the proposed draft system will pass, and we shall regain our equilibrium and our sanity and will have no more of this business. But once we adopt it, of course, it is much harder to get rid of rather than to prevent in the first instance.

I read further from the article:

Deferments also are to be granted to doctors and dentists undergoing technical training. But they must serve their terms before they reach 30. Coal miners are exempt from service now. Agricultural workers may be let off next year.

France keeps conscripts in service only 12 months, but this may soon be raised to 15 or 18 months. Youths are called up at 20, then serve in the reserves until age 48.

Deferments are granted to students up to 3 years before starting their training. Some coal miners also are deferred temporarily now.

Russia drafts her young men into service mostly at the age of 19. Only enough youths are called to fill a quota set each year. These usually are the men who are most fit, physically and mentally.

Others are put into second-line reserves, subject to call within 5 years. Also in the second-line reserves, but subject only to wartime call, are youths with slight physical defects and those with two disabled parents, or a father over 60 and a mother over 55.

Conscripts serve from 2 to 5 years, depending on the branch of service. Infantrymen serve 2 years, navy men 5. Longer-term recruits usually are volunteers. Deferments generally are granted only for remediable physical defects and to permit completion of secondary-school education.

Belgium and Holland have military conscription. Mr. President, that strikes me as rather ridiculous. They have military conscription, but they are so small they cannot even retard the progress of an enemy of any consequence. In the last war the Germans simply ran over them roughshod. They might just as well—in fact, they would have been much better off if they had had no army, because they put up practically no resistance, anyhow, and were just slaughtered in the process. Yet here they are, right back at the old stand with their draft again, setting up the dinky little army, no good to anybody.

Belgium and Holland call up their youths at age 18. Belgian boys serve 1 year. No more than four sons are drafted from any one family, and deferments are granted liberally for completion of high school, college, and religious studies, as well as for some workers in vital trades. There is no enlisted reserve.

Dutch youths ordinarily serve 1 year, too. But because of the fighting in Indonesia, they now are held in service for almost 2 years. Conscripts get 3 months' training at home, then are sent to Indonesia. Upon release, they are enrolled in the reserves until 45.

Isn't that terrible, Mr. President, to draft those young men in Holland and ship them over to Indonesia, to browbeat and cow the people in Indonesia, who love their freedom just the same as the Dutchmen love their freedom? Recently the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said that the amount of aid we have given Holland under the Marshall plan approximates the amount of money they have spent in reconquering Indonesia. In other words, we are financing Holland's imperialism.

Sweden and Denmark require only 11 months' service. Danes register at 17, may volunteer at 18 or 19 and are drafted at 20. Only enough youths are called up to fill an annual quota. Selection is on a basis of physical and mental examinations. Students are deferred while studying. Conscientious objectors are given civilian tasks.

Swedish youths usually are called up in their 20th year. But training may be deferred until the 25th year for educational or other good reasons. Those physically unfit are assigned to noncombatant duties. Women are employed in training camps for service duties. Reserves are subject to call until age 47.

Norway calls up her youth at 19 for 1 year's service. Sailors and fishermen are assigned to the Navy, others to the Army or Air Force. Students are deferred until they graduate. Reserves are subject to call until age 49.

Here is the best plan of them all. This is Switzerland.

Switzerland trains its youth in a citizens' militia, instead of in the regular army. Most boys are called up when they finish secondary school, usually in their 19th year. Cavalrymen serve 130 days, others 116 days. But an additional 200 days of training is given all men during the next 20 years in 3-week refresher courses.

After completing basic training, the recruit takes home his rifle, uniform, and other equipment, including his horse or motorcycle, if a mounted soldier. This equipment is looked over at annual inspections until age 48, when it becomes the citizen's personal property.

Mr. President, I think that would be the most sensible thing, if we simply had to have some kind of program, to train everybody regardless of health, practically, unless they were just incapacitated; but to turn a man down because he has a punctured ear drum or because his sight is not exactly up to snuff strikes me as silly. We ought all to be trained. Then let us take our rifle and equipment home, and in case we get a blitz of atomic bombs—I do not know what you could do; you could not shoot the bombs, but at least everybody would be ready to go, and it would be more democratic, instead of getting into an army when you are pushed around and lose your initiative and get used to being ordered around.

Other European countries draft their youths at the age and for the terms of service listed below:

Country	Age	Service (months)
Italy	20-21	12
Turkey	20	36
Poland	21	18
Spain	20	24
Czechoslovakia	20	24
Greece	21	24
Portugal	21	15
Yugoslavia	21	24

Outside Europe, all countries except the United States, the Dominican Republic, and four British dominions—Australia, Canada, India, and New Zealand—practice conscription.

Thus, if the United States adopts peacetime selective service, it will be following a custom long practiced in most countries, with age and service requirements more stringent than under most systems in Europe, but more lenient than some.

That is a fact, Mr. President. If we have this we will doubtless be following customs long established in European countries where they have incessant wars, where the people have very few of the liberties we are accustomed to and enjoy in this country, and yet here we are on the point of following their very poor example.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Army's whole handling of the manpower situation suffers from the same kind of thinking. The Army always wants more men than it can use. That is what the generals are doing all the time, both in peace and in wartime. They are thinking about the future, how they can remain generals. They do not want peace, that is, firm peace; they want an uneasy, cold war. That is what they like. They are proposing to draft more doctors for the newly enlarged armed forces.

Mr. President, a few days ago I saw a story which stated that the whole civilian population is suffering from a bad and growing shortage of doctors that might prove disastrous. The shortage is greatest in the rural areas. I suppose the Army's prescription for the shortage is to take more young men out of the rural areas than they take from out of the cities, which will somewhat relieve the demand for doctors.

I should like to place these facts before the Senate, so it may judge for itself as to the wisdom of removing doctors from areas in which they are badly needed. There is no one part of the country that does not need doctors.

This little article is from the Gazette and Daily, of York, Pa. I happen to know the editor of the newspaper. It is one of the few really liberal newspapers in the United States. It is a remarkable publication. How it has kept going all through the years, when almost all liberal publications have gone to the wall, is somewhat of a mystery.

The title of the article is the Shortage of Doctors, by the Physicians Forum. Every week in medical journals throughout the country scores of rural communities plead for help. Yes, Mr. President, the small communities of this Nation have a terrible shortage of doctors. They need doctors; they are desperate for them.

It is no easy matter to see your wife or child in pain, with no doctor available inside of 50 or 100 miles. I have gone through that experience and have seen my wife and child needing medical attention, which they could not get, not because there was not a doctor within 100 or 500 miles, but because it was back in the good old depression days, right in the depths of the depression, and I did not have money to hire a doctor. I was an itinerant, moving from community to community. In those days if one did not have his roots down somewhere, he was in bad shape indeed. There were so many people who were patients that the doctors were pretty callous toward any outsiders who happened to be in unfortunate circumstances. So both my wife and baby needed medical attention but could not get it. I know what that means. That is why I am sympathetic to people who are unable to obtain medical care. I believe we should have a medical plan in this country to enable poor people to get medical care. I have always been for that idea and am still for it. Of course it lays one open to the charge of being a Communist if he wants to get a doctor, even if he cannot afford to pay for it.

There are about 150,000 active licensed physicians in America, one for every 930 persons. That sounds high enough, but on closer examination we find that this is true in only 470, 15 percent, of the 3,000 or more counties. In 1,642 counties, 55 percent have one doctor for every 2,000 persons; in 600 counties, 5 percent or 1 doctor for every 2,000 to 3,000 persons. Thirty-seven counties have no doctors at all.

I should not be surprised if one or two of those counties were in Idaho. I can think of some counties there which are very sparsely settled and probably could not support a doctor.

I read:

The situation is generally the worst in rural States. The average farming community is unable to muster enough buying power to support good doctors. The poor health of farmers and farm workers is almost a direct result of this situation.

I remember, Mr. President, when we used to think of the farm as a healthy place on which to live. We are going to send our sickly children out to the farm, and they would get well and be robust in no time and return to us sparkling with good health. But that is not the fact any more. It used to be the case that the slum dwellers in the cities were the most underprivileged and, consequently, their health suffered the most. But in these days it is the farm children who are the most underprivileged and whose health is the poorest, and for that reason they produce the poorest physical specimens. They desperately need medical care.

Even in the largest cities, with one physician for every 600 persons, a majority of the 600 probably cannot afford a doctor. Because of this the health of most low-income city families is as poor as that of farm families. The rest of the 600, that is, those who either have the cash or are covered by some form of health insurance, often have to wait weeks for an appointment. When the long-awaited day arrives, they frequently have a 15- to 20-minute session with a tired, overworked physician who has neither the time nor the energy to do an adequate examination. The situation is even worse if the patient happens to be a Negro.

Most Negroes cannot afford to pay a doctor's fee, and even the few who are fortunate enough to have the ready cash cannot even buy the service because of the scarcity of physicians who will treat colored patients. There are approximately 4,000 Negro physicians and approximately 12,000,000 Negroes in the country. That is about one doctor for every 3,000 Negroes.

Few white private doctors treat Negroes. Too many of them subject the Negroes to humiliation. The quality of medical care which the American Medical Association and most health workers consider of primary importance is therefore deteriorating because of the inadequate supply of physicians. The situation is becoming gradually worse. Modern medical practice requires more services, of better quality, from the practicing doctor. He is supposed to give more careful consideration to the mental problems of his patients. Seventy-five percent of all private patients have these problems, and they require more of the physician's time. Doctors are expected to do more complete physical examinations in order to discover cancer, heart disease, and other killers in their early curable stages. This, too, requires more time per patient. Today a practitioner must take time out from his busy practice.

It will take a national health insurance program on social security lines to lift the financial barriers to adequate medical care. This program, together with hospital construction legislation, will make it possible for rural communities and other communities to attract and support more doctors.

There will be an overwhelmingly sustained demand for medical services which cannot possibly be met at the current rate of production of doctors.

It is almost laughable how bitter some people become against union workers nowadays because they departmentalize so much. An electrician will not use a saw and a carpenter will not use a monkey wrench, and people get all up in the air about it. At the same time the same people who in most lines of professional business criticize—I have in mind especially doctors—are getting so that if one treats your big toe he cannot look at your nose, and if he treats your nose he will not even move over 2 inches to look at your eyes to see how they are. Medicine is becoming the most specialized of all crafts. I am not saying it is bad, perhaps it is good, but I hope that when some people are prone to criticize the carpenter or the plumber for not moving out of his particular field they will remember these others who are doing the same thing.

Of course, if you want to know something about the Army's attitude on its own personnel, you can do no better than read the Doolittle Report on Officer-Enlisted Men Relationships. There is one conclusion made by this committee which is more damning of the Army mentality than anything that has ever been said by antimilitarists. I give it verbatim:

There is need for a new philosophy in the military order, a policy of treatment of men, especially in the "ranks," in terms of advanced concepts in social thinking. The present system does not permit full recognition of the dignities of man.

How can you trust the youth of the country to men who have continued to operate for years under a system which does not permit full recognition of the dignities of man?

Mr. President, how can we trust the youth of this country to men who have continued to operate for years under a system which does not permit full recognition of the dignities of man?

This condemnation from the pen of men who have themselves been closely associated with the military condemns this bill better than anything I could say.

I should like to read a few excerpts from this little report. One of the fine conclusions of this report is that, "It is extremely difficult under existing procedures to get rid of incompetents and undesirables among the officer group." I think that the mothers and fathers of this country would enjoy knowing that their sons are going to be put under a system that is loaded with incompetents and undesirables.

There is another little comment in this report worth noting. The report states that—

The peacetime army did not adequately prepare officers for the wartime job of handling civilian soldiers; it did not offer a code of officer-enlisted man conduct flexible enough for application to an army where the bulk of the men in all ranks were civilians.

Mr. President, there are many defects in our system of training our military as it is, without enacting a vast new program without putting any safeguards into it whatever in the way of doing away with discrimination and segregation, and redefining the relationship between officers and enlisted men, as this report has suggested should be done.

It seems that we are very fond of having fancy reports made and then we do nothing about them. We have the President's report on civil liberties and we do nothing about it. We have the President's report on the draft, and they report many things, including the statement that the draft is necessary, but they give us a whole list of things that should accompany it, and all we do is enact a draft law and put none of the other good things in to try to make it acceptable. Then we have the Doolittle report on the relationship of officers to their men in the armed services. We get the report and do nothing about it. Let us either quit having reports and wasting the taxpayers' money on them or else act upon them when once we get them.

Mr. President, that is an interesting commentary on the peacetime army. It would seem to me to mean that the Army has a professional standard that sets them apart from ordinary civilians, and in fact that prolonged association with this standard and system makes them pretty much unfit to handle a bunch of raw civilians. I never heard a better argument against the draft.

Of course, the military men of all countries are not necessarily dumb. I certainly do not want to leave that impression. My purpose is merely to show that the mistakes they make are profound errors of judgment which come from their training, the kind of training that one of their chiefs of staff thought made them unfit for a certain type of civilian leadership. But the military men also have their own ideas of intelligence, ideas which they have used in the past to befuddle the civilian population.

I have at hand that interesting little story that came out of Germany some months ago. The very efficient British Intelligence Service had discovered a little document, called Protocol M, which purported to be a Soviet document giving instructions to German Communists to take action against the western Allied occupation. The New York Times correspondent discovered it was a forgery, but published long after the damage of the original discovery was done.

I should like to read a little comment on this Nazilike technique of getting out the big lie and then neglecting to correct it for a long time. And of course, the purpose is perfectly clear, to embitter relations between the former Allies.

Of course, the purpose is perfectly clear—to embitter relations between former allies. Mr. President, this is a deplorable, despicable thing that is going on in the world. They even resort to forged documents to try to embitter relations between this country and Russia, when anyone who stops to think at all must realize that if relations deteriorate to the point where war finally breaks out, where the cold turns to the hot war, it must mean the end of civilization at least, and the experts tell us quite frankly that all life on this planet can be destroyed simply by exploding 250 atom bombs any place on earth. It is not the explosion of the bombs that will kill everybody, but the whole world will become so radioactive that no one can live; and we have hundreds of bombs. Yet we are considering drafting boys and putting them in uniform.

I have in my hand an article taken from the Gazette and Daily of York, Pa., the liberal newspaper I mentioned a while ago, under date of April 12, 1948. April 12 happens to be my birthday. It was saddened to the extent that it is difficult to celebrate nowadays, because President Roosevelt died on April 12.

The title of this editorial is "Nazi Opportunity."

Writing in the New York Times of yesterday, C. L. Sulzberger reported that Protocol M which raised a considerable storm about a year ago, was discovered by

the British Intelligence Service to be a forgery.

Protocol M was supposed to have been a Soviet document, giving instructions for action by German Communists against the Allied occupation. It created quite a disturbance when first released to the press by the British. Learned arguments of the intentions of the Communists—the Russian Communists—were based upon this document.

Now the document turns up as a forgery, after the damage has been done.

Mr. Sulzberger adds that the market for such phony documents—

The market, Mr. President, mind you—is probably better today than ever before in history.

If you are a good forger of documents you are all right; you can make plenty of money now.

He suggests that the Russians probably have been misled by the same sort of thing. He points out that as recently as a few days ago, the French Ministry of Interior was duped by a similar document allegedly detailing the activities of the French Communist Party.

This is a sad state of affairs.

Hitler masqueraded his preparations for aggression in the garment of anticommunism. It resulted in the most disastrous war of all time. At a cost of millions of lives, Germany was finally defeated. We thought, too, that we had defeated fascism.

Franklin D. Roosevelt had envisioned a world at peace. He saw ahead a unity of purpose among the Allies toward that end. It was the only way the real defeat of the Fascists could be accomplished.

Let divisive forces split the wartime Allies, and the result easily could be the ultimate victory of fascism through the quarreling among those who fought against this scourge of the world.

Well, here we are today, on the third anniversary of the passing of Roosevelt, on the verge of war with our recent allies—not really knowing to what extent the forgeries of our recent enemies have contributed to our growing war hysteria.

Here we are today, initiating a program for Europe's recovery, and west Germany—the sector of Germany occupied by the western powers—included in our recovery program, and those who suffered most at the hands of Germany, not only excluded, but regarded by us as threats to the peace of the world, perhaps on the basis of Nazi-forged documents. Here we are today, rebuilding the Reich, forgiving the Nazi industrialists who made Hitler's aggression possible, openly declaring that our Nazi friends will be a great bulwark against dreaded communism.

The only way we could have prevented this was the Roosevelt way—through unity among the Allies until the affairs of a war-upset world were settled. We should have known that the Nazis would use any tricks to divide us. It should have been the constant aim of our Government to make clear to the people of this country how important unity was, so that we would not be misled by the vicious propaganda of certain sections of the press and certain special interests.

We lacked the wisdom to lay the ground work for unity. As a result, we now pay in ill will for giving the Nazis their chance to divide us and lead us to the brink of war.

We weren't very smart, were we?

There is one aspect of the military preparedness business that has gotten everyone who considers it considerably worried as to whether the Army wants more manpower or not. That has been the Army's handling of enlistments. The Army apparently upped the requirements for its peacetime forces as against its wartime forces, thereby cutting down the proportion of men accepted into the service by enlistment. Then the Army comes along and offers more advantages to men who enlist for 3 years as against men who enlist for only 2 years. The result is that in the period April 1, 1947, to February 28, 1948, the Army discloses that 179,408 men enlisted as new 3-year enlistees, but during the same period they got only 10,219 men for 3-year enlistment periods. The reason is given in the fact that 3-year enlistees are given various options as to the type or branch of service and the place where they may serve, whereas the 2-year men are not given those options.

And yet the Army comes along and asks for a 2-year period for the draftees under the bill proposed. Giving the same privileges to 2-year enlistees would increase their number considerably more than the 3-year total, and a conservative estimate would give something like 350,000 men available by enlistment if these options are given to all alike. And if we increased the incentives for 3-year enlistments, those enlistments could be raised.

But that is not what the Army wants, apparently. They want a continuous state of crisis instead. I want to read a few remarks from a statement on this subject issued by the National Council for Prevention of War, entitled "A GI Mystery, or the Case of the Empty Barracks." The article is as follows:

Hardly anybody comes home these nights to the barracks at Fort Dix. In fact, all over the Army things are rough. It seems enough manpower just can't be had. So what does the Army do about it? Nothing. Or, worse, it remains as exclusive as a Chevy Chase country club.

Suppose you want to join up for 2 years. "Go 'way, lad," says the recruiting sergeant. The Army can't be bothered.

In fact, the Army during the entire 11 months prior to February 28, this year, only accepted 10,219 men for 2-year enlistments, forcing the other applicants either to sign up for 3 years or stay out. Army recruiters got 179,408 3-year men in spite of themselves.

WHAT'S BEHIND THIS MYSTERY?

Army recruiting methods, for one thing. They stack the cards against the 2-year recruits. A 3-year man gets everything but a chauffeur and a bronze star to start out with. A 2-year man gets little more than KP.

CLUE FROM THE PENTAGON

"Incredible," you say? Well, here it is in the words of the "big brass."

"Individuals who enlist for 3 years are given enlistment options: First, choice of service, branch, or unit. Second, choice of geographical location. Men enlisting for 2 years are not given these opportunities. This probably accounts for the fact that fewer men enlist for a 2-year period."

Source: Department of the Army, letter from Col. J. H. Riepe; file No. CS-GPA-032, June 16, 1948.

BUT THIS IS STILL A MYSTERY

While the Army practically says "No" to youngsters who are dying to get into the Army for 2-year enlistments, it at the same time lobbies busily for a draft which will force hundreds of thousands of others into the Army for the same 2-year period.

Mr. President, some telegrams were just laid on my desk. Perhaps it might be well to see how people feel about this. I have not read them. I do not know whether they say "Stay with it" or "Sit down and shut up." I shall read them, and we shall find out what the people think about this.

The first one is from New York:

NEW YORK, *June 18, 1948.*

Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:

As a veteran and citizen, I congratulate you on your stand against the draft bill. I hope you will be able to prevent little Hitlers with brass on their shoulders from corrupting the youth of this country.

JOSEPH BREUER.

Here is one from St. Paul, Minn.:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *June 18, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:

We who want peace are with you and count upon you to spearhead the fight to prevent our needless destruction.

JOHN HINES, JR.

This one is from Richmond, Va.:

RICHMOND, VA., *June 18, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Resurrect democracy in America by talking the draft to death. Your filibuster is the most important thing going on in the world tonight.

HOWARD H. CARWILE.

This one is from Brookline, Mass.:

BROOKLINE, MASS., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Grateful for your fine courage in fighting the draft bill. It is unconstitutional and un-American. It represents the degree of fatigue and neurotic fear also senility now bankrupting the Nation and wrecking our democracy.

M. B. ROBBINS.

Here is one from Elizabeth, N. J.:

ELIZABETH, N. J., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Floor of the Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work. We are with you.

Mrs. S. MELSER.

Here is one from New York:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge continued filibuster to defeat draft bill keep up good work.

HARRY, REBECCA, AND JOY COHEN.

Here is another one from New York:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep the filibuster up. The people back you.

RAY TOBIN.

These seem to be all from New York:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C:

Keep up fight against draft. Will get my vote November.

NELL GREENFIELD.

That is very gratifying.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

My hearty support to you. Keep up your good work.

S. MIRIAM.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up your fight against peacetime draft.

Mr. and Mrs. STEINHART.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work. You have my wholehearted support.

R. KATZ.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

I support your fight against militarism.

HARRY MATKOV.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

We are with you in your filibuster.

WESTSIDE CHAPTER, CIVIL RIGHTS CONGRESS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

We will vote for you in November. Keep it up.

LEE BASSEN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your filibuster. Keep up the good work.

MAX SILVERMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work.

M. DAITCH.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work. Am with you.

P. MARGOLIS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your magnificent fight against draft legislation.

MILDRED ELLINGSEN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

I hail your courageous fight against the draft bill.

MARION KLAPPER.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

We support your courageous fight against the draft.

MAX PERLOW,
Secretary-Treasurer, United Furniture Workers of America, CIO.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

As a Purple Heart vet I applaud your fight to prevent the peacetime draft. Keep up the good fight.

SID LEHMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good fight; the people are behind you.

R. STEVENS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up thrilling fight to defeat draft bill. All my support.

MIRIAM LEVY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

As a veteran and wife heartily support and deeply grateful for your efforts to prevent passage of selective-service bill.

MARVIN and SHIRLEY ROTHENBERG.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Am happy that one of our Congressmen has our people's welfare at heart. Congratulations. Keep up the filibuster on the draft bill. We don't want it passed.

SYLVIA A. SADKIN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

We support your splendid fight to defeat the draft measure. This bill is definitely an aggressive war move and not in the best interest of our country. Keep up the fight.

Mr. and Mrs. SEYMOUR ATLAS.

BROOKLYN, N. Y. *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up your fight. God bless you.

ROBERT GELLAR.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Citizens of this Nation can congratulate themselves on having one honest Senator who respects his duty to represent the desires and interests of the people instead of special interests of enemies of peace. God give you strength.

——— ———.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator take his seat, because of language unworthy of the conduct of a Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The Senator from Idaho will take his seat, under the rule. The Chair will read the rule. Rule XIX, paragraph 4, reads as follows:

If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall sit down, and not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate.

Paragraph 3, immediately preceding, reads as follows:

No Senator in debate shall refer offensively to any State of the Union.

Paragraph 2 reads as follows:

No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate now proceed with the business before it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The business before the Senate is a motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. BREWSTER. I move that the conferees be appointed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from South Dakota will first have to be put.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senator cannot raise a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is out of order. He will have to sit down.

The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the names of the conferees.

The CHIEF CLERK. Mr. GURNEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. BYRD.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I understand that the unfinished business is the bill providing for the extension of the terms of office of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The unfinished business is the bill providing for the extension of the terms of office of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, is it not?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; that is the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Malone
Baldwin	Green	Martin
Ball	Gurney	Maybank
Barkley	Hatch	Millikin
Brewster	Hawkes	Moore
Bricker	Hayden	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Brooks	Hill	Myers
Buck	Hoey	O'Conor
Butler	Holland	O'Daniel
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Jenner	Pepper
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Connally	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Cooper	Kilgore	Russell
Cordon	Knowland	Saltonstall
Donnell	Langer	Smith
Downey	Lucas	Sparkman
Dworshak	McCarthy	Stennis
Eastland	McClellan	Stewart
Ecton	McFarland	Taft
Ellender	McGrath	Taylor
Feazel	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McMahon	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Tobey

Tydings	Watkins	Wiley
Umstead	Wherry	Williams
Vandenberg	White	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Senate will proceed to its business.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE OF PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 2655).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on Senate bill 2655, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings, p. 9253.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to adopt the conference report.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is the Senator going to give us an explanation?

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. President, the Senate accepted the House figures on the total over-all manpower strength for the three services. In the case of the Army, the Senate figure was 790,000, the House figure 837,000. In the case of the Navy and Marine Corps the House and Senate figures were the same, 666,882. The Senate figure on the Air Force was 453,000; the House figure 502,000. The trainees, 18-year-olds, as in the Senate bill, 161,000.

The conferees adopted an amendment similar to the Capehart amendment, allowing 90 days before they would be subject to induction. The 90-day period comes automatically. The date is 90 days after the bill becomes effective.

With respect to conscientious objectors, the Senate yielded to the House. Those who oppose any military service, as differentiated from those who have religious scruples against kind of service such as medical aid, are deferred and are not put in a conscientious-objector camp.

We also agreed to exempt men who have 12 months' prior service instead of the Senate provision of 18 months' past service. That applies to veterans.

The conferees agreed, and it is so written in the bill, definitely, that the intelligence score for entrance into the armed services shall be not 80, but 70, as in the House provision.

Members of the enlisted Reserve components can volunteer for 21 months' active duty, the same as the selective-service period of duty, which is 21 months instead of the Senate provision for 24 months' service. Short-term enlistments of 21 months are also provided in the conference report for men 19 to 26 years of age; in other words, through 25, in the Army.

No provision was adopted by the conference for drafting doctors or dentists, feeling that no great numbers would come in until after Congress meets again. The conferees felt we could not set a special category to come under the responsibilities of the draft until we found out that volunteers did not come in under the medical and dental provisions. The conferees felt they would come in, and that at least we would have a chance to look at the situation after the first of the year, before we would be compelled to do anything in a mandatory way regarding doctors.

The plan for enlisting 25,000 aliens in the Army was not agreed to by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.]

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. TAYLOR addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The "ayes" have it, and the report is agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I am thoroughly opposed to the filibuster which has been proceeding, but there is no question of the fact that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] were on the floor asking recognition long before the Chair put the question. I want to raise a point of order and ask for a ruling to set aside the Chair's ruling on the vote just announced by the Chair so that either the Senator from Florida or the Senator from Idaho can be recognized for remarks on the conference report. Important as passage of the conference report is, we cannot as individual Senators deny two Senators the right to be recognized by the Chair when they were so obviously, to the senses of everyone on the floor, seeking to be recognized before the vote was taken.

I raise a point of order as to whether the ruling of the Chair should stand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make a motion as to whether the Senate will sustain the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. MORSE. I raise a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that he did not see the Senators of whom the Senator from Oregon speaks. He was merely putting the question, and the question was put and the decision was made.

Mr. MORSE. Then I raise a parliamentary inquiry as to whether the junior Senator from Oregon has the right at this time to make a motion that the Chair's ruling be reversed, the vote set aside, and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] be recognized. I think it is obvious to the Presiding Officer that what the Senator from Oregon is seeking to do is to have the Senate pass on the question as to whether the Senator from Florida has the right to be recognized for remarks on the business which was pending before the Chair ruled that the report had been agreed to. After all, we are dealing here with a pretty fundamental right, so far as each and every Member of the Senate is concerned. I am standing here, Mr. President, to protest the ruling of the Chair, when two Members of this body were shouting for recognition before the time the Chair announced that the report was agreed to. We cannot, in my judgment, permit any Senator to be denied the exercise of his rights on the floor. I think the right of each one of us to unlimited debate under the rules shall have been denied if this action stands. I am simply making a parliamentary inquiry as to how I can give this body an opportunity to pass on whether or not the decision of the Chair is to be sustained.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. I am heartily in favor of the position taken by the Senator from Oregon, but I do not raise my point of order upon a mere parliamentary inquiry. I make the point of order at this time with reference to the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Florida, respectively, for to my own personal knowledge I could see them and could hear them demanding recognition. In the sense of pride and in the sense of law I make the point of order—not a parliamentary inquiry—that the result of the vote was invalidly announced by the Presiding Officer.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the rules of the Senate the Chair undoubtedly has a discretion as to whom he shall recognize when a number of Senators are seeking recognition, but I doubt very much whether that discretion gives the Chair the right to exercise it by refusing to recognize any Senator who is seeking recognition. For that reason, and for the sake of future interpretation of the rules, not that I wish to give any advantage, parliamentary or otherwise, to any Senator who seeks to delay a vote on the matter, I doubt whether the Chair could refuse to recognize either one of the Senators. They were both seeking recognition. I hope that the Chair, in all fairness to himself and to the Senate, will hold that, notwithstanding the fact that he declared the conference report agreed to, one of the Senators was entitled to recognition.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that since there are so many Senators who feel that the Chair overlooked a request for recognition, if a majority think the Chair was incorrect, I suggest a unanimous-consent request that the ruling of the Chair be vacated and that the Senator from Florida be permitted to proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. I want it perfectly clear, first, that just as the Senator from Oregon stated for himself, I am not countenancing or favoring the plan of filibuster which has been indulged in. I want it distinctly understood, in the second place, that I am in harmony with the thought of the Senator from Ohio as to the advisability of not shutting Senators off, as I am also in harmony with the idea of the Senator from Oregon; but I insist on my point of order which is before the Senate for determination. It is, Mr. President, that the announcement of the result of the vote was invalid. It is not a question of setting it aside. It is void.

Rule XIX of the Senate provides as follows:

> When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him.

It would be tyrannous, Mr. President, if the Presiding Officer had the right to disregard this rule and to hold that it is discretionary on the part of the Presiding Officer either to recognize or not to recognize a Senator.

So I insist on my point of order. Under the facts, of which I have personal knowledge, the two Senators referred to were on the floor demanding recognition. My point of order is that the announcement of the vote is invalid, and therefore insist, as against the Senator from Ohio, that the point of order has precedence and should be ruled upon.

Mr. TAFT. May I point out to the Senator that whether the Chair is mistaken or not is a question of fact, a question which is often difficult to determine, whatever the Senator may think. It seems to me that the proper way to proceed is by unanimous consent to vacate the order of the Chair and to permit the Senator from Florida to proceed. Many of the Senators were not present and do not know what the facts were. Where there is a question of fact of that kind, it seems to me only reasonable to reach the result by unanimous consent.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I will not give unanimous consent. My point of order stands and is made as forcefully as I know how to make it. I know what the facts were. I saw and heard. My point of order is presented again and at this moment to the present Presiding Officer of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. My question is as to whether or not the Senator from Idaho had the right to recognition, after a previous ruling of the Chair that he was called to order and ordered to sit down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no question that the Senator from Idaho had the right to be recognized on a different question. The Chair wishes to state now that he did not see either the Senator from Idaho or the Senator from Florida on his feet seeking recognition.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the other hand, the Chair desires to be perfectly fair, and if there be any question in the mind of the Senator from Missouri, the Chair will reverse the order he made, and let the matter rest as it was when the Chair put the question.

Mr. DONNELL. I greatly appreciate the courtesy of the Chair. I may say, however, that there is no question in my mind. I know the facts, and I assert them and state that my point of order should be sustained.

If I may have the privilege of the floor for a moment more, I may say that I am not willing to surrender my point of order in favor of the request for unanimous consent. Suppose unanimous consent were not given, my point of order would be before the Senate, and I understand that the Presiding Officer has indicated his intention to sustain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his desire to be fair, has agreed with the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Chair. I understand the point of order is sustained. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state the question now before the Senate. The question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the conference report. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Chair that I deeply appreciate the ruling he has now made. I join with the Senator from Missouri in assuring the Chair that the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon did see both the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Idaho on the floor calling for recognition, and I wish to assure the Senator from New York, the present Presiding Officer, that in reversing his decision the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon can give him our honor-bound word that those were the facts, and that in reversing himself we feel he is protecting us, as well as every other Member of the Senate, and we deeply appreciate the action of the Chair in reversing himself.

Mr. DONNELL. I join in the statement of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to repeat once more that the Chair saw neither the Senator from Idaho nor the Senator from Florida on his feet.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I made the statement I did make, if the Chair will permit me to say so, because I knew that if I gave him my word as to what were the facts, and the Senator from Missouri would give him his word, the Chair would reverse himself.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to inquire whether this is to constitute a precedent, so that if any Member of the Senate at any time raises a question of this character on a ruling of the Presiding Officer, it will be a precedent that the ruling is immediately to be rescinded. All of us familiar with Senate procedure know that at times something resembling this situation has frequently arisen, when half a dozen Senators will be on their feet, and no Senator may be recognized and the pending matter may be disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to observe, in that connection, that nothing of this kind can really constitute a precedent. These matters in each instance rest with the Chair.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida. The Chair apologizes to the Senator from Florida for failure to see him.

Mr. PEPPER. The Chair is characteristically gracious. We recall that it is a saying in the law that "hard cases make bad law," and probably extremities sometimes force us to decisions which are undoubtedly regrettable and out of character.

I doubt very seriously if there is anything so important as preserving the democracy of this Republic, and I doubt if anything is a surer foundation of the abiding safety of the Republic than continuing recognition of democracy in the Senate of the United States. What has just happened is a new proof of the integrity of this body and of our democratic institutions in America.

For myself, I rose only to ask a question. I had not heard the statement of the able Senator from South Dakota as to what the length of the time of the draft was. I did not rise to address the Senate, and I do not now arise to address the Senate. The Senator from Idaho is no doubt quite capable of speaking for himself.

What I wish to ask, if the Senator from South Dakota will yield, is, What was the length of time of the draft that was agreed to in the conference report?

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator from Florida has the floor; and if he will yield to me to answer him, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. PEPPER. I am asking the question. That is all I wished to be informed of. I do not care for the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. The period of service is 3 months less than what was provided in the Senate bill for those between 19 and 26 years of age. It is 21 months.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What is the length of the time of the draft?

Mr. GURNEY. The same as in the Senate bill—2 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. How much service is required in the Reserve?

Mr. GURNEY. That matter was not in conference, because the House and Senate provisions were both the same—2 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And the same service is required in the Reserve?

Mr. GURNEY. About the same as the Senate provisions originally required.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the distinguished chairman of the committee advise the Senate as to what is the provision of the conference report for the beginning of the draft—for the initiation of the actual proceedings under the draft?

Mr. GURNEY. The proceedings of setting up all the agencies necessary under selective service are to start immediately upon the enactment of the bill. No one can be brought in under selective service until 90 days after the date of the enactment of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it mandatory upon the President of the United States to begin the calling up of men under the selective service system set up by the conference report at the expiration of 90 days?

Mr. GURNEY. It is not necessary for the President to make the call. Calls will automatically come at the end of 90 days. Of course, monthly quotas are approved by the Commander in Chief.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I understand the Senator correctly, then, that there is nothing left in the conference report by way of any question of discretion or judgment on the part of the President of the United States as to whether the draft will be placed in effect at the end of 90 days?

Mr. GURNEY. The President does not have to make any decision on that. It automatically comes into existence 90 days after the date of enactment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. And Mr. President, I desire to express to the able Senator, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and to his fellow conferees my feeling that he and they have done a difficult job exceedingly well in the conference. I want to state now my congratulations and my gratitude.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I make the motion that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho. The Chair also wishes to apologize to the Senator from Idaho for failing to see him.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to read paragraph 4 of rule XIX, as follows:

> If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall sit down, and not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate.

I make the parliamentary inquiry as to whether or not the leave provided for has been granted to the senior Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has already ruled on that point. That question arose on the motion to appoint the conferees, the first motion made by the Senator from South Dakota, to disagree and appoint the conferees. The ruling by the Chair was on that question. We are now on the second motion, that is, a motion to accept or agree to the conference report. So that the point the Senator from Connecticut raises does not apply. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I had intended to, and I fully believe I could have held the floor until midnight tonight, or later. I believe I physically could have done so. But what I have just witnessed here in so many of these good Senators coming to my aid and assistance——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator from Idaho has had ample time to discuss this matter. I still press my point. It seems to me, Mr. President, that when a Senator has transgressed the rules of the Senate, as has been ruled by the Chair, and he has been directed to sit down, that then the only way he can get back on his feet in any manner is to ask the permission of the Senate to do so.

Now, the particular motion which was under consideration at the time and the motion now pending both pertain to the matter that was the subject of debate when the Senator from Idaho was speaking.

Mr. President, I question the ruling of the Chair in that matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to insist on his ruling, and that is that the question on which the Chair ruled the Senator from Idaho out of order is another matter entirely; it is a different motion. That motion has been disposed of. Therefore the ruling of the Chair in that instance, that the Senator from Idaho should take his seat does not apply in this instance. Another motion is before the Senate at the present time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In support of the decision of the Chair on that point, I might add that if the position of the Senator from Connecticut were valid it would be impossible for the Senator from Idaho to obtain the floor at any time during the day, although we may have in the meantime passed half a dozen other bills and been on some other questions. So the Chair is undoubtedly correct in his ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAYLOR. If I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will see that the Senator from Idaho gets it back.

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho yields to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Idaho yielded to the Senator from Kentucky not for a question. I want to raise the point of order whether the Senator from Idaho has not spoken once on this motion already.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. He yielded to the Senator from Kentucky, not for a question, but for other observations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to hold in this particular instance that that is a pretty fine technicality. The Senator from Idaho is still on his original speech on this particular motion. The Senator from Idaho has been under some difficulty at the present time—which he brought on himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, as I said a while ago I think I could have held forth here indefinitely, but I deeply appreciate what has just taken place here, the evidence of devotion to the principles of democracy displayed by a majority of the Senators present at least. I have sincerely felt that this draft bill was jeopardizing our future as a democratic free people. I have disliked very much having to play the role I have indulged in during the night, talking at length. I disliked the inconvenience and discomfort that I have caused to the Members of the Senate. I feel that so long as the Senators have the regard for democratic procedures and principles which was displayed here a while ago this country is safe, although there will be other Senators elected later whose election will be influenced more greatly by the fact that the military has become strong, and I am afraid that we will permit the military to become even stronger to the point where our democratic freedoms will be seriously jeopardized.

Nevertheless, I do not want to inconvenience the Senate further, and inasmuch as the Members of the Senate have seen fit to come to my rescue when I felt that I was being unfairly treated—in spite of the fact that I have treated them sort of rough during the past several hours, I appreciate what they did, and I am going to take my seat, and just urge the gentlemen present, whether

as Senators or after they have retired from the Senate, to keep a close watch on the Military Establishment of this country, and be not afraid, should it become all-powerful, to oppose it and try to get it back under control, because I am afraid that is what we are headed toward in this country.

I want again to express my appreciation to the Senators who spoke up in behalf of the principles of unlimited debate in the Senate, which are basic in our rules, in spite of the fact that in doing so they were laying themselves open to further torture probably by having to listen to further extended remarks.

So with those statements, Mr. President, I am going to take my seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, so the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the conference report on House bill 6705.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 6705, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

(For conference report, see p. 8839 of the House proceedings of June 18, 1948.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6705, which was read, as follows:

> IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
> *June 18, 1948.*
>
> *Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 84, 101, 125, 150, 151, 152, 178, 190, 199, and 231 to the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concur therein.
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 126 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "$34,132,439."
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 189 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike out lines 13 and 14 of said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(parcels of land adjoining Big Bend National Park necessary to connect the park road system with State Highway 227)."
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 211 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$250,000."
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 212 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "$9,928,509."
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 214 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "$9,928,509."

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 126, 189, 211, 212, and 214.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska state with what the amendments he just mentioned deal?

Mr. WHERRY. Senate amendment No. 126 is the over-all amount. It represents the adjustment of the total.

Senate amendment 189 is to strike out lines 13 and 14 of the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof "(parcels of land adjoining Big Ben National Park necessary to connect the park-road system with the State highway 227)."

Senate amendment 211 has to do with the purchase of wildlife management areas in California.

Senate amendments 212 and 214 represent a change of totals.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. There is one statement that should be made about the conference report in the absence of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who asked me to say for him there is an amount for a project in Owl Creek, Wyo. This project, Senator O'MAHONEY says, is in phase B, and in order that construction of this project may be provided for it must be moved into phase A. I want the RECORD to show at this point that while evidently no decision was made in the conference committee, yet that was apparently the reason for the appropriation by the House, and the Senate conferees concur in that action.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question in on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I note that the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is present in the Chamber. I take this occasion to say to him that I appreciate very much his action earlier in the day when the Interior Department appropriation bill was under consideration, in calling attention to what I conceive to have been a clerical oversight in the submission of the conference report by which the Owl Creek project in Wyoming was listed as in phase B under the Missouri Valley project, instead of phase A, as was understood.

The Senator has made that statement upon the floor and I want him to know that it is very much appreciated not only by myself, but certainly by all of those in the State of Wyoming who will be benefited by the project.

I think I should add, Mr. President, that the Senator from Nebraska in his labors upon the Interior Department appropriation bill subcommittee has done very successful service in increasing the appropriations for reclamation in the West. He has not insisted upon working only for his own State, but he has included projects in other States. I wish it clearly understood that as one of the Senators who has been delighted to cooperate with the junior Senator from Nebraska, I very much appreciate what he has done.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this is most unusual, because usually the Senator is needling me a little about the politics of the affair. I deeply appreciate the words spoken by my distinguished colleague and friend.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me add another word or two in connection with this reclamation matter.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress, the last Congress, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and I were the authors of a bill to amend the Oil and Gas Leasing Act. The bill amending the Oil and Gas Leasing Act was considered by the Senator from New Mexico and myself as being a means of increasing the revenues of the Federal Government, of increasing the production of oil, and of benefiting reclamation, particularly. I have had a recent report made to me by the Geological Survey on the results of prospecting under those amendments. The results have been very satisfactory.

In 1947 there were 12 new fields discovered, 20 new pools, 15 extensions of old pools, and 1 field redeveloped. In 1948 there have already been discovered 10 new pools and 1 extension. The overall result has been that whereas the annual royalty of the Federal Government before the adoption of the measure to which I refer was running at a rate of approximately $10,500,000, it ran, during the year 1947, at the rate of $16,725,000, thereby indicating that there has been increased revenue to the Federal Government, largely as a result of the stimulation to exploration which was given by that law. This addition of $6,125,000 goes into the fund which is divided 10 percent to the Treasury for administrative expenses, 37½ percent to the States in which the oil is discovered, and 52½ percent to the reclamation fund. Thus the reclamation fund, out of which the appropriations contained in the Interior Department bill for reclamation are made, has been enriched as a result of that legislation.

I am one of the Members of the Senate who greatly regretted the decision of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] to retire from this body; and I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to pay tribute to the sagacity and ability and foresight with which he has served in this body. Particularly do I wish to compliment him on the great service he has been to the public-lands States. He was for years chairman of the Public Lands Committee, now the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. When the next Senate assembles without the presence of the

Senator from New Mexico, it will be a loss to the Senate, to the State of New Mexico, and, I think, to the country.

The new discoveries have resulted in the addition to the estimated oil reserve of the Nation a total of approximately 411,665,000 barrels.

This addition comes at a time when the people of the United States are consuming more oil than at any time in history.

When I introduced the bill amending the Oil and Gas Leasing Act, I gave as one of the reasons for its enactment my belief that it would stimulate the search for new oil reserves and that it would bring into the public-lands States oil and gas operators who had never before drilled on the public domain.

This has proved to be the case, and if one is to judge by the present activity under the new law we may anticipate additional discoveries. This is particularly true in Wyoming and New Mexico where the rate of exploration is high.

Wyoming leads all of the States in the number and extent of discoveries. The total addition to the reserve is estimated at 255,285,000 barrels, with the other States showing the following results: Colorado, 2,000,000; Montana, 31,660,000; New Mexico, 56,100,000; and California, 66,620,000.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks about the increase of discoveries of petroleum, I should like to have placed in the RECORD a table which I have had prepared by the Geological Survey. The table shows the unit discoveries which have been made in the States of Colorado, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and California since January 1, 1947.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public land and unit discoveries since Jan. 1, 1947 (northwestern region)

Field	Serial	Location	Year of discovery	Type of discovery	Estimated reserves discovered
					Barrels
Colorado:					
Elk Springs	Denver 012174	39-5N-98W	1947	Extension	500,000
Mandlin Gulch	Denver 053129	35-4N-95W	1947	New field	500,000
Rangely	Various		1947	Extension	1,000,000
Total					2,000,000
Montana:					
Elk Basin (Unit)	Billings 038541	28-9S-23E	1947	Extension (Madison)	28,200,000
Cut Bank	Great Falls 083298	12-36N-6W	1947	do	500,000
Elk Basin (Unit)	Great Falls 038541	28-9S-23E	1947	Extension (Second Frontier)	2,500,000
Kevin-Sunburst	Great Falls 082139	19-34N-2W	1947	Extension (Ellis)	400,000
Bears Den	Great Falls 084925	29-26N-6E	1947	do	Gas
Total					31,660,000
Utah: Gordon Creek	Salt Lake City 064211	24-14S-7E	1948	New field (CO_2)	Gas
Wyoming:					
Adon (unit)	Buffalo 038017	2-52N-72W	1947	New field	500,000
East Lance Creek (unit)	Cheyenne 062101	26-36N-64W	1948	Extension	1,000,000
Do	Cheyenne 060101	26-36N-64W	1948	New pool (converse)	300,000
Do	Cheyenne 060101	26-36N-64W	1948	New pool (Leo)	600,000
Elk Basin (unit)	Patented land		1947	New pool (Madison)	104,100,000
Hatfield	Cheyenne 032122 (a)	2-19N-88W	1947	New pool (Tensleep)	3,200,000
Lost Soldier	Cheyenne 063546	3-26N-90W	1948	New pool (Madison)	30,000,000
Do	Cheyenne 065646	3-26N-90W	1948	New pool (Cambrian)	12,000,000
Big Medicine Bow	Cheyenne 032201 (a)	20-21N-79W	1948	New pool (Tensleep)	5,250,000
Mush Creek	Cheyenne 037630	15-44N-83W	1947	Extension	6,500,000
Neiber (unit)	Buffalo 037645	19-45N-92W	1947	New pool (Embar)	6,000,000
Pitchfork (unit)	Cheyenne 044259 (a)	11-48N-102W	1948	New pool (Madison)	600,000
South Sand Creek	Buffalo 037919	25-46N-91W	1947	New field	8,600,000
Seven Mile	Cheyenne 068646	8-17N-77W	1947	do	1,035,000
South Fork	Buffalo 037915	24-46N-92W	1947	do	1,000,000
Wertz Dome (unit)	Cheyenne 064912	1-26N-90W	1948	New pool (Madison)	18,000,000
Do	Cheyenne 029320 (b)	1-26N-90W	1948	New pool (Amsden)	6,000,000
West Poison Spider (unit)	Cheyenne 073678	11-33N-84W	1948	New pool (Frontier)	20,000,000
Worland (unit)	Patented land		1947	New pool (Embar)	26,000,000
Do	do		1947	New pool (Tensleep)	2,000,000
Alkali Butte (unit)	Cheyenne 045483	1-33N-95W	1947	New pool (Embar)	(1)
South Shoshone (unit)	Cheyenne 071173	25-50N-103W	1947	New field	(1)
Badger Basin	Cheyenne 069170	7-37N-101W	1947	Extension	(1)
East Antelope (unit)	Cheyenne 067655	26-27N-93W	1947	New field	Gas
Pine Mountain	Cheyenne 067682	26-34N-84W	1947	do	Gas
Sage Creek (unit)	Cheyenne 067739	6-57N-97W	1948	New pool (Madison)	Testing
Total					255,285,000
New Mexico:					
Sawyer	Las Cruces 063151	19-9S-38E	1947	New field	2,000,000
Black River	Las Cruces 065421	13-24S-26E	1947	Redeveloped field	100,000
Grayburg-Kelly	Las Cruces 028784 (c)	26-17S-29E	1947	New pool (San Andres)	3,000,000
Teague	Las Cruces 030187	28-23S-37E	1948	New field	50,000,000
Unnamed	Las Cruces 057159	11-26S-37E	1948	New field	1,000,000
Total					56,100,000
California:					
Sunset	Los Angeles 033068	32-12N-23W	1947	New pool (Miocene)	5,000,000
Oak Canyon	Los Angeles 042151	32-8N-17W	1947	New pool (Miocene)	520,000
McKittrick	Sacramento 019414 (a)	30-30S-22E	1947	Extension	10,000,000
McKittrick	Sacramento 035506	29-30S-22E	1947	Extension	10,000,000
South Mountain	Los Angeles 055490	19-3N-20W	1948	Extension	2,400,000
Aliso Canyon	Los Angeles 055641	29-3N-16W	1948	Extension	900,000
South Mountain	Los Angeles 055656	19-3N-20W	1948	Extension	1,800,000
Ramona	Los Angeles 056697	13-4N-18W	1948	Extension	1,000,000
Kettleman Middle Dome (Unit)	Sacramento 019275 (a)	30-23S-19E	1948	New pool (Eocene)	35,000,000
Total					66,620,000

[1] No estimate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Wyoming embarrasses me greatly. Needless to say, however, I deeply appreciate the most kind remarks he has just made.

However, it is not in connection with that matter that I desired that he yield to me.

I wish to refer to the Mineral Leasing Act which he has just discussed. I was not aware of the figures he has placed in the RECORD. I know that both the Senator from Wyoming and I were prompted by the matters he has mentioned and by the strong desire to secure exploration and development in the Western States.

I have not been able to keep up with the matter in the other States, but I have watched with great interest and gratification the development which has occurred in New Mexico, in large part as a result of this act. I may say now that it has even exceeded my fondest expectations. More pools are being discovered in New Mexico now than ever before, and a great part of that is due to this Minerals Leasing Act.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I.—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER

SEC. 1. This title may be cited as the "Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act."

SEC. 2. Creation and purposes: For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, of assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as "agricultural commodities"), and of facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States, within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general direction and control of its Board of Directors.

SEC. 3. Offices: The Corporation may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 4. General powers: The Corporation—

(a) Shall have succession in its corporate name.

(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) May sue and be sued, but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district courts of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation may intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit against the Corporation shall be allowed unless it is shall have been brought within 4 years after the right accrued on which suit is brought. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) shall be applicable to the Corporation. Any suit by or against the United States as the real party in interest based upon any claim by or against the Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this subsection (c) to the same extent as though such suit were by or against the Corporation.

(d) May adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

(e) Shall have all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the United States with respect to the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding.

(f) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(g) May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary in the conduct of its business. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements.

(h) May contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of plants and facilities for the physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control. Except as provided in section 16, the Corporation shall not have power to acquire or lease any such plant or facility or to acquire or lease real property or any interest therein, except that it may rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business, and it may continue to lease (by renewing or extending existing leases or entering into new leases) property leased by it on the date of the enactment of this act.

(i) May borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation: *Provided*, That the total of all money borrowed by the Corporation, other than trust deposits and advances received on sales, shall not at any time exceed in the aggregate $4,750,000,000. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

(j) Shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

(k) Shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

(l) May make such loans and advances of its funds as are necessary in the conduct of its business.

(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 5. Specific powers: In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 841), the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

(a) Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

(b) Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

(c) Procure agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

(d) Remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

(e) Increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

(g) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

In the Corporation's purchasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall, to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the fulfillment of the Corporation's purposes and the effective and efficient conduct of its business, utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

SEC. 6. Existing statutes applicable to the Corporation: The Federal statutes applicable to Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall be applicable to the Corporation, Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall cease to be an agency of the United States as provided in section 7 (a) of the act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 713 (a)).

SEC. 7. Capital stock: The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $100,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. Such subscription shall be deemed to be fully paid by the transfer of assets to the Corporation pursuant to section 16 of this act. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-4), as amended, at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

SEC. 8. Funds: The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred or allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

SEC. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall consist of five members. The Secretary of Agriculture, or his nominee, shall be a member of the Board and the remaining members shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman of the Board shall be selected by the Board. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of 6 years, except that the terms of the first Board shall be shortened to provide for replacement or reappointment of its members in number as nearly equal as practicable in each year. The power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States. The Corporation may provide, by its bylaws, for the compensation to be paid the directors: *Provided*, That the compensation paid any director shall not exceed in the aggregate $10,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not receive

additional compensation for their services on the Board. Employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not comprise, in the aggregate, more than one-half the members of the Board.

SEC. 10. The executive staff: Responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the business of the Corporation shall be vested in a staff of executive officers, headed by a chief executive appointed by the Board and responsible to the Board. The executive staff shall include a controller. Members of the executive staff shall devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation. The Board shall define the authority and duties of the members of the executive staff, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as it may determine, require that such of them as it may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds of any officer or employee. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 661).

SEC. 11. Cooperation with other governmental agencies: The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation, be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

SEC. 12. Utilization of associations and trade facilities: The Corporation may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis, committees or associations of producers, producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations, and trade facilities.

SEC. 13. Records; annual report: The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the Secretary of Agriculture a complete report as to the business of the Corporation, a copy of which shall be forwarded by the Secretary of Agriculture to the President for transmission to the Congress.

SEC. 14. Interest of Members of the Congress: The provisions of section 1 of the act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 22), shall apply to all contracts or agreements of the Corporation, except contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 15. Crimes and offenses—

FALSE STATEMENTS; OVERVALUATION OF SECURITIES

(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself or another, money, property, or anything of value, under this act, or under any other act applicable to the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than 5 years, or both.

EMBEZZLEMENT, AND SO FORTH; FALSE ENTRIES; FRAUDULENT ISSUE OF OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (iii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in, or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefits through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine or not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

LARCENY; CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE

(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

GENERAL STATUTES APPLICABLE

(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts and agreements, employees, and operations: *Provided*, That such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That sections 114 and 115 of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 204, 205) shall not apply to contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 16. Transfer of assets of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation: The assets, funds, property, and records of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, are hereby transferred to the Corporation. The rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, in respect to any contract, agreement, loan, account, or other obligation shall become the rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities, respectively, of the Corporation. The enforceable claims of or against Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall become the claims of or against, and may be enforced by or against, the Corporation: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall limit or extend any period of limitation otherwise applicable to such claims against the Corporation.

SEC. 17. Dissolution of Delaware Corporation: The Secretary of Agriculture, representing the United States as the sole owner of the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, is hereby authorized and directed to institute or cause to be instituted such proceedings as are required for the dissolution of said Corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware. The costs of such dissolution of said Corporation shall be borne by the Corporation.

SEC. 18. Effective date: This title shall take effect as of midnight June 30, 1948.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAW

SEC. 201. Section 8 (a) of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended (U. S. C., 1940, ed., Supp. V, title 50, sec. 968), is amended by striking out "before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated" and by inserting in lieu thereof "on or before December 31, 1950."

SEC. 202. Section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 15, sec. 713a–8 (a)), is amended by striking out "the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated" and by inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1950."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER conferees on the part of the Senate.

POLLUTION-CONTROL ACTIVITIES IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 418, a bill to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 418) to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows: Page 2, line 12, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "hereinafter declared to be a public nuisance"; page 2, lines 13 and 14, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "such interstate waters and tributaries thereof" and insert the following words "surface and underground waters"; page 9, line 11, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$200,000" and insert the figure "$250,000"; page 11, line 25, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$20,000,000" and insert the figure "$22,500,000"; page 12, line 25, of the amendment of the House, after the words "study of" insert the word "water", and strike out the word "of" after the word "pollution"; page 13, line 1, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "interstate waters"; page 13, line 2, of the amendment of the House, before the word "pollution" insert the word "water", and after the word "pollution" strike out the words "of interstate waters"; page 14, line 17 through line 23, of the amendment of the House, strike out all after the words "SEC. 9 (a)" and insert the following: "Five officers may be appointed to grades in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service above that of senior assistant, but not to a grade above that of director, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act. Officers appointed pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year shall not be counted as part of the 10 per centum of the original appointments authorized to be made in such year under section 207 (b) of the Public Health Service Act; but they shall for all other purposes be treated as though appointed pursuant to such section 207 (b)."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

LABOR DISPUTE AT OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 726)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1937, it is my duty to report to the Congress concerning the labor dispute which recently existed at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The important facts concerning the dispute may be summarized as follows:

The Oak Ridge National Laboratory is Government-owned. Some 2,350 persons are there engaged in important atomic-energy research, but not directly in production of fissionable materials or weapons.

The dispute was between the Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp., and the Atomic Trades and Labor Council, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The corporation operates the laboratory under a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract with the Atomic Energy Commission. The corporation also operates two other important plants of the atomic-energy installation at Oak Ridge. The council represents some 900 employees who perform maintenance, operating, and service functions at the Laboratory.

The recent dispute resulted from the failure of negotiations concerning both wages and working conditions. These negotiations were begun with the predecessor contractor in the latter part of November 1947 and continued with Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp. beginning February 9, 1948.

It is clear that there was a difference in objectives sought by the council and the corporation. On the one hand, the council desired to preserve differentials over the two nearby atomic-energy plants as to wage rates and conditions of employment—differentials which have been in existence in the laboratory since its beginning. On the other hand, the corporation desired uniformity of wage rates and conditions of employment and the elimination of the laboratory differentials.

In a union meeting held Sunday, February 29, the employees voted to strike unless settlement were made by Friday, midnight, March 5, and this intention was reaffirmed by another meeting on the night of March 3. Accordingly, on March 5, I issued Executive Order 9934, creating a board of inquiry pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act. At my request, both parties agreed to maintain the status quo until March 19.

On March 15 the Board of Inquiry submitted to me its first report. It found the existence of a labor dispute at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and it advised me of the facts of that dispute. It further found that grave danger to the national safety would result if the operations of the laboratory were interrupted.

Thereupon, at my request, the Attorney General on March 19 instituted an action and obtained an injunction in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee. This order enjoined both the corporation and the council, and all persons in active participation with them, from engaging in any strike or lock-out or from interfering with normal continuance of work, or from making any change in terms or conditions of employment other than by mutual agreement.

On March 24, I reconvened the Board of Inquiry. Negotiations between the parties continued, with the assistance of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. On May 18 the Board of Inquiry submitted to me its second report, stating that the position of the parties remained unaltered and the dispute unsettled.

On June 1 and 2 the National Labor Relations Board conducted a secret ballot of the employees to ascertain whether they wished to accept the final offer of settlement as stated and made by the employer. The employees, by a vote of 771 to 26, rejected the employer's last offer. On June 7 the National Labor Relations Board certified to the Attorney General the results of this election. On June 8 the employees at a union meeting took action looking to a possible stoppage if the injunction were lifted and if the employer unilaterally placed in effect the terms proposed in its final offer.

On June 10, pursuant to section 210 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, the Attorney General moved the court to discharge the injunction. The injunction was discharged on June 11.

During this period the parties continued negotiations, with the assistance of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. On June 15 the parties reached agreement on the terms of a new contract.

All parties to this dispute and the Government agencies concerned complied with all legal and procedural requirements of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

A number of additional facts concerning this dispute are set forth in the first and second reports of the Board of Inquiry. Copies of these reports are transmitted to the Congress with this message.

Both parties are to be commended for achieving settlement of this dispute without an interruption of work.

The dispute at Oak Ridge has raised some question, nevertheless, as to the sufficiency of present collective-bargaining methods in atomic-energy installations.

This question is somewhat different from others which have arisen in the past. On the one hand, it is clear that the national security and the development of the beneficial arts and sciences are bound up with the progress of our atomic-energy program. Thus, every dispute which threatens to seriously impair that program imperils the national health and safety.

On the other hand, it is equally clear that the progress of our atomic-energy program requires the support and drive of broad sectors of the American economy. In order to encourage such support, the Atomic Energy Commission has lodged in its contractors a large measure of responsibility and authority. The progress of the program is equally dependent upon the full and willing support of the men and women who work in atomic-energy plants and laboratories.

Under these circumstances, it is imperative that the most successful techniques of the collective-bargaining process should be adopted for the atomic-energy program.

The objective should be twofold. The parties should continue to enjoy the maximum of voluntary action and freedom of choice. Secondly, the public interest must be protected at all times.

I believe that special study should be given to the problem of peaceful and orderly settlement of labor disputes in Government-owned, privately operated atomic-energy installations, such as those at Richland, Wash.; Oak Ridge, Tenn; Los Alamos, N. Mex.; the Argonne National Laboratory, Chicago, Ill., and others.

I propose, therefore, to establish a commission composed of men having expert knowledge in the field of labor relations to study this problem and to make such recommendations as they may find necessary. The commission should explore the question whether any special legislation should be enacted to protect the national interest without depriving management or labor organizations of the initiative and freedom necessary for the progress of our atomic-energy program. The commission should study ways and means of adapting to the atomic-energy program the best of our experience in the complex field of labor relations. The commission should concern itself also with special aspects of

the problem, such as questions of bargaining representation, uniformity of working conditions and wages, and procedures for grievance handling.

The commission should concern itself, in short, with the broad code of conduct which should be observed by management and labor in their relations with each other in this vital program.

In appointing this commission I shall request the advice of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, both as to the membership of the commission and the specific questions to be studied.

I believe that the report of this commission, which should be submitted as soon as possible, will be of great value in guiding contractors, labor organizations, and the Government in this new and vital field. I am confident that this is the best avenue to follow to achieve and maintain that proper balance between freedom and responsibility which is the tradition in all our economic relations, including those between management and labor.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report on Senate bill 2242, a bill to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, which was read by the Chief Clerk.

(See conference report printed in House proceedings, p. 8855, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 18, 1948.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to be heard on this question before it is disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida seeks recognition. Does the Senator from West Virginia wish to speak on the report?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the explanation. I merely wish to be heard before the question is disposed of.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in presenting this conference report on the displaced-persons bill, I desire to make a very brief statement respecting the displaced-persons bill as passed by the Senate, the bill as passed by the House, and the bill which has now been reported after an extended conference.

The Senate will recall the extended debate which took place when the bill was pending before the Senate. It is my position at the present time that the bill was debated on the floor of the Senate very fully and completely, and it is my belief that legislation dealing with the problem of displaced persons must be in accordance with two fundamental principles.

First, such legislation should be consistent with the best interests of the country; and, second, in view of the tremendous scope of the problem, the legislation dealing with it must, so far as practicable, be confined to displaced persons in Europe who were displaced as a direct result of the war, and who cannot be repatriated.

With respect to the differences between the bill as it passed the Senate and the conference report; the bill as it passed the Senate provided, after amendments were made on the floor of the Senate, for the admission of 200,000 persons within the course of 2 years. The bill, as reported by the conferees, permits the entry in 2 years of 205,000 persons, the difference being that the 3,000 displaced orphans to be admitted under the Senate bill had been included within the 200,000 limit. The conference bill lets the number of orphans come in over and above the 200,000 limit.

In addition, the conferees agreed to, and the bill as it comes from conference provides for, the entry of 2,000 persons who fled from Czechoslovakia prior to April 1, 1948. With the additions of these 2,000, as I say, the total number will be 205,000.

The bill also provides an adjustment of status, as it is called, for 15,000 displaced persons who are here on a temporary basis, that is, those who come in under temporary visas issued by the representatives of this Government.

Mr. President, it cannot be said that the category of 15,000 is a definite number fixed to come into the country, or to stay here. The bill simply provides that 15,000 may have their status adjusted by the Attorney General of the United States, as may be done in the case of any immigrant into the country on a temporary visa or temporary stay. If the Attorney General extends the time beyond 6 months, he must report it to the Congress; and if the Congress, after reviewing the case, finds that the Attorney General's viewpoint is sustained, then the person is deportable. That applies in the case of any temporary entrance. On the other hand, if the Congress approves within the session within which the list of persons is sent to this country or within the succeeding term, then that person obtains permanent status.

It will be recalled that certain vocational preferences were provided in the bill as passed by the Senate. As I recall, 50 percent of those who were to be admitted into the country were to be persons who had engaged in agriculture—agricultural workers—and who intended to go into agriculture in this country. In the conference report that figure has been changed to 30 percent, and a preference is given to the agricultural worker.

Under the bill as passed by the Senate, at least 50 percent of those admitted were to be persons who were natives of a land which had been annexed de facto by a foreign power. That would mean Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and eastern Poland, east of the Curzon line. In the previous debate, I fully discussed the reasons for that preference.

The conference report incorporates the provisions of the Senate bill providing for a three-member commission, but leaving the administration of the act in the hands of the regular immigration officials.

The conference report also provides for the opening of the German and Austrian quotas, with a provision that up to 50 percent of such quotas for the next 2 years, may be assigned to the Volksdeutsche. The Volksdeutsche, as the Senator recalls, are those persons of original German descent who may for generations have lived in Poland, Czechoslovakia, or Yugoslavia, and who, after the defeat of Hitler, under the Potsdam agreement were driven from their homes back into Germany or Austria.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL—CHANGE OF CONFEREES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment, in order to ask that I may be excused from further service as a conferee on the Government corporations appropriation bill, and that a new conferee be appointed?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the request of the acting majority leader is granted, I shall ask that a new conferee be appointed.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope my request will be granted, because it is physically impossible for me to attend any further meetings of the conferees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

Will the junior Senator from Michigan suggest whom he desires to have named as a conferee, in place of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to refer to the seniority list of the committee. As I understand, at the present time it will be the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] will be named as an alternate conferee.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have stated, a first preference is to be given to agricultural workers.

I wish to say that a second preference is to be given, as was provided in the House bill, to persons who are household workers or construction, clothing, or garment workers, and others who are needed in the locality in the United States in which such persons propose to reside, or eligible displaced persons possessing educational, scientific, technological, or similar qualifications. That provision was taken from the bill as passed by

the House, in substantially the same language.

A third preference is given to eligible displaced persons who are the blood relatives of citizens or lawfully admitted aliens in the United States, such relationship in each case to be within the third degree of consanguinity, computed according to the rules of common law.

Within those preferences, certain priorities are to be issued, first, to eligible displaced persons who during World War II bore arms against the enemies of the United States and are unable or unwilling to return to the countries of which they are nationals, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion; and, second, to eligible displaced persons who on January 1, 1948, were located in the displaced persons camps and centers. In exceptional cases, however, a preference may be given to persons outside, under the regulations of the Commission.

Mr. President, I believe that states the principal differences between the bill as passed by the Senate and the conference report.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. As the Senator knows, the clothing industry in the United States is badly in need of qualified tailors and hand operators on clothing. I am informed that that need cannot be supplied in this country, but it can be supplied from European sources. Can the Senator state whether the words "clothing and garment workers" are intended to include and do include tailors and hand operators on clothing?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is my understanding that the reference to clothing and garment workers, would include anyone who works with clothing and garments, and certainly it would be my understanding that it would include tailors. However, if there were any reason to doubt for a moment that such persons were covered by the words used in the conference report, the reference in the report to other workers needed in such places in the United States where such displaced persons would reside, would certainly cover the situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I read the conference report rather hastily, the number of persons who can come into the United States under it, from any one country could displace not more than 50 percent of the quota of immigrants from that country for that year. I should like to know this: If there are eligibles from Latvia, who are just the sort of people we want, and who qualify under this measure in every other way, will the fact that 50 percent of the quota for that country has been used for that year, keep other of such eligible persons from being admitted that year, but give them priority in the next year; or what will happen?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should have mentioned that point in the opening statement I made. I am glad the Senator has asked the question. I think it best that I read the provision of the conference report in that connection. It is to be found in subsection (b) of section 3:

> Upon the issuance of an immigration visa to any eligible displaced person as provided for in this act, the consular officer shall use a quota number from the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in section 12 of the act of May 26, 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 212), for the fiscal year then current at the time or, if no such quota number is available for said fiscal year, in that event for the first succeeding fiscal year in which a quota number is available: *Provided*, That not more than 50 per centum of any quota shall be so used in any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That eligible displaced orphans may be issued special nonquota immigration visas, except that the number of such special nonquota immigration visas shall not exceed 3,000.

In other words, it does not block the number of persons who may be admitted into the United States in any one year. I know exactly what the able Senator has in mind. For instance, the quota of Estonia is very low; I do not recall, but it is probably around 200 or under 200. The question asked by the Senator is, Would that primarily affect the number to come in in any one year? No; it would not. As many as are available, as many as will, may come in. As many as will, even beyond the whole quota, may come in. But the charge against future quotas is only chargeable to half the yearly quota. In other words, it leaves half the quota for persons, natives of that country other than displaced persons, to use it in those years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, then, to finish with that, they can be admitted in any number, if they are otherwise eligible, from Estonia, but 50 percent of the quota from that country would be pledged for years to come until that number is filled up. Is that correct?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes, that is right. In other words, this is a provision that was in the House bill, which was insisted upon by the House, called by some a mortgaging of future quotas up to 50 percent a year. It does not affect the number who may come in within any year of the 2 years covered by the statute, or rather within the whole 2-year period covered by the statute.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like the floor in my own right.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thought the Senator wanted me to yield for a question. I tried to give an explanation of the bill as it came from conference. It is the Senate bill as passed by the Senate by a large majority, with the differences I have tried to express in this opening statement. With that explanation, I am very glad to yield the floor at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as one of the conferees, I have not placed my signature to the conference report, and while the report was taken to the floor of the House and adopted, and I anticipate it will be adopted by the Senate, I still deem it my duty to state for the RECORD and to the Senate my reason for declining to sign the report.

Mr. President, there are two questions involved in the bill as to which I could not compromise the principle which I think is involved. While I realize a vote was taken upon each of the questions in the Senate, I still think the principle is so vital to the proper solution of the problem of displaced persons that it should now be called to the attention of the Senate, because I believe the bill is not workable in its present condition, and that in the future, amendments will of necessity be made, and therefore we should understand what we are about to do.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Merely that we may understand the basis of the Senator's statement, did the Senator vote for the bill in the Senate on final passage?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, Mr. President; I voted for the bill. I thought then it was as good a bill as the Senate at that time would pass; I believe now it is as good a bill as the Senate will pass; but I still think I should make these remarks to the Senate at this time because to me they deal with a vital matter. The questions I have in mind are two in number. The first has to do with the date for reckoning displaced persons under the bill. As I recall, the war ended on May 8, 1945. Some of the displaced-persons camps were in existence at that time, and were filled later by taking people who were displaced from wherever they were found.

Sometime subsequent to December 22, 1945, the President of the United States issued an Executive order allowing displaced persons from the camps to come into the United States under the regular quota. The report of the committee indicates that there were many. And, by the way, the President used the date of December 22, 1945, as being the date he would recognize persons as being displaced if they were in the camps prior to that date.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Can the Senator give us any explanation for the vigorous insistence by the majority on the December 22, 1945, date, which was known to deny eligibility status to large numbers of displaced persons?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the record is quite full, because it was contended on the floor that the real displaced persons were those who were in the camps prior to December 22, 1945. But as the Senator from Michigan sees the proposition, all displaced persons in the camps prior to the time they were officially closed by the order of General Clay, are displaced persons.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have before me an editorial from the Denver Post of June 13, 1948, the heading of which is "Cutting out the bias," in which appears this paragraph:

> A second provision of the Senate bill, plainly containing an anti-Jewish bias, limits eligible DP's to those refugees who entered

the camps of western Europe before December 22, 1945. Most Jews, who comprise 18 percent of the total displaced persons, came to the refugee centers after that date.

Certainly there is an inference in the editorial statement and in the fact that justifies a possible assumption there might have been some conscious design to deny eligibility to the Jews.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me at once remove from the mind of the Senator from Florida any conscious design to discriminate against anyone whomsoever because of religion or faith. I think the other members of the committee will bear me out in that statement, and will do so emphatically. This was a displaced-persons bill, and there was not, and should not have been, any idea of bringing the faith or beliefs of any persons into the discussion. Let that be put at rest.

So far as the Senator from West Virginia is concerned, this is a displaced-persons bill, whoever they might be, and the persons earliest displaced, those more certainly displaced, were the ones who should receive first attention. I point out to the Senator who has raised the question—and I do not desire to discuss it because it has no part in the consideration—that there are displaced persons all over the world. Under IRO camps are maintained not only in Europe but in north Africa, in the Middle East, and in China.

We are advised by Sir Arthur Rucker, who is the deputy administrator of the PCIRO, that the representatives of the new state of Pakistan came before him and reported that there were 10,000,000 displaced persons in that country. Those people would be qualified. It is limited to Germany and Austria, where the American, the British, and the French zones are located, with respect to who may come under this bill. Perhaps that is discrimination, but it is wise and necessary discrimination as to the area dealt with in the bill.

As to other discriminations, I think the Senator will find that there are none, in fact, regardless of charges by groups and by writers. I do not think that there would be any unjust discrimination whatever under the effects of this bill.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would rather not yield. I have a conference to attend with regard to the Government corporations bill. It is very essential that I be present because of the closing of the session today. As soon as I can finish what I have to say, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The question has been raised as to whether the bill is, in effect, discriminatory. There is no doubt that it is discriminatory. It does not make any difference to the people who are being discriminated against whether it is a conscious or an unconscious discrimination, but it makes a difference to the people who are exercising the discrimination.

The reason this bill will not work is that it will suggest the filing of fraudulent applications because on December 22, 1945, registration was not complete in the camps. It was not known who were in the camps prior to that date or who were in the camps after that date, and not until April 21, 1947, was there an actual investigation to the extent of taking fingerprints of those who were in the camps. So on April 21, 1947, it was known exactly what persons were in the camps, by photograph, by fingerprint, and by record.

I have not agreed with the committee. I had presented these problems on the floor previously. I have not signed the report, because under the circumstances I felt my conscience would not allow me to sign it. I merely came to the floor to present the picture, so that we may realize what we are doing. If we do not solve the problem of displaced persons we shall have a cancer in Europe that may lead even to disturbances which will affect the whole world. For that reason I raise my voice today upon the floor.

I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the question propounded to the Senate by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] with respect to the date of December 22, 1945, which was made the effective date of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized in his own right.

Mr. McGRATH. I join in the sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. To me it is a matter of deep regret that after 18 months of sincere, honest, and courageous effort on the part of so many thousands of humanitarian Americans, we come to this sad moment in the Senate of the United States when we probably shall have to write into the law of this country principles of narrowness, intolerance, and bigotry.

Mr. President, the date of December 22, 1945, was deliberately written into this bill because that date prohibited Jews from taking part in this program. The committee may deny it had that deliberate intent, but I want the RECORD to show that the committee had full knowledge that such would be the effect, whatever the intention of the committee may have been. It was pointed out in the committee by myself, that on this date most of the poor wandering people who had been driven from their homes and were still wandering about the war-torn countries of Europe had not been collected together.

If we take the date of December 22, 1945, there will be no record. If a person is able to claim that he was in a camp prior to that date, he would be recognized as a displaced person. Therefore a dishonest person could get out of the camp as a displaced person. But if we take the official record, as of April 21, 1947, we have something on which to work. Those who will administer the act will have something on which to work.

I say, Mr. President, if we unconsciously discriminate against those who are actually displaced persons, it is still discrimination. If we discriminate, we are in effect un-American.

Mr. President, there is one other provision in the bill which I think discriminates against the same persons. When it was brought up on the floor and in the conference committee, it was turned down, but I think we should realize what we are doing. We tried to make it fair in the bill so that there would be no question about taking persons from the groups. The groups were the nationality groups, with one exception, and that was the Jew. He was treated under IRO as a nationality, and therefore if we had applied the rule that there would be no discrimination among groups, we would have discovered that there would have been no discrimination as to nationality. Therefore everyone would have been able to say we were trying to bring into America qualified displaced persons, no matter what their race, their color, or their creed might be.

So when we boil it down and reach the question of whether we are actually discriminating, we will be unable, in my humble judgment, to solve the problem of displaced persons unless at some time this bill is amended or a law is passed providing that there shall be no discrimination as to groups, and that we shall use a date on which there were official records so that we can ascertain whether the applicants are really displaced persons. They had not been put into camps, so they are ineligible to participate under this program.

I want the RECORD to show that another discrimination is writen into the bill, which is a discrimination against those who come from the Catholic parts of Europe, by giving a great preference to another segment of the area from which these displaced persons were driven.

Mr. President, I feel that before there is a final vote on the conference report I should make the observation I have previously stated, namely, that we have approached this problem from the point of view of seeing what we could do to prevent displaced persons from coming to the United States, rather than how to bring them here. Our whole aim and purpose, it seems to me, has been to find reasons and excuses for not passing any displaced-persons legislation whatsoever.

I am firmly of the conviction that the only reason why we have a bill before us is that we do not dare, in the months ahead, face up to public opinion if we dare to adjourn the Congress without passing some legislation on this subject. I hope the people of the United States will not be fooled into thinking that we are doing, by this bill, that which by tradition and honor the United States of America should do for the displaced people of Europe.

Mr. President, I was a member of the committee which was appointed to go to Europe to study the displaced persons problem. I regret that I could not stay in Europe during the entire tour of the committee, but I was there long enough to visit more than 15 of the camps, and I think I am equipped with knowledge of the problem.

We came back to the United States and worked diligently and laboriously upon the legislation. I disagreed wholeheartedly and vigorously with the majority of

the committee. In committee I took the view which has been taken here today by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and my reward for making that kind of a fight was that when a conference committee of the Senate was appointed to meet with the conferees of the House of Representatives and try to get a workable bill, though I had been one of the Democratic members of the committee all during the progress of the legislation, I was denied a place upon the conference committee. Instead of my going on the conference, where I could have discussed this question intelligently, there was sent the distinguished Senator from Mississippi to represent the Democratic Party, when his view has all along been that we should not pass displaced-persons legislation at all, that we owe no obligation to these people. That is the kind of situation we had when the Senate should have had an opportunity to get a reasonable bill out of the conference of the House and Senate.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I resent such treatment at the hands of those who were responsible for it.

This morning the New York Times has a very splendid editorial very much in line with the editorial referred to by the distinguished Senator from Florida. We all have confidence in the fairness and in the integrity of the New York Times. It starts its principal editorial today by calling this bill a "shameful" displaced-persons bill, and I wish to read into the RECORD here and now the opinion of the distinguished editors of this newspaper:

> Eighteen months ago a humanitarian drive, worthy of the best traditions of this country, was begun to save some of the lives of 850,000 men, women, and children in the displaced-persons camps of Europe. With sweeping support of Americans in every walk of life and of civic, government, labor, and religious groups, the Stratton bill emerged, symbolizing the highest principles as a basis for taking a fair share of the DP's—400,000 over a 4-year period—on the concept of justice for each group of DP's.
>
> That bill died in committee, and two bills subsequently took the Stratton bill's place. In the House a more moderate bill, but nevertheless humane, was sponsored by Representative FRANK FELLOWS, to admit 200,000 DP's over a 2-year period. In the Senate a bill written by Senators REVERCOMB and WILEY was the antithesis of humanitarianism and deliberately sought to scuttle every high concept of either of the House bills.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McGRATH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator knows I voted for the bill personally, does he not, but did not write into it one word, one sentence, or one clause? It came out as a subcommittee bill, and as a committee bill, and my name is on it without authority from me. Is not that the fact?

Mr. McGRATH. I am very happy the Senator has interrupted me to make that point. I am very happy to know that the Senator from Wisconsin is disowning this bill, as I would disown it myself if it had my name attached to it.

Mr. WILEY. Will not the Senator answer my question directly? He sat on the subcommittee. Did I have anything to do with writing the bill? I will have something to say on the merits of the bill later. The Senator was a member of the subcommittee, and I should like to get the matter straight, because all over this country I have been credited as being the sire of the bill, and I should just like to know definitely if the Senator does not know personally that I had nothing to do with writing the bill or shaping it. Is it not a subcommittee bill, a majority of the subcommittee voting for it, and was it not afterwards adopted by the full committee?

Mr. McGRATH. When anyone says that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is the father of this bill he is stating an untruth.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McGRATH. I agree with the Senator that he had little or nothing to do with the bill as it came out in final form.

Mr. WILEY. Or with drafting the bill. I did not sit on the subcommittee that drafted the bill.

Mr. McGRATH. The reason why the Senator's name is on the bill at all is that we reported the bill bearing the number that had been given the original bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin, and the Senator had very little to do with the recommendation or the approval of the concepts we now find in the bill that is before us in this conference report.

Mr. WILEY. One other question, if the Senator will yield. Is it not true that this bill was written by the majority of the subcommittee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]?

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The attention of Senators has been called to the responsibility for the bill. There was a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], who is speaking now, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and myself. The bill was not written by any one individual. It came out of the subcommittee as a very definite compromise of the views of a subcommittee which wanted to present to the Congress an opportunity to vote upon a bill dealing with this subject.

The Senator from Rhode Island well knows that. He attended the meetings of the subcommittee. He knows of the extended and lengthy discussions had upon this subject in the subcommittee. He knows that it came out of the subcommittee as a compromise of the views of the subcommittee, that a majority of three voted to report the bill out, that one of the Senators did not agree with some of the provisions but did agree with others, and I think that the Senator from Rhode Island, while he did not agree with the terms of the bill as a member of the subcommittee, did want some bill brought out upon this subject.

That is the way the bill came before the Senate. No one individual, no one Senator, offered this bill or wrote it. This was a bill which came out of a subcommittee of five, in which there was definite disagreement about the terms, and eventually a sufficient number, a majority of the subcommittee, found a bill upon which they could agree, and reported it out.

That agreement was by way of compromise and settlement for the purpose of bringing this subject before the Congress of the United States so the Congress could determine it. There was no attempt here to bury the question of the displaced persons, but to give the Congress an opportunity to vote upon the question.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I am not surprised that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee wants now to disown the paternity of the bill, and I think he will be more ashamed of it as time goes on, than he is now.

Of course the final form in which the report came to the Senate represents compromises which were reached by the conference committee. But I am not going to let the record stand without saying that in every way that he could the distinguished Senator from West Virginia whittled down this bill to the point where it was most distasteful to us, and we reached the conclusion in the committee that if we were going to have any legislation whatsoever upon this subject, the only way to get it would be by writing the legislation on the floor. We agreed to have the bill reported, unsatisfactory as it was, in the hope that we might accomplish that purpose. I, myself, joined with other Senators in offering an amendment on the floor as a substitute for the bill. I and other Senators who shared the same views withdrew the substitute in the hope that in the final analysis we would not, by voting on the substitute, foreclose the possibility of getting a fair bill from the House and Senate conference.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There is no question that the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from West Virginia were in disagreement on many points in consideration of the bill, and there is no question that the Senator from West Virginia today is not, as he previously was not, in favor of some of the terms contained in the bill today.

When the bill came to the floor of the Senate the figure was fixed at 50,000 persons a year. The Senate, by amendment, raised the number to 200,000 for 2 years. But regardless of that, the Senator from West Virginia accepted the verdict of the Senate, and went into conference to uphold the Senate's bill.

The Senate disagreed with and would not support the views of the Senator from Rhode Island, and now the Senator from Rhode Island complains about the bill. The Senator from Rhode Island denounced the bill as it came before the Senate, and when it was amended. The Senate has disagreed with the Senator from Rhode Island. The bill has been passed by the Senate, and although the

DP's to be siphoned into America on top son, judgment and foresight. We must Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]

Senator from West Virginia disagreed with the bill as it was passed by the Senate, he stood by the judgment of the Senate in the conference.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island realizes that the damage has been done, and that we are now considering a conference report on which there is no opportunity to make changes in the bill. I realize that it is a matter of voting it up or down, approving it or disapproving it.

I merely want to make my own position clear upon the record that I think the bill is not only unsatisfactory, but it is largely unworkable. Time alone, of course, can answer many of the doubts we have within us at the present time.

I rose, Mr. President, to answer the question propounded by the distinguished Senator from Florida, and I had started to read an editorial from the New York Times. I offer the complete editorial for insertion in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. I do, however, wish to make a reference to one more paragraph, which I think sums up the situation very adequately when it says:

This week has brought a shameful victory for this latter school of bigotry. A joint conference committee approved virtually every narrow concept of the Senate measure, and the House yesterday endorsed the conference report.

The editorial goes on to say:

This is a sad conclusion. There is also no assurance that the 100,000 proposed for the first year's admissions will come into the country, because of the bill's unworkability.

What is the position of those of us who have a deep feeling for the bitter experiences of fellow human beings who have for years been driven from their homes and countries, forced to live under cruel circumstances which the enemies of our democracy and our way of life have visited upon them?

Mr. President, I have weighed this matter carefully in my own mind, and I can see before me 200,000 human souls that may probably in some small way be benefited by this bill. I can see their confreres, some six-hundred-thousand-odd of them, who can have no hope because we have seen fit to put a limitation of 200,000 on our action.

I have come to the conclusion, Mr. President, that if there is a chance to give aid and succor to any one of these that we should not miss the opportunity. I have come to the conclusion that it does not make a particle of difference whether a man is a Jew or a Catholic or a Protestant, whether he is a Balt, or whether he is something else, if he is in want and in misery, we ought to help him if we can. And while this bill discriminates against Jewish DP's, and while it discriminates against Roman Catholic DP's—and the Roman Catholics of this country know it, and they know that the Senate knows it; and the Jews of this country know it, and they know that the Senate knows it—yet these people have been persecuted before, and they have lived through it; and, Mr. President, neither of these groups because of further intolerant discrimination would want to deny what little aid may come to fellow human beings by this bill.

Doing therefore what I know in their hearts they would have me do, that is vote for this bill even though it does not do all it should for them, on that basis, Mr. President, I shall vote for the conference report in the hope that time will justify what I have said, and that our consciences will be aroused and that these wrongs will be righted in the not-too-distant future.

There being no objection, the editorial submitted by Mr. McGRATH was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SHAMEFUL DP BILL

Eighteen months ago a humanitarian drive, worthy of the best traditions of this country, was begun to save some of the lives of 850,000 men, women, and children in the displaced persons camps of Europe. With sweeping support of Americans in every walk of life and of civic government, labor, and religious groups, the Stratton bill emerged, symbolizing the highest principles as a basis for taking a fair share of the DP's—400,000 over a 4-year period on the concept of justice for each group of DP's.

That bill died in committee, and two bills subsequently took the Stratton bill's place. In the House, a more moderate bill, but nevertheless humane, was sponsored by Representative FRANK FELLOWS, to admit 200,000 DP's over a 2-year period. In the Senate a bill written by Senators REVERCOMB and WILEY was the antithesis of humanitarianism and deliberately sought to scuttle every high concept of either of the House bills. It cruelly favored one DP group above another, injected the religious issue, and because of its unworkable administrative provisions was a bill of exclusion rather than admission of DP's.

This week has brought a shameful victory for this latter school of bigotry. A joint conference committee approved virtually every narrow concept of the Senate measure and the House yesterday endorsed the conference report.

It is to their honor that four of the Senate-House conferees refused to sign the bill—Senators FERGUSON and KILGORE, and Representatives BOGGS and CELLER. This DP bill's main provisions are these: 205,000 DP's shall be permitted to enter over the next 2-year period, including 3,000 war orphans; 40 percent of admissions shall be allotted to DP nations of the Baltic States and Poland east of the Curzon line; 30 percent of admissions shall go to farmers, discriminating against other skills; those not in the camps by December 22, 1945, are not eligible for admission, discriminating against the bulk of Jewish DP's, who suffered the most cruelly during the war. Even the Volksdeutsche are given a boost—permitting these persons of German ethnic origin, many of whom had strong Nazi ties, to compete for regular quota numbers with bona fide DP's.

This is a sad conclusion. There is also no assurance that the 100,000 proposed for the first year's admissions will come into the country, because of the bill's unworkability. Perhaps most significant, this triumph for the Revercomb group holds disturbing portents for the future. Good bills have gone down the drain; a bad bill and a bad precedent bode ill for democracy, which finds discrimination on its books repugnant.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the other day I read a little skit wherein a school teacher wanted to have an essay written about Socrates, and was going to give a prize. The boy who received the prize wrote:

Socrates was an ancient philosopher. He went around giving advice. He got poisoned.

Mr. President, I am not going to give advice, but neither am I going to permit to go unanswered criticism of the subcommittee, three of whom agreed on the committee bill—one a Roman Catholic, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and two Protestants, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], while the other two—one a Catholic and one a Protestant—disagreed. I mention these facts much as I dislike to even mention the religious faith of a colleague, for I feel that such reference has no real place in our discussion. Unfortunately, references as to religion have already been made by others.

I heard no such argument in committee as I have heard on the floor of the Senate, as advanced by my friend Senator McGRATH. The injection of what we have heard said by my good friend not only disappoints me, but adds, I believe, to the confused thinking that has gone on throughout this country in relation to the bill.

Because my name appeared on the bill I have been the target of the worst kind of misrepresentation. The kind of propaganda that has gone out to my people is beyond belief. Folks have sent me letters in which they have said "I am not replying to this kind of rot," but many did, Mr. President.

Mr. President, the displaced persons in Europe today, although faced with many serious problems are, according to the record, better fed and better looked after in Europe than the people outside the camps in Germany. They are receiving more calories.

What was the real purpose of trying to get a workable bill? Senators realize how difficult it is to draft a bill that will work. I agreed wholeheartedly with the majority of the subcommittee, and I wish to tell the Senate why.

I appointed three men, one of whom is a former judge of the supreme court of his State, and a Catholic. He knew what was necessary to place in operation a working mechanism. He knew that 40 percent of all the applications for visas to this country were fraudulent. He knew that the record showed that this situation presented the finest vehicle in the world for Joe Stalin to get people into the United States. We know that 125,000,000 people have been taken over by the Communists without firing a shot but by penetration and infiltration.

When it is said that these three men, Christian, honorable men, Members of the Senate, permitted bigotry and religious bias to dictate their judgment, I think that is one of the nastiest things that has ever been said on the floor of the Senate. Knowing these men as I know them, working with some of them in Christian relationship, I know that what was said is not only wrong, but false.

These men have no prejudice against Jews or against Catholics. I, for one, absolutely detest and abhor every form of religious intolerance and discrimination. Senators sought to meet the impact of this DP problem in connection with all the other problems of America. They sought to evolve a mechanism that would permit, between now and January, 50,000

DP's to be siphoned into America on top of the quotas. Those men knew that next January, once the mechanism was arranged, the tide would be coming in if we had the jobs, the facilities, and the people in America who would take them and give them jobs and housing. They knew that there were 2,000,000 veterans getting married who did not have homes. They knew that this program should be handled with judgment and not with unreason. So they brought forth this bill.

I sat with the subcommittee on one or two occasions when the bill was being discussed. There was the same opposition then that we apparently have on the floor of the Senate now. But not once did I hear the question of religion or the question of race interjected into those discussions. It is not there, Mr. President and should not be there. I say that to the people of the country. I say that editorial writers, yes even for the New York Times, who write in such a vein should read the letter which Donald Richberg wrote to a Washington newspaper the other day. He spoke of the obligation of the men who write for the press to be acquainted with the facts before they attempt to educate the American public. I agree with that sentiment, Mr. President.

This Immigration Subcommittee was appointed by myself. The subcommittee went to Europe. They did not know that I was going to Europe. As I have heretofore stated, I went to Europe at my own expense. I went through those countries. I saw the situation. I felt the vast humanitarian implications of this controversy. Yet I did not come back and say a word to the subcommittee as to my own personal conclusions. I refrained from trying to influence them. But when the subcommittee had arrived at its conclusion, after the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and other members had arrived at their conclusion, I saw before me a working mechanism which, if it could be gotten through the two Houses would point to the solution of this problem.

As has been said by the Senator from West Virginia, we had before the Senate the question of who are displaced persons. We had that question in the committee. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] offered an amendment providing for the inclusion of 10,000,000 Sudeten Germans—the Volksdeutsche. If they had been included, what would have happened to the percentages? There are in India and China today tens of million of displaced persons.

But, Mr. President, we were facing a European situation of 800,000 displaced persons. If we pass this bill today, we are assuming that within the next 2 years this country will take one-fourth of them. But do not forget that we are feeding those DP's over there better than we are feeding the stricken German people. They receive more calories and have better housing conditions.

Since the day of victory in Europe 7,000,000 DP's have been handled and only some 800,000 remain.

This thing cannot be done overnight. The problem must be handled with reason, judgment, and foresight. We must have places to put these immigrants. How many of our people have come forth and told us how many displaced persons they would take? I wrote to the State of Wisconsin because the governor had appointed an able resettlement committee. I wanted to know how many the people of that State were prepared to take. A response came and I was glad to insert it in the RECORD, along with telegrams from my State, even though some of those wires disagreed with my own position. Last week 41 county agents sat downstairs as the guests of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, two House Members from Wisconsin, and myself. I asked how many offers to take DP's had been received, how many places could be found, how many would be taken in my own county. The county agent in my county said, "There was one offer in my county of 45,000 people."

Mr. President, we cannot take these displaced persons and simply throw them into this country. That would be a tragedy and a sin against the DP's themselves. We must have places to lodge them. There must be folks who will feed them and look after them. Already the homes of America are crowded because of our "ain folk." We are trying to build houses. We are trying to keep our economy stable, and all at once the charge is interjected that we have a prejudice against Jews and against Catholics. It makes my heart sick that that charge should be made against my associates, whom I know so well, whom I have learned to love because of their ability to work together for the general welfare and because they, like I, detest intolerance.

Here we are in the Senate, 96 Senators, no two of whom have the same educational, economic, religious, social, geographic, and political background. Consequently we do not see things just alike. But we all love our country. But, Mr. President, if we get to the point of misjudging our fellow citizens, if we completely unjustifiedly call them bigots, we lose our poise. We lose our perspective. We cannot see through the mist that divides us.

Of course this bill is not a masterpiece. No bill could be whipped into shape, under the conditions which exist today, which would fit the conditions of tomorrow. What we have here is a bill which is the result of Members of the House and Members of the Senate getting together. My distinguished colleague from Michigan voted for the bill as it left the Senate, and while he disagrees with some of the provisions I am glad to note he will vote for the same.

That brings up one other subject. I am partially responsible for what occurred in relation to the appointment of the Senate conferees. We were having a Republican convention in Wisconsin last Friday. I had to leave early. A fellow Senator came to me and said, "You will have to name the conferees." Without detailed thought, because I had not been in the midst of this thing, and because time was lacking with a thousand other things to be done, whom did I name? The ranking Democrat, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] was absent because of illness. I named among others the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the ranking Republican who was acquainted with the bill and the facts. I was informed afterward that my original appointments would not stand by the bill aimed at in the Senate. They would not fight for the Senate bill. Then I also recognized that I had inadvertently omitted two Senators, one of whom had been on the original subcommittee; but my original appointments had been made with the best intentions. Of course I had named the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] chairman of the subcommittee.

That raises in my mind a very serious question. Personally I would not act as a conferee if I could not support a bill which went out of this body. I would not think it was my right to act as a conferee under such circumstances, if I could not basically support the measure which the Senate passed and what I was supposed to support. Perhaps others think differently.

I am not questioning the motives of anyone. But I think that matter should be thoroughly discussed on an appropriate occasion, and should be settled.

I am the guilty party because of necessary haste in desiring to go back to my native State and to attend the convention. Otherwise I probably would have appointed from the very start the ones I subsequently appointed. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] should certainly have been appointed in the first instance; and I appointed the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] instead of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who was ill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a privileged matter? I think an attack has been made upon me personally by the Senator from Wisconsin, and I demand that the Senator yield to permit me to inquire as to that.

Mr. WILEY. Certainly.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator has inferred that I declined to go along with with the Senate version of the bill, and that the Senator made a mistake in naming me as one of the conferees. I think the Senator did make a mistake in naming me as one of the conferees.

Mr. WILEY. Then the Senator and I agree.

Mr. KILGORE. Because since I was appointed as one of the conferees, I received a letter—and I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin has ever seen the letter. It was sent on April 15, 1948; and it says that the Senate version of the bill is unworkable.

Mr. WILEY. Who wrote the letter?

Mr. KILGORE. The Under Secretary of State, Mr. Robert A. Lovett.

Mr. WILEY. That answers itself, I think. I have no recollection of seeing such a letter.

I did not mean in any way to imply anything particularly derogatory. I wished to get the facts in the RECORD, and I think I have them in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I wish to return to the basic problem. Eight hundred thousand displaced persons, more or less, are involved. The Senate committee reported

the bill to the Senate. The Senate amended the bill, and after the bill was passed by the House, the bill went to conference. The conferees have reported.

When some say that the bill is not workable, only time will tell that. Of course, there can be all kinds of opinions as to that. I believe the bill has merit and will, if properly administered, do the job.

But, Mr. President, if we do not accept the conference report, in what situation will the displaced persons be left? Are we going to permit unfounded and loose statements to interfere with getting a mechanism which will serve the purpose so generally desired? I believe the bill we sent to the House was not only workable but would have done the job. It would have given us additional time to handle this problem. But this measure will permit the entrance of 105,000 DP's annually, plus 150,000 aliens under the quota, and probably an equal number of nonquota persons annually. I do not think the country could absorb more than that in 1 year.

So, Mr. President, if we sit back cooly and evaluate the situation, do we not arrive at the conclusion that we are doing the best we can? We are operating under trying circumstances, having to meet a number of difficult problems, staying up all night, and working during the following day, and probably during the following night.

I wish to say again that I believe that after we have rested and have had time to think about these matters, we shall arrive at the conclusion that although we have differed, although members of the subcommittee have differed, no Senator has meant to impugn the motives of any other Senator or has claimed that any Senator was anti-this or anti-that, or was anything but pro-American.

Mr. President, with those words, I shall take my seat.

INCORPORATION OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I now move that the bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause, and substituting the text of Senate bill 1183.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to continue the Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. HATCH conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senators who are engaging in the debate on this bill to make their remarks as brief as possible. I think there is no question but that the conference report will be adopted. So I hope Senators will make their remarks brief, for there are very important bills awaiting action. There is the problem of increasing the pay of approximately one million and a half Federal employees, and there are other questions which we are very anxious to reach and to dispose of. If this conference report is going to be adopted anyway, as I think it is, I hope Senators will make their remarks on it as brief as possible.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island has seen fit to criticize the appointment of the Senator from Mississippi as one of the conferees. The Senator from Rhode Island says he should have been appointed because he has seen the displaced-persons camps and could intelligently discuss the question.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. McGRATH. I did not predicate my right to be a member of the conference committee on the fact that I had seen the displaced-persons camps. I predicated it on the fact that I was the only available Democratic member of the subcommittee who had been appointed to study this problem, and I pointed out that we did go to Europe and did study the problem, and that I knew of the various angles to it.

As I have watched the appointment of conferees here in the Senate since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have observed that the conferees appointed have always been those who have been charged with the construction and handling of the legislation.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yielded for a question, not for a speech. I have only a few remarks to make.

Mr. McGRATH. The Senator has my answer.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know that the Senator from Rhode Island is more intelligent than the Senator from Mississippi, and probably would have done better on the conference committee. But, Mr. President, I have seen as many displaced persons in Europe as the Senator from Rhode Island has seen.

As I conceive the situation, it is the duty of a Senate conferee to uphold the position taken by the Senate until a reasonable compromise can be worked out. I think that is our duty, under our oath of office.

I submit that that is all I did. We made one proposition to the House. That proposition was accepted, and a bill was worked out.

All that the Senator from Mississippi did was to uphold to the best of his ability the position taken by the Senate.

As I remember the debate, the Senator from Rhode Island complained about several provisions in the original bill. One was the provision that 50 percent must come from Baltic states east of the Curzon line, and he also complained about the provision that 50 percent must be farmers.

The fact is that the Senator from Mississippi and others of the conferees agreed to write in that restriction.

We brought back a conference report which certainly should be more palatable to the Senator from Rhode Island than the original bill passed by the Senate.

I submit that I considered it my duty as a matter of honor to uphold the position taken by the Senate of the United States. That is what I did without regard to religious or racial feeling of any kind or type.

Although I shall vote against adoption of the conference report, I think it is as good a measure as we could have gotten under the circumstances.

Mr. KILGORE obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to address a question to the Senator from Mississippi. I was trying to get him to yield to me before he concluded his remarks.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, did the junior Senator from West Virginia desire to ask a question? I understood that, after I sat down, the Senator desired to ask a question. Would the senior Senator from West Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to my colleague for the purpose of a question, most certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to ask this question with respect to the attack made on this point by the Senator from Mississippi. Is it not correct that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] was on the subcommittee, and was the ranking Democratic member of the subcommittee?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not know whether the Senator from Mississippi is even aware of it, but I want to say that on June 7, 1948, the Senator from Nevada wrote to the director of the staff of the committee, the Senator from Nevada being ill and confined to the hospital at that time, as follows:

With regard to the other matter about which is asked my opinion, namely, the appointment of a conferee in my stead on the displaced-persons bill, I suggest and recommend Senator EASTLAND.

That was the request of the ranking minority member of the subcommittee dealing with this subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. He was the ranking Democratic member, and, by the way, he is a fine gentleman, a member of the Catholic Church. But those arguments and those reasons should have no place in this discussion. As I understand the rules or the customs of the Senate, conferees are appointed on the basis of seniority. When the Senator from Nevada refused to serve, the next two ranking Democrats were appointed conferees, according to the custom of the Senate.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, as one of the two dissenters to the conference report, I desire at this point to call attention to one paragraph in a letter which only came to my attention, and, I think, only came to the attention of anybody, this week. It is a letter dated April 15, 1948. Under the heading of "Eligibility," it makes this statement:

The bill would exclude otherwise qualified displaced persons who entered Germany, Austria, and Italy after December 22, 1945. This would be extremely difficult to administer and would apparently result in discrimination against most of the Jewish displaced persons.

I ask at this time to include that as part of my remarks, and I would state that it is one of my reasons for dissenting in the report of the conferees. The principal reason is that, knowing that never before April 1947 was there an adequate census taken of displaced persons, I look forward to fraud, forged papers, and so forth, in an effort to obtain entry into this country under the pending bill. If we can place the date at the date on which General Clay made a census, which is April 21, 1947, I say that then there is no chance whatever of fraud, for forged passports, for forged birth certificates, or anything else.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(2) Eligibility.—The bill would exclude otherwise qualified displaced persons who entered Germany, Austria, and Italy after December 22, 1945. This would be extremely difficult to administer and would apparently result in discrimination against most of the Jewish displaced persons. The Committee's report explains that the date of December 22, 1945, was selected because it was the date applied under the President's directive of that date. There was justification for establishing this deadline under the President's directive at the time of its issuance because the numbers applying for admission to the United States obviously exceeded those admissible under the quotas and also because it was desired to avoid an influx of refugees into the United States zone for the purpose of taking advantage of its provisions. However, our own consuls subsequently found this date so difficult to administer that the Department of State, on February 12, 1948, changed the date to April 21, 1947. This later date was the one on which General Clay closed the displaced-persons camps to further admittance.

As far as discrimination against Jewish displaced persons is concerned, I should like to point out that almost all of the Jewish displaced persons who remain in Germany, Austria, and Italy arrived in those countries after December 22, 1945. They have been admitted to the displaced-persons camps and are fully eligible under the International Refugee Organization Constitution. Under the circumstances, it would be unfortunate to exclude most of this group from potential eligibility. It is therefore recommended that the date of eligibility be changed to April 21, 1947.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to press a question in connection with the Senator's having read a paragraph from a letter written to me under date of April 15, 1948, by Acting Secretary of State Robert A. Lovett, in which, as I understand, Mr. Lovett went on to say that unless the date were moved back to April 21, 1947, there could be no satisfactory administration of it. I want to ask the Senator if he knows that up until February 1948, while this committee was meeting and when it had been meeting for months and months, for the first time, in February of this year, the date was changed or fixed for the admission of displaced persons by making it April 1947, and that for more than 2 years the State Department had administered the admission of displaced persons under the President's directive of December 22, 1945, under the deadline date of December 22, 1945. In other words, when the Under Secretary of State or anyone else comes forward and says the act cannot be administered, he is flying full in the face of the very thing that has been done for 2 years under that very State Department.

Mr. KILGORE. That, I presume, is in the way of an interrogation. If I may counterinterrogate, I would ask my colleague if the contents of the letter were ever disclosed to any member of the Judiciary Committee, or to any member of the subcommittee? I certainly never saw it until this matter came up, or I would not have voted for the Senate bill when it passed originally.

CONVEYANCE TO CHEYENNE (WYO.) OF CERTAIN LAND

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5734) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo., and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say I have had a conference with the Senator from Wyoming and with the Representative from the Cheyenne district. The House bill contains a reservation which in my judgment protects the Federal Government. Also, the property is going to surround the Federal hospital and will be used for park and recreational purposes for the patients of the hospital as well as for other citizens. Therefore, I ask to withdraw my amendment and to have the House version of the bill approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise merely to express my appreciation of the action of the Senator from Oregon in withdrawing his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, before I begin my brief remarks on the pending question of the DP's, I want to make it clear for the RECORD that I never have questioned and I never shall question, so long as I am in the Senate, the motives of any fellow Member of the Senate. I have no sympathy with the questioning of anybody's motives in what they do. I give credit to my colleagues for the same sincerity that I myself try to show in dealing with all the problems that are constantly before us.

Mr. President, I shall support the conference report, because of the conviction that it is time we began to show attention and interest and America's deep feeling for the courageous people who have been in these camps for the past few years. It is far too late for us to have acted, but we must act now, and we must get the movement under way, in order that the problem may be solved.

I supported the amendments offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and others and myself on the floor. I am not going into those again. I support the position taken by the Senator from Michigan this morning in his presentation. I want to say also that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] who was called to a committee meeting a few minutes ago, asked me to say for him that he identified himself fully with the position taken by the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], and myself on the amendments which were offered during the debate and in our position with regard to the report.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. Has the Senator in mind the number of displaced persons there were when the war ceased in Europe? I think it was approximately 8,000,000, and the number has been reduced to approximately 850,000. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. In round figures, that is correct. In my opening statement in the debate I gave the figures. I think 8,000,000 was the number. Approximately 7,000,000 were repatriated. Of those remaining to be cared for approximately 600,000 are in the American zones in Germany and Austria.

Mr. difficulty with the bill is that it does

I am advised that the negotiations now

that what I feel are restrictive practice

In addition to those who might have

My difficulty with the bill is that it does not solve that problem. We shall be called upon to pass additional legislation. But I am in favor of the report and shall support it, because it is time we started the wheels moving to get the problem solved.

Mr. WILEY. The point I am making is that there has been not only a major solution of the problem, but seven-eighths of it has been solved. I think the number is 150,000 less than one-eighth, and we are now seeking to solve the problem by getting information through the United Nations, by individual action; and by taking appropriate steps. The impression which has been given throughout the country, I am sure, is that nothing has been done, that we have just been sitting down and doing nothing.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator. Of course, the repatriation problem was largely solved after the war was over. Many persons went back to the countries from which they had fled. Our problem is to deal with those who were brought in as war prisoners and made to work, and those who fled from persecution.

I shall not discuss the Jewish problem, the Catholic problem, or the Protestant problem, as such. The reason I made as strong an argument as I made in the debate for fixing the eligibility date in 1947 rather than 1945 was that between 1945 and 1947 one of the most difficult situations arose in Europe, in Poland, where there was a pogrom, and the Jewish people were forced to flee for their lives. I consider that the members of that group which came over to our camps in Germany and Austria were received by General Clay because they were fleeing for their lives, and we said, "We will do for you what we do for the other persons." In was in 1947 that General Clay came to the conclusion that we would have to fix a date after which we would not take people into the camps. We did take them in up to that date, and they are our responsibility, whatever legislation we may pass at this time. So the fact that it affects the Jewish people particularly is only a coincidence. The best figures I can obtain show that if we leave the date in the bill as it is, 90 percent of the Jewish people in the camps in Germany and Austria will be left out, and only 10 percent will be taken care of.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I am glad the Senator has made that statement, because it reflects my own idea, drawing the inescapable conclusion that by the adoption of the earlier date discrimination actually will be practiced. That is said upon the facts, and without charging any bad motive against anyone.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator completely. I am charging no bad motives against anyone. If we adopt the earlier date we shall still have the problem left on our hands, because 90 percent of the Jews in our camps will not be taken care of.

I am advised that the negotiations now going on in England with both the British and the Arabs with regard to the Palestine problem are being affected by the fact that the United States has not yet shown a willingness to take our share of these Jewish displaced people into this country. I am advised that our negotiations would be enormously strengthened with the Arabs and the British if it could be shown that we had been willing to do our share in taking in these persecuted and unfortunate people. It might be possible to help in the solution of the very tragic Palestine situation, and especially the immigration phase of that problem. It is a very important question, the significance of which I frankly do not think the Senators realized when they chose the earlier date.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I appreciate the viewpoint of the Senator from New Jersey and that he does not impugn the motives of Senators. I want to say that the motives, so far as I know, have been of the highest order. There was no intent to discriminate, and, I will say further, there was no discrimination, as the Senator views it, against anyone on account of his faith or religion. I shall speak to that point later. I know that great pressure was brought to bear, but the idea of the religion of any of these persons did not and should not enter into the matter. There were people of all faiths who presented their cause together. They did not bring up the question of faith. It was a question of a displaced person, whoever he might be, regardless of his faith. Since the point has been injected into the debate, I should like to speak on it later.

Mr. SMITH. May I interrupt the Senator to say that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] asked me if I would make my remarks very brief because of the pressure on us today. I want to keep faith with the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me finish my sentence. I want to say to the Senator that I can understand someone injecting the religious question into the matter on the outside, but it is difficult to understand how it could be injected into the debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. Vote! Vote!

Mr. SMITH. The displaced persons came into the camps after 1945 for the same reason that the Balts fled from their area of Europe before the Russian advance, prior to 1945. So far as the classification is concerned, we have exactly the same reason. It was because General Clay recognized that situation and thought he ought to find a dead line for closing the camps, that he finally set the closing date of April 21, 1947.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the report, but I want to serve notice that I propose to continue my studies and efforts which have been going on for 18 months, and in January, when we return for the next session of the Congress, after seeing what progress has been made this summer, it is my intention to offer amendments to the act if it is found that what I feel are restrictive practice in the act are preventing us from finally settling the problem of our over-all responsibility for these people who are in our camps in the United States zones in Germany and Austria.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I was very much pleased to hear the very frank and clear statement made by the Senator from New Jersey. I appreciate the fact that we are today laboring under stress, and the necessity for economy of time. I shall endeavor to recognize those conditions in the remarks which I shall make.

I think it only fair to the Senator from New Jersey to say that he has shown for many months a careful, honest interest in the solution of this problem. While last fall he was in Europe upon another matter primarily, nevertheless he gave generously of his thought and of his activities in the study of this problem.

Mr. President, I am happy to know that he will support the conference report. I think he is doing a wise thing in taking the action which he is taking.

It was indicated by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], by his questions to the Senator from Wisconsin, and by his questions and remarks with respect to the answers of the Senator from West Virginia, that there was an effort on the part of the committee to escape responsibility, I want to say first, Mr. President, that, so far as I know, there is no Member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary who seeks to escape responsibility for what he does, either in committee or upon the floor.

In the second place may I say, speaking with respect to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], that he is entirely correct in what he has said with respect to his participation in this matter. He was the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, he evidenced some interest, he appointed a subcommittee, he has interested himself and has informed himself upon the subject; but so far as the authorship of the bill is concerned, his statement is entirely correct as to the relatively small part, if any, which he had personally in the authorship. Yet, Mr. President, he has studied the matter, and stands behind and supports the bill and the conference report.

While I am on that subject, I may say that with respect to myself I do not attempt to shirk my responsibility in connection with the bill. I share the responsibility and am proud to share it with the other members of the subcommittee and of the Committee on the Judiciary. It was my privilege, under appointment from the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, to make the trip to Europe. I was with the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from West Virginia, and members of our staff, and also the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] who, although not a member of the committee, as was mentioned by me on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, went over to Europe and contributed very materially to the work done by the committee and to the securing of adequate information.

Mr. President, this was a difficult problem. It was a problem in which we had human beings by the hundreds of thousands with whom to deal. It was a problem which appealed to the humanity of the situation and to the humane feelings of the members of our subcommittee and the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and, finally, the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives themselves.

At the same time, our subcommittee and all these other Members of Congress were confronted with the fact that, after all, we are representatives in the Congress of the United States, and it is our duty to consider the effect upon the United States of America of any legislation, of whatever nature it is, that is before us for consideration and adoption. I say this was a difficult problem. It was one upon which it was difficult to secure an agreement from the members of the subcommittee. Day after day we had differences, and those differences were not reconciled until after the passage of days.

I wish to say that the distinguished members of the subcommittee which labored upon this matter, in my judgment, gave it of their best and of their conscientious thought.

The Senator from Rhode Island referred, as I recall his remarks, to what he thought was advisable in reporting the bill to the floor of the Senate, that upon the floor we would there have the opportunity of writing a bill.

In the first place, we all realize that it is difficult to write a bill upon any complicated situation on the floor of the United States Senate. Let me say in that connection that a very important part of this bill was at least preserved, and to that extent I would say it was corroborated, if I may use that term, by the action upon the floor. That was with regard to the fixing of the date of December 22, 1945. That matter was considered on the floor of the Senate, and the able Senator from New Jersey and others, I think, contributed strongly and vigorously to the argument in support of the adoption of the April date in 1947. But the Senate, after hearing the argument, and after considering it in the course of what the Senator from Rhode Island has called, I take it, the writing of the bill upon the floor, determined to adhere to the date of December 22, 1945.

Mr. President, we have heard here today the intimation, the very strong suggestion, that there were ulterior purposes in the selection of the date of December 22, 1945. I wish to say that, in my judgment, the problem we faced and the problem we attempted at least to make a contribution toward the solution of was the problem of taking care of a reasonable number of those persons who were displaced by the great global conflict, and who were in these countries of Germany, Austria, and Italy following the conclusion of the war as a result of the war.

The majority of the committee felt that, inasmuch as the German portion of the war had ended back in May 1945, we were certainly sufficiently liberal in extending the approximately 7½ months, as I recall, until December 22, 1945, the date which should be the final date of determination of who should be considered within the range of displaced persons.

It was not the problem, as I conceive it, of the Senate and of the Congress as a whole to attempt to solve the problem with relation not solely to war displaced persons, but of subsequent infiltrees who for some 16 or 17 months thereafter were coming into these various camps.

So, Mr. President, the date of December 22, 1945, was fixed upon as a date which was thought to be and I believe is a fair date for the conclusion of the period as to persons coming into these various countries, within which they shall be deemed to be eligible displaced persons. It has been intimated that there are various ulterior reasons for the selection of the priority to the persons who came from countries which are now de facto attached to a foreign power. I take it that it is perfectly clear that if a person went from a country now in the possession of a power which has de facto attached it to itself, as is the case of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and the Polish portion of the country east of the Curzon line, there is very grave doubt as to the safety of the persons who would attempt to return to those particular sections.

Mr. President, we had before us the thought that many people could safely go back to Poland, and I myself shared that view to a very considerable extent from information which we had. But I may say that in visits to those displaced persons camps—and I had the privilege of visiting numbers of the camps in company with these other gentlemen—I inquired of person after person, and while I could not make affidavit as to the exact source from which they originally came, my impression is very clear that many of them were from these countries which have been taken over and attached to a foreign power. My information was from them, in response to questions, that there was a widespread fear that if they should attempt to return to those countries or should return to those countries they would either become the victims of persecution from the people themselves, or would possibly become even the victims of murder, and there was fear in the hearts of these people that they might return there to a condition which had been already illustrated by the injury, persecution, and death of many of their own families and friends.

Mr. President, a statement was made, as I understood it, by the Senator from Rhode Island, to the effect that all the narrow concepts—I think he was reading from the New York Times when he used that expression, or possibly quoted it—that all the narrow concepts had been adopted into this bill as it comes out of conference. I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill as it comes out of conference is even more liberal than was the bill in the Senate. I say that advisedly with respect to liberality. After all, Mr. President, this country is faced with a situation in which there is no legal obligation upon it, but we do feel that there is a strong obligation of humanity.

In addition to those who might have failed to pass the tests to be permitted to come into this country, the conference report provides that 15,000 persons who are already here may be permitted to remain in this country under certain conditions.

It provides further for the admission of 2,000 persons from Czechoslovakia. It provides that as to 3,000 orphans they shall no longer be charged as a part of the initial 200,000, but shall come in over and above the 200,000. So, Mr. President, we have here the original 200,000 for which the Senate provided in its process of writing a bill upon the floor of this body, as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] stated, and the conferees included 15,000 more, plus the 3,000 orphans, making a total of approximately 220,000 who are comprehended within the terms of the bill.

Now as to the alleged narrowness of concept. I undertake to say that in many respects the interests of both the United States of America and the interests and the comfort and the sanitation of the displaced persons who shall come into this country are identical, and are so recognized in the bill.

There is a provision, as the Chair will well recall, by which housing for these people is taken into consideration, but it is taken into consideration from the standpoint that it shall not force other people already in this country out onto the streets. And certainly it conduces both to the benefit of the displaced persons and to the people of our own country that when they arrive in this country they shall not find themselves confronted by the necessity of going into homes which are already overcrowded and forcing, possibly, some of those who are already in the homes out of them.

Then, Mr. President, as to these so-called narrow concepts, may I refer to the provision that a certain number are required to be persons who have been engaged in agricultural pursuits. That was put in the bill for an extremely wholesome purpose, and the purpose was this, Mr. President. It was the thought of the majority of the committee—I am not so sure but that it was the thought of the minority as well—that it was inadvisable to bring into already crowded centers of population, New York City or other great metropolitan areas, numbers of people to crowd out those who are already there, or to make living conditions well nigh unbearable.

So, Mr. President, it was thought advisable that the provision should be inserted which requires that a certain proportion should be from those who are in the agricultural-pursuits class.

I may call to the Senate's attention that in the conference the percentage of this type of persons was reduced from 50 to 30 percent.

Mr. President, I have spoken of these so-called narrow concepts to which the Senator from Rhode Island referred. I am going to mention one more, and that is that the bill sets forth in substance a provision to the effect that these people shall be admitted to go in the parts of the country where they are needed. I submit most respectfully that that is

not an inappropriate concept to carry

conference report, but the bill itself which

have a better bill and give better relief;

not an inappropriate concept to carry into this law.

Mr. President, the bill has received thoughtful, honest, honorable, and careful consideration. It is a matter upon which there is a divergence of opinion. It is one which the distinguished Senator from New Jersey recognizes possesses the possibility of difference of opinion but just as he does, I undertake to say that it is the part of wisdom to adopt this conference report, to approve it, and put it into the laws of our land.

TOLL BRIDGES OVER THE DELAWARE RIVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 6465) to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, was read twice by its title.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate passed Senate bill 2667, a bill identical with House bill 6465, which has just come over from the House. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6465) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I enter a motion that the Senate bill (S. 2667) be recalled from the House with a view to its indefinite postponement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had expected to accept the admonition of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] when he called our attention to the vast amount of work to be done, and asked Senators to be brief in their remarks on the pending matter. That had been my intention, and is now. I am not going to be disagreeable. But I also have certain deep convictions about the bill. I have been interested in it for a long time, and in the plight of the displaced persons.

I am going to cast a vote this afternoon of which I am somewhat ashamed. I think I have a right to say why I shall cast that vote. I say I am ashamed, because I am compelled to vote for a bill which in my judgment does amount to discrimination, unfair discrimination, and unjust discrimination. And because of the terms of the bill—not the conference report, but the bill itself which passed the Senate—it is my judgment that few if any displaced persons will come into this country, as was so ably pointed out by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. The other day in speaking upon this bill I stated that the cruelest and harshest thing this great Government could do to those unfortunate displaced people would be to hold out to them some promise and some hope that they would be able to come into this country to the extent of 200,000 or 205,000, only to find that the restrictions in the legislation were such that they could not qualify, and that they would be denied admission to this land.

I think the restrictions and limitations in this bill are of that kind, and that but few people are going to find any advantage from the bill we passed in the Senate, which has been improved in some respects by the conference. Mr. President, because I think it will be a disappointment, because I think it will dash down hopes which have been raised, and because it does not even approach a solution of the problem, I hesitate to vote for it; but I know that the situation in the Congress is such that if we vote down the conference report in all probability there will be no bill at all at this session.

I do not want to take that responsibility, Mr. President. I am convinced that a few people can come in under this bill. A start will be made, and because the bill does make a start I shall vote for the conference report.

Mr. President, that is about as briefly as I can explain my position. From now on and throughout the remainder of the day I hope Senators will not resort to personalities, but will extend to each other those courtesies which are so absolutely necessary if the business of the Senate is to be transacted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as I stated earlier, I shall take only a few moments. I did not sign the report. I voted for the bill when it left the Senate because I considered it the lesser of two evils, and that we had better bring in some kind of a bill rather than none. But because I could not agree with the conference report, I felt it my solemn duty to protest. I want the Senate to understand my feelings and the reason why I did not sign the report. I made remarks earlier to the same effect.

I think we stand in this position at this time: We are again facing the lesser of two evils in relation to displaced persons. If we do not pass this bill as it is now, it is my opinion that no bill will be passed during this session. Therefore, I feel that I have no alternative other than to give some relief by my vote, and, therefore, I shall vote for the conference report, because if it is not adopted I feel certain that, the House already having voted by a great majority to change the date, so far as its bill was concerned, we shall not get any bill. Therefore, I shall cast my vote for the conference report. However, I believe that we should discuss it for a short time. If the act does not work—and I am convinced that it will not—in January of next year amendments should be made so that we shall have a better bill and give better relief in an effort to solve this problem.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I realize that it is most important today that we do not spend time on matters about which we can do little. But because of certain statements which have been made by members of the subcommittee with whom I served, and by others, I feel that I must spend a few minutes upon this subject.

I was a member of the subcommittee appointed to study the problem of displaced persons and served with the distinguished Senators from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH].

In our discussions in the subcommittee I found myself in agreement with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] upon most aspects of the problem. Together we offered amendments in the subcommittee, which were rejected. We filed a minority report with the full committee. In the full committee we offered amendments which were again rejected.

Upon the floor of the Senate, when the bill came up for consideration, I joined with the distinguished Senators from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], in offering amendments which we believed would improve the committee bill.

I am very sorry that the bill which was passed by the Senate, and the one which we consider today do not incorporate those amendments, and I am not personally satisfied with several provisions of the pending bill. Nevertheless, I must say in justice today that in my belief, the statements which have been made are not fair to the distinguished chairman of the committee on the Judiciary [Mr. WILEY], or to the distinguished members of the subcommittee, Senators REVERCOMB, MCCARRAN, and DONNELL. It has been suggested that the deliberations of the committee were conducted with the intent to discriminate against certain nationalities and faiths. I attended all the meetings of the subcommittee, and of the full committee and no discrimination against any nationality or religion was at any time suggested or considered.

I deplore the fact that it is necessary to talk about discrimination, for unless it is evident that it was intended, such talk is inflammatory and does no good to any group.

Does this bill, in fact, discriminate against religious groups? If I remember correctly the statistics that were given the committee, I believe that about 20 percent of the total number of displaced persons are Jews, 15 percent are Protestants, and the remainder are Catholics. With the great number of the displaced persons to be admitted from eastern Poland and with the large proportion of people of Catholic faith among all the displaced people, I cannot believe that in fact there can or will be any discrimination against those of that faith. There should not be because they stood

out strongly against fascism and stand strongly today against communism.

So far as the Jewish population is concerned, I must agree that the fixing of the date as of December 22, 1945, will cut off for the time being those who fled from Poland in 1945. I am informed that 20 percent of the displaced persons population are Jews, and that 20 percent of all displaced persons admitted should be Jews, upon the principle of fair treatment to all groups. If we assume that 200,000 will be admitted under this bill, and take into consideration that 40,000 have been admitted up to this time under the President's order, it follows that a total of 48,000 Jews should come in. It is my understanding that more than 20,000 have already been admitted. The committee statistics indicate that about 15,000 Jewish persecutees are eligible under this bill, and if Jewish people are taken from other groups the total will approach 48,000, and there should not be any discrimination as far as numbers of religious faiths are concerned. I give these facts in simple justice because I believe that the facts ought to be known.

This is a problem which can be greatly overemotionalized and overpropagandized because it is a human problem. I have made that statement before. My own interest in the problem was stirred because I saw them as a member of the armed forces. Since that time I have been greatly interested in the problem. When the question was before the subcommittee, I first believed that the date should have been fixed at December 22, 1945. Having seen the displaced people at first-hand I felt very strongly that those who had been forcibly and actually displaced during the war and who had been in slavery in Germany should have the preference over those who had been in their homes during the war but had come to Germany later. I so stated in the subcommittee; and that those who came later, who came by choice, should be treated as refugees and should come under the regular immigration quotas.

Later, when I saw that it would be difficult to administer the law on the basis of the December 22, 1945, date because complete records were not available as of that date I changed by mind; but in justice I must say that there is some strength to the argument that those who were forcibly displaced by war and who endured a type of slavery for years should have preference over those who made a choice later.

I also say that I do not believe the newspapers and others who are interested in the problem have given full importance to the affirmative positions of policy declared by this bill. It is the first declaration by a major nation that this problem shall be solved by resettlement. It is the first declaration by a major nation that these people shall not be required to come as single workers, and that they shall be permitted to bring their families with them and establish themselves as families upon our soil. These principles make a start toward the world solution of the problem. It must be solved on the basis of resettlement of family units.

I have great affection for my friend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH]. We worked together on the bill. I know his deep and sincere interest in these unfortunate people. Yet I am sorry that the matter of suggested discrimination has been brought into the discussion today.

Mr. President, I hope that the passage of this measure will be the beginning of the resettlement of all the displaced persons. It is imperfect, but we cannot forget that it will bring into this country 200,000 human beings of diverse faiths and nationality who will find here the opportunity for a new life.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I believe that Congress will not be proud of its passage of this measure, and neither do I believe that the miserable people who are looking hopefully to the Congress for assistance will find any satisfaction in the measure.

I hold in my hand an editorial appearing in the Denver Post for June 13, 1948. The editorial is entitled "Cutting Out the Bias." It reads as follows:

[Denver Post, June 13, 1948]

CUTTING OUT THE BIAS

As was to be hoped, the displaced persons bill passed by the House Friday omits the worst features of the Wiley bill, which the Senate approved last week.

Like the Senate bill, the House measure, sponsored by Representative FELLOWS (Republican) of Maine, would admit 200,000 homeless Europeans to the United States during the next 2 years. In addition, it would open our doors to 2,000 Czechs who fled after the Communist coup in their homeland, plus several thousand orphan children.

But the House version does not contain the provisions of the Senate bill which are a crudely camouflaged effort to exclude Catholics and Jews from the program.

The discriminatory Senate bill contains an amendment requiring 50 percent of the DP's to be from "countries annexed by a foreign power"—obviously referring to Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, whose populations are overwhelmingly Protestant.

A second provision of the Senate bill, plainly containing an anti-Jewish bias, limits eligible DP's to those refugees who entered the camps of western Europe before December 22, 1945. Most Jews, who comprise only 18 percent of the total displaced persons, came to the refugee centers after that date.

The House bill eliminates the Balt proviso and extends the date of eligibility to April 1, 1947. This is a great deal more harmonious with the United States traditions of generosity and tolerance.

The shape and spirit of the final legislation will depend upon the action taken this week when a Senate-House conference committee meets to compose differences between the two bills.

The conferees will meet in an atmosphere fortunately removed from the poisonous demagoguery with which such "statesmen" as Representative RANKIN and Senator EASTLAND of Mississippi and Representative GOSSETT of Texas have polluted the atmosphere concerning the DP question.

With care in the choice of conferees, there is hope that the bill finally adopted will proclaim the sincerity of American brotherhood with freedom-aspiring peoples regardless of creed.

Then, at last the United States will be doing something toward a final solution to one of the most heart-breaking problems left by the war.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, to permit me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent, as chairman of the conferees on the Government corporations appropriation bill, that I be permitted to move that the Senate recede on amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3 to that bill, House bill 6481, and that the vote on this motion be taken without debate. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to move to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me make an inquiry. If the requested agreement is not entered, would the result be that no opportunity would be provided to move to instruct the conferees?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was unable to hear the Senator, due to the confusion presently existing in the Chamber.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to inform the Senator, the Senator from Georgia asked whether, in the event the motion contemplated by the Senator from Michigan were defeated, opportunity would be given to offer a motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then I would ask unanimous consent to have a vote to instruct the conferees.

Mr. RUSSELL. If that is included in the request, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I may say that the reason for making this motion, which is unusual, is that the conference appears to be deadlocked. This is the last day. There is a grave question as to whether we would get any agreement, otherwise.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Do I correctly understand that the motion is that there be no opportunity to explain to the Senate what is involved in this matter?

Mr. FERGUSON. I considered that the matter was debated at considerable length, and I also considered the present parliamentary situation.

Mr. HILL. I realize that the matter was debated previously at considerable length, and I have no disposition to go over that debate. But there have been some developments which I think should be stated.

Of course, the ordinary, customary procedure would be for the House to have a separate vote on this amendment, by having the conferees on the part of the House take the amendment back to the House. The Senate having had a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment, and having thereby voted to place this amendment in the bill, the normal procedure would be for the conferees on the part of the House to take the amendment back to the House and have a vote taken on the amendment in the House.

As I understand, up until today the conferees on the part of the House have refused to take the amendment back to the House. So the distinguished Senator from Michigan now presents the request which, as he has well said, is a rather unusual and extraordinary one, and is one which I know in my service here I have seldom, if ever, heard before.

I am not going to object to the request, but I wish the Senate to understand what this matter is.

The only thing we are asking now is the normal, regular thing, which is to have the Senate sustain its position by making an effort to have the House take a vote on this amendment. It is only fair, and only cricket, and only playing square that the House have a vote on the amendment. Certainly the Senate should not surrender or yield in its position until the House has had an opportunity to declare itself by taking a vote on the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me include in my proposal a further proposal that the debate be limited to 7 minutes for each side, and that the time be assigned by the acting majority leader and the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request will be modified accordingly.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request propounded by the Senator from Michigan?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now make the motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I assign 4 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, so that we may take up this matter, of course without causing the Senator from Florida to yield the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to defer——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The floor is now under the control of the Senator from Massachusetts, who has yielded 4 minutes to the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has the floor, and has yielded to the Senator from Michigan to propound the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was agreed to, and there is to be 7 minutes' debate on each side.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in order to avoid any controversy, I ask unanimous consent that when this particular discussion is concluded, the Senator from Florida again be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in view of the nature of the request and the importance of this matter and the fact that it relates to a conference report, although I hate to be, as it were, taken off my feet right in the middle of what I was saying, I yield for this purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to state the position in which the Senate finds itself at the present moment. We have been in conference for 3 or 4 days, during which time we have endeavored to get a settlement of the three items involving the building of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., for the TVA. The bill now carries assent from the Senate to $4,000,000. The total cost of that would be $54,000,000, plus about $30,000,000 for transmission lines and various accessories to the steam plant. I had advocated on the floor that the steam plant be not included. I assigned the reasons for that, and I do not care now to discuss them as to the stand I have taken.

The House had taken a vote on this same issue, which was 192 to 152. The Senate took a vote by yeas and nays, which was carried 45 to 37. We found later, this situation which is unusual. We face the real probability, not the possibility, but the probability, of getting no bill at all unless we recede. The proper procedure is that the House should vote first, but there is no way the Senate can compel the House to vote first. Rather than to have no bill a method was conceived and brought to the floor. I am of the opinion that if we want a bill we should recede. That shall be my vote. Every other Senator will, of course, have reasons for voting either for or against the steam plant, and will have to decide for himself how he should vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that in my judgment the issue here presented far transcends in importance the mere question of whether we shall proceed with the construction of the steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. There is involved the broader question as to whether we insist that all the ordinary parliamentary processes through which it is necessary that legislation should pass, if it shall ever be enacted, should be observed. This is the first time in my experience as a conferee that we have been met with the flat refusal of the Representatives of the other body to submit the matter to the House for a yea-and-nay vote when the conference could not agree and the matter at issue had been inserted by the Senate on a record vote.

Mr. President, I have seen on other occasions items in appropriation bills where there would be as many as four yea-and-nay votes in each House of Congress before the matter was finally determined. When conferees meet and cannot agree on any one item and have reconciled some 25 or 30 other matters at issue, the proper course is to sign a conference report and report back to the respective Houses the items in disagreement. In this case the conferees either have agreed, or can shortly agree, upon every one of the other 30 or 40 amendments to the bill, save and except this one. In the ordinary normal course of parliamentary procedure the report should go back to the House with the conference report signed as to the matters in agreement, and let the House take action on the matters in disagreement. After they have acted the papers can be messaged here and the Senate can determine its course. Until now, we have not had a free conference on this item, because of the fact that we were met with what amounted to an ultimatum that unless the Senate receded there would be no bill.

In these circumstances, Mr. President, we are not voting merely upon the New Johnsonville steam plant, we are voting to preserve the regular processes of parliamentary procedure, and in this case the Senate should vote down the motion to recede and overwhelmingly vote to insist, in order that we may not set a precedent here that will defeat legislation and degrade the Senate in the future. The matter should go back to the House. If the House then stands adamant in its position, that will be time enough to talk about a recession on the part of the Senate. Conference committees are the servants, not the masters, of the authority appointing them. When they cannot agree on important matters they should report the matters in agreement and ask for further instructions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am not going to prolong the arguments that we discussed quite fully in regard to the steam plant at New Johnsonville, except to say that after listening to the arguments before the committee, I became convinced the plant was essential to the firming up of the power for the TVA, and that unless they have the opportunity of firming up the power, in my judgment it will throttle the development of that great area of our Nation.

I desire to join with my colleague, the Senator from Georgia, in saying it seems to me we should by all means insist on the committee amendments and refuse to recede at this time. After all, this is a two-House Congress, and if we are going to conduct the legislative business in the proper way I believe that the Senate of the United States has a right to expect that at least the House will act on the conference report with a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute merely to say that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is slightly in error in saying the House voted on the proposition. What happened was, they voted on a motion to recommit, which was an indirect vote. They have never had a direct vote on this proposal. The motion to recommit was a motion to recommit the entire bill, not this particular item. It is not accurate to say they have voted directly on the amendment.

As the Senator from Georgia and other Senators have said, it seems to me the Senate should stand by its position, and that the House should take the amendment and vote upon it directly so we may have an expression of the views of the House.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. My time has expired.

Mr. KEM. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no more time.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky if the motion to recommit in the House did not contain the steam plant amendment, so that in effect it was a direct vote on that question?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; but it was not a direct vote. The vote was to recommit the whole bill, not merely the amendment.

Mr. KEM. It contained the steam plant amendment, did it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. It included all the items of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield myself the remaining 3 minutes. I would simply say to my colleagues in the Senate that I am a new member of the confefence committee, by reason of the resignation of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] from that committee. I became convinced, sitting in the conference for the few minutes I was present, that we could not expect the House conferees to make any change in their votes. They refused to take the matter back to the House. The chairman of the committee was the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] who on the floor of the Senate had voted against the so-called steam plant. I personally voted with him as against the steam plant, but we both thought, and the other conferees thought, we should ask the Senate for its position on the matter. It is important because there are various other matters in the appropriation bill affecting various Government corporations, which will have to be taken care of by means of a joint resolution if we cannot get together. That is the importance of the issue. It is for each Member of the Senate to decide for himself whether to substantiate his previous position or not.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion until we use the remainder of our time? Has the time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senator from Massachusetts has 3 minutes, the Senator from Kentucky, 2.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I assign the remainder of my time to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall not use all of the time that has been yielded to me. I do not think this is a matter of precedent. I think the rules of the Senate should be such as to permit us to meet situations as they arise. We cannot be held by precedent. We cannot vote or refuse to vote on a question merely because we think it will establish a precedent.

Mr. President, I want to say that I shall vote "aye," which will mean a vote to recede from insisting on the building of the steam plant. In other words, an "aye" vote would mean that the Senate would recede from the building of the steam plant and the appropriation of $4,000,000 to start the breaking of the ground and the initial start of the steam plant.

That is all I have to say at the present time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee the remainder of the time allotted to me.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I have been attending conferences for more than 32 years, but I have never seen a conference before that was conducted in the way in which this conference was conducted. I want to say that the Senate Members, even those who differed with me, were exceedingly considerate all the time. The House members declined to consider the question of the steam plant of the Tennessee Valley Authority at all. They said they had made up their minds on the steam plant—that they were not going to recede. They took part in the discussion, but they did not yield or discuss any method of getting together. I have never before seen a conference of that kind. They laid the law down to us, put a pistol to our heads, so to speak, as it were, and said, "We will not consider what you may think about it." That was the situation. Under the circumstances, the chairman of the committee, Senator FERGUSON, acted very courteously and politely, and suggested that the Senate conferees would come back to the Senate for instructions, and here we are.

It seems to me that the Senate owes it to itself to stand by the position it previously took by a vote of 45 to 37. By that vote the Senate decided that the steam plant should be constructed. The House Members claimed that this question was involved in some motion to recommit made in the House, but that was not a vote upon the question in the House as we voted upon it in the Senate. We voted on the direct question of building this particular steam plant. The House voted on a general motion to recommit.

I hope the Senate will vote as it previously voted and vote for the steam plant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has a minute remaining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield my time to the Senate and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Reverconib
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Jenner	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Cain	Kem	Sparkman
Capehart	Kilgore	Stennis
Chavez	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Feazel	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Flanders	Maybank	Williams
Fulbright	Millikin	Young
Green	Moore	
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair asks the clerk, for the purposes of the record and the information of the Senate, to read the three amendments from which the Senator from Michigan asks the Senate to recede.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, after the word "vehicle", to strike out "$27,389,061" and insert "$30,972,061"; on page 2, line 9, to strike out "$21,689,000" and insert "$25,689,000"; and on page 2, line 11, after the word "dams", insert the words "one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn."

Mr. KEM and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KILGORE (when his name was called). I have a pair on this vote with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is absent because of a death in his family. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

During the calling of the roll,

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, is it in order to ask what is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to recede from the position the Senate has taken on the Tennessee Valley Authority amendment providing for the steam plant.

Mr. MILLIKIN. A vote "yea" is to recede?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote "yea" is a vote to recede.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announced that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—37

Baldwin	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Ball	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Smith
Bricker	Ives	Taft
Bridges	Jenner	Thye
Brooks	Kem	Tobey
Buck	McCarthy	Umstead
Byrd	Malone	Vandenberg
Cain	Martin	Watkins
Capehart	Millikin	Wiley
Dworshak	Moore	Williams
Eaton	Reed	
Ferguson	Revercomb	

NAYS—47

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Barkley	Hill	Murray
Butler	Hoey	Myers
Chavez	Holland	O'Conor
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Cordon	Knowland	Russell
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Downey	Lucas	Stennis
Eastland	McClellan	Stewart
Ellender	McFarland	Taylor
Feazel	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McKellar	Tydings
Fulbright	McMahon	Wherry
Green	Magnuson	Young
Hatch	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—12

Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Wagner
George	O'Daniel	White
Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson

So Mr. FERGUSON's motion was rejected.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I understand that no further motion is necessary. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That was my understanding.

AMENDMENT OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to say that this is the second interruption we have had upon the consideration of a privileged matter, which is the DP conference report. A few moments ago there was an interruption and we were told that it would occupy but a few minutes to dispose of a matter, but extended debate occurred. I shall object from now on to the consideration of any further matters until we complete action on the pending privileged business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Was it not the unanimous-consent agreement that at the conclusion of the vote the Senator from Florida should have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from West Virginia will yield, I will say that it is my understanding that it is not expected that there will be any further interruption before action on the DP measure is completed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to hear that. I shall object to any further interruptions until the completion of the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virgina object to action being taken on the conference report?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, all that is required now is the appointment of conferees.

Mr. REVERCOMB. How much time does the Senator expect will be required.

Mr. WILEY. All that is necessary is that a motion be adopted and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Very well.

Mr. WILEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. WILEY, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MAGNUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall make my remarks very brief.

I have in my hand an editorial published in the St. Louis Star-Times of June 4, 1948, as follows:

DP BILL, A SORRY MESS

Earl G. Harrison, former United States Immigration Commissioner, now dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law College and chairman of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, resorted to fiery language the other day in paying his respects to the Senate-approved bill to admit 200,000 homeless Europeans to this country.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, how long does the distinguished Senator from Florida expect he will speak?

Mr. PEPPER. Not more than 10 minutes.

I continue to read from the editorial:

Dean Harrison finds the bill a "sorry mess" and "a booby trap and a monstrosity which discriminates on the grounds of religion, nationality, and occupation." He charged it is "deliberately designed to exclude displaced persons, not admit them."

It is easier to believe that the bill was conceived in ignorance of the vital issues involved rather than a deliberate plot to circumvent American responsibility, but the effect is the same. If the bill became law, it would accomplish little toward enhancing American prestige abroad and contribute virtually nothing to the culture and economic advantage of this country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield, though it will prolong the time I had expected to consume.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Who is the Senator quoting?

Mr. PEPPER. I am quoting from an editorial published in the St. Louis Star-Times which quotes Earl G. Harrison, former United States Immigration Commissioner, now dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School and chairman of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. I continue to read from the editorial:

The dean's bitter criticism on the grounds of racial and religious discrimination finds justification in the provision that 50 percent of the DP's must come from countries annexed by a foreign power, specifically Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and eastern Poland. These constitute far less than half the DP population and are predominantly Protestant.

He finds discrimination also in the provision that 50 percent of the DP's must be farmers and points out, as have other critics, that farmers are a small minority among them. The special provision admitting outside the quota regulations members of the notorious Volksdeutsche, the Nazi fifth column; the eligibility date which automatically eliminates most of the Jewish victims of Nazi barbarism and the provision that each refugee must be hired by Americans, sight unseen, before he is granted a visa are obvious cruel defects in the bill.

There is hope that the Fellows bill now awaiting action in the House, and which is far more liberal and realistic, will eventually get the congressional green light. The whole question must have much further exploration than it obviously has had in both Chambers if stupid and worthless legislation is to be avoided.

I have in my hand an article by Walter H. Waggoner, published in the New York Times of Friday, June 18. The heading is:

DP bill approved; four refuse to sign.
Compromise joint action hit as discriminatory—allows 205,000 entry in 2 years.

The article is as follows:

DP BILL APPROVED; FOUR REFUSE TO SIGN—COMPROMISE JOINT ACTION HIT AS DISCRIMINATORY—ALLOWS 205,000 ENTRY IN 2 YEARS

(By Walter H. Waggoner)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—A Senate-House conference committee agreed on an emergency displaced-person bill this evening, but only after a prolonged and bitter contest and harsh dissents from four members who refused to sign the agreement and two who did so "reluctantly."

The compromise measure signed by 8 of the 12 committee members provides for the entrance into the United States of 200,000 displaced Europeans and political refugees in the next 2 years.

In addition to 200,000 DP's proper, provisions are made for the admission of 2,000 anti-Communist Czechs who have fled their country since January 1, 1948; up to 3,000 homeless European orphans under 16 years of age, and 15,000 eligible DP's already in this country on temporary visas.

Senators HOMER FERGUSON (Republican), of Michigan, and HARLEY M. KILGORE (Democrat), of West Virginia, and Representatives J. CALEB BOGGS (Republican), of Delaware, and EMANUEL CELLER (Democrat), of New York, refused to sign the conference report.

Mr. CELLER, who has fought vigorously for the House [FELLOWS] bill since the beginning, assailed the conference measure as "worse than no bill at all."

"All it does is exclude all Jews," he exclaimed. "It is no solution to the problem. I will move to recommit it as soon as it appears. I'm heartsick about it."

Representative FRANK L. CHELF (Democrat), of Kentucky, told reporters: "Please emphasize that when I voted for this bill in conference that I did it reluctantly—say that again, 'reluctantly.'"

The author of the House measure, Representative FRANK FELLOWS (Republican), of Maine, was also indignant, but he declared: "Listen, we had to have something. That's why I voted for it and I reiterate Mr. CHELF's stand. I did so 'reluctantly.'"

Principal features of the compromise bill, and those which were subject to the fiercest debate and disagreement, are as follows:

Eligible displaced persons are those who were the homeless victims of nazism and fascism and in allied DP camps not later than December 22, 1945. This was the most sharply contested feature of the Senate bill. The House bill fixed the cut-off date at April 21, 1947, which, its advocates explained, gave DP status to the 10,000 to 15,000 Jews fleeing the Polish pogroms of January 1946.

Not less than 30 percent of the admission visas will be made available to DP's who are farmers, and intend to become farmers in the United States. This requirement is said by its opponents to discriminate against DP's of the Jewish faith.

The House bill had no provision of this sort, but the Senate version placed the percentage requirement at 50 percent.

Not less than 40 percent of the DP's compared with an original Senate minimum of 50 percent, must come from the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and Poland east of the Curzon line. Discrimination against both Jews and Catholics is also charged of this provision, on the ground that the Baltic countries are primarily Protestant, and the 40 percent requirement weights the division in their favor.

The so-called Volksdeutsche provision, attached to the Senate measure but rejected by the House, is also part of the conference agreement. It requires that 50 percent of the quotas available to the Germans and Austrians under the law be limited exclusively to those persons of "German ethnic origin" who are nationals of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania and Yugoslavia, but on the effective date of the bill are in Germany or Austria.

This is felt by many friends of DP legislation to allow admission to persons who might have been closely associated with the Nazis, rather than those who were more clearly the victims.

CARRY-OVER FEATURE WINS

The bill provides, as the House measure also did, that the number of DP's by which the first-year limit of 100,000 is short may be admitted under the second-year allowance. Known as the carry-over feature, this means that 120,000 will be granted visas in the second year if only 80,000 are admitted in the first.

No one will be granted admission, however, who will displace an American from a job, or unless he has "safe and sanitary" housing in which to live.

In a prepared statement Representative CELLER said that the agreement "completely scuttled" the House bill, and assailed many of its provisions as discriminatory. The "strangest of all," he added, was the "Volksdeutsche" feature which granted admission to "the quislings who fertilized the field for Hitler's panzer divisions."

Mr. President, I have read an editorial from the Seattle Times, an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times, and a special report to the New York Times with respect to the conference report. Very serious charges are made by a responsible press.

Far be it from me to suggest that there was any intentional design or purpose on the part of honorable Members of the Senate to practice any un-American policy. But, Mr. President, we know the principle of law that a man is presumed to intend the natural and probable consequences of his act. It is the effect of which I am speaking, not what was in the minds of Senators who conceived the language which provides the effect.

What do we have? When Europe's displaced people were stretching their plaintive appeals to America for succor and sanctuary, when they had been persecuted in their wretchedness and misery, when they had seen their families tortured and killed, this is what we give them. They plead for bread, and we hardly give them a stone.

What does the bill do? In the first place, the Stratton bill, which for months has been in this Congress, provided for 400,000 for a period of 2 years. That number has been cut in half. We now accommodate only 205,000 in 2 years, or 100,000 a year, on an average.

Secondly, what does the bill do? It weights the eligible groups to those who come from the Baltic countries, and gives a disproportionate number of the eligibles who come from that area the status of admission.

Mr. President, I am a Baptist and a Protestant.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. In just a moment.

But, Mr. President, as a Senator and as an American I am not voting on the basis of religious principles or preferences, and I do not want to see any religion, any race, or any nationality discriminated against by Congress. It is out of harmony with the American character and Constitution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am certain that the Senator does not want to make a misleading statement on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. He certainly does not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The newspapers and the organizations which have been driving in on this subject have their own selfish ends. When the Senator talks about the Balts being given special preference, let me say to the Senator that if he will read the original bill and the one reported from the conference, he will see that there is no reference to the Balts. Those mentioned are the Lithuanians, the Latvians, and the Estonians, which are the Baltic nations, and the Polish people east of the Curzon line who have been taken over by Russia. There are twice as many people east of the Curzon line, whom the Senator has not mentioned, and whom the newspapers and organizations which are fighting for their own selfish ends have not mentioned. There are twice as many Poles as Balts affected by this bill. I am sure that the Senator does not mean to make a statement and exclude more than half the people affected by the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Florida certainly does not. But when Members of the Senate such as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and others who have been conversant with this subject from the beginning, and when other responsible authorities sustain the opinion of the Senator from Florida, when that is the understanding of the press, and when that is the understanding of so worthy an authority as the dean of the Pennsylvania Law School, a former Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, who is chairman of the Displaced Persons Citizens Committee—when they share the opinion expressed by the Senator from Florida as to the practical effect of the bill, the Senator from West Virginia will have to let me adhere to my own opinion of the practical effect it will actually have.

In the third place, what does the bill do? It has already been pointed out that in two ways it discriminates against the Jews. First, it denies eligibility to those 18,000 miserable Jews who fled from the pogrom of Poland in January 1941, fleeing for their lives to the sanctuary of the occupied American zone in Germany. Yet, Mr. President, in spite of every effort to get them into the eligible class, they have been factually excluded, whether by design or not. They are not permitted to be counted in the displaced-persons group, and for some strange reason the date has been tenaciously held to December 22, 1945, in spite of every effort of the House and of Senators who shared the opinion of Members of the House who wished the date moved up to April 21, 1947, so as to give those wretched people a chance of eligibility in this group of displaced persons.

In the next place, Mr. President, among the number who are to come in, 40 percent must be farmers. Is agriculture in America so needy of labor that we must consciously place a provision in this bill to require that a certain number be farmers? Was that done at the instance of agriculture? Was that pursuant to a policy of those who wrote the measure, knowing that the Jewish people affected do not have an agricultural background?

So, Mr. President, because of the date and because of the character of their employment and occupation, the practical effect of the provision in the conference report is to deny to the most wretched people of all, the Jews, the sanctuary which this bill was intended to afford.

Mr. President, I would hardly believe it possible that anyone who has been to the displaced-persons camps of Europe, anyone who has been to Dachau, Nuremburg, and to the other concentration camps under the evil Nazis, to see what the Jewish people have suffered, would ever countenance the possibility that they should be denied their proportionate share of eligible persons to seek sanctuary under this legislation.

Let me make one further point. The bill provides that those who may have been quislings or Nazi fifth columnists in the countries which were later the victims of Nazi aggression are included in the eligible class. We exclude the Jews fleeing from the Polish pogroms, but we reach out and extend the tender

hand of welcome and sympathy and inclusion to the quislings and the Nazi fifth columnists who, as one of the spokesmen said, prepared the field for the Nazi aggression. Is that the kind of legislation to which the Senator wishes to attach his name? Is that the solution of the displaced-persons question?

There are three things which I wish to mention at this point. The first is that before a displaced person may come to the United States, under this measure, someone in this country must provide for him. That means that such a displaced person must have a rich relative in this country or a relative of such financial means that he can satisfy the Government of the United States that he will look after the displaced person, or there must be an arrangement of some sort along those lines. Mr. President, that is contrary to the American tradition. I suspect that the ancestors of most of us came to this country poor, without any particular sponsor, and I suspect that the ancestors of most of us would never have gotten into this country at all if it had been necessary for some relative of theirs to be in this country first and to give some such assurance prior to the arrival of our ancestors. Mr. President, I say that the poor must be permitted to come to the United States or else we shall be going contrary to the rich American tradition.

In the second place, no eligible displaced person can come to the United States if he displaces any American in a job, and that point must be determined before the displaced person comes to the United States. How can it be determined that there would not be some displacements? The displacements might be minor, but I say that this bill, instead of being a welcoming bill, has written into it every obstacle that it seems possible to conceive of to keep out the displaced persons.

The last provision which I wish to mention is the one to the effect that displaced persons cannot come into this country unless it can be assured that they will find sanitary and adequate housing, yet, Mr. President, today the Congress is deadlocked as regards the feasibility of passing any kind of a housing bill. We do not even provide housing for our veterans; due to the delinquency of Congress, we have failed to make such provision. So how are we going to say that we can be sure that the displaced persons who will come to the United States will find sanitary and adequate housing without displacing someone else?

I am saying that we must suffer some hardships if we are to perform this American and Christian duty of giving sanctuary to these most wretched of all peoples on the face of the earth today.

But what has been done by the conference report is to limit the class and put obstacles in the way of their coming here—obstacles which will make it administratively possible to keep all of them out, if that happens to be the administrative policy in the execution of this act.

So I say this measure is unworthy of the Congress of the United States in the effect it has. The newspapers have said it will be considered abroad as out of character with American policy.

Yet, Mr. President, what can we do? We have protested against this measure; we have tried to improve it. Those efforts have been turned down or denied or spurned. Now we are presented with a choice between this measure or nothing. So if we are to do any good at all in this connection, this measure is the only vehicle we have.

So, like the able Senator from Michigan, the able Senator from Rhode Island, and other Senators who have voiced their conscientious objections to the provisions of this measure, I, too, state that I can do nothing other than support the measure; but I believe that the experience we shall have with it will rebuke the United States Congress and will reprove us for this policy.

I hope that in the new session of Congress it will be possible to correct the wrong we shall have done to these sad people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because of my long record of work in connection with the displaced-persons issue this year, I feel that I owe it to myself and to the groups with whom I have worked to place myself on record in connection with this conference report.

I had hoped that the Senate bill would be amended in the conference much more than it has been, and that the final report would much more closely resemble the House bill.

However, I wish to say a word about the conferees, because they are very good friends of mine, and I am perfectly sure that they are acting in good faith and in accordance with their honest convictions on this issue. I have worked very closely with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] in some work outside the Senate of the United States, in the field of some religious brotherhood work; and I know of no two finer Christians than those two friends. I am satisfied that not only those two gentlemen, but also the other members of the conference committee, have taken action which, according to their sights and lights, represents their honest convictions on this issue.

However, the final recommendations they make are not satisfactory to me. But under the circumstances, I find myself compelled, because of the realities of the situation which now confront us in the Senate, to vote to approve the conference report.

Nevertheless, the adoption of this conference report will not end this issue, in my opinion, Mr. President, because I think we shall have resting upon us at future sessions of Congress a further obligation, namely, to correct what many of us consider to be some shortcomings in this conference report. It was in 1945, as I recall, when I first came to the Senate of the United States, that in one of my speeches in this body I proposed an international conference on the displaced-persons problem. I have always felt, and I still feel, that the calling of an international conference is the best way to handle the problem.

We are following a different course of action today, but I do not think it will be as good a course of action as would have been the case had we taken a leading part in urging the other countries of the world, which I believe have responsibilities equal with our own in connection with the solving of the displaced-persons problem, to call an international conference, to the end of seeing to it that proper provision be made for those people, who were so much persecuted by our enemies in World War II. One of the causes of the war, after all, was to be found in our determination to end persecution of minority groups. In my judgment, we fought the war in part to make clear to the world that we would not stand by and permit the type of persecution of which Hitler's Germany was guilty in relation to minority groups.

But I know we are confronted with the practical situation that this is the best measure which under the circumstances we can pass this afternoon. Therefore, I shall vote for it.

Mr. President, I close my remarks by saying that my difference with my dear friend the Senator from Missouri is an honest difference over a question of fact. I think it was a mistake to adopt in this measure the date of December 1945 which was adopted, because I think the bill will now result in an unintentional discrimination against Jews. But let us try this measure; let us put it into operation. Then, as reasonable men, on the basis of the facts which develop, let us seek to improve it at future sessions of the Congress, if experience shows that it needs to be improved.

Mr. President, there is great controversy in the country over this bill, as indicated by a statement which I hold in my hand. I ask unanimous consent that this statement may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Frank Goldman of Lowell, Mass., president of B'nai B'rith, America's oldest and largest Jewish service organization, today issued the following statement on the Senate-House conference report on the displaced-persons bills:

"The conference bill on displaced persons substantially embodies the provisions of the Senate's bill, which President Truman described as discrimination against national and religious groups. The date selected to determine eligibility for admission into the United States, against the advice and recommendation of the State Department, has the deliberate effect of such discrimination.

"In the 105 years of its existence, B'nai B'rith has never witnessed proposed congressional action so violative of American principles of equality and fair play. The vice of the bill is aggravated by its sanctimonious pretensions.

"In the guise of a humanitarian measure, we have a gratuitous insult to millions of loyal Americans, as well as callous rejection of the pleas of innocent and worthy refugees.

"As an organization dedicated to the preservation of American ideals, we are constrained to condemn the conference bill as an affront to American traditions and a blow to American prestige in the eyes of the world.

"We respectfully call for the rejection of the discriminatory provisions of the bill by Congress."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall delay the Senate only a few moments on this matter. I was necessarily absent

from the city when this bill passed the Senate several weeks ago, and therefore I did not have an opportunity to express my views with reference to this matter, either by my vote or by stating my position in a speech on the floor.

As the Senator from New Jersey knows, I have been very profoundly interested in the problem facing us today. Twice within the last year I had an opportunity to visit some of the displaced persons camps in Europe, first with the Senator from New Jersey, as a member of the Smith-Mundt Committee, which visited approximately 23 European countries last September and October, and more lately, during the Christmas holidays, when I myself was in Germany on official business.

I visited one of the largest of what they called the Baltic camps in Germany, some 6,000 people who had fled from the Baltic nations because they had the courage to take all the chances on leaving their homes and families rather than to submit to the domination of the Government which had been imposed upon them from without. I have never seen under such unfavorable circumstances a finer type of citizenship—doctors and lawyers and school teachers and farmers and merchants, many of them speaking English, many of them afraid to go back because some of their compatriots had gone back and perhaps for a month or two they would hear something from them, but finally there was no word and the conclusion was that they had either been liquidated or sent off into exile. I went through two of the camps in which Jews exclusively were cared for and I want to say I never saw a better-organized camp of any sort. They also were housed in barracks which had previously been used in training the German soldiers, which brought about their disaster and brought about all the evils that have happened in Europe as the result of the training carried on by Hitler and his government of the German soldier.

I found that from the smallest child to the oldest person, they were orderly, they were of a type that might be welcomed into any country. When I walked into the room where there was a kindergarten school in progress in which there were some 15 or 20 young children, boys and girls, 3 and 4 and 5 years of age, as soon as I stepped in the door everyone of them rose and saluted me, and they did it very beautifully. I visited every school room from the kindergarten up to the graduating or senior class, and that same order, that same decorum, that same respect, that same consideration, and that same hopefulness I might say pervaded the entire body.

I took occasion during my visit in the camp to ask those in each room where they desired to go after they were discharged from the camp, and, from the little children all the way up to the senior class and to the parents of these children, all of them without exception expressed their desire to go to Palestine as soon as they were released or could be discharged from the displaced-persons camps.

I profoundly hope that order and government and peace and accord may come in Palestine, in order that all these displaced persons who want to go there may go. But I myself would not feel that our country had been injured or damaged in any respect if they came here instead of going to Palestine. For that reason I formed a profound sympathy for those people in every possible way, and while I know we cannot accept or receive in this country all the displaced persons—it is not necessary to do it—I very strongly supported the provision that we should accept 200,000 instead of the original 100,000 in the bill as reported by the committee. While with regard to any of these classes, these unfortunate people, who either were driven out of their country or voluntarily left it because they were unwilling to submit to tyranny, are entitled to a refuge and a haven somewhere in the world.

We are a Christian nation. We preach in our churches every Sunday, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Certainly we can accept, with all of its injustices and its shortcomings and with all its failures, a bill that enables 205,000 to come in here. If I had been writing the bill myself I should no doubt have made some of the provisions different and more favorable, but it seems to me this is the only chance now to get any legislation whatever. It may be the only chance for several months or years to get any legislation whatever. I think if we find from experience we have done injustice to any class of these worthy and distressed and distraught people in the camps of Europe, we can remedy the situation by future legislation and by amendment, rather than take the initiative again to bring in legislation in the hope that we may enact a better bill than the one now before the Senate. For those reasons I expect to vote for the conference report.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to remind me when I shall have consumed 2 minutes. I shall then take my seat.

Mr. President, in the bill we are about to send to the President for his signature, we have made only a start at meeting a grave moral question. If I were to grade this branch of the Government upon the contents of the bill, I should say we have taken a grade C examination. I am hopeful that when this Congress, or a slightly different Congress may I say, returns next January, we can take a new examination and produce a grade A bill.

Mr. President, one of the cancers of nazism was racism, and I regret very greatly that, regardless of the fine and good intention of my honorable colleagues who served throughout the long months in drafting the bill, there are those—and the editorials were read this morning—who seem to find within the four corners of the bill ample grounds for concluding and contending that injustice and discrimination have been practiced. I hope when we come back in January we may rectify the errors we have committed in the pending legislation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, above all I desire to bring this discussion to a close and have the Senate decide upon just what shall be done with the bill that has been reported from conference. However, in view of statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate, which I say are so unfair, so unwarranted, and so unsustained, I fear it is my duty as chairman of the conference, a position that fell to my part, that I should reply briefly and in a summary way to some of the things that have been said above the conference report.

I can understand, though I cannot commend, organizations representing certain groups of people who group themselves according to the common interest, driving hard to get an advantage, seeking to protect their own, as they may feel it; that is understandable. Yes, I sometimes can understand, but it is deplorable that individuals who write in newspapers, such as the editors, will become so zealous in their advocacy of their own personal desires they will go beyond the facts and try to prejudice the people. I can understand that somewhat. It is a deplorable situation in our country that that must occur.

I do not understand why upon the floor of a legislative body such as the Senate there should be brought in elements of discussion which have no place whatsoever, which are unfounded, and which cannot be warranted by the facts before us. As I recall, one of the Senators, in reading an editorial, spoke of the bill as "shameful." Of course, that is a very prejudiced and unfair remark. Looking into the situation, the idea of discrimination upon religious grounds is more shameful than is anything that I can think of in the legislation.

I repeat, Mr. President, that the conferees would not be guided or influenced by the idea of any man's faith. We have recognized in this country and in every part of the world that a man has a right to have his own faith. We are not dividing people upon that ground. We were asked to deal with the subject of displaced persons, and we went straight after that question. Representatives of the churches came before the committee. It was a grand thing to see them come in a body representing the various churches and to sit down together. I will say to the Senate that they did not raise the question of discrimination against one or the other. That question comes in from pressure groups which have been so active, and it has come from the prejudiced writers. So far as I am concerned, and I believe I may speak for my colleagues who signed this report, the subject of a man's faith plays no part in this bill.

Since it has been mentioned, however, let us get at some facts. I have before me a letter which is signed by the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc., Latvian Relief, Inc., and Estonian Relief Committee, Inc. Witnesses representing those organizations appeared before the committee. Pressure groups, driving for their own ends, brought out this subject which seems to have influenced some persons. I thankful to say they have not influenced the members of the committee of the Senate who signed the report on behalf of the Senate.

I read from a letter of June 9, 1948, addressed to me, from the organizations which I have just named:

The alleged discrimination against Catholics and Jews by reason of the provisions granting 50 percent priority to persons with

agricultural background and people originating from the nonenemy areas annexed by a foreign power, is found nonexistent in fact. As it is clear from the Judiciary Committee's report, the priority is intended for the people from the Baltic States, and Poland, east of the Curzon line. In this large block of displaced persons, Luthuanian, Ukrainian, and Polish Catholics and Jews make up the bulk of the numbers eligible under this bill.

We know, Mr. President, from the facts which are before us, that the charge of discrimination against those faiths is utterly unfounded in fact. I have seen some of the articles and editorials which speak of preference being given to the Baltic states. They absolutely ignore the fact that the same 40-percent preference is given to those states east of the Curzon line and a large part of Poland which has been annexed by another nation. The people in the annexed land are largely of the faiths which have been said to be discriminated against.

Mr. President, I read further from a letter which is a copy of a letter written by the Reverend Dr. Joseph B. Koncius, of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, and it is written to one of the writers who very bitterly and very falsely made the charge of discrimination. I read from that letter for the information of the Senate:

For your information I wish to state Lithuanians are 87 percent Catholic; Latvians, 35 percent, and only the Estonians 2 percent.

The Senator from Florida stated just a few minutes ago that there were none of that faith in the Baltic countries. Lithuania is the largest and most populous of the Baltic countries.

I read further:

This makes the average of Baltic people who are Catholics over 40 percent. The Senate Wiley bill—

which is the bill we are now discussing—

requires that 50 percent of the refugees allowed admission should consist of Poles and Ukranians from Poland's former territory east of the Curzon line.

Of course, that is a mistake. He means Polish nationals. That has nothing to do with the faith. We know that the faiths of east Poland, covered by this bill, in large measure are the faiths which are said to be discriminated against. I read further from the letter:

Seventy-five percent of these people are Catholics and their number is nearly twice that of the Baltic DP's.

I read further from the letter, which is a copy of a letter written to one of the news writers:

The Baltic DP's together with the Poles and Ukrainians from east of the Curzon line are among the first refugees who came to Germany, Austria, and Italy. Some of them had fled their native land from communistic aggression even as early as 1941. The majority of them arrived in 1944. The Senate bill is just in giving them priority as they have been the people who suffered the longest period in the concentration and DP camps of Germany, Austria, and Italy.

Mr. President, the reason that some preference, now 40 percent, was given to the people of those countries was this. Those people cannot return home. There is no question about that. If they go back to their native land, the people of East Poland, those of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, they are certain to suffer bodily harm and perhaps death. They were among the first who were seized by the Germans and forced into so-called slave-labor camps. That has already been explained, but it may well be repeated. Why was a dead line of December 22, 1945, fixed? It was fixed for only one reason, Mr. President, and that was that, knowing we could not take all DP's, we wanted to take those who were in truth and fact the earlier comers, the ones who were forced into labor, the real DP's who were, without their own choice, forced to go into camps and work during the war.

I have heard it said by one of the Senators critically—yes, unfairly critically—that December 22, 1945, was fixed "for some strange reason." There is no strangeness about it at all, Mr. President. The date of December 22, 1945, was first fixed by the President of the United States. When he issued a directive in December 1945 that the DP's should be given preference under the quotas into this country, the terminal date within which a person was to be considered as an admissible DP into this country was fixed in 1945, as December 22, 1945.

Is there anything strange about the date being fixed in the bill? No; it is the date which has been set and which was acted under, and every displaced person who has come into this country—and the number is approaching 40,000 at this time—has come in under the limit of the date of December 22, 1945. They came here under that date.

Why was that date fixed originally? It was because in 1946 people began to come in from all directions, not as displaced persons, but as immigrants traveling to some other land, not forced to come. The war was over, the fighting was over in May 1945, but in 1946 and 1947, and even up until this time, they are moving out of their countries. We cannot blame them. It is because of the economic conditions of the countries, because they are war-torn, because they cannot get along as well and as comfortably as they would like.

Do Senators think the committee should have mixed those who were not displaced persons with displaced persons? Was it not the duty of the committee, Mr. President, when we were called upon to make a displaced-persons bill, knowing that America cannot take them all, to see that displaced persons were taken rather than other nationals who simply emigrated because they wanted to get out of their land, and were not displaced or forced out of it?

I say that date is a strange date. It is the date under which for more than 2 years the State Department has administered the law, it is the terminal date which fixed the time which made a displaced person eligible.

I say there is something strange. Not until the committee, which has worked for a year, was trying to agree upon a date, not until February 1948, this very year, did the State Department change the date and move it up suddenly without any reason to April 21, 1947

My colleague from the State of West Virginia asked the question—and I wanted to get the floor and answer it—whether or not a letter written by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Lovett, was placed before the committee. I have the letter. The staff has a copy of the letter. Many things were placed before the committee. I have consulted with the staff. I do not know whether that exact letter was placed before the committee or not, but I take it it was, as were all data which came there.

The point in the letter was whether or not they could administer the act unless it was up to April 1947. That is the point I have raised, but I wish to say there can be no question about that point being opened before the committee, and not once, but time after time, by those who were advocating that as a permanent date for eligible displaced persons.

Not only was it before the committee, but here on the floor of the Senate, in extended debate with my colleague from West Virginia, present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey—and he has made the statement in this debate today—brought up that very question, saying that the State Department took the position that no law could be administered unless a terminal date were extended to April 1947. That does not stand up, it did not stand before the Senate when we voted upon the amendment, and it should not stand because for 2 years they administered the law under the date of December 1945.

I do not know why they make such a claim. No one knows. It is said they will bring in 50,000 by July 1, and they brought that many in under the December 1945 date. There has been no discrimination made until this time.

In order to have the date extended, what would have been done? They would have mixed in with the really displaced persons those who had chosen of their own free will to emigrate during 1946 and 1947.

Mr. President, we have covered this subject pretty fully. Some statement was made to the effect that we were going to permit to enter this country persons who had fought against America, persons who had supported Hitler. That is probably one of the most mistaken and unwarranted statements made in the debate, and I wish to read from section 13 of the reported bill, which rather indicates that Senators who make such a statement have not studied the bill or read it. I know they would not make a misstatement intentionally so misleading and so wrong.

Let me read section 13. Could language be clearer?

No visa shall be issued under the provisions of this act to any person who is or has been a member of or participated in any movement which is or has been hostile to the United States or the form of government of the United States.

Yet this bill is assailed. Do Senators want a bill to pass which will permit to come into this country men who are hostile to the form of government of the United States? Why would they advocate such a thing? This is the bill they said they wanted passed without that provision in it.

I wish to say, Mr. President, this bill is not all the Senator from West Virginia wants. I think it covers too many. I think the numbers are too large, for one thing. But there is one phase of the provisions of the bill upon which I stand, and which I think is justified, namely, that those who come must be found to be people who can fit into the life of America, must come here without displacing people who have jobs here, must come here in this day of housing shortage without displacing the people already here. Yet Senators complain of those provisions.

It seems sometimes that in the great sympathetic appeal to hearts—and I think it is a just appeal, I do not criticize it—Senators are willing that men generally are willing to turn their backs upon the situation in our own country—to the grave problems our own people confront.

Mr. President, I want to see the right thing done. There are two phases of the problem. One is a natural appeal to sympathy to help, and I hope the great heart of America will continue to feel for people anywhere in need. But there is another phase. With 2,000,000 families out of homes in this country, with 2,000,000 young servicemen entering schools, getting ready to go out looking for jobs, we cannot ignore them. That is why a provision is placed in the bill that those who come in must be able to find work. If there is work for them they must not displace others in that work. Secondly, whoever they may be and from whence they come they must not unhouse or displace other persons out of their homes in America. I think those provisions are fair.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] read an editorial based upon statements made by Earl G. Harrison. I asked him the question, if Senators will recall, from whom were the quotations taken in the editorial, and the Senator from Florida, who had read it to the Senate, and who used the editorial as an authority for his position, said it was by Earl G. Harrison. I do not know Mr. Harrison, but I understand that he is the dean of the law school at the University of Pennsylvania, a highly responsible position. I do not know anything about that. I do not know anything about him as a law teacher. But he is the chairman of perhaps the most active committee upon this subject that has resorted to every high-pressure method known to lobbyists in this country. He is the chairman of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. And, as pointed out previously in the RECORD, this is the organization which has a lobby here in Congress and a pay roll aggregating $152,000 a year to lobby the Congress to break down these barriers on immigration.

Mr. President, do Senators want that kind of a man as their authority in the criticism of any bill of the Senate?

Mr. LANGER. In addition to all expenses of every kind and character.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. That amount of $152,000 was the pay of some twenty-odd lobbyists who came here to Capitol Hill to try to influence the Members of the Congress upon this problem. I pay tribute to my colleagues who stood steadfast on this proposition, that all the high-paid lobbyists did not move them on this subject.

Let us see more about Mr. Harrison. Mr. Harrison, as I recall, was Commissioner of Immigration, and during the time he was Commissioner of Immigration from the year 1942 to August 1944, some very interesting things were done under the Immigration Act. That was the time when some 982 immigrants—whether it could be excused by saying that the war was on or not—were brought into this country in violation, I say, of the immigration law. That is just one incident in connection with him.

I am advised that on April 7, 1943, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born gave a dinner for Mr. Harrison and awarded him their annual medal. This committee was, in April 1944, 1 year later, listed as subversive by the House Un-American Activities Committee and was on May 8, 1948, listed as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

I think Senators should stop and wonder when such an authority is used here. But when unfair attacks are made upon Senators and upon the conference committee upon which I served, and had the privilege of acting as chairman, and such arguments are presented from such sources as this, let the RECORD speak for itself.

I do not want to discuss the case any further. Men may differ upon the general idea of immigration and upon its basic ideas. They may well differ. I do not think men can exactly differ upon what is best for their own country. I do not charge that they ignore the rights of their own country. It is simply a matter of opinion as to what is best.

I have heard more speeches made against the bill, coupled with the statement that the speakers are going to vote for it, than I have ever heard in respect to any proposed legislation in this body. I can understand that. The bill is not all I want. It is a compromise bill. Much of the legislation that comes out of this body is in the nature of compromise. We are doing the best we can. The bill was offered to the Senate. The House passed a different bill. We have met in conference and the bill is now presented to the Senate to accept it or to reject it as in the judgment of Senators they feel should be done.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that I am not altogether happy about the bill. I wish it might have been better. I realize that all legislation that comes through Congress is a matter of compromise. More than a year ago, when the Stratton bill was first introduced into the House of Representatives, I came out in favor of it, and I would have favored that bill over the present bill. However, I support the present bill because I think it is the best bill we can get at this time, because of the great division of minds and opinions on this important matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on Senate bill 2242.

The report was agreed to.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE GREAT WEST—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, one of the most important questions that has been discussed recently is the reclamation program in the West. The President has referred to it. Publicists have been writing about it. I am convinced the public must be greatly confused over the conflicting statements.

I have prepared a speech for delivery in the Senate, which is too long to be delivered on what is probably the last day of this particular session. So I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPING THE GREAT WEST

Mr. President, ever since the opening of the West for settlement, the development of the great region west of the Mississippi has been undertaken impartially by both political parties in Congress. Westerners of every political complexion learned to work and stand together for the reclamation program which is the heart of western progress and prosperity. They have realized it is difficult for other Congressmen coming from sections of the country where excess of water is the problem—not scarcity—to understand how desperate is their need for Government help in reclaiming the western lands and bringing water to the arid soil. With this realization came a unity of purpose between Democrats and Republicans alike in explaining and illustrating the needs of the West to their eastern colleagues.

DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION TURNS RECLAMATION INTO POLITICS

The unity of western Representatives is now threatened in two quarters: (1) By those who seek to make political capital out of the reclamation program; and (2) by high-level officials in the Reclamation Bureau whose unwise tactics endanger western development. Both of these unfortunate occurrences have been blended together to make a political issue out of what was formerly a nonpartisan tradition.

The President of the United States is himself responsible for a partisan tinge. Speaking at Spokane and other places on his western tour the President made a sideswipe at Republicans and the present Republican Congress in these words: "You are not going to get those (water and power) projects as long as you have a Congress that believes in the theory of Daniel Webster: that the West is no good and there is no good in wasting money on it.

"There are still men in Congress who are following Daniel Webster, and they are chairmen of key committees which make these appropriations."

In this unfortunate remark the President made Reclamation a partisan issue by implying that Republicans do not care enough about the West to support western development programs. His charge is false and ridiculous in the face of the undisputable Republican championship of the West, as will be shown in this statement.

Taking cue perhaps from the President, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY of Wyoming also made an attack on Republican policy toward reclamation. The partisan nature of the attack seems evident from the very magazine chosen to carry it. Writing in the Democratic Digest (reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3283), a political publication, he declared: The reclamation program "stands in mortal peril at the hands of the present leadership of the

Republican Party." The usually astute Senator from Wyoming had merely to look honestly at the record of the Eightieth Congress, controlled by this same leadership, to ascertain how false his statement is.

THE TRUE STORY OF RECLAMATION APPROPRIATIONS

Republicans have not been niggardly with western programs. During the first year of their control of Congress they voted more funds for reclamation than the Democrats had provided in the most lush days of New Deal spending. Senator O'MAHONEY's assertion appears ridiculous when the $218,682,000 the Bureau has to spend in the fiscal year 1948 is compared with $101,361,631 in 1942 which is the highest sum ever appropriated to the program by the Democrats in all the years since 1932.

While condemning the mythical congressional "cuts," Senator O'MAHONEY has only praise for the extravagant requests of the administration and of President Truman's free-spending policies towards reclamation. In this case the Senator was trying to find praise for the administration's big talk and small performances. He conveniently ignores, however, the fact that the severest set-back that the Bureau of Reclamation has had to weather in the postwar period came from the President himself—not the Congress.

In August of 1946 President Truman—to use a favorite phrase of his Commissioner of Reclamation, Michael W. Straus—put "Reclamation on the merry-go-round" by freezing one-half of the money Congress had appropriated for the Bureau's construction program. Badly needed irrigation and power projects were slowed down, contract negotiations were canceled, and the whole program was thrown out of gear.

The President explained his action was to assure a balanced budget, provide for debt reduction, and to "hold back our capital outlay for construction so that we do not commit the Government to heavy expenditures either for fiscal 1947 or for subsequent years by initiating too much work at this time."

These sentiments might have been in line with the general reconversion policy, but they were certainly not pleasant to the ears of a thirsty and power-hungry West, overburdened by an unprecedented increase in population. Even Commissioner Straus complained bitterly that "once momentum is accumulated, it cannot be stopped short without wreckage, destruction, and waste."

If President Truman was sincere in his belief that construction should be held back so as "not to interfere with private construction and the over-all job of reconversion," his freeze order would have been respected in that light. But leaning as always to the political winds, the President turned around 4 months later and contradicted his previous statement by requesting a mammoth appropriation of $145,952,200 for fiscal year 1948.

Later in 1947, he decried the mounting inflation before a special session of Congress, but his fears over inflated prices were apparently not strong enough to induce him to take the most obvious course to curb them. Instead of recommending a reduction in Government expenditures, he presented Congress with a $40,000,000,000 budget which included an expanded reclamation program of $278,000,000. Here again was a display of Democratic contradiction of principles, as well as contradiction in fact.

This is what the President recommended, but how did he apply his proposals in practice? Let me illustrate:

The construction of the Provo River reclamation project in Utah had been delayed during the war. A special measure was passed by this Congress to expedite the early completion of this project. In addition to the regular budget request, $1,000,000 of additional funds was determined by the Bureau of Reclamation to be necessary to expedite the completion of this project.

In order to support my request to the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate, it was necessary for me to get a budget request from the Budget Bureau for the additional amount. When the matter was placed squarely before the Budget Bureau, which is an arm of the President and a part of his official family, I was told that the President had issued a directive to the Budget Bureau that no new reclamation projects are to be undertaken and that there should be no acceleration of the construction of the old projects, unless it could be demonstrated that an emergency existed. This, of course, is a direct contradiction in practice to what the President had been saying to the Congress when he urged a greatly expanded reclamation program. In other words, he talked one way and acted another.

This budget was so obviously padded as to make a cut by a Congress committed to sound economy an inevitability. The Democratic administration undoubtedly planned it that way. By raising hopes of a vast spending program in the West beyond all reasonable limits, the Democratic Party leaders knew disappointment would be felt even more acutely by the water-hungry public. Through the wide propaganda machine built up by the administration, blame for dashing these hopes could then be nailed to the Republican Congress.

Senator O'MAHONEY belittles the early record of the Bureau of Reclamation by saying that in 30 years only 3,500,000 acres were irrigated, whereas in the past 15 years the total has been raised to 5,000,000 acres. What he neglects to point out is that the predominantly Republican administrations brought 3,500,000 acres under irrigation with an expenditure of only $330,000,000, while the additional 1,500,000 under Democratic control cost an additional $1,184,000,000.

But the cost per acre cannot be realistically compared any more than the number of acres per year brought under cultivation, and the Senator is walking on thin ice when he tries to leave such an implication in his figures.

Naturally, the lands which could be irrigated most quickly and easily were provided for first. The very complex, long-range, and most expensive projects have only been feasible from an engineering and economic standpoint in the last two decades. In the pre-Hoover Dam period, Reclamation's scope was very much smaller, for nothing like this huge dam's magnitude had ever been tried before.

Senator O'MAHONEY seems to forget that what he calls the "golden era" of reclamation was simultaneous with the worst depression in the country's history and that much of the money spent on reclamation projects during the thirties came from emergency funds appropriated to relieve unemployment. In other words, reclamation was looked upon as another "make-work" project by the New Dealers to help alleviate the depression primarily, and only secondarily to help the West. But to give recognition where it is due, this was perhaps one of the few "make-work" programs that was of lasting and beneficial value and in which there was no boondoggling.

The Senator also observes that Democratic policy is creating in the West a new and prosperous competitive economy. Yet to any careful observer of the Government management of power facilities in the Columbia Basin, Central Valley, or Davis Dam, it would appear evident that the Government is doing its best to crowd private competition out of the power market. The recent fight in California over the Bureau's insistence that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. could buy Government-generated power only if it agreed to act as a delivery boy for the Bureau of Reclamation is illustrative proof of the administration's disregard for competitive economy.

When the Congress does anything that meets with Senator O'MAHONEY's disapproval he charges it against Republican leadership. But when Congress acts commendably, as the Senate did in restoring much of the House's 1948 budget cuts, Senator O'MAHONEY cuts himself and his Democratic colleagues in on it by asserting that "We were enabled in the Senate to restore a substantial part of President Truman's recommendations." No mention is made about how Republican leadership in this instance discovered that the House had been misled by the Bureau's confusing figures and restored the necessary amounts to insure a progressive and economical construction program. But in one of the Senator's less partisan moments, he did recall the thoroughness of this leadership for he said on the floor of the Senate on July 22, 1947, after the largest Interior appropriation bill on record had passed that body:

"I feel that there has been a substantial gain in the preservation of the public interest in the bill as it has been presented by the conference committee. I join with the Senator from California, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, in expressing my gratification for the diligent, and I may say the combative, manner in which the Senator from Nebraska, KENNETH S. WHERRY, sustained the amendments of the Senate."

Even Commissioner Straus felt called upon to take off his hat to the generosity of the Republican Congress in providing for reclamation last year. The Commissioner told the National Reclamation Association in October of that year that "* * * the Congress not only last year but again this year made the largest reclamation appropriations in history. By any interpretation, Congress affirmed its appreciation, support, and confidence in the West's reclamation program. The Congress, as a whole, seems to be ahead of some self-appointed spokesmen or any pleaders amongst us for special interests. Just remember these facts when anybody tells you that the Congress does not support reclamation." Straus was speaking, let me remind you, of a Congress under Republican leadership. Does this sound like a Congress which the President charges is not interested in the development of the West?

THE ISSUE ON ELECTRIC POWER AND DEVELOPMENT

In true demagogic style, the Senator maintains in his later statement that the further development of hydroelectric power "cannot be entrusted to the tender mercies of the leaders of the Republican Party who have clearly demonstrated their complete lack of sympathy." Does a record appropriation for construction of power facilities as was voted by both Houses last year and the even greater one approved for the fiscal year 1949 represent a lack of sympathy? Never before has so much attention been paid or money appropriated for water and power development in the West as by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress.

Both Senator O'MAHONEY and the President have tried desperately to create an issue on which they believe they can make political hay. At the risk of dividing the West itself and setting class upon class, they are trying to make it appear that the Republican Party represents "selfish interests" and the Democratic Party is the champion of the people. No such issue exists except in the political minds of these two partisans who are willing for their own advantage to plunge the people of the West into needless political strife.

The power policy of the Republican Party has always been clear and in the best American tradition of freedom to the people to decide their own programs in their own localities. Instead of pushing public power upon communities where it is not needed or wanted, the Republican Party has always adhered to the policy of providing public power in areas where the people have been long accustomed to it or have voted their

desire for it. They have not tried to force upon the people anywhere programs dictated from Washington. Republicans have always respected local wishes on great national problems and have generously furnished the money to implement them.

BUREAUCRATS DRUNK WITH POLITICAL POWER

Rather than entrusting the vital function of reclamation to men with "lack of sympathy," it must be entrusted "to men of vision and leadership" says the Senator from Wyoming. By men of vision, he undoubtedly means the present Commissioner of Reclamation, Michael W. Straus * * * a man whose policies and administration have been so questionable that he has endangered the whole reclamation program which his predecessors built up so painstakingly for many years.

This man, who for the last 4 years has been heading the largest engineering organization in the world, had had no engineering or administrative experience to speak of when he was appointed to this powerful office. His practice of running an engineering outfit as a mammoth propaganda organization had become so intolerable to men of good will that both Houses of Congress just recently voted into law the proviso that, henceforth, no man who was not an engineer with many years of experience could hold this important position. As was pointed out in debate on the Senate floor, it had never before been necessary for Congress to prescribe qualifications for the Commissioner of Reclamation because it was commonly assumed by both parties that only the highest caliber men of the engineering profession would be considered for the office. Experience with the propaganda administration operated by Straus compelled Congress to take extraordinary steps to protect the western program.

The type of administration provided by this particular man of vision was aptly displayed during the spring and summer of 1947 by a mixture of confusion, cajolery, and direct attempt to thwart the spirit of the Antideficiency Act.

Commissioner Straus dipped more heavily than usual into his bag of political tricks a year ago April and May. He has always exhibited symptoms of grandiose delusions and unbridled liberties in the use of taxpayers' money entrusted to his Bureau, but ever since the spring of 1947 he has been like a man obsessed with the political possibilities of his power.

Fully aware that inflation demanded economy in Government spending and that Congress was compelled to be careful with the taxpayers' money, Straus set out to block every attempt at economy even if he had to resort to highly questionable tactics.

By presenting incomplete and confusing figures to Congress, he first misled the House into an error in their appropriation of funds for the reclamation program. Instead of appealing to the Senate for what he might have considered unnecessary cuts in vital projects, the Commissioner went over the heads of the people's elected representatives, and appealed to the reclamation users and supporters in the West to help him denounce Congress even before legislative action was complete. With the propaganda machine he has built up in the Bureau of Reclamation, he directed premature blasts at the Republican Congress from all over the West. This action, whether he planned it that way or not, had the effect of turning the reclamation program into a political instrument.

Westerners were led to believe that these great wealth-producing projects which they so sorely needed would be closed down and abandoned because of false economy upon the part of Congress. It was never brought out to them that the legislative process was only half completed and that the Senate had yet to act. Nor were they told of the confusion created by the Bureau itself because of its faulty figures and accounting procedures.

Straus was not interested in fact or equity. He was engaged in a political experiment to discover how far it lay within his power to inflame the West against a Republican Congress. After he started the political fire, his chief, Secretary Krug, fanned it into flame with the extraordinary scare that "the proposed budget reduction * * * would cause a tremendous set-back in the Nation's economy. That set-back might be enough to set off a major depression."

A flood of supporting propaganda thereafter flooded the 17 Western States and the people there, unaware of how they were being used, responded angrily exactly as the Bureau of Reclamation desired. They bombarded western Senators and Representatives with letters, telegrams, and phone calls reprimanding Congress and demanding enlarged appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation. The manner in which this effect was achieved stamped it for a plain attempt to discredit a Republican Congress before completion of final legislation.

Mr. Straus has had much better preparation for propaganda activity than for directing a huge engineering and technical institution such as the Bureau of Reclamation. His Government experience started as public relations director for the Public Works Administration and later in the same capacity in the Department of the Interior. He worked hand in glove with the master of Government-inspired pressure groups, Harold L. Ickes, and has carried on the same practices even after his teacher had been dismissed from office. Since he has taken over the direction of Reclamation, the fine tradition established by his competent predecessors, all highly qualified engineers, has fallen to the point where the interests of the West are sacrificed to politics and enhancement of the power of bureaucrats.

PLAYING POLITICS AND JUGGLING THE TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Mr. Straus was so pleased with the results of his 1947 trial run into politics that he went to the annual conference of Reclamation officials held at Salt Lake City a week after Congress recessed and boasted that by the same tactics he could get even more appropriations from Congress. Disregarding the plain and legal limits of the appropriations just provided by Congress he brazenly announced a program for 1948 totaling $195,000,000, which was $36,000,000 more than allowed by law. He was fully aware that he was exceeding his authority, but with cocksurety he announced he had "decided to go full steam ahead" on the Bureau's own program regardless of the fact that congressional appropriations were plainly intended to curb the Straus dreams of expansion.

He sought by his boast to the Salt Lake Conference to project a 6-year program of additional expenditures totaling $1,335,000,000 through 1954. Two months later his superior, Secretary Krug, expanded this into a 7-year program and called for an over-all expenditure of $2,148,000,000. Such was the arrogant assumption of power of these officials as against the people's representatives in Congress.

When called to task for these unwarranted statements, Straus and Secretary Krug released assurances that "the program is proceeding in strict accordance with the law and the determination of the Congress. No deficiency has been or will be incurred * * *. Any supplemental funds required to permit construction to proceed without waste of funds will be determined by Congress." They maintained that the appropriation would be spent as Congress wanted it spent, that it would all last until late in the fiscal year, and that Congress would have ample time to act before any project was shut down from lack of funds.

At the same time these solemn promises were being made publicly by Krug and Straus, the Bureau had overobligated itself on at least 19 different projects and had issued orders to its regional directors to "crowd construction to the utmost." In California, the assistant regional director informed his subordinates after Secretary Krug had visited the Central Valley project that "the Secretary and the Commissioner are insistent that 1949 funds be spent early in the year—by January 1, if possible."

When enough of the money had been spent so that shut-downs would be unavoidable if additional money was not provided, Mr. Straus finally notified Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department, on September 29, 1947, of the accomplished fact.

The fiscal year for Straus had begun on July 1 and was to last 12 months, but within three, he claimed he was running out of money. He admitted that Congress had provided generously for most of the projects, and yet shut-downs would occur "no matter how much rescheduling and spreading on money is done * * * preliminary reports show that we cannot finish the fiscal year with funds available." Either by coincidence or design these shut-downs took place on a group of large and carefully dispersed projects from which could flow the maximum political dissatisfaction with Congress if the Bureau by propaganda could settle the blame there.

Mr. Straus talked of slow-downs and rescheduling only when it was past the time they would do any good, but neglected to explain why he did not consider them as possibilities 2 months earlier when he announced a program far in excess of the intent of Congress.

And so Straus' plan for creating discontent in the West and forcing Congress to appropriate more money than it deemed prudent continued as scheduled. Contractors were deliberately taken by surprise by unexpected notices that funds would soon be exhausted and they in turn protested to their Congressmen who were home for the recess. The familiar New Deal cycle was put into operation again—Government officials using a propaganda to mislead the public into lobbying for them.

Commissioner Straus had stated on October 30, 1947, that funds would begin to be exhausted some time after February 1. But within 2 weeks after Congressmen were unexpectedly called back to Washington for the special session on November 17, they were notified by their constituents that the Bureau had announced that some of the projects would be out of money on November 30, some December 15, and others on December 31. It was as if the progressive shut-down of projects was deliberately contrived to produce a rising intensity of anger against the Congress.

The only conclusion that can be reached for such a drastic change of schedule within such a short period is that originally Straus had decided to turn on the "heat" during the second session of Congress, but the unexpected special session provided too good an opportunity for the crafty Commissioner to ignore. He quickly revised his program of shut-downs when he saw a chance of getting more appropriations at an earlier date.

The notices of exhaustion of funds in the Central Valley project were not received by contractors until 4 days before the dead line, November 30. Four of the five large contractors completely shut down their vast operations and did not return to work until the latter part of February. They lost millions of dollars—and the Government and the project lost 3 months of the best construction weather due to the prolonged California draught. This loss of money and time is all the more condemnable in the light of evidence submitted to a House committee investigating the Bureau of Reclamation. In this investigation it was revealed that the

Bureau had on hand $7,000,000 in unobligated funds which it could have allocated to prevent the Central Valley shut-down.

The impact of these shut-downs on the economy of the West was so apparent and the criticism against the Bureau from Republicans and Democrats alike so strong that a joint hearing by both the Senate and the House Appropriations Subcommittees were held even before a request for supplemental appropriations was received from the President.

Although this joint hearing revealed many interesting and pertinent facts about the operations of the Bureau, it also proved again what a master of subterfuge is the Commissioner of Reclamation. Again and again Senator WHERRY asked Commissioner Straus why he announced within 5 days after Congress adjourned that he was going to spend $36,000,000 more than Congress had appropriated. Repeatedly Senators CORDON and CAIN inquired why they, as legal representatives of affected States, had not been forewarned of the pending shut-downs and why the matter had not been discussed with them before it was promiscuously announced all over the Western States. These questions were met with vague and evasive answers more carefully calculated to divert the Senators away from inquiries embarrassing to Commissioner Straus and the Bureau officials than to reveal the true state of their operations.

Even though it had been grossly imposed upon by the tricks employed by Mr. Straus and the Bureau, the Republican leadership quickly provided more funds than the President requested to meet the deficiencies created by the Bureau. In making its recommendation, the Senate Appropriations Committee regretted the lack of time to make a more thorough investigation of the Bureau's operations. From the testimony it did hear, the committee stated that the Bureau deliberately designed to exhaust its funds prior to the end of the fiscal year in clear violation of the intent of Congress. On this point the committee concluded: "If such a policy is allowed to be followed in the future, it would take out of the hands of the Congress and put into the hands of the Bureau and the contractors the control of the rate of expenditures on reclamation projects."

CONGRESS DEMANDS INVESTIGATION OF THE BUREAU

The committee's irritation lay not with the need for the additional money but with the highly questionable methods used by the Bureau to compel Congress to enlarge precipitously a program which it had carefully planned in the regular fiscal year appropriation.

The committee also took the stand as it had the previous spring, that the data furnished it by the Bureau was so varied as to clearly evidence the fact that "the whole accounting system of the Bureau needs complete overhauling. Contradictory data were such as to destroy the confidence of the committee in the reliability of the figures furnished by the Bureau."

At the time the bill was on the Senate floor for consideration, several Senators called for an investigation of the Bureau. They believed that the charges made against Straus and his cohorts deserved much fuller consideration. Among many charges leveled at the Bureau were those which maintained that public funds had been misused in disregard of express law, that the Bureau violated the Antideficiency Act, and its officers had issued false and misleading statements for the purpose of influencing Congress with respect to legislation.

This demand for an investigation had already been put in the form of Senate and House resolutions by Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY and Congressman ALFRED ELLIOTT, both Democrats from California, and members of Straus' own party. Senator DOWNEY had been battling with the Bureau for many years as chairman of the old Irrigation and Reclamation Committee and particularly over the administration of the Central Valley project of California. During this time, he had unearthed much evidence and had participated in many incidents which led him to believe that the Bureau was guilty not only of maladministration but of trying to "impose by high-pressure lobbying and propaganda an economic strait-jacket upon a sector of free and successful enterprise." We find no mention of this in Senator O'MAHONEY's article in the Democratic Digest magazine.

It was Senator DOWNEY who successfully accused the Bureau of planning to exhaust all available funds for the CVP before January 1. He produced a letter sent out by the assistant regional director to his subordinates which corroborated the Senator's accusations. On the floor of the Senate, Senator DOWNEY read a very significant paragraph from this letter dated June 17—1 day after the Senate had acted on the regular Interior appropriation bill. R. S. Calland, assistant regional director and chief engineer of the CVP, wrote:

"The Secretary and the Commissioner are insistent that 1948 funds be spent early in the year—by January 1, if possible. We are concerned here lest we end the fiscal year with another carry-over.

"I wish to emphasize the Secretary's, the Commissioner's, and our regional policy which is to crowd construction to the utmost regardless of individual opinions as to adequacy of funds, and to repeat that I am now convinced of our ability to spend the amount that will be available in fiscal year 1948."

From June 17 onward and while this letter remained the secret of the Bureau, Commissioner Straus had been assuring California Congressmen that there were ample funds to carry the Central Valley project through the spring of 1948. But the Bureau, by undercover methods, had been driving ahead by every possible means, at any cost, however wasteful, to spend the full appropriations in half the allotted time. They succeeded in doing so by December 1.

Senator DOWNEY, through years of association, had come to so doubt the integrity of Mr. Straus and his cohorts that during the Senate appropriation hearings, he went through the unusual practice of having a Government official put under oath. He also accused Straus of attempting to organize pressure groups in northern California in violation of the Federal law (sec. 201 of title 18 of the Criminal Code which prohibits a Federal official from using funds appropriated by the Congress to influence Congress on pending legislation). The purpose of this propaganda was to take away from the Army engineers and turn over to Straus' Bureau the job of building and control of a dam on the American River. On the basis of statements made to the press, Senator DOWNEY claimed that Straus was not only guilty of gross impropriety in lobbying, but had also violated the penal statute of the United States.

He declared, and furnished evidence to support his view, that "the prosecution of this work (the CVP) was designedly held back at a lamentably low level in 1946 and 1947 for political reasons and was expedited to the utmost for political reasons in this year (fiscal year 1948). * * * Representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation for months now in the Central Valley by the hundreds have been gossiping over the Central Valley that the Bureau of Reclamation would show up Congress on this appropriation, and the Republican Party."

Senator DOWNEY is so sincere in his feelings and so confident of his facts that he deliberately removed himself from senatorial immunity by independently publishing a book containing the same charges he had made previously on the Senate floor. By publicly printing his assertions, he put himself in a position to be sued in criminal and civil actions for libel. Up to the present date, neither Commissioner Straus nor any of the other Reclamation officials who stand accused by Senator DOWNEY have started proceedings.

Senator DOWNEY is not the only Democrat who has had the courage to denounce "incompetency and maladministration" when he has seen it growing in his own garden. Congressman ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, Democratic Member of the House for 12 years and one of the best friends that Reclamation has had during those years from either party, also became incensed over the operations of the Bureau in the Central Valley. He took an active part in exposing the tricks of Bureau officials. Disgusted with them, he sponsored the amendment in the House to the 1949 Interior appropriation bill which takes the highly technical direction of the Bureau of Reclamation out of the hands of propagandists who now control it and will place eminent engineers at the helm instead.

The full details of wrongful manipulation by a few individuals of the huge Government investment in reclamation and power projects makes sordid reading for those who count upon steady development of the great West. The story belies Senator O'MAHONEY's attempt to shift the blame to Republicans for Democratic political gain. Republicans are not in charge of a Bureau whose affairs are now so badly mishandled.

REPUBLICAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO DEVELOPMENT OF THE WEST

Contrary to Senator O'MAHONEY's insinuations, Republican administrations have an unsurpassed record of solid achievements in building up the West from the days of Lincoln onward. The very foundation of western settlement stems from the Homestead Act of 1862, upon which the basic reclamation law also rests; and its wise provision that no man should own more than 160 acres of public land is still in effect today.

It was Republican administrations which created the Department of Agriculture, authorized Government aid in building the first transcontinental railroad, bought Alaska, organized the Weather Bureau, and enacted the Reclamation Act itself in 1902. The father of reclamation by any standard is Theodore Roosevelt and those men of true vision in the Republican Congress of 46 years ago which established the plan for which Democrats, nearly a half century later, claim credit.

Senator O'MAHONEY also conveniently forgets that it was Republican leadership which fostered rural free delivery. They established a majority of the national parks of the West, which brought recreation, business, and trade to this growing area. Republicans passed the Agricultural Marketing Act to build farm prosperity. They organized the Bureau of Mines to assist the West in the development of its basic natural resources.

It should also be remembered that the protective-tariff policies of the Republican Party gave the necessary help to many infant western industries, such as mining, sugar, cattle, and sheep, and agricultural fields generally. This protection came at a time when it was badly needed.

No amount of political chicanery can becloud these contributions from men of vision in the Republican Party. They worked unceasingly, efficiently, and economically for the betterment of the West in the firm belief that thereby the Nation as a whole is enriched.

TRIBAL FUNDS OF CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF WARM SPRINGS RESERVATION, OREG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House

of Representatives to the bill (S. 1243) to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes, which were, on page 3, to strike out all after line 19, over to and including line 4 on page 4, and on page 4, line 5, to strike out "Sec. 4" and insert "Sec. 3."

Mr. CORDON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LANGER. I submit a conference report on Senate bill 2510 to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "$12,000."

WILLIAM LANGER,
ZALES N. ECTON,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EDWARD H. REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
TOM MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2849) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statute of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5508. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans;

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SETTLEMENT OF LAND CLAIMS TO PUBLIC DOMAIN IN ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to settle and extinguish land claims to the public domain in the Territory of Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SETTLEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF TERRITORY OF ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition signed by sundry pupils of the Mark Twain Junior High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to carry out the President's civil-rights program; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of John P. Mullen, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 115, to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 265), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946, Senate Resolution 130, agreed to June 26, 1947, and Senate Resolution 201, agreed to March 11, 1948.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

WE WANT PEACE—ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on peace delivered by President Truman at a Sunday morning breakfast given under the auspices of the International Labor Organization at San Francisco, on June 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

FALSE PROMISES—FALSE ECONOMY—THE 1948 BUDGET CUT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "False Promises—False Economy—The 1948 Budget Cut," prepared by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CHALLENGE TO FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Challenge to Freedom," delivered by him at the Columbus Day Banquet of the Progressive Club of Minneapolis, Minn., on October 11, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

HIRAM W. JOHNSON

[Mr. KNOWLAND, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public services of Hiram W. Johnson, late a Senator from the State of California, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN THOMAS

[Mr. BROOKS, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by Hon. Addison T. Smith, formerly a Representative in Congress from the State of Idaho, on the life, character, and public services of John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH BY SENATOR UMSTEAD ON MAY 4, 1948

[Mr. UMSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio speech delivered by him in North Carolina on Tuesday, May 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH OF SENATOR UMSTEAD FROM RALEIGH, N. C., ON MAY 18, 1948

[Mr. UMSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio speech delivered by him from Raleigh, N. C., on May 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY SUBCOMMITTEE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway by the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLORADO'S ATTRACTIVE WINTER PLAYGROUNDS—RADIO REPORT BY CEDRIC FOSTER

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio report by Cedric Foster, reporting in Denver over radio station KFEL on one of Colorado's attractive winter playgrounds, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE JUDICIARY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "High Standard of Justice," published in yesterday's addition of the Washington Evening Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN THOMAS

[Mr. DWORSHAK, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public service of John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

HENRY CLAY—BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH BY DAVID B. G. ROSE

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a biographical sketch of Henry Clay written by David B. G. Rose, of Louisville, Ky., which appears in the Appendix.]

SPRINGTIME IN THE MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK REGION—POEM BY MAURICE H. THATCHER

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Springtime in the Mammoth Cave National Park Region," by Maurice H. Thatcher, former Representative from Kentucky, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR CONDITIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him before the convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers at Atlantic City, N. J., May 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOE BRIDGES: SPLENDID AMERICAN—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him in tribute to John Joseph Bridges, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY SAM TUCKER

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Muddle, Do-Nothing Record of the Republican Congress," by Sam Tucker, from the Decatur Herald of June 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EAGLES' CONFERENCE ON EMPLOYMENT OF HANDICAPPED

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD remarks by him and a statement by Paul A. Strachan, and a bill introduced, all relating to services for the physically handicapped, which appear in the Appendix.]

SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATION ENACTED BY PREVIOUS REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATIONS

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of major legislation enacted by previous Republican administrations, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON COLLEGE OF LAW COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the annual commencement exercises of the Washington College of Law on June 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FEDERAL PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY H. E. BRYANT

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Word of Appreciation," published in the Maine Potato Growers News for June 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MUNDT BILL—TELEGRAM FROM ALFRED J. SCHWEPPE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram received by him from Alfred J. Schweppe, of Seattle, Wash., which appears in the Appendix.]

CLIFFORD J. DURR

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD biographical data relative to Clifford J. Durr, a member of the Federal Communications Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

COL. HENRY BANKHEAD

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles regarding the retirement of Col. Henry Bankhead, one from the Windsor Star, of June 12, and one from the Evening Citizen, of Ottawa, Canada, of June 21, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

WHAT UNESCO CAN DO IN THESE TROUBLED TIMES—LECTURE BY HOWARD E. WILSON

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a lecture on the subject What UNESCO Can Do in These Troubled Times, by Howard E. Wilson, at the conference of the American Federation of Teachers at Maywood, Ill., April 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL LITERACY EDUCATION—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorial comments on adult literacy in the United States, which appear in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter to Senator REVERCOMB, from Under Secretary of State Robert A. Lovett, with regard to displaced persons legislation; which appears in the Appendix.]

THEATER FOR WASHINGTON—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Theater for Washington," from the Washington Post of June 19, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will appear after the adjournment of the session on Saturday next, a statement prepared by me relative to rural electrification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUMMARY OF WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the final issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there be printed a statement which I shall prepare summarizing the work of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so orderd.

A CITIZEN'S OBLIGATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the final issue of the RECORD a statement which I shall prepare on a Citizen's Obligation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX ON OLEOMARGARINE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the final issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I am preparing on the subject of the oleo controversy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MUNDT-NIXON BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared concerning the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill and a copy of the bill as proposed to be revamped.

There being no objection, the statement and the bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Judiciary Committee received the Mundt-Nixon bill on the 21st day of May. The committee held hearings, assigning to the proponents about one-fifth of the time allotted and to the opponents about four-fifths.

Because the bill raised two questions—(1) of law, whether the bill is constitutionally written, (2) of policy—the committee called for opinions from distinguished counsel in New York and Washington and received a number of opinions from counsel representing various groups.

The committee also asked the Attorney General of the United States for an opinion. The opinions reflected generally the conclusion that there were constitutional objections to the bill. Thereafter, the chairman consulted with the subcommittee and with counsel, including Donald Richberg, in relation to the bill and, as a result, the objections that were raised were, in large measure, met by a revamped bill, but in view of the time element, it was found that the bill could not be brought to the calendar and action taken thereon in the Senate unless there should be a special session.

I ask that the revamped bill be printed in the RECORD so that it can have further study by not only the committee members, but by anyone interested in the subject.

At this time there is no need to dwell upon the amount of unhelpful opposition, amounting in some instances to hysteria and emotional unbalance, and in some instances almost threats. The chairman of the committee feels that the subject of the penetration of communism is one that merits the consideration of every thinking American. He realizes that no legislation is an adequate cure for any crime—that it needs helpful cooperation of the citizenry, the officials and, in many instances, a tremendous lot of education. That is particularly true in this case where so much loose thinking has been found, and so forth.

Mr. President, I stated, when we originally received the Mundt-Nixon bill, that we would not act with rash haste on it, but would seek to make sure that the civil liberties of every American were protected, even the civil liberties of Communists.

Because we undertook to conscientiously consider all phases of the bill, we have been subjected to criticism by those who would have preferred for the Senate Judiciary Committee to simply rubber stamp the House bill and send it to the Senate floor.

I have condemned rubber stamping of administration measures, and I am completely opposed to rubber-stamp measures which are opposed by the administration, or for that matter, any rubber-stamp measure which is presented to any committee of which I am a member.

Let it therefore stand on the record, that the fact that the Mundt-Nixon bill did not reach the Senate floor was not in any way due to dilatory tactics by the members of the Judiciary Committee. Exactly to the contrary. We worked night and day on this bill. We used every available second and minute to analyze it. We met for many hours at a time, skipping luncheon periods, abandoning all other work, however pressing, in order to be adequate to our responsibility on this bill.

We have no apologies. We have no excuses. We do want this description of our effort, however, to stand in the RECORD.

We did not allow Communist and Communist-minded individuals to sabotage our consideration by extending the hearings indefinitely, nor did we allow those who wanted us to simply rubber stamp the bill to sabotage the congressional process by simply having us approve the bill without any consideration.

It is my earnest hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee and the entire Senate will have the opportunity to further explore this important subject of Communist infiltration in America. At the same time, in order to defeat the menace of communism, we will never resort to the tactics of fascism or any totalitarian method. We will act, as I humbly believe we have acted, in a truly American, fair, and democratic manner.

In summary may I say that the Mundt-Nixon bill arrived too late in the Senate. Let there be no recriminations, no accusations, because, unfortunately, time was not available to consider it in committee and the full Senate, with all the time and all the detail that its importance justifies.

Let not the Communists, however, take heart and crow about the fact that the Senate did not act on his bill. Let them not attempt to imply that they had anything to do with killing the bill. On the contrary, we emerged from committee meetings with a firmer conviction than ever before that the Communist threat must be met and will be met. The lack of action on the Mundt-Nixon bill is not, therefore, a victory for the Communists. It is merely due to the lack of time that was available. However much we despise communism, we love more our constitutional processes of congressional government, and we will not foresake them even to meet the Communist threat.

H. R. 5852

An act to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities

Be it enacted, etc.,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Subversive Activities Act, 1948."

NECESSITY FOR LEGISLATION

SEC. 2. As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, Congress hereby finds that—

(1) The system of government known as totalitarian dictatorship is characterized by the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial basis, and by an identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists, such identity being so close that the party and the government itself are for all practical purposes indistinguishable.

(2) The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the ruthless suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the complete subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism, and brutality.

(3) There exists a world communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a worldwide revolutionary political movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in all the countries of the world through the medium of a single world-wide Communist political organization.

(4) The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

(5) The Communist dictatorship of such foreign country, in exercising such direction and control and in furthering the purposes of the world Communist movement, establishes or causes the establishment of, and utilizes, in various countries, political organizations which are acknowledged by such Communist dictatorship as being constituent elements of the world Communist movement; and such political organizations are not free and independent organizations, but are mere sections of a single world-wide Communist organization and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the Communist dictatorship of such foreign country.

(6) The political organizations so established and utilized in various countries, acting under such control, direction, and discipline, endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship.

(7) In carrying on the activities referred to in paragraph (6), such political organizations in various countries are organized on a secret, conspiratorial basis and operate to a substantial extent through organizations, commonly known as "Communist fronts," which in most instances are created and maintained, or used, in such manner as to conceal the facts as to their true character and purposes and their membership. One result of this method of operation is that such political organizations are able to obtain financial and other support from persons who would not extend such support if they knew the true purposes of, and the actual nature of the control and influence exerted upon, such "Communist fronts."

(8) Due to the nature and scope of the world Communist movement, with the existence of affiliated constituent elements working toward common objectives in various countries of the world, travel of members, representatives, and agents from country to country is essential for purposes of communication and for the carrying on of activities to further the purposes of the movement.

(9) In the United States those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in the world Communist movement, when they so participate, in effect repudiate their allegiance to the United States and in effect transfer their allegiance to the foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement; and, in countries other than the United States, those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in such Communist movement similarly repudiate their allegiance to the countries of which they are nationals in favor of such foreign Communist country.

(10) In pursuance of communism's stated objectives, the most powerful existing Communist dictatorship has, by the traditional Communist methods referred to above, and in accordance with carefully conceived plans, already caused the establishment in numerous foreign countries, against the will of the people of those countries, of ruthless Communist totalitarian dictatorships, and threatens to establish similar dictatorships in still other countries.

(11) The recent successes of Communist methods in other countries and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions and make it necessary that Congress, in order to provide for the common defense, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation, and to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such world-wide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "person" means an individual or an organization.

(2) The term "organization" means an organization, corporation, company, partnership, association, trust, foundation, or fund; and includes a group of persons, whether or not incorporated, permanently or temporarily associated together for joint action on, or advancement of views on, any subject or subjects.

(3) The term "Communist political organization" means any organization in the United States having some, but not necessarily all, of the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party, which (A) is substantially dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization controlling the world Communist movement referred to in section 2, and (B) operates primarily to advance the political objectives of such world Communist movement.

(4) The term "Communist-front organization" means any organization in the United

States (other than a Communist political organization and other than a lawfully organized political party which is not a Communist political organization) which (A) is under the control of a Communist political organization, or (B) is operated primarily for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2.

(5) The term "Communist organization" means a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

(6) The term "publication" means any circular, newspaper, periodical, pamphlet, book, letter, post card, leaflet, or other publication.

(7) The term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone.

(8) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication (A) between any State, Territory, or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof, or (B) within any Territory or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone) or within the District of Columbia.

(9) The term "Board" means the Subversive Activities Board established by section 12 of this act.

(10) The term "final order of the Board" means an order issued by the Board under section 13 of this act, which has become final as provided in section 14 of this act, requiring an organization to register under section 7 of this act as a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to combine or conspire with any other person to perform any act which would substantially assist in the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship the direction and control of which is to be vested in, or exercised by or under the domination or control of, any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual, with intent to assist in the establishment within the United States of such totalitarian dictatorship. For purposes of this subsection, the term "totalitarian dictatorship" means a form of government, not representative in form, characterized by (1) the dominance of a single political party to such an extent that such party and its policies are indistinguishable for all practical purposes from the government and governmental policies of the country in which such party exists, (2) the suppression of opposition to such party, and (3) the denial of those fundamental rights and liberties of individuals which are characteristic of a representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship.

(b) Any person who violates subsection (a) of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or by both such fine and such imprisonment, and shall, moreover, be thereafter ineligible to hold any office, or place of honor, profit, or trust created by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

SEC. 5. (a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization, with knowledge that such order has become final—

(1) in seeking or accepting any office or employment under the United States, to conceal the fact that he is a member of such organization; or

(2) to hold any nonelective office or employment under the United States.

(b) When there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to appoint or employ any individual as an officer or employee of the United States, knowing that such individual is a member of such an organization.

DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization, with knowledge that such order has become final—

(1) to make application for a passport, or the renewal of a passport, to be issued or renewed by or under the authority of the United States; or

(2) to use or attempt to use any such passport.

(b) When there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to issue a passport to, or renew the passport of, any individual knowing that such individual is a member of such organization.

REGISTRATION AND ANNUAL REPORTS OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Each Communist political organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Board, to register as a Communist political organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist political organization.

(b) Each Communist-front organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Board, to register as a Communist-front organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist-front organization.

(c) The registration required by subsection (a) or (b) shall be made—

(1) in the case of an organiaztion which is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization on the date of the enactment of this act, within 30 days after such date;

(2) in the case of an organization becoming a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization after the date of the enactment of this act, within 30 days after such organization becomes a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be; and

(3) in the case of an organization which by a final order of the Board is required to register, within 30 days after such order becomes final.

(d) The registration made under subsection (a) or (b) shall be accompanied by a registration statement, to be prepared and filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, containing the following information:

(1) The name of the organization.

(2) The name and last-known address of each individual who is at the time of the filing of such registration statement, and of each individual who was at any time during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement, an officer of the organization, with the designation or title of the office so held, and with a brief statement of the duties and functions of such individual as such officer.

(3) An accounting, in such form and detail as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, of all moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and the purposes for which expended) by the organization during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement.

(4) In the case of a Communist political organization, the name and last-known address of each individual who was a member of the organization at any time during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement.

(e) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to file with the Attorney General on or before February 1 of the year following the year in which it registers, and on or before February 1 of each succeeding year, an annual report, prepared and filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, containing the same information which by subsection (d) is required to be included in a registration statement, except that the information required with respect to the 12-month period referred to in paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of such subsection shall, in such annual report, be given with respect to the calendar year preceding the February 1 on or before which such annual report must be filed.

(f) (1) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to keep, in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, accurate records and accounts of moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and purpose for which expended) by such organization.

(2) It shall be the duty of each Communist political organization registered under this section to keep, in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, accurate records of the names and addresses of the members of such organization and of persons who actively participate in the activities of such organization.

(g) It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to send to each individual listed in any registration statement or annual report, filed under this section, as a member or as an officer of the organization in respect of which such registration statement or annual report was filed, a notification in writing that such individual is so listed; and such notification shall be sent at the earliest practicable time after the filing of such registration statement or annual report.

(h) In the case of failure on the part of any organization to register or to file any registration statement or annual report as required by this section, it shall be the duty of the executive officer (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of an executive officer) and of the secretary (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of a secretary) of such organization, and of such officer or officers of such organization as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, to register for such organization, to file such registration statement, or to file such annual report, as the case may be.

(i) If there is in effect with respect to an organization a final order of the Board requiring it to register under this section—

(1) such organization shall, upon conviction of failure to register, to file any registration statement or annual report, or to keep records, as required by this section, be punished for each such offense, by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000; and

(2) each individual having a duty under subsection (h) of this section to register or to file any registration statement or annual report on behalf of such organization, shall,

upon conviction of failure to so register or to file any such registration statement or annual report, be punished for each such offense by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

For the purposes of this subsection, each day of failure to register, whether on the part of the organization or any individual, shall constitute a separate offense.

(j) Any individual who, in a registration statement or annual report filed under this section, willfully makes any false statement or willfully omits to state any fact which is required to be stated, or which is necessary to make the statements made or information given not misleading, shall upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such offense by a fine or not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

KEEPING OF REGISTER; PUBLIC INSPECTION; REPORTS TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

SEC. 8. (a) The Attorney General shall keep and maintain in the Department of Justice a register of all organizations which are registered under section 7, and such register shall be known as the "Register of Communist Organizations." Communist political organizations and Communist-front organizations shall be listed separately in such register.

(b) Such register, together with the registration statements and annual reports filed under section 7, shall be kept and maintained in such manner as to be open for public inspection.

(c) The Attorney General shall submit to the President and to the Congress annually (and at any time when requested by either House by resolution) a report with respect to the carrying out of the provisions of this act, including the names of the organizations listed in such register and of the data (including the names and addresses of the individuals listed as members of such organizations) contained in registration statements and annual reports filed under section 7.

MEMBERSHIP IN CERTAIN COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 9. It shall be unlawful for any individual to become or remain a member of any organization if he knows that (1) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7 of this act as a communist political organization, (2) more than 30 days have elapsed since such order became final, and (3) such organization is not registered under section 7 of this act as a communist political organization.

USE OF THE MAILS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

SEC. 10. It shall be unlawful for any organization which is registered under section 7, or for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring it to register under section 7, or for any person acting for or on behalf of such organization—

(1) to transmit or cause to be transmitted, through the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, any publication which is intended to be, or which it is reasonable to believe is intended to be, circulated or disseminated among two or more persons, unless such publication and any envelope, wrapper, or other container in which it is mailed or otherwise circulated or transmitted bears the following, printed in such manner as may be provided in regulations prescribed by the Attorney General, with the name of the organization appearing in lieu of the blank: "Disseminated by ———, a communist organization"; or

(2) to broadcast or cause to be broadcast any matter over any radio station in the United States, unless such matter is preceded by the following statement, with the name of the organization being stated in place of the blank: "The following program is sponsored by ———, a communist organization."

DENIAL OF TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTION

SEC. 11. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no deduction for Federal income tax purposes shall be allowed in the case of a contribution to or for the use of any organization if at the time of the making of such contribution (1) such organization is registered under section 7, or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7.

(b) No organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax, under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code, for any taxable year if at any time during such taxable year (1) such organization is registered under section 7, or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES BOARD

SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby established a Board, to be known as the Subversive Activities Board, which shall be composed of three members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, and one for a term of 3 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 3 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, and two members of the Board shall, at all times, constitute a quorum. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

(d) Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of $ a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(e) Upon application made by the Attorney General under subsection (a) of section 13 of this act or by any organization under subsection (b) of section 13 of this act, the Board shall determine whether any organization is a "communist political organization" within the meaning of paragraph (3) of section 3 of this act, or a "communist-front organization" within the meaning of paragraph (4) of section 3 of this act, as the case may be.

(f) Subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Board may appoint and fix the compensation of a clerk and such examiners and other personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

(g) All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual designated by it for that purpose.

(h) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place.

(i) The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

(j) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board such sums as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE BOARD

SEC. 13. (a) Whenever the Attorney General shall have reason to believe that any organization which has not registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this act is in fact an organization of a kind required to be registered under such subsection, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization a petition for an order requiring such organization to register pursuant to such subsection.

(b) Any organization registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this act may, not oftener than once in each calendar year, make application to the Attorney General for the cancellation of its registration and for relief from obligation to make further annual reports. Within 60 days after the denial of any such application by the Attorney General, the organization concerned may file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for an order requiring the cancellation of such registration and relieving such organization of obligation to make further annual reports.

(c) Upon the filing of any petition pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (b) of this section, the Board (or any member thereof or any examiner designated thereby) may hold hearings, administer oaths and affirmations, may examine witnesses and receive evidence at any place in the United States, and may require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, and other records deemed relevant to the matter under inquiry. Subpenas may be signed and issued by any member of the Board or any duly authorized examiner. Subpenas shall be issued on behalf of the organization which is a party to the proceeding upon request and upon a statement or showing of general relevance and reasonable scope of the evidence sought. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States. In case of disobedience to a subpena the Board may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. Any of the district courts of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce documentary evidence if so ordered) and give evidence relating to the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found.

(d) All hearings conducted under this section shall be public. Each party to such proceeding shall have the right to present its case by oral or documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. The testimony in any hearing conducted under this section shall be reduced to writing and filed in the office of the Board.

(e) In determining whether any organization is a "communist political organization", there shall be taken into consideration—

(1) the extent to which its policies are formulated and carried out and its activities performed, pursuant to directives or to effectuate the policies, of the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization in which is vested, or under the domination or control of which is exercised, the direction and control of the world communist movement referred to in section 2 of this act;

(2) the extent to which its views and policies do not deviate from those of such foreign government or foreign organization;

(3) the extent to which it receives financial or other aid, directly or indirectly, from or at the direction of such foreign government or foreign organization;

(4) the extent to which it sends members or representatives to any foreign country for instruction or training in the principles, policies, strategy, or tactics of such world communist movement;

(5) the extent to which it reports to such foreign government or foreign organization or to its representatives;

(6) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members are subject to or recognize the disciplinary power of such foreign government or foreign organization or its representatives;

(7) the extent to which in order to conceal its foreign connections (i) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, its membership (by keeping membership lists in code, by instructing members to refuse to acknowledge membership, or by any other method); (ii) its members refuse to acknowledge membership therein; (iii) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, records other than membership lists, (iv) its meetings are secret; and (v) it otherwise operates on a secret basis; and

(8) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members consider the allegiance they owe to the United States as subordinate to their obligations to such foreign government or foreign organization.

(f) In determining whether any organization is a "communist-front organization", there shall be taken into consideration—

(1) the relationship of persons who are active in its management, direction, or supervision, whether or not holding office therein, to any communist political organization, communist foreign government, or the world communist movement referred to in section 2;

(2) the extent to which its support, financial or otherwise, is derived from any communist political organization, communist foreign government, or the world communist movement referred to in section 2;

(3) the extent to which its funds, resources, or personnel are used to further or promote the political objectives of any communist political organization, communist foreign government, or the world communist movement referred to in section 2; and

(4) the extent to which the positions taken or advanced by it from time to time on matters of policy do not deviate from those of any communist political organization, communist foreign government, or the world communist movement referred to in section 2.

(g) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines that the organization is a communist political organization or a communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order requiring such organization to register as such under section 7 of this act.

(h) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines that the organization is not a communist political organization or a communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying his petition for an order requiring such organization to register as such under section 7 of this act. A copy of such order shall be sent to such organization.

(i) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines that the organization is not a communist political organization or a communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order requiring him to cancel the registration of such organization and relieve it from the requirement of further annual reports. A copy of such order shall be sent to such organization.

(j) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines that the organization is a communist political organization of a communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order refusing to cancel the registration of such organization and to relieve it from the requirement of further annual reports.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 14. (a) The party aggrieved by any order entered by the Board under subsection (g), (h), (i), or (j) of section 13 may obtain a review of such order in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by filing in the court, within 60 days from the date of service upon it of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Board be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Board, and thereupon the Board shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including all evidence taken and the report and order of the Board. Thereupon the court shall have jurisdiction to review the proceedings of the Board. In such review, the court shall review the evidence contained in the record so certified, make its findings of fact and conclusions of law thereon, and enter an order affirming or setting aside the order of the Board. If the court sets aside an order issued under subsection (j) of section 13 it may enter a judgment canceling the registration of the organization and relieving it from the requirement of further annual reports. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari, as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 28, sec. 347).

(b) Any order of the Board issued under section 13 shall become final—

(1) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for review, if no such petition has been duly filed within such time; or

(2) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Board has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and no petition for certiorari has been duly filed; or

(3) upon the denial of a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Board has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; or

(4) upon the expiration of 10 days from the date of issuance of the mandate of the Supreme Court, if such Court directs that the order of the Board be affirmed or that the petition for review be dismissed.

PENALTIES

SEC. 15. Any organization which violates any provision of section 10 of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000. Any individual who violates any provision of sections 5, 6, 9, or 10 of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

APPLICABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

SEC. 16. Nothing in this act shall be held to make the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act inapplicable to the exercise of functions, or the conduct of proceedings, under this act, except to the extent that this act affords additional procedural safeguards for organizations and individuals.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 17. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, which were, in line 8, to strike out "June 30, 1954" and insert "June 30, 1950", and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to extend for 1 year the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry."

Mr. GURNEY. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 83. An act authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn;

S. 1107. An act relating to the arming of American vessels;

S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner Irrigation District, and for other purposes;

S. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer;

S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation;

S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyances;

S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota;

S. 2747. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company; and

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1243) to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1683) to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the house had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4856. An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmer's Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6428. An act to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.; and

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. BECKWORTH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19 to the bill and concurred thereon, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 28 and 30 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6712) to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequities, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov;

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor; and

H. R. 6318. An act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6712) to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequities, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATIONS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GURNEY. I submit a conference report on House bill 6771, making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today's RECORD, p. 9218.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to the House bill 6771, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 19, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to the bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Military construction, Army: For construction, installations, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations and facilities, as authorized by the Act of June 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims under the Act of July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), and pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (28 U. S. C. 921); $76,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, including not to exceed $205,000 for the purchase, development, or construction in connection with, land adjacent to the Percy Jones Hospital, Michigan; and in addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $75,000,000: *Provided*, That the funds made available in this paragraph by appropriation and contract authorization shall not be subject to section 10 of this Act." That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$70,000,000."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 28 and 30.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a compilation of the amounts involved in the bill and the results of the conference.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National Military Establishment military functions appropriation bill, 1949, H. R. 6771

CASH APPROPRIATIONS

Regular and supplemental budget estimates	[1] $7,278,842,000
House bill	[2] 6,509,939,000
Senate bill	[3] 6,915,676,052
Conference bill	[3] 6,767,668,163
Conference bill under total estimates	511,173,837
Conference bill over House bill	[3] 257,729,163
Conference bill under Senate bill	148,007,889

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS IN BILL

Clothing and equipage (added by Senate and agreed to by conferees)	$25,000,000
Signal Corps (included by House and agreed to by Senate bill and not in conference)	50,000,000
Military construction, army (Senate included $75,000,000, which was agreed to by conferees)	75,000,000
Ordnance Department (Senate included $75,000,000 and $70,000,000 agreed to by conferees)	70,000,000
Total contract authorizations in bill as agreed to be conferees	220,000,000

[1] Includes $62,250,000 "Special Accounts, Department of the Army", which are not carried in bill, but which are reflected in totals to reconcile with totals used on page 33 of House Report.

[2] Includes $76,000,000 of a supplemental budget estimate for "Military Construction, Army".

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I was called out of the Chamber a moment ago when H. R. 6243 was disposed of. I should like to make some remarks, which will take about 3 minutes, which I should like to have inserted immediately following debate on the Military Establishment bill.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the conferees of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress for so courageously, so forthrightly disregarding the wishes of the common lay Members of the Senate and the House.

Mr. President, the Members of this body well know how the House and the Senate has on several occasions, in no uncertain manner, expressed its views about the extraordinary restrictions and controls, which for 62 years, have been adopted to protect the American people from that dangerous, that alien, that un-American, Fascist, communistic, subversive substance, legally denominated—oleomargarine, and sometimes illegally and unconstitutionally called just plain margarine.

Mr. President, in spite of the unprecedented pressure, the insistent presumption of the great majority of the common Members of both the Senate and the House, the conferees have gallantly resisted that presure and have reinstated the provisions of this bill which protects the flower of our manhood from the subtle and invidious influence of oleomargarine, sometimes known as just margarine.

Incidentally, at the same time, Mr. President, I also wish to call this to the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, the conferees have successfully required the Army to get rid of 10,000,000 more of the surplus dollars which so grievously burden our National Treasury.

Mr. President, it would be impossible I think, in any walk of life throughout our great land, to find a group of men more completely devoted to the higher law, to their own divinely inspired conscience, than are these conferees.

Their devotion to their own conscience is so strong that they are able, apparently, to resist the combined influence of practically all the housewives of America, in addition to that of the ordinary, garden variety, Member of Congress.

Mr. President, there is talk in the cloakrooms of another session of this Congress later this summer. I submit, Mr. President, in all sincerity that there is no need whatever for the ordinary, lay Member of Congress to come back to Washington for a special session.

It is clearly evident, Mr. President, that to save the world and the people of this country from disaster, all that is needed is to reconvene, preferably in secret, only those incomparable sages, the conferees of the Appropriation Committee.

From their deliberations the same results would be achieved and without the expense and trouble to everyone that is involved in going through the archaic ritual of pretended legislation. It is quite clear that regardless of what the common Members of this body may wish, the conferees make the decisions.

PAYMENT TO MEMBERS OF RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA FROM SALE OF TIMBER AND LUMBER

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Chair lay before the Senate House bill 5355.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 5355) authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; was read twice by its title.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the bill merely provides for payment to the Chippewa Tribe of Minnesota $50 per capita out of a balance of $1,000,000 in their timber fund.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, this matter has come to my attention, and I am in agreement with the purposes of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARYLAND SENATORIAL ELECTION CONTEST

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish this session of Congress to close without expressing my thanks and appreciation to the subcommittee of the Rules Committee, headed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], for the very fair, judicial, and thorough way the election contest between General Markey and my colleague, Senator O'CONOR, was considered and decided. I appreciate the fact that inasmuch as Maryland is close to the District of Columbia, no doubt the committee was subjected to constant pulling and hauling by the advocates of both the contestants. The fact that the committee decided in favor of the Democrat, when the committee was composed overwhelmingly of a Republican membership, is not only a high compliment to the committee itself, but reflects credit on the entire Senate as being above politics and meanness in a matter of so much magnitude.

On behalf of the people of Maryland, both Democrats and Republicans, and on behalf of my colleague, as well as myself, I thought this word of appreciation of the fairness and impartiality of the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Indiana should stand in the RECORD as a guide for all of us, should we again be confronted with a contest for a seat in this body.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2589) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is Senate bill, S. 2589, a bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to straighten out a parliamentary situation. House bill 6402 is a companion bill, and identical to Senate bill 2589. House bill 6402 was passed by the House of Representatives yesterday, and was sent to the Senate and now lies on the desk. I ask unanimous consent at this time, rather than waiting until some time later in the discussion, that House bill 6402 be now read, and that it be substituted for Senate bill 2589 as the business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 6402) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to be clear that House bill 6402 is substituted as the business of the Senate with the same force and effect as would apply to Senate bill 2589. It is an identical bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

STUDY OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a report, together with tables, from the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, on the subject of civilian personnel.

Among other activities of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has been a continuing study of civilian personnel in the executive branch of the Federal Government which now has been constantly pursued since 1942.

There are other reasons for such a study, but the committee has found by experience that inefficient use of public personnel almost invariably is a clue to other—and frequently more costly—waste. Excessive employment is the smoke from nonessential fires.

In the course of its 7 years of operation the committee has made numerous recommendations. Those which have been adopted have resulted in savings averaging approximately a billion dollars a year. The average cost of the committee has been $15,000 a year. This year the committee was without funds although its authority was continuing.

Working without funds, the committee's activities naturally have been curtailed, but it has managed to continue its personnel studies.

There being no objection, the report and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There could be no better occasion than this to sum up the civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government. Briefly it is this:

1. As of this date civilian personnel in the executive branch numbers somewhere in excess of 2,050,000. This was the total in April and since then it has been increasing by the hundreds on a daily average.

2. This number is more than twice the World War I peak.

3. It is more than three and one-half times the level at the end of the last previous Republican Congress and administration.

4. It is more than twice the prewar emergency peak of 1939.

5. In the civilian establishments, departments, and agencies, exclusive of the Military Establishment, civilian employment totals nearly 80,000 more than the World War II peak, and it is 165 percent of the prewar emergency peak of 1939.

6. The Military Establishment in April was employing nearly three times as many civilians per man in uniform as it employed at the World War II peak.

These figures are developed from studies by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and in order that the record may be complete and documented I shall submit seven tables compiled from the records of the committee. Every figure in these tables for the period since 1942 is based upon signed statements from the agencies involved (with exceptions which are noted). Prior to 1942 the figures are based upon such information as is available from the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission.

I shall not burden the Senate with reading the tables, but I shall summarize them in text and request that the tables be made a part of my remarks.

COMPARISON WITH WORLD WAR II PEAK

These tables will show an interesting comparison between Federal personnel by agencies as between now and World War II peak. In discussing this comparison it will be simpler to consider first employment in the civilian agencies and departments as distinguished from civilian employment by the agencies of the Military Establishment. Each is a whole subject in itself.

CIVILIAN DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Federal civilian personnel in all agencies, including those of the Military Establishment, is still more than half of the World War II peak. (See table 1.)

In civilian departments and agencies, exclusive of the Military Establishment, civilian employment actually has increased a net of 77,592 since World War II peak. (See table 1.)

This is an increase of 6 percent in the civilian agencies, after taking into account all reductions, including those in the temporary war agencies which could no longer be justified. In April there were 38 agencies with personnel greater than the war peak and 36 with less. (See tables 2 and 3.)

Among the 8 regular departments of Cabinet level, excluding those in the National Military Establishment, 4 in April were employing a combined total of 124,128 more personnel than they were at the war peak. The other 4 recorded a combined decrease of 26,373. The net increase for these departments was 14 percent over the war peak. (Increases in the Post Office Department should be noted.) (See tables 2 and 3.)

Employment in the Executive Offices of the President, including the Mansion and Grounds, in April was 66 percent greater than at the war peak. (See table 2.)

The 36 agencies, exclusive of the Military Establishment, with net reductions since the war peak, included 19 of the so-called war emergency agencies. All of these except Selective Service and Office of Defense Transportation have expired. The net reduction by these 36 agencies totaled 222,922 as of April.

More than 75 percent of the total net reduction was accounted for in the demise of war emergency agencies. Net reductions in all other civilian agencies totaled only 57,055. (See table 2.) Reduction in these agencies more than offset increases in the Veterans' Administration. (See table 3.)

As a partial offset to the 165,867 reduction resulting from expiration and curtailment of 19 war emergency agencies, there was 34,763 in new employment as of April for 10 so-called new postwar agencies. (See table 3.)

If employment in the new postwar agencies is added to that of other independent agencies, exclusive of the Veterans' Administration, there is a postwar increase of 7 percent in the independent establishments. (See table 3.)

Including the Veterans' Administration, there was an increase in the employment by regular independent agencies of 43 percent. Twenty-one of these agencies show net increases over their war-peak personnel. There were decreases in 13. (See tables 2 and 3.)

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Between July 1945—the war-peak month—and April 1948 net reduction in civilian personnel employed by agencies of the National Military Establishment was 77,592 greater than the net reduction in the executive branch of the Government as a whole, including the civilian employment by the military agencies.

Civilian employment in the National Military Establishment was reduced from 2,630,361 in July 1945 to 853,611 in April 1948—a net reduction of 1,776,750.

Civilian employment in the executive branch as a whole, including the Military Establishment, was reduced from 3,749,578 in July 1945 to 2,050,420 in April 1948—a net reduction of 1,699,158.

This of course means that there was a net increase during the period in civilian agency employment of 77,592. (See table 4.)

Of the total net civilian reduction in the Military Establishment, 1,776,750, nearly half, or 865,787, were industrial workers. And more than half of these, 527,059, were employed outside of continental United States. Among these a great many were foreign laborers, native to areas in which United States military installations and activities are located overseas. (See table 6.)

The War and Navy Departments were forced down to a total of 276,000, classified employees (exclusive of industrial workers) during fiscal year 1947, under the graduated personnel ceiling provisions, but civilian employment in all categories began a steady climb in January of this year. This was despite unification, and prior to any suggestion of the new military expansion program. (See table 4.)

The National Military Establishment in April was employing nearly 3 times as many civilians per man in uniform as it employed at the war peak. And this was true before the new military expansion program was proposed. In April there was a civilian employee for every 1.7 men in uniform. At the peak of the war effort there was a civilian employee for every 4.7 men in uniform. Since the postwar low point in December 1947, civilian employment in the National Military Establishment has increased 24,378, while the military personnel declined 48,333. (See table 4.)

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYEES

One category of Federal employment frequently overlooked, but still on the pay roll, are the so-called industrial employees. This group includes those employed in Navy yards, arsenals, and so forth, and it includes also a great many foreign native laborers employed outside of continental United States.

A quick summary of the industrial employee situation would include the following facts:

Eight hundred and sixty-two thousand eight hundred and fifty-two of all Federal civilian personnel separated since the war peak—or more than half—were so-called industrial employees. (See table 5.)

Five hundred and twenty-seven thousand and fifty-nine—or nearly one-third of the total reduction in all categories since the war peak—were industrial employees of the Military Establishment employed outside continental United States. Many of these were foreign natives. (See table 5.)

Three hundred and thirty-eight thousand seven hundred and twenty-eight of the civilian reduction in the Military Establishment were industrial employees working inside the United States, in arsenals, Navy yards, and so forth, where continuation of strictly war projects could not be justified after the war ended. (See table 5.)

Although the National Military Establishment reduced civilian industrial employment heavily, civilian agencies actually have increased industrial employment by 2,935 since the war peak.

TREND

Federal civilian employment reached a war peak of 3,749,578, including civilian employment by the agencies of the Military Establishment which totaled 2,630,361 in July 1945. The civilian agency employment at that date totaled 1,119,217.

Employment in Federal agencies outside the Military Establishment rose sharply in the year that followed, and by July 1946 civilian agency employment had risen nearly a quarter of a million, or about 19 percent. (See table 2.)

Fiscal year 1947 (July 1946–July 1947) was the best civilian employment year from the standpoints of both the net number of separations and percentage of decrease exclusive of the Military Establishment. This was the year in which graduated ceiling reductions were in force as a means of compensating for the 1946 pay raises. The net reduction in civilian agency employment was approximately 8 percent, or 104,618, exclusive of the Military Establishment.

In fiscal year 1948—the first year under appropriations voted by a Republican Congress:

Thirty civilian agencies (most of them old line) requested and received more personal service funds for fiscal year 1948 than they received in 1947. (See table 6.)

One agency requested more personal service funds for 1948 than it had in 1947 and received the same amount. (See table 6.)

Six agencies requested more personal service funds for 1948 than they had in 1947 and received less. (See table 6.)

Three agencies requested less personal service funds for 1948 than they had in 1947 and were actually given more. (See table 6.)

One agency requested less personal service funds for 1948 than it had in 1947 and was given the same. (See table 6.)

Fourteen agencies requested less personal service funds for 1948 than they had in 1947 and received less. (See table 6.)

Funds available for personal service in fiscal year 1947 totaled $6,407,239,891.

Funds available for personal service in fiscal year 1948 totaled $5,655,238,259.

Over-all reduction in personal service funds between 1947 and 1948 totals $752,001,632. (See table 7.)

Personal-service funds for 1948 for the Military Establishment and other agencies still clearly overmanned on the basis of war requirements and immediate postwar conditions were reduced by a total of $716,331,120.

These agencies include Office of Defense Transportation, Office of Scientific Research and Development, War Assets Administration;

Maritime Commission, Selective Service System, Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiary activities, and the Veterans' Administration, which had reached the end of the first phase of its postwar program. (See table 7.)

It was natural for these agencies to be reduced by their own postwar weight. With these items omitted, the reduction in personal-service funds which resulted from real efforts for economy in government routine for fiscal year 1948 totals $33,670,512. This reduction amounts to 0.005 percent.

Under appropriations by the current Republican Congress—

Thirty-one civilian agencies requested and were granted authorization for greater average employment in fiscal year 1948 than they had in 1947. This was more than half of the agencies of the Government. (See table 6.)

One agency requested authorization for greater average employment in 1948 than it had in 1947 and got the same. (See table 6.)

Eight agencies requested authorization for greater average employment in 1948 than they had in 1947 and were granted less. (See table 6.)

One agency requested authorization for less employment in 1948 than it had in 1947, and actually was granted more. (See table 6.)

Fourteen agencies requested authorization for less average employment in 1948 than they had in 1947, and were granted less. (See table 6.)

During the first 10 months of the current fiscal year the net reduction in personnel employed in the executive branch of the Government, exclusive of those in the Military Establishment, was 56,406, or less than 5 percent. (See table 1.)

In the executive branch as a whole, civilian personnel reached its low point in December when that total was 1,995,388. In January it rose at the rate of a little more than 200 a day. In February the increase was at the rate of about 400 a day. In March the rate of increase was 500 a day. In April it was increasing at the rate of 650 a day. The increases were in all categories, civilian agencies and military agencies, and in classified and industrial workers. In April the total stood at 2,050,420.

The President requested funds for 1948 employment averaging 2,151,537. Congress voted funds for an average employment of 2,012,163. The average for the year through April is 2,022,695. (See table 7.)

Original budget requests by the President for fiscal year 1949 would provide for employment averaging 2,086,000. While accurate calculation is impossible pending final enactment of all the pending appropriation bills, I venture the prediction that this figure will be increased 10 to 20 percent on the basis of personal-service funds authorized in the various money bills approved in the current session.

OBSERVATIONS

It is obvious to those who have studied the subject that over a long period of years the executive branch of the Government has indicated no inclination to reduce its own personnel, except in strictly emergency positions, or to furnish adequate information so that Congress might accomplish proper reductions without impairment of essential functions.

It is likewise obvious that Congress is reluctant to reduce appropriations for personal service as a means of requiring more efficiency in the administration of essential functions, and deflating the emphasis which is too frequently placed upon luxury functions.

TABLE 1.—*History and trends of Federal civilian personnel, 1913–48*

Agency categories	End of World War I, Nov. 11, 1918	End of Hoover administration, Dec. 31, 1932	Prewar emergency peak, June 30, 1939	War peak, July 30, 1945	GOP responsibility, June 30, 1947	Postwar low, Dec. 31, 1947	Apr. 30, 1948
Departments (except Military Establishment)	(1)	[2] 467,768	553,117	698,418	799,454	754,943	796,173
Independent establishments	(1)		171,373	254,165	397,214	369,997	365,106
Emergency war agencies	(1)			166,634	1,281	722	767
Postwar agencies	(1)				55,266	40,493	34,763
Military Establishment	(1)	96,037	195,286	2,630,361	861,645	829,233	853,611
Totals	917,760	563,805	919,776	3,749,578	2,114,860	1,995,388	2,050,420

[1] Break-down not available.
[2] Including independent establishments.

The table above shows that Federal civilian personnel—

1. Is now more than twice the World War I peak.

2. Is now more than three and one-half times its level at the end of previous Republican administration.

3. Is now more than twice its prewar emergency peak of 1939.

4. Is still more than half the World War II peak.

5. Exclusive of civilian employment by the Military Establishment, is within 56,406 of its level when appropriations voted by present Republican majority became effective July 1, 1947—a reduction of less than 5 percent.

6. Has been increasing since December 1947.

7. In civilian departments and agencies, exclusive of the Military Establishment actually has increased a net of 77,592 since World War II peak.

8. In civilian agencies, and departments, exclusive of Military Establishment is approximately 165 percent of the prewar emergency peak of 1939.

TABLE 2.—*Federal personnel—comparison with war peak; reductions under ceilings and reductions under Republicans (for civilian agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment)*

Department or agency	World War II peak, July 1945	July 1946	July 1947	April 1948	Increase over war peak	Decrease under war peak
Executive departments (exclusive of National Military Eestablishment):						
Agriculture	91,624	102,437	85,093	75,351		16,273
Commerce	35,243	35,227	37,204	40,146	4,903	
Interior	44,857	53,726	51,745	49,776	4,919	
Justice	27,129	24,573	24,798	26,270		859
Labor	6,804	31,580	4,792	4,578		2,226
Post Office	384,249	493,014	474,459	488,059	103,810	
State	11,380	21,184	21,335	21,876	10,496	
Treasury	97,132	104,372	89,587	90,117		7,015
Subtotal, departments	698,418	866,413	785,941	796,173	124,128 +97,755	26,373
Executive Office of the President:						
Bureau of the Budget	591	766	565	612	21	
White House Office	56	203	270	222	166	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	47	79	65	91	44	
National Security Council				18	18	
National Security Resources Board				150	150	
Council of Economic Advisers			59	44	44	
Office of Government Reports			17	18	18	
Subtotal, Executive Office	694	1,048	907	1,155	461 +461	
Emergency war agencies:						
Committee on Fair Employment Practice	124					124
Foreign Economic Administration	6,512					6,512
Institute of Inter-American Affairs	1,292	540				1,292
National War Labor Board	3,711					3,711
Office of Alien Property Custodian	758					758
Office of Censorship	8,907					8,907
Office of Contract Settlement	76					76
Office of Defense Transportation	3,191	99	93	47		3,144
Office of Price Administration	64,818	32,330				64,818

TABLE 2.—*Federal personnel—comparison with war peak; reductions under ceilings and reductions under Republicans (for civilian agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment)*—Continued

Department or agency	World War II peak, July 1945	July 1946	July 1947	April 1948	Increase over war peak	Decrease under war peak
Emergency war agencies—Continued						
Office of Scientific Research and Development	1,362	334	71			1,362
Office of Strategic Services	2,350					2,350
Office of War Information	1,127					9,127
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	294	214				294
Petroleum Administration for War	986					986
Selective Service System	18,598	13,870	867	720		17,878
Smaller War Plants Corporation	1,843					1,843
War Manpower Administration	28,234					28,234
War Production Board	12,002					12,002
War Shipping Administration	5,554	3,340				5,554
Subtotal, emergency war agencies	166,634	52,495	1,027	7	−165,867	165,867
Postwar agencies:						
Civilian Production Administration		3,861				
National Wage Stabilization Board		880				
Economic Cooperation Administration				113	113	
Office of Economic Stabilization						
Office of the Housing Expediter			7,084	4,554	4,554	
Philippine Alien Property Administration			122	159	159	
Philippine War Damage Commission			425	784	784	
Price Decontrol Board						
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission			4,105	4,990	4,990	
War Assets Administration		45,108	41,047	24,103	24,103	
Subtotal, postwar agencies		49,849	52,783	34,763	+34,763	
Independent agencies:						
American Battle Monuments Commission	1	41	97	114	113	
American Commission Protection Monuments in Europe						
Civil Aeronautics Board	343	424	533	598	255	
Civil Service Commission	7,014	4,140	3,434	4,096		2,918
Employees' Compensation Commission	515					515
Export-Import Bank of Washington	62	106	115	118	56	
Federal Communications Commission	1,494	1,337	1,332	1,361		133
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,222	1,176	1,151	1,122		100
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service				300	300	
Federal Power Commission	661	794	769	803	152	
Federal Security Agency	33,418	32,614	33,765	34,660	1,242	
Federal Trade Commission	453	500	590	557	104	
Federal Works Agency	20,459	23,853	23,478	22,302	1,843	
General Accounting Office	14,036	13,809	10,483	9,262		4,774
Government Printing Office	6,957	7,312	7,736	7,223	266	
Indian Claims Commission			11	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,030	2,298	2,271	2,250	220	
Maritime Commission	10,494	10,177	7,984	7,261		3,233
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,706	5,792	5,919	6,204		502
National Archives	348	363	376	344		4
National Capital Housing Authority	221	279	279	288	67	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	14	18	23	6	
National Gallery of Art	270	318	369	319	49	
National Housing Agency (housing and home finance)	15,418	18,249	14,042	11,723		3,695
National Labor Relations Board	807	985	921	1,610	803	
National Mediation Board	98	103	101	115	17	
Panama Canal	31,391	28,274	24,987	24,225		7,166
Railroad Retirement Board	1,784	1,928	2,704	2,755	971	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	13,191	12,172	7,622	5,634		7,557
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,151	1,193	1,162	1,111		40
Smithsonian Institution	406	501	521	509	103	
Tariff Commission	296	227	272	221		75
Tax Court of the United States	118	123	125	126	8	
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,349	11,306	14,716	14,697	2,348	
Veterans' Administration	68,751	181,094	217,872	201,910	132,159	
Subtotal, independent agencies	253,471	361,202	285,671	363,951	141,162 +110,480	30,682
Total, exclusive National Military Establishment	1,119,217	1,331,007	1,226,389	1,196,809	300,514 +77,592	222,922
National Military Establishment:						
Office of Secretary of Defense				827	827	
Department of the Army:						
Inside continental United States	1,135,450	615,572	349,929	381,075		757,375
Outside continental United States	733,792	262,802	147,160	130,780		603,012
Department of the Air Force				(117,205)		
Department of the Navy:						
Inside continental United States	698,190	398,010	303,505	297,102		401,088
Outside continental United States	59,929	72,520	49,589	43,827		16,102
Subtotal, National Military Establishment	2,630,361	1,348,904	850,173	853,611	827 −1,776,750	1,777,577
Grand total	3,749,578	2,679,911	2,076,562	2,050,420	301,341 −1,699,158	2,000,499

The table above shows:

1. Civilian employment in the executive branch, exclusive of the National Military Establishment, during April 1948 was 77,592 higher than the war peak—an increase of more than 6 percent not including deductions for temporary agencies which have expired such as OPA, WPB, War Manpower Board, OWI, Censorship, etc. There are 88 agencies with personnel greater than the war peak, and 86 agencies with less.

2. Among the 8 regular departments of Cabinet level, excluding those in the Military Establishment, 4 are employing a combined total of 124,128 persons more than they were the war peak. The other 4 recorded a combined net decrease of 26,373. The net increase for these departments was 14 percent over the war peak.

3. Employment in the Executive Offices of the President, including the mansion and grounds, in April was 66 percent greater than at the war peak.

4. The 86 agencies, exclusive of the Military Establishment, with net reductions since the war peak included 19 of the so-called war emergency agencies. All of these, except the Selective Service System, the Office of Defense Transportation have expired. The net reduction by the 86 agencies totaled 222,922. More than 78 percent of the total net reduction was accounted for by the demise of war emergency agencies. Net reduction in all other civilian agencies totaled only 87,088.

5. As a partial offset to the 165,867 reduction resulting from the expiration and curtailment of 19 war emergency agencies, there was 34,763 in new employment for 10 so-called postwar agencies.

6. The net increase in 34 regular independent agencies over the war peak totaled

110,480, or 43 percent. Of course, the Veterans' Administration expansion accounted for a large part of the increase but, even so, increases were reported by 21 agencies whereas agencies with net decreases numbered 13.

7. The civilian employment total for agencies outside the Military Establishment rose sharply above the war peak during the first postwar year. By July 1946 the net increase totaled nearly a quarter of a million, or about 19 percent.

8. Fiscal year 1947 (July 1946–July 1947) was the best civilian employment reduction year from the standpoints of both the net number of separations and percentage, exclusive of the Military Establishment. This was the year in which the graduated personnel ceiling reductions were in force as a means of compensating for the 1946 pay raises. The net reduction in civilian agency employment was approximately 8 percent, or 104,618.

TABLE 3.—*Changes in Federal personnel (civilian), between World War II peak and Apr. 30, 1948*

Date	Executive departments exclusive of National Military Establishment	Emergency war agencies	Postwar agencies	Independent agencies			National Military Establishment			Total	Total, exclusive of National Military Establishment
				Exclusive of Veterans' Administration	Veterans' Administration	Total	Classified	Industrial	Total		
War peak	668,418	166,634	----------	184,414	69,751	254,165	1,221,927	1,408,434	2,630,361	3,749,578	1,119,217
April 1948	790,173	767	34,763	163,196	201,910	365,106	310,964	542,647	853,611	2,050,420	1,196,809
Net increase or decrease	+97,755	−165,867	+24,763	−21,218	+132,159	+110,941	−910,963	−865,787	−1,776,750	−1,699,158	+77,592

It may be noted from the table above that—

1. Employment in the eight executive departments, exclusive of the military departments, increased 14 percent. (Post Office Department increases should be noted.)

2. If employment in the new postwar agencies is added to that of other independent agencies, exclusive of Veterans' Administration, there is a 7-percent increase.

3. Reduction in emergency war agencies employment—which by no stretch of the imagination could be further justified—more than offsets the increase in the Veterans' Administration.

TABLE 4.—*Civilian and military personnel of the National Military Establishment, June 1945 to February 1948*

Month	Department of the Army[1]				Department of the Air Force[2]				Department of the Navy				Secretary of Defense		Total, National Military Establishment			
	Civilian employees	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Military personnel	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Civilian employees	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Military personnel	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Civilian employees	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Military personnel	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Civilian employees	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Civilian employees	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Military personnel	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
1945																		
July	1,872,242	----------	8,266,373	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	758,119	----------	4,028,718	----------	----------	----------	2,630,361	----------	12,295,091	----------
Aug	1,810,971	−61,271	8,186,444	−79,929	----------	----------	----------	----------	721,342	−36,777	4,058,817	+30,099	----------	----------	2,532,313	−98,048	12,245,261	−49,830
Sept	1,621,792	−189,179	8,023,304	−163,140	----------	----------	----------	----------	649,425	−71,917	4,058,908	+91	----------	----------	2,271,217	−261,096	12,082,212	−163,049
Oct	1,556,728	−65,064	7,564,514	−458,790	----------	----------	----------	----------	591,538	−44,527	3,955,018	−103,890	----------	----------	2,161,126	−110,091	11,519,532	−562,980
Nov	1,468,505	−65,723	6,487,059	−1,077,461	----------	----------	----------	----------	551,538	−13,360	3,663,900	−351,118	----------	----------	2,082,043	−79,083	10,050,953	−1,428,579
Dec	1,226,901	−263,601	5,333,978	−1,153,075	----------	----------	----------	----------	587,636	−3,902	3,241,607	−362,293	----------	----------	1,814,540	−267,503	8,575,585	−1,515,368
1946																		
Jan	1,158,944	−69,960	4,228,936	−1,105,042	----------	----------	----------	----------	586,994	−642	2,819,048	−422,559	----------	----------	1,743,938	−70,602	7,047,984	−1,527,601
Feb	1,114,211	−42,733	3,469,272	−759,664	----------	----------	----------	----------	592,556	+5,562	2,486,751	−332,297	----------	----------	1,707,067	−36,871	5,956,023	−1,091,961
Mar	1,073,804	−40,347	2,785,748	−683,524	----------	----------	----------	----------	561,501	−31,355	2,180,406	−306,345	----------	----------	1,635,365	−71,702	4,966,154	−989,869
Apr	1,064,018	−9,846	2,430,779	−354,969	----------	----------	----------	----------	543,854	−17,647	1,915,614	−264,792	----------	----------	1,607,872	−27,493	4,346,393	−619,761
May	1,006,240	−63,778	2,167,931	−262,848	----------	----------	----------	----------	529,664	−14,190	1,690,209	−225,405	----------	----------	1,529,904	−77,968	3,858,140	−488,253
June	927,075	−73,165	2,008,494	−159,437	----------	----------	----------	----------	490,239	−39,425	1,437,231	−252,978	----------	----------	1,417,314	−112,590	3,443,725	−412,415
July	873,374	−48,701	1,890,023	−118,471	----------	----------	----------	----------	470,530	−19,709	1,159,907	−277,324	----------	----------	1,343,904	−68,410	3,049,930	−395,795
Aug	809,829	−77,546	1,815,356	−74,667	----------	----------	----------	----------	419,280	−51,250	930,000	−229,907	----------	----------	1,229,108	−128,796	2,745,356	−304,574
Sept	736,825	−64,003	1,731,040	−84,316	----------	----------	----------	----------	394,740	−24,540	743,166	−186,834	----------	----------	1,131,565	−88,543	2,474,206	−271,150
Oct	699,841	−36,984	1,737,701	+6,661	----------	----------	----------	----------	384,356	−10,404	739,513	−3,653	----------	----------	1,084,177	−47,388	2,477,214	+3,008
Nov	653,190	−46,651	1,717,432	−20,269	----------	----------	----------	----------	380,480	−3,456	723,904	−15,609	----------	----------	1,034,070	−50,107	2,441,336	−35,878
Dec	623,194	−29,996	1,511,202	−206,170	----------	----------	----------	----------	377,353	−3,497	692,308	−31,596	----------	----------	1,000,577	−27,493	2,203,570	−237,766
1947																		
Jan	608,601	−20,593	1,319,483	−191,779	----------	----------	----------	----------	376,454	−929	660,174	−32,134	----------	----------	985,055	−21,522	1,979,657	−223,919
Feb	602,548	−6,053	1,253,619	−65,864	----------	----------	----------	----------	373,922	−2,531	646,268	−13,906	----------	----------	976,471	−8,584	1,899,887	−79,770
Mar	574,923	−27,625	1,199,456	−54,163	----------	----------	----------	----------	372,124	−1,799	636,855	−9,413	----------	----------	947,047	−29,424	1,836,311	−63,576
Apr	562,134	−12,789	1,147,948	−51,508	----------	----------	----------	----------	370,317	−1,807	629,024	−7,831	----------	----------	932,451	−14,616	1,776,972	−59,339
May	547,164	−14,970	1,081,492	−66,456	----------	----------	----------	----------	366,061	−4,256	621,614	−7,410	----------	----------	913,225	−19,206	1,703,106	−73,866
June	542,213	−4,951	1,023,819	−57,673	----------	----------	----------	----------	358,432	−7,629	610,967	−10,647	----------	----------	901,645	−11,580	1,631,786	−71,320
July	497,079	−6,134	988,664	−31,155	----------	----------	----------	----------	353,094	−5,338	601,871	−9,096	----------	----------	850,173	−11,472	1,591,535	−40,251
Aug	492,302	−4,777	972,569	−17,095	----------	----------	----------	----------	340,148	−3,946	602,727	+856	----------	----------	841,450	−8,723	1,575,296	−16,239
Sept	495,227	+2,925	955,668	−16,871	----------	----------	----------	----------	341,815	−7,333	601,698	−1,029	----------	----------	837,042	−4,408	1,557,366	−17,900
Oct	500,711	+5,484	946,582	−15,116	110,305	----------	329,523	----------	340,159	−1,656	602,549	+851	435	----------	841,303	+4,261	1,543,131	−14,235
Nov	491,413	−9,298	920,044	−20,538	111,229	+924	335,671	+6,148	339,219	−940	570,431	−32,118	455	+22	831,087	−10,216	1,491,475	−52,656
Dec	489,329	−2,084	911,537	−8,507	111,700	+471	339,246	+3,575	339,268	+49	540,921	−29,510	636	+181	829,233	−1,854	1,452,458	−38,017
1948																		
Jan	494,162	+4,833	898,472	−13,065	112,777	+1,077	353,143	+13,897	339,620	+352	513,687	−27,234	594	−42	834,376	+5,143	1,412,159	−40,299
Feb	493,584	+1,722	905,286	+6,821	113,680	+903	365,186	+12,043	340,131	+511	504,015	−9,672	675	+81	826,690	+2,314	1,409,308	−2,851
Mar	505,287	+9,403	909,453	+4,200	115,331	+1,651	368,348	+3,162	339,967	−224	500,353	−3,662	751	+76	845,945	+9,255	1,409,846	+538
Apr	511,535	+6,568	906,237	−3,261	117,305	+1,974	375,299	+6,951	340,929	+1,022	497,893	−2,460	827	+76	853,611	+7,666	1,404,125	−5,721
Net increase or decrease	----------	−1,360,287	----------	−7,360,141	----------	[1](+7,000)	----------	[1](+45,770)	----------	−417,190	----------	−3,530,823	----------	+807	----------	−1,776,750	----------	−10,890,966

[1] Includes Air Forces.

[2] The Air Forces were divorced from the War Department as of September 1947 pursuant to the Unification Act, Public Law 253, Eightieth Congress. Air Force civilian personnel outside United States is still included in the Army civilian personnel reports. The Air Force figures set forth above are included in those for the Department of the Army for purposes of comparison between June 1945 and February 1948. Therefore, it should be noted that the civilian and military personnel figures for the Air Forces are compiled for current information.

NOTE.—Of the total decrease in the civilian employment of the Department of the Army and Department of the Air Force combined, 659,754 were industrial employees and 700,485 were classified employees.

NOTE.—Of the total decrease in the civilian employment of the Department of the Navy, 206,633 were industrial employees and 211,157 were classified employees.

NOTE.—Of the total decrease in the civilian employment of the National Military Establishment, 865,787 were industrial employees and 910,963 were classified employees.

Sources: Civilian-employment figures, monthly personnel reports to Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures; military personnel figures, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and Department of Air Force Statistics Division.

The table above shows that—

1. Between July 1945—the war peak month—and April 1948 net reduction in civilian personnel employed by agencies of the National Military Establishment was 77,592 greater than the net reduction in the executive branch of the Government as a whole.

From the table above it may be seen that civilian employment in the Military Establishment was reduced from 2,630,361 in July 1945 to 853,611 in April 1948—a net total reduction of 1,776,750.

From table 2 it may be seen that civilian employment in the executive branch as a whole, including the Military Establishment, was reduced from 3,749,578 in July 1945 to 2,050,420 in April 1948—a net total reduction of 1,699,158.

This, of course, means that there was a net increase during the period in civilian agency employment of 77,592.

2. Of the total net civilian reduction in the Military Establishment (1,776,750) nearly half, or 865,787 were industrial workers. And, more than half of these—527,059—were industrial workers employed outside of continental United States, a great many of whom were native laborers; 910,963 of the total net reduction were among other categories of employees, including those of the classified civil service.

The War and Navy Departments were forced down to a total of 276,000 classified employees during the fiscal year 1947 under the graduated personnel ceiling provisions, but civilian employment in all categories of personnel began a steady climb in January this year. This was despite unification, and prior to any suggestion of the new military expansion program.

3. The National Military Establishment in April was employing nearly three times as many civilians per man in uniform as it employed at the war peak, and this was true before the pending military expansion program was proposed. In April there was a civilian employee for every 1.7 men in uniform. At the peak of the war effort there was a civilian employee for every 4.7 men in uniform. Since the postwar low point in December 1947 civilian employment in the National Military Establishment has increased 24,738, while the military personnel declined 48,333.

TABLE 5.—*Federal civilian industrial employees*

Date	Civilian departments and agencies inside and outside of United States	Military Establishment			Combined total		
		Inside United States	Outside United States	Total, Military Establishment	Inside United States	Outside United States	Grand total
November 1945	18,860	749,203	659,231	1,408,434	768,063	659,231	1,427,294
June 1946	20,539	601,235	338,208	939,443	621,774	338,208	959,982
June 1947	23,194	204,888	158,515	363,403	418,082	158,515	576,597
April 1948	21,795	410,475	132,172	542,647	432,270	132,172	564,442
Total increase or decrease	+2,935	−338,728	−527,059	−865,787	−335,793	−527,059	−862,852

No records are available on civilian industrial employment prior to November 1945, but from trends in total employment it may be readily assumed that industrial employment in the war peak month of July 1945 was equal to, if not greater than, the number recorded above for November 1945.

The over-all World War II employment peak in July 1945 totaled 3,749,578. The net reduction from this peak through April 1948 totals 1,699,158.

Using the November 1945 industrial employment figure as the peak in this category, the table above shows:

1. Eight hundred and sixty-two thousand eight hundred and fifty-two of the separated personnel—or more than half—were so-called industrial employees.

2. Five hundred and twenty-seven thousand and fifty-nine—or nearly one-third of the reduction—were industrial employees of the Military Establishment employed outside continental United States. Many of these were foreign natives.

3. Three hundred and thirty-eight thousand seven hundred and twenty-eight were employees outside the classified service working in military establishments within the United States, such as navy yards, arsenals, etc., where it was impossible to justify continuation after the cancellation of war orders.

4. Industrial employees hired by the civilian departments and agencies actually have increased by 2,935 since the war peak pay roll. The majority of these employees work inside continental United States.

TABLE 6.—*Break-down of personal service funds and personnel available under appropriations for fiscal year 1948, compared with funds and services available in fiscal year 1947, and funds and services requested in the President's budget for 1948, showing individual increases and decreases for each department and agency*[1]

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED AND RECEIVED MORE PERSONAL SERVICE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN WERE AVAILABLE TO THEM IN 1947 (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1948 AND AMOUNT REQUESTED IN THE 1948 BUDGET)

Department or agency	Amount available in 1947	Amount requested in budget for 1948	Amount available in 1948	Comparison of amount available for 1948 with 1947		Comparison of amount available for 1948 with amount in budget for 1948	
				Decrease under 1947	Increase over 1947	Decrease under budget	Increase over budget
1. Commerce Department	$111,707,430.00	$143,672,870	$126,634,550	----------	$14,927,120.00	$17,038,320	----------
2. Interior Department	138,615,435.00	160,772,965	139,382,513	----------	767,078.00	21,390,452	----------
3. Justice Department	82,230,762.00	84,032,761	94,760,395	----------	12,556,633.00	----------	$10,760,634
4. Post Office Department	1,200,983,983.00	1,274,047,227	1,209,029,052	----------	8,045,069.00	65,018,175	----------
5. Council Economic Advisers	218,162.00	318,000	292,000	----------	73,838.00	26,000	----------
6. Housing Expediter	[2]8,454,000.00	27,840,520	19,588,062	----------	11,131,062.00	8,255,748	----------
7. Atomic Energy Commission	[2]6,487,062.50	22,543,000	19,000,000	----------	12,512,937.50	3,543,000	----------
8. Philippine Alien Property Administrator	[2]169,027.00	297,000	19,297,000	----------	127,973.00	----------	----------
9. American Battle Monuments	104,255.00	107,589	107,589	----------	3,334.00	----------	----------
10. Bureau of the Budget	3,051,883.00	3,190,406	3,076,308	----------	24,425.00	74,098	----------
11. Civil Aeronautics Board	2,098,784.00	2,729,519	2,650,000	----------	463,216.00	179,519	----------
12. Civil Service Commission	11,820,646.00	24,565,908	13,678,218	----------	1,857,572.00	10,887,690	----------
13. Export-Import Bank	650,300.00	719,700	658,540	----------	8,040.00	61,160	----------
14. Federal Communications Commission	5,415,366.00	6,205,000	5,556,481	----------	141,115.00	648,519	----------
15. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	4,284,920.00	4,621,067	4,440,707	----------	155,877.00	180,210	----------
16. Federal Power Commission	3,283,610.00	3,728,528	3,451,471	----------	167,861.00	277,057	----------
17. Federal Security Agency	94,864,385.00	109,704,241	105,448,424	----------	10,584,039.00	4,255,817	----------
18. Federal Trade Commission	2,673,760.00	3,629,534	2,712,400	----------	38,640.00	917,134	----------
19. Indian Claims Commission	14,374.00	104,829	104,829	----------	90,455.00	----------	----------
20. Interstate Commerce Commission	9,324,314.00	10,438,375	9,532,534	----------	208,220.00	905,841	----------
21. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	18,623,305.00	20,787,000	20,597,000	----------	1,973,695.00	190,000	----------
22. National Capital Housing Authority	793,957.00	837,172	837,172	----------	43,215.00	----------	----------
23. National Capital Park and Planning Commission	87,141.00	115,199	110,081	----------	22,940.00	5,118	----------
24. National Gallery of Art	771,591.00	833,600	823,026	----------	51,435.00	10,574	----------
25. National Labor Relations Board	3,468,030.00	6,157,000	3,750,000	----------	347,000.00	2,407,000	----------
26. Philippine War Damage Commission	590,580.00	2,548,563	1,778,599	----------	1,188,019.00	769,964	----------
27. Railroad Retirement Board	6,916,700.00	8,579,620	8,579,620	----------	1,662,920.00	----------	----------
28. Securities and Exchange Commission	5,044,569.00	5,896,300	5,196,000	----------	151,431.00	700,300	----------
29. Smithsonian Institution	1,537,461.00	1,775,485	1,651,861	----------	114,400.00	123,624	----------
30. Tax Court of United States	646,428.00	686,944	686,944	----------	40,516.00	----------	----------

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED MORE PERSONAL SERVICE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN WERE AVAILABLE IN 1947 BUT RECEIVED THE SAME AS IN 1947 (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1948 AND AMOUNT REQUESTED IN 1948 BUDGET)

1. National Mediation Board	$426,726	$437,626	$426,726	----------	----------	$11,[illegible]	----------

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—*Break-down of personal service funds and personnel available under appropriations for fiscal year 1948, compared with funds and services available in fiscal year 1947, and funds and services requested in the President's budget for 1948, showing individual increases and decreases for each department and agency* [1]—Continued

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED MORE PERSONAL SERVICE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN WERE AVAILABLE IN 1947 AND RECEIVED LESS (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1948 AND AMOUNT REQUESTED IN 1948 BUDGET)

Department or agency	Amount available in 1947	Amount requested in budget for 1948	Amount available in 1948	Comparison of amount available for 1948 with 1947		Comparison of amount available for 1948 with amount in budget for 1948	
				Decrease under 1947	Increase over 1947	Decrease under budget	Increase over budget
1. State Department	$93,599,877	$73,481,844	$60,742,133	$2,857,744		$12,739,711	
2. Treasury Department	305,923,535	307,601,863	277,631,359	28,292,176		29,970,504	
3. Office of Government Reports	469,500	513,475	215,500	254,000		297,975	
4. National Archives	1,200,145	1,540,830	1,183,335	23,810		355,495	
5. Panama Canal	41,210,013	44,569,708	41,197,275	12,738		3,359,433	
6. Tariff Commission	1,114,653	1,299,666	1,098,349	16,304		161,317	

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED LESS PERSONAL SERVICE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN WERE AVAILABLE IN 1947 AND RECEIVED MORE (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR 1948 AND AMOUNT REQUESTED IN 1948 BUDGET)

1. Federal Works Agency	$64,362,500	$60,281,479	$64,624,546		$262,046		$4,343,067
2. Tennessee Valley Authority	38,886,103	38,837,458	43,718,147		4,832,044		4,880,689
3. White House Office	1,093,433	999,765	1,187,373		117,940		217,608

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED LESS PERSONAL SERVICE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN WERE AVAILABLE IN 1947 AND RECEIVED THE SAME AMOUNT (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR 1948 AND AMOUNT REQUESTED IN 1948 BUDGET)

1. Government Printing Office	$23,937,562	$23,818,283	$23,937,562				$119,279

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED AND RECEIVED LESS PERSONAL SERVICE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN WERE AVAILABLE TO THEM IN 1947 (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR 1948 AND AMOUNT REQUESTED IN 1948 BUDGET)

1. Agriculture Department	$237,422,679	$233,041,979	$209,023,700	$31,398,979		$27,018,279	
2. Army Department	1,695,586,499	1,488,548,042	1,383,326,462	312,260,037		105,221,580	
3. Labor Department	59,074,245	26,631,654	16,218,812	42,855,433		10,412,842	
4. Navy Department	1,204,423,265	1,037,871,138	931,422,188	273,001,077		106,448,950	
5. Executive Mansion and Grounds	163,628	151,830	151,830	11,798			
6. Office of Defense Transportation	332,098	287,029	198,916	133,182		88,113	
7. Office of Scientific Research and Development	568,857	77,400	88,400	480,457			$11,000
8. Office of Selective Service Records	7,192,675	3,797,430	3,107,420	4,085,255		690,010	
9. War Assets Administration	187,003,412	102,498,800	108,006,900	78,996,512			5,508,100
10. General Accounting Office	38,019,000	35,075,000	34,500,000	3,519,000		575,000	
11. Housing and Home Finance	42,332,238	39,050,055	31,724,189	10,608,049		7,325,866	
12. Maritime Commission	41,607,369	33,368,210	24,833,350	16,774,019		8,534,860	
13. Reconstruction Finance Corporation	38,624,000	37,809,000	30,537,000	8,087,000		7,272,000	
14. Veterans' Administration	587,819,059	578,940,796	563,302,478	24,516,581		15,638,318	

NEW AGENCIES CREATED BY CONGRESS SUBSEQUENT TO ISSUANCE OF PRESIDENT'S 1948 BUDGET

1. Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service			$1,001,503		$1,001,503		$1,001,503
2. National Security Council			84,320		84,320		84,320
3. National Security Resources Board			405,000		405,000		405,000
4. Office of Secretary of Defense			[3] (3,676,000)		[3] (3,676,000)		[3] (3,676,000)
Total	$6,407,299,891.50	$6,101,933,932	$5,655,238,259	$838,184,561	$86,182,928.50	$474,026,873	$27,331,200
Net decreases				$752,001,632.50		$446,695,673	

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED GREATER AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN IN 1947 AND MAY EMPLOY GREATER AVERAGE (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT IN 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT POSSIBLE IN 1948 AND AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT CONTEMPLATED IN 1948 BUDGET)

Department or agency	Average number in 1947	Average number requested in 1948 budget	Average number possible in 1948	Comparison of number possible in 1948 and number in fiscal year 1947		Comparison of number possible in 1948 and number contemplated in 1948 budget	
				Decrease under 1947	Increase over 1947	Decrease under budget	Increase over budget
1. Commerce Department	30,488	38,309	33,573		3,085	4,736	
2. Justice Department	22,320	23,476	26,681		3,861		3,205
3. Post Office Department	438,718.8	464,107.7	439,943.7		1,224.9	24,164	
4. Selective Service Records	851	1,309	984		133	325	
5. Council Economic Advisers	29.75	49	45.72		15.97	3.28	
6. Office Housing Expediter	[2] 2,221	6,522	3,572		1,651	2,950	
7. Philippine Alien Property Administrator	[3] 33.5	154	148		112.5	6	

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—*Break-down of personal service funds and personnel available under appropriations for fiscal year 1948, compared with funds and services available in fiscal year 1947, and funds and services requested in the President's budget for 1948, showing individual increases and decreases for each department and agency* [1]—Continued

Department or agency	Average number in 1947	Average number requested in 1948 budget	Average number possible in 1948	Comparison of number possible in 1948 and number in fiscal year 1947		Comparison of number possible in 1948 and number contemplated in 1948 budget	
				Decrease under 1947	Increase over 1947	Decrease under budget	Increase over budget
8. U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	[4] 2,083	8,195	5,300		3,217	2,895	
9. Bureau of the Budget	590	610	595		5	15	
10. Civil Aeronautics Board	481.2	668.8	589.3		108.1	79.5	
11. Civil Service Commission	3,600.5	7,838.8	4,263.1		662.6	3,563.7	
12. Export-Import Bank	114.4	135.7	124.8		10.4	10.9	
13. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	949.1	1,202.9	1,157.9		208.8	45	
14. Federal Power Commission	780.2	944	828.3		42.1	115.7	
15. Federal Security Agency	33,519	37,870	35,645		2,126	2,225	
16. Federal Trade Commission	567	915	577		10	338	
17. Government Printing Office	7,962	8,090.5	8,008.4		46.4	82.1	
18. Indian Claims Commission	2.5	18	18		15.5		
19. Interstate Commerce Commission	2,298.8	2,628.4	2,338.4		39.6	290	
20. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,992.7	6,358.2	6,171.5		178.8	183.7	
21. National Capital Housing Authority	283.7	309	309		25.3		
22. National Capital Park and Planning Commission	15.99	26.61	24.1		8.11	2.51	
23. National Gallery of Art	306.8	320	318		9.2	2	
24. National Labor Relations Board	818.9	1,580	900		81.1	680	
25. Philippine War Damage Commission	161	733	532		371	201	
26. Railroad Retirement Board	2,908.2	3,124.2	3,124.2		719		
27. Securities and Exchange Commission	1,186.9	1,425.2	1,160.3		12.4	223.9	
28. Smithsonian Institution	526.4	581	540.4		14	40.6	
29. Tax Court of United States	122.2	131.7	131.7		9.5		
30. Tennessee Valley Authority	12,684	13,879	15,055		2,371		1,176
31. Veterans' Administration	205,518	213,965	207,891		2,376	6,074	

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED GREATER AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN IN 1947 AND MAY EMPLOY THE SAME AVERAGE NUMBER (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT IN 1948 AND 1947 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT POSSIBLE IN 1948 AND AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT CONTEMPLATED IN 1948 BUDGET)

1. National Mediation Board	94	96	96			2	

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED GREATER AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN IN 1947 AND MAY EMPLOY A SMALLER AVERAGE NUMBER (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT IN 1948 AND 1947 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT POSSIBLE IN 1948 AND AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT CONTEMPLATED IN 1948 BUDGET)

1. Interior Department	46,943.8	53,525.5	45,836.2	1,107.6		7,689.3	
2. State Department	20,500.6	22,519.8	19,213.8	1,286.8		3,306.0	
3. Treasury Department	99,398.2	99,509.8	88,565.8	10,832.7		11,004.3	
4. American Battle Monuments	60.8	100.9	64.4	26.4		36.5	
5. Federal Communications	1,387.2	1,623.3	1,377.1	10.1		246.2	
6. National Archives	364.9	451.0	350.0	14.9		101.0	
7. Panama Canal	26,624.0	30,298.0	26,354.0	270.0		3,944.0	
8. Tariff Commission	227.9	274.0	226.0	1.9		48.0	

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED LESS AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN THEY HAD IN 1947 AND MAY EMPLOY A GREATER AVERAGE (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT IN 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT POSSIBLE IN 1948 AND AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT CONTEMPLATED IN 1948 BUDGET)

1. White House Office	263.3	227	269.1		5.8		42.1

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED LESS AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN IN 1947 AND MAY EMPLOY THE SAME AVERAGE NUMBER (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT IN 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT POSSIBLE IN 1948 AND AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT CONTEMPLATED IN 1948 BUDGET)

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED LESS AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN IN 1947 AND WHICH MUST EMPLOY A SMALLER AVERAGE (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT IN 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT POSSIBLE IN 1948 AND AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT CONTEMPLATED IN 1948 BUDGET)

1. Agriculture Department	76,002.7	71,743.1	63,412.4	12,590.3		8,330.7	
2. Army Department	679,801	582,202.9	530,059.8	140,741.2		13,143.1	
3. Labor Department	20,894	7,326	4,215	16,679		3,111	
4. Navy Department	381,600	371,330	333,940	47,660		37,390	
5. Executive Mansion and Grounds	61.4	60	60.5	.9			0.5
6. Office of Defense Transportation	67.4	65.2	42.8	24.6		22.4	
7. Office of Scientific Research and Development	172	14	17	155			3
8. Office of Government Reports	155	153	20	135		133	
9. War Assets Administration	52,173.55	29,327.1	29,531.75	22,641.8			204.65
10. Federal Works Agency	24,573.9	29,427	24,010.1	563.8			583.1
11. General Accounting Office	11,914.4	11,036.2	10,416.8	1,497.6		619.4	
12. Housing and Home Finance	11,683.7	10,674.6	8,880.7	3,105		2,693.9	
13. Maritime Commission	12,538	10,893	7,917	4,621		2,976	
14. Reconstruction Finance Corporation	9,426	9,166	7,403	2,023		1,763	

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—*Break-down of personal service funds and personnel available under appropriations for fiscal year 1948, compared with funds and services available in fiscal year 1947, and funds and services requested in the President's budget for 1948, showing individual increases and decreases for each department and agency* [1]—Continued

NEW AGENCIES CREATED BY CONGRESS SUBSEQUENT TO ISSUANCE OF PRESIDENT'S 1948 BUDGET

Department or agency	Average number in 1947	Average number requested in 1948 budget	Average number possible in 1948	Comparison of number possible in 1948 and number in fiscal year 1947		Comparison of number possible in 1948 and number contemplated in 1948 budget	
				Decrease under 1947	Increase over 1947	Decrease under budget	Increase over budget
1. Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service			200		200		200
2. National Security Council			14.8		14.8		14.8
3. National Security Resources Board			81		81		81
4. Office of Secretary of Defense			[2] (640.2)		[2] (640.2)		[2] (640.2)
Total	2,254,800.29	2,151,537.11	2,012,163.57	265,990.6	23,353.88	144,883.69	5,510.15
Net decreases				242,636.72		139,373.54	

[1] Agencies which received personal service funds and were authorized to employ personnel during fiscal year 1947, but which went out of existence during the course of the year, either by act of Congress or by Executive order or by transfer to another agency:

Alien Property Administration:
Personal service funds $588,900
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 196.3
Transferred to Justice Department, Sept. 30, 1946.
Inter-American Affairs:
Personal service funds $399,750
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 133.25
Transferred to State Department, Sept. 30, 1946.
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion:
Personal service funds $392,700
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 130.9
Liquidated Apr. 30, 1947.
War Shipping Administration:
Personal service funds $536,100
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 178.7
Transferred to Maritime Commission, July 31, 1946, pursuant to Public Law 492 (79th Cong.).
Civilian Production Administration:
Personal service funds $9,314,100
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 3,104.7
Liquidated Apr. 30, 1947.
Wage Stabilization Board:
Personal service funds $399,750
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 133.25
Liquidated pursuant to Executive order, Feb. 23, 1947.
Office of Price Administration:
Personal service funds $58,830,600
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 19,610.2
Liquidated May 1947.
Price Decontrol Board:
Personal service funds $30,900
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 10.3
Liquidated July 1947.
Established August 1946.

Agencies created during the course of fiscal year 1947, and the first months of fiscal year 1948, which may be classified as new agencies (they follow in order of their inception):
Council of Economic Advisers: August 1946.
Philippine Alien Property Administration: December 1946.
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission: December 1946.
Office of Government Reports: January 1947.
Office of Housing Expediter: January 1947.
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: August 22, 1947 Public Law 101 (80th Cong. 1st sess.)
Office of Secretary of National Defense: Public Law 253 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) creating the National Military Establishment.
National Security Resources Board; Public Law 253 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) creating the National Military Establishment.
National Security Council; Public Law 253 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) creating the National Military Establishment.

[1] Agencies which were created in January 1947 and received funds and employed people for half of the fiscal year 1947. The figures for personnel are on a man-year basis.

[2] Personal service funds and personnel for the Office of the Secretary of Defense come from the funds and personnel of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Navy, and are included in the figures reported herein for those Departments. The figures are listed separately and in parentheses above for purposes of information only.

The tables above show that—

1. Thirty civilian agencies (most of them old line) requested and received more personal service funds for fiscal year 1948 (under Republican appropriations) than they received for 1947.

2. Thirty-one civilian agencies requested and were granted authorization for greater average employment in fiscal year 1948 (under Republican appropriations) than they had in 1947.

3. One agency requested more personal service funds for 1948 than it had in 1947 and got the same.

4. One agency requested authorization for greater average employment in 1948 than it had in 1947 and got the same.

5. Six agencies requested more personal service funds for 1948 than they had in 1947 and received less.

6. Eight agencies requested authorization for greater average employment in 1948 than they had in 1947, and were granted less.

7. Three agencies requested less personal service funds for 1948 than they had in 1947, and actually were given more.

8. One agency requested authorization for less employment in 1948 than it had in 1947, and was granted more.

9. One agency requested less personal service funds for 1948 than it had in 1947 and was given the same.

10. Fourteen agencies requested less personal service funds for 1948 and received less.

11. Fourteen agencies requested authorization for less average employment in 1948 than they had in 1947, and were granted less.

TABLE 7.—*Consolidated table of personal service funds and personnel available under appropriations for fiscal year 1948 (compared with funds and services available in fiscal year 1947, and funds and services requested in the President's budget for 1948* [1])

	1947 and 1948 Federal funds for personal service			1947 and 1948 average Federal employment		
	Appropriated and available for fiscal year 1947	Requested in budget for 1948	Appropriated and available for fiscal year 1948	In fiscal year 1947	Contemplated in budget requests for 1948	Possible under personal service funds available for fiscal year 1948
Executive departments (exclusive of National Military Establishment):						
Agriculture Department	$237,422,679.00	$233,041,979	$206,023,709	76,092.7	71,743.1	63,412.4
Commerce Department	111,707,490.00	143,672,870	126,634,550	30,488	38,309	33,573
Interior Department	138,615,435.00	160,772,965	139,382,513	46,943.8	50,525.5	45,836.2
Justice Department	82,226,762.00	84,032,761	94,793,395	22,820	23,476	26,681
Labor Department	59,674,245.00	26,631,674	16,218,812	20,894	7,326	4,213
Post Office Department	1,200,983,983.00	1,274,047,227	1,206,029,032	438,718.8	464,107.7	439,943.7
State Department	63,569,577.00	73,481,844	60,742,133	20,500.6	22,519.8	19,218.8
Treasury Department	305,923,535.00	307,601,863	277,631,359	99,398.2	99,569.8	88,365.5
Executive Office of the President:						
Bureau of the Budget	3,051,883.00	3,150,466	3,076,398	590	610	595
White House Office	1,069,433.00	969,765	1,187,373	263.3	227	269.1
Executive Mansion and Grounds	163,628.00	151,830	151,820	61.4	60	60.5
National Security Council			84,320			14.8
National Security Resources Board			405,660			81
Council of Economic Advisers	218,162.00	318,660	292,660	29.75	49	45.7
Office of Government Reports	469,900.00	513,475	215,500	155	153	20

Footnote at end of table.

TABLE 7.—*Consolidated table of personal service funds and personnel available under appropriations for fiscal year 1948, compared with funds and services available in fiscal year 1947, and funds and services requested in the President's budget for 1948* [1]—Continued

	1947 and 1948 Federal funds for personal service			1947 and 1948 average Federal employment		
	Appropriated and available for fiscal year 1947	Requested in Budget for 1948	Appropriated and available for fiscal year 1948	In fiscal year 1947	Contemplated in Budget requests for 1948	Possible under personal service funds available for fiscal year 1948
Emergency war agencies:						
Office of Defense Transportation	$332,098.00	$287,029	$198,916	67.4	65.2	42.8
Office of Scientific Research and Development	568,857.00	77,400	88,400	172	14	17
Postwar agencies:						
Philippine Alien Property Administration [2]	109,027.00	297,000	297,000	35.5	154	148
War Assets Administration	187,003,412.00	102,498,800	108,006,900	52,173.55	29,327.1	29,531.75
Independent agencies:						
American Battle Monuments Commission	104,255.00	107,589	107,589	90.8	100.9	64.4
Atomic Energy Commission [3]	6,487,062.50	22,543,000	19,000,000	2,083	8,195	5,300
Civil Aeronautics Board	2,086,784.00	2,729,919	2,550,000	481.2	668.8	589.3
Civil Service Commission	11,820,646.00	24,505,908	13,678,218	3,600.5	7,828.8	4,265.1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	650,500.00	719,700	658,540	114.4	135.7	124.8
Federal Communications Commission	5,415,366.00	6,205,000	5,556,451	1,387.2	1,623.3	1,377.1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	4,284,920.00	4,621,007	4,440,797	949.1	1,202.9	1,157.9
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service [4]			1,001,503			200
Federal Power Commission	3,283,610.00	3,728,528	3,451,471	786.2	944	828.3
Federal Security Agency	94,864,385.00	109,704,241	105,448,424	33,519	37,870	35,645
Federal Trade Commission	2,673,760.00	3,629,334	2,712,400	567	915	577
Federal Works Agency	64,362,500.00	60,284,479	64,624,546	24,575.9	23,427	24,010.1
General Accounting Office	38,019,000.00	35,075,000	34,500,000	11,914.4	11,036.2	10,416.8
Government Printing Office	23,937,562.00	23,848,283	23,937,562	7,962	8,090.5	8,008.4
Housing and Home Finance Agency	42,332,238.00	39,050,055	31,724,189	11,685.7	10,674.6	8,580.7
Indian Claims Commission	14,374.00	104,829	104,829	2.5	18	18
Interstate Commerce Commission	9,324,314.00	10,458,375	9,532,534	2,298.8	2,628.4	2,338.4
Maritime Commission	41,607,369.00	33,368,210	24,833,350	12,538	10,893	7,917
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	18,623,305.00	20,787,000	20,597,000	5,692.7	6,355.2	6,171.5
National Archives	1,209,145.00	1,540,830	1,185,335	364.9	451	350
National Capital Housing Authority	760,937.00	837,172	837,172	253.7	309	309
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	87,141.00	115,199	110,681	15.99	26.61	24.1
National Gallery of Art	771,591.00	833,600	823,026	308.8	320	318
National Labor Relations Board	3,403,000.00	6,157,000	3,750,000	818.9	1,580	900
National Mediation Board	426,726.00	457,626	426,726	94	98	94
Office of the Housing Expediter [5]	8,454,000.00	27,840,830	19,585,082	2,221	6,522	3,872
Office of Selective Service Records	7,192,675.00	3,747,420	3,107,420	851	1,301	984
Panama Canal	41,210,013.00	44,596,708	41,197,275	26,624	30,268	26,354
Philippine War Damage Commission	590,580.00	2,548,553	1,778,599	161	733	532
Railroad Retirement Board	6,916,700.00	8,579,620	8,579,620	2,405.2	3,124.2	3,124.2
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	38,624,000.00	37,809,000	30,537,000	9,426	9,166	7,403
Securities and Exchange Commission	5,044,589.00	5,893,300	5,196,000	1,186.9	1,425.2	1,199.3
Smithsonian Institution	1,537,461.00	1,775,485	1,651,861	526.4	581	540.4
Tariff Commission	1,114,663.00	1,259,666	1,098,349	227.9	274	226
Tax Court of the United States	646,428.00	695,944	686,944	122.2	131.7	131.7
Tennessee Valley Authority	38,886,103.00	38,837,458	43,718,147	12,684	13,879	15,055
Veterans' Administration	587,819,059.00	578,940,706	563,302,478	205,515	213,965	207,891
Total (exclusive of National Military Establishment)	3,507,230,127.50	3,575,614,752	3,340,490,609	1,193,399.29	1,228,004.21	1,139,163.77
National Military Establishment:						
Department of the Army (and Air Force)	1,695,580,499.00	1,488,548,042	1,383,326,462	679,801	552,202.9	539,059.8
Department of the Navy	1,204,423,265.00	1,037,871,138	931,422,188	381,600	371,330	333,940
Office of the Secretary of Defense			[3] (3,676,000)			[2] (640.2)
Total (including National Military Establishment)	6,407,239,891.50	6,101,933,932	5,655,238,259	2,254,800.29	2,151,537.11	2,012,163.57

[1] Agencies which received personal-service funds and were authorized to employ personnel during fiscal year 1947, but which went out of existence during the course of the year, either by act of Congress or by Executive order or by transfer to another agency:

Alien Property Administration:
Personal-service funds $588,900
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 196.3
Transferred to Justice Department, Sept. 30, 1946.
Inter-American Affairs:
Personal-service funds $399,750
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 133.25
Transferred to State Department, Sept. 30, 1946.
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion:
Personal-service funds $392,700
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 130.9
Liquidated Apr. 30, 1947.
War Shipping Administration:
Personal-service funds $536,100
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 178.7
Transferred to Maritime Commission, July 31, 1946, pursuant to Public Law 492 (79th Cong.).
Civilian Production Administration:
Personal service funds $9,314,100
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 3,104.7
Liquidated Apr. 30, 1947.
Wage Stabilization Board:
Personal service funds $399,750
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 133.25
Liquidated pursuant to Executive order, Feb. 23, 1947.
Office of Price Administration:
Personal service funds $58,830,600
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 19,610.2
Liquidated May 1947.
Price Decontrol Board:
Personal service funds $30,900
Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 10.3
Liquidated July 1947.
Established August 1946.

Agencies created during the course of fiscal year 1947, and the first months of fiscal year 1948, which may be classified as new agencies (they follow in order of their inception):
Council of Economic Advisers: August 1946.
Philippine Alien Property Administration: December 1946.
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission: December 1946.
Office of Government Reports: January 1947.
Office of Housing Expediter: January 1947.
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: August 22, 1947. Public Law 101 (80th Cong.).
Office of Secretary of National Defense: Public Law 253 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) creating the National Military Establishment.
National Security Resources Board: Public Law 253 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) creating the National Military Establishment.
National Security Council: Public Law 253 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) creating the National Military Establishment.

[1] Agencies which were created in January 1947 and received funds and employed people for half of the fiscal year 1947. The figures for personnel are on a man-year basis.

[2] Personal service funds and personnel for the Office of the Secretary of Defense come from the funds and personnel of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Navy, and are included in the figures reported herein for those Departments. The figures are listed separately and in parentheses above for purposes of information only.

From the table above it may be seen that:

1. Funds available for personal service in fiscal year 1947 totaled $6,407,239,891.

2. Funds available for personal service in fiscal year 1948 totaled $5,655,238,259.

3. Over-all reduction in personal service funds between 1947 and 1948 totals $752,238,259.

4. 1948 personal service funds for the Military Establishment, along with other agencies still clearly overmanned on the basis of war and immediate postwar conditions, were reduced by a total of $718,331,120. (These agencies include Office of Defense Transportation, Office of Scientific Research and Development, War Assets Administration, Maritime Commission, Selective Service System, RFC which has liquidated its war corporations, Veterans' Administration which had reached the end of its first postwar phase, and National Military Establishment.)

5. It was natural for these agencies to be reduced by their own postwar weight. With these items omitted the reduction in personal service funds for fiscal year 1948 totals $33,670,512.

6. This reduction amounts to 0.005 percent.

7. The reduction in the number of people who could be employed with available funds was about 1 percent.

TRYGVE LIE, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared on a topic of world-wide concern; namely, the job of Secretary General of the United Nations, and in particular, Secretary General Trygve Lie.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the most arduous and trying jobs in the world today is that of the Secretary General of the United Nations. I believe that the Secretary General, Mr. Trygve Lie, deserves the commendation of every Member of this body for the admirable manner in which he has been fulfilling his difficult role as top administrator of the top world organization. Mr. Lie carries on his work under far greater pressure than any official of any national government. He is the focal point of the multiple, combined, and conflicting pressures of more than 50 sovereign nations.

I consider it a tribute to his character and to his judgment that he has been able to perform his appointed tasks with a minimum of friction and a maximum of effectiveness. Mr. Lie has slowly but surely developed the prestige of the office of Secretary General to the point where it is not merely a post of administrative authority over the Secretariat, but a platform from which he can address the conscience of mankind.

I am particularly moved to offer this praise of Mr. Trygve Lie by the news of an action he has taken within the past few days with regard to the tragic Palestine war. The United Nations mediator on that war, Count Bernadotte, had requested the Secretary General to circulate an appeal from the mediator in the Middle East to all member states of the United Nations urging them to aid United Nations observers at ports throughout the world in an effort to control, restrict, and halt the migration of people into the truce area. This request, like most of the truce terms themselves, was rankly discriminatory against the one people that wants to reach that truce area, in particular, that part of the area controlled by the state of Israel. In effect, Count Bernadotte's proposal would have set up a world control over the movements of the exiled Hebrew people who now, at long last, have their own country, under their own government, and who naturally are making every effort to reach home.

Upon receiving this request, Mr. Lie, however, showed himself to be above any participation in such a discriminatory maneuver against the people whose state has been attacked by seven satellite countries of Great Britain. Mr. Lie suggested to Count Bernadotte that he address his request for world control of migration to the Security Council, on the grounds that the legality of such an action was questionable and could best be decided by the Council itself.

Mr. Lie thereby refused to associate his high office with the Bernadotte scheme for a world-wide dragnet—a scheme which the British have for several years been trying to put over in one guise or another, even in the American occupation zones of Europe. In Count Bernadotte's revised request—this time addressed to the Security Council—there was no mention of the original plan. The mediator had understood that Mr. Lie was too astute to be caught in this web.

Yes, Mr. President, the Secretary General of the United Nations is to be complimented. Not only did he refuse to allow the machinery of the UN Secretariat to be employed in a most dubious political maneuver, he also protected the sovereign rights of every member nation of the UN with respect to control of their own immigration policies. I, for one, would have opposed with my strength any scheme to restrict the movement of persons out of American harbors on the grounds that they might be heading for Israel.

It is worth remarking at this time that the very crux and core of this crisis in Palestine is precisely the issue of the right of the Hebrew people to return to the land of their fathers. This right, time and again affirmed in international covenants, to which our own country has subscribed with the approval of the United States Congress, is the basic right of the Hebrew nation to self-determination and settlement in its own country.

For what other purpose, may I ask, has the state of Israel been established and been recognized by our country and a dozen others, if not to prove a homeland and a haven for the stateless and oppressed Hebrews of the world, especially of post-Nazi Europe?

Mr. Lie is to be felicitated, in my opinion, for his rejection of any plan to distort the purpose of the United Nations—which itself voted in General Assembly to establish a state in Israel—by transforming it into an international control agency to deprive the Hebrew people of their rights as human beings to go to the land they now hold as their own.

WYOMING POSTMASTERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I observe that the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is in the Chamber. I should like to address a question to him.

For some time there have been pending before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service several postmaster nominations for the State of Wyoming.

One of these was the nomination of Kenneth L. Wingo, of Encampment, Wyo., a veteran of World War II, who enjoys the preference of veterans under the law. He was No. 1 on the eligible register—as a matter of fact, the only eligible on the register. His qualifications to serve are well established.

Also the nomination of Mr. George L. Gibson, of Powell, Wyo., likewise a veteran with veteran's preference, who successfully met the civil-service test and was No. 1 among three eligibles on the register.

The third nomination is that of Mr. Silvio J. Pedri, of Reliance, like the other two, a veteran of World War II, with 10 points disability preference. He was No. 1 upon the Civil Service Commission's list of two eligibles.

The fourth nomination was that of Mrs. Roxanna M. Smith, of Lingle, Wyo. She is currently acting as postmaster of that community, and has been since August 1946. Her popularity and efficiency are so well recognized by the people of her community that she had no competition. She was the only applicant for the postmastership, and therefore was No. 1 on the eligible register. All four of these nominees have complied with the requirements of the merit system.

These matters were called by me to the attention of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and to the attention of other members of the committee early in the session. At the time that was done there were no protests of any kind against any of these nominations from any person in their respective communities and I have heard of none since. I understood that the committee had voted unanimously to report the nominations about 2 weeks ago. The Senator from North Dakota so advised me. Thereafter, however, something happened. The nominations have not been reported despite the committee action.

Would the Senator from North Dakota indulge me by stating what the situation is with respect to these nominations?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that the resolution adopted by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee provides that, first of all, both Senators of the State in which the post office is located must concur in the nomination. At the time the nominations were before the committee, the understanding of the office staff was that no one had objected, and that both Senators had agreed to these four nominations.

Later the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] objected to each of these four nominations; and I am satisfied that he will take full responsibility for having objected to their being reported.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Objection was filed after the committee had voted unanimously to report the nominations favorably, is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. The junior Senator from Wyoming stated that he objected to them before they were reported; but through some mistake the office staff felt that he had concurred when, as a matter of fact, he never had. I am sure that if the junior Senator from Wyoming were here he would take full responsibility.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared relative to Senate Joint Resolution 76 guaranteeing equal rights for women, together with a letter which I have written stating my position on this issue.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, it now appears that the Congress is about to adjourn without fulfilling a pledge made by both political parties. I refer to the pending Senate Joint Resolution 76 guaranteeing equal rights for women, which eight of us in this Chamber introduced.

Apparently no determined effort will be made by the leadership to consider this proposal which merely provides that the people of the several States be given this opportunity to accept or reject the question. It seeks only justice and equity for one-half of our population.

But the ironical aspect of the situation is that the two major political parties are about to meet in Philadelphia. And we can be sure they again will solemnly adopt a plank in their platforms promising women to sanction an equal-rights constitutional amendment.

If the two parties really mean what they say they will take favorable action today on our resolution, which has been in the Senate since February 21, a period of 4 months.

No more propitious year could be found in which to set in motion the constitutional processes which eventually would lead to inclusion in our great Constitution of this guaranty of equality for womanhood.

We are within a few weeks of the one hundredth anniversary of the first meeting on record, in behalf of woman's rights, held at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in July 1848. Women have progressed far within that century in their search for full equality under the law.

In the professions, in public life, in the scientific world and in the economic pursuits of our Nation, they have given incontestable evidence of their capacity for any duties or responsibilities of citizenship that may be assigned them.

The only handicap to their full and complete participation in all civic and national affairs is the discrimination that Senate Joint Resolution 76 would seek to remove.

I sincerely urge that the Senate consider and approve this resolution today, so that it may be put before the legislatures of the several States for their consideration and approval. Under our democratic system, the people have the right of decision on all matters. Let us give opportunity for their voice to be heard, through their elected representatives in the 48 States.

JUNE 15, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: You may count upon my earnest support for the submission of the equal-rights amendment, of which I was privileged to be a cosponsor, to the States for their consideration. I sincerely trust that our efforts to secure action on this amendment at this session will be entirely successful.

Increased participation by women in the political, professional and economic life of the Nation is greatly to be desired. The pending amendment fills a long-felt need in its provision that "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

To all intents and purposes this equality is now freely granted, but the United States has been hesitant in giving constitutional guaranty of such equality. The splendid record made by women in public life, in the professions and in all phases of business and in many industries is evidence of their largely untapped capacities for public good in every walk of life.

This year would be an appropriate one in which to proclaim the constitutional equality of rights for men and women, marking as it does the one hundredth aniversary of the first women's rights meeting ever held in the world, at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in July, 1848.

Inasmuch as the amendment must be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, to become effective 3 years after the date of ratification, the operative data of the proposed legislation is at least 10 years away, which makes it all the more important that no time be lost in passing the amendment at this session.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1882, House bill 6935, which is the second deficiency appropriation bill, which we must pass and get to conference if we are to finish action on it tonight.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that I presume I should yield willingly. I have been used to this for the past 3 days. How long does the Senator feel that, within reason, it will take?

Mr. BALL. I do not believe that there are any controversies in the bill. I believe that as fast as we can consider the committee amendments and dispose of them, together with one or two correctional amendments, action on the bill can be completed. We did not finish work on the bill until late last night.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator that there are no serious controversial matters in the bill.

Mr. BALL. I think we can finish consideration of the bill in 10 or 15 minutes at the most.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have the utmost confidence in the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Arizona. Therefore I yield, hoping that their judgment is sound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Legislative Branch—Senate," at the top of page 2, to insert:

For an aditional amount, fiscal year 1949, for the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $8,020: *Provided*, That the rates of basic annual compensation for the following positions shall be: Four laborers at $1,320 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 5, to insert:

For payment to Mrs. Adelaide R. Hasse for compensation for the compilation of the index digest of the Temporary National Economic Committee, $3,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses of the Senate," on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery for the second session of the Eightieth Congress, to remain available until December 31, 1948, $200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 16, after "per diem," to strike out "allowance in lieu of subsistence expenses for consultants and staff, at the rate of $10 within the continental limits of the United States and $12 abroad" and insert "and subsistence expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 21, to insert:

Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1949: To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1949, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for extra police, $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for the "Capitol Buildings," including the objects specified under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1949, $35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 6, to insert:

Capitol Building: For an additional amount to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry forward the improvements affecting the Senate wing of the Capitol authorized by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 629), as amended by the acts of June 8, 1942 (56 Stat. 342), and July 17, 1945 (59 Stat. 472), $600,000. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into contracts, including cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts as approved by the Special Committee on Reconstruction of Senate Roof and Skylights and Remodeling of Senate Chamber, and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for the improvements affecting the Senate wing of the Capitol authorized by such acts, in such amounts as may be approved by the Senate committee appointed under section 1 of the act of July 17, 1945, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of that act: *Provided*, That the amounts so approved by such committee may be obligated in full prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 2, to insert:

ADDITIONAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Acquisition of site: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, to acquire on behalf of the United States, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise (any condemnation proceedings to be in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 1, 1929 (45 Stat. 1415)), as a site for an additional office building for the United States Senate, all of the land, buildings, and other structures and alleys and parts of alleys (whether private or public) contained in that part of square 725 in the District of Columbia, bounded on the west by First Street NE., on the north by C Street NE., on the south by B Street NE., and on the east by the west boundaries of lots Nos. 104, 105, 840, 805, and 80 and by a line running from the northwest corner of lot No. 805 across the 30-foot alley to a point on the southern boundary of lot No. 840 due north of such corner and from such point to the southwest corner of lot No. 840, and also to acquire in similar manner lot No. 852 in said square 725, as such square appears on the records in the office of the surveyor of the District of Columbia as of the date of the approval of this land; and, upon acquisition of such property or any part thereof to provide for the demolition and removal as expeditiously as possible of any buildings or other structures on any

such land acquired and, pending such demolition, to lease any or all of such property for such periods and under such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the United States and to provide for the maintenance and protection of such property; $1,100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 8, to insert:

Construction and equipment of building: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, at a total cost (exclusive of site and other expenses authorized under the preceding paragraph) not to exceed $20,600,000, and in substantial accordance with the preliminary plans prepared under the authority of the act of July 11, 1947 (Public Law 169, 80th Cong.), and approved by the Senate Office Building Commission, with such modification as may be necessary or advantageous, to provide for the construction and equipment of a fireproof office building for the use of the United States Senate on the site hereinbefore designated, containing committee and office rooms and such other rooms and accommodations as may be approved by the Senate Office Building Commission, including connections with the present Senate Office Building and subway transportation system by suitable tunnels and transportation system under First Street and B Street NE., and structural and other changes in the present building and subway system necessitated thereby, and also including approaches, connections with the Capitol Power Plant and public utilities, and architectural landscape treatment of the grounds, $850,000: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for materials, supplies, equipment, accessories, advertising, travel, personal and other services, and any other items required for the proper completion of the project, and to obligate in full the total amount of $20,600,000 herein authorized, prior to the actual appropriation thereof, notwithstanding that an initial amount of only $850,000 thereof is herein appropriated, and notwithstanding any other partial appropriations that may hereafter be made: *Provided further*, That upon completion of the project, the building and the grounds and sidewalks surrounding the same shall be subject to the provisions of the act of June 8, 1942 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 174 (c) and (d)) and the act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718), in the same manner and to the same extent as the present Senate Office Building and the grounds and sidewalks surrounding the same.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 23, to insert:

Senate Restaurant: For repairs, improvements, furnishings and equipment for the Senate Restaurant, Capitol Building, including personal and other services, fiscal year 1949, $15,000, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Funds appropriated to the President," on page 13, after line 12, to insert:

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to enable the Commission during the fiscal year 1949 to carry out the provisions of S. 2242, Eightieth Congress, entitled "A bill to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes," including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses without regard to the standardized Government travel regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed 15, including 1 at not to exceed $3,000) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail (39 U. S. C. 321d); payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); health-service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; and purchases and services abroad without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; $3,500,000: *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the Commission may enter into agreements with governmental and private agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "Independent offices—Federal Security Agency," on page 15, after line 5, to insert:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

National Institute of Health, operating expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "National Institute of Health, operating expenses," $1,000,000; and the limitation under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1949, on the purchase of passenger motor vehicles is increased from 10 to 16, of which 10 shall be for replacement only: *Provided*, That appropriations under said head for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available for carrying out the purposes of the National Heart Act, including erection of temporary structures for storage of equipment and supplies and housing of animals.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 16, to insert:

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Working capital fund: For establishment of a working capital fund in accordance with and for carrying out the purposes of S. 2767, Eightieth Congress, $2,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 2767, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Works Agency," on page 16, after line 7, to insert:

Administrative expenses, water-pollution control: For expenses necessary, fiscal year 1949, to carry out the administrative functions of the Federal Works Agency under the provisions of S. 418, relating to pollution-control activities, $75,000, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel, printing, and binding; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 418, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Buildings Administration," on page 16, after line 17, to insert:

Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio: For preparation of plans for buildings and facilities at Cincinnati, Ohio, for the use of the Public Health Service, as provided for by S. 418, Eightieth Congress, $200,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 418, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 24, to insert:

Improvement of post-office facilities, Los Angeles, Calif.: For the construction of an additional story and the extension and remodeling of the existing Terminal Annex Station, Los Angeles, Calif., as provided for by H. R. 5750, Eightieth Congress, $1,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 5750, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 21, after the figures "$750,000", to insert "to remain available until June 30, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 21, to insert:

National industrial reserve: For expenses necessary, fiscal year 1949, to carry out the duties imposed upon the Federal Works Agency by S. 2554 or H. R. 6098, Eightieth Congress, relating to the retention and maintenance of a national industrial reserve, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed 10 passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $35 per diem, and maintenance, protection, repair, restoration, renovation, and other services by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; $10,000,000; and in addition, the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to enter into contract, for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $10,000,000: *Provided*, That appropriations or funds available to the War Assets Administration for use in connection with property or functions transferred to the Federal Works Agency under the provisions of S. 2554, or H. R. 6098, Eightieth Congress, shall be transferred, in such amounts as may be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to the Federal Works Agency for the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of either S. 2554 or H. R. 6098, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after the amendment just stated, to insert:

BUREAU OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Disaster relief, public facilities: For expenses necessary to alleviate damage or hardship caused by flood, tornado, fire, or other catastrophe respecting which the President has heretofore made a determination under the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 233), by grants, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Federal Works Administrator, to local public agencies to assist them in defraying the cost of (1) the repair, restoration, replacement, or reconstruction of local public facilities damaged or destroyed by such catastrophe and (2) the construction, maintenance, and operation of schools necessary for children of families from Vanport City, Oreg., including personal services in the District of Columbia, $35,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1950: *Provided*, That no grant shall be made to any local public agency unless the Administrator determines that other Federal funds are not available for such facilities and that such agency needs the grant and cannot otherwise defray such cost without creating an excessive tax or debt burden: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 4 percent of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses required in connection with such grants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 19, to insert:

Maintenance and operation of schools: For carrying out the provisions of S. 2795 or H. R. 6527, Eightieth Congress, relating to assistance to certain local school agencies, fiscal year 1949, $5,000,000, of which not to exceed $200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including travel, printing and binding, and personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of either S. 2795 or H. R. 6527, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Accounting Office," on page 21, line 6, after the word "Salaries", to strike out "450,000" and insert "$680,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 6, to insert:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Contingent upon the enactment of the Federal Housing Act of 1948, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is hereby authorized to increase in the aggregate not to exceed $2,000,000 the allocation for administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator, Federal Housing Administration, National Home Mortgage Corporation, and the Public Housing Administration for carrying out the provisions of said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 18, to insert:

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Maintenance and operation of properties: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Maintenance and operation of properties," $2,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 22, to insert:

NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission: For expenses necessary for the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to prepare and carry out a program for the commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, as authorized by the act of July 18, 1947 (Public Law 203), including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses of employees; travel, hotel, and other necessary expenses of the Commissioners; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $35 per diem; deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail; and rent in the District of Columbia; $15,000, to remain available during the life of the Commission: *Provided*, That the Commission may accept and utilize gifts of money or services from private individuals and organizations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 15, to insert:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary, fiscal year 1949, to carry out the provisions of H. R. 6401 or S. 2655, Eightieth Congress, establishing the Selective Service System, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation when specifically authorized by the Director; purchase (not to exceed 94) of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail (39 U. S. C. 321d); payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and purchase of typewriters; $31,800,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of either H. R. 6401 or S. 2655, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 8, to insert:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief," $245,000, to be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 12, to insert:

Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: For an additional amount for "Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans," $1,500,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services," and to be available for the purposes specified under this head in the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 663), as extended by the Emergency Appropriation Act, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "District of Columbia," on page 24, after line 21, to insert:

PUBLIC WELFARE

Day-care centers: For all expenses necessary for the transfer, maintenance, and operation of a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of children of school or under school age, including personal services, as authorized by Public Law 123, approved June 27, 1947, as amended, fiscal year 1949, $150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 3, to insert:

PUBLIC WORKS

Operating expenses, Office of Superintendent of District Buildings: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1948, for "Operating expenses, Office of Superintendent of District Buildings," $12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 8, to insert:

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

For the payment of claims in excess of $250, approved by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 11, 1929, as amended (46 Stat. 500), $8,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Audited claims," on page 26, line 21, after the numerals "1945", to strike out "$8.80" and insert $1,566.19."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 5, after the words "In all", to strike out "$28,167.50" and insert "$29,724.89."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture," on page 28, after line 11, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses for carrying into effect those provisions of the Housing Act of 1948, imposing duties upon the Secretary of Agriculture, including printing and binding and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, technical services and research, $150,000, which shall be available for allocation by the Secretary of Agriculture to the several agencies of the Department, to local public agencies, and to State agencies through the Agricultural Extension Service: *Provided*, That this appropriation is made contingent upon the enactment of the Housing Act of 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Research Administration—Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and expenses," on page 29, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$15,000"; and in line 8, after the name "Columbia", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 19, to insert:

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Insect and plant disease control: For an additional amount fiscal year 1949, for "Insect and plant disease control," to carry out the Golden Nematode Act of June —, 1948 (Public Law —), including not to exceed $11,970 for personal services in the District of Columbia and the purchase of not to exceed seven passenger motor vehicles, $492,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 13, to insert:

FOREST SERVICE

EMERGENCY RECONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR

Emergency reconstruction and repair: For the reconstruction or replacement of roads, trails, bridges, telephone lines, and other facilities and improvements in the national forests damaged or destroyed by floods in May and June 1948, $4,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 21, to insert:

LOANS TO FARMERS, 1948 FLOOD DAMAGE

Loans to farmers, 1948 flood damage: To provide assistance to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1948,

$6,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1949, which the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to utilize through any existing agency or bureau for loans in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe for the purpose of aiding such farmers to continue farming operations, and for all necessary administrative expenses in connection with making and servicing such loans, including printing and binding, and personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce," on page 32, after line 2, to insert:

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Census of business: For expenses necessary to collect, compile, and publish the 1949 census of business in accordance with the act of June —, 1948 (Public Law —), including personal services at the seat of government; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and personal services by contract or otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census without regard to the Classification Act; $2,480,000, to be available July 1, 1948, and to remain available until December 31, 1951: *Provided*, That funds for administrative expenses may be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation "General administration, Bureau of the Census."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 17, to insert:

Census of transportation: For expenses necessary to collect, compile, and publish the 1949 census of transportation in accordance with the act of June —, 1948 (Public Law —), including personal services at the seat of government; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and personal services by contract or otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census without regard to the Classification Act; $220,000, to be available July 1, 1948, and to remain available until December 31, 1951: *Provided*, That funds for administrative expenses may be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation "General administration, Bureau of the Census."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 6, to insert:

Census of mineral industries: For expenses necessary to collect, compile, and publish the 1949 census of mineral industries in accordance with the act of June —, 1948 (Public Law —), including personal services at the seat of government; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and personal services by contract or otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census without regard to the Classification Act; $80,000, to be available July 1, 1948, and to remain available until December 31, 1951: *Provided*, That funds for administrative expenses may be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation "General Administration, Bureau of the Census."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Administration," on page 34, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,600,000" and insert "$341,499."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "one public airport" and insert "two public airports, one at Fairbanks and one"; in line 13, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000"; in line 17, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$9,000,000"; and in line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$175,000" and insert "$325,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 6, after "per diem", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 6, to insert:

Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946, $500,000: *Provided*, That such $500,000 shall be included in, and available for grants as part of, the discretionary fund established by section 6 (b) of said act: *Provided further*, That if and when an appropriation is made under this head for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and apportioned pursuant to section 6 (a) of said act, any portion of the sum appropriated herein which shall heretofore have been obligated for a project shall be assessed against the apportionment for the State in which such project is located and the amount of the State apportionment so assessed shall be transferred to the said discretionary fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 19, to insert:

Hereafter the salary of the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration shall (unless increased to a higher amount by other law enacted either prior or subsequent to this act) be at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce," on page 36, after line 7, to insert:

Departmental salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Departmental salaries and expenses," $150,000, and the amount made available under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1949, for transfer to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses" under the Office of the Secretary is increased from $190,000 to $194,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 14, to insert:

Field office service: For an additional amount for "Field office service," fiscal year 1949, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 6, after the word "act", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation may be used to enforce any regulation prohibiting the export of one-hundred-pound bags of flour as or in gift packages of any type.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Office of the Secretary," on page 37, after line 21, to insert:

Columbia Basin flood repair: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, through such bureaus of the Department of the Interior as he may designate, and in such manner as he shall determine, to reimburse applicable appropriations for costs of manpower and equipment diverted for flood work and to repair, reconstruct, rehabilitate, and replace structures, buildings, and other facilities (including equipment) under the jurisdiction of the Department damaged or destroyed by the flood in the Columbia Basin area, $2,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 12, to insert:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Red Lake Band, Chippewa Indians, Minnesota (tribal funds): For a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, Minnesota, $130,000, payable from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber of the Red Lake Reservation: *Provided*, That this amount is made available contingent upon the enactment of H. R. 5355, Eightieth Congress, second session.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 20, to insert:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Fort Sumner irrigation district, New Mexico: For the purpose of aiding and assisting the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico to protect its diversion dam and the existing works of said irrigation district from flood damage, in the event the Secretary of the Interior determines that flood damage is or appears to be imminent, $60,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 3, to insert:

Construction: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Construction," $453,000, to remain available until expended for Preston Bench project, Idaho: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 1987, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 8, to insert:

ADVANCES TO COLORADO RIVER DAM FUND

Boulder Canyon project: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Boulder Canyon project," $600,000, to remain available until advanced to the Colorado River dam fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Military Establishment—Department of the Army—Civil functions—Corps of Engineers," on page 41, after line 6, to insert:

Flood control, general: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Flood control, general," including the objects specified under this head in the "Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1949," $2,000,000, to be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Yards and Docks—Public works," on page 42, line 22, after the word "expended", to strike out "$47,983,200" and insert "$51,337,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Continental United States," on page 46, after line 21, to insert:

Naval Air Station, Key West (Boca Chica), Fla.: Acquisition of land, approximately 1,000 acres, $60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Outside Continental United States," on page 49, after line 17, to insert:

Naval Radio Station, Sabana Seca, P. R.: Radio operating facilities, including collateral equipment, accessory construction and transfer of land, $3,294,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State—Foreign Service," on page 52, line 22, after the word "Service", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,430,754."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 2, after the word "Service", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International activities," on page 53, after line 22, to insert:

United States contributions to international commissions, congresses, bureaus: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, $50,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation is contingent upon the enactment of S. 2341, Eightieth Congress, second session.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 12, after the word "of", to insert "June 14, 1948"; in line 13, after the word "Law", to insert "643"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "(S. J. Res. 98)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department," on page 55, after line 6, to insert:

FISCAL SERVICE

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

Contingent expenses, public moneys: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1948, for "Contingent expenses, public moneys," $12,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Refunds under Renegotiation Act, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 20, to insert:

COAST GUARD

Acquisition, construction, and improvements: For an additional amount under the title "Acquisition, construction, and improvements, Coast Guard," for replacement or rebuilding of aids to navigation and shore facilities, $400,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments," on page 57, line 10, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 177 and"; and in line 12, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$12,838,409.60" and insert "$15,231,868.15."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—General provisions," on page 61, after line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 401. Except as otherwise provided therein, the Renegotiation Act of 1948 (sec. 3 of Public Law 547, 80th Cong.) shall apply to all contracts entered into by the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy or the Department of the Air Force, obligating funds from any appropriations provided herein or hereafter or in any regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1949, and all subcontracts under such contracts. This section shall also apply in like manner to contracts entered into by any other department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government pursuant to authority or direction of the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and chargeable against any such appropriations, and all subcontracts under such contracts. For the purposes of the Renegotiation Act of 1948 the term "subcontract" means any purchase order or agreement to perform all or any part of the work, or to make or furnish any article, required for the performance of any other contract or subcontract.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 16, to change the section number from "402" to "401."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 4, to change the section number from "403" to "402."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have four minor amendments proposed by the committee, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the four committee amendments submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on behalf of the committee.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 5, after the word "each," to insert "*Provided*, That the provisions of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, shall not apply to two positions of special employees under the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, and the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for 1949 is amended accordingly."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 17, to insert:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," fiscal year 1949, $100,000: *Provided*, That appropriations under this head for fiscal year 1949 shall be available for the preparation of plans and specifications for the National Institute of Dental Research buildings and facilities provided for in H. R. 6726 which shall be available for transfer to the Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations made herein shall be available only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 6726, Eightieth Congress, second session."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 20, to insert "National Industrial Reserve". Transfer this appropriation to follow line 21 on page 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, lines 15 and 16, strike out "June —, 1948 (Public Law —), S. (1675)" and insert "June 16, 1948 (Public Law 653)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

For payment to the following-named contractors in the following designated amounts in full settlement of their claims, legal or equitable, of any nature whatsoever arising out of or connected with the notice by the United States Reclamation Service of the exhaustion of funds for payment of contractors' earnings in connection with the construction of the Friant-Kern canal, California, Peter Kiewit Son's Co., $186,195.33; Arizona-Nevada Constructors, $348,867.62; Morrison-Knudson, Inc., and M. H. Hassler, $217,618.47; Bechtel Bros.-McCone Co., $32,018.51; in all, $784,699.93.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the amendment. The Senate will remember that last year a serious situation arose in the Central Valley, Calif. Because of lack of funds, as the contractors thought, they shut down their work. I am offering the amendment out of a feeling of conscientiousness. I offer it because I feel I was in part at fault because that situation arose. The only objection that can be made to the amendment is that it might set a precedent for similar claims at some later time; but I assure the Senate that under no circumstances within the lifetime of any Senator in this body could a similar situation arise. There would be no difficulty about the matter at all if in a half-dozen different places appropriate action had been taken. If the Bureau of the Budget had notified the Bureau of Reclamation that it was possible for them to divert funds to pay the contractors, the situation would not have arisen. If the contractors themselves had made inquiry in Washington, they could have learned that at the very moment they shut down the work Congress was in process of providing the necessary funds. If their attorney had done so, it would have been all right. I am offering this amendment because I feel that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I did not do my full duty to ascertain the facts when the matter was under consideration by the Senate.

In good conscience, therefore, I offer the amendment. The figures in the amendment are based upon instructions given by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to the contractors and the Bureau of Reclamation to get together and determine what would be a fair settlement of the damages. The contractors presented a bill for approximately $2,000,000. These figures were worked over and agreed upon between the Bureau of Reclamation and

the contractors as being a fair settlement of the loss.

In my opinion, the bill should be paid.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why do they not go to the Court of Claims.

Mr. HAYDEN. Because they cannot get into the Court of Claims.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because, under the law, a contract made with any contractor, whether it be by the Board of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation, if the contract is subject to appropriations by Congress, they have notice that if they do any work beyond that, however beneficial it might be to the United States, they have no standing in the Court of Claims.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why did they not file their claim in the regular way so that it would go through the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. My judgment is that neither the Judiciary Committee nor any other committee would devote the weeks of time that our committee devoted to a study of the problem, and give it any better judgment as to what should be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to say that I think the amendment should not be agreed to. There is a committee which could proceed to hear the claim in the regular way, and that is the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BALL. Does the Senator from Arizona move to suspend the rule?

Mr. HAYDEN. No point of order was made. If the point of order is made, I shall move to suspend the rule.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment violates rule V.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order raised by the Senator from Minnesota is sustained.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Chair to page 8410 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 16, wherein I filed a proper motion for suspension of the rules. I move that the rules be suspended and that my amendment be adopted. I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona. [Putting the question.]

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask for a division.

On a division the motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Michigan with reference to the committee amendment on page 21 of the bill, relating to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I notice that it reads as follows:

Contingent upon the enactment of the Federal Housing Act of 1948, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is hereby authorized to increase in the aggregate not to exceed $2,000,000 the allocation for administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator, Federal Housing Administration, National Home Mortgage Corporation, and the Public Housing Administration for carrying out the provisions of said act.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to answer the question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will address the question, then, to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. I did not get the point of the Senator's question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have not yet stated the question. I was simply referring to the amendment on page 21, and calling attention to the fact that an additional amount of $2,000,000 is provided upon the passing by this Congress of the Federal Housing Act of 1948. I very much fear that as a result of the attitude expressed by the House of Representatives, or those who are in charge of that legislation, there will not be enacted into law a Federal Housing Act of 1948. But there exists this condition, that as a result of the $750,000,000 authorization which we gave to FHA in December, and an additional $400,000,000 authorization that we gave in March——

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to finish my statement, if I may.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator is laboring under a misapprehension, because this item was put in in pursuance of testimony which came up in that form in connection with the Housing Act of 1948. It has nothing to do with the situation of which the Senator is speaking.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I realize that. It is a figure that certainly ought to go in some other bill, rather than in this deficiency appropriation bill. This is the only place that there is any additional money provided for administrative expenses for the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. BALL. It was the only budget figure before the committee concerning this subject.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And is this the only place in this bill?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there is outstanding throughout the United States today approximately a billion dollars in commitments for buildings to be erected under title 6 of the FHA Act. It is not 1949 money. In fact, we do not put up the money at all. We simply insure the loans. The loans were authorized in December 1947 and in March 1948, but as to the buildings, the money has not yet been spent. The commitments have been made.

There have been no inspection of these buildings because they have not been erected, and there is no money available with which to make the inspections or to process the loans or construction commitments which have been made. It is estimated that they need $1,650,000. Of course, we discussed this matter a few days ago when the Government corporations appropriation bill was under consideration, and I believe that the Senator from Michigan at that time misunderstood the situation from the statement he made.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I thought the Senator was talking about a question that was connected with the pending bill. The matter the Senator is discussing is covered in the Government corporations bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; but there was no money carried in that bill, and if it was not carried, and if they need money, it seems to me it should be in this deficiency bill, and the payment should not be made contingent on the happening of something that is not going to happen.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand what the Senator is requesting.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They are going to come here July 1, or even today in connection with the various buildings for which commitments have been made throughout the country, and there will be no money with which to process those commitments, and no money with which to inspect the buildings when they are erected. This is not money which is appropriated, it is not money that is paid out of the Treasury of the United States. It is simply an authorization for the FHA to use a part of the fees which are paid in for that particular purpose. I believe, Mr. President, that some provision should be made in this bill to take care of these outstanding commitments.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and myself, I send to the desk an amendment which I wish to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, after line 8, it is proposed to insert, under a new heading "Rural Electrification Administration," a new paragraph to read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1949, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1949, $450,000, such sum to be in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for such fiscal year.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, an amendment increasing the amounts for REA administrative expenses was adopted on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, but was an amendment to the independent offices bill, where it did not belong, and the House conferees rejected it. When the deficiency subcommittee was considering the same amendment, we figured the Senate action of a few days ago would stand, and therefore we did not accept it. I think the committee would have been in favor of the amendment, because since then it has been thrown out of the other bill. So I am going to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if any consideration was given to an appropriation under the authority of the Smith-Mundt Act, Public Law 402, for the cooperative exchange of persons authorized by that act.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, we considered the estimate submitted by the State Department for $5,000,000. We were working under pressure at the time and did not have time to go into the estimate. What we had before us did not seem adequate, and the committee was unanimous in rejecting the item and in telling the State Department to come back January 1. We did not think a delay of 6 months would do any harm. We simply did not have time to go into the estimates the way they should have been examined.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this matter was discussed when the first deficiency appropriation bill was under consideration, and the committee withheld the appropriation from that bill on the understanding of the Department that it would be considered in connection with the second deficiency appropriation bill.

It seems to me that this is but another instance of the practice which has become very common in both Houses of Congress, that a legislative act is adopted by a very substantial majority, authorizing certain things, and in a way committing the country, as in the case of the ECA authorization, and then the appropriation committees follow along and completely disregard what the Congress has determined to be a policy.

For that reason, Mr. President, and in order to keep the record straight, I should like to propose an amendment, which I assume, from the attitude of the committee members, will be rejected, but I do think that an amendment carrying at least a million dollars should be offered to carry out the cooperative exchange of persons as authorized by Public Law 402.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator submit his amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I offer such an amendment, to be inserted at the proper place, on page 53, I think it is, but I should like to have the clerk insert it at the proper point. I believe it would be in proper form if it provided "to carry out the exchange of persons under Public Law 402, $1,000,000."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For what purpose?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to support the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have a telegram in my hand from the president of the University of Florida calling attention to this omission, and stating in so many words that the commitments already made are going to be seriously affected, and that there will be disappointment and ill will instead of the good will that is intended to be created by the exchange of scholarships.

I certainly hope that the very modest sum requested by the Senator from Arkansas will be approved. He requests only one-fifth of the amount of the estimate of the State Department, and I am not at all certain that even that will be sufficient to carry on the program until, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, the matter can be presented in a subsequent bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I realize the amount is wholly inadequate, but in view of the attitude of the committee, if it does not intend completely to nullify the policy of the act referred to, I thought surely they would accept this amendment calling for this appropriation. In order to get this program going the committee did approve a small appropriation of $60,000, which was simply to get some organizational work done. That was not intended actually to finance any exchanges. That is hanging up in the air, and there will be no money for the actual exchange of persons under the law.

I reiterate, if we are not going to carry out the program we should not have adopted it, and if we have changed our minds I think those who have undertaken in the Committee on Appropriations to nullify the policy should offer a repealer of that part of the law. It should not be left in force, both our own people and other people expecting something to be done under it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. It seems to me that with a program under way, and relying upon an announced policy of the Congress, in good faith we should go ahead and finance the program. We are leaving our educational institutions and our educational leaders in the lurch by not backing them up in the efforts which they have already started in pursuance of legislation we have adopted. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be defeated. I rather resent the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas that the Committee on Appropriations pays no attention to authorization acts passed by the Congress. We have in the regular bill $28,000,000 for this informational and educational program. The bill was passed early this year. The State Department had ample time to bring these estimates to the committee. Instead, they come in on the last day of the session, practically, asking us to approve estimates totaling $5,000,000 for this program. Just glancing through the items, I think most Members of Congress are of the opinion that this program is an exchange-of-students program. Out of $5,000,000 which the State Department requested, $500,000 went for exchange of students, and the rest of it went largely to employ war personnel here in Washington in about 20 different departments.

There was one item we did not have time to go into, and I do not have the faintest idea of what it means. That was an item of $250,000-plus for grants to labor unions. I do not have the faintest idea of what it means. But as a responsible Member of the Senate and as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am not prepared to approve items of a quarter of a million dollars or any other amount, having no idea of what is planned to be done with the money. I have been in favor of exchange of students, but I must say that under the so-called Fulbright Act, which provided for exchange of students with the countries in the Orient, several hundred thousand dollars have been spent, and so far there have been only four students exchanged, which is a pretty expensive per capita proposal. I think the Appropriations Committee is entitled to enough time to go into estimates of this kind before we vote such amounts of funds.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe I understood the Senator from Minnesota to say that the State Department has made no effort to present these estimates. I was informed that the State Department presented them to the House committee and asked for hearings on them, but that the committee refused hearings, and, therefore, they had no opportunity until the measure got to the Senate. They could not, of course, make the House committee consider them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on page 16, after line 6.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the remarks I made just a short time ago with regard to the appropriation for the Cooperative Exchange of Persons, the report I hold in my hand from the Committee on International Interchange of Jurists, Section of International and Comparative Law, American Bar Association, be included, together with the remarks of Prof. Claude Horack, former dean of Duke University Law School, at the dinner given in his honor by the Inter-American Bar Association and the Duke University alumni, at the Dodge Hotel, Washington, D. C., June 16, 1948.

I merely wish to say that this report and statement applies directly to the matter which was being discussed with regard to the failure of the Committee on Appropriations to include an appropriation for the Smith-Mundt Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL INTERCHANGE OF JURISTS, SECTION OF INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LAW, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

To the Members of the Section of International and Comparative Law:

Since the meeting of the association at Cleveland, Ohio, September 21–23, 1947, there have been a number of important developments in the various activities covered by the work of this committee. The following developments are of particular interest:

1. Fulbright Act: The Fulbright Act, approved August 1, 1946 (Public Law 584, 79th Cong., 60 Stat. 754), provided for the education of students from the United States in foreign countries on scholarships financed by the proceeds of surplus war materials sold in those countries. Transportation of foreign students to and from the United States may also be paid from these funds. All grants to American citizens under the act may include tuition or salary, maintenance, and

travel expenses, and will be paid to the recipient in the currency of the country to which he goes. Grants will normally be made for the period of one academic year. Selection of candidates in general will be guided by excellence of scholastic or professional achievement, and preference will be given to veterans of World Wars I and II. Applicants will be expected to demonstrate a proficiency in the language of the country to which they go wherever it is essential to the project which they propose to undertake.

As previously reported considerable delay occurred in the negotiation of agreements to give effect to the provisions of this act. It is a pleasure to report now that the following agreements have been completed:

(a) Agreement between the United States and China signed November 10, 1947 (press release No. 890; Department of State Publication No. 3050).

(b) Agreement between the United States and Burma signed December 22, 1947 (press release No. 930; Department of State Publication No. 3051).

(c) Agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines signed March 28, 1948.

(d) Agreement between the United States and Greece signed April 23, 1948.

Many other agreements have been transmitted to eligible governments, the eligibility being established when a foreign government purchases surplus war materials from the United States.

A board of foreign scholarships to select American students for study abroad under the act has been appointed. As of April 1, 1948, the membership of that board was as follows:

Col. John N. Andrews, personal representative of the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

Sarah Gibson Blanding, president, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Laurence Duggan, director, Institute of International Education, New York, N. Y.

Charles S. Johnson, president, Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.

Walter Johnson, professor of history, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Ernest O. Lawrence, professor of physics, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Martin R. P. McGuire, acting dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Catholic University of America, Washington D. C.

Francis Trow Spaulding, chairman, board of foreign scholarships, Commissioner of Education, State of New York, Albany, N. Y.

John W. Studebaker, Commissioner, United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Helen C. White, vice chairman, professor of English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Persons desiring information should write to the Institute of International Education, 2 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 19, N. Y.

2. Latin-American student exchange: Pursuant to the provisions of the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations of 1936, the exchange of students with Latin-American countries has been increased during the past year.

There are 35 students from Latin America who are now studying law in the United States as indicated in the following list:

State	Institution	Country of origin	Name
California	Los Angeles City College	Costa Rica	Zuniga, Robert Lionel.
Florida	University of Miami	Cuba	Morgado, Martha.
Louisiana	Louisiana State University	Honduras	Matamoros, Daniel.
Do	do	Panama	Ramirez, Martin.
Do	do	do	Ruiz, José Antonio.
Do	do	Venezuela	Sahagun, Teresa.
Do	Southeastern Louisiana College	Nicaragua	Stadthagen, Salvador A.
Massachusetts	Harvard University	Bolivia	Rivero, E. Guillermo.
Do	do	Mexico	Siqueiros, José L.
Do	do	Nicaragua	Arguello, S. Adan.
Do	do	Peru	Reisner, Arthur J.
New Mexico	University of New Mexico	Mexico	Baez, Paul H.
New York	Cornell University	Venezuela	Mateu, José Armando.
Do	New York University	Argentina	Bledel, Enrique Elnar.
Do	do	do	Bunge, Eduardo Alfredo.
Do	do	do	Gabay, Colombo Alberto.
Do	do	do	Naglieti, Oreor Gino.
Do	do	Brazil	Amaral, Sylvio Do.
Do	do	do	Beltrao, Helio Marco P.
Do	do	do	Frazao, Guimaraes, C. A.
Do	do	do	Oliveira, Altamir.
Do	do	do	Feashaus, Gustavo Cintra.
Do	do	Costa Rica	Facio, Secrada Gonzalo.
Do	do	Mexico	Carrillo, Hector.
Do	do	do	Zamora, Morales Jorge.
Do	do	Peru	Cisneros, Maximo.
Do	do	do	Guevarra, Alberto Luis.
Do	do	Uruguay	Vallarino, Carlos Rivero.
Do	do	Venezuela	Laya, Morales Luis.
Ohio	University of Toledo	Ecuador	Cordova, Carlos Alberto.
Pennsylvania	Muhlenberg College	Brazil	Wiznasi, Frederico A. G.
Virginia	Roanoke College	Cuba	Nuez, Lescano V.
Do	University of Virginia	Panama	Wong, George Ramiro.
Do	do	Venezuela	Cornell, Goodrich Bruce.
Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	Costa Rica	Montealegre, José R.

Recapitulation

Country of origin:	Number
Argentina	4
Bolivia	1
Brazil	6
Costa Rica	3
Cuba	2
Ecuador	1
Honduras	1
Mexico	4
Nicaragua	2
Panama	3
Peru	3
Uruguay	1
Venezuela	4
Total	35

There are eight students from the United States who are studying law in Latin-American countries under Public Law 346—Seventy-eighth Congress (GI bill of rights) as of March 31, 1948.

Country and institution:	Number of law students
Costa Rica: University of Costa Rica	1
El Salvador: Universidad Autonomo de El Salvador	1
Cuba: University of Habana	2
Ecuador: Universidad Catolica del Ecuador	2
Mexico: National University of Mexico	2
Total	8

Dr. Felipe Gil, secretary of the University of Montevideo, visited the United States on a Department of State grant. There is one United States student, Irving Glenne Tragen, of California, studying labor legislation in Mexico under the United States Government travel-maintenance grant program. Mr. Tragen, who is carrying out independent research, is a member of the California bar.

3. Privately financed interchange of law students: The Institute of Inter-American Law, organized by Arthur T. Vanderbilt, dean of New York University Law School, began its work on September 2, 1947, with 17 students enrolled from eight countries in the Americas. Dean Vanderbilt was appointed chief justice of New Jersey. The work of the institute is being actively carried forward by Dr. Miguel A. de Capriles who is the director of the institute. Its work was the subject of an interesting address delivered by Dr. de Capriles at the Lima Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association. It is believed that this institute is performing a highly important function and we hope that it will succeed.

Another similar organization, namely, the Southwestern Legal Foundation of Southern Methodist University has been organized under the leadership of Dean Robert G. Storey, of the law school of that university. This institute is holding inaugural ceremonies on the date of our spring meeting, May 22, 1948. We wish it success in its activities. Its proximity to Mexico and Central America gives it a particularly favorable location for students from those countries. Exchange of students and professors from foreign countries will be stimulated.

4. No interchange with Russia: As indicated in our previous report, the United States Ambassador at Moscow, the Honorable Walter Bedell Smith, has endeavored to arrange for the interchange of persons for the advancement of cultural and scholarly understanding and knowledge with Russia. Although further efforts have been made to bring about such exchanges, no progress has been accomplished.

5. Fifth conference of the Inter-American Bar Association: The fifth conference of the IABA was held at Lima, Peru, November 25–December 8, 1947. The deans of several law schools of this hemisphere met at the University of San Marcos and under the chairmanship of Dr. Luis Alberto Sanchez, many important resolutions were drafted which were later adopted at the closing plenary session. The conference adopted 133 resolutions and brought together the leaders of the bar in an interchange of views on the problems of the legal profession which will be far-reaching in its effects on the legal history of their nations.

6. Survey of Pan American law schools: Resolution LXIV of the fourth conference of the Inter-American Bar Association, held at Santiago, Chile, October 20–29, 1945, provided that the association "recommend to the various nations of the American Continent, in regard to the credit in other countries of professional degrees and diplomas granted by a recognized university in one of them, that such degrees and diplomas be accredited in the other countries, giving credit for studies which do not deal with the legislation or case law of the country in which the approval is given, and requiring an examination in studies which deal with such legislation and case law and the other requisites of practice in said country.

"(c) To recommend to the law schools of the universities of America that a congress of the professors of law be convened in order to study and determine the measures tending to achieve uniformity in the studies, programs, and curricula in the said schools.

"(d) To recommend that the same congress shall determine the qualifications that

may be necessary for entrance in said law schools."

At the fifth conference at Lima it was decided to recommend as follows:

"Resolution 92: (1) To reiterate the recommendations made by the fourth conference of the Inter-American Bar Association to the law schools of the universities of the Americas, that a congress of professors of law be convened in order to determine the role of law schools in legal education; to study measures which might tend to achieve uniformity in studies, courses, and programs; and to determine the qualifications that may be required for entrance to said law schools."

In order that students throughout this hemisphere may be encouraged to carry on their studies in different law schools it is essential that they should be able to receive credit for work previously done in accredited law schools. No complete up-to-date information with respect to the work of the law schools, however, is available and consequently no satisfactory arrangement for interchange of credits has been made between the law schools of the United States and those of the other nations of the hemisphere. In order to remedy this situation, the Inter-American Bar Association has arranged with the aid of a grant from the Department of State to send Dr. Claude Horack, retiring Dean of Duke University Law School, to the Latin-American nations to conduct a survey of their law schools including their curricula, methods, physical equipment, personnel, and exchange opportunities. Dr. Horack is scheduled to leave the United States from New Orleans on June 25, 1948, and after visiting practically all of the Latin-American countries will return to the United States about May 1, 1949. His report will be presented at the Sixth Conference of the I. A. B. A. to be held at Detroit, Mich., May 22–June 1, 1949.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH E. DAVIES,
WILLIAM CULLEN DENNIS,
ARTHUR K. KUHN,
JACOB M. LASHLY,
WILLIAM L. RANSOM,
CARL B. RIX,
HAROLD E. STASSEN,
WILLIAM ROY VALLANCE,
Chairman.

MAY 14, 1948.

REMARKS OF PROF. CLAUDE HORACK, FORMER DEAN OF DUKE UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL, AT THE DINNER GIVEN IN HIS HONOR BY THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION AND THE DUKE UNIVERSITY ALUMNI, JUNE 16, 1948, DODGE HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The objectives of the trip through Central and South America and the Caribbean area are to help promote a better understanding between the law schools of the United States and the Latin-American countries. At the present time it is safe to say that only three or four law schools in the United States have a fair understanding of the type and objectives of legal education in these countries, and it is a fair assumption that the Latin-American countries know as little about North American legal education. Each group has a long history and tradition behind it which has affected its viewpoint. Should we be able to effect in even a slight degree a friendly and understanding attitude of one group toward the other, that in itself will be most worth while.

Already there is a very great interest in the interchange of students. Many young men from the United States are applying under the GI bill to study in Latin-American law schools because they see in this an opportunity to represent United States interests in these countries. On the other hand, there are now about 40 students from Latin-American countries who are studying law in the law schools of the United States. It seems quite apparent that this movement will accelerate, and within the next few years we may expect a very great interchange. The business interests of the Latin Americas that deal with United States business interests are equally concerned about having in their offices, or in the offices of their legal advisers, young men who know something of United States business and traditions and law.

The provision for extension of credit to Latin-American students has already been made by the Association of American Law Schools, which now provides for at least 1 year of transfer credit, and in some cases, such as in the schools of Louisiana, as much as 2 years.

Up to the present time the difficulty in most schools has been that a school in the United States has not known what to do with a student from Latin America or how to evaluate his credits, either for entrance or for law-school credit. In the short time I have been interested in this matter, I have already made a great discovery, and that is that I could send transcripts to Dr. Jorge Basadre, of the Pan American Union, or to the United States Bureau of Education, and I would be told what the credits were worth from the standpoint of requirements for admission. If I did nothing else, I would do a great service to the law schools of this country by bringing this fact to their attention. In a few cases on which I had to pass as dean of the law school, I wrote to all the law schools I could think of which had had some experience, to try to obtain some help, at least enough on which to pass a judgment as to the students' qualifications. The information I received was very sketchy and sometimes very inaccurate, yet here was a source of information about which I knew nothing and which would have made it much easier for a student to enter the law school of his choice. As this movement of students gains force, I know that Dr. Basadre's help and that of the Bureau of Education, will be of inestimable value and will do much to promote cultural relations in the Western Hemisphere. So our main objective is to secure better understanding of the purposes and methods of the schools involved in these interchanges and seek to effect a better understanding so that we may get to see the other fellow's viewpoint, with the result of securing better relations between lawyers and the countries they represent.

As to the manner in which the trip has been arranged, it is sponsored by the Inter-American Bar Association, the membership of which, as you know, is composed of various bar associations in the hemisphere. We are much indebted to the support given by the American Bar Association, the Bar Association of the District of Columbia and the Women's Bar, the Federal Bar Association, and the many other legal organizations which are members and have contributed through their membership to the support of the association which sponsors this trip. The major portion of the funds has been provided by the Department of State through a grant-in-aid, and I am also indebted to Duke University for the aid which it has given me to make possible this venture.

As to the countries to be visited, this takes in nearly all of the Latin-American Republics. After visiting with a number of law-school deans in Washington, I will proceed to Louisiana, the one civil-law jurisdiction in the United States, where I will talk with the three schools there to get their ideas about the interchange of students and how it can be best effected. Some day I hope to visit the interesting institution which was established by Judge Arthur Vanderbilt at New York University where at the present time a large portion of the Latin American law students are studying. There is a most sympathetic interest in the problem in Southern-Methodist University where, under the leadership of Dean Robert Storey, an institute similar to the one started by New York University is now beginning operations. Many other schools are considering the problem and are establishing courses which will be of particular value to Latin American students.

Because of the vast territory involved, it will not be possible at this time to visit all schools, but at least one law school in most of the Latin-American Republics will be visited. The first stop will be in Ecuador, then to Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Colombia, where the South American trip must necessarily end because this takes up to the 1st of December at which time the schools of most South American countries begin their summer vacations. The first stop in Central America will be at Guatemala, then to Honduras and to Mexico, and finally a hop to the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Cuba, and then back to the United States after almost 11 months. A survey can in no way be complete in this length of time, but at least it is a start and I hope it may be carried on by others in subsequent years until we have as full information about Latin-American schools as the American Bar Association now has through its system of school inspection and surveys covering the law schools of the United States.

It is interesting to note that a movement has started in South America for an association of law professors which in general outline seems to correspond with the objectives of the Association of American Law Schools, so that they may discuss law-school problems and secure a better understanding of each other, their objectives and methods, and establish somewhat uniform standards for those who are expecting to practice law.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota a question about an amount on page 32, for the Bureau of Census, a matter in which I am very much interested. It applies, I take it, to my bill, S. 554, which was recently enacted. I take it also that it is not proposed to go ahead with the 20 percent of the budget estimate for the preparatory work unless the Appropriations Committee is going to provide for continuing the work after January 1; so that amount of money would not be lost if the work were continued after January 1, 1948.

Mr. BALL. We had estimates of mineral resources, transportation, and business totaling nearly $14,000,000. In the limited time available to us we could not go into those estimates thoroughly, but the Bureau representatives told us that they wanted to get the preparatory work done and the maps drawn in the next 6 months, but they would not actually employ the enumerators until 1949. So we allowed 20 percent for the preparatory work, with the understanding that we will early in January examine the estimates for the full enumeration work.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator for his explanation. I am quite sure that this is something which is vital to business and industry. Colleges and other educational institutions are very much interested in it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from Minnesota a question or two with regard to the matter referred to by the junior

Senator from Alabama. Is it not true that there is no provision made in the general appropriation bill for administering title VI mortgages, FHA mortgages?

Mr. BALL. I am sorry, I cannot answer the Senator. I am not on the subcommittee that handled the bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I then make a suggestion, at least for the sake of the record. There are many millions of dollars of title VI FHA mortgages still unprocessed for which administrative funds are necessary. Would it not be appropriate for the record for the chairman in charge of these appropriations to state that it would be proper to use title II funds temporarily for administering title VI funds, and come back next January if necessary?

Mr. BALL. I am sorry, but I cannot answer the Senator. I think the Senator is under a misapprehension. I am merely substituting for the Senator from New Hampshire, chairman of the committee in charge of the bill. I certainly cannot take the responsibility. I am not an expert in the housing field. I could not take the responsibility when we did not consider anything in the committee of authorizing transfers of funds or in effect authorizing a deficiency.

Mr. FLANDERS. There have been no applications for these funds?

Mr. BALL. We had no estimates before the deficiency subcommittee involved in this bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. Then, Mr. President, I think perhaps this little colloquy is about as far as we can go, and I hope it will serve some useful purpose.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 2, beginning in line 22, was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this amendment deals with the Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1949. We had a budget estimate of $108,000, and the committee cut it down to $75,000. The Senator from Illinois is much more familiar with the subject than any of the other members on the committee. Unfortunately he was not present when we considered this item. He wants to have inserted the full budget estimate and have it taken to conference. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has asked unanimous consent for reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment on page 2, beginning in line 22, was agreed to. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote agreeing to the amendment is reconsidered.

Mr. BROOKS. I now move that the amount $75,000 on line 4, page 3, be stricken, and in lieu thereof $108,000 be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, is the bill still open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert "Federal Security Agency, Bureau of Employment Security: General administration, for an additional amount for general administration, $72,500."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this is an item which I understand came up from the Bureau of the Budget to the House too late to get into the bill, and was presented to the subcommittee probably in one of its last sessions. I wonder if the Senator in charge of the bill will accept the amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota cannot consider the amendment, because the committee considered it specifically and turned it down. The item is for $72,500 for additional employees in the United States Employment Service to specialize on employment of handicapped persons. Frankly, the committee felt that there was no justification whatever for adding employees at the Federal level to deal with this question, since the only employment of handicapped people that can possibly take place is managed at the State level by employees of the various States, for whom we made grants in the regular bill this year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word about the amendment.

Two or three years ago Congress passed a resolution which set aside a National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. If I correctly recall, in the resolution we requested the President to set up a committee or commission for the purpose of carrying on this program. Each year since that time the President has declared 1 week of the year to be National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, and Congress has appropriated money in the past to help defray the expenses of this week. That is what this small item is for.

Of course it is true that most of the employment is at the State level. A great deal of it is in private industry, but a great deal of good has been done by the program which has been put on, urging people both in Government and in private industry to employ physically handicapped persons.

I dare say there is not a Member of the Senate who has not had the experience of trying to obtain employment for physically handicapped persons. We all know the difficulty we run into every time. Seventy-two thousand five hundred dollars is a pitifully small sum for us to give in extending help toward the employment of this great army of physically handicapped people throughout the country. It is a much bigger army than most of us realize.

I certainly urge upon the Senate favorable action upon this amendment to provide a small amount to help the physically handicapped people of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6935) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Doris E. Snyder;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton;

S. 1717. An act for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased;

S. 2440. An act for the relief of Charles Duncan Montieth;

S. 2698. An act to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, and for other purposes;

S. 2705. An act to reimburse the Hamen & Phelps Construction Co.; and

S. 2709. An act for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, disagreed to by the Senate, and agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. PATMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2352. An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees;

H. R. 3999. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals; and

H. R. 6116. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1734. An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co;

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 564. An act for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg;

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Anthony Arancio;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Adney W. Gray;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp. of Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 1779. An act for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn.;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor;

H. R. 1930. An act for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of George Cleve Williams;

H. R. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;

H. R. 2551. An act for the relief of William R. Ramsey;

H. R. 2552. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley;

H. R. 2732. An act for the relief of Dennis Stanton;

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Henry;

H. R. 2889. An act for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston;

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr.;

H. R. 3261. An act for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson;

H. R. 3427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 4047. An act for the relief of Edmund Huppler;

H. R. 4199. An act for the relief of George Hamiotis;

H. R. 4441. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency;

H. R. 4452. An act for the relief of Douglas L. Craig;

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 4518. An act for the relief of Gerald S. Furman;

H. R. 4587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey);

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6705. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry;

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended;

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; and

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments.

AMENDMENT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on House bill 2798, to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That subsection (1) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following provision at the end thereof:

"'Any Federal savings and loan association may convert itself into a savings and loan type of institution organized pursuant to the laws of the State, district, or Territory (hereinafter referred to in this section as the State) in which the principal office of such Federal association is located: *Provided*, (1) That the State permits the conversion of any savings and loan type of institution of such State into a Federal savings and loan association; (2) that such conversion of a Federal savings and loan association into such a State institution is determined upon the vote in favor of such conversion cast in person or by proxy at a special meeting of members called to consider such action, specified by the law of the State in which the home office of the Federal association is located, as required by such law for a State-chartered institution to convert itself into a Federal association, but in no event upon a vote of less than 51 percent of all the votes cast at such meeting, and upon compliance with other requirements reciprocally equivalent to the requirements of such State law for the conversion of a State-chartered institution into a Federal association; (3) that notice of the meeting to vote on conversion shall be given as herein provided and no other notice thereof shall be necessary; the notice shall expressly state that such meeting is called to vote thereon, as well as the time and place thereof, and such notice shall be mailed, postage prepaid, at least 20 and not more than 30 days prior to the date of the meeting, to each member of record of the Federal association at his last address as shown on the books of the Federal association and to the General Manager of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, Washington, District of Columbia; (4) that, upon the effective date of the conversion, the association has repurchased the total amount invested in its shares by the Secretary of the Treasury; and (5) that if, upon the effective date of conversion, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will hold of record shares of the association, its approval of the conversion has been obtained; (6) that, in the event of dissolution after conversion, the members or shareholders of the association will share on a mutual basis in the assets of the association in exact proportion to their relative share or account credits; (7) that such conversion shall be effective upon the date that all the provisions of this act shall have been fully complied with and upon the issuance of a new charter by the State wherein the association is located; it being provided that its act of converting into a State-chartered institution shall consitute an agreement to be bound by all the requirements that the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation may legally impose under section 403 of title IV of the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, and the association shall upon conversion and thereafter be authorized to issue securities in any form currently approved at the time of issue by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for issuance by similar insured institutions in such State, District, or Territory.

"'In addition to the foregoing provision for conversion upon a vote of the members only any association chartered as a Federal savings and loan association, including any having outstanding shares held by the Secretary of the Treasury or Home Owners' Loan Corporation, may convert itself into a State institution upon an equitable basis, subject to approval, by regulations or otherwise, by the Home Loan Bank Board and by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: *Provided*, That if the insurance of accounts is terminated in connection with such conversion, the notice and other action shall be taken as provided by law and regulations for the termination of insurance of accounts.'

"SEC. 2. Section 19 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and subsection (c) of section 402 of the National Housing Act, as amended, are hereby each amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'All necessary expenses in connection with the making of supervisory or other examinations (except examinations of Federal home loan banks), including the provision of services and facilities therefor, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

HARRY P. CAIN,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
FREDERICK C. SMITH,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$35,000,000."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House with an amendment to strike out "$35,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$40,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the immediate consideration of a number of routine resolutions which were unanimously approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to know what they are.

Mr. HAYDEN. They are a group of resolutions giving assistance to committees, and so forth.

Mr. BROOKS. They will be read, one by one, and the Senator can object to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not intimating that I am going to object, but I have the right to know what they are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of a number of resolutions? The Chair hears none.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF MANUSCRIPT ENTITLED "TOWARD PEACE," A HANDBOOK ON AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, 1941-47

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably without amendment Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) submitted by Mr. VANDENBERG on July 23, 1947, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the manuscript entitled "Toward Peace," a handbook on American international relations, 1941-47, be printed as a Senate document, and that 1,000 additional copies shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 260, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, Senate Resolution 260, reported by Mr. LANGER on June 15, 1948, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress $2,500 in addition to the amount and for the same purposes specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946.

PRINTING AND BINDING OF CANNON'S PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with amendments, House Joint Resolution 190, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 190) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were, in line 4, after the word "copies", to strike out "of a revised edition"; in line 11, after the word "domain", to strike out "such revised edition of", and to amend the title so as to read: "Authorizing the printing and binding of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 263, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 263) submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL on June 17, 1948 (an original resolution from the Committee on Armed Services), was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending March 31, 1949, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under the resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 262, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 262), submitted as an original resolution from the Committee on the Judiciary on June 16, 1948, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress $5,000 in addition to the amount and for the same purpose specified in Senate Resolution 120, agreed to July 26, 1947.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 247, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 247), submitted by Mr. REVERCOMB on June 2, 1948, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $5,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 265, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 265), an original resolution reported by Mr. BRIDGES from the Committee on Appropriations, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946; Senate Resolution 130, agreed to June 26, 1947; and Senate Resolution 201, agreed to March 11, 1948.

STUDY OF OPERATION OF MARITIME COMMISSION — AUTHORIZATION TO MAKE CERTAIN EXPENDITURES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 259, submitted on June 11, 1948, by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause, and in lieu thereof to insert:

That the authority, powers, and duties of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 152, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 25, 1947, and Senate Resolution 189, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 28, 1948, are hereby extended until February 15, 1949.

SEC. 2. In studying the operations of the United States Maritime Commission with a view to determining its economy and efficiency, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is hereby authorized to expend, in accordance with the authority conferred upon said committee by said Senate Resolution 189, Eightieth Congress, such sums as it may deem advisable from the moneys made available to said committee under the provisions of said Senate Resolution 152.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to have printed in a subsequent issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary of the legislative record of this session of the Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me ask about the request.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is the usual request to have inserted in the RECORD a summary of the legislative record of the present session—in this case, the present session of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator mean a summary which he has prepared?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; prepared under my supervision.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the right to insert in the RECORD—did the Senator from Kentucky mean to have the summary to which he referred inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Then I ask unanimous consent to have the right to insert a summary of the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio wish to compare his summary with mine, to see whether they are identical?

Mr. TAFT. They might not be identical. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] asked unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a digest of the major legislation of the Eightieth Congress. He asked that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I now ask unanimous consent that it also be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: I omitted to make the same request in connection with the summary I asked to have printed in the RECORD. I also ask that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VALEDICTORY OF SENATOR HAWKES

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, and my distinguished friends and colleagues in the United States Senate, when the Eightieth Congress ends, my term of office in the United States Senate will likewise end.

I shall have completed almost 50 years of active service in the harness of American business and a full 6-year term in this great deliberative body. I have always tried to make my service an effort to preserve our great form of government and the American system of free men. This effort will not end until my power to think and act have ceased.

I was born in Chicago November 20, 1878, of highly respectable parents whose ancestry on both sides of the family dated back to the early colonial days in America.

These ancestors grew up under New England traditions in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. They taught me that even though our family was of modest means, no boy who was reared under the American flag with the freedoms and opportunities guaranteed by our American constitutional system of government could possibly be rated as poor.

They told me no man is poor who is the beneficiary of the choice blessings and benefits of life provided through the wisdom of our forefathers, who courageously gave us the Declaration of Independence and then successfully fought to establish and preserve its principles through the creation and adoption of the Constitution of the United States.

They taught me further that the most precious possessions in this world, such as the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, could be lost unless we continually recognize that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

They taught me that my duty was to obey the law, uphold the Constitution, and stand out in the open for the principles which are necessary if our great way of life is to be preserved.

Many of my friends in the State of New Jersey and throughout the Nation came to me in 1941 and 1942 to urge that I be a candidate for the Republican nomination to the United States Senate from New Jersey.

I acquiesced in their plan to support and nominate me, for the reason that I felt—regardless of my lack of political experience—that I might nevertheless invoke my experience in our industrial and business system throughout the Nation, and make a contribution to the thinking of the people's representatives which would, in some small way, contribute to the preservation of the principles and practices which I consider necessary if we are to endure as the greatest nation of freemen on earth.

I want to say to my colleagues in the Senate that I have had here the greatest experience of my life. I have formed, on both sides of the aisle, many friendships which I shall cherish the rest of my life. I am deeply indebted to a number of Senators for their kindly interest in trying to help me understand what they were doing and how they were doing it. I believe I have acquired a little knowledge of such matters.

I have known for a great many years that the label "Republican" or "Democrat" is not the vital thing in the preservation of the United States of America. The great question is this: Does a citizen or representative of the people believe in the American system and wish to preserve and improve it or is he one of those who wish to exchange a success for a failure, by following what I call un-American activities?

My experience here will enable me to continue making a contribution toward the preservation of our form of government and our institutions.

From the standpoint of service to his country, no man could fail to have sorrow and regret at leaving the Senate. No personal gratification in looking forward to more ease and comfort could possibly compensate for the loss of opportunity to continue in this great deliberative body as a servant of the people.

There was nothing here I wanted for myself when I arrived, except the opportunity to serve the people and help preserve in our mutual interest the rights and opportunities which developed under our American system of freemen.

As I leave the Senate, there is nothing I want for myself, except to continue working toward that same objective.

I am thinking of the existing generations following me and of those generations yet unborn. They should be allowed to follow in the paths of liberty and opportunity through our system of reward for work, thrift, and the use of genius, coupled with the acceptance of individual responsibility to the limit of individual capacity.

Of course, every man in public service should like to have his acts meet with public approval; but it is far more important that he should stand on principle, in the hope that what he does will receive approval when the people understand, than it is that he should seek public approval at the expense of sacrifice of principle.

Alexander Pope said:

What's fame? A fancied life in others' breath; a thing beyond us, even before our death; * * *.

Benjamin Franklin made a remarkable public statement which should give comfort to every servant of the people who is trying to do his duty by standing on principle rather than acceding to political expediency. He said:

We must not in the course of publick life expect immediate approbation and immediate grateful acknowledgment of our services. But let us persevere thro' abuse and even injury. The internal satisfaction of a good conscience is always present, and time will do us justice in the minds of the people, even of those at present the most prejudic'd against us.

The recipe which Lord Macaulay gave to the British people in 1830, when the United States was in its infancy, was a good plan for the free people of Britain, and is still a good plan for the United States of America. The British people failed to follow that plan and they have ended in socialism.

Lord Macaulay appreciated that the siren voice of political promisers could easily lead many people away from the principles vital to the preservation of a government of freemen. He recognized if the leaders of a free people induced them to adopt temporary expedients at variance with the principles vital to their permanent welfare in an effort to avoid the problems and hardships of the day, it could only end in having the government become the master and the people, its slaves. This is what he said:

> Our rulers will best promote the improvement of the people by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties—by leaving capital to find its most lucrative course, commodities their fair price, industry and intelligence their natural reward, idleness and folly their natural punishment—by maintaining peace, by defending property, by diminishing the price of law, and by observing strict economy in every department of the state. Let the government do this—the people will assuredly do the rest.

I urge all my colleagues in all seriousness and kindness to reflect on what has been happening in this great Congress the past 2 or 3 weeks at the close of the session. No government can support its people and assume all the individual burdens of its citizens without becoming the master of the people and defining what liberties they shall have left.

I am not attempting today to criticize the acts of any of my colleagues or any political party. I wish to set down in simple form the things which I believe must be done if we are to preserve our form of government—our system of human relations—our economic system based on freedom of the individual and his opportunity to improve his own relative position in life. Freemen must be willing to pay the price of success so far as that price lies within their ability and the talents which God Almighty has given them.

It is perfectly clear to me that we should immediately recognize the following basic things which must be solved if our system is not to succumb to the onslaughts which are being made by unthinking people who have come under the domination of shrewd, skillful planners throughout the world. If these planners are successful, it will mean the destruction of the underlying philosophy, principles, and privileges of our American system of freemen.

First. We must recognize that one of the principal routes to socialism and communism is national bankruptcy. Our national debt of $253,000,000,000 is, in reality, a mortgage upon every private business institution and all personal property in the United States because of the constitutional power to tax, which, if misused, is the power to destroy.

Few people appreciate that the national debt through the power of taxation is a burden on each citizen and a mortgage on his earning power and property rights. That applies from the highest to the lowliest individual in the land who owns property and has earning power. The distinguished and able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], in a factual and realistic speech which he made in this Senate on May 19, 1948, pointed out to his colleagues and to the American people the fact that as we are now going our annual budget by 1951 will be just slightly under $50,000,000,000.

It should be apparent to all that when the rest of the world is able to provide the materials and when demand is less than production or supply, problems which we cannot now calculate will come before the American people.

We should all understand at this time that if we have less production, less profits, and higher taxes to meet the "must" bills, we shall then likely be confronted with a decreased initiative which in other countries has gone to the point where the Government has had to take over—and then socialistic or communistic practices have supplanted individual freedom and opportunity.

Second. Unless we soon recognize that if our Government uses its power to tax to raise funds for investment in fields of private business which heretofore have always been left to private citizens, we will find the same thing happening in our country that has already happened in Great Britain.

Governmental invasion of the business field, which we call the field of free competitive enterprise, is dangerous if our system is to endure.

Perhaps Abraham Lincoln expressed in simple terms as well as any other American the thought I have in mind. He said—and this is very simply expressed:

> In all things which the people can do for themselves as well as or better than the Government—then the Government should never interfere.

Mr. Lincoln was a champion and defender of the common man. He was more interested in the common man than almost any other man in public life of whom I have ever heard.

Our people must first understand the meaning of these encroachments by Government into the field of private business, and then they will have to decide whether our citizens as a whole have fared better under our American way of doing business than have the citizens in the other countries which have indulged in these socialistic practices which have ultimately led to complete control by the state.

The real cost to the people for things produced by private enterprise would be found to be less than the cost the people will pay for the same services from Government-built plants managed by Federal employees who are held to no accountability or responsibility for results attained. Under Government ownership it has been proved to my satisfaction that there is no way possible for the public to check operations and know real costs.

Third. We must soon get back to the place where all excess powers granted to the Chief Executive by the Congress must be returned to the Congress if we are to keep the wise balance between the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of the Government which were thought by our forefathers to be the safeguards of the people's rights and the protectors of individual freedom.

Fourth. We must in all our laws regarding employment relations never forget that our American system is one primarily based upon voluntary cooperation.

In enacting laws affecting or governing employment relations, we must bear in mind that America was made successful because the workingman of today has often become the owner or employer of tomorrow. That opportunity must always be kept alive under our system for the great majority of our people are in the employee class.

If we are to remain a free people, the solution of the greater part of all human relations problems must be left to the people, and must be brought about by voluntary action.

The whole history of the world shows that the more Government invades the field of regulating human relationship and action, the more it curtails the liberties of its people. When that intrusion has gone far enough, the Government becomes the master and the people have lost the freedoms and rights of action which made possible the development of the United States of America.

Fifth. The Chief Executive, the representatives in the Congress, and the judiciary must so conduct themselves as to convince all fair-minded citizens that none of them represents any special group or interest.

Respect for government is vital. That is why we should be careful in this great body always to remember that when we discuss or criticize our Government and try to improve it—we should recognize it as the most sacred thing we have, outside of our religion.

Therefore, the people's representatives must seek to find a fair balance in equity and justice between all groups and interests in the United States and thus retain that respect.

Sixth. Our Government and people have a definite obligation to do the fair and sound thing so far as it lies within our power to do it for all those who have given their service in defending the Nation in war.

The veteran and the veterans' organizations have a like obligation to seek only those things which are vital and necessary to them and which lie within the power of the people to do, without destroying the very thing the veteran sought to preserve on the battlefield.

I should like to interject here to my good colleagues and friends that I do not think any man had a better understanding of the veteran and what the Nation owed him, since I have been old enough to remember, than did Al Smith. I have always gone along with his philosophy and admired his feeling with regard to the veterans.

I have frequently said that those veterans who are substantially or totally incapacitated through their great service to their fellow Americans are entitled to the maximum aid within our power to give while yet we are preserving the liberties and freedoms of our people for which they fought.

Seventh. I have been alarmed at the growing tendency of different citizens and groups, which make up our American economy, to ask the Government to solve all their problems and guarantee them against the ordinary contingencies which free men under our system of free competitive enterprise have, up to the last quarter of a century, accepted as their own responsibility. Our system is not a profit system but it is a profit and loss system. We seem to be trying to get rid of the loss and turn it over to the Government, and keep the profits. That is something for all Americans to think about.

If our American citizens expect to remain free men and preserve the free competitive enterprise system and yet operate under the philosophy that they can keep their profits if they are successful and, on the other hand, the Government will pay their losses or guarantee them against substantial loss if they experience such losses—then to my mind there will be no hope of ending anywhere except in statism with state control and state direction in the affairs of our citizens.

If group after group of our citizens are willing to raid the public treasury, and I say that advisedly, not because they approve of that course but because some other citizen or group of citizens has been successful in raiding the Treasury, then my conclusion is that we will soon be through with our great system which has been the outstanding success of the world.

We will find ourselves on a common level with the people throughout the world who are now engulfed in socialism and statism because they were willing to have the government assume their responsibilities rather than to accept those responsibilities themselves.

Eighth. My votes on foreign policy and foreign gifts and loans have been based upon my knowledge of the people in the various countries selected as the recipients of the unusual favors we have been granting.

There has never been a time when it would not have been more pleasant for me to have "gone along" than it was to vote as I did. Parts of certain legislation against which I voted would have been acceptable to me, but I have felt and still feel strongly that the representatives of our people must soon take an inventory of our debts and obligations—must analyze our power to continue with the programs they have undertaken—must analyze what could happen to our Nation if we have a depression—must recognize that the very things we are doing to build up foreign nations in competition with us must of necessity decrease our own earning power and ability to pay—and finally must recognize that we will have committed a crime against ourselves and the world if we find we have exceeded our ability to do things and thus have destroyed our vital leadership for the peace and stability of free men throughout the world.

Even those running an eleemosynary corporation must be guided by the amount of funds within their power to accomplish their objectives. Regardless of where their hearts might take them, their brains must direct every action if they expect to complete their kindly deeds and accomplish their objectives.

They must know how much a thing will cost, how far they must proceed with it, what funds are available now, and whether the source for future funds to complete their objective will be available.

Ninth. Everything I have learned in life teaches me that there are certain fields dealing with human relationship among a free people which can never be successfully covered by law.

I feel strongly that a compulsory law can never accomplish the desired results in fair employment practices which I use simply as an illustration. I have taken that position on the floor of the Senate, before this.

No law under our system can ever successfully force an employer to give any person satisfactory employment with hope for the future. Take the reverse. In the fourteenth amendment, we decided that no man in the United States should be forced to work against his will for another man. Fair employment practices can and should be developed in our Nation.

I might say at this point that in my business affairs I have had the most remarkable success in absorbing all kinds of people, colored and white, Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant, and mixing them together. The businesses with which I have been connected have never taken any cognizance of what a man's religion may be. Nor have we determined a man's rate of pay by the color of his skin. Performance is the best test. That development can best be brought about through voluntary processes—greater understanding between men—and through the making of an effort to eliminate all misunderstandings based on race, color, and creed.

I think it would help all of us if we could always remember that we had no choice for ourselves when we came into this world. We could not decide whether we would be black or white, Jew or gentile. But we all came from a common source, from God Almighty. If we try to treat one another properly, try to get along together, try to do the best we can and practice the Golden Rule, perhaps we shall make much more progress than by trying to put hard and fast laws upon the people.

Tenth. One of the most important things this great deliberative body should consider more completely than it has in recent years, and I think it is faced with it now, is the demarcation between States' rights and the Federal field of operation.

You, my colleagues, will soon be confronted with problems of leaving with the States the things which they can do for their own citizens as well as or better than the Federal Government. For example, this means you will be confronted with deciding what taxing areas are to be left to the States and what taxing areas are going to be preempted by the Federal Government. There may be areas where a different division than that now in existence will be necessary.

Unless the Congress shows that the Federal Government can stay in its own sphere as planned under our Constitution, and leave unadulterated to the States the rights which belong to the States, then I rather feel our people will be a little wary about how far we go into the United Nations and interalliance with other nations of the world.

If we cannot adhere to the form of government we started to build in this country, what right have we to assume that if we become entangled with nations throughout the world, some overall power will not take all our rights away?

If the Federal Government will function in the sphere it is intended to occupy and leave to the States the conduct of the affairs of the citizens of the States, then in my opinion the Representatives in the Congress and in the Federal Government will be able to apply themselves to the more important affairs and have time to do a better job for the Nation in keeping with the plan of our forefathers.

Mr. President, I went to Europe in 1945. I left the United States the day after VE-day and flew across the ocean. We spent Decoration Day at the Anzio beachhead, one of the most remarkable and memorable days I ever spent, because there I attended the Decoration Day services as the only funeral service for my boy, who had been buried at Milne Bay, New Guinea, out in the Pacific. I thought of every one of the 6,900 fine American boys buried in that Anzio beachhead cemetery the same as I thought of my own son. We went on to Rome, and in Rome on June 3, 1945, as a member of the Communications Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I talked to a group of American soldiers.

Those American soldiers expressed themselves quite freely. They stood up and said that from what they heard, apparently the war was not over, and they expressed the thought that unless the war was over they would like to stay in Europe and finish it.

I shall never forget a staff sergeant who had been through the war for 4 years. He rose and said, "Mr. Senator, I have at home two little boys. One is 8 years old and the other five. I have been through hell's half acre over here for 3½ years. I have lain out in the mud and have endured many hardships." He added, "If this war is not over now, I should like to stay over here and finish it, because I don't want those little boys of mine ever to have to do what I have done." He added, "We have this wonderful manpower on continental Europe, such as no nation ever had."

I commented that we as a nation could no more stay in partnership with a partner who was accused of heinous crimes and offenses against civilization than could a private individual remain in a business partnership with a man accused of dastardly crimes. I did not say that such accusations against our allies were true, but I said that we should ascertain the facts and know the truth, that it was our duty to do so if we expected to stand before the world as true disciples of justice and peace.

Further I said we should restate at that time the objectives for which we fought the war and announce the course we planned to take toward peace.

My reason for that statement was that we had 3,400,000 of the best trained and armed soldiers in the world on continental Europe at a cost considerably exceeding $200,000,000,000 and the loss of precious lives. The British had 750,000 similarly armed forces. If we had defined our plan of action and course for peace and justice then, our ally's attitude might have been entirely different than it was after that great force and power was removed from continental Europe months before we ever knew what we were talking about, and what our peace objective was. I am not sure that we know yet. Our course then was the most vital thing in the world. I felt action at that time could definitely prevent another war and definitely establish an agreement on principles which would lead to peace and might save us from complete exhaustion of our material wealth and thus save us from statism, which has almost engulfed the earth.

Every statement I made was misquoted back home, without my knowledge, while I was yet abroad in the service of my country, riding 25,000 miles through the air. For making my suggestion I was accused of trying to incite more war. Now, more than 3 years after the statement, those who criticized me are agreeing with what I said, and regretting that the course suggested was not followed.

Unfair attacks upon any group in our American life can be productive of division among our people. The maximum unity, respect, and confidence that we can obtain are vital to the protection of the rights and interests of every man in our country from the lowest to the highest.

If men in high places say publicly untrue things about each other for political reasons or any other reasons, and hire commentators, newspapers, or other public relations agencies to assassinate character, then how can we expect to preserve our Government and our freedoms? Only people who can and will find a way to get along with each other with due regard for honesty and the truth can remain free.

If the current abuse of free speech and propaganda is continued, it could well lead to the destruction of the safeguards which protect free speech. Thus free speech could prove to be its own executioner.

My whole statement means that if we want to preserve our liberties, we will have to pay the price. The price at times seems high to some because it means self-denial, self-control, self-restraint, standing squarely on principle out in the limelight where one is open to the fire of unjust and unfair criticism.

It means, as Mr. Farley, a distinguished Democratic national chairman, said, "Willingness to surrender office rather than compromise with principle."

It means refusal to compromise with principle for the sake of what some call temporary expedients.

It means acceptance of the consequences for acting as one's intelligence and conscience tell him is right.

It may mean loss or gain in material things.

Our forefathers were willing to pay the price of freedom. That price exacted from them all the things I have mentioned, including the supreme sacrifice in hundreds of thousands of cases.

I have often asked myself: Why were they willing to pay the price? The answer has always come back to me: Because they considered individual freedom, coupled with opportunity for self-improvement, the most valuable thing in the world.

Unless we as a people redeem our morals, rebuild our character, and recognize the mandates of our God differently than we have been and are doing, then we will not have the fiber and the courage to do the things necessary to pay for the preservation of individual freedom in its true sense.

So long as a majority of our people seek to give less for a dollar, they will get less for a dollar, and if they are going to be led astray by the philosophy that they can get something for nothing or that the world owes a living to the indolent, the shiftless, and the sluggards—there is no hope for the redemption of America.

Honest people should beget honesty in their representatives. Intelligence in the selection of representatives is vital to the preservation of representative democracy.

Our system of government and human relationship will not be preserved by the representatives of the people unless the people show by their votes that they wish it preserved.

On June 14, 1948, I received unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I made entitled "Who Can Preserve Representative Democracy?" This speech, which subsequently appeared on page A3884, contained thoughts which had accumulated in my mind over a period of more than 45 years in American business.

During the coming adjournment period, I ask that you, my colleagues, read this speech for it is my humble opinion that the conclusions contained therein apply with as much if not more force today than they did when that speech was delivered on November 27, 1939.

To increase American voluntary cooperation, the keystone of our American system, we must redevelop respect for one another, invoke equity in our relations, and thus rebuild confidence between our citizens. One recipe for that program is set forth in the following little poem, The Man in the Glass:

THE MAN IN THE GLASS

When you get what you want in your struggle for self
And the world makes you king for a day,
Just go to a mirror and look at yourself,
And see what that man has to say.

For it isn't your father or mother or wife
Whose judgment upon you must pass,
The fellow whose verdict counts most in your life
Is the one staring back from the glass.

You may be like Jack Horner and chisel a plum
And think you're a wonderful guy,
But the man in the glass says you're only a bum
If you can't look him straight in the eye.

He's the fellow to please—never mind all the rest,
For he's with you clear up to the end,
And you've passed your most dangerous, difficult test
If the man in the glass is your friend.

You may fool the whole world down the pathway of years
And get pats on the back as you pass,
But your final reward will be heartaches and tears
If you've cheated the man in the glass.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I may say as acting majority leader that I know I express the sentiments of every Member on this side when I say that ALBERT HAWKES is our friend; that we will always remember him as one who has proven himself to be of the utmost sincerity, honesty, and high integrity. He is a man of great ability. He has always fought for what he thought was right. He has always acted from the highest principles.

Mr. President, it has been my great and good fortune to know him. As he leaves this body, I wish for him continued health and happiness. He will carry with him our high regard. We will remember him for years and years to come.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to say that I am glad I have had the privilege of being on the floor of the Senate this afternoon to listen to the splendid advice, the very sound admonitions that have been given to us here today by the Senator from New Jersey. The Senator from New Jersey and I entered the Senate together. I have grown to know him over the course of years—now almost six. I know him as a man who is absolutely devoted to his country, a man who is thoroughly courageous in advocating those things in which he believes, and as one who is fair.

We have not always agreed, but this much I know—whether in agreement or whether in disagreement—he was earnest and sincere in those things he advocated. Now, Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has chosen, through his own decision, not to be a candidate again for membership in this body. But that does not mean—certainly to me—that we shall not have his advice, that we shall not have his splendid help. I express the hope to him that he will frequently return to Washington and to the Senate Chamber, where he has served with such distinction and with such great service to his country.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6402) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I may say at the outset that I request that in the few remarks I shall make I be not interrupted until I have concluded. I expect to speak a very few minutes and at the conclusion of my remarks I shall be happy to answer any questions that may be raised.

But before I discuss the bill under consideration I should like to take just a moment to pay a personal tribute to the Senator from New Jersey who has just spoken.

When I came to this body almost 4 years ago, he was one of the first Members of the Senate I met.

I became better acquainted with him, of course, as the years went on. I have come to the complete conviction that, while this statement is applicable to every other Member of the Senate, in connection with his particular habits, his particular attitude, his particular accomplishments, there is no man whom I have met who has proved more conclusively by his life and by his attitude the verity and the truth of the fundamental philosophies and policies which have guided him. He has been a great stimulus. We regret to see him leave; but, as the Senator from West Virginia has so ably said, his counsel and his advice will remain with us.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to add that I concur in the kind remarks which the Senator has made in regard to the Senator from New Jersey. I have worked with him on committees. It has been a pleasure to know him. He has my best wishes in his future work.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a combination of circumstances has entered the situation at this moment to cause me to alter my original intentions of about 10 days or 2 weeks ago, when the bill was placed upon the list of bills which must be passed before this session is over. It has been the unfinished business of the Senate for several days, but matters of urgent consideration which had to be decided have displaced it and postponed it from time to time, and certain other considerations have caused delay. So we come to what perhaps is the last day of this session, for the consideration of this bill, which now is House bill 6402, that bill having already passed the House of Representatives and having been substituted earlier today for Senate bill 2589, the bill to extend the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission for a year and 11 months from next August 1.

A few weeks ago the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through the Senate Members, filed a rather comprehensive majority report setting out the reasons, and, I believe, insofar as the real interests of national safety and genuine confidence in the progress of the Atomic Energy Commission will permit, the details as to why it is an utterly sound, utterly sensible, and utterly practicable, as well as utterly indicated procedure for those terms to be continued en bloc for almost 2 years after the original expiration date fixed by the McMahon Act on its original passage.

The majority report is not only on the desks of Members, and has been for days, but it was placed in the body of the RECORD at the time of filing. I feel confident that Members have seen the report. While it is a report of some length, Senators have undoubtedly gone through it and examined the very logical and sound reasons why this bill should become law.

There is a second matter which has arisen by virtue of the circumstances of the moment, which has caused me to alter my plans somewhat, and that is that on this last day of the session a most important bill to a great many people is now waiting to be considered and acted upon by the Senate, along with others which will follow. The bill is the Federal employees pay bill. I hope that we can proceed with expedition to consider and act upon that bill.

There is another consideration which moves me, and I think I should say it to Members of the Senate in all frankness and candor. It is simply a practical fact, and I think it goes without argument, that the bill which has already passed the House of Representatives and is here must, in the interest of atomic energy and the smooth and confident continuity of the atomic energy program itself, be passed today and become law. Any other course at this moment would be detrimental, and in some ways damaging indeed, to the atomic energy program.

The realization that this bill must become law is contained in the statements made by Members of the House of Representatives yesterday or the day before, when the bill was passed there. I invite the attention of Senators to the statement and reasoning of Mr. DURHAM, who is a member of the joint committee. Mr. DURHAM was one who voted against the bill in committee. While he feels that other proceedings would be better, he nevertheless makes this statement:

I feel that it is in the best interests of the country to adopt this measure at this time.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois, also a member of the joint committee and one of the Members who voted against the recommendation of this bill, makes the same statement.

I merely refer to these statements as indicating that there is a realization of the vital necessity of this bill becoming law.

I had prepared, and have on my desk, and originally intended to deliver, a statement of some length, in which I attempted to outline in detail the supporting reason why this bill is a good bill, why it is a solution to the difficult problem facing us in connection with atomic energy, and why it must be passed.

The remarks which I had prepared for delivery amplify to some extent, but generally follow, the reasoning of the majority report. That report has been in the hands of Senators for perhaps a month—at least 3 weeks—and I assume that members therefore are familiar with it. It would be in some ways a recapitulation or a rehashing, perhaps, of the general outline contained in that report. I therefore propose to take 5 minutes or so to give merely a few highlights in the reasoning as to why this is a good bill, and then ask that the remarks which I had prepared to deliver at some length be printed in the RECORD as a statement, so that the reasons can be better amplified for the RECORD. Then if any questions arise in the minds of Senators I shall be happy to try to answer them. I then hope that Senators who have comments on the bill will be permitted to proceed with as little interruption as possible. I would then be confident that we could reach a vote very shortly on this measure. Later I shall ask that my prepared statement be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, atomic energy descended with a suddenness and startlingness upon the world, at the close of the Japanese war, that was beyond imagination. We suddenly found that we had on our hands the greatest explosive force that had ever been conceived by man, and we had to do something about it. It had vast areas of possibilities for humanitarian and peacetime uses, too. Having this great force on our hands and having the responsibility of it in connection with war, as well as peace, it became incumbent upon this country to find some solution for its control and its safeguarding.

In summary, without going into detail, I call attention to the fact that the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, called the McMahon Act, was passed after lengthy hearings, exhaustive examination, and exploration of the possibilities and the avenues of travel down which we might go. It became the law of the land, and today we are operating under that law.

In that act itself there is a recognition that it was a pioneering adventure into an unknown field, and that undoubtedly it would require amendment, change, and alteration from time to time as conditions unfolded.

It has created the greatest monopoly this Nation has ever seen. It has put in the hands of a commission more power, more authority, and more right to go into more economic and social fields than any other bureau or body of this Government has ever enjoyed before, with the possible exception of the martial emergency of war. We made the provisions contained under this act because the committee and the Congress knew of no other way to handle the matter with the greatest possible safety and security. But in doing so, as I say, we created this great monopoly, interlocked and interlaced with every business, industry, science, electronics, and all the technical professions. We set up a commission to administer this great authority and great power.

We provided in the law that the Commission should hold office for a 2-year period, and it was fully explained that during that period the administration of the policies of the atomic energy set-up under the act could be examined and judged and evaluated.

The law set up a unique relationship between an administrative body of the Government and the Congress of the United States, when it established the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and gave it power to examine and inquire into and learn about this new venture in public monopoly and public operation. Contrary to the original intent of the law, there has not really been a 2-year

period in which to evaluate the administrative policies of the Commission, as applied to the over-all atomic-energy policy as prescribed and laid down in the act.

The bill we are now considering, I wish to make very clear, has nothing whatsoever to do with the policy of our Government on atomic energy. That policy is outlined and set forth in the act. This bill goes only to the administrative programs to implement that policy. That point must be kept clearly in mind. Nothing in this measure changes the policy on atomic energy as prescribed in the law. This bill touches only the question of the further examination of the administrative programs that are applied to the policy in the development and progress of atomic energy.

I said that the full 2-year period for the examination of the beginnings of this program in its administrative part has not been had. The terms of office of the first commissioners would expire 2 years after the effective date of the act. The act became effective on August 1, 1946, and that would make the termination period of the terms of office of the Commissioners August 1, 1948. However, the President did not appoint the Commissioners until about the 1st of November 1946. He did not appoint the General Manager until about the 1st of January 1947; I think it was on December 30, 1946. The nominations of the Commissioners did not come to the Senate until January 20, 1947, and they were not confirmed until some time in April 1947, or approximately 1 year ago. They then for the first time got a reliable hold on their offices, and they then began to feel an assurance in the tenure of the office they had, so that they could go ahead with some confidence in the establishment of their administrative programs. The joint committee could not function until about a year ago. So the Commission and the joint committee began almost in infancy, on a reliable basis, approximately 1 year ago.

The Commission has adopted policies. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy began its studies and has carried them on; but up to this time the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in my opinion and in the opinion of the majority of the members, has not had sufficient time or sufficient opportunity in volume of experience, in learning about this subject itself, to give to the Congress any sound, reasonable judgment upon which it would ask the Congress to rely in fixing a permanent program or a permanent administrative policy for the Commission, in relation to this subject which is so vitally integrated into the American system.

Therefore, the joint committee by a vote of 11 to 5, with two members not voting, recommended to each House of the Congress that this bill be passed and that the terms of all the Commissioners be extended, en bloc, 1 year and 11 months after the 1st day in August next.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under that arrangement, there would be no need of confirmation; would there?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. In other words, this measure would automatically extend the present terms of office; would it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. We would simply take August 1, 1948, out of the calendar, really, and would insert in its place June 30, 1950.

Mr. CONNALLY. So the Senate would not have to act on the question of confirmation; is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. President, there are certain advantages to this procedure. One is that it will establish an uninterrupted continuity of service on the part of the entire Commission, without the chance of having any new appointments next year to the Commission. The entire Commission thus can go forward with confidence and with assurance for over 2 years from this date, and their administrative programs and patterns can be approached with a reliability which might not be the case under any other plan or program.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Congress can have opportunity to see the further development of their plans and programs; and then the Congress—the Senate and the House of Representatives—at that time, if sufficient evidence then exists and if sufficient confidence and judgment have then been established, can determine the permanent administrative pattern, whether it be this type or a slightly changed one, or whatever the developing facts shall show or indicate.

Just to illustrate, and not by way of suggesting that this should be done, but to illustrate the fact that responsible bodies in this country are now considering that we might well begin at this time to think about whether the basic philosophy of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 should be changed or not, I call Members' attention to the fact that I received yesterday by mail a copy of an article which is to appear in the July issue of the technical journal called Nucleonics. I have checked it and I find it is a reliable, reputable scientific journal, written perhaps for the education of the layman but nevertheless with a high degree of reliable scientific background, and it is published by McGraw-Hill Publications. This article, with the endorsement of the editorial staff of the journal takes up some suggestions under the heading "New legislation to replace McMahon Act," and it discusses for instance a completely new theory of administrative control of atomic energy. I do not say it is a good program or a bad program, but I use it merely to illustrate the fact that there is responsible thinking going on in this country now outside the Government, if you please, wondering whether we have the right approach to the control of atomic energy, wondering whether the interests of the country itself would not be better served by some other approach. I do not necessarily think it would; I have not come to those conclusions at all. But I do say that any organization that operates in secrecy as this must, that has such a limited economic power as this organization has, and as this program has, that is so vitally in control of perhaps the very safety and salvation of this Nation, can well afford to be examined carefully and scrutinized minutely by the Congress of the United States in calmness and over a sufficient period of time so that when a permanent program is finally decided upon, whether it be this one or another one, the Congress will have available the best and most voluminous supporting data, proved by experience, if you please, upon which the American people will rely and for which the Congress need not later be apologetic.

Just one other thing, and then I am through. Unfortunately in the past the cry of politics has been raised about this bill. May I call Members' attention to the fact that of the five members of the Atomic Energy Commission and the General Manager of that Commission, of those five members I know the partisan politics of only two members. They are Republicans, and I am a Republican. I do not know the partisan politics of the other three members, nor do I know the partisan politics of the General Manager. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress, of which I have been honored by being selected as chairman, employs a staff of 16 people. I have never inquired the partisan politics of a single employee of the committee, and I have not been informed as to the partisan politics of any member of the Commission, directly or indirectly, by innuendo or insinuation. The knowledge of the politics of the individual has never been involved in the employment of a single member of that staff, with one exception. I know the politics of one man on the staff, and it is entirely collateral and not applicable at all to the question of his job. He was never asked his politics as a matter of qualifying for his job, and it has been a nonpartisan staff and a nonpartisan activity. I think it is safe to say that in the deliberations of the joint committee—composed of Democrats and Republicans—there has never been a partisan issue as a matter of discussion or action in the committee. I think every member of the committee will agree with that. So I say it is not partisan political activity from that standpoint.

Now let us see if it is partisanly political from the standpoint of the criticism that has been raised in certain quarters that all I want to do, or all we want to do on this side is to let a Republican President appoint the Commissioner. Let us see. If the present law, which provides for staggered terms from 1 to 5 years, goes into effect, the next President of the United States under existing law will appoint four of those Commissioners anyway, because four terms will expire in the next Presidential term. The bill extends the whole kit and caboodle of the Commission, if you please, for approximately 2 years; they do all expire at that time, but there would be five appointed at that time instead of four under the situation that presently exists under the law.

No, Mr. President, there is no controlling politics in this matter. There are differences of opinion, there are those who genuinely believe that the staggered terms should be put into effect now, and I respect them for their opinion. There are those who do not believe in this type of Commission, if you please, and I respect them for their opinion. There are those who, for one reason or another, oppose the present provisions of the law, and I respect them for their opinion. But I have found there is the greatest unanimity of opinion in the Congress, among the public, among the scientists, and among the technical people that the 2-year proposition is a workable, a practical proposition and that it will, in fact, enable the Commission to continue with confidence in the development of its programs and its plan.

I said I was going to say just one more thing. I want to mention just one other thing. This was a tremendous job. The Manhattan District that had it during wartime developed a multibillion dollar corporation. It ramified throughout the country. It was in many ways a mysterious and a complicated establishment. The Commission took it over and is today still operating in great measure upon the pattern and the plan and the program of the Manhattan District. Certain changes have begun to be made, certain experiments have begun to be gone into, but the records and the history and the proof of the soundness of present administrative policies is not sufficiently mature at this time to warrant final conclusions in a matter of such vital importance.

Mr. President, I merely wish to quote one paragraph which I think is significant, to me, at least, in closing my remarks. I wish to call attention to the fact that this legislation is not to be interpreted or accepted as a criticism of the present Commission. Rather do I interpret it as a cooperative activity to enable them to go forward with greater confidence and with greater continuity of authority and operation of the Commission for an additional year and 11 months.

Personally, I believe this view is shared by the majority of the joint committee, I hope to see the present Commission given further and adequate opportunity to bring its administrative plans to a higher state of completion by extending their terms until June 30, 1950. I think it is fair to the Commission members. I think it is fair to the scientists, the technicians, the contractors, and the employees. I think it is in the best interests of the American people. The thing which would contribute to restlessness within the atomic-energy project would be the precipitate establishment of a permanent administrative arrangement, the advisability of which is now seriously questioned by many who have only the vigorous development of the program at heart.

I may have a word or two to say later, before the final vote, in an effort frankly and factually to discuss matters that might be in doubt. Above all I want to see atomic energy kept on a basis of acceptance by the Congress, of acceptance by the American people, and of united support and vigorous support by the Congress. I see no reason why that cannot be. I see no reason why the bill cannot contribute to that end, and I see every reason why the enactment of the bill will contribute to it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, following my verbal statement, my prepared remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, in considering the passage of H. R. 6402, the sole effect of which is to extend the expiration date of the terms of the present Atomic Energy Commissioners from August 1, 1948, to June 30, 1950, the Senate is considering a vital matter deeply affecting our national economy, our pattern of Government operation, and our national security.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 was passed as a result of the urgent necessity for setting up the most reliable controls over atomic weapon production and development in order to maintain the preeminence of the United States in this field. In considering the provisions of the act, it became the inevitable conclusion of the committees of the Senate and of the House, and of the Congress itself, that a monopolistic enterprise in the hands of the Government was the unavoidable device by which security and progress could be combined and so the act was so designed.

The program for the operation of the atomic energy enterprise was defined in that act and still is the program of this Nation. I point out now that H. R. 6402 does not alter or change the program of atomic-energy activities in this country, but that it only goes to the matter of further time for the examination, consideration, and reliable establishment of administrative policies as set up and carried out by the Atomic Energy Commission, that most efficiently put into effect the program already established and confirmed by law. A commission of five civilians and a general manager were provided for with broad authority to adopt and put into effect these administrative policies. At the time of the passage of the act it was fully realized that this was a new venture in governmental operations; the theory of Government monopoly in this field was accepted by the Congress and the Nation because there seemed to be no other way to handle it. This theory demanded and the law confirmed the placing of vast and exclusive powers in the hands of the Atomic Energy Commission. These powers are more extensive than any peacetime powers heretofore possessed by any Government department and these powers are exercised throughout innumerable fields of our social and economic system. Tremendous appropriations and authorizations, which, when combined, exceed a total of over $1,000,000 a year are requested by this Commission and have been granted by the Congress without the furnishing of or the requirement of detailed break-downs as to their need and expenditure universally required in other agencies and departments of Government. Without specific comment at this time, I call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that this situation is causing concern within the Congress and quote from the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in connection with the independent offices appropriation bill filed with the Committee of the Whole House on June 13, 1947, as follows:

"The committee considered a budget estimate totaling $250,000,000 for this purpose together with a contract authorization for an additional $250,000,000. The committee heard the Commission in connection with the estimates on two different occasions. On the first occasion, the committee found it impossible to obtain definite information as to the distribution and use of personnel requested or to secure a reasonably comprehensive break-down as to the distribution of funds requested for other objects of expenditure.

"The committee thereupon requested the Commission to make a further survey and report back at a later date, giving an administrative break-down as to personnel and a somewhat detailed break-down of other estimated expenditures in order that a concrete picture could be obtained as to the distribution of funds under the estimate of $250,000,000.

"The committee regrets to report that the second hearing of this agency failed to produce any substantial additional information which would warrant appropriation of the amount requested in the budget estimate."

In order to show that this impression of the House Appropriations Committee has not substantially changed in a year's time, I call your attention to the statement of that committee submitted to the Committee of the Whole House on June 8, 1948, in connection with the supplemental independent offices appropriation bill, in which the committee states:

"The committee is not satisfied with its relations to date with the Atomic Energy Commission. The committee is fully aware of the vital importance, particularly under present world conditions, of the work of the Commission and of the technical aspects connected with it, and is desirous of making every provision for its adequate support. However, the Commission's refusal to furnish the committee with information and appraisals of its various budgeted items, based on technical information which can be available only to the Commission, because of the scientific and secret character of the work involved, leaves much to be desired in establishing the confidence which the committee must have if it is to continue to supply these large grants of funds under conditions of secrecy which prevent full disclosure of the details involved.

"As a matter of fact, there is some feeling among the membership of the committee that the Commission has taken advantage of its strategic position in modern military defense to avoid facing the practical realities on less important and subsidiary elements of their budget. The impression left with the committee is one of general extravagance."

These passages are quoted above to show that the operations of the Commission and the Atomic Energy Enterprise are clothed with secrecy and with authority and that the absence of detailed information creates areas of uncertainty and dissatisfaction within important and responsible committees of the Congress.

This is not an unanticipated situation. The Congress realized that full examination into the activities of the Commission would not be in the public interest. Therefore, the Congress, also realizing that it must in some manner set up a mechanism by which information could be secured as to the development and the progress of the whole atomic energy project, established by law the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to which the Commission is required to report with full and current information in connection with its activities in this program. The joint committee is further charged with making continuing studies of atomic energy activities and to make such recommendations to the Congress, from time to time, as it feels to be in the public interest.

The Atomic Energy Act wisely provided that the terms of the first commissioners should extend for 2 years after the effective date of the act thus giving a minimum of 2 years' time during which the joint committee, the Congress, and the public might have an opportunity to evaluate the progress of the administrative policies which would administer the program set up by law. However, while the Atomic Energy Act became effective by the President's signature on August 1, 1946, the first commissioners were

not appointed by the President until October 28, 1946, while Congress was in recess, and the general manager was not appointed until December 30, 1946. The transfer of the affairs of the Manhattan district to the commission did not occur until January 1, 1947. Thereafter the Congress convened and the nominations of the commissioners and the general manager were sent to the Senate by the President on January 20, 1947. Hearings on these nominations consumed a substantial portion of the time of the commissioners and of the general manager until their confirmation on the 9th of April 1947, slightly over a year ago. Under the law, the expiration date of the commissioners is August 1, 1948. It is only fair to say, in justice to the commissioners themselves, that the uncertainty resulting from the circumstances surrounding the late appointments of the commissioners and the general manager, and the period of time consumed in their confirmation, made it difficult if not impossible for the commission prior to April 1947, to feel any reasonable security in the tenure of their offices or in the appropriateness of their attempting to set up substantial administrative policies for a peacetime operation under the act. In fact, it has been stated in hearings before the joint committee with the commission, that the commission actually did not feel that they were in "effective control" until approximately June of 1947.

By the same token, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy set up by the Congress for its own service, was unable to begin a satisfactory organization until late in April 1947. It was necessary for the Joint Committee to pioneer in the field of staff selection and to begin the development of a pattern of study of the atomic-energy program. The Joint Committee's responsibilities, by law, are more extensive than receiving information as furnished it by the commission. It is affirmatively charged with making continuing studies of the program and its administration. During the past year, the committee has been developing organization and techniques for the most effective receipt of information as well as initiating its own studies of the various phases of the entire operation.

The Joint Committee in a unanimous report of January 30, 1948, made to each House of Congress, clearly stated the inadequacy of cumulative information and the need for continued examination of policies and program, as follows:

"As a legislative committee, it does not feel that it should at this time draw any final conclusions respecting the operation of this program or the administrative policies in effect. Sufficient time has not elapsed to warrant conclusions of this kind. This is not to be construed either as an attitude of hostility or an attitude of approval, but on the contrary, expresses an attitude on the part of the committee to objectively evaluate the various phases of the program as a result of more mature operation."

Less than 3 months after this unanimous statement by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and approximately 4½ months prior to August 1, 1948, the expiration date of the terms of the Commissioners, the President sent to the Senate the nominations for commissioners with terms of 1 to 5 years beginning August 1, 1948. To the best of my knowledge no member of the joint committee or other Member of the Congress was consulted. I do not suggest that the President is under any compulsion to consult with members of the committee or Members of Congress as to his appointments. I respect the President's constitutional prerogative of exercising his judgment in connection with nominations which he is authorized to make. Atomic energy, however, has been approached by the Congress as a nonpartisan and therefore a nonpolitical common interest of the whole American people and the joint committee and the Congress have respected the nonpolitical nature of this program. It is surprising, therefore, and not without peculiar significance, that the President neglected to cooperatively consult with the joint committee or others in the Congress as to the progress, efficiency, or propriety of the present administrative plan.

As quoted above, the joint committee on January 30 expressed the need for more time to study the administrative pattern. Several members of the committee were giving serious consideration to the necessity for an extension of the terms of the present Commissioners and the reasonable postponement of the permanent 5-year term plan. The exceptionally early submission of the nominations by the President precipitated this issue and caused it to be passed upon by the joint committee and recommended to the Congress at a somewhat earlier date than might have otherwise occurred.

The joint committee did consider S. 2589, together with its companion bill, H. R. 6402, and reported both bills to the respective houses of Congress on May 17, 1948. The report of the joint committee on S. 2589 is on the desk of each member and sets out in more detail than time will permit in these remarks of mine the general reasons why the bill should be passed. Without taking the time to read that report now, I call attention of Members to the report and ask unanimous consent that a copy of that report be printed as a statement at this point in my remarks.

The report (No. 1342) is as follows:

"The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through the Senate members thereof, to whom was referred S. 2589, a bill to extend the time of the expiration date of the terms of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission from August 1, 1948, to June 30, 1950, report the bill back to the Senate with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

"The atomic-energy program was developed during World War II as a military project for the production of atomic weapons. They were successfully produced under military direction as a result of the unprecedented coordination of the highest degress of scientific, engineering, and industrial skills ever mobilized.

"In the process, startling and revolutionary scientific discoveries were made which suggested unlimited future possibilities for research and development in the field of social and humanitarian benefits. Complete emphasis, however, was placed on the development of a weapon and these other discoveries or possibilities were laid aside, at the time, for future investigation, research, and development in a peaceful atmosphere.

"With the end of the war the problem of how to handle atomic energy for the good of mankind became paramount. It was universally agreed that the bomb must be secured, if possible, against international use in war, and this principle became a major consideration in all domestic approaches or suggestions to the problem. It also became a special and intensive problem of the United Nations within which a special Atomic Energy Commission was immediately set up with specific terms of reference directed toward a solution of this problem.

"Meanwhile, the Congress commenced immediate studies for the purpose of passing proper legislation for the control and for the advancement and development of the limitless possibilities of this science. A special committee of the Senate and the Military Affairs Committee of the House over a period of months devoted time and held extensive hearings which eventually resulted in the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, approved by the President on August 1, 1946.

"In considering the original legislation, the Congress, and eminent citizens who testified, recognized the pioneering nature of the project; the revolutionary power of the bomb; the perils of unrestricted tampering with the dangerous products of atomic fission and the possibilities of new and unforeseen dislocations in industry and social fields. The fact that there was no historical experience for guidance, when considered with other factors, indicated that any legislation and any program undoubtedly would be subject to future change as a result of mature experience.

"In section 1 (A) of the act, it is clearly stated as follows:

" 'The effect of the use of atomic energy for civilian purposes upon the social, economic, and political structures of today cannot be determined. It is a field in which unknown factors are involved.'

"The declaration continues:

" 'Therefore, any legislation will necessarily be subject to revision from time to time. It is reasonable to anticipate, however, that tapping this new source of energy will cause profound changes in our present way of life.'

"In section 1 (B) (5), the law further states:

" 'A program of administration which will be consistent with the foregoing polices and with international arrangements made by the United States, and which will enable the Congress to be currently informed so as to take further legislative action as may hereafter be appropriate.'

"The report from the Senate Special Committee on Atonic Energy, which accompanied S. 1717, states:

" 'It is recognized that many unforeseeable developments may arise in this field requiring changes in the legislation from time to time.'

"The Congress recognized that under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, which placed this vast enterprise in the hands of a commission to operate, there was being created the greatest administrative monopoly with the most far-reaching power ever set up in this country; but there was no other course. The authority of this Commission is greater than any other commission or bureau either heretofore or presently established in Government. It ramifies throughout industry, management, labor, and natural resources. Its authority extends into the international field of atomic energy. Because of the secrecy necessary to preserve the knowledge essential to the production of atomic weapons the operation of this vast set-up is clothed with restrictions and mandates for security, and the opportunity for public examination and evaluation of its progress and of the impact of its activities upon our normal peacetime or even potential wartime economy are nonexistent. This situation is unique in administrative policy of our Nation. It places solemn responsibility upon your joint committee.

"The Atomic Energy Commission is presently operating on an annual basis of over $600,000,000 in cash and $300,000,000 in contract authorizations. It has unlimited discretion in the types and kinds of goods and raw materials it buys; it has complete control over the extent to which private enterprise may venture in this field; it preempts patents; it has full authority over all phases of production and activity in atomic energy; it has, subject to certain responsibilities of periodic direction by the President, complete discretion and control over the production of atomic weapons; it can make foreign contracts and arrangements; it can contract with State and local governments; it operates municipalities, is the landlord, and subsidizes many local services traditionally within the province of private enterprise; it has the duty of extensive participation in the fields of public health; it is authorized to participate and is participating in agricultural and industrial research and development and may give or withhold its aid in its discretion. Its broad powers enable it to establish and maintain countless programs which are not clearly defined. It employs, either directly or through its operating contractors, over 85,000 people who, with their families, probably total 200,000; it has discretionary authority over the release or the withholding of information affecting the program.

"The Atomic Energy Commission, because of the nature of its duties and the extent of its power, can exercise decisive control over the destiny of our Nation and the lives of our people.

"The Congress, under the Atomic Energy Act, and in consideration of the inherent dangers and problems involved, deemed these broad powers essential for the protection of the public and in order to prevent if possible the devastating use of atomic weapons in war. In addition, these powers have been deemed initially essential in order that we may make the greatest progress and maintain our preeminence in the advancement of the science of atomic energy. Your committee refers to these powers therefore to illustrate the magnitude of the social and economic area within which atomic energy operates and to emphasize that its growth and integration into the American system of individual free enterprise must be carefully measured and that hasty decisions as to a permanent administrative pattern are unwarranted and unwise.

"Because of the unprecedented monopolistic control of atomic energy set up in the Government through the Commission, the Congress, in section 15 of the act, created the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy composed of nine Members of each House. This committee has a responsibility to 'make continuing studies of the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy.'

"This section further provides that—

" 'The Commission shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to the Commission's activities.'

"It was intended that by setting up such a joint committee, necessary secrecy of the project could be preserved, but at the same time a responsible body of Congress would be constantly kept informed so that it would be able, from time to time, to make such recommendations for legislation affecting the policy and operation of the atomic-energy program, and to make such reports, as might be indicated in the public interest.

"Although the law went into effect on August 1, 1946, the President did not appoint the members of the Commission until October 28, 1946, and the general manager was not appointed until December 30, 1946. The transfer of the affairs of the Manhattan district (which was the wartime agency in charge of this project) to the Commission occurred on January 1, 1947. The nominations were sent to the Senate by the President on January 20, 1947, and thereafter beginning on January 27, a substantial portion of the time of the Commissioners and the general manager was devoted to hearings on the question of the confirmation of their nominations until their confirmation on the 9th of April 1947. The first terms of the Commissioners were fixed by law for expiration 2 years after August 1, 1946, which was the effective date of the act.

"In fixing the term of office for the first Commissioners at 2 years after the effective date of the act, it was the purpose of the Congress to provide at least a 2-year period for examination and observation of the program. The legislative intent to provide an initial 2-year term was predicated upon the sound reasoning that in an undertaking of this magnitude a minimum of 2 years would be necessary before any valid evaluation of the administrative policies could be made. These terms all expire on August 1, 1948. Since the Commission was not confirmed until the 9th day of April 1947 and from a practical standpoint has had uninterrupted and unquestioned security in the performance of its duties only since that time, it is obvious that there has been but 1 year for the reliable formulation of programs and for observation and study instead of the 2-year period wisely contemplated by the law.

"The transition from the military operation to eventual full control by the Atomic Energy Commission was accompanied by many dislocations and uncertainties. Following the confirmation of the Commissioners, they and the joint committee undertook the coordination of their respective duties; on the one hand, the Commission went forward with plans for the development of their administrative policies under the act and, on the other, the joint committee began to inform itself and receive information as to the entire situation and the proposals for future development.

"As noted before, the necessary activities of the Commission ramify throughout the general economy and the national policy of our Nation. It is a pioneering venture of a new, vast, and startling nature; there was no history or experience of a similar peacetime operation upon which the Commission or the joint committee could rely. In this year that has passed some programs have been set up and many policies considered, some of which have been adopted; many have remained under consideration without determination; others have been rejected. There has been some reorientation of attitude in connection with the setting up and expansion of these policies and programs. Not only have problems of personnel, science, industry, and labor been confronted, but many questions involving the interpretation of the act and the powers and responsibilities of the Commission have arisen.

"Many of the key members of the Commission's staff have been employed in recent months in connection with the establishment of new policies and new administrative approaches. Many of the Commission's policies are in the process of formulation. Many of the plans of the Commission are on the drafting table. These are conditions to be reasonably expected. Fairness to the Commission dictates that additional time be allowed for the Commission to develop more definitely its administrative policies in order to justify conclusion as to the final direction of this program.

"The Commission has just announced the recent test of an atomic weapon which is the culmination of researches and plans begun 3 to 4 years ago. The results of such progressive developments cannot now be adequately or properly evaluated as to their long-range effect upon the national needs.

"In the field of patents, while the law sets up a framework for establishing a program for patent acquisition and compensation, no such program has as yet been finally established in this field hitherto sacred to the individual.

"Recent events have shown that labor-management disputes in vital installations have threatened continuity of operation. In one instance a settlement was had 2 hours after the so-called deadline for a walk-out. At the time of filing this report, this same installation is again in the throes of a labor dispute and is presently operating as a result of injunction proceedings instituted under the Taft-Hartley Act. The effective period of that injunction is rapidly running out. The joint committee is determined that labor-management policies be reliably established so that continuity of operation can be assured in these vital plants. The joint committee has held hearings on this subject, but no satisfactory formula was presented or developed. The joint committee has asked the Atomic Energy Commission to provide it with its plans for the accomplishment of this purpose. The joint committee is aware that the Atomic Energy Commission is also vitally interested in the accomplishment of this purpose, but the Commission has not as yet developed its specific proposals for the reliable solution of this problem.

"The Commission recently has begun to put into effect a changing theory of sectional operation of the program which is in the nature of decentralization. This method of operation may have much to recommend it but only experience can demonstrate whether or not it is a progressive move.

"While many advisory groups have been set up by law and by the Commission, to give it advice and suggestions as to the development of pertinent phases of the atomic energy program, it is to be noted that the joint committee has received few reports of these advisory groups and, therefore, is in no position to reliably gage either the extent of these recommendations or the degree to which such recommendations have been accepted and put into effect or held in abeyance, or rejected, by the Commission.

"In a number of areas the joint committee has requested, from the Commission and other vital coordinating agencies, information, conclusions, and recommendations which will aid in evaluating the national program and its operation. Information has not as yet been furnished to the joint committee enabling it to fully comprehend or determine long-range goals of production and operation policies of the Commission. This reference is not made by way of criticism but merely to indicate that the composite circumstances involved in our public affairs and within our economy create a certain indefiniteness that needs time and the unfolding of events before long-range policies can be fully justified.

"It is to be noted that the Military Liaison Committee, the vital link between the defense establishments and the Atomic Energy Commission, has undergone a reorganization within very recent weeks. What the beneficial results of this action may be cannot be presently evaluated.

"Due to the nature of the Commission's operation, its budgetary and accounting problems are ramified and very extensive. The accounting situation has been more complicated because of the fact that under previous wartime operation of this project necessitating complete secrecy, utmost speed, etc., standardized accounting procedures were not in effect; therefore, historic detailed costs are not fully available. A satisfactory system has not yet been set up. This fact is recognized by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress as well as by the Commission itself in its most recent report of February 2, 1948.

"It is to be noted that, in addition to strict scientific and production activities of the Commission, it is involved, under existing policies, in the operation of cities and towns within the project. The problems of such operations are under serious consideration, both by the Commission and by the joint committee. Complicated problems of jurisdiction, of administrative authority, of voting rights, including prerogatives attendant upon residence, town management, court jurisdiction, heavy subsidies, schooling, public utilities, and other problems, demand careful and more mature experience and examination before any final policies with respect thereto can be adopted by the Congress or by the Commission.

"A vital section of the efficient and progressive advancement of atomic science is the reactor program. Recently a basic change in the operation of this program has been decided upon and certain preliminary steps to effectuate this change have been undertaken. The operation of this proposed program will be and must be continuously under the most careful observation for a substantial period of time. Only experience can evaluate this move.

"The importance of establishing satisfactory and adequate personnel programs in the operation of this project is evident. The necessity for security cannot be disputed. Policies for assuring the personnel security of the project under conditions of fairness

to individuals but at the same time protecting inviolate the rights of the public and the integrity of this national venture, have been and still are in a state of study and trial. The Commission has been searching for a final formula and the joint committee has been concerned with the necessity that a reliable formula be established.

"The unsettled international situation has a direct effect upon the pattern of our atomic-energy program. Had a satisfactory system of international control been established, certain provisions of the Atomic Energy Act, in due time, would have automatically become void and many vital powers of the Commission would have been transferred to an international agency. It is now conceded, however, after nearly 2 years of exhaustive effort in the United Nations, that satisfactory universal agreement for reliable international control of atomic energy is presently impossible. Only time and maturing events will enable us to determine the permanent direction of our administrative policies in this field.

"It is important to emphasize that these matters which have been referred to are conditions which suggest the formative nature of our atomic-energy program and by no means indicate a lack of progress. Further, they must not be interpreted as a criticism of the Commission or as evidence that the joint committee lacks confidence in the present Commission. Since the confirmation of the Commissioners on April 9, 1947, very definite progress has been made in our atomic-energy program. This fact is encouraging but would in no way justify any hasty conclusions based upon insufficient knowledge as to the advisability of any particular permanent administrative pattern in this gigantic but infant national venture.

"On January 30, 1948, your joint committee filed a unanimous report to each House of the Congress and, clearly recognizing the present inadequacy of the cumulative information and the definite need for continued examination before a final conclusion of any kind could be drawn about the long-range administration of this program, stated:

"'As a legislative committee, it does not feel that it should at this time draw any final conclusions respecting the operation of this program or the administrative policies in effect. Sufficient time has not elapsed to warrant conclusions of this kind. This is not to be construed either as an attitude of hostility or an attitude of approval, but on the contrary expresses an attitude on the part of the committee to objectively evaluate the various phases of the program as a result of more mature opportunity.'

"The passage of this bill will immediately give assurance of uninterrupted continuity in office for 2 years and 2 months following the date of this report during which the present Commission can continue without disruption or without the necessity of reappointment. Any programs and policies now under way can be observed and brought into substantial operation; it will give approximately 2 years more for the over-all evaluation of the atomic energy program and its theory of operation. It will insure continuity and confidence and it will give assurance of continuity of operation and program upon which all employees, contractors, and consultants may rely.

"The joint committee strongly emphasizes to the Congress that in the performance of its duty it has conducted, and intends to conduct, its business relating to atomic energy, and to the Atomic Energy Commission, on a totally nonpolitical basis. The joint committee unequivocally declares its determination to support the best and most progressive atomic energy program which can be developed to maintain our preeminence in this field. The committee has been guided, at all times, by one paramount principle and that is to maintain a course of conduct which will best serve to build confidence in, acceptance of, and support for a sound and vigorous atomic energy program. This is essential for the safety of the United States and for the peace of the world. It is in furtherance of this principle that your committee considered this legislation.

"Your committee therefore recommends that the bill do pass."

This report gives a general indication of the extensive powers, the ramified activities, and the many undetermined areas in which vital decisions and vital administrative programs have not been and perhaps as yet cannot be reliably established.

This report sets out the reasons why the joint committee urges that the Congress pass S. 2589 and continue the present terms of office of the atomic energy commissioners to June 30, 1950. This course of action will permit a more firm establishment of administrative policies and will allow time for an objective evaluation by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Before fixing the permanent administrative organization, additional mature experience will be available and therefore the interests of the American people will be served.

Unfortunately and without any justification, the cry of politics has been raised in certain quarters about this bill. The genesis of the injection of this political charge is in the White House, as evidenced by a news story in the New York Times of April 21, 1947, the date on which the President sent the nominations to the Senate, quoting an alleged White House spokesman who was said to have charged the Republicans with politics in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission. From then on every attempt has been made from administration sources to insinuate partisan politics in this issue.

I would like to make the record clear. I am informed as to the partisan politics of only two members of the Atomic Energy Commission and they, I am told, are Republicans. I do not know to what political party the other three members belong. I do not know the partisan opinions of the general manager of the Commission. Partisan affiliations have not been an element in the selection or employment of any member of the staff serving the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I have never inquired, and so far as I know the others members of the joint committee have never inquired, as to the partisan association of any member of the staff.

The joint committee has kept entirely free of partisan activities or influences, believing that atomic energy and its development should and must be nonpartisan and should and must be approached from the standpoint of the broad interest of the American people. This bill is sponsored by a Republican and a Democrat. It is true that if this bill becomes a law the terms of all five commissioners would expire on June 30, 1950; and, therefore, if the pattern of 5-year terms was put into effect at that time, the next President would nominate five commissioners. It is to be emphasized and understood, however, that in any event the present situation were all present terms expire August 1 this year, the terms of four of the five commissioners would expire within the next 4 years and would be subject to the nomination and appointment by the next President of the United States.

Therefore, it is not a question, Mr. President, of Presidential appointments but rather a vital question concerning the establishment of a reliable and a satisfactory pattern of administration for atomic energy. By passing this proposed legislation, the Congress will eventually have before it a substantial history of development which will furnish guidance in the adoption of the permanent administrative pattern.

Again I call to your attention the fact that the joint committee and the Commission itself has had, for all practical purposes, only 1 year to operate in this unique field of Government activity. As pointed out in the report of the joint committee on this bill, many policies of the Commission have not been finally adopted and no evaluation thereof can be made by the joint committee. The joint committee has collected and is collecting considerable information but it cannot evaluate any over-all program until the policies of that program have been more adequately developed.

The statement has been made that the extension of these terms would disrupt the organization or interfere with progress in the development of atomic energy. I think it should be clear beyond argument that, to the contrary, the proposal would contribute to confidence and would insure continuity of authority and operation of the Commission for an additional year and eleven months. During this time the Commission can work out and put into effect policies that are now embryonic or in the early stages of proof. It is also to be recalled that this bill does not affect the tenure of the general manager of the Commission.

The members of the Atomic Energy Commission have worked zealously but in most instances they are still operating under the program and pattern of the Manhattan engineer district. This is not pointed out by way of adverse criticism but as plain fact. Our atomic-energy program as a peacetime program is vast and far-reaching. No doubt it has been grafted permanently upon our social and economic system but it is a matter of plain common sense that it be examined with caution and with thoroughness if it is to be successfully developed as an integrated part of our future life. Its monopolistic phases, its secrecy, its delegation of unprecedented peacetime powers demand the most careful study and the most reliable assurances that can be obtained.

Nor should any final policies be governed by personalities or individuals. If we are to remain a nation of laws and not of men, a nation in which fundamentals control and individuals administer, then we must realize that the atomic-energy program and the interests of the American people are the controlling factors and that individuals who administer the program, capable though they must be, are only important, temporary elements. Personally, and I believe this view is shared by the majority of the joint committee, I hope to see the present Commission given further and adequate opportunity to bring its administrative plans to a higher state of completion by extending their terms until June 30, 1950. I think this is fair to the Commission members; I think it is fair to the scientists, the technicians, the contractors, and the employees; and I think it is in the best interests of the American people.

The thing that would contribute to restlessness within the atomic energy project would be the precipitate establishment of a permanent administrative arrangement, the advisability of which is now seriously questioned by many who have only the vigorous development of the program at heart. The extension of 2 years will certainly give time for more satisfactory examination and proof and should represent a more satisfactory solution. I believe it represents a perfectly sound and practical compromise between those, on the one hand, who desire to set up the permanent administrative arrangement as originally contemplated in the law and those on the other hand who are presently definitely opposed to the beginning of the long-term arrangements at this time. I earnestly hope that the Senate will act favorably on H. R. 6402, and I give you my assurance and, I believe, the assurance of my colleagues who support this measure, that the passage of this bill will be in the genuine interest of the vigorous development of the atomic energy program.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like at the outset of my remarks, which I shall make——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Feazel	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BALDWIN. I submit a conference report on Senate bill 2830, to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2830) to extend for five years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert "June 30, 1951"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended title proposed by the House, amend the title so as to read: "An Act to extend for two years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry"; and the House agree to the same.

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
WAYNE MORSE,
LISTER HILL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

PRICE POLICIES OF LARGE INDUSTRIAL CORPORATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I gave notice yesterday that it was my intention to make some remarks about the price policies of large industrial corporations. It would be altogether inappropriate to make those remarks at this time. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may offer the remarks for printing in a succeeding issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be printed in the same manner as though I had delivered them on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not understand the request of the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My request was simply this, that yesterday I gave notice that it was my intention to make some remarks on the Senate floor on the problem of price policies of large industrial and commercial corporations. I say it is altogether inappropriate to make those remarks in the present state of the session, and I merely ask unanimous consent, in accordance with the practice in former years, that the remarks be printed in a subsequent edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was not aware that it was the practice to have editions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD subsequent to the day of adjournment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes, that has been customary for years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Did I not also hear the Senator add that he wished to have the remarks printed precisely as though he had delivered them on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I dislike ever to disagree with my friend from Wyoming, but I believe that is in complete violation of the practice.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know it is a violation of the practice that was followed prior to the assembly of the Eightieth Congress, but during the Eightieth Congress I have noticed that rule has been more honored in the breach than in the observance.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not believe that is quite a fair statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I endeavor to be fair.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The President pro tempore is in constant touch with the Chief of the Official Reporters on this subject, and whenever a situation of this sort occurs, it is usually brought to the attention of the President pro tempore. What the Senator suggests is not a good habit. The Senator I am sure will agree in that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senate does not operate on the same basis with the House with respect to the publication of undelivered remarks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know that, and I would not make bold to make such a request if it were not for the fact that Senators did not want matters which were not pertinent discussed. Of course, I can take the floor and make the speech.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was about to say to the Senator that I have no objection in the world to the publication of his statement as a statement in the RECORD, but I do not think it should be printed as though delivered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall ask that it be printed in the Appendix, if that will satisfy the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My desire in requesting that it be printed as though it had been delivered was merely to be sure that the remarks were not printed in the minute type which we cannot read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONFERRING OF JURISDICTION ON NEW YORK STATE RESPECTING OFFENSES COMMITTED ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1683) to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State, which was, in line 8, after "State", insert "*Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any Indian tribe, band, or community, or members thereof, hunting and fishing rights as guaranteed them by agreement, treaty, or custom, nor require them to obtain State fish and game licenses for the exercise of such rights."

Mr. ECTON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6402) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I am fully conscious of the fact that we are not many hours away from the adjournment of this session of the Congress. I am also conscious of the fate that awaits my efforts. I shall be defeated. The bill upon which we will be called to vote has been before the Senate now for about 5 weeks. It had been my earnest hope

that we would have had plenty of time to deliberate and consider a proposal which may well have such far-reaching consequences on the life and the peace and the happiness of the people of the United States and of the world.

I think that the present proposal which has been advanced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] can only be properly considered in the framework of the situation which confronts the United States and the world today—a situation in which the informed know that only the possession of a stock of atomic bombs by the United States of America maintains the balance of power in a very uncertain peace.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Connecticut, who was the former chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, I wish to take a moment to pay a tribute to my colleague from Iowa, who succeeded me as chairman, for the diligence with which he has undertaken his duties, and his unfailing courtesy to me at all times. It is with real regret that I find it necessary to disagree with the proposal which he has advanced.

Mr. President, our record in the field of atomic energy is something of which we can be rightfully and truly proud. I do not intend to take the time now to review the efforts which we have made to get this force under international control. I shall only briefly allude to it, because I have been the recipient of a bitter attack by the Soviet delegate, Mr. Gromyko, at the last session of the Commission seeking atomic agreement. Mr. Gromyko on the night before last said that the Senator from Connecticut and the former eminent Secretary of State, Mr. James Byrnes, were clanking their atomic armor, and that we have been backing a proposal to which the Soviet Union could not agree, and which was designed to promote war and not peace. I stated to the press at that time that I could no better answer him than to quote the immortal words of Bernard Baruch, when on June 14, 1946, in opening these negotiations he stated "that the world was engaging in a race between the quick and the dead." It is my sincere and heartfelt conviction that I have voted for life with all of the American policymakers in this field, and Gromyko has voted for death.

I say, Mr. President, it was the vision of some of us that we might be well today on the road to world disarmament if we had been successful in concluding an agreement with the other countries of the world, including Russia, for the complete control of this force, a force which can destroy and a force out of which can come life and good.

After interminable negotiations, and after interminable hours, and weary hours, and days of debate, all countries that were members of that commission came to the final conclusion that the only satisfactory and effective agreement for the international control of this force was the program that had been advanced by the Government of the United States. All governments agreed except the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, if they had agreed there would not have been need for appropriation in the Congress, as we have done, the sum of billions and billions for our defense. If they had agreed at Lake Success the dawn of a new and glorious day would have broken over a war-weary world. Today we would have been marching down the blessed paths of peace to which all decent men hope and aspire.

Mr. President, I know why the Senator from Connecticut has been singled out for the animadversions of Mr. Vishinsky and Mr. Gromyko. When they are attacked on their policy in Europe, when they are attacked on their policy in South America, when they are attacked on their policy in Turkey, or when they attack us respecting our policy in Greece, they bring forth their propaganda from Moscow, and if Senators listen to it, they will find that much of it has a certain ring of truth. So they do not particularly care what any Senator should say in this Chamber regarding their policies, economic propaganda, or social policies that they are advancing to seek domination of the world. But, Mr. President, they do care when you start to put the wood to them on this policy, because on this policy it is as demonstrable as that two and two make four that it is right, that it is objectively right, and that they cannot answer.

That is why I shall be expecting more and more attacks, not only from Vishinsky but from Gromyko and the rest of them, because they know that it is dangerous to have their obstinancy and intransigence shown on this vital and key policy upon which the world must depend for peace. They know it is absolutely necessary that they suppress the truth, if they can, regarding our efforts. Those efforts we must take forward to the world. We must advertise them to the world. We must let the world know that we are for total disarmament, and that this is the first and vital step. If the peoples of the world understand that, then we need have no fear whether they will back us in our determination to give our total support to a policy that there shall be total and complete peace and not total war.

Mr. President, I merely allude to our international policy as more or less of a framework for our domestic policy which is so vitally affected by the pending proposal.

The bill which became an act and which bears my name was an act upon which more work was done than by any Senate committee I know of, at least in my 4 years in the Congress. It was pursued line by line, comma by comma, paragraph by paragraph. It was torn apart and put together and torn apart and put together again. In the determinations and the deliberations that gave birth to this act there was not the slightest bit of partisanship, there was not the slightest suggestion of Democratic or Republican or any other kind of politics.

It would seem unnecessary to make such an assertion, Mr. President, because after all sane men know that what we are dealing with is a force that underlies the universe. It is the basic force of nature. There is no politics in the atom, gentlemen, and any suggestion that it has even barely attained the faint aroma of the pork barrel must be resisted with all the force at our command.

Mr. President, Senators know what that act provides. Senators know the law under which the Commission is operating this enterprise, the most gigantic of all Government operations and works.

I now wish to call attention to the statement of the former Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, for whom Senators on both sides of the aisle have such a deep and abiding respect. Mr. Patterson said:

> The news that reappointment of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission is to be resisted in the Senate on lines of political partisanship is bad news for the people of the United States. Under the law the five members of the Commission are appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. The terms of all five members will expire on August 1. The President has reappointed them. The question now is whether the Senate will confirm. We must assume that those opposing confirmation are unaware of the immense risks that a disruption of the atomic energy program at this time would produce.
>
> Our survival as a Nation may well depend on the intelligence, the skill, and the vigor with which the atomic energy project is carried forward. Of all activities in the country, there is none more vital to our safety than this activity. If a hostile power should get the lead on us in the development of atomic energy, the future would be dark indeed.

There has been some argumentation to the effect that the pending proposal has not been politically inspired. I regret to say that I must take issue with my colleague from Iowa. I shall take issue because I shall advert to facts which seem to me demonstrably and conclusively to prove that the pending proposal was politically inspired.

On April 19, the morning press of New York City carried a story to the effect that nominations for the Atomic Energy Commission were about to be made by the President. Later, on the same day, the Republican policy committee met, and at noon the chairman of the policy committee, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] gave an interview to the press. In this interview he stated that the committee, at its meeting that morning, had resolved "to go slow on all confirmations of appointments made by the President."

On April 20, the next day, the President sent the following nominations for the Atomic Energy Commission to the Senate: Mr. David E. Lilienthal, Mr. Robert F. Bacher, Mr. Sumner T. Pike, Mr. Lewis L. Strauss, and Dr. William W. Waymack. On April 23, three days later, over a Nation-wide hook-up, on a program entitled "Meet the Press", the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee was asked if he included in this "go slow" policy Mr. Lilienthal, and he stated that he most assuredly did.

The fat was in the fire. Now, how to get it out?

The Senate Members had a meeting. In that meeting it was suggested that perhaps a further testing period for the Commission would be in order—say a year. I immediately protested, and

pointed out what I thought was the error in the proposal. Then that proposal went to the people and the press of this country. There began an outcry and an uprising which soon made itself evident, and the next proposal we got was that it should be changed to 2 years. Then we met again, and this time we met with some distinguished scientists, with men whose work had been of a key nature in the production of this atomic phenomena.

One of them was Dr. Oppenheimer. He probably did more at Los Alamos to bring the thing about than any other man. Dr. Rabi, of Columbia, also recognized as being preeminent in the field, was there, as was Dr. DuBridge, who at one time, I believe, was in charge of Los Alamos.

We talked over the problem with them, and they were told that if we were to bring the nominations before the Senate for confirmation there would be "a dirty political fight." In view of that fact, the scientists were asked what their advice would be in this situation.

I invite attention to the letter of Dr. Oppenheimer, addressed to the chairman of the committee, under date of April 29, after he was let into the secret that a proposal was to be made to avoid "a dirty political fight." Dr. Oppenheimer wrote:

> DEAR SENATOR HICKENLOOPER: Thank you for inviting us to learn of your plans for the future of the AEC. You have asked us to write to you of our views, and this I gladly do. To my mind the way to assure the continuity of the work of the AEC and inspire confidence in its policies is to confirm the Commissioners. In all areas in which I am qualified to judge, they richly deserve confirmation; and above all, by their success in the "paramount objective of assuring the common defense and security."
>
> You and other Senate members of the joint committee assured us that confirmation could be achieved, if possible at all, only after a long-bitter struggle and a long period of uncertainty, delay, and sustained attack on the Commission.
>
> It is not appropriate for me to judge to what extent these difficulties are beyond the control of your committee. However, we may almost agree that a worse fight than last time over the issue of confirmation would gravely and perhaps fatally impair the work of the Commission and confidence in its stability.

The doctor concludes that if it is to be extended, for the sake of the United States, extend it for 2 years. But, first, he says "confirm them now to conform to the McMahon Act." Now, let us see what the other consultative witnesses who were brought in to pull the fat out of the fire say. Under date of April 29, Dr. DuBridge addressed the Senator from Iowa and said:

> I wish to state right off that I am convinced that the AEC has made enormous progress toward its statutory objectives in the year that has elapsed since it was confirmed by the Senate. Furthermore, I have confidence that the AEC will be even more successful in the future in developing a sound basic program and an organization to carry it out.
>
> It is of the most vital importance to the AE program of the United States that confidence and continuity should exist in its direction. It is necessary that the personnel of the Commission, of industry and of the national defense establishment should work in harmony toward the common end of the welfare and security of the United States.

To quote from the letter of Dr. DuBridge:

> We were shocked to hear that such a controversy—

That is, unjustified attacks against the Commissioners and their work—

> is even a possibility. I would hope that your committee could find a way to confirm the Commissioners in such a way as to avoid such controversy.

Then he goes on and states in great detail his estimate of the fine work which has been done by the Commission.

Mr. President, that may be rather amazing. Nevertheless it is the record; and it is well that that record should be told to the Senate and to the people of the United States. I beg to point out that the reasons which are given in the report of the majority to the Senate are not really the reasons which have dictated this proposal. The committee has seen fit to point out that in its estimation a further period of time is necessary for testing the qualifications of these commissioners.

Mr. President, every 3 months this committee receives a highly secret report of the work of the Commission. Twice a year a report of the Commission goes to the Congress, containing the reports which have been made. They are made in great detail—as much as can be given out for public consumption.

We have had the Commission before us hour by hour. I suppose that there is no activity of this Government that has received the continuing and close scrutiny that this group has received.

Mr. President, what is their job, and how have they done it? Their job is to assure the security of the United States of America through the production of fissionable material at the greatest rate they can, and to promote peacetime use and research.

I do not think I violate secrecy when I say that the Commission, at this date, is meeting the requirements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff laid down by them as necessary for the defense of this country. I think it is bitterly unfortunate that we cannot tell in much more detail of the accomplishments of the Commission since they took over from the Manhattan District. It is no secret now, because it has largely been told, that when they took over this project, Los Alamos was a shambles. We had succeeded, it is true, in making some laboratory bombs, but the Commission has succeeded in putting them on the production line.

In my talks with them, I find that they are regretful, as I am regretful, and as everyone of good sense is regretful, that they must devote so much of their time and their effort to the production of these weapons of war. That is one of the reasons why at the beginning of my remarks I outlined that unfortunate necessity and where the blame if any there is must rest in the verdict of history.

They have not been derelict in their trust in setting up the proper devices and administrations for the peaceful production and use of this God-given force.

Mr. President, those who see in this new development nothing but the atomic bomb are of but little faith and but little hope in regard to the possibilities of constructive progress in the future in this new field; their attitude is much the same as that of those who, with the advent of electricity, saw in the possibilities of its future use nothing but a chair for the electrocution of convicts.

But, Mr. President, there are achievements in the field of medicine and in the field of chemical substances and in the developments and work in that great building at Hanford, into which we are putting hundreds of millions of dollars, that hold wonderful promise for the future. For instance, the contributions in the way of the development of the breeding process, on which we reported to the Congress a few months ago, hold promise for the future the like of which has not been dreamed of by free men in all the ages of history. These men, whom we are so fortunate to have, see that vision and have that light of the future. They are going ahead bravely in every proper direction.

There has not been one word of criticism against the basic attitudes of the Commission from any responsible source. Of course they are not perfect. They are men. They have made mistakes, because they have done things, and they will make more mistakes. If they did not make any more mistakes, I would want to get them out of their present positions instantly.

Of course, the provisions of the measure now before us, carrying an extension of their terms for 2 years, constitute complete recognition of the fact that they should be confirmed for the appointments which the President has wisely sent to the Senate. If they are good for 2 years in this undertaking, then they are good for the statutory terms which are set out under the act.

Mr. President, if there is a determination by some to get rid of the Chairman of that Commission just as soon as it can be accomplished, I simply wish to point out that I see and observe signs and indications of an effort to take this force and put it back into the Pentagon Building. The evidence that was given by the Chairman, as contained in an article by the McGraw-Hill Publication Co., is not the first evidence that the senior Senator from Connecticut has had that that is the fixed intention of a very powerful group in our country.

When the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] introduced a bill, a few months ago, to turn this whole program back to the military, I pointed out to the Senator from Nebraska that there were so many things wrong in the world that it seemed a shame and a crime that we could not leave alone something that seemed to be in good measure right. I anticipate the efforts of those who wish to place others than civilians in control of this program, and expect them to persist; I thank God that with the help of the voters of the State of

Connecticut who have given me a franchise to remain on this floor for two more years, I shall during that length of time be here to resist that move with all the force at my command.

The members of the Commission seem to have done a good job. They seem to have carried out the responsibilities and duties which have been placed upon them by the statute. We know they are honorable men.

We tried for about 3 months to prove that they were not, but our efforts met with flat and complete failure; and a year and a half ago they were confirmed by the Senate by an overwhelming vote.

Despite that fact and despite the fact that they have done their job magnificently and have carried out the duties with which they have been charged by the law, their nominations have lain here since April 20, 1948, and they have not even been accorded the courtesy of a hearing before the committee.

Mr. President, the thing that the Senate should do with this bill is to reject it. It is now 25 minutes of 6. If the Senate will reject this bill, we on the committee can adjourn to a room just outside the door of this Chamber, and certainly there is not a Senator on the committee who will be able to voice a single objection that I believe to be worthy of consideration to the confirmation to which these men are richly entitled.

Mr. President, I could go on, but I am conscious of the hour. I said when I started that I would take 25 or 30 minutes. I notice that I have taken 35.

One editorial writer said that this proposal constituted fiddling with fission—a very apt description.

Mr. President, I advert to the sage advice of Bob Patterson. He indicated that the only safe course now, in the absence of international control, is to keep ahead in this matter, because if any other nation ever surpasses us, and if that country has designs against the peace of the world, then peace will be of very short duration.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that we can strike a blow here that will notify not only our own people, but the peoples of all the world, that we do understand that with which we are dealing; that we are determined to treat it in an absolutely nonpolitical, nonpartisan way. If we do that we will add to our strength and we will add to the defense of America.

WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., OF MAINE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I cannot allow this session of Congress to adjourn without paying tribute to one of the kindest, most lovable, conscientious men who has ever graced this Senate Chamber. It has been my privilege to have served with him and under him in committee for 8 years, and it is a privilege that I will never forget, for he has exemplified all that is right and decent and fair-minded in the consideration of all legislative matters and in his relations with his colleagues.

I refer, of course, Mr. President, to the esteemed senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who some time ago announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection, and is retiring at the end of this Congress to a well-earned rest after 31 years of continuous service in the two Houses of Congress. I regret exceedingly, and I know that everyone of my colleagues regret, that Senator WHITE decided not to return to the Senate—I say "decided not to return" advisedly, because I am sure the people of Maine would have returned him by an overwhelming majority.

No man in this body, so far as I know, has earned greater esteem from his fellow members than has the senior Senator from Maine. Possessed of a fine sense of courtesy, an unfailing good humor, a rare tact, and equipped with legislative experience second to none, he has endeared himself to all who know him.

He has devoted his life to the public service. He came to Congress following his graduation from Bowdoin as secretary to his esteemed grandfather, the late great Senator Frye who during his long service was not only President pro tempore of this body but also chairman of the same committee which his grandson, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], heads today. His 4 years as a secretary and clerk proved valuable to him when he was elected to the Sixty-fifth Congress, the First World War Congress, in 1917. Following 13 years in the House, he came to the Senate in 1930, and in the 18 years that have followed he has made a mark to which all of us may aspire and seek to emulate.

The senior Senator from Maine will not be with us next year but he has left a mark which will keep his memory bright. He may well be called the father of two major legislative policies—communications and shipping. His work on the Safety-of-Life-at-Sea Convention, which set a new standard for all maritime nations to follow, is a monument to him that all who know anything about shipping will remember always. His interest in telecommunications, and particularly in the early days of radio when it was regarded as a toy, has carried through to this day. He was the principal author of every communications law now on the statute books and he worked indefatigably to the very end of this Congress in an effort to secure the enactment of new, more comprehensive and urgently needed revision of the present Communications Act. It is a matter of sincere regret to me, and, I am sure, to every member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as well, that the difficulties in reconciling diverse views in the industry, prevented the earlier consideration of a bill which would have gone far to clarify and resolve some of the more pressing problems in the broadcast industry today. I am sure, however, that when communications matters are considered in succeeding Congresses, whether Republicans or Democrats are in control, the views and opinions of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], as expressed in the bill authored and reported by him in this Congress, will be reflected in whatever legislation is finally enacted.

I find it difficult to find the words to express the feelings that I have for our esteemed colleague. Those of you who have served with him know what I mean when I say there is about him an indefinable graciousness and decency—a lovableness that is beyond my poor means of explaining. Never a partisan, I know that his Democratic colleagues on the committee as well as on the floor regard him fully as highly as do his Republican friends, and in saying that I believe I am indicating the true measure and character of Senator WHITE.

The senior Senator from Maine is a great American in every sense of the word; he is a true gentleman in every sense of that word. His State, the people of his State, and his family may well be proud of what he has done for the people of this Nation in his 31 years of service here; he leaves with the warmest good wishes of all of us who wish him many years of health and happiness in his home.

PRINTING OF REPORTS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I am informed that the Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance expects to submit two or more reports during the coming recess or adjourned period of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that at the time these reports are submitted to the Secretary of the Senate they be printed as Senate documents with illustrations, and that thereafter a compilation of the various reports by the Advisory Council with other relevant materials on the subject be printed as a Senate document with illustrations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6402) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to comment very briefly on the pending bill and the situation which the Senate confronts in respect to it. I dislike to be in the middle between my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and my able friend from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] in an argument over atomic energy, because it has been my privilege to cooperate with both of them for a considerable period, and I am unable to recall a single instance where we have had anything but the happiest relationships and cooperations. But, Mr. President, I feel that I owe it to the able Senator from Iowa as the ranking Republican Member on the Senate side of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, and chairman of the committee, to state emphatically and categorically and without any reservation whatever that I think the course which he has recommended to the Senate in the pending bill is in the interest and welfare of the uninterrupted advantage of atomic energy as an American asset.

I am sure I shall be acquitted of engaging in any conspiracy against Mr. Lilienthal, as intimated by the Senator from Connecticut, as being one of the impulses of the pending bill. I am sure I shall be acquitted of any sort of political racketeering in connection with either Mr. Lilienthal or his associates on this Commission. I simply feel, Mr. President, on the basis of the facts as I see them and as I think I know them, that I must submit my total disagreement with the conclusions of the Senator from Connecticut and my complete adherence to the thesis submitted by the able Senator from Iowa. When the Senator from Connecticut was speaking, he read from a letter from Mr. L. A. DuBridge, of the general advisory committee of the Atomic Energy Commission, and he read one sentence which I want to reread. That sentence, which is from the testimony of a witness for the Senator from Connecticut in behalf of his appointment, reads:

> I would hope that your committee could find a way to confirm the Commissioners—

Referring to the Atomic Energy Commissioners—

> in such a way as to avoid controversy.

Mr. President, I think this bill is the precise and prayerful answer to those exact specifications. I suggest that the Senate contemplate the alternatives to the passage of the bill, a bill which horizontally extends for 2 years the terms of all the Atomic Energy Commissioners, pending the subsequent staggered appointments for from 1 to 5 years each.

I suggest that the Senate consider the alternatives to the passage of this bill. The first alternative would be an effort to confirm the existing Commissioners under the reappointments which the President has sent to the Senate. Surely it is an axiom that that is impossible, short of another controversial contest of substantially the same nature as that which plagued the subject when the appointments were originally submitted. Surely it is obvious that it could not be done in the closing days of this session.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator feel that if such a contest were pitched on the floor of the Senate there would be any consideration that would move the Senator from Michigan to do other than he did so magnificently a year and a half ago?

Mr. VANDENBERG. My answer to the Senator is that I am unable to respond conclusively to his question at the moment. So far as my own information goes, I should be inclined to stand precisely where I stood before, with respect to the Commissioner to whom the Senator refers. But since the Senator faces me with this inquiry, I am bound to say that I have heard from other Senators a suggestion of dissatisfaction regarding divers and sundry alleged exhibits, let us say, upon which I would not care to pass final judgment until I knew precisely what is involved. Therefore I am unable to say with finality that my position would be the same. But my expectation is that it probably would be. I submit to the Senator that that is beside the point, because there are those Senators who very deeply feel that they do have a justification for challenging the record of several members of the Commission, as the able Senator from Connecticut understands and well knows. I am bound to say for myself that I think it has been an act of very generous cooperation with the viewpoint of the rest of us, Mr. President, that some, let us say the minority of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy—the minority which does feel very deeply and sincerely and conscientiously that some of these nominations should not be confirmed—I think it is a very great tribute to their lack of political impulse in this situation to be willing to join with the rest of us in stabilizing the entire situation for another two highly critical years.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to point out to the Senator that if there is any member of this body who has in his possession any information which would lead him to vote against the confirmation of the Commissioners, I submit he will have to challenge his conscience before he votes to extend the terms of the Commissioners as provided under this bill. That, I submit, is really the heart of this whole difficulty. By confirming their appointments for 2 years, by extending their service for 2 years, we are giving a vote of confidence to the Commissioners and are demonstrating that they are highly worthy. If any Senator on the floor believes that they are not worthy of confidence, he should vote "no" on the bill, and we should call up the confirmation and fight it out. God in his heaven did not ordain that this Congress should end tonight. That determination comes from the majority leadership.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his concluding contribution, by which he has so clearly demonstrated that he is anxious to discuss political partisanship in connection with the subject. I do not respond to him, because I am not interested in that phase of the matter at all.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Michigan in the remarks he has made. I have a friend on the Commission, Mr. Lewis L. Strauss, of New York, but formerly of Virginia. I voted for his confirmation last year. He is an able and valuable member of the Commission and an exceptionally fine man. I am personally interested in seeing him confirmed again. Considering the fact that we have only a few hours left before we expect to adjourn this session of the Congress sine die, and there is a division of opinion as to what should be done, it would be in the interest of my friend on the Commission for me to vote for an extension of the term of 2 years and at least stabilize the situation for that period.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his comment. It is completely in line with my own irresistible conviction on the subject.

Mr. President, if we must discuss the question of whether this is a political bill, I want to submit one or two exhibits.

Under the presently existing law the President has 20 years of appointive tenures in respect to these Commissioners. Under the proposed new law, the new President who comes in next January, has 25 years of appointive tenure. I respectfully submit that the difference between 20 years and 25 years does not constitute a ripper bill.

Secondly, so far as the tenures of the existing Commissioners are concerned, under the existing law, they would have a total tenure of 15 years maximum. Under the proposed law which is now pending, and which is supposed to be some sort of a political racket, they would have a total tenure of 10 years, plus a subsequent chance for further appointment. I again submit that we cannot make either a political racket, a political conspiracy, or a ripper bill out of those unanswerable equations.

Mr. President, let me get back to the contemplation which I was submitting to the Senate. If we do not pass this bill, we confront one perfectly obvious alternative. We cannot have the interim appointments confirmed, and everyone knows it, including the Senator from Connecticut. All that we can have as a result of the refusal to pass this measure is a group of five interim appointments which will be good only until next year and which will clothe the entire enterprise with complete insecurity and completely inadequate reliance.

Mr. President, there is one thing upon which the able Senator and I will completely agree, and that is that we both are dedicated to the best welfare of atomic energy as a resource and asset of the Government of the United States. I agree that the Senator from Connecticut has that objective in his heart, and I know he will yield the same concession to me.

I do not see how, in choosing between these alternatives—and that is the sole question concerning the Senate; there is no political conspiracy here, there is no ripper bill here, the facts deny both these indictments—the only question pending is the choice of alternatives, and I again say that I cannot see how any Senator who is devoted to the continuity of reliable, dependable atomic development, which is of such vital concern to the United States, can say that a set of temporary interim appointments which have no stability whatever can possibly be a preferable choice to two solid years of reappointment for the entire Commission, with a report which asserts that the bill is passed without any prejudice against any of them.

So, Mr. President, with this brief word I wish to associate myself with my distinguished friend from Iowa not only in behalf of the necessity of the pending measure, but equally in behalf of its good faith.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not desire to make any lengthy statement; in fact, I shall make a very brief statement. Everything has been said that can be said on this question, I think, and my only reason for rising now is because I associated myself with the Senator from Iowa in sponsoring the pending legislation.

I realize that there are differences of opinion with respect to Mr. Lilienthal and some of the other members of the Commission. I wish to make it plain that when I associated myself in sponsoring the bill with the Senator from Iowa, I was not reflecting any dissatisfaction or any criticism whatsoever of Mr. Lilienthal. If I had the opportunity I would vote today for his confirmation. I have full confidence and faith in him. I know he is a great administrator, and I believe he is doing a splendid job. That is not the situation we are facing. I hope that the Senate will not follow the advice of the Senator from Connecticut and vote down the pending bill, because I think it would be a very reckless thing to do, a very reckless thing for the safety of our country.

Atomic energy is a new science. We are not able at the present time to measure its potential, but we do know enough about it to realize that we must regard it with great respect, and that we must give it every possible assistance and cooperation in its development.

At the present time the Atomic Energy Commission are carrying on a very large program. They are building a great plant near Chicago. They are enlarging the work at Hanford, Wash. They have contracts outstanding with many of the universities of the country. They are right in the midst, I might say right in the middle, of a very great program, and to interrupt that program at the present time with any break in the continuity in the terms of the Commissioners might be a very serious thing indeed. Two years will give them an opportunity to finish the enterprises upon which they are now engaged.

Mr. President, for this reason, and for other reasons which have been mentioned by others, I sincerely hope that the Senate will vote the continuance of 2 years rather than insist upon bringing these men up for confirmation or for rejection by the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. A great many Members of the Senate are somewhat confused and disturbed as to the alternative which faces the Senate on this proposition. As I understand, if the bill shall not be passed, these nominees would not be confirmed, and the President would then probably appoint all of them during the interim, which would terminate in January. They would have 6 months tenure under interim appointments. If the bill is passed, as I understand, it will extend the terms for 2 years without confirmation. Is that the fact?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true. The original bill gave them an extension of a year and a half, 18 months, and no new appointments would have to be made. After that period they are to be appointed in a staggered relationship one to the other, one for 5 years, one for 4, another for 3, the fourth for 2, and the fifth for 1.

The pending bill extends the terms of all the commissioners a full 2 years, and at the end of the 2-year period they will come up in their staggered relationship for appointment. So that the 2-year interim, the 2-year continuance in office which the bill provides, will add stability, and will not make any changes at a time when stability is an absolute essentiality.

There is nothing quite so important as that, because, as I have said, they are engaging in new enterprises, a big plant at Chicago, and the other plants, and these men are right in the very beginning of that work. They are undertaking something, and they should not be removed from office until they have an opportunity to fulfill and complete the assignments which they have assumed in the interest of our defense, and in the interest of the United States generally.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's answer, and the situation which prompted me to ask the question, present an unpleasant alternative on both sides. Personally I am for these men. I think they have done a good job, and I should be willing, of course, to confirm them for the entire period provided in the law as it is now. But we cannot confirm them. No matter what happens here with regard to the pending bill, I assume we cannot confirm them.

If that is true, the question is, Which is better for the program and the Government and the people, regardless of any politics which may have been injected into the matter originally that prompted the reduction of the term and the introduction of the pending bill or the original bill?

What I was seeking from the Senator, who is a member of the joint committee, was as between the two alternatives, assuming the impossibility of confirmation and the possible interim appointments which would last until January—and assuming they were reappointed in January, the question of their confirmation would then arise again—as between that situation and the 2-year period for which the terms would be extended, which, in the Senator's judgment, is better for the program, for the Government, and the people? That is what is disturbing me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think the choice is very hard to make. I had very little difficulty in making it myself. Looking at the matter from the point of view of the good of the country, and the good of the new art and the new science, it is not very difficult for me to make the decision, and I hope it will not be difficult for others to make it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me in his time, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut the question. He has done a wonderful job, I wish to say, in regard to the whole program. He has been not only industrious and sincere, but he has been patriotic, and he has devoted himself to this matter with a singleness of purpose which I think is as highly commendable as could have been expected from any Member of this body.

I ask this question of the Senator from Connecticut: If we are faced with the alternative which I posed to the Senator from Colorado of 2 years certain tenure for all these commissioners, or failure to confirm and interim appointments for 6 months, and assuming even that they would be reappointed at the end of 6 months and the fight would again arise over their confirmation, which of these two alternatives, if there is an alternative, would best serve the program of continuity of the work the Commissioners are now doing, and the program, which is essential, as I agree with the Senator from Connecticut, to our national defense? I will say that that question has been posed to me by a large number of Senators, and I should like to have the benefit of the Senator's judgment in regard to the alternative, if it is an alternative.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that the best thing that could happen for the welfare of this Commission, in the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut, and therefore the best thing in my opinion for the welfare of the United States, would be the rejection of this bill and the confirmation, before the Senate recesses, of these Commissioners. I cannot accede to the dilemma that is posed by the Senator from Kentucky, because in my opinion the issue that is raised here is so vital, and so basic to our whole future system of preparedness that I cannot accede to the dilemma upon which the senior Senator from Kentucky finds himself impaled.

I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that these men are in a real sense like the Commander in Chief of the Navy, Admiral Denfeld, or General Bradley of the Army. We must not establish a precedent in this matter that shall serve those who might wish for political reasons to change the Chiefs of our Army or Navy. In my opinion the bill should be rejected, and if it is rejected, then I say to the Senator from Kentucky that this Congress may adjourn at 12 o'clock tonight, but if it adjourns sine die at 12 o'clock tonight those Commissioners will be confirmed for the statutory time provided for under the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I further pursue the matter? If I were as sure as the Senator from Connecticut seems to be, that the rejection of this bill would result in their confirmation for the full term, I would certainly agree with him. But I am wondering on what basis we have any assurance that if the bill is rejected, the nominees would be confirmed, and if they are confirmed, whether the dilemma of which I spoke would then arise.

Mr. McMAHON. The reason I am so confident, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, that that would be the course of events, is that I cannot conceive that the leadership on the other side of the aisle would permit the Congress to recess and go home leaving this situation to interim nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank both Senators.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak but briefly. It was not my intention to speak at all, but I understand there may be a question as to whether a record vote will be taken. Therefore, I wish to make my record on the bill. I still hope we can have a record vote, because I know of no good reason why Members of the Senate should not be willing to put themselves on record on this question.

I have analyzed this problem to the best of my ability. I have listened to

the able arguments of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] and my dear friend the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. Although I seldom find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Michigan, I regret that on this occasion I do, because the issue to me is very simple. These men are either qualified or they are not qualified for the positions to which they are appointed. If they are qualified, then it seems to me they are qualified for the statutory period and not for any compromise period that has been worked out short of that statutory period. I think the interests of the country are so great and so serious in this matter, Mr. President, that we ought to know for a certainty whether or not these men should be entrusted with the solemn duties and obligations which are theirs under this assignment.

As the Senator from Connecticut has pointed out, these nominations have been before the committee now since some time in April. I think the issue should be met here as to whether or not we ought to confirm them because we think they are able to do the work for the statutory period, or reject them, and if they are not able to do it for the statutory period, then I say we ought not to confirm them for a lesser period.

Therefore I shall reluctantly vote against the proposal to confirm them for a 2-year period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The bill (H. R. 6402) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2589 will be indefinitely postponed.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO PRINT TRIBUTES TO DECEASED SENATORS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators having statements on the life, character, and public service of the deceased Senators for whom memorial services were held on April 21, 1948, may have leave to insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be issued subsequent to the adjournment or recess of the session today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF POSTAL AND OTHER GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate House bill 6916.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department was read twice by its title.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for immediate consent of the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, there have been on the calendar for some time bills recommended by our Civil Service Committee for increasing the pay of postmasters and also a bill increasing the pay of Government employees in general. There have been constant conferences with the House as to what they might be willing to accept, and we finally worked out an agreement, so far as we can reach an agreement, under which the House agreed to a $450 increase for postal employees. The House up to this time has been unwilling to increase the pay of other employees, and the House has sent to the Senate a bill which merely increases the pay of postal employees by $450, and also imposes certain increases in postal rates.

It is my proposal that we amend the bill by a substitute which increases postal employees pay $450, and which increases the pay of other employees $360, and which provides certain other increases in the upper brackets, which will be explained by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able Senator from Ohio say that the total amount of the increase for postal employees is $450?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, $450 per person.

Mr. President, very roughly it seems to me that both of these classes of employees ought to be increased, and if my proposed substitute is adopted it will be sent to conference with the House, and I hope the House may take the increase for the other employees as well as the postal employees. I cannot guarantee that they will do so. Some House Members seem to be in favor and others not, but I think very likely the conferees on the part of the House might accept that addition to the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the House bill provide for an increase of $450?

Mr. TAFT. The House bill provides an increase of $450, and we propose to go along with the House on that amount. It is the highest figure it is possible to get the House to accept. We also propose to add a general increase of $360 for other Government employees as well as a provision for reclassification, which would give them on an average an additional increase of perhaps something a little less than $100. That increase will be $88, according to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. It provides also for an increase in the salaries of those above $10,000 which will be explained by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. Both these groups are entitled to an increase. Very roughly, the figures show that whereas the cost of living has increased about 70 percent, the postal pay increase will be about 70 percent, both over 1939 figures.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Ohio have an estimate of the cost of those two increases?

Mr. TAFT. The two increases will cost approximately half a billion dollars. I will leave it to the Senator from Vermont to say exactly what it is. I think the postal increase is about $185,000,000.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Ohio, and for the information of the Senator from Virginia, that the postal increase amounts to about $206,000,000. The increase to classified workers amounts to about $305,000,000. There are certain other officers and employees with respect to whom the increase would amount to about $1,000,000. Those are the top figures.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I cannot hear what the Senator says.

Mr. TAFT. Roughly speaking, the postal increase is $200,000,000, classified employees, $300,000,000 and one or two million for the upper brackets.

Mr. BYRD. The postal employees increase is more than $200,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. The figure is $206,000,000.

Mr. FLANDERS. Two hundred six million dollars for the postal employees, $305,000,000 for the classified employees; and then the higher executive officers, from the Cabinet class down through heads of bureau, amounting to $1,000,000. Then there is $11,000,000 for legislative, judicial, customs clerks, and other miscellaneous workers, making a total of $523,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. May I ask the Senator from Ohio whether he proposes to increase the postal rates in his substitute?

Mr. TAFT. No. The substitute does not increase postal rates. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service felt that there were a number of those rates brought into question. They did not want to accept the rates. They want to have the question in conference, where they can discuss the individual raises which are proposed. It seemed the wise thing to substitute a bill without those rates, so that they will all be in conference.

Mr. BYRD. This will involve an increased burden on the Treasury, so far as Senate action is concerned, of $523,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I think the rates should clearly be increased.

On the general question of the justice of the increase, I cannot see any answer to the fact that if the cost of living has increased 70 percent since 1939, if the general salaries of workmen in factories today have increased about 110 percent or 120 percent, if the average of all nonagricultural workers has increased 80 percent, it seems to me that we cannot be criticized. I do not see how we can avoid the duty of at least a 70-percent increase for general employees. This proposal works out almost exactly as a 69-percent increase for civil-service employees over prewar, and about a 75-percent increase for postal employees, over prewar. In 1939 postal employees

had gone for a much longer period without an increase—practically since 1922, as I remember—and they were comparatively lower at that time than other civil-service employees. I think the additional 5 percent is justified.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator takes into consideration, does he not, the other increases made since 1939?

Mr. TAFT. Oh, yes. This includes everything. I have all the figures. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the table, from which I will eliminate the unnecessary matter.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE B.—*Comparison of compensation of Federal classified and postal employees with compensation paid in private industry*

[NOTE.—Cost of living increase since 1939=69.3 percent.[1]]

Item	Number of employees at present[2]	Amount, 1939	Present		Proposed increase: [3] $450 postal, $360 classified	
			Amount	Percent increase over 1939	Amount	Percent increase over 1939
Manufacturing employees:[4]						
Annual earnings:						
Estimated full-time average[5]	15,850,000	$1,593.00	$2,850.00	109.0		
Estimated actual average[6]	15,850,000	1,020.00	2,700.00	165.0		
Weekly earnings (production workers only)	12,600,000	23.86	49.26	106.0		
Hourly earnings (production workers only)	12,600,000	.63	1.22	94.0		
Retail trade employees:						
Annual earnings:						
Estimated full-time average[5]	6,800,000	1,224.00	2,450.00	100.0		
Estimated actual average[6]	6,800,000	930.00	2,300.00	147.0		
Weekly earnings	6,800,000	21.17	36.67	73.0		
Hourly earnings	6,800,000	.54	.99	83.0		
Federal Government employees in positions under Classification Act:[7]						
Total	[8]823,807					
Average rates, weighted by the employment in each period:						
Annual		1,893.00	3,006.00	51.0	$3,377	69
Weekly		36.33	57.81	51.0		
Average rates, weighted by July 1947 employment in both periods:						
Annual		2,288.00	3,006.00	31.0	3,377	48
Weekly		44.00	57.81	31.0		
Annual starting rate by grade:						
Grade 2:						
SP-4	288	1,020.00	1,660.00	66.0	2,070	102
CPC-2	25,193	1,080.00	1,620.00	56.0	2,070	91
CAF-1	4,113	1,260.00	1,755.00	39.0	2,070	64
CPC-3	22,558	1,200.00	1,822.00	52.0	2,130	77
SP-2	12,397	1,200.00	1,822.00	45.0		
Grade 3:						
CAF-2 and SP-3	119,828	1,440.00	1,954.00	36.0	2,430	68
CPC-4	18,387	1,320.00	2,020.00	53.0	2,430	84
CAF-3 and SP-4	155,013	1,620.00	2,168.00	34.0	2,500	54
CPC-5	7,648	1,500.00	2,244.00	50.0	2,570	71
Grade 4:						
CAF-4 and SP-5	100,239	1,800.00	2,394.00	33.0	2,870	59
CPC-6	18,286	1,680.00	2,469.00	47.0	2,870	71
P-1, SP-6, and CAF-5	60,569	2,000.00	2,645.00	32.0	2,970	49
CPC-7	9,489	1,860.00	2,695.00	45.0	2,970	59
Grade 5:						
CPC-8	3,371	2,000.00	2,896.00	45.0	3,470	74
CAF-6 and SP-7	29,506	2,300.00	3,021.00	31.0	3,470	51
CPC-9	1,227	2,360.00	3,272.00	42.0	3,595	56
P-2, SP-8, and CAF-7	72,661	2,600.00	3,397.00	31.0	3,720	43
Grade 6:						
CPC-10	894	2,600.00	3,648.00	40.0	4,220	63
CAF-8	13,152	2,900.00	3,773.00	30.0	4,220	45
P-3 and CAF-9	58,869	3,200.00	4,150.00	30.0	4,570	43
Grade 7:						
CAF-10	6,770	3,500.00	4,526.00	29.0	5,270	51
P-4 and CAF-11	32,226	3,800.00	4,902.00	29.0	5,270	39
Grade 8: P-5 and CAF-12	24,920	4,600.00	5,905.00	28.0	6,320	38
Grade 9: P-6 and CAF-13	11,002	5,670.00	7,102.00	25.0	7,470	34
Grade 10: P-7 and CAF-14	4,372	6,500.00	8,180.00	26.0	8,570	32
Grade 11: P-8 and CAF-15	1,610	8,000.00	9,975.00	25.0	10,070	26
U. S. Post Office Department:[9]						
Average annual earnings:[10]						
Total	296,209	1,894.00	2,857.00	51.0	3,307	75
Departmental	1,710	2,239.00	3,232.00	44.0	3,682	64
Field service:						
Total	294,499	1,892.00	2,855.00	51.0	3,305	75
City delivery carriers	66,335	2,008.00	2,954.00	47.0	3,404	70
Clerks, first- and second-class offices	104,745	2,165.00	3,012.00	39.0	3,492	60
Annual starting rates:[11]						
Clerks, first- and second-class offices	80,182	1,700.00	2,100.00	23.5	2,550	50
Mail handlers	5,213	1,500.00	2,000.00	33.3	2,450	63
City delivery carriers	67,896	1,700.00	2,100.00	23.5	2,550	50
Clerks, railway-mail service	23,115	1,900.00	2,300.00	21.1	2,750	45

[1] Based upon the increase in the Consumers' Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics between Aug. 15, 1939, and Mar. 15, 1948.
[2] Federal employment shown in this column represents total within grade, although rates shown are starting rates only.
[3] Increases for "postal" employees are flat amounts for each person. Increases for "classified" employees include (a) an average $100 per person resulting from revision of the Classification Act of 1923, plus (b) a flat increase for the balance shown.
[4] Source: B.L.S., Department of Labor.
[5] Full-time equivalent annual earnings, as published by the U. S. Department of Commerce. Data for 1947 estimated.
[6] Full-time equivalent annual earnings, as reported in the line above, minus estimated loss in earnings through lay-offs, sickness, strikes, etc.
[7] Source: Federal Employment Statistics staff of U. S. Civil Service Commission.
[8] Excludes 212 messengers under 18 years of age in present CPC-1, and 3,836 clerical-mechanical employees paid at hourly rates. Employment is as of July 31, 1947; comparable employment as of Dec. 31, 1947, was 784,000.
[9] Source: Office of Budget and Planning, U. S. Post Office Department.
[10] Employment represents an average for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947. Earnings represent total pay roll for the fiscal year divided by the average employment.
[11] Employment is as of June 30, 1947.

NOTE.—The 823,807 employees shown above in Federal positions under the Classification Act of 1923, represent only those in the executive branch within continental United States (exclusive of clerical-mechanical employees who are paid on an hourly basis) as of July 31, 1947. (This group numbered 794,000 as of Dec. 31, 1947.) The figure, therefore, is lower than the 846,155 employees upon which the estimates of annual pay-roll costs of proposed pay increases were based, which covered all employees in positions under the Classification Act of 1923 (exclusive of clerical-mechanical employees) as of, roughly, the first quarter of 1948, including employees outside continental United States and those in the legislative and judicial branches and District of Columbia government.

The 296,209 employees of the Post Office Department, shown above, represent the average number of regular employees during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, whereas the figure of 438,000 on which pay-roll cost estimates were based represent the estimated average number of both regular and substitute employees, including substitutes hired for the Christmas season, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether he agrees with the statement which was made before our committee in investigating this subject, in justification of the increase. The statement was:

In 1947 Federal employees in classified positions received an average gross salary of $2,856, as compared with an average of $2,140 in August 1939; but in terms of what the current salaries buy, the $2,856 is worth only $1,719 today. It is also important to note that up until the early part of 1941 the purchasing power of the Federal employees remained fairly constant. From then on until the latter part of 1942 it declined rapidly.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the general statement. I have not had time to check the exact figures, but the general effect of the statement is entirely correct.

Mr. O'CONOR. Does the Senator from Ohio see any justification for raising one group of employees without giving a general raise to the other Federal employees?

Mr. TAFT. I think they all ought to be increased. I cannot see any reason for a distinction.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I think there may be an amendment to be considered before the substitute. The substitute is marked "Committee Print No. 2" and has been distributed on the desk of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. TAFT was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That this act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Pay Act of 1948."

TITLE I—INCREASES IN PAY RATES OF POSTMASTERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

INCREASE IN BASIC PAY RATES OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 101. The rate of compensation of each postmaster, officer, and employee in the postal service whose rate of compensation is prescribed by the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended, and by the act entitled "An act to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service," approved May 21, 1946, is increased by $450 per annum, except that any such rate which is paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall be increased 22.5 cents per hour, and rates of compensation of postmasters at post offices of the fourth class shall each be increased 22.5 percent.

INCREASE NOT TO DEFER PROMOTION

SEC. 102. The increase in any existing rate of compensation provided by this act shall not be construed to be such an increase in the rate of pay as, under the provisions of the act approved July 6, 1945, as amended, would defer an increase in pay by reason of promotion.

INCREASE IN EQUIPMENT ALLOWANCE FOR RURAL CARRIERS AND SPECIAL-DELIVERY MESSENGERS

SEC. 103. (a) Sections 17 (e) and 22 (d) of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, are each amended by striking out "6 cents per mile" and inserting in lieu thereof "8 cents per mile."

(b) Section 22 (d) of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, is further amended by striking out "75 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1."

(c) The act entitled "An act to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 1 cent per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes" (Public Law 467, 80th Cong.), is hereby repealed.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS OF THE CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923, AS AMENDED

COMPENSATION SCHEDULE

SEC. 201. (a) Hereafter the rates of basic compensation for officers, employees, and positions in the departmental and field services, who are required to be compensated in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, shall be in conformity with the following compensation schedule of per annum rates:

Grade	Minimum rate	Intermediate rates	Maximum rate
1	$1,410	$1,475, $1,540, $1,605	$1,670
2	2,070	$2,150, $2,190, $2,250, $2,310, $2,370	2,430
3	2,430	$2,500, $2,570, $2,640, $2,710, $2,780	2,850
4	2,870	$2,970, $3,070, $3,170, $3,270, $3,370	3,470
5	3,470	$3,595, $3,720, $3,845, $3,970, $4,095	4,220
6	4,220	$4,395, $4,570, $4,745, $4,920, $5,095	5,270
7	5,270	$5,445, $5,620, $5,795, $5,970, $6,145	6,320
8	6,320	$6,570, $6,820, $7,070	7,320
9	7,470	$7,720, $7,970, $8,220	8,470
10	8,570	$8,870, $9,170, $9,470	9,770
11	10,070	$10,370, $10,670, $10,970	11,270
12	11,570	$12,070, $12,570, $13,070	13,570

Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of $1.07 an hour, and head charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of $1.12 an hour.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended:

Grade 1 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 1 of the crafts, protective, and custodial service under such act.

Grade 2 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grades 1 and 2 of the subprofessional service, grade 1 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, grades 2 and 3 of the crafts, protective, and custodial service, and grade 1 of the clerical-mechanical service under such act.

Grade 3 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grades 3 and 4 of the subprofessional service, grades 2 and 3 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, grades 4 and 5 of the crafts, protective, and custodial service, and grade 2 of the clerical-mechanical service under such act.

Grade 4 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 1 of the professional and scientific service, grades 5 and 6 of the subprofessional service, grades 4 and 5 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, grades 6 and 7 of the crafts, protective, and custodial service, and grade 3 of the clerical-mechanical service under such act.

Grade 5 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 2 of the professional and scientific service, grades 7 and 8 of the subprofessional service, grades 6 and 7 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, grades 8 and 9 of the crafts, protective, and custodial service, and grade 4 of the clerical-mechanical service under such act.

Grade 6 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 3 of the professional and scientific service, grades 8 and 9 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, and grade 10 of the crafts, protective, and custodial service, under such act.

Grade 7 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 4 of the professional and scientific service and grades 10 and 11 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, under such act.

Grade 8 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 5 of the professional and scientific service and grade 12 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, under such act.

Grade 9 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 6 of the professional and scientific service and grade 13 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, under such act.

Grade 10 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 7 of the professional and scientific service and grade 14 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, under such act.

Grade 11 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 8 of the professional and scientific service and grade 15 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, under such act.

Grade 12 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include positions the duties of which are to plan and direct or to plan and execute frontier or unprecedented professional, scientific, or other specialized programs of outstanding difficulty, responsibility, and national significance, requiring extended professional, scientific, or other specialized training and experience which has demonstrated outstanding leadership and attainments in professional, scientific, or other specialized research, practice, or administration; to serve as the head of a professional, scientific, or other bureau where the position, considering the kind and extent of the authorities and responsibilities vested in it, and the scope, complexity, and degree of difficulty of the activities carried on, is exceptional and outstanding among the whole group of positions of heads of such bureaus; or to perform consulting or other professional, scientific, or other specialized work of equal importance, difficulty, and responsibility.

No position shall be placed in grade 12, and no officer or employee to whom the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, applies shall be compensated at any of the rates of such grade, except by provision of an act of Congress referring to that specific position, or after prior approval by the Civil Service Commission. Such prior approval shall cover the evaluation of the duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements of the position and the qualifications of any proposed appointee thereto.

The Civil Service Commission shall submit to the Congress, not later than December 31 of each year, a report setting forth the number of positions placed in grade 12 in the respective departments and agencies during that calendar year, and the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent, together with a statement of the functions performed by each: *Provided, however,* That in any instance where the head of the department or agency may consider full public report on these items detrimental to the national security, the Commission is authorized to omit such items from its annual report, and in lieu thereof, the head of the department or agency shall present such information in executive sessions of such committees of the Senate and House of Representatives as the presiding officers of those bodies shall designate.

(c) Whenever payment is made on the basis of a daily, hourly, weekly, or monthly rate, such rate shall be computed from the appropriate annual rate specified in subsection (a) according to the method prescribed in section 604 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945.

(d) The following paragraphs of section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, under the headings indicated, are hereby repealed:

"PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC SERVICE

"Grade 9 in this service, which may be referred to as the special professional grade, shall include all positions which are or may be specifically, authorized or appropriated for at annual rates of compensation in excess of $10,000."

"CLERICAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND FISCAL SERVICE

"Grade 16 in this service, which may be referred to as the special executive grade, shall include all positions which are or may be specifically authorized or appropriated for at annual rates of compensation in excess of $10,000."

INITIAL SALARY ADJUSTMENTS

SEC. 202. (a) The existing rate of basic compensation of any officer or employee in a pay status in a position required to be compensated in accordance with the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of section 201 shall be initially adjusted as follows:

(1) If his position is in grade 1 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$1,080	$1,410.00
$1,170	1,475.00
$1,258	1,540.00
$1,330	1,605.00
$1,402	1,670.00

(2) If his position is in grade 2 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$1,690	$2,070.00
$1,756	2,070.00
$1,822	2,130.00
$1,872	2,190.00
$1,868	2,190.00
$1,954	2,250.00
$2,017.60	2,310.00
$2,020	2,310.00
$2,093.04	2,370.00
$2,168.28	2,438.28
$2,243.52	2,513.52

(3) If his position is in grade 3 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$1,954	$2,430.00
$2,020	2,430.00
$2,093.04	2,430.00
$2,163.20	2,500.00
$2,168.28	2,500.00
$2,243.52	2,570.00
$2,318.76	2,640.00
$2,329.60	2,640.00
$2,384	2,710.00
$2,469.24	2,780.00
$2,544.48	2,850.00
$2,619.72	2,889.72
$2,694.96	2,964.96

(4) If his position is in grade 4 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$2,384	$2,870.00
$2,469.24	2,870.00
$2,496	2,870.00
$2,544.48	2,870.00
$2,619.72	2,970.00
$2,641.60	2,970.00
$2,644.80	2,970.00
$2,694.96	2,970.00
$2,770.20	3,070.00
$2,845.44	3,170.00
$2,895.60	3,270.00
$2,920.68	3,270.00
$3,021	3,370.00
$3,146.40	3,470.00
$3,271.80	3,541.80
$3,397.20	3,667.20

(5) If his position is in grade 5 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$2,808	$3,470.00
$2,895.60	3,470.00
$3,021	3,470.00
$3,099.20	3,470.00
$3,146.40	3,470.00
$3,271.80	3,595.00
$3,397.20	3,720.00
$3,522.60	3,845.00
$3,648	3,970.00
$3,773.40	4,095.00
$3,898.80	4,220.00
$4,024.20	4,294.20
$4,149.60	4,419.60

(6) If his position is in grade 6 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$3,648	$4,220.00
$3,773.40	4,220.00
$3,898.80	4,220.00
$4,024.20	4,395.00
$4,149.60	4,570.00
$4,275	4,570.00
$4,400.40	4,745.00
$4,525.80	4,920.00
$4,651.20	5,095.00
$4,776.60	5,095.00
$4,902	5,270.00

(7) If his position is in grade 7 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$4,525.80	$5,270.00
$4,651.20	5,270.00
$4,776.60	5,270.00
$4,902	5,270.00
$5,027.40	5,445.00
$5,152.80	5,620.00
$5,278.20	5,620.00
$5,403.60	5,795.00
$5,654.40	5,970.00
$5,905.20	6,320.00

(8) If his position is in grade 8 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$5,905.20	$6,320.00
$6,144.60	6,570.00
$6,384	6,820.00
$6,623.40	7,070.00
$6,862.80	7,320.00

(9) If his position is in grade 9 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$7,102.20	$7,470.00
$7,341.60	7,720.00
$7,581	7,970.00
$7,820.40	8,220.00
$8,059.80	8,470.00

(10) If his position is in grade 10 of such compensation schedule, and his existing rate of basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$8,179.50	$8,570.00
$8,478.75	8,870.00
$8,778	9,170.00
$9,077.25	9,470.00
$9,376.50	9,770.00

(11) If his position is in grade 11 of such compensation schedule, his existing rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted as follows:

(A) If he has had less than 18 months of service creditable for within-grade salary advancements under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, since his last equivalent increase, his existing rate shall be adjusted to $10,070 per annum.

(B) If he has had 18 but less than 36 months of such creditable service since his last equivalent increase, his existing rate shall be adjusted to $10,370 per annum.

(C) If he has had 36 but less than 54 months of such creditable service since his last equivalent increase, his existing rate shall be adjusted to $10,670 per annum.

(D) If he has had 54 but less than 72 months of such creditable service since his last equivalent increase, his existing rate shall be adjusted to $10,970 per annum.

(E) If he has had 72 or more months of such creditable service since his last equivalent increase, his existing rate shall be adjusted to $11,270 per annum.

(b) A previous salary advancement of $25 per annum, or a salary increase under paragraphs (1) to (10), inclusive, of subsection (a) shall not be considered an "equivalent increase" for the purpose of within-grade salary advancements under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

(c) Upon adjustment of the salary of any person pursuant to subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph 11 of subsection (a) any creditable service in excess of that required for such adjustment shall be credited toward the first within-grade salary advancement subsequent to such adjustment.

(d) Each of the rates, $2,438.28 and $2,513.52 in grade 2, $2,869.72 and $2,964.96 in grade 3, $3,541.80 and $3,667.20 in grade 4, and $4,294.20 and $4,419.60 in grade 5, is authorized to be paid only to those employees whose existing compensation is initially adjusted to that rate under this section.

BASIS FOR CLASSIFYING POSITIONS

SEC. 203. Section 2 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence thereof, and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) (1) Each position shall be placed in its appropriate class and grade. The basis for determining the class and the grade in which each position shall be placed shall be the duties and responsibilities of such position and the qualifications required by such duties and responsibilities.

"(2) In placing positions in classes and grades, there shall be taken into consideration all material facts which, in a given case, are relevant to the degree of difficulty, the weight of the responsibility, and the qualification requirements of the work involved in the position, such as (1) kind and variety of work; (2) nature and extent of available guide lines for performance of work; (3) nature of supervisory control exercised by others over the work; (4) initiative, originality, or judgment required; (5) purpose and nature of personal contacts required by the work; (6) nature and scope of recommendations, decisions, commitments, and conclusions involved; (7) kind, scope, and extent of knowledge, ability, and other qualities required; (8) kind, length, and quality of experience necessary; and (9) nature and extent of supervisory control over the work of other employees.

"(3) Additional duties and responsibilities assigned to an employee because of his exceptionally efficient service shall be given due weight in placing his position in its appropriate class and grade.

"(4) Supervisory positions shall not be placed in a class and grade solely on the basis of the size of the group, section, bureau, or other organization unit or the number of subordinates supervised. Such factors may be given effect only to the extent warranted by the work load of the organization unit and then only in combination with other factors, such as the kind, difficulty, and complexity of work supervised, the degree and scope of responsibility delegated to the supervisor, and the kind, degree, and value of the supervision actually exercised."

STANDARDS FOR CLASSIFYING POSITIONS

SEC. 204. The third paragraph of section 3 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is further amended by inserting "(c)" before the first sentence of such paragraph; by inserting "(e)" before the sixth sentence of such paragraph; and by amending the second, third, fourth, and fifth sentences of such paragraph to read as follows:

"(d) (1) The Civil Service Commission, after consultation with departments and agencies, shall prepare and publish standards for placing positions in their proper classes and grades. The Commission is authorized to make such inquiries or investigations of the duties and responsibilities and qualification requirements of positions as it deems necessary for this purpose. Such standards shall, in terms of duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements, define the various classes of positions that exist in the service; shall establish the official class titles; shall show the grades in which such classes have been placed by the Commission; and shall be published in such form as the Commission shall determine. At the request of the Commission, departments and agencies shall furnish information and cooperate in the preparation of such standards.

"(2) The Commission shall keep such standards up to date. From time to time, after consultation with the departments and agencies to the extent deemed necessary, it may revise, supplement, amend, abolish, merge, or divide existing standards, or prepare new standards, so that, as nearly as may be practicable, positions existing at any given time within the service will be covered by current published standards.

"(3) The official class titles so established shall be used for personnel, budget, and fiscal purposes to the extent deemed necessary by the Commission, but this shall not prevent the use of organizational or other titles for internal administration, public convenience, law enforcement, or similar purposes."

AUTHORITY AND PROCEDURE

SEC. 205. Section 4 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) In conformity with standards issued pursuant to the provisions of section 3 (d) of this act, departments and agencies (1) shall place all positions in their departmental and field services in their respective classes and grades and (2) shall review the determination of the class and grade of a position whenever it materially changes with respect to its duties, responsibilities, or qualification requirements and shall revise such determination when the facts warrant.

"(b) Action taken under the authority of subsection (a) of this section shall be final unless and until changed by certification of the Commission: *Provided*, That departments and agencies shall refer to the Commission for final action such positions in the departmental service as are not at the time covered by standards published by the Commission.

"(c) The Commission shall postaudit actions taken under the authority of subsection (a) of this section, and shall have authority on its own motion, or at the request of the employee occupying the position, or otherwise to ascertain currently the facts as to the duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements of any position. In connection with such postaudits, departments and agencies shall provide the Commission with information regarding the duties and responsibilities of positions, reasons for placing individual positions in the respective classes and grades, and related information requested by the Commission.

"(d) Whenever the Commission, after investigation and after affording the department or agency concerned an opportunity for explanation and for submitting further information, shall determine that any position subject to this act (1) has not been placed in its proper class and grade, or (2) has not been placed in any class and grade, the Commission shall place such position in its proper class and grade and shall certify its findings and a statement of the necessary corrections to the department or agency concerned and to the General Accounting Office.

"(e) Departments and agencies shall take action in accordance with such certificates of the Commission. The Commission's certificates shall be binding on all certifying, pay-roll, disbursing, and accounting officers of the Government. Any pay adjustment shall be effective at the beginning of the pay period in which the Commission's certificate is received in the appropriate administrative office.

"(f) The rate of basic compensation to which an officer's or employee's existing rate shall be adjusted when (1) the standards issued under section 3 (d) of this act are first applied to his position or (2) an error in placing his position in a class and grade is corrected, shall be in accordance with the compensation schedule established by section 201 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1948 and shall be governed by regulations issued by the Commission: *Provided*, That if such rate is lower than the rate at which he has theretofore been receiving compensation, or at which he was hired, and the Commission finds that the circumstances of the individual case warrant (A) continuance of the rate at which he has theretofore been receiving compensation or at which he was hired, or (B) adjustment to any standard rate falling between the rate specified in (A) and the appropriate rate as set out in such compensation schedule; it may authorize such continuance or adjustment. If any officer or employee of long and efficient service is transferred or reassigned, not for delinquency or misconduct, to a position in a lower class or grade, and the Commission finds that the circumstances of the individual case warrant (i) continuance of the rate at which he has theretofore been receiving compensation, or (ii) adjustment to any standard rate falling between the rate specified in (i) and the appropriate rate as set out in the compensation schedule, it shall so notify the employing agency and such continuance or adjustment shall be made accordingly.

"(g) Whenever the Commission finds that the actions of any department or agency in placing positions in classes and grades are not in accordance with standards issued pursuant to section 3 (d) of this act and that the errors or failure in applying such standards are sufficiently serious to warrant immediate supervision by the Commission of future action, the Commission may, in its discretion, after affording the department or agency an opportunity for consultation and explanation, withdraw or suspend in whole or in part the authority of the department or agency to take final action and require approval of such actions by the Commission prior to their becoming effective. After any such withdrawal or suspension, the Commission may restore such authority when, in its judgment, such restoration is warranted by the corrective steps taken by the department or agency to prevent future errors or failures. The Commission shall promptly notify the General Accounting Office of any such withdrawal, suspension, or restoration.

"(h) In determining the rate of compensation which an employee shall receive, the principle of equal compensation for equal work irrespective of sex shall be followed."

WITHIN-GRADE SALARY ADVANCEMENTS

SEC. 206. Subsection (b) of section 7 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "12 months" and substituting "52 weeks" therefor; and by striking out "18 months" and substituting "78" weeks" therefor.

ADDITIONAL SALARY ADVANCEMENTS

SEC. 207. Subsection (f) of section 7 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is amended by inserting before the words "this subsection" wherever they appear therein the words "the first sentence of," and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Within the limit of available appropriations, as a reward for long, faithful, and outstanding service, under standards to be issued by the Commission, and subject to prior approval by the Commission, or delegation of authority as provided in subsection (g), the head of any department or agency is authorized to award additional salary advancements to an employee beyond the maximum rate of the grade in which the employee's position is placed, but no employee's

salary shall be increased beyond the maximum rate fot his position by more than three such additional salary advancements, and no employee shall receive more than one such advancement during any 3-year period. Each such additional salary advancement shall be equal to the highest increment between any two consecutive rates of the grade in which the employee's position is placed, and shall be subject to the following conditions:

"(1) The employee shall have completed at least 3 years of continuous service, certified by his department or agency as being of outstanding value to the Government, at the maximum rate of his position, or at such rate in excess thereof as is authorized by this subsection, without change of grade or rate of basic compensation except that due to an act of Congress of general application.

"(2) He shall have had, in the aggregate, not less than 10 years of service in the position which he then occupies, or in positions of equivalent or higher class or grade.

"(3) The performance of an employee who is receiving additional salary advancement beyond the maximum rate shall be reviewed annually, and if this review reflects a failure to render outstanding service the employee's rate of pay shall revert to the rate which he received immediately prior to his last advancement."

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 208. Rule 6 of section 6 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except that appointments or other assignments to positions in grades 11 and 12 may, with the prior approval of the Civil Service Commission, be made at, or subsequently adjusted to, any rate of the grade."

SEC. 209. Whenever the Civil Service Commission shall find (a) that a sufficient number of qualified eligibles for positions of a given class cannot be secured in one or more areas or locations at the existing minimum rate for such class, and (b) that a sufficient number of such eligibles can be secured by increasing the minimum rate for such class in such areas or locations to a rate not higher than the middle rate of the grade in which such class is placed, the Commission may, by regulation, establish such higher rate as the minimum rate for that class in the areas or locations concerned. Each such regulation shall specify the date, not more than 1 year from the date of issuance, when it shall cease to be effective unless extended by another such regulation.

SEC. 210. The Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of the foregoing provisions of this title in the departmental and field services and to identify the positions falling under section 211 of this title.

SEC. 211. Section 5 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) This act shall not be applicable to positions and employees in recognized trades or crafts, or other skilled mechanical crafts, or in unskilled, semiskilled, or skilled manual-labor occupations; and the rates of basic compensation of such positions and employees shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose.

"(b) This act shall not be applicable to employees of the Transportation Corps of the Army of the United States on vessels operated by the United States, vessel employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, vessel employees of the Department of the Interior, vessel employees of the Panama Railroad Co., or other vessel employees of the United States; and the rates of basic compensation of such employees shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with wage practices of the maritime industry."

TITLE III—INCREASE IN RATE OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

COVERAGE

SEC. 301. The provisions of this title shall apply to civilian positions, officers, and employees (other than officers and employees who serve without compensation) in or under (1) the executive departments (2) the independent establishments and agencies in the executive branch, including wholly owned Government corporations and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; (3) the Administrative Office of United States Courts; (4) the Library of Congress; (5) the Government Printing Office; (6) the General Accounting Office; (7) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol; (8) the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; and (9) the Court of Claims.

HEADS AND ASSISTANT HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

SEC. 302. The rate of basic compensation of the head of each executive department and of the Secretary of Defense shall be $20,000 per annum; of each Under Secretary of an executive department, of the Solicitor General of the United States, of the Assistant to the Attorney General, and of the First Assistant Postmaster General, $18,000 per annum; and of each Assistant Secretary of an executive department, of each Assistant Attorney General, of the Second, Third, and Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, of the Counselor of the Department of State, and of each of three special assistants to the Secretary of Defense, $15,000 per annum.

HEADS AND ASSISTANT HEADS OF INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS AND AGENCIES

SEC. 303. (a) The rate of basic compensation of the Comptroller General, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Federal Security Administrator, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, and the Federal Works Administrator shall be $18,000 per annum. In any case in which the responsibility immediately below that of an officer referred to in the preceding sentence (other than the Housing and Home Finance Administrator) for the direction and administration of the functions of his agency is concentrated in a single position, the rate of basic compensation of such position shall be $16,500 per annum. In any case in which such responsibility is concentrated in more than one but not more than three positions the rate of basic compensation of each such position shall be $15,000 per annum. The rate of basic compensation of the members of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Public Housing Commissioner, and the Federal Housing Commissioner shall be $15,000 per annum.

(b) The rate of basic compensation of (1) the other full-time members of independent boards or commissions (including the boards of directors of such wholly owned Government corporations as the President may designate and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation) in the executive branch and not within or under any executive department or agency; (2) the heads of other independent establishments or agencies in the executive branch; (3) the governors of Territories or possessions; (4) the Commissioners of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; (5) the Director of the Administrative Office of United States Courts; (6) the Librarian of Congress; (7) the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board; (8) the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board; (9) the Chairman of the Munitions Board; (10) the Chairman of the Research and Development Board; and (11) the Public Printer, shall be $16,500 per annum. In any case in which the responsibility immediately below that of a board, commission, or other head of an agency referred to in this subsection, for the direction and administration of the functions of such board, commission, or agency is concentrated in a single position, the rate of basic compensation of such position shall be $15,000 per annum.

(c) The rates of basic compensation of the heads of the component parts of the Executive Office of the President (other than the Bureau of the Budget), and of such secretaries, administrative or executive assistants, and other immediate staff assistants to the President in the White House Office as the President may designate shall be $18,000 per annum, $16,500 per annum, or $15,000 per annum, to be determined by the President of the United States.

(d) The rate of basic compensation of the Architect of the Capitol shall be $15,000 per annum; and that of the Commissioners of the Court of Claims shall be $11,270 per annum.

(e) The provisions of this section shall not apply in the case of any position with respect to which the Congress shall hereafter fix the rate of basic compensation.

TITLE IV—INCREASES IN PAY RATES OF LEGISLATIVE, JUDICIAL, AND CERTAIN OTHER EMPLOYEES

INCREASE IN PAY RATES OF EMPLOYEES IN LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SEC. 401. (a) Section 501 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence of such section the following: "thereby, plus, except as hereinafter provided, (1) 18 percent of his rate of compensation (including the additions thereto provided by the foregoing portion of this sentence), or (2) $360 per annum, whichever is the lesser. No employee in the office of a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, and no clerical or professional staff member of a committee of the Senate or House of Representatives shall be paid, with respect to any pay period, any additional compensation under the provisions of clause (1) or (2) of the preceding sentence, or any compensation at a rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, unless such Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, or the chairman of such committee, shall so certify in writing to the appropriate disbursing office, and in such event payment of such compensation shall begin on the first regular pay day following such certification, or following the effective date of title IV of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1948, whichever is later. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or laws, the basic compensation of any employee, other than an administrative assistant, in the office of a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be fixed by such Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner at any multiple of $6 per month which is not in excess of $5,700 per annum. Any such increase shall be made by certification in writing to the appropriate disbursing officer before the first day on which compensation at such increased rate is to be effective."

(b) The annual compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the Presiding Officers of the two Houses), as fixed by section 201 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, shall be increased by $360.

INCREASE IN PAY RATES OF EMPLOYEES IN JUDICIAL BRANCH

SEC. 402. Section 521 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence of such section the following: "thereby, plus (1) 18 percent of his rate of compensation (including the additions thereto provided by the foregoing portion of this sentence), or (2) $360 per annum, whichever is the lesser."

INCREASE IN PAY RATES OF CUSTOMS CLERKS, IMMIGRANT INSPECTORS, AND CERTAIN OTHER EMPLOYEES IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH WHOSE RATES ARE FIXED BY STATUTES OTHER THAN THE CLASSIFICATION ACT

SEC. 403. (a) Each of the existing rates of basic compensation provided by the act entitled "An act to adjust the compensation of certain employees in the Customs Service," approved May 29, 1928, as amended and supplemented, and those provided by the second paragraph of section 24 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended and supplemented, are hereby increased by (1) 18 percent of such rate, or (2) $360 per annum, whichever is the lesser. Such augmented rates shall be considered to be the regular rates of basic compensation.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, rates of basic compensation specifically provided by statute (including any increases therein computed in accordance with section 602 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and section 4 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946), for positions in the executive branch or the District of Columbia municipal government which are not included in section 102, as amended, of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 or in the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, and are not increased by any other provisions of this act, are hereby increased by (1) 18 percent of such rate, or (2) $360 per annum, whichever is the lesser. Such augmented rates shall be considered to be the regular rates of compensation.

(c) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees who, on the effective date of this act, are receiving basic compensation at the rate of $9,975 or more per annum in positions not subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or to the provisions of title III of this act, but in organizations subject generally to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and for which a single or maximum rate of basic compensation has heretofore been fixed by statute at $9,975 or more, shall, upon recommendation by the head of the department or agency concerned and approval by the Civil Service Commission, be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

MINIMUM RATE OF COMPENSATION

SEC. 404. If any rate, as increased by section 402 or 403 of this act, except a rate provided for a foreign service staff officer or employee is insufficient to provide compensation of $2,070 for each 2,080 hours required to be devoted exclusively to the service of the United States by any worker who has attained his 18th birthday anniversary, such rate shall be adjusted by the head of the employing agency so as to provide such compensation. Such adjusted rate shall be considered to be the regular rate of compensation. For the purpose of this section, the number of hours required in the case of any position to be devoted exclusively to the service of the United States, if not determined by law, shall be determined, from time to time, by the head of the employing agency.

MAXIMUM RATE OF COMPENSATION

SEC. 405. (a) Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, is amended by striking out "$10,000" where it first appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,270."

(b) Section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,270."

(c) No officer or employee shall, by reason of any provision of this title, except section 401 (b) or 403 (c), be paid with respect to any pay period, basic compensation, or basic compensation plus any additional compensation provided by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, at a rate in excess of $11,270 per diem.

INCREASE IN MAXIMUM PER DIEM RATES FOR TEMPORARY OR INTERMITTENT SERVICES

SEC. 406. (a) As to departments and agencies subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, expert and consultant personnel employed by contract in accordance with section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress, may, notwithstanding provisions of other laws, be compensated at any rates of compensation not in excess of the daily rate equivalent of the highest annual rate provided for grade 11 by section 201 of this act.

(b) Section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress, is amended by striking out "payable under the Classification Act", and inserting in lieu thereof "provided for grade 11 by section 201 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1948."

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

RATES OF PRESENT INCUMBENTS NOT TO BE REDUCED

SEC. 501. In no case shall the rate of basic compensation, authorized by law, being received by the incumbent of any position subject to this act on the date of enactment of this act be decreased as a result of the enactment of this act so long as he continues to occupy the position occupied by him on the date of enactment of this act, other than by reason of action of the Civil Service Commission pursuant to the provisions of section 203, 204, or 205, or by reason of the provisions of section 211; but when the position becomes vacant, the basic rate of compensation of any new appointee shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of this act.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZED

SEC. 502. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, The additional amounts required by any agency for that purpose shall not be subject to any limitations now imposed by law (other than appropriation acts) on the amount that may be appropriated for the salaries of its officers and employees.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 503. This act shall take effect with respect to any officer or employee on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not quite understand the Senator's reply to the question of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Roughly there is a $523,000,000 increased expenditure, but how much will the increased postal rates carried by the House bill return as compared to the present rate?

Mr. TAFT. Approximately $125,000,000. So they fall by about $60,000,000 to pay for the increase in postal salaries. I may say that there should be a further increase in postal rates, but the House committee apparently prepared these figures for increases very rapidly, and our committee thinks with some lack of discrimination, which we should like to consider in conference. I think next year there should undoubtedly be a much larger increase, to pay not only for these increases, but also the deficit which already exists in postal receipts.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yeld?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say for the information of the Senate that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service yesterday approved a Senate resolution authorizing a study of the whole question of postal receipts and postal rates by a management engineering firm, unspecified in the resolution, the report to be made the middle of next January. We are satisfied that only a scientific investigation will determine what these rates ought to be. We have had a perfect hail-storm of letters, telegrams, and objections by telephone and verbally, over the proposals in the House bill, indicating that it is most unwise to undertake to make changes in postal rates quickly and without real study. That real study the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service desires to make.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. Would it be in order for me to offer at this time an amendment to the proposed substitute for the House bill?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to suggest that there is an amendment which has priority over the Senator's amendment. It will be offered by the junior Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator from Washington willing to defer offering his amendment?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments to the original bill and amendments to the substitute are in order. Amendments to the original bill will take precedence.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, beginning with line 14, it is proposed to strike out all through line 16, and insert the following:

SEC. 214. This title, except section 204, shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the calendar month in which it is enacted. Section 204 shall take effect on January 1, 1949.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, briefly, let me state what the amendment proposes to do. Section 204, as thus amended, will be effective January 1, instead of 60 days following the enactment of this bill.

The purpose is to give the mail-order houses and nurserymen a chance to change their catalogs and revise their price schedules.

I do not think there are objections from the committee to this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to know how much revenue is expected from this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The increased postal rates are supposed to provide approximately $125,000,000 additional revenue annually. I do not know how much this amendment will remove from that amount, but only a percentage of the total amount since the effective date is only being delayed 6 months on part of the authorized increase. Perhaps the

Senator from Vermont can give you the amount.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, my guess would be approximately $15,000,000. If the House proposal for an increase in the postage is to be retained, I feel that this amendment is an excellent one, because so many price lists include postage, as in the case of nurserymen and mail-order houses, and so forth, that they would be completely upset if the increased postage were installed now.

So it seems to me that this is an appropriate amendment to the original bill.

I must say that I hope the original bill will not pass; but this is an appropriate amendment to it, and is in order, and I would suggest that we adopt it by a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer, and ask to have stated. It is an amendment to the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the substitute will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the substitute, it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. —. The provisions of this act granting an increase in compensation to employees of the United States and of the District of Columbia shall not apply to any employee in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia prior to the time that legislation providing a sales tax in the District of Columbia is enacted by the Congress and becomes effective.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not understand the answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Washington. Is it in order to offer amendments now to the original House bill or to the substitute, or both?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order to offer amendments to both, but amendments to the original bill take precedence.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then, Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I shall offer to both, and at the proper time I shall ask to have the amendment called up.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to inquire whether my understanding is correct. I understand that the amendment just being offered is to the substitute, for it refers to the classified employees of the District of Columbia rather than to postal employees of the District of Columbia.

I would make only one comment about this amendment. Certainly I am but one of many who wish we did not have to offer such an amendment, for the amendment says in effect that the pay raises intended within this bill shall go to everyone throughout the country except 7,000 employees who are classified employees within the District of Columbia. But we cannot very well, within this District, sponsor or approve of deficit financing; nor can we, without much more study than has been given to the problem, take automatically out of the real property within the District of Columbia sufficient revenues with which to meet this obligation. The District of Columbia has approximately 18,000 employees, about 8,000 of whom are classified. If this amendment did not prevail, those 8,000 would benefit from these wage and salary increases, while 10,000 other employees within the District of Columbia would receive no increase at all.

Over a period of months the fiscal subcommittees of the District of Columbia Committees of both the House and the Senate have wrestled with our local District of Columbia problem of how to obtain sufficient revenues to meet justifiable demands for services within the District of Columbia. Our coordinated and agreed-upon program was a sales-tax and a revised income-tax program.

As is known to nearly everyone in the Senate, opposition has been taken to that program. The program represents the moneys and revenues out of which we could meet such an obligation as will be incurred by the passage of this proposed legislation.

In the absence of having moneys with which to meet our obligations, it becomes necessary to adopt an amendment of the kind in question, which would deny to 7,000 people what hundreds of thousands are to receive throughout the rest of the land.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we hope later in the evening to put the District of Columbia sales tax on the agenda.

In the meantime, I shall accept the amendment of the Senator from Washington. I have a right to modify my amendment to include the amendment of the Senator from Washington, and I do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate briefly on this pay-increase bill.

The committee has been at great pains to try to work out this matter. It has not been an easy thing to do, because the members of the Senate committee had different views on it, as compared to the views of the House committee. I could say that our committee reported two bills, one which I introduced—being Senate bill 1949—and another which was introduced by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and myself, being Senate bill 1531.

This proposed amendment is a combination of the terms and provisions of both those bills, with a substantial reduction in amount.

I should like to present a matter for consideration by the Senate in connection with the differential between $450, as provided for the Federal postal employees, and the amount to be provided for the regular Federal employees.

An examination of the chart introduced by the senior Senator from Ohio will demonstrate that for some period of time the postal employees have lagged behind the Federal employees, so far as salaries are concerned. I only need to state that the average annual wage of the Federal employees in 1939 was $1,993, and presently it is $3,006, as compared with $1,894 for the postal employees in the earlier period, and $2,857 presently, on the average. That explains the differential.

I, for one, would like to see the postal employees, particularly, receive a larger increase than is provided here.

The House reported a bill carrying an increase which would be effective, as I recall, for only 1 year. It provided a larger amount than this measure does. This amount, however—$450—is stated in that bill as a permanent increase.

I hope, Mr. President, that this bill will pass as amended by the Senate so that we can take it into conference and come out with a bill that will grant these substantial increases to the postal employees, and also a substantial increase to the Federal workers.

I might say also that in this bill there are some very salutary provisions. We have heard criticism for a long time to the effect that the heads of departments and agencies in the Government have their compensation fixed on the basis of how many workers they employ in their particular department—the more workers, the higher their pay. That provision, Mr. President, is eliminated in the pending bill. The bill also contains a new classification of the Federal service, a simplification of it. I think it also furnishes a good foundation upon which the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in succeeding sessions can work out a real, sensible, and sane reorganization of Federal employment and Federal pay.

As the matter now stands, it seems to be in great confusion, with a great number of classifications and rates that are highly complicated. There is an effort in this bill to reduce that complication and to bring greater simplification into the system.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to ask the Senator to explain the increases made in the various grades. Is that in addition to the $360?

Mr. BALDWIN. There are some increases made in the grades, but those increases in most instances are less than $100. I think there are none over. But the bill also provides that the increases resulting from the changes in classification will not be added to the $360 increase. In other words, under the terms of the bill, the most a Federal employee outside the postal service can get is the $360. If by reason of the reclassification he gets an increased amount, that will be deducted from $360.

Mr. BYRD. The total is $360, is it?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. Just a moment. If I may say so, I think there is a slight mistake.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am glad to be corrected by my friend.

Mr. FLANDERS. The average is $360, with some around $44, as an extreme, and some $44 less, as an extreme. The average is $360.

Mr. BYRD. That is, up to what grade? Ther are larger increases to certain officials, I see.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would say to the Senator from Virginia that it is carried clear up to and through grade 11. One

of the things which has been out of order has been that the lower grades have been pressing up against the $10,000 limit. The reclassification also takes care of that. We have had many cases in which the boss was getting less than the men under him.

Mr. BYRD. I do not think the Senator has got the answer to the question in regard to the higher officials.

Mr. FLANDERS. Does the Senator mean the Cabinet officers?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Cabinet and under-Cabinet officers, the heads of boards, bureaus, and commissions.

Mr. FLANDERS. I can give the Senator from Virginia a summary of it.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, up to grade 10 the average increase is $360, is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Then what about grade 11?

Mr. FLANDERS. It also includes grade 11. There is a new grade 12 which is included to take care of the flock of special bills we have had coming in which call for higher salary increases for scientists and similar special employees.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator explain the increases above grade 11?

Mr. FLANDERS. Let us start at the top. Cabinet members are increased from $15,000 to $20,000, under secretaries are increased from $10,000 to $18,000, and assistant secretaries from $10,000 to $15,000. Heads of the seven largest agencies, which includes the Federal Security Administrator, Federal Works Administrator, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, Comptroller General, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, whose present salaries range from $10,000 in the case of the Bureau of the Budget, up to $17,500 in the case of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; are all raised to $18,000. Those are the heads of boards, commissions, and other independent agencies.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, could we have order? We canot hear what is being said by Senators. It is a private discussion. We cannot tell what is going on. May we have order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. FLANDERS. The heads of boards and commissions and other independent agencies and deputy heads of the above are raised from $10,000 or $12,000 to $16,500. Assistant heads are raised from $10,000 to $15,000. One interesting thing for instance is that the Federal Trade Commission members had their $10,000 salaries set back before World War I. If the salary was right then, it is dead wrong now, and this remedies the thirty-five-odd-years increase in the cost of living with which all of us who are over 35 years of age have had some experience.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, under this particular bill and classifications about which the Senator from Vermont has just been talking affecting those in the higher bracket, the total over-all of all those increases will amount to about $1,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is the addition it would make to the Federal pay roll?

Mr. BYRD. Does the proposal of the Senator from Connecticut raise them $5,000 each? Is that the approximate amount?

Mr. FLANDERS. It would not be possible to raise them a given amount over their base because their base is scattered all over the lot.

Mr. BYRD. What is the largest raise made?

Mr. FLANDERS. Under Secretaries are raised from $10,000 to $18,000. That is the largest raise.

Mr. BYRD. Cabinet members are raised from $15,000 to $20,000, are they not?

Mr. FLANDERS. From $15,000 to $20,000, and the final result is an even gradation from the $20,000 of the Cabinet members down through to the old $10,000 flat.

Mr. BYRD. That is a pretty heavy raise for Under Secretaries—$10,000. It is nearly doubled.

Mr. FLANDERS. We have been losing Under Secretaries very heavily of late. There is a hole in the bag in which Under Secretaries are kept, and this is intended to stop up that hole.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Was any consideration given to increasing the salaries of the Indian Claims Commission, which has now been appointed and which is a very important Government organization? It is comparable to the Court of Claims, which formerly handled these claims.

Mr. FLANDERS. I can get that information for the Senator shortly. I do not have it right at hand.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to say to the Senator that that is a Commission performing duties which were formerly performed by the Court of Claims. The salaries of the Commissioners of the Court of Claims have all been vastly increased.

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the Senator from Texas they have been raised to $16,500.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Indian Claims Commission?

Mr. FLANDERS. The Indian Claims Commission.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is, the members of it. There are three members of it.

Mr. FLANDERS. All the members of it. It is set on a level comparable with others with similar responsibilities and similar experience.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under the pending bill, then, the salaries of the Indian Claims Commissioners will be $16,500?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want it to be confused with any other commission.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Is that the Commission which was just recently created?

Mr. FLANDERS. The Indian Claims Commission? I do not know how old the Commission is, sir.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is not very old. It was created only about 2 years ago.

Mr. HATCH. About 2 years. The salaries of the Commissioners are being increased from $10,000 to $16,500.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the comparable figure for other officers of the Government having comparable responsibility, and requiring comparable ability. The present salary scheme, I will say to the Senator from New Mexico, in the upper ranges, is a crazy patchwork. Some have been far out of line and some have furnished standards to which the rest should be brought.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that a short time ago the salary was based at $10,000 per year, and inside of 2 years' time an increase of $6,500 seems rather unusual, to me. I have no objection to it, but I was wondering why that quick jump in salary was made.

Mr. FLANDERS. Even though 2 years old, the salary could have been set a bit too low, as is the case with the Federal Trade Commissioners, whose salaries were set too low in 1912. The salary is far too low now.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont whether, in the fixation of the amounts the committee or the subcommittee had the benefit of expert advice from the Civil Service Commission, or whether it was the result of extensive study, or otherwise.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would say to the Senator from Maryland that he is asking questions which he is perfectly competent to answer, since the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the junior Senator from Vermont spent many months working on this reclassification of salaries. We had the advantage of nearly 2 years of work previously carried on by the Civil Service Commission in a more or less easy-going way, which we brought to a head, so that we could do our work on the basis of that work. We have also held hearings with the personnel services involved in the Government, including personnel men from as far away as the Pacific coast. We have had hearings which involved the organized groups in the Federal service, and we have taken into account every possible means of gaining information.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I intend to vote for this bill, of course, but I am disappointed that the original Senate bill is not the bill which we are considering. I appeared before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, months ago, which committee is under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like, if I may, to say a word to the Senator from

South Carolina. His disappointment is easy to understand, but we are faced with the hard choice of having a bill which can be enacted into law, or having a bill which cannot be enacted. I am satisfied that we can enact into law at this session nothing more favorable than what is in this bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall vote for the bill. I was here and voted for the bill providing increases for the postal employees some years ago.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. The bill refers to basic compensation for the heads of departments, and so forth. Is their overtime to be added to that, or is that the total compensation?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the total compensation.

Mr. BYRD. The executive assistants to the President and his staff assistants are listed in the bill at $18,000 a year. Do they receive $10,000 at this time?

Mr. FLANDERS. Not all of them. I think that is the lowest salary, if I remember correctly. It is not set at $18,000. There are three rates from which the President may choose. One assistant now receives $15,000, one receives $12,000, and the rest receive $10,000.

Mr. BYRD. Referring to page 26, what is the present salary of employees in that category?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is section 303. I will get the Senator the figures in a moment. They range all over the lot. The Comptroller General now receives $12,000. The Senator will recall that an exceedingly competent and faithful public servant in the Bureau of the Budget had to resign because of his low salary. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget now receives $10,000.

Mr. BYRD. Under the bill he is increased to $18,000?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Would it be a fair statement to say that in the higher brackets there will be an increase of approximately 50 percent?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. In some instances, as much as 80 percent?

Mr. FLANDERS. That salary was correspondingly low.

Mr. BYRD. I am speaking of the average. Some of them are increased 80 percent and none of them less than 50 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. It is approximately 50 percent, yes.

Mr. BYRD. Some have been increased 80 percent, from $10,000 to $18,000. Is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. At the top, which is the Cabinet, they have been raised only 33⅓ percent.

Mr. BYRD. But others have been raised 80 percent, have they not?

Mr. FLANDERS. Some have been, yes.

Mr. BYRD. Has the salary of any of them been doubled?

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not remember an instance of any salary having been doubled.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that in the lower salaried positions the employees are raised $350, but the $10,000 men will receive $18,000, or an increase of 80 percent.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would say to the Senator from South Carolina that in the latter case we are in an entirely different situation. Instead of gathering employees from thousands of possible applicants, the head of the administration of the Federal Government is looking around the country and picking out the best man here, and the best man over here, and the best man there. I will say that I picked out the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] that time.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his generous offer but I must respectfully decline to accept it.

Mr. FLANDERS. The administrative head is picking out individually the best men he can find for the purpose, and that is a far different thing from running an employment agency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have been here for a number of years and I have always heard that the Federal Government could not secure enough personnel. Through restrictions, and through the Civil Service Commission's ratings they are treated more or less unfairly, in my judgment. But when we raise the salary of a man from $10,000 to $18,000, and then tell the postmasters and the poor Government workers that all we can do for them is to give them a few meager hundreds of dollars to balance their food bill only, it is rather disappointing. I shall vote for the bill, but under the most trying circumstances, knowing that it is wrong.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would again call the Senator's attention— and I think the Senator from South Carolina knows that I have a great deal of respect and affection for him—I call his attention to the fact that of the $523,000,000 only $1,000,000 goes to the higher officials and I think it is a good investment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have the deepest affection for the Senator from Vermont, and my association with him has been most pleasant. Of course only $1,000,000 goes for that purpose, but I am interested in the masses of the employees.

Mr. FLANDERS. They are getting a total of $523,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. But we are dividing the money among 2,000,000 of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is my amendment in the nature of a substitute in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I may say that I am very much in favor of the bill. I agree with what the Senator from Ohio said about the necessity of raising the pay of these employees due to the increase in the cost of living. I believe that the bill certainly should be passed.

My amendment is also designed to increase the real incomes of the employees included, in addition to the relief of everyone else in the United States. I believe we should make such a contribution. All the amendment does is remove a tax upon a basic article of food. I hope the sponsor of the substitute will accept the amendment. As has already been demonstrated, I believe the majority of both the Senate and the House of Representatives have already approved the amendment, which I offer to the bill. In other words, the amendment is certainly appropriate to the bill, being a revenue measure. I ask for the consideration of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I am satisfied that most of the Senators on the floor do not know the substance of the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought the Senator understood it.

Mr. WHERRY. We cannot hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will cease conversation so that the speakers can be heard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought the Senator from Nebraska understood. This amendment is designed, like the bill, to increase the real wages and incomes of Federal workers and postal workers. All it does is remove a tax from a basic food in which they are all interested as consumers.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the food?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is legally known as oleomargarine. [Laughter.] It is sometimes known as margarine.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Arkansas, for whom likewise I have a great deal of respect and affection, that the purpose of the bill is to have the legislation in such form and with such content that it can be enacted into law within the next few minutes. While I sympathize with the desire to reduce the cost of living by the reduction of any tax on any necessity of life, yet I fear that the Senator's amendment would interfere with the possibility of getting the bill passed within the next few minutes, which seems to be necessary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am unable to follow the Senator's reasoning, in view of the fact that the House of Representatives voted 260 to 106—nearly 2½ to 1—in favor of this very amendment only about a month ago. I also remind the Senator of the fact that the Senate voted, in the only way it could vote—that is, on a motion to bring the bill up—57 to 26 only within the week. Last night this body voted to remove the restriction from the military appropriation bill.

Since I mention that, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to what

I consider a very arrogant and petty act on the part of the conferees. Last night they removed that very slight restriction upon the sale of this article to the armed forces, in spite of the fact that the House had approved it, and also in spite of the further fact that the Committee on Armed Services of the House had reported unanimously a bill removing by direct legislative action the same restriction that was in the appropriation bill.

In other words, it comes down to this, I submit to the Senator from Vermont, that both Houses overwhelmingly have approved the removal of this tax, as well as the removal of the restriction on the purchase of the article by the armed forces. Yet, due to the supposed crises of passing the pending bill and another, we cannot get a direct vote in the Senate. This measure was reported by the Committee on Finance I think on June 2, with a unanimous vote, with a statement that it was in the public welfare, and the committee recommended its immediate passage. I submit it is quite as important to the people of this country, by and large, as any other bill that has been acted on today.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, obviously if we begin to offer irrelevant amendments on bills, we will simply block the passage of any more bills whatsoever. I think it is fair in this case to move to lay the amendment on the table. Therefore, because of the fact that I think it is irrelevant, and that the time has come when we have to dispose of irrelevant amendments, I move that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas be laid on the table.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S.C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Feazel	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to lay the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on the table. The motion is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, some time ago I accepted the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] relating to the District of Columbia. I now modify that amendment. The amendment provided that the increase should not apply prior to the time the legislation providing a sales tax in the District is enacted by Congress. I am proposing to strike out the words "a sales tax," and insert the words "adequate revenues to meet the obligation," so as to read "prior to the time that legislation providing adequate revenues to meet the obligation in the District of Columbia is enacted by the Congress and becomes effective."

So that it is not necessary that the revenue be provided in that particular way. I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to page 21, section 207, line 17. Apparently by the language there the head of a department has the right to increase the salaries of the employees of his department. I think that is a very remarkable procedure, which will result in getting an uneven scale of salaries, and then the demand will be made that all should be raised to the high standard. Is it correct that the head of a department can increase salaries in his own department?

Mr. FLANDERS. I should be glad to give to the Senator from Virginia an explanation of that section. It provides that employees who have given long, faithful, and outstanding service and have for a period of 3 years been at the top of their grade shall, with and by the appproval by the Commission, receive an additional salary advancement equal to the highest salary increment of their grade. An employee may receive not more than three such advancements, and the 3-year period must elapse between each of these advancements. Essentially that is to reward exceptionally long and faithful service for which the more or less mechanical provisions of civil-service grades do not provide.

Mr. BYRD. It is absolutely with the head of the department, is it?

Mr. FLANDERS. No; with the approval of the Commission.

Mr. BYRD. The head of any department or agency can increase salaries in his department.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes; but he must have the approval of the Commission.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; but the Commission has never yet failed to approve an increase in salary. I have been dealing with the Civil Service Commission for a long time, and it has never failed to favor an increase. If it has, I do not know when it was.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator's experience may be largely unfortunate. But we ran into many cases in which advances have been refused. I could not give the ratio.

Mr. BYRD. Under some standard as established by the Civil Service Commission, the head of the department, then, is the final arbiter as to whether the salaries shall be increased?

Mr. FLANDERS. The Commission is the final arbiter. I shall try to explain the situation briefly. Let us say that the Senator from Virginia had on his beautiful apple farm a man of a degree of intelligence and manual dexterity that made him excellent for certain particular operations on the Senator's farm. The employee has worked for years. He is faithful. The Senator cannot advance him to an executive activity of some sort, because he just is not made that way. But he has worked very long and very faithfully, and I am sure the Senator would want to give him small advances over a long period of time.

Mr. BYRD. The law already provides for that. There are in-grade promotions at a certain date all through the civil service, and employees are promoted and increased periodically. The Senator from Vermont knows that.

Mr. FLANDERS. This is for those who over long years have reached the limit.

Mr. BYRD. But if they work over a long period of years they get the increase that goes with the length of service. The point I make is that if it is left to the head of the department it will result in an uneven scale of wages, and then the demand will come to Congress to increase all employees up to the increases that have been made by a head of a department. I do not think that authority should be given.

Mr. FLANDERS. We do have to depend on the administration of the Commission, and in this case the final authority goes back to the Commission.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I invite the attention of the junior Senator from Vermont to the following sentence which I find beginning in line 19 of page 29. I desire to ask the interpretation of the committee of the meaning of the sentence, which reads as follows:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or laws, the basic compensation of any employee, other than an administrative assistant, in the office of a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be fixed by such Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner at any multiple of $5 per month which is not in excess of $5,700 per annum.

Now if I understand the English language, that is an authorization to any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or the rest, to fix the salaries of all the employees of his office at not to exceed $5,700 per year, because it says "any employee"; not any single employee, or any two employees, or any three, "any employee." Is it intended to mean any single employee?

Mr. FLANDERS. The distinction, I will say to the Senator from Wyoming, is not between single and married employees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, now the Senator is indulging in his usual good humor.

Mr. FLANDERS. The provision in question simply permits the Senator to do what he is already doing now within the present ceiling. It simply raises the ceiling by the same amount that the average ceiling of the average Federal employee is raised. It gives him the benefit of the same increase.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But is it not said here that the increase is in multiples of $5 per month, and the only limitation is $5,700, but it affects every employee in the office. There is nothing in the sentence to make the present ceilings apply. And there is nothing in the paragraph to make them apply.

Mr. FLANDERS. The present ceiling applies to every employee in the Senator's office.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But there is a schedule for the various employees.

Mr. FLANDERS. There still would be, but they would be in multiples of $5 a month.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Apparently I have not made myself clear to the Senator. This sentence, if it should be enacted into law as part of the bill, and the bill should be approved, would have the effect of repealing every other law dealing with this subject. This will be the latest expression of legislative intent governing these positions. I am sure that it is not the intention of the Senator or of the committee to repeal the various classifications and categories, but merely to allow a promotion to a limit of $5,700 for one employee in the office. Am I mistaken about that?

Mr. FLANDERS. The only effect that this provision has on existing law or laws is that it modifies such other law or laws in one respect only.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does not say so.

Mr. FLANDERS. That would seem to me to be inherent in the English in which it is stated. That certainly is the purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to have the expression of the purpose. In my opinion it certainly needs a legislative explanation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood a few minutes ago, after I made a brief statement, that the distinguished Senator from Vermont, for whom I have the greatest respect, made the statement that salaries would be raised 33⅓ percent. Am I correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. What I said was that in the case of Cabinet officers the salaries are raised 33⅓ percent.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say this: I supported this bill from the day it went to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I testified before that committee. I understood that the Federal pay raise bill for postmasters and various other Government employees was in the Congress of the United States because of the increased cost of living. If we raise the salary of someone who makes $10,000 a year by 33⅓ percent, that does not make sense to the poor fellow who makes $1,200. While I am still going to stand by my friend and vote for the bill, because I understand from him that this is the only thing we can get through, I want the RECORD to show that I do not believe that the $10,000 people ought to be raised to $18,000, and the poor people three or four or five hundred dollars a year. The poor man pays the same for beefsteak as the fellow who has money, and the poor man pays the same for other things he needs in this life, as does the rich man.

I do not believe that a 33⅓-percent increase in salary is justified in the higher brackets. I supported the bill and testified before the committee. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] gave me that privilege. I was acting upon the theory that we would adjust salaries in line with the cost of living, and do something to help the poor people. My good friend the Senator from Virginia says that some salaries are raised 80 percent. Is that correct? That does not make sense.

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me say briefly to the Senator from South Carolina that this part of the bill was drawn to meet the recommendations of the present President of the United States, transmitted to this body in a message.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. Just a moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. The President of the United States sent a civil-rights message down here, too.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should also like to say to the Senator from South Carolina that any future Democratic President, or any future Republican President, or any future President of the third party, the name of which I do not at the moment remember, will ask for this consideration for the higher salaries.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I simply wish to invite the attention of the Senate to what it is voting for. I have a list of these increases. Some of the salaries are doubled. Others are increased 80 percent. I believe that the officials who hold the higher positions should perhaps have an increase; but when we talk about increasing the average employee 10 percent, and then increasing salaries in the higher brackets 80 percent——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I do not recall any legislation in this Congress since 1939 which has increased the salary of Cabinet officers or others included in this bracket.

Mr. BYRD. It makes no difference.

Mr. BALDWIN. On the other hand, Federal employees, and some post office employees, industrial employees, and retail workers, have had very substantial increases, all the way from 65 percent to 100 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator know of many persons who refuse Cabinet positions?

Mr. BALDWIN. I do not.

Mr. BYRD. They are increased from $15,000 to $20,000. I do not say that there should not be an increase, but I say that the increase is entirely out of proportion to the increase given to the postal employees and the average employee of the Federal Government.

Mr. BALDWIN. I can only respond by saying the same thing my friend from Vermont said, that these men fall into an entirely different classification. They are all specialists of one kind and another. I do not doubt that it would be extremely easy to find anyone to take a Cabinet position in the Government of the United States; but I did not suppose that we lacked applicants for such a position. I supposed that we wanted men who were peculiarly and specially qualified for a particular job.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator believe that there are now able men in the Cabinet?

Mr. BALDWIN. I think there are some who are able, and I think there are some who are not so able; but I hope that we shall be able to attract extremely able ones. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD. That is the reason the Senator is proposing to increase the salaries.

Mr. BALDWIN. That has nothing to do with it. If that were the case, we would have had a provision in the bill which would not be effective until the 1st of January, but we are generous. We are willing to have this go into effect right now.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to point out one thing, and that is that every Senator and every Member of the House is receiving about $16,500, or between $16,000 and $16,500. That is not as large a salary as it seems when written out expressly in so many words.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator enumerate the perquisites? The salary is $12,500.

Mr. TAFT. There is an allowance of $2,500 for expenses, which is tax-free. That is equivalent to another $3,500, making about $16,000. So when we give the head of a department $16,500 we do not pay him anything very different from what we are paying Members of Congress.

Mr. BYRD. Some of them are being paid $20,000. Under secretaries receive $18,000.

Mr. TAFT. They have always received more than Members of Congress. We have increased our salaries more than 50 percent. I do not believe that these increases are out of line with what we have done for ourselves.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to make this statement: So far as the Senator from Virginia is concerned, I am willing to vote for the $360 increase to the classified civil service and $450 to postal employees, but I am not willing to vote for the schedule of high salaries in the higher brackets. I do not believe that the schedule has been coordinated and put together in a uniform manner. From time to time Congress has fixed salaries by legislation. This bill changes act after act which Congress has passed fixing salaries. I submit that in the closing hours of the session we ought not to take as drastic a step as this without knowing more about it.

Furthermore, the bill changes the classification in a way that needs careful study.

Mr. President, I shall vote for that part of the bill which gives the classified employees and postal employees an increase, but I am not at this time going to vote for these very high increases, some of them as much as 100 percent, and others 80 percent, for higher officials in the Government.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have a vote? We have several conference reports ready, and they are privileged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute as amended.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to strike out all of title III, which relates to increases in salaries in the higher brackets. That would leave the increases to apply to the classified service and to the postal employees. Then when Congress reconvenes, if, as the Senator from Connecticut says, we have a Republican President, perhaps we can go into the question further and see what can be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute bill, as amended, which is offered as an amendment to the bill.

The substitute as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LANGER, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. O'CONOR conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio desire to have the two Senate bills indefinitely postponed?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I ask that the two Senate bills be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objections, the bills will be indefinitely postponed.

SENATOR McKELLAR AND THE TVA

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 23, 1942.*

Senator KENNETH McKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McKELLAR: We have been informed that some unadvised people of Tennessee have challenged your loyalty to the Tennessee Valley Authority. Such people certainly are misinformed.

We who have served with you on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate venture the statement that but for you the dams along the Tennessee River and its tributaries never would have been built. We know that this is true concerning the Pickwick, Guntersville, Chickamauga, Hiwassee, Gilbertsville, Watts Bar, Fort Loudon, Holston River, and Watauga Dams. As to all of these dams, we know that the Budget Director did not recommend them, but all were built through amendments offered by you, first in the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and then in the full committee, of which you are a member. We know that none of these dams, except Douglas, had the approval of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and that the members of the Authority not only disapproved all of them, except Douglas, but came to Washington and lobbied with us not to appropriate the money with which to build them. We know that your amendments providing for these dams were vigorously fought, the late Senator Adams, of Colorado, taking the lead in a fight against them. The dams were approved by the committee by the closest kinds of votes, sometimes the vote in the subcommittee or in the full committee was a tie, but by your vigorous support of the dams and your untiring energy in their favor the bills were finally passed by the Senate and sent to conference. You were one of the conferees on each and every one of these bills, and it was due to your skillful management and untiring devotion to these matters that the House Members of the conferences finally yielded and the bills were passed and the dams built. If ever a man was beset with difficulties you had them in the building of these dams.

We are informed by the clerk of the Senate Committee on Appropriations that $667,969,270 has been spent on these dams. Every dollar of that money was invested in the dams through your efforts. Some of us who are signing this letter were strongly for you and some of us were just as strongly opposed to you in the building of these dams, but we unite in saying that the amendments providing for the building of the dams never would have been reported out of our committee and the dams never would have been built but for you. The committee was almost evenly divided in every case. It was well known to the members of the committee that the Tennessee Valley Authority wanted to build only three dams as a "yardstick" and that they did not want to build a system of dams for the purpose of going into competition with the private-power companies. You wanted just what has finally been accomplished.

We wish to say, also, that when the proposal was made to buy most of the private power companies of Tennessee, all except those in northeast Tennessee, you piloted that measure through the Senate over just the same kind of Senate opposition that you had before, and this proposal, in our judgment, would not have been passed but for your support.

We wish to add that Douglas Dam, when it did not have your approval, was twice beaten in the committee and in the Senate. It would not have passed the last time, except for your support and vote. The amendment passed the subcommittee by one vote, and that was your vote.

We take pleasure in assuring you that, in our opinion, there would have been no Tennessee Valley Authority such as you now have but for your untiring and vigorous support of the Authority and the dams.

Very sincerely yours,

John H. Overton, Pat McCarran, Rufus C. Holman, Gerald P. Nye, Styles Bridges, Chan Gurney, Wallace H. White, Jr., M. E. Tydings, H. C. Lodge, Jr., Carter Glass, Carl Hayden, Elmer Thomas, Burnet R. Maybank, Harry Truman, Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Jas. M. Mead, Dennis Chavez, Theodore Francis Green, Francis Maloney, Richard B. Russell, Wall Doxey.

LETTER FROM THE COMMISSIONER OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an insertion?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have received a letter from the Honorable Watson B. Miller, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate. Senators who are sponsors of special bills for the relief of immigration cases will be especially interested in this matter. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND
NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1948.

Hon. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This refers to your telephonic request of Wednesday concerning the resolution of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the substance of which is set forth in the letter dated June 16, 1948, from Mr. Arens, staff director of the committee.

I shall be glad to comply with the suggestions made that:

1. In the case of any alien concerning whom a private bill is pending in the Senate, but concerning which bill unfavorable action shall not have been taken by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by the end of the present session of the Congress, deportation should be stayed until April 1, 1949; and

2. In the case of any alien concerning whom a private bill has been introduced in the Senate, but concerning which bill unfavorable action has been taken by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary prior to the end of the present session of the Congress, deportation should be carried out.

It will be appreciated if you will have Mr. Arens send me a list giving the names of the aliens in both categories as well as the immigration file numbers if the numbers are available.

Sincerely,

WATSON B. MILLER.

THE HOUSING ACT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the status of House bill 6959? It is a housing bill which I think has been sent over from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the subject of a message from the House.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask whether the House bill has been sent to the Senate; and if so, has it had its second reading? What is the status of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been read at all in the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Therefore, if it is to be brought to the attention of the Senate, for consideration, unanimous consent to that effect will be required; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of House bill 6959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may the title of the bill be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator please to withhold his objection until I can present an explanation of the bill. The explanation will take only approximately 5 minutes.

Mr. President, this bill was passed in the House of Representatives by a vote of approximately 317 to 90.

As I understand the amendments to title I of the National Housing Act, they provide that the limit on FHA title I insurance is raised by an amount of $35,000,000, to a total of $200,000,000.

The maximum mortgage amount for title I, class 3 loans is raised from $3,000 to $4,500.

Insurance is provided up to $10,000 limit for loans for repair or conversion to provide additional housing for two or more families in existing structures, with occupance preference given to veterans.

TITLE II—DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED PERMANENT WAR-HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS

All permanent, Government-owned war housing must "be sold for cash as expeditiously as possible and not later than December 31, 1949," at a price not less than value as determined by an FHA appraisal.

War housing may be transferred to the Army, Navy, or Air Force if such transfer had been requested prior to April 15, 1947.

Preference for sale to veterans is provided both as to individuals buying separate houses and as to cooperative groups buying whole projects. After the preference period has expired, there is no restriction on the sale except that it must be for cash.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

This title is a complete revision of title III of the National Housing Act, and provides for a greatly restricted secondary market operation by the Federal National Mortgage Association.

The FNMA is authorized to buy FHA loans under sections 203 and 603 and VA loans under section 505 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act—second loans. This precludes purchase of FHA loans on rental housing under either section 207 or section 608, as well as purchase of VA loans under section 501 of the GI bill of rights. Purchase of loans from public agencies is prohibited.

The purchase price may not exceed 98 percent of the unpaid loan balance, and purchases are limited to mortgages not exceeding an original principal of $10,000. Loans must be offered by the original mortgagee and must be dated after June 19, 1948. Purchases from any single mortgagee are limited to 25 percent of eligible loans made by the lender after June 19, 1948.

The capital stock of FNMA is increased by $10,000,000 to $20,000,000. Its obligations may not exceed 40 times capital and surplus. The bill specifically continues the present FNMA as an RFC subsidiary under the supervision of the FHA Commissioner and empowers the latter to liquidate the FNMA when the need for it no longer exists.

TITLE IV—TAX INCENTIVE FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL RENTAL HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS

The title amends the Internal Revenue Code by permitting an amortization deduction for income-tax purposes of 10 percent per year for the first 5 years for new rental housing and new rental units created by conversion of existing structures. This deduction would be in lieu of the present amortization deduction. The taxpayer may elect to discontinue the special deduction at any time within the 5-year period.

To be eligible for the special deduction, construction of the rental-housing facilities must be started on or after July 1, 1948, and before the close of July 1, 1950, and the FHA must certify (a) that there is a shortage of rental housing in the area, and (b) that the units will be "of such character and will be rented and at such rentals" as will tend to relieve the shortage.

Excise tax in sales of trailer coaches are removed until July 1950.

TITLE V—GI HOME-LOAN INCONTESTABILITY CLAUSE

This title simply adds to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act a clause making the mortgage guaranty incontestable in the hands of a secondary purchaser.

TITLE VI—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Title VI of FHA is extended until March 31, 1949, and the insurance authorization is raised by $1,600,000,000 to $6,950,000,000, of which $800,000,000 is reserved for rental housing under section 608 and $200,000,000 for multifamily dwellings under section 603. The maximum mortgage amount under section 603 may be raised to $9,100 at the direction of the Administrator.

The new feature of this title is an authorization of FHA to insure, under section 603, individual house loans up to 95 percent of value provided the mortgage does not exceed $6,000. The bill also permits 95-percent loans for rental housing under section 608 if the mortgagor is a veterans' nonprofit housing cooperative.

The title raises the maximum interest rate from 4 to 5 percent if the FHA Commissioner finds that "in certain areas or under special circumstances the mortgage market demands it." This applies to both section 603 and 608 loans.

Amendments to section 609 provide for more liberal insurance of loans to house manufacturers, and a new section 611 authorizes insurance of construction loans for mass producers of housing.

TITLE VII—EQUITY INVESTMENT AIDS

This is the yield-insurance plan and is identical with section 402 of the T-E-W bill.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

This title increases the lending authority of RFC from $1,500,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 and authorized RFC to subscribe to FNMA stock to the extent of $20,000,000.

Mr. President, that very briefly sketches the high lights of the bill, which finally came out of the House by the vote I mentioned, of 317 to 90.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not quite understand the parliamentary situation which requires unanimous consent, but I think that a piece of legislation of the importance of housing would seem to require that the political party blocking a vote should do it in the open. Within a very few days it is my guess that we are going to have a call from the President of the United States for a special session of this Congress on housing, and those who are responsible for defeating this bill, and the political party responsible, should make themselves known at this time, so that all may know where to place the responsibility for the special session. Throughout the fall campaign we are going to hear speech after speech from every rostrum in the country and from every schoolhouse in the country with respect to the failure of Congress to enact housing legislation. I want to know who is responsible, what Senator is responsible for defeating the bill the majority leader seeks to lay before us. I want to make it plain that housing is the most vital domestic issue today. Make no mistake about that.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall answer the distinguished Senator from Colorado first, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] after the Senator from Nebraska concludes.

Mr. WHERRY. To be perfectly frank, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] objected to a unanimous-consent request, making his position very plain. I requested him to withdraw his objection in order that I might explain the bill, thinking that possibly after an explanation, we might be able to get the bill up for consideration.

I may say to the Senator from Colorado that, as he well knows, under the rules, it is necessary that we have unanimous consent. The bill has not yet gone to committee. I believe it has not had its second reading yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Therefore, it will be necessary to move to discharge the committee, which would require that the motion lie over for 1 day. If we intend to adjourn tonight, the only way we can get it up for consideration is by means of unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield to anybody except the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understood the bill had come over from the House.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I cannot understand why it requires a unanimous consent agreement before this body, but I shall not argue the point.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana, because he was so kind as to withhold his objection a little while ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I regret to have to renew objection to the consideration of this bill at this time. Let me say to the Senate that for the past 4 years the Senate has been working on over-all housing bills. During the Seventy-ninth Congress the so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill was passed by the Senate without objection. During the Seventy-ninth Congress that bill was sent to the House, and there it was pigeonholed. During this Congress the Senate passed Senate bill 866, after full hearings. That bill was recommended not only by the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate and the House Committee on Banking and Currency, but by a joint committee of the House and Senate. Notwithstanding all that, there is a little czar over in the House who heads the Banking and Currency Committee, and he has seen fit again to stymie the passage or even the presentation of our bill before the House of Representatives. Senate bill 866 was passed by this body and was considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee. It is now before the Rules Committee of the House. When House bill 6959 came before us it received little or no committee hearings. Instead of using Senate bill 866 as a vehicle to place before us the contents of this bill, the House saw fit not to do that, so what we have today is almost a brand-new bill with a few of the titles from the so-called Taft-Ellender bill, and we are now asked to pass that bill.

Mr. WHERRY. The bill will be open for amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that. I understand we can offer a substitute, amend it, and all that. But let me say to the Senate that if the little czar who heads the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, has been able to prevent the House from voting on Senate bill 866, my guess is that he will be in equally as good a position to prevent a vote on Senate bill 866 if we attached it to the House bill. As I see it, there is no chance for the House of Representatives to consider Senate bill 866, which they have had before them for some time.

Mr. President, I renew my objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator withhold his objection long enough for me to yield to other Senators?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I want to make the RECORD clear. Seven times, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee over a period of years, I voted for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I voted for it on the Senate floor. I voted against substitution. I want to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska tonight the fact that we are discussing a bill which has been sent over from the House. I feel certain that the chairman of the committee, with whom I have always had the pleasure of working and supporting housing for the GI's, is interested in this matter. I have a letter from my attorney who says that the only GI loans covered by the secondary market provisions of the Wolcott bill are second mortgage loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration under section 505. These are the cases where first mortgage loans are insured by the FHA. They amount to only 15 or 20 percent of the GI loans, while section 501 loans amount to 80 to 85 percent of the GI loans. So, again, Mr. President, they have left out the GI loans.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, a more detailed statement on the secondary market for home mortgages.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECONDARY MARKET FOR HOME MORTGAGES UNDER THE WOLCOTT BILL, H. R. 6959

One of the most urgent needs in the current home financing picture is a Government-sponsored secondary market for home mortgages insured by the FHA or guaranteed under the GI Act.

Through the Federal National Mortgage Association we have had such a market for FHA mortgages, on both sale and rental housing until last June. We also had such a market for GI home loans.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as passed by the Senate would have continued the secondary market which we now have for FHA mortgages on both sale and rental housing, and would leave also provided a secondary market for all GI home mortgage loans. It would have provided a half billion dollar revolving fund for this purpose.

Last week there were many complaints by lenders that the Federal National Mortgage Association had suddenly issued a stop order to prevent further purchase of FHA mortgages.

The reason for this was the introduction of the Wolcott so-called housing bill—H. R. 6959. That bill changes even the present secondary market for FHA mortgages. It provides that no mortgage may be purchased for more than 98 percent of the unpaid principal plus accrued interest. In other words, banks and other lenders could sell such mortgages only at 2-percent discount. The reason for the stop order thus becomes apparent. Had it not been issued the Federal National Mortgage Association would have had millions of dollars of mortgages dumped on it the next morning, and its present funds would have been exhausted immediately.

But that is only one of the completely unsound and unworkable provisions of the secondary market provisions of this Wolcott bill.

It prohibits further purchases of FHA mortgages for urgently needed rental housing under sections 207 or 608 of the National Housing Act. It prohibits the purchase of FHA mortgages on veterans cooperative projects.

Unlike the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which made provision for the purchase of both section 501 and section 505 GI mortgages, the Wolcott bill limits such purchases only to section 505 GI mortgages. These are the second mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration where the first mortgage is insured by the FHA. They amount to only 15 to 20 percent of the GI loans, while the section 501 loans amount to about 80 to 85 percent of the GI loans.

So the Wolcott bill would exclude 80 to 85 percent of GI loans from the secondary market. It would exclude from the secondary market all mortgages on veterans cooperatives insured by the FHA. It would require all banks and other lenders to sell their mortgages in the secondary market at a 2 percent discount.

It is therefore perfectly apparent that the secondary market provisions of the Wolcott bill are wholly inadequate. They would not meet the needs of the banks and other lenders, and would discriminate against rental housing loans, loans guaranteed under the GI Act, and FHA insured mortgage loans to veterans cooperatives.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, when the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] rises to his feet, propounds an inquiry, and shows an honest doubt in his mind, I have a very sympathetic interest in relieving his apprehension and improving his understanding. I want to include in the scope of my remarks every Senator in the Chamber. This bill which has come before us this afternoon is a snare and a delusion; it is a hollow shell; it is a phony housing bill. It is put up to deceive the American people and to deceive the Senate. It is the result of the machinations of a group of men in the real-estate business and the real-estate lobby operating with certain men on Capitol Hill. It is a hollow sham. As the Senator from Louisiana truthfully said, four times this deliberative body has passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill containing public-housing provisions. We passed it again this year. It went to the House, and the House committee passed it, but the real-estate crowd would not recognize the action of the House committee. So this monstrosity was produced. The men in the House who sent this bill here are denying the right of the representatives of the American people in the House of Representatives to cast their votes for or against public housing, and slum clearance, and farm housing. I say as to that sort of action, "It shall not pass."

All over this country there are millions of little people who have been seeking homes; veterans of the last war who are hungry for a home. The point I make is that they have been looking with hope and encouragement toward Capitol Hill. It was my privilege to address a veterans' convention in the auditorium of the Labor Department 3 months ago. I never saw a body of men so enthusiastic

as they were about the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

This bill which is now before us would never be signed by my friend from Colorado. There is a tax depreciation scheme of tremendous magnitude involved which is interesting only to the millionaire real-estate owners of the country. So I ask the Senate to reject this House bill and pass the bill which has received years of preparation and hard work by a committee headed by my friend and old colleague, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who put into it honest-to-God effort to produce an honest-to-God housing bill, to remove the menacing slums, to give public housing to the little people of the country, 500,000 homes in a 5-year program.

Now we are handed this monstrosity. It is a miscarriage of justice in the housing field. It is not a housing bill of the kind which the Senator of Colorado has in his heart and mind. This is a scheme, a circumlocution process. Give us the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, or no bill at all, because that is the only bill which has provided for public housing and slum clearance and farm housing.

Millionaires are behind this monstrosity sent over from the House. I say again, it shall not pass. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] objected to the consideration of the bill. We fought for the Senate bill, but a little group of men got together and turned thumbs down.

So I say to the Senate, support the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Do not make a mockery of our years of effort for the people of the country who need public housing.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Colorado asked me to yield first.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to remind the Senator from New Hampshire that, according to the testimony, in addition to cutting out the public housing and cutting out the slum clearance and cutting out the farm housing, 80 to 85 percent of veterans' loans guaranteed under the GI act would be cut out in this House bill. But in the bill which our committee, of which the Senator is chairman, reported out and which the Senate passed all these would be covered.

Mr. TOBEY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. It knocks out help to veterans.

Mr. TOBEY. The veterans have been filmflammed by this legislation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I trust that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will still withhold his objection because I think that, now that we have brought the question up, there should be a chance given to those who want to ask questions on the bill to say something about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The question before the Senate is: Shall we consider this matter?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The question is not at all on the merits or demerits of the bill as it came from the House, or the merits of Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill, or the other way around. Those bills are not before us.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The only way in which we can enact a bill which the Senate likes is by bringing this measure up and amending it and sending it back to the House, proceeding in such a routine legislative manner.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me enlighten the Senator. When it goes back, the Senator may as well know that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has said he will not take it to conference. It is a dead smelt.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Colorado desire to have me yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to give the House a chance to kill housing if that is what they want to do. Let the House assume full responsibility.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am yielding to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One Senator at a time, please. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very anxious to establish responsibility. I want to know who killed cock robin. If we act upon this bill, if we amend it, if we send it back to the House, if it is killed back there, the country will know whom to blame, and that is what I am seeking.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Please let me make one observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to explain the reason why we have brought the bill forward now. I am not saying that this bill has all the merits the House says it has, I am not saying it has all the bad qualities my distinguished colleagues, and the chairman of the committee, who has done so much work on the subject, says it has. I suggest to Senators that this is the mechanical parliamentary situation. The House passed this bill and sent it to the Senate. If the bill is taken up tonight by unanimous consent and amended in any way Senators desire to amend it, even putting in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, then it will go back to the House and will go to conference.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator knows that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has said he will not take it to conference.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not acquainted with that.

Mr. TOBEY. He said that just within 24 hours.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know anything about what that man said.

Mr. TOBEY. I give the Senator my word for it.

Mr. WHERRY. I take it. [Laughter.] I have the highest regard for the Senator from New Hampshire, and he knows it. I still think, however, that it is impossible, in the present situation, to get a housing bill, because there was no chance to get a conference on a housing bill, until this bill was passed. This bill has been passed. The Senate can put on as an amendment the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and send it to the House, and then if they do not send it to a conference, it seems to me the responsibility will be entirely upon the House of Representatives. Do not Senators agree with me? That is the mechanical situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just one moment. I am not saying that this bill is one that should go back to the House. The Senate is going to amend it in any way it desires to amend it. But the unfortunate situation is—and I respectfully call this to the attention of my colleague from New Hampshire, and I pay him a compliment and a tribute for the work he has done on housing—I can see it in no other way, if we recess or adjourn tonight or before next week, or whenever we do finally terminate this session of Congress, to get a bill into conference except by taking the House bill and amending it as the Senate desires to amend it, and sending it back to the House of Representatives.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I say to my good friend from Nebraska that if we were to follow the suggestion he has made, one objection from the House side would make it impossible for the matter to go to conference.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; let us send it over there.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me suggest a way by which this could be done more easily. Let the Rules Committee in the House——

Mr. WHERRY. We have no control of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. But one objection will block it, and the way to do it is to let the Rules Committee of the House simply permit, as it were, the House Members to vote on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and we can have a bill passed within the next 2 hours.

Mr. WHERRY. May I propound a question to my distinguished friend?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not deny that the procedure I suggested would accomplish the purpose, does he?

Mr. ELLENDER. If I thought it would, I would not object, but I know it will not.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know what the conferees would do, but the only thing we can do is to give them a chance to turn it down.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Frankly, Mr. President, it makes me rather sick away down deep inside to see the Senate arguing tonight, not over whether we should have housing legislation, but over whose name that housing legislation should contain. Much of the controversy here tonight is not over the question of what the bill should contain, but rather whose name should appear as sponsor of the bill. So that we will have it crystal clear as to what the Senator from Louisiana is vetoing if he persists in his objection, he is vetoing, not the bill the House passed, for he knows as well as I do that we can amend that bill in any way we see fit. He knows we can amend it by substituting practically every section of what he sees fit to call the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Rather than do that he is vetoing the right of this body to pass any housing legislation.

If the Senator from Louisiana—and I weigh my words well when I say this—if the Senator from Louisiana persists in this privilege which unfortunately he enjoys here tonight, then he will be doing a number of things.

First, he will be freezing in the present public-housing units tenants who are making as high as $22,000 a year. He will be making it impossible for the Congress to do with the public-housing units, 190,000 of them, which are in existence, what it could do, so that they would be available to the men who really need those units. He will be saying, "I, myself, one Senator from Louisiana, want you to see that in the city of Detroit, for example, men making $22,000, or $14,000, or $12,000, a year shall continue to occupy these subsidized places which some low-income veteran with a wife and two or three children could have occupied."

Second. If the Senator from Louisiana persists in his objection, he will be absolutely vetoing any right for the veterans of this Nation to form veterans' cooperatives, the type of housing cooperative which the Joint Housing Committee, on which were men representing every line of thought—the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]—unanimously agreed that we should provide for in housing legislation. If the Senator from Louisiana persists in insisting upon the privilege which, I say, unfortunately he has tonight—a privilege upon which he can insist—he will be vetoing the work which our Housing Committee has done.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator from Wisconsin mind if I ask him a question? It is not quite germane, but what the Senator is saying now brought something to my mind like a flash. Has the Senator talked with the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee about this legislation?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have.

Mr. TOBEY. And was not the conversation the Senator had with the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee the subject of whether or not this bill would be taken up in conference with the House if it is sent back to the House?

Mr. McCARTHY. It was.

Mr. TOBEY. Did the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee say he would take it to conference, or did he say he would not take it to conference?

Mr. McCARTHY. I discussed with him what I thought were the necessary amendments. I told him I thought the bill was incomplete without having some research section—not the setting up of a laboratory within the Housing and Home Finance Agency, but the provision for a section within that Agency, to work with the municipalities, to secure some semblance of standardization of building codes and to work with the industry to attempt to obtain standardization of measurements. Mr. Wolcott said he had no objection whatsoever to such amendments. I suggested to him what I thought with respect to salaries of the heads of the housing agencies. Take Mr. Foley, for example. He has dropped from $12,000 to $10,000 a year since he was promoted. I said I thought the salaries were entirely inadequate, and that we could not expect to obtain competent men to run fifteen- or eighteen- or twenty-billion-dollar empires on salaries of $10,000 a year. I told him I expected to submit an amendment providing for salary increases. He consented to that. Since that time, however, the Senate has passed a wage increase which takes care of that problem.

I suggested to him that the bill would be incomplete unless we had the type of slum-clearance provision which our Housing Committee wrote. Incidentally, that is not the provision in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner original bill. It is in the bill which the 14 men of the Joint Housing Committee studied during the whole of the summer and recommended.

I suggested to him further that we should have some type of public housing, not of the type which we have had in the past, which allows the housing authorities to skim the cream off the lower income group, but a public housing measure which would start down at the bottom. He said he was heartily opposed to any public housing. I did get the impression, however, that he would take it to conference. Even though I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from Michigan, Representative WOLCOTT—I believe he is a very sincere, honest and able man—I do not believe the Senate should be guided by what one Representative says. If the majority of the Senate still feels that public housing is necessary, obviously the answer is not to kill all the housing legislation, but, rather, to take the House bill and amend it so as to put the best possible provisions for public housing in the bill and then go to conference with it. Perhaps the presently proposed five-year plan may not be adopted in conference, but it is entirely possible that a compromise can be made on a one-year plan or a two-year plan. After all, we shall be back in session next year.

Mr. President, I hope that one Senator will not take it upon himself to veto—not the House bill, because by his objection he would not be vetoing the House Housing bill; he would be vetoing the right of every young veteran, every young man who is desirous of getting a home within a reasonable time, to get such a home. I would hesitate a long time before I would take it upon myself to veto the right of the American people because I might happen to dislikc some part of a bill.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Wisconsin and I have labored together in this matter. The fact is that the chairman of the House Banking and Currency refuses to give the peoples' Representatives in the House of Representatives a chance to vote on these salient measures of public housing and slum clearance. He has told the Senator from Wisconsin that he would not bring the bill to conference if public housing and slum clearance were contained in it. He has told others the same thing. There, Mr. President, we see the die cast. There we see the position, and we are meeting tonight to do the best we can in view of the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask Members of the Senate if we cannot suspend what we are discussing for a while in order to take up a number of conference reports on which action is very necessary.

Mr. ELLENDER. How long does the Senator think it will take to do what he has in mind? I have been on the floor of the Senate now for 4 hours waiting for this occasion. I have not had anything to eat.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe some others of us are in the same situation as the Senator from Louisiana is in. We have been in session now for 2 days and 1 night and are entering into the second night. I should like to get a number of privileged matters out of the way. It will take only a few minutes to do so.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5882) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2377) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 7, 13, 16, 24, and 26 to the

bill and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 2, and 3 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further anounced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCCOWEN, Mr. LANDIS, Mr. BREHM, Mr. KEARNS, Mr. BARDEN, and Mr. LUCAS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4 and 8 to the bill and concurred therein.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN SCHOOL AGENCIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SMITH, Mr. DONNELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1969) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III, which was, on page 1, beginning with line 3, to strike out all over to and including line 10, page 2, and insert:

That section 302 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized, under such regulations as he may adopt, to provide training for not to exceed 10 Filipino engineers, to be designated by the President of the Philippines from the regularly employed staff of the Philippine Public Works Department and the engineer officers of the armed forces of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), in the construction, maintenance, and highway traffic engineering and control necessary for the continued maintenance and for the efficient and safe operation of highway transport facilities."

SEC. 2. Section 305 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) To accomplish such purposes the Public Health Service shall at the earliest practicable time survey the health situation in the Philippines, and is authorized to replace, expand, or install such health services and facilities in the Philippines as are deemed essential to preservation of health, and may assist in the rehabilitation and development of a Philippine quarantine service for prevention of introduction of disease from abroad or from one island to another. The Public Health Service may set up demonstrations and establish training centers in the Philippines; may establish and maintain in the Philippines a school or schools for the purpose of providing practical instruction in public health; and may, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, provide not to exceed 1 year of training in public-health methods and administration, through study at appropriate schools or colleges in the United States and supplementary field work and observation of public-health work, to not more than 90 Filipinos, to be designated by the President of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), and not to exceed 5 months of training in such methods and administration, through field work and observation of public-health work, to not more than 10 additional Filipinos, to be so designated. It may replace equipment and supply reasonably necessary additional equipment, utilizing for this purpose, so far as possible, surplus property, and may recommend to the Commission the repair or construction under the provisions of section 304, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, of buildings deemed essential to the rehabilitation of public health and quarantine functions."

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FERGUSON. I submit a conference report on House bill 6481, making appropriations for the Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for the Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949 and for other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 5, 8, and 21.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$330,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the Corporation is authorized to pay not to exceed $1,482.90 for services actually rendered by former employees during the fiscal year 1947 and for which there is no present authority to pay, as follows: L. Brown, $120.06; W. Finch, $140.11; J. Johnson, $116.16; S. Jones, $86.31; R. Neely, $148.71; G. Sanders, $103.19; N. L. Sanders, $123.82; G. Walker, $130.78; W. Winfield, $183.37; W. Scruggs, $153.60; E. Donley, $102.66; H. Thomas, $74.11"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 7, 13, 16, 24, and 26.

HOMER FERGUSON,
CLYDE M. REED,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
F. R. COUDERT, JR.,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6481, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 19, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Before the period at the end thereof, insert: ": *Provided further*, That section 304 (b) of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (Public Law 248, approved December 6, 1945), shall not be applicable with respect to the Panama Railroad Company until after June 30, 1949."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: After "plus accrued dividends thereon" insert: "which, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall be computed at a rate approximating the average interest cost incurred by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation on its total borrowings during each respective fiscal year."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter propcsed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment, insert the following: "not later than July 30, 1948, as of June 30, 1948 (the corporate records for the fiscal year 1948 to be closed by Defense Homes Corporation prior to actual transfer thereof)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the said amendment, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding provisions of law to the contrary, in addition to the foregoing the Corporation is authorized to utilize, from the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (12 U. S. C. 1148a), such sums as may be necessary (a) to make loans, during a period of five years, to bona fide fur farmers in accordance with the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148), all such loans to carry full personal liability of the borrowers and to be secured by such collateral as is deemed by the Corporation to be necessary to afford reasonable assurance of repayment, the aggregate principal amount of which loans shall not exceed $4,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and (b) not to exceed $25,000 for administrative expenses of the Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration in connection with such loans, which amount and the aforesaid item of $146,800 may be combined for accounting purposes."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the said amendment, insert the following:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"VIRGIN ISLANDS COMPANY

"Section 304 (b) of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (Public Law 248, approved Dec. 6, 1945), shall not be applicable with respect to the Virgin Islands Company until after June 30, 1949.

"The Virgin Islands Company is authorized to borrow from the Treasury of the United States not to exceed $500,000, for which purpose there is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated $500,000. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such loans to the Company for repayment not later than 1 year after the making thereof, at rates of interest determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of any such loan to the Company.

"Not to exceed $97,800 of the funds available to the Company shall be available for administrative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis), including salaries of officers, Washington office personnel, and the accounting, purchasing, and pay-roll departments; clerical services; traveling, automobile, office, and sundries expenses; stationery and office supplies; telephone and telegraph; postage; dues and subscriptions; repairs, and maintenance of office buildings and equipment; employees' welfare; and public relations: *Provided*, That such total sum shall be inclusive of the gross amounts of the foregoing categories of expenses before apportionment of any part thereof to manufacturing or other expenses: *Provided further*, That such administrative expenses shall be exclusive of salaries of the engineering and shipping departments, storekeepers, and plant clerical personnel; interest expense; bank service charges; audit fees; and depreciation."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3 to said bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 13, 16, 24, and 26.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now move that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND SUNDRY INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS, ETC.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REED. I submit a conference report on House bill 6829, making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today's RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN WAR CLAIMS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 4044, to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases, and I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The conference report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today's RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

PENSACOLA NATIONAL MONUMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 3416) to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument, and I submit a report (No. 1771) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill and report will be received, and the report will be printed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is at the desk House bill 3416, which is a bill unanimously approved by the Armed Services Committee. It seeks to create a national monument at Pensacola, Fla. It requires the addition of some amendments. I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 3416, so that it may be sent to the House as proposed to be amended. I am confident that there will be no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3416) to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after "authorized" to strike out "and directed to acquire on" and to insert "to receive on"; in line 4, after "United States", to strike out "by transfer, gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise"; in line 8, to strike out "War Department" and insert "Department of the Army."; in line 9, after "Navy Department", to insert "and transferred in accordance with existing law."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

THE HOUSING ACT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which handles housing matters. I have been through the housing question for approximately 3 years. I do not wish to argue the merits of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I do not wish to argue the merits of the House bill, but I do wish to make one observation, and I make it because I feel that we should do something here tonight in respect to housing.

It seems to me that some of us in the Senate are taking the same position that we accuse certain Members of the House of taking. We accuse certain Members in the House of denying the House the right to vote upon the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It seems to me that tonight we are likewise denying the Senate the right to consider the housing bill, knowing that any Senator can offer the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as a complete substitute for the House bill. I do not know whether the chairman of the House

Banking and Currency Committee would take the bill to conference or not. I have no way of knowing. But we are acting in the same way that we are accusing the chairman of the Housing Banking and Currency Committee of acting. That is, we are bowing our necks and saying, "Unless we can have our way we will not take anything."

I believe in all fairness that we should permit the unanimous-consent agreement, and if some Senator wishes to offer the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as a complete substitute, put it up to the Senate and let the Senate vote on it and send it back to the House. If the House does not care to consider it, it seems to me that the responsibility will be upon the House, and not upon us.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe that we have exhausted the patience of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. He has been very patient about withholding his objection. I should like to ask him once again, in the light of what has been said, the mechanical situation, and the parliamentary procedure through which we must go, if he does not feel that we might take up the House bill, let the Senate do what it pleases so far as amendments are concerned, and send it back to the House for consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I renew my objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6959; that all of that bill after the enacting clause be stricken out and that there be inserted the provisions of Senate bill 866, heretofore passed by the Senate; that the Senate insist upon its amendments and ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. President, we passed a housing bill. It was considered for months in the House. Instead of taking that bill, as the House should have done, and substituting what it wished and sending it to conference, it refused to consider the Senate bill. It put the Senate bill aside and wrote a bill of its own and now sends it over here on the last day of the session.

I have not been able to read all of the provisions of the House bill. As we know, if we debate the question of whether or not to adopt a substitute for the House bill, and the various provisions of the bill, it will require another week, as it did before. It seems to me that the proper way to do is to say, "We passed a bill. We will substitute that bill for the House bill and send it to conference." Then we shall have an opportunity, for example, to correct the provision which was pointed out by the FHA, in which the GI-loan provision does not cover 80 percent of the GI loans in the secondary market. I believe that the most important single thing we can do to keep up the flow of housing is to provide that secondary market. A small committee can consider the two bills and try to reconcile them in some way that may be satisfactory to both Houses.

The suggestion I have made, to take up the bill in one unanimous request, substitute the Senate bill and send it to conference, is the reasonable thing to do at this time.

It has been said that the chairman of the House committee will not agree to a conference. I cannot believe that any such arbitrary position could be taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ELLENDER. I object.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I think the record should be absolutely clear at this time, in the closing hours of the session, as to just who is blocking housing.

First, I thank the Senator from Ohio for the attitude he has taken and congratulate him. He is always a reasonable man. He has demonstrated it again.

The only way we can get housing legislation of any kind—and the Senator from Louisiana, who is blocking this housing legislation, knows it—is by taking up the House bill in the manner suggested by the Senator from Ohio. We all know that there are many things about the bill which the Senate has passed that we do not like. There is also much debris in the House bill. But the only way we can get sensible housing legislation is to have the conferees get together tonight and reconcile the differences.

I know that the Senator from Louisiana is not worried for fear that the Senate conference committee will be loaded with men who take a position opposite to that which he takes. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who takes the same position on public housing that the Senator from Louisiana does, would have the job of selecting the conferees. So there is no conceivable possibility of having the conference loaded with Senators who are opposed to public housing.

Again, Mr. President, so that the RECORD may be absolutely clear—and I know this matter will be brought up again and again this year—let me say that the Senator from Louisiana, by exercising a privilege which unfortunately is his tonight, is doing several things. First, he is making it impossible for the veterans to get the 100-percent guaranteed loans which the entire Congress has decided the veterans have a right to have. If the Senator from Louisiana persists in his objection, that will mean that he will have absolutely vetoed the right of nearly 15,000,000 young Americans to take advantage of the type of loans which the Congress has decided they have a right to have.

If the Senator from Louisiana persists in his one-man veto, which is of a type which we have seen all too often, not only in the Congress but in the Presidency, it will mean that we shall not have liberal loan guaranties for low-cost housing, and that will be particularly at the expense of the young men who have been in the service, and who have large families, families who really need low-cost housing. If the Senator from Louisiana persists in his objection—and this matter is of tremendous importance; we held hearings on it, all the way from San Francisco to New York, and from New Orleans to St. Paul; and every veterans' organization which came before us urged that we pass some workable and sensible veterans' cooperative housing legislation—so if the Senator persists in his one-man veto, that will mean that he will have vetoed the desires of all the veterans' organizations and the desires of the entire Senate and House to give the veterans who fought the war a right to get together and build some cheap housing. It will also mean that the Senator from Louisiana will have stopped cold the operations of a great number of prefabricated-housing manufacturers.

Mr. President, I do not desire to take up any more of the time of the Senate tonight, for there are a number of other measures which must be passed before we adjourn; but I think the RECORD should be clear that tonight we have seen the unintelligent exercise of a veto privilege which one man should not have. During the past 2 years we have seen the veto privilege abused by the President, and six times the measures have been passed over his vetoes by a majority of the Congress. Mr. President, the only other President of the United States who had thus abused this veto power and had so many vetoes overridden was Andrew Johnson—and Andrew Johnson was impeached.

But tonight we see the use of a veto by a Member of the Senate to prevent the veterans from getting reasonably priced housing this year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, has a ruling been made to the effect that objection is made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION SERVICE TO ALASKA

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 219, Calendar 1817, relating to ocean transportation to Alaska, and I ask that the joint resolution be read by title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to continue until December 31, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection temporarily, to permit an explanation and a statement? I should like to call attention to a certain matter.

Mr. LANGER. Very well.

Mr. CAIN. I wish to call the attention of the Senate, in the presence of the Senator from North Dakota, to the fact that yesterday when this measure was reached during the call of the calendar, the Senator from North Dakota was moved to object for the reason, as he said, that he had been advised that the

Governor of Alaska was in opposition to this proposed legislation. The Senator from North Dakota told me and my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]—that subcommittee having jurisdiction over the proposed legislation—that he would endeavor to get in touch by telephone with the Governor of Alaska.

I do not know whether the Senator from North Dakota has had opportunity to do so; but I was able to contact the Governor of Alaska late yesterday afternoon at Oakland, Calif., and I was authorized and encouraged by the Governor of Alaska to say to the Senate and to say to individual Senators—I refer particularly to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who objected to the consideration of this measure yesterday during the call of the calendar—that in the considered opinion of the Governor of Alaska, the very best interests of the citizens of that great Territory would be adversely affected and prejudiced unless this proposed legislation is passed.

Inasmuch as yesterday my very good friend the Senator from North Dakota said that his only objection to the measure was that the Governor of Alaska was opposed to it, and inasmuch as the Senator now knows, as I was able to advise him last night, that the Governor of Alaska no longer objects, therefore I hope that the Senator from North Dakota will find it convenient to go along with the desire to have the Senate pass this proposed piece of legislation, which will properly protect the interests of a great Territory belonging to this country.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] will agree to an amendment changing the date from December 31, 1949, to October 1, 1948.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to accept that amendment, if it is agreeable to the author of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from North Dakota that this measure proposes an extension of the public law here involved for the short period of 8 months, according to a proposed change in the date. The chairman of the House committee, whose committee is waiting to see what action the Senate will take, tells me that he will accept the Senate joint resolution word for word as it is, with its present date.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if objection has been made——

Mr. LANGER. The objection is withdrawn.

Mr. President, in my humble judgment, this is a very very bad measure. Under its provisions the Government will lease a ship for $1 to three private companies, and then will pay a subsidy of $3,500,000.

In view of the fact that Alaska may be hurt, I am perfectly willing, if the chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment I have proposed—making the date October 1, 1948—not to object, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, all we propose to do here is to extend a law which the Congress passed a year ago. The law expires on June 30. Many of us feel that we should not continue the law except for a limited period of time. We picked the date February 28, 1949—that is the present proposal, under an amendment to the date appearing on the face of the joint resolution as printed, which is December 31, 1949—in order to give the operators of the ship and the Maritime Commission time to get together and work out a new arrangement.

I am fearful that a hardship would be worked upon the people of Alaska if this measure were killed tonight, because then there would be only the time between the present and June 30 in which to work out the new arrangement, and possibly that would not provide sufficient time for the new arrangement to be worked out and for the problem to be handled.

For that reason, if the Senator from North Dakota will not go along with the February 28, 1949 date—which I believe the Senator from North Dakota should do in all fairness to the people of Alaska and the Maritime Commission and the ship operators—I shall accept the October 1, 1948 date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from North Dakota, who, of course, not only wishes to have good legislation enacted, but wishes to be of as much assistance as he can to the people of Alaska in their problems and troubles. The measure, as we would have it considered, would call for the date to be March 1, 1949, but the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota is October, I believe.

Mr. LANGER. October 1, 1948.

Mr. CAIN. And the date under the committee recommendation is March 1, 1949.

I should like to request the serious consideration of the Senator from North Dakota of this matter, because we think the latter date is important. Yet we recognize the seriousness and sincerity of the Senator's opposition.

Would the Senator consider splitting the difference between the two dates?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have made it a habit never to split the difference. I do not believe in compromises.

The Senator from Indiana said that the October 1, 1948, date would be satisfactory, so that is my position.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, does the Senator refer to October of this year?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will split the difference, as it were.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is splitting it, all right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I have the attention of the Senator from North Dakota?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am reserving the right to object. On February 28 next year, all the maritime authority will expire, all the wartime authority previously given to the Maritime Commission. We moved the Alaskan contracts up to that time. At that time it will be necessary to review the whole maritime situation. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will agree to February 28, and then we will review the maritime situation, including the Alaskan situation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. May I say that my distinguished friend, the author of the bill, has said October 1 is entirely agreeable.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Whether it is February 28, March 28, or October 1, what is the difference.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator has already said he would agree.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Why does not the Senator agree?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest that if Senators cannot agree, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. CAIN. That is the very worst thing we could do, Mr. President.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Washington has the floor. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am sorry this is Saturday night and we have to have this preliminary discussion on the floor. The Senator from New York, who is now in the chair, understands these situations, I hope.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has a good idea.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, may I ask what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation is the unanimous-consent request to take up Calendar No. 1817, the joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 219.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understood the objection had been withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection has not been withdrawn.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1817, the joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 219.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska. [Putting the question.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, what is Calendar 1817?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title has been read. The clerk will again read the title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to continue until December 31, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make

provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to continue until December 31, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the word "in", to strike out "securing effective, efficient, and reasonably competitive ocean transportation services, by common carriers so far as may be practicable, for Alaska, to encourage the economic development of the Territory and growth of its population, and to increase the Territory's civilian strength and services in support of the national defense" and insert "providing essential water transportation service for the Territory of Alaska pending the determination of a long-range policy with respect to such transportation"; on page 2, line 15, after the word "vessels", to insert "made available to the Commission for such purposes and vessels"; in line 18, strike out "December 31, 1949" and insert "March 1, 1949"; on page 5, line 13, strike out "(1)"; in line 19, after the word "determination", strike out "and (2) the unconditional right to cancel any such contract, charter, or other arrangement, effective as of April 1 of any year, provided written notice of such cancellation be given to the Commission on or before January 1 of such year"; on page 6, after line 14, strike out "SEC. 4. All agencies of the Federal Government shall cooperate to the end that, to the maximum extent practicable, traffic by water to, from, and within Alaska, which such agencies control, either directly or as a contracting agency or otherwise, be transported on vessels of the common carriers operating in the Alaska service"; in line 21, strike out "5" and insert "4"; and in line 23, after the word "vessels", strike out "tugs and barges to be employed in combined operation" and insert "tugs, barges", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution of March 7, 1947, entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes", is amended to read as follows: "That it is the intention of the Congress to assist in providing essential water transportation service for the Territory of Alaska pending the determination of a long-range policy with respect to such transportation.

"SEC. 2. (a) The United States Maritime Commission is authorized to enter into contracts, charters, and other arrangements deemed by it to be appropriate, with American citizens, deemed by the Commission to be qualified, to supply ocean transportation service with American-flag vessels to, from, and within Alaska. Such contracts, charters, or arrangements may include provisions for making available to such operators Government-owned vessels made available to the Commission for such purposes and vessels under the control or jurisdiction of the Commission for operation on voyages commencing not later than March 1, 1949. Such provisions may include (1) charter hire at a nominal rate; (2) such marine insurance to be provided by the Commission, as the Commission may determine to be necessary or appropriate as to vessels made available by the Commission and other vessels operated in the Alaska service under contracts, charters, or arrangements with the Commission; (3) requirements that the operators shall operate such vessels to secure the most economical transportation adequate for the Alaska service; and (4) such other requirements, terms, and conditions as the Commission may deem appropriate.

"(b) Each such contract, charter, or arrangement shall provide that, as of the end of each accounting period, the cumulative gross profit, before overhead expenses, from the operation of vessels thereunder, as approved by the Commission, shall be allocated as follows and in the following order:

"(1) To provide for the operator's proportionate share of the expenses of all operators of maintaining a survey of Alaska ocean transportation services and of the costs and methods of operation of operators in said services, in accordance with a program approved by the Commission;

"(2) To allow compensation to the operator for working capital, use of facilities other than operator-owned vessels, and overhead expenses, on such bases as the Commission may determine; and such bases may be fixed in terms of a percentage or percentages, deemed by the Commission to be reasonable, of vessel operating revenues;

"(3) To allow the operator a return at the rate of 10 percent per annum, before Federal income taxes, on the fair value of operator-owned vessels used in the Alaska service;

"(4) Any profit remaining thereafter, at the conclusion of each accounting period, shall be held in a special account. At the end of the second and each succeeding accounting period, if any, such account shall be available for paying any then cumulative deficiency (covering the period from the commencement of operations hereunder) with respect to any amounts which, if earned, would have theretofore been allocated pursuant to the previous paragraphs of this subsection;

"(5) At the conclusion of operations under any such contract, charter, or other arrangement, any balance in said special account shall be promptly divided and paid 75 percent to the Commission and 25 percent to the operator.

"(c) The Commission may incorporate in each such contract, charter, or arrangement such definitions and formulas for the determinations of vessel-operating revenue, gross profit before overhead expenses, overhead expenses, accounting periods, fair value, and depreciation, as it may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the other provisions of this subsection and of this joint resolution. The Commission's determination of the value of operator-owned vessels, for the purposes of such contract, charter, or other arrangement, shall be for the purposes of this joint resolution only and shall not be relevant evidence in any regulatory proceeding before the Commission.

"SEC. 3. (a) Every contract, charter, or arrangement made under this joint resolution shall expressly reserve to the Commission, after reasonable notice to the operator and affording him opportunity for hearing if the Commission determines that it is in the public interest so to do, the right to cancel the same upon reasonable notice of such cancellation but not less than 90 days. Such contract, charter, or arrangement shall also reserve to the operator the right to request the Commission to modify or cancel the same for good cause shown, and if the Commission shall determine that the operator's claim is justified, it may make such modification or shall permit such cancellation at such time thereafter as it may consider reasonable but not more than 90 days after such determination.

"(b) Whenever the President shall proclaim that the security of the national defense makes it advisable, or during any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President, the Commission may terminate any contract, charter, or arrangement hereunder, without cost to the United States, upon such notice to the operator as the President shall determine.

"(c) Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to limit the right of the Commission to enter into other contracts, charters, or arrangements with new or other operators, if after such notice, investigation, or consultation as the Commission may deem necessary or appropriate in the particular case, but without the necessity of hearings, the Commission shall determine such action to be in the interest of the economy of the Territory of Alaska or of the national defense.

"SEC. 4. The word 'vessels' as used in the joint resolution shall include such passenger vessels, freight vessels, combination freight and passenger vessels, tugs, barges, and other watercraft, as shall, in the discretion of the Commission, be deemed suitable for us in ocean transportation to, from, and within Alaska.

"SEC. 5. The provisions of this joint resolution, as amended, shall not, prior to July 1, 1948, affect the operation of contracts, charters, or other arrangements in accordance with their terms in effect on the date of enactment of this amendatory section, unless superseded before July 1, 1948, by contracts, charters, or arrangements entered into under this joint resolution, as amended."

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the United States Maritime Commission under date of June 18, 1948, referring to the joint resolution which has just been passed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, June 18, 1948.

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: This is in reference to your telephone conversations this afternoon with Commissioner Mellen and Commissioner Carson. You related that Senator LANGER interposed, through Senator JOHNSTON, an objection to consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 219 on the ground that someone representing himself to be an attorney informed Senator LANGER that the United States Maritime Commission was opposed to Senate Joint Resolution 219.

The representation to Senator LANGER was false. It was without authority from the Maritime Commission.

Senate Joint Resolution 219 is obviously a temporary expedient to authorize operations on a preferable basis than under Public Law 12 and to afford an opportunity to effect a transition to another and better form of operation.

Failure to pass this legislation now will result in an abrupt and drastic disruption of transportation to and from Alaska for at least 90 days following the 30th of this month. This disruption will take place during the very peak of the Alaskan shipping season. If adequate transportation can thereafter be restored it necessarily will be at substantially higher costs with resulting substantial increases in freight rates.

The Maritime Commission unanimously favors the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 219 as reported by Mr. CAPEHART, with amendments, on June 17 (legislative day June 15), 1948, as a temporary measure to facilitate developing a sounder transportation system for the Territory of Alaska.

Sincerely,

GRENVILLE MELLEN,
Commissioner.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, would the Senator from Nebraska be willing to yield to me for a statement which would require about 8 or 10 minutes, on an important matter?

Mr. WHERRY. I would suggest to the Senator that we first proceed to the consideration of the next business on the Calendar.

Mr. DONNELL. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take up for immediate consideration Calendar No. 1421, joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162) to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska which had been reported from the Committee on Interior with amendments.

LIABILITY FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield for the purpose indicated?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a statement with respect to an important subject and to present information concerning certain hearings.

On May 24, 1948, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] introduced, and on the same day there was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill S. 2728.

Lines 1 to 9, both inclusive, of page 1, of the printed copy of said bill, read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no court of the United States or of any State shall have jurisdiction of any action or proceeding, whether instituted prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this act, to enforce liability or impose punishment for or on account of the failure of the employer to pay an employee overtime compensation for which the employer is not liable under this act.

Section 2 of said bill reads:

SEC. 2. No employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under any law of the United States, in any action or proceeding commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this act, on account of the failure of such employer to pay an employee overtime compensation on any claim therefor that is inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary on May 25, 1948, appointed to consider said bill a subcommittee consisting of the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the last named being designated chairman of subcommittee.

In the case of Bay Ridge Operating Co., Inc., petitioner, against James Aaron and others, who were respondents, to wit, case No. 366, and in the case of Huron Stevedoring Corp., petitioner, against Leo Blue and others, who were respondents, to wit, case No. 367, each of said cases being in the October term, 1947, of the Supreme Court of the United States, said Court considered what it characterized as—

Another aspect of the perplexing problem of what constitutes the regular rate of pay which the Fair Labor Standards Act requires to be used in computing the proper payment for work in excess of 40 hours.

Those two cases were decided by the Court on June 7, 1948.

To quote the Court further:

The problem posed is the method of computing the regular rate of pay for longshoremen who work in foreign and interstate commerce varying and irregular hours throughout the workweek under a collective-bargaining agreement for handling cargo which provides contract straight time hourly rates for work done within a prescribed 44-hour time schedule and contract overtime rates for all work done outside the straight time hours.

The agreement, in the two cases mentioned, established, to quote again the Court:

A basic working day of 8 hours and a basic working week, that is, workweek, of 44 hours.

Further, the Court said:

Hourly rates for different types of cargo were specified for work between 8 a. m. and 12 noon and between 1 p. m. and 5 p. m. during five working days of the week, Monday through Friday, and from 8 a. m. to 12 noon on Saturday, and a different schedule of rates for work during all other hours in the workweek.

Continuing, the Court said:

The first schedule was called straight-time rates, and the second schedule was entitled overtime rates.

The opinion of the Court designated these rates as contract straight time and contract overtime.

The court, referring to section 7 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act as section 7 (a), stated the respective claims of the parties to the suits as follows, namely:

Respondents claim that their regular rate of pay under the contract for any workweek, within the meaning of section 7 (a), is the average hourly rate computed by dividing the total number of hours worked in any workweek for any single employer into the total compensation received from that employer during that week; and that in those workweeks in which they worked more than 40 hours for any one employer they were entitled by section 7 (a) to statutory excess compensation for all such excess hours computed on the basis of that rate. The petitioners claim that the straight-time rates are the regular rates, and that they have, therefore, with minor exceptions not presented by this review, complied with the requirements of section 7 (a). That is, no rates except straight-time rates are to be taken into consideration in computing the regular rate.

The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit which reversed the judgment of the district court had held—to quote again the Supreme Court—"that the regular rate must be determined as an 'actual fact' and could not be arranged through a collective-bargaining agreement." Said Circuit Court of Appeals, so the Supreme Court said, "therefore concluded that on the basis of the findings below the regular rate must be computed by dividing the total number of hours worked into the total compensation received."

The Supreme Court agreed with the conclusion reached by said Circuit Court of Appeals. Three Justices of the Supreme Court dissented. One Justice of said Court took no part in the consideration or decision of the case. Said cases, Nos. 363 and 367, had been consolidated for trial.

On June 8, 1948, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] introduced, and on the same day there was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill No. S. 2832, the printed copy of which bill is, except as to one punctuation, identical with S. 2728.

On June 9, 1948, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary appointed, to consider said S. 2832, a subcommittee, the members of which are the Senators who constitute the subcommittee which said chairman appointed, as aforesaid, to consider said Senate bill 2728.

Excerpt from the minutes of June 14, 1948, of the Committee on the Judiciary, reads as quoted by me as follows:

S. 2728, Document 1386 was discussed before the full committee. After further discussion on the bill which involves overtime on overtime payments, it was ordered that the subcommittee on the bill, consisting of Senator DONNELL, chairman, Senator COOPER, and Senator EASTLAND, be authorized to hold hearings during the recess period between adjournment and January 1949, with a view to preparing a record for use in the Eighty-first Congress.

Said last-mentioned subcommittee will, accordingly, at times and place or places to be hereafter determined, hold said hearings if funds therefor be provided. Persons who shall have the desire to be informed of such times and place or places should promptly communicate that desire to Robert Barnes Young, clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary, 424 Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

Said last-mentioned subcommittee will, in my opinion, reserve the right to limit the number of witnesses to such number as it shall deem reasonable and to accept or call as witnesses only such persons as, in order that said subcommittee may obtain a clear and fair understanding of the facts, it shall deem advisable to hear.

INDIAN RESERVATIONS IN ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162) to

rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, before proceeding to make a few brief remarks regarding the pending joint resolution, which I consider one of the important resolutions to be discussed this evening, let me say that I am sorry that the proponents of the resolution had to wait until the last minute to discuss the rights of American people. Senate Joint Resolution 162 affects the very lives and the livelihood of Indians who cannot defend themselves and are at the mercy of those who exploit them.

Mr. President, only today this body and the House of Representatives have agreed on an appropriation which has for its purpose an attempt to bring relief in Europe and elsewhere. We are sorry for the people of Europe. We try to show the world that we are charitable. But when it comes to a question of doing what is right by those we actually control we would by law in the last minute of the Congress take away the basic rights of poor people who cannot defend themselves.

Mr. President, it would be a calamity if Congress passed this joint resolution at this time. It is true the committee held hearings, but the hearings and the witnesses were confined to those who would deprive the Indian of Alaska of what belongs to him. Are we proud of our history in dealing with the Indians? Are we proud of the way we have treated them? Are we proud of the action we are about to take tonight so that without having his day in court or coming before a committee and expressing his views, in the last minute of the session of Congress this body, without consideration of what is involved, would pass a law which would deprive innocent people, fine people, harmless people, people who cannot defend themselves, out of what belongs to them?

What is the hurry? I ask any Senator within the hearing of my voice what he knows about the purport of the resolution, what effect it will have on the Indians of Alaska, what effect it will have on our so-called good will, what effect it will have on our doing what is right for the suffering people throughout the world?

Mr. President, the Senate can pass this resolution, but it will go down in history as being one of the greatest exploitations of harmless and inoffensive people in the history of this body. The Indians and the natives of Alaska will be the ones who will suffer as a consequence of the enactment of the resolution, if it becomes law.

In all sincerity, I ask those here who took an oath to support the Constitution, and who are so desirous and anxious to help people, to consider this case carefully. I know that about a year ago today I submitted finally to the passing of another law which was supposed to help the Indians of Alaska. It was going to develop the pulp of Alaska. The law was passed, but to this day nothing has been done, not an Indian has been given a bit of work, and he has not got his property. That is all that is happening.

When we are taking care of all the peoples of the world, why is it not fair to wait 6 or 7 months so that a real investigation can be made of the basic rights involved, and not let a group of exploiters from continental United States go there and deprive those poor people out of their property and their rights? The joint resolution can be passed, but it is indecent, to say the least, to take from the Indians of Alaska what little they have without an investigation of the matter. Oh, yes, we brag about how good we are, we brag about what we do about communism. We want to save the Jews, the Greeks, the Chinese, and everybody else, but can we here in the last minutes of the Congress, with clear consciences, deprive Indians, for whom we assumed the responsibility, who canont defend themselves, of some of their property rights.

Mr. President, in my opinion this resolution as reported is inadequate to the needs of Alaska, and extremely unfair to the Indians and the Eskimos. It would withdraw from the Interior Department authority granted in 1936 to create reservations in Alaska, except for village sites, smokehouses, and things of that sort. It would extinguish claims of the Indians and other natives, taking away their right to seek redress in court, wiping away completely whatever rights the Indians may have, without their having their day in court, without their being allowed to at least defend themselves, in their ignorant, meek, humble way.

The Indians of Alaska and the Eskimos will suffer what the Indian in continental United States has suffered throughout the years. They will be done away with as were the Cherokees, they will be done away with as were the Indians of New York, New England, and the other States. I ask in all sincerity that this terrible exploitation be stopped.

The President, in his Alaska message, suggested that negotiations be undertaken with the natives by the Interior Department to provide the Indians and the Eskimos with sufficient lands for their livelihood, and that their claims to the other lands be extinguished.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, what is the Senator reading from?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am reading from some notes I made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I see.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is a great difference between provisions of sufficient land for their livelihood and the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 162.

There has been submitted to the Congress a very carefully worked out suggestion with regard to the settlement of native claims in Alaska. I understand this suggestion reached the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate yesterday. I am certain that it should be considered by the Congress before any action is taken. This suggestion has exactly the same objective as is proclaimed by Senate Resolution 162, and it would fill the needs of the President, the Senate committee, and others for correction of the present situation with regard to the occupation of lands in Alaska.

If it is practicable to substitute the language which has been suggested in the letter from the Acting Secretary, which I understand has been received by the Senate and by the House of Representatives, I should have no objection to action now on this question; but it is impracticable.

Mr. President, it is a terrible thing to take away from a human being basic rights because we have the power to do it. Action is up to the Senate.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as one of the sponsors of the joint resolution, I think the Senator from New Mexico, who has spoken so feelingly and so sincerely, has nonetheless very sadly misjudged the intent and the effect and the result of the proposed legislation. So far as I know, there is not any intention on the part of anyone who hopes that this legislation will pass tonight to usurp or take away or destroy or abuse the right of any Indian in the Territory of Alaska to any property or human right which the Indian may possess.

On the other hand, Mr. President, a good many of us who hope that Alaska will develop at an accelerated pace in the next few years are of the considered opinion that the time has come when we must no longer take it for granted that people possess large rights to which, on examination, they may not be entitled. All the joint resolution does is to instruct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the individual rights of Indians, and of groups and tribes of Indians, and once his determination has been established, if he can secure concurrence from the Secretary of Agriculture the wish and the decision and the determination of the Secretary of the Interior shall become fact.

Admittedly this is by no means an easy problem to solve. Certainly we might hope that it were possible for every Indian claiming a right in Alaska to have a full opportunity to have his day in court or to be heard in that field. But outside the realm of the law, if we cannot in this Congress place our reliance for the doing of a good and fair and competent job in two of the Cabinet positions of the Government, I for one do not know where we could place any reliance or any faith.

Congress during the closing hours of the last session passed a bill which was intended to make available some of the excess surplus forests of Alaska for the production of pulp out of which there might come an industry so progressive and so healthy that the very Indians to whom the Senator from New Mexico has rightfully given his support and allegiance might be the better qualified to make livings and become other than public charges.

One last word about this measure, Mr. President. It says in no uncertain language that the Secretary of the Interior shall make it his business to protect and save for the Indians the lands which they actually possess and areas which are presently used or occupied for town sites. That takes in quite a good deal of territory which they use for villages, smokehouses, gardens, burial grounds or missionary stations. It seems very clear to me if the Indians claim rights to such facilities and such areas, that everyone will be protected, and no one will be taking an unfair advantage of the Indians in the Territory called Alaska.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope that in the closing hours of the session we will not be unduly alarmed about this joint resolution. As a matter of fact, it does but two things. There are Indian reservations in Alaska, and I am more cognizant of them, I know more about them than perhaps any other Senator, and I am just as considerate of them as any other Member of this body. There are some reservations that have a square mile per Indian. At the most, there are only 35,000 natives in Alaska. There are more Indian reservations in Alaska per capita and per square mile than any place in the whole of the United States. This measure does not affect them at all. All it provides is that we shall keep these reservations with which Indians in Alaska are happy, but with which I am not so sure some Indian lawyers downtown are happy. They make their living off these Indians. They have an Indian bar association downtown. They meet about every month and discuss what the next move is to be to make a charge against Indians. I am quite tired of that.

The measure does nothing but maintain the Indian reservation in Alaska and provides that no Secretary of the Interior shall extend those Indian reservations for somebody who would make an investment.

As I said the other day on the floor, the joint resolution involves the economy of Alaska. It does not hurt the Indians at all But every time a bill is brought up in Congress and the word "Indian" is mentioned, Members of Congress will hear from some Indian lawyers downtown who make their living by exploiting the Indians. They tell us why the bill should not pass, or why we should amend it, or something else.

I know as much about Alaska as any other man on this floor, and I am as appreciative of the rights of the Indian as any other man on this floor. The measure does not hurt the Alaska Indians one single bit. It would allow Alaska to progress. It would allow somebody to go up there and make an investment in pulp and papers, in mines or in salmon or any other industry. No one is going to make an investment if he thinks the Secretary of the Interior can extend an Indian reservation over the land in which he has invested.

One thing more. I do not like to talk about Indian lawyers, but it is high time someone did.

Let me mention the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior. They have had an opportunity, as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] will say, to testify and present their case. They have been before the committee and said all they had to say, and the committee unanimously said they were wrong. So when the bill comes up in the Senate under unanimous consent they write to everyone in the Senate. They get some Senator to object after they have had their day in court.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not mean the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator yield to me anyway?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I dislike the Indian lawyers as much as does the Senator from Washington, and I know what he is talking about.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from New Mexico knows more about the Indian lawyers than I do.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not worrying about the Indian lawyers, but I am concerned about the Indians in Alaska who do not have any lawyers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am very much concerned about the Indians in Alaska. As a matter of fact, if the joint resolution is passed the Indians in Alaska will be better off than they have ever been in their whole history. I believe that sincerely.

Mr. President, I say again as I said the other day, that this measure means the economy of Alaska. Its adoption will mean that men can go up there and develop pulp and paper, salmon, and minerals.

I am sure the Senator from Nebraska knows that everyone has had his day in court, that everyone has had an opportunity to testify, but the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of the Interior, even after its representatives have been in court, after they have testified, write letters to Senators to object to bills. This is a good measure. It will help Alaska. If it would not help Alaska I would not be standing on the floor advocating it, and neither would my junior colleague.

Mr. BUTLER. I am not certain whether my good friend the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] was directing his remarks against the original bill which was introduced. Much of his comment was more or less applicable to the bill as originally introduced. The bill as now proposed will be of benefit, to the people of Alaska, including the natives as well as the whites.

Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2 after the resolving clause it is proposed to strike out the following:

That the orders of the Secretary of the Interior issued under authority of the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), establishing the Akutan, Karluk, Wales, Unalakleet, and Venetie, or any other Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska, are hereby rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 8, to strike out "SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act of May 1, 1936, is hereby repealed" and insert "that section 2 of the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), is hereby repealed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3 to insert a new section 2 as follows:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, in the Territory of Alaska, is authorized to issue patents to the appropriate native tribes and villages or individuals for the lands actually possessed, used or occupied for town sites, villages, smoke houses, gardens, burial grounds, or missionary stations: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of the Interior, prior to issuing patents to any such lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest, shall obtain the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the measure does not take away from any single Indian reservation one single foot of land that has been declared an Indian reservation today. It does place some limit upon the creation of additional reservations in the future.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was stricken out.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to repeal section 2 of the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), and for other purposes."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. PATMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 190) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 371. An act for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado;

H. R. 912. An act for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa;

H. R. 915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate

of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Chester O. Glenn;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand 3d;

H. R. 1642. An act for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader;

H. R. 1733. An act for the relief of G. C. Hedrick;

H. R. 1780. An act for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.;

H. R. 2193. An act for the relief of Robert E. Graham;

H. R. 2395. An act for the relief of the Cypress Creek Drainage District of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 2696. An act for the relief of Otto Krause, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.;

H. R. 2873. An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein;

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems;

H. R. 3499. An act for the relief of Petrol Corp.;

H. R. 3735. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4272. An act to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4516. An act for the relief of the Moore Dry Dock Co., of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 4635. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4644. An act for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.;

H. R. 4690. An act to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 4881. An act for relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 4962. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 5252. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes, approved October 14, 1940, as amended;

H. R. 5750. An act to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5881. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 5886. An act to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 6089. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134);

H. R. 6090. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title;

H. R. 6096. An act to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.;

H. R. 6186. An act for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 6224. An act for the relief of John Watkins;

H. R. 6293. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives;

H. R. 6327. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette;

H. R. 6452. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States;

H. R. 6507. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6598. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939;

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6634. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea;

H. R. 6698. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 6818. An act to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting;

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State; and

H. R. 6860. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the final edition of the RECORD a statement which I am preparing, on the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO FILE INTERIM REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT PERIOD

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or the full committee, be authorized to file interim reports during the adjourned period of the Eightieth Congress, and that they be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMISSION FOR INSERTION OF MATERIAL IN APPENDIX

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the final issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Eightieth Congress certain material which I now have in the process of preparation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION OF APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 264, which corrects an error in a date in the last paragraph of Senate Resolution 81, of the Eightieth Congress, agreed to June 17, 1947, authorizing an investigation of the appointment of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 264) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the last paragraph of Senate Resolution 81, Eightieth Congress, agreed to June 17, 1947 (authorizing an investigation of the appointment of postmasters) is hereby further amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 15, 1949."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it is obvious that no investigation could be made and a report received as early as June 30, 1948. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN ARTICLES IMPORTED TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the House has passed House Joint Resolution 433, permitting the free entry of certain articles to promote international good will, and for other purposes. Normally it would be referred to the Senate Committee on Finance. Obviously there is no time to process the joint resolution. I have a message from the executive department of the Government urging that the joint resolution be acted upon, if that is at all possible. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 433) permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That any articles, including approximately 48 railroad cars and incidental equipment, certified by the Secretary of State as being donated in promotion of international good will by the people or Government of the Republic of France for sale for charitable purposes in the United States or for presentation, in the case of the railroad equipment, to noncommercial organizations in the United States may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption free of customs duties, fees, or charges, internal-revenue taxes, and marking or other import requirements or restrictions.

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of its enactment and prior to the close of December 31, 1948.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Colorado if he knows of any objection to the joint resolution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I know of no objection to it. If there is objection, I shall immediately withdraw the request.

The purpose of the joint resolution is to permit the Republic of France to send some railroad equipment into this country and some incidental equipment which ultimately will either be given away or sold for charity in this country as a gesture of good will from the Republic of France to this country. I know of no objection to the joint resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVOLVING FUND FOR PURCHASE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND RAW MATERIALS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2376) for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold, which were, on page 1, to strike out lines 3 to 10, inclusive, and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to issue notes from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed in the aggregate outstanding at any time $150,000,000. Each such note shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the note. Payment of the purchase price of such notes and repayments thereof by the Secretary of the Army shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. The proceeds of these notes shall be used by the Secretary of the Army, or his duly authorized representatives, as a revolving fund for the purpose of (a) purchasing natural fibers (including"; on page 3, line 18, after "report", to insert "to the Congress", and on the same page, line 21, after "Congress", to insert "by concurrent resolution."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the House amendment provides a different means by which the Treasury will furnish the Army the money which is called for in the bill. I understand that the amendment will not permit the Army to secure this money at less than the actual cost to the United States. Therefore I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is this the bill about which the Senator spoke to me?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; this is the revolving fund for the purchase of fibers within the United States to be sold in Japan and other occupied countries.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I join in the request of the Senator from Vermont that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I asked to have it held a little while this morning until I could get the opinion of the Comptroller General, but the amendment seems to be satisfactory.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's action.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, are hides included in the amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. No. The bill is not changed otherwise than as indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1515, Senate bill 843, being a bill concerning the revenue of the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have made a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is in order.

The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 843) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will now consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is a bill imposing a 2-percent sales tax on the people of the District of Columbia. It also exempts from income taxes the first $8,000 of income. In addition, there are personal exemptions. I want Senators to know that this is a Republican bill, out and out, for the big man. The little fellow pays the price. That is it, in a nutshell.

Let us see what is going to happen when we impose a sales tax in a congested district such as the District of Columbia. I know what I would do if I owned a store like Hecht's in the District. I would move over to Virginia, and sell over there, and save 2 percent on everything I sold. Hecht's now has a store in Maryland.

The main question is, Is it right in principle? It is claimed that additional revenue is needed for the District of Columbia. I intend to read the entire bill. I want Senators to know just what is in it, and I shall read it all. Then I shall read the report, to let Senators know what they are facing.

Mr. President, I will yield to no one, even for a question. Senators can sit here and listen. I now read from the bill:

That this act divided into titles and sections may be cited as the "District of Columbia Sales and Compensating Use Tax of 1948."

TITLE I—SALES TAX

SEC. 1. Definitions.—When used in this title the following terms shall mean or include:

(a) "Person".—Includes an individual, partnership, society, association, joint-stock company, corporation, estate, receiver, trustee, assignee, referee, or any other person acting in a fiduciary or representative capacity, whether appointed by a court or otherwise, and any combination of individuals.

(b) "Vendor".—Includes a person selling property or rendering services upon the receipts from which a tax is imposed under section 2 of this title.

(c) "Purchaser".—Includes a person who purchases property or to whom are rendered services, receipts from which are taxable under section 2 of this title.

(d) "Receipt".—The amount of the sale price of any property or the charge for any service specified in section 2 of this title, valued in money, whether received in money or otherwise, including all receipts, cash, credits and property of any kind or nature, and also any amount for which credit is allowed by the vendor to the purchaser, without any deduction therefrom on account of the cost of the property sold, the cost of materials used, labor, transportation or service cost, interest or discount paid, taxes paid, or any other expense whatsoever.

(e) "Sale" or "selling".—Any transfer of title or possession or both, exchange or barter, license to use, license to consume, conditional or otherwise, in any manner or by any means whatsoever for a consideration, or any agreement therefor, and shall include the rendering of any service specified in section 2 of this title.

(f) "Tangible personal property".—Corporeal personal property of any nature.

(g) "Retail sale" or "sale at retail".—A sale to any person for any purpose other than for resale in the form of tangible personal property. A "sale or purchase at retail of tangible personal property" shall also be deemed to include the sale of the services of producing, fabricating, processing, printing, or imprinting tangible personal property, to a person who directly or indirectly furnishes the tangible personal property, not purchased by him for resale, upon which such services are performed; other than the rendering of services in connection with the repair, alteration, or reconditioning of tangible personal property on behalf of the owner thereof to refit it for the use for which it was originally produced.

Mr. President, I am reading this bill because I want the people here tonight to know just what it is, and because it

has so many details that will affect the people within the District of Columbia. The people will find that this bill will tax the little fellow every time. On small sales the proposed sales tax will sometimes run very high—not just 2 percent, but probably it will run as high as 8 or 10 percent, on small sales, catching the little fellow at every turn more and more, but letting out the big taxpayers. Of course, it will make no difference how big they are; they will get the $8,000 exemption to begin with. That is the Republican way of doing things.

I continue to read from the bill:

(h) "Semipublic institution".— Those charitable, educational, and religious institutions which are supported principally by public subscriptions or endowment or by appropriation made by the Congress of the United States and are not organized or operated for private gain.

(i) "Return".—Includes any return filed or required to be filed as herein provided.

(j) "District".—The District of Columbia.

(k) "Commissioners".—The Commissioners of the District or their duly authorized representatives.

(l) "Assessor".—The Assessor of the District or his duly authorized representatives.

(m) "Collector".—The Collector of Taxes of the District or his duly authorized representatives.

(n) "Food".—Cereals and cereal products; milk and milk products; candy and confectionery; ice cream and ice-cream products; meat and meat products; fish and fish products; eggs and egg products; vegetables and vegetable products; fruits, fruit products, and fruit juices; flavoring extracts, condiments, spices, and salt; sugar and sugar products; coffee and coffee substitutes; tea, cocoa and cocoa products; and ice when used for household consumption: "Food" shall not include spirituous or malt liquors, beer, soft drinks, and sodas and beverages such as are ordinarily dispensed at bars and soda fountains or in connection therewith, other than coffee, coffee substitutes, tea and cocoa.

Mr. President, I notice that something is said about whisky here. I wonder if Senators know that in the District of Columbia there is a tax of only 50 cents a gallon on whisky and 50 cents a barrel on beer. Still we are told that it is impossible to find any way by which to raise additional revenue for the District of Columbia, except by placing this proposed sales tax on the people who go out to buy clothes and shoes for little babies.

I continue to read:

SEC. 2. Imposition of tax.—Beginning 60 days after approval of this act but not prior to July 1, 1948, for the privilege of selling certain tangible personal property at retail as defined in this title and for the privilege of dispensing certain services as defined in this title, there is hereby imposed and there shall be paid a tax upon the amount of receipts from every sale of tangible personal property sold at retail in the District, including services rendered in connection therewith, computed as follows:

(a) On each sale where the price is from 14 cents to 50 cents, both inclusive, 1 cent;

(b) On each sale where the price is from 51 cents to $1, both inclusive, 2 cents;

(c) On each 50 cents of price or fraction thereof in excess of $1, 1 cent.

The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the purchaser.

The man who collects the tax should be prepared for an emergency. He should get a little box and put it by the cash register, so that every time he collects the tax he can put in in a box. He is going to have to pay that to the city. He must pay to the city the same amount he collects, otherwise he might be accused of taking something that does not belong to him.

SEC. 3. Exemptions.—Receipts from sales of the following and services rendered in connection therewith shall be exempt from the taxes imposed by this title:

(a) Sales to the United States or the District or any instrumentality thereof.

(b) Sales to a State or any of its political subdivisions if such State grants a similar exemption to the District. As used in this subsection, the term "State" means the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

(c) Sales to a semipublic institution.

(d) Sales of food for human consumption in the home or residence. It is not intended by this subsection to exempt from the tax sales of food for human consumption in restaurants, cafes, hotel dining rooms, taverns, night clubs, and similar establishments.

(e) Sales of drugs and medicines.

(f) Sales of motor-vehicle fuels upon the sale of which a tax is imposed by the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended or as may be hereafter amended.

(g) Sales of tickets for admission to places of amusements and sports.

(h) Sales of gas and electricity and services rendered incident therto: *Provided*, That the receipts from such sales and services are subject to a gross-receipts tax in force in the District during or for the period of time covered by any return required to be filed by the provisions of this title.

(i) Sales of transportation and telephone and telegraph service.

(j) Sales of property purchased by a utility or public-service company for use or consumption in furnishing a commodity or service: *Provided*, That the receipts from furnishing such commodity or service are subject to a gross-receipts tax in force in the District during or for the period of time covered by any return required to be filed by the provisions of this title.

(k) Sales of newspapers and magazines.

(l) Casual and isolated sales by a vendor who is not regularly engaged in the business of selling tangible personal property.

(m) Sales of livestock, poultry, seeds, feeds for livestock and poultry, fertilizers, lime, and land plaster used for agricultural purposes.

(n) Sales of advertising space and sales of radio advertising.

(o) Sales of food or beverages of any nature if made in any car composing a part of any train or in any aircraft or boat operating within the District in the course of interstate commerce.

(p) Sales of goods made pursuant to bona fide contracts entered into before the date of approval of this act: *Provided*, That there is a contract in writing signed by the buyer and seller which imposes an unconditional liability on the part of the buyer to purchase goods covered thereby, and an unconditional liability on the part of the seller to deliver a definite quantity of such goods at the contract price.

(q) Sales of natural or artificial gas, oil, electricity, solid fuel, or steam, to any purchaser for use in manufacturing, assembling, processing, or refining.

(r) Sales which the States would be without power to tax under the limitations of the Constitution of the United States.

(s) Sales of motor vehicles and trailers.

SEC. 4. Upon each taxable sale or service the tax to be collected shall be stated and charged separately from the sale price or charge for service and shown separately on any record thereof—

Just imagine what a time they are going to have keeping records—

at the time when the sale is made or evidence of sale issued or employed by the vendor and shall be paid by the purchaser to the vendor as trustee for and on account of the District, and the vendor shall be liable for the collection thereof and for the tax. The vendor shall be personally liable for the tax collected or required to be collected under this title, and the vendor shall have the same right in respect to collecting the tax from the purchaser, or in respect to nonpayment of the tax by the purchaser, as if the tax were a part of the purchase price of the property or service and payable at the time of the sale: *Provided, however*, That the Collector shall be joined as a party plaintiff in any action or proceeding brought by the vendor to collect the tax.

SEC. 5. The tax imposed by this title shall be paid upon all sales made and services rendered beginning 60 days after approval of this act but not prior to July 1, 1948, although made or rendered under a contract dated prior thereto. Where a service is billed on either a monthly or other term basis, the payment of such bill for such month or other period of time shall be a receipt subject to the tax herein imposed. The Commissioners may provide by regulation that the tax upon receipts from sales on the installment plan may be paid in full at the time the agreement therefor is made or on the account of each installment and upon the date when such installment is due.

Poor little fellows. The tax is collected before they get paid. This is a regular Republican bill. I think the Republicans should write it into their platform. I imagine they will do that. How well I remember when we were debating the income-tax bill. We had a hard time getting any exemptions for the little fellows. But the big boys got some reductions in their taxes. There will be much said about the income taxes after the conventions. That shows definitely the principles of the two parties. One looks after the rich, and other looks after the poor, the people who are struggling to make a living. I predict that if the Republicans capture the Presidency of the United States, we shall have a new kind of tax throughout the United States—a sales tax, something that will hit all the little people, and then the Republicans will take the income taxes off entirely.

The Commissioners may provide by regulation for the exclusion of amounts representing sales where the contract of sales has been canceled, or the property returned, or the receipt has been ascertained to be worthless or, in case the tax has been paid upon such receipt, for a credit or refund of the amount of the tax upon such receipt upon application therefor as provided in section 13 of this title.

SEC. 6. Presumptions.—For the purpose of the proper administration of this title and to prevent evasion of the tax hereby imposed, it shall be presumed that all receipts for property and services mentioned in this title are subject to tax until the contrary is established, and the burden of proving that a receipt is not taxable hereunder shall be upon the vendor or the purchaser. Unless the vendor shall have taken from the purchaser a certificate signed by and bearing the name and address of the purchaser and the number of his registration certificate to the effect that the property or service was purchased for resale, the sale shall be deemed to be a taxable sale at retail.

SEC. 7. No person engaged in the business of selling property or services the receipts from which are subject to tax under this title shall advertise or hold out to the public in any manner directly or indirectly that the tax imposed by this title is not considered as an element in the price to the purchaser.

SEC. 8. Collection of tax from purchaser.—The tax shall be paid by the purchaser to the vendor as trustee for and on account of the District, and the vendor shall be liable for the collection thereof for and on account of the District.

SEC. 9. Every vendor shall keep records of receipts and of the tax payable thereon in such form as the Commissioners may by regulation require. Such records shall be offered for inspection and examination at any time upon demand by the Assessor and shall be preserved for a period of 3 years.

SEC. 10. Returns.—(a) Every vendor shall file with the Assessor a return of his receipts and of the taxes payable thereon for monthly, quarterly, or other periods as the Commissioner may by regulation prescribe, or as the Assessor may require as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Such returns shall be filed within 20 days from the expiration of the period covered thereby. The Assessor may permit or require returns to be made by other periods and upon such dates as he may specify: *Provided*, That the receipts during any year shall be included in returns covering such year and no other. If the Assessor deems it necessary in order to insure the payment of the tax imposed by this title, he may require returns to be made for shorter periods than those prescribed pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section, and upon such dates as he may specify.

(c) The form of returns shall be prescribed by the Assessor and shall contain such information as he may deem necessary for the proper administration of this title. The Assessor may require amended returns to be filed within 20 days after notice and to contain the information specified in the notice.

SEC. 11. Payment of tax.—(a) At the time of filing a return of receipts each vendor shall pay to the Collector the taxes imposed by this title upon the receipts required to be included in such return, as well as all other moneys collected by the vendor acting or purporting to act under the provisions of this title even though it be judicially determined that the tax collected is invalidly imposed. All the taxes for the period for which a return is required to be filed shall be due from the vendor and payable to the Collector on the date limited for the filing of the return for such period, without regard to whether a return is filed or whether the return which is filed shows correctly the amount of receipts and the taxes due thereon.

(b) The vendor shall be entitled to apply and credit against the amount of tax payable by him an amount equal to 3 percent of the gross tax to the remitted by him to the Collector in payment for the vendor's expense in the collection and remittance of said tax: *Provided, however*, That the credit allowed by this subsection shall be denied to any vendor who shall fail or refuse to file his return within the time prescribed by regulation or as required by the Assessor as provided in section 10 of this title.

Some of these people will have to employ a bookkeeper to keep their accounts in some little business in which they are engaged in order to keep them correctly. If they do not do that they will probably lose their 3 percent, and also they will be penalized by heavy fines. I will read the penalty provision in a little while.

SEC. 12. Determination of tax.—If a return required by this title is not filed, or if a return when filed is incorrect or insufficient, the amount of tax due shall be determined by the Assessor from such information as may be obtainable. Notice of such determination shall be given to the person liable for the collection of the tax from the purchaser and payment thereof to the Collector. Such determination shall finally and irrevocably fix the tax unless the person against whom it is assessed, within 30 days after the giving of notice of such determination, shall apply in writing to the Assessor for a hearing, or unless the Assessor of his own motion shall redetermine the same. After such hearing or redetermination the Assessor shall give notice of his final determination to the person against whom the tax is assessed.

SEC. 13. Refunds.—(a) Except as to any tax finally determined as provided in section 12, where any tax has been erroneously or illegally collected the tax shall be refunded if application is filed with the Assessor for such refund within 1 year from the payment thereof. For like cause and within the same period a refund may be made upon the certificates of the Assessor and the Collector. Whenever a refund is made upon the certificates of the Assessor and the Collector, the Assessor and Collector shall state their reasons therefor in writing. Such application may be made by the person upon whom such tax was imposed and who has actually paid the tax. Such application may also be made by a vendor who has collected and paid such tax to the Collector: *Provided*, That the application is made within 1 year of the payment by the purchaser to the vendor, but no actual refund of moneys shall be made to such vendor until he shall first establish to the satisfaction of the Assessor, under such regulations as the Commissioners may prescribe, that the vendor has repaid to the purchaser the amount for which the application for refund is made. In lieu of any refund required to be made, a credit may be allowed therefor on payment due from the applicant.

(b) Application for a refund or credit made as herein provided shall be deemed an application for a revision of any tax, penalty, or interest complained of and the Assessor may receive evidence with respect thereto. After making his determination of whether any refund shall be made, the Assessor shall give notice thereof to the applicant.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, provided it does not count on my time.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the able Senator as to how long he expects to speak on the tax bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not know how long it is going to take me to speak. I am going to try to speak long enough so that there will not be a sales tax in the District. That is my object. I think one of the most outrageous things would be to put this tax on under the circumstances.

Mr. LUCAS. I am against the sales tax. I was just making inquiry of the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will do anything to keep this bill from becoming a law.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Provided it does not take me off the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. It has been rumored that there are some people who have in mind the adoption of a sales tax for the District of Columbia with a view to making that the spearhead for the national sales tax. Would the Senator from South Carolina care to comment on that?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad the Senator from Florida brought that subject up. This is our Capital City, the Capital of the Government of the United States, and the object now, as I understand it, is that if they can get a sales tax here within the District of Columbia within the Capital of the United States, then the Federal Government, the Republican Party, if they capture the Presidency and also the Congress——

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not expect them to do that, does he?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not expect them to do that, but they have in view, as I understand, to use this as a spearhead to put on a sales tax in the entire Nation. That is one reason why I am fighting this so hard. I do not want it in the District, although I live right over in Maryland. I do not live in the District at the present time, but I do sympathize with the people who live in the District, and will have to purchase things in the District, especially the little man who earns probably $2,000 or $2,500 a year.

As will be seen from a reading of the bill it is proposed to give an $8,000 exemption from the income tax. An individual making from $4,000 to $8,000 would not pay any income tax, but he may have a house full of children, and every time he bought his children shoes he would have to pay a sales tax. Every time he bought a pair of socks at 15 cents he would have to pay 1 cent more to cover the sales tax. If one were to count up all the purchases large and small it would be found that they would amount to about 6½ cents on every dollar—more than 6 percent. It is expected that in all there would be collected $17,000,000 by the imposition of the sales tax. I cannot see any fairness in such a tax. Show me one who favors the tax and I will immediately say that he must be a Republican, because only Republicans would believe in such taxation.

I begin to read section 14:

SEC. 14. Any person aggrieved by a final determination of tax as provided in section 12 or denial of an application for refund of any tax under section 13 may, within 90 days from the date of the final determination of the tax or from the date of the denial of an application for refund, as the case may be, appeal to the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia in the same manner and to the same extent as set forth in sections 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of title IX of the act entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, and for other purposes", approved May 16, 1938, as amended, and as the same may hereafter be amended. The remedy provided in this section shall not be deemed to take away from the taxpayer any remedy which he might have under any other provision of law, but no suit by the taxpayer for the recovery of any part of any tax shall be instituted in any court if the taxpayer has elected to file an appeal with respect to such tax with the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 15. The taxes imposed by this title and penalties and interest thereon may be collected by the Collector——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will yield for a question, provided I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be understood.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree to that condition. My question is whether the Senator from South Carolina would yield to permit the Senator from Illinois to make a few remarks, with the understanding that if the motion is again brought up the Senator from South Carolina will have the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not want my yielding, even with the understanding that I may regain the floor, to count against me as one of the speeches which I am entitled to make. I want that understood.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from South Carolina is speaking on a motion to take up a bill. He has not yet made one speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the motion should prevail, the Senator would be entitled to about four speeches in all.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I realize that, Mr. President. The reason I secured the floor now was so I could make two speeches on each motion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, if I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will proceed.

Mr. MORSE. I make my parliamentary inquiry with the understanding that it will in no way change the present position of the Senator from South Carolina respecting his rights or position on the floor with regard to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair may not be the occupant of the chair when the matter arises again, and the present occupant of the chair, therefore, is unable to make any guaranty respecting the matter.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina: I will yield, providing I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PEPPER. Would it not be possible to accomplish the purpose by unanimous-consent agreement, which would be binding upon any occupant of the chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; assuming the unanimous consent is forthcoming.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the acting majority leader might propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina may yield the floor for the time being in order that the Senator from Illinois may make a few remarks, and that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Illinois the Senator from South Carolina may regain the floor without losing any rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is that agreeable to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. In order that we may understand what the situation may be, I should like to inquire of the Senator from South Carolina how long he proposes to discuss the motion.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not know how long I may be able to continue. I was in the same clothes I now have on all of last night. I did not get to bed last night. I wish I was fresh; then the Senator from Washington would be here until Monday morning, when the convention opens in Philadelphia.

Mr. CAIN. One further question, so I may try to reconcile my right to object. Is the Senator from Washington to understand that the Senator from South Carolina, who in my considered opinion is a very healthy, strong person, is going to speak for as long as he has strength to stand on his feet?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is my purpose to attempt to explain the bill in every detail before I finish. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will proceed with that understanding.

CARL A. HATCH, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to express my deep sense of appreciation for the kindness on the part of the acting majority leader, as well as my appreciation to my dear friend from South Carolina for yielding to me. He will not lose any rights by doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois suspend while we have a little order for this very important speech?

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair for obtaining order, and for his compliment.

Before I begin reading the manuscript and making a few remarks as I go along, I wish at this time to pay my respects to an individual Member of this body who is about to say farewell.

I speak, of course, of the distinguished and able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], whom we all know. He will not be with us next year because some time ago he issued a statement in which he told the people of his State that he would not be a candidate for reelection. In my service in the United States Senate I have learned to know the distinguished Senator from New Mexico very well. I say without fear of successful contradiction that the Senator from New Mexico has proved himself to be one of the most constructive, able, sincere, and trustworthy legislators I have ever had the good fortune to serve with in my 13 years in Congress. I regret, as I am sure all other Senators do, that he is leaving the service of the United States Senate. I wish for him every success in his new undertaking, whatever it may be. I am sure I speak for all Members of the Senate when I pay this inadequate tribute to our beloved colleague and friend.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am happy to hear the comments of the senior Senator from Illinois in regard to our distinguished colleague.

Mr. President, with the utmost regret I realize that when we reconvene next January 3, we shall not have with us one of our most able and respected Members, who has highly distinguished himself while in the Senate.

He has stood unswervingly for the rights and welfare of the mass of our people; he has fought for the purity of our governmental processes and of the practices of politics. The act which bears his name was his major tangible effort to foster and assure fair and honest elections. He has established an enviable reputation as a student and practitioner of the constitutional operations of government.

It has been my pleasure to serve with him on the floor, in committees, and elsewhere. I have observed him under the wide variety of acid tests which bring out the true character, spirit, and honor of a man. I know from personal knowledge of his ability, his energy, his continuing desire to be helpful, and his willingness to understand and to work with others.

He has elsewhere distinguished himself as assistant attorney general of his State, as collector of internal revenue, and as district judge. His proved ability as lawyer and jurist has been repeatedly recognized by all who worked with him, whether members of the bench, bar, or laity.

Mr. President, I shall miss my close friend and colleague from my neighboring State, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I very sincerely join with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] in his remarks commending the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] for the exceptional and outstanding service he has rendered as ranking member of the minority group on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

As chairman of the committee I wish to state that it has been a very pleasant and memorable experience to serve with the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico. I can say the same about each member of this committee. Not once do I recall that personal or partisan matters were permitted to mar the hearings or discussions of the committee. The Senator, Mr. HATCH, is voluntarily not a candidate for reelection, a rather unusual situation, especially with one in his physical and mental prime, as is the case with the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, each member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs joins with me, as I am sure do all other Members of the Senate, in expressing our appreciation of his friendly association and cooperation in the work of this great legislative body. Mr. President, likewise, we all join in wishing him health and happiness on through the many years of useful service we see ahead for him.

ILLINOIS POSTMASTERS—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, these are the closing hours of this Republican-controlled Congress, which has distinguished itself, not only by its inept handling of its heavy legislative responsibilities, but also by its shabby and insolent treatment of individuals who have had the misfortune to become the subject of its abuse.

It is most distasteful to me to be forced to reply to vicious and malicious charges made by one of the less eminent Members of this body on the floor of the Senate in the early hours of this day. Yet, I cannot under any circumstances permit the record to stand as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has left it. In order to justify and defend his dictatorial and partisan handling of postmasters' nominations in the State of Illinois, the senior Senator from North Dakota saw fit to attack me through the members of my family. How characteristic the action, and how typical the reaction.

The chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has seen fit, after his committee reported the nominations in question, to take it upon himself to hold up these nominations in defiance of the will of his committee.

Mr. President, I seriously contend that the time has arrived when a rule must be adopted in the United States Senate making it mandatory that any clerk of any committee report to the Senate the favorable action of that committee upon any bill, resolution, or appointment, and that there should be a penalty on the clerk for failure to do so, thereby enjoining dictatorial and totalitarian methods of chairmen of committees who have no regard for proper and orderly procedure.

Mr. President, because I would not stoop to the tactics used by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I followed parliamentary procedure and filed resolutions for the purpose of discharging the committee from the further consideration of some 40 nominations, 28 of them being veterans of World War I and World War II, hoping to achieve by regular and parliamentary procedure what the committee had tried to accomplish and failed because of the pocket veto of the chairman of the committee.

It is apparent, Mr. President, that this parliamentary procedure antagonized the Senator from North Dakota when he was confronted with the necessity of obeying the rules of the Senate instead of following his own rules. The Senator from North Dakota descended to a cheap, partisan, low, and personal attack on two members of my family who had been appointed postmasters in Illinois in 1943 and 1946 and duly confirmed by the Senate.

He charges in one of the statements, "dirty politics in the appointment of postmasters in Illinois," thereby, through innuendo, condemning the Senator from Illinois and defaming the good name of that great State. If I were the Senator from North Dakota, I believe I would be the last man in the Senate to talk about dirty politics anywhere, at any time.

The Senator from North Dakota chose not to discuss the nominations of the veterans from whom he is withholding employment, and whose cause is the point at issue. He did not mention one disabled veteran after another who had placed as No. 1 on the eligible register, and are still waiting for an opportunity to serve their communities. But, in order to throw up a smoke screen and in order to make a personal attack on me, the Senator went back into history for the subject of his challenge.

Mr. President, I recall Senate Resolution 81, under which the Senator from North Dakota got $35,000 to make an investigation as to political activities in civil service; to determine whether any postmasters, under threat of losing their positions, were forced to contribute to political funds; whether there was any attempt to compel civil-service employees to violate the Hatch Act; but I never understood that the spirit or the letter of that resolution permitted the Senator from North Dakota to send his political, partisan, prejudicial snoopers to investigate members of the family of a United States Senator serving in the same body with him. I never realized that the Senator from North Dakota was setting up a little gestapo to spy and snoop on cases that were settled long before the Republicans came into power.

In his discussion of my brother-in-law and brother, respectively holding post offices in Illinois, he made many queer, unsupported, and outrageous statements.

In connection with the appointment of Hardy E. Altig as postmaster at Cullom, Ill., the chairman stated flatly that he tried to get the files but could not get them; then he proceeded to quote facts and figures, and grades which, from his own admission, must have been made up from some other source than the official files on the case. He made specific charges of upgrading and downgrading of applicants at Cullom, and quoted numerical ratings in his harangue, and, yet, from his own admission, he was unable to obtain any files on this case from the Civil Service Commission and the Post Office Department, and the query is—How did the political snoopers of Senator LANGER get this information? Where did it come from? I have my own ideas, Mr. President.

But, this so-called upgrading and downgrading is an amazing and amusing thing. The records of the Cullom post office show that the Commission certified an eligible register from an examination held February 15, 1941. The register shows that Jerome W. Kiley had 80.63; LaVern Floyd Haag had 78.75; J. Virgil Fraher, 78.13; Sylvester J. Kiley was given a rating of 77.38; H. E. Altig, present postmaster, had a grade of 76.25; Grover C. Stucker, veteran, had a grade of 75.

In other words, when the list was established, there were four applicants with a higher grade than Mr. Altig. Is it not a rather strange phenomenon that if someone manipulated the rating of Mr. Altig, as the Senator from North Dakota would want the Senate to believe, that manipulator would place Mr. Altig fifth on the eligible register when, under the law, only the first three on the eligible register are within reach for appointment? The so-called manipulators were certainly poor manipulators if they could not get Mr. Altig above the fifth spot on the register.

But, Mr. President, this is all tommyrot, balderdash, and utterly without any foundation. Today I communicated with the Civil Service Commission, and they advised me that Mr. Altig was rated 80 on experience and was rated 72.50 on the written examination. These two ratings, added together, gave him a gross rating of 152.50, which when divided by two gave him a final rating of 76.25. This was the original, the final, and the only rating ever given him by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission advised that there was absolutely no juggling of his rating. It was never changed from beginning to end. Mr. President, I am sure that the majority of the United States Senate believe the word of the Civil Service Commission on this so-called fantastic juggling of ratings as disclosed by the Senator from North Dakota. It appears that the snoopers of the Civil Service Committee were the real jugglers in this case.

The Senator from North Dakota stated that while Mr. Altig was upgraded, the Commission downgraded the veteran, Mr. Stucker, 10 points. I checked that also, and this is what the Civil Service Commission said: Mr. Stucker received a grade of 70 on the written examination, and a grade of 70 on experience. These, added together, gave him a gross rating of 140, which, when divided by two, gave him a general average of 70, barely a passing grade. However, his 5 points for veteran's preference brought him up to 75. They state emphatically that there never was any attempt to downgrade him; 75 was his first, final, and only rating. Again, Mr. President, can it be the snoopers of the Civil Service Committee who are doing the juggling?

It may be interesting to know how Mr. Altig became postmaster, since he was fifth on the list. The facts are these: Sylvester J. Kiley, the postmaster, was disqualified after a long investigation by the Civil Service Commission; Mr. Haag went into the military service, and Mr. Fraher withdrew, placing Mr. Altig second on the list. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois was very, very happy to appoint his brother-in-law; but he was appointed honestly; he was appointed fairly, notwithstanding the inferences and the innuendoes of the Senator from North Dakota to the contrary. Of course, I am sure that the Senator from North Dakota has never at any time shown the slightest partiality in the selection of members of his family for a political appointment under any political office that he has held throughout his stormy political career.

Mr. President, let us see what kind of a postmaster Mr. Altig has been, in view of the scurrilous and scandalous statements made about a man whom the Senator from North Dakota does not even know.

On March 20, 1945, the Post Office Department rated Mr. Hardy E. Altig 84.4. In July 1946, they gave him a rating of 94.5. On the last inspection of his office, he was rated 98. That was on May 19, 1948. He has shown consistent improvement, and all of the inspector's reports show that he is an excellent postmaster, giving satisfactory service. There have been no complaints from the patrons of the office. The only complaints—political, prejudicial, partisan, captious, and cheap—come from the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, in discussing the appointment of a postmaster at Abingdon, where my brother, Dr. J. Wiley Lucas, serves, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service resorted to the worst kind of double-talk and trickery in order to confuse United States Senators. I quote him as follows:

Now we come to another post office in the town of Abingdon, Ill. The postmaster is J. Wiley Lucas, I believe his name is. In this case, an examination for postmaster, second-class office, was held in December 1944. There being no eligible, a second examination was held in March 1946. Only one eligible was secured, the acting postmaster, with a rating of 81.70, including 10 points for being a veteran's widow. She was appointed in that town, which was not Abingdon; but in Abingdon an examination for postmaster, second-class office, was held in August 1945.

In that language of utter confusion and chaos, the Senator from North Dakota left the impression that somehow a veteran's widow had been mistreated in this case. Mr. President, no examination for postmaster at Abingdon was held in December 1944. No veteran's widow ever took an examination at that time in Abingdon for postmaster. In the examination for postmaster at Abingdon in August of 1945, no veteran's widow made application for the position, and no failure on the part of my brother to pass the examination appears in any of the official documents in my files on this case. The Senator from North Dakota indirectly charged in his speech this morning that Dr. Lucas' grades were rerated.. I called the Civil Service Commission on that matter, and this is what they told me: Dr. Lucas took a civil-service examination on August 23, 1945. It was the only examination he was ever given. He made a grade of 70.23, which was passing. That was the only rating and the final rating he was assigned, and it was never changed upwards or downwards. Let me give a few more facts: In 1939, I recommended to the Post Office Department that Arthur L. Knable, who had been serving as postmaster there, be reappointed when his term expired. Mr. Knable continued to serve until the time of his death in 1945.

After Knable's death, Dr. J. Wiley Lucas was installed as acting postmaster at Abingdon on April 1, 1945. On August 23, 1945, the Civil Service Commission held an examination, and Dr. Lucas was the only applicant who had filed and who took the examination. On February 12, 1946, the Civil Service Commission certified Dr. Lucas as the only eligible for that position, and he was appointed permanent postmaster at Abingdon.

Since the Senator from North Dakota insulted the intelligence of my good brother, I think the record should show the ratings assigned to Dr. Lucas by the post-office inspectors since the beginning of his service as postmaster in Abingdon:

June 1, 1945 (2 months after installation as acting postmaster)	86.8
Oct. 17, 1946	91.5
Oct. 7 and 8, 1947	98.0

His ratings have shown consistent improvement, and all of the inspector's reports indicate that he is a good postmaster, conversant with his duties, and pleasing to the public. There have been no complaints whatever about his services as postmaster.

Mr. President, Mr. Altig and Dr. Lucas are honorable men. They are honest men. There are no ugly scars on their records. They are efficient postmasters. They are a credit to the communities in which they reside.

They have not been hurt by this attack, because they are guilty of nothing for which they could be attacked. But let me remind the Senator from North Dakota of the wise old adage that he who lives in a glass house should not throw stones.

Mr. President, let us get back to the postmaster nominations the Senate should be discussing—the postmaster nominations that should be on the calendar now, instead of in the pocket of the Senator from North Dakota. These are the ones certain Senators do not want to talk about, because it does not make a very pretty picture.

I realize that the matter I discuss is only one small defect among the mass of faults which comprise the record by which this Republican Congress will be known—a record on domestic issues that is so clumsy and reactionary that it would be ludicrous, were it not for the fact that it dealt with critical national problems, the solution of which are indispensable to a successful foreign policy.

It is indeed tragic that among those who have suffered at the hands of the Eightieth Congress is a group of American citizens, the majority of them veterans or their widows, who have done nothing to deserve the ill-treatment they have received. They have engaged in no activities for which they could be called on the carpet and persecuted for political reasons, as was Howard Hughes. There is nothing in their records which would justify their being dragged before the Un-American Activities Committee. No; their exposure to the misuse this Republican Congress is capable of applying to individuals is indeed an anomaly, for it came about because of their sincere desire to serve their Government. One and all, they aspired to become employees of the Government, and, what is more, they proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that they were fully qualified and competent to discharge the duties sought. The only crime of these good American citizens, who are conscientious, useful members of their communities, hundreds of miles from the whirlpool of Washington politics, is that they wanted to become postmasters under a Democratic administration.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, I heard the colloquy on the floor this afternoon, learning what happened to good men in the Senator's State.

Many of these unfortunate citizens of my State, and of other States, have had prior service with the Government—in uniform. But let it be said they had no such difficulties in getting into uniform as they are now experiencing in going to work for Uncle Sam as civilians. One applicant after another, wounded and disabled in fighting for the Stars and Stripes, fighting for freedom and independence, fighting for the continuation of a free and untrammeled Senate, finds his rights as a free American citizen jeopardized, and even nullified, by the dictatorial and totalitarian methods of the Republican chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Will it be the purpose of the Senator to press his motion tonight to discharge the committee, which motion was filed last night?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my able friend, I do not know what the parliamentary situation is. I doubt that it could be done tonight. There has not been another legislative day or another executive session since I filed the motion to discharge, and unless it is done by unanimous consent, I doubt that it could be done, if we adjourn tonight.

Others in this group have been serving the Government as civil-service employees, and the question now is whether or not they are to be promoted in the service. All of them have met the high standards set by the Federal Government as prerequisites for entering its service. They have taken and passed examinations, and in this open competition many of them have proved themselves better qualified than all other applicants by placing first on the eligible register.

But, strange as it may seem, all this has been ignored by the Republican-controlled Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service which theoretically is the guardian of civil service, and protector of the merit system. What a travesty on justice. What a mockery of civil service under the leadership of the Senator from North Dakota.

Stranger still, this action has been taken after the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service conducted an investigation through its own highly paid and partisan employees into the lives, the records, and the qualifications of these nominees I am discussing. Mr. President, this is the first time in the history of the Congress that a committee handling nominations of this type has sent out its own private snoopers, and acted on their partisan, prejudiced recommendations, rather than on the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission and of the citizens of the communities in which the applicants reside. But, despite this political witch hunt, the committee itself says it can find nothing wrong with the background, the education, the patriotism, or the ability of more than 40 Illinois men and women whose economic future it would like to destroy, solely for political pelf and gain. Shame on you, my Republican brethren.

What can be the reason for this unconventional action on the part of a committee whose duty it is to see to it that the Federal Government obtains the very best in the way of personnel? Thereby hangs a tale. I have been informed, and on the reliable authority of the membership of the committee, that at a meeting some days ago these postmaster nominations were reported out by vote of the committee. What happened after that is obscure. The nominations failed to appear on the Senate Calendar. I made inquiry and ran into a maze of political chicanery which would challenge the ingenuity of even the best investigators of this notoriously famous investigating Congress. Out of the labyrinth through which the nominations have traveled since the committee action, I have been able to trace only a few definite paths. I am told that subsequent to the committee action of which I have spoken, the committee met again and voted to report out all postmaster nominations to which no objection has been made. Up to that point I had been able to ascertain definitely that no objection had been made to the postmaster nominees of whom I speak. No objection, that is, from their communities, or from the committee itself.

Casting about for what possible objections could prevent these patriotic and splendid Illinoisans from having their nominations placed on the Executive Calendar, I asked my colleague from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] on the floor of the Senate if he had objected. His reply was, "I do not know who they are and to that extent I have not approved them."

Mr. President, I had every reason to believe that all of these applicants for postmaster jobs would be confirmed when they were passed by the committee. Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina, a member of the committee, called and gave me the names of those that had been favorably reported. Obviously, I was very happy. Later when these applicants failed to reach the Executive Calendar I again interviewed Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina to determine what was wrong. He advised me that Senator LANGER told him that Senator BROOKS, of Illinois, was objecting. I did, however, take the matter up with Senator LANGER and the statement of Senator JOHNSTON was corroborated by him. However, on the next evening the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service completely reversed himself and took the full and complete responsibility for their failure to be reported from the committee.

I should like to ask my friend from South Carolina whether the statement I made is true and correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The statement is entirely correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that from the eligible lists of the departments and information spread upon the records about these applicants that my colleague will join me in protesting the obvious discrimination being practiced against our Illinois veterans and comrades by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say to the Senator that I am glad at this late hour to have him ask for my cooperation. In 8 years in the Senate this is the first time I have heard even an intimation of his asking or offering to cooperate with the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a very lovely speech. I yielded for a question only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may still retain the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I know I can retain the floor, and I thank the Chair for that information. I thought I had the floor.

Mr. President, of course the Senator from Illinois can either cooperate or not cooperate on these postmaster appointments. He has given me an indication in the answer which he made that he does not want to cooperate at this late hour in getting these postmasters out of the pocket of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, so that their nominations may be confirmed and they can go on their way.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield for any more speeches. The Senator has told me that he does not want to cooperate.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I did not say that I did not want to cooperate. I said I was pleased that my colleague had asked me at last to cooperate on something.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have been getting evasive answers like that for years from my colleague. I sincerely hope that with the information spread upon the record the confirmations can be made.

Mr. President, I am very happy that the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois said what he did, because in view of the evidence which has been presented here, after the statement he made, the senior Senator from Illinois and the veterans who are eligible for these positions will know exactly where to place the responsibility for their failure to achieve confirmation, notwithstanding the statement of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] last night to the contrary, in which he assumed all responsibility.

Veterans and others are being flagrantly discriminated against by not being permitted to receive the Federal appointments for which they qualified.

Every responsible, thinking citizen of Illinois will recognize that, although there is no good reason from the standpoint of qualifications, or of good character, that these nominees should not be commissioned in the Federal posts they seek, they are being deprived for political reasons of the opportunity of Federal employment offered without discrimination to all American citizens. And, what is even more repelling, veterans who have fought overseas and come back disabled are being deprived of the preferential treatment given them by law enacted when the Democrats were in control of the Congress.

It is impossible for me to understand what purpose the Republicans could have in doing this, since a veteran on an eligible register cannot be passed over for any reason under existing law. They can gain nothing by holding up these appointments. Even though the Republicans may hope to come into control of the executive branch next year, they must know that they cannot appoint as postmasters anyone but the veterans whose nominations are now pending unless it is their intention to change the law to such an extent that a disabled veteran who is No. 1 on the eligible register can be passed over for political reasons.

Mr. President, it would be amusing if it were not so tragic to watch the performance of the Republicans in control of the United States Senate who pay loud and voluble lip service to the interests of the men who defended this country in her hour of need, and of their widows, when they have an opportunity to reward these heroes with a small Government position. Nothing is too good for the veterans, they proclaim. They can bandy words at great length about what members of the armed services have done for their country, wax loquacious on their sacrifices, their wounds, and their sufferings, proclaim to the world that veterans are entitled to every consideration it is within the power of the Federal Government to give, and that they must never be discriminated against—oh, never!

But, Mr. President, 28 veterans in Illinois are being discriminated against. Five of them are disabled, wounded veterans from World War II, but their nominations cannot get through the United States Senate because of sordid Republican politics. They stand No. 1 on the list.

What happens when a disabled veteran in Illinois asks for appointment as a postmaster in his community in order that he may take care of himself and his family and lead a peaceful life among his friends and neighbors after his soul-racking experiences away from them? He finds himself in another fight, face to face, this time, with a political enemy.

Mr. President, these Illinois soldiers and sailors and marines whose cause I have been championing alone—I say again, alone—are still fighting for their rights in peace as they did in war. I know that if the majority, or certain members of it, have decided that these good citizens of Illinois are not to be given the Federal positions they seek, and to which they are entitled, that settles it for the moment. But those responsible for blocking these nominations have not administered a final defeat to these postmaster nominees who have never known what it was to be licked in a fight. I have done my best to give them what they deserve. I shall continue the fight even after this Congress adjourns. These political casualties may not be skilled in the devious ways of political battles, but, Mr. President, this insult to

their patriotism will not impair their fighting ability. They will some day serve their communities as permanent postmasters, and that time will come when a Democratic Senate takes control in 1949.

That time will come next January, when we inaugurate a Democratic President of the United States and a Democratic Congress.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES TAX

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina this question. If I withdraw my motion to bring up the sales tax for the District of Columbia, will he yield the floor?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I certainly will.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion.

CARL A. HATCH, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it now appears that the Eightieth Congress will come to an end this evening. Several of the present Members will not be with us when the Congress is again assembled. Of course we shall miss their advice and sound judgment. Our association with Senators who are leaving the Senate has been most pleasant and profitable.

I should like to say a word or two about my personal friend and colleague, Senator CARL A. HATCH, of New Mexico. My colleague, by his great patriotism, intelligence, and diligence, has reached national and international greatness, with honor to himself and the Nation. He has also earned the great respect of this body.

I have known Senator HATCH and his family for many years. I have been his colleague since 1935. Our association has been one of mutual respect and consideration. In many instances we have differed on legislation and official votes, but never an unkind word has escaped the lips of either one of us. I shall miss him. The Senate will miss him. New Mexico will miss him. The country and the world will miss his advice and counsel. I know that in the future he and his fine family will be the recipients of that happiness which comes only to those who have lived well and have done their duty well. I wish him only the best.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not want this session to close without expressing deep regret that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is leaving the Senate.

Those of us who have been privileged to associate with him in intimate contact and to know him well know how fine he is. We know the loss to his State and to the Nation in his departure from this body. Diligent and able in the performance of his duties in committees and on this floor, gifted of speech, and with an understanding heart, possessing the vision to see and the will to act, he has played a yeoman's part in the important matters that have come before the Senate during the epic years that he has served here.

We shall miss him. We shall miss him as a friend and an associate. We shall miss the wisdom of his counsel, the example of his high purpose, the courage, the character, the distinction of his service. No matter how powerful the lobby, how overwhelming the propaganda, how strong the pressure, he has held fast to his convictions and has served all the people. He has kept the faith. He has been the captain of his soul.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I would not want these words of commendation concerning our colleague the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] to go without a word on my part. I suppose that no two Senators have been closer personally or officially than have the Senator from New Mexico and I. I have learned not only to feel a very high personal regard for him as a friend but to have the utmost confidence in his sound judgment and his integrity, morally, mentally, and politically. Among all the Members of the Senate, I have the greatest pain, sorrow, and regret that the Senator from New Mexico has decided to relinquish his seat here in the Senate. I wish for him, in whatever he does hereafter, the greatest possible success, long life, and happiness.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR HATCH

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, during the day several of my colleagues in the Senate on both sides of the aisle, in private conversations, and some on the floor of the Senate, have been most kind and generous in their expressions concerning my proposed retirement from the Senate. I do not wish to appear ungrateful. I am not ungrateful. Their remarks were greatly to my surprise, and somewhat to my embarrassment. I want all of them to know that I deeply appreciate the generous things they have said.

Mr. President, it is not my intention to make a farewell address, now or at any other time. I rise now merely to say, in these brief words, "Thank you; I am grateful."

WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., OF MAINE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to say a word at this time concerning another distinguished friend with whom I have served longer, I think, than I have with the Senator from New Mexico—a friend who likewise is relinquishing his seat here in the Senate. He is doing so to retire to private life. I served with him for many years in the House of Representatives, and I have served with him for many years in the Senate.

As I have often said, both here and elsewhere, there is no man for whose ability, honor, integrity, and personality I have a higher regard than I have for the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] who is leaving the Senate at the end of his present term.

Not only have I served with Senator WHITE in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, but I have visited him in his home in Maine, and I have been charmed by his dignity and his attitude, not only on national matters and international matters, but also on matters regarding the State of Maine where he lives.

I wish for him the most pleasant retirement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am quite sure I express the feelings of my colleague from Maine in appreciation to the minority leader, with whom he has been so long associated here in the Senate of the United States. It has been a matter of profound regret that the senior Senator from Maine, the majority leader, has not been able to be more active here on the floor of the Senate in his last year in the Senate, as his service comes to a close; and it is even more of a source of regret to him that in these closing days of the session, his strength did not seem to make it wise for him to stay longer. I think it was more the overwhelming emotion of the last day, perhaps, when he might be in the Senate that prevented him from coming to the Senate tonight. It was suggested that perhaps he would make the final motion to adjourn—as a graceful gesture and tribute to his position here and his many years of service; but he said he was afraid that his emotions would be too keen in that matter.

I have often said that I felt that no Member of the Senate was more fortunate in his colleague than was the junior Senator from Maine in his association with the distinguished majority leader, Senator WHITE, with his vast knowledge and understanding of the procedure of our Government and the kind sweetness of character with which he has cooperated in every matter concerning both Maine and his country. His is a rather remarkable record of service.

What the senior Senator from Kentucky has said about the others who have served here for so long is almost equally true of Senator WHITE, who came here as a young man, serving first as a clerk to a committee, and then as assistant President pro tempore of the Senate, and finally rising to the position of Senator, and then to the position which he has graced in recent years, that of majority leader of the Senate, when rounding out more than a quarter of a century of service here; and also being recognized as an outstanding authority in the field of shipping, where the "White bill" was the name of one of our most important pieces of merchant-marine legislation; and in a rapidly expanding field of radio legislation, as well, where he was recognized in an almost unique manner when the President of the United States, heading another political party, asked him, when he was merely a member of the minority, and not chairman of a committee, to serve as chairman of the United States delegation to one of the great international radio conferences; and the invitation was repeated in more recent years, recognizing his vast authority in this field, as well as the devotion he brought to every field of service into which he entered.

I know I express the profound regret of the citizens of Maine that he has determined to terminate his long career of public service at this time, when he still has before him many years of activity, in which I know all of us wish for him the very happy days to which his distinguished service so abundantly entitles him.

JAMES W. MURPHY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I should like to call attention to a rather remarkable record on the part of a family which has long been associated with the official work of the Senate. We have one of our reporters, in the person of Mr. James W. Murphy, who has been reporter of the debates of the United States Senate for 52 years without interruption. His father before him was a reporter of the debates of the Senate, and his uncle also.

His uncle began his service here as a reporter in 1848; and when the 4th of December arrives, the family of Murphy—father and son and uncle—will have served a solid century as reporters of the debates of the United States Senate. I think that is a remarkable and outstanding record, and I imagine it is an exclusive record, as made by the Murphy family.

Of course, they have rendered their service in this capacity unobtrusively and quietly. Their names never appeared in the headlines, because their position and their work did not call for any publicity. But it would be difficult to estimate the contribution that family has made to the legislative history of the United States Senate, and I imagine it would also be difficult to enumerate the number of times when, through their reportorial work and their knowledge of language, they have dressed up our speeches, which otherwise would have looked somewhat crude.

I wish to pay tribute to the Murphy family for their century of service to the Senate of the United States; and I wish for our present reporter, Mr. James W. Murphy, who has already served 52 years, great happiness, long life, and useful service here for many years more as a reporter of the debates of the United States Senate.

I thought that while we were paying these tributes to our departing colleagues, it was most appropriate to pay this tribute to a member of our official family.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1801, Senate bill 2756, the strategic materials bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2756) to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense, and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a mine incentive payments division, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator in charge of this legislation is the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An objection is out of order on a motion. If the Senator wishes to speak, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. For what purpose?

Mr. MILLIKIN. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, is it appropriate at this time to move the consideration of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion has been made. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the Senator makes his argument against the motion, there is a bill on the calendar, order No. 1340, Senate bill 2688, to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency. I am told by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that there is no controversy involved. I am also told by the distinguished Senator that he would like to ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1340, Senate bill 2688, and that if it becomes controversial, he will ask for the regular order, and proceed upon the motion which has been made.

I ask the Senator from Missouri if he will not yield for that purpose, if the unanimous consent request is made.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should be glad to yield with the understanding that it will be without prejudice.

Mr. WHERRY. That is right.

Mr. KEM. And will not be considered to affect my right to the floor, or as one of my speeches.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1340, Senate bill 2688.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2688) to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have only a few remarks to make.

The purpose of the bill is to grant to the Central Intelligence Agency the authorities necessary for its proper administration. The bill deals with procurement, travel allowances, and related expenses, general authorities, and methods of expenditures of appropriated funds. Further, it protects the confidential nature of the Agency's functions and makes provisions for the internal administration of the Agency. In almost all instances, the powers and authorities contained in the bill already exist for some other branch of the Government, and the bill merely extends similar authorities to the Central Intelligence Agency.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Hearings on the matter were conducted in executive session because the confidential nature of the Agency's functions were deemed to be such as to require the discussions to be so held. The committee carefully considered all sections of the bill, and, after such consideration, is satisfied that all provisions of the proposal are justified and necessary to the efficient operation of the intelligence service of the United States.

The bill has the unanimous approval of the committee, and I ask for its immediate adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, it is with great reluctance that I rise to object. I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to section (b) of the bill, on page 12, which reads as follows:

(b) The sums made available to the Agency may be expended without regard to the provisions of law and regulations relating to the expenditure of Government funds; and for objects of a confidential, extraordinary, or emergency nature, such expenditures to be accounted for solely on the certificate of the Director and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified.

Mr. President, it is with reluctance that I would move to strike this section from the bill. Representations have been made by Senators for whom I have a very high regard that this is a most necessary provision for the successful operation of the Agency. I must say that I am slightly Scotch about it, and I have my doubts. I would suggest that the chairman accept the amendment to strike out this section, and at least that we try for a period of 6 months or so, until Congress returns, to see whether or not this Agency cannot get along with that section out of the act.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in view of my promise to the Senator from Missouri that I would not delay debate, I am compelled to accept the amendment, in the hope that we can get the bill over to the House and secure its passage in the House tonight, where a similar bill is on the calendar. I, therefore, accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, after line 7, it is proposed to strike out subdivision (b) as follows:

(b) The sums made available to the Agency may be expended without regard to the provisions of law and regulations relating to the expenditure of Government funds; and for objects of a confidential, extraordinary, or emergency nature, such expenditures to be accounted for solely on the certificate of the Director and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. That when used in this act, the term—

(a) "Agency" means the Central Intelligence Agency;

(b) "Director" means the Director of Central Intelligence;

(c) "Government agency" means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government; and

(d) "Continental United States" means the States and the District of Columbia.

SEAL OF OFFICE

SEC. 2. The Director of Central Intelligence shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Central Intelligence Agency, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

PROCUREMENT AUTHORITIES

SEC. 3. (a) In the performance of its functions the Central Intelligence Agency is authorized to exercise the authorities contained in sections 2 (c) (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (10), (12), (15), (17), and sections 3, 4, 5, 6, and 10 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (Public Law 413, Eightieth Congress, second session).

(b) In the exercise of the authorities granted in subsection (a) of this section, the term "Agency head" shall mean the Director, the Deputy Director, or the Executive Director of the Agency.

(c) The determinations and decisions provided in subsection (a) of this section to be made by the Agency head may be made with respect to individual purchases and contracts or with respect to classes of purchases or contracts, and shall be final. Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, the Agency head is authorized to delegate his powers provided in this section, including the making of such determinations and decisions, in his discretion and subject to his direction, to any other officer or officers or officials of the Agency.

(d) The power of the Agency head to make the determinations or decisions specified in paragraphs (12) and (15) of section 2 (c) and section 5 (a) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 shall not be delegable. Each determination or decision required by paragraphs (12) and (15) of section 2 (c), by section 4 or by section 5 (a) of the Armed Service Procurement Act of 1947, shall be based upon written findings made by the official making such determinations, which findings shall be final and shall be available within the Agency for a period of at least 6 years following the date of the determination.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

SEC. 4. (a) Any officer or employee of the Agency may be assigned or detailed for special instruction, research, or training, at or with domestic or foreign public or private institutions; trade, labor, agricultural, or scientific associations; courses or training programs under the National Military Establishment; or commercial firms.

(b) The Agency shall, under such regulations as the Director may prescribe, pay the tuition and other expenses of officers and employees of the Agency assigned or detailed in accordance with provisions of subsection (a) of this section, in addition to the pay and allowances to which such officers and employees may be otherwise entitled.

TRAVEL, ALLOWANCES, AND RELATED EXPENSES

SEC. 5. (A) Under such regulations as the Director may prescribe, the Agency, with respect to its officers and employees assigned to permanent-duty stations outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, shall—

(1) (a) pay the travel expenses of officers and employees of the Agency, including expenses incurred while traveling pursuant to orders issued by the Director in accordance with the provisions of section 5 (A) (2) with regard to the granting of home leave;

(b) pay the travel expenses of the members of the family of an officer or employee of the Agency when proceeding to or returning from his post of duty; accompanying him on authorized home leave; or otherwise traveling in accordance with authority granted pursuant to the terms of this or any other act;

(c) pay the cost of transporting the furniture and household and personal effects of an officer or employee of the Agency to his successive posts of duty and, on the termination of his services, to the place where he will reside;

(d) pay the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an officer or employee of the Agency who is absent under orders from his usual post of duty, or who is assigned to a post to which, because of emergency conditions, he cannot take or at which he is unable to use his furniture and household and personal effects;

(e) pay the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an officer or employee of the Agency on first arrival at a post for a period not in excess of 3 months after such first arrival at such post or until the establishment of residence quarters, whichever shall be shorter;

(f) pay the travel expenses and transportation costs incident to the removal of the members of the family of an officer or employee of the Agency and his furniture and household and personal effects, including automobiles, from a post at which, because of the prevalence of disturbed conditions, there is imminent danger to life and property, and the return of such persons, furniture, and effects to such post upon the cessation of such conditions; or to such other post as may in the meantime have become the post to which such officer or employee has been assigned.

(2) Order to the continental United States on leave provided for in 5 United States Code 30, 30a, 30b, or as such sections may hereafter be amended, every officer and employee of the Agency who is a citizen of the United States, upon completion of 2 years' continuous service abroad, or as soon as possible thereafter: *Provided*, That such officer or employee has accrued to his credit at the time of such order annual leave sufficient to carry him in a pay status while in the United States for at least a 30-day period.

(a) While in the continental United States on leave, the service of any officer or employee shall be available for work or duties in the Agency or elsewhere, but the time of such work or duties shall not be counted as leave.

(b) Where an officer or employee on leave returns to the continental United States, leave of absence granted shall be exclusive of the time actually and necessarily occupied in going to and from the continental United States, and such time as may be necessarily occupied in awaiting transportation.

(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, transport for or on behalf of an officer or employee of the Agency, a privately owned automobile in any case where the Agency head shall determine that water, rail, or air transportation of the automobile is necessary, or expedient for any part or of all the distance between points of origin and destination.

(4) (a) In the event of illness or injury requiring the hospitalization of an officer or employee of the Agency who is a citizen of the United States, not the result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct on his part, incurred while on assignment abroad, in a locality where there does not exist a suitable hospital or clinic, pay the travel expenses of such officer or employee by whatever means he shall deem appropriate and without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and section 10 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1516; 5 U. S. C. 73b), to the nearest locality where a suitable hospital or clinic exists and on his recovery pay for the travel expenses of his return to his post of duty. If the officer or employee is too ill to travel unattended, the Director may also pay the travel expenses of an attendant;

(b) Establish a first-aid station and provide for the services of a nurse at a post at which, in his opinion, sufficient personnel is employed to warrant such a station;

(c) In the event of illness or injury requiring hospitalization of an officer or employee of the Agency who is a citizen of the United States, not the result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct on his part, incurred in the line of duty while such person is assigned abroad, pay for the cost of the treatment of such illness or injury at a suitable hospital or clinic.

(d) Provide for the periodic physical examination of officers and employees of the Agency and for the cost of administering inoculations or vaccinations to such officers or employees.

(B) In accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe and notwithstanding the provisions of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 70), the Director is authorized to grant to any officer or employee of the Agency who is a citizen of the United States allowances in accordance with the provisions of sections 901 (1) and 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

GENERAL AUTHORITIES

SEC. 6. In the performance of its functions, the Central Intelligence Agency is authorized to—

(a) transfer to and receive from other Government agencies such sums as may have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and appropriated, for the performance of any of the functions or activities authorized under sections 102 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong.), and any other Government agency is authorized to transfer to or receive from the Agency such sums without regard to any provisions of law limiting or prohibiting transfers between appropriations. Sums transferred to the Agency in accordance with this paragraph may be expended for the purposes and under the authority of this act without regard to limitations of appropriations from which transferred;

(b) exchange funds without regard to section 3651, Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543);

(c) reimburse other Government agencies for services of personnel assigned to the Agency, and such other Government agencies are hereby authorized, without regard to provisions of law to the contrary, so to assign or detail any officer or employee for duty with the Agency;

(d) authorize couriers designated by the Director to carry firearms when engaged in transportation of confidential documents and materials affecting the national defense and security;

(e) make alterations, improvements, and repairs on premises rented by the Agency and pay rent therefor without regard to limitations on expenditures contained in the act of June 30, 1932, as amended: *Provided*, That in each case the Director shall certify that

exception from such limitations is necessary to the successful performance of the Agency's functions or to the security of its activities;

(f) in the interests of the security of the foreign intelligence activities of the United States and in order further to implement the proviso of section 102 (d) (3) of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong., 1st sess.) that the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure, the Agency shall be exempted from the provisions of sections 1 and 2, chapter 795, of the act of August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 956, 957; 5 U. S. C. A. 654), and the provisions of any other law which require the publication or disclosure of the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel employed by the Agency: *Provided*, That in furtherance of this section, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall make no reports to the Congress in connection with the Agency under section 607, title VI, chapter 212, of the act of June 30, 1945, as amended (5 U. S. C. A. 947 (b)).

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, sums made available to the Agency by appropriation or otherwise may be expended for purposes necessary to carry out its functions, including—

(1) personal services, including personal services without regard to limitations on types of persons to be employed, and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere; preparation and transportation of the remains of officers and employees who die aboard or in transit, while in performance of their official duties, to their former homes in this country or to a place not more distant for interment, and for ordinary expenses of such interment; penalty mail; health-service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); rental of news-reporting services; purchase or rental and operation of photographic, reproduction, cryptographic, duplication and printing machines, equipment and devices, and radio-receiving and radio-sending equipment and devices, including telegraph and teletype equipment; purchase, maintenance, operation, repair, and hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, and vessels of all kinds; printing and binding; purchase, maintenance, and cleaning of firearms; subject to policies established by the Director, expenses of travel in connection with, and expenses incident to attendance at meetings of professional, technical, scientific, and other similar organizations when such attendance would be of benefit in the conduct of the work of the Agency; association and library dues; payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 843; 28 U. S. C. 921); repair, rental, operation, and maintenance of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 8. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held intral Intelligence Agency Act of 1948."

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 9. This act may be cited as the "Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1948."

Mr. McMAHON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Senate bill 2688, Calendar No. 1340, which was passed a short while ago.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this is the bill providing for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency. The Senator from Connecticut is about to ask that the section stricken out be put back in the bill. I hope the Senator will not object. It will require only a minute.

Mr. McMAHON. It will not take more than 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the votes by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] was agreed to and the bill ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, are reconsidered, and the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I had moved to strike from the bill subsection (b) on page 12, because I am constitutionally rather averse to giving agencies a great deal of money with nonaccountability provisions. However, the Senator from Connecticut is not dogmatically certain that he is right in this instance. After conferring with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, for whom I have the highest regard, as well as with some of my colleagues on the committee, and with officials of the Agency, I have resolved that the thing to do is to withdraw the objection to subsection (b) on page 12 and ask that it be reinstated in the bill. I do so with the clear notice that when we return in January it may be a very good idea to reexamine the subject to find out whether or not this provision of the bill is working as those who have passed upon it in the Armed Services Committee think it should work. I therefore ask unanimous consent that section (b) on page 12 be reinstated in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2688) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRODUCTION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. WHERRY's motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1801, Senate bill 2756, to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask that the pending business be laid aside and that Calendar No. 1253 be taken up.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Objection is heard.

Mr. KEM. I believe I have the floor, and I yield only with the understanding I have previously had, that it be without prejudice, and that it will not be considered that I have made one speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the Chair having just taken the chair, and not being familiar with the prior understanding, would like to have it repeated.

Mr. KEM. I can state the prior understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed the Senator from Missouri has the floor. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana on the understanding that I yield without prejudice, that I will regain the floor when he has completed the business he has in mind, and that the interlude will not be considered as in any way affecting my right to the floor or my right to discuss the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Chair's understanding that the Senator from Indiana has made a unanimous-consent request which has been objected to by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. I had the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the distinguished Senator from Missouri have the right to establish the conditions on which he will yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has, to this extent, that the Senate can do anything by unanimous consent. The Senator from Colorado or any other Senator can object to the Senator from Missouri yielding the floor for such a purpose, and under a strict interpretation of the rules of the Senate the Senator of course has the right to yield only for a question or privileged business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I object to any yielding of the floor at this time by the Senator from Missouri. The motion before the Senate, the pending business, is to take up a certain bill. I shall object to any attempt to set it aside until it is disposed of.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 595. An act (S. 595) to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war; and

S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc., Walsh Construction Co., and Atkinson-Kier Co.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2730) to

credit, in certain cases, military service and training preparatory thereto performed by employees of the postal service, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LECOMPTE, Mr. LEFEVRE, Mr. FERNANDEZ, and Mr. ENGLE of California were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. REES, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. VURSELL, Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, and Mr. LYLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2009) for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 83. An act authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn;

S. 1107. An act relating to the arming of American vessels;

S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner irrigation district, and for other purposes;

S. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer;

S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation;

S. 2186. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes";

S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act;

S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory;

S. 2510. An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes;

S 2706. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building;

S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.;

S. 2821. An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents;

S. 2825. An act to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1734. An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.;

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2192. An act for the relief of the Mossman Construction Co.;

H. R. 2352. An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees;

H. R. 3566. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3999. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals;

H. R. 5355. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5716. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Bessie Schwartz;

H. R. 5888. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6116. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act;

H. R. 6428. An act to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.; and

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, in accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 129, agreed to June 18, 1948, appointed the following Senators as the members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee To Investigate the Trust Territory of the Pacific:

From the Committee on Foreign Relations: The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

From the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 19, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions:

S. 2501. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2895. A bill to promote the general welfare by scrapping the unsound and ruinous monetary policy which is wrecking our domestic economy and creating chaos throughout the world, and replacing it with a sound monetary system in strict accordance with article I, section 8, clause 5 of the Constitution of the United States and the act of Congress of November 1, 1893 (sec. 311, U. S. C. A. (ch. 8, 28, Stat. 4)), which will stabilize the currency; prevent economic collapse in the United States; and give economic stability to the rest of the world; stop communism and other forms of absolutism; insure peace by eliminating the causes of war; save for the American taxpayers most of the billions of dollars proposed to be spent under the European recovery program; reduce taxes; protect our national sovereignty; preserve the American way of life; raise the American standard of living; quadruple the recoverable mineral wealth of America; make possible the profitable production here at home of 99 percent of our mineral requirements, including strategic minerals; and usher in an era of the greatest prosperity the United States has ever known, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HILL, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 2896. A bill to establish a Federal commission on services for the physically handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. MALONE introduced Senate bill 2897, to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, and section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERALS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Exchange Act of 1934, to provide an incentive for the exploration and development of minerals for national defense, and I request that an explanatory statement by me of the bill together with some tables and other data in connection therewith be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the explanatory statement, tables, and data presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2897) to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, and section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory statement, tables, and data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MALONE

No nation on the face of the earth has ever achieved the high level of income and general prosperity as that enjoyed by the United States. This unequaled achievement has come about as a result of our rich natural resources in combination with a set of political and economic principles and institutions which has encouraged private enterprise and the maximum amount of economic and political freedom.

Our high level of prosperity and free-enterprise system is seriously threatened by the New Deal policies which have been adopted by the Government during the past 15 years. These policies have reversed, in many ways, the policies in effect for the past century and one-half which made this Nation great.

During the past 15 years, increasing controls have been placed upon industry, taxes have increased by leaps and bounds, thereby reducing the amount of savings available for the investment in new enterprises, and protective tariffs have been progressively lowered so that today few American producers have any protection whatever from the low-wage competition of foreign countries.

Mr. President, the bill which I am introducing, calling for specific amendments to the Security Act of 1933 and the Exchange Act of 1934, is designed to curb the abuses which have arisen in the administering of the securities acts and to encourage the investment of private venture capital in new enterprises, particularly new mining enterprises.

The alarming decline in the investment of private venture capital in the United States, as a result of the New Deal policies, is shown in the statistics recently furnished me by the Treasury Department. During the 5-year period from 1925–29, new capital issues of common and preferred stocks in the United States totaled $12,600,000,000. Under the New Deal, for the 5-year period from 1935–39, new capital issues of common and preferred stocks amounted to only $199,000,000, or less than 10 percent of the amount 10 years earlier. For the five most recent years ending with 1947, such new issues have totaled $3,660,000,000, or less than 30 percent of the level attained in the 1920's.

This tremendous decline in investment of private venture capital in the United States during the past 15 years is partly the result of restrictive policies practiced by the Securities and Exchange Commission under its rules and regulations and partly the result of other New Deal policies, including the policy of tremendous increases in taxation of the American people.

GROWING BURDEN OF TAXATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The increase in taxation of the American people during the past 15 years has become so burdensome that it threatens to destroy the American system of free private enterprise. The per capita cost of government in the United States has grown from $89.76 in 1930 to $350 per person in 1947. In 1932, the revenue of the Federal Government amounted to 4 percent of the income of the American people; last year, Federal receipts totaled 21 percent of the income of the American people. This, however, does not measure the total burden of taxation of the American people, but only the part paid to the Federal Government. If we add payments made by American citizens to the State and local governments, we find that in 1947 the American people paid approximately $57,000,000,000 to their Government, or approximately 28 percent of their total income.

It should be emphasized that during the 15-year period of the administration from 1932 to 1947, Federal taxes increased five times as much as the percentage of the national income of the American people, rising from 4 to 21 percent.

This tremendous increase in taxation has discouraged private enterprise and investment of new venture capital by destroying the source from which private venture capital comes, as people have to pay an increasing percentage of their income for taxes they have less and less left over for investment in corporate securities and other forms of business saving.

The further expansion of prosperity in the United States and the progressive utilization and development of our rich natural resources can only be achieved by reversing the restrictive burdensome policies of the past 15 years and substituting therefor a policy for the encouragement of private enterprise and of encouragement for the exploration and development of all of our basic natural resources.

TABLE I.—*New capital issues in the United States, 1919–47, of common and preferred stocks*

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Amount	Year	Amount	Year	Amount
1919	1,436	1929	5,924	1939	97
1920	1,002	1930	1,503	1940	135
1921	265	1931	311	1941	173
1922	570	1932	20	1942	118
1923	699	1933	120	1943	92
1924	829	1934	34	1944	224
1925	1,182	1935	69	1945	657
1926	1,087	1936	352	1946	1,472
1927	1,474	1937	408	1947	1,215
1928	2,951	1938	67		

Source: U. S. Treasury Department.

TABLE II.—*Increases in taxes, 1922–47*

Fiscal year	Federal net receipts	Total Government revenue—Federal, State, local	Federal receipts as percent of national income	Total Government receipts as percent of national income [1]
	Millions	*Millions*		
1922	$3,554	$7,569	6	13
1927	3,346	9,068	4	12
1932	1,792	8,150	4	20
1937	4,765	11,892	6	16
1942	12,288	20,859	9	15
1947	43,038	[2] 57,000	21	[2] 28

[1] This percentage indicates roughly the part of income which is taken by taxes.
[2] Approximately.

Compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress from the following sources: Publications of the National Industrial Conference Board, United States Bureau of the Census, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933 AND THE EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 TO PROVIDE AN INCENTIVE FOR THE EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERALS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

PARAGRAPH 12, SUBSECTION (A) OF SECTION 3

Section 3 of the original act deals with securities exempt from registration. There are 11 classes or groups not required to be registered in the original act. This new section places the securities of issuers engaged in the exploration and development of mineral resources under special statutory regulation. The filing of limited information on such issues, leaves the Securities Commission with full power to administer its other provisions. It takes away the necessity to go through the difficulties of registration where the Commission undertakes to apply the material-fact formula or otherwise evaluate the mining property, consider its feasibility or delay the public offering by stop orders and deficiency citations as now take place under the present law. This amendment, however, requires the issuer to file certain essential statutory information with the Commission, disclosing all material facts.

(NOTE.—The wording of this proposed amendment follows the text of certain rules issued by the Commission in respect to stock offerings under the Vandenberg amendment, and its application has been found apparently satisfactory and in the public interest.)

This amendment adds a new section to the law and all other provisions of the original Securities Act are retained, including civil liability, criminal responsibility, and the fraud sections. This new section 3 takes nothing away from the present power of the Commission.

The purpose of this proposal is to offer an incentive for the development of our mineral resources by making it easier for free enterprise and venture capital to participate in the development of our mineral resources in this critical period, and such efforts should be encouraged so as to make it unnecessary to appropriate such large sums of money for the Bureau of Mines and other Government agencies to do this same type of important exploratory work.

As a matter of fact, the Federal Government is now spending large sums of money in the search for new domestic sources of copper, lead, and zinc. Stock piles of critical metal and minerals are to be built up more rapidly in months ahead. The big stock-piling program approved by Congress in 1946 has been falling behind schedule. To obtain these strategic materials, it is evident that someone will have to reopen mines and find new ones. This all takes time, money, trained men, and equipment, yet the effort is vital to our national defense. However, we should supplement a Government program by encouraging private industry, free enterprise, and venture capital to engage in this important program.

In most cases, the average mining stock buyer wants only an honest run for his money, a chance to risk a small portion of his surplus earnings in something he hopes will be a profitable venture, like the hundreds of others that have enriched the casual venture in the past. He is more interested in his chances than in statistical facts, balance-sheet items, or a complicated engineering analysis. With this in mind, the proposed change in the present law does not require such detail to be first set forth. There is little to be gained by such information, and there is a limit to what the average prospector seeking venture capital can or should be required to do in the preparation of an issue of stock for public sale.

SUBSECTION (E) OF SECTION 19 AND SUBSECTION (A) OF SECTION 20

The following proposed amendments are designed to limit the Securities and Exchange Commission in its power to conduct

roving, inquisitorial, compulsory investigations without following rules of legal procedure or of evidence and subjecting the private affairs of an individual person or company to a searching investigation with the object of looking for something as a basis for a civil or criminal sanction against such citizen.

It is a well-established policy of the Commission under its subpena power to order books, records, and other papers to be brought before it for examination, where such private records are inspected and the accompanying witnesses are subjected to incriminating, misleading, and suggestive questions. This process is conducted behind closed doors where the parties are without benefit of counsel, and is one of the most tyrannical methods ever developed in American administrative procedure. It is clearly an abuse of the power granted by Congress, and must be corrected.

The testimony of the witness is not available to him, and it may be used as a basis for a civil or criminal action in the courts. This practice was positively condemned by the Supreme Court of the United States, but it is, nevertheless, being followed because the courts have held that such is the will of Congress; otherwise, Congress would change the law. (See the following Supreme Court case.)

"A general, roving, offensive, inquisitorial, compulsory investigation conducted by the Commission without any allegations, upon no fixed principles, and governed by no rules of law or evidence and no restrictions, except its own will or caprice, is unknown to our Constitution and laws and such an inquisition would be destructive of the rights of a citizen and an intolerable tyranny. Let the power once be established and there is no knowing where the practice under it would end" (*Boyd* v. *U. S.* (116 U. S. 616)).

How closely allied in principle are the three protective rights of the individual, that against compulsory self-accusation; that against unlawful search and seizure; and that against unlawful inquisitorial investigation. (Reversed (80 L. ed. 1015).)

The Department has consistently taken the position that the information gathered in its investigation is not open to the public. It has refused to give copies of testimony to individuals who have been required to appear and testify.

The following United States court decision is also of interest:

"Denial to defendants of copies of testimony given by them during investigation carried on upon instructions from the Securities and Exchange Commission by one of its representatives was not a deprivation of due process" (*Exchange Commission* v. *Torr* (15 Supp. Fed. (2d) 14?)).

The harshness of the present law is seen in the language of the following case where the Court is called upon to construe the provisions of the Securities Act now in force, which clearly justifies the proposed amendment.

"The Securities and Exchange Commission, as a fact-finding body, performs functions similar to that of a grand jury, the scope of whose inquiries should not be limited narrowly by questions of propriety or forecasts of the probable result of the investigation. And it's not constrained by technical rules of admissibility of evidence or by doubts whether any particular individual will be properly subject to accusation of crime. As has been said before, the identity of the defender and the precise nature of the offense, if there be one, are developed at the conclusion of the grand jury's labors and not at the beginning" (*Boehm* v. *U. S.* (123 Fed. (2d) 791; 97 Fed. (2d) 704)).

If the Commission is in possession of facts affording reasonable grounds for belief that a violation of the act has occurred, or is threatened, it may order an investigation. The form of the investigation, or its source, is not material (*Consolidated Mines* v. *SEC* (79 S2 705)).

Such practice can hardly be said to be in the interest of new business ventures. On the contrary, it has a definite restrictive and oppressive effect.

AMENDMENT TO EXCHANGE ACT 1934—SECTION 3, ADDING NEW SUBSECTION

This amendment provides a trading post for the sale of mining and oil securities wherever brokers care to auction them off in secondary distribution between buyers and sellers, using the same plan for the sale of such securities as adopted for the sale of first-grade industrial issues. At the present time, all open bidding in over-the-counter mining stocks is prohibited. They may not be auctioned off to the highest bidder on the same basis as registered securities are sold on registered exchanges.

A substitute procedure is followed in some western markets which requires each broker handling mining securities and desiring to participate in the over-the-counter transactions for his customers, to first submit his written bids and offering in writing on all shares in each category in which he may be interested in the beginning of the day's business. These quotations are then assembled in a private room to which no broker is allowed, and the highest bid and the lowest offering is matched together and posted for that stock on that day, and used as a basis for trading. These are mere formal quotations and have nothing to do with the volume of business or the closing figures that may take place. This procedure brings out errors and mistakes and has cost the general public money. There is no drawing together the buyer and the seller as occurs in an auction sale, and, consequently, a wide spread exists between bids and offerings in such securities. The public has no true market for over-the-counter natural-resource stocks—it has only a makeshift system. The trouble is caused because the original law limits an exchange, first (a) the definition of an exchange; (b) the right of those to do business on the exchange; and (c) the quality of the shares to be traded thereon. Such law took away the trading privileges to about 90 percent of the mining securities being bought and sold by the public in the Western States. It unfortunately deprives the public of the basis for arriving at a true value for over-the-counter mining stocks in secondary distribution.

The purpose of this bill is to reestablish the right of the brokers to trade in second-grade, unlisted, over-the-counter stocks of all categories upon the basis of the bid and asked prices arrived at in open competition among buyers and sellers.

This amendment will allow such procedure without violating the Exchange Act. It is a supplement to present arrangements. The public is amply protected under section 15. Sections (1), (2), and (3) of the Exchange Act which govern the conduct of over-the-counter brokers and dealers in such stocks.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 6657. An act to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6800. An act to amend sections 3108 and 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6958. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6501. An act to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS OF CERTAIN HOUSE COMMITTEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate two concurrent resolutions providing for the printing of certain hearings before a House committee. The Chair is advised by the chairman of the subcommittee on Rules and Administration under the rule of comity existing between the two Houses, is desirous that the Senate agree to these two resolutions and, without objection, that action will be taken.

There being no objection, the Senate agreed to the following House concurrent resolutions:

House Concurrent Resolution 199

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 6,000 additional copies of the report (H. Rept. No. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an Advocate of Overthrow of Government by Force and Violence, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies shall be for the House document room.

House Concurrent Resolution 213

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,500 copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee during current Congress, relative to investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating and as to whether there is a necessity for a change in either the procedure or basic law.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (S. DOC. NO. 197)

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated April 15, 1948, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, with a view to ascertaining as near as can be estimated the exact damages that may be caused at Clinton, Iowa, by the creation of pool No. 14, and I ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Public Works and printed as a Senate document with illustration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVENTION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive L, Eightieth Congress, second session, a convention on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, signed at Geneva on March 6, 1948, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and other states concerned. Without objection the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD; and, without objection, the message from the President, together with the convention will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Convention on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, signed at Geneva on March 6, 1948, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and other states concerned.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the convention and a copy of the English text of the final act of the United Nations Maritime Conference, held at Geneva, February 19 to March 6, 1948.

For the reasons outlined in the report of the Secretary of State, I recommend that the Senate approve the convention with the appropriate reservation in regard to article 4, as recommended in the report of the Secretary of State, to insure that ratification of the Convention will not have the effect of altering the antitrust statutes. Upon becoming a party to the convention the United States of America, as a leading maritime nation, may participate in the work of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) Convention on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, signed at Geneva March 6, 1948 (certified copy); (3) final act of the United Nations Maritime Conference (English text).)

CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2730) to credit, in certain cases, military service and training preparatory thereto performed by employees of the postal service, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 25 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 39, sec. 875), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 25. Allowable service under the provisions of this act shall be only such continuous active service as has been rendered and shall not include previous periods or terms of employment, except that in the case of employees who have been separated or shall hereafter be separated from the field service of the Post Office Department for military duty, or to comply with a war transfer as defined by the Civil Service Commission, the periods or terms of such service immediately preceding entry into military service or immediately preceding such transfer, as well as the time engaged in military service and service on war transfer, shall be construed as allowable service, and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in military service and service on war transfer for each year of such service."

SEC. 2. Any person who prior to the enactment of this act received any amounts the payment of which is authorized for the first time by this act is hereby relieved of all liability to refund such amounts to the United States; and in the audit and settlement of the accounts of any postmaster, or of any other designed disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service, the payment of such amounts shall be considered to have been authorized. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to repay, out of any funds hereafter appropriated pursuant to the authority of this act, any amounts heretofore credited to the employee or refunded by him to the United States on account of such receipt by him of unauthorized payments.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. The amendment made by the first section of this act to section 25 of the act of July 6, 1945, shall take effect as of July 1, 1945.

And to amend the title so as to read: "A bill to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces and on war transfer by employees in the field service of the Post Office Department."

Mr. LANGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire, What is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The pending question is the motion by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to consider Senate bill 2756. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has the floor on that motion. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it seems apparent from the course of the business of the Senate recently that all one has to do if one is opposed to a motion on the floor is to talk at considerable length and to indicate a desire and intention to talk further. However, I do not intend to avail myself of that precedent. I do want to speak, however, at some length upon the motion. My reason is that I regard the bill which it is proposed by motion to bring before the Senate as one that involves an exceedingly important principle. It goes to our very American way of life, and is one that involves a tremendous, inestimable, uncounted amount of money.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. During the course of his remarks on the motion will the Senator explain the degree of similarity between this bill and the bill which Congress passed a year or so ago and the President vetoed?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to. One of the principal differences between the two bills is that the bill vetoed by the President last year was for a comparatively modest project. It provided for the sum of $35,000,000 a year for a period of 2 years. The proponents of this bill have much larger ideas. I will not say they have delusions of grandeur, but their imagination has certainly run rife.

The proposition here tonight is to spend $80,000,000 a year in subsidies, or so-called price premiums, for two purposes: To encourage production and to encourage exploration. Then the bill provides for commitments in connection with the carrying out of the project, which amount to not more than an additional $80,000,000 a year. Then, in addition to the premiums or subsidies which are paid to encourage production and conservation and exploration, it is provided that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be compelled to purchase at the market price all ore and metal produced as a result of these incentives.

Of course, it is impossible to tell the amount of ore or metal which will be produced as the result of these incentives, but whatever it may be, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is compelled to buy under the terms of the bill.

Nor is that all. There is a very considerable administrative expense connected with the carrying out of the project.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT I did not hear the Senator's statement. Did he give an estimate of what he thought the bill might cost in that connection?

Mr. KEM. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that it is impossible to estimate the amount the bill will cost because of the intangible factors involved. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is directed—it is made mandatory upon it—to buy all the ores and metals and minerals that may be produced as the result of the incentives from the distribution of this $80,000,000 a year or $160,000,000, as the case may be.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN Is it not expressly provided that the total shall be $80,000,000 a year?

Mr. KEM. It is not so expressly provided. I will read the provision in that respect for the enlightment of the Senate. It is the contention of the Senator from Colorado, for whom I have great respect, and for whose opinion I have great respect, that the total amount involved in the bill is $80,000,000 a year. But I will undertake to demonstrate to the Senate beyond any vestige of a doubt that that contention is not correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. I will yield when I have answered the Senator's previous question. I think the bill has been distributed and is on the desks of all Senators, and if Senators will be kind enough to follow

as I read, I think the discussion may be more intelligent.

Section 7 on page 9 of the bill provides:

SEC. 7. (a) All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and shall not exceed $80,000,000 in any one year—

Then the bill continues—

nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States which obligates the United States Government (including all departments and agencies thereof) to make disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act in excess of $80,000,000 in the aggregate in any one year.

I know that it is the contention of the Senator from Colorado that those two phrases run along with each other, and that the total amount is $80,000,000 in any one year. But if the Senate will observe the provision is that:

All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments • • • shall not exceed $80,000,000 in any one year.

And then further that the commitments shall not exceed that amount. In other words, it is perfectly plain that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation can disburse $80,000,000 a year and can make additional commitments for the same amount.

Nor is that all. If the Senate will refer to subparagraph (b) on page 8 this sentence may be read:

(b) All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments and which comply with Munitions Board minimum stock-pile specifications shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to yield until I have answered the Senator's previous question, then I will yield for another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield at this time.

Mr. KEM. Then further, at the bottom of the page, is this provision:

(c) The Bureau of Federal Supply of the Treasury Department shall reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the extent of the current market price for all metals, minerals, and ores placed in the national security stock pile under this section.

In other words, Mr. President, regardless of the construction placed upon section 7, it is perfectly clear that the duty, the obligation, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy the ores and metals is independent and in addition to the obligation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make subsidy or production encouragement payments.

That is not all. This really is a very remarkable bill. If Senators will refer to page 3, at the middle of the page, the following language appears:

The Director—

The Director is a very interesting person. Before I get through I shall undertake to show that if the bill is passed the Director, under the price-premium plan, will be one of the most powerful men in the United States. The Director is not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director is appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, and the Senate has not one word to say about it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he finishes his answer to this particular interrogatory?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator know on what assumption the bill carries the mandatory provision that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall buy these ores? The Senator from Maryland would assume that in time of short supply they would be purchased in the open market anyway. Can the Senator give me any information on that point?

Mr. KEM. Perhaps the idea is to create a market for all the ore that may be developed as a result of these incentive payments. As I shall undertake to show, under the provisions of the bill every man who wants to go into the mining business will be guaranteed a market out of the treasury of the RFC, at a price that will will make him a profit, no matter whether he is a marginal producer, or under what conditions he is operating. It is mandatory to afford him a profit.

Mr. TYDINGS. What the Senator from Maryland is puzzled about is this: If the RFC is going to purchase these minerals at the market price, why could not the producer sell them in commercial channels at the market price, without burdening the Government with the operation of purchasing?

Mr. KEM. I do not know what is in the mind of the draftsman of the bill, but it seems to me that his purpose is to have the RFC constantly in the market as a purchaser of these metals at the expense, of course, of the Government.

I was discussing this very remarkable person, the Director of the price-premium plan.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether he has answered the question I asked him about the $80,000,000?

Mr. KEM. Not quite yet. I am still on the matter of the expenses. I have just covered some items.

This is a remarkable bill in that it covers a large amount of expense, and provides for a number of different kinds of payments to be made out of the Treasury.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield at this time.

Mr. KEM. The Senator was so gracious and kind in objecting a minute ago that I feel under no particular compulsion to yield to him, although in view of our long friendship I shall be glad to yield in a few minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. I was just discussing the remarkable powers which are placed in the Director. He is to be employed at a salary of $12,000 a year. That provision is found at the top of page 3. The bill does not specifically say by whom he is to be appointed, but, in view of the fact that he is an administrative officer of the Incentive Payments Division, which is made a division of the Department of the Interior, I think it is a fair inference or assumption that he is to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. No confirmation by the Senate is required.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. Not quite yet.

Let us see what the Director may do.

The Director may select, employ, and fix the compensation of such engineers and other experts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923 and shall employ such other staff as he may deem necessary.

I do not hold any brief for the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923; but as Senators know, there is a very elaborate provision as to the employment of professional and scientific persons. That law establishes nine grades. Grade 1 is the junior professional grade; grade 2, the assistant professional grade; grade 3, the associate professional grade; grade 4, the full professional grade; grade 5, the senior professional grade; grade 6, the principal professional grade; grade 7, the head professional grade; grade 8, the chief professional grade; and grade 9, the special professional grade. The salaries of all those grades are fixed by law.

The draftsman of this bill has cut right through those provisions, and he has given the Director, the $12,000 a year man, the right to employ as many people as he sees fit, at whatever salary his imagination dictates. I have searched the statutes with some care, and I cannot find any limitation at all upon the unbridled discretion of the Director in employing personnel under the language of this act.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. STEWART. Where would the money come from?

Mr. KEM. I will get to that in a moment. There has been no appropriation. There has been a very devious method of going around the Appropriations Committee. Payments for the premiums or the subsidies are to be made by the RFC. They do not have to go to the Appropriations Committee. The purchase price for the ores produced under the plan comes from the RFC.

Mr. STEWART. Is there a limitation on the amount?

Mr. KEM. None whatever.

When the plan was presented to the Congress in the closing hours of the last session, an appropriation of $300,000 was made in the second deficiency bill for the Department of Commerce; but no such provision is made this year, so I take it that the Director would merely set up housekeeping, employ an unlimited number of people at unlimited rates of pay, and then depend on deficiency appropriations at the next Congress, or perhaps juggle some other funds in the Department of the Interior. But to answer the question of the Senator from Tennessee directly, there is no appropriation to implement this work. The only limitation on the compensation of these employees of the Director, if this bill be-

comes law, will be a provision in the statute to the effect that a limitation of $10,000 a year or $50 a day is placed upon all so-called experts.

So I think it is fair to say that the persons employed by the Director, under the first provision, could not be paid more than $10,000 a year or $50 a day; but a subsequent provision provides that the Director shall employ such other staff as he may deem necessary. In other words, he can employ the experts, who are limited as to salary; but he can employ other staff without any limitation at all as to salary; and if he needs a manager or someone of that sort, I take it that under the provisions of this bill there would be no limitation at all on the salary which that person might be paid.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the Senator's feeling that even though section 7 is limited to $80,000,000 in any one year, there could be an unlimited amount for the purchase of metals, up to $500,000,000, if that were available?

Mr. KEM. There can be no doubt about that.

What is limited to $80,000,000 is set forth in section 7, namely—

All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall yield in just a moment. First I wish to demonstrate what this bill will cost.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was not clear as to what "conservation payments" meant, until the Senator gave his explanation. I thought that included the bonus.

Mr. KEM. No; those are premiums or incentives given for production and exploration.

In addition to these payments, as I read the section, commitments can be made for an additional $80,000,000; and then in the middle of page 8 the additional ores are required to be purchased; and then on page 3 the Director is authorized to employ these experts as members of his staff.

In answer to the question as to the cost of the bill, I have to say that after considerable study I cannot tell, and I do not think any Member of the Senate can tell.

There are to be payments for exploration and development and conservation, not exceeding $80,000,000 a year. There are commitments to be made by any officer or employee of the United States, not exceeding $80,000,000 a year.

Then there is to be the purchase of—

All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments—

As set forth on page 8.

And then there are the expenses, upon which there is no limit, as set forth in the middle of page 3.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the really dangerous provision, it would seem from what the Senator has said, is subparagraph (b) on page 8. We really cannot estimate a limit on that, it seems.

Mr. KEM. Yes; but it seems to me it is a rather dangerous precedent to have a man appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, without advice or consent on the part of the Senate, and to have him authorized to employ any number of persons whom he sees fit to employ, at any salary his imagination may dictate.

Having discussed at some length the cost of the plan, from my point of view, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado for a further question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what is his interpretation of the language in italics, beginning in line 22, on page 9, and running down to line 3 on page 10.

Mr. KEM. I construe that to be a limitation on commitments to be made by any officer of the United States Government in carrying on this plan. My construction is that that is an additional limitation to the proviso in the previous phrase.

In other words, the disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments are limited to $80,000,000 a year; but, in addition, there may be commitments by an officer or employee of the United States, who may obligate the United States Government to the extent of $80,000,000 a year.

To be more specific, I take it that that paragraph involves the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in this amount of money, namely, twice $80,000,000 a year, or $160,000,000 a year, for 4 years, or a total of $640,000,000.

In addition to that, we have the items of what it will cost to buy all the ore, the production of which is stimulated by these incentive payments, plus the cost of operating the plan, for all of which there has been no appropriation, and no appropriation is presently contemplated from the United States Treasury.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the Senator what disbursements are to be made under the bill except those to be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I am speaking as to ores and minerals.

Mr. KEM. Evidently other disbursements are contemplated, because subparagraph (e) on page 10, provides:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums sufficient to carry out the administration of this act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not true, of course, that there is the purchase of the ores, which involves one sum of money; and there is also the necessary administration to carry on the purchase of the ores, which would involve another sum of money.

Mr. KEM. I understood the question of the Senator from Colorado to be as to what sums, in addition to those to be paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, are involved. Is that the question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. The answer is the cost of administration, which is referred to in subparagraph (e) on page 10; and it involves the rather unique situation of having this Director, appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, without the advice and consent of the Senate, employing an unlimited number of persons at unlimited compensation, except in another statute what he can pay the experts is limited.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator be more comfortable about it if it were made subject to the advice and consent of the Senate?

Mr. KEM. I certainly think the Senate would feel more comfortable about it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator feel more comfortable about it if the salaries were made subject to the usual salary ranges?

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Missouri would feel more comfortable about it, because he feels——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, over on this side of the aisle it is difficult to hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators will please speak more loudly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my request was not addressed to the Senator from Missouri, but to the Senator from Colorado.

If the Senator will be kind enough to yield to me now, let me say that the objection I made a moment ago was not directed to anything the Senator from Missouri was doing. I was merely anxious that this bill be taken up, and that the Senator from Missouri have an opportunity to explain. Therefore, I was objecting to interruptions of the Senator's criticism of the measure.

I may say further that the amendment in italics was placed in the bill at my suggestion. It was not drafted by me, and I recognize that there is a great deal of virtue in what the Senator has said about the interpretation of that amendment. But I think I can say to the Senator that the purpose of the committee was to make an over-all limitation. So may I inquire of the Senator whether the criticism which he makes of the amendment and of this section with respect to the expense involved would be cured if the amendment in italics at the bottom of page 9 and on the top of page 10 should be changed so as to read, as follows:

Nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States which obligates the United States Government, including all departments and agencies thereof, to make any disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments or for administrative expense as authorized by this act, nor shall any such disbursement be made in excess of $80,000,000 in the aggregate in any one year.

The purpose of these changes would be to eliminate any difference between disbursements and commitments and to make the administrative expenses inclusive in the over-all limitation.

Mr. KEM. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that of course I understand the purpose of his objection and it is perfectly clear, and that I hope that my palate will cleave to the roof of my mouth if I am about to say anything that is unkind or discourteous to my old friend of 25 years standing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure it would.

Mr. KEM. As to the Senator's amendment, in studying the bill I gave serious consideration to whether or not I should offer certain amendments to the language of the bill, but I came to the conclusion that there were so many vices in the bill that it was beyond repair. It could not well be amended in such a way

that it could be acceptable to any careful, right-minded Senator. And so I decided not to offer any amendments. And whether the Senator decides to offer any, of course, depends on the Senator's own judgment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator, of course this measure comes under the general criticism that may be leveled against working under the tremendous pressure under which the Senate is now working. Of course, there is not an opportunity to give thorough consideration to every bill that is presented, but I assure the Senator that every effort was made in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make the bill a measure which would be definitely limited and therefore which would be free of the criticisms which resulted in the veto a year ago.

Mr. KEM. I am sure the intentions of the Committee on Insular Affairs were good and entirely right. But I call the Senator's attention to the fact that no hearings were held on this particular bill.

The chronology on the bill seems to be this: It was introduced on May 26, 1948. No hearings on the bill were held, and on June 16, 1948, the bill was reported. Two days later, on June 18, it appeared on the Consent Calendar and on June 19 an effort is being made at a quarter of twelve at night to pass the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator that the bill as he sees it here is the result of at least a year's effort on the part of Members of the Senate. Members of various committees of the Senate and Members of the House and members of committees of the House, the officials of the Bureau of Mines and of the RFC have been in constant conference with respect to the measure. Hearings were held last year, and every effort has been made to bring out a workable bill which leads me to another question I desire to propound to my good friend from Missouri, namely, whether in his view an amendment which would limit the operation of the bill say to 2 years would tend to relieve the criticism and the objection which he makes?

Mr. KEM. Before answering that question I want to refer briefly to the comment made by the Senator from Wyoming. He said that hearings were held. Now it is quite true that hearings were held by the committee upon the general question of stimulating the production of lead, zinc, and other metals in the United States. The point I make and which cannot be successfully controverted is that no hearings were held on this bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. After the bill was introduced, no producer in Joplin, Mo., or St. Francois County, Mo., or Galena, Ill., or elsewhere in the United States had an opportunity to come here and present his views. Before the discussion is completed on the bill, I think the Senator from Wyoming will admit that it would have been wise to have conducted hearings and given those interested an opportunity to test the bill in the crucible of public discussion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I, without impairing the Senator's right to the floor, say that I quite agree with that view? I quite agree that that would have been a desirable procedure. But we were operating under an understanding that this session of the Congress was to adjourn on the 19th of June, and to many of us it seemed highly desirable that authority should be granted by the Congress of the United States to make certain that the United States was building up a stock pile of domestic minerals, because we knew that the Government of Russia was leaving nothing undone to promote the exploration and the development of minerals within that domain.

Mr. KEM. That brings me, Mr. President, to the very interesting history of this legislation. The bill is what may be fairly called a Johnny Come Lately. It was rushed through the last session of the Senate, the third day before adjournment. In this session it was introduced in the House. The House committee declined to grant a rule on it, but no effort was made to bring it to the Senate until May 26, at which time it was introduced. It was not brought to the Senate floor until June 16, when it was reported by the committee.

The question I raise, Mr. President, is whether important legislation such as this—and certainly no Senator within the sound of my voice will say that legislation which goes to the very foundation of the American way of life and the American free-enterprise and free-competitive system, and which involves an uncounted amount of money is not important. The question is whether it is proper, whether it is orderly, for legislation of this kind to be rushed through the Senate on the last day of the session and then taken over to the House, and, I suppose, passed over there under suspension of the rules.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has not this bill been introduced in the House?

Mr. KEM. It was introduced, but the Rules Committee declined to grant a rule on it. The strategy is, I believe, to rush it through the Senate tonight, then rush it over to the House by special messenger, and try to get it through.

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Wyoming. I was interested to hear the statement of the Senator from Wyoming that the RFC was cooperating in the matter. I do not know at first-hand the present position of the RFC on this bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said that the RFC was consulted about the matter. I know that a year ago the RFC raised objections to some of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. KEM. I will say, for my part, that I have no reason to believe that the position of the RFC regarding the proposed legislation has changed. If the Senator from Wyoming has more recent information I shall be glad to have him make it available to the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My recollection is that the objection of the RFC a year ago—and I personally consulted the officials of the RFC—was based upon the fact that the terms of the bill authorized commitments against the Government in excess of the authorized amount. That is precisely the objection which was sought to be eliminated by the amendment which is in the bill and some changes which I discussed a moment ago.

Mr. KEM. I believe the memory of the Senator from Wyoming, which is usually good, has played him a trick. The criticisms of the RFC went to further points, much further than the statement of the Senator from Wyoming indicates. I shall be glad to read a letter from Mr. John D. Goodloe, if the Senator has any doubt about the fact. Would the Senator like to have it read?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should be very glad to have it read if the Senator cares to read it.

Mr. KEM. Very well. It is as follows:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1947.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: Reference is made to H. R. 1602, which provides for the continuation of the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc for an additional 2-year period beyond June 30, 1947, and which, as passed by the House of Representatives on July 22, 1947, adds manganese as an additional material on which premiums are to be paid.

We were not requested to submit a report to the House Public Lands Committee or to testify concerning the bill. However, inasmuch as it provides that the RFC shall disburse the premium payments, we consider it expedient to point out that, in the light of 5½ years of experience with the plan for copper, lead, and zinc, the amount of money authorized will be insufficient to accomplish the desired purposes.

In other words, the first complaint made by the RFC was that they were directed to do things that the estimate of $35,000,000 a year would not by any means cover.

I continue reading from the letter:

The bill authorizes a maximum expenditure of $70,000,000, with not more than $35,000,000 to be expended during the year ending June 30, 1948. Other provisions make it quite plain that the premium-price plan as operated during fiscal 1947 is not to be curtailed as respects benefits to producers, but is to be expanded, particularly with regard to premiums for exploration projects. The present rate of disbursements on copper, lead, and zinc, based on available figures for March and April 1947, is in excess of $3,500,000 a month, and our estimate is that between $3,500,000 and $4,000,000 would be needed monthly for such metals during fiscal 1948 if the bill becomes law. This does not take into account premium payments on manganese, which has not heretofore been embodied in the plan and for which no procedure has been set up. Likewise, it makes no provision in the case of the fou. materials for a declining market. It should be borne in mind that if the prevailing high prices for the subsidized materials should decline, the amount of the subsidy paid will proportionately increase. During fiscal 1947, when price controls were eased and then gradually abandoned, we will have disbursed approximately $60,000,000 on copper, lead, and zinc premiums.

Under the terms of the bill we would feel obligated to discontinue disbursements when the $35,000,000 ceiling had been reached. However, we have reason to believe that producers will insist that the bill gives them a 2-year guaranty of operations and that they are entitled to payment for any eligible production derived during such period. Thus the question of a deficiency appropriation to pay off such accrued amounts would be presented. Further, a difficult administrative situation is created, which we believe might give rise to claims and possibly litigation against the Government for reimbursement of expenditures allegedly made in reliance on the statute.

If the present dollar limitation is to be retained, we feel that the Congress should indicate clearly that this is a limited program, to be tailored within the exact sums authorized. The Department of Commerce, which will certify the premiums to RFC for payment, would be able to project its quotas on a definite basis, and the producers could likewise raise no questions as to the exact amount of funds available.

We have not had an opportunity to give much thought to the question of the inclusion of manganese within this plan since the matter was first brought to our attention today. However, it is desired to point out that manganese is marketed in an entirely different manner than copper, lead, and zinc and that the existing procedures for copper, lead, and zinc could not apply to manganese.

We express no opinion as to the merits of the bill. Should further comments be desired, we shall be glad to supply same.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. GOODLOE,
Chairman.

In other words, Mr. President, the RFC was not concerned about the limitation in the bill which was placed at $35,000,000, but it was concerned about the fact that it could not do what it was required to do, under the provisions of the bill, for $35,000,000.

I believe I agreed to yield to the Senator from Colorado for some questions.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator, but I shall ask the questions later on.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it is not a question of whether the RFC approves this bill. I think it is quite interesting to note that it is apparently not approved by any of the departments of Government which would legitimately deal with the situation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it approved by the National Resources Board?

Mr. KEM. No; it is not. I made inquiry of the National Resources Board from Colonel Allen. Mr. Kenneth Johnson, general counsel of the Board, called me and gave me the following statement, which he said had been authorized by Mr. Hall, the Chairman of the Board:

The Board approved legislation which provides for incentive payments to stimulate the exploration for strategic and critical materials. Long-range contracts should be used wherever practicable to bring about increases in current production for stock-pile purposes. Legislation which authorizes payments to be made in advance of delivery of materials procured under the Stock-Piling Act has the approval of the Board.

The statement of Mr. Hall, the Chairman of the Resources Board, continues as follows:

The Board presently is not in a position to approve legislation which provides for the payment of premiums on current production.

I assume the Senator from Colorado will agree that this report does provide for figures of current production. If there is any doubt about that, I shall be glad to point out the provision.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. KEM. I prefer that the Senator take that up in his own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, since we are discussing the position of the various departments of the Government having to do with this matter, I should like to read a letter from Mr. J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, dated May 26, 1948. It reads as follows:

MY DEAR MR. WELCH: This is in response to your recent request by telephone for an immediate report on H. R. 6623, "a bill to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals, and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes."

This Department cannot support H. R. 6623 in its present form, not because this Department does not advocate the expressed purposes of the bill, but because the bill is not properly devised to accomplish those purposes. Stimulation of the production of strategic and critical metals and minerals for national defense and domestic economy is obviously desirable, but it is no simple matter. This Department now has under consideration a draft of a bill for the purposes expressed in H. R. 6623, which is designed to overcome the objections here expressed to that bill.

In other words, if I may interject, the Secretary of the Interior says that he has under consideration a bill which will accomplish the express objectives of the bill we are discussing, but he does not approve of this bill because he does not think it will properly accomplish its objectives.

I continue the letter of Secretary Krug:

The intention of H. R. 6623 is to provide for incentive payments to producers of strategic and critical metals and minerals, in addition to the money received by them from sales. The idea is that the mere increase in the money returns to producers will result in bringing about the desired increase in production. Assuming that the bill makes adequate provisions for such payments, this Department does not believe that such payments would accomplish the purpose. The present economic conditions and prevailing high prices for the metals and minerals in question do not indicate that a mere general increase in the money returns to domestic producers would result in a significant increase in production. To be effective, any such incentive payments should be tied to and limited to the actual increase in production.

The bill does not indicate whether the incentive payments are to be made with reference to the production from particular mines or properties or with reference to the total production from all mines and properties of a particular producer. It seems plain to this Department that not only should such incentive payments be tied to and limited to actual increase in production, but that such payments should be made with reference to the total production of a producer rather than with reference to individual mines or properties of a producer. Unless such payments refer to the total production of the producer the tendency would be to divert facilities and labor from low-cost production to marginal and high-cost production in order to get the fullest benefit from incentive payments while they were obtainable. This might bring into production some marginal and high-cost properties, but would be just as likely to decrease the total national production as to increase it.

Lack of definitions in the bill makes it impossible to ascertain just how it is intended to operate. The bill provides that the incentive payments "shall be made hereunder for all ores, metals, and minerals determined to be strategic or critical" under the Stock-Piling Act (60 Stat. 596). No specification whatever is made with respect to eligibility for such payments. For all that is contained in the bill the payments might be claimed by a mere broker or dealer in the metals or minerals in question.

The bill provides for two types of incentive payments. Payments for production are termed "development and conservation payments." The bill purports to make provision for another type of payment termed "exploration payments." The sole provision for these "exploration payments" is the following: "Exploration payments shall be made in addition to development and conservation payments without regard to payment limitations provided in this act, and not in excess of a total maximum to be determined by the Director." No definition of "exploration" nor any sort of guide is provided as to what is intended to be accomplished by these "exploration payments," as to whom the payments are to be made, or as to the amounts in which they should be made or their relation to the "development and conservation payments."

This Department believes that any program for incentive payments to the producers of strategic and critical metals and minerals can be justified under present conditions only for purposes of national defense and for building up the national stock pile under the Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 596).

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Would the Senator be in favor of a bill which followed the recommendations of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. KEM. I should not care to commit myself to the bill until I saw it, but generally speaking I believe in the American way of free enterprise and free competition, and the producers of these metals in my own State—and it is an important industry, employing thousands of people there, many small companies and some large ones—in the long run would be better off under the system of free enterprise and free competition because anything else leads inevitably to governmental control.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator does not think that those mines in his State which are closed down today would be better off, does he?

Mr. KEM. I think those mines in the long run would be better off than if they were opened today under artificial Government stimulation under an uneconomic situation.

Mr. McFARLAND. If I may make an observation to the Senator I will say I have talked to a great many people of his State and I do not believe he can convince them of that.

Mr. KEM. When I come to it I will be glad to show the Senator the widespread opinion among the people of my State upon that subject. I can read a

large number of letters and telegrams, and we can be here all night, if the Senator desires, on that subject.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am willing to stay here just as long as the Senator wants to stay.

Mr. KEM. Very well.

Now to continue to read from Secretary Krug's letter:

H. R. 6623 is not sufficiently coordinated with this proper purpose either in language or intent. The bill recites (section 5 (b)): "All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation," for transfer to the national stock pile. But the bill does not define what is meant by "additional ores, metals, and minerals" nor does it lay down any standard for determining which ores, metals, and minerals are to be considered as resulting from incentive payments. Moreover, as previously pointed out, the bill does not provide that incentive payments are to be tied to or limited to increased production. It would be impossible to determine by any means afforded by the bill what metals or minerals are to be available for the national stock pile.

To be sure the bill does provide (section 3 (c)) that the Director shall "prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act in the simplest manner." The bill does not, however, provide a sufficiently clear and unambiguous course of action within which the Director is required to function and which the rules and regulations would be intended to implement. In order to administer the bill as now framed, the rules and regulations would have to supply the inadequacies and clarify the ambiguities in the bill.

The bill provides (section 5 (a)) that the incentive payments "• • • shall include a reasonable profit to the producer • • •." The term "reasonable profit" is not defined. This Department believes that profit is not a suitable measure for incentive payments in the mining industry to increase production. What may be a reasonable profit in such a speculative and uncertain business as mining—particularly with reference to bringing in new or marginal production—would be a highly controversial subject. It may be doubted, moreover, if changes in the Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale price index of all commodities is a suitable standard for escalation of incentive payments under the act. The prices of the very metals and minerals in question are an important element of the index, with the apparent result that one increase in the price of those metals and minerals calls for another increase, ad infinitum.

Finally, estimates based upon mineral production during World War II do not indicate that any such over-all subsidy to producers as is provided in this bill will sufficiently stimulate domestic production of the strategic and critical metals and minerals that are most needed for the national stock pile.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, I have here another interesting opinion on this bill from the Director of the Budget. The letter from the Director of the Budget, which is written on the letterhead of "Executive Office of the President's Bureau of the Budget, Washington 25, D. C.," dated June 3, 1948, and addressed to "The honorable the Secretary of the Interior," reads as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to the draft of bill designed to stimulate the production of and exploration for strategic and critical materials, which draft bill was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget on May 4 by the Department of the Interior in accordance with established procedure.

The draft bill has been referred to various Government agencies concerned with this matter and has been the subject of extensive conferences. Information developed in these discussions appears to indicate that, while major administrative improvements have been made in the draft bill over H. R. 1602, vetoed by the President in the first session of the Eightieth Congress, production subsidy provisions of the draft bill are subject to the same difficulties which impelled the veto of H. R. 1602. Accordingly that feature of the proposed bill would not be in accord with the program of the President.

You are further advised that there would be no objection to the submission to the Congress for its consideration of draft legislation in respect of exploration payments along the lines of the attached draft which has been developed as a result of interagency discussions on this matter. It is believed that contracts with private producers under which the Government would pay not to exceed 50 percent of the cost of authorized exploration, would result in increased production of strategic and critical materials required for the stock pile.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. WEBB, *Director.*

So, Mr. President, we have here statements from three important public officials who have examined this bill and have expressed an opinion upon it: The Chairman of the National Resources Board, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Director of the Budget. And the opinion of all these gentlemen is adverse.

Surely the Senate of the United States, in the face of evidence such as that, at a quarter after 12 Sunday morning, is not going to rush through to final passage a bill of this importance and involving such a large amount of money with that kind of expert opinion urging caution.

I know my friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is chafing at the bit, and my friend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] as well, but before I sit down I want to discuss the circumstances and conditions under which the payments will be made by this very powerful individual, the Director of the premium-price plan, over whom we would have no control.

The Director is authorized to make two kinds of payments. They are known as development and conservation payments and exploration payments. Of course, from the name, it is clear the class of cases involved. Development and conservation payments go to those who are already engaged in business. The exploration payments go to those who want to engage in business. But, Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that there is an inconsistency in the very statement of development and conservation payments because, if the properties are going to be developed, if there is to be an incentive given to develop the property, by the same token the minerals will not be conserved in the ground. The method of calculation is provided for at the bottom of page 4:

Such payments shall be calculated at such rates within the limitations defined in this act so as to encourage exploration and development, increase production, and effect conservation and make reasonable allowances for depreciation and depletion and afford opportunity for a reasonable profit to the producer based upon the values of the recoverable metals and strategic and critical minerals contained in the ores.

In other words, this paragon of executive ability is given the difficult task of fixing payments that will encourage development and also effect conservation. In addition, he is told that he shall guarantee a reasonable profit to the producer based upon the values of the recoverable metals and strategical and critical minerals contained in the ore. In addition, he is told to make a reasonable allowance for depreciation and depletion. That language could be discussed at great length, but I should like to ask this question: Upon what basis is the depreciation and depletion of a submarginal mine to be calculated? If it cannot be operated at a profit today, how are we to figure depreciation and depletion on it?

But the provision for exploration payments is the most remarkable of all. That appears at the middle of page 6, and reads as follows:

Exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on projects approved by him under rules as prescribed in section 3 (c).

Let us turn to section 3 (c). Section 3 (c) provides that—

(c) It shall be the duty of the Director, and he is hereby authorized and directed, (1) to perform the functions hereinafter specifically authorized, and (2) to prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act in the simplest manner.

In other words, he is directed to make these exploration payments under rules which he himself prescribes, and which he can change from time to time. Suppose John Smith comes to him and says, "I have a yen to discover a lead mine, or a zinc mine, or a manganese mine." The Director, under rules which he himself prescribes and can change to suit that particular case, can, as I see it, give John Smith any amount of money he thinks proper to use in exploration.

Mr. President, I have taken up more time than I should, but I wished to answer the question of the Senator from Arizona. I do not see him in the Chamber at the moment. He asked me about the position of the people engaged in this industry in my own State. I should like to read to him a short paragraph from a statement made by Mr. Andrew Fletcher.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, does the Senator wish to have the Senator from Arizona called into the Chamber?

Mr. KEM. I should be very glad to have him here. He raised a question as to how the producers in my own State felt about this plan. I wanted to read him short excerpts from statements which I thought would answer his question fully and completely. I could read him a large number of letters and statements about that matter, but I shall not take time to do so.

I wish to pick out some typical instances which I think will express fully and completely what I consider to be the best informed opinion on the subject in my State.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I was moved

to make that statement by reason of the fact that I have received many telephone calls from persons in the Senator's State, and some of them have called on me personally, expressing an interest in this proposed legislation. So I was at a loss to understand why the Senator from Missouri would be opposing a bill which his own constituents regard as so important to their welfare.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey in his very eloquent address this afternoon quoted Mr. James A. Farley, who said, "Willingness to sacrifice office, rather than to compromise with principle, is something we all must keep in mind."

I know that there are a great many people in my State, many of whom are personal friends of mine of many years' standing, who think that if this bill is passed and largess is distributed by the Director of the premium-price plan, some of the manna will fall on them and the members of their families. I know that full well; I am apprised of that, just as well as the Senator from Arizona.

I desire to point out to the Senator from Arizona what I think is the best informed and most intelligent, the most farsighted opinion on the subject held by the people of my State. The first man I want to quote pays the price of success. He is president of the largest operation in my State. I am sure that before the debate is completed it will be said of him, "He is a big operator, do not pay any attention to what he says. He is a big operator." But let me read something he said on March 13 of this year when he appeared at a meeting of his employees in the lead belt in Missouri.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator mind giving us the man's name?

Mr. KEM. The man is Mr. Andrew Fletcher, president of the St. Joseph Lead Co., who came from New York for the purpose of delivering an address to his employees, which address I have here in full. I am going to refer to it, though I am not going to read all of it. He began by paying a tribute to the wives of the men, whom he had invited to be there, and then talked about teamwork and earnings and the future. He said this, and I invite the attention of every Member to it:

The dark cloud on the metal horizon is the present hysteria for the reinstatement of Government subsidies on metal production, which if adopted by Congress in a form similar to the wartime premium-price plan, can only result in Government controls of profits, wages, salaries, metal allocations—and decreased efficiency. Every member of the St. Joseph Lead management is definitely opposed to Government subsidies on metal production, as no nation has yet succeeded in regimenting an economy, without eventually regimenting the individuals and the companies, whom the economy was supposed to benefit. Our country has been built up by encouraging the individual to build for himself, and so to create wealth. We have built a society that is unique in the world. For the first time in history, hundreds of thousands of enterprises, big and small, competitively operated, and individually managed, are effectively creating wealth in terms of a better living standard for all. Yet we seem to have lost ground in effort to make this basic idea of our society understood. The philosophy that man and his affairs must be managed by the government is certainly a reactionary doctrine. We must do our part to defeat this belief, because only as long as the means of livelihood of a people remain unrestricted, can they as individuals remain free.

Today in the world around us, millions of people suffer from hunger, are without adequate clothes and housing. They live in fear and terror—never knowing whether tomorrow will bring them imprisonment or death. Freedom has been lost. We today are living in a happy contrast to the unfortunate peoples of other lands, as we have freedom of religion, of the press, and we have our competitive free-enterprise system, which is directly responsible for our prosperity, and for the great opportunities which lie before us and our children.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator consider the stock piling of lead important to the defense of the Nation?

Mr. KEM. I do not think the stock piling is of great necessity under present conditions, as I shall show in a few minutes. As soon as we got back to the free-enterprise system last June, the production of the country began to increase. So long as we piddle along with price premiums and that sort of thing we are not going to get the full production of which the industry is capable.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator does regard a stock piling of lead as important, does he not?

Mr. KEM. Yes. We have done some stock piling. I think that is all well and good. I would not criticize it, and I would not criticize further stock piling if authorized or requested by those charged with our national defense.

Let me make this clear. In the discussions with people from my State who have come to my office to talk about this matter, who have urged the necessity of providing for the national defense, I have said to them, "Go over to the Pentagon Building and get from the officials there charged with the national defense a statement that this bill is necessary, and I will not oppose the bill on the floor, but I shall become one of its protagonists." Such a statement has never come from the Pentagon Building.

Mr. McFARLAND. If I may ask the Senator another question, has Mr. Fletcher any lead to sell the United States Government for stock piling?

Mr. KEM. That, of course, is the line of argument that I knew, when I read Mr. Fletcher's statement, would be advanced. He is president of the largest operation in our State, and, as I said before, he pays the price of success. In certain quarters, however, anything he says may be discounted.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; the Senator misunderstands me. I merely asked whether Mr. Fletcher has any lead to sell the United States Government for stock piling. It was not to discount anything he says. If Mr. Fletcher says he has the lead, then he has it; but he does not say it, because he does not have it.

Mr. KEM. The Senator may be surprised to hear me say it, but I do not have the pleasure of Mr. Fletcher's personal acquaintance. I know a large number of his employees in Missouri, many of whom are personal friends of mine, but I do not know Mr. Fletcher. I cannot answer for his plans or his purposes or the extent of his operations, but I shall have to direct the Senator to Mr. Fletcher himself.

Something was said about Members of Congress being willing to sacrifice office rather than compromise their principles. Businessmen are willing to do the same thing. There is in St. Louis a businessman, Mr. Howard I. Young, active for many years in the civic life of that city. Whenever there are civic and charitable enterprises under way, one is very apt to find Howard Young not only generously contributing but also doing much of the spade work necessary to make the thing a success. He is one of the most public-spirited men I know. He happens to be the president of a comparatively small concern known as the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., whose headquarters are in St. Louis. I quote from the annual report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1947. Mr. Young, as the president of the company, says this:

Government subsidies continued under the premium-price plan until June 30, 1947. The plan was renewed by the Congress as the Allen bill in August, and later was vetoed by President Truman.

Our total receipts for the year 1947 under the premium-price plan amounted to $623,931, which compares with our subsidy receipts during 1946 of $1,418,938. In 1947 receipts represent an amount equal to 27.17 percent of our net operating income before depreciation and taxes.

Mr. President, in order that we may have the situation of the company clearly in mind, 2 years before he drew out approximately $623,000 and $1,418,000, respectively. He says that in 1947 it amounted to 27 percent of the net operating income before depreciation and taxes. Under those conditions one would imagine he would think pretty well of the premium-price plan and would want it put back into effect, but one would be exactly wrong.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, is the Senator personally acquainted with Mr. Young?

Mr. KEM. I know him well.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has he any lead to sell to the United States Government for stock piling?

Mr. KEM. He is in the lead and zinc business, and I dare say he would be glad to have the Government's business. I suppose he is conducting business with the Government now.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is not the Senator informed about the lead business in his State?

Mr. KEM. I did not understand that to be the question. I understood the question was whether or not Mr. Andrew Young had any lead to sell.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does not the Senator know whether there is a surplus of lead in his State, or whether there is a scarcity of it, or what the mines are doing in his State?

Mr. KEM. I will show the Senator that when the premium plan ceased to operate production increased.

I want to read Mr. Young's comments about the price premium plan,

notwithstanding his own personal interest in it. I am reading from the report:

It is our judgment that subsidies on metal production in peacetime are not justified unless the metals are required for permanent stockpiling by those responsible for national defense.

In other words, it seems that Mr. Young is willing to sacrifice his own personal interest rather than compromise with principle.

Mr. President, someone made the comment, "You are reading what the big men say. Let us hear what the little fellows have to say about it." I have a letter from Mr. Tom J. Rightly, of Joplin, Mo., under date of March 2, 1948. He is a mining engineer. He addressed me as follows:

JOPLIN, MO., *March 2, 1948.*

Hon. JAMES P. KEM,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEM: I trust it is in order to avail myself of the privilege of requesting you to continue your opposition to any bill that may be presented in Congress concerning a subsidy for zinc.

At the termination of the emergency a group of zinc producers began a lobby and propaganda campaign for the continuation of the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc, under the Allen bill (H. R. 1692).

That is the companion bill in the House. I continue reading from the letter:

The proposed subsidy was so unnecessary and wasteful of taxpayers' money that even New Deal President Truman felt called upon to veto the measure. The lesson of the past 8 months without a zinc premium has clearly demonstrated the justification and correctness of the action.

Now again appears the "give me" producers in the zinc-mining industry attempting again to lobby and propagandize through Congress a dole for zinc, under any misnomer cause.

The same old gravy train, on another similar track, carrying the same load, but under new camouflage, and still fired and oiled by the same give-me group.

Many statements were misleading in the propaganda brochure put out last June by the Tri-State Zinc & Lead Ore Producers Association. Likewise many statements and assertions by some of our Republican friends who cuss out the New Deal but work for and have their hands out for New Deal give-me money from taxpayers' funds. It is surprising who some of these so-called Republicans are.

Contrary to the chiselers' wail of no subsidy, no production, the zinc production, with the subsidy ended in June, in the United States increased 9 percent during 1947 over 1946, when the subsidy was in full blast. This information was recently furnished by the Bureau of Mines. This production was made in contrast to the propaganda that mines would close, become flooded and worthless.

Some mines in this district and in other districts did close when the former subsidy terminated. They should remain closed until a price for zinc on a supply-and-demand basis in a free market will justify operations.

The Engineering and Mining Journal of February 1948 issue, considered by all mining men an authoritative and authentic source, states, "Most of the advocates want subsidies because their own operations will be helped." These advocates stand to make large profits at the expense of the taxpayer by an unwarranted subsidy. The recent subsidy gave them large profits and they can well afford to gamble large sums for propaganda and lobby in their new effort and let the taxpayer cry and be damned.

Zinc mines have operated for 8 months without a bonus. Supply and demand is in good position. Even with the large demand during the past 16 months a considerable tonnage of zinc has been diverted to Government stock pile.

There is no justifiable cause or reason at this time to warrant the unnecessary spending of taxpayers' money for a subsidy for zinc except that a privileged few may win large profits at taxpayers' expense.

I trust that your opposition to subsidies has not changed since last March and I respectfully and earnestly request that you oppose any effort to revive a subsidy for zinc. The taxpayer will welcome and appreciate such an action by you.

Sincerely yours,

TOM J. RIGHTLY.

Mr. President, the question has been raised concerning the production of lead and zinc under present conditions. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] was curious to know about whether I had any information as to the present condition of the industry. I shall be glad to answer that question. I have in my hand a statistical history of United States lead production. I believe the Senator's question was directed to lead production, was it not?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I am interested in all of the metals and minerals.

Mr. KEM. This is a statistical history of United States lead production for 1945 to 1947, inclusive, and it carries through year by year. It shows the price in cents per pound; domestic mine production; domestic secondary production; imports of ores and concentrates; imports in bullion and refined lead; exports of refined lead, and so forth. The source is the United States Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and the Engineering and Mining Journal. It shows, Mr. President, that the domestic mine production in 1946, when the price-premium plan was in effect, was 332,500 short tons. In 1947, the amount increased to 400,000 short tons. The domestic secondary supply in 1946 was 392,800 short tons. In 1947 it increased to 425,000 short tons. Imports of ores and concentrates in 1946 were 44,500 short tons. In 1947 the amount increased to 50,000 short tons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the table as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A statistical history of United States lead production and foreign trade, 1925 to 1947, inclusive

[In short tons]

Year	New York price (cents per pound)	Domestic mine production	Domestic secondary production	Imports in ores and concentrates	Imports in bullion	Imports of refined lead	Total imports	Exports of refined lead	Drawback in manufactures
1925	9.02	684,400	226,900	44,500	70,600	7,000	122,100	103,500	----------
1926	8.42	684,000	277,300	58,100	78,300	11,200	147,600	71,900	----------
1927	6.76	663,500	276,000	40,600	118,300	2,500	161,400	125,300	----------
1928	6.30	627,200	308,000	25,900	128,500	700	155,100	116,300	13,400
1929	6.83	648,000	311,600	31,300	83,100	1,700	116,100	73,300	13,100
1930	5.52	588,300	255,800	39,400	38,600	200	78,200	48,200	12,200
1931	4.24	404,600	234,700	20,900	32,300	----------	53,200	21,700	10,500
1932	3.18	293,000	198,300	21,000	13,500	----------	34,500	23,500	7,200
1933	3.87	272,700	224,500	6,000	1,000	100	7,600	22,800	6,100
1934	3.86	257,400	208,400	10,600	2,500	300	13,300	5,700	7,200
1935	4.07	331,100	270,400	20,000	2,700	1,300	24,000	7,000	8,100
1936	4.71	372,900	292,900	20,700	300	2,600	23,600	18,300	8,305
1937	6.01	464,900	275,100	34,100	1,800	5,000	40,800	20,100	8,700
1938	4.74	369,700	224,900	45,400	15,300	2,000	63,900	45,900	9,100
1939	5.05	414,000	241,500	36,800	48,900	5,400	86,900	74,400	10,400
1940	5.18	457,400	260,300	111,300	19,600	151,600	282,500	23,800	15,600
1941	5.79	461,400	397,400	82,100	24,700	274,200	381,200	14,400	22,000
1942	[1] 6.48	496,200	328,600	79,400	43,900	366,500	492,500	1,900	26,300
1943	[1] 6.50	453,300	342,100	70,000	4,600	244,000	319,100	2,000	15,500
1944	[1] 6.50	416,900	331,400	58,600	60	222,800	221,300	15,500	20,200
1945	[1] 6.50	390,800	363,000	70,000	----------	227,500	299,700	1,400	5,400
1946	[2] 8.11	332,500	392,800	44,500	125	112,200	160,900	600	----------
1947 estimate	14.67	400,000	425,000	50,000	2,000	150,000	202,000	1,800	----------

[1] Premium payments by U. S. Government not included.
[2] Free market restored on Nov. 12, 1946.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Mines; Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; Engineering and Mining Journal.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it is rather interesting that as soon as the price premium plan was discontinued the efficiency of our southeast Missouri lead belt operations increased. Under the operation of the price premium plan they dropped from around 16 tons per man-shift to 10.6 tons per man-shift. When the price premium plan went off they bounded back again. In other words, there seems to be a peculiar quirk in human nature that when the Government is paying for things and subsidizing there is not the efficiency, there is not the morale, there is not the production that is evident when the employer is on his own and the employees are on their own.

Mr. President, I have talked too long. My position in this matter may be inapplicable to some, but I think I can probably explain it.

I know very well that when Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany the main instrument he used to undermine the independence and self-reliance of the German people was subsidies. He paid subsidies right and left. He made the people generally apply to the Fuehrer as the source from which all blessings came. So it was not long before 40,000,000 Germans were goose-stepping and crying "Heil Hitler," and we know what a chain of human suffering followed. So, for my part, I want to stick to the American way of life, the free-enterprise system of free competition that has served us so well, that has given us in America the highest standards of life the world has ever seen.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to answer some of the questions raised by the Senator from Missouri, for whom I have the highest regard, and I pay tribute to his sincerity and honesty, and I know that what he says comes from his heart.

I wish to say in all seriousness that the Senator from Missouri must know, as, indeed, anyone from a mining State must know, that for 30 years after the return of our Army from France in 1919 many committees of Congress began holding hearings to try to find out how to meet the serious emergency affecting metals.

I was in France with the field artillery during the First World War and we got nice new shiny 4.7 guns just a few weeks before the Armistice. Because of the lack of metals and other materials, we never got an American plane in the air over there. There was no timber or metals in stock piles.

During World War II, I was a special consultant for the Armed Services Committee, and we sat and sweated blood while the submarines of the Germans were sinking American ships carrying manganese and trying to bring goods from foreign countries because we did not have a stock pile.

I know that my colleague did not mean to approach this question in a facetious frame of mind. This is a desperate situation. When he says "Johnny Come Lately," I reply that these conditions have existed for 30 years. In the last 2 years the House committee has been holding hearings almost continuously, and on my desk are 28 volumes of transcripts of hearings we have held during the past 2 years as part of the investigation conducted by the Senate National Resources Economics Subcommittee, and two-thirds of the hearings were devoted to minerals.

We published a 300-page statement showing the mineral position of the United States. There is not time tonight, I agree with the Senator, to go into this matter, but this is a good report. It comes largely from the Bureau of Mines, and it shows the mineral position of the United States, and how pitifully inadequate many of our known mineral resources are. I submit the report for the consideration of Members of the Senate.

Let me read a letter, only one letter, because I am not going to take much of the Senate's time. Mr. Krug made certain objections to the Russell bill, so to meet these objections we made the necessary changes in the bill after we had had 2 years of hearings. Nearly every mining man in the United States engaged in operations of any magnitude appeared before one of the congressional committees, and every mining association in the United States joined in a resolution asking for just such legislation as we are seeking to have passed by the Senate tonight. Here is a letter from Mr. Krug:

MY DEAR MR. RUSSELL: In your letter of May 5 you inquire as to the position of the Department of the Interior on incentive payments to domestic mine operators.

I do not feel that incentive production payments in excess of market prices are normally economically justified for minerals in times of peace. If it should appear, however, that a particular mineral is in such short supply that it cannot be stock-piled in quantities adequate for the national defense and if it appears that incentive payments to the marginal and submarginal producers of such a mineral would result in increasing the total national production of that mineral, the Department would not be opposed to incentive payments in such circumstances. The Department would not be inclined, however, to support a proposal for incentive payments where the mineral involved can be otherwise sufficiently stock-piled or where it appears that the incentive payment would produce such a displacement of labor from low-cost to marginal and submarginal mines as to reduce the total national production of the mineral involved.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Is there any difference between the Malone bill in the Senate and the Allen bill in the House?

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator mean the Russell bill?

Mr. KEM. It is called the Allen bill by Mr. Krug.

Mr. MALONE. No. I am a little shocked. The Allen bill last year was a premium-price plan, which was a war baby. Neither the Russell bill nor the bill which, with nine other Senators, I joined in introducing, has any relation whatever to the price premium payment plan.

Mr. KEM. I am talking about the bill pending in the House.

Mr. MALONE. The Russell bill?

Mr. KEM. Is that identical with the Malone bill?

Mr. MALONE. No. There are five or six vital differences.

Mr. KEM. Between that and the House bill?

Mr. MALONE. Yes. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. The caption of the bill is the same, is it not? I read the caption from Mr. Krug's letter.

Mr. MALONE. The caption is the same, and that is about all the similarity there is between them.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BRIDGES. I submit a conference report on House bill 6801, making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 7, 12, 22, 32, 40 and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34 and 35; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "June 30, 1949: *Provided*, That the entire amount may be apportioned for obligation or may be obligated and expended, if the President, after recommendation by the Administrator, deems such action necessary to carry out the purposes of said Act, during the period ending April 2"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the amount inserted in said amendment, insert "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number inserted by said amendment, insert "fifty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert "hire of aircraft"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That not less than 5 per centum of each special local currency account established pursuant to section 115 (b) (5) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government for expenditure for strategic materials where available or for other local currency requirements of the United States of America"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $58,000,000 may be expended for administrative and other expenses including not to exceed $12,000,000 for direct administration and not to exceed $6,000,000 for technical assistance authorized under section 111 (a) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That pursuant to section 117 (c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, the Administrator shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to any participating foreign country, regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That guaranties of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media provided for under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, or otherwise, shall not exceed $10,000,000 in the first year"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That there shall be included within the local currency administrative expenditures of the United States such sums as may be necessary to meet expenditures of members and staff of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation in the course of performance of committee functions within respective participating countries"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$35,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$225,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "$400,000,000, of which not to exceed $1,200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses and of which $125,000,000 shall be available exclusively as provided in subsection 404 (b) of said Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished, and such supplies, commoditi s, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; $1,300,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert "*Provided further*, That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the Secretary of the Army shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to Japan, Korea, or the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That not to exceed 60 per centum of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for contribution to the International Refugee Organization until such time as there are effected agreements providing for a caloric diet for the occupants of refugee camps in Europe that is no higher than that prevailing in the country in which such camps are located"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert:

"SEC. 202. No funds made available under the authority of this Act shall be used for the purchase in bulk of any commodities (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to Act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498), as amended), at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination, quality, and terms of payment: *Provided*, That no funds available under this act shall be used for the purchase of wool other than from existing stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless or until such stocks are exhausted."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert:

"SEC. 203. No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to purchase farm machinery, including tractors, in the United States in an amount which will bring the total exports of such machinery and tractors during the period for which this appropriation is made, from the United States, by or for the benefit of the countries participating in the European recovery program, to more than $75,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. Whenever an export license for a commodity, the production or shipment of which to a nonparticipating country was contracted for in good faith prior to March 1, 1948, is denied or cannot be obtained under section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, the Administrator shall provide for the procurement of such commodity to transfer to a participating country in accordance with the requirements of such country, at not less than the contract price of such commodity to the producer or exporter, as the case may be, including any cost incurred in converting the commodity to meet the requirements of the participating country."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 205. Not less than 50 per centum of the United States export requirements of nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) for nonoccupied areas shall come from production of plants operated by or for the Department of the Army.

"In addition, the Department of the Army shall make available, for the commercial production of nitrogenous fertilizer materials for domestic use, ten per centum of the total anhydrous ammonia produced in the United States in plants operated by or for the Department of the Army, said anhydrous ammonia to be distributed as directed by the Department of Commerce, which shall give preference, in distributing said anhydrous ammonia, to producers of ammonium sulphate who were producing ammonium sulphate during the six months preceding the enactment of this Act or who shall have ceased to produce, or shall be faced with an imminent shutdown in the production of, ammonium sulphate for want of anhydrous ammonia, to the extent necessary to permit such producers to operate. The Department of the Army is hereby authorized to produce and sell, in addition to its production for occupied areas, such nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) required for United States exports to nonoccupied areas or for the production of nitrogenous fertilizer materials for domestic use and to credit the proceeds of such sales to the appropriation for Government and Relief in Occupied Areas to the extent of the cost of such production for such sales and any balance to miscellaneous receips of the Treasury."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The House agrees to the title of the bill as amended by the Senate.

STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the report.

Mr. BRIDGES. In general, let me say, that after many long hours of conferences extending over a period of days, the Senate conferees were able to reach an agreement with the House conferees. I think the agreement reached will be generally satisfactory to the Senate, because the major points in controversy, so far as the Senate is concerned, were settled along the lines of action taken by the Senate.

The total amount of the bill as finally agreed upon in conference, is $6,030,710,228.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. How does the figure $6,030,000,000 compare with the figure in the original Senate bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. The $6,030,710,228 is broken down as follows:

Four billion dollars for the Economic Cooperation Administration, which is the part which goes for economic recovery and relief in Europe.

Four hundred million dollars for China.

One billion three hundred million dollars for government and relief in the occupied areas, which include the recovery items for Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus.

Two hundred and twenty-five million dollars for Greek-Turkish relief.

Thirty-five million dollars for the International Emergency Children's Fund.

And there is $70,710,228 for the International Refugee Organization.

Making a total of $6,030,710,228.

The total amount recommended by the conferees is $408,000,000 below the amount that was approved in the Senate bill.

The final figure on all items is $503,000,000 under the amount authorized.

The amount for ECA is unchanged. It is $4,000,000,000. The conferees put it back on a 12-month basis, for all practical purposes.

I might say to the Senator that the main disagreement between the House and the Senate was on the time element; whether it should apply to a 15-month period as the House voted, or a 12-month period as the Senate decided. We arrived at an agreement, finally, which makes the following provision:

The money is available "until June 30, 1949," which is the 15-month figure; "provided, that the entire amount may be appropriated for obligation or may be obligated and expended if the President, after recommendation by the Administrator, deems such action necessary to carry out the purposes of said act during the period ending April 2, 1949."

In other words, if the Administrator makes a recommendation and the President accepts the recommendation, the full amount may be available within the 12-month period, as was originally planned under the authorization act.

Mr. HAWKES. Has the distinguished Senator any doubt that the President and the Economic Administrator will make such a recommendation?

Mr. BRIDGES. I would assume, if the estimates and the recommendations and the testimony which were given before the committee were correct, that with the cuts which we have made, a reexamination or resurvey would probably result in a somewhat similar recommendation on the use of the fund.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not need to suggest to the Senate my deep interest in this report and the extent of my belief that it is fundamentally related to the peace of the earth and the destiny of free America in a free world of free men.

I do not even hesitate long enough to express dissent from any of the reductions made by the committee, because I want to say without reservation that I think the conferees have done a splendid piece of constructive work which maintains the full spirit of this great enterprise.

I want to express my own sense of personal gratitude, Mr. President, not only to the conferees in general, but particularly, and with emphasis, to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, for what I know has been his stalwart loyalty to a great ideal.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I thank very much the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I think that generally speaking we have met the objective of the Senate, and that the bill, as reported, will carry out the objectives which this country seeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in this connection I should like to make a brief explanation of one of the items which we have considered, so that it will be clarified as a part of the report. I refer to the item relative to fertilizer.

The bill, as it now stands, would permit the Army to get the highest amount of production out of its fertilizer plants. The language in the report directs them to lease their plants to free enterprise wherever possible and to get out of cost-plus contracts as soon as feasible. The report is open to the interpretation that the Army cannot expand its facilities at all and such is not the intent of the committee. It is our intent that they shall let private enterprise make the investment for expansion in all possible instances. It seems reasonable that the expansion of the Army plant at Morgantown, W. Va., and the movement of fertilizer trains from the Missouri ordnance plant, where the Bureau of Mines is now experimenting on synthetic fuel, should be done out of such funds as are legally available to get the maximum fertilizer production. Otherwise, I think the report makes it very clear that the Members of this Congress want the Army to lease out facilities on a competitive basis and not to use Government funds for expenditures which private enterprise is willing to make on an investment basis.

In connection with these remarks, I submit a letter addressed to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and ask that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 16, 1948.

HON. STYLES BRIDGES,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: Senator MORSE'S amendment requiring that a percentage of Army nitrogen production must be used to supply domestic needs, added to the previous requirement in Public Law 606 that the Army must meet 50 percent of the export requirements from the United States to nonoccupied countries, makes it even more critically necessary to increase production as rapidly as possible.

The Army accepts without reservation the decision of your committee that the Cactus plant should be promptly leased and that the lessee should bear the cost of the capital improvements to create increased capacity there. It is our understanding that paragraph 6 (p. 15) of your committee's report referred primarily to the Cactus plant.

There are two other plants, however, in which more production can be obtained promptly at relatively small capital cost. While we believe that the proposed statutory language of section 204, as the Senate passed it, would, standing alone, be sufficient to authorize us to proceed with such increased production in these plants, utilization of GARIOA funds for this purpose would not be in accordance with paragraph 6 (p. 15) of your committee's report, unless its wording is clarified. We request such clarification to permit the expenditure of a total of about $4,000,000 in connection with the Morgantown and Missouri ordnance plants.

The Morgantown, W. Va., plant requires relatively small modifications, estimated to cost only $750,000, which would bring its facilities into better balance and so step up production by about 15,000 tons of nitrogen per year. It would not be practical at this time to lease this plant, and the added production can only be obtained promptly by utilization of Army funds.

At the Missouri ordnance plant, 60 percent of which is now being utilized by the Bureau of Mines, and which is not now an Army plant, there are two so-called trains which are not being utilized and which are capable of producing 24,000 tons of nitrogen per year. Because of lack of an assured gas supply at the present location, and also because of interference with the Bureau of Mines' program, it is necessary to move this equipment to a location at which an assured gas supply is available. The total estimated cost for this is $3,200,000. It is possible that such installation could later be leased, and we will do so if possible, but we cannot be assured of achieving the production promptly without being in a position to make the initial expenditure ourselves.

These two measures to step up production would decrease the severe deficit which the occupied areas will have because of the new demands which have recently been made upon its production. Such steps will save at least several times their cost, in avoiding exports of food which would otherwise be required.

If we could merely have some expression from the floor indicating that the course here proposed is acceptable to the Senate Appropriations Committee, we should feel free to proceed at once. Such expenditures have previously been discussed informally with the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, who indicated that he was not opposed to such use.

We would, of course, still follow the policy set forth in paragraph 6 (p. 15) of your committee's report, of leasing these plants in appropriate cases in which it can be done with profit to the Government. The Department of the Army is in full accord with the policy expressed by the committee of having such plants, wherever it is practicable and profitable to do so, commercially operated under lease rather than under cost-plus contracts.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did I correctly understand the Senator from New Hampshire to say that the committee report recommended that the Army dispose of these plants?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; it recommended leasing them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the report make it quite clear that if they are leased they are still to be operated for the purpose of manufacturing fertilizer?

Mr. BRIDGES. It does, very clearly. That is the intent of the provision.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly want that statement in the RECORD.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] or the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]?

Mr. MALONE. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Having adopted the conference report on the appropriation for foreign reconstruction and relief, what is there now awaiting action by the Senate, if anything, before the session is ended? Many Senators are interested. We have been in continuous session for 38 hours without intermission. In order that Senators may understand what is to be taken up between now and the time when we are supposed to adjourn, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska what the program is from now on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes that all Senators will be interested in the explanation of the acting majority leader relative to the remainder of the program prior to adjournment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the suggestion of the minority leader. I shall be glad to give Senators an idea of our present plans. We shall be glad to inform Members of the Senate as to the probable length of the session.

It is true that we have been in session for nearly 38 hours. I just had the Parliamentarian look up the record. The longest continuous session of the United States Senate was in 1915, I believe, in connection with a shipping bill. That session ended on February 18, after 54 hours. We have already reached second place, and I am not sure how much longer we shall have to operate, but there are some things we shall have to do.

I appreciate the fine cooperation and the spirit which is being shown in getting our work done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I want the Senator to understand that I am not complaining about the length of this session.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are operating under the legislative day of June 15, which is 5 days ago; but my anatomy tells me that it is Sunday, the 20th of June. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. I think the Senator's anatomy is about right.

At this particular time, of course, the unfinished business is the motion made by the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1801, Senate bill 2756, which motion is now being debated. We have had to break in on that debate several times to take up privileged matters.

We have just concluded action on the conference report on ECA. Shortly, I hope, we shall have before us action on the conference report on the second deficiency bill. I understand that the conferees have agreed. The report has gone to the House for consideration. As I understand, between 40 and 45 minutes are required to obtain a vote in the House. That conference report will be coming over here, I should say, within an hour.

There are also some other conferees working on other legislation. One such measure is the farm bill. I understand that some headway is being made on that measure, and that there is likely to be an agreement on some basis. We shall have to wait for that.

In the meantime, while we are debating and waiting for conference reports, several suggestions have been made by Members on both sides of the aisle as to bills which they would like to bring up for consideration at this time.

After Calendar No. 1801, Senate bill 2756, is disposed of, we have the civil transport aircraft legislation, Calendar No. 1507, Senate bill 2644, in which Members on both sides of the aisle are very much interested.

There is also Calendar No. 1480, Senate bill 2680, which should come up for consideration.

There is Calendar No. 1457, Senate bill 2754, which several Senators would like to bring up for consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, can a Senator make a brief statement as to what the various bills involve?

Mr. WHERRY. I have only the figures. The civil transport aircraft bill is Calendar No. 1507.

The next calendar number is 1480. These are not in order. This is a list.

The next number is Calendar No. 1457.

The next calendar number is 1436.

We passed Calendar No. 1421, Senate Joint Resolution 162, in which the senior and junior Senators from Washington were both interested.

We have passed Calendar No. 1340, Senate bill 2688.

Several Senators would like very much to have a vote on the equal-rights amendment, if we can possibly reach it before the session is concluded.

Also one or two Members would like to bring up, by unanimous consent, the antilynching bill which was recently reported.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator has already indicated enough business to prevent us from adjourning today.

Mr. WHERRY. I have great hopes of getting away today.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is a bill which has been on the calendar for some time, waiving the provisions of the law with respect to an appointment for Hon. Dean Acheson, who for a long time was Under Secretary of State. Is that on the list of bills?

Mr. WHERRY. It is not on the list I have.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is on the list, but it has been crossed out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who crossed it out?

Mr. WHERRY. Calendar No. 1436, House bill 5708 is the very bill. That is one of the requests which the minority leader made, and we wish to accommodate him if possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is contemplated with respect to an executive session?

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the minority leader that we have not crossed that hurdle yet.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have not crossed these other hurdles either.

Mr. WHERRY. We did not wish to take up the Executive Calendar until we had reached conference reports which we are awaiting and got them out of the way, if possible, as well as much of the legislation to which I have referred.

I should not be a bit surprised if before this session is over the Executive Calendar will probably be called.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator would not be surprised if it is probably called? That is a very elusive statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I wanted to make it as elusive as I could. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will recall, I am sure, that day before yesterday when he asked unanimous consent that we call the calendar for consideration of executive nominations, with the exception of that of Frieda B. Hennock, who was nominated to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, I agreed that the nomination might go over, with the understanding that there would be another call of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I told the Senate that so far as I was concerned, I thought there would be another call of the Executive Calendar, but I could not guarantee it. But I am quite satisfied that if we take these hurdles as we go along, everything will work out satisfactorily.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the Senator from Nebraska is willing to state that before the adjournment occurs, there will be another call of the Executive Calendar; is he?

Mr. WHERRY. I think before the work is concluded, there will be a call of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the suggestion of the minority leader, on behalf of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who reported this nomination, and on behalf of my colleague, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the chairman of the committee, who has discussed this matter with the acting majority leader and with others associated with it; and the committee indicated by its vote that it hoped this matter might receive the consideration of the Senate before the adjournment.

Do I correctly understand that it is settled that there will be an executive session? I simply felt that Senators should understand how we felt about this matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator to mean favorable consideration.

Mr. BREWSTER. The committee voted 8 to 0. There were six Republicans in the list.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am delighted to find Republicans who were right.

Mr. BREWSTER. We hope there will be many more.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am happy to acknowledge that.

But it was a unanimous report of the committee, was it?

Mr. BREWSTER. There was one who voted "present," but at least he did not vote in the negative.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am indebted to the minority leader for this opportunity to announce the program for the next few hours. If all of us just keep our sweet dispositions, I am quite satisfied that we shall adjourn before the time mentioned for the end of this session.

AVIATION LEGISLATION CONSIDERED BY INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a summary of the aviation legislation considered by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the Eightieth Congress, second session. It is a compilation prepared by me of the legislation with which we have dealt.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AVIATION LEGISLATION CONSIDERED BY THE SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE IN THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Attached hereto is a list of 15 bills which the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee considered for action. Of these 15 bills, 12 have passed both the Senate and the House and have been signed by the President or are at the White House awaiting action. At this writing one of the bills, namely, S. 2644, to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft, has passed the House and is on the table of the Senate awaiting legislative action.

Half the bills referred to the White House by this Congress developed from the recommendations of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of which the Senator from Maine was chairman and Congressman CARL HINSHAW, of California, was vice chairman.

The work of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with regard to aviation may be viewed as a milestone in passing vital legislation necessary for the administration and regulation of the airline industry as well as contributing greatly to the safety and certainty of air transportation. The aircraft manufacturing industry has been revitalized in behalf of national security by enacting into legislation recommendations of the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board.

While we, here in the Senate, may be justly proud of these accomplishments, I believe it is only fair and just to give due credit to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for their time and devotion to these same problems. I cannot overemphasize the cooperation that has been received from the House committee in passing this legislation.

The remaining recommendations of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board will be in order for consideration at the next session of the Congress.

Bill	Title	Action
S. 3. Introduced by Senator McCARRAN.	To provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators	Passed both Houses of Congress. At White House for signature.
S. 1833. Introduced by Senator WHITE.	To authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation.	Passed both Houses of Congress. Bill at White House awaiting signature.
S. 2122. Introduced by Senator TOBEY.	To authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations	Do.
H. R. 3510. Introduced by Senator CAIN.	To authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska.	May 28, 1948—Signed by the President (Public Law 562).
S. 2449. Introduced by Senator BREWSTER.	To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the regulation of interstate contract carriers by air, and for other purposes.	Bill still in committee.
S. 2451. Introduced by Senator BREWSTER.	To encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes.	Passed both Houses of Congress. Bill at White House awaiting signature.
S. 2452. Introduced by Senators BREWSTER and HAWKES.	To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to local enforcement of safety regulations of civil aviation, and for other purposes.	Hearings held by subcommittee. Bill still in committee.
S. 2454. Introduced by Senator CAPEHART.	To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make further provision for the recording of title to, interests in, and encumbrances upon certain aircraft.	Passed both Houses of Congress. Bill at White House awaiting signature.
S. 2455. Introduced by Senator CAPEHART.	To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by limiting the liability of certain persons not in possession of aircraft.	Passed both Houses of Congress. Bill at White House awaiting signature. (Signed.)
S. 2456. Introduced by Senator CAPEHART.	To provide safety in aviation and to direct an investigation of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms.	Do.
S. 2460. Introduced by Senators BREWSTER and HAWKES.	To exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees overtime services, and for other purposes.	Passed both Houses of Congress. Awaiting action by President.
S. 2464. Introduced by Senators BREWSTER and HAWKES.	To authorize the U. S. Maritime Commission to provide for the development of lighter-than-air rigid airships for commercial use.	Do.
S. 2466. Introduced by Senator BREWSTER.	To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, and for other purposes.	Do.
S. 2644. Introduced by Senator BREWSTER.	To provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.	On calendar of both Houses of Congress. (Passed House.)
S. 2841. Introduced by Senator BREWSTER.	To amend the Federal Airport Act	Passed both Houses of Congress. Bill at White House for signature.

PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate now recurs to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2756, to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the letter I read from Secretary Krug, addressed to Mr. WELCH, chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands, under date of May 26, 1948, made certain criticisms of House bill 6623, pending in the House, which has the same caption as this Senate bill.

As I understand the Senator from Nevada, the House bill and the Senate bill differ in certain material respects.

Mr. MALONE. They differ in vital respects.

Mr. KEM. Then I ask the Senator if in his opinion the Senate bill meets the criticism made in Secretary Krug's letter.

Mr. MALONE. I think it does. Certainly it meets the suggestion of the letter from Secretary Krug which I read.

Mr. President, let me make an observation. This is not to be taken as in any way derogatory of any public official, but I must say that the letter just put into the RECORD by the Senator from Missouri is full of excuses and groundless objections and is a remarkable illustration of the lengths to which resort may be had in presenting a myriad of unsound excuses in an attempt to defeat a vital proposal.

In this connection, Mr. President, let me read from an article appearing in the United States News and World Report for April 9, 1948:

Only way to insure large enough future supplies of these and certain other minerals and fibers is through stock piling.

It already has mentioned tungsten, tin, lead, copper, cobalt, and others. Everything is included except rubber, in this bill.

I read further from the article:

A big stock-piling program approved by Congress in July 1946, has been falling behind schedule from the start.

Mr. President, I shall undertake, briefly, to demonstrate the correctness of that statement. I shall not attempt to read statistics, because it would be tiresome at this time of night, but the chief reason for stock piling falling behind is shown on page 6479 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, at which time I introduced this bill at the request of nine other Senators.

Much has been said about lead. In 1938, 369,726 tons were produced in the United States, and we imported 112,371 tons. In 1947, 10 years later, 346,210 tons were produced in the United States, a considerably less amount than in 1938. Almost twice the 1938 amount was imported, or 211,773 tons. I could go on. The entire record is exactly to the same effect. It is a failing program, because the mines cannot operate to produce an

adequate supply of minerals, with inflation and increased costs of production of minerals, in competition with the low-cost labor of Asia and Europe, where these minerals can be obtained. As I say, Mr. President, I have no time to go into all the figures, and I would not tire the Senate with it tonight. We find here the record of chrome and manganese coming from Russia. There are other potential foreign sources of chrome and manganese. It can also be obtained here, but it is not profitable to pay $9 a day to a miner in the United States, in competition with the 40 cents a day a Chinese receives. I know nothing of the details, but the President says there is an emergency impending. He asked for the draft, and we have only today finally agreed upon a draft bill. We voted a 70-group air program, to cost nearly $17,000,000,000, though there is nothing in the stock pile with which to build the planes. I shall read another paragraph.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I understand the position of the Senator from Nevada is that the premium-price plan might increase domestic production of these critical minerals.

Mr. MALONE. It certainly is, and if the Senator will bear with me a minute, I will get into that. I regret taking the time of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. I would ask the Senator to direct his attention to this point before he completes his remarks: If the premium-price plan is so efficacious in increasing production, why is it that production increased as soon as the premium-price plan terminated?

Mr. MALONE. Production increased in the larger mines. No new materials are being discovered. As a matter of fact, I just read the figures of production over the last 10 years, also figures showing increased imports. As a matter of fact, over the years, increased production has not resulted from the termination of the premium-price plan.

From the article in United States News and World Report, referred to previously, I quote further:

Schedules called for delivery of about 40 percent of the total amount of materials involved by June 1948. Actually, only about 20 percent will be on hand. In some important materials, the amount obtained is only 5 percent of the amount required. Details of stocks and buying plans are guarded secrets. Stock piles now are stored at 55 military reservations.

I shall read only one short paragraph from Mr. Webb's letter. It seems we have quoted nearly everyone tonight, and I shall not bore Senators by reading the whole letter. In a letter dated June 3, 1948, and referring to the House bill, Mr. Webb says, among other things:

You are further advised that there would be no objection to the submission to Congress, for its consideration, of draft legislation in respect to exploration payments.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the letter refer to the House bill, which the Senator says differs in material respects from the Senate bill?

Mr. MALONE. It refers to the same bill.

Mr. KEM. It refers to the House bill, and not to the bill now under consideration.

Mr. MALONE. Yes. Of course, it does not apply at all to the pending bill.

Now, Mr. President, I shall read a resolution that has been adopted by practically every mining organization in the United States. In the resolution it is stated:

That the production of minerals is preeminent in insuring our national safety and well being, and that present conditions warrant an incentive program designed to foster exploration for the development of resources and to provide incentives to the marginal segment of the mining industry.

All western mine organizations, as well as middle-western, southern, and eastern organizations, with the exception of American Lead Industry Association, have adopted similar resolutions.

I have one more quotation, which is from Mr. Hill, of the National Resources Board. Senators will remember Mr. Hill from last year, when, in consolidating the military forces, we created the National Resources Board. Mr. Arthur Hill has since become chairman and is building up the organization. I called him, had a conversation, and very carefully asked if he could be quoted. This is what he said:

The Board approves legislation which will provide for incentive payments to stimulate the production of strategic and critical materials.

There are various reasons why he could not write a long letter of detailed instructions to anyone; one of the reasons being that the President was not here, and Mr. Hill works directly under the President.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. KEM. Has the Senator completed the reading of the statement Mr. Hill made to him?

Mr. MALONE. I read all I intended to read, but if the Senator wants the rest of it read, I shall read it. I have it here.

Mr. KEM. The Senator need not read it all. I will ask the Senator if Mr. Hill's statement contained, at the end, this sentence: "The Board at present is not in a position to approve legislation which provides for the payment of premiums on current production"?

Mr. MALONE. He told me he was not in position to approve any legislation. I shall come to that however.

Mr. KEM. I ask the Senator, first, does the Malone bill now under consideration provide for the payment of premiums on current production?

Mr. MALONE. It does provide a payment on current production, but it is very carefully guarded, as the Senator will notice. I may say it is very carefully guarded by the wording that there is an opportunity to make a reasonable profit, but there is no guaranty. But after the Board's deduction of 2 cents a pound, which is guaranteed to go into development and for which receipts must be tendered to supervisors of the Department before payment is made they can further reduce the price. It is doubly guarded.

Mr. KEM. If I understand the Senator correctly, Mr. Hill, in his conversation with the Senator, indicated disapproval of the Senator's bill.

Mr. MALONE. He did not at all indicate disapproval of the bill. He said he was not in position to analyze any bill. I would ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri whether he, at this late hour, is going to take the word of every Government official as to how to produce minerals? As a matter of fact, the one we are now quoting has had no experience in mining.

I think the record speaks for itself. The stock piles are low; everything is gone. We are, perhaps, about to get into war for the third time, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri and if we do not produce some materials, we shall murder our youths a third time as we murdered them twice before.

Mr. KEM. I understood the Senator to refer to Mr. Hill as an authority on the subject.

Mr. MALONE. Then you misunderstood me. I referred to him as a man holding a very powerful position, but not possessing a profound knowledge of mining and mining problems.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, without pressing the point further, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada if this language was not used:

The Board presently is not in a position to approve legislation which provides for the payment of premiums——

Mr. MALONE. No; he did not use that language. He used the language which I read. He said that was as far as he could go without further consultation, and he had not reviewed the bill.

I refer the Senator to a 30 years' record of empty stock piles, and two wars, without anything to fight with.

I want to read just one more thing, and then I am through. It is unbelievable, to me, that this Congress could adjourn without some legislation, after we have appropriated fifteen or sixteen billion dollars on military and naval preparedness, and when the President says an emergency is coming up. We hear hints that there will be a special session because of an emergency, practically before we reach home. I, for one, after voting for the draft bill and for the 70 air-group force, want some legislation along this line. I have seen boys go into action without equipment. I have seen them, at Port Moresby and in New Guinea, soar aloft to drop their bombs. We knew some of them would not come back, but we did not know which ones. I was with General Kenny. He was trying to keep 50 percent of the airplanes ready to fly. Thirty percent is a good record. We are arguing tonight about $80,000,000. We have several amendments to offer. If I had succeeded in getting the floor first I was going to offer an amendment to cut the amount to $69-

000,000 annually for 3 years, or maybe 2 years. The important consideration is to get the program started. Here we are, in the same position for the third time, with an emergency confronting us, nothing to fight with, and talking big to every nation in the world. To me it is unbelievable that we cannot take a position tonight, instead of haggling over whether we are going to pay a stenographer $125 or $235.

I want to read a short article with reference to chromium:

Chromium is another essential material coming from Soviet Russia. American industry has enough chromium for 5 months, at current rates of consumption. The Munitions Board has a stock pile. Chromium is required for hard steels for oil drills, chemical plants, armor plate.

The United States imported 466,290 tons of metallurgical-grade chromite in 1947. Russia provided 47½ percent of that. About 13 percent came from Turkey.

Mr. President, I wanted to offer some amendments, but I should like to make this closing statement. The stock piles are nearly empty. We have made provision for a 70 air group, and for a draft army. We should not go home without having done something to stimulate domestic production of minerals. We hear reports that there are more and better submarines in the hands of Russia, nearly twice or three times as many as Germany had when the world war started. If we do not pass this legislation, the blood is on our own hands.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I want to compliment the Senator from Nevada for his splendid statement. I hope the bill may be speedily enacted into law.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator. I will say to my distinguished colleague from Arizona that if I had the time I should be glad to discuss each strategic mineral, but time does not permit. I say to my colleague from Arizona, and to my other colleagues on the Senate floor, that if we do not have production in the next few months, there will be a stringent rationing of metals.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada a few questions regarding the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] seemed to believe that it is possible, under this bill, to multiply several times the $80,000,000 which is authorized. Without disrespect to him, I could not follow his argument. Is it not the intention of the distinguished Senator from Nevada, by the language in italics, commencing on line 22, page 9, and running through line 3, on page 10, to make it completely clear that both expenditure and committal cannot exceed, in the aggregate, $80,000,000?

Mr. MALONE. I will say to my distinguished colleague from Colorado that we at first had it worded that disbursements authorized by the bill should be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and should not exceed $80,000,000 in any one year. In committee we spent 4 hours trying to iron out all difficulties. The chairman was the distinguished Senator from Colorado. We thought we could make it doubly clear by reinforcing it and adding the words "nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee," and so forth. We wanted to make it doubly clear.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did not the language in italics result from the suggestion that they can disburse a lot of money, but, at the same time, they can also be obligating a lot of money, and was it not the intention by the language used in section 7 (a) that disbursements and obligations should not exceed $80,000,000?

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Except for the administrative expense, is there any authorization for the expenditure of any additional money?

Mr. MALONE. There is not, to my knowledge. If we could make it more air-tight, we would do it in a minute.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the distinguished Senator offer an amendment which will identify the source of the money for the payment of administrative expense, assuming that the motion to consider the bill is accepted and that we enter upon the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MALONE. Yes. We have amendments prepared for that very purpose, and it was the intention to offer amendments at the appropriate time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it the Senator's intention, responsive to the suggestion of several Senators, that the amount of $80,000,000 a year be reduced to $60,000,000 a year?

Mr. MALONE. That is absolutely true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And an amendment will be offered to that effect?

Mr. MALONE. An amendment will be offered to that effect.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it also true that an amendment will be offered reducing the expiration of the term from June 30, 1952, to June 30, 1951?

Mr. MALONE. That is true. Such an amendment has already been prepared.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it the Senator's intention to offer an amendment, if the motion to consider is adopted, striking out the words "exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on products approved by him under rules as presented in section 3 (c)"?

Mr. MALONE. That has already been printed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That, I take it, is pursuant to the suggestion which has been made that we might give the Director additional authority over the specific directions which are given to him in the act. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. That was the sense of the conversation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And that is by way of further emphasis?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25 to the bill.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1222) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national defense incurred, enrollments.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 4656. An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5734. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.; and

H. R. 6412. An act to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code entitled "The President."

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BRIDGES. I submit a conference report on House bill 6935, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 17, 29, 40, 50, 51, 58, 74, 75, 85, and 86.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 27, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 44, 45, 48, 52, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68,

70, 71, 72, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, and 83, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the citation "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", appearing in the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail (39 U. S. C. 321d)"; and in lieu of the sum of "$3,500,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"National Institute of Health, operating expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for 'National Institute of Health, operating expenses', $500,000: *Provided*, That appropriations under said head for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available for carrying out the purposes of the National Heart Act, including erection of temporary structures for storage of equipment and supplies and housing of animals."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Before the words "passenger motor vehicles" in said amendment, strike out the word "ten" and insert the following: "five"; and in lieu of the sum of "$10,000,000" named twice in said amendment insert in each instance the following: "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$5,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$3,000,000"; and in lieu of the sum of "$200,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

"Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary, fiscal year 1949, to carry out the provisions of H. R. 6401 or S. 2655, Eightieth Congress, establishing the Selective Service System, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation when specifically authorized by the Director; purchase (not to exceed 94) of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); and purchase of typewriters: $25,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of either H. R. 6401 or S. 2655, Eightieth Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the word "available" where it appears in said amendment, insert the following: "until June 30, 1949"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the words "administrative expenses" where they appear in said amendment, insert "(not to exceed four per centum of the total amount of loans made)"; and at the end of the paragraph before the period, insert ": *Provided*, That no such loan shall be made unless no other source of public or private credit is available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$450,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the citation "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", appearing in said amendment and following the semicolon, strike out the following: "health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150)"; and in lieu of the sum of "$2,480,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$150,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$100,000"; and in lieu of the sum of "$194,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$192,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "or quantity"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the sum of "$60,000" named in said amendment and the comma, insert the following: "to be reimbursable and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$400,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: $300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed, whenever in his judgment the best interests of the United States so require, to direct the insertion of a clause incorporating the Renegotiation Act of 1948 in any contracts for the procurement of ships, aircraft, aircraft parts, and the construction of facilities or installations outside continental United States entered into by or in behalf of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy or the Department of the Air Force which obligates any funds made available for obligation in the fiscal year 1949."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 25.

STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6935, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 19, 1948.

Resolved, That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. I move that the Senate recede from amendment No. 25.

The amount involved in the item was about $35,000,000. The Senate insisted, and after long hours the House conferees refused to agree, and the item remained in disagreement. The House conferees took the matter to the floor of the House, and they had two votes on it, in both instances refusing to agree to the amendment. So I think the only thing left is for the Senate to recede.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What was the House figure?

Mr. BRIDGES. On the House vote?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, the amount.

Mr. BRIDGES. An item of $35,000,000, which the Senate inserted, was in dispute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House knocked it all out?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. They refused to appropriate anything for this item.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Refused anything for the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. BRIDGES. There were several other items in the bill for flood relief. All the other items, like the provision for loans to farmers, the Coast Guard item, and provision for improvements on the Columbia River, four or five separate items having to do with relief from floods, were agreed to. The only one rejected was this amendment 25, which provided grants to local agencies for public works.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I deeply appreciate the fine work the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senate conferees did in insisting upon this item. I looked into this matter. I discussed it with my senior colleague, and there is no question that the record is perfectly clear that, so far as the Senate side is concerned, everything possible was done to save the item, and the responsibility is very clear on the face of things. It is going to be shocking news to the people of Washington and Oregon, of course, but I sincerely trust and hope that when we reconvene we will have additional facts available which I am sure will, if the House will give the consideration which the facts warrant, convince the House that an appropriation should be made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, like the Senator from Oregon, I am greatly shocked at the fact that this appropriation was stricken from the bill. I appreciate the position of the Senator from New Hampshire who insisted on the amendment, and of course there are some other amendments in the bill which give us some relief. I appreciate his work. Like the Senator from Oregon, we had hoped we would get the full amount. So long as the House position is what it is, I merely want the RECORD to show what they did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to recede from amendment 25.

The motion was agreed to.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2756) to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I notice on page 2 the statement of purposes seems to override the subsequent contents of the bill. I refer to the language commencing on line 10, page 2. I quote:

To coordinate the programs now provided for or to be provided for by law for making scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence; the development, mining preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States; and to stimulate the commercial extraction and production of the same.

I remind the distinguished Senator from Nevada that that particular statement of purposes is not implemented in the later provisions of the bill, and might be confusing, and I am delighted to know that the Senator will later accept an amendment to strike out that provision.

Mr. MALONE. In earlier conversation we had arranged to offer an amendment to strike out beginning at line 7 to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada what he estimates will be the annual cost of the bill as now drawn. Not as it will be subsequently amended, but as now before the Senate. What will be the annual cost of the bill, in his opinion, as now before the Senate?

Mr. MALONE. We have an amendment drawn to cover that. We estimated $350,000 annually.

Mr. KEM. Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars annually?

Mr. MALONE. That would be a maximum for administrative cost.

Mr. KEM. I did not ask the Senator that. The Senator failed to understand my question. And then I think he failed to answer it as he understood it.

Mr. MALONE. I beg pardon. I am answering it as I understood it, and I want that distinctly understood. I thought we had already covered it, and I am happy to listen to the Senator if he has another question.

Mr. KEM. I think the Senator understood my question: What will be the cost of the bill as amended? I did not ask him about the cost of administrative expenses. I asked him what the total overall cost to the Government would be per annum of the bill now pending before the Senate.

Mr. MALONE. The over-all cost, including the stock-pile cost, by this bill is $80,000,000 per year.

Mr. KEM. If that is so, I should like to ask the Senator what amount of money he figures will be necessary to do this—and I refer to page 8 of the bill:

All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments and which comply with Munitions Board minimum stock-pile specifications shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Section 7 of the bill provides for disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments, not to exceed $80,000,000 a year.

Now, I should like to ask the Senator at what amount he estimates the cost of the additional ores, metals, and minerals that are to be purchased as the result of these incentive payments?

Mr. MALONE. I should be very happy to explain the bill to the distinguished Senator from Missouri. As a matter of fact, I offered to do it today. Under the Stock-Piling Act of 1946, there is remaining $660,000,000, and we have a stock pile as low as 5 percent on some of the minerals. It will be impossible to secure the needed minerals either from foreign sources or domestic sources. The stock pile is practically bare. If we could buy the ores at the current market price, the $660,000,000 would pay for all of the materials contemplated by the original 1946 bill. But all of the evidence—and I have much evidence here that I will not bother to go into, newspaper clippings and letters—shows that all the public officials are on record to the effect that the ores are not available. So the $80,000,000 asked for is to be used to pay the additional premium price which will induce the production of the additional ore, and that is in addition to the price that would be normally paid, but at which the minerals needed cannot be found.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. KEM. How can the Senator estimate the amount of metals and ores that will be produced in any 1 year as a result of these incentive payments?

Mr. MALONE. That is impossible, of course, and the Senator should know that. But we would know within a year or two; and the appropriation is limited to the $80,000,000, so the Government cannot be hurt. Furthermore, no money is expended by the Government whatever until the ore is mined and offered to the Government.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I hope the Senator will emphasize that feature again; that no money is paid except for the delivery of ore resulting from the program provided and initiated under this bill.

Mr. MALONE. That is absolutely true. Furthermore, no producer need come under this bill unless by his own request.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I cannot follow the suggestion that the limitation of $80,000,000 a year is a limitation on the language at the middle of page 8. If the Members of the Senate will refer to the bill on their desks——

Mr. MALONE. I will be happy to yield for a question. I am on my own time now.

Mr. KEM. Yes. I am trying to frame my question. At the middle of page 8 we find this language:

All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments and which comply with Munitions Board minimum stockpile specifications shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

My question is: Is it not true that by the language on page 8, the RFC is directed to purchase all the ores, metals, and minerals resulting from incentive payments?

Mr. MILLIKIN. All the additional ores.

Mr. KEM. Yes, all the additional ores. And is it not true that the limitation on page 9 is, "All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments"? In other words, is it not true that the language on page 8 applies to the purchase of these additional ores, metals and minerals; that is the acquisition of titles to them; whereas, section 7 on page 9, in which the limitation of $80,000,000 appears, is an entirely different thing, namely, "disbursements for exploration and development and conservation"?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I see no conflict at all. The paragraph to which the distinguished Senator refers in the middle of page 8 states that "all additional ores," that is, those ores which result from this incentive program, shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. That is a mandate to purchase. There is another half of the proposition. They have to have authority to pay for what they buy, and that is found in section 7. One is an authority to purchase; the other an offer to pay.

Mr. KEM. I will ask the able and distinguished Senator if section 7 does not specifically say "disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments," whereas section (b) on page 8 says ores and metals shall be purchased? In other words, is there not a distinction between the purchase and acquisition of a title to these ores and metals and the disbursement of the incentive payments?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think I have already answered the Senator to the best of my ability. One is a mandate to buy. The other that payment is to be made.

Mr. KEM. Where does the Senator find any limitation on the amount to be paid in acquiring title to the minerals?

Mr. MILLIKIN. In section 7. We will go through it again: "All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments", and there are no other kinds provided in the act.

Mr. KEM. The acquisition of title is provided for in the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is what is paid for.

Mr. KEM. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is why the disbursement is made.

Mr. KEM. No, the "disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payment" in the bill are a bonus, they are something for nothing. The Government does not get anything for them. They are premiums. They are bonuses. What I am asking the Senator about is the purchase price for the ores and metals which are acquired.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is a definite formula for the purchase price which the Senator will observe on page 7. It is a very definite formula for the purchase price.

Mr. KEM. Where is it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall quote. I read from page 7:

Section 6 (a). Exploration, development, and conservation payments for any particular metals or minerals shall be in addition to the amount received per unit from other sources by the producer.

Mr. KEM. Well——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Be patient, please. I respectfully suggest and with great respect, that the Senator has turned this into a subject of complete confusion. I am not the author of this language. I have no author's pride in it. It seems to me to be clear as a bell. But since the Senator finished with it and left it in complete confusion, I would now like the privilege of trying to untangle it, which the Senator would not afford me when he was making his own speech.

Section 6 (a). Exploration, development, and conservation payments for any particular metals or minerals shall be in addition to the amount received per unit from other sources by the producer of the metal or mineral.

That is the extra he gets.

The sum of such payments per unit of production—

That is all he is going to get—

The sum of such payments per unit of production shall not exceed the difference between the current market price and (1) in the case of metals produced under the premium-price plan, an amount equal to the highest market price plus the production premiums—

And so forth. It sets out a complete formula of price to be paid. That is the answer to the Senator's question. That is the question he asked me. It is perfectly clear in the bill. I challenge the Senator to show any place in the bill where there is any authority to spend more than $80,000,000 altogether, with the exception of administrative expense—for actual disbursements plus obligations, if any are made.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will not the Senator admit that there is a distinction between disbursements for exploration and development and conservation and disbursements for the purpose of acquiring title to ores and metals?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Of course there is a distinction between paying and acquiring title. Title is acquired and then it is paid for.

Mr. KEM. Will not the Senator admit that the limitation of $80,000,000 in any 1 year appearing in section 7 is distinctly a limitation on disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments and in no manner refers to a limitation on disbursements for the acquisition of title?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let us go back again to the middle of page 8. What are we talking about there?

All additional ores, metals, and minerals, or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments—

That means put the plant in operation, and those ores which result from the operation of the plant, which is to say, the additional ores, are the ores which shall be produced. They have been produced. How are we going to pay for them? Section 7 (a) tells how they are to be paid for.

Mr. KEM. That is not what I asked the Senator. The Senator is pointing out something entirely different from what I asked him.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, may I answer the question?

Mr. KEM. Let me make myself clear.

Mr. MALONE. Certainly.

Mr. KEM. It is evident that I failed to make myself clear. What I am asking the Senator is this: Is there any limitation on the amounts that may be paid for purchase of ores and metals, and if so, where is the language to be found? Let me say that I am not at all impressed by the Senator's citation of section 7 (a), because that applies to the premium payments. That applies to disbursements for exploration and development and conservation, and does not apply in any respect to the disbursements by way of purchase price of the ores and metals.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Colorado for a moment, I believe I can clear this up for the Senator from Missouri, because I am not sure that he has had time to explore the entire bill. If he will turn to page 5, starting about line 11 or 12, he will find the limitation provided for exploration payments. This bill provides only for the payment of exploration payments in this connection. So it specifically sets out that it is paying for exploration payments. Then it goes over to what the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, in paragraph 7, which relates to the 7 cent, 6 cent, and 5 cent payments. As production goes up the amounts go down. Then after that paragraph the distinguished Senator from Colorado has pointed out the connection.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have the floor. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I desire the floor in my own right.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I relinquish the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in discussing strategic critical materials I read from an article from Dun's Review, this month's issue, which has this to say about the subject——

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a conference report?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on Senate bill 1322, the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1322)

to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.'

"SEC. 2. Creation and purposes: For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, of assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as 'agricultural commodities'), and of facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corporation'), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general direction and control of its Board of Directors.

"SEC. 3. Offices: The Corporation may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

"SEC. 4. General powers: The Corporation—

"(a) Shall have succession in its corporate name.

"(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

"(c) May sue and be sued, but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district courts of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation may intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit by or against the Corporation shall be allowed unless it shall have been brought within four years after the right accrued on which suit is brought. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress) shall be applicable to the Corporation. Any suit by or against the United States as the real party in interest based upon any claim by or against the Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this subsection (c) to the same extent as though such suit were by or against the Corporation.

"(d) May adopt, amend, and repeal by-laws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

"(e) Shall have all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the United States with respect to the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding.

"(f) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

"(g) May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary in the conduct of its business. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements.

"(h) May contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of plants and facilities for the physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control. Except as provided in section 16, the Corporation shall not have power to acquire or lease any such plant or facility or to acquire or lease real propery or any interest therein, except that it may rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business and it may continue to lease (by renewing or extending existing leases or entering into new leases) property leased by it on the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(i) May borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation: *Provided*, That the total of all money borrowed by the Corporation, other than trust deposits and advances received on sales, shall not at any time exceed in the aggregate $4,750,000,000. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

"(j) Shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

"(k) Shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

"(l) May make such loans and advances of its funds as are necessary in the conduct of its business.

"(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

"SEC. 5. Specific powers: In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, 841), the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

"(a) Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

"(b) Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

"(c) Procure agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

"(d) Remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

"(e) Increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

"(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

"(g) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

"In the Corporation's purchasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall, to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the fulfillment of the Corporation's purposes and the effective and efficient conduct of its business, utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

"SEC. 6. Existing statutes applicable to the Corporation: The Federal statutes applicable to Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall be applicable to the Corporation. Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall cease to be an agency of the United States as provided in section 7 (a) of the Act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, 713 (a)).

"SEC. 7. Capital stock: The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $100,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. Such subscription shall be deemed to be fully paid by the transfer of assets to the Corporation pursuant to section 16 of this Act. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the Act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a–4), as amended, at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

"SEC. 8. Funds: The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred or allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to appoint an interim Board consisting of five members, including the Secretary, who shall serve until October 1, 1948.

"SEC. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall consist of five members. The Secretary of Agriculture, or his nominee, shall be a member of the Board and the remaining members shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman of the Board shall be selected by the Board. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of five years, except that the terms of the first Board shall be shortened to provide for replacement or resppointment of its members in number as nearly equal as practicable in each year. The power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States. The Corporation may provide, by its bylaws, for the compensation to be paid the directors: *Provided*, That the compensation paid any director shall not exceed in the aggregate $10,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not receive additional compensation for their services on the Board. Employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not comprise, in the aggregate, more than three of the members of the Board.

"SEC. 10. The executive staff: Responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the business of the Corporation shall be vested in a

staff of executive officers, headed by a chief executive appointed by the Board and responsible to the Board. Members of the executive staff shall devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation. The Board shall define the authority and duties of the members of the executive staff, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as it may determine, require that such of them as it may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds of any officer or employee. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 661).

"SEC. 11. Cooperation with other governmental agencies: The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation, be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

"SEC. 12. Utilization of associations and trade facilities: The Corporation may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis, committees or associations of producers, producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations, and trade facilities.

"SEC. 13. Records; annual report: The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the Secretary of Agriculture a complete report as to the business of the Corporation, a copy of which shall be forwarded by the Secretary of Agriculture to the President for transmission to the Congress.

"SEC. 14. Interest of Members of the Congress: The provisions of section 1 of the Act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 22), shall apply to all contracts or agreements of the Corporation, except contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

"SEC. 15. Crimes and offenses.—

"FALSE STATEMENTS; OVERVALUATION OF SECURITIES

"(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself or another, money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, or under any other Act applicable to the Corporation shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than five years, or both.

"EMBEZZLEMENT, AND SO FORTH; FALSE ENTRIES; FRAUDULENT ISSUE OF OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

"(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (iii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in, or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefits through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"LARCENY; CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

"(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE

"(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

"GENERAL STATUTES APPLICABLE

"(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts and agreements, employees, and operations: *Provided*, That such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That sections 114 and 115 of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 204, 205) shall not apply to contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

"SEC. 16. Transfer of assets of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation: The assets, funds, property, and records of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, are hereby transferred to the Corporation. The rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, in respect to any contract, agreement, loan, account, or other obligation shall become the rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities, respectively, of the Corporation. The enforceable claims of or against Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall become the claims of or against, and may be enforced by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall limit or extend any period of limitation otherwise applicable to such claims against the Corporation.

"SEC. 17. Dissolution of Delaware corporation: The Secretary of Agriculture, representing the United States as the sole owner of the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, is hereby authorized and directed to institute or cause to be instituted such proceedings as are required for the dissolution of said Corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware. The costs of such dissolution of said Corporation shall be borne by the Corporation.

"SEC. 18. Effective date: This Act shall take effect as of mignight, June 30, 1948."

And the House agree to the same.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
ELMER THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Vermont on bringing in a conference report, but I am a little curious to know for how long it extends the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. This conference report gives perpetual existence to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The principal change from the Senate bill is this: The Senate bill provided for a board of five members to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The House bill provided for a board of five members, three of whom must be outside the Department of Agriculture. The conference committee report provides for a board of five members to be appointed by the President, two of whom shall not be employees of the Department of Agriculture, leaving the Board comprised of three who may be employees of the Department of Agriculture and two chosen from outside the Department.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Secretary of Agriculture a member of the Board?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, indeed. I am sure he is a member of the Board.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator believe that this Board, as constituted under the terms of the conference report, will be closely integrated with the work of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. The Senator from Vermont is satisfied that probably three members chosen out of the five will be within the Department of Agriculture. The Senator from Vermont is not satisfied that the Board of five is large enough, but has hope that the next Congress may see fit to enlarge the Board if the five members prove to be inadequate.

I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I express the final hope that Congress will not recess or adjourn for a little while, because we may have a long-range farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will observe that there seems to be some ground for that hope.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3416) to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument.

The message notified the Senate that Mr. GILLIE had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes, vice Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin, excused.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on House bill 6527, to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the House bill and agree to the bill as originally passed by the House.

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
WAYNE MORSE,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
LISTER HILL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GERALD W. LANDIS,
WALTER E. BREHM,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
WINGATE H. LUCAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, there is objection to this conference report.

This is a bill continuing for 3 years after the end of the war Federal assistance to local school districts to educate the children in areas where there have been war plants or war installations.

The bill came over from the House authorizing $6,000,000 a year of this assistance. Mind you, this is 3 years after the end of the war. There was never any authority of law during the war. It was done under the war powers.

The bill which came over from the House proposed not only to provide approximately $5,000,000 of assistance to those school districts in which there were located war plants which had not yet been turned back to private ownership, and the Senate decided it could go along with that, but the House bill also provided an additional $1,000,000 to start this program all over again, for assistance to school districts which may incur increased enrollments because of new defense or military installations resulting from the present national defense program.

The wisdom of any assistance to these school districts is somewhat doubtful. I may point out that according to the figures furnished to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, about three-fourths of this assistance goes to three States—Oregon, Washington, and Texas, all three of which have received hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal contracts. Those States and their industries and their Representatives in Congress were extremely active in seeking those Federal appropriations, and those appropriations undoubtedly have increased tremendously the wealth and income of those States. Then they have the gall to come to Congress and ask for Federal assistance to carry on the local function of education.

I grant that in various cases the local school districts are in trouble because the Federal Government has taken title to much of their land, with the result that it does not pay taxes, and the local school districts are in difficulty.

But in every one of those situations the income of the State, which is their basis for taxation, has been increased tremendously by the Federal expenditures which have been sought by those States; and yet they are asking the taxpayers of all the other 45 States to help them bear that little additional expense.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I shall finish my statement, if the Senator does not mind.

This, mind you, is 3 years after the end of the war. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee, after looking at all the facts, decided that we were perhaps justified—it was doubtful—in going on for one more year with a program, insofar as it concerned the school districts that were helped during the war. During the war we did a lot of things which are a little difficult to cut off immediately after the end of the war. But we decided that it would be a serious mistake to start adding new districts.

After all, we in the Senate know very well that these increased expenditures—and they are tremendous this year—are the cause of considerable rivalry among the States as to which shall get them. The States which get them, I think, have no right to come to the Congress and ask for help to the extent of $10,000, $20,000, $50,000, $100,000, or, in the case of one State almost a million dollars, to educate children of the workers who will be migrating into those States because of the increased activities arising from Federal appropriations, as a result of which the States derive increased income.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare therefore eliminated the provision, which permitted the addition of new school districts to receive assistance under this program. We cut the amount, in accordance with the estimates furnished us, from $6,000,000 to $5,000,000.

Mr. President, that decision of the committee, I may say, was sustained by the Senate; it was challenged and was sustained here on the floor. Yet the Senate conferees went into conference with the conferees on the part of the House, and yielded everything.

I am just a little bit tired of having the Senate always take the position of increasing the contributions and the expenditures of the Federal Government every time it gets a chance.

The taxpayers of the forty-odd States that have not participated to the extent of hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in these Federal expenditures and have not had their incomes increased to that extent, are being called upon not only to pay the taxes necessary to support those expenditures in the first place, but also to help those States maintain and operate their purely local functions of government. That strikes me as not only getting to the trough, but climbing into it with all four feet.

So I hope the Senate will reject this conference report, and will say, "Let us have an end to this running to the Federal Treasury every time any small local community gets into the least little bit of trouble." If we do not call a halt to it pretty soon, we might as well abolish all local and State governments.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I realize the difficulties referred to by the Senator from Minnesota. I regret that there should be any difference of opinion between us.

As I stated, in the committee we felt that we should eliminate such assistance in the case of future installations, and should let the States take care of the educational problem. The committee composed of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Montana

[Mr. MURRAY], and myself met this afternoon with the House conferees, and we had presented to us the record of the hearings that had been taken by the House, as well as the evidence we had before our own committee.

The effect of such Government installations is to take taxable property from the States, as the properties are tax exempt.

Frankly, I am not prepared to see established a policy whereby federally-held property should be taxed in order to take care of these problems, rather than to have special arrangements made for the schools.

But the fact remains that, for the coming year, the conferees on the part of the Senate felt that we should not reduce the program as proposed by the Senate; and in considering the evidence they presented to us, we believed that at least we should take care of the program that was taken care of last year, with the insistence that our staff study this matter and see whether we could deal more equitably with these cases in which, because of the expansion of our Military Establishment, we are taking from the State areas formerly taxable.

Therefore we have presented the conference report in the form in which we have.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that we are making the contributions in peacetime because the war plants are being expanded?

Mr. SMITH. The plants are being expanded, and the property is being turned over to the Government.

I agree that I think this is a wrong principle; but if we cut it off this year, I think many school children will suffer.

So we had to weigh the problem of the school children as against the principle the Senator from Minnesota has been discussing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is there a general provision, or are specific locations mentioned in the authorization?

Mr. SMITH. They are in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to know whether the areas which are to receive the benefits are stated in the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is a lump-sum appropriation, and there are certain communities to which it will go. They were enumerated—about 15 or 20.

Mr. SMITH. The House had evidence of the communities to which it would go.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking the Senator if he knows the different areas and different States where this lump sum is to be distributed. Is there a chart?

Mr. TAFT. There is a House report.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask whether there are any in the State of Nebraska.

Mr. SMITH. That is a very relevant question from the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. It certainly is.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; there are three in Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator tell me where they are located in Nebraska? Can he give me the names?

Mr. SMITH. I cannot give the Senator the names from this table. The House committee had the break-down. The clerk of our committee, I think, has all those documents. I do not have them before me.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator will look a page or two further on he will see that the list of towns in each State appears in the pamphlet.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Missouri is correct, and I shall be very glad to give the Senator from Nebraska the list of places in his State where the plants are located. They are at Glenville, Cairo, and Sidney.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there are other schools in a similar situation. Those are the ones the Senator named in my own State that are now getting any relief. I should like to know how the distribution is made.

Mr. SMITH. There is a table in the report showing each State and the places in each State where distribution is made, and another table is shown which sums up the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that. I should like to have the Senator answer the question. Who makes the determination as to where aid is to be given? I am satisfied there are other school districts in my own State corresponding to those mentioned in the observations of the distinguished Senator that are not receiving relief.

Mr. SMITH. Is it the Senator's statement then that he feels that not less relief should be given, but more, in the case of Nebraska? Is that his position?

Mr. WHERRY. No, I am not asking that. I am asking who makes the distribution, and on what basis.

Mr. SMITH. It is made by the Federal Works Administrator. He is authorized to make it, the same as he is authorized to make decisions as to the location of Federal works.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think we can clear up the subject referred to in the questions asked by the Senator from Nebraska by asking the distinguished Senator handling the bill if it is not a fact that all the Federal Government is doing is paying an amount which would otherwise be paid in taxes if private enterprise were operating the factories.

Mr. SMITH. I assume that is the case, because the table is broken down, and the appropriation is simply based on the deficit in each case. Each one of the States takes care of the great bulk of the funds. The amount appropriated is merely the deficit.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If the Government did not own the properties, the taxes would be paid into the State and into the school districts to take care of the subject, would they not?

Mr. SMITH. I assume that is so.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Inasmuch as the Federal Government owns those properties, the situation is different.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I would say it has no relation whatever to the taxes that might be paid on the property. The school districts are selected. They have a deficit because there happens to be a plant there, and because there happened to be more children coming in. There is property in the district on which taxes are paid, and the Federal Government pays the deficit.

I think it is absolutely unjustifiable for us to begin again to increase the program of the Federal Government paying for local school expenses. Last year we spent $4,500,000 on something left over from the war, which was strictly a war proposition. Now, for the first time this year, we are asked to expand it from an authorization of $5,000,000 to one of $7,000,000. We are starting on a new program which calls on the Federal Government whenever a plant is located in a community to pay the expenses of the school districts because children are brought into the community. The Federal Government pays for the education of the children of contractors who are actually brought in to build the building. It starts paying for children of the Navy personnel and Army personnel, and now we are asked to pay for a great many children of people to come in to establish stores or to engage in other activities in the neighborhood. It seems to me the program should not be enlarged. I think the conference report should be rejected.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Ohio I agree with him that the program should not be enlarged. But we have a problem before us in regard to the children, and I think we have to meet the problem. We have got to study the problem to see how it can be taken care of. Perhaps it can be taken care of out of the taxable assets of the communities.

Mr. TAFT. The States seek the plants; they seek the Government installations. They make the argument that we should locate them in their States. There is a responsibility. There is no reason why the State should not bear the expense. The moral justification probably is that if the local school district is unable to pay, then the State government ought to pay it. There is not the slightest ground that I can see for the Federal Government being asked to pay the expenses of local school districts.

We undertook the program during the war, when we suddenly had vast numbers of people moving in overnight. We continued the program, greatly increasing it from year to year, until finally this year we inserted a new provision that it shall include not only war plants but any new installation the Federal Government has recently made. The State of Washington already gets $1,000,000 out of the $5,000,000. The new provision will give the State of Washington $800,000 more, so that $1,800,000 will go to

the State of Washington alone out of the proposed contribution of $7,000,000. I see no reason for the Federal Government's paying $1,800,000 toward the support of schools in the State of Washington.

Mr. SMITH. I ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio, having in mind the plans dealing with expansion of the National Military Establishment, which is bound to come with the advent of our Air Force expansion, and so forth, does he propose to take care of the situation by letting the States handle the increased obligations, or does he have some plan whereby the property which the Federal Government takes over is to become subject to State taxation? What is the Senator's plan?

Mr. TAFT. Every plant that comes into a locality brings more wealth and more income into the State than it had before, perhaps two or three times what was there before. The State government can certainly find some way to get the money from that additional income to pay for the schools. There are certain problems where a local school district is so situated that it cannot get its usual revenue from real estate, but in the State of Ohio a large part of the school money comes from the sales tax which the State collects and redistributes to the school districts according to their need.

I think the Federal program is very undesirable. What I object to is a new beginning of the expansion of the program. Last year it was $5,000,000. This year, I assume it was reduced. Did the conference report reduce it to $3,000,000?

Mr. SMITH. The House asked for $5,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Last year the authorization was $5,000,000, and they spent about $4,500,000, as I remember. We tried to hold it down at least to the same figure.

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the Senator from Ohio that Ohio gets out of this $163,352.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, referring specifically to one city in Texas, Grand Prairie, it is my understanding that one branch of the Federal Government owning property in that locality has been paying in lieu of taxes about $74,000. That Federal property has been turned over to the Navy Department, and unless the pending bill is passed as amended, the Navy Department claims it will be unable to make the contribution which was made when the property was under the control of another branch of the Federal Government. It means nothing new to Grand Prairie; it only means continuing the payment of the same amount which has been paid heretofore.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I want to point out one thing in connection with this item. The Senate has approved a $5,000,000 item. The conference report adds to that $1,000,000. In the last few moments of the session it seems to me that if this report is not accepted there is a great chance for killing the entire bill. I am familiar with one school at Pascagoula, Miss. There were erected there during the war a huge shipping plant and an enormous Government housing project. The plant is still in operation. The school is still there. That little city was absolutely overwhelmed. They did not have a chance to take care of the children. If this conference report is rejected it leaves them uncared for.

I know of another situation where a plant was erected out in the country, against the wishes of the people. It absolutely overwhelmed the local district. I respectfully submit that under those circumstances and at this late hour we almost have to approve the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES). If there is going to be a debate, the Chair will recognize a privileged matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, this matter is privileged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has a privileged matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, we cannot lay aside one conference report and take up another conference report without unanimous consent.

Does the Chair mean to rule that the Chair can select which conference report shall be before the Senate for consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that one conference report coming on the floor can be placed ahead of another one which may be under consideration at the time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that is the most unusual ruling I have ever heard. The Senate is proceeding to the consideration of a conference report, in due order. It has just as much sanctity, under the rules, and just as much priority under the rules as any other conference report, except a conference report in connection with an appropriation bill. I submit that the Chair, while he presides over the Senate, does not direct the Senate's activities. The Senate decides which report shall be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order to expedite the work of the Senate, the Chair would suggest that the Senator from New Jersey continue.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a great deal of sympathy with the desire to bring the program to a close, but here is the situation in regard to this particular conference report: The Senate conferees went to the conference fully intending to support the Senate bill. We proceeded to discuss the facts which were brought out in conference. We read a report which had not been made available to us before, in the form of a letter received from George Field, in whom we all have confidence. We got a representative of his office on the telephone and asked a series of questions on problems which bothered all the conferees. We became satisfied that for the next year, until the whole subject can be taken up for consideration and study, we could not justify failing to pass the House bill, or recommending the passage of the House bill without change. Therefore the Senate conferees unanimously voted to recede from the Senate's position.

I think that when a report is received from conference, after the consideration we gave to the subject, we should be backed up on the floor of the Senate when our report is unanimous. That is all I shall say about it, because I am satisfied that we must have the money to keep the schools in operation. I do not think we ought to make a choice at 3 o'clock in the morning that we are going to deny what I am satisfied will be decent education for thousands of youngsters, by a failure, at 3 o'clock in the morning, to accept the conference report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. What agency of the Government allocates this amount?

Mr. SMITH. The Federal Works Administration.

Mr. BYRD. On what basis is it allocated?

Mr. SMITH. On the basis of the location of the plants and the problems presented.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Federal Works Administrator the sole arbiter? Does he have any program to guide him?

Mr. SMITH. So far as I am advised—and I take my evidence from the House hearings and what the House conferees advised us—the Federal Works Administrator bases his allocations on the needs of the school districts in the areas where the work is going on.

Mr. BYRD. Why is it that there is an increase of $2,000,000 over last year?

Mr. SMITH. I do not see that there is an increase of $2,000,000 over last year. I think the amount is practically the same as last year.

Mr. BYRD. I understood that there was an increase from $5,000,000 to $7,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The figures clearly show that the plants included under the original category called for approximately $5,000,000.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. While the plants included in the new category called for about $2,000,000 more. Under the act the Federal Works Administrator could buy all kinds of things, with no basis of allocation, except as the program proceeded one district got one amount and some other district another amount. That is one reason the program ought to be closed up and not be operated in such manner that a bureau can exercise such wide discretion.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it happens that I am one of the members of the conference committee which considered this particular bill. In going to the conference, I went with the full realization that my knowledge of the subject was extremely limited. There is one phase of it with which I was not entirely satisfied. As I see it, Mr. President, we have here a situation in which the bill applies to two things: First, to the maintenance of school facilities in local school agencies which are still overburdened with school enrollments caused by war activities and the transition from war to peacetime conditions. That is one category. The second category is not one in which there is to be a reactivation in the future, a building up of plants in the future, and a charge upon the Federal Government for the maintenance of school facilities where they are. The second category is one in which the facilities have already become overburdened with defense establishments, encouraging school enrollments as a result of the reactivation or expansion of any defense establishment or the operation of any new defense establishment. Here we have a number of school districts in which there has already been this activation, as it is termed in the bill. It is another way of saying the rebuilding or the reopening of these plants. We have in those particular communities the need to make up the various deficits which are listed in the committee report.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the wise course of precdure is for us to approve this conference report, but at some time, that is, between now and the meeting of the Eighty-first Congress, I think there should be made a careful, detailed study of this entire situation.

I may say that tonight, in the conference committee's session, that course of action was determined upon, and it is contemplated that the staff of both the House committee and the Senate committee will, in the interim between now and the meeting of the Eighty-first Congress, make such investigation, so that in the future we may be better able to decide as to what we should do. I am in favor of the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I know it is 3 o'clock in the morning——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sunday morning.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, Sunday morning, and I recall that there used to be a song entitled "Three O'Clock in the Morning." I wish to say just a few words in thorough endorsement of the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

In my section of the country the authorities came to Charleston and built schools, and brought thousands of people to work in the navy yard and the ordnance plant. The schools needed Government aid, as they needed it from 1942 through 1947. While I do not intend to delay the Senate, because it is 3 o'clock in the morning, I hope the Senate will agree to the provisions that were placed in the bill by the House of Representatives, and vote down the other suggestions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not know about all the different projects, but I do know of one particular project in my own State which during the war was engaged in manufacturing airplanes under the direction of the Army. That plant now has been turned over to the Navy, is engaged in the same activity which occupied it during the war, and it is now going to manufacture jet planes, all for preparedness, along the lines of the legislation sponsored by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. Its work is still war work; it is not new, it is simply revived and going into this line.

In that school district the Government has acquired real estate on which formerly taxes were paid, and now the community does not receive a cent of taxes toward the support of the schools.

What is the result? The school district has levied taxes to the limit. They are limited by the constitution of my State as to the amount they can levy, but they have levied all they could. Some of the Senators say, let the State pay them, but it would take an amendment to the constitution, and that would require time and a meeting of the legislature. What are they to do with regard to the present school year? What are we going to do with the children of the people who work in those plants? I am not concerned with the places from which the children come. The Government needs their parents, the Government wants them, the Government tells them to come and engage in this war work, to manufacture planes for the defense of everybody in the United States, and they come and bring their children with them. Their children are entitled to an education, as every other child is.

I know that in the particular locality in my State to which I am referring the authorities are doing everything humanly possible. There has been no change in the status, except for short interruptions. The same war activity in which the plant was engaged while hostilities were going on is now being followed in preparing guns, renewing preparations so that if the need should come, our Government will be able to defend itself and resist the aggressor against the liberties of the United States.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri. This matter must be worked out along on the basis of a satisfactory plan between now and next year.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I emphasize the point which the Senator from Texas has made with respect to the necessity for taking time to do a thing like this. In that connection, I bring out the fact which was mentioned by the Senator from Ohio, that in the district where these plants exist the communities prosper and have much more in the way of receipts by reason of the fact that the plants are there. That may well be true, yet if the school district is supported by an ad valorem tax on real estate, and the real estate has been taken by the Government, it may be quite a problem to devise some other tax plan in view of the increased prosperity. I agree with the views stated by the Senator from Texas that we cannot work out this problem immediately. We are confronted with a situation in which we have already reactivated some of these plants, and we ought to take care of the educational needs of the children for this year.

Mr. CONNALLY. The school year will soon begin, and we cannot arrange for it instantly. It will take time to work out the formula and plan, I agree, but what are we going to do for the child who goes to school on the first of September? There is no school now. Some of the districts, it is said, will not be able, without the help here provided, to maintain the schools more than 4 or 5 months out of the entire year.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. If the Senator has no objection to the Federal Government contributing to the support of schools in Texas, I wonder what his position would be if the Federal Government stepped into the State of Texas and told them that they must have no segregation in their public schools.

Mr. CONNALLY. I refuse to reply to that sort of an argument.

Mr. BALL. The Senator is all for State aid when it suits his purposes, but he does not want the States to take any responsibility.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is on a par with what those associated with the Senator from Minnesota have been doing before on this floor. I refuse to go into the question of segregation. The colored schools in my State get the same amount of money the white schools get, and we have recently appropriated $3,000,000 to provide a colored university in the city of Houston.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Missouri suggests that it is hard to work out a system since communities cannot get the ad valorem taxes with which to provide the school districts with money. They can come to Congress and demand the money and get it from here, but they do not go to the State legislature, they do not go to Austin, Tex., and ask the State of Texas for the money. It is just as easy for them to work this out by revenues from the State as it is to work it out by revenues from Washington and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Ohio knows that this matter cannot be taken care of instantly. The new school year is approaching. Something has to be done to take care of the children in the coming school year. I do not fear having a plan worked out, a long-range plan, and the establishing of some standard, but I do think we now face an emergency which we should meet courageously and firmly, and I appeal to Senators to vote for the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the conference report which was just approved on the deficiency appropriation bill, carries an appropriation for this purpose. That appropriation is predicated upon the passage of this measure, which is the basis of authorization for that appropriation, because it continues this type of authorization for another year.

I am not entering into the argument as to whether the base for payments of taxes should be broadened to take in future Government plants or not. That portion of the bill which has to do with the existing status of things, however, is the portion for which appropriation has been made, and this report should be adopted, because it is the basis for the appropriation itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

REPORTS OF CONFEREES—STATEMENT BY PRESIDING OFFICER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before turning to the next order of business, in line with the ruling of the Chair made in order to expedite the business of the Senate a short time ago, the Chair would like to read a very short paragraph from Senate rule XXVII, dealing with the reports of conferees. It deals with the presentation of such reports. I read paragraph 1 as follows:

> The presentation of reports of committees of conference shall always be in order, except when the Journal is being read or a question of order or a motion to adjourn is pending, or while the Senate is dividing; and when received the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report, if raised, shall be immediately put, and shall be determined without debate.

In this connection the Chair observes that when the request was made to consider a conference report while another was in order the Chair was in error because he did not put the question, but he could see no purpose in doing so under the circumstances.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to state that there was no difference between my position and that of the Chair, expressed in the reading of the rule. I recognize, of course, that on a motion to proceed immediately another conference report was in order, but I understood the Chair had by a ruling indicated that he could select one report over another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair's position is that one report could supersede another unless a question was raised. The Chair did not put the question to a vote because he was trying to expedite business.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL AND OTHER GOVERNMENT WORKERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FLANDERS. I submit a conference report on House bill 6916, to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report see House proceedings in the RECORD, p. 9314.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the conference report was considered and agreed to.

INCORPORATION OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. BUTLER. I submit a conference report on House bill 5904, to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same.
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.
>
> HUGH BUTLER,
> CARL A. HATCH,
> GUY CORDON,
> *Managers on the Part of the Senate.*
>
> F. L. CRAWFORD,
> K. M. LECOMPTE,
> JAY LEFEVRE,
> A. M. FERNANDEZ,
> *Managers on the Part of the House.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senate to the fact that the pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to consider Senate bill 2756.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to suggest that there are other conference reports to be considered. It is hoped that they can be considered in a comparatively short time. I hope the Senate will be patient.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President,. will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I understand, in the first place, because of the long continuous session, that the reporters are having a very difficult time to keep up with the proceedings.

There are two matters of importance with which the Senate should deal, and only two that are essential, before the Senate adjourns. The first is the so-called Jenner bill (S. 2790), which is in the House, which deals with the secondary market for GI loans. The House is acting on an amendment to that bill, which it is expected will be returned to the Senate shortly, and I hope the Senate will concur in the House amendment.

The bill dealing with the long-range agricultural program is in conference. The conferees are meeting again for about the third time. There is some hope of their reaching an agreement. I was just in the conference. I think agreement on that measure may take some little time, but there is a hope of an agreement being reached. The bill deals with a matter of prime importance. So we would like to ask the Senate to remain in session, but I think it might be desirable that the Senate take a recess for 15 or 20 minutes at least and let the reporters catch up.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Ohio has made the statement I had intended to make, so it is unnecessary for me to make it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to make a very brief comment on the situation and the spectacle which the Senate is presenting. I have been here a good many years, but I have never seen any session of this body come to a conclusion or approach a conclusion with such utter chaos, confusion, and impotence as we observe here now. It is now nearly 4 o'clock on Sunday morning, after 41 hours of confused session. We do not know what we are going to act upon yet before we adjourn. I am willing to stay here all night tonight, and all night tomorrow if we can get through.

We have been tossed back and forth between promises that conference reports will be presented. We have been told that conferees on various measures would soon be ready to report. The conferees have met and held sessions, which have been broken up and collapsed. Then we are apparently on the verge of doing something, but we find that a report is not ready. Then someone rushes in and announces that if we wait a few more minutes there will be something for us to do. In one room there is a committee which is attempting to give birth to a farm bill. In a room at the other end of the Capitol, in an obstetrical ward over there they are trying to give birth to a conference report on a House bill. Nobody knows what it will be when the birth takes place. It will be a monstrosity, I am sure.

At the end of this most important session two of the most important matters that ever came before Congress are still suspended in midair. I understand hope has been abandoned of getting a housing bill, but I have been told tonight that the Republican moguls in Philadelphia have sent word down here that we are not to adjourn until a housing bill is passed—just anything that has got a house in it.

Senators recall having read that one of the great English kings on a historic occasion shouted, "A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse!" And so the Senator from Ohio, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the majority leader of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House are shouting, "A house! a house! my candidacy for a house!" [Laughter.]

Mr. President, we ought to know something about what we are going to do here. I am perfectly willing to stay here indefinitely. I am as wide awake as anyone here. But it is rather ridiculous that every time we get a conference report in the Senate it should be necessary to go around and wake up sleeping Senators and ask them to come in to vote. Those just awakened have to ask, "On what are we going to vote? On what is it we are going to vote?" And each conference report must be explained to them in their yet sleepy condition.

If the Senator wants the Senate to recess for a few minutes, so that it may be seen what may come out of these "birthday" wards, very well, but we ought to make up our minds what we are going to do; whether we are going to pass a farm bill. We have not even voted whether we are going to take up the mining bill. Debate is being had on the motion to take it up. Surely we ought to be able to vote on the motion.

In all this confusion I am reminded of an expression which has come down to us from the great Roman orator, Cicero, who shouted, "O tempora! O mores! O hell!" [Laughter.]

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the remarks of the minority leader. He certainly woke us up.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I suggest that we proceed with the business before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2756.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	Johnston, S.C.
Baldwin	Ecton	Kem
Ball	Ellender	Kilgore
Barkley	Fessel	Knowland
Brewster	Ferguson	Langer
Bricker	Flanders	Lucas
Bridges	Fulbright	McCarthy
Brooks	Green	McClellan
Butler	Gurney	McFarland
Byrd	Hatch	McGrath
Cain	Hawkes	McKellar
Capehart	Hayden	McMahon
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Connally	Hill	Malone
Cooper	Hoey	Martin
Cordon	Holland	Maybank
Donnell	Ives	Millikin
Downey	Jenner	Morse
Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Myers	Smith	Umstead
O'Conor	Sparkman	Vandenberg
O'Daniel	Stennis	Watkins
O'Mahoney	Stewart	Wherry
Pepper	Taft	Wiley
Revercomb	Taylor	Williams
Robertson, Va.	Thomas, Okla.	Young
Russell	Thye	
Saltonstall	Tydings	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2756.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am not going to delay the vote, except for a few minutes. I merely wish to reply very briefly——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the rule on speaking twice in one day on the same subject?

Mr. KEM. This is my second speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule still holds, but the present occupant of the Chair, not having been here all the time during this debate, is unable to say whether this is the second or tenth time the Senator from Missouri has spoken.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it an abiding rule in the Senate that when the occupant of the Chair comes in a new day and a new deal commences, without any knowledge of what preceded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not the ideal way to proceed, but unfortunately the Chair does not keep record as perhaps he should keep them. So far as the Chair has been able to observe, however, the Senator from Missouri has been speaking, with the exception of one speech which the Chair has noted, in reply to questions which have been raised, or in other cases, where he has asked a Senator in the debate to yield. In that case that would not be a speech.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There has been a distinct interval between the point where the Senator from Missouri left off before and his start at the present time. I respectfully suggest that we have not been engaged in a running fire of debate. The Senator yielded the floor, took his seat, and now he takes the floor again.

Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has already spoken twice on the same subject on the same day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a question of fact. The Chair cannot answer that because the Chair has not been presiding all during this debate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What are the procedures by which the Chair may advise himself as to the fact?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. None seem to have been created for a case of this sort.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, this is my second speech. I put certain questions to the Senator from Nevada; but I spoke but once before this time.

This is the second time I have addressed myself to the motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD be read back, to determine how many speeches the Senator has made. That is a way to find that out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. However, the Chair believes the Senator from Missouri to be an honest man; and if he says he has spoken only once in his own right, the Chair will accept his word for it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I shall accept the Senator's word for it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I say to the Chair that certainly is my recollection, although I realize that I may be in error.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I withdraw my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order has been withdrawn.

The Senator from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to answer briefly the points made by the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Colorado. I understand there are two points.

First, they say this program is required for the national defense; they say additional supplies of these metals are required for the national defense.

In the second place they say the price-premium plan will increase the production.

As to whether additional metals are required for the national defense, it seems to me to be clear that the best evidence comes from the officials of our Government who are charged with responsibility for the national defense. I have never observed that where the national defense is concerned, there has been any hesitancy on the part of the officials in charge of the national defense to tell the Congress the facts or to address letters to the chairman of congressional committees, when they think the national defense is involved. Being the fine, patriotic men that they are, they could not do otherwise.

So, Mr. President, where are the statements from those who are charged with the national defense? On the contrary, they are conspicuous by their absence.

But we do have statements from the Chairman of the National Resources Board, from the Secretary of the Interior, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. All those statements are to one effect—and that is, that they do not agree with the principles of this bill, and that they do not believe this bill will accomplish what its proponents expect it to do.

In the second place, we do not have to speculate as to whether these price-premium plans increase production. We know they get money into the hands of some people who otherwise would not have it, but we also know by the records

that these price-premium plans do not increase production.

I hold in my hand a statement of the monthly lead and zinc production, by States, as prepared by the United States Bureau of Mines. The figures are given in pounds, for the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Idaho, Arizona, Washington, and California, and also for the Central States and the Eastern States. I ask unanimous consent that these figures may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Monthly lead and zinc production by States, U. S. Bureau of Mines

COLORADO

[In pounds]

	Lead		Zinc	
	1946	1947	1946	1947
	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	2,426,000	2,420,000	5,726,000	5,920,000
Feb.	2,990,000	2,200,000	6,262,600	5,714,000
Mar.	2,908,000	2,680,000	6,866,000	6,464,000
Apr.	2,524,000	2,900,000	5,516,000	6,178,000
May	3,160,000	2,940,000	6,110,000	5,950,000
June	3,262,000	3,350,000	5,934,000	6,900,000
	17,270,000	16,490,000	36,444,000	37,076,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	2,966,000	2,500,000	4,968,000	5,900,000
Aug.	3,142,000	3,255,000	5,360,000	6,000,000
Sept.	2,228,000	3,465,000	5,174,000	6,378,000
Oct.	2,480,000	3,660,000	5,510,000	7,030,000
Nov.	2,960,000	3,600,000	5,180,000	6,540,000
Dec.	2,700,000	3,350,000	5,090,000	6,220,000
	16,476,000	19,830,000	31,192,000	38,068,000
Total	33,746,000	36,320,000	67,636,000	75,144,000

NEW MEXICO

	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	1,104,000	764,000	5,566,000	7,202,000
Feb.	1,050,000	748,000	5,908,000	6,834,000
Mar.	768,000	716,000	5,306,000	7,038,000
Apr.	776,000	708,000	4,980,000	7,104,000
May	688,000	988,000	5,358,000	7,424,000
June	782,000	920,000	5,108,000	7,960,000
	5,168,000	4,934,000	32,226,000	42,662,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	912,000	1,000,000	6,454,000	6,966,000
Aug.	732,000	1,092,000	7,046,000	7,686,000
Sept.	692,000	1,222,000	6,370,000	7,598,000
Oct.	820,000	1,348,000	6,800,000	8,218,000
Nov.	900,000	1,300,000	7,000,000	7,524,000
Dec.	800,000	1,320,000	6,000,000	7,300,000
	4,856,000	7,282,000	40,500,000	43,822,000
Total	10,024,000	12,216,000	72,726,000	86,484,000

UTAH

	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	5,400,000	7,360,000	4,950,000	6,840,000
Feb.	2,993,000	7,480,000	3,200,000	6,730,000
Mar.	3,400,000	8,040,000	3,730,000	7,470,000
Apr.	3,250,000	8,600,000	3,540,000	8,340,000
May	3,400,000	9,000,000	3,300,000	8,500,000
June	3,020,000	8,920,000	3,160,000	8,400,000
	21,420,000	50,500,000	21,880,000	46,280,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	4,900,000	6,480,000	3,800,000	6,020,000
Aug.	5,880,000	7,960,000	4,660,000	6,740,000
Sept.	8,000,000	8,080,000	4,800,000	6,120,000
Oct.	5,600,000	7,480,000	5,100,000	6,370,000
Nov.	5,400,000	7,600,000	5,060,000	6,340,000
Dec.	5,800,000	8,660,000	5,200,000	6,330,000
	33,180,000	45,700,000	28,620,000	37,920,000
Total	54,600,000	96,200,000	50,500,000	84,200,000

Monthly lead and zinc production by States, U. S. Bureau of Mines—Continued

IDAHO

[In pounds]

	Lead		Zinc	
	1946	1947	1946	1947
	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,700,000	13,400,000
Feb.	11,500,000	11,170,000	12,400,000	11,700,000
Mar.	12,000,000	11,760,000	13,700,000	12,600,000
Apr.	11,200,000	12,400,000	12,000,000	13,200,000
May	9,600,000	12,000,000	11,200,000	14,750,000
June	8,800,000	13,250,000	11,300,000	15,370,000
	65,100,000	72,520,000	73,300,000	81,020,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	8,600,000	12,300,000	10,300,000	12,800,000
Aug.	9,200,000	13,000,000	10,800,000	12,900,000
Sept.	9,200,000	12,540,000	10,700,000	11,800,000
Oct.	9,200,000	13,740,000	11,350,600	12,730,000
Nov.	9,200,000	13,800,000	11,100,000	13,160,000
Dec.	9,200,000	13,500,000	11,200,000	13,300,000
	54,600,000	78,980,000	65,450,000	76,680,000
Total	119,700,000	151,500,000	138,750,000	157,700,000

ARIZONA

	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	4,460,000	4,660,000	8,100,000	9,200,000
Feb.	4,710,000	4,260,000	7,700,000	8,840,000
Mar.	3,480,000	4,460,000	5,900,000	9,420,000
Apr.	2,090,000	4,820,000	3,730,000	9,580,000
May	1,950,000	4,600,000	3,940,000	8,960,000
June	1,970,000	4,960,000	3,380,000	9,600,000
	18,630,000	27,700,000	32,750,000	55,500,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	4,670,000	4,600,000	7,600,000	8,900,000
Aug.	5,400,000	4,440,000	9,100,000	8,150,000
Sept.	4,700,000	4,360,000	8,700,000	7,720,000
Oct.	4,800,000	4,760,000	9,250,000	8,740,000
Nov.	4,500,000	4,540,000	8,600,000	8,370,000
Dec.	4,800,000	4,600,000	9,000,000	8,420,000
	28,870,000	27,300,000	52,250,000	50,300,000
Total	47,500,000	55,000,000	85,000,000	105,800,000

WASHINGTON

	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	530,000	650,000	1,710,000	2,120,000
Feb.	520,000	670,000	1,920,000	2,126,000
Mar.	600,000	950,000	2,110,000	2,090,000
Apr.	580,000	880,000	1,950,000	1,954,000
May	560,000	750,000	2,250,000	1,670,000
June	400,000	730,000	2,050,000	2,350,000
	3,190,000	4,630,000	11,990,000	12,310,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	240,000	810,000	1,130,000	2,050,000
Aug.	230,000	830,000	1,300,000	2,530,000
Sept.	540,000	870,000	2,200,000	2,560,000
Oct.	600,000	700,000	2,330,000	2,720,000
Nov.	900,000	680,000	2,100,000	2,546,000
Dec.	600,000	680,000	2,250,000	2,550,000
	2,810,000	4,570,000	11,310,000	14,956,000
Total	6,000,000	9,200,000	23,300,000	27,266,000

CALIFORNIA

	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	2,200,000	1,960,000	1,520,000	880,000
Feb.	1,400,000	2,180,000	1,050,000	1,020,000
Mar.	1,880,000	2,820,000	1,130,000	1,320,000
Apr.	1,900,000	2,600,000	1,540,000	1,780,000
May	1,480,000	1,960,000	1,440,000	1,560,000
June	1,400,000	1,700,000	1,430,000	1,440,000
	10,260,000	13,220,000	8,110,000	8,000,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	1,500,000	1,240,000	1,120,000	980,000
Aug.	1,400,000	1,280,000	1,060,000	620,000
Sept.	1,460,000	1,520,000	920,000	600,000
Oct.	1,050,000	1,020,000	1,000,000	200,000
Nov.	1,900,000	1,100,000	1,000,000	150,000
Dec.	1,950,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	50,000
	9,870,000	7,160,000	6,100,000	2,600,000
Total	20,130,000	20,380,000	14,210,000	10,600,000

Monthly lead and zinc production by States, U. S. Bureau of Mines—Continued

CENTRAL STATES

[In pounds]

	Lead		Zinc	
	1946	1947	1946	1947
	(1)	*Premium* 672,000	(1)	*Premium* 28,000,000
Jan.	(1)	768,000	(1)	25,018,000
Feb.	(1)	870,000	(1)	25,946,000
Mar.	(1)	988,000	(1)	27,074,000
Apr.	(1)	876,000	(1)	26,650,000
May	(1)	840,000	(1)	27,858,000
June				
	(1)	4,964,000	(1)	160,546,000
		No premium		*No premium*
July	(1)	914,000	(1)	27,830,000
Aug.	(1)	815,000	(1)	25,616,000
Sept.	(1)	910,000	(1)	25,056,000
Oct.	(1)	890,000	(1)	27,308,000
Nov.	(1)	788,000	(1)	25,398,000
Dec.	(1)	796,000	(1)	25,446,000
	(1)	5,116,000	(1)	156,654,000
Total	11,158,000	10,080,000	276,976,000	317,200,000

EASTERN STATES

	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	994,000	672,000	26,966,000	28,000,000
Feb.	1,136,000	768,000	22,676,000	25,018,000
Mar.	1,342,000	870,000	25,214,000	25,946,000
Apr.	1,368,000	988,000	25,126,000	27,074,000
May	528,000	876,000	25,546,000	26,650,000
June	1,044,000	840,000	18,404,000	27,858,000
	6,412,000	4,964,000	143,932,000	160,546,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	676,000	914,000	14,084,600	27,830,000
Aug.	974,000	818,000	18,110,000	25,616,000
Sept.	910,000	910,000	24,140,000	25,056,000
Oct.	804,000	890,000	26,620,000	27,308,000
Nov.	618,000	788,000	24,602,000	25,398,000
Dec.	606,000	796,000	25,142,000	25,446,000
	4,688,000	5,116,000	132,698,000	156,654,000
Total	11,100,000	10,080,000	276,630,000	317,200,000

[1] Not available.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, those figures show the production of each of those metals in each of the States and districts named, for 1946, and the corresponding production by months for the year 1947. Six months in 1947 were without price premium stimulation. Two other periods of 6 months were under the premium plans.

I shall not go into detail as to what these figures show; I shall simply summarize them briefly:

For Colorado, both lead and zinc production have risen since the termination of the premium-price plan. I invite the attention of the Senator from Colorado to that fact.

New Mexico: There was an increase in production of lead after the termination of subsidies. That increase is startling. Zinc products more than held their own.

Utah: Lead production has increased fairly steadily throughout the year, but in zinc there was a slight decline.

Idaho: The record shows that production increased as subsidies vanished.

Arizona: Very little change in production over the entire year.

Washington: Both lead and zinc products have increased.

California: Both lead and zinc products have shown a drop.

Central States: Lead production maintained. Zinc output off about 40 percent.

Eastern States: No marked change in lead or zinc production.

In other words, Mr. President, if we wish to give some Government money to a lot of people in this industry, that is one thing. If we are really seriously interested in increasing the production of these metals, that is another thing.

There is no reason to believe, judging from the record, that the price-premium plan similar to this will effect that result.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that if it does not produce, if it does not have an incentive effect, and if there is not additional ore, it will not cost anything.

Mr. KEM. Oh, yes it will. The Senator was never more wrong in his life.

I invite the Senator's attention to the provision about exploration payments. When such payments are made, we do not know whether anything will be produced or not. Probably all of us have had an opportunity to observe that; I know I have.

On page 6 it is provided:

Exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on projects approved by him under rules as prescribed in section 3 (c).

Section 3 (c) provides:

(c) It shall be the duty of the Director, and he is hereby authorized and directed, (1) to perform the functions hereinafter specifically authorized, and (2) to prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act in the simplest manner.

In other words, the exploration payments will be made by the Director to anyone to whom he sees fit to make them, on whatever projects he sees fit to make them, according to the rules he himself prescribes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator from Nevada said he would offer an amendment to delete the language to which the Senator from Missouri refers, on page 6. In a moment I shall read from page 6.

Let me read what page 5 says on the subject of exploration payments:

Exploration payments shall be made in addition to development and conservation payments within the limitations provided in section 6 of this act, upon application of any mine operator upon either of the following bases (1): Maximum exploration payments shall be based on production of recoverable metal produced from each mine operation at the rate of 7 cents per pound for the first 250 tons.

And so forth and so on, scaling down to a maximum of 2,000 tons.

I repeat that no payment is made unless the incentive plan works.

Mr. KEM. I respectfully submit that payment is made.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator challenges that statement; does he?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But I have just read it; that is what the bill says.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Colorado is referring to some other amendment which may or may not be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I have read from the bill which the Senator has in front of him. I prefaced my remarks by saying that I would read a portion of the bill, on page 6—reading as follows:

(2) Exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on projects approved by him under rules as prescribed in section 3 (c).

I stated as a preface to my subsequent remarks that the sponsor of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Nevada, offer an amendment to eliminate that. I have been reading from what remains in the bill after that is done.

Mr. KEM. The point I have in mind is that the bill we are voting on now is not the bill as subsequently amended, but the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the consideration of a very difficult situation?

Mr. KEM. I yield, without prejudice.

CONTINUANCE OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar 1484, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 197), and I shall explain my reasons for so doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I object.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator let me explain?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will, reserving the right to object.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the Hon. RALPH A. GAMBLE, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Housing, was liable and has paid from his own pocket $1,700 in expenses to the staff of his committee. In order to relieve him of that expense, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I offer no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will read the concurrent resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution to continue the Joint Committee on Housing beyond March 15, 1948, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 197), which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "continue" to strike out "until July 15, 1948" and insert "from May 15, 1948, until July 1, 1948."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I would waive the amendment if I may be allowed to do so, because it is no longer necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was on my feet before the Chair ruled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not rule.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Chair said the motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair said "without objection." The Senator raises objection, so that annuls what the Chair said.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to raise a question as to whether the Senator from Vermont has authority to waive an amendment reported by a committee. I do not know what the amendment is or what the resolution is. It is merely another example of the chaotic condition into which we find ourselves plunged. I feel that before unanimous consent is granted on a matter of this kind we ought to know what kind of amendment is being considered.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 1, after the word "continue", it is proposed to strike out "until July 15, 1948" and insert "from May 15, 1948, until July 1, 1948."

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say for the information of the Senator from Wyoming that I wrote the amendment myself and put it in the concurrent resolution, but I do not blame the Senator for not knowing that. I shall ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania intend to speak on the amendment?

Mr. MYERS. Might I ask the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the purpose is to curtail the operations of the committee. They have already been curtailed, as I understand.

Mr. MYERS. But I am asking the purpose of the amendment that was just read.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is to shorten the time.

Mr. MYERS. So as to run up to July 1?

Mr. FLANDERS. Until July 1.

Mr. MYERS. Why is it necessary to extend the life of the committee until July 1?

Mr. FLANDERS. According to the chairman of the committee, there is quite a bit of detailed work to be cleaned up, and it involves one female clerk.

Mr. MYERS. Again reserving the right to object, it was my understanding the committee had been continued.

Mr. FLANDERS. I suggest the Senator from Pennsylvania continue.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask whether the amendment which the Senator is describing has anything to do with the housing bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. The resolution has something to do with the reports of the Joint Committee on Housing, on which the housing bill was presumably based.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the life of the committee had been extended for a period of a month or two, the reason given at the time for the extension being that there was some work still to be finished. A resolution was then introduced to continue the life of the committee again for a month or two. I understand that primarily the chairman of the committee has himself expended considerable sums of money in order to pay the two employees. I understand the employees

have been engaged in sending out 15,000 or 16,000 copies of a staff report, whereas only 1,500 or 1,600 copies of the committee report were printed. Of course the staff report is not at all in accord with the views contained in the committee report. I do not desire to prevent Representative GAMBLE from being reimbursed for moneys he has expended, but the two employees have been sending throughout the country propaganda against the findings of the committee itself and I see no reason to continue the committee until July 1. Would it not sufficiently protect Mr. GAMBLE if the life of the committee were extended only until July 15, or until June 15?

Mr. FLANDERS. I was about to say to the Senator that his arithmetic puzzled me a little bit.

Mr. MYERS. Until June 15.

Mr. FLANDERS. Until June 15. Let us see; when does that happen?

Mr. MYERS. It has already occurred.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is all right. Why not make a motion to that effect.

Mr. MYERS. Why not strike out the amendment? What is the concurrent resolution? What does it provide? Mr. President, I move to strike out the date "July 1" and substitute "June 15, 1948."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FLANDERS. Perfectly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania raised a very interesting question, it seems to me. Do I correctly understand that the staff report to which he refers is that report which has been described in the newspapers as the report prepared by the real-estate lobby to defeat the purposes of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is a most unfair description of the report. If I may give my own impression of what has been going on, the staff has been running away with the chairman.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can hardly understand.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I am constrained to think that is a very interesting but strange suggestion of the Senator, in view of the fact that the Senator from Vermont——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have made no suggestion, I may say to the Senator. I was merely raising the question. I know from what I have read in the newspapers that charges have been made that the real-estate lobby had succeeded in inducing the staff of one of the committees to prepare a propaganda release, which has been broadcast throughout the country. Whether that is true or not, I have no information.

The remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania have certainly raised a question. Does the Senator from Washington know whether or not this staff report is in fact a report which is contradictory of the position of the committee?

Mr. CAIN. I think not, sir, particularly for the reason that the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who believes sincerely in public housing and is asking for the adoption of the resolution, simply could not ask for its consideration if there were truth in the question which the Senator has raised.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is not in the question; it is in the report. I am only asking a question. May I say that I have a great deal of confidence in the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. CAIN. Both of us have.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am in complete harmony with the point of view he has expressed. These reports have been in circulation with reference to the public-housing section of the bill to which the Senator from Washington has been very vigorously opposed.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has been pigeonholed in the Rules Committee of the House. I know that the Jenner bill which passed the Senate today and to which the Senator from Ohio alluded a few moments ago is now in the House of Representatives, and there is a rumor that it is now being subjected to a process of having attached to it those portions of the housing bill which the real-estate lobby has been supporting, and there will be eliminated the portions which have been defended by the Senator from Vermont. So in this chaos I want to be sure that the Members of the Senate know exactly what is being done, and I certainly want to know, myself.

Mr. CAIN. I can see no connection between the pigeonhole to which the Senator refers and the housing report to which the Senator from Vermont has addressed himself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt that is true. But the situation is such that Members of the Senate, unless they ask questions, will not know what is being done. I happened to go into the lobby a few moments ago and there I met some very estimable ladies whom I have known for many years. They represent the Woman's Party. The ladies told me that responsible Republican Senators had informed them that the equal rights amendment was on the agenda of the majority for disposal at this session, before we adjourn. I wonder if that is true. I wonder what we are going to do. The Senator from Ohio a moment ago said there were only two matters which are left for consideration. One is the farm bill and one is the Jenner bill. The Jenner bill deals with housing. This resolution deals with housing. But I am sure the plan which is now given to us is that the extension of the life of the committee has nothing to do with the compensation to those who may have prepared a propaganda report which was circulated throughout the country to defeat the recommendations of the committee itself.

Mr. CAIN. It is certainly my understanding, sir, as a member of the joint committee, that the purpose of the resolution in question is to pay the salaries and wages of three of the members of the clerical staff, who had nothing whatsoever to do with the molding of the policy that went into the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the title will be appropriately modified.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2756.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to make a few comments on the subject, and also on some of the speeches which have been made.

I listened a few moments ago to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] for whom I have as much affection, I think, as I have for any other Member of this body. I heard him comment on the chaotic situation which prevails as the Senate tries to dispose of its business before adjourning. I must admit I was somewhat disturbed. Usually I find myself pretty much in agreement with statements on policy made by the Senator from Kentucky. But I cannot quite go along with the statement made this time, because it seemed to me to be not in accord with the facts.

I have attended several closing sessions of Congress, and it seems to me that every one I have ever attended has wound up in pretty much the present situation. I do not see anything particularly unusual about it, nor is there anything unusual in the fact that several measures for which there is strong pressure from various groups did not happen to become law. That happens at every session of Congress.

I think that during this session, more than in any other that I can remember in 8 years, Congress has tried to handle more issues than any legislative body could possibly handle, consider, and give really intelligent consideration to in one 6-months session. I recognize that there is a philosophy, an ideology, abroad in the world that concentrates on the weaknesses and the evils in the present system and insists that overnight we should make over our whole system of economy. I simply cannot go along with that kind of philosophy. It seems to me, from my reading of history, that every time a free people have succumbed to the idea and plea that they should make their society over, overnight, and cure all its problems overnight, they have wound up with a dictatorship under which the people have been slaves.

Under the rules of the Senate, which permit unlimited debate—and while I think it is sometimes abused, there is much to be said for it—there is a limit to how many major controversial issues this body can intelligently consider in one session.

Mr. President, I think the Congress in recent years has succumbed to the pressure of a great many groups who are not interested in preserving in this country a free parliamentary system of government. One of their techniques for destroying that system is continually to upbraid Congress as a do-nothing body dominated by pressure groups and lobbyists, and all that sort of thing, which never gets anything done for the people, and the impression is sought to be given that somehow the people all would be the beneficiaries of what this or that particular pressure group seeks to put over. So every session we are loaded down with literally dozens of major controversial measures—housing, agriculture, national defense, legislation for compulsory health insurance, and I could go on almost indefinitely enumerating them. Each session when the Congress does not pass all these measures it is a do-nothing Congress.

Mr. President, I think a Congress which in one session has passed the European recovery program, passed a tax-reduction bill, passed a national defense program, including a 70-group Air Force and a selective-service-in-peacetime bill, has disposed of about as many major controversial issues in 6 months as would be possible in any legislative body which really considered the issues on their merits, with due regard to their long-range implications in a free system of enterprise.

I think it ill befits those who profess to believe in democracy and a free system continually to upbraid and criticize, not individual Members of the Congress for the positions they take on various issues, but the institution of Congress because it does not remake the world overnight. The only way it is possible to remake the world overnight is by granting complete, arbitrary, and absolute power to one individual to do the job, and that is dictatorship. If it is left to a parliamentary system, where something over 500 men and women have to act by a majority and reach agreement on a given position on a major controversial issue, it is not possible to resolve such issues overnight, and it is about time that the Congress of the United States and the American people recognized that fact, and quit demanding that Congress do everything in one session, because it cannot be done, freedom retained, and a parliamentary system in the United States of America kept intact.

Mr. President, what I have said is apart from the presently pending business, which is the motion to take up the bill to authorize Federal subsidies totaling $80,000,000 a year for certain mineral producers in the United States; but I think it is pertinent to the motion, at 4 a. m. on Sunday morning, June 20, for the Senate to take up and consider such a measure.

Mr. President, I am a strong believer in the system of free enterprise. I think it has been abused, I grant it has been abused, but I think that over the years the freedom we have granted to individuals, whether they are workers who have only the skill and the labor of their hands and their brains to sell, or the individuals who have capital to invest, has paid tremendous dividends to all the people of America. I believe in the free system.

Mr. President, I do not believe in subsidies. As I read this bill, it authorizes $80,000,000 for subsidies to private corporations in the United States who take national resources out of the soil and sell them for what they can get. I was under the impression—and it is intensified by the speeches I have heard from the other side of the aisle—that we are in sort of a boom in this country, and that we are particularly short of various minerals. If the free enterprise system is as good as I think it is, I cannot understand for the life of me why at this late hour in the morning the United States Senate should be asked to consider a measure proposing an $80,000,000 subsidy to that free enterprise in order to induce it to produce the minerals we need for our economy.

Mr. President, if our production of the minerals which we need to support our economy is in such a sad state that private enterprise owners have to come to Washington begging for a subsidy of $80,000,000, then I am gravely disturbed. If we really need that kind of a subsidy to make the free-enterprise system produce what the American economy needs in order to achieve prosperity and abundance, then I think we are confronted with a further consideration, namely, if that is the case, then perhaps we had better question whether we want free enterprise and the exploitation of these natural resources, or whether we want to adopt the socialist system, and turn the whole ownership and operation and exploitation of these natural resources over to the state.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not think this time is quite appropriate to consider that kind of a fundamental question, and it seems to me it is inevitably involved in this subsidy proposition.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does not the Senator think that the hands of the clock keep going around and that this country will be jeopardized if we do not have stock piles?

Mr. BALL. I rather think the stock piles are there whether they are in the ground or whether on top. I have sufficient confidence in the free people of America to make me feel that if they confront an emergency they will get what they need one way or another. I do not think we have to subsidize private corporations to build up stock piles of materials we need for the defense of America. If we have come to that point in the United States of America, then I am really disturbed about where we are going.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Have we now stock piles adequate to our defense needs?

Mr. BALL. Frankly, I doubt if we do. I do not think we had stock piles adequate to our needs when we got into World War II on December 7, 1941.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator knows, does he not, that within the past year we have taken the tariff off copper, we have taken the tariff off zinc, we have taken the tariff off lead? Yet our stock piles are empty, and we cannot import enough to fill our stock piles and to meet our domestic needs. Many factories are running half time because they cannot secure enough lead. Does not that, in the opinion of the Senator, present some sort of an emergency?

Mr. BALL. If we are so tremendously short of these minerals, if industries are closing down because they cannot secure them, I wonder why the law of supply and demand, which I always thought operated regardless of what kind of laws we pass here, have not operated to fix a price on these minerals which would result in the increasing production we need in the United States or that is needed anywhere else in the world.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the Senator that the American stock piles are empty, though there is no tariff at all on lead, copper, and zinc. If we cannot fill our stock piles with lead, copper, and zinc we cannot keep our economy going. That leads us to one of two things: We will either build up those stock piles by increasing our production, or we will have allocation, and allocation does not square with a free-enterprise system.

Mr. BALL. I agree with the Senator completely. I am not in favor of allocation, I am not in favor of price fixing, and I am not in favor of subsidies. If we are going to go Socialist, then I think we ought to face the issue squarely and go all the way. I do not believe in socializing only a part of the economy, and doing it only to the extent of subsidizing a few private producers.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator favor filling the stock piles?

Mr. BALL. I am in favor of doing that, but I am not in favor of a few private producers holding a club over the head of the United States, and saying, "We will not produce what you need unless you give us a subsidy." That does not make sense.

Mr. MILLIKIN. How can the United States get these vital strategic materials? It is proposed to take boys into the service through the draft to protect our American system, to protect the private enterprise system.

Mr. BALL. The Senator has raised the question of the draft. Freedom implies responsibility. It implies the responsibility, if necessary, to defend that very system and the freedom which is guaranteed by the laws and the Constitution of this country against all its enemies if the representatives of the people consider that necessary. Freedom carries with it responsibilities, and the draft is the freest way of providing for the defense of the Nation of which I can conceive. That is much different, I may say to the Senator, from the Government dishing out subsidies to—I do not know how many producers of these minerals there are—dishing out subsidies to them of $80,000,000.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator was not in the Chamber—and if he had heard the statement it would perhaps not make any difference so far as his argument is concerned—when the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] said he was going to offer an amendment to make the amount $60,000,000, and to lessen the term from 4 years to 3 years.

Mr. BALL. I do not like subsidies—period. I do not care whether the amount is $35,000,000 or $80,000,000.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not care to confuse the two subjects.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I think I have stated my position. I hope the Senate will defeat the motion to consider a bill of this nature involving a subsidy of $80,000,000 a year, which in my opinion is completely repugnant. I am not impressed by the idea that a lot of presidents of corporations want subsidies. I recognize that many business executives in this country do not really believe in a free system. They are always coming here looking for special privilege just like many other groups.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I submit that at this hour of the morning, on the closing day of the session of Congress, is not the time to bring up a question involving the fundamental issues involved in this measure.

I now yield to the Senator from Nevada for a question.

Mr. MALONE. Is the Senator aware that four or five times in the last 12 months the Secretary of the Interior has asked for very large sums of money for exploration, and to increase the production of minerals? I think his first suggestion, 2 or 3 years ago, was that there be an appropriation of $20,000,000,000 for exploration and all. Now he comes down to about one billion.

Mr. BALL. Did the Senator say twenty billion?

Mr. MALONE. I did for a fact.

Mr. BALL. What Secretary of the Interior was that—Mr. Krug?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. Krug.

Mr. BALL. He must be having hallucinations. Twenty billion dollars.

Mr. MALONE. The record is clear, and I would get it and show it to the Senator if the hour were not so late. I want to bring to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota the fact that we have not given him the money, but that we have a choice to make. This plan would put the money into the hands, not of corporations—that does sound very bad. Very few of the large ones would get this particular aid. But the small ones would. Those are the ones it is designed to aid.

Mr. BALL. May I ask the Senator, what is the difference between a large and a small corporation in the United States of America? I do not believe in discrimination.

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the Senator that I am just as much a private-ownership man as he is, as the record will show. But the purpose of giving a Government official $1,000,000,000—and that, I think, was the last request—or any greater amount is to put metal in the stock piles, so as to implement the thing the Senator and I voted for a very few days ago, which is to put the drafted boys on the front line when the shooting starts. We have now seen it happen twice that we have entered into a war with practically bare hands, and now it is proposed to send the drafted boys into the front lines again, if a war should come, without an adequate stock pile of minerals which will be so desperately needed to provide the boys with the necessary munitions.

Perhaps there will not be an emergency tonight, or very soon—we hope there will not be—but if this opportunity is passed up it will mean that we have nearly empty stock piles and we will not produce from present existing facilities needed to fill up the stock piles. If war should come it would be impossible to produce from present existing facilities sufficient minerals to conduct a war. Properly to conduct a war it is necessary that we have a stock pile ready. It is necessary that we have mines operating in this country when the submarines cut off supplies from abroad.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator from Nevada has made an admirable argument in favor of the Government taking over the whole industry. If private enterprise cannot produce the minerals essential to prosperity and a prosperous, abundant economy in the United States, and the needs of our national defense, then I will say it has failed, and we should adopt socialism in that field, but I am not willing to do it by way of a subsidy to a group of private corporations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2756.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I approach this question briefly, from another point of view, a little different, perhaps, than that expressed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

I hope very much that this motion will not prevail, and that we shall not take up this bill in the closing hours of this session. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I recall that Mr. Hill appeared before us on several occasions. I think I was present at all of them. At none of them that I can remember did Mr. Hill mention a subject of this character. Subsequently Mr. Kramer, his assistant, came before us in connection with the problem of building up our resources, but Mr. Kramer came before us to preserve, at the cost of several million dollars—not as many as this bill would require, but if I remember rightly, about $15,000,000 or $16,000,000 a year—certain factories and plants which we had built up during the war, and which we were keeping in a mothball condition. Those factories were going to pieces because the machinery was deteriorating and because the conditions under which we kept them were not adequate. So we passed a bill at this session of Congress to make it possible for those factories to be kept in a more active condition, in case we needed more resources in a time of emergency; but at no time, so far as I can remember, did he mention a matter of this character.

More recently I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, which has considered appropriations for the Army and Navy, and ordnance in connection therewith. Certainly so far as the Navy ordnance is concerned, no question was raised as to the building of a stock pile. They asked for very substantial increases for increased ordnance, but they did not mention a subject of this character.

I remember very clearly a speech which was made in this body by my colleague [Mr. LODGE] before he went into the Army in 1943. Whether it was after Pearl Harbor or just before, I cannot remember, but at that time he spoke of the fact that this country was no longer a self-supporting country, and that it never would be again entirely a self-supporting country in the matter of its natural resources. At that time, 8 years ago, he raised this same question of how self-supporting we could be, and how much we could build our supplies of natural resources. So it seems to me that if we are going to consider the question of stock piling there are natural resources which should be given a very complete study before we go into the question of subsidizing, at a very substantial amount each year in the form of Government aid to some of our more marginal production mines.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I merely wish to invite the distinguished Senator's attention to the fact that this subject has received repeated study. It has been before the House in extensive hearings several times. The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has held lengthy and elaborate hearings on the subject. So far as congressional knowledge is concerned, it is not a subject of complete novelty.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to my friend from Colorado that I realize that it is not a complete novelty in any way. What I was trying to bring out was that the question of undertaking a new subsidy on the last night of a session, when there is a very substantial cost involved, should be given very complete debate and thorough study and discussion of what we have and what we have not. I know that my colleague from Colorado is on the committee which has to do with atomic energy. I do not begin to know that subject, but I believe from what I know that there again is a question of some of the resources which perhaps will not always be entirely in this country.

All those questions enter into the picture. But the point I wish to make particularly is that in my personal discussions with Mr. Hill I have never heard this subject mentioned by him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. One of the astonishing things in connection with all these reports and expert opinions is that the experts never come forth with a constructive plan, and they never come forth with a stock pile. Our stock piles are empty, and we do not have enough of these materials for our domestic industry. Here is an affirmative measure to produce additional supplies of strategic materials. We do not pay for anything that is not produced.

What is the alternative? I suggest to the distinguished Senator that the alternative is that which was developed in the colloquy between the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and myself, namely, allocation. Allocation will not fill the stock piles, nor will it fill the bins of our manufacturers who, in many instances, are shut down or partially shut down because they do not have these materials. We must have an affirmative method of increasing the supply of materials. We have removed the tariffs, and the material has not come in, because the needs of other countries are somewhat similar to our own. We are getting some, but still our supply taken from all sources, with no tariff, and free importation, is completely inadequate. We neither supply our domestic peacetime needs nor are we supplying our military stock piles.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me briefly reply to the Senator from Colorado.

My reply to my distinguished colleague is that, as a result of the war, the whole economy of the world today, and our economy in this country are unbalanced. We have the largest peacetime productive income today in the history of our Nation—probably in the history of the world. The Senator knows the figures much better than I do; but if my memory serves me aright, our productive income is running at the rate of $241,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. MILLIKIN. These statistical inquiries and these interesting philosophical facets of the subject do not put strategic materials in the stock piles, and that is where we need them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, there is another reason that appeals to me enormously against adopting this motion at this time, and that is the very fundamental question of the cost. There are some of us in this body who voted against TVA. We may have so voted for several reasons. I know the two reasons why I voted against it. One was the question of cost, ultimately running up to some $84,000,000 in the coming years. The other was, of course, the very deep and fundamental question of the extension of public power in our economy.

This is another bill that would enter a new field and cost approximately $80,000,000 a year running over a period of 4 or 5 years. Eighty million dollars would be the minimum that would be spent. I wish to correct myself because I see the Senator approaching me. The $80,000,000 is a possibility; and there is the administrative cost, in addition to the uncertainty in connection with various other sections of the bill, which may involve a substantial amount over $80,000,000.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. By this time all the arguments as to uncertainty have been dispelled, I believe, because the sponsor of the bill has agreed to take out of it one paragraph which I believe was the cause of the uncertainty. He has also agreed to reduce the amount of money involved to $60,000,000 a year and to reduce the term from 4 years to 3 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask if there is not necessarily an intangible amount of ore and metals to be produced, and to be purchased by the RFC, as a result of the incentive payments.

I invite attention to page 8, subparagraph (b), reading, in part, as follows:

(b) All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments and which comply with Munitions Board minimum stock-pile specifications shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

So far as I know, no one who has examined this bill has undertaken seriously to estimate what the expenditure there would be. Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator. I heard the Senator's discussion on that point.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The maximum expenditure under the suggested amendment would be $60,000,000 a year.

I think the distinguished Senator from Missouri is overlooking the fact that when the ores are bought, certain reimbursements come back to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which leaves the $60,000,000 available for paying the premium, and the $60,000,000 takes care of the market price, independently of the premium.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether that reimbursement is not provided for at the bottom of page 8. I read:

(c) The Bureau of Federal Supply of the Treasury Department shall reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the extent of the current market price for all metals, minerals, and ores placed in the national security stock pile under this section.

In other words, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts, is not that just taking the money out of one pocket and putting it in another, and in the last analysis, is not the outlay an outlay by the Government?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understood that under the bill the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would put up the money; and then when the goods were purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, they would be taken over into another account.

Mr. KEM. Is not that a payment on the part of the Federal Government?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not assume that the Federal Government could stock pile without paying for it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Bureau of Federal Supply is the agency of the Treasury which operates under the appropriation for stock-pile purposes, which already has been made by the Congress. Speaking very roughly, I think they have half a billion dollars available for that purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope this measure will not be taken up for consideration, because it is a new subject, at a very late hour, so far as most of us are concerned, and it is going to be an expensive subject, and it goes into a whole new form of assistance to our economy.

Mr. President, I ask that the motion be defeated.

Mr. KEM. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, during this long debate I have noticed that it has been stated over and over again that there is a limitation on the amount which it might cost the Government, that limitation being stated as $80,000,000. That sum is mentioned twice in section 7 of the bill, but it is not a limitation on the amount which this bill would cost the Government.

I draw my colleague's attention to that by reading the words of section 7, which comprises two paragraphs. One is that:

All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and shall not exceed $80,000,000 in any 1 year—

That is one provision. Then there is another provision—

nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States which obligates the United States Government (including all departments and agencies thereof) to make disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act in excess of $80,000,000 in the aggregate in any 1 year.

So that is another provision of $80,000,000. Together, those made $160,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. Not yet; I have not finished the sentence.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is a rather long sentence.

Mr. GREEN. Well, I have the floor. I think many Senators who have asked questions have made much longer speeches and have not had them counted against them as their two speeches on this question, and I am not sure but that the Senator who interrupted me is guilty of that himself.

I say that these two limitations of $80,000,000 each make a total of $160,000,000; but that is not all, because that counts only as the disbursements by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and commitments may be made by officers and employees of the United States.

In addition to those two, commitments are to be made by the Bureau itself. That provision has just been read:

All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments and which comply with Munitions Board minimum stock-pile specifications shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation,

In other words, there is a third element. That is merely one example of the commitments made by the bill. They do not come under the head of either of the others, and that is an indefinite amount.

So, instead of being $160,000,000, it may be $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 or $500,000,000.

If it is plain, as I have no doubt the Senator who is sitting on the edge of his chair, waiting to ask me a question, will claim, that such commitments are covered by one or the other of the paragraphs previously mentioned, I may say it is very poor drafting, because the words do not bear out the idea.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question, let me ask if that is all the objection the Senator from Rhode Island has to the bill? If we cure that, so as to provide for a maximum of $160,000,000, is the Senator willing to vote for this bill then? Is that all the objection the Senator has to it?

Mr. GREEN. It certainly is not.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then I ask the Senator to state the other objection. We should like to have the bill brought up for consideration.

Mr. GREEN. The way to have it brought up for early consideration is not to ask me to restate all the objections which have been stated during the last few hours. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLAND. But I want to find out what the Senator's objection is. He has stated one, and we can cure that one easily enough, if that is his only objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the argument is as illogical as the phasing of the bill is irregular.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I want to know whether the Senator thinks perfecting a bill is an illogical argument.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I think there have been too many so-called questions allowed by the Presiding Officer as questions, when in reality they have been speeches. They really should be counted against the questioner as the first of the two speeches to which he is entitled. I regret the necessity for a ruling of that kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be taken up when the rules are revised.

Mr. GREEN. But I think the Chair has been very lenient in allowing many Senators to make speeches at length in the guise of questions, and long colloquies to be drawn out under the guise of a question and an answer. I thought it my duty to call my colleague's attention to the fact there is no limitation on the number of millions of dollars or, theoretically, billions of dollars, to which the United States Government might be committed if the bill were passed in its present form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to consideration of Senate bill 2756.

Mr. KEM. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are detained on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Hill	Myers
Baldwin	Ives	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Butler	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson, Va.
Chavez	Langer	Russell
Connally	Lucas	Sparkman
Cooper	McCarthy	Taft
Dworshak	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Maybank	Wherry
Hatch	Millikin	Young
Hayden	Morse	
Hickenlooper	Murray	

NAYS—28

Ball	Capehart	Green
Barkley	Donnell	Gurney
Bricker	Ellender	Hoey
Brooks	Feazel	Holland
Byrd	Fulbright	Jenner
Kem	O'Daniel	Tydings
Kilgore	Saltonstall	Umstead
McGrath	Smith	Williams
McMahon	Stennis	
Martin	Thye	

NOT VOTING—28

Bridges	Knowland	Stewart
Buck	Lodge	Taylor
Bushfield	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cain	McClellan	Tobey
Capper	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	Moore	White
Downey	O'Conor	Wiley
Eastland	Reed	Wilson
George	Revercomb	
Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.	

So Mr. WHERRY's motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2756) to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "and", to insert "maximum"; on page 4, line 16, after the word "after", to strike out "six months" and insert "one year"; and in line 24, after the word "be", to strike out "made" and insert "calculated"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "and", to strike out "shall include" and insert "afford opportunity for"; in line 5, after the word "and", to insert "strategic and critical"; in line 13, after the word "payments", to strike out "without regard to payment" and insert "within the"; in line 14, after the word "in", to insert "section 6 of"; and after the word "act", to strike out "on the following basis, namely" and to insert "upon application of any mine operator upon either of the following bases (1)"; on page 6, line 7, after the word "tons", to insert "on (2) exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on projects approved by him under rules as prescribed in section 3 (c)"; in line 13, after the word "accrue", to strike out: "Exploration payments received by an operator shall be deemed gross income within the meaning of section 22, Internal Revenue Code, and all expenditures by such operator for exploration work for which exploration payments are received under this act shall be allowable as deductions under section 23, Internal Revenue Code"; on page 7, line 4, after "(a)", to strike out "Development" and insert "Exploration, development"; in line 7, after the word "mineral", to strike out "such" and insert "The sum of such"; in line 8, after the word "payments", to insert "per unit of production"; and in line 23, after the word "paid", to strike out: "Hereafter all maximum development and conservation payment, limitations provided in this section shall be adjusted by the Director in proportion to each five-point change in the Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale commodity price index of all commodities (1926 equals 100). These maximum limitations shall apply unless in the opinion of the Director special consideration is necessary for further stimulation of development or production of a particular metal or mineral";

on page 9, line 4, after the word "section", to strike out "and such credits may be expended for purchases and development and conservation payments over and above the limitations imposed in section 7 (a) hereof"; and after line 21, to insert "nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States which obligates the United States Government (including all departments and agencies thereof) to make disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act in excess of $80,000,000 in the aggregate in any one year"; and on page 10, line 7, after the word "provisions", to insert "administration", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Minerals Development and Conservation Act of 1948."

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the policy of the Congress that every effort be made to stimulate the exploration, development, mining, and maximum production of strategic and critical metals and minerals by private enterprise to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the United States by providing for the development and conservation of these materials in order to decrease and prevent, wherever possible, a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of such materials. To this end it is the further policy of the Congress that every effort be made to stimulate, stabilize, and maintain a sound and active mining industry within the United States and to coordinate the programs now provided for or to be provided for by law for making scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence; the development, mining preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral subetances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States; and to stimulate the commercial extraction and production of the same.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created within the Department of the Interior a Mine Incentive Payments Division, hereinafter called the "Division."

(b) The administrative officers of the Division shall be a Director, suitably qualified in actual administrative and mining experience, and an Assistant Director. The salaries of the Director and Assistant Director shall be $12,000 per annum and $10,000 per annum, respectively. In the absence of the Director his duties shall be performed by the Assistant Director.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Director, and he is hereby authorized and directed, (1) to perform the functions hereinafter specifically authorized, and (2) to prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act in the simplest manner.

(d) The Director may select, employ, and fix the compensation of such engineers and other experts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923 and shall employ such other staff as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 4. All of the functions of the Office of Premium Price Plan for Copper, Lead, and Zinc, pertaining to the administration of said plan are hereby transferred to the Division, together with all pertinent records and equipment.

SEC. 5. (a) To carry out the purposes of this act, development and conservation payments shall be made hereunder for all ores, metals, and minerals determined to be strategic or critical, pursuant to section 2 (a), Public Law 520 (79th Cong., ch. 590, 2d sess.), and included in group A of the Munitions Board list of strategic and critical materials, dated January 1948, together with any minerals or metals that subsequently may be added thereto, produced from ores, dumps, tailings, slag piles, and residues (excluding scrap materials), except that in the event that the Munitions Board shall find that further purchases of particular ores, metals, or minerals for national security stock-pile purposes are no longer necessary or shall within 1 year of the date of finding cease to be necessary, then (1) if such finding is made within 30 days after the effective date of this act, no payments shall be made under the authority of this act, except in cases of small mines as hereinafter provided, with respect to such ores, metals, or minerals, and (2) if such finding is made more than 30 days after the effective date of this act, no payments under the authority of this act shall be made with respect to such ores, metals, or minerals, produced after 1 year from the date of such finding except in cases of small mines as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That in the event any such findings are amended by the Munitions Board to the effect that purchases of such ores, metals, or minerals have again become necessary for national security stock-pile purposes the payment provisions of this act shall again become applicable subject to the limitations of this paragraph. Such payments shall be calculated at such rates within the limitations defined in this act so as to encourage exploration and development, increase production, and effect conservation and make reasonable allowances for depreciation and depletion and afford opportunity for a reasonable profit to the producer based upon the values of the recoverable metals and strategic and critical minerals contained in the ores. And in cases of small mines where production in any calendar year is less than 300 tons of recoverable metal, maximum payments shall be made on total production therefrom on application and none of the restrictions other than those of maximum payment limitations shall govern in such cases. Exploration payments shall be made in addition to development and conservation payments within the limitations provided in section 6 of this act, upon application of any mine operator upon either of the following bases: (1) Maximum exploration payments shall be based on production of recoverable metal produced from each mine operation at the rate of 7 cents per pound for the first 250 tons or fraction thereof of metal produced during any calendar year; at the rate of 6 cents per pound for the second 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; 5 cents per pound for the third 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; 4 cents per pound for the fourth 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; 3 cents per pound for the fifth 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; 2 cents per pound for the sixth 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; and 1½ cents per pound for all metals produced during any calendar year in excess of 1,500 tons and less than 2,000 tons; on (2) exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on projects approved by him under rules as prescribed in section 3 (c). Exploration payments shall be made monthly, provided expenditures for such work are made prior to the end of the calendar year following the year in which such allowances accrue. It shall be a condition of the making of all such payments that recipients thereof shall pay no royalties on exploration payments or on such portion of the amount received by the producer as is in excess of market prices, except where landowners share in the expense of transportation, milling, and smelting of ores.

(b) In addition to the other powers and duties created by this act, the Director may authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to enter into such contracts as would aid in effectuating the policies of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) Exploration, development, and conservation payments for any particular metals or minerals shall be in addition to the amount received per unit from other sources by the producer of the metal or mineral. The sum of such payments per unit of production shall not exceed the difference between the current market price and (1) in the case of metals produced under the premium-price plan, an amount equal to the highest market price plus the production premiums received by any domestic producer during the years 1942 to 1946, inclusive, and (2) in the case of other ores, metals, and minerals an amount equal to the highest amount paid any domestic producer for such metals and minerals during the years 1942 to 1946, inclusive, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or its subsidiaries or by other Government departments or agencies, such amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) hereof to be adjusted by the Director in proportion to the changes in the Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale price index of all commodities (1926 equals 100) since such highest sums or amounts were first offered or paid. All ores, concentrates, metals, and minerals on which payments are made shall meet previously established minimum industrial specifications or minimum specifications determined by the Munitions Board for the national security stock pile.

(b) All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments and which comply with Munitions Board minimum stock-pile specifications shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall transfer such ores, metals, and minerals to the national security stock pile established pursuant to Public Law 520 (79th Cong., ch. 590, 2d sess.): *Provided*, That any producer may deliver an equivalent quantity of recoverable metal in form and grade satisfactory to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in lieu of the particular metal or mineral resulting from payments hereunder.

(c) The Bureau of Federal Supply of the Treasury Department shall reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the extent of the current market price for all metals, minerals, and ores placed in the national security stock pile under this section.

(d) Each producer shall at all times have access to a complete file of all copies of all calculations and analyses and all other information or determinations used as a basis for his individual assignment, revision, or denial of development and conservation payments or prices and exploration premiums.

(e) Copies of all rules, regulations, and policies and changes therein shall be furnished to each producer registered with the Division and shall be published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 7. (a) All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and shall not exceed $80,000,000 in any 1 year, nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States which obligates the United States Government (including all departments and agencies thereof) to make disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act in excess of $80,000,000 in the aggregate in any 1 year.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (a) of this section shall expire June 30, 1952.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums sufficient to carry out the administration of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to submit three amendments, and I ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 10, it is proposed to insert a period after "States" and strike out the remainder of the section, as follows: "and to coordinate the programs now provided for or to be provided for by law for making scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence; the development, mining preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States; and to stimulate the commercial extraction and production of the same"; on page 6, line 7, insert a period in place of the semicolon after the word "tons" and strike out "on (2) exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on projects approved by him under rules as prescribed in section 3 (c)."; on page 7, line 10, after the word "metals", insert the words "that were"; on the same page, line 1, strike the comma after the word "act" and insert "and subject to the limitations of section 7 (a) of this act"; on page 9, line 21, it is proposed to change "$80,000,000" to "$60,000,000"; on page 10, line 3, to change "$80,000,000" to "$60,000,000"; on the same page, line 5, to change "1952" to "1951"; on page 10, line 3, after the word "year" and following the period, insert a new sentence reading, as follows: "During the fiscal year 1949, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Department of the Interior not to exceed $350,000 for the administration of this act."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall not take much time, except to make a very short statement of a few sentences with regard to this bill. Any bill which looks ahead to the acquisition of critical and rare minerals or other essential war materials is worthy of consideration. Under normal circumstances, a bill coming before the Senate with the recommendation of the committee would receive more consideration from me, at least, than I could give to this measure, for the reason that no one in the Government service and no one connected with the business of national defense has recommended a bill. If it were supported by someone charged with the duty of national defense, such as the Chairman of the Natural Resources Board, and this were a scheme devised to build stock piles which are needed as a matter of defense, I should be delighted to support it; but the truth of the matter is that the bill comes here without any evidence, so far as I know, from anyone except those who are interested in the measure and who come primarily from mining States. This bill, in its last analysis, will cost a great many million dollars; indeed, it could cost several hundred million dollars, even if it were prudently administered. Here at 5 o'clock in the morning, as the sun comes up, it is a pretty large undertaking to commit the Government to a policy calling for an expenditure of more than a quarter of a billion dollars a year for a period of 4 years, without the slightest recommendation of anyone in America connected with or having the prime responsibility for the acquisition and stock piling of resources as a matter of national defense.

We may be very short on many critical materials, and it is our duty as the Congress to repair the shortage as speedily as we can. But there is certainly not the type of bill here, supported by expert testimony, to carry such a project to a conclusion. While I am normally in favor of stock piling of critical and rare minerals, I cannot give my support to this particular bill, for the reasons I have indicated.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, and I direct my request to the proponents of this measure, that, because of the fact that it has become almost a physical impossibility for the reporters, in view of the long period of duty to which they have been subjected, to take the remarks of the Members of the Senate, the Senate recess for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will recess until 5:20 a. m.

On the expiration of the recess, at 5:20 o'clock a. m., the Senate assembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. IVES in the chair).

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if I may ask unanimous consent for a further recess——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, before the Senator does so, will he yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

EXCHANGE OF LAND ALONG MOUNT VERNON MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, from the Committee on Public Works, Senate bill 2694, to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes, and to submit a report (No. 1772) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have discussed this bill with the acting majority leader, and I am quite sure there would be no controversy over it. It is unanimously approved by the Public Works Committee. It merely involves an exchange of land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway. A similar bill has been passed by the House. I am advised by those in charge of the highways that the exchange would be very advantageous to the Government. I will say to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that the land involved is in his State. The bill has been urged upon us. The committee has unanimously reported the bill, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I am sure that it will not involve discussion. If it does, I shall withdraw the request.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senators in charge of the bill which has been under discussion are the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. It is up to them.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, let me suggest that the Senator be patient so that we can get ahead with the amendments on which we are working.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have been patient for hours. I brought the bill to the attention of the acting majority leader some time ago. I am sure that it will not delay anything. It is more or less a perfunctory matter. If we do not pass the bill now, it will probably die with the Congress.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator agree that if there is any controversy over the bill he will withdraw his request?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I certainly agree to that. If there is any controversy or objection whatsoever, I shall withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The bill is reported by unanimous vote of the committee. It is not on the printed calendar, but it can be considered by the Senate if the Senate will give consent for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2694) to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to protect more adequately the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway, and to add further to its memorial character, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to carry out the following transactions with the Smoot Sand & Gravel Corp.:

(a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire certain lands in exchange for certain dredging and other rights on land already owned by the United States on the east side of the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in Fairfax County, Va., extending from approximately station 426 to station 516 plus 50, shown as areas "A," "B," "C," and "D" on plan No. 105.22 minus 415 in the files of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and more particularly set forth as follows:

(1) To accept on behalf of the United States of America a good and sufficient title in fee simple, free of all encumbrances, to that piece of land lying on the east side of the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway and extending from approximately opposite station 459 to station 516 plus 50, approximately 5,750 feet in length and averaging approximately 800 feet in width, and containing 110 acres, more or less, and as further shown as area "A" on said plan.

(2) To accept on behalf of the United States of America a good and sufficient title in fee simple, free of all encumbrances, to area "D" lying between area "A" and the Potomac River, and containing 150 acres, more or less; the Smoot Sand & Gravel Corp.

reserving unto itself, its successors and assigns, the right to remove sand and gravel therefrom for a period of 30 years, and for the same period reserving such riparian rights as may exist in area "D."

(3) To permit the Smoot Sand & Gravel Corp., its successors and assigns, to remove sand and gravel from that part of United States property lying east of area "B" and opposite stations 426 to 459, to the extent of 85 acres, more or less, of the total 110 acres in area "C," as shown on said plan, for a period of 20 years, and for the same period granting such riparian rights as may exist in this area.

(4) To require that the scope of dredging operations necessary to remove the sand and gravel in areas "C" and "D" be so limited and conducted as not to undermine the adjacent shores of areas "A" and "B" and to provide that the Government shall have the right of ingress and egress from the Potomac River to the lands marked on the plan as areas "A" and "B" for the purpose of depositing dredged material in those areas; and to allow the workmen employed in the dredging operations at the locations described above to have access to the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway for the purpose of going to and from work, and to park their cars at designated places.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of War are hereby further authorized to prescribe in any contract or contracts entered into pursuant hereto any other terms and conditions deemed necessary to protect the interests of the United States in the above transactions.

(c) All lands acquired by the United States pursuant to this act shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service as a part of the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway and shall be subject to all laws and rules and regulations applicable thereto.

(d) All dredging shall be performed in accordance with plans recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War as provided in section 10 of River and Harbor Act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 U. S. C. 403), as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2790) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT—HOUSING FOR VETERANS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House to Senate bill 2790.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2790) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"CREATION AND POWERS OF THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"SEC. 301. (a) The Administrator is further authorized and empowered to provide for the establishment of a Federal National Mortgage Association (hereinafter referred to as the "Association") which shall be authorized, subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Association—

"(1) to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, which are insured after April 30, 1948, under section 203 or section 603 of this act, or guaranteed under sections 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended: *Provided, however,* That—

"(A) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by, or if it covers property held by, Federal, State, or municipal instrumentalities;

"(B) no mortgage may be purchased for an amount exceeding the unpaid principal balance thereof, plus accrued interest, at the time of purchase;

"(C) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase if the original principal obligation of the loan exceeds or exceeded $10,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage or other lien securing the loan;

"(D) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase unless offered by the original mortgagee prior to any other sale thereof;

"(E) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by any one mortgagee (1) unless such mortgage is secured by property used, or designed to be used, for residential purposes and (2) if the unpaid principal balance thereof, when added to the aggregate amount paid for all mortgages purchased by the Association from such mortgagee pursuant to authority contained herein, exceeds 25 percent of the original principal amount of all mortgages made by such mortgagee which, except for this subparagraph (E), meet the requirements of this section.

"(F) no mortgage shall be purchased by the Association unless the mortgagee certifies that the housing with respect to which the mortgage was made meets the construction standards prescribed for insurance of mortgages on the same class of housing under the National Housing Act, as amended.

"(2) to borrow money for any of the foregoing purposes through the issuance of notes or other such obligations as hereinafter provided.

"(b) The Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and established pursuant to the provisions of this title as in effect prior to June 1, 1948, shall be the Association referred to in subsection (a) of this section. The Board of Directors of the Association shall consist of not less than five persons to be appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the Acting Chairman in the case of a vacancy in the office of Chairman, from the Directors, officers, or employees of such Corporation and the officers shall be appointed by the Board of Directors from the Directors, officers, or employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(c) The Association created under this section shall have succession from the date of its organization unless it is dissolved by order of the Administrator as hereinafter provided, or by act of Congress, and shall have power—

"(1) to adopt and use a corporate seal;

"(2) to make contracts;

"(3) to sue and be sued; complain and defend, in any court of law or equity, State or Federal;

"(4) to conduct its business in any State of the United States, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, and to have one or more offices in such State, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, one of which offices shall be designated at the time of organization as its principal office;

"(5) to do all things as are necessary or incidental to the proper management of its affairs and the proper conduct of its business.

"(d) The Association may have a capital stock of not to exceed $20,000,000 and paid-in surplus of $1,000,000, subscribed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(e) The Association, for the purpose of all actions by or against it, real, personal, or mixed, and all suits in equity, shall be deemed a citizen of the place in which its principal office is located.

"(f) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation, except the association organized under this section, shall hereafter use the words 'Federal National Mortgage Association' or any combination of such words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $100 or imprisonment not exceeding 30 days, or both, for each day during which such violation is committed or repeated. The provisions of section 5243 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the association created under this title.

"OBLIGATIONS

"SEC. 302. The Association is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any time notes or other obligations in an aggregate amount not to exceed (1) 40 times the amount of its capital and surplus, and in no event to exceed (2) the current unpaid principal of mortgages held by it and insured under the provisions of titles II and VI of this act and guaranteed under sections 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, plus the amount of its cash on hand and on deposit and the amortized value of its investments in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"INVESTMENT OF FUNDS

"SEC. 303. Moneys of the Association not invested in mortgages or in operating facilities shall be kept in cash on hand or on deposit, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States; except that the Association shall keep and maintain such reserves as it may deem necessary.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 304. The Association, including its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, mortgage loans, income, and stock, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Association shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

"MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

"SEC. 305. The Association shall have power to deal with, rent, renovate, modernize, or sell for cash, with a view to assuring a maximum financial return to the association, any property acquired by it as a result of foreclosure proceedings or otherwise.

"LIQUIDATION

"SEC. 306. The Administrator shall have power to terminate the existence of the Association and order its liquidation and the winding up of its affairs whenever the Administrator determines, in his judgment, that the need therefor no longer exists. The Association shall make a report of its activities to the Administrator in January and July of each year for the preceding 6 months' period, which report shall be transmitted to the Congress, together with the Administrator's recommendations thereon."

SEC. 2. Nothing in the amendment made by the first section of this act shall limit the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to service or sell any mortgage purchased prior to the date of the enactment of his act, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgage with respect to which a commitment to purchase was made prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. Section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$1,500,000,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000,000,000."

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(h) The Corporation may subscribe for the nonassessable stock of the Federal National Mortgage Association: *Provided,* That the total face amount of stock so subscribed for and held by the Corporation shall not exceed at any one time $20,000,000."

SEC. 5. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section 510 thereof the following new section:

"INCONTESTABILITY

"SEC. 511. Any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the loan for guaranty or insurance under the provisions of this title and of the amount of such guaranty or insurance, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from establishing, as against the original lender, defenses based on fraud or material misrepresentation, and except that the Administrator shall not, by reason of anything contained in this section, be barred from establishing, by regulations in force at the date of such issuance or disbursement, whichever is the earlier, partial defenses to the amount payable on the guaranty or insurance."

SEC. 6. (a) Section 207 (c) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of paragraph numbered (2), inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and adding the following new proviso: "*And provided further,* That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph (2), a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporation, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members, may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 95 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed; and."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may we have some explanation of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I intend to explain it.

The Senate passed a bill introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], which provided for a secondary market for GI loans. The bill has been rewritten in the House. I have consulted with the author of the bill, and with other Senators who are interested.

In effect, the bill continues the powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association to buy and take off the hands of banks mortgages which are insured under section 203 or section 603 of the FHA Act, and also those guaranteed under section 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the GI Act. The bill provides approximately $800,000,000 in capital with which such loans may be purchased from banks. The capital is provided by the RFC, which for that purpose is given an increase from one and a half to $2,000,000,000.

In addition to the power given to discount GI loans, one or two other small provisions have been inserted in the bill, relating to veterans, one providing for the incontestability of veterans' loans, similar to the incontestability clause for FHA loans; and another provides for special 95 percent loans on nonprofit cooperative housing corporations whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II. Those provisions relate to another feature, and are strictly provisions for the benefit of veterans.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Ohio advise the Senate in what manner the Senate bill was rewritten in the House, with respect to the issuance or purchase of the GI loans?

Mr. TAFT. The text of the Senate bill was stricken out. The Senate bill provided the capital to the Veterans' Administration. This bill gives it to the Federal National Mortgage Association. It is a complete substitute for the Senate bill, but it does exactly the same thing in a somewhat more restricted way. The original bill provided, I think, for the purchase of something like 60 percent of the loans of any bank. This provides for only 25 percent.

The distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House took the position that there are now approximately $7,000,000,000 of loans outstanding, and that unless we were somewhat restrictive in taking such loans off the hands of banks we might be flooded with billions of dollars worth of such mortgages. So it is provided that a bank may have only 25 percent of its loans rediscounted. I think that is somewhat small, but it is sufficient to last until next spring, when we may deal further with the problem.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What standards are provided for the exercise of this authority by the purchasing agency?

Mr. TAFT. There is no provision, except that it is required that the GI loans must meet the construction standards provided for insurance of mortgages on the same class of housing under the FHA Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the purchasing agency free to decline to purchase such loans?

Mr. TAFT. Oh, yes. They are not bound to purchase any loans at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I feel that there are a great many amendments which should be made to the bill. While it is not a good bill, it is better than nothing. That is about all we can say about it.

There is one amendment which I should like to offer, but I do not think it would be wise to offer it if it would mean that because of the lateness of the time we would get nothing.

I do not know whether or not Senators generally realize that if we adjourn and merely pass this bill, we shall have continued a freeze in public housing of all the over-income groups. There is now a tremendous demand for the few public-housing units by those who really need them. We cannot blame the public-housing officials for keeping in public housing men receiving $10,000, $12,000, or $20,000 a year, because we have frozen those over-income groups in public housing. If there were any possibility of adding the amendment, to which I am sure the Senate would agree, again placing upon the Public Housing Authority the duty to remove over-income groups and make way for those who really need those units, I should like to offer the amendment. But if the Senator from Ohio believes that by so doing and sending it back to conference it would mean that we would get nothing, I shall refrain from doing so.

Mr. TAFT. I have no hesitation in advising the Senator from Wisconsin that I think it would be exceedingly unwise to attempt to amend the House amendment. The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, who wrote this amendment, is a very particular gentleman. He has written it exactly as he wishes it to be. I have no means of knowing whether he would reject the amendment which might be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin or not at this late hour. We hope to adjourn very shortly, as soon as we agree to the conference report on the farm bill.

I think it would be very dangerous, indeed, to attempt to add an amendment and send the bill back to a further conference.

So I feel that if the Senator wants the bill to be enacted into law, he had better not offer an amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think it is inexcusable that we have come up to this late hour with nothing except the little that we have before us. I think it is almost entirely due to the emotional approach which so many of us have made to the housing problem, the insistence that we tie what is known as public housing with everything else we think should be done in a housing bill. Now we wind up with practically nothing at all.

The reason why I am not going to offer the amendment and other amendments which I think should be adopted is that I think the Senator from Ohio is correct, and that if we added some badly needed amendments, perhaps we would get nothing at all; and I think this is slightly better than nothing at all.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have only this to say about a secondary market for

GI loans: The lack of such a market is a serious handicap to building today. In general, the market is very liberal. Certainly the financing of housing is not the bottleneck, except where banks have filled themselves up with this type of loan, and do not propose to take any more loans of this character. There are many regions in the country where the banks will not take any more GI loans. So this bill meets that particular phase of the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

GOP POLITICS AND THE VETERAN

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared relative to 37 Pennsylvania veterans who have been nominated to the position of postmaster in the State of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

GOP POLITICS AND THE VETERAN

Mr. President, a month or so ago the Senate passed a bill which pleased just about everyone and brought us much praise. The bill provided that over and above present civil-service preferences for veterans and disabled veterans, the Civil Service Commission must exert its efforts toward filling as many jobs in the Government as possible with disabled veterans. Where a nonveteran or even a veteran who is not disabled is selected for a job over a disabled veteran, the Civil Service Commission would be required to file a written explanation for its action in not picking the disabled veteran applicant.

And so the newspapers came out that day with headlines—I have one here from the Philadelphia Bulletin—stating, "Senate seeks more jobs for disabled veterans."

The Senate is always, either collectively or via statements of individual Senators, going on record as favoring the veteran, as recognizing our obligations to our veterans, as being determined to carry out our wartime pledges to these boys.

Memories aren't that short that all of us, Mr. President, cannot remember that flowery accolades streaming up to these iron rafters over our heads during the war for the men who were, a short while ago—4 years ago this month—hitting the beaches of Normandy; for the men battling the weary, steaming path up through the jungles which led to Japan. Three years ago when the Nazis yelled quits and gave in, and when Japan surrendered, pledges were made here—solemn pledges—as to what we would do for these brave men when they came home.

Homes? Why sure, there would be homes—modern American homes—for our soldiers when they came back to the families they had left, when they picked up again the home life that they had interrupted.

Oh well, perhaps the veterans should have realized that when we pledged them homes on their return, homes to replace the ones they left, homes to shelter newly established families, that we made a slight exaggeration and meant homes for those veterans who can afford $15,000 or $20,000 accommodations. Such veterans are getting homes.

And how about those good-paying jobs we promised—jobs which would enable our veterans to enjoy the conveniences of life and to buy the products of our expanding economy? Well, it's true there are jobs for nearly all of our veterans. But the poor fellows are learning, much to their amazement and regret, that the pay checks which would have looked so fancy to them before the war will hardly, today, cover the cost of feeding and sheltering their families—in many cases, not even that. It might be interesting to find out how many of those millions of American families which have had to cash out their war bonds completely, which have so gone into debt that consumer credit today is at the highest level it has ever been in our history—it might be interesting to know how many of these families are the families of veterans who accumulated their war bonds out of meager Army pay and allowances and by sacrifices and hard work on the part of the wives while their husbands were overseas.

The inflation which has been let loose on this country by the selfish action of the Congress 2 years ago in tearing the roof off the price level, in killing price control, has hit hardest at the very fellow we were pledging ourselves three short years ago to show our gratitude—that is, the veteran. The shortage of homes, due to the selfish ignorance of those who have refused to allow the Federal Government to carry through on a gigantic housing program—a private industry housing program—has hit hardest the same fellow, the veteran.

Oh, Mr. President, we sure love the veteran. But it appears that the Congress of the United States seems to feel that the veteran went through so much travail and inconvenience and hardship during the war that he is tough by now and can take the consequences of congressional cruelty.

I would like to address myself for a few minutes to one group of veterans from my State who happen to have been kicked around by the Senate of the United States not just in the same way the Congress has kicked nearly all veterans around in these past 2 years, but kicked around personally, directly, individually.

They happen to be Pennsylvania veterans who took examinations for postmasterships, and they happen to have been selected by the President of the United States for jobs as postmasters on the basis of those examinations, on the basis of their war records, on the basis of their Americanism and their ability.

These men apparently made the mistake of believing that if they were qualified for a position, if they could obtain appointment to a position within the purview of their Government to grant, if their characters were commendable and if they were found not to be disloyal to our country, if they appeared able and willing to do the job for which they were selected, then they could expect the Senate of the United States to say—"All right, fellows, you've earned these jobs; they're yours."

As I said, they apparently made the mistake of believing that things work out here in that fashion. After all, it is the Soviet Union we generally think of these days when we speak of obstructionists, of apple-cart upsetters, when we think of the veto.

The Soviet Union has exercised her veto in the United Nations in order to prevent the UN from taking certain particular actions which the Soviet Union alone—or the Soviet Union and her satellites—thought to be against their interests.

The Senate of the United States—the Republican leadership of this Senate—has used the veto as ruthlessly, as spitefully, as maliciously as the Soviets have used it in the UN. The Republican leadership of the Senate, for purposes of raw political greed, has vetoed the chances of 30 American war veterans of becoming postmasters in Pennsylvania.

After sitting on nomination to postmasterships for months and months and months, the Senate Post Office Committee finally, on Wednesday, let out a dribble of nominations, sent a handful of nominations to the floor for possible action before adjournment of this session of Congress.

Among these were four Pennsylvania war veterans, and the widow of a fifth. The committee sat on these nominations interminably and finally let them out of committee at the very end of the last session of this Congress. I appreciate the committee's action in finally letting these nominations come out. It was, shall I say, decent of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to let four veterans and the widow of a fifth Pennsylvania war veteran come before the Senate for final approval for jobs for which they happen to be fully qualified, for jobs they have earned on their merit, and on their records.

We should all sing hosannahs, Mr. President, to the patriotism of this committee and of the Republican leadership of the Senate for letting these five nominations come out after all these months of refrigeration.

One of these nominations is that of a man who entered the Army as a private in the First World War, qualified eventually for an officership, a second lieutenant, was discharged in 1918, remained active from then on in the Reserve Corps, attended camp nearly every summer, became chairman of his county's Citizens Military Training Corps and stuck with it and went back to active service nearly a year before Pearl Harbor and rose to the rank of colonel; a man who served in steaming India; a man who twice served as commander of an American Legion post.

Isn't it nice, Mr. President, isn't it decent of the Senate Committee finally to give its O. K. to this man, William McCurdy, whom the President selected to be a postmaster at Pitcairn, Pa., a man who happened to be at the very top of the register.

The veterans of America owe the committee and the Senate's Republican leadership the most generous praise and gratitude for finally—finally—after months and months and months of delay—letting this man take his rightful job as postmaster in his home town.

In all the delay in the committee's action on this man's nomination—in all the long months of delay since January 26—there was not, Mr. President, a single word, a single shred of evidence against Colonel McCurdy and his qualifications for the postmastership. Then what held up action, Mr. President?

Now there's another the committee finally let out of its deep-freeze cabinet. He is Walter A. Hilsbos, Jr. He was nominated much more than a year ago, on April 7, 1947, to be postmaster of Oakford, Bucks County. He was naive enough to believe when he was nominated that if he gave the Senate committee a few facts about himself, that the Senate confirmation would be prompt. In May of 1947, he expressed the belief to me in a letter that if I asked the Senate Post Office Committee to do so, it would certainly confirm the nomination of a marine who met all the requirements when our flag was to be put on Mount Suribachi and also met all the requirements of the Civil Service Commission. Well, he was right. The committee would approve him. All he had to do was wait more than a year, however. This was a young fellow who had served 28 days and 28 nights on Iwo Jima. He, too, should bend his knee, I presume, in grateful obeisance for the magnanimous action of the Senate Post Office Committee and the Republican leadership of the Senate in allowing his nomination finally to come before us.

Another of four Pennsylvania war-veteran nominations finally to come out of cold storage is of a Navy man, who served in the Pacific. He is Charles W. Brader, nominated for postmaster at Tannersville, Pa., in Monroe County. He is now acting postmaster. He was nominated January 30, 1948—a long time ago; a long time to wait and wait for the Senate of the United States to say he is a fit citizen—for on what grounds can these nominations be rejected?

Another nomination reported out was that of disabled First World War veteran, Albert Howe, wounded by shrapnel at Verdun in 1918. A combat engineer, he was nominated for postmaster at Vanport in Beaver County. First on the register, he is the father of a boy who flew 39 missions out of Italy in this last war. No protest had been received against his nomination. The committee has no reason we know of to suspect wounded veteran Howe would not make a good postmaster. Yet, Mr. President, it has taken since February 7, 1947—16 months—since his nomination was first submitted, for the Post Office Committee of the Senate and for the Republican leadership of the Senate to satisfy themselves that this disabled veteran should be allowed to be a postmaster. Wasn't that nice of them?

A fifth nomination from Pennsylvania reported out was that of Pearl Chappell, widow of a First World War veteran. Her husband died in 1938. She subsequently took an examination for postmaster of Barnesville, in Schuylkill County, and was first on the register. She was nominated last January. Now, finally, she is approved by the committee.

Mrs. Chappell and the four veterans—and I—all thank the committee for these generous favors, for this speedy—shall we say, almost hasty?—action in their behalf. But we rather wonder, Mr. President, what took so long?

Further, Mr. President, I wonder—and so do a lot of other Pennsylvanians wonder—what has happened to the nominations of 31 other Pennsylvania war veterans which are still frozen up in that deep-freeze cabinet in the Senate Post Office Committee.

The 31 ignored veterans are, by and large, no less patriotic, no less honorable Americans than are the 4 whose nominations got out of committee. What happened, Mr. President? What are the measuring rods—the measures of value? What are the criteria?

Let us take one case, for instance. Let's take the case of veteran Woodrow W. S. Lehr of a little town in Pennsylvania called Fogelsville, in Lehigh County. Woodrow Lehr is acting postmaster. He was nominated for the permanent position last March, after having been the only man to qualify by examination. Woodrow Lehr is a veteran. Woodrow Lehr has 14 holes in his body from mortar shrapnel. Woodrow Lehr had nine bones broken. The nerve in Woodrow Lehr's left arm was cut. Woodrow Lehr's nomination to be postmaster at Fogelsville, Pa., is pigeonholed in the Senate Post Office Committee. The Republican Party is keeping it there. The Republican Party seems to feel that Woodrow Lehr doesn't deserve to be postmaster of Fogelsville, Pa.

Why not, Mr. President? Why not? Who shall say he is not deserving or qualified? Who has the gall to say so?

Weren't enough of his bones broken to suit the Republican Party's conception of wounded deserving veteran? Doesn't Woodrow Lehr carry enough shrapnel wounds? Don't his two Battle Stars and his Combat Infantry Badge, his Purple Heart, and the 14 mortar holes and nine bone fractures mean anything to the Republican leadership of this Senate? Are such wounds liabilities to a man seeking an office to which he was properly appointed?

What is the reason, Mr. President, that this nomination is still in committee? I would gladly yield to the chairman of the Senate committee long enough for him to explain to me why this nomination has not come out. I will gladly yield to any Senator who can explain who opposes Woodrow Lehr.

Woodrow Lehr served in France and Belgium and Holland and up to the Siegfried line with the Thirtieth Division. His division lost 1,800 men in a 6-day engagement in Lehr's first battle. When they hit the Siegfried line he was sent back to practice taking pill boxes. On October 2, 1944, the division attacked; all but six men in Lehr's company were either wounded or killed. Lehr was one of those wounded. He was shifted from one hospital to another until November 30, 1946. Both legs and an arm were in a cast for 5 months.

That's quite a record. We were pretty impressed with records like that a few short years ago. Today, a man with a record like that can't be postmaster of Fogelsville, Pa., because the Republican Senate won't let him.

Or, Mr. President, how about Herbert C. Klinger who was nominated by the President for the postmastership at Herndon, Pa., in Northumberland County. Like young Lehr from neighboring Lehigh County, Klinger is now acting postmaster. He was first on his register. The Republican Party serves notice on men like these two that if the GOP wins in November, these veterans lose their post-office positions—positions they have qualified for, have earned.

Klinger enlisted as a volunteer in the Glider Corps. He has ability. He was trained in various enlisted men's schools and finally became a second lieutenant and a navigator. He was a lead navigator-bombardier on a B-17. He was wounded in action over Ludwigshafen, Germany, while bombing a chemical plant. After recovering, he was promoted to first lieutenant. He completed 30 combat missions—30 of them. He won the Distinguished Flying Cross for participating in 25 lead missions over Germany in the command bomber of the groups.

What do you think, Mr. President? This young veteran has the audacity—the gall—the nerve—to think that the Republican Senate would consider confirming him for postmaster of Herndon, Pa. What impudence. What naivete. What complete lack of understanding of the American politics as practiced here by this Republican Senate.

Personally, I am puzzled. I just can't figure what is holding up his nomination. Could it be the proveteran attitude of the Republican Party in the Senate of the United States?

Perhaps the Republican leadership of the Senate believes, despite his 30 missions over Germany, despite his wounds, despite his medal, his DFC, Postmaster-nominee Herbert Klinger, of Herndon, Pa., shouldn't be confirmed because he wasn't in the service long enough to deserve such a great concession from this Republican Senate. After all, he was only in the service for 3½ years.

Well, then, Mr. President, if that is the criterion—and I admit I just don't have any idea what the criterion might be in the Republican leadership's designation of which nominations are to be confirmed and which are to be ignored—what about the case of Wiley C. Hamby, of Salona, Pa.? Salona is in Clinton County. Hamby hasn't had too much opportunity to spend too much time in Salona these past 26 years because he has spent about 24 of them in the Navy. He enlisted in 1922. He stayed in. He was commissioned during the war. He was discharged in August 1946 as a lieutenant, senior grade, and a few months later took the postmaster examination. He was notified that he stood first on the register. He was nominated in January. But has he been confirmed? Has his nomination been approved by the Senate Post Office Committee? It has not.

During the war this man served on the staff of the Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Fleet. He was senior communication watch officer in charge of code room and radio communication. He was top secret cipher officer for the Flagship. He was awarded a commendation by Admiral Ingersoll and a Bronze Star by Admiral Jonas Ingram.

But he can't be postmaster at Salona, Pa., because the Republican leadership of the Senate won't let him.

Why, Mr. President? Why?

Mr. President, do you remember the praise we used to heap here on the Navy's famous and courageous Seabees? Well, Eugene William Collins of Altglen, Pa., in Chester County, was a Seabee. He served in New Guinea, in Manus, in Leyte, Luzon, Mendora. He knows everybody in Altglen, Pa. He has a wife and four children. He considers a postmastership a job which carries with it security in return for faithful service. He was nominated months ago—in March. The Republican Party now says he cannot be postmaster. Was his war record bad? It was not. It was spotless. But that doesn't seem to matter here.

George Hawkins Davis of Saxonburg, Pa., in Butler County, served 3 years and 2 days overseas in World War II. Does that carry any weight with a Republican United States Senate? Apparently not. The Senate says, in effect, that unless the Democrats win so that this nomination can be re-submitted, 3 years and 2 days of overseas service do not qualify, or influence in any way, the qualifications of George Hawkins Davis, who is now the acting postmaster, to be postmaster of Saxonburg, Pa.

Nothing, Mr. President, is too good for the veterans of America where this Congress is concerned. Nothing, that is. Just nothing. Nothing is what they get. We make our Flag Day speeches and our Armistice Day speeches and our Memorial Day speeches and we wave the flag all over the place and we shed the biggest crocodile tears you ever saw, and we shed them for the veterans. But when it comes down to the simple matter of letting a veteran take a position which he has earned, this Senate cannot be bothered.

Shame, Mr. President. Shame.

Perhaps the Republican leadership of the Senate believes that these postmaster nominees are not really qualified—that the Civil Service Commission just gave them high ratings for the pure, patriotic fun of it.

Here's Leonard Devilbiss, acting postmaster of Fawn Grove in York County. He was nominated last January. A veteran, yes. Top man on his register, yes. A man with a number of years of business experience before entering the Army. A man who was employed by the War Department as a civilian before entering the service, and was in charge of all procurement in the automotive testing section of the Aberdeen Proving Ground. A man who entered the Army as a private, rose to second lieutenant, and organized and directed, as postal officer, the Army post office in the Army service forces separation center at Camp Atterbury, Ind., supervising the setting up of the physical requirements of the post office, as well as the planning and determination of mailing schedules for incoming and outgoing official and personal mail. Who was also responsible for supervising military personnel in the operation of this post office activity. Doesn't it appear, Mr. President, that such a man would make a fine postmaster for Fawn Grove, York County, and its third-class post office? Wouldn't he, Mr. President, as a veteran, be entitled at least to the courtesy of an explanation from

the Senate Post Office Committee and the Senate Republican leadership for their action in delaying and killing his nomination, in serving notice on him that if the Republicans win in November he is out as postmaster?

Joseph W. Petrovich, acting postmaster of Wilburton, Pa., in Columbia County, served overseas for 28 months of the 3 years he was in the Army. He has had business experience. He has had governmental experience. In the Army, one of his jobs was as supervising clerk of a service shop, in which he supervised 12 workers. The Senate committee, despite Petrovich's standing at the top of the civil-service register, won't let him be confirmed as postmaster. His nomination has been kicking around here since January.

Raymond Stuckey, a World War II veteran and a career employee of the postal service in Newport, Pa., post office in Perry County, was nominated July 12, 1947, nearly a year ago, to be postmaster. His nomination recognized the desire I think all of us share to see career men who are qualified rise in the Government service. We applauded the appointment of a career man—for the first time—to be postmaster general. We have had, in this case, an opportunity to encourage that trend. But Stuckey's nomination died in committee last year and is dying in committee again this year. This is the Republican Senate's method of encouraging career people and encouraging veterans in the Government service.

Steve Vrotny stands first on the register for postmaster at Natrona Heights in Allegheny County. He is a veteran. He was nominated by President Truman on June 27, 1947. No action was taken by the committee. He was renominated last January Again no action. Why?

Robert A. McNaul, nominated to be postmaster of Curwensville in Clearfield County, served both in the Navy and in the Army in the past 10 years. He enlisted in the Navy in 1937, served and was injured in line of duty aboard the USS *Cuyama* a year or so later, was hospitalized and then went back aboard ship and was finally given a medical discharge in August 1949. The Veterans' Administration gave him, at that time, a 10-percent disability rating. He had served 2 years and 10 days in the Navy.

In 1942 McNaul entered the Army and served 3½ years, including overseas service in Belgium and France with a hospital unit, and participated in a major engagement and earned a Battle Star. He was discharged as a technician, 3d grade. He still suffers from his Navy injuries, although his rating is not up to the minimum 10 percent to qualify him for disability preference.

He stands No. 1 on a register of three for this postmastership. He is the only veteran on the register.

Navy service, Army service, a service injury, overseas service, and civil service standing—all of these he has. Yet, he can't be postmaster of Curwensville, Pa., because the Senate won't let him. For all of his service, he is receiving from this Senate dishonorable discharge.

Mr. President, let me tell you about Thurlow C. Brenneman, the acting postmaster of York Haven in York County, Pa. Mr. Brenneman is a veteran. Mr. Brenneman is a disabled veteran. He served with the 90th Division in the European theater and there are two Bronze Stars on his European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign ribbon. He has the Purple Heart. He got it in the Battle of the Bulge. He lost six toes. He is married and has two children. He is a man of good character. He has been acting postmaster at York Haven for more than 2 years. He was a good soldier. He earned the Combat Infantry Badge. He participated in the Ardennes and Rhineland campaigns. This man was nominated to be postmaster of York Haven on March 26, 1947, nearly 15 months ago. The Senate Post Office Committee a year ago allowed the nomination to die in committee. The first session of the Eightieth Congress ended with no action on this nomination. President Truman resubmitted the nomination on January 26, 1948. Again, it is to die in committee. Again, Thurlow Brenneman, disabled war veteran and acting postmaster is to be told by the United States Senate, in effect, that he is not the sort of man they think should be postmaster of York Haven, Pa. Why?

How about Capt. Chester J. Kukleski, now on temporary active duty with the Reserves, assigned as a unit instructor for the training of Reserve officers at Baltimore, Md.? He was nominated about 6 months ago to be postmaster at Braddock, Pa. He was the only veteran to qualify among the top three in the civil-service register. He entered the Army 9 months before Pearl Harbor and worked his way up through the ranks to an officership. He was traffic regulating officer for an ammunition depot on Omaha Beach in 1944. He later was put in command of an ammunition company and had the responsibility for operating an ammunition depot and railhead. He participated in the Normandy, northern France, southern France, and Rhineland campaigns, winning four Battle Stars. He was awarded the Bronze Star Medal. The Senate of the United States says, in effect, that despite the fact that he is the only veteran on this register, despite his impressive war record, and despite the responsible work he is now doing for the Army in training officers, in preparing training bulletins, directives, manuals, and handbooks for distribution to units of command and supervising administration and assignment of Reserve officers and enlisted men in training units, he may not be postmaster of Braddock, Pa.

Frank Coughanour, Jr., acting postmaster of Hopwood, Pa., in Fayette County, is another veteran whose nomination for permanent appointment has been strangled to death in committee. Let me, Mr. President, tell you something about Frank Coughanour, Jr. Three weeks after Pearl Harbor, at the age of 17, Frank Coughanour enlisted in the Navy. He served on the USS *Tuscaloosa* and the USS *Guest*. He has two Battle Stars for engagements in the European-African theater and seven Battle Stars for engagements in the Pacific. He was discharged as a seaman, first class. The Senate Post Office Committee and the Senate's Republican leadership, so vocal in their appreciation for the veteran in the abstract, doesn't seem at all impressed when it comes to acting on deserving veterans individually. Is there anything lacking in the qualifications of Frank Coughanour, Jr., to bar his promotion from acting postmaster to postmaster at Hopwood, Pa.? Is it politics? What politics? Whose politics? He is the only eligible for this job.

Kenneth Eugene McQuiston came out of the war a corporal in the marines. He was in the marines for nearly 3 years. He took a civil-service examination to be postmaster of Home, Pa., in Indiana County. He was the only person to qualify. He was nominated last January, but it appears as if he is not going to be confirmed. Marine Corporal McQuiston doesn't fit the Republican leadership of the Senate's idea of fitness for a postmaster. That is the only inference that can be taken for the failure to act on this nomination. He well suited Marine Corps ideas of a good American. Apparently, the marines have different standards from the standards of the Senate Post Office Committee and the Republican Party.

Walter F. Walsh, of Spangler, Pa., in Cambria County, finds it advisable not to tell me or anyone else exactly what it was he did in the Army. The reason for that is that Mr. Walsh, who was nominated to be postmaster of Spangler, had orders from his commanding officer in the Signal Corps not to discuss it with anyone, even prospective employers. This is what Maj. James H. Frier, Jr., wrote to Mr. Walsh at the time this nominee was honorably discharged as a technician, fourth grade:

"It is a pleasure to inform you that the War Department recognizes officially your contribution to the war effort by your faithful service with the Second Signal Service Battalion.

"The confidential nature of your work here prevents you from discussing it with anyone, even prospective employers. You may say that your position here was of a confidential nature. You may also present this letter showing that your work was entirely satisfactory and your average efficiency rating was excellent. Anyone desiring further information may contact this office."

Now here is a man who could be trusted with work so confidential that even after the end of the war, he was under instructions not to discuss it with anyone. Being a mature man of 36 at the time he went into the Army, a family man, it would appear that he was selected for confidential work for which his maturity and judgment suited him. The Civil Service Commission says he qualified to be postmaster of Spangler, Pa. Who says he isn't? Who, Mr. President, will come forward and say that this man is not the right type of American for the postmastership of Spangler, Pa.?

Here is a very interesting case. It is the nomination of Louis J. DePaul, now acting postmaster, to be postmaster of Mount Pocono, Pa., in Monroe County. For some reason, for some mysterious, unfathomable reason, Mr. DePaul's nomination has rigor mortis in committee. It is dead. It won't come out. Since the Senate committee won't approve him, are we to understand that he is not a fit person for the job? Mr. DePaul, a lieutenant in the Naval Reserve, served 3 years, 8 months, and 14 days on active duty. Thirty-two months of that time was spent continuously in overseas service. He was on LST 344. He participated in the initial amphibious assaults and follow-up operations at Gela, Sicily, at Salerno, and the Normandy invasion. He participated in the North African campaign. In the first three campaigns he and his LST were on enemy beaches on D-day. He is a college graduate. In addition to serving as acting postmaster of Mount Pocono, he is the volunteer recruiting officer for the United States Naval Reserve in his district. Before the war he had a year's experience in the Post Office Department here in Washington. All in all, I would say Lieutenant DePaul well earned this postmastership and would make a good postmaster. What does the Senate Post Office Committee say?

Willis C. Latshaw has been acting postmaster of Spring City, Pa., in Chester County since April 16, 1948. In an open competitive examination for the postmastership, he placed first on the register, and he is the only veteran on the register. Mr. Latshaw served in World War I. In the 2 years that he has been acting postmaster he has had every right to look forward to promotion to the permanent postmastership on the basis of his efficiency, ability, and veteran's preference. Yet, the Republican Party, as it operates through the leadership of the Senate, has bottled up Mr. Latshaw's nomination and has taken the position that war service, veteran's preference, civil-service standing—all of these considerations—mean nothing. His nomination is to be salted away and forgotten. This is the Senate which so often has professed itself to be the friend of the veteran and the friend of civil service.

Another First World War veteran who is at present an acting postmaster and who is also No. 1 on the register is Eaton A. Hartman of Windsor, Pa., in York County. He was a corporal in the Meuse-Argonne offensive in the decisive last months of the First World War. Despite his service, despite his preference, despite his civil-service standing, and despite the Republican Party's solemn platform declaration in 1944 to support, and I quote, "suitable measures to reflect the Nation's gratitude and to discharge its duty toward the veterans of all wars," Mr. Hartman, like Mr. Latshaw, and like all the others I have mentioned whose nominations are frozen in committee, cannot be made postmaster of Windsor, Pa., cannot have the security of permanent status, cannot have the consideration his service and his ability earned for him.

Is this the way the Republican Party carries out its platform pledges, Mr. President? Going through that platform indicates that this is just one of numerous ways in which the Republican Party has demonstrated that its 1944 platform was something to run on, but not to stand on, once elected.

The acting postmaster of Twin Rocks in Cambria County, Pa., is Robert A. Lanzendorfer. He was nominated last January to the permanent position. He was an electronic technician's mate, third class, in the Navy. He spent a year on sea duty in the Pacific. He is an official of his Veterans of Foreign Wars post. He aided in the liberation of the Philippines, but the Republican Party won't let him be a postmaster. He is the only eligible for the job.

Here are some more acting postmasters in Pennsylvania, veterans, men qualified by Civil Service, some top men on their registers, others top among veterans, who can't be postmasters with permanent status at present because the Republican Party won't let them.

There is, for instance, former Master Sgt. William Debreczeni, of Richeyville, in Washington County, Pa., a man who spent 19 months overseas, and was a specialist in air intelligence, helping to chart and analyze enemy activity and enemy strength, and enemy strength and location, and probable intentions, while attached to the Fifteenth Air Force in Italy at the time it was operating in the Balkans and into France and Germany and the Po Valley, a man who once worked in the coal mines. He is the only veteran on his register.

There is Harry T. Richey, acting postmaster of Hyndman, in Bedford County, Pa., No. 1 on his register, a veteran of 4 years in the Navy, of which 2 years 3 months and 2 days were spent overseas; a yeoman, first-class, who was given responsible clerical work, admirably qualifying him for the post-office work he is now doing. His VFW post commander at Hyndman, Charles H. Sides, says that by training and experience, both in civilian and service life, Richey is completely qualified for the job.

There is Thomas J. Zimmerlink, of Allison, in Fayette County, Pa., a radio operator overseas during the war for the Fifty-eighth Army Airways Communication System.

Another one is former First Sgt. Adam C. Dietrich, of East Petersburg, in Lancaster County, Pa., the only veteran on the register, a man with disability preference, a man who served overseas in Oahu and Guam.

These men are not being permitted by the Republican leadership of the United States Senate to take their rightful positions with the security and the prestige of permanent status as postmasters in their home towns. Why, Mr. President? Why? Who has protested their nomination? Who says they aren't fitted? Who says they shouldn't be confirmed?

Douglas McHenry, acting postmaster at Fort Washington, Montgomery County, a veteran of World War I, was first on the register in the civil-service examination for postmaster. He was nominated on July 17, 1947. Again, no action. He was renominated last January. His nomination, like so many others, is being passed over, neglected, ignored.

Let me name a few more veterans who have been pushed around by the Republican Senate personally and individually, for reasons unpublished, unknown, unfathomable:

Joseph Ersagovich, acting postmaster, nominated for postmaster at Crucible in Greene County; Frank W. Thomas, nominated for postmaster at Skytop, in Monroe County; Victor Lescovitz, nominated for postmaster at Midway, in Washington County; Robert N. Eisenhart, nominee for the postmastership at Aspers, Adams County; Michael J. Pagani, acting postmaster and nominee for postmaster at New Galilee, Beaver County; and Malcolm A. Young, Monroeton, Bradford County.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a letter I just received a few days ago from Acting Postmaster John A. Habel, of Garrett, in Somerset County, Pa. Mr. Habel was nominated for postmaster on January 26, 1948, 5 months ago. Here is what he wrote me:

GARRETT, PA., *June 7, 1948.*

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MYERS: Although I received word several months ago that my name has been sent to the Senate for confirmation as postmaster, I have heard nothing about it since.

Is there any possible chance that my appointment may be confirmed before the adjournment of the present session of Congress? As a veteran with 45 months of service (42 of which were spent overseas), I am most anxious about the security of my position.

Your continued interest and support in my behalf will be greatly appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN A. HABEL,
Acting Postmaster.

Think of it, Mr. President, nearly 4 years in the service; exactly three and a half years spent overseas; shipped overseas only 3 months after he went into the service and left there for 3½ years—and now he cannot be postmaster of Garrett, Pa.

What can I tell Mr. Habel? That the Republican-controlled Senate, in 5 months, has not had time to examine his qualifications? That the Republican-controlled Congress thinks him unfit? That the Republican-controlled Congress is not interested in keeping 1944 Republican platform pledges to the veterans?

Mr. President, it occurs to me that since so many of these nominees are now acting postmasters, that if anything in their backgrounds or their records or their qualifications or their character or their habits or their standing in the community made them unsuitable, unfit or improper to be postmasters, then certainly those who oppose their confirmation, who are holding these nominations in cold storage, in the deep freeze, in the refrigerator of the Senate Post Office Committee, are derelict in their obligations as citizens in not bringing to the attention of the Post Office Department the scandal, if any, in the lives of these men, so that if they are unfit for office, they can be removed for cause from the present responsible positions they now hold.

Contrariwise, if there is nothing damaging in their records either as citizens or as veterans or as acting postmasters—those who now hold such positions—then by all that is right and decent and proper—under the pledges of the Republican Party in 1944 in their platform—these men should be confirmed for the positions to which they have been nominated.

Mr. President, I am amazed, I am disappointed, I am hurt by the arbitrary manner in which this Senate and its Post Office Committee, under the direction of the Republican Party, have allowed only four veterans from Pennsylvania to have their nominations for postmaster confirmed in this entire session of Congress and have arbitrarily ruled out about 30 others, similarly deserving, and have refused to allow their nominations to come to the floor.

What were the standards which were used? What were the criteria? How did the committee decide on the 4 that it approved and on the 30 or so that it refused to approve? If it was on the basis of service records, no standards were followed, because many of these 30 have outstanding service records. It could not have been on the basis of civil service rating. What could it have been?

I invite an answer. But I am afraid there is no Senator, Mr. President, who can, in any conscience, and with any conviction give an answer which will be reasonable or credible. There is only one answer. It is politics at the expense of the veteran.

This is a fine record for the Republican Congress to take to the veterans of America.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD three editorials dealing with the housing bill or housing.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

CONGRESS MUST NOT LET THE HOUSING BILL DIE

Omission of any provision for alleviating the housing shortage is by far the worst feature of the whittled-down "must" list of legislation to be passed by Congress before it adjourns.

The Nation's need for housing speaks for itself, through high prices, the virtual disappearance of rental space, doubling up of families, and the existence of trailer camps near many cities. All the arguments and pressures of the real-estate lobby cannot dispel the unpleasant fact that there is a shortage.

Congress had it in its power—and still has—to do something toward solving the problem. More than 6 weeks ago, the Senate passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill, which aimed at spurring the construction of 15,000,000 new housing units over the next 10 years.

That the House had done nothing about the measure since then is a tribute to its stubbornness, but not to its willingness to come to grips with a national need. Because of their opposition to the public-housing feature, a relatively few men have blocked the legislation, even though it contains many necessary inducements for continuing private building.

Attacks on the modest public-housing provision gloss over the fact that present high prices of homes put them out of reach of large numbers of families, including those of veterans. Opponents of any Federal low-cost housing program refuse to acknowledge the effects of the wartime halt in construction on the Nation's housing requirements.

It would take but a few hours of Congress' remaining time to complete action on a housing program. All that is needed is a decision to face the problem. The leaders of Congress should decide without further delay that they, and the Nation, cannot afford to let the housing bill die.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 14, 1948]

PA PITT AND THE T-E-W BILL

The Allegheny Conference on Community Development, in urging passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, rightly sees that measure as essential to Pittsburgh's as well as the Nation's welfare. Certainly private enterprise here and elsewhere has proved itself unable to meet the desperate need for low-cost rental housing—simply because it is just not profitable for builders to put up such units.

The T-E-W bill, which the Senate has already approved, would overcome this condition by making Federal loans and subsidy grants to municipalities in order to finance construction of 500,000 housing units over the next 4 years. This, of course, would greatly benefit Pittsburgh.

Moreover, the T-E-W bill would help the city in another way. One section of the measure permits the Federal Government to "write down" some of the cost of redeveloping local slum areas and other deteriorated districts. With this aid, the conference's executive director, Park H. Martin, notes, "the Pittsburgh Redevelopment Authority would be in a position to make a full-scale attack upon the city's blighted districts."

Actually, unless Federal assistance is forthcoming, there is no real hope of meeting the Nation's housing crisis or of ridding Pittsburgh and other American metropolitan areas of the cancer of slums. The support now given the T-E-W bill by the Allegheny Conference should spur district Congressmen to do all they can to bring the measure, presently bottled up in committee, to an early vote in the House.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of June 18, 1948]

THE HOUSING FIASCO

The Republican leadership in the House has resorted to unconscionable procedure in denying the American people an adequate long-range housing program.

After a long, bitter struggle, the House Banking Committee last week approved legislation substantially in accord with the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. That measure, already passed twice by the Senate, included provisions for public housing, slum clearance, and urban redevelopment. It was a broad approach to this country's greatest domestic need.

But then the Rules Committee, led by Chairman LEO S. ALLEN, vetoed the Banking Committee's action by voting 6 to 2 to table the legislation. Now Chairman WOLCOTT of the Banking Committee has come forth with another housing bill, an emasculated document eliminating the public-housing features of the T-E-W bill. It is expected to reach the floor under an airtight gag rule. The only hope now for a decent housing bill lies in the meager possibility that eventually the Senate might prevail in a joint conference.

Perhaps the best way to drive home the real nature of the blow the House leadership has dealt ill-housed Americans is to state briefly what it means to the Pittsburgh district.

It means, first, that the Pittsburgh Housing Authority's plans for 7,000 more badly needed low-rent housing units, now on file in Washington, are stymied. The need of 62,000 families in the district's lower rent market, like those of thousands of others over the Nation, have been ignored. The 30,000 families actively applying for low-rent housing here can continue to cool their heels.

The House action means that work of Pittsburgh's new urban redevelopment authority is severely handicapped. The law creating the authority provides quite properly that before a blighted area can be cleared for redevelopment, housing provisions must be made for persons who will be dislocated. Invariably, such areas are tenanted by those in the lower-income brackets, whose housing needs private industry has been unable to meet. The T-E-W bill would make available funds for the redevelopment work.

The T-E-W bill also provided for a subsidy to bridge the gap between the cost of acquiring land for urban redevelopment and the use value of the land after it is cleared. Moreover, it encouraged private housing projects by guaranteeing returns to large-scale investors like insurance companies.

Now these provisions, constituting the real backbone of a housing bill, have been knocked out by the House leadership.

Apparently the reactionary Martin-Halleck-Taber-Allen-Wolcott clique in the House cares not how many campaign obstacles it puts in the way of the man its party will nominate next week in Philadelphia.

RAY FOLEY

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press congratulating Mr. Ray Foley.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRATULATIONS, RAY FOLEY

Today's chamber of commerce luncheon honoring Raymond M. Foley is a fitting and well-deserved tribute to a former Pontiac resident.

His unusual ability, unquestioned integrity, and devotion to the tasks at hand have highlighted the Washington career of Federal Housing Administrator Foley. They have enabled him to achieve a success in National Government equaled by few appointive officeholders.

Without resort to the political maneuverings of lesser men, Ray Foley has won a national reputation in an office so politically trying it has broken several predecessors.

Not only has he earned the confidence and respect of his own party, but of Republicans as well. His contribution to good government also has won him the unusual recognition of an honorary degree which was conferred on him Wednesday evening by the University of Detroit.

No one in Pontiac who has known him is surprised by Ray Foley's Washington success. He would succeed in any chosen field.

He doesn't know how to slight a task.

In the finest and fullest meaning of the words, he is a former home-town resident who has made good in one of the most difficult appointive posts in our National Capital.

We of the Daily Press who worked with him when he was our managing editor are proud to join the congratulations extended to him.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a notice of public hearings which will be held during the adjournment by a special subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

There being no objection, the notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The special subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee authorized by Senate Resolution 241 to conduct an inquiry into existing legislation concerning Government policy affecting the activities of the Federal Trade Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission and impact of recent Supreme and other court decisions relative to basing-point or freight-equalization system of pricing and its effect upon small and large business and the American consumers and the trend toward economic concentration will hold hearings during the recess of the Congress to receive information and suggestions pertaining to the subject matter of the Senate resolution.

The exact date for the commencement of these hearings cannot now be stated. Further information as to the dates will appear in the public press.

Any person or organization wishing to testify or offer information on this subject matter to the subcommittee may do so by notifying the office of the subcommittee chairman, Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, room 140, Senate Office Building. Telephone National 3120, extension 814.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2756) to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 10, it is proposed to insert a period after the word "States", and to strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, in line 21, it is proposed to strike out "$80,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, in line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$80,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10 in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "1952" and insert "1951."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, has the Senator from Nevada considered offering an amendment to meet the criticism which was raised by the Senator from Missouri to the committee amendment on pages 9 and 10, so that it would be clear that the $60,000,000 provided shall be a limitation both on the disbursements for exploration and development and on commitments of every kind?

Mr. MALONE. I do not quite understand the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair finds that the Senator from Nevada has sent to the desk three other amendments, which have not yet been stated or considered.

The Chair suggests that the Senator from Wyoming defer his remarks until after the reading of the amendments.

The first amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, in line 7, it is proposed to insert a period in place of the semicolon after the word "tons", and to strike out the remainder of line 7 and lines 8 and 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, in line 10, after the word "metals" it is proposed to insert "that were."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, it is proposed to strike out the comma after the word "act", in line 1, and to insert "and subject to the limitations of section 7 (a) of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, in line 3, after the word "year" and the period, it is proposed to insert a new sentence, reading as follows:

During the fiscal year 1949 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Department of the Interior not to exceed $350,000 for the administration of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I tried to get the attention of the Chair in regard to the last amendment which was acted upon. I have tried to obtain the attention of the Senator from Nevada and those who have been following this bill.

We wish to meet the criticism made by the Senator from Missouri and also by the Senator from Rhode Island: namely, that there is a double authorization in section 7. The committee amendment which begins in line 22, on page 9, and ends at the end of line 3 on page 10, should be revised to read as follows:

Nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States whioh obligates the United States Government (including all departments and agencies thereof) to make disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments or payments for administrative expenses as authorized by this act in excess of $60,000,000 in the aggregate in any one year, nor shall any such disbursement be made in excess of such sum.

Such a statement would definitely tie the two together, and would also bring the administrative expense within the $60,000,000.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Under the amendment which the Senator has sent to the desk, the administrative expense would be beyond the $80,000,000; would it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I certainly think it would be a good thing to clarify the possibility of a double authorization there, so that there could be no question whether the $60,000,000 is to be subtracted from the $80,000,000, or added to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of the fact that the measure has been criticized because of the expenditures involved—although those of us who have supported the bill feel that in view of the great necessity for the building up of stock piles it is justified—I think it would be proper to have all the amounts in one authorization.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator read it again?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to read it as a whole, so that the entire committee amendment, as amended, will be understood:

Nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States which obligates the United States Government (including all departments and agencies thereof) to make disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments or payments for administrative expenses as authorized by this act in excess of $60,000,000 in the aggregate in any one year, nor shall any disbursement be made in excess of such sum.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator be willing to include in that limitation the amounts expended for additional ores, metals, or minerals or the equivalent thereof, under the provisions of subsection (b) on page 8? It is my understanding that it is the contention of the proponents of the bill that the over-all expense to the Government shall not exceed $80,000,000 a year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to offer another amendment which would cover that point.

Mr. MALONE. If I may explain, that is not the entire expense of the Government. It is an expense incurred by the Board under the pending bill. The Stock-Piling Act provides the amount of money to buy the mineral. This is the amount of money the producers get.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. MALONE. If I might finish my explanation, that is the money provided in the bill for the development payments. It is confined to the $80,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not want to interrupt. There did not seem to be anything going on. I should like to get the floor as soon as I can. I have waited 5 hours now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment which I suggest the Senators from Nevada and Colorado accept.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question arises, in that case, on reconsidering the committee amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. KEM. Is the Senator from Wyoming including in the limitation the amounts paid for the acquisition of title to ores and metals?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator referring to subparagraph (b) on page 8?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is not included in this amendment, but I have another amendment that I shall submit with respect to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on reconsidering the committee amendment. Is there objection to the reconsideration thereof? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendment is reconsidered.

The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Barkley	Holland	Revercomb
Brewster	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Jenner	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnston, S.C.	Smith
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Connally	Kilgore	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Stewart
Donnell	Lucas	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thye
Ecton	McFarland	Tydings
Ellender	McGrath	Umstead
Feazel	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 8, line 15, after the word "corporation", I move to insert the words "within the limitations of section 7."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open for further amendment.

If there be no further amendments, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Barkley	Holland	Revercomb
Brewster	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Jenner	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnston, S.C.	Smith
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Connally	Kilgore	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Stewart
Donnell	Lucas	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thye
Eaton	McFarland	Tydings
Ellender	McGrath	Umstead
Feazel	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the final passage of Senate bill 2756.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do not for a minute pose as an expert in the mining business. I have had, however, an opportunity for observation of that business in connection with the practice of law. In my judgment, there is nothing wrong with the metal market that a higher price will not cure. Most minerals are produced and come into use when the price is raised. If the price is lowered they go into hiding or are not produced. The same applies to the metals with which we are dealing. When the price is increased, production is increased; when the price is reduced, production falls off. There is no problem faced by the small mine today that cannot be cured by high Government metal prices. The proponents of the bill say it is the small mine in which they are particularly interested. What such producers need, in my judgment, and in the judgment of many experienced mining men, is a higher price.

We have never had and never will have, even with subsidies, a sufficiently high price in the United States to justify the operation of every prospect of every kind in the country. That is the dilemma faced by those who currently urge subsidies based upon some such system as proposed in this bill—this price premium plan. They do not know where to draw the line without hurting somebody. If, for example, they believe that a subsidy amounting to 5 cents a pound should be given to eligible lead properties, any mines that could not operate short of the current price of 15 cents plus 5 cents a pound subsidy would feel discriminated against.

I wish to put this question to the Senate. Is it not better for a free market to decide whether a mine shall operate, rather than to have it depend on a Government subsidy? We have had Government subsidies in the past. We had them as recently as last June. We know from recent experience what the subsidy does and what the free market does. I placed in the RECORD a few minutes ago the records of production in different parts of the United States under the free-market plan and under the subsidy plan, and those figures show conclusively that in almost every district the production was larger under the free market than under a fixed regimented subsidy plan.

There is another immediate aspect of subsidies, Mr. President, which I think has been lost sight of, namely, its very impact on the metal market. In times of rising demands for metals and an unsaturated market, the metal produced by virtue of subsidies, if sold on the open market, has a restraining influence as a brake on a higher market. The effect is just the reverse when the market becomes filled and there is oversupply. Then sales of comparatively modest tonnages might even be demoralizing in their influence.

The only experience we have had in this country with subsidies in metal markets, so far as I know, was the recent one during the war that terminated in June 1947. That was a price premium plan not unlike that proposed in the pending bill.

I quoted some time ago the statement of Mr. Andrew Fletcher, the president of the St. Joseph Lead Co., to the effect that there was a marked drop in efficiency in mines operating in the southeast Missouri district during the operation of the plan because inefficiency was paid for by the Government. There is no incentive, there is no impetus, to the private operator to be efficient, insistent on a full day's work for a full day's pay, when the Government is holding an umbrella over the entire operation. I believe, on adequate evidence, that this experience was had by many mines in our State operating under the premium-price plan.

Some advocates of subsidies say what they are interested in is the marginal mine. I assume by "marginal mine" they mean one that never appeared profitable in a free market. The argument is based, I understand, on the fact that increased production is necessary today. The contention is made that this is only procurable from marginal production; that they have to open up these marginal mines in order to supply the demand.

Let us see how that works out. The record does not bear out the contention. Recently the Hero mines indicated in its statistical report that 51 mines had been closed because of the termination of the premium-price plan. These 51 mines, closed for that reason, accounted for only 600 tons of lead a month. Of course, 600 tons a month is a very minor matter in a market which produces and consumes a hundred thousand tons and more a month.

As I have said, strangely enough the termination of the premium-price plan came along in June 1947, and, contrary to the expectations of many who studied the situation, instead of falling off, production increased.

I remember very well when a similar bill was under consideration by the Senate in the closing days of the last session. The feeling on the part of the proponents of the bill was that if the price-premium plan were allowed to expire, the whole metal business would go to pot; that very dire consequences would ensue. Induced by that feeling the Congress passed a bill providing for a price-premium plan. The bill, as I recollect, was vetoed by the President. So there was no price-premium plan, but the dire consequences predicted did not ensue. To the contrary production increased.

This production increased, due partly to the migration of labor from subsidized markets where the output per mine is low, to the larger mines with richer ores where the metal output per day is bound to be higher.

If these gentlemen are really concerned about the actual amount of metal available for military purposes, if they think that the stock piles require increases in size, I think it is clear from the record that the place to secure those increases is not through sending out a lot of people boondoggling and trying to open up some new mines or trying to open some marginal properties, and get them into production again, but to turn to the large, known mineral deposits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri suspend while the Senate may receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6248) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2767) to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

House Concurrent Resolution 218

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Sunday, June 20, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock m. on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock m. on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

House Concurrent Resolution 219

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses until December 31, 1948, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator from Illinois move the adoption of the report on the farm bill so we can get out of here?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is just about to recognize the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] if the Senator from Missouri will be so kind as to yield to him.

Mr. KEM. I yield without protest.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of the RECORD, p. 9338.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. AIKEN. The conference report, Mr. President, embodies that part of the House bill which provided temporary price supports for the six basic commodities and for milk, hogs, chickens, and eggs, at 90 percent of parity or comparable price for 1 year. At the conclusion of the 1 year titles III and IV of the Senate long-range farm program, which are the price-support part of the farm program, come into effect and continue thereon.

That, in brief, is what the conference bill is.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont what disposition was accorded the so-called tobacco amendment. Is it still in the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. The amendments adopted by the Senate are still in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under this bill the amendment which extended the present situation for 2 years has been modified to extend for 1 year, although the bill adopted by the Senate a few days ago takes on from thereon without any change in the Senate bill as passed.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The higher support levels the House proposed will prevail for 1 year instead of a year and a half. Then the titles III and IV of the Senate bill take effect on January 1, 1950, instead of 1949, the date fixed in the bill as it passed the Senate.

There is one little amendment in the conference report which does fix a base period for Maryland 32 tobacco for the period of 1 year.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is in what would be the House bill?

The AIKEN. That is in what would be the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall say only two or three words. I congratulate the Senator from Vermont for the rugged obstinacy he has shown in securing the enactment of his bill. I am glad that we have 1 year to operate under the present program for I believe present laws are more advantageous to the farmers of the country than the Aiken bill which takes effect in January 1950.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Georgia include, along with the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly would not deny any honors the Senate conferees deserve, and they deserve the very highest accolade for imposing their will on the House. I refer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] who, I believe, were the conferees on the part of the Senate. But the Senator from Vermont, being the author of the bill, I thought was entitled to perhaps a small measure of credit larger than the other conferees.

Mr. President, I hope the committees of the two Houses which have to deal with agricultural matters will carefully study this legislation, because it has come upon us here at the end of a very lengthy session, a tiring session, and that they will examine it in the 1 year interim we have.

I think the general principle embodied in the Aiken bill is excellent for a normal period in this country. I have not yet been able to reconcile it in my mind as desirable under present conditions, in view of the great demands that are being made and that will be made upon American agriculture to increase production, because I do not believe sufficient incentives are provided to maintain the high levels of production in the future to enable us to meet our commitments under the Marshall plan. In any event, I am still opposed to any program to reduce the amount of parity and commodity loans. Farm income is not too high and Aiken bill will reduce it materially. I hope the next Congress will rewrite the Aiken bill before it takes effect and thereby avoid loss to the already underpaid farmers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

RECRUITMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2767) to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment, which were, on page 1, lines 3 and 4, to strike out "the Secretary of Labor" and insert "the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency", and on page 2, line 20, to strike out "the Secretary of Labor" and insert "the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency."

Mr. AIKEN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to take up the consideration of the bill (S. 2756) to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, as I have been saying, there is no reason for speculation as to the effect of the price premium plan on production, because we have the actual figures of last year and of this year showing what the production was under the premium plan and what it has been since. I have put it in the RECORD. It is available there.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. KEM. I will yield without prejudice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields without prejudice.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask unanimous consent, and without prejudice at all to the Senator from Missouri, to have the Senate consider two stamp bills. When they were reached on the calendar I objected

to one, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] objected to the other. I do not believe any other Senator objects to the two bills. I want to get them acted upon and off the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to permit the Senator from South Carolina to have action on the bills to which he has referred?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, if it will have no effect on me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assures the Senator from Missouri that he can resume after action has been taken on the two bills in question.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have some information. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the Senate consider what bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. House Joint Resolution 327, Calendar 1741, and House Joint Resolution 305, Calendar 1753. Both measures provide authorization for issuance of a special series of stamps. When the calendar was called I objected to one measure and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] objected to the other.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I have indicated, I have been waiting very patiently for the bill which was next on the list presented. I do not think it will take a very long time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If there is any opposition——

Mr. BREWSTER. I had understood that we were to terminate the discussion long before now. The bill to which I refer is a bill which very much concerns our national defense, one which the House has passed, and upon which it is awaiting our action. I want to have it considered by this body before we go away, and I must ask that we proceed as promptly as possible to that end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BREWSTER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, as I was saying, I have heretofore inserted in the RECORD a monthly tabulation of the mine production by States which shows that lead and zinc production actually increased, with certain minor exceptions, after the premium plan was ended. From expressions on the floor, there seems to be a particular interest in the proposed price premium plan in the Western States.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri please yield to the Senator from Nebraska, without prejudice?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Before we adjourn——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we are not going to adjourn right now. We are going to transact some further business.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I believe it is planned to have an executive session and take up the question of postmasters.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall ask the Senate to be patient while we proceed.

Mr. President, I see no reason for not laying down the concurrent resolution which has come over from the House. I ask it be laid before the Senate at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the concurrent resolution is laid before the Senate, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I simply wished to ask my good friend from Nebraska what time he thought we might adjourn?

Mr. WHERRY. We have some other things to do. We plan to adjourn just as soon as we can.

Mr. MAYBANK. What time would the Senator guess?

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot tell the Senator. It will not be long.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator wishes to ask unanimous consent to take up the oleomargarine bill——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has the pending bill been abandoned or laid aside?

Mr. WHERRY. No; this is a privileged matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending bill is still the unfinished business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Sunday, June 20, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair points out that the concurrent resolution is not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to say a few words.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wish to observe that in my opinion a resolution of this sort is really in violation of the provision of the Constitution with respect to the calling back of Congress by the President of the United States.

When the Democrats were in the majority, the Republicans insisted that a provision of this sort go into the resolution of adjournment; otherwise, they would fight the adjournment. But in the resolution we always gave the minority some voice in determining whether the Congress should be called back, even in an unconstitutional way. I am wondering why it is, in this resolution, that only the majority are to be consulted as to whether Congress shall be called back. Also, why is the adjournment proposed to be taken until the 31st of December, when the new Congress will meet on the third day of January?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is precedent for this resolution. It is almost identical with the one adopted last year.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true, but that still does not satisfy my inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. I am giving the Senator one reason. If he will give me sufficient time, I can give him several more reasons. That is the first one.

The second reason is that I am quite satisfied that the minority leader would agree with the proponents of the resolution that the President has a right to bring the Congress back. He happens to be of the same party as the distinguished minority leader. The resolution provides that the opposite party, through their constitutional officers, have the right to summon the Congress back to their duties if it becomes necessary. That is reason No. 2.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say further that heretofore all such resolutions have been adopted as a matter of expediency. I have never yielded in my opinion that they are not constitutional. We cannot by concurrent resolution modify the Constitution of the United States which provides for an adjournment of Congress, to be called back by the President of the United States under extraordinary circumstances.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a debatable question, and the Senator has a perfect right to his opinion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky sponsored resolutions exactly like this when he was majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. But it was on the demand of the minority, who would have been unwilling to adjourn unless we had done it.

Mr. TAFT. The argument that it is unconstitutional hardly lies in the Senator's mouth. He must at that time have satisfied his doubts as to the constitutionality or I presume he would not have sponsored such a resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I stated that we adopted similar resolutions as a matter of expediency, because the minority even threatened to bring about the failure of an effort to recess or adjourn unless we included them in the power to bring Congress back.

Mr. TAFT. But at the present time the Democratic Party, represented by the President, can bring Congress back at any time. This resolution in no way limits the power of the President to call us back, as he did last year, during the recess.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator contending that he has more faith in the President of the United States than he has in the officers of the minority?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all; but so far as calling Congress back on its own motion is concerned, the Republican Party had no representation whatever. The only purpose of giving some right to call Congress back was to allow the minority party during the war to have some voice—not a final voice, but some voice. I think it was a final voice. I think the two Republican leaders could have done it, if there had been no other way in which the Republican Party could call Congress back.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wished to call attention to the difference between the resolution now proposed and the kind of resolution we sponsored when we were in the majority in both Houses of Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this is the identical wording of the resolution adopted last year, which I think provided equal rights for all those who wanted them. It worked out very satisfactorily.

Mr. BARKLEY. That reminds me—what about the equal-rights amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. That is another measure which we have on the calendar. Would the Senator like to have it taken up at this session?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am merely asking the Senator——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has been after me day after day to adjourn with this type of resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. I know what the Senator has told me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have said that I would cooperate in adjournment, but I never have said——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is one of those who has been complaining about adjournment, but I suppose he has his railroad ticket in his pocket right now.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's supposition is as erroneous in that respect as it is on everything else.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The resolution is not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry if a mere inquiry has stirred up so much discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky was proceeding under unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to make only one observation with respect to the statement of the Senator from Nebraska and the statement of the Senator from Ohio. The reason I regard this resolution as being unfair to the minority is based upon the fact that life is uncertain. We all hope and pray that nothing will happen to the present President of the United States. But in the event that providence should intervene to remove him from this scene of action, under the legislation sponsored by the Senator from Nebraska he would be succeeded by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and in that event the minority would be absolutely helpless and would be denied the rights of the minority when the majority was in power.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Nebraska a question, by unanimous consent: Why the hiatus between the 31st of December and the 3d of January, when the new Congress assembles?

Mr. WHERRY. New Year's Day falls on Saturday and is a holiday. Tuesday, January 3, is the day when the Congress would ordinarily convene. I think December 31 was selected, so that the Congress could come back without interfering with the meeting of the new Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, the Congress would automatically have to come back.

Mr. WHERRY. At any rate, I gave the reasons; and now that the concurrent resolution has been adopted, I am satisfied that there will be no quarrel about it.

WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., OF MAINE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would like the RECORD to contain my very deep expressions of appreciation to our majority leader, Mr. WALLACE WHITE, for the advice and counsel he has given to me during my term in the Senate. I am wishing for him very many years of happy living, following his retirement from the Senate this year.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 219), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses until December 31, 1948, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

NORTHWEST FLOOD-RELIEF LEGISLATION—INTERPRETATIONS BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate passed Senate bill 2877, a bill which seeks to afford some permanent housing relief to the flood victims of the Pacific Northwest.

The bill was so amended in the House of Representatives that it will provide very little relief to the flood victims. Nevertheless, in order that the matter might be clarified, I sent to Mr. Dougherty, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under date of June 18, 1948, a letter concerning certain questions as to interpretations by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of Senate bill 2877. Under date of June 18, 1948, I received a reply to my letter. I ask that the two letters be inserted at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 18, 1948.

Mr. JAMES L. DOUGHERTY,
General Counsel, Reconstruction Finance Corporation,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DOUGHERTY: In conference yesterday with members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, we worked out a bill to thoroughly adapt the RFC disaster loan operations to the situation resulting from the flood in the Pacific Northwest. In view of the understandings reached and statements made at that time I am anxious to have certain questions answered regarding operations under the bill.

You will recall that the bill which I had introduced clearly recognized and made adequate provisions for a direct and open subsidy operation where necessary to provide housing for families deprived of housing as a result of the Vanport flood disaster and who could not afford to buy or rent existing housing.

You will recall that in the course of discussions with the committee it was clearly pointed out that if the RFC disaster loan operation was to meet this portion of the need, the RFC would be required to take substantial losses on disaster loans made for this purpose. Furthermore, in this connection, in response to my questions you stated that this is clearly contemplated by the RFC. I think it would be desirable if this understanding were confirmed in writing.

I am listing below several statements of your undertakings which I would like to have confirmed. I am sure you agree that this information must be made available to the public officials and the people of the communities in the flood area at once. The RFC bill was substituted for my bill upon the understanding that it would meet fully the objectives which I had in mind, which were contained in my bill and which are obviously necessary to meet the needs of these disaster victims. If the bill is to achieve these objectives, all parties concerned must be fully conversant with the program which you stated the RFC would undertake and carry forward expeditiously under the terms of this bill.

1. The RFC will be able to make loans to former residents of Vanport for both the purchase of existing or new dwellings and the construction of dwellings.

2. The granting of such a loan by the RFC will be based solely on the need of the family for housing and such loans will not be denied

because the income of any family is too low or too uncertain to assure repayment of the RFC loan under normal mortgage loan payment and amortization schedule.

3. The RFC will be able to establish low monthly payments within the means of the former Vanport families, with a balloon payment subject to refinancing at the end of the twenty-fifth year.

4. In the event that the borrower fails to meet monthly payments on the RFC loan, except in the case of a willful failure to meet monthly payments, the RFC will undertake to refinance or otherwise adjust the debt and payments to avoid foreclosure. If foreclosure is thereafter necessary, the RFC will not obtain any deficiency judgment against the borrower as a result of any foreclosure sale, and will not dispossess the borrower, except for waste or other misuse of the property, and will offer the borrower continued occupancy as tenant for at least 5 years on terms reasonably suited to his ability to pay.

5. The RFC is prepared to make a loan or loans to the Portland Housing Authority for the construction and ownership of large-scale rental-housing projects for rental to families formerly residents of Vanport who cannot pay economic rents and thus cannot assure sufficient income to assure repayment of the RFC loan over a 25-year period. The RFC will be able and willing to make such loans in order to meet this need which has resulted from the flood disaster even if the making of such loans involves the possibility or probability of substantial deferments of principal and interest and eventual loss at the end of the mortgage term. The RFC will not find it necessary to pass upon the proposed rent schedules of projects of this type, but will rely upon the physical properties as its security for the ultimate repayment of the loan.

I await your confirmation of these understandings in order that I may apprise local officials of this program at the earliest possible moment.

Yours very truly,

WAYNE MORSE.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1948.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have your letter of June 18, 1948, requesting a written reaction of this Corporation to the series of statements outlined therein with regard to the operations of this Corporation in connection with the disastrous flood situation existing in the Pacific Northwest.

You mention that the bill which you introduced clearly recognized and made adequate provisions for direct and open subsidy operation where necessary to provide housing for needy families, and that in lieu of your bill the modifications proposed to be made in the RFC bill with respect to disaster loan operations would constitute a substitute for the bill which you had introduced and that RFC would be required to take substantial losses on disaster loans made for housing purposes. The amendatory bill which was voted out of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and passed by the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 1948, had the effect of making two changes in the present RFC bill. The first was to eliminate the maturity limit of 10 years on disaster loans with the understanding that the loan maturity would not exceed 25 years, and secondly, increased the amount that this Corporation may have outstanding at any one time in disaster loans from $25,000,000 to $45,000,000. There was, however, no change made in the basic lending authority of the Corporation for disaster purposes, and we are of the opinion that the present RFC bill, as amended by the Senate, does not permit the making of grants or subsidies to alleviate flood sufferers, but is limited to the extension of loans on a reasonable credit basis with the expectation that such loans shall be repaid.

In the case of disaster loans as distinguished from loans made under other sections of the RFC act, the Corporation does liberalize substantially its collateral requirements. Notwithstanding this liberal approach, however, they are loans and not grants. The Corporation would be outside the scope of its authority under the act and the intent of Congress if, at the time of making a disaster loan, the Corporation anticipated that the loan would not be paid. It is obvious, however, that with the liberal approach to such loans, which we believe to be the intent of Congress, that substantial losses may occur in the aggregate of the loans made. As I stated to the subcommittee yesterday, loans of this character, if they are to serve the purpose intended, must be made even though the security is considered "light."

With respect to the statements set forth in your letter, I shall comment on them in numerical sequence as follows:

1. Those residents of Vanport who have been damaged and have suffered loss by the flood are eligible for loans for the purchase of existing or new dwellings and the construction, repair, rehabilitation of dwellings.

2. The granting of such loan by the RFC will be based on the need of the family for housing and a showing that the applicant has a reasonable possibility of repaying the loan under terms which would be more liberal than the normal mortgage-loan amortization. This does not mean, however, that a family which, by the application of minimum economic standards, is found financially incapable of repaying a loan made on liberal terms, will be granted the money to acquire a new dwelling.

3. The RFC will be able to establish reasonably low monthly payments with a balloon payment at maturity date as may be established by the Congress.

4. In the event the borrower fails to meet monthly payments on the loan, except in the case of willful failure, the RFC will make every effort to work out and adjust the terms and payments in order that foreclosure may be avoided. If, after all efforts have been exhausted, foreclosure becomes necessary, the RFC will be obligated to obtain a deficiency judgment against the borrower if the facts and circumstances in a particular case warrant such action. Dispossession of the borrower after foreclosure will have to be determined when and if such occasion arises, and no assurance can be given that the borrower will not be dispossessed when action to foreclose has been instituted.

5. The RFC is prepared to make a loan or loans to the Portland housing authority for the construction and ownership of large-scale rental housing projects for rental to such families as the Housing Authority may determine, provided that the housing authority is legally authorized to borrow money and makes a proper showing that the housing it will supply is necessary and appropriate to relieve flood sufferers. The RFC, in passing upon a loan to the housing authority, will of necessity look to the housing authority's source of income in order that there may be some assurance that the loan, if made, will ultimately be repaid. In addition thereto, the RFC will rely upon the physical properties as security for the ultimate repayment of the loan.

I agree that it is appropriate that the officials in Oregon be apprised of these understandings.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES L. DOUGHERTY,
General Counsel.

THE POSTAL PAY BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain telegrams addressed to me, dealing with various phases of the postal pay bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 17, 1948.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Gilbert Goodkind has talked with you concerning discriminatory rider on postal pay bill. I hope you can help kill rider. I recall with pleasure our visit at bookseller's banquet last year.

R. B. CAMPBELL,
President, American Booksellers Association.

CORVALLIS, OREG., *June 16, 1948.*

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Vigorously protest hasty discriminatory action on proposed raise in book postal rate which is part of bill raising postal pay.

OSC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION.

EUGENE, OREG., *June 16, 1948.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber:

Proposed increase book postal rate carries dynamite for western book stores. Bill appears hastily drawn and discriminatory. Will greatly appreciate your best effort to prevent its passage. Best regards.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON CO-OP STORE,
MARION M. MCCLAIN.

CITY LIGHT OF CASCADE LOCKS, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a statement concerning the history and record of the City Light of Cascade Locks, Oreg.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOD RIVER, OREG., *June 11, 1948.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
443 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing a copy of a story from the Hood River County Sun concerning the history and record of the City Light of Cascade Locks, Oreg. This community was the first customer on the books of the great Bonneville Dam. I thought you might be interested in it.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. TRAVIS.

CITY LIGHT,
Cascade Locks, Oreg., June 10, 1948.

DEAR MR. TRAVIS: This is the data compiled and edited (supposedly) by members of the Bonneville Administration. Anyhow, after a conference on the matter, and with the help of the BPA, this is what was finally completed.

I believe you requested Russel Nichols to have something of this sort done, and this is it.

Sincerely,

CITY LIGHT,
NORMA ANDERSON,
Secretary.

CASCADE LOCKS—BRIGHTEST TOWN BY A "DAMSITE"

In a few days Cascade Locks will observe the ninth anniversary of its municipally owned electric system, and city fathers are congratulating themselves on the record they have made in public distribution of Bonneville power. The success story is indelibly written into the ledgers and records of the city light department, but the men who can see the twinkling lights of the dam they built prefer

to reminisce about shoulder-to-shoulder stand they made nearly a decade ago.

By a vote of better than 10 to 1, the people of Cascade Locks decided to issue bonds to operate their public power system. But the local utility refused to sell its lines to the town. In fact, the company president threatened to procure a court injunction to stop the townspeople from distributing Bonneville power themselves.

The community promptly responded by forming an emergency citizens' committee. Late that Saturday afternoon—and far into the night—they worked up and down the main street of Cascade Locks, setting up poles and insulators, helping the crews string the heavy wire that was to link their homes and shops to the newly built dam. Bonfires dotted the town, and the women kept huge pots of coffee brewing for the menfolk who were determined to build the backbone of their city light system before the courts reopened Monday morning.

Eventually the company relented and the town bought the local power lines with the bonds the people had voted. Seventy-nine thousand dollars worth of revenue bonds were issued—bonds which were to be paid for out of power earnings rather than taxes. Twenty-eight thousand dollars worth of the bonds already have been retired; the people have an equity in their business amounting to $57,000, or better than $100 a customer. The depreciated value of the power properties now exceeds $100,000. The town has improved and extended its lines, bringing electricity to many families who had never been served.

But the real achievement of Cascade Locks power system may be found in the power bill residents proudly pay at the end of each month. For the cost of electricity has dropped from 4.92 cents (per kilowatt-hour) to 1.39 cents—a reduction of 72 percent. Most astounding is the way the demand for electricity has skyrocketed under these low rates. Nine years ago the average home used 53 kilowatt-hours a month; today the figure is 314—nearly six times as much. Forty-two homes are heated entirely by electric heat—and many are planning to follow suit.

Official Federal Power Commission figures reveal that the average patron of Cascade Locks municipal system pays $14 less per year for electricity than the average householder in nearby Hood River Valley. Stores and mills have profited equally from the low price at which Cascade Locks distributes Bonneville power. Commercial rates have dropped nearly 60 percent and use has shot up 378 percent. That is why the lights burn so brightly in the shops that line the highway at Cascade Locks. It explains why Gibbs Restaurant is all electric in every sense of the word.

With industrial power rates cut from 60 to 72 percent over the old charges, Cascade Locks is looking forward to its share of industrial expansion. The Cascade Locks Lumber Co. is completing its all-electric mill—safer and more efficient than the old-style operations with steam or Diesel power.

In 1939 the town's power system had 387 customers; today it has 560. The new line to Bridal Veil has added 75 new customers to the books, and the lumber mill there absorbs 162,000 kilowatt-hours a month.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven revenues of the city light system totaled $28,656. Cost of Bonneville power was $6,980, operating expenses $11,569, depreciation $1,330, taxes $1,330, and interest and bond payments $1,210. Add up these figures and you'll see that Cascade Locks city light department netted $6,217 after paying all expenses. This net of $6,217 represents a return of 10 percent upon the people's investment in the business of $57,000. But they still have their eye on the record of Monmouth's city light department, which just burned the last of its bonds and became another debt-free public power system.

City of Cascade Locks, accomplishments by municipal distribution

REDUCTIONS IN TYPICAL MONTHLY RESIDENTIAL BILLS

	50 kilowatt-hours	85 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	125 kilowatt-hours	200 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours
Former residential rates [1]	$3.10	$4.15	$4.60	$5.35	$7.60	[2] $10.60
Present residential rates with Bonneville power [1]	$2.25	$2.95	$3.25	$3.50	$4.25	$6.25
Savings with municipal distribution:						
Monthly	$0.85	$1.20	$1.35	$1.85	$3.35	$4.35
Annually	$10.20	$14.40	$16.20	$22.20	$40.20	$52.20
Percent	27	29	29	35	44	41

[1] Rates of the West Coast Power Co.
[2] Includes 300 kilowatt-hours water heating on separate rate.
[3] In effect since November 1939. Began distributing Bonneville power July 1939.

REDUCTIONS IN TYPICAL MONTHLY COMMERCIAL BILLS

	Commercial lighting			Commercial power			Industrial power service				
							150 kilowatts		500 kilowatts		1,000 kilowatts, 400,000 kilowatt-hours
	3 kilowatts, 375 kilowatt-hours	6 kilowatts, 750 kilowatt-hours	12 kilowatts, 1,500 kilowatt-hours	6 kilowatts, 750 kilowatt-hours	12 kilowatts, 1,500 kilowatt-hours	30 kilowatts, 6,000 kilowatt-hours	30,000 kilowatt-hours	60,000 kilowatt-hours	100,000 kilowatt-hours	200,000 kilowatt-hours	
Former rates [1]	$14.25	$25.50	$41.00	$31.00	$62.00	$180.00	$855	$1,140	$2,851	$3,801	$7,602
Initial rates with Bonneville Power (November 1939)	$13.50	$22.25	$39.15	$22.25	$39.15	$127.25	$403	$540	$1,036	$1,326	$2,391
Present rates [2] by municipal distribution	$11.63	$18.50	$31.65	$18.50	$31.65	$84.75	$328	$457	$940	$1,167	$2,160
Initial savings with Bonneville power:											
Monthly	$0.75	$3.25	$1.85	$3.75	$22.85	$32.75	$452	$600	$1,815	$2,475	$5,211
Annually	$9.00	$39.00	$22.20	$105.00	$274.20	$633.00	$5,424	$7,200	$21,780	$29,700	$62,532
Percent	5	13	4	28	37	29	53	53	64	65	69
Present savings by municipal distribution:											
Monthly	$2.62	$7.00	$9.85	$12.50	$30.35	$95.25	$527	$983	$1,941	$2,634	$5,442
Annually	$31.44	$84.00	$112.20	$150.00	$364.20	$1,143.00	$6,324	$9,960	$23,292	$31,608	$65,304
Percent	18	27	23	40	49	53	62	66	68	69	72

[1] Rates of West Coast Power Co.
[2] Effective July 1942.

City of Cascade Locks, annual revenue reductions by municipal distribution

Service	Reduction of November 1939				Reduction of July 1942			
	Annual revenues		Annual reductions		Annual revenues		Annual reductions	
	Former rates [1]	New rates	Dollars	Percent	Former rates	Estimated present rate	Dollars	Percent
Residential	$12,642	$8,242	$3,800	32	$15,120	$15,120		
Commercial and other	16,727	15,007	1,630	10	16,106	14,419	$1,687	10
Total	28,769	23,331	5,430	19	31,236	29,549	1,687	5

[1] West Coast Power Co.

City of Cascade Locks, accomplishments by municipal distribution, relationship of price and use

	Residential		Commercial	
	Kilowatt-hours per customer	Price per kilowatt-hour	Kilowatt-hours per customer	Price per kilowatt-hour
		Cents		*Cents*
1939 [1]	635	4.92	3,920	3.36
1940	1,079	2.67	5,253	2.88
Use increase, 1939–40, percent	70		32	
Price decrease, 1939–40, percent				
1941	1,483	2.22	5,111	2.91
Use increase, 1940–41, percent	37		−3	
Price decrease, 1940–41, percent	17			−1
1942	1,880	1.97	6,659	2.06
Use increase, 1941–42, percent	27		30	
Price decrease, 1941–42, percent		11		29
1943	2,280	1.77	7,382	1.60
Use increase, 1942–43, percent	21		11	
Price decrease, 1942–43, percent		10		22
1944	2,463	1.68	5,489	2.08
Use increase, 1943–44, percent	8		−26	
Price decrease, 1943–44, percent		5		−30
1945	2,866	1.57	5,892	2.06
Use increase, 1944–45, percent	16		7	
Price decrease, 1944–45, percent		7		1
1946	3,204	1.49	7,293	1.92
Use increase, 1945–46, percent	12		24	
Price decrease, 1945–46, percent		5		7
1947	3,768	1.39	18,970	1.39
Use increase, 1946–47, percent	18		160	
Price decrease, 1946–47, percent		7		28
OVER-ALL DEVELOPMENT, 1939–47				
Use increase, percent	493		378	
Price decrease, percent		72		59

[1] Based on first 9 months at company's rates expanding for a year's operations.

City of Cascade Locks, comparison of principal rate schedules

Former rates (W. C. P. Co.)	Rates effective November 1939	Present rates
Residential:		
40 kwh. at 7¢.	50 kwh. at 4½¢.	50 kwh. at 4½¢.
265 kwh. at 3¢.	50 kwh. at 2¢.	50 kwh. at 2¢.
Excess, at 2¢.	200 kwh. at 1¢.	200 kwh. at 1¢.
	500 kwh. at ½¢.	500 kwh. at ½¢.
Minimum, $1.	Excess, at ¼¢.	Excess, at ¼¢.
Water heating, 1¢ per kwh.	Minimum, $1.	Minimum, $1.
		(Effective since July 1942)
Commercial:		
75 kwh. at 7¢.	150 kwh. at 4.5¢.	150 kwh. at 4¢.
725 kwh. at 3¢.	350 kwh. at 2¢.	350 kwh. at 2.5¢.
Excess, at 2¢.	1,000 kwh. at 1.5¢.	1,000 kwh. at 1.5¢.
	3,500 kwh. at 1.3¢.	13,500 kwh. at 0.8¢.
Minimum, $1.	10,000 kwh. at 0.8¢.	50,000 kwh. at 0.5¢.
	25,000 kwh. at 0.6¢.	Excess kwh. at 0.3¢.
	60,000 kwh. at 0.4¢.	
	Excess kwh. at 0.3¢.	Demand charge, first 10 kw. no charge.
	Demand charge, first 10 kw. no charge. Over 10 kw. 95¢ per kw.	Over 10 kw. 95¢ per kw.

HOUSING FOR VANPORT, OREG., EVACUEES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a telegram which I have received relative to housing for the Vanport evacuees.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 15, 1948.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Two provisions are indispensable if private enterprise is to build for Vanport evacuees: (1) easy long-term financing; (2) guaranteed return so builder is assured of income to meet mortgage payments, fixed charges with small return for self in case of rental units. Financing would be easier if term were 32 years 7 months, the same as 608. Telegram mentions no provision in proposed legislation for guaranteed return to builder-owner in case of rental unit. Every unit should be built for either rent or sale without both above provisions. We doubt private enterprise will build many units. Any limitation in cost should apply equally to private and public housing. Until survey of family size is made formula for price limitation is difficult. Would prefer discretion in hands of Administrator. If limit is imposed it should be at least $9,000 to house larger families. Between properties owned and adjacent sites easily acquired builders have estimated 2,000 lots near utilities, many with improvements in construction, can start immediately. Within 5 to 8 months 3,000 to 4,000 units can be built. These scattered sites would not present problems of schools, playgrounds, utilities, and shipping centers. Only private enterprise using lots where improvements are substantially in place can do anything before next winter if flood victims live in emergency housing and trailers over winter. Many serious problems will develop, and the longer they live in this emergency phase the greater will be the expense for the Government. Legislation providing simultaneously for public and private housing should extend equal benefits to both. No public housing project will ever produce home ownership with attending responsibility and good citizenship. Over the long period most single-family units built by private enterprise will be sold. Result would be less cost to Federal Treasury and each such unit will pay its just share of the tax burden.

LOYD P. CARTER,
President, Portland Realty Board.
HERMAN SCHMITT,
President, Portland Builders Association.
EDWIN SANDBERG,
Northwest Regional Vice President, National Association of Home Builders.

FLOOD DAMAGE TO FARMS IN COLUMBIA BASIN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement issued by the United States Department of Agriculture relative to flood damage to farms in the Columbia Basin.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOOD DAMAGE TO FARMS IN COLUMBIA BASIN ESTIMATED

Lost farm-production income estimated for this year in the areas of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, devastated by the Columbia River floodwaters, will approximate nearly $10,000,000, according to preliminary advance estimates sent to Secretary Charles F. Brannan, of the United States Department of Agriculture, today by George T. Hudson, special representative of the Secretary, stationed in the Pacific Northwest to coordinate efforts of the Department agencies in behalf of flood sufferers.

In making their estimates, the Department observers in the stricken areas did not include part-time farmers or nonfarm rural residents in the first list of damages. It is also exclusive of flood damage now being surveyed and reported by the Forest Service on upper watersheds. Likewise, possible damage to public roads, bridges, rural electric-power lines, or telephone lines are not included in any survey to date.

To date, the best available flood-damage figures furnished to the Department of Agriculture by State USDA councils and other agency specialists include the following for Washington and Oregon farms, which are sketchy and incomplete pending further surveys:

Washington State: 1,375 farms affected, with rehabilitation costs placed at $1,375,000; acres of farm land inundated, 104,000; cropland or cultivated pasture flooded, 52,135 acres, cost to return cropland to normal cultivation, $731,900; cows evacuated, 11,500 head; hay requirements to next pasture season, 20,000 tons, valued at $700,000; seed requirements, 263,800 pounds, worth $205,000; grain feed requirements, 10,625 tons, worth $1,062,500; fences destroyed, 1,955 miles, to cost $627,000 for replacement; 860 farm buildings damaged or destroyed, at a cost to rehabilitate of $2,279,500; fertilizer needed, 5,000 tons, worth $375,000; farm bridges to rebuild or repair, at cost of $200,000; repair of damaged farm roads, $50,000; loss of home-grown food, estimated at $137,500; and personal-property damages, valued at about $1,330,000. In addition, special needs must be met in Chelan, Douglas, and Pend Oreille Counties, at cost of about $272,000, the estimate concludes.

Oregon estimates: 800 farms affected with rehabilitation costs put at $450,000; acres of farm land inundated, 50,000; cropland or cultivated pasture flooded, 26,000 acres; cost to return cropland to normal cultivation, $390,000; number of cows evacuated, 5,400 head; hay requirements to next pasture season, 12,150 tons, at a value of $425,000; seed requirements, $430,000 for replanting mint and seeding pasture and hay crops; grain feed requirements, 4,050 tons, worth $405,000; fences destroyed, 500 miles, to cost $157,000 for replacement; 450 farm buildings damaged or destroyed, at a rebuilding and repair cost of $1,350,000; fertilizer needed, 1,000 tons, worth $75,000; $50,000 for repair of farm bridges; $20,000 for repair of farm roads; loss of home-grown food, $45,000; and personal-property damages, estimated at $225,000.

Loss of income from crops and livestock, in addition to the current flood-damage rehabilitation costs, is estimated for Washington, Oregon, and Idaho farms at $9,863,000.

ALBERT W. HAWKES, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, to my friend, ALBERT W. HAWKES, with whom I have disagreed on some issues, I wish to say, as he retires from the Senate, that my sincere good wishes go with him. Although we have had our differences, I think both Senator HAWKES and I have sought in the sincerity of our convictions to preserve what we call the American system in accordance with the principles and guaranties of the Constitution. I served with Senator HAWKES when both of us were members of the War Labor Board, during the war. My association with him there, as well as here in the Senate, has been a source of inspiration to me.

ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also wish to pay my respects to the grand young man of the Senate, ARTHUR CAPPER. As a boy on a farm in Wisconsin, I first came under the influence of Senator CAPPER as I read his writings in the Capper Farm Journal. All one needs to say about ARTHUR CAPPER is that he retires from the Senate rich in the love of all of us.

CARL A. HATCH, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show my appreciation of my very good friend, CARL HATCH, for our many pleasant associations in the Senate.

DUPLICATION OF CLEAR CHANNELS AND SUPERPOWER—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE AND THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD an exchange of letters between the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Federal Communications Commission. As ranking member of the minority side of that committee, I believe that these letters will help clarify the existing situation with respect to the question of duplication of clear channels and superpower, a subject which has had a great deal of committee attention during the present session of Congress.

I believe it will be clear from this exchange of letters and the favorable committee report of the White radio bill (S. 1333), which includes a section—section 6—prohibiting the granting of power in excess of 50 kilowatts for any AM radio broadcast station, that the Federal Communications Commission must maintain its present policy of limiting power to 50 kilowatts. It is important to likewise point out that the language of Senate bill 1333 makes clear that the Commission's present authority to duplicate clear channels wherever and whenever the Commission finds that it is in the public interest to do so is not interfered with in any way and that the Commission retains such authority. I insist that it continue to exercise that authority, but with more vigor, in the public interest.

The letters, which follow, include the letter of February 27 from the committee to Chairman Coy, of the Commission, advising him that the committee has under consideration a bill dealing with the question of superpower, and requesting the Commission to take no administrative action on that question until the committee has held hearings on the legislation; the letter of March 2, 1948, from the committee to Chairman Coy, of the Commission, requesting that the Commission take no action on the question of clear channels and superpower until the committee has taken definite action on the legislation then pending; the letter of April 5, 1948, from Chairman Coy, of the Commission, to the acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], advising him that the Commission will take no action on the question of clear channels and superpower under the conditions set forth in the committee's letter of February 27; the letter of June 9, 1948, from the committee to Chairman Coy, of the Commission, advising him that the committee had voted to favorably report Senate bill 1333, and that under the circumstances the letter of February 27 was being withdrawn; and finally the letter of June 15, 1948, from Chairman Coy to the committee acknowledging receipt of the letter of June 9, 1948.

I repeat that in the interests of clarification, I deem it important to point out that the committee has favorably reported legislation which sets a limitation on power and preserves the Commission's authority to duplicate AM radio frequencies. To the extent that the committee's views are important to a quasi-judicial agency which is an arm of Congress, I assume the Commission will take into the fullest consideration these views.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
February 27, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE COY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN COY: I understand that your Commission has been giving long and serious consideration to the question of clear channels and superpower; that your public hearings have been completed; and that the Commission will shortly take up the matter for decision. We of the committee, primarily concerned with the peoples' interest, are anxious that no decision be reached in the premises which is contrary to the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

For your information, there has been introduced in the Senate, as of yesterday, S. 2231, introduced by Senator JOHNSON, a bill to limit the power of radio broadcast stations and to provide for the break-down of clear-channel frequencies. A copy of the bill is enclosed herewith. The bill speaks for itself. You will understand it fully upon reading.

Because of the importance of this legislation and of the interest of our committee as expressed in executive session today, I have been instructed by the committee unanimously, by formal vote, to write you, advising you of this legislation and request your Commission to reach no conclusions and take no action in the pending matter of superpower and clear channels until such time as the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has assigned hearings on S. 2231 and have you and other interested parties come before this committee in the premises.

I write this letter upon the instruction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, made in executive session this afternoon. Will you kindly acknowledge receipt of this letter and confirm that your Commission will take no action on the question of superpower and clear channels until the enclosed bill, S. 2231, has been assigned for hearing and testimony is heard from interested and affected parties.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Acting Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
March 2, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE COY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a copy of a letter being mailed by the committee this week to all radio stations in the United States. It is being sent you for the information of the Commission.

You will note that it is an announcement that hearings on the Johnson bill, S. 2231, will begin on or about April 5 before the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In my letter of February 27, as acting chairman, I requested that no further action be taken in the so-called clear-channel case until our committee has completed hearings on the pending bill. I will appreciate confirmation from you that the commission will take no action in the matter of clear channels and superpower until such time as the committee has taken definite action for or against the proposed legislation.

Very sincerely yours,
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Acting Chairman.

APRIL 5, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have your letter of February 27, 1948, and your note of February 28, 1948. In your letter you refer to the introduction in the Senate of S. 2231 and you state that because of the importance of this legislation and the interest of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as expressed in an executive session that you have been instructed by the committee, by unanimous vote, to write the Commission advising us of this legislation and requesting that the Commission reach no conclusions and take no action on the question involved until testimony is heard by the Senate committee. You request that I confirm that the Commission take no action on the question.

You will recall that in a conference with you shortly after receipt of your letter I explained the situation which the Government of the United States faced with respect to the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement which expires March 29, 1949. I am sure that after our discussion you and I were in agreement that we should persuade the State Department to seek agreement with the other countries involved to a further extension of NARBA. At a later date the Assistant Secretary, Garrison Norton and Mr. Walter Radius of the Telecommunications Division, State Department, accompanied me to a conference with Senator Johnson. The result of that conference was that Senator Johnson, as you had done earlier, expressed his opinion that the State Department should seek an extension of NARBA. The State Department is now proceeding with the negotiations looking toward an extension of NARBA.

In view of the understanding which the State Department now has of your views and Senator JOHNSON's views and in view of the fact that they are proceeding to seek an extension of NARBA, the Federal Communications Commission now confirms the Committee's request that it take no action on the question of superpower and clear channels under the conditions set forth in your letter of February 27.

Sincerely yours,
WAYNE COY,
Chairman.

JUNE 9, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE COY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In view of the fact that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce today voted to favorably report the bill S. 1333, dealing with various amendments to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, the committee voted to instruct me, as chairman, to advise you that the committee is hereby withdrawing its letter of February 27, 1948, addressed to you as Chairman of the Federal Communications

Commission, in which was discussed the matter of superpower and clear channels.

Very sincerely yours,

WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Chairman.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1948.

Hon. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHITE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 8, 1948, informing me of the action of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in voting to withdraw its letter of February 27, 1948, addressed to me as Chairman of the Commission, concerning the matter of superpower and clear-channel broadcasting. I have informed my fellow Commmissioners of the action of your committee.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE COY,
Chairman.

AUTHORITY FOR APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES AND FOR SECRETARY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AFTER ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President pro tempore be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

Ordered further, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives subsequent to the adjournment of the present session.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 19, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions:

S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of General Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, even in this closing hour of the session, I am very hopeful that we may get to the next bill. If those who are responsible for the pending bill will consider laying it aside at this stage, I shall ask the Senator from Nevada whether he feels it proper to do that, so that we may take up Senate bill 2644, Calendar No. 1507, a defense measure which many of us feel to be of very considerable importance.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Nevada whether he will consent to let the Senator from Maine be recognized to request the consideration of a bill?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1507, Senate bill 2644; to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service. I have spent a very interesting 5 hours waiting to be recognized so that I could request consideration of this bill. I shall take only 5 minutes to explain briefly what the bill is, in the hope that it may be considered and passed at this time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Has the bill been passed by the House?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; it has been passed unanimously by the House, and also has been approved by every Government agency concerned with our defense and with the development of civil aviation, and also by every other group that has studied it. The President's Board on Aviation Policy strongly recommended its passage, and the Joint Aviation Board has strongly recommended it.

The bill has been very carefully prepared, and it is considered the only means by which American aviation can continue its progress.

The more recent planes which have been developed have cost around $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 to develop; and the two or three companies that have done that have literally lost their shirts. They have to sell 300 of these planes in order to get their money back. The air lines cannot buy them, so that situation is perfectly hopeless.

The defense aspect of the matter is perfectly apparent. We need thousands of these planes of the most modern and constantly improved types. With the complete stoppage of the development of new types of transport planes, our defense transport will be terribly crippled.

I hold in my hand a list of six jet-propelled planes being developed by England at the present time. That gives us an indication of how seriously England regards this matter. Some of these planes are actually flying. They are 2 years ahead of us in the development of this type of transport plane.

The only way this desirable development can be brought to pass is by having an authorization of this character. It creates within the various defense agencies concerned the Government group which shall determine the different types to be developed.

One small one and one large one are contemplated at the start, with the idea that once the Government develops a prototype, at whatever expense may be involved, private companies will then build the planes, at whatever reasonable profit shall be determined, and with whatever recapture of Government costs may be determined.

In the judgment of those who are concerned with aviation, it is the only way by which this development can possibly be carried on.

I hope very much that the Senate may see fit to pass this measure at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. I object.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then I move that the bill be considered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a motion of that sort, if agreed to, would displace the unfinished business, would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. But the Senator from Nevada permitted it to be brought up.

Mr. WHERRY. I simply wish to make plain what the situation is.

Mr. BREWSTER. I now move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 2644.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask now that House bill 6501, which is in exactly the same terms, be substituted for the Senate bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does it require unanimous consent in order to take up consideration of the House bill at this time? Has the House bill been printed, and is it on the calendar?

Mr. BREWSTER. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall have to object.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then, may we not proceed with the consideration of the Senate bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is perfectly in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask that that be done.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is the House bill on the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. PEPPER. Does it require unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

Mr. PEPPER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate bill is now before the Senate, having been taken up on motion. The Clerk will state the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in the interest of national security the Federal Government should promote the employment in air commerce in as large numbers as possible of more efficient transport and cargo aircraft; and, to this end, sponsor the design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototype transport and cargo aircraft, intended primarily for commercial use, but adaptable also for auxiliary military service.

SEC. 2. The Civil Transport Aircraft Evaluation and Development Board (referred to hereinafter as "the Board") hereinafter provided for, is authorized and directed—

(a) to survey the national requirements for aircraft types designed primarily for commercial transport and cargo service, but adaptable also as auxiliary military transport for one or more of the departments of the National Military Establishment;

(b) to prepare and recommend, from time to time, the operating and utility characteristics and specifications of such aircraft: *Provided*, That such characteristics and specifications shall be consistent with the requirements of the civil air regulations promulgated by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

(c) to advise the Secretary of the Air Force (referred to hereinafter as "the Secretary") of the Board's findings and recommendations under this section, and to recommend the allotment by the Secretary, from funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this

act, of appropriate sums for design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototypes of each such type of aircraft.

SEC. 3. (a) The Board shall be composed of one representative designated by each of the following agencies: The United States Air Force, the United States Navy, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and such other agencies of the Federal Government, concerned with aeronautics, as the Board may, from time to time, determine.

(b) To assist the Board in carrying out its functions, it is authorized to establish an industrial advisory committee composed of not less than six members appointed by the Board with the approval of the Secretary. Each member of such committee shall serve for a term of 2 years, except that (1) the terms of three of the members first taking office after the enactment of this act shall expire at the end of 1 year, and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occuring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds. No member shall be eligible to serve continuously for more than one term unless in the opinion of the Board his reappointment is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act. Members of such committee may be designated without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and shall receive such compensation, not in excess of $50 for each day or part of a day actually devoted to the performance of the duties of such committee, as the Board shall determine. Each member of such committee shall be allowed actual necessary transportation expenses and an allowance not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence when engaged in the performance of the duties of such committee at any place other than his permanent residence or place of business. Nothing contained in section 41, 109, 112, or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 93, 198, 202, and 203), section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 119), or any other provision of law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply to any such person solely by reason of membership on such committee: *Provided*, That the provisions of the act of July 12, 1870 (R. S. 3679; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 665), as amended, shall not apply to the acceptance of voluntary service by any member of any such committee.

(c) The Chairman of the Board shall be designated by the Secretary from among the members thereof and the Board shall act in accordance with such regulations and rules of procedure as it may, from time to time, prescribe. The Board is authorized and directed to consult with manufacturers of aircraft, and with United States operators of transport aircraft. Members of the Board shall serve as such without additional compensation, but each member of the Board shall be allowed actual necessary transportation expenses and an allowance not to exceed $10 per diem, in lieu of subsistence, when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Board at any place other than his permanent station.

(d) The Board and the Secretary are authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, but without regard to any provision of law limiting the number of civilian personnel which may be employed by the Department of the Air Force, to employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be deemed necessary to assist the Board and the Secretary in carrying out their respective functions under this act: Provided, That to the extent possible, consistent with other duties and assignments, the personnel and facilities of the member agencies of the Board shall be used to carry out the duties of the Board.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized and directed, if he concurs in the advice and recommendations of the Board referred to in section 2 of this act, to provide, out of funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, for the design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototypes of each such type of aircraft, by contract or otherwise. Any such contract entered into by the Government shall contain a provision that—

(1) sales of aircraft subsequently manufactured from the design specifications of such prototype or prototypes shall be made at a price allowing a reasonable profit, not exceeding such profit as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and

(2) in determining the fair selling price of such aircraft, except to the extent required by the Secretary, there shall not be included in the cost thereof any development, engineering, tooling, or other costs which have been reimbursed to the manufacturer by the Secretary; and

(3) aircraft subsequently manufactured from the design specifications of such prototype or prototypes shall be sold only to purchasers who, by contract with the Secretary, have undertaken (a) unless required by the civil air regulations to make no changes in the design or standard equipment of such aircraft without first obtaining the approval of the Secretary; and (b) to make, for an agreed sum payable by the Secretary, such changes in the design or standard equipment of such aircraft, not inconsistent with the civil air regulations, as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of section 4 of this act, may enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, with or without legal consideration, with or without performance or other bonds, and, in carrying out such contracts, arrangements, or modifications thereof, may make advance, progress, and other payments without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) Each contract, arrangement, or modification thereof, executed pursuant to this act, shall contain such provisions, consistent with the laws affecting the issuance or use of patents, governing the disposition and use of inventions made thereunder as are appropriate, in the judgment of the Secretary, to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract, arrangement or modification thereof is executed.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to procure and test prototype aircraft from any manufacturer whose design meets the operating and utility characteristics and specifications recommended by the Board: *Provided*, That, in the event such manufacturer is not in a position to produce promptly the prototype aircraft desired, then the Secretary may procure such prototype aircraft from any other qualified manufacturer.

SEC. 7. Aircraft manufactured from design specifications pursuant to this act shall not be sold directly or by resale to either foreign governments or other foreign users without the approval of the Secretary: *Provided*, That in approving any such sale the Secretary may waive such of the requirements of section 3 hereof as he may deem proper.

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized and directed, if he concurs in the advice and recommendations of the Board with respect thereto, by appropriate contractual conditions, or otherwise, to recover, in whole or in part, as deemed to be practicable and expedient, the costs incurred by the United States pursuant to this act. The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress within a period of 1 year following the passage of this act a report setting forth the means and methods which he intends to utilize in effecting such recovery.

SEC. 9. In the event the Board shall recommend the development of a seaplane commercial transport or cargo aircraft and the Secretaries of the Navy and the Air Force concur, the Secretary of the Navy shall be authorized to perform all of the functions with respect to such aircraft as are vested in the Secretary of the Air Force by this act, and the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy such funds appropriated under this act as may be necessary for the performance of such functions.

SEC. 10. As used in this act—

(a) The term "aircraft" shall include engines, propellers, instruments, accessories, and standard equipment for such aircraft.

(b) The term "standard equipment" means all operational features of such aircraft, including, without limitation, standard cockpit arrangement, communications facilities, and provisions for such items, but excluding commercial equipment.

(c) The term "commercial equipment" means removable furnishings and fittings, not part of the primary structure or the mechanical apparatus of such aircraft, and which is generally installed for the accommodation of passengers, baggage, or cargo.

(d) The term "prototype aircraft" means the initial models of each type, built primarily for static tests, flight performance, and service test.

SEC. 11. The Secretary and the Board shall transmit to the Congress, on the 1st day of January in each year, a report on (1) the progress made in the accomplishment of the purposes of this act and (2) the amounts of the expenditures made or obligated pursuant thereto.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Air Force such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, my reason for objecting was that the bill is pretty much in the same class as the one we were discussing in the earlier part of the evening—perhaps I should say morning. I do not understand why bills of such importance should come to us right at the end of the session, and on Sunday morning.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator will recognize that the reason it is so late in being presented is because the Senator from Delaware has been objecting for the last 2 weeks when I was trying to have it considered. That is why it is necessary to call it up now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought it was not the kind of bill to be disposed of on a call of the consent calendar, but the Senator will recall I told him I would not delay consideration of the bill, but would limit my remarks to 10 minutes.

I think the bill has some merit. On the other hand, the bill in my opinion is too uncertain in some respects. Section 12 authorizes funds to be appropriated for the Department of the Air Force in such amount as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of the bill, with absolutely no limitation on the amount. As many of the so-called prototype planes may be developed as may be thought advisable.

Section 7 of the bill provides that the airplanes produced may be sold to foreign governments if the Secretary of Defense sees fit. Congress has nothing to say about it.

The best explanation I can make of the bill is to read an analysis of it that appeared in the Wall Street Journal of June 4, entitled "Airplane Subsidy." The headlines are, "Taxpayers may foot bill for costly design of new commercial craft; Senate bill would lift load from makers, airlines; insure going industry; Air Force would be boss." I am going to read this, because it is the best analysis of the bill I can get.

It says:

The commercial air fleet of the future may be designed with taxpayers' dollars.

Congress is pressing a measure to shift the burden of development costs for new style cargo and passenger planes from aircraft manufacturers and commercial air lines to the Federal budget.

The argument: A modern, healthy commercial air fleet is a necessary defense supplement for the military air force.

Backers of the plan think they have a better than a 50-50 chance of getting it enacted this session. The Senate Commerce Committee approved the bill yesterday and House sanction is expected if the full Senate adopts the plan.

Air-minded Congressmen are pushing this new subsidy for aircraft in the closing minutes of Congress because they think it a needed defense measure. Also, this would put into effect one major recommendation of the Congressional Air Policy Board.

MONEY SAVER FOR AIR LINES

The so-called prototype bill would enable air lines to buy the latest planes for a fraction of the price they now plunk down for new cruisers like the DC–6's and the Constellations.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the remainder of the article, but I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

They'd have to pay only actual production cost of each plane plus a "reasonable profit" for plane makers. Uncle Sam would foot the bill for all the costly research, designing, tooling, building, testing, and refining of the first basic model—the prototype.

But, paying the piper, the Government would also call the tune. There would be Federal control over all the prototypes it finances—right down to the matter of determining what the "reasonable profit" should be for makers of the aircraft.

The goal of the subsidized airplane development program is nearly 1,000 newly developed cargo and passenger planes in the air by 1953. Cost estimates range as high as $1,000,000,000.

Senator BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine, sponsor of the Senate measure, hesitates to estimate the total outlay required. He generalizes that it "used to cost" from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000 to develop a new style aircraft. There would be at least three prototype planes to start with. More would be promoted as the program gets under way. Aircraft makers estimate only $10,000,000 would be needed to get started on designs for the three planes in the first year.

IN THE PILOT'S SEAT

The United States Air Force would ride in the pilot's seat to guide the spending of "such sums as may be necessary" and to determine final specifications for the plane research.

Arguments flared over who should control this new Federal subsidy program. The Civil Aeronautics Administration, contending the show should be run by civilians, lost out to the Secretary of the Air Force. Senator BREWSTER said Congress would be likely to approve the measure only on grounds of national defense.

Here's how the prototype bill would work:

A Civil Transport Aircraft Evaluation and Development Board, working with a special industry advisory committee, would survey national requirements for new commercial aircraft types. Recommendations would go to the Air Force Secretary.

The Air Force Secretary, if he approved the plans, would authorize funds. The Air Force would contract with an aircraft manufacturer to make a prototype to recommended specifications, with the Government paying for all design and development costs. Once the working model was perfected, manufacturers could fill orders from commercial air lines. But the cost of the individual plane wouldn't have to include the expense of developing the model. Each airplane would be priced to cover only actual cost of production plus a reasonable profit. The Air Force Secretary would decide what a reasonable profit should be.

AIR FORCE CONTROLS DESIGN

Air lines buying planes fashioned on the Government-sponsored prototype would be required to make no changes in the design or standard equipment without special Air Force permission. Also, they would be required to make any changes the Air Force might demand. The aircraft made from the specifications couldn't be sold to foreign governments, directly or through resale, without special Air Force approval.

The Senate bill suggests that the Air Force Secretary should figure out some way to get back part or all of the Government funds put into aircraft development. The legislation is vague on whether this is mandatory or not and merely directs the Air Secretary to report to Congress on how he would go about getting the Government repaid.

Prototype contracts would be let by the Air Force in design competition among the aircraft manufacturers. The plane makers could also submit their ideas for new type planes to the Air Force.

The air lines back the measure because it means more and cheaper cargo and passenger planes for them. Aircraft manufacturers consider such a subsidy necessary if they are to keep up the research and development needed for a modern United State air fleet. The military favors the proposal because it will guarantee a going aircraft industry, with designs convertible for military use.

MARKET IS LIMITED

When private plane manufacturers pay the cost of bringing out a new airplane model, they have to pass on the costs to the air lines—the main purchasers. But the market is comparatively limited.

For example, Douglas Aircraft Corp. designed the new DC–6. At the time the corporation put the plane into production it figured it had to sell about 200 planes at nearly $800,000 each to break even on its cost of development. Now, Douglas officials think, the break-even point will come after some 350 DC–6's have been sold and they've boosted the price to $900,000. So far, only 97 DC–6's are in use, and around 50 more are still to be delivered against orders on the books.

Under the prototype plan, the development of this plane might have been paid for by the Air Force. Thus, the company would have passed the break-even point when it sold its first plane at a reasonable profit.

In the first year aircraft officials believe there will be three design competitions—one for a trans-Atlantic passenger-cargo plane, one for a feeder-line plane, and one for a cargo type capable of operating for 5 cents a ton-mile or less.

Speed and economy of operation are the two main features that the development board will look for in paper plans submitted to it.

Here's what the Nation's air-transport systeem needs to get it out of the financial doldrums, according to the industry:

1. High-speed, long-range transports capable of carrying 50 or more passengers on nonstop flights from coast to coast and between continents. Jet-propelled transports promise speeds of 500 miles an hour or more, but there are plenty of bugs to be taken out of existing jet engines before they can be used on scheduled flights. At present, jet propulsion hasn't much range. It burns fuel too quickly to be practical over long distances.

2. A small, compact plane for use on the feeder or regional air lines—the short-route operators which link the trunk-line air systems with outlying towns. What's needed is a safe passenger-cargo plane which can be operated cheaply enough to break even when only half of its seats are taken. At present the feeder air lines are largely operating surplus DC–3's. Empty seats, coupled with rising costs of operation, make them increasingly dependent on Government mail pay.

3. A cargo plane which will cost less than 5 cents a ton-mile to operate. Such a development would have a ready market for several thousand planes, a prototype bill witness told Congress. Present theoretical operating costs range upward from 7.5 cents a ton-mile.

Lawrence B. Richardson, president of Fairchild Engine & Airplane Co., told the congressional committee that commercial cargo operators "cannot make full use of the terrific potential" volume of business until they have this inexpensive type airplane.

What may evolve from the prototype program could be a combination of any of these needs. A basic plane for use on the feeder lines might, for instance, be converted for all-cargo service over short routes. Or a long-range jet-propelled passenger plane prototype could also be used for transcontinental cargo.

The development board could also recommend new seaplanes, if the Secretaries of Navy and Air Force agree. For seaplane development, the Secretary of the Navy would be given the powers vested in the Air Secretary for land aircraft.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not saying the bill does not have some merit, but I think it is much too loosely drawn to be a suitable defense measure.

In section 8 it is provided that the Secretary of Defense shall prepare and transmit to the Congress within a specified time a plan whereby the Government may be able to regain a part of the money which is to be expended.

If a plan to regain some of the money is to be prepared by the Secretary of Defense, I think the plan should have accompanied the bill. The Senator from Maine has pointed out that discussions have been had on the subject of the bill for nearly a year. I think it is time it came to Congress. We should have had a program for that purpose in our minds, indicating how the money is to be regained.

We should also have been advised how much money the program is to cost. The article from which I have read claims the cost might amount to as much as $1,000,000,000 in the next 2 years. I do not agree with that estimate, of course.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Wall Street Journal spoke of the $1,000,000,000 which

was to be paid by private interests who would purchase the planes from aircraft companies. It was not in any sense a suggestion that the cost to the Government might be any such sum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have said I do not agree that the figures are accurate. I think they are overloaded. But I believe the bill could cost the Government a substantial amount of money. As the Senator from Maine well knows, I think, when we first discussed the possibility of an amendment limiting the amount of money to be spent, the suggestion was that the maximum should be $5,000,000. The last suggestion was that it should be——

Mr. BREWSTER. Six million dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Six million dollars for the first year. But the Senator wanted an 3-year limitation. I opposed the bill, until we could determine what the program would cost, and until we might know.

I think if the Government is going to subsidize planes in the interest of military defense, it is inexcusable to include a provision in the bill authorizing the Secretary of Defense, if he sees fit, to sell the planes to a foreign government. Therefore I object to the bill. If the Senate wants to pass it, I shall not block its passage, but I believe it to be an unsound measure.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. So long as the Senator from Delaware does not like this bill, I wonder if he would object if I requested unanimous consent for the Senate to consider a bill to pay a bonus of 30 cents a bushel on wheat and corn.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the Senator might put it on this bill as an amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I must object to the bill. If I correctly understand what the Senator from Delaware says, I think he is absolutely correct. The Committee on Armed Services has already held up a bill which was passed by the House, which would authorize the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy to make contracts and then come to the Congress and ask for an appropriation, without any prior knowledge of the authorization on the part of the Congress. At the present time the Navy—and I say this advisedly, because I have studied the subject—has 1,161,000 tons of ship capacity which it can build by getting the consent of the President, and then coming to the Congress and saying, "Here is the bill; now appropriate the money." The House put through a bill to allow the same authority to be extended to the Army and to the Air Force, putting the Air Force on a pound basis for planes, and the Army for tanks and trucks. If the authority is extended, if I understand the last section of this bill along with its other sections, we would completely lose our authority over the building of planes. The Air Secretary could authorize contracts, and then could come to Congress and say, "Appropriate the money to pay for them."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure this bill in no way affects any existing authority of the Secretary for Air. In fact, he is one of the sponsors of this measure and is the one given authority to handle the entire appropriation. He also has other authority which would be in no way mitigated by the passage of this bill. He says that appropriations should be separately allocated. They do not want them merged with other appropriations. That is really the purpose of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Maine confirms my idea: If we pass bills of this character we give the National Defense Establishment complete authority to go ahead on a large scale and then they can come to Congress and say, without any prior authority, "Pay these bills." Of course the Secretary of the Air Force has approved the bill. He approved the other bill that came before the Senate Committee on Armed Services. So did the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of the Navy, with some hesitation. I believe we would make progress by proceeding in the other direction and taking away, if necessary, some of the powers we have given the naval authorities, rather than to give them more power.

I hope this bill will not pass without more careful consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think I have the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. The Chair inadvertently overlooked that fact.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have never conceived, and I do not now conceive, that there is any contractual authority whatsoever in this bill for the Secretary for Air or any other Government official, apart from appropriations which will have to be made by the Congress, or the authority for contract issuing by the Congress. We simply say that "there is hereby authorized to be appropriated" to the Department, or to the Air Force, "such sums as may be necessary." Until the appropriation is made, there is not a cent that can be either expended or obligated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Section 5 (a) provides that the Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of section 4, "may enter into contracts or other arrangements or modifications thereof, with or without legal consideration, with or without performance or other bonds, and, in carrying out such contracts, arrangements, or modifications thereof, may make advance, progress, and other payments without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes."

Section 12 provides:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Air Force such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

In other words, if I read it correctly—I want to be right about it before we attempt to pass it—the Air Force could make contracts and then say, "Pay for them."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am a member of the Air Policy Board and am on the committee that sponsored this legislation. Unless I am badly mistaken, and I do not believe I am, the bill permits the Secretary of Air only to engineer and design one airplane, called a prototype. It does not contemplate in any way the construction of airplanes. It is purely to design one prototype, or possibly more than one model.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yielded to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have finished. I think I have said all anyone can say about it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Indiana is correct. The bill authorizes the Government to pay for one initial plane; but I should like also to point out that in some of the recent hearings which were held before our committee, as the Senator from Maine well knows, it was testified that the cost of prototypes would be $12,500,000; that is, for the first plane.

Paragraph (2), page 13 provides that—

Any contract entered into by the Government shall contain a provision that in determining the fair selling price of such aircraft, except to the extent required by the Secretary, there shall not be included in the cost thereof any development, engineering, tooling, or other costs, which have been reimbursed to the manufacturer by the Secretary.

The tooling costs might make up three-fourths of the cost of the airplane, just as in the case of General Motors when they are designing and building a Chevrolet. The first one costs a great deal more than the second one.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is very evident that there is objection to this bill. I have spoken to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and I do not want to engage in any such strange ventures as we have been embarking upon in the last 3 or 4 hours. So if there is a single objection it will make it impossible for us to act. While the House bill is here and has been approved, since it did not go on the calendar, after 42 hours, technically it would have to go to the calendar and be printed.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM (S. 2318) AND FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION (S. 1322)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that is to come out after the adjournment an analysis of the long-range farm bill and the Commodity Credit Corporation charter bill as they

were reported by the conference committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

JULIETTE LOW COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a short time ago the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] submitted a unanimous-consent request regarding a joint resolution about which he said there was no controversy. I think the Senator objected to the consideration of the joint resolution, and desired to see that it was passed. At that time there was an indication at least that he would have an opportunity to present the joint resolution and I say now that I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, providing there is no objection to it. If there is objection, I shall ask for the regular order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up Calendar No. 1741, House Joint Resolution 327.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROUGH RIDERS COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there is on the calendar another joint resolution similar to the one just passed, which merely authorizes the issuance of a commemorative stamp, and I wish to have it passed also. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1753, House Joint Resolution 305.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 305) authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps, commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of Rough Riders of the Spanish-American War, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT BOARD ON DEFENSE, UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is a bill on the calendar, Order No. 1436, House bill 5708, relating to the exemption of civilian members of the permanent Joint Board on Defense, United States and Canada, from certain statutory restrictions on outside activities, which I think should be passed by the Senate, having already been passed by the House.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have an objection to the bill, and I am sorry, but it would have to be raised now on a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I should have to object.

ALASKAN RAILROADS AND RECIPROCAL TARIFFS AND IMMIGRATION ARRANGEMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator about to present a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the calendar number of the measure?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is Senate Concurrent Resolution 59, requesting the President to commence negotiations with Canada relating to the existing railroad system, and studies relating to tariff and immigration arrangements.

Mr. WHERRY. To what committee was it referred?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is Calendar No. 1830.

Mr. GURNEY. I can acquaint the Senator from Nebraska with the objective of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that the concurrent resolution be reported by title.

Mr. WHERRY. If it is not on the calendar I shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I have the floor, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: I should like to inquire of the Senator from Washington if there are amendments of any importance to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59), which I see is on the latest calendar.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know of any important amendments. The Foreign Relations Committee reported it unanimously.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not object if the Senator from Washington wishes to bring it up now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 59.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) relative to negotiations with the Canadian Government concerning the construction of railroads in Alaska and the establishment of reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Foreign Relations were, on page 2, line 2, after the word "toward", to insert "determining the desirability of"; in line 4, after the name "Alaska", to strike out "and"; in line 5, after the word "specifications", to insert "and"; in the same line, after the word "prepared", to strike out "for the purposes of constructing" and insert "covering the construction of"; in line 10, after the word "including", to strike out "negotiations" and insert "studies"; in line 11, after the word "for", to strike out "the establishment of"; and in line 12, after the word "arrangements", to insert "in connection with this project", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the President is requested to commence negotiations with the Canadian Government with a view toward determining the desirability of extending the existing railroad system now terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, to the Territory of Alaska, to cause surveys to be made and plans, specifications, and cost estimates, and budget requests to be prepared covering the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, with a railroad system extended from Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, to the Territory of Alaska; also including studies with the Canadian Government for reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements, in connection with this project.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the defense of the Territory of Alaska is essential to the national security of the United States; and

Whereas further development of mineral, timber, and other resources of Alaska is necessary to the defense of that Territory and to the welfare and security of the United States; and

Whereas adequate transportation facilities within the Territory of Alaska and between the Territory of Alaska and the United States are essential to the development of the resources and the defense of Alaska; and

Whereas existing transportation facilities within the Territory of Alaska and between the Territory of Alaska and the United States are inadequate for the development of the resources and the defense of Alaska: Therefore be it

NOMINATION OF FRIEDA B. HENNOCK TO THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, 2 days ago a nomination on the Executive Calendar came up for consideration, and at that time I said that I felt that the nomination should go over because objection had been made. I understand the objection still exists. I realize the Senate has been continuously in session for 2 days and 2 nights, and Senators are worn out, and certainly this is no time for bringing up something which will provoke argument. But so long as I have been the acting majority leader I have tried to be fair about all the duties surrounding that position, and even though some Members of the Senate on this side are insistent that this nomination not come up, I feel that because of the representations made, and because of the fact that those who are interested feel that they would have a right at least not to be short circuited in regard to the nomination, I now ask, as in executive session, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, to be a member

of the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG. I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, I move that the nomination of Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, what kind of procedure is this? We are not in executive session.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked for unanimous consent.

Mr. BALL. I did not hear any motion.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. I asked for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator asked unanimous consent, and unanimous consent was granted.

Mr. BALL. I am sorry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand that that is what it was for.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is any doubt about it——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Consent was granted.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. BALL. Are we in executive session, then?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are.

Mr. WHERRY. We are, for the consideration of the nomination of Miss Frieda B. Hennock.

Mr. BALL. May we proceed in the regular order, then, and have the nomination stated, so that we will know what we are doing? I do not like to have the Senate doing things by unanimous consent. I am not going to hold up the Senate——

Mr. WHERRY. That is the very thing that is done after the Executive Calendar is taken up, and I ask that the nomination be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Nomination passed over. Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I do not intend to make a lengthy speech about this nomination. I am opposed to it, and I want the RECORD to show that. So far as I can discover, the only investigation, the only hearing, regarding this nomination, was a brief executive session of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. For several weeks the reports were that the nomination would never get out of committee. Then all of a sudden it was reported, with, I may say, somewhat suspicious haste. It is for a 7-year term on the Federal Communications Commission. In my opinion that is a tremendously important Commission. I think it is up to the Senate to satisfy itself—and frankly I am not satisfied; I do not know about the wisdom of the nomination one way or the other—that appointments to this Commission will really serve the best interests of the Nation.

I myself have observed some rather disturbing things about the Federal Communications Commission. I have heard more disturbing reports since this nomination was reported. I have heard a report, on what I consider reliable authority—and obviously in the past few days I have not had any opportunity to investigate it, I do not know whether it is true or not—which indicates that certain interests, groups, who are greatly interested in this nomination, have a direct pipe line to the Federal Communications Commission, which we certainly would not want to have occur. What the score is I do not know. So far as I can determine, Miss Hennock is a lawyer from New York, and I might point out that the late President Roosevelt never appointed a member of the Federal Communications Commission from New York City, for the simple reason that New York City is the center of the radio industry, and he wanted to avoid any possibility of the industry itself having too much influence on the Commission. So far as I can discover, she has had no experience in radio matters, and from what I can learn of her background, frankly I do not think she is qualified for the job, and I want to be on record as opposed to her confirmation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota has been very fair in his statement. As chairman of the subcommittee which investigated this nomination for the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which reported it by a vote of 8 to 0, with another member voting "present," I think the Senate should know what we have learned as to the circumstances.

Miss Hennock has been a member of the New York bar for 20 or 25 years. I hesitate to estimate the age of a lady, but I should say she is between 40 and 50 years old, so she is reasonably mature. She has had quite a brilliant record at the bar. She is a member now, which is somewhat unusual for a woman, of the third largest law firm in New York City, one of the most highly respected and distinguished, one composed almost exclusively of Republicans. She has had no experience in radio, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, which, it seemed to many of us, was perhaps most fortunate, because one who had been active in radio work, representing radio clients, would by that very fact come in under somewhat of a cloud. The committee took into consideration her breadth of experience and training and recognized abilities.

I may say that one of her most earnest sponsors was John W. Davis, of New York, who certainly is a leader of the New York bar, and who vouched most earnestly for her capacity and character. And from many other quarters there have come most earnest testimonials as to the character and competency of this woman.

Obviously only the future can tell how well she can fulfill these responsibilities. I can say that we in our committee, share the concern which the Senator from Minnesota has experienced concerning the functioning of the Federal Communications Commission. We think it needs new blood, and it was the consensus of those of us who became familiar with this matter through contact with many who were acquainted with her and through various representations, that she would be well qualified to fit into this position, and we believed her confirmation was warranted and wise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

The nomination of Jack Bostwick to be postmaster at Bastrop, in the State of Louisiana.

On motion by Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the said nomination be considered with those postmasters appearing on today's calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator intend that the nominations of postmasters shall be considered?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations of postmasters on the calendar.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of postmasters on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be confirmed en bloc.

Without objection the President will be notified of all nominations this day confirmed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, are there any measures any Senator desires to bring up at this time, or is there any other matter that is desired to be considered?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader whether there is any intention to proceed with Calendar No. 1253, Senate Joint Resolution 76?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the equal-rights amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the Senator who was particularly interested in the legislation stated that it would not be taken up at this time. I would not undertake to take it up.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO DECEMBER 31, 1948

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 14 minutes a. m., Sunday, June 20, 1948) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the provision of House Concurrent Resolution 218, to Friday, December 31, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of June 15), 1948:

TRUCE COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

John J. Macdonald, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of class 3, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Truce Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations April 23, 1948, vice Thomas C. Wasson, deceased.

PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARD, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1948

The following-named persons to be members of the Public Advisory Board, established under title I, of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948:

James Barron Carey, of the District of Columbia.
George Meany, of New York.
Allan Blair Kline, of Iowa.
Albert S. Goss, of Washington.
James George Patton, of Colorado.
Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.
Jonathan W. Daniels, of North Carolina.
Robert Henry Hinckley, of Utah.
Sarah Standing, of New York.
George Houk Mead, of Ohio.
Eric A. Johnston, of the District of Columbia.
Arlon Everett Lyon, of Illinois.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

William E. Willett, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

David J. Coddaire, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term expiring April 15, 1954.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of June 15), 1948:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Frieda B. Hennock to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1948.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Betty M. Means, Bolgee.
Arcaster Kimbrell, Fayette.
Lucy Torreano, Marvel.

ARIZONA

Robert S. Collins, Superior.

ARKANSAS

Edbert Jessup, Glenwood.
Rayburn G. Smith, Harrisburg.

CALIFORNIA

John S. Hillery, Cathedral City.
William H. Lambert, Eureka.
Howard T. Mitchell, Kenwood.
John E. McSweeney, Mill Valley.
Boyd Beall, Monterey.
Haskell E. Strawn, Rancho Santa Fe.
Ivor E. Lanigar, Susanville.

COLORADO

Ernest J. Redmon, De Beque.
Philip Madonna, Keenesburg.

FLORIDA

Arrie R. Royal, Brewster.
Mary R. Buzbee, Gibsonton.
Grady A. Warren, Lake City.
Alice S. Given, Windermere.

GEORGIA

Benjamin L. Robertson, Jr., Byron.

LOUISIANA

Jack Bostwick, Bastrop.
Inman J. Vining, Choudrant.
Robert Lee Trahan, Maurice.
Hughes T. Young, Sicily Island.

MAINE

Edwin C. Brown, Yarmouth.

MARYLAND

Charles L. Brockmeyer, Glenarm.
Cora L. Sappington, Keymar.
Edward C. Seipp, Pasadena.
Edward V. Dorsey, Upper Marlboro.

NEW YORK

Naoma Brown, Fair Haven.
Victor A. Willette, Mooers.

NORTH CAROLINA

Simon C. Sitterson, Kinston.

OKLAHOMA

Ethel V. Hamrick, Avant.
Omri B. Autry, Marietta.

OREGON

Robert E. Ballard, McMinnville.
Albert R. McCall, Rainier.

RHODE ISLAND

Edward J. Quinn, Barrington.
Stephen H. Greene, Slatersville.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Gerome H. Stafford, Jr., Latta.
Edmund R. Kaminer, Lexington.
George C. Aycock, Pinewood.

TEXAS

Arlie Farrington, Alba.
Wallace L. Rickaway, Blessing.
Robert A. Runyon, Brownsville.
Sims A. Palmer, Colorado City.
Sidney R. Malone, Devine.
Elmer E. Carruth, Elsa.
Timmie A. George, Louise.
Guy Miller Mann, Malone.
Wilson O. Dunn, Mauriceville.
Alfred M. Weir, McAllen.
Jewel M. Latimer, Olmito.
Alvin O. Fields, Ozona.
Earl Bennett Spinks, Raymondville.
Guy B. Karr, Spur.
Cleo M. Hagan, Yoakum.

VIRGINIA

O. Ray Vanlandingham, Avalon.
Abram C. Turner, Jr., Clover.
Edward C. Taylor, Hanover.
Clinton Webb, Jr., Hillsville.
Arlene H. Bane, Vernon Hill.
Robert C. Sanders, Warsaw.

WASHINGTON

Melvin S. Jones, Cheney.
Malcolm P. Hutton, Edwall.
Walter A. Oliver, Hoodsport.
LeRoy P. Jensen, Lopez.
Sherman T. Combs, Packwood.
James C. Banta, Millwood.
Lavon B. Kelly, Zenith.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord God, forever let our prayers go up and Thy blessings of love and mercy come down upon all associated with the Congress. In these final hours, as we make difficult decisions, be Thou with us and guide us, for what we do here is of untold influence upon all our people.

As we separate for a while, O keep us beneath the shadow of a great protection, for we know that naught Thou hast made, above, below, can part us from Thy tender care. Let Thy wonderful love encircle all our homes and bless us with good health and comfort. The Lord bless you and keep you. The Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you. The Lord lift the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, June 17 (June 17 and 18), 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4044. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals;

H. R. 5882. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes;

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6116. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act;

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments;

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948; and

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 411. An act for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 10 years old);

S. 2054. An act for the relief of Engebert Axer;

S. 2075. An act for the relief of Wisla Paryzenberg;

S. 2235. An act for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic;

S. 2299. An act for the relief of Ella L. Browning;

S. 2339. An act to prohibit the mailing of propaganda disseminated by agents of foreign principals unless the source of such propaganda is identified therein;

S. 2360. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui;

S. 2382. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon;

S. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948; and

S. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2321. An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; and

S. 2325. An act to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5888) entitled "An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two matters.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, two things become most apparent today. One is that the House will not be given a chance to vote on a genuine housing bill that will do something to eliminate the critical housing shortage for veterans in the cities and for veterans on the farms.

It also becomes apparent that the Congress will not adjourn sine die tonight, but will be back here in session. Therefore, I urge you and all Members who want a real housing bill, instead of a phony one, to sign the discharge petition to discharge the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill so that when we come back here after this recess this bill will be up for action and the House will be able to stand up and be counted on how we stand on a genuine and a real housing bill.

CHRONIC SOBBING

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to hear the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the great statesman who was awarded $10,000 and the Collier's certificate of merit as an outstanding Member of the Congress, take the floor and cry and sob and complain about the shortcomings of the Republican Congress—and his sob story he will probably leave out of the RECORD.

He has long been a member of the Democratic, or of the New Deal, I know not which, party in the Congress. For 14 years his party was in control of the Congress or, perhaps more accurately, of the executive branch of the Government, which was a Democratic or a New Deal—shall we say—institution or mouthpiece—perhaps the latter is the better term—for as many long-haired, dizzy crackpots as could conveniently find housing in Washington.

For that period, the Democratic Party—and let us get down to facts—was under the domination of the New Dealers. The majority party was so befuddled, confused, and without leadership, so spineless, that it became known the country over as the "yes man" party, the rubber stamp party. The party organization had no mind of its own; consequently, no will of its own. It merely executed orders which came from the executive branch, of which the New Dealers had control.

It might be said, with a degree of truth, that the gentleman's party dictated the policy of the judicial branch of the Government; that we had in that branch of the Government men who, instead of interpreting the laws enacted by the Congress in accordance with judicial precedence and the will of Congress as expressed in the debates, wrote their ideas of what the Congress should do or imposed them upon the enactments of the Congress.

The gentleman's party organization spent and caused to be spent billions upon billions of dollars, some of it needfully, most of it extravagantly, much of it wastefully. According to some of the reports of congressional committees of which the party which was doing the spending had control, some of the money was spent for political purposes.

The gentleman's party caused to be given to foreign governments, much of it to politicians of other nations, since 1940, something like $80,000,000,000. That does not include the cost of the war to which we were surreptitiously committed and in which we were engaged months before the Congress declared war.

During the war and after the war, as well as prior to the war, the gentleman's party caused other billions to be spent upon unsound projects. Lend-lease, UNRRA, the Voice, to mention but three, have been demonstrated to be the sources for corruption and activities which, instead of being good for the country, were bad—absolutely bad.

Billions upon billions of dollars were spent by the gentleman's party, taken from the taxpayers, and wasted upon socialistic plans and schemes. A million or more unnecessary Federal employees were put upon the Federal pay roll. Millions of dollars were spent on public housing, and while a few were provided with homes, the cost was exorbitant, and the number who were disappointed and disillusioned was far greater than the number of those who actually received a benefit.

Oh, the gentleman can criticize the Republican Party for its failure to cure all of the ills inflicted upon the country during the 14 years his party was in control, but the mess they left us it will take years to clean up. The cleaning of the Aegean stables was but child's play compared to the job which the Republicans inherited from the New Dealers.

Our efforts to do a worth-while job have been obstructed, hindered, delayed, and thwarted by the executive branch of the Government. With an Executive whose agencies cover up the stealing of elections, pardon known gangsters, and who himself assails the Congress and attempts to discredit it in the eyes of the people, it is small wonder that we have been able to accomplish anything worth while.

Yet the fact remains that, in spite of the obstacles thrown in its pathway, notwithstanding the efforts of a President who has time and again vetoed legislation and which—may I say to the gentleman—the members of his own organization have been forced to override, this Congress—the Eightieth Congress—has done a worth-while job.

If the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] can find consolation in forgetfulness of the sins of omission and commission of his own party, whose activities seem destined to involve us in a third world war and to make certain our national bankruptcy, by crying and whining about the Republican Party, I shall not sob, but I do not propose to let the gentleman nor his party forget that, in addition to all the financial ills which we have inherited from his party, we have been confronted with a situation where a majority of the Congress seems to feel that it is necessary to draft our young men, to conscript them, to take them from their homes in order that we may meet a situation which, we are told, threatens our national security and which the gentleman's party in the Congress and in the executive departments—particularly in the State Department—lacks the statesmanship to prevent.

Talking about housing, how can the gentleman expect a returned veteran to get building materials when all the time his organization has been insisting that it and other essential items be sent abroad?

I wonder, sometimes, if there will be lumber enough left in this country to make caskets to bring back the ashes and the bones of those who, if we continue our foolishness, vacillation, and

interference in the problems of other nations, will be what is left of the boys we conscript to back up United Nations.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not true also they had the so-called Wyatt housing bill and spent billions on it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. They had everything. They had the public purse, they had the ability to tax the taxpayers, the citizens of this country. The net results are bankruptcy, hardships for our citizens, higher and ever higher prices, and conscription in peacetime.

The record is so bad, I think the gentleman should hang his head in shame, repent in sackcloth and ashes, and ask the good Lord to forgive his party for the irreparable harm it has done to our citizens, to our Nation.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the gentleman from Oklahoma, absolutely surprised. We had a bill up here yesterday to help the veterans to get more housing, and it will help them, and he voted against that bill. It is a great thing for some of these New Deal Democrat spenders to come in here now at the end of a session and cry "Wolf, wolf, wolf." For 14 years they have had everything their own way, and they did not do what they should have done for some of the people of this country. For 14 long years they have spent money like drunken sailors. They have thrown everything in the category of permanent help to our people to the winds. A lot of people in this country who needed help, they overlooked, yet they go out here now and cry, "Wolf, wolf." There is the gentleman from Texas. He did the same thing; he voted against the housing bill. It is about time that some of these fellows take recognition of what they have done in the past. They cry "Wolf, wolf," and there is no wolf. They try to let veterans know there is no help, it is just the opposite—it gives the greatest help to all veterans. If you will just come to the conclusion that the Republican Party is going to help the people of America instead of selling out to the people in foreign countries, we will do something for our own people.

The housing bill passed yesterday will aid the veterans get more housing than ever before and last year we built the most houses ever built for veterans.

The slum-clearance feature of a bill at this time does not make sense, if they tore down slums now it would increase cost of veterans' houses because it would make materials more scarce and cause the price to be higher. It would work against the veterans.

We can postpone slum clearance for another year because it is sensible to do so and I am for slum clearance and I hope we start here in the District of Columbia, but not this year.

I hope the gentlemen from Oklahoma and Texas stop such criticism as they offer as I think it is anything but just practical or gives the honest situation. Do not try to fool the people any longer. It is not good taste or sound.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 123]

Anderson, Calif.	Gallagher	Meade, Md.
Andresen, August H.	Gamble	Mitchell
Andrews, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norton
Bates, Mass.	Harless, Ariz.	O'Konski
Beckworth	Hartley	Peden
Bell	Hébert	Price, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Isacson	Rains
Buffett	Jackson, Calif.	Regan
Celler	Jensen	Rivers
Chapman	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cox	Kee	Sasscer
Crawford	Kefauver	Scoblick
Cunningham	King	Simpson, Ill.
Dawson, Ill.	Kirwan	Simpson, Pa.
Domengeaux	Lane	Smith, Maine
Dorn	Ludlow	Stigler
Ellsworth	Macy	Stratton
Fellows	Manasco	Taber
Flannagan	Marcantonio	Thomas, N. J.
Fuller	Meade, Ky.	West
		Wolcott

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 369 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WAR CLAIMS BILL OF 1947

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide relief for internees in certain cases, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to say that in my opinion, Congress ought not to adjourn sine die if it means rushing legislation through in this way.

It is doing infinitely more harm than good. If you want to adjourn over for a few days so that you can hold your convention, that is all right; but I do not believe in rushing important legislation through without due consideration.

I am not going to object to sending this bill to conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HINSHAW, O'HARA, HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., CHAPMAN, and BECKWORTH.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the conference report, including the statement on the part of the manager of the House.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the report, I might say, is unanimous.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5888) entitled "An Act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: change the figure "$40,000,000" to read "$450,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 4, of the amendments of the Senate, strike out the words "one fiscal year" and insert in lieu thereof the words two fiscal years;

Page 2, line 12, of the amendments of the Senate, after the word "year" insert the following: ", including any funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Page 2, strike out all of subsection (a) under 2 (a) and on page 3, line 8, strike out "(b)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Page 4, line 8, of the amendments of the Senate, change the figure "$20,000,000" to read "$17,500,000";

Page 5, line 19, change the colon to a period, and strike out the remainder of the paragraph through line 9, on page 6; and the Senate agree to the same.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
E. G. ROHRBOUGH,
J. GLENN BEALL,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
A. J. ELLIOTT,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5888) submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 strikes out the unnecessary word "postwar".

Amendment No. 2 fixes the amount authorized to be appropriated at $450,000,000, $50,000,000 less than the House bill, for each fiscal year.

Amendment No. 3 inserts the word "and", an insertion made necessary by elimination of the authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

Amendment No. 4 eliminates the authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

The Senate conferees, by receding from amendment No. 5, agree to restoration of the House language in lines 11-21, page 2.

Amendment No. 6 advances the latest date on which the apportionment to the States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, must be made to September 1, 1948. Under existing law such apportionment could have been made as late as January 1, 1949.

Amendment No. 7, as agreed to by the conferees, makes the grace period, in which apportionments shall be available for expenditure, 2 years; the House bill provided for 3 years. Also, insertion of the words ", including any funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act," after the word "year", in line 1, page 4, makes more definite the application of the provisions regarding apportionment under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948.

Amendment No. 8, as agreed to by the conferees, strikes out section 2 (a) and thereby eliminates amendment of existing law regarding the Federal share payable on projects on the national system of interstate highways. Subsection (b) becomes section 2.

Amendment No. 9, as agreed to by the conferees, authorizes $20,000,000 for forest highways, as compared to $25,000,000 in the House bill; authorizes $17,500,000 for forest development of roads and trails, as compared to $12,500,000 in the House bill. By changing the colon, after the word "program", in line 17, page 7, and striking out the balance of the language in section 3 (a), the provision is eliminated whereby any State wherein forest highways are located, and where it is not found feasible to expend all of the funds apportioned under section 1 for the purposes for which such funds were so apportioned, the Commissioner of Public Roads in his discretion, and upon application in writing by the State highway department of the State, could agree to pay, from the funds apportioned under section 1 to the State, any or all of the funds which are not covered by formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of specific projects, for payment up to the full cost of the construction of forest highways across national-forest lands within the State.

Section 3 (b) of amendment No. 9 cancels the authorization in section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

Section 3 (c) of amendment No. 9 provides that—

Hereafter, construction work on forest-development roads and trails, pursuant to the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as amended and supplemented, estimated to cost $10,000 or more per mile, exclusive of bridges, shall be advertised and let to contract. If such estimated cost is less than $10,000 per mile, or if, after proper advertising, no acceptable bid is received, or the bids are deemed excessive, the work may be done by the Secretary of Agriculture on his own account.

Amendment No. 10 changes a section designation; amendments Nos. 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 18 are made necessary by elimination of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

Amendment No. 11 increases the amount authorized for the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, from $4,250,000 in the House bill to $10,000,000.

Amendment No. 14 was receded to by the Senate conferees, leaving the authorizations for access roads to national parks and Indian reservation roads, but in each instance eliminating the authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

Amendment No. 19 merely changes a section designation.

Amendment No. 20 corresponds to H. R. 3759, passed by the House on July 7, 1947, and increased the percent for administrative costs from 2½ percent to 3¾ percent.

Amendment No. 21 merely changes a section designation.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
J. GLENN BEALL,
E. G. ROHRBOUGH,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
A. J. ELLIOTT,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2849) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to say that the Veterans' Committee went into this proposition fully. We think this measure is justified.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to Washington County, Ark., without consideration, the following-described tract of land, which is a part of the lands of the Veterans' Administration hospital, Fayetteville, Washington County, Ark.:

A part of the southeast quarter of northeast quarter of section 9 and a part of the southwest quarter of northwest quarter of section 10, township 16 north, range 30 west, fifth principal meridian, more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the southwest corner of southeast quarter of northeast quarter of said section 9, running thence north 200 feet; thence east 530 feet; thence north 50 degrees 18 minutes east 234$^{85}/_{100}$ feet; thence east 744$^{11}/_{100}$ feet to the center of said United States Highway No. 71; thence south 2 degrees 2 minutes west along center of said United States Highway No. 71 350$^{24}/_{100}$ feet; thence west 1,442$^{40}/_{100}$ feet to the place of beginning, containing 9$^{96}/_{100}$ acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, insert after the word "directed" the words "subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 17, insert: "The deed shall reserve to the United States all interest in and to any oil, mineral, or fissionable material in said land, and shall provide for reversion to the United States if the land ceases to be used for hospital purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SOMERS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GORDON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article and an editorial.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CROSSER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include certain articles.

Mr. SABATH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two different instances and to include an editorial from the New York Times, and two additional articles.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BULWINKLE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert various clippings from newspapers.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two different instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include an editorial in each.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some excerpts and letters from constituents.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include two newspaper editorials and a magazine column.

Mr. CHAPMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

Mr. PRIEST asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a transcript of a program held in the Press Gallery honoring the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters and information from the Veterans' Administration, and certain newspaper articles.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 122, the housing bill, I am recorded as not voting. I was unavoidably detained on official business. Had I been present I would have voted in favor of that measure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on research in the Quartermaster Corps, notwithstanding the fact that the article may slightly exceed the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Maryland) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include an article from the Women's Investors' League.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances, one on the late Thomas L. Owen, one on veterans' legislation, and in one to include a telegram on parachutes for airplanes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include quotations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous material. In one I ask unanimous consent to include the Meet the Press program of a recent date. This will probably slightly exceed the limit established by he Joint Committee on Printing. The Government Printing Office has not supplied the figure. Notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests of the gentleman from Nebraska are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MacKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of the Red Lake Indians, and the per capita payment to Indians.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in answer to President Truman and his farm set-up.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. ISACSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

PATMAN WITHDRAWS RESTRAINING AMENDMENT CONCERNING PERU

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today withdrawing my proposed amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act which I introduced a few days ago in the House Banking and Currency Committee. This amendment would have prohibited loans to countries who had failed to live up to their agreements with the United States. This proposal was the result of action on the part of Peru in suspending the operating permit of Braniff International Airways into Lima. The reason for my change of position is that the Government of Peru Thursday lifted the Braniff suspension, and Braniff Airways is now able to inaugurate service into Lima, effective immediately.

UNITED STATES MUCH IN COMMON WITH PERU

I am only too happy to learn of the decision of the Government of Peru to lift the Braniff suspension. Peru has worked side by side with us during the war. They have stood shoulder to shoulder with the United States in many problems before the United Nations. We want to maintain the friendly relations with Peru which have existed these many years.

COLOMBIA, ARGENTINA, AND MEXICO

It is my sincere hope that the Governments of Colombia, Argentina, and Mexico will soon complete the Bilateral Air Transport Agreements with the United States which have been under discussion for many months. Nothing would bring our countries closer together than rapid means of transportation, and nothing would pour dollars into these countries quicker than an air line bringing in tourists and businessmen.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on a uniform American pension.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that this Congress has not done more to provide a reasonable and uniform American pension for the aged of this country. I have, from time to time, raised my voice not only in the Third Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent in Congress, but elsewhere pleading that something really constructive be done about this matter.

When I think of the billions and billions, and then more billions of dollars that have been appropriated by this Congress for so-called foreign aids of all kinds, the major portion of which money can be considered as having been poured down a rat hole, I think the least that we could have done was to have given more consideration to our aged here at home. It is this group of people who, over the past generations, have done their part to bring America forward to the great nation that we are today. They certainly are entitled to and should have received more consideration than has been given them. It is appalling when we consider that all we have done for our aged is approximately raise the figure of assistance of $1 a day to $1.17 a day on an average. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues agree with me that this can only be considered little or nothing in view of the increased cost of living that has taken place in the last few years. It really amounts to nothing more than a moderate-priced dessert for one meal. As my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GERALD LANDIS], has put it, this leaves nothing for breakfast, nothing for dinner, nothing for housing, nothing for medical care, and nothing for the myriads of incidentals so necessary to the security and comfort to which they are entitled in the twilight of life.

Mr. Speaker, we should all stand and bow our heads in shame for what we have failed to do for the honored and respected mothers and fathers of our country to whom we owe so much. For Europe we say, "How much does it take?" Then we appropriate it. Why not say with respect to our elder citizens, "How much do they need?" and then appropriate that? That is, in my opinion, the least we can do with any conscience. Is it so much worse, Mr. Speaker, to be hungry and cold in Europe than it is in America? God forbid. Cold and hunger are no respecters of persons or places.

Do we feel so much more concern for the poor in Europe than we do in America? Whom do we as Representatives in the Congress really represent?

I know not what course other Members of this great legislative body propose to take, but as for myself, I shall continue to raise my voice to the best of my ability and strive to do something for our aged.

When we assumed our most solemn obligation to discharge the duties of our offices as Members of the Congress in support of the Constitution of the United States, we obligated ourselves to "promote the general welfare and make secure the liberties" of the people of this country. That is our first and most solemn duty, Mr. Speaker. I am agreeable to being a good neighbor to other countries, but I also believe that charity begins at home. Our first duty is to the citizens of this country. I cannot, therefore, reconcile myself to the idea of billions for foreign countries and mere "beans" for the fathers and mothers who preserved and made this country a great nation.

I am sincerely convinced that a great many of our bureaus in the executive department of our Government are thoroughly unnecessary and if the proper economy measures were taken in the right places billions of dollars could be stricken from our budget and more than enough money left over after making a substantial payment on our national debt to provide a uniform American pension that would be hailed by people in every walk of life as one of the greatest social advancements of our age. This seems to me not only the American way of doing things but also the Christian thing to do.

The united pension program sponsored by the gentleman from Indiana, Representative LANDIS, is, in my opinion, reasonable and just. It would provide for a uniform payment to the elder citizens of our country and certainly is not out of line when we stop to consider the high cost of living in these reconstruction days. This program is not promoted to glorify any individual or any organization either in Congress or out of Congress, but is a sincere desire on the part of many people to recognize a pressing American problem and to strive to do something about it. This matter, in my opinion, should be given earnest and prayerful consideration and should be enacted into law. Failure of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, to do something about this urgent problem may be responsible for bringing about untold suffering and hardships upon millions of our elder citizens this coming winter. This is one of the emergencies which should have been given proper consideration and legislation passed to correct the deplorable condition. Even at this late hour, it is my hope that this Congress will do something about it before we adjourn and go home. The responsibility is ours and should be acted upon now.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of God and for the sake of the aged of this country let us assume our responsibility and take care of them.

Before taking my seat I cannot help but pay tribute to the many people who have worked so diligently and tirelessly to bring the attention of Congress to this grave problem, and to those Members of Congress who have banded themselves together in this cause. These patriotic men and women who have a great love for our country and a sincere desire to assist in bringing about proper recognition for our elder citizens. God bless them and give them strength to carry on the fight.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BATES of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GWINN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech on labor legislation.

COLUMBIA RIVER FLOODS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, we in the great Pacific Northwest are thankful that the flood waters are receding, but it will be several weeks before the submerged lands are uncovered and an appraisal and survey can be made of the destruction wrought and the actual property damage as well as the accurate determination of the lives lost. The Department of Agriculture reports that loss in farm crops and production alone in the Washington-Oregon-Idaho areas will approximate nearly $10,000,000. The loss to buildings privately owned, Federal and public structures and facilities cannot be accurately determined at this time.

I include for the information of the House Members the following reports which give such information as is available now:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 16, 1948.

FLOOD DAMAGE TO FARMS IN COLUMBIA BASIN ESTIMATED

Lost farm production income estimated for this year in the areas of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho devastated by the Columbia River flood waters will approximate nearly $10,000,000, according to preliminary advance estimates sent to Secretary Charles F. Brannan, of the United States Department of Agriculture, today by George T. Hudson, special representative of the Secretary stationed in the Pacific Northwest to coordinate efforts of the Department agencies in behalf of flood sufferers.

In making their estimates, the Department observers in the stricken areas did not include part-time farmers or nonfarm rural residents in the first list of damages. It is also exclusive of flood damage now being surveyed and reported by the Forest Service on upper watersheds. Likewise, possible damage to public roads, bridges, rural electric power lines or telephone lines are not included in any survey to date.

To date, the best available flood damage figures furnished to the Department of Agriculture by State USDA councils and other agency specialists include the following for Washington and Oregon farms, which are sketchy and incomplete pending further surveys:

Washington State: One thousand three hundred and seventy-five farms affected, with rehabilitation costs placed at $1,375,000; acres of farm land inundated, 104,000; cropland or cultivated pasture flooded, 52,135 acres; cost to return cropland to normal cultivation, $781,900; cows evacuated, 11,500 head; hay requirements to next pasture season, 20,000 tons valued at $700,000; seed requirements, 263,800 pounds, worth $205,000; grain feed requirements, 10,625 tons worth $1,062,500; fences destroyed, 1,955 miles, to cost $627,000 for replacement; 880 farm buildings damaged or destroyed at a cost to rehabilitate of $2,279,500; fertilizer needed, 5,000 tons worth $375,000; farm bridges to rebuild or repair at cost of $200,000; repair of damaged farm roads, $50,000; loss of home-grown food estimated at $137,500, and personal property damages valued at about $1,330,000. In addition special needs must be met in Chelan, Douglas, and Pend Oreille Counties at cost of about $272,000, the estimate concludes.

Oregon estimates: Eight hundred farms affected with rehabilitation costs put at $450,000; acres of farm land inundated, 50,000; cropland or cultivated pasture flooded, 26,000 acres; cost to return cropland to normal cultivation, $390,000; number of cows

evacuated, 5,400 head; hay requirements to next pasture season, 12,150 tons at a value of $425,000; seed requirements, $490,000 for replanting mint and seeding pasture and hay crops; grain feed requirements, 4,050 tons worth $405,000; fences destroyed, 500 miles, to cost $157,000 for replacement; 450 farm buildings damaged or destroyed at a rebuilding and repair cost of $1,350,000; fertilizer needed, 1,000 tons, worth $75,000; $50,000 for repair of farm bridges; $20,000 for repair of farm roads; loss of home-grown food, $45,000; and personal-property damages estimated at $225,000.

Loss of income from crops and livestock, in addition to the current flood damage rehabilitation costs, is estimated for Washington, Oregon, and Idaho farms at $9,863,000.

DIGEST OF REPORT FROM L. R. DURKEE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY, PORTLAND, JUNE 16, 1948

Columbia and Willamette are dropping faster than estimated with prospects of 2-foot recession by Saturday. Portland level down to 29.35 and Vancouver stage at 29.6 Tuesday noon. River forecaster Elmer Fisher expects river at Portland to be 28.4 Thursday, 27.9 Friday, and 27.5 Saturday.

Down-river dikes, seriously saturated, described as still critical, but no new breaks reported. Levee repairs on upper Puget Island about completed which will permit faster drainage of flooded acreage below, and the Columbia slough, filling the Multnomah drainage district northeast of Portland since Friday morning, has been plugged at both ends. Army engineers expressed hope their battle was nearing an end.

Flood levels started dropping on the upper Columbia 4 days ago and in British Columbia the flood-control commission announced recessions in the Frazer River Valley.

Known dead attributable to the flood placed at 42, missing at 28.

Red Cross case load in Oregon and Washington numbered 8,523 families Tuesday, homeless families 43,440. It is sheltering 3,533 individuals and feeding 19,354. Peak case load registration expected to reach 12,000 families.

Red Cross emergency relief expenditures so far approximately $600,000 for food, clothing, some shelter, and hay for cattle.

Housing: Dr. J. Bion Philipson, representing Foley, arrived Monday, visited Vancouver Tuesday with Epstein and Portland-Vancouver Housing Authority. Floyd S. Ratchford, Vancouver, said 22 apartment wings at Ogden Meadows would be renovated, work starting today and first families moving in July 1. Rearrangement will provide 43 three-room units, 88 two-room, and 12 one-room units. The buildings were up for sale 3 days before the Vanport disaster. Bids were returned and the sale canceled. Cost estimate for work is $400,000 to come out of $10,000,000 flood-relief fund.

Ten buildings being renovated at Vancouver Barracks include four barracks-type buildings to be made into 128 three- and four-bedroom apartments, three apartments to house 26 families and two nurses' homes to be developed into 16 apartments. Believe War Assets would make more buildings available at the deactivated Army post. About 1,300 evacuees already housed at Swan Island.

Unable yet to get working figure on estimated number of housing units needed. Two hundred eighty-three trailers expected by Thursday at Guilds Lake housing site, under FWA assignment. Been coming in since Saturday from Stockton and 100 due Wednesday afternoon on 50 flatcars from San Antonio. A trailer city is growing on the housing site. Water and sewers ready to be hooked up.

Phillipson unwilling to guess number of houses needed, everybody else reluctant to hazard opinion at this time, among the Federal men.

FWA: Large amounts of materials, expendable and inexpendable, are converging on Portland by trains, trucks, and vans. Beds, mattresses, and bedding for more than 1,500 families, other furniture, mobile unexpendable equipment out of WAA surplus, are being assigned to various areas of the disaster district. Formal applications for such assistance are being received from towns, counties, and diking districts. The big impact of the movement has not yet arrived, but eight carloads of additional furniture, including 560 beds, mattresses, chests, chairs, and tables would reach the FWA warehouse on Swan Island by tonight. Twenty-five vanloads of furniture and expendable equipment from housing projects and military installations in Texas, Arkansas, New Mexico, and Kansas were expected in Portland by Sunday. An additional 25 vanloads of materials and equipment, including furniture, have been loaded at Willow Run, Mich.; Ottawa, Ill., and Manitowoc, Wis., for shipment here.

Movement of nonexpendable equipment into the flood-disaster areas about Bonners Ferry, Orofino, and St. Maries, Idaho, includes 32 Quonset huts in transit from Cincinnati to replace city and county buildings lost in the flood at Orofino. Equipment also includes dump trucks, drag lines, a bulldozer, and lumber for rebuilding bridges. Materials were moving into the Kootenai River flood areas from the Ogden Army depot and WAA warehouses in Spokane and San Francisco, and included 43,000 feet of cable, power shovels, and trucks, a suction dredge, pile driver, and steam cleaning unit. Also included were DDT spray and portable sprayers. A water-purification system for Bonners Ferry was located at the University of Idaho.

Have assigned a fire pumper truck located by WAA in Portland to the mayor of Clatskanie.

Public health: Dr. H. M. Erickson, Oregon State health director, and Porter Stephens, in charge of the Portland-Vancouver area for the State sanitary service, report excellent cooperation with USPHS, Department of the Interior, FWA, and other Federal agencies. The present need is for prompt immunization and typhoid vaccine has been received in sufficient quantities. Sanitary engineers have been sent to the flood area from Atlanta, New Orleans, and San Francisco, with Federal entomologists. The environmental sanitation problem will grow as the water recedes, the work of mosquito and fly eradication is already proceeding. In the Oregon-Washington area 10,000 pounds of 40-percent DDT, 400 pounds of 100-percent DDT, and 3,000 gallons of oil are now available.

Interior expects more funds by July 1 for its work on rat control. Col. Roy Bessey, executive director for the Pacific Northwest region, says that mobile and electrical equipment and transportation services have been supplied to flooded areas.

Public roads, FWA: The Union Avenue cut-off is now serving for emergency travel, busses, milk, vegetables, and other perishables. Public Roads Administration engineers in Washington, Montana, and Idaho are reporting on the condition of roads, and the State highway departments in Washington and Oregon are taking care of emergency traffic with detours and temporary work, such as sandbagging between Portland and Longview, Wash.

Department of Agriculture: Reports engineering assistance and the assignment of equipment, bulldozers, drag lines, etc., in rehabilitation of irrigation work in Okanogan County, and the Methow and Kittitas Valleys, in Washington, and in northern Idaho. (Don't know about the reported $1,400,000 residue from 1942 act.)

Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Receiving some applications for loans for repair or rebuilding of barns and other farm buildings, William Kennedy, Portland manager, said. Reconstruction Finance Corporation has opened offices in Woodland, Rainier, and Vancouver. To examiners from Cleveland and two from San Francisco, experienced in disaster work, have been assigned to Portland. An anticipated situation of considerable gravity is expected as the flood waters recede.

Pacific Northwest floods

(Compiled from latest reports and issued by Disaster Relief Service, American Red Cross, June 15, 1948)

	Number of families affected	Number needing Red Cross aid	Number of families registered	Number of homes destroyed	Number of homes damaged	Number of persons made homeless	Number of persons in Red Cross shelters	Number of persons fed by Red Cross
Montana:								
Flathead County	55	39	8		35			
Lincoln County	60	20			60			
Sanders County	15	6			15			
Lake County	15	4			10			
Missoula and Mineral Counties	15	5			15			
Ravalli County	5	4			5			
Cascade County	65	15			40			
Total	220	93	8	0	170	0	0	0
Idaho:								
Benewah County	60	40	22	1	60	100		
Bonner County	50	10			40	30		
Boundary County	330	280	100	35	200	1,400		
Clearwater County	150	100	50		50			
Idaho County	195	135	180	25	60	60		
Nez Perce County	25	2	6		1			
Shoshone County	10	7	2	1	10	55		
Total	1,240	674	363	62	521	1,645	0	0

Pacific Northwest floods—Continued

(Compiled from latest reports and issued by Disaster Relief Service, American Red Cross, June 15, 1948)

	Number of families affected	Number needing Red Cross aid	Number of families registered	Number of homes destroyed	Number of homes damaged	Number of persons made homeless	Number of persons in Red Cross shelters	Number of persons fed by Red Cross
Washington:								
Spokane County	15							29
Benton County	1,349	175	377	1	437	5,400	113	149
Franklin County	300	100	140	2	148	900	30	70
Okanogan County	500	200	56	55	370	244		
Chelan County	95	40	12		60	200		
Kittitas County	103	24	5		60	60		
Walla Walla County	30	4	5		4	22		
Yakima County	600	150	352	25	246	700		555
Clark County	3,550	795	859		524	2,200	85	1,600
Cowlitz County	1,600	344	314	10	365	7,400	575	1,230
Wahkiakum County	275	200	225		140	1,050	30	250
Whitman County	16	8	8		3	1		
Skamania County	3	1	1		1			
Grant County	25	8	3		23	6		
Pend Oreille County	300	150	65	1	184	600		
Douglas County	60	20	5		35	120		
Klickitat County	3				3			
Total	9,124	2,219	2,457	93	2,703	18,903	533	3,874
Oregon:								
Clatsop County	40	3	9		18			
Umatilla County	18	18			6	8		
Wasco County	24	17	17	2	16	24,900	3,000	15,000
Multnomah County (Portland)	7,800	6,380	6,152	[1] 5,042	142	860		500
Columbia County	395	295	67	15				
Sherman County	15							
Union County	1							
Clackamas County	1	1	1		1			
Total	8,294	6,714	6,246	5,059	183	25,768	3,000	15,500
Grand total	18,987	9,700	9,074	5,214	3,577	46,316	3,863	19,374

[1] On the last report a footnote indicated "Represents 4,000 living units in Government housing project buildings."

Distribution: President O'Connor; United States Senators and Representatives from Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon; headquarters management; area managers. Copies also sent to: General Fleming, Federal Works; Mr. Egan, Public Housing; Mr. Foley, Housing and Home Finance; Colonel Morrell, FWA.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

JUNE 17, 1948.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE MEMBERS THEREOF:

This is to notify you that I have resigned as a Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Indiana, effective at the close of the day, July 1, 1948, and have transmitted my resignation to the Governor of the State of Indiana, a copy of such resignation so transmitted is hereto attached.

NOBLE JOHNSON.

To the GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF INDIANA:

This is to notify you that the undersigned, a Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Indiana, hereby and by this instrument resigns as such Representative in Congress, said resignation to take effect on the 1st day of July 1948.

Dated this 17th day of June 1948.

NOBLE JOHNSON.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

JUNE 19, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on appropriations.

Respectfully yours,

NOBLE JOHNSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION ON THE COURTS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK WITH RESPECT TO OFFENSES COMMITTED ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1683) to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of New York shall have jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations within the State of New York to the same extent as the courts of the State have jurisdiction over offenses committed elsewhere within the State as defined by the laws of the State.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any Indian tribe, band, or community, or members thereof, hunting and fishing rights as guaranteed them by agreement, treaty, or custom, nor require them to obtain State fish and game licenses for the exercise of such rights."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION ON THE STATE OF IOWA OVER OFFENSES COMMITTED BY OR AGAINST INDIANS ON THE SAC AND FOX INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1820) to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa for offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation in that State to the same extent as its courts have jurisdiction generally over offenses committed within said State outside of any Indian reservation: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall deprive the courts of the United States of jurisdiction over offenses defined by the laws of the United States committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE WARM SPRINGS RESERVATION OF OREGON

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1243) to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm

Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what this bill is all about?

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, this has to do with certain lands adjoining a national forest in Oregon, formerly held by the Indians in that area. It is proposed in this bill to give the revenues from this national forest to the Indians, but the land is to be administered by the National Forest Administration.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, is this S. 580?

Mr. D'EWART. It is S. 1243.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what happened to the provision with respect to attorney's fees?

Mr. D'EWART. Section 3 is stricken from the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) all money received by or on account of the Forest Service or other agency of the United States after the dismissal of the proceeding in the Court of Claims entitled "The Warm Springs Tribe of Indians of Oregon versus the United States," numbered M–112, for timber (on a stumpage basis) grown on, the lease or rental of, or other rights in, the lands described in subsection (b) of this section shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, pursuant to the provisions of the Act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560). The funds so deposited together with any other funds credited to the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Spring Reservation of Oregon under said act shall be available for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of said Confederated Tribes and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The sixth paragraph under the heading "Forest Service" of the act of May 23, 1908, and section 13 of the act of March 1, 1911, both as amended (16 U. S. C., sec. 500), and the fourteenth paragraph under the heading "Forest Service" of the act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C., sec. 501), shall not be applicable to the money so received.

(b) The lands referred to in subsection (a) of this section are described as follows:

All lands of the United States included within the Mount Hood National Forest in the State of Oregon and lying and being within an area bounded by a line beginning at a point in the middle of the channel of the Deschutes River, established as the initial point of the Handley survey of 1871; thence in a direct line northwestwardly to the seven-and-one-half-mile post of the McQuinn survey of 1887; thence continuing northwestwardly along the line of the McQuinn survey to the 30-mile post thereof at Little Dark Butte in the Cascade Mountains; thence following the McQuinn survey southwestwardly in a direct line to the summit of Mount Jefferson; thence northeastwardly in a direct line to the western terminus of the northern boundary of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation as established by the act of June 6, 1894 (28 Stat. 86); thence along said northern boundary to the place of beginning.

(c) The lands described in subsection (b) of this section shall continue to be administered by the departments and agencies now administering them.

SEC. 2. The benefits herein granted to the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of such Indians asserted in the above-mentioned proceeding in the Court of Claims. Any remaining jurisdiction of the Court of Claims with respect to such proceeding is hereby withdrawn, and no court or commission shall have jurisdiction over the subject matter of such proceeding.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall determine the proper fees to be paid to the attorneys of said Confederated Tribes as full compensation for services rendered and amounts necessarily expended by them in representing the tribes in the above-mentioned proceeding. Such fees shall be paid out of the tribal funds of said Confederated Tribes: *Provided*, That no payment on account of said fees in any year shall exceed 50 percent of the sums received by said Confederated Tribes in said year under the terms of this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall not become effective unless the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon accept its provisions, in such manner as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, within 1 year after the approval hereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 20, strike out all of section 3.

Page 4, line 5, strike out "4" and insert "3."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VALIDATING CONVEYANCES OF THE OREGON SHORT LINE RAILROAD CO. AND THE UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2371) validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyances.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain this bill?

Mr. D'EWART. This bill clears the title to a fraction of an acre of land along the rights-of-way of these railroads on which an elevator and a mill has been built. It was formerly owned by the Indians, and a flaw has developed in the title. This simply clears the title of this fraction of an acre of ground.

Mr. RICH. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That that certain conveyance made by Oregon Short Line Railroad Co., a corporation of Utah, to the Colorado Milling & Elevator Co., a corporation of Colorado, dated September 30, 1927, and recorded April 25, 1932, at 9:02 a. m. in book 68 of deeds at page 42, records of Bannock County, Idaho, and covering the following-described land located in Bannock County, Idaho, to wit: A tract of land one hundred feet wide and one hundred and forty feet long in northeast quarter of southwest quarter of section 26, township 6, south, range 34 east, of Boise meridian, and more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the present northeasterly corner of right-of-way of Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. opposite and west of block 329 of townsite of Pocatello, said corner bearing south thirty-three degrees forty-two minutes twenty seconds east three thousand four hundred and sixty-one and three-tenths feet from northwest corner of said section 26; thence south eight degrees forty-one minutes east along present easterly right-of-way boundary of said railroad company, one hundred and forty feet; thence south eighty-one degrees nineteen minutes west one hundred feet; thence north eight degrees forty-one minutes west one hundred and forty feet to point in the present northerly right-of-way boundary of said railroad company; thence north eighty-one degrees nineteen minutes east along said northerly right-of-way boundary one hundred feet to point of beginning, and containing in all thirty-two one-hundredths of an acre, more or less; and that certain conveyance made by the Union Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation of Utah, to the Colorado Milling & Elevator Co., a corporation of Colorado, dated April 28, 1941, and recorded May 29, 1941, at 2:14 p. m. in book 84 of deeds at page 183, records of Bannock County, Idaho, and covering the following-described land located in Bannock County, Idaho, to wit: A tract of land one hundred feet wide and one hundred and forty feet long in northeast quarter of southwest quarter of section 26, township 6 south, range 34 east, of Boise meridian and more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the present northeasterly corner of right-of-way of Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. opposite and west of block 329 of townsite of Pocatello, said corner being southeasterly corner of that certain tract of land conveyed by Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to the Colorado Milling & Elevator Co. by quit claim deed dated September 30, 1927, and recorded April 25, 1932, in book 68 at page 42 of deeds, records of Bannock County; thence south eight degrees forty-one minutes east along said right-of-way boundary one hundred and forty feet; thence south eighty-one degrees nineteen minutes west one hundred feet; thence north eight degrees forty-one minutes west one hundred and forty feet; thence north eighty-one degrees nineteen minutes east one hundred feet to point of beginning, and containing thirty-two one-hundredths of an acre, more or less; which said lands heretofore formed part of the right-of-way, station grounds, and yards of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. granted by the United States of America to the Utah & Northern Railway Co., predecessor of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co., by act of Congress dated September 1, 1888, or by any other act of Congress, are hereby legalized, validated, and confirmed and all title and all rights of reverter or forfeiture of the United States of America in or to the lands described in said conveyances, as provided in the act of September 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 452), or otherwise, is hereby waived, relinquished, and disclaimed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO THE ARMING OF AMERICAN VESSELS

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1107) relating to the arming of American vessels.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during time of war or national emergency the President is authorized, through such agency or agencies of the National Military Establishment as he may designate, to arm, or to permit or cause to be armed, any American vessel as defined in the Neutrality Act of 1939. For the purposes of this act, the term "national emergency" means any time at which the President determines that the security of the United States is threatened through the application, or imminent danger of the application, of physical force by any foreign government or agency against the United States, its citizens, their property, or commercial interests. The provisions of section 16 of the Criminal Code (relating to bonds from armed vessels on clearing) shall not apply to any such vessel.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall become effective on July 1, 1948.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CANAL ZONE CODE

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2747) to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is the policy of this act, incorporating the Panama Railroad Company pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Government Corporation Control Act, approved December 6, 1945, for the purpose of conducting business activities incident to the care, maintenance, sanitation, operation, improvement, government, and protection of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone; to preserve the authority vested in the President by the Panama Canal Act of August 24, 1912; to govern and operate the Panama Canal and govern the Canal Zone, or cause them to be governed and operated, through a Governor of the Panama Canal and such other persons as he may deem competent to discharge the various duties connected with the care, maintenance, sanitation, operation, government, and protection of the Canal and Canal Zone. Also it is the policy of this act that the operations in the Canal Zone shall continue to be coordinated, through the President, in order that the responsibility for and authority over this important utility shall not be divided.

REINCORPORATION OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY

SEC. 2. Chapter 12 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122), is amended by adding at the end of said chapter a new article numbered 3, embracing new sections 245 to 256 of said title 2, and reading as follows:

"ARTICLE 3—PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY ACT

"245. Creation, purpose, offices, and residence of Panama Railroad Company: For the purpose of conducting business operations incident to the care, maintenance, sanitation, operation, improvement, government, and protection of the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone, there is hereby created, as an agency and instrumentality of the United States, and as an adjunct of the Panama Canal, a body corporate to be known as the Panama Railroad Company, hereinafter referred to as the 'corporation'. The principal offices of the corporation shall be in the city of New York, N. Y., and in the Canal Zone, but the corporation may establish agencies or branch offices in such other place or places as it may deem necessary or appropriate in the conduct of its business. Within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to venue in civil actions, the corporation shall be deemed to be an inhabitant and resident both of the southern judicial district of New York and of the Canal Zone.

"246. Investment of the United States: (a) As of the beginning of business July 1, 1948, the corporaton shall issue to the United States, and deliver to the Secretary of the Treasury, a receipt for $1 acknowledging the transfer to the corporation, under the provisions of section 251 of this title, of the net assets of the Panama Railroad Company, hereinafter referred to as the 'New York company', a corporation created by an act of the Legislature of the State of New York passed on April 7, 1849, as amended by an act of that legislature passed on April 12, 1855, and which is wholly owned by the United States, and such receipt shall be evidence of the ownership of the corporation by the United States of America. In its capacity as owner of the corporation, the United States shall be represented by the President of the United States or such officer of the United States as may be designated by him, hereinafter referred to as the 'stockholders'.

"(b) The amount of the receipt (referred to in paragraph (a) above) shall be increased by subsequent additional direct investments of the United States, in excess of repayments to the Treasury and extraordinary expenditures and losses applicable as offsets to such investments under the provisions of paragraph (d) of this section, due to (1) funds advanced to the corporation from the Treasury within such appropriations by the Congress as may from time to time be made to meet increased capital needs, and (2) transfers to the corporation from other Government agencies (or, conversely, decreased by transfers from the corporation to other Government agencies), pursuant to applicable provisions of law, of business enterprises, facilities, appurtenances, and other assets, less liabilites assumed in connection with such transfers. Transfers of properties and other assets from or to other Government agencies under clause (2) above shall be at such appropriate amount or amounts as shall be agreed upon between the corporation and the agencies concerned and approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and in the determination thereof due consideration shall be given to the cost and probable earning power of the transferred assets, or usable value to the transferee if clearly less than cost, and adequate provisions made for depreciation of properties and equipment, obsolete or otherwise unusable inventories, and other reasonably determinable shrinkages in values, and, insofar as practicable, there shall be excluded from such amount any portion of the value of the transferred property which is properly allocable to national defense. The board of directors shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of each such transfer, the amount of any accumulated repayments to the Treasury or extraordinary expenditures or losses applicable as offsets to the amount of such transfer under the provisions of paragraph (d) of this section, and the effective date of the transfer.

"(c) In order to reimburse the Treasury, as nearly as possible, for the interest cost of the funds or other assets directly invested in the corporation, the corporation shall pay interest to the Treasury, at least annually, on the net direct investment of the Government in the corporation, as defined in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, and shown by the receipt described therein, at a rate or rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as required to reimburse the Treasury for its cost.

"(d) The corporation shall account for its surplus as follows: (1) The total net income from operations from and after 1904 (when the Government acquired control of the New York company), plus the undistributed net income prior to 1904, less (2) payments to the Treasury as dividends from and after 1904, not applied as offsets to direct capital contributions as described below, and less (3) extraordinary expenditures or losses incurred through directives based on national policy and not related to the operations of the corporation, not reimbursed through specific appropriations by the Congress, and not applied as offsets to direct capital contributions as described below. The corporation shall not be required to pay interest to the Treasury on any part of its surplus, as above defined. Repayments to the Treasury as dividends shall be applicable as offsets against directly contributed capital, past or future, in determining the base for the interest payments required under paragraph (c) of this section. Extraordinary expenditures and losses (as defined in clause 3 above), to the extent not reimbursed through specific appropriations, shall be considered as repayments to the Treasury analogous to dividends and similarly applicable as offsets against directly contributed capital.

"247. Board of Directors: The management of the corporation shall be vested in a board of directors consisting of not less than 9 nor more than 13 persons who shall be appointed by and hold office at the pleasure of the stockholder, or, if he so elects, consisting of the stockholder and 8 to 12 other persons: *Provided*, That the Governor of the Panama Canal shall be a director and president of the corporation. Before entering upon his duties, each of the directors so appointed shall take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office. The directors shall receive no salary for their services on the board, but under regulations and in amounts prescribed by the board of directors, with the approval of the stockholder, may be paid by the corporation a reasonable per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence expenses in connection with attendance at meetings of the board or in connection with the time spent on special service of the corporation, and their traveling expenses to and from meetings or when upon such special service, without regard to the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, or the Standardized Government Travel Regulations. Nothing contained in this article or in any other act shall be construed to prevent the appointment and service, as a director, officer, or employe of the corporation, of any officer or employee of the United States. The directors, of whom a majority shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, shall meet for organization purposes

when and where called by the stockholder, and for subsequent meetings as provided by the bylaws.

"248. General powers of corporation: The corporation shall have and may exercise the following general powers, in addition to those elsewhere conferred in this article:

"(a) Shall have perpetual succession in its corporate name, unless dissolved by act of Congress.

"(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

"(c) May adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws governing the conduct of its general business, and the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law.

"(d) May sue and be sued in its corporate name.

"(e) May appoint such officers, agents, attorneys, and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the corporation, define their authority and duties, fix their compensation, delegate to them such of the powers of the corporation as may be necessary, require that such of them as it may designate be bonded, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums of such bonds. Persons employed by the corporation whose compensation is paid on any basis other than a per annum basis shall not be included in making computations pursuant to the provisions of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945.

"(f) May enter into contracts, leases, agreements, or other transactions.

"(g) Shall have, in the payment of debts out of bankrupt estates, the priority of the United States.

"(h) May determine the character of and necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, and may incur, allow, and pay the same, subject to pertinent provisions of law generally applicable to Government corporations.

"(i) May purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, and hold, own, maintain, work, develop, sell, lease, exchange, convey, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of, and deal in, lands, leaseholds, and any interest, estate, or rights in real property, and any personal or mixed property, and any franchises, concessions, rights, licenses, or privileges necessary or appropriate for any of the purposes expressed in this article.

"249. Specific powers of corporation: Subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, the corporation shall have and may exercise the following specific powers, in addition to those elsewhere conferred in this article:

"(a) May construct, maintain, and operate a railroad across the Isthmus of Panama.

"(b) May construct or acquire vessels, and operate the same for transportation of passengers or freight and for other purposes.

"(c) May construct or acquire, establish, maintain, and operate docks, wharves, piers, harbor terminal facilities, shops, yards, marine railways, salvage and towing facilities, fuel-handling facilities, motor-transportation facilities, power systems, water systems, a telephone system, construction facilities, living quarters and other buildings, warehouses, storehouses, hotels, a printing plant, commissaries and manufacturing, processing or service facilities in connection therewith, laundries, dairy facilities, restaurants, amusement and recreational facilities, and other business enterprises, facilities, and appurtenances necessary or appropriate for the accomplishment of the purposes of this article.

"(d) May make or furnish sales, services, equipment, supplies, and materials, as contemplated by this article, to vessels, to agencies of the Government of the United States, to employees of the Government of the United States, and to any other governments, agencies, persons, corporations, or associations eligible to make or receive such purchases, services, supplies, or materials under the laws prevailing at the time and the policies heretofore or hereafter adopted consistently with such laws.

"(e) May use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

"(f) May take such actions as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the powers in this article or hereafter specifically conferred upon it: *Provided*, That the corporation shall undertake no new types of activities not included in the annual budget program prescribed by section 102 of the Government Corporation Control Act (except those which may be transferred to it under the provisions of section 246 (b) of this title): *And provided further*, That in the event an emergency is declared to exist by the board of directors during a period when the Congress is not in session (or by the Governor of the Panama Canal, acting in his capacity as president of the corporation, with the concurrence of as many of the directors as may be consulted without loss of time unreasonable in the circumstances), recommended appropriate action within the scope of this article may be undertaken. A report on such emergency activity shall be presented promptly to the Congress, when it reconvenes, for its approval and such action as it may deem necessary or desirable with respect to reimbursement through supplemental appropriation of funds to cover costs or losses arising from such emergency.

"250. Subjection of corporation to laws applicable to New York company: The corporation shall, so far as consistent with the terms of this article, be deemed subject to all provisions in treaties and in acts of the Congress of the United States, now in force, which relate or apply to the New York company; and shall have all the rights, privileges, and exemptions, and be subject to all the obligations, liabilities, and responsibilities applicable to the New York company under or by virtue of such provisions.

"251. Taking over of assets and liabilities of, and dissolution of, New York company; release of United States treaty rights in assets: The corporation is authorized and directed to take over the assets and assume the liabilities of the New York company as of July 1, 1948. To accomplish the transfer of such assets to, and the assumption of such liabilities by, the corporation, and to accomplish the dissolution of the New York company, the two corporations are authorized and directed to take, under the supervision of the stockholders, whatever action shall be determined to be appropriate and necessary, whether by agreement, transfer, merger, consolidation, dissolution, or otherwise. Effective upon the transfer of such assets and the assumption of such liabilities, there are hereby released and transferred to the corporation all the right, title, and interest, in and to such assets, which the United States now has or may hereafter acquire by virtue of the convention of November 18, 1903, between the United States and the Republic of Panama; and, specifically, there are hereby released to the corporation any and all reversionary rights of the United States in the lands of the corporation located in the cities of Panama and Colon, Republic of Panama.

"252. Reimbursement of other agencies: The corporation shall reimburse the Civil Service and Canal Zone Retirement and Disability Funds for Government contributions to the retirement fund applicable to the corporation's employees, and the Employees' Compensation Fund, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency, for the benefit payments made to the corporation's employees, and shall also reimburse other Government agencies for any payments of a similar nature made on its behalf.

"253. Payment of excess funds into the Treasury: The board of directors shall have the power and duty to appraise, at least annually, its necessary working capital requirements, together with reasonable foreseeable requirements for authorized plant replacement and expansion, and to pay into the Treasury as dividends the amount of funds in excess thereof. Such dividends shall be treated by the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, but shall be treated on the books of the corporation as applicable to reduction of past or future direct Government capital contributions (as provided in section 246 (d) of this title) in determining the base for interest payments required under section 246 (c).

"254. Emergency fund: The corporation may borrow from a fund to be established and maintained in the Treasury, for any authorized purposes of the corporation, but for limited periods only, sums of money not to exceed a total of $10,000,000 outstanding at any one time. The fund shall be established by the deposit by the New York company with the Treasury on or before June 30, 1948, of the sum of $10,000,000 from the invested depreciation reserve funds presently maintained by the New York company, which amount, less any amounts borrowed therefrom by the corporation from time to time, shall be maintained by the Treasury as a separate fund. Amounts borrowed from said fund shall be paid over to the corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, and repayments thereof shall be redeposited in said fund and will be available for subsequent loans. Loans to the corporation from this fund shall not bear interest.

"255. Amendment or repeal: The right to alter, amend, or repeal this article is expressly reserved.

"256. Separability clause: If any provision of this article, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this article and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASSMAN CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. JENNINGS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H R. 2192) for the relief of Massman Construction Co., having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

JOHN JENNINGS, JR.,
ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of Massman Construction Co., submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed the House appropriated the sum of $88,000 to Massman Construction Co. for the use and rental of equipment under a contract, which sum was inadvertently and mistakenly omitted by said company from its bid for the work done under contract No. W-1096-eng-7350.

The Senate reduced the amount to $28,623.12; and at the conference, the House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment.

JOHN JENNINGS, JR.,
ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUTHER BROS. CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6428) to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss, if any, sustained by Luther Bros. Construction Co. of Fort Worth, Tex., under Reclamation Bureau contract No. 12r-15757 arising out of or attributable to the alleged failure of the Government to supply materials as provided for in said contracts.

"SEC. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to the Luther Bros. Construction Co."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN AMERICAN RAILWAY CONGRESS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 177) providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the Government of the United States in, and to appoint the United States delegates and their alternates to, the Pan American Railway Congress, the constitution and bylaws of which were approved in Montevideo, Uruguay, April 1946, and deposited in the archives of the Pan American Union in Washington.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

(a) Not more than $5,000 annually for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the Pan American Railway Congress and its permanent Commission; and

(b) Such additional sums as may be needed for the payment of all necessary expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities thereof, including expenses of the United States delegates, their alternates, and appropriate staff, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and such other expenses as the Secretary of State finds necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 30, 1946 (Public Law 565, 79th Cong.), and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b).

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT SUMNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1639) authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner irrigation district, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of aiding and assisting the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico to protect its diversion dam and the existing works of said irrigation district from flood damage, in the event the Secretary of the Interior determines that flood damage is or appears to be imminent, he, the Secretary of the Interior, is hereby authorized to cooperate with such district and to perform such flood preventive work, repair and rehabilitation upon the diversion dam and the irrigation works of said irrigation district as may be necessary or proper: *Provided*, That, prior to the initiation of such work under this authorization, a repayment contract in pursuance of the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws has been executed with said district.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be expended not to exceed $60,000 from any funds previously appropriated for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation for use in said prevention work, the rehabilitation, reconstruction, and repair of the existing works of such irrigation district, in accordance with the relief program hereinbefore authorized.

SEC. 3. Nothing hereinbefore contained shall be construed as a determination of or in any way to prejudice any rights involving the use of the waters of the Pecos River, or any part thereof.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2676) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the Regents of the University of Minnesota, a body corporate, organized and existing by virtue of the constitution and laws of the State of Minnesota, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those parcels of real property located in the county of St. Louis, Minn., which were formerly operated as a Federal fish-cultural station, and more particularly described as follows:

All that part of sections 5 and 8 in township 50 north, range 13 west, fourth principal meridian, which is bounded as follows: Beginning at a point in the westerly shore of Lester River, three hundred feet southeasterly from the center line of the Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range Railway track measured on a line at right angles to the line of said railroad track, thence southwesterly parallel with said railroad track six hundred and fifty-six feet, thence southeasterly at right angles with the line of said railroad track to the shore of Lake Superior, thence northeasterly along the shore line of Lake Superior to the mouth of the Lester River, thence along the westerly shore of Lester River to the place of beginning, containing 6 acres of land, more or less, together therewith all of lots 9 and 10 in block 7 in Lester Park first subdivision, according to the recorded plat thereof, but subject to the right-of-way for highway purposes as conveyed by deed dated February 7, 1945, recorded on March 13, 1945, at 3:30 p. m., in book 765, page 47, in the offices of the register of deeds in and for St. Louis County, Minn.: *Provided*, That the State of Minnesota shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the United States Department of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2056) to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317) relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the

State of Kentucky, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 9, after "receipts" insert ": *Provided*, That no part of this authorization shall be used for road development or construction until after all the lands within the maximum boundaries, as authorized by the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635), have been acquired by purchase, condemnation or otherwise."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, the total cost of the Mammoth Cave area was $2,600,000, which was raised through the medium of State and Federal funds, which included $800,000 contributed from a voluntary Mammoth Cave National Park Association with a membership of some 17,000 loyal Kentuckians.

In order to acquire the present acreage of some 50,000, it was necessary to buy out and to move over 600 families. Mammoth Cave was known for its scenic beauty and had attracted thousands of tourists for more than 50 years before the State of Wyoming came forth with the report of its now famous Yellowstone National Park.

I believe that the late Irvin S. Cobb has described this magnificent natural beauty far better than anyone when he stated that the cave was "an open mouth to proclaim the glories of Kentucky and an open door to her hospitality." It was said at the dedication ceremony at which the State transferred the park to the Federal Government:

Kentucky does not part with Mammoth Cave; it merely transfers to the custody of the Nation a great national asset for the perpetual use of a great and generous people.

In the acquisition and purchase of this vast acreage of surface land, the additional rights to the cave's and cavern's minerals, gas, oil, timber, and limestone were also acquired. In the acceptance speech at the dedication on September 17, 1946, Secretary of the Interior Krug said:

Public interest has always, and naturally, been focused on the underground here. Yet this park has those things above ground which contribute much to the enjoyment of visitors. So far as I know, no other park can boast of two navigable rivers—

The Green and Nolin—

and these are rivers of loveliness and charm. I hope to see developed here better means by which the traveler may become acquainted with what they have to offer.

H. R. 2096 provides for the authorization of an appropriation not to exceed $350,000 to acquire additional adjoining lands and interest in adjoining lands which are so vitally necessary for the full and complete development of the Mammoth Cave National Park. At the present time, there are several caves individually owned which are not only contiguous to the boundary of Mammoth Cave National Park, but in some instances, are completely bounded by the present park area. For instance, there is one cave known as the Great Onyx Cave located under a tract of land which is entirely surrounded by the Mammoth Cave Park and, at the present time, the owners of this and other privately owned caves are placed in the unfortunate and unhappy position, as taxpayers, of competing against the United States Government which pays no taxes.

The purchase of these additional caves which are contiguous to the Mammoth Cave Park itself would most certainly enhance the value, prestige, and scenic beauty of the Mammoth Cave National Park. The additional revenues from these caves would add considerably to the revenue now derived by the Mammoth Cave Park from the tourist trade. It is estimated that the total receipts from these privately owned caves, within less than a period of 10 years, will be more than enough to repay to the Federal Treasury the sum authorized in this appropriation.

As my good friend and former colleague from the Second District of Kentucky, the Honorable Earle C. Clements, who is now the Governor of Kentucky, has said:

The entrance is in FRANK'S district—but I have the cave over in the Second District.

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in the proper development and expansion of Mammoth Cave National Park simply because the entrance lies within the boundary of the Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, but I am interested in its growth and development because it will mean so much to all native Kentuckians and citizens throughout the Nation and the world.

For these reasons I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2096, as amended and passed by the Senate, revises this bill and brings it into line with the original form in which it was introduced by my distinguished predecessor, the Honorable Earle C. Clements, presently Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; this bill is now in the form that it should be and the Senate amendment thereto has my hearty endorsement and approval.

The purpose of this legislation is to enable the National Park Service to acquire additional cave lands in the present area of the Mammoth Cave National Park, which will not only add to the value and increase the revenues of this national park but contribute to the more orderly, efficient, and harmonious operation of this entire cave area. As the House report on H. R. 2096 explains, under existing conditions an unsatisfactory situation exists, in that the Mammoth Cave National Park is contiguous to and in some instances completely surrounds privately owned caves. Out of this situation has developed confusion and even a competitive spirit which, obviously, is not in the interests of the public or the National Park Service. The enactment of H. R. 2096 will correct this situation.

Mammoth Cave was discovered in 1799—hundreds of thousands of people have visited this marvel of nature's work and countless thousands of people will continue to visit it; while some of you may not as yet have afforded yourselves the opportunity and pleasure of seeing it, all of us are familiar with it—in fact, long before the discovery and development of many of our other great national parks and playgrounds, Mammoth Cave was listed among the "Seven Wonders of the World." Because it is one of America's great natural marvels—one of our national treasures—we all share in it and all of us are interested in its development, progress and welfare.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH PICKERING WINN

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 83) authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, Elizabeth Pickering Winn may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States by taking the naturalization oath of allegiance before any court having jurisdiction of the naturalization of aliens, or by taking such oath before any diplomatic or consular office of the United States abroad.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNA V. REYER ET AL.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1730) for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, who was admitted into the United States on a visitor's visa, and her two sons, Alexander A. Reyer and Vitaly A. Reyer, who were admitted into the United States on student visas, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their last entries.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of the Soviet Union and two numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of China.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMED SERVICES

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6039) to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after "1946", insert "The President is further authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint in the Regular Navy one officer in the permanent grade of admiral from among any officers on the active list of the Regular Navy who served in the temporary grade of admiral from February 4, 1944, to the present date, and commanded a major combatant unit of the United States Fleet in the Pacific Theater of Operations during all or any part of the Second World War."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know the purpose of making these appointments.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill as passed by the House provides for the appointment in the Army of one general of permanent rank and in the Air Force of a general of permanent rank. It was amended in the Senate to provide for the promotion of one admiral to permanent rank. My request is to concur in the Senate amendment, so that the bill when passed will authorize the appointment of one permanent general in the Army, one permanent general in the Air Force, and one permanent admiral of the Navy. The individuals affected by the bill are General Spaatz, General Bradley, and Admiral Spruance.

Mr. RICH. Is this going to add to the high-ranking officials of our Government additional officers?

Mr. COLE of New York. All of these men within a few days will be in retirement. As a matter of fact, one of them already is in retirement.

Mr. RICH. As I understand it, in the last 3 or 4 years, you have been increasing the rank of so many people in the Army and the Navy that it has become quite a burden on the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. COLE of New York. On the contrary, I can assure the gentleman that it has been the determined effort of the Committee on Armed Services to hold down the advancement of and appointment of top-ranking generals. In fact, we wrote a provision of limitation in the promotion bill adopted by the Congress last year designed to effect that very objective.

Mr. RICH. I understand that if the bill which was before the House yesterday on conscription is not passed, that a great many generals and admirals who are now in the Navy will have to be demoted because they do not have a sufficient number of men to keep these ranks. Is that an accurate statement?

Mr. COLE of New York. I cannot advise the gentleman of the effect of the selective-service bill upon the retention or promotion of individuals to the rank of general. However, I can assure the gentleman that the promotion or retention of individuals to the rank of general and admiral was not considered as one of the purposes of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. RICH. Is there such a motive behind the high-ranking officials of the Army and Navy that if they do not keep a great large Army they will not be permitted to keep their rank?

Mr. COLE of New York. All I can say in reply to the gentleman is that so far as I have observed, I have seen no indication of that as being their motive.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to compliment the committee highly upon their fairness in dealing with this bill. Does this extend the same privilege to Admiral Spruance as to the generals involved?

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6465. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 543. An act to confer jurisdiction on the States of North Dakota and South Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation;

S. 617. An act for the relief of Richard T. Charett;

S. 1301. An act for the relief of Alfonso Felici;

S. 1872. An act for the relief of Jose Babace;

S. 1973. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 1982. An act for the relief of Herman A. Bennink;

S. 1995. An act for the relief of George Bailey;

S. 2049. An act for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co.;

S. 2050. An act for the relief of Gracy Mariluch;

S. 2382. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon;

S. 2504. An act for the relief of Horace J. Fenton, former associate professor at the United States Naval Academy;

S. 2524. An act for the relief of Carl Plowaty and W. J. Plowaty;

S. 2551. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes;

S. 2605. An act for the relief of the widow of Robert V. Holland;

S. 2662. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach;

S. 2667. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey;

S. 2686. An act to establish the Navajo-Hopi Administration, to provide for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes, and for other purposes;

S. 2691. An act authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement;

S. 2693. An act to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, and for other purposes;

S. 2705. An act to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.;

S. 2709. An act for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura;

S. 2726. An act for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson;

S. 2764. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act;

S. 2790. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2810. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired members of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

S. 2831. An act to authorize the coordination of emergency and relief activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas, and for other purposes; and

S. 2850. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1734. An act for the relief of Cabel Construction Co.;

H. R. 2009. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;

H. R. 2352. An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees;

H. R. 2729. For the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; and

H. R. 3999. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5004. An act to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. HATCH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4044) entitled "An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WILEY, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MAGNUSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) entitled "An act to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the said bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GURNEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. BYRD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2830) entitled "An act to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. HILL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1322) entitled "An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6705) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 126, 189, 211, 212, and 214 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) entitled "An act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6402. An act to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2524. An act for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; and

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution to print as a document a manuscript entitled "Toward Peace," relating to American international relations.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1243. An act to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes; and

S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2830) entitled "An act to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TO AMEND THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6641) entitled "An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948," with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: 'Any such annuitant who died during the period beginning on February 29, 1948, and ending on April 30, 1948, leaving a surviving wife or husband, shall be deemed to have made the election authorized in the foregoing proviso and to have named such wife or husband to receive an annuity as provided in such proviso, but no such annuity shall become due or payable to such wife or husband prior to April 1, 1948.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTESTED ELECTION—WILSON AGAINST GRANGER

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up House Resolution 692 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the election contest of David J. Wilson, contestant, against Walter K. Granger, contestee, First Congressional District of Utah, be dismissed, and that the said WALTER K. GRANGER is entitled to his seat as a Representative of said district and State.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the committee has reached a conclusion on a very difficult contest; and in behalf of the committee I want to say that every member of the committee approached this contest in a judicial frame of mind, and throughout the hearing of evidence, arguments, and deliberations that attitude and frame of mind was maintained.

The conclusion represented by this resolution is an honest, sincere, and, I think, judicial decision of this difficult matter. All angles and all phases and incidents were considered. It is true this is not a unanimous conclusion, but it is a carefully considered decision, and the members of the committee did what seemed to be right and correct in the premises. There were irregularities in connection with the election beyond doubt, and those were weighed. The majority believes that this resolution represents the correct conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, no one has asked to be heard, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4856) entitled "An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes," with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 9, after "law.", insert "Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to supersede or modify in any way the provisions of section 9 of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESCINDING CITATION FOR CONTEMPT AGAINST JOSEPH P. KAMP

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 495) to rescind the citation for contempt against Joseph P. Kamp, vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, Inc.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the citation heretofore voted by the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1944, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, for contempt against Joseph P. Kamp, vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, Inc., be, and the same hereby is, rescinded for the following reasons:

1. Said citation was not the legal act of the said committee for the reason that information necessary to said committee and to each member thereof for their consideration was withheld from them.

Certain of said withheld and necessary information was improperly deleted from the official printed record of the hearings without the knowledge of any member of said committee and, therefore, was not available to the members of the said committee at the time they considered the matter and took action resulting in voting a citation for contempt.

Certain of other withheld and necessary information was denied to some members of said committee who were refused answers to specific questions about information available to other members of the committee. Some of this same withheld and necessary information was deliberately kept from the knowledge and consideration of a majority of the members of the said committee.

2. Said citation was not the legal act of the said committee for the reason that exhibits in evidence before the committee and necessary to said committee and to each member thereof for their consideration was withheld from them.

The said withheld necessary exhibits were illegally removed from the committee's files prior to the consideration of the matter by the committee and were not available to the members of the committee at the time they took final action resulting in voting a citation for contempt.

3. The said citation resulted in the indictment of the said Joseph P. Kamp, who was tried for criminal contempt of the Congress in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in December 1946.

On behalf of the defense, the court issued a subpena for one of the said withheld exhibits. Because the said withheld exhibit was not available in the files of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, where it legally belonged, having been removed without the knowledge of the committee or by the authority of the House, the defendant, the said Joseph P. Kamp, was prevented from presenting a full defense and therefore was denied a fair trial.

4. The said Joseph P. Kamp is again to be tried under the said indictment which resulted from the said illegal act of the said committee. The said withheld exhibit, together with the other committee exhibits, were delivered to a representative of the American branch of an international propaganda movement, and the former chairman of the said committee has unsuccessfully attempted to have the said withheld exhibits returned to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and has written to the said Joseph P. Kamp, * * * "We have made another effort to secure the memorandum you desire. We have not been able to get it." Therefore, the said withheld exhibit will again be unavailable and the said Joseph P. Kamp will again be unable to subpena this evidence in his behalf and will therefore again be denied his constitutional right to a fair trial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. EBERHARTER and Mr. KLEIN objected.

REVENUE REVISION ACT OF 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6712) to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequalities, and for other purposes, with committee amendments.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I notice the motion stated "permission to offer amendments." Am I correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman misheard the request. The request was to suspend the rules and pass the bill with committee amendments.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does that allow those who oppose the amendments 5 minutes on each amendment?

The SPEAKER. The rule provides for 20 minutes on each side. That is, the Republican side will have 20 minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], who will demand a second, will have 20 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the only amendments that may be considered then are those that the committee acted upon?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) Short Title: This act, divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as the "Revenue Revision Act of 1948":

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—INCOME TAXES

Sec. 101. Taxable years to which amendments applicable.
Sec. 102. Definition of corporation surtax net income.
Sec. 103. Dividends on preferred stock of public utilities.
Sec. 104. Life insurance, annuities, etc.
Sec. 105. Certain employees annuities.
Sec. 106. Restriction on exclusion of certain compensation for disability.
Sec. 107. Allowance for military and naval personnel.
Sec. 108. Last-in first-out inventory.
Sec. 109. Tax treatment upon death of partner.
Sec. 110. Expenses incurred by farmers for soil and water conservation.
Sec. 111. Deduction on account of worthless stock or securities in affiliated corporations.
Sec. 112. Bad debts.
Sec. 113. Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses.
Sec. 114. Contributions to employee retirement plans.
Sec. 115. Charitable contributions by corporations.
Sec. 116. Change of election with respect to standard deduction.
Sec. 117. Disallowance of deduction for wearing apparel.
Sec. 118. Wages paid to dependents.
Sec. 119. Items not deductible in the case of related taxpayers.
Sec. 120. Dividends received credit.
Sec. 121. Installment basis.
Sec. 122. Taxable years of approximately 12 months.
Sec. 123. Returns by certain tax-exempt organizations.
Sec. 124. Farmers' returns as declarations of estimated tax.
Sec. 125. Surtax on corporations improperly accumulating surplus.
Sec. 126. Service rendered for a period of 36 months or more.
Sec. 127. Election as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations.
Sec. 128. Distribution of stock on reorganization.
Sec. 129. Gain or loss in connection with certain corporate liquidations.
Sec. 130. Gain resulting from involuntary conversions.
Sec. 131. Percentage depletion.
Sec. 132. Retirement of bonds.
Sec. 133. Holding period of capital assets.
Sec. 134. Sales of livestock.
Sec. 135. Unlimited deduction for charitable contributions.
Sec. 136. Net operating loss deduction.
Sec. 137. Stock options.
Sec. 138. Foreign tax credit.
Sec. 139. Withholding of tax at source.
Sec. 140. Taxation of the income of estates and trusts.
Sec. 141. Life insurance trusts.
Sec. 142. Family partnerships.
Sec. 143. Capital gains of nonresident alien individuals.
Sec. 144. Treaty obligations.
Sec. 145. Income from sources within possessions of the United States.
Sec. 146. Period of limitations on claims against transferees.
Sec. 147. Date of payment of taxes withheld.
Sec. 148. Extension of period for refund in case of waiver by transferee.
Sec. 149. Tax on regulated investment companies.
Sec. 150. Commuting expenses of disabled individuals.
Sec. 151. Short sales of capital assets.

TITLE II—ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

Part I—Estate tax

Sec. 201. Estates to which amendments applicable.
Sec. 202. Transfers taking effect at death.
Sec. 203. Proceeds of life insurance.
Sec. 204. Transfers in contemplation of death.
Sec. 205. Exclusion of amounts payable under certain employee retirement plans.
Sec. 206. Repeal of deduction for support of dependents.
Sec. 207. Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses.
Sec. 208. Marital deduction in case of life-insurance or annuity payments.
Sec. 209. Technical amendments.
Sec. 210. Credit for taxes of foreign countries and of Puerto Rico.
Sec. 211. Requirement of transfer certificates.
Sec. 212. Period of limitation upon assessment and collection.
Sec. 213. Exemption from the additional estate tax for members of armed forces.

Part II—Gift tax

Sec. 251. Reciprocal trusts.
Sec. 252. Certain employee-retirement plans.
Sec. 253. Gift tax exclusion for future interests.
Sec. 254. Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses.
Sec. 255. Valuation of gifts.
Sec. 256. Period of limitation upon assessment and collection in cases of omitted gifts.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS AND PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Review of Tax Court decisions.
Sec. 302. Penalty for failure to pay withholding tax.
Sec. 303. Verification of returns.
Sec. 304. Reports to Congress of refunds.
Sec. 305. Reports of compensation of officers and employees.
Sec. 306. Collection of delinquent taxes of Federal employees.
Sec. 307. Distraint on salaries, wages, and compensation.
Sec. 308. Loans of bonds.
Sec. 309. Compromises.
Sec. 310. Reports of refunds to the joint committee.
Sec. 311. Relief in case of certain recapitalizations.
Sec. 312. Travel of field employees.

(b) Act amendatory of Internal Revenue Code: Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a chapter, subchapter, title, supplement, section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, subparagraph, or clause, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of the Internal Revenue Code.

(c) Meaning of terms used: Except as otherwise expressly provided, terms used in this act shall have the same meaning as when used in the Internal Revenue Code.

TITLE I—INCOME TAXES

SEC. 101. Taxable years to which amendments applicable.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, the amendments made by this title shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 102. Definition of corporation surtax net income.

(a) The first sentence of section 15 (a) (relating to corporation surtax net income) is hereby amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'corporation surtax net income' means the net income minus the credit for dividends received provided in section 26 (b) (computed by limiting such credit to 85 percent of the net income in lieu of 85 percent of the adjusted net income) and minus, in the case of a public utility, the credit for dividends paid on its preferred stock provided in section 26 (h)."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be effective as if it were made by section 122 (g) of the Revenue Act of 1945.

SEC. 103. Dividends on preferred stock of public utilities.

(a) Surtax on corporations: The second sentence of section 15 (a) (relating to corporation surtax net income) is hereby amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this subsection dividends received on the preferred stock of a public utility with respect to which the credit provided in section 26 (h) is allowed shall be disregarded in computing the credit for dividends received provided in section 26 (b)."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be effective as if it were made by section 116 of the Revenue Act of 1943.

SEC. 104. Life insurance, annuities, etc.

(a) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 22 (b) (relating to exclusions from gross income) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Proceeds of life insurance:

"(A) Amounts received under a life insurance contract paid by reason of the death of the insured, whether in a single sum or otherwise (but if such amounts are held by the insurer under an agreement to pay interest thereon, the interest payments shall be included in gross income);

"(B) Transfers: In the case of a transfer for a valuable consideration, by assignment or otherwise, of a life insurance contract, or any interest therein, only the portion of the amounts received thereunder equal to the aggregate of the value of such consideration and the amount of the premiums and other sums subsequently paid by the transferee shall be exempt from taxation under this paragraph. This subparagraph shall not apply in the case of such a transfer if such contract or interest therein has a basis for determining gain or loss in the hands of a transferee determined in whole or in part by reference to such basis of such contract or interest therein in the hands of the transferor.

"(C) Life insurance in discharge of alimony: This paragraph shall not apply with respect to so much of a payment under a life insurance contract, or any interest therein, as, under section 22 (k), is includible in gross income.

"(2) Annuities, etc.:

"(A) Amounts other than annuity payments: Amounts received (other than amounts excludible from gross income under paragraph (1) (A) of this subsection and other than amounts includible in gross income under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of this paragraph) under an annuity, endowment, or life insurance contract, but if such amounts (when added to amounts received before the taxable year under such contract and excluded from gross income) exceed the aggregate premiums or consideration paid for such contract (whether or not paid during the taxable year), then the excess shall be included in gross income.

"(B) Amounts received as an annuity: There shall be included in gross income all amounts received as an annuity, whether for a period certain or during one or more lives, under an annuity contract or under an endowment or life insurance contract payable other than by reason of death, and all additional amounts received under such a contract on or after the date on which the first annuity payment is received; except that there shall be excluded from gross income an amount equal to the same proportion of the amounts received as an annuity during the taxable year under such contract which the total consideration paid for such contract bears to the aggregate of the amounts receivable as an annuity under such contract.

"(C) Employees' annuities:

"(i) If any annuity contract is purchased by an employer for an employee under a plan with respect to which the employer's contribution is deductible under section 23 (p) (1) (B), or if an annuity contract is purchased for an employee by an employer exempt under section 101 (6), or if an employer enters into an employee retirement benefit contract with an employee, the employee shall include in his income the amounts received under such contract for the year received; except that if the employee paid any of the consideration for such contract, amounts received as an annuity under such contract shall be included in his income as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph; and except that in the case of amounts received under a contract with respect to which the employer's contribution is deductible under section 23 (p) (1) (B), if the total distributions payable with respect to the employee are paid to the distributee within one taxable year of the distributee on account of the employee's separation from the service, the amount of such distribution to the extent exceeding the consideration paid by the employee, shall be considered a gain from the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than 6 months.

"(ii) If an annuity contract (other than a contract described in clause (i) of this subparagraph) is purchased by an employer for an employee and if the employee's rights under the contract are nonforfeitable except for failure to pay future premiums, the amount contributed by the employer for such annuity contract on or after such rights become nonforfeitable shall be included in the income of the employee in the year in which the amount is contributed, and amounts received as an annuity under such contract shall be included in the income of such employee as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph: *Provided, however*, That amounts contributed by an employer to a trust (other than a trust, which on May 26, 1948, met the requirements of section 165 (a)) to be applied by the trustee for the purchase of annuity contracts for the benefit of an employee of said employer shall not be included in the income of the employee in the year in which the amount is contributed if the amount is contributed to the trustee pursuant to a written agreement entered into prior to October 21, 1942, between the employer and the trustee, or between the employer and the employee, and if under the terms of the trust agreement the employee is not entitled, except with the consent of the trustee, during his lifetime to any payments under annuity contracts purchased by the trustee other than annuity payments.

"(D) Annuities in discharge of alimony: Subparagraph (B) shall not apply with respect to so much of a payment under a life insurance, endowment, or annuity contract, or any interest therein, as, under section 22 (k), is includible in gross income.

"(E) Annuities having a refund feature: Where an annuity contract contains a provision giving the estate or beneficiary of a deceased annuitant the right to a refund in respect of the consideration paid, the following special rules shall apply:

"(i) the refund received by the estate or beneficiary of the annuitant shall be included in gross income only to the extent that it, plus any amounts received by the annuitant prior to his death, exceeds the total consideration paid;

"(ii) where the entire consideration for an annuity contract is paid by the annuitant or annuitants, the amount of the 'total consideration paid for such contract', as defined in subparagraph (F) (i), shall be further reduced by the value of any payments to be made to a beneficiary or the estate of an annuitant upon or after the death of the annuitant or annuitants which are in the nature of a return of the consideration;

"(iii) for the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'refund in respect of the consideration paid' shall include amounts paid after the death of an annuitant by reason of a provision in the contract for an annuity certain.

"(F) Definitions: For the purposes of this paragraph—

"(i) the term 'total consideration paid for such contract' means the aggregate consideration paid reduced by any amounts received prior to January 1, 1948, under such contract or prior to the date on which the first annuity payment under such contract is receivable, whichever is later, and excluded from gross income; and, in the case of an annuity contract referred to in subparagraph (C) (i) or in the proviso in subparagraph (C) (ii), the portion of the consideration contributed by the employee reduced by any amounts received prior to January 1, 1948, under such contract and excluded from gross income; and, in the case of an annuity contract referred to in subparagraph (C) (ii) (but not in the proviso thereof), the aggregate of the portion of the consideration contributed by the employer on or after the employee's rights under such contract become nonforfeitable except for failure to pay premiums and the portion thereof contributed by the employee, reduced by any amounts received prior to January 1, 1948, under such contract and excluded from gross income; and, in the case of a transfer for a valuable consideration, by assignment or otherwise, of a life insurance, endowment, or annuity contract, or any interest therein, if such contract or interest does not have a basis for determining gain or loss in the hands of a transferee determined in whole or in part by reference to such basis of such contract or interest in the hands of the transferor, the aggregate of the value of the consideration paid for such contract and the amount of the premiums and other sums subsequently paid by the transferee, reduced by any amounts received prior to January 1, 1948, under such contract and excluded from gross income;

"(ii) the term 'aggregate of the amounts receivable as an annuity under such contract' includes, in the case of a contract providing for annuity payments during one or more lives, the sum of the amounts receivable as an annuity under an annuity, endowment or life-insurance contract during the period of normal expectation of life of the person or persons whose life or lives were involved in determining the cost of such contract, computed as of the date on which the first annuity payment under such contract was receivable or January 1, 1948, whichever is later, in accordance with mortality tables under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, except that if such contract was transferred but does not have a basis as provided in clause (i), such period of normal expectation of life shall be computed as of the date on which the first annuity payment after the transfer was receivable by the transferee.

"(G) Definition of employee retirement benefit contract: For the purposes of subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, the term 'employee retirement benefit contract' means a bona fide contract between an employer and his employee under which the employer agrees to pay to the employee a specified amount, annually or at more frequent intervals, for the period beginning with the date of retirement of such employee from the service of such employer and ending with the date of death of such employee, if—

"(i) the rights of the employee to receive payments under such contract are to be forfeited in the event of his separation from such service prior to such date of retirement,

"(ii) no life insurance, endowment or annuity contract is at any time purchased or acquired by such employer for the purpose of providing, directly or indirectly, for the payments to be made under such contract,

"(iii) such employee does not, at any time during such employment, own stock possessing more than 10 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock of the employer corporation or of a parent corporation. For the purposes of this clause such individual shall be considered as owning the stock owned, directly or indirectly, by or for his brothers and sisters (whether by the whole or half blood), spouse, ancestors, and lineal descendants; and stock owned, directly or indirectly, by or for a corporation, partnership, estate, or trust, shall be considered as being owned proportionately by or for its shareholders, partners, or beneficiaries,

"(iv) the date of retirement under such contract will in no event occur before such employee attains the age of 65, except in the case of his total and permanent disability, and

"(v) in any case where such employee is an officer, director, or highly compensated employee of a corporation, the contract has been approved or ratified at a duly constituted meeting of the stockholders of the employer corporation after reasonable notice to such stockholders of the proposed contract; except that such term shall not include any such contract which has as a principal purpose the prevention of the imposition of the surtax on such employee during any part of the period of such employment."

(b) Section 23 (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(bb) Employee retirement benefit contract: If amounts are paid by an employer to an employee under an employee retirement benefit contract as defined in section 22 (b) (2) (G), such payments shall be deductible only in the taxable year when paid by the employer without regard to the method of accounting used by the taxpayer."

SEC. 105. Certain employees' annuities.

(a) In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1938, and prior to January 1, 1948, amounts contributed by an employer to a trust to be applied by the trustee for the purchase of an annuity contract described in the second sentence of section 22 (b) (2) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code (prior to its amendment by this Act) for the benefit of an employee of such employer shall not be included, notwithstanding any provision of the Internal Revenue Code, in the income of the employee in the year in which the amount is contributed if—

(1) the amount is contributed to the trustee pursuant to a written agreement entered into prior to October 21, 1942, between the employer and the trustee, or between the employer and the employee; and

(2) under the terms of the trust agreement the employee is not entitled, except with the consent of the trustee, during his lifetime to any payments under annuity contracts purchased by the trustee other than annuity payments.

Such amounts contributed by the employer shall not constitute consideration paid by the employee for such annuity contract in determining the amount of annuity payments required to be included in his gross income under section 22 (b) (2) of such code, unless the tax under chapter 1 of such code has been paid by the employee with respect to such amounts and not credited or refunded.

(b) No interest shall be allowed or paid on any overpayment, or assessed on any deficiency, resulting from the application of this section.

SEC. 106. Restriction on exclusion of certain compensation for disability.

Section 22 (b) (5) (relating to compensation for injuries or sickness) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(5) Compensation for injuries or sickness:

"(A) Except in the case of amounts attributable to (and not in excess of) deductions allowed under section 23 (x) in any prior taxable year, amounts received, through accident or health insurance or under workmen's compensation acts, as compensation for personal injuries or sickness, plus the amount of any damages received whether by suit or agreement on account of such injuries or sickness; and

"(B) Amounts received as a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country, except that if such amounts exceed $3,400 during the taxable year, and the taxpayer also receives during the same taxable year earned income, as defined in section 116 (a) (3), the exclusion under this subparagraph shall be reduced by the amount of such earned income, but not to an amount less than $2,400. The provisions of this subparagraph shall not affect amounts exempt from taxation under the act of August 12, 1935, entitled 'An act to safeguard the estates of veterans derived from payments of pension, compensation, emergency officers' retirement pay and insurance, and for other purposes' (49 Stat. 609; 38 U. S. C. 454a).

SEC. 107. Allowance for military and naval personnel.

(a) Section 22 (b) (13) (relating to exclusions from gross income) is hereby amended by striking out "January 1, 1949" wherever occurring therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1950."

(b) Section 10 (b) of the act of August 8, 1947 (Public Law 384, 80th Cong.), entitled "An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II" is hereby amended by striking out "January 1, 1949" and inserting in lieu there of "January 1, 1950."

SEC. 108. Last-in first-out inventory.

(a) Section 22 (d) (6) (A) (relating to the involuntary liquidation and replacement of elective inventories) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By amending that portion thereof preceding clause (i) to read as follows:

"(A) Adjustment of net income and resulting tax: If, for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940, and prior to January 1, 1948, the closing inventory of a taxpayer inventorying goods under the method provided in this subsection reflects a decrease from the opening inventory of such goods for such year, and if the taxpayer elects, at such time and in such manner and subject to such regulations as the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary may prescribe, to have the provisions of this paragraph apply, and if it is established to the satisfaction of the Commissioner, in accordance with such regulations, that such decrease is attributable to the involuntary liquidation of such inventory as defined in subparagraph (B), and if the closing inventory of a subsequent taxable year, ending prior to January 1, 1951, reflects a replacement, in whole or in part, of the goods so previously liquidated, the next income of the taxpayer otherwise determined for the year of such involuntary liquidation shall be adjusted as follows:".

(2) By amending the last sentence thereof to read as follows: "Any increase in such taxes resulting from such adjustments shall be assessed and collected as a deficiency with interest computed from January 1, 1948, or from the date prescribed by law for the payment of the tax for the year of replacement, whichever date is the later, and any overpayment so resulting shall be credited or refunded to the taxpayer with interest computed from January 1, 1948, or from the date of expiration of one year after the filing of

a claim for credit or refund of such overpayment, whichever date is the later."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940.

SEC. 109. Tax treatment upon death of partner.

(a) Income tax treatment of surviving partners: Section 22 (b) (relating to exclusions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(15) Exclusion of income after death of partner:

"(A) If, in accordance with an agreement between individuals carrying on business in partnership, a share of the net income from the business is paid, subsequent to the death of a partner, to the estate of the decedent or to any person who acquired from, or by reason of the death of, such decedent the right to receive such share, the amount so paid, except as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, shall not be included in the gross income of a surviving partner or in computing the distributive shares of surviving or successor partners under section 182 (c).

"(B) The provisions of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph shall not apply to any portion, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, of the amount paid in accordance with such an agreement which is paid on account of such decedent's interest in partnership property having a basis (unadjusted) for determining gain or loss on sale or exchange in the hands of the partnership prior to such death in excess of zero."

(b) Income-tax treatment of decedent's estate, etc: So much of section 126 (a) (1) (relating to income in respect of decedents) as precedes subparagraph (A) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) General rule: The amount of all items of gross income in respect of a decedent which are not properly includible in respect of the taxable period in which falls the date of his death or a prior period, and all amounts paid in respect of a deceased partner to which section 22 (b) (15) (A) applies, shall be included in the gross income, for the taxable year when received, of:".

(c) Basis: Section 113 (a) (13) (relating to the basis of partnership property) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(13) Partnerships:

"(A) If the property was acquired, after February 28, 1913, by a partnership and the basis is not otherwise determined under any other provision of this subsection, then the basis shall be the same as it would be in the hands of the transferor, increased in the amount of gain or decreased in the amount of loss recognized to the transferor upon such transfer under the law applicable to the year in which the transfer was made. If the property was distributed in kind by a partnership to any partner, the basis of such property in the hands of the partner shall be such part of the basis in his hands of his partnership interest as is properly allocable to such property.

"(B) If any interest in partnership property with a basis (unadjusted) for determining gain or loss on sale or exchange of zero in the hands of the partnership prior to the death of a partner is acquired by a surviving partner or partnership making a payment under an agreement described in section 22 (b) (15) (A), and if any amount paid under such agreement on account of such interest is not includible under such section in the gross income of a surviving partner or in computing the distributive shares of surviving or successor partners under section 182 (c), the basis of such interest shall be zero."

SEC. 110. Expenses incurred by farmers for soil and water conservation.

(a) Section 23 (a) (1) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(D) In the case of a taxpayer engaged in the business of farming, expenditures made for the purpose of soil and water conservation and the prevention of erosion of land used in farming shall be allowed as deductions under subparagraph (A). For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'expenditures made for the purpose of soil and water conservation and the prevention of erosion' means expenditures for the treatment, moving, or cultivation of earth, including (but not limited to) leveling, grading, and terracing, contour furrowing, the construction of diversion channels and drainage ditches, the control and protection of watercourses, outlets, and ponds, the planting and cultivation of cover and protective crops or windbreaks, the control of weeds and brush and other special or emergency cultivation and tillage; but such term does not include the purchase, construction, installation, or improvement of structures, appliances, and facilities made of masonry, concrete, tile, metal, or wood, such as tanks, reservoirs, pipes, conduits, canals, dams, wells, and pumps, which are subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 23 (l). For the purpose of this subparagraph, the term 'land used in farming' means land used (prior to the expenditure for conservation made by the taxpayer) by the taxpayer or his tenant or the predecessor owner or his tenant for the production of crops, fruits, and similar agricultural products or for the sustenance of livestock."

(b) Section 24 (a) (2) is hereby amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except, in the case of a taxpayer engaged in the business of farming, expenditures incurred for the purpose of soil and water conservation and the prevention of erosion within the meaning of section 23 (a) (1) (D)".

(c) Section 113 (b) (1) (A) is hereby amended by inserting after "other carrying charges" the following: ", or for expenditures described in section 23 (a) (1) (D),".

SEC. 111. Reduction on account of worthless stock or securities in affiliated corporations.

Section 23 (g) (4) (B) (relating to worthless stock in affiliated corporations) and section 23 (k) (5) (B) (relating to worthless securities in affiliated corporations) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(B) either—

"(i) more than 90 percent of the aggregate of its gross incomes for all taxable years has been from sources other than royalties, rents (except rents derived from rental of properties to employees of the company in the ordinary course of its operating business and except rents constituting 50 percent or more of the gross income for all taxable years), dividends, interest (except interest received on deferred purchase price of operating assets sold), annuities, or gains from sales or exchanges of stocks and securities; or

"(ii) it is a corporation excluded from the definition of personal holding company under section 501 (b); and".

SEC. 112. Bad debts.

The last sentence of section 23 (k) (4) (relating to nonbusiness debts) is hereby amended to read as follows: "The term 'nonbusiness debt' means a debt other than (A) a debt evidenced by a security as defined in paragraph (3), (B) a debt arising in the course of the taxpayer's trade or business, and (C) a debt the loss from the worthlessness of which is incurred in such trade or business."

SEC. 113. Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses.

(a) Section 23 (o) (relating to charitable and other contributions by individuals) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) by inserting in paragraph (2) thereof after "or of any State or Territory" the following: ", or of the District of Columbia,"; by inserting in such paragraph after "religious, charitable, scientific," the following: "veteran rehabilitation service,"; and by striking out of such paragraph after "or educational purposes," the words "or for" and inserting in lieu thereof "including the encouragement of art, and"; and

(2) by striking out paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) posts or organizations of war veterans, or auxiliary units or societies of, or trusts or foundations for, any such posts or organizations, if such posts, organizations, units, societies, trusts, or foundations are organized in the United States or any of its possessions, and if no part of their net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; or

"(4) a domestic fraternal society, order, or association, operating under the lodge system, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation, but only if such contributions or gifts are to be used exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals";

(b) Section 23 (q) (relating to charitable and other contributions by corporations) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) by striking out of paragraph (2) thereof after "or educational purposes" the words "or for" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", including the encouragement of art and"; by inserting in such paragraph after "prevention of cruelty to children" the words "or animals"; and by striking out of such paragraph the parenthetical expression appearing therein; and

(2) by amending paragraphs (3) and (4) thereof to read as follows:

"(3) posts or organizations of war veterans, or auxiliary units or societies of, or trusts or foundations for, any such posts or organizations, if such posts, organizations, units, societies, trusts, or foundations are organized in the United States or any of its possessions, and if no part of their net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; or

"(4) a domestic fraternal society, order, or association, operating under the lodge system, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, but only if such contributions or gifts are to be used exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals;".

(c) Section 213 (c) (relating to charitable, etc., contributions by nonresident aliens) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Charitable, etc., contributions: The so-called 'charitable contribution' deduction allowed by section 23 (o) shall be allowed whether or not connected with income from sources within the United States, but only as to contributions or gifts made to—

"(1) domestic corporations, or

"(2) trusts, community, chests, funds, or foundations, created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory, or of the District of Columbia, or of any possession of the United States, and if such contributions or gifts are

to be used within the United States or any of its possessions."

(d) Section 232 (b) (relating to charitable, etc., contributions by foreign corporations) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "(but in the case of contributions or gifts to a trust, chest, fund, or foundation, only if such contributions or gifts are to be used within the United States or any of its possessions)."

SEC. 114. Contributions to employee retirement plans.

Section 23 (p) (1) (E) (relating to contributions of an employer to an employees' trust or annuity plan) is hereby amended by striking out "within 60 days after" and inserting in lieu thereof "on or before the fifteenth day of the third month following".

SEC. 115. Charitable contributions by corporations.

(a) Section 23 (q) (relating to charitable and other contributions) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"In the case of a corporation whose net income is reported on the accrual basis, contributions or gifts payment of which is made on or before the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of a taxable year shall, at the election of the taxpayer, be considered as paid during such taxable year and not during the succeeding taxable year. Such election shall be made at such time and in such manner as is provided under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942. If the taxpayer elects the benefits of the amendment made by this section for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1948, such election shall not be allowed unless the taxpayer, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, consents in writing to the assessment (within such period as may be agreed upon) of any deficiency, to the extent resulting from such election, for any other taxable year of the taxpayer, even though on the date of the filing of such consent such assessment is otherwise prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law.

SEC. 116. Change of election with respect to standard deduction.

(a) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 23 (aa) (3) (relating to optional standard deduction for individuals) are hereby amended by striking out the word "only"; and subparagraph (C) of section 23 (aa) (3) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(C) If the taxpayer upon making his return fails to signify, in the manner provided by subparagraph (A) or (B), his election to take the standard deduction, such failure shall be considered his election not to take the standard deduction."

(b) Section 23 (aa) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) Change of election: Under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, a change of election with respect to the standard deduction for any taxable year may be made after the filing of the return for such year. If the spouse of the taxpayer filed a separate return for any taxable year corresponding, for the purposes of paragraph (4), to the taxable year of the taxpayer, the change shall not be allowed unless, in accordance with such regulations—

"(A) the spouse makes a change of election with respect to the standard deduction for the taxable year covered in such separate return, consistent with the change of election sought by the taxpayer, and

"(B) the taxpayer and his spouse consent in writing to the assessment, within such period as may be agreed upon with the Commission, of any deficiency, attributable to such change of election, even though at the time of the filing of such consent the assessment of such deficiency would otherwise be prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law."

SEC. 117. Disallowance of deduction for wearing apparel.

Section 24 (a) (relating to items not deductible) is hereby amended by striking out the word "or" at the end of paragraph (6) thereof, by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding after paragraph (7) a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(8) Any amount otherwise allowable as a deduction under section 23 (a) or (l) with respect to wearing apparel (including uniforms and work clothes), but this paragraph shall not prevent the allowance of a deduction to an employer with respect to such apparel furnished to an employee; or."

SEC. 118. Wages paid to dependents.

(a) Section 24 (a) (relating to items not deductible) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(9) Any amount paid or accrued as salary or other compensation for personal services rendered by any individual with respect to whom a credit is allowed to the taxpayer by section 25 (b) (1) (D) for the taxable year in which such amount is paid or accrued."

(b) Section 25 (b) (1) (D) (relating to credits for dependents) is hereby amended by striking out "$500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$600."

SEC. 119. Items not deductible in the case of related taxpayers.

Section 24 (c) (relating to unpaid expenses and interest) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Unpaid expenses and interest: In computing net income no deduction shall be allowed under section 23 (a), relating to expenses incurred, or under section 23 (b), relating to interest accrued—

"(1) if, at the close of the taxable year of the taxpayer or at any time on or before the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such taxable year, both the taxpayer and the person to whom the payment is to be made are persons between whom losses would be disallowed under section 24 (b); and

"(2) if, by reason of the method of accounting of the person to whom the payment is to be made, the amount thereof does not become includible in the gross income of such person during the period ending on or before the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of the taxable year of the taxpayer."

SEC. 120. Dividends received credit.

Section 26 (b) (relating to dividends received credits of corporations) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Dividends received: 85 percent of the amount received as dividends—

"(1) from a domestic corporation which is subject to taxation under this chapter, and

"(2) from a foreign corporation which is subject to taxation under this chapter and is engaged in trade or business within the United States if more than 50 percent of the gross income of such foreign corporation for the 3-year period ending with the close of its taxable year preceding the declaration of such dividends (or for such part of such period as the corporation has been in existence) was derived from sources within the United States as determined under the provision of section 119, but only in an amount which bear the same ratio to 85 percent of such dividends as the gross income of the corporation for such period from sources within the United States bears to its gross income from all sources.

For the purpose of the preceding sentence, if the whole or any part of a dividend is received in property other than money, and if no gain or loss is recognized to the distributing corporation by reason of the distribution, then, with respect to such property, the shareholder shall be considered to have received as a dividend an amount not in excess of the adjusted basis of such property in the hands of the distributing corporation at the time of distribution. In no event shall the credit allowed by this subsection exceed 85 percent of the adjusted net income. The credit allowed by this subsection shall not be allowed in respect of dividends received from a corporation organized under the China Trade Act, 1922, 42 Stat. 849 (U. S. C., title 15, ch. 4), or from a corporation which under section 251 is taxable only on its gross income from sources within the United States by reason of its receiving a large percentage of its gross income from sources within a possession of the United States."

SEC. 121. Installment basis.

Section 44 (d) (relating to gain or loss upon disposition of installment obligations) is hereby amended by inserting immediately after the fourth sentence thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of section 23 (w) (2) and section 126 (c) (relating to deduction for estate tax), all amounts of income for which bonds are filed as provided in the preceding sentence shall be considered income in respect of a decedent described in section 126 (a) (1), and the recipient shall be considered a person who includes such amount in income under section 126 (a) (1)."

SEC. 122. Taxable years of approximately 12 months.

Section 48 (b) (defining fiscal year) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Fiscal year: 'Fiscal year' means—

"(1) an accounting period of 12 months ending on the last day of any month other than December, or

"(2) under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, an accounting period regularly adopted and used by the taxpayer varying from 52 weeks to 53 weeks and ending within 7 days of the last day of any month. The last day of such month shall be deemed the close of the fiscal year for the purpose of determining the time for filing the return and the time for payment of the tax."

SEC. 123. Returns by certain tax-exempt organizations

Section 54 (f) (relating to returns by certain tax-exempt organizations) is hereby amended by striking out paragraphs (2) to (6), inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) which is an organization exempt under section 101 (15), if such organization is a corporation wholly owned by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, or a wholly owned subsidiary of such a corporation; or

"(3) which is an organization exempt under section 101 (3) or (6) and has gross receipts of less than $25,000 (exclusive of gifts or contributions, dues or assessments other than service charges, and payments made by or on behalf of students, patients or inmates) and, in the case of an organization exempt under section 101 (6), is—

"(A) an educational organization which normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly organized body of pupils or students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are regularly carried on; or

"(B) a charitable organization, or an organization for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, which is supported, in whole or in part, by funds contributed by the United States or any State or political subdivision thereof, or is primarily supported by contributions of the general public; or

"(C) an organization operated, supervised, or controlled by or in connection with a religious organization exempt under section 101 (6).

If, under the provisions of paragraph (3), an organization would not be required to file a return but for the fact that its gross receipts are $25,000 or more, such organization will not be required to itemize its gross receipts from gifts or contributions, dues or assessments other than service charges, and payments made by or on behalf of students, patients or inmates, but the aggregate of each class of such receipts shall be shown on the return."

SEC. 124. Farmers' returns as declaration of estimated tax.

Section 60 (a) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "; and if such an individual files a return on or before January 31 of the succeeding taxable year, and pays in full the amount computed on the return as payable, such return shall have the same effect as that prescribed in section 58 (d) (3) in the case of a return filed on or before January 15."

SEC. 125. Surtax on corporations improperly accumulating surplus.

(a) Reasonable needs of the business: Section 102 (c) (relating to evidence determinative of purpose) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Accumulation of surplus:

"(1) Evidence determinative of purpose: The fact that the earnings or profits of a corporation are permitted to accumulate beyond the reasonable needs of the business shall be determinative of the purpose to avoid surtax upon shareholders unless the corporation by the clear preponderance of the evidence shall prove to the contrary.

"(2) Reasonable needs of the business: In any case in which the Commissioner proposes to determine a deficiency with respect to the tax imposed by subsection (a) he may, prior to the mailing of a notice of deficiency as provided in section 272 (a), give the taxpayer notice, by registered mail, of an opportunity to file with the Commissioner a statement of the grounds (together with facts sufficient to apprise the Commissioner of the basis thereof) on which the taxpayer relies as establishing that the earnings or profits of the corporation have not been accumulated beyond the reasonable needs of the business. If a statement of such grounds, with such supporting facts, is filed with the Commissioner within such time (not less than 30 days after such notice is mailed) as the Commissioner may prescribe, the burden of proof with respect to the issue as to whether earnings or profits have been permitted to be accumulated beyond the reasonable needs of the taxpayer's business shall be upon the Commissioner if the taxpayer (after the mailing of a notice of deficiency as provided in section 272 (a)) files a petition with the Tax Court of the United States, and if the taxpayer in the proceedings before such court does not rely upon any grounds with respect to such issue other than those presented to the Commissioner in such statement. If the Commissioner mails such notice of deficiency for any taxable year without giving the taxpayer an opportunity to file such a statement, the Commissioner shall have the burden of proof in any proceeding before the Tax Court of the United States with respect to such issue for such year."

(b) Long-term capital gains: Section 102 (d) (1) (relating to definition of section 102 net income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(D) Long-term capital gains: The excess of the net long-term capital gain for the taxable year over the net short-term capital loss for such year, minus the taxes imposed by this chapter attributable to such excess. The taxes attributable to such excess shall be an amount equal to the difference between (i) the taxes imposed by this chapter (except the tax imposed by this section) for such year and (ii) such taxes computed for such year without including such excess in net income."

(c) Dividends paid after close of year: Section 102 (d) (2) (relating to definition of undistribution section 102 net income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "At the election of the taxpayer, the computation of such credit under section 27 (b) for any taxable year shall be made by considering the dividends paid within 75 days after the close of such taxable year, to the extent such dividends exceed the dividends paid within the first 75 days of such year, as paid within such taxable year; but if such election is made for the taxable year, then such dividends to the extent of such excess shall not, for the purposes of computing the tax imposed by this section for the succeeding taxable year, be considered as paid during such succeeding taxable year. Such election shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, but may not be made at any time after the filing of any claim for refund, or after the date of the filing of a petition with the Tax Court of the United States, with respect to the tax imposed by this section."

SEC. 126. Service rendered for a period of 36 months or more.

(a) Section 107 is hereby amended by inserting before the closing parenthesis in subsection (a) a comma and the words "or, in the case of uncompleted services, to the close of the taxable year."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947, and at the election of the taxpayer, made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

SEC. 127. Election as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations.

(a) Section 112 (b) (7) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(7) Election as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations:

"(A) General rule: In the case of property distributed in complete liquidation of a domestic corporation, if—

"(i) the liquidation is made in pursuance of a plan of liquidation adopted after the date of the enactment of the Revenue Revision Act of 1948; and

"(ii) the distribution is in complete cancellation or redemption of all the stock, and the transfer of all the property under the liquidation occurs within some one calendar month in 1949—

then in the case of each qualified electing shareholder (as defined in subparagraph (C)) gain upon the shares owned by him at the time of the adoption of the plan of liquidation shall be recognized only to the extent provided in subparagraphs (E) and (F).

"(B) Excluded corporation: The term 'excluded corporation' means a corporation which at any time between May 1, 1948, and the date of the adoption of the plan of liquidation, both dates inclusive, was the owner of stock possessing 50 percent or more of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote on the adoption of such plan.

"(C) Qualified electing shareholders: The term 'qualified electing shareholder' means a shareholder (other than an excluded corporation) of any class of stock (whether or not entitled to vote on the adoption of the plan of liquidation) who is a shareholder at the time of the adoption of such plan, and whose written election to have the benefits of subparagraph (A) has been made and filed in accordance with subparagraph (D), but—

"(i) in the case of a shareholder other than a corporation, only if written elections have been so filed by shareholders (other than corporations) who at the time of the adoption of the plan of liquidation are owners of stock possessing at least 80 per centum of the total combined voting power (exclusive of voting power possessed by stock owned by corporations) of all classes of stock entitled to vote on the adoption of such plan of liquidation; or

"(ii) in the case of a shareholder which is a corporation, only if written elections have been so filed by corporate shareholders (other than an excluded corporation) which at the time of the adoption of such plan of liquidation are owners of stock possessing at least 80 per centum of the total combined voting power (exclusive of voting power possessed by stock owned by an excluded corporation and by shareholders who are not corporations) of all classes of stock entitled to vote on the adoption of such plan of liquidation.

"(D) Making and filing of elections: The written elections referred to in subparagraph (C) must be made and filed in such manner as to be not in contravention of regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. The filing must be within 30 days after the adoption of the plan of liquidation, and may be by the liquidating corporation or by the shareholder.

"(E) Noncorporate shareholders: In the case of a qualified electing shareholder other than a corporation—

"(i) There shall be recognized, and taxed as a dividend, so much of the gain as is not in excess of his ratable share of the earnings and profits of the corporation accumulated after February 28, 1913, such earnings and profits to be determined as of the close of the month in which the transfer in liquidation occurred under subparagraph (A) (ii), but without diminution by reason of distributions made during such month; but by including in the computation thereof all amounts accrued up to the date on which the transfer of all the property under the liquidation is completed; and

"(ii) There shall be recognized, and taxed as short-term or long-term capital gain, as the case may be, so much of the remainder of the gain as is not in excess of the amount by which the value of that portion of the assets received by him which consists of money, or of stock or securities acquired by the corporation after May 1, 1948, exceeds his ratable share of such earnings and profits.

"(F) Corporate shareholders: In the case of a qualified electing shareholder which is a corporation the gain shall be recognized only to the extent of the greater of the two following—

"(i) The portion of the assets received by it which consists of money, or of stock or securities acquired by the liquidating corporation after May 1, 1948; or

"(ii) Its ratable share of the earnings and profits of the liquidating corporation accumulated after February 28, 1913, such earnings and profits to be determined as of the close of the month in which the transfer in liquidation occurred under subparagraph (A) (ii), but without diminution by reason of distributions made during such month; but by including in the computation thereof all amounts accrued up to the date on which the transfer of all the property under the liquidation is completed."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only to taxable years ending after December 31, 1948.

SEC. 128. Distribution of stock on reorganization.

(a) Section 112 (b) is hereby amended by adding after paragraph (10) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) Distribution of stock on reorganization:

"(A) In liquidation: If there is distributed (whether in one distribution or a series of distributions), in pursuance of a plan of reorganization, to a shareholder of a corporation which is a party to the reorganization, in complete cancellation or redemption of all of its stock, solely stock in two or more corporations, each of which is a party to the reorganization in pursuance of which its stock is distributed, no gain or loss to the distributee from the receipt of such stock shall be recognized, unless it appears that any corporation whose stock is so distributed pursuant to such reorganization (i) was not intended to carry on business or (ii) was principally a device for the distribution of earnings or profits to the shareholders of the corporation whose stock was canceled or redeemed.

"(B) Not in liquidation: If there is distributed, in pursuance of a plan of reorganization, to a shareholder of a corporation which is a party to the reorganization, stock (other than preferred stock) in such corporation or in another corporation which is a party to the reorganization, without the surrender by such shareholder of stock in such a corporation, no gain or loss to the distributee from the receipt of such stock shall be recognized, unless it appears that (i) any corporation which is a party to such reorganization was not intended to carry on business after such reorganization, or (ii) the corporation whose stock is distributed was principally a device for the distribution of earnings and profits to the shareholders of any corporation a party to the reorganization.

"(C) Any provision of this section, other than this paragraph and so much of subsection (c) or (e) as refers to this paragraph (except as otherwise provided in section 371 (g)) shall not apply in respect of any property distributed, in respect of which the provisions of this paragraph or so much of the provisions of subsection (c) or (e) as refers to this paragraph are applicable."

(b) Technical amendments:

(1) Section 112 (c) is hereby amended by striking out "or (5)," and inserting in lieu thereof "(5), or (11) (A)."

(2) Section 112 (e) is hereby amended by striking out "or (10)," and inserting in lieu thereof "(10), or (11) (A)."

(c) Section 113 (a) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(23) Tax-free distributions: If the property consists of stock distributed after August 1, 1948, to a taxpayer in connection with a transaction described in section 112 (b) (11) (B), the basis in the case of the stock in respect of which the distribution was made shall be apportioned, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, between such stock and the stock so distributed."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to distributions of stock made after August 1, 1948, but only if, in the case of a series of distributions in complete cancellation or redemption of all of the stock, the first distribution in such series is made after such date.

SEC. 129. Gain or loss in connection with certain corporate liquidations.

(a) Gain or loss on sales or exchanges in connection with certain corporate liquidations: Section 112 (b) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(12) Gain or loss on sales or exchanges in connection with certain corporate liquidations:

"(A) In general: No gain or loss from the sale or exchange by a corporation of property shall be recognized to such corporation if—

"(i) prior to such sale or exchange a written plan of complete liquidation is formally adopted and, within 30 days after the date of adoption of such plan, the Commissioner is notified thereof in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary; and

"(ii) within 12 months after the date of adoption of such plan of liquidation, all the assets of the corporation are distributed in complete liquidation, other than such assets in reasonable amounts as are set aside for the purpose of meeting unascertained or contingent liabilities and expenses.

"(B) Definitions: As used in subparagraph (A)—

"(i) the term 'property' includes (1) stock in trade of the taxpayer or other property of a kind which would properly be included in the inventory of the taxpayer if on hand at the close of the taxable year, and property held by the taxpayer primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of its trade or business, if, in accordance with this paragraph, substantially all of the assets (including such stock in trade and other property) of the corporation are sold or exchanged to one person, and (2) installment obligations acquired in respect of such sale or exchange;

"(ii) except as provided in clause (i), the term 'property' does not include (1) stock in trade of the taxpayer or other property of a kind which would properly be included in the inventory of the taxpayer if on hand at the close of the taxable year, (2) property held by the taxpayer primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of its trade or business, (3) installment obligations acquired in respect of property sold or exchanged prior to the date of adoption of the plan of liquidation referred to in subparagraph (A), or (4) installment obligations acquired in respect of the sale or exchange (without regard to whether such sale or exchange occurred prior to, on, or after such date) of stock in trade or other property referred to in (1) and (2) of this clause;

"(iii) the term 'sale or exchange' does not include a sale or exchange in respect of which gain or loss in whole or in part is not recognized under any provision of this section (other than this paragraph); and

"(iv) the term 'liquidation' does not include a liquidation which is a liquidation within the provisions of subsection (b) (6) or as to which an election under subsection (b) (7) is made."

(b) Gain or loss on the distribution in liquidation of certain installment obligations: Section 44 (d) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If an installment obligation is distributed by a corporation in liquidation and if no gain or loss would have been recognized to the corporation under the provisions of section 112 (b) (12) if the corporation had sold or exchanged such installment obligation on the day of such distribution, then no gain or loss shall be recognized to such corporation by reason of such distribution."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to plans of liquidation adopted after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 130. Gain resulting from involuntary conversions

(a) Section 112 (f) (relating to recognition of gain or loss resulting from involuntary conversions) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) by striking out "(f) Involuntary conversions.—" and inserting in lieu thereof

"(f) Involuntary conversions:

"(1) In general.—."

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Anticipatory replacement: If a conversion described in paragraph (1) is into money, and the taxpayer before the receipt of such money, for the purpose of replacing the property so converted, makes expenditures or incurs indebtedness in the acquisition of other property similar or related in service or use to the property so converted, or in the acquisition of control of a corporation owning such other property, at the election of the taxpayer such money so received shall be considered, for the purposes of paragraph (1), as having been expended in the acquisition of such other property or control of such corporation to the extent that such money is forthwith used by the taxpayer in replacement of the amounts so expended or in liquidation of such indebtedness. Such election shall be made at such time and in accordance with such regulations as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may prescribe. If such other property or control of such corporation was acquired prior to the taxable year in which any part of the money was received, such election may be made only if the taxpayer, in accordance with such regulations, consents in writing to the assessment (within such period as may be agreed upon) of any deficiency, to the extent resulting from such election, for any taxable year ending before the date of the filing of such consent, even though on such date such assessment is otherwise prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to money received after December 31, 1947, except that the amendments shall not be applicable to the extent that such money is used in replacement of amounts expended, and in liquidation of indebtedness incurred, on or before such date.

SEC. 131. Percentage depletion.

Paragraphs (2) and (4) (A) of section 114 (b) are hereby amended by inserting after "bentonite," the following: "marble, granite, tripoli,".

SEC. 132. Retirement of bonds.

Section 117 (f) (relating to retirement of bonds) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Retirement of bonds, etc.: For the purposes of this chapter, amounts received by the holder upon retirement of bonds, debentures, notes, or certificates or other evidences of indebtedness originally issued with interest coupons or in registered form by any corporation (including those issued by a Government or political subdivision thereof) shall be considered as amounts received in exchange therefor."

SEC. 133. Holding period of capital assets.

The first sentence of section 117 (a) (1) (relating to hold period) is hereby amended to read as follows: "In determining the period for which the taxpayer has held property received on an exchange there shall be included the period for which he held the property exchanged, if the property exchanged, at the time of such exchange, was a capital asset as defined in section 117 (a) (1), and if under the provisions of section 113, the property received has, for the purpose of determining gain or loss from a sale or exchange, the same basis in whole or in part in his hands as the property exchanged."

SEC. 134. Sales of livestock.

Section 117 (j) (1) (relating to definition of property used in trade or business) is hereby amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Such term includes animals used in the trade or business of the taxpayer except those animals which customarily would be selected during the taxable year for sale or exchange in the ordinary course of his business."

SEC. 135. Unlimited deduction for charitable contributions.

(a) Section 120 is hereby amended by striking out "in respect of preceding taxable years" and inserting in lieu thereof "in respect of such year or preceding taxable years".

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

SEC. 136. Net operating loss deduction.

(a) Amendment of section 122 (a): Section 122 (a) (relating to definition of net operating loss) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Definition of net operating loss: As used in this section, the term 'net operating loss' means the excess of the deductions allowed by this chapter over the gross income. Such excess shall be computed, in the case of a net operating loss for a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1949, with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d), or in the case of a net operating loss for a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1948, with the exceptions and limitations provided in subsection (d) (3) and (5)."

(b) Amendment of section 122 (b): Section 122 (b) (relating to amount of carry-back and carry-over) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Amount of carry-back and carry-over:

"(1) Net operating loss carry-back:

"(A) Loss for taxable year beginning before 1949: If for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, and before January 1, 1949, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-back for each of the two preceding taxable years, except that the carry-back in the case of the first preceding taxable year shall be the excess, if any, of the amount of such net operating loss over the net income for the second preceding taxable year computed—

"(i) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6); and

"(ii) by determining the net operating loss deduction for such second preceding taxable year without regard to such net operating loss or to any reduction specified in subsection (c).

"(B) Loss for taxable year beginning after 1948: If for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1948, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-back for the preceding taxable year.

"(2) Net operating loss carry-over:

"(A) Loss for taxable year beginning before 1949: If for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1949, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-over for each of the two succeeding taxable years, except that the carry-over in the case of the second succeeding taxable year shall be the excess, if any, of the amount of such net operating loss over the net income for the intervening taxable year computed—

"(i) if such intervening taxable year began before January 1, 1949, with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6), or if such intervening taxable year began in 1949, with the limitation provided in subsection (d) (4) (B); and

"(ii) by determining the net operating loss deduction for such intervening taxable year without regard to such net operating loss, to any net operating loss carry-back, or to any reduction specified in subsection (c).

For the purposes of the preceding sentence the net operating loss for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, shall be reduced by the sum of the net income for each of the two preceding taxable years computed for each such preceding taxable year—

"(iii) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6); and

"(iv) by determining the net operating loss deduction without regard to such net operating loss, to any net operating loss for the succeeding taxable year, or to any reduction specified in subsection (c).

"(B) Loss for taxable year beginning after 1948: If for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1948, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-over for each of the five succeeding taxable years, except that the carry-over in the case of each of such succeeding taxable years (other than the first succeeding taxable year) shall be the excess, if any, of the amount of such net operating loss over the sum of the net income for each of the intervening taxable years computed—

"(i) with the limitation provided in subsection (d) (4) (B); and

"(ii) by determining the net operating loss deduction for each intervening taxable year without regard to such net operating loss or to the net operating loss for any succeeding taxable year.

For the purposes of the preceding sentence the net operating loss for any taxable year shall be reduced by the amount, if any, of the net income for the preceding taxable year computed—

"(iii) if such preceding taxable year began after December 31, 1948, with the limitation provided in subsection (d) (4) (B), or if such preceding taxable year began in 1948, with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6); and

"(iv) by determining the net operating loss deduction for such preceding taxable year without regard to such net operating loss or to any reduction specified in subsection (c)."

(c) Amendment of section 122 (c): Section 122 (c) (relating to amount of net operating loss deduction) is hereby amended by striking out "taxable year reduced" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "taxable year, except that in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1949, such aggregate shall be reduced."

(d) Amendment of section 122 (d):

(1) Section 122 (d) (4) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(4) (A) Gains and losses for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1949, from sales or exchanges of capital assets shall be taken into account without regard to the provisions of section 117 (b). As so computed the amount deductible on account of such losses shall not exceed the amount includible on account of such gains.

"(B) In the case of gains and losses for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1948, from sales or exchanges of capital assets, the amount deductible on account of such losses shall not exceed the amount includible on account of such gains."

(2) The last sentence of section 122 (d) (5) is hereby amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this paragraph deductions and gross income for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1949, shall be computed with the exceptions and limitations specified in paragraphs (1) to (4), both inclusive, of this subsection.".

(e) Rule for application of section 122: Section 122 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection;

"(f) Law applicable in computing gross income, etc.: In computing the net operating loss deduction for any taxable year, the gross income and deductions for any other taxable year involved in such computation, and the exceptions, additions, and limitations (provided in subsection (d) in effect for such other taxable year) with respect to such gross income and deductions, shall be determined under the law applicable to such other year."

(f) Effective date: The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall be applicable in computing the net operating loss deduction for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941, and the amendment made by subsection (e) of this section shall be applicable in computing the net operating loss deduction for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940.

(g) Carry-overs in the case of certain reorganized railroads: Subsection (c) of the first section of the act of July 15, 1947 (Public Law 189, 80th Cong.), entitled "An act to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code" is hereby amended by striking out "three instead of two" and inserting in lieu thereof "one more than that prescribed in the Internal Revenue Code."

SEC. 137. Stock options.

(a) Supplement B of chapter 1 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 130A. Employee Stock Options.

"(a) General rule: In the case of an option granted by an employer (or any other person) to an individual, for any reason connected with the employment of such individual, to purchase stock of a corporation, no income shall result upon the granting of such option; but if stock is transferred to such individual upon his exercise of such option for an amount less than its fair market value, the difference between the amount paid for such stock and the fair market value of the stock at the time of the transfer shall be included as compensation in the gross income of such individual for the taxable year in which falls the date of such transfer.

"(b) Restricted stock options: In the case of a restricted stock option (as defined in subsection (c))—

"(1) Option price not less than 90 percent of value of stock: Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), if, at the time such option is granted, the option price is at least 90 percent of the fair market value at such time of the stock subject to the option—

"(A) No income shall result at the time of the transfer of such stock to the employee upon his exercise of the option; no deduction under section 23 (a) shall be allowable at any time to the employer corporation with respect to the stock so transferred; and no amount other than the option price shall be considered as received by the employer corporation for the stock so transferred;

"(B) If the employee, within 3 years after the transfer to him of such stock, makes a disposition (as defined in subsection (c)) of the stock, there shall be included as compensation (and not as gain upon the sale or exchange of a capital asset) in his gross income, for the taxable year in which falls the date of such disposition, an amount equal to the lesser of—

"(i) the amount of the excess of the fair market value of the stock at the time of its transfer to the employee over the option price; or

"(ii) the amount of the excess of the fair market value of the stock at the time of such disposition over its adjusted basis determined without regard to the following sentence.

The basis of such stock in the hands of such employee shall be increased by an amount equal to the amount so includible in his gross income.

"(2) Option price less than 90 percent of value of stock: Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), if, at the time such option is granted, the option price is less than 90 percent of the fair market value at such time of the stock subject to the option—

"(A) For the taxable year in which falls the date of the transfer of such stock to the employee upon his exercise of the option, there shall be included in his gross income as compensation an amount equal to the amount by which the option price is exceeded by the lesser of—

"(i) the fair market value of the stock at the time the option is granted, or

"(ii) the fair market value of the stock at the time of the transfer of the stock to the employee.

No deduction under section 23 (a) shall be allowable at any time to the employer corporation, with respect to the stock so transferred, in any amount in excess of the amount so includible as compensation, and no amount other than the option price plus the amount of such compensation shall be considered as received by the employer corporation for the stock so transferred. If, upon the application of this subparagraph (without regard to this sentence) for any taxable year of the employee, not more than $200 is includible in his gross income by reason of all such transfers of stock of any one corporation, the provisions of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), and not the provisions of this subparagraph, shall be applicable for such year with respect to the transfers of such stock.

"(B) If the employee, within 3 years after the transfer to him of such stock, makes a disposition (as defined in subsection (c)) of the stock there shall be included as compensation (and not as gain upon the sale or exchange of a capital asset) in his gross income, for the taxable year in which falls the date of such disposition, an amount equal to the lesser of—

"(i) the amount of the excess of the fair market value of such stock at the time of its transfer to the employee over the option price plus the amount includible in gross income under the provisions of subparagraph (A); or

"(ii) the amount of the excess of the fair market value of the stock at the time of such disposition over its adjusted basis determined without regard to the following sentence.

The basis of such stock in the hands of such employee shall be increased by an amount equal to the amount so includible in his gross income.

"(3) Acquisition of new stock: If the stock transferred by the employer corporation to the employee upon his exercise of the option is exchanged by him for stock or securities in an exchange within the provisions of section 112 (b) (2) or (3), or if new stock, as described in section 113 (a) (19), is acquired upon a distribution with respect to such stock, the stock or securities acquired in such exchange and such new stock shall be considered as having been transferred to the employee upon his exercise of such option. A similar rule shall be applied in the case of a series of such exchanges or acquisitions.

"(4) Death of employee: If such option is exercised after the death of such employee by his executor or any other person, the provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable with respect to such exercise or any subsequent disposition of the stock acquired upon such exercise. (For provisions relating to such exercise by an executor, etc., see section 126.) If stock received by an employee during his lifetime upon his exercise of such option is disposed of after his death by his executor or any other person, the provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable with respect to such disposition.

"(c) Definitions: As used in this section—

"(1) Restricted stock option: The term 'restricted stock option' means an option granted by a corporation to an individual, for any reason connected with its employment of such individual, to purchase stock of the employer corporation or stock of a parent corporation, but only if—

"(A) Such option by its terms is not exercisable after the expiration of 10 years from the date such option is granted;

"(B) Such option by its terms is not transferable by such individual otherwise than by will or under the laws of descent and distribution, and, during his lifetime, is exercisable only by him and only if he is an employee of the employer corporation at the time of exercise;

"(C) Such option, prior to any exercise thereof, is approved or ratified at a duly constituted meeting of the stockholders of the employer corporation, after reasonable notice to such stockholders of the proposed option; and

"(D) Such individual, at the time the option is granted, does not own stock possessing more than 10 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock of the employer corporation or of a parent corporation. For the purposes of this subparagraph—

"(i) such individual shall be considered as owning the stock owned, directly or indirectly, by or for his brothers and sisters (whether by the whole or half blood), spouse, ancestors, and lineal descendant; and

"(ii) stock owned, directly or indirectly, by or for a corporation, partnership, estate, or trust, shall be considered as being owned proportionately by or for its shareholders, partners, or beneficiaries.

"(2) Parent corporation: The term 'parent corporation' means any corporation in an unbroken chain of corporations ending with the employer corporation if, at the time of granting of the option, each of the corporations other than the employer corporation owns stock possessing more than 50 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock in one of the other corporations in such chain.

"(3) Disposition: The term 'disposition' includes a sale, exchange, gift, or any transfer of legal title, but does not include—

"(A) a transfer from a decedent to his estate or a transfer by bequest or inheritance;

"(B) an exchange which is within the provisions of section 112 (b) (2) or (3); or

"(C) a mere pledge or hypothecation."

"(d) Modification, extension, or renewal of option: If the terms of any option to purchase stock are modified, extended, or renewed, the following rules shall be applied with respect to transfers of stock made upon an exercise of the option after the making of such modification, extension, or renewal:

"(1) For the purposes of subsection (c), such modification, extension, or renewal shall be considered as the granting of a new option;

"(2) For the purposes of subsection (b), the fair market value of such stock at the time of the granting of such option shall be considered as (A) the fair market value of such stock on the date of the original granting of the option, (B) the fair market value of such stock on the date of the making of such modification, extension, or renewal, or (C) the fair market value of such stock at the time of the making of any intervening modification, extension, or renewal, whichever is the highest."

(b) Amendment of section 126: Section 126 (a) (relating to income in respect of decedents) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) Employee stock option: If an option to purchase stock granted by an employer (or any other person) to a decedent, for any reason connected with the employment of such decedent, is acquired by the estate of the decedent from the decedent or by a person who acquires such option by reason of the death of the decedent or by bequest, devise, or inheritance from the decedent—

"(A) upon transfer of the stock subject to the option to such estate or such person, the excess of the fair market value of such stock at the time of transfer over the option price shall be considered as an item of gross income in respect of the decedent; and

"(B) such option shall, for the purposes of paragraph (2), be considered as a right to receive an item of gross income in respect of the decedent."

(c) Amendment of section 22: Section 22 (relating to gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(o) Employee stock options: For provisions relating to amounts includible in gross income upon the transfer of stock to an employee upon his exercise of a stock option, see section 130A."

(d) Amendment of section 24: Section 24 (relating to items not deductible) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Certain stock options granted to employees: For disallowance of deductions in the case of certain stock options granted by employers to employees, see section 130A (b)."

(e) Amendment of section 113 (b) (1): Section 113 (b) (1) (relating to adjustment of basis of property) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(I) to the extent provided in subparagraph (B) of section 130A (b) (1) or (2) in the case of certain dispositions of stock acquired upon the exercise of a restricted stock option."

(f) Effective date:

(1) General rule: Except as hereinafter provided, the amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to options granted on or after the date of the enactment of this act. If the terms of an option granted before such date are modified, extended, or renewed on or after such date, the amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to such modification, extensions, or renewal. If an option granted before such date is a restricted stock option on the date of such enactment, the amendments shall be applicable with respect to any exercise, by the employee receiving such option, made on or after such date, even though the terms of such option have not been modified, extended, or renewed on or after such date.

(2) Restricted stock options: In the case of any transfer of stock made before the date of the enactment of this act upon the exercise of a restricted stock option granted after February 26, 1945, at the election of the employee receiving such stock the amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to such a transfer, but only if there are filed with the Commissioner before July 1, 1949 (in accordance with regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary), by such persons as may be prescribed under such regulations, signed consents—

(A) that the basis of such stock received by the employee shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of such amendments; and

(B) that there shall be paid, at such time as the Commissioner may prescribe, all of the taxes under chapter 1 or chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code which would have been imposed for all taxable years concerned if such amendments had been applicable with respect to such option.

(3) Deficiencies and overpayments: The period of limitations provided in sections 275 and 276 of the Internal Revenue Code on making of assessments and the beginning of distraint or proceeding in court for collection shall with respect to any deficiency resulting

from any such consents include 1 year immediately after the date such consents were filed, and such assessment and collection may be made notwithstanding any provision of law or any rule of law which would otherwise prevent such assessment or collection. No interest shall be allowed or paid on any overpayment, or assessed on any deficiency, resulting from the application of paragraph (2) of this subsection.

SEC. 138. Foreign tax credit.

(a) Refund of foreign taxes: Section 131 (c) (relating to adjustments on payment of accrued taxes) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "In such redetermination by the Commissioner of the amount of tax due by the taxpayer for the year or years affected by a refund, the amount of the taxes refunded for which credit has been allowed under this section shall be reduced by the amount of any tax described in subsection (a) imposed by the foreign country or possession of the United States with respect to such refund; but no credit under this section shall be allowed for any taxable year with respect to such tax imposed on the refund. No interest shall be assessed or collected on any amount of tax due upon any redetermination by the Commissioner, resulting from a refund to the taxpayer, for any period prior to the receipt of such refund, except to the extent interest was paid by the foreign country or possession of the United States on such refund for such period."

(b) Effective date of subsection (a): The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1938. If the allowance of a credit or refund of any overpayment of tax resulting from the application of the amendment made by subsection (a) is prevented on the date of the enactment of this act, or within 1 year from such date, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to compromises), credit or refund of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be allowed or made if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act.

(c) Taxes of foreign corporations: Section 131 (f) (relating to credit for taxes of foreign corporations) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) by striking out—

"(f) Taxes of foreign subsidiary—

"(1) Foreign subsidiary of domestic corporation.—"

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"(f) Taxes of foreign corporations:

"(1) Stock of foreign corporation owned by domestic corporation.—"

(2) by amending the first sentence of paragraph (1) thereof to read as follows: "For the purposes of this section, a domestic corporation which owns stock of a foreign corporation from which it receives dividends in any taxable year shall be deemed to have paid the same proportion of any income, war-profits, or excess-profits taxes paid or deemed to be paid by such foreign corporation to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States, upon or with respect to the accumulated profits of such foreign corporation from which such dividends were paid, which the amount of such dividends bears to the amount of such accumulated profits."

(d) Limitation on claims for refund:

(1) Section 322 (b) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) Special period of limitation with respect to foreign taxes paid or accrued: If the claim for credit or refund relates to an overpayment attributable to any income, war profits, and excess-profits taxes paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States for which credit is allowed against the tax imposed by this chapter in accordance with the provisions of section 131 or the provisions of any treaty to which the United States is a party, in lieu of the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in paragraph (1), the period shall be 7 years from the date prescribed by law for filing the return for the year with respect to which the claim is made. In the case of such a claim, the amount of the credit or refund may exceed the portion of the tax paid within the period provided in paragraph (2) or paragraph (3), whichever is applicable, to the extent of the amount of the overpayment attributable to the allowance of a credit for the taxes described in this paragraph."

(2) Section 322 (d) is hereby amended by inserting in lieu of the period at the end thereof a semicolon and by adding the following thereafter: "or (4) if such portion was not paid within the period described in clause (1), but the notice of deficiency was mailed within 7 years from the time prescribed for the filing of the return, or a claim described in subsection (b) (7) was filed, that such portion does not exceed the amount of the overpayment attributable to the allowance of a credit for taxes described in subsection (b) (7)."

(e) Effective date of subsection (d): The amendments made by subsection (d) shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1945.

SEC. 139. Withholding of tax at source.

(a) The first sentence of section 143 (c) (relating to return and payment of certain taxes withheld at source) is hereby amended to read as follows: "Every person required to deduct and withhold any tax under this section shall, on or before June 15 of the following year, make return thereof and pay the tax to the collector designated in section 53 (b)."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxes required to be deducted and withheld after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 140. Taxation of the income of estates and trusts.

(a) Income of estates and trusts: Section 162 (b), (c), and (d) (relating to the computation of the net income of estates and trusts) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Income required to be distributed currently: There shall be allowed as an additional deduction in computing the net income of the estate or trust the amount of the income of the estate or trust for its taxable year which is to be distributed currently as income by the fiduciary to the beneficiaries, but the amount so allowed as a deduction shall be included in computing the net income of the beneficiaries whether distributed to them or not. No deduction shall be allowed under this subsection with respect to any amount of the income of the estate or trust which does not constitute gross income of the estate or trust under this chapter; and no such amount shall be included in computing the net income of the beneficiaries.

"(c) Income not required to be distributed currently: There shall be allowed as an additional deduction in computing the net income of the estate or trust the amount of the income (other than an amount deductible under subsection (b)) of the estate or trust for any period which is distributed as income by the fiduciary to the beneficiaries during the taxable year of the estate or trust, but not in excess of the distributable income. If the aggregate of such distributions during the taxable year exceeds the distributable income, the amount of the deduction allowed with respect to the distribution to any one beneficiary shall be that proportion of the distributable income which the amount so distributed bears to the aggregate of such distributions. The amount allowed as a deduction under this subsection shall be included in computing the net income of the beneficiaries. For the purposes of this subsection, 'distributable income' means the income of the estate or trust for the taxable year less amounts allowed as deductions under subsections (a) and (b) and excluding amounts which do not constitute gross income of the estate or trust under this chapter.

"(d) Other distributions: There shall be allowed as an additional deduction in computing the net income of the estate or trust amounts (other than an amount deductible under subsection (b) or (c)) distributed by the fiduciary to the beneficiaries during the taxable year of the estate or trust, but not in excess of the statutory income. If the aggregate of such distributions during the taxable year exceeds the statutory income, the amount of the deduction allowed with respect to the distribution to any one beneficiary shall be that proportion of the statutory income which the amount so distributed bears to the aggregate of such distributions. The amount allowed as a deduction under this subsection shall be included in computing the net income of the beneficiaries. Amounts allowed as deductions under this subsection shall not include any amount distributed under the terms of the will or trust instrument as a gift of a specific sum of money (not to be made at intervals) or as a gift of specific property. For the purposes of this subsection, 'statutory income' means the net income of the estate or trust for the taxable year computed under this chapter without the deductions allowed under this subsection.

(b) Distributions by estates and trusts: Section 162 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(g) Rules for the application of subsections (b), (c), and (d):

"(1) No deduction shall be allowed to the estate or trust under subsection (b), (c), or (d) with respect to any amount which is not includible in computing the net income of the beneficiaries.

"(2) If the gross income of the estate or trust for the taxable year includes gains from the sale or exchange of capital assets, that portion of the amounts to be included under subsection (b), (c), or (d) in computing the net income of the beneficiaries which is attributable to such capital gains shall, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, be treated as long-term capital gains or short-term capital gains in the hands of such beneficiaries depending upon the period during which such capital assets were held by the estate or trust, but the provisions of section 117 (b) shall not be applicable with respect to such portions in computing their net capital gain, net capital loss, and net income.

"(h) Definition of beneficiary: For the purposes of this section, the term 'beneficiary' includes heir, legatee, and devisee."

(c) Credits of beneficiary: Section 163 (b) (relating to credits of beneficiary) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Credits of beneficiary: If the income of the estate or trust for the taxable year includes interest specified in section 25 (a), each beneficiary, required to include amounts under this supplement in computing his net income, shall, for purposes of the normal tax, be allowed as a credit against net income, in addition to the credits allowed to him under section 25 an amount equal to that portion of the amount so included by such beneficiary which is attributable to such interest. Any portion of such interest with respect to which credits are not allowed to the beneficiaries shall, for the purpose of the normal tax, be allowed as a credit to the estate or trust."

(d) Bond premium deduction: Section 163 (c) (2) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) For the purposes of subsection (b) the portion of the amount included by the beneficiary which is attributable to such interest shall be such portion (determined without regard to this paragraph) reduced by so much of the deduction under section 23 (v) attributable to such portion. The remainder of such deduction, for the purposes of the last sentence of subsection (b), shall be applied in reduction of such credits of the estate or trust."

(e) Gifts of income: The last sentence of section 22 (b) (3) (relating to exclusion of gifts, etc., from gross income) is hereby amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this paragraph, a gift, bequest, devise, or inheritance shall be considered a gift, bequest, devise, or inheritance of income from property to the extent that it is paid out of income from property, if under the terms of the gift, bequest, devise, or inheritance the distribution thereof is to be made at intervals, or to the extent that the distribution thereof constitutes a deduction to the estate or trust under section 162."

(f) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948, except that, in the case of amounts distributed or to be distributed by an estate or trust, the amendments made by this section shall not be applicable with respect to such amounts distributed or to be distributed in any taxable year of the estate or trust beginning prior to January 1, 1949.

SEC. 141. Life insurance trusts.

(a) Section 167 (a) (3) is hereby amended by striking out "or of any person not having a substantial adverse interest in the disposition of such part of the income" and inserting in lieu thereof: "not acting as trustee or cotrustee."

(b) Section 167 (a) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In cases where premiums upon policies of such insurance are paid out of corpus or out of other than income for the taxable year, such premiums shall be considered paid out of income to the extent of the income of the trust for such taxable year which is not paid, credited, or to be distributed under section 162 and which is not otherwise taxable to the grantor."

SEC. 142. Family partnerships.

(a) In general: Supplement F of Chapter 1 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 191. Family Partnerships.

"(a) Partnership status: An individual who is carrying on business in partnership and who is a relative of another member of such partnership shall be deemed to be a partner for the purpose of the tax imposed by this chapter if—

"(1) he was 21 years of age or over at the beginning of the taxable year of the partnership or at the date the partnership agreement was entered into, whichever is later;

"(2) he contributes either capital or substantial personal services to the partnership;

"(3) the partnership agreement is in writing; partnership books are kept showing the contribution, if any, of such individual to the capital of the partnership and his interest in the partnership income; and no misrepresentation has been made by any partner with respect to such contribution or interest;

"(4) his distributive share in any partnership income is determined on the basis of a reasonable allocation of the income of the business as between income attributable to personal services and income attributable to capital, with the amount of income attributable to such services apportioned between him and the other members of the partnership who are his relatives on the basis of the fair value of the services rendered by each, and with the amount of income attributable to capital contributed by him and such relatives apportioned between him and such relatives on the basis of the capital contributed by each;

"(5) he has an equal right with other members of such partnership who are his relatives to determine whether or not partnership income is to be distributed; and

"(6) his distributed share of the partnership income is not subject to any control by another member of the partnership.

"(b) Definitions: As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'capital' includes money or other property (including good will and an interest in an existing business) acquired by an individual at any time by purchase, bequest, devise, inheritance, or bona fide gift from any person even though such person is his partner and relative. A gift is a bona fide gift if the donee has absolute control over the money or property acquired.

"(2) The term 'relative' means an individual who bears any of the following relationships either to the partner or his spouse: (A) spouse, (B) son or daughter, or a descendant of either, (C) brother or sister, (D) father or mother, or an ancestor of either, (E) stepfather or stepmother, (F) son or daughter of a brother or sister, (G) brother or sister of the father or mother, (H) son-in-law, daughter-in-law, father-in-law, mother-in-law, brother-in-law, or sister-in-law. As used in this paragraph the terms 'brother' and 'sister' include a brother or sister by the half-blood. For the purpose of determining whether any of the foregoing relationships exist, a legally adopted child of a person shall be considered a child of such person by blood and a trust or an estate shall be deemed to be a relative of another partner if a beneficiary thereof is a relative of such other partner.

"(3) The term 'individual' includes a trust created by the will of a deceased partner, a trust where neither the grantor nor any trustee is a partner or the spouse of a partner, and the estate of a partner who is deceased or who is incompetent (other than by reason of minority). Such term also includes a guardian of a minor if such guardian is not a relative of such minor, and if no capital contributed to the partnership by such guardian on behalf of such minor originated with any partner."

(b) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to partnership taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

(c) Treatment of family partnerships for taxable years 1941–47:

(1) Partnership status: An individual who was carrying on business in partnership during any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940, and before January 1, 1948, and who was a relative of an individual who was a member of such partnership during any such taxable year shall be deemed to be a partner for such taxable year for the purpose of the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code if—

(A) with respect to any such taxable year, he was 21 years of age or over at the beginning of the taxable year of the partnership or at the date the partnership agreement was entered into, whichever is later;

(B) he contributed either capital or substantial personal services to the partnership;

(C) in cases where formal books of account were kept by the partnership, such books of account show the contribution, if any, of the taxpayer to the capital of the partnership and his interest in the partnership income;

(D) his distributed share of the partnership income was not subject to absolute control by another member of the partnership; and

(E) he had an equal right with other members of such partnership who are his relatives to determine whether or not partnership income was to be distributed.

(2) Computation of distributive share: For the purposes of section 182 of the Internal Revenue Code, the distributive share of an individual, with respect to whom the requirements of paragraph (1) of this subsection have been complied with, in any partnership income shall be an amount which is determined on the basis of a reasonable allocation of the income of the partnership as between income attributable to personal services and income attributable to capital, with the amount of income attributable to such services apportioned between him and the other members of the partnership who are his relatives on the basis of the fair value of the services rendered by each, and with the amount of income attributable to capital contributed by him and such relatives apportioned between him and such relatives on the basis of the capital contributed by each.

(3) Definitions: As used in this subsection the terms "capital," "relative," and "individual" shall have the meaning assigned to them in section 191 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(d) Taxable years to which applicable: The provisions of subsection (c) shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940, and prior to January 1, 1948, at the election of the taxpayer, made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Such election shall not be allowed unless in accordance with such regulations, the taxpayer and his partners who are his relatives consent in writing to the assessment, within such period as may be agreed upon with the Commissioner, of any deficiency attributable to such election, even though at the time of the filing of such consent the assessment of such deficiency would otherwise be prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law; and such assessment and collection may be made notwithstanding any provision of the internal revenue laws or any rule of law which would otherwise prevent such assessment and collection.

SEC. 143. Capital gains of nonresident alien individuals.

(a) Section 211 (a) (1) (B) (relating to tax on nonresident alien individuals not engaged in trade or business within the United States) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(B) Capital gains of aliens temporarily present: In the case of a nonresident alien individual not engaged in trade or business in the United States, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year, in addition to the tax imposed by subparagraph (A)—

"(i) if he is present in the United States for a period or periods aggregating less than 90 days during such taxable year—a tax of 30 percent of the amount by which his gains, derived from sources within the United States, from sales or exchanges of capital assets effected during his presence in the United States exceed his losses allocable to sources within the United States, from such sales or exchanges effected during such presence; or

"(ii) if he is present within the United States for a period or periods aggregating 90 days or more during such taxable year—a tax of 30 percent of the amount by which his gains, derived from sources within the United States, from sales or exchanges of capital assets effected during such year exceed his losses, allocable to sources within the United States, from such sales or exchanges effected during such year.

For the purposes of this subparagraph, gains and losses from sales or exchanges of capital assets shall be computed without regard to the provisions of section 117 (b), and such losses shall be determined without the benefit of the capital loss carry-over provided in section 117 (e).

"(C) Cross reference: For inclusion in computation of tax of amount specified in shareholder's consent, see section 28."

(b) Section 211 (a) (2) (relating to tax on nonresident alien individuals with income of more than $15,400) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) Aggregate more than $15,400: The tax imposed by paragraph (1) shall not apply to any individual if during the taxable year the aggregate amount received from sources specified in paragraph (1) (A) plus the amount by which the gains exceed the losses determined under paragraph (1) (B) is more than $15,400."

(c) So much of section 211 (c) (relating to tax on nonresident alien individuals with income of more than $15,400) as precedes paragraph (1) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) No United States trade or business and income of more than $15,400: A nonresident alien individual not engaged in trade or business within the United States who has received for any taxable year an aggregate amount from sources specified in subsection (a) (1) (A) plus the amount by which the gains exceed the losses determined under subsection (a) (1) (B) of more than $15,400 shall be taxable without regard to subsection (a) (1), except that—"

(d) Section 211 (c) (3) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) The tax under this subsection shall, in no case, be less than 30 percent of the aggregate amount received from sources specified in subsection (a) (1) (A) plus the amount by which the gains exceed the losses determined under subsection (a) (1) (B); and".

SEC. 144. Treaty obligations.

No amendment made by this act shall apply in any case where its application would be contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

SEC. 145. Income from sources within possessions of the United States.

(a) Section 251 (relating to income from sources within possessions of United States) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) Employees of United States: For the purposes of this section, amounts paid after December 31, 1947, for services performed by a citizen of the United States as an employee of the United States or any agency thereof shall be deemed to be derived from sources within the United States."

(b) Section 1621 (a) (8) (B) (relating to definition of wages) is hereby amended by inserting after "for an employer" the following: "(other than the United States or any agency thereof)".

(c) The amendment made by subsection (b) shall be applicable with respect to wages paid on or after January 1, 1949.

SEC. 146. Period of limitations on claims against transferees.

(a) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 311 (b) (relating to period of limitation for assessment of transferee liability) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) In the case of the liability of an initial transferee of the property of the taxpayer, within 1 year after the expiration of the period of limitation for assessment against the taxpayer (except that where such transferee becomes a transferee after the expiration of the period of limitation for assessment against the taxpayer and no assessment against the taxpayer has been made, no assessment of the liability of such transferee shall be made):

"(2) In the case of the liability of a transferee of a transferee of the property of the taxpayer, within 1 year after the expiration of the period of limitation for assessment against the preceding transferee, but only if within 3 years after the expiration of the period of limitation for assessment against the taxpayer (except that where the transferee of a transferee becomes such a transferee after the expiration of the period of limitation for assessment against the preceding transferee and no assessment against the preceding transferee has been made, no assessment of the liability of such transferee shall be made);".

(b) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to transferees whose liability arises after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 147. Date of payment of taxes withheld.

(a) Section 322 (e) (relating to presumption as to date of payment of taxes) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Presumption as to date of payment: For the purposes of this section—

"(1) any tax actually deducted and withheld at the source during any calendar year under subchapter D of chapter 9 shall, in respect of the recipient of the income, be deemed to have been paid by him not earlier than the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of his taxable year with respect to which such tax is allowable as a credit under section 35;

"(2) any amount paid as estimated tax for any taxable year shall be deemed to have been paid not earlier than the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such taxable year; and

"(3) any tax actually deducted and withheld at the source during any calendar year under section 143 or section 144 shall, in respect of the recipient of the income, be deemed to have been paid by him not earlier than the fifteenth day of June following the calendar year during which such tax was withheld."

(b) Section 3771 (f) (relating to estimated tax and tax withheld at source) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Estimated tax and tax withheld at source: For date of payment in respect of estimated tax, tax withheld at source on wages, and tax withheld under section 143 or 144, see section 322 (e)."

(c) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxes deducted and withheld after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 148. Extension of period for refund in case of waiver by transferee.

(a) Section 322 (relating to the period of limitation for refunds and credits) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Exception in the case of waivers by transferees or fiduciaries: If both the Commissioner and a transferee or fiduciary have agreed in writing under the provisions of section 311 (b) (4) to extend the time within which the Commissioner may make an assessment—

"(1) the provisions of this section applicable in case an agreement is executed under section 276 (b) shall be applicable with respect to such transferee or fiduciary as if such provisions referred to agreements executed under section 311 (b) (4) within the period prescribed in section 311 (b) (4) for making such waiver, and without regard to section 276; and

"(2) in applying the limitations on the amount of the credit or refund, the period prior to the execution of the agreement within which a portion of the tax is paid and the period from the time of filing the return within which the agreement was executed shall be increased by so much of the applicable period of limitation for assessment against the transferee or fiduciary provided in section 311 (b) (1), (2), or (3) elapsed prior to the execution of the agreement, as exceeds the period of limitation for assessment against the taxpayer with reference to whom the liability of such transferee or fiduciary arises."

(b) Effective date: A provision having the effect of the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be deemed to be included in the revenue laws respectively applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1937, but such amendments shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning prior to January 1, 1948, only if on or at some time after the date of the enactment of this act the Commissioner may assess the tax for such taxable year solely by reason of having made (either before, on, or after the date of such enactment) an agreement with the taxpayer pursuant to section 311 (b) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code or the corresponding provision of the applicable prior revenue law to extend beyond the time prescribed in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 311 (b) or the corresponding provision of such prior revenue law the date within which the Commissioner may assess the tax.

SEC. 149. Tax on regulated investment companies.

Section 362 (b) (relating to tax on regulated investment companies) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(8) For the purposes of this subsection, a distribution of a taxable dividend other than a capital gain dividend made during the first 75 days of any taxable year may at the election of the taxpayer, to the extent that such distribution exceeds any such distribution made within the first 75 days of the preceding taxable year, be treated as having been made during such preceding taxable year; but if such election is made as to any taxable year, an amount equal to the excess so computed shall be excluded in determining the amount of such distribution in the year in which it was actually made. Such election shall be made at such time and in such manner as is provided under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary."

SEC. 150. Commuting expenses of disabled individuals.

Section 23 (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by inserting after subsection (x) thereof the following new subsection:

"(y) Transportation of disabled individuals to and from work: In the case of a disabled individual, expenses paid during the taxable year for transportation to and from work to the extent that such expenses do not exceed $600. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'disabled individual' means an individual who has lost the use of a leg, of both legs, or of both arms, to such an extent that he is unable during the entire taxable year to use, without undue hardship or danger, a streetcar, bus, subway, train, or similar form of public transportation, as a means of traveling to and from work."

SEC. 151. Short sales of capital assets.

(a) Section 117 (relating to capital gains and losses) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) Short sales, etc.: In the case of a short sale of property made by the taxpayer after May 31, 1948:

"(1) Short-term gains and holding periods: If substantially identical property has been held by the taxpayer on the date of such short sale for not more than 6 months (determined without regard to the effect, under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, of such short sale on the holding period), or if substantially identical property is acquired after such short sale and on or before the date of the closing thereof—

"(A) any gain upon the closing of such short sale shall be considered as a gain upon the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for not more than 6 months (notwithstanding the period of time any property used by the taxpayer to close such short sale has been held); and

"(B) the holding period of such substantially identical property shall be considered to begin (notwithstanding the provisions of

subsection (h)) on the date of the closing of the short sale, or on the date of a sale, gift, or other disposition of such property, whichever date occurs first. This subparagraph shall apply to such substantially identical property in the order of the dates of the acquisition of such property, but only to so much of such property as does not exceed the quantity sold short.

"(2) Long-term losses: If substantially identical property has been held by the taxpayer on the date of such short sale for more than 6 months, any loss upon the closing of such short sale shall be considered as a loss upon the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than 6 months (notwithstanding the period of time any property used by the taxpayer to close such short sale has been held, and notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (g) (2)).

"(3) Rules for application of subsection:

"(A) The provisions of paragraph (1) (A) or (2) shall not apply to the gain or loss, respectively, on any quantity of property used to close such short sale which is in excess of the quantity of the substantially identical property referred to in the applicable paragraph.

"(B) For the purposes of this subsection—

"(i) the term 'property' includes only stock, securities, or commodity futures which are capital assets in the hands of the taxpayer; and

"(ii) an option to sell such property at a fixed price shall be considered as a short sale, and the exercise or failure to exercise such option shall be considered as a closing of such short sale."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years ending after May 31, 1948.

TITLE II—ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

PART I—ESTATE TAX

SEC. 201. Estates to which amendments applicable.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, the amendments made by this part shall be applicable only with respect to estates of decedents dying after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 202. Transfers taking effect at death.

So much of section 811 (c) (relating to certain transfers of a decedent) as precedes the last sentence thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Transfers in contemplation of, or taking effect at death: To the extent of any interest therein of which the decedent has at any time made a transfer (except in case of a bona fide sale for an adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth), by trust or otherwise—

"(1) in contemplation of his death; or

"(2) under which he has retained for his life or for any period not ascertainable without reference to his death or for any period which does not in fact end before his death (A) the possession or enjoyment of, or the right to the income from, the property, or (B) the right, either alone or in conjunction with any person, to designate the persons who shall possess or enjoy the property or the income therefrom; or

"(3) intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after his death. In no case shall the amount includible in determining the value of the gross estate under the provisions of this paragraph exceed the value of any reversionary interest of the decedent immediately before his death with respect to the interest so transferred. Such value immediately before his death shall be determined in accordance with tables of experience or probability or other accepted methods of actuarial valuation under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. For the purposes of this paragraph, (A) a reversionary interest includes a possibility that an interest so transferred or a portion thereof may return to the decedent or his estate, and (B) a possibility that an interest so transferred or a portion thereof may be disposed of through the exercise of a power by the decedent shall be considered as a possibility that the interest subject to such power may so return."

SEC. 203. Proceeds of life insurance.

Section 811 (g) is hereby amended by striking out paragraph (3) thereof, and section 811 (g) (2) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) Receivable by other beneficiaries: To the extent of the amount receivable by all other beneficiaries as insurance under policies upon the life of the decedent with respect to which the decedent possessed at his death any of the incidents of ownership, exercisable either alone or in conjunction with any other person."

SEC. 204. Transfers in contemplation of death.

(a) Transfers, etc., in contemplation of death: Section 811 (relating to gross estate) is hereby amended by striking out "(l)" at the beginning of subsection (l) and inserting in lieu thereof "(n)," and by inserting after subsection (k) the following new subsection:

"(l) Contemplation of death: If the decedent within a period of three years ending with the date of his death (except in case of a bona fide sale for an adequate and full consideration in money's worth) transferred an interest in property, relinquished a power, or exercised or released a power of appointment, such transfer, relinquishment, exercise or release shall, unless shown to the contrary, be deemed to have been made in contemplation of death within the meaning of subsections (c), (d), and (f); but no such transfer, relinquishment, exercise, or release made prior to such 3-year period shall be deemed or held to have been made in contemplation of death."

(b) Amendments of section 811 (c) and (d):

(1) Section 811 (c) (relating to transfers in contemplation of death) is hereby amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(2) Section 811 (d) (relating to revocable transfers) is hereby amended by striking out paragraph (4) thereof.

SEC. 205. Exclusion of amounts payable under certain employee retirement plans.

Section 811 (relating to gross estate of the decedent) is hereby amended by inserting after subsection (l) thereof (added by section 204 of this act) the following new subsection:

"(m) Exclusion of certain employee benefits: In determining the value of the gross estate of a decedent there shall not be included in the gross estate the value of amounts receivable by any person (other than the executor) under—

"(1) a pension, annuity, or retirement plan of the United States, any State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing;

"(2) an employees' trust forming part of a pension, stock bonus, or profit-sharing plan which, at the time of the decedent's separation from employment, met the requirements of section 165 (a);

"(3) a retirement annuity contract purchased by an employer (and not by an employees' trust) pursuant to a plan which, at the time of the decedent's separation from employment, met the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6).

If such amounts payable after the death of the decedent under a plan described in paragraph (2) or (3) are attributable to any extent to payments or contributions made by the decedent after his separation from the employment covered by such plan, no exclusion shall be allowed for any part of the value of such amounts."

SEC. 206. Repeal of deduction for support of dependents.

Section 812 (b) (relating to deductions for expenses etc.) is hereby amended—

(a) by inserting the word "and" at the end of paragraph (3) thereof;

(b) by striking out of paragraph (4) thereof the following: "and ;

(c) by striking out paragraph (5) thereof; and

(d) by striking out "(3), (4), and (5) exceed" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3), and (4) exceed".

SEC. 207. Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses.

(a) Section 812 (d) (relating to transfers for public, etc., uses) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses: The amount of all bequests, legacies, devises, or transfers (including the interest which falls into any such bequest, legacy, devise, or transfer as a result of an irrevocable disclaimer of a bequest, legacy, devise, transfer, or power, if the disclaimer is made prior to the date prescribed for the filing of the estate tax return) to or for the use of:

"(1) the United States, any State, Territory or any political subdivision thereof or the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States, for exclusively public purposes; or

"(2) a corporation, trust, or community chest, fund or foundation, created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory, or of the District of Columbia, or of any possession of the United States, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, veteran rehabilitation service, literary, or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation; or

"(3) posts or organizations of war veterans, or auxiliary units or societies of, or trusts or foundations for, any such posts or organizations, if such posts, organizations, units, societies, trusts, or foundations are organized in the United States or any of its possessions, and if no part of their net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; or

"(4) a domestic fraternal society, order, or association, operating under the lodge system, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation, but only if such contributions or gifts are to be used exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals. Property includible in the decedent's gross estate under section 811 (f) received by a donee described in this subsection shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be considered a bequest of such decedent. If the tax imposed by section 810, or any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance taxes, are, either by the terms of the will, by the law of the jurisdiction under which the estate is administered, or by the law of the jurisdiction imposing the particular tax, payable in whole or in part out of the bequests, legacies, or devises otherwise deductible under this paragraph, then the amount deductible under this paragraph shall be the amount of such bequests, legacies, or devises reduced by the amount of such taxes. The amount of the deduction under this subsection for any transfer shall not exceed the value of the transferred property required to be included in the gross estate."

(b) Section 861 (a) (3) (relating to transfers for public, etc., uses) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses: The amount of all bequests,

legacies, devises, or transfers (including the interest which falls into any such bequest, legacy, devise, or transfer as a result of an irrevocable disclaimer of a bequest, legacy, devise, transfer, or power, if the disclaimer is made prior to the date prescribed for the filing of the estate tax return) to or for the use of:

"(A) the United States, any State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof or the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States, for exclusively public purposes; or

"(B) a corporation, trust, or community chest, fund or foundation, created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory, or of the District of Columbia, or of any possession of the United States, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, veteran rehabilitation service, literary or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals (but in the case of contributions or gifts to a trust, chest, fund, or foundation, only if such contributions or gifts are to be used within the United States or any of its possessions exclusively for such purposes), no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation; or

"(C) posts or organizations of war veterans, or auxiliary units or societies of, or trusts or foundations for, any such posts or organizations, if such posts, organizations, units, societies, trusts, or foundations are organized in the United States or any of its possessions, and if no part of their net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; or

"(D) a domestic fraternal society, order, or association, operating under the lodge system, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, but only if such contributions or gifts are to be used within the United States or any of its possessions exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals.

Property includible in the decedent's gross estate under section 811 (f) received by a donee described in this paragraph shall, for the purposes of this paragraph, be considered a bequest of such decedent. If the tax imposed by section 860, or any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance taxes, are, either by the terms of the will, by the law of the jurisdiction under which the estate is administered, or by the law of the jurisdiction imposing the particular tax, payable in whole or in part out of the bequests, legacies, or devises otherwise deductible under this paragraph, then the amount deductible under this paragraph shall be the amount of such bequests, legacies, or devises reduced by the amount of such taxes. The amount of the deduction under this paragraph for any transfer shall not exceed the value of the transferred property required to be included in the gross estate."

SEC. 208. Marital deduction in case of life insurance or annuity payments.

(a) Section 812 (e) (1) (G) (relating to life insurance with power of appointment in surviving spouse) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(G) Life insurance or annuity payments with power of appointment in surviving spouse: Where proceeds receivable under an insurance contract on the life of the decedent, or under an endowment or annuity contract, are payable in annual or more frequent installments commencing not later than 13 months after the decedent's death, or where proceeds of an insurance or endowment contract are held by the insurer under an agreement to pay interest thereon annually or at more frequent intervals, if, under the terms of the contract, all amounts payable during the life of the surviving spouse are payable only to such spouse, and such spouse has the power to appoint all amounts payable under such contract (exercisable in favor of such surviving spouse, or of the estate of such surviving spouse, or in favor of either, whether or not in each case the power is exercisable in favor of others), with no power in any other person to appoint to any person other than the surviving spouse any part of the amounts payable under such contract—

"(i) such proceeds shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (A), be considered as passing to the surviving spouse, and

"(ii) no part of such proceeds shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (B) (i), be considered as passing to any person other than the surviving spouse.

This subparagraph shall be applicable only if, under the terms of the contract, such power in the surviving spouse to appoint, whether exercisable by will or during life, is exercisable by such spouse alone and in all events."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 209. Technical amendments.

(a) Section 821 (a) (3) (relating to requirement of estate-tax return) is hereby amended by striking out "$40,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$60,000."

(b) Section 851 and Supplement E of chapter 3 (relating to estates in China) are hereby repealed.

SEC. 210. Credit for taxes of foreign countries and of Puerto Rico.

(a) Credit against basic estate tax: Section 813 (relating to credits against tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof two new subsections to read as follows:

"(c) Same—Paid to foreign countries:

"(1) The tax imposed by section 810 (after deducting from such tax the credits provided by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be credited with the amount of any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes actually paid to any foreign country in respect of any property situated within such foreign country and included in the gross estate (not including any such taxes paid with respect to the estate of a person other than the decedent). The determination of the country within which property is situated shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, in accordance with principles not inconsistent with the provisions of section 862. If the decedent was not a citizen of the United States, credit shall not be allowed under this subsection unless the country of which such decedent was a national, in imposing such taxes, allows a similar credit in the case of a citizen of the United States resident in such country.

"(2) The credit provided in this subsection—

"(A) shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the tax actually paid to such foreign country as the value of property which is—

"(i) situated within such foreign country,

"(ii) subjected to the tax of such foreign country, and

"(iii) included in the gross estate

bears to the value of the entire gross estate reduced by the aggregate amount of the deductions allowed under subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 812.

"(3) (A) The values referred to in the ratio stated in paragraph (2) (A) are the values determined for the purposes of the tax imposed by such foreign country.

"(B) The values referred to in the ratio stated in paragraph (2) (B) are the values determined under this chapter; but, in applying such ratio, the value of any property described in clauses (i) (ii), and (iii) of such ratio shall be reduced by such amount as will properly reflect, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the deductions allowed in respect thereof under subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 812.

"(4) The credit provided in this subsection shall be allowed only if the taxpayer establishes to the satisfaction of the Commissioner (A) the amount of tax actually paid to the foreign country, (B) the amount and date of each payment of such tax, (C) the description and value of the property in respect of which such tax is imposed, and (D) all other information necessary for the verification and computation of the credit.

"(5) The credit provided in this subsection shall be allowed only for such taxes as were actually paid and credit therefor claimed within 4 years after the filing of the return required by section 821, except that—

"(A) If a petition for redetermination of a deficiency has been filed with the Tax Court of the United States within the time prescribed in section 871, then within such 4-year period or before the expiration of 60 days after the decision of the Tax Court becomes final,

"(B) If, under section 822 (a) (2) or section 871 (h), an extension of time has been granted for payment of the tax shown on the return, or of a deficiency, then within such 4-year period or before the date of the expiration of the period of the extension.

Refund based on the credit may (despite the provisions of sections 910 to 912, inclusive) be made if claim therefor is filed within the period above provided. Any such refund shall be made without interest.

"(d) Same—Paid to Puerto Rico: If the decedent died on or after March 22, 1946, the tax imposed by section 810 (after deducting from such tax the credits provided by sec. 813 (a) and (b) shall be credited with the amount of any inheritance taxes actually paid to Puerto Rico in respect of any property situated within Puerto Rico and included in the gross estate. Such credit shall be computed, allowed, and refund based thereon made, as provided in section 813 (c)."

(b) Technical amendment: Effective with respect to estates of decedents dying on or after March 22, 1946, section 813 (b) is hereby amended by inserting after "United States" the following: "(except Puerto Rico)."

(c) Credit against additional estate tax: Section 938 (relating to credits against tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) The tax imposed by section 935 (after deducting from such tax credit provided by subsec. (b) of this section) shall be credited with the amount of any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes actually paid to any foreign country in respect of any property situated within such foreign country and included in the gross estate (not including any such taxes paid with respect to the estate of a nonresident not a citizen of the United States or a person other than the decedent). The determination of the country within which property is situated shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, in accordance with principles not inconsistent with the provisions of section 862. If the decedent was a resident but not a citizen of the United States, credit shall not be allowed under this subsection unless the country of which such decedent was a national, in imposing such taxes, allows a similar credit in the case of a citizen of the United States resident in such country.

"(2) The credit provided in this subsection—

"(A) shall not exceed the amount by which such tax paid to such foreign country exceeds the amount of the credit allowed for such tax under section 813 (c); and

"(B) shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the tax imposed by section 935 as the value of property which is—

"(i) situated within such foreign country,

"(ii) subject to the tax of such foreign country, and

"(iii) included in the gross estate

bears to the value of the entire gross estate reduced by the aggregate amount of the deductions allowed under subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 812.

"(3) (A) For the purposes of paragraph (2) (A) 'such tax paid to such foreign country' shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the tax actually paid to such foreign country as the value of property which is—

"(i) situated within such foreign country,

"(ii) subjected to the tax of such foreign country, and

"(iii) included in the gross estate

bears to the value of all property subjected to the tax of such foreign country. The values referred to in this ratio are the values determined for the purposes of the tax imposed by such foreign country.

"(B) The values referred to in the ratio stated in paragraph (2) (B) are the values determined under this chapter; but, in applying such ratio, the value of any property described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of such ratio shall be reduced by such amount as will properly reflect, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the deductions allowed in respect thereof under subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 812.

"(4) The credit provided in this subsection shall be allowed only if the taxpayer establishes to the satisfaction of the Commissioner (A) the amount of tax actually paid to the foreign country, (B) the amount and date of each payment of such tax, (C) the description and value of the property in respect of which such tax is imposed, and (D) all other information necessary for the verification and computation of the credit.

"(5) The credit provided in this subsection shall be allowed only for such taxes as were actually paid and credit therefor claimed within 4 years after the filing of the return required by section 821, except that—

"(A) If a petition for redetermination of a deficiency has been filed with the Tax Court of the United States within the time prescribed in section 871, then within such 4-year period or before the expiration of 60 days after the decision of the Tax Court becomes final.

"(B) If, under section 822 (a) (2) or section 871 (h), an extension of time has been granted for payment of the tax shown on the return, or of a deficiency, then within such 4-year period or before the date of the expiration of the period of the extension.

Refund based on the credit may (despite the provisions of sections 910 to 912, inclusive), be made if claim therefor is filed within the period above provided. Any such refund shall be made without interest.

"(d) If the decedent died on or after March 22, 1946, the tax imposed by section 935 (after deducting from such tax the credit provided by section 936 (b)) shall be credited with the amount of any inheritance taxes actually paid to Puerto Rico in respect of any property situated within Puerto Rico and included in the gross estate. Such credit shall be computed, allowed, and refund based thereon made, as provided in section 936 (c)."

(d) Technical amendment: Section 927 (relating to credit for State death taxes) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 927. Credit for death taxes.

"Such part of any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes allowable as a credit under section 813 (b), (c), or (d) against the tax imposed by this subchapter, or under section 936 (c) or (d) against the tax imposed by subchapter B, as is attributable to such reversionary or remainder interest may be allowed as a credit against the tax attributable to such interest, subject to the limitations on the amount of credit contained in such sections, if such part is paid, and credit therefor claimed, at any time prior to the expiration of 60 days after the termination of the precedent interest or interests in the property."

(e) Estates or residents of Puerto Rico:

(1) The heading to subpart IV of part II of subchapter A of chapter 3 reading "Subpart IV—Special classes of residents" is hereby amended to read as follows: "Subpart IV—Special classes of decedents."

(2) Such subpart IV is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 852. Residents of Puerto Rico.

"In the case of the estate of a resident of Puerto Rico (other than such a resident who was at the time of his death a citizen of the United States and who was not, at the time he became such a citizen, a resident of Puerto Rico) the tax under this subchapter shall be imposed in the same manner as in the case of the estate of a nonresident not a citizen of the United States."

(f) Extension of period of limitations, etc., in case of recovery of taxes claimed as credit: Section 874 (b) (relating to exceptions to general rule as to period of limitation upon assessment and collection) is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Recovery of taxes claimed as credit: If any tax claimed as a credit under section 813 (b), (c), or (d) or section 936 (c) or (d) is recovered from any foreign country, State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or possession of the United States, the executor, or any other person or persons recovering such amount, shall give notice of such recovery to the Commissioner at such time and in such manner as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, and the Commissioner shall redetermine the amount of the tax under this chapter and the amount, if any, of the tax due upon such redetermination, shall be paid by the executor or such person or persons, as the case may be, upon notice and demand by the collector."

SEC. 211. Requirement of transfer certificates.

Section 828 (relating to certain cross-references) is hereby renumbered section 829, and there is inserted immediately following section 827 the following new section:

"SEC. 828. Transfer Certificates.

"If any corporation or its transfer agent or registrar transfers certificates of its stock or bonds situated in the United States and standing in the name of or known by such corporation or its agent to belong to a nonresident decedent, or if any corporation or person transfers, removes, or extinguishes a property right situated in the United States of the estate of a nonresident decedent (such as a debt, stock, bond, or note) issuing from or enforcible against corporation or person, or if any bank, trust company, or custodian in possession of property situated in the United States of the estate of a nonresident decedent transfers or removes such property (whether or not such stock, bond, property right, or property was jointly held with one or more other persons), before the tax, interest, and penalties, if any, imposed by this chapter with respect to the estate of such nonresident decedent is fully paid or provided for to the satisfaction of the Commissioner, such corporation, agent, registrar, person, bank, trust company, or custodian shall be personally liable for such tax, interest, and penalties, to the extent of the value at the time of the decedent's death of such stock, bonds, property right, or property, unless prior to such transfer, removal, or extinguishment, the Commissioner issues his certificate permitting the transfer, removal, or extinguishment of such stock, bonds, property, or property rights without personal liability or unless under regulations, prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, such transfer, removal, or extinguishment may be made without such certificate."

SEC. 212. Period of limitation upon assessment and collection.

(a) Section 874 (b) (relating to exceptions to period of limitation upon assessment and collection) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) Omission from gross estate: If the executor fails to make disclosure in or with the return of property the value of which is properly includible in the gross estate and such value exceeds 25 percent of the value of the gross estate stated in the return, the tax may be assessed or a proceeding in court for the collection of such tax may be begun without assessment at any time within 5 years after the return was filed."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to returns filed after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 213. Exemption from the additional estate tax for members of armed forces.

(a) Subchapter B of chapter 3 (relating to additional estate tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 939. Members of the Armed Forces.

"The tax imposed by section 935 shall not apply to the transfer of the net estate of a citizen or resident of the United States dying on or after December 7, 1941, and before January 1, 1947, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or any of the other United Nations if such decedent—

"(1) was killed in action; or

"(2) died as a result of wounds or other injuries, or of disease, suffered while in line of duty by reason of a hazard to which he was subjected as an incident of military or naval service."

(b) If the refund of any overpayment resulting from the application of this section is prevented on the date of the enactment of this act, or within 1 year from such date, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to compromises), refund of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be made if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act. No interest shall be paid on any overpayment resulting from the application of this section.

PART II.—GIFT TAX

SEC. 251. Reciprocal trusts.

Section 1000 (relating to imposition of gift tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Certain reciprocal trusts: In the case of property in a trust created prior to January 1, 1940, if and to the extent that such property may be deemed to have been transferred to such trust by a person other than

the nominal grantor of such property (by reason of the fact that such person has made a reciprocal transfer of property in trust), then a relinquishment by such person on or before December 31, 1948, of any power over such property or the income therefrom shall not be deemed a transfer of property for the purposes of this chapter. If such property was transferred in trust while a law was in effect imposing a tax upon the transfer of property by gift, this subsection shall apply only if (1) a gift tax was paid with respect to the aforesaid reciprocal transfer of property, and not credited or refunded, by the person relinquishing such power, or (2) a gift tax return was made by such person on account of such reciprocal transfer within the time prescribed but no gift tax was paid with respect to such reciprocal transfer because of the deductions and exclusions claimed on such return. If a relinquishment is executed under this subsection, then such reciprocal transfer made by the person relinquishing such power shall for all purposes be deemed to have been a completed gift at the time when such reciprocal transfer was made."

SEC. 252. Certain employee retirement plans.

Section 1000 (relating to imposition of gift tax) is hereby amended by adding after subsection (g) thereof (added by section 251 of this act) the following new subsection:

"(h) Certain employee retirement plans: In the case of a gift made to any person after December 31, 1947, of amounts payable after the donor's death under—

"(1) a pension, annuity, or retirement plan of the United States, any State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing;

"(2) an employee's trust forming part of a pension, stock bonus, or profit-sharing plan which, at the time of such gift, meets the requirements of section 165 (a);

"(3) a retirement annuity contract purchased by an employer (and not by an employees' trust) pursuant to a plan which, at the time of such gift, meets the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6);

such gift shall not be considered a transfer of property for the purposes of this chapter. The preceding sentence shall not be applicable with respect to payments or contributions to or under a plan described in paragraph (2) or (3) if such payments or contributions are made after the donor's separation from the employment covered by such plan."

SEC. 253. Gift tax exclusion for future interests.

Section 1003 (b) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) Gifts of future interests: In the case of gifts of future interests made by the donor during the calendar year 1948 and subsequent calendar years, an aggregate of $3,000, for all such gifts, shall not, for the purposes of subsection (a), be included in the total amount of gifts made during such year."

SEC. 254. Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses.

(a) Section 1004 (a) (2) relating to charitable, etc., gifts) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) by inserting in subparagraph (A) thereof after "or the District of Columbia," the following: "or any possession of the United States,";

(2) by inserting in subparagraph (B) thereof after "foundation," the following: "created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory, or of the District of Columbia, or of any possession of the United States,"; and by inserting in such subparagraph after "charitable, scientific," the following: "veteran rehabilitation service,";

(3) by striking out of subparagraph (C) thereof "a fraternal society" and inserting in lieu thereof "a domestic fraternal society"; and by inserting after "under the lodge system," the following: "no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation,";

(4) by inserting in subparagraph (D) thereof after "units or societies of" the following: ", or trusts, or foundations for,"; and by striking out of such subparagraph "or societies are organized" and inserting in lieu thereof "societies, trusts, or foundations are organized"; and by striking out the semicolon at the end of such subparagraph and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(5) by striking out subparagraphs (E) and (F) thereof.

(b) Section 1004 (b) (relating to charitable, etc., gifts by nonresidents) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) by inserting in paragraph (1) thereof after "or the District of Columbia," the following: "or any possession of the United States,";

(2) by striking out paragraphs (2) and (3) thereof and by adding after paragraph (1) a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) a corporation, trust, or community chest, fund or foundation, created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory, or of the District of Columbia, or of any possession of the United States, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, veteran rehabilitation service, literary, or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals (but in the case of gifts to a trust, chest, fund, or foundation, only if such gifts are to be used within the United States or any of its possessions exclusively for such purposes), no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation;";

(3) by striking out of paragraph (4) thereof "a fraternal society" and inserting in lieu thereof "a domestic fraternal society"; by inserting after "under the lodge system," the following: "no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation,"; and by inserting in such paragraph after "within the United States" the following: "or any of its possessions"; and by renumbering such paragraph as pragraph (3);

(4) by inserting in paragraph (5) thereof after "units or societies of" the following: ", or trusts, or foundations for,"; by striking out from such paragraph "or societies are organized" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "societies, trusts, or foundations are organized"; by striking out the semicolon at the end of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and by renumbering such paragraph as paragraphs (4); and

(5) by striking out paragraphs (6) and (7) thereof.

(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to gifts made in the calendar year 1949 and succeeding calendar years.

SEC. 255. Valuation of gifts.

Section 1005 (relating to gifts made in property) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1005. Valuation of Gifts.

"(a) Gifts made in property: If the gift is made in property, the value thereof at the date of the gift shall be considered the amount of the gift.

"(b) Valuation of gifts for preceding calendar years: If the time has expired within which a tax may be assessed under this chapter or under title III of the Revenue Act of 1932, 47 Stat. 245, upon the transfer of property by gift made during any of the preceding calendar years, as defined in section 1001 (b), and if a tax under this chapter or such title III has been assessed or paid for such preceding calendar year, the value of such gift made in such preceding calendar year shall, for purposes of computing the tax under this chapter for the calendar year 1948 and subsequent calendar years, be the value of such gift which was used in computing the tax for the last preceding calendar year, for which a tax under this chapter of such title III was assessed or paid."

SEC. 256. Period of limitation upon assessment and collection in cases of omitted gifts.

(a) Section 1016 (b) (relating to exceptions to period of limitation upon assessment and collection) is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Omission from total gifts: If the donor fails to make disclosure in or with the return of property transferred by gift during the calendar year and the total amount of the gifts of such property exceeds 25 percent of the total amount of gifts made during the calendar year stated in the return, the tax may be assessed or a proceeding in court for the collection of such tax may be begun without assessment at any time within 5 years after the return was filed."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to returns for the calendar year 1948, and succeeding calendar years.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS AND PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Review of Tax Court decisions.

(a) Section 1141 (c) (1) (relating to the review of Tax Court decisions) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) To affirm, modify, or reverse: Upon such review, the scope of review by such courts and the power of such courts to affirm, modify, or reverse the decision of the Board, with or without remanding the case for a rehearing, shall be the same as upon review of a decision of a United States district court in a suit for recovery of an internal revenue tax tried without a jury."

(b) The first sentence of section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act is hereby amended by inserting after "the courts," the following: "The Tax Court of the United States".

(c) Effective dates: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable with respect to decisions rendered by the Tax Court of the United States after the date of the enactment of this act; and the amendment made by subsection (b) shall be effective as of the date of the enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act.

SEC. 302. Penalty for failure to pay withholding tax.

(a) In general: Section 1626 (c) (relating to penalties) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Failure of employer to file return or pay tax:

"(1) In case of any failure to pay the tax required by this subchapter, within the time prescribed by law or prescribed by the Commissioner in pursuance of law unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, there shall be added to the tax: 5 percent if the failure is for not more than 30 days with an additional 5 percent for each additional 30 days or fraction thereof during which such failure continues, not to exceed 25 percent in the aggregate. The amount added to the tax by this subsection shall be collected at the same time and in the same manner and as a part of the tax unless the tax has been paid before the discovery of the neglect, in which case the amount so added shall be collected in the same manner as the tax.

"(2) In case of any failure to make and file return or pay the tax required by this subchapter, within the time prescribed by law or prescribed by the Commissioner in pursuance of law, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, the addition to the tax shall not be less than $10."

(b) Waiver of interest: Section 1420 (b) (relating to additions to tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If the date prescribed for payment of the tax is a date prior to the date prescribed for filing of the return in respect of such tax, the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may waive such interest for the period beginning on the date prescribed for such payment and ending on the date prescribed for filing such return."

(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to wages paid on or after July 1, 1948.

SEC. 303. Verification of returns.

(a) The second sentence of section 52 (a) (relating to corporation returns) is hereby amended to read as follows: "The return shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, signed by the president, vice president, or other principal officer and by the treasurer, assistant treasurer, or chief accounting officer."

(b) Section 142 (a) (relating to fiduciary returns) is hereby amended by striking out the words "make under oath a return," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "make a return, which shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury,".

(c) The second sentence of section 187 (relating to partnership returns) is hereby amended to read as follows: "The return shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, signed by any one of the partners."

(d) Section 821 (a) (1) and section 864 (a) (1) (relating to estate tax returns) are hereby amended by striking out the words "make a return under oath in duplicate", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "make a return in duplicate, which shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury."

(e) Section 1006 (a) (relating to gift tax returns) is hereby amended by striking out the words "make a return under oath in duplicate", and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "make a return in duplicate, which shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury."

(f) Chapter 38 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 3809. Verification of returns, etc.

"(a) Penalties: Any person who willfully makes and subscribes any return, statement, or other document, which contains or is verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and which he does not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter, shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be subject to the penalties prescribed for perjury in section 125 of the Criminal Code.

"(b) Signature presumed correct: The fact that an individual's name is signed to a return, statement, or other document filed shall be prima facie evidence for all purposes that the return, statement, or other document was actually signed by him.

"(c) Power of Commissioner to require: The Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may require that any return, statement, or other document required to be filed under any provision of the internal revenue laws shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and such declaration shall be in lieu of any oath otherwise required."

(g) The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 3', 1947. The amendments made by subsection (d) shall be effective with respect to returns filed after December 31, 1948, and the amendment made by subsection (e) shall be effctive with respect to returns for the calendar year 1948 and succeeding calendar years. The amendment made by subsection (f) shall be applicable with respect to any return, statement, or document filed after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 304. Reports to Congress of refunds.

Section 3776 (relating to reports to Congress of refunds) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 305. Reports of compensation of officers and employees.

Section 148 (f) (relating to reports of compensation of corporate officers and employees exceeding $75,000) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 306. Collection of delinquent taxes of Federal employees.

Subchapter A of chapter 36 is hereby amended by renumbering sections 3662 and 3663 as sections 3663 and 3664, respectively, and by adding after section 3661 a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 3662. Collection of Delinquent Taxes of Federal Employees.

"(a) In general: If any employee (as defined in section 1621 (c)) of the United States, of the District of Columbia, or of any agency or instrumentality thereof, liable to pay any Federal tax (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts), fails to pay the same within 10 days after notice and demand, the collector may send to the agency, in which such employee is employed, a notice setting forth the name of the employee and the amount of unpaid tax. Upon receipt of the notice, such agency shall deduct and pay over to the collector from each payment of compensation thereafter payable to such employee, until the amount specified in such notice is fully paid, 10 percent of the compensation represented by each such payment up to a rate of $10,000 per annum, and 25 percent of the portion of such compensation as exceeds such rate, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary.

"(b) Government agency: As used in this section, the term 'agency' shall include the Office of the President, the Congress, the courts of the United States, all departments and agencies in the executive branch of the United States Government, and all agencies and instrumentalities of the United States and of the District of Columbia.

"(c) Regulations: The Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary shall prescribe the regulations for carrying out the provisions of this section."

SEC. 307. Distraint on salaries, wages, and compensation

(a) Continuing levy: Section 3692 (relating to levy) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: "A levy with respect to salary, wages, and compensation for personal services shall be a continuing levy remaining in effect until the liability in respect of which the levy is made is satisfied or becomes legally unenforceable, but shall attach to such salary, wages, or compensation accruing or becoming payable after the date on which such levy is made only to the extent of 10 percent of any such salary, wages, or compensation up to a rate of $10,000 per annum, and 25 percent of the portion of such salary, wages, or compensation as exceeds such rate."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the day following the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 308. Loans and bonds.

(a) Section 3481 (a) (relating to stamp tax on transfers of bonds) is hereby amended by inserting after the word "deposited" in the second proviso thereof a comma and the following: "nor upon mere loans of instruments nor upon the return of instruments loaned."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall take effect as of the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 309. Compromises.

Subsections (a) and (b) of section 3761 (relating to compromises) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Authorization: The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, or of the Under Secretary of the Treasury, or of an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, may compromise any civil or criminal case arising under the internal revenue laws prior to reference to the Department of Justice for prosecution or defense. Any case in which the amount of tax liability (including any interest, penalty, additional amount, or addition to such tax) is less than $500, may be compromised prior to reference to the Department of Justice for prosecution or defense by any officer or agent of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, including the field service, who is authorized in writing by the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary. The Attorney General may compromise any civil or criminal case arising under the internal revenue laws after reference to the Department of Justice for prosecution or defense.

"(b) Record: Whenever a compromise is made by the Commissioner in any case in which the amount of tax liability (including any interest, penalty, additional amount or addition to such tax) is $500 or more, there shall be placed on file in the Office of the Commissioner the opinion of the General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury, or of the officer acting as such, with his reasons therefor, with a statement of—

"(1) the amount of tax assessed,

"(2) the amount of additional tax or penalty imposed by law in consequence of the neglect or delinquency of the person against whom the tax is assessed, and

"(3) the amount actually paid in accordance with the terms of the compromise."

SEC. 310. Reports of refunds to the joint committee.

(a) Section 3777 (relating to review of refunds and credits by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation) is amended by striking out "$75,000" wherever appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the day following the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 311. Relief in cases of certain recapitalizations.

(a) For the purposes of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code, if after March 11, 1941, and prior to July 1, 1945, stock in a corporation held by a testamentary trust was exchanged by such trust solely for other stock and securities in such corporation, in pursuance of a recapitalization of the corporation under the applicable State law, and if the stock and securities so received by such trust are surrendered prior to January 1, 1949, to the corporation solely in exchange for stock identical in character and amount with that held by the trust prior to the original exchange, no gain, profit, income, loss, or deduction (from such exchange or reexchange) shall be recognized to the corporation or to the trust.

(b) In the case of stock acquired by the trust in a reexchange described in subsection (a), the basis for determining gain or loss in the hands of the trust, or any person in whose hands the basis is determined by reference to the basis in the hands of

the trust, shall be the same as the basis of the stock originally exchanged by the trust in connection with such recapitalization.

SEC. 312. Travel of field employees.

Section 4040 (relating to posts of duty of employees in field service or traveling) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Authorization of employees of the internal revenue service to travel on official business may be provided by any officer or employee of the internal revenue service designated by the Commissioner.".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is not one who is opposed to the bill entitled to recognition to demand a second?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. Is the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] opposed to the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify to demand a second. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] opposed to the bill?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 6712 which we have before us today is a revenue revision measure and, in my opinion, the bill represents a new and progressive era in revenue revision. It is not designed to raise revenue or to reduce taxes, nor does this measure contain any excise tax provisions. Rather it is a bill to alleviate hardships, remove inequities, and simplify the administration of our tax laws.

May I say that the committee has worked for over 13 months on this measure. We began hearings on the 9th day of May 1947, and we have worked practically continuously ever since.

I shall not take much time on the bill, because it is highly technical, as every member of the committee will agree, but I do wish to say that this legislation is something that the country needs very much. I doubt if there are any who have had experience with the administration of the Internal Revenue Code who are not in favor of Congress ironing out the wrinkles and removing the inequities therein.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who now says he is against the bill, which, of course, is nothing out of the ordinary or unusual, did not vote against reporting the measure out. The bill H. R. 6712 was voted out of the committee without a dissenting vote. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was there at the time. I realize, even though we were to bring in and propose to enact into legislation the Ten Commandments, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would find something highly objectionable in what was proposed to be done, and if he does not believe in the Bible, it is because he did not write it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I notice the absence of any minority report or any minority views or anything in opposition to the bill. Usually minority views, at least, are filed.

Mr. KNUTSON. It comes with a complete surprise to me that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is opposed to the bill, but in light of his past performances, I should not be surprised.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman well knows that several Members reserved the right to oppose the bill on the floor of the House. I think the House should know that. The gentleman from Minnesota also knows full well that on Friday, June 11, I spoke on the bill and I inserted in the RECORD a complete analysis of what my objections were, and I have repeated those objections at all times that I was opposed to the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. The analyses that the gentleman inserted in the RECORD are suspected of having been made by the Treasury Department.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then the gentleman admits that the Treasury is opposed to the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, the Treasury Department blows hot and cold. They did when the gentleman's side was in control; in fact, on several occasions it was necessary for the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], while chairman—and I want to say he was one of the greatest chairmen that the committee has had in my time—to intimate to the Secretary of the Treasury that certain of his aides were persona non grata so far as the Committee on Ways and Means was concerned.

I might say, further, that we have worked in the closest collaboration with the Treasury Department, and when I talked to Mr. Wiggins, Under Secretary of the Treasury, over the telephone, he informed me that there were only three major items in disagreement. You can imagine my surprise when I received a letter from the Treasury saying that there were 12 matters to which they took exception, and a lot of minor ones. Well, I say, as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] said upon that occasion after the letter had been read, that it would be passing strange if there would not be something in here that would be objectionable to the Treasury Department, and I consider it a great accomplishment that we have been able to report out a bill to which the Treasury could only find 10 percent objection. I hope I have not misquoted the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. The committee adopted many of the suggestions and recommendations of the Treasury, did it not?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. We met them more than halfway, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Gladly.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is one provision that many Members are interested in in relation to the exemption of veterans. I think the chairman ought to explain that to the Members of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. As I said before, this bill is very technical.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a provision in there in relation to the GI's relating to the exemption of those getting disability payments, officers and men, subject to the income tax. I think it is $1,200. My understanding is that the amendment is being offered to that.

Mr. KNUTSON. We exempt all payments under the veterans' law, so that is taken care of.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think my friend from Massachusetts has reference to paragraph 13, extension of additional allowances for military and naval personnel.

Mr. KNUTSON. The amendment was prepared and offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and I yield to him at this point to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. With regard to section 106, which has for its purpose the removal of a part of the exemption provided in the present law for ex-servicemen because of physical disability, the committee since this bill was drawn has proposed and adopted committee amendments which lift the exemption to $2,400 of retired pay and which also eliminate the application of this restriction, so that it now does not apply to enlisted men at all and does not apply to any veteran who draws his pay through the Veterans' Administration. Under the pay charts, which I have here but which are too bulky to review, you can say roughly that any veteran of the rank of captain or less who has less than 12 years' service has complete exemption of his retired pay under the bill as amended, any warrant officer with less than 30 years' service has complete exemption, and any chief warrant officer with less than 12 years' service has complete exemption. All officers and warrant officers retired for physical disability carry a $2,400 exemption of their retired pay from income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in order to give a full discussion of section 106 of the bill H. R. 6712.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, section 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, chapter I, defines gross income. Section 22 (b) sets out the various exclusions from gross income and among the items not to be included in gross income and that are granted exemptions from taxation under chapter I is listed section 22 (b) (5) entitled "Compensation for Injuries or Sickness." Section 22 (b) (5) in the present law reads as follows:

Except in the case of amounts attributable to (and not in excess of) deductions allowed under section 23 (x) in any prior taxable year, amounts received, through accident or health insurance or under workmen's compensation acts, as compensation for personal injuries or sickness, plus the amount of any damages received whether by suit or agreement on account of such injuries or sickness (and amounts received as a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country).

You will note by comparing section 106 (A) of the bill, H. R. 6712, and the committee amendment offered to that section by the Committee on Ways and Means the only change proposed by section 106 has reference to that part enclosed in parentheses in the foregoing quotation of the law. The portion of the above-quoted law that I have enclosed in parentheses will be changed by section 106 as amended to read as follows:

Except that if such amounts exceed $2,400 during the taxable year, and the taxpayer also receives during the same taxable year earned income, as defined in section 116 (a) (3), the exclusion under this subparagraph shall be reduced by the amount of such earned income, but not to an amount less than $2,400. The provisions of this subparagraph shall not affect amounts exempt from taxation under the act of August 12, 1935, entitled "An act to safeguard the estates of veterans derived from payments of pension, compensation, emergency officers' retirement pay and insurance, and for other purposes" (49 Stat. 609; 38 U. S. C. 454a).

Payment of benefits for disability incurred in line of duty in the armed services fall into two general classes. In the case of officers the amount of compensation is governed by the rank held by the officer and by his length of service and no additional payments are made to a retired officer because of the seriousness of his disability. An officer is retired whenever he is found disabled for general military duty and the amount of his retired pay is not dependent upon the extent of his disability beyond that point. On the other hand, veterans' disability compensation is based upon the extent of the veterans' disability for civilian employment. Therefore, the assumption that the recipient is handicapped in competing in civilian employment is far more valid in the case of veterans' pensions than is the case with retired officers. This entire matter came to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means because of the number of officers retired for physical disability who are earning large incomes in private industry while benefiting from the full exclusion of their retired pay under the present law. The maximum compensation that a disabled ex-enlisted man can draw is $360 a month but the higher compensation rates are paid only in cases of extreme disability and necessary care. I should add also that at the time of retirement proceedings an officer who is seriously disabled may elect to forfeit his status as a retired officer and qualify for disability compensation if such compensation exceeds his pay on the retired list. Because the retired pay of officers has generally exceeded the maximum allowances at which they may be entitled under veterans' laws granting disability compensation, I understand very few officers have availed themselves of that election.

Exemption from taxes of retired pay based upon disability came into the law in the 1942 Revenue Act and with the greatly increased rank of officers because of the wartime expansion of the armed forces the tax exemption granted by the 1942 Revenue Act brought about a great increase of retirements based upon physical disability. The legal subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services has just completed a very good survey and study of this matter and I refer you to their recent report to the Committee on Armed Services rather than take the time here to set out the very interesting and informative data and analysis contained in that report. I will confine my remarks here entirely to the matter of tax liability. I do not believe many Members of Congress would oppose exemption from income tax any compensation based upon the extent of the disability incurred in line of duty in the armed forces. On the other hand, high retired pay based upon the rank of the officer retired should not be granted complete exemption from income tax, especially in those cases where the disability that is great enough to disqualify the officer for general military service is not a disability to him in a great many civilian occupations. Section 106 of the bill, H. R. 6712, approaches this problem by continuing the tax exemption of all veterans disability compensation. Section 106 as amended also continues the exemption of retired pay based upon physical disability for those officers who have no other earned income. This action is based logically upon the assumption that the total absence of earned income is due generally to the seriousness of the disability of such retired officer. Section 106 as amended will reduce the tax exemption of officers retired for physical disability by the amount of their earned income but in no case will the exemption of retired pay be reduced below $2,400. This is a fair limitation.

I should add by way of explanation that when section 106 was first drafted it did apply to both retired officers and disabled veterans drawing veterans' disability compensation and when the situation was more fully analyzed by the Committee on Ways and Means the committee quickly approved the proposed committee amendment to produce the effect I have described above.

DISCUSSION OF SECTION 107 OF THE BILL H. R. 6712

Section 22 (b) 13 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 10 (B) of the act of August 8, 1947 (Public Law 384, 80th Cong.) exclude from gross income $1,500 active-duty pay of commissioned officers and commissioned warrant officers of the military or naval forces and they exclude also the full compensation of men below those ranks. These exclusions in present law terminate with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948 and section 107 of the bill, H. R. 6712, changes the termination date from January 1, 1949, to January 1, 1950. The extension of these laws for 1 year was approved by the Committe on Ways and Means and is recommended for enactment by Congress in order to give the armed services additional time to complete their study relating to pay scale of the armed services.

The studies of the pay structure are now under way and have been conducted at the direction of the Secretary of Defense. An advisory commission to study service pay was appointed and this commission has held numerous meetings, instituted exhaustive collection of data, and has held hearings on the subject. The commission recently advised the Secretary of Defense that their studies could not be completed in time to permit a recommendation being submitted to the Eightieth Congress and the commission recommended the extension of the exemption through the calendar year of 1949, since the discontinuance of the exemption would be in effect an actual reduction in pay starting January 1949. The Committe on Ways and Means desires to cooperate with the Secretary of Defense in this matter in the hope that the extension of the period of exemption will be beneficial in maintaining the personnel strength of the armed services until the Eighty-first Congress has an opportunity to consider the pay matter.

I quote herewith a news item from page 10 of the Army and Navy Register of June 12, 1948:

The Service Pay Commission, which is making a comprehensive analysis of the pay structure of the armed services, met in Washington on May 17, and will meet here again on June 15. Since its appointment, last December, the Commission, of which Mr. Charles R. Hook, formerly president of the American Rolling Mills Co., is chairman, has been meeting at least once a month to receive and review reports from subcommittees and a corps of consultants. Special studies are being conducted in four fields:

1. Industrial wage comparisons.
2. Retirement and allied benefits.
3. Special pay and allowances.
4. Historical analysis.

It is expected that the Commission will report its findings to Secretary of Defense James Forrestal about September 1. It will make recommendations for pay scales in all branches of the armed services, including uniformed personnel in the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the United States Public Health Service.

In addition to Chairman Hook, members of the Commission include the Rev. John J. Cavanaugh, president, Notre Dame University; Mr. Keith S. McHugh, vice president,

American Telephone & Telegraph Co.: and Mr. Lawrence H. Whiting, president of Whiting & Co. and of the American Furniture Mart Building Co. The executive secretary is Mr. John L. Hoen.

DISCUSSION OF SEC. 213 OF THE BILL H. R. 6712

Section 213 of the bill adds a new section, subchapter B of chapter III—relating to additional estate tax. The new section will be section 939 and will provide that the tax imposed by section 935 shall not apply to the transfer of the net estate of a citizen or resident of the United States dying on or after December 7, 1941, and before January 1, 1947, while in active service if the decedent was killed in action or died as a result of wounds, injuries, or disease suffered while in line of duty and because of a hazard incident to the service. Provision is made for refund without interest of overpayment of any taxes already made and 1 year from date of enactment is provided for making application for refund.

The Committee on Ways and Means does not believe that the estate of a member of the armed services meeting the above qualifications should be subjected to the additional burden of an estate tax. A similar exemption was made during World War I.

The exemption provided in section 213 of this bill is restricted to the additional estate tax and does not apply to the basic estate tax. This provision is made in order to avoid interference with the inheritance- and estate-tax laws of the individual States.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that one of the amendments I have sent to the desk by direction of the committee allows a special deduction for expenses incurred by disabled persons traveling to and from work where the use of public transportation results in undue hardship or danger.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate that very much. I called that to the attention of the chairman and he cooperated very effectively.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman always has helpful suggestions to make and we always listen to him. He was for years a valued member of the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, only in a very few instances do any of the provisions of this bill entail any consequential loss and the effect on the budget is relatively negligible. The loss to the budget for the fiscal year 1949, for example, will be approximately one hundred and fifty million, most of which comes from the provision in the bill continuing for another year the exemption from the income tax of the pay of military personnel. The 1950 fiscal year budget will suffer by about three hundred million, approximately one-half of which is again the result of this same provision.

The task before us is long overdue. Not since 1927 has Congress made any thorough study of the Internal Revenue Code in order to keep its provisions in line with our constantly shifting economic forces, and to make it more workable and fair to all our taxpayers. As you well know, our present tax system was adopted in the midst of great financial stress. Like "Topsy" it has been permitted to grow with too little regard for its effect and operation. Fully recognizing the need for general revision of the tax laws, and in conformity with the recommendation of Secretary Snyder, our committee started hearings on general tax revisions early in May of 1947. These hearings were continued through the winter of 1947–48 and embrace over 3,000 pages of printed testimony. More than 100 witnesses from every part of the country appeared and outlined to us particular recommendations for improving and streamlining the effective operation of our tax laws. In addition, the committee appointed a special tax study group of which the Honorable Roswell Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, was the chairman. This committee made a report containing a great many useful suggestions for simplifying and improving our tax laws. We have had, moreover, the benefit of suggestions from the Treasury Department and, as a matter of fact, almost half of the provisions of this bill are based directly on recommendations made to us by the Treasury Department. Furthermore, we have had the constant service of our own staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, as well as suggestions from the American Bar Association and many State bar associations. You will fully appreciate, therefore, that this measure is the result of long, careful, and detailed planning; that each provision has been studied and analyzed with the utmost attention, and that there exists today a real need for the remedial provisions in this administrative revenue revision bill.

The bill before us contains some eighty-odd changes in the Internal Revenue Code, and there are provisions which specifically benefit every type of taxpayer. For example, members of the armed forces have received attention under section 107 of the bill, which provides for the continuance for another year of the existing law which specifically excludes the first $1,500 of compensation for officers, and all the compensation of enlisted men, from the income tax. These exclusions would otherwise expire January 1, 1949, and the armed forces have particularly requested us to make this extension effective in order to assist them in attracting high-caliber personnel. This provision will, as I have stated, result in the largest single revenue loss, estimated at $145,000,000 for the calendar year 1949. Moreover, the bill provides that a person who gave his or her life while serving in the armed forces during World War II should not be made to bear the additional penalty of an estate tax. This is similar to the relief Congress granted to persons killed in action during World War I.

The bill contains several provisions specifically benefiting our farmers. The bill provides, for example, for the deductibility as an expense of amounts spent on soil and water conservation, yet at the same time we have been careful to provide that improvements which involve the construction or purchase of assets subject to depreciation must continue to be treated as capital outlays. The bill, moreover, rectifies a congested situation by giving a farmer the option to file his final return on January 31 following the close of his taxable year in lieu of making a declaration of estimated tax. Under present law a farmer in order to avoid making an estimate is required to file his final return on or before January 15.

As in the case of military personnel and farmers, the bill contains several specific provisions which will benefit employees of all businesses throughout our country. Section 137 of the bill deals, for example, with the over-all problem of employee stock options. The underlying purpose of the provision in this bill is to encourage and increase incentive in employees by giving them a stake in the business, and to eliminate the present uncertainty existing as the result of current Bureau regulations. Under the present law the general rule is that an employee exercising an option to purchase stock from his employer corporation receives taxable income at the time of the exercise of the option to the extent of the difference between the market value of the stock at the time of the exercise and the option price. Actually, you see, at this time the employee has received nothing but stock, and yet he must, under existing law, pay an income tax on what is at most a paper profit. In order to pay this tax, however, the employee must in many cases sell the very stock given him under an option as an incentive for him to remain with the company. Under the provisions of our bill, however, the imposition of a tax at the time the option is exercised is delayed, and in the ordinary case where the option price is approximately equal to the fair market value of the stock at the time the option is granted, no tax is levied against the employee until the employee subsequently sells his stock which he purchased under the option from his company. We have provided special rules to govern cases where the option price differs materially from the fair market value, and we have limited this favorable treatment only if the option in question conforms to certain rules intended to distinguish options which have the characteristics of true incentive devices.

In this bill we have added a new section to the code dealing with family partnerships in order to clarify the existing law in this field, which extends to small businesses in all parts of our country, and in order to remedy an inequitable situation resulting from two recent Supreme Court cases.

This new section provides in general that related members of a partnership shall be partners for purposes of Federal income tax if they meet the tests which are set forth in the section. Family partnerships qualifying under section 191 will determine their distributive share in the manner provided in the bill, and members of the family will not be denied partnership status because the capital they contributed to the partnership originated with some other member of the family if the provisions of this section are complied with. Partners

who do not meet the test set forth in the new section 191 are now, however, denied status as partners but they are restricted to the present law and decisions in determining whether or not they are partners and to what extent they are recognized as partners for income-tax purposes.

We have provided new and simpler laws in regard to the taxation of estates and trusts and their beneficiaries. Section 140 of the bill provides that a beneficiary is taxable only on the part of the income as defined in the terms of the trust instrument (or local applicable law), which is also included in the gross income of the trust for tax purposes. Under present law distributions are in some cases taxable to the beneficiary even where the amounts involved do not represent taxable income to the estate or trusts. The distributions out of past accumulations are deductible by the trust and included as income to the beneficiaries to the extent of the current income of the trust. The bill also provides that income received by the beneficiary will be taxable to him in the same way as if he had received it directly, rather than through the estate or trust. As a result of this rule a long-term capital gain received by the trust or estate and distributed, will also be considered for tax purposes, as a long-term capital gain in hands of the beneficiary.

The bill also contains provisions relating to a pension and profit-sharing plan and we have revised the present formula applied to annuities under the individual income tax by eliminating the so-called 3-percent rule which excludes from taxable income the portions of the annual receipt in excess of 3 percent of the price the annuitant paid for the annuity. Our bill substitutes a new plan for the 3-percent rule. In the simple case the amount of the annuity payment to be excluded from the taxpayer's annual income is calculated by applying to the annuity payment a percentage obtained by dividing the annuitant's aggregate consideration by the total sum receivable under the annuity contract during the period of the annuitant's life expectancy at the time the annuity period begins.

In the field of corporate taxes we have amended the net operating loss carryover by substituting a 5-year carry-forward and a 1-year carry-back for the 2-year carry-forward and 2-year carry-back allowed under the existing law. The bill moreover, redefines the content of the net operating loss in order to eliminate the current discrimination against those businesses with fluctuating incomes.

Section 125 of the bill contains three amendments to section 102 of the code which provides for the surtax on corporate earnings improperly accumulated. Our amendments have been made necessary in order to permit corporations to retain in their businesses their reasonable needs in order that they may have a cushion for the less prosperous times which will some day come. Also in the field of corporations the bill contains a clarification of the existing law in connection with certain corporate liquidations. This provision is made necessary by the Court Holding Company case.

Just as we have provided for the relief of hardship cases and inequities, so have we endeavored to plug existing loopholes in our tax structures. The bill, for example, contains a provision relating to the capital gains on nonresident aliens. This is section 143 of the bill which provides that nonresident aliens who have been within this country for less than 90 days during a taxable year are taxed on such capital gains as were realized in the United States during their presence in this country. If the nonresident alien is present 90 days or more then the tax applies to all such capital gains during the entire taxable year, whether or not the nonresident alien is present in the United States at the time the sales took place. The 30-percent tax on net capital gains provided in this bill applies only to those nonresident aliens not engaged in trade or business in the United States. Nonresident aliens who have a place of business in the United States are already taxed on capital gains.

These are a few of the major provisions which this revenue-revision bill contains. Many important and urgent revisions could not be made at this time because of the revenue loss which they would entail. Among these are the double taxation of dividends, earned income, the additional penalty on consolidated returns, relief from unincorporated business, accelerated depreciation, and the elimination of the "notch" provision in the corporation tax on small business.

This bill, however, represents the first step in our tax-revision program. We hope to and we plan to continue our studies on tax revision so that we may place the Internal Revenue Code on a sound, practicable, and workable basis.

Section 106 of your committee's bill limits the exclusion from the income tax in the case of pensions, annuities, and similar allowances for disability resulting from active service in the armed forces. Under the bill where the taxpayer also receives earned income, the exclusion is reduced by the amount of the earned income, but never below $1,200 a year. In the bill as reported by your committee this restriction applies to veterans' pensions, as well as officers' disability pay. An amendment is now being offered which will make section 106 apply only to officers retired by reason of physical disability and raises the limit to $2,400 below which the exclusion is never reduced.

As the committee report indicates, section 106 was intended to correct a situation in which retired officers earning large incomes in private industry are also benefiting from the full exclusion of their retirement pay. This is possible because the test used to determine disability in these cases is the officer's fitness for military service rather than civilian employment. Moreover, the amount of the retirement pay depends not on the extent of the officer's disability, but upon his rank at the time of retirement and his length of service.

The assumption that the recipient is handicapped in competing in civilian employment is far more valid in the case of veterans' pensions. These are based squarely upon disability for civilian rather than military activities, and the size of the payment depends on the degree of disability rather than rank or length of service. When recipients of veterans' pensions obtain earned incomes, they usually do so in the face of very real handicaps. Therefore, your committee recommends that in the case of veterans' pensions the full exclusion allowed under existing law continue in effect and that the $1,200 limit be raised to $2,400.

The proposed amendment to section 106 is drafted so as to restrict the application of the section to cases where the exclusion depends entirely upon the existence of section 22 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code. Payments received under the act of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 609; 38 U. S. C. 454a) and any other similar veterans' legislation are not subject to the restriction imposed by section 106 of this bill.

RETURNS OF CERTAIN TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS

Most types of tax-exempt organizations are now required to file an informational return, although they pay no income taxes. Section 123 of your committee's bill extends this filing requirement to certain fraternal beneficiary societies and educational and charitable organizations. However, these organizations are required to file the return only if they have gross receipts of $25,000 from sources other than dues or assessments, tuition, and gifts or contributions. The primary purpose of this extension of the filing requirement is to give the Government some indication of the extent of the business and investment income of these organizations. It does not in any way change their tax-exempt status.

Tuition was excluded in determining whether or not one of these exempt organizations must file a return, so that educational organizations with only a small amount of income from investments or business enterprise would not be required to file. However, the attention of your committee has been called to the fact that schools frequently receive fees and service charges from students in addition to tuition. These fees and charges, like tuition, are essential in carrying on educational activities and do not represent a type of receipt on which more information is needed. For this reason your committee is offering an amendment to liberalize the filing requirement by substituting the phrase "payments made by or on behalf of students" for the word "tuition."

The amendment offered by your committee also adds to the list of receipts, which will not be taken into consideration in determining whether one of these organizations must file a return, payment by or on behalf of "patients or inmates." Thus tax-exempt hospitals, homes for the aged, orphanages and various similar types of charitable institutions will not be required to file the informational return because of receipts of these types.

Even where a return is required from a tax-exempt organization by reason of section 123 of the bill, your committee believes that there is no need to make them itemize the receipts from gifts or contributions, dues or assessments, and payments made by or on behalf of students, patients, or inmates. Therefore,

this amendment requires that only the aggregates of each class of such receipts need to be shown on the return.

COMMUTING EXPENSES OF DISABLED INDIVIDUALS

Your commitee is offering an amendment to H. R. 6712 to provide for the deduction by disabled persons of commuting expenses up to a limit of $600 a year.

It is believed that disabled persons, who despite their handicap are supporting themselves, should be encouraged to continue working. However, present tax laws place disabled persons, who are forced to take taxis or private cars, at a disadvantage because they must pay a tax on the portion of their income devoted to this extraordinary commuting expenses—an expense not required in the case of the average person.

To correct this inequity your committee is offering an amendment to permit special deductions in these cases. A deduction of up to $600 is allowed a disabled individual for expenses paid during a taxable year for transportation to and from work. A disabled individual is defined for the purpose of this new subsection as an individual who has lost the use of a leg, of both legs, or of both arms to such an extent that he is unable during the entire taxable year to use, without undue hardship or danger, a streetcar, bus, subway, train or similar form of public transportation in traveling to and from work. The words "similar form of public transportation" as used here do not include taxicabs.

TAX AVOIDANCE THROUGH SHORT SALES

Under existing law, as it has been since the passage of the Revenue Act of 1942, the tax on a net long-term capital gain is not more than, and may be less than one-half the tax on a net short-term capital gain. Under section 117 (b), for an individual, only 50 percent of the gain or loss resulting from the sale or exchange of a capital asset held more than 6 months is taken into account in computing net income—whereas 100 percent of such gain or loss is taken into account if the capital asset has been held not more than 6 months—and under section 117 (c) (2) the maximum rate of tax on this 50 percent of the gain is 50 percent. It is thus not surprising that various devices have been used to give what is in effect a short-term gain the appearance of being a long-term gain.

A device which has been widely used and extensively publicized is the use of a short sale within the 6 months' period instead of an actual sale, to convert a short-term gain into a long-term gain, and, if circumstances are favorable, to reduce the amount of the gain which is to be taxed. A short sale of stock is effected by selling borrowed stock. At a later time stock either previously owned or bought for that purpose, is delivered to the lender to close the short sale.

As applied to stock and securities, transactions and devices commonly used may be illustrated as follows:

A. January 1 buys 100 shares of stock at $10 per share for a total of $1,000. June 1, sells short 100 shares at $16 per share for a total of $1,600.

July 2, he delivers the 100 shares he bought January 1 to the lender of the stock used to effect the short sale.

Actually, the taxpayer has a short-term gain of $600, but by deferring delivery of his long stock this is converted into a long-term gain, so that $300 instead of $600 is included in taxable income.

B. January 1, buys 100 shares of stock at $10 per share for a total of $1,000. On June 1, he sells short 100 shares at $16 per share for a total of $1,600.

July 2, he sells 100 shares of stock at $18 per share for a total of $1,800. He buys 100 to cover at $18 for a total of $1,800.

Here also, the true result is a short-term gain of $600. But, under existing law, the four transactions are viewed as: First, the purchase of 100 shares in January and their sale in July with a long-term gain of $800; and, second, a short sale in June, closed by purchase and delivery in July, with a short-term loss of $200. This results in a tax of $200 instead of a tax on $600.

It should be noted that when a taxpayer having a long position in securities sells short an equal number of shares, bonds, and so forth, nothing that happens thereafter can affect his actual gain. If the market goes down after the short sale is effected, this decline does not affect the taxpayer, since he has sold at the higher price and can deliver the stock which he holds long at any time to close the short sale. On the other hand, if the market goes up, he is similarly unaffected, since any loss resulting therefrom in his short position is exactly offset by a gain in his long position. Although his actual gain is thus unaffected, the tax saving resulting from the use of a short sale may be substantial.

The device of a short sale can be used whenever, within a period of not more than 6 months, the taxpayer is willing to take any gain he may then have, being so uncertain about the future trend of the market as not to risk the chance of the price of his security going down thereafter, or being uncertain whether any additional gain would be greater than probable tax savings.

Having made his short sale, the taxpayer will then use device A above if, after 6 months from his original purchase, the price has dropped below the price at which he made the short sale. If, for example, the price on July 2 is 14, if he used device B he would have a long-term gain of $400 and a short-term gain of $200, with $400, instead of $300, as his taxable income. He will use device B if the price, after 6 months from the original purchase, is higher than at the time of the short sale. The greater such an increase, the less the tax. If, for example, the price on July 2, or any time after July 1, were 24 instead of 18, there would be, for tax purposes, a long-term gain of $1,400 and a short-term loss of $800, with a deductible loss of $100 instead of taxable income of $600.

Taxation should be based upon realities—upon gains or losses as they actually are—not as they may appear to be. For that reason it is proposed that the Internal Revenue Code be amended by adding new provisions, subsection (l), to section 117, which will give rules intended to eliminate the tax advantages resulting from short sales made at a time when the taxpayer has equivalent property. The provisions of the new subsection will apply in the case of short sales made after May 31, 1948.

The new provisions deal with the first situation described above—where the taxpayer sells short within the 6 months' period and delivers his long stock to cover the short sale after he has held it 6 months—by providing that where a short sale is made at a time when the taxpayer has substantially identical property, held not more than 6 months, any gain on the closing of such short sale shall be considered as a short-term gain. Thus, if these provisions were applied to the situation described in A above, the taxpayer, instead of having a long-term gain of $600 as under existing law, would have a short-term gain of $600.

The situation described in the second example—where the taxpayer buys stock to cover his short sale, and sells his long stock independently when it has been held more than 6 months—is dealt with by a provision which treats the holding period of the long stock as beginning on the date the short sale is closed—unless it is disposed of previous to that date, in which case, the date of such disposition starts the building period. If this provision were applied to the illustration given in B above, the $800 gain on the sale of the long stock would become a short-term gain, since the holding period would be 1 day—beginning on July 2 when the short sale was closed—instead of 6 months and 1 day. The loss on the closing of the short position would still be a short-term loss of $200, but such a loss offsetting a short-term gain of $800 leaves, as the amount to be included in taxable income, the actual net gain of $600.

These two provisions apply only to the extent that, at the time of the short sale, the taxpayer has substantially identical property which he has held not more than 6 months at that time. Thus, these provisions do not apply to a normal short sale effected at a time when the taxpayer does not own substantially identical property. Neither do they apply if the substantially identical property has been held by the taxpayer for more than 6 months at the time the short sale is made, since in that case a long-term gain would result whether the taxpayer sold his long stock outright or indirectly by means of a short sale.

Another provision deals with a loss arising from the closing of a short sale, where the taxpayer has substantially identical property which he has held for more than 6 months at the time of the short sale. Here there is no question of converting a short-term gain into a long-term gain, but by making a short sale instead of selling his stock directly, the taxpayer can offset any loss that may arise from buying stock in the open market to close his short position against double the amount of long term gain. For example, if stock which was acquired at 10 and has been held more than 6 months is selling at 16, the taxpayer may make a short sale at that time. If subsequently the market goes up to 20, there is a loss of 4 points on his short position offset by a gain of 4 points in his long position. Under existing law, if the taxpayer then buys to close his short sale and sells his long stock, he will have a long-term gain of $1,000, of which $500 is taken into account, offset by a short-term loss of $400, leaving $100 net to be included in taxable income, whereas the actual gain was $600. To eliminate this device, the amendment provides that in such cases the loss on closing the short sale shall be deemed to be a long-term loss rather than a short-term loss, so that the net long-term gain is $600, with the correct $300, instead of $100, taken into account.

Instead of using an actual short sale, as in the illustrations previously given, the taxpayer may buy a "put," which is an option to sell stock of securities at a fixed price during a given period of time, even though the market may go lower than the price indicated. If the market does in fact go lower, the taxpayer holding such a "put" will exercise the "put" and sell his long stock at the price stipulated, when he has held it more than 6 months. If the market goes up he will not exercise his "put" and will thus lose the amount which he paid for the option. Since the use of such a "put" can have tax consequences similar to the use of a short sale, it is provided that, for the purposes of the new subsection, such a "put" shall be deemed to be a short sale, and failure to exercise such a "put" shall be considered as a closing of such short sale.

Similar tax avoidance practices are, of course, possible if the taxpayer starts his operations with a short sale instead of with a purchase. If, for example, the taxpayer makes a short sale in January and buys an equivalent amount of identical property in March at a lower price, he may convert the short-term gain into a long-term gain by holding the property thus acquired for 6 months before delivering it to close the short sale, or he may similarly reduce his taxes by matching purchase and sale transactions at that time. To meet such situations, the provisions of the proposed amendment apply not only where substantially identical property is held at the time of the short sale, but where substantially identical property is acquired after a short sale, and on or before the date of the closing of the short sale.

Substantially similar tax avoidance schemes have been, until recently, practiced on a considerable scale with respect to transactions in commodities for future delivery, and to a limited extent are still possible. If, for example, a taxpayer in January buys, through a member of the Chicago Board of Trade, 10,000 bushels of wheat for delivery in September, he may in March sell 10,000 bushels for delivery in September. Ordinarily the sale in March would be deemed the sale of the wheat bought in January, and a short-term capital gain or loss would result. However, many taxpayers have directed their brokers to keep both transactions open. By then ordering the two transactions to be offset against each other at a date more than 6 months after the date of original purchase, or by arranging matching additional purchase and sale transactions, tax results similar to those described above were possible. Alternatively, the purchase of a commodity for future delivery may be made through one broker and the offsetting sale be made through another broker.

In a ruling issued on March 8, 1948, Mimeograph 6243, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has held that such simultaneous long and short transactions in the same commodity, for delivery in the same future period, and on the same market, are shams, and that the gain or loss is realized at the time the offsetting purchase or sale is made. Moreover, the Commodity Exchange Authority of the Department of Agriculture has recently amended its regulations under the Commodity Exchange Act by adding a new section, section 1.46, chapter 1 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations. This new section of the regulations provides that when any broker makes a sale for any customer when he is at that time long, of the same commodity, in the same future, on the same market, or vice versa, such purchase or sale must be immediately applied against the previously held long or short position. This regulation was issued on May 3, 1948, to be effective June 8, 1948.

Whether or not these recent rulings may be effectively questioned, or their effect avoided by devices which do not come specifically within their terms, the proposed amendment would have the effect of eliminating the tax avoidance features of such devices as may be applied in that field.

To avoid interference with bona fide hedging operations by operators of grain elevators, millers, producers of cloth, and so forth, the proposed amendment will apply only to purchases and sales of capital assets as defined in section 117 (a).

The new provisions will apply only when substantially identical property is owned by the taxpayer. No definition of substantially identical is given, since it is believed that the term must be applied in accordance with the actual circumstances of each transaction. As applied to securities, this term has for many years been in section 118 of the code, and various rulings and decisions have been made which will, in general, be equally applicable to the provisions of this proposed amendment. It is not believed that the term substantially identical should be applied to securities of different corporations, nor, in general, to preferred stock or bonds as compared with common stocks. However, in special situations where preferred stocks or bonds are convertible in common stocks of the same corporation, it may be that the relative values and price changes during the period in question may be so similar as to make them substantially identical. It is not believed that different commodities, such as corn and wheat, would ever be substantially identical; and, in general, it appears probable that different futures—for example, May wheat and July wheat—and contracts in different markets—for example, Minneapolis and Kansas City—may be so different as to make transactions in different futures, or in different markets, not substantially identical. In special circumstances, however, contracts on different markets, or with respect to different delivery periods, may be in fact so similar as to be substantially identical.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, just a little while ago the Speaker said that this is very important legislation. He said it affects every person in the United States, and with that I agree. Mr. Speaker, is it not a sham and a shame to bring a measure up that affects the pocketbooks of every person in the United States, and to be allowed only 40 minutes' consideration of it? The chairman of the committee stands up and cannot even explain the provisions of the bill. He cannot even tell what one of the important provisions of the bill would do. The committee report does not even contain the usual detailed explanations of the technical sections. Here you are asked to vote for this measure on the last day of the session when any child knows that it is not going to be acted upon finally by the present Congress. So this is all just a question of taking up time uselessly, or passing this in order to promise to the people of great wealth and great means what they may expect in the future from a Republican Congress. There is scarcely a provision here that will affect persons making less than $5,000 a year. The report itself says that it may reduce the revenue by $400,000,000. Where does that benefit go under this bill? That benefit goes only to those of great accumulated wealth. Yes, the bill does a couple of things affecting the workingman. The workingman who has to buy uniforms or special equipment on account of his work is allowed under existing law to charge that as an expense. But in this measure, they take that little bit of crumb away from the man who goes out and works in hazardous employment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield, gladly.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman's statement is not accurate, and he knows it. One hundred and forty-five million dollars is chargeable to our continuing the law which gives $1,500 exemption to those in the military service, and it was placed in the law at the request of John L. Sullivan, Secretary of the Navy. Why does not the gentleman give the facts?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I tried to introduce an amendment the other day to take care of that very situation, and the gentleman from Minnesota raised a point of order because he knew that the House would vote overwhelmingly for it. He knows I am for that provision which continues the same exemption they had since 1943.

Mr. KNUTSON. Exactly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. So you are not giving them anything extra.

Mr. KNUTSON. Exactly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And the exemption continues under the present law until the end of the year. So you are not doing a thing extra for them.

Mr. KNUTSON. And it is costing us in revenue $145,000,000. Will the gentleman deny that?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am not denying that that is a good provision.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why does not the gentleman stick to the facts?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman himself objected to the consideration of an identical provision the other day. The benefits will not be shut off under the present law until January 1, 1949.

Of course, the committee knew that it made some errors in passing out this bill so rapidly. Now they have come along with a lot of amendments, committee amendments. Yet they want to consider the measure in 40 minutes. Here is where the number of loopholes is increased and the loopholes made larger.

First, you know that during the war, partnerships increased fourfold. The Treasury started to investigate that matter. They found that men who were in the high-income surtax brackets would form a partnership taking in as partners with them their wife or cousin or a couple of sons,—thereby reducing the bracket in which they had to pay tax, and thus saving to themselves and their families thousands upon thousands of dollars.

The Treasury Department caught up with those tax dodgers. Yet here in this bill is a retroactive feature, back to 1940, which legalizes all this tax dodging that occurred during the war.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I cannot yield. My time is limited.

This bill legalizes that tax-dodging practice back to 1940.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I decline to yield. I do not have the time.

Second. Another thing this bill does, and an example is in the RECORD. I put it in the RECORD on Friday, June 11. Under certain provisions of this bill, with relation to estate taxes on insurance proceeds, a man can get an insurance policy for his wife and three children, for instance. He dies, and he pays no estate tax, even though the value of his estate in insurance may exceed a million dollars. He can distribute a million dollars by using the technical definitions and other provisions of this bill. So we are taking care of the wealthy again. It is not without reason that there have been advertisements in the newspapers by tax experts, by banks and trust companies, reviewing the last tax bill, saying: "Bring your will in. We want to reexamine it in view of the provisions contained in the Revenue Act of 1948."

Now, if the provisions of this bill become law, every tax accountant in the country, every tax lawyer will have still more business from the wealthy people. They would all distribute their estates differently. They would all form family partnerships, or they would all find ways in which to dodge taxes.

Mr. Speaker, where would these taxes come from? The $400,000,000 that they even admit in their own report would be lost by this bill? Who is going to pay those taxes? I will tell you who will pay those taxes. The workingman; the man in the bracket up to five, six, seven, and eight thousand dollars.

Another nice thing they did in this bill: For years and years executives of large corporations have been trying to get Congress to legalize what is known as the stock-option plan. By that, corporations give their high-salaried executives, in lieu of salary, an option on their stock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield myself two additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the Congress never saw fit to do that, because they knew these corporations could give a stock option to an executive, and then, after a few years, he would sell that stock and would only have to pay the capital-gains tax of 25 percent; whereas, if he received the salary as cash compensation, he would have to pay a higher tax rate, perhaps 50 or 60 or 70 percent. So, finally, on the last day of the session, they slip this bill in with 40 minutes' debate, 20 minutes for the opposition.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. This is a bill to relieve those rich people of their income taxes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is correct. There is another nice thing. They exempt from the estate tax the value of the interest of these big corporation executives in a pension plan. In other words, in lieu of giving him all of his salary on which he pays a higher income tax rate, they say, "We will give you a pension. After you quit work you will be getting practically the same salary you are getting now." The interest of a surviving widow or other dependent in such a pension or annuity would be excluded from the gross estate of the exemptive. Of course, everybody is exempt from estate tax up to the extent of $60,000. So this provision is just to lower the tax rate on anybody leaving an estate of more than $60,000.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a great day. I am going to ask for the reading of the bill. I am going to ask for the reading of every word in the bill, and then, perhaps, some of the Members will realize what is being done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to go a little more fully into section 106 which has to do with the tax which will be applied to military personnel. The committee has agreed to raise the exemption to $2,400 rather than leave it at $1,200. As I understand it what this means is that a man in the services who lost both arms or both legs and receives a pension which might go up as high as $2,400 a year it will be exempt from taxation. But anything he may earn by reason of his own labor over and above his $2,400 pension is taxable and in some cases his tax exemption on his pension will be reduced.

Now, when these boys came out of the service the Government spent a great deal of money training them to become useful citizens and again take their place in society. We have trained these men to earn a portion of their living. Now we turn around and penalize them by taxing them on the money they derive from their own efforts. It seems to be a very unwise, inconsistent policy and constitutes a waste of the taxpayers' money. I do not think it ought to be done.

The report on this bill indicates a saving will be effectuated to some corporations of $71,000,000—which may be justified but not when the loss in revenue is to be made up by taxing the pensions of paraplegics, amputees, and combat injured veterans.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would not such a policy lead to idleness on the part of the veterans?

Mr. SMATHERS. Absolutely.

Mr. CURTIS. But it does not do what the gentleman says it does.

Mr. SMATHERS. This legislation instead of being an incentive to work penalizes them for working.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. But the gentleman will find out that this does not apply to any sums veterans might receive from the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is entirely true; but there are a lot of Regular officers who receive their money direct from the Army.

Mr. CURTIS. They can receive it from the Veterans' Administration if they want to.

Mr. SMATHERS. If they do, they get less; and it is my understanding that some Regular officers have to receive their retirement pay from the Army.

I recognize, of course, the purpose that is sought to be accomplished with this legislation. You are trying to work out a situation in this bill where the big generals and admirals who get large retirement pay will not be able to go out and make a lot of money in high-priced jobs while they are still drawing large pensions. Certainly, I sympathize with the purpose; but the result of this legislation in its present form will be to penalize the little fellow—the enlisted men, the lieutenants, and the captains, and the majors, in which ranks were suffered the greatest casualties. In the Marine Corps the highest rate of attrition was in the grades of lieutenants and captains. Certainly, these restrictions on earnings and the tax penalties should not apply to anyone of the rank of major and below.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY. I believe the gentleman misunderstands the purpose of the section. As I understand, it does not take anything away from the retired personnel but merely provides that he shall be taxed on a certain part of his income.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me read the section. It reads:

> Except that if such amounts exceed $1,200 during the taxable year, and the taxpayer also receives during the same taxable year earned income, as defined in section 116 (a) (3), the exclusion under this subparagraph shall be reduced by the amount of such earned income, but not to an amount less than $1,200.

It does not take anything away from retired personnel; it just puts an unjustified tax on his pension and what he may earn.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to call the attention of the membership to the Appendix of the RECORD, at page A3892, which answers in great detail the points raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] in his extension of remarks of last week.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. I presume the minority members of the committee, feeling that in the interest of the country the House will adjourn shortly, have not raised a great deal of opposition to this bill. I further feel that the other body will not have the temerity to pass such an untenable and outrageous piece of legislation.

Nevertheless, I feel that the House should know what the Under Secretary of the Treasury has to say regarding these measures. I quote from his statement, as follows:

> Representing the Treasury, I opposed these measures in hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, but they were nevertheless adopted by the committee. If the objectionable features are removed by the House or the Senate we feel you will have to some extent an acceptable bill.

But none of these objectionable features the Under Secretary of the Treasury has called attention to have been removed. In fact, other objectionable features have been added, and this bill is simply another privileged-class bill, catering and exempting certain special interests from taxation—a practice that the Ways and Means Committee has been guilty of during this Congress. That is, reducing the taxes of those who can best afford to pay and unloading that burden onto the shoulders of those least able to pay.

I feel that this bill will never pass; however, the country ought to know to what extent you are going in trying to aid those you rely on for large contributions which you will need in the forthcoming campaign.

Never before throughout all the years have I witnessed such a procedure as is contemplated in passing H. R. 6712. This bill, containing 145 pages, is being brought up under suspension of the rule and only a very few members of the Ways and Means Committee are familiar with its provisions, to say nothing of the membership of the House.

Not only is this bill being considered under suspension, which will permit only 20 minutes for each side to speak, but a request that it be read has been denied by the action of the Speaker.

I fully apppreciate that the Speaker is trying to expedite the business before the House before adjournment this evening, but this does not justify his preventing the bill from at least being read for those Members who would like to know its provisions.

It has been stated that of the 82 provisions, 68 have had the approval of the Treasury Department, but, unfortunately, the 14 remaining provisions that have not been approved by the Treasury Department are the loopholes that will work in the interest of those with large incomes who will be benefited again to the amount of about $400,000,000.

Because I am confident that the other body will not dare to match the shameful action of the House, I shall not say any more about it. Since I made my statement the bill was declared passed by the Speaker denying the request that it should be read without really submitting it to a vote.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, at long last we have before us a bill to revise the internal-revenue code. Not since 1927 has the Congress made a detailed study of our Federal tax laws and acted on legislation to correct the inequities, simplify the tax system, and generally improve our tax structure. The bill before us is long overdue.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] who just addressed you called this measure an outrageous piece of legislation and expressed the opinion that this bill would never pass. While there is some doubt that there is sufficient time, in view of the present adjournment plans, for the Senate to act on the bill, nonetheless the passage of the bill by the House will itself be a forward step. When the new Congress assembles in January we will be in a position to take prompt action for immediate enactment of the bill.

I have no doubt that if those who have the same philosophy as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] were to control the Congress a bill of this character, however meritorious, would never pass. But there has been a great awakening in the United States, and I venture the prediction that it will be many many years—if ever—before the American people allow their Government to come under the control of those who would use the Federal taxing power to socialize our economy.

My colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has called this a privileged-class bill. He would have us continue the injustices and the inequities of existing law, because those injustices and inequities operate against those who have been successful. Mr. Speaker, when the day comes that it is a crime to be successful, that thrift, hard work, and self-sacrifice are to be penalized, there will be an end of national progress.

I believe in the principle that taxes should be paid upon a basis of ability to pay. That is a sound principle. In general those with the largest property holdings and those with the larger incomes receive and have received greater benefits from the Government than those with no property holdings and little income. No one objects to a graduated income-tax scale.

The principle of ability to pay is not in issue here. The bill before us makes no income-tax reductions. It is simply designed to improve our existing tax structure. It is simply designed to correct certain more or less obvious injustices in the operation of our Federal tax laws and, at the same time, provide increased incentives to management and venture capital.

The bill contains 80 sections dealing with income, estate, and gift taxes, as well as with certain administrative provisions. Only a few of the provisions would entail any material revenue loss. It has been estimated that the total revenue loss by virtue of this bill would amount to around $400,000,000, and this total loss will not be effective for a couple of years. Indeed, of this total estimated revenue loss, about $145,000,000 arises from the provision in the bill continuing the $1,500 exemption from individual income tax of the pay of military personnel.

No, Mr. Speaker, this is not an outrageous piece of legislation. It is outrageous to think that it has taken so long for Congress to act on this type of legislation. A general tax revision of this character is long overdue.

The point was also made by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], in their opposition to this measure that the House does not have sufficient knowledge of what is in the bill. The fact is, however, that this measure is the product of many weeks of hearings and exhaustive study by the Treasury Department itself, by the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means and by the committee members, as well as by individual Members of Congress.

The hearings on the subject of improving and streamlining our tax laws began in May of 1947. Over 100 witnesses appeared before the committee, and the testimony embraces over 3,000 printed pages. The bill before us embodies the suggestions of many experts. To assist the committee in this technical job, a special tax study group under the chairmanship of a former Under Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Roswell Magill, was set up and made its report. And it is my understanding that about half of the provisions of the bill are the recommendations of the Treasury Department.

To be sure, this is a very technical measure. A bill of this nature could never be written on the floor of the House. A single reading of it would not enable one to understand all its contents. The bill is the product of many minds and many weeks of exhaustive study. To try to leave the impression with the country that the measure is being rushed through, without adequate consideration, is pure nonsense.

If this proposed revision of the internal revenue code, as embodied in the pending bill, is so outrageous, why is it that the minority did not file a report? Why is it that the ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. DOUGHTON, for whom everyone of us on both sides of the aisle has great respect, has spoken in favor of the bill? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the only people who oppose this

bill are that small group who would socialize our whole economy. They believe that the way to help the poor is to destroy the rich.

I hold no brief for the wealthy and the rich. But, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has made this country great is the fact that each and everyone of us has the opportunity to be wealthy and rich. As each of us strives to improve ourselves we inevitably serve to improve our community and Nation. Those who have the ability and the capacity to create and to produce are entitled to their reward. That is what opportunity means, and this is the land of opportunity. That is why the United States of America is the strongest and the greatest in the world. That is why hundreds of thousands seek to come here.

I did not intend to enter into a discussion of the philosophy of government. I felt constrained to do so, because I become very much annoyed with those who try to make it appear that it is a crime to be successful. I become very much annoyed with those who try to make it appear that every rich man is a criminal and should be punished. Our job is to encourage, not discourage, self-advancement.

It is impossible to discuss all the features of the pending bill in the time allotted me. There is one feature of the bill, however, that I believe should receive special mention. I refer to the attempt to furnish incentives to management and venture capital.

On previous occasions I have pointed out that in order for the country to meet the increasing demands there must be not only sustained production but there must be an expanding production. There must be an expansion of existing facilities. Existing facilities and equipment must be replaced and improved.

In his message to Congress on the state of the Union, President Truman stated that in the next few years industry must invest $50,000,000,000 in new facilities and equipment. I believe his figure was conservative, particularly considering the plant replacement costs at present inflated prices. At any rate, it is perfectly clear that many billions of dollars are needed by industry to improve, replace, and enlarge existing productive facilities.

But where is this money to come from? There is a very grave shortage of venture capital in the United States today. One of our problems is to encourage the flow of venture capital into private enterprise.

This bill assists in that regard by the amendment to the net operating loss carry-over provision of existing law. Under existing law a 2-year carry-back and a 2-year carry-forward is allowed. The bill before us provides for a 1-year carry-back and a 5-year carry-forward.

Thus, under the proposed change more emphasis is placed on the loss carry-forward than on the carry-back. By this provision both management and investors are given greater incentive, and it brings an advantage to the new businesses which cannot benefit in any way by the carry-back. Likewise, established businesses undergoing a material expansion are favored by the change.

Another provision of the bill which is worthy of mention in this regard is that relating to the improper accumulation of surplus under section 102 of the code. This section provides for the imposition of a surtax on corporate earnings accumulated to prevent the imposition of the surtax on individual stockholders.

In order to reduce the pressure on taxpayers to distribute earnings needed for real business purposes, the bill amends this particular section. In the first place, it places on the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the burden of proving that the accumulation of earnings and profits is beyond the reasonable needs of the business. In the second place, the existing law is amended to provide that the excess of net long-term capital gains over net short-term capital losses of any corporation shall not be included in the tax base on which the penalty tax under section 102 is imposed. And, in the third place, the bill would allow a corporation 75 days after the close of its taxable year to make a distribution of dividends and have this distribution deducted in computing the corporation's income for the purposes of the section.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, without entering into all the technical phases of the bill, it is designed not only to correct certain injustices and inequities that have developed in our Federal tax law, but it is also designed to furnish greater incentives to management and to venture capital so that our national economy may continue to move forward. If this were the sole purpose of the bill, that in itself would be sufficient reason for our passing it. Surely we recognize that the key to the problems confronting us, both nationally and internationally, is to find ways and means to stimulate more and more production.

Over the last several years we have allowed our Federal tax laws to become a patchquilt affair. We have even allowed our tax laws to be used for social purposes rather than simply to raise revenue. This bill is a corrective step. I intend to vote for it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is in keeping with the legislative record of the Eightieth Congress. This Congress has not concerned itself with the general welfare of the people. It has legislated to the benefit of those in the high-income groups.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the last hours of the session. We have failed to pass a bill to control prices. And yesterday, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], backed by the Republican leadership, succeeded in killing the long-range housing program—a program sponsored by both major parties. A battle was waged between the real estate lobby and the American people. The real estate lobby won at the expense of family life in America.

Yesterday this House voted to subsidize the continuance of slums—breeders of delinquency, disease, crime, and despair. When I say subsidize, I mean subsidize, Mr. Speaker. Do we not pay for crime? Do we not pay for disease? Do we not pay for juvenile delinquency with hard, cold cash?

What is this nonsense that is talked when Congress seeks to help the great mass of American people? Why is any form of social legislation always referred to as socialism?

If subsidy is socialistic, then this Congress voted for socialism yesterday when it voted to subsidize those who will build penthouses for the rich. When Congress seeks to help those in the high-income brackets, some call that free enterprise.

But if we seek to clean out the slums that rot our American democracy at the grass roots, those same people call that socialism.

In the last hours of Congress, what do we do? Take time out to consider this unjust, unfair, loophole-creating, tax-rebating bill when time is so precious.

Here we have a small picture of what we have been doing all year long. We have had time for tax cuts, time to take the railroads out from under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the antitrust laws, time to pass the tidelands bill—time to further impair the Labor Department, time to strike a blow at social security while vowing to believe in it wholeheartedly—time, in fact, for everything but the legislation that is needed to strengthen the Nation and to give hope and security to the American people and leadership to the world.

By the way, where is the Federal aid to education bill? Where is the health insurance bill so desperately needed? Where is minimum wage legislation? I can tell you—in the deep freeze.

By the way, where is the building fund for the United Nations? There is no time, I suppose, to bring that out on the floor. Does the Republican leadership have the effrontery, in the face of its refusal to bring this bill out, to go on protesting its faith in the United Nations?

But, to get back to the tax bill before us, I would like to point out that the bad features do not total more than 10 or 15 new loopholes in a bill of eighty-odd sections. But that argument is like trying to average horses and rabbits.

We are now being asked to vote for this bill because there has been so much work put into it and because it embodies sound revision of the tax structure. Yes, that is right, but it has some jokers in it, too—and I, for one, will not buy jokers.

Why has this bill been brought to the floor, anyway? The President will not sign it. The Under Secretary of the Treasury, in his letter appearing in the RECORD of June 11, has given us advance notice—in my opinion—that he will recommend a veto.

Why then are we considering it? The communication sent by the Republicans after the last tax bill to their contributors via the Republican News, a publication sponsored by the Republican National Committee, throws some light on the subject. Under the title—and I quote—"Do Not Throw Peanuts to the Elephant," we find this language:

> Many of our friends feel that, entirely apart from other important considerations, the least they can do to express their appreciation is to contribute a substantial part of their tax savings for this year to insure the reelection of the Congress which made this possible.

Then they have the gall to print the savings of families under the new plan. I read it:

Savings of family of 4 under new tax plan

Net income	Present tax	New tax	Savings
$2,500	$95.00	$16.60	$78.40
$5,000	592.00	431.60	157.40
$10,000	1,892.00	1,360.96	501.04
$15,000	3,658.50	2,512.00	1,128.50
$25,000	8,521.50	5,475.84	3,045.66
$50,000	24,111.00	16,577.92	7,533.08

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are asking for a kick-back on the first tax bill that was passed by this Congress. The Republican News, in the same June 1948 issue, does not stop there. It goes on to say brazenly:

> Don't delay, contribute today.
>
> Don't throw peanuts to the elephant.
>
> Don't count on winning by throwing peanuts to the elephant. The Republican Congress did more than provide a few peanuts for the harassed taxpayer.
>
> We are not going to win this election by sitting around denouncing Democrats or Henry Wallace. We are going to win only by hard work and by liberal contributions. The stakes are too high to take any chance on not winning. If we do not win this year, we may not have another chance.

Mark those words, Mr. Speaker—"the stakes are too high to take any chance on not winning." What are the stakes? Is the bill before us one of them? It won't become law under a Democratic President, but it can be held up as another of the exhibits of what may become law if we have a Republican President and a Republican Congress.

To illustrate just how bad this bill is, let me mention just two provisions which alone should be enough to kill it:

Let me read from the memorandum inserted in the RECORD on June 11, 1948, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], a couple of examples to show the tax avoidance possibilities under the bill. One relates to salaries of corporate executives paid to them in the form of options to buy stock at less than market prices. For example, consider an executive with a net salary (before exemptions) of $50,000. Prior to this year he would have paid a tax of $38,500 on an additional income of $50,000, realized on the exercise of an option to purchase stock in the corporation. The tax has already been reduced to $29,200, or 24 percent, by the Revenue Act of 1948. That, Mr. Speaker, is the tax bill we just got through passing. Remember? This provision in the bill before us would reduce the tax by another 43 percent, to $12,500, for a total 67 percent reduction this year. How's that, Mr. Speaker? I agree with the Republican newspaper that this isn't peanuts.

Mr. Speaker, this sort of carefully selective tax reduction is reckless in its disregard of elementary fairness to taxpayers who continue to be burdened with most of the heavy war-imposed taxes.

The second outrageous provision in this bill is a return to the family partnership device which was such a useful surtax evasion during the war. What does a family partnership enable a taxpayer to do? Consider this example:

Prior to this year a married businessman with two children and an income of $100,000 paid $62,300 in taxes. The Revenue Act of 1948 has already reduced this tax to $45,600 or by 27 percent. If the taxpayer divided the profits in four equal parts between himself, his wife, and two children, the tax would be reduced by this provision by another 18 percent to $34,400, or a total reduction this year of 45 percent. Such possibilities for tax avoidance would weaken, and might eventually discredit, the income-tax system as the fairest method of producing large amounts of revenue.

So, what we have here is another refund of taxes at the top level of the income brackets and this time we do not even sugarcoat the cut in taxes with any pretense of doing anything for the low income groups which are literally abandoned by the premature adjournment of Congress. The Eightieth Congress has done nothing at all for the old people—the mothers and fathers of America—some of whom barely exist on pensions, and nothing at all for the bulk of the wage earners of the country who are in desperate straits. In fact, there is hardly one of the 80 sections of the bill that has general application to the 48,000,000 taxpayers below $5,000.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, those who introduce this bill still have the effrontery to talk about communism. They are not really interested in whether or not communism develops in this country. They are interested in one thing: Winning the next election at any cost.

Mr. Speaker, this bill goes to the heart of the whole peace program and right to the heart of the problem that confronts us here at home.

We still owe a tremendous war debt. Who is going to pay off that war debt? Who is going to pay for the last war while we continue to talk about the next? Are we going to remove from the shoulders of the high income brackets—those who have enjoyed the highest profits in history—the responsibility for paying the war debt and place it on the backs of those in the middle- and low-income brackets? That is what this bill proposes to do. The House should reject it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. • • •.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the words of the gentleman from Minnesota be taken down.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will withdraw the words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has not asked unanimous consent to withdraw them. He just said, "I will withdraw the words." Let us have a little regularity here.

Mr. KNUTSON. I make the point of order that the objection comes too late, because I had recognized the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the request at this time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. He did not make any request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CHURCH. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the request at this time. Is there objection to the request that the words be withdrawn?

Mr. BLOOM. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KNUTSON. The request that the words be taken down comes too late.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to withdraw his words, and the Chair puts the question to the House.

Mr. BLOOM. I object.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Members on this side of the aisle did not hear the gentleman say that he asked unanimous consent to withdraw the words; he just said, "I will withdraw the words." I reserve the right to object. I want it clearly understood.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Minnesota did not make any unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the request to the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I appeal from the decision of the Chair. I ask that the words be taken down.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] be permitted to proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the request to the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, there was an objection. I objected.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] objected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the benefit of the Members of the House, may I inquire of the Speaker what the present status is?

The SPEAKER. The words will be reported to the House as taken down unless they are withdrawn, which the Chair thinks would be a happy solution of the whole situation.

Mr. KNUTSON. I should like to make a brief statement, Mr. Speaker. I had no reference to the gentlewoman from California. I was referring to the applause up in the gallery.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Minnesota has asked unanimous consent that he withdraw his words?

Mr. BLOOM. That is what I objected to. He did not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that he did not ask unanimous consent, but the previous occupant of the chair put it as a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the unanimous-consent request that he withdraw his words been granted?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in a little doubt about that. The previous occupant of the chair thought the request had been granted.

Mr. McCORMACK. When a gentleman asks unanimous consent to withdraw his words, that is an admission that he has perhaps unconsciously said something he should not have said, and I hope the request will be granted.

Mr. BLOOM. He has not asked for it. That is the idea.

Mr. McCORMACK. Ask again.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order, that the words taken down be reported.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the wise counsel of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to withdraw my remarks, all of them.

Mr. SABATH. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the previous discussion was not taken out of my time. I hope, now that we are back to business, we can look at this without any feeling one way or the other. I am afraid that perhaps a little feeling has been aroused against this bill by this occurrence, but we want to be practical about the matter.

This is a bill that has some 80 amendments to the Internal Revenue Code. These amendments are absolutely necessary. Many of them were recommended by the Treasury. To the 80 amendments something like 13 objections were made by the Treasury, and only 3 are of any great importance. These matters were given careful consideration by the committee.

It has been said here, and truly so, that no great benefit comes to the people in the low brackets with respect to this bill, but I must call your attention to the fact that it is not a tax bill as such; it is a revision bill that was brought in for the purpose of ironing out inequities that developed. The Treasury Department itself did not, nor did anyone on our side, recommend any cut in taxes whatsoever. We understood that it was going to be a revision bill without a reduction in tax rates. We understood that no excise taxes would be taken up. We understood that the purpose of the bill was to try to cut away the underbrush that has developed in connection with the interpretation of the Internal Revenue Code over the past years.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. Is it not true, however, that even a revision, when applied to a tax matter, may have the effect of reducing the amount of taxes that may be paid?

Mr. LYNCH. There is no question about the fact that the gentleman has made a correct statement. There was bound to be some loss of revenue because of the inequities that developed, and it was decided that in view of these inequities, even though it should cost the Government a certain amount of money, and the amount of money is small as we look upon it in these days, a revision of the Internal Revenue Code should be made to do away with these inequities. The very fact that the Treasury recognized these inequities should be sufficient to convince you that a revision was necessary. It takes a long time for the Treasury to recognize an inequity, and a far longer time to recommend that the injustice be corrected.

Every recommendation of the Treasury was carefully considered and a large majority of them adopted. We did not adopt all of the Treasury recommendations, nor did we adopt all the recommendations of the joint staff.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6712, as its name implies, is a bill designed to revise the tax structure, not to reduce taxes. The bill is concerned with the income, estate, and gift taxes, and also with certain administrative features of the tax law.

The introduction in the report on H. R. 6712 points out that the bill will remove inequities, eliminate uncertainties for both taxpayers and tax administrators, prevent tax avoidance, simplify the tax system, moderate certain harsh provisions, and provide increased incentives to management and venture capital. This is a large order, but I can assure you that the sentence I quoted is not an empty phrase. I shall use the time at my disposal to point out to you specific provisions in the bill designed to accomplish each of these goals.

REMOVAL OF INEQUITIES

The first aim of the bill is to remove inequities. This objective is evident in the provisions dealing with the content of the net operating loss carry-over, reverters under the estate tax, the tax treatment of annuities, lump-sum distributions under qualified pension plans, life insurance under the estate tax, corporate liquidations, and the averaging provision for earned income contained in section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code.

At the present time the net operating loss used in the carry-over to off-set income of prior or succeeding years is defined in such a way that this loss is reduced by the amount of tax-exempt interest, the excess of percentage depletion over cost depletion, and the 50 percent of long-term capital gains not taken into account in computing net income.

Your committee believes that it is not equitable to deny these deductions and exclusions to businesses with losses while they are being allowed to businesses which have net incomes. Therefore, your committee's bill removes the present major limitations now being applied in the calculation of the net operating loss.

Another inequality is corrected in the case of reverters under the estate tax. To illustrate how this works at present assume, for example, that a taxpayer has made a gift of property to a friend to take effect at or after the taxpayer's death. Also assume that the property will revert to the taxpayer in case the friend dies before the taxpayer. In this case the taxpayer would pay a gift tax at the time the gift was made. Moreover, at the time of his death the full value of the property, less a credit for the gift tax, is included in his estate. This is true even though the possibility of his outliving his friend on an actuarial basis may be infinitesimally small. Your committee's bill corrects this inequity by including in the taxpayer's gross estate only the actuarial value of the decedent's interest in such property just prior to his death.

Your committee's bill also removes inequities in the tax treatment of annuities. At present annuities are taxed under the so-called 3-percent rule, the vagaries and inequities of which are now well known. In some cases the annuitants can expect to recapture under this rule the amount they paid for the annuity on a tax-free basis only if they live many years beyond their normal life expectancy. In other cases the exclusions during the first years of the annuity period are so large that they exceed the personal exemption and thus are wasted. Your committee's bill replaces the 3-percent rule with a more equitable formula which spreads the amount returned on a tax-free basis over the normal life expectancy of the individual in question. Thus, in the average case there will be neither a wastage of exemption on the one hand, nor a failure to recapture tax-free, before death, the amount paid for the annuity.

Inequity is also removed in the case of lump-sum distributions under qualified pension plans. Existing law treats such distributions as long-term capital gains only if they happen to be paid under trusteed plans. Your committee believes that the treatment of qualified plans should be the same irrespective of whether a trust is employed in financing the plan. Therefore, long-term capital gains treatment is also provided for qualified plans financed without the use of a trust.

The present treatment of life insurance under the estate tax represents still another important example of inequitable tax treatment. At the present time if a husband takes out insurance on his own life and makes his wife the beneficiary, the payments received from the life insurance are includible in the husband's gross estate upon his death. This would not be the case if the situation involved any other type of property. Therefore, the so-called premium payment, which provides for such inclusions in the gross estate under present law, is removed in order to place life insurance on a comparable and equitable basis in this respect with other forms of property.

Certain aspects of the present laws and regulations governing corporate liquidations also are inequitable. At present if a corporation is liquidated by distributing its assets to its stockholders, no tax is imposed on the corporation on any appreciation in the value of the assets while in the hands of the corporation. On the other hand, if the corporation sells its assets just prior to liquidation, a tax is imposed on the corporation. The two methods of liquidation are essentially the same, and your committee believes that there is no justification for subjecting the second method to discriminatory tax treatment. Therefore, your committee's bill provides that if a corporation sells its assets just prior to liquidation, no gain or loss shall be recognized to the corporation if certain specified rules are followed.

The last example which I shall mention of inequality corrected by the bill concerns the averaging provision relating to personal services covering a period of 3 years or more, where 80 percent of the compensation is received in a single year. Present law limits relief under this averaging device in cases where the work is completed. Relief is denied in situations where an individual is employed continually for long periods but receives portions of his compensation for the work in lump sums at infrequent intervals. Your committee believes that it is only equitable to provide relief in these cases, as well as those where the work is completed.

ELIMINATION OF UNCERTAINTY FOR TAXPAYERS AND TAX ADMINISTRATORS

A very large number of provisions in your committee's bill are designed partially, at least, to eliminate uncertainties for both the taxpayers and the tax administrators. Of the many examples available I shall discuss only the contemplation of death provision under the estate tax, the tax treatment of family partnerships, stock options, the use of 52- or 53-week periods for reporting income taxes, and the tax treatment given to deceased partners where the surviving partners make payments to his estate.

Existing law includes all transfers made within 2 years prior to death within the gross estate of the taxpayer, unless the estate can prove that these transfers were not made in contemplation of death. Transfers made more than 2 years prior to death are not includible in the gross estate unless the Government can prove that they were made in contemplation of death. While the taxation of such transfers has long been recognized as necessary in order to prevent tax avoidance, this feature of the law has resulted in a great deal of uncertainty for both taxpayers and the Government. The result has been much needless litigation. Principally this is due to the fact that contemplation of death deals with intent, and intent is difficult for either the estate or the Government to establish. To eliminate this uncertainty, your committee's bill makes the contemplation of death clause inapplicable to transfers made more than 3 years prior to death, and extends from 2 to 3 years the presumption that transfers were made in contemplation of death. This will give much greater certainty for everyone involved and will probably result in some increase in revenue.

The tax treatment of family partnerships represents another area in which your committee provides more certain tax treatment. At the present time, largely as the result of the Tower and Lusthaus cases, members of a family who are also partners in a business cannot be sure of how the earnings from the partnership will be treated for tax purposes. This is an especially perplexing problem where the capital of one partner arose from a gift made to him by another related partner. Your committee's bill provides that where family partners can meet certain tests laid down in the bill, no question may be raised as to the validity of the partnership even though the capital of one partner was originally given to him by another related partner. It is important to emphasize, however, that this provision of your committee's bill will not in any way deny partnership treatment for tax purposes to any partners who can now qualify under present law irrespective of whether or not they can meet the tests set out in the new section. It simply provides certainty for family partnerships meeting these tests.

Certainty of tax treatment is also provided under your committee's bill for employee stock option plans meeting certain specified tests. This, however, I shall discuss more fully at a later point.

At the present time the Internal Revenue Code requires taxpayers to report their income on the 12-month basis, yet for business reasons many taxpayers have been keeping their records on a 52- or 53-week basis as a matter of business convenience. Although not specifically provided for by present law, the Bureau of Internal Revenue accepts reporting on this basis for purposes of the income tax. Your committee's bill removes the uncertainty faced by taxpayers keeping their records in this manner by giving specific legal sanction to this practice.

The tax law is also made more specific in its application to the tax treatment of payments made to a partner after his death. This provision is concerned with personal service partnerships, such as law partnerships. These partnership agreements often provide for the payment of a specified portion of future partnership income for a limited period to the estate of a deceased partner, as a rough equivalent of the decedent partner's share of the partnership assets at the time of his death. The tax status of such payments is uncertain under existing law. Your committee's bill specifically excludes amounts so distributed from the distributive share of the surviving partners and includes them in the income of the estate of the deceased partner in the year received.

PREVENTION OF TAX AVOIDANCE

Many of the provisions of H. R. 6712 are designed to prevent tax avoidance. For example, your committee's bill plugs loopholes in the case of intercorporate distributions in kind, capital gains of nonresident aliens, and exclusion of military retirement pay. Your committee is also offering an amendment to the bill to plug a loophole in the case of short sales of stock or commodities.

A practice has been developing in recent years which leads to an undesirable type of tax avoidance through the distribution of dividends by one corporation to another in the form of stock in trade rather than money. As a result the distributing corporation realizes no income and pays no tax. Because of the intercorporate dividend credit the corporation to whom the property is distributed pays a tax on only 15 percent of the value added by the first corporation. Thus, through this type of an arrangement it is possible almost entirely to escape the corporate income tax. To plug this loophole your committee's bill restricts the allowance of the dividends received credit to the value of the stock in trade in the hands of the distributing corporation. Thus, when the second corporation sells the stock in trade, income is realized and taxable to it even if the stock in trade has not appreciated in value since it was received by the second corporation.

I am sure that most of you are well acquainted with the fact that under existing law capital gains of nonresident aliens are exempted from the income tax. A number of cases have been brought to the attention of your committee where these nonresident aliens are escaping the capital gains tax, although in fact they are in this country for considerable periods of time and are carrying out transactions on American exchanges. Your committee's bill plugs this loophole by subjecting capital gains derived from sources within the United States by nonresident aliens to a 30-percent tax. If the nonresident alien is present less than 90 days during the year, he is taxed only on such capital gains realized while he was present in the United States. If he is present 90 days or more, the tax applies to all such capital gains during the entire year whether or not he was present in the United States at the time of the sale.

The Armed Forces Committee and the Secretary of Defense have already called attention to the fact that military retirement pay is excluded from the income tax even though the recipient of such a pension or annuity may be receiving a large salary from private industry. Your committee's bill plugs this loophole by restricting this exclusion from the income tax to cases of real need. This is done by reducing the exclusion by the amount of any earned income received, although in no case is the exclusion allowed reduced by the bill below $1,200. An amendment which will be offered by your committee, however, will limit this in such a way that it will not apply to veterans receiving disability pensions and to raise this $1,200 limit to $2,400.

Your committee also intends to offer an amendment to plug a loophole now existing in the case of short sales of stock or commodities. At the present time it is possible to manipulate short sales in such a way that gains on risks entered into on the stock or commodity markets for periods of 6 months or less can technically be made to qualify as long-term capital gains. As a result only half of the gain is now taken into consideration in computing taxable income, while short-term capital gains, which would realistically characterize these transactions, are fully taxable. The amendment to be offered by your committee recognizes reality in these transactions, and treats gains on risks taken for periods of 6 months or less as short-term capital gains irrespective of the form in which they may be carried out.

TAX SIMPLIFICATION

A very large proportion of your committee's amendments have simplification as one of their aims. Outstanding examples of this are the provisions relating to estates and trusts, contemplation of death, and deductions for charitable and other similar contributions.

The present provisions relating to the tax treatment of estates and trusts and their beneficiaries are extremely complex, especially those dealing with taxes imposed on beneficiaries when the prior year's earnings are distributed. The complexity is so great that even lawyers specializing in the field of estates and trusts have complained vociferously. Much of the difficulty has centered around the so-called 65-day and 12-month rules for the taxation of the prior year's earnings distributed in the current year. Your committee's bill eliminates these rules entirely. It substitutes in their place a rule which, in effect, would treat distributions by estates or trusts as if they were made out of any current earnings of the estates or trusts not actually distributed currently. Other changes in your committee's bill improve the equity of the tax treatment of trusts and estates, and it is hoped that it will be possible in the future to do still more along this line.

I have already outlined to you the changes which your committee's bill will make in the estate tax with respect to the contemplation of death provisions. From the standpoint of simplification, this feature of your bill will be especially beneficial.

Your committee's bill makes a series of amendments to the Internal Revenue Code relating to income-, estate-, and gift-tax deductions for contributions to charitable and similar organizations. These amendments are intended to simplify the tax laws by placing the deductions allowed for charitable and related contributions on a comparable basis under all three of these taxes. At the present time one type of contribution may be deductible under the estate tax and not deductible under the income or gift taxes, or vice versa. Your committee's amendment correlates these deductions so that generally any charitable or similar deduction allowed, or limitation imposed, with respect to one of these taxes is also allowed or imposed with respect to the other two.

MODERATION OF HARSH PROVISIONS

The moderation of harsh tax provisions is another aim of your committee's bill. I have already explained to you how harsh and inequitable features of the taxation of annuities, and the taxation of family partnerships are remedied in the bill. Other particularly harsh features of the tax law which also are moderated by your committee's bill include the provision dealing with the improper accumulation of surplus under section 102, the extension of the military exclusions and deductions for another year, the revision of the tax treatment of corporate reorganizations, the leeway granted in the case of deductions for charitable contributions by corporations and the last-in, first-out inventory adjustments.

Your committee has received many taxpayers' complaints that administrative officials are too harsh in their interpretation of what constitutes improperly accumulated surpluses. Reports have been received that the fear of subjecting earnings to the penalty tax imposed on improper accumulated earnings has in many cases resulted in distributions of funds needed by the corporation for valid business purposes. Your committee's bill contains three amendments designed to reduce the pressure on taxpayers to distribute earnings needed for real business purposes and to remove some of the harsher aspects of this penalty tax.

First, the burden of providing that an accumulation of earnings and profits in certain cases is beyond the reasonable needs of a business is shifted from the taxpayer to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. This was done to assure the taxpayer that the penalty will be imposed only where there is proof of an improper accumulation.

Second, your committee's bill removes the penalty tax from any excess of net long-term capital gains over net short-term capital gains. Your committee believed that the application of penalty tax in this case is unduly harsh. When such income is realized by a corporation, it is taxed at 25 percent. This represents the maximum rate at which it would be taxed if realized directly by an individual. Thus the accumulation of capital gains by a corporation does not in reality represent a means of avoiding the regular graduated individual income tax, and your committee did not believe that a penalty tax should be applied in this situation.

Third, your committee's bill provides that dividends paid within 75 days after the close of the corporation's taxable year may be deducted in computing the income of the corporation subject to the penalty tax. Many businesses customarily distribute dividends after the end of the year and it is recognized as a legitimate business practice. To ignore this practice and subject these earnings to a penalty tax in the opinion of your committee is unduly harsh.

Your committee believes that it would also represent a real hardship to members of the armed forces if the present exclusions from tax are not continued, in view of the fact that their pay has not been revised upward for some time. As a result your committee's bill extends for another year the full exclusion now available to enlisted personnel and the $1,500 exclusion now granted commissioned officers. Without this extension these exclusions would lapse after December 31 of this year. Your committee is providing this extension at the specific request of the Secretary of the Navy, who has indicated that a study is being made of the pay scales of the armed forces.

Your committee believes that there are many areas of hardship in the present tax treatment of corporate reorganizations, and intends to give this problem further study. However, one feature of the reorganization provisions appeared so harsh as to deserve immediate attention. At the present time where two new corporations are formed by the liquidation of an old corporation, no tax is customarily imposed as a result of such a reorganization. However, if it is desired to retain the old corporate charter and form only one new corporation, the reorganization would be a taxable one. It appeared to your committee that it was undesirable to compel corporations to follow the first rather than the second type of reorganization where there were valid business reasons for using the latter. As a result your committee's bill provides for tax-free organizations in the latter, as well as the former case. However, certain limitations are imposed to assure the Government that this form of reorganization will not be used as a tax avoidance scheme.

Your committee believes that the present tax treatment of charitable contributions by corporations is unduly strict. Many corporations desiring to make the maximum charitable contributions allowable as tax deductions are unable to determine what constitutes 5 percent of their adjusted gross income before closing their books at the end of their taxable year. Yet present law requires them to make these contributions before the end of the taxable year if they are to be taken as deductions for that year. H. R. 6712 permits corporations to treat contributions made in the first 2½ months of the succeeding year as charitable deductions in the current year if they so desire.

There are also certain harsh aspects in the tax law applying to last-in first-out inventory adjustments. One provision under this feature of the law provides for the payment of refunds to taxpayers because of the liquidation of inventories during the war which could not be replaced until the cost of the replacements had risen substantially. However, in many cases these refunds have not yet been paid, and in some cases it appears likely that it will be necessary to wait several more years for these payments. This delay is due in large part to the fact that the corporations involved are also faced with complex excess profits tax problems which must be settled before the refunds may be paid. These refunds do not, however, bear interest, and as a result taxpayers are being denied the use of their money, while at the same time receiving no interest for its use by the Government. For this reason your committee's bill provides that refunds of this type shall bear interest beginning January 1, 1948, or the date for the payment of the tax for the year of replacement, whichever is later.

Other harsh aspects of the tax treatment of last-in first-out inventory adjustments arise from the fact that it has not always been possible for taxpayers to know that they would benefit under this provision. For that reason your committee's bill gives the Commissioner of Internal Revenue discretion in determining when the taxpayer must exercise the election under the last-in first-out adjustment for the involuntary liquidation and replacement of inventories. Thus, it will be possible for him to provide relief in hardship cases.

INCREASED INCENTIVES TO MANAGEMENT AND CAPITAL

The fifth and last aim of your committee's bill outlined in the general statement of the report is to provide increased incentives to management and venture capital. I shall attempt to give you only the two most outstanding examples of provisions in your committee's bill providing such incentives. They are the net operating loss carry-over and stock-option provisions.

At the present time it is possible for either incorporated or unincorporated business to carry a net operating loss first back to the income of the two prior years, and then forward to the two succeeding years. Thus, present law provides a 5-year averaging period for such losses. Your committee's bill extends this averaging period to 7 years. Moreover, a 5-year carry-forward and a 1-year carry-back are substituted for the present 2-year carry-back and 2-year carry-forward. The longer averaging period provided by your comittee's bill will decrease business risks and, therefore, increase the willingness of investors to buy new stock or bond issues. The increased reliance placed on the carry-forward and the decreased emphasis on the carry-back should also be advantageous from an incentive standpoint, since to gain relief under the carry-forward a business must be brought back to a profitable basis, while a carry-back automatically provides relief to business with profitable years in the past.

The stock-option provisions in your committee's bill are also of prime importance from an incentive standpoint. They represent devices which can be used to attract new and better management. They may also be used to increase the interest of employees in the business by giving them a stake in the business. The present method of taxing these options is so severe that they cannot be used extensively for either of these purposes. Moreover, the Bureau of Internal Revenue is attempting to extend the application of court decisions in this area to cases which your committee feels confident that the Congress did not intend them to apply. As a result, businesses frequently are afraid to use stock options because they cannot be certain how either the employer or employee will be taxed.

To remove this difficulty, your committee's bill establishes what are called restricted stop options. For these options where there is only a relatively small leeway between the price at which the employee has the option to buy stock and the fair market value of the stock at the time the options are granted, any difference between the option price and the price at the time the option is exercised under your committee's bill is taxed to the employee at the time the stock is purchased. As a result, under present law, the employee frequently finds that he must sell part of this stock in order to pay the tax due. Your committee's bill removes this deterrent to the use of stock options.

In addition to postponing the date when the tax must be paid, your committee's bill also provides that the gain representing the difference between the option price and the market price of the stock at the time the option is exercised will be treated as a capital gain rather than as ordinary income in certain cases. This special treatment is provided to encourage the holding of stock by the employee and is available to him if he holds the stock purchased under an option for 3 years or more.

The favorable type of tax treatment afforded restricted stock options is limited to stock-option plans which meet certain tests specified in the bill. This was necessary to assure the Government that stock-option plans would be used only as incentive devices or means of increasing employee interest in the business.

SUMMARY

In showing you how H. R. 6712 removes inequities, eliminates uncertainties for taxpayers and tax administrators, prevents tax avoidance, simplifies the tax system, moderates certain harsh provisions and provides incentives to management and capital, I have drawn upon only about a third of the sections in the bill—25 out of a total of 80 sections. Yet despite the size of this bill it represents only a modest beginning on a program of correcting the flaws and incongruities in our tax system.

It is modest in that it loses only about $150,000,000 of revenue in 1949. It is also modest in that many more changes, some much more far-reaching than the provisions in this bill, must be undertaken before we shall have a satisfactory tax structure. However, I believe it is important that we, here and now, take the first step in overhauling the hybrid tax system that has grown up in the last few years. Everyone has recognized the importance of the job to be done, and the passage of this bill represents the best way we can show the country that we are starting on this journey.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill includes a committee amendment in which I am greatly interested.

It is aimed at closing a loophole which has been discovered in the capital-gains provision of the law.

Speculators on the stock and grain exchanges have managed to change what are really short-term profits into long-term profits and thus have avoided a large part of their taxes. I cannot blame anyone for taking advantage of quirks in the law to reduce his taxes. But it is our duty here to watch the workings of the law and plug up loopholes as we find them.

What they have been doing is briefly as follows:

If a man bought shares of a certain stock or so many bushels of a commodity and within the 6 months' period had a profit thereon, instead of selling the item when he felt it the time to do so market-wise, thus subjecting himself to the full income tax on short-term capital gains, he would sell the same number of shares of stock or the same amount of a commodity short keeping both transactions open until the 6 months' holding period had expired and thus pay only a 25 percent tax on the profit as a long-term capital gain, where if he had closed out the transaction technically when he actually did so and ceased to have any risk marketwise, he would have paid a full tax on the entire profit as a short-term capital gain.

There are many ramifications in this method of tax avoidance. There is, of course, the reverse of what I have described—where the short sale is made first, covered by a purchase later.

There is what is called short selling against "box" where securities are already held.

There is the use of "puts" which are an option to sell stock at a fixed price during a given time.

We have attempted in this amendment to close up all the loopholes along this line which we could find. Drafting has been extremely difficult and it is possible that we have not covered everything. However, if other loopholes develop we can correct them at a later date.

Though tax avoidance is legal, those who avoid taxes make necessary higher taxes for others who cannot avoid their own taxes. Therefore, it is the duty of our committee to do everything we can to make everyone pay his fair share. By this amendment we hope to help accomplish this purpose.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the main objection—if it may be called an objection—to this measure is simply that it does not go far enough. There are many other instances, in my opinion, where the Internal Revenue Code should be revised to correct tax inequities and to clarify some of the interpretations of the Internal-revenue laws as made by the Internal Revenue Bureau.

I have in mind one instance in particular which I would like to point out at this time. Section 3649 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code provides that the tax imposed on the transportation of persons is interpreted to include transportation on fishing party boats. I had introduced a bill, known as H. R. 5537, to amend the above-mentioned provision of the Internal Revenue Code so that this tax would not apply to persons merely on a fishing party from shore to short distances to fishing grounds and return. This part of the Internal Revenue Code was never intended to apply for fishing party purposes. I have searched through the legislative history of this section. Nowhere in the record can I find any intention, even by inference, that this tax should apply for fishing party purposes. I had hoped that this bill before us now would include a provision to correct this situation. It was my hope that the provisions of the bill which I introduced would have been made a part of the bill before us. I have been working during this Congress to get this matter corrected, and I have found very sympathetic support; and while the

members of the committee were very sympathetic, yet, unfortunately, this bill does not go far enough to correct the provision which I have pointed out.

I would like to make it clear that I intend to continue my fight against the application of this transportation tax to fishing parties.

For the information of all Members of Congress, I would like to insert right here a copy of H. R. 5537:

H. R. 5537

A bill to amend section 3469 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax imposed on the transportation of persons shall not apply to transportation on boats for fishing purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3469 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the exemption of certain trips from the tax on the transportation of persons) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Exemption of certain trips: The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts paid for transportation which do not exceed 35 cents, to amounts paid for commutation or season tickets for single trips of less than 30 miles, to amounts paid for commutation tickets for 1 month or less, or to amounts paid for transportation in a boat where the transportation takes place for the sole purpose of fishing from the boat in which such transportation is furnished."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall apply to amounts paid on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this act for transportation on or after such first day.

WORTH-WHILE TAX REVISION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for many years we have just added and added to our tax structure and the time is overdue when we should have a major revision of our tax program. This tax-revision bill is the first step in the right direction.

There are certain features of it that may have to have a second look when they reach the Senate. I refer particularly to the section on family partnerships. It will, however, be a big improvement over the present situation. Our report calls attention to the fact that in our attempt to clarify the situation in regard to family partnerships, we do not want anyone to lose any of his present rights with respect to rulings and holdings of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

There are two important matters in this bill dealing with agriculture. It was my privilege to sponsor these measures, but I am grateful to many others who have helped me in advancing them.

In the first place, we extend the time in which a farmer must file his tax returns. At the present time a farmer's estimated return must be filed by January 15. A high percentage of the farmers like to have this estimated tax be their final tax return. This bill provides that if it is their final return they may have until January 31, instead of the 15th, to make this return. This will be very helpful.

The other provision that I would mention relates to soil conservation. It mean in substance that the farmer who spends his money to improve the soil not only for himself, but for his country and for the benefit of his neighbors shall pay less taxes than if he were a soil robber. Sound soil-conservation practices are a business expense for the farmer. This provision says that they shall be so regarded for the purposes of income tax. This section provides that—

Expenditures made for the purpose of soil and water conservation and the prevention of erosion of land used in farming shall be allowed as business deductions. • • • The term "expenditures made for the purpose of soil and water conservation and the prevention of erosion" means expenditures for the treatment, moving, or cultivation of earth including (but not limited to) leveling, grading and terracing, contour furrowing, the construction of diversion channels and drainage ditches, the control and protection of watercourses, outlets, and ponds, the planting and cultivation of cover and protective crops, or windbreaks, and other special or emergency cultivation and tillage; but such term does not include the purchase, construction, installation, or improvement of structures, appliances, and facilities made of masonry, concrete, tile, metal, or wood, such as tanks, reservoirs, pipes, conduits, canals, dams, wells, and pumps, which are subject to the allowance for depreciation.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, that this proposal will be a great boost to conservation in America.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this tax revision bill is a very important piece of legislation. It represents the work of the members of the Ways and Means Committee for several months and also the work of the Treasury force and the force of the Joint Committee on Taxation, all of whom are tax experts.

For a number of years there has developed a larger number of inequities by reason of overlapping tax laws and regulations. There has been much confusion and much litigation by reason of unfair and unjust regulations and interpretations of any laws controlling the levying and collection of taxes.

The Ways and Means Committee decided to revise the general tax laws and the bill that we are considering today is the result of that decision.

Nobody could give a complete and thorough analysis of this bill in less than an hour. I shall not attempt it here today. I worked on this bill many hours. I listened to the testimony of many witnesses with reference to its provisions. I have no hesitancy in recommending the passage of this legislation. It is not claimed that this bill is a complete revision in all respects. There are many other changes that could yet be made before all the tax legislation is free from any inconsistencies or inequities.

This bill should be passed.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I know that I am speaking the sentiments of every Member of this House when I say that we have no intention of legislating in such a manner as to work a hardship upon the men who became disabled in the service of our country. I am sincerely interested in the welfare of those men who have served their Nation, whose service has been honorable and because of such service they have become disabled and are receiving compensation for their disabilities from our Government. I believe a great many of our disabled veterans were under the impression that section 106 of this bill would make it necessary for them to pay taxes on their small compensation or pension. I am glad that the intent of the committee to set substantial maximum earnings which retired officers may receive before exemption of their retirement is affected is clarified with this amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the best legislation gets the least attention at the time it is passed. There is a section of this bill (H. R. 6712) which may get far less attention than it deserves.

Its long-range benefits, however, warrant special mention. I refer to section 110, which establishes expenditures for soil and water conservation as deductible business expenses in farming operations.

That it is in the national interest, no one can deny. We often appropriate money directly for soil and water conservation. This section says that if a farmer uses his own money for that purpose he may enter it as a business-operating expense in making out his return for income-tax purposes.

The idea is one which I have discussed many times with my good friend and neighbor the gentleman from Nebraska, the Honorable CARL T. CURTIS, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. He introduced a bill to accomplish it and I am glad to see it now incorporated in this bill as section 110.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the House will understand my attitude in this matter when I say I favored reporting the bill in order that the House may have the opportunity to vote upon the provisions of the bill, but I made it definite and clear at the time that I had some fundamental objections to the bill and that I reserved the right to oppose the measure. I admit there is much good in the bill. There were many things that should have been corrected over the years. The committee tries to correct these. The administrative difficulties develop with time. They develop with succeeding changes in our tax structure. No one is particularly to blame for these occurrences which manifest themselves in due time. The revisions in the pending bill make many minor administrative corrections, but also and more important several changes are made which constitute a material reduction in taxes. I believe the resulting loss of revenue, approximating about $400,000,000, for the large part that amount of tax cut goes to the benefit of the people with incomes above $5,000—I think that is correct—although people with incomes under that amount do get some concessions for uniforms and certain clothing and other things that they use, perhaps in their business or trade.

I call your attention to the fact that section 102 is being destroyed by changes. I am not a lawyer, so I will not discuss it from a technical standpoint, but the lawyers knew when these changes were proposed that it was intended to weaken that section and give the benefits of the change to a certain class of taxpayers. I favor strengthening rather than weakening section 102 even while making administrative changes.

The Secretary of the Treasury says in his letter of objections that "the present protective tax to prevent corporations from being used as a depository for avoidance of surtaxes by their stockholders would be weakened by increasing the burden of the Government in proving its case."

Instead of weakening section 102, I have always contended that it should have been strengthened. That could be done with justice and fairness, both to the taxpayers and the Treasury. Section 203 also is found to be costly insofar as the Treasury is concerned, and the Treasury strenuously objected to this provision. The Secretary says:

I quote:

SECTION 203. PROCEEDS OF LIFE INSURANCE

Under existing law insurance purchased by the insured on his own life is included in his taxable estate. The basic purpose of this provision is, of course, very clear. Life insurance is inherently testamentary and, like any testamentary arrangement, is intended to benefit the insured's family after his death. In the absence of the present law, wealthy individuals might—as they once did—pass on large portions of their wealth through the form of life insurance without paying an estate tax. The proposed amendment would permit precisely this result. In fact, this amendment, when coupled with the large gift-tax exemptions and exclusions already provided by the Revenue Act of 1948 would permit taxpayers to leave very large estates without paying either an estate tax or a gift tax.

For example, a 40-year-old married man with three children could make annual tax-free gifts of $6,000, each to his wife and children for the payment of life-insurance premiums. These premiums would provide $900,000 worth of life insurance. If at death he left a net estate of $700,000 to his wife, in addition to his insurance estate of $900,000, the estate tax would be $73,300, or 65 percent less than the $206,900 tax due on the $1,600,000 net estate under existing law.

Moreover, if the insured's estate, over and above his life insurance, were $120,000, one-half of which was left to his wife, there would be no tax at all. Thus an estate of over $1,000,000 would pass entirely free of all estate and gift taxes.

These changes constitute at one and the same time, revision and even more reduction in taxes for the favored few.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the pending tax revision bill, which was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. Although time did not permit a complete revision of the Internal Revenue Code, it has been possible to correct a number of errors and inequities in the present law.

After hearings lasting many weeks to obtain the views of the Treasury Department, practicing tax attorneys and accountants, and spokesmen for agriculture, industry, and labor, the committee went into executive session to write this bill.

The unanimous vote of the committee to report favorably H. R. 6712, without even a supplementary minority report, is, in my opinion, an achievement and a well-deserved tribute to the leadership of my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota. I know by experience the heavy responsibilities that fall upon the committee chairman in the preparation of a technical tax revision bill. And I take the opportunity here to acknowledge for myself, and I feel sure the other minority members of the committee as well, the fair, courteous, friendly, nonpartisan consideration extended to all the members in our deliberations on this measure.

The bill contains more than 30 technical changes recommended by the Treasury Department. Other amendments originated with the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, or with members of the committee. The more than 80 amendments of the Federal tax structure were agreed to only after discussion with the Under Secretary of the Treasury and his technical staff. At all times the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation gave us the benefit of his able and experienced judgment. But in the final analysis, this is a committee bill for which joint responsibility has been assumed by the entire membership of the Committee on Ways and Means. In a few instances the committee declined to follow the recommendations of the Treasury, but never was this decision a partisan issue.

It has been my experience that it is impossible to write a technical tax bill that does not contain at least a few provisions which each Member would alter in some respect if he were writing the bill alone. It is my sincere belief and conviction, however, that passage of H. R. 6712 will be a contribution toward a sounder and more equitable Federal tax system.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I believe you stated this bill was considered on a nonpartison basis.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It was.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not correct that 68 of the 82 amendments that are submitted have been approved as being just and fair by the Treasury Department?

Mr. DOUGHTON. There were about 30 technical amendments contained in the bill that were recommended and insisted upon by the Treasury Department. I think the bill contains about 80 changes in the code, and 30 of those were recommended by the Treasury. There were only a few provisions in this bill that were opposed by the Treasury.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not true that your committee brought this bill out unanimously? It was by unanimous vote of the members of the Ways and Means Committee, was it not?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Well, I thought so at the time, but the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who is opposed to it, and whose ability and sincerity nobody questions, said that in voting to report the bill he reserved the right to oppose the bill on the floor. But I heard so little opposition to the bill when it was originally reported that it seems extremely strange that someone did not have enough interest to write a minority report to be included with the majority views, so that we would have known if there were so many objections. There has certainly been ample time to get out a minority report. I think there is much more good in this bill than there is bad.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is it not also true that not one single provision was ever put into this bill with any idea of saving taxes for anybody?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It seems that you cannot bring out any tax bill but that somebody raises the issue of trying to do something for the rich. I have no brief for the wealthy and the rich. I have helped write a great many tax bills, but where would the Treasury be if somebody did not have some wealth and pay some taxes? Yet every time a bill comes in that issue is raised.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Are we not entitled to a reading of the bill?

The SPEAKER. That time has passed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. No one asked unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Nobody demanded the reading of the bill at the right time. If the gentleman wanted the bill read, he should have done that before a second was ordered.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In order to give the Members an opportunity to know what is in this bill, and study it before a vote is taken, I demand the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. There can be no demand for reading of the engrossed copy under suspension of the rules.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House Resolution 656, making in order consideration of the tax-revision bill will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

MILITARY FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6771) "making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 6, 8, 16, 41 and 55.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 7, 9, 12, 24, 33, 39, 40, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57 and 58; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$889,486,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$305,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,314,342,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$28,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,493,642,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$210,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$113,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$931,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$412,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$153,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$166,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$263,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$429,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$610,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$26,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,440,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "the purchase (not to exceed one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles for official use only"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$290,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"No appropriation in this Act shall be available for the pay, allowances or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the National Guard for periods of active duty, training, drills, instruction or other duty for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the Act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, Eightieth Congress), who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this provision shall be so construed as to prevent the application of funds herein contained to the pay, allowances or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer or enlisted man of the National Guard who may waive or relinquish said pension, disability allowance, or disability compensation where such disability is of such degree as not to prevent acceptance for active federal duty for the periods of active duty, field training, instruction or other duty, except drill, for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the Act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, Eightieth Congress): *Provided further*, That adjutants general who may be drawing such emoluments may be continued in a federally recognized status without pay under this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "$125,000,000: *Provided*, That $25,000,000 of this appropriation is made contingent upon the enactment into law by the Eightieth Congress of S. 2655 or similar authorization for the voluntary enlistment of persons between the ages of eighteen and nineteen years"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"No appropriation in this Act shall be available for pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Organized Reserves for periods of active duty, drills, training, instruction, or other duty for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the Act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, Eightieth Congress), who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this provision shall be so construed as to prevent the application of funds herein contained to the pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Organized Reserves who may waive or relinquish said pension, disability allowance, or disability compensation where such disability is of such degree as not to prevent acceptance for active federal duty for the periods of active duty, field training, instruction, or other duty, except drill, for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the Act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, Eightieth Congress)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$39,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$628,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$674,525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "or to the use of funds for (a) water transportation of personnel and supplies, or (b) laundry services; and (7) in connection with construction activities"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 19, 28, and 30.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
HOMER FERGUSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommend in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 relates to the purchase of an automobile for the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2 relates to a health service program as authorized by law, for the National Security Resources Board, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 relates to funds carried in the bill for the National Security Resources Board, and appropriates $3,000,000, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $3,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4 relates to funds for general expenses, United States Air Force, and appropriates $889,486,000, in lieu of $884,486,000, as proposed by the House, and $896,986,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5 relates to funds covering civilian personnel of the Air Force, and establishes a ceiling of $305,000,000, in lieu of $300,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $312,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6 relates to the so-called Byrd law, which places a ceiling on the number of civilian employees, and strikes out an amendment proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7 relates to departmental salaries of the Air Force and appropriates $825,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $750,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8 relates to the expenses for the Chief of Staff, Air Force, and appropriates $6,500,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $7,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9 relates to contingencies of the Army, and appropriates $32,900,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $30,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10 relates to expenses for the Inter-American Relations, Department of the Army, and appropriates $750,000, in lieu of $650,000, as proposed by the House, and $850,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 relates to pay of the Army, and appropriates $2,314,342,000, in lieu of $2,300,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,320,942,000, as proposed by the Senate; $342,000 of the amount appropriated is to cover flying pay for flight surgeons.

Amendment No. 12 relates to flying pay for flight surgeons, and strikes out the word "not", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13 relates to compensation for employees of the Finance Department and appropriates $28,500,0000, in lieu of $28,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $29,868,630, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14 adjusts the total for the Finance Service, Army, at $2,493,642,000, instead of $2,478,800,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,501,610,630, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15 relates to welfare of enlisted men and appropriates $8,250,000 in lieu of $8,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $8,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 relates to the purchase of butter and restores the language as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17 relates to regular supplies of the Army and appropriates $100,000,000, in lieu of $95,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $105,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18 relates to clothing and equipage and appropriates $210,000,000, in lieu of $200,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $235,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19 relates to contract authorization of $25,000,000 for clothing and equipage and is reported in disagreement. A motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment will be offered.

Amendment No. 20 relates to incidental expenses of the Army and appropriates $113,000,000, in lieu of $110,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $118,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House figure does not increase the allowance for special service schools.

Amendment No. 21 adjusts the total for Quartermaster Service, Army, at $931,250,000, in lieu of $913,000,000, as carried in the House bill, and $966,500,000, as carried in the Senate bill.

Amendment No. 22 relates to expenses for Transportation Service, Army, and appropriates $412,000,000, in lieu of $400,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $420,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23 relates to the Signal Service of the Army and appropriates $153,000,000, in lieu of $150,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $155,787,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24 relates to the Medical Department and appropriates $75,126,163, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $75,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25 relates to Engineer Service, Army, and appropriates $166,000,000, in lieu of $160,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $170,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26 relates to Barracks and Quarters, Army, and appropriates $263,000,000, in lieu of $250,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $280,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27 adjusts the total for Engineer Service, Army, at $429,000,000, in lieu of $410,000,000, as carried in the House bill, and $450,000,000, as carried in the Senate bill.

Amendment No. 28 relates to military construction, Army, and is reported in disagreement. A motion to recede and concur with an amendment will be offered.

Amendment No. 29 relates to Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army, and appropriates $610,000,000, in lieu of $580,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $665,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30 relates to contract authorization in connection with Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army, and is reported in disagreement. An amendment to recede and concur with an amendment will be offered.

Amendment No. 31 relates to Chemical Service, Army, and appropriates $26,000,000, in lieu of $25,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $27,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32 relates to maintenance and operation, United States Military Academy, and appropriates $5,440,000, in lieu of $5,279,000, as proposed by the House, and $5,600,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33 relates to the liquidation of indebtedness of cadets at the United States Military Academy and accepts clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34 relates to language and the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles for the National Guard as follows: "The purchase (not to exceed 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles for official use only".

Amendment No. 35 relates to expenses for the National Guard and appropriates $290,000,000, in lieu of $240,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $298,113,759, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36 relates to services in the National Guard of partially disabled persons for services in the National Guard if they waive or relinquish any pension, disability allowance, or disability compensation they would otherwise receive from the Federal Government.

Amendment No. 37 relates to the Organized Reserves and appropriates $125,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $100,000,000, as proposed by the House, provided the use of $25,000,000 of the amount appropriated is contingent upon the enactment into law by the present Congress of S. 2655 or similar authorization for the voluntary enlistment of persons between the ages of 18 and 19 years.

Amendment No. 38 relates to services in the Organized Reserves of partially disabled persons and permits the payment to said persons for services in the Organized Reserves if they waive or relinquish any pension, disability allowance, or disability compensation they would otherwise receive from the Federal Government.

Amendment No. 39 relates to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and appropriates $21,175,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $21,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 40 relates to the promotion of rifle practice and adopts language proposed by the Senate to permit rifle and pistol teams to compete in the Olympic games during the calendar year 1948.

Amendment No. 41 relates to the promotion of rifle practice and appropriates $175,000, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $303,500, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42 relates to a ceiling on departmental employees and authorizes $39,000,000, in lieu of $37,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $39,172,326, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43 relates to a dollar ceiling placed on civilian personnel (O–1 classification) and adjusts the figure at $628,500,000, in lieu of $600,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $691,700,000, as proposed by the Senate. It is the understanding of the conferees that the personnel table appearing on pages 12 and 13 of the House committee report on H. R. 6771 is advisory in character and not to be considered as a definite limitation on personnel in any instance.

Amendment No. 44 adjusts the dollar ceiling on civilian personnel (departmental and

O–1 classified employees) at $674,525,000, in lieu of $644,525,000, as proposed by the House, and $737,297,326, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45 contains clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46 retains language proposed by the House and includes language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47 relates to contingent expenses, Department of the Army, and appropriates $2,300,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $2,200,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48 contains language relating to printing and binding, communications, and other services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49 corrects a typographical error.

Amendment Nos. 50 and 51 eliminates language as proposed by the Senate to make the general provisions of this bill conform with other previously passed appropriation bills.

Amendment No. 52 corrects language.

Amendment No. 53 adopts language proposed by the Senate similar to language previously carried in this bill.

Amendment Nos. 54, 56, and 58 correct section numbers.

Amendment No. 55 strikes out language proposed by the Senate which would partially eliminate the so-called Byrd law ceiling.

Amendment No. 57 adopts language as proposed by the Senate to make available funds in this bill contingent upon the enactment, by the present Congress, of S. 2655 or similar authorization is contained for the voluntary enlistment of persons between the ages of 18 and 19 years.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 19, providing a contract authorization of $25,000,000 for clothing and equipage, Quartermaster Corps, Army: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 28, providing an appropriation of $76,000,000 and a contract authorization of $75,000,000 for military construction for the Army: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 20, providing a contract authorization of $70,000,000 for ordnance service and supplies, Army: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Members on the Part of the House.

RECESSES MADE IN ORDER TODAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the balance of the day for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MILITARY FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 24, line 18, insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary of the Army may, prior to July 1, 1949, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $25,000,000."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 34, after line 15, insert the following:

"Military construction, Army: For construction, installations, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations and facilities, as authorized by the act of June 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, R ised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims under the act of July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), and pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (28 U. S. C. 921); $76,000,000, to remain available until expended; and in addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $75,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be used for the construction of family quarters for personnel of the Army at a cost per family unit in excess of $14,040, except that when such units are constructed outside the continental United States the average cost per unit of all such units constructed shall not exceed $20,800."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 28: Mr. ENGEL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Military construction, Army: For construction, installations, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations and facilities, as authorized by the act of June 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims under the act of July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), and pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (28 U. S. C. 921); $76,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, including not to exceed $205,000 for the purchase, development, or construction in connection with land adjacent to the Percy Jones Hospital, Michigan; and, in addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $75,000,000: *Provided*, That the funds made available in this paragraph by appropriation and contract authorization shall not be subject to section 10 of this act."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to call the attention of the membership to the fact that this military construction program started by the Senate amendment is under the authorization of the recently passed Bates bill. Members of the House will recall the debate which I precipitated on the floor in reference to the limitation on the size of quarters which might be built. This appropriation bill as passed by the House, in section 10, carried language which has been carried in appropriation bills for a number of years providing a dollar limitation on the size of quarters. In order that the action we are here taking will be consistent with the construction authorization, we carry a proviso in this paragraph in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan that the funds made available in this paragraph by appropriation and construction authorization shall not be subject to section 10 of this act. This leaves housing construction in this paragraph subject to the space limitation that no quarters shall be built with a space in excess of 1,080 feet but exempts it from section 10 of this bill. That was the only way we could bring the bill in harmony with the action that was worked out by the House when we had the construction authorization bill before us.

With permission of the House, I will insert at this point the construction program with priorities as indicated by the armed services and a summary of the estimates and appropriations picture in this bill.

Summary of the bill

Regular and supplemental budget estimates for 1949	$7,278,842,000
House bill	6,509,939,000
Senate bill	6,915,676,052
Conference bill	6,767,668,163
Conference bill under budget	573,423,837
Conference bill over House bill	257,729,163
Conference bill under Senate bill	148,007,889

NOTE.—Totals include $62,250,000 special accounts.

Contract authorizations carried in the bill:

Clothing and equipage	$25,000,000
Signal Corps	50,000,000
Military construction, Army	75,000,000
Ordnance service	70,000,000
Total	220,000,000

GROUP I.—CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

1. Emergency projects overseas	$18,317,012
2. Emergency projects 21	4,200,000
3. Land for	1,042,200
4. Classified installations, Alaska	5,000,000
5. Alamagordo, N. Mex., rocket-firing facilities and quarters	1,419,570
6. Camp Hood, family quarters	3,699,000
7. Muroc rocket test facilities	2,646,500
8. California Institute of Technology, completion of supersonic wind tunnel	410,700
9. White Sands Proving Grounds, 11 separate projects	3,525,100
10. Carswell Air Force base (Fort Worth), quarters, storage, and training facilities	1,635,170
11. Whittier Port Development (9 projects)	5,332,277
12. Mile 26, barracks and utilities	1,906,238
13. Ladd Field, 12 items, barracks and operating facilities	11,499,650
14. Camp Lee, quarters and barracks	2,871,220
15. Fort Knox, quarters and utilities	2,383,170
16. Mountain Home, quarters	739,830
Total, group I	66,688,537

GROUP II.—CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

17. MacDill Field, control tower and quarters	$829,330
18. West Point, quarters and plans	2,763,590
19. Rapid City Airfield, facilities	5,000,000
20. Air Force bases, Marianas	5,376,708
21. Lowry Field, Colo., quarters	1,035,700
22. Yuma, quarters and other buildings	389,620
23. Camp Detrick, testing buildings and quarters	700,950
24. Vint Hills farm stations, quarters	666,550
25. Oakland Army base, quarters and barracks	850,610
26. Army-Navy medical procurement office, New York	390,000
27. Alaska communication system (16 stations)	2,159,548
28. Sacramento Signal Depot, dust control	47,970
29. Lexington Signal Depot, equipment headquarters	25,000
30. Fort Bragg, N. C., quarters	1,479,000
31. Wright Field, rotary wing test and armament laboratory	1,887,000
32. Kelly Field, 2 helicopter test cells	152,000
33. Oklahoma City, 4 jet-engine test cells	362,000
34. Fort Sheridan, Ill., family quarters	296,000
35. Fort Lewis, Wash., family quarters	2,220,500
36. Selfridge Field, quarters	652,740
37. Tripler General Hospital, bachelor officers and family quarters	2,914,735
38. Bergstrom Field, quarters	1,183,670
39. Air-safety program and fire program	4,573,500
40. Picatinny Arsenal, 6 test buildings	1,226,800
41. Edgewood Arsenal, laboratory and quarters	728,920
42. Army Ground Forces bases, Marianas, barracks	3,668,644
43. Fort Hamilton, N. Y., quarters	474,560
44. Two Rock ranch, Calif., water lines and quarters	139,250
45. Adak (Alaska) Airfield, quarters and utilities	4,181,400
46. Malta test station, New York, hydraulic laboratory	205,000
47. Fort Leavenworth, feeder station and buildings	1,161,500
48. Fort Brook, P. R., water storage and quarters	283,354
49. Fort Buchanan, P. R., water storage and quarters	466,500
50. Marietta Army Airfield, Ga., control tower	54,500
51. Williams Field, Ariz., gunnery range	51,500
52. Craig Field, Ariz., crash station	26,370
53. Wingate Ordnance Depot, additional well	20,000
54. Anniston Ordnance Depot, industrial waste disposal	60,000
55. Kearney Air Force Field, Nebr., family quarters	1,183,790
56. Fort Bliss, quarters	1,007,500
57. Fort Belvoir, Va., quarters	650,920
58. Army-Navy General Hospital, Arkansas, barracks and quarters	750,100
59. Fitzsimons General Hospital, quarters and utilities	$324,760
60. Keflavik Airfield, improvements	10,352,100
Total, group II	62,976,789

GROUP III.—CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

61. Fort Richardson, 8 items of development	$10,190,375
62. Fort Yukon, 14 items of development	4,160,950
63. Randolph Field, control and housing	1,190,200
64. Fort Sill, quarters	443,900
65. Fort Jay, quarters	296,100
66. Fort Sam Houston, quarters	592,200
67. Kindley Field, Bermuda, water and quarters	2,272,429
68. Henry Barracks, P. R., barracks	561,200
69. Watertown Arsenal, shop	87,000
70. Fort McPherson, quarters	296,600
71. Fort Meade, Md., quarters	710,440
72. San Antonio induction center	1,035,700
73. Keesler Field	1,035,700
74. Fort Riley, Kans., quarters	592,000
75. Presidio of San Francisco, quarters	296,600
76. Fort Benning, quarters	1,253,550
77. Hickam Field, barracks and quarters	2,242,200
78. Valley Forge, quarters	231,000
79. Stoneman, quarters	711,640
80. Frobisher Bay, quarters and utilities	396,905
81. Roswell Army Airfield, training facilities	95,790
82. Fort Chimo, Canada, quarters and utilities	214,570
83. Borinquen, P. R., water system	165,000
84. Albrook Field, sewer cover	276,000
85. Percy Jones Hospital and quarters	231,000
86. Army Airfield, Nenana, Alaska, barracks and quarters	505,000
87. Brook Army Medical Center, quarters	474,060
88. Oliver General Hospital, quarters	231,000
89. Madigan General Hospital, quarters	281,670
90. Fort Myers, Va., refrigeration	108,000
91. Clark Stotsenberg, barracks	669,300
92. Chanute Field, quarters	1,035,700
93. Fort Armstrong, Hawaii, telephone exchange	55,000
94. Helemano, Hawaii, quarters	428,535
95. Waipio, Hawaii, quarters	191,410
96. Fort De Russey, Hawaii, quarters	477,400
97. Scott Field, Ill., quarters	1,035,700
98. Andrews Field, quarters	2,384,410
99. Hamilton Field, quarters	44,940
100. Harmon Field, Newfoundland, additional construction	13,812,700
101. Huntsville Arsenal, Ala., fence	20,600
Total, Group III	51,334,674

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement showing the various funds covered by this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Regular and supplemental budget estimates for 1949	$7,278,842,000
House bill	6,509,939,000
Senate bill	6,915,676,052
Conference bill	6,767,668,163
Conference bill under budget	573,423,837
Conference bill over House bill	257,729,163
Conference bill under Senate bill	148,007,889

NOTE.—Totals include $62,250,000 special accounts.

Contract authorizations carried in the bill:

Clothing and equipage	$25,000,000
Signal Corps	50,000,000
Military construction, Army	75,000,000
Ordnance Service	70,000,000
Total	220,000,000

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 36, line 16, after "1948", insert the following: ", and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary of the Army may, prior to July 1, 1949, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $75,000,000: *Provided*."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 30: Mr. ENGEL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$70,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess until 1:15 p. m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess until 1:15 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of Texas asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. PHILBIN, and Mr. WOODRUFF asked and were granted permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite apparent now, with the Congress set to adjourn this week, that no Federal-aid-to-education bill will pass the Congress at this session. This is a deep disappointment, not only to the teachers and trustees of our public-school system in the United States, and others interested, but it is also disappointing to many of us here who would like to see an appropriate law enacted providing for Federal aid to our public schools.

As one who taught in the public schools of my native State of Mississippi, and who realizes the necessity for such legislation, I became interested in this subject shortly after I came to Congress. In fact, the late and lamented Senator Pat Harrison from my State, and I, several years ago, cosponsored a bill for this purpose. Unfortunately our efforts at that time were of no avail. Since that time others have sponsored similar legislation. This year it appeared that we were within sight of the goal when a leading Republican, Senator TAFT, of Ohio, introduced and succeeded in passing Senate 472 in the other body, which, of course, like this one, is dominated by the Republican Party.

However, for some unknown reason, the Republican leadership in this body has seen fit to shelve this legislation, notwithstanding the fact that extensive hearings were conducted in the House Labor and Education Committee, and notwithstanding the further fact that I am informed that a majority of the members of that House committee were favorable to such legislation.

I have not only been in close touch and have worked with the representatives of the cause of education in my own State, but have also been in contact with and have cooperated with the officers of the National Education Association of the United States, who have sponsored this worth-while legislation. When it became evident that the majority leadership was stymieing the legislation in committee I was among the first to sign the petition on the Clerk's desk to discharge that committee from further consideration of the bill and to automatically bring it to the floor for a vote, but again the House leadership was successful in preventing the required number of signatures of the Members to get the bill to the floor for a vote.

In this connection, I am appreciative of the following communications from those with whom I have labored in this cause:

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1948.

Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLMER: A large share of the credit should be yours for the progress that has been made toward the enactment of Federal aid to education.

We wish to take this opportunity to express appreciation for your support of this legislation not only in the Eightieth Congress but over a number of preceding years.

Your counsel and assistance will be anticipated and valued as further steps are made in behalf of the Federal-aid program as a means of equalizing basic educational opportunity without impairing State control of educational policy.

Sincerely yours,
R. B. MARSTON,
Director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division.

MERIDIAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
Meridian, Miss., June 15, 1948.

Congressman WILLIAM M. COLMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLMER: Now may I take occasion to express personal appreciation on the part of myself and all teachers, school officials, and patrons who are interested in the proper development of public education facilities in our State and Nation for the help you have been and will continue to be in securing the passage of this legislation and securing it without Federal control. You and I join our fellow-Mississippians in opposing Federal dictatorship as to how we shall operate our public schools, but we recognize that our economic status requires that we have national assistance in solving our elementary and secondary school problems, more particularly, in view of the fact that we send so many of our white and Negro youths annually to live in other States in which they become either assets or liabilities.

Looking forward to seeing you some time soon and with kindest personal regards, I am

Yours very truly,
H. M. IVY, *Superintendent.*

It seems strange, indeed, that the Federal Government can and does grant Federal aid to the farms, to roads, to hospitals, and many other activities in the interest of and for the welfare of the people of the several States of the Union, but cannot and does not grant Federal aid to one of the most important activities aimed at the common good of the country, the education of our children.

I realize that there are those from my own section who oppose Federal aid to education for one reason or another. One of the arguments made is that it would eventually mean the break-down of the segregation customs in our public schools of the South.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this Congress or in the South, for that matter, who has been more active against the efforts of the politicians, the northern "do-gooders," and the President to enact the so-called civil-rights program into law, and generally break down our southern traditions with reference to segregation, and so forth, than have I. My selection as chairman of the group of 78 southern Members of Congress organized to fight this program is evidence of this.

But there is nothing in this proposed legislation that would tend to do that. On the contrary, the bill which passed the Senate and which was tentatively approved by the House committee specifically provides that the Federal Government shall have no control whatever over the administration of our public schools; that the administration and control, on the contrary, shall be left entirely within the State and its institutions. Of course, I would not support any legislation which either authorized or appropriated Federal funds in aid to our public school system that carried with it any Federal control whatsoever.

On the other hand, due to the fact that the Southern States are not as wealthy as States in other sections of our common country, they are forced to tax their people on a higher ratio for educational purposes than their more wealthy sister States. And even with this, they are unable to raise anything like a comparative per capita revenue for the education of their children. For instance, up until this year my State of Mississippi taxed its people for this purpose at a higher rate than any other State in the Union, and yet it was at the bottom of the list of States in the amount of revenue expended per child. Therefore, it is obvious that the Southern States, and particularly Mississippi, have more to gain from this legislation than the States in other sections.

The bill, if authorized into law, providing as it does three hundred million dollars a year for this purpose, would not only bring up the standard of opportunities for Mississippi children, and enable our school authorities to pay better salaries to our teachers and those who transport our children to and from school, but would also lighten the burden of taxation on our overburdened taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much in hopes that when this Congress reconvenes, either after the November elections or at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress in January, that this most desirable and necessary legislation will be enacted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked and received permission to insert in the RECORD a speech by Maj. W. Calvin Wells, before the Mississippi State Bar Association, at the University of Mississippi. This speech, as I stated yesterday, exceeds the amount allowed under the rule and will require 4½ pages and cost $301.75.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert the speech in the Appendix, notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Florida, Mr. McCULLOCH, and Mr. ARNOLD asked and were granted permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain excerpts, letters, and documents.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess for 20 minutes.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.

FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN IMPORTED ARTICLES

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 433, permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That any articles, including approximately 48 railroad cars and incidental equipment, certified by the Secretary of State as being donated in promotion of international good will by the people or Government of the Republic of France for sale for charitable purposes in the United States or for presentation, in the case of the railroad equipment, to noncommercial organizations in the United States may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption free of customs duties, fees, or charges, internal-revenue taxes, and marking or other import requirements or restrictions.

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of its enactment and prior to the close of December 31, 1948.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Joint Resolution 433, was introduced for the purpose of permitting the free entry of certain articles imported into the United States from foreign countries in the promotion of international good will.

The people of France now are planning to send, next October, a train of 48 freight cars (40 hommes—8 chevaux) to the 48 States of the United States, as a gesture of gratitude for the American Freedom Train.

These 48 cars will be filled with French merchandise, such as handbags, women's wear, hats, furniture, perfume, and other typical French productions. The plan is to deliver one car to the capital of each of the 48 States, and let local State committees auction off the merchandise, the money to be used for the benefit of a charity in that State. The freight cars will remain in the United States as a token gift to the American Legion or Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Existing law requires the payment of duty on goods under these circumstances, and for that reason I believe that this legislation should pass so as to encourage this gesture of international good will.

REFUND OF TAXES PAID ON BEER LOST THROUGH BOTTLING OPERATIONS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6808) to permit refund of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations, with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 5. That section 3404 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to manufacturers' excise taxes on musical instruments) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(d) Musical instruments, but the tax imposed by this section shall not apply to musical instruments sold for the use of any religious or nonprofit educational institution for exclusively religious or educational purposes. The right to exemption under this subsection shall be evidenced in such manner as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may prescribe by regulations.'

"SEC. 6. Section 3443 (a) (3) (A) (i) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits and refunds) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(i) resold for the exclusive use of any State, Territory of the United States, or any political subdivision of the foregoing, or of the District of Columbia, or in the case of musical instruments embraced in section 3404 (d), resold for the use of any religious or nonprofit educational institution for exclusively religious or educational purposes;'.

"SEC. 7. The amendments made by sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be applicable with respect to sales made after the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. McCORMACK (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6116) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "July 31" and insert "April 30."

Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out "August 9, 1948" and insert "April 30, 1949."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEARNS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CARSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 6712, the tax bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the tax bill.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, insist upon the amendments of the House, agree to the conference asked by the Senate and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, SMITH of Ohio, KUNKEL, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. REES submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the House to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "$12,000"; and the House agree to the same.

EDWARD H. REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
TOM MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIAM LANGER,
ZALES N. ECTON,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill amends the provisions of law relating to contracts for transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes in New York, N. Y., including the Borough of Brooklyn, so as to

provide that the annual rental contract payment rate for the use of the 26.909 miles of double-line pneumatic-tube facilities shall not exceed $12,000 per mile nor be less than $10,500 per mile.

The amendment of the House provided that the maximum rate should not exceed $11,000 per mile, and eliminated the minimum payment figure contained in the Senate bill.

The conference agreement restores the $12,000 per mile maximum rate as provided by the Senate bill, and eliminates the $10,500 per mile minimum in accordance with the House amendment.

EDWARD H. REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
TOM MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES & PHELPS CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2705) to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the James & Phelps Construction Co., of Oklahoma City, Okla., in full settlement of all claims under contracts numbered 12r 15920 and 12r 15994, providing for the construction of earthworks and structures, laterals and Altus City pipe line, city laterals and sublaterals, on the W. C. Austin project of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, in Oklahoma, such sum, not in excess of $193,617.58, as the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative may find is required to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co. for losses, exclusive of profit, incurred by the company as a result of the failure of the United States to furnish steel reinforcement bars as required under specifications numbered 1130 and 1182: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $25,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GABEL CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1734) for the relief of Gabel Construction Co., with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss and damages, if any, sustained by Louis E. Gabel, an individual, trading as Gabel Construction Co., of Orlando, Fla., under contract No. NOY-9336 of the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Department of the Navy arising out of or attributable to the alleged delay in supplying materials as provided for in said contracts: *Provided*, That the jurisdiction conferred by this section shall be confined to questions of fact.

"SEC. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to Louis E. Gabel, trading as Gabel Construction Co."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DORIS E. SNYDER

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 165) for the relief of Doris E. Snyder.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Doris E. Snyder, of Dayton, Ohio, the sum of $4,737. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Doris E. Snyder against the United States for compensation for the loss of personal property owned by her which was destroyed and lost in the burning and sinking of the Argentine ship, steamship *Rio de la Plata*, on August 17, 1944, aboard which she was accompanying her husband, Capt. Wesley E. Snyder, under War Department orders: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARCHIE HAMILTON AND DELBERT HAMILTON

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1715) for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,672 to Archie Hamilton and the sum of $1,696.35 to Delbert Hamilton, of Owensboro, Ky., in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, and property damage sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle near Owensboro, Ky., on November 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM R. STIGALL, DECEASED

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1717) for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the death of said William R. Stigall (Army serial number 15041820), sustained on September 5, 1941, between Little Rock and Benton, Ark., as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES DUNCAN MONTIETH

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2440) for the relief of Charles Duncan Montieth.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the indebtedness of Charles Duncan Montieth, of McLean, Va., in the amount of $165.14, arising out of the transportation of his household effects from McLean, Va., to Chicago, Ill., upon transfer of his official station, while employed by the Department of the Interior, extension of authorization for such transportation not having been approved within the 6-month period prescribed by regulations of the President of the United States issued under authority of the act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1105). The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Charles Duncan Montieth, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, any amount heretofore credited to such indebtedness or refunded or paid to the United States on account of such indebtedness. In the audit and settlement of the account of any accountable officer of the United States, the payment of the amount for such transportation expenses shall be considered to have been duly and timely authorized.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSE MARY AMMIRATO

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2729) for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6707) to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the laws requiring retirement of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers because of age shall not apply to officers of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59). The President, may, in his discretion, upon the request of the officer concerned, restore to the active list of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force any officer of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force on the retired list who was appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59).

"Officers appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59), shall not be counted within the limited number of officers authorized to be serving on active duty in grades above lieutenant general as provided in section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.) unless they be serving as Chief of Staff or in command of any territorial or tactical subdivision of the Army or the Air Force.

"SEC. 2. In addition to the number of officers authorized to serve after July 1, 1948, on the active list in the grade of General in the Army and Admiral in the Navy pursuant to sections 504 and 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, officers now on the active list of the Army in the grade of general whose dates of rank in such grade are between March 8, 1945, and April 15, 1945, inclusive, and of the Navy in the grade of admiral whose dates of rank in such grade are prior to April 4, 1945, may, at the discretion of the President, be continued in such grades until July 1, 1950, unless sooner retired and the total number of officers authorized by these sections to have the grade, rank, title, pay, and allowances of vice admiral or admiral and lieutenant general or general, is temporarily increased accordingly: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section in no way affect the status of the officer who may be serving as Chief of Staff in the Army on the effective date of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE B. SOTO

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 350.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of the action of the Department of State with respect to the claim of George B. Soto, a native-born American citizen, against the Government of Guatemala, amounting to approximately $3,000,000, which has been pending in the Department of State since 1929; to ascertain why the agreement made by Guatemala with the Department of State to arbitrate this claim in 1932 was not carried out by the Department of State; to ascertain why, when the claim was approved as valid and meritorious by the Legal Department and the Counselor of the Department of State in 1938 and 1940, and dispatches sent to Guatemala demanding settlement of the claim in June 1941, such claim should by October 1941 become not valid and not meritorious and be dropped by the Department of State after Guatemala had made two offers of cash payments of the claim, thereby admitting liability under the claim; to ascertain whether or not the dropping of the Soto claim by the Department of State was the quid pro quo for securing the cooperation of Guatemala in the freezing order issued by the late President Roosevelt in July 1941, and before Guatemala was at war with Germany and Japan; to ascertain the liability of the United States Government for the payment of this claim when the claim has been used by the Government for its own purposes and, if so, to provide for payment of the claim out of Department of State appropriations, if, by the failure of the Department of State to act, the liability has been fixed by the Department of State on the United States Government; to ascertain and determine whether the legal rights of an American citizen under the Pecuniary Claims Convention of Buenos Aires of 1910 to arbitration of the claim can be denied by the Department of State under color of a bureaucratic practice and procedure established by the Department of State for which there is no statutory authority.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) within 120 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, dispatches, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for your action a resolution introduced by me on July 25, 1947, calling for an investigation of the handling of a claim of a native-born American citizen against the Government of Guatemala, which has been in the hands of the State Department for 19 years without conclusive action.

Our Nation has a treaty with the Government of Guatemala which is known as the Convention of 1910 for the Arbitration of Pecuniary Claims, the first article of which treaty provides as follows:

The high contracting parties agreed to submit to arbitration all claims for pecuniary loss or damage which may be presented by their respective citizens and which cannot be amicably adjusted through diplomatic channels, when said claims are of sufficient importance to warrant the expense of arbitration.

The claim of Mr. Soto for loss, damage, and interest is approximately $3,000,000 and is, therefore, such a claim as would be considered of sufficient importance to warrant the expense of arbitration. I wish you also to note that the provisions of the article read and of the remaining articles of the treaty do not provide for any action on the part of the State Department except that of arranging for the arbitration of claims. As you know, the claims of American citizens against foreign governments must be made through the intermediary of the State

Department. The provisions of the article cited do not require or suggest that the intermediary, the State Department, has any other function than that of demanding arbitration for the American claimant. The treaty does not provide, nor is there any law which authorizes the Department of State to prejudge, the claim of an American citizen who seeks justice and relief under the treaty cited. There is no law or provision of the treaty which requires the State Department to support the claim of an American citizen, the treaty only granting to the claimant the right to arbitration. Any points of difference which may arise between the parties as to facts are within the sole jurisdiction of the arbitrator who may be selected to determine the validity and merits of the claim.

The foregoing are the facts with reference to international arbitration of claims of American citizens under treaties entered into between our Nation and other governments.

It is indeed unfortunate that our State Department considers itself free from the obligations of our international treaties, disregards them as though they were not the supreme law of the land, arrogate to themselves the powers of judge and jury and deny American citizens of their rights under the law. It is because of this wanton disregard of our national obligation under our treaty with Guatemala that the resolution was submitted to this house, was sent to the Rules Committee, which has approved the resolution for an investigation of the handling of this claim by the State Department, and which I now present to you in order that the investigation may be carried forward by the Judiciary Committee.

The State Department is more interested in relief for the peoples of other nations than it is to secure the rights of American citizens under our laws and treaties. It is apparent from this particular case that we cannot depend upon our State Department to respect our international treaties and to preserve for our citizens the rights to which they are entitled under those treaties.

In my statement before the House at the time I introduced H. R. 350, I stated that the handling of this claim by the State Department had been submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate which had declared that this American citizen was entitled to arbitration of his claim under the treaty. I further stated that this particular claim had been called to the attention of the State Department by Senators WILEY, BUTLER, JENNER, and myself, but the Department refuses to act.

The purpose of this resolution is to require a thoroughgoing investigation of this claim not only in fairness to this American citizen, by the name of Soto, but because of the possibility, if this matter has been grossly mishandled, of similar action having been taken in other instances involving our own citizens. I earnestly request that whichever committee of the House of Representatives receives my resolution, will follow the matter to its conclusion. I am personally confident that an investigation is warranted.

My only interest is in obtaining redress for an American citizen who from all available facts is certainly entitled thereto. I further submit that it is the duty of Congress to extend its power for the protection of the rights of our citizens, and if it appears—as it definitely does—that the Legal Department of the State Department is so engrossed in other matters that it not only neglects but refuses to maintain and protect the rights of our own citizens, at a time when we are being called upon to assist the plight of foreign nationals, then, I say, Mr. Speaker, that something effective must be done.

The sole relief which the claimant—Soto—desires, is that the rights granted under the treaty cited, be made available to him by the State Department and that he may have his claim arbitrated under the provisions of that treaty. In other words, that the State Department be compelled to obey the law as set out in this treaty.

Truly, gentlemen, we have reached a sorry state when it becomes necessary for an American citizen to appeal to this body to investigate the State Department and to exert its power to enforce respect of our treaties and to insist that the State Deparment abide by and carry out the supreme laws of our land.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when the Eightieth Congress adjourns sine die it will mark the end, for a time at least, of the services of a great American, a true Congressman and a fine statesman. I refer to my beloved colleague from Iowa, the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE. JOHN GWYNNE has served his country in the House long, faithfully, and ably, he has become known for his fearless and courageous stand for all things American. The country, the Congress, and his own State of Iowa will suffer from the loss of his influence and leadership. However, wherever he may be and in whatever he may do he will always serve his native State and country loyally and well. He is that kind of a citizen. I am sure I speak for the entire membership, and especially the Iowa delegation in Congress when I say "We all regret he will not be a Member of the Eighty-first Congress." Best wishes and good luck to the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

THE LATE JAMES I. FARLEY

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sorrow that I report the death of a former Member of Congress from Indiana, James I. Farley, of Auburn, on Wednesday, June 16, at Philadelphia, Pa. Mr. Farley died after a heart attack while visiting the home of a daughter. He was 76 years old.

Mr. Farley, a Democrat, preceded me as Representative in Congress from the Fourth Indiana District. He was elected to the House in 1932 and served three terms. He was an authority on finance and was a member of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Surviving are the widow, Lotta; three sons, Frank and Thain, of Auburn, Ind., and Paul, of Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; two daughters, Mrs. J. D. Spurrier, of Philadelphia, and Mrs. Robert Shaw, of Scarsdale, N. Y.

Born near Hamilton, Ind., Mr. Farley spent his entire life in the Hoosier State and for the past 34 years had been a resident of Auburn, Ind., where he maintained a farm. Before coming to Congress he served as president of the Auburn Auto Corp. He was a thirty-second degree Mason.

Mr. Farley's passing is noted with sorrow by Members of the Indiana delegation in Congress and by former colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, who served with him during the eventful years from 1932 to 1938.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 129, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the joint committee to make a study and investigation of the islands and other areas of the Pacific subject to the authority of the United States the following Members of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LEMKE, Mr. FERNANDEZ.

And the following Members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives: Mr. FULTON, Mr. JACKSON of California, Mr. PFEIFER.

NEW MEXICO MILITARY INSTITUTE

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2698) to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized, upon the request of the institution, to transfer without reimbursement, to the New Mexico Military Institute, Roswell, N. Mex., a tax-supported State institution, to Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., to Norwich University, Norwich, Vt., and to Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va., all horses, except those used in the Remount breeding program, together with their records and equipment, property of the United States Army, located at and utilized by each of the said institutions for military training purposes: *Provided*, That the receiving institution in each case agrees to arrange for the proper pension and old-age care of the donated horses.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.

THE HONORABLE PETE JARMAN

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a resolution of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, a resolution of esteem and good wishes extended to the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. PETE JARMAN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The resolution referred to follows:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington.

RESOLUTION OF ESTEEM AND GOOD WISHES EXTENDED TO HON. PETE JARMAN

Whereas the Honorable PETE JARMAN has served as Representative in Congress of the Sixth District of Alabama from the Seventy-sixth through the Eightieth Congress, and has demonstrated a constant devotion to the public good; and

Whereas his diligence and wisdom have been of particular value on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which he has been a member throughout his career in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas his retirement from the House of Representatives brings a sense of loss to those who appreciate the value of his faithful collaboration in the development of United States foreign policy in a fateful period of the history of this Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, That an expression of esteem and good wishes be extended to the Honorable PETE JARMAN in the name of all his colleagues on the committee.

Charles A. Eaton, chairman; Robert B. Chiperfield; Sol Bloom; John M. Vorys; Karl Mundt; John Kee; Bartel J. Jonkman; J. P. Richards; Frances P. Bolton; Joseph L. Pfeifer; Lawrence H. Smith; Chester E. Merrow; Wirt Courtney; Walter H. Judd; Thomas S. Gordon; James G. Fulton; Helen Gahagan Douglas; J. K. Javits; Mike Mansfield; Thomas E. Morgan; John Davis Lodge; Wm. M. Colmer; Donald L. Jackson; Franklin J. Maloney; Boyd Crawford, administrative officer.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Burke, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5355. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2877) entitled "An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended," with an amendment, as follows: Strike out "$35,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$40,000,000."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) entitled "An act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6771) entitled "An act making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 26 and 30 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) entitled "An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes."

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 691, authorizing the appointment of a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized, empowered, and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission with a view to determining whether or not such Commission in its organization, in the selection and appointment of personnel, and in the conduct of its functions and activities, has been, and is, acting in accordance with law and the public interest; including (but not limiting the foregoing authority) a study and investigation of the Commission's licensing and license renewal activities; the Commission's power and authority, if any, to promulgate and issue its so-called "Blue Book", and the extent to which, if any, the same has been, or is being, used as the basis or excuse for regulation by the Commission, directly or indirectly, of radio-program content at licensed radio stations; whether the Commission has licensed, or proposes to license, any radio station or stations owned or controlled by persons who are members of, or affiliated with, subversive or Communist-front organizations or who might permit the facilities of such radio stations to be used contrary to the public interest; and whether there has been, or is, any concerted movement or effort to procure the concentration of radio station licenses, including frequency modulation, amplitude modulation, and television, in the hands of a limited class of persons or concerns rather than a distribution of such licenses on a geographical and equitable basis, as provided by the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at the earliest practicable date, but during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, records, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution speaks for itself. It proposes a five-member select committee of the House to make a study and investigation of the Federal Communications Commission. I doubt if there is a Member of the House who is not aware of the widespread apprehension that exists throughout the Nation of the activities of this agency of our Government.

I make no charges against this agency because I have no personal knowledge of the facts; however, if this agency is operating in the public interest and according to law, it should be as eager as any one to have this investigation made. My conception of such an investigation would be to examine the charges carefully, make a searching investigation of the agency and report to this Congress and let the chips fall where they may. If there is no foundation for the charges, then the Congress should be informed and the agency should be cleared and exonerated.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution will be adopted.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Under the Reorganization Act the committees of Congress are given general powers to investigate. It is my understanding that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—and I am very fond of that committee, because I happened to be a member of it for 24 years and chairman of it for 6 years—has made some investigation. They tell me that they went as far as they could under the general powers of investigation, and in that committee

they voted out a resolution for further investigation, which resolution has been lying in the Committee on Rules for several months. I am wondering why that resolution has not been acted upon by the Committee on Rules. I am wondering why the Committee on Rules did not report that resolution and give a committee that knows about this matter, a committee that brought into existence the Federal Communications Commission under my chairmanship, or a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the power to go into these things.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is the first knowledge that I had that there was such a resolution pending.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am informed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] that such a resolution has been lying in the Committee on Rules for some weeks, if not months.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman understands that unless this resolution is adopted the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would not have the authority, after the adjournment of the Congress, to make such an investigation.

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, that is, of course, what I am talking about. The committee did ask for that authority. I understand that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] was the author of the resolution. But it has been lying in the Committee on Rules for quite some time.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I ask for this time for the purpose of stating that the resolution to which the distinguished minority leader refers is House Resolution 165, which I introduced at the request of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on March 31, 1947.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us was introduced day before yesterday, in the afternoon, I think around 2 or 2:30. At 3 o'clock a meeting of the Committee on Rules was called. The committee acted upon the resolution even before it was printed. It was reported without any hearings and in the few moments that the committee was in session, there was no testimony with the exception of a statement that was made by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. I observed that other members of the committee were not familiar with the resolution.

Now, this action to authorize an investigation is not a new matter. The Commission has been investigated by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and a select committee before, and I have the reports before me. It was in 1943 or 1944 that a resolution was introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], and a special committee was appointed, and the gentleman from Georgia was made the chairman of this special committee.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from Georgia will tell this House the story if the gentleman from Illinois so desires. Never in the history of this Congress was so outrageous a campaign initiated and prosecuted against a Member of this House as was that carried on against myself, in the effort to prevent the exposure of a record that would be shocking even to the gentleman that has the floor if he knew it.

Mr. SABATH. It was because of the strong personal plea of the gentleman from Georgia made at that time that the resolution was adopted and the investigation was ordered, but later the gentleman from Georgia resigned from the select committee and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was appointed in his place, and the final report which I now have before me does not bear out the statement of the gentleman from Georgia. It does not indicate that there was any interference in the investigation. I want to be fair with the gentleman from Georgia, being a member of the Committee on Rules, which I had the honor to serve as chairman, and he as a member for many years, but I also want to be fair with Mr. LEA, who succeeded him as chairman of the select investigating committee, and only because of the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia, and in fair play, I quote in part from the report of the select committee dated January 2, 1945, as follows:

> The hearings have also emphasized the personalities involved in the matters investigated, both those connected with the Commission and those in private life who had some relation to the matters investigated. This investigation has been contemporaneous with innumerable bitter conflicts largely based on personal interests and animosities which have tended to obscure the constructive properly which were the matters of most concern to legitimate investigation. These animosities provoked exaggerated statements. Suspicions and rumors were distorted into reckless charges. This led to distortion of facts and the difficulties in the consideration and proper appraisement of the real merits of the controversies involved. Partisans of each side were parties to these bitter and vindictive activities which contributed more of confusion than enlightenment to the proceedings of the investigation.
>
> This bitterness had more of its impulse in personalities than in concern for the public good. It would be a perversion of this investigation to give undue emphasis to the personal equations involved, many of which should be charged off to personal idiosyncrasies and impetuous temperaments. The memories of these should best be charged off and placed in the discard.
>
> The committee hopes and believes, by patient and friendly cooperation and consideration, a substantial number of the difficulties that now exist can be eliminated or greatly minimized.

Mr. COX. Yes. The investigation continued under the domination and under the control of a power that the committee simply could not resist, and after every record bearing upon the whole question had been impounded at the White House and the committee denied the right to summons it.

Mr. SABATH. Personally, I am not going to contradict the gentleman from Georgia. I know he was demanding the investigation and made certain charges, and it was on those charges that the investigation was held. I was not a member of that committee and I can only go on the record. As I stated, the select committee carried on the investigation for upward of 2 years and indicated in its final report that many of the allegations, charges, and countercharges were not borne out by facts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking to the resolution before us, I was surprised, as I have stated, with respect to the unusual introduction of the resolution, the hurried hearings, and reporting of the resolution by the Committee on Rules, especially in view of the fact that House Resolution 165 covering the same proposed investigation was introduced last year and has been pending before the committee ever since. The resolution, instead of proposing the appointment of a special select committee, gave the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the authority to make the investigation. Therefore, I cannot grasp why in the closing hours of this session this new resolution should have been reported in such extraordinary haste and rushed to the floor for consideration. I have my suspicion. My position in the meeting of the Committee on Rules was to withhold hasty action and to obtain more facts and information before passing on the resolution. It was not my desire or intent to defend anyone who might be guilty of any unfair or illegal act, but to avoid the smearing of any of the members of the Federal Communications Commission against whom charges had been made. I felt that in all justice and in the spirit of fair play they should be accorded the opportunity to explain or refute the charges that were made, but, unfortunately, that privilege was denied me and the resolution was reported out. From the brief statement that was made in the hearing before the Committee on Rules, the country would be made to believe that the membership of the Commission was composed of Reds or with men affiliated with communistic fronts.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know the members of the Commission? They are not all Reds, of course.

Mr. SABATH. I did not know any one of them. I do not have a single appointee in the Commission and I do not think I have been in the offices of the Commission for 10 years. I have never requested anything of the Commission and, naturally, I was not denied anything. I am disinterested in the affairs of the Commission, but, believing in fair play, believe that when men are once in the service of the Government they should not be unfairly and unjustly assailed, attacked, or investigated. Even if they are not guilty of anything an investigation in itself is a reflection on their character and good reputation. In my desire to have first-hand information, I questioned three of the members of the Commission and learned that most of them have served with the Commission for many years, with the exception

of the Chairman, Mr. Wayne Coy, and a former Republican Member of the House from Ohio, Bob Jones, who was appointed a member last year, who was charged at one time with being a member of the Black Legion, which is surely not a communistic-front organization. The remaining five members have advanced from the ranks of the Commission and have been promoted to commissionership. The Commission consists of seven members, three of whom are Republicans, three Democrats, including the chairman, and one an independent.

Mr. Speaker, mention has been made of the fact that the Commission granted several licenses to a gentleman, a Mr. Lamb, whom I do not know and to my knowledge never have met. It was charged that he has leanings to the left and it was charged that two of the stations he has operated for the past several years have carried broadcasts allegedly communistic in character or that might be deemed in advocacy of communistic-front organizations. I wish to state that if I thought for one moment that the Commission had issued these licenses to Mr. Lamb's organization without warrant or justification and without any investigation, they ought to be investigated and I would be keenly interested to know about it. The fact is that while the applications were approved a few weeks ago, one of them was filed as far back as 5 years ago. It is also a matter of record that no complaints have been filed against Mr. Lamb's two operating stations by the citizens in the cities in which the two stations are located. The issuance of the four permits was not unusual because the Commission has been investigating whether the activities and the character of the broadcasts of the two operating stations entitled his organizations to these additional permits. The record shows that the Commission, as well as the FBI, had made a thorough investigation and that the four licenses were granted conditionally. Two of the stations, I am informed, he is not in position to finance. He does not own them personally; they are held by different corporations, but he has the controlling management.

Mr. Lamb, I understand, is the same gentleman who filed the first portal-to-portal suit against a certain corporation. I wonder if that fact is not the underlying reason for the attack being made against him. Personally, I feel there is no evidence that either of his operating stations has been or will be used by left-wingers or communistic-front organizations because it is a known fact that he has been supporting Republican candidates for Congress in radio broadcasts in Ohio, and, if I am not mistaken, in broadcasts in one of his stations in Pennsylvania. Furthermore, he has advocated the loan of money to Spain and has advocated friendship with Spain. Surely he cannot be a left-winger if he has been advocating the loan to Spain and supporting Fascist Franco. Surely no one can charge that Franco is pink. If anything, from the evidence that I have been able to obtain, he is very much to the right and more conservative than many of the gentlemen who actually advocate legislation that we on the progressive side oppose.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to delay the House unnecessarily. I think the resolution has no place here. As to the question as to whether the employees in the Commission are disloyal, I am told that the 1,300 men who are employed have been investigated by the FBI.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman referred to himself and others as progressives. Is the gentleman referring to the Progressive Party headed by Mr. Wallace?

Mr. SABATH. Again, I will say that that is not the issue at this time.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand, but I just wanted some information.

Mr. SABATH. I am not here to pass upon whether Mr. Wallace is a progressive or whether Mr. TAFT is a pink because he introduced the housing bill that has been described as socialistic. I am not going into that. I do not want to hurt Mr. TAFT, and I do not want to boost Mr. Dewey or any of the other Republican candidates, because, as I have said before, if, unfortunately, we must have a Republican President, I would rather have JOE MARTIN than anybody else that I know of.

I hope the Speaker will not hold me out of order or hold me in contempt for what I have said.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. For fear the Speaker was engaged in something else and did not hear what the gentleman from Illinois said, I will repeat his remarks as well as I remember them, that if this country for the next 4 years must be afflicted with a Republican President, then the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] thinks it would be better for the country to have the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] in that seat.

Mr. SABATH. That is about what I had intended to say. However, I think I said if the country should be so unfortunate as to have a Republican President.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Coming from Illinois, will the gentleman now proceed in the regular order and nominate the Vice President?

Mr. SABATH. I am being placed in a very embarrassing position. I did not want to make a political speech. You know I always try to keep away from politics. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] places me in this unfortunate position, that in Illinois we have an outstanding Democratic Senator, SCOTT LUCAS, and I recollect that I succeeded in obtaining his endorsement for Vice President by the Illinois State delegation in 1944. I presume he may be willing to listen to the demands of the people of Illinois and consent to be a candidate, and I believe he would not only make a strong candidate for the Vice Presidency but even for the Presidency.

However, we have in this House a gentleman from Massachusetts, the former majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK], a friend of mine and whose friendship I value highly, whom a vast majority of the membership of this House and the people of his State urge as a candidate for Vice President. With his splendid record, ability, and popularity, he would add strength to any Presidential candidate that the Democrats may select, and whom I am confident the Democrats will elect in the ensuing election. Now, I am torn between love and duty. But if the lightning strikes, notwithstanding my high regard for the Senator from Illinois, I think that New England, perhaps, might be in better geographical position to succeed in obtaining the nomination for the Vice Presidency than a candidate from my State or any of the Middlewestern States. I am giving you my candid opinion for what it is worth and, as usual, I am trying to be frank.

Now, to the resolution.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. On the resolution?

Mr. EBERHARTER. No. The gentleman did not quite make himself clear. I think he meant to say that the country could do no better in selecting a Vice Presidential candidate and electing one than to reach out to the City of Boston and select our beloved whip, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. Is that what the gentleman meant to say?

Mr. SABATH. That is what I intended to say. Again I am thankful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for making clear my thoughts and expressions. It is difficult for me at times at the end of a long-day's session to express myself as clearly as I would like to, but Members who have served with me know that I mean well even though I do not say it well on such occasions.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is it the gentleman's intention to yield some time to some of his colleagues on the committee?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, yes; I always do so, even when they disagree with me, but I have not had any requests for time from Members to speak on the resolution.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has about 10 minutes left.

Mr. SABATH. Now, having stated my position, I feel that this resolution is not entitled to favorable consideration, because under the Reorganization Act which was passed last year, we have given power and jurisdiction to the legislative committees to investigate matters coming within their jurisdiction and in view of the fact that the chairman and several members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce were on the select committee that conducted the last investigation of the Federal Communications Commission, I feel that by every right and precedent, they are entitled to conduct this investigation, which they originally sought under House

Resolution 165, which as I have stated was introduced and referred to the Committee on Rules last year and which has remained buried in the committee during all these months. Consequently, I wondered and have sought the underlying reason for this hastily introduced and hastily reported resolution now before us. I surmise what is behind it but I am constrained to express my suspicions. However, in view of the statement and interruption of my colleague from Georgia [Mr. Cox] I strongly feel that he may have been behind the influence in urging this action. I also wonder why the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held a meeting this morning and by a nearly unanimous vote agreed to oppose this resolution and now have been obliged to reverse its position and to support the resolution. Again, I refrain to express my views because it has been my policy that if I could not do a person some good, I would not harm him.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission has doubled the number of stations since the war. It has had a work load not exceeded by any department or agency of the Government and it has done a good job. Its employees have been conscientious, faithful, and the investigations thus far conducted by the FBI have not disclosed disloyalty on the part of any one of them, and I am confident that when the investigations have been completed the record of personnel loyalty of the Commission will rank with the top governmental agencies.

I could have proceeded further, had I not yielded to the Member, and have given additional information and facts. As some Members have indicated that they desire to speak to the resolution, I shall conclude my remarks and yield them the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which is before the House deals with a matter which comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Under the Reorganization Act the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is given legislative jurisdiction over matters relating to the Federal Communications Commission. The Reorganization Act lodges with each of the regular committees of Congress the responsibility of examining into the administration of the agencies of Government within their respective jurisdictions. In other words to constantly examine whether such agencies of Government were properly fulfilling their duties within the authority set forth in the statutes that created such agencies. In order that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce might deal intelligently with the several agencies of the Government which come within its jurisdiction, immediately after the convening of this Congress in January of 1947, we called before our committee representatives of all of the different agencies of Government over which our committee had jurisdiction. You know how great a list that is. Practically all of the regulatory bodies within our Government come under the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The committee took approximately 6 weeks of time in examining the several commissioners, their top employees, and such others as were necessary to the end that our committee members, some of whom were new to the work of the committee, might be fully aware of the extent of its jurisdiction, that the committee might have knowledge of the manner in which the authority of these several commissions was being carried out, their procedures, and so forth. In addition to that, we brought to the attention of these commissions the complaints that had come to the attention of the committee in one way or another and they were discussed with the Commissioners. I think all of the members of the committee will agree with me when I say it was one of the most constructive things that any committee of this House has ever done. I am of the opinion, and I believe the Members of this House are, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been faithful to the duties entrusted to it. I know of no committee of Congress that has worked harder, that has spent more time in the holding of hearings on matters that related to the welfare of this Nation than has the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commrce. Today I am filing with this House a report of the wide scope of inquiries that have been made and hearings held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I hope the Membership of the House will have time to read that report. I am sure they will be astounded at the scope that has been covered by this committee and I am certain that you will feel as proud of its efforts as the committee itself.

At this point may I express a tribute of appreciation and praise to the members of that committee. When I speak of the members of the committee I draw no distinction as to whether they be majority or minority members. In each instance they have been loyal, they have been able, they have been constructive in their efforts and it has been the unanimous action of the committee that brought to the attention of this House the many important matters that the committee has had to consider during the work of this session of Congress.

Mr. SABATH. This resolution does not authorize the gentleman's committee to make the investigation, does it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, that brings me to the point that notwithstanding the wide scope that our inquiries have taken in matters within the jurisdiction of the committee and that includes the Federal Communications Commission, there are limitations to the authority of committees of the House in the Reorganization Act that, in my opinion, should not be there.

I do not think that the regular committees of this House should be restricted in their powers to investigate the matters that are within their jurisdiction. In that portion of the Reorganization Act that deals with Senate committees, by statute Senate committees have been given the right to carry on investigations of matters within the jurisdiction of the committees, with power of subpena, allocation of funds, and so forth. I think that similar authority should also have been given to the House committees, but it was not, and, therefore, it is necessary to ask for these special powers such as are provided for in the resolution which has been introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

On March 31, 1947, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at the direction of the committee after full consideration, I introduced House Resolution 165, that would have given the power and authority to the committee to go further than we had been able to do under the powers that had been granted to us under the Reorganization Act. I am convinced that a resolution for this purpose should be passed, because there is a line beyond which the committee cannot go in its investigations. Such a resolution would make any investigations more effectual.

I would have been pleased to have seen House Resolution 165 reported out long ago. However, the committee has been busy, and whatever work has to be done of a special character will have to be done during the recess. But if we are not to have House Resolution 165, which is general in character, and in accord with what I believe is expected of House committees, then, Mr. Speaker, we must accept this resolution which is presented today, because it does provide the authority which the regular committee does not have.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does not the gentleman feel that his committee should, if it can be given power, make this investigation?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am of the opinion that in the formation of a special committee—and maybe the wish is father of the thought—the Speaker will take into consideration the high caliber of the men on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and recognize that fact in connection with whomever he will appoint to this committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret to hear the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey just before he closed. When I was chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and any other committee of this House had tried to take jurisdiction away from that committee, they would have had a fight with me. Now, I was the author of the bill which brought into being the Federal Comunications Commission, the old Radio Commission, which was not doing much of anything.

We took telegraph and telephone from the Interstate Commerce Commission and put all communications together.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think the gentleman understands that this resolution does not take any jurisdiction away from the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, they ask for extended authority. They do have authority to investigate and they have investigated this very thing, and all these other things, but they said they could not go as far under the general powers as they thought they should, and they asked the Committee on Rules more than a year ago, 15 months ago, to give them this additional power.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That resolution is not before the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I know it is not.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And if this resolution is not adopted they will be without that power.

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, it is an easy matter for the gentleman to offer as a substitute for his resolution the resolution that was advocated by the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and this investigation to be made by somebody who knows something about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman could yield to the gentleman from New Jersey for the purpose of offering an amendment, and he could offer his substitute, and there would be no opposition.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The gentleman from Texas knows there is no one in this House for whom I have higher regard than the gentleman from Texas. It was my privilege to serve under him when he was chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I cannot find words that would adequately express the high regard I have had for him ever since he presided over that committee. I am grateful to the gentleman for having directed attention to the issue as to whether this resolution takes any jurisdiction away from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I had intended to include in my remarks a reference to that subject. I am grateful to the gentleman that he has reminded me of it. I do not consider that this resolution will diminish the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The jurisdiction of that committee was fixed by the Reorganization Act. Unfortunately it does not extend as far as this resolution does. It should in my opinion, but, as I say unfortunately it does not. However, I assure the gentleman from Texas that as long as I am chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that committee will exercise as fully as is within our power our jurisdiction in this matter or any other matter, regardless of whether or not any special resolutions such as this are passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes; but the trouble about that is the gentleman does not have the authority under the general law. When I was chairman of that committee I went out and fought for that jurisdiction and I did not give it up. That is the reason I brought in about six major bills here in about 4 years.

I do not want to say something myself about this Commission. I am not in love with this Commission. I want you to understand that. I do not believe in persecuting anybody. I have had a good deal to do with this Commission. I have watched it. I think it is a better Commission now than it was several months or a year or two ago. I think then we had on that Commission some men, not a majority of them, who were cowards and weaklings. I do not know what kind of a chairman Wayne Coy is going to make. I think he is a very good and a very able man. But whatever he is, he is a better man and a better chairman than the man he succeeded was capable of being.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, what we face here today has a very important relationship to efficiency and effectiveness of the Congress. In the reorganization of Congress, after many, many months of study, and testimony by some of your leaders on your own Republican side, it was determined that special committees performing investigatory duties destroyed the jurisdiction, the authority, and the responsibility of the standing legislative committees of this House. As a result, 12 or 13 special committees, which, like Topsy, had "just growed," were lopped off in the reorganization.

Jurisdiction of the reorganized committees was clarified. Congress has been pretty good about holding the line against breaking down the new committee organization. I think there have been three or perhaps four special committees established during the 2 years of this Congress. Some of those were on matters which spread-eagled two or three jurisdictions, and perhaps accounted for a few of those special committees. But this proposed investigation here is directly the responsibility of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, make no mistake about that.

To remove this jurisdiction here and create an unneeded special committee at vast extra expense violates the spirit, if not the letter of our own Reorganization Act.

The men on the regular Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have the powers and can come here by unanimous consent and get the subpena powers if that is necessary if they wish to conduct this investigation.

A vote for this resolution today is a vote of "no confidence" in a great committee headed by a great chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], one of the greatest chairmen in the House.

With ranking members on his committee, such as the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], as well as other Members, these men understand the problem and are perfectly capable of doing this job.

You are not only destroying the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but you are weakening other legislative committees so far as their watchdog functions provided for in the Reorganization Act are concerned.

Things are beginning to take hold now where the legislative committees consider it a part of their duty to follow up legislation to find out if the bureaus under their control are carrying out their duties. When you strip a committee of its jurisdiction, as is being done here, by establishing control outside of the framework of your standing committees system, you destroy that much of the value of reorganization and you weaken all other regular committees.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Is it not true that if the previous question on the pending resolution is voted down, it will then be in order to substitute the resolution introduced by Chairman WOLVERTON of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee?

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman from Tennessee is exactly correct, and that is what should be done if you are in favor of living up to your own rules that you have established, if you favor keeping the jurisdictional lines of the Congress straight and clear.

If you oppose, as I do, the usurpation of the jurisdiction of the regular standing committees of the House of Representatives, by these hit-or-miss special committees, then you should vote down the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma does not surprise me, but I must confess that I was pained at my long-time and most devoted friend, the gentleman from Texas, giving the impression by the statement that he made that he is resisting the adoption of the pending resolution. My colleagues, I have labored here with you for a long time. It has been my hope that I would so conduct myself as to earn your confidence. I come to you as a party interested in the setting up of this committee and in carrying out an honest investigation of the Communications Commission and I am looking to my friends on the Democratic side who have confidence in me and who are willing to stand by me, to vote for this resolution. I do not want to rip this thing open, because to me it

would be most painful. The resolution simply proposes the naming of a committee to take up where a previous special committee left off in the business of investigating the Federal Communications Commission.

You recall that when the first committee was set up, it was my resolution, and I was named chairman. The committee engaged the services of the best people that could be found to do the work. We were able to enlist the services of a very great lawyer. He came here at enormous expense to himself and spent many months with the committee in building up a record to be used as the basis for recommendations to the House of Representatives.

Due to the fight that was made upon me, I left the committee in the hope that so doing would make it easier for the committee to carry on. I want to say to you that never in the history of this Congress was a meaner thing done to a Member than that which was done to me. I was made the object of the most terrible smear campaign that was ever built up. The thing is too painful to me for me to rest. I hate to tell you all about it. Unfortunately, the committee found itself opposed by an angry White House. All the powers attaching to that great office were brought into play against the committee. The committee had the cooperation of the Army and the Navy. The Communications Commission had been interfering with the communications of both the Army and the Navy. The committee had the benefit of the assistance of representatives of both Army and Navy. They worked with us and in some instances helped in the investigation that was being made.

As I say, the counsel for the committee was not only a great lawyer but was also a conscientious man who was seeking to do a man's job. He was persistent and through various sources of information kept informed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. COX. But this is what happened: People in the Government were directed to dishonor any summons that the committee might issue; and, to make certain that the committee would not be able to get the evidence it wanted, the records in the War Department, the Navy Department, the Communications Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and others were seized, taken to, and impounded at the White House.

After I left the committee, the smear artists then directed their attention to Gene Garey, the counsel for the committee, and to show you the extent that these people were willing to go in their effort to intimidate and smear one of the country's greatest lawyers, they searched his record from the time he was a boy selling newspapers on the streets of Chicago in order to support a widowed mother. They followed him down to that particular moment, but they were never able to get anything that might be used to intimidate, browbeat, and drive him from the committee. But here is what they resorted to, and listen to me:

When the representatives of Japan were here and our President, through the State Department, was undertaking to reach some sort of an understanding, or get some particular information, they gained knowledge that Mr. Desvernine, one of the associates of the then lawyer of the committee had at one time been the counsel of the Mikado Bank in this country. Through Mr. Baruch, as I recall, Mr. Desvernine was brought in and under the urge and direction of the White House, he obtained from the representatives of Japan information that the President wanted. At the time the committee was undertaking to prosecute the investigation, Desvernine was told that if Garey continued to represent the committee that he, Desvernine, would be charged with having, prior to Pearl Harbor, been the representative of the Mikado, and threats of prosecution were made against him.

The story, as I recall, is that Mr. Baruch, great man that he is, sought to protect Desvernine. It was, as I remember, Mr. Baruch who got Desvernine to come into the picture. Finally, and in order to save Desvernine from being smeared and ruined, Garey left the committee in disgust and the investigation fizzled out.

Let me say to you there is no Member of this House who has a greater appreciation of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee than myself, but this is a special job that ought to be done by a special committee. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has not, in view of the tremendous burden that rests upon the committee, found it possible to conduct a thorough investigation of the Commission up to the present time. The splendid chairman of that committee tells you that this is a job that ought to be done, and since that committee is not empowered to carry on the work, the resolution ought to be adopted and this special committee set up.

Mr. Speaker, let me say again that I hope the membership will find it consistent with their sense of what is right to support this resolution.

The Commission is carrying on now just as it has carried on through the several years that have gone by. You recall the disclosure made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] with reference to the issuance of five licenses to one man within 2 weeks, of whom it has been said—witnesses can be produced who will so testify—that he served in the Communist Party with him for some length of time. Think of it—five licenses to one man in 2 weeks and he a man with Communist connections. Mr. Speaker, the broadcast carriers live under a terrorism exercised by this Commission; law-abiding, high-minded, patriotic Americans always under the gun of the Commission, and yet here is a man who, the Commission was informed had Communist connections, comes in and obtains within 2 weeks' time five licenses worth millions of dollars.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. HÉBERT. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia in connection with the case of this man who has Communist associations and the fact that he obtained five licenses in 2 weeks, I wrote a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House and asked him to obtain an explanation from the Communications Commission. That was approximately 7 or 8 weeks ago, yet as of this date I have received no explanation and do not know what is going on about it.

Mr. COX. Let me say this, no blame should attach to any member of that committee. I understand that; but what the gentleman says argues strongly the importance of the setting up of this committee to carry on this all-important investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the membership will support the resolution.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana the majority leader [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution should be adopted. Certainly it is no invasion of the affairs of any other committee and certainly no reflection upon any other committee.

It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for a number of years. I enjoyed my services there. I know of the greatness of that committee.

However, this is something that needs to be done. I recall the circumstances about which the gentleman from Georgia has just spoken, and I was as resentful at some of the tactics there pursued as he was. I take it that this resolution is not intended to go back into matters of that day but, rather, is to inquire into some of the things that are presently alleged to be going on.

For that purpose this resolution is proper and should be adopted.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I have asked the gentleman to yield in order that I may reply to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. I understood he said that he had written to me and had received no reply.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HEBERT. I do not think I said that. If I did, I did not intend to do so. I said I had written to the gentleman asking for an explanation from the Federal Communications Commission and as of this day there has been no explanation, as far as I know, from the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am pleased to hear from the gentleman what he did say.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am not talking about the gentleman or about the committee.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Upon receipt of the information on the matter of which he complained I wrote to the gentleman under date of May 7, 1948, stating that I had received the complaint and would proceed immediately to investigate it. Upon the same day I communicated with Hon. Wayne Coy, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, asking him for an explanation. Afterward I received the explanation which I have here in my hand and which is a part of the files of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HÉBERT. May I ask on what day the reply from the Federal Communications Commission was received?

Mr. WOLVERTON. The first reply was made on the 13th.

Mr. HÉBERT. That was merely an acknowledgment. I mean the explanation.

Mr. WOLVERTON. May 13.

Mr. HÉBERT. Since May 13 the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has been in possession of an explanation of the relationship between Mr. Lamb and the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Yes. The committee, however, has not closed the matter.

Mr. HÉBERT. I may say to the gentleman that since May 7 I have received no additional information at all, nor have I ever received any information or acknowledge that he had received a reply or explanation from the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Nor have I heard a word from the gentleman from Louisiana since that time.

Mr. HÉBERT. I may say I was waiting on the gentleman replying to my letter.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I think that is the easiest thing to say, you were waiting, but the fact is we acted on the gentleman's complaint. We have taken more interest in it than he has and now he is seeking to raise an issue which does not exist.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I think the matter has been sufficiently explored. I am sure there is no reason for recriminations between the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from New Jersey. Probably the information which the gentleman sought is another reason why this resolution should be adopted.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Of course, I do not care to engage in a controversy with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey except to keep the RECORD absolutely correct. His letter told me he would inform me when he had received the information, and I am still waiting on the information. To this I have not been informed.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understand the matter correctly, the gentleman from New Jersey was seeking further information that probably would complete the story. Under those circumstances the gentleman's understanding about it and his present view could be very well justified, as I am sure the view and understanding of the gentleman from New Jersey could be justified.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it desired to pass this resolution to investigate Bob Jones, one of the new members of the commission, and a former Member of this House?

Mr. HALLECK. Well, now, of course, the gentleman, I am sure, is quite facetious in his question. The resolution of inquiry is general in its terms and has to do with the commission, and I suppose any individual's action in connection with the commission would be under scrutiny so far as the committee is concerned if this resolution is adopted which again, I say, I hope shall turn out to be the case.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If this committee is no more successful in getting information than the Committee on Un-American Activities has been in getting a letter from the FBI on Dr. Condon, then I fear we are wasting our time.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SABATH) there were—ayes 174, noes 50.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement. This statement exceeds the prescribed limit, but I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the rule it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANBORN further asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two radio addresses.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter, a statement, and certain testimony with regard to the sale of Lanham war housing.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD immediately following the passage of House Joint Resolution 433.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include an editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal.

Mr. JENSEN, Mr. D'EWART, and Mr. DONDERO asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by William T. Faricy before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news items.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD.

STEFAN MAGURA AND MICHAL MAGURA

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2709) for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stefan Magura and Michal Magura, of Donora, Pa., who were admitted into the United States on temporary visas, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of April 29, 1948, upon payment of visa fees and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for Czechoslovakia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 624 OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4816) to

amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "$250,000" and insert "$100,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $100,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3999) to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "adjudicate" and insert "determine according to law."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "and is substantiated in such manner as the Attorney General may prescribe."

Page 1, line 9, after "limitation", insert "as to amount."

Page 2, line 13, strike out all after "therefrom." down to and including "case." in line 16.

Page 3, lines 3 and 4, strike out "who is otherwise resident in a foreign country" and insert "by and on behalf of any alien who on December 7, 1941, was not actually residing in the United States."

Page 3, line 13, strike out "and."

Page 3, line 16, strike out "suffering." and insert "suffering; and."

Page 3, after line 16, insert:

"(5) for loss of anticipated profits or loss of anticipated earnings."

Page 3, lines 22 and 23, strike out "Any relevant evidence having probative value shall be considered by the Attorney General in his inquiries."

Page 4, line 6, strike out all after "General." down to and including "same." in line 9.

Page 4, line 14, strike out all after "of" where it appears the second time down to and including "the" in line 17 and insert "service. The."

Page 4, line 24, strike out "dispose of" and insert "adjudicate."

Page 5, line 10, after "name", insert "and address."

Page 5, line 12, after "case", insert "and the reasons for each adjudication."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF INTERESTS IN ESTATES OF DECEASED CROW INDIAN ALLOTTEES

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2352) to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate admentments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, after line 11 insert:

"SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior with the consent, in writing, of the tribal council representing the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation, is hereby authorized and directed to sell and convey to the Board of County Commissioners of Comanche County, Okla., for public purposes, to wit: A site for a county hospital for said county upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe—ten acres from the north one-half of section 30, township 2 north, range 11 west, Indian meridian, and more definitely described as follows:

"The southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of said section 30, township 2 north, range 11 west, Indian meridian: *Provided*, That out of the proceeds of such sale the sum of $1.25 per acre shall be credited to the general fund of the United States Treasury and the balance shall be deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the tribal fund of Indians of the said Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees, and to provide for the sale of certain lands to the Board of County Commissioners of Comanche County, Okla. and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, 1949

Mr. PLOESER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for the Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 5, 8, and 21.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$330,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the Corporation is authorized to pay not to exceed $1,482.90 for services actually rendered by former employees during the fiscal year 1947 and for which there is no present authority to pay, as follows: L. Brown, $120.06; W. Finch, $140.11; J. Johnson, $116.16; S. Jones, $86.31; R. Neely, $148.71; G. Sanders, $103.19; N. L. Sanders, $123.82; G. Walker, $130.78; W. Winfield, $133.37; W. Scruggs, $153.60; E. Donley, $102.68; H. Thomas, $74.11"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 7, 13, 16, 24, and 26.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
F. R. COUDERT, JR.,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER FERGUSON,
CLYDE M. REED,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 2 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 4 appropriates to the Public Housing Administration $4,840,000, as proposed by the House, for payments of annual contributions to locally owned low-rent housing projects, instead of $6,200,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5 restores the provision of the House bill requiring that no part of the appropriation to the Public Housing Administration for annual contributions to low-rent housing projects be paid to such projects making payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the amount specified in the original contract between such projects and the Public Housing Administration.

TITLE II

Amendment No. 6 changes the effective time when the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Company are required to declare and pay a dividend to the Treasury of the United States from "immediately upon the enactment of this Act" to "prior to July 31, 1948".

Amendment No. 7 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 8 restores the provision of the House bill limiting the amount of funds available for liquidation of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., and requiring this corporation to be liquidated and dissolved at the earliest practicable date without additional appropriations therefor.

Amendment No. 9, relating to the standard under which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall account for its administrative expenses, changes the requirement of the House bill so that "generally recognized" accounting principles and practices must be followed.

Amendment No. 10 authorizes not to exceed $2,300,000 for administrative expenses of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, instead of not to exceed $2,250,000, as proposed by the House, and not to exceed $2,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12 authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to cancel bonds of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation as proposed by the Senate, instead of capital stock as proposed by the House, upon transfer of the capital stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to the Treasury.

Amendment No. 13 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 14 authorizes not to exceed $9,500,000 for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, instead of not to exceed $9,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $10,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15 requires the capital stock of the Defense Homes Corporation to be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of to the Secretary of the Treasury, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17 authorizes not to exceed $3,000 of the funds of the Housing and Home Finance Agency available for travel expenses to be used for attendance at meetings, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18 authorizes payment by the Federal intermediate credit banks to the Farm Credit Administration for services rendered in amount not to exceed $330,000, instead of not to exceed $373,600, as proposed by the House, and not to exceed $223,600, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19 authorizes not to exceed $1,500,000 for administrative expenses of the production credit corporations, as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed $1,350,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 20 and 21 provide that the production credit corporations shall return Government capital of not less than $30,000,000, instead of not less than $60,000,000, as proposed by the House, and not less than $20,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and that such capital be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury, as proposed by the House, instead of being returned to the production credit corporations revolving fund authorized in title 12 of the United States Code, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22 authorizes not to exceed $146,800 for administrative expenses of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed $46,800, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23 authorizes payment by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington to the Farm Credit Administration for services rendered in amount not to exceed $21,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed $12,500, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25 authorizes the Inland Waterways Corporation to pay not to exceed $1,482.90 for services actually rendered by 12 former employees who had been reemployed after having engaged in a strike against the Government, for which the Corporation has no present authority to pay, instead of not to exceed $3,918.48 for 18 such former employees, as proposed by the House, and the elimination of any such authority, as proposed by the Senate.

In recommending authority to pay certain of such former employees to the exclusion of others, it is the intention of the managers on the part of both Houses that such action shall not be construed as a bar or a limitation on the rights of any of such former employees of this Corporation to make or prosecute claims for funds alleged to be owing to them.

Amendment No. 26 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 27 provides that funds of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., shall be available in amounts not to exceed $338,000 during the fiscal year 1948 and $380,000 during the fiscal year 1949 for expenses of vocational training of prisoners as authorized by the act of May 11, 1948 (Public Law 521), as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III

Amendment No. 28 strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House bill increasing the salaries of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Amendment No. 29 changes the number of a section of the bill.

Amendments Nos. 30, 31, and 32 strike from the bill language, proposed by the House, to forbid employment by agencies included in the bill of members of labor organizations the officers of which are not in compliance with the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

Amendment No. 33 changes the number of a section of the bill.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 7, relating to the requirement that the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Company declare and pay a dividend of $10,000,000 into the Treasury of the United States, if not otherwise required to be turned in to the Treasury under the provisions of the proposed Federal charter: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 13, providing that the amount of bonds canceled by the Secretary of the Treasury upon receipt from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation of the outstanding capital stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation shall equal the par value of such stock plus accrued dividends thereon: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 16, relating to the effective date for the transfer of the stock, assets, liabilities, and records of the Defense Homes Corporation to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 24, authorizing the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make loans to fur farmers and to incur administrative expenses in connection therewith: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 26, authorizing the Virgin Islands Company to borrow $500,000 from the Treasury; appropriating $500,000 for this purpose; and enabling the company to continue its present operations until June 30, 1949: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
F. R. COUDERT, JR.,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3, which are in disagreement, be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first three amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 5, strike out "$27,389,061" and insert "$30,972,061."

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 2, line 9, strike out "$21,689,000" and insert "$25,689,000."

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 11, after the word "dams", insert "one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLOESER moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GORE moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] the ranking minority member of the committee, 25 minutes, to be yielded by him as he sees fit.

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman wish me to use some time now?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman will take an equal amount of time?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. And will alternate speakers?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes. We want the last 10 minutes on this side.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the closing speaker on this side will be the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and he will be recognized for 10 minutes just before the final time on the other side.

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the long hours that we have been laboring together, but I trust that for a few minutes my colleagues will give me a respectful hearing on this important matter, despite the fatigue suffered by all.

The motion I have offered would concur in the Senate action, by which $400,000,000 was appropriated for a steam generating plant.

What is the purpose of the steam plant here in disagreement? The purpose of the steam plant is to firm up the vast amount of hydroelectric power which is generated by the Tennessee Valley Authority, owned entirely by the Federal Government.

The issues involved here were debated rather fully in the House and I shall not go into them in detail. I think the RECORD shows, however, that since the matter left this body the issues have been further clarified. For one thing, some Members of this body seemed to be bothered or troubled as to whether the original TVA Act was broad enough in its authority to give authorization for this appropriation. That question, however, did not seem to trouble more than one or two Members of the other body. True, the question was raised, that very point of order was made, the able lawyers of the other body debated it, but the distinguished presiding officer, President pro tempore of the other body, ruled on the point of order and he ruled that the original TVA Act did authorize appropriations for the construction of steam plants.

Suffice it to say that up until this year that question has never been raised before and Congress has previously appropriated money to build a TVA steam plant.

Some additional clarification came out in the hearings and in the debates of the other body. For instance, it was argued here that this steam plant was not needed to supply energy to preferred customers. That opinion, as set out in the committee report, seemed to be based upon testimony before the committee which Mr. Purcell Smith, the representative of the private power companies, admitted during the hearings of the Senate committee were incorrect. Omitted from preferred customers as referred to in the House committee report was the Federal Government, and in the TVA Act the Federal Government and its agencies have top priority even over the local REA's and municipalities.

I have here a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission which I shall read. When this question was before the House we did not seek to justify it on any grounds other than a necessary addition to generating capacity to meet normal peacetime growth of our demand for electricity. We did recognize, of course, and make reference to the war plants located in the valley. I did not know how much electricity the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge used or needed now or would need in the future, and I so said in debate. Perhaps I was derelict in my duties, but I have not tried to find out too much about the atomic energy plant. Nevertheless, the senior Senator from Connecticut did seek such information. He wrote the Atomic Energy Commission and received a letter which I would like to read, and I want the Members who may contemplate voting against this to reflect on this letter written to Senator MCMAHON:

JUNE 10, 1948.

DEAR SENATOR MCMAHON: We have your letter of June 7 regarding power requirements for Oak Ridge. While we have not publicized the figures on the quantity of power furnished Oak Ridge by the Tennessee Valley Authority, we agree with you that such information does not involve classified information. The present contract between the Commission and TVA establishes an electrical power demand of 225,000 kilowatts. The present power load averages about 211,000 kilowatts. There are, however, certain particulars regarding our power requirements that do involve classified information, because these particulars, together with certain other facts, could possibly provide an index to the rate of production of fissionable materials at Oak Ridge. This information would include figures on the power generated by the Commission itself at Oak Ridge, details on type and quantity of power required by any individual facility within Oak Ridge, and records of total power consumption over an extended period of operation. If you wish, we shall be glad to send a representative of the Commission to discuss these matters with you.

At present there is no definite program for reactivating any of the facilities at Oak Ridge which are in stand-by status. However, there is always the possibility that future developments or an emergency might necessitate the start-up of these facilities. The minimum additional power required for reactivating such facilities is estimated to be in excess of 50,000 kilowatts and the maximum might be several times this figure. None of this additional power requirement could be met from the Commission's own installed power generating capacity at Oak Ridge.

Sincerely yours,

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
SUMNER T. PIKE,
Acting Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot order large generating facilities from Sears Roebuck and get them overnight. It has been estimated by responsible engineers and leaders that another great country with whom we are not always in accord may have atomic energy developed by 1952. If we start now, or on July 1, 1948, as provided by my motion, building this plant, the very first generator will not come into production until 1951.

There is in this country only two-tenths of 1 percent reserve of electric energy above that demanded. If an emergency should arise, and unless there is danger, why are we enacting a draft law? I am not one who wants to be responsible for denying this additional generating capacity in an area in which there is not only the atomic-energy plant but the largest aluminum plants, arsenals, and munition plants in the entire United States.

Though this proposed plant is important as a national-defense reserve of electric energy, it is fully justified on a peacetime basis. If there were no atomic energy plants in the valley this steam plant should be constructed. The desirable economic relationship of steam to hydro in the Tennessee Valley is 25 to 30 percent steam to 70 to 75 percent hydro. What is the ratio now? It is down to 16 or 17 percent, and with the additional hydroelectric units coming into production the ratio will sink in 2 years down to 13 or 14 percent steam. That is a wholly uneconomic relationship.

Unless there is additional generating capacity the Tennessee Valley faces an acute shortage of power. We can only look to the TVA because it is the sole supplier of power in the valley. This proposed steam plant is the practical way to augment the generating capacity.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, those of you who were present at the time this bill was originally debated at great length—in fact, it was debated over a period of 2 days—will recall that in substance this was an issue and still is an issue between those charming people who inhabit the beautiful Valley of the Tennessee, their charming Representatives in this House and the rest of the country, the taxpayers who provide them with subsidized public power that makes living so pleasant for the people of the valley and attracts to its delightful valley, hillsides, and slopes, the industry of the rest of the country at the expense of and to the detriment of communities in the rest of the country. Some of those charming peoples' Representatives, I know, have been very busy pressing for a favorable vote on this bill.

I am confident however, that Members will be governed by the fundamentals involved here and will not yield to the charming people who are appealing, very naturally, to get something more for nothing at the expense of the rest of the taxpayers of the country. In substance, as was fully debated and fully made clear when the House originally voted down the steam plant, this is an attempt to effect a revolution in the operation of the TVA. It is, in effect, a first step in establishing the principle that the United States Government shall set up, not hydroelectric power plants as an incident to the development of a great river valley area, but shall set up steam generating public utility enterprises in competition with private industry and in competition with all of those other communities in the United States who do not have the advantages of Federally subsidized cheap power. All this talk about firming up is nothing but nonsense. Every kilowatt-hour of power that is generated by the hydroelectric facilities in the Tennessee Valley is used; not one bit of it goes to waste. It is not as though power were being lost or potential power not used.

Moreover, in this bill provision is made for additional dams, and additional generating capacities that will increase the total generating production of TVA by 400,000 kilowatts, and that without the steam plant. In addition to that, 200,000 additional kilowatt-hours of power will come to TVA through the development of the Cumberland River Dam by the Army engineers, the disposition of which is to be turned over to TVA. So that really effectively disposes of the argument which my friend from Tennessee has just made about the needs of this steam plant in a particular place in the interest of national defense. Now, a steam plant, gentlemen, as you all know, can be set up anywhere. You can set up the same plant in my district, on the island of Manhattan, and generate just as much power as that steam plant is going to generate in the valley of the Tennessee. The only difference is that the inhabitants in the Tennessee area, and the stockholders of those great industrial companies who had the sense to settle there and take advantage of cheap public power, are given the benefit of it rather than my constituents who are going to pay the bill.

So I say to you, gentlemen, the issue is the same one that we fought out once before and decided, I think, properly in this House. Until there is a clear-cut legislative determination defining the Authority's power and purpose and placing a clear-cut limitation upon the territorial area that it is to serve, then certainly we should not decide upon an appropriation bill, an issue that is as far reaching as this one.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York, has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the issue here is whether we shall go ahead and waste money to build this steam plant. In the situation we are at the present time the charges for electricity in the Tennessee Valley by the Authority are below the cost of production, if you consider the cost of the installations that have been made, and the interest on the money. The issue is whether your folks and my folks back home shall pay the electric light bills of those people. Just the other day I read in the paper where the representatives of those communities that are served by the TVA were in New York making arrangements for loans from bankers for the purpose of installing steam plants of their own. Why not let them do that, instead of making a contract with them on the part of the TVA, which prohibits the customers of the TVA from putting in power plants of their own? These people can do it. Let them run their own business in their own way. There is no sense in the Government of the United States putting itself out and getting into this situation. I hope the motion will not be agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] for yielding to me at this time.

This amendment providing for a steam plant in the Tennessee Valley, to firm up the power generated in that area, is one of the most important issues that has come before this Congress.

It not only means the saving of billions of kilowatt-hours of electricity for consumers within the distribution radius, but it means additional power for our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., the greatest defense project the world has ever known.

The Senate has already voted favorably on this amendment twice, and I trust the membership of this House will not cripple this great development by voting against it.

The American people who pay the electric bills, and especially the residential and commercial consumers, have a right to be alarmed at these efforts that are being made to cripple or destroy the TVA and other public power projects throughout the country.

As I have pointed out time and time again, the power business is a public business. Electricity is the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. It has become a necessity of our modern life. No home is complete without it. No business establishment can operate successfully without it. It must be handled by a monopoly. If a half dozen different concerns were engaged in distributing electricity to a given community, the overhead expense would be so great the people could not bear it.

Any monopoly of a necessity of life is a public business.

Besides, the water power of this Nation, that is, the hydroelectric power in our navigable streams and their tributaries, already belongs to the Government. The Supreme Court so held in the Appalachian Power case as well as in the Ashwander case.

The yardsticks provided by our public power projects, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Bonneville Power Administration, have a tremendous effect in holding down the power rates to the American consumer.

The same thing is true of the Tacoma, Wash., public power system, which, by the way, pays a higher rate of taxation, or money in lieu of taxes, than is paid by the average power company serving a city of its size.

The Ontario Power Commission, operating just across the line from New York, is another outstanding example of the benefits the people derive from public power.

I am inserting at this point a table showing the number of power consumers in each State in 1947, the amount of electricity used, the cost of that electricity, and the savings that would have accrued if this power had been supplied at the TVA rates, the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the Bonneville rates, or the Ontario rates.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 1.—*Total electric sales, 1947*

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
				Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	528,401	5,480,972,000	$52,872,700	$32,438,173	$20,434,527	$26,797,859	$26,074,841	$37,326,851	$15,545,849	$34,642,116	$18,230,584
Arizona	151,468	1,128,795,000	18,228,700	8,583,322	9,645,378	7,542,687	10,686,013	10,191,477	8,037,223	14,365,527	11,538,873
Arkansas	336,529	1,116,014,000	25,904,400	13,484,997	12,419,403	11,418,455	14,485,945	15,732,950	10,171,450	216,347,302	72,631,798
California	3,117,788	18,035,720,000	288,979,100	201,144,595	87,834,505	168,137,160	120,841,940	233,303,657	55,675,443	14,141,525	14,865,675
Colorado	337,671	1,166,990,000	29,097,200	13,670,595	15,336,605	12,038,693	16,968,507	16,216,270	12,790,930	34,054,502	36,186,808
Connecticut	595,613	2,945,948,000	70,241,400	32,772,352	37,469,048	27,962,632	42,278,768	38,165,037	32,076,363	4,479,775	4,536,123
Delaware	83,970	452,731,000	9,567,800	4,341,148	5,226,652	3,735,020	5,832,780	8,088,025	1,479,775	4,536,123	5,031,677
District of Columbia [1]											
Florida	637,712	2,363,649,000	63,900,300	26,086,976	37,813,324	23,271,027	40,629,273	31,043,836	32,856,464	26,431,722	37,468,578
Georgia	612,635	3,421,532,000	56,635,700	31,966,305	24,669,395	27,892,303	28,743,397	37,698,592	18,937,108	33,000,535	23,635,165
Idaho	169,242	1,194,849,000	15,879,300	9,859,890	6,019,410	8,656,935	7,222,365	11,617,941	4,261,359	10,022,988	5,856,312
Illinois	2,407,993	13,946,033,000	268,066,500	132,349,440	135,717,060	112,414,144	155,652,356	154,434,196	113,632,304	139,258,220	128,808,280
Indiana	1,123,529	5,996,387,000	116,255,900	59,467,245	56,788,655	50,319,196	65,936,704	69,157,645	47,098,255	62,640,512	53,615,388

[1] Included in Maryland data.

TABLE 1.—*Total electric sales, 1947*—Continued

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
				Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Iowa	741,812	2,564,733,000	$62,028,909	$31,049,521	$30,979,376	$27,133,113	$34,895,787	$36,049,483	$25,979,417	$32,043,786	$29,985,120
Kansas	490,353	2,040,248,000	45,178,300	22,338,943	22,839,357	19,206,260	25,972,097	28,168,195	19,010,105	23,366,604	21,812,296
Kentucky	547,419	2,578,483,000	47,368,300	25,712,700	21,655,600	21,891,503	25,476,797	29,978,220	17,390,080	26,870,339	20,497,961
Louisiana	519,269	2,472,257,000	44,665,400	20,484,866	23,580,534	17,718,967	26,946,433	24,042,533	20,622,867	21,274,184	22,791,216
Maine	275,314	1,142,871,000	22,911,300	10,971,088	11,940,212	9,426,210	13,485,090	12,869,762	10,041,538	11,306,441	11,604,859
Maryland and District of Columbia	734,648	4,993,671,000	82,199,300	45,162,229	37,037,071	38,691,783	43,507,517	53,145,018	29,054,282	48,191,938	34,007,362
Massachusetts	1,439,541	5,400,491,000	144,720,800	63,171,478	81,549,322	53,778,203	90,942,597	73,481,311	71,239,489	65,762,048	78,958,752
Michigan	1,763,974	9,956,502,000	186,229,400	93,696,512	92,532,888	81,655,236	104,584,164	110,185,486	76,053,914	95,994,359	90,235,041
Minnesota	808,590	3,069,935,000	73,592,700	36,857,025	36,705,675	32,278,319	41,284,381	43,430,295	30,132,405	37,996,451	35,866,249
Mississippi	323,945	1,678,294,000	34,587,200	11,922,107	12,665,093	10,491,956	14,182,244	14,044,062	10,543,138	12,286,071	12,301,129
Missouri	1,010,438	4,381,830,000	88,593,700	47,008,810	41,496,890	40,791,691	47,714,009	55,372,335	33,132,865	48,924,908	39,589,792
Montana	151,006	1,851,532,000	18,040,600	10,827,747	7,212,853	9,020,983	9,020,083	12,526,534	5,513,766	11,586,022	6,452,578
Nebraska	330,996	1,132,871,000	26,683,100	14,115,259	12,567,841	12,512,614	14,170,486	16,792,124	9,890,976	14,472,431	12,210,669
Nevada	41,584	394,694,000	6,236,700	3,024,534	3,212,166	2,629,502	3,607,198	3,579,633	2,657,067	3,199,234	3,037,466
New Hampshire	178,261	622,762,000	15,890,100	7,452,558	8,437,542	6,367,034	9,523,066	8,685,703	7,204,397	7,707,876	8,182,224
New Jersey	1,427,674	6,357,912,000	152,823,900	71,956,274	80,869,626	61,291,773	91,531,127	83,857,001	68,966,899	75,504,061	77,321,839
New Mexico	199,992	388,274,000	10,434,900	4,329,724	6,105,176	3,819,080	6,615,820	5,137,705	5,297,194	4,473,881	5,960,919
New York	4,458,147	22,618,807,000	457,991,900	189,435,038	268,476,862	168,271,632	289,640,268	226,318,570	231,593,330	196,511,419	261,480,481
North Carolina	747,689	4,493,786,000	66,363,200	38,059,380	28,303,820	32,232,234	34,130,966	44,239,177	22,124,023	40,060,465	26,302,735
North Dakota	110,944	286,566,000	9,755,300	4,176,700	5,578,600	3,832,613	5,922,687	5,050,294	4,705,006	4,205,484	5,549,816
Ohio	2,247,329	15,494,727,000	293,282,600	136,125,909	117,106,691	114,767,730	138,464,864	138,035,932	93,196,798	143,353,625	109,878,975
Oklahoma	608,642	1,757,374,000	40,894,700	19,717,091	16,978,530	22,616,147	23,108,710	17,485,960	20,572,872	20,021,528	20,021,528
Oregon	428,643	4,311,383,000	43,096,100	29,778,713	13,320,387	28,825,541	17,270,559	34,945,571	8,150,529	30,712,030	12,384,061
Pennsylvania	2,853,776	19,696,741,000	387,872,100	175,862,760	150,009,340	146,409,619	179,462,481	203,605,181	122,866,919	186,565,440	138,906,660
Rhode Island	297,872	961,961,000	21,121,600	10,795,158	14,326,442	9,063,150	16,038,450	12,492,490	12,629,110	11,378,727	13,742,873
South Carolina	359,966	2,120,342,000	27,725,300	17,610,758	12,624,542	14,936,097	15,299,303	20,497,695	9,737,605	18,496,231	11,739,069
South Dakota	128,214	329,142,000	8,544,934	6,140,106	3,981,226	5,063,574	4,594,306	5,200,794	4,925,886	4,652,220	5,048,660
Tennessee	608,018	7,730,687,000	58,838,700	43,707,026	15,131,674	36,729,797	22,108,903	50,597,756	8,240,944	45,914,538	12,924,162
Texas	1,663,699	7,404,667,000	143,699,600	73,232,888	70,373,712	63,366,077	80,240,523	86,305,559	57,391,041	76,998,374	66,698,226
Utah	177,458	928,295,000	16,348,200	9,374,545	6,973,655	8,120,474	8,227,726	10,988,813	5,359,387	9,629,565	6,718,635
Vermont	114,835	418,844,000	10,566,200	5,123,436	5,452,764	4,402,227	6,164,073	5,978,812	4,587,488	5,274,053	5,292,245
Virginia	642,672	3,266,181,000	61,918,400	30,527,617	31,060,783	26,689,940	35,237,757	36,199,864	25,718,536	31,948,089	29,970,311
Washington	674,769	9,604,980,000	77,118,200	55,350,295	21,767,905	47,563,860	29,554,340	64,851,753	12,266,447	57,643,748	19,474,452
West Virginia	414,823	3,568,492,000	50,719,200	27,184,528	23,534,672	21,996,275	28,722,925	31,011,009	19,708,200	29,423,063	21,296,138
Wisconsin	887,089	4,748,573,000	97,969,700	49,902,011	48,057,689	42,952,694	55,007,006	58,585,037	39,374,663	52,211,7[illegible]	45,747,907
Wyoming	64,720	212,163,000	5,943,500	2,587,005	3,356,495	2,326,582	3,617,318	3,096,338	2,847,062	2,635,391	3,308,509
United States total	38,431,950	217,581,497,000	3,852,764,700	2,009,489,255	1,843,275,445	1,719,152,955	2,133,611,765	2,350,465,966	1,502,298,734	2,107,487,218	1,745,77,482

You will note that there were 38,431,950 consumers of electricity in the United States last year. That includes the residential, the commercial, and the industrial users. For that electricity they paid $3,852,764,700.

If the TVA rates had been in effect in every State in the Union, they would have paid $2,009,489,255, and the savings would have amounted to $1,843,275,445. Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates they would have saved $2,133,611,765. Under the Bonneville rates they would have saved $1,502,298,734. Under the Ontario rates they would have saved $1,745,277,482.

If it had not been for these yardsticks, I daresay that the cost of this electricity to the consumers of this Nation, would have been multiplied many times.

RESIDENTIAL CONSUMERS

Now let us take the residential consumers of electricity. In 1947 there were 31,621,959 residential users of electricity throughout the United States. They used 44,171,314,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $1,366,498,200. Under the TVA rates they would have paid $729,920,006, and would have saved $636,578,194. Under the Tacoma rates they would have paid $676,953,298, and would have saved $689,544,902. Under the Bonneville rates they would have paid $860,482,582, and would have saved $506,015,618. Under the Ontario rates they would have paid $632,044,096, and would have saved $734,454,104.

In order to show the number of residential consumers, the amount of electricity used, and the overcharges in each State, I am inserting a table which covers every State in the Union.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 2.—*Residential electric service, 1947*

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
				Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	390,740	665,944,000	$14,899,100	$9,699,314	$5,199,786	$8,999,056	$5,900,044	$11,427,610	$3,471,490	$8,403,092	$6,496,008
Arizona	136,050	229,156,000	6,539,700	3,296,009	3,243,691	3,060,580	3,479,120	3,884,582	2,655,118	2,857,849	3,681,851
Arkansas	230,220	214,148,000	8,573,200	4,106,563	4,466,637	3,896,501	4,766,699	4,835,285	3,737,915	3,549,305	5,023,895
California	2,260,379	3,092,663,000	84,670,300	33,599,227	51,071,073	31,073,963	49,701,407	34,968,793	63,163,909	21,506,231	46,390,270
Colorado	263,654	318,900,000	11,196,700	5,508,776	5,687,924	5,105,695	6,091,005	6,494,086	4,702,614	4,769,794	6,426,906
Connecticut	513,186	775,997,000	25,760,800	13,034,965	12,725,835	12,081,815	13,678,985	15,353,437	10,407,363	11,283,230	14,477,570
Delaware	71,408	94,126,000	3,768,300	1,624,137	2,144,163	1,507,320	2,260,980	1,914,296	1,854,004	1,409,344	2,358,956
District of Columbia [1]											
Florida	537,889	830,957,000	22,973,000	12,532,307	10,441,693	11,609,169	11,363,731	14,770,219	8,203,681	10,833,873	12,139,027
Georgia	531,778	902,045,000	21,917,700	13,391,715	8,525,985	12,427,336	9,490,364	15,780,744	6,136,956	11,594,463	10,323,237
Idaho	139,132	400,261,000	7,545,100	4,610,056	2,935,044	4,278,072	3,267,028	5,432,472	2,112,628	3,991,358	3,553,742
Illinois	1,984,258	2,587,553,000	85,214,600	46,782,815	38,431,785	43,374,231	41,840,369	55,133,846	30,080,754	40,476,935	44,737,665
Indiana	889,206	1,200,421,000	39,908,500	20,872,146	19,036,354	19,355,622	20,552,878	24,623,545	15,284,955	18,078,550	21,829,950
Iowa	578,965	730,511,000	26,518,600	13,072,684	13,445,916	12,118,086	14,398,514	15,406,145	11,110,455	11,322,588	15,194,012
Kansas	390,571	460,182,000	17,080,000	8,271,560	8,808,440	7,673,410	9,406,590	9,741,300	7,348,700	7,160,710	9,919,290
Kentucky	492,027	514,359,000	16,927,300	9,800,907	7,126,393	9,089,960	7,837,340	11,561,346	5,366,954	8,497,505	8,429,795
Louisiana	436,536	424,300,000	16,541,300	8,022,530	8,518,770	7,443,585	9,097,715	9,461,624	7,079,676	6,947,346	9,593,954
Maine	232,125	267,035,000	9,897,200	4,612,095	5,285,105	4,275,590	5,621,610	5,443,460	4,453,740	2,998,469	5,898,731
Maryland and District of Columbia	600,240	824,007,000	23,991,100	13,765,462	10,225,638	12,774,686	11,216,414	16,240,829	7,750,271	11,925,574	12,065,526
Massachusetts	1,247,213	1,302,997,000	55,011,800	24,548,643	30,463,157	22,757,505	32,254,295	28,951,987	26,059,813	21,301,177	33,710,623

[1] Included in Maryland data.

TABLE 2.—*Residential electric service, 1947*—Continued

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
				Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Kilowatt hours	Revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Michigan	1,534,686	2,575,721,000	$69,410,800	$41,577,069	$27,833,731	$38,522,994	$30,887,806	$49,004,025	$20,406,775	$35,954,794	$33,456,006
Minnesota	662,446	987,396,000	29,860,800	16,483,162	13,377,638	15,288,730	14,572,070	19,439,381	10,421,419	14,273,462	15,587,338
Mississippi	254,189	315,618,000	9,896,000	5,012,202	4,873,798	4,646,420	5,239,580	5,911,828	3,974,172	4,339,954	5,546,046
Missouri	823,305	1,040,008,000	32,946,100	18,383,924	14,562,176	17,033,134	15,912,966	21,045,588	11,900,512	15,912,966	17,033,134
Montana	128,927	205,101,000	6,195,600	3,134,670	3,060,930	2,905,455	3,289,545	3,692,220	2,502,780	2,713,410	3,481,590
Nebraska	268,209	358,266,000	11,740,600	6,257,740	5,482,860	5,799,856	5,940,744	7,373,097	4,367,503	5,412,417	6,328,183
Nevada	32,174	99,464,000	2,255,100	1,037,734	1,267,366	1,116,693	1,139,529	1,163,632	1,091,468	854,653	1,400,447
New Hampshire	154,714	179,391,000	6,941,400	3,081,982	3,859,418	2,899,857	4,081,543	3,637,294	3,304,106	2,672,439	4,268,961
New Jersey	1,224,461	1,405,548,000	54,114,200	25,974,816	28,139,384	24,080,819	30,033,381	30,028,637	23,485,563	22,511,507	31,602,693
New Mexico	88,663	106,220,000	4,146,700	1,792,923	2,347,777	1,664,561	2,476,139	2,115,898	2,024,802	1,552,762	2,587,938
New York	3,784,189	4,307,288,000	166,409,400	76,714,733	89,694,667	71,223,223	95,186,177	90,526,714	75,882,686	66,397,351	100,012,049
North Carolina	615,569	818,932,000	24,406,000	13,130,428	11,275,572	12,178,594	12,227,406	15,473,464	8,932,536	11,373,196	13,032,804
North Dakota	87,557	122,297,000	4,403,500	2,078,452	2,325,048	1,928,733	2,474,767	2,452,750	1,950,750	1,801,032	2,602,468
Ohio	1,881,529	2,789,596,000	84,591,000	47,878,506	36,712,494	44,410,275	40,180,725	56,596,788	28,094,212	41,534,181	43,056,819
Oklahoma	405,949	381,705,000	16,143,800	7,493,723	8,653,077	6,941,534	9,201,966	8,830,659	7,313,141	6,489,808	9,653,992
Oregon	358,794	1,197,628,000	18,713,200	12,537,844	6,175,356	11,639,010	7,073,590	14,783,428	3,929,772	10,872,360	7,840,831
Pennsylvania	2,440,893	3,251,373,000	109,426,400	55,703,128	53,733,272	51,653,981	57,782,419	65,552,404	43,883,996	48,152,016	61,284,384
Rhode Island	208,113	189,226,000	8,594,700	3,678,532	4,916,168	3,412,696	5,182,004	4,340,324	4,254,376	3,183,634	5,406,066
South Carolina	295,380	394,301,000	11,119,500	6,293,637	4,825,863	5,897,738	5,281,762	7,427,826	3,691,674	5,459,675	5,659,825
South Dakota	98,892	125,990,000	4,354,100	1,994,178	2,359,922	1,850,493	2,503,607	2,351,214	2,002,886	1,778,294	2,629,876
Tennessee	532,000	1,234,766,000	20,675,000	13,609,625	7,065,375	14,472,500	6,202,500	18,400,750	2,274,250	13,521,450	7,153,550
Texas	1,314,995	1,417,529,000	49,473,881	25,028,683	24,260,932	26,922,465	22,551,416	30,865,590	18,608,291	21,529,950	27,943,931
Utah	140,210	274,991,000	6,966,900	4,117,438	2,849,462	3,817,861	3,149,039	4,848,962	2,117,938	3,567,053	3,399,847
Vermont	94,077	128,864,000	4,894,100	2,217,027	2,677,073	2,055,522	2,838,578	2,613,449	2,280,651	1,918,487	2,975,613
Virginia	537,568	756,899,000	24,538,400	12,416,430	12,121,970	11,508,510	13,029,890	14,624,886	9,913,514	10,747,819	13,790,581
Washington	572,159	2,057,145,000	29,434,200	21,604,703	7,829,497	20,015,256	9,418,944	25,490,583	3,973,617	18,490,717	10,743,483
West Virginia	339,538	361,107,000	13,282,600	6,229,539	7,053,061	5,916,040	7,366,560	6,561,604	6,720,996	4,977,064	8,305,536
Wisconsin	758,465	1,161,172,000	33,195,500	18,556,285	14,639,215	17,228,464	15,967,036	21,875,835	11,319,665	16,066,622	17,128,878
Wyoming	54,741	70,979,000	2,692,700	1,187,481	1,505,219	1,101,314	1,591,386	1,400,204	1,292,496	1,028,611	1,664,089
United States total	31,621,959	44,171,314,000	1,366,498,200	729,920,006	636,578,194	676,953,298	689,544,902	860,482,582	506,015,618	632,044,096	734,454,104

If it were not for these yardsticks, I dare say that the average user of electricity in this country would be paying many times the rates which he now pays. That would curtail his use of electricity and limit the enjoyment of those appliances that lift the burden of drudgery, and go to make the American home more pleasant and more attractive.

The same elements that are trying to destroy this public power program fought the development of rural electrification. If they had succeeded, the chances are that we would not have had 1 farm house out of 10 in this country electrified at the present time. Whereas, we now have about 70 or 75 percent of our farm homes electrified, and we are moving forward to the day when we will see electricity in every farm home in America.

It has done more for the farmers of the Nation than anything else that has ever been proposed. It takes to the farmer everything people have in the cities—except the noise and city taxes.

COMMERCIAL CONSUMERS

Now let us turn to the commercial consumers, the merchants, the hotel people, the operators of restaurants, filling stations, and so forth. There were 4,950,895 of them last year who used 38,378,995,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $1,031,335,100.

Under the TVA rates they would have paid $440,824,620 which would have given them a savings of $590,510,480.

Under the Tacoma rates they would have paid $420,878,747, which would have given them a savings of $610,456,353.

Under the Bonneville rates they would have paid $564,059,382, which would have given them a savings of $467,275,718.

Under the Ontario rates they would have paid $506,447,654, which would have given them a savings of $524,887,446.

Here is a table showing the number of commercial consumers for each State in the Union for 1947, the amount of electricity used, as well as what it cost them in each State, and showing what they would have saved.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 3.—*Commercial electric service, 1947*

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
				Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	52,624	408,856,000	$8,758,400	$4,573,724	$4,184,676	$4,300,238	$4,302,162	$5,863,749	$2,894,651	$5,268,353	$3,490,047
Arizona	20,191	392,175,000	6,228,100	2,649,371	3,578,729	2,527,487	3,700,613	3,393,595	2,834,505	3,047,098	3,181,002
Arkansas	40,852	255,451,000	7,457,200	3,095,410	4,361,790	2,937,103	4,520,097	3,953,352	3,503,848	3,556,265	3,900,935
California	452,387	3,339,106,000	75,199,600	42,660,573	32,599,027	40,664,184	34,535,416	54,296,368	20,903,232	48,719,564	26,480,036
Colorado	44,995	385,119,000	9,767,100	4,174,947	5,592,153	3,983,865	5,783,235	5,321,800	4,445,300	4,768,493	4,998,607
Connecticut	69,945	470,099,000	16,296,400	5,819,775	10,476,625	5,552,196	10,684,204	7,441,954	8,794,446	6,989,397	9,547,003
Delaware	10,795	108,370,000	2,672,900	1,018,642	1,654,258	969,087	1,703,813	1,299,457	1,373,443	1,164,556	1,508,344
District of Columbia [1]											
Florida	94,419	652,100,000	22,574,800	7,590,389	15,084,411	7,240,064	15,434,736	9,692,343	12,982,457	8,688,077	13,986,723
Georgia	78,306	714,115,000	17,312,100	7,988,496	9,323,604	7,614,035	9,698,065	10,217,428	7,094,672	9,165,372	8,146,728
Idaho	22,826	212,204,000	4,194,400	2,298,364	1,896,036	2,190,358	2,004,042	2,924,797	1,269,603	2,622,381	1,572,019
Illinois	302,708	1,984,472,000	65,988,300	26,847,340	39,140,960	25,623,917	40,364,383	34,459,780	31,528,520	30,903,385	34,994,915
Indiana	132,321	865,449,000	24,410,300	10,937,035	13,473,265	10,439,326	13,970,974	14,094,433	10,315,867	12,571,305	11,838,995
Iowa	106,265	579,656,000	17,516,200	7,974,425	9,541,775	7,615,591	9,902,609	10,193,553	7,322,647	9,165,177	8,351,023
Kansas	66,730	401,803,000	12,080,300	5,201,052	6,879,248	4,964,641	7,115,659	6,644,406	5,435,894	5,972,500	6,107,800
Kentucky	60,964	385,739,000	10,246,100	4,706,854	5,539,246	4,495,784	5,750,316	6,036,692	4,209,508	5,424,490	4,821,610
Louisiana	69,395	494,365,000	14,176,600	4,862,432	9,314,168	4,643,404	9,533,196	6,191,204	7,985,396	5,548,721	8,627,879
Maine	35,756	182,418,000	5,261,800	2,102,825	3,158,975	1,999,852	3,261,948	2,666,470	2,595,330	2,390,068	2,871,732
Maryland and District of Columbia	100,303	853,455,000	23,007,400	12,387,221	10,620,179	11,839,806	11,167,594	15,923,380	7,084,020	14,295,827	8,711,573
Massachusetts	180,182	810,293,000	32,727,900	11,056,794	21,671,106	10,551,143	22,176,752	14,090,670	18,637,230	12,641,152	20,086,748

[1] Included in Maryland data.

TABLE 3.—*Commercial electric service, 1947*—Continued

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
				Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Michigan	201,386	1,877,309,000	$48,312,609	$21,148,841	$27,163,769	$20,203,363	$28,109,237	$27,020,754	$21,291,846	$24,283,845	$24,028,755
Minnesota	110,070	708,425,000	22,281,900	8,904,738	13,377,162	13,700,268	8,581,632	11,337,477	10,944,423	10,167,008	12,114,892
Mississippi	38,216	272,252,000	7,616,900	3,020,482	4,596,418	2,879,264	4,737,636	3,844,249	3,772,651	3,451,979	4,164,921
Missouri	135,494	995,109,000	26,875,200	11,958,389	14,916,811	11,404,759	15,470,441	15,307,846	11,567,354	13,730,002	13,145,198
Montana	19,616	157,776,000	3,933,600	1,944,772	1,988,828	1,855,637	2,077,963	2,487,687	1,445,913	2,228,384	1,705,216
Nebraska	49,394	396,364,000	9,701,100	4,158,429	5,542,671	3,970,225	5,730,875	5,332,470	4,368,630	4,785,779	3,915,321
Nevada	7,536	135,645,000	2,515,000	958,467	1,556,533	914,429	1,600,571	1,225,253	1,289,747	1,098,351	1,416,649
New Hampshire	20,220	94,295,000	3,171,700	1,277,339	1,894,361	1,215,268	1,956,432	1,630,158	1,541,542	1,460,283	1,711,417
New Jersey	194,357	1,228,506,000	41,197,100	14,384,792	26,812,308	13,748,296	27,448,804	18,416,927	22,781,173	16,506,442	24,690,658
New Mexico	16,179	112,031,000	3,695,400	1,278,904	2,416,496	1,221,510	2,473,390	1,632,887	2,062,513	1,469,217	2,226,183
New York	652,206	6,642,641,000	188,812,400	62,315,997	126,496,403	60,083,323	128,719,077	80,707,880	108,104,540	72,539,836	116,272,564
North Carolina	88,928	649,140,000	15,205,900	7,439,487	7,766,413	7,079,259	8,126,641	9,459,895	5,746,005	8,473,184	6,732,716
North Dakota	22,023	124,930,000	4,381,500	1,642,712	2,738,788	1,565,992	2,815,508	2,094,006	2,287,494	1,877,385	2,504,115
Ohio	249,471	1,840,547,000	49,521,400	23,310,218	26,211,182	22,260,078	27,231,322	29,890,126	19,631,274	26,829,704	22,691,696
Oklahoma	66,873	353,387,000	10,966,700	4,574,759	6,391,941	4,360,140	6,606,560	5,828,582	5,138,118	5,241,205	5,725,495
Oregon	55,290	687,237,000	10,960,700	6,628,949	4,331,751	6,322,132	4,638,568	8,444,562	2,516,138	7,575,269	3,385,431
Pennsylvania	351,295	2,150,045,000	59,693,800	26,507,291	32,886,509	25,577,600	34,116,200	34,269,899	25,323,901	30,863,277	28,828,523
Rhode Island	27,634	131,085,600	5,294,000	1,788,525	3,505,475	1,706,733	3,587,267	2,268,373	3,025,627	2,033,902	3,260,098
South Carolina	42,817	312,549,000	6,927,800	3,325,206	3,602,594	3,175,357	3,752,443	4,238,566	2,689,234	3,803,293	3,124,507
South Dakota	24,939	114,791,000	4,356,200	1,606,306	2,749,894	1,534,515	2,821,685	2,054,994	2,301,206	1,839,623	2,516,577
Tennessee	99,738	696,296,000	10,261,100	6,789,201	3,461,899	6,472,442	3,778,658	8,668,638	1,582,462	7,781,712	2,469,388
Texas	216,609	1,819,369,000	44,937,800	19,764,094	25,173,706	18,838,376	26,099,424	25,272,120	19,665,680	22,726,394	22,211,406
Utah	16,200	155,294,000	4,070,200	1,903,307	2,166,893	1,819,461	2,250,739	2,435,730	1,634,470	2,188,383	1,881,817
Vermont	13,070	77,200,000	2,224,000	872,764	1,351,236	831,531	1,392,469	1,110,999	1,113,001	994,172	1,229,828
Virginia	79,493	725,901,000	17,920,900	7,180,367	10,740,533	6,848,114	11,072,786	9,173,888	8,747,012	8,214,045	9,706,855
Washington	76,176	1,333,884,000	18,489,400	11,883,598	6,605,802	11,330,272	7,159,128	15,235,266	3,254,134	13,692,695	4,796,705
West Virginia	48,506	228,134,000	6,668,500	2,884,793	3,783,707	2,754,291	3,914,209	3,605,286	2,973,217	3,310,644	3,357,856
Wisconsin	118,250	871,724,000	24,226,100	11,802,713	12,423,387	11,253,750	12,972,350	15,121,448	9,104,652	13,574,368	10,651,732
Wyoming	7,857	77,535,000	2,210,300	885,601	1,324,699	844,622	1,365,678	1,129,198	1,081,102	1,013,092	1,197,208
U. S. total	4,909,895	38,378,995,000	1,081,335,100	440,824,620	590,510,480	420,678,747	610,456,353	564,059,382	467,275,718	506,447,654	524,887,446

If the Power Trust could get rid of these yardsticks I dare say that those rates would increase by leaps and bounds until the average commercial consumer would be paying many times the rates he now pays for his electricity.

As I have said before, this power issue is the greatest economic question now before the American people. The hydroelectrical power in our navigable streams and their tributaries constitute the greatest wealth of this Nation, outside of the soil from which we live. It is our duty to see that this power is developed and supplied to the American people at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

Now let us take the industrial consumers. Last year there were 1,849,086 industrial users of electricity in this country. They used 135,031,188,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $1,454,931,400. Under the TVA rates they would have paid $838,744,629 which would have meant a saving of $616,186,771; under the Tacoma rates they would have paid $621,320,890, which would have meant a saving of $833,610,510; under the Bonneville rates they would have paid $925,924,002 which would have meant a saving of $529,007,398; under the Ontario rates they would have paid $968,995,468 which would have meant a saving of $485,935,932.

At this point I am inserting a table showing the number of industrial users of electricity in every State, the amount of electricity used, the amount paid for it, and the overcharges according to the TVA rates, the Tacoma rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario rates.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 4.—*Industrial and other electric services, 1947*

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
				Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	79,037	4,406,172,000	$29,215,200	$18,165,135	$11,050,065	$13,432,565	$15,782,635	$20,035,492	$9,179,708	$20,970,671	$8,244,529
Arizona	1,227	507,464,000	5,460,900	2,637,942	2,822,958	1,954,620	3,506,280	2,913,390	2,547,510	3,051,114	2,409,786
Arkansas	60,457	646,415,000	9,574,000	6,283,024	3,290,976	4,654,801	5,219,199	6,934,313	2,939,687	7,259,957	2,614,043
California	388,022	11,603,940,000	129,109,300	104,947,785	24,161,515	77,771,569	51,337,731	115,843,320	13,265,980	121,228,468	7,880,832
Colorado	39,022	462,971,000	8,043,400	3,986,872	4,056,528	2,949,193	5,094,207	4,400,384	3,643,016	4,603,238	3,440,162
Connecticut	10,482	1,060,945,000	28,244,200	13,917,612	14,326,588	10,328,621	17,915,579	15,567,646	12,674,554	16,081,965	12,162,235
Delaware	1,767	250,235,000	3,126,600	1,698,369	1,428,231	1,258,613	1,867,987	1,871,272	1,252,328	1,962,223	1,164,377
District of Columbia [1]											
Florida	5,704	860,592,000	13,251,600	5,964,280	7,287,320	4,421,794	8,829,806	6,581,274	6,670,326	6,889,772	6,361,828
Georgia	2,461	1,805,392,000	17,405,900	10,586,094	6,819,806	7,850,932	9,554,968	11,700,420	5,705,480	12,240,700	5,165,200
Idaho	7,274	982,384,000	4,139,860	2,951,470	1,188,390	2,188,505	1,951,295	3,290,672	879,128	3,409,249	730,551
Illinois	121,027	9,374,008,000	116,863,600	58,719,285	58,144,315	43,415,996	73,447,604	64,840,600	52,023,000	67,787,900	49,075,700
Indiana	102,092	3,930,517,000	51,937,100	27,658,064	24,279,036	20,504,248	31,432,852	30,529,667	21,407,433	31,990,657	19,946,443
Iowa	59,482	1,254,566,000	17,996,100	10,002,412	7,993,688	7,401,436	10,594,664	11,049,785	6,946,315	11,556,015	6,440,085
Kansas	39,052	1,178,263,000	16,008,000	8,866,351	7,141,649	6,568,242	9,439,758	9,782,489	6,225,511	10,232,794	5,775,206
Kentucky	34,428	1,678,385,000	20,194,900	11,204,939	8,989,961	8,305,759	11,889,141	12,380,282	7,814,618	12,948,364	7,246,536
Louisiana	13,329	1,583,592,000	13,347,500	7,599,934	5,747,566	5,631,978	7,715,522	8,386,705	4,957,795	8,778,117	4,569,383
Maine	7,933	603,418,000	7,752,300	4,256,168	3,496,132	3,150,768	4,601,532	4,699,832	3,052,468	4,917,904	2,834,396
Maryland and District of Columbia	34,105	3,218,209,000	35,200,900	19,009,546	16,191,254	14,077,291	21,123,609	20,980,909	14,219,991	21,970,537	13,230,263
Massachusetts	12,146	3,287,201,000	56,951,100	27,560,041	29,385,059	20,439,750	36,511,350	30,438,654	26,512,446	31,819,719	25,131,381
Michigan	27,702	5,303,472,000	66,516,000	30,970,602	37,545,398	22,928,879	43,587,121	34,160,707	32,355,293	35,755,760	32,760,240
Minnesota	36,074	1,374,117,000	21,420,000	11,469,125	9,950,875	8,497,957	12,922,043	12,653,437	8,766,563	13,258,981	8,161,019
Mississippi	31,540	490,424,000	7,084,300	3,889,423	3,194,877	2,879,272	4,205,028	4,287,985	2,796,315	4,494,138	2,590,162
Missouri	81,639	2,346,719,000	28,684,400	16,666,497	12,017,903	12,353,798	16,330,602	18,419,401	10,264,999	19,281,940	9,402,460
Montana	2,469	1,487,655,000	7,912,000	5,748,305	2,163,695	4,250,425	3,661,575	6,346,927	1,565,073	6,646,238	1,265,762
Nebraska	14,393	436,219,000	6,241,400	3,699,090	2,542,310	2,742,533	3,498,867	4,086,557	2,154,843	4,274,235	1,967,165
Nevada	1,880	159,585,000	1,466,600	1,078,333	388,267	799,502	667,098	1,190,718	275,882	1,246,200	220,400

[1] Included in Maryland data.

TABLE 4.—*Industrial and other electric services, 1947*—Continued

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
				Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
New Hampshire	3,327	349,078,000	$5,777,000	$3,093,237	$2,683,763	$2,291,909	$3,485,091	$3,418,251	$2,358,749	$3,575,154	$2,201,846
New Jersey	8,861	3,763,858,000	57,514,600	31,576,666	25,937,934	23,375,658	34,138,942	34,512,437	23,002,163	35,488,112	21,026,488
New Mexico	5,150	170,003,000	2,598,800	1,257,897	1,340,903	622,709	1,976,091	1,388,981	1,209,819	1,452,002	1,146,798
New York	21,752	11,668,878,000	102,690,100	49,904,368	52,785,732	36,955,686	65,735,014	55,083,996	47,606,104	57,574,232	45,115,864
North Carolina	43,202	2,935,714,000	26,751,300	12,974,381	13,776,919	9,261,835	17,489,465	17,218,631	9,532,669	20,214,085	6,537,215
North Dakota	1,364	39,360,000	970,300	337,888	632,412	466,762	503,538	527,067	443,233		
Ohio	116,329	10,864,484,000	119,120,200	64,937,185	54,183,015	48,067,383	71,052,817	71,038,888	47,481,312	74,988,760	44,130,460
Oklahoma	35,790	1,020,282,000	13,484,200	7,651,609	5,832,591	5,676,579	7,807,621	11,717,581	1,766,619	12,264,401	1,157,799
Oregon	14,559	2,426,518,000	13,422,200	10,610,920	2,811,280	7,863,709	5,558,491	8,449,499	4,972,701	8,514,633	4,907,567
Pennsylvania	61,588	14,295,322,000	156,741,900	93,352,341	63,389,559	69,178,038	87,563,862	103,082,878	53,659,022	107,948,147	48,793,753
Rhode Island	2,085	631,650,000	11,232,900	5,328,101	5,904,799	3,944,321	7,288,579	5,883,793	5,349,107	6,156,191	5,076,709
South Carolina	20,501	1,413,492,000	12,188,000	7,991,915	4,196,085	5,923,002	6,264,998	8,331,303	3,856,697	9,233,263	2,954,737
South Dakota	4,353	88,361,000	1,834,800	804,450	1,030,350	590,218	1,238,582	886,098	946,702	929,033	905,767
Tennessee	6,280	5,908,623,000	27,912,600	21,308,200	6,604,400	15,784,555	12,127,745	23,528,368	4,384,232	24,611,376	3,301,224
Texas	131,495	4,167,490,000	47,485,400	27,314,077	20,171,323	20,266,769	27,218,631	30,169,849	17,315,551	31,597,734	15,887,666
Utah	2,048	497,980,000	5,311,100	3,353,800	1,957,300	2,483,152	2,827,948	3,704,121	1,606,979	3,874,129	1,436,971
Vermont	7,688	212,530,000	3,448,200	2,043,645	1,404,555	1,515,174	1,933,026	2,254,364	1,193,836	2,361,396	1,086,804
Virginia	28,434	6,213,951,000	29,194,600	21,892,084	7,332,516	16,196,322	12,998,278	21,399,287	11,368,813	22,294,039	10,473,461
Washington	26,779	2,079,251,000	30,768,100	13,012,445	17,755,655	13,189,261	26,067,620	19,399,257	21,587,754	18,950,346	22,576,803	17,967,207
West Virginia	110,374	2,715,747,000	40,338,100	19,543,013	20,795,087	14,470,480	25,867,620	21,582,084	18,755,916	22,570,803	17,767,197
Wisconsin	2,122	53,349,000	1,040,900	513,923	526,977	380,646	660,254	567,436	473,464	593,688	447,212
Wyoming											
United States total	1,849,086	135,031,188,000	1,454,931,400	838,744,629	616,186,771	621,320,890	833,610,510	925,924,002	529,007,398	968,995,468	485,935,932

Let me remind you that in 1921 there was only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity produced and sold in this country for all purposes, including residential, commercial, and industrial, as well as for street lighting and transportation purposes.

You will note from table 1 that last year there were 217,581,497,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity sold in this country for residential, commercial, and industrial consumption alone. There were probably thirty or forty billion kilowatt-hours used for street lighting and transportation purposes.

Just the other day I called attention to the fact that the engineers of the Federal Power Commission, together with the Army engineers, have made an investigation and found that there are 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power going to waste every year in our navigable streams and their tributaries.

If that power were all harnessed and firmed up to the peak of the average year, there would be an additional supply of 510,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, which added to our present production would light every home, including every farm home, operate every industry, and every commercial enterprise, and heat every house in America.

It would make this the richest and the most powerful Nation the world has ever known.

Then, America could go on her glorious march of progress throughout the unfolding centuries as Henry W. Grady once said, holding high the torch and "making light the way up which all other nations of the earth must come in God's appointed time."

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain statistics.)

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. May I say to the Members of this House in reply to the statement made by my good friend from New York [Mr. TABER] in which he states that the people of the Tennessee Valley area are getting electricity at less than they ought to pay for it, that he is utterly wrong. Those dams were built for a triple purpose, for flood control, for navigation, and to translate the energy of the falling water into electric energy.

This country has spent billions of dollars elsewhere for flood control and for navigation, and this is the first time any money was ever spent in the valley of the Tennessee River and its tributaries for flood control or for navigation.

When Mr. TABER stated that he had read in the paper where people from Tennessee cities were borrowing or seeking to borrow money in New York with which to build steam plants, he was repeating a falsehood that was put in circulation by the $55,000-per-year lobbyist Purcell Smith who trailed his slimy length across the threshold of this Capitol in his effort to retard and, if possible, destroy the future growth and development of the State of Tennessee and all the other parts of the 80,000 square miles of territory and the property of the 5,000,000 people who live in the area. The people of my congressional district, who number 460,000 souls, have no other source from which to purchase electric power than the Tennessee Valley Authority, and unless this steam plant is authorized and this $4,000,000 appropriated to begin its construction, thousands of citizens of the Second Congressional District of Tennessee will be deprived of the benefits of electricity in their homes, on their farms, and in their businesses. The defeat of this project will be a deadly blow to the growth, development, and prosperity of 5,000,000 American citizens. It will be a victory for the corrupt, ruthless private power lobby that has haunted this Capitol since the day the proposal to build this steam plant came before the Congress.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we are, in a short time, to cast one of the significant votes in this session of the Congress. Mr. Speaker, the matter involved is not a local issue. I do not live in the Tennessee Valley. I live in the great Southwest. I believe in free enterprise, private business, and in fair opportunity for individual effort. But I am among those throughout the Nation who believe that this issue today must be resolved in favor of this steam plant. America must be strong within. People who, like most of you, are so interested in the aviation program and who realize that one of the vital issues before the world today is atomic energy can hardly be other than in favor of the motion made by the gentleman from Tennessee. Yes, the vote on the issue today is a significant one, particularly in view of the tense world situation and the demands of the future. It was no accident that the Senate, in voting on this issue, approved this plant in the Tennessee Valley by a vote of 47 to 37. If we should retard that development where we now have this atomic-energy plant by refusing to provide this steam plant, we would be playing havoc with the long-range aluminum and aviation program which has been adopted by the Congress. I am thinking of the 70-group Air Force program which we have put through Congress at this session.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that on a basis of broad policy it is the duty of the Congress to approve the pending motion. The vote today is going to be one that Members will look back to and say, "Yes, upon that occasion I did all I could to promote the aviation program and the cause of national defense."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Has this not been voted on twice in the other body?

Mr. MAHON. It has, and it has been voted on favorably. This is not a local issue, as I said. This vote today will be looked back upon by Members as a vote in favor of a real program of development of our own country. We have done enough—we have certainly done much to build up our friends abroad. But this Nation, if it is to be strong, must be

TABLE 4.—*Industrial and other electric services, 1947*

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
				Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	79,037	4,406,172,000	$29,215,200	$18,165,135	$11,050,065	$13,432,565	$15,782,635	$20,035,492	$9,179,708	$20,970,671	$8,244,529
Arizona	1,227	507,464,000	5,460,900	2,637,942	2,822,958	1,954,620	3,506,280	2,913,390	2,547,510	3,051,114	2,409,786
Arkansas	60,457	646,415,000	9,574,000	6,283,024	3,290,976	4,654,801	5,219,199	6,934,313	2,939,687	7,259,957	2,614,043
California	388,022	11,603,940,000	129,109,300	104,947,785	24,161,515	77,771,569	51,337,731	115,843,320	13,265,980	121,228,468	7,880,832
Colorado	39,022	462,971,000	8,043,400	3,986,872	4,056,528	2,949,193	5,094,207	4,400,384	3,643,016	4,603,238	3,440,162
Connecticut	10,482	1,060,945,000	28,244,200	13,917,612	14,326,588	10,328,621	17,915,579	15,567,646	12,674,554	16,081,965	12,162,235
Delaware	1,767	250,235,000	3,126,600	1,698,369	1,428,231	1,258,613	1,867,987	1,871,272	1,252,328	1,962,223	1,164,377
District of Columbia [1]											
Florida	5,704	860,592,000	13,251,600	5,964,280	7,287,320	4,421,794	8,829,806	6,581,274	6,670,326	6,889,772	6,361,828
Georgia	2,461	1,805,392,000	17,405,900	10,586,094	6,819,806	7,850,932	9,554,968	11,700,420	5,705,480	12,240,700	5,165,200
Idaho	7,274	982,384,000	4,139,860	2,951,470	1,188,390	2,188,505	1,951,295	3,290,672	879,128	3,409,249	730,551
Illinois	121,027	9,374,008,000	116,863,600	58,719,285	58,144,315	43,415,996	73,447,604	64,840,600	52,023,000	67,787,900	49,075,700
Indiana	102,092	3,930,517,000	51,937,100	27,658,064	24,279,036	20,504,248	31,432,852	30,529,667	21,407,433	31,990,657	19,946,443
Iowa	59,482	1,254,566,000	17,996,100	10,002,412	7,993,688	7,401,436	10,594,664	11,049,785	6,946,315	11,556,015	6,440,085
Kansas	39,052	1,178,263,000	16,008,000	8,866,351	7,141,649	6,568,242	9,439,758	9,782,489	6,225,511	10,232,794	5,775,206
Kentucky	34,428	1,678,385,000	20,194,900	11,204,939	8,989,961	8,305,759	11,889,141	12,380,282	7,814,618	12,948,364	7,246,536
Louisiana	13,329	1,583,592,000	13,347,500	7,599,934	5,747,566	5,631,978	7,715,522	8,386,705	4,957,795	8,778,117	4,569,383
Maine	7,933	603,418,000	7,752,300	4,256,168	3,496,132	3,150,768	4,601,532	4,699,832	3,052,468	4,917,904	2,834,396
Maryland and District of Columbia	34,105	3,218,209,000	35,200,900	19,009,546	16,191,254	14,077,291	21,123,609	20,980,909	14,219,991	21,970,537	13,230,263
Massachusetts	12,146	3,287,201,000	56,951,100	27,560,041	29,385,059	20,439,750	36,511,350	30,438,654	26,512,446	31,819,719	25,131,381
Michigan	27,702	5,303,472,000	66,516,000	30,970,602	37,545,398	22,928,879	43,587,121	34,160,707	32,355,293	35,755,760	32,760,240
Minnesota	36,074	1,374,117,000	21,420,000	11,469,125	9,950,875	8,497,957	12,922,043	12,653,437	8,766,563	13,258,981	8,161,019
Mississippi	31,540	490,424,000	7,084,300	3,889,423	3,194,877	2,879,272	4,205,028	4,287,985	2,796,315	4,494,138	2,590,162
Missouri	81,639	2,346,719,000	28,684,400	16,666,497	12,017,903	12,353,798	16,330,602	18,419,401	10,264,999	19,281,940	9,402,460
Montana	2,469	1,487,655,000	7,912,000	5,748,305	2,163,695	4,250,425	3,661,575	6,346,927	1,565,073	6,646,238	1,265,762
Nebraska	14,393	436,219,000	6,241,400	3,699,090	2,542,310	2,742,533	3,498,867	4,086,557	2,154,843	4,274,235	1,967,165
Nevada	1,880	159,585,000	1,466,600	1,078,333	388,267	799,502	667,098	1,190,718	275,882	1,246,200	220,400

[1] Included in Maryland data.

strong from within. We must be sure to develop our own resources in the interest of the peace and happiness of our people.

Our atomic energy plants in Tennessee represent an investment of huge magnitude. This investment should be made to yield the maximum in the interest of peace, national defense, and the promotion of our own domestic welfare.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, this question has, as you know, been before the House before, and as we all know, the House voted down the provision for this steam plant in the TVA.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, do you not know that in 1941 they built one that cost $40,000?

Mr. JENSEN. When you talk about firming up power in the TVA, is it not more important to firm up the United States Treasury and keep it firmed up? I ask you in all sincerity, my colleagues on both sides of the middle path of this House of Representatives of the United States of America.

I made a short talk on the radio not long ago in cooperation with my good friend, Congressman KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. I shall read a part of that speech, but before I do that I would like to say that I have just received a letter from the Iowa Development Commission as did the other Iowa Congressmen, and I wish to read one paragraph from that letter which is signed by Mr. Rodney Selby, director:

> The commission feels that the use of Federal taxes collected from Iowa citizens and industries should not be used in the promotion of this TVA expansion which will compete with the growth of Iowa, and do so on an unfair and subsidized basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been said that we were short of aluminum cable for transmission lines because of the shortage of aluminum. The fact of the matter is, I have information from Alcoa to the effect that the bottleneck was not aluminum but it was the steel core which goes into the cable.

I humbly request your attention while I read the remarks which I recently made over a national network and which I am sure a great majority of the deep-thinking people of America will endorse.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman explain that this propaganda that was put out about a shortage of aluminum was purely and wholly a lie?

Mr. JENSEN. They said it was mainly a shortage of the steel core, and not a shortage of aluminum.

I will now read the radio talk that I referred to:

> I am glad to take part in this broadcast with my good friend and colleague, ESTES KEFAUVER.
>
> A primary function of the Federal Government is to defend the Nation and to break the will of any enemy to our free-enterprise system in peacetime as well as in time of aggression. That function in time of war is chiefly confined to the actions and activities of the armed forces. Nevertheless the activities of the military forces must be closely allied to the functions of the national economy.
>
> Fortunately, the lessons of World War II are too recent to have been forgotten. It will be recalled that prior to World War II the Nation underwent an era of preparation during which Federal agencies, dedicated to promotion of Government ownership, continually raised the cry of "power shortage," with the assertion that private enterprise was incapable of meeting the emergency of war.
>
> There were several gross miscalculations in their estimates, however. These were revealed when the industry was put to the actual test of war production. True, some additional capacity was added in Government-owned systems, but the main burden fell directly upon private industry. The capacity that was added to Federal systems could as well have been added to the installations of private enterprise, built with private funds and subject to taxation by the local, State, and Federal governments.
>
> As Mr. Krug, then Chairman of the War Production Board, and presently Secretary of the Interior, was free to state:
>
> "Electric power has been the lubrication for this tremendous war plant * * * this unique record of the electric utilities is an inspiring tribute to the men and women in the industry whose unfailing efforts made the record possible."
>
> He could well have added that TVA itself was "bailed out" on its war contract commitments through the facilities of private enterprise which during drought periods interchanged power from adjacent private power systems from distances of as far as a thousand miles away. He also could have added that under the direction of the United States Army, private enterprise built the steam plant which furnished most of the power at the Oak Ridge atomic plant.
>
> The pent-up buying power and consumptive capacity of the Nation following VJ-day released an enormous demand for increased electric capacity far greater than existed even during World War II. This placed a combined demand on the private companies and municipal facilities. Furthermore, additional capacity since installed is all now available for any emergency to an extent greater than dreamed of during World War II, and more is on the way.
>
> The private utilities' construction program is bigger than that of any other single industry in America because they have faith in the patriotism and good sense of the American people to properly protect private enterprise.
>
> The present emphasis on national defense must not be permitted to become a clinching argument in the hands of those who seek to nationalize, socialize, or communize America. The Administration's proposal to construct steam plants now carries with it a precedent affecting the time-tested principles of our Nation. With these proposals, the great planners no longer hide behind what Senator Norris called the "constitution peg" of navigation and flood control as a legal basis upon which to conduct electric power business. They also appear to forget the fact that our laws provide that Federal power production from multipurpose projects must be justified on need for irrigation.
>
> They now want to embark upon a program of manufacture and sale of electric energy as an end in itself. We know now what actually is in the mind of the great planners who brazenly admit they want to put the Government in direct competition with its own citizens.
>
> If the principle is established this precedent certainly will not be confined to electric power. This can only lead to Government ownership of every industry including farming, mercantile, and all, both large and small, upon which the life and productive capacity of our Nation is dependent for its very existence.
>
> The privately owned electrical industry cannot now be a "power trust," for the reason that Congress long ago took steps under the death-sentence clause—by breaking up the large holding companies in this industry—to effectively eliminate the possibility of the existence of a private power trust.
>
> But the same cannot be said of the federally dominated power trust which is entirely different than farmer-owned REA or municipally owned or PUD-owned power facilities.
>
> Acting in obvious concord and prearranged plan, the Federal power trust fostered and aided by the policies of the Federal Government for the past 15 years, has now become a very real threat to the operation of our free economy. Let us not forget in this electric age that he who controls the electric energy of America controls America.
>
> It is noteworthy that the privately owned electric companies pay annually over $650,000,000 in local, State, and Federal taxes which would have to be paid by other taxpayers if the Federal power trust has its way.
>
> I should like to quote to you the candid statement of David E. Lilienthal, former Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority and at present the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in an article appearing in October 1945:
>
> "* * * those who control energy, control people."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the time stands?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has 20 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Texas 8.

Mr. PLOESER. I have an agreement not to use 10 minutes of my time. I therefore ask the gentleman from Texas to use his time.

Mr. MAHON. I think in fairness the RECORD should show that numerous Members have requested time but that it is not possible to give it to them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], a member of the committee, the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope I may have the attention of every man on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, I do not live in the Tennessee Valley. My home section is served by the Mississippi Power & Light Co., though a large part of my State is served by the TVA. However, I have been privileged to sit on this committee and to hear the testimony with regard to this proposed steam plant. I say to the Members on the left side of the aisle, who have been led to believe that this steam plant is a proposal to take away business from the private utilities, such is not the case. This power to be generated by this steam plant is for the purpose of firming up additional water power that is provided in this bill.

This is not a question of public power against private power. That question was decided when this region was made to depend on the TVA for power.

Insofar as the Tennessee Valley is concerned it was determined by this Congress a number of years ago that the TVA would be the sole utility serving a big area in seven States. That is the only utility to which those people can look for current, that is the only source of supply; and here today is an amendment to provide that they have a steam plant to fill in during the dry summer months so that the hydro power will be dependable on a year-round basis, and not left as dump power, largely usable only by industry.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry, I do not have time to yield.

This Congress decided that the TVA was the only source of supply they would have.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I refuse to yield. I have only a few minutes. I wish I could.

This Congress decided that question for them, having decided that question we should see to it that the TVA is permitted to meet the needs of the area as the private utilities meet the needs in their areas. Having set the TVA system up, it belongs to the United States, the dams, the distribution system, everything. Last year we provided that the TVA repay over a period of 40 years, the Federal Government the money we have invested.

When this is done, and it will be done, the TVA system will still belong to the United States.

Owning this system, we have placed numerous war plants in the region. These take hundreds of thousands of kilowatt-hours of electricity that is not available for use by domestic users in the region. The atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge there for the defense of this Nation takes annually more than 225,000 kilowatt-hours and the record shows that in the future they are going to need 50,000 more kilowatt-hours of electricity.

This is not a new venture. The TVA today operates five steam plants. The Congress transferred one, authorized the purchase of others, and we built another.

These steam plants produce about a billion kilowatt-hours of electricity as a result of these steam plants' production. The TVA has been able to supply three or four million dollars of extra kilowatt-hours of hydro, firm dependable power that they could not sell and could not deliver to the people of this Nation in the absence of those steam plants. The record shows last year three or four million kilowatt-hours were made available to this country that is starving for electric current. Today millions of people beg for electricity. According to the Federal Power Commission there is only two-tenths of 1 percent margin of safety between the electricity used in this country today and our total capacity to produce.

The addition of this steam plant manufacturing 200,000 kilowatt-hours will make dependable 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity needed by the municipalities and REA co-ops in the region and elsewhere.

Oh, this Congress has appropriated this year and for next year $800,000,000 for the REA. We thought we were doing a whole lot for the American farmer. But as stated today there is only two-tenths of 1 percent margin of safety between the amount of electricity that we are consuming and the maximum that we can produce? We do not have the needed electricity in this Nation. Did you know that the TVA is interconnected with the private utilities, that any firm power, manufactured by the TVA, and not needed by them, goes to the private companies and helps to serve their areas too; that during the war the TVA is all that saved us.

Under the terms of this bill a number of new hydro units are provided.

For about 7 months of the year those hydro units can produce electricity. It is said you do not want to move industry from other areas to the Tennessee Valley, and I can appreciate that feeling. The TVA has made no effort to do that and the record shows industry has grown throughout the South. I believe this is wholesome for the area and the Nation. You are providing this current from hydroelectric facilities for 7 months of the year and the folks cannot get it the rest of the time unless it is firmed up. What REA cooperative could take electricity for only 7 months? How could they provide this extra energy for the people who want it in their homes, for the municipalities, unless it is firmed up and made available on a year-round basis. I would like to see it go to the homes, to the people, to the communities. I would like to see it firmed up so it will be dependable, otherwise industry is bound to be the only taker, directly or through the private utilities who would buy the hydroelectricity at dump rates.

This Congress only yesterday considered the drafting of the youth of this land to be put in the Army for the defense of this Nation. I say to you when you are willing to do that, and I know there is not a man who did not regret casting that vote, it is just as important to provide for the future national defense of this country by having power necessary for the operation of war plants in time of need. I do not come from the Tennessee Valley. I am served by a public utility. As I stated, it is just as important to provide for the future national defense of this country in this bill as it was in the other bill.

They may say that this is just starting a plant and it is not supposed to be in being until 1951. But let me tell you that the Watts Bar Dam built in 1940 and 1941 under the exigencies of the situation was completed in 18 months. We are starting that which we can call on in time of need.

Did you know that in the Tennessee Valley 51 percent of all the aluminum that was used in the last war was produced by reason of TVA electricity? That there is no other area that is able to provide that? Did you know that you just passed a bill providing for a 70-group air force and that air force will not be built unless you can get the aluminum? That the TVA is the source of power to which we must look?

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that in 1941 this Congress appropriated virtually $40,000,000 for construction of the Watts Bar steam plant?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is true. The Congress did that and it was a life saver during the recent war. I hope we will not have any war in the future. I hope you will see that this is just as much in the interest of the national defense as were these acts you have passed in the last few days.

The Senate has just approved this plant for the second time. The vote was by a considerable majority. A few days ago this House of Representatives provided under the Marshall plan more than $5,000,000,000 in foreign aid in an effort to provide for the national security. I believe that this Congress having provided that the people of a great part of 7 States must look to the TVA and the TVA alone for their electricity that we are obligated to make additions to the TVA system to meet the needs of the region. We cannot justify doing otherwise. We owe it to the Nation to make available the extra billion kilowatt-hours the steam plant would make firm, but above all else in this time of emergency, we should provide the maximum amount of electricity available for the very security of the Nation in time of war, badly needed by the people in time of peace. I plead with you to support this amendment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe this matter now before the House is of paramount importance to every Member of the House from every part of the country. We are changing the entire philosophy of the Tennessee Valley Authority. That Authority was originally authorized to build dams for flood control and navigation. Now they come in here and for the first time in this bill ask us to authorize a project, the initial cost of which will be $4,000,000, for the benefit of a group of industries and which it is estimated will cost ultimately $80,000,000.

We would like to have these power plants in our part of the country. In the daily papers we read that the private industries in the New England area and in the other great industrial areas of the country are building their own power plants at their own expense. Why then should we authorize power plants to be built in the Tennessee Valley area with public money in order that low-cost electricity may be provided for competing industries to those industries in our part of the country? I hope the pending proposition will be defeated.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is highly important that all of the Members of the House understand at this point the parliamentary situation. The situation is that the Committee on Appropriations did not allow any money and felt that it would be subject to a point of order if they authorized by any language the building of a steam-power plant at New Johnsonville in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority. When the bill came to the floor of this House there was an attempt made to amend it. The language was not offered because it was clear to both sides that such language probably could not withstand a point of order. The request here for $4,000,000

to begin construction would result ultimately in the establishment of an $84,000,000 project. The House denied that amendment by a vote of 192 to 152. The amendment was included, I should say, in a motion to recommit; and a roll call was had. The Senate restored this amount and sought to put in the language. The conference became deadlocked because the House refused to yield.

Now we are back to the House in disagreement. I have offered a motion to insist upon the House position, because I have confidence and reason to think that if this House maintains its position, which I believe to be right, that that will be the ultimate position of the Congress when the bill becomes law. There has been a preferential motion made to recede from the House position and concur in the Senate amendment. So, those who believe in the House position have the duty and the obligation to vote "no" on the motion before the House at the present time. "No" means no money for an unauthorized steam plant at New Johnsonville; "yes" means an attempt to authorize that which has not heretofore been authorized in the TVA Act.

This committee has been most liberal with TVA. We have given them $29,000,000 for the acquisition and installation of hydroelectric generators—11 in all. We have given them $15,000,000 for the completion of two dams. There has never been an attempt on the part of this committee, and I have been a member of it since its inception, to forestall in any way that part of the development of the Tennessee Valley which is legally authorized. Now the attempt is to reach out and go into the full utility business, even though it is clearly stated in the law and clearly admitted by even the advocates of the Tennessee Valley Authority that there was never any intent on the part of the organic act that hydroelectric power be anything but a surplus commodity, the original intent of the act being navigation and flood control.

As to the argument that this is a national defense project the Atomic Energy Commission refused me as chairman of this committee the very information which they gave to the former chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, and which he made public. I had to visit the Tennessee Valley Authority and Oak Ridge where the management of Oak Ridge very freely gave me the information in the presence of numerous people, even including one newspaper reporter, and said there was no secret about it.

Oddly enough, that information was available from the former head of the TVA, who in testimony in years past admitted that they had no authority to build a steam plant. Oddly enough, that testimony was readily available when they thought they had a chance to put it over in the other body. But to an official Appropriations Committee of this House it was a secret matter and could not be made available.

They did make available to me certain figures as regards the uses of power from TVA, but they were made to me as totally restricted. I have them in my possession and they have never been released, so I cannot give them to you, but I can tell you that TVA bought power from Oak Ridge. I yield to the vice chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee for a statement he might wish to make on this subject.

Mr. COLE of New York. I think it is most unfortunate that the proponents of this steam plant for TVA have seen fit to justify it upon the needs of the Atomic Energy Commission in its operations at Oak Ridge. Oak Ridge was selected by the Manhattan District for the purpose of obtaining cheap power from TVA, that is true, but in order to make sure that the Commission's activities at Oak Ridge would not be completely dependent upon TVA power during slack periods, it has constructed and is operating a steam-generating plant, and, as the gentleman said, in times past has sold its surplus power back to TVA. So the answer is that if the Atomic Energy Commission needs additional power, and there is some indication that it does, the way to get it is not to rely on TVA, but simply to expand its presently operated steam-generating plant at Oak Ridge, which I understand can be done by the installation of one additional boiler.

Mr. PLOESER. That is correct. I thank the gentleman from New York. Let me say the chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, a Senator, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] voted against this plant.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As one Member of the Congress of the United States who has felt that some curtailment of Federal spending is absolutely essential in the interest of the country, I want to say to the gentleman and the members of his Committee on Appropriations who have fought for economy and who have fought for integrity in the affairs coming before them that they have my compliments and my commendation. I know it is not an easy job to do some of the things you gentlemen on the committee have been called on to do, but you have done them and dealt with them as best you could. I am glad to have observed as we have gone along through this Congress the willingness of the Members to stand with the committee.

Mr. PLOESER. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Let me read one more thing in connection with national defense, but let me preface it by saying that when Mr. Clapp was before the committee at no point did he attempt to make any pretense of the argument of national defense. I want to quote the hearings, because this particular quotation is vitally important.

This is what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], for whom I have the highest regard and who is a very able member of this committee, said during the hearing:

> It seems to me that it is very fundamental. It goes beyond the questions which have, I think, only been scratched. It goes to the very basic purposes of the TVA Act. That was my purpose. I specifically reemphasize and purposely so the fact that on yesterday Mr. Clapp stated categorically and repeatedly that this program was not related to the national defense and that he in no way was attempting to justify on that basis.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal said about lobbying. Personally I am one of those fellows who do not care whether lobbyists are here or not. I do not pay any attention to them. There are more lobbyists per square foot in this town from the bureaus than you can find in the balance of the world from any place else. I just want to let you see how lobbying does go on for cheap power.

I hold in my hand an enlargement of a circular. It says:

> Be sure and write your Senator from Tennessee to see that he votes right on this steam plant.

That is lobbying for cheap power. I just show that to you. These people have a right to do that. They have a perfect right to do it. I do not blame them. All I say, and the only purpose for calling that to your attention is that it is cheap power because the balance of the United States of America is subsidizing it. Why delude ourselves?

It has been said that they need this to firm up power. I doubt that argument. I could deny the argument, but let us concede it for the sake of controversy. Why cannot these various communities put in their own steam plants? The reason is very simple—because the TVA has negotiated and completed with them monopoly contracts that prohibit them from purchasing power from any other source or developing it themselves. Talk about monopolies? Is a monopoly any less damnable because it is operated by government? In my conception of free enterprise, you can be equally as oppressive so far as the progress of a nation is concerned by the deadening monopoly hand of government as you can by any other monopoly.

I have before me an article from the New York Herald Tribune which announces on its financial page that—

> The four cities of Memphis, Chattanooga, Nashville, and Knoxville have been reported in financial and utility circles as drawing plans for the possible construction of a steam generating plant in the event that the Senate should not grant the authority to TVA.

I compliment those cities for doing that. That is the way we do it in good old Missouri—we do it ourselves. When I was in the Tennessee Valley I was asked by a newspaperman, "Well, what are we going to do if we want to bring more industry into Tennessee?" I said, "Do it as we do it in Missouri." He said, "How is that?" "Well," I said, "we get the lead out of your energy and go out and build it yourselves."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And we pay for it.

Mr. PLOESER. Yes; and we pay for it ourselves.

Now, I have no objection to the development of hydroelectric power, but I do have a very definite objection to the creation of a corporate state which like an octopus keeps reaching, and reaching, and reaching socialistically until it engulfs and monopolizes and controls everything within its vicious, oppressive grasp.

I do not mind telling you that I think, if we allow these things to go on until they expand and cover the entire 48 States, you will have by that time completely crushed freedom in America, because you will have crushed free enterprise.

I ask this House again to stand by its conferees and vote down this motion to recede and concur, and vote for the motion to stand firm in the conference for the elimination of this item from the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, after thorough study and deliberation the Senate has passed favorably upon the TVA request for funds with which to commence construction of a steam powered electric generating plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. Much detailed discussion of great length and complexity has been heard on this subject but the basic question is clear and simple. Is the TVA to be allowed to continue its vitally important development? There is no question but that this great project which has met its many obligations, has served the people and has stimulated private industry to a higher peak of development than this area has ever before known. TVA must be allowed to continue.

I submit that the continued development of TVA is linked directly with our national preparedness and our Nation's industrial strength which is the main artery of our military strength.

I wish to make three fundamental points concerning the need for the New Johnsonville steam plant.

First. I submit that TVA power is the only source of supply in this area and failure to allow the construction of this much needed new source with which to firm up power during the summer months will adversely affect the 5,000,000 people and hundreds of industries in the Valley.

Second. I submit that the entire Nation is faced with a power shortage and that to deny the right of expansion of power anywhere in the Nation at this time would be an ill-conceived move. Demand for power in the Tennessee Valley has increased 60 percent since the war and those who distribute TVA power expect a 60-percent increase on top of that.

Third. I submit that in the face of the billions we are spending to rehabilitate foreign countries and reestablish their economies we must not overlook the reasonable needs of the people of our own country.

The full weight of the validity of the claim we make as to the serious need for this new steam plant as wholly necessary to TVA in carrying on its power supply and over-all development of the resources of this region has been underscored by the approval given this appropriation in the Senate. I sincerely hope that my colleagues in the House will review the facts and carefully consider the voluminous evidence in favor of allowing TVA to construct the New Johnsonville steam plant. This matter is of deep concern to the millions of people who live in this area. They are anxiously awaiting the answer of the House.

The territory served by the TVA is fixed by contract. We are not asking this appropriation for the purpose of competing with any utility in any other section. It is for the service of the people in the Tennessee Valley. Remember that Congress has decreed that the people of the Tennessee Valley must rely upon the TVA for power. It is the sole supplier. In good faith Congress should allow this further development. It is not fair to any section to put an economic lid on their further progress. The TVA is only asking for authority to do for the people of the Tennessee Valley the very things that private power companies are seeking to do for people in other sections—that is to increase their electric supply.

We are operating on a dangerous margin of available electric energy. These different plants, such as the atomic energy plant and the aluminum plants have been located in the Tennessee Valley recently. They cannot be moved. If we are to carry out our program of preparedness we cannot in good faith deny available electricity for these plants.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that the taxpayers of the rest of the Nation will pay for this investment. This is not true. Under the law the TVA investment will be amortized in 40 years. It will be paid for by the users of electricity in the Tennessee Valley and our vital defense plants will have electric power available.

I have served here for 9 years. I have made many pleas to my colleagues but I have never been more concerned or more vitally interested in a project than I am in this one. I urge you to consider it on the basis of its merits. I wish to make a personal plea to my colleagues to not put an economic ceiling on the development of the great Tennessee Valley region. I urge you personally to vote for the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the vote in order to stand by the conferees of the House?

The SPEAKER. The vote will come on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GORE) there were—ayes 143, noes 157.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 186, nays 201, answered "present" 1, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—186

Abbitt	Anderson, Calif.	Battle
Abernethy	Andrews, Ala.	Beckworth
Albert	Angell	Bland
Allen, Calif.	Barden	Blatnik
Andersen, H. Carl	Barrett	Bloom
	Bates, Ky.	Boggs, La.
Bonner	Gregory	Norton
Boykin	Hardy	O'Brien
Brown, Ga.	Harless, Ariz.	O'Konski
Bryson	Hart	O'Toole
Buchanan	Havenner	Pace
Buckley	Hill	Patman
Bulwinkle	Hinshaw	Peterson
Burleson	Hobbs	Pfeifer
Byrne, N. Y.	Holifield	Philbin
Camp	Horan	Phillips, Tenn.
Cannon	Huber	Pickett
Carroll	Hull	Poage
Celler	Isacson	Poulson
Chapman	Jackson, Wash.	Powell
Chelf	Jarman	Preston
Cole, Mo.	Javits	Price, Fla.
Colmer	Jennings	Price, Ill.
Combs	Johnson, Calif.	Priest
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Cooper	Karsten, Mo.	Rankin
Courtney	Kee	Rayburn
Cox	Kefauver	Redden
Cravens	Kelley	Richards
Crosser	Kennedy	Riley
Curtis	Keogh	Rockwell
Davis, Ga.	Kerr	Rogers, Fla.
Davis, Tenn.	Kilday	Rooney
Deane	Kirwan	Sabath
Delaney	Klein	Sadowski
Dingell	Lanham	Sasscer
Donohue	Lea	Sheppard
Dorn	Lesinski	Sikes
Doughton	Lucas	Smathers
Douglas	Lusk	Smith, Va.
Eberharter	Lyle	Somers
Elliott	McCormack	Spence
Ellsworth	McDonough	Stefan
Engle, Calif.	McMillan, S. C.	Stockman
Evins	Mack	Stratton
Fallon	Madden	Teague
Feighan	Mahon	Thomas, Tex.
Fernandez	Manasco	Tollefson
Fisher	Mansfield	Trimble
Flannagan	Marcantonio	Vinson
Fogarty	Meade, Ky.	Welch
Folger	Meade, Md.	West
Forand	Miller, Calif.	Wheeler
Garmatz	Miller, Nebr.	Whitaker
Gary	Mills	Whitten
Gathings	Monroney	Whittington
Gearhart	Morgan	Williams
Gordon	Morris	Wilson, Tex.
Gore	Morrison	Winstead
Gorski	Morton	Wood
Gossett	Multer	Worley
Granger	Murdock	
Grant, Ala.	Murray, Tenn.	

NAYS—201

Allen, Ill.	Dague	Jackson, Calif.
Allen, La.	Davis, Wis.	Jenison
Andresen, August H.	Dawson, Utah	Jenkins, Ohio
Andrews, N. Y.	Devitt	Jenkins, Pa.
Arends	D'Ewart	Jensen
Arnold	Dirksen	Johnson, Ill.
Auchincloss	Dolliver	Johnson, Ind.
Bakewell	Domengeaux	Jones, N. C.
Bates, Mass.	Dondero	Jones, Wash.
Beall	Ellis	Jonkman
Bell	Elsaesser	Judd
Bender	Elston	Kean
Bennett, Mich.	Engel, Mich.	Kearney
Bishop	Fenton	Kearns
Blackney	Foote	Keating
Bolton	Fuller	Keefe
Bradley	Fulton	Kersten, Wis.
Brambiett	Gamble	Kilburn
Brehm	Gavin	Kunkel
Brooks	Gillette	Landis
Brophy	Gillie	Latham
Buck	Goff	LeCompte
Buffett	Goodwin	LeFevre
Burke	Graham	Lewis, Ohio
Busbey	Grant, Ind.	Lichtenwalter
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffiths	Lodge
Canfield	Gross	Love
Carson	Gwinn, N. Y.	McConnell
Case, N. J.	Gwynne, Iowa	McCowen
Chadwick	Hagen	McCulloch
Chenoweth	Hale	McDowell
Chiperfield	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGarvey
Church	Halleck	McGregor
Clark	Hand	McMahon
Clason	Harness, Ind.	McMillen, Ill.
Clevenger	Harris	MacKinnon
Clippinger	Harrison	Macy
Coffin	Harvey	Maloney
Cole, Kans.	Hébert	Martin, Iowa
Cole, N. Y.	Hedrick	Mason
Corbett	Herter	Mathews
Cotton	Heselton	Merrow
Coudert	Hess	Meyer
Crawford	Hoeven	Michener
Crow	Hoffman	Miller, Conn.
Cunningham	Hope	Miller, Md.
		Mitchell

Muhlenberg	Rogers, Mass.	Stevenson
Murray, Wis.	Rohrbough	Sundstrom
Nicholson	Roe	Taber
Nixon	Russell	Talle
Nodar	Sadlak	Taylor
Norblad	St. George	Tibbott
Norrell	Sanborn	Towe
O'Hara	Sarbacher	Twyman
Passman	Schwabe, Mo.	Vail
Patterson	Schwabe, Okla.	Van Zandt
Phillips, Calif.	Scott, Hardie	Vorys
Ploeser	Scrivner	Vursell
Potter	Seely-Brown	Walter
Potts	Shafer	Weichel
Ramey	Short	Wigglesworth
Reed, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.	Wilson, Ind.
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Kans.	Wolcott
Rees	Smith, Ohio	Wolverton
Rich	Smith, Wis.	Woodruff
Riehlman	Snyder	Youngblood
Rizley	Stanley	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wadsworth

NOT VOTING—42

Banta	Hays	Peden
Bennett, Mo.	Hefferman	Plumley
Boggs, Del.	Hendricks	Reeves
Brown, Ohio	Holmes	Regan
Butler	Johnson, Okla.	Rivers
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Dawson, Ill.	King	Scoblick
Durham	Knutson	Scott,
Eaton	Lane	Hugh D., Jr.
Fellows	Larcade	Simpson, Pa.
Fletcher	Lemke	Smith, Maine
Gallagher	Lewis, Ky.	Stigler
Hall,	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Leonard W.	Lynch	Thompson
Hartley	Mundt	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Durham for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Bennett of Missouri against.

Mr. Peden for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Lemke for, with Mr. Wadsworth against.

Mr. Hefferman for, with Mr. Banta against.

Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Scoblick against.

Mr. Stigler for, with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Johnson of Texas for, with Mr. Gallagher, against.

Mr. King for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

General pairs until further notice.

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Butler with Mr. Ludlow.

Mr. Fellows with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Mundt with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

Mr. Knutson with Mr. Regan.

Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Hendricks.

Mr. Fletcher with Mr. Larcade.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded in the negative. I have a pair with the gentleman from North Dakota, Mr. LEMKE. Had he been present he would have voted in the affirmative. I therefore withdraw my vote and ask to be recorded as present.

Mr. KEARNEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BRADLEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] to insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 7: On page 8, line 17, insert "If not otherwise required to be turned into the Treasury under the provisions of the proposed Federal charter."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLOESER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Before the period at the end thereof, insert ": *Provided further*, That section 304 (b) of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (Public Law 248, approved December 6, 1945), shall not be applicable with respect to the Panama Railroad Company until after June 30, 1949."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 13: Page 6, line 24, insert "plus accrued dividends thereon: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 of the funds of said Corporation shall be available until June 30, 1952, for the payment of such expenses as the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board or his designee or designees may find necessary for winding up the affairs and effecting the dissolution of the United States Housing Corporation and the United States Housing Corporation of Pennsylvania."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLOESER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: after "plus accrued dividends thereon" insert "which, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall be computed at a rate approximating the average interest cost incurred by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation on its total borrowings during each respective fiscal year."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Texas delegation in Congress, and in behalf of the delegation, I have asked for this time in order to take note of the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST], who has recently been in the hospital, is back on the House floor. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. Speaker, the Members have indicated by their standing and applause the high regard which Members have for MILTON WEST. Few will have an opportunity to speak but the spontaneous applause of Members on both sides of the aisle will mean more to MILTON WEST than any number of rhetorical speeches. For him I want to thank you for the tribute you have paid him.

When that great Texan, John Nance Garner, went from the speakership of the House of Representatives to the Vice Presidency, MILTON WEST was elected in his district to succeed him. MILTON WEST has served faithfully and well through the years. He has occupied a position of power and usefulness on the Ways and Means Committee, the major committee of the House. He is retiring voluntarily from Congress after the end of this term, and this may be the last day that he will be on the floor with us in an official capacity; and in behalf of my colleague from Texas and the others who love MILTON WEST I wanted to say this word of tribute and good cheer.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the distinguished Democratic leader of the House and former Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am not going to delay the proceedings, but I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying something about one of the loveliest men I have ever known, a man of sterling character, of stout heart, a great friend, and a fine American.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Of all the men with whom I have served in Congress, MILTON WEST is one of the finest fellows I have ever known in or out of Congress. He is a gentleman of the highest order and I am glad to call him a real friend and a fine Congressman.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I would just like to add my word of appraisal of MILTON WEST, a fine friend, a great man, one of the true western type. MILT WEST will be missed by his many friends in this House.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I just want to say on behalf of the Republican membership of the Ways and Means Committee that we have enjoyed the companionship of MILTON WEST and his fine character. We are sorry to see him go.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I wish to inform the House that the gentleman from Texas comes from the neighborhood of Mission, McAllen, and that area of Texas where I served in 1916. Since I became a Member of the House I have come to know MILTON WEST personally and I want to say that when he retires a real American will leave this House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I realize there are many who want to speak, many who have asked me to yield to them, but in view of the limitation of the time I will not be able to. Yet, I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED of New York. I think MILTON WEST comes nearer to being the typical American that will keep this country safe than any man with whom I am acquainted. I have a great affection and respect for him. I am sorry he is leaving.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, on June 19, 1948, and was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means:

RESOLUTION OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Whereas the Honorable MILTON H. WEST, of Texas, has been a Member of Congress since 1933 and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means since 1939; and

Whereas the said MILTON H. WEST has by his diligence and ability made a lasting contribution to the work accomplished by the Ways and Means Committee in the preparation and passage of important legislation; and

Whereas the said MILTON H. WEST has gained the respect, admiration, and affection of all the members of the committee for his devotion to the highest principles of public service to his country; and

Whereas the said MILTON H. WEST is resigning from Congress at the end of his present term: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means, United States House of Representatives hereby express its sorrow over the loss to us of the intelligent, farsighted, and statesmanlike services of Mr. MILTON H. WEST, and that a copy of this resolution be presented to him as a tangible token of our high esteem for him and as evidence and recognition of our appreciation for his services on our committee.

At this time I wish to add my own personal sentiments on the retirement of my friend and colleague. It was a pleasure and a privilege for me to have served on the Ways and Means Committee with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST]. His advice and his constructive thinking on the legislation which came before us was always of the greatest value and assistance to the committee. His retirement from Congress is both a personal loss to me and to the membership of the Ways and Means Committee.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] is an outstanding public servant, and I know I speak for every member of the Ways and Means Committee in wishing him continued success and happiness.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, all of us are happy to see MILTON WEST on the floor again. We regret he is retiring. No man in the House is more respected and admired more.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with his many other friends in the House who regret to see MILTON WEST retire from Congress. As a member of the Texas Legislature and during his tenure in Congress, MILT was a real public servant and a great American. We hate to see him leave.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as one of Mr. WEST's colleagues from Texas, I desire to pay tribute to him. It was my privilege to serve in the Texas Legislature after MILTON had served there. He was recognized as one of the most able members of the Texas House of Representatives. This was demonstrated by the fact the the people of the congressional district in which he lived chose him to succeed Hon. John Nance Garner when Mr. Garner was elected Vice President.

When I came to Congress 10 years ago, one of the Members of Congress who helped me most was MILTON WEST. Always he has been and is considerate of and helpful to new Members who consult him as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, on committee assignments. The people of MILTON'S district and of Texas as well as the membership of the House know about and are aware of the faithful and efficient job of work MILTON has done here. It is known well that he is competent, conscientious, courageous, and able. We are not happy that MILTON is leaving Congress. We all shall miss him and his effective and constructive work; however, as he leaves Congress voluntarily, we wish for him every success and happiness.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have ever known any Member of the House to "go WEST" without causing me profound sorrow.

This afternoon the entire membership of the House has gone "WEST" in a glorious outpouring of affectionate regard the like of which these walls have rarely, if ever, heard or witnessed.

It was genuine. Spontaneous. Heartwarming. Never to be forgotten. Such popularity must be deserved. It is. Our joy in paying these tributes is tinged with sorrow, only our sense of loss that we share with the district, State, and Nation he served so well till he voluntarily laid the burden of that service down.

He can leave us, but never our love.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words to those already spoken in praise of MILTON WEST. Before I came to Congress I had heard many times of the great stature of the man and now that I have served with him I know that his reputation, as I had known it, and his stature, is even greater and higher than I had expected. He has served this House and our country well and diligently and his retirement from this body will create a vacancy among us which will be keenly felt. We all regret that he has chosen to leave us but we wish him restored health and happiness among his people in the southern tip of Texas. God speed you, MILTON. You take with you our best wishes, always.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is losing a valuable and able Member, the Honorable MILTON WEST. He has made a wonderful record in Congress and has as many friends in this House as any Member I have ever known. He has always been constructive in his efforts and no district has had a truer and more effective Representative than MILTON WEST.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the applause of his fellow Members attests the high regard in which MILTON WEST is held. I served with MILT in the legislature of Texas 15 years ago. I admired his character and ability then. For 10 years I have been his neighbor on the fifth floor of the House Office Building. All those years I have known him as a good neighbor. He enjoys the friendship and the respect not only of his Texas neighbors but of the entire House. He is retiring of his own volition. We all wish him well. We regret the parting, but those of us who know his "magic valley" will understand why he might prefer a home there instead of the tumult of Washington. Adios, mi amigo.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting here to say that the people of the Fifteenth District of Texas are losing a fine Representative with the departure from Congress of MILTON WEST. This hard-working and conscientious Congressman from Brownsville served his people and his Nation well. I know I echo the regret of all in his leaving.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of Congress I sought advice from the elder members of the Texas delegation and I sincerely appreciate the helpful counsel given me by the Honorable MILTON WEST. He has been an able Representative for his Texas district here in Congress and is deserving of the rest and relaxation of retirement he looks forward to after this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely wish that Mr. WEST will enjoy good health which all of us pray he has regained and we will long remember our pleasant association with him in Congress.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I, of course, joined in the resolution unanimously adopted by the committee and presented by Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman, on June 19, 1948. However, I desire to add my own personal comment on the retirement of this splendid public servant.

It has been my pleasure to serve with him throughout the years and although I have served with many men since I have been a Member of this body, I have not served with any person who has made a more favorable impression on me than has MILTON WEST. He is a rugged individual and a credit to the great State of Texas from whence he comes. I have found him to be a man of strong personal convictions and possessing at all times the courage of his convictions. I have never known a more kindly individual, a more loyal friend, or a more modest public servant than MILTON WEST. I think his autobiography in the Congressional Directory is expressive of the modesty of this outstanding individual. It simply states: MILTON H. WEST, Democrat, of Brownsville, Tex.

It is with deep regret that I learned of his voluntary retirement but I know that he has longed for the wide open spaces of Texas, and, as he returns to the land of his nativity and the soil he loves so well, he carries with him the affection, the high esteem, and the best wishes for health, happiness, and prosperity of every Member of this body.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it was with keen regret that I learned of the determination of our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. MILTON WEST, to retire from public life. The Congress, the country, and the congressional district which he has served so well during the past 15 years will lose a valuable and distinguished Representative.

It was my good fortune to have served with him on the Committee on Ways and Means for the past 6 years. His quiet humor, his logical thinking, the cheerful presentation of his views won for him the admiration and respect of his colleagues on the committee.

I wish him many years of happiness and good health down along the Rio Grande.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 20, line 14, strike out "within 30 days after the date of enactment hereof" and insert "as of June 30, 1948."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLOESER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment, insert the following: "not later than July 30, 1948, as of June 30, 1948 (the corporate records for the fiscal year 1948 to be closed by Defense Homes Corporation prior to actual transfer thereof)."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 25, line 11, after "$25,000,000" insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provisions of law to the contrary, in addition to the foregoing the Corporation is authorized to utilize, from the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (12 U. S. C. 1148a), such sums as may be necessary (a) to make loans, during a period of 5 years, to bona fide fur farmers in accordance with the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148), all such loans to carry full personal liability of the borrowers and to be secured by such collateral as is deemed by the Corporation to be necessary to afford reasonable assurance of repayment, the aggregate principal amount of which loans shall not exceed $4,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and (b) not to exceed $25,000 for administrative expenses of the Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration in connection with such loans, which amount and the aforesaid item of $146,800 may be combined for accounting purposes."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: On page 27, line 1, insert the following:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"VIRGIN ISLANDS COMPANY

"There is hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000 to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be made available by him, as a loan, to The Virgin Islands Company, upon request of the President of the Company, for the purpose of enabling the Company to continue its present operations until June 30, 1949. The loan shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan to the Company."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 26: Mr. PLOESER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the said amendment, insert the following:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"VIRGIN ISLANDS COMPANY

Section 304 (b) of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (Public Law 248, approved December 6, 1945) shall not be applicable with respect to The Virgin Islands Company until after June 30, 1949.

"The Virgin Islands Company is authorized to borrow from the Treasury of the United States not to exceed $500,000, for which purpose there is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated $500,000. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such loans to the Company for repayment not later than 1 year after the making thereof, at rates of interest determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of any such loan to the Company.

"Not to exceed $97,880 of the funds available to the Company shall be available for administrative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis), including salaries of officers, Washington officer personnel, and the accounting, purchasing, and pay-roll departments; clerical services; traveling, automobile, office, and sundries expenses; stationery and office supplies; telephone and telegraph; postage, dues and subscriptions, repairs and maintenance of office buildings and equipment; employees' welfare, and public relations: *Provided*, That such total sum shall be inclusive of the gross amounts of the foregoing categories of expenses before apportionment of any part thereof to manufacturing or other expenses: *Provided further*, That such administrative expenses shall be exclusive of salaries of the engineering and shipping departments, storekeepers, and plant clerical personnel, interest expense, bank service charges, audit fees, and depreciation."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6935) the second deficiency appropriation bill, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND SUNDRY INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AND OFFICES, 1949

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 7, and 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 12, and 14, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$511,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment insert "$7,744,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For the purpose of this proviso, education or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly or related aviation courses in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation shall not be considered avocational or recreational"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

"Effective February 28, 1949, the Office of War Assets Administrator is abolished and the War Assets Administration shall cease to exist as an agency of the Government and its affairs, functions, and responsibilities shall thereafter be disposed of and liquidated in accordance with the following:

"(1) All powers, authority, functions, and responsibilities of the War Assets Administrator and of the War Assets Administration pertaining to surplus real property, which as used herein shall mean land and interests in land together with buildings, fixtures, facilities, utilities, equipment, and other property located thereon or adapted to use in connection with such property for its highest and best use, and all right, title, and interest in notes, mortgages, and contracts of sale or lease in connection with surplus real property shall be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to be held and disposed of by such Corporation in accordance, except as provided herein, with the terms of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

"(2) All aircraft and aircraft parts shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force to be held and disposed of by such Department in accordance, except as provided herein, with the terms of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

"(3) All personal property (other than aircraft and aircraft parts), except such as may be necessary to the liquidation of the War Assets Administration or the exercise of the functions transferred herein, shall be transferred to the Bureau of Federal Supply, Treasury Department, to be held and disposed of by such Bureau in accordance, except as provided herein, with the terms of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

"(4) Except as necessary to the administration of the functions herein transferred to the Department of the Air Force, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Bureau of Federal Supply, all administrative property, records, and accounts of the War Assets Administration shall be transferred to the Treasury Department for liquidation of the affairs of the War Assets Administration;

"(5) Such administrative property, records, and personnel of the War Assets Administration as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary to the administration of any of the functions herein transferred shall be transferred to the agency to which such function is transferred: *Provided*, That the right to retention in employment by the Government of the personnel so transferred shall be neither greater nor less than such right would have been had the War Assets Administration continued as an independent agency of the Government;

"(6) The provisions of section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1945 (Public Law 263, 79th Cong.) shall apply to the transfers effected by this paragraph in like manner as if such transfer were a reorganization of the agencies and functions concerned under the provisions of that act;

"(7) Priorities and preferences provided for in the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall not continue beyond August 31, 1948, as to the disposal of personal property but shall continue as to the disposal of real estate;

"(8) The agencies herein authorized to dispose of surplus personal property may, after the date of enactment hereof, transfer any of such property without charge to any other agency of the Government if such property, by such transfer, can be put to public use by the transferee agency;

"(9) The agencies herein authorized to dispose of surplus property shall proceed with due diligence and use all reasonable means within the purview of this Act and the Surplus property Act of 1944, as amended, to accomplish such purpose at the earliest practicable date and shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the end of each month as to progress made;

"(10) The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may authorize the abandonment, destruction, or donation to public bodies of personal property herein transferred to their respective agencies which has no commercial value or the estimated cost of care and handling of which would exceed the estimated proceeds from its sale;

"(11) The Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall not apply to property of the Government which has not been declared surplus under the terms of such Act as of the date of enactment hereof and any such property determined to be surplus shall be disposed of in accordance with the terms of other existing law.

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES, WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION SPECIAL FUND

"Salaries and expenses: There is hereby appropriated from the special fund account in the Treasury as provided for in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, not to exceed $65,000,000, which may be apportioned for obligation during the period ending February 28, 1949, for necessary expenses of the War Assets Administration established by Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1947; for allocation or reimbursement by the War Assets Administrator to Government agencies designated by the Administrator as disposal agencies by or pursuant to law, and for payment to Government agencies designated by the Administrator for rendering special services in connection with the disposal of surplus property, in such amounts as shall be approved by the Bureau of the Budget; and for allocation or reimbursement to owning agencies for the care and handling (including pay and allowances and subsistence of military and naval personnel) of surplus property subsequent to the filing of a declaration of surplus covering such property with a disposal agency designated by the Administrator, or, if the Administrator prescribes procedures whereby declarations of surplus are made at approximately the time of disposal or removal, subsequent to notice by the owning agency to the disposal agency that property has been determined to be surplus and is subject to such procedures, such funds to be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; fees and mileage of witnesses at rates provided by law for witnesses attending in the United States courts (28 U. S. C. 600c); payment of claims pursuant to Section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and other special services and reports by contract without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, including real estate brokers and appraisers at rates of pay or fees not to exceed those usual for similar services; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), (not to exceed $73,000); acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; printing and binding; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration; procurement of supplies, equipment, reports, and services in connection with the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, upon determination by the Administrator or by any official designated by him for this purpose that such method of procurement is necessary; purchase and procurement of reports of experts or consultants or organizations thereof; advertising, including radio time; maintenance, operation, and repair of aircraft in the Territories and possessions in connection with disposal activities and, in the continental limits of the United States in connection with the disposition of aircraft and airports; acquisition of buildings, lands, leaseholds, and other interests therein, and temporary use thereof for the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property; payments to States or political subdivisions thereof of sums in lieu of taxes accruing against real property declared surplus to the Administration by Government corporations; advance of funds to Administration cashiers and collection officials upon furnishing bond, for the purpose of handling cash transactions and making change at surplus property sales: *Provided*, That any employee of the War Assets Administration is authorized, when designated for the purpose by the Administrator, to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit, when such instrument is required in connection with the performance of the functions or activities of the War Assets Administration: *Provided further*, That the Administration may procure by contract or otherwise and furnish to governmental employees and employees of Government contractors at the reasonable value thereof food, meals, subsistence, and medical supplies, emergency medical services, quarters, heat, light, household equipment, laundry service, and sanitation facilities, and erect temporary structures and make alterations in existing structures necessary for these purposes, when such employees are engaged in the disposal of surplus property, or in the preparation for such disposal, at locations where such supplies, services, equipment, or facilities are otherwise unavailable, the proceeds derived therefrom to be credited to this appropriation.

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4 and 8.

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
F. R. COUDERT, JR.,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
JOE HENDRICKS,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
ALBERT THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLYDE M. REED,
STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
GUY CORDON,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 inserts the provision of the Senate limiting the purchase of newspapers and periodicals by the Atomic Energy Commission to not to exceed $8,000.

Amendment No. 2 inserts the provision of the Senate limiting travel expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission and limits the amount at $1,500,000, instead of $1,842,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 appropriates $511,850,000 for expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, instead of $501,850,000, as proposed by the House, and $521,850,000, as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the House and the Senate have agreed that no part of the increase above the original House figure shall be available for administrative expenses.

Amendment No. 4 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5 relating to the Rural Electrification Administration is eliminated.

Amendment No. 6 relating to the United States Maritime Commission appropriates $68,360,775 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House, instead of $69,360,775, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7 provides a limitation of $10,600,000 for administrative expenses, United States Maritime Commission, as proposed by the House, instead of $11,600,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9 appropriates $7,744,000 for Maritime training, instead of $8,133,080, as proposed by the House, and $6,943,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides that $75,000 shall be available for restoration or repair of buildings at the maritime training station at Pass Christian, Miss., as proposed by the Senate. It is understood and agreed between the House and Senate conferees that of the reduction from the above mentioned House proposal, no decrease is to be made in the number of students anticipated to be trained under the House proposal.

Amendment No. 10 relating to the conversion of C–4 type vessels of the United States Maritime Commission, as proposed by the Senate, is eliminated.

Amendment No. 11 eliminates language carried in the House and Senate bills and substitutes therefor, the following language:

For the purpose of this proviso, education or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly or related aviation courses in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation, shall not be considered avocational or recreational.

The language as finally agreed upon is intended to permit all training which will contribute to bona fide use in the veteran's present or future business or employment.

Amendment No. 12 inserts the provision of the Senate permitting payment from the fund "veterans' miscellaneous benefits" to certain veterans as authorized by law in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities.

Amendment No. 13 provides for liquidation of the War Assets Administration, as proposed by the House, but makes such liquidation effective February 28, 1949, instead of August 31, 1948, and appropriates $65,000,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of $50,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $90,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14 inserts the provision of the Senate making funds available for examination of appropriation estimates in the field.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 4 clarifies the intent of Congress in regard to rent control violators and continues their right to go to the Emergency Court of Appeals: The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 8 allows the United States Maritime Commission, as required for the development and maintenance of the commerce of the United States and for use in time of war, to expend amounts to acquire the vessels *Mariposa* and *Monterey*: The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur.

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
P. R. COUDERT, JR.,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
JOE HENDRICKS,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
ALBERT THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 6829 and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 5, line 8, after the word "Expediter", insert the following: ": *And provided further*, That as to cases involving the functions transferred to the Office of the Housing Expediter by Executive Order 9841, section 204 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be considered as remaining in full force and effect during fiscal year 1949."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 6, line 23, after "1948", insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That the Commission may expend amounts to acquire the vessels *Mariposa* and *Monterey* and materials and equipment in conjunction therewith on hand or committed for and expend the amounts necessary to complete the vessels, if required for the development and maintenance of the commerce of the United States and for use of the United States in time of war and national emergency, from any amounts available within this limitation."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Star, by David Lawrence.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in these closing days of Congress I desire to pay tribute to the magnificent service the Honorable J. HARRY MCGREGOR has rendered as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Public Works Committee of the House. He has been courageous and courteous. He has worked hard and brought forth much needed legislation, and at the same time worked diligently to save the taxpayers' money. As a member of his committee I am proud of and commend his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO, as chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House, has performed an outstanding service during the Eightieth Congress. He is courteous, capable, and efficient, and as chairman of a complex committee has been responsible for much beneficial legislation, and at the same time protected the economy of our Nation. He believes in economy but is forward looking when the need arises. It has been a pleasure for me to serve under his leadership.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and move that the House concur in the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to bill of the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

Mr. WOLCOTT submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2830) to extend for five years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert "June 30, 1951"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended title proposed by the House, amend the title so as to read: "An act to extend for two years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry."; and the House agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
WAYNE MORSE,
LISTER HILL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill extended for a period of 5 years, or until June 30, 1954, the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry. The amendment of the House extended the authority for a period of only 1 year, or until June 30, 1950. The conference agreement provides for the extension of the authority for a period of 2 years, or until June 30, 1951.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference on the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933

Mr. WOLCOTT submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That subsection (i) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following provision at the end thereof:

"'Any Federal savings and loan association may convert itself into a savings and loan type of institution organized pursuant to the laws of the State, district, or Territory (hereinafter referred to in this section as the State) in which the principal office of such Federal association is located: *Provided*, (1) That the State permits the conversion of any savings and loan type of institution of such State into a Federal savings and loan association; (2) that such conversion of a Federal savings and loan association into such a State institution is determined upon the vote in favor of such conversion cast in person or by proxy at a special meeting of members called to consider such action, specified by the law of the State in which the home office of the Federal association is located, as required by such law for a State-chartered institution to convert itself into a Federal association, but in no event upon a vote of less than 51 per centum of all the votes cast at such meeting, and upon compliance with other requirements reciprocally equivalent to the requirements of such State law for the conversion of a State-chartered institution into a Federal association; (3) that notice of the meeting to vote on conversion shall be given as herein provided and no other notice thereof shall be necessary; the notice shall expressly state that such meeting is called to vote thereon, as well as the time and place thereof, and such notice shall be mailed, postage prepaid, at least 20 and not more than 30 days prior to the date of the meeting, to each member of record of the Federal association at his last address as shown on the books of the Federal association and to the General Manager of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, Washington, District of Columbia; (4) that, upon the effective date of the conversion, the association has repurchased the total amount invested in its shares by the Secretary of the Treasury; and (5) that if, upon the effective date of conversion, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will hold of record shares of the association, its approval of the conversion has been obtained; (6) that, in the event of dissolution after conversion, the members or shareholders of the association will share on a mutual basis in the assets of the association in exact proportion to their relative share or account credits; (7) that such conversion shall be effective upon the date that all the provisions of this act shall have been fully complied with and upon the issuance of a new charter by the State wherein the association is located; it being provided that its act of converting into a State-chartered institution shall constitute an agreement to be bound by all the requirements that the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation may legally impose under section 403 of title IV of the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, and the association shall upon conversion and thereafter be authorized to issue securities in any form currently approved at the time of issue by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for issuance by similar insured institutions in such State, District, or Territory.

"'In addition to the foregoing provision for conversion upon a vote of the members only any association chartered as a Federal savings and loan association, including any having outstanding shares held by the Secretary of the Treasury or Home Owners' Loan Corporation, may convert itself into a State institution upon an equitable basis, subject to approval, by regulations or otherwise, by the Home Loan Bank Board and by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: *Provided*, That if the insurance of accounts is terminated in connection with such conversion, the notice and other action shall be taken as provided by law and regulations for the termination of insurance of accounts.'

"SEC. 2. Section 19 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and subsection (c) of section 402 of the National Housing Act, as amended, are hereby each amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'All necessary expenses in connection with the making of supervisory or other examinations (except examinations of Federal home loan banks), including the provision of services and facilities therefor, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
FREDERICK C. SMITH,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY P. CAIN,
JOHN BRICKER,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the bill strikes out all after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute amendment. The committee of conference recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and Senate amendment and that the Senate agree to the same.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contain provisions for the conversion of any Federal savings and loan association into a comparable State association. The Senate amendment also permitted conversion into a State mutual savings bank. The provisions of the Senate amendment with respect to the procedure for conversion were

more detailed than the provisions of the House bill.

The Senate amendment contained a provision not contained in the House bill amending section 19 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and subsection (c) of section 402 of the National Housing Act, to provide that all necessary expenses in connection with the making of supervisory or other examinations (except examinations of Federal home loan banks), including services and facilities therefor, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses.

The conference substitute, while following the more detailed procedural provisions of the Senate amendment, permits the conversion of a Federal savings and loan association into a comparable State association but not into a State mutual savings bank. The conference substitute also contains the provisions of the Senate amendment referred to above with respect to expenses in connection with the making of supervisory or other examinations.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
FREDERICK C. SMITH,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Prof. Claude Horack.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great issues facing us at this time is the high cost of living. The prices of necessaries of life are bounding into the inflationary stratosphere. Commodity prices have skyrocketed. Things which manufacturers and businessmen utilize to keep business and employment at a high level are not only scarce and difficult to procure in all too many instances, but prices thereof are excessive. What is even more disturbing to a great many of us, the prices of food, clothing, and essentials of life have risen to new high peaks.

These inflationary features operating in the economic system are causing great hardship to the rank and file of the American people who have to pay heavy taxes and who are burdened down with the utterly crushing current costs of necessaries like meat, groceries, provisions, clothing, household accessories, and the like, which are indispensable to the ordinary American family to provide comfort and a decent living standard to breadwinners and children, indeed to the American family.

This threat of the inflational spiral was manifest to me some time ago. Right after VJ-day I urged that wages and prices be brought into a proper equitable relationship and held at that level. As long ago as February 1947 I introduced a resolution in this House calling for a study of the prices of necessaries of life and problems facing the purchasing public as the result of price advances and to take remedial action looking toward increased production, efficient distribution, lower prices for consumer goods, and increase in consumer purchasing power.

Although I urged favorable action along these lines to check inflation, very unfortunately the resolution was never reported from the Rules Committee and consequently no effective steps have been taken to try to hold back the onrushing tide of inflationary pressure that is bringing such high prices and such great hardship to the people.

There are many causes for current high prices. In the first place exceptional pent-up domestic demand for goods, commodities, and materials of every kind has tended to create serious shortages. Secondly, the impact of ERP and other foreign-aid programs upon the American economy has augmented these shortages. The related gigantic military program channeling billions of dollars of essentials out of uses of the consumer into uneconomic purposes of the military—necessary though some of them may be—is of course a very material factor in the advance of the general price level and will continue to exert even greater influence as military expenditures grow beyond the huge figure of twenty-two billion as is contemplated for fiscal year 1949.

I feel strongly that Congress should have dealt with this basic question affecting so vitally the well-being of the Nation long ago.

Most assuredly Congress should deal with this question of the high cost of living before adjournment. I hope it will not be too presumptuous on my part to express the wish that Congress had acted on my House Resolution 121 many months ago and I utter the hope that vigorous, forthright, decisive action along these lines will not be further delayed.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the managers on the part of the House, I ask unanimous consent that they be permitted to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 4044) by midnight tonight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

DONATION OF EXCESS AND SURPLUS ARMED FORCES PROPERTY FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5882) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "facilities."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCCOWEN, LANDIS, BREHM, KEARNS, BARDEN, and LUCAS.

PROVIDING EXPENSES FOR CONDUCTING THE INVESTIGATION INCURRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 691

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 697) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 691, Eightieth Congress, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures (a) for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and (b) for necessary expenses incurred by advisers to such committee, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on

vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AND BINDING OF A REVISED EDITION OF CANNON'S PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 190) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Line 4, strike out "of a revised edition."
Line 11, strike out "such revised edition."
Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 7 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes:

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I

"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Selective Service Act of 1948.'

"(b) The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

"(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the armed forces and the Reserve components thereof should be shared generally, in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

"(d) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both Ground and Air, as an integral part of the first line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.

"To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the Ground Forces and the Air Forces, and those in active service under this title, the National Guard of the United States, both Ground and Air, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

"(e) The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

"AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTHS

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorized active duty personnel strength of the armed forces, exclusive of personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, officer candidates, personnel of the armed forces employed in the Selective Service System, and persons paid under the appropriations for the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve, is hereby established as follows: (1) Of the Army of the United States, eight hundred thirty-seven thousand plus one hundred ten thousand one-year enlistees; (2) of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, the present authorized statutory strength of six hundred sixty-six thousand, eight hundred and eighty-two, plus thirty-six thousand one-year enlistees; and (3) of the Air Force of the United States, five hundred two thousand plus fifteen thousand one-year enlistees. The strength herein established for each of the armed forces shall mean the daily average number of persons on active duty therein during the fiscal year.

"REGISTRATION

"SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.

"TRAINING AND SERVICE

"SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of nineteen and twenty-six, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of nineteen after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the armed forces of the United States. Any citizen of a foreign country, who is not deferable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title (other than this subsection), shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the armed forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States. The President is authorized from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the armed forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the personnel strengths (other than one-year enlistee personnel strengths) of the respective armed forces authorized by section 2 of this title.

"No person shall be inducted for training and service under this title unless and until he is acceptable to the armed forces for such training and service and his physical and mental fitness for such training and service has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"No persons shall be inducted for such training and service until adequate provision shall have been made for such shelter, sanitary facilities, water supplies, heating and lighting arrangements, medical care, and hospital accommodations, for such persons, as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to public and personal health.

"The persons inducted into the armed forces for training and service under this title shall be assigned to stations or units of such forces. Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Army of the United States; persons inducted into the naval forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, as appropriate; and persons inducted into the air forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Air Force of the United States.

"No person, without his consent, shall be inducted for training and service under this title, except as otherwise provided herein, after he has attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of his birth.

"(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) shall serve in the armed forces for a period of twenty-one consecutive months, unless sooner discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"(c) (1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of nineteen and twenty-six shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section.

"(2) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this Act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of department concerned: *And provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component.

"(3) The passing requirement for the General Classification Test shall be fixed at seventy points.

"(d) (1) Each person who hereafter is inducted, enlisted, or appointed (except a person enlisted under subsection (g) of this section) and serves for a period of less than three years in one of the armed forces and meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a reserve component of the armed force in which he serves, shall be transferred to a reserve component of such armed force, and until the expiration of a period of five years after such transfer, or until he is discharged from such reserve component, whichever occurs first, shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component and shall be subject to such additional training and service as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law for such reserve component: *Provided*, That any such person who completes at least twenty-one months of service in the armed forces and who thereafter serves satisfactorily (1) on active duty in the armed forces under a voluntary extension for a period of at least one year, which extension is hereby authorized, or (2) in an organized unit of any reserve component of any of the armed forces for a period of at least thirty-six consecutive months, shall, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, be relieved from any further liability under this subsection to serve in any reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any such person, while in a reserve component of such forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such forces.

"(2) Each person who hereafter is enlisted under the provisions of subsection (g) of this section and who meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a reserve component of the armed forces shall, upon discharge from such enlistment under honorable conditions, be transferred to a reserve component of the armed forces of the United States and shall serve therein for a period of six years or until sooner discharged. Each such person shall, so long as he is a member of such reserve component, be liable to be ordered to active duty, but except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress no such person shall be ordered to active duty, without his consent and except as hereinafter provided, for more than one month in any year. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force determines that enlistment enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can without undue hardship be filled by, any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program and to serve satisfactorily therein for a period of four years. Any such person who fails or refuses to perform such duty may be ordered to active duty, without his consent, for an additional period of not more than twelve consecutive months. Any such person who enlists or accepts appointment in any such organized unit and serves satisfactorily therein for a period of four years shall, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, be relieved from any further liability under this subsection to serve in any reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any such persons, while in a reserve component of such forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such forces. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to prescribe regulations governing the transfer of such persons within and between reserve components of the armed forces and determining, for the purpose of the requirements of the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, the credit to be allowed any person so transferring for his previous service in one or more reserve components.

"(e) With respect to the persons inducted for training and service under this title there shall be paid, allowed, and extended the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability, and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other enlisted men of like grades and length of service of that component of the armed forces to which they are assigned. Section 3 of the Act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, Eightieth Congress), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following: 'Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148, ch 165), as amended.' The Act of March 7, 1941 (56 Stat. 143–148), as amended, is hereby made applicable to persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this title.

"(f) Nothing contained in this or any other Act shall be construed as forbidding the payment of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation to persons inducted into the armed forces of the United States for training and service under this title, or to members of reserve components of such forces now or hereafter on any type of active duty, who, prior to their induction or order to active duty, were receiving compensation from such persons, firm, or corporation.

"(g) Subject to the authorized one-year enlistee active duty personnel strengths established by section 2 of this title for the respective armed forces, the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are authorized and directed to accept enlistments for periods of one year in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, and the Air Force of the United States, respectively, from among qualified male persons between the ages of eighteen and nineteen.

"(h) No person who is enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection (g) shall be permanently assigned to duty at any place outside of the continental limits of the United States; and no person who is enlisted under the provisions of such subsection in the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, or the Air Force of the United States shall be assigned to duty at any naval or air force installation which is located on land outside of the continental limits of the United States.

"SELECTION

"SEC. 5. (a) The selection of persons for training and service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from the persons who are liable for such training and service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided*, That in the selection of persons for training and service under this title, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this title, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations.

"(b) Quotas of men to be inducted for training and service under this title shall be determined for each State, Territory, possession, and the District of Columbia and for subdivisions thereof, on the basis of the actual number of men in the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, and the subdivisions thereof, who are liable for such training and service but who are not deferred after classification, except that credits shall be given in fixing such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who are in the armed forces of the United States on the date fixed for determining such quotas. After such quotas are fixed, credits shall be given in filling such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who subsequently become members of such forces. Until the actual numbers necessary for determining the quotas are known, the quotas may be based on estimates, and subsequent adjustments therein shall be made when such actual numbers are known. All computations under this subsection shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

"DEFERMENT AND EXEMPTIONS

"SEC. 6. (a) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy, members of the reserve components of the armed forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President, residing in the United States, and who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4 (b).

"(b) (1) No person who served honorably on active duty between September 16, 1940, and the date of enactment of this title for a period of twelve months or more, or between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, for a period in excess of ninety days, in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, or the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

"(2) No person who served honorably on active duty between September 16, 1940, and the date of enactment of this title for a period of ninety days or more but less than twelve months in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, or the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title, if—

"(A) the local board determines that he is regularly enlisted or commissioned in any organized unit of a reserve component of the armed force (or the Coast Guard) in which he served, provided such unit is reasonably accessible to such person without unduly interrupting his normal pursuits and activities (including attendance at a college or university in which he is regularly enrolled), or in a reserve component (other than in an organized unit) of such armed force or the Coast Guard in any case in which enlistment or commission in an organized unit of a reserve component of such armed force or the Coast Guard is not available to him; or

"(B) the local board determines that enlistment or commission in a reserve component of such armed force or the Coast Guard is not available to him or that he has voluntarily enlisted or accepted appointment in an organized unit of a reserve component of an armed force other than the armed force in which he served or in the Coast Guard. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to be applicable to any person to whom paragraph (1) of this subsection is applicable.

"(3) No person who after the date of enactment of this title is honorably discharged upon the completion of a period of three years or more of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

"(4) No person who is honorably discharged upon the completion of an enlistment pursuant to section 4 (c) or section 4 (g) shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

"(5) For the purposes of computation of the periods of active duty referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection, no credit shall be allowed for—

"(A) periods of active duty training performed as a member of a reserve component pursuant to an order or call to active duty solely for training purposes;

"(B) periods of active duty in which the service consisted solely of training under the Army specialized training program, the Army Air Force college training program, or any similar program under the jurisdiction of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard;

"(C) periods of active duty as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or United States Coast Guard Academy, or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, or in a preparatory school after nomination as a principal, alternate, or candidate for admission to any of such academies; or

"(D) periods of active duty in any of the armed forces while being processed for entry into or separation from any educational program or institution referred to in paragraphs (B) or (C).

"(c) (1) Persons who, on the effective date of this title, were members of organized units of the federally recognized National Guard, the federally recognized Air National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast Guard Reserve, or the Public Health Service Reserve, shall, so long as they continue to be such members and satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, be exempt from training and service by induction under the provisions of this title, but shall not be exempt from registration unless on active duty.

"(2) (A) In any case in which the Governor of any State determines and issues a proclamation to the effect that the authorized strength of any organized unit of the National Guard of his State cannot be maintained by the enlistment or appointment of persons referred to in subsection 6 (b) (2) or persons who are not liable for training and service under this title, any person who prior to attaining the age of eighteen years and six months enlists or accepts appointment in any such organized unit shall be deferred from training and service under this title so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily as a member of such organized unit.

"(B) Except as provided in subsection (b) or clause (A) of this paragraph, no person who shall become a member of a reserve component after the effective date of this title shall thereby be exempt from registration or training and service by induction under the provisions of this title.

"(d) (1) Any person, who on the effective date of this title, is enrolled in the advanced course, senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or is a member of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and has entered upon the junior or senior year, or is a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until the completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration.

"(2) Within such number as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) on or after the effective date of this title, is selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' training Corps, or who, on or after the effective date of this title, is appointed a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, and (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission if tendered and to serve, subject to call by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration.

"(e) Fully qualified and accepted aviation cadet applicants of the Army, Navy, or Air Force who have signed an agreement of service shall, in such numbers as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense, be deferred, during the period covered by the agreement but not to exceed four months, from induction for training and service under this title but shall not be exempt from registration.

"(f) The Vice President of the United States; the governors of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and all other officials chosen by the voters of the entire State, Territory, or possession; members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the Several States, Territories, and possessions; judges of the courts of record of the United States and of the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia shall, while holding such offices, be deferred from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States.

"(g) Regular or duly ordained ministers of religion, as defined in this title, and students preparing for the ministry under the direction of recognized churches or religious organizations, who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction in recognized theological or divinity schools, or who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction leading to their entrance into recognized theological or divinity schools in which they have been preenrolled, shall be exempt from training and service (but not from registration) under this title.

"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board.

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this title prior to his graduation from such school or institution, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, have his induction under this title postponed (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest. The induction of any such person shall not be postponed under this paragraph beyond the date so determined.

"(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, have his induction under this title postponed (A) until the end of such academic year or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.

"(j) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training and service in the armed forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being

involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code. Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, if he is inducted into the armed forces under this title, be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or shall, if he is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, be deferred. Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal, the appeal board shall refer any such claim to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. The Department of Justice, after appropriate inquiry, shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the person concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommend to the appeal board that (1) if the objector is inducted into the armed forces under this title, he shall be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or (2) if the objector is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, he shall be deferred. If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall, in making its decision, give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice together with the record on appeal from the local board. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant training and service because of conscientious objections is sustained shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors.

"(k) No exception from registration, or exemption or deferment from training and service, under this title, shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

"(l) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person between the ages of 18 and 21 shall be discharged from service in the armed forces of the United States while this title is in effect because such person entered such service without the consent of his parent or guardian.

"(m) No person shall be relieved from training and service under this title by reason of conviction of a criminal offense, except where the offense of which he has been convicted may be punished by death, or by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year.

"(n) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment made under subsection (h) of this section may, within 5 days after such deferment is made, be submitted for review and decision to the appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the President, and such decision shall be made public.

"(o) Where one or more sons or daughters of a family were killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the armed forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, the sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this title.

"ACTIVE DUTY FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

"SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this title, the President is hereby authorized to order into the active service of the armed forces of the United States, without their consent and for a period not to exceed 21 consecutive months each, members (other than those exempted or deferred from training and service under the provisions of section 6 (c)) of any or all reserve components of the armed forces of the United States who shall have had less than 90 days' continuance active service in the armed forces of the United States, exclusive of periods of active training duty. No member of the National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia shall be ordered into the active service of the armed forces of the United States under this section unless the governor of such State or Territory, or the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard in the case of a member of the District of Columbia National Guard, has consented to the ordering into active service of the armed forces of the United States of members of the National Guard of his State, Territory, or District, as the case may be, in accordance with such program or programs as may have been mutually agreed upon. Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or abridge any existing law which authorizes the ordering of members of reserve components of the armed forces into active service.

"BOUNTIES; SUBSTITUTES; PURCHASES OF RELEASE

"SEC. 8. No bounty shall be paid to induce any person to enlist in or be inducted into the armed forces of the United States: *Provided*, That the clothing or enlistment allowances authorized by law shall not be regarded as bounties within the meaning of this section. No person liable for training and service in such forces shall be permitted or allowed to furnish a substitute for such training and service; no substitute as such shall be received, enlisted, enrolled, or inducted into the armed forces of the United States; and no person liable for training and service in such forces under section 4 shall be permitted to escape such training and service or be discharged therefrom prior to the expiration of his period of such training and service by the payment of money or any other valuable thing whatsoever as consideration for his release from such training and service or liability therefor.

"SEPARATION FROM SERVICE; REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

"SEC. 9. (a) Any person inducted into the armed forces under this title for training and service, who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes his period of training and service under section 4 (b) shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect upon the completion of such period of training and service, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. In addition, each such person who is inducted into the armed forces under this title for training and service shall be given a physical examination at the beginning of such training and service, and upon the completion of his period of training and service under this title, each such person shall be given another physical examination and, upon his written request, shall be given a statement of physical condition by the Secretary concerned: *Provided*, That such statement shall not contain any reference to mental or other conditions which in the judgment of the Secretary concerned would prove injurious to the physical or mental health of the person to whom it pertains.

"(b) In the case of any such person who, in order to perform such training and service, has left or leaves a position (other than a temporary position) in the employ of any employer and who (1) receives such certificate, and (2) makes application for reemployment within ninety days after he is relieved from such training and service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year—

"(A) if such position was in the employ of the United States Government, its Territories, or possessions or political subdivisions thereof, or the District of Columbia, such person shall—

"(i) if still qualified to perform the duties of such position, be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or

"(ii) if not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in the employ of the employer, be restored to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case;

"(B) If such position was in the employ of a private employer, such person shall—

"(i) if still qualified to perform the duties of such position, be restored by such employer or his successor in interest to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or

"(ii) if not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in the employ of such employer or his successor in interest, be restored by such employer or his successor in interest to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case,

unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so;

"(C) if such position was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that such person should—

"(i) if still qualified to perform the duties of such position, be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or

"(ii) if not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in the employ of the employer, be restored to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case.

"(c) (1) Any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) shall be considered as having been on furlough or leave of absence during his period of training and service in the armed forces, shall be so restored without loss of seniority, shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence in effect with the employer at the time such person was inducted into such forces, and shall not be discharged from such position without cause within one year after such restoration.

"(2) It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) should be so restored in such manner as to give him such status in his

employment as he would have enjoyed if he had continued in such employment continuously from the time of his entering the armed forces until the time of his restoration to such employment.

"(d) In case any private employer fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of subsection (b) or subsection (c) (1), the district court of the United States for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business shall have power, upon the filing of a motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading by the person entitled to the benefits of such provisions, specifically to require such employer to comply with such provisions and to compensate such person for any loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action: *Provided*, That any such compensation shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such provisions. The court shall order speedy hearing in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar. Upon application to the United States district attorney or comparable official for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business, by any person claiming to be entitled to the benefits of such provisions, such United States district attorney or official, if reasonably satisfied that the person so applying is entitled to such benefits, shall appear and act as attorney for such person in the amicable adjustment of the claim or in the filing of any motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading and the prosecution thereof specifically to require such employer to comply with such provisions: *Provided*, That no fees or court costs shall be taxed against any person who may apply for such benefits: *Provided further*, That only the employer shall be deemed a necessary party respondent to any such action.

"(e) (1) Any person who is entitled to be restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) of subsection (b) and who was employed, immediately before entering the armed forces, by any agency in the executive branch of the Government or by any Territory or possession, or political subdivision thereof, or by the District of Columbia, shall be so restored by such agency or the successor to its functions, or by such Territory, possession, political subdivision, or the District of Columbia. In any case in which, upon appeal of any person who was employed immediately before entering the armed forces by any agency in the executive branch of the Government or by the District of Columbia, the United States Civil Service Commission finds that—

"(A) such agency is no longer in existence and its functions have not been transferred to any other agency; or

"(B) for any reason it is not feasible for such person to be restored to employment by such agency or by the District of Columbia,

the Commission shall determine whether or not there is a position in any other agency in the executive branch of the Government in the government of the District of Columbia for which such person is qualified and which is either vacant or held by a person having a temporary appointment thereto. In any case in which the Commission determines that there is such a position, such person shall be restored to such position by the agency in which such position exists or by the government of the District of Columbia, as the case may be. The Commission is authorized and directed to issue regulations giving full force and effect to the provisions of this section insofar as they relate to persons entitled to be restored to positions in the executive branch of the Government or in the government of the District of Columbia, including persons entitled to be restored under the last sentence of paragraph (2) of this subsection. The agencies in the executive branch of the Government and the government of the District of Columbia shall comply with such rules and regulations and orders issued by the Commission pursuant to this subsection. The Commission is authorized and directed whenever it finds, upon appeal of the person concerned, that any agency in the executive branch of the Government or the government of the District of Columbia has failed or refuses to comply with the provisions of this section, to issue an order specifically requiring such agency or the government of the District of Columbia to comply with such provisions and to compensate such person for any loss of salary or wages suffered by reason of failure to comply with such provisions, less any amounts received by him through other employment, unemployment compensation, or readjustment allowances: *Provided*, That any such compensation ordered to be paid by the Commission shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such provisions, and shall be paid by the head of the agency concerned or by the government of the District of Columbia out of appropriations currently available for salary and expenses of such agency or government, and such appropriations shall be available for such purpose. As used in this paragraph, the term "agency in the executive branch of the Government" means any department, independent establishment, agency, or corporation in the executive branch of the United States Government.

"(2) Any person who is entitled to be restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) of subsection (b) and who was employed, immediately before entering the armed forces, in the legislative branch of the Government, shall be so restored by the officer who appointed him to the position which he held immediately before entering the armed forces. In any case in which it is not possible for any such person to be restored to a position in the legislative branch of the Government and he is otherwise eligible to acquire a status for transfer to a position in the classified (competitive) civil service in accordance with section 2 (b) of the Act of November 26, 1940 (54 Stat. 1212), the United States Civil Service Commission shall, upon appeal of such person, determine whether or not there is a position in the executive branch of the Government for which he is qualified and which is either vacant or held by a person having a temporary appointment thereto. In any case in which the Commission determines that there is such a position such person shall be restored to such position by the agency in which such position exists.

"(3) Any person who is entitled to be restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) of subsection (b) and who was employed, immediately before entering the armed forces, in the judicial branch of the Government, shall be so restored by the officer who appointed him to the position which he held immediately before entering the armed forces.

"(f) In any case in which two or more persons who are entitled to be restored to a position under the provisions of this section or of any other law relating to similar reemployment benefits left the same position in order to enter the armed forces, the person who left such position first shall have the prior right to be restored thereto, without prejudice to the reemployment rights of the other person or persons to be restored.

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to the date of enactment of this title and while it is in effect, enlists in the armed forces of the United States (other than in a reserve component) or the Coast Guard (other than in a reserve component) for not more than three years shall, if such enlistment is his first enlistment in the armed forces or the Coast Guard subsequent to the date of enactment of this title, be entitled, upon the expiration of his enlistment (including any extension thereof by law but not including any voluntary extension thereof) or upon his discharge under honorable conditions prior to the expiration thereof, to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of inductees.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to the effective date of this title and while it is in effect, enters upon active duty in the armed forces of the United States, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of inductees, if he is relieved from active duty not later than three years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such three years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(h) The Secretary of Labor, through the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, shall render aid in the replacement in their former positions of persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty in the armed forces of the United States, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service. In rendering such aid, the Secretary shall use the then existing Federal and State agencies engaged in similar or related activities and shall utilize the assistance of volunteers.

"(i) Any person inducted into the armed forces for training and service under this title shall, during the period of such service, be permitted to vote in person or by absentee ballot in any general, special, or primary election occurring in the State of which he is a resident, whether he is within or outside such State at the time of such election, if under the laws of such State he is otherwise entitled so to vote in such election; but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require granting to any such person a leave of absence or furlough for longer than 1 day in order to permit him to vote in person in any such election. No person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces for training and service under this title shall, during the period of such service, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, be required to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

"(j) The Secretaries of Army, Navy, or Air Force shall furnish to the Selective Service System hereafter established a report of separation for each person separated from active duty.

"THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM; CONSTRUCTION; CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 10. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an agency to be known as the Selective Service System, and a Director of Selective Service who shall be the head thereof.

"(2) The Selective Service System shall include a national headquarters, at least one State headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, and the local boards, appeal boards, and other agencies provided for in subsection (b) (3) of this section.

"(3) The Director shall be apopinted by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 per year.

"(4) The functions of the Office of Selective Service Records (established by the Act of March 31, 1947) and of the Director of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service

System and the Director of Selective Service, respectively. The personnel, property, records and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System. The Office of Selective Service Records shall cease to exist upon the taking of effect of the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That, effective upon the termination of this title and notwithstanding such termination in other respects, (A) the said Office of Selective Service Records is hereby reestablished on the same basis and with the same functions as obtained prior to the effective date of this title, (B) said reestablished Office shall be responsible for liquidating any other outstanding affairs of the Selective Service System, and (C) the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Selective Service System shall be transferred to such reestablished Office of Selective Service Records.

"(b) The President is authorized—

"(1) to prescribe the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this title;

"(2) to appoint, upon recommendation of the respective governor or comparable executive official, a State director of the Selective Service System for each headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States and for the District of Columbia, who shall represent the governor and be in immediate charge of the State headquarters of the Selective Service System; to employ such number of civilians, and to order to active duty with their consent and to assign to the Selective Service System such officers of the selective-service section of the State headquarters and headquarters detachments and such other officers of the federally recognized National Guard of the United States or other armed forces personnel (including personnel of the Reserve components thereof), as may be necessary for the administration of the national and of the several State headquarters of the Selective Service System;

"(3) to create and establish within the Selective Service System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and such other civilian agencies, including agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out its functions with respect to the registration, examination, classification, selection, assignment, delivery for induction, and maintenance of records of persons registered under this title, together with such other duties as may be assigned under this title. He shall create and establish one or more local boards in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto of each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia. Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President from recommendations made by the respective governors or comparable executive officials: *Provided*, That an intercounty local board consisting of at least one member from each component county or corresponding subdivision may be established for an area not exceeding five counties or political subdivisions corresponding thereto within a State or comparable jurisdiction when the President determines, after considering the public interest involved and the recommendation of the Governor or comparable executive official or officials, that the establishment of such local board area will result in a more efficient and economical operation. Any such intercounty local board shall have within its area the same power and jurisdiction as a local board has in its area. No member of any local board shall be a member of the armed forces of the United States, but each member of any local board shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States residing in the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which such local board has jurisdiction, and each intercounty local board shall have at least one member from each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto included within the intercounty local board area. Such local boards, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, shall have the power within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized, all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption of deferment from, training and service under this title, of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local board shall be final, except where an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. There shall be at least one appeal board for each State. Appeal boards within the Selective Service System shall be composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States and who are not members of the armed forces. The decision of such appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal unless modified or changed by the President. The President, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from training and service under this title, and the determination of the President shall be final. No person who is a civilian officer, member, agent, or employee of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, or of any local board or appeal board or other agency of such Office or System, shall be excepted from registration or deferred or exempted from training and service, as provided for in this title, by reason of his status as such civilian officer, member, agent, or employee;

"(4) to appoint, and to fix, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the compensation of, such officers, agents, and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That the compensation of employees of local boards and appeal boards may be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided further*, That any officer on the active or retired list of the armed forces, or any reserve component thereof with his consent, or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this title (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards established or created pursuant to section 10 (b) (3)) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer in the armed forces or reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States;

"(5) to utilize the services of any or all departments and any and all officers or agents of the United States, and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and subdivisions thereof, and the District of Columbia, and of private welfare organizations, in the execution of this title;

"(6) to purchase such printing, binding, and blank-book work from public, commercial, or private printing establishments or binderies upon orders placed by the Public Printer or upon waivers issued in accordance with section 12 of the Printing Act approved January 12, 1895, as amended, and to obtain by purchase, loan, or gift such equipment and supplies for the Selective Service System, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, with or without advertising or formal contract;

"(7) to prescribe eligibility, rules, and regulations governing the parole for service in the armed forces, or for any other special service established pursuant to this title, of any person convicted of a violation of any of the provisions of this title;

"(8) subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purpose, to procure such space as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and Public Law 26, Eightieth Congress, approved March 31, 1947, by lease pursuant to existing statutes, except that the provisions of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended by section 15 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517; 40 U. S. C. 278a), shall not apply to any lease entered into under the authority of this title;

"(9) subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purposes, to determine the location of such additional temporary installations as he may deem essential; to utilize and enlarge such existing installations; to construct, install, and equip, and to complete the construction, installation, and equipment of such buildings, structures, utilities, and appurtenances (including the necessary grading and removal, repair or remodeling of existing structures and installations), as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title; and, in order to accomplish the purpose of this title, to acquire lands, and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, for temporary use thereof, by donation or lease, and to prosecute construction thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended;

"(10) subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purposes, to utilize, in order to provide and furnish such services as may be deemed necessary or expedient to accomplish the purposes of this title, such personnel of the armed forces and of Reserve components thereof with their consent, and such civilian personnel, as may be necessary. For the purposes of this title, the provisions of section 14 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390, Seventy-ninth Congress) with respect to the maximum limitations as to the number of civilian employees shall not be applicable to the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force.

"(c) The President is authorized to delegate any authority vested in him under this title, and to provide for the subdelegation of any such authority.

"(d) In the administration of this title, gifts of supplies, equipment, and voluntary services may be accepted.

"(e) The Chief of Finance, United States Army, is authorized to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent of the Director in carrying out the provisions of this title.

"(f) The Director is authorized to make final settlement of individual claims, for amounts not exceeding $50, for travel and other expenses of uncompensated personnel of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, incurred while in the performance of official duties, without regard to other provisions of law governing the travel of civilian employees of the Federal Government.

"EMERGENCY MEDICAL CARE

"SEC. 11. Under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President, funds available to carry out the provisions of this title shall also be available for the payment of actual and reasonable expenses of emergency medical care, including hospitalization, of registrants who suffer illness or injury, and the transportation, and burial of the remains of registrants who suffer death, while acting under orders issued under the provisions of this title, but such burial expenses shall not exceed $150 in any one case.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 12. (a) Any member of the Selective Service System or any other person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying out any of the provisions of this title, or the rules or regulations made or directions given thereunder, who shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform such duty, and any person charged with such duty, or having and exercising any authority under said title, rules, regulations, or directions who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making, of any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical, or mental examination, deferment, induction, enrollment, or muster, and any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certificate regarding or bearing upon a classification or in support of any request for a particular classification, for service under the provisions of this title, or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant thereto, or who otherwise evades or refuses registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this title, or who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this title, or of said rules, regulations, or directions, or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect or refuse to perform any duty required of him under or in the execution of this title, or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant to this title, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere or attempt to do so in any way, by force or violence or otherwise, with the administration of this title or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or who conspires to commit any one or more of such offenses, shall, upon conviction in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment, or if subject to military or naval law may be tried by court martial, and, on conviction, shall suffer such punishment as a court martial may direct. No person shall be tried by court martial in any case arising under this title unless such person has been actually inducted for the training and service prescribed under this title or unless he is subject to trial by court martial under laws in force prior to the enactment of this title. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this title, and such cases shall, upon request of the Attorney General, be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing.

"(b) Any person (1) who knowingly transfers or delivers to another, for the purpose of aiding or abetting the making of any false identification or representation, any registration certificate, alien's certificate of nonresidence, or any other certificate issued pursuant to or prescribed by the provisions of this title, or rules or regulations promulgated hereunder; or (2) who, with intent that it be used for any purpose of false identification or representation, has in his possession any such certificate not duly issued to him; or (3) who forges, alters, or in any manner changes any such certificate or any notation duly and validly inscribed thereon; or (4) who, with intent that it be used for any purpose of false identification or representation, photographs, prints, or in any manner makes or executes any engraving, photograph, print, or impression in the likeness of any such certificate, or any colorable imitation thereof; or (5) who has in his possession any certificate purporting to be a certificate issued pursuant to this title, or rules and regulations promulgated hereunder, which he knows to be falsely made, reproduced, forged, counterfeited, or altered; or (6) who knowingly violates or evades any of the provisions of this title or rules and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto relating to the issuance, transfer, or possession of such certificate, shall, upon conviction, be fined not to exceed $10,000 or be imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Whenever on trial for a violation of this subsection the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of any certificate not duly issued to him, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to establish an intent to use such certificate for purposes of false identification or representation, unless the defendant explains such possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

"NONAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAWS

"SEC. 13. (a) Nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99), in section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 119 (e)), or in the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148), entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities", as amended, shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this title or the regulations made pursuant thereto, as an uncompensated official of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant or noncombatant training because of conscientious objections.

"(b) All functions performed under this title shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) except as to the requirements of section 3 of such Act.

"(c) In computing the lump-sum payments made to Air Force reserve officers under the provisions of section 2 of the Act of June 16, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 300a), and to reserve officers of the Navy or to their beneficiaries under section 12 of the Act of August 4, 1942, as amended (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 850k), no credit shall be allowed for any period of active service performed from the effective date of this title to the date on which this title shall cease to be effective. Each such lump-sum payment shall be prorated for a fractional part of a year of active service in the case of any reserve officer subject to the provisions of either such section, if such reserve officer performs continuous active service for one or more years (inclusive of such service performed during the period in which this title is effective) and such active service includes a fractional part of a year immediately prior to the effective date of this title, or immediately following the date on which this title shall cease to be effective, or both.

"CIVIL RELIEF

"SEC. 14. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 604 of the Act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1191), and the provisions of section 4 of the Act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 339, Eightieth Congress), all of the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, including specifically article IV thereof, shall be applicable to all persons in the armed forces of the United States, including all persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this title, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service, until such time as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, is repealed or otherwise terminated by subsequent Act of the Congress: *Provided*, That, with respect to persons inducted into the armed forces while this title is in effect, wherever under any section or provision of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, a proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction has been authorized or provided with respect to military service performed while such Act is in force, such section or provision shall be deemed to continue in full force and effect so long as may be necessary to the exercise or enjoyment of such proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction.

"NOTICE OF TITLE; VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS

"SEC. 15. (a) Every person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of this title upon publication by the President of a proclamation or other public notice fixing a time for any registration under section 3.

"(b) It shall be the duty of every registrant to keep his local board informed as to his current address and changes in status as required by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President.

"(c) If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the title, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"(d) Except as provided in section 4 (c) or section 4 (g), nothing contained in this title shall be construed to repeal, amend, or suspend the laws now in force authorizing voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, except that no person shall be accepted for enlistment after he has received orders to report for induction and except that, whenever the Congress or the President has declared that the national itterest is imperiled, voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in such forces, and their reserve components, may be suspended by the President to such extent as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 16. When used in this title—

"(a) The term 'between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six' shall refer to men who have attained the eighteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of their birth; and other terms designating different age groups shall be construed in a similar manner.

"(b) The term 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, shall be deemed to mean the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

"(c) The term 'armed forces' shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force.

"(d) The term 'district court of the United States' shall be deemed to include the courts of the United States for the Territories and possessions of the United States.

"(e) The term 'local board' shall be deemed to include an intercounty local board in the case of any registrant who is subject to the jurisdiction of an intercounty local board.

"(f) The term 'Director' shall be deemed to mean the Director of the Selective Service System.

"(g) The term 'duly ordained minister of religion' means a person who has been ordained, in accordance with the ceremonial, ritual, or discipline of a church, religious sect, or organization established on the basis of a community of faith and belief, doctrines and practices of a religous character, to preach and to teach the doctrines of such church, sect, or organization and to administer the rites and ceremonies thereof in public worship, and who as his regular and customary vocation preaches and teaches the principles of religion and administers the ordinances of public worship as embodied in the creed or principles of such church, sect, or organization.

"(2) The term 'regular minister of religion' means one who as his customary vocation preaches and teaches the principles of religion of a church, a religious sect, or organization of which he is a member, without having been formally ordained as a minister of religion, and who is recognized by such church, sect, or organization as a regular minister.

"(3) The term 'regular or duly ordained minister of religion' does not include a person who irregularly or incidentally preaches and teaches the principles of religion of a church, religious sect, or organization and

does not include any person who may have been duly ordained a minister in accordance with the ceremonial, rite, or discipline of a church, religious sect or organization, but who does regularly, as a vocation, teach and preach the principles of religion and administer the ordinances of public worship as embodied in the creed or principles of his church, sect, or organization.

"(h) The term 'organized unit', when used with respect to a reserve component, shall be deemed to mean a unit in which the members thereof are required satisfactorily to participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"(i) The term 'reserve components of the armed forces' shall, unless the context otherwise requires, be deemed to include the federally recognized National Guard of the United States, the federally recognized Air National Guard of the United States, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, and the Marine Corps Reserve, and shall include, in addition to the foregoing, the Coast Guard Reserve and the Public Health Service Reserve when serving with the armed forces.

"TERMINATION OF TITLE

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title, all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby suspended to the extent of such conflict for the period in which this title shall be in force.

"(b) All of the provisions of this title, except the provisions of section 2, the second sentence of section 4 (a), section 4 (b), sections 4 (d), 4 (e), 4 (f), 9, 10 (a) (4), 10 (b) (10), 13 (c), 14, and 17 (b), shall become inoperative and cease to apply on the second anniversary of the date of enactment of this title or on such earlier date as may be specified in a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"UTILIZATION OF INDUSTRY

"SEC. 18. (a) Whenever the President after consultation with and receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board determines that it is in the interest of the national security for the Government to obtain prompt delivery of any articles or materials the procurement of which has been authorized by the Congress exclusively for the use of the armed forces of the United States, or for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, he is authorized, through the head of any Government agency, to place with any person operating a plant, mine, or other facility capable of producing such articles or materials an order for such quantity of such articles or materials as the President deems appropriate. Any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be advised that such order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section. Under any such program of national procurement, the President shall recognize the valid claim of American small business to participate in such contracts, in such manufactures, and in such distribution of materials, and small business shall be granted a fair share of the orders placed, exclusively for the use of the armed forces or for other Federal agencies now or hereafter designated in this section. For the purposes of this section, a business enterprise shall be determined to be "small business" if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of its employees does not exceed 500, and (3) it is independently owned and operated.

"(b) It shall be the duty of any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a), (1) to give such order such precedence with respect to all other orders (Government or private) theretofore or thereafter placed with such person as the President may prescribe, and (2) to fill such order within the period of time prescribed by the President or as soon thereafter as possible.

"(c) In case any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) refuses or fails—

"(1) to give such order such precedence with respect to all other orders (Government or private) theretofore or thereafter placed with such person as the President may have prescribed;

"(2) to fill such order within the period of time prescribed by the President or as soon thereafter as possible as determined by the President;

"(3) to produce the kind or quality of articles or materials ordered; or

"(4) to furnish the quantity, kind, and quality of articles or materials ordered at such price as shall be negotiated between such person and the Government agency concerned; or in the event of failure to negotiate a price, to furnish the quantity, kind, and quality of articles or materials ordered at such price as he may subsequently be determined to be entitled to receive under subsection (d);

the President is authorized to take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or other facility of such person and to operate it, through any Government agency, for the production of such articles or materials as may be required by the Government.

"(d) Fair and just compensation shall be paid by the United States (1) for any articles or materials furnished pursuant to an order placed under subsection (a), or (2) as rental for any plant, mine, or other facility of which possession is taken under subsection (c).

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to render inapplicable to any plant, mine, or facility of which possession is taken pursuant to subsection (c) any State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, or employment standards of employees.

"(f) Any person, or any officer of any person as defined in this section, who willfully fails or refuses to carry out any duty imposed upon him by subsection (b) of this section shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years, or by a fine of not more than $50,000, or by both such imprisonment and fine.

"(g) (1) As used in this section—

"(A) The term 'person' means any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or other form of business organization.

"(B) The term 'Government agency' means any department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation in the Executive branch of the United States Government.

"(2) For the purposes of this section, a plant, mine, or other facility shall be deemed capable of producing any articles or materials if it is then producing or furnishing such articles or materials or if the President after consultation with and receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board determines that it can be readily converted to the production or furnishing of such articles or materials.

"(h) (1) The President is empowered, through the Secretary of Defense, to require all producers of steel in the United States to make available, to individuals, firms, associations, companies, corporations, or organized manufacturing industries having orders for steel products of steel materials required by the armed forces, such percentages of the steel production of such producers, in equal proportion deemed necessary for the expeditious execution of orders for such products or materials. Compliance with such requirement shall be obligatory on all such producers of steel and such requirement shall take precedence over all orders and contracts theretofore placed with such producers. If any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refuses to comply with such requirement, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to take immediate possession of the plant or plants of such producer and, through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the armed forces, to insure compliance with such requirement. Any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refusing to comply with such requirement shall be deemed guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

"(2) The President shall report to the Congress on the final day of each six-month period following the date of enactment of this Act the percentage figure, or if such information is not available, the approximate percentage figure, of the total steel production in the United States required to be made available during such period for the execution of orders for steel products and steel materials required by the armed forces, if such percentage figure is in excess of 10 per centum.

"SAVING PROVISION

"SEC. 19. Nothing in this title shall be deemed to amend any provision of the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 495).

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 20. This title shall become effective immediately; except that unless the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, declares a national emergency after the date of enactment of this Act, no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this title within ninety days after the date of its enactment. The Secretary of the Army, for the Army and the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy, for the Navy and Marine Corps, are hereby authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign in an effort to obtain the required personnel strengths.

TITLE II

"SEC. 201. The Articles of War (41 Stat. 787 to 811, as amended) are hereby amended as follows:

"Article 1 is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The word "officer" shall be construed to refer to a commissioned officer.

"'(b) The word "soldier" shall be construed as including a noncommissioned officer, a private, or any other enlisted man or woman.

"'(c) The word "company" shall be construed as including a troop, battery, or corresponding unit of the ground or air forces.

"'(d) The word "battalion" shall be construed as including a squadron or corresponding unit of the ground or air forces.

"'(e) The word "cadet" shall be construed to refer to a cadet of the United States Military Academy.'

"SEC. 202. Article 2, subparagraph (a), is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) All officers, warrant officers, and soldiers belonging to the Regular Army of the United States; all volunteers, from the dates of their muster or acceptance into the military service of the United States; and all other persons lawfully called, drafted, or ordered into, or to duty or for training in, the said service, from the dates they are required by the terms of the call, draft, or order to obey the same;'

"SEC. 203. Article 4 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 4. Who May Serve on Courts-Martial: All officers in the military service of the United States, and officers of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President, shall be competent to serve on courts-martial for the trial of any persons who may lawfully be brought before such courts for trial.

"'All warrant officers in the active military service of the United States and warrant officers in the active military service of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President, shall be competent to serve on general and special courts martial for the trial of warrant officers and enlisted persons, and persons in this category, shall be detailed for such service when deemed proper by the appointing authority.

"'Enlisted persons in the active military service of the United States or in the active military service of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President, shall be competent to serve on general and special courts martial for the trial of enlisted persons when requested in writing by the accused at any time prior to the convening of the court. When so request no enlisted person shall, without his consent, be tried by a court the membership of which does not include enlisted persons to the number of at least one third of the total membership of the court.

"'When appointing courts-martial the appointing authority shall detail as members thereof those officers of the command and when eligible those enlisted persons of the command who, in his opinion, are best qualified for the duty by reason of age, training, experience, and judicial temperament; and officers and enlisted persons having less than two years' service shall not, if it can be avoided without manifest injury to the service, be appointed as members of courts-martial in excess of minority membership thereof. No person shall be eligible to sit as a member of a general or special court-martial when he is the accuser or a witness for the prosecution.'

"SEC. 204. Article 5 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 5. General Courts-Martial: General courts-martial may consist of any number of members not less than five.'

"SEC. 205. Article 6 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 6. Special Courts-Martial: Special courts-martial may consist of any number of members not less than three.'

"SEC. 206. Article 8 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 8. General Courts-Martial: The President of the United States, the commanding officer of a Territorial department, the Superintendent of the Military Academy, the commanding officer of an Army group, an Army, an Army corps, a division, a separate brigade, or corresponding unit of the Ground or Air Forces, or any command to which a member of the Judge Advocate General's Department is assigned as staff judge advocate, as prescribed in article 47, and, when empowered by the President, the commanding officer of any district or of any force or body of troops may appoint general courts-martial; but when any such commander is the accuser or the prosecutor of the person or persons to be tried, the court shall be appointed by superior competent authority, and may in any case be appointed by superior authority when by the latter deemed desirable.

"'The authority appointing a general court-martial shall detail as one of the members thereof a law member who shall be an officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department or an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States and certified by the Judge Advocate General to be qualified for such detail: *Provided*, That no general court-martial shall receive evidence or vote upon its findings or sentence in the absence of the law member regularly detailed. The law member, in addition to his duties as a member, shall perform the duties prescribed in article 31 hereof and such other duties as the President may by regulations prescribe.'

"SEC. 207. Article 9 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 9. Special Courts-Martial: The commanding officer of a district, garrison, fort, camp, station, or other place where troops are on duty, and the commanding officer of an Army group, an Army, an Army corps, a division, brigade, regiment, detached battalion, or corresponding unit of Ground or Air Forces, and the commanding officer of any other detached command or group of detached units placed under a single commander for this purpose may appoint special courts-martial; but when any such commanding officer is the accuser or the prosecutor of the person or persons to be tried, the court shall be appointed by superior authority, and may in any case be appointed by superior authority when by the latter deemed desirable.'

"SEC. 208. Article 11 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 11. Appointment or Trial Judge Advocates and Counsel: For each general or special court-martial the authority appointing the court shall appoint a trial judge advocate and a defense counsel, and one or more assistant trial judge advocates and one or more assistant defense counsel when necessary: *Provided*, That the trial judge advocate and defense counsel of each general court-martial shall, if available, be members of the Judge Advocate General's Department or officers who are members of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States: *Provided further*, That in all cases in which the officer appointed as trial judge advocate shall be a member of the Judge Advocate General's Department, or an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State, the officer appointed as defense counsel shall likewise be a member of the Judge Advocate General's Department or an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States: *Provided further*, That when the accused is represented by counsel of his own selection and does not desire the presence of the regularly appointed defense counsel or assistant defense counsel, the latter may be excused by the president of the court: *Provided further*, That no person who has acted as member, trial judge advocate, assistant trial judge advocate or investigating officer in any case shall subsequently act in the same case as defense counsel or assistant defense counsel unless expressly requested by the accused: *Provided further*, That no person who has acted as member, defense counsel, assistant defense counsel, or investigating officer in any case shall subsequently act in the same case as a member of the prosecution: *Provided further*, That no person who has acted as member, trial judge advocate, assistant trial judge advocate, defense counsel, assistant defense counsel, or investigating officer in any case shall subsequently act as a staff judge advocate to the reviewing or confirming authority upon the same case.'

"SEC. 209. Article 12 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 12. General Courts-Martial: General courts-martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law for any crime or offense made punishable by these articles, and any other person who by the law of war is subject to trial by military tribunals: *Provided*, That general courts-martial shall have power to adjudge any punishment authorized by law or the custom of the service including a bad-conduct discharge.'

"SEC. 210. Article 13 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 13. Special Courts-Martial: Special courts-martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law for any crime or offense not capital made punishable by these articles: *Provided*, That the officer competent to appoint a general court-martial for the trial of any particular case may, when in his judgment the interests of the service so require, cause any case to be tried by a special court-martial notwithstanding the limitations upon the jurisdiction of the special court-martial as to offenses herein prescribed.

"'Special courts-martial shall not have power to adjudge dishonorable discharge or dismissal, or confinement in excess of six months, nor to adjudge forfeiture of more than two-thirds pay per month for a period of not exceeding six months: *Provided*, That subject to approval of the sentence by an officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction and subject to appellate review by The Judge Advocate General and appellate agencies in his office, a special court-martial may adjudge a bad-conduct discharge in addition to other authorized punishment: *Provided further*, That a bad-conduct discharge shall not be adjudged by a special court-martial unless a complete record of the proceedings of and testimony taken by the court is taken in the case.'

"SEC. 211. Article 14 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 14. Summary Courts-Martial: Summary courts-martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law, except an officer, a warrant officer, or a cadet, for any crime or offense not capital made punishable by these articles: *Provided*, That noncommissioned officers shall not, if they object thereto, be brought to trial before a summary court-martial without the authority of the officer competent to bring them to trial before a special court-martial: *Provided further*, That the President may, by regulations, except from the jurisdiction of summary courts-martial any class or classes of persons subject to military law.

"'Summary courts-martial shall not have power to adjudge confinement in excess of one month, restriction to limits for more than three months, or forfeiture or detention of more than two-thirds of one month's pay.'

"SEC. 212. Article 16 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 16. Persons in the Military Service—How Triable: Officers shall be triable only by general and special courts-martial and in no case shall a person in the military service, when it can be avoided, be tried by persons inferior to him in rank. No enlisted person may sit as a member of a court-martial for the trial of another enlisted person who is assigned to the same company or corresponding military unit.

"'No person subject to military law shall be confined with enemy prisoners or any other foreign nationals outside of the continental limits of the United States, nor shall any defendant awaiting trial be made subject to punishment or penalties other than confinement prior to sentence on charges against him.'

"SEC. 213. Article 22 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 22. Process to Obtain Witnesses: Every trial judge advocate of a general or special court-martial and every summary court-martial shall have power to issue the like process to compel witnesses to appear and testify which courts of the United States having criminal jurisdiction may lawfully issue; but such process shall run to any part of the United States, its Territories, and possessions. Witnesses for the defense shall be subpenaed, upon request by the defense counsel, through process issued by the trial judge advocate, in the same manner as witnesses for the prosecution.'

"SEC. 214. Article 24 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 24. Compulsory Self-Incrimination Prohibited: No witness before a military court, commission, court of inquiry, or board, or before any officer conducting an investigation, or before any officer, military or civil, designated to take a deposition to be read in

evidence before a military court, commission, court of inquiry, or board, or before an officer conducting an investigation, shall be compelled to incriminate himself or to answer any question the answer to which may tend to incriminate him or to answer any question not material to the issue or when such answer might tend to degrade him.

"'The use of coercion or unlawful influence in any manner whatsoever by any person to obtain any statement, admission, or confession from any accused person or witness, shall be deemed to be conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline, and no such statement, admission, or confession shall be received in evidence by any court-martial. It shall be the duty of any person in obtaining any statement from an accused to advise him that he does not have to make any statement at all regarding the offense of which he is accused or being investigated, and that any statement by the accused may be used as evidence against him in a trial by court-martial.'

"SEC. 215. Article 25 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 25. Depositions—When Admissible: A duly authenticated deposition taken upon reasonable notice to the opposite party may be read in evidence before any military court or commission in any case not capital, or in any proceeding before a court of inquiry or a military board, if such deposition be taken when the witness resides, is found, or is about to go beyond the State, Territory, or district in which the court, commission, or board is ordered to sit, or beyond the distance of one hundred miles from the place of trial or hearing, or when it appears to the satisfaction of the court, commission, board, or appointing authority that the witness, by reason of age, sickness, bodily infirmity, imprisonment, or other reasonable cause, is unable to, or, in foreign places, because of nonamenability to process, refuses to, appear and testify in person at the place of trial or hearing: *Provided*, That testimony by deposition may be adduced for the defense in capital cases: *Provided further*, That a deposition may be read in evidence in any case in which the death penalty is authorized by law but is not mandatory, whenever the appointing authority shall have directed that the case be treated as not capital, and in such a case a sentence of death may not be adjudged by the court-martial: *And provided further*, That at any time after charges have been signed as provided in article 46, and before the charges have been referred for trial, any authority competent to appoint a court-martial for the trial of such charges may designate officers to represent the prosecution and the defense and may authorize such officers, upon due notice, to take the deposition of any witness, and such deposition may subsequently be received in evidence as in other cases.'

"SEC. 216. Article 31 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 31. Method of Voting: Voting by members of a general or special court-martial upon questions of challenge, on the findings, and on the sentence shall be by secret written ballot. The junior member of the court shall in each case count the votes, which count shall be checked by the president, who shall forthwith announce the result of the ballot to the members of the court. The law member of a general court-martial or the president of a special court-martial, shall rule in open court upon interlocutory questions, other than challenge, arising during the proceedings: *Provided*, That unless such ruling be made by the law member of a general court-martial, if any member object thereto, the court shall be cleared and closed and the question decided by a majority vote, viva voce, beginning with the junior in rank: *And provided further*, That any such ruling made by the law member of a general court-martial upon any interlocutory question other than a motion for a finding of not guilty, or the question of accused's sanity, shall be final and shall constitute the ruling of the court; but the law member may in any case consult with the court, in closed session, before making a ruling, and may change any ruling made at any time during the trial. It shall be the duty of the law member of a general or the president of a special court-martial before a vote is taken to advise the court that the accused must be presumed to be innocent until his guilt is established by legal and competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, and that in the case being considered, if there is a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the accused, the doubt shall be resolved in the accused's favor and he shall be acquitted; if there is a reasonable doubt as to the degree of guilt, the finding must be in a lower degree as to which there is no such doubt; that the burden of proof to establish the guilt of the accused is upon the Government.'

"SEC. 217. Article 36 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 36. Disposition of Records—Special and Summary Courts-Martial: After having been acted upon by the officer appointing the court, or by the officer commanding for the time being, the record of each trial by special court-martial and a report of each trial by summary court-martial shall be transmitted to the headquarters of the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the command, there to be filed in the office of the staff judge advocate: *Provided, however*, That each record of trial by special court-martial in which the sentence, as approved by the appointing authority, includes a bad-conduct discharge, shall, if approved by the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction under the provisions of article 47, be forwarded by him to The Judge Advocate General for review as hereinafter in these articles provided. When no longer of use, records of summary courts-martial may be destroyed as provided by law governing destruction of Government records.'

"SEC. 218. Article 38 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 38. President May Prescribe Rules: The President may, by regulations, which he may modify from time to time, prescribe the procedure, including modes of proof, in cases before courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, and other military tribunals, which regulations shall, insofar as he shall deem practicable, apply the principles of law and rules of evidence generally recognized in the trial of criminal cases in the district courts of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing contrary to or inconsistent with these articles shall be so prescribed: *Provided further*, That all rules and regulations made in pursuance of this Article shall be laid before the Congress.'

"SEC. 219. Article 39 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 39. As to Time: Except for desertion or absence without leave committed in time of war, or for mutiny or murder, no person subject to military law shall be liable to be tried or punished by a court-martial for any crime or offense committed more than two years before arraignment of such person: *Provided*, That for desertion in time of peace, rape or for any crime or offense punishable under articles 93 and 94 of this code the period of limitations upon trial and punishment by court-martial shall be three years: *Provided further*, That the period of any absence of the accused from the jurisdiction of the United States, and also any period during which by reason of some manifest impediment the accused shall not have been amenable to military justice, shall be excluded in computing the aforesaid periods of limitation: *Provided further*, That this article shall not have the effect to authorize the trial or punishment for any crime or offense barred by the provisions of existing law: *And provided further*, That in the case of any offense the trial of which in time of war shall be certified by the Secretary of the Department of the Army to be detrimental to the prosecution of the war or inimical to the Nation's security, the period of limitations herein provided for the trial of the said offense shall be extended to the duration of the war and six months thereafter.'

"SEC. 220. Article 43 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 43. Death Sentence—When Lawful; Vote on Findings and Sentence: No person shall, by general court-martial, be convicted of an offense for which the death penalty is made mandatory by law, nor sentenced to suffer death, except by the concurrence of all the members of said court-martial present at the time the vote is taken, and for an offense in these articles expressly made punishable by death; nor sentenced to life imprisonment, nor to confinement for more than ten years, except by the concurrence of three-fourths of all the members present at the time the vote is taken. Conviction of any offense for which the death sentence is not mandatory and any sentence to confinement not in excess of ten years, whether by general or special court-martial, may be determined by a two-thirds vote of those members present at the time the vote is taken. All other questions shall be determined by a majority vote.'

"SEC. 221. Article 44 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 44. Officers—Reduction to Ranks: When a sentence to dismissal may lawfully be adjudged in the case of an officer the sentence may in time of war, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, adjudge in lieu thereof reduction to the grade of private.'

"SEC. 222. Article 46 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 46. Charges; Action Upon:

"'a. Signature; oath: Charges and specifications must be signed by a person subject to military law, and under oath either that he has personal knowledge of, or has investigated, the matters set forth therein and that the same are true in fact, to the best of his knowledge and belief.

"'b. Investigation: No charge will be referred to a general court-martial for trial until after a thorough and impartial investigation thereof shall have been made. This investigation will include inquiries as to the truth of the matter set forth in said charges, form of charges, and what disposition of the case should be made in the interest of justice and discipline. The accused shall be permitted, upon his request, to be represented at such investigation by counsel of his own selection, civil counsel if he so provides, or military if such counsel be reasonably available, otherwise by counsel appointed by the officer exercising general courts martial jurisdiction over the command. At such investigation full opportunity shall be given to the accused to cross-examine witnesses against him if they are available and to present anything he may desire in his own behalf, either in defense or mitigation, and the investigating officer shall examine available witnesses requested by the accused. If the charges are forwarded after such investigation they shall be accompanied by a statement of the substance of the testimony taken on both sides.

"'c. Forwarding charges; delays; service of charges: When a person is held for trial by general court-martial, the commanding officer will, within eight days after the accused is arrested or confined, if practicable, forward the charges to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction and furnish the accused a copy of such charges. If the same be not practicable, he will report to superior authority the reasons for delay. The trial judge advocate will cause to be served upon the accused a copy of the charges upon which trial is to be had, and a failure so to serve such charges will be ground for a continuance unless the trial be had on the charges furnished the accused as hereinbefore provided. In time of peace no person shall, against his objection be brought to trial before a general court-martial within a period of five days subsequent to the service of charges upon him.'

"SEC. 223. Article 47 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 47. Action by Convening Authority:

"'a. Assignment of judge advocates; channels of communication: All members of the Judge Advocate General's Department will be assigned as prescribed by The Judge Advocate General after appropriate consultations with commanders on whose staffs they may serve; and The Judge Advocate General or senior members of his staff will make frequent inspections in the field in supervision of the administration of military justice. Convening authorities will at all times communicate directly with their staff judge advocates in matters relating to the administration of military justice; and the staff judge advocate of any command is authorized to communicate directly with the staff judge advocate of a superior or subordinate command, or with The Judge Advocate General.

"'b. Reference for trial: Before directing the trial of any charge by general court-martial the convening authority will refer it to his staff judge advocate for consideration and advice; and no charge will be referred to a general court-martial for trial unless it has been found that a thorough and impartial investigation thereof has been made as prescribed in the preceding article, that such charge is legally sufficient to allege an offense under these articles, and is sustained by evidence indicated in the report of investigation.

"'c. Action on record of trial: Before acting upon a record of trial by general court-martial or military commission, or a record of trial by special court-martial in which a bad-conduct discharge has been adjudged and approved by the authority appointing the court, the reviewing authority will refer it to his staff judge advocate or to The Judge Advocate General for review and advice; and no sentence shall be approved unless upon conviction established beyond reasonable doubt of an offense made punishable by these articles, and unless the record of trial has been found legally sufficient to support it.

"'d. Approval: No sentence of a court-martial shall be carried into execution until the same shall have been approved by the convening authority: *Provided*, That no sentence of a special court-martial including a bad-conduct discharge shall be carried into execution until in addition to the approval of the convening authority the same shall have been approved by an officer authorized to appoint a general court-martial.

"'e. Who may exercise: Action by the convening authority may be taken by an officer commanding for the time being, by a successor in command, or by any officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction.

"'f. Powers incident to power to approve: The power to approve the sentence of a court-martial shall include—

"'(1) the power to approve or disapprove a finding of guilty and to approve only so much of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty or a lesser included offense;

"'(2) the power to approve or disapprove the whole or any part of the sentence; and

"'(3) the power to remand a case for rehearing under the provisions of article 52.'

"SEC. 224. Article 48 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 48. Confirmation: In addition to the approval required by article 47, confirmation is required as follows before the sentence of a court-martial may be carried into execution, namely:

"'a. By the President with respect to any sentence—

"'(1) of death, or

"'(2) involving a general officer:

Provided, That when the President has already acted as approving authority, no additional confirmation by him is necessary;

"'b. By the Secretary of the Department of the Army with respect to any sentence not requiring approval or confirmation by the President, when The Judge Advocate General does not concur in the action of the Judicial Council;

"'c. By the Judicial Council, with the concurrence of The Judge Advocate General, with respect to any sentence—

"'(1) when the confirming action of the Judicial Council is not unanimous, or when by direction of The Judge Advocate General his participation in the confirming action is required, or

"'(2) involving imprisonment for life, or

"'(3) involving the dismissal of an officer other than a general officer, or

"'(4) involving the dismissal or suspension of a cadet;

"'d. By the Judicial Council with respect to any sentence in a case transmitted to the Judicial Council under the provisions of article 50 for confirming action.'

"SEC. 225. Article 49 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 49. Powers Incident to Power to Confirm: The power to confirm the sentence of a court-martial shall be held to include—

"'a. The power to approve, confirm, or disapprove a finding of guilty, and to approve or confirm so much only of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense;

"'b. The power to confirm, disapprove, vacate, commute, or reduce to legal limits the whole or any part of the sentence;

"'c. The power to restore all rights, privileges, and property affected by any finding or sentence disapproved or vacated;

"'d. The power to order the sentence to be carried into execution;

"'e. The power to remand the case for a rehearing under the provisions of article 52.'

"SEC. 226. Article 50 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 50. Appellate Review:

"'a. Board of review; judicial council: The Judge Advocate General shall constitute, in his office, a Board of Review composed of not less than three officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department. He shall also constitute, in his office, a Judicial Council composed of three general officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department: *Provided*, That the Judge Advocate General may, under exigent circumstances, detail as members of the Judicial Council, for periods not in excess of sixty days, officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department of grades below that of general officer.

"'b. Additional boards of review and judicial councils: Whenever necessary, the Judge Advocate General may constitute two or more Boards of Review and Judicial Councils in his office, with equal powers and duties, composed as provided in the first paragraph of this article.

"'c. Branch offices: Whenever the President deems such action necessary, he may direct The Judge Advocate General to establish a branch office, under an Assistant Judge Advocate General who shall be a general officer of The Judge Advocate General's Department, with any distant command, and to establish in such branch office one or more Boards of Review and Judicial Councils composed as provided in the first paragraph of this article. Such Assistant Judge Advocate General and such Board of Review and Judicial Council shall be empowered to perform for that command under the general supervision of The Judge Advocate General, the duties which The Judge Advocate General and the Board of Review and Judicial Council in his office would otherwise be required to perform in respect of all cases involving sentences not requiring approval or confirmation by the President: *Provided*, That the power of mitigation and remission shall not be exercised by such Assistant Judge Advocate General or by agencies in his office, but any case in which such action is deemed desirable shall be forwarded to The Judge Advocate General with appropriate recommendations.

"'d. Action by board of review when approval by President or confirming action is required: Before any record of trial in which there has been adjudged a sentence requiring approval or confirmation by the President or confirmation by any other confirming authority is submitted to the President or such other confirming authority, as the case may be, it shall be examined by the Board of Review which shall take action as follows:

"'(1) In any case requiring action by the President, the Board of Review shall submit its opinion in writing, through the Judicial Council which shall also submit its opinion in writing, to the Judge Advocate General, who shall, except as herein otherwise provided, transmit the record and the Board's and Council's opinions, with his recommendations, directly to the Secretary of the Department of the Army for the action of the President: *Provided*, That the Judicial Council, with the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General shall have powers in respect to holdings of legal insufficiency equal to the powers vested in the Board of Review by subparagraph (3) of this paragraph.

"'(2) In any case requiring confirming action by the Judicial Council with or without the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General, when the Board of Review is of the opinion that the record of trial is legally sufficient to support the sentence it shall submit its opinion in writing to the Judicial Council for appropriate action.

"'(3) When the Board of Review is of the opinion that the record of trial in any case requiring confirming action by the President or confirming action by the Judicial Council is legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, or the sentence, or that errors of law have been committed injuriously affecting the substantial rights of the accused, it shall submit its holdings to the Judge Advocate General and when the Judge Advocate General concurs in such holding, such findings and sentence shall thereby be vacated in accord with such holding and the record shall be transmitted by the Judge Advocate General to the appropriate convening authority for a rehearing or such other action as may be proper.

"'(4) In any case requiring confirming action by the President or confirming action by the Judicial Council in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, or the sentence, and the Judge Advocate General shall not concur in the holding of the Board of Review, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the Judicial Council for confirming action or for other appropriate action in a case in which confirmation of the sentence by the President is required under article 48a.

"'e. Action by board of review in cases involving dishonorable or bad-conduct discharges or confinement in penitentiary: No authority shall order the execution of any sentence of a court-martial involving dishonorable discharge not suspended, bad-conduct discharge not suspended, or confinement in a penitentiary unless and until the appellate review required by this article shall have been completed and unless and until any confirming action required shall have been completed. Every record of trial by general or special court-martial involving a sentence to dishonorable discharge or bad-conduct discharge, whether such discharges

be suspended or not suspended, and every record of trial by general court-martial involving a sentence to confinement in a penitentiary, other than records of trial examination of which is required by paragraph d of this article, shall be examined by the Board of Review which shall take action as follows:

"'(1) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally sufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, and confirming action is not by the Judge Advocate General or the Board of Review deemed necessary, the Judge Advocate General shall transmit the holding to the convening authority, and such holding shall be deemed final and conclusive.

"'(2) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally sufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, but modification of the findings of guilty or the sentence is by the Judge Advocate General or the Board of Review deemed necessary to the ends of justice, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the Judicial Council for confirming action.

"'(3) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, and the Judge Advocate General concurs in such holding, the findings and sentence shall thereby be vacated in whole or in part in accord with such holding, and the record shall be transmitted by the Judge Advocate General to the convening authority for rehearing or such other action as may be appropriate.

"'(4) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, and the Judge Advocate General shall not concur in the holding of the Board of Review, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the Judicial Council for confirming action.

"'f. Appellate action in other cases: Every record of trial by general court-martial the appellate review of which is not otherwise provided for by this article shall be examined in the Office of the Judge Advocate General and if found legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, shall be transmitted to the Board of Review for appropriate action in accord with paragraph e of this article.

"'g. Weighing evidence: In the appellate review of records of trials by courts-martial as provided in these articles the Judge Advocate General and all appellate agencies in his office shall have authority to weigh evidence, judge the credibility of witnesses, and determine controverted questions of fact.

"'h. Finality of court-martial judgments: The appellate review of records of trial provided by this article, the confirming action taken pursuant to articles 48 or 49, the proceedings, findings, and sentences of courts-martial as heretofore or hereafter approved, reviewed, or confirmed as required by the Articles of War and all dismissals and discharges heretofore or hereafter carried into execution pursuant to sentences by courts-martial following approval, review, or confirmation as required by the Articles of War, shall be final and conclusive, and orders publishing the proceedings of courts-martial and all action taken pursuant to such proceedings shall be binding upon all departments, courts, agencies, and officers of the United States, subject only to action upon application for a new trial as provided in article 53.'

"SEC. 227. Article 50½ is rescinded.

"SEC. 228. Article 51 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 51. Mitigation, Remission, and Suspension of Sentences:

"'a. At the time ordered executed: The power of the President, the Secretary of the Department of the Army, and any reviewing authority to order the execution of a sentence of a court-martial shall include the power to mitigate, remit, or suspend the whole or any part thereof, except that a death sentence may not be suspended. The Judge Advocate General shall have the power to mitigate, remit, or suspend the whole or any part of a sentence in any case requiring appellate review under article 50 and not requiring approval or confirmation by the President, but the power to mitigate or remit shall be exercised by the Judge Advocate General under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of the Army. The authority which suspends the execution of a sentence may restore the person under sentence to duty during such suspension; and the death or honorable discharge of a person under suspended sentence shall operate as a complete remission of any unexecuted or unremitted part of such sentence.

"'b. Subsequent to the time ordered executed:

"'(1) Any unexecuted portion of a sentence other than a sentence of death, including all uncollected forfeitures, adjudged by court-martial may be mitigated, remitted or suspended and any order of suspension may be vacated, in whole or in part, by the military authority competent to appoint, for the command, exclusive of penitentiaries and the United States disciplinary barracks, in which the person under sentence may be, a court of the kind that imposed the sentence, and the same power may be exercised by superior military authority or by the Judge Advocate General under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of the Army: *Provided*, That no sentence approved or confirmed by the President shall be mitigated, remitted, or suspended by any authority inferior to the President: *And provided further*, That no order of suspension of a sentence to dishonorable discharge or bad conduct discharge shall be vacated unless and until confirming or appellate action on the sentence has been completed as required by articles 48 and 50.

"'(2) The power to suspend a sentence shall include the power to restore the person affected to duty during such suspension.

"'(3) The power to mitigate, remit or suspend the sentence or any part thereof in the case of a person confined in the United States disciplinary barracks or in a penitentiary shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Department of the Army or by the Judge Advocate General under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of the Army.'

"SEC. 229. Article 52 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 52. Rehearings: When any reviewing or confirming authority disapproved a sentence or when any sentence is vacated by action of the Board of Review or Judicial Council and the Judge Advocate General, the reviewing or confirming authority or the Judge Advocate General may authorize or direct a rehearing. Such rehearing shall take place before a court-martial composed of members not members of the court-martial which first heard the case. Upon such rehearing the accused shall not be tried for any offense of which he was found not guilty by the first court-martial, and no sentence in excess of or more severe than the original sentence shall be enforced unless the sentence be based upon a finding of guilty of an offense not considered upon the merits in the original proceeding.'

"SEC. 230. Article 53 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 53. Petition for New Trial: Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, the Judge Advocate General is authorized, upon application of an accused person, and upon good cause shown, in his discretion to grant a new trial, or to vacate a sentence, restore rights, privileges, and property affected by such sentence, and substitute for a dismissal, dishonorable discharge, or bad conduct discharge previously executed a form of discharge authorized for administrative issuance, in any court-martial case in which application is made within one year after final disposition of the case upon initial appellate review: *Provided*, That with regard to cases involving offenses committed during World War II, the application for a new trial may be made within one year after termination of the war, or after its final disposition upon initial appellate review as herein provided, whichever is the later: *Provided*, That only one such application for a new trial may be entertained with regard to any one case: *And provided further*, That all action by the Judge Advocate General pursuant to this article, and all proceedings, findings, and sentences on new trials under this article, as approved, reviewed, or confirmed under articles 47, 48, 49, and 50, and all dismissals and discharges carried into execution pursuant to sentences adjudged on new trials and approved, reviewed, or confirmed, shall be final and conclusive and orders publishing the action of the Judge Advocate General or the proceedings on new trial and all action taken pursuant to such proceedings, shall be binding upon all departments, courts, agencies, and officers of the United States.'

"SEC. 231. Article 70 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 70. Charges; Action Upon, Unnecessary Delay: When any person subject to military law is placed in arrest or confinement immediate steps will be taken to try the person accused or to dismiss the charge and release him. Any officer who is responsible for unnecessary delay in investigating or carrying the case to a final conclusion shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.'

"SEC. 232. Article 85 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 85. Drunk on Duty: Any person subject to military law, who is found drunk on duty, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.'

"SEC. 233. Article 88 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 88. Unlawfully Influencing Action of Court: No authority appointing a general, special, or summary court-martial nor any other commanding officer, shall censure, reprimand, or admonish such court, or any member thereof, with respect to the findings or sentence adjudged by the court, or with respect to any other exercise, by such court or any member thereof, of its or his judicial responsibility. No person subject to military law shall attempt to coerce or unlawfully influence the action of a court-martial or any military court or commission, or any member thereof, in reaching the findings or sentence in any case, or the action of an appointing or reviewing or confirming authority with respect to his judicial acts.'

"SEC. 234. Article 89 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 89. Good Order To Be Maintained and Wrongs Redressed: All persons subject to military law are to behave themselves orderly in quarters, garrison, camp, and on the march; and any person subject to military law who commits any waste or spoil, or wrongfully destroys any property whatsoever or commits any kind of depredation or riot, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct. Any commanding officer who, upon complaint made to him refuses or omits to see reparation made to the party injured, insofar as the offender's pay shall go toward such reparation, as provided for in article 105, shall be dismissed from the service, or otherwise punished, as a court-martial may direct.'

"SEC. 235. Article 92 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 92. Murder—Rape: Any person subject to military law found guilty of murder shall suffer death or imprisonment for life, as a court-martial may direct; but if found guilty of murder not premeditated, he shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

Any person subject to military law who is found guilty of rape shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct: *Provided*, That no person shall be tried by court-martial for murder or rape committed within the geographical limits of the States of the Union and the District of Columbia in time of peace.'

"SEC. 236. Article 93 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 93. Various Crimes: Any person subject to military law who commits manslaughter, mayhem, arson, burglary, housebreaking, robbery, larceny, perjury, forgery, sodomy, assault with intent to commit any felony, assault with intent to do bodily harm with a dangerous weapon, instrument, or other thing, or assault with intent to do bodily harm, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct: *Provided*, That any person subject to military law who commits larceny or embezzlement shall be guilty of larceny within the meaning of this article.'

"SEC. 237. Article 94 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 94. Frauds Against the Government: Any person subject to military law who makes or causes to be made any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, knowing such claim to be false or fraudulent; or

"'Who presents or causes to be presented to any person in the civil or military service thereof, for approval or payment, any claim against the United States, or any officer thereof, knowing such claim to be false or fraudulent; or

"'Who enters into any agreement or conspiracy to defraud the United States by obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the allowance or payment of any false or fraudulent claim; or

"'Who for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or against any officer thereof, makes or uses, or procures, or advises the making or use of, any writing or other paper knowing the same to contain any false of fraudulent statements; or

"'Who, for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, makes or procures, or advises the making of, any oath to any fact or to any writing or other paper knowing such oath to be false; or

"'Who, for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, forges or counterfeits, or procures, or advises the forging or counterfeiting of any signature upon any writing or other paper, or uses, or procures, or advises the use of any such signature, knowing the same to be forged or counterfeited; or

"'Who, having charge, possession, custody, or control of any money or other property of the United States, furnished or intended for the military service thereof, knowingly delivers, or causes to be delivered, to any person having authority to receive the same, any amount thereof less than that for which he receives a certificate or receipt; or

"'Who, being authorized to make or deliver any paper certifying the receipt of any property of the United States furnished or intended for the military service thereof, makes or delivers to any person such writing, without having full knowledge of the truth of the statements therein contained and with intent to defraud the United States; or

"'Who steals, embezzles, knowingly and willfully misappropriates, applies to his own use or benefit, or wrongfully, or knowingly sells or disposes of any ordnance, arms, equipment, ammunition, clothing, subsistence stores, money, or other property of the United States furnished or intended for the military service thereof: *Provided*, That any person, subject to military law, who commits larceny or embezzlement with respect to property of the United States, furnished or intended for the military service thereof, or with respect to other property within the purview of this article, steals said property within the meaning of this article; or

"'Who knowingly purchases or receives in pledge for any obligation or indebtedness from any soldier, officer, or other person who is a part of or employed in said forces or service, any ordnance, arms, equipment, ammunition, clothing, subsistence stores, or other property of the United States, such soldier, officer, or other person not having lawful right to sell or pledge the same; or

"'Who enters into any agreement or conspires to commit any of the offenses aforesaid:

"'Shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by fine or imprisonment, or by such other punishment as a court martial may adjudge, or by any or all of said penalties. If any person, being guilty of any of the offenses aforesaid or who steals or fails properly to account for any money or other property held in trust by him for enlisted persons or as its official custodian while in the military service of the United States, receives his discharge or is dismissed or otherwise separated from the service, he shall continue to be liable to be arrested and held for trial and sentence by a court martial in the same manner and to the same extent as if he had not been so separated therefrom.'

"SEC. 238. Article 104 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 104. Disciplinary Powers of Commanding officers: Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, the commanding officer of any detachment, company, or higher command, may, for minor offenses impose disciplinary punishments upon persons of his command without the intervention of a court-martial, unless the accused demands trial by court-martial.

"'The disciplinary punishments authorized by this article may include admonition or reprimand, or the withholding of privileges, or extra fatigue, or restriction to certain specified limits, or hard labor without confinement or any combination of such punishments for not exceeding one week from the date imposed; but shall not include forfeiture of pay or confinement under guard; except that any officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction may, under the provisions of this article, also impose upon a warrant officer or officer of his command below the rank of brigadier general a forfeiture of not more than one-half of his pay per month for three months.

"'A person punished under authority of this article, who deems his punishment unjust or disproportionate to the offense, may, through the proper channel, appeal to the next superior authority, but may in the meantime be required to undergo the punishment adjudged. The commanding officer who imposes the punishment, his successor in command, and superior authority shall have power to mitigate or remit any unexecuted portion of the punishment. The imposition and enforcement of disciplinary punishment under authority of this article for any act or omission shall not be a bar to trial by court-martial for a serious crime or offense growing out of the same act or omission, and not properly punishable under this article; but the fact that a disciplinary punishment has been enforced may be shown by the accused upon trial, and when so shown shall be considered in determining the measure of punishment to be adjudged in the event of a finding of guilty.'

"SEC. 239. Article 108 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 108. Soldiers—Separation From the Service: No enlisted person, lawfully inducted into the military service of the United States, shall be discharged from said service without a certificate of discharge, and no enlisted person shall be discharged from said service before his term of service has expired, except in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of the Department of the Army, or by sentence of a general or special court-martial.'

"SEC. 240. Article 110 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 110. Certain Articles of War To Be Read or Explained: Articles 1, 2, 24, 28, 29, 54 to 97, inclusive, 104 to 109, inclusive, and 121 shall be read or carefully explained to every soldier at the time of his enlistment or muster in, or within six days thereafter, and shall be read or explained once every six months to the soldiers of every garrison, regiment, or company in the service of the United States. And a complete text of the Articles of War and of the Manual for Courts-Martial shall be made available to any soldier, upon his request, for his personal examination.'

"SEC. 241. Article 116 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 116. Powers of Assistant Trial Judge Advocate and of Assistant Defense Counsel: An assistant trial judge advocate of a general or special court-martial shall be competent to perform any duty devolved by law, regulation, or the custom of the service upon the trial judge advocate of the court. An assistant defense counsel shall be competent likewise to perform any duty devolved by law, regulation, or the custom of the service upon counsel for the accused.'

"SEC. 242. Article 117 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 117. Removal of Civil Suits: When any civil or criminal prosecution is commenced in any court of a State of the United States against any officer, soldier, or other person in the military service of the United States on account of any act done under color of his office or status, or in respect to which he claims any right, title, or authority under any law of the United States respecting the military forces thereof, or under the law of war, such suit or prosecution may at any time before the trial or final hearing thereof be removed for trial into the district court of the United States in the district where the same is pending in the manner prescribed by law, and the cause shall thereupon be entered on the docket of such district court, which shall proceed as if the cause had been originally commenced therein and shall have full power to hear and determine said cause'

"SEC. 243. Section 1 of article 121 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 121. Complaints of Wrongs: Any officer or soldier who believes himself wronged by his commanding officer, and, upon due application to such commander, is refused redress, may complain to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the officer against whom the complaint is made. That officer shall examine into said complaint and take proper measures for redressing the wrong complained of; and he shall, as soon as possible, transmit to the Department of the Army a true statement of such complaint, with the proceedings had thereon.'

"SEC. 244. This title shall become effective on the first day of the eighth calendar month after approval of this title.

"SEC. 245. All offenses committed and all penalties, forfeitures, fines, or liabilities incurred prior to the effective date of this title, under any law embraced in or modified, changed or repealed by this title, may be prosecuted, punished, and enforced in the same manner and with the same effect as if this title had not been passed.

"SEC. 246. Section 8 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 61), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 8. Judge Advocate General's Corps: The Judge Advocate General's Corps shall consist of one Judge Advocate General with

the rank of major general, one assistant with the rank of major general, three officers with the rank of brigadier general, and an active list commissioned officer strength to be determined by the Secretary of the Department of the Army, but such strength shall not be less than 1½ per centum of the authorized active list commissioned officer strength of the Armed Services of the National Military Establishment who are subject to the Articles of War, and in addition warrant officers and enlisted men in such numbers as the Secretary of the Department of the Army shall determine.'

"SEC. 247. Regular Army officers shall be permanently appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the commissioned officer grades of major general, brigadier general, colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, and first lieutenant. The names of commissioned officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps below the grade of brigadier general shall be carried on the Judge Advocate's promotion list. The Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be established by entering thereon the names of the officers concerned without change in their order of precedence on the existing promotion list. The authorized numbers in each of the several grades in the Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Department of the Army, but the numbers thus authorized shall not exceed the following percentages of the total strength authorized for that list: 8 per centum in the grade of colonel; 14 per centum in the grade of lieutenant colonel; 19 per centum in the grade of major; 23 per centum in the grade of captain; and 36 per centum in the grade of first lieutenant: *Provided*, That numbers may be authorized for any grade in lieu of authorization in higher grades: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not operate to require a reduction in permanent grade of any officer now holding permanent appointment.

"Officers whose names are carried on the Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be promoted to the several grades as now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers generally and the authorized numbers in grades below colonel on such list shall be temporarily increased from time to time in order to give effect to the promotion system now or hereafter prescribed by law for promotion-list officers.

"Within the authorized strength of the Judge Advocate General's Corps additional officers may be appointed by transfer of qualified officers from other branches of the Army, by appointment of Reserve judge advocates or qualified civilian graduates of accredited law schools. Those originally appointed in the Regular Army in the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be credited with an amount of service for the purpose of determining grade, position on promotion list, permanent-grade seniority, and eligibility for promotion as now or hereafter prescribed by law.

"SEC. 248. The Judge Advocate General shall, in addition to such other duties as may be prescribed by law, be the legal adviser of the Secretary of the Department of the Army and of all officers and agencies of the Department of the Army; and all members of the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall perform their duties under the direction of the Judge Advocate General.

"SEC. 249. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocate General and general officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps who are recommended for such positions by the Secretary of the Department of the Army. Upon the appointment of an officer to be the Judge Advocate General or Assistant Judge Advocate General with the rank of major general, he shall at the same time if not then holding permanent appointment in such grade be appointed a permanent major general of the Regular Army."

CHAN GURNEY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
HARRY F. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

W. G. ANDREWS,
W. STERLING COLE,
GEORGE J. BATES,
CARL VINSON,
P. J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTHS

Senate bill, Army, 790,000 plus 110,000 one-year trainees.

House amendment, 837,000.

Senate bill, Navy (including Marine Corps), 666,882, plus 36,000 one-year trainees.

House amendment, 666,882.

Senate bill, Air Force, 453,000, plus 15,000 one-year trainees.

House amendment, 502,000.

The conference agreement provides for authorized active duty personnel strengths for the armed forces as follows:

Army: 837,000 plus 110,000 one-year enlistees.

Navy (including Marine Corps): 666,882 plus 36,000 one-year enlistees.

Air Force: 502,000 plus 15,000 one-year enlistees.

ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS

The Senate bill authorized the Secretary of the Army until June 30, 1950 to accept enlistments in the Regular Army, for periods of not less than 5 years, of not more than 25,000 qualified aliens between the ages of 18 and 35. The House amendment contains no comparable provision. The conference agreement eliminates the provision for enlistment of aliens.

REGISTRATION

The Senate bill provided for the registration of male persons between the ages of 18 and 26, and contained no specific provision authorizing registration by age groups. The House amendment provided for the registration of male persons between the ages of 18 and 31, and specifically authorized the President to provide for registration by age groups. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to registration.

LIABILITY OF ALIENS FOR SERVICE

The Senate bill provided that citizens of a foreign country should be relieved from liability for training and service upon application for such relief, but provided that any person who sought relief should thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States. The House amendment excluded from liability for service those aliens who have not declared their intentions to become citizens of the United States. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to liability for training and service of aliens but insuring that properly deferrable aliens may be relieved from liability for induction without debarment from citizenship.

MORATORIUM ON INDUCTIONS

The House amendment contained provisions prohibiting inductions under the Act until the President proclaims not earlier than 75 days after the date of enactment (1) that a sufficient number of persons is on active service in the armed forces to maintain an adequate national defense, and (2) that a sufficient number of such persons cannot, in his judgment, be attained by voluntary enlistment and by voluntary request for call to active duty. The amendment did not delay the registration, classification, et cetera, of persons. The amendment further provided that upon the issuance of such a proclamation the provisions authorizing inductions should come into effect but that no person should be inducted prior to 90 days after the date of enactment of the legislation. The amendment further provided that no induction should be made before January 31, 1949 and that no induction should be made after that date unless the President found that the requisite manpower strengths could not be obtained or maintained by an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign which was directed to be carried out. The amendment further provided for original enlistments in the armed forces for periods of two years and for reenlistments for periods of either one or two years.

The Senate bill contained no provisions comparable to those described in the preceding paragraph.

The conference agreement requires that involuntary inductions under the Act be delayed for 90 days after the date of its enactment unless the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, declares a national emergency after the date of enactment of the Act. The conference agreement requires the armed forces to initiate and carry on an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign in an effort to obtain the required personnel strength.

PERIOD OF SERVICE

The Senate bill provided that persons inducted under the legislation should serve for a period of 24 consecutive months. The House amendment provided that persons inducted should serve for a period of 12 months. The conference agreement provides that persons inducted shall serve for a period of twenty-one consecutive months.

SPECIAL CALLS FOR DOCTORS AND DENTISTS

The Senate bill provided for the special registration and calling for service of members of the medical and dental professions and allied specialist categories who have not attained the age of 45. It established an order of priority for the induction of persons in medical and dental categories and contained provisions designed to prevent the induction or call to active duty for more than 1 month in any calendar year of any doctor of medicine or dental surgery, established in his profession in the community in which he resides, if the local board determined that the health of the community in which he resides would be unduly jeopardized as a result of his induction or service on active duty.

The House amendment contained no provisions providing for the special registration of and calling for service of persons in medical and dental categories.

The conference agreement eliminates the provisions of the Senate bill providing for the special registration and calling for service of persons in medical and dental categories.

SHORT-TERM ENLISTMENTS

The House amendment contained a provision requiring the acceptance of enlistments in the Regular Army of persons between the ages of 19 and 26 for enlistment periods equal to the periods of service required of inductees. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference agreement includes the provision of the House amendment relative to enlistments in the Regular Army.

ARMY GENERAL CLASSIFICATION TEST SCORE

The House amendment contained a provision prohibiting the establishment of a passing score on the Army General Classification Test higher than 70 points. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference agreement provides that the passing score on the Army General Classification Test shall be 70 points.

ONE-YEAR TRAINEES

The Senate bill contained provisions providing for the enlistment in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for 1-year periods of limited numbers of qualified male persons between the ages of 18 and 19. Persons enlisting for the period of one year would, upon completion of their enlistments, be transferred to the reserve components for periods of 6 years and would be under strong compulsion to accept assignment to organized units of the reserve components or to officer training programs of the armed forces.

The House amendment also provided for the enlistment in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for 1-year periods of qualified male persons between the ages of 18 and 19 but placed no limit on the number who could be so enlisted. The House amendment, while providing for the transfer of such persons to reserve components for periods of six years, did not impose any compulsion upon them to join organized units of the reserve components.

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill relative to enlistments for 1-year periods of persons between the ages of 18 and 19.

DEFERMENTS AND EXEMPTIONS

The Senate bill exempted from liability for induction those persons who served for more than 18 months, either in the armed forces of the United States or allied countries, between September 16, 1940, and the date of enactment. It also provided for the exemption of those veterans who served for more than 90 days between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945. The Senate bill provided that those veterans who served for 90 days or more but less than 18 months in the period September 16, 1940, to the date of enactment should be exempt from liability for induction if they should be determined by the local board to have taken on certain reserve obligations. The House amendment provided for the exemption of those veterans who served for 12 months or more subsequent to September 16, 1940, and also provided for the exemption of those veterans who have been awarded the purple heart or any badge, award, or decoration evidencing exceptional valor, bravery in combat, or continued service in combat. The House amendment also provided for the exemption from liability for induction of those veterans who served for 90 days or more but less than 12 months subsequent to September 16, 1940, if the local boards should determine that they had assumed certain reserve obligations which might be assumed without interrupting their normal pursuits and activities.

The conference agreement is that veterans with 12 months or more of service shall be exempt from induction. It was further agreed that veterans who served between Pearl Harbor Day and V-J Day for more than 90 days shall be exempt.

The conference agreement also was that veterans with less than 12 months of service shall be exempt if they assume certain reserve obligations which might be assumed without interrupting their normal pursuits and activities.

The Senate bill provided for the exemption from liability for service of those persons who joined the national guard before attaining the age of 18½ only in cases in which the governor of the State determined that the strength of the national guard could not be attained by the registration of persons not liable for training and service under the bill. The House amendment provided for the exemption from liability for training and service of all persons joining organized units of the reserve components, which participate in scheduled drills and training periods throughout the year, if such persons join before attaining the age of 18½. The House amendment also provided for the deferment of persons who, at any time prior to the date they are ordered to report for induction, join reserve components and who serve in such components for a total period of 6 years during which they satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods.

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to the matters discussed in this paragraph.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment contained exemptions for a limited number of persons enrolling in the Reserve Officers Training Programs of the armed forces subsequent to the effective date of the legislation. The Senate bill conditioned such exemption upon those persons agreeing to serve, after being commissioned, for a period of 2 years. The House amendment conditioned the exemption upon an agreement to serve, after being commissioned, for a period of time equal to the period of service of inductees.

The conference agreement requires persons who are deferred from induction while undergoing training in the Reserve Officers Training Programs to agree to serve on active duty for a period of 2 years.

The Senate bill provided for the exemption from training and service of regular or duly ordained ministers of religion and of theological and pre-theological students. The House amendment broadened this exemption to include Christian Science Readers and practitioners and those persons who have been recognized by the officials of their church, synagogue, or sect as having given definite and acknowledged intention of entering into full-time religious work.

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to exemption of ministers and theological and pre-theological students, for the reason that it was felt that to include any specific sect or religion by name in this provision would logically compel the inclusion of many others or, by interpretation, indicate that other such sects would be excluded were the original House provisions accepted.

The Senate bill specifically provided the President with authority to defer from induction those persons whose activity in study, research, or medical or scientific endeavors was found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. The House amendment, although giving the President sufficient authority to defer such persons, contains no specific provisions relating to such persons.

The conference agreement adopts the specific provisions of the Senate bill with respect to deferment of those whose activities in study, research, or medical or scientific endeavors are found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

The Senate bill provided that those conscientious objectors who were found to be opposed to participation in noncombatant service should be assigned to work of national importance under immediate civilian direction. The bill extended to persons who might be so assigned and who might suffer disability or death while performing such work the benefits of the Employees Compensation Act of September 7, 1916. The House amendment provided that conscientious objectors found to be opposed to participation in noncombatant service should be deferred from induction for service under the legislation.

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House amendment providing for the deferment from induction of those conscientious objectors who are found to be opposed to participation in noncombatant service.

SOLE SURVIVING SON EXEMPTION

The House amendment added a provision to the effect that where one or more members of a family have been killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the armed forces of the United States, the sole surviving son of such family should not be inducted for service under the legislation. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference agreement adopts the provision of the House amendment with a clarifying amendment.

PROVISIONS WITH RESPECT TO HEALTH AND MORALS

The House amendment contained a provision requiring that the training under the Act be administered and carried out on the highest possible moral, religious, and spiritual plane. It also prohibited the maintenance, within distances specified by the Secretary of Defense, of any military installation utilized for training purposes of any house of ill fame or place of entertainment constituting a public nuisance. The conference agreement eliminates the provisions of the House amendment because of the fact that the conferees determined that the Act of May 15, 1946 (60 Stat. 182) had made permanent the provisions of the Act of July 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 583) which contains substantially the same provisions with respect to prohibition of prostitution within the vicinity of military and naval establishments as does the provision of the House amendment.

REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

The Senate bill provided that persons completing their periods of service under the Act and securing restoration to their former positions in accordance with the terms of the Act should be restored without loss of seniority. The bill contained a declaration by the Congress to the effect that persons so restored should be restored in such manner as to give them the status in their employment which they would have enjoyed if they had continued in their employment continuously. The Senate bill contained detailed provisions with respect to the enforcement of the reemployment rights of Federal Government employees and gave the Civil Service Commission the power to issue necessary rules, regulations, and orders to assure that the restoration rights would be effective. It contained no specific provisions with respect to court proceedings for restoration to positions in the Federal Government. The Senate bill designated the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Bureau of Veterans Reemployment Rights, as the Federal official to render aid to veterans in obtaining restoration to their former employment. The bill also contained a provision authorizing and requesting the President to formulate and recommend to Congress plans for the rehabilitation and retraining of veterans serving after the date of enactment of the legislation.

The House bill provided that those restored to positions pursuant to the terms of the act should be entitled to all promotions, increases in pay, vacation rights, and accumulations of seniority to which they would have been entitled if they had been working in their old positions during their periods of service. The House amendment, unlike the Senate bill, did not specifically prohibit the layoff, within 1 year after his

restoration, of a person restored to employment under the provisions of the legislation. The House amendment also contained detailed provisions with respect to the restoration to their positions of those veterans who held positions under the Federal Government prior to the beginning of their periods of service. These detailed provisions included specific authority for such persons to obtain court orders requiring their restoration to positions under the Federal Government. The House amendment designated the Director of Selective Service as the Federal official charged with the duty of rendering aid to veterans in obtaining restoration to their former positions.

The conference agreement adopts the language of the Senate bill with respect to reemployment rights, except that (1) the provision of the Senate bill authorizing and requesting the President to formulate and recommend to Congress plans for the rehabilitation and retraining of veterans was eliminated, and (2) the provision of the House amendment deleting the prohibition against lay-offs of restored veterans was adopted.

CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

The Senate bill provided specific penalties for those forging or altering certificates issued under the Act and for persons possessing or using any such forged or altered certificates. The House amendment contained no comparable provisions. The conference agreement adopts the provision of the Senate bill with respect to this matter.

LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS TO RESERVE FLYING OFFICERS

The Senate bill contained a provision having the effect of preventing Reserve flying officers from obtaining the lump-sum payments of $500 per year for the periods of active duty which they might perform during the time the legislation would be effective. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to lump-sum payments.

UTILIZATION OF INDUSTRY

The Senate provisions with respect to the placement of mandatory orders for articles and materials required that mandatory orders be placed by the President only after receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board. The bill authorized the placement of mandatory orders to obtain articles or materials for the use of the armed forces of the United States or the Atomic Energy Commission.

The provisions of the House amendment relating to the placement of mandatory orders differed considerably in wording but not so much in substance from the corresponding provisions of the Senate bill. The House amendment authorized the President, through the Secretary of Defense, to place mandatory orders only for products or materials required by the armed forces. The House amendment contained a provision, which had no counterpart in the Senate bill, empowering the President to require producers of steel to make available to manufacturers having orders for steel products or steel materials required by the armed forces the necessary steel to enable such manufacturers to execute their orders. It provided for enforcing compliance with the allocation of steel by authorizing the President to take possession of the plants of steel producers failing to comply with the required allocations. The amendment further required the President to report to the Congress at the end of each 6 months' period the percentage of steel production in the United States required in the execution of orders for steel products and steel materials for the armed forces, if such requirement was in excess of 10 per centum of production.

The conference agreement adopts the provision of the House amendment empowering the President to require producers of steel to make steel available to persons having orders from the armed forces for materials requiring steel products or materials in their manufacture. The conference agreement otherwise adopts the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to mandatory orders.

MILITARY JUSTICE

The Senate bill contained provisions incorporating the substance of the bill H. R. 2575, as previously passed by the House during this Congress, revising the articles of war and making changes in the status of the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army. The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference agreement incorporates the provisions of H. R. 2575 with respect to military justice together with certain clarifying amendments.

W. G. ANDREWS,
W. STERLING COLE,
GEORGE J. BATES,
CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve component thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order, and I ask the indulgence of the Speaker so that I may argue the point.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the document which has just been presented is not the report of any conference. It is not the product of a full and free conference as required in Jefferson's Manual. I make my point of order based on the proposition that there has never been a valid conference—specifically, that there has never been a valid meeting on the part of the managers on the part of the House.

I would like at this time, first, to present the facts chronologically.

Yesterday the House voted, under suspension of the rules, to send the bill to conference, and the House conferees were appointed. A motion was made in the other body for the same purpose. Extended debate was had on that motion. This morning the motion to send the Senate bill to conference and disagree with the House amendments and authorizing the appointment of conferees was adopted. Immediately, before there was any time for a meeting, a physical meeting to take place between the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate, this document before you, Mr. Speaker, was filed and acted upon in the Senate. Physically there were some meetings. The meetings that took place yesterday, Mr. Speaker, all of the meetings that took place yesterday were prior to the adoption of the motion in the other body to send this bill to conference. How could they have been valid meetings? They could not have been valid meetings because there were no managers in existence on the part of the Senate. The Members of the other body who met with the House conferees were not managers on the part of the other body, therefore those meetings had no validity whatsoever. It is true that at those meetings the provisions of the document which we have before us were agreed upon. It is likewise true that the people who participated in those meetings on behalf of the other body were Members who were subsequently appointed as managers for the other body, but throughout those meetings they were not there as managers who had been appointed; in fact all the while they were participating in those meetings they had not as yet been authorized by the other body to be there. They had no authority to act.

After the motion was adopted to send the bill to conference, and before the Senate adopted this document as a conference report, and before this document had been filed in the other body there was no meeting. A meeting took place after that.

The question is whether or not that ex post facto meeting constituted a valid meeting, pursuant to the various sections of Jefferson's Manual that define a free and full conference. That meeting that took place after the Senate had adopted this document as a conference report could not have been a valid meeting; it has no validity, because the managers on the part of the other body had no longer anything to discuss. They no longer had any duties to perform. Whatever was said at that meeting or whatever was done at that meeting could not have any validity because action had already been taken by the other body.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the argument will be made that the House cannot go across the Capitol and review what has happened in the other body. I know that it will be said that the illegal action on the part of the other body in accepting this document as a report on which the conferees never formally met as conferees is conclusive and binding as far as the House is concerned. However, that action is absolutely illegal and void, and, in my humble judgment, places in jeopardy the legality of this entire legislation.

I know that the argument will be made that we in the House cannot go into the legality of any Senate action. That is a debatable question and I do not press it.

The argument that I do make, Mr. Speaker, is against the action not of the Senate conferees but the actions of the House conferees. My point of order is that they did not attend a valid conference, that the meetings that they attended yesterday were not valid conferences because the persons with whom they were meeting had not been appointed managers for the Senate; that the meeting they had subsequent to the adoption of this document as a conference report or subsequent to the filing of this document as a conference report in the Senate cannot be considered a valid meeting. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the document that is presented here presumably as a report of a conference is not the report of a valid conference. It is not a report of a full and free conference. Since there has been no valid conference this document has no validity before this House.

I press this point of order in all earnestness, Mr. Speaker, being fully cognizant of the seriousness and far-reaching consequences of our action here tonight on the peace and future of the youth of our Nation. It is because I am aware of the disastrous consequences that will flow from the action you will take tonight that I make this effort to prevent it.

Mr. Speaker, there is one further point I should like to make for the purpose of reemphasis, and that is that the chairman of the committee, Mr. ANDREWS, and the other House conferees can never establish that there was ever a valid meeting. Since there was never a valid meeting there was never a valid conference as required in Jefferson's Manual. This document not being the product of a valid conference is, therefore, not in order before the House.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I shall make a short and factual statement.

The conferees duly appointed on the part of the House met informally after their appointment yesterday to consider this subject matter. At a later time the House conferees met with the Senate conferees and agreed upon the terms of the conference report in a full committee meeting. The Senate conferees then presented the conference report to the Senate this morning and the Senate subsequently adopted that conference report as shown by the message from the Senate which the House has received.

There is no dispute whatever among the conferees as to what was agreed to in the conference, and the Chair will note that the conference report is signed by all of the Senate conferees and by six of the seven House conferees.

Out of an abundance of caution, having learned that some question might be raised in the House as I had been informed was raised in the Senate, I called another meeting of the full conference committee including the managers on the part of the Senate today to approve the conference report. The conference report was then agreed to by the committee of conference and it is now properly before the House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard briefly further on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, said there was a conference later. I think that word "later" is the key to the question.

What does he mean by "later"? If by "later" he means after this document was filed as a conference report in the Senate then definitely that meeting was not a conference.

The only "later" that could validate this report would be a meeting between the moment the motion to send this bill to conference was adopted in the Senate and the moment this document was filed in the Senate as a conference report. Such a meeting, I repeat, never took place. That statement is not being challenged. Such a meeting could not take place, could not physically take place because not enough time elapsed between the motion to send to conference and the filing of this document as a report, for such a meeting to take place. There never was any such meeting and the chairman and every conferee of the House knows that my statement is true.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

On page 770, volume 5, of Hinds' Precedents, section 6497 states:

A conference report is received if signed by a majority of the managers of each House.

The Chair has examined the report and the papers and finds that it is signed by five of the managers on the part of the Senate and six of the seven managers on the part of the House.

The Chair has no knowledge, of course, how this report was reached, but the Chair cannot impeach the names of the managers on the part of the two Houses. Furthermore, the Senate having already received the report, and according to a message heretofore received by the House has officially adopted it, the Chair feels that under the circumstances the report is properly before the House for such action as the House may see fit to take. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the House has been attentive to the reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House, I believe they know more about it now than they will after hearing most of the speakers who will address them in the next hour.

I intend to yield one-half of the time insofar as I am able to to the minority side and on the minority side to those in opposition. Throughout the entire consideration of this bill I have tried to be fair. Also, on the majority side I will yield time to those in opposition. As I understand it, the yielding rests solely with me. I shall try to recognize everybody who has requested time and will try to divide the time evenly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the managers on the part of the House is, I am sure most will agree, clear in expressing what has been agreed upon in the conference. I think it is far clearer than the average conference report that comes before us. There were numerous changes made, of course, and I think I shall address myself to what I regard as the two major changes made by the committee of conference in the original House bill.

The first major change has to do with the effective date of the act. The bill as reported by the House committee provided that the act should become effective upon its approval by the President, but that induction should be deferred for a period of 90 days. On the floor the committee offered a committee amendment which provided that not sooner than 75 days after the approval of the act the President could place inductions into effect by issuing a proclamation and thereafter inductions should not take place sooner than 90 days after the approval of the act.

The conference report has practically the same provision that was originally brought in by the House committee. A provision was adopted which would have delayed inductions and registrations until January 31, 1949.

I want to make clear the difference between the provision in the conference report and the provision requiring the President to "pull the trigger," you might say, is one of form and not of substance. Under the bill as it is now reported to you from conference, nothing can be done—you cannot have a registration—until the President issues a proclamation for registration. The bill is not self-enacting. The President must take the affirmative action of fixing the date of registration; then the President must issue the call for the quotas of the persons to be inducted. That is the way it was done under the Selective Training and Service Act in the recent war; that was the provision of the law in the First World War. So, as I say, it is mostly a matter of form and not substance.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Is there any limitation as to how soon after the call of the President for registration he may direct that these boys be called into service?

Mr. KILDAY. There is not.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman said that the President must issue this proclamation. Is that right? The law requires that?

Mr. KILDAY. No; it does not require him to do so.

Mr. JUDD. He must do it to bring it into effect?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes. If there is to be any induction the President must take affirmative action.

Mr. JUDD. If the situation should improve and there might be an avalanche of enlistments, it would not have to be done?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes. The bill places an absolute ceiling on the number that can be taken in the Army, the Navy, and Air Force. If that is reached then necessarily he cannot direct the induction of

anyone and an appropriation bill for anything in excess of those ceilings would be subject to a point of order because there would be no authorization.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand the conference report provides for men between 21 and 35 for 21 months?

Mr. KILDAY. The 21 months is correct. That is the point I am coming to next. It provides for registrations 18 to 25, inclusive, and inductions 19 to 25, inclusive.

Mr. DONDERO. For 21 months?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why was it that the committee did not include in its report the things that were embodied in the vote of the membership of the House in committee? Why did the committee not give consideration to those things and retain them in the bill?

Mr. KILDAY. We were sent to conference for the purpose of reconciling the differences between the two Houses. We did make a sincere effort to sustain the House provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to include in my remarks a summary of the instances in which the House yielded and in which the Senate yielded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

1. House provisions accepted by Senate.

(a) Elimination of enlistment of 25,000 aliens (Lodge amendment).

(b) Postponement of inductions for 90 days and requirement for intensified enlistment campaign.

(c) Elimination of doctors provision.

(d) Short-term enlistments for period of induction.

(e) ACCT score of 70 points.

(f) Exemption of veterans with 12 or more months of service.

(g) Require that veterans' reserve obligation be undertaken only if it is not unduly inconvenient.

(h) Exemption of conscientious objectors who are opposed to any service.

(i) Sole surviving son provision.

(j) Elimination of "laid off or" in reemployment provisions whereby discharged draftee could displace World War II veteran.

(k) Elimination of requirement on President in Senate bill to establish large-scale rehabilitation and retraining program for veterans.

(l) Steel allocations to small business.

(m) Authorized strengths.

2. Senate provisions accepted by House.

(a) Limitation on numbers of 1 year enlistees from among the 18-year-olds.

(b) Top registration age limit of 25.

(c) Exemption of aliens from induction with subsequent debarment from citizenship if induction exemption is requested.

(d) Compulsion on 1-year enlistees (18-year-olds) to enter Reserve units after discharge.

(e) Exemption of 18½-year-olds if they join National Guard (House bill permitted their entrance into other Reserve units).

(f) Two-year active-duty obligation on ROTC graduates (House bill required service so long as induction period only).

(g) Senate provisions on ministers.

(h) Senate provisions on scientists.

(i) Elimination of provision in respect to maintenance of health and morals in vicinity of Army camps (excluded because present law already covers the subject).

(j) Labor Department to administer veteran reemployment provisions instead of Director of Selective Service.

(k) Penalties for those forging or altering certificates issued under the Selective Service Act.

(l) Elimination of $500 per year lump-sum payments to Air Reserve officers called to duty under the act.

(m) Senate provisions on mandatory orders to industry.

(n) Senate provisions relating to military justice.

(o) Exemption of all veterans who served between Pearl Harbor day and VJ-day (House amendment deferred only those who served in combat).

3. Compromises between House and Senate.

(a) Insuring that aliens requesting exemption from induction be not thereafter debarred from American citizenship unless exemption is based solely on grounds of the person being an alien.

(b) Ninety-day induction postponement was compromise of Shafer amendment postponing inductions until January 31, 1949, and no comparable provision in Senate bill.

(c) Twenty-one months required service in place of 24-months in Senate bill, 12-months in House bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he said it would require affirmative action on the part of the President before this would be put into effect?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true this action would be taken immediately on the effective date of the act or shortly thereafter as distinguished from the affirmative action that was contemplated in the bill passed by the House which required that affirmative action be taken at the end of 90 days?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. It being the idea that in that time the situation might be so altered in the world or in the country as to eliminate the necessity for this action at all?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. The other provision put a time limitation on the President. This provision does not, but he must take some affirmative action before there can be any inductions under the act.

Mr. HALLECK. It takes affirmative action before the registration starts. After that is done then, of course, the provisions of the act apply and it would become effective without any subsequent further action by the President?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true. They apply within the ceilings placed in the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I want to point out the further provision in the bill that if voluntary enlistments are not up to the regular quota, which they should be for the current authorized strength of the Regular Army in any one month, only in that case can selective service become effective.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. To keep the record clear in this case, as I understand the bill coming from the Senate, this is automatic and does not shift the burden to the President of the United States; is that true?

Mr. KILDAY. The burden has always been there. It has been in each act that we have passed.

Mr. CARROLL. I am asking whether or not this bill is automatic.

Mr. KILDAY. It becomes effective on the date that it is signed, and then the President can direct registration at any time, or he need not direct registration.

Mr. CARROLL. But the Senate and this body assume their responsibilities.

Mr. KILDAY. That is true.

Mr. CARROLL. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman address himself to the proposition as to what provisions there are in the bill to compel voluntary action before the bill goes into effect and the induction starts.

Mr. KILDAY. Before we get to that, may I say that we adopted an amendment in the House that fixed the tour of duty at 12 months. The Senate had an amendment fixing the tour of duty at 24 months. We made a sincere effort to secure a lesser period of time. I never felt that 18 months was the proper time, but I did know that my burden here in attempting to secure agreement of the conference report would be much lighter if we adopted the 18-month period. So, we had reached the compromise stage. We were sent there to compromise, and we did the best we could.

I believe, in answer to the gentleman from New York, that we have in here every possible inducement for voluntary enlistment, in addition to a positive direction to the departments to carry on an active enlistment campaign. We also provide here for the building up of our Reserve components, the National Guard and the organized Reserves. We have maintained the position that the House took that a man who served for 12 months during the recent war would have fully discharged his obligation; if less than 12 months, that he should enter the National Guard or the Organized Reserves. Those matters are all in the bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. But that is only true on the effective date of this act; is that not correct?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. That does not give the Reservists and the Guard members much time to enlist.

Mr. KILDAY. Well, probably not, but they do have the right to enlist, those up to 18½ years of age, after the effective date of the act. In that way we do believe that it will build up the National Guard and the Organized Reserves.

Of course, we have come now to this point: The bill has been argued thoroughly here in the House; it has passed the Senate; we have reached the compromise stage. I assure you that the conferees have done the best they could with the conferees in the other body and I sincerely trust that the report will be accepted.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to answer the question of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

If there was ever a bill at any time in the history of this country that really should benefit the National Guard, it is this bill. It benefits it in four directions. All veterans who served 12 months or more are exempted from this bill, if they are not otherwise exempted, provided they enlist in the National Guard. There are 161,000 provided for at 17 and 18 years of age who may enlist in the Regular Army for 1 year and then come into the National Guard at the end of the year. Any young man up to the point he is 18 years and 6 months old may enlist in the National Guard and be exempt from the draft. As far as I can see, I know of no bill that has ever benefited the National Guard to this extent.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I was simply asking as to the effective date of this act. If this act goes into effect tomorrow or next week, the gentleman knows as well as I do that the National Guard or the Organized Reserves are not going to benefit very much by it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. They have been benefiting by it for 2 months. If the gentleman will make a study of his own National Guard in New York State, he will understand that.

Mr. KEARNEY. We have today 14,000 and should have 62,000 for the two divisions in the State of New York, namely, the Twenty-seventh Division and the Forty-second Division, besides the Air Corps. I sincerely hope that this act will bring full strength to the guard of the United States. They should be taken into consideration in all plans for the proper defense of our country. They are too valuable and in this thought I include all the civilian components of our armed forces.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I voted for this bill when it passed this body and I voted against the motion to recommit. As much as I dislike it, I feel that it is in the best interest of our country. It is my feeling that 1 year's service is long enough. This is not a universal training bill, it is a bill where we reach in and take some boys and pass up others. Those that we take should not be required to serve for more than 1 year. If you take them for longer than that, the danger is much greater that you will disastrously and permanently interfere with their education and life plans. It should be for 1 year only.

It is not my purpose to delay or defeat this measure. But I would suggest that this conference report be voted down, so that a preferential motion may be offered directing the managers on the part of the House to insist on the Coudert amendment, which fixes the period of service at 12 months. If the conference report is voted down, it is my understanding such a motion will be offered, and I shall support it.

If this conference report is voted down the legislation is not killed, it merely means that managers must confer further.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the atmosphere of the National Capital today is filled with military propaganda. Earlier in the day I listened to a radio broadcast of a review of General Stillwell's recently published book. The reviewer quoted the retired general as criticizing a former President of the United States for "meddling too much in military affairs." Here is a concise illustration of the arrogance of militarism, which would denounce even the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of this Nation if he presumed to say how he thought the Military Establishment should be conducted.

In a news dispatch from Denver published today the present Chief of Staff of the Army, General Bradley, is reported to have delivered a prepared speech in that city last night in which he criticized this Congress for "vacillation, timidity, and for blundering into a costly retreat."

Regardless of the merits of this criticism, I think that the spectacle of the head of the Army making a political speech directed against this Congress is a proper subject for an investigation by the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That subcommittee has recently issued a well-deserved rebuke to the officials and employees of the War Department for expending tax funds in publicity and propaganda campaigns designed to influence public sentiment in favor of compulsory military service. I suggest that this committee ascertain whether the cost of General Bradley's trip to Denver to make a political speech was paid for out of tax funds, and if not, whether a general of the Army is authorized by law to devote his official time, which is paid for by the taxpayers, to such a political junket.

My colleagues of the House, you will be called upon in a very short while to cast one of the most fateful votes in the history of the Congress of the United States—a vote on the question whether permanent peacetime compulsory military training service shall become the law of the land.

I want to emphasize now that the bill which is here presented to you does not resemble in many essential provisions the bill which was passed by the House this week after many hours of debate and amendments. I call your attention to the fact that the Shafer amendment, which was adopted by the House by a three to two vote, has been thrown out the window. Indeed almost the whole House bill was thrown out of the window, and our conferees have accepted, instead, as the recent reading of the report of the managers indicated to you—our conferees have accepted in almost every important instance the Senate bill in toto.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill has never been considered in the House until this time, but that is the bill which the military high command prefers, and that is the bill which will be crammed down our throats tonight unless the House of Representatives exercises its constitutional authority and rejects it. By your votes on this measure tonight, my colleagues, you will decide whether the historic policy of Thomas Jefferson, that civil authority shall be superior to military authority in time of peace, shall continue to be the policy of the United States of America, or whether this traditional free government shall adopt for the first time in its glorious career a policy of peacetime compulsory militarism for all of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have said before on two previous occasions: This bill is intended to put into effect a permanent policy of the Government of the United States. I want to illustrate again my statement. The record of the hearings before the Armed Services Committee is filled with statements by the spokesmen for the Military Establishment that, if this bill is enacted, it will remain in effect until you get universal military training.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to become vindictive in the statement I make tonight. My heart goes out to the House conferees on this bill.

I understand the conferees have come back to us and, according to the reading of the report, after one of the most gruelling conferences ever held in the history of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, it was a knock-down, drag-out fight. There is no question about it. Our conferees punched and they punched and they exerted every effort to keep the House amendments in this draft bill. There is no doubt about that. But, Mr. Speaker, our friends met a superior force, and they

have had to return to us with heads bloody but unbowed.

I understand my good friend and colleague, one whom I love, the gentleman from Missouri, DEWEY SHORT, was the only conferee standing at the end of this vicious battle. He was somewhat saddened, but he was not beaten. His signature was not on the conference report.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I foresaw the result of this bloody conflict even before it was staged. That is the reason I voted "no," even after my amendment to delay inductions until the Army had made an honest effort to obtain recruits was agreed to.

While I am sure the House conferees battled hard to keep my amendment in the bill, I anticipated the victory of the more numerous forces. In throwing out the Shafer amendment the managers on the part of the Senate—the Senate, if you please—flagrantly disregarded the will of the House, especially as to the Shafer and the Coudert amendments. I think we should give our House conferees a good rubdown, a little shot in the arm, and anything else that is necessary, and send them back into the fray. We should insist upon the Shafer and the Coudert amendments.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our conferees do not want the Army and the Navy to have the best football teams again. This draft act goes into effect immediately. The boys are registered right away; inducted in 90 days, and by the time the football season opens all of our good stars will be out of our best teams, with only the IV–F's left. Michigan, Illinois, Southern California, as well as other great teams will be without first-class players while all the good ones will remain at West Point and Annapolis, as happened during the war.

Again, the Army and Navy may proclaim the greatest teams. Mr. Speaker, let us make it possible—and we will do so under this bill—to keep Notre Dame and Michigan in the same standard as the Army and the Navy.

Do not let anybody fool you about the Presidential procamation, for it has been taken out of the bill.

The Shafer amendment that won by a vote of 135 to 90 in the House was given no consideration by this conference.

Mr. Speaker, I would not for a moment oppose this draft if I thought it were necessary. If I thought it were needed I would be the first one to say: 'Go ahead, boys, put it into effect." But there is not a Member of this House; there is not a high official of the Army or Navy, or the State Department, who can come here today and make a case for this act. Every Member of this House knows this as well as a great many of our news commentators. Just tonight I asked permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include a commentary by David Lawrence which appeared in last night's Washington Star, stating that neither the Army nor the State Department have made a case for enactment of this draft legislation.

The draft is unnecessary. Mr. Speaker, let us return this report to the conference committee.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York yield to permit a bill to be sent to conference?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, insist upon the House amendments, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, SMITH of Ohio, KUNKEL, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thought perhaps I would get a little more time, but I understand the difficulties with which the chairman is confronted. Three minutes is a mighty short time to even touch on this subject.

I enjoyed the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], and I think they were rather appropriate.

The House does not want this bill to be effective for 24 months. The House does not want this bill to be effective for 21 months. I think the great majority of Members expected the conferees to bring back a report carrying not more than 18 months.

So far as I am concerned I was and am so thoroughly of the conviction that the draft is not needed, not necessary, that I voted against the bill before and I will vote against it tonight.

The War Department has not made out a case, but the membership has been called upon to take this drastic step on rumors, hearsay, and conclusions reached by men definitely and directly interested.

On yesterday, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee would not even tell us what Mr. Marshall testified to before his committee because it was a secret. Why should this secret information be withheld from the membership of this body and yet at the same time those in high position tell us to assume responsibility for this drastic legislation? It is not fair, it is not right, it is not safe, and is not to the best interest of good government.

We want protection, yes; and we can get all the men we want if we are willing to pay them fairly. Just as we can get airplanes by paying a fair wage to the workmen.

The young men may be physically able to render the active service. But that does not relieve the rest of us from the responsibility of paying them. Every American should be willing to do his part toward defending this Nation and in my opinion they are.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no consideration given the school systems of this country. Where are we to get our doctors? Where are we going to get our scientists? What provision, if any, has been made to give any consideration to farming-agricultural colleges, engineering, etc? For 150 years we have been working and striving to try to lift the standard of education in this country, and we have done a pretty job of it, but tonight with a smile on the War Department's face we draft these boys and think nothing of it.

I do not know. I wish that we could feel satisfied about this case. But we know what the War Department wants. I have always had the feeling that all strong men were ambitious and sooner or later must have certain safeguards to keep them from going too far. The man who wants too much power should not have it, and a man who loves to exercise power should not be trusted with it. I feel that way about this. If the War Department had given enlistments a fair chance, you know the War Department would have the men.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. May I ask the gentleman if the reading of this report and the contemplation of all this legislation does not lead to the inevitable conclusion that this establishes a military hierarchy in the United States?

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is undoubtedly correct and I fear this will be a case of the camel's nose under the tent.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I was prepared to vote in favor of selective service. But I have always reserved my right to make a decision on important legislation until such time as I have heard the debate pro and con. I listened with a great deal of interest to the debate in the House for the last 3 days, and I have arrived at the one conclusion, and that is that the State Department and the administration have furnished the Committee on Armed Services with misinformation right down the line.

No one can accuse me of being an isolationist or pacifist. I say there are three to four million veterans, who recently completed a shooting war, here in the United States, all combat veterans, all in good shape. We veterans, I being one of them, will be happy to meet any emergency. We will go forward and do what we can to keep enemies from our shores.

I cannot find where the Army has done anything but discourage enlistments. They have done nothing to encourage them. I have talked to high-ranking generals, admirals, captains in the Navy, in the Army, and Marine Corps, and the Air Force, particularly. They say that there is only one group that wants this draft, and that is the Army. The brass hats, Mr. Speaker, want this draft, and they want it badly.

I want to tell you, and tell you sincerely, that I voted against this bill, and

I will vote against it again. I feel that the greatest fraud is being perpetrated on the American people in this draft legislation that has ever been heaped upon them. It has been repeatedly stated, and correctly so, that our standing Army, Navy, and Air Force is adequate to defend our shores. If an emergency exists, as has been pointed out by the Armed Services Committee, then let us draft everyone; let us put a ceiling on profits; let us take the profits out of war; let us, as the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] said the other day, put a ceiling on wages and prices; let us freeze ourselves into a war economy; let us bring ourselves up to strength so that Soviet Russia will know we mean business, and let us not have this token draft. It is similar to bringing a ham sandwich to a banquet.

Members of the House, I implore you, vote this insidious legislation down, and if we need it, for God's sake let us put in a draft that will protect our country and not just deprive our 18- and 19-year-old boys of an education and a chance to be free and honest and not have to worry where they are going from day to day.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of grief to follow in opposition, my able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL]. During the course of this debate we have seen and heard the highest and the lowest expressions of comedy, pathos, and deep sincerity. We have heard ridicule heaped upon a committee of the house which committee has put a considerable amount of effort, thought, and work in bringing out this piece of vitally needed legislation. We have seen artists in poesy and prose rise to the heights of histrionics and to the depths of abuse. I, for one, am for this legislation, and I intend to vote for it.

The point that is to be decided here tonight is only this: Do you want an adequate defense for the United States of America or do you not? No matter how flowery or how adequate your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the 140,000,000 people of this country are going to render their decision on your individual vote on this matter. In spite of what the President has said about "Dear Old Joe" Stalin, that same dear old Joe is playing for keeps; he is not playing for marbles, money, or chalk. He has a blueprint for conquest, and oratory may be expected to leave him cold. There is no adequate national defense in high comedy and there is no defense in low comedy. Gay reparteé, while amusing, wins no battles. The only way to impress "Dear Old Joe" is in an adequate force of trained men equipped and ready to maintain the peace.

If this legislation is voted down, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow there will be smiles of derisive satisfaction in the Kremlin, and all that we have attempted to do in the way of building a stronger and a finer world will have come to naught, and, indeed, you can then say that all of the billions that we have spent will have been poured down the rat hole.

There is only one question, and that is, Are you for national defense or are you against it?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it is just a little encouraging and heartening to hear the young patriotic American, veteran of this last global conflict, who volunteered for extra-hazardous service, and who has received two Presidential citations for the dangerous missions he carried out as one of the demolition divers—I am referring to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL]—who has spoken here very frankly and very courageously. He is not the only one of his kind who opposes this draft bill. I know, of course, there are Members of this body who can speak with an air of dogmatic finality on all matters pertaining to foreign affairs. They even know more about our national defense and military affairs than the members of our committee. At least they admit it.

It is too bad I did not have my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], on my team yesterday as I went forth to that bloody, prolonged battle. I merely want to say now what I said shortly following the roll-call vote yesterday:

> Mr. SHORT. I merely wish to repeat what I said in general debate yesterday: I know I am going to be a lonely figure; I am going to be here alone. My hands are tied, but I will fight over there. And then they will bring it back and throw the conference report into your laps. I hope that you have enough conscience, and courage, and conviction to rise up and vote on that conference report when it is returned to you.

I knew, I think, pretty well in advance, and I am no seer or prophet or a son of a prophet, but anyone with a thimbleful of brains could have prognosticated rather accurately the kind of conference report you would receive today.

We opened the conference informally and not altogether legally at 11 o'clock yesterday morning, and we sat there from 11 until 6 o'clock, seven long hours. I remarked at the beginning of the conference that if I wanted to be nasty and mean I could delay and prolong the conference. I could object until one or two Senators had finally run down, taking the whole night, of course, to do it. But I did not try to be too stubborn or obstreperous. Of course, I could not in clear conscience and in my best judgment sign the report. We did not have a compromise, we had a capitulation, and as is always the case, the lonely figure that I was then, I come back to hand this report to you today.

What is the rush in passing it tonight? We are not going to adjourn sine die, we are going to be brought back here. You know why they want to vote on this report at this late hour, when we are all tired and worn, irritable and suffering with the jitters due to hard work, little sleep, and much-debated differences of opinion on many pieces of legislation. They do not want you to go back home and hear from your farmers and organized labor. They do not want you to hear from the churches and schools and the educators. They do not want you to hear from the fathers and mothers or the youths themselves about this bill. They are afraid. When you get back on the stump in September and October this fall, and you are telling your people about the grave emergency that we are in, while Harry has been riding back and forth across the country on his nonpolitical tour at the taxpayers' expense, when Congress is going to recess or adjourn for several months, some of them to take trips all over the country or to go abroad, I am afraid that these mothers and fathers are not going to be greatly impressed by your argument about the great emergency that we are in. Gentlemen, you who have read the minority views on this legislation know that our reasoning is fundamentally sound and our logic is unanswerable. Some of you have not read that report, but you are going to hear more about it, perhaps from your opponents when you get into the thick of the fight. You have to search your own consciences and vote your own convictions. I cannot add much to what already has been said. This measure is unnecessary, expensive, and dangerous. It will regiment our people and our industry, lower our standard of living and threaten our private enterprise. It strikes a blow at our liberty.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I gladly yield to my good friend.

Mr. RAMEY. The gentleman speaks about conscience. I supported this bill. We have always spoken about tolerance in the Congress of the United States. Why did the conferees discriminate against the Christian Scientists in the conference?

Mr. SHORT. I do not believe they did. All of us, I think—at least I hope—are against religious intolerance and bigotry. I know that the gentleman from Ohio, Judge RAMEY believes in and practices religious liberty. He is always fair and just. Being a devout believer in Christian Science, I am glad to see him alert to see that no discrimination is made against them. All denominations will be given equal justice under this bill. The conferees thought it best not to mention specifically any one particular faith, sect, or creed. In justice to the conference, I think this matter was handled satisfactorily.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The Christian Scientists fall within the terms of the bill as it now comes to us. There is no discrimination. The gentleman's statement is quite incorrect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

INCORPORATING VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the

Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CRAWFORD, LECOMPTE, LEFEVRE, FERNANDEZ, and ENGLE of California.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the minority leader on our committee [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, of course the House was very much entertained by the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] in his vein of ridicule of the conference and the conferees. Of course, that is old tactics for anyone who cannot meet an argument. It is tactics that oftentimes we ourselves engage in with our opponents. When we are unable to answer arguments and facts and a reasonable position, then we seek to ridicule.

My mind goes back, if I am not in error, to the time that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] some years ago, in 1940, was also one who signed a a minority report against the draft bill at that time. So we find the gentleman from Michigan today occupying in this crisis which now confronts the country, the same position which he occupied when a crisis confronted the country in 1940. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the leopard never changes his spots.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. No; I do not yield.

Mr. SHAFER. Now you have made a statement.

Mr. VINSON. I do not yield. I do not yield, Mr. Speaker, because the gentleman from Michigan has made his bed. Let him lie in it.

Mr. SHAFER. I made my bed; yes.

Mr. VINSON. I do not yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SHAFER. The situation is not the same today as it was in 1940, and the gentleman knows it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TWYMAN. The point is, Is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] the point, or is it the matter under discussion?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not state a point of order.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I trust the Speaker does not allow that kind of a statement to be made, using the time of the gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will protect the time of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, the logic of this conference report, reducing it down to 21 months, after our inability to get 18 months, was due, and I particularly call this to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], to the fact that it saves $500,000,000. It is far more economical to the taxpayers of America to have a draft of 21 months than a draft of 12 months. It is $500,000,000 in the taxpayers' pockets in that length of time.

Now, let us see if the gentleman from Michigan, who is so concerned about economy, is willing now to try to save the taxpayers some money.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. You will never save $500,000,000 when you take the boys away from their homes against their will and put them into the Army. That is not saving money. It is doing the very thing that the Constitution of the United States does not permit.

Mr. VINSON. Now, the gentleman has made a speech.

If this House tonight adopts the 1-year term of enlistment or induction, then you will have to pay $500,000,000 more to support the draftees than you would if you had the 21-month provision.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. And further than that, it would be necessary to induct some 400,000 additional American youth.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the few remaining minutes that I have, I wish to say this is an important bill. The security of the Nation is involved in whether or not you have a sufficient Army. The thing that led to World War I—and I was right here—was the unpreparedness of your country. Some of you served here before World War II.

You saw the unpreparedness that led to World War II. If you continue the policy in 1949 and 1950 that we followed in those years, you will be sowing the seed for the third world war.

If you adopt the stern policy and let the world know that this country is ready to back up her arguments when she is confronted with questions, you can keep the peace. You cannot negotiate when you are weak but you can negotiate when you are strong. Let this world know that we are strong. This will insure and guard a lasting peace.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill even though I am against a peacetime draft.

I sat in this Congress back in the days of 1939 and 1940 and voted against selective service at that time. Many of you will recall when I left this House and reported to active duty, and it took me to the North Atlantic and then to Pearl Harbor. There I saw the remains of our battleships, the *Utah*, the *Oklahoma*, the *Arizona*, the *California*, the *Pennsylvania*, several destroyers, and smaller craft; and then saw them lift the bodies of sailors and officers from the holds of those ships. Then I went on into the Pacific and took part in 26 invasions under General MacArthur, sending one assault wave after another ashore. Boys died at my right and at my left, but the good Lord took care of me and returned me to this Congress.

When I landed in San Diego with my ships in January of 1946, the newspapers asked me for a statement, and I stated then and there that I would never again vote against national defense, but would always be for preparedness. It is for that reason that I am for preparedness tonight and intend to support this preparedness bill.

Mr. Speaker, last January, when discussion began on this bill, I was opposed to it. I listened to others who opposed it, and was told by them the veterans, the church people, the college people, and the fathers and mothers were opposed to it. The majority of you know that almost every week end I am somewhere in the United States addressing groups of veterans and others. Therefore, I visited with the church people, the college people, I rubbed elbows with the veterans, and talked to the fathers and mothers; and, frankly, did not find the opposition to preparedness they who oppose this bill have preached about for the past several months.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I wish to say that I have several hospitals in my district where there are hundreds and thousands of veterans of the criminal negligence of this country on their backs today. They are not opposed to it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a short observation?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am sorry, I cannot yield further.

Mr. Speaker, as you know I served in World War I and when that war was won like others I took a solemn pledge that everything in my power would be done never again to let this country find itself unprepared. Well in 1941 we were again caught unprepared and could have lost the war were it not for our friends who held the lines until we built the world's greatest fighting machine.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national defense measure and I say approve it. Give to our national defense adequate manpower so we, the American people, have a defense capable of giving to all of us the security we are entitled to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the foreword of this bill reads in part as follows:

To provide for the common defense, for increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in the minds of some of the opponents of this legislation, it seems we are coming down to the real issue as to whether it should be 18 or 21 months. Our good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], said that the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House believe it ought to be 18 months. Mr. Speaker, we did struggle with that issue in the committee, and the plain fact is that if we are going to train these boys, it will ordinarily take about 8 months to do that. If we ship them overseas it takes another month and a half. That makes 9½ months. There is another month and a half to get back, which is 11 months. If we provide 18 months' service, that will allow 7 months' actual service overseas.

The question is whether or not in the interest of the boys who are serving over there, both in the European and Asiatic areas, whether they have the right to have some replacements.

Mr. Speaker, some of us are quite personally interested in this legislation. We know from bitter experience what war means and the tragedy of war in some of our homes. I said yesterday and say again today, that I have three of my own in the service today and another one going in. I therefore have some interest, from a personal standpoint, as to just what this legislation means from the standpoint of the father and mother. We are also interested in the broader question as to whether or not this legislation is in the interest of the security of these great United States of America. Some question has been raised by certain of the speakers as to what the emergency is, whether or not any of the witnesses appearing before the committee have stated that an emergency does exist. Well, the President of the United States appointed a Commission to investigate the advisability of the institution of a universal-military-training program. Among those appointed was Professor Compton, chairman of the Commission, also president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and an outstanding citizen of this country. When he appeared before the Armed Service Committee I asked him the question as to whether or not in his opinion there was a critical situation in the world today. Professor Compton, of the President's Commission, said that in his opinion the situation is more serious today that what it was in 1938 when we instituted the 20-percent expansion in the Navy, in 1940 when we instituted the draft, and in 1941 when we extended the draft.

Rev. Father Walsh, another member of that commission, and an outstanding student and authority on world affairs, said in answer to the same question that he believes there is a greater menace today than what there was during the period I mentioned a moment ago.

Secretary Forrestal states that the situation is critical.

Are we to believe those men or are we to believe some of these people who are giving advice but know nothing about the international situation? We should in the interest of world peace and our own future security approve the legislation now before us.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am following the schedule I have prepared in that I am dividing the time between those who are in favor of the bill and those who I understand are opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, like my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], I am for this bill. You know it is a strange procedure that we saw in this House the last several days—a strange spectacle that alarms me. After World War I we sank our battleships, we dismantled our fortifications, and we placed our trust in people that we thought were as right-minded as we were. We listened to the pacifists. We thought we had fought a war to end all wars. What happened? Did we bring peace to the world? No. Out of it came the Trotzkys, the Lenins, the Stalins, the Hitlers, the Goerings, the Himmlers, and Mussolinis and if you believe you can curb the ambitions of periodic dictators who arise to disturb the equilibrium of the world unless you stand prepared you are mistaken. So, again, after World War II, what happened; we listened to the pacifists and propaganda—the war is over, so we rushed to demobilize our Army, our Navy, and our Air Corps, and we paved the way again for this world unrest that is giving us grave convern. Today we have the spectacle here in the House of men, who actually have been over there, holding this program rather lightly. They have seen the utter destruction and devastation, they know the critical situation that exists. They have seen what has happened. They know that the world is in a desperate plight and that any slight incident may be upon us at any time that would catapult us into another war, and still we are going down the pathway of pacifist peace that may ultimately lead us into another world catastrophe, wishfully thinking and praying to God that conditions will right themselves. We have had over 1,300,000 casualties in two wars. We have spent $400,000,000,000. Is it not about time that we wake up and build up our national security to protect this great Nation of ours and all that it represents? Let us be practical realists. I am sick and tired of sacrificing each generation of American youth in the futile wars of Europe, and therefore preparedness is one of the paramount issues in world affairs today. We should stand back of our national defense program. As General Smuts, that great South African leader, said, "Peace without the power to back it up becomes but an empty dream."

I would like to ask my good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who has a distinguished record as a combat soldier and one who has suffered the cruelties of war, to express his opinion on what he thinks about national preparedness.

Mr. POTTER. The gentleman knows what I think.

Mr. GAVIN. You, my very good friend, tell this House what you think.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished and able gentleman. I cannot be facetious; I cannot joke; I cannot ridicule any Member of the House or committee of this great body or our military leaders who won us a great victory in World War II. This is too serious a proposition to treat lightly. I feel very keenly about this legislation. Well do I remember Pearl Harbor. I was in a little cottage near my home town in Michigan when the news reached us of the bombing of Pearl Harbor. I remember after that bombing news commentators quoting Members of Congress bragging that the war would not last 6 months. In 6 months we would be running the Japs back to their islands and into the ocean. We know what happened. We know that many thousands of men lost their lives in a long war. We found out that we were not prepared to protect ourselves. The disabled veterans in our hospitals favor a strong national defense program, and if they had this opportunity they would certainly vote for this measure to provide a strong national defense.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the fateful hour is at hand when this House must determine an issue that will gravely affect the future of our country. We must decide whether America will continue as a great dynamic democracy or whether we will henceforth indenture the youth of the land into military enslavement.

This report should be voted down. It completely emasculates the House bill which contained a 1-year service limitation and which would suspend the operation of the draft until next January. Other vital amendments put into the bill in the committee were also eliminated. The result of the conference—if it was indeed a legal conference—was not to compromise with the Senate but to capitulate completely to the other body on virtually every important point incorporated into the bill by the expressed will of the House.

Let no one vote for this bill on the theory that it is necessary to effect national preparedness. Practically all the opponents of this bill favor strong national defense. I favor—I strongly favor and have worked for—a strong, vigorous national defense, on land, sea, and in the air, a great Navy which can continue to command the high seas, a scientifically-trained Army, comprised of volunteers, trained in modern technical skills, adapted to modern inventions and weapons. I favor an overwhelming Air Corps so thoroughly equipped with manpower and latest types of aircraft and equipped with the atomic bomb and every other new scientific weapon and agent.

I believe this kind of force can be built and based upon the voluntary system. The Navy has no difficulty getting enlisted personnel. The Air Corps is turning away men. Only the land Army—massed Army—claims that compulsion is necessary. This is true militarism.

The National Guard and the Organized Reserve have been woefully neglected. They should be brought to full

strength, ROTC units should be expanded; disaster components organized and trained; industrial coordination and training perfected; scientific research and development promoted.

There is no true present national emergency. There is no imminent danger of war. If there is an emergency, this draft is not enough. If there is no emergency it is too much, because it inevitably abandons the traditional American system and adopts the continental Prussian system of regimentation which has invariably led to bankruptcy and war. Let no one deceive himself that the American people will believe there is a present crisis and emergency when they behold the spectacle of this Congress passing a draft bill and then recessing for the political conventions.

Three million or ten million men in massed armies cannot match Russia with manpower. America will protect the Nation and win future wars, not with massed manpower alone, but by utilizing our superior industrial potential and by the quality of our young men, their training, their courage, and their willingness to sacrifice and die, if necessary, for their country, and their scientific arms and equipment.

The conference report negates the action of the House in Committee. It should be defeated. I will vote against the report and against the bill and against every other measure which would threaten or destroy precious American individual liberty. This bill means ultimate military dictatorship in the United States, possible bankruptcy, and war. It will come back to plague not only the Nation but those who by their votes may make its adoption possible tonight.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this may well prove to be a historic moment. What the historian of the future will say we cannot predict with absolute certainty, but I think no one within the sound of my voice will deny that we are facing an exceedingly important issue. It is not the first critical issue that we have faced in the Congress of the United States in the last 10 or 12 years. We have faced others in the past. Upon one or two occasions, if my memory is correct, we had some very, very narrow escapes from fatal error.

What is our situation today? I shall not indulge in any personalities or criticize any person here present, any Member of this great body, for the expressions of opinion which he has uttered, but what is our situation today? Actually, the whole world is looking at us. No one will deny that. The Tass news service will carry the story that is written here tonight, and what goes on here tonight will be known tomorrow and the day after in country after country. The decision we make here tonight may bring encouragement to some people who are a potential menace to freedom, and discouragement or encouragement, as the case may be, to millions who are devoted to freedom and look to us as their champion. One result or the other will come out of this debate and from this vote.

What does this legislation propose to do? It proposes the organization of an efficient military force which will command respect. The military force which is inefficient or shallow, undisciplined, untrained, does not command respect despite its numbers. It is for that reason that I believed that the 2-year term of enlistment would provide a much more efficient force than the 12-month term of enlistment, which I am positive cannot do such a thing. The turn-over would be too great. You cannot have efficiency in a military force in which you teach men, we will say, to be good soldiers and sailors, and then discharge them and bring in raw recruits all over again. It just cannot be done.

I will not deny for one moment that the perfection of our defense involves sacrifice.

Reading history, I have never yet found an instance in which the defense of liberty and its preservation did not involve some sacrifice—sometimes terrific sacrifice, and of course this bill involves some sacrifice from the American people. I think it is a sacrifice very well worth making. If we hesitate, if we draw back for some of the sentimental reasons expressed in this debate, people in other countries will get the idea that we do not care to sacrifice. I hope that the House of Representatives this night will show the world that America intends to be strong in support of righteousness.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS of New York) there were—ayes 232, noes 114.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 259, nays 136, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—259

Abbitt	Canfield	Engle, Calif.
Abernethy	Carroll	Evins
Albert	Case, N. J.	Fallon
Allen, Calif.	Chadwick	Fellows
Allen, La.	Chapman	Fenton
Anderson, Calif.	Chelf	Fernandez
Andrews, Ala.	Clason	Fisher
Andrews, N. Y.	Coffin	Flannagan
Angell	Cole, Kans.	Fletcher
Arends	Cole, N. Y.	Fogarty
Auchincloss	Combs	Foote
Bakewell	Cooley	Forand
Bates, Ky.	Cooper	Fuller
Bates, Mass.	Corbett	Fulton
Battle	Cotton	Gamble
Beall	Coudert	Garmatz
Beckworth	Courtney	Gary
Bell	Cox	Gathings
Bennett, Mich.	Cravens	Gavin
Blackney	Crow	Gearhart
Bland	Dague	Gillette
Boggs, La.	Davis, Ga.	Goff
Bonner	Davis, Tenn.	Goodwin
Boykin	Deane	Gordon
Bramblett	Devitt	Gore
Brooks	Dingell	Gorski
Brown, Ga.	Dirksen	Gossett
Bryson	Domengeaux	Graham
Buchanan	Dondero	Grant, Ala.
Buck	Donohue	Gregory
Bulwinkle	Dorn	Gwinn, N. Y.
Burke	Durham	Hale
Burleson	Eaton	Hall,
Byrne, N. Y.	Eberharter	Edwin Arthur
Byrnes, Wis.	Elston	Hall,
Camp	Engel, Mich.	Leonard W.
Halleck	Lynch	Redden
Hardy	McConnell	Reeves
Harless, Ariz.	McCormack	Richards
Harris	McDonough	Riehlman
Harrison	McDowell	Riley
Hébert	McMahon	Rizley
Hedrick	McMillen, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Hendricks	Mack	Rogers, Mass.
Herter	MacKinnon	Rohrbough
Heselton	Mahon	Ross
Hess	Manasco	Russell
Hinshaw	Mathews	Sadlak
Hobbs	Meade, Md.	St. George
Holmes	Merrow	Sarbacher
Hope	Meyer	Sasscer
Huber	Michener	Scrivner
Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Seely-Brown
Jackson, Wash.	Miller, Md.	Sheppard
Jarman	Mills	Sikes
Jenkins, Pa.	Monroney	Smathers
Johnson, Calif.	Morgan	Smith, Va
Jones, Ala.	Morrison	Spence
Jones, N. C.	Morton	Stanley
Jones, Wash.	Muhlenberg	Stockman
Jonkman	Multer	Sundstrom
Judd	Mundt	Taber
Karsten, Mo.	Murdock	Taylor
Kean	Murray, Tenn.	Teague
Kearney	Nixon	Thomas, Tex.
Kearns	Norblad	Thompson
Kee	Norrell	Tibbott
Kefauver	O'Brien	Tollefson
Kelley	Pace	Tovle
Kennedy	Passman	Trimble
Kersten, Wis.	Patman	Van Zandt
Kilburn	Patterson	Vinson
Kilday	Peterson	Vorys
King	Phillips, Calif.	Wadsworth
Kirwan	Pickett	Walter
Kunkel	Ploeser	Wheeler
Lanham	Plumley	Whitaker
Larcade	Poage	Whitten
Latham	Potter	Whittington
Lea	Potts	Wigglesworth
LeFevre	Poulson	Williams
Lesinski	Preston	Wilson, Tex.
Lichtenwalter	Price, Fla.	Winstead
Lodge	Price, Ill.	Wolcott
Lucas	Priest	Wolverton
Lusk	Rains	Woodruff
Lyle	Rayburn	Worley

NAYS—136

Allen, Ill.	Gillie	Miller, Nebr.
Andersen, H. Carl	Grant, Ind.	Mitchell
	Griffiths	Morris
Andresen, August H.	Gross	Murray, Wis.
	Gwynne, Iowa	Nicholson
Arnold	Hagen	Nodar
Barden	Hand	O'Hara
Barrett	Harness, Ind.	O'Konski
Bender	Hart	O'Toole
Bennett, Mo.	Harvey	Pfeifer
Bishop	Havenner	Philbin
Blatnik	Hill	Phillips, Tenn.
Bloom	Hoeven	Powell
Bolton	Hoffman	Ramey
Bradley	Holifield	Rankin
Brehm	Horan	Reed, Ill.
Brophy	Hull	Reed, N. Y
Buffett	Isacson	Rees
Busbey	Javits	Rich
Butler	Jenison	Rockwell
Cannon	Jenkins, Ohio	Rooney
Carson	Jennings	Sabath
Case, S. Dak.	Jensen	Sadowski
Celler	Johnson, Ill.	Sanborn
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ind.	Schwabe, Mo.
Chiperfield	Keating	Schwabe, Okla.
Church	Keefe	Scoblick
Clevenger	Keogh	Scott, Hardie
Clippinger	Kerr	Shafer
Cole, Mo.	Klein	Short
Crawford	Landis	Simpson, Ill.
Crosser	LeCompte	Smith, Kans.
Cunningham	Lewis, Ohio	Smith, Ohio
Curtis	Love	Smith, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	McCowen	Snyder
Delaney	McCulloch	Somers
D'Ewart	McGarvey	Stefan
Dolliver	McGregor	Stevenson
Doughton	Macy	Talle
Douglas	Madden	Twyman
Elliott	Maloney	Vail
Ellis	Mansfield	Vursell
Ellsworth	Marcantonio	Weichel
Elsaesser	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Ind.
Feighan	Mason	Wood
Folger	Miller, Conn.	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—35

Banta	Buckley	Dawson, Ill.
Boggs, Del.	Clark	Dawson, Utah
Brown, Ohio	Colmer	Gallagher
Granger	Lewis, Ky.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Hartley	Ludlow	Simpson, Pa.
Hays	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Heffernan	Meade, Ky.	Stigler
Johnson, Okla.	Norton	Stratton
Johnson, Tex.	Peden	Thomas, N. J.
Knutson	Regan	Welch
Lane	Rivers	West
Lemke	Robertson	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnson of Texas for, with Mr. Ludlow against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Knutson against.

Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mr. Banta against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Peden.

Mr. Boggs of Delaware with Mrs. Norton.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Lemke with Mr. Hays.

Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Stigler.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the House would like to know just what is involved in this bill, or at least some Members of the House would like to know.

Mr. REES. I will say to the gentleman that the House approved the bill, H. R. 6916, which provided for certain increases in postal rates and made a further provision for increases in the salaries of postal employees across the board of $450 per year. Then there is a percentage increase for the fourth-class postmasters and a smaller increase for those who are employed on a per diem basis. The bill went to the other body for consideration, and that body has seen fit to strike out that portion of the bill providing for an increase in postage rates, and has attached among other things a reclassification act.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the cost involved in each of those two categories?

Mr. REES. The approximate cost on the first category is $206,000,000. The approximate cost on the second category is between $300,000,000 and $350,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The number of Federal employees is presently increasing at the rate of 600 a day so that the annual cost would be approximately $600,000,000, is that correct?

Mr. REES. The gentleman can figure it out. There are about 850,000 employees in the classified service. If you multiply that by the amount of increase in their salaries, then you can figure it out and can know just what the amount is.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This House has had no opportunity whatever to consider the matter.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. May I remind the gentleman that pursuant to the rule under which we are operating we can get the bill to conference. May I say to the gentleman I am convinced that the bill must go to conference. There are certain other provisions that have been inserted by the other body which I do not think will be found in the bill when it comes back.

I believe a satisfactory arrangement can be worked out. I have asked for this opportunity to make this suggestion only to express the hope that in the interest of expedition of the work we may proceed with this matter of the conference.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. May I ask this question: The bill goes to conference. When it returns from conference, will the same opportunity be provided for considering the matter?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course not. If the conference report comes back in agreement, then the motion is on agreeing to the conference report, and it would be in order, under the rules under which we are operating, and the vote would be up or down on the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not care at this late hour to detain the House, of course, or cause any more inconvenience than is absolutely necessary. I do want to state, however, that the manner in which this legislation is being handled is hardly what the people of this Nation expected from a Republican Congress.

I withdraw my reservation to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. REES, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, and Mr. LYLE.

EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 201, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints the following Members on the part of the House to attend the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association to be held in Bermuda beginning November 15, 1948: Mr. TALLE, of Iowa, chairman; Mr. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania; Mr. KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; Mr. WORLEY, of Texas.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, after the adjournment of this Congress, there is going to be a lot of talk by the Republicans about what this Congress has done for the people. Minor accomplishments are going to be blown up into something of major significance. Major legislation which aids the special interests and which really is detrimental to the interests of the common people is going to be distorted into accomplishments for all the people.

The reasons for magnifying small accomplishments and distorting the benefits of the important legislation which has been passed are obvious. The Republican Party will have to do these things, for it can honestly point to precious few accomplishments which are of benefit to the common man. Rather, its record in this Congress is one of doing things to the common man and precious little for him. The Republican Party has bowed to the will of the powerful special interests and has turned a deaf ear to the voice of the people.

Whenever bills which suit the special-interest lobbies have come before Congress they have received sympathetic and prompt attention of the Republican-dominated committees and have been pushed through the Congress under the whip of Republican leadership. Only the veto of the President has prevented the enactment of some of the most vicious legislation. But legislation which is in the interest of the common people, such as bills providing health and sound education programs and extending social security has received hostile attention and inaction in committees. Their advocates have been bullied and harrassed by the Republicans for even suggesting that the Congress do the things which the people need, while their selfish opponents have been accorded the courtesy characteristic of fellow members of an exclusive club. Even when, under the insistent demands of the people, such legislation as housing has been reported for action in this House, the Republican leadership has cracked the whip and has prevented the members from having the opportunity to vote.

Before examining what this Congress has not done, let us take a look at its accomplishments and see whether they do things for the people or to the people.

I am quite confident that the tax reduction voted in this session is going to be proclaimed throughout the country as a major accomplishment of the Republicans for the people. It is quite true that in making a $7,500 gift to the typical family with a $50,000 income that this Congress threw a $114 sop to the $3,000 family. That small saving may look good on the small taxpayer's income-tax return. But he would have been a lot better off if the Republican Congressmen who wailed so much about the inflationary effects of deficit financing when we were at war had applied these gifts for the rich to deflationary reduction of the public debt in these times of high incomes and high prices. The President's tax program which would have reduced taxes for the typical family, rich and poor, by $160, and which would have raised corporate taxes would have done more for most people in both their tax bills and the cost of living.

The bipartisan foreign-aid program is, in my judgment, the only major constructive legislation which has been enacted by this Congress. Quite aside

from the humanitarian aspects, the common people have a real interest in this, because it means the protection of democratic institutions at home and abroad and, with an effective international organization, holds the major hope for peace in our time. Yet when it came to implementing this program in these times of peril, the Republican record is unbelievably bad. Under the lash of the Republican leadership, this House passed a bill which would have chopped off 25 percent of the money which this Congress, after long deliberation, had determined would be the minimum needs of our fellow democracies for postwar recovery. The amounts that have been restored will not undo the harm which this meat-ax philosophy or the intemperate remarks of the Republican diehards have done to the preservation of democratic governments abroad.

And then there is the reciprocal trade program, which for many years has become the symbol of this country's willingness to do business abroad. Despite the dependence of foreign democracies on these reciprocal trade pacts for their survival, despite the interests of the common man in this country in a healthy foreign trade for jobs and reasonable prices, the Republicans in this House yielded to the pressure of the high-tariff lobbies which think more of profits than of world security. In extending the authority for reciprocal trade agreements for only 1 year and imposing unworkable restrictions, this House would have all but wrecked this program. Fortunately the Senate eliminated the worst restrictions, but the crisis precipitated by the Republican leadership in this House serves notice to the people of the kind of special-interest legislation which can be expected if the Republicans are returned to power. The actions taken and not taken show the Republicans in the House of Representatives are essentially isolationist.

Another accomplishment of the Republicans is the crippling of the services of the Federal Government to the people. They have done this by meat-axe appropriations methods and by driving out of Government service thousands of conscientious and efficient officials and employees. They are going to distort this accomplishment by bragging about how they have reduced Government expenses. Actually the total reductions they have accomplished over and above the budget estimates submitted by the Democratic Administration are a mirage, compounded of country bookkeeping. The facts are that while the Republicans have been very generous with the taxpayers' money and with the assets of this Government when the special interests have been involved, they have wielded the meat axe on services to the common people.

The exodus of capable people from the Government service and the demoralization of those who remained are due to failure of the Congress to adjust salaries to the costs of living, by irresponsible and trumped-up charges, and by the constant threats of insecurity. By these tactics the Republicans have threatened one of the foundations of democratic government—that of sound and efficient administration.

Any review of the accomplishments of the Republican Congress would be inadequate if it did not include the curtailment of the right of the laboring man to organize and have free political expression which was accomplished under the Taft-Hartley Act. Another accomplishment of the Republican Party is returning the Atomic Energy Commission to partisan politics, despite the earlier determination of Congress that the development of this resource, on which the fate of the world depends, should be free of political maneuvering. This Congress reversed that decision by renewing the appointments of the members of the Commission for only 2 years.

These are the accomplishments of this Republican Congress. Now, let us take a look at the much larger list of things which this Congress has failed to do for the people.

What has the Congress done about the rising cost of living which, day by day, is reducing the pay checks and savings of workers? Early this session the President outlined a 10-point program, aside from the reduction of the Federal debt—to control inflation. Congress has done nothing on most of these recommendations and enacted inadequate measures on the others. It has done nothing on credit controls, on regulation of commodity exchanges, on regulating marketing practices for livestock and poultry, on allocation and inventory controls, on selective rationing, and on authorizing price ceilings on products in short supply. It has done something about export controls. It has done something about encouraging conservation practices for foreign agriculture, but nothing for domestic agriculture. It extended rent control, but failed to remove those weakening provisions which this Congress enacted last year. The inaction of this Congress, according to economists, will result in a continuing spiral of inflation.

The President recommended a program of health insurance, in order that workingmen would be able to afford adequate medical and hospital service. The accomplishment of the Congress is exactly nothing.

For a while this year it looked as if at long last this Nation was to have a long-term, comprehensive housing program that would eliminate the accumulated housing deficit by which 3,000,000 families are denied homes and clean out the slums in which over 5,000,000 families live. The comprehensive housing bill was passed by the Senate under bipartisan sponsorship; after extended hearings a few Republicans joined with the Democrats on the Banking and Currency Committee of this House to recommend passage of similar legislation. But when the real estate lobby put on the pressure, the Republican leadership cracked the whip. Six men sitting on the Rules Committee denied the Members of the House the opportunity to vote on this bill. The results on housing—nothing.

The plight of education in this country, which has previously held up its head with pride for its accomplishments in this field, is a disgrace. Average salaries of teachers are less than $2,000, many are under $1,000. Some 350,000 teachers have given up the fight for public service to enter more lucrative avocations. Classes are overcrowded and school facilities are wholly inadequate. Particularly because of higher prices, many States and local communities are unable to do anything and have come to the Federal Government for help. A bill providing $300,000,000 in Federal aid to education was passed by the Senate, but it never came out of committee in this House. The Republican accomplishment in education—exactly nothing.

Several years ago, this Government enacted a minimum wage law, to assure American workers at least enough money to eke out a bare existence. This was established at 40 cents an hour. It is obvious that an income of $16 a week is inadequate today with $3 shirts and $10 shoes. The President recommended that minimum wages be raised from 40 cents to 75 cents. The Republican accomplishment—nothing.

The President, on frequent occasions, has recommended an extension of the Social Security system to include several million workers, such as farm laborers, employees of Federal, State, and local governments, domestic workers and self-employed people. The legislative program enacted by the Republican Congress was a small increase in benefits to the aged, blind, and dependent children, a reduction in the number of employees eligible for further benefits. The Republican accomplishment is for all practical purposes meaningless.

The overhauling of the Nation's agricultural program has been a necessity in the interest of both the farmers and consumers. The President recommended a program calling for a flexible system of price supports, an expansion of soil conservation, the strengthening of consumption of agricultural productions, assistance to farmers' cooperatives and an extension of crop insurance. Instead of acting on this program, Congress merely extended the present aids to agriculture. The Republican accomplishment—nothing.

One of the gravest dangers to democracy in America today is the increasing control over our economy by monopolies. Antitrust legislation needs to be strengthened to give the Government more effective means of breaking up monopolies and control public utilities. But instead of legislating for the people and small business, this Congress enacted legislation which removes the railroads from liability under the antitrust laws. The Republican accomplishment—less than nothing.

Summing up, this Republican Congress has been a Congress of the special interests who make up campaign contributions and not of the common people. It has cut taxes for the rich in an era of record profits, and thrown a few crumbs to wage and salary earners. It has crippled the Federal service by irresponsible and unjustified attacks on honest and capable public servants, by failure to raise Government salaries to meet higher living costs, by creating insecurity and by meat-ax appropriations

methods which have not effectively reduced Government costs. It has returned the Nation's most powerful and dangerous resource, atomic energy, to the realm of partisan politics. It has failed to do most of the things necessary to stop inflation. It has done nothing about the health, housing, and education of the people. It has failed to increase minimum wages and has reduced, rather than increased, the number of workers eligible for the benefits of social security. It has failed to bring the farm program up to date. Instead of strengthening the laws to deal with the growing power of monopolies, it has removed one important industry, the railroads, from the reach of existing legislation.

This Congress' only accomplishment for the people was its cooperation in a foreign-aid program. And then it turned right around to nullify much of the effect by threatening to apply the meat-axe to appropriation and by weakening the reciprocal-trade program which is the symbol of America's willingness to do business with other countries.

And lastly, the leadership has refused to bring to the floor the bill that would permit the United Nations to begin building their permanent home in New York. How will this be interpreted by the rest of the world. I wonder.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3416. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5734) entitled "An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the City of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration Center at Cheyenne, Wyo."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. LANGER, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. O'CONOR to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 6527) entitled "An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SMITH, Mr. DONNELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. HILL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6481) entitled "An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3 to the above-entitled bill; and that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 7, 13, 16, 24, and 26 to said bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4044) entitled "An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a Commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases."

PURCHASE OF LANDS ON THE FORT BERTHOLD RESERVATION

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a resolution from the affiliated tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., with reference to the proposed Garrison Dam:

THE THREE AFFILIATED TRIBES
OF THE FORT BERTHOLD
RESERVATION, N. DAK.,
Elbowoods, N. Dak., June 16, 1948.

A resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to take action on a contract for the purchase of certain Indian lands by the United States from the Three Affiliated Tribes of Ft. Berthold Reservation:

"Whereas the Tribal Business Council of the Three Affiliated Tribes has negotiated a contract with the United States Army Engineers, acting for the United States, covering the proposed taking of approximately 155,000 acres of trust allotted and tribal lands within the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., for the Garrison Reservoir; and

"Whereas a majority of the adult members of the tribes has approved the contract; and

"Whereas the contract was submitted to the Congress before the first day of June 1948 as required by an item in the War Department's Civil Appropriations Act, 1948 (Public Law 296, 80th Cong., approved July 31, 1947); and

"Whereas in a hearing before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate on June 5, 1948 to consider S. J. Res. 224 to ratify the contract it was suggested by the chairman, Senator WATKINS, that since the tribes state in the language of the contract that they will seek additional relief legislation that there should be added enough provisions to the ratifying resolution to make a complete and full settlement in one piece of legislation; and

"Whereas a resolution was drafted as suggested in the preceding clause; and

"Whereas the construction of the Garrison Dam is going on with the result that with the passage of each day the flooding of our lands and homes is brought nearer and nearer and the members of the Tribes are having less and less time to relocate themselves, to salvage their timber, lignite and buildings, and to take advantage of the provisions of the contract so long as it is not ratified by the Congress; and

"Whereas each day that goes by without ratification of the contract by the Congress means a financial loss to the members of the Tribes; and

"Whereas the majority of th adult members of the tribes epproved the contract in good faith and to prevent the taking of their lands by condemnation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the tribal business council of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, in special session assembled, That the appropriate committees of the Congress be, and are hereby, respectfully requested to give the earliest possible consideration to the ratification of the contract and the passage of additional provisions in the ratifying resolution by the Congress to compensate the members of the Three Affiliated Tribes for the lands to be taken from them within the Fort Berthold Reservation for the Garrison Reservoir; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who is hereby respectfully requested to attempt to have it introduced in the records by the appropriate committees of the Congress."

The foregoing resolution was adopted by unanimous vote of the tribal business council of the Three Affiliated Tribes in a special session on June 16, 1948.

GEORGE GILLETTE,
Chairman.
MARK MANTO,
Secretary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANBORN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LANDIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CUBA

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, this body sitting in joint session with the Senate on April 19 celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Cuba. Addresses were delivered by the President of the United States and the Cuban Ambassador to this country, Guillermo Belt.

Over the years the American people have paid little attention to the political and economic developments in our sister countries of Latin America. The recent explosion in Colombia and the complete unpreparedness of our own people to the shocking facts of life in this country is clear evidence of how little we know of what is going on at our very doorstep. The fact is that in practically every country in Latin-America today there exists tremendous ferment and unrest among the common people. Only a thin crust covers this volcano and it can erupt suddenly as we saw in Colombia a few weeks ago. Misery and poverty is the lot of the common man in all of these countries.

Cuba is no exception to this general state of affairs.

The reality of life in Cuba today is that of extremes—of great wealth for the few, of extreme poverty for the many.

And the reality of Cuban independence from the United States is worth examining. I would like to review briefly some of the high points in the political and economic history of our sister republic. I feel that it is evidence of the sort which I intend bringing forth here today which will stand as a warning to all of us of what might happen in this country.

Cuba is sugar.

More than 30 percent of the territory is in sugar production. In a country with a population of less than 5,000,000, more than 500,000 workers are employed in the sugar industry; and sugar accounts for 81 percent of the exports of the country.

As the price of sugar goes, so goes the economic well-being of the economy of Cuba. It is a fact that only when sugar prices are high and profits are large that the workers of Cuba enjoy—if one can use this word—a better standard of living. This means that in 1946, for example, when the price of sugar was the highest then on record and the sugar industry was earning the greatest profits in history that the Cuban sugar workers were averaging about $2.00 a day. And it must be remembered that for the greater number of these workers employment in the industry exists only for 3 or 4 months in each year. When we go back to the early 30's when the bottom had fallen out of the sugar market these workers were receiving a dirty hovel, a pair of overalls and sack of rice for their work in the sugar fields and sugar mills.

The fact is that despite the tremendous profits that have been earned by the sugar industry it has never furnished a livelihood much less a decent standard of living to the Cuban sugar workers. Surveys made in Cuba on housing, nutrition and the prevalence of diseases show how badly off these people are.

But this is only one side of the Cuba that is sugar. This is only the side of the workers. There is another side of the story and that is the side of the owners of these tremendous sugar plantations and sugar factories.

In 1946 there was $1,050,000,000 invested in the entire sugar industry of Cuba. United States interests accounted for more than one-half of this or over $600,000,000.

Or look at it from another point of view. The centrales or mills control the sugar industry. Farmers or colonos, all of whom are Cubans, rent land from the centrales, hire workers, and grow a crop of sugarcane. They receive a return on every 100 pounds of sugar delivered to the mills. This is a practice which in many ways is similar to the tenant-farmer system which exists in some of our southern States.

In 1946 there were 173 centrales in Cuba. Although the United States companies owned but 58 of these—about one-third—these United States mills produce more than one-half of the entire sugar crop.

Although recent figures on the ownership of land by Americans are not available, before World War II the four biggest sugar companies in Cuba had the following properties:

Cuban American Sugar, 6 factories, 770 square miles of land.

Cuban Cane Sugar Co., 12 factories, 562 square miles of land.

General Sugar Co., 9 factories, 465 square miles of land.

United Fruit Co., 2 factories, 444 square miles of land.

These four American corporations alone owned about 25 percent of all the sugar land in Cuba. In fact, it was estimated that before the war—and these holdings certainly must have grown since then—the American centrales or mills owned directly or partially about 75 percent of all the sugar land in Cuba. And with this ownership of land went ownership of villages and roads, of seaports and railways.

The United States domination goes even further however. For most of the companies which are nominally Cuban in ownership are financed by the Cuban branches of Wall Street banking houses. It would be no exaggeration to say that over 80 percent of the entire Cuban sugar industry is under United States control—either directly or indirectly.

The financial domination of Cuba by large Wall Street banking houses—at one time by the Chase National Bank of New York alone—is euphemistically described as "cooperation" between American bankers and Cuban industry. It is interesting to note however that when the Cubans try to move out on their own and finance their own industry they are warned that they are harming themselves. A nationally circulated commercial newspaper said on October 20, 1947, in regard to this:

> Efforts by the United States to widen the area of cooperation between itself and Cuba are likely to be partly thwarted as Cuba presses forward with plans to make itself more financially and industrially independent.

This is an amazing statement. It reveals for all of us to see that not only is the Cuban economy dominated by American financial interests but those controlling groups in our own country intend to continue this domination despite any attempts by the Cubans themselves to break away.

Though the Cuban Republic is but 50 years old, in this brief span of years the country has had many bitter experiences because of its domination by American financial interests.

While Cuba was still a colony in the Spanish Empire the United States already had what was then considered to be a huge financial stake in that country. And because of this our country has always played a dominant role in Cuban politics.

It is no secret that no government has ever come into power in Cuba—or stayed there—without United States approval. And history shows that United States troops have helped remove some governments not to the liking of the United States.

When the battleship *Maine* was blown up in the harbor of Habana in 1898 it was anchored there to protect the American interests in that country. As early as 1895 United States companies already had over $50,000,000 invested in Cuba.

For about the first 25 years in the life of the Cuban Republic—up to the early years of the twenties—United States marines occupied Cuba almost without a break. In fact, although Cuban independence was finally proclaimed in 1902, during the political disturbances that broke out in that country between 1906 and 1909 the United States Government appointed an American governor for this so-called free country. A United States citizen, William Howard Taft, later succeeded by Charles Magoon, ruled Cuba after the Cuban President was removed, and the United States could find no satisfactory substitute.

Violent fluctuations in the price of sugar have inevitably brought about political as well as economic crises in Cuba. In 1921 when the world sugar price collapsed and Cuba faced bankruptcy, and internal revolt, it was the United States that sent General Crowder down there to keep things under control. Crowder remained in Cuba until 1927, and when he retired practically the entire economy of Cuba was completely in the hands of American corporations. The former holdings of Spanish, French, and British interests had been squeezed out.

What was the technique through which this seizure of power took place? It was obvious and it was simple. Cuba, facing bankruptcy, required foreign credit to keep the Government functioning. General Crowder had the whip-hand and after he exacted the concessions he desired the "House of Morgan" lent Cuba $5,000,000 in 1921 and another fifteen million in 1923. And like any other banking house these bankers demanded security on their loans; increased American control of the political and economic life of Cuba would guarantee the "stability" of the country and of course guarantee the interest and principal of the loans. Thus American control was even more firmly established.

By the middle twenties the total United States investments in Cuba for sugar, tobacco, and public utilities amounted to almost a billion dollars. The dictator, Machado, came to power in 1927. And when, in 1933, the people revolted and he was overthrown the United States was hard put to control the situation. Machado was succeeded by Grau San Martin, the present President of Cuba.

The people's revolution that overthrew the dictator Machado swept into power a group of liberals who attempted to do something about the living conditions and the miserable poverty of the Cuban workers.

Wages in the sugar industry were ordered to be increased. The hours of the workers were ordered cut. The public utilities rates were reduced. American investors shouted loudly about communism as some high-placed people shouted a few weeks ago about communism in Colombia.

In 1933 the United States Government reacted promptly to the situation in Cuba by immediately sending 30 warships on a "good-will mission" to Habana. The State Department refused to recognize the new Cuban Government and when Grau asked that Sumner Welles, special American Ambassador to Cuba, be recalled for "holding communications and dealings with the enemies of the Government" his request was refused.

Four months after coming into office Grau was removed and a new President, Mendieta, who met the approval of the State Department was put in his place. Five days later this Government was recognized by the United States. And things were back on a peaceful keel again. The reforms of the liberal government were speedily repealed. Mendieta prohibited all strikes, dissolved the unions, and went about to create "confidence" in the new Cuban regime.

This is an expression we hear much these days. In the course of the debate on ERP we were told repeatedly that the recipient countries must establish conditions of "stability and confidence." It is a sad fact that to our State Department these words invariably mean wiping out the social advances of the workers and their attempts to improve living conditions.

In 1934 and 1935 a special American commission was sent to Cuba to survey the political and economic situation there. They reported back:

> The fundamental obstacle to good relations between Cuba and the United States is the widespread belief in Cuba that the American State Department attempts to make and unmake governments, and that the present—1934—disturbed situation is an outgrowth of a plan for provisional government which Washington induced the Cubans to accept.

Since the midthirties, United States control of Cuba has increased and, although the political domination has become less open and more disguised, it still remains the main fact of Cuban economic and political life.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

The current situation in Cuba is a continuation of this stormy past and the result of continued interference by the United States in the internal affairs of this Republic.

The sugar industry—or, to be more exact, its American owners—are today facing a period of retrenchment. The industry is overexpanded in terms of profitable sales to this country and the future price outlook is not too certain. As a first step of this retrenchment—as employers seem to do everywhere—Cuban trade-unions are being attacked.

Over the past 6 or 8 months the country has been strife-torn. There have been kidnapings, shootings, assassinations, and bombings. The Government has quite openly taken over the entire trade-union movement. On October 15 last the Cuban Federation of Labor called a strike in Habana to defend the free trade-union movement. The strikers were charged by the Government with a conspiracy to overthrow the present regime and 2,000 workers and 150 trade-union leaders were jailed as a result of this action. Their releases came only after world-wide protest and a 2-day hunger strike by the prisoners. Protest meetings were held all over Cuba.

Grau San Martin, the present President of Cuba, and the same man who was removed by American interference in 1933, was elected to power in 1942 through a coalition of all of the liberal groups in Cuba. But in the past year he has increasingly repudiated the support of the trade-union movement and the progressive parties and has utilized the most brazen and open techniques of intimidation and force against his former allies. The Cuban constitution forbids the President from running for office after he has served two terms. Grau San Martin's present term is his second and unless the country is in such a state of chaos that an election would be impossible he will be out of office this year. Anyone familiar with politics in Cuba would not be hard put to imagine some groups in that country are quite willing to see riot and confusion develop in Cuba if the result would mean the postponement of the elections.

On January 22 of this year Jesus Menendez, leader of the Cuban Sugar Workers Union, with some 350,000 members, and an elected member of the house of representatives of the Republic of Cuba was assassinated by a captain in the Cuban Army. Menendez who had been on a speaking tour in one of the outlying provinces was shot in the back three times because he insisted that his congressional immunity prevented his arrest.

Five hundred thousand sorrowing people turned out in the streets of Habana at the funeral of Menendez. A beloved leader of the poorest and most poverty stricken workers in that country had been shot down in cold blood.

Since the assassination of Menendez violence and terror in Cuba has increased so that today the country whose independence this House celebrated a few weeks ago is in a barely concealed turmoil which breaks forth openly in some violent action almost every day.

The Cuban people are proud and fine. They bitterly resent being treated as a colony of the United States.

Only last year this Congress sitting in its first session passed the Sugar Act of 1948, Public Law 388. It contained in section 202E an open insult to the Cuban people, in providing that their increased share in United States sugar consumption could be withdrawn if the Secretary of State found that they discriminated against nationals of the United States.

This clause was introduced to aid a few American bankers who were suing the Cuban Government in an aged litigation over a relatively small amount of money. So the United States Congress told Cuba, in effect, unless you pay this claim exactly as demanded by these private United States interests we will choke off your sugar sales in the United States.

I have introduced an amendment to the Sugar Act of 1948 repealing section 202E outright. This Congress is not a collecting agency. And the Cuban people should not be so insulted. American nationals have never yet complained about the Cuban courts. The reason why is clear from what I have already said.

At the same time I would amend title III of the Sugar Act of 1948 to include among the conditions to be met before the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make payments under the act the payment of a minimum wage of $5 per day to all persons employed on the farm in the production, cultivation, or harvesting of sugar beets or sugarcane.

Such an amendment—in many producing areas wages are above this minimum—would go a long way toward raising wage standards in Cuba and in Puerto Rico.

In both Cuba and Puerto Rico today the sugar industry has grown fat on the backs of misery and poverty stricken workers. This Congress has reviewed legislation guaranteeing the profits of the industry; a minimum wage provision would help raise the standard of living of the workers who grow and harvest the sugar cane.

Although Cuban growers are not eligible for payments under the act, the floor on wages, once established in Puerto Rico, would result in a similar wage floor in Cuba.

Before concluding I must mention the recent presidential elections in Cuba

which resulted in the victory of Carlos Prio Socarras, recent convert to the brand of democracy practiced by Grau. Mr. Prio is a member of Grau's party and was elected on a platform of continuing the present way of doing things.

With the price of sugar continuing to fall, and with an abundant sugar crop, the Cuban people again face the tragedy of wage cutting, unemployment, and sharp reductions in production. At a time when the world demand for sugar has increased sharply over World War II levels, with the world's population greater and people everywhere hungry for the high nutritional sugar food—with world production still one and a half million tons below prewar—at such a time Cuba is embarking on a program of crop reductions, discharges of sugar workers, and wage reductions.

The new regime of President Prio will, I feel sure, use every force in its power to put through such a program in the interests of the sugar monopolists and their henchmen. The people will suffer and go hungry.

These are some of the facts of life in Cuba today. We would do well to see the ills so close to our own shores before waxing so wrought about what some claim to see in other countries of the world.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the island of Puerto Rico is small, its population is great, and the working people lead a life of poverty and privation which is not duplicated in any other part of the United States. And because this is so, and because the politicians now in power are trying to ape the reactionary leaders on the mainland, this United States possession has recently produced the most outrageous spectacles of violence against workers and students; the most unrestrained of antidemocratic demonstrations have taken place in Puerto Rico.

We in Congress, in looking at Puerto Rico, can see the hysteria, the terror, and intimidation spreading like wildfire. And what is happening there will certainly take place in our own cities and towns if our reactionaries and witch hunters have their way.

In all of this the rough hand of certain misguided Puerto Rican political leaders cloaks the direction that comes from the American financial and sugar interests on the mainland. For it is these groups who are attempting to make Puerto Rico into a "paradise" for American businessmen; and a purgatory for the poor people of that island.

A recent item in the New York Herald Tribune—June 10, 1948—described Puerto Rico as "the last frontier of free enterprise, where business has a better run for its money than on the prosperous mainland."

The story goes on to quote an industrialist as saying:

> You can practically write your own ticket. They'll build you a modern factory. Plenty of labor at half the scale back home; hydroelectric power; government cooperation; and no taxes for 12 years.

Behind this pleasant picture—and an essential part of it—has been the manner in which the so-called New Deal Popular Democratic Party has moved steadily away from its original program and swung further and further to the right side of big business. Convinced, according to the New York Herald Tribune story already referred to, that "private enterprise is best" Senator Muñoz-Marín, head of the Popular Democratic Party, has replaced the old theme of "state enterprise for the people" with the slogan of "private enterprise for profit."

The recent political crises reflect the strains of imposing such a callous program on a people crying desperately for social and economic reforms along the lines of our own New Deal; greater security for the poor and aged, wage increases, housing, medical care, and the eventual establishment of a balanced and stable economy.

RECENT CRISIS

The fundamental fact is that Puerto Rico has a one-crop economy. Sugar is the key to Puerto Rico.

During World War II the high demand for sugar and the high prices created some little improvement in the economic condition of the workers. And economic stability—if it could be called so—did develop in Puerto Rico.

But since the war's end and the steady stream of people moving to the mainland has been proof of how rapidly the economic situation has deteriorated.

Since the beginning of 1948 the price of sugar—both in the United States and on the world market—has slumped sharply. To the economy of Puerto Rico this spells disaster. To the workers it spells wage cutting, unemployment, less purchasing power, and a decrease in their already pitifully low standard of living. It will probably mean an island-wide economic collapse.

Politically this economic development will add up to greater poverty for the many of Puerto Rico; and as this develops the false promises and platitudes of the politicians will fall on empty ears. Already unrest and dissatisfaction has been developing among the common people of Puerto Rico. The people want action and results.

Dr. Pedro Albiza Campos, head of the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico, has recently returned to Puerto Rico. He has spent 11 years in exile and imprisonment. He has been Puerto Rico's No. 1 victim of Wall Street imperialism.

The antidemocratic outbursts have become intensified since Campos returned to Puerto Rico.

UNIVERSITY RIOTS

Early in April of this year Campos was invited to speak at the University of Puerto Rico. The university officials denied him a meeting place—and as students have always in the past—the students of the University of Puerto Rico protested this denial of academic freedom and free speech.

From such a seemingly inocuous incident there developed violence, arrests, and the eventual closing down of the university itself.

The 1-day student strike on April 13 was described as an outbreak of violence by the university rector. He immediately closed the university grounds to the students, and the police, armed with clubs and guns, were called upon to enforce this ruling.

Although some weak-kneed political figures—forgetting their own past and their own promises—backed the rector in this action, the students, prominent faculty members and leaders of Puerto Rico from every walk of life, unanimously condemned the police interference and the decision to close the university.

Many students were jailed. Protest meetings were broken up by police clubs and tear gas. Students were expelled from the university in wholesale lots. Even faculty members who expressed sympathy with the students were dismissed from their positions.

On May 7 the shut-down of the university was made permanent and the 1948 commencement exercises were never held.

What is really behind this action on the part of the university authorities?

In Puerto Rico the students have always participated actively in politics. From their ranks have come many of the island's political leaders. And this crack-down is not merely an isolated student escapade. It is in reality a blow at a substantial part of the progressive movement in Puerto Rico.

It is the result of fear and hysteria on the part of the present political leaders. Little men who are bent on establishing a paradise of free private enterprise are ruthlessly suppressing the student movement and every other progressive force in Puerto Rico.

The national guard has been called out to reinforce the police and judiciously planted rumors about insurrection and revolution have been planted to justify this action by the Governor.

And the students? They have refused to be provoked into violence. They have insisted upon their right to assemble peacefully and to protest. Beyond that the trouble has come from the police and the national guard.

Since then the university has continued to be an armed camp. The general tension among the people has increased.

The entire situation demands immediate investigation.

THE NEW GAG LAWS

Part and parcel of the situation in the university, and reflecting the crack-down on all civil rights in Puerto Rico, was the passage on May 22 of three bills designed "to control all activities aiming at destroying the insular government, and so forth."

The Mundt-Nixon technique has its counterpart in the three laws, H. R. 23, 24, and 25. The laws were rushed through Puerto Rican Legislature at 5:30 on the morning of May 22.

It is interesting to notice that these legislative monstrosities—cloaked in the hysteria which we in this House have recently experienced—were introduced shortly after the recent visit of President Truman to Puerto Rico. In the President's party was Admiral Leahy, former Governor of Puerto Rico, and still a shadowy background figure in the political life of the Islands.

I have learned on unimpeachable authority that these gag laws—in their original version—came to Puerto Rico in English. An import from the mainland. And they were translated into Spanish and then passed through the legislature.

The insular government was ordered to pass these laws to get at any individual or group refusing to fall in line behind the program acceptable to the mainland masters.

The gag laws specifically vest the district courts with jurisdiction and explicitly provide for trial by the court without jury.

Like the infamous Mundt-Nixon bill, H. R. 24 in defining a felony under the acts enumerates the illegal actions and concludes that these are proscribed as well as organizations formed to accomplish these ends or formed "for other purposes."

The unanimity with which the legislature passed these laws is a true reflection of the pressure that has been put on them. Certainly there is no threat to the government of Puerto Rico today; excluding the threat to continued office that comes to any official in a democracy who has forgotten the needs of their constituents. But called to the heel by the political leaders who do not speak in the name of the people of Puerto Rico, the legislators cast their vote against freedom and against their own good conscience.

The bills were passed without hearings and after but one day of debate.

This legislative development in Puerto Rico, like similar actions we have seen in other countries in Latin America during the past year are clearly the result of United States pressure. In Cuba, in Chile, in Peru, in Brazil, and also in Puerto Rico the crack-down against the progressive forces, against the trade-union leaders, against every possible group which speaks for the down-trodden people has developed even as the people in power in these areas have drawn closer to the United States. It is a sad realization that is forced upon the people of these countries—that today everywhere the United States Government pushes its hand—there the ordinary man feels the increased weight of oppression while the man of privilege and wealth becomes more powerful.

LAND MEASURES

When 2,000,000 people must make a living on a 3,435 square-mile agricultural island—of which only 47 percent was reported as crop land in 1940—widespread land hunger is to be expected. Such is the situation in Puerto Rico. And because of this there is a deep and emotional intensity attached to the land tenure problem by the people of the island.

Since the American Government took over Puerto Rico in 1898 the concentration of land holdings and the development of absentee ownership has developed at a rapid pace.

Land concentration probably reached its peak around 1930. The large sugar mills and related interests constituted over 60 percent of all land in the farms growing sugarcane. The big four American-owned companies themselves operated or controlled 46 percent of all the land under the control of the sugar companies.

The concentration of land control is not the only grievance of the people of Puerto Rico against the sugar industry. There has always been widespread discontent over the distribution of the proceeds of the sugar industry among the various factors cooperating in its production. The people have always demanded that the land should be operated in order to produce wider social benefits.

Although land reform was the key plank in the platform of the Popular Democratic Party in the 1940 elections the fact is that to June 30, 1943, land reform in Puerto Rico had affected a perceptible but not considerable area of farm land. For example, less than 9 percent of the total holdings of the sugar companies as of 1934–35 have been affected by the land reform bills. I mention all of this in order to emphasize the importance of land holdings to the Puerto Rican people.

And what are we doing to solve this problem?

In the same manner that it drove the natives off Bikini, the United States Navy is depopulating the Puerto Rican island of Vieques and turning it into a military training base. But where Bikini was only a sparsely inhabited barren Pacific atoll the island of Vieques is a fertile spot and one of the oldest communities in the Western Hemisphere. Despite the frantic opposition of the Puerto Ricans, the Navy has already ordered the complete evacuation of the inhabitants of Vieques by the early part of this year. This order will affect some 5,000 people and will cripple an agricultural economy which supported 4 sugar mills—producing 20,000 tons of sugar annually—and an extensive grazing industry.

To the people of Puerto Rico who do not have nearly enough arable land to support their dense population the removal of Vieques as a source of agricultural products is a national calamity.

Professors and students of the University of Puerto Rico have condemned the removal of these islanders in these words:

> The case of Vieques is one of the gravest events that have taken place since the beginning of the United States occupation. It is the first time that action has been taken to eliminate an important nucleus of the social and cultural community of Puerto Rico and a part of the geographical patrimony of our fatherland."

The General Confederation of Labor has condemned the Navy Department's action as "an unjustifiable act of aggression."

We can well ask with the Puerto Rican people what has become of article 73 of the United Nations Charter dealing with non-self-governing territories, which stipulates that the "interests of the inhabitants are paramount."

At the same time the small island of Culibre is reported to be purchased by the United States Navy. The island of Culibre has a natural harbor, and the Navy obviously intends to use it for its own purposes.

It is interesting to notice that the United States only recently filed a report with the UN in regard to Puerto Rico. Our Government pointed out in this report to the Secretary-General of the UN, as follows:

> The pressure of population upon land resources in Puerto Rico is very severe. There is only 1 acre of land area per person in Puerto Rico as compared to 7.1 acres per person in the United States. On page 11 it is stated that there are 1,053,000 acres of crop land. Thirty-one percent of this is devoted to sugar. This report says that 0.6 of 1 percent of the farmers own 25 percent of the crop area in holdings above 500 acres, that 5 percent of all farmers own 27 percent of the land in holdings between 100 and 500 acres, and that 73.2 percent of the farmers own 20.1 percent of the crop land.

One can search through the entire report and find no data furnished on the amount of land used by the United States for military bases in Puerto Rico.

CONCLUSION

There is no need to summarize the facts which have already been brought forth in this brief outline of the current situation in Puerto Rico.

There is a pressing need for a complete and thorough investigation of the political and economic situation in Puerto Rico today. Unless a prompt investigation takes place and unless the drift toward undemocratic and militaristic developments is stopped at once the people of Puerto Rico will be further despoiled and impoverished.

Before the Spaniards came to the New World the Indians called this island Borinquen. This name survives in poetry. This means the garden of flowers. Puerto Rico today is no garden for the greater mass of the people who live there.

Only complete independence of the Puerto Rican people and their freedom to develop their country and their lives as they wish will remove them from the curse of American intervention.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as we await the hour of adjournment I want to utter a word of caution to the Republican leadership of the House, upon whom rests the responsibility for the completion of a worth-while legislative program.

You may be disposed to abandon the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees, who deserve a pay increase and who were led to believe that they would be treated on par with their fellows of the postal service. Seemingly they were forgotten, or—worse—they were betrayed. The postal workers were only partially compensated for their service, but all others in the great family of Uncle Sam's Federal workers were thus denied even that consideration. It is not too late to bring in a last-minute token award or pay raise and thus redeem ourselves before adjourning.

But why all this rush to get away, all the hubbub about adjournment, when there is so much that is left undone? We are all weary and anxious to go home, to get some rest, to renew our acquaintances, to build or to mend our political fences, but I warn you to beware of what we may leave undone. We are the servants of the people, paid on an annual basis. Maintaining a 24-hour-a-day office, as has always been my custom over the years for the benefit of my constituents, I cannot reconcile myself with the idea of adjourning prematurely because of the party convention, or because I want to go to the seashore. The legislative docket has not been cleared.

Unsolved to date is the most important question of prices, ever-increasing and higher and higher prices. Inflation, like an all-consuming and devastating fire, is destroying our savings and endangering our Nation's financial safety. Our low-income families are the greatest victims of this scourge of inflation, yet this Congress, in the face of this obvious threat, has not made the effort to throttle or even to control the menace.

The civil-rights program has been all but forgotten by the Republicans, who always posed as the champions of the proposal expressed so forcefully by President Truman.

Housing seemingly will be abandoned or be so totally inadequate as to be almost worthless. Coastal oil lands, upon which rests the country's security, and many other important matters have not been satisfactorily settled, or repose in pigeon holes.

Let me say as a final, parting shot, do not vote to adjourn until the job is done and done right.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE LATE J. FREDERICK RICHARDSON

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a great and good man, an efficient public servant, a friend of every person in this House, a fine Christian gentleman has passed away. I refer affectionately to J. Frederick Richardson, Coordinator of Information of the House.

I ask unanimous consent at this time that each Member of the House, if he or she so desires, may extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD with reference to this fine man.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE MILTON WEST

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each member of the Ways and Means Committee may have an opportunity to extend his remarks with reference to the retirement of the Honorable MILTON WEST, and that the Ways and Means Committe may have consent to insert resolutions with reference to the retirement of the gentleman from TEXAS covering his distinguished service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION FOR DISABILITIES INCURRED IN ACTIVE MILITARY OR NAVAL SERVICE OTHER THAN IN A PERIOD OF WAR SERVICE

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 595, to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective the first day of the first month following the passage of this act, paragraph II of part II of Veterans Regulation No. I (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"II. For the purposes of part II, paragraph I (a) hereof, if the disability results from injury or disease, the compensation shall be equal to 80 percent of the compensation now or hereafter payable for the disability, had it been incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service during a period of war service as provided in part I of this regulation."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPLIMENTS TO THE MEMBERSHIP

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, this is probably my last appearance in the House of Representatives. I had always hoped that when I left my last remarks would be something complimentary to the membership of this House. For that reason I now ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read a resolution into the RECORD which I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress has been faced with some of the gravest issues in the history of this Nation, and has worked diligently to resolve these issues; and

Whereas the Members of the House of Representatives appreciate the assistance given by appointees, attachés, and employees; and

Whereas the Members of the House of Representatives recognize the important role played by the press and radio in keeping the public informed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this body that in the House of Representatives of this, the world's greatest legislative assembly, elected directly by a majority of the finest people in the greatest country in the world, are 435 of the most able, sincere, honest, and intelligent men and women of this country:

That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the appointees, attachés, and employees of this body are most courteous, capable, and efficient;

That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the press, with rare exception, carries on the great tradition of enlightening the people. The press guards and is worthy of that freedom guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; and

That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that in the radio galleries are the representatives of the world's greatest and most progressive and enlightening radio system.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for 10 minutes in which to discuss this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I did not introduce this resolution with any intention of having it passed. I knew that it would be a self-serving declaration upon the part of the House if they did pass it. I introduced it by way of saying that I have enjoyed being associated with you.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this resolution by way of saying how much I feel that our attachés and employees, our pages, everyone with whom we associate have been courteous, kind, efficient, and capable. I feel that the press has always been here ready to praise or criticize according to the dictates of their conscience. I have felt that our radio system was the greatest system of the world that carries the every act of this Congress to the entire world.

When I have finished here tonight I will not say anything more on the floor of the House, because I wanted my last words to be complimentary to the people here with whom I have been associated.

I am going back to the empire of the sun, going back to the great State of Florida. I am going to live with my people there. Many people have asked me: "What are you going to do?" I would reply the same as General Eisenhower replied to someone who asked him what he was going to do when he retired from military service. He said: "Well, I am going out in the country and find me a nice house. I am going to find one with a porch on it and get a good rocking chair, put it on the porch, and I am going to stay on the porch in the rocking chair, and after about 2 months I am going to commence to rock slowly."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to go back to Daytona Beach, Fla., where we have that remarkable 25-mile beach, which is from 200 to 300 yards wide at low tide and as smooth as the surface of a road. I am going to get the maid, the yard man or manager or somebody to put a rocking chair out on the terrace overlooking that ocean and the great beach there; I am going to sit down first for about 2 months, then I will commence to rock slowly. After that I shall decide what I am going to do.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot be as magnanimous as Will Rogers was when he said he never met a man he could not like. I will say this, however: I have never met a Member of this House, man or woman, that I disliked in any way.

Mr. Speaker, I hope in future years I will have the pleasure of seeing you again. I have future political aspirations and it may be that some day I may or may not have the opportunity of having associations again with you in an official capacity; but whether I do or whether I do not, I hope to see you from time to time here in the Capitol and I hope to see you from time to time in the State of Florida. I hope you will all come down there and visit me in that great State.

Let me say that I have been extremely fond of all of you. These have been trying years. I came here as a young man and I served for 12 years in this House of Representatives. It has taught me that this is a great country, even though times have been trying. I served through an economic depression and a military crisis. I feel this association with you has been one of the richest experiences in my life and to each and every one of you I say, I want to see you again and God bless each and every one of you.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I want to ask the gentleman if he could put two rocking chairs out on that terrace?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I will be delighted to.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I want to say to the Members of the House that I have served with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] upon the same subcommittee, that I have a great admiration for him, that I have gone through some very difficult arguments with him, but he stands like the Rock of Gibraltar. He has ability, he has been outstanding and it has always been a pleasure to work with him. He will be missed very much by all of us, particularly myself.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I know that every Member of this House shares my regret at the fact that our distinguished and able colleague is leaving the Congress. When I came to this House 8 years ago, JOE HENDRICKS was then a veteran in the service and a man who had gained much stature, much recognition, for the outstanding quality of his work. He has added to that record during each succeeding year he has served here. His service to our great State of Florida and to this Nation will go down as one of the outstanding records in the history of this country.

He has been uniformly helpful to each of us in his own delegation and to many Members of Congress who needed his help.

Wherever JOE HENDRICKS finds himself in the future, he will carry the good wishes of the men and women who have served with him, and I am confident that in whatever undertaking he may engage he will gain additional recognition and will carry on in the same splendid manner that we have been accustomed to see him carry on in this House of Representatives.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the Florida delegation will lose two good men, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], and the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE]. Both of these gentlemen have made a contribution to the workings of the Congress while they have been here.

They are real public servants; they are loyal, capable, honest, and sincere, and I am sure that the membership of this House will miss the value of their services.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the hour is late and much is to do. I know many of the gentleman's colleagues would like to say a word of praise about him, and I certainly do want to pay tribute to his fine personality and his splendid statesmanship.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincerest regret that we learn of the retirement from Congress of our distinguished colleague, JOE HENDRICKS.

I did not personally know JOE HENDRICKS before I was elected to Congress in November of 1946, but since that time I have come to know him well and admire him greatly. His long and useful career in Congress and as a member of the Appropriations Committee has made his always generous advice invaluable to me, and I feel a deep sense of loss at his retirement.

JOE has served his district, the State of Florida, and this Nation with sincerity and ability, and I am confident that the people of his district and the State of Florida are well aware of that fact. His record of accomplishment here will serve as an inspiration to those of us who will carry on.

I am sure that I express the sentiments of everyone who knows JOE HENDRICKS when I say that we wish him Godspeed and outstanding success in all that he undertakes in the future.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest as well as one of the ablest Members of the Congress is my distinguished friend and colleague from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]. While we respect the reasons which prompt him to voluntarily retire, we regret his decision. At any time, but particularly in these trying days, the country can ill afford to lose the services of such an able, experienced, and courageous legislator.

I know that I express the thoughts and sentiments of my colleagues in extending to him my very best wishes for every future happiness and success.

I hope his voluntary retirement from public life will not be permanent, and in the not far future he will again in some capacity, elected or otherwise, give the public the benefit of his outstanding ability and experience. In any event, I know his deep interest in public affairs, and in good government, and from a political angle, in the best interest, progress, and success of our great party, the Democratic Party, founded by the immortal Thomas Jefferson, will never be dimmed, and will always be strong and active.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many Members on both sides of the aisle in expressing regret over the voluntary retirement of Representative JOE HENDRICKS.

Last November a testimonial dinner was given him at Orlando, Fla., by admiring friends and I was honored with an invitation to attend. Circumstances were such that my attendance was impossible, but I addressed a letter to Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON to be read at the dinner which expressed my affection for JOE. I desire to incorporate in these remarks a copy of this letter which expressed my feeling at that time and at the present time:

Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I wish I could attend the testimonial dinner for our mutual friend, JOE HENDRICKS. I think it is most appropriate and a further evidence of the deep affection his friends have for him.

JOE and I entered Congress at the same time in January 1937, and it was my good fortune to become intimately acquainted with him in the early days of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

It was with deep regret that I learned some time ago of his intention to return to private life, but regardless of the direction of our paths in years to come I shall always remember him for his fine character, sincerity of purpose, loyalty, and devotion to duty, as well as the personal friendship I have enjoyed which has ripened with the passing years.

In his departure from public life the Nation, the State, and his own district will lose a valuable public servant whose place will be hard to fill.

He has my best wishes for health, happiness, and prosperity which he so richly deserves.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to revise and extend my remarks to include a radio address delivered at a testimonial dinner in my honor at Orlando, Fla., on November 12, 1947. While this is not a complete record of my service in Congress, it gives a brief view:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished hosts, and friends of the radio audience, I do not know how you will classify the speech I shall deliver tonight. It is not my swan song, for, in announcing that I would not be a candidate to succeed myself in the 1948 election, so far as I am concerned, I very clearly left the gate open for my return to the political arena at any time. This, then, is not a farewell address. It might reasonably be considered the closing chapter of book 1, only.

What I have to say may sound more like a speech opening a new campaign—than like one closing a long-standing political career. However, my real reason for talking to you is to express my appreciation, which I shall

never quite be able to do adequately, for the great honor you have bestowed on me for 12 years. It is indeed a great honor, an honor which 99 out of every 100 men would envy. It is the greater honor to me because of the miraculous way in which I attained it. My whole career has been the typical American dream, concrete evidence of the opportunity this country offers to those who have the will to do something. Not for one moment could I claim all the credit, for I have been blessed with the finest friends in the world, and the guidance and protection of a divine providence. I think you will agree when you hear my story.

I was born at Lake Butler, in north Florida. The son of Joseph and Mary Andrews Hendricks, good and intelligent parents, parents of noble birth and good blood. My father died and left mother with five little children, and I arrived 23 days later, making the sixth. Mother struggled to take care of us; and later married again and had six more children. I was, therefore, 1 in a family of 12.

Mother passed away when I was only a boy and left me with very little of this world's goods, but she did leave me her determination and stamina with which to carry on. Until I was 14 years old, I was ill 6 months of each year and had not yet completed the fourth grade in a rural school. I soon came to the realization that I needed an education if I were to compete with my chosen associates. I was able to improve my health somewhat by strenuous processes and proceeded to work during summers and in the evenings to further my education.

In the summer of 1921, I happened to be in Umatilla and saw a show put on at a small theater by students of the Montverde School—a very fine school. Mr. and Mrs. H. P. Carpenter were then the heads of the school. To make a long story short, I contacted them through friends and entered the school in 1922. With the aid of Jesse Hunter and others I worked my way through and graduated in 1925. The school has thoroughly justified its existence in what it has done for me and for many, many others.

I worked for the Montverde School in 1926 in order to pay some debts and in the fall of that year entered Stetson University where I again worked to earn all I could and called on my good friends, Mr. H. J. Carpenter, Jesse Hunter, Karl Lehman, and others, and the divine providence, for additional help. I graduated with an AB in 1930, worked for a year, and returned to study law. I received my LL. B. degree in 1934, after which I went to work for the State as an attorney for the tax survey directed by Bill Anderson, the son of lovable Mrs. F. L. Anderson, of Orlando, who is here with us tonight.

I resigned this position and became head of the insurance and tax department of the American Oil Co. in Jacksonville. This position I held until the 1935 session of the legislature created the new Fifth Congressional District of Florida. I immediately decided that this was my opportunity to fulfill an ambition which I had nurtured for many years—to become a Member of the Congress of the United States. I returned to Deland and the practice of law. Early in 1936, I announced that I would be a candidate for Congress from this district. Never did a political announcement create less enthusiasm and excitement that I can recall. There were, at that time, nine prominent men in the race—judges, representatives, senators, State's attorneys, and others. Nevertheless, in June of 1936, with the aid of you fine friends and the divine providence, 2 years after I had finished school, I was elected a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and the first Representative of this district.

Friends, if I could review this picture with you, if you could look back with me as I see myself in 1918 when mother passed away, a frail boy, with neither health, funds, nor education, and during the period of 18 years until I took my seat in Congress, you would understand why I say I appreciate this great honor. But may I say from the depths of my heart, I am grateful to God, to my country, and to you.

Have I shown that appreciation by my acts? I have tried to honestly. It is not for all Members of Congress to author broad and sweeping legislation which will place their names in headlines; some of us are the peddlers.

I was on a legislative committee for only a short time. The Appropriations Committee does not sponsor general legislation. General legislative committees sometimes change a bill which you have introduced, even to the point of inserting another name, and, therefore the public may not give you the credit which you deserve. DWIGHT ROGERS is a case in point. He introduced the terminal leave pay bill and it came out of committee with another man's name on it. In spite of this, we, in Congress, are able to recognize our bills even though the public does not and therefore we get no credit.

I introduced the bill for a postwar economic planning committee. The bill was passed and the committee has done excellent work in assisting the Administration in its long-range economic planning. Many of the public projects which will benefit you in later years will be the result of this committee's work. I got none of the credit because a member of the Rules Committee had changed the bill slightly and placed his name on my bill. Those things happen.

I sponsored legislation for variable grants in old-age assistance. That principle was adopted over a year ago.

I sponsored and passed legislation—when I was a member of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee—for the benefit of postal employees throughout the Nation. They remembered me.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that it was my action on the floor of the House which brought the case of Watson, Dodd, and Lovette—three Government employees—communistic sympathizers—to the Supreme Court.

It was my bill which set up a system of offsets against the credits of foreign countries for debts that they owed to companies in this country for carrying the mail on our flag ships. This amounted to millions of dollars.

I could go on and name many others. But time will not permit.

It is a sad commentary that people judge their Congressman more by what he brings to the district in dollars and cents than by his legislative record—which is much more important.

But this is an understandable, human error.

My vote has never been radical or reactionary—always progressive. I wil stand on my record.

As far as the dollars-and-cents column is concerned, I think I can qualify with the best in the State: In the years that I have represented you in Congress—the 12 counties, comprising the Fifth District, have received more revenue than at any time in the previous history of the State. We have received around $300,000,000 in Federal funds for construction of schools, sewer systems, roads, gymnasiums, armories, rural electrification lines, air fields, waterways projects—and many other projects of permanent benefit to you and your children.

I have secured employment for constituents whose aggregate salaries are about $250,000 per year, or $3,000,000 for the time that I have been in Congress.

I have, by direct appointments, secured educational benefits for young men in the amount of about $400,000.

I have passed claim bills for counties and individuals ranging from $100 to $30,000.

I have aided the citrus men, the cattlemen, the dairymen, the businessmen, the farmer, sent out bulletins, baby books.

I have done yeoman service for my district—and I am happy that I have been able to do it.

It may surprise you to hear that I think one of the most important accomplishments of my years in Congress is my work in getting the approval of the Army engineers and the appropriation of money for the deepening—to 12 feet—and the widening—of the St. John's River channel—from Jacksonville to Sanford. You may wonder why I feel this is so important. It is, my friends, because this is an excellent channel and opens a very desirable artery of commerce—and Sanford thus will become an inland port.

But this is not the only reason. It is the end-result that makes this project important: From my observation of the development of waterways—and I am an ardent exponent of them—I am sure that once the St. John's channel is completed, the natural result will be approval of the Sanford-Titusville Canal to connect with the East Coast Canal—which is also to be deepened and widened to 12 feet—and will be an inland waterway all the way from Miami to Boston, Mass., for commercial and pleasure craft. The final result will be flood control on the upper St. John's Valley—and the net result of that will be flood control on the Kissimmee River Valley—so sorely needed in the past. And so on and on until central Florida, incorporated—an interlocking system of canals through lakes and streams throughout central Florida—will be approved and completed. This is my dream for the St. John's and central Florida. I hope I will be permited to see it come true.

This, briefly, my friends, is my record. I know you approve, because I have never had serious opposition since my first election, in 1936. I am glad I could serve you.

What about my future as a private citizen? Up until the last few months I asked myself that question many times: I have observed—during my period in Congress—so many Members of the House who had either been defeated or had refused to run again, and so many of them came back to Washington asking for employment. Some obtained positions and others did not. I knew, from my personal relations with many of the Members, that they were barely living on a shoestring and when they had left Congress they had no funds to rely on. You may be interested to know that when Senator Park Trammel passed away, his estate was valued at $200. I have seen so many sad cases of this sort. I have seen so many Members desperately trying to stay in the House when, because of health, age, or for other reasons, they should have been retired. (Parenthetically, I think Congress should be commended for passing a pension system for these Members so that they may retire, when necessary, with dignity and some income. Incidentally, I did not take advantage of the pension system and will receive no benefits.)

After I had been in Congress for a number of years, and because of these observations, I began to ponder my own future. I can personally testify to the striking truthfulness of the statement made by Franklin D. Roosevelt in an inaugural speech, that: "All we have to fear is fear itself!". It upsets a man and decreases his efficiency.

I had wondered if some day I might be turned out after dissociating myself from all possibilities of a profession at home, and without funds become more or less a despondent shadow.

I came to the conclusion before 1942 that I wished to retire, but war was declared in 1941 and I could not retire. And even now, though I thought we would have settled world affairs by the time by present term expired, I have grave apprehension.

In regard to my financial possibilities as a private citizen, I am not at all concerned. After announcing that I would not be a candidate to succeed myself, I had many offers: I was first approached to take over a job which I promptly declined because I did not feel I was temperamentally qualified. There are those here who can testify to that. I next had an offer of a position which I declined because I did not think it would work out to my advantage or to the advantage of the person involved. And then I was approached by a man in behalf of certain interests in this State to take a job which, in his words, "is the biggest job in the State." I am sure that would agree (if I were at liberty to disclose what it is) that if that job were well done, it would be the biggest job in the State. I neither accepted nor declined, and the proposition has not been pushed further.

Recently, I was offered a part-time job with a New York corporation which would pay me more than my present salary in Congress. I actually signed the contract and worked for 2 weeks, at which time I took advantage of a revocation clause and terminated my services for two reasons: First, I was not convinced that I approved certain things the corporation was doing; and, second, I found that it would require my presence in New York at the very time of the year when I would much prefer to be in Florida.

I may say, that in addition, I have a small business which I have developed, which will, in the coming year, pay me a great deal more than my present salary in Congress.

I studied for years to prepare myself for a profession—the practice of law. I have good opportunities in that field.

Then, too, I was raised on a farm, and if it becomes necessary I can make a living farming. So the future looks bright to me and I have no fear of fear. I look to the future with great anticipation—and I have you, my good friends, to thank for that.

And now, will you permit a few words of parting advice: I would like to say that it will be the responsibility of you people to elect the right man to represent you in the Eighty-first Congress. I, myself, will have no further interest in the matter other than that of a voter and a citizen. There are a number of potential candidates present here. All of them are close friends of mine, some of them schoolmates and others fraternity brothers. It would be an impossible situation for me to attempt to favor one as against the other. Therefore, if any candidate thinks I am committed to support him, I must here and now revoke such commitment, because you, the voters, must make the decision.

So, to you voters, I say: We are facing grave world problems, no less grave than when Hitler invaded Poland in 1939. Your present representative has, at all times, been keenly aware of international affairs and problems. In most matters affecting you, I have followed the will of the majority. In foreign affairs this was not always possible: There were times when I possessed more information than you, and felt it incumbent upon me to exercise my own judgment, based on information which I had and therefore did the best thing for my country.

I voted for the first conscription bill. I definitely voted my judgment and not the wishes of the majority of my constituents. When I voted for the extension of the act, the same situation obtained, and though criticized at the time, I was vindicated a few weeks later when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. I have always made a close study of our relations with the rest of the world, and the effects thereof, and in regard to foreign policy, I have, on occasion, had to vote as I believed best.

This requires self-assurance, conviction, and a good deal of personal courage, and it is a large responsibility.

My advice to you is to elect a man who will study, in order to inform himself on foreign affairs; convince himself, and then vote his best judgment. Elect a man who is neither a nationalist or internationalist, but a man who is keenly conscious of the rest of the world and the neighborhood of nations. That kind of man will serve you best in these critical times.

The Hawaiians have a word which, when it comes to the finer attributes of mankind, those which so closely resemble God, is all-inclusive. The word is "aloha." Aloha means:

I welcome you.
I am happy because you are here.
I hope you are happy.
I hope you like me.
The sun is bright and all is love.
I am sad because you are leaving.
I hope you will return.
I love you.
Farewell until we meet again.
May God bless you.

And all the finer sentiments. So, in the true meaning of the word, I say, thank you, and aloha.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION UPON THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2217) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine on the merits and to render, in accordance therewith, judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co. against the United States which are embodied in the petition of the said companies filed in the Court of Claims May 1, 1939, as amended February 14, 1940, and therein docketed as No. 44,659, excepting from such jurisdiction, however, the claims set out as causes of actions Nos. 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, and 31 in the said petition and excepting therefrom that part of the claim set out as cause of action No. 14 in the said petition for which judgment was rendered by the court in No. 44,659 on October 1, 1945, in the amount of $1,099.80. The Court of Claims is directed to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the said claims notwithstanding any prior determination, any statute of limitation, or any abandonment of, nonconformance with, or deviation from the protest and appeal provisions and procedure of the said contract, including but without limitation to article 15 of the contract and paragraph 14 of specifications No. 570 involved in such claims, and without regard to any provisions of the said contract or specifications purporting to confer finality upon the decisions of questions arising under the contract by any officer of the United States.

SEC. 2. Adjudication of the said claims by the Court of Claims is directed to be made without reference to the decision by the court in the case of Silas Mason Co., Inc., Walsh Construction Co., Atkinson-Kier Co. against the United States on October 1, 1945, No. 44659; but the court shall consider as the evidence in such suit any and all evidence heretofore taken by the parties in the said case of Silas Mason Co., Inc., Walsh Construction Co., Atkinson-Kier Co. against the United States; and the court may use as a basis for its findings of fact the report of its commissioner, Ewart W. Hobbs, filed January 11, 1944, upon such evidence subject to the exceptions thereto filed by the petitioners and by the defendant United States both on May 1, 1944.

SEC. 3. Any suit upon such claims brought under the provisions of this act shall be instituted within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VITO ABARNO

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2009) for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a committee report.

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CARS FOR AMPUTEES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentlewoman wish to make a valedictory speech?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a request and plea for the House to take action on the amputee car bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sympathizes with the gentlewoman but cannot recognize her for that purpose at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the Chair recognize me to submit a unanimous-consent request for the immediate consideration and passage of the bill (S. 1391)?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it has been the practice that all

legislation taken up by unanimous consent shall have the approval of the majority and minority leaders. Has the gentlewoman secured that permission?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have been talking to them, but the hour is getting late. May I ask, is the Congress going to adjourn tonight?

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes he could answer the gentlewoman to that effect, and would like to be able to say so, but he is inclined to think it will not.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If we have a recess, will there be a chance later to get legislation through?

The SPEAKER. There will be a chance to get legislation through later.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We have spent millions of dollars for foreign countries and millions on everything else, and this is such a small bill for the amputees.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sympathizes entirely with the gentlewoman.

REPRESENTATIVES ANTON JOHNSON AND JOHN FLANNAGAN

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman wish to make a valedictory address?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on this evening we all think of some of those who will not be in the next Congress. There are many whose parting we regret. Most of us find that there is some particular individual whose retirement from official life will leave its mark of sadness upon our feelings. I find myself especially distressed to lose the company of one of the majority members who has served with me on the Committee on Agriculture for a number of years, one whom I have come to trust and love and to look upon as a fine personal friend as well as an outstanding public servant, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ANTON JOHNSON.

This House has no finer Member than ANTON JOHNSON. There just are no finer men than ANTON JOHNSON. Of course, he and I disagree on many matters, but I never knew Anton to take a position which he thought was wrong, and I have never had occasion to fall out with that kind of man. If we had more of his kind on both sides of the aisle we would have a finer Congress. The Congress and the country will be the poorer by reason of the fact that he will not be with us this coming year. His history is one of the finest in the American tradition. He is a self-made man who has gone to the top by hard work, honesty, loyalty to his friends, his family, and his country, and a fine fund of common sense. Our committee is going to miss him. It is also going to miss our former chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable JOHN FLANNAGAN, who is not a candidate for reelection. So I want to say to Anton and to John that we are going to miss you both in the next Congress and that we are sorry you are leaving us, but we hope you will be happy and prosperous wherever you are.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOBLICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to adress the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. CANFIELD.) Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOBLICK. Mr. Speaker, on these the closing hours of the Eightieth Congress, I ask you to bear with me for a few minutes so that I might extend to you one and all a fond farewell.

In leaving these halls I bid adieu to the sanctums that have been made hallowed by men and women who have been fired with a patriotism that this Nation shall live, that this Republic shall never be excelled in the family of nations; that right shall ever be our aim and wrong our challenge adversary.

I came to the Eightieth Congress inspired with the opportunity of service and I leave it with the conviction that so long as the fires of patriotism burn brightly in the men and women in this Nation and continues to be reflected by their Representatives in the Congress, then the Republican form of Government that was founded here shall continue to be the beacon light for the freedom-loving peoples of the world and the United States shall continue to be the greatest Nation ever permitted by divine providence to be born and flourish.

It is to the credit of the House that the Members have ever held sacred the fundamentals of our Republic.

This House has faced with courage and has refused to turn its head from the principle that when an inalienable right has been menaced, then it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it.

I leave this House with the utmost respect for its Members, for many reasons but above all that it has remained true to the principles which caused us to be founded and that its Membership reflects the spirit of neighborliness to other peoples of the world and in this connection I believe our hero dead from their "Valhalla" will say Amen.

However, there are some who will detract from the best effort we have put forth but they cannot successfully challenge the pureness of our motives, the sincerity of our aims or the patriotism that has moved us.

To them we may with confidence examine their motives and let history translate them with finality.

It has not been my good fortune to win renomination to the Eighty-first Congress, however, may I say without bitterness, no man can ever deserve to win who does not know how to lose, and furthermore please believe me that when the people go to the polls to name a Representative for the Tenth Pennsylvania District for the Eighty-second Congress, I will be there and I shall expect to return here and continue the work I have come to know and the finest service an humble citizen can give to his country.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOBLICK. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I commend the gentleman on his outstanding service as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I am only going to say "so long" to you because I know you will be back 2 years hence.

Mr. SCOBLICK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for several minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, I know that those of us who look forward to serving in the Eighty-first Congress would like to pay tribute to many of our retiring colleagues. I feel that I would be untrue to the feelings in my own heart if I did not on this occasion pay at least a brief tribute to two of the finest men it has ever been my pleasure to know, who are voluntarily retiring from Congress at the end of the present session, Hon. J. BAYARD CLARK, of North Carolina, and Hon. JOHN H. FOLGER, of North Carolina.

Both of these distinguished North Carolinians have served in this House for many years. They have with great ability and becoming dignity served their country. They are outstanding Members of Congress, gentlemen of sterling character and great patriotism. I know that we shall miss them, and we shall look forward to the time when they shall visit these Halls, in which they have served so well and faithfully.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of the friendships that are made in this House and of the separations that will occur at the end of this session, I can think of nothing more appropriate to say than to quote the last verse of a little poem which I think was written by Thomas Moore, called Farewell:

Let fate do her worst, there are relics of joy,
Bright dreams of the past, which she cannot destroy,
Which come, in the nighttime of sorrow and care,
And bring back the features that joy used to wear.

Long, long be my heart with such memories filled!
Like the vase in which roses have once been distilled—
You may break, you may shatter the vase, if you will,
But the scent of the roses will cling round it still.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House when I say we all deeply regret the decision of our fellow-member of that committee and our respected colleague, Hon. JOHN H. FOLGER, to retire as a Representative in Congress from North Carolina. His ability, his industry, and his intense interest in the problems affecting the welfare of our country, I am sure, have deeply impressed all of his colleagues and especially those on the Banking and Currency Committee where for a long time he has served with distinction and been a valuable member. No man has been more assiduous in his attendance at committee meetings and his deep study of the problems presented. His sound judgment and sensible conclusions were always eagerly sought by the members of the committee. His colleagues will miss him and the State of North Carolina and the Nation have sustained a loss in the retirement of this patriotic, public-spirited Representative. We wish him success and happiness in all his undertakings.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, it was with genuine regret that I learned that the Honorable JOHN HAMLIN FOLGER, who has so admirably represented the Fifth District of the great State of North Carolina, had decided to retire to private life. I know that this is not in keeping with the desire of his fellow Members in Congress or of his constituency at home.

I was privileged to serve on the Banking and Currency Committee during the first session of the Eightieth Congress along with Judge FOLGER. When Judge FOLGER spoke in the committee or on the floor of the House, he always made a valuable contribution toward the solution of the problem involved. He took his job seriously. He is in the true sense of the word a southern gentleman.

I wish to express to him sincerest good wishes for his health and happiness in the days to come.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HINSHAW submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'War Claims Act of 1948'.

"WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

"SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the War Claims Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') and to be composed of three persons to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. At least two of the members of the Commission shall be persons who have been admitted to the bar of the highest court of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia. The members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 a year. The terms of office of the members of the Commission shall expire at the time fixed in subsection (d) for the winding up of the affairs of the Commission.

"(b) The Commission may, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys, and employees, and may make such expenditures, as may be necessary to carry out its functions. Officers and employees of any other department or agency of the Government may, with the consent of the head of such department or agency, be assigned to assist the Commission in carrying out its functions. The Commission may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the Government, utilize the facilities and services of such department or agency in carrying out the functions of the Commission.

"(c) The Commission may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions, and may delegate functions to any member, officer, or employee of the Commission. The Commission shall give public notice of the time when, and the limit of time within which, claims may be filed, which notice shall be published in the Federal Register. The limit of time within which claims may be filed with the Commission shall in no event be later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(d) The Commission shall wind up its affairs at the earliest practicable time after the expiration of the time for filing claims, but in no event later than three years after the expiration of such time.

"JURISDICTION OF COMMISSION

"SEC. 3. The Commission shall have jurisdiction to receive and adjudicate according to law claims as hereinafter provided.

"EMPLOYEES OF CONTRACTORS

"SEC. 4. (a) The Federal Security Administrator is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any person specified in section 101 (a) of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes', approved December 2, 1942, as amended, or by the legal representative of any such person who may have died, for the amount by which (1) the total sum which would have been payable to such person by his employer (not including any payments for overtime), if such person's contract of employment had been in effect and he had been paid under it for the entire period during which he was entitled to receive benefits under section 101 (b) of such Act, exceeds (2) the entire amount creditable to such person's account for such period under the provisions of such section plus any amounts paid to such person by such employer for such period or recovered by such person in any legal action against such employer based upon such person's right against such employer for such period under the contract of employment, including payments in settlement of the liability of the employer arising under or out of such contract. No claim shall be allowed to any person under the provisions of this section unless such person executes a full release to the employer and to the United States in respect to the liability of the employer arising under or out of the contract of employment, except liability for workmen's compensation benefits under the Act of August 16, 1941, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1651 and the following), or detention or other benefits paid under the Act of December 2, 1942, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1751 and the following). Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this Act.

"(b) (1) The Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to cancel any obligation to the United States of any person specified in section 101 (a) of such Act of December 2, 1942, to pay any sum which may have been advanced to or on behalf of any such person by the Department of State for the purpose of paying the costs of food and medical services furnished to such person during his period of internment by the Imperial Japanese Government or for the purpose of paying transportation or other expenses of repatriation.

"(2) The Federal Security Administrator is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any person specified in section 101 (a) of such Act of December 2, 1942, for the repayment of any sum which may have been paid by such person to the Department of State in settlement of any obligation of the type referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection. Any claim allowed under the provisions of this paragraph shall be certified by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this Act.

"(c) Section 102 (a) of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes', approved December 2, 1942, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the proviso in such subsection and by substituting the following: 'Provided, That the total compensation payable under this title for injury or death shall in no event exceed the limitations upon compensation as fixed in section 14 (m) of such Act as such section may from time to time be amended except that the total compensation shall not be less than that provided for in the original enactment of this Act: Provided further, That any amendment to such Act, the effect of which is to increase the amount of benefits payable for injury or death, shall be applied in the administration of this section as if the amendment had been in effect at the time of the particular injury or death and the compensation (except funeral and burial expenses) in any case previously determined shall be adjusted accordingly in respect to the beneficiary entitled thereto under the Act.'

"INTERNEES

"SEC. 5. (a) As used in this section, the term 'civilian American citizen' means any person who, being then a citizen of the United States, was captured by the Imperial Japanese Government on or after December 7, 1941, at Midway, Guam, Wake Island, the Philippine Islands, or any Territory or possession of the United States attacked or invaded by such government, or while in transit to or from any such place, or who went into hiding at any such place in order to avoid capture or internment by such government; except (1) a person who at any time voluntarily gave aid to, collaborated with, or in any manner served such government, or (2) a person who at the time of his capture or entrance into hiding was (A) a person within the purview of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes', approved September 7, 1916, as amended, and as extended; or (B) a person within the purview of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes', approved December 2, 1942, as amended; or (C) a person within the purview of the Missing Persons Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat.

143), as amended; or (D) a regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of any military or naval force.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by, or on behalf of, any civilian American citizen for detention benefits for any period of time subsequent to December 6, 1941, during which he was held by the Imperial Japanese Government as a prisoner, internee, hostage, or in any other capacity, or remained in hiding to avoid being captured or interned by such Imperial Japanese Government.

"(c) The detention benefit allowed to any person under the provisions of subsection (b) shall be at the rate of $60 for each calendar month during which such person was at least eighteen years of age and at the rate of $25 per month for each calendar month during which such person was less than eighteen years of age.

"(d) The detention benefits allowed under subsection (b) shall be allowed to the person entitled thereto, or, in the event of his death, only to the following persons:

"(1) Widow or dependent husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

"(2) Widow or dependent husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or dependent husband and the other half to the child or children in equal shares; and

"(3) Child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or dependent husband.

"(e) Any claim allowed under the provisions of subsection (b) shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this Act, and shall be payable by the Secretary of the Treasury to the person entitled thereto or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one.

"(f) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the provisions of titles I and II of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes', approved December 2, 1942, as amended, are extended and shall apply with respect to the injury, disability, or death resulting from injury of a civilian American citizen occurring while he was held by or in hiding from the Imperial Japanese Government, to the same extent as if such civilian American citizen were an employee within the purview of such Act of December 2, 1942, as amended.

"(2) For the purpose of determining the benefits extended and made applicable by paragraph (1)—

"(A) the average weekly wage of any such civilian American citizen, whether employed, self-employed, or not employed, shall be deemed to have been $37.50;

"(B) the provisions of such Act shall be applicable whether or not any such civilian American citizen was employed;

"(C) notice of injury or death shall not be required; and limitation provisions with respect to the filing of claims for injury, disability, or death shall not begin to run until the date of enactment of this section; and

"(D) the monthly compensation in cases involving partial disability shall be determined by the percentage the degree of partial disability bears to total disability and shall not be determined with respect to the extent of loss of wage earning capacity.

"(3) the following provisions of such Act of December 2, 1942, as amended, shall not apply in the case of such civilian American citizens: Section 101 (b), section 104, and section 105.

"(4) Rights or benefits which, under this subsection, are to be determined with reference to other provisions of law shall be determined with reference to such provisions of law as in force on January 3, 1948.

"(5) The money benefit for disability or death shall be paid only to the person entitled thereto, or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one, and shall not upon death of the person so entitled survive for the benefit of his estate or any other person.

"(6) The benefit of a minor or of an incompetent person who has no natural or legal guardian may, in the discretion of the Federal Security Administrator, be paid, in whole or in such part as he may determine for and on behalf of such minor or incompetent directly to the person or institution caring for, supporting, or having custody of such minor or incompetent.

"(7) No person, except a widow or a child, shall be entitled to benefits for disability with respect to himself, and to death benefits on account of the death of another.

"(8) If a civilian American citizen or his dependent receives or has received from the United States any payments on account of the same injury or death, or from his employer, in the form of wages, or payments in lieu of wages, or in any form of support or compensation (including workmen's compensation) in respect to the same objects, the benefits under this section shall be diminished by the amount of such payments in the following manner: (A) Benefits on account of injury or disability shall be reduced by the amount of payments to the injured person on account of the same injury or disability; and (B) benefits on account of death shall be reduced by the amount of payments to the dependents of the deceased civilian American citizen on account of the same death.

"(9) This subsection shall take effect as of December 7, 1941, and the right of individuals to benefits shall be held to have begun to accrue as though this subsection had been in effect as of such date.

"PRISONERS OF WAR

"SEC. 6. (a) As used in this section, the term 'prisoner of war' means any regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the military or naval forces of the United States who was held as a prisoner of war for any period of time subsequent to December 7, 1941, by any government of any nation with which the United States has been at war subsequent to such date.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any prisoner of war for compensation for the violation by the enemy government by which he was held as a prisoner of war, or its agents, of its obligation to furnish him the quantity or quality of food to which he was entitled as a prisoner of war under the terms of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929. The compensation allowed to any prisoner of war under the provisions of this subsection shall be at the rate of $1 for each day he was held as a prisoner of war on which the enemy government or its agents failed to furnish him such quantity or quality of food. Any claim allowed under the provisions of this subsection shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this Act.

"(c) Claims pursuant to subsection (b) shall be paid to the person entitled thereto, or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one, and shall in case of death of the persons who are entitled be payable only to or for the benefit of the following persons:

"(1) widow or dependent husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

"(2) widow or dependent husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or dependent husband and the other half to the child or children of the deceased in equal shares;

"(3) child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or dependent husband; and

"(4) dependent parents (in equal shares) if there is no widow, dependent husband, or child.

"RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 7. The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any religious organization functioning in the Philippine Islands and affiliated with a religious organization in the United States, or by the personnel of any such Philippine organization, for reimbursement of expenditures incurred, or for payment of the fair value of supplies used, by such organization or such personnel for the purpose of furnishing shelter, food, clothing, hospitalization, medicines and medical services, and other relief in the Philippines to members of the armed forces of the United States or to civilian American citizens (as defined in section 5) at any time subsequent to December 6, 1941, and before August 15, 1945. Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this Act.

"REPORT WITH RESPECT TO PERSONAL INJURY AND PROPERTY CLAIMS

"SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall inquire into and report to the President, for submission of such report to the Congress on or before March 31, 1949, with respect to war claims arising out of World War II, other than claims which may be received and adjudicated under the preceding sections of this Act, and shall present in such report its findings on—

"(1) the estimated number and amount of such claims, classified by types and categories; and

"(2) the extent to which such claims have been or may be satisfied under international agreements or domestic or foreign laws.

"(b) The report of the Commission shall contain recommendations with respect to—

"(1) categories and types of claims, if any, which should be received and considered and the legal and equitable bases therefor;

"(2) the administrative method by which such claims should be considered, and any priorities or limitations which should be applicable; and

"(3) any limitations which should be applied to the allowance and payment of fees in connection with such claims.

"(c) The Commission shall include in such report—

"(1) such other recommendations as it deems appropriate; and

"(2) such proposals for legislation as it deems appropriate for carrying out the recommendations made in such report.

"(d) Such report, with accompanying evidence, shall be printed as a public document when received by the Congress.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to imply that the Congress will enact legislation—

"(1) adopting any recommendations made under this section with respect to the consideration or payment of any type of claim; or

"(2) making any moneys, including moneys remaining in the war claims fund after the making of payments from such fund provided for by this Act, available for the payment of such claims.

"REPORT TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 9. Not later than six months after its organization, and every six months thereafter, the Commission shall make a report to the Congress concerning its operations under this Act.

"REMUNERATION FOR SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH CLAIMS

"SEC. 10. No remuneration on account of services rendered or to be rendered to or on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the administering agency under this Act shall exceed 10 per centum (or such lesser per centum as may be fixed by the administering agency with respect to any class of claims) of the amount allowed by the administering agency on account of such claim. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere, pays or offers to pay, or promises to pay, or receives, on account of services rendered or to be rendered in connection with any such claim, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both, and, if any such payment shall have been made or granted, the administering agency shall take such action as may be necessary to recover the same, and, in addition thereto any such claimant shall forfeit all rights under this Act.

"HEARINGS WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS

"SEC. 11. The Commission shall notify all claimants of the approval or denial of their claims, and, if approved, shall notify such claimants of the amount for which such claims are approved. Any claimant whose claim is denied, or is approved for less than the full allowable amount of such claim, shall be entitled, under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe, to a hearing before the Commission or its representatives with respect to such claim. Upon such hearing, the Commission may affirm, modify, or revise its former action with respect to such claim, including a denial or reduction in the amount theretofore allowed with respect to such claim. The action of the Commission in allowing or denying any claim under this Act shall be final and conclusive on all questions of law and fact and not subject to review by any other official of the United States or by any court by mandamus or otherwise, and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer for payments in accordance with such action.

"AMENDMENT TO TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

"SEC. 12. The Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 39. No property or interest therein of Germany, Japan, or any national of either such country vested in or transferred to any officer or agency of the Government at any time after December 17, 1941, pursuant to the provisions of this Act, shall be returned to former owners thereof or their successors in interest, and the United States shall not pay compensation for any such property or interest therein. The net proceeds remaining upon the completion of administration, liquidation, and disposition pursuant to the provisions of this Act of any such property or interest therein shall be covered into the Treasury at the earliest practicable date. Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or otherwise affect the operation of the provisions of section 32 of this Act or of the Philippine Property Act of 1946.'

"WAR CLAIMS FUND

"SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby created on the books of the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the War Claims Fund. The War Claims Fund shall consist of all sums covered into the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended. The moneys in such fund shall be available for expenditure only as provided in this Act or as may be provided hereafter by the Congress.

"(b) The Federal Security Administrator is authorized and directed to estimate and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total amount which will be required to pay all benefits payable as a result of the enactment of section 5 (f) of this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the War Claims Fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount so certified by the Federal Security Administrator.

"(c) The Federal Security Administrator is authorized and directed to estimate and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total amount which will be required to pay all additional benefits payable as a result of the enactment of section 4 (c) of this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the war claims fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount so certified by the Federal Security Administrator.

"(d) The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total amount of all obligations canceled pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (b) (1) of this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the war claims fund to the general fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the local amount so certified.

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the war claims fund, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions under this Act.

"PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RELIGIOUS ORDERS

"SEC. 14. In any case in which any money is payable as a result of the enactment of this Act to any person who is prevented from accepting such money by the rules, regulations, or customs of the church or the religious order or organization of which he is a member, such money shall be paid, upon the request of such person, to such church or to such religious order or organization.

And the Senate agree to the same.

CARL HINSHAW,
JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the bill and inserted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which differed from the House bill in a number of respects.

The substitute agreed to in conference differs from both the House bill and the Senate amendment, but follows in general the provisions of the Senate amendment. The principal differences between the House bill and the conference substitute are explained briefly below:

Section 2 of the House bill, suspending payment of debt claims under section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, has been omitted.

The report of the War Claims Commission, created by the bill, is to be made on or before March 31, 1949.

The conference substitute contains provisions, taken from the Senate amendment, which are to be administered by the Commission, relating to the adjudication and payment of claims by former members of the armed forces, held as prisoners of war by the enemy during the recent war, based upon failure to furnish the quantity and quality of food required by the Geneva Convention. It also provides for the adjudication and payment of claims filed by any religious organization functioning in the Philippine Islands and affiliated with a religious organization in the United States, or by personnel of any such Philippine organization, on account of expenditures incurred by them in furnishing shelter, food, clothing, and other relief in the Philippines to members of the armed forces of the United States or to civilian internees.

The provisions of the conference substitute relating to payment of benefits for detention are to be administered by the Commission, and the detention benefit is to be at the rate of $60 for each calendar month during which the individual was at least 18 years of age and at the rate of $25 per month for each calendar month during which such person was less than 18 years of age. Under the House bill, detention benefits (as well as disability and death benefits) would have been administered by the Federal Security Administration, and determined in accordance with titles I and II of the Act of December 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 1028), as amended, as though the individual suffering detention were an employee within the purview of that Act; and it was provided that the average weekly wage of such individual, for such purpose, whether employed, self-employed, or not employed, should be deemed to have been $37.50.

The conference substitute contains provisions, taken from the Senate amendment, but changed so that they would be administered by the Federal Security Administrator, authorizing adjudication and payment of claims of individuals who were employed by contractors of the Government on Wake, Guam, and Cavite, for amounts equal to the difference between what they would have received under their contracts and what they actually received.

The conference substitute contains a section, taken from the Senate bill, limiting the amount of remuneration any person may receive on account of services rendered to or on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the Commission or the Federal Security Administrator under the Act.

The conference substitute, as did the Senate amendment, provides for the creation of a trust fund in the Treasury to be known as the War Claims Fund. The fund is to consist of all sums covered into the Treasury pursuant to section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act. The moneys in the fund are to be available only for carrying out the provisions of this legislation or as may be provided hereafter by the Congress.

CARL HINSHAW,
JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE AND TRAINING FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2730) to credit, in certain cases, military service and training preparatory thereto performed by employees of the postal service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 25 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 39, sec. 875), is hereby amended by adding to the last sentence *"Provided*, That in the case of employees who have been separated from the field service of the Post Office Department to transfer under war service regulations to private industry or another department or independent establishment or agency of the Federal Government, the periods or terms of such service immediately preceding such transfer as well as the time engaged in military service shall be construed as allowable service and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in military service."

SEC. 2. Any person who prior to the enactment of this act received any amount the payment of which is authorized for the first time by this act is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any such amount; and in the audit and settlement of the amounts of any postmaster, or of any other designated disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service, such amount shall be considered to have been authorized. Any amount heretofore credited to the employee or refunded by him to the United States on account of any such overpayment shall be repaid out of any money available for the payment of salaries of employees in the service in which he is employed.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect as of July 1, 1945.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 6734, as amended.

"That section 25 of the act entitled 'An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes', approved July 6, 1945 (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 39, sec. 875), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 25. Allowable service under the provisions of this act shall be only such continuous active service as has been rendered and shall not include previous periods or terms of employment, except that in the case of employees who have been separated or shall hereafter be separated from the field service of the Post Office Department for military duty, or to comply with a war transfer as defined by the Civil Service Commission, the periods or terms of such service immediately preceding entry into military service or immediately preceding such transfer, as well as the time engaged in military service and service on war transfer, shall be construed as allowable service, and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in military service and service on war transfer for each year of such service."

SEC. 2. Any person who prior to the enactment of this act received any amounts the payment of which is authorized for the first time by this act is hereby relieved of all liability to refund such amounts to the United States; and in the audit and settlement of the accounts of any postmaster, or of any other designated disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service, the payment of such amounts shall be considered to have been authorized. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to repay, out of any funds hereafter appropriated pursuant to the authority of this act, any amounts heretofore credited to the employee or refunded by him to the United States on account of such receipt by him of unauthorized payments.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. The amendment made by the first section of this act to section 25 of the act of July 6, 1945, shall take effect as of July 1, 1945.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces and on war transfer by employees in the field service of the Post Office Department."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 10 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Speaker.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 11 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PLAN—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 7, 12, 22, 32, 40 and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34 and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "June 30, 1949: *Provided*, That the entire amount may be apportioned for obligation or may be obligated and expended, if the President, after recommendation by the Administrator, deems such action necessary to carry out the purposes of said Act, during the period ending April 2"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount inserted in said amendment insert "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number inserted by said amendment insert "fifty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "hire of aircraft;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That not less than 5 per centum of each special local currency account established pursuant to section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government for expenditure for strategic materials where available or for other local currency requirements of the United States of America"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, that not to exceed $58,000,000 may be expended for administrative and other expenses including not to exceed $12,000,000 for direct administration and not to exceed $6,000,000 for technical assistance authorized under section 111 (a) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That pursuant to section 117 (c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, the Administrator shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to any participating foreign country, regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That guaranties of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media provided for under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, or otherwise, shall not exceed $10,000,000 in the first year"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That there shall be included within the local currency administrative expenditures of the United States such sums as may be necessary to meet expenditures of members and staff of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation in the course of performance of committee functions within respective participating countries"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$225,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "$400,000,000, of which not to exceed $1,200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses and of which $125,000,000 shall be available exclusively as provided in subsection 404 (b) of said Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished, and such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; $1,300,000,000,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert *"Provided further*, That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the Secretary of the Army shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to Japan, Korea, or the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals:"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That not to exceed 60 per centum of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for contribution to the International Refugee Organization until such time as there are effected agreements providing for a caloric diet for the occupants of refugee camps in Europe that is no higher than that prevailing in the country in which such camps are located"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 202. No funds made available under the authority of this Act shall be used for the purchase in bulk of any commodities (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to Act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498), as amended), at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination, quality, and terms of payment: *Provided*, That no funds available under this Act shall be used for the purchase of wool other than from existing stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless or until such stocks are exhausted."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 203. No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to purchase farm machinery, including tractors, in the United States in an amount which will bring the total exports of such machinery and tractors during the period for which this appropriation is made, from the United States, by or for the benefit of the countries participating in the European recovery program, to more than $75,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. Whenever an export license for a commodity, the production or shipment of which to a nonparticipating country was contracted for in good faith prior to March 1, 1948, is denied or cannot be obtained under section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, the Administrator shall provide for the procurement of such commodity to transfer to a participating country in accordance with the requirements of such country, at not less than the contract price of such commodity to the producer or exporter, as the case may be, including any cost incurred in converting the commodity to meet the requirements of the participating country."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 205. Not less than 50 per centum of the United States export requirements of nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) for nonoccupied areas shall come from production of plants operated by or for the Department of the Army.

"In addition, the Department of the Army shall make available, for the commercial production of nitrogenous fertilizer materials for domestic use, 10 per centum of the total anhydrous ammonia produced in the United States in plants operated by or for the Department of the Army, said anhydrous ammonia to be distributed as directed by the Department of Commerce, which shall give preference, in distributing said anhydrous ammonia, to producers of ammonium sulphate who were producing ammonium sulphate during the six months preceding the enactment of this Act or who shall have ceased to produce, or shall be faced with an imminent shutdown in the production of, ammonium sulphate for want of anhydrous ammonia, to the extent necessary to permit such producers to operate. The Department of the Army is hereby authorized to produce and sell, in addition to its production for occupied areas, such nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) required for United States exports to nonoccupied areas or for the production of nitrogenous fertilizer materials for domestic use and to credit the proceeds of such sales to the appropriation for Government and Relief in Occupied Areas to the extent of the cost of such production for such sales and any balance to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The House agrees to the title of the bill as amended by the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Clarifies the period of time for which appropriations included in the bill are made available, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Restores language of the House providing for the availability of funds to June 30, 1949, instead of April 2, 1949, as proposed by the Senate, and adds language authorizing apportionments, obligations, and expenditures of appropriated funds by April 2, 1949, if the President deems such action necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act.

Amendment No. 3: Limits the amount that may be expended for attendance at meetings to $60,000, instead of $30,000, as proposed by the House, and $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Eliminates the Senate provision for the purchase of typewriters and similar machines without regard to provisions of the Treasury-Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1949, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Limits the purchase of automobiles to 50, instead of 40, as proposed by the House, and 60, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Amends the provision of the Senate to provide for the hire, rather than the purchase and maintenance of aircraft.

Amendment No. 7: Deletes the provision of the Senate providing for deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Provides language and the amount of not to exceed $20,000,000 for assistance to the Free Territory of Trieste, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Eliminates the provision of the House limiting to $65,000,000 the amount to be expended for the purchase in the United States of nonfat dried milk solids, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Eliminates the provision of the House limiting administrative expenditures to $68,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Restores the provision of the House providing for the allocation to the use of the United States of a certain portion of funds deposited in the special local currency account of each participating country; reduces the amount of such allocations from 10 to 5 per centum; and limits the expenditure of funds so allocated for purchases of strategic materials to countries where such strategic materials are available.

Amendment No. 12: Restores the provision of the House providing that allocations of funds provided pursuant to provision of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 for Austria and any other occupied country shall be made to the United States military government of such countries.

Amendment No. 13: Deletes the provision of the House providing for the expenditure of Economic Cooperation Administration funds for economic rehabilitation in Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Provides for reimbursement to military authorities by the Economic Cooperation Administrator for administrative expenses incurred in connection with the program, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Limits the amount that may be expended for administrative and other expenses to $58,000,000 instead of $63,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and adds additional limitations of not to exceed $12,000,000 for direct administration and $6,000,000 for technical assistance.

Amendment No. 16: Inserts in slightly amended form provision of the Senate providing for uniform payments for ocean transportation of relief packages.

Amendment No. 17: Clarifies language of the Senate which limits the amount to be expended for guarantees of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media to $10,000,000.

Amendment No. 18: Inserts a provision of the Senate providing for certain expenditures of members of staff of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation from the local currency funds of each participating country.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $35,000,000 for the International Children's Emergency Fund, instead of $60,000,000, as proposed by the House and $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $225,000,000 for assistance to Greece and Turkey, instead of $200,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $250,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Provides for assistance to China until April 2, 1949, as proposed by the Senate, instead of June 30, 1949, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Deletes language of the Senate providing for deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $400,000,000 for assistance to China of which not to exceed $1,200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $460,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; and makes $125,000,000 of the appropriation available exclusively for carrying out the provisions of subsection 404 (b) of the China Aid Act of 1948.

Amendment No. 24: Deletes the provision of the House providing for administration of the assistance to China program to conform with the objectives of assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $1,300,000,000 for government and relief in occupied areas under the Department of the Army, instead of $1,250,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,325,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; restores House language, and adds clarifying language covering purchases of supplies, commodities, and equipment, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Inserts provision of the Senate authorizing the use of funds appropriated for government and relief in occupied areas, Department of the Army, for economic rehabilitation in Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus.

Amendment No. 27: Inserts provision of the Senate making available funds unexpended at the time of termination of occupation in any country for further procurement of commodities and services under direction of the President and for the fulfillment of previously negotiated contracts.

Amendment No. 28: Inserts provision of the Senate making certain assistance in formerly occupied areas contingent on agreements between the President and such government that is established upon termination of occupation by the United States.

Amendment No. 29: Inserts provision of the Senate providing that requirements of certain contracts with foreign governments correspond to requirements contained in specific sections of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947.

Amendment No. 30: Inserts provision of the Senate authorizing the payment of transportation charges incurred by voluntary nonprofit relief agencies in connection with shipment of relief packages from the United States to Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus.

Amendment No. 31: Inserts in slightly amended form provision of the Senate providing for a uniform rate, fixed by the Secretary of the Army, for ocean transportation of relief packages.

Amendment No. 32: Deletes the provision of the Senate providing for certain exemptions from existing law pertaining to the employment of experts, consultants, and technicians, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33: Restores the provision of the House making contingent the use of funds for the International Refugee Organization upon the execution of certain agreements relating to diet, amended to set the limitation at 60 percent of such funds for Europe.

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35: Strike from the bill language proposed by the House to forbid employment of members of labor organizations which are not in compliance with the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

Amendment No. 36: Restores provision of the House establishing price limitations on commodities purchased with funds provided for in the act and providing for the purchase of wool from existing stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, amended to provide for certain price adjustments.

Amendment No. 37: Eliminates provision of the House limiting expenditures for farm machinery and farm tractors to $50,000,000, and amends substitute language of the Senate which provides for a total export limitation of farm machinery of $75,000,000 by including in the language of the Senate, "tractors", and changing the period of applicability of the limitation to the period for which the appropriation is made rather than to fiscal year 1949.

Amendment No. 38: Restores language of the House providing for purchase by the Economic Cooperation Administration of commodities for which contracts were entered into in good faith prior to March 1, 1948, but for which export licenses are denied and cannot be obtained, and changes the word "and" to "or" for purposes of clarification.

Amendment No. 39: Eliminates language of the House governing the production and sale of nitrogenous fertilizer materials and inserts a substitute provision setting forth conditions for the production and sale of nitrogenous fertilizer materials by the Department of the Army.

Amendments Nos. 40 and 41: Correct section numbers.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6801), and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are presenting a complete report on this bill. It carries a provision in title I with reference to ECA; I think I should read it to you in full, because it was not set out completely in the statement that was read in lieu of the conference report. I refer to amendment No. 2 where we carried the funds in the House to run to the 30th of June. This is the amendment:

Until June 30, 1949, provided that the entire amount may be apportioned for obligation or may be obligated and expended if the President after recommendation by the Administrator deems such action necessary to carry out the purposes of said act during the period ending April 2, 1949.

Frankly, I believe they have ample money to carry through all that they can honestly and legitimately spend until that date.

The amount of $4,000,000,000 which was carried in the House bill was not changed by the Senate so that remains as it was, $245,000,000 below the budget.

The other major changes were to the House figure of $400,000,000 for China, which was retained, and the date was left as the Senate placed it, April 2, 1949.

The item for IRO was changed so that not more than 60 percent of the funds appropriated might be available unless an agreement is made providing that the caloric ration would be no higher than that prevailing in the country in which the camps were located.

The item for Greece and Turkey was made $225,000,000 as against $250,000,000 in the Senate and $200,000,000 in the House.

The item for relief in occupied areas was made $1,300,000,000 as against $1,250,000,000 in the House and $1,325,000,000 in the Senate.

There was carried into that provision an authorization for expenditures along the line of the ECA in occupied territories and that provision which had been incorporated in the ECA was deleted.

I think that concludes the story of about what happened to the bill.

I just want to call attention to one thing as I close. While there has been insufficient time in which to complete a tabulation of total budget estimates and total appropriations for this session of the Eightieth Congress, my preliminary information is that the reduction in the total budget estimates will be nearly $3,000,000,000.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DEVITT. I call the attention of the gentleman to amendments Nos. 16 and 31 dealing with the payment of ocean freight charges on relief packages by the Administrator, and ask if he will explain the provisions of the conference report and in what respect they differ from the bill as passed by the other body.

Mr. TABER. We have made some changes in the language there, and I believe we have left it where these profiteers cannot declare a dividend out of the operations. We have not provided subsidies for anybody in connection with the operations.

Mr. DEVITT. I will say to the gentleman that section 117 (c) of the European Recovery Act makes provision by the terms of which the Administrator is required to pay the ocean freight charges on these relief packages for persons who ship packages to individuals overseas. I would like to ask the gentleman if under the terms of this bill now it is applicable to commercial organizations that operate for profit.

Mr. TABER. I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin to answer that.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important question and one that should be clarified in the RECORD so that we may have an understanding as to just what the conferees have done. You will recall that the enabling legislation provides for the payment of ocean freight to be paid out of ECA funds. There are a large number of nonprofit organizations engaged in the business of sending relief packages abroad. Among them is CARE, Inc., which you all know about, and which General Clay said was doing one of the greatest works that any organization could possibly do to establish proper relations with the people in Europe. They have a unique method of distribution. They ship their food and other materials in bulk by ocean shipment to warehouses abroad, thus obtaining a very low ocean-freight rate on the bulk shipments. They assemble these packages over in the foreign countries and when an order comes in for a CARE package and payment is made here, that order is sent abroad and is filled in the country abroad. Thus, they are able to get a lower ocean-freight rate than anybody else engaged in the business.

Now, the individual in your town and mine who is sending a package to a foreign country by parcel post has complained to you and to me that when he pays the established parcel-post rate the rate is so high that it sometimes is more than the value of the goods that he sends. The demand has been made upon you and me to try to get relief to the individual shipper of individual packages consigned to individuals in Europe. The only thing that is authorized to be paid to such an individual is the ocean-freight carriage under the basic law. That requires that the Administrator of ECA enter into an agreement with the Post Office Department by which the Post Office Department will accept individual parcel-post packages for shipment to individuals abroad and give to that individual a reduced parcel-post rate equivalent to the ocean-carriage freight on that individual package. That has been accomplished by virtue of the language in this bill—the exception that was written into it.

As to the argument that many concerns have gotten into this relief business for profit and are making money on the deal and want to obtain a subsidy of this ocean freight rate as provided in the ECA law, after some consideration some people felt that if you give a subsidy to these profit takers in that field you will have to raise the subsidy to CARE, because CARE gets, for example, a 2-cent rate, and, for the purposes of illustration, the other rate is 8 cents or 7.5 cents. If you gave the other people the benefit of the ocean rate by way of subsidy and CARE is able to ship at a 2-cent rate, the story was that that would hurt this great nonprofit organization. So the conferees agreed that they would leave the situation exactly as it is, leave CARE with its 2-cent rate, and would pay the lowest freight rate, so that all of the nonprofit organizations and profit organizations would be in the same classification, but proposed to give the benefit to the individual shipper.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. What I am interested in finding out is if any of these private groups that are in the business of shipping packages overseas for profit are going to be able under the present provision of the conference report to get ECA funds to help defray the expenses of shipping the packages overseas?

Mr. KEEFE. In my opinion they will not be able to get anything, because their freight charges are much higher than those enjoyed by CARE.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that the language of the Senate amendment, which we accept with a proviso, provides for the payment of a uniform rate, so that they will get in cents or dollars the same amount per pound that CARE will get, but we provide that this limitation should not apply to shipments from individuals to individuals?

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly right. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The limitation does not apply from individuals to individuals, it lets individuals get whatever the cost may be determined by the Administrator to be.

Mr. DEVITT. Can the gentleman answer this question yes or no? May a private organization in business for profit use some of these funds in order to defray freight costs on these packages going overseas?

Mr. KEEFE. They cannot get any more than CARE gets.

Mr. DEVITT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. CARE is on a very low bulk shipment rate that these people are not on, and it seems to me that you have language under which they cannot possibly get a subsidy.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What was done in reference to the funds for feeding children in occupied areas?

Mr. TABER. That was raised from $20,000,000, which was the Senate figure, to $35,000,000, and it appeared from the testimony that was available to us that there was a $12,000,000 balance, which made $47,000,000, which is $7,000,000 more than was available this year.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that we were unable to keep the fund for feeding children in Europe to the figure allowed by the House which was the full amount requested. Your House committee kept in the full amount $60,000,000 and the House voted to keep in the full amount. The Senate cut this amount to $20,000,000 and your House committee was able to restore only $15,000,000. In order to get some increase for feeding of children we had to compromise. I fought to the best of my ability to restore the amount requested by the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. The Senate, among some other reasons, cut the amount because it was believed some of the children of Communist parents may be getting some food from this relief program.

My stand on this matter is no contradiction.

The provision of $60,000,000 for UNICEF is part of the Economic Cooperation Administration appropriations bill, fiscal year 1949. I have opposed—and I will continue to oppose—many of the expenditures called for in this bill. I never have—and I never will oppose—expenditures expressly earmarked to save the lives and guarantee the future of children.

By far the greater majority of the items in the ECA appropriation bill are not there because of any commitment of this Government. UNICEF is the result of an agreement between 21 nations, approved by the Senate, and an integral part of American foreign policy.

My conscience would never permit me to vote for the support of the multimillion-dollar tobacco monopolies of foreign socialist states. My conscience demands that I vote for the full continuance of the most efficient international group concerned with keeping the breath of life in children, regardless of the political affiliations of their parents.

The provisions of ECA which permit strategic war materials to sift through western European countries, united by trade treaties with Moscow, to the Soviet Union by devious and indirect routes—these I abhor and decry. I champion the direct dealings which UNICEF has had with eastern European countries, where their inspectors make sure that food and other necessities go to anti-Communist and Communist alike, where the only criteria of giving aid is that a child is in want.

This Congress has not been given any reason to extend unlimited confidence to ECA personnel. Too many of ECA's keymen can only wear service stripes from defunct WPA and discredited UNRRA. Mr. Pace, Executive Director of UNICEF, is a Nebraskan. His integrity and ability are beyond question, and he is a field general rather than a swivel-chair autocrat. His staff, and the results of the downright hard work of his staff, are a credit to his talents and his efficient management.

It has been a habit of ECA propagandists to shame Members of Congress into voting for their pet projects by screaming that Europeans would feel let down if those projects were defeated. It is my well-defined purpose to work for the defeat of luxury-supplying projects, projects which add nothing to the possibility of eventual reconstruction and flagrantly waste the money of the American taxpayer. It makes no difference to me how much the European luxury-lover screams or how loudly the ECA propagandist howls.

It does make a difference to me that, somewhere in this world, there are children who cannot speak because they are hungry. It does make a difference to me that UNICEF, with necessary appropriation, could see to it that some of those children were fed.

Christ said: "Suffer the little children to come unto Me."

Christ did not say: "Suffer the non-Communist children to come unto Me and suffer the Communist children to stay away."

If one out of a hundred Communist children who might be fed by UNICEF learned that America was playing a big part in keeping them alive, that knowledge would prove an insurmountable barrier to communism. If one out of a hundred Communist children who might be fed UNICEF learned that they would not be fed because of an action of the Senate, this could well create a million future enemies of this Nation.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, since title 2 of this bill providing $60,000,000 was my amendment for the children, may I ask whether the fund is to be used for the relief of children wherever they may be?

Mr. STEFAN. Wherever they may be. Yes, sir. And that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. FULTON. That is whether they are behind the "iron curtain" or in occupied areas or in countries that have been overrun.

Mr. STEFAN. It makes no difference. That is right.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr TABER. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Congress will bear with me while we discuss for 1 minute the diet of 650,000 people for next year. It is worth 1 minute of our time. I had a minute and a half while this was on the floor before. As chairman of the Displaced Persons and Refugee Special Committee, I would like to hear about this, because I have disagreed with my worthy friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I would like to hear how the displaced persons should be fed—whether they should simply be fed 1,550 calories, which the people that oppress them are fed, which the victors who had put them in concentration camps are fed, or are they going to be fed just a little more than 450 calories, which is below, much below, the average person's normal consumption. What has been done on that?

Mr. TABER. The way this has worked out, 60 percent of what is available of the $70,000,000 is without restriction. The rest of it is only available in case that organization agrees that the caloric rations shall be limited to what is available in the country. Unless that is done, it is absolutely impossible ever to get these people out of the camps.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents a complete victory for the Senate program. It provides ample appropriations for the effective administration of the Marshall plan, now so successfully operated with the preliminary funds already provided. The report is highly satisfactory to the minority. We have all signed it and we urgently recommend its adoption.

But the proceedings attending the settlement of the disagreement between the House and Senate serve to lighten, with a happy spirit of levity, the monotonous grind attending the closing days of the session.

The majority managers on the part of the House, after sabotaging the program for foreign aid, by cutting the appropriation of approximately $2,000,000,000, found themselves in an uncomfortable position as soon as the Senate announced its amendments. From that time down to tonight there has been a wild foot race upon the part of the House conferees, in a scurrying search for a loophole through which to escape from the trap in which they had snared themselves.

There were two primary differences between the two Houses.

One was the amount of the appropriation and the other was the date to which the appropriation would be available—determining whether the appropriation would be spread over a period of 12 months, as originally provided, or over a period of 15 months, as the House managers insisted. In short the question was whether the money would suffice for 12 months or 15 months. Of course, the change in date was merely a subterfuge. It was a device to cut the amount available by 20 percent, instead of cutting the appropriation in so many words. All familiar with the program agree that such a drastic cut would make the bill a bare relief measure and abandon the recovery features upon which the principal success of the program depends.

In their efforts to save face, the majority Members clung to that date throughout the conference like shipwrecked sailors to an empty barrel. And they finally saved the date.

But they sacrificed everything else to retain it and then find it meaningless as the Senate amendment as adopted authorizes the President to ignore it. In other words, this report amounts to a complete recapitulation to the Senate program.

In their desperate efforts to find some device which would conceal the fact that they were making every concession, they agreed that the money should be spent in 12 months, instead of 15 months, "if the President * * * deems such action necessary."

That amounts to a complete surrender as the President has already recommended the use of the entire appropriation in 12 months. So the verbiage of the agreement is simply a smoke screen resorted to to conceal the fact that they were yielding abjectly and completely. The language insures the expenditure of the appropriation as originally planned.

But their endeavor to escape the consequences of their rash attempt to hamstring the Marshall plan involves a matter of even deeper significance—the independence of the legislative branch of the Government.

The proposal to thus delegate to the President of the United States legislative functions of the Congress amounts to an abdication of constitutional authority in favor of the Chief Executive. It is a transfer of power and duties from the legislative branch of the Government to the executive branch of the Government. And to that extent it is in effect an abandonment of the rights and prerogatives so jealously maintained by able and eminent Members of both the House and the Senate ever since the adoption of the Constitution. That is an appalling price to pay to extricate the House conferees from the consequences of their folly.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman consider that as a compliment to the President and as an expression of confidence in the President?

Mr. CANNON. They could have paid him no greater compliment. They could have written no more eloquent testimonial of the confidence Congress places in the President than this action by which they propose to delegate to him the discharge of duties vested in the Congress by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISACSON. I wish to ask the gentleman whether, after the amendments changing some of the appropriations, the specific appropriation to Great Britain of $1,200,000,000 with which to arm the hordes of King Abdullah of Transjordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Egypt remains intact?

Mr. CANNON. I leave that to the chairman of the committee who is explaining the technicalities of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the situation would be comic if it were not tragic. We have delayed this bill unnecessarily. It should have been enacted long ago. The world has been waiting to learn what America proposes to do. They have been waiting to know if we intend to carry out our commitments as embodied in the authorization bill which passed both Houses of Congress by such overwhelming majorities.

While the world has been waiting—while international relations have been deteriorating—while Russia has been gaining in prestige and military strength—while our friends over there have been losing heart—we have been quibbling. And now we wind up by adopting the bill in practically the form first presented. Why did we not do it before this and help our friends and confound our enemies and merit the respect of the world and future generations?

The future peace of the world, the hope of halting the march of communism around the globe, depend on strengthening our allies in western Europe to a point where they can withstand Russian pressure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. This bill merely shows, with the passage of the draft bill earlier this evening, that the power of America is going to be used determinedly for good and to assist freedom-loving nations throughout the world in resisting tyranny and aggression. This is one of the most important bills that is to pass the Congress, and I think there ought to be a roll-call vote on this bill on passage, and at the proper time I am going to ask for a roll-call vote.

Mr. CANNON. I heartily agree with the gentleman. No more important bill has been considered by the House in recent years. At the suggestion of the gentleman I shall ask for a record vote.

The bill carries funds to fully administer the Marshall plan. It is a part of our rearmament program, a measure for national defense. Every minority member of the committee of conference has signed the conference report. For the sake of its influence on our foreign relations, both friend and foe, I trust the conference report, so ably dictated by the Senate, will have the unanimous approval of every Member of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], with regard to a roll-call vote on this measure. I am sure the proponents of this bill are just as anxious to be recorded as those of us who are in opposition to the bill and in all fairness to everyone I think we should have a roll-call vote on this bill and I hope the committee will insist on it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the Members on final vote upon this conference report. But I think it is unfortunate that we should leave the statement with respect to this conference report with a sour note. The gentleman from Missouri sat all through this very arduous conference. I did not hear him make any suggestions during the conference. We struggled long and hard to come to an agreement and to try to iron out differences that seemed almost insoluble when we started, and that is the duty of the conference committee. When we had concluded that conference, of which the gentleman from Missouri was a party, he signed the conference report, and it was unanimous. Every Member signed the conference report on both sides of the aisle. It would have been much better for anyone who is interested in this program to have devoted some time in explaining some of the provisions in the conference report more minutely, perhaps, than to attempt to cast aspersions upon the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has made a most gallant fight to bring the facts to the attention of the American people. You people will live to see the day when the people of America will pay tribute to the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, for the courageous fight that he has made under the most difficult conditions to get the truth to the American people. How many people in America are there tonight who know that when this Congress passed this bill, this legislative authority, that they wrote into that law, "Nothing in this title is intended, nor shall it be construed, to be an express or implied commitment to provide any specific assistance, whether for funds, commodities, or services, to any country or countries."

And, it was the language written into the bill by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and yet the people of America have been told, as has been stated by the gentleman from Missouri here tonight, that there was a commitment when that bill was passed to not cross a "t" or dot an "i" or examine a single estimate by the Committee on Appropriations. Shame, tommyrot on such an argument.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and who helped write this bill.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to say that when the ERP authorization bill came to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, it was an open-end bill with very few limitations and without the language the gentleman from Wisconsin has just read. The committee carefully prepared the language and wrote it in on my motion, for the express purpose of preventing anyone from taking the authorization as a promise. One of the members of the minority moved to strike out the word "funds" from the amendment and the House committee voted to retain it.

In all the news stories and columns that have appeared chastizing the Committee on Appropriations and this House for allegedly breaking a commitment, I have seen no mention of the plain language of the law itself that "nothing in this title is intended nor shall it be construed to be an express or implied commitment to provide any specific assistance whether of funds, commodities, or services, to any country or countries." It is not the figures of the gentleman's committee that are irresponsible; it is those who have taken it upon themselves to write or speak about this matter without even reading the law.

As the gentleman knows, I voted against these so-called cuts on every occasion, because I thought the psychological effect would be bad and I preferred to err on the side of too much rather than too little when the stakes are so great. So nobody can accuse me of trying to deny adequate funds for ECA. But I resent intensely the completely irresponsible and misleading propaganda and misrepresentations of the committee's action over the radio and in the press, and the equally inaccurate charges by the President and various candidates for the Presidency. They are either ignorant of or have chosen to ignore the plain language of the law, of the committee report, and numerous statements made in the debate in both Houses setting forth the clear intention of the Congress.

Furthermore such loose talk has been thoroughly mischievous to the interests of the United States. It was to be expected that the Communist press in Paris or Rome would charge that we were letting down our friends. Most Europeans would not believe them. But what are they to think when prominent American newspapers and officials make charges that the United States is breaking faith? If damage has been done it is due more to misrepresentations by people who ought to know better, than to the actions themselves if examined soberly.

I want to pay tribute to your committee and your chairman the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for sticking to the facts despite all the abuse heaped on you. I opposed some of the so-called reductions you made even though the economic facts you had might justify them, because I feared they might jeopardize the success of the program through weakening the confidence of some European countries.

But I knew that your committee had many more facts available to it than we had in the Committee on Foreign Affairs at the time when we were considering

the enabling legislation last winter before anyone could know what kind of a growing season Europe would have this year, and a dozen other important factors.

At that time there was an attempt to cut down the authorization as everyone will recall. Many of us resisted it, urging that a maximum be set high enough to take care of any probable emergency; let it be high enough to provide a cushion. Then if Europe should have good crops and other favorable developments, the gentleman's committee could cut down the next appropriation accordingly. That is exactly what you did on the basis of the evidence you had in June and which we could not have in March.

Your committee would have been derelict in its duty if it had not carefully scrutinized the facts and held the amount down to what you deemed necessary to carry on the program successfully. I am willing to predict that the amount of money you have provided cannot be well used in less than the 15 months, although you have rightly made it available for 12 months if it proves necessary and if they get the program going so that they can use it effectively.

In short, you did not break a commitment, for no commitment had been made. You did not go back on the word of the United States. You did not fail to carry out any agreement or promise made by the Congress. You did not reverse a policy. What you did was to change the figure, which the more recent facts indicated to you was necessary to carry out the policy voted by the Congress. I congratulate the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota for that very lucid and splendid contribution to the thinking on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, we worked hard on this bill. We should not be abused and castigated by anyone who is a member of the conference committee that signed the conference report. That should not be. We came here in full agreement on this conference report. We came here presenting a solid front to say to the world, "We are united on this thing now, and here is the action of the Congress of the United States."

Let me call your attention to this. I think we have taken a great step forward. Everybody who is familiar with the language we have written into this bill to iron out the differences between the House and the Senate knows that we have taken a great step forward, because those who know the facts, instead of those who are just emotionally inspired politically, realize that the ECA will not be able effectively to spend the amount of money we have given it by April 3, 1949. So we have left the door open and we have said to the ECA administration, "Do not throw this money away. You are not forced to get rid of this money by the 3d of April. You can take until the 30th of June. Make a decent, proper screening of the necessities before you spend this money. If you take a little more time, the impact upon the economy of America with its resultant inflation may not be so great as though you were forced under the original action of the other body to spend the entire amount by April 3, 1949."

Everybody agrees that the action that finally resulted as a result of this conference makes available every single dollar, the entire $4,000,000,000, but we say to the Administrator, "Use some judgment in spending this money, and if you have any money that is unexpended by the 3d of April you may continue the availability of those funds until the 30th day of June."

If that is not good, common sense, then I think the gentleman from Missouri is the only man on the floor of this House or in the Senate or among the conferees that has offered even the slightest objection to the action the conference unanimously agreed upon.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. At that point, in connection with the rate of commitment, it might be well to point out that at the present rate of commitment the ECA will probably by the end of this month not have committed as much as $450,000,000, which would be the average rate of the original request on a 12-month basis.

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly. They have obligated only $300,000,000. Let me call your attention to this. The gentleman from Missouri said that we have delayed and delayed this thing. He seems to forget that the original law gave to the ECA administration $1,000,000,000, and they have been operating on it. The last word that I have had is that they have only been able to obligate $300,000,000 of the billion dollars. They have plenty of money to lend. They have this money yet without any additional funds. There has been no delay in this program. The Congress saw to it when it passed the basic legislation.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand it, there is a $503,000,000 reduction in this appropriation below the budget estimates, and the report recommending this reduction in such appropriations was signed by all the conferees, including the minority members.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It should be borne in mind that the $503,000,000 applies to all of the various items on foreign aid in the bill and is not limited to ECA.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly what I want to say. The total reduction is not specifically limited to the ECA program proper, because this bill contains a large number of other items, as you well know, other than those included in the program.

There is an over-all reduction in the total amount of substantially that amount, and the gentleman from Missouri signed the conference report, and it is a unanimous report. Why should we have any more argument about this situation?

DIFFICULT DECISION

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the vote on this conference report presents to me, at this late hour, a most difficult decision.

I am opposed to the granting of any subsidies or loans or credits to Great Britain as long as that country pursues its present anti-American, antidemocratic course, as long as Great Britain continues to encourage Arab aggression against Israel, as long as Great Britain continues to carry on a two-faced policy of world exploitation.

I am equally opposed to cutting funds for the Economic Administration's work in Europe proper.

If I voted for the European recovery program with a certain skepticism, aside from my opposition to continuing to follow in the perfidious footsteps of Great Britain and sharing her world guilt, at least I believe that ECA should have the funds to work with to try to make the plan a success.

This is a characteristic Republican procedure—to grant funds just far enough below the efficiency level to insure failure of any agency to achieve a true level of efficiency. It is part of the ridiculous paradox of Republican claims to economy; it is a wasteful and extravagant fiscal policy.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, to vote against the report is to vote for chaos, and that I cannot do. With reluctance, and impelled only by the exigencies of the international situation and the fact that we cannot hope for anything better, I shall vote to adopt the report.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the pending conference report on foreign aid with greatest of misgivings but it is the only rational course to follow at this point.

I opposed authorization of this program for what I still regard as good reasons, stated to the House at the time. The program was authorized, however, and became at once recognized throughout the world as our foreign policy. I believe in a bipartisan foreign policy although I reserve the right to differ on its details and to oppose any of these phases of its development which I regard as dangerous or unsound. Once agreed upon and authorized by Congress, however, we must close our ranks and present a united front to the world. Much of that world, the free part of it, depends upon us. It has been having a hard time keeping up with the variations in our foreign policy, due to inept administration of it. Congress cannot afford and must not at this hour add to that confusion by rejecting this appropriation to implement a policy it has previously authorized. The course to follow now is to watch to see that the funds we provide are spent with a proper regard for our own welfare as well as of that of those we seek to help abroad. It might well be added that some of the funds in the conference report are to support our occupation of enemy territories until the peace treaties are concluded. There can be no good, patriotic reason for not supporting the job our armed forces are doing in that regard.

I did not speak awhile ago on the selective service bill which will draft young Americans for 21 months of military service in peacetime. I voted against it. How can we in peacetime, in absence of a great military crisis, adopt such a policy conscripting our youth when UMT calls only for 1 year of training and most of the boys in World War II had less training than that?

If I was convinced the national security required it I would support the bill. But we are not undefended. We have the biggest standing Army in our peacetime history, 1,500,000 men. We have authorized a 70-group air force, and I voted for it. We have a Navy bigger than all of the other navies of the world combined. Most of our expenditures are for defense. The armed services, as the debates showed, have deliberately discouraged volunteer enlistments, the National Guard and the Reserves, in order to get a peacetime draft, to militarize America. If we need such legislation to meet an emergency Congress can set it up at any time. I favor a national training program but not one such as this which will discourage education, will not apply equally to all and which makes no effort to take the profits out of war or put the munitions makers under laws which will separate iron, blood, and profits, dealt in by the merchants of death who have propagandized this Congress and country for this legislation in peacetime after we have just gone through a war allegedly to put an end to such things.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 318, nays 62, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—318

Abbitt	Burke	Dawson, Utah
Abernethy	Burleson	Deane
Albert	Butler	Delaney
Allen, Calif.	Byrne, N. Y.	Devitt
Andersen, H. Carl	Byrnes, Wis.	D'Ewart
Anderson, Calif.	Camp	Dingell
Andrews, Ala.	Canfield	Dirksen
Angell	Cannon	Dolliver
Arends	Carroll	Domengeaux
Auchincloss	Carson	Dondero
Bakewell	Case, N. J.	Donohue
Barrett	Case, S. Dak.	Dorn
Bates, Ky.	Celler	Douglas
Bates, Mass.	Chadwick	Durham
Battle	Chapman	Eberharter
Beall	Chelf	Elliott
Beckworth	Chenoweth	Ellsworth
Bell	Clason	Elsaesser
Bennett, Mo.	Coffin	Elston
Blackney	Cole, Kans.	Engel, Mich.
Bland	Cole, N. Y.	Engle, Calif.
Blatnik	Combs	Evins
Bloom	Cooley	Fallon
Boggs, La.	Cooper	Feighan
Bolton	Corbett	Fellows
Bonner	Cotton	Fenton
Boykin	Courtney	Fernandez
Bradley	Cravens	Fisher
Bramblett	Crosser	Flannagan
Brehm	Crow	Fletcher
Brooks	Cunningham	Fogarty
Brophy	Curtis	Folger
Brown, Ga.	Dague	Foote
Bryson	Davis, Ga.	Forand
Buchanan	Davis, Tenn.	Fuller
Buck	Davis, Wis.	Fulton
Gamble	Kerr	Potter
Garmatz	Kersten, Wis.	Potts
Gary	Kilburn	Poulson
Gathings	Kilday	Preston
Gavin	King	Price, Fla.
Gearhart	Kirwan	Price, Ill.
Gillette	Klein	Priest
Goff	Kunkel	Rains
Goodwin	Lanham	Ramey
Gordon	Latham	Rayburn
Gore	Lea	Redden
Gorski	LeCompte	Rees
Gossett	LeFevre	Reeves
Graham	Lesinski	Richards
Grant, Ala.	Lichtenwalter	Riehlman
Grant, Ind.	Lodge	Riley
Gregory	Lucas	Rockwell
Gwinn, N. Y.	Lusk	Rogers, Fla.
Gwynne, Iowa	Lynch	Rogers, Mass.
Hagen	McConnell	Rohrbough
Hale	McCormack	Rooney
Hall, Leonard W.	McCulloch	Ross
Halleck	McDonough	Russell
Hand	McDowell	Sadlak
Hardy	McMahon	St. George
Harless, Ariz.	McMillan, S. C.	Sarbacher
Harris	McMillen, Ill.	Sasscer
Harrison	Mack	Scoblick
Hart	MacKinnon	Scott, Hardie
Harvey	Madden	Seely-Brown
Havenner	Mahon	Sheppard
Hébert	Maloney	Sikes
Hedrick	Manasco	Simpson, Ill.
Hendricks	Mansfield	Smathers
Herter	Meade, Ky.	Smith, Va.
Heselton	Meade, Md.	Smith, Wis.
Hess	Merrow	Snyder
Hill	Meyer	Somers
Hinshaw	Michener	Spence
Hobbs	Miller, Calif.	Stanley
Hoeven	Miller, Conn.	Stefan
Holifield	Miller, Md.	Stevenson
Holmes	Mills	Sundstrom
Hope	Mitchell	Taber
Horan	Monroney	Talle
Huber	Morgan	Taylor
Jackson, Calif.	Morrison	Teague
Jackson, Wash.	Morton	Thomas, Tex.
Jarman	Muhlenberg	Thompson
Javits	Multer	Tibbott
Jenkins, Pa.	Mundt	Tollefson
Jennings	Murray, Tenn.	Towe
Jensen	Murray, Wis.	Trimble
Johnson, Calif.	Nicholson	Van Zandt
Jones, Ala.	Nixon	Vinson
Jones, N. C.	Nodar	Vorys
Jones, Wash.	Norblad	Wadsworth
Jonkman	Norrell	Walter
Judd	O'Brien	Welchel
Karsten, Mo.	O'Toole	Wheeler
Kean	Pace	Whitaker
Kearney	Patman	Whitten
Kearns	Patterson	Whittington
Keating	Peterson	Wigglesworth
Kee	Pfeifer	Williams
Keefe	Philbin	Wilson, Tex.
Kefauver	Phillips, Calif.	Winstead
Kelley	Phillips, Tenn.	Wolcott
Kennedy	Pickett	Wolverton
Keogh	Plumley	Worley
	Poage	

NAYS—62

Allen, Ill.	Hoffman	Ploeser
Andresen, August H.	Hull	Rankin
Arnold	Isacson	Reed, Ill.
Banta	Jenison	Reed, N. Y.
Barden	Jenkins, Ohio	Rich
Bennett, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.	Rizley
Bishop	Johnson, Ind.	Sadowski
Busbey	Landis	Sanborn
Chiperfield	Larcade	Schwabe, Mo.
Church	Lewis, Ohio	Schwabe, Okla.
Clevenger	McCowen	Scrivner
Clippinger	McGregor	Shafer
Cole, Mo.	Marcantonio	Short
Crawford	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Kans.
Doughton	Mason	Smith, Ohio
Ellis	Mathews	Twyman
Gillie	Miller, Nebr.	Vail
Griffiths	Morris	Vursell
Gross	O'Hara	Wilson, Ind.
Harness, Ind.	O'Konski	Wood
	Passman	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—50

Allen, La.	Bulwinkle	Granger
Andrews, N. Y.	Clark	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bender	Colmer	Hartley
Bland	Coudert	Hays
Boggs, Del.	Cox	Hefferman
Brown, Ohio	Dawson, Ill.	Johnson, Okla.
Buckley	Eaton	Johnson, Tex.
Buffett	Gallagher	Knutson
	Norton	Smith, Maine
Lane	Peden	Stigler
Lemke	Powell	Stockman
Lewis, Ky.	Regan	Stratton
Love	Rivers	Thomas, N. J.
Ludlow	Robertson	Welch
Lyle	Sabath	West
McGarvey	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Woodruff
Macy	Simpson, Pa.	
Murdock		

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hefferman for, with Mr. Powell against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Lyle.
Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Murdock.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Boggs of Delaware with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Lemke with Mr. Regan.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Granger.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Dawson, Ill.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Sabath.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the conference report just prior to the motion for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6935) "making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 17, 29, 40, 50, 51, 58, 74, 75, 85, and 86.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 27, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 44, 45, 48, 52, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, and 83, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the citation "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", appearing in the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "deposits in

the Treasury for penalty mail (39 U. S. C. 321d);" and in lieu of the sum of "$3,500,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$2,060,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"National Institute of Health, operating expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for 'National Institute of Health, operating expenses', $500,000: *Provided*, That appropriations under said head for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available for carrying out the purposes of the National Heart Act, including erection of temporary structures for storage of equipment and supplies and housing of animals."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Before the words "passenger motor vehicles" in said amendment, strike out the word "ten" and insert the following: "five" and in lieu of the sum of "$10,000,000" named twice in said amendment insert in each instance the following: "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$9,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$4,060,000" and in lieu of the sum of "$250,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

"Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary, fiscal year 1949, to carry out the provisions of H. R. 6401 or S. 2655, Eightieth Congress, establishing the Selective Service System, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation when specifically authorized by the Director; purchase (not to exceed 94) of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); and purchase of typewriters; $25,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of either H. R. 6401 or S. 2655, Eightieth Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the word "available" where it appears in said amendment, insert the following: "until June 30, 1949,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the words "administrative expenses" where they appear in said amendment, insert "(not to exceed 4 per centum of the total amount of loans made)".

And at the end of the paragraph before the period, insert ": *Provided*, That no such loan shall be made unless no other source of public or private credit is available".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$480,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the citation "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", appearing in said amendment and following the semicolon, strike out the following: "health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150)" and in lieu of the sum of "$2,480,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,860,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$150,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$100,000" and in lieu of the sum of "$194,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$192,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "or quantity"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the sum of "$60,000" named in said amendment and the comma, insert the following: "to be reimbursable and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$400,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed, whenever in his judgment the best interests of the United States so require, to direct the insertion of a clause incorporating the Renegotiation Act of 1948 in any contracts for the procurement of ships, aircraft, aircraft parts, and the construction of facilities or installations outside continental United States entered into by or in behalf of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy or the Department of the Air Force which obligates any funds made available for obligation in the fiscal year 1949."

And the Senate agree to the same,

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1–13: Make appropriations for the United States Senate, as proposed by the Senate, except the payment of a claim is denied.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $2,000,000 for the Displaced Persons Commission instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Appropriate $500,000 for the National Institute of Health instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. The amounts specified in the Senate committee report on such item are also reduced in half.

Amendment No. 17: Strikes out an appropriation of $100,000 for the National Institute of Health, proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $1,000,000 for a working capital fund instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20: Appropriate $275,000 for the Federal Works Agency, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $1,000,000 for improvement of post-office facilities, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Extends availability of an appropriation until June 30, 1949.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $5,000,000 for the national industrial reserve, instead of $10,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Inserts a title.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $3,000,000 for maintenance and operation schools, instead of $5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $680,000 for the General Accounting Office, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $450,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $1,000,000 for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Strikes out an appropriation of $2,960 for the National Capital Housing Authority, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $15,000 for the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $25,000,000 for the Selective Service System, instead of $31,800,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 32 and 33: Appropriates $245,000 for soldiers' and sailors' civil relief, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Provides $1,500,000 for purchase of automobiles for disabled veterans, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $150,000 for day care of children, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $12,000 for the Superintendent of Buildings, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $8,400 for settlement of claims, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $1,566.10 for the D. C. Training School, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Corrects a total.

Amendment No. 40: Strikes out an appropriation of $150,000 for the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42 appropriate $425,000 for Remount Service instead of $400,000, as proposed by the House, and $500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43 appropriates $492,000 for Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45: Appropriates $4,000,000 for Emergency Reconstruction and Repair, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates $6,000,000 for loans to farmers, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $225,000 for Rural Electrification instead of $450,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 48, 49, 50, and 51: Appropriate $1,800,000 for Bureau of the Census instead of $2,780,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates $341,499 for air-navigation facilities, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,600,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 53, 54, 55, and 56: Appropriate $3,500,000 for construction of airports in Alaska instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. In addition provide contract authority for the same purpose of $9,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates $100,000 for air navigation development, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 58: Strikes out an appropriation of $500,000 for the Federal-aid airport program as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Increases the salary of the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60 appropriates $100,000 for departmental salaries, Department of Commerce, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Appropriates $15,000 for Field office service, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Prohibits the use of funds to enforce any regulation prohibiting the export of flour under certain circumstances.

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates $2,000,000 for Columbia Basin flood repair, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates $130,000 for Bureau of Indian Affairs, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 65, 66, 67, and 68: Appropriate $1,113,000 for Bureau of Reclamation, as proposed by the Senate except that one item is required to be reimbursable.

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates $1,000,000 for Flood Control, General instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70: Corrects general language.

Amendment No. 71: Corrects total.

Amendment No. 72: Appropriates $60,000 for purchase of land as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73: Appropriates $5,204,000 for Naval Radio Station, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 74 and 75: Appropriate $1,280,000 for Foreign Service, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,780,754, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates $60,000 for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 77, 78, and 79: Correct formal language.

Amendment No. 80: Provides $12,000 for contingent expenses, public moneys, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 81: Appropriates $300,000 for the Coast Guard, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 82 and 83: Make provision for payment of judgments and claims, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84: Makes provision for extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1948 to additional types of contracts when determined to be necessary by the Secretary of Defense.

Amendments Nos. 85 and 86 correct section numbers.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 6935 and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this have anything to do with CAA?

Mr. TABER. It does.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment number 25: Page 18, line 23, insert the following:

"Disaster relief, public facilities: For expenses necessary to alleviate damage or hardship caused by flood, tornado, fire, or other catastrophe respecting which the President has heretofore made a determination under the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 233), by grants, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Federal Works Administrator, to local public agencies to assist them in defraying the cost of (1) the repair, restoration, replacement, or reconstruction of local public facilities damaged or destroyed by such catastrophe and (2) the construction, maintenance, and operation of schools necessary for children of families from Vanport City, Oreg., including personal services in the District of Columbia, $35,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1950: *Provided*, That no grant shall be made to any local public agency unless the Administrator determines that other Federal funds are not available for such facilities and that such agency needs the grant and cannot otherwise defray such cost without creating an excessive tax or debt burden: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 4 percent of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses required in connection with such grants."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANGELL moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 25.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will give attention to this matter. The Chairman has been very generous in allowing 3 minutes to discuss this amendment to take care of the flood victims, not only in Oregon, but all over the United States. I am particularly interested in it, because Vanport, which is in my district, is mentioned in this particular amendment. There were in Vanport before this flood 18,700 people, 60 percent of them are veterans. Every single stick in the town was owned by the Federal Government—every building and school building and everything else. They were completely wiped out. The whole town was blotted out. There is not a single home left. Eighteen thousand seven hundred people now are without homes and without schools.

The Federal Government owns the schools, and the Federal Government owns the whole town of Vanport. I merely mention Vanport as an example

because I have 3 minutes only to explain this motion, which covers the whole United States. This committee, in its generosity, has said, We cannot give $35,000,000 to the people of America for taking care of those who are in distress, like the people of Vanport, but we have just passed $6,000 000 000 to go overseas for aid of peoples in foreign lands.

My chairman has said there is no precedent for this. I placed in the RECORD recently three or four pages with the citations where we had passed acts covering the moneys that had been appropriated in the past for conditions like this. One of them provided money which went to Russia when they had a poor crop. One of them went to Japan when they had a tornado. Many of them went to various communities in the United States. Here, now, in our own country, not only these 18,000 people but 100,000 people, all up and down the Columbia River valley are in distress by reason of the greatest flood in our history, and, in addition to that, people all over the United States will share in this fund. This merely gives $35,000,000 to be expended under the control of the President and under the Public Works Administration.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that this motion which you are making would also make possible the rehabilitation of the Gulf Coast area which was severely damaged in a hurricane last fall.

Mr. ANGELL. That is absolutely true.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Would there be sufficient funds to take care of the disaster that has occurred in Oregon, your State, and also on the Gulf coast, if this amendment were adopted?

Mr. ANGELL. That is absolutely true and it would be available for future disasters.

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly it behooves the House to take care of our own people first.

Mr. ANGELL. Yes. We have billions of dollars to send overseas, but if the people of America want a little help, they have to move overseas in order to get it.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If we do not take this action, no relief will be had?

Mr. ANGELL. No relief will be had. They do not have a cent for schools in Vanport which were owned by the United States. All of these school children, over 5,000 of them, have no place to go to school. The Federal Government owned the schools and owned the buildings in which they lived.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am very much interested in this legislation. Thousands of children have to use school busses to get to school and they do not have any.

Mr. ANGELL. Anyone who votes against this amendment cannot square with their own conscience the vote we have just made for $6,000,000,000 to send overseas.

I hope you will uphold my motion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, by a vote of 5 to 1, this Congress appropriated $6,000,000,000 for the damaged communities and suffering people of Europe. We gave money to Ireland, which was not involved in that war. We gave huge sums to Italy, which was our enemy in this last war. Tonight we are asking in this bill for $35,000,000 to restore the facilities in the communities on the Columbia River, where the people suffered $140,000,000 of flood damage.

In the little town of Woodland, in my district, a town of 2,000 people, a typical one of those hit by the floods, the community suffered more than $2,000,000 in damage. These people must rebuild or refurnish their homes; they will have to repaint their homes. In addition to that, they will have to furnish the money to clean out their sewers, clean out their drainage ditches, to rebuild the roads that lead from the farms to the communities, to rebuild their water systems, and rebuild their schools.

It seems to me that the motion of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], should be supported.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to agree with what the gentleman says about the damage in the Northwest.

I hope, too, that we support the motion of the gentleman from Oregon and vote what the Senate allowed, $35,000,000, to help out in these four Western States.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is it not a fact that these funds will be available in any disaster area so that if a disaster occurs down in the Gulf area, funds will be available for relief?

Mr. MACK. Yes, for damage done to publicly owned facilities—done by floods, fires, and tornadoes.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. And the money will be available.

Mr. MACK. Yes, for those purposes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. And the entire matter of allocation under the funds here appropriated is under an established Federal agency, the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. MACK. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to point out two or three facts about this motion and the amendment in the bill to which it refers.

First, let me say that an objection is to be raised that there is no precedent for making this type of appropriation. I submit to the Members of the House that it is high time this type of appropriation should be made in this country in view of the need in so many sections and in view of the fact that these disasters occur from time to time.

Not one cent of this appropriation is to be spent for any individual; not one cent of it is to be spent for any community or public body unless and until the Federal Works Administrator has determined that the community or the local agency is unable to take care of the need because it is virtually bankrupt and cannot raise the necessary funds. It is a justifiable appropriation.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I might say to the gentleman from Oregon that I am in sympathy with his position and shall support the motion of the gentleman from Oregon, for I have had several towns in my own district which have suffered similar disasters.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The funds herein appropriated will be applicable nationally to any disaster area.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. LARCADE. Is it not a fact that some years ago we appropriated $100,000,000 for earthquake relief in Japan?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I am sure it is.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I hope this motion is adopted, but I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that if we had not cut down our flood-control appropriations as we did the other day we would not have these conditions arising, necessitating this appropriation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman has a point there, I believe. We are proceeding with flood control fairly well, but not as speedily as we should.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will vote "aye" on this motion to recede and concur. The money is appropriated for a proper purpose and for a humanitarian need.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that in the floods in the Northwest it is not only the States of Washington and Oregon that have suffered, but also the State of Idaho in the upper reaches of the Columbia River.

I have a telegram from the Governor of Idaho in which he states that in my district alone there has been damage of over $50,000,000. Much as I dislike to oppose anything put forward by the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I hope that the Members of this House will support the motion of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], and give this help to the people in the Pacific Northwest who need it so urgently now.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I hope I may have the attention of the Members because we are passing on one of the very important things of this session.

If we concur in the motion of the gentleman from Oregon we are going to open the door to tremendous expenditures in the future which previously we have avoided. Not only that, but we must also go back if we are to be honest with ourselves and make appropriations for every community that has suffered disaster.

I have the greatest sympathy for the people in the flooded areas and for the motives of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] who has offered the motion. I do not see how we can afford to vote for this motion, and I will tell you why and we will have no difficulty in understanding why.

The Texas City disaster was a disaster running into more than $100,000,000. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and other Members from that State, came before the Appropriations Committee and said: "We have suffered an unprecedented disaster involving more than $100,000,000 and we want some relief."

The committee went through the records of the Congress and we found there was no precedent for any such action. What did the Congress do? It said to Texas City, "Not one dime." The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] came before the committee a few months ago and said:

> My city has been swept off the map. Our schools have been destroyed, our public utilities have been put out of order. The situation is desperate.

He asked for funds from the Treasury to rehabilitate his town. Of course, the Federal Government always grants emergency aid, as we did in Oregon and in other areas. The Red Cross, the Army, and the Navy come in and do what they can. In this very bill before us we are providing money for loans to the farmers in stricken areas and we provided all manner of aid that reasonably can be made available. We recently appropriated more than $600,000,000 for river and harbor and flood-control work. All of those things go through the regular procedure.

But if you adopt this amendment, then every Member of Congress who has a disaster, a cyclone, for instance, in his town—and we have them somewhere in the West almost every day—is going to have to be in the House with a bill for relief the next day and he is going to be on the spot to persuade the Congress to make an appropriation to rebuild his town and community as a result of the disaster that has come upon his district. I tell you emphatically that we cannot afford to vote for this amendment. Certainly you cannot afford to vote for it unless you intend to go back and vote $100,000,000 perhaps for Texas City and millions of dollars for Woodward, Okla., and for all sufferers here and there all over the country.

As much as I sympathize with these people, I urge you not to open the door to this sort of legislation which will make every Member of Congress come in and seek an appropriation for every disaster that may sweep away a part of his city.

We should think a long time before we set the dangerous precedent provided for in this motion before us.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas, is it better for the Nation to take care of the entire Nation or else to have those who suffered in the Texas City disaster come over to my city of New Orleans and let us put on a charity bazar to help Texas City?

Mr. MAHON. I think a little giving to the Red Cross is good for America and I hope we do not quit doing that sort of thing.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Does not the gentleman feel that when this Nation can afford to give away, like it did tonight, $6,000,000,000 to the other nations of the world, we can take care of our own people?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman asks me if we can afford to spend this money in Europe can we not take care of the flood sufferers? We have given temporary aid to flood sufferers. I have not voted to spend one dime in Europe that I did not think or hope would help the United States of America promote peace and our national defense. I say we cannot afford to enter this field and we will rue the day that we do. I ask that this amendment which provides for an expenditure of $35,000,000 be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon. As I understand his motion, the funds made available would be used for the rehabilitation of public institutions. There was $100,000,000 of damage done in Texas City, but there was not $100,000,000 of damages done to public institutions—to streets, to schools, to the sewer system, to the utility systems.

When communities like these little towns in Oregon, and in other places in this Nation, such as the Mississippi Gulf coast, the Florida Gulf coast, the Louisiana Gulf coast, and the Texas Gulf coast, were stricken by a hurricane last September, these communities did not have the funds to go out and repair the sea walls, the utility plants, the schools, the public installations which have taken years and years to build. I think this is a fair proposition. When disaster strikes today we have no funds to move in and do something about it. Now, I know something about that because we had a hurricane and the only thing that we could get in the way of aid was surplus property and things of that character provided by the Federal Works Agency. But, so far as being of real assistance to many communities which were completely paralyzed, there was nothing provided whatsoever. I think that this is a fair thing. It applies all over the United States. It is a relatively small amount of money, and if a disaster should strike between now and January we would be mighty glad that we had done this.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Does not the gentleman think it better practice to start a good precedent now than to have ourselves placed in a situation where we cannot help our own people in the future?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I certainly agree with that.

Mr. HÉBERT. Does not the gentleman agree that we have to start something, and that we have seen the precedent started during the last 10 or 12 years in this country?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think the best evidence of that is that if we had something similar to this in existence, that these people in Oregon would not be coming in and asking for relief now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

I suggest to the Committee on Appropriations that you are not establishing any precedent. It is already established. In 1936 there was a flood disaster on the Ohio River, and a similar measure was passed to provide a disaster fund of $25,000,000. Before that measure passed the Senate a cyclone swooped down on my home town, destroyed 600 homes, all the school buildings, killed about 200 people, and wounded 1,000. It swept on across and virtually destroyed Gainesville, Ga. I went before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and explained the situation, and they raised the amount from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000 and included cyclone disasters.

That was known as the disaster fund. And I can see no difference here.

As the gentleman has said, that money was used to replace the public buildings and to repair the public highways. This money, if used for that purpose, certainly will not be misspent. You just voted

more than $6,000,000,000 to be given to the people of Europe, Africa, and Asia. Certainly this small amount can be provided to assist our own people, who have suffered unavoidable disasters, along the Columbia River, or along our Gulf Coast.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I wish that there was more time for these last mellow hours of the session when the camaraderie of long and intimate associations is drawing to a close, but even in the press of business I must take time to observe the amenities which ordinarily mark the concluding session of a Congress. I would particularly like to express the appreciation which every Member feels for the able administration by Speaker MARTIN of his high office, of the courtesy and admirable generalship which the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] the majority leader, has displayed in a particularly difficult session. But it is late and the House has been patient.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen the gavel fall on 46 consecutive sessions of Congress. This is the forty-seventh session of Congress, the close of which I have attended.

In all of these 47 sessions there has never been such confusion and congestion as we have had in the last week of this session. Since the 1st of June half a dozen of the largest and most difficult appropriation bills have been messaged over to the Senate and the Senate has been compelled to hold hearings comprising a few hours on the bills on which the House expended months. Is it to be wondered that hasty and ill-digested conference reports are being rushed through in order to meet the adjournment dead line?

And never has any Congress fallen so far short in the fulfillment of promises and predictions made at its beginning.

For example, at the opening of the Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in a press release said:

> We have now nearly 2,300,000 civilian employees, and we do not need over 500,000 at the most.

He assured the Congress and the country that they would reduce the number of employees. How does fulfillment comport with the promise so emphaticaly made? Notwithstanding the fact that the war peak of Government employment is long past, we had on April 30, 2,048,248 civilian employees and the number is climbing. In brief, we have 118.7 percent more Federal employees on the Government pay roll today than we had in 1940.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOFF. I do not believe the gentleman is speaking on the motion before us. I think he is out of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. CANNON. The chairman of the committee also told us this last January——

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOFF. The gentleman is not in order. He is not speaking on the motion before us.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri will kindly address himself to the motion, which relates to the Oregon disaster fund.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman also told us he would reduce appropriations by $6,000,000,000.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri will kindly proceed in order. The gentleman should not impose on the House at this hour of the morning. He should proceed in order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am following the precedent which has been followed from time immemorial, of introducing at the close of each session of Congress a summary of the appropriation record for the session.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not hear any request by the gentleman to include that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not made any request yet.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How could he get them in if he has not made that request?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of the leave to extend already granted.

Mr. Speaker, free government is founded on the right of the minority to present its side of the case—to have its day in court. We were not granted time on the conference report. We have had no opportunity to present the summary always submitted by the minority at the close of a session of Congress. We have been granted only 5 minutes at this time, and even that is now denied on a technicality.

It is in keeping with the action of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who a little while ago made ridiculous personal charges against me and then refused to yield to me to answer. It is the first time I can recall in the proceedings of the United States Congress when the minority has been denied the right to discuss the appropriation record of the Congress during the debate on the last appropriation bill. The minority have always been accorded an opportunity to make their closing argument. The people and the country are entitled to hear it. And I have never before known it to be denied—the denial of the right to answer.

Likewise, any Member attacked and named personally on the floor has always been afforded opportunity to reply. In both instances it is not only an infringement of our democratic legislative processes but it is, to say the least, lacking in sportsmanship. So far as the gentleman from Wisconsin is concerned, I have since his last personal reference to me on the floor, addressed him in another place and to his face characterized him accurately and appropriately in unmistakable language. So there is no need for further reference to him at this time.

I now take up the record made by the majority in this Congress. The gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, announced that he would cut the number of civilian employees on the Government rolls to 500,000. Today at the end of the session we have more than 2,000,000. He also announced last January that he would cut the President's estimates by $6,000,000,000. He said they could be cut $7,000,000,000 to $7,500,000,000 but that he proposed to cut them $6,000,000,000. The Senate took a more conservative view of the proposed reduction and the legislative budget finally agreed on a programed cut of $2,800,000,000.

As a matter of fact, the actual cut of either $6,000,000,000 or $2,800,000,000 now shows up at an actual cut of less than a billion dollars.

In this fashion the majority in control of this Congress for the past 2 years have kept their solemn pledges of economy and retrenchment to the American people.

Is it to be wondered that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF] does not want me to use even the remainder of 5 minutes to discuss the record and the failure of his party to keep faith with the country?

Before quoting the specific figures let me contrast the record of the Eightieth Congress with the accomplishments of the Seventy-ninth Congress following the cessation of hostilities.

In the fiscal year 1946, the fiscal year in which hostilities ceased, our budget totaled $76,200,000,000. In 1947 we dropped from $76,200,000,000 to $42,500,000,000, a record which has been unequaled in any session of any Congress before or since. We made the greatest reduction in appropriations, the greatest reduction in the budget, the greatest reduction in expenditures. In addition to that, we excised over $64,000,000,000 and were preparing for further rescissions when the stewardship of the Congress changed. At that time there was a potential additional recovery of more than $20,000,000,000, and all the Republicans have done, after 2 years of control, has been to excise about 7 percent of the $20,000,000,000 plus, and the bulk of the 7 percent was money that could not be obligated and would have reverted to the Treasury automatically. Moreover, within 6 months after the close of the fiscal year in which hostilities ceased, the President transmitted to the Congress a balanced budget, the first balanced budget since it went into the red when President Hoover was in the White House, with a majority in both branches of the Congress. When he entered the White House the public debt was $16,604,000,000, resulting from World War I. When he went out of office the debt had soared to $22,539,000,000, and today we are well on the way again to deficit financing, adding to the tremendous existing debt, and at a time when there is no unemployment and

business is at a level never before approached.

Here I append the performance record, in summary fashion, of the second session of the Eightieth Congress on the budget estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year commencing next July 1, and for the current and prior fiscal years:

Comparison of amounts of appropriations carried in appropriation bills, 80th Cong., 2d sess., compared with budget estimates for such bills

Bill	Amount of budget estimate	Amount of appropriation	Increase (+), decrease (−), appropriations compared with estimates
Department of Agriculture	$636,412,090	$577,546,953	−$58,865,137
District of Columbia	101,897,283	99,729,483	−2,167,800
Independent offices:			
Regular bill	1,047,606,864	967,442,551	−80,164,313
Supplemental	6,299,809,000	5,819,659,851	−480,149,149
Interior Department	474,773,535	407,836,674	−66,936,861
Labor-Federal Security:			
Regular bill	931,539,169	890,139,000	−41,400,169
Supplemental	993,708,460	976,914,700	−17,793,760
Legislative branch	61,379,520	56,140,401	−5,329,119
Military	7,216,592,000	6,705,418,163	−511,173,837
Navy	3,936,738,700	3,749,059,250	−187,679,450
State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and judiciary	589,417,230	511,129,662	−78,287,568
Treasury and Post Office Departments:			
Regular bill	2,044,949,200	1,996,313,425	−48,635,775
Supplemental	355,205,375	248,414,255	−106,791,120
Army, civil functions	737,804,200	641,575,666	−96,228,534
Government corporations	49,644,100	38,479,061	−11,165,039
Total, regular annual and bills supplemental thereto	25,477,477,126	23,684,799,395	−1,792,677,731
Urgent deficiency	131,546,901	136,368,385	+4,821,484
First deficiency	1,092,150,316	777,986,045	−224,164,271
Second deficiency	761,135,650	549,774,876	−211,360,774
H. J. Res. 355—foreign aid—tax refunds	555,125,000	555,125,000	
Supplemental national defense	[1] 2,417,100,000	[1] 3,224,000,000	+806,900,000
Foreign aid	6,533,710,228	6,030,710,228	−503,000,000
Total, deficiency and miscellaneous bills	11,490,768,095	11,273,964,534	−126,803,561
Grand total	36,878,245,221	34,958,763,929	−1,919,481,292

[1] Including contractual authority.

NOTE.—The foregoing statement is exclusive of permanent annual appropriations, which occur automatically in consequence of law without further action by Congress.

It shows a net reduction in budget estimates of appropriations of $1,919,481,292, but that excludes funds to finance the pay increases provided at the last minute for Federal employees, including postal employees—creating an added expense of approximately $600,000,000; it excludes deferment until the next Congress of $500,000,000 for the European recovery program; it excludes in line with the misleading procedure resorted to at the last session, numerous other deferments or unjustifiable reductions, including large amounts for national defense, which must be restored at the next session; it excludes contractual authority, other than for the air arm, substituted for immediate appropriations, but which must be provided later; and, it excludes reappropriations which take money from the Treasury equivalent to new appropriations. All in all, the saving to the taxpayers will be well under a billion dollars—possibly no more than $500,000,000, as against the economy goal established by the Republicans in the fore part of the session just closed of $2,800,000,000. As in the first session it presents a sorry and defenseless spending record by a party which faithlessly promised economy and retrenchments.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have searched the records, beginning in 1803, for a precedent for anything of this kind. We did it a year ago when the question of the Texas City disaster was up.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. No; not at this point.

Mr. ANGELL. I call the gentleman's attention to one that passed 2 years ago, from my committee, for help to the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. TABER. That was a different proposition. That was temporary relief and not rehabilitation. Those precedents do not apply to this situation. This is a question of repairing damage. The Congress has dealt very generously with the people who have been hurt by this flood. There is in this bill alone $4,000,000 for forest roads, a very large part of $15,000,000 for forest roads and trails, $6,000,000 for dikes, $6,000,000 for loans which may be made, $500,000 for temporary relief, making a total of $16,500,000. In addition, the Committee on Public Works has provided within a few days $10,000,000 for housing in these flooded territories. In addition the power of the Disaster Loan Corporation to lend money was increased from $25,000,000 to $40,000,000 on yesterday. There is such a thing as being reasonable. Here it is proposed that we put up $35,000,000 to be given out as grants at a time when they can go before the Disaster Loan Corporation and get a loan to do all that they need to do. It has never been customary for us to rehabilitate completely these places. We have done a great deal for them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will this be a precedent for us in the Midwest to come to the Congress when a tornado sweeps through one of our villages and ask that the Federal Government take care of that damage?

Mr. TABER. It will be a precedent. There is no question about it. It is a precedent to take care of and repair all damage to all public facilities everywhere whenever there is a disaster. I do not know how far the Congress wants to go. This has never been done before. This has never been asked for. I hope this motion will be rejected, and that the House will follow the practice that we have been following. I do not believe we should establish a precedent by putting up $35,000,000 in a situation of this kind. We have been liberal in connection with taking care of all suffering and to provide the people with loans to help them as this motion seeks to do. I hope the Congress will vote "No" on this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANGELL) there were—ayes 58, noes 143.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Twelve Members have risen, not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. (After counting.) Two hundred and ninety-eight Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 169. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (H. Rept. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an advocate of overthrow of Government by force and violence; and

H. Con. Res. 213. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee, current Congress, relative to investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating and as to whether there is a necessity for a change in either the procedure or basic law.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 197. Joint resolution to continue the Joint Committee on Housing until June 15, 1948.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following

titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2688. An act to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; and

S. 2694. An act to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] be excused as conferee on the bill (H. R. 6841) entitled "An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] be appointed in lieu thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2730. An act to credit, in certain cases, military service and training preparatory thereto performed by employees of the postal service.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6935) entitled "An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment numbered 25 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1322) entitled "An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5004. An act to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department;

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments; and

H. R. 6801. An act making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

RECORD OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS ON TAXES, SOCIAL SECURITY, TARIFF, AND RECIPROCAL TRADE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the end of the first session of the Eightieth Congress brought the criticism of the public and press that this is a "do-nothing Congress" and the "worst Congress since reconstruction days." The American people wished they had never heard the campaign slogan "Had Enough." The Republican majority pleaded for patience. They asserted that they had worked hard, but that time had been required to organize Congress after their 14 years as the minority party. They assured the people that more action and less talk would be forthcoming during the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

It is only fitting, therefore, as this Congress draws toward adjournment, that the record be reviewed. I have prepared today a summary of the action of the Eightieth Congress in three very important legislative fields—taxes, social security, and reciprocal trade—all of which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means on which I served for a number of years.

Let us examine promise and performance in each of these areas.

TAXES—PROMISE

The Christian Science Monitor of October 21, 1946, reported:

A statement signed by all Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee sets the GOP fiscal goal in the next Congress as a budget trimmed to between $32,000,000,000 and $33,000,000,000, a $5,000,000,000 reduction in the national debt, a reduction in personal income taxes of 20 percent, and downward adjustments in Federal excise taxes. The statement is the work of 27 House Republican Members, including all members of the Ways and Means Committee, and known as the House Republican postwar tax-study committee.

Even after the 1946 election was in the bag, Ways and Means Chairman KNUTSON is reported by the Chicago Tribune of November 7, 1946, as follows:

KNUTSON told the Tribune in a statement telephoned from his home at Wadena, Minn., that the new Republican-controlled Congress will pass the bill immediately and save taxpayers $3,000,000,000 despite President Truman's insistence that taxes can't be lowered.

Moreover, KNUTSON said, his committee will open public hearings in February on another bill to save the taxpayers' money. Its purpose will be to cut back luxury excise taxes to 1942 levels. It will reduce, and in some cases eliminate, excises on a long list of items that includes jewelry, furs, cosmetics, and liquors. The reductions are to be effective next July 1.

"It is our plan to balance the budget and reduce Federal expenditures for the next fiscal year to $32,000,000,000 as against nearly forty billion the Democrats figured would be required," KNUTSON said.

"On that basis I estimated we could make a 20-percent cut in income taxes and begin at once reducing the national debt by paying off four or five billion dollars next year."

Fairly summarized, I think the voters were promised both before and after the 1946 election—

First. A drastically reduced budget.

Second. A $5,000,000,000 annual reduction in the public debt.

Third. A 20 percent across-the-board tax cut.

Fourth. Reduction or repeal of wartime excise taxes. Indeed, on January 18, 1946, the present chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means had introduced H. R. 5174, a bill to terminate wartime excise tax rates after June 30, 1946.

PERFORMANCE

First. Wartime excise taxes made permanent: In view of such firm assurances that the Republicans would terminate the temporary war excise tax rates, it was indeed a startling prediction of other events to come when the first important tax bill passed by the Eightieth Congress made these war excise taxes permanent.

President Truman asked that the wartime rates be extended for only 1 year, or until July 1, 1948. He asked that this action be taken to enable Congress to review the entire group of excises in connection with excise tax revision.

The Republican response was to fix the excise tax yoke firmly upon the necks even of those people with incomes so low as to be exempt from income taxes. The campaign promise of prompt reduction or repeal of excise taxes changed to clamor for deriving more Federal revenue from excises, or even a general sales tax. In hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means, on May 28, 1947, Chairman KNUTSON announced, in direct contradiction of his expressed desire to reduce excise taxes, that—

It is the hope of the committee to be able to shift much of the burden that is now being carried by the income tax group, which includes almost everyone, over to the excises, at least in part.

And he added:

Obviously, if we are going to extend the excise field we will have to include a great many items that are not now included.

Still another high-ranking Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means introduced a bill for a 10-percent manufacturer's excise tax, and when the committee chairman appointed a special tax-study committee of prominent industrialists, bankers, and tax lawyers, the two major Wall Street financial dailies commented that increasing emphasis upon sales taxes could be expected. The special tax-study group—the so-called Magill committee—fulfilled this prediction far more accurately than did the Republican membership of the Ways and Means Committee their commitment to reduce excise taxes. In its report filed on November 4, 1947, the special tax-study group recommended:

A case can certainly be made for strengthening the excise-tax structure.

The record of the Eightieth Congress, therefore, is not merely nonperformance of their campaign pledge to reduce excise taxes but of complete and utter repudiation.

Second. Twenty-percent rich-relief income-tax cut: In reducing surtaxes, Republican purposes and performance can perhaps be most convincingly demonstrated by an item taken from a recent edition of the Republican News, sponsored by the Republican national committee: "Don't throw peanuts to the elephant" is the caption, and here are a few quotations:

Don't delay, contribute today.

Don't count on winning by throwing peanuts to the elephant.

Many of our friends feel that, entirely apart from other important considerations, the least they can do to express their appreciation is to contribute a substantial part of their tax savings for the year to insure the reelection of the Congress which made this possible.

We are going to win only by hard work and by liberal contributions.

To demonstrate that "peanut" pittances of the great masses of the people were not sought, the article included a table clearly suggesting that a $50,000 a year man, whose tax reduction amounted to $7,500, should contribute the entire amount to the Republican cause. The end of the article "gets down to brass tacks" and says: "Make checks payable to Republican National Committee."

Mr. Speaker, never since I came to Congress have I seen such a brazen admission that legislation was enacted as inducement for campaign contributions. Only the well-to-do taxpayers above $5,000, the 2,000,000 people at the top, who received 37 percent of the total income tax reduction, would be able to make substantial contributions out of their tax savings.

The nearly 50,000,000 taxpayers under $5,000, among whom the other 63 percent of the tax-cut melon was divided, obviously received only peanuts. Their share of the tax cut averaged $1.15 a week—which has already been consumed by the Republican NAM inflationary prices. So these millions of low-income taxpayers could not feed peanuts to the elephant, if they wanted to, because the Republican tax reduction will not supply even their families with peanuts.

To illustrate, the average American family of four with a $2,200 net income before personal exemption received a tax cut of 73 cents a week—with a 1.3 percent increase in "take-home" pay. The $2,400 family's taxes were cut $1.46 a week, providing a 3.3 percent increase in "take-home" pay. The "take-home" pay of a $5,000 family was increased by 3.6 percent, as a result of a weekly tax cut of $3. The $10,000 a year man with a wife and two kids has nearly $10 a week more to spend, from a 6.2 percent increase in "take-home" pay.

From here on Mr. Speaker, we have nothing but the sweetest sugar for the elephant. The $25,000 family received a tax cut of $58.50 a week, for a take-home pay increase of 18.5 percent. The $50,000 family now has $145 a week, or 29.1 percent more to spend. The $250,000 family may meet the high cost of living with $668 more per week, and 58.4 percent increase in take-home pay. While the poor millionaire is now able to buy a much-needed extra yacht or country home with his additional $1,337 a week, or 43.1 percent more, and still have substantially more than peanuts for the Republican elephant.

To recapitulate, Mr. Speaker, how does Republican performance compare with the Republican preelection promise of a 20 percent across-the-board income tax cut?

As a result of successive vetoes by the President, the bill that finally became law is admittedly less lopsided in favor of the rich than H. R. 1—the first Knutson tax bill. Even ill-fated H. R. 1, however, abandoned the strict 20 percent across-the-board reduction, because it was found that this Republican campaign slogan actually would have reduced the taxes of the highest-income taxpayers to below the 1939 prewar level. Lower-income taxpayers would still have paid several times their prewar taxes. The result would have been to forgive top-bracket taxpayers entirely from any additional obligation toward retirement of the $260,000,000,000 war debt above their prewar burden, leaving other taxpayers to bear the brunt of the war.

This was somewhat embarrassing to the gentleman from Minnesota, Chairman KNUTSON, so his 20 percent plan became the 10.5—20 percent reduction—the 10.5 percent being the highest cut possible without reducing the upper-bracket taxpayers to the 1939 prewar level. Democratic protests against the heavy concentration of tax relief for the rich brought still another concession to increase to 30 percent the reduction for taxpayers with net income below $1,000. So the 20 percent plan became the 10.5–20–30 plan—which still provided the gross windfalls for the wealthy from which the Republican National Committee expects to extract more than peanuts.

In contrast with this tax-grab bill for the rich was the recommendation of the President of an honest across-the-board individual income-tax cut of the same dollar amount for all taxpayers, regardless of income, to be financed by a modified excess-profits tax on the exorbitant, inflationary profits of corporations. Of course, the Republican apologists for monopoly big business refused to touch the $17,000,000,000 annual corporate profits after taxes, even though they are 67 percent greater than the profits of the peak war-year 1943.

So, we shall have to give Chairman KNUTSON and his Republican colleagues E for effort on their campaign pledge of a 20 percent across-the-board tax-relief bill for the rich. This pledge was amended to provide a small increase in individual income-tax exemptions, and place married couples on the same tax basis, wherever they may reside. But to the extent that the Republican Eightieth Congress was thus impelled toward considerations of equity, and the elimination of discriminations in the tax system, the minority accept full responsibility.

Third. Thirty percent reduction in estate and gift taxes. To compensate the wealthy for the adjustments the Democrats forced in their income-tax cut plan, the majority added a provision to give a $250,000,000 annual reduction in estate and gift taxes to about 12,000 of the Nation's wealthiest families. This amounts to roughly a 30 percent decrease in estate and gift taxes on the average.

Fourth. Effect of the tax cut upon debt reduction and the budget: The Republican promise of a $5,000,000,000 debt retirement and a balanced budget now have vanished like the cotton candy at a circus carnival. Instead of reducing the President's budget of $39,700,000,000, it now appears that the Congress has exceeded this amount.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 18, 1948, just a month ago, contains an estimate by the senior Senator from Ohio—a leading Republican Presidential candidate—that expenditures would approximate $40,600,000,000—or a billion more than the President's budget. The tax cut had left only $42,300,000,000 in revenues for fiscal 1949, according to the report of the Committee on Finance. And to the dismay of the Senator, there would be not $5,000,000,000, but a mere $1,700,000,000 to apply on the public debt.

So, on the performance of the campaign promise of debt retirement of $5,000,000,000, and a budget of $32,000,000,000 or $33,000,000,000, we can chalk up for the Republicans a well-earned zero.

Fifth. Scuttling of tax revision: As late as May 26, 1948, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means acknowledged that "a general tax revision was promised to the American public in the last congressional election." He added that his bill, H. R. 6712, "is the fulfillment of that promise."

Mr. Speaker, the fulfillment of the promise of the Republican majority to revise and eliminate inequities in the internal-revenue laws is on a par with the performance on most of its other pledges. Although this bill was favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on June 2, 1948, at an early hour on June 19, scheduled to be the last day of the session, it was still on the House Calendar.

The bill was finally passed by the House, but not even the most optimistic Member had any hope that it could possibly become law. So the weeks of committee hearings at taxpayers' expense and the report of a Special Tax Study Committee authorized to spend $25,000 have failed of fruition, regardless of whether the result would have been improvement or detriment to the Federal tax laws.

In the field of tax equity, therefore, we can only conclude that the elephant's omnipotent memory has failed him. All that he has been able to remember during the Eightieth Congress is to reduce most the taxes of those best able to pay. And to this favored group he now cries for campaign contributions—"Don't—please don't—feed peanuts to the elephant."

SOCIAL SECURITY—PROMISE

The 1944 Republican platform pledged support of the following:

First. Extension of the existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems to all employees not already covered.

Second. A careful study of Federal-State programs for maternal and child health, dependent children, and assistance to the blind, with a view to strengthening these programs.

PERFORMANCE

The social security planks of the 1944 Republican platform, therefore, promised unqualified support of extending "the existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems to all employees not already covered." This promise sounded to me, Mr. Speaker, pretty much like other Republican campaign pledges intended to be forgotten

after election day, for I could not forget that the entire Republican membership of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1935, when a Democratic Congress responded to the plea of President Roosevelt to enact social security laws, filed a minority report protesting that the old-age and survivors' insurance titles of the act were unconstitutional, and expressing doubt whether the unemployment insurance provisions would result in a general national benefit at that time. The present chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means said flatly that the program would not work, but since it was being enacted he recommended that it be made a responsibility and appendix of the Veterans' Administration.

Still it seemed barely possible that the Republican Party by 1944 had gotten to the point of accepting the most fundamental social legislation enacted in the history of this great Nation. So I reserve judgment.

But what has been the record of the Eightieth Congress on social security? During the first session two bills were passed—one to freeze the rate of social security taxes in order to stifle the clamor of people pressed by inflation for more adequate benefits; the second, the Gearhart bill to overrule a court decision which held that certain news vendors employed by Hearst Publications, Inc., on the west coast were entitled to social security protection. The President, however, refused to sign this bill, so it did not become law.

And what is the record of the Republican majority on social security during the second session of the Eightieth Congress?

First, news vendors were deprived of coverage by enactment of a bill over the veto of the President.

Second, House Joint Resolution 296 was passed, to reverse a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court and to take away social-security coverage granted by Congress in 1935 to 750,000 workers and their families. This bill, too, was vetoed by the President. In addition to the 750,000 employees directly affected, the veto message emphasized that the bill would enable employers desiring to avoid the payment of employment taxes to do so by "the establishment of artificial legal arrangements governing their relationship with their employees. I cannot approve legislation which would permit such employers at their own discretion to avoid the payment of social-security taxes and to deny social-security protection to employees and their families." But the Congress overrode the veto.

Finally, in a desperate effort to expunge their consistent record of contracting coverage and curtailing benefits, the Republican leadership called up for consideration H. R. 6777, a bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. Although this bill would extend old-age and survivors' insurance coverage to employees of State and local governments and nonprofit institutions on a voluntary basis, it admittedly did nothing or almost nothing about the following major recommendations repeatedly urged by the President:

First. More adequate benefits under old-age and survivors' insurance, to compensate for the 65-percent cost-of-living increase since 1939, when the present benefits were fixed.

Second. Extended coverage for old-age and survivors' insurance.

Third. Extended coverage for unemployment insurance.

Fourth. Insurance against loss of earnings due to illness and disability.

Fifth. Improved public assistance for the needy.

When Democratic Members of the House sought to provide an opportunity to the membership to pass an adequate and comprehensive social security bill, the Republican majority foreclosed them by suspending the rules and precluding any and all amendments. This bill has now been tabled by the Senate Committee on Finance. The only contribution toward a more adequate social security structure by the Eightieth Congress has been two inadequate amendments of the provisions for old-age pensions and pensions for the blind and dependent children.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican record on social security must be engraved in bitter hemlock upon the hearts of all the recipients of old-age and survivors' insurance, all the old people receiving public assistance, all the needy children, and all those unfortunates who cannot see. These people know, as you and I can never know, unless we become similarly afflicted, how complete and utter has been the failure of the Eightieth Congress to live up to the solemn pledges on social security adopted by the Republican National Convention in 1944.

TARIFF AND RECIPROCAL TRADE—PROMISE

In its 1944 platform the Republican Party "pledges that it will join with others in leadership in every cooperative effort to remove unnecessary and destructive barriers to international trade. We will always bear in mind that the domestic market is America's greatest market and that tariffs which protect it against foreign competition should be modified only by reciprocal bilateral trade agreements approved by Congress."

Although this plank of the Republican platform was obviously designed as a compromise between Republicans who favored a return to the logrolling, tariff-writing days of the Smoot-Hawley Act, and others who did not desire to return quite so far into the nineteenth century, the promise to cooperate "to remove unnecessary and destructive barriers to international trade" afforded some hope that the Republican Party might come out of the isolationist shell incrusting its views on foreign economic policy.

PERFORMANCE

These hopes were short-lived. During the first session of the Eightieth Congress both the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means conducted extensive hearings on the operation of the Reciprocal Trade Program and the proposed negotiation of a Charter for an International Trade Organization. These hearings were generally recognized by the public and the press as a deliberate effort to sabotage the Geneva Trade Conference in which the United States was assuming leadership in the elimination of restrictive barriers to international trade and commerce.

When this failed, high-tariff protectionists then induced the Republican leadership of the House to kill the reciprocal trade program altogether. Althought the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was scheduled to expire on June 12, 1948, the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tariff and Reciprocal Trade did not begin hearings until May 3. And, Mr. Speaker, it has never been explained why these important hearings had to be behind closed doors with the press and the public barred. The bill reported by the subcommittee and the entire Committee on Ways and Means, in each instance by a strict party vote, would have ended the reciprocal trade agreements program as a major instrument of foreign policy by prescribing preliminary procedures involving interminable delays before the President could negotiate a reciprocal trade agreement. H. R. 6556, as passed by the House, would have made possible the imposition of tariff rates 50 percent higher than the rates of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930, which resulted in the stagnation of our trade and commerce. The bill, in fact, was so bad that Secretary of State Marshall advised that it would be better to enact no legislation at all.

Important amendments were made in the other body, but severe limitations have been imposed by the Republican Congress upon the effectiveness of the reciprocal trade program. The unmistakable threat to American leadership in international economic affairs has been recognized both at home and abroad.

In the field of tariff and reciprocal trade, Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress has very convincingly lived up to the ancient and traditional Republican support of tariffs so high as to keep out all competitive imports. In this respect I think we can agree that the Republican Party has kept faith with its implied hostility to the reciprocal trade program contained in its 1944 platform, even though congressional review of each reciprocal trade agreement is not required by the bill now at the White House.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in these closing moments of the Congress, I desire briefly to express my keen disappointment with the failure of several measures in behalf of our beloved veterans. Together with other Members, I have worked earnestly to secure favorable action on these pending measures. I appreciate that the leadership was and is faced with the necessity of balancing the relative merits of consideration of various vital measures and that is not an easy responsibility. There are serious omissions in the program nevertheless;

the high cost of living, housing, and particularly certain veterans' legislation.

Of special and touching omission is that of the bill giving cars to a group of amputees which would cost, it is estimated, about $15,000,000. At a time when we are spending billions for foreign relief and recovery, it is regrettable, if not tragic, that we cannot spend a mere $15,000,000 or $19,000,000 for those who are so seriously afflicted because of their unselfish service to their country.

The failure to pass the secondary loan bill for veterans is also unfortunate, as is the loss of the so-called veterans' homestead bill. Both these measures would facilitate housing for veterans and would improve the housing situation nationally. As a vigorous advocate and worker for these measures, I deplorc the fact that they could not have been submitted and passed before we recess or adjourn. But there will be future opportunities to pass these measures. Let us continue our efforts.

I understand now that a secondary loan bill will be reported under the housing bill and the GI bill of rights which is in substance similar to the bill presented by the veterans' committee. This will compensate in part, if it is finally enacted in worth-while form, for other omissions, but I am frank to state that it is very difficult to understand why the bill providing for cars for certain classes of the blind and amputees has been sidetracked. This is perhaps the greatest omission in the veterans program because it affects a group which should receive the most solicitous consideration of this House.

Let me congratulate and commend my friend and beloved colleague, the distinguished gentlelady from Massachusetts for her untiring and effective work for the veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the provision of H. R. 6712 which discriminates against our young Regular officers of the armed services who are retired by reason of physical disability and who, under the provisions of this bill, must pay income tax on their retired pay. It is only proper that they should receive the same benefits available to other Government employees and disabled veterans who receive disability compensation which is tax free.

Of course, we know just who the committee had in mind when they place this provision in the tax bill. However, just because a few high ranking officers of our service are now drawing tax-free disability retirement pay is not reason enough to place an additional burden on the young Regular officers who are also retired because of physical disabilities. The solution to this problem is to have the various services review the retirement proceedings of their general officers and determine whether or not they are still entitled to disability retirement. In the event they are not, then they should be restored to duty or placed on retirement by reasons of their length of service.

I do not favor this provision which will hurt our young Regular officers who are deserving of the tax-free retirement benefits the same as our other veterans drawing disability retirement or compensation from the Veterans' Administration.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES

Mr. LANDIS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 6527, an act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or postwar national defense-incurred, enrollments, for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the House bill and agree to the bill as originally passed by the House.

GERALD W. LANDIS,
WALTER E. BREHM,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
WINGATE H. LUCAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
WAYNE MORSE,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
LISTER HILL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate, on the basis of information contained in the House report, receded from its amendment, and accepted the bill as originally passed by the House.

GERALD W. LANDIS,
WALTER E. BREHM,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
WINGATE H. LUCAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 6527.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1322), to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act'.

"SEC. 2. Creation and purposes: For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, of assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as 'agricultural commodities'), and of facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corporation'), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States, within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general direction and control of its Board of Directors.

"SEC. 3. Offices: The Corporation may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

"SEC. 4. General powers: The Corporation—

"(a) Shall have succession in its corporate name.

"(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

"(c) May sue and be sued, but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district courts of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation may intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit by or against the Corporation shall be allowed unless it shall have been brought within four years after the right accrued on which suit is brought. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress) shall be applicable to the Corporation. Any suit by or against the United States as the real party in interest based upon any claim by or against the Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this subsection (c) to the same extent as though such suit were by or against the Corporation.

"(d) May adopt, amend, and repeal by-laws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

"(e) Shall have all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the United States with respect to the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding.

"(f) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

"(g) May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary in

the conduct of its business. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements.

"(h) May contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of plants and facilities for the physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control. Except as provided in section 16, the Corporation shall not have power to acquire or lease any such plant or facility or to acquire or lease real property or any interest therein, except that it may rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business and it may continue to lease (by renewing or extending existing leases or entering into new leases) property leased by it on the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(i) May borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation: *Provided*, That the total of all money borrowed by the Corporation, other than trust deposits and advances received on sales, shall not at any time exceed in the aggregate $4,750,000,000. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

"(j) Shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

"(k) Shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

"(l) May make such loans and advances of its funds as are necessary in the conduct of its business.

"(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

"SEC. 5. Specific powers: In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 841), the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

"(a) Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

"(b) Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

"(c) Procure agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

"(d) Remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

"(e) Increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

"(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

"(g) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

"In the Corporation's purchasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall, to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the fulfillment of the Corporation's purposes and the effective and efficient conduct of its business, utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

"SEC. 6. Existing statutes applicable to the Corporation: The Federal statutes applicable to Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall be applicable to the Corporation. Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall cease to be an agency of the United States as provided in section 7 (a) of the Act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, 713 (a)).

"SEC. 7. Capital Stock: The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $100,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. Such subscription shall be deemed to be fully paid by the transfer of assets to the Corporation pursuant to section 16 of this Act. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the Act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a–4), as amended, at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

"SEC. 8. Funds: The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred or allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

"SEC. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'). The Board shall consist of five members. The Secretary of Agriculture, or his nominee, shall be a member of the Board and the remaining members shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman of the Board shall be selected by the Board. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of five years, except that the terms of the first Board shall be shortened to provide for replacement or reappointment of its members in number as nearly equal as practicable in each year. The power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States. The Corporation may provide, by its bylaws, for the compensation to be paid the directors: *Provided*, That the compensation paid any director shall not exceed in the aggregate $10,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not receive additional compensation for their services on the Board. Employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not comprise, in the aggregate, more than three of the members of the Board.

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to appoint an interim Board consisting of five members, including the Secretary, who shall serve until October 1, 1948.

"SEC. 10. The Executive Staff: Responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the business of the Corporation shall be vested in a staff of executive officers, headed by a chief executive appointed by the Board and responsible to the Board. Members of the executive staff shall devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation. The Board shall define the authority and duties of the members of the executive staff, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as it may determine, require that such of them as it may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds of any officer or employee. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 661).

"SEC. 11. Cooperation With Other Governmental Agencies: The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation, be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

"SEC. 12. Utilization of Associations and Trade Facilities: The Corporation may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis, committees or associations of producers, producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations, and trade facilities.

"SEC. 13. Records; Annual Report: The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the Secretary of Agriculture a complete report as to the business of the Corporation, a copy of which shall be forwarded by the Secretary of Agriculture to the President for transmission to the Congress.

"SEC. 14. Interest of Members of the Congress: The provisions of section 1 of the Act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 22), shall apply to all contracts or agreements of the Corporation, except contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

"SEC. 15. Crimes and Offenses:

"FALSE STATEMENTS; OVERVALUATION OF SECURITIES

"(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself or another, money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, or under any other Act applicable to the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than five years, or both

"EMBEZZLEMENT, AND SO FORTH; FALSE ENTRIES; FRAUDULENT ISSUE OF OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

"(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (iii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefits through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"LARCENY; CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

"(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE

"(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

"GENERAL STATUTES APPLICABLE

"(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts and agreements, employees, and operations: *Provided*, That such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That sections 114 and 115 of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 204, 205) shall not apply to contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

"SEC. 16. Transfer of assets of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation: The assets, funds, property, and records of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, are hereby transferred to the Corporation. The rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, in respect to any contract, agreement, loan, account, or other obligation shall become the rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities, respectively, of the Corporation. The enforceable claims of or against Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall become the claims of or against, and may be enforced by or against, the Corporation: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall limit or extend any period of limitation otherwise applicable to such claims against the Corporation.

"SEC. 17. Dissolution of Delaware corporation: The Secretary of Agriculture, representing the United States as the sole owner of the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, is hereby authorized and directed to institute or cause to be instituted such proceedings as are required for the dissolution of said Corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware. The costs of such dissolution of said Corporation shall be borne by the Corporation.

"SEC. 18. Effective date: This Act shall take effect as of midnight June 30, 1948."

And the House agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
ELMER THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to the bill struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment and that the House agree to the same.

In general, the conference substitute follows the language of the House amendment. The major differences between the conference substitute and the House amendment are indicated below.

The Senate bill provided that Commodity Credit Corporation shall have the immunities of the United States from State statutes of limitations. The House amendment did not contain such a provision. Under the conference substitute a four year statute of limitations will apply to suits brought by or against the Corporation.

Under the House amendment not more than two employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government could serve as directors of the Corporation. The conference substitute increases this number to three.

The conference substitute contains a provision not in the House amendment authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint an interim Board consisting of five members, including the Secretary, who shall serve until October 1, 1948.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill, S. 1322, to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the adjournment of Congress I may have permission to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Wilson analyzing certain prices. I think this will run slightly beyond the limit, but notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD after the session shall have adjourned.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

TRYING TO GET A CUT OUT OF ERP FUNDS

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I want to warn the House and the Economic Cooperation Administration against a scheme to divert funds appropriated for economic recovery abroad into improper channels for personal profit. As a portion of these remarks I include a copy of a letter and so-called service contract originating with a firm known as Federal Trading Co., having its offices at 1406 G Street, suite 306, Washington, D. C. C. G. Caffrey, who signs the contract as a general partner, is registered as a lobbyist for the American Cotton Manufacturers Association. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 5, 1948, page 5354.

Now, Mr. Caffrey wants to convince the ECA to export 100,000 draft animals and livestock as a part of the recovery program, although the participating nations have not asked for them and presumably do not need them. But for $1 per head, or a neat $100,000, Mr. Caffrey and his associates are prepared to bring pressure to bear on the ECA to buy 100,000 livestock for export.

This appears to be one of the bolder attempts to pervert the European recovery program for personal profit. It has been carried on on a very hush-hush basis because the name of the Federal Trading Co. does not even appear on the outside door of Mr. Caffrey's office.

The situation demands that the utmost care be exercised by the ECA and the Appropriations Committee of this

Congress to see that the billions of dollars for foreign aid are not expended unnecessarily just because someone is able to do a good job of convincing for a commission. Specifically, all dealings with regard to the purchase and sale of horses and mules and livestock should be scrutinized with particular care. I intend to keep in touch with the matter for the purpose of determining whether any draft animals and livestock are purchased for ECA export as a result of this kind of convincing.

Copies of this extension and of the letter and contract in question are being furnished to the Director of the Economic Administration, Mr. Hoffman, and to the chairman of each of the Committees on Appropriations, with the urgent recommendation that a full investigation be conducted.

The letter and contract of the Federal Trading Co. are as follows:

FEDERAL TRADING CO.,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1948.

We know that the recent passage of the Marshall plan, now titled Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) has increased your interest in possible livestock and, specifically, draft animal sales to European countries.

There was no provision for the purchase of livestock in the bill, nor was it mentioned in the plan for allocating and spending ECA eppropriations. They might be included if a convincing program, with congressional and Departments of Commerce and Agriculture backing, could be presented to the ECA Director, Mr. Hoffman, and his staff. Quite a lot of ECA money is planned for farm machinery. Machinery is in short supply here in the United States and it is questionable if European farmers, especially those in southern Europe, could use mechanical equipment as advantageously as they could use mules and horses.

Here is our propcsition. We want to push the livestock program for you. We will endeavor to convince the ECA people that livestock should be included. After this is accomplished we will maintain close contact with the agencies doing the buying to insure that you have an opportunity to bid on each and every purchase made under ECA. This will include representation with the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture, the purchasing missions of foreign countries, the foreign embassies and the consulates both in Washington and New York. Our goal will be 100,000 animals during the first 15 months of the program. To make our proposal doubly fair, we put our service to you on an "if you make money—we make money" basis. One dollar a head for each animal you sell under the ECA program.

We have enclosed a contract which sets forth those items. We will confine our representation only to those dealers who sign contracts. If this proposal meets with your approval, sign the attached contract and mail it to our Washington office. Retain the contract in the blue jacket for your file. We will keep you periodically informed of our progress.

SERVICE CONTRACT

1405 G Street NW.

Washington, D. C., Date --------

I, The undersigned, a resident of ---------- does hereby agree to pay to the Federal Trading Co., a limited partnership doing business in the District of Columbia, for good and valuable services rendered, a fee or service charge in the amount of $1 per head on all horses, mules, or cattle which the undersigned is able to purchase and sell to, or through the Economic Cooperation Administration as established pursuant to the act, Foreign Assistance Act of 1948. It is further agreed that the same charge or service fee will also be paid on all business and in the same amount which stems from or has its inception in the European recovery program.

II. The fee, service charge, or consideration as stipulated in paragraph I above is to be made to the Federal Trading Co., for services rendered or to be rendered in connection with the securing of, or having earmarked funds, which have been appropriated, but not allocated for specific projects or programs.

III. It is further agreed and stipulated between the parties to this contract that said contract will continue in full force and effect on the same basis as set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 during the continuation of the European recovery program, unless it is mutually agreed between the parties to modify the terms as herein above set forth.

Witnessed and signed:

HELEN SCHLATTER,
Witness.

April 16, 1948.

FEDERAL TRADING CO.,
By C. G. CAFFREY,
General Partner.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. NIXON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WATCH INDUSTRY THREATENED

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to review, for the information and consideration of my colleagues, the serious situation which confronts the jeweled-watch industry of the United States.

The facts will reveal that this industry is handicapped to the advantage of its foreign competitors.

Here is an American industry, employing American labor, paying American wages, and trying to sell American products to the American people. It wishes no special favors. It asks no stifling of competition; it seeks no monopoly in business; it desires to be accorded only the fair treatment it deserves.

At the outset, I want to make clear to you that the American watch-manufacturing industry has never been accused of being inefficient in its manufacturing operations and techniques. It has repeatedly proved that everything possible has been done to meet the difference in cost of manufacturing watch movements here and abroad, and is not trying to hide behind a tariff wall.

The 1930 Tariff Act provided this industry with a schedule of specific dollar-and-cents duties which fairly well reflected, at that time, the difference in the cost of production of watch movements here and abroad. Even if those rates were still in effect, they would not be adequate today because the cost of production has sharply risen in this country. However, the trade agreement of 1936 with Switzerland reduced the rates of the 1930 Tariff Act by about 34 percent on the average. In many classifications, it even carried them below the rates of the 1922 tariff.

The result was that the American industry's share in the American jeweled-watch market dropped from considerably more than half, where it stood during 1930–36, to considerably less than half during the years 1936–41. This loss in position is a very significant thing and reflected itself during the war years in the fact that the American industry was not then large enough to meet, as quickly as was desired, the demands of our armed services. What had happened was that, during 1936–41, as we began to come out of the depression, the reduced rates of the trade agreement with Switzerland prevented the American industry from expanding, by decreasing the percentage of the market it could obtain.

During the war years, of course, their facilities were devoted to the war effort. After the fall of France, Switzerland was entirely surrounded by the Axis Powers, and we became the sole remaining source of precision timing instruments for the Allies. But the Swiss exports of watches of a nonmilitary character were not cut off, and imports of jeweled watches into the commercial channels of this country soared from slightly over 4,000,000 units in 1941 to a high of over 9,000,000 units in 1946, at a time when we were out of the market.

The industry had already been hurt in the prewar year by the Swiss trade agreement, not only to its own detriment, but also to that of the national defense. A flood of importations poured into this country for American customers and so thoroughly saturated the demand for watches that no backlog of demand, after the war, to rebuild the industry, could be anticipated.

For these reasons the watch industry has, for several years, without success, been trying to obtain relief from the reduced rates of the trade agreement.

Finally, in 1946, the State Department called the representatives of the industry to Washington and suggested a course of action. The State Department proposed that the Swiss be asked to impose an export quota on the direct shipment of watches to this country from January 1, 1946, to March 31, 1947. This export quota for the year 1946 was to be based on the direct exports to the United States by Switzerland during 1945, the biggest year, up to that time, in the history of Swiss watch exports to the United States. The Swiss were also to do what they could to curtail indirect shipments so as to prevent the quota being exceeded by importers obtaining watches by way of third countries. They were also to expedite the delivery of watchmaking machinery which the American industry, principally Waltham, then had on order with Swiss machine builders to replace that which could not be made during the war. Although the obvious ineffectualness of this proposal was protested, the State Department went ahead with it in an exchange of notes under date of April 22, 1946.

The figure agreed to with the Swiss provided no protection for the American companies. The significant thing about all of this maneuvering, however, is that

there was a recognition by the trade-agreements organization that the American industry had a good case. The State Department, after 2 years of delay, felt that something had to be done to dispose of the matter, but were unwilling to take direct, effectual action.

As for Swiss compliance with the agreement of the exchange of notes, suffice it to say that 1946 imports exceeded 1945 by over 300,000 jeweled units, although the Tariff Commission, has, by making certain deductions and the use of Swiss classifications, decided that there was compliance with the spirit, if not the letter of the agreement. No one has been able to even technically justify the refusal by the Swiss to deliver the machinery, which has not been done to this day. Instead of expediting delivery, as agreed, the ink was no sooner dry on the notes which were exchanged than the Swiss created a machinery trust known as Machor, to lease the machinery, on terms wholly unacceptable to the American industry.

In December of 1946, by which time it had become apparent that the export quota established by the Swiss, pursuant to the exchange of notes, had afforded no protection to the American industry, the State Department was asked to consider extending the agreement from March 31, 1947, to the end of the year, but on a more realistic basis as to quota. This they flatly refused to do. The State Department was then asked to consider canceling the trade agreement so as to restore the 1930 tariff rates; this they also refused to do. The State Department, under the reciprocal trade-agreements program, is treating this American industry as a static force in a dynamic economy, and, unless we accomplish a reversal of this kind of treatment, we are going to see this important American industry sustain irreparable damage.

What the American watch-manufacturing industry needs is an equality of opportunity in their own market. They are not seeking an unfair advantage, only a balancing of factors over which they have no control, so that a natural growth can be promoted, which is absolutely essential if this industry is to be adequate to the defense of the Nation in times of war, and a preventive to monopoly control during times of peace.

In considering measures to protect and preserve the American jeweled-watch industry, we are not hurting commodities and industrial products that wartorn countries are using to rebuild their export markets. We are not discriminating against the Marshall plan countries. We are dealing with one nation only—Switzerland.

Our State Department has continually ignored the legitimate complaints of the industry that reduction in tariff duties on watch movements and parts, under the Swiss trade agreements, has resulted in almost complete usurpation of the American market by Swiss competition. The State Department has also proved itself unable or unwilling to get this industry desperately needed machinery replacements from Switzerland and has turned a deaf ear to all pleas for establishment of a quota upon the importation of watch movements from Switzerland.

Congress scientifically established in 1930 Tariff Act rates of duty upon imported watches which enable the American watch industry to expand with the growth in consumer demand for watches. But the State Department has misconstrued congressional purpose until today highly skilled American watch makers are in danger of finding their craftsmanship an unsalable item, and America may well lose a vital factor in national defense.

The American watch industry wants no Government subsidy to compete with Swiss watches in the domestic market. It asks, and rightfully should have, the benefit of adequate tariff protection if it is to continue to maintain its highly skilled ranks of workers.

I submit that the jeweled-watch industry of the United States is of primary national concern because, in this atomic age, its precision-instrument production is a key point in our national security system. I urge you, my colleagues, to exert every individual and collective effort to afford this vital industry the fair treatment it deserves by granting reasonable tariff protection and by calling upon the State Department to cease and desist its discriminatory tactics.

I am again urging the State Department to review and adjust these oppressive discriminatory rates which are threatening to extinguish not only the great watchmaking industry of our Nation—an industry which has loaned invaluable service to our country in wartime. It is of the utmost importance that the faithful workers and the enterprising management of this great industry should receive the consideration of this Government it is entitled to, if it is to survive.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION SERVICE TO AND WITHIN ALASKA

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 219, continuing until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution of March 7, 1947, entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes," is amended to read as follows: "That it is the intention of the Congress to assist in providing essential water transportation service for the Territory of Alaska pending the determination of a long-range policy with respect to such transportation.

"SEC. 2. (a) The United States Maritime Commission is authorized to enter into contracts, charters, and other arrangements deemed by it to be appropriate, with American citizens, deemed by the Commission to be qualified, to supply ocean transportation service with American-flag vessels to, from, and within Alaska. Such contracts, charters, or arrangements may include provisions for making available to such operators Government-owned vessels made available to the Commission for such purposes and vessels under the control or jurisdiction of the Commission for operation on voyages commencing not later than March 1, 1949. Such provisions may include (1) charter hire at a nominal rate; (2) such marine insurance to be provided by the Commission, as the Commission may determine to be necessary or appropriate as to vessels made available by the Commission and other vessels operated in the Alaska service under contracts, charters, or arrangements with the Commission; (3) requirements that the operators shall operate such vessels to secure the most economical transportation adequate for the Alaska service; and (4) such other requirements, terms, and conditions as the Commission may deem appropriate.

"(b) Each such contract, charter, or arrangement shall provide that, as of the end of each accounting period, the cumulative gross profit, before overhead expenses, from the operation of vessels thereunder, as approved by the Commission, shall be allocated as follows and in the following order:

"(1) To provide for the operator's proportionate share of the expenses of all operators of maintaining a survey of Alaska ocean transportation services and of the costs and methods of operation of operators in said services, in accordance with a program approved by the Commission;

"(2) To allow compensation to the operator for working capital, use of facilities other than operator-owned vessels, and overhead expenses, on such bases as the Commission may determine; and such bases may be fixed in terms of a percentage or percentages, deemed by the Commission to be reasonable, of vessel operating revenues;

"(3) To allow the operator a return at the rate of 10 percent per annum, before Federal income taxes, on the fair value of operator-owned vessels used in the Alaska service;

"(4) Any profit remaining thereafter, at the conclusion of each accounting period, shall be held in a special account. At the end of the second and each succeeding accounting period, if any, such account shall be available for paying any then cumulative deficiency (covering the period from the commencement of operations hereunder) with respect to any amounts which, if earned, would have theretofore been allocated pursuant to the previous paragraphs of this subsection;

"(5) At the conclusion of operations under any such contract, charter, or other arrangement, any balance in said special account shall be promptly divided and paid 75 percent to the Commission and 25 percent to the operator.

"(c) The Commission may incorporate in each such contract, charter, or arrangement such definitions and formulas for the determinations of vessel-operating revenue, gross profit before overhead expenses, overhead expenses, accounting periods, fair value, and depreciation, as it may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the other provisions of this subsection and of this joint resolution. The Commission's determination of the value of operator-owned vessels, for the purposes of such contract, charter, or other arrangement, shall be for the purposes of this joint resolution only and shall not be relevant evidence in any regulatory proceeding before the Commission.

"SEC. 3. (a) Every contract, charter, or arrangement made under this joint resolution shall expressly reserve to the Commission, after reasonable notice to the operator and affording him opportunity for hearing if the Commission determines that it is in the public interest so to do, the right to cancel the same upon reasonable notice of such cancellation but not less than 90 days. Such contract, charter, or arrangement shall also reserve to the operator the right to request the Commission to modify or cancel

the same for good cause shown, and if the Commission shall determine that the operator's claim is justified, it may make such modification or shall permit such cancellation at such time thereafter as it may consider reasonable but not more than 90 days after such determination.

"(b) Whenever the President shall proclaim that the security of the national defense makes it advisable, or during any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President, the Commission may terminate any contract, charter, or arrangement hereunder, without cost to the United States, upon such notice to the operator as the President shall determine.

"(c) Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to limit the right of the Commission to enter into other contracts, charters, or arrangements with new or other operators, if after such notice, investigation, or consultation as the Commission may deem necessary or appropriate in the particular case, but without the necessity of hearings, the Commission shall determine such action to be in the interest of the economy of the Territory of Alaska or of the national defense.

"SEC. 4. The word 'vessels' as used in the joint resolution shall include such passenger vessels, freight vessels, combination freight and passenger vessels, tugs, barges, and other watercraft, as shall, in the discretion of the Commission, be deemed suitable for use in ocean transportation to, from, and within Alaska.

"SEC. 5. The provisions of this joint resolution, as amended, shall not, prior to July 1, 1948, affect the operation of contracts, charters, or other arrangements in accordance with their terms in effect on the date of enactment of this amendatory section, unless superseded before July 1, 1948, by contracts, charters, or arrangements entered into under this joint resolution, as amended."

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes a. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes a. m.

PENSACOLA NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3416) to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "and directed to acquire on" and insert "to receive on."

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "by transfer, gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "War Department" and insert "Department of the Army."

Page 1, line 9, after "Department", insert "and transferred in accordance with existing law."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. CRAWFORD submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5904) making provision for the continuation of the Virgin Islands Company until June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

F. L. CRAWFORD,
K. M. LECOMPTE,
JAY LEFEVRE,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HUGH BUTLER,
CARL A. HATCH,
GUY CORDON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5904) making provision for the continuation of the Virgin Islands Company until June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely: The Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substituted the following:

"That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Virgin Islands Company shall continue as an agency of the United States until the close of business June 30, 1949. It is authorized to borrow from the Treasury of the United States, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall loan to it upon the request of its president, such sums as may be required to carry out its operations until such date, not exceeding in the aggregate $500,000. Each loan shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to continue the Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States."

The House recedes.

FRED L. CRAWFORD,
K. M. LECOMPTE,
JAY LEFEVRE,
A. FERNANDEZ,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. REES, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this act shall be cited as the "Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948".

"TITLE I—ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTMASTERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FIELD SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

"SEC. 101. All postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal service whose rates of compensation are prescribed by the Act entitled "An Act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes", approved July 6, 1945, as amended, shall receive additional compensation at the rate of $450 per annum: *Provided*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 25 cents per hour: *Provided further*, That postmasters at post offices of the fourth class shall receive additional compensation at the rate of a sum per annum equal to 25 per centum of their basic annual compensation.

"SEC. 102. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to skilled-trades employees of the mail-equipment shops, job cleaners in first- and second-class post offices, and employees who are paid on a fee or contract basis.

"SEC. 103. (a) Sections 17 (e) and 22 (d) of such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended, are each amended by striking out '6 cents per mile' and inserting in lieu thereof '7 cents per mile.'

"(b) Section 22 (d) of such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended, is further amended by striking out '75 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '90 cents.'

"(c) The Act entitled 'An Act to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 1 cent per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of two years, and for other purposes' (Public Law 467, Eightieth Congress), is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 104. This title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after June 30, 1948.

"TITLE II—POSTAL RATE REVISION

"AIR MAIL

"SEC. 201. The rate of postage on all domestic air mail as defined in Public Law 730, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall, except in the case of postal cards and private mailing or post cards, be 6 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof. The rate of postage on postal cards and private mailing or post cards (conforming to the conditions prescribed by the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the postal laws relating to use of postal cards', approved May 19, 1898 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 39, sec. 281)), when sent by air mail, shall be 4 cents each.

"THIRD-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 202. The rate of postage on third-class matter shall be 2 cents for the first two ounces or fraction thereof, and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof up to and including eight ounces in weight, except that the rate of postage on books and catalogs of twenty-four pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants not exceeding eight ounces in weight shall be 1½ cents for each two ounces or fraction thereof: *Provided*, That upon payment of a fee of $10 for each calendar year or portion thereof and under such regulations as the Postmaster General may establish for the collection of the lawful revenue and for facilitating the handling of such matter in the mails, it shall be lawful to accept for transmission in the mails, separately addressed identical pieces of third-class matter in quantities of not less than twenty pounds, or of not less than two hundred pieces, subject to pound rates of postage applicable to the entire bulk mailed at one time: *Provided further*, That the rate of postage on third-class matter mailed in bulk under the foregoing provision shall be 14 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1 cent, except that in the case of books and catalogs of twenty-four pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants the rate shall be 10 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1 cent: *And provided further*, That pieces or packages of such size or form as to prevent ready facing and tying in bundles and requiring individual distributing troughout shall be subject to a minimum charge of 3 cents each.

"CONTROLLED CIRCULATION PUBLICATIONS

"SEC. 203. Publications containing twenty-four pages or more issued at regular intervals of four or more times a year, 25 per centum or more of whose pages are devoted to text or reading matter and not more than 75 per centum to advertising matter, which are circulated free or mainly free, may, upon authorization by the Postmaster General and under such regulations as he may prescribe, be accepted for mailing at the postage rate of 10 cents a pound or fraction thereof, computed on the entire bulk mailed at one time, but not less than 1 cent per piece, provided the copies of such publications are presented for mailing made up according to States, cities, and routes as directed by the Postmaster General: *Provided*, That publications owned and controlled by one or several individuals or business concerns and conducted as an auxiliary to and essential for the advancement of the main business or calling of those who own or control them shall not be accepted under this section.

"FOURTH-CLASS (PARCEL POST) MAIL

"SEC. 204. (a) On fourth-class matter (limit of weight over eight ounces to seventy pounds) the rate of postage except as herein provided for catalogs (limit of weight over eight ounces up to and including ten pounds), books, and library books, shall be by the pound as hereinafter provided, the postage in all cases to be prepaid by stamps affixed thereto or as otherwise prescribed by the Postmaster General.

"(b) The rate of postage on matter of the fourth class shall be as follows:

"(1) On all matter mailed at the post office from which a rural route starts, for delivery on such route, or mailed at any point on such route for delivery at any other point thereon, or at the office from which the route starts, or on any rural route starting therefrom, and on all matter mailed at a city-carrier office, or at any point within its delivery limits, for delivery by carriers from that office, or at any office for local delivery, the postage shall be 10 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and ¼ cent for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(2) For delivery within the first and second zones, except as provided for in paragraph (1), and except when the distance by shortest regular mail route from the office of origin to the office of delivery is three hundred miles or more in which case the rates of postage shall be the same as for delivery within the third zone, 12 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 2½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 2 cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(3) For delivery within the third zone, 13 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 2½ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(4) For delivery within the fourth zone, 14 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 4½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 4¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(5) For delivery within the fifth zone, 15 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 6 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 5½ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(6) For delivery within the sixth zone, 16 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 7½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 7¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(7) For delivery within the seventh zone, 17 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 9½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 9¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(8) For delivery within the eighth zone, 18 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 11½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 11¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(9) On parcels measuring more than 84 inches but not more than one hundred inches in length and girth combined the minimum postage charge shall be the zone charge applicable to a ten-pound parcel.

"(c) Catalogs and similar printed advertising matter in bound form weighing more than eight ounces but not exceeding ten pounds shall be subject to postage rates based on the eight parcel-post zones as follows:

"(1) When mailed at the post office from which a rural route starts, for delivery on such route, or mailed at any point on such route for delivery at any other point thereon, or at the office from which the route starts, or on any rural route starting therefrom, and when mailed at a city-carrier office, or at any point within its delivery limits, for delivery by carriers from that office, or at any office for local delivery, the postage shall be 7½ cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound.

"(2) For delivery within the first and second zones, except as provided for in paragraph (1), and except when the distance by shortest regular mail route from the office of origin to the office of delivery is three hundred miles or more in which case the rates of postage shall be the same as for delivery within the third zone, 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(3) For delivery within the third zone, 9 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 2 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(4) For delivery within the fourth zone, 10 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 2½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(5) For delivery within the fifth zone, 12 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(6) For delivery within the sixth zone, 13 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(7) For delivery within the seventh zone, 14 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(8) For delivery within the eighth zone, 15 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 6 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(d) Books, permanently bound for preservation consisting wholly of reading matter or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for student's notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books and when in parcels not exceeding seventy pounds in weight, may be sent at the postage rate of 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(e) Books, consisting wholly of reading matter and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books, when sent by public libraries, organizations, or associations not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, as a service to county or other unit libraries or as a loan to readers or when returned by the latter libraries or readers to such public libraries, organizations, or associations shall be charged with postage at the rate of 4 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof, except that the rates now or hereafter prescribed for third- or fourth-class matter shall apply in every case where such rate is lower than the rate prescribed in this subsection for books under this classification: *Provided*, that this rate shall apply only to such books as are addressed for local delivery, for delivery in the first, second, or third zone, or within the State in which mailed. Public libraries, organizations, or associations before being entitled to the foregoing rates shall furnish to the Postmaster General, under such regulations as he may prescribe, satisfactory evidence that none of their net income inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual.

"(f) To procure the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable of mail matter of the fourth class, special-handling stamps shall be affixed thereto, in addition to the regular postage, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than two pounds, 15 cents; matter weighing more than two but not more than ten pounds, 20 cents; matter weighing more than ten pounds, 25 cents: *Provided*, That, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, ordinary stamps of equivalent value may be accepted in lieu of the special-handling stamps herein specified.

"SPECIAL DELIVERY

"SEC. 205. To procure the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable and the immediate delivery of mail matter at the office of address, special-delivery stamps

shall be affixed thereto, in addition to the regular postage, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than two pounds, if of the first class, 15 cents; if of any other class, 25 cents. Matter weighing more than two but not more than ten pounds, if of the first class, 25 cents; if of any other class, 35 cents. Matter weighing more than ten pounds, if of the first class, 35 cents; if of any other class, 45 cents: *Provided*, That, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, ordinary postage stamps of equivalent value may be accepted in lieu of the special-delivery stamps.

"MONEY ORDERS

"SEC. 206. A money order shall not be issued for more than $100, and the fees for domestic money orders shall be as follows: For orders less than $5 and 1 cent, 10 cents; for orders from $5 and 1 cent up to and including $10, 15 cents; for orders from $10 and 1 cent up to and including $50, 25 cents; for orders from $50 and 1 cent up to and including $100, 35 cents.

"POSTAL NOTES

"SEC. 207. (a) The Postmaster General may authorize postmasters at such offices as he shall designate, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, to issue and pay money orders not exceeding $10, to be known as postal notes. The fee for issuance thereof shall be 8 cents each.

"(b) Postal notes shall be valid for two calendar months from the last day of the month of their issue, but thereafter may be paid by the Postmaster General, or refund may be made in case of loss, upon evidence satisfactory to him, under such regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That no claim for the amount of a postal note will be considered unless filed within one year from the last day of the month of issue. Postal notes shall not be negotiable or transferable through endorsement.

"REGISTERED MAIL

"SEC. 208. (a) Mail matter shall be registered on the application of the party posting the same. The registry fees, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this subsection, shall be as follows: For registry indemnity not exceeding $5, 25 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $25, 35 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50, 40 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $75, 45 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $75 but not exceeding $100, 50 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200, 60 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $300, 70 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $300 but not exceeding $400, 85 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $400 but not exceeding $500, $1; for registry indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $500, $1.10; for registry indemnity exceeding $600 but not exceeding $700, $1.20; for registry indemnity exceeding $700 but not exceeding $800, $1.30; for registry indemnity exceeding $800 but not exceeding $900, $1.40; for registry indemnity exceeding $900 but not exceeding $1,000, $1.50.

"(b) For registered mail having a declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid, there shall be charged additional fees (known as "surcharges") as follows: When the declared value exceeds the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid by not more than $50, 2 cents; by more than $50 but not more than $100, 3 cents; by more than $100 but not more than $200, 4 cents; by more than $200 but not more than $400, 6 cents; by more than $400 but not more than $600, 7 cents; by more than $600 but not more than $800, 8 cents; by more than $800 but less than $1,000, 10 cents. If the excess of the declared value over the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid is $1,000 or more, the additional fees for each $1,000 or part of $1,000 on articles destined to points within the several zones applicable to fourth-class matter shall be as follows: For local delivery or for delivery within the first zone, 11 cents; for delivery within the second zone, 12 cents; for delivery within the third zone, 14 cents; for delivery within the fourth zone, 15 cents; for delivery within the fifth or sixth zone, 16 cents; for delivery within the seventh or eighth zone, 18 cents.

"(c) For insured mail treated as registered mail having a declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid, there shall be charged additional fees (known as 'surcharges') as follows: When the declared value exceeds the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid by not more than $50, 1 cent; by more than $50 but not more than $100, 2 cents; by more than $100 but not more than $200, 3 cents; by more than $200 but not more than $400, 4 cents; by more than $400 but not more than $600, 5 cents; by more than $600 but not more than $800, 6 cents; by more than $800 but less than $1,000, 7 cents. If the excess of the declared value over the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid is $1,000 or more, the additional fee for each $1,000 or part of $1,000 on articles destined to points within the several zones applicable to fourth-class matter shall be as follows: For local delivery or for delivery within the first zone, 8 cents; for delivery within the second zone, 9 cents; for delivery within the third zone, 10 cents; for delivery within the fourth zone, 11 cents; for delivery within the fifth or sixth zone, 12 cents; for delivery within the seventh or eighth zone, 13 cents.

"(d) All such fees shall be accounted for in such manner as the Postmaster General shall direct. Mail matter for the official business of the Post Office Department which requires registering shall be registered free of charge, and pass through the mails free of charge.

"RETURN RECEIPTS FOR REGISTERED MAIL

"SEC. 209. Whenever the sender of any registered mail shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 5 cents at the time of mailing or of 10 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such registered mail, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 25 cents at the time of mailing of any such registered mail, a receipt shall be obtained for such registered mail, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for return receipts for registered mail where the failure to furnish the sender a return receipt or the equivalent is not due to the fault of the postal service.

"FEES FOR INSURED MAIL

"SEC. 210. The fees for insurance, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this section, shall be as follows: 5 cents for indemnification not exceeding $5; 10 cents for indemnification exceeding $5 but not exceeding $10; 15 cents for indemnification exceeding $10 but not exceeding $25; 20 cents for indemnification exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 25 cents for indemnification exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 30 cents for indemnification exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200. Whenever the sender of an insured article of mail shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 5 cents at the time of mailing or of 10 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 26 cents at the time of mailing of any such insured article of mail, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for return receipts for insured mail where the failure to furnish the sender a return receipt or the equivalent is not due to the fault of the postal service.

"FEES FOR COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

"SEC. 211. The fees for collect-on-delivery service for sealed domestic mail matter of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate and for domestic third- or fourth-class mail matter shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be as follows: 20 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $2.50; 25 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $2.50 but not exceeding $5; 35 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $25; 45 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 55 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 60 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $150; and 65 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $150 but not exceeding $200. The fee for notifying the sender or his representative of inability to deliver a collect-on-delivery article shall be 5 cents.

"RESTRICTION IN DELIVERY

"SEC. 212. The Postmaster General, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to collect an additional fee of 20 cents for effecting the delivery by carrier or otherwise of domestic registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail, the delivery of which is restricted to the addressee only, or to the addressee or order: *Provided*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for this service unless request for refund is made and erroneous delivery of the article or articles was made by the postal service or nondelivery of the article or articles was due to some fault of the postal service.

"REGISTERED COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

"SEC. 213. (a) The fee for collect-on-delivery service for registered sealed domestic mail of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be 55 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $10; 70 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $10 but not exceeding $50; 90 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; and $1.15 for collections and indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200. The maximum amount of charges collectible on any registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery article shall be $200.

"(b) When indemnity in excess of $200 is desired, the fee for such registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery mail shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be $1.20 for indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $300; $1.25 for indemnity exceeding $300 but not exceeding $400; $1.30 for indemnity exceeding $400 but not exceeding $500; $1.35 for indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $600; $1.40 for indemnity exceeding $600 but not exceeding $700; $1.45 for indemnity exceeding $700 but not exceeding $800; and $1.55 for indemnity exceeding $800 but not exceeding $1,000.

"SEC. 214. This title shall take effect on January 1, 1949.

"TITLE III—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY INCREASES

"SEC. 301. Except as provided in section 303, each officer and employee of the Federal Government, and each officer and employee of the District of Columbia municipal government, whose rate of compensation is increased by section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall receive additional compensation at the rate of $330 per annum: *Provided*, That any employee paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour.

"SEC. 302. The additional compensation provided by this Act in the case of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, shall not be construed to be an 'equivalent increase' in compensation within the meaning of section 7 (b) (1) of such Act, as amended.

"SEC. 303. (a) Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, is amended by striking out '$10,000' where it first appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,330'.

"(b) Section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 is amended by striking out '$10,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,330'.

"(c) No officer or employee shall, by reason of any provision of this title be paid with respect to any pay period, basic compensation, or basic compensation plus any additional compensation provided by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, at a rate in excess of $10,330 per annum.

"SEC. 304. The provisions of this Act granting an increase in compensation to employees of the United States and of the District of Columbia shall not apply to any employee in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia prior to the time that legislation providing adequate revenues to meet the obligation in the District of Columbia is enacted by the Congress and becomes effective.

"SEC. 305. This title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after June 30, 1948."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended title proposed by the Senate amendment, amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for permanent postal rates and to provide pay increases for Government employees."

EDWARD H. REES,
WM. H. STEVENSON,
C. W. VURSELL,
TOM MURRAY,
JOHN LYLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIAM LANGER,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted a substitute which provided for increases in pay of postal employees, and for revision of the classification schedules of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and for increased pay for Federal employees other than postal employees. The Senate amendment did not provide for postal rate revision. The substitute agreed to in conference follows closely the House bill except as explained below.

With respect to additional compensation for postal employees, title I of the conference substitute is the same as the House bill except that by inclusion of provisions from the Senate amendment the additional 1 cent per mile equipment allowance for rural carriers provided by Public Law 467, Eightieth Congress has been made permanent, and the equipment allowance for special delivery messengers has been increased from 75 cents per hour to 90 cents per hour. The increases provided in the Senate amendment were eight cents and one dollar, respectively. The increases provided by this title are made effective beginning with the first pay period following June 30, 1948.

The provisions of the Senate amendment relating to the revision of the compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1923 have not been included in the conference substitute but there are included provisions substantially similar to H. R. 6917 as reported to the House. There are, however, the following differences from H. R. 6917: It is provided that each officer and employee whose rate of compensation is increased by section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall receive additional compensation at the rate of $330 per annum. This title of the conference substitute also raises the present ceiling on salaries from $10,000 per annum to $10,330 per annum. It is provided that the increases in compensation shall take effect beginning with the first pay period following June 30, 1948. The provision of H. R. 6917 which provided that these increases should continue only until July 1, 1949, is not included in the conference substitute.

The conference substitute contains the provisions of title II of the House bill, relating to postal rate revision, without change except that the changes in postal rates provided for are to be effective beginning January 1, 1949.

The conference substitute includes a provision, taken from the Senate amendment, providing that the pay increase provided for shall not apply to any employee in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia prior to the time that legislation providing adequate revenues to meet the obligation in the District of Columbia is enacted by the Congress and becomes effective.

The committee of conference recommends a modification of the title of the bill to conform to the provisions of the bill as agreed to in conference.

EDWARD H. REES,
WM. H. STEVENSON,
C. W. VURSELL,
TOM MURRAY,
JOHN LYLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill, H. R. 6916, and ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE FEDERAL PAY RAISE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have recognized the need for a wage increase for Federal employees and who have fought for such legislation were greatly heartened by the action taken by the Congress today.

It is unthinkable that we should forget our Federal employees at a time when there have been so many increases in the cost of living. Many of this group, often referred to as the white collar workers, entered the Federal service when the Government appealed for workers in connection with various Government bureaus and departments having to do with our war effort. These people responded to the call and many of them sacrificed their jobs in private industry, which are lost to them now, in order to aid their country in time of war. Now it is our duty to aid them in time of peace.

Every problem which faces the postal worker, for whom both the House and Senate have passed salary increases, also faces all other Federal employees. It would have been a gross discrimination to provide a pay raise for one group and to completely ignore the needs of the other.

We have generally recognized the great importance of maintaining not only high employment but also high consumption in order to stimulate the recovery of production and distribution of consumer goods of all kinds. For this reason too we must take care to see that the substantial number of workers who are employed by the Federal Government are able to maintain their share of the high consumption necessary if we are to enjoy business prosperity and a high standard of living.

I know that the postal employees are entitled to the $450 raise they have received. I am glad other Federal employees have at least gotten the $330 annual raise provided for in the conference report. Both amounts should have been larger to bring their income up to 1948 living costs. However, the increases provided will help greatly.

RESIGNATION FROM CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE BILL

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to resign as a conferee on the bill, H. R. 2648, an act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities, to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act re-enacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman's resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE ON AGRICULTURE BILL

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] to serve in place of the gentleman

from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] on the bill, H. R. 2648, an act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities, to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and for other purposes.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

JUNE 19, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully,

EARL WILSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 699):

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That EARL WILSON, of Indiana, be and he is hereby elected a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE HONORABLE JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I have to announce that my colleague and friend JOHN FLANNAGAN, of the Ninth District of Virginia, has announced that he will retire from the Congress at the close of this session.

As this is the last occasion upon which the House will meet this session I think it only proper that I should announce this fact to the House. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] has served here for 18 years with distinction and honor and has endeared himself not only to the Virginia delegation but to the Members generally of this Congress and previous Congresses. For many years he has served upon the Committee on Agriculture, and during the Seventy-ninth Congress he was the chairman of that committee. He has rendered great service to the farming industry of this country.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN is the author of much legislation. He has a record here of liberal, forward-looking progressiveness; and I know this House and the Nation will regret his leaving this body when this session ends.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Virginia, JOHN FLANNAGAN, enjoys the respect, the confidence, and the friendship of everyone who has served with him; a man whose nobility of character is an inspiration to all of us. I consider him without exception the most courageous man that I have ever served with in any legislative body. Coming from the district he does, with that forward outlook of his, it took indomitable courage for him to vote the way he did on many occasions; and I consider him as I have termed him in the past to many friends of mine, and I am proud to publicly state it now, as the most courageous man I have ever served with in public life.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, no one in the House of Representatives could regret the retirement of the gentleman from Virginia, JOHN FLANNAGAN, more than I do. He has been my intimate personal friend and supporter for many years. He is a man of courage, he is a man of vision. He may be classed as a real, sensible liberal.

I trust that for him and his their path in the years that are allotted to them, may lie through green fields and by still waters.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman that I have had the pleasure and the honor of serving with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] ever since I have been a Member of Congress. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, no man could be any more fair. His word is just as good as his bond. The gentleman from Virginia, JOHN FLANNAGAN, is one of the great friends any man ever had.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I desire to take this opportunity to express my deep regret that this House is to lose the very valuable services of JOHN FLANNAGAN. We have lost too many good men from the Virginia delegation within the last 2 or 3 years. In fact, we have suffered the largest number of changes in a like period of time within my memory. None of those who have departed will be missed more than Mr. FLANNAGAN.

As former chairman of the important Commitee on Agriculture, he has rendered an outstanding service to the farmers of the Nation. Agriculture was a potent factor in winning the recent world war and JOHN FLANNAGAN, by the part he played in helping to frame the agricultural war program, made a substantial contribution to the cause of victory. In war and in peace his services have been outstanding and he leaves behind him an enviable record.

During my association with him in the House I have come to admire JOHN FLANNAGAN greatly. I have recognized his many high qualities and have enjoyed his keen sense of humor and his genial personality. Mr. Speaker, I entertain for JOHN FLANNAGAN a genuine affection, and it is with deep personal regret that I bid him farewell and wish him Godspeed in his future undertakings.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Although the gentleman from Virginia, JOHN FLANNAGAN was elected by the people of the Ninth District of Virginia he has represented not only the citizens of the great Commonwealth of Virginia but he has been truly a representative of the people of the United States. The farm people in particular throughout this Nation are going to miss him from the Congress. I have enjoyed my service with him not only as a colleague in the House of Representatives but as a friend. I really feel that my life has been greatly enriched by this brief association with him.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. It has been my high privilege to serve with the gentleman from Virginia, JOHN FLANNAGAN, for 10 years as a Member of the House Committee on Agriculture. Certainly there is no man who has a better understanding of our agricultural problems and is more devoted to the welfare of those who till the soil than JOHN FLANNAGAN. We all regret seeing him go and wish him many happy years of comfort and contentment at home.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. I think that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] is one of the outstanding Members of this House. I have consulted him on many occasions in regard to legislation and with reference to other matters. Although I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I found him one of the most liberal members of the Democratic Party. Now, that to my mind means something when you consider the fact that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] is not, like myself, one of those Democrats from north of the Mason-Dixon line. But he has a broad concept. He has demonstrated time after time his courage insofar as legislation is concerned. I sincerely say that I regret he has made the decision that he will not again become a Member of the House.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Virginia and the other Members who have paid tribute

and spoken with reference to the outstanding service JOHN FLANNAGAN has rendered his district, State, and Nation and in expressing deep regret on account of his leaving the Congress. He could continue to come to Congress from his district as long as he would choose to, and his decision to not seek reelection is a distinct loss to this body.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Virginia. It is true that I have only been here a short while, but the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] has been ever helpful to me and he has been a true friend of mine. It is with deep sorrow that I see him leave this House. The farmers of Virginia and all over the country will suffer a great loss. It is with heartfelt sorrow that we realize he is leaving.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to pay my tribute to JOHN FLANNAGAN. JOHN FLANNAGAN and I have served on the Committee on Agriculture for 18 years. During a part of that time he was chairman; during part of the time I have been chairman. During all of that time our relationships have been the most pleasant that could possibly exist between two members of a committee. JOHN FLANNAGAN is broadminded; he is cooperative. He is unselfish. His character is unassailable. He is a man of great ability. During all of the period that he has served on the committee either as a member or as chairman I have never known him to let the slightest tinge of partisanship govern his action on the committee. He is a sincere friend of American agriculture and of the men and women who live and toil on the farms of this country. His loss to agriculture will be a severe one. He will leave behind him as a memorial to his work on the committee many outstanding pieces of legislation which will be of benefit to the agricultural interests of this country for many years to come. I can only say that I wish for JOHN FLANNAGAN the very best that a man can possibly have in the years to come.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, that I am not too sorry to see a Democrat leave the committee or the House. Nevertheless, if we have to have them there, I would like to see more of JOHN FLANNAGAN'S kind. JOHN FLANNAGAN is one of those fellows that has been loyal to his party and loyal to the South. To say that there is no partisanship in the Committee on Agriculture is not altogether the case. But, whenever that bobs up, he is loyal to where he belongs, and I want to say that the closer you get to JOHN FLANNAGAN, the better you like him. He is just a grand man, and I hope that in the years to come he will live to enjoy the friends that he has so well served and the fruits of his labor.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture in paying our respects to two fine gentlemen, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON]. I have learned to love them. They have done very fine work on the Committee on Agriculture. In saying farewell to two fine gentlemen I recall Robert Burns' farewell to Bonnie Prince Charles, who was leaving for the Indias, when he said:

Bonnie Charlie noo awa'
Sailing o'er the bounding main.
Many a stormy wind shall blow
Should he ne'er come back again

Will ye no come back again
Will ye no come back again
Better loved ye canna be
Will ye no come back again.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress loses one of its ablest and most lovable Members in the retirement of JOHN FLANNAGAN. A real liberal, JOHN FLANNAGAN has always worked for the little man. His contribution to the farm program of the Nation will give him a place in history as the foremost farm leader. The gentleman from Virginia leaves a place that will be difficult to fill. He is a real friend and a real man.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, in the retirement of JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., of Virginia, I feel the Nation is losing an outstanding public servant. As a long-time member of the Committee on Agriculture his wisdom, his diligent and untiring efforts for the cause of agriculture has redounded to the benefit of every agricultural home in America. We who represent agricultural districts feel that there has been no member of this body throughout many years who has contributed more to the cause of agriculture than JOHN FLANNAGAN. Although his efforts have been most helpful to us of the tobacco sections, his work has by no means been confined to one particular group of agriculture.

JOHN FLANNAGAN is a true and typical Virginia gentleman and in his retirement we wish him peace, contentment, and prosperity as a just reward for a long life of outstanding public service.

EVERETT DIRKSEN

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 15 years EVERETT DIRKSEN has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He is one of the ablest speakers I have ever known. He has been diligent in his work. He has carried more than his share of the load. I think that in debate here on the floor he has been as forceful and as effective as any man who has ever stood in the well of this House. He is retiring because of his health. The thing that pleases me most about that situation is that since he announced his retirement his health has begun to mend, and it now looks as though he is on the road to a permanent recovery.

EVERETT DIRKSEN, I have no hesitation in saying, is the peer of any man who has stood in this well. He will be remembered long after he retires, not only as a great orator but a fine, honest, sincere fellow. If he had a fault, it was that he worked so many hours of the day that it seems to have impaired his health. I wish him the best of luck in the days that are to come. I regret that he is leaving us, but I am glad that his health is such that at the present time he can look forward to years and years of great usefulness to the public of this great country.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I, too, would like to add my word with respect to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is going to leave this House of Representatives after 15 years of service. I know of no other man who has been such an able, conscientious legislator, a man who seemed to be filled with energy from early morning until late at night. He finally worked himself into a situation where his health began to fail. Like my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I rejoice that his health is now improving. We hope that in the near future he will again be his old self and will some day be back among us, where he has in public life served so faithfully and well.

At the same time, if the gentleman will permit, I want to pay tribute to three other Members from the State of Illinois who are voluntarily leaving this body. This is their last Congress. I refer to WILLIAM STRATTON, ROY CLIPPINGER, and ANTON JOHNSON. Each and every one in his own right is an able and conscientious legislator. I know the State of Illinois is losing valued and true servants when these men leave. To each and every one, we wish the best of health and prosperity. I am happy that I have had the privilege to associate with each and every one of these outstanding gentlemen.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I do not wish to minimize the great tributes, and deserved, which have been paid to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, with whom I have served and been closely associated since the Seventy-third Congress.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are other Members of the Congress who deserve the same consideration at the hands of the Congress. There is one, JOE HENDRICKS, of Florida, who comes from the other side of the aisle, a man of very considerable ability, who has faithfully and well served his constituency and the country, who

is leaving us. He served on my committee. I want to pay him my respects and compliment him on the outstanding service he has rendered. I am sorry JOE is not going to be on my committee next year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I, too, would like to join in the commendation that has been spoken for the services of EVERETT DIRKSEN. Every Member of the House of Representatives has had an opportunity to see EVERETT work on the floor. Members of the Committee on Appropriations have had an opportunity to see him work in committee. For a number of years I was on the same Subcommittee on Independent Offices where I saw how he worked in the daily grind of appropriation hearings. There, as well as on the floor, the evidence of real ability was apparent every day. He was a hard worker. He was a brilliant worker. He had an unusual ability to marshal facts and then combine them with a logic that was irresistible on the floor of the House. We will miss him here. We wish him well wherever he goes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member I have found in EVERETT DIRKSEN a friend, a man of calm and lofty mind, with a silver tongue, a man with a large, generous heart. I gladly pay this tribute to him, and I hope that he will be back with us, or perhaps his people will see fit to send him to the other body.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I had the pleasure of serving with EVERETT DIRKSEN on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices. I found him a man of diligence and intelligence. Although the time is short, I want to take this moment to pay my respects to EVERETT DIRKSEN. It was a pleasure to have served with him. I wish him well in the future.

Mr. TABER. I wish that he were going to serve longer.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in commendation of EVERETT DIRKSEN. As a new Member of this body, I feel that my life has been very much enriched by my association with him. He is a man of high character, great charm, exceptional ability, and outstanding eloquence. We have lost a brilliant and high-minded colleague who has made significant and vital contributions to the work of this body. We shall miss his wise counsels.

EVERETT DIRKSEN has left a great record in the Congress. It is a monument to distinguished service. It is a noble example of high statesmanship. It must be an inspiration to American youth.

In a prostrate and floundering world we can ill afford to lose the help, the leadership, which EVERETT DIRKSEN gave so modestly, so generously, and so effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I wish him well. I know that he will find useful service for his talents in the years to come. I trust that our Government will not long be deprived of his participation. I count it a privilege to claim him as my friend.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. As one who had the pleasure of serving on the subcommittee with EVERETT DIRKSEN, I think it is significant that we are paying this tribute to one who served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture Appropriations at 3 o'clock in the morning while we are waiting for a farm policy bill to return from the Senate. He loved American farming and agriculture. He wants it to be sound and progressive. His loss to this Congress is something of tremendous moment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to join in all the good things that have been said about EVERETT DIRKSEN. EVERETT has the respect of the entire House membership and in my opinion is probably the most outstanding man in ability who has served here during the 10 years I personally have been a Member. He will go far and our good wishes go with him.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, you will observe that the members of the subcommittee are unanimous in their respect and admiration for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I have already expressed to him my personal regret. I repeat it now. He is a good chairman, a good friend. To know him is to admire and respect him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without paying tribute to EVERETT DIRKSEN, whom I consider a truly great American and one of our most capable legislators. EVERETT DIRKSEN has made a great contribution to the Congress and he has always been an inspiration to us other Members. Hard-working, thorough, intelligent, and courteous at all times, EVERETT will always be remembered and admired as a top-notch statesman. I am sorry he is retiring. I hope his health will be restored soon and that he may resume public service.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my very special privilege to have served with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Measured by any standards, EVERETT DIRKSEN stands out among men and among Members of this House. His quiet courtesy, his amazing knowledge of the intricate details of a thousand and one things, his sure judgment in management and executive functions, by themselves, would have marked him for distinction.

However, he combines with these qualities a swift, creative imagination, a magnetic personality which impressed itself on his colleagues without apparent effort, and a genuine liking for his fellow men which is unmistakable in its sincerity.

EVERETT DIRKSEN is a natural leader, free of bravado or bluster, but compelling by his obvious competence. It has been a privilege and a pleasure to have served with him and to have known him. His decision to retire from public life, while necessary, is a serious loss to this House and to the Nation.

A TRIBUTE TO EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, in my estimation, EVERETT DIRKSEN has no superior in all-around ability in the House of Representatives. Like all men, I have selected a few persons whom I consider tops in their respective spheres. Ev DIRKSEN is on my list. The story of his life reads like one of the books I read as a boy when I was at the hero-worshipping stage. If ever there was a self-made man, he is one. Completing his education while a Member of Congress, he has developed into one of its best-informed Members, and his vocabulary should make many of us timid in attempting to elaborate upon the nice things which have been said about him. With that in mind, I can only say that the people of the United States are losing a great Congressman.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, EVERETT DIRKSEN, is one of the outstanding American statesmen of our day and I deeply regret his decision to leave the House. His loss to this body where he has served with such conspicuous distinction for many years, and to the Nation to which he gave so unselfishly and selflessly of himself, is indeed incalculable.

Of great gifts of personality, mentality, and eloquence, this fine noble son of Illinois, is a dear and loyal friend, a devoted and effective legislator and a diligent and tireless worker for all causes which command his attention. Always warm and humane, moved by evangelical zeal for the truth and principle as he sees them, the gentleman from Illinois, EVERETT DIRKSEN, is a giant figure in our House.

It has always been surprising to me that his party never recognized his marked availability for national office. As a member of the minority party in this House, I would view with genuine apprehension, for example, a national Republican ticket comprised of our beloved distinguished Speaker, the warm friend of every member of this party, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the esteemed, scholarly and talented statesman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. It has for some time seemed to me that a national ticket led by the "blacksmith's son" from Massachusetts and the "baker boy" from Illinois might well give us Democrats something to think about.

In any event, I am happy to pay my sincere tribute of respect, admiration, and affection to the gentleman from Illinois, EVERETT DIRKSEN, and to extend to him my very best wishes for future health, success, and happiness. It is my earnest hope that he may continue his

activities in some sphere of the public service because it would be nothing short of tragic for his great and striking talents and his noble heart to be denied to the American Nation and people which he so profoundly loves and has served so faithfully and well.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the right to extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great loss to the House to have the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, retire at the end of this session. He has served his country and his constituents faithfully and well for a goodly number of years, and he has made among the Members of both Houses of Congress a vast number of friends on account of his pleasing personality and charm.

He is an efficient legislator and has contributed immeasurably to the best interests of our country. Perhaps he will be remembered most for the excellent work which he has done for the District of Columbia. With unselfish zeal and singleness of heart he devoted a great part of his time to the problems of the Capital City and under his leadership as chairman of the District Committee much sound legislation has been enacted into law. He was a firm believer in home rule for the people of the District of Columbia and for many years advocated their enfranchisement.

No one can speak of EVERETT DIRKSEN without remarking on his eloquence in debate, and I venture to say that there are few people who have even been Members of the House of Representatives with a greater gift of oratory. When he spoke he commanded the attention and respect of all who listened, and it was notable that Members gathered when they knew that he was to address the House.

I personally will miss him more than I can say, because it has been my privilege to work closely with him in the past few years, so I have had an opportunity to measure the full stature of the man. I wish him every success in the days to come, and I hope that his path in the future will lead him back to the Halls of Congress. He is a fine citizen and a great American.

TO AMEND SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2790) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is entitled to 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. My inquiry is whether or not S. 2790, under suspension of the rules, is the same as S. 2790 reported out of committee.

The SPEAKER. The motion is to suspend the rules and pass the bill with an amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that. None of us knows what the amendment contains.

The SPEAKER. The bill has not been read yet.

The Clerk will report the bill and the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was going to suggest that, or that the gentleman from Michigan state what it contains.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appreciates that. The gentleman is well within his rights.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"CREATION AND POWERS OF THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"SEC. 301. (a) The Administrator is further authorized and empowered to provide for the establishment of a Federal National Mortgage Association (hereinafter referred to as the 'Association') which shall be authorized, subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Association—

"(1) to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, which are insured after April 30, 1948, under section 203 or section 603 of this act, or guaranteed under sections 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended: *Provided, however,* That—

"(A) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by, or if it covers property held by, Federal, State, or municipal instrumentalities;

"(B) no mortgage may be purchased for an amount exceeding the unpaid principal balance thereof, plus accrued interest, at the time of purchase;

"(C) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase if the original principal obligation of the loan exceeds or exceeded $10,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage or other lien securing the loan;

"(D) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase unless offered by the original mortgagee prior to any other sale thereof;

"(E) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by any one mortgagee (1) unless such mortgage is secured by property used, or designed to be used, for residential purposes and (2) if the unpaid principal balance thereof, when added to the aggregate amount paid for all mortgages purchased by the Association from such mortgagee pursuant to authority contained herein, exceeds 25 percent of the original principal amount of all mortgages made by such mortgagee which, except for this subparagraph (E), meet the requirements of this section.

"(F) no mortgage shall be purchased by the Association unless the mortgagee certifies that the housing with respect to which the mortgage was made meets the construction standards prescribed for insurance of mortgages on the same class of housing under the National Housing Act, as amended.

"(2) to borrow money for any of the foregoing purposes through the issuance of notes or other such obligations as hereinafter provided.

"(b) The Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and established pursuant to the provisions of this title as in effect prior to June 1, 1948, shall be the Association referred to in subsection (a) of this section. The board of directors of the association shall consist of not less than five persons to be appointed by the chairman of the board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the acting chairman in the case of a vacancy in the office of chairman, from the directors, officers, or employees of such Corporation and the officers shall be appointed by the board of directors from the directors, officers, or employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(c) The Association created under this section shall have succession from the date of its organization unless it is dissolved by order of the Administrator as hereinafter provided, or by act of Congress, and shall have power—

"(1) to adopt and use a corporate seal;

"(2) to make contracts;

"(3) to sue and be sued; complain and defend, in any court of law or equity, State or Federal;

"(4) to conduct its business in any State of the United States, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, and to have one or more offices in such State, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, one of which offices shall be designated at the time of organization as its principal office;

"(5) to do all things as are necessary or incidental to the proper management of its affairs and the proper conduct of its business.

"(d) The Association may have a capital stock of not to exceed $20,000,000 and paid-in surplus of $1,000,000, subscribed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(e) The Association, for the purpose of all actions by or against it, real, personal, or mixed, and all suits in equity, shall be deemed a citizen of the place in which its principal office is located.

"(f) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation, except the Association organized under this section, shall hereafter use the words 'Federal National Mortgage Association' or any combination of such words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $100 or imprisonment not exceeding 30 days or both, for each day during which such violation is committed or repeated. The provisions of section 5243 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the Association created under this title.

"OBLIGATIONS

"SEC. 302. The Association is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any time notes or other obligations in an aggregate amount not to exceed (1) 40 times the amount of its capital and surplus, and in no event to exceed (2) the current unpaid principal of mortgages held by it and insured under the provisions of title II and VI of this act and guaranteed under section 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, plus the amount of its cash on hand and on deposit and the amortized value of its investments in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"INVESTMENT OF FUNDS

"SEC. 303. Moneys of the Association not invested in mortgages or in operating facilities shall be kept in cash on hand or on deposit, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States; except that the Association shall keep and maintain such reserves as it may deem necessary.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 304. The Association, including its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, mortgage loans, income, and stock shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Association shall be subject to State, Territorial county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

"MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

"SEC. 305. The Association shall have power to deal with rent, renovate, modernize, or sell for cash, with a view to assuring a maximum financial return to the Association, any property acquired by it as a result of foreclosure proceedings or otherwise.

"LIQUIDATION

"SEC. 306. The Administrator shall have power to terminate the existence of the Association and order its liquidation and the winding up of its affairs whenever the Administrator determines, in his judgment, that the need therefor no longer exists. The Association shall make a report of its activities to the Administrator in January and July of each year for the preceding 6 months' period, which report shall be transmitted to the Congress, together with the Administrator's recommendations thereon."

SEC. 2. Nothing in the amendment made by the first section of this act shall limit the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to service or sell any mortgage purchased prior to the date of the enactment of this act, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgage with respect to which a commitment to purchase was made prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. Section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out $1,500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000,000,000."

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(h) The Corporation may subscribe for the nonassessable stock of the Federal National Mortgage Association: *Provided*, That the total face amount of stock so subscribed for and held by the Corporation shall not exceed at any one time $20,000,000."

SEC. 5. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section 510 thereof the following new section:

"INCONTESTABILITY

"SEC. 511. Any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the loan for guaranty or insurance under the provisions of this title and of the amount of such guaranty or insurance, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from establishing, as against the original lender, defenses based on fraud or material misrepresentation, and except that the Administrator shall not, by reason of anything contained in this section, be barred from establishing, by regulations in force at the date of such issuance or disbursement, whichever is the earlier, partial defenses to the amount payable on the guaranty or insurance."

SEC. 6. Section 207 (c) (2) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of paragraph numbered (2), inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and adding the following new proviso: "*And provided further*, That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph (2), a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporation, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members, may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 95 per centum of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed; and".

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be helpful in at least two respects. A great many Members have been interested in a secondary market for GI mortgages. We have provided in this bill a secondary market for GI mortgages.

We have provided that the Federal National Mortgage Association, by an expansion of its capital and the number of times that that capital and its surplus may be multiplied, will be available as a secondary market for the sale and purchase of GI mortgages. In order to create this market, we have increased the lending and borrowing authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by an additional $500,000,000, bringing the total of loaning authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation up to $2,000,000,000, $840,000,000 of which will be available to the Federal National Mortgage Association as a secondary market.

At the present time there is something less than $250,000,000 which has been used in this secondary market. In round figures, we have increased the amount of available secondary-market money by $510,000,000.

We provide that this secondary market is available for new paper, for paper issued after April 30, 1948. We provide that the paper may be discounted at par, not 98 percent, as was contained in the original bill that was before the House yesterday. We provide also that not more than 25 percent of a borrower's portfolio of GI paper may be discounted at any one time. So we have created a secondary market which should be of material benefit to the veterans in financing their homes.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. This market, as I understand, differs fundamentally only in one respect from the so-called Brown amendment in the TEW bill, and that is the effective date; is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The effective date, yes, I think that is substantially true. Frankly, I have not the wording and the details of the Brown amendment in mind at present.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Under the terms of the proposed arrangement no papers could be purchased which were unsecured prior to the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right. Thereby we prevent the dumping into this market any part of the $7,000,000,000 GI loans which are now outstanding which would result in the drying up of the secondary market. We also provide that veterans' cooperatives may be organized, and when veterans' cooperatives are organized for the purpose of building properties for veterans, that paper is also eligible for FHA financing and discounting or sale in the secondary market. We have provided for the incontestability of this paper, so that when once it has been sold in the secondary market the validity of the paper cannot be contested. I am firmly of the belief, although we do not go as far as we did in the bill which passed the House, that this bill be of great benefit not only to the veterans, but all others who may build. We have set up in this bill adequate funds for all legitimate transactions. It will be an aid, a very important aid, in the construction this year of over 1,000,000 units.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MITCHELL. The gentleman has stated that 25 percent of the paper in the portfolio in the loaning institutions will be absorbed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is a limit that any one financial institution may sell to FNMA.

Mr. MITCHELL. Can the gentleman tell me how many days must elapse before the loaning institution may be able to present more paper in that portfolio?

Mr. WOLCOTT. As soon as any part of their 25 percent is sold by the Federal National Mortgage Association then, of course, they may sell up to 25 percent of their portfolio to replace that which the Federal National Mortgage Association sold of that paper.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to state at this point that I feel that this is a great step in the advancement or the potentialities of GI home building. I think that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is to be commended upon his great step. I think that the GI's will benefit tremendously by what he contemplates doing here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am sure they will, and that is the primary purpose of the legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman tell the House whether this is the totality of the housing legislation that we will have before we adjourn?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I could not say.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. What is the rate of service charge; one-half of 1 percent?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe so.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his endeavors. At one time we did have authority in the RFC to purchase these loans, and that was withdrawn last July, and mighty few veterans in some sections of the country have been able to make loans.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will say that we appreciate the gentleman's efforts in connection with the secondary market. It seemed an almost insurmountable hurdle. The gentleman has been most cooperative in helping us work out this secondary market for GI loans, and we should give the gentleman from Georgia very much credit for the work which he has done on this, making it possible for us finally to set up this worth-while institution and this worth-while practice which will make it possible for so many veterans to get loans that would not get them otherwise.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does the proposed bill make any provision for the extension of title VI of FHA?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. How does the proposed bill differ from the bill we passed here yesterday?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In respect to the secondary market?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No, in respect to the titles.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It has to do only with the secondary market, with veterans cooperatives, and incontestability clauses. There is nothing else contained in this bill which was contained in the bill we passed yesterday.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. How are the veterans' cooperatives financed without title VI?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have made them eligible under title II by this bill.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. In the pending legislation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In the pending legislation. We have made it clear that the veterans' cooperatives are eligible under title II. Title VI is not continued in this bill. I am hopeful that title VI will be continued, but if title VI is not continued, then veterans' cooperatives may finance their undertakings through title II, which is permanent legislation.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Are there additional authorizations for title II?

Mr. WOLCOTT. There does not need to be. They have plenty in title II, enough to service all transactions.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Does this contain the provision which was in the bill passed yesterday with reference to the tax bonus or the fast acceleration?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In respect to accelerating the depreciation?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, it does not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to inquire with respect to the 25 percent of the portfolio of the lending institutions. Suppose building and loan association A has $100,000 worth of these loans, and it discounts $25,000 worth to the mortgage association, it would then have $75,000. Then suppose it makes another $100,000 of new loans to veterans, would it not be entitled to step in immediately and discount an additional $25,000?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is my understanding of it; yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What is the rate of interest on title II loans?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am not positive about this but I think the limit on the interest rate on title II financing is 5 percent. Under title VI, if title VI is restored, under existing law it is 4 percent. It has been recommended that that be increased to 4½ or 5.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. As I understand, title VI is definitely eliminated from the bill now before us.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is not included in this bill.

Mr. SIKES. We all realize that title VI has been of inestimable value in securing housing construction. Is there any way the gentleman foresees that title VI might be added to this bill before its final approval?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I know the way title VI financing could be enacted, but unfortunately the legislation must be brought up in the other body by unanimous consent, and there have been objections to the consideration of the legislation in the other body. If the gentleman in the other body who has made the objection would withdraw his objection, then I am reasonably certain that we would have all the very good provisions in the bill the House passed yesterday enacted before we adjourn. Unless he does withdraw his objection, then I am afraid we are not going to get title VI.

Mr. SIKES. It would be extremely unfortunate if we should allow title VI to lapse.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is there any way, I would like to ask the gentleman, that title 6 can be included, from a parliamentary standpoint, if it leaves the House without being written into the bill (S. 2790) as an amendment. It is not in either the bill from the Senate or the bill of the House, and therefore would not be subject to conference action.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am not familiar enough with the rules of the Senate to give the gentleman a correct answer.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not there are any provisions in this bill for either slum clearance or public housing?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Decidedly not.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MACK. Are any plywood materials involved in this?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is no secret that the gentleman has been conferring with representatives of the other body. Is the gentleman in a position to tell us whether or not this bill, which is similar to the bill that passed yesterday, will receive the same treatment as the other bill, which the gentleman brought to the Senate?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that this bill is similar in only two respects to the bill passed yesterday. I cannot predict what the other body will do with this bill, any more than I can predict what the other body will do with any legislation. We have a job to do here. If we do our job, then we have met our responsibility. I think we have worries enough of our own without worrying about what the other body will do.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is the same in respect to the lack of public housing?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Decidedly the same in that respect.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And from the conference the gentleman has had with the Senator, we are receiving no assurance that we are going to get any different treatment on this bill than on the other.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the only way, as I understand it, that public housing can be considered in the Senate is for a Member of the other body to withdraw his objection to the consideration of the House bill. I understand under their rules a motion could then be made to substitute the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill for the House bill. If the gentleman in the other body persists in his objection, then the other body of course is denied the privilege of voting on whether they shall substitute the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill for the House bill. We cannot control the action of any individual Member or group of individuals in the other body.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does not the gentleman think that if he had yielded in favor of public housing, we would not be here all night?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, I do not think anything of the kind.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman inform me as to this particular case? Several of my little country banks have about $200,000 of this paper today, and have had it for approximately a year. Will this be of any help toward finding a secondary market for that paper?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If they continue to make GI loans under FHA, standards, I understand it will be a decided help to them, but it will be of no help to them in the discounting or sale of any of their existing outstanding GI mortgages.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In other words, it is of no help to them in regard to the present paper which they hold.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I could not say that it would be—no.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the majority party has found itself in a predicament, and this bill is the weak and ineffective substitute for a housing bill that might have met the needs of our veterans and others.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Would the gentleman inform the House as to whether or not he was consulted about this bill which we now have?

Mr. SPENCE. I was not consulted about the bill nor have I any knowledge that any minority member of the committee was consulted. It was not referred to the committee. It was not reported by the committee, and there is no report as to this bill. It is obvious that the Members cannot consider this bill deliberately and with information which it is necessary to have to come to some conclusion.

We have heard a great deal about socialism. The majority has used the cry of socialism as a red herring to cross every trail that leads to progress or to the welfare of the plain people.

When we passed the Federal Reserve Act, it was said that it would socialize our banking system. When we passed the act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which has protected the depositors and stabilized our banking system, the same cry was raised. The same argument was made against the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act. But you cannot say that this bill has any element of socialism in it, according to their theory, because it does nothing for the common man. There was a provision in the bill as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee providing for the stimulation of the construction of rental property. By reason of the inadequate supply of housing facilities and the overwhelming demand, there exists today a seller's market. As the supply of housing increases there will necessarily be a depreciation in the prices of houses, and when the demand is finally met there will be a stabilized price level far below that existing at the present time. Consequently, veterans and others who are compelled to buy now, unless they obtain bargain prices, will necessarily run the danger of sustaining a serious loss on their investment. Hence, the necessity of stimulating the construction of rental housing so that many of those who wish to obtain homes may be enabled to wait until the existing high level of prices is reduced as the result of increased production. No provision for rental housing is contained in the bill now presented for your consideration. There is no rural housing in the bill. There is no provision for slum clearance or the clearance of blighted areas in the bill. There is nothing in the bill which the great majority of the American people need. There is nothing to meet the housing situation as it exists today. It is but a pretense of enacting housing legislation as a result of the arbitrary action of the Rules Committee in refusing to grant a rule for the consideration of the bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee.

I hope you will not be beguiled by this late introduction of this bill which will not accomplish any purpose in the interest of the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. I understood from the explanation made a moment ago that 25 percent rediscount of secondary mortgages of GI loans was allowed. Will the gentleman explain just how that works?

Mr. MONRONEY. That means, if you have $100,000 of GI loans, you can sell $25,000 worth of them to the RFC. That is all you can sell.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman read that section?

Mr. MONRONEY. This is not the identical language, but it is very close to it——

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Do you know the identical section? Do you have the language before you?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. I believe there is only one copy of this bill available, and I do not have that.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. How do you explain the bill? Have you ever seen it?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the gentleman that I tried to follow it and correct it in lead pencil as the Clerk read it from the original Wolcott bill that was before us yesterday. One section of that bill is very similar.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does the gentleman have the bill before him?

Mr. MONRONEY. No.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. How can the gentleman explain what is in the bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am trying to. There is so little in it that it should not be difficult.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Can the gentleman answer the question that was asked by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER]?

Mr. MONRONEY. After hearing the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] explain this, and after having read what he had in the former bill, and after having listened to the clerk carefully as he read the bill, I think I understand that you are going to allow the RFC to buy 25 percent of the portfolio of mortgages that any single investor holds. That is as clear as I can make it, and I believe the chairman will agree with me that that is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is, which they acquired after April 30.

Mr. MONRONEY. Which they acquired after April 30.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman mean to say to the House that we are about to enact an important housing bill when not even members of the committee have seen nor now have copies of the bill? I am very interested in and concerned about housing, particularly veterans housing, but this is a most remarkable procedure.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true. We are however faced with a desperate situation. It is certain that unless the House takes some action now there will be absolutely no money to support any Government-insured mortgage. I do not like this bill. It is 10 times weaker than I want. I would like to see an all-embracing and general housing bill and I have fought for one for several months. The Republican leadership in the House has turned thumbs down. It is now 3:20 a. m. The RFC is almost out of money for supporting the mortgage market. The question now comes: Are you going to enact this little-bitty teeny-weeney piece of housing legislation that might help build housing just a little bit, a very little bit? Or are you going to say, "Well, we are tired, we want to go home, and we are not going to pass even this makeshift microscopic bit of housing aid."

I hope you will pass it, for only by doing so can funds be furnished to the FNMA of the RFC to support Government-insured mortgages that are being issued. I am afraid, however, that the bill is in very bad shape from this standpoint in not bringing in an extension of title 6, and I would like to ask the distinguished chairman how he is going to get to conference with title 6 when it is not under the Senate version of the bill or in his amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This is not a conference report.

Mr. MONRONEY. I realize that, but if I understand the rules of the House a conference is limited to the material that has been passed by the two Houses and you cannot go outside the bounds of what the two Houses have passed and include that in any conference report; it is not possible to do it under our rules.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I doubt very much under the present situation if we could put title 6 on here now. The only way we could get any title 6 financing in this bill would be to have the other body when this bill is sent over there accept the House amendment with an amendment continuing title 6 financing. I do not know whether they will do it or not. If they do it then we can go to conference immediately and then we determine whether we accept the title 6 provision.

Mr. MONRONEY. I understand this is going over under a Senate number. The principal need, as I see it, to make this bill more useful, is to add now the necessary extension of title VI, FHA. This addition, if made, coupled with this support market for GI and FHA loans, would give this bill some degree of substance.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It does.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say here in the closing hours of this session that I have seen about everything happen in this committee in the past few weeks that I could ever conceive could not happen in an illustrious committee of this House. I have had a lot of esteem and respect for our chairman, but at this late hour to come in here and present a proposition for this House to accept when not until a few moments ago when the Clerk took back on the desk a revised copy of what was read erroneously here at this hour, I cannot conceive anything other than that this is a very shallow and shabby trick. Somebody is on a hook. There is a lot of pressure being applied somewhere. Somebody has been left out in the rain and somebody is putting on the heat.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is it not a fact that from the standpoint of the private builders themselves that all of them have considered title 6 to be essential?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That has been the keynote of all private builders.

And that is exactly what they are trying to get into this bill by subterfuge and trickery. There is a demand for an extension of title VI and until this very night I have coincided with the chairman in his opposition to including sections 501 and 502 of the Veterans Readjustment Act. In June of 1947 the secondary market provision was stricken out of the RFC bill in its extension. Then in the hearings on the original Wolcott bill reported out by our committee, H. R. 6841, it included only section 505 loans under the Veterans Readjustment Act. This includes sections 501 and 502 and until this very point the chairman has always been a consistent opponent of including these two titles, until the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] of the committee included those in his amendment and it was reported out by the committee as H. R. 6888. That is the bill on which we tacked four amendments in the committee and it has been bottled up in the Rules Committee.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. To the gentleman's knowledge, has there been any opposition in the committee to the extension of title VI?

Mr. BUCHANAN. There never has been any opposition; in fact, we have passed two pieces of legislation covering title VI. There was H. R. 5854 for $2,000,000,000, which is on the other side at the present time. The chairman has said this could be tacked on if the other side sees fit. But the point I want to make is that at this late hour somebody is trying to get out of being left out in the rain. They are going to come out and go down to Philadelphia next week to their convention and say: "The House passed a housing bill. The House passed two housing bills. The House passed three housing bills." And they are going to blame it on somebody somewhere for not going along with what has been passed on this side.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a very strong rumor floating around here that the committee on platform of the Republican convention sent word up here that the Republicans should not adjourn until some bill with the word "housing" in it is passed.

Mr. BUCHANAN. There is that rumor, which I have heard. I also am reminded to check a housing plank in the 1944 Republican platform. It contained this statement:

> We pledge our support of a stimulation of State and local plans to provide decent low-cost housing, properly financed by the Federal Housing Administration or otherwise when such housing cannot be supplied or financed by private sources.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, if that is what we are going to expect, a breach of promise, a breach of faith, a breach of a statement, I think this gesture we are going into at this very late hour is a futile, shallow gesture.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does the gentleman have the bill we are considering before him?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not, and just a few moments ago I walked to the Clerk's desk and asked to see a copy of it. I wanted to read again what is in section 2. I am familiar with what is in section 1.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I wonder if the gentleman would mind if I called his attention to one very significant thing. This bill is S. 2790. It was reported by the Committee on Labor and Education of the Senate. Has the Committee on Labor and Education of the Senate ever considered housing legislation?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If we pass this legislation and have to go to conference, would we have a conference between the House Banking and Currency Committee and the Committee on Labor and Education on this bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is a puzzle I cannot answer. I do not think anybody else can unravel that riddle at this late hour either.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The section the gentleman just read from the Republican platform is so interesting. I would like to ask a question. Would the gentleman call it, in the terms of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], socialistic?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Very much so, if the testimony that he offered before the Committee on Rules is taken as a basis for comparison. The platform plank in the Republican platform of 1944 is clearly the very feature that our chairman has objected to so strenuously.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, let me say just this: We are presented here at 3:30 in the morning with what is proposed to be an important housing bill that no committee worked out and nobody can now read because there is no such printed bill in existence. We have found out enough about it to know that it provides no slum clearance or housing of that nature. There is no title VI insurance which has produced most of the housing that we have, and there is no GI loan discount provision that is worth anything. In short, this bill is nothing; it is a phony.

Farm people and ex-soldiers living in rural areas have never received the benefit of loans to build homes and improve their farms. The difficulty in the small communities and the rural areas, in particular, is this: the financial institutions that make GI loans, the little country banks and small financial institutions, cannot carry this long-time paper in any quantity. They need a secondary market through RFC. The bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency would have taken care of that. Now then, under this phony bill the little bank will have to carry 75 percent of every loan it makes permanently. It cannot do that. It cannot put its depositors' money into that kind of long-time paper. Hence, this bill offers no relief at all to the rural GI's and people in the communities where they can only finance through these institutions. We have repeatedly offered an amendment authorizing—not compelling—the RFC to make these rediscounts. The bank then could make arrangements with the RFC to carry the loans and thus get some housing built for people in the rural areas. Under this bill they cannot do it because, as I have said, the small institutions cannot handle the paper. You might as well refuse all aid to farm-home buildings as to make the banks carry 75 percent of it. This bill ought to be defeated.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to divide this housing question into three phases which I think are most important from a legislative point of view.

Private housing, which has been going at a record pace; public housing, which is in reality political housing; and, veterans' housing, which we are considering at this moment in the amended Senate bill S. 2799. If the public housing advocates had not tried to shove down our throats political housing in order to get private housing, we would have had both phases of housing stand on their own merits and we could have passed one or the other or both. If we pass this veterans' housing bill, it will be a great help to the veterans, and we have a moral obligation to take care of veterans' housing promised under the GI bill of rights. I strongly urge the House to pass this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is the most unusual procedure that I have ever witnessed in my 20 years as a Member of the House to have a bill submitted under these conditions at this time in a mad effort to deceive the people in the coming campaign that they put through some kind of legislation relating to housing. This bill illustrates what should have been done the other day. If the gentleman from Michigan was sincere in trying to bring about legislation of some kind, he would have called the Senate bill from the Speaker's table and moved to strike out all after the enacting clause and sent it to conference. Then the conferees could have worked and agreed on a bill, or agreed to strike out certain parts of either bill, if there was a majority of the conferees of both branches that agreed to striking them out. This is nothing but an effort to try to bail out this Republican Party in its convention and to support the Committee on Resolutions and Platform in its effort to put something in with regard to housing. They are not going to deceive the public.

There are jeers from the Republican side. They have been trying to deceive the public the same as they did in 1946, but this time they cannot do it. That is the spirit; that is the spirit of defiance of the will of the people, the spirit of arrogance in relation to representing the people. That is all they have been having for 2 years in this body, complete defiance of the will of the people. The Republicans applaud that statement that they have been defying the will of the people. Not one piece of legislation has passed this body that has been in the best interest of the people. The real estate lobby has not only controlled the preparation of legislation but has prevented the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill from coming up in this body. This is one of the big issues of the coming campaign.

The more noise you make, the more music it is to my ears.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make clear to the Members one point, namely, title VI of the FHA act has been passed twice by this House and sent to the Senate. If you want to scold somebody for not passing title VI, do not scold Members of the lower House, scold those of the Senate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is understandable that in the closing minutes of this Congress, with the time now reading 20 minutes to 4, there is a tendency on the part of the Members who are addressing the House to confuse the issue which is before us. The statement has been made concerning this bill that it represents an attempt to convince the people that it is an effective housing bill when actually it is not.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I trust that my side of the House does not make a spectacle of themselves while the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] is speaking, like the other side did when the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was speaking.

Mr. NIXON. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the statement has also been made that the purpose of this bill is to save face for the Republican Party in developing its platform in Philadelphia.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is the gentleman a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. NIXON. No; but the gentleman will see in a moment why I am speaking on this bill.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Has the gentleman read this bill?

Mr. NIXON. Yes; I might explain to the gentleman that I have a particular interest in this bill because I introduced a similar bill in the House providing a secondary market for GI loans.

Mr. Speaker, the statement has even been made that this bill is unimportant and that it would be useless in meeting the housing problem.

Let us analyze this problem to see whether these changes have any merit. The real reason Members have made these derogatory statements in regard to this bill is that they would rather have had the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, with its slum-clearance and other public-housing provisions. That is understandable. I realize the resentment Members feel when the particular type of bill they want does not pass and another which they consider inadequate is substituted for it.

In that connection I think it should be pointed out, however, that one of the most publicized features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is that it is primarily in the interest of veterans. As a result a number of veterans' organizations have endorsed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I should like to read to the membership of the House at this time a statement made by Senator TAFT, one of the authors of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, on the floor of the other body yesterday in relation to the bill before us. You will see from hearing this statement why this bill is vitally important to the veterans' housing program.

I quote:

> MR. TAFT. It seemed wise to have this bill passed. The most serious check on housing today apparently is the piling up of GI loans in the banks. This bill provides a secondary market for GI housing loans. There is such a provision, on a rather more elaborate scale, in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; but we are not certain whether that bill will be enacted.

Now get this:

> I think this particular feature is the most important feature, certainly to veterans, of that bill—

That is the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, Senator TAFT, a coauthor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, has categorically stated that the bill we are considering tonight is, as far as veterans are concerned, the most important feature of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I think this statement by the distinguished Senator from Ohio clearly shows the importance of this bill, particularly as it applies to veterans.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there is this much to be said about this—shall I call this a housing bill? The term is a misnomer.

But I started to say that there is this to be said about it: Since the Republican Party has refused to raise a roof for America, I certainly hope and expect that America will raise the roof with the Republicans.

I cannot say what I think of the compromise brought back from conference, or of the procedures by which this pathetic decision was arrived at, and stay within the bounds prescribed by comity.

I can, however, repeat what I said yesterday: That this action proves the complete demoralization of majority leadership as between the two Houses.

It proves that the Republican Party is without a head, and without a heart—and the American people without a home.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances in the RECORD.

HON. ELLSWORTH BUCK

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it requires a great deal of courage to address the House at 5 a. m. I never expected in all my life to stand on the floor of the greatest legislative body in the world to perform a very pleasant task, which I shall discharge in a few moments, at this hour in the day.

There have been some very kind things said here tonight about retiring Members, and I endorse everything that has been said about each of those who have

announced that they are retiring from Congress.

I, for one, and I know others feel the same way, am sorry to see them go.

There is one man retiring from the Congress, however, who has not been mentioned. I want to make this statement, that no man is worth more than he contributes to the social and civic life of the Nation to which he owes allegiance. Measured by that yardstick, the gentleman to whom I shall refer is a very wealthy man. He is one of the New York State Members. I refer to Hon. ELLSWORTH BUCK. He has served in this House two terms, and he has established a name for himself as a fine constructive legislator. The New York delegation, and I believe it is true of the House, are proud of the record of this distinguished gentleman and able statesman.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. We on the Democratic side have had an opportunity to serve on the Labor Committee with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK], and we all regret that he is going into retirement, because he was a credit to that great committee.

Mr. REED of New York. There never was a time in the history of this Nation when we needed men in this House of the fine nobility, experience, and character as that of the gentleman from New York, ELLSWORTH BUCK.

Now that he is leaving us, I hope that he and his lovely family will have many happy, pleasant, and prosperous years. I hope, too, that he will return from time to time and give us the inspiration of his presence and his fine character. I speak of him with great personal affection. I shall always cherish the memory of having served with him here in this House.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the Democratic delegation from the city of New York, I wish to say that ELLSWORTH BUCK is one of the finest gentlemen that I have ever met. I have known him for several years, since he came here to Congress. I knew him before by reputation. He has been one of the outstanding men in our community. When I, as a Democrat, praise a Republican, I want you to know that the praise is deep-seated and most sincere.

ELLSWORTH BUCK turned a district that was Democratic for years into, unfortunately, a Republican district. He did that because of his own personality. He did that because of his devotion to public service. That public service began before he became a Member of this Congress.

He was appointed as a member of the board of education in the city of New York and served on that board which has to do with the education of millions of children in our city. After a distinguished service as a member of that board he was finally appointed president of the board of education. I, as a Democrat, want to say that Mr. BUCK discharged the duties of that office faithfully and well and I am sincerely sorry that he has decided to leave us, because although we have differed on almost every vote in this Congress he has represented as he saw fit the people of his district. He has been returned time after time since his first election by reason of his stanch integrity, by reason of the fact that he believed that Staten Island and lower New York had confidence in him. I am sorry to see him retire.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to thank the gentleman. I endorse his remarks. I especially want to thank him for letting us know that ELLSWORTH BUCK had the ability to turn a Democratic district into a Republican district. Now we know what to do with Mr. ELLSWORTH BUCK, we will send him out doing missionary service for the Republican cause in the Democratic districts of the country.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. It was my privilege to have served with the distinguished gentleman from New York during the Seventy-ninth Congress as a member of the Merchant Marine Committee. I have never known a more sincere or capable man than ELLSWORTH BUCK. We all wish him well.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I want to add my tribute to the others which have been paid so graciously to my fellow townsman, ELLSWORTH BUCK. I have learned one thing about Ellsworth, that he makes very short speeches, and I would like to make a short one about him and I would like it to ring as true as I can make it ring: ELLSWORTH BUCK is an honest man.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve with Mr. BUCK on the Merchant Marine Committee. As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal he accompanied me on an investigation to the Canal. I do not know of anyone who attended to his duties more diligently and more thoroughly than the gentleman from New York. It is a great regret to me personally to hear that he is leaving Congress. He is a fine gentleman, he is an honest statesman, and he is a true friend to any man who may have the privilege of his friendship. I regret his leaving this body.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I heartily endorse the statements of the other gentleman with regard to ELLSWORTH BUCK. It happens that for most of the period of this Congress his office was immediately next to mine and many a time I went into his office for counsel and received good counsel. Many a time I walked over to the Labor Committee where I sat next to him and noticed his wisdom in so many things, and in the most difficult ones, labor relations, he brought a great deal of wisdom. He was able to see both sides of a question.

As I understand it, Mr. BUCK is now going to spend a considerable amount of time in my own State, the State of Wisconsin, where he has a home also. I certainly hope that he will stay there a great deal of the year.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I join with my other colleagues in paying a personal tribute to ELLSWORTH BUCK. I know I am expressing the sentiment of every Member of this House in wishing to him long life and happiness.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse the grand tributes which have been paid to ELLSWORTH BUCK here tonight. I recall when Mr. BUCK won the special election in Staten Island and the lower part of New York. He has rendered most valuable service in his work in the House of Representatives and we are sorry to see him leave. Since coming to the Eightieth Congress I got to know him quite well. I know that in the early days of the first session he was a tremendous help to me, as he was to all the new Members who came down here from New York. I want to thank him and to pay this tribute to a very fine man.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to add a word of commendation for my good friend, ELLSWORTH BUCK. I have not served on any committees with him, but since he first came to the House most every day I have sat next to him in the second row of the middle tier of seats of the House. The Doorkeeper of the House once said to me, "We are always able to find the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] in the center seat on the second row of the middle tier when the House is in session."

The State of New York is losing an excellent Representative. The House is losing an able legislator. We shall miss you, Ellsworth, so I hope you will visit us often.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that it is entirely unjust for the State of New York to take all of the credit for the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK]. The fact is that the gentleman, or at least his family, originated in the town of Buckfield, in my district, and it is only by the merest chance that he is not representing my district instead of his own. My association with the gentleman has been so extremely pleasant and my admiration for him has been so hearty that I testify to it on this occasion.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying my respects and appreciation of the fine character of the Honorable ELLSWORTH

B. BUCK, who is retiring from Congress at the end of this session.

It is hard for the Congress to lose a man of his abilities and background because our great Republic needs him. All his life he has been devoted to the service of his fellow citizens and he has brought to his work an attitude and a brilliance of mind which has made a lasting impression on our system of government. His humility and his charm and gentleness are only exceeded by his loyalty and deep-seated affection for the principles of democracy and he has been a constant inspiration to those of us who have had the privilege of serving with him.

He has been brave and courageous in times of deep sorrow and he has shown his courage by always standing for what he thinks is right and just. I trust that the days ahead will be filled with the good things of life for him and his family, but I am selfish enough to hope that he may return from time to time to visit us who may still be in Congress so we may renew our faith in the high principles he stands for.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

HON. GEORGIA L. LUSK

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think any of us would want to leave here tonight without expressing our very real and very deep regret at not having the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK] as a Member of the next Congress.

I have enjoyed working with the gentlewoman of New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK] very much and I appreciate the real intelligence, sincerity, and dignity she has brought to the Congress of the United States. She has demonstrated her capacity for service in the public interest. This Gold-Star Mother and outstanding Congresswoman from the great State of New Mexico will be missed by the many of her sincere friends and this body.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure this is in order, but since the gentlewoman from California has been so gracious to me, I would like for all of you to know that I certainly have enjoyed my very brief experience here with you. I do not intend for it to be my last visit. I hope to return. And I wish for all of you the compensation you deserve for your untiring perseverance in your work.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. I have had the extreme pleasure of serving on the great Veterans' Affairs Committee of this House with the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK]. I treasure the many contributions that she has made to the committee and I hope sincerely she will come back and give the House the benefit of her knowledge and experience.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to endorse what has been said about the distinguished lady from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK]. She is one of the few, probably the only, Gold-Star Mother in the Congress. She gave a son to this war.

I have served on the committee with her even since she has been in Congress. I want to say that her departure is a great loss to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. We from the neighboring State of Texas are pleased with the kind of representation that the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK] has given her State in this body, and we regret exceeding that she is leaving. She has a charming personality, and we will miss her keenly in the next Congress.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I simply want to say of the gentlewoman we all regret to see Mrs. LUSK leave the Congress; she is a very able and distinguished lady and has contributed much to her own State and to this great Nation.

No one in the Congress has done more for veterans then she. She has taken the lead in regard to the passage of a number of veterans' measures. Today the House approved finally legislation to aid a group of veterans, former prisoners of war who suffered inhumane treatment as prisoners of the Japanese and Germans. A number of the POW's are from New Mexico. As one who has worked for almost 3 years in behalf of legislation to aid this group, I can say Mrs. LUSK has worked diligently and constantly and effectively in their behalf. In Mrs. LUSK, the former prisoners of war have had a great champion and leader in behalf of legislation to help them.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have served in the House with a lot of gentle people; a lot of fine people; a lot of people of high fundamental character. But, I have never served with one who lived up to all of those high standards more and better than this very gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in all the years of my service in the House of Representatives I have never come in contact with a finer, more personable character than GEORGIA LUSK. She has proved her ability from the outset and has devoted her talents to the benefit of her constituency.

Her service was not limited to her own State, because her vision extended far and beyond the ordinary horizon. She mastered her work and performed more than was expected of her at all times. The House of Representatives will have become impoverished because of her departure. New Mexico will long seek to fill the void caused by her retirement. We wish her Godspeed.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the many fine things which have been said on the floor about my colleague from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK] are well deserved. She is held in just as high esteem throughout our fair State. It has been my privilege to campaign with her and for her on many occasions, and it has been a pleasure to serve with her in this Congress, always in the closest cooperation. My friendship and esteem for her has been increased by the memory of our happy association here in the service of our State, and I look forward to her return again to this House where she has served so well and so faithfully.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with former Speaker RAYBURN in his fitting and touching tribute to Mrs. LUSK. She leaves here with the regret of her colleagues and with the respect of all of us. In leaving, Mrs. LUSK carries with her the kindest regards of all of her colleagues and I hope that her departure from public service will be short.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I speak of the departure from our midst of the Honorable GEORGIA L. LUSK of Santa Fe, N. Mex. Mrs. LUSK came to the Eightieth Congress with a very fine background of public service. She has made a very real contribution quietly and with great dignity. A Gold Star Mother, her service on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been constructive and from her heart. Being of different political faith we have our differences, of course, she and I, but on the fundamental things of life we are in deep agreement.

This is true of women, Mr. Speaker, which makes it possible for us to bring to public service a capacity for understanding that should be of real value not only to our Government but to the perplexing problems of the world of today.

So I would say to my colleague on the Democratic side of the aisle that I shall miss her and that I hope for her all the good things of life. She has brought something fine into this Chamber. I trust that she takes back with her a sense of comradeship of all the House, not just of those of her own political faith.

Good luck to you, Georgia!

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, for 12 years the House has been privileged to enjoy the fine friendship, the splendid ability and the great services of the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS. On the Committee on Military Affairs, subsequently the Committee on the Armed Services, and in the House of Representatives, he has been a faithful servant of the people; one of the hardest

workers in Congress; and a Member who in his quiet, sincere, and able way has contributed much to the Congress and to the Nation. He is leaving us after this term. I know that all of you join me in wishing him Godspeed in whatever he may undertake in the years ahead. We shall miss him and his good work, but he can take pride in the fact that the fruits of that work will live on long after he has left this great legislative body.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it so happens that I have been privileged to represent a district which is adjacent to the district represented by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. In the decade that he and I have served here together I have had occasion to counsel with him and to discuss problems that have related to our specific area. I certainly concur in what the gentleman from Florida has stated, that there has never been a more diligent worker or a more sincere legislator than the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. As one of the high-ranking members of the Committee on Military Affairs and of the Committee on Armed Services, he as every Member of this House knows, had a commanding part in helping to pass all the legislation that has been designed to strengthen and keep strong this Nation.

Further, he has done a great deal with reference to aiding servicemen and their dependents. Beyond that, also, he has worked diligently for all the projects that have related to the rivers and streams in his area.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. Briefly I have served on the House Committee on Armed Services with the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana and have observed him to be a conscientious legislator and a man of such great capacity that I am sure will be utilized by his State in the more embracive field which he has entered.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. When I first came here in 1940, one of the first Members of the House whom I met was the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS. Since that time I have had occasion to confer with him on various matters of legislation. I have been benefited by his sound advice. I am sorry to see him leave the House of Representatives, and I wish him all success in his future life.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I do agree with him that the men about whom he has been speaking have given great service to this House and great service to the Nation. We are all sorry to see them leave.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the services of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, OVERTON BROOKS and I served together on the Military Affairs Committee. It was a distinct privilege working with him on that committee. He was attentive, energetic, and most capable. He was instrumental in the passage of many bills which have assisted in the defense of the Nation.

He worked tirelessly for flood control and river and harbor projects. He will be greatly missed.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the congressional district I have the honor to represent joins the district of Hon. OVERTON BROOKS who represents the Shreveport, La., district. Because of the similarity of our districts and their problems, Representative BROOKS and I have had a very close relationship as fellow Members of Congress and friends in the last decade.

I personally know that Representative BROOKS had diligently, faithfully, and energetically represented the people of his district and area. No Member of the House works harder than he in behalf of his people. Moreover, as one of the high-ranking members of the Military Affairs Committee and now of the Armed Services Committee, he has had a major part in formulating much of the important legislation which has passed the Congress in the last decade, legislation designed to strengthen and keep strong this country and legislation designed to help soldiers and their dependents. Furthermore, he has ever led the fight in behalf of the flood-control projects in his area.

The contributions made by Representative BROOKS to the welfare of his country as an able, conscientious, competent, and constructive legislator will always be recognized.

We his colleagues shall always miss him and we wish for him, his wife and daughter every happiness and success in the future.

HON. JAMES GALLAGHER, HON. E. WALLACE CHADWICK, HON. JAMES P. SCOBLICK, AND HON. MITCHELL JENKINS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania delegation will miss four of our Members who will not be with us after tonight, the Honorable JAMES GALLAGHER, of Philadelphia; the Honorable E. WALLACE CHADWICK, of Chester; the Honorable JAMES P. SCOBLICK, of Scranton; and the Honorable MITCHELL JENKINS, of Wilkes-Barre.

We in Pennsylvania have been remarkably favored in the fact that we have had 28 Members in the Republican delegation from our State. We have had a very friendly contact due to the fact that we hold weekly meetings when we meet to discuss the problems that confront us. In this close association we have come to know, to respect, and to admire these men who are about to leave us. It is true that the tenure of office of some has been very short and rather brief. I refer particularly to the Honorable E. WALLACE CHADWICK, who served with me on the Committee on the Judiciary. I know all of you who were present the few times Mr. CHADWICK has entered the well of this House were impressed with his remarkable ability, his courage, his deep conviction, and his high sense of responsibility to the office which he fills.

The other gentlemen have served on other committees. Therefore, speaking in behalf of the remaining Members of the Pennsylvania delegation, we wish them every success. We trust as they go to their respective vocations, back to their homes, their lives will be filled with every success and that they will treasure and remember their present associations here.

Mr. Speaker, as the Republican Convention opens in Philadelphia Monday morning, we will welcome you there, too, along with these other good people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, so many Members have requested an opportunity to pay tribute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] I ask unanimous consent that they may have that privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD during the next 5 days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HON. VIRGIL CHAPMAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I know the Kentucky delegation and his many other friends in the House will learn with profound regret that Hon. VIRGIL CHAPMAN, who is the dean of the Kentucky delegation and who has served in the House of Representatives longer than any Democrat in the history of Kentucky, will voluntarily retire at the end of this session of the Congress. Mr. CHAPMAN is held in the deepest affection by the Members and by the citizens of his district. He could remain here as a Representative in Congress as long as he desires. He represents the old Ashland district of Kentucky which was represented by Henry Clay. It is an historic district. It has produced in a small area in the center of Kentucky, carpeted with bluegrass over a limestone strata for its soil, more fast horses than any other section of the world.

VIRGIL CHAPMAN is a man of fine ability. He is an able legislator, and for many years served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce where he rendered valuable service to State and Nation. I am sure all of the Members who know him and who have a profound respect for him will wish him Godspeed and success and happiness in his retirement from the House.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky and other Members who have expressed a very sincere appreciation of the services of VIRGIL CHAPMAN in the House of Representatives, and in expressing extreme regret that he is leaving this body. It was my pleasure to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with him for some years. I know the very valuable work he has done on that committee, particularly in the field of public health and with reference to the Pure Food and Drug Act. He has rendered very valuable legislative service to the entire Nation in those fields. I am sure we all join with you in wishing him well.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] on the same committee. I also had the further privilege of having him as my next door neighbor. I have never found anyone in the Congress so helpful. He would come in and consult with me on my problems when I was a young man here, and he showed me the way many and many a time. I hope that whatever course he follows will be a course which brings him much happiness. He deserves it. He is a good neighbor, a good Congressman, and a fine friend.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, within the next 24 hours the Eightieth Congress plans to adjourn. When the Speaker's gavel falls upon the conclusion of the second session of this Congress, we shall lose by voluntary retirement our able and distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable VIRGIL CHAPMAN, of the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky, who for more than the past two decades has represented the great blue-grass section of our beloved Commonwealth. VIRGIL CHAPMAN has been the champion of the tobacco farmer, not only in Kentucky but throughout the Nation. His name is synonymous with all tobacco legislation which has been enacted into law; not only has he fought for the passage of tobacco bills which were helpful to our tobacco farmers but he has vigorously and courageously championed all farm legislation. He has worked hard in the interest of REA, soil conservation, the school-lunch program, flood control, FHA, and many, many other types of laws which sought to make farm life more profitable, more enjoyable, a little brighter, and easier.

For me just to say that our colleague has supported legislation in the interest of the farmer and the people of Kentucky would be a misnomer because, by support, I mean that the able Representative from the Sixth Congressional District not only drafted and introduced bills but he appeared before subcommittees of the House and testified in their behalf. He spearheaded the fight before the full committee in order to secure favorable consideration and when the bill was called up before the House on the calendar he would address the House on the floor in its interest and would later talk to individual Members, soliciting their vote and active support. He has worked long hours day after day in meetings made up of farmers, tobacco growers, warehousemen, tobacco Congressmen from various States, and other interested parties, in order that all groups might be unanimous and solidly behind a given tobacco bill. In my opinion, there is no man in the entire House of Representatives who has done more for the farmers of Kentucky and the Nation during his tenure of office.

The voluntary retirement of VIRGIL CHAPMAN from his seat in the House means that we shall lose the most aggressive, the most outstanding, the most capable, and the most learned tobacco Representative in the lower Chamber.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, a little more than 10 years ago I arrived in Washington to begin my duties as a Member of Congress. My friend and colleague VIRGIL CHAPMAN escorted me down this aisle to be sworn in. He has been my friend continuously throughout the years, and it is with affectionate appreciation of his friendly helpfulness that I speak today. He has been a most valuable Member of Congress serving his constituency well and faithfully. His service to the farmers in Kentucky, especially the tobacco farmers, has been of untold value to the farmers and the State in general. Much of the prosperity existing in the agricultural sections of Kentucky today is due to his farseeing wisdom and untiring efforts. He is leaving the House of Representatives to embark in a larger field of service, and he carries with him the best wishes of his many friends on this side of the Capitol.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, during the time I have had the honor to serve in this House, many Members have come and gone. We have lost many valuable Members through death, the spin of the political wheel of fortune, by promotions to higher office, and by retirement. It has been my pleasure to know many outstanding Members of this body through my tenure of service, but I have never known a Member for whom I have a higher regard than my fellow Kentuckian and warm personal friend, VIRGIL CHAPMAN.

I have known him and watched his record throughout the years, and long before I became a Member of this body. When I became a Member of the Seventy-fifth Congress, he with his long years of valuable experience and his position of influence and leadership in the House took me immediately under his wing, advising and counseling me in the intricate and complex problems of congressional life. Our friendship has ripened throughout these years and my constant association and personal friendship has enabled me to evaluate his true worth, not only to the people of Kentucky but to the Nation. He commands the respect of all who have served with him. He is a man of strong personal convictions and has the courage of his convictions. Never at any time have I known him to waver in a decision which reflected his personal convictions because of pressure from any group. The entire membership of the House has come to know and appreciate his fairness, his honesty, his kindness, and his desire at all times to serve his country first.

As a member of the important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, his service to his Nation has been outstanding. The Pure Food and Drug Acts on the statute books of the United States today stand as a monument to his untiring efforts and study concerning the problems of the health of the people of this Nation. No man contributed more toward the enactment of this legislation than did my colleague, VIRGIL CHAPMAN.

In addition to his valuable service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, he has taken an active interest in all legislation and particularly in the field of agriculture. Throughout Kentucky the name of VIRGIL CHAPMAN is a household word in agricultural sections. He became interested in the problems of the farmer and the tobacco grower long before he came to Congress, and his valuable experience and his study of their problems since becoming a Member of Congress has contributed most materially toward the well-being of the farmers of Kentucky and of the Nation. There is no Member of Congress in either body more conversant with the problems of tobacco growers than VIRGIL CHAPMAN, and no Member who has more diligently worked for their economic well-being, and I am sure that the farmers of Kentucky will never cease to be grateful to him for his long years of service in their behalf.

HON. ROY CLIPPINGER, HON. EVERETT DIRKSEN, HON. ANTON JOHNSON, HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON, AND HON. EVAN HOWELL

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, this House loses five Members from the great State of Illinois, that State which has contributed in the past illustrious Members to this body.

It was our State that was responsible for the recognition of Abraham Lincoln in his service to the State. General Grant reached his success as a result of his residence in the great State of Illinois.

Illinois has contributed in no small measure to the importance of this great body.

Last week we bade farewell to Representatives CLIPPINGER, DIRKSEN, JOHNSON of Illinois, STRATTON, and HOWELL, who will not return to the Eighty-first Congress.

Of course, we know well that Representative HOWELL was elevated to a position on the Federal bench. We all respect and revere Mr. CLIPPINGER. We all know Mr. DIRKSEN for his familiarity with international affairs. We all know the effectiveness of Mr. JOHNSON as a member of that great Committee on Agriculture. We all respect Mr. STRATTON. It is the regret of the Illinois delegation that five great Members will not return to the Eighty-first Congress of their own free will and volition.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentlemen from Illinois that Illinois has been a great State for great men from other States. Abraham Lincoln was from Kentucky. General Grant, I believe, was from Ohio.

Mr. TWYMAN. He came from Ohio. May I say that all seem to be great when they get to the State of Illinois.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to join the distinguished gentleman in paying tribute to these distinguished men in this Congress from his State who are now leaving, and to say to him that I agree with everything he has said concerning them. We bid them farewell with sad hearts and with fond affection.

Mr. TWYMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. For the sake of the RECORD, may I point out that the illustrious gentleman you mentioned, Abraham Lincoln, was born in the great State of Kentucky, but he reached his eminence in the great State of Illinois.

Mr. Grant was born some 75 yards from the Kentucky line. He did reach his eminence as a colonel in the Army in an Illinois regiment.

I, too, regret to see these five eminent men of the Illinois delegation retire from the House.

I wish them all the best of everything.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Ten years ago, when I first came to this House, I became acquainted with another gentleman who entered that year, from the State of Illinois, Mr. ANTON JOHNSON. There has never been a finer gentleman and a truer friend than the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON] in this House of Representatives.

Mr. TWYMAN. I appreciate those remarks.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have known ANTON JOHNSON as a member of the Committee on Agriculture. I would like to make this my word of testimony: I have never met a finer man, I have never served with a finer man in a group than ANTON JOHNSON. May the Lord bless him in his chosen services, as he leaves the Membership of this House.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want to subscribe to everything that has been said about ANTON JOHNSON. He is one of the finest characters I have ever met.

I wish also to pay my tribute to the other Members from the gentleman's State who are leaving Congress, for what they have contributed to the welfare and the benefit of the country. When they leave these Halls may they take with them the kindly feelings of their fellow Members and may good health and happiness for many years be their portion in life.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to pay my respects to my dear friend, ANTON JOHNSON, who has rendered such distinguished service as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

To know ANTON JOHNSON is to love him. He is inherently cooperative, and friendly, his character is above reproach, above all he is a great American. I cannot think of anything more inspiring than to hear ANTON JOHNSON tell some of the history of himself and his family and pay the tribute to America that he is capable of paying.

I know it is the hope of all of the members of the Committee on Agriculture that whatever future endeavors he may undertake will be filled with the happiness and joy he so richly deserves.

Mr. TWYMAN. I appreciate those words and I thank the Members for all that has been said about the retiring members of our delegation who will not be back in the Eighty-first Congress. Once again I express my pride and esteem of our delegation for our retiring colleagues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

THE HONORABLE ESTES KEFAUVER

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks procured by our distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, I am more than pleased to express my appreciation of the services rendered to his country and his district by the eminent gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER.

I deem him one of the best qualified of our public servants. He has acted always for "the greatest good for the greatest number." I talk with authority because I closely watched his work as a comember with me in the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

He is a liberal in the truest and finest sense of the word. Never once did his interest in the welfare of the individual give way before those who advocated swollen privileges. He was most forthright and courageous in his battle to strengthen the antitrust laws which powerful interests sought to weaken. His will to work for the common welfare was matched by his knowledge of government, his clarity of vision, and his indefatigable energy in amassing and digesting the wealth of information to support his statesmanship.

As one who is interested in the aims and aspirations of the Jewish people in Palestine, I made note with a great deal of comfort of his espousal of the cause of Israel. He was among the first to recognize justice and logic of the Zionist position and by word and deed strengthened public opinion in favor of the partition resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations and in favor of the recognition by our Government of the new state of Israel. The Jewish people have a friend in him.

ESTES KEFAUVER takes his place with ease among the able men of good will in our country.

THE HONORABLE FADJO CRAVENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would not impose upon my colleagues at this time of the morning, but as we are pronouncing encomiums and paying tribute to so many of our fine colleagues with whom we have had the pleasure of serving I want to call to your attention the fact that one of the finest, most splendid gentlemen I have ever known, a man whom I have learned to know very intimately and admire and respect is voluntarily retiring from this Congress, our colleague, FADJO CRAVENS.

FADJO CRAVENS came here as the successor to his father, Ben Cravens. I am sure many of you who served in years gone by knew Mr. Ben Cravens and the fine man that he was and the splendid service he performed for the Nation. Also you have observed the fine work of our colleague, Fadjo, with whom I have had the pleasure of serving the 8 years of my membership in this body. He came to Congress in 1939. I am glad to pay tribute to the splendid service he has performed and say to you that there is no finer American in this country or one who has rendered greater service than FADJO CRAVENS.

Mr. HOBBS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama who served on the Judiciary Committee with the distinguished gentleman [Mr. CRAVENS] for so long.

Mr. HOBBS of Alabama. This Congress and the Nation are grateful and will ever be to the gentleman's great State of Arkansas for sending us the Cravens boys. I had the pleasure of knowing and loving his father before him. Both of them merit all of the eulogies that can be paid them. Faithful, skillful, adroit, competent legislative and personal services have characterized them every day. We are grateful to you and your State for the work that these men have done and it will live throughout all time to come.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DEVITT. May I join the gentleman in the sentiments he expresses about our friend and colleague on the Judiciary Committee, FADJO CRAVENS. It has been my privilege to serve with him for 2 years and I may say without fear of successful contradiction that I know of no man of finer character or better legal ability than FADJO CRAVENS.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity in praising the services rendered Arkansas and the Nation by Hon. FADJO CRAVENS. His work on the Judiciary Committee of the House has been marked with honor

and distinction. He is a most learned lawyer. It is regretted that he has seen fit to voluntarily retire from this body. I wish for him every happiness, contentment, and success as the years come and go.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The retirement of FADJO CRAVENS from Congress is a great loss to the United States. I have never met a finer American or a more worthy Representative of a great people than FADJO CRAVENS.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. I was personally acquainted with the illustrious father of FADJO CRAVENS. I think Fadjo is one of the most profound men who has ever been a Member of the House of Representatives. I know that the Nation is losing a great man.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. FADJO CRAVENS is a scholarly man, a fine gentleman, and one we shall certainly miss in this House.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I know all of you join me in expressing gratitude for having had the intimate association with Fadjo and wish for him much joy and happiness as he continues his life's journey. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD at this point on the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have known FADJO CRAVENS for many years. His keen wit, clear head, and loyalty to his friends has endeared him to all who know him. We know he will enjoy getting back to "God's country" for a rest and a well-earned vacation. We wish for him the best that life affords.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, during the time I have had the honor to serve in this House, many Members have come and gone. We have lost many valuable Members through death, the spin of the political wheel of fortune, by promotions to higher office, and by retirement. It has been my pleasure to know many outstanding Members of this body through my tenure of service, but I have never known a Member for whom I have higher regard than my good friend, FADJO CRAVENS, of Arkansas.

It was with deep regret that I learned some time ago of his intention to return to private life, but regardless of the direction of our paths in years to come, I shall always remember him for his fine character, sincerity of purpose, loyalty and devotion to duty, as well as the personal friendship I have enjoyed which has ripened with the passing years. Industry, integrity, and ability have marked his record of service.

In his departure from public life, the Nation, the State, and his own district will lose a valuable public servant whose place will be hard to fill. May good fortune and happiness attend him all the days of his life.

HON. JOE HENDRICKS AND HON. EMORY H. PRICE

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, we in Florida are losing two of our distinguished Members, Messrs. JOE HENDRICKS and EMORY PRICE, who served with great distinction in the House.

Mr. PRICE served on the Naval Affairs Committee and on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He has served his State and his district exceptionally well. We feel keenly his leaving. It has been very pleasant working with him. The effectiveness of the Florida delegation has been in teamwork and he has been an important part of that team.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I am glad to join in all that my distinguished leader of the Florida delegation has said about EMORY PRICE. We shall miss him very keenly. It is great to know a man with such a lovable, sincere character. He is one of the hardest-working Members of Congress I have ever known. He has accomplished a great deal for his district, his State, and the Nation. We genuinely regret his leaving us and wish him well in anything he might undertake.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I want to add a word on the retirement of EMORY PRICE. I think it can be said of him that he is a man who recognizes that public office is a public trust. He possesses the qualifications that are necessary to make a good public servant. I join my colleagues in wishing for him a future successful life. He has done a great work during this Congress and he has been a doer, not a speaker.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my words of tribute to EMORY PRICE. When I came to Congress I did not know the gentleman, but the 2 years that I have been here his warm and charming personality have certainly endeared him to me and to everyone whom he has worked with. As a freshman Congressman I was able to go to him and he gave to me his counsel and his advice generously on all occasions. He has been an excellent Congressman, and I join with my fellow Congressmen from Florida in regretting his leaving.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have come to know EMORY PRICE in the past 6 years that I have been associated with him. I have found him to be one of the most conscientious and one of the hardest-working Members of Congress that I have come in contact with. I know that he will be sorely missed because of his ability and because of the good work that he has done for his native city of Jacksonville, for the State of Florida, and for the country as a whole.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep regret at the going away from this great body of my good friend, EMORY PRICE. He has been my next-door neighbor during the 14 years that I have been here. I regard him not only as a fine, genuine Christian gentleman, but I regard him as an able statesman. We are going to miss him very much.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

HON. PETE JARMAN AND HON. CARTER MANASCO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker and friends of the House, 43 faces will be absent from these seats come January, according to the present tabulation; each will be sorely missed. It seems to me that death, defeat, and voluntary withdrawal each "loves a shining mark." These enemies of Congress seem to take toll of our very best.

Alabama will suffer the loss of two of our greatest Representatives, PETE JARMAN and CARTER MANASCO. You all know them and therefore love them, not for the office they have each graced but for what they are.

So often during our primary campaign and since, I have said and said sincerely that I would much rather have been defeated myself than that either of these two outstanding servants of the people should be lost to the service of their districts, their State, and the Nation.

Of course you know the story of their records here and the Congressional Directory gives a brief of some of the high points of their services before coming to Congress. Each of you can testify how well each of them has served in this body. You know how diligent they have been and how, in spite of our crowded days during their service, they have managed somehow to make friends of all their contacts and keep them. I doubt if there are two more popular Members of this body. So it seems to me that the least we Alabamians can do is to invite all those who care to and who can find the time at this late hour of the morning in the dying hours of the Eightieth Congress to extend our remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks at his point in the RECORD with reference to the services of Messrs. JARMAN and MANASCO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to endorse everything the distinguished gentleman from Alabama has said about our two colleagues [Mr. MANASCO] and [Mr. JARMAN]. Both of their districts join mine. I am frank to say that Alabama never had two more worthy Representatives than these two distinguished sons of that great State.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always delighted to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I had no idea I would attempt to make a speech at this extremely early hour, 5 o'clock in the morning, here in the closing hours of this session of Congress. However, I could not pass by this opportunity to pay tribute to two of my very best and warmest friends; two eminent and outstanding members of this Congress.

PETE JARMAN has represented the Sixth District of Alabama since 1936. Prior to his election to Congress, PETE JARMAN had an outstanding record of public service as an official of the State of Alabama. He also had a distinguished war record during the First World War. During his service here in the Congress, he has been for many years one of the leaders on the great Foreign Affairs Committee, and has been instrumental in the writing of much of the momentous legislation which has been presented by that great committee and adopted as the foreign policy of our country. I am sure that the Members of the House of Representatives will concur with me in the statement, no Member of Congress has worked harder, labored more diligently, and with a greater sincerity of purpose, than has PETE JARMAN of Alabama. He has many friends here, and in his native State of Alabama, who are grateful to him for the fine and splendid service he has rendered to his country over a long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe there is, among the 435 Members of Congress, no Member who has more devoted personal friends here in the Congress than does CARTER MANASCO. Carter came here, as you know, as Secretary to the beloved Speaker Will Bankhead. Carter was elected to Congress from the Seventh District of Alabama, at a special election to fill the vacancy created by the death of Speaker Bankhead. During his service in the House of Representatives, he served with distinction during the Seventy-ninth Congress, as Chairman of Expenditures in Executive Departments, and has served on many notable special investigating Committees. Prior to coming to Congress, CARTER MANASCO was a member of the Alabama legislature and an outstanding lawyer in his home in Pasper, Ala. Among his colleagues here, he is regarded as one who always has the courage of his convictions. His work in the Congress has given ample evidence of his devotion to duty. During his service in Congress, no Member of the Alabama Delegation has contributed more to the welfare of his State and Nation. Carter is my warm personal friend, and I regret exceedingly that he is leaving us.

I wish for both of my colleagues, Pete and Carter, the very best of everything that life can bring.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina with much pleasure.

Mr. BONNER. I am happy to have this opportunity to pay my respects to the splendid character and the fine manhood that CARTER MANASCO has exhibited here in the Congress and before becoming a Member of Congress here in the Capitol. It was my particular pleasure to meet him when he was a secretary in Congress and I was a secretary. He then was congressional timber, and he showed his ability and has demonstrated his ability since he has become a Member of the House. No finer gentleman, no more courageous man, has ever served. Here recently he demonstrated in the cloakroom the most courteous sportsmanship I have ever seen, when he brought his successor in and said to his friends, "This is a fine man. This man will make a fine Congressman, though he defeated me in the primaries in Alabama." My hat is off to Carter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. It is a pleasure, sir.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to pay my highest respects to two of Alabama's greatest Congressmen, PETE JARMAN and CARTER MANASCO, whose services in this body will be terminated at the expiration of the present session. I know you all join me in extending felicitations of good will to them and in expressing appreciation for their fellowship and for the contributions they have made during their service in the Congress.

Both have distinguished themselves, not only as Representatives of their districts, but as loyal public servants, contributing immeasurably to the well-being of the whole Nation by their constant devotion to service which they have manifested during their tenures. Their stewardship has been remarkable in that they have at all times in their attention to duty, been reliable and trustworthy in all their dealings.

I wish to express to them my personal gratitude for their kindness and helpfulness to me as a new Member, and I shall always covet their friendship.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about PETE JARMAN and CARTER MANASCO. They are two of the greatest human beings I have ever known. They are just about everything. If I talked all night I could not tell you how much I love them and respect them. They are really and truly great men. We are going to miss them. I also want to say something about my great friend from Missouri [JASPER BELL]. I do not see him here, at present, but I do see him every day and every night and all the time. JASPER BELL is retiring of his own accord. He is one of the greatest men I have ever known anywhere. I visit at his home out on his ranch, which is right next to that great Jesse James country. JASPER BELL is a great statesman and a great man. With his great energy and brain he has done a great job here. History will record the great work that JASPER BELL and PETE JARMAN and CARTER MANASCO and JOE HENDRICKS and all of these great men who are leaving us have done. We are going to miss them. We love you all. We just wish you could stay right here with us forever and ever. God bless you and good luck.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I have had the pleasure of knowing the gentleman from Alabama, PETE JARMAN, and as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] has said, he is one of the best Members of the House. I hope his life is a long one and a happy and contented one.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Delighted, sir.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to speak here about our two beloved colleagues from Alabama who are leaving us. Everybody knows them as Pete and Carter. Both of them came to the Congress with a background of public service. PETE JARMAN was secretary of state of the State of Alabama before he came to Congress. He has a fine record here. His service in the House and on the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been outstanding. CARTER MANASCO was a member of the legislature of the State of Alabama and for many years was secretary to our late beloved Speaker, William Bankhead. We will miss them both, and we wish them Godspeed and good luck in their future endeavors.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the leaving of my distinguished friends from Alabama, PETE JARMAN and CARTER MANASCO, the House loses two of its most valuable Members. They have both served with ability and fidelity. I have served on the Committee on Expenditures with CARTER MANASCO during the past 2 years and it has been a great pleasure to me. I regret very much their leaving. I shall always treasure my association with them and I shall always equally treasure their friendship.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as the curtain is rung down on the second session of the Eightieth Congress, the hearts of members of the Alabama delegation in our national legislature are sad. Two of our popular and beloved Members from Alabama will not be with us in the Eighty-first Congress.

PETE JARMAN leaves an important position as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Especially in the past few years has Pete's work and endeavors on this committee been vital. A veteran with distinguished service in World War I, Pete has devoted his time and effort to an extraordinary degree to make a

permanent peace. PETE JARMAN's labors in shaping a firm international policy of the United States Government will stand always as a memorial to an able Congressman and statesman.

As CARTER MANASCO makes his exit from this Hall, Alabama members are aware that our State is losing a most able parliamentarian. A practicing disciple of the Bankhead political school, Carter has given to the seventh district a forceful and aggressive representation. As ranking Democrat on the Committee to Investigate Executive Expenditures he made wholesome contributions to the shaping of important legislation affecting full employment and surplus property. As counselor, adviser, and friend, CARTER MANASCO will remain high in the rank of legislators who have molded governmental policies for the welfare of our people.

Residents of Alabama and citizens of the United States are the real losers in the departure of these two Congressmen.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, those Members who have been here for a number of terms have noted with sorrow the departure of others from among us who have become personal friends and we are somewhat prone to become hardened to the experience. But I am quite sure that practically all Members will feel a special sense of regret at the departure from our midst at the end of this session of one of our most beloved and distinguished Members. I need not point out to you that I refer to PETE JARMAN, of Alabama.

During his 12 years of service among us he has endeared himself to all by his unfailing congeniality, sincerity of motives, and strict devotion to the many tasks confronting a Member; and, above all, he has earned the highest respect for his always competent judgment on matters of critical interest to the Nation.

It is my earnest hope, as I am sure it is of all of us, that this Government may be able to utilize his talents and services in some manner other than purely legislative, because such unselfish devotion as PETE JARMAN has rendered is not easily obtainable. The knowledge and experience he has gained in this Hall will be of inestimable value in almost any capacity in which he is called upon to serve.

And, Mr. Speaker, may I add that all of us know of the fine, arduous, and helpful assistance given to Pete by his charming and devoted wife, Beryl, in the many accomplishments which are now a part of the history of the past six Congresses.

In whatever endeavors the Jarmans undertake we wish them the utmost success and happiness.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to pay tribute to my good friend and colleague, JOE HENDRICKS, who is retiring from Congress. JOE HENDRICKS has been an outstanding member of the House Appropriations Committee where he was respected for his keen discerning mind and his ability to consider all things in a fair and equitable fashion. The House is losing a valuable Member who will always be kindly remembered by all of us who knew him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and to include the speech she intends to make at the Republican Convention on Tuesday morning.

HON. JASPER C. BELL

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a few minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the very fine compliments and encomiums paid to various Members who are retiring. With all I have heard, I have a strong feeling of concurrence. I thought that one of the most distinguished Members of this House, one of the finest gentlemen in this House had been overlooked. I was ready to make a little speech about him until my friend from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] had to steal my thunder and mention my very warm and distinguished friend, JASPER BELL, of Missouri.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Is that the same Honorable JASPER BELL who lives in Kansas City, Mo., which is a suburb of Kansas City, Kans.?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, when I came to this Congress, I came here with that natural feeling that every newcomer has, wondering, in a sense, just how a State delegation gets along that is divided by parties. I found that in the Missouri delegation, regardless of your party, you always had a friend, you always had fine counsel and a very able counselor and a sincere helper in Judge BELL. The State of Missouri loses a great public servant here when they lose his representation, and this Congress loses a great advocate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I concur in what the gentleman has said. I may say that it is most gracious of the gentleman to make the remarks he has made. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was going to be recognized to make some remarks.

Judge BELL has the strength and dignity to which the gentleman from Missouri has referred, which has impressed him upon all of his colleagues. A man of great ability, a man of unusual character, a man of great talent, a man who has depth at all times, the highest type of a gentleman. He and his loved ones can well be proud of the great character of service he has rendered to his State and to his country while a Member of this body.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to endorse all that has been said about our good friend and colleague from Missouri, JASPER BELL. So many nice things have been said tonight about him that about all that remains to be said is that he is the cream of the crop. He is one of nature's noblemen. We are going to miss him.

Mr CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it has been jocularly said that office holders rarely die, seldom resign, and never retire. Judge BELL is a notable exception to that rule. He served on the circuit bench with distinction and could have occupied that position indefinitely but preferred to enter active practice and resigned before the end of his term. And again, at the close of this session, after a notable service of 14 years, he is once more retiring to engage in active practice, over the protest of his constituency and to the regret of his colleagues here on the floor. JASPER BELL brought to the House an invaluable knowledge of the law, acquired both as a judge and as a practitioner, on the bench and before the bar, and for more than a decade has been exceptionally useful in the formulation of a large part of the statutory law of the land. At the same time he has exercised a commanding influence in both the domestic and foreign relations of the Federal Government. His service in the negotiations which led up to the establishment of Philippine independence were so outstanding that he was sent as a member of the Commission representing the United States at the final ceremonies and was awarded the especial honor of the Distinguished Service Star by the Philippine Government.

Judge BELL's retirement comes at an inopportune time. Never was the Nation in greater need of unselfish and impartial men of wise experience and seasoned judgment, and his retirement will leave a vacancy that cannot be easily filled. But he is entitled to a well-earned vacation—while the sun is yet high and the best of life is still before him. So, regretfully and affectionately we wish him good luck and good fortune and Godspeed.

THE HONORABLE W. J. BRYAN DORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that we all join in paying tribute to those Members who are knowingly going out of Congress. I wonder if it would not be worth a little something to throw out a ray of comfort to those Members who are going out unwittingly?

But I rose to pay my tribute to one of the younger Members of this House—a serviceman of the last war, a man who represents the district from which my people originally came. I am speaking of WILLIAM J. BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina—one of the most energetic, one of the most worthy, and one of the most reliable Members of this House.

Mr. DORN is going out of this House, and he will take with him the love and respect of every Member who really knows him.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would like to share the sentiment of the gentleman from Mississippi in what he has to say of Mr. DORN. Certainly all the younger Members are extremely sorry that he is going to leave this House. His enthusiasm and devotion to the welfare of this country have made him extremely beloved by all of us on this side and I think also on the Republican side. I wish him success in the years to come.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I, of course, endorse everything my distinguished colleague has said about BRYAN DORN. I have never know a man of more courage than BRYAN DORN. With his ability, character, and courage, I predict for him a long career of public service.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tributes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]. I think he has been of great value to this House. He did not serve with stars or bars, as I understand, but was a corporal in the Army. He came back here and gave something to this House which it needs, that was the viewpoint of the enlisted man and also a young man.

I hope he will succeed in his political efforts because America needs that kind of young man today very badly.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, and I agree with what he says about the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], who when he came here brought with him the viewpoint of the rank-and-file in the Army in the recent war.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would like to join in what my colleagues have said in paying tribute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]. As has been said, he brought to this Congress the viewpoint of the soldier. He represented the enlisted man well. He is vigorous, he is able, as a Member of Congress and I wish him all that he wants in the future.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I join in the fine tributes that have been paid to our colleagues who are leaving the House of Representatives this year. Among those who will leave is the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE, dean of the Iowa delegation.

Judge GWYNNE is completing his seventh term of service, a most valuable man on the Committee on the Judiciary, a great constitutional lawyer, a man whose advice was eagerly sought by all those who are interested in legislation that came from that great committee.

Judge GWYNNE is a man of great courage, a man who never had any hesitancy in speaking his honest convictions regardless of the political consequences.

That type of an individual, that kind of a rugged American is the type of man most needed in America today.

I personally regret that my very good friend, Judge GWYNNE, is leaving the House at this time. He has my best wishes for success and happiness in all his endeavors.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. For 10 years it was my privilege to sit beside the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE in the Committee on the Judiciary. On the other side of me sat Raymond Springer, who has passed to the Great Beyond. In sitting between these two outstanding men, it was an inspiration to work with them.

In JOHN GWYNNE we are losing one of the most able men of this House, one of the hardest workers, one of the bravest and most courageous men who dared stand up for what he thought was right. He never sought public favor. All through his career he has been guided by one thing and that is devotion to duty to his country and to his God.

We shall miss him and this country and this Congress will suffer by his departure.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It has been said this evening, "I heartily approve." I could not let this occasion pass without expressing my admiration for one of the great, and I think one of the truly distinguished and capable statesmen of Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE is an outstanding lawyer, a very careful student of government, a man of demonstrated courage, and a man of the highest ideals. It seems to me that JOHN GWYNNE, at all times, has demonstrated that he is the soul of honor. He never had any thought of anything except the correct vote as he could analyze the problem confronting the House. It never seemed to me it ever occurred to JOHN GWYNNE to make what might be called a demagogic speech or to ever act as an opportunist. He always believed in his quiet way in making what he thought was a sound vote and a vote in the interest of his country.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I realize the hour is so late that dawn is breaking, but I must nevertheless ask the indulgence of the House for a brief moment to pay tribute to my colleague the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE, who will not return to this chamber when the next Congress convenes.

Congressman GWYNNE has been a tower of strength as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. He is equipped with a brilliant legal and judicial mind. Thorough scholarship in the law, facility for precise expression, fairness in dealing with his fellow men, energy in discharging the duties of his office, unfailing gentlemanly conduct, these are the attributes he has so clearly revealed during his service in the House of Representatives.

There is always great demand for the vigor and talents with which he is endowed. He will soon be free to engage in other enterprises, and in these he will continue to serve with credit to himself, his family, and our common country.

JOHN W. GWYNNE will take with him the good will and the wholesome respect of his associates on Capitol Hill. It is my wish for him and his fine family that they may enjoy continued good health and much happiness in all the years that lie ahead.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve on the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of which JOHN GWYNNE was chairman. I have never served with an abler lawyer or a finer gentleman. I shall never forget that close association which will remain as one of the most pleasant and most inspiring of my congressional experiences. His retirement is much more than a loss to his district and the State of Iowa, it is a loss to the country, because JOHN GWYNNE embodies those characteristics which go to make up a statesman.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor indeed to serve in Congress the past 10 years with my distinguished colleague and friend, Hon. JOHN W. GWYNNE, of Iowa, a great American and a real leader. Mr. GWYNNE is closing his service in Congress with adjournment and it is with real regret that I must bid him farewell as a colleague and as dean of the Iowa congressional delegation.

It has indeed been a privilege and an inspiration to serve with him and I will always look to him as a great statesman and leader I wish him the continued success I know will be his and I know all of the Members of Congress who have served with him join me in this tribute in recognition of his outstanding service.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, "You can fool some of the people all the time, and all the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time" are words of wisdom that have come from one of our greatest statesmen. I have had the great joy of serving with JOHN GWYNNE on the Committee on the Judiciary for 14 years, and on the other side of the political fence, if there was one, which there never has been in that great committee. We on our side all loved him just as intensely and fervently as did his colleagues on the other side. So, I want to pay my tribute by saying a fervent "Amen" to every word that has been said about him, and then I could add a good deal more if I had the time.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT].

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my words to the sentiments expressed by the gentlemen with reference to our good friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. It has been my privilege to serve with him on the

Committee on the Judiciary for the last 2 years. I have looked up to him for guidance and he has furnished it to me. We think a lot of him. He is a great lawyer, a great jurist, and above all else he has great character, emblematic of a bit of philosophy that is very rare nowadays; a philosophy of good, sound, midwestern Republicanism. I am sure that all of us are going to miss JOHN GWYNNE.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I join in every word that has been said about JOHN GWYNNE. Not only did I have the opportunity to serve with him the first 2 years I served in the Seventy-seventh Congress, but I have watched and have grown to love and admire him as a great American, a great patriot, and a very, very able lawyer. I think the greatest loss that this House has suffered as a result of some of the primaries has been that of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] and I regret exceedingly that he was defeated.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that I feel greatly the loss of JOHN GWYNNE of Iowa. I think it is a great loss to the State of Iowa; it is a great loss to this Congress, and it is a great loss to this Nation. Few men have made the impression of character and ability on me as has the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I join in the encomiums that have been paid to our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Iowa, JOHN GWYNNE, the dean of our delegation. When I came to Congress I found that he was the unifying force in the Iowa Republican delegation. He gave us leadership, guidance, and inspiration. His record in this House will long remain a challenge to the rest of us to emulate his fine accomplishments. It is with deep regret that we know that he must leave us, and we wish for him the greatest success that can come to anyone. Indeed, he has always accomplished that because of his fine record of public service which we know will continue down through the years.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the country can ill afford to lose men of the stamp and character of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. Having served with him for well over a decade, I shall always consider it a rare privilege and a source of everlasting inspiration to have had the opportunity of working with a man such as he, and of having known him.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I also want to join in the words of tribute paid to our colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. I have had the privilege of serving with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] for 10 years, the last several years of which his office has adjoined mine, and from that close experience I have learned to know JOHN GWYNNE as one of the ablest lawyers and one of the finest men that it has been my privilege to know as a Member of this body. The Nation can ill afford to lose the services of a man of the character and the ability and the integrity of JOHN GWYNNE. We wish for him the vesy best that life can hold.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to join in paying my tribute to JOHN GWYNNE of Iowa, one of the greatest Representatives the people of that State have had in Congress for the last 25 years.

Thomas Jefferson once said there were three questions to ask of a man who is applying for public office: Is he honest? Is he qualified? Is he faithful? JOHN GWYNNE met all those requirements, and in addition to that he had that rare quality that makes a real statesman, that is, the courage of his convictions. His departure from this House will be a great loss to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GORSKI. I want to pay my tribute to JOHN GWYNNE. I have served on the Committee on the Judiciary with JOHN GWYNNE and found him to be a very, very fine lawyer, and an able man. I am sorry to see him leave us and wish him the best of luck. We will miss him on the Judiciary Committee; he was one of the very hard-working members. We have found him very helpful on many of our difficult problems and his judgment and advice was eagerly sought. I hope that he will have many years of happiness in his future life and I wish him good luck and Godspeed.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. It is a privilege to join the other Members of the House in paying tribute to a great legislator, JOHN GWYNNE, a man whom I have known and learned to respect as a friend and as an able legislator. I hope and know that the people of his State when he returns to private life will receive him with the same high regard we in this Congress have for him, for he has proved himself in this legislative body to be a remarkable man.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LEFEVRE. I, too, want to pay tribute to my colleague, JOHN GWYNNE. He was a neighbor of mine in the House. Ever since I have been here I have enjoyed knowing him. He has been one of my best advisers. We are all going to miss John.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, it was a source of great regret to me to find that the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE, who was Representative of the Third District of Iowa continuously since his election to the Seventy-fourth Congress, would not return as a Member of the Eighty-first Congress.

It has been my privilege to serve with him as a member of the Judiciary Committee, and also as a member of Subcommittee No. 2, of which he was the chairman.

Judge GWYNNE is possessed with rare legal ability which he has demonstrated throughout the years as a member of the Judiciary Committee. He was fearless in his advocacy of measures which he believed to be for the welfare of the country, although they may have been temporarily unpopular politically. He has a judicial temperament, and if he so desires, I hope he will adorn the bench of a Federal court. On the other hand, if he resumes the practice of law I know that the people will make a beaten path to his door to obtain his wise counsel. Should he desire to return to political life, I am fully satisfied that the voters of his congressional district will in the not too distant future recognize the error of their way and return him to the Congress where he may again take up the work which he so admirably performed, not only for their benefit, but for the welfare of the entire country.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, four members of the Committee on the Judiciary will not return to the Eighty-first Congress.

JOHN GWYNNE, of Iowa, has served 14 years in the House and 12 years on the committee. He has demonstrated that he is a man of unusual attainments. An outstanding lawyer, a fearless and courageous legislator, he thinks for himself at all times. He not only thinks for himself, he acts for himself; that is, he is entirely independent. I have not always agreed with him, but on such occasions I wondered if possibly I was not wrong. There is no harder worker in the Congress. The little things and the big things all receive JOHN GWYNNE'S meticulous attention. Always judicial, he was especially qualified for the important chairmanship of Subcommittee No. 2. He has always shown a keen interest in agriculture. Indeed, because of these activities, many of us have affectionately referred to him as "the farmers' friend."

In short, he has done a grand job and it is regrettable that he is not returning. We will not say farewell to him because I feel sure that he will be called upon in the future to render public service either in the legislative or judicial field.

ESTES KEFAUVER has served 10 years in the House and 9 years on the committee. He is also a splendid lawyer and a man of ability, who takes his work seriously and therefore gets results. He has been a pioneer in a number of legislative fields, and believes that today is better than yesterday and that tomorrow will be better than today. He is retiring of his own volition and, at the moment, is engaged in a primary contest for a seat in the United States Senate. I do not know who his opponents are but, if we must have a Democrat in the Senate from Tennessee, I feel sure that ESTES KEFAUVER will uphold the tradition of his party.

FADJO CRAVENS has served 10 years in the House and 8 years on the committee, and is retiring to return to the practice of law in his native Arkansas. A perfect gentleman, a lovable friend, a great lawyer, an indefatigable worker, he has given his district and his State the best possible representation in the Congress. Another will come to represent his district, but that individual is going to find that FADJO CRAVENS has left a large pair of shoes to fill in the Halls of Congress.

WALLACE CHADWICK, of Pennsylvania, has served but one term, and it seems too bad that one so well qualified and one who has blazed the way for what promised to be a distinguished career should leave us so soon. Few Members have made the progress in a first term that Judge CHADWICK has made.

Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that these four Members are leaving us. Each one has the respect, the confidence, and the affection of every member of the committee and, I believe, of every Member of the House. If there was ever a time when experience and sound thinking on the part of the Congress are essential, it is now. These Members will undoubtedly be succeeded by capable successors, but their respective districts will be deprived of the experience, knowledge, and know-how which only service makes possible. I join with the others in wishing each of these colleagues pleasure, enjoyment, and success in all the days that are to come.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, may I join with the many other friends of JOHN GWYNNE in expressing my regrets that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa is leaving Congress. It was my great pleasure to work with JOHN GWYNNE on the House Judiciary Committee where he was one of the most highly respected members. The departure of this great lawyer and statesman is a loss that Congress can ill afford. JOHN leaves behind him many kind and pleasant memories that will linger long in the thoughts of those of us who knew him.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the services of JOHN GWYNNE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

A PRESIDENT FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it has been said tonight that there are three things which might make a man retire from membership here: one, death; another, defeat; and another, a decision to withdraw from the political arena. None of those three will apply to the departure of my able, affable, and eloquent colleague from South Dakota, KARL MUNDT. When he leaves the House at the close of this Congress, he will leave for another reason, but I think he will still be around the Capitol and I predict we will see and hear much of him as a Member of the other body.

So I shall not use this time for further eulogies to Karl since he will be with us, but will say something about another Member of the House of Representatives who may not be with us here next year.

In his case, if he is not here, it will also not be for one of the three reasons enumerated, not death nor defeat nor a decision to withdraw. It will be because of a decision that will be made by others.

This Member of the House of Representatives is a man who today more than any other person, in my opinion, typifies representative government.

Last fall I had the privilege of having this fine Representative stop off a few days in my district. I received a telegram of greetings from a former Member of the House, Frank Horton, in Wyoming. At a public meeting which we had, I read this telegram which said of this man:

> In these days when freedom is on trial, and when people are trying to learn how to govern themselves, he more than any other man in all the world has demonstrated that he knows how to make representative government work.

That is the man I have in mind tonight. He is a man who, if the public appreciates that quality and wants a man of that character to be associated with the Government next year—not in the House of Representatives, not in the Senate of the United States—but in the White House, they will turn to the House of Representatives and pick that Member from this body, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker of the House of Representatives JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, the delegation to which I have the honor to belong is a small one. Therefore, any gap in it is the more deeply felt. The senior member of our Maine delegation in point of service has elected to seek election to another body. This means that she will leave this body where she will be very much missed. It is my belief that none of our Members is more respected and admired than my colleague, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, a woman of great charm, of great dignity, and of almost incredible efficiency in the performance of her duties. She has been a notably good sportswoman on all the missions, some of them very arduous and dangerous, that it has been her duty as a Member to perform. I repeat that we shall all miss her very much, and I personally shall miss her as a colleague. I take this occasion to pay her this small tribute. I only wish I could do it more worthily.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have for months been committed to a candidate for nomination for the Presidency of the United States. For months I have been campaigning for that candidate.

I wish to state that last week, upon my return to my district, I found that my people are highly in favor of, and will wholeheartedly support, the candidacy of our distinguished Speaker, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

I assure you that his nomination will insure my return to Congress.

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, WALTER G. ANDREWS, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, is retiring from Congress this year. He has been with us for 18 years. As chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, he has made a fine record in getting legislation passed, but, more than anything else, in the harmony he has secured in that committee.

Today he has just completed one of the major bills of the session, and he has demonstrated in connection with that operation an ability which we all admire. HAM, as he is very affectionately known to his friends, is a very pleasant fellow socially, and he has been very kind to many of us all through the period here.

I am very sorry that he has felt that his health will not permit him to continue with us. I hope as he goes along in the days to come that he will enjoy the rest that will come to him in his retirement.

I wish him everything good in the days to come.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am reluctant to even raise my voice in joining the expressions uttered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] with respect to our colleague who has announced his decision to leave us, not because he is not deserving of it, not because his sincerity of purpose has not been recognized and appreciated by those of us who have served with him, not because his devotion to the security of his country has not always been paramount in his thought and effort, but because, if he were here, he would not want me or any of us to make expressions.

HON. PETE JARMAN AND HON. CARTER MANASCO

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my fellow Alabamians in expressing my high esteem for our two coworkers who will not be with us next year, the Honorable PETE JARMAN and the Honorable CARTER MANASCO. They have served their districts capably, honestly, and courageously. The State of Alabama suffered a great loss when those two gentlemen were defeated, a greater

loss than they realize at the present time. Our country also has suffered a great loss.

I want especially to thank them for the services which they have rendered me in suggestions, advice, and kindness during this, my freshman term in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I also want to express my appreciation of and to commend the great service which has been rendered by our good friend from Missouri, the Honorable C. JASPER BELL, who I understand will not be with us in the next Congress. Although these three distinguished gentlemen are leaving us, their influence will be felt in Congress for years to come.

A WORD OF APPRECIATION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we are coming to what I hope will shortly be the end of this second session of the Eightieth Congress, but before that adjournment resolution is adopted I just want to say to all of you that I am deeply grateful for the many courtesies that you have shown me in this job of mine and to thank you for your cooperation, your helpfulness, and your friendliness.

THE HONORABLE NOBLE J. JOHNSON

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for just a moment on one of my colleagues who is leaving the Congress after this session. He is going to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. He was here in Congress for a while before he came back on this period of service. He came here the second time in 1938 after I had been here a couple of terms. Then for the first time I got to know him. Since that time he and I have developed a great friendship. I am referring to NOBLE JOHNSON, of the Sixth District of Indiana.

He has labored diligently on the Appropriations Committee, heading up that subcommittee that is near and dear to the heart of everyone of us, the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee. He is the gentleman who looked after our wants, who has listened to our pleas, who has sought to provide for us the things that we need in the way of assistance in carrying on our efforts as Members of Congress. He has always been a friendly, kindly, conscientious Member of the House of Representatives. I am sure we are all going to miss him, but, missing him, we shall above everything else wish for him the greatest success and the greatest happiness in his new assignment. In that assignment I am sure he will bring to the service of his Government and our country and its people that same fine character, extreme diligence, and great ability that has marked his service here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. NOBLE JOHNSON has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations since 1938. His work upon the Naval Appropriations Subcommittee has been outstanding. More than all, his courage to meet every situation as it came up, his industry, and his loyalty have been outstanding. We are going to miss him here, but we believe that he will have a fine opportunity for great public service in the days to come in the station to which he has been elevated.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to join in the tributes that have been expressed here to our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, NOBLE JOHNSON. It was my privilege to have served with our fellow Hoosier for some 10 years in this body. He is a great legislator, an outstanding lawyer, a distinguished American. In his elevation to this high Court of Customs and Patent Appeals the House of Representatives is losing one of its most able Members and the Federal judiciary is gaining a distinguished jurist.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. O'TOOLE).

Mr. O'TOOLE. I join with the gentleman from Indiana in his tribute to his colleague.

May I say to the gentleman from Indiana on behalf of myself and on behalf of the Democrats that we have a great appreciation of you, Charlie. It is a very difficult thing for two men to stand eye to eye and for one to express appreciation, friendship, and feeling for the other; but in the 2 years you have been here as majority leader you have behaved yourself in a manly way, you have commanded the respect of the minority and we have a genuine affection for you. We have a conviction that Philadelphia will do great things for you and that will not be unpopular with us.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I want to say to you, Charlie, that if you contributed in any way to taking NOBLE JOHNSON off my Subcommittee on Appropriations and making him a judge, you did me no favor. Every member of the committee, as well as myself, has relied upon his judgment. It will be a great loss to the country to have a man who is so well posted, so well informed, with such keen judgment, taken out of the Congress and put in that court where he is going.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to add my word of friendship and tribute to NOBLE JOHNSON. It has been my pleasure since being on the Appropriations Committee to be associated with him, originally on two subcommittees and up until these final days on one.

He is most able and one of the friendships I value most in this Congress.

Before I conclude, may I say that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has just thanked this House for the way it has treated him. I think at least the majority, if not the entire House, should thank you for the fine floor leadership you have given us.

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, if I read the clock right, it is almost daybreak. I feel that despite the unusual hour many of my colleagues have risen in their places and praised those who have been with us, who have done effective work here with us, and have planned deliberately to leave us for other walks of life, that I should be unappreciative to fail to say something about the loss which the State of Arizona will suffer in the departure from this House of my colleague from Arizona.

My young colleague, RICHARD HARLESS, has decided that he will not be a candidate for reelection to Congress. For several years, when I was the sole Member from Arizona, I was very anxious to get the assistance of a young man who would aid me in representing that great State. My wishes were well fulfilled in the election of RICHARD HARLESS in 1942. He has been a very able man, young, energetic, competent.

I greatly regret that DICK has decided not to be a candidate for reelection, but I know whatever he may do he will serve his State and community in some other equally effective way.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I desire to join Representative MURDOCK in paying tribute to our colleague, RICHARD F. HARLESS, of Arizona. Dick was born some 8 miles from where I live in my home county of Upshur. His people were and are highly respected.

For 6 years I have worked side by side with Dick as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I have never known, in my 10 years in Congress, a truer and finer man; he is clean, honest, trustworthy, and wholesome; as a legislator, he is competent, constructive, energetic, and effective. Dick, as many know, is a person of great vision and sound judgment; he is a leader of men. His success and attainments in the past have been and are outstanding. I know he will be successful in his future undertakings. We all wish him the greatest of success and happiness in the future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

AGRICULTURAL PRICE STABILIZATION BILL

Mr. HOPE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Agricultural Act of 1948'."

"TITLE I—1949 PRICE STABILIZATION

"SECTION 1. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed through any instrumentality or agency within or under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, by loans, purchases, or other operations—

"(a) To support prices received by producers of cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts marketed before June 30, 1950, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such commodity for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which the crop is harvested. The price support authorized by this subsection shall be made available as follows:

"(1) To cooperators at the rate of 90 per centum of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year;

"(2) To noncooperators at the rate of 60 per centum of the rate specified in (1) above and only on so much of the commodity as would be subject to penalty if marketed.

"All provisions of law applicable with respect to loans under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall, insofar as they are consistent with the provisions of this subsection, be applicable with respect to loans or other price-support operations authorized under this subsection, except that for the purpose of computing the parity price for Maryland tobacco the base period shall be the period August 1936 to July 1941 in lieu of the period August 1919 to July 1929.

"(b) To support until January 1, 1950, a price to producers of commodities with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture by public announcement pursuant to the provisions of the Act of July 1, 1941, as amended, requested an expansion of production of not less than 60 per centum of the parity or comparable price therefor nor more than the level at which such commodity was supported in 1948, except that Irish potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs shall be supported at 90 per centum of the parity or comparable price. The comparable price for any such commodity shall be determined and used by the Secretary for the purposes of this subsection if the production or consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for the commodities referred to in (a) hereof. In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support.

"(c) Sections 1 and 3 of the Act approved August 5, 1947 (Public Law 360, Eightieth Congress), are amended by striking out in each section the date of 'December 31, 1948' wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the date 'June 30, 1950.'

"(d) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture (other than those referred to in subsections (a), (b), and (c) hereof) shall be carried out until January 1, 1950 so as to bring the price and income of the producers of other agricultural commodities not covered by subsections (a), (b), and (c) to a fair parity relationship with the commodities included under subsections (a), (b), and (c), to the extent that funds for such operations are available after taking into account the operations with respect to the commodities covered by subsections (a), (b), and (c). In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support.

"SEC. 2. From any funds available to the Department of Agriculture or any agency operating under its direction for price support operations or for the disposal of agricultural commodities, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to use such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this Act.

"SEC. 3. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as added by section 31 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 773), reenacted by section 1 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 246), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

"'(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 per centum ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during a representative period as determined by the President: *And provided further*, That in designating any article or articles, the President may describe them by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other bases as he shall determine.

"'(c) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States.

"'(d) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section.

"'(e) Any decision of the President as to facts under this section shall be final.

"'(f) No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party.'

"SEC. 4. Section 8 (a), as amended, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended (a) by striking out 'January 1, 1949' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1951', and (b) by striking out 'December 31, 1948' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1950'.

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this Act, the Act of July 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 506), shall continue in effect.

"SEC. 6. This title shall take effect on January 1, 1949, except that sections 3 and 4 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

"Definitions of 'parity price', 'carry-over', 'normal supply', and 'total supply'

"SEC. 201. Section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended—

"(a) By striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(1) (A) The "parity price" for any agricultural commodity, as of any date, shall be determined by multiplying the adjusted base price of such commodity as of such date by the parity index as of such date.

"'(B) The "adjusted base price" of any agricultural commodity, as of any date, shall be (i) the average of the prices received by farmers for such commodity, at such times as the Secretary may select during each year of the ten-year period ending on the 31st of December last before such date, or during each marketing season beginning in such period if the Secretary determines use of a calendar year basis to be impracticable, divided by (ii) the ratio of the general level of prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities during such period to the general level of prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities during the period January 1910 to December 1914, inclusive.

"'(C) The "parity index", as of any date, shall be the ratio of (1) the general level of prices for articles and services that farmers buy, interest on farm indebtedness secured

by farm real estate, and taxes on farm real estate, for the calendar month ending last before such date to (ii) the general level of such prices, rates, and taxes during the period January 1910 to December 1914, inclusive.

"'(D) The prices and indices provided for herein, and the data used in computing them, shall be determined by the Secretary, whose determination shall be final.

"'(E) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), the transitional parity price for any agricultural commodity, computed as provided in this subparagraph, shall be used as the parity price for such commodity until such date after January 1, 1950, as such transitional parity price may be lower than the parity price, computed as provided in subparagraph (A), for such commodity. The transitional parity price for any agicultural commodity as of any date shall be—

"'(i) its parity price determined in the manner used prior to the effective date of the Agricultural Act of 1948, less

"'(ii) five percent of the parity price so determined multiplied by the number of full calendar years which, as of such date, have elapsed after January 1, 1949.

"'(F) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraphs (A) and (E), if the parity price for any agricultural commodity, computed as provided in subparagraphs (A) and (E) appears to be seriously out of line with the parity prices of other agricultural commodities, the Secretary may, and upon the request of a substantial number of interested producers shall, hold public hearings to determine the proper relationship between the parity price of such commodity and the parity prices of other agricultural commodities. Within sixty days after commencing such hearing the Secretary shall complete such hearing, proclaim his findings as to whether the facts require a revision of the method of computing the parity price of such commodity, and put into effect any revision so found to be required.

"'(2) "Parity", as applied to income, shall be that gross income from agriculture which will provide the farm operator and his family with a standard of living equivalent to those afforded persons dependent upon other gainful occupation. "Parity" as applied to income from any agricultural commodity for any year, shall be that gross income which bears the same relationship to parity income from agriculture for such year as the average gross income from such commodity for the preceding ten calendar years bears to the average gross income from agriculture for such ten calendar years.'

"(b) By amending paragraph (3) (A) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"'(A) "Carry-over", in the case of corn, rice, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be the quantity of the commodity on hand in the United States at the beginning of such marketing year, not including any quantity which was produced in the United States during the calendar year then current.'

"(c) By amending paragraph (3) (B) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"'(B) "Carry-over" of cotton for any marketing year shall be the quantity of cotton on hand within the United States at the beginning of such marketing year, which was produced in the United States prior to the beginning of the calendar year then current, plus the quantity on hand within the United States at the beginning of such marketing year which was produced outside the United States.'

"(d) By striking out paragraph (10) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(10) (A) "Normal supply" in the case of corn, cotton, rice, wheat, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be (i) the estimated domestic consumption of the commodity for the marketing year ending immediately prior to the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (ii) the estimated exports of the commodity for the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (iii) an allowance for carry-over. The allowance for carry-over shall be the following percentage of the sum of the consumption and exports used in computing normal supply: 7 per centum in the case of corn; 30 per centum in the case of cotton; 10 per centum in the case of rice; 15 per centum in the case of wheat; and 15 per centum in the case of peanuts. In determining normal supply the Secretary shall make such adjustments for current trends in consumption and for unusual conditions as he may deem necessary.

"'(B) "Normal supply" in the case of tobacco shall be a normal year's domestic consumption and exports, plus 175 per centum of a normal year's domestic consumption and 65 per centum of a normal year's exports as an allowance for a normal carry-over.'

"(e) By amending paragraph (16) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"'(A) "Total supply" of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be the carry-over of the commodity for such marketing year, plus the estimated production of the commodity in the United States during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins and the estimated imports of the commodity into the United States during such marketing year.

"'(B) "Total supply" of tobacco for any marketing year shall be the carry-over at the beginning of such marketing year plus the estimated production thereof in the United States during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins, except that the estimated production of type-46 tobacco during the marketing year with respect to which the determination is being made shall be used in lieu of the estimated production of such type during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins in determining the total supply of cigar filler and cigar binder tobacco.'

"Price support

"SEC. 202. (a) Section 302 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary, through the Commodity Credit Corporation (except as provided in subsection (c)) and other means available to him, is authorized to support prices of agricultural commodities to producers through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations. Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amounts, terms, and conditions of such price support operations, and the extent to which such operations are carried out, shall, in the case of operations carried out by Commodity Credit Corporation, be determined by the Corporation with the approval and subject to the direction of the Secretary, and, in the case of operations carried out by other means, be determined by the Secretary. In making such determinations, consideration shall be given to (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which other commodities are being supported, (3) the availability of funds, (4) the perishability of the commodity, (5) its importance to agriculture and the national economy, (6) the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price support operation, (7) the need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets, and (8) the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand. Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices prescribed by the Secretary may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support. The Secretary shall in all cases give consideration to the practicability of supporting prices indirectly, as by the development of improved merchandising methods, rather than directly by purchase or loan.

"'(b) (1) Price support shall be made available to producers of any basic agricultural commodity at levels determined as hereinafter provided in this subsection. On the basis of the latest available statistics of the Department of Agriculture as of the beginning of each marketing year for each such basic agricultural commodity, the Secretary shall, with respect to such marketing year and such basic agricultural commodity—

"'(i) estimate the total supply;

"'(ii) determine the normal supply; and

"'(iii) determine the percentage which the estimated total supply is of the normal supply (such percentage being referred to herein as the "supply percentage").

"'(2) The level at which the price of such basic agricultural commodity for such marketing year shall be supported for cooperators (other than cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) shall not exceed 90 per centum of the parity price of such commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year or be less than the percentage of its parity price as of the beginning of such marketing year determined from the following table:

If the supply percentage is:	The level of support shall be not less than the following percentage of the parity price
Not more than 70	90
More than 70 but not more than 72	89
More than 72 but not more than 74	88
More than 74 but not more than 76	87
More than 76 but not more than 78	86
More than 78 but not more than 80	85
More than 80 but not more than 82	84
More than 82 but not more than 84	83
More than 84 but not more than 86	82
More than 86 but not more than 88	81
More than 88 but not more than 90	80
More than 90 but not more than 92	79
More than 92 but not more than 94	78
More than 94 but not more than 96	77
More than 96 but not more than 98	76
More than 98 but not more than 102	75
More than 102 but not more than 104	74
More than 104 but not more than 106	73
More than 106 but not more than 108	72
More than 108 but not more than 110	71
More than 110 but not more than 112	70
More than 112 but not more than 114	69
More than 114 but not more than 116	68
More than 116 but not more than 118	67
More than 118 but not more than 120	66
More than 120 but not more than 122	65
More than 122 but not more than 124	64
More than 124 but not more than 126	63
More than 126 but not more than 128	62
More than 128 but not more than 130	61
More than 130	60

"'(3) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section—

"'(A) the minimum level of price support to cooperators for any basic agricultural commodity shall be 120 per centum of the minimum level determined from the foregoing table, if acreage allotments are in effect at the beginning of the planting season for such commodity, or if marketing quotas are in effect at the beginning of the marketing year for such commodity; but in no case shall the level of price support for any commodity be increased thereby above 90 per centum of its parity price as of the beginning of the marketing year; and

"'(B) the level of price support for any basic agricultural commodity normally marketed in any marketing year with respect to which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers shall be 50 per centum of the parity price of such commodity as of the beginning of such marketing year.

"'(4) The level at which the price of corn shall be supported for cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area shall be 75 per centum of the level at which the price is supported for cooperators in the commercial corn-producing area with respect to corn.

"'(5) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the level of price support to cooperators for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas are in effect shall be 90 per centum of its parity price as of the beginning of the marketing year.

"'(c) The support price for any nonbasic agricultural commodity shall not exceed 90 per centum of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year or season in the case of a commodity marketed on a marketing year or seasonal basis, and as of January 1 in the case of any other commodity. Any price support operation undertaken with respect to either turkeys or chickens shall be applicable to all chickens, including broilers, appropriate adjustments being made as provided in subsection (e) of this section: *Provided*, That if any price support operation is undertaken with respect to either chickens or turkeys, the same parity price support operation shall be undertaken with respect to ducks and ducklings and other poultry. The price of wool shall be supported at such level, not in excess of 90 per centum nor less than 60 per centum of its parity price as of January 1, as the Secretary may consider necessary in order to encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool. The price of any kind of Irish potatoes harvested after December 31, 1949, shall be supported at not less than 60 per centum nor more than 90 per centum of the parity price for Irish potatoes as of the beginning of its marketing season. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not carry out any operation to support the price of any nonbasic agricultural commodity (other than Irish potatoes) which is so perishable in nature as not to be reasonably storable without excessive loss or excessive cost; but any such operation may be carried out by the Secretary through other means available to him such as those provided by section 32, Public Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended: *Provided*, That the foregoing provisions shall not be construed to prohibit the Commodity Credit Corporation from supporting the price of any perishable nonbasic agricultural commodity by a loan, purchase, payment, or other operation undertaken with respect to a storable commodity processed from such perishable nonbasic agricultural commodity: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, in carrying out programs with respect to perishable and nonperishable commodities under section 32 of Public Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, and section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, may utilize the services and facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation (including but not limited to procurement by contract) and make advance payments to it: *And provided further*, That in any fiscal year, if at the end of the preceding fiscal year the sums appropriated under said section 32 and remaining unexpended do not exceed $300,000,000, Commodity Credit Corporation may, as provided in section 302 (a) of this Act, carry out any operation to support the price of any such perishable, nonbasic agricultural commodity to the extent that the reserve for the postwar price support of agriculture established pursuant to the First Supplemental Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 5) and other funds appropriated for agricultural price support are sufficient to cover any losses which may be incurred in connection with such operation.

"'(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, price support operations at levels in excess of the maximum level of price support otherwise prescribed in this section may be undertaken whenever it is determined by the Secretary after reasonable public notice and public hearing with records of said hearing and a finding thereon by said Secretary available to the public that price support at such increased levels is necessary in order to increase or maintain the production of any agricultural commodity in the interest of national security.

"'(e) Appropriate adjustments may be made in the support price for any commodity for differences in grade, type, staple, quality, location, and other factors. Such adjustments shall be made in such manner that the average support price for such commodity in each marketing year will, on the basis of the anticipated incidence of such factors, be equal to the level determined as provided in this section for such marketing year.

"'(f) For the purposes of this section—

"'(1) A "cooperator" with respect to any basic agricultural commodity shall be a producer on whose farm the acreage planted to the commodity does not exceed the farm acreage allotment for the commodity under this title, or, in the case of price support for corn to a producer outside the commercial corn-producing area, a producer who complies with conditions of eligibility prescribed by the Secretary. For the purposes of this subsection a producer shall not be deemed to have exceeded his farm acreage allotment unless such producer knowingly exceeded such allotment.

"'(2) A "basic agriculture commodity" shall mean any of the commodities cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts of a crop harvested after December 31, 1949.

"'(3) A "nonbasic agricultural commodity" shall mean any agricultural commodity other than a basic agricultural commodity.

"'(g) No producer shall be personally liable for any deficiency arising from the sale of the collateral securing any loan made under authority of this section unless such loan was obtained through fraudulent representations by the producer. This provision shall not, however, be construed to prevent Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary from requiring producers to assume liability for deficiencies in the grade, quality, or quantity of commodities stored on the farm or delivered by them, for failure properly to care for and preserve commodities, or for failure or refusal to deliver commodities in accordance with the requirements of the program.

"'(h) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at less than (1) a price determined on a pricing basis for its stocks of such commodity on hand, which makes due allowance for grade, type, quality, location, and other factors and which is reasonably calculated to reimburse it for costs incurred by it with respect to such stocks; (2) a price halfway between the support price, if any, and the parity price of such commodity; or (3) a price equivalent to 90 per centum of the parity price of such commodity, whichever price is the lowest, except that the foregoing restrictions shall not apply to (A) sales for new or byproduct uses; (B) sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil; (C) sales for seed or feed if such sales will not substantially impair any price-support program; (D) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or of nonbasic perishable commoditics where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage; (E) sales for the purpose of establishing claims against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity; (F) sales for export; (G) sales of wool; and (H) sales for other than primary uses.'

"(b) Section 381 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is repealed.

"MARKETING QUOTAS

Corn

SEC. 203. (a) The first sentence of section 322 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"'Whenever in any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"'(1) that the total supply of corn for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 per centum; or

"'(2) that the total supply of corn for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for the marketing year so ending, and that the average farm price for corn for three successive months of the marketing year so ending does not exceed 66 per centum of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than November 15 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and marketing quotas shall be in effect in the commercial corn producing area for the crop of corn grown in such area in the next succeeding calendar year and shall remain in effect until terminated in accordance with the provisions of this title.'

"(b) Sections 322 (b) and 322 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution relating to section 322 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended', approved July 26, 1939 (53 Stat. 1125), are hereby repealed.

"(c) Section 322 (d) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended (1) by striking out "(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a)", and (2) by striking out "September" and inserting in lieu thereof "March".

"Wheat

"SEC. 204. (a) Section 335 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by striking out the first two sentences thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'Whenever in any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"'(1) that the total supply of wheat for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 per centum; or

"'(2) that the total supply of wheat for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for the marketing year so ending, and that the average farm price for wheat for three successive months of the marketing year so ending does not exceed 66 per centum of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than July 1 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and, during the marketing year beginning July 1 of the next succeeding calendar year and continuing throughout such marketing year, a national marketing quota shall be in

effect with respect to the marketing of wheat.'

"(b) The first sentence of section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by striking out 'June 10' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 25'.

"Cotton

"SEC. 205. The first sentence of section 345 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"'Whenever during any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"'(1) that the total supply of cotton for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 8 per centum; or

"'(2) that the total supply of cotton for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for such marketing year, and that the average farm price for cotton for three successive months of such marketing year does not exceed 66 per centum of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than November 15 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and marketing quotas shall be in effect with respect to cotton during the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year.'

"Rice

"SEC. 206. The first sentence of section 355 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"'Whenever during any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"'(1) that the total supply of rice for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 per centum; or

"'(2) that the total supply of rice for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for such marketing year, and that the average farm price for rice for three successive months of such marketing year does not exceed 66 per centum of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than December 31 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and, during the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year and continuing throughout such marketing year, a national marketing quota shall be in effect with respect to the marketing of rice by producers.'

"SEC. 207. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended—

"(a) By inserting in section 328 after the words 'outside the commercial corn-producing area' the following: 'or imported';

"(b) By inserting in section 333 after 'or such crop' the following: 'and imports';

"(c) By inserting in section 343 (a) after 'August 1 of such succeeding calendar year' the following: 'and imports';

"(d) By striking out sections 359 (d) and 359 (e);

"(e) By striking out of section 385 'or loan' and inserting in lieu thereof 'loan, or price support operation'.

"Tobacco

"SEC. 208. Section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That the Secretary shall proclaim a national marketing quota for each marketing year for each kind of tobacco for which a national marketing quota was proclaimed for the immediately preceding marketing year, and shall proclaim a national marketing quota for Virginia sun-cured tobacco for each marketing year for which a quota is proclaimed for fire-cured tobacco, and, beginning on the first day of the marketing year next following and continuing throughout such year, a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the tobacco marketed during such marketing year.'

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"Section 32 funds

"SEC. 301. Section 32, as amended, of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes', approved August 24, 1935 (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 612c), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The sums appropriated under this section shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available for the purposes of this section until expended; but any excess of the amount remaining unexpended at the end of any fiscal year over $300,000,000 shall, in the same manner as though it had been appropriated for the service of such fiscal year, be subject to the provisions of section 3690 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 712), and section 5 of the act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and seventy-five, and for other purposes" (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 713).'

"'Parity'—other statutes

"SEC. 302. (a) Section 2 (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Through the exercise of the powers conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture under this title, to establish and maintain such orderly marketing conditions for agricultural commodities in interstate commerce as will establish, as the prices to farmers, parity prices as defined by section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.'

"(b) Section 8c (18) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended to read as follows:

"'(18) The Secretary of Agriculture, prior to prescribing any term in any marketing agreement or order, or amendment thereto, relating to milk or its products, if such term is to fix minimum prices to be paid to producers or associations of producers, or prior to modifying the price fixed in any such term, shall ascertain the parity prices of such commodities. The prices which it is declared to be the policy of Congress to establish in section 2 of this title shall, for the purposes of such agreement, order, or amendment, be adjusted to reflect the price of feeds, the available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk or its products in the marketing area to which the contemplated marketing agreement, order, or amendment relates. Whenever the Secretary finds, upon the basis of the evidence adduced at the hearing required by section 8b or 8c, as the case may be, that the parity prices of such commodities are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, the available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk and its products in the marketing area to which the contemplated agreement, order, or amendment relates, he shall fix such prices as he finds will reflect such factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest. Thereafter, as the Secretary finds necessary on account of changed circumstances, he shall, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, make adjustments in such prices.'

"(c) Section 8c (17) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended by striking out 'and section 8e'.

"(d) Section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is repealed.

"(e) Section 4 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting after the section designation the subsection designation '(a)' and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(b) Any program in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by this Act, on the effective date of section 302 of the Agricultural Act of 1948 shall continue in effect without the necessity for any amendatory action relative to such program, but any such program shall be continued in operation by the Secretary of Agriculture only to establish and maintain such orderly marketing conditions as will tend to effectuate the declared purpose set out in section 2 or 8c (18) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by this Act.'

"(f) All references in other laws—

"(1) parity,

"(2) parity prices,

"(3) prices comparable to parity prices, or

"(4) prices to be determined in the same manner as provided by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 prior to its amendment by this Act for the determination of parity prices,

with respect to prices for agricultural commodities and products thereof, shall hereafter be deemed to refer to parity prices as determined in accordance with the provisions of section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by this Act.

"Effective date

"SEC. 303. Titles II and III of this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1950."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
GEO. W. GILLIE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
ELMER THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The conferees have agreed to a substitute which incorporates the substance of the House bill and titles III and IV of the Senate amendment, with modifications. Except for clarifying, clerical, and minor changes the differences between the House amendment and substitute agreed to in conference are explained below.

The House bill is retained with virtually no change except clarifying and clerical amendments to make it conform to the substitute agreed upon by the conferees, and two minor amendments in substance, one changing the base period for the computation of parity on Maryland tobacco and the other making it clear that the act of July 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 506) relative to dark tobacco remains unchanged. There was added a provision extending until December 31, 1950, authority to make soil conservation payments.

In the substitute amendment agreed to by the conferees that portion which was the

House bill now provides for interim price supports on agricultural commodities to continue through the calendar year 1949. Titles III and IV of the Senate bill appear virtually without changes as titles II and III of the substitute amendment. In general, these titles provide for a modernization of parity and for a permanent price support program. The effective date of titles II and III of the substitute amendment is January 1, 1950.

Following is a detailed explanation of the provisions of titles II and III:

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Section 201 amends section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 in the following respects:

(1) The method of computing parity prices would be changed to the extent necessary to give appropriate recognition to changes in relationships among the prices of the agricultural commodities themselves occurring since the base period, 1910–1914, such as those resulting from the discovery of new uses or new methods of production. This section would provide a formula which, while preserving the 1910–14 relationship between farm and nonfarm prices, will reflect the developments of recent years. The general level would be based on the differences between the 1910–14 and the present prices of things that farmers buy, the parity prices of some commodities would be reduced while others would be increased. This section also provides for a transition from the present method of computing parity prices and for any corrective action which may become necessary in the future. The section would accomplish these objectives in the following manner:

At present the parity price of any agricultural commodity as of any date is computed by—

(i) Preparing a parity index showing the changes in prices of things that farmers buy since the base period 1910–1914; and

(ii) Multiplying the price of the commodity during the base period by the parity index.

The section would change this formula only by substituting an adjusted or moving base price for the 1910–14 price of the commodity. This adjusted base price for the commodity would be a price bearing the same relationship to—

(i) The price of such commodity during the preceding 10 years—

as the general level of prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities during the period 1910–14 bears to—

(ii) The general level of prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities during the same 10 years.

In order to prevent the parity price for any particular commodity from being reduced substantially in any year by reason of this change use of a transitional parity price would limit such reduction to 5 percent per year. The transitional parity price would be the parity price as now computed less 5 percent for each full year elapsed after January 1, 1949. The transitional parity price would be used for a commodity until the first time that the parity price is equal to or above the transitional parity price.

In addition, the Secretary may revise the method of computing any parity price which becomes seriously out of line with the parity prices of other agricultural commodities.

(2) "Parity" as applied to income is redefined for the purpose of establishing a more accurate standard. This change has no substantive effect.

(3) The term "carry over" as applied to cotton, corn, rice, and peanuts is redefined to include imports. Foreign-stored cotton is excluded. This term was not previously applied to peanuts.

(4) The term "normal supply" as applied to corn, cotton, rice, wheat, and peanuts is redefined to represent current requirements more accurately than has heretofore been the case. Instead of using 10-year averages of exports and domestic consumption in the computation of normal supply, estimated exports for the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined and estimated domestic consumption for the preceding marketing year would be used. The allowance for carry-over provided for in the existing definition of "normal supply" remains the same except in the case of cotton which would be 30 percent in lieu of 40 percent in existing law. The definition in existing law for "normal supply" is not applicable to peanuts but the new definition would be made so. The allowance for carry-over in the case of peanuts would be 15 percent. Provision is made for adjustments for current trends in consumption and for unusual conditions. The term "normal supply" as applied to tobacco would not be changed.

(5) The term "total supply" has been redefined to cover peanuts and in the case of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and peanuts to include imports. The term as applied to tobacco has not been changed.

Section 202 would amend section 302 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (which contains the principal permanent price support provisions) to provide as follows:

(1) Price support of any agricultural commodity through loans, purchases, payments, or other operations would be authorized. This authorization provides the necessary flexibility in the choice of methods to be used in supporting prices. Thus it authorizes not only loans and purchases but also direct payments to farmers. The use of indirect methods such as the development of improved merchandising methods is encouraged. In determining the methods to be used, as well as the other terms and conditions of price support operations, the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation are required to give consideration to (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which other commodities are being supported, (3) the availability of funds, (4) the perishability of the commodity, (5) its importance to agriculture and the national economy, (6) the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation, (7) the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand, and (8) the necessity of offsetting temporary losses of export markets. Compliance with acreage allotments and production goals may be required as a condition of price support.

(2) In the case of the basic commodities price support at from 60 to 90 percent of parity, the minimum level depending upon the relationship of the total supply of each commodity to its normal supply would be required to be made available to cooperators (those who do not exceed farm-acreage allotments); except that if marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers the level of price support would be reduced to 50 percent of parity. If marketing quotas are approved by producers the level of price support which would otherwise be given to the commodity would be increased by 20 percent, but shall not exceed 90 percent. Tobacco would be supported at 90 percent of parity.

(3) Price support for nonbasic commodities is discretionary with the Secretary up to a maximum level of 90 percent of parity. The price of wool, however, is required to be supported at such level between 60 and 90 percent of parity as the Secretary considers necessary in order to encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool. Potatoes are also supported at 60 to 90 percent of parity.

(4) In case the national interest requires, price support operations at levels in excess of 90 percent of parity are permitted with respect to either basic or nonbasic commodities.

(5) Subject to certain exceptions the Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from using its funds to carry out any operation to support the price of any nonbasic agricultural commodity which is so perishable in nature as not to be reasonably storable without excessive loss or excessive cost.

(6) Limitations are imposed upon the price at which Commodity Credit Corporation can sell farm commodities subject to a number of exceptions. These limitations and exceptions are generally comparable to those now in effect and are intended to prevent sales of farm commodities by Commodity Credit Corporation in a manner which would impair price support operations with respect to such commodities.

Marketing quotas

Sections 203, 204, 205, and 206 change the conditions which must be determined by the Secretary to exist before marketing quotas can be imposed upon corn, wheat, cotton, and rice. As reported, the sections would provide that whenever the Secretary determines—

(1) That the total supply of the commodity for the marketing year beginning in the then current calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 percent (8 percent in the case of cotton), or

(2) That the total supply of the commodity for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for the marketing year so ending and that the average price for the commodity for three successive months does not exceed 66 percent of parity—

the Secretary shall proclaim marketing quotas for the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year.

Acreage allotments—imports

Section 207 requires the Secretary to take imports into consideration in determining acreage allotments for corn, wheat, and rice for the purposes of marketing quotas.

Amendments

Section 208 would amend section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to require the Secretary, first, to proclaim a national marketing quota for each marketing year for each kind of tobacco for which a national marketing quota was proclaimed for the immediately preceding marketing year, and, second, to proclaim a national marketing quota for Virginia sun-cured tobacco for each marketing year for which a quota is proclaimed for fire-cured tobacco. This would mean that, once the Secretary proclaims a marketing quota for any kind of tobacco, he is required to proclaim a marketing quota for that kind of tobacco for each succeeding year without regard to the supply conditions presently required by the statute.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

Section 32 funds

Section 301 provides for accumulation, up to $300,000,000, of section 32 funds not currently required for program purposes. Section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), appropriates for each fiscal year an amount equal to 30 percent of the customs duties for the preceding calendar year, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage exportation and to increase (by means of diversion programs) domestic consumption of agricultural commodities and products and to reestablish farmers' purchasing power. To the extent that funds annually appropriated by section 32 are not fully utilized during any fiscal year, this provision would permit the balance of the funds not utilized to be carried over to subsequent fiscal years and used for the purpose for which such funds were appropriated. This provision would make it possible to formulate long-range surplus disposal programs.

Parity—Other statutes

Section 302 conforms the definitions of "parity" contained in other statutes to the

definition of "parity" contained in section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by the bill.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
GEO. W. GILLIE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the bill H. R. 6248. This bill, in part, passed the House on last Saturday in the form of a measure to extend the present price-support program for 1 year. In the Senate the measure was amended by striking out all after the enacting clause, and there was substituted the provisions of a Senate bill dealing with a long-range farm program. The conferees have agreed upon a measure which contains substantially all of the provisions in the House bill, to be applicable only for the year 1949; in other words, we are bringing back to you the same bill which we passed in the House to extend price supports for 1 year.

In addition, the bill as agreed upon by the conferees contains substantially all of titles 3 and 4 of the Senate long range bill, which provisions deal with a long range price support program. The Senate bill consisted of four titles originally. Two of those titles dealt with the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, and particularly with a reorganization of the Soil Conservation Service, a reorganization which in effect would have eliminated the Soil Conservation Service and turned its functions over to the Extension Service, the land grant colleges, and the Production and Marketing Administration, under a new name, however.

Your conferees did not agree to those two titles in the bill. They have been eliminated and, as already stated, the bill now contains substantially all of the provisions of titles 3 and 4 relating to a price support program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Do the provisions of titles 3 and 4 of the Aiken bill have any application in this coming year?

Mr. HOPE. No. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. As far as the provisions of titles III and IV are concerned, they will go into effect on January 1, 1950, at which time the provisions of that part of the bill which the House passed will go out of effect.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. One more question: If we agree to this tonight, will we have the opportunity, if the House so decides next spring, to change some of the provisions of titles III and IV as contained in this bill? I am referring especially to the lack of 90 percent parity guaranties.

Mr. HOPE. The bill will not go into effect until a year from next January 1. It offers approximately 18 months within which the bill may be studied and amendments made if they are necessary. I say that the Committee on Agriculture intends to study the bill carefully in that intervening time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is no commitment on the part of this Congress now that we must continue in effect past next year these two titles to which we have reference? Personally, I do not care to agree to any program which would guarantee less than 90 percent of parity in our basic commodities.

Mr. HOPE. The bill if it becomes a law will be subject to amendment, of course, just as any law, and we will have the advantage of having this 18 months' period in which to study it before it actually goes into effect.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think I can safely say as a conferee that the Senate conferees have agreed to a sympathetic consideration of any proposals we in the House may make with reference to changes in this bill.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is a correct statement. I may say that the bill is one which contains a great many intricate and technical provisions.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. May I inquire as to what the necessity is for passing at this time legislation that will not become effective until 1950? What is the reason? What is the cause of it?

Mr. HOPE. The bill, as I know the gentleman understands, passed the Senate in such a form that it became effective next January 1. It was the purpose of the Senate in passing it to put a long-range program in effect on next January 1 at the expiration of the present temporary program which is embodied in the Steagall amendment and other similar legislation. I will say to the gentleman it was the position of the House conferees when we first went to conference that there was no necessity for passing a long-range program at this time. We thought that the conferees from the Senate should accept the provisions of the House bill, which would carry us forward for a year, and we thought that at the end of that time we would be in a better position to work out a long-range program. The Senate conferees took a different view and, as in the case of all conferences of this kind, in the end we worked out a compromise, and this is the result.

Mr. BONNER. That part of the proposal now offered to the House is superfluous and unnecessary. All that is needed is Senate approval of the continuation of the existing law that has been passed in the House. I think there must be some reason why this legislation is so urgently brought here at this late hour.

Mr. HOPE. There are many in this country, including the leaders of all of the great farm organizations, that is, the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Farmers Union, and the Cooperative Council, who have urged that a long-range program be enacted at this time. All four of those organizations have endorsed that part of the Senate bill which we have adopted as a part of this conference report. There is greater unanimity on the part of the farm organizations of this country on this bill than on any important agricultural bill with which I have been familiar.

Mr. BONNER. Yes; but with all the time available in the first session of the next Congress, certainly the proper and intelligent thing to do would be to bring the bill into this House so the House could debate it and study it and know more about it.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is repeating some of the arguments I made in conference.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The fact of the matter is that the House is now in the position of voting on a long-range program when the House Committee on Agriculture did not make any report on this bill or any other bill on the long-range program. Therefore, the Members of the House have not had the benefit of the views of the House committee with respect to this long-range program. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HOPE. That is true in a technical sense, at least. Of course, the Committee on Agriculture of the House has conducted extensive hearings, both in Washington and over the country, on the question of a long-range program.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In all fairness, in addition to it being true in a technical sense, is it not a fact that the Committee on Agriculture of the House announced that they would not report a long-range program bill in this session.

Mr. HOPE. That is true.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Therefore, we do not have the benefit of the study and the reports of the House committee in the consideration of this bill. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HOPE. That is true. May I say to my friend that the conferees refused to agree under any circumstances to any long-range program which would become effective at once or as soon as January 1. But we felt under the circumstances that when we would have this time in which to study the measure and make amendments which might be necessary, we were justified in agreeing in the conference to this report.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will permit me to say so, I think it is unwise and unsound to pass a bill that will not be put into effect for a year in order to have the privilege of studying it and amending it. With all due deference, I favor the provisions of the House bill. I think the Senate bill discriminates against the major agricultural commodities, including cotton, wheat, and corn.

Mr. HOPE. If the gentleman will present his views to the Committee on Agriculture in the next session of the Congress, I am sure the committee will give careful attention to those views.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me half the time, as I have other gentlemen on my side who would like to be heard?

The SPEAKER. The chairman of the committee generally has control of the time. If the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] has Members on his side who desire to address the House, he can give the names of the gentlemen to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have served in this body for 18 years, but I have gone through my strangest and most unusual experience since yesterday at 2 o'clock. I do not believe any Member present ever went through a similar experience in legislative matters. Thursday night about 11 o'clock, the other body passed what is known as the Aiken farm bill. At 2 o'clock on yesterday we were called into conference, and the House conferees to a man turned down the Aiken bill. They turned it down for the reason that they did not know what was in it. I doubt that some of the conferees from the other body knew a bit more about what was in the bill than the conferees from the House, who had not had an opportunity to examine the legislation.

At 5 p. m. on Friday we were called into conference. The House conferees, because they did not know what was in the Aiken bill, turned it down. So the conference adjourned.

At 2 o'clock yesterday, Saturday, we were called back into conference, and the House conferees again stood pat and we adjourned. Then, at 4 o'clock yesterday, we were called back into conference for the third time and the roll was called, and the House committee still stood pat. We were not willing to place our O. K. upon a piece of legislation that no Member of the House conferees knew anything about, and we broke up in a rather heated discussion.

Then a strange thing happened. In order to bring this conference report back, they had to rape the House conferees. When they came back Mr. MURRAY resigned as a conferee and Dr. GILLIE was appointed in his stead; and then we met again. The Democratic members still stood pat, but the Republican members went over to the Aiken bill. Now, that is the way you get this piece of legislation.

Now, why did these things happen? I do not want to inject politics into this discussion, but evidently the Philadelphia Republican Convention had to have a farm program, and in order to give that convention a farm bill, they had to rape the conferees in order to give the convention a program.

Now, I am telling you frankly, no member of the House conferees can tell you what is in the Aiken bill, and yet they bring the bill here and ask you to O. K. it. It is true that the Aiken bill does not go into effect for 18 months. They adopted the House bill, but provided that the House bill should expire December 30, 1949, and thereupon the Aiken bill becomes the farm program.

Mr. Speaker, I think the House bill is a well-considered bill. The House bill continues in effect the program we have developed over the last 15 years.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The fact of the matter is, the House committee has reported no long-range program; they have submitted no long-range bill; and the further fact is that we have a bill of 60 or 65 pages in length, and thus far, with four titles. The only explanation that this House has of the bill is that titles I and II have been stricken from the bill?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right. As I said, the House bill will be the agricultural program during next year. It has proven to be successful. The only redeeming feature about this piece of legislation is this:

That part of the legislation known as the Aiken bill does not go into effect until 18 months from the present time, and during next year I hope—I know—and I confidently believe that the House Committee on Agriculture will work out a long-range farm program to take the place of the Aiken bill. When that is done I will not be here, but I make the prediction that the long-range program that the House committee will present to you next year will not be the Aiken bill.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is it not a fact that this Congress cannot bind the next Congress? In other words, cannot the Eighty-first Congress pass legislation that will correct any inequality in the so-called Aiken bill?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I am glad the gentleman called attention to that fact because I would hate to think that this Congress would bind the next Congress to anything like the Aiken bill. I believe the House Committee on Agriculture should hold hearings and bring in a farm program that they understand and that they can explain to this House before they ask the House approval.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virgina has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, while I realize that the Members of this House are tired and weary and are anxious to go home and get some rest, I do not feel that I should permit this conference report to be adopted without making at least a few comments and observations.

Every Member of this House has a share of responsibility and will be held to account for the actions here taken. I doubt if any man in this House—even the oldest man in point of service in this body—has ever witnessed such a spectacle as this. For long hours the conferees labored and they brought forth a monstrosity. It is neither bird nor beast nor fish nor fowl. It has the head of an elephant, but the heart of the Republican long-range farm program has been torn from the monster's body. In one part you will find provisions which authorize a continuation of the present price-support program—a program which has meant much to the welfare and prosperity of American agriculture. These provisions will continue a vital part of the Democratic farm program only until after the grand November election will be safely behind us and a matter of history. Then another program will go into effect and the agricultural economy of this Nation will be shaken to its foundation.

This is a spectacle of the rarest variety of political pressure. When the conferees were unable to agree on either the House bill or the Senate bill, and after the discussions clearly indicated that the Senate would not accept the House bill or surrender any part of the Senate bill, and after the representatives on the part of the House had indicated that they would not surrender the House bill or accept any part of the Senate bill, we adjourned, and I am sure that everyone considered the adjournment final. The House conferees did not have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the many far-reaching and complicated provisions of the Senate bill. This House was in almost constant session from the very moment the Senate took final action on the much-talked-of Republican long-range farm program. While the bill was introduced by Senator AIKEN many long weeks ago, it was never called up for consideration in the House Committee on Agriculture.

Usually when the Senate passes a bill of importance it comes to the House and is referred to the House committee, but, obviously, this could not be done and when the representatives on the part of the House objected to having the measure rammed down our throats, whether we liked it or not, political pressure went up. As pointed out by my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], when the House conferees, Republicans and Democrats alike, found the Senate bill to be obnoxious and highly objectionable in the form in which it was submitted, politicians were apparently horrified. But something took place during the long and dreary hours, either here in Washington, or perhaps in Philadelphia, or maybe in both of these very important places. After secret meetings, and no doubt because of one Member's unwillingness to surrender his convictions or to compromise his conscientious views, he resigned and another was appointed in his place. Again the conferees conferred and as a result you are now faced with a unique situation. As intelligent Representatives of the people of this country, as weary and as fatigued as you are, you are urged to embrace this monstrosity which has a dual parentage and a dual purpose. There is not one of you who knows what it is or what is in it. You are not even told what is in it and you have no way of knowing about its provisions.

I love and admire the great and noble chairman of my great committee, the

Mr. HOPE. May I say to the gentle-

very able and alert and distinguished gentleman from Kansas, and certainly no finer man ever lived than the gentleman from Kansas, CLIFFORD HOPE. I regret that the temper of this House is such, and even that is perhaps easily understood, in view of the lateness of the hour, that when he was undertaking to tell you something about the provisions, yes, the important provisions of this conference report, and while he was talking, we heard cries go out over this House, "Vote! Vote! Vote!" Yes, vote, but vote for what. Certainly you do not even know what you are voting for, yet you must vote because Republican politicians must have something that they can at least call a long-range farm program.

I served in this Congress through the New Deal and many, many times Democrats were called rubber stamps. This is a super duper case of rubber stamp. Take it for TAFT so that he can talk about it. Do it for Dewey so that he can dangle it before the people. Write it into law for Warren, and mark it up for MARTIN. Stay here late for Stassen, and win a victory for VANDENBERG. Whoop it up for the Old Guard, so that you may have a hot time in the old town on Tuesday. Yes, you will have H. R. 6248 with provisions you have never seen and charts and tables you do not understand. Here in this great farm program is written this strange and uncertain language:

To assist low-income families and school children in maintaining an adequate diet, particularly in periods of underconsumption and unemployment.

Certainly when you think of the Republican Party you must be impressed with the significance of the last two important words in this great provision, "underconsumption" and "unemployment." Some parts of this bill read like a Republican platform and oh how they will read it and wave it at the convention. This is not only a package of promises to the people and a platform on which to run, but it is actually handed to you with a promise that it will be changed before it goes into effect. It embraces the producers of not only basic commodities and the Steagall commodities, but many other commodities have been added, including even the ducks and little ducklings. The Democratic administration was criticized on account of potatoes and putrified eggs, but everything is here included within the four corners of this bill. It must be rubber stamped and approved. But at least there is one Republican here who was unwilling to embrace this monstrous thing. I congratulate and compliment the very distinguished, able, fearless, and courageous Representative, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. REID F. MURRAY, who refused to yield to pressure or to be lashed by the party whip or to be black-jacked into surrendering his honest convictions on this thing the Republicans will call a farm program. Men have a right to change their minds, to alter their positions, and to modify their views. Upon mature consideration no doubt many Members of this House would have modified their views, but at least it is a rather strange thing that the views of so many could be modified so soon.

Certainly we know why this bill is here in its present form. It is here because Congress is about to adjourn and the Republicans are about to convene in convention to be assembled in Philadelphia only a few hours from now. You Republicans came into power on a promise that you would write a long-range farm program, and throughout all of the sessions of the Eightieth Congress you have talked of a long-range farm program for the American farmer, but you have done nothing about writing such a program and now you awaken to the fact that you have been sleeping on the job. Yes, asleep at the switch. Perhaps you were lulled to sleep by the fact that the farmers of America already had written on the statute books a long-range farm program with which they are well satisfied. All you need to do is to continue the price-support program, the soil-conservation payments, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, and you knew this when you came into power, and yet you have put the poor farmer off until the very last thing, and while in a state of utter confusion you insist upon having some sort of a paper writing to call a farm program. Do you not know that the American farmer is well informed and intelligent enough to know, to understand, and to appreciate fully the circumstances under which your political promise was so pitifully performed. Yes, you promised the American farmer you would write a farm program and he knows now that you have not done it.

We sat up with the corpse of the Republican farm program all through the night; Republican leaders were weeping and wailing; finally, about daybreak, the corpse came back to life again. A transfusion was administered and when some signs of life appeared there was great rejoicing. Although the breath of life was breathed again into the dead monster he will not be permitted to move from the place of his curious construction until he is 18 months of age. Yes, that is the ridiculous proposition that is now placed before you. You are asked to enact this thing into law, to write it into the law books and into the United States Code, and to read it and to study it for 12 or 18 months and if you find that it will work you can put it into harness and hitch it to the plow, but if its head is too heavy or its legs are too short, or if its body is too weak, we will subject it to surgery or feed it some strange vitamin that will give it strength enough to support the floor under American agriculture.

Frankly, I have tried to understand the provisions of this bill, but, frankly, I must tell you that I even now do not fully understand it. I do not believe that there is a man on the floor of this House on either side of this aisle who can tell you the far-reaching ramifications of this bill. Shall we place our stamp of approval upon Federal legislation which we do not understand and cannot explain? Shall we have such little regard for the sanctity of Federal law as is now involved in the action this House is about to take? We are told that some of the farm organizations were in favor of the Senate bill, but that was carved to pieces in conference. Go ahead and rubber stamp it and then go back to your constituents and try to explain your conduct. That is what you will do. That is what you must do. The monster is now asleep but when he is awakened and aroused you shall hear from him.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, there were three measures which had to be considered and acted upon this week. One was to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation which would expire on June 30. The Congress has taken appropriate action during the night granting a permanent charter to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The second was extending the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. That extension is contained in the pending conference report.

The third was extending the price-support program, which, under the present law at its level, would expire on December 31. That is the matter now before the House.

This is a rather singular conference report. The House passed a bill, the Senate passed a bill, and the compromise is to enact both of them.

You are about to go home. I am sure those of you who represent agricultural sections will want to report the situation to your constituents. We now have a 90-percent support for this year. Under the conference report we will have a continuation of 90-percent support next year for the basic commodities and a few others and other commodities supported at from 60 to 90 percent of parity. Therefore, generally speaking, you will have 90 percent for 1948 and 1949.

On January 1, 1950, titles III and IV of the so-called Aiken bill will go into effect. That will give us two changes I have not been able to give my approval to. It will entirely change the parity formula. It sets up one of those fantastic schemes known as the 10-year moving average. It has two unfavorable features. One entirely abandons the parity principle of comparable purchasing power as to a particular commodity. The second is it reduces the parity prices of practically all of the commodities, except cattle, hogs, milk, rice, and tobacco. Within a short time it will bring about many inequities and discrimination among commodities. As between commodities it does not take into account the respective cost of production, the labor required, or the advancement in mechanization in planting, cultivating, and harvesting.

Then under this report you will reduce the support prices which are on a flexible basis ranging from 60 to 90 percent. The Senate author of the bill admitted that no commodity would ever have 90 percent support under the bill unless it was under a control program, except wool and tobacco. This is all I can say now. When the Aiken bill becomes effective a year and a half hence, the farmer will suffer a reduction in his parity price, and at the same time a reduction in his support price. Therefore he will be hit twice. I think it is unfortunate and not in keeping with our obligation to him. Personally I cannot give my approval to a bill now which I know will take me months to completely analyze, and completely understand, and which is a step backward in providing the farmers with the security and protection they are entitled to. I think it would have been more sensible if we had waited until the next session to enact a long-range program and in the meantime have drafted a simple and understandable bill. But, it is here. It is a so-called long-range program effective a year and a half hence. The Republican leadership says it must pass now. As my distinguished chairman has said, it is hoped that he and the others of us on the committee who will return to Congress will endeavor to correct the serious mistakes we make tonight. It is with regret that I cannot give the conference report my support at this time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTINGTON) there were—ayes 147, noes 70.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECRUITMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2767) to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. HOPE. I shall be glad to explain the bill, Mr. Speaker. This is a bill which has been requested by the United States Employment Service and also by the farmers who are the users of agricultural labor, in order to make the recruitment and distribution of farm labor more effective during this season. This is a measure that is not only in the interest of agricultural producers but certainly in the interest of consumers, because with the current labor shortage, unless we can bring in some farm labor, it is my opinion we are likely to have a loss of food in this country during the current year.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Labor in carrying out his responsibilities to maintain a farm placement service is authorized to recruit foreign workers within the Western Hemisphere and Puerto Rico for temporary work, and to provide for their transportation to and from the United States and to and from different parts of the United States. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the administration of the program.

Then there is a further authorization of appropriations for the establishment of a working capital fund, this fund to be used for the payment of expenses for transportation, lodging, and subsistence of the workers. This fund is to be reimbursed by growers who use workers, so that the United States Government will not be out any money on account of the transportation and the lodging and the subsistence of these workers. In other words it is a revolving fund, and with the exception of administrative expenses all expenses will be paid by the growers who use these farm workers.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. This is merely a perpetuation of the same New Deal measure we have had for the last several years. I am surprised the gentleman would present this to our side of the House. I thought we got rid of this last year and were going to get rid of it forever. Now the gentleman brings it out here and asks us to accept it. I certainly hope my side of the House will have the courage of its convictions and get rid of this New Deal measure.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this is not the only New Deal legislation that he has voted for and that his side has voted for. We have converted you right along the line.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Does this bill in any way change the law that was passed with reference to sugar controls and workers and their salaries and so forth?

Mr. HOPE. No; this bill in no way changes or affects the Sugar Act of 1947.

Mr. CARROLL. That is with reference to the protection of agricultural workers in sugar and the workers' salaries and the controls?

Mr. HOPE. These workers are not only under the protection of that act, but they are under the protection of State laws. They are under the protection, in the case of Mexican workers, and most of them are Mexican workers, of the very strict and rigid agreement between the United States and Mexico calling for the protection of the workers. If the gentleman is familiar with that agreement, he knows they are very well taken care of under the agreement.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I just want to say that you have already passed an appropriation bill providing the money for this act. You have appropriated $1,000,000 to carry it out.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I ask the gentleman from Kansas if I am correct in believing that the amendment concerning which I previously spoke to him, has been withdrawn?

Mr. HOPE. May I say to the gentleman from California that it is my purpose to withdraw the amendments. The committee amendments in effect would put administrative expenses under the revolving fund, and would require that the administrative expenses be paid by the employer. I am going to ask unanimous consent to withdraw those amendments. I have spoken to a number of members of the committee who are present at this time, and there is no objection so far as I know to the withdrawal of the amendments. Then I also propose to offer two amendments which are necessary because of the fact that the United States Employment Service is now a part of the Federal Security Agency instead of the Department of Labor. That makes it necessary to offer an amendment on page 1, line 3, and on page 2, line 21.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. My sole concern with this legislation is not to injure the farmers who need this type of labor, but to express a word of caution. These people have been exploited and paid cheap wages. In many instances they have been used as strikebreakers. It is one thing to help agriculture and help the farmers when they are short of labor, but it is another matter to have these people used as scabs and as cheap labor. I do hope that the department which will supervise this program will see to it that these people will neither be exploited nor used as strikebreakers and scabs.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think every one of us agrees with the observation made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the Secretary of Labor, in carrying out his responsibilities to maintain a farm placement service under the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, is authorized to recruit foreign workers within the Western Hemisphere and workers in Puerto Rico for temporary agricultural employment in the continental United States and to direct, supervise, coordinate, and provide for the transportation of such workers from such places of recruitment to and between places of employment within the continental United States and return to the places of recruitment not later than June 30, 1949. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums for the administration of the program authorized by this section as the Congress may deem necessary.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the establishment of a working capital fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, $2,500,000, such fund to be used only for the payment of expenses for transportation, lodging, and subsistence in connection with the temporary migration of foreign agricultural workers from foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere, and workers from Puerto Rico, to and between places of employment within the continental United States and return to the place of origin. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the employers utilizing such workers shall be required to reimburse

such fund to such extent and in such manner and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Labor may by regulation or otherwise prescribe.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the committee amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I offer two amendments, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. HOPE:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "the Secretary of Labor" and insert "the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency."

On page 2, line 21, strike out "the Secretary of Labor" and insert "the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency."

Mr. FOGARTY. The first amendment was to strike out "the Secretary of Labor" and insert "the Federal Security Administrator"; is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. That is made necessary by reason of the act that was passed, the appropriation bill, which transferred the Federal Employment Service to the Federal Security Agency.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUING PATENTS IN ALASKA

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 162, a joint resolution to repeal section 2 of the act of May 1, 1936, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART]?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill do?

Mr. D'EWART. The bill repeals section 2 of the act of May 1, 1936, having to do with the issuing of certain patents in Alaska. Second, it permits the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in Alaska to individual tribes, villages, or individuals, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it is now 15 minutes after 6 in the morning. It is almost time to go to church. It seems to me this legislation should be deferred until some other time. I object.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That when the two Houses adjourn on Sunday, June 20, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 219) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses until December 31, 1948, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress until Friday, December 31, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

REPORTS OF INVESTIGATING COMMISSIONS TO BE DOCUMENTS OF EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the adjournment of the House until Friday, December 31, 1948, by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the Eightieth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S OFFICE TO BE PRINTED AS HOUSE DOCUMENTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 700) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to Congress, pursuant to section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945 (56 Stat. 6), and the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597), after the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, shall be printed as House documents of the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATION OF ASSISTANT CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 701) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That in order that the duties of his office may be discharged in case of his absence or disability or in case his office should become vacant, the Clerk of the House of Representatives on or before June 19, 1948, shall designate a subordinate in his office to perform the duties thereof in any such contingencies until the commencement of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. Such designee when acting under this authorization, shall subscribe himself as Acting Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk of the House shall promptly communicate to the Speaker the name of the employee designated hereunder for the information of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 701 adopted by the House today, I have designated Mr. Harry Newlin Megill, an official in my office, to discharge the duties contemplated by said resolution.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include tabular material.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. I just wish to call attention to the fact that this is Father's Day, and, therefore, I say: Good night, good morning, good luck.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many have ever attended a sunrise service before, but you have today.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes a. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes a. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Latta, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the two Houses of Congress until December 31, 1948; and

H. Con. Res. 219. Concurrent resolution authorizing the signing of enrolled bills following adjournment.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (H. R. 6248) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer United States Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitments; and

S. 2790. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 371. An act for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas;

H. R. 564. An act for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg;

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Anthony Arancio;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Adney W. Gray;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado;

H. R. 912. An act for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa;

H. R. 915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Chester O. Glenn;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsang III;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp. of Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 1642. An act for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader;

H. R. 1733. An act for the relief of G. C. Hedrick;

H. R. 1734. An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.;

H. R. 1779. An act for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn.;

H. R. 1780. An act for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor;

H. R. 1930. An act for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation;

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2192. An act for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.;

H. R. 2193. An act for the relief of Robert E. Graham;

H. R. 2352. An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of George Cleve Williams;

H. R. 2395. An act for the relief of the Cypress Creek drainage district of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;

H. R. 2551. An act for the relief of William R. Ramsey;

H. R. 2552. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley;

H. R. 2696. An act for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.;

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 2732. An act for the relief of Dennis Stanton;

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Henry;

H. R. 2878. An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein;

H. R. 2889. An act for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston;

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association;

H. R. 3052. An act for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr.;

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems;

H. R. 3261. An act for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson;

H. R. 3427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 3499. An act for the relief of Petrol Corp.;

H. R. 3566. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3735. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 3999. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders;

H. R. 4047. An act for the relief of Edmund Huppler;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4199. An act for the relief of George Haniotis;

H. R. 4272. An act to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4441. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency;

H. R. 4452. An act for the relief of Douglas L. Craig;

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 4516. An act for the relief of the Moore Dry Dock Co., of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 4518. An act for the relief of Gerald S. Furman;

H. R. 4567. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey);

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen;

H. R. 4635. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4644. An act for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.;

H. R. 4690. An act to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between

Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals;

H. R. 4856. An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4881. An act for the relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 4962. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5252. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5355. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5506. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans;

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended;

H. R. 5716. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Bessie Schwartz;

H. R. 5734. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public park and golf course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo;

H. R. 5750. An act to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 5886. An act to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 5888. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6089. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134);

H. R. 6090. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title;

H. R. 6096. An act to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6116. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act;

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.

H. R. 6186. An act for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 6224. An act for the relief of John Watkins;

H. R. 6293. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives;

H. R. 6318. An act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone;

H. R. 6327. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette;

H. R. 6412. An act to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President";

H. R. 6426. An act to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.;

H. R. 6452. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States;

H. R. 6507. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level-premium-term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6598. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia" approved August 9, 1939;

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6634. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea;

H. R. 6698. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 6705. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes;

H. R. 6818. An act to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting;

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State;

H. R. 6860. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act;

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry;

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended;

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses;

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life-insurance or annuity payments;

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 83. An act authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn;

S. 1107. An act relating to the arming of American vessels;

S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner irrigation district, and for other purposes;

S. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer;

S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation;

S. 2186. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes";

S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act;

S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory;

S. 2510. An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes;

S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes;

S. 2706. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building;

S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.;

S. 2821. An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents;

S. 2825. An act to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The House stands adjourned pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 218.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes a. m.) pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 218, the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1667. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, the Committee on Ways and Means was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5849) to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6697. A bill to authorize the sale and grant to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., of certain interests in public lands, and repealing a certain act; with amendments (Rept. No. 2429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on the activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on the survey and study of the postal service; without amendment (Rept. 2434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Seventeenth intermediate report on investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating; without amendment (Rept. No. 2441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Senate Joint Resolution 219. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provisions for certain ocean-transportation service to, from, and within Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 2447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 6999. A bill to provide for capital-gain treatment with respect to income received on the redemption of certain United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7000. A bill authorizing municipalities of the Territory of Alaska to enact transaction taxes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 7001. A bill to aid the settlement and development of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 7002. A bill to settle and extinguish land claims to the public domain in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 7003. A bill to provide for a cash allowance for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 7004. A bill repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 7005. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 7006. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 7007. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 7008. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 7009. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. R. 7010. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of certain persons who served in the Polish Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADE of Kentucky:

H. R. 7011. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 7012. A bill to promote a sound monetary system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 7013. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 7014. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 7015. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 7016. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7017. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 7018. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7019. A bill to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7020. A bill to authorize a program of useful public works for the development of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7021. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7022. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7023. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7024. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7025. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 7026. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 7027. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. McMAHON:

H. J. Res. 435. Joint resolution to establish a commission to investigate and study the entire field of educational nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 695. Resolution authorizing an investigation of conditions in Palestine; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 696. Resolution authorizing an investigation of conditions in Palestine; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. Res. 697. Resolution providing expenses for conducting the investigation incurred by the select committee authorized by House Resolution 691; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Res. 698. Resolution calling upon Congress to take effective action against the spread of inflation and the high cost of living; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7028. A bill for the relief of Maria Forbes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7029. A bill for the relief of John J. O'Mara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 7030. A bill for the relief of Adalbert (Bela) Juth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2115. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition by the members of Otsego County (N. Y.) Pomona Grange, urging that the Congress of the United States take immediate steps to appropriate money to set up a laboratory for the study and research of the causes, remedies, and final eradication of the hoof-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2116. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to the recognition of the state of Israel and the lifting of the embargo on arms to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80*th* CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 94—PART 8

JULY 26, 1948, TO DECEMBER 31, 1948
(PAGES 9353 TO 10316)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1948

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 26, 1948

The Senate reassembled this day in its Chamber at the Capitol, in the city of Washington, in pursuance of the proclamation of the President of the United States of the 15th day of July 1948.

ARTHUR VANDENBERG, President pro tempore, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of infallible wisdom, we have entered upon days which are fraught with perplexing problems and heavy responsibilities, but also with glorious opportunities and possibilities.

We pray that we may have the interpreting light and the clear and confident leading of Thy spirit in all our deliberations and decisions.

May the ideals and principles of our blessed Lord not only stir our emotions but our wills, and may every lofty God-inspired sentiment be translated into action and achievement.

Grant that it may be the goal of all our aspirations to glorify Thy great and holy name and to build Thy kingdom of peace and good will among men and nations.

Hear us for the sake of the Christ. Amen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proclamation of the President reconvening the Congress will be read by the clerk.

The Chief Clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.) read the proclamation, as follows:

CONVENING THE CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the public interest requires that the Congress of the United States should be convened at 12 o'clock noon on Monday, the 26th day of July 1948, to receive such communication as may be made by the Executive;

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the Congress of the United States to convene at the Capitol in the city of Washington on Monday, the 26th day of July 1948, at 12 o'clock noon, of which all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as Members thereof are hereby required to take notice.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the United States.

Done at the city of Washington this 15th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1948, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-third.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

By the President:
G. C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Brewster	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kem	Russell
Capehart	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capper	Knowland	Smith
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cooper	Lodge	Stennis
Cordon	Lucas	Stewart
Donnell	McCarthy	Taft
Downey	McClellan	Taylor
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McMahon	Thye
Feazel	Magnuson	Tobey
Ferguson	Martin	Umstead
George	Maybank	Vandenberg
Green	Millikin	Watkins
Gurney	Moore	Wherry
Hatch	Murray	Wiley
Hawkes	Myers	Williams
Hayden	O'Conor	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official state business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without reading, the Journal of the proceedings of the Senate for the calendar days Friday, June 18, Saturday, June 19, and Sunday, June 20, 1948, be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on June 20, 1948, the President pro tempore, under the authority of House Concurrent Resolution 219, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Doris E. Snyder;

S. 418. An act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes;

S. 595. An act to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war;

S. 1243. An act to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1260. An act to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers;

S. 1322. An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton;

S. 1717. An act for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased;

S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III;

S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co.;

S. 2242. An act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes;

S. 2281. An act to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes;

S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co., and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyance;

S. 2376. An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold;

S. 2440. An act for the relief of Charles Duncan Montieth;

S. 2554. An act to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes;

S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks;

S. 2655. An act to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota;

S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund;

S. 2698. An act to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institution, a State institution, and for other purposes;

S. 2705. An act to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.;

S. 2709. An act for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura;

S. 2730. An act to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces and on war transfer by employees in the field service of the Post Office Department;

S. 2743. An act providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians;

S. 2747. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company;

S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment;

S. 2790. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2794. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations;

S. 2830. An act to extend for 2 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry;

S. 2849. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.;

S. 2861. An act to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans;

S. 2877. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended;

H. R. 333. An act for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, the veterans of World War II;

H. R. 2209. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;

H. R. 2798. An act to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure";

H. R. 3416. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument;

H. R. 4044. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases;

H. R. 4917. An act to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken;

H. R. 5416. An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5882. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes;

H. R. 5904. An act to continue the Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States;

H. R. 6248. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6402. An act to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission;

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City;

H. R. 6465. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey;

H. R. 6481. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments;

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948;

H. R. 6771. An act making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6801. An act making appropriations for foreign aid, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations;

H. R. 6829. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and to provide pay increases for Government employees;

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor;

S. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska;

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author;

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer U. S. Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War;

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America; and

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on June 20, 1948, the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, heretofore duly signed by the Presiding Officers of the two Houses, were presented to the President of the United States by the Secretary of the Senate:

On June 21, 1948:

S. 83. An act authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn;

S. 1107. An act relating to the arming of American vessels;

S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner irrigation district, and for other purposes;

S. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer;

S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation;

S. 2186. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes";

S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act;

S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory;

S. 2510. An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes;

S. 2706. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building;

S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.;

S. 2821. An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; and

S. 2825. An act to increase the rates of service-connected-death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes.

On June 23, 1948:

S. 418. An act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes;

S. 595. An act to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war;

S. 1243. An act to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1260. An act to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers;

S. 1322. An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton;

S. 1717. An act for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased;

S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III;

S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc., Walsh Construction Co., and Atkinson-Kier Co.;

S. 2242. An act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes;

S. 2281. An act to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes;

S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyance;

S. 2376. An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold;

S. 2440. An act for the relief of Charles Duncan Montrieth;

S. 2554. An act to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes;

S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks;

S. 2655. An act to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota;

S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund;

S. 2698. An act to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, and for other purposes;

S. 2705. An act to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.;

S. 2709. An act for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura;

S. 2730. An act to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces and on war transfer by employees in the field service of the Post Office Department;

S. 2743. An act providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians;

S. 2747. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company;

S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment;

S. 2794. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations;

S. 2830. An act to extend for 2 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry;

S. 2849. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.;

S. 2861. An act to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans;

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

S. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

On June 24, 1948:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Doris E. Snyder;

S. 2790. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 2877. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on June 20, 1948, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved acts and joint resolutions as follows:

On June 19, 1948:

S. 263. An act to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes;

S. 295. An act to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended;

S. 424. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John J. Higgins, and others;

S. 554. An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census;

S. 612. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, and to repeal section 36 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments;

S. 692. An act to authorize a mileage allowance of 7 cents per mile for United States marshals and their deputies for travel on official business;

S. 673. An act for the relief of Warren H. McKenney;

S. 1052. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West;

S. 1082. An act to credit service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion;

S. 1214. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946, as amended;

S. 1265. An act to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of James R. Walsh;

S. 1442. An act to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

S. 1470. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract diseases while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1747. An act to authorize credit in certain accounts of United States property and disbursing officers under the War Department, and for other purposes;

S. 1783. An act to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army and Air Force personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 1790. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes," approved March 6, 1946;

S. 1791. An act to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the Department of the Army;

S. 1795. An act to repeal section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874, prescribing regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 174);

S. 1835. An act for the relief of Harry Daniels;

S. 1861. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide promotions for temporary employees of the custodial service;

S. 1871. An act to restore certain lands to the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.;

S. 1925. An act to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak.;

S. 2040. An act for the relief of the owners of certain properties abutting Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia;

S. 2152. An act to increase the maximum travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks;

S. 2251. An act to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States Naval Hospital, United States Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.;

S. 2288. An act to amend the Lanham Act so as to permit the sale of certain permanent war housing thereunder to veterans at a purchase price not in excess of the cost of construction;

S. 2460. An act to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels;

S. 2406. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make further provision for the recording of title to, interests in, and encumbrances upon certain aircraft, and for other purposes;

S. 2592. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico, in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government, and final judgments in certain condemnation proceedings;

S. 2642. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; and

S. 2643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens," approved June 30, 1939.

On June 21, 1948:

S. 1933. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to School District 55, Roosevelt County, Mont.

On June 22, 1948:

S. 1090. An act to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Hou Chung Chay;

S. 1493. An act to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), and for other purposes;

S. 1573. An act for the relief of Marcella Kosterman;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki; and

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations.

On June 24, 1948:

S. 1266. An act to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying;

S. 1274. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Wilkinson County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins;

S. 1275. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Warren County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans;

S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act;

S. 2223. An act to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes;

S. 2237. An act to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act;

S. 2505. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2508. An act relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico;

S. 2655. An act to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2706. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building; and

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians.

On June 25, 1948:

S. 1409. An act for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Imamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu;

S. 2242. An act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes;

S. 2401. An act to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 2675. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; and

S. 2770. An act to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements.

On June 26, 1948:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Doris E. Snyder;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton;

S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation;

S. 2186. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes"; and

S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Vervasio Artigas, and for other purposes.

On June 28, 1948:

S. 83. An act authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn;

S. 2849. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.; and

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

On June 29, 1948:

S. 3. An act to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators;

S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 239. An act to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta;

S. 1087. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944;

S. 1107. An act relating to the arming of American vessels;

S. 1303. An act for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson;

S. 1322. An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 1447. An act to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes;

S. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer;

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency;

S. 2281. An act to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes;

S. 2376. An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold;

S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks;

S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota;

S. 2698. An act to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, and for other purposes;

S. 2709. An act for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura;

S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.;

S. 2747. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company;

S. 2830. An act to extend for 2 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry;

S. 2877. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended;

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; and

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to change the name of the Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam.

On June 30, 1948:

S. 418. An act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes;

S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation;

S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyances;

S. 2440. An act for the relief of Charles Duncan Montieth;

S. 2510. An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes;

S. 2705. An act to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.;

S. 2730. An act to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces and on war transfer by employees in the field service of the Post Office Department;

S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund;

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day;

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

On July 1, 1948:

S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory;

S. 2790. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2625. An act to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes;

S. 2661. An act to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans; and

S. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

On July 2, 1948:

S. 595. An act to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war;

S. 1260. An act to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers;

S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State;

S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III;

S. 2554. An act to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industry productive capacity, and for other purposes;

S. 2743. An act providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians; and

S. 2821. An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents.

On July 3, 1948:

S. 1243. An act to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co.; and

S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment.

DISAPPROVAL OF BILLS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on June 20, 1948, transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate lists of bills and a joint resolution disapproved by him, with his reasons for such action, as follows:

On July 2, 1948:

ESTATE OF WILLIAM R. STIGALL, DECEASED

S. 1717. I have withheld my approval from S. 1717, an act for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased.

The purpose of this bill is to compensate the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased, for his death from injuries sustained by him while in the military service.

It appears that on September 5, 1941, Pvt. William R. Stigall, a member of Headquarters Company, First Signal Armored Battalion, Fort Knox, Ky., which was en route from Fort Knox to Camp Polk, La., by Army convoy, was accidentally electrocuted when the antenna of the radio scout car in which he was riding touched a high-tension electric power line. The convoy had halted by the roadside for the noonday meal. The antenna of the radio scout car was released to permit the canvas top of the car to be rolled back, and as the antenna rose into the air it came into contact with a high-tension power line approximately 19 feet above the ground. Private Stigall dismounted from the car, with one hand on the door thereof, and as he stepped on the ground, completing the circuit, the current flowed through his body, causing his death almost instantly. It appears that the power line had not been recognized as such by any member of the military personnel, in view of the fact that it was composed of two light wires suspended comparatively close to the ground.

In view of the fact that at the time of his death Private Stigall was in line of duty as an enlisted man of the Army, any dependents left by him would be entitled to all of the benefits conferred by general law on dependents of members of the armed forces of the United States who die in line of duty. It appears, however, that Private Stigall left no one who was dependent upon him. His service record, under the heading "Government Insurance," bears the notation "No insurance desired." Had he chosen to take advantage of the opportunity afforded him to obtain national service life insurance, he could have been insured in the maximum amount of $10,000, and his beneficiary, or beneficiaries, would have been compensated in that amount for his death. However, his father, Dumont Stigall, received the statutory death gratuity benefit, in an amount equal to the decedent's Army pay for 6 months.

The approval of this bill awarding compensation for the death of Private Stigall would be discriminatory in that it would grant to his estate a special benefit denied to the estates of other members of the armed forces where the facts are similar and to the estates of military and naval personnel who are killed in action. There are no circumstances present in this case that would warrant singling out this estate for preferential treatment. On June 11, 1948, I withheld my approval from a similar bill, S. 252, an act for the relief of the estate of Lee Jones Cardy (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, p. 8080, June 14, 1948). While deeply regretting the untimely death of Private Stigall, I am obliged to withhold my approval from this bill.

RATES OF PAY FOR CERTAIN VETERANS' AFFAIRS FIELD INSTALLATION POSITIONS

S. 2794. I am withholding my approval from S. 2794, an act "To authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations."

This bill would authorize the Administrator to establish pay scales for some 60,000 field employees of the Veterans' Administration, including hospital attendants, dental mechanics, and others who work in veterans' hospitals. These employees are now paid under the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923.

It is argued that this authority is needed since the Administration has had difficulty in recruiting and retaining personnel to staff veterans' hospitals. It is estimated that the increase to be given the employees affected by this bill would have been about $80 per year. Since I have just approved a bill increasing salaries for persons covered by the Classification Act by $330 per year, the authority granted by this bill would be unnecessary.

Furthermore, I do not believe that this bill represents a sound approach to the problem of recruiting and retaining Government employees. It would have affected only certain employees of one agency, whereas the same problem confronts many other agencies, and should be dealt with by general legislation. It would have set no standards or limits to guide the Administrator except the single provision that he could not set rates of pay lower than those prescribed by the Classification Act. This would have been a step toward uncoordinated and diverse pay scales for Government employees, when the need is for greater uniformity.

On July 3, 1948:

REPAIR AND REHABILITATION OF IRRIGATION WORKS IN FORT SUMNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner Irrigation District, and for other purposes. (No statement.)

On June 27, 1948:

FRANCIS SCOTT KEY MANSION

S. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key Mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Memorial, and for other purposes. (No statement.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
H. C. M. Case, consultant [1]	$10,000.00	$1,055.50
James M. Kendall, clerk	7,075.06	3,537.53
Joycette K. Jones, clerk	6,026.72	3,013.36

[1] Service terminated Feb. 8, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	2,851.51
Amount expended as of Dec. 31, 1947	2,416.90
Balance unexpended	4,731.59

ARTHUR CAPPER,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LONG-RANGE FARM PROGRAM, PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 147, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$15,000.00
Amount expended	2,477.88
Amount expended as of Dec. 31, 1947	5,345.46
Balance unexpended	7,176.66

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Everard H. Smith, Chief Clerk	$10,000.00	$4,999.98
Cecil H. Tolbert, Assistant Chief Clerk	9,524.13	4,762.02
Adelbert F. Teague, assistant clerk	7,075.06	3,537.48
Edmund T. King, assistant clerk	7,549.08	3,774.54
Mary K. Yanick, clerical assistant	$3,212.74	$1,606.32
Marie Jeneau, clerical assistant	3,461.04	1,730.52
Bernadine Wassam, clerical assistant	3,047.22	1,523.58
Kimball Sanborn, professional staff member	7,075.06	3,537.48
Robert H. Montgomery, professional staff member	8,023.09	4,011.54
Earl W. Cooper, professional staff member	8,023.09	4,011.54
Francis S. Hewitt, professional staff member	8,023.09	4,011.54
Harold E. Merrick, professional staff member	8,023.09	4,011.54
Thomas J. Scott, professional staff member	8,023.09	4,011.54
Yvonne A. Beaudry, clerical assistant	3,047.22	1,523.58
John Pillsbury, professional staff member	7,075.06	3,537.48
Lawrence H. Wendrich, assistant clerk	6,522.05	3,261.00
Herman E. Downey, assistant clerk:		
Jan. 1-19	5,447.37	287.49
Jan. 20 to June 30	6,440.54	2,880.34
Regina H. Simms, clerical assistant, Apr. 27 to June 30	3,047.22	541.71
Margaret S. Smith, clerical assistant, Feb. 2 to June 12	3,047.22	1,108.83
Thomas J. Graves, professional staff member:		
Jan. 1-7	8,576.10	166.75
Jan. 8 to June 30	10,000.00	4,805.53
H. Maurice Joyce, assistant clerk, Jan. 1 to June 20	6,522.05	3,079.83

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

EMPLOYED TEMPORARILY

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Carl R. Dortch, staff member	[1] $20.96	
Jan. 22, to Feb. 29		$817.80
May 20 to June 19		650.05
Wilbur E. McCann, staff member	[1] 20.96	
Jan. 19 to Mar. 11		1,111.37
Hale G. Knight, consultant	[1] 35.00	
Feb. 4-7		140.00
Apr. 22-27		210.00
June 1-19		665.00
Laurence A. Lawler, consultant	[1] 35.00	
Jan. 20-24		175.00
Feb. 2-3		70.00
Horton H. Nielson, clerical assistant	5,281.84	
Feb. 1-18		264.09
Claude S. Holloway, staff member	[1] 20.96	
Feb. 3 to Mar. 31		1,216.22
Betty M. McClure, assistant clerk	3,047.22	
Feb. 1 to Apr. 10		592.50
L. H. Simerl, assistant clerk	[1] 20.96	
Feb. 1 to May 15		2,201.78
Robert Ralston, Jr., staff member	[1] 20.96	
Mar. 1 to Apr. 30		1,279.13
Harold C. M. Case, staff member	10,000.00	
Apr. 16 to May 25		1,111.10
Earl R. Lind, assistant clerk:		
Apr. 1-30	1,188.00	99.00
May 1 to June 15	2,004.20	250.51
Robert K. Rochester, assistant clerk	[1] 20.96	
Apr. 1 to June 30		1,908.22
E. William Andrews, Jr., assistant clerk	[1] 20.96	
May 10-23		293.57

[1] Per diem.

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John G. Adams, Chief Clerk	$10,000.00	$5,000.00
J. M. Chambers, staff adviser	10,000.00	4,646.26
Mark Galusha, staff adviser	10,000.00	4,646.26
Verne D. Mudge, staff adviser	10,000.00	4,646.26
H. S. Atkinson, assistant clerk	6,440.54	2,148.84
Georgia Earle, clerical assistant	3,626.56	1,813.28
Irene Posey, clerical assistant	3,626.56	1,813.28
Roberta Van Beek, clerical assistant	3,626.56	1,813.28
Anne Reardon, clerical assistant [1]	3,626.56	372.72
Walter L. Smalley, assistant clerk [2]	5,281.84	880.30

[1] Temporary.
[2] Employment terminated Mar. 1, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	6,234.06
Balance unexpended	3,765.94

CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$50,000.00
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1947	$990.36
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	13,055.34
	13,745.70
Balance unexpended	36,254.30

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report in addition to the statement showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Miscellaneous expenses

Unexpended balance of funds authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 130, as of January 1, 1948, plus additional authorizations in S. Res. 201 and 265		$25,875.37
Amount expended January 1 to June 30, 1948		13,587.97
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948		12,287.40
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of January 1, 1948		43,158.89
Amount expended January 1 to June 30, 1948		5,031.91
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948		38,126.98

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 30, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. George Stewart, Chief Clerk	$8,023.09	$4,011.54
James R. Kirkland, counsel	8,971.11	4,485.55
Thomas S. Henderson, assistant counsel	7,549.08	3,313.20
Edna L. Ward, stenographic secretary	3,626.56	1,813.28
Ruth Wallace, stenographic clerk	3,295.51	1,647.75

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	4,306.36
Balance unexpended	5,693.64

C. D. BUCK,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 15, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 6, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 3, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Robert D. L'Heureux, professional staff member	$10,000.00	$4,788.73
Wm. F. McKenna, professional staff member	10,000.00	4,976.53
Joseph P. McMurray, professional staff member	10,000.00	4,694.42
Charles T. Andrews, professional staff member	10,000.00	3,638.87
Raimond Bowie, clerk	6,996.06	2,995.30
Eunice V. Avery, clerical assistant	5,281.84	2,608.71
Caro McNeill Pugh, clerical assistant	3,543.80	1,771.86
Pauline C. Beam, clerical assistant	3,543.80	1,771.86
Edna A. Stewart, clerical assistant	3,543.80	1,771.86

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, balance Dec. 31, 1947		$2,625.07
Additional appropriation		10,000.00
Total		12,625.07
Amount expended through June 30, 1948		7,631.51
Balance unexpended		4,993.56

C. W. TOBEY,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 30, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. George Stewart, Chief Clerk	$8,023.09	$4,011.54
James R. Kirkland, counsel	8,971.11	4,485.55
Thomas S. Henderson, assistant counsel	7,549.08	3,313.20
Edna L. Ward, stenographic secretary	3,626.56	1,813.28
Ruth Wallace, stenographic clerk	3,295.51	1,647.75

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	4,306.36
Balance unexpended	5,693.64

C. D. BUCK,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 15, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. H. Macomber, Jr., Chief Clerk	$9,524.13	$4,762.02
Glenn K. Shriver, Assistant Chief Clerk	7,391.07	3,695.52
E. B. Van Horn, staff director	10,000.00	4,999.98
Walter L. Reynolds, staff member	8,734.11	4,367.04
Thomas A. Sappington, staff member [1]	7,075.06	1,768.74
Philip C. Ward, staff member	9,050.11	3,821.12
Gordon R. Ewing (from June 16, 1948), staff member	10,000.00	416.66
Ann M. Grickis, clerk-secretary	6,316.23	2,668.16
Emily I. Tennyson (Mrs.), clerk-stenographer	3,461.04	1,716.72
Marie C. Tylor, clerk-stenographer	3,461.04	1,716.72
Welda Blanche Holder, clerk-stenographer	3,212.74	1,402.53

[1] Terminated Feb. 29, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 80th Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended	4,501.12
Balance unexpended	5,498.88

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 15, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 152

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Eli E. Nobleman (from Jan. 17, 1948), counsel, Subcommittee on Relations with International Organizations	$6,026.73	$2,745.47
Dr. Clarence Heer, staff director, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations	25.00	305.54
Paul H. Menk, Jr. (May 19 to June 15, 1948), administrative analyst, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments	6,338.06	512.84

[1] Per day (per diem basis).

Funds authorized or appropriated for expenditure under S. Res. 152, 80th Cong		$30,000.00
Amount expended:		
Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations	$5,416.57	
Subcommittee on Relations with International Organizations	3,321.13	
Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments	512.84	
Balance on statutory receipts	499.47	
		9,750.01
Balance unexpended		20,249.99

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURPLUS PROPERTY OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
George F. Boos, chief investigator	$7,707.08	$1,284.50
Kathleen M. Colson, stenographer	2,633.40	621.77
Edward A. Connors, investigator	4,695.66	2,847.78
Cairn May Cook, secretary	3,626.56	226.04
Philip F. King, consultant	7,470.07	3,735.00
Myles C. McCahill, investigator	5,695.66	1,423.89
Hubert R. Moody, investigator	5,695.66	1,170.75
Robert L. Piper, chief clerk and investigator	5,695.66	1,423.89

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$45,027.35
Amount expended	16,123.50
Balance unexpended	28,903.85

HOMER FERGUSON,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF SENATE INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from March 1, 1948, to July 1, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jerome S. Adlerman, assistant counsel	$6,495.72	$1,994.80
Carmine S. Bellino, investigator and consultant	8,476.10	2,477.52
George F. Boos, chief investigator	7,707.08	2,569.00
Robert Brosnan, assistant counsel	8,578.10	
Kathleen Colson, assistant clerk	2,716.10	716.74
Frederick M. Coughlin, assistant counsel	6,026.74	1,640.56
Mary M. Cousins, assistant clerk	3,378.27	922.01
Francis D. Flanagan, chief assistant counsel	8,996.14	3,332.58
John D. Leadbetter, messenger	2,222.00	
Lydia Lee, record clerk	5,033.55	552.90
Myles C. McCahill, investigator	5,695.66	1,423.89
Mollie Jo McCarthy, assistant clerk	3,129.98	804.27
Robert L. McElroy, assistant clerk	3,232.74	883.16
Gladys E. Mostler, assistant clerk	3,626.56	966.99
Constance L. Morris, assistant clerk	3,129.98	825.99
Betty F. Oliver, assistant clerk	2,716.10	716.74
Robert L. Piper, assistant counsel	5,695.66	1,423.89
William P. Rogers, chief counsel	10,000.00	2,333.32
Mary Lou Shepherd, assistant clerk	3,129.98	625.99
James F. Sheridan, investigator	5,695.66	1,740.31
Ruth M. Young, clerk	3,792.09	948.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$125,000.00
Amount expended	32,745.69
Balance unexpended	92,254.31

HOMER FERGUSON,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 6, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to July 1, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Sherwood B. Stanley, clerk:		
Jan. 1 to June 8, 1948	$7,549.08	$3,856.00
June 9 to June 30, 1948	8,892.11	
Elizabeth B. Springer, assistant clerk:		
Jan. 1, to June 8, 1948	5,116.32	2,683.44
June 9 to June 30, 1948	5,530.14	
Fred R. Peel, research clerk	5,281.84	2,640.90
Bernice N. Crouse, clerk-stenographer:		
Jan. 1 to June 8, 1948	3,626.56	1,838.54
June 9 to June 30, 1948	4,040.38	
Janice Everly, clerk-stenographer:		
Jan. 1 to June 8, 1948	3,626.56	1,838.54
June 9 to June 30, 1948	4,040.38	
Jesse R. Nichols, document clerk:		
Jan. 1 to June 8, 1948	3,129.98	1,573.09
June 9 to June 30, 1948	3,295.51	

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1947, through Dec. 31, 1947 (previously reported)	4,909.83
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948	2,610.83
Total expended	7,520.66
Balance unexpended	2,479.34

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 7, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 3, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff	$10,000.00	
Richard H. Heindel, professional staff	10,000.00	
Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, professional staff	9,129.12	
C. C. O'Day, clerk	8,576.10	
Emmett M. O'Grady, assistant clerk	4,590.97	
Isabel M. Smith, assistant clerk	4,040.38	
Morella R. Hansen, assistant clerk	3,709.33	
Ellene Marie Galloway, assistant clerk	5,281.84	

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	[1] $20,000.00
Amount expended	11,021.81
Balance unexpended	8,978.19

[1] $10,000 of this amount was authorized under S. Res. 215, 80th Cong., 2d sess.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 7, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE EFFECT OF CERTAIN STATE DEPARTMENT ACTIVITIES (S. RES. 161, 80TH CONG., 1ST SESS.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 26, 1947, to January 28, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditures	4,827.96
Amount expended	4,827.96
Balance unexpended	[1] 20,172.04

[1] Authority of above subcommittee expired on February 1, 1948, and said balance of $20,172.04 has reverted to the contingent fund of the Senate.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 30, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Hugh R. Brown, chief clerk	$10,000.00	$5,000.00
Nellie D. McSherry, assistant chief clerk	7,075.00	3,537.48
Albert A. Grorud, professional staff	7,707.08	3,796.45
Elmer K. Nelson, professional staff	7,707.08	3,688.47
Orville Watkins, clerical staff	5,116.32	2,558.16
Estelle Betsworth, clerical staff	3,543.80	1,751.17
Charlotte Mickle, clerical staff	3,212.74	1,585.63
Lynne A. Kaufman, clerical staff	2,964.45	[1] 1,111.68

[1] Terminated May 15, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$17,847.14
Amount expended	10,450.78
Balance unexpended	7,396.36

HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman.
By HUGH R. BROWN,
Chief Clerk.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 30, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Edward Jarrett, clerk	$10,000.00	$4,723.16
Edward Cooper, professional staff member	10,000.00	4,723.16
Halford G. Davis, professional staff member	10,000.00	4,723.16
Vera Burgess, clerical staff	4,619.73	[1] 369.57
Harriet Gray, clerical staff	3,626.56	1,813.26
Dorothy Prout, clerical staff	3,626.54	1,813.26
Martha Shaffer, clerical staff	3,212.74	1,606.32
C. H. Dolan, air accident investigator (temporary)	8,339.10	1,389.84

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$20,431.20
Amount expended	7,058.75
Balance unexpended	10,372.45

WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 24, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Richard Arens, professional staff (legal)	$7,944.09	$3,972.05
Maurice Covert, professional staff (legal)	7,944.09	3,899.94
Joseph A. Davis, assistant clerk	7,944.09	3,972.05
Miriam O. Fox, stenographer	4,040.38	2,020.19
Helen Ganss, stenographer	3,461.04	1,730.52
Margaret Holland, stenographer	3,461.04	1,492.00
Mary Rogers, stenographer	4,040.38	2,020.19
J. Carlisle Ruddy, professional staff (legal)	7,944.09	3,972.05
Harold R. Wilde, clerk of committee (5 months)	10,000.00	4,166.65
Robert B. Young, professional staff (legal)	7,944.09	3,310.00
Robert B. Young, clerk of committee (1 month)	8,655.10	721.26

TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES UNDER S. RES. 120

Leila Lively, clerk-typist (5½ months)	$2,964.45	$1,136.00
Rita Baird, clerk-typist (2 months and 6 days)	2,550.63	446.39

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$40,000.00
Amount expended	23,826.35
Balance unexpended	16,173.65

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 30, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION, PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 137, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from

January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Thomas J. Davis, investigator	$5,695.66	$2,847.78
John A. Loftus, investigator	5,695.66	2,847.78
Guy M. Massey, investigator	5,695.66	2,847.78
Fred M. Mesmer, investigator	5,695.66	2,847.78
Margaret P. Hogan, stenographer	3,626.56	1,813.26
Lois C. Odham, stenographer	3,626.56	1,813.26
James C. Messersmith, clerk	5,695.66	2,847.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$33,027.21
Amount expended	18,231.32
Balance unexpended	14,805.89

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 28, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Philip R. Rodgers, clerk	$9,062.13	$4,788.38
Earl B. Wixsey, assistant clerk	8,181.09	4,089.56
Paul Sample, clerical assistant	4,702.50	2,351.28
Crawford C. Heerlein, clerical assistant	4,123.06	2,061.54
Vivien Harman, clerical assistant	3,212.74	1,606.42
Dorothy Murphy, clerical assistant	2,964.45	1,482.18
Melvin W. Sneed, professional staff member [1]	8,023.09	4,011.54
Archibald Cox, professional staff member [2]	7,549.06	3,141.70

[1] Appointed Jan. 1, 1948.
[2] Appointed Feb. 2, 1948, resigned June 30, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure:		
Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	$10,000.00	
July 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	8,000.00	
		$18,000.00
Amount expended:		
Jan. 1 to June 30, 1947	3,660.00	
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1947	3,533.38	
Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	7,342.58	
		14,535.96
Balance unexpended		3,464.07

ROBERT A. TAFT,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 10, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
E. W. Bassett, professional staff	$10,000.00	$5,000.00
Ronald Moist, professional staff	10,000.00	5,000.00
William A. Stevens, professional staff	10,000.00	5,000.00
Theo W. Sneed, professional staff	8,200.09	364.16
Orren L. Jones, clerical staff	10,000.00	5,000.00
Eloise Porter, clerical staff	5,281.84	2,640.92
Priscilla E. Cordova, clerical staff	5,281.84	220.07
Frances Stovall, clerical staff	4,619.73	2,309.86
Mary Batalo, clerical staff	3,295.51	1,882.22
Joan Beam, clerical staff	3,047.22	550.00
Burnett, Frank, staff member	10,200.09	$4,631.29
Chrisses, Costas D., committee reporter	5,027.15	2,399.53
Homan, Colette E., Chief Clerk	6,680.05	3,257.99
Irwin, Mary, clerk	4,702.50	2,316.77
Lynott, Dorothy, clerk	3,957.69	1,951.22
Phenix, John D., statistician	10,000.00	5,000.00
Riley, George D., staff director	10,000.00	5,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	6,993.82
Balance unexpended	3,006.18

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 10, 1948.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE (SENATE) OPERATING UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 61

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Burton, Ralph, chief investigator, Jan. 1-3, 1948	$7,628.08	$63.56
Fox, Thomas F., investigator	5,530.14	2,765.07
Rinker, John T., chief investigator	7,628.08	3,432.61
Van Olinda, Walter K., assistant investigator, Jan. 1-3	5,116.32	42.63
Ulsrud, Jennie, clerk	5,447.37	2,206.38

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$35,000.00
Amount expended	21,893.80
Balance unexpended	3,106.20

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 30, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Albert L. Seidel, Chief Clerk	$9,999.96	$4,999.98
Nelson Deranian, professional staff (counsel)	9,999.96	4,999.98
George J. Nilles, assistant clerk	6,522.05	3,261.03
Laura Vogt, clerk (secretarial) (employed from Feb. 17, 1948)	3,047.22	1,134.22
Myrtle Paynter, clerk (stenographic) (employed from Mar. 10, 1948)	2,964.45	914.01
B. Floye Gavin, clerk (research)	4,868.02	2,434.01
Ella N. Hathaway, clerk (research) (employed to Feb. 19, 1948)	3,461.04	471.06
Phyllis M. Wherry, clerk (stenographic) (employed to Feb. 16, 1948)	3,129.98	309.93

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure remaining Jan. 1, 1948	$9,406.87
Amount expended Jan. 1, through June 30, 1948	279.70
Balance unexpended	9,127.17

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 6, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Albert L. Seidel, Chief Clerk	$9,999.96	$4,999.98
Nelson Deranian, professional staff (counsel)	9,999.96	4,999.98
George J. Nilles, assistant clerk	6,522.05	3,261.03
Laura Vogt, clerk (secretarial) (employed from Feb. 17, 1948)	3,047.22	1,134.22
Myrtle Paynter, clerk (stenographic) (employed from Mar. 10, 1948)	2,964.45	914.01
B. Floye Gavin, clerk (research)	4,868.02	2,434.01
Ella N. Hathaway, clerk (research) (employed to Feb. 19, 1948)	3,461.04	471.06
Phyllis M. Wherry, clerk (stenographic) (employed to Feb. 16, 1948)	3,129.98	309.93

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure remaining Jan. 1, 1948	$9,406.87
Amount expended Jan. 1, through June 30, 1948	279.70
Balance unexpended	9,127.17

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 6, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION, SUBCOMMITTEE, PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Henry P. Kiley, investigator	$5,695.66	$2,847.78
Burbeck B. Gilchrist, investigator	5,695.66	1,423.89
Jack M. Poorbaugh, investigator	5,116.32	2,558.16
Elda G. Quiet, clerk	3,626.56	473.16
Evelyn M. Kearsey, clerk	3,626.56	273.75
Grace E. Johnson, finance clerk	6,357.78	3,178.89
Francis T. Kelly, chief investigator	6,357.78	2,649.05
Helen C. Earp, clerk	3,626.56	240.21
Arthur R. Brear, Jr., chief investigator	6,357.78	2,902.96
Mary L. Green, administrative assistant	3,792.09	1,896.00
Camille Jeneau, administrative assistant	3,792.09	1,264.00
Leah G. Miller, clerk	3,212.74	524.62
Robert K. Lyle, investigator	4,286.68	1,786.95
Marie A. Heid, clerk	3,212.74	201.41
Joseph V. McCann, investigator	5,695.66	2,675.38
Betty J. B. Du Jack, secretary	3,792.09	1,788.10
Fred H. Kohler, investigator	5,116.32	2,487.10
Joseph F. Langan, investigator	5,695.66	2,675.38
William P. Reed, investigator	5,192.08	2,555.06
Dorothy A. Sellers, clerk	3,212.74	251.70
Joseph F. Kelly, investigator	5,116.32	213.18

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Kelso Elliott, assistant counsel	$8,339.10	$3,288.36
Judd Leighton, investigator	5,116.32	1,065.90
Roy St. Lewis, counsel	6,026.72	2,008.88
Helen Austin, stenographer	3,212.74	7.31
Doris L. Le Master, stenographer	3,212.74	7.31
Martha Lesinewski, stenographer	3,212.74	14.63
Elizabeth McGunity, stenographer	3,212.74	14.63
Lena Orme, secretary	3,212.74	267.72

Funds on hand, July 1, 1948, plus funds authorized by S. Res. 233 agreed to May 19, 1948:
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $172,069.24
Amount expended 58,419.10
Balance unexpended 113,650.14

W. E. JENNER,
Chairman, Subcommittee, Privileges and Elections.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to May 15, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jerome S. Adlerman, assistant counsel	$6,495.72	$1,264.05
Bernard S. Bercovici, investigator	8,075.76	3,030.39
Lucille Bruskin, assistant clerk	3,378.27	1,266.83
William S. Cole, assistant counsel	9,366.12	2,731.78
Frederick M. Coughlin, assistant counsel	6,026.72	1,372.73
Philip R. Davis, assistant counsel	10,000.00	833.33
Agnes P. Dodge, assistant clerk	2,881.69	1,080.62
Francis D. Flanagan, chief assistant counsel	9,998.14	1,666.34
Phelps Hunt, editorial clerk	1,931.60	160.96
Linton W. Jeffery, investigator	8,075.76	3,028.39
Lydia Lee, editor	5,033.55	1,665.55
Joseph M. Mannix, investigator	6,026.72	284.50
George Meader, consulting counsel	10,000.00	833.33
Gladys E. Montier, assistant clerk	3,543.80	590.71
Constance L. Morris, assistant clerk	2,881.69	680.39
Erle Nordholm, messenger	1,188.09	165.69
Betty F. Oliver, assistant clerk	2,633.40	621.77
Franklin N. Parks, assistant counsel	6,680.05	313.44
Jeanie M. Prichard, assistant clerk	3,212.74	713.92
William P. Rogers, chief counsel	10,000.00	1,666.66
Haven Sawyer, investigator	5,392.22	1,572.72
James F. Sheridan, investigator	5,392.22	1,048.48
Dorothy M. Smithson, assistant clerk	3,212.74	535.44
Eleanor L. Taylor, assistant clerk	3,212.74	330.18
Agnes S. Wolf, investigator	5,190.08	938.70
Franklyn F. Yearsley, investigator	4,203.91	876.22
Ruth M. Young, clerk	3,792.09	948.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $62,946.08
Amount expended (including accrued annual leave) 55,179.43
Balance unexpended 7,766.65

OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be read, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration thereafter.

The resolution (S. Res. 266) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is reassembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] as the committee required by the resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in keeping with the custom, the tradition, and the precedents of the Senate, I now move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 26, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the proclamation of the President of the United States convening this extraordinary session of the Eightieth Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONVENING THE CONGRESS OF THE THE UNITED STATES

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the public interest requires that the Congress of the United States should be convened at 12 o'clock noon, on Monday, the 26th day of July 1948, to receive such communication as may be made by the Executive;

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the Congress of the United States to convene at the Capitol in the city of Washington on Monday, the 26th day of July 1948, at 12 o'clock noon, of which all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as Members thereof are hereby required to take notice.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the United States.

Done at the city of Washington this 15th day of July, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and forty-eight, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-third.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

By the President:
G. C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State.

PRAYER

Rev. Jacob S. Payton, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all mercies, with reverence and gratitude we acknowledge Thy unfailing goodness. Lift up the light of Thy countenance, O Lord, upon the peoples of the earth and give them peace. Out of the testimony of many witnesses may Thy truth be established throughout the world.

At the beginning of this special session of Congress, may these Thy servants give Thee a high and honored place in their lives. Suffer not the works of their hands to be stained with dishonor nor their minds to be abased with unworthy thoughts.

May every memory of patient endurance by which justice has been established, and may every example of sacrificial service by which America's advancement has been made possible, offer inspiration and guidance to those who bear responsibility in government. This we pray in the name of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of June 19, 1948, was read and approved.

APPOINTMENTS MADE AFTER ADJOURNMENT

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by House Resolution 691, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of June 19, 1948, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did on June 29, 1948, appoint as members of the select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission the following Members of the House: Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS, Indiana, chairman; Hon. LEONARD W. HALL, New York; Hon. CHARLES H. ELSTON, Ohio; Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, Tennessee; Hon. OREN HARRIS, Arkansas.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by Public Law 636, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of June 19, 1948, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did on July 9, 1948, appoint as members of the United States-Washington and Lee University Bicentennial Commission the following members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ohio; Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, New York; Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., Virginia; Hon. FADJO CRAVENS, Arkansas.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE AFTER ADJOURNMENT

A message from the Senate, received by the Clerk of the House on June 24, 1948, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution relative to negotiations with the Canadian Government concerning the construction of railroads in Alaska and the establishment of reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 333. An act for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, the veterans of World War II;

H. R. 2009. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;

H. R. 2796. An act to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure";

H. R. 3416. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument;

H. R. 4044. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases;

H. R. 4917. An act to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken;

H. R. 5416. An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5882. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes;

H. R. 5904. An act to continue the Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States;

H. R. 6248. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6402. An act to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission;

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City;

H. R. 6465. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey;

H. R. 6481. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments;

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948;

H. R. 6771. An act making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6801. An act making appropriations for foreign aid, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6829. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and to provide pay increases for Government employees;

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations;

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author;

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer U. S. Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War;

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America; and

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 219, Eightieth Congress, announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate as follows:

On June 22, 1948:

S. 418. An act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes;

S. 595. An act to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war;

S. 1243. An act to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1260. An act to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers;

S. 1322. An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton;

S. 1717. An act for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased;

S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III;

S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co.;

S. 2242. An act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes;

S. 2281. An act to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes;

S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyance;

S. 2376. An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold;

S. 2440. An act for the relief of Charles Duncan Montrieth;

S. 2554. An act to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes;

S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks;

S. 2655. An act to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota;

S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund;

S. 2698. An act to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institution, a State institution, and for other purposes;

S. 2705. An act to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.;

S. 2709. An act for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura;

S. 2730. An act to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces and on war transfer by employees in the field service of the Post Office Department;

S. 2743. An act providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians;

S. 2747. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company;

S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment;

S. 2794. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations;

S. 2830. An act to extend for 2 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry;

S. 2849. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.;

S. 2861. An act to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans;

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

S. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

And on June 23, 1948, enrolled bills of the Senate as follows:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Dor'a E. Snyder;

S. 2790. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 2877. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 21, 1948:

H. R. 371. An act for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas;

H. R. 564. An act for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg;

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Anthony Arancio;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Adney W. Gray;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph de Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado;

H. R. 912. An act for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa;

H. R. 915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Chester O. Glenn;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp., of Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 1642. An act for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand III;

H. R. 1733. An act for the relief of G. C. Hedrick;

H. R. 1734. An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.;

H. R. 1779. For the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn.;

H. R. 1780. An act for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor;

H. R. 1930. An act for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation;

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2192. An act for relief of the Massman Construction Co.;

H. R. 2193. An act for the relief of Robert E. Graham;

H. R. 2352. An act to provide for sale to the Crow tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees, and to provide for the sale of certain lands to the Board of County Commissioners of Comanche County, Okla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of George Cleve Williams;

H. R. 2395. An act for the relief of the Cypress Creek drainage district of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;

H. R. 2551. An act for the relief of William R. Ramsey;

H. R. 2552. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley;

H. R. 2696. An act for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie and Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.;

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 2732. An act for the relief of Dennis Stanton;

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Henry;

H. R. 2878. An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein;

H. R. 2889. An act for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston;

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr.;

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems;

H. R. 3261. An act for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson;

H. R. 3427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 3499. An act for the relief of Petrol Corp.;

H. R. 3566. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3735. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 3999. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders;

H. R. 4047. An act for the relief of Edmund Huppler;

H. R. 4071. An act to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4199. An act for the relief of George Haniotis;

H. R. 4272. An act to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4441. An act for the relief of the Williams J. Burns International Detective Agency;

H. R. 4452. An act for the relief of Douglas L. Craig;

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 4516. An act for the relief of the Moore Dry Dock Co., of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 4518. An act for the relief of Gerald S. Furman;

H. R. 4587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey);

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorsine Thomsen;

H. R. 4635. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4644. An act for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.;

H. R. 4690. An act to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $100,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals;

H. R. 4856. An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4881. An act for the relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 4962. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5252. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5355. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5508. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans;

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended;

H. R. 5716. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Beatrice Schwartz;

H. R. 5724. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H. R. 5750. An act to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 5886. An act to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 5888. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6089. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134);

H. R. 6090. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title;

H. R. 6096. An act to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa; Kansas City, Mo.; and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of

the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6116. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act;

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.;

H. R. 6186. An act for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 6224. An act for the relief of John Watkins;

H. R. 6293. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives;

H. R. 6318. An act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone;

H. R. 6327. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette;

H. R. 6428. An act to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.;

H. R. 6452. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States;

H. R. 6507. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6508. To amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939;

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6634. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea;

H. R. 6698. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Office Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381), 80th Cong.), and for other purposes;

H. R. 6818. An act to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting;

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State;

H. R. 6860. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act;

H. R. 6412. An act to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President";

H. R. 6419. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6705. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6772. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statute of Commodore John Barry;

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended;

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; and

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments.

On June 23, 1948:

H. R. 333. An act for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, veterans of World War II;

H. R. 2009. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;

H. R. 2798. An act to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure";

H. R. 3416. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument;

H. R. 4044. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief of internees in certain cases;

H. R. 4917. An act to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken;

H. R. 5416. An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5882. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes;

H. R. 5904. An act to continue the Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States;

H. R. 6248. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6402. An act to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission;

H. R. 6446. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City;

H. R. 6465. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey;

H. R. 6481. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments;

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948;

H. R. 6771. An act making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6801. An act making appropriations for foreign aid, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations;

H. R. 6829. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and to provide pay increases for Government employees;

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author;

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer United States Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War;

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America; and

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes.

APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

A message from the President of the United States, received by the Clerk of the House, reported that on the following dates the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 19, 1948:

H. R. 238. An act for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction;

H. R. 636. An act for the relief of W. A. Knox, W. L. M. Knox, and Frank C. Morris, operating as Knox Lumber Sales Co., of Thomson, Ga.;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. M. C. Lewis;

H. R. 1726. An act for the relief of Elsie L. Rosenow;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Annie L. Taylor, and William Benjamin Taylor;

H. R. 1855. An act for the relief of Elbert Spivey;

H. R. 2062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee;

H. R. 2273. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant;

H. R. 2684. An act for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware who sustained losses as the result of the fumigation of apples with methyl bromide in order to comply with the requirements of the

United States Department of Agriculture relating to the Japanese beetle quarantine;

H. R. 2721. An act to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "an act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Walter Vandahl and Esther S. Vandahl, Allabrada Adams, Mrs. Lucile L. Rrice Talbot, Mrs. Gladys Webb, and John E. Webb;

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of Charles B. Featherstone;

H. R. 3007. An act for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of the estate of John Delman;

H. R. 3159. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald;

H. R. 3260. An act for the relief of Clarence S. Osika;

H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Emeline Latigue;

H. R. 3402. An act to extend the authorized maturity date of certain bridge revenue bonds to be issued in connection with the refunding of the acquisition cost of the bridge across the Missouri River at Rulo, Nebr.;

H. R. 3433. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3500. An act for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Mrs. Esther E. Elder;

H. R. 3641. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen E. Scofield;

H. R. 3683. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Territory of Alaska the title to the Army vessel *Hygiene;*

H. R. 3915. An act to increase the size of the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4244. An act to authorize assistance to certain veterans in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities;

H. R. 4455. An act to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co., of certain lands lying in the bed of Roaches Run, Arlington County, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4663. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners of the fee-simple titles and leasehold interests in lands leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga.;

H. R. 4638. An act to enlarge the Gettysburg National Cemetery;

H. R. 4820. An act for the relief of Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.;

H. R. 4874. An act to transfer Pelican Rock in Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif., to that county;

H. R. 5065. An act to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt hospitalized servicemen and veterans from the admissions tax when admitted free;

H. R. 5112. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 5147. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Florence A. W. Arens;

H. R. 5174. An act to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii;

H. R. 5344. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5330. An act for the relief of W. W. DeLoach;

H. R. 5655. An act confirming the claim of Juan Berrar to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of St. Martin, said claim being listed as No. B-690 in the report of the commissioners dated June 1811, so as to include section 2, township 11 south, range 6 east, Louisiana meridian, containing one hundred and thirty-nine and sixty-two one-hundredths acres;

H. R. 5758. An act to amend further the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to permit certain payments to be made to surviving brothers and sisters, and nieces and nephews, of deceased members and former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 5808. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5820. An act to aid in the development of improved prosthetic appliances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5883. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5889. An act to extend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 5891. An act to repeal an act approved August 24, 1894, entitled "An act to authorize the purchasers of the property and franchises of the Choctaw Coal & Railway Co. to organize a corporation, and to confer upon the same all the powers, privileges, and franchises vested in that company," and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto;

H. R. 5957. An act to provide for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, to include the site of the old Hudson's Bay Co. stockade, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5983. An act to amend section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, as amended, to remove the present restriction on appointments to the Navy Medical Service Corps;

H. R. 6073. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing and related purposes;

H. R. 6110. An act to permit the landing of halibut by Canadian fishing vessels to Alaskan ports, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6113. An act to transfer certain land in Langlade County, Wis., to the United States Forest Service;

H. R. 6114. An act to amend title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to increase the interest rate on title I loans, to provide for the redemption of nondelinquent insured mortgages, to authorize advances for the preservation and protection of the insured loan security, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6229. An act to authorize the extension of leases of certain land in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6234. An act to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6252. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situated in the county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, for school purposes;

H. R. 6339. An act to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6489. An act to provide for the temporary free importation of lead;

H. R. 6716. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California; and

H. R. 6758. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

On June 21, 1948:

H. R. 633. An act for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde;

H. R. 6368. An act to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory.

On June 22, 1948:

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey;

H. R. 4964. An act to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier;

H. R. 5071. An act to extend the public land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma; and

H. R. 5272. An act relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks;

H. R. 5822. An act to establish the Saratoga National Historical Park, in the State of New York, from the lands that have been acquired by the Federal Government for that purpose pursuant to the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608), and for other purposes;

H. R. 6239. An act to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 6246. An act to authorize the transfer of certain Federal lands within the Chopawamsic Park to the Secretary of the Navy, the addition of lands surplus to the Department of the Army to this park, the acquisition of additional lands needed to round out the boundaries of this park, to change the name of said park to Prince William Forest Park, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6289. An act to provide for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital.

On June 23, 1948:

H. R. 2538. An act requiring all mails consigned to an airport from a post office or branch, or from an airport to a post office or branch, within a radius of 35 miles of a city in which there has been established a Government-owned vehicle service to be delivered by Government-owned motor vehicles; and

H. R. 6766. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

On June 24, 1948:

H. R. 239. An act to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard;

H. R. 2867. An act to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest, designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3889. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases;

H. R. 4071. An act to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 4047. An act for the relief of Edmund Huppler;

H. R. 4516. An act for the relief of the Moore Dry Dock Co., of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 4962. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 5036. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to September 25, inclusive, 1948;

H. R. 5275. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer;

H. R. 5936. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the States of Georgia and Tennessee, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6318. An act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone;

H. R. 6771. An act making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State;

H. R. 6186. An act to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa;

H. R. 6698. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 6726. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6772. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

On June 25, 1948:

H. R. 564. An act for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg;

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Anthony Arancio;

H. R. 912. An act for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa;

H. R. 945. An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik;

H. R. 1642. An act for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader;

H. R. 2009. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;

H. R. 2193. An act for the relief of Robert E. Graham;

H. R. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased;

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Henry;

H. R. 2766. An act to amend section 2 of an act, entitled, "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725);

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure";

H. R. 3214. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary";

H. R. 3427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 4114. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4298. An act for the relief of Henry Hill;

H. R. 4452. An act for the relief of Douglas L. Craig;

H. R. 4566. An act for the relief of William Nally;

H. R. 4587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey);

H. R. 4518. An act for the relief of Gerald S. Furman;

H. R. 4659. An act to ratify and confirm amendments to certain contracts for the furnishing of petroleum products to the United States;

H. R. 4881. An act for the relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 5524. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5886. An act to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 6293. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives;

H. R. 6327. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette;

H. R. 6412. A act to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President";

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948;

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry; and

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes.

On June 26, 1948:

H. R. 2551. An act for the relief of William R. Ramsey;

H. R. 2732. An act for the relief of Dennis Stanton;

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6224. An act for the relief of John Watkins;

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

On June 28, 1948:

H. R. 371. An act for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Chester O. Glenn;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand III;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4635. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4690. An act to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 4917. An act to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken;

H. R. 5058. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended;

H. R. 5716. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Beatrice Schwartz;

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City;

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6801. An act making appropriations for foreign aid, and for other purposes.

On June 29, 1948:

H. R. 333. An act for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, veterans of World War II;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado;

H. R. 915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America;

H. R. 1930. An act for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation;

H. R. 2239. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of George Cleve Williams;

H. R. 2395. An act for the relief of the Cypress Creek Drainage District of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 2744. An act to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Forces, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $100,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals;

H. R. 5734. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and

golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H. R. 5750. An act to provide for the extension and improvement of postoffice facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 5886. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6026. An act to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status. (Hour indicated on bill, 5:05 p. m. eastern daylight time.)

H. R. 6039. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134);

H. R. 6186. An act for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 6452. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6507. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments;

H. R. 6860. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act;

H. R. 6634. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea;

H. R. 6705. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Vounteer United States Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War;

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses.

On June 30, 1948:

H. R. 631. An act for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.;

H. R. 1780. An act for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.;

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;

H. R. 2552. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley;

H. R. 2696. An act for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie and Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.;

H. R. 2878. An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein;

H. R. 4856. An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5416. An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5904. An act to continue the Virgin Islands Co. as an agency of the United States;

H. R. 6090. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title;

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor;

H. R. 6419. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6465. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey;

H. R. 6598. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939;

H. R. 6481. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6829. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

On July 1, 1948:

H. R. 2252. An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees, and to provide for the sale of certain lands to the Board of County Commissioners of Comanche County, Okla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 2889. An act for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston;

H. R. 3566. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4272. An act to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4441. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency;

H. R. 5355. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 6116. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; and

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments.

On July 2, 1948:

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp., of Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 1734. An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.;

H. R. 2192. An act for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr.;

H. R. 3261. An act for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson;

H. R. 3416. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument;

H. R. 3735. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3999. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders;

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 4644. An act for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.;

H. R. 5252. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5568. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans;

H. R. 5882. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes;

H. R. 6096. An act to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6428. An act to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.;

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States.

On July 3, 1948:

H. R. 2798. An act to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4044. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases;

H. R. 6402. An act to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission;

H. R. 6808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations;

H. R. 6248. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and to provide pay increases for Government employees; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America.

DISAPPROVAL OF BILLS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The message also announced that the President had vetoed the following bills of the House on the dates indicated:

ADNEY W. GRAY

I withhold my approval from the enrolled bill H. R. 851, "For the relief of Adney W. Gray."

The bill provides for payment of the sum of $3,810 to Adney W. Gray, Pepperell, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of silver foxes allegedly caused by the operation of a sawmill, belonging to an agency of the Department of Agriculture, near claimant's fox ranch.

It appears that after the New England hurricane in September 1938, millions of feet of timber were blown down and it became the responsibility of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture to develop a program whereby such timber could be salvaged. Accordingly, contracts were entered into for a large number of portable sawmills for manufacture of the salvaged logs into lumber. One of the contract sawmills, operated by A. L. Trueax, was moved to a site near claimant's ranch during the latter part of March 1939, and began sawing operations which continued for several weeks. Under the express terms of this contract Mr. Trueax assumed "all obligations and responsibilities • • • for damage to other property arising from his operation." Mr. Trueax's position was that of an independent contractor, as distinguished from an employee or agent of the Government. Claimant had 18 vixens ready to whelp at the time, and basing his estimates on average production of pups in previous years, he expected a minimum of 64 pups. The unusual disturbances resulting from operation of the mill, however, so annoyed and unnerved the vixens that claimant was able to realize only 12 pups which could be raised to salable size, the balance of the expected production of 64 being either aborted or killed by the vixens soon after birth.

It would appear that the sawmill whose operations caused the damage to claimant's silver foxes did not belong to an agency of the Department of Agriculture, as alleged in the bill, but was owned and operated by an independent contractor who, under the express terms of his contract, assumed all obligations and responsibilities for damage to other property arising from its operation. The Government can in no proper sense assume responsibility for the negligence of independent contractors.

Accordingly, I am unable to approve the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

G. C. HEDRICK

I am withholding my approval of H. R. 1733, Eightieth Congress, "An act for the relief of G. C. Hedrick."

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $318.22 to G. C. Hedrick, Beckley, W. Va., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained as the result of a fire alleged to have been caused by Donald Benjamin Nichols, on March 21, 1945.

Donald Benjamin Nichols, a World War II veteran, was admitted to the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Roanoke, Va., on July 20, 1944, the day he was discharged from the Army. The medical staff of the hospital granted him leave for a ninety-day trial visit to his home on November 24, 1944, in accordance with the desire of his mother and himself. Before such leave was granted, the veteran's mother signed the following statement: "I agree to assume all responsibility as to the designated patient's care, treatment, and conduct while in my custody and to return him to the hospital at my own expense." The granting of such leave was in accordance with Veterans' Administration regulations and sound medical practice. In December 1944, the veteran's mother reported that his condition was improving and that he was adjusted to civilian life. An additional 90-day leave was granted, beginning on February 22, 1945.

I find no legal, equitable or moral grounds for imposing liability upon the Government for damages resulting from the fire.

While the amount of damages sought is relatively small, the precedent which would be established by the bill is so far reaching that I would be remiss in my duty if I approved the bill. During the next 50 or more years, thousands of disabled veterans will be hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration. A large percentage of them will, unfortunately, be suffering from nervous or mental disabilities as in this case. Accepted medical principles require the granting of leave to certain of such veterans for trial visits when circumstances indicate that the veteran is socially adaptable and that a trial visit would best serve his interests and health. Such trial visits are part of the curative treatment. To deny leave under appropriate circumstances would jeopardize the entire program for the care and treatment of the mentally ill. Moreover, if the Government is to assume liability for all damages caused by veterans who have been hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration for mental conditions, especially during periods while such veterans' are not under the direct care and control of the Veterans' Administration, the ultimate cost of such program cannot be anticipated, but it is apparent that such cost would be very considerable.

Under the circumstances, I have felt obliged to withhold my approval of the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

WINONA MACHINE & FOUNDRY CO.

I have withheld my approval of enrolled enactment H. R. 1779, entitled "An act for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn." This enactment would release the Winona Machine & Foundry Co. from its liability to the United States arising out of the termination by the Navy Department of a contract of June 11, 1940, and the subsequent purchase by that Department against the contractor's account of the items called for by the contract, namely, certain stretcher weights needed for the Navy. It would authorize and direct the Comptroller General of the United States to cancel the entire debt which has been raised against the contractor in the sum of $7,148.77.

The facts are that the Navy Department requested bids, to be opened May 14, 1940, for the furnishing of 145 "stretcher weights," 8-ton, for delivery either at destination, transportation charges paid, to the Naval Fuel Depot, Tiburon, Calif., or f. o. b. bidder's shipping point for shipment to said destination on Government bills of lading. The Winona Machine & Foundry Co. submitted a bid offering to furnish the stretcher weights f. o. b. its shipping point, Winona, Minn., for shipment on Government bills of lading at a unit price of $358.8175, or for the total sum of $52,028.54. Also, there was received by the Government a bid from the Pottsville Castings & Machine Shops offering to furnish the weights f. o. b. its shipping point, Pottsville, Pa., at a total price of $50,025. However, after adding freight costs, handling and other charges to the above f. o. b. shipping point bids, it was determined by the Navy Department that the bid of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co. would result in a lower destination cost to the Government than would the bid of the Pottsville Castings & Machine Shops. Accordingly, the bid of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co. was accepted by the Navy Department on June 8, 1940, well within the time specified for acceptance by the contractor and, pursuant thereto, the parties entered into formal contract on June 11, 1940, which provided that delivery of the stretcher weights was to commence within 90 days and be completed within 150 days from the date of the contract.

Shortly after the contract was entered into, the contractor advised the Navy Department that there had been an increase in the cost of scrap iron since May 10, 1940, the date on which its bid was submitted, and requested that the contract unit price be increased by the sum of $49.50. However, the Navy Department promptly advised the contractor that the acceptance of its bid and the award of the contract obligated it to perform in accordance with the terms of the contract and that the Navy Department was without authority to relieve the contractor from the execution of its contract or to increase the contract price agreed upon. Subsequently, the contractor reiterated its request for an increase in the contract price but was advised that since it was apparent that the contractor would be unable to furnish the stretcher weights by the time required, action toward purchase of same elsewhere would be taken and any excess cost would be charged against its account in accordance with article 5 of the contract.

Thereafter, the Navy Department purchased the stretcher weights from the American Car & Foundry Co. at an excess cost to the Government of approximately $7,148.77, with which sum

the contractor is chargeable under the terms of its contract.

In support of the bill it is stated that the contractor, acting on the understanding that it was not the low bidder and assuming that the contract would not be awarded to it, did not take steps to protect itself by purchasing scrap iron and other materials at the prices prevailing when the bid was made, May 10. It is noteworthy, however, that the Navy expressly reserved the right to accept bids at any time within 60 days after the date of opening, which was May 14. It is also to be noted that the contract was executed by the company on June 11, within 3 days after receiving notice of the award, and that a request for an adjustment because of the increase in the cost of scrap iron was not made until June 13. The contractor was thus on notice at the time of submitting its bid, if not actually aware of the possibility, that its bid might be accepted at any time within the 60 days' period, and that during this period it would be subject to the normal business risk of an increase in material prices.

The record shows that performance of the contract was not rendered impossible by any circumstances or events arising after it had been entered into by the parties but merely that the cost of performance proved to be higher than the contractor had anticipated at the time its bid was submitted. Nor is the explanation convincing as to why the contractor did not act more promptly to protect its sources of supply at the prices currently in effect.

So far as the usual rules of law are concerned, it is well settled that where a contractor agrees to perform for a fixed sum, a thing possible to be performed, it will not be excused, or become entitled to additional compensation because unforeseen difficulties are encountered—whether such conditions are caused by the existence of war, or other circumstances, that the contractor did not anticipate. See *United States* v. *Spearin* (248 U. S. 132, 136); *Columbus Railway & Power Co.* v. *Columbus* (249 U. S. 399, 412); *Day* v. *United States* (245 U. S. 159, 161). It has been held by the courts that an abnormal rise in the price of goods or in transportation charges due to the existence of war or unusual trade conditions such that the contractor could not perform its contract without greater expense than anticipated is not such an impossibility as will excuse performance. *Farmers' Fertilizer Co.* v. *Lillie* (18 F. 2d. 197, 199). Also, see 30 Op. Atty. Gen. 301, 302, wherein it was held by a former Attorney General of the United States that increased costs of performing a contract caused by the outbreak of the First World War, which outbreak occurred after the contract involved had been entered into, did not afford any basis for an executive officer of the United States to release the contractor from its obligation under its contract. Furthermore, it has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States that the fact that a contractor's cost of performance may have been increased by the outbreak of war not only affords no basis for recovery on legal grounds but, also, that such fact does not afford any basis for equitable relief. See *Columbus Railway & Power Co.* v. *Columbus, supra.*

Under the principles of law established in the cases cited above it is clear that there is no legal or equitable basis for relieving the contractor from its obligation under the contract to make payment of any excess cost occasioned by the Government by virtue of its default. The proposed legislation would accord preferential treatment to only one of many contractors for whom no similar relief is provided by the law of the land, and would establish an undesirable precedent. It is known that there have been many such cases where bidders have incurred losses during periods of rising prices; conversely, in other cases the advantage may have been the other way in times of falling prices. To approve legislation in cases such as the present only encourages the disregard of contractual obligations which once entered into, are fully binding on the United States and should be of no less consequence on the other side.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

PETROL CORP.

I withhold my approval from the enrolled bill (H. R. 3499) for the relief of Petrol Corp.

The bill directs the Comptroller General to enter into a written arbitration agreements with Petrol Corp., to determine the amount, if any, by which the United States has failed to reimburse Petrol Corp., in accordance with commitments made by Federal officials, for losses incurred by the corporation in paying excessive war-risk marine insurance and purchasing residual fuel oils in aid of the war effort as requested and directed by such officials; and the amount, if any, by which the petroleum supply programs and related rulings (approved by the United States for the purpose of compensating the petroleum industry for the maintenance of adequate petroleum supplies on the Atlantic coast during 4 years of the war period) discriminated against Petrol Corp. The bill provides that the arbitration board shall consist of three members, one to be selected by the Comptroller General, another by Petrol Corp., and the third by agreement between these two arbitrators, or, failing agreement, by the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The board is to decide the issues presented and report its findings to the Congress.

The need for a special arbitration procedure, as provided for in the bill, is not apparent. There already exists an established statutory procedure designed to accomplish the purpose of this legislation. Under long standing provisions of law, claims of this type may be referred to the Court of Claims for consideration and determination of the facts. No reasons appear why this established procedure should not be utilized in this particular instance. To approve the creation of a special arbitration board for the determination of the issues in this case would be to establish an undesirable precedent for the determination of numerous other special cases arising out of the interpretation and administration of wartime governmental regulations. Moreover, the bill lacks any provision for the payment of the expenses attendant upon the creation of the board of arbitration. The authority granted to the Comptroller General to enter into the arbitration agreement might be interpreted to imply the authority to commit the Government to pay the claim in accordance with the findings of the board, as well as the expenses incurred by the proceedings.

Accordingly, I am unable to approve the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

ROBERT LEE THREATT

I have withheld my approval from H. R. 1910, "An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor."

The purpose of this bill is to pay to the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor, the sum of $4,000 on account of the personal injuries sustained by said minor as a result of the explosion of an Army shell.

It appears that on October 17, 1943, Robert Lee Threatt, who was then 15 years of age, accompanied by John Junior Parker, who was then 17 years of age, entered upon the Camp Chaffee Military Reservation in Arkansas. While walking about the reservation they found a small shell embedded in the ground. Robert Lee Threatt dug the shell out of the ground and then tapped it against a rock in an attempt to remove the copper band. When the shell was tapped against the rock it exploded. As a result of the explosion Robert Lee Threatt's right hand was badly mangled and it had to be amputated about 2 inches above the wrist.

The evidence in this case clearly establishes that Robert Lee Threatt was a trespasser on a military reservation when he found the shell which exploded and caused his injuries. From the fact that the shell was buried in the ground it would appear that it was in a part of the reservation which had been used as a target area and that it was one of the shells which had failed to explode upon impact.

It is a general rule of law that the possessor of land owes no duty to trespassers other than to abstain from wilfully or wantonly injuring them and so, ordinarily, is not liable for injury to trespassers caused by conditions on the land or by articles taken by trespassers from the land. It appears that the law of Arkansas, the jurisdiction in which this incident occurred, recognizes and follows this general rule. While some jurisdictions allow an exception to the rule of nonliability to trespassers in the case of trespassing children of tender years, this exception in all cases is based on a recognition of the inability of young children, because of their youth and inexperience, to appreciate the dangers to which they expose themselves. Robert Lee Threatt, however, was 15 years of age at the time of this incident and was accompanied by a youth 2 years his senior. There is no evidence tending to indicate that he did not possess at least average intelligence for a boy of his age. He was, or should have been, fully aware of the danger latent in the shell. He was not a child of "tender years" and as such entitled to protection from dangerous instruments and conditions on the land even though he was trespassing. In attempting to remove the copper ring from the shell by tapping it against a rock he was doing a thing which he knew or should have known to be dangerous. In so doing he was negligent and his negligence was the sole proximate cause of his injury.

In the light of all of the facts and circumstances in this case there is no justifiable basis for the granting of an award for the benefit of Robert Lee Threatt. While deeply regretting this tragic occurrence, I feel obliged to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

GEORGE HANIOTIS

I am withholding my approval from H. R. 4189, an act for the relief of George Haniotis.

This bill would have provided for recording the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of George Haniotis, a national of Greece. It would have provided also for deducting one number from the immigration quota for Greece.

Since this bill was passed by the Congress, Mr. Haniotis has died. If I should sign it now, its only effect would be to reduce the immigration quota from Greece.

If Mr. Haniotis were still alive, I would gladly give this bill my approval in order that he might become a permanent resident of the United States. But I am sure that neither he nor his family would want it approved when its only effect would be to prevent some other person from emigrating from Greece to the United States.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

MRS. LORAINE THOMSEN

I am withholding my approval from H. R. 4590, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen.

The bill would authorize and direct the Federal Security Administrator to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to Mrs. Thomsen "as if such Administrator had found that the death of her husband, Immanual H. Thomsen, on December 5, 1946, had been the result of a personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty as an employee of the Navy Department."

It appears from the records of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Federal Security Agency that Mr. Thomsen, a Navy Department employee at the naval ammunition depot situated at Hastings, Nebr., suddenly fell dead while sweeping crushed rock with a push broom at his place of employment. A claim for compensation for death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act was filed by his widow, Mrs. Thomsen, who attributed the cause of her husband's death to the effects of excessive strain and exhaustion said to have been suffered by the decedent during the month of October in the performance of his duties.

The Bureau of Employees' Compensation submitted the evidence to a well-known heart specialist for an opinion as to the cause of death, who concluded:

> It is quite obvious from going over the medical report that Mr. Thomsen died as a result of arteriosclerotic heart disease involving the coronary arteries. These findings are substantiated at the time of the autopsy on Mr. Thomsen. This is a natural disease, the course of which is well known. I have carefully gone over the documents in reference to the alleged precipitating injury and it seems to me that there is insufficient evidence to point to the fact that this patient was subjected to any serious or unusual form of physical endeavor that was sufficiently close to the onset of the fatal attack to have any bearing on the course of a natural disease. I feel quite certain that death occurred purely as a result of the natural courses of his particular disease, namely, that of sclerosis of the coronary arteries that supply the heart muscle with blood. I do not believe that there is any validity in this claim as to the alleged injury being responsible for Mr. Thompson's death, but that he died rather as a result of natural processes of a well-known disease.

After careful investigation and upon the basis of all the evidence before it the Bureau of Employees' Compensation denied the claim for death benefits on the ground that the decedent's death "did not result from personal injury sustained while in the performance of duty, or from disease proximately caused by his employment," as the act requires.

Mrs. Thomsen, if she believed that the action of the Bureau was erroneous, had the right to appeal therefrom to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board established within the Federal Security Agency under the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946, as a quasi-judicial tribunal independent of the Bureau, but she failed to avail herself of that right. The bill thus runs counter to the salutary principle, recognized in the rules of the Subcommittee on Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary itself, that a claimant ought to be required to exhaust all available administrative remedies before seeking a review elsewhere.

In effect the bill amounts to a legislative review and reversal of a determination which has been made by the agency duly authorized by law to make such determinations and which has been made in accordance with a general law laying down the governing principles of adjudication. Such a method of review by legislative action cannot have satisfactory results. If Congress believes that an opportunity for an independent review of determinations upon claims is desirable outside the executive branch, the act could be amended by providing for the right of judicial review upon the record after exhaustion of administrative remedies.

I feel constrained for the above reasons to withhold my approval of this bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

EAST COAST SHIP & YACHT CORP.

I have withheld my approval of enrolled enactment H. R. 6184, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "An act for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp. of Noank, Conn."

This enactment would authorize the payment of $2,100, which represents a part of the liquidated damages withheld by the Government in making payment under contract No. W–52–qm–412, dated April 4, 1934, entered into with the War Department (now Department of the Army) for making repairs to the U. S. S. *Colonel Barnett*, and the amount of $4,518.74, which represents an amount claimed as payment for repairs made by the contractor to a section of the ship, which had been damaged while in possession of the contractor. Under the terms of the contract, the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp. agreed, for and in consideration of the payment of the prices set forth in schedule "B" attached to and made a part of the contract, to furnish all labor and materials and to perform all work required for the accomplishment of the items of repair on the steamer *Colonel Barnett* in accordance with the schedule and as specifically set forth in detail in the Specifications for Repairs to be Made to Twin Screw Steamer *Colonel Barnett* Stationed at Fort Slocum, N. Y. It was provided that the work would be commenced on the date the steamer was received at the contractor's yard, and be completed within 45 calendar days. In event of delay in completion of the required work, beyond the period specified, liquidated damages at the rate of $100 per day were to be charged against the contractor, unless the delay in performance was found by the contracting officer, or by the head of the Department on appeal from the finding of the contracting officer, to be due to an unforeseeable cause beyond the control and without the fault or negligence of the contractor, including, but not restricted to, the causes of delay specified in article 9 of the contract.

The record shows that the ship was delivered at the contractor's yard on April 9, 1934; that all of the required work of repair was completed on July 27, 1934; and that the ship was returned to Fort Slocum, N. Y., on July 28, 1934. The contractor was paid the sum of $18,724.90 for performance of the contract work, computed in accordance with the aforementioned schedule B, plus the amounts of certain change orders, less per diem allowance for a Government inspector as provided in the special conditions of the contract, the cost of fuel, oil, and supplies used by the contractor in removing the ship from Fort Slocum to its yard and in returning it to Fort Slocum after completion of the required repairs, and less liquidated damages in the amount of $4,200 for 42 calendar days of delay.

The basis for the contractor's claim for remission of liquidated damages is that it was required to perform extra work, and that the delay in performance was due to the performance of such work. However, the contracting officer reported, in effect, that none of the required work involved in the contractor's

claim represented extra work, and that the delay in completing performance resulted from the contractor's failure to prosecute the contract work with diligence, efficiency, and with a proper regard for its contractual obligations. While some officials of the War Department proposed recommending favorable consideration of the contractor's claims to the extent of refunding one-half of the liquidated damages which had been deducted, or $2,100, said recommendation was not approved by the Secretary of War, who disapproved payment of any amount upon the basis of a determination that the delay was not excusable under the terms of the contract. Such action is final and conclusive in the absence of a showing of fraud or of a mistake so gross as to amount to bad faith, neither of which has been established by the contractor.

With respect to the item of $4,518.74 paid to the contractor by the Home Insurance Co. by reason of damages to the ship while it was in the yards of the contractor, the administrative officers of the Government in charge of the work determined that the contractor had damaged the shaft log and contiguous parts to such an extent that they had to be replaced. Thereupon the contractor made claim on the insurance company, presumably under the terms of an insurance policy, for reimbursement of expenses incurred in installing the new shaft log. The insurance company made an investigation of the matter at the time, and upon a report of their investigator, payment of the sum of $4,518.74 was made to the contractor. However, a subsequent investigation was made by the insurance company almost a year later, at which time the insurance company concluded that the damage to the shaft log was not the result of any action by the contractor, but was due to its old and worn condition. As a result the company requested the contractor to refund the sum of $4,518.74 theretofore paid to it, and the contractor in turn requested payment of this amount from the Government. However, the contracting officer found as a fact that, on the basis of reports of the War Department employees who were present on the project, the contractor was responsible for the damage to the shaft log.

The claim for liquidated damages deducted from payment under the contract was forwarded by the War Department to the General Accounting Office for settlement, and said claim was disallowed. In decision of the then Comptroller General dated January 14, 1936, the disallowance of the claim was sustained. In addition, the claim for $4,518.74 was denied for the reason the record contained a finding of fact by the contracting officer, as provided in the contract, which was based upon reports made by three representatives of the War Department who were assigned to duty at the contractor's plant during progress of the work, all of whom were in agreement that the difficulty and delay in completing the work of repairing the vessel was due to the lack of efficiency in the operation of the contractor's yard, and to the contractor's constant attempt to avoid its obligations under the contract.

While there is some disagreement between the contractor and the Government's representatives on the site of the work as to the facts in the matter of the claims, the contractor has not established that the facts as found by the contracting officer were erroneous. Furthermore, several bills similar to H. R. 6184, supra, previously were introduced for the relief of the contractor but all failed of enactment, thus indicating that, after carefully considering the matter, it was determined on each occasion, that the claims were not sufficiently established to warrant payment by the enactment of a private bill. These bills were H. R. 12535 and S. 4366, Seventy-fourth Congress; H. R. 8227 and S. 718, Seventy-fifth Congress; S. 1106, Seventy-sixth Congress; H. R. 5702 and S. 1733, Seventy-seventh Congress; H. R. 2214, Seventy-eighth Congress; and H. R. 3053, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Accordingly, I am withholding Executive approval of the enrolled enactment.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

AMEND TITLE X OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

I am withholding approval of H. R. 6818, a bill "to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting."

I believe that this bill is unsound in principle, would not accomplish the ostensible purpose for which it was enacted, and would do serious damage to our social-security program. This bill is contrary to the most important principle on which our entire public-assistance program is based—relief of need. If it became law it would inevitably operate unfairly against those needy blind who are unable to work and who have no other sources of income. It would actually lead to reductions in the assistance payments of thousands of blind persons who are most in need of assistance and whose payments are even now far below that necessary to sustain them at a decent standard of living. Payments to these most needy recipients would have to be reduced in order to make available the funds required for the increased payments to those able to earn and who would be benefited by this bill. The most compelling reason for disapproval of this bill is my firm belief that the unsound principle on which it is based would seriously hinder further progress in the development of a sound and comprehensive social-security program.

Title X of the Social Security Act provides for Federal participation in assistance payments by the States to needy blind persons. One of the conditions of such participation is that the State agency take into consideration, in determining need, any other income and resources of the assistance claimant. H. R. 6818, now before me, would permit the States, in determining such income and resources, to disregard earnings up to $40 per month received by the blind person, without thereby losing the benefit of the Federal grants.

Naturally, everyone has a genuine concern for the plight of blind persons and a desire to help them overcome their affliction and attain security to the maximum extent possible. This concern found concrete expression in title X of the Social Security Act, which singled out blindness over all other kinds of physical disability for a special Federal-State program of public assistance. From a superficial point of view this bill might seem to be of benefit to all blind persons and a logical improvement in the aid-to-the-blind program. However, a thoughtful examination of the bill leads to the conclusion that it not only would endanger the benefit rights of thousands of blind persons presently receiving assistance under title X of the Social Security Act but would also, in the long run, retard a more constructive approach to the attainment of an adequate measure of security for the blind and other handicapped persons.

The bill would operate to the detriment of many needy blind persons now receiving financial assistance because in many States any new or increased assistance to blind persons who are employed can only be provided through reducing the assistance currently being granted blind persons who are without income. The capacity of many low-income States to contribute out of their own funds to the support of the blind has already been reached. This bill would increase the recipient case loads by perhaps as much as one-third by making eligible for assistance blind persons not now eligible because of their earnings from employment. Faced with the necessity of adding to their rolls these thousands of blind persons not now eligible for assistance, and with the necessity of increasing the assistance payments of many others whose earnings have heretofore operated to reduce their assistance payments, these States which are unable to make available additional money will simply have to divide among the larger groups of eligibles the limited funds now available. The result will be that the most needy blind persons in these States—blind persons unable to work and without any source of income whatever—will have their already meager assistance payments reduced in an amount sufficient to permit new or larger payments to the less fortunate of their fellows.

I fully appreciate that the relaxation of each State's present no-income requirement is, under the wording of H. R. 6818, optional with each State. But the arguments and influences which were brought to bear upon the Congress and led to the hasty last-minute passage of H. R. 6818 would, if that bill became law, be exerted with equal if not greater force upon the individual States. I believe it reasonable to expect that most of the States would soon conform their laws to the relaxed Federal requirement with the unfortunate results which I have described above.

I have recommended to the Congress that it amend all the public assistance programs in the Social Security Act—the old-age assistance and aid-to-dependent-children programs, as well as the aid-to-the-blind programs—so as to make it possible for the States, particularly the low-income States, to provide assistance payments more nearly adequate in terms of present-day living costs. What is needed in the public assistance area is, among other things, a substantial increase—much larger than the inconsequential $5 recently enacted by the Congress—in the maximum assistance payments in all three categories in which the Federal Government will participate. Furthermore, it is perhaps even more important to enact special provisions relating Federal grants more equitably to the financial resources and needs of the various States. Only by so doing can we provide our needy blind and all other needy persons with a realistic measure of assistance. A bill such as H. R. 6818, which would affect only one of the public assistance programs, and which would operate in many States merely to spread even thinner the already insufficient amounts available for assistance payments, is in no sense a response to my recommendation and offers no real solution to the problems of the needy blind.

There is another fundamental objection to this bill. The aid-to-the-blind program in title X of the Social Security Act, like the other public-assistance programs provided in that act, was designed and intended to provide financial assistance at a decent minimum of subsistence to those unable to provide for themselves. Necessarily payments under these programs must be made on the basis of a finding as to the need of each individual for assistance, and for such a finding to be realistic and equitable to all alike, it must be based on a consideration of each individual's earnings from employment and of any other resources available to him. To disregard an individual's income in determining the extent of his need for assistance negates the principle of providing assistance on the basis of need. Once this principle has been breached, grave questions arise as to a logical stopping place to changes of this character short of converting public-assistance payments into flat, noncontributory pensions.

I am sure that the American people would not want to make so significant a change in one of the public-assistance programs of our social-security system without the most careful consideration of its implications for the other public-assistance programs and for the contributory programs of unemployment insurance and old-age and survivors insurance. No such consideration was given to this bill by the Congress. The bill was introduced and passed in the closing hours of the recent session. No public hearings were held and no opportunity was provided the affected Government agencies—Federal, State, or local—to express their views.

The avowed object of the present bill as stated in the committee reports, is to provided a much-needed encouragement to the blind to become useful and productive members of the community. I do not in the least question the sincerity of purpose behind this measure. I question, instead, the underlying assumption of the bill that a cash incentive is needed to this end. I am not yet ready to believe that persons thus handicapped are so lacking in the spirit of self-reliance and in a desire to be useful and independent as to require this sort of incentive. The blind, like other people, want to work and be self-supporting. The blind, more than all others, would not welcome the establishment of such an incentive at the price of reducing the assistance payments available for the most unfortunate of their company and at the price of opening the door to distortions in, and potential wreckage of, our social-security program.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

The President further informed the House that he had withheld his approval of the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution (S. Res. 266):

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is reassembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the above resolution, Mr. WHERRY and Mr. BARKLEY were appointed on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll to establish a quorum.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members answered to their names:

[Roll No. 127]

Abbitt	Byrnes, Wis.	Evins
Albert	Camp	Fallon
Allen, Calif.	Canfield	Feighan
Allen, Ill.	Cannon	Fernandez
Allen, La.	Case, N. J.	Flannagan
Anderson, Calif.	Chapman	Fletcher
Andrews, N. Y.	Chelf	Folger
Angell	Chiperfield	Foote
Arends	Church	Forand
Arnold	Clevenger	Fuller
Auchincloss	Clippinger	Fulton
Bakewell	Coffin	Gamble
Banta	Cole, Kans.	Garmatz
Barden	Cole, Mo.	Gary
Barrett	Cole, N. Y.	Gavin
Bates, Mass.	Colmer	Gearhart
Battle	Cooley	Gillette
Beall	Cooper	Gillie
Beckworth	Corbett	Goff
Bell	Cotton	Goodwin
Bender	Cravens	Gordon
Bishop	Crawford	Gore
Blackney	Crow	Gorski
Bland	Cunningham	Gossett
Bloom	Dague	Graham
Bogg, Del.	Davis, Ga.	Grant, Ala.
Bolton	Davis, Wis.	Gregory
Bonner	Deane	Griffiths
Boykin	Devitt	Gross
Bradley	D'Ewart	Gwinn, N. Y.
Bramblett	Dingell	Gwynne, Iowa
Brehm	Dirksen	Hagen
Brophy	Domengeaux	Hale
Brown, Ga.	Dondero	Hall,
Brown, Ohio	Donohue	Edwin Arthur
Bryson	Dorn	Hall,
Buchanan	Doughton	Leonard W.
Buck	Douglas	Halleck
Buckley	Eaton	Hardy
Buffett	Eberharter	Harness, Ind.
Burke	Ellis	Hartley
Busbey	Ellsworth	Harvey
Butler	Engel, Mich.	Havenner
Byrne, N. Y.	Engle, Calif.	Hays
Hedrick	McMahon	Rooney
Herter	McMillan, S. C.	Ross
Heselton	Mack	Russell
Hobbs	MacKinnon	Sabath
Hoffman	Macy	Sadlak
Holifield	Madden	Sadowski
Holmes	Mahon	St. George
Hope	Maloney	Sanborn
Horan	Manasco	Sasscer
Huber	Mason	Schwabe, Okla.
Hull	Mathews	Scoblick
Jackson, Wash.	Meade, Ky.	Scott, Hardie
Jarman	Meade, Md.	Scott,
Javits	Merrow	Hugh D., Jr.
Jenison	Meyer	Scrivner
Jenkins, Ohio	Michener	Seely-Brown
Jensen	Miller, Calif.	Shafer
Johnson, Calif.	Miller, Conn.	Sheppard
Johnson, Ill.	Miller, Nebr.	Sikes
Johnson, Okla.	Mills	Simpson, Ill.
Jones, Ala.	Morris	Simpson, Pa.
Jones, N. C.	Morrison	Smathers
Jones, Wash.	Mundt	Smith, Kans.
Jonkman	Murdock	Smith, Maine
Judd	Murray, Tenn.	Smith, Ohio
Karsten, Mo.	Murray, Wis.	Smith, Va.
Kearney	Nicholson	Smith, Wis.
Kearns	Nixon	Snyder
Keating	Norblad	Spence
Kee	Norrell	Stevenson
Kefauver	Norton	Stratton
Kelley	O'Brien	Sundstrom
Keogh	Passman	Taber
Kersten, Wis.	Patterson	Talle
Kilburn	Peden	Taylor
King	Pfeifer	Teague
Kirwan	Philbin	Tibbott
Klein	Phillips, Calif.	Tollefson
Kunkel	Plumley	Towe
Lane	Poage	Trimble
Lanham	Potter	Twyman
Larcade	Potts	Van Zandt
Latham	Poulson	Vinson
Lea	Preston	Wadsworth
LeCompte	Price, Fla.	Walter
LeFevre	Price, Ill.	Welchel
Lemke	Priest	Welch
Lesinski	Rains	West
Lewis, Ky.	Rankin	Wheeler
Lewis, Ohio	Redden	Whitaker
Lichtenwalter	Reed, N. Y.	Whitten
Love	Rees	Wigglesworth
Lusk	Reeves	Williams
Lyle	Rich	Wilson, Ind.
McConnell	Richards	Winstead
McCormack	Richlman	Wolcott
McCowen	Riley	Wolverton
McCulloch	Rivers	Wood
McDonough	Robertson	Woodruff
McDowell	Rogers, Fla.	Worley
McGarvey	Rogers, Mass.	
McGregor	Rohrbough	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 310 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 702) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communications that he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

INVESTIGATION UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 618

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the letter of the Secretary of the Interior, dated July 2, 1948, relative to the investigation sought in House Resolution 618 of the Eightieth Congress.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the communication from the Secretary of the Interior.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1948.

Mr. JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ANDREWS: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter to me on June 17, 1948, transmitting an attested copy of House Resolution 618, Eightieth Congress, which was adopted by the House of Representatives on June 16.

Pursuant to the request of the Congress, we have scheduled the investigation recommended in House Resolution 618 in our work to be undertaken in the fiscal year 1949.

Sincerely yours,
J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

SECOND QUARTERLY REPORT OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the President of the United States addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, received in the office of the Clerk on June 30, 1948.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the message from the President.

The Clerk read as follows:

PRESIDENT'S LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the second quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign aid program authorized by Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress, approved December 17, 1947.

This report covers the period from January 1, 1948, through March 31, 1948, during which the flow of United States supplies to Austria, France, and Italy accomplished the purposes of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947—"to alleviate conditions of hunger and cold and prevent serious economic retrogression."

Pursuant to section 5 (d) of the act, this report also includes the statements of the Governments of Austria, France, and Italy on the method of distribution and use of commodities made available under the act; the itemized list of commodities supplied each Government, the average price at which each commodity was sold, and the gross proceeds derived from their sale; and the disposition of local currencies derived from these sales.

The supplies provided by the United States have freed the peoples of these three countries temporarily from the fear of starvation and want and enabled them to hold their economy intact until a long-range program could help them and other countries to a general European reconstruction. To the peoples of these countries, however, the gift of these supplies by the people of the United States meant something more—this aid represented also a symbol of hope for their future.

To us, the American people, our aid was an act of faith in a future in which freemen shall prevail. The freely expressed will of the Italian people in their national election has already confirmed that faith.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MILLER of Maryland (at the request of Mr. BEALL), indefinitely, on account of being called back to active duty in the Army Reserves.

To Mr. SARBACHER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for this week, because of training with the Marine Corps reserves.

To Mr. HESS (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of being confined to hospital through illness.

To Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of being confined to hospital by illness.

To Mr. STIGLER (at the request of Mr. MORRIS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. REGAN (at the request of Mr. GOSSETT), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. VAIL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of the two Houses was assembled, and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he might be pleased to make, has performed that duty.

The President has informed the committee that he would communicate to the House a message in person tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 1948, at 12:30 o'clock p. m.

PROVISION FOR JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 220) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, July 27, 1948, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States may be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESSES IN ORDER TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, July 27, 1948, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

THE LATE EDWARD BROWN, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I formally announce to the House the death on June 29, 1948, of Edward Brown, superintendent of the House Office Buildings, in the seventy-fifth year of his age. He had been ill from a heart attack which confined him to the hospital for about 7 weeks before he succumbed.

Ed Brown, as he was affectionately called by his many friends, had a long and useful life, the larger part of it spent in the service of the Federal Government. He entered the employ of the Government in 1900 under Mr. Clark, who was then Architect of the Capitol. He held the position of assistant to the constructor in 1905 when the Old House Office Building was built, and acted in the same capacity in 1909 and 1910, when the Capitol power plant and the Senate Office Building were constructed. He served in various other positions until 1930, when he was appointed superintendent of the House Office Buildings.

He met a great number of men and women who served in the Congress and he was respected by all for his rugged honesty, his cheerfulness of spirit, his devotion to duty, and his helpful service. He knew every pipe and pane of glass in the House Office Buildings; he loved his job and he worked unselfishly for the comfort of the Members. I, together with

many other Members, have lost a dear friend, and the Government service a faithful servant.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to pay my tribute to Mr. Brown. He was tireless in his devotion to duty. He had a tremendous knowledge of his work and he performed it with real enthusiasm. He took a great interest in each and every Member of Congress. He was endlessly patient, especially if we all wanted something done at the same time. We shall miss him and I join with those who mourn his loss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article by Walter Lippmann.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news item.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "A Job for the Special Session."

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address made by himself a year ago.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an admirable address delivered on Saturday last by Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., of Pennsylvania, chairman of the National Republican Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a radio address.

THE TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER HOUSING BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the House will need no advice as to what to do on the housing issue. The Members have been home, and I am sure most of them, if not all, recognize it is still the No. 1 domestic issue in the country.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill remains the one comprehensive housing measure before the country. Upon it the hopes of our people for housing are built. It can be passed by the House in the ensuing days while we are in session if the discharge petition now on the Speaker's desk is completed. It is by now clear that if any comprehensive housing measure is to pass it must be this bill. It is on the table, available for the signature of any Member. The record on housing in the coming session will be made on that discharge petition in this House.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Or if a rule comes out of the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE PRESENT HIGH COST OF LIVING AND ITS CAUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the high cost of living that is getting higher every day is worrying the President so much it is going to be the burden of his song here tomorrow and can be directly laid on the doorstep of this administration. It has nine agencies in this country purchasing vast quantities of commodities every day, which they are giving to countries that do not need them and who definitely say they do not want them in many cases.

This administration is responsible for the high cost of living, and the people of this country ought to know it. The Republican Party ought to make an issue out of it right now and give the people the truth and facts. The administration is to blame because they want the high cost of living to get higher in the hope of getting the farmer's vote. The farmer wants his price made in the market place and the consumer is entitled to have his price made in that same market place. Until you get it determined at the right place, the high cost of living will get higher and higher. The blood and misery of this situation should be placed where it belongs.

In April of this year these nine agencies bought $129,800,000 worth of food and shipped it out of the country independent of ERP.

Thirty million dollars' worth of wheat and wheat products to countries that did not need it and some expressed themselves so. Europe has the largest harvests they have had for many years. The whole mess should be cleaned up, then prices would adjust themselves. When the OPA was ended, prices would have come down had not the Government entered the purchasing field.

There is no backlog of material or labor in the housing field, so if the Government goes into the building business present builders will have to quit, for supplies will have to be channeled through Government agencies, and it will take the Government at least a year to get started and housing will cost much more than the building now going on. On every hand square miles of houses are going up. Let us keep up the good work as is.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each newspaper articles.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by John W. Scoville.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include acceptance speeches of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, and Gov. Earl Warren, of California, at the recent National Republican Convention.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include correspondence with General Gray regarding the payment of dividends to veterans who carry insurance.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent.

THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I look around this Chamber today and see very few people who appear to be happy. Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to be unhappy because this special session is nothing but a continuation of the Democratic National Convention. Most of them are still suffering from a combination of pigeonitis and platformitis. All that we need here to remind us of the reasons for this meeting will be a big cage and a shower of white pigeons. It is possible that the humane society may have managed to release them by this time and maybe they will be back with us in time for tomorrow's session. I suggest that we come well equipped tomorrow with umbrellas. Even if we are not greeted by the birds, we may be able to use them to ward off the shower of abuse being prepared for us.

Since the last time we had the pleasure of hearing our President, he has been indulging in a good deal of name calling. He has described this Congress as the worst in American history. Nevertheless, for the first time since 1856, we have been called into extra session in an election year—and the reasons are as obvious to us as they are to the President.

But I am not here to defend this Congress. The record will speak for us. That record will show that we have

strengthened our Nation's military defenses, that we have given our taxpayers at least some relief from an oppressive burden of taxation, that we have moved closer to stabilizing labor-management relations than ever before in our history, and that we are doing our share in the business of government.

I have risen, however, to propose that we rise higher than the motives which prompted our President to call us back to Washington. Let this session boomerang on the White House. We ought to consider some of the unfinished business on our agenda. I urge this special session to enact the measure which I had the honor of sponsoring which would abolish the poll tax from our statute books. I urge this special session to pass antilynching legislation, the civil-rights program endorsed by both political parties in their platforms, and the provision of the funds necessary to aid the United Nations in its building program. Let us take this opportunity to seize the ball. This Congress can give the birds, pigeons, and otherwise back to the President, by doing a job.

Some very good friends of mine made things fairly warm for the President in the City of Brotherly Love a few days ago. We are going to make things hotter still for him by proving that the Chambers of the Eightieth Congress can stand the heat of public appraisal better than the White House.

AMERICAN SHIPPING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that the administration is using foreign ships to send relief commodities to foreign countries and that our own ships are put into disuse. It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that the United States look after its own shipping. I need not remind the House that looking after our own shipping at the present time is particularly vital.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is no good reason for this special session of Congress. It is a political move, pure and simple. Every Member of the House knows this to be true. I do not believe anything has developed in either the domestic or international scene since the adjournment of Congress on June 19 that justifies the calling of this special session. Surely nothing has happened during this period that the administration was not aware of prior to that adjournment. I am therefore introducing a resolution to adjourn sine die immediately upon receipt of the President's message tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three matters and include newspaper items and other literature.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK.

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written by William Rose Benet, appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each a newspaper article.

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he recently made to the Rotary Club of Norfolk.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as this special session of Congress convenes today the people of America are thinking and wondering about two questions, namely, how long Congress will remain in session subject to this call, and what legislation, if any, will be enacted.

Many people in my home district have asked me these questions since the President issued his call. The answer will depend on a number of conditions and events. There may or may not be cooperation between the Democrats and Republicans. There may or may not be cooperation between the Congress and the President. No one at this particular time can go further than to guess the answers to these questions.

Whatever may have been the motive behind the call for this special session, we have now convened and are here. It behooves every Member of Congress today to take an objective view of the situation and try to reach a conclusion as to how long this session should last. If there is a probability that Members can work together in sufficient harmony to enact needed legislation, then the country will benefit by having Congress remain in session.

If there cannot be a spirit of cooperation between the Democrats and Republicans in Congress, and also between Congress and the President, then the best thing for the country would be for Congress to adjourn as quickly as possible. There can be no possible benefit to the country from a prolonged session of Congress if nothing is to result from it but political wrangling and quarreling. That would add another useless expense to the already heavily burdened taxpayer.

For my own part, since we have convened and are here ready to go to work, I would like to see action taken to complete legislation on at least three important pending measures before consideration is begun of matters on which there is going to be heated controversy.

These three pieces of unfinished legislation, which should be completed as speedily as possible, are the Veterans' Homestead Act, which will provide low-cost homes and rental houses for veterans, both city and rural, the bill to provide State administered Federal aid for education, and the bill to remove Federal tax on oleomargarine.

There is no sectional bitterness involved in these measures. They will be beneficial to every section of the country. They are not political bills and they cannot be labeled as being either Democratic bills or Republican bills. They are supported by Members of both parties and by Members from all sections of America. I believe the President will sign each one of these bills. They are needed and should be enacted.

On this the opening day of this session, while it is still possible to make this a constructive, worth-while session of Congress, I earnestly urge consideration of and final action upon these three important unfinished pieces of legislation.

REPEAL OF TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to call to the attention of the House the fact that I have filed a petition to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, from consideration of the Lesinski bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley law. I think experience has shown that this law does not work. It cannot work. It is not necessary.

The claims of the proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act that this law has been the decisive factor in the present era of industrial peace are not supported by the facts.

There is always a strong tendency on the part of management, particularly of management with a poor labor-relations policy, to exaggerate the losses due to work stoppages.

Figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that in the year of postwar adjustments, 1946, man-days lost jumped from 38,000,000 in 1945, while we were still fighting, to 116,000,000; and in 1947 they dropped back to 34,600,000 man-days lost.

However, it is a distortion of the facts to claim that this disruptive law had anything to do with the decrease in strikes.

At every point at which established labor-management relations have come into collision with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act there has been trouble. In most cases both sides have been willing to await court tests, which proves only that established reciprocity between the negotiators has not yet been entirely broken up by this law. However, the Chicago printers' strikes prove what happens when a conservative, long-established union comes up against this kind of intolerable intervention in recognized collective bargaining.

The Wagner Labor Relations Act had just been shaken down into its fullest usefulness after 10 years of trial and error when the disruptive Taft-Hartley law, reversing the purpose of the basic act and perverting the intent of the Congress which passed the old law, was superimposed on the NLRB machinery. The ill effects of this will become more apparent as time goes on; and I warn you solemnly that now is the time to repeal this law.

It is my belief that man-days lost from strikes can be reduced to the wartime lows of less than one-tenth of 1 percent if we get rid of this law; but with it they will rise again.

SIR OSWALD MOSLEY

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have read an article in the New York Post of July 17, 1948, that Sir Oswald Mosley, British Fascist leader, is planning to visit the United States soon to consult with certain individuals of like political persuasion.

We all know that this black-shirted menace is recognized as England's leading anti-Semite. It seems incredible to me that he should be granted permission to enter our United States. He has fomented enough trouble in his ruthless efforts to bring about the conquest of Britain, and certainly would be a most undesirable visitor to our shores.

Individuals of this ilk should not be granted the privilege of accepting our hospitality and proceed to stir up racial hatred and religious prejudice. I am sure that every American citizen would resent the intrusion of this Fascist leader. Under the circumstances, I cannot conceive our Department of State granting his application for a visa. I have already communicated with the Secretary of State for the purpose of vigorously protesting the issuance of a visa in the event it is applied for by Mr. Mosley.

NEW JOHNSONVILLE STEAM PLANT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to appropriate $4,000,000 to enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to begin construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. This appropriation was declined in the last session of Congress by a very narrow margin because of partisanship and lack of full understanding of the necessity of the project on the part of some Members. I do not believe this partisanship would enter into consideration of this appropriation at the present time, in view of the further evidence of the absolute necessity of building this steam plant for defense purposes.

Last week I had a conference with Mr. A. D. Huddleston, general manager of the Aluminum Co., at Alcoa, Tenn. Mr. Huddleston and other officials of the Aluminum Co. are terribly concerned over the inability of getting sufficient electricity to continue full operation of the Aluminum Co. Mr. Huddleston told me that the Aluminum Co. had been advised by the TVA that it would have to reduce the amount of electricity it was furnishing the Aluminum Co. This means that production at the Nation's largest aluminum company will have to be curtailed and, of course, any possibility of increased production is out of the picture. The same situation prevails in other defense industries in the Tennessee Valley. In view of the tense international situation and the program of plane production which has been inaugurated by Congress, it is unthinkable that TVA should not be allowed to build this plant to furnish electricity vitally needed in our defense effort.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is the sole supplier of power for this large area containing 5,000,000 people. The progress that has been made in the last few years has substantially increased the proportionate tax revenue of the Tennessee Valley, and it has meant increased business for all sections of the country. The electrical equipment and farm machinery which the people are buying as the result of TVA development comes largely from other sections of the United States. Those in Congress who want to retard the progress of the Tennessee Valley are very shortsighted. A healthy development in any section is in the national interest. Members of Congress should also keep in mind that this appropriation is not a burden on the taxpayers of the Nation. Under the amortization plan adopted at the last Congress, this appropriation will be repaid to the Government within 40 years and the steam plant will, of course, then be the property of the Government. It is an advance of money that will pay big dividends to people not only of the Tennessee Valley but also of the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, last week I sent a telegram to the President of the United States, urging that he recommend in his message to this special session of Congress that funds be voted to allow construction of this steam plant. I have a letter from the President indicating that this will be done. I hope very much that Congress may consider this recommendation with an open mind and without partisanism or sectionalism and, with this kind of consideration, I know the appropriation will be approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative program for the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

RANKIN CHALLENGES BOTH TRUMAN AND DEWEY FOR DEBATE ON THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, our country is now at the crossroads. We are threatened by communism at home and abroad.

The American people were shocked and disappointed when both major political parties wrote a Communist plank into their platforms endorsing the so-called civil-rights program including the damnable FEPC with which Governor Dewey has punished the people of the State of New York.

I am tired of this whining about racial minorities. It is about time that somebody said something about the majority of the American people—the white Americans, if you please, who fight the Nation's battles in times of war and sustain its institutions in times of peace—and who are being punished or threatened with this kind of un-American legislation.

I here and now extend a challenge to President Truman and to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, to engage in a Nation-wide radio debate with me on this FEPC, the most dangerous communistic piece of legislation with which the American people have ever been threatened.

If they do not want to take me on personally I will take whomever they designate.

I will take this issue to the American people and show how it is inspired by Moscow and being used to undermine and destroy the American way of life as well as the American Government.

You Republicans talk about what President Truman said about you. Do

not forget that both political parties repudiated both the Democrats and the Republicans in Congress, because I know that you decent Americans on both sides of the aisle are not in favor of that communistic program.

If it continues you are going to see a rising tide of opposition to both tickets.

If Governor Thurmond and Governor Wright get their ticket on the ballot in every State of the Union, and the people understand what this communistic program means, they will sweep this country in the November election.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING AND THE HOUSING SITUATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the 1-minute speeches that have been made I have asked for this time. If those speeches had not been made today, I would not have asked for permission to address the House. But we might just as well clarify the situation since they were made.

The two most important problems confronting the American people today are the high cost of living and the housing problem. Those are inescapable facts. Every housewife in America knows what the high cost of living is doing and has done to her family budget. Every housewife knows what happens when she goes out to the store with $5 or $10, or even $20 and what she can bring back to her family. Everyone knows about the cost of meat, steaks, clothing, and all of the other items that enter into the cost of living. There are millions of families in America today who are suffering keenly as a result of the present high cost of living.

It is not my purpose to make any condemnatory speech, but to call attention to the fact that the people are acutely interested in this situation.

Both parties agree that there is a cruelly high cost of living. Our Republican friends used the word "cruel" in their platform. Everyone knows there has been an over-all increase in the cost of living of 40 percent during the past 2 years. Everyone knows that during the preceding 3½ years prior to June 30, 1946, the over-all increase in the cost of living was 6.6 percent. One of our distinguished friends in his speech referred to Government purchases. Of course, everyone knows that when controls were taken off, any purchase, small or large, accumulated, would have an effect on the cost of living and on prices, where there were shortages. But we must bear in mind that during the war the Government bought more farm commodities and food for export abroad than the Government has ever bought during the last 2 years. The Government has bought almost as much, if not more, for civilian purposes abroad, never mind our military purposes, during the war than it did for civilian purposes abroad during the past 2 years. Yet during the war period, prices were held down. Of course, strong measures had to be used, but that was the only way that justice could be brought to the average family in America. Otherwise, prices would have become abnormally high. The price level now is higher after World War II than it was after World War I. That is the situation, without regard to politics, that confronts millions and millions of American families.

Now, let us go to the question of housing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a backlog of labor and material in the country at the moment with which to build houses?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, we will come to that.

Mr. GROSS. I hope you will.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Now, so far as the housing legislation is concerned, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill or the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is reported out of the House Committee on Banking and Currency now. That bill contains provisions for slum clearance, low-cost housing, and public housing. Also, it contains title 6, which we failed to reenact in the last days of the last session, or failed to extend. The Democratic Party stands in favor of slum-clearance legislation, low-cost housing, and public housing, also extension of title 6. The Republican platform stands in favor of the same things where need exists. I think there is a need. The leadership in the House is opposed to the bill that passed the Senate. The Republican leadership in the House is opposed to the plank that is contained in the Republican platform. Both party platforms are in agreement on housing. Both parties recognize that there are insufferable conditions existing throughout the country in relation to the high cost of living. It seems to me that the people are concerned with that, and that party politics is not going to cause them to change their minds in the firm belief that insufferable conditions exist and that something should be done by the Congress. The people recognize that the President does not legislate. The Congress legislates. The President and the executive branch of the Government enforce the law.

So, making no speech of condemnation, we want results to give the people a break. Let us give them a break; never mind our inconvenience; let us go ahead. The housing bill can be brought up within a short time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I repeat, the housing bill can be brought up within a very short time. I realize that in the matter of legislation dealing with living conditions and the high cost of living that committees must sit and consider the bills.

We have got to be practical and we have got to be fair and I do not criticize because there is not immediate action on it; to criticize on that ground would not be fair. But with reference to the housing bill, it is in such shape that it could be reported out immediately by the Rules Committee and we could consider those provisions of the bill reported out of the committee that were not enacted in the closing days of the last session.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that on the last day of the session we passed under a suspension of the rules a tax bill in a very short time. The gentleman will concede, I am sure, that we could pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill here in 2 hours.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I have been listening with great interest to what the gentleman has been saying. I take it that he is the acting minority leader. Speaking for myself, I had concluded that I would wait until tomorrow to hear what the President had to say before I made any comment with respect to this special session.

I am wondering if the gentleman knows what the President will present in his speech tomorrow and whether we may rely on the proposition that what the gentleman has been saying is in anticipation of what the President will say tomorrow and is, in truth and in fact, a statement similar to or in line with what the President will say?

Mr. McCORMACK. In answer to my friend, the majority leader, I have no knowledge, I may say, as to what the President's message will contain. I have knowledge, however, of what the conditions are. I have been home. I did not have to go home to have knowledge that the people are suffering. Certainly we ought to try to make an effort to give the people a break under these conditions. So my answer is that I have no knowledge of what the President will say, but I do have a deep and intensely sympathetic knowledge of the suffering of the poor and the middle classes, the backbone of America, constituting millions of American families; and I think I know what is in their minds.

My remarks today are made simply because there were a couple of speeches made which I did not think expressed the full facts, and to allow them to go unanswered would not be a proper thing for me to do.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The President in his early morning acceptance speech of the nomination referred to price control, rationing, and allocation; in other words, the OPA. Is the gentleman suggesting that we reconstitute the OPA, with control of prices, rationing, and so forth?

Mr. McCORMACK. On this occasion my remarks are aimed at the basic proposition that something ought to be done in order to protect the American people against the insufferable conditions that exist at the present time and which the Republican platform frankly admits are cruelly high. Mark you, the word "cruel" means to inflict not only punishment but unusual punishment. The Republican platform, by the use of that word "cruelly", admits that the American people, so far as the high cost of living is concerned, are having inflicted upon them punishment of an insufferable nature.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader [Mr. McCORMACK], who was the majority leader 2 years ago and who preceded me.

I recall very distinctly that the Eightieth Congress—this Congress—was elected upon many propositions, but principally upon the proposition that price controls would be abolished. The people did not want high prices, yet they did not want the black markets. The prices charged the American people for every desirable commodity were prohibitive because of the black markets. The people of the country could not buy a commodity which they wanted without going into the black market. The shelves of the butcher shops and the grocery stores were empty because everything for which there was a demand had been driven into the black market.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I wonder if the gentleman cannot remember far enough back, the American people I am sure remember that far back, to the time just before the election in 1946 when Mr. Truman himself took all price controls off.

Mr. BENDER. Three weeks before the election public sentiment was so terrific for doing away with OPA controls that the President, with his ear to the ground, finally abolished price controls himself. As a matter of fact, the then majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, begged the President to suspend price controls for, I believe, 60 days. The President did so and he was in agreement with every other leader in the Republican and the Democratic Parties because the people were sick unto death of price control. They could not get what they wanted in the regular, legitimate markets. So at that time one of the most important issues before the American people was getting rid of price controls. The Eightieth Congress has respected the wishes of the people by abandoning price controls.

Our own majority leader has called attention to the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts. From what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, and he is an able and well-informed man, we have, I think, a foretaste of what the President is going to say.

Who has been running this country for the past 16 years? Not the Republicans. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman were in the White House, and they had their own way 100 percent. Who is responsible for the condition in which the country finds itself today? We won the war, but we lost the peace at Teheran, at Yalta, at Potsdam. The two gentlemen who were there were the leaders of the Democratic Party. They, and they only, knew what was going on. As a result of our having lost the peace, we have had to pay a terrific price. We have had to provide the sustenance, the food, the clothing, and the material for the rest of the world in order to carry out the cold war that now exists.

As the result we find ourselves with shortages in this country. I have thought this thing out and I know that you and I agree that if we did not have to divide our substances, our goods, our foods, our materials with the rest of the world, the supply at home would meet the demand. While we are feeding the world we lack the supply to meet our own domestic demand. When the supply meets the demand in this country you are going to have lower prices and not before. And possibly an old-fashioned buyers' strike might help.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I listened with a great deal of interest to the distinguished minority leader making this appeal to the people about the high cost of living. The gentleman from Massachusetts was one of the advocates of the subsidy payments whereby we take the American taxpayers' money, go out into the market, buy up the potatoes, take them out of the market to hold up the price structure, then dump them for fertilizer or put kerosene on them, destroy them, or feed them to the hogs wherever possible.

Mr. BENDER. That is right.

Mr. GAVIN. If they would have let that supply come into the market the prices would automatically come down and the American people would secure relief from high prices on, not alone potatoes, but many products. It is about time for the Government to discontinue these unsound practices.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I did not have time to finish what I wanted to say about those pigeons earlier today. You know, it served the Democrats right to have the pigeons carry on the way they did at their convention. Somebody conceived the idea of putting those 48 pigeons in a floral piece, not realizing the habits of the pigeons. The pigeons were turned loose during the Democratic convention. The doors, you know, were closed. They did not want to let anybody out; they wanted to keep them in to hear the President speak at 2 a. m. The pigeons served them right. I hope they turn pigeons loose here tomorrow when the President speaks. All we will have tomorrow will be campaign speeches. Mr. Truman will not tell you that at Potsdam and Teheran and Yalta he and his predecessor were responsible for creating these shortages by giving Russia everything they wanted. They turned over the whole works to Russia, including Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia. They turned the whole works over to them, and now Mr. Truman says, "Look at this fellow; see what he is doing to us." As a result of spending these billions of dollars all over the world we find ourselves, our own economy, in a terrible state. That is what is responsible for your high prices and your high cost of living and your shortages. You cannot feed the rest of the world and your own people too, and not pay high prices; and when you create an OPA, you create a black market. Under OPA no restaurant man, no consumer, no individual could go into a store and purchase anything at regular prices. There were two prices—one on top of the table and one under the table.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. My good friend, I wonder if the idea was not to eliminate rationing?

Mr. BENDER. Rationing?

Mr. HUBER. And do we not have more rationing today regarding those in the low-income brackets than we had under OPA?

Mr. BENDER. My friend, your crowd has been playing politics with this thing now for years. I am sick and tired of it, and I hope you will have the courage to do what should be done and tell the American people the truth about this thing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

CALLING SPECIAL SESSION NOW ENDANGERS NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the calling of a special session of Congress, in view of our international situation, seems to me to be a dangerous and reckless step.

The setting for this call was the culmination of the most partisan political event in the entire country. We all know that the political conventions, held every fourth year to select candidates for President and Vice President, accentuate partisanship to the nth degree. At the end of the Democratic convention, to the assembled delegates, the President chose to make his announcement. Preceding the actual announcement he detailed a

number of matters which he had submitted to Congress, some of which had not been passed to his liking, and some of which had been passed over his veto by a vote of the majority of each of the major parties in both Houses of Congress.

Any amateur student of American political life knows that rabid partisanship and statesmanship seldom, if ever, coincide. In this case they clearly did not. After detailing the matters which Congress had already passed upon in most cases pursuant to recommendations by the President, he made this statement:

I am therefore calling this Congress back into session on the 26th of July.

To show how partisan and almost bitter the President was, he made this statement:

Senator BARKLEY and I will win the election and make these Republicans like it; don't you forget that.

It never was my conception that the provision in the Constitution which provides in article II, section 3, that the President may, "on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses or either of them," gives him the right to call Congress together for the purpose of reconsidering matters which may have been suggested to it by the President, some of which had been acted upon and some of which had not been acted upon. The general conception is that extraordinary occasions mean some emergency which requires the calling of Congress, when it is out of session, for some necessary present action on an actual emergency. This is not a right granted to the President to be exercised at his whim, or convenience, or for the purpose of trying to coerce Congress into action in accordance with his views on some controversial political matter.

If there was any emergency, as contemplated by the Constitution, why was the President away on a political junket during the closing days of Congress? At that time the same controversial matters, cited by him in his convention speech, concerning which he is calling us back, were before the country. Yet he made a purely political trip, castigating Congress and making wisecracks that it seemed to me were unbecoming of our President. When he announced his determination to reconvene Congress the particular emergency he found himself in was as a political candidate, nominated by a divided convention, where an opponent who was not a candidate, was not at the convention, and was not seeking the nomination, getting the votes of almost 300 delegates, and also part of the solid South walking out on the convention because it was determined to nominate Truman, and some of the big Democrats publicly stating that Truman could not be elected.

It must be apparent, considering the whole picture involving the calling of this special session, that the only extraordinary occasion involved was that an election was coming up in which Mr. Truman was one of the candidates and in which his announced plan is to convince the electorate that Congress, by its actions in this session, is not worthy of their confidence.

The matter that concerns me is not the statements made by the President. He has a perfect right to make such statements. Perhaps we cannot blame him for making the statements which he did, or for the obvious anger which he has exhibited by the manner in which the statement was made.

Undoubtedly we are in one of the most precarious and dangerous international situations in which the country has ever found itself. Over 3 years since the ending of the war, we still do not have stability or peace. This may be partly due to the President. We have joined in Congress in supporting the President, many of the Members against their own personal judgment, to present to the world a united front in our determination to bring peace and stability to the world, and especially to Europe. The situation between ourselves and the Soviet Union today is something that will make any thoughtful person, and especially those who have even a minor responsibility connected therewith, shudder with fear. It is laden with dynamite. It could involve us in a war which would be more devastating and deadly than the last one. Everyone who reads and thinks about the matter realizes that every foreign office in Europe is watching every move that America makes. One of the great obsessions that many of us have is that we must be thoroughly united on our international policy. We must make a showing of united strength, which we think will bend the will of those who are thwarting, opposing, and irritating us into a mood to bring a cessation to the present impasse. Some of us have personal knowledge of other hot spots, such as Austria, Korea, Trieste, Greece, and China. Any one of them could provide the setting for an explosion that might rock the world and possibly destroy civilization.

What concerns me is that this action of the President and the setting where it was germinated may give the world the idea that we are disunited, disorganized, flabby, and starting to drift and disintegrate as we did, with reference to international affairs, in the early twenties. Our foreign friends and antagonists do not understand American politics or psychology. If they think we are lapsing back into our old isolationist position those who we are trying to strengthen will lose faith and hope; those who are trying to start trouble may put more pressure on us. This disunity—or the show of it—was distinctly caused by the President. To the foreigner, he cannot say with any degree of faith in the belief of it by foreigners "that what I am saying and doing at this convention and following this convention, does not apply to or count in the international field." They cannot discriminate to that extent. They simply see the President riding around the country condemning the Congress, especially the Republican Members of it; they see him enter, after a long wait in a back room, the Democratic convention and condemn the Congress and in a bitter partisan tirade obviously designed to destroy confidence in Congress, say to the convention, "I am going to call them back into session." They see also that he does not even have the support of his own party, a big block of delegates walking out and a large block voting for another candidate and many of the leaders, such as Hague, before the convention convened, publicly voicing their disapproval and lack of faith in Truman.

To show that I am not relying entirely on my own judgment as to what might be accomplished by a Congress called back by an angry President to consider matters in an election year, I will quote from one of the most experienced and respected legislators in Congress. I refer to Senator BARKLEY, the running mate of the President. In the consideration of an agricultural bill on the Thursday before the Saturday on which Congress adjourned he made this statement—page 8559, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know, but I am told by members of the House committee they will not consider the legislation without holding further hearings. We know the difficulty which will be encountered concerning this bill if we adjourn Saturday. I have done what I could to cooperate with the majority in bringing about an adjournment, because I think if we sit here until after the convention, or if we sit here between the conventions, or after the two conventions the entire time of the Congress will be taken up with political bickering and political legislation and political oratory, and I do not want that to be brought about. I want to finish what we can finish and adjourn the Congress, and I have tried my best to cooperate with the leaders on the other side to bring about an adjournment.

It must be remembered that the President is calling a special session, not to take up anything new, nor is he announcing that there is anything of an emergency nature requiring the convening of Congress.

It is called to again submit to Congress matters which he has several times before submitted to us. These matters have been considered by Congress, and while Congress did not agree with the President in some of them, nevertheless it has never been felt that, where the President and Congress disagree, this furnishes the basis which gives the President the right to call a special session. He merely wishes a rehash of what has gone before, and it seems to me that he must know full well, unless Congress changes its mind, what the answer to these questions will be.

It must be admitted that the situation—internationally—is very critical. The reports one reads every morning indicates the tenseness of the situation. Congress has wholeheartedly gone along with the President in trying to present a solid front against insults, intimidations, and even aggression by any foreign power. We believe that, by taking a firm and undeviating stand for our rights and the rights of other people, we will ultimately bring about some type of a peace. The important thing to the world, which is watching us closely, is that America be united in its program. We should not indicate to the world that

we are in a cat-and-dog position of internal controversy, bickering politics, and petty jealousies. Those who suggested the call of this present session may have been smart, but they certainly were not wise. It seems incredible to me that the President, who spent 10 years in the United States Senate, would issue such a call. He knows enough about the American legislative procedure, the cross currents that will be given play by discussion of some of these controversial measures, that it is doubtful if anything can be accomplished. That is one of the prices we pay for freedom of discussion and freedom of political ideas. It may be wrong, but we certainly must face the realities of the situation.

The result might be that the world would think that we are weak and disintegrating. That might give comfort to those of other nations who would like to put pressure and heat upon us, and God knows that it might be more than heat and might result in an incident. Think what might happen in the train of such an event.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I give a list of all previous "extraordinary occasions" which our Presidents have called, indicating the reason for the call and showing that in every case a real emergency existed:

LIST OF SESSIONS

The first was called by President Adams in 1797 to suspend diplomatic relations with France. The others:

1803: By Jefferson, on Spain's cession of Louisiana to France.

1807: By Jefferson, to consider relations with Great Britain.

1811: By Madison, preparatory to declaring war on Great Britain.

1814: By Madison, on matters concerning the war with Britain.

1837: By Van Buren, to suspend specie payments.

1841: By William Henry Harrison, to consider finances and revenue.

1856: By Pierce, to pass an Army appropriation bill.

1861: By Lincoln, because of "insurrection in certain Southern States."

1877: By Hayes, to pass an Army appropriation bill.

1879: By Hayes, for legislative, executive, judicial, and Army appropriations.

CLEVELAND'S ACTION

1893: By Cleveland, to repeal the Silver Purchase Act.

1897: By McKinley, to pass the Dingley Tariff Act.

1903: By Theodore Roosevelt, to consider a commercial treaty with Cuba.

1909: By Taft, to revise the Dingley Tariff Act.

1911: By Taft, to consider a reciprocal trade agreement with Canada.

1913: By Wilson, to change tariffs.

1917: By Wilson, to declare war on Germany.

1919: By Wilson, to appropriate funds for Government operation.

1921: By Harding, to consider war-caused economic problems.

1922: By Harding, to consider a merchant marine.

1929: By Hoover, to consider farm relief and tariff changes.

1933: By Franklin D. Roosevelt, to take steps to relieve the depression.

1937: By Roosevelt, to fight the industrial recession.

1939: By Roosevelt, to repeal the Neutrality Act on the outbreak of World War II.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING AND THE SHORTAGE OF HOMES ARE THE RESULT OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] tells us what we all know, that is, that our people are suffering from the high cost of living and from a shortage of homes. There is no doubt about that. But the gentleman from Massachusetts did not tell us, as he also well knows, that both were the direct result of the policies of his party, of the present administration.

The gentleman from Ohio and others this morning have told us why we have this high cost of living. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] attempted to excuse the present prices by saying that, if we had the same controls now that we had during the war, the prices would be down; that might be true, but we would have the same scarcities we had then. But what the gentleman forgets or neglects to state is that since the war we have given other nations, other customers, millions and billions of dollars to come into our local open markets and compete and bid against us and that has forced our prices even higher. What he also forgets is that the Government by subsidies, by support prices, by going into the market and purchasing with tax money, at a price which the individual cannot pay, is increasing the price of everything that we use.

With one breath, President Truman cries out against high prices, but uses Government funds to increase them. What the President is doing is seeking to retain the seller's vote by increasing prices with Government funds and, at the same time, angling for the purchaser's vote by yelling that prices are too high.

He is indulging in the small-minded politician's double-talk, playing both ends against the middle.

He is attempting to make the voters feel that they are misused and abused; that, if they will vote for him, their distress, which his administration has created, will be relieved.

As to the shortage of homes, the same reasons caused that shortage. The administration has gone into the market and has not only been buying materials which we need and must have if we are to build homes but they compete with the man, with the veteran, with the farmer who wants to build his own home.

Yes, and the administration, to catch the tenant vote, has insisted upon a rent schedule which has curtailed the repair of old, the building of new, housing facilities.

It is true, is it not, that all during these years, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has said, the Democratic Party, or rather the New Deal Party, has been in control of the whole situation. They have had control of the executive department. They have shaped and put through Congress legislation, except during the last 2 years, legislation designed to create present conditions. And about every time during this session the Republican Congress has enacted a law which was beneficial the administration has sabotaged every effort to make it work.

I will cite just two instances, and both were disclosed in sworn testimony given before House committees. We passed the Taft-Hartley Act. A large number of you gentlemen on the Democratic side voted for that legislation. The Congress passed it by substantial majorities over the President's veto. After the Congress passed that law over the President's veto, he said, that being the law of the land, he would enforce it. Instead of so doing, he has attempted to bypass it; to, by indirection, make it of no real benefit, after promising his support.

Then here in Washington, when the first test arose under that law, what happened? The issue was raised in the GSI strike. I will tell you what happened, and this is from the sworn testimony from friends of the President, from officials in the present administration.

The President, Mr. Truman, called to the White House the Secretary of Labor and others, and there advised him that he should use his efforts to settle that strike, which was all right except that he gave him to understand that he should force the private corporation to deal with an outfit whose officers refused to deny before a House committee that they were Communists. By that action the President sabotaged, and he did it deliberately, the Taft-Hartley Act, the act which he had told us that he would, although he did not believe in it, enforce after the Eightieth Congress passed it.

I charge here and now that he deliberately not only ignored but attempted to render ineffective a law passed by the Congress of the United States. That is the testimony, that is the record, and the President cannot dodge it.

To give the President the benefit of the doubt, to give him the opportunity to deny that his agents had endeavored to coerce the GSI into dealing with known Communists, a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee subpenaed Mr. Steelman. Mr. Steelman refused to appear.

The subcommittee subpenaed him the second time and again he refused to appear, and gave as his reason for his refusal and for his violation of a Federal statute the statement that the President of the United States, Mr. Truman, had told him not to appear before the subcommittee.

The statute to which I refer is section 192 of title 2, United States Code, and it reads as follows:

Every person who having been summoned as a witness by the authority of • • • any committee of either House of Congress, willfully makes default • • • shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 nor less than $100 and imprisonment in a common jail for not less than 1 month nor more than 12 months.

When the President of the United States orders, as did President Truman, one of his assistants to disregard a subpena duly and lawfully issued under a Federal statute, what reason is there to believe that he will comply with the law of the land if it does not happen to meet with his approval?

I will give you another one. The President is responsible for the appointment of the Attorney General. The Attorney General appoints members of the Parole Board. A few years ago six gangsters, members of a Chicago mob, the Capone gang, were convicted of a conspiracy to extort a million dollars from the motion-picture industry. Mark you, they were convicted and were sent to prison. They were also indicted for using the mails to defraud. That was on a charge that they had collected from members of unions in the motion-picture industry, from workingmen and workingwomen, another million dollars. That was the mail-fraud indictment.

They were sent to prison on the conspiracy charge. Then an application for parole was made and later endorsed by a friend of the President, a man who visits him here in Washington, Paul Dillon by name. This is the sworn testimony of Dillon himself.

An application for a parole was made. To get a parole it was necessary that the mail-fraud indictment be dismissed. And who appeared as attorney in support of the application for the dismissal of the mail-fraud indictment? None other than Maury Hughes, of Dallas, Tex., the boyhood and long-time friend of Attorney General Clark. That is the testimony of Maury Hughes and not of someone else.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there an objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, that is the record up to that point. Then what happened? The paroles were granted.

When Mr. Truman took office I incurred the ill will of some of my Republican friends in my district by sending out a newsletter in which I stated that I thought Mr. Truman was an honest, sincere, and average American citizen, and that if he were left to his own devices, he would make us an honest and conscientious—a good President. That was my thought for I did not believe that any average American accepting that high office could do otherwise.

Yet, when this question of granting these paroles came along, I found that the President, who was still a member of the Pendergast Club, a political organization down in his home State, I found that man not raising a hand or saying a word to prevent the parole of these gangsters.

And when our committee asked the President to issue an Executive order making available to it the results of an investigation conducted by the FBI into the granting of these paroles, the President refused to give us that information. Well, the committee held hearings and it was disclosed that the trail of those interested in securing paroles led from the gangsters in Chicago to the attorneys for gangsters in St. Louis, down to Dallas, Tex., and to the White House and the offices of the Parole Board here in Washington, and traveling that trail we found a personal friend of the President, the President's campaign manager in two senatorial contests, and a boyhood friend of the Attorney General. The improvident granting, if you want to put it charitably, of these paroles was exposed and last week two of the six went back to jail.

There is not very much use of following the advice of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] as to the enactment of legislation when there is not fair, impartial and wholehearted enforcement of that legislation by the executive department. It makes little difference—it makes little difference what laws this Congress or any Congress enacts when you have in the White House and in the administrative departments and executive branches of the Government men who will violate their oath of office and go along with gangsters and crooks and politicians and nullify and sabotage the laws that we do pass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in one, to include an address delivered by him on July 5, 1948, on the occasion of the centennial anniversary of the settlement of Frankenlust township, Bay County, Mich.; in another, to include an article by Tom L. Munger; and in the third, to include an article by Samuel Pettengill, a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a while ago, when my distinguished friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], who talked so much about pigeons and all that goes with them, was speaking, I repeatedly asked him to yield as I wanted to ask him a question or two. He did not see fit to do so. As long as he is seated here now, I am going to ask him, What has the Republican majority done in the year and a half they have been in control of Congress about the high cost of living? And, No. 2, What are they going to do at this session about the presently impossible high cost of living?

I will now yield to my distinguished friend to answer these questions, if he can.

Mr. BENDER. First, I want the gentleman to answer me. What did you do about the high cost of living?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, now, you see, my distinguished friend is answering me with another question, and I do not believe that is cricket. The gentleman from Ohio repeatedly refused to yield to me for just these two simple questions during the tirade that he made a while ago. I am awaiting his answers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman let me answer the question?

Mr. ROONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BENDER. That is what I was talking to the gentleman about. I hope the gentleman was listening when I was speaking. How are you going to reduce the high cost of living when everything is short because of the mistakes principally that your fellow partisans made in bungling the whole foreign situation?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman and his colleagues on the majority side of the aisle are in control of this Congress. They have a wide margin of votes in favor of anything they agree upon. They really control our foreign policy.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman knows we do not control the administration.

Mr. ROONEY. But the gentleman was more interested in talking about pigeons and all that goes with pigeons than he was in the issues that have been confronting the lives and existence of the American taxpayer and the American citizen.

Mr. BENDER. But I said to the gentleman that as a result of the things that your administration had done we were having shortages which created the high cost of living.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman was talking about that at the beginning of the Eightieth Congress and he is still talking about it, after a year and a half has gone by with his party in control.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has again expired.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the question has been asked by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] as to whether the President tomorrow in his address to the Congress will speak to the membership on the high cost of living and on the great shortage of housing in this country.

The minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], for whom I have a very deep regard, answered the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], whom I also respect very greatly,

saying, "I do not know." I do not know, either, but I suspect that the President will report on those two vital issues. I hope that he will. I hope that he will for the Republican housewives of America, as well as for the Democratic housewives of America, as well as for the third-party housewives of America. I hope he will, not only for the sake of our economy at home but for the peace which we must have if our civilization is to survive. I hope that he will, for the sake of unity—the unity which the Republican nominee, Governor Dewey, said he seeks to obtain, and for which I commend him. I believe he is sincere.

May I point out, however, that the only way we are going to obtain unity in America is to look at the whole community as a whole and the total needs of all the people in the community.

We have made a real contribution this morning to this special call of the Congress because the majority Members—the Republicans—have at long last admitted that there is a danger in the present high cost of living and the continuing spiraling of prices of food, clothing, rent—everything that people need. They have also admitted that there is a drastic shortage of housing.

In order to solve any problem you first have to recognize the problem exists. The Republicans in this House have today recognized and admitted the two great problems that face the American people—the drastic housing shortage and the dangerously high and soaring cost of living. The first hurdle is passed.

Now we come to the second—the basic issue. What are the causes of the present inflation that is drying up the savings of the American people, sending them into debt and mortgaging the economic future of the families of America?

I want to tell this Congress very seriously the housewives of America cannot eat speeches, whether they be campaign speeches or just speeches on the floor of this House or in the Senate. They cannot pay their bills with speeches. They cannot pay the $125 a month asked for a two-room apartment with a speech. They cannot pay doctors' bills with speeches. They cannot buy milk which they need for their children with speeches.

What is the cause of present high prices? Because we have to agree on the cause in order to arrive at the remedy.

Let us stop making speeches and see if we cannot agree on a remedy to correct present high prices and get some houses built.

The gentleman from Ohio says our foreign policy is the cause of our present inflation. I do not agree with him, but if our foreign policy of foreign aid has brought about inflation, then may I point out that the foreign policy of this country is bipartisan. It has been said on the floor of the House today that our foreign policy, inasmuch as it aids other countries to buy goods in this country, has brought on present high prices. This is not the basic cause of our present troubles. But even if it were the basic cause, and if the gentleman is really making a sincere statement and not just indulging in campaign oratory, then I ask seriously does he suggest that the remedy to high prices is the withdrawal of all foreign aid—a shutting off of all exports?

I point out again what I have said, and others have said, in this House, Mr. Speaker, that the total export program is but a small percentage of the productive capacity of this country. No; exports are not the basic cause of inflation.

The export program carried out under our foreign policy helps to aggravate the inflation we have permitted to overtake us, but it is not the root cause of this inflation. If we had no foreign-aid program at all we would still have inflation today in the absence of controls.

I remind the gentleman from Ohio that his party helped to make this foreign policy, and I remind him, for instance, that we passed the British loan before we killed price control.

I repeat that we passed the British loan before we killed price control. Go back over my speeches. My record is clear and I remember making the statement before we killed price control that we were not yet out of the woods; that we ought to keep full controls a while longer, a year, possibly 2 years. I also reminded the Members that if we did not keep price control we would not only endanger our own economy and the living standards of our own people but that we would jeopardize the rehabilitation program that must be successful if peace was to be permanently established in the world. I pointed out that the money we were lending the British would not go as far as they planned or we planned. Why? Because prices would get out of hand here at home in the United States. I pointed out that this was short-sighted in our own long-term interests.

I have not finished my statement yet, but the gentleman can see where I am going.

Mr. BENDER. Yes, I know where the gentlewoman is going.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from California may proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. I know where the gentlewoman is going, and as far as foreign policy is concerned, the present policy, I cannot disagree because I voted as the gentlewoman from California did. I am talking, however, about what happened before we voted that and before Mr. VANDENBERG acted and before the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, and the Foreign Affairs Committee acted.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. To what period does the gentleman refer?

Mr. BENDER. I am talking about what happened at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Prices were under control at the time of the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam Conferences——

Mr. BENDER. My friend, the gentlewoman, knows also what happened 2 weeks before election the last time. Did you agree with that or did you disagree with that? I say that as a result of that foreign policy, as a result of those mistakes that were made——

Mrs. DOUGLAS. At Potsdam, Yalta, and Teheran?

Mr. BENDER. Yes. Because of those mistakes that were made we are having to pay the price now.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further.

This business of Yalta and Teheran needs a full-dress speech. It has been kicked around very unthinkingly, I believe, by the Republican side of the aisle—very short-sightedly.

I make the flat statement now that the policies adopted at those conferences are not the basic causes of the high cost of living today.

The high cost of living today is the result of the war. No nation can begin when the last shot is fired where it left off before the first shot was discharged because in the meantime billions upon billions upon billions of dollars' worth of raw materials throughout the world have been detroyed.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Now, wait a minute. We know that we are short of raw materials not only in our own country but throughout the world. We have been burning up raw materials all through the war at a frightening rate. We had to burn them up if we were to win the war, if we were to remain freemen. The price we paid was not too much but we dare not lose sight of that price now if we are to act intelligently in the face of perplexing problems.

We know that we came out of the war short of consumer goods. For years we were making munitions of war instead of refrigerators, stoves, farm machinery, and homes for the American people. We know that people are short of these very things in other countries. We know also that in the other countries they not only have been going without new refrigerators, without new machinery and without homes, but the very factories that make those things have themselves been destroyed.

Now, of course, we could have pulled back into our shell and said that we would not help the rest of the world, that we had done our part in the war and that we would not participate in the restoration of other nations. That would have been a withdrawal into isolationism and I think the gentleman from Ohio would agree that such a policy would have been and would be today, foolhardy, very shortsighted and finally ruinous.

In recognizing our responsibilities for participation in the rebuilding of the world since we were the strongest, the healthiest, the wealthiest nation, we had a further obligation.

It was our obligation to ask ourselves: How long must we exercise such controls over the amount that we ourselves will consume in order that the whole world may move forward?

It was our duty to have exercised the necessary self-control the peace demanded—for the future of our children and the children of the world.

I say that the Republican side of the House, with some Democrats, but the majority of the Republican side of the House with a minority on the Democratic side of the House, fought to remove all price controls the day the war was over. It was too early. That is a simple fact.

Instead of all this vituperation today, instead of asking who did what, who was responsible for this or that, for heaven's sake, can we not recognize that food has risen 50 percent since this Congress took over? Can we not recognize that the consumer today is in hock to banks, stores, and loan companies more than double what they were in 1929 when the plug was pulled on consumer buying power and this country was crippled and toppled into a depression? Can we not recognize that this is a common problem from which we all suffer, that we must do something about it, that we cannot permit prices to go on up because, if we do, everybody will go down, rich, poor, middle class, and everybody else, and our international program will be ruined?

There are some people who say: Let the Republicans do nothing in this Congress. So what. Housing? It is not an issue, when it is passed you cannot tell who passed it; let the gentleman on the Banking and Currency Committee have his way.

Mr. Speaker, I say such an attitude in view of the present conditions existing in the world is too costly for everyone.

Mr. BENDER. Does the gentlewoman advocate OPA?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Failure to act on housing in this session and failure to act to control the rising costs of living will be disastrous. I would remind the gentleman from Ohio that I introduced a price-control and allocations bill over 3 months ago. At the same time I made my report to Congress on high prices. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, I am sure, that I have repeatedly urged Congress to act on these vital matters.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING AND ITS CAUSE—THE CURE IS IN THE HANDS OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, except to announce that I think at the conclusion of this address I will move the House adjourn, if the Speaker will recognize me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, these are serious days. We have a national debt of $256,000,000,000. We had an assessed valuation of every farm and every farm building in the United States in 1940 of some $40,000,000,000. Prices are high, taxes are high, everything is high.

Since I have been a Member of this body I have tried to operate on the basis that my country comes first, my party second, and I come third. It is a pretty good formula. I do not know whether I have always followed it or not, but at least that has been the objective.

Coming from a State that was the sixth agricultural State of the Nation until the present administration shoved it down to eleventh place last year, I feel somebody has got to say something about the high cost of living that we hear so much about but do nothing about. There is plenty of land in the United States. I happen to live in a country where you can go out and pick berries any time you want to. The berries retail at 50 cents a quart. There is not a farmer or producer involved in that. You just go out and pick the berries. How are you going to lower the cost of those berries?

It is easy enough to talk about lowering prices, but whose prices are you going to lower? It is always somebody else's price you want to lower, not yours. I do not want to get personal, but if we are interested in lowering prices it might be a pretty place to start right here among ourselves. Why do not these people who talk about lowering prices talk about lowering their own salaries?

The fact is that if the farmer gave his milk away the consumer would be paying 12 to 15 cents per quart for milk. The fact is that some meats would be 50 to 60 cents per pound even if the farmer gave the meat animals away.

The fact is that on many food products the spread between the producer and the consumer is more than the producer received for his food product in 1939.

Now, there is an opportunity and a pretty good place to start. One should not stand up here and complain about some firm or businessman who is making $5,000, $6,000, or $7,000 or more in a year so long as he obtains more for his own services. We hear much about the minimum-wage law. Our friends in the cities say that everything is so high that they cannot eat. Well, there is lots of land to be had; if they want to, they can go out and raise the food that they need. Of course, they might have to work more than 40 hours a week if they get into that business.

It surely would be nice if you can keep the rural people of this country on a peasant basis; that would be fine, like we had them in 1939. You do not have to go back to 1932, but 1939, the seventh year of the more abundant life, when we still had 54-cent-per-bushel wheat, 5-cent hogs, and our 8-cent cotton. Surely it would be fine if you can get the women and children to work for practically nothing on the farm. You do not say anything about their wages and hours; you do not say anything about working the children on the farm—boys and girls of 10 and 12 years of age, even—out working, running tractors. They think that is fine as long as they produce cheap food. Is food high in comparison to a piece of farm machinery or an automobile? But, is that the way you want food produced, or do you want to have the American farmers have the things that the rest of society think they should have? If we are going to keep this thing going, the first thing to do is to have somebody in the Department of Agriculture live up to the promises they made to the American farmers, and not be playing cheap politics all the time. There is no Member of the House that can deny that statement that the President at this moment has the power and the authority and the money to control prices at the wholesale level on every agricultural product, just as much as the OPA ever had on a retail level. You cannot ship anything out of this country without obtaining an export license. We put in fifteen or twenty billion into a defense program. It was deemed necessary. Most of us voted for it. Of course, that has had repercussions. We appropriated another five or six billion dollars, a large part of it for food that went into the Marshall aid plan. Of course, that has an influence on our economy. The same people that sigh and cry and moan about the high cost of living are the same ones who want to give it all away and then come up here and complain about it. I do not know how much longer we are going to be able to deceive the American people, but the time has come to act. I think every Member of Congress should assume his or her responsibility along this line, and we should have a Department of Agriculture that will quit playing politics and furnish abundant food to the American people. It can be done. Does it make sense to you to burn potatoes, give them away for $5 a car, and at the same time have the consumer pay 6 or 8 cents a pound or $4.80 to $6.40 a bushel for them? That is due to faulty administration. This whole food program is the policy of the present administration. Support prices are not high prices. Support prices are not any more than fair prices, and any time we have an administration that wants to do something about it, something can be done. And why all these crocodile tears; all these people that holler about what it costs to eat? Sure, I realize what the average family is up against, but the responsibility is down here at the White House, and no one needs to pass the buck to me as far as that is concerned, because I know who can handle it any time he wants to do that, and no one can deny that statement. It is surprising that the Luckmans have not done more harm than they already have done to the food program of our country.

Who but the Secretary of Agriculture put a 165-percent parity support price under flax and then why complain about the price of paint made from linseed oil?

Why does the President, in one breath, tell about the large farm income and

praise high prices to them, and in the next breath tell the consumers that the Republicans are to be blamed for the price they pay for their groceries?

Farm prices have taken a nose dive of late, but just how much will it be reflected in consumer prices?

Mr. Truman, with the available power, authority, and money can control prices, and he did not need to depose Mr. Eccles as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank for trying to control excess credits which is the basis of any inflation, if he was really as interested in doing something about inflation as he is talking about it.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I know it is not a very pleasant thing to come back to Washington in this humid weather when tempers are taut. But, notwithstanding that, we face a realistic condition, and I am sure that there have been many things said here this afternoon on both sides of the aisle that are really food for thought. I am certain that with the President's message tomorrow that he will give us, sincerely and without passion, a task and a duty to perform. I feel that a great legislative body that we are, a legislative Government that is looked upon for leadership throughout the world today, has a mission to perform. We should not grope for lack of vision and we should measure up to the task that is ours. We must face realistically conditions as they are today. No amount of apology, no amount of dodging, no amount of trying to shake the finger at one side or the other will be the answer to the question. The challenge is here. It is, What are we going to do with the conditions from now on in? That responsibility faces us now—today, and in the succeeding days of this special session. Let us measure up to our responsibility. The public awaits our answer. Failure to act in itself is a declaration of policy. The challenge is with us, the Members of Congress. How shall we meet it?

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 411. An act for the relief of Ghetel Polak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 10 years old); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 543. An act to confer jurisdiction on the States of North Dakota and South Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 617. An act for the relief of Richard T. Charett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1301. An act for the relief of Alfonso Felici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1691. An act for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1872. An act for the relief of Jose Babace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1973. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1982. An act for the relief of Herman A. Bennink; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1995. An act for the relief of George Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2049. An act for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2050. An act for the relief of Gracy Mariluch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2054. An act for the relief of Engebert Axer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2075. An act for the relief of Wisia Paryzenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2235. An act for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2299. An act for the relief of Ella L. Browning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2339. An act to prohibit the mailing of propaganda disseminated by agents of foreign principals unless the source of such propaganda is identified therein; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2360. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2382. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2504. An act for the relief of Horace J. Fenton, former associate professor at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2524. An act for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2551. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2605. An act for the relief of the widow of Robert V. Holland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2662. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2677. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to clerks in air-mail field railway post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2686. An act to establish the Navajo-Hopi Administration, to provide for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2691. An act authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 2726. An act for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2764. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2810. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired members of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2831. An act to authorize the coordination of emergency and relief activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2850. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1668. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1669. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of a submarine chaser to the University of North Carolina Institute of Fisheries, State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1670. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of the number of professors and instructors and the amount of compensation for each employed at the United States Naval Postgraduate School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1671. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture advising that he is withdrawing his request for the voluntary plan for the conservation of grain by the brewing industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1672. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for the United States Atomic Energy Commission projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1673. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for warm-air heating equipment for residential housing and copies of the requests for compliance therewith which the Secretary of Commerce has issued to various steel producers and steel consumers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1674. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report on the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and the program for purchase and sale of tin metal in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1675. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, transmitting the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Federal Housing Administration, for the calendar year 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1676. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1677. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a recommendation in the form of an amendment to section 4 (g) of the Communications Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1678. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report entitled "The Merger Movement: A Summary Report"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1679. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting one copy of the report, Production of Electric Energy and Capacity of Generating Plants in the United States for the year 1946, and one copy of the report, Power Market Survey, Colorado River, Upper Basin, Part 1—Power Requirements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1680. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report on manufacture and distribution of farm implements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1681. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report on international steel cartels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1682. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "The International Electrical Equipment Cartel"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1683. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request that the case of Angele Charlotte Douthe, nee Rivis, or Simone Rivis, or Simone Douhte, be withdrawn from those now before Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1684. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request that the case of Viggo John Schmidt be withdrawn from those now before Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1685. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request that the case of Armando Pinto y Bisquerra be withdrawn from those now before Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1686. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a request that the case of Camilo Crestes Rafael Faneral y Bertini be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1687. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 10 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in the Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1688. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of all claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), for the period July 1, 1947, to the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1689. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1690. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Post Office Department under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act during the fiscal year 1947-48; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1691. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting Report No. 15 of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1692. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1693. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Forty-seventh Annual Report of the Governor of Puerto Rico, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1694. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one certified copy of each of the ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1695. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1696. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a volume containing the acts of the fourth regular session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, February 9 to April 15, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1697. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a joint resolution adopted by the Eighth Guam Congress on June 5, 1948, which permits and authorizes the printing and issuance of Liberation Day memorial stamps on July 21, 1948, to commemorate the fourth anniversary of the liberation of Guam; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1698. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty-inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1947; the number of pieces procured, the estimated mailings, and the estimated cost by departments and agencies for the period July 1, 1947, to March 31, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1699. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 11, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., with a view to improvements at Muscatine, Iowa, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 21, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 733); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1700. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of findings on a plan for the development of the Gooseberry project, Utah, together with related data and letters of comment on the report; to the Committee on Public Works.

1701. A letter from the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Fourth Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, as required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

On June 29, 1948.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Select Committee to Investigate Commodity Transactions. Preliminary report of speculative transactions on commodity markets by employees and officials of the United States Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 2449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 7031. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 7032. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 7033. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 7034. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 7035. A bill making an additional appropriation to carry out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, to provide for the construction of one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7036. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on fermented malt liquors, provide for the establishment of brewery bottling house on brewery premises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 7037. A bill to provide emergency relief for livestock farmers in drought-stricken areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 7038. A bill to amend the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 so that the pay increase granted by such act shall apply to officers and employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 7039. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the ninetieth anniversary of the beginning of the petroleum industry in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Bankruptcy Act so as to reserve to the States authority over the service, operation, and rates of railroads reorganized under said act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States favoring a comprehensive program of merchant shipbuilding in this country and expanding our merchant marine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 7040. A bill for the relief of Jose Jamie Kohn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7041. A bill for the relief of Francesco Benintende; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7042. A bill for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2117. By the SPEAKER: Petition of American Federation of Women's Auxiliaries of Labor, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to proceeding of fourth convention of the American Federation of Women's Auxiliaries of Labor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2118. Also, petition of Adam Daniel and others, of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to making such necessary representations to England as will bring about the end of the partition of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2119. Also, petition of President Fernando Leon de Vivero, of Peru, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to expression of profound condolence of the passing of Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2120. Also, petition of Hector J. Campora, President of the House of Deputies, Buenos Aires, Argentina, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to notifying the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives that the House of Deputies of Argentina paid hearty homage to the anniversary of the independence of their great brother country, the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2121. Also, petition of Kaminskis V. & Ritums H., Esslingen a. N., Germany, United States zone, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a booklet entitled "We Accuse the Eastern Power of Despotism—the Western Ones of Indifference," asking for support in the abolishment of the inhuman terror as is executed by the Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2122. Also, petition of Greek-American Parliamentary Group, of Athens, Greece, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the Fourth of July; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2123. Also, petition of Leroy Switzer, Illinois State Penitentiary, Menard, Ill., petitioning consideration of his petition for a writ of habeas corpus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2124. Also, petition of Nicholas J. Curtis, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to a redress of grievance according to the provisions of the decision of the board of review in the case of Nicholas J. Curtis against Phillip Forman, United States district judge, district of New Jersey, and Guy L. Fake, United States district judge, district of New Jersey, Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2125. Also, petition of the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Virgin Island Company, St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2126. Also, petition of the secretary, Lions International, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to favoring statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2127. Also, petition of Manhattan Wallace Committee, New York 16, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to demanding the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

2128. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to an amendment to the Wigglesworth bill, H. R. 6829; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2129. By Mr. EATON: Joint resolution of the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to proceed with all possible dispatch to the preparation and adoption of necessary legislation designed to encourage and make adequately effectual a comprehensive program of merchant shipbuilding in this country's shipyards and expanding our merchant marine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JULY 9, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George L. Reid, Jr.	Clerk	$4,999.98
Joseph O. Parker	Attorney	4,999.98
Dr. Walter W. Wilcox	Economic consultant.	1,027.77
John J. Heimburger	Research specialist	4,762.08
Hugh H. Soper	do	3,811.20
Fred R. Benham	Attorney	1,313.47
Katherine Wheeler	Assistant clerk	2,999.10
Mae Toole	Stenographer	786.25
Mary Elizabeth Laxton	do	1,545.44
Lorraine Adamson	do	1,823.58
Ruth B. Phillips	do	824.68

(H. Res. 298 and H. Res. 317 of the 80th Cong., 1st sess., authorized and appropriated $25,000 for the House Committee on Agriculture to conduct hearings, studies and investigations by the committee acting as a whole or by a subcommittee, H. Res. 676, 80th Cong., 2d sess., appropriated an additional $5,000, making a total of $30,000. The funds so appropriated have been used for traveling expenses, hotel and other expenses of the committee in conducting hearings in the various parts of the United States. No personnel has been employed from these funds.)

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	10,964.32
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	8,303.31
Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	19,267.63
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	10,732.37

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JULY 15, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey	The clerk	$4,999.98
Kenneth Sprankle	The assistant clerk	4,999.98
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk.	4,827.90
Arthur Orr	Assistant clerk	4,498.68
R. E. Lambert	do	4,498.68
Corbal D. Orescan	do	4,498.68
Robert F. Williams	do	4,169.52
Paul M. Wilson	do	4,169.52
Claude E. Hobbs, Jr.	do	3,511.20
Jay B. Howe	do	3,511.20
Bert J. Skinnard	Junior assistant clerk.	2,556.16
Lawrence C. Miller	do	2,144.34
Earl C. Silsby	Clerk-stenographer	1,523.58
John D. Cook	do	343.81
Melvin E. Lefever	do	1,316.70
Watson L. Cormier	do	416.96
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger	1,440.84
Frank B. Avery	Page	1,119.20
William H. Jahn	Clerk to minority	4,527.75
Dorothy Davis	Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member.	1,730.52
Dorothy E. Henry	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman.	1,730.52
Charlotte B. Plumley	do	1,730.52
Eleanor L. Fox	do	1,153.68
Mary Jane Fisher	do	576.84
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	do	1,730.52
Marjorie H. Van Riper.	do	576.84
Veronica Strozak	do	1,730.52
David Phillips	do	1,730.52
Molly J. Turner	do	1,730.52
Helen Kenehtel	do	1,730.52
Dorothy Lydic	do	288.42
G. Homer Skarin	do	1,442.10
Vivian I. Raber	do	1,730.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$165,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	63,893.26
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	78,589.24
Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	142,882.50
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	22,417.50

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIVE STAFF)

JULY 15, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert E. Lee	Chief investigator	$4,498.68
Harris H. Huston	Investigator	3,511.20
James J. Kerr	do	3,511.20
Harry S. Barger	do	3,511.20
Eugene F. Rinta	do	3,511.20
Enid Morrison	Legal clerk	2,144.34
Jean R. Morrow	Clerk-stenographer	129.30
Mildred E. McGinnis	do	1,440.84
Laura J. Ames	do	365.75
Pamela C. Farakerley	do	65.84
Hazel M. Hall	do	431.59
Marjorie Dickey	do	16.16
Mary H. Smock	do	49.40
Margaret P. Mac-Vicker	do	137.37
Pamela C. Farakerley	do	121.22
Christobel J. Dodge	do	347.49
Alden C. Fensel	Investigator (special employee).	1,216.22
William C. Meyer	do	1,614.67
Theodore H. Smith	do	838.77
Arthur R. Stone	do	1,132.36
Cliff K. Titus	do	1,850.60
Charles H. Towne	do	735.93
Clarence L. Turner	do	1,090.43
Wallace G. Kileen	do	1,782.42
Arch D. Schultz	do	419.39
William H. Stauffer	do	272.61
J. S. Seidman	do	419.38
C. Oliver Wellington	do	146.78
J. M. Ashton	do	629.09
Edward A. Kracke	do	1,803.36
Albert P. Learned	do	629.09
E. B. Nutt	do	880.70
Thomas J. Quinn	do	1,656.58
Arthur R. Roberts	do	587.13
George E. Slipway	do	503.26
Paul L. Tracy	do	1,006.53
A. J. Watson	do	943.61
Tom Worthan	do	1,027.50
Arch D. Schultz	do	601.98
Wilfred H. Sigerson	do	1,656.66
George A. Hewitt	do	671.02
Arthur J. McCrary	do	1,530.78
Gordon W. Blair	do	1,216.24
Benjamin S. Simmons	do	1,782.42
Reimbursement to—U. S. Treasury Department.	For services of special employee, J. Robert Brown.	2,038.41
Federal Bureau of Investigation.	For services of special employees: James E. Nugent, $3,397; R. C. Gresham, $2,957.10.	6,354.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	41,171.29
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948	64,670.38
Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	105,841.67
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	44,158.33

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

JULY 6, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert H. Harper	Chief Clerk	$4,999.12
James Deakins	Assistant clerk	1,597.17
Townsend W. Hoopes	Assistant to the chairman.	3,708.68
John R. Blandford	Professional staff member.	4,345.11
Clinton B. D. Brown	do	4,191.47
Bryce N. Harlow	do	4,345.11
Robert W. Smart	do	4,345.11
Agnes H. Johnston	Secretary	2,986.84
Rosemary Curry	Stenographer	1,879.95
Gladys E. Flannigan	Stenographer (investigation staff).	1,516.68
Bernice Kalinowski	Stenographer	1,879.95

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	2,707.44
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1948	2,482.50
Total amount expended from July 25, 1947, to June 30, 1948	5,189.94
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	19,810.06

W. G. ANDREWS,
Chairman.

BANKING AND CURRENCY

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink	Technical staff director	$4,367.04
William J. Hallahan	Clerk	4,103.64
Elsie L. Gould	Deputy clerk	3,397.39
Margaret P. Battle	Stenographer	2,144.34
Mary W. Layton	do	219.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, none.	

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Mabel G. Haller	Executive secretary (clerk).	$4,109.55
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Minority clerk	3,511.20
Ruth Pingley	Stenographer	2,144.34

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, none.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, *Chairman.*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOME RULE AND REORGANIZATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George B. Galloway	Staff director	$4,999.98
Clarence M. Pierce	Assistant staff director.	4,103.70
Geraldine W. Eaker	Stenographer (January, February, March).	727.32

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	11,328.87
Amount expended from Dec. 31, 1947, to May 31, 1948	9,244.94
Total amount expended	20,773.81
Balance unexpended as of May 31, 1948	9,226.19

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, *Chairman.*

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

JULY 2, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
W. Manly Sheppard	Chief clerk	$5,000.00
F. Albert Reiman	Assistant clerk (professional staff).	5,000.00
Irving G. McCann	Chief counsel (professional staff).	5,000.00
Frank S. McArthur	Investigator (professional staff).	5,000.00
Bingham W. Mathias	Minority clerk (professional staff).	5,000.00
Jennie Ward Carter	Clerk-stenographer	2,433.96
Mary Pauline Smith	do	2,433.96
Mary Ellen Gilbert	do	2,433.96
Myrtle S. Locher	do	2,433.96
Frances A. Los	Clerk-stenographer (minority).	2,433.96
Special employees pursuant to H. Res. 111		
Henry A. Bates	Investigator	1,417.27
John O. Graham	do	4,000.00
Kenneth P. Dilion	Special counsel	543.88
Agnes Ainilian	Clerk-stenographer	2,433.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Total amount expended from Jan. 2 to June 30, 1948	19,288.61
Balance unexpended	30,711.39

FRED A. HARTLEY, JR., *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JULY 12, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Annual base salary rate during 6-month period
Helen M. Balog	Clerk-stenographer	$3,700.00
Helen M. Boyer	Clerk	6,000.00
Dolores Fel'Dotto	Clerk-stenographer	2,900.00
Carl E. Hoffman	Professional	6,000.00
Hazel Huffman	Investigator	6,200.00
Francis T. O'Donnell	Professional	6,000.00
George H. Perkins	Investigator, Jan. 13 through Apr. 20, 1948.	4,400.00
Martha C. Roland	Clerical	3,700.00
Lawrence Sullivan	Professional, Jan. 1 through May 31, 1948.	7,365.00
William A. Young	Professional	5,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$8,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	775.07
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	434.94
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	1,210.01
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	5,289.99

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXTRA-LEGAL ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JULY 12, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
None (all work done by staff of full committee)		

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$40,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	5,867.41
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	4,517.19
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	10,384.60
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	29,615.40

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

PROCUREMENT AND BUILDINGS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Benjamin J. Brooks	Special counsel, Apr. 22 to May 31.	$666.34
Peter Coleman	Stenographer, Jan. 1 to June 30.	1,207.46
Virginia Craft	Investigator, June 1 to June 30.	357.39
Jane Deem	Stenographer, Apr. 23 to June 30.	296.65
Marion Galland	Secretary to counsel, Mar. 10 to June 30.	1,040.46
Henry H. Glassie	Chief counsel, Jan. 12 to June 30.	3,757.19
Betty Judd	Typist, June 1 to June 30.	185.16
Fritzie Manual	Investigator, Jan. 1 to June 30.	3,006.42
Saul G. Stillman	Associate counsel, Mar. 1 to June 30.	2,340.80
C. D. Terry	Chief Clerk, Jan. 1 to June 30.	3,931.98
Gertrude Weber	Investigator, Jan. 1 to June 30.	2,499.50
Jon Magnusson	Investigator, Mar. 5 to Apr. 17.	774.20
Robert Brown	Special counsel, Jan. 1 to Feb. 29.	1,024.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure:	
First session	$40,000.00
Second session	40,000.00
Supplemental	15,000.00
Total	95,000.00
Amount expended	50,712.40
Balance unexpended	44,287.60

GEORGE H. BENDER, *Chairman.*

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE ACTIVITIES OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
None		

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$10,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	92.70
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	882.43
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	975.13
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	9,024.87

J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
Chairman.

SURPLUS PROPERTY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Edmond J. Donohue, Jr.	General counsel, Jan. 1 to June 15.	$3,794.63
George L. Quinn, Jr.	Special Counsel, Mar. 16 to June 15.	2,074.29
Harold S. Harrison	Associate counsel, Apr. 12 to May 15.	600.44
Joseph C. Lewis	Associate counsel, Apr. 12 to May 15.	600.44
Paul F. Morrison	Chief Investigator, Jan. 1 to June 15.	3,015.86
Edward E. Fine, Jr.	Investigator, Jan. 1 to June 15.	1,065.64
Elmer B. Solomon	Investigator, Mar. 1 to June 15.	1,492.26
Abe Lincoln Mahony	Investigator, Mar. 5 to 14.	101.62
J. V. Falvey	Investigator, Apr. 1 June 9.	1,896.87
Kathryn E. Smith	Chief Clerk, Jan. 1 to May 31.	1,758.20
Anna-Marie Hogin	Stenographer, Jan. 1 to June 30.	1,937.40
Mary Donna Long	Stenographer, Jan. 1 to 31.	288.42

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$90,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	58,806.42
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	29,771.90
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	88,578.32
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	1,421.68

ROSS RIELEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Clerk and administrative officer.	$5,000.00
George Pettee	Staff assistant	5,000.00
Charles B. Marshall	do	5,000.00
John W. Easton	do	5,000.00
Howard S. Piquet	do	4,944.44
June Nigh	do	2,144.34
Winifred Osborne	do	2,558.16
Doris Leone	do	2,144.34
Mabel Henderson	do	1,799.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	23,819.85
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	15,612.16
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	39,432.01
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	85,576.99

CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Marjorie Savage	Clerk, Committee on House Administration.	$3,379.50
Frank J. Specht	Assistant clerk, Committee on House Administration.	3,247.86
Jack Watson	do	3,247.86
Irene Gilchrist	do	1,937.40
Gladys Rizer	do	1,937.40
Maureen B. Sandiford	do	1,937.40
George P. Forbes, Jr.[1]	Counsel, Subcommittee on Elections of Committee on House Administration.	877.80

[1] Served May 15 to June 30, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, none.

K. M. LECOMPTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
CLERICAL STAFF		
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$4,999.98
Marjorie A. Biddle	Assistant clerk	2,144.34
Royce Reno	do	2,144.34
Georgia G. Glasmann	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	2,020.14
Julia Watterson	Assistant clerk-stenographer, from Jan. 15, 1948.	1,863.00
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	1,454.64
PROFESSIONAL STAFF		
Arlin E. Stockburger	Aviation and engineering consultant.	4,999.98
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	4,999.98
Kurt Borchardt	Professional assistant.	4,199.23
John H. Frederick	Consultant	3,642.84
ADDITIONAL STAFF PERSONNEL		
Martha E. Wright	Stenographer, from Feb. 2, 1948.	1,432.48
Alice M. Dodd	Stenographer, June 3 to 21, 1948.	191.30

The following additional amounts have been expended from the appropriation under H. Res. 163—Transportation survey:

Western Union Telegraph Co., January 1948	$16.54
The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., February 1948	3.10
House stationery room, March 1948	90.41
The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., March 1948	1.15
The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., March 1948	2.85
The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., April 1948	1.10
Majority room, S. Molinen (stencils) May 1948	27.50
House stationery room, June 1948	267.20

The above additional staff personnel is pursuant to H. Res. 63—Transportation survey.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	10,095.32
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to July 1, 1948	2,663.72
Total amount expended from June 30, 1947, to July 1, 1948	12,759.24
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1948	22,240.76

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
C. Murray Bernhardt	Chief clerk	$4,498.73
Velma Smedley	Assistant chief clerk	4,199.55
Walter R. Lee	Claims specialist	3,311.20
Walter M. Besterman	Clerk-stenographer	2,591.51
Anne J. Berger	do	2,006.40
Frances Christy	do	1,963.41
Harriet B. Lamb	do	2,006.40

SCHEDULE A

1. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:		
A. Unexpended balance Jan. 1, 1947, preparation of new edition of United States Code, 1944–46		$479.93
B. Unexpended balance Jan. 1, 1947, preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year)		[1] 101,730.71
C. Revision of the laws, 1947		[2] 8,000.00
D. Revision of the laws, 1948		10,000.00
Total		119,809.61
2. Amount previously expended during period covered by prior reports:		
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code, 1944–46	0	
B. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year)	54,419.08	
C. Revision of the laws, 1947	0	
D. Revision of the laws, 1948	0	
Total		54,419.08
3. Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1948:		
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code, 1944–46	0	
B. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year)	0	
C. Revision of the laws, 1947	0	
D. Revision of the laws, 1948	4,959.54	
Total		4,959.54

[1] Unexpended balance returned to Treasury.
[2] Including $12,000 appropriated Mar. 22, 1947 (Public Law 25).

SCHEDULE A—continued

4. Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948:		
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code, 1944–46	0	
B. Preparation of new edition of United States code (no year)	$51,419.08	
C. Revision of the laws, 1947	0	
D. Revision of the laws, 1948	4,959.54	
Total		56,378.62
5. Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948:		
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code, 1944–46		[1] 79.90
B. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year)		47,311.63
C. Revision of the laws, 1947		[2] 8,000.00
D. Revision of the laws, 1948		5,040.46
Total		[3] 60,431.99

[1] Unexpended balance returned to Treasury.
[2] Of this amount, $43,120.36 was returned to the Treasury, leaving an available balance of $47,311.63 as of July 1, 1948.

EARL C. MICHENER,
Chairman.

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JULY 13, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Gus S. Caras	Professional staff	$3,774.54
Elizabeth B. Bedell	Chief clerk	2,834.04
Leonard P. Pliska	Clerk	1,776.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	3,104.37
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	761.67
Total amount expended	3,866.04
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	46,133.96

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

JULY 12, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George M. Moore	Chief counsel	$4,999.02
Frederick C. Belen	Counsel	4,498.08
Lucy K. Daley	Assistant clerk	2,006.40
Elayne Morelle	Secretary	1,799.46
Lillian Hopkins	do	1,661.52
Margaret Barnes	do	1,592.58
Barbara Blakesley	Stenographer	182.88

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Employed under H. Res. 176		
Edward J. McCormack	Chief, studies and investigations.	$4,999.54
Albert Briggs	Statistical clerk	772.14
Ann Hayden	Secretary	355.57
Nan Clark	Stenographer	88.90
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		9,123.42
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948		17,364.96
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948		26,488.38
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948		23,511.62

EDWARD H. REES,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

JULY 12, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George H. Soule	Mining expert	$4,611.09
Ernest A. Grant	Clerk	5,000.00
Claude A. Ragan	do	2,000.10
Nancy J. Arnold	do	2,006.10
Gemma M. O'Brien	do	2,006.10
Forrest Reeve	do	2,006.10
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 94)		$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		11,480.17
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948		2,231.58
Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948		13,711.75
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1948		11,288.25

RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert F. McConnell	Clerk of committee	$2,971.98
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.	Professional staff member.	4,006.53
Joseph H. McGann, Jr.	Minority clerk	2,144.34
Mrs. Vera Watts	Stenographer-clerk	2,489.19
Mrs. Elaine Jackson	do	2,489.19
Mrs. Violet V. Young	do	2,489.19
SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING QUESTIONABLE TRADE PRACTICES		
John T. M. Reddan	Counsel	$4,749.96
E. R. Ferguson, Jr.	Assistant counsel	3,355.14
Martin O. Hanson	Chief investigator	1,658.07
Charles F. Meany	Investigator-accountant.	2,406.17
Arthur Perlman	Investigator	2,519.96
George G. Vlk	do	2,471.94
Walton Woods	do	2,759.41
Joseph M. Mannix	do	2,705.77
Herbert J. Cooney	do	1,887.67
Jay S. Hartzell	do	1,354.22
William E. Davis	do	451.03
Doris M. Mahood	Stenographer-clerk	1,776.30
Dorothy B. Hayward	do	1,479.54
Catherine C. Hubbard	do	1,038.27
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		12,303.95
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30		44,460.79
Total amount expended to June 30		56,766.74
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 30, 1948		68,233.26

GEO. A. DONDERO,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JULY 1, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Lyle O. Snader	Clerk	$4,999.98
Donald O. Montgomery.	Assistant clerk	2,971.98
Humphrey Scott Shaw.	Minority clerk	2,709.84
Jane E. Wright	Assistant clerk-stenotypist.	2,694.77
Mildred M. McGuire	Stenographer (entered on duty May 1, 1948).	457.28
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, none.		

LEO E. ALLEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
HOUSE PAY ROLL		
Robert E. Stripling	Chief investigator	$4,999.98
Benjamin Mandel	Director of research	4,270.24
Louis E. Russell	Investigator	4,153.05
Donald T. Appell	do	3,642.84
John W. Carrington	Minority clerk	3,642.84
Anne D. Turner	File clerk	3,511.20
Rosella A. Purdy	Clerk-stenographer	2,885.72
Carolyn Graham	File clerk	2,282.28
Juliette Joray	Clerk-stenographer	2,144.34
Margaret S. Kerwan	do	2,144.34
VOUCHER PAY ROLL		
Virginia Allen	Clerk-typist	2,144.34
Jo Benisch	do	2,144.34
Jean D. Carey	Clerk-stenographer	2,144.34
Lucille Fitzgerald	File clerk	2,144.34
Lillian E. Howard	Research clerk	2,144.34
Mary E. McFarran	Clerk-stenographer	2,144.34
Lorraine M. Nichols	do	2,144.34
Thelma I. Scearce	do	2,144.34
Ruth Tansill	do	747.38
Jacqueline Ilif	do	714.78
Peggy Shaw	Clerk-typist	2,144.34
Catherine Lee Crews	do	690.93
Sadie C. Cagle	do	353.50
Alice Elaine Walker	do	774.34
Lucille Lowther	do	857.73
Lois Marie Padberg	do	1,523.58
Helen Irene Mattson	Research clerk	2,144.34
Ann W. Kelliher	Clerk-typist	774.34
Mary Ann Moffett	Research clerk	833.90
Alvin W. Stokes	Investigator	3,511.20
William A. Wheeler	do	3,642.84
Robert B. Gaston	do	3,642.84
Walter Wieczerzak	do	1,983.32
James H. Walter	do	782.41

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:	
Jan. 30, 1947	$50,000
Apr. 2, 1947	50,000
Mar. 9, 1948	200,000
Total	300,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	84,572.73
Amount unexpended Jan. 1, 1948	15,427.27
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	41,335.14
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	141,335.14
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	158,664.86

J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JULY 6, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Karl Standish	Chief Clerk	$5,000.00
Bessie N. Kenyon	Assistant clerk	3,840.37
Louise M. Peter	Clerical staff	2,148.34
Frances Montanye	do	2,148.34
Mary C. Schmidt	do	2,148.34
George J. Turner	do	2,098.34
Casey M. Jones	Professional aide	5,000.00
Edwin B. Patterson	do	5,000.00
Ida Rowan	do	4,169.55

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	8,964.61
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	1,807.69
Total amount expended from Apr. 2, 1947 to June 30	10,772.60
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	13,491.00

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
CLERICAL STAFF		
Gordon Grand, Jr.	Lawyer	$1,899.44
T. J. Polsky (Schnitz)	Assistant clerk	3,511.23
Gladys L. Kullberg	Stenographer	2,144.34
Dan E. Larson	Stenographer and accountant	1,964.00
Susan Taylor	Stenographer	1,899.05
Margie Halsey	do	1,899.05
Sam Hardy	Messenger	1,111.00
Hughlon Greene	do	1,111.00
Harry Parker	Retired messenger	1,188.00
PROFESSIONAL STAFF		
Lynn L. Stratton	Tax adviser	5,000.00
Serge Benson	Lawyer-economist	4,498.73
Charles W. Davis	Lawyer	4,169.55
James A. Tawney	do	4,498.73

Special Tax Study Committee:	
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	2,457.91
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	22,542.09

HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Edward Ames	Consultant	$624.81
Barbara Berry	Economic analyst	951.45
John R. Burton, Jr.	Consultant	222.22
Blanche Dell	Secretary	687.61
Nathalie J. W. Fallon	Clerk-typist	610.20
Carl J. Friedrich	Consultant	416.65
Theodore Geiger	do	2,861.04
Charles R. Gellner	International relations librarian	657.01
Edwin B. George	Consultant	1,560.00
Dorothy I. Gray	Secretary	1,011.12
Maurice H. Hellner	Consultant	190.59
Robert J. Landry	do	[1] 144.13
Phyllis H. Leuchtenburg	Secretary-executive assistant	1,366.69
Franklin A. Lindsay	Consultant	2,666.59
Samuel Lubell	do	416.66
Max F. Millikan	do	557.74
Dorothy S. Nellson	Secretary	178.60
Wallace Parks	Consultant	1,297.08
Winfield W. Riefler	do	55.55
John Kerr Rose	Geographer analyst	366.35
Frances K. Topping	Secretary-economist	[1] 705.44
Fulton Want, Jr.	Clerk-typist	141.71
Emily Whitman	Secretary	1,429.56
Rose Mary Woods	do	762.36

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	81,682.81
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	31,868.51
Total amount expended from July 27, 1947, to June 30, 1948	113,551.32
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	11,448.68
Plus credits	129.36
Total	11,578.04

CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NEWSPRINT AND PAPER SUPPLY

JULY 12, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Alyce E. Warren	Clerk	$1,523.58

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	5,929.22
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	1,679.19
Total amount expended from Mar. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	7,608.41
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	17,391.59

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE COMMODITY TRANSACTIONS

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Golden N. Dagger	Chief counsel	$4,389.00
Charles D. Budd	Investigator	2,006.40
Bertram M. Long	do	2,006.40
Marie E. Wolff	Secretary	1,666.03

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:	
H. Res. 407, Dec. 19, 1947	$25,000.00
H. Res. 674, June 18, 1948	10,000.00
Total	35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended	None
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	12,263.00
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	22,737.00

AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Chairman, Select Committee To Investigate Commodity Transactions.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
H. Ralph Burton	General counsel, Apr. 15 to June 30.	$1,899.44
William E. Murray	Chief investigator, Apr. 15 to June 30.	1,503.68
Robert B. Barker	Investigator, Apr. 15 to June 30.	1,482.51
Walter K. Van Olinda	do	1,482.51
Catherine Fadely	Stenographer, May 5 to June 5.	333.65
LaRue Dickson	Typist, May 19 to June 30.	339.41
Kathryn E. Smith	Chief clerk, June 1 to 30.	357.39
J. V. Falvey	Investigator, June 10 to 30.	346.73

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$40,000.00
Total amount expended from Apr. 15, to June 30, 1948	8,937.51
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	31,062.49

ROSS RIZLEY,
Chairman.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the second calendar quarter of 1948.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name ----------
Business address ----------

INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM PERSONS REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:
(1) ----------
(2) In whose interest he appears or works:
(2) ----------
(3) The duration of such employment:
(3) ----------
(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:
(4) ----------
(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:
(5) ----------
(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:
(6) ----------
(7) What expenses are to be included:
(7) ----------
See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name ----------
Business address ----------

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:
(1) ----------
(2) To whom paid:
(2) ----------
(3) For what purposes:
(3) ----------
(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:
(4) ----------
(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:
(5) ----------

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the second calendar quarter 1948, and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B. (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

American Association of University Women, The,[1] 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) Represents its general membership. (3) [Blank.] (4) Receives no money for legislative activities—legislative information prepared for membership from general fund used for preparing all of association's study materials for its members. (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) Only expenses for preparing mimeographing, and mailing informational materials to members.

Austern, H. Thomas, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, B. C., Canada. (2) British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, B. C., Canada. (3) Indefinite. (4) This is an attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis, computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services, to advise concerning pending legislation which may affect Canadian fisheries. (5) British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, B. C., Canada. (6) Actual expenses incurred. (7) Traveling expenses, within the District of Columbia, telephone, and telegram.

Ayer & Son, N. W., Inc., a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y. (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., is employed as publicity counsel by National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Registrant is engaged by National Association of Electric Companies to furnish the association with consulting service on public relations and services in connection with publicity affecting the electrical industry. The arrangement does not contemplate that registrant shall engage in lobbying as that term is commonly understood and registrant is not engaged, and does not propose to engage, in lobbying. Under the arrangement registrant may, however, engage in publicity work which may aid or influence the passage or defeat of legislation pending from time to time before the Congress of the United States and affecting the electric industry. Registrant is also exposed to the risk that its publicity service, though not engaged in for the purpose of so aiding or influencing action by legislators, will, nevertheless, be held to have such purpose. Registrant does not believe that its proposed activities come within the purview of the Lobbying Act and files this registration solely for self-protection and to avoid the penalties of the act and with full reservation of all rights. (3) Registrant is engaged on a month to month basis. (4) The association pays N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., $2,100 per month plus a 16⅔ percent commission on printing, photographs, and like expenditures; and also miscellaneous expenses. (5) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., is paid by National Association of Electric Companies and the individual registrants are paid by N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (6) The expenses are estimated at an average of $200 per month exclusive of any expenses on any special work. (7) Principally mimeographing, printing, traveling, and miscellaneous expenses.

Banigan, Leon F., 1015 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The registrant believes that this registration is not required by him by the terms and intent of the act but files this registration as a precaution to comply fully with the requirements to the extent if any that it might be held applicable and valid. Registrant is employed as managing director of the National Council of Private Motor Truck Owners, Inc., a New York corporation, with headquarters at Suite 1015, National Press Building, Washington, D. C. My employment is not principally for the purpose of or necessarily in any part for the purpose of influencing legislation. My principal duties involve management of association affairs and rendering of informational services to the membership of this organization regarding various legislative, regulatory, trade, and other activities affecting their operations as private motor-truck owners. This includes the issuance of bulletins and various other informational services, publications, statistical reviews, etc. (2) Registrant would appear or work on legislative problems in the interest of private motortruck owners. (3) My employment is on contract subject to termination on 60 days' notice by the board of directors or by myself. (4) Registrant has received no compensation and none has been determined with respect to such duties as I may or may not have assigned to me which would involve principally the influencing of legislation. (5) See item 4. (6) See item 7. (7) Registrant receives remuneration for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in traveling and so forth. There is no predetermined expense allocation.

Barnard, Robert C., 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Cooley, Crowley & Gaither, 393 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Owren, doing business under the name of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., Mills Building, San Francisco, Calif. (3) Employed to render professional legal services, and the services, being professional, could be terminated at any time. (4) Normal professional fee. (5) Cooley, Crowley & Gaither. (6) Actual out of pocket disbursements. (7) Normal office expenses, such as telephone, telegraph, taxi fares, and mail expenses.

Beeks, William T., 111 Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Evans, McLaren, Lane, Powell & Beeks, 111 Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash. (2) Alaska Freight Express Corp., pier 50, Seattle, Wash. (3) Indefinite. (4) Compensation will depend on duration of employment at rates not yet fixed. (5) Alaska Freight Express Corp. (6) Reimbursement for ordinary expenses such as travel, lunches, telephones, taxies, etc. (7) Travel, lunches, telephones, taxies, etc.

Bennett, Irving, Ketchum, Inc., Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Ketchum, Inc., Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (2) National Education Association. (3) April 20 to June 15, 1948. (4) Part of fee paid to Ketchum, Inc. (5) Ketchum, Inc. (6) Refund of actual expenses. (7) Travel, meals, cabs, hotel bills, tips, and usual personal expenses.

Bennett, Jess B., 625 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Braniff Airways, Inc., Love Field, Dallas, Tex. (2) The above company. (3) Permanently employed for contacts in Washington, D. C., and in the capitols of South America. (4) Salary, $9,000 annually. (5) Braniff Airways, Inc. (6) Reimbursed for taxi fares and an occasional

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

meal while on duty in Washington. (7) Only those listed in (6) above.

Berger, Robert L., 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinite, no fixed term. (4) One payment of $250. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

Berns, Tell, 10525 Carnegie Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 10525 Carnegie Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) The United States Machine Tool Industry. (3) Continuous since 1937. (4) $25,000 per year. (5) Above association. (6) Actual out-of-pocket traveling expenses only—average about $150 per week. (7) Only actual traveling expenses.

Blair, Newell, 421 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant is vice president and director of Cardin Mining & Milling Corp., Picher, Okla. (2) Same as (1) and other operators of tailing mills in the tri-State district. (3) Indefinite. (4) To be determined upon outcome of legislation. (5) Cardin Mining & Milling Corp. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, telephone, telegraph, taxis, entertainment.

Boorde,[1] Thomas A., 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) General Welfare Federation of America, Inc., 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Behalf of old-folks retirement under Social Security Act (extension and liberalization). (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary. Travel and other incidental expenses. (5) General Welfare Federation of America, Inc. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel, hotel, telegrams, and telephone, taxi, etc.

Bromsen,[1] Archibald, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) The Railroad Pension Conference, P. O. box 798, New Haven, Conn. (2) The Railroad Pension Conference. (3) First compensable employment as of May 1948. (4) To be paid $50 per diem for specific legal services, together with expenses. (5) The Railroad Pension Conference. (6) Approximate, actual expenses incurred. (7) Travel, lodgings, meals, etc.

Buckman, Henry Holland, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md. (1) Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla. (2) Florida Island Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla. (3) Indefinite. (4) Compensation to be on the basis of time spent pro rated from total compensation for all services on normal consultant-client basis. (5) Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla. (6) No arrangement for expenses for this purpose. (7) [Blank.]

Buckman, Henry Holland, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md. (1) Retained by the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (2) The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (3) Indefinite. (4) Compensation to be on the basis of time spent pro rated from total compensation for all services on normal consultant-client basis. (5) The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (6) Reimbursement for telephone calls to the Vulcan Co. only. (7) [Blank.]

Building Products Institute, The, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The institute is not employed by anyone unless working in the interest of its contributors constitutes being employed. Names and addresses of contributors filed with form A. (2) In the interest of its contributors. The Building Products Institute is an organization devoted to economic research and analysis of trends in construction, disseminating its findings to those interested in the construction industry and to the public. However, in view of the uncertain intepretation of certain provisions of the regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes "principal purpose" and the phrase "to influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation, etc.," we are filing this form giving a full disclosure of the information required under the act. (3) Indefinite. (4) Contributions in varying amounts. (5) By the contributors. (6) The amount received from contributions. (7) Offices, staff, legal and administrative fees, public relations counsel, economist, printing, news service, accounting, etc.

Burke, Edward R., 514 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Hawaii Statehood Commission, 740 Eleventh Street, Washington, D. C. (2) Same. (3) Continuing. (4) Annual retainer, $5,000. (5) Hawaii Statehood Commission. (6) None. (7) None.

Leo Burnett Co., Inc., 360 North Michigan, Chicago, Ill. (1) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (3) From November 6, 1944, until termination of relationship. (4) 15 percent of total amount expended by employer through Leo Burnett Co., Inc. (5) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Carey,[1] John L., 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) American Institute of Accountants, the Journal of Accountancy, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Same. (3) Continuous. (4) Total annual salaries, $22,000; less than 10 percent of time spent on legislative work. (5) American Institute of Accountants, the Journal of Accountancy. (6) Only amount of actual disbursement for travel. (7) Travel expenses.

Carpenter, Austin W., Sherburne, N. Y. (1) New York Associated Businessmen, Inc. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary; will be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenditures. (5) Will be reimbursed for actual expenses by New York Associated Businessmen, Inc. (6) Will be reimbursed for expenses incurred; no set amount. (7) Travel, meals, hotel, postage, stationery, printing, telephone, etc.

Carr, Ralph, 614 Symes Building, Denver, Colo. (1) United Indian Traders Association, Inc., Gallup, N. Mex. (2) The above association. (3) Until the completion of work involving pending legislation. (4) $10,000. (5) The above association. (6) $2,000 (not more). (7) Travel expense, living costs away from home and other expenses such as stenographer, printing, and like items.

Carter, Clarence B., P. O. box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) Railroad Pension Conference, P. O. box 798, New Haven, Conn. (2) Membership of Railroad Pension Conference. (3) Indefinite. ((4) Actual expenses. (5) Membership. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses.

Case, Ralph H., Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Allied Aviation Corp., Cockeysville, Md. (2) Same as (1). (3) Eightieth Congress, from and after June 11, 1948. (4) Paid nothing. To receive not over 5 percent of the recovery. (5) Same as (1). (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Chan, Sau Ung, 934 Smith Street, Honolulu, T. H. (1) Chinese Merchants Benevolent Association of Honolulu, T. H., 71 North Hotel Street, Honolulu, T. H. (2) Chinese Merchants Benevolent Association of Honolulu. (3) Approximately 2 months. (4) $7,700. (5) Chinese Merchants Benevolent Association of Honolulu. (6) Expenses are included in $7,700 stated in (4). (7) All expenses, including travel.

Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade,[2] 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) List of committee members attached.[3] (2) Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. (3) Three months. (4) No reimbursement. (5) Contributions solicited for expenses only. (6) $39,100. (7) Professional counsel, printing, mimeographing, distribution of leaflets, news releases, weekly newsletter, travel, telephone, and telegraph.

Clarke, David R., 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Self. (2) National Metal Trades Association, Chicago, Ill., for which he is general counsel. (3) Indefinite. (4) An annual retainer for all legal services rendered of which not over $1,000 (after payment of all office expenses) per year can reasonably be allocated to Federal lobbying. (5) National Metal Trades Association, Chicago, Ill. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Cost of transportation, hotel room, meals, etc., for registrant.

Coles, Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Ingoldsby, Coles & Wright, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Alaska Freight Express Corp., pier 50, Seattle, Wash. (3) Indefinite. (4) Compensation will depend on duration of employment at rates not yet fixed. (5) Alaska Freight Express Corp. (6) Reimbursement for ordinary expenses such as travel, lunches, telephones, taxies, etc. (7) Travel, lunches, telephones, taxies, etc.

Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Members. (2) Communications workers. (3) [Blank.] (4) Per capita dues at 25 cents per member per month. (5) Members. (6) [Blank.] (7) Expenses authorized by executive board.

Courtney, Paul Lawrence, 1025 Vermont NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinitely employed. (4) Not over $1,000 per annum for legislative work (should any be done). (5) National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont NW., Washington, D. C. (6) I am reimbursed for amounts actually incurred and paid by me for travel and other incidental expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel bills and other similar incidental expenses.

Crawford, William A., 536 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) Railroad Association of Georgia, 536 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga. (2) Railroad Association of Georgia and its member roads (member roads are listed in exhibit A,[3] attached as a part of this registration). (3) Continuing. (4) Applicant receives $625 a month which covers compensation for all the work he does for the railroads shown in exhibit A. Only a small part of that work is related to Federal legislation, almost all of his duties being devoted to general public relations activities. Those activities consist almost entirely of local public relations and other service having to do with State matters within the State of Georgia. His compensation is not allocated between Federal legislation work and other activities. (5) Railroad Association of Georgia. (6) Reimbursement of personal expenses incurred in the performance of his duties. (7) Out-of-pocket expenses incurred in his employment, such as taxicab fares, use of personal automobile and other traveling expenses while away from headquarters, including hotel bills, and cost of meals, telephone and telegraph bills, and stenographic or clerical expenses.

Daczkowski, Wallace W., 225 Frankford Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Amputees of World War No. 2, 2225 Frankford Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Amputees of World War No. 2. (3) November 1, 1948. (4) None. (5) No one. (6) None. (7) None.

Damon, Eugene J., 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo. (2) See appendix A.[3] (3) Continuous. (4) See appendix A.[3] (5) See appendix A.[3] (6) Reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses in the performance of his duties. (7) Travel, meals, hotels, postage, telephone, taxi, tips, entertainment, miscellaneous and incidental expenses.

Darby, Frederick R., 3270 Westerville Road, Columbus, Ohio. (1) Work for myself. (2) Self. (3) Period not known, in re S. 2213 until action is completed. (4) Unpaid as yet. (5) Undetermined. (6) Undetermined. (7) Undetermined.

de Quevedo, R. G., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Building Products Institute, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Building Products Institute. (3) Month-to-month beginning October 16, 1946; employed student attending Georgetown University Law School. (4) $350 monthly for secretarial and general office work. (5) Building Products Institute. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses only. (7) Same as item 6 including taxis, streetcars, etc.

Dilweg, LeVern R., 801 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Philippine Veterans' Mission to U. S. A., Manila, Philippine Islands. (2) Philippine Army Veterans. (3) 30 days. (4) $3,750. (5) Same. (6) None. (7) [Blank.]

Disney, Wesley E., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Henry B. Cleereman, Green Bay, Wis. (2) Some as (1) above. (3) Retainer for indefinite period. (4) Retainer of $2,500 with additional fees to be agreed on the basis of work involved and time and effort expended. (5) By person named in (1) above. (6) No expenses involved or to be paid except possible telephone and taxi, reimbursable by clients. No expense account involved or furnished. (7) No expenses to be included except possible telephone or taxi, reimbursable by client. No expense account involved or furnished.

Dow, Fayette B., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for Pipe Line Companies, care of L. H. Kahle, treasurer, box 1349, Tulsa, Okla. (2) Interstate pipe line companies which are subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission and which are represented by Committee for Pipe Line Companies referred to in (1) above. (3) No limitation has been fixed. (4) See statement on Form A, to be filed by Committee for Pipe Line Companies, for purposes and functions of the committee by which deponent is employed. Of total compensation received, paid, and to be received by deponent, the sum of $500 is believed to be a fair apportionment, under present conditions, for services that might be covered by the Lobbying Act. (5) The Committee for Pipe Line Companies, referred to above. (6) No fixed amount; deponent is an attorney and expects to be reimbursed for such expenses as are ordinarily incurred by an attorney for his client. (7) These expenses will include travel, telephone, telegraph, etc. See (6) above.

Drake, John, 1721 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinite; no fixed time. (4) $5,000 per year for all services for the federation including such services, if any, as may be rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (6) Actual expenses. (7) All expenses incident to the employment.

DuBrul, Stephen M., 11-243 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. (2) General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. Registrant is director of the social and economic relations section of the Public Relations Staff of his employer. In addition to his normal duties in the above capacity registrant has also now been authorized by his employer, as circumstances require, to engage in activities on behalf of his employer which, if and when performed, may require registration under the act. Accordingly, registrant is registering so as to be in compliance with the act, if and when he may be so engaged. (3) Monthly. (4) See statement attached.[3] (5) General Motors Corp. (6) See statement attached.[3] (7) See statement attached.[3]

DuBuque, Jean H., 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., suite 1016, Washington, D. C. (1) National Aviation Trades Association, Inc., 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., suite 1016, Washington, D. C. (2) Represents the above association as public relations counsel. Present activities are not believed to be within the purview of the act but registration is submitted in the event future activities should fall within the scope of section 308. (3) Indeterminate; subject to the will of the executive committee of the association. (4) $500 per month retainer fee for public relations counsel to the association, embracing publicity, public speaking, liaison with Federal agencies, associations, private organizations; writing bulletins, magazine articles, speeches etc. (5) National Aviation Trades Association, Inc. (6) Actual expenses incurred in conducting public relations activities as covered by approved vouchers. (7) Transportation, telephone, telegraph, hotel, taxies, secretarial, reproduction of material, postage, meals, and any other incidental expenses in connection therewith.

Edwards, Alanson W., 1731 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Marsh Stencil Machine Co., Belleville, Ill.; Ideal Stencil Machine Co., Belleville, Ill.; Diagraph-Bradley Industries, Inc., 5455 Forest Park Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo. (2) To obtain revision of the exise tax laws as they pertain to the above-named companies. (3) One year. (4) $125 per month. (5) Companies named in paragraph 1. (6) None. (7) None, except telephone and telegraph charges directed to the above companies.

Eliason, Courtleigh W., 11-243 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. (2) General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. Registrant is a member of the staff of the social and economic relations section of the public relations department of his employer. In addition to his normal duties in the above capacity, registrant has also now been authorized by his employer, as circumstances require, to engage in activities on behalf of his employer which, if and when performed, may require registration under the act. Accordingly registrant is registering so as to be in compliance with the act if and when he may be so engaged. (3) Monthly. (4) See statement attached.[3] (5) General Motors Corp. (6) See statement attached.[3] (7) See statement attached.[3]

Ellsworth, Charles K., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Hill & Knowlton is not engaged in any lobbying activities and does not believe that it is required to register under Public Law 601. However, it has been engaged by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, the American Butter Institute, and the National Creameries Association to carry on certain educational activities intended to explain the consequences of proposed legislation to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine. In view of announced interpretations by representatives of the Department of Justice implying that such educational activities are subject to Public Law 601, the firm is reporting receipts and expenditures for said educational campaign, pending judicial clarification of the law's intent. (3) Indefinite. (4) $750 per month. (5) Hill & Knowlton, Inc. (6) Necessary travel and entertainment expenses. (7) See above.

Examerica Traders of New York, Inc., 135 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Lloyd Triestino, Societa Anonima di Navigazione, Trieste, by Capt. Francisco Filbier now in the United States on behalf of Lloyd Triestino. (2) Lloyd Triestino, Societa Anonima di Navigazione. (3) Indefinite. (4) Have been paid the sum of $3,500 and is to receive a 3-percent commission on all ships purchased from the United States Government by Lloyd Triestino. Amounts received have been against expenses. (5) Capt. Francisco Filbier for Lloyd Triestino. (6) Have been paid total of $3,500 in full for expenses only part of which have been consumed or are to be consumed in lobbying. (7) Printing, mailing, telephones, telegrams, railroad fares, hotels, and entertainment (not of Members of Congress).

Fain, David, of Black & Kendall, 1200 Cascade Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Anacortes Shipways, Inc., room 904, Lewis Building, Portland, Oreg. (2) Anacortes Shipways, Inc. (3) Our firm has been and is general counsel for Anacortes Shipways, and to the extent we have been professionally retained, it is possible that this employment may be terminated by Anacortes at any time. In regard to our work in connection with Senate bill 2476 and House bill 6057, the same is limited to the second session of the Eightieth Congress. (4) The usual and normal legal fees. (5) Anacortes Shipways, Inc. (6) Direct reimbursement for taxi fares, telephone calls and mailing costs, and legal fees for services rendered. (7) Taxi fares, telephone calls, mailing expense to the extent the same are necessary or required by our representation of Anacortes Shipways, Inc.

Ferguson, Herbert T., Langdon Street, Madison, Wis. (1) Wisconsin Valley Improvement Co., care of Wisconsin Power & Light Co., 100 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (2) Wisconsin Power & Light Co., Madison, Wis.; Wisconsin Public Service Corp., Milwaukee, Wis.; Consolidated Water Power & Paper Co., Wisconsin Rapids, Wis. (3) 1 year. (4) Have not been paid anything as yet and will receive compensation at $35 per day plus traveling expenses. (5) Wisconsin Valley Improvement Co. (6) Traveling expenses actually incurred. (7) Railroad, bus, airplane, and taxi fares, meals, hotel bills, and incidental expenses.

Fifer, Russell, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Same as above. (3) Annual basis. (4) $12,000 per annum; such payments are received for services as executive secretary of the American Butter Institute and are not dependent upon services encompassed by this act. (5) American Butter Institute, for services as executive secretary. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Usual and normal expense items such as travel, telephone and telegraph, meals, hotels, taxi, etc.

Fistere, Charles M., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) American Butter Institute. (3) Indefinite. (4) Subject to future agreement depending upon amount of time spent in the interest of client. (5) American Butter Institute. (6) Reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Taxi fares, telephone.

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.
[2] Registration with the Clerk only.
[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Fleming, Roger W., 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) American Farm Bureau Federation. (3) Continuing. (4) $10,000. (5) American Farm Bureau Federation. (6) None, except reimbursement of actual necessary expenditures approved by officers of the American Farm Bureau Federation. (7) None, except as noted under (6).

Foster,[1] Charles E., 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW. Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of service-connected disabled American war veterans and their dependents. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,500 per annum and 10-percent bonus. (5) Disabled American Veterans. (6) Any expenses incurred (see No. 7). (7) Taxies, lunches, and other expenses incidental to work at the Capitol. Actual traveling expense.

Gaither, Jr., H. Rowan, 333 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Member of the law firm of Cooley, Crowley & Gaither, 333 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Orren, copartners doing business under the name of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., Mills Building, San Francisco, Calif. (3) Cooley, Crowley & Gaither have been general attorneys for Stapleton since 1936. There is no employment or retainer contract and the services, being professional, could be terminated by the client at any time. (4) There is no contract, contingent or otherwise, concerning compensation and the practice has been to bill Stapleton at an hourly rate for services rendered. The rate varies, depending upon which member or employee of the firm performs the service. (5) Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co. (6) Stapleton pays for actual out-of-pocket disbursements which include expense of communication (telephone, telegraph), travel, and actual subsistence expenses while away from San Francisco. (7) Communication and travel.

Garstang, Marion R., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinite; no fixed term. (4) $6,500 per year to cover all services as attorney for the Federation, including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the Federation.

Gavitt, Frank, Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Schenley Distillers Corp. (2) Schenley Distillers Corp (3) Have been employed for the past 8 years as public relations counsel, with lobbying incidental to this employment. (4) $3,000 per month and disbursements due under the general contract as public relations counsel to Schenley Distillers Corp. (5) Schenley Distillers Corp. (6) Reimbursement of all expenses. (7) All expenses incurred by Carl Byoir & Associates on behalf of Schenley Distillers Corp.

Goodwin, William J., the Loch, Roslyn, N. Y. (1) National Resources Commission of China, 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Same as above. See statement attached.[2] (3) March 31, 1949. (4) $30,000. (5) National Resources Commission of China. (6) None. (7) None.

Griffith, George M., 109 Vine Street, Columbiana, Ohio. (1) Farm Labor Association of Northern Ohio, 109 Vine Street, Columbiana, Ohio. (2) The above association consisting of fruit and vegetable growers who are praying for farm labor at once in order that fruit and vegetable crops may be produced for the requirements of the public. (3) Not any longer than it will take Congress to enact the proper legislation which we fervently hope will not take longer than a month. (4) Is to receive a nominal sum of $150 per month as secretary-treasurer of the association. (5) By the Farm Labor Association of Northern Ohio from assessments of its membership. (6) No set amount designated; however expenses cover ordinary travel and hotel. (7) None other than covered in No. 6.

Griffiths, Dr. H. M., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) National Economic Council, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, organized under the membership corporation law of the State of New York, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) National Economic Council, Inc., whose purpose is to aid in developing an informed public opinion on the major political, social, and economic problems of the Nation. Said National Economic Council, Inc., does not in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicit, collect or receive money or any other thing of value to be used principally to aid, nor is its principal purpose to aid, in passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress, or to influence, directly or indirectly, passage or defeat of such legislation. Consequently, nothing in this statement is to be construed as an admission that the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act applies to it. (3) Indefinite, currently serving as director of public relations, National Economic Council, Inc. (4) $7,500 annually. (5) National Economic Council,, Inc. (6) Reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses, principally stationery, stenography, postage, and traveling expenses. (7) See (6) above.

Haines, Samuel P., 4407 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, Otto K. Eitel, chairman, 171 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Hotel owners who are members of the Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, as listed in addenda exhibits 1 and 2.[1] (3) Until reduction or repeal of the 20 percent cabaret tax is brought about. (4) Copy of agreement, April 28, 1948, with the Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee attached hereto as exhibit 3.[2] (5) Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, Otto K. Eitel, chairman, 171 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. (6) See exhibit 3 attached.[2] (7) See exhibit 3 attached.[2]

Hale, John, 408–416 Tama Building, Burlington, Iowa. (1) Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (2) Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. (3) I am regularly employed by the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. and on very rare occasions I am asked to go to Washington in connection with pending legislation. (4) $100 per day for actual time spent. (5) Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual and necessary expenditures for food, lodging, and transportation. There is no definite agreement as to entertainment but very modest items have been approved in the past. However, I have never spent more than $50 for entertainment in any one year.

Hall, Edwin S., Farmington, Conn. (1) Self. (2) The American people. (3) Life. (4) Nothing. (5) Nobody. (6) Nothing. (7) Thinking, living, travel, and printing expenses—out of my pocket.

Hanlon, Daniel J., 1727 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Sidney Smith, Inc., Joplin, Mo. (2) Sidney Smith, Inc., Joplin, Mo. (3) Duration of the Eightieth Congress. (4) $3,000. (5) Sidney Smith, Inc., Joplin, Mo. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Hawes, Robert N., 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Forks Chamber of Commerce, Forks, Wash.; Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce, Port Townsend, Wash.; Sequim Chamber of Commerce, Sequim, Wash; and Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Port Angeles, Wash. (1) Forks Chamber of Commerce, Forks, Wash.; Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce, Port Townsend, Wash.; Sequim Chamber of Commerce, Sequim, Wash.; and Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Port Angeles, Wash. (3) Year of 1948. (4) Compensation covered by payment from the Grays Harbor Industries of retainer of $10,000 and out-of-pocket expenses. (5) See (4). (6) See (4). (7) Travel, telephone, telegraph, stenographic services, entertainment.

Hill & Knowlton, Inc.,[1] Room 300, Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C. (1) American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill.; National Creameries Association, 625 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.; National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) Basic retainer of $3,000 a month plus necessary out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Same. (6) Necessary expenses for travel, entertainment, postage, and communications. (7) See above.

Hinders, Justin, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) National Association of Real Estate Boards. (3) Since June 21, 1948. (4) $4,000 per annum. However only about 50 percent of my time is devoted to legislative activities. (5) National Association of Real Estate Boards. (6) Reimbursed as such expenses are incurred. (7) Hotel bills, meals, travel, and miscellaneous.

Hinkson,[1] Ralph H., 3405 Milton Avenue, Dallas, Tex. (1) PER, Inc, 3405 Milton Avenue, Dallas, Tex. (2) PER, Inc. and a group of clients located in the South and Southwest. (3) Permanently, as president of PER, Inc. (4) $6,000 per annum. (5) PER, Inc. (6) Expenses as required and necessary. (7) Travel, food, lodging, entertainment.

Hynes, W. J., 409 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho. (1) Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. (2) The Union Pacific Railroad Co. (3) Continuing employment by employer, but activity in connection with Federal legislation is incidental to regular employment and subject to assignment for temporary periods. (4) Salary at the rate of $20 per day plus reimbursement of expenses. (5) Union Pacific Railroad Co. (6) No fixed amount. Reimbursement of expenses incurred. (7) Traveling expense, hotel, meals, transportation, postage, telephone, secretarial service and all miscellaneous expense incurred in discharge of duty.

Jackson, Robert C., 301 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cotton Council of America, 165 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. (2) National Cotton Council of America—an organization of cotton producers, ginners, merchants, warehousemen, cottonseed crushers and cotton textile mills. Sole purpose of organization is to increase consumption of cotton, cottonseed and the products thereof. (4) $10,800. (5) National Cotton Council of America only. (6) Reimbursement for legitimate out-of-pocket expenditures. (7) Legitimate out-of-pocket expenses such as out of town travel, telephone and telegram, cab fares, meals for guests, etc.

Jaillette, Harold W., 209A West Evans Street, Florence, S. C. (1) South Carolina Association of Public Accountants. (2) Public Accounting profession. (3) Duration of Eightieth Congress. (4) $25 per day for each day in Washington, D. C. (5) South Carolina Association of Public Accountants. (6) All expenses incurred to and from Washington, D. C. Also expenses of hotel and meals in Washington, D. C. (7) Traveling expenses, hotel, and meals.

Keesling, Francis V., Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) City and county of San Francisco (Calif.). (2) City and county of San Francisco. (3) April 15, 1948, to June 30, 1948 (amended to July 7, 1948, through June 30, 1949). (4) At the rate of $1,000 per month, plus reimbursement for expenses. Covers services before executive departments and is not confined solely to legislative services. (5) City and county of San Francisco. (6) No fixed amount. Depends on amount expended. In no event can exceed $10,000. (7) Travel, living, stenographic, telephone, telegraph, conference, and related expenses.

Krueger, A. H., National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (2) Millers' National Federation, a corporation not for profit, organized under the General Not-for-Profit Corporation Act of the laws of the State of Illinois. (3) Employment with Millers' National Federation is on an annual basis for indefinite period. (4) I am employed by the Millers' National Federation at an annual salary of $8,500 paid to me for a variety of services which have no relationship to the activities described in section 307 of title 3 of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Any services which I may perform in connection with the activities set forth under subdivisions (a) or (b) of said section 307, would be incidental to the services which I perform for the Millers' National Federation. No specific amount of my salary is allocated for activities covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. I estimate that such activities would take less than 5 percent of my time. (5) Millers' National Federation. (6) No specific amount. Regular expense incurred in performance of services for which employed will be paid by me and reimbursed by my employer. (7) Actual expenses incurred in performing duties of employment.

La France, Francis X., 911 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (1) Partner, Swan, Keeney & Smith, attorneys and counselors at law, 911 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (2) Narragansett Brewing Co., New Depot Avenue, Cranston, R. I. (3) Undetermined at this time. May be terminated at any time—not on contract basis. (4) Reasonable amount to be determined by the amount of services rendered; not to exceed $150 per diem. (5) Narragansett Brewing Co. (6) Only necessary expenses for traveling, etc. (7) Traveling expenses only.

League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Self. (3) Indefinite. (4) Registrant receives no contributions specifically for activities for which this registration is being filed. An extremely small portion of the activities of the registrant are such as might possibly be construed as being covered by any provision of this act. (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

McCaskill, James L., 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Department of Higher Education, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Membership of the above. (3) Permanent (beginning April 26, 1948). (4) Total annual salary, $6,400. Not more than 10 percent of time will be allocated to activities under this act. (5) Department of higher education. (6) Actual expenses only. (7) Transportation and incidental.

McGrath,[1] Tom J., Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, National Coal Association, 324 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) This is to notify that assignment has been completed and registration should be withdrawn. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Marks, Herbert S., 305 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The Detroit Edison Co., 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) Undetermined except as reasonable value of legal services in matters requiring advice and assistance of Washington counsel, including legislative matters as to which registration may be necessary. (5) Detroit Edison Co. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses. (7) Customary expenses incidental to legal work, such as telephone, telegraph, taxis, and travel.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) William J. Goodwin, The Loch, Roslyn, N. Y. (2) National Resources Commission of China, 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. See statement attached to registration form of William J. Goodwin. (3) March 31, 1949. (4) $7,500. (5) William J. Goodwin. (6) None. (7) None.

Martin, Robert F., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Vitrified China Association, Inc. (3) Continuous; executive secretary of association. (4) Maximum proportion of salary allocable to legislative affairs, $1,500 per annum. (5) Vitrified China Association, Inc. (6) Under $500 per annum allocable to legislative affairs. (7) Travel, printing, mimeographing, entertainment, and incidentals.

Mattei, A. C., president, Honolulu Oil Corp., 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Honolulu Oil Corp. (2) Honolulu Oil Corp. (3) Permanent. (4) I receive no compensation earmarked for or in consideration of activities for the principal purpose of aiding or influencing the passage or defeat of legislation. However, in the absence of authoritative opinion as to what constitutes a principal purpose within the meaning of Public Law 601, I am reporting that part of my compensation which may be allocated to activities in any sense related to legislative matters. It is estimated that compensation allocable to such activities will not exceed $1,000 per annum. (5) Honolulu Oil Corp. (6) Indefinite. (7) Such travel and miscellaneous expenses as may be required.

Meixell, Harry, 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C. (1) National Aviation Trades Association, Inc., 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Represents the above association as executive director. The association is a federation of 42 State chapters, composed of more than 3,200 fixed base operators engaged in all phases of the aviation trades. (3) Retained on annual contractual basis subject to the will of the executive committee of the association. (4) Retainer for services as executive director is $11,000 per annum, no part of which is paid for activities covered in Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (5) National Aviation Trades Association, Inc. (6) Actual expenses incurred in connection with official duties as executive director. (7) Transportation, meals, hotel, telephone, and telegraph, secretarial, postage, mimeographing, and all other incidental expenses.

Messer, James, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla. (1) Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla. (2) Florida Railroad Association, composed of Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., Florida East Coast Railway Co., Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co., and Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. The principal purpose of my employment with Florida Railroad Association is not in connection with pending or proposed legislation in the Congress of the United States, such work being only incidental to my employment. (3) Indefinite—at the pleasure of the employer. (4) $4,800 per annum. (5) Florida Railroad Association. (6) Actual expenses not to exceed $265 per month. (7) Actual traveling, office, telegraph, and telephone expense.

Mote, Lynn E., 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York City, N. Y. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) At the rate of $8,000 per annum, of which only a part, if any, is applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601. (5) Association of American Ship Owners. (6) Actual and necessary expenses. (7) Traveling expenses, phones, taxis, etc.

Mougey, William J., 200 Hill Building, Seventeenth and I Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. (2) General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. The duties of the registrant are as follows: (a) Registrant is in charge of his employer's Washington office, located at 200 Hill Building, Seventeenth and I Streets NW., which is maintained to assist his employer and its representatives in their business relations with the various agencies of the Federal Government. Registrant believes that these activities are not within the scope of Public Law 601. (b) Registrant also collects information regarding, and reports on proposed and anticipated action by Congress and agencies of the Federal Government for the information and guidance of his employer and its representatives, and sometimes assists in assembling information which may be submitted to Members of Congress, congressional committees or other agencies of the Federal Government. The activities listed as (b) above, in the opinion of the registrant, are not subject to the act. However, they are enumerated herein and the registrant is registering in order to be in compliance with the act in the event of any contrary interpretation. (3) Monthly. (4) See statement attached.[2] (5) General Motors Corp. (6) See statement attached.[2] (7) See statement attached.[2]

National Association of Stevedores,[1] 90 West Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) All members. (2) All members of association. (3) See statement A attached.[4] (4) See statement A attached.[4] (5) See statement A attached.[4] (6) All expenses will be reimbursed. (7) All travel expenses including transportation, hotel, and food expenses.

National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The registrant is not employed by anyone. Its membership, however, consists of agricultural cooperatives owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by farmers acting together on a cooperative basis. (2) Registrant works in behalf of its membership. (3) There is no employment. (4) Registrant receives no funds for the specific purpose of influencing legislation. It receives dues from its members for its operation. (5) Registrant receives no payments other than from its members who pay dues. (6) Registrant receives no amount for expenses, but all expenses are taken care of out of dues collected from its members. (7) There are no specific expenses allocated to influencing legislation. Any expenses incurred, however, in appearing before committees of Congress or otherwise with respect to legislation are absorbed as a part of the cost of operation of registrant.

Noyes,[1] Charles E., 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) American Institute of Accountants, American Institute Publishing Co., 13 East Forty-first Street, New York,

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.
[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.
[3] Registration with the Secretary only.
[4] Registration with the Clerk only.
[5] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

N. Y. (2) Same. (3) Continuous. (4) Total salaries $10,000 annually; not over 10 percent of time spent on legislative work. (5) American Institute of Accountants, American Institute Publishing Co. (6) Actual expenses when traveling. (7) Only travel expense.

O'Connell, Jerry J., 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill. (3) Indefinite. (4) On loan from the Progressive Party of the State of Washington from which salary received is $125 per week. (5) See (4) above. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Traveling: transportation, hotels, etc.

Oliver, Fred N., 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Senior partner of Oliver & Donnally, attorneys, with offices at 110 East Forty-second Street, New York City, and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (2) (a) The National Association of Mutual Savings Banks and (b) the Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc. Oliver & Donnally is general counsel for both associations. (3) Indefinite. (4) Estimated $525 from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks and an indeterminate part of $3,250 from Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc. About $7,000 is the estimated proportion of distribution received by registrant as partner of Oliver & Donnally of total annual compensation from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks for all legal services performed by the firm. Registrant estimates that not in excess of 15 percent of that amount is for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act, or $1,050 annually, of which about $525 is for the first 6 months. Six thousand five hundred dollars is the total compensation of Oliver & Donnally received from the Railroad Security Owners' Association for all legal services since January 1, 1948. It is estimated that not in excess of 50 percent is for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act, or $3,250. An indeterminate part of this amount is distributed to registrant. All of such work was confined to public appearances before congressional committees. (5) The associations pay Oliver & Donnally and registrant draws his share as a partner from the firm. (6) The registrant is reimbursed for all legitimate expenses only. None paid during this period. (7) These expenses include only traveling expenses, long-distance telephone, printing, and extra stenographic expenses.

Pastor,[1] Richard, 213 East Twenty-fifth Street, New York City. (1) None (volunteer worker for the Veterans Committee Against Mundt-Nixon bill). (2) None. (3) Two weeks. (4) Nothing. (5) None. (6) $137.05. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, miscellaneous.

Patterson, Belknap & Webb, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. As counsel, for the purpose of obtaining an amendment to the Trading with the Enemy Act, whereby alien property in this country formerly owned by persons under persecution by an enemy government, in cases where the owner is dead and left no heirs, may be turned over to organizations for the relief of survivors. (3) Indefinite period; such period may last until the necessary amendment to the Trading with the Enemy Act is passed. (4) Not yet determined; sum to be paid will depend upon amount of time spent by registrant in this matter. (5) The American Jewish Committee. (6) The amount of the payment will depend upon the expenses actually incurred by the registrant. (7) Transportation expenses and telephone and stenographic charges.

[1] Registration with the clerk only.

Phillips, Clare L., 2700 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Self. (2) Concessionaires and applicants for concessions in Government buildings and national parks. (3) Indefinite. (4) Fee basis from interested parties. (5) Applicants for concessions and any present concessionaires interested. (6) According to services rendered. (7) Traveling and retaining fees.

Powell, E. Henry, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) As a partner of Oliver & Donnally, attorneys, with offices at 110 East Forty-second Street, New York City, and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (2) The National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (3) Indefinite. (4) $10,000 approximately, is annual share of partnership income for all legal services. Only a small part of this (not more than 5 percent) is for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act. (5) Oliver & Donnally. (6) The registrant is reimbursed for all legitimate expenses such as travel, hotel, and meals. (7) All necessary expenses of the character indicated above.

Putt, C. J., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans. (2) The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. (3) Continuing. (4) Nothing for legislative service. My salary as an officer of the company is $12,000 per year. (5) The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. I do not directly or indirectly for any purpose solicit, collect, or receive money or other thing of value from any person other than my employer; legislative activity on my part is not my principal purpose but is only occasional and incidental. Registration is made as a matter of precaution because of the vagueness and indefiniteness of the act. (6) Reimbursement of actual expense incurred in discharge of duty. No fixed amount. (7) All expense necessarily incurred, including travel, hotel, meals, etc.

Ragland, Edward F., 109-110 Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) Associated Tobacco Manufacturers, 109-110 Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. (2) Associated Tobacco Manufacturers. (3) Indefinite. (4) Registrant is regularly employed as executive secretary of the Associated Tobacco Manufacturers and receives an annual salary for his duties in that connection. Registrant will receive no compensation in addition to his regular salary for legislative activities covered by the act, which activities comprise only an incidental and minor part of the registrant's duties. (5) Associated Tobacco Manufacturers. (6) Registrant is reimbursed monthly for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in the performance of his duties as executive secretary. (7) See item (6).

Railroad Pension Conference, post office box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) Railroad Pension Conference. (2) Membership of Railroad Pension Conference. (3) Indefinite. (4) Membership fees. (5) Membership. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses.

Ratcliffe, William O., Baltimore Lumber Co., 1600 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Jack Pustilnik, district manager, 1600 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) No accounts. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Reese, Richard J., Sr., 146 North Irby Street, Florence, S. C. (1) The South Carolina Association of Public Accountants, Columbia, S. C. (2) The public accounting profession. (3) During the session of the Eightieth Congress. (4) $25 per diem while actually in Washington, D. C. (5) The South Carolina Association of Public Accountants, Columbia, S. C. (6) Actual expenses incurred while in Washington, D. C., and traveling to and from Washington to Florence, S. C. (7) Transportation, meals, tips, hotel, and incidentals.

Reese, Robert S., 146 North Irby Street, Florence, S. C. (1) The South Carolina Association of Public Accountants, Columbia, S. C. (2) The Public Accounting Profession. (3) During the session of the Eightieth Congress. (4) $25 per diem while actually in Washington, D. C. (5) The South Carolina Association of Public Accountants, Columbia, S. C. (6) Actual expenses incurred while in Washington, D. C., and traveling to and from Washington to Florence, S. C. (7) Transportation, meals, tips, hotel, and incidentals.

Reckord, Milton A., 1600 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) The National Rifle Association of America, Washington, D. C. (2) The National Rifle Association. (3) I have been an official of the association for 20 years as the executive vice president. (4) As an official I receive $12,000 per year. (5) By the National Rifle Association. (6) Actual expenses, which I estimate are approximately $100 per month. (7) Only actual expenses.

Richter, Mrs. Persis, 1710 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Foreign Affairs Research Council, United World Federalists, Inc., World Government House, 31 East Seventy-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Foreign Affairs Research Council, United World Federalists, Inc., World Government House, 31 East Seventy-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Approximately July 1, 1948. (4) $20 per week. (5) Foreign Affairs Research Council, United World Federalists, Inc., World Government House, 31 East Seventy-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Rudy, John Forney, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Employed as director of public relations for and by National Federation of American Shipping, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. It is not believed that the duties performed as director of public relations come within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. However, this registration is being filed in order that there may be compliance with the act in the event it is interpreted to cover such activities. (2) See (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) See (1). (5) See (1). (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Travel, hotel, and meals.

Russo, Paul M., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural, Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee, Detroit, Mich. (2) Members of the UAW-CIO, all working men and women, and consumers. (3) Indefinite. (4) $90 per week. Covering duties as a Washington representative for functions which include representation of UAW-CIO and its members before Government agencies, service on special labor committees, distribution of information to our members on Government activities, laws and regulations, as well as presentation of UAW-CIO views to members of Congress and congressional committees. (5) UAW-CIO. (6) $8.50 per day, plus transportation, hotel, etc., expense when traveling, not to exceed $6 per day. (7) Transportation and hotel, etc., not to exceed $6 per day.

Rutherford, F. S.,[1] 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Republic Steel Corp. (3) Permanent. (4) No part of my compensation is earmarked for the purposes set forth in Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. My services (insofar as legislative matters are concerned) consist primarily of factually reporting the status and content of pending proposals affecting the steel industry. The maximum part of my compensation which may be allocated to services within the scope of Public Law 601 will not exceed $5,000 per annum. (5) Republic Steel Corp. (6) Undetermined; estimated not to exceed $500 per

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

year for expenses incident to legislative work. (7) Travel, meals, and miscellaneous.

Smith, Howard J.,[1] 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) Central Arizona Project Association, Wayne M. Akin, president, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (2) Central Arizona Project Association, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Indefinite. (4) $750 per month. (5) Central Arizona Project Association, Phoenix, Ariz. (6) Actual and necessary expenses, car mileage, travel expense, room and board when engaged in travel in interest of association. (7) All expenses listed above and any additional expense which may occur in connection with work of the association.

Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc. (3) Counsel to association under annual retainer agreement. In the opinion of the registrant, none of its activities nor any contemplated for the future fall within the terms of Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) Annual retainer at the rate of $5,000 per annum, no part of which, however, is paid for activities covered by Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. (5) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc. (6) Disbursement of actual expenditures; (7) Telephone tolls, postage, telegrams, fares, and similar items to be disbursed pursuant to the prevailing rules of the legal profession.

Stone, John, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill. (3) From June 1, 1948. (4) No salary. (5) [Blank.] (6) Actual expenses incurred, not to exceed $100 per week. (7) Expenses incurred in preparing press releases, photography, motion-picture coverage, radio coverage, and general public relations.

Stoudenmire, Sterling F., Jr., 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. I am not engaged specifically "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress." My employment with the Waterman Steamship Corp. is as attorney in the office of the general counsel of that corporation and its subsidiaries in Washington, D. C., and my duties of employment are the usual duties of an attorney with such a corporation. The Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries are interested in any legislation affecting the merchant marine, the operation of aircraft, and transportation generally. This, of necessity, requires presentation of information and facts to the members of committees handling such legislation. This work is not the principal part of my employment by any means, but is just one of the many general duties in connection with my employment. (2) Waterman Steamship Corp. (3) Permanent. (4) $8,400 per annum. (5) Waterman Steamship Corp. (6) I am paid no expenses "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress," but am reimbursed for all out-of-pocket expenses incurred in connection with my duties as attorney for this corporation. (7) Waterman Steamship Corp. reimburses me for out-of-pocket expenses only, incurred in connection with my employment with this corporation in Washington, D. C., which include cab fares, traveling expenses, if any, and other miscellaneous expenses.

Sullivan, Francis M., care of National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, Central Building, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers. (2) National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers. All legislative work performed by associate. (3) Indefinite. (4) $2,000 annually (divided by two associates). (5) See No. 1. (6) Only reimbursement for out-of-city travel. (7) See No. 6.

Tool Owners Union, Local No. 104, Tenth Congressional District, 1318 Beacon Street, Brookline, Mass. (1) Tool Owners Union, Brookline, Mass., Local No. 104, a chapter of the Tool Owners Union (a nonstock, nonprofit organization, which may be at times interested in proposed legislation before Congress). (2) In the interest of its members all of whom are individuals. (3) During such period as Brookline local, No. 104, remains a constituent organization of the Tool Owners Union. (4) Unknown. Income is derived from voluntary contributions, varying from $1 to $100 per annum to $1,000 for life membership. All officers serve without compensation. (5) Individuals who voluntarily contribute from year to year, and who may cease to contribute at will. (6) Expenses vary according to contributions received, and include all costs of operation of the organization. (7) None coming under the scope of title 601. Expenses may include reimbursement for traveling expenses of officers on trips or for printed material to be used incident thereto.

Townsend, Dr. F. E., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) The Townsend plan. (3) Indefinite. (4) Approximately $7,800 per year. (5) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (6) Only living expenses when away from home and/or company business. (7) Hotel, travel, and meals when away from home.

Townsend, R. C., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) The Townsend plan. (3) Indefinite. (4) Approximately $5,200 per year. (5) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (6) Only living expenses when away from home and/or company business. (7) Hotel, travel, and meals when away from home.

Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) This is a trade association of vitrified china manufacturers: (1) Buffalo Pottery, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.; (2) Gladding, McBean Co., Los Angeles, Calif.; (3) Iroquois China Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; (4) Jackson Vitrified China Co., Falls Creek, Pa.; (5) Mayer China Co., Beaver Falls, Pa.; (6) D. E. McNicol Pottery Co., Clarksburg, W. Va.; (7) Onondaga Pottery Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; (8) Scammell China Co., Trenton, N. J.; (9) Shenango Pottery Co., New Castle, Pa.; (10) Sterling China Co., East Liverpool, Ohio; (11) the Walker China Co., Bedford, Ohio; (12) Wallace China Co., Ltd., Huntington Park, Calif.; (13) Warwick China Co., Wheeling, W. Va. (2) The vitrified china industry. (3) Continuous. (4) Not over $2,000 per annum allocable to legislative affairs. (5) Vitrified china industry members—see attached list. (6) Not over $500 per annum allocable to legislative affairs. (7) Travel, printing, mimeographing, entertainment, and incidentals.

Walker, Jimmie, P. O. box 1329, 305-306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc. (2) [Blank.] (3) An elected secretary-treasurer for 1 year from March 1948, and work on a voluntary basis. (4) Retained by Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., and reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in behalf of the association. (5) Voluntary and reimbursement on expense basis. (6) Actual, as incurred and approved. (7) Travel, telephone, postage, meals, and lodging; and when considerable time is devoted to work of association, it is expected in the future that some salary will be paid.

Wheeler, Burton K., Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Shore Line Oil Co., Las Vegas, Nev.; Craw Co., Las Vegas, Nev. (2) Above-named companies. (3) June 30, 1948, unless matter terminated earlier. Should purpose of employment be not completed at that date, retainer agreement will probably be renewed. (4) $1,000 per month (the legal fee covers presentation of actions in Federal district court and cognizant departments of the Federal Government). (5) Above-stated companies. (6) All out-of-pocket expenses, including court costs, telephone, traveling, mimeographing, printing, and taxicabs. (7) See (6).

Wheeler, Edward K., Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Shore Line Oil Co., Las Vegas, Nev.; Craw Co., Las Vegas, Nev. (2) Above named companies. (3) June 30, 1948, unless matter terminated earlier. Should purpose of employment be not completed at that date, retainer agreement will probably be renewed. (4) $1,000 per month (the legal fee covers presentation of actions in Federal District Court and cognizant departments of the Federal Government). (5) Above stated companies. (6) All out-of-pocket expenses including court costs, telephone, traveling, mimeographing, printing, and taxicabs. (7) See (6).

Whitlock, Douglas, partner, law firm of Sanders, Gravelle, Whitlock & Howrey, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The address of the employer, Building Products Institute, has been changed from 1756 K Street NW., to 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Same. (3) Same. (4) Registrant's services include a wide field, viz, legal, administrative (management, economic research, public relations) and legislative. For all such services he has received $1,500 per month from date of employment. This has been allocated as follows: $1,000 to legal and administrative and $500 per month to legislative. (5) Same. (6) Same. (7) Same.

Willingham, Carl H., lawyer, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) (a) National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 4 Park Avenue, New York City; (b) Oneida, Ltd., Oneida, N. Y.; (c) Willmark Service System, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City; (d) Clyde Y. Morris, 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md. (2) Those listed above. (3) (a) annual; (b) 1948; (c) 1948; (d) 1948. (4) (a) $12,000 per annum; (b) $2,500; (c) not determined; (d) not determined. (5) Those listed above. (6) (a) Reimbursement for travel expenses, hotels, telephone, taxicabs; (b) none; (c) none; (d) none. (7) Travel, hotels, telephone, taxicabs.

Yeaman, Addison, 1600 West Hill Street, Louisville, Ky. (1) Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., 1600 West Hill Street, Louisville. (2) Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. (3) Registrant is an attorney employed since May 1, 1937, by Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. as assistant to the general counsel to that corporation. The term of registrant's employment, as above stated, is indefinite. (4) Registrant was not, and is not engaged "for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of legislation," except as such activities may be within the scope of his employment as stated in (3) above, which includes services as counsel in all matters affecting Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. It is impossible for registrant to estimate what part of his time, as an employee of Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., will be spent in activities covered by this registration. Registrant, therefore, states that the amount he is to be paid for activities covered by this registration is $5,500, being a part of his total compensation

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

as counsel. (5) Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. (6) Actual expenses as incurred. (7) Travel, hotel, and miscellaneous living expenses.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the second calendar quarter, 1948, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 9393) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Abbott, Charlotte E., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated May 7, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910. "Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act."

Adkerson, J. Carson, 976 National Press Building, Washington D. C. (1) Expended $252.30. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Interested in any legislation having to do with manganese or strategic minerals.

Alfas, Nels Peter, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,999.98; reimbursed to the extent of $60 for legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying, i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 50 percent of time spent on this work. (4) The Federal Machinist, a monthly periodical, of which he is editor. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allen, William, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time. In June spoke to two Senators relative to merchant marine legislation.

Allman, Roy G., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received; however expended approximately $100 per month. (2) Transportation, taxis, telephone, cables, postage, entertainment. (3) To promote bills to pay Americans for damages received as result of war in the Far East. (4) None. (5) To pay Americans for war damages.

American Booksellers' Association, Inc., Gilbert E. Goodkind, secretary, 31 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) One hundred and three dollars and twenty cents expended. (Bills for telegrams sent and long-distance phone calls made during June not received in time for inclusion in this report—amount expended to be included in next quarterly report.) (2) ABC Mailing Service, 1 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (3) Mimeographing and mailing leaflets to members of this association. (4) None. (5) Legislation to increase the book parcel-post rate.

American Association of University Women,[4] 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary of staff member for quarter (approximately one-half of staff member's activities are in legislative field), $1,000. Expenditures on communications to branches and taxi fares, telegrams, etc. $50.83. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Journal of American Association of University Women (quarterly). General director's letter (issued three or four times a year for educational guidance of branch officers. (5) Support: Federal aid to education; housing bill; repeal of oleo tax; Marshall plan; Foreign Informational and Educational Exchange Act; renewal of Reciprocal Trade Act; status of women bill; Stratton bill for D. P.'s; WHO; appropriations bills. Oppose: equal rights amendment; Social Security appropriations bill.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

American Nurses' Association,[5] 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Five dollars for postage. (2) Edith M. Beattie, chairman of American Nurses' Association special committee on Federal legislation. (3) See item number 1. (4) The American Journal of Nursing is the official publication of the American Nurses' Association. Through the medium of the American Journal of Nursing, membership is kept informed of pending legislation affecting nurses, nursing or health by means of editorials or signed articles. (5) Legislation pertaining to health, nurses or nursing. Specifically, promotion of legislation to amend the Social Security Act to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to the self-employed, and to employees of nonprofit agencies. Legislation affecting nurses in the Army and Navy Nurse Corps—active and retired, and promotion of United States participation in World Health Organization.

American Nurses' Association,[6] 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Approximately $50, clerical assistance, postage, copies of bills, taxi, telephone. (2) Edith M. Beattie, chairman of American Nurses' Association Special Committee on Federal Legislation. (3) See item No. 1. (4) The American Journal of Nursing is the official publication of the American Nurses' Association. Through the medium of the American Journal of Nursing, membership is kept informed of pending legislation affecting nurses, nursing, or health by means of editorials or signed articles. (5) Legislation pertaining to health, nurses, or nursing. Specifically, promotion of legislation to amend the Social Security Act to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors' insurance to the self-employed and to employees of nonprofit agencies. Legislation pertaining to bill S. 2583 and House Joint Resolution 161.

American Short Line Railroad Association, The, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Contributed by 310 member lines during second quarter 1948, $20,322, only a small portion of which is for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) J. M. Hood, $157; National Press Club, $445.95; Tiny Meeker, $76.67; proportion of president's time and supporting secretary and clerks, telegraph, telephone, postage, rent, office supplies, taxes, and so forth, estimated at $412. (3) For salaries, office expenses, printing, and reimbursement of personal expenses in furtherance of the legislative program of the 310 member lines of the association. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting short-line railroads. (See previous report for complete text of legislative program.)

Aring, Hector M., 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See original registration form for complete explanation. No other contributions received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposed to appropriation for cotton subsidy under section 32 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act, 1947—tax legislation.

Arnold, W. C., Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) None. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Austern, H. Thomas, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, B. C., Canada. (1) No money received or expended during second quarter of 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Canadian fisheries.

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

Ayer & Son, Inc., N. W., a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (Ayer) received from National Association of Electric Companies $7,194.37, of which $6,311.14 represented compensation to Ayer and $883.23 was for out-of-pocket expenses (see item 2 below). The only money received or spent by registrants, J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, was for out-of-pocket expenses noted in item 2 below. (2) J. Vance Babb, R. C. Baker, and B. J. Kelly, employees of Ayer, for traveling and miscellaneous expenses, $508.77; materials, postage, messengers, clippings, telephone and telegrams, mimeographing, prints, etc., $374.46. (3) The amounts described in items 1 and 2 above were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the electric industry as described in registration dated March 3, 1947. Neither the services, nor the expenditures involved lobbying within the meaning of the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) None, except commencing about February 10, 1948, Ayer services include publicity regarding the proposed appropriation to the Tennessee Valley Authority for construction of steam power plants.

Babbitt,[7] Elizabeth Clarke (Mrs. George Harris Babbitt), The Service Star Legion, 1819 Wyoming Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $35; expended $15. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) Service Star Legion magazine. (5) Education equalization, support; Bureau of Child Welfare, support; housing for veterans, support; OPA, oppose; international relations, support; Marshall plan, support; displaced persons, oppose; school lunches, support; public health, support; charter for Service Star Legion, support.

Babcock, Charles E., route 4, box 73 Vienna, Va.; National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Have an expense account of $50 per month for out of pocket expenses. No salary. (2) Various—see below. (3) Services at gasoline stations; postage; telegrams; meals; and hotel rooms. Transportation to and from Washington. (4) The Junior American; the official organ of the Junior Order (as above). (5) Immigration, deportation, and naturalization matters; free public school measures; and occasionally other legislation that the Order believes for the general good.

Baillen, Elsie T., Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, January 29–February 21, 1948, $425; travel and transportation expenses, January 29–February 21, 1948, $370.53; (services terminated February 21, 1948). (2) Salary received used for personal expenses, no part of it spent on behalf of the Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery. Travel and transportation expenses covered by actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. (3) Some as (2) above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channel. (5) Legislation to provide for a European recovery program.

Bailey, C. Lloyd, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, $1,000; travel expense, $234.83. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation,

[7] Filed with Clerk only.

and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Bailey, Frazer A., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500 received as salary from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., during the second quarter of 1948 which is allocable to legislative activities. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) As President of the Federation, am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. However, during past quarter supported overtime-on-overtime legislation and certain amendments to Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Baker, Gibbs L., 1011 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Charles Niedner's Sona Co., Inc., Malden, Mass.; the United States Rubber Co., New York City; the Firehose Mfg. Co., Inc., New York City; the Approved Equipment Mfg. Co., Inc., New Milford, N. J.; and the Federal Firehose Mfg. Co., Inglewood, Calif. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5608.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Expenses, April 1 through July 1, 1948, $109.70; salary, same dates, $379.25. (2) Expenditures made for transportation, office work, and supplies, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting civil liberties.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, April 1 through May 22, on which date my resignation became effective, $500. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation for a permanent FEPC, S. 984 and H. R. 2824.

Baldrige, H. M., United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C., and 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 per month, or $6,000 for the quarter. No money expended on any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) During the year I opposed H. R. 5051, H. R. 6502, and H. Res. 425.

Baldwin and Mermey,[1] Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received retainer from Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, $16,460.23; reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, $14,829.77. (2) Various. (3) Telephone and telegraph service, postage, messenger service, mimeographing, printing, travel, distribution of newsletter, and releases. (4) [Blank.] (5) Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Baldwin and Mermey,[1] 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; Hershey Corp., Hershey, Pa. (1) Received retainer from Hershey Corp., $2,250; reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, $4.29. (2) New York Telephone Co., Baldwin and Mermey. (3) Telephone and postage. (4) [Blank.] (5) Sugar legislation.

Banigan, Leon F., National Council of Private Motor Truck Owners, Inc., 1015 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) See (1). (5) None.

Barber, Hartman, room 301, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.,

[1] Filed with the clerk only.

Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Seventh Floor, Brotherhood Bldg., Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. Total salary for quarter, $1,320; total expenses for quarter, $469.78. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; The Haloid Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barlow, Joel, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (1) Received, $1,408.56; expended, $112.67. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $78.07; Western Union, $5.78; cab fares, miscellaneous expense, $28.82. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, teletype messages, transportation within the District of Columbia and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer for the purpose of rendering general legal advice and assistance. Considerable time is being currently spent and may continue to be spent in the preparation of materials for presentation to Congress in support of proposed legislation to improve marketing conditions in the fruit industry during the postwar interruption in normal export marketing.

Barnard, Robert C., Associate of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Cooley, Crowley & Gaither (attorneys for Stapleton Lumber and Piling Co.), 333 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No money was received by registrant or by Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox for professional services rendered in connection with H. R. 6253 and S. 2539. Expenditures by Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, $33.63. (2) Leet Brothers Co., Inc., 1221 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C., $33.48; postage, $0.15. (3) For photostatic copies of contracts between James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., and the War Department of the United States, for submission to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6253 and S. 2539, both bills entitled, "For the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co."

Barnett, Arthur R., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $3,375 as an officer and employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $526.68 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, airlines, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, book stores, and stationers. (3) Railroad and transportation $93.20, hotel and restaurants $356.75, book stores and stationers $1.10, telephone and telegraph $0.35, gratuities and miscellaneous $75.28. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies of which I am an officer and employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Bass, Frank E., legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $229.17. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Bauer, Charles J., Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, 1120 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) BOMA Letter (bimonthly news letter). (5) I was not employed to support or oppose any proposed legislation. I was employed as permanent secretary of Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington with duties including appearance at public hearings on legislative and regulatory matters of direct concern to the association.

Beirne, Joseph A., Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $588.87 expenses, $3,300 salary, total moneys $3,888.87. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, airlines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my positions with the Communications Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Bemmels, Violet G., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated June 15, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Bennett, Jess B., 625 Bowen Building, 816 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Braniff International Airways, Love Field, Dallas, Tex. (1) Salary, $2,250; reimbursements, taxi, phone calls, railroad fares, dinners, and entertainments, total for last quarter, $701.73. (2) No money paid to any individual. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) All constructive legislation which will advance civil aviation.

Benson, Ernest H., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. National Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary at rate of $8,600 per annum. No expense account. (2) Ernest H. Benson. (3) Activities in connection with legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.

Berckes, Herbert C., secretary, Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Received for services as secretary, $750; expended for travel expense, $1,337.08 (includes transportation and per diem). (2) [Blank.] (3) Legislation. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the Southern Pine Lumber Industry.

Berge, Wendell, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Council of Technical Schools, fees

none, disbursements, $25.28; National Council of Business Schools, fees none, disbursements, $16.85. (2) No disbursements for purposes of section 307. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Veterans' training program.

Bergin, Preston B., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $400 salary, $47.05 expenses. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Berns, Tell, National Machine Tool Builders Association, 10525 Carnegie Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $1,396.50. (2) Paid for meals, lodging, transportation, and other traveling expenses only. (3) Traveling expenses on business trips. (4) Technical journals such as American Machinist, Iron Age, etc., and business journals such as Business Week, etc. (5) H. R. 6081, appropriation bill for ECA, section 204.

Bernard, William S., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) "Homeless, Tempest-Tossed," Survey Graphic, April 1948. "The Time is Now," Machinists Monthly Journal, April 1948. "Children of Misfortune," Pi Lambda Theta Journal, May 1948. (5) H. R. 6369, Emergency Displaced Persons Act.

Berns, Karl H., legislative-federal relations division, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,771.18, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $354.23. (2) Self (salary), expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Biorn, Norman E., Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 511-516 Commerce Building, St. Paul, Minn. (1) Salary from Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., none; received for actual expenses, $395.02; spent for legislative activities, none. (2) United States post office, $25.09; Northwest Bell Telephone Co., $30.55; Mary Lou Kustelski, $150; Northwest Airlines, $120.64; Railway Express Co., $5.13; McClain & Hedman, $7.38; miscellaneous, $56.23. (3) Postage, phone, telegrams, stenographic services, travel, express charges, stationery, miscellaneous travel expenses. (4) None. (5) Elimination of inequalities in tax legislation.

Bison, Henry, Jr., 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,581.27, expenditures for living purposes only. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of the free-enterprise system.

Bloch,[1] Charles J., Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co., 614 Persons Building, Macon, Ga. (1) Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, under which I have registered, requires that reports shall be filed by registrant so long as his activity continues. Inasmuch as my activity did not continue during the preceding quarter, I am filing no formal report. The only money which I have received from the Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. during the past quarter is as stated in paragraph 1 of my report for the previous quarter. There have been no expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Bodary, D. A. (national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America), 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 107 West Linwood Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo. (1) Annual compensation of $6,000; $12 per diem for expenses, hotel, meals, etc. (2) D. A. Bodary. (3) As national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America. My duties include handling of legislative matters and handling and progressing of grievances and other activities of my organization. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.

Bodfish, Morton, United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended $850.16. (2) Various. (3) For travel, hotel, and maintenance in Washington, D. C. (4) Only the customary materials found in our trade papers, in our trade association periodicals, and in our trade association bulletins: FSLIC Premium Reduction—Now, by Morton Bodfish, March 1948, Savings and Loans News; FSLIC Premium Rate Reduction Still on Congress' Agenda, by Morton Bodfish, April 1948, Directors Digest (condensed from Savings and Loans News of March 1948). (5) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

Boehne, John W., Jr., 1058 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association Employees of Collector of Internal Revenue, $900; same for postage and printing, $83.31. (2) John W. Boehne, Jr. (3) Counsel for above association. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employees of Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Bohannon, John N., Asheville, N. C., and 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) Personal remuneration, including expenses, during the preceding calendar quarter, $4,500. Money expended, see (3) below. (2) See (3) below. (3) Personal subsistence, transportation, routine, and other customary expenses only. Also see (6) Form B heretofore filed. (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect producing, gathering, transportation, distribution, or sale of natural gas.

Boorde, Thomas E.,[4] 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Railroad fares, $19.84; hotel, $4.50; meals, telephone, and incidentals, $14.95; total, $59.29. (2) Indicated above. (3) Indicated above. (4) National Pension Guide. (5) Extension and liberalization of old-age retirement (pensions) under Social Security Act.

Borkin, Joseph,[5] 1017 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.; Federation for Railway Progress, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $643.95. (2) Mimeographing service, Western Union, telephone company, office supplies company; hotels and railroads. (3) Office supplies and services, and travel. (4) [Blank.] (5) The above amount represents expenses in connection with the Washington office of the Federation for Railway Progress and travel and were not paid to me for the support of or opposition to any legislation.

Borkin, Joseph,[6] 1017 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $537.65. (2) Mimeographing service, Western Union, telephone company, office supplies company. (3) Office supplies and services. (4) [Blank.] (5) The above amount represents expenses in connection with the Washington office of the Federation for Railway Progress and was not paid to me for the support of or opposition to any legislation.

Bourg, Clarence J., 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Sugar Cane League, main office, New Orleans, La.; Farmers & Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, main office, Saginaw, Mich. (1) $170.95 has been received and expended in connection with legislation and other contacts with Government, of which not more than one-fourth has been expended in connection with legislation, such as taxicab fares about Washington and an occasional lunch when Congress is in session. (2) Various. (3) See (1). (4) Sugar Bulletin, of New Orleans, La.; Sugar Beet Journal, of Saginaw, Mich. (5) Any legislation affecting the domestic sugar producer.

Bowden, Benjamin Edward, 267 Robbins Drive, Newark (Licking County), Ohio; American Train Dispatchers Association, 10 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,022.34; expenses, $622.36; no money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxicabs, telephone, postage, laundry, cleaning, pullman fare, and various restaurants. (3) Necessary living, transportation, communication (lodging, meals, laundry, and cleaning services, transportation, telephone, and telegraph). (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor, particularly to oppose legislation detrimental to existing Railroad Retirement Insurance System.

Bowden, Ray E., National Grain Trade Trade Council, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, National Grain Trade Council (3 months), $1,919.30; refunds for travel expense, National Grain Trade Council, $558.99. (2) Salary, all for personal use; none for business or lobbying use. Travel expense, refunds for routine trips among market members of National Grain Trade Council. For actual lobbying expenses, not more than $5 paid for lobbying expenses, and this for taxi service in Washington, D. C. Remainder for other than lobbying activity. (3) Travel expense is for routine activity, carried on for many years, in visiting member markets, speaking at trade conventions, attending regular meetings of the Council; not designated as a lobbying activity except insofar as certain legislation, enacted or proposed, may be discussed as matter of information to trade. (4) Trade journals and occasionally the daily press comments upon talks I have made before meetings over the country. (5) Opposed international wheat agreement; favored minor revisions in Fair Labor Standards Act; favored modification of C. C. C. Charter language.

Boyd, H. B., U. S. Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Boyd, William R., Jr., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached schedule[2] for answers to items 1 to 5. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Boyle, James J., 410 Hill Building NW., Washington, D. C.; the United Public League Health, room 2009, 450 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received from employer United Public Health League, $3,128.22. (2) To the undersigned salary $2,101; rent $225, travel $156, telephone and telegrams $33.42, office supplies $10, clerical service $78, taxis $40.80, postage $11, conferences, lunches, dinners, $426. (3) All money received was paid for salary, rent, travel, miscellaneous services, office supplies, postage, conferences, taxis. (4) An occasional bulletin by the United Public Health League, San Francisco, Calif. (5) To support any and all legislation in the interest of the Public Health and to oppose what may not be of interest.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

Bradley, Otis T., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Guaranty Trust Co., of New York as trustee of the several trusts described as the Frances G. Phipps trust, Herbert Sanford Ward trust, Sarita E. Barclay trust, and Colville Herbert Sanford Barclay trust, under indenture dated December 24, 1913, and various indentures supplemental thereto made by Charles H. Sanford, 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) The employment is for the purpose of attempting to secure an amendment to the Federal Gift Tax Acts involving gifts in trust and the effect for gift tax purposes of the surrender by the grantor of a retained power to alter the disposition of the property but not in any way beneficial to himself, and the employment is expected to continue until such amendment is either secured or rejected.

Brady, Joseph E., International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Regular salary at the rate of $8,500 per year, plus $12 a day for 4 days in Washington and $22 added expense for telephone, telegrams, and cab. (2) Ambassador Hotel; Western Union; Telephone Co.; cab company. (3) General expenses while in Washington. (4) None. (5) Dry legislation—opposed.

Breed, Arthur H., Jr., 310 Fifteenth Street, Oakland, Calif.; Waterfront Employers Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948: salary, $3,574.92; transportation, $583.78; travel expense, $1,346.46; portage, telephone and telegraph, miscellaneous office expense approximately $145. (2) James D. Hahn, Associate, $50 per week plus expenses. (3) Supporting overtime-on-overtime legislation. (4) None. (5) Overtime on overtime.

Brewbaker, James M., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125; expenses reimbursed by employers, $481.20; expenditures, $481.20. (2) Expenses paid to various restaurants, hotels, and taxicabs. (3) Attending meetings to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trade-marks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC Acts.

Bright, O. O., 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $73.49. (2) To various hotels, cab drivers, and so forth. (3) See No. 2 above. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the lumber manufacturing industry.

Brightman, Melvin H., Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 salary as executive secretary of Dairy Industry Committee. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To observe legislation possibly affecting dairy industry.

Bronson, Ruth M., 1426 Thirty-fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Congress of American Indians (unpaid secretary), Claremore, Okla. (1) $40. (2) [Blank.] (3) Postage informing members and interested organizations and individuals of pending bills, telegrams and telephone, same purpose. (4) National Congress of American Indians Washington Bulletin. (5) All legislation concerning North American Indians.

Brooks, A. E., 2202 Forth Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.; American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Cook Building, Mexico, D. F. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To exempt from income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

Brooks, William F., National Grain Trade Council, 607 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expenses received during period amounted to $2,741.52, of which less than $10 was spent for any purpose covered by the act. (2) Taxicab fares, no one of which was in excess of 95 cents. (3) Transportation. (4) None, other than weekly newsletter published by employer. (5) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

Brown, Edgar G., director, National Negro Council, 1717 Euclid Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Money received: $1,600 membership contributions; expended, $1,380.39. (2) Various. (3) Printing, publicity, and advertising, etc. (4) None. (5) Antilynching, civil rights, legislation, nondiscriminatory measures, and reduction of representation based on disfranchisement.

Brown, Frederick E., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street, N. Y., Washington, D. C. (1) La Roe, Brown & Winn, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Meat-inspection bills, S. 2256, H. R. 5675, H. R. 6259.

Brown, Russell B., Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act: $30. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) My normal duties include periodic reporting to members of the association on pending legislation. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include those of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Bryson,[3] Jack, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received, $6,280.79; expended, $6,280.79. (2) To self. (3) For personal and family needs. No sums received or expended in connection with activities covered by act. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

NOTE.—Delay in filing this return was due to absence from city.

Bryson,[4] Jack, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received, $6,280.79; expended, $6,280.79. (2) To self. (3) For personal and family needs. No sums received or expended in connection with activities covered by act. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

Buckman, Henry Holland, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.; the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (1) Received from the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J., for professional services, $500 pro rata; expended for long distance telephone calls to the Vulcan Detinning Co. an amount to be reported next quarter. Complete telephone bills not yet received. (2) The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (3) Long distance telephone service. (4) None. (5) S. 2830, Eightieth Congress. In support of amendatory language designed to place private enterprise on a par with Government in the smelting of tin.

Bugbee,[4] George, American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $4,749.96; reimbursement of travel expenses, $377.57. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4)

[3] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the Journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Bugbee,[4] George, American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $4,749.96; reimbursement of travel expenses, $1,177.48. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Buck, Mrs. J. L. Blair, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N. Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For April, May, and June 1948, $1,450 travel and expense of entertaining in connection with work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. (2) See question 1. (3) See question 1. (4) General Federation clubwoman and State federation magazines. (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the General Federation supports or opposes legislation, and asks the organization membership to do likewise, when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention.

Building Products Institute,[5] 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No contributions received during last quarter. See attached sheet for expenditures during last quarter. The Building Products Institute is an organization devoted to economic research and analysis of trends in construction, disseminating its findings to those interested in the construction industry and to the public. However, in view of the uncertain interpretation of certain provisions of the regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes "principal purpose" and the phrase "To influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation etc." we are filing this form giving a full disclosure of the information required under the act. (2) See attached sheet.[3] (3) As indicated by items on attached sheet.[3] (4) Construction trends, press releases, and certain economic studies. (5) Proposals which may affect the producers of building materials.

Building Products Institute,[6] Room 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa. The Building Products Institute is an organization devoted to economic research and analysis of trends in construction, disseminating its findings to those interested in the construction industry and to the public. However, in view of the uncertain interpretation of certain provisions of the regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes "principal purpose" and the phrase "To influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation, etc." we are filing this form giving a full disclosure of the information required under the act. (2) See attached sheet.[3] (3) As indicated by items on attached sheet.[3] (4) Construction trends, press releases, and certain economic studies. (5) Proposals which may affect the producers of building materials.

Bulow, William J., Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, none; money expended $85.60. (2) Various transportation, telephone and telegraph companies, and United States Post Office. (3) Customary business expense for transportation,

[5] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[6] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

telephone calls, telegrams and postage. (4) None. (5) Postage rate legislation.

Burger,[1] George J., National Federation of Small Business, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $5,780.90 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent and acting as director in charge Washington office, National Federation of Small Business. Disbursements, $5,427.83. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publications, weekly bulletin, travel expenses. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Antitrust law enforcement, rubber tires bill, all legislation affecting small business.

Burger,[1] George J., 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $5,068.05 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent and acting as director in charge, Washington office, National Federation of Small Business. Expenditures: $4,770.96 for general operating expenses. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publications, weekly bulletin, travel expenses, etc. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Antitrust law enforcement (monopoly), rubber tires bill, all legislation affecting small business.

Burke, Edward R., 514 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Hawaii Statehood Commission, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $5,000 annual retainer as legal adviser to Hawaii Statehood Commission. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) The Enabling Act for Hawaii Statehood.

Burke, Harold, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for 3 months at $708.33⅓ per month equals $2,125. No expenses received or expended on any legislative activity. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Burke, Thomas F., the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received no money from the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits during April, May, and June, and had no expenses incurred on their behalf during like period. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946. Please accept this as notice of my last filing under Public Law 601, inasmuch as I will not be actively engaged in supporting or opposing any type of legislation after June 1948.

Burke, William R., 6612 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated June 15, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Burnett, Leo, Co., Inc.,[2] 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $90,355.86. (2) See addendum A.[3] (3) See addendum A.[3] (4) None. (5) Generally, legislation favorable to margarine manufacturers; specifically, discharge petition No. 12, and the Rivers bill (H. R. 2245).

Burnett, Leo, Co., Inc.,[2] 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) For National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $77,142.26. (2) See addendum A.[3] A portion of this sum not definitely ascertainable was for purposes referred to in section 307, Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. The reason for our not being able to specify the exact amount used for so-called lobbying purposes is that we handled advertising generally for the margarine association. Not only is some of our advertising not directed at the effective legislation at all, but individual advertisements may be partially what may be termed general advertising and partially an appeal to support the Margarine Association's position in the legislative matters referred to. (3) See addendum A.[3] (4) None. (5) Generally legislation favorable to margarine manufacturers; specifically the Rivers bill (H. R. 2245).

Burrows, Orrin A., International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L., 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,725, expenses $81.42, minus withholding and railroad retirement deductions. The expenses are deductible expenses, such as for transportation and other incidental items. None for lobbying purposes. (2) Telephone, taxi and bus companies, hotels and restaurants. (3) Transportation, meals, lodging, and telephone calls. (4) The Electrical Workers Journal. (5) All legislation affecting the electrical worker in particular and labor in general.

Butler, Eugene J., National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,758.96 salary for 3 months. (2) Eugene J. Butler. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

Butts, Joseph G., Jr., Gall & Lane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $4,000, expended $60.32. (2) Retainer paid to Gall & Lane. Expenses as indicated in item (3) below. (3) Taxi fares $17.25; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, $19.37; Eastern Photoprint Co., Washington, D. C., for photostat copies $19.20; miscellaneous, $4. (4) None. (5) To support limitation on Federal funds for insulation subsidies.

Byrum, George N., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $437.50; expenses, $437.50. (2) To George N. Byrum. (3) For salary and expenses while working in behalf of legislation in which the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen is interested. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interest of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

Cadden,[1] Joseph, Civil Rights Congress, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $101.26. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, hotel and restaurants. (3) Transportation and living expenses in Washington. (4) [Blank]. (5) Civil rights legislation; including support of bills to outlaw lynching abolish poll-tax, establish permanent FEPC, and oppose Mundt bill.

Caffrey, Charles G., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Manufacturers Association, 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C. (1) One-quarter of per annum salary of $9,000 per year effective as of May 1, 1948. (2) No payments were made to anyone by Charles G. Caffrey for any purpose whatsoever during the quarter in question (normal expenses excepted). (3) None. (4) None, however I might record that I spent about $25 during quarter for taxicab fare, lunches, telephone and carfare to and from the Capitol to find out and keep informed on legislation. (5) None.

Caldwell, Louis G., member of Kirkland, Fleming, Green, Martin & Ellis, 914 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) May 12, 1948, $4,472.09; May 14, 1948, $6,800.63; breakdown; $2,400 retainer at $1,200 per month; $7,027 legal fees in excess of retainer; disbursements on behalf of client, $1,845.72; May disbursements for which payment received July 5, 1948, $538.01; June disbursements for which payment has not been received $1,523.34. (2) See attached.[1] (3) See attached.[2] (4) None. (5) S. 2231, to limit the power of broadcast stations and to break down clear channels, and other bills and resolutions covering the same subject matter.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Rehabilitation Association, care of H. Earle Correvont, president, 900 Bauch Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) $450 received from the National Rehabilitation Association by the firm of Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for the association. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) No particular legislation. The association is interested in any legislation affecting the vocational rehabilitation program.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $2,100 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for National Tax Equality Association. Allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Firm retained as Washington counsel to prepare and present to congressional committees legal aspects of tax advantages enjoyed by cooperatives and other tax-exempt corporations.

Carey,[1] John L., American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary received, $5,500 (less than 10 percent of time devoted to legislative work). Travel expenses to Washington on legislative work, $75. (2) I have paid no money to anyone for any purposes related to legislative work. (3) None. (4) The Journal of Accountancy, the Certified Public Accountant. (5) Legislation relating to rights of certified public accountants to practice before Federal agencies (H. R. 2657, H. R. 3214, H. R. 5732), or other legislation relating to accounting or auditing.

Carpenter, Austin W., New York Associated Businessmen, Inc., Sherburne, N. Y. (1) Receipts, $1,817; expended, $2,362.27. (2) Various. (3) For dispensing information and traveling expenses to appear before congressional legislative committees. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which discriminates in any way against the constitutional right of small business people to equality of competitive opportunity.

Carr, Ralph, 614 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.; United Indian Traders Association, Inc., Gallup, N. Mex. (1) Have received $6,000 from United Indian Traders Association, Inc., Gallup, N. Mex. (2) Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., $55.13; United Air Lines, Denver, Colo., $103.16; Pennsylvania Railroad, $15.31; Northwestern Air Lines, $95.39; Santa Fe Railroad, $100.16; El Navajo Hotel, Gallup, N. Mex., $10.26; meals, incidentals, tips outside of hotel, $165; total, $544.41. (3) Traveling to Washington, D. C., and Gallup, N. Mex., for work in connection with my employment. (4) None. (5) My employment is not in any sense for lobbying, but appearance before the Congress in connection with matters involving my employer which necessitated appearance before a joint committee of the House and Senate on proposed legislation of $90,000,000 for Navajo Indians. My first work is to advise and represent the traders on the Navajo Reservation in their dealings with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Navajo Tribal Council.

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $3,000 as compensation; reimbursed $764 for expenses advanced. Expended $975.65 which will be reimbursed as follows: Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $87.90; Munsey Trust Co., $525; travel expense, $250; incidentals, $37.50; stenographers, $75. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Munsey Real Estate Co., stenographers, transportation, and incidentals. Stenographers G. Miller and M. Smith. (3) Telephone service, rents, transportation, and incidentals; stenographers. (4) None. (5) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.

Carter, Asa L., B-Line Abutters, 325 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) I received and expended only $112.16; costs and disbursements herein, divided: Petty cash, clerical work, searching records, and addressing mail, $60.14; and for postage, printing, telephoning, carfare, etc., $52.02. (2) It was paid to postmasters, printers, public-service companies, and standard clerical help at Pittsburgh, Pa. (3) For the purpose of furthering sentiment for a "Rainhill prize" for the best, very high speed electric B-line pipeway wagon train for major heavy freight—maximum ton-miles and minimum time and space for passageway rolling stock, etc. (low-priced ocean electric power, no tunnel costs at sea and equipment one two-hundredths weight of present used railroad rolling stock—same cost per weight). (4) I publish nowhere except by first-class mail to abutters and contributors, and their due and immediate representatives. (5) Everything for or against very high speed B-line. I include that set forth in last quarter report and that which appears in hereto attached "exhibit A" each, every, and all statements of which I repeat herein. (Note: The first three figures of high-speed curves is a supplement to the note in last quarter's report.)

Carter,[3] Clarence B., Railroad Pension Conference, post office box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) Received $45 for traveling expenses. (2) Clarence B. Carter. (3) Traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support of H. R. 4695 and S. 2055 which provided retirement after 30 years of railroad service at half pay.

Carter,[4] Clarence B., Railroad Pension Conference, post office box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) Received $60 for traveling expenses. (2) Clarence B. Carter. (3) Traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support of H. R. 4695 and S. 2055, providing 30-year retirement at half pay for railroad workers.

Carter, Jack, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $375 per month as salary, minus social security and withholding taxes; $33.50 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration.

Case, Ralph H., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Allied Aviation Corp., Cockeysville, Md. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 631, Eighth Congress.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the secretary only.
[3] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

Case, Ralph H., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.: (A) the Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; (B) the Quinaielt Tribe, Washington State; (C) the Sioux Tribe, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Montana. (1) Receipts (A) the Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., $1,077.25; (B) the Quinaielt Tribe, Washington State, none; (C) the Sioux Tribe, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Montana, none. (2) Disbursements: (A) Stenographer and reporter, $65; (B) None; (C) stenographer, telegrams, sundries, $36.65. (3) As stated above. (4) None. (5) None.

Casey, D. E., American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received as salary, $2,649.99. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specified.

Casey, Joseph E., Committee for Equalization of Tobacco Taxes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $15,000. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912, which provides for a fair and equitable tax on cigarettes depending upon the price at which these cigarettes are sold.

Cates, Larry, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $2,338.10, expended $586.10. (2) Various companies and business firms for transportation, communications, gasoline, oil, airplane operation, miscellaneous entertainment, meals, hotels, tips, and incidental expenses. (3) Travel and all expenses in connection therewith, taxi, telegraph, telephone, and for the prosecution of a pilot strike on National Airlines where scab pilots are currently employed in a strike-breaking attempt. (4) Air Line Pilot. (5) All legislation concerning aviation safety and hours, wages, and working conditions of pilots on our commercial air lines.

Chace, W. E., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $75 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 669, 2494, 3421, 4562, 4752, 4417, and S. 1251.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Salary, $6,250; expenses in Washington reimbursed by employer, $1,041.46; expenditures in Washington, $1,041.46. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills affecting national labor policy, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trade-marks, control powers, revision of SEC, foreign aid, Federal housing, Government competition with business, and such other matters as may affect industry.

Chan, Sau Ung, 934 Smith Street, Honolulu, T. H. (mailing address, Post Office Box 3315, Honolulu, T. H.); Chinese Merchants Benevolent Association of Honolulu, 71 North Hotel Street, Honolulu, T. H., and Mr. K. L. Wong, King and Smith Streets, Honolulu, T. H. (1) Money received: $350 from Mr. K. L. Wong, King and Smith Streets, Honolulu, T. H. ($7,700 from Chinese Merchants Benevolent Association of Honolulu, 71 North Hotel Street, Honolulu, T. H., previously reported). Money expended: See Form A attached herewith.[1] (2) V. K. Kwong, Pan-American Airways, United Airlines, Hotal New Yorker, Hotel Shoreham, Hotel Delmonico, Hotel Sir Francis Drake (for details see Form A attached herewith[1]). (3) Refund of expenditures incurred on my behalf, travel and miscellaneous expenses. (4) Pamphlet entitled "To Rectify a Hardship on Certain Persons Lawfully Resident in the United States of America for Periods of 16 to 24 Years." (5) H. R. 5922, 5929, S. 2349 (identical bills); H. R. 6476 and S. 2667 (identical bills).

Chandler, E. Lawrence, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $10. (2) Taxicab drivers, United States post office. (3) Taxicab fares, postage. (4) None. (5) Legislative bills regarding which it is considered that the engineering viewpoint can be constructive.

Christman, Miss Elisabeth, National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,105 salary as secretary-treasurer of the Nation Women's Trade Union League. Legislative work is only one phase of the program of the league. My work is predominantly administrative, but a small percentage of my time is spent in activities in furtherance of our legislative program. (2) No money expended except for an occasional taxi fare. (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin, the league's monthly publication. (5) [Blank.]

Church, R. R., 6000 Champlain Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Commission, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I receive no salary, $10 per day allowance, when away from home for hotel and meals only, as incurred, plus railroad transportation when necessary. I advance out of my funds, paying these expenses, after which I am reimbursed by the National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission. At the present time said council is indebted to me for advancement for hotel, meals, and railroad fare. (2) Dunbar Hotel, Washington, D. C.; McAlpin Hotel, New York; B. & O. Railroad, and Pennsylvania Railroad. (3) For subsistence of myself, when actively engaged for aforesaid council. (4) None. (5) Ives-Fulton bill (S. 984) against discrimination in employment.

Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade,[1] 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) List of contributors attached.[2] (2) Rider attached.[2] (3) Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. (4) [Blank.] (5) Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Clarke, David R., 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Cohn, Marcus, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During a typical month, the registrant devotes a maximum of 5 percent of his time to matters which may possibly be regarded as embraced in section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The figures set forth here for the months of April, May, and June 1948 are based upon that percentage; salary, $93.75; travel, $6.66; telephone, $12.36; office and miscellaneous expenses, $65.41. (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) See (1). (4) I have supplied information to the general press on immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) Legislation dealing with immigration and S. 2764 and H. R. 6817. See original registration statement and item (1).

[3] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed.

[1] Not printed.
[2] Not printed. Filed in the clerk's office.
[3] Filed with the clerk only.

Colborn, Miss Fern M., Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Personal expenses refunded, meals, $30.25; lodging, $6; travel, $38.26; total, $74.51. Salary, quarterly, $350. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as No. 3.

Coles, Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.: Alaska Freight Express Corp., Pier 50, Seattle, Wash. (1) During past calendar quarter, registrant has received no money from Alaska Freight Express Corp. as compensation for work done has not yet been fixed or paid. Expenditures have been approximately $180. (2) Payments have been made to the telephone and telegraph company, several restaurants, taxies, and Army and Navy Club. (3) Telephone, telegraph, luncheons, dinners, taxies, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation dealing with Government assistance to Alaska shipping.

Coles, Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; New York Foreign Freight Forwarders & Brokers Association, 27 Water Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Since April 1, 1948, we have received a total amount of $1,632.54 from members of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Customs Brokers Association and $700 from various freight forwarders located in other cities. Our expenditures have been $122.95. (2) Expenditures have been purely for incidental matters such as telephones, lunches, transportation, and mimeographing, and have been paid to the telephone company, taxicab company, mimeographers, restaurants, etc. (3) Telephones, luncheons, transportation, mimeographing. (4) [Blank.] (5) Registrant has been employed as attorney to present to the Congress and to the governmental agencies concerned information concerning foreign freight forwarders and use of their services under the foreign relief programs.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., which firm receives an annual retainer from the Chase National Bank of the city of New York for professional services. As stated in his registration statement on form B, registrant does not believe he is subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Registrant's Federal tax legislative work comprises only an incidental and minor part of his duties. If any of registrant's activities are subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act the portion of the annual retainer from the Chase National Bank that might be attributed to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $250 during the second quarter of 1948, and disbursements pertaining to such activities were $11.32. (2) See answer to (1). Expense payments were made to the firm under the terms of the annual retainer for hotel rooms, meals, transportation, postage, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of members and employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the city of New York.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Collett, F. G., 1844 Mintwood Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Indians of California, Inc., 1078 University Avenue, Berkeley, Calif. (1) Receipts, $2,154.21; expended, $2,173.57. (2) To various persons and concerns for miscellaneous services, such as stenographic services, stationery and supplies, rooms and meals, telephone and telegraph, postage and transportation, and expenses and maintenance of delegates representing Indians of California, and of other persons (see attached report of expenditures[1]). (3) To secure remedial legislation. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to Indians of California.

Compton, R. T., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary $3,750; expenses reimbursed by employer, $778.11; expenditures, $778.11. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,175, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $235. (2) Self (salary); expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), and informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Condon, Arthur D., 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., Military and Naval Distributors Association, Inc., 295 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,250. Expended none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Condon, Arthur D., 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Morton Salt Co., 310 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) April, May, June 1948, received $5,221; expended $221. (2) $221 expended for long-distance calls and transportation. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717.

Cone, John C., Pan American Airways, Inc., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since registering under the lobby, I have been ill with virus pneumonia and other complications and have been confined to the hospital, at home, and later away from Washington, convalescing in Florida, until returning to duty June 14, 1948, and have not received or spent any funds in connection with legislation. (2) None received or spent in connection with legislation. (3) Same as above. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose legislation but may be concerned with any legislation relating to aviation which may be pending.

Conn, Donald A., Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the calendar quarter April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, my salary from the association was $6,250. The time spent in Washington in this period were the days April 13–16, May 21–24, and June 9–10. Expended $459.50. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Conover, Julian D., American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received no compensation other than regular salary as previously stated. Expended, $36.09. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $15.75; telephone, $20.34. (4) Am editorial director of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Conroy, Eugene J., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None—no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cooley, Thomas M., II, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (Compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement.) Employment terminated as of June 30, 1948. (2) Employment terminated as of June 30, 1948. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 6396.

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass.; Veterans' Association Federal Employers Naval Ship Yard, New York, N. Y., Lenruth Hall, Waverly and Myrtle Avenues, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) None this quarter. (2) Self. (3) Travel, hotel, meals, and expenses only when on official business for Veterans' Association Federal Employees Naval Ship Yard, New York. (4) None. (5) Support or oppose legislation effecting veterans' preference in Federal employment.

Corbett, John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $2,681.70 as wages and $200.01 for office rental. (2) $200.01 to "Labor" for office rental. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and legislative matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interest of labor.

Cortright, Frank W., National Association of Home Builders, Suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, April, May, and June 1948, $4,375.02; per diem, April, May, and June 1948, $637; expenses, travel, $594.08, taxis in town, $54; entertainment, $83—$731.08; expenses in connection with committee meetings, taxis, meals, tips, entertainment, and so forth, $45; total, $5,788.10. As indicated upon my registration, I have been advised by counsel that I am not subject to the Lobbying Act. Such registration and this report are therefore filed under protest and merely as a matter of personal precaution in view of the indefiniteness of said act and the lack of judicial interpretation thereof. Neither said registration nor this report in any way are intended to constitute an admission by me that I am subject to the act. The payments reported above as my salary and per diem are for general services as executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders, and are not dependent upon rendition of services which might be considered "lobbying" within the meaning of the act. Similiarly, expenses reported include substantial amounts for routine association business which could not be regarded as lobbying within the meaning of the act. Expenses reported do not include items of association expense such as travel, secretary's salary, telephone, and rent, which are part of the general administrative budget of the association and do not represent moneys received by me from the association. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, INS, UP, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation, directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. I also write an article each month

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

for the American Builder, a monthly publication devoted to the interests of the housing industry. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but I am the executive vice president of the trade association for the home building industry. In that capacity it is incumbent upon me to supervise, among other things, the work of the association's legislative department. The function of that department of the association is to follow all legislation affecting the home building industry; to advise the membership of the association of all such legislation; and to make known to the public and to the Congress the opinion of the membership on all such legislation.

Costello, John M., 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.; American League for an Undivided Ireland, care Charles T. Rice, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Received as fee for service ., $750; received as reimbursement for expenditures, $1,193.25. (2) (a) Public Printer, Washington, D. C., $1,025.79; (b) Truman Ward, Washington, $52; (c) Acme Newspictures, Washington, D. C., $14; (d) Wide World Photos, $17; (e) Albee Stenographic Service, $20; (f) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $26.17; (g) miscellaneous, $37.69. (3) (a) Reprints congressional speech; (b) mimeographing letter; (c) photographs; (d) photographs; (e) mimeographing; (f) long-distance toll charges; (g) travel expenses, gas, oil. (4) Congressional Record. (5) Any legislation which may tend to effectuate the unification of all Ireland into a united nation.

Covington, J. Harry, III, American Smelting & Refining Co., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for clients, $88.37. (2) Telephone and telegraph expense, $63.37; travel expense including hotel accommodations, $25. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Crampton, Charles J., 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex. State Rights Association, box 2559, Houston, Tex. (1) Retainer fee as counsel, State Rights Association, second quarter, 1948, $5,000; second quarter, 1948 expense account filed for reimbursement, $630.79. (2) Statement attached. (3) Statement attached. (4) None. (5) To bring about constructive cooperation between community property and common law States for the development of a plan of tax equalization which will afford an equitable basis for income, estate, and gift taxation in the Federal tax structure. To support complete retroactive repeal of the 1942 estate and gift-tax amendments as they apply to community property States in an unfair, discriminatory, inequitable manner. We have supported and will continue our support of the American Bar Association's recommendation for tax equalization.

Crawford, William A.,[1] Railroad Association of Georgia, 596 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) No money received or expended for any lobbying activities. (2) No one. (See reply to question (1) above.) (3) None. (See reply to question (1) above.) (4) None. (5) None.

Crowley, Leo J., 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.; the Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, 509 Seventeenth Street, Denver, Colo. (1) In connection with Federal legislation received attorney's fee of $130 and expenses of $257 during April 1948, and attorney's fees of $200 and expenses of $402 during June 1948. Expense money was reimbursement for amounts expended for Pullman fare, hotel expenses, dining car, restaurants, taxicabs, tips, and other incidentals. (2) Various restaurants, Hotel Statler and Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Pullman Co., taxicab drivers, Washington Baseball Club and various Washington theaters. (3) $659 was expended by me during the period of this report for hotel expenses, meals in restaurants, dining cars, pullman fares, taxicabs, tips, entertainment, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads operating in and having trackage in the State of Colorado.

Cullum, Robert M., Committee for Equality in Naturalization, 261 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary totaling $1,500 for quarter; traveling expenses, $47.60. (2) Paid out miscellaneous traveling expenses, fares, hotels, taxis, etc. (3) To attend executive board meetings in New York City. (4) None. (5) Legislation to provide that the right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race.

Cuneo, John C., 922 Jay Street, post office box 1054, Modesto, Calif.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Receipts for California operations of Townsend plan, $839.16; less deductions by national office, $125.78; net amount for operations in California, $713.38; received from California legislative committee for operations, $675; total available for California operations, $1,388.38; amount paid to John C. Cuneo for his personal use, $1,080; balance to be used for future California operations. (2) Total disbursements for State operations paid from total receipts deposited in State office account, $370.66. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Townsend national recovery plan.

Curran, Roland, Central Valley Project Association, box 15, Bakersfield, Calif. (1) Received from Central Valley Project Association for all activities connected with association, April 1 to June 30, 1948, $8,978. (2) Maintenance of Bakersfield office and California activities, $1,428; Hotel Carroll Arms, Washington, D. C., 31 days, $270; Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C., 49 days, $392; telephone and telegraph, postage, meals, taxi, stenographic service, miscellaneous, $665; total, $2,755. (3) Salary, maintain California office and Washington activities, personal expenses to and from Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Central Valley project and flood-control project in same area.

Curtiss, Ralph E., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; retained by Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc., 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis. (1) Received, $1,000.10; expended, $9. (2) Telephone company and telegraph company. (3) Telephone calls and telegrams. (4) ATOA News (monthly publication of the association). (5) Any legislation affecting the tavern industry.

Daley, William L., 528 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Receipts and expenditures on behalf of National Editorial Association, $1,072.92. (2) Railroads, telegraph and telephone companies, taxicabs, office-supply companies, $247.92. (3) Reimbursement for expenses, transportation, and communication. (4) NEA Legislative Bulletin, the National Publisher, bulletins of State and other publishers' organizations, and industry trade publications. (5) Furnishes advisory analysis of all legislation affecting the press.

Damon, Eugene J., St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., chairman, Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Salary indicated on Form B plus reimbursement of $172.82 out-of-pocket expenses.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

(2) Hotels, restaurants, Pullman Co., taxi operators. (3) Travel, rooms, meals, and incidental expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation of interest to railroads generally.

Darby, Frederick R., 3270 Westerville Road, Columbus, Ohio. (1) No money received or expected. Action will not begin until middle of following quarter. (2) Negate. (3) Negate. (4) The Columbus Citizen, April 29, 1948; United Press Radio, June 5, 1948. (5) In re bill S. 2213 of the second session in the Eightieth Congress.

Daugherty, Paul J., Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to the organization.

Davidson, John B., Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., formerly Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 902 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Davies, Aled P., American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $2,538.46. Travel expenses when out of Chicago, including lodging, meals, taxicabs, entertainment, transportation, telephone, and telegraph, $3,880.11. (2) Various railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and telephone and telegraph companies. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry.

D'Avila, Sarah H., National Committee To Abolish the Poll Tax, 127 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $510.41. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections.

Davis & Gilbert, a partnership consisting of A. M. Davis and A. M. Gilbert, the Best Foods, Inc., 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Expenditures: $526.96 for transportation, meals, lodging, telephone, and telegraph expenses; and $102.90 to Dr. A. J. Carlson for transportation from Chicago to Washington, D. C. and return, and for his hotel and living expenses during the course of the trip. Receipts: The registrant was reimbursed in part by the Best Foods, Inc., during the quarter for the aforementioned expenditures, and will be reimbursed by said company for the entire sum thereof. Registrant has received from the Best Foods, Inc., the usual equal monthly installments of its annual legal fee of $35,000, which fee the registrant has received every year for many years. (2) $526.96 to railroads, air lines, cabs, hotels, restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies; $102.90 to Dr. A. J. Carlson, University of Chicago. (3) $526.96, travel to and from Washington, D. C., living expenses in Washington, D. C., and telephone calls and telegrams; $102.90 paid to Dr. A. J. Carlson to reimburse him for expenses incurred in connection with his appearance as a witness on April 2, 1948, before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services which was then considering margarine legislation. (4) None. (5) Registrant is not and was not employed specifically for the purpose of supporting or opposing any pending legislation, nor was registrant employed specifically for the purposes set forth in the first sentence of section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Registrant is paid a yearly retainer for acting as legal counsel to the Best Foods, Inc., and, in addition to registrant's major duties as such counsel, registrant presented the cause of the company in respect to legislation affecting margarine which is one of the many products manufactured by that company.

Dawes, Bourbon, Hotel Association of Washington, D. C., 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,024.98; expenses,

$84.30. (2) (a) Taxis and transportation, $31.30; (b) miscellaneous lunches, dinners, $33.25; (c) miscellaneous entertainment of visitors, $19.80. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia hotels.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley (the Chase National Bank of the City of New York), 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., which firm receives an annual retainer from the Chase National Bank of the City of New York for professional services. As stated in his registration statement on Form B, registrant does not believe he is subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Registrant's Federal tax legislative work comprises only an incidental and minor part of his duties. If any of registrant's activities are subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act the portion of the annual retainer from the Chase National Bank that might be attributed to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $250 during the second quarter of 1948, and disbursements pertaining to such activities were $11.32. (2) See answer to (1). Expense payments were made to the firm under the terms of the annual retainer for hotel rooms, meals, transportation, postage, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of members and employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley (the New York Stock Exchange), 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Dawson, Joseph Martin, Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations, Baptists of the United States, 1628 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) In addition to monthly salary (a total of $1,749.99 for the quarter) allocated by sustaining conventions and paid for conducting the office which has little to do with Congress, I expended $9 for congressional approaches. (2) United States post office, office printer. (3) Letters and literature. (4) Report From the Capital, monthly newsletter issued by the organization; various papers published by the Baptist denomination throughout the United States; news releases to Religious News Service; Larston D. Farrar's Washington Religious Review; and local newspapers. (5) None. In the case of Federal Aid to Education, I did write letters and send literature to some Congressmen urging amendment to Taft and McCowen bills with view to amending said bills so as to prevent application of Government tax funds to nonpublic schools; also in response to official resolutions adopted by northern and southern Baptist conventions, I appeared before Senate Military Committee in opposition to universal military training. In addition, I attended citizens' committees in behalf of admitting displaced persons and renewing Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, following which I wrote a few letters to congressional committees in behalf of these measures.

Day, Mary R., lawyer, 741 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Massman Construction Co., 20 West Ninth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Bill for the relief of the Massman Construction Co., H. R. 2192.

DeGroot, E. H., Jr., 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) See attached statement,[1] typewritten and signed, which is hereby made an integral part of this Form C, to which the oath of the registrant filing same applies without reservation or exception. (2) See statement attached.[2] (3) See statement attached.[2] (4) None. (5) See statement attached.[2]

Denning, William I., 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,875 was received as retainer for services rendered plus $346.27 reimbursement for personal expenses in connection with work for the association; $150 of the above amount covers the salary of an economist employed in my office. (2) William I. Denning. (3) For general legal representation in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Not called upon during quarter in connection with any legislation.

DeQuevedo, Rafael G., Building Products Institute, Room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C.: Salary, $1,050; expense, $146.55. (2) Taxi, $42.70; restaurant, $103.35; publication, $2.50. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Dickerman, John M., National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary from April 1 through June 30, 1948, $2,500; expenses, $150.06. The salary and expenses listed under (1) are charged against that portion of the association's budget allocated to the legislative department, of which I am in charge, which allocation is $20,000 for 1948. Only some of the functions of this department might be deemed as coming within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, hotel rooms, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, INS, UP, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter, and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) All legislation affecting the home-building industry.

Dickinson, A. W., American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary $1,375 for this activity; expended $22.05. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $9.50; luncheons, $12.55. (4) Am associate editor of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Disbrow, Walter L., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, April, May, and June 1948, $1,080.90. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of the retirement federation on legislation affecting their welfare. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any and all legislation affecting the civil-service retirement laws.

Disney, Wesley E., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, $1,500; Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C., $6,250; American Hotel Association, New York, N. Y., $1,000; Wilcox Oil Co., Tulsa, Okla., $500; Marlboro Cotton Mills, Inc., McColl, S. C., $100; Penobscot Chemical Fiber Co., Boston, Mass., $575; Lowell Liquidation Corp., Boston, Mass., $2,500; Rudolph Wurlitzer Co., Chicago, Ill., $500; Henry B. Cleereman, Green Bay, Wis., $1,000; Ozark-Mahoning Co., Tulsa, Okla., $7,500; incidentals, such as taxi fares, telephone calls, etc., $163.29. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Natural Gas Act amendments; depreciation allowance; family partnerships; percentage depletion; attention to legislative matters affecting oil and gas industry.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) $600 salary and $225 expense allowance. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., the postmaster, the Superintendent of Documents, and others. (3) Telephone service, postage, Government documents, rent, and minor office expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dorsett, J. Dewey, Association of Casualty Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the first quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Article entitled "Casualty Companies Prepare for Atomic Energy Problems" appearing in May 28, 1948, issue of the New York Journal of Commerce. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

Dougherty, John E., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $619.36 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $85.83 was expended by me as expense money, during the second quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $171.62 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $85.83 was expended by me as expense money during the second quarter of 1948 for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Dow, Fayette B., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Pipe Line Companies, care of L. F. Kahle, treasurer, box 1349, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Deponent has rendered no services in the past for the Committee for Pipe Line Companies that come within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. This registration under the act is made in order to comply with its provisions with respect to any such services that he may render in the future. Of total compensation received by deponent the sum of $500 is believed to be a fair apportionment for such services as might come within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. (2) No money has been expended by deponent. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) No legislation is proposed by Committee for Pipe Line Companies, deponent's employer, and there is no pending legislation which deponent has been called upon to support or oppose.

Dowd, M. J., care of Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) For second quarter of year 1948: Salary $960 per month; incidental traveling expenses, $1,047.63. (2) The salary is regular compensation for my full-time employment as consulting engineer for Imperial Irrigation District on irrigation, power, drainage, and related matter. Expenses represent reimbursement to me for personal travel, hotel, and subsistence expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the Colorado River and affecting Imperial Irrigation District.

Downs, Scheib, Becker & Walsh, a law firm, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See statements filed by Thomas J. Downs. Registrant does not believe that it is required either to report or register under the act. (2) Same. (3) Same. (4) Same. (5) Same.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers (now known as Associated Fur Manufacturers, Inc.), 393 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank]. (3) [Blank]. (4) [Blank]. (5) Legislation affecting the fur industry.

Drake, John, The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $37.60. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares. (4) [Blank]. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act jointly to process and market their milk.

Dresie,[1] Grey, 202 Bitting Building, Wichita, Kans., Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) $5.98 received as reimbursement for actual expense. (2) Telephone Co., $5.98. (3) Telephone calls. (4) Friendly Dollar. (5) Tax equality.

Dresie,[2] Grey, 202 Bitting Building, Wichita, Kans., Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, Wichita, Kans. (1) $150 from Kansas Independent Business Men's Association for traveling expense to Chicago, Ill. (2) Various filling stations, hotels, etc., from Wichita, Kans., to Chicago, Ill. (3) Travel. (4) The Friendly Dollar. (5) Tax equality.

Drysdale, R. M., Jr.,[2] Federation for Railway Progress, 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,958.34, represents total remuneration as executive vice president and includes no amount for supporting or opposing any legislation; expenses, $316.83. (2) To various railroads, hotels, etc. (3) Travel expenses. (4) Railway Progress, vol. 2, No. 1, March 1948 "A Report on One Year of Progress." (5) None.

Drysdale,[2] Robert M., Jr., Federation for Railway Progress, 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $2,124.99; expenses, $139.75. (2) To various hotels, railroads, etc. (3) For traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

DuBois, Ben, secretary, Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Center, Minn. (1) I perhaps am employed in a dual capacity. I am secretary of the Independent Bankers Association and carry on the work of the association. I am also our Washington representative and, therefore, am registered as a lobbyist. I can't conceive of the necessity of listing all the general expenses of this organization. It would seem that the information required was that amount of money spent in what might be called lobbying. I was in Washington once during this quarter and my total expenses covering transportation, hotel accommodation, sustenance, etc., amounted to $207.68. I visited a few Members of the Congress as we were interested in the passage of S. 829. We haven't put out any general circular letter as I have been attending State banker association conventions and calling on banks generally in quite a number of States. Some of my conversations with bankers might be in the category of lobbying, as I have urged them to urge their representatives in Congress to use their influence in support of S. 829. If under the terms of this act this constitutes lobbying, kindly advise and I will file my expenses incident to the trips I have taken. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Dunn, William M., Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $295.40, expenses; $1,999.98, salary; total, $2,295.38. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform the normal functions of my positions with the Communications Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Dwyer, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary previously reported. Expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,193.67. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, retail stores, taxicabs, telephone companies, Government Printing Office, Hickey Bros. (3) Administrative, traveling and incidental expenses, newspapers, periodicals, cigars, cigarettes, etc.; meals and entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting petroleum and its products, or natural gas.

Echols, Oliver P., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Nothing received except salary no part of which was paid for activities covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. No expenditures. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Edleman, John W., 1031 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Textile Workers Union of America-CIO, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,499.94 salary; $582.89 to reimburse actual expenses incurred—$100 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington—remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Eichelberger, Frank, 1501 Taylor Way, Tacoma, Wash.; Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co., 1225 Crocker First National Bank Building, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co., $159.60. (2) Mayflower Hotel and Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., $84.36; Pennsylvania Railroad, New York City, $42.84; restaurants, taxicabs, and transportation companies, $32.40. (3) Rooms, meals, and transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6535.

Elliott, John Doyle, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received salary of $60 per week and reimbursement for fares, mileage, hotel expenses, meals while traveling or away from residence location, up to the amount of $30 per week; these latter expenses amounting to $85 during this last quarter. (2) Expenses designated in (1), above, consisting of fares and meals only in this quarter, paid to carriers and restaurants. (3) Contacting citizens, organizations, and Townsend Clubs. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, Eightieth Congress, first session, generally known as the Townsend National Recovery Plan, in support thereof.

Ellis,[1] Clyde T., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,000; car allowance, $300; expense accounts, $249.64; American Airlines, $380.07; total, $3,929.71. (2) Self for salary and expenses including reimbursement for meals, hotel, transportation, and tips. (3) Travel incident to members' meetings, board of directors meetings, etc. (4) Rural electrification. (5) Legislation affecting the growth and welfare of rural electric cooperative corporations, public power and public utility districts, and legislation affecting public power developments where they would in turn affect the rural electric cooperative corporations, public power and public utility districts.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Arabian-American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None received and none expended. This is submitted as a final report, since we are no longer retained to represent Arabian-American Oil Co. Therefore, there will be no further activities by us. At such time as we render a bill and are paid by this client we shall submit a report, but until that time we shall file no quarterly report because of our inactivity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; R. W. Britton, 1416 Cherry Street, Erie, Pa. (1) None received and none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to partnerships.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; St. Joe Paper Co. and affiliated companies, Barnett National Bank Building, Jacksonville, Fla. (1) None received and none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with investigation by subcommittee of Senate Judiciary Committee into question of any impairment of credit of Florida.

Ellsworth, Charles K., Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,250; expenses, $650 Hill & Knowlton is not engaged in any lobbying activities and does not believe that it is required to register under Public Law 601. However, it has been engaged by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, the American Butter Institute, and the National Creameries Association to carry on certain educational activities intended to explain the consequences of proposed legislation to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine. In view of announced interpretations by representatives of the Department of Justice implying that such educational activities are subject to Public Law 601, the firm is reporting receipts and expenditures for said educational campaign, pending judicial clarification of the law's intent. (2) Expense money paid out only to hotel, restaurants, and cab drivers. (3) Covered above. (4) Have no records of any such publication. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Have been assigned by Hill & Knowlton, Inc., to prepare educational information and material showing consequences of measures proposing to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; as general counsel, American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Services to date have not involved the supporting or opposing legislation. At the request of the association, legal analyses and opinions are rendered from time to time on legislation affecting public power.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. Report as attorney for Water Project Authority of the State of California. (1) $1,500, the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Filed for first quarter 1948.
[2] Filed for second quarter 1948.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions, and legislative matters incidental thereto. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telephone, telegraph, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 2873, 3194, 3218, 4152, 4157, 5524, 5901, 5927, 6367, 6419, 6705, 6763, 6935; House Resolution 618; House Joint Resolution 226; S. 912, 2265, 2377, 2473, 2858; Senate Joint Resolution 145.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel for Colorado River Board of California and Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $8,520, representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in legislation and litigation affecting California's interests in the Colorado River. Of this figure $1,500 was paid by the Colorado River Board and $7,020 by the Six Agency Committee. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on: H. R. 2873, 3194, 3218, 3533, 5313, 5776, 5777, 5901, 6367, 6658, 6705, 6717, 6763, 6935; House Resolution 618; House Joint Resolution 226; S. 1987, 2255, 2346, 2392, 2473, 2714, 2858; Senate Joint Resolution 145.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel, department of water and power, city of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $2,400, representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, litigation and legislative matters incidental thereto. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telephone, telegraph, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 727, 728, 2873, 3194, 3218, 4989, 5313, 5776, 5901, 6031, 6367, 6658, 6697, 6705, 6717, 6763, 6777, 6935; House Resolution 618; House Joint Resolution 226; S. 1985, 1987, 2346, 2392, 2473, 2858; Senate Joint Resolution 145.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) $2,100 representing legal fees, etc., for services of this office, and in California, in negotiation with the Government departments, litigation, and legislative matters relating thereto. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telephone, telegraph, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on: H. R. 2873, 3194, 3218, 5776, 5777, 5901, 6367, 6658, 6705, 6717, 6763, 6935; House Resolution 618; House Joint Resolution 226; S. 1987, 2255, 2346, 2392, 2473, 2714, 2858; Senate Joint Resolution 145.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; as special counsel for Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif. (1) None. Services as special counsel are loaned by the Water Project Authority of the State of California, which pays a fee of $500 per month. See registration and report under that employment. (2) See No. 1 above. (3) See No. 1 above. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 4152, 4157, 5524, 5927, 6705; S. 2377.

Euler, W. A. F., United Zinc Smelting Corp., 50 Union Square, New York, N. Y.; and the Ore & Chemical Corp., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $65 for expenses including train and plane fare, hotel accommodations, meals, entertainment, telephone calls, and other sundry "out-of-pocket" expenses for trip to Washington, April 11–13, inclusive, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6623—Russell bill.

Evans, Mrs. Ruth M., Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,650. (2) Self (salary), expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, and so forth. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Fain, David, Black & Kendall, 1200 Cascade Building, Portland, Oreg.; Anacortes Shipways, Inc., 904 Lewis Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Expended, $37.13. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) To support H. R. 6057.

Fairbanks, Joseph, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, Milton Addison Thomas, secretary general, 212 West Highland Avenue, Chesnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) No payments. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2673, a bill to incorporate the Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Fakler, Herman, 347 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) I received $5,000 salary and a regular annual bonus of $1,100 as an officer of the Millers' National Federation. I am not employed specifically to engage in activities described in section 307 of title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. During the preceding quarter I devoted approximately 5 days to such activities, which were incidental to my regular employment. My expenditures for these activities total $433.94, for which I have been reimbursed by Millers' National Federation. (2) [Blank.] (3) My expenditures were for taxi fares, meals, and hotel expenses of members of the industry attending congressional hearings. (4) Wrote a letter to the editor of Chicago Journal of Commerce answering a personal attack by a columnist. Letter was published April 7, 1948. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During the preceding quarter I attended a hearing on a proposed amendment to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, prepared a letter of information for an industry committee on pending labor legislation, and assisted an industry committee in preparing testimony in opposition to the proposed international wheat agreement.

Farrington, Charles J., National Coal Association, 903 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,627.70, salary and expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lunch, taxi, telephone, telegrams, salary. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting the coal industry.

Farshing, Donald D., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,300 gross salary received, $145.60 expenses. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Farshing, Donald D., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary received $1,950, expenses, $123.20. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Fenning, Karl, National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $709.06, expended none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2860.

Ferguson, Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Taxicabs, telephone calls, telegrams, and lunches, $138.19; general retainer as Washington counsel, United States Building and Loan League (less than half of work is in connection with legislation), $1,750; expense trip to Chicago, $112.05; expense trip to Savannah, $87.51; total, $2,087.75. (2) Taxicab drivers, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., railroads, hotels, and incidental expense. (3) Charges for services rendered. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting building and loan association and general mortgage lending.

Ferguson,[1] H. T., 1 Longdan Street, Madison, Wis.; Wisconsin Power & Light Co., 100 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Received $250 from Wisconsin Power & Light Co. to cover expenses of trip from Madison to Washington, D. C., and return; expended $150; retained $100 for future expenses. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, taxi fares, etc. (3) To cover expenses of trip. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5992, so-called tidewater bill; H. R. 2972, H. R. 2973, re Federal Power Commission.

Ferguson, John H., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery, 8 West Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, April 1–9, 1948, $230.70; travel and transportation expenses, April 1–9, 1948, $50.85. (Services terminated April 9, 1948.) (2) Salary received used for personal expenses, no part of it spent on behalf of the Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery; travel and transportation expenses covered my actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. (3) Same as (2) above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channels. (5) Legislation to provide for a European recovery program.

Ferguson, John A., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,125 (allocated); expenses, $210.61. (2) Reported as disbursements by Independent Natural Gas Association of America; miscellaneous including taxis, tips, luncheons, etc., $210.61. (3) See (2) above. (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) All legislation pertaining to natural gas.

Ferris, Muriel, League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $185.42 salary every 2 weeks; received and expended carfare to and from the Capitol and travel, $60. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) carfare and travel only. (4) Trends, Member Magazine; publications of the League of Women Voters of the United States. (5) I am employed principally to inform league members on legislative matters; secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation, see League Program adopted by national convention, 1948, attached.[2]

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

Filer, Russell L.,[1] in care of American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin St., Chicago, Ill. (1) Expended, $1,057.31. (2) To hotels, air lines, etc., for services rendered. (3) Normal business and traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) General farm legislation affecting the butter and dairy industry.

Filer, Harry L., the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary $5,200 and expenses $546.05. (2) Hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, taxis, telephone, etc. (3) Expenses for traveling and as shown in item 2. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Fillius, Maurice W., the National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc., 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received fee of $5,000; reimbursed $6.40 for expenditures made. (2) Various taxicab operators. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5965; activity on this ceased with the passage of the bill.

Fillius, Maurice W., Puerto Rico Rum Institute, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received retaining fee as reported on form B filed January 7, 1947. Engaged in no activities and made no expenditures in quarter ending June 30, 1948, for purpose of influencing legislation. All activity affecting or having any influence on legislation has ceased. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3282 and H. R. 3283; however, all activity on these bills has ceased.

Finkel, William H., Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received nothing from the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits and had no expenses on their behalf. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Crosser Act passed into law July 31, 1946. Please accept this as my last filing inasmuch as I will not actively be engaged in supporting or opposing any type of legislation after June 30, 1948.

Finucane, James, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Compensation at the rate of $3,600 annually. Expenses totaling $93.55. (2) Expenses paid to miscellaneous stores, vendors, and carriers. (3) Books, periodicals, train, and carfare, etc. (4) Peace Action, monthly publication of the NCPW. Daily newspapers carrying NCPW releases. (5) to support an act to repeal the Selective Service Act of 1948, and any other legislation leading to a more peaceful world. To oppose any legislation tending to militarize the United States and bring war.

Fisher, Lewis H., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; and Canal Construction SVC Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z. (1) Receipts from Canal Construction SVC Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z., none; receipts from the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, $300; receipts from Dr. Alexander Renner, native of Hungary, latest residence, Shanghai, China, $50. (2) Various individuals and companies. (3) Taxicabs, $17.25; postage, $10; telephones and telegraphs, $23.50; office help, $95; stationery, $7.50; 25 meals, etc., $60. (4) Annuitant. (5) Support of legislation in the interests of annuitants, potential annuitants, and civil pensioners; support of displaced persons bill, S. 2242.

Fitzpatrick, F. Stuart, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $3,250; expenses, $36.60. Expended: Transportation, $1.60; lunches, $35. (2) Taxi companies and the Statler Hotel. (3) Transportation to and from, and communication with, the Capitol; other necessary normal expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the general fields of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

Fleming, Charles Henry, Coast Guard League, 1011 DuPont Circle Building, 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) Nothing. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting veterans of service in the United States Coast Guard, or any legislation affecting the United States Coast Guard in which the league has a definite interest.

Fleming, Roger W., 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $24.60 expended (from May 17 to June 30, 1948). (See item (6) of form B, filed May 1948.) (2) Taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation, luncheon, conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, farm credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of postwar construction of highways, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department, transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment of Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by Secretary of Agriculture, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, labor extension service, alcohol plants, social security, weed killer, crop insurance, wheat carry-over, international wheat agreement, Parker River project, fiber identification, displaced persons, reciprocal trade agreements, rural electrification, radio, health, housing, standard time, Fair Labor Standards Act, railroad rates, Government corporations.

Ford, Mrs. J. A., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Approximate average $30 per week expenses. (2) Hotels, meals, and traveling expenses when away from my own home. (3) Above. (4) The Townsend National Weekly. (5) Support a bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Ford, John B., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (1) A fair proportion of my salary chargeable to lobbying purposes is $100 per month—$300 for the quarter. I have not expended or received any other money for lobbying purposes. (2) To me. (3) Compensation for personal services. (4) I caused no articles or editorials to be published. (5) Legislation affecting the American merchant marine, specifically legislation amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (H. J. Res. 377, 398, 412, and 413, and companion bills). Overtime-on-overtime legislation and other legislation affecting shipping.

Ford,[1] Tirey L., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Fort,[1] J. Carter, Association of American Railroads, 922 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For all services rendered to the Association of American Railroads, described in registration Form B, filed December 1946, registrant received salary at the rate shown in such registration and in the supplement thereto filed on January 10, 1948, and received in addition $399.48 as reimbursement for traveling expenses while away from Washington and certain business expenses in Washington such as cab fares, business meals, etc. Of the salary received, $6,535.32 is estimated to be allocable to legislative activities. Of the expenses for which registrant was reimbursed, $194.93 is estimated to be allocable to legislative activities. The legislative activities above referred to include not only activities in support of or in opposition to pending measures but also activities with respect to measures which were neither supported or opposed which registrant was called upon to consider, analyze, etc. The legislative activities as shown above include appearances before congressional committees, preparation for such appearances, etc. (2) The expenses above shown were paid to the Netherlands-Plaza, Cincinnati, Ohio; Chicago Club, Chicago, Ill.; Waldorf-Astoria, New York, N. Y.; various restaurants, taxis, etc. (3) Traveling expenses while away from Washington and such expenses in Washington as business meals, taxis, etc. (4) None. (5) Generally to support all legislation in the interests of the railroads and of a sound national transportation policy and to oppose all legislation contrary to the interests of the railroads and to a sound national transportation policy. Bills supported during the second quarter of 1948 included S. 110, S. 1567, S. 2041, S. 2782, H. R. 221, H. R. 1639, H. R. 5711, H. R. 6766. Bills opposed included S. 2062, S. 2437, S. 2438, H. R. 4092, H. R. 5875, H. R. 5988, H. R. 5993, House Joint Resolution 412, House Joint Resolution 413.

Fort,[1] Josiah, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Tobacco Association of United States, Greenville, N. C. (1) Expenses: Salary, $2,500; stenographer, $700; rent, $225; travel, $463.04; entertainment, $78.03; office expenses, $429.71; total, $4,393.78. (2) Receipted bills available for inspection. (3) See (1) above. (4) [Blank]. (5) To assist in getting fair consideration for American leaf tobacco in connection with aid programs, for delivery through private trade channels.

Foster,[2] Charles E., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) At $339.25—salary for January, February, March 1948, $1,017.75 (after withholding and social-security tax); incidental expenses, January, February, and March, $24.15; travel expense, $42.94. (2) Charles E. Foster. (3) Salary, incidental expenses, travel expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to disabled veterans, their families, and the dependents of deceased veterans.

Foster,[3] Charles E., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, June, 1948 $1,021.95 (after withholding and social security tax); incidental expenses, $32.10. (2) Charles E. Foster. (3) Salary, incidental

[1] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[2] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to disabled veterans, their families, and the dependents of deceased veterans.

Fox, O. J., Welfare Federation Act Committee of One Thousand, Post Office Box 916, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) No activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Francis,[4] Joseph H., Morgan, Utah. (1) Five thousand eight hundred and ninety-two dollars and eighty-nine cents received from National Board of Fur Farm Organizations. (2) Three thousand dollars represents salary for acting as executive secretary of organization, April, May, June 1948; $2,892.89 personal expenses, April, May, June 1948. (3) Personal expenses as shown under item 2, included transportation; hotel and meals; telephone; telegraph and minor personal miscellaneous expenses. (4) American Fur Breeder, National Fur News, Fur Journal and Black Fox magazine. (5) Any and all legislation affecting the fur farming industry of the United States.

Franklin,[1] L. S., box 94, route 7, Greensboro, N. C.; National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 94, Route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (1) Received $405 for April, May, and June 1948; paid out $405. (2) L. S. Franklin, salary, $375; stamps and mailing costs, $30; total, $405. (3) Tax reform. (4) None. (5) Reform for taxation.

Fredrickson, Fred J., Valley City, N. Dak.; North Dakota Resources Board, 311 North Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak., and State Water Conservation Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak. (1) Quarterly salary for April, May, and June 1948, before deductions for withholding and social-security taxes, $1,350; and reimbursed expenses for the same period, $1,900.76. Only a small part of these items was for legislative work. (2) Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C., and other hotels and eating establishments; railroad, air-line, telephone and telegraph companies; taxicabs and busses; mimeographers, lithographers, and office suppliers; post office and express company. Only a small part of these items was for legislative work. (3) Lodging and office space, meals, transportation, communications, mimeographing, office supplies, postage and express. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting irrigation, reclamation, water conservation, flood control, land and mineral development and utilization in North Dakota, and allied legislation.

Freeman, Milton V., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Silver Rod Sales Co., Inc., 660 Newark Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.; Ace Mail Order Co., East Orange, N. J.; Black Cigar Store, Newark, N. J.; Globe Mail Order Co., Jersey City, N. J. (1) $2,500 received on account of legal fees. (For other funds received see attached letter[2] to Clerk of the House of Representatives.) (2) [Blank.] (3) Telephone, telegraph, railroad, taxi fares, and other actual expenses have been advanced by the firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter in the amount of $459.70 and will be charged to and paid by the clients named above. (4) None. (5) Oppose H. R. 5645.

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) April, $129.80; May, $173.45; June, $714.15. (2) Miscellaneous. (3) Entertainment and transportation. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

Fyffe & Clarke (David R. Clarke, John Harrington, Albert J. Smith), Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Gaither, H. Rowan, Jr., 333 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., a copartnership, 822 Mills Building, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received from Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co. for preceding calendar quarter the sum of $310, which was paid to firm of Cooley, Crowley & Gaither, of which registrant is a partner. (2) No expenditures. (3) For legal services rendered in preparation of statement and accumulation of evidence in support of legislation mentioned in paragraph 5. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6253.

Galvin, M. J., 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.; Minnesota Railroads, St. Paul, Minn. (1) None. (All of the undersigned's clients as listed on his registration have paid the expenses reported herein, and the undersigned's salary, on the ratio of the mileage which they have within the State of Minnesota; amount paid is the same as that expended.) (2) March 30 to April 3, 1948, inclusive, St. Paul Union Depot, St. Paul, Minn., railroad transportation, $29.68; Carleton Hotel, Washington, D. C., $92.21; Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., $25.50. May 4 to May 6, 1948, inclusive, Northwest Airlines, Minneapolis, Minn., transportation, $113.45; and Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., $11.40; total, $272.24. (3) Board and room, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads, such as Bulwinkle bill, etc.

Gammons, Earl H., Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $250. (2) Restaurants, hotels, and incidental expenses. (3) Entertainment and out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Gardiner, Elizabeth G., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated June 15, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Garstang, Marion R., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $15.45. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Gavitt, Frank, Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) We have been retained as public relations counsel for Schenley Distillers Corp. for more than 8 years, at a fixed fee of $8,000 per month, plus disbursements. The fee received for the period covered by this report amounts to $9,000. While this fee includes payment for all lobbying activities, it is the identical amount that would have been paid and received if no lobbying activities had been performed. Salaries of employees of Carl Byoir and Associates working full time on general public relations for Schenley Distillers Corp., including work on legislative matters, $5,013.20. Charges of specialty departments of Carl Byoir and Associates for time devoted to work done on Schenley account, $346.50. Expenses for typing, mimeographing, and mailing of material opposing limitation of grain to distillers, and opposing changes in control of liquor advertising, $55. (2) Salaries and bills payable as indicated in (1) above. (3) Reimbursement of expenses incurred as indicated above, in opposing limitation of grain to distillers, and opposing changes in control of liquor advertising. (4) Newspaper articles were distributed during the period covered by this report to approximately 300 daily and weekly newspapers in the United States. (5) Incidental to our engagement as public relations counsel for Schenley Distillers Corp., we worked with Schenley in opposing limitation of grain to distillers, and in opposing changes in control of liquor advertising.

Geary, Paul M., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expenses incurred and no money received other than salary originally reported on Form B, filed May 22, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Geaslin, Bon,[3] 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. (1) No expenditures made during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp., we are interested in all legislation affecting the merchant marine and civil aeronautics.

Geaslin, Bon,[4] 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. (1) No expenditures made during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp., we are interested in all legislation affecting the merchant marine and civil aeronautics.

Gebhard, Mrs. Paul, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Presbyterian Church, United States of America, division of social education and action, board of Christian education, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Personal expenses refunded: Travel, $197.04; lodging, $57.58; food, $63.65; total expenses, $318.27. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine; special bulletins. (5) Same as (3).

George, Leo E., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW. (1) Salary, April, May, June 1948, $2,499.99; legislative expenses, April, May, June 1948, $450; travel and organization expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $1,033.50. (2) The travel and organization expenses referred to in (1) above were a reimbursement for actual expenses for transportation, hotels, meals, and incidental minor expenses. (3) See above. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the civil-service retirement system; improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks and to improve the postal service.

Gerrity, Harry J., 1001 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.; Oregon-Washington Bridge Co., Olympia, Wash. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 560 and S. 570.

Giddings, Ernest, assistant director, legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,318, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $263.60; expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (2) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Gilbert, C. C., Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) $1,500 salary as secretary Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation as affects industry generally.

Gilliam, A. W., 727 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; American Meat Institute. (1) Received salary of $2,200 from American Meat Institute. Expenses attributable to legislative work, $24.75. (2) Restaurants, taxicabs, telephones. (3) Meals, transportation. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry.

Glazier, William, room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary, $1,105.02; expenses, $411.91. (2) Expenses include those in Washington as well as air transportation and living expenses while out of town. (3) See (2). (4) The Dispatcher, publication of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and longshoremen and warehousemen specifically; oppose undemocratic legislation.

Glazier, William, room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO, 68 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No salary or personal expenses, $300 or $100 per month received toward cost of office operations. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The Voice, publication of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and maritime workers specifically; oppose all undemocratic legislation.

Goddard,[3] Livingston, Federation for Railway Progress, 2412 Terminal Tower. (1) Salary, $327.77; expenses, $88.67. (2) Travel expenses in the amount of $88.67 paid to various railroads, hotels, etc. (3) Travel expenses, exclusive of any legislative activity. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Goddard,[4] Livingston, 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $833.31; expenses, $64.48. (2) For various hotels, railroads, etc. (3) For traveling expenses. (4) Railway progress, volume II, No. 3, May 1948. (5) None.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received. Only expenditures were $21.60 for mimeographing, $42.65 for printing, and incidental expenses for long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and taxis. (2) Batt, Bates & Co., Washington, D. C., for mimeographing; Kirby Lithographing Co., Washington, D. C., for printing, telephone companies, telegraph companies, and taxicabs. (3) See (1). (4) The Journal of Accountancy and the Certified Public Accountant. (5) Advancing the interests of the accounting profession in reference to H. R. 2657 and H. R. 3214.

Goss, Bert C., 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hill & Knowlton, Inc.; 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received no money other than salary as vice president of Hill & Knowlton, plus essential travel and entertainment expenses. I estimate that of my travel and entertainment expenses for the 3 months ended June 30, 1948, less than $100 was expended for purposes that might be interpreted as indirectly influencing legislation. (2) Paid to taxicabs and restaurants. (3) For travel to and from the Capitol, for luncheons, and dinners for committee personnel and Congressmen, etc., (4) Have no record of such publication. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose legislation. Interested in legislation affecting aviation, in proposals to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine, and in other legislation affecting interests of clients of Hill & Knowlton.

Gourley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; American Osteopathic Association, 139 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $3,000 retainer. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4.) None. (5) Bills affecting the public health.

Gray, David G., post office box 2180, Houston, Tex.; (H. O. & R. Co.). (1) Of my total salary $750 might be considered applicable to services in connection with consultations with reference to legislation. (2) Expenses April 1 to June 30, 1948, inclusive; Shoreham Hotel, $1,108.50; taxi fares, $78. (3) Living, communication, transportation expenses. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. My duty was to watch the program of legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Green, Abner,[3] American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Immigration and naturalization.

Green, Angus, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; (1) Receipts: $1,668.99 salary, plus $1,165.57, reimbursement of the expenditures referred to in Nos. (2) and (3) below. (2) Transportation and communications services, post office, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Travel, living and business expenses connected with employment. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting shipping industry which concerns employer.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building; Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, post office box 2450, Honolulu, Hawaii. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation. I appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee in favor of H. R. 5174. I also favored H. R. 49 before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the second quarter of 1948.

Greenman, Shea, Lane, Sandomire & Zimet, 46 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y.; Ion Stanescu, Volney Hotel, New York, N. Y. (1) $105.40 in reimbursement of actual expenses for travel and telephone calls incident to proposed legislation and other matters relating to the status of Mr. and Mrs. Stanescue as aliens. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) S. 2512 (H. R. 6353), private bill authorizing Ion Stanescu and his wife, Catherina, Rumanian subjects, to remain in the United States notwithstanding the immigration laws.

Greenwood, Joseph R.,[4] 1029 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Greenwood, Joseph R.[5] room 1102, 1029 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Sea-Air Legislative Committee, received $500; expended, none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Griffiths, Dr. H. M., National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Received, salary, $1,900. (2) Expenses, one trip to Washington, $50.50. (3) Travel, hotel, and meals. (4) National Economic Council Action Report. (5) Labor Extension Service bill.

Grimes, Weston B., 436 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Received (includes office, travel, and general expenses totaling $2,065.30), $5,390.29; expended (for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act), $5. (2) Taxicabs, $5. (3) Taxicabs to and from the Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation concerning commodity exchanges, international commodity agreements, exports and imports, taxes, and regulation of business generally.

Grinberg,[3] P. Irving, Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Jeweler, Jewelers' Circular-Keystone, Jewelry, Jewelers' Outlook, Jewelers' Newsletter, Executive Jeweler, ANRJA Bulletin, NACJ Bulletin, Mid-Continent Jeweler, Northwestern Jeweler, Southern Jeweler, Pacific Goldsmith, Trader & Canadian Jeweler, Manufacturing Jeweler. (5) Interested in securing relief from excise taxes as applied to jewelry.

Grosscup, Ambler & Stephan,[1] 711 Central Building, Seattle, Wash.; Alaska Transportation Co., Pier 57, Seattle, Wash. (1) Firm received a fee of $650 for professional services in connection with various conferences concerning legislation affecting Alaska shipping. These conferences subsequently resulted in the introduction and enactment of bills in the House and Senate identified as House Joint Resolution 396 and Senate Joint Resolution 219. (2) Expenses totaling $440.23 were not segregated because they were billed with separate charges for other legal work in Washington before the United States Maritime Commission. (3) Expenses covered hotel, meals, taxis, phone calls, and incidentals, and embraced a period from February 20, 1948, through March 13, 1948. (4) None. (5) None.

Haas, Frank E., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary as per original registration and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of $1,373.84. (2) Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C.; the Pullman Co.; to various restaurants, taxicab companies, and to various others in nominal amounts. (3) To Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., $378.20; to Pullman Co. for Pullman space, $131.64; to various taxicab and bus companies, etc., for local transportation, $128.90; to various restaurants for meals, $522.65; for postage, telephone, stenographic services, and miscellaneous expense, $214.45. (4) None. (5) Any legislation of mutual interest to class I railroads operating in the western district and their employees.

Haas, Herbert A., Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1188 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $559.40 from the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits for expenses incurred during April, May, and June of 1948. (2) Money received spent for hotels, cab fares, entertainment and meals, and train fare on various trips to Washington, D. C., and other points. (3) Necessary expenses while engaged in seeking corrective legislation to H. R. 1362, passed into law July 31, 1946. (4) None. (5) Crosser Act; passed into law July 31, 1948.

Haddock, Hoyt S., CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) No portion of time or money expended on legislative activities during quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) To support legislation in interest of seamen; to oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Hadley, Harlan V., 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None, other than one-quarter of the annual compensation of $2,500 as set forth in supplemental registration (Form B) filed April 9, 1948, and miscellaneous expenses not to exceed $12. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Federal tax (excise) legislation, materials control legislation, and such other legislation as the Association may hereafter from time to time indicate.

Haines, Samuel P., 4407 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; 20 Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, 171 West Randolph Street,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the Secretary only.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.
[4] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[4] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $25,000; expended, $18,969.79. (2) Various. (3) Office staff and office expenses. (4) None. (5) Reduction or repeal of the 20-percent excise tax applying to dine and dance rooms of hotels.

Hale, William C., Tennessee Eastman Corp., Kingsport, Tenn. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Revisions in the Tariff Act, draw-back regulation.

Hallbeck, E. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW. (1) Salary, April, May, June, 1948, $1,999.98; legislative expenses, April, May, June, 1948, $1,008.71; travel expenses (transportation), $61.42. (2) Incidental expenses, meals, streetcar, taxi, etc., $550.65; joint Senate and House recording facility, $192; travel and incidental expenses of Mrs. Stewart Robinson, Belleville, Ill., vice president Woman's Auxiliary, NFPOC, $175; meals, hotels, and incidental expenses attending meetings at Atlantic City, N. J., Waterbury, Conn., and Cleveland, Ohio, $88.03; American Railway Express Co., $3.03. (3) Travel and incidental expenses, expenses attending meetings, and incidental expenses are an actual reimbursement for cash expended for transportation, hotels, meals, and minor incidental expenses. Joint Senate and House recording facility, copies of radio transcriptions. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the civil-service retirement system; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks; and to improve the postal service.

Hamlet, Harry G., Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $600. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended nothing. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Corps, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.. (1) Salary, $425; expenses, $280. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress (a) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below, of the convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations held triennially and (b) the opinion of the national board of the Young Women's Christian Associations in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) None. (5) Legislation related to international security, social and economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties.

Harris, Winder R., room 203, 1039 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $313.71; expended $313.71. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Not employed for this purpose principally, but took interest in H. R. 5653, H. R. 377, H. R. 398, House Joint Resolution 412, House Joint Resolution 413, S. 2696, S. 2649, and H. R. 6829, all dealing with merchant marine.

Hart, Merwin K., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) For expenses that are or might be allocable to lobbying activities, $165.35; salary, $1,666.66. (2) Pennsylvania and Baltimore and Ohio Railroads, Willard Hotel, one or more restaurants in Washington and Philadelphia, taxi drivers and miscellaneous. (3) Trips to Washington to keep informed on legislative matters and to Philadelphia to appear before resolution committee of the Republican National Convention, etc. (4) Economic Council letters, issued semimonthly. (5) Legislation for Federal aid to education, Immigration, FEPC, ITO, and public housing.

Hart, Stephen H., 350 Equitable Building, National Livestock Tax Committee, Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) During the quarter the National Livestock Tax Committee paid to me a per diem of $50 for office work and $100 out of town for actual time spent in study, advice, conferences, and correspondence concerning general livestock tax questions including the analysis of the present provisions of Internal Revenue Code and current rulings and decisions concerning Federal taxation of livestock operators. Such activities also included work in connection with proposal of the National Livestock Tax Committee to amend the Internal Revenue Code, recognizing capital gains in sale of breeding livestock and permitting deduction of ordinary recurring ranching expenditures. It is impossible to determine what part of my services related to this problem, but it is my opinion that only a portion of my activity during the preceding quarter could be interpreted as lobbying. During the quarter a total of $1,090 for legal services was paid to me for all my activities and services. I was also reimbursed $407.83 for out-of-town pocket expenses, chiefly traveling expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.]. (4) [Blank.]

Harter, Dow W., 412–14 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (1) Receive annual retainer from The B. F. Goodrich Co. for all services as its Washington counsel. Allocation of amount paid for my services between legal and legislative activities is not feasible. Amount received during second quarter of 1948, $1,875. In addition, receive reimbursement for long-distance telephone, travel, taxicab fares, and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The B. F. Goodrich Co. is interested in legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of synthetic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes. It is interested in various proposals now under study by Congress for a long-range rubber program for this country. It is also interested in the repeal of the present excise taxes on tires and tubes and in other legislative proposals which come before Congress from time to time.

Hawes, Robert N., 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.; Grays Harbor Industries, Inc., Aberdeen, Wash. (1) From Grays Harbor Industries, Inc., $1,666.66 retainer; expenses, $76.49. (2) Joseph T. King, associate, $200; Clements-Pearsons (cocktail party), $150; out-of-pocket, $256.71. (3) Joseph T. King, associate, $200; Clements-Pearsons (cocktail party) $150; taxis, restaurants, telephone, telegraph, and stenographic, $256.71. (4) None. (5) Reference to Olympic National Park.

Hawkins, Paul M., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,800 salary, only a small fraction of which was for lobbying activities; $303.06 expenses, only a small fraction of which was expended for lobbying activities. (2) Taxicabs, railroads, restaurants, hotels, airlines. (3) Transportation, meals, rooms. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the hotel industry.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $250 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $45.92 incidental expenses for months of April, May, and June 1948. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) $45.92 incidental expenses for months of April, May, and June 1948, taxi, carfare, phone calls, meals. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Hayes, William E., Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Co., La Salle Street Station, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary as reported in registration; expenses amounting to $850.65. (2) Traveling expenses, hotels, clubs, taxis, telephone, and telegraph, etc. (2) Necessary out-of-pocket expenses in connection with registrants employment. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting registrant's railroad.

Hays, Joseph H., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary as per original registration and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of $1,517.90. (2) Mayflower and Shoreham Hotels, Washington, D. C.; the Pullman Co.; to various taxicab companies, restaurants, hotels, and to various others in nominal amounts. (3) To Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., $283.45; to Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., $116.26; to Pullman Co., pullman space, $164.29; to various cab and bus companies, etc., for local transportation, $134.20; to telephone and telegraph, $168.25; to various restaurants, hotels, etc., for meals, $460.71; for postage, stenographic services, stationery supplies, and miscellaneous expense, $190.74. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting class I railroads operating in the western district.

Hays, William J., 4863 Potomac Avenue NW.; United Public Workers of America, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $875. (2) All money received was for personal salary. (3) Same as (2). (4) None. (5) H. R. 5524.

Hazen, John C., 1008 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Meals, $250.35; hotel, $38.99; taxis, $56; transportation, rail-plane, $71.94; miscellaneous, $18.60; incidental, photograph, $17.50. (2) [Blank.]. (3) [Blank.] (4) The special bulletin of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, published weekly. (5) H. R. 6067, optometry bill, opposed; S. 1388, fur bill, opposed.

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G Street NW, Washington, D. C.; Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary of $600 per month, which is paid for all services rendered, only a part of which concerns legislation; out-of-pocket travel and incidental expenses, $181.55. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and luncheons. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Without salary. Received $53.13 for traveling expense, entertainment, etc.; expended, $53.13. (2) Various. (3) Railroad fare, miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management.

(5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriations for United States Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education.

Heiney, Robert B., National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,625 as one-quarter year's salary as assistant to secretary of association for all work performed; $96.10 has been received as reimbursement for expenses incurred. (2) Taxi fares and miscellaneous expenses, $96.10. (3) See above. (4) National Canners Information Letter. (5) Opposing marketing orders on commodities for canning; supporting S. 2386, H. R. 6050, and S. 2409.

Henderson, Elmer W., National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F. Street NW., room 901, Washington, D. C. (1) Travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, $558.85; salary April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, $1,185.40. (2) [Blank.] (3) For travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, $558.85; salary after tax deductions, $1,185.40. (4) [Blank.] (5) Permanent fair-employment legislation, Senate bill 984 and House bill 2824.

Henderson, Joseph D., American Association of Small Business, 602 Carondelet Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary of $1,500 (based on $6,000 per year) received this quarter from the American Association of Small Business. No money expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Small Business Review, official monthly publication of the American Association of Small Business; routine news releases to newspapers and radio stations. (5) To support legislation favorable to small business; to oppose legislation unfavorable to small business, standing always for that which is right for the country and the will of the majority.

Henney, Elizabeth C., 702 Albee Building, Fifteenth and G Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; John J. O'Connor (for National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis), 423 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $975. (2) [Blank.] (3) Received a retainer from National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. (4) [Blank.] (5) To watch legislation on infantile paralysis.

Hensel, Robert E., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended $25.68 in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85 percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Herndon, Maurice G., 1001–1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original Form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Herrmann, Louis F., The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $1.40. (2) [Blank.] (3) Taxi fares. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Hess,[1] Amiel Edgerton, Oil-Heat Institute of America, Inc., 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

[1] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

Hess,[1] Amiel Edgerton, Oil-Heat Institute of America, Inc., 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Hester, Ewart A., the law offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: April, May, and June, $2,500. Expenses for quarter: Transportation, telephone, telegraph, and miscellaneous expenses estimated at $502. Purchase of copies of hearings on H. R. 6606, $135. (2) Alderson Reporting Service, Western Union Telegraph Co., Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (3) Transportation, telephone, telegraph, miscellaneous, and for the purchase of copies of hearings. See (1). (4) None. (5) See supplementary statement paragraph 2 attached to Form B filed by me January 9, 1948. H. R. 6356. H. R. 6606, H. R. 6162, H. R. 6246, H. R. 6263, H. R. 6632, S. 265, S. 2352, S. 2365, S. 2318.

Hewes & Awalt, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, and Maxwell M. Merritt, 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn.; 622 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) This registrant received no money or other compensation from the Life Insurance Association of America during the calendar quarter ended June 30, 1948. This registrant made $122.07 out-of-pocket expenditures during the calendar quarter ended June 30, 1948, in connection with its employment by the above-named association for which registrant has not received reimbursement. (2) Various. (3) Expenses for transportation, communication, and other purposes, as listed in the attached statement. (4) None. (5) Any revision of Internal Revenue Code affecting life insurance and annuities.

Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C.; see attached statement.[2] (1) See attached statement.[2] (2) See attached statement.[2] (3) See attached statement.[2] (3) Distributed publicity material, but did not cause any articles to be published. (5) See attached statement.[2]

Hinders, Justin, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) June 21 to June 30, 1948. Received $124 salary; no expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Attached list[2] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Hines, Lewis G., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $2,080. Expenses for April 1948, $39.90; May, $53; June, $49.80; total for 3 months, $141.70. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company, when not at office, and other incidentals. (3) As shown in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Hinkson,[2] Ralph H., PER, Inc., 3405 Milton Avenue, Dallas, Tex. (1) None; registration now in process; no previous lobbying activity. (2) None; see (1) above. (3) None; see (1) above. (4) None; see (1) above. (5) To support legislative action to effect dispersement of military purchases, manufacture, and research and development to that area of the United States least vulnerable to attack; to support legislation which will provide for a portion of all military expenditures to be spent in the South and Southwest,

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

competitive bidding requirements of existing law notwithstanding.

Hinman, Ray C., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary (this represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act), $1,250; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $332.62; total, $1,582.62. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $332.62. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Hoffmaster, John E., 2203 South Bonsall Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) A total of $448 was received from the Philadelphia Depot Employees Development Association. (2) $204 retained by undersigned as personal compensation at $17 per day; $244 paid by undersigned for railroad fare, meals, hotel room, taxi fare, telephone calls and telegrams, service charges, and tips. (3) For personal compensation and personal living expenses as set forth above. (4) None. (5) To oppose H. R. 512 and S. 286, providing for establishment of quartermaster research and development laboratories at Boston, Mass.

Hollister,[1] R. F., Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Money received, salary, $1,800; money expended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Holloway, William J., 2216 First National Building; Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., and Santa Fe Railway Co., Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co.: Attorney's fees, $2,475; expenses, $1,239; Santa Fe Railway Co.: attorney's fees, $3,100; expenses, $2,038.50. (2) William J. Holloway. (3) Attorney's fees and necessary expenses for travel, hotel bills, meals, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Jennings venue bill, Santa Fe Railway Co.; Interior Department appropriation bill, Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. (NOTE.—Have earned other fees but same not yet collected.)

Holman, Charles W., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $431.86. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that affects milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Holmes, George T., Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky. (1) No money was received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Hood, J. M., president, the American Short Line Railroad Association. 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received from the American Short Line Railroad Association, $4,125. Expenses incurred for account of the American Short Line Railroad Association and for which reimbursement has been or will be made, $769.23. Impossible to accurately allocate either salary or expenses, but carefully calculated estimate is that 6 percent of salary, $206.25, and 10 percent of expenses, $76.92, total, $283.07, expended for purpose of influencing legislation. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, clubs, transportation, and communication companies. (3) For travel and entertainment in connection with the furtherance of the legislative program of the 310 common carriers by rail members of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting member lines of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (See text of legislative program attached to prior return of that association.)

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

Hooks, Homer E., Canners League of Florida, post-office box 1567, Lakeland, Fla. (1) Received, total salary for quarter, $1,500; expended, $52.44 for telephone and telegraph. (2) Homer E. Hooks; Western Union Telegraph Co.; Peninsular Telephone Co. (3) To further league's opposition to two pieces of pending legislation. (4) Winter Haven Chief, Florida Times Union, Fort Pierce News-Tribune, Lakeland Ledger, Bradenton Herald, Tampa Morning Tribune. (5) S. 2173 and H. R. 5633. (NOTE.—Adjournment of Congress on June 20, 1948, terminated our activities with regard to these bills, subject to resumption if a special session of the 80th Cong. is called.)

Horsky, Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle 4, Wash.; Libby, McNeill & Libby Food Products, Chicago, Ill.; New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Kodiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (1) Received: None. Expended: $2.19. (2) Western Union. (3) Telegrams. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon-canning companies and the Department of Interior, relating to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered.

Hosking, Floyd J., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1.03 as miscellaneous expenses. (2) Christabel Hill, notary public, $1; postage, 3 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report, postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Howard, Paul, American Library Association, national relations office, 1709 M Street NW.; The American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, $6,042.75; expended, $4,892.55. (2) Various. (3) Operation of office; not more than one-third of expenditures applicable to legislative activity. (4) ALA Bulletin, Library Journal, San Antonio Express, New York Times, and any other newspaper who use our releases; since we do not subscribe to a clipping service, we do not know who they are. (5) Any legislation affecting American Library Association members and/or the library profession.

Howard,[4] S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa. (1) Received salary of $1,162.50 for the second quarter of 1948 and had expenses of $617.60 for this quarter. (2) Hamilton Hotel, various restaurants, taxicabs, streetcar and pullman fares. (3) Lodging, meals, and transportation. (4) None. (5) All legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular. Working in behalf of proposed laws to amend the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Act.

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (1) Received $1,500 as salary, and $561.56 as reimbursement for general expenses. (2) Various, see answer to question (3). (3) Miscellaneous and incidental, including local transportation, lunches, gratuities, committee meeting expenses, and other incidental expenses of Washington office, American Institute of Laundering. (4) Not applicable under section 308 (a). (5) I am interested in all legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof; my primary function as to legislation is to report

[4] Filed with the Secretary only

status, prospects, etc., to my employer, the American Institute of Laundering. See, also, letter attached to registration Form B, which is made a part hereof.

Howrey, Edward F., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 914 Eleventh Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 914 Eleventh Street SE., Washington, D. C.; fee, none this quarter; expenses, $38.25. (2) Telephone company, $21.75; taxis, $3.50; notary fees, $1; three photostatic copies of almond growers' petition to President, $11.70; total, $38.25. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) Proposals affecting peanuts and tree nuts, particularly those placing limitations and restrictions on importation of nuts.

Huff,[4,10] George B., secretary, the Indiana Tax Equality Commission, Inc., room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none. Money received for reimbursement of actual travel expenses, $142.50. (2) American Airlines, Pennsylvania Railroad, Hotel Statler, taxicab operators. (3) Procurement of travel, housing, and subsistence. (4) The Seymour Daily Tribune and the Brownstown Banner. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Huff,[4,6] George B., secretary, The Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received for reimbursement of actual expenses, $48; (2) American Airlines, Hotel Statler, taxicab operators, various filling stations and restaurants. (3) Procurement of housing, travel, and subsistence. (4) Seymour Daily Tribune and Rensselaer Republican. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Huff,[6] George B., secretary, the Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received for reimbursement of actual travel expenses, $67.43. (2) American Airlines, Hotel Statler, taxicab operators, various filling stations and restaurants. (3) Procurement of travel, housing, and subsistence. (4) None. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Huff, W. T., 806 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.; Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., 101 West Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) $240.55. (2) Taxicabs, restaurants, telephone, and telegraph, Government Printing Office. (3) To attend meetings of Congress and its committees and obtain reports thereof. (4) None. (5) To support the program of the Presidential Air Policy Commission and the Congressional Air Policy Board for the advancement of aviation.

Huntress, Carroll B., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.; National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y., acting as chairman for the National St. Lawrence Project Conference without compensation and for reimbursement of expenses. (2) Railroads, hotels, $461.50; New York Telephone Co., Western Union, $22.72; United States Post Office, $12.50. (3) To carry on duties as chairman. [Blank.] (5) Senate Joint Resolution 111; House Joint Resolution 192.

Hushing, W. C., chairman, national legislative committee, American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $2,080; expenses for April 1948, 043.40; May, $31.10; June, $33.20; total for 3 months, $107.70. (2) Taxi driver, phone company (away from office), messengers, and incidentals. (3) As shown in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Hutson,[7] John B., Suite 719, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Tobacco Associates, Inc., Raleigh, N. C. (1) Salary at the rate previously reported on Form B, which registrant filed as a matter of information to the Congress, although of the opinion that he does not come within the purview of the act (Public, No. 601, 79th Cong.). (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See schedule A [2] for all money received during preceding calendar quarter and attachment [3] for allocated expenditures. (2) See attachment.[6] (3) See attachment.[3] (4) Regular association publications. (5) Natural Gas Act; general duty to keep the industry informed of any matters which affect it.

Ingles, William, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Electric Companies. (1) Receipts: Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., $900; American Mining Congress, $900; J. I. Case Co., $300; the Falk Corp., $900; Foremen's League for Education and Associates, $1,800; Inland Steel Co., $900; National Association of Electric Companies, $5,000. Expenditures: Office salaries, $750; lunches, taxi fares, and incidentals (No individual expenses exceeding $10) $360; office rent, $330; telephone, $205.59; office services, supplies, and general expenses, $99.22; traveling expenses, $220.58. (2) See (1) above. (3) Normal office operating expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting industry.

Ishikawa, Isamu Samuel, 40 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in Form B, filed April 1, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Jackson, Boyd J., Klamath Tribe of Indians of Oregon, Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) Received salary of $10 per day and per diem of $6 per day from April 1 to June 11, 1948, while serving as official delegate of the Klamath Tribe. Expenditures covered living expenses in Washington, transportation, and small amounts for telegraph. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2502 and H. R. 2775; opposing; S. 1222, S. 1210, H. R. 1113, and H. R. 4725.

Jackson, Charles E., general manager, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 228 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) 60 cents; taxicabs to Capitol to attend hearings on Hope bill. (2) Taxicab operators. (3) Transportation to Capitol. (4) None. (5) Attended public hearing on H. R. 6064.

Jackson, Robert C., 1406 G Street NW., National Cotton Council of America, 1406 G Street NW. (1) In addition to regular salary from National Cotton Council as reported on Form B, received expense reimbursements amounting $91.30 that might be considered as relating to legislative activity. (2) Meals for guests, $13.65; taxi fares, $60.30; phone calls, $14.35. (3) Luncheon conferences, transportation, and communications. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During past quarter have supported efforts to repeal taxes and license fees on margarine; supported certain appropriation items for USDA and Bureau of Census; supported appropriation for European recovery program; supported S. 2376, to provide a revolving fund for purchase of agricultural commodities for processing in occupied countries.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[10] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

Jackson, Thomas J., elected by Retired Officers League, 1424 K Street NW. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. With this I witdraw my registration. (5) When requested may testify concerning veterans' legislation.

Jhung, Walter, post office box 1706, Washington, D. C.; Korean-American Trading Co., 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (1) April, May, and June monthly salaries of $333.33 received as employee of Korean-American Trading Co., as its public-relations manager; expended, $504.24. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) S. 152 and H. R. 860 (superseded by H. R. 2932) for immigration quota for Koreans and extend them naturalization privileges.

Jobe, William T., National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Employed on a full-time annual basis as general counsel for the National Association of Ice Industries at a salary of $10,800 per annum. I have received my regular monthly salary for the past calendar quarter of 1948 and nothing more. Pursuant to the requirements of Public Law 601, I have expended no money. (2) None. (3) None. (4) No. (5) None.

Johnson, Curtis E., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated June 25, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Johnson, Elmer, president, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The sum of $416.20 was received during the second quarter of 1948. (2) None. (3) Fee of $100 per month; $116.30 to cover transportation, meals, etc. (4) The annuitant. (5) In support of any measure designed to improve the Federal retirement system.

Johnson, Gilbert R., 874 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Pro rata of annual retainer as legal counsel as set forth in my letter of April 9, 1948, amending initial registration dated January 10, 1947, and reimbursement of traveling expenses amounting to $116.46. (2) Retainer to self; expenses incurred in connection with travel. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) During this quarter I have given attention to legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping as part of my work as legal counsel for Lake Carriers' Association. I do not consider that I am engaged for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation and this report is made without prejudice to that position.

Johnson, James G., Jr., 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Graves, Kizer & Graves, Old National Bank Building, Spokane, Wash. (1) Receipts, none. Expenditures: Notary fee, $2; Western Union, $4.87; telephone tolls, $34.11; publications, $1.78; mimeographing, $18; total, $60.76. (2) Telephone company (tolls); Congressional Intelligence (publications); Virginia Bowman, Bowen Building (mimeographing); Western Union (telegrams); notary public (notarization. (3) To obtain and furnish Members of the Congress and of the interested executive departments with information relating to the proposed legislation in question. (4) None. (5) S. 2105 and H. R. 5535.

Johnson, Vernon A., Lockheed Aircraft Corp., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. (1) Total received was $3,448.48, all from the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. Of this, $2,750.02 was received as salary. The balance of $698.46 was received for expenses, itemized as follows: $13.02 for auto mileage; $61.85 for taxi and bus fares; $16.31 for telephone calls; $443.15 for entertainment; $50.02 for hotel room rent; $56.12 for travel tickets; and $57.99 for meals. (2) Expense items paid to various taxis, telephone company, restaurants, hotels, travel carriers, etc. (3) Paid in normal course of business travel and business relationships. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Johnson, W. D., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) January 1948 annual compensation of $8,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Johnson, Walter R., National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $4,000; expenses, $384.50 for April; $450.30 for May; $815.72 for June. (2) Registrant. (3) Transportation, $373.52; meals for self and guests, $1,207; miscellaneous, $70. (4) None. (5) To confirm and establish titles in States to land beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

Jones, Bascom F.,[4] Tennessee Railroad Association, 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn., Tennessee Railroad Association. (1) During the quarter I have neither received nor expended any money in connection with Federal legislation and have caused no articles or editorials to be included in any publication. While I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, I spent a total of 2 days in Washington during said quarter for the purpose of discussing with Tennessee Representatives (two) the merits of proposed legislation embodied in H. R. 5711. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Jones, Bascom F.,[4] 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn.; Tennessee Railroad Association. (1) During the quarter I have neither received nor expended any money in connection with Federal legislation and have caused no articles or editorials to be included in any publication. While I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, I spent a total of 8 days in Washington during said quarter for the purpose of discussing with Senators and Representatives the merits of proposed legislation embodied in S. 110, (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Jones, J. M., National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Salary, $6,100; expenses, $2,886.48; total, $4,986.48. (2) [Blank.] (3) The above paid to J. M. Jones as secretary of the National Wool Growers Association for duties in connection with association work. All expense included for all the work in Washington, whether in connection with legislative work or not. (4) The National Wool Grower, coeditor, J. M. Jones. (5) Supported long-range agricultural program; Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act; various and sundry land bills; various and sundry appropriation bills; and any other legislation affecting the sheep industry.

Jones, L. Dan, Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act, $21.85. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) I'm not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Jones, Lyle W., 1737 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Small Business Men's Association, Akron, Ohio. (1) $600 monthly salary less withholding tax and social-security tax; $125 personal expenses during April, May, June, 1948. (2) Lyle W. Jones. (3) Luncheons, taxicabs, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) Pulling Together, monthly bulletin, national Small Businessmen Association. (5) [Blank.]

Kane, John E., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported in Form B heretofore filed pursuant to act; expenses reimbursed by employer $215.90. (2) Various taxicab companies; restaurants, hotels, other service establishments. (3) Administrative expenses, transportation, meals, gratuities. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.

Kane, John E., District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $478.61 as treasurer of District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee. The sum of $478.61 expended on behalf of committee during quarter (detail in schedule A attached).[3] (2) See schedule A attached.[3] (3) See schedule A attached.[3] (4 None. (5) Legislation affecting the sale and distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

Keehn, Thomas B., 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Church, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,145.86, salary, $236.33 expense. (2) Money paid to self for salary and expenses such as railroad fare, food, taxis. (3) To cover living expenses and special expenses allowable within expense account. (4) Washington report, intercollegian. (5) Same as material filed October 1946. Interested especially in European recovery program, displaced persons legislation, housing, Federal aid to education. More time spent on education of constituents than opposing or supporting legislation.

Keesling, Francis V., Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; City and County of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif. (1) $2,500 retainer; $1,970.83 reimbursement for travel, subsistence, secretarial, stenographic, telephone, telegraph, and postage expense. (This also covers services with respect to matters under jurisdiction of the executive departments and includes expenses at Washington, D. C., San Francisco, and elsewhere.) (2) No payments made except as set forth in (1) above. (3) In connection with legislation and other Federal matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco. (4) None. (5) Various bills of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including Army civil functions, housing, surplus property, in lieu taxes.

Kelly, Eugene, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; State of California. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) To support S. 1988.

Kennedy, Gilbert F., Esq.,[3] partner of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 15 Broad Street, New York, Washington, D. C., and 1 Garden Court, Middle Temple, London, England; Mr. Louis Dreyfus, of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York, and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) Received $1,500 by my firm in London on account of various services in connection with matter mentioned in No. (5) below; approximately $95 expended during said quarter.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

(2) Railroad (Washington, D. C., and New York City); Hotel Carlton, Washington; meals, taxis, and various traveling expenses, approximately $70; also photostats, long-distance telephone calls, taxis, and miscellaneous, approximately $25. (3) Only expenditure paid consisted of above items (2). (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, being a bill to enable wife, Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus, to regain her United States citizenship.

Kennedy, Gilbert F., Esq.,[4] partner of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 15 Broad Street, New York, Washington, D. C., and 1 Garden Court, Middle Temple, London, England; Mr. Louis Dreyfus, of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York, and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) Received $1,500 by my firm in London on account of various services in connection with matter mentioned in No. (5) below; approximately $95 expended during said quarter. (2) Railroad (Washington, D. C., and New York City); Hotel Carlton, Washington; meals, taxis, and various traveling expenses, approximately $70; also photostats, long-distance telephone calls, taxis, and miscellaneous, approximately $25. (3) Only expenditure paid consisted of above items (2). (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, being a bill to enable wife, Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus, to regain her United States citizenship.

Kennedy, Harold L., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.; Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Received 3 months' retainer in the amount of $3,000; expended $38. (2) See (3) below. (3) Expended for 50 taxi fares (40 cents each) to and from the Capitol. 12 meals at $1.50 each, comprising a total of $18. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation that might affect the oil and gas industry.

Kent, Arthur H., 1720 Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif., American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Payment of $1,265.44 received from American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., May 27, 1948. (2) United Air Lines: Transportation San Francisco to Washington and return and excess-baggage charges $320.44; Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., charges, room, etc. $440.70; out-of-pocket expenses, trip Washington to New York for conference with client $21.30; meals, taxies, telephone, and telegraph charges, Washington, D. C., $483; total, $1,265.44. (3) Out-of-pocket expenses incurred to May 1, 1948, and reimbursed by above payment. (4) None. (5) Support of amendment to section 116 (a), Internal Revenue Code, relating to taxation of earned income of United States citizens from foreign sources.

Kern, Geo. A., Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) Apportionment of annual salary at $20 per day, $200 travel and subsistence, $431.74. (2) Travel and subsistence payments to railroad companies, Pullman Co., hotels, taxis, etc. (3) Travel and subsistence. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the railroad industry.

Ketchum, Inc., 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Education Association, March 8, 1948, $4,000. (2) Ketchum, Inc., $4,000. (3) Services. (4) News releases sent to Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (Information distributed also to Members of Congress.) (5) Current educational problems in furtherance of the passage of H. R. 2953 and S. 472.

[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Received from Main & Co.: January 15, 1948, $336.12; February 1948, [blank]; March 1948, [blank]; total, $336.12. (2) (a) Romeike Press Clipping Bureau, $7; (b) Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $1.12; (c) Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $328; total, $336.12. (3) (a) Clipping service, (b) postage, (c) services. (4) News releases sent to Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Wall Street Journal, Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, and general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (5) The incentive income tax plan, a program of income-tax revision prepared by Frank Wilbur Main and other partners in Main & Co., certified public accountants, with headquarters office in Pittsburgh.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $833 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes, $65.50 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

King,[1] Carol, 220 Broadway, New York, N. Y., American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. (1) No moneys received or expended since registry. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Lawyers Guild Review; the Lamp. (5) Immigration, naturalization, and deportation bills.

King, Joseph T., suite 1028, Barr Building, 912 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; Robert N. Hawes. (1) $200 legal fee for services rendered, received from Robert N. Hawes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to Olympic National Park.

King, Joseph T., suite 302, The Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets, NW., Washington, D. C.; National Retail Lumber Dealers Association. (1) $1,800 salary and $423.12 expenses. (2) Pullman Co., railroads, restaurants, caterer, cab drivers. (3) Meals, taxi fares, and tips while traveling on official business; business luncheons, entertainment. (4) National affairs reports and bulletins. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building supply dealers, such as Emergency Price Control Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, wage and hour legislation, housing legislation, tax legislation, and Second War Powers Act.

King,[2] Karl V., 409 Boston Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Received of each of the following men, $50, or a total of $550: Bartolome Errea, Elko, Nev.; Marcelino Yturbe, Elko, Nev.; Francisco Lorono, Elko, Nev.; Pete Elguezabal, Elko, Nev.; Zenon Zubieta, Elko, Nev.; Francisco Alluntiz, Elko, Nev.; Damin Gandiaga, Elko, Nev.; Manuel Zulueta, Elko, Nev.; Jose Antonio Odriozola, Battle Mountain, Nev.; Fidel Acordarrementeria, Battle Mountain, Nev.; Pedro Bastido, Battle Mountain, Nev. (2) United Air Lines, travel, Salt Lake City to Washington, D. C., $221.40; New Colonial Hotel, room and meals, $182.50. (3) Travel and living expenses. (4) None. (5) Private bills for the relief of the persons listed in paragraph 1.

King,[1] Karl V., 409 Boston Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) No additional money received. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Private bills.

King,[2] Karl V., 409 Boston Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) No additional money received. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Private bills.

King, Willford I., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During this past quarter, I received an over-all of $2,729.51, including salary and expenses. (2) I am not a disbursing officer and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Kitchen, C. W., United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Various articles have been prepared and published in trade periodicals and association yearbooks on marketing subjects, none dealing specifically with legislative matters. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Kline, Allan B., American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $417.18 expended (see item (8) of Form B filed January 1948). (2) Taxi fares, train fares, hotel, and restaurants. (3) Transportation, lodging, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, Farm Credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of postwar construction of highways, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department, transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment of Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by Secretary of Agriculture, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, Labor Extension Service, alcohol plants, social security, weed killer, crop insurance, wheat carry-over, international wheat agreement, Parker River project, fiber identification, displaced persons, reciprocal trade agreements, rural electrification, radio, health, housing, standard time, Fair Labor Standards Act, railroad rates, Government corporations.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., Washington counsel for Kirlin, Campbell, Hickox & Keating, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.
[2] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.
[2] Filed for second and third quarters, 1947.
[10] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947, and first quarter, 1948.

to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Kneipp, Leon F., 3700 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Organization of Professional Employees of Department of Agriculture, Administration Building, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. (1) Only money received was compensation for services at rate of $100 per month, total $300. (2) No money paid to any person, company, or appropriation, or otherwise. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Measures relating to interests of Federal professional employees, viz, retirement, pay increases, disability compensation, per diem allowances, etc.

Koch, Robert M., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) It is estimated that, as secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., $1,000 of my salary represents that part of my time covered by Public Law 601 during the second quarter of 1948. This was all disbursed for personal living expenses. In addition, I received $25 reimbursement for taxis and carfare in connection with legislation of interest to members of the association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation directly or indirectly affecting the agricultural limestone industry.

Krebs,[4] Alfred U., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has stated in Form B that he does not believe Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act applicable to him for the reason that all of his time in connection with legislative activities is spent in appearing before congressional committees or in preparing correspondence addressed to chairmen of such committees. Registrant believes that $166.66 per month represents a fair allocation of his salary to these activities. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) Registrant is not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Krebs,[5] Alfred U., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has stated in Form B that he does not believe the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act is applicable to him for the reason that all of his time in connection with legislative activities is spent in appearing before congressional committees or in preparing correspondence addressed to chairmen of such committees. Registrant believes that $166.66 per month represents a fair allocation of his salary to these activities during the second quarter of 1948. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) Registrant is not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Kreutz, Oscar R., executive manager, National Savings and Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $4,500 salary and $2,067.06 special expense. Approximately 27 percent of my time was devoted to legislative matters so that $1,215 of my salary would be allocable. Of the special-expense item, none of it could be construed as applicable. (2) None. (3) None. (4) National Letter and National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry.

Krueger, A. H., 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the quarter April–June 1948, I was paid a total of $2,125 as an employee of Millers' National Federation for various services which have no relationship to the activities described in section 307 of title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Since legislative activity is only incidental to my regular employment, no specific amount of my salary is allocated for activities covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. I estimate that such activity took less than 5 percent of my time during the quarter. My expenditures for the quarter amounted to $16.05, for which I was reimbursed by my employer. (2) None. (3) All of the following expenditures were made for members of this industry: $8.75 was paid for meals and $7.30 for miscellaneous items and taxis. (4) None. (5) I assisted in preparation of a statement presented by president of Millers' National Federation before Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Relations in opposition to international wheat agreement. Helped prepare statement filed with Senate Labor Committee requesting amendment to Fair Labor Standards Act. Generally, I am expected to keep my employer informed on legislation directly affecting the flour milling industry—subsequent activity, if any, subject to employer's direction.

Kruse, Herman C., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary for quarter $2,100 for all services to employer, only part of which pertained to legislation. Reimbursement of hotel, travel, and incidental expenses for quarter, $2,573.45. (2) Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., $1,268.03; railroads and air lines, $497.47; restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies, taxis, and incidentals, $807.95. (3) Hotel, travel, and incidental expenses, as stated above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting water and power projects, flood control, and reclamation.

Lacques, Paul H., Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston; 99 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received various sums during the quarterly period (April, May, June) at various times a total of $753.37 from Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston. None of such receipts exceeded $100. (2) Railroad companies; hotels and club. (3) Transportation; accommodations, meals, telephone and telegraph charges. (4) None. (5) H. R. 669.

La France, Frances X., Esq., Swan, Keeney & Smith, 911 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.; Narragansett Brewing Co., New Depot Avenue, Cranston, R. I. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2759 and any correlative bill.

Lane, John F., care of Gall and Lane, Steel, Foundry and Scrap Industries' Committee for Expediting Iron and Steel Scrap, 401 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C. (1) (a) Money received as fees for all services possibly within scope of act, $3,000 (estimate). (b) Money expended consisted only of minor actual expense disbursements (such as local transportation, telephone and telegraph charges, etc.) in the estimated amount of $150. (2) Fees paid to Gall and Lane; expense disbursements paid to taxi companies, telephone company, telegraph company, etc. (3) Fees paid for legal research, information, advice, consultations, and memoranda. (4) None. (5) Legislation bearing upon United States ferrous scrap stocks.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C.; A. E. Brooks, 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) No money received and no expenditures except small sums for postage. (2) No expenditures except for postage. (3) Postage. (4) None. (5) Legislation with reference to taxation of nonresident citizens of the United States engaged in business abroad.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 11 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.; Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) From National Patent Council as retainer, $1,500; from American Fair Trade Council as retainer, $1,000; from Trinity Improvement Association for rental and other expenses $750 and $300 additional for added services, in this quarter. No expenditures have been made except small sums for postage, office supplies, etc. (2) $408 to Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (3) Rental and garage. (4) None. (5) My employers are all nonprofit organizations, and I was employed in an advisory capacity and not for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation in Congress. Their purposes are principally educational with reference to the objectives of their organizations.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C.; State Rights Association, Houston, Tex. (1) Received $2,500 in payment of remainder of retainer; no expenditures except small sums for postage. (2) No expenditures except for postage. (3) Postage. (4) None. (5) Legislation to preserve and promote the rights of the States under our system of Government, to return to the States such normal functions as they should rightfully assume, to restrict Federal agencies to Federal functions, and to equalize taxation in accordance with State laws.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) La Roe, Brown & Winn, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Meat inspection bill, S. 2256, H. R. 5675, H. R. 6259.

Laugherty,[9] R. R., 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D. C.; Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., room 1309, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $250. No money expended except for personal maintenance. (Ill during months of February and March.) (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxi fare, postage, telephone and telegraph, cleaning and food. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroad labor, especially Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Act.

Laugherty,[9] R. R., 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D. C.; Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., room 1309, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $750; no money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxi fare, postage, telephone and telegraph, cleaning and pressing and meals. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting and detrimental to railroad employees.

Lawrence, John V., American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $119.70. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Building, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money was paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., suite 301, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW. (1) Total receipts $4,919.34; total expenses $925.52. (2) Hotels and air lines. (3) Travel, hotels, and meals. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health

[4] Filed for first quarter, 1948
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

endorsed or opposed by the section of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

Laylin, John G., Aluminum Research Institute, 701 Union Trust Building. (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $83.37. (2) Telephone and telegraph expense, $83.37; travel expense, including hotel accommodations, $25. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has received no contributions for the purposes designated in subparagraph (a) or (b) of section 307, Public Law 601; expenditures, salary, carfare, telephone, telegraph, postage, publications, $3,065.05. (2) Muriel Ferris, salary, and carfare; balance as indicated in (1). (3) As indicated in (1). (4) Trends in Government and Member Magazine, both published by registrant; broadsides on the European recovery program, and reciprocal trade, also published by registrant. (5) See attached program [1] of the League of Women Voters of the United States.

Lee, Ivy, and Ross, T. J. (registrant disclaims that Public Law 601 has any application to it but is filing this form in the event that the act may be deemed to be applicable to it), United States Cuban Sugar Council, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) See appended statement I.[1] (2) See appended statement I.[1] (3) See appended statement I.[1] (4) See appended statement I.[1]. (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public-relations matters pertaining to sugar legislation relating to the Sugar Act of 1948.

Leete, Malcolm R., 41 Mount Vernon Street, Boston, Mass.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated June 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Leopold, Joseph F., 936 Liberty Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle, Cricago, Ill. (1) Nothing received other than regular salary. (2) Nothing paid other than travel expenses, for which I received reimbursement from National Tax Equality Association. (3) Transportation, hotel, and usual travel expenses and incidentals. (4) None. (5) No legislation in particular, only tax equality in general.

Letts, David S., attorney, 901 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; American Transit Association, 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,350 salary as attorney for the American Transit Association; received $254.53 for actual business expenses. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, etc.; hotels and restaurants; merchants and others. (3) Traveling and living expenses away from Washington; expenses in Washington for transportation, fees, dues, entertainment, and miscellaneous. (4) None. (5) In connection with proposed legislation affecting the transit industry, registrant may present the views of members of the American Transit Association.

Levine, Seth, CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,365 in salary; $130, expenses; 50 percent of time spent on research work and 50 percent on legislative activities. (2) Expenses paid to taxi companies, telephone company, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxies, telephone calls, periodicals. (4) CIO News, NMU Pilot, IPAWA Fisherman, the American Marine Engineer. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen, longshoremen, fishermen, and allied workers and oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Lewis, George J., Kentucky Railroad Association (for fuller details see Form B, filed by me on June 3, 1947), Union Station, Lexington, Ky. (1) No moneys received, except reimbursements for out-of-pocket expense amounting to $393.81. (2) Hotel, restaurant, dining car, pullman, taxis, telephone, etc. (3) For living and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Employed to support legislation favorable to the railroad industry and to oppose legislation detrimental to that industry.

Libby, Frederick J., executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,149.99; expenses, $267.06; total, $1,417.05. (2) Expenses for railroad tickets, hotels, taxis, porters, telephone and telegraph service, postage, and miscellaneous expenses when away from Washington. (3) Speaking trips, attending conferences, meetings, etc. (4) Peace Action, monthly news bulletin of National Council for Prevention of War. (5) Supports, in pursuance of the purposes of the organization, legislation which promotes peace and opposes legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Linton, D. H., Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, 250 Stuart Street, Boston, Mass. (1) $141.87 ($50 compensation and $91.87 expenses). (2) Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., railroads, food, taxis, telephone, tips, and miscellaneous expenses. (3) Traveling and incidentals. (4) None. (5) H. R. 4099, H. R. 5473, and H. R. 5392.

Littell, Norman M., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Navajo Tribe of Indians, residing in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado (address of superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz.). (1) For quarter ended June 30, 1948, $1,875 as retainer for legal services as general counsel and $649.73 for expenses. (2) To employees of registrant's law office, including stenographers. (3) For legal services in connection with Navajo business. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the Navajos as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting the Navajos is being considered.

Little, Charles R. (executive secretary), Kenwood Road, box 153–M, rural route 508, Cincinnati, Ohio; Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress (Dr. Charles E. Holzer, Sr., president, Holzer Hospital, Gallipolis, Ohio). (1) Total received for salary, $900; total received for expenses, $600; total expenses, $395.84. Actual amounts directly chargeable to lobbying are less than totals shown above. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, etc. (3) Transportation, $94.31; lodging, $73.68; meals, $56.91; tips, $17.20; office (periodicals, communication, postage, stationery, supplies), $153.74. (4) The Waterways Journal. (5) Not solely employed for this purpose, but concerned with any legislation dealing with conservation and flood control in the Ohio Valley, including appropriation bills.

Little, Walter J., 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Southern Pacific Co., et al. (1) Received from Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, Northwestern Pacific, and Western Pacific Railroads, for expenses, $743.88. (2) Various. (3) Hotels and meals, etc. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the railroads.

Lockwood, Maurice H.; the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $200 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News, Fertilizer Review, Agronomic Notes, and Pasture Progress, all published by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., Washington, D. C. I issued and distributed, in the customary manner, a press release relative to the association's report on fertilizer consumption in 1947 and one relative to the program of the association's annual convention of June 1948, but do not know what publications may have published them in whole or in part. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Lodge, F. S., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $150 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Loft, George, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, April, May, June, $1,055.57; travel expense, $345.19. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of discussing developments on universal military training and conscription legislation, and to organize opposition against it. (4) [Blank.] (5) In general to oppose conscription, universal military training, and the militarization of America, and to support the rights of conscience and world disarmament.

Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, and 1216 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $31,775.05, largely for legal services, preparation of brief, legal research, etc. (2) Traveling expenses, mimeographing briefs, etc., $589.59. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

Lovelady, Rufus M., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Lodge 14, American Federation of Government Employees, Balboa, C. Z. (1) $840.04. This amount on the basis of $350 per month for the period April 1 to June 12, 1948, inclusive. (NOTE.—My legislative representative activities ceased on June 12, 1948, and I returned to the Canal Zone on June 14, 1948.) (2) Landlord at 1505 W Street SE., Washington, D. C.; grocery stores; gasoline stations; and others for ordinary necessities of life. (3) Apartment for myself, wife, and children; food and clothing; gasoline and oil for my private automobile; subscription to newspapers, tips, etc. (4) None. (5) Retirement legislation for Canal Zone employees; increase in basic pay for Federal employees; increased injury compensation benefits; legislation to prohibit aliens taking civil-service examinations for appointment on the Canal Zone.

Lucas, James C., 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $200, salary; $24.90, expenses. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) Transportation. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Lunn, Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Ariz.; Townsend National Recovery Plan on no salary basis, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) No salary, no specified amount, a small commission on dues, for incidental mail and stationery, never enough; I donate balance. (2) [Blank.] (3) I pay for printing cards announcing meetings of club members, stationery, postage, especially in behalf of local pensioners, paying mostly out of my own pocket. (4) None. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Lyon, A. E., executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation; total salary for quarter, $2,250; total expenses for quarter, $596.93. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

Lyon, R. B. H., 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Kinsman Optical Co. 1320 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 6241, Eightieth Congress, second session.

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary of Jonas A. McBride, $3,500; salary of Glenn C. Russell, stenographer, $955. Printing and supplies, $66.73; rent, $270; personal expenses, Jonas A. McBride, $982.23; telephone and telegrams, $85.86; postage, $90. (2) Salaries to Jonas A. McBride and Glenn C. Russell as indicated; printing and supplies to various printers and stationery supply companies; rent to labor, 10 Independence Avenue SW. (3) For maintenance of office of National Legislative Representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,232.50 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $255.13 was expended by me as expense money, during the second quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $510.26 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $255.13 was expended by me as expense money, during the second quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

McCaskill, J. L., associate secretary, department of higher education, National Education Association, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,269, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. Estimated for legislative servces, $100. Expenses: None. (2) Self-salary. Expenses: None. (3) No expense incurred. (4) College and University Bulletin. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

McClure, Warren C., box 207, Camden, Ark. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

McDonald, Angus H., 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., the Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) $750, salary; $450, expenses; total, $1,200. (2) Salary and expenses were used by self in a trip to nine States west of the Rockies and in keeping up home obligations. (3) Answered above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; The Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) A Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The preamble shall be amended to read "We, the people of the United States devoutly recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ the Saviour and King of Nations, in order to form, etc."

McGough, Richard, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.; Northern Pacific Railway Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Great Northern Railway Co., the Milwaukee Road, Seattle, Wash. (1) Salary as stated in original registration. Expenditures for meals, $238.50; taxi fares, $25.80; Pullman fares, $61.74; baggage, $5.40; hotel accommodations, $239.98; telegrams and postage, $17.02; miscellaneous, $8.20; notary fees, $1. (2) Various restaurants, hotels, taxi companies, railroad companies, etc. (3) Living and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Washington.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, 630 I Street, formerly 626 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Taxpayers, U. S. A., United States Treasury. (1) Approximately $165. (2) Thomas Edward McGrath. (3) To use as I see fit. (4) For a fee, none. (5) [Blank.]

McGrath, Tom J., 324 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, National Coal Association, Boston, Mass., and Washington, D. C. (1) No payments received. (2) No expenditures (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Participating in the consideration of natural gas legislative matters as the interests of clients may appear to be affected by such legislation.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, a partnership, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; The Holstein-Friesian Association of America, Brattleboro, Vt. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support H. R. 3884.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; The Lincoln Electric Co., 12818 Coit Road, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received $150 fees; reimbursement of traveling expenses, $69.14. Expended, none. (2) McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart. (3) Attorneys' fees $150; reimbursement of traveling expenses, $69.14. (4) None. (5) Pension trust statutes; and Internal Revenue Code, section 23 (a).

McKercher, M. C., 3660 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.; the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Salary, $325 per month; total for quarter, $975. Expenses for quarter ending June 30, 1948, $908.39. No money expended in connection with legislative work. (2) Hotel Hamilton, various restaurants, telephone, telegraph, postage, pullman, streetcar, and taxi fares. (4) Necessary living and transportation expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

McLaughlin, Robert E., 410 Central Building, 805 G Street NW., Washington D. C.; AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended, except petty cash for taxi fares. Since March 1, 1948, I have been acting national legislative director for AMVETS at a modest per diem rate for time actually consumed. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) National AMVET and AMVET Letter. (5) To support legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II and their dependents.

McLaughlin, Robert E., National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $250. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) To support legislation beneficial to this client and civil-service employees in general.

McMahon, John A., president, National Association of Postal Supervisors, 171 Milton Street, Boston, Mass.; National Association of Postal Supervisors, box 1225, Nashville, Tenn. (1) $65.16 received from Michael C. Nave, treasurer, National Association of Postal Supervisors, room 326, main post office, Chicago, Ill. (2) John A. McMahon, president, Boston, Mass., Pennsylvania Railroad; New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; American Air Lines; Boston, Hotel Continental, Washington, D. C. (3) Reimbursement for loss of salary while absent from regular post office duty, railroad and air line transportation, hotel accommodations, meals, telephone, and telegraph services. (4) The Postal Supervisor, official magazine of the National Association of Postal Supervisors. (5) Legislation pending in Congress involving salary adjustments, and retirement, all in the interests of the supervisory officials in the field postal service.

McMains, W. H., Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary same as previous report. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the industry represented is reported to members, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as S. 265, S. 2352, S. 2365, H. R. 4388, and H. R. 6852.

McMillan, Robert W., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,100, with less than one-twentieth of the time and services for which such compensation was paid being for activities which might conceivably be construed as coming within the purview of any of the provisions of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; $92.70, reimbursement of expenses allocable to foregoing activities. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Transportation and other normal out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

McQuatters, Geneva F., 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,050; expense, $210.67. (2) Travel, postage, telephone, telegraph, taxis. (3) Travel, postage, telephone, telegraph, transportation. (4) Independent Woman. (5) Merit system, Women's Bureau appropriations, equal-rights amendment, opposition to discriminations against women, Federal aid in support of public education, jury service for women, child-labor legislation, United Nations participation, retention of women's units as a permanent part of the services, universal military training.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Remington Rand, Inc., 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y., and American Optometric Association, 518 Wilmac Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) None received. (2) Telephone and telegrams, $117.27; taxis and miscellaneous, $5.25; total, $122.52, for American Optometric Association. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) On behalf of the American Optometric Association development fund I have continued to support the action of the District of Columbia Optometric Association in requesting an amendment to the District of Columbia optometry law, for the purpose of raising the standards of the profession, providing better visual care for the residents of the District of Columbia. I supported inclusion in the selective-service legislation of a provision which would require the calling of optometrists on a basis similar to that proposed for calling physicians and dentists. I also favored exempting ophthalmic materials used by optometrists from the proposed District of Columbia sales-tax bill. On behalf of Remington Rand, Inc., I supported an

amendment to the provision in the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, limiting the price which the Government could pay for typewriters. The statutory limitations in this respect have been so restricted that it has been practically impossible for the Government to purchase any typewriters.

Macleay, Lachlan, Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with general work done for the Mississippi Valley Association, all reimbursed by association, $1,515.10. (2) Railroads, etc., $572.34; hotels and miscellaneous, $942.76. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) A portion of Mr. Macleay's time was used in regard to legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, and regulation of domestic transportation.

MacMillen,[2] William C., Federation for Railway Progress, 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $616.66; expenses, $418.43. (2) Travel expenses in the amount of $418.43 paid to various railroads, hotels, etc. (3) Travel expenses, exclusive of any legislative activity. (4) [Blank.] (5) None.

Mac Millen,[2] William C. Jr., 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,249.98; expenses, $150.26. (2) For various hotels, railroads, etc. (3) For traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Macnamee,[2] W. Bruce, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) One thousand and fifty dollars received as salary from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., allocable to legislative activities; $267.66 received for expenses (registrant registered with Sea-Air Committee since January 1947). (2) No expenditures except for transportation, hotels, and meals. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Macnamee,[2] W. Bruce, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G. Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) One thousand and fifty dollars received as salary from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., allocable to legislative activities; $104.06 received for expenses. (2) No expenditures except for transportation, hotels, and meals. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Madaris, James B., 220 South Alfred Street, Alexandria, Va.; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 107 West Linwood Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo. (1) One hundred and ninety-seven dollars and twenty-eight cents for salary and $48 per diem for expenses; also about $7.20 for miscellaneous expenses. (2) Paid out our transportation, meals, hotels, and other miscellaneous expenses by James B. Madaris. (3) Living expenses, hotels, meals, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting employees of Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America.

Magee, Miss Elizabeth S., National Consumers' League, 348 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, part time, $966.64; travel, Washington, D. C., May 1-7, $120.49. (2) [Blank.] (3) Travel and living expenses. (4) National Consumers League Bulletin. (5) Supporting minimum wage legislation; extension of social security.

Manly, Milo A., National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., room 901, Washington, D. C. (1) Travel, telephone calls, and living expenses April 1 to June 30, 1948, $800; salary after tax deductions, April 1 to June 30, 1948, $1,092.80. (2) [Blank.] (3) Travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, $800; salary after tax deductions, $1,092.80. (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate bill 984 and House bill 2824.

Margolin, Leo J., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated June 30, 1948. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6369, Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Margolin, Mrs. Olya, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,125 (gross, before income-tax deduction) in salary received from National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y., none of which was spent in this work; $39.42 received from above, spent for carfare, postage, and supplies. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.

Markham, Baird H., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached schedule [3] for answers to items 1 to 5. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marks, Herbert S., 305 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; The Detroit Edison Co., 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Fee not yet received for general legal services to client; expended in connection with all matters for client, $170.50. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $77.81; travel expenses, $82.79; miscellaneous, $9.90. (3) Telephone and telegraph, transportation, taxis, postage. (4) None. (5) General legal services to this client include services in connection with proposed amendment to exempt limited interstate and international electric connections under the Federal Power Act.

Marks, Raymond E., Southern Pacific Co., 139 North Virginia Street, Reno, Nev. (1) Expended and was reimbursed $1,151.57 which was expended as follows: Meals, $480.50; hotel, $210; pullman and transportation, $272.50; streetcar, taxicab, and bus fares or gasoline, $66.80; tips, $85.50; miscellaneous expenditures including telephone tolls, postage, incidentals, $36.27. (2) Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.; various restaurants and hotel dining rooms; pullman and transportation companies; taxi drivers, porters, bellboys, waiters, telephone companies, et al. (3) Meals and lodging, pullman and transportation accommodations, taxi and bus services; telephone calls, postage, porters, bellboys, waiters, and other services. (4) None. (5) Federal legislation affecting the interests of Nevada railroads, viz, Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, Western Pacific.

Marran,[2] Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of which registrant is an associate, did not receive or expend any sums during the preceding calendar quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax legislation proposing to amend section 116 (a) and section 1621 of the Internal Revenue Code, pertaining to United States citizens earning income from sources outside the United States and withholding required on such income.

Marran,[2] Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended $25.68 in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) New York Telephone Co., $24.08; Western Union Telegraph, $1.50; carfare, 10 cents; total, $25.68. (3) Telephone toll calls, $24.08; Western Union messenger service, $1.50; carfare, 10 cents; total, $25.68. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85 percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Marsh, Benjamin C., Peoples Lobby, Inc., room 31 810 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts, largest contribution $836.98, $3,142.58; salaries and wages, $825.15; bulletins and printing, $911.25; postage, $415.25; rent, $165; Andrew Walker, $47.55, addressograph $25.77, B. C. Marsh, expenses to two meetings, $27.85, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., $12.82, expenses May 29, conference $40.75, incidentals $83.14. (2) B. C. Marsh, Arlene Ryan, Marie McEnaney, Graphic Arts Press, United States Post Office, J. B. Stein, Andrew Walker, Addressograph Corp., incidentals. (3) Salaries and wages for publicity and clerical work, other for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) We have not caused any article to be published but have sent material and releases to hundreds of papers. (5) Support attached program and oppose that against it.

Marshall, J. Paul, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None received; $21.19 expended. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Kirby Lithographic Co. (3) Long distance telephone calls, reproductions of newspaper clipping. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3314, H. R. 6341, S. 1675, S. 230.

Marshall, Mrs. Katharine Lee, 1734 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (United States section), 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (National Administration Headquarters). (1) Salary $670, expenses $131.20. (2) Salary $670, to landlord, grocers, United States Government, savings, etc.; expenses $131.20, to railroads, restaurants, taxicab drivers. (3) Salary $670, for personal living expenses, taxes, savings, etc., $131.20 for my own expenses incurred while attending meetings, conferences held by WILPF and other organizations; my own taxi fare to such meetings and to Capitol Hill. (4) None. (5) Support strengthening UN and its specialized agencies; extension reciprocal trade program; European recovery program; emergency admission displaced persons on non-quota basis; permanent and Federal FEPC; Federal anti-lynch law. Oppose UMT, selective service, United States Arming of Latin American Countries; restrictions of imports.

Marston, R. B., Director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,018.34 which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. Estimated for legislative service $409.27. Expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Martin, Robert F., Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. As incident to association activities testified at two congressional hearings on H. R. 6556.

Masoka, Mrs. Etsu, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.; Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in Form B, filed January 6, 1948. See attached supplementary sheet.[4] (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list.[3] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Masaoka, Mike M., national legislative director, Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., post office box 1628, Washington, D. C.; Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in Form B, filed January 22, 1947. See attached supplementary sheet.[3] (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list.[3] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Maslow, Will, American Jewish Congress, 1834 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received fee for services of $112.50; expended, $25. (2) Rail and hotel expenses on trip to Washington, D. C. (3) Same as 2. (4) Law and social action, March-April, 1948; University of Iowa Law Review, May 1948—book review. (5) Legislation designed to implement the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights; to keep separate church and state, to liberalize immigration laws.

Mason, Walter J., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $2,080; expenses for April 1948, $44; May, $44.50; June, $56; total for 3 months, $144.50. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (away from office) and other incidentals. (3) As shown in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Mathews, John Clifford, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America for the Christian Amendment Movement, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (denominational headquarters). (1) Salary received from J. S. Tibby for April, May, and June, $750; from J. S. Tibby for expenses, $60; preaching fee from Kansas City Reformed Presbyterian Church, $15. (2) Salary used for personal and family expenses only. Receipts for expenses and preaching fees used for paying railway fare, cost of hotel rooms, meals, etc., in necessary travel for the Christian Amendment Movement. (3) See above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) In support of House Joint Resolution 239 and Senate Joint Resolution 150 in Eightieth Congress, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States to acknowledge Jesus Christ as Saviour and King of nations.

Maudlin, C. V., 710 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.; Georgia Power Co. and its associate company, Savannah River Electric Co., Electric Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) Receipts and receivable, $2,342.81 from Georgia Power Co., for all services and expenses, including both legislative and nonlegislative activities; expenditures, $84.51, exclusive of stenographic and research services furnished by my office personnel. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union, Federal Power Commission, cab drivers, and various others. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list.[3] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Maslow, Will, American Jewish Congress, 1834 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received fee for services of $112.50; expended, $25. (2) Rail and hotel expenses on trip to Washington, D. C. (3) Same as 2. (4) Law and social action, March-April, 1948; University of Iowa Law Review, May 1948—book review. (5) Legislation designed to implement the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights; to keep separate church and state, to liberalize immigration laws.

Mason, Walter J., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $2,080; expenses for April 1948, $44; May, $44.50; June, $56; total for 3 months, $144.50. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (away from office) and other incidentals. (3) As shown in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Mathews, John Clifford, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America for the Christian Amendment Movement, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (denominational headquarters). (1) Salary received from J. S. Tibby for April, May, and June, $750; from J. S. Tibby for expenses, $60; preaching fee from Kansas City Reformed Presbyterian Church, $15. (2) Salary used for personal and family expenses only. Receipts for expenses and preaching fees used for paying railway fare, cost of hotel rooms, meals, etc., in necessary travel for the Christian Amendment Movement. (3) See above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) In support of House Joint Resolution 239 and Senate Joint Resolution 150 in Eightieth Congress, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States to acknowledge Jesus Christ as Saviour and King of nations.

Maudlin, C. V., 710 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.; Georgia Power Co. and its associate company, Savannah River Electric Co., Electric Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) Receipts and receivable, $2,342.81 from Georgia Power Co., for all services and expenses, including both legislative and nonlegislative activities; expenditures, $84.51, exclusive of stenographic and research services furnished by my office personnel. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union, Federal Power Commission, cab drivers, and various others. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list.[3] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Masaoka, Mike M., national legislative director, Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., post office box 1628, Washington, D. C.; Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in Form B, filed January 22, 1947. See attached supplementary sheet.[3] (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list.[3] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Masoka, Mrs. Etsu, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.; Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in Form B, filed January 6, 1948. See attached supplementary sheet.[4] (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list.[3] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

[2] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[3] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

Mechem, Frank L., 603 Central Building, Seattle, Wash.; P. E. Harris & Co., et al. (1) As stated in answer to question (4) on Form B, the only money received by registrant is (a) legal fee on per diem basis for services performed and (b) reimbursement for traveling expenses. No money was received during the preceding calendar quarter by law of legal fees, and the total amount of reimbursement for traveling expenses was $643.86. (2) See (3). (3) The only expenditures during the preceding calendar quarter consisted of traveling expenses covering air and railroad transportation, hotel, meals, telephone, and telegraph tolls. (4) None. (5) The formulation and presentation of proposed legislative program designed to stabilize certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry.

Messer, James, Jr., Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla. (1) Total amount received and expended, $165.28, as per detailed statement attached.[3] (2) See attached list.[3] (3) For purposes stated on attached list [3] in connection with S. 110 (Reed-Bulwinkle bill) pending in the Congress. (4) None. (5) Any legislation in which I might be directed to support or oppose by Florida Railroad Association, generally legislation affecting railroads.

Messer, Ross A., National Association of Post Office Mechanics and Custodial Employees, box 1611, room 527, Victor Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,250; expenses, $635.01; expenses include postage, office supplies, box rent, taxi, postage for mailing publications and bulletins and other necessary expenses for handling legislation and grievances. (2) [Blank.] (3) In support of all beneficial legislation for postal employees, and in handling grievances between the membership and the Post Office Department. (4) The Post Office Custodial News and special news bulletins advising the membership on legislative activities. (5) All beneficial legislation for postal employees and custodial employees in particular.

Middleton, P. Harvey, Railway Business Association, 33 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) The only money received by me during the period from April 1 to June 30, 1948, was $5,666.66 in salary, gross. No part of this salary was spent in legislative activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) The only item of legislation dealt with by me in this period was a letter to members of the Railway Business Association, dated April 30, 1948, requesting their continued support of the Reed-Bulwinkle bill (S. 110, H. R. 221) in regard to which the Railway Business Association had appeared before the House committee to state its reasons for approving this legislation.

Miles, Clarence E., Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW. (1) Received: Salary, $4,126; expenses, $148.80. Expended: Transportation, $105.13; meals, $34.79; telephone, $8.86. (2) Taxi companies, railroad, restaurants, and telephone company. (3) Transportation to and communication with the Capitol, other normal and necessary expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Miles, Harold M., Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No money received or spent during the past quarter on any Federal legislative work. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The Reed-Bulwinkle bill; the amendments to the Crosser Act.

Miller, Charles C., 713 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) I have received from my employers during the quarter ended June 30, 1948, prorated to cover time spent in legislative activities during this period, a total of $2,250.54. The full receipts and manner of prorating each expenditure are shown in the attachment.[3] (2) $125.37 to various hotels and restaurants for guest luncheons; $32.33 for cabs; $26.18 in tips and miscellaneous expenditures; $1.50 for mimeographing; $154.63 for telephone and telegraph; $7.93 for postage; $14.30 for office supplies; $322.50 to the Ring Engineer Co. for rent; and $1,574 to the registrant and his secretary, H. Mathewson, in salaries. (3) [Blank.] (4) Press coverage consisted of general news reports on tire and tube production, on rubber consumption, and in detailing the arguments presented by tire manufacturers in support of a brief appealing for modification of existing wartime excise taxes on their products. (5) Revision of excise taxes on tires and measures regulating the transportation of flammable textiles and coated fabrics.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.; Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.; State Rights Association, Houston, Tex. (1) Received: $1,500 plus $750 expenses from Dallas Chamber of Commerce; $1,500 plus $278.64 expenses from Intracoastal Canal Association; $1,500 plus $972.20 expenses from Texas Gulf Sulphur Co.; $2,500, no expenses, from State Rights Association. Expended: $2,000.84; this sum includes all business expenses in Washington, only a small portion of which would apply to activities within the purview of the act. (2) Carlyn Apartments, Mayflower Hotel, United States post office, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation facilities, stationers, food and beverage establishments. (3) Apartment rent, $481.50; office rent, $650; taxi fares, etc., $105; telephone and telegraph, $196.04; stamps, stationery, other usual office expenses, $160; entertainment and miscellaneous, $398.30. (4) Monthly article in Dallas magazine, official publication of Dallas Chamber of Commerce. (5) Legislation affecting flood control, water transportation, river and harbor improvement, appropriations, and taxes.

Milton, Charles J., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J.; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3237 and S. 249.

Mollin, F. E., executive secretary, American National Live Stock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Have had no special contributions for lobbying purposes. The association finances handled in normal fashion. My compensation as executive secretary of the American National Live Stock Association is $1,000 a month. In addition I received in January of this year a bonus of $1,000 for last year. (2) No payments to anyone in connection with lobbying activities. Only part of the expense of myself as executive secretary of the association on trips to Washington in past quarter could be chargeable to such. Total expense for this purpose was $921.72; telephone and telegraph, $156.50; Washington stenographer, $113.95. (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own official magazine, the American Cattle Producer. (5) Federal meat inspection (S. 2356), capital gains (H. R. 6712), National Land Policy Act (H. R. 6054), Reciprocal Trade Act (H. R. 6556).

Montgomery, Donald E., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks at $100, $1,300; subsistence, 13 weeks, $819; expenses, 13 weeks, $427.67; total, $2,546.67. This amount covers nonlegislative work as described under (4) in form B, as well as legislative work. Legislative work accounts for less than half of total duties. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Worker, Ammunition and Washington Report (UAW-CIO publications), Economic Outlook (CIO publication), Antioch Review, Labor and Nation. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Mooney, William W.: 505 South Eleventh Street, Tacoma, Wash.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Gross amount paid to me in the form of commissions from the Townsend National Recovery Plan headquarters, $953.93. (2) The $953.93 paid to William W. Mooney: Expenses for travel, such as train, bus, auto, and hotel when out of home city, $330.67; withholding tax, $106; social security, $9.05; total expense, taxes, etc., $445.72, leaving a balance out of the $953.93 of $508.21 for personal use. (3) To promote meetings to create more interest in the Townsend plan bills; to help in building morale and organizing clubs and building membership in the clubs. (4) Send articles in at times to be printed in the Townsend National Weekly, with headquarters at 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio; also, at times, announcements of larger meetings to be held in the State of Washington. (5) Townsend National Recovery plan bills, H. R. 16 and H. R. 2476 and S. 690, now in the Eightieth Congress of the United States.

Moore, Chester B., Western Growers Association, 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Regular salary as managing director of Western Growers Association, plus traveling expenses. (2) To all regular accounts of my personal and business life. (3) [Blank.] (4) Western Grower and Shipper. (5) Am paid regular salary; not directly employed to support or oppose any specific legislation; I do oppose or support any legislation of interest to our members.

Moore, Clayton, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Fourth and Main Streets, Winston-Salem, N. C. (1) Actual expenses incurred, $189.27 (salary for full-time services as associate counsel same as amount in last quarterly report and for the purposes more fully set out in registration form). (2) Railroad and Pullman fares, $61.66; hotel, meals, and phones, $126.11; taxicabs, $1.50. (3) Travel, hotel, meals, phones, and taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation affecting R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Moran, Raymond H., 46 Burnside Avenue, Cranford, N. J.; International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Ninth and Mount Vernon Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200 (April 1 to June 1, 1948); expenses, $94.50; no other expenses other than living expenses. (2) Hotel Hamilton, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph, postage, meals, laundry, etc. (3) All living, transportation, telegraph, and telephone expense. (4) None. (5) All legislation pertaining to railroad labor, particularly all bills affecting the now-existing Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts.

Morelock, Phil D., 1009 Commerce Building, Kansas City, Mo.; Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo. (1) None with respect to this or any other matters before the legislature. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2192, for the relief of Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Morgan, George W., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made registrant received only his salary and expenses; the portion of registrant's salary applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601 is estimated to be less than $1,250; the portion of registrant's expenses applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating such registration is estimated to be not more than $443.18. (2) No expenditures except for transportation, hotels, meals, and similar out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See item 2. (4) A copy of the only issue of any publication in which the registrant caused any article or editorial to be published during the quarter for which this report is filed is annexed hereto[1] and made a part hereof. (5) The registrant is employed as president of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation; during the quarter for which this report is filed the registrant did, however, support bills to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; this is the first quarter since the effective date of the act during which the registrant has engaged in any activity in furtherance of any object necessitating registration.

Morgan, Gerald D., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Alaska Transportation Co.; Pier 58, Seattle, Wash. (1) Engaged in legislative activity on behalf of Alaska Transportation Co. for approximately 14 days, for which firm of Morgan & Calhoun received $1,400; expended during this period $425.51 for telephone and teletype messages, for which the firm received reimbursement from Alaska Transportation Co.; this sum includes expenses in connection with nonlegislative matters, but an allocation is impossible. (2) $425.51 paid to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., for telephone and teletype service. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Legislative activity consisted of conferences with various persons in the Maritime Commission and the Department of the Interior, as well as various Members of Congress respecting legislation to take the place of Public Law 12, Eightieth Congress, relating to Alaska shipping, when that law expires on June 30, 1948.

Morgan, Gerald D., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; the Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) $253.37 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services for the Toilet Goods Association, Inc., during the quarter; allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible; expended $1.38 for telephone call, which was reimbursed by the Toilet Goods Association, Inc. (2) $1.38 paid to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Legislation providing for relief from the existing 20-percent retail tax on toilet preparations.

Morris, Curtis, East Texas Chamber of Commerce, Box 1592, Longview, Tex. (1) Expenses: Hotel, $480.19; transportation, $313.17; meals, $212.75; taxies, $58.30; miscellaneous, $102.70. Compensation, regular salary. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Anything affecting the business or civic interests of east Texas.

Morris Plan Corp. of America, the, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received. (2) Appeal Printing Co., $1,796.73 (this payment made from corporate funds. (3) Printing. (4) None. (5) The corporation in its interests and in the interests of its stockholders opposes the adoption of bank holding-company legislation in the forms represented by S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Morse, Henry Hoyt, 99 Pearl Street, Gardner, Mass., Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid. (3) No work undertaken. (4) Stove builder. (5) None.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Mosier, Harold G., Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.; The Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (1) As previously reported, registrant receives compensation of $1,000 per month for his services. In the course of performing these services registrant has expended $482.34 for travel, subsistence, communications, etc., for which he has been or will be reimbursed. Payment of these amounts so expended has been made directly to the hotels, railroads, restaurants, etc. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Mote, Lynn E., 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Association of American Shipowners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary from April 16, 1948, through June 30, 1948, at a rate of $8,000 per annum plus expenses totaling $157.64. (2) Expenses paid to taxicabs, hotels, railroads, telephone and telegraph services. (3) For services named in (3) above, only an insignificant portion of which was spent pursuant to activities within the purview of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, which activity is only a minor portion of employee's duties.

Mote, Lynn E.,[10] 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made registrant received only his salary and expenses. The total salary received by the registrant during the quarter was $1,565.99 and the total expenses received by him amounted to $157.64. Only a small portion of such salary and expenses is applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration. (2) No expenditures except taxicabs, railroads, meals, and similar out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) The registrant is employed as manager of the Washington office of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During the quarter for which this report is filed, the registrant did support bills to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. This is the first quarter since the effective date of the act during which the registrant has engaged in any activity in furtherance of an object necessitating registration.

Munro, Walter J., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (1) No money received or expended in connection with legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. My work pertains entirely to public relations.

Murph, Daniel S., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $100 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4563, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Chiropractic Insurance Co. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Chiropractic Journal and Chiropractic News. (5) None specified. At present time supporting S. 1428, the Langer bill, and H. R. 5468, the Patterson bill.

Murphy, Ray, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the first quar-

[10] Amended form.

ter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

Myers, Abram F., Dupont Circle Building, Washington 6, D. C. (formerly 729 Fifteenth Street NW.); 18 regional theater associations named in Form B; Allied States Association of Motion Picture Exhibitors. (1) Was reimbursed from general funds of associations for expenditures in connection with hearing on H. R. 5014. See below. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co., $97.06 (telegrams notifying clients of hearing); $64.40, Federal Reporting Co. (transcript of hearing); total, $161.46. (3) All in connection with notifying witnesses of hearing and purchase of transcript of their testimony. (4) None. (5) Appeared with others as a witness in support of H. R. 5014, to amend the copyright law. The bill was adversely reported by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Myrup, Andrew William, 932 Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union, 2719 North Wilton Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $108 a week; $1,404 per quarter. (2) To the registrant. (3) Salary for conducting the research department of the international union with the following duties: To collect statistical data and compile same for use of the member locals in negotiations, such surveys to cover hours and earnings, contract clauses, economic data on industries in which our members work. Also to act as liaison between our organization and various Government agencies, such as NLRB, Labor, Commerce, Agriculture, Social Security, etc., and to watch the progress of Federal and State legislation. (4) None. (5) None.

National Association of Real Estate Boards: Its Realtors Washington Committee, and the public relations department;[1] Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) Schedule attached.[1] (2) Schedule attached.[2] (3)-Schedule attached.[2] (4) Attached list shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Real Estate Boards: Its Realtors Washington Committee, and its public relations department;[2] Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) Schedule attached.[2] (2) Schedule attached.[2] (3) Schedule attached.[2] (4) Attached list shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Stevedores, 90 West Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) $10,750 received, see statement A attached;[3] $317.96 expended, see statement B attached.[3] (2) See statement B attached. (3) See statement B attached. (4) None. (5) H. R. 4387, S. 2366.

National Postal Committee for Books, Room 305, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (See registration for statement of membership of committee.) (1) No receipts during said period; expenditures, $6.57. (2) American Book Publishers Council. (3) For mimeographing, mailing, and telegrams. (4) None during said calendar quarter. (5) The committee opposes unfair increases in postal rates and discrimination in postal rates such as contained in H. R. 2406 and H. R. 3519.

National Savings and Loan League,[2] 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; member savings and loan associations of the league. (1) Financial statement attached.[2] (The item of $200, Federal legislation committee, represents payment to C. H. Ellingson for reimbursement for legal services.) In the report filed by Mr. O. R. Kreutz, it was stated that no portion of his expense was allocable to legislation during the quarter. Perhaps $125 of the National Letter charge may be allocable and $375 of officers' salary. (2) See (1). (3) Legal services and legislation as stated in (1). All other expenditures were for routine league business not connected with legislation. (4) National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) Bills to improve the facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home ownership are supported while legislation inimicable to the interest of the savings and loan industry is opposed.

National Savings and Loan League,[11] 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; member savings and loan associations of the league. (1) Financial statement attached.[3] Approximately $1,125 of officers' salary and $147 of National Letter expense may be applicable. (See previous reports.) (2) Batt, Bates & Co. and Darby Printing Co. (3) Printing National Letter. (4) National Savings & Loan Journal and National Letter. (5) Support S. 801, S. 802, S. 203, S. 804, S. 913, S. 1149 and President's reorganization plan No. 3. Oppose some provisions of S. 866 and H. R. 3756.

National Savings & Loan League,[12] 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Financial statement attached.[3] The following portions of the indicated items may be applicable: Of officers' salaries, $1,215; of National Letter, $150. (2) Oscar R. Kreutz, executive manager of the league (salary); Batt, Bates & Co., and Darby Printing Co. (for National Letter). (3) Salary, printing, and distribution of National Letter. (4) National Letter and National Savings & Loan Journal. (5) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing; and oppose legislation inimical to interests of savings and loan industry.

Nau, Carlton L., American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW. (1) See attached sheet.[2] (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) See attached sheet.[2] (4) None. (5) See attached sheet.

Neal, William S., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y., and 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,757.50. (2) Received from salary; expenses paid for taxi, railroad transportation, hotel rooms, lunches, dinners, telephone, similar miscellaneous items; expenditures for quarter, $382.50; salary, $3,375. (3) As above for incidental and social purposes. (4) National Association of Manufacturers' News (regular contributor). (5) NAM program: For tax reduction, for reduction of Government expenditures, against economic-controls legislation, against continuation of Office of Technical Services, for European recovery program, National Science Foundation. Note: It is my opinion that a small part of my time and expenses can be charged to duties requiring registration.

Neel, Samuel E., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See attached sheet.[1] (2) See attached sheet.[2] (3) See attached sheet.[2] (4) Washington News Letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; Letter to Members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; the Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage banking industry.

Nelson, G. W., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposing antilabor legislation and favoring legislation of benefit to labor.

Nelson, Herbert U., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Reimbursement by employer for travel expenses and per diem, $2,278.91; salary, 20 percent of time devoted to legislative activities, $1,250; per diem, 71 days, trip to Europe to study housing, $1,420; total, $4,943.91. (2) See attached itemized statement.[2] (3) See attached itemized statement.[2] (4) Attached list[2] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Newton B. Wayne, National Association of Cooperatives, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) April 6, $22.05 expense account; April 15, $115.23 expense account, $350 salary; April 22, $22.20 expense account; April 30, $353.34 salary; May 4, $305.89 expense account; May 14, $367.87 salary; May 19, $79.94 expense account, $137.03 expense account; May 28, $64.64 expense account, $367.66 salary; June 15, $367.86 salary, $101.29 expense account; June 30, $367.87 salary. (2) R. Wayne Newton. (3) See (1). (4) Wall Street Journal, The Place for Cooperatives. (5) Employed to counteract the anti-farmer-co-op lobbying activities of the National Tax Equality Association; Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, whether lobbying individually, as officers and employees of the National Tax Equality Association or as a firm of organization and industry counselors claiming the National Tax Equality Association as a client; all State and local tax equality associations and all National, State, and local small business or other associations however known which are subsidized from, or contributors to, the lobbying funds of the National Tax Equality Association.

Nixon, Russ, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received for lobbying purposes; none expended for lobbying purposes.[3] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Noble, William R., National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Assocation, 1026 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $69.80. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, luncheons, and hotel. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing, Hardware Retailer. (5) Have taken position on wage-and-hour legislation, taxation matters, and several minor bills.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Council of Business Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) June 1948 edition, Business

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for first quarter 1948.
[3] Filed for second quarter 1948.
[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[11] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[12] Filed for first and second quarters, 1948.
[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

School Executive. (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Federation of Private School Associations, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $2,165.83; no expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Noffsinger, J. S., National Council of Technical Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Home Study Council, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Norgord, Christian P., 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW.; the American Humane Association, 135 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y. (1) During the first quarter of 1948, total receipts $678.35. (2) Per diem for self, $545.80; to railroad companies and Washington firms for travel and supplies and service, $133.55. (3) As indicated above. (4) None. (5) S. 1447 and H. R. 5952.

Northam,[1] Harry E., Suite 704, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $2,500; traveling, hotel, and subsistence expenses, $300. Only approximately 10 percent is devoted to legislative activities in behalf of my association. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, hotels, etc. (3) Travel, subsistence, and lodging. (4) Monthly news letter of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, issued to the membership of the association. (5) About 10 percent of my time is devoted to supporting or opposing legislation which deals with medical care.

Nortman,[1] Walter, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) The undersigned received as salary, on a pro-rata basis for the time spent on Federal legislation at the rate of $30 per day, the total sum for the 3-month period, April 1 to June 30, 1948, the sum of $900, for 15 days devoted to Federal matters; the undersigned expended a total sum of $245.30 during such period. (2) Expenses were incurred for various miscellaneous matters such as meals, lodging, and traveling expenses, all of which was in amounts of less than $10 for any single item, except hotel bills for lodging of May 6, Mayflower Hotel, $21.20; May 12, $14.30; and June 17, Wardman Park Hotel, of $5.30. (3) Expenditures were made for meals, lodging, taxi fares, and similar miscellaneous items. (4) The Milwaukee Journal, June 23, 1948. (5) S. 110, known as the Reed-Bulwinkle bill.

Noyes,[1] Charles E., American Institute of Accountants, American Institute Publishing Co., 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Total salaries, $2,500. (2) No money paid for legislative work. (3) None. (4) Journal of Accountancy, Certified Public Accountant. (5) Legislation relating to rights of certified public accountants to practice before Federal agencies (H. R. 2657, H. R. 3214, H. R. 5732).

Nyce, Peter Q., 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received and none expended. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to lands of the United States.

O'Brien, John, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Riegel Textile Corp., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received; long-distance telephone call, $1.38. (2) New York Telephone Co. (3) Same as (1). (4) None. (5) Proposals for relief of work-glove manufacturers on account of payments made in settlement of controversy with Office of Price Administration.

O'Connor,[1] Edward H., Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received during quarter, $2,499.96; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $547.62. (2) Paid out $547.62 in traveling expenses to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous items of personal expense. (3) For personal traveling expenses of the undersigned incurred in carrying out my work for the Insurance Economics Society of America. No moneys expended during this quarter for lobbying activities. (4) None. (5) The Howell bill, H. R. 3150, and its companion Senate bill, S. 670, by Senator HAWKES; S. 1320 and its companion, H. R. 3543; H. R. 6355; Senate Resolution 249.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 396 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,500 compensation; $205.27 expenditures (allocation of the registerable part of the compensation can only be a best estimate; it follows the allocation adopted in 1947 under identical terms of employment). (2) [Blank.] (3) $42 taxicab fares, telephone tolls, and telegrams; $163.27 for the Public Printer (copies of S. 2582). (4) None. (5) H. R. 2860, amendment to section 1 (b) in Eightieth Congress, second session; House Joint Resolution 131 in Eightieth Congress, second session; H. R. 6556, H. R. 6379, S. 2682, Eightieth Congress, second session.

O'Gara, Herrick J., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes; $12 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Ogg, William Raymond, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $22.35 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (This covers the period April 1 to May 15, 1948.) (2) Taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation, luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, farm credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of postwar construction of highways, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department, transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment of Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by Secretary of Agriculture, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, Labor Extension Service, alcohol plants, social security, weed killer, crop insurance, wheat carry-over, international wheat agreement, Parker River project, fiber identification, displaced persons, reciprocal trade agreements, rural electrification, radio, health, housing, standard time, Fair Labor Standards Act, railroad rates, Government corporations.

O'Hara, Bart W., secretary-treasurer, Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 450 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation that may be designed to bring about tax equality concerning corporations.

Oliver, Fred N., 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; senior partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York City, and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Estimated $525 from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks and an indeterminate part of $3,250 from Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc. (See appendix.[2]) (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation but is to appear before congressional committees on legislation in which the mutual-savings banks and railroad-security owners have a legitimate interest.

Oliver, John P., 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) April 1948, $583.33 plus $34.75; May 1948, $583.33 plus $34.75; June 1948, $583.33. (2) The grocer, the baker, the landlord, the taxi driver, etc. (3) Living expenses for self and family, transportation, taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received: Fees amounting to $2,500 from National Council on Business Mail, Inc. Expended: Approximately $125 in taxicab fares. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to postal rates and regulations.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Electric Power Board, Sixth and Market, Chattanooga, Tenn. (1) Received fees amounting to $1,875 from Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association. Expended approximately $100 in taxicab fares. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to public and private power.

Owens, T. R., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, URWA Building, High and Mill Streets, Akron, Ohio. (1) Salary, $960; expenses, $888. (2) Hotels, railroads, and other traveling expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) United Rubber Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Oxholm, Mrs. Theodor, volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) To Elton T. Cowan Co. for 1,000 envelopes, $22; to Ardlee Services for 3,000 pamphlets, $130; to Mrs. Oxholm for stamps, $12; travel, $8; membership contributions, $131. (2) As indicated. (3) As indicated. (4) [Blank.]

[1] Filed with the Secretary only.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.
[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

(5) Federal legislation specifically affecting children and child welfare.

Parel, James Donald, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $54.32 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation, luncheon-conferences. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting, resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, farm credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of construction of postwar highways, transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment of Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by Secretary of Agriculture, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, Labor Extension Service, alcohol plants, social security, weed killer, crop insurance, wheat carry-over, international wheat agreement, Parker River project, fiber identification, displaced persons, reciprocal trade agreements, rural electrification, radio, health, housing, standard time, Fair Labor Standards Act, railroad rates, Government corporations.

Parker, James P., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A total of $1,500 has been received as fees. Expenditures were as follows: April 14, $9.50, long-distance calls; May 14, $100, Chicago directors meeting; July 1, $10, cabs, tips, etc. The amount for the above expenses has been refunded. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Veterans' education and training program outlined in Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

Parks, Gilbert L., P. O. A. U., 1628 Sixteenth Street NW., or 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary only ($100 per week gross). Salary net for second quarter, $1,061. (2) Gilbert L. Parks. (3) Performs duties of office manager, general public relations. (4) Placed paid advertising in various other publications. (5) Concerned only with educational program designed to activate concern for religious freedom in terms of the first amendment to the Constitution.

Pastor,[1] Richard, volunteer worker for the Veterans' Committee Against the Mundt-Nixon Bill, 213 East Twenty-fifth Street, New York City. (1) Received $137.05 for expenses. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) The Mundt-Nixon bill.

Patterson, Belknap & Webb, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; the American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received; expended $103.04. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, United Air Lines, taxis, stenographers, telephone company. (3) Transportation expenses and stenographic and telephone charges. (4) None. (5) As counsel for the purpose of obtaining an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act whereby alien property in this country formerly owned by persons under persecution by an enemy government, in cases where the owner is dead and left no heirs, may be turned over to the organizations for the relief of survivors. H. R. 6817 was introduced this session.

Patton, James G., Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $144.85 reimbursement for expenses. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, phones, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Peebles, Ivey Edwin, Maryland Public Expenditure Council, Inc., 636 Equitable Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activity at Federal level in this quarter, and none contemplated in future. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Peterson, Dutton S., Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, April, May, June, $833.34; travel expense, $634.59. (2) Carfare, $248.05; room, $45.50; meals, $89.95; telephone and telegraph, $115.10; miscellaneous, $155.99; April-June total, $634.59. (3) Travel is for the purpose of discussing developments on universal military training legislation and to organize opposition against it. (4) The organization sends a news letter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription, and the militarization of America.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary of $1,222. Received $596.22 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $350.30 of this amount was for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Hotels, railroad, restaurants, cab drivers, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) CIO News and the Advance. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Peterson, Oliver A., Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, January 26–February 28, 1948, $307.75; travel and transportation expenses, January 26–February 28, 1948, $623.83. (Services terminated February 28, 1948.) (2) Salary received used for personal expenses, no part of it spent on behalf of the committee for the Marshall plan to aid European recovery. Travel and transportation expenses covered my actual expenses traveling on behalf of the coramittee. (3) Same as (2) above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channels. (5) Legislation to provide for a European recovery program.

Peterson, William J., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 704 Insurance Building, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my regular salary as executive secretary for the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, for which I performed my regular duties as chief administrative officer of the chamber, which said duties were related only incidentally to Federal legislation. Aside from my regular salary nothing was received nor spent for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Petty, Don, National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 received for services as attorney for the National Association of Broadcasters for quarter ending July 1, 1948. $947.68 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, communications companies, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth in (1), above, were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as general counsel handling all of the legal affairs of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involved Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None. (5) None. I am interested in any legislation, Federal or State, which may affect the radio broadcasting industry. During the past quarter I testified before the House Appropriations Committee relating to the Copyright Office.

Pierson, A. T., the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $1,815; expenses, $114.65. (2) Hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, taxis, telephone, etc. (3) Expenses for traveling and as shown in item 2. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Pirnie, Warren Bruce, president, Pirnie, Lee & Co. Federation, Inc., U. S. A., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Hunan Provinces as Negotiating Agents for Reconstruction of China. (1) No money received from my constituents in China during this quarter or since I began to act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) A China recovery program part of record before Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives presented by N. F. Allmon (80th Cong.). (5) [Blank.]

Place, Henry C., care of Townsend, Elliot & Munson, 1100 Provident Trust Building, Seventeenth & Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; National Association of Electric Companies. (1) The firm received from the National Association of Electric Companies $6,225 for legal services for the quarter ending June 30, 1948, and reimbursement of $1,027.74 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all legal services to the association, only a part of which fee and expenses was for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $449.96; subsistence expenses away from Philadelphia, $453.74; telephone and telegraph, $116.79; miscellaneous, $5.25. (4) [Blank.] (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which our firm is counsel, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association, therefore, is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members directly or indirectly as going business concerns.

Pogue, L. Welch, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $4,500 fee received during quarter, plus disbursements as follows: Taxicabs, $13.65; telephone, $4.02; and notary fees, $2. (2) [Blank.] (3) See memorandum attached to Form B in your office. (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B in your office.

Pollitzer,[1] Anita, national chairman, National Woman's Party, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Woman's Party, May 24, 1948, $100 (reimbursement for traveling expenses). (2) [Blank] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. See attached statement.[2]

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.
[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

(1) Receipts, $3,033.01; disbursements, $626.77. (2) See attached statement.[1] (3) See attached statement.[1] (4) None. (5) S. 2179, H. R. 5563, S. 2202, H. R. 6556.

Posner, Stanley L., attorney, Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Linen Supply Association of America: Fees, $1,500; disbursements, $180.88. Institute of Industrial Launderers: Fees, $1,500; disbursements, $163.68. National Council of Technical Schools: Fees, none; disbursements, $25.28. National Council of Business Schools: Fees, none; disbursements, $16.85. (2), No disbursements for purposes of section 307. (3) None. (4) Mimeographed bulletins of Linen Supply Association and Institute of Industrial Launderers; also Linen Supply News. (5) Labor legislation on behalf of Linen Supply Association and Institute of Industrial Launderers; veterans training programs on behalf of National Council of Technical Schools and National Council of Business Schools.

Powell, E. Henry, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,800 received from Oliver & Donnally as partner's drawing account and distribution; $156.54 received and expended for travel, etc.; $2,800 is the entire amount received by registrant from Oliver & Donnally for all his legal services rendered during the quarter. A small proportion of this amount (not more than 5 percent) was for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act. The $156.54 represents reimbursement of legitimate expenses actually incurred by registrant such as travel, hotel, and meals. (2) See answer to question 1. (3) See answer to question 1. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

Pratt, Foster J., International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, A. F. of L., Room 908, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As president he receives a monthly salary ($600) minus withholding and social-security taxes, expended for personal living expenses. (2) Foster J. Pratt. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as administrative and executive head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, A. F. of L. (lobbying is minor and incidental). (4) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, A. F. of L., Weekly Federal News Letters, and Monthly Outlook for the dissemination of organization news including legislation. (5) Beneficial to the employees in the engineering and architectural professions.

Pray,[2] Kenneth L., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $5,000; expenses, allowance $1,260. (2) University Club, National Press Club, Statler Hotel, taxicabs, Pennsylvania Railroad, etc. (3) Dues, meals, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) My services insofar as legislative matters are concerned consist primarily of factually reporting the status and content of proposals affecting Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies.

Pray,[3] Kenneth L., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and Affiliated Companies, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $5,000; expense, allowance, $1,260. (2) University Club, National Press Club, Statler Hotel, taxicabs, Pennsylvania Railroad, etc. (3) Dues, meals, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) My services insofar as legislative matters are concerned consist primarily of factually reporting the status and content of proposals affecting Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and Affiliated Companies.

Proctor, Harry E., attorney at law, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2,000 paid the registrant as salary by Oliver & Donnally. No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (5) The registrant contributed articles for the April, May, and June issues of Mutual Savings Banking, a trade publication of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) The registrant studied and analyzed a number of bills pertaining to banks, savings and loans associations, taxes, railroads, veterans, and housing.

Pritchard, E. Anthony, National Lead Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) money received by this registrant was for salary and expenses in connection with his duties as assistant to the manager of the Washington Office of the National Lead Co. Impossible to segregate amount for legislative activities. Only $25 was expended during second quarter 1948 on legislative work. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., various garages, taxicabs, and lunch. (3) The money was expended for the purpose of keeping the various company offices advised on legislation, for taxicabs and automobile expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Press, William H., Washington Board of Trade, 204 Star Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,000; expenses, $178.86. (2) Miscellaneous taxi and transportation, lunches, etc. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) Releases sent to Washington newspapers—Evening Star, Washington Post, Times-Herald, and Washington Daily News. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia.

Prentice, Howard A., 1329 E. Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.03 as miscellaneous expenses (see below). (2) Notary public, $2; postage, 3 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report; postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Purves, Edmund R., director of public and professional relations, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Institute of Architects, Same. (1) None, except salary for this period, which amounted to $2,500. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.

Putt, C. J., the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) Reimbursed by the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. for actual expenses incurred as follows: Carlton Hotel, room and phone, $35.80; Mayflower Hotel, room and phone, $138.23; Pullman Co., $78.39; dining cars, hotels, restaurants, for meals, $279.80; various taxicabs, $57.30; various redcaps and checking stands, $9.50; shows, ball games, and other entertainment, $56.50; cigars, $11; notary fee, $1. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Various bills affecting railroads.

Quigley,[2] Frank, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $616.42. (2) Taxicabs; travel, Washington to New York headquarters (Pennsylvania Railroad, $21.42; Hotel Madison, New York, $38); cafes; clubs; and incidental expenses. (3) Out-of-pocket business expenses, personal conference expenses, publications, stenographic services, etc. (4) None. (5) None.

Quigley,[3] Frank, 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $677.22. (2) Hotels, taxicabs, clubs, and restaurants. (3) Conferring with headquarters in New York, Associated Bell Telephone Companies of the United States and any governmental bodies in connection with matters of information or public relations. (4) None. (5) None.

Quinlan,[2] William A., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (See exhibit B attached.[4]) (1) The undersigned has received no payments either particularly or principally for the purposes designated in the act. As to expenditures, see exhibit A, attached.[5] (2) See exhibit A.[5] (3) See exhibit A.[5] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation to bar portal-to-portal liabilities for the period subsequent to enactment of the Portal-to-Portal Act, May 14, 1947, in addition to other legislation, if any, which may be of interest to clients employing the undersigned on general retainers.

Radner & Zito (the firm members and associates are William Radner, Frank J. Zito, J. Franklin Fort, Odell Kominers, and Mary L. Schleifer), room 528, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting maritime industry, particularly in relation to wage-and-hour law.

Raebeck, Helen, National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $850. On leave as of March 1. Pro rata salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Spotlight, a house organ of the National Council of Jewish Women, a small part of which is devoted to asking membership support of certain legislative measures. (5) None. My job is to keep the membership informed on legislative developments and indicate action they can take in support of certain bills.

Raesly, Leon, 1218 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) H. R. 669.

Ragland, Edward F., Associated Tobacco Manufacturers, 109–110 Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None, but am interested in any legislation affecting tobacco industry.

Ramsey, Donald J., Silver Users Association, 1730 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Railroad and airplane tickets, $562.77; hotels, $208.35; meals, $223.06; taxis and tips, $124.35; telephone, $253.47; office expenses, including supplies and expenses of employees, $863.87; meetings, $31.69; total, $2,267.56. Salary (before tax withholdings), $3,000; reimbursement for expenses, $1,846.87; total, $4,846.87. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Silver News Letter. (5) Legislation affecting the silver-using industry.

Ramspeck, Robert, Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported. Expended $28.15. (2) Taxi fares to and from Capitol Hill. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation for the proper advancement of the airline industry in the public interest. For specific legislation supported and opposed during this quarter, see exhibit A[5] attached.

Rankin, J. Lee., Beghtol and Rankin, Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[3] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[5] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Rapp, Leslie M., Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant's activities in behalf of Jack & Heints Precision Industries, Inc. (which consisted only of testifying before a congressional committee and hence were not actually subject to the act), ceased as of the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress. Registrant has been reimbursed by the law firm of Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett (by which he is employed) for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in behalf of said client in the amount of $69.83. Said law firm will in turn be reimbursed by said client for such expenses and in addition will be reimbursed in the further amount of $28.72 for client's portion of railroad fare for registrant paid directly by it. Said law firm has not yet received any fee from said client on account of registrant's services. Such fee, when received, will be in connection with said law firm's bill for all legal services for the year 1948 and will be based on the actual time spent by registrant charged for at the customary rate for professional services. On such basis the portion of said fee attributable to the services performed under this registration will not exceed $1,000. (2) Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Pennsylvania Railroad, and various taxi drivers. (3) Hotels, meals, transportation, telephone, and telegrams. (4) None. (5) Proposed legislation treating a successor corporation in a tax-free reorganization as the same taxpayer as the predecessor for purposes of the carry-over and carry-back provisions.

Rapp, Leslie M., Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant's activities in behalf of Paramount Pictures, Inc., ceased as of the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress. Registrant has been reimbursed by the law firm of Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett (by which he is employed) for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in behalf of said client in the amount of $56.40. Said law firm will in turn be reimbursed by said client for such expenses and, in addition, will be reimbursed in the further amount of $9.58 for client's portion of railroad fare for registrant paid directly by it. Said law firm has not yet received any fee from said client on account of registrant's services. Such fee, when received, will be in connection with said law firm's bill for all legal services for the year 1948 and will be based on the actual time spent by registrant charged for at the customary rate for professional services. On such basis the portion of said fee attributable to the services performed under this registration will not exceed $1,000. (2) Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Pennsylvania Railroad, and various taxi drivers. (3) Hotel, meals, transportation, telephone, and telegrams. (4) None. (5) Proposed legislation treating the disposition of property pursuant to a civil decree under the antitrust laws as an involuntary conversion.

Ratcliffe, William O., Baltimore Lumber Co., 1600 New York Avenue NE., Washington, D. C. (1) No accounts. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Ray, L. S., 2015 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $750. (2) Me. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting members of this organization.

Reck, Jacob, 1023 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Printing, mimeograph, and binding costs for petitions, bulletins, and reprints, $145.82; postage, $38.77; advertising, $25; telephone, $28.79; miscellaneous lunches, dinners, and entertainment, $22.40; total amount expended, $260.78. (2) Advertising, Congressional Secretaries Club, $25; printing, mimeograph, binding costs, etc., paid by National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association from dues collected. No receipts specifically for legislative purposes. (3) Petitions printed were distributed to persons engaged in beauty and barber industry for signatures. Petitions urged members of the Senate to support H. R. 3825, providing for the repeal of the excise tax on cosmetics used in beauty and barber shops. Bulletins urged industry members to contact Senators regarding H. R. 3825, urging their support. (4) National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association Legislative Bulletin, which is issued by registrant in his capacity as Washington representative; Brokmeyer Bulletin. (5) H. R. 3825. Registrant is paid an annual retainer as counsel for the National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association. No determinable amount of compensation is paid or received on account of legislative activities. Normally, the total time used by registrant in activities covered by this law is infinitesimal. However, activity on legislation has consumed 50 percent of registrant's time in this quarter.

Reckord, Milton A., National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received, and none expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Nothing published. (5) Our effort was to add funds to the Army appropriation bill for aid to civilian rifle clubs and to conduct the national rifle and pistol matches.

Reinhold, James P., Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary for calendar quarter as reported in January 10, 1949, Quarterly Report Form C; also reimbursed in the amount of $523.99 expended during calendar quarter, of which $174.66 was expended for purposes other than covered in the act. (2) Paid for meals in hotels and various restaurants, expended for taxicabs and automobile, telephone calls, postage, and telegrams. (3) In furtherance of duties described in Registration Form B, of which personal legislative activity is not my principal purpose but is occasional and incidental. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Rhodes, Hubert M., room 209, 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Credit Union National Association, Inc., post-office box 431, Madison, Wis. (1) Registrant is a regular employee of the Credit Union National Association, Inc., and receives no additional compensation for service on legislative work. The amount received and expended by him was $9.06. (2) Various. (3) Trips to House and Senate Office Buildings and Capitol, telephone calls, and notarizing reports required to be filed under the Lobbying Act for the quarter ended March 31, 1948. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

Rice, Richard M., Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) No money was received for salary. No money was received or expended for purposes falling within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to effect tax equality between similar businesses.

Rice, Robert A., Railway Mail Association, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant is president, Railway Mail Association, elected by membership for a term of 2 years at annual salary of $8,500. No money received and expended for activities which fall within the terms of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) See No. 1. (3) See No. 1. (4) Registrant writes report to membership of Railway Mail Association in monthly issues of official journal, The Railway Post Office. (5) Activities consist of serving as president, Railway Mail Association, and supporting such legislation as is beneficial to members of this organization. Membership consists of employees of the Railway Mail Service.

Richards, D. D.,[1] 1238 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Mail Order Association of America, 1061 West Thirty-fifth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specifically.

Richman, Paul, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Approximately $125. (2) Paul Richman. (3) Office telephone. (4) Washington Newsletter. (5) Fair employment practices, immigration.

Rising, E. W., Western Beet Growers Association, et al., 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) (a) Western Beet Growers Association, Great Falls, Mont., $166.97; (b) National Water Conservation Conference, $543.15. (2) Received by E. W. Rising and expended for office expenses, postage, stationery in connection with information service furnished members of Western Beet Growers Association and for time of E. W. Rising; no legislation pending in this quarter. (3) Received by E. W. Rising and expended as follows: Stenographic service, $299.94; stationery, $25.40; telephone and telegraph, $30.16; express, $3.20; stamps, $24.06; miscellaneous, $12.75; trip from Washington to Omaha and return, $147.64. (4) None during second quarter 1948. (5) (a) Legislation of interest to beet growers. None in second quarter 1948; (b) legislation in connection with development and conservation land and water resources and in preservation of States rights, tidelands legislation, regional and valley authority legislation.

Rivers, T. E., National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter ending June 30, 1948, I have received and expended $17.24. (2) Railroad company, taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) [Blank.] (5) S. 1229 and H. R. 5723.

Roark, L. E., National Founders Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000; expenses, nominal travel, hotel, and meals. (2) Common carriers for travel, hotels for room and meals. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Labor legislation, tax legislation, and legislation affecting the foundry industry.

Robb, George Mackay, 121 Warner Avenue, Syracuse, N. Y.; Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Cash on hand April 2, 1948, $135.35. This had been received from Mr. J. S. Tibby, treasurer of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, a few days previous. (2) Of above amount, $75.05 was paid out in incidental expenses. (3) For traveling to Washington, D. C., and mimeographing and mailing letters in the interest of our proposed legislation. (4) The Christian Patriot, edited by Dr. J. C. Mathews, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) Senate Joint Resolution 150 and House Joint Resolution 238.

Robbins, Paul H., National Society of Professional Engineers, 1359 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $500, and expenses, $50, for April, May, and June, 1948, for attention to legislative matters. (2) Regular office and travel expenses. (3) As executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers. (4) American Engineer; Legislative Bulletin, National Society of Professional Engineers. (5) All legislation affecting the welfare of professional engineers.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

Rogers, Watson, National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Rowe, Roland H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money was received or expended by the undersigned for purpose of influencing legislation except. (a) $12 (4 hours, estimated time, at $3 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,480 received by the undersigned as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., allocable to assistance in preparation of statements which were used in the association's appearance before congressional hearings on amendments to the Wage and Hour Act and on repeal of oleomargarine taxes; (b) $24 (8 hours, estimated time, at $3 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,480 received by the undersigned as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., allocable to preparation of association's mimeographed published material in which Federal legislation was advocated, opposed, or mentioned. (1) See attachment. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). Washington News Letter of United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers; he was later specifically authorized by the executive committee of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., to support or oppose general labor legislation and fair employment practice legislation.

Rudy, John Forney, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 received as salary from National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., during the second quarter of 1948, allocable to legislative activities. (2) $4 for postcards, for which reimbursed. (3) See item 2. (4) None. (5) As director of public relations of the federation, am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation; during the Eightieth Congress issued several news releases and assisted in preparation of statements to our membership which outlined the provisions of different bills and resolutions before Congress.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building (room 427), Washington, D. C.; Spencer Gordon, counsel for American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Opposing H. R. 2657; my employment ended with the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress. No further moneys will be received or expended by me and consequently no further reports will be filed.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building (room 427), Washington, D. C.; Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 fee received during quarter, plus disbursements as follows: Taxicabs, $29.65; telephones, $97.68; printing, $17.11; travel, $40; entertainment, $57.08; miscellaneous, $6.14, for a total received during quarter of $3,947.66. (2) [Blank.] (3) See memorandum attached to Form B in your office. (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B in your office.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building (room 427), Washington, D. C.; Consolidated Steel Corp., Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $3,080 fee and $77.95 for out-of-pocket disbursements such as long-distance phone calls, telegrams, and taxicabs, received during quarter; this, together with original $1,000 retainer, is total sum to be received. (2) [Blank.] (3) For assisting in passage of H. R. 4377, a private bill for the relief of Consolidated Steel Corp., which was signed by the President on June 3, 1948, and became Private Law No. 328. (4) None. (5) To support passage of H. R. 4377; my employment for this purpose is now concluded, and thus no further reports will be filed by me in this connection; no further funds to be received or expended.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building (room 427), Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) None received; approximately $5.60 expended for taxi fares during quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with a proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code relating to the foreign tax credit.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building (room 427), Washington, D. C.; Harbor Boat Building Co. and Wilmington Welding & Boiler Works, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) None received, although work completed and bill for services rendered, submitted in amount of $1,920 fee and $36.68 disbursements, will report further when received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 4379, a private bill for the relief of the companies listed above, which bill was signed by the President on June 3, 1948, and became Private Law No. 329.

Rumely, Edward A., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I received my salary, commissions, and expenses, as reported on earlier Form B; the corporation has reported its disbursements separately on Form A. (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed but issue news releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation; sometimes the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then I distribute educational material on the question.

Rush, Charles J., Washington Real Estate Board, 1417 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $66.66 per month as executive secretary. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate.

Russell, Francis M., National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $480 (expended for matters relating to legislation); (2) See (3) below. (3) Telephone and telegraph, taxi fares, entertainment. (4) None. (5) As an incidental part of registrant's duties as vice president in charge of Washington office of National Broadcasting Co., Inc., including operation of the company's radio stations in Washington, registrant may engage in activities relating to legislation affecting radio communications companies.

Russell, Horace, 7 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.; United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received retainer payable monthly at the rate of $11,000 per annum for one-half time, a small proportion of which is for legislative activity. Also received and expended $100.60. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) Contents of the Legal Bulletin of the United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill.; Private Housing vs. Public Housing, Directors Digest, April 1948, United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill.; Federal Aid to Housing: Pro and Con, Directors Digest, May 1948, United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill., condensed from American Bar Journal, February 1948. (5) Legislation affecting the savings and loan business.

Russell, Richard M., Estate of Charles W. Taintor (administrators, Merchants National Bank and Alexander Whiteside), care of Alexander Whiteside, 30 State Street, Boston, Mass. (1) Money received from administrators of estate of Charles W. Taintor, $103.21 for actual disbursements and $1,000 in full payment for services. Money expended, $103.21 for actual disbursements. (2) Various. (3) Transportation, phones, etc. (4) None. (5) S. 483, a bill to reallocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes, and its companion, H. R. 1597, to the same effect.

Russo, Paul M., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee, Detroit, Mich. (1) Report covers period beginning week ending April 3, 1948, to and including week ending May 22, 1948. Salary (6 weeks at $90), $720; subsistence, $406; expenses, $361.73; total, $1,487.73. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) None. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Ryan, M. O., 1405 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for quarter, $3,300. April 1 to June 30, 1948, inclusive, total personal expenses for taxis, lunches, dinners, phones, etc., in Washington, D. C., were $600.40, of which insignificant amount was for activities related in any way to lobbying. (2) Taxis, Washington restaurants and hotels. (3) Transportation, lunches, and dinners. (4) Organizational bulletins for American Hotel Association. (5) Any legislation affecting hotel industry.

St. Clair,[1] Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Automobile Dealers Association, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,250. (2) No expenditures. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of interest to dealers.

St. Clair,[2] Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street N. W., Washington, D. C.; Stran steel division, Great Lakes Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich. (1) Received $1,500. (2) No expenditures. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of interest to client.

St. Clair,[2] Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C.; National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 Seventeenth Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,250. (2) Nothing paid. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of interest to retail dealers.

St. Clair,[2] Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Stran Steel Division, Great Lakes Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich. (1) Received $1,500, no expenditures. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of interest to the client.

Sands, Charles E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, A. F. of L., 528 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Pay at the rate of $7,200 per year; expenses $5 a day. (2) None. (3) None. (4) One article in our official publication, The Catering Industry Employees. (5) Support all labor and social legislation; oppose all antilabor and antisocial legislation.

Saville, Russell, American Pension Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary paid by American Pension Committee, Inc., $900. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Comet, the American Pension Committee weekly report. (5) Legislation on old-age pensions and social security generally. H. R. 781 and other bills.

Saylor, Richard D., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and expenses in connection with his duties as manager of the Washington office of the National Lead Co.; impossible to segregate amount for legislative activities; only $65 was expended during second quarter 1948

[1] Filed for first quarter of 1948.
[2] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

on legislative work. (2). Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., various garages and taxicabs. (3) The money was expended for the purpose of keeping the various company offices advised on legislation, for taxicabs, and automobile expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Scanlin, Theresa F., 12 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; MacArthur for President Campaign Committee, 1333 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (and self), 12 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $50, MacArthur Campaign Committee for President, 1333 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., from Erim Hohensee, executive secretary. Still due me, $8.98 expended for phone calls, cab fares, and postage; $62.54 salary and overtime. (2) To me by Erim Hohensee, executive secretary, MacArthur for President Campaign Committee, 1333 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Promotional work, advocating the nomination of General MacArthur for President. (4) None. (5) Polling Senators and Members advocating the nomination for President of General MacArthur, civil-service legislation for legislative clerks, housing, and welfare.

Schell, S. D., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received approximately $300 of regular salary for services performed on matters relating to legislation. The chief legislation with which my duties were concerned were House Joint Resolution 412 and House Joint Resolution 413, relating to merchant marine legislation, and H. R. 6534 and S. 2728, legislation to clarify provisions of the Wage and Hour Act; in addition to this proportion of my salary, I received as reimbursement for expenses for meals, taxicabs, hotel accommodation, trains, and hotel quarters a total of $37.85; expenses paid out totaled $37.85. (2) Hotels for meals and lodging, restaurants for meals, taxicab drivers for taxi fares, and to porters for tips. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) House Joint Resolution 412, House Joint Resolution 413, H. R. 6534, and S. 2728. Activities consisted of several conferences with Members of Congress who were interested in explanations of these bills and concerned with their passage. Activities also included giving information to members of industry who were likewise interested in the passage of the merchant marine legislation and the wage and hour legislation, and wished to discuss the principles involved in the legislation.

Schoen,[1] Paul W., Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, post-office box 692, Valdosta, Ga. (1) Salary $480 (1 month which was maximum expended on direct legislative work; field expense, $202.23 (travel expense and incidentals in Washington); office expense, $203.87 (clerical help, postage, telegraph, etc.), total $896.20. (2) No payments made to anyone; above items expenditures from regular operating budget used for legislative activity of regular association work. (3) All expenditures other than indicated above for work in behalf of private forestry activities of USFS as in agricultural appropriation and on Clark-McNary fire and planting bills. (4) The Forest Farmer (association publication and press releases of which no record of publication is available. (5) Forestry legislation applicable to or affecting private-timber landowners.

Schoene, Freehill & Kramer, a law-partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, and Milton Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All written materials are delivered to the client and dissemination is entirely in the client's control. (5) Railroad retirement, unemployment insurance, and employers' liability matters.

Schoenhals, E. L., Tax Equality League of Utah, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Received from Tax Equality League of Utah, $745; this was paid for acting as attorney and in addition for the use of my law offices, for stenographic services, telephone and long-distance phone calls, mailing, addressing, and postage advanced by me, and traveling expense. (2) To my secretary, Jean Powers, telephone company, Kearns Building for office rental, United States postal service. (3) To maintain my office, receive phone calls from members and carry on correspondence with members of the organization. (4) Deseret News, Salt Lake Tribune, and Salt Lake Telegram have carried news items only, but not paid advertising. (5) To obtain tax equality.

Scott, Jack Garrett, National Association of Motor Operators, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No receipts except annual retainer for general legal services as shown in registration statement. No expenditures for legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Generally all legislation affecting the intercity motor bus industry. Thus far this session I have made presentations before congressional committees on S. 110, H. R. 221; excise-tax legislation, H. R. 584 and S. 1126; House investigation of Fair Labor Standards Act, S. 1812; national transportation inquiry; standard and daylight saving time; and S. 2082 and S. 2386.

Scott, John W., Victor J. Evans & Co., et al., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None other than salary received at the total monthly rate of $700 from Victor J. Evans & Co., Harvey B. Jacobson, John N. Randolph, and Patrick D. Beavers. No expenditures made. (2) Does not apply. (3) Does not apply. (4) None. (5) As previously stated in my registration statement. (NOTE.—The firm of McMorrow, Berman & Davidson is attempting to cancel contract of employment with me and is not currently paying me any sum of money.)

Scott, Vernon, and Schuler, Loring A., constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott & Loring A. Schuler, organizers and counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. See attached statement.[2] (1) For money received, see attached statement; [2] no money was received or expended for purposes within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) No one. (See answer to par. (1).) (3) (See answer to par. (2).) (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to have various types of business corporations taxed on the same basis.

Scott, William C., report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No receipts or expenditures during said period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Sears, W. J., the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, and 715 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) During this period I neither have engaged in any legislative activity, nor have I made any expenditure for this purpose.

Seay, Temple W., 902 Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C.; Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo. (1) None with respect to this or any other matters before the legislature. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2192 for the relief of Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo.

See, Harry, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street, SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $20.45. (2) Restaurants. (3) Lunches. (4) None. (5) Opposing antilabor legislation and favoring legislation of benefit to labor.

Selby, Meredith, (Mrs.), Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated June 15, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.]. (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Shackelford, P. L., international representative, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250. Total expense for quarter, $2,649.71. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am employed to handle my many and varied duties as international representative of the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association. My work in connection with legislation is incidental to these other duties and consumes a very small part of my time. It is confined to giving attention to legislation affecting railway employees in which we are interested.

Shaw, Mark R., 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass. (New England office), 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (national office), National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $400; traveling expenses, $114.65; total, $514.65. (2) Railroads, bus lines, gas stations, restaurants, etc. (3) Travel to speaking dates, conferences, meetings, etc. (4) Bulletins of the NCPW. (5) Universal military training (oppose); renewal of selective service (oppose); economic relief of war-devastated countries (favor); admission of displaced persons (favor). Other measures related to peace and world order.

Shields, Robert H., 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Beet Sugar Association. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Shufelt, Bernard E., Ward 44, Veterans' Administration Hospital, Richmond, Va.; Paralyzed Veterans' Associations of America, 99 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received, Paralyzed Veterans Associations of America, $200; Eastern Paralyzed Veterans' Association, $200; expended, $391.05. (2) Various. (3) Accommodations, travel, attendant service. (4) Richmond Times Dispatch, Richmond, Va. (5) Paraplegic housing bill, amputee car bill, charter for Paralyzed Veterans of America.

Shuford, Helen Alcott, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None (compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement). Employment terminated as of June 30, 1948. (2) Employment terminated as of June 30, 1948. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 6396.

Sifton, Paul, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO, 411 West Milwaukee, Detroit, Mich. (1) $1,200 salary; expenses, $1,098.21; total $2,298.21. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto workers. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Slayman, Charles H., Jr., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated June 16, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Smart, Elizabeth A. (Miss), 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C. (Special Committee to Promote the Capper Bill.) (1) Received $665.07 salary. Received and paid out $302.12. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; Washington Times-Herald; E. Morrison Paper Co.; Western Union; Abel & Co., photostat prints; Royal Typewriter Co.; Bethesda Duplicating Co., copies of Rees speech; President's Conference on Citizenship; A. B. Dick Co.; post office. (3) Telephone; subscription; two erasers; telegrams; photostat prints; one coupon book and cleaning fluid for typewriter; 5,000 letterheads, 5,000 6¾ envelopes; luncheon and enrollment fees, banquet; mimeograph stencil sheets, ink, correction fluid; postage. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relation.

Smith, Allen L., Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., post-office box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Anthony W., Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative employment, $75. This is computed as stated in registration statement at $300 a year. No expenditures. (2) None. (3) Compensation as above received for legislative work. (4) CIO-News, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Forestry legislation, river valley development, resource conservation.

Smith, Donald W. (report as attorney for American Nurses' Association), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; American Nurses' Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) No receipts during said period. Expenditures: Transportation, $39.06; hotel rooms and meals, $23.87; carfare, 30 cents; telephone calls, 17 cents; taxicab fares, $1.90. (2) The Pennsylvania Railroad; Hotel Belvedere, Baltimore, Md.; Hotel Wardman Park, Washington, D. C.; and various transportation, telephone, and taxicab companies. (3) Transportation, hotel rooms and meals, carfare, telephone calls, and taxicab fares. (4) The American Journal of Nursing, New York, N. Y. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health, on which the American Nurses' Association has taken a stand, including the extension of social-security coverage and Federal aid to nursing education.

Smith, Dudley, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,250 monthly from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for the principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for the purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Harold O., Jr., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) During the past quarter I did not have occasion to engage in any activities which I believed would be construed as lobbying. Serving full time as executive vice president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., my activities are those of a trade association executive and any contacts with Members of Congress are purely incidental to my many other activities in connection with trade association work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) In our bulletins and weekly news letters to members, we occasionally report on legislative matters affecting the trade. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. In behalf of our members we opposed the rulings of the Department of Internal Revenue which exempted cooperatives from taxation; also the Department's rulings which placed an unreasonable burden on wholesale grocers in reporting sales of oleomargarine.

Smith,[1] Hilda W., National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $200 salary. (2) Paid to self. (3) Living expenses for self. (4) Occasional articles sent out through Labor Press Associates; article in Bryn Mawr Bulletin. (5) Bill for a Labor Extension Service in the Department of Labor.

Smith, Howard J., Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) April, salary, $750 per month; May, salary unpaid; June, salary unpaid. (2) Howard J. Smith, executive secretary, Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Salary. (4) The Case for Water in Central Arizona; Work for Water; California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River. (5) Employed to support Senate bill 1175.

Smith, Lloyd W., room 425, Shoreham Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $1,650 for the period April 1 to June 30, 1948, for services as special representative of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., as well as reimbursement for routine expenses of $404.50 in April, $280.65 in May, and $360.40 in June. (2) Various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, telephone, telegraph, Pullman Co., stationers, etc. (3) In furtherance of duties described in registration Form B, which involve legislation only incidentally and to a limited extent. Affiant states upon information and belief, that none of his activity during the period covered by this report was within the scope of section 307 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Other duties for said company comprise the major part of this work.

Smith, Purcell L., National Association of Electric companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $16,250 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $509.91 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, clubs, railroads, air lines, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $77.06; hotels, clubs, and restaurants, $371.95; gratuities and miscellaneous, $54.40; telephone and telegraph, $6.50. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am president, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Smith, Robert E., Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Smith, Robert E., National Conference of Railroad Investors, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $660.90; no expenditures. (2) None. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Smith, Russell, 300 B Street SE, Washington, D. C.; Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Snyder, Calvin K., Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached.[2] (2) See attached.[3] (3) See attached.[3] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Snyder, James D., Illinois legislative committee, room 1236, La Salle Street Station, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, 6 days at $50, $300; expenses, $277.92. (2) Various. (3) Carlton Hotel, $21; Pullman Co., $82.87; meals, $108.51; porters, tips, etc., $22.50; taxi, $19.05; telephone and telegraph, $15.12; miscellaneous, $8.87. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Illinois railroads.

Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Aircraft Industries of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Spencer, Lyndon, Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Stack, Thomas George, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill. (1) $1,169.89 paid to me by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., covering all expenses incurred during trips to Washington, D. C., and stay there, for the second 3 months of 1948. (2) Thomas George Stack. (3) To get before Congress bills to protect the interest of the rank and file employees of the various railroads throughout the country on pension matters and secure more adequate pensions, as reflected in H. R. 6766. (4) National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., newspaper, Rail Pension News, costing $700 each edition; 3 editions, April, May, June, $2,100; circulation, 72,000. (5) Supported H. R. 6766 passed in this session of Congress and opposed certain unjust parts of the so-called Crosser bill, Public Law 572, of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Starling, Howard M., 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $150 received by registrant during the second quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act, as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock, casualty and surety insurance companies.

Stebbins, Frank L., Illinois Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me for lobbying purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation designed to tax like business organizations on a like basis.

Steele, Raymond E., general counsel, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 228 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) 80 cents, taxicab to clerk of Senate Labor Committee, re Fair Standards Act. (2) Taxicab operators. (3) Transportation to Capitol. (4) None. (5) Wage-and-hour law (Fair Labor Standards Act).

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Steffan, Arthur A., 812 Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., Petrol Corp. (1) Fees, $1,400; expenses, $1,651.84. (2) Railroads, hotels, employees, restaurants, etc. (3) Secretarial, travel, and office expense. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3499 for relief of Petrol Corp. (vetoed July 2, 1948).

Stein, Margaret I., 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $1,000.02; received expenses, $72.79; total, $1,072.81. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National Health Insurance.

Stengle, Charles I., American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $37.20. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) Rides to and from Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Federal employees.

Stewart, Annalee (Mrs. Alexander Stewart),[10] Women's Committee To Oppose Conscription, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) July 1947, railroad fare, $53.68, room, $25; meals, $51.90; carfare, $11.75; tips, $4.70; secretary help, $21.50; postage, telephone, $25. August 1947, no expenses. September 1947, railroad fare, $27.26; room, $10; meals, $33.65; carfare, $1.25; tips, $3.40; secretary help, $50.50; postage, telephone, $35.95. (2) [Blank.] (3) Room and board and actual living expenses while in Washington working to oppose universal military training. (4) [Blank.]. (5) Oppose universal military training.

Stewart, Annalee (Mrs. Alexander Stewart),[11] Woman's Committee To Oppose Conscription, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) October 1947, railroad, $4.14; room, $15; meals, $33.90; carfare, $2.35; tips, $2.65; telephone and postage, $23.32; secretary, $18.75. November 1947, railroad, $60.22; room, $23; meals, $28.70; carfare, $3.25; tips, $2.60; telephone and post, $7.70. December 1947, railroad, $114.62; room, $28.75; carfare, $13.15; meals, $37.25; tips, $3.45; telephone and postage, $7.55; secretary, $34. (2) [Blank.] (3) Room and board and actual living expenses while working to oppose universal military training. (4) [Blank.] (5) Oppose universal military training.

Stewart, Annalee, (Mrs. Alexander Stewart),[4] Women's Committee to Oppose Conscription, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) January 1948, railroad, $31; hotel, $23; meals, $43.15; carfare, $13.25; tips, $3.25; telephone, $5.04; postage and supplies, $10.75. February 1948, railroad, $19.90; room, $28.09; meals, $38.55; carfare, $11.65; tips, $2.35; telephone, $3; postage and supplies $13.85; secretary $9. March 1948, railroad $9.03; room $25; meals, $63.75; carfare $19.95; tips, $3.55; telephone, $3.90; postage and supplies, $24.50; secretary, $23. (2) [Blank.] (3) Room and board and actual living expenses while in Washington working to oppose universal military training. (4) [Blank.] (5) Oppose universal military training.

Stewart, Annalee, (Mrs. Alexander Stewart),[5] 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) April 1948, railroad, $59.21; room rent, $26.50; meals, $47.62; taxi and carfare, $20.30; tips, $3.70; telephone, $11.06; postage and supplies, $28.81. May 1948, railroad, $53.19; room rent, $25.; meals, $43.90; taxi and carfare, $16.15; tips, $3.60; telephone, $7.; postage and supplies, $19.93. June 1948, railroad, $27.94; room, $25.; meals, $28.30; taxi and carfare, $11.60; tips $2.25; telephone, $4.80; postage and supplies, $12.24. (2) [Blank.] (3) Room and board and actual living expenses while in Washington to oppose universal military training and selective service. (4) [Blank.] (5) Oppose universal military training and selective service.

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary $3,000.00 (50 percent of time devoted to legislative activities); reimbursement by employer for travel expenses, incidental expenses and per diem, $541.85; travel expenses to study housing and real-estate conditions in Europe, June 7 to August 15, $2,500; total, $6,041.85. (2) See attached itemized statement.[6] (3) See attached itemized statement.[3] (4) Attached list[3] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed; complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) April 1 to June 30, 1948; expended, $43.25. (2) See attached form.[3] (3) See attached form.[3] (4) Attached list[3] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed; complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Stone, Mrs. Margaret F., National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Full salary, $311.56, about half of which was paid me for legislative work; no money expended by me for legislative activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin. (5) See regular legislative program of league already on file with your office; testified before subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of Senate Joint Resolution 67, on the legal status of women; testified in support of House Joint Resolution 335, extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Stoudenmire, Sterling F., Jr.,[7] 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries, Mobile, Ala. (1) Salary, $2,100; expense reimbursements, $100.32. (2) (a) Taxicabs, $49.25; (b) restaurants and cafes, $45.58; (c) miscellaneous, $5.49. (3) (a) Taxicab transportation, $49.25; (b) meals and entertainment of officials and employees of Waterman Steamship Corp., $45.88; (c) miscellaneous and sundry expenses, $5.49. (4) None. (5) I am not engaged specifically "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by Congress." My employment is as attorney in the general counsel's office of Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries, who are interested in any legislation affecting the merchant marine, the operation of aircraft, and transportation generally; such employment of necessity requires presentation of information and facts to members of committees handling such legislation; this work is not the principal part of my employment, but is one of the incidental duties in connection therewith.

Strachan, Paul A., American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1376 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) There has been no change in my status as a legislative representative since my letter to you of March 31, except that this federation is now supporting S. 2896, to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped; S. 2319, a survey (census) of handicapped; H. R. 6525, National Cerebral Palsy Institute, and H. R. 6653, National Leprosy Act; neither I nor any officer of this federation has paid any sums to anyone, as affecting legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Sponsoring legislation on behalf of our 28,000,000 physically handicapped citizens; supporting S. 2896, S. 2319, H. R. 6525, H. R. 6653.

Strackbein, O. R., America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 601 Carpenters' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, April to June 1948, $3,870; expenses, April to June 1948, $3,327.81 (consisting of $2,600 in salary and $727.81 in expenses). (2) No payments were made to individuals; expenses were paid out for the purposes listed below. (3) Rent, telephone, telegraph, office supplies, taxicab fares, one trip to Chicago, two to Philadelphia, payment for typing and mimeographing reports, a few lunches a month with individuals. (4) Editorials in the Photo-Engraver, a monthly publication of the International Union of Photo Engravers; two or three articles in the Glass Cutter, a publication of the Window Glass Cutters' League. (5) Tariff legislation (trade agreements, International Trade Organization, etc.).

Stringer, Harry R., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Strong, Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Salary April 1 to June 30, 1948, $525; reimbursement for expense, $300; total, $1,125. (2) Arthur D. Strong. (3) Salary and reimbursement for traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meetings, hearings, and conventions. (4) None. (5) Registrant is employed to support legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. He is employed to oppose legislation detrimental to the above.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; expenses, $22.10. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Sturrock, J. E., Texas Water Conservation Association, 605–609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $1,500, less income and social-security taxes; traveling expenses for April, May, and June 1948, $369.68. (2) $369.68 traveling expenses paid to various railroad and taxi companies, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Covering transportation, meals, lodging, and entertainment. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association bulletins and pamphlets and various analyses of bills pending in Congress. (5) Employed to support all legislation, both State and national, having to do with the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation which seeks to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan, Francis M., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, April, May, June, 1948 (after withholding and social security), $1,716.95; incidental expenses, April, May, June 1948, $53.35. (2) Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington,

[3] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1947.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[7] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

D. C. (3) See (1) above. (4) DAV Semimonthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their dependents, and the survivors of deceased servicemen and women.

Sullivan, Francis M., care of National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, Suite 406, Central Building, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Legal fee, $500. (2) Francis M. Sullivan, same as above. (3) Represent the interests of the association before various Federal governmental departments. (4) None. (5) All legislative duties performed by an associate.

Sutlive, Carey R., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, salary, $2,125, expenses reimbursed by employer, $245.60; expenditures, $245.60. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents and investments.

Swanson, Walter S. J., National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 938 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. During the quarterly period just ended, he has expended no money and has made no payments to anyone in connection with any activities coming within the Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Prepared articles for Highway Highlights and certain bulletins released by the National Highway Users Conference. (5) Within the general responsibility of my office I have carried out the work outlined above. During the past quarter this has been solely confined to reportorial coverage of congressional activities dealing with Federal highway aid and highway taxation, the only legislation in which I am interested. I have conducted no activity during the quarterly period coming within the purview of the Lobbying Act.

Swomley, John M., Jr.,[4] 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Travel expenses between Washington and New York, Chicago, etc., plus out-of-pocket expenses, $377.92. (2) John M. Swomley, Jr., for personal expenses indicated above. (3) Indicated above. (4) Conscription News, weekly. (5) I serve as acting director of the National Council Against Conscription on a volunteer basis to promote the achieving of the international abolition of conscription, worldwide disarmament, and the defeat of conscription.

Taylor, Hugh W., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky. (1) Amount received from Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association for salary, less social security and tax, $2,250; for expenses incurred, $418.10. (2) See attached statement.[1] (3) See attached statement.[2] (4) None. (5) Legislation which affects tobacco production and foreign trade in leaf tobacco.

Taylor, John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridan Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $500 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social security taxes; $244.14 reimbursement for traveling expenses during April, May, and June 1948; $19.50 incidental expenses for April, May, and June 1948. (2) John Thomas Taylor. (3) $244.14 reimbursement for traveling expenses, three round trips to Philadelphia, Pa., two round trips to Indianapolis, Ind., round trip to Elizabeth, N. J., and round trip to Trenton, N. J.; $19.50 incidental expenses for April, May, and June 1948. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; The National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of The American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of The American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policymaking bodies of The American Legion.

Taylor, Margaret K., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $353.92. (2) Various. (3) Travel, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Taylor, Tyre, 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $2,500 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by National Association of Retail Grocers. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expense amounting to $857.14; (b) traveling expenses, $76.70. (2) (a) Landlord, secretary, postage, telephone, etc.; (b) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above. (4) National Grocers' Bulletin (published monthly). (5) Repeal of margarine-license taxes and other legislation of interest to independent retail-food distributors.

Taylor, Tyre, 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.; Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) Received $3,362.50 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by Southern States Industrial Council. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expenses amounting to $507.14; (b) research and technical assistance, $1,581.27; (c) travel expenses, $76.60. (2) (a) Landlord, stamps, telephone, etc. (b) Henry Bison, Jr.; (c) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above for purposes. (4) Semimonthly News Bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council. (5) The general legislative program of the council, with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

Temple,[3] Miss Marjorie L., American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received in salary for the calendar quarter $1,000 (possibly slightly over half of this was for duties in connection with legislative work). (2) None of the money received by me was paid to anyone in connection with legislative work. (3) None. See under (2) (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women, Quarterly AAUW General Director's Letter, issued three or four times a year; sent to leaders in the American Association of University Women. (5) See attached list as printed in the spring, 1948, AAUW Journal, stating in full the legislation supported and opposed.

Temple,[4] Marjorie L., American Association of University Women, 1634 I street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,000 salary (approximately half of my work is in the legislative field). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women (quarterly), General Director's Letter, published three or four times a year, for educational guidance of branch officers. (5) Support: Federal aid to education; housing bill; repeal of oleo tax; Marshall plan; Informational and Educational Exchange Act; renewal of Reciprocal Trade Act; status of women bill; Stratton bill for DP's; WHO; appropriation bills. Oppose: Equal rights amendment and social-security appropriations bill.

Terrell, John U., Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Colorado River Association, $3,500. (2) Ordinary business expenses, including travel, hotels, personal living, fares, business supplies.(3) Same as (2). (4) Wire services, all southern California newspapers, general distribution of news releases. (5) House Joint Resolution 226.

Thompson, Chester C., The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary from the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; $5,000 covering April, May, June, 1948. (2) Miscellaneous expenses, $75.30. (3) Local transportation and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting domestic water carrier and operator industry of the United States.

Thompson, Louis E., Small Business Association of New Jersey, Inc., box 188, Glen Ridge, N. J. (1) Contributions received in second quarter of 1948, $35. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co., $2.25. (3) Telegrams to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and to Senator H. Alexander Smith. (4) None. (5) To support any bills that would promote the policies of the Conference of American Small Business Organizations that have been filed with Members of the Senate and House; and to urge passage of House Joint Resolution 131.

Thomson, Mrs. Dorothy W., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $96.35 for miscellaneous expense; expended, $96.35. (2) Various. (3) Telephone calls, cab fares, lunches, and other miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriations for United States Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education bill.

Tinney, William H., The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $519.36 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $172.38 was expended by me as expense money, during the second quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $344.77 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $172.38 was expended by me as expense money, during the second quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Tobin, Fred A., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, and Helpers Union, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) My salary is $1,250 per month, or $3,750 for quarter year; I do not incur any expenses in performance of legislative work. (2) Fred A. Tobin. (3) I am an attorney representing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Union and its affiliated locals before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Labor Relations Board; am the liaison representative between various Government agencies and international union and the affiliated locals. The above includes general services of a nonlegislative nature pertaining to business and operation of International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals; also for part-time services in connection with legislation, both Federal and State, for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals. (4) I do not have any connection with any newspaper. (5) Legislation, Federal and State, which may affect the interests of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals, particularly in the field of labor law.

Tobler, H. Willis, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $59.40 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, farm credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of postwar construction of highways, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department, transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment of Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by Secretary of Agriculture, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, Labor Extension Service, alcohol plants, social security, weed killer, crop insurance, wheat carry-over, international wheat agreement, Parker River project, fiber identification, displaced persons, reciprocal trade agreements, rural electrification, radio, health, housing, standard time, Fair Labor Standards Act, railroad rates, Government corporations.

Tool Owners Union, Inc., 1802 Massachusetts Avenue, Lexington 73, Mass. (1) Received $4,424.91; expended $4,640.64. See attached schedule.[1] (2) See attached schedule.[1] (3) See attached schedule.[1] (4) 1. Advertisement, Boston Herald-Traveler, June 7, 1948. Copy enclosed. 2. Advertisement, New York Herald Tribune, Weekly Book Review, June 7, 1948. Copy enclosed. 3. Program for Progress (a newsletter for tool owners), volume 2, Nos. 1 and 2. Copies enclosed. (5) No specific legislation.

Townsend,[2] Dr. F. E., 6675 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio (Townsend National Weekly), (1) Approximately $1,625. (2) All money used in living expenses and no record kept. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (5) The Townsend plan.

Townsend,[2] Dr. F. E., Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Approximately $1,625. (2) All money used in living expenses and no record kept. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (5) The Townsend plan.

Townsend,[2] R. C., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio (Townsend National Weekly, Inc.). (1) Approximately $1,300. (2) All money used in living expenses and no record kept. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (5) The Townsend plan.

Townsend,[2] R. C., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio (Townsend National Weekly, Inc.). (1) Approximately $1,300. (2) All money used in living expenses and no record kept. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (5) The Townsend plan.

Truitt, Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $447.50. (2) Various persons. (3) Taxis, carfare, miscellaneous phone calls, luncheons, etc. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., partner of law firm of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mr. Louis Dreyfus, president of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York City, and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) Received $1,500 from Mr. Louis Dreyfus of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York City, and Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England, in connection with matter mentioned in No. (5) below. $26.40 expended during said quarter. (2) Mackay Radio Co., Washington, D. C. (3) Two cables to London in connection with matter mentioned in No. (5) below. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, a bill to facilitate naturalization of Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; John Frederick Firth-Hand, 1744 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 1742, Eightieth Congress, first session, a bill for the relief of John Frederick Firth-Hand.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia; the Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania, 308 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the just payment of French spoliation claims.

Turner,[3] Harold J., 325 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.; Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Pacific Building, Portland, Oreg.; Southern Pacific Co., Pittock Block, Portland, Oreg. (for the period December 31, 1946, to March 31, 1948). (1) None on Federal legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular proposed Federal legislation. See statement A to my registration, Form B.

Turner,[3] Harold J., 325 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Long-distance telephone $11.95; telegraph, $3.10. (2) The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co. (3) To obtain information on legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Oregon. (4)None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular proposed Federal legislation. See statement A to my registration, Form B.

Van Arnum, John R., National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, 512 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) As of present date, no active bills.

Vance, C. W., Room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) Salary, $1,134; expenses, $799.85; no money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxicabs, telephone, telegraph, postage, laundry, cleaning, railroad and Pullman fare, and various restaurants. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railroad labor and particularly to oppose bills detrimentally affecting the existing railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance system.

Van Nostrand, George C., American Airlines, Inc., 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As assistant vice president of American Airlines, on a permanent basis, I received a monthly salary of $1,000, or $3,000 for the quarter for all my activities. Only about one-fourth of my time was spent on activities involving legislation. Expended in connection with activities involving legislation, $110.15. (2) Transportation and telephone calls. (3) Transportation and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting air transportation.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., which firm receives an annual retainer from the Chase National Bank of the City of New York for professional services. As stated in his registration statement on form B, registrant does not believe he is subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Registrant's Federal tax legislative work comprises only an incidental and minor part of his duties. If any of registrant's activities are subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act the portion of the annual retainer from the Chase National Bank that might be attributed to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $250 during the second quarter of 1948, and disbursements pertaining to such activities were $11.32. (2) See answer to (1). Expense payments were made to the firm under the terms of the annual retainer for hotel rooms, meals, transportation, postage, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of members and employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Versen,[2] Albert F., Missouri Valley Chapter, Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) See statement attached.[3] (2) See statement attached.[3] (3) See statement attached.[3] (4) None. (5) None.

Versen,[2] Albert F., St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) See statement attached.[3] (2) See statement attached.[3] (3) See statement attached.[3] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Viles, A. L., the Rubber Manufacturers' Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During this quarter I have engaged in no legislative activities, neither have I made any expenditures for this purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the Secretary only.
[3] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[3] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

Virkus, Frederick A., Conference of American Small Business Organizations, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Compensation, $3,000; expenses, $298.46. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Wardman Park and Raleigh Hotels, taxi drivers, telephone company, telegraph company. (3) Expenses, primarily travel; some miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business.

Vogt, Joseph F., Employees Committee for Low-Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received no money from the Employees Committee for Low-Cost Retirement Benefits and had no expenses incurred on their behalf during the period April, May, June 1948. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946. Please accept this as notice of my last filing under Public Law 601 inasmuch as I will not be actively engaged in opposing or supporting any type of legislation after June 30.

Voorhis, H. Jerry,[1] 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; the Cooperative League of the U. S. A. (1) This letter is in lieu of the filing of Form C entitled "Quarterly Report of Persons Registering Under the Lobbying Act" and is to certify that no funds have been spent during either of the quarters ending April 1 or July 1, 1948, by me or on my behalf in connection with activities covered by the Lobbying Act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Walker, Jimmie, voluntary, Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., post-office box 1329, 305–306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax equality among all business.

Walter, Stephen M., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $6,635.02 as an employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $1,294.62 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, book stores, and stationers. (3) Transportation, $502.06; meals and incidental expenses on account of association members in Washington, $510.95; telephone and telegraph, $40.99; newspapers and publications, $28.05; miscellaneous, $212.55. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies of which I am an employee is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Walter, Thomas G., room 1006, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor). (1) As operations director, receives a monthly salary ($530) minus withholding tax and social-security tax—expended for personal living expenses. (2) Thomas G. Walters. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as operations director of council—lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) Washington newspapers, international union publications, weekly council bulletin for the dissemination of organizational news, including legislation. (5) Favorable to Federal Government employees and opposition to adverse legislation.

Ward, D. J., 1025 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Imported Nut Section, Association of Food Distributors, Inc., 161 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting imports of tree nuts.

Warfel, George L., president, National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (gross, withholding, and social security tax deducted), $1,250; expense vouchers, covering cab fares, phone calls, luncheon guests, and notary fees, $50.75. (2) George L. Warfel. (3) To improve the special delivery service and promote the welfare of the special delivery messengers in the postal service, including liaison contacts with administrative officials of the Government, and legislative contacts. (4) The Special Messenger, Special News—mimeographed bulletins to membership. (5) Supporting all legislation beneficial to the special-delivery service and special-delivery messengers.

Warfield, Ethelbert (report as attorney for American General Corp.), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; American General Corp., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) No receipts during said period. Expenditures: Transportation, $14.03; hotel rooms and meals, $9.26; postage, 30 cents; telephone calls $1.88; carfare, 10 cents. (2) American Airlines Inc.: Hotel Carlton, Washington, D. C.; United States Post Office; various telephone and transportation companies. (3) For transportation, hotel rooms and meals, postage, telephone calls, and carfare. (4) None. (5) To oppose S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Warfield, Ethelbert (report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No receipts during said period. Expenditures: Transportation, $9.02; hotel rooms and meals, $68.02; postage, 32 cents; telegrams, 78 cents; telephone calls, $19.31; miscellaneous travel expenses (transportation, hotel rooms and meals, etc.), $73. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad; American Airlines, Inc.; Hotel Carlton, Washington, D. C.; United States Post Office; Western Union; and various telephone companies. (3) For transportation, hotel rooms and meals, postage, telegrams, and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Warner, Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio (The Prudential Insurance Co. of America). (1) Received from the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J., for professional services; conferences with various Members of Congress in regard to legislation for the period January 1 to March 31, 1948, inclusive, $2,500. Expenses for transportation and traveling to and from Washington, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, entertainment, and expenses in Washington, $482.54; total, $2,982.54. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Services were rendered in connection with housing, credit, labor, railroad reorganization, and general welfare legislation and protective of the interests of the policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

Wasserman, Jack, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; self. (1) With the passage of S. 1739 and H. R. 5716 for the relief of Bessie and Patricia Schwartz, my activities in this matter have ended. No additional fees or disbursements other than those already reported are to be paid. This is my final return in this matter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Watson, J. R., Mississippi Railroad Association, room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss. (1) Salary monthly, without segregation; and reimbursement of expenses incurred in the amount of $797.20. (2) Hotel Raleigh, Pullman Co., telephone company, telegraph company, and various restaurants, dining cars, taxicabs, and nominal sums, including tips, to individuals, stationery, postage, and other incidental travel and subsistance expenses in the aggregate sum of $797.20. (3) Hotel, travel, communication, meals, and other expenses incident to my employment, as stated above. (4) None. (5) Employment is on annual basis, primarily for services not related to Federal legislation. Matters of Federal legislation are other and different from and only incidental to principal employment and purpose, but as an incident thereto, legislation pertaining to railroads in Mississippi.

Waybur, Bruce, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,060; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, District No. 44, I. A. of M., Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,000; $40 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying, i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general; not more than 10 percent of time spent on this work. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Webb, William H., National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received for salary, $1,076.60, and $562.85 for expenses; expended $428.40. (2) Various. (3) As indicated in attached schedule,[2] and for miscellaneous office, personal, and traveling expenses. (4) The Waterways Journal; Waterways, the National Magazine of the River; and the Workboat. (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Weingarten, J. W., 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.; 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me during the quarter ending June 30, 1948, on account of lobbying activities; I received my regular monthly compensation described in last report for the duties of my office but neither received nor expended any money in connection with any lobbying activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroad business.

Weitzer, Bernard, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Railroad fares, $23.72; hotel bills (including room and meals), $30.10; taxi fares, $37.95; miscellaneous office expenses, $8.64; postage, $11.69; telephone calls from booths, $10.05; salaries, $2,000. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad; Tudor Hotel, N. Y.; various restaurants; various taxi drivers; various telephone booths. (3) As indicated by the nature of expenses in (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) He is to support such legislation as will carry out the purposes of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution which follows and to oppose any legislation which would tend to frustrate the purposes therein expressed: "To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America; to foster and perpetuate true Americanism; to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions; to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed; to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all man; to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster the education of exservicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

Welch, Don, persons named in original declaration, P. O. Box 231, Madill, Okla. (Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Ry. Co., et al.). (1) Received and spent as traveling expenses on a trip from Madill, Okla., to Washington, D. C., and return, from May 4, 1948, to May 19, 1948, $379.15. (2) To hotels, restaurants, the Pullman Co., taxi drivers, etc., as ordinary and usual traveling expenses. (3) For ordinary and usual traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) S. 110, commonly called the Reed-Bulwinkle bill.

Welliver, Edward M., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration; he expended a total of $30.25. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Wescott, James B., 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) The law firm of Miller, Gorham, Wescott & Adams, of which firm registrant is a partner, received from Salt Producers Association, Detroit, Mich., $284.12 during the preceding calendar quarter. (2) Various. (3) The expenses incurred were in connection with H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211.

West, Oscar H., 1001–1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter; status of registrant the same as stated in original form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Wheeler, Burton K., Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Shore Line Oil Co., and Craw Co. (both), Las Vegas, Nev. (1) During the period from April 1, 1948, to July 1, 1948, no moneys or things of value were received from said companies; expenses were incurred amounting to $111.62 for the period; registrant has not been reimbursed for said expenses. (2) Does not apply. (3) The expenses incurred were for the following: Taxicabs, $14; traveling expense to Chicago, $84.24; maps purchased, $3.15; mimeographing, $7.50; and postage, $2.73. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5992, S. J. Res. 15, S. 1988, S. 2222 (all measures pertaining to the so-called tidelands oil question).

Wheeler, Edward K., Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Shore Line Oil Co., Craw Co. (both) Las Vegas, Nev. (1) During the period from April 1, 1948, to July 1, 1948, no moneys or things of value were received from said companies; expenses were incurred amounting to $111.62 for the period; registrant has not been reimbursed for said expenses. (2) Does not apply. (3) The expenses incurred were for the following: Taxicabs, $14; traveling expenses to Chicago, $84.24; maps purchased, $3.15; mimeographing, $7.50; and postage, $2.73. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5992, S. J. Res. 14, S. 1988, S. 2222 (all measures pertaining to the so-called tidelands oil question).

Whitehall, Albert V.,[3] 1834 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $1,937.52; reimbursement of travel expenses, $634.28. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitehall, Albert V.,[4] 1834 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $2,187.48; reimbursement of travel expenses, $460.21. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitlock, Douglas, partner of law firm Sanders, Gravelle, Whitlock & Howrey, room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Building Products Institute. (1) From the Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C.; total fee, $4,500; allocated $1,500 to legislative and $3,000 to legal and administrative; total expenses, $157.67; allocated $83.26 to legislative and $74.41 to legal and administrative. (2) Legislative: Taxi, $27.65; telephone, $48.91; notary, $4.50; restaurant, $2.20. Legal and administrative: $39.66; $34.75. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Whyte, Louis E., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (allocated), $725; expenses, $44.95. (2) Reported as disbursements by Independent Natural Gas Association of America (miscellaneous) for taxicabs and lunches. (3) Transportation. (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) Am interested in legislation proposing changes in the Natural Gas Act.

Wicklein, L. M. (General vice president, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association), 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250. Total expense for quarter, $3,239.28. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am employed to handle my many and varied duties as general vice president of the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association. My work in connection with legislation is incidental to these other duties and consumes a very small part of my time. It is confined to giving attention to legislation affecting railway employees in which we are interested.

Wiley, Mrs. Harvey W.,[5] 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C.; not employed for pay, volunteer worker, District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs. (1) Not any. (2) See question (1). (3) See question (1). (4) District of Columbia Federation Clubwoman, January and March 1948. (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, interested especially in legislation affecting the District of Columbia, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body of the District of Columbia Federation.

Wiley, Mrs. Harvey W.,[6] 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C.; not employed for pay, volunteer worker. (1) Not any. (2) See question (1). (3) See question (1). (4) District of Columbia Federation Clubwoman April, May, and June 1948. (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, interested especially in legislation affecting the District of Columbia, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body of the District of Columbia Federation.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Francis M. Goodwin, and Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Klamath Tribe of Indians of Oregon, Klamath Agency, Oregon. (1) Received $1,125 as quarterly payment under contract for legal services approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Expended $78.20 as follows: Notary fees, $1.25; taxicabs, $14.70; express charges, $8.83; telegraph, $29.91; telephone, $23.51. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2502 and H. R. 2775; opposing S. 1222, S. 1210, H. R. 1113, H. R. 4725.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Francis M. Goodwin, and Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, Keshena, Wis. (1) Received $650 for legal services, only a portion of which are devoted to legislative matters. Expended $41 for the following: Notary fees, 75 cents; taxicabs, $18.50; telegrams, $11.68; telephone, $7.38; mimeographing, $2.69. (2) see (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 5300; opposing H. R. 1113, H. R. 4725, and S. 1222.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., and Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Radio Service Corp. of Utah, 10 South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) No money received. Expenses totaled $142.30. Break-down is as follows: Taxicabs, $31.30; lunches and dinners for witnesses and attorneys, $78.10; telephone and telegraph, $78.10; telephone and telegraph, $25.94; mimeographing, $6.96. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Opposing S. 2231, Senate Resolutions 240 and 246.

Willard, A. D., Jr., National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $6,250, received for services as executive vice president of the National Association of Broadcasters for the quarter ending July 1, 1948; $778.90 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, communication companies, hotels and restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as executive vice president, acting as administrative officer at the headquarters of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involve Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None; miscellaneous information is furnished to members through weekly bulletin. (5) None; I am interested in any legislation, Federal or State, which may affect the radio-broadcasting industry; during the past quarter I testified at two public hearings relating to uniform time.

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $1,500; no

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[5] Filed for second quarter 1948.

part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin; press release concerning the availability of copies of the Retired Officers Association Bulletin for distribution to retired officers. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Corps, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service. See attached report [1] of activities for specific items.

Williams, Myers & Quiggle, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Paul F. Myers, James Craig Peacock, Martin W. Meyer, John E. Skilling, and Robert H. Meyers, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Food Brokers Association, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Washington Food Brokers Association, care of R. J. Dannemiller, president, 2653 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 8, D. C. (1) No money was received, but $3.20 for taxicab fares, $27.90 for transcript of proceedings in the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel's office, and $1.80 for telegrams were expended on account of services to National Food Brokers Association. $7.40 was expended for taxicab fares on account of services to Washington Food Brokers Association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) S. 2409, which became Public Law 509 on May 3, 1948.

Williamson,[2] C. J. S., 901 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Annual salary, $7,200; expense allowance, $1,800. (2) C. J. S. Williamson. (3) No expenditures, as that term is used in Public Law 601. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Williamson,[2] C. J. S., 901 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Annual salary, $7,200; expense allowance, $1,800; (2) C. J. S. Williamson. (3) No expenditures, as that term is used in Public Law 601. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Williamson, John C., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1036 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 per month as salary, minus social security and withholding taxes; $64.50 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Willingham, Carl H., Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 4 Park Avenue, New York City; Oneida, Ltd., Oneida, N. Y.; Willmark Service System, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City; Clyde Y. Morris, 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md. (1) Received, $4,299.95; expended, $1,174.95. (2) Railroad and planes, $472.44; meals, $165.70; taxis, $155.60; Circle Line, New York (sightseeing tour of New York Harbor), $340.39; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $29.32; railroad porters, $6; Campbell Photostat Service, $5.50. (3) Travel, taxis, and plane cars, meals, telephone, etc. (4) None. (5) Excise taxes, commercial building under Housing Act and wage-hour legislation.

Wilson, E. Raymond, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, April, May, June, $1,500; travel expense, $324.50. (2) Carfare, $182.96; meals, $40.12; telephone and telegraph, $17.16; miscellaneous, $84.24; April–June total, $324.50. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Wilson, Eugene E., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Wilson, Everett B., Jr., 728 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $750 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) None.

Wilson, J. B., Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo. (1) Salary, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, $1,500; expenses paid by National Wool Growers Association and Wyoming Wool Growers Association, $1,318.35. (2) J. B. Wilson, whose principal employment is as secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association; lobbying for or against legislation is a part of his duty, but not his principal occupation and for which he receives no added compensation. His expenses, however, are paid by the National Wool Growers Association as chairman of their legislative committee and by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association. (3) Incidentals. (4) J. B. Wilson is secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association and editor of the Wyoming Wool Grower, a semimonthly publication published by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association for its members. (5) To support any legislation affecting wool-growing industry, including wool bills, tariff, public-land legislation, etc.

Wilson, Lacey C., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,012.50; expense, $1,012.50. (2) Lacey C. Wilson. (3) Salary and expenses while working in the interest of the brotherhood. (4) Wilmington Sunday Star. (5) Any legislation affecting labor in general, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen in particular.

Wingert, E. L., 1 West Main Street, Madison, Wis.; Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my share of retainer fee paid my firm for general services as legal counsel for Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, involving mainly services unrelated to Federal legislation. Aside from that, received nothing for use in influencing Federal legislation and expended nothing for that purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) La Roe, Brown & Winn, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Meat inspection bills, S. 2256, H. R. 5675, H. R. 6439.

Winston, James H., 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) The law firm of Miller, Gorham, Wescott & Adams, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago 2, Ill., of which firm registrant is a partner, received from Salt Producers Association, Detroit, Mich., $284.12 during the preceding calendar quarter, as reimbursement for cash expenditures. (2) See (1). (3) The expenses incurred as shown in answer to (1) were in connection with H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211.

Winter, Everett T., 705 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with legislative matters, $225.87. All reimbursed by Mississippi Valley Association. One round trip Omaha to Washington, D. C. (2) Railroads, air lines, etc., $130.64; hotels and miscellaneous, $95.23. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, regulation of domestic transportation.

Woodrum, Clifton A., president, American Plant Food Council, Inc., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The registrant, Clifton A. Woodrum, nor his employer, the American Plant Food Council, Inc., neither received nor expended during last quarter any funds for the purpose of influencing directly or indirectly any legislation. Please see letter filed with original registration. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Woodson,[2] George W., 424 North Washington Avenue, Lansing, Mich. (1) I have received from our national office the amount of $1,344.15 since April 1 and all has been spent for hotel, telegrams, telephone, travel, and office expenses. (2) I have employed no one. I have paid no ads for any purpose. (3) Stated above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, Townsend plan.

Woodul, Walter F., Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.; Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex.; Burlington-Rock Island Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Co., Forth Worth, Tex.; Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Galveston, Tex.; the Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; International-Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex.; Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex.; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co., Houston, Tex.; Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway Co., Amarillo, Tex.; Paris & Mount Pleasant Railroad Co., Paris, Tex.; Quanah, Acme & Pacific Railway Co., Quanah, Tex.; St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; St. Louis, Southwestern Railway Co. of Texas, St. Louis, Mo.; Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Texas Electric Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Texas South-Eastern Railroad Co., Diboll, Tex.; the Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; the Texas-Mexican Railway Co., Laredo, Tex.; the Union Terminal Co., Dallas, Tex.; Wichita Falls & Southern Railroad Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.; the Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Compensation as previously reported, and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses for months of March, April, and May, 1948, in sum of $2,015. (2) Missouri Pacific Lines, $139.68; Shoreham Hotel, $1,262.78; and to various other hotels, eating places, and others, in amounts less than $10. (3) Transportation, $139.68; hotels, $1,362.78; meals, $282.65; entertaining, $143.81; taxis, telephones, tips, and incidentals, $153.21. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting Texas railroads.

Woodward, Albert Young, Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) In addition to compensation as regular employee of Signal Oil & Gas Co., received $1,019.95 as reimbursement for expenses itemized below. Included in reimbursement and expenses are items which were not directly or indirectly related to passage or defeat of legislation but which amounts are not readily segregated. (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, hotels, taxicab operators, garages, etc. (3) Telephone and telegraph, $46.85; transportation (including cabs, car allowance, mileage allowance, and parking), $284.05; social and business engagements, $532.80; postage, express, and miscellaneous, $156.25. (4) None. (5) In addition to general activities unrelated to legislation, observes, analyzes, and reports on the several items of legislation introduced in Congress affecting oil and oil operations.

Wootton, Edward W., Wine Institute, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 quarterly, salary as manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute—principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco. (2) Received by the undersigned for all personal services rendered as manager of this office, some of which services involve legislative activity. (3) See (1) and (2) above. No expenditures were made by undersigned to any other person for legislative purposes. (4) None. (5) Proposed amendments to Internal Revenue Code affecting wine and brandy production, and also with respect to S. 265, S. 2352, and S. 2365; also with respect to extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Wormhoudt, Marion P., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; R. W. Britton, 1416 Cherry Street, Erie, Pa. (1) None received and none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to partnerships.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C., 410 Gulf States Building, Dallas, Tex.; Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, Falling Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) $1,000, fees for services (received by firm of Case & Wozencraft). $384.88, reimbursement for traveling, telephone, and telegraph (including that paid to firm of Case & Wozencraft), (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved, Western Union and telephone company. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Bank holding company legislation.

Wright,[2] Mrs. Leslie B., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; volunteer worker. (1) January, February, and March 1948: For postage, office supplies, and periodicals pertaining to work of chairman of legislation, $50.63. (2) See answer No. 1. (3) See answer No. 1. (4) [Blank.] (5) Not "employed" for pay. A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The General Federation supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Wright,[2] Mrs. Leslie B., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4630 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) April, May, and June 1948: Postage and miscellaneous, $7.12; travel expense to General Federation convention in Portland, Oreg., $325.61; total, $332.73. (2) See answer No. 1. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The General Federation supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Yeaman, Addison, Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., 1600 West Hill Street, Louisville, Ky. (1) Registrant has received no moneys and has expended no moneys except his regular salary and traveling expenses, which were paid without regard to registrant's activities under the so-called Lobbying Act. (2) See question (1) above. (3) See question (1) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912.

Yonkers, Andrew J., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary (this represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act), $875; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $591.47; total, $1,466.47; money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $591.47. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Young, Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: salary, $2,666.68; expenses, $36.58. Expended: Transportation, $12.40; meals, $11.50; telephone, $12.68. (2) Taxi companies, restaurants, telephone company. (3) Transportation to and communication with the Capitol; other necessary normal expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Young,[2] Robert R., 2412 Terminal Tower, Federation for Railway Progress, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) Does not apply. (3) Does not apply. (4) [Blank.] (5) None. However, he has publicly supported the Mahaffie bill and opposed the Bulwinkle bill.

Young,[2] Robert R., 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, none; expenses, $113.21. (2) For various hotels, railroads, etc. (3) For traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Zook, John D., Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to the organization.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[3] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 27, 1948

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant that in our thoughts and toils during this day we may have the companionship of Thy Spirit to counsel us in the ways of truth and righteousness.

Show us how we may mobilize the moral and spiritual resources which Thou hast placed at our disposal for the dawning of that blessed day of prediction when all the members of the human family shall live together in friendship.

Inspire us with courage to believe that the prospects of its consummation and final triumph are as glorious and wonderful as the promises of the Lord God Omnipotent.

To Thy name we shall ascribe the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 26, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communications that he might be pleased to make, and that the Speaker had appointed Mr. HALLECK, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. MCCORMACK the members of the committee on the part of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 220) providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, July 27, 1948, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States may be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. BARKLEY appeared in the center aisle, and Mr. WHERRY said:

Mr. President, the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House has reassembled and is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make has performed that duty, and the committee was informed by the President that he would address the two Houses in person at 12:30 o'clock p. m. today.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution which has just come over from the House, House Concurrent Resolution No. 220, be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 220), which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two

Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, July 27, 1948, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States may be pleased to make to them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P. M. TOMORROW

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that when the joint meeting of the two Houses to be held under authority of House Concurrent Resolution 220, just adopted, is dissolved, the Senate stand in adjournment until 1 o'clock p. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hoey	Pepper
Ball	Holland	Reed
Barkley	Ives	Revercomb
Brewster	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stennis
Connally	Lodge	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McGrath	Thye
Ecton	McMahon	Tobey
Ellender	Magnuson	Tydings
Feazel	Martin	Umstead
Ferguson	Maybank	Vandenberg
George	Millikin	Watkins
Green	Moore	Wherry
Gurney	Morse	Wiley
Hatch	Murray	Williams
Hawkes	Myers	Young
Hayden	O'Conor	
Hickenlooper	O'Daniel	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official state business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Without objection, the Senate will stand in informal recess for 5 minutes and will leave the Chamber at 12:20 o'clock to participate in the joint meeting of the two Houses.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

The informal recess having expired, at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., on motion by Mr. WHERRY, the Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Carl A. Loeffler), the Sergeant at Arms (Edward F. McGinnis), and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to attend the joint meeting of the two Houses and to hear the address to be delivered by the President of the United States.

(The proceedings in the House of Representatives and the address delivered by the President of the United States at the joint meeting of the two Houses appear on p. 9441 of the House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

ADJOURNMENT

The joint meeting of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), under the order previously entered, stood in adjournment until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 28, at 1 o'clock.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 27, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jacob S. Payton, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

As citizens we return thanks unto Thee, O Lord, for the heritage of yesterday, for the blessings of today, and for the promises of tomorrow. Because we believe that these are precious in Thy sight, and because they are dear to us, we pray for strength to hold our gains and for perseverance to make our dreams come true.

By the help which is from above, may these Thy servants set a watch over their lives, and in reverence and in quiet faith may they walk in the way of Thy commandments. May they realize that in all human planning nothing is done right and nothing will prove durable unless it follows Thy pattern of justice, mercy, and wisdom.

May our hearts become Thy dwelling place this day that we may live helpfully and honorably. We offer our prayer in the name of Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 220. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on July 27, 1948.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

At 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the President pro tempore of the Senate and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The President pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. On behalf of the Senate, as members of the same committee, the President pro tempore appoints the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

At 12 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair presents the President of the United States.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 734)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Eightieth Congress, the urgent needs of the American people require our presence here today.

Our people demand legislative action by their Government to do two things: First, to check inflation and the rising cost of living; and, second, to help in meeting the acute housing shortage.

These are matters which affect every American family. They also affect the entire world, for world peace depends upon the strength of our economy.

The Communists, both here and abroad, are counting on our present prosperity turning into a depression. They do not believe that we can—or will—put the brake on high prices. They are counting on economic collapse in this country.

If we should bring on another great depression in the United States by failing to control high prices, the world's hope for lasting peace would vanish. A depression in the United States would cut the ground from under the free nations of Europe. Economic collapse in this country would prevent the recovery throughout the world which is essential to lasting peace. We would have only ourselves to blame for the tragedy that would follow.

In these tense days, when our strength is being tested all over the world, it would be reckless folly if we failed to act against inflation.

High prices are not taking "time off" for the election.

High prices are not waiting until the next session of the Congress.

High prices are getting worse. They are getting worse every day.

We cannot afford to wait for the next Congress to act. [Applause.]

The Eighty-first Congress will not get under way for nearly 6 months. Before the new Congress could take action against high prices, it would have to draft new bills, study them, hold hearings, debate, and decide whether to pass them. It would be at least 8 months from now before the new Congress could pass the laws we need.

Eight months more of inflation would be much too long.

It was 8 months ago—November 1947—that I called a special session of this Congress and recommended a comprehensive anti-inflation program. But that program was not enacted. If it had been enacted, we would have lower prices today. [Applause.]

Since last November, prices have gone even higher. As every housewife knows, food prices rose rapidly throughout 1947. They are climbing even faster now. Month after month the cost of clothing, fuel, and rent keeps on going up.

The cost of living is now higher than ever before in our history. There are not very many rich men in the Congress of the United States. Most of you have to live on your salaries. All you need do is just go home and ask your wife how living costs are now as compared with what they were January 1, 1947.

We cannot risk the danger, or suffer the hardship, of another 8 months of doing nothing about high prices. [Applause.]

Prices are already so high that last year more than one-fourth of the families of this country were forced to spend more than they earned. Families of low or moderate income are being priced out of the market for many of the necessities of life. They are not able to buy as much as they could 2 years ago, and they are paying a lot more for what they can buy.

At the same time industrial prices, which affect all business and employment, are rising and rising fast. Large price increases have recently been announced by industries that set the pace for the whole economy. Within the last few days, the steel industry, for example, increased its prices, on the average, by more than $9 a ton.

The rise in industrial prices is just as important, in the long run, as the high cost of living. It is already squeezing the independent businessman. It threatens to destroy a fair balance between industry and agriculture. It can end only in catastrophe if allowed to continue.

In the face of these facts, it is foolish to point at every feeble straw as a sign that the danger is disappearing. In February some people said that the break in commodity prices meant that inflation was almost over. They were wrong. Prices rose again.

There are still some people who repeat the old argument which was used by those who killed price control 2 years ago. They said that if we would only take controls off, production would increase, prices would go down, and there would be more for everybody at a lower cost.

The record shows unmistakably that this argument was false.

Production has increased somewhat, and we want it to increase still more. But even with full employment, full use of available materials, and practically full use of plant capacity—all of which we have today—prices are still climbing much faster than production. It is obvious that we cannot rely solely on more production to curb high prices. Instead, we must attack inflation directly.

If we do not stop inflation, production and employment will both fall sharply when the break comes.

Positive action by this Government is long overdue. It must be taken now. [Applause.]

I therefore urge the Congress to take strong, positive action to control inflation. I have reexamined the anti-inflation program I proposed to the Congress 8 months ago. In its essentials that program is as sound now as it was then. It has been revised and strengthened in the light of changing circumstances. The program I now propose is as follows:

First, I recommend that an excess-profits tax be reestablished in order to provide a Treasury surplus and provide a brake on inflation.

Second, I recommend that consumer credit controls be restored in order to hold down inflationary credit.

Third, I recommend that the Federal Reserve Board be given greater authority to regulate inflationary bank credit.

Fourth, I recommend that authority be granted to regulate speculation on the commodity exchanges.

Fifth, I recommend that authority be granted for allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production, or the cost of living.

Sixth, I recommend that rent controls be strengthened, and that adequate appropriations be provided for enforcement, in order to prevent further unwarranted rent increases.

Seventh, I recommend that stand-by authority be granted to ration those few products in short supply which vitally affect the health and welfare of our people. On the basis of present facts, and unless further shortages occur, this authority might not have to be used at all.

Eighth, I recommend that price control be authorized for scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production or the cost of living. I have said before, and I repeat, that many profit margins have been adequate to absorb wage increases without the price increases that have followed. Rising wages and rising standards of living, based on increasing productivity and a fair distribution of income, is the American way. Noninflationary wage increases can and should continue to be made by free collective bargaining. Where the Government imposes a price ceiling, wage adjustments which can be absorbed within the price ceiling should not be interfered with by the Government. The Government should have the authority, however, to limit wage adjustments which would force a break in a price ceiling, except where wage adjustments are essential to remedy hardship, to correct inequities, or to prevent an actual lowering of living standards.

The measures I have recommended make up a balanced program to attack high prices. They are all necessary to check rising prices and safeguard our economy against the danger of depression. If they are made the first order of business by the Congress, as they should be, they can be promptly enacted. Every week of delay will mean additional hardship for the American people. [Applause.]

The second reason why I have called the Congress back is that our people need legislation now to help meet the national housing shortage.

We desperately need more housing at lower prices—prices which families of moderate income, particularly veterans' families, can afford to pay. [Applause.] We are not getting it.

Even more urgently, we need more rental housing, especially low-rent housing. We are not getting it.

Most of the housing now being built is for sale, or for rent, at prices far above the reach of the average American family.

I have recommended time and time again that the Congress pass a comprehensive housing bill which would help us obtain more housing at lower prices—both for sale and for rent.

A good housing bill, Senate bill 866, known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, passed the Senate on April 22. This bill would provide aid to cities in clearing slums and in building low-rent housing projects. It would give extensive aid to the private home-building industry. It includes provisions for farm housing and for research to bring down building costs. It contains many other provisions, all aimed at getting more housing at lower prices and at lower rents.

This is the bill we need. We need it now, not a year from now. [Applause.]

If this legislation is passed this summer, it will be possible to start immediately the production of more houses of the kind our families need, at prices they can afford to pay. If it is not passed now, the Eighty-first Congress will have to start all over again with a new housing bill. In that case, we might lose a full year in meeting our national housing need.

This Congress can complete action on this comprehensive housing bill in a few days. I strongly urge that it do so. [Applause.]

I have called the Congress back primarily to deal with high prices and with the housing shortage. Delay on either of these items would be most dangerous. In addition, there are other important legislative measures on which delay would injure us at home or impair our world relations.

I therefore recommend that the present session, without allowing anything to interfere with its vital work on legislation concerning high prices and housing, take action on certain other important measures. These measures can speedily be enacted now because of the amount of study already given to them by the Congress.

First, the Congress should provide Federal assistance to the States in meeting the present crisis in education. [Applause.] The children in our schools, and the men and women who teach there, have been made the victims of inflation. More children are entering school than ever before. But inflation has cut down the purchasing power of the money devoted to educational purposes. Teachers' salaries, for the most part, have lagged far behind increases in the cost of living. The overcrowding of our schools is seriously detrimental to the health and the education of our boys and girls. Every month that we delay in meeting this problem will cause damage that can never be repaired. Several million children of school age are unable to attend school, largely because of lack of facilities or teachers.

To meet these vital educational needs, the Congress should complete action on Senate bill 472, which passed the Senate on April 1. All that remains to be done is its passage by the House of Representatives.

Prompt action by the Congress is also needed to help another group of our people who are suffering from inflation. These are the workers who depend on the protection of a minimum-wage law. The present minimum wage is pitifully inadequate in the face of today's high prices. Proposals to raise minimum wages have long been before the Congress. I urgently recommend that the minimum wage be raised to at least 75 cents an hour at this session. [Applause.] Senate bill 2062 and its companion House bills would be suitable measures for this purpose.

I urge also that action be taken by the Congress to relieve other victims of inflation. These are the people who depend upon the benefits being paid under the old-age and survivors insurance system. The average old-age retirement benefit for a man and his wife is only $39 a month. For a widow with two children, the average monthly benefit is only $49. These benefits are utterly inadequate. I urge that they be increased by at least 50 percent and that the age at which women can receive benefits be lowered from 65 to 60 years. [Applause.] I also hope that the protection of this system will be extended to the millions who are not now covered.

In our relations with the rest of the world, action is also needed at once, and can be taken quickly, to afford additional proof that we mean what we say when we talk about freedom, humanity, and international cooperation for peace and prosperity. Three measures are involved.

First, the Displaced Persons Act in its present form discriminates unfairly against some displaced persons because of their religion, land of origin, or occupation. These provisions are contrary to all American ideals. This act should be promptly amended to wipe out these discriminations. [Applause.] Furthermore, the present act permits the entry of only 200,000 persons, and charges them against future immigration quotas. I believe strongly that the act should provide for the entry of 400,000 persons over a 4-year period, and they should be outside the normal immigration quotas. [Applause.] The act can and should be amended promptly.

Second, many people in the world must wonder how strongly we support the United Nations when we hesitate to assist the construction of its permanent home in this country. Legislation can and should be passed at once to authorize a loan by the United States Government to the United Nations, for the construction of UN headquarters buildings in New York City.

The international wheat agreement is another vital measure on which the Congress should act. This agreement is designed to insure stability in the world wheat market in the years ahead when wheat will be more plentiful. It would guarantee American farmers an export market of 185,000,000 bushels of wheat at a fair price during each of the next 5 years. Since the agreement is in the form of a treaty it requires only ratification by the Senate. Although this agreement should have been ratified by July 1 of this year, we have good reason to believe that it can still be made effective if it is now ratified promptly.

Also, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress three other problems on which action can and should be taken at this session.

The Congress should reconsider its recent actions which cut sharply into our national electric power policy. There is an acute shortage of electric power in this country now. I am therefore resubmitting to the Congress appropriation requests for certain power projects which must be provided right away. These requests include the TVA steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., and certain other projects on which congressional reductions, if allowed to stand, will delay the production of power for a year or more. These appropriations should be promptly enacted, and at the same time certain crippling limitations should be removed from the law. [Applause.]

In the last days of the session, before adjourning in June, the Congress passed a bill raising the salaries of some Federal employees. However, this bill neglected long overdue reforms in Federal pay scales and discriminated unfairly against certain groups of employees. The Congress should take this opportunity to enact more equitable and realistic Federal pay legislation.

Finally, I wish again to urge upon the Congress the measures I recommended last February to protect and extend basic civil rights of citizenship and human liberty. A number of bills to carry out my recommendations have been introduced in the Congress. Many of them have already received careful consideration by congressional committees. Only one bill, however, has been enacted, a bill relating to the rights of Americans of Japanese origin. I believe that it is necessary to enact the laws I have recommended in order to make the guarantees of the Constitution real and vital. I believe they are necessary to carry out our American ideals of liberty and justice for all. [Applause.]

I hope there is no misunderstanding of the recommendations I have made. I have asked the Congress to return, first of all, in order to meet the urgent need of our people for relief from high prices and the housing shortage. I urge the Congress not to be distracted from these central purposes.

At the same time, as I have stated, the Congress can and should act on certain other important items of legislation at this special session.

There are still other problems of great moment which vitally affect the welfare of the Nation. I have discussed them in previous messages to this Congress. I have made recommendations for legislation to meet them. I do not repeat them now—because the purposes and limited time of this special session do not readily permit action on them.

However, I feel just as strongly as ever that all of these measures are necessary. If the Congress finds time to enact any of them now the country will greatly benefit. Certainly, the next Congress should take them up immediately.

These include: a comprehensive health program, based on health insurance; a fair and sound labor-management relations law—in place of the Taft-Hartley law, which has proved to be unfair and unsound and which should be repealed; a real long-range farm program; a stronger reciprocal trade agreements act; a universal training program; a national science foundation; strengthened anti-trust laws; and approval of the St. Lawrence waterway treaty.

The vigor of our democracy is judged by its ability to take decisive actions—actions which are necessary to maintain our physical and moral strength and to raise our standards of living. In these days of continued stress, the test of that vigor becomes more and more difficult. The legislative and executive branches of our Government can meet that test today.

The American people rightfully expect us to meet it together. I hope that the American people will not look to us in vain. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m., the President retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The members of the President's Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m., the Speaker announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon the President pro tempore and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Message of the President of the United States be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

A PEACETIME EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I note that the President has recommended an excess-profits tax to provide a brake on inflation. An excess-profits tax in peacetime is one of the most inflationary measures we could adopt.

I will briefly enumerate some of the main objections to an excess-profits tax in peacetime:

First. It will stifle new growing and expanding corporations. This will be accomplished by making it impossible for them to secure capital either through the sale of equities or from borrowing. Few organizations would want to lend money to businesses when a large part of their profits would have to be paid to the Federal Government before paying any part of the principal of the debt. From the competitive angle, the new and growing corporations would be unable to compete with their old established competitors with large base period or invested capital credits.

Second. An excess-profits tax in peacetime, to use the language of that distinguished Democrat, the late Senator Glass:

> It encourages wasteful expenditure, puts a premium on overcapitalization, and a penalty on brains, energy, and enterprise, discourages new ventures, and confirms old ventures in their monopolies.

Third. No stronger condemnation of a peacetime excess-profits tax could be made than the one advanced by former Secretary of the Treasury Vinson, now Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, in his recommendation for the repeal of the excess-profits tax in 1945. In this connection he said:

> Repealing the excess-profits tax means getting out of the tax system a tax which certainly in its present form has no place in the peacetime system.
>
> The case against the excess-profits tax for 1946 goes beyond the facts that it is primarily a wartime control and that it is erratic and inequitable. It is also an obstacle to that reconversion and expansion of business which is so necessary for a high level of employment and income.
>
> . . . . .
>
> Clearly, the repeal of the excess-profits tax will stimulate production. Today we are starved for new houses, new cars, new radios, and the like. The best defense against the use of our wartime economy, the excess-profits tax has been an erratic and in many instances an inequitable tax. The difficulty is that calling profits excessive does not make them excessive. Calling profits normal does not make them normal. Normal profits and excessive profits look alike. There is no chemical reagent to distinguish them.
>
> The excess-profits tax, to be sure, has a formula—a very complicated formula in its entirety—for distinguishing normal and excessive profits. But that formula is seriously defective.
>
> One serious defect of the excess-profits tax for the postwar period lies in the weakness of the average earnings credit, which uses prewar profits as a measure of normal profits. A corporation may continue to earn free of excess-profits tax 95 percent as much as it averaged during the years 1936–39, and this amount is often enlarged by various relief provisions. A corporation with a high prewar earnings experience may thus earn 20 percent, 30 percent, or more on its invested capital without paying any excess-profits tax. New and rising corporations do not have the benefit of such a credit.

Fourth. To the extent the excess-profits tax is passed on to the consumer, the excess-profits tax instead of decreasing prices, will actually increase them and thus make it more difficult for the consumer to purchase the things he needs for his family. Thus, instead of helping the victims of high prices and high-living costs, the excess-profits tax would intensify their problem by adding impetus to the inflationary spiral.

I am against imposing any tax which penalizes production, which is inequitable in its distribution of the burden between particular companies and which stands a good chance of further increasing prices.

THE NEW DEAL AND INFLATION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal administration from the very first has deliberately promoted inflation. It has been the avowed aim of the New Deal to raise prices. Its planners have sat up nights for the past 16 years devising ways and means to increase the cost of living by propaganda and by legislation. No other administration in the history of this Republic has done so much, either in war or in peace, to promote inflation as has the New Deal. Its general and fiscal policies have been inflationary. The New Deal has used artificial stimuli to create high prices. The Brain Trusters, not satisfied to raise prices by monetary and fiscal policies, spread the propaganda that prices must rise.

Who went on the air and urged the public not to save but to spend? It was the "brain trusters" of the New Deal. What administration created the device known as the NRA, with its production limitation, minimum price agreements, and price-fixing features? The New Deal, of course. This was particularly true in the field of agriculture by imposing production limitations and employing price-pegging operations. Not satisfied with these steps to inflate prices, it increased business taxes, particularly the excess-profits and the undistributed-profits taxes, which not only increased costs of production, but these measures were also designed to force money into circulation.

Then, too, what about the pump-priming operation of the New Deal to raise prices?

In order to raise the money which the New Deal pumped into circulation to raise prices, the administration had to resort to deficit financing on a peacetime scale never before approached. Thus, early in the New Deal administration the national debt was increased some $19,000,000,000 to carry out its inflationary program. Throughout the New Deal administration every variety of legerdemain has been put in operation to inflate the prices of the necessities of life. What about the effect of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 as a continuing inflationary measure? Under this act the President devalued gold 40.6 percent, setting the mint price at $35 an ounce nine-tenths fine, an increase of 69.4 percent over the former price of $20.67 an ounce which had prevailed since 1837. The fact that the gold so purchased was to be sterilized has not removed its inflationary effect.

It is detrimental to the American people, but it has financed and is financing Russia. The effect is that the devaluation of newly mined gold is worth more in terms of dollars.

Sellers of gold to the Government receive more dollars than formerly and among the foreign beneficiaries of this inflationary scheme is Russia. In addition, the price of $35 an ounce for gold brings high cost mines into production, mines that could not afford to operate at the old price, thus increasing the available supply. Thus this new purchasing power created either swells the amount of currency in circulation or is deposited in banks, thereby further enlarging the credit base. Just another New Deal high-cost-of-living device.

I may mention that in the Gold Reserve Act of 1934—Public Law 87, Seventy-third Congress, section 10–a—part of the profit accruing to the Treasury as

a result of devaluation was to be placed in a stabilization fund. The inflationary aspect of this fund was expressed by Mr. Owen D. Young:

Insofar as the stabilization fund is used to buy gold abroad, the matter is even worse, for the gold that is bought replenishes the fund, and, therefore, you have something like perpetual motion in credit expansion, through the use of a stabilization fund. (Senate hearings on Gold Reserve Act, 1934, p. 327.)

It is a crime for an American citizen to have gold in his possession, but he is taxed to pay a premium price for Russian gold and then suffer from its inflationary effect because of such purchase of foreign gold.

Then to increase the cost of living the New Deal administration embarked on a silver program. When silver is purchased by the Treasury it is purchased by the issuance of new currency. No matter how this new money is used it is a tremendous contribution to the inflation of prices.

The fiscal program of the New Deal down to the present minute has been one of inflation. Every well-informed person knows that there is a limit to the amount of taxes that can be levied without absorbing the profits which should be put back into business for increased production. Production of goods of which there is a shortage is one way to meet the problem of inflation. If too much of the surplus, which is the excess of net income over consumption, is taken in taxes, the margin available for capital investment is perilously reduced.

If the sources of capital investment are dried up, the flow of all income may eventually cease. Yet in the face of these facts President Truman repeatedly vetoed a tax-reduction bill, which had not his veto been overridden by Congress would have slowed down production and thus eventually increased inflation. Has President Truman sought to assist in the reduction of Government expenses? What does the record show? The facts are that at the end of April there were 2,050,420 civilian employees on the Government's pay roll. There has been a net increase of 34,920 since December 31, 1947. New employees have been put on the Federal pay roll as follows:

The rate of increase in January was slightly more than 200 a day. In February the increase rate was about 400 a day. In March it was 500 a day. In April it was 650 a day. This load upon the taxpayers will continue throughout this election year. It must not be forgotten that Franklin D. Roosevelt in his first two terms spent $62,000,000,000. This vast program of deficit financing was inflationary. This was during peacetime when the New Deal program was to create prosperity by reckless public spending and inflation. Yet there were between eight and fifteen million unemployed all the time.

This was at a period when people were paid to produce less. The inflationary philosophy of scarcity was substituted for the philosophy of plenty. Cotton planters were paid to plough under the crops. The packers were paid to buy up and render unfit for human consumption vast quantities of hogs. Large firms were paid enormous sums not to produce sugar. President Truman, as a spender of public funds, has surpassed the Roosevelt peacetime spending.

Talk about the high cost of living. Can it be otherwise when the warehouses in hundreds of foreign cities are bulging with American goods which are not wanted over there but are sorely needed here?

Now after carrying on a program of inflation for 16 years by means of spending, currency manipulation, crop and livestock destruction, deficit financing, pump priming, devaluation of gold, Silver Purchase Act, price fixing, subsidies, pay-roll expansions, blank checks, WPA, NRA, UNRRA, and the creation of innumerable bureaus, I believe that just so long as President Truman occupies the White House the high cost of living will not only increase but continue. He possesses every conceivable inflationary power, none of which does he want to surrender, but instead he now asks for more powers to regiment the people. Does he want the power to fix wages or does he wish the power to fix the price of everything except wages?

CONGRESS CALLED--WHY?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that Congress has been called in special session by the President. He chose a most unusual setting in which to announce the call, during the turbulent Democratic National Convention recently held at Philadelphia. This was most unfortunate, for everyone realized that it was political in its every aspect.

But the people of the country really want to know why the President has called Congress in special session. In the editorial columns of one of the great newspapers of the Southwest, the Tulsa Daily World, of my home city, Tulsa, Okla., there appeared in the issue of July 17, 1948, a very realistic analysis of the situation. The editorial answers the people's question, "Why?" I am pleased to quote the editorial, as follows:

CONGRESS CALLED—WHY?

It is possible the special session of Congress, called for July 26, will have some political importance. It can have little valid bearing on what President Truman fatuously calls public welfare. The session is bound to be partisan and prejudicial.

In making the call the President listed a lot of controversial measures, none of which can properly be classed as emergency. Apparently the public power question is to be on the schedule, and it can well be the bitterest of issues. There is a disposition to jam over more authorities and the resistance will be stiff. The tentative list of subjects for legislation carries civil rights, price controls, Federal aid to schools, minimum wages, displaced persons. All these subjects are explosive.

The immediate political urgency probably is the so-called civil-rights legislation. The President is plenty mad at Congress as a whole, at probably half the Democratic Members, and particularly all southerners. Undoubtedly he will try to put over some sort of force bill designed to please the Negro voters of the North and the racial minority voters in the larger cities. This, of course, will afford room for all sorts of Congressmen to sound off. The results will probably be small in comparison to the noise and the unwise expenditure of energy. This wicked debate is timed for just before the election.

From any standpoint except practical and fanatical politics, the special session is already foredoomed to failure. Ostensibly the President is trying to give Congress—which he calls the worst ever—another chance to win his approbation. He was roughly handled in the regular session; he didn't get much of his program over, and he suffered reversals on his vetoes. The anger, formally aimed at the Republicans, reaches a lot of Democrats. It is certain many Democrats will fight back at the President with renewed wrath.

That Philadelphia convention caused a lot more sore spots. Seemingly, Mr. Truman has abandoned whatever philosophy and tolerance he may have had and is determined to be a big, ruthless boss. He will fail. His own party is very sore at him, and the Members of Congress, on the Democratic side particularly, are in no mood to be pushed around. At this distance, it looks like a matter of all loss and no gain.

There are indications a new Democratic leader will be put in the ring. Senator RUSSELL, who was named at the head of the forlorn anti-Truman movement, spoke out sharply and put the call for the session on a sectional, racial basis. He said the Republicans and Truman Democrats are practically in a conspiracy to see who can kick the South the hardest. Senator VANDENBERG, President of the Senate, was incisive, caustic, bitter. Thus at least two leaders of opposing parties are on record right now in condemning the President's action as callow, uncivil, futile.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a column by George Sokolsky.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include some newspaper material.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of a speech made before the Rotary Club of Hobart, Delaware County, N. Y., on Federal public housing.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by our colleague, Hon. BEN JENSEN, before the South Dakota Republican Convention.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD on the subject of the President's message.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the President's message.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of the President's message.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one, to include an editorial from the Boston Post; and in the other, an editorial from the Chelsea Record.

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. SABATH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article and an editorial.

Mr. DORN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HARDY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD my own remarks, together with editorials in each instance, which had previously been requested before the adjournment of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to insert them in the RECORD at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances on two different subjects.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Thursday, July 29, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1702. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, Munitions Board, National Military Establishment, transmitting a report detailing the activities with respect to stock piling between January 1 and June 30, 1948, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAGEN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 954. A bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without loss of second-class mail privileges; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7043. A bill to authorize the sale of the war housing project known as Custerdale in Manitowoc, Wis., to the city of Manitowoc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 7044. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act by liberalizing benefits, by increasing amounts beneficiaries may earn without loss of benefits, and by lowering the age of eligibility of women beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOFF:

H. R. 7045. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of Idaho the former United States naval training center at Farragut, Idaho, determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. R. 7046. A bill to repeal the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 7047. A bill to provide that certain persons who served in the merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 7048. A bill to repeal the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7049. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 7-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7050. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 7051. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 7-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. J. Res. 436. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the nomination and election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 437. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the Battle of Stony Point; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 221. Concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment sine die of the two Houses of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Res. 703. Resolution for the relief of Beatrice Kelley; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DORN:

H. Res. 704. Resolution authorizing a full and complete investigation and study of the conduct in office of Judge J. Waties Waring, of the eastern district of South Carolina; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7052. A bill for the relief of George Geiger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7053. A bill for the relief of Ella Spielman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 7054. A bill for the relief of the estate of Thomas O'Hare, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 7055. A bill for the relief of Avak Hagopian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2130. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Thomas J. Reardon, of Hartford, Conn., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to enactment of legislation concerning the common defense of our divine national economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2131. Also, petition of E. J. Kiernan and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to permitting veterans to remain in temporary or permanent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA

JULY 1, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frank T. Bow	General counsel, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948.	$4,821.30
Oscar L. Hume	Investigator, Jan. 1 to May 1, 1948; staff director, May 1 to June 30, 1948.	3,202.46
Sylvia Deane	Clerk, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948.	2,682.30
J. Robert Brown	Investigator, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948.	2,872.79
R. J. Hodson	Investigator, Apr. 19 to June 30, 1948.	1,202.66
Thomas F. Simpson	Investigator, Mar. 8 to June 20, 1948.	1,720.33
Hubert R. Moody	Investigator, Mar. 15 to June 15, 1948.	1,519.90
George C. Perkins	Investigator, May 1 to June 15, 1948.	731.61
A. J. Watson	Auditor, Mar. 21, 1948.	1,749.48
L. M. Dodge	Auditor, Mar. 14 to May 31, 1948.	1,735.34
Charlotte C. Garver	Secretary, Feb. 24 to Apr. 24, 1948.	550.44
Elizabeth Voth	Secretary, May 1 to June 30, 1948.	622.32
Total		23,527.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported. 16,078.28
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948 ..... 34,060.42

Total amount expended from May to June 30, 1948 ..... 50,148.70
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1948 ..... 34,851.30

FOREST A. HARNESS,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JULY 15, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Willis J. Ballinger	Economic counsel	$3,999.78
Arvilla M. Benson	Stenographer	1,661.82
J. G. Crost	Staff investigator	727.84
Leo P. Cullinane	do	3,511.20
Margaret Denny	Stenographer	1,298.38
Virginia F. Flatley	do	1,399.44
James W. Forisel	Executive director	4,021.44
Margaret Korin	Stenographer	992.97
C. J. Reynolds, Jr.	File clerk	1,247.70
William J. Warmack	Accountant	53.53
Hilfred O. Wood	Stenographer	446.94
Paul O. Peters	Staff investigator	4,021.44

On hand, Jan. 1, 1948 ..... $2,208.34
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures 70,000.00

72,208.34

Amount of expenditures previously reported. .....
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to July 1, 1948. 28,719.53

Total amount expended. .....

Balance unexpended as of 43,488.81

WALTER C. PLOESER,
Chairman.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 1948

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, we have been privileged to enter upon a new day ladened with innumerable blessings and filled with tasks which challenge the consecration of our noblest manhood.

May this moment of fellowship in prayer be radiant with insight and inspiration as we address ourselves humbly and confidently to every duty and responsibility.

Help us to make a more daring trial of those moral and spiritual values which Thou hast ordained. Show us how we may implement them in the building of a social order in which mankind shall find its joy and peace.

In the name of the Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, Tuesday, July 27, be approved without reading.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the acting majority leader make a statement as to the plans of the majority for today's business.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be happy to do that. We are now proceeding under the morning hour. It was my intention to ask unanimous consent—and if the Senator prefers, I shall make the request now—that at the conclusion of the morning business——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will have to state that the approval of the Journal is the first order of business.

Mr. WHERRY. I will state now that a unanimous-consent request will be proposed, which I hope will be agreeable, that at the conclusion of the morning business the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.

I think that statement should be made, because I always want to keep the Senate advised of the contemplated procedure. I think that today what we should do is to proceed with the routine business of the morning hour, such as the introduction of bills and resolutions, and then if there are any speeches to be made they can be made at the proper time, following which the Senate should recess until tomorrow at noon. That is the procedure contemplated by the acting majority leader, and no other business is to be undertaken. So I can assure, and do assure, the distinguished Senator from Georgia that if the Journal is approved I shall immediately ask unanimous consent—and I am satisfied that it will be agreeable—that at the conclusion of the morning business, if the hour of 3 o'clock has not arrived, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2644. So once again I ask unanimous consent that the Journal be approved.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I inquire if the Chair ruled that the unanimous-consent request was not in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the Chair's view that the Journal has to be disposed of one way or the other as the first order of business, but, upon reflection, the Chair is of the opinion that a unanimous-consent agreement can probably be entered into by the Senate at any time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was certain of that, and I should like to have the Chair submit the unanimous-consent request proposed by the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well. The Chair will submit the unanimous-consent proposal just made by the Senator from Nebraska. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The question recurs on the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska regarding the approval of the Journal. Without objection, the Journal is approved.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under Public Law 636, the President pro tempore must appoint four Senators as members of the Washington and Lee Bicentennial Commission. The Chair appoints the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

REPORT ON FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the second quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-aid program authorized by Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress, approved December 17, 1947.

This report covers the period from January 1, 1948, through March 31, 1948, during which the flow of United States supplies to Austria, France, and Italy accomplished the purposes of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947—"to alleviate conditions of hunger and cold and prevent serious economic retrogression."

Pursuant to section 5 (d) of the act, this report also includes the statements of the governments of Austria, France, and Italy on the method of distribution and use of commodities made available under the act; the itemized list of commodities supplied each government, the average price at which each commodity was sold, and the gross proceeds derived from their sale; and the disposition of local currencies derived from these sales.

The supplies provided by the United States have freed the peoples of these three countries temporarily from the fear of starvation and want and enabled them to hold their economy intact until a long-range program could help them and other countries to a general European reconstruction. To the peoples of these countries, however, the gift of these supplies by the people of the United States meant something more—this aid represented also a symbol of hope for their future.

To us, the American people, our aid was an act of faith in a future in which freemen shall prevail. The freely expressed will of the Italian people in their national election has already confirmed that faith.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1948.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

WITHDRAWAL OF PLAN FOR CONSERVATION OF GRAIN BY BREWING INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture withdrawing compliance with the voluntary plan for the conservation of grain by the brewing industry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS FOR UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION PROJECTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for United States Atomic Energy Commission projects and of the request for compliance therewith which the Secretary of Commerce has issued to various members of the steel industry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EMPLOYMENT OF SPECIAL ASSISTANTS BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from January 1 to June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 10 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Three letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Viggo John Schmidt, Armando Pinto y Bisquerra, and Angele Charlotte Douthe nee Rivis or Simone Rivis or Simone Douthe, whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on December 15, 1947, January 15, and February 15, 1948, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Camilo Orestes Rafael Fanenal y Bertini from a report relating to aliens whose deportation was suspended by the Attorney General more than 6 months ago, and transmitted to the Senate on May 15, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS FOR WARM-AIR HEATING EQUIPMENT FOR RESIDENTIAL HOUSING

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for warm-air heating equipment for residential housing and of the request for compliance therewith issued by the Secretary of Commerce to the various steel producers and steel consumers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LIBERATION MEMORIAL STAMPS FOR GUAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a petition of the Guam Congress regarding a joint resolution passed by that Congress for the printing and issuance of Liberation Day memorial stamps on July 21, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL SUBMARINE CHASER TO UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the University of North Carolina had requested the Navy Department to transfer a submarine chaser for use by that university in connection with oceanographic and topographic studies and with surveys of the fishing grounds which are under the jurisdiction of the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF PROFESSORS AND INSTRUCTORS AT UNITED STATES NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on the number of professors and instructors and the amount of compensation for each, employed at the United States Naval Postgraduate School as a separate activity; to the Committee on Armed Services.

JOHN I. MALARIN

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report in favor of the relief of John I. Malarin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by the Post Office Department under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PENALTY MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 364, approved June 28, 1944, a report showing the quantity of penalty inscribed material on hand and on order on June 30, 1947, the number of pieces procured, estimated mailings, and estimated cost of handling for the period July 1, 1947, to March 31, 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON GOOSEBERRY PROJECT, UTAH

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on the Gooseberry project, Utah (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACTS OF LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the acts of the fourth regular session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, February 9 to April 15, 1948 (with an accompanying volume); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the forty-seventh annual report of the Governor of Puerto Rico, fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ORDINANCES OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Department under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of May 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON STOCK PILING BY MUNITIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Military Establishment Munitions Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report detailing the activities of that Board with respect to stock piling for the period January 1 to June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TIN SMELTER AT TEXAS CITY, TEX., AND PROGRAM FOR PURCHASE AND SALE OF TIN METAL

A letter from the Vice Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and the program for the purchase and sale of tin metal in the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON COORDINATION OF FORWARDING OF WATER-BORNE EXPORT AND IMPORT FOREIGN COMMERCE

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report (No. 15) of the action taken by that Commission under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON MERCHANT SHIP SALES

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report on that Commission on its activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON THE MERGER MOVEMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Merger Movement: A Summary Report" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL STEEL CARTELS

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of that Commission entitled "International Steel Cartels" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON MANUFACTURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM IMPLEMENTS

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report entitled "Manufacture and Distribution of Farm Implements" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT CARTEL

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of that Commission entitled "The International Electrical Equipment Cartel" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON PRODUCTION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY AND CAPACITY OF GENERATING PLANTS AND POWER MARKET SURVEY, COLORADO RIVER

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting two reports entitled "Production of Electric Energy and Capacity of Generating Plants in the United States," for the year 1946, and "Power Market Survey, Colorado River, Upper Basin, Part I—Power Requirements" (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourteenth annual report of that Administration for the calendar year ended December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

A letter from the president of the National Academy of Sciences, transmitting a report of that Academy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 199)

A letter from the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth semiannual report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Irish-American Unified Society, Yonkers, N. Y., favoring the unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Manhattan Wallace for President Conference, New York, N. Y., favoring the abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by F. Ben Brillantes, secretary general, Philippine Ex-Political Prisoners' Association, Manila, P. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant benefits to Filipino internees in Japanese prisons during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Morton I. E. Erlichman, of Philadelphia, Pa., relating to the loyalty probe of Government employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Alliance of Postal Employees, in convention at Richmond, Va., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Nixon un-American activities bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by District 50 of the Lions International, Wailuku, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation providing statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A paper in the nature of a petition from Arizona-United States Cancer Cure Society, signed by James O. McDowell, of Bisbee, Ariz., praying for the enactment of legislation to purchase a cancer-cure salve from Dr. Agnew, of Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the national conclave of Kappa Delta Rho Fraternity, in Chicago, Ill., favoring an increased exemption on income-tax payments to students in all accredited institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American Legion, Washington, D. C., signed by John Thomas Taylor, director, National Legislative Commission, praying for the enactment of House bill 4488, to create the Veterans' Homestead Act, and recommending the enactment of other legislation beneficial to veterans of World Wars I and II (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Conference for the Preservation and Advancement of Independent Business, of New York, N. Y., relating to inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Thomas J. Reardon, of Hartford, Conn., relating to price controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Mr. and Mrs. Max J. Oberhauser, of Butte, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation to reduce postage rates on gift parcels to foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Western Plant Board, Reno, Nev., favoring authority for airplane inspection by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWKES:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to proceed with all possible dispatch to the preparation and adoption of necessary legislation designed to encourage and make adequately effectual a comprehensive program of merchant shipbuilding in this country's shipyards and of expanding our merchant marine

"Whereas through the sale of our tankers and cargo carriers abroad, the export of our steel, and the failure to grant authority for the construction of needed merchant tonnage at home, our merchant marine and our shipbuilding activities have suffered drastic decline; and

"Whereas while our position in world shipping has thus deteriorated, other nations have achieved new highs in ship construction; and

"Whereas we have learned that we must depend upon our own resources of ships and shipbuilding for our national defense and security; and

"Whereas the present world situation requires that the United States stand fully prepared against any emergency: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby urged to proceed with all possible dispatch to the preparation and adoption of necessary legislation designed to encourage and make adequately effectual a comprehensive program of merchant-shipbuilding in this country's shipyards and of expanding our merchant marine.

"2. That the Secretary of State be and is hereby directed to transmit immediately following the passage of this joint resolution a copy thereof, properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress, and the Maritime Commission.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

"Approved July 16, 1948."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.)

RESOLUTION OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, HAGERSTOWN, MD.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, in convention at Hagerstown, Md., May 7-9, 1948. It calls attention to a matter of vital interest, particularly to disabled veterans, and requests that employers in private industry, as well as in the Federal and State Governments, give preference in employment to members of the armed forces returning to civilian life, with highest priority for those who have been disabled in the service.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas there appears to be a tendency on the part of employers in private industry, as well as in the Federal and State Governments, to forget the promise made by the citizens of this country through their legislators and the Congress that when the members of the armed forces would return to civilian life that they would be given preference for civilian employment and this preference as to those disabled in service would receive the highest of all such preference;

"Whereas this tendency is being evidenced by action of employers not only in private industry but also the State and Federal Governments and by various bills which have been introduced in the legislature and the Congress, to weaken that preference and in some cases to eliminate: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, in convention assembled at Hagerstown, Md., these 7th to 9th days of May 1948, That we reaffirm employment resolution No. 21, adopted at the 1947 national convention of the Disabled American Veterans and hereby repeat that resolution part as the resolution of this department convention:

" *'Now, therefore, be it*

" *'Resolved by the Disabled American Veterans assembled in its twenty-sixth annual convention at Las Vegas, Nev., August 17, 1947,* That we do hereby condemn any and all efforts that may be made by any other organization or individual to endeavor to take away any benefits that have previously been extended by Congress, or by any Federal agency, to service-disabled veterans, under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, or of any other laws, Executive order, regulations, instructions, or policies; and be it further

" *'Resolved by the Disabled American Veterans assembled in its twenty-sixth annual national convention at Las Vegas, Nev., August 17-23, 1947,* That the Disabled American Veterans shall use every resource to fight against any efforts to enact any laws in the United States Congress, or in any State, or any action through any governmental agency of the Federal Government, of any State, or of any municipality which would eliminate any rights, privileges, preferences, or benefits for any service-disabled veterans'; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution with an appropriate statement be personally presented by the department commander and the appropriate member of his staff to the Governor of the State of Maryland and to each Member of Congress from the State of Maryland.

"HAILE CHISHOLM,
"Commander, Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chapter, No. 10, Disabled American Veterans."

The above resolution passed by the Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, assembled at Hagernstown, Md., department convention, May 7-9, 1948.

JAMES F. AUBREY, Sr.,
Department Commander, 1948-49 Term.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of June 1948, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
June 30, 1948.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of June, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Leona V. MacKinnon, 1443 Spring Road NW.; Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency; annual salary, $5,905.20.

Fedele F. Fauri, 3227 Northampton Street NW.; Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; annual salary, $9,975.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, *Chairman.*

REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JUNE 30, 1948.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from December 31, 1947, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
George F. Meredith, executive director	$10,000.00	$5,000.00
Raymond R. Dickey, chief counsel	9,050.11	4,525.06
Bertram H. Wimer, chief investigator	8,418.10	4,209.05
Albert J. Wolken, special investigator	8,418.10	4,209.05
Albert E. Johnson, special counsel	[1] 25.00	3,600.96
Catherine Guyon, consultant	6,522.05	3,261.03
Homer Zopf, special investigator	[1] 25.00	1,647.18
William Broadgate, special counsel	[1] 25.00	1,639.65
Paul Hadlick, special counsel	[1] 25.00	1,333.30
Maxwell Dickey, special investigator	[1] 25.00	888.87
Allene J. Loveland, secretary	3,792.09	1,896.05
Pearl Mae Nichols, secretary	3,792.09	1,896.05
Dorothy Holshouser, editorial secretary	3,792.09	1,896.05
Mrs. Grace McNamara, secretary	3,212.80	1,606.40
Mrs. Alma Youse, secretary	3,212.80	1,606.40
Charlotte Southmayd, clerk	3,212.80	1,606.40
Virginia Lee Bauer, file clerk	2,633.40	1,316.70
Gene Wynes, messenger	2,004.20	229.01
John M. Payne, messenger	2,004.20	923.05
Jeanne M. Larson, clerk-typist	2,467.87	482.30
Marvel B. Spacensky, clerk-typist	2,467.87	113.00
John M. Frier, special investigator	[1] 25.00	905.10

[1] Per diem.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$215,000.00
Amount expended	142,027.08
Balance unexpended	72,972.92

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. MCCLELLAN introduced Senate bill 2898, to increase personal income tax exemptions, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 2899. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 the qualifying age for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2900. A bill to authorize the construction by the Tennessee Valley Authority of a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2901. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. IVES, and Mr. TOBEY) introduced Senate bill 2902, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 2903. A bill to repeal the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 2904. A bill to authorize the sale of the war housing project known as Custerdale in Manitowoc, Wis., to the city of Manitowoc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. BALL, Mr. THYE, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 2905. A bill to provide emergency relief for livestock farmers in drought-stricken areas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2906. A bill for the relief of Public School District No. 17, Winnebago, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. O'CONOR introduced Senate bill 2907, to provide pay increases for employees of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced Senate bill 2908, to check inflation and aid in preserving a competitive economic system by requiring publicity on the pricing policies of certain large corporations, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia introduced Senate bill 2909, to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. MCKELLAR):

S. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to build a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MCGRATH:

S. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution requiring persons and organizations registered as lobbyists to file weekly reports with the Clerk of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE OF PERSONAL INCOME-TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, which I send to the desk and ask for its appropriate reference.

The bill (S. 2898) to increase personal income-tax exemptions, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement as to the purposes of the measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arkansas to make a brief statement concerning the bill he has just introduced? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Have we reached the order of petitions and memorials?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order of petitions and memorials was reached, and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] asked unanimous consent to address the Senate in connection with the measure he has introduced.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to ask the Chair if following the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas the presentation of petitions and memorials would still be in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Following the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas the presentation of petitions and memorials would still be in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the bill which I have just introduced is to increase the personal exemption of Federal income-tax payers. After three long battles in the Congress we finally enacted into law at the regular session of Congress, over Presidential veto, a tax bill giving relief to all personal income-tax payers. There was a sharp difference of opinion with respect to the merits of the bill. There are those who still contend that it was and is simply a bill to help the rich and for the relief of the rich and not a bill to help the small-income taxpayer, who needs relief the most. Notwithstanding the criticism that has been made of the bill as finally enacted, respecting which I also voted to override the President's veto, I am sure we can all agree that the bill did not give as much relief to small-income earners as they deserve, and as much as we would have liked to have given them. But, Mr. President, those who criticize other provisions of the bill also would criticize the Congress for having removed the grossest inequity and discrimination that has existed in our tax structure. I refer, of course, to the split-income provision granting this right to the husbands and wives of 38 States of the Union, a privilege only enjoyed heretofore by 12 States that have community-property laws. It is also to criticize and condemn the effort of this Congress to give relief in small measure, at least, to the low-income groups of this Nation who now have to pay income taxes on their salaries and their small incomes, all of which are needed if they are to purchase and have the actual minimum essentials of life.

With the high national income which we have in this Nation today, with wages higher than ever before in the history of the Nation, with farm income at a peak, and with the cost of living, about which we hear so much, at possibly the highest level in the history of the Nation, the small-income groups are in real distress. If this is an extraordinary session of Congress to deal with urgent matters and to give relief to those who are oppressed, then this is a good way to start. Let us increase the personal income-tax exemptions so as to give relief to those who need it most.

The President of the United States has criticized the bill which was passed, but he has offered no substitute for it. He has offered nothing which would grant relief to the groups which he says were "stabbed in the back." Obviously he does not want tax relief for anyone.

I do not know what the program of the Republican majority in Congress is or will finally be. I do not know whether we are to stay here and deliberate and try to legislate under the conditions; but if we are, I ask the Republican majority to take up this bill, give it appropriate hearings in committee, and bring it to the floor of the House and Senate so that we may vote upon it at this session. If there is an emergency, if there is distress, and if there is an effort to give relief to a large group, of millions of our taxpayers, in my opinion this is the way to do it.

I shall ask to have incorporated in the RECORD an analysis of the bill. I shall not take time to read it, but I shall make a brief statement about it.

The bill as introduced would increase personal exemptions from the present figure of $600 per taxpayer to $1,000 for a single taxpayer, and $1,000 for each husband and wife. It may be said that that is a pretty big increase. It is, but it will afford relief that is badly needed.

The next question which arises is whether, under the present economic conditions and the heavy cost of Government today, together with the extraordinary programs which we are undertaking to finance, the Government can afford it. In other words, if this bill should pass, what would be the loss of revenue to the Federal Treasury? Having that question in mind, I have obtained estimates from the Treasury Department, and also from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the Congress. Those estimates vary somewhat, but I shall place them in the RECORD. In obtaining the estimate as to the amount of loss of revenue which would result if the bill which I am introducing today should be enacted, I also asked for an estimate as to the amount of loss of revenue which would be incurred if personal exemptions were increased to $900 per person, instead of $1,000. Then, as a very minimum, I asked what the loss would be if personal exemptions were increased to $750 per person. Let me give the estimates of the Treasury Department.

If personal exemptions were increased to $1,000 per person, the loss of revenue based upon present national income would be $3,600,000,000, and 12,600,000 taxpayers would be removed from the tax rolls.

If personal exemptions were increased to $900 per person instead of $1,000, the loss of revenue which would result would be $2,800,000,000, and 9,800,000 taxpayers would be removed from the tax rolls.

If the committees, after hearings and due study of this legislation, should conclude that we could not at this time absorb that much loss, in view of the anticipated cost of government and anticipated revenues, then, as a very minimum to give relief to those groups of our citizens, I suggest that the committee amend the bill so as to increase exemptions to $750 per person. If that were done, according to the Treasury estimate, a loss of revenue of only $1,500,000,000 would be incurred, based upon present national income; and 5,500,000 taxpayers would be removed from the tax rolls.

Mr. President, a great many things are done and said in a campaign year for political purposes. We hear that charge on every hand. The whole atmosphere here is now charged with such accusations. I am not introducing this bill for political purposes. I have no opponent in this election. However, I know the hardship which is now being imposed on our income earners because of the high cost of living and because of the Federal tax which is withheld from their pay envelopes. I am introducing this bill in absolute sincerity, and in the hope that if this Congress is to try to attend to those things which are of importance and are pressing, the Congress will take action on this bill. The bill would not go into effect until next year. It would afford no relief for this year's taxes, but would take effect for next year.

As I stated a moment ago, I do not know what course this Congress is to take or what will be the policy and procedure of the majority party. It may be that this will be nothing but a civil-rights session and a political dog fight from beginning to end. However, we can much better serve our country and serve the interest of humanity and human rights by dealing with legislation of this character and giving relief to the poor people of the Nation who are in distress, instead of wasting time in a political dog fight which would be a disgrace to the Congress of the United States.

The primary responsibility must rest upon him who has forced the issue and forced us into that situation; but the Republican Party can rise to true statesmanship at this hour. It does not have to force this battle; it can rise to true statesmanship and take up measures which are of importance in present world conditions and the condition in which this Government and this Nation finds itself. Thus the Republican Party can raise itself in the esteem of the American people. It is up to them. They have the majority. They have the power. I plead with them to take up measures of this character and others which will not tend to embitter any section of the country and will not serve to bring more strife and to emphasize abroad the disunity of our people. All that would be accomplished by such a course would be to furnish propaganda material to the enemies of this Nation, who would make far greater gains than either the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, or anyone else would make by forcing legislation which is so reprehensible and distasteful to as loyal a section and group of Americans as can be found anywhere in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief analysis of the bill, together with Treasury Department estimates of loss of revenue.

There being no objection, the analysis and estimates were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 2 of the attached bill would increase the basic personal income-tax exemptions for a taxpayer and his spouse from $600 each to $1,000 each. The remaining sections of the bill are of a technical nature, designed to implement the increase in exemptions provided for by section 2. The bill would not increase the exemptions now provided for old age, blindness, or dependents, but I recommend the appropriate committees study this with a view to making reasonable increases for them. A section by section analysis of the bill follows:

The first section gives the bill a short title "The Tax Reduction Act of 1949."

Section 2 provides for the increased personal exemptions described above.

Subsection (a) of section 3 increases the minimum gross income for which a declaration of estimated tax is required from $600 per annum to $1,000 per annum in order to make it correspond to the increased exemptions provided for by section 2.

Subsection (b) of section 3 amends sections 1622 (a) and 1622 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for withholding exemptions corresponding to the increased exemptions provided for by section 2.

Subsection (c) of section 3 amends section 1622 (h) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code by dividing the substance of subparagraph (D) into two subparagraphs (D) and (E) relating, respectively, to the basic withholding exemption for the taxpayer's spouse and the withholding exemptions for old age and blindness of the taxpayer's spouse. This change makes it easier to refer to these exemptions in the table contained in section 1622 (b) (1) of the Code as it would be amended by section 3 (b) of the bill. Subsection (c) of section 3 also changes the language of section 1622 (h) (2) of the Code to make it applicable to the increased withholding exemptions provided for by section 3 (b) of the bill.

Subsection (d) of section 3 increases the minimum gross income or payment for which individual, fiduciary, and information returns are required from $600 per annum to $1,000 per annum, in view of the increased exemptions provided by section 2.

Subsection (e) of section 3 raises the credit allowed to an estate in lieu of the exemptions provided by section 25 (b) (1) of the code from $600 to $1,000 so that it corresponds to the increased personal exemption.

Subsection (f) of section 3 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to make such changes in the optional tax tables and the wage bracket withholding tables as may be necessary to reflect the increased exemptions provided for by section 2.

Section 4 of the bill makes the bill applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948.

Section 5 provides that the bill shall be applicable on a pro rata basis to taxable years beginning in 1948 and ending in 1949.

Respectfully,

HARKER T. STANTON,
Assistant Counsel.

JULY 27, 1948.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON
INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, July 23, 1948.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: The following estimates are furnished pursuant to your telephone request of July 19, 1948, to Mr. Smith of this office.

The estimated revenue loss in a full year of operation with personal income of $209,000,000,000 from various changes in the present law per capita exemptions for individuals is as follows:

1. Seven hundred and fifty dollars for single persons, $1,500 for married couples, and $600 for each dependent. Revenue loss, $1,847,000,000.

2. Nine hundred dollars for single persons, $1,800 for married couples, and $600 for each dependent. Revenue loss, $3,604,000,000.

3. One thousand dollars for single persons, $2,000 for married couples, and $600 for each dependent. Revenue loss, $4,758,000,000.

Respectfully yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

JULY 23, 1948.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your letter of July 19, 1948, requesting the estimated revenue loss from three plans for increasing the personal exemption of single persons and married persons from the present level of $600 per capita.

The following table presents estimates for the calendar year 1948 of the decreases in tax liability and in the number of taxable-income recipients from present law under each of the three personal-exemption plans:

Personal exemptions			Estimated calendar year 1948 decrease in tax liability from present law	Estimated calendar year 1948 decrease in number of taxable income recipients from present law
Single persons	Married couples [1]	Dependents		
			Billions of dollars	*Millions of income recipients*
$750	$1,500	$600	1.5	5.3
$900	1,800	600	2.8	9.8
$1,000	2,000	600	3.6	12.6

[1] It is assumed that the first dependent of a single person would qualify the taxpayer as the head of a family and entitle him to the married couple's exemption.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS SHERE,
Director of Tax Research.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. This is a simple amendment changing the date of eligibility of the displaced persons now in the camps in the American zones in Germany and Austria. The act, which was passed, fixed the date as December 22, 1945. Our bill calls for a change in this date to April 21, 1947, in order to make eligible a substantial number of displaced persons, estimated at 180,000, who came into our zones in Germany and Austria after 1945. Practically all of this group are persecuted Jewish people who fled into our camps, particularly from Poland, because of the fear of anti-Semitism. Since there are now only about 200,000 displaced persons of Jewish faith in our charge, the present law as it stands would exclude about 90 percent of the total. It is inconceivable that the United States should bar the eligibility of these unfortunate persecuted people who are people without a country and who above all others suffered from the tragic Hitler regime and its aftermath.

It is our belief that the passage of this bill will bring about a fuller cooperation of the other nations of the world with the United States in providing resettlement for all the DP groups. In this way we can cooperate most fully with the International Refugee Organization and can move toward a final solution of our responsibility for those who are in the American zones in Germany and Austria.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Debate is not in order during the morning hour. May the Chair again respectfully suggest to Senators, it is perfectly obvious that during the special session it is going to be absolutely necessary to observe the rules of the Senate with some degree of fidelity. No discussion is possible in the morning hour, except by unanimous consent. If any Senator wishes to make remarks in the morning hour, the Chair asks that he obtain unanimous consent before he does so.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, would the Chair allow a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Certainly.

Mr. TOBEY. Would it be inconsistent with the ruling of the Chair, just uttered and expressed, for me to ask the Senator from New Jersey to yield to me, in order that I may ask the privilege of having my name joined to the names of other Senators in favor of the bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks it is against the rules, but under the circumstances the request will be considered, in order to save time, and agreed to.

Mr. TOBEY. As the Spaniard would say, muchas gracias.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator for asking to be identified with the introduction of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That takes care of that.

The bill (S. 2902) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. IVES, and Mr. TOBEY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMPLOYEES

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide increased compensation for District of Columbia employees, on the same basis as that granted to other employees of Federal agencies and departments.

Having participated both as a member of the Senate Civil Service Committee and as a conferee on the pay increase bill in the closing hours of the session, in the prolonged discussions incident to consideration of the proposed increase, I am convinced that the cost-of-living increment given to other Federal employees is merited just as richly by the workers in the various District of Columbia offices and agencies.

The continuing upswing in the cost of practically all living essentials makes it imperative that these employees of the District of Columbia be given some assistance toward balancing the family budget.

The bill (S. 2907) to provide pay increases for employees of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. O'CONOR, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLICITY OF PRICING POLICIES OF CERTAIN CORPORATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a

bill to check inflation and aid in preserving a competitive economic system by requiring publicity of the pricing policies of certain large corporations, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill together with the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2908) to check inflation and aid in preserving a competitive economic system by requiring publicity on the pricing policies of certain large corporations, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress recognizes (1) that mounting prices and mounting profits are undermining the purchasing power of the Nation and are setting the stage for a new depression, all at a time when international recovery and world peace depend in great measure upon stopping inflation, and (2) that a few giant corporations have control over the production, the distribution, and the price of basic commodities upon which all American economy depends. The Congress believes that inflation will be checked if the pricing policies of these corporate giants are publicly reviewed before increased prices may be made effective, and to that end the provisions of this act are enacted.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this act—

(1) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

(2) The term "essential commodity" means any commodity which basically affects the cost of living or industrial or agricultural production ", as determined and made public from time to time by the Federal Trade Commission."

(3) The term "person" includes individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

PROHIBITION AGAINST CERTAIN PRICE INCREASES WITHOUT NOTICE

SEC. 3. No corporation in any industry engaged in the production of essential commodities for commerce, 30 percent or more of the annual output of which is produced by five or less of the producers in such industry, shall, either directly or through any subsidiary, affiliate, individual, or other person, fix any price for any essential commodity in excess of the price charged therefor by such producer in the ordinary channels of trade on July 27, 1948, until such corporation has complied with the provisions of section 4 of this act and until a public hearing has been held as required by such section. The Federal Trade Commission shall determine and make public from time to time the industries to which this section applies.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO INCREASE PRICES—PUBLIC HEARING

SEC. 4. (a) Any corporation desiring to make any price increase referred to in section 3 shall file with the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Federal Trade Commission a notice of intention to increase prices, particularly describing the commodity or commodities to which any increase is to be applied and indicating the extent and proposed effective date of such increase. Not later than 30 days after such notice has been given the Federal Trade Commission shall call a public hearing on the proposed increase at which it shall be the duty of the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce to examine such corporation with respect to the reasons for and the justifiability of the proposed increase and to take testimony on the impact of such increase on the economy of the Nation. At such public hearing all persons desiring to be heard shall be allowed to appear and give testimony either for or against the proposed increase under rules to be prescribed by the Federal Trade Commission.

(b) For the purpose of any such hearing the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 49 and 50), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce under this act; and the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce may designate examiners or other personnel from their respective agencies to administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

(c) The Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce shall make a joint report to the Congress upon such hearing and shall submit in connection therewith their joint or separate recommendations, if any, for additional action.

PENALTIES

SEC. 5. Any corporation violating the provisions of section 3, and any officer or agent of such corporation or any person acting for or employed by such corporation who shall knowingly and willfully participate in any such violation, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

PROTECTION AGAINST REPRISAL

SEC. 6. Any corporation which either directly or indirectly refuses to do business with any person by reason of the fact that such person has given testimony at any hearing held under section 4, and any officer or agent of such corporation or any person acting for or employed by such corporation who shall knowingly and willfully participate in such action, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both; and any such person who shall be injured in his business or property by the action of such corporation in so refusing, may sue therefor in any district court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the costs of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated so much as may be necessary to enable the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce to carry out their respective functions under this act.

The statement by Mr. O'MAHONEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE OR THE PROFITEERS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Congress is face to face with the issue: The people or the profiteers.

Both major parties have recognized the plain fact that the cost of living is higher now than at any time in history. It will not do for Congress to waste its time in fruitless debate about who or what is responsible for this condition. It is here. The question is, What are we, the only legislative power of the Nation, going to do about it? We must act or drift. If we act, we can stop inflation now. If we drift, it will become steadily worse and create a constantly growing demand for more and more drastic action.

I am introducing a bill to hold inflation immediately by stopping price increases on basic commodities, the supply of which is controlled by a handful of corporate managers and the prices of which are likewise fixed by management.

When three or four giant corporations can fix the prices and the supply for the basic commodities in daily use by 140,000,000 Americans—and this is the situation—it is time to realize that the people of the United States have become the subjects of private economic government over which their Congress declines to exercise any restraining influence, although it has the constitutional power to do so.

As I have already pointed out, three meat-packing corporations produce 43 percent of all the processed meat consumed by all the people of the United States. They also fix the prices, and their corporate reports show that they are making record profits. There are 121 basic products in common use throughout the United States by business for industrial production and by the people for their daily living which are under such concentrated control that in 1937 more than 75 percent of the total output of each commodity was manufactured by only four firms. These commodities range from meat and corn sirup to steel, milk bottles, and cigarettes to gasoline, tires, tin cans, and window glass. There is scarcely a commodity in daily demand from the building of homes to living in them that is not subject to this concentrated control.

My proposal is simple—it is merely that no corporation engaged in the production of essential commodities, 30 percent or more of the annual output of which is produced by five or less of the producers in the industry, may increase the price for such a commodity without first filing with the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Federal Trade Commission a notice of intention to increase the price, and no such price will be permitted until within 30 days after the filing of such notice the Federal Trade Commission shall have called a public hearing on the proposed increase at which the producer shall be subjected to examination as to the reasons for and the justifiability for the propcsed increase.

This proposal requires no new machinery. The Federal Trade Commission now has the power to conduct such investigations. The only thing new about this proposal is that the hearings shall be held before profiteering takes place and not afterward when it can do the people no good.

It will be effective because the giant corporations which control the supply and fix the prices of the commodities 140,000,000 people must buy will be unwilling to subject themselves to cross examination about their pricing policies and their gigantic profits.

The National City Bank of New York City, in its economic letter of June 1948, reported that the net income after taxes of the 100 largest manufacturing corporations increased in 1947 91 percent over the net income after taxes in 1945. The jump was from $1,943,000,000 in 1945 to $3,730,000,000. The income of these corporations is so great that they are plowing it back into plant expansion and thus gaining a still larger control over the production of industrial commodities in the United States.

Congress has not hesitated to enforce a cooling off period on organized labor which may not sell its commodity for the price it demands under the Railway Labor Act and the Taft-Hartley Act until a certain period of time has elapsed. If we can freeze the wages of labor, certainly we can freeze the prices at which concentrated business organization sells its products particularly when the public interest demands that Congress halt inflation.

These corporations are collectivist institutions which are managed not by their owners, the stockholders, but by hired executive managers. They are setting the pattern for political collectivism and unless Congress acts to stop this concentration of economic power the battle to prevent political collectivism in the United States will be on us before we know it.

The measure I suggest is a perfectly constitutional proposal. The men who drafted the Constitution of the United States gave to Congress the power to regulate commerce. This power does not belong to the President. It does not belong to the courts. It belongs to the Congress, and if the Members of Congress choose not to exercise this power, they will not only be abandoning the people to the profiteers but they will be abandoning their constitutional duty to protect a democratic economy in a democratic system.

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FINANCE ACT

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "Educational Facilities Finance Act," and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in explanation of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2909) to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

I am offering today an educational facilities finance act, which might be an alternative to the Educational Finance Act passed by the Senate last April which has not been acted on by the House.

I voted against the Taft bill primarily because I knew the States could not get the kind of aid it proposed without Government control, which ultimately would involve the question of segregation. Even if the House should pass the bill in the form approved by the Senate, without injecting the segregation issue, there is no assurance that a future Congress will not amend the provisions under which the grants are made.

Moreover, the Taft bill would not solve the problem of Virginia or of other Southern States. It is not sufficient merely to increase the salaries of present teachers. We must have a more efficient system, which necessitates the consolidation of small units and that means new buildings for the grade schools as well as for the high schools. This building program is the biggest need.

Under the plan proposed in my bill, schools could be built promptly by local agencies which would be allowed to repay their share of the cost in easy installments over a 20-year period. This would release funds that could be used for increasing teachers salaries and for other purposes.

Unlike the Taft bill, my proposal would not involve the Federal Government in a program of recurring annual contributions that would permanently increase the national budget. Nor would localities become so dependent on a Federal contribution that they would find themselves helpless to resist some future attempt to tie strings to the funds, dictating qualifications for teachers, prescribing curricula, or forbidding segregation.

I knew I was doing an unpopular thing in voting against the Taft bill because everyone recognizes the need for improving our education system. But I felt the long-range danger of that plan outweighed the advantage my State would immediately enjoy through receiving Federal funds that would be larger than the State's proportional contribution.

I feel that my bill has the advantages without the dangers of the Taft plan.

We need better schools in every part of the Nation and especially for the colored people of Virginia and the South. My State and others are trying to provide the necessary facilities with inadequate funds and I know of no better way to help them than by such a building program as I have proposed.

My bill would designate the RFC as fiscal agent for distributing $300,000,000 of outright grants and for advancing another $300,000,000 of loans to be secured by bonds of school districts. The interest rate on these bonds would be fixed at 2½ percent, making the money available as cheaply as possible without any cost to the Government for this portion of the program. The RFC is the best agency, it seems to me, for handling this program without exerting any pressure on the States or giving the Federal Government even a latent power to usurp the functions of local self-government in the important field of education.

Funds would be divided among the States on the basis of the proportion of the number of children of school age (5 to 17) in each State to the total number of children of this age in the Nation. Allocations within each State would be made by the State board of education or the agency performing similar functions and each local project would require approval by the State agency.

THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I have just returned from several weeks spent in my home State of Indiana. On every hand and on the tip of almost every tongue there one hears the question, "Are we going to have war?"

For many months the newspaper correspondents and the radio commentators have poured out millions of words relative to the tense situation that now exists between this country and Soviet Russia.

Repeated requests have been made to the State Department and the administration by this body and by Members of the House of Representatives for complete information relative to the controversy over the situation in which we find ourselves in occupied Berlin.

Three years ago representatives of the United States took the lead, acting with representatives of 49 other nations, in writing at San Francisco the Charter for the United Nations. This great world organization was launched in the belief and hope it would be a potent organization for settling international disputes and avoiding future armed conflict. It is time now to test the capabilities of the United Nations as an organization that can resolve international differences around the conference table and avoid the war which so many in our country believe is so imminent.

If the United Nations is a potent organization, then the American-Soviet controversy should be submitted to it for amicable settlement. If it is powerless to settle such differences, then in my opinion it is an impotent organization, lacking the possibilities of fulfilling the hope so fervently expressed at San Francisco and throughout the world 3 years ago.

I now offer a resolution declaring it to be the sense of the United States Senate that the present controversy between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair in his capacity as a Senator from Michigan would have to object if there should be no other objection raised.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I inquire if the Senator from Indiana desires to have the resolution taken up for consideration immediately without reference to the committee?

Mr. JENNER. I have asked unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I consider the problem one of the most important ones confronting this Nation and the world.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, without in any way passing on the substantive merits of what the Senator from Indiana says, it seems to me that a matter of this kind, being of such far-reaching character, should have the benefit of committee investigation and study.

Mr. JENNER. Why far reaching?

Mr. LODGE. I think it is very far reaching. I think it has all sorts of implications which involve the security and the peace of the world, and it seems to me that the resolution ought to have the benefit—and I say it is in the friendliest spirit to my friend from Indiana—of committee investigation and study. So for that reason at this moment I should feel constrained to object.

Mr. JENNER. The United Nations organization was set up 3 years ago. It is a functioning organization. Only recently it has been recommended that we appropriate $65,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money to build it a permanent home. So it is time to test the organization. If it is to exist as a going organization, if it is to fulfill the hope of peace of the people of the world, let us give it a chance to act, and not to continue to circumvent every time an international problem arises.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a point of order. Are not the present proceedings out of order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The discussion is out of order. The question is whether or not unanimous consent shall be given which the Senator from Indiana is asking.

Mr. LODGE. I object.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, is the request for immediate consideration out of order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over under the rule, or be referred, whichever the Senator from Indiana prefers. Which does the Senator prefer?

Mr. JENNER. I prefer that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over under the rule.

The resolution (S. Res. 267), submitted by Mr. JENNER, was ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the present controversy between the United States and the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics with respect to restrictions imposed upon the movement of personnel, supplies, and materials between the occupation zones of Germany and the occupation sectors of Berlin should be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations organization and that the President should instruct the United States Representative in the Security Council to take such action as may be necessary to present this matter to the Security Council for immediate consideration and settlement.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the President of the United States has called the Congress into extraordinary session. When I heard the President announce at the Philadelphia convention that he would call the Congress into session on the 26th day of July, I immediately made the statement that I would offer a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the two Houses of Congress immediately after they were called into session. I made that statement because I believed it would not be in the best interests of the people of the United States to have the Congress convene in session at this particular time.

If we could accomplish the two things the President has set forth in his message to Congress and has asked the Congress to accomplish, that would be all right. Let us read them now, as set forth in his statement:

The urgent needs of the American people require our presence here today.

Our people demand legislative action by their Government to do two things. First, to check inflation and the rising cost of living; and second, to help in meeting the acute housing shortage.

Those are the two things the President set forth. In his message other things are enumerated, but only by slight reference. Those two things could be the only reason for calling an extraordinary session of Congress.

I notice in the morning newspaper that it is stated that the Republican leaders of Congress plan a quick adjournment. The headline reads:

Republican leaders plan quick adjournment; special session is branded political maneuver; Truman asks for controls, housing action.

Those are the only two things mentioned there.

If the Congress could get down to business and could pass a proper housing bill and could do something about the rising cost of living, then the Congress could very well stay in session and do something. But judging from the rumors I hear, instead of taking up those two subjects, the Senate will attempt to take up the whole civil-rights program, which happened to be mentioned briefly on page 6 of the President's message to Congress, at the tail end of his message, so to speak. The President did not urge very strongly that anything be done about civil rights, as we observe if we read his message closely. That situation is not a national emergency at the present time.

Mr. President, what will develop here if an attempt is made at this session of the Congress to have the Congress, and particularly the Senate, enact civil-rights legislation? What will happen at this session? I fear that what will happen will be that the majority party in the Senate will bring up such matters as antilynching legislation and anti-poll-tax legislation. Probably anti-poll-tax legislation will be proposed first, judging from the word which comes on the grapevine, from which I receive my information. If we start the fight on anti-poll-tax legislation, the Republican Party knows what will happen, for it has a little bit of sense. The Republican Party knows very well that that will bring about a prolonged debate in the Senate. When that happens, let them not attempt to lay the blame at the feet of the southern Democrats, for we shall not be the ones who will undertake to bring up such legislation. I wish the world to know who brings those bills to the front, in an attempt to block the consideration of legislation needed at the present time in the United States.

I now offer my resolution, and I wish to read it to the Senate. It corresponds somewhat to the Republican adjournment resolution of the last session, so the Republicans cannot object to it. They can call the Congress back in session, if that should become necessary. I now read my resolution:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 60

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, July 31, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. President, it will be noted that my resolution gives to the majority party the right to reconvene the Congress, and, of course, the President can recall it in case of dire emergency. At the present time, immediately after the two national conventions and before the general election in November, Mr. President, you know as well as I do that there will be some nice politics played here, which probably will not be for the interests of the people of the United States, because—let us face facts—the majority party in the Senate, since I have been serving here, has not always acted for the best interests of the common people of America.

Let me again warn you, Mr. President, that we have had a bipartisan foreign program; but if the Congress stays in session 4 weeks, 5 weeks—it is out of the question to pass the necessary legislation in 2 weeks, 2 months, or what not—the Nation, and especially the Senate of the United States, will be stirred to such fever heat that the bipartisan foreign policy will no longer exist. The peace of the world will then probably have been jeopardized, and probably seeds will have been planted which will eventually develop and grow into a third world war. That is how serious the situation is as I see it.

Not only that; we want peace not only here in the Senate, we want peace on the home front. Mr. President, when such issues as civil rights are brought up, if you go down into my State you will find out what I am talking about. You will find down there that that issue is so hot they will hardly let me sit down when I return home. That issue is hot, it is stirring up strife and discontent here in the United States, making a fertile bed in which the Communists may plant their seed. Those who bring up that issue, I here and now tell them, are aiding and abetting the Communists. Communists thrive where there is discontent.

That being so, as I see it at the present time, nothing good can come out of this session of the Congress. For that reason, I am submitting this resolution, asking that it be printed and lie over, to be taken up either tomorrow or Friday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and will lie over under the rule.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. HAYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair respectfully suggest that debate is not in order until the morning hour is concluded. The morning hour is nearly concluded. Debate will be in order shortly.

EMPLOYMENT OF PAGES

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 263), as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms hereby is authorized to employ 21 pages for duty in the Senate Chamber, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from July 22, 1948, to and including the third day following the final recess or adjournment of the Congress, at the basic rate of $1,800 per annum.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The rules require that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee, but, by unanimous consent, the rules can be waived.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rules be waived.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that the rules be waived. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained permission for a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to hold sessions while the present session of Congress continues.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a matter which comes over from the previous session, and asks the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. When House bill 6959, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, came over from the House, the Senator from Louisiana objected to the second reading of the bill. Therefore the bill has never been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is the Chair's understanding that the Senator from Louisiana is now willing to have the bill read the second time and referred to the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask that the bill be read the second time, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will now be read the second time by title.

The bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was read the second time by title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill is referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction over housing matters.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 261), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of S. 2633, a bill to amend section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and that said bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the resolution go over without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will go over.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech of acceptance delivered by President Truman at the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH OF SENATOR BARKLEY AS TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech delivered by him as temporary chairman of the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR BARKLEY'S SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE AT DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech of acceptance delivered by him at the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE 1948 DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MCMAHON BEFORE THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MCMAHON before the Democratic National Convention on July 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SITUATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY — STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him on the subject of the Democratic Party, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE 1948 PLATFORM OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the 1948 platform of the Republican Party, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY GOVERNOR DEWEY

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, accepting the nomination as President of the United States, delivered at the Republican Convention, Philadelphia, Pa., June 25, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY GOVERNOR WARREN

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech by Gov. Earl Warren, accepting nomination as Vice President of the United States, at the Republican Convention, Philadelphia, Pa., June 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ISSUED BY REPUBLICAN LEADERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued on July 27, 1948, by the Republican leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives with a view to its presentation to their respective Republican conferences for consideration, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECORD OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the record of the Eightieth Congress, delivered by Senator WHERRY before the Republican National Convention, at Philadelphia, Pa., on June 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

KEYNOTE SPEECH BY FRANK M. DIXON AT SOUTHERN STATES CONVENTION

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the keynote speech delivered by Frank M. Dixon at the Southern States Convention held at Birmingham, Ala., July 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of civil rights, delivered by Samuel B. Pettengill over the ABC network on July 25, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS AND STATES' RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast on the subject of civil rights and States' rights, delivered by Samuel B. Pettengill over the ABC network on February 29, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE AND EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Worcester Telegram of June 21, 1948, relating to the counting of electoral votes for President and Vice President, together with a statement prepared by himself, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT UNITY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Harmony at the Conference Table," written by him and published in the July 1948 issue of the magazine Partners, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AND STATE TAXATION—LETTER FROM ROBERT B. DRESSER

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding State and Federal taxation, addressed by Robert B. Dresser, of Providence, R. I., to Governor Hildreth, of Maine, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM ECONOMICS—ARTICLE BY HENRY HAZLITT

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Democratic Platform Economics," written by Henry Hazlitt and published in Newsweek for July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND THE CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY JOHN O'DONNELL

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by John O'Donnell, written under the headline "Capitol Stuff" in the July 28 issue of the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARRIVAL OF JET PLANES IN GERMANY—ARTICLE BY ANSEL E. TALBERT

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the arrival of 16 American jet planes in Germany, written by Ansel E. Talbert, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TAX ON MARGARINE AND COLOR—STATEMENT BY HUNTER A. GIBBES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the Federal tax on margarine and color, by Hunter A. Gibbes, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS—WHEN AND HOW?—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Civil Rights—When and How?" published in the Christian Science Monitor of July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONVENING OF CONGRESS—LETTER FROM T. J. WERTENBAKER

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by him under date of July 16, 1948, from Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, relating to the convening of Congress by the President, which appears in the Appendix.]

SEGREGATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to commend and congratulate Gen. Omar Bradley, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States. After the long struggle we had in passing selective service legislation some 2 months ago, the statement in yesterday morning's newspapers that the President of the United States by Executive order had attempted to undo what the Senate did when the amendments were defeated here, makes it necessary for me, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, to say here that it was my understanding with the Army officials at all the committee meetings that they would retain segregation. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read General Bradley's statement, but I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, so that the people of the United States may know what General Bradley thinks and what General Eisenhower testified to before our committee, regardless of what President Truman may say.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY TO KEEP SEGREGATION, BRADLEY SAYS—NUMBER OF DRAFTEES MAY BE FURLOUGHED BECAUSE OF HOUSING

FORT KNOX, KY., July 27.—Chief of Staff Gen. Omar Bradley told a news conference today that the Army will keep racial segregation as long as the Nation does.

"The Army is not out to make any social reforms," said Bradley. "The Army will put men of different races in different companies. It will change that policy when the Nation as a whole changes it."

Lt. Gen. Willard Paul, director of personnel, said the Army might find it necessary to furlough a number of new draftees as soon as they are inducted because housing and training facilities possibly will not be available.

Bradley and Paul are here attending a 3-day conference of high-ranking officers studying the possible adaptation of universal military training policies to all Army training.

Bradley told the Army's top brass that they must treat incoming selectees in a way that will send them back to civilian life as friends of the Army.

"Sure, we will have discipline and the caste system and we will keep the men busy," Bradley declared, but he added "we must treat our men as individuals and not as rows of men lined up on the parade field before us."

The Army's Chief of Staff said the Army had itself to blame for its status as "the favorite whipping boy of the country." He told the high-ranking officers they must work to sell the Army to the public, "instead of blasting their superiors and bragging about low prices in the post exchange."

Bradley said the caste system will remain in the Army, "and we need to make no apologies for it." The caste system, Bradley said, is the same in industry, "and really it's only the just reward for those who work hardest."

Separate clubs will be maintained for officers and enlisted men to maintain respect for rank, Bradley said, but he added he saw nothing wrong with officers and enlisted men who are close friends attending private parties together.

PROPOSAL FOR IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST FEDERAL JUDGE J. WAITES WARING

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of a telegram received by me from Mr. Alan Johnstone, of Newberry, S. C. I also request that my answer to Mr. Johnstone be printed.

In his telegram Mr. Johnstone requested me to bring impeachment proceedings against Federal Judge J. Waites Waring. In my reply I reminded Mr. Johnstone that, under the law, any such action must necessarily begin in the House of Representatives.

I have previously condemned Judge Waring for his actions in reaching beyond the jurisdiction of his court, and I still feel that he exceeded his authority in his orders to the Democratic Party of South Carolina. There is no precedent in South Carolina for his actions in a civil case.

I simply wanted to take this opportunity to say to the people of South Carolina and to my colleagues in the Senate that such action as has been requested of me can originate only in the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the telegram and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWBERRY, S. C.

The Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Impeach Judge Waring in the Senate. These orders by which he makes war on South Carolina, white and black, and in which he has gone beserk and dishonors the memory of Woodrow Wilson, Senator Smith, and yourself. This setting aside of our best traditions of a good life together, fair play, and a fair hearing. For it is not the good conduct which the Constitution demands of a judge with life tenure. All our people, including Negro citizens, deserve better conduct than this and can no longer risk the prejudice it stirs up.

ALAN JOHNSTONE.

JULY 26, 1948.

ALAN JOHNSTONE,
Care of County Chairman,
County Campaign, Newberry, S. C.:

Yours. You are a lawyer and should know that impeachment proceedings must be brought in the House of Representatives.

BURNET R. MAYBANK.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERALISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a speech which I delivered on July 8, 1948, before the National Education Association at Cleveland, Ohio, on the subject, The Republican Party and Constitutional Liberalism.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, fellow teachers, and guests, I address you as fellow teachers because over a period of more than 20 years I too was entrusted with the great responsibility of teaching young men and women in the classrooms of three universities. I think I understand and appreciate some of the problems which confront the teaching profession and the school administrators of our country.

Of one thing you may be sure and that is I am well aware of the fact that neither the Democratic Party nor the Republican Party has measured up as yet to its clear responsibility to put into effect a national policy which will assure an equality of educational opportunity for America's boys and girls.

I hold to the proposition that an educated citizenry is democracy's greatest strength and our Nation's greatest potential wealth. I say potential wealth because the sad fact is that we still must talk about equality of educational opportunity in America in terms of a future goal because equality of educational opportunity does not exist in fact in our country today.

It is not necessary for me to point out to you teachers and school administrators that in a very real sense the educational opportunities of an American boy or girl are still determined in a large measure by the State and locality in which he or she is born and raised through the period of schoolhood.

Unfortunately, the question as to whether or not those educational opportunities will be rich or poverty stricken depends upon the tax-producing economic assets of their local communities.

There are other barriers to providing our children of America, no matter where they live, with an equality of educational opportunities such as discrimination because of race, color, or creed.

However, the primary cause for the great disparity in educational opportunities in this country is the failure of the Congress of the United States to date to recognize the importance of making democracy work in this country by passing a fair and adequate Federal aid to education bill so that all of our boys and girls can enjoy the freedom, inspiration, and intellectual wealth which are the natural and inevitable products of enlightened minds.

Oh, yes, I know that S. 472, the Federal aid to education bill which several of us, including Senator THOMAS of Utah, cosponsored in the Senate this year under the authorship of Mr. TAFT, of Ohio, was not a perfect bill in that it did not meet with the complete approval of all school authorities and of all educational groups in America. However, it was a vitally important bill in that it sought to establish the principle which needs to be established that our Federal Government does have a responsibility in providing funds on an equitable basis, subject to State administration, control and spending, so that there can be provided throughout the country at least a uniform minimum standard of educational opportunity for all our children.

I was happy to work for the passage of that bill through the Senate, knowing full well that if we could write it into the statute books of our Government we could perfect it in the future from time to time as we learned from experience through its administration.

If we were to wait for perfection in the bills which are considered by Congress or for unanimity of opinion of all parties interested

in a given bill, such as the Federal aid to education bill for example, we would never succeed in making social progress through legislation.

We were successful in passing S. 472 through the Senate but it died a smothering death in the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

However, the issue of Federal aid to education is not dead and candidates for high political office of both major political parties must be required to face the issue until our Government keeps faith with the educational needs of the children of America.

Not only our politicians but our people, generally, need to ponder the truth of the teachings of Jefferson when he said:

"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be. Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppression will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day."

I hope you will pardon this rather long introduction to the subject matter of my address, The Republican Party and Constitutional Liberalism.

However, as a constitutional liberal, I thought it particularly appropriate that I make clear to my audience at the outset of my speech my position on the issue of Federal aid to education.

I do not wish to give the impression that all members of the Republican Party in the last session of Congress share my view on this issue because, if they did, S. 472 would be a law today. Nevertheless I also wish to point out that if a sufficient number of Democrats in the last session of Congress had shared the views of those Republicans who were supporting Federal aid to education, S. 472 would have been enacted into law. In other words, I would point out to you that most issues involving social legislation, such as the Federal aid to education bill, cut across party lines in the Congress of the United States.

Although some politicians and party partisans seek to convince the American people that their party, be it Republican or Democratic, is chiefly responsible for all the good things accomplished by the Congress and the opposition party is responsible for all the shortcomings of the Congress, I hope that I shall always be nonpartisan enough to face the fact that coalitions and alinements of both Republicans and Democrats in the Congress of the United States are responsible for the passage of sound social legislation which seeks to promote social justice. I wish to add quickly that coalitions and alinements of both Republicans and Democrats also frequently succeed in blocking, smothering, or defeating legislation which seeks to promote the common good.

I do not think we help the cause of truth any in political campaigns by seeking to give the American people the impression that one's own party and the men in it are the only sincere advocates of the country's best welfare and that the opposition party and its leaders seek to destroy our constitutional rights as a free people.

Such blind partisanship and political extravaganza make a very bad impression upon fair-minded voters and particularly upon independent voters, who hold the balance of power in every election, because such tactics are revolting to the average American's sense of fair play and sportsmanship.

Thus, from this platform tonight I would give the gratuitous advice to the thousands of campaign workers in my party who are going to wage a great campaign for a Republican victory in November to remember that we are not running against Franklin Roosevelt.

The members of my party, including candidates as well as campaign workers, should remember that Franklin Roosevelt was the choice for President of millions of American voters on four different occasions. Irrespective of what differences of opinion we may hold as to his position and record on certain great issues, he, nevertheless, will be recorded in history as both a great American President and as a great world statesman.

I say that as a Republican who openly campaigned against him in 1944 when I campaigned in that year, as I shall again in the campaign this year, for that great leader of the Republican Party, the distinguished Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey.

However, my party needs to remember that Franklin Roosevelt is dead and he is entitled to the solemn respect due the dead and his record is entitled to be adjudged by history.

Likewise, I would advise my party that in the campaign about to start it is not running against the New Deal because the New Deal also is dead.

I think the American people, particularly the independent voters, are weary of the type of Republican political speech which predominated entirely too much at the recent Republican convention and which took the form of adjective rattling of the skeleton of the New Deal.

Intellectual honesty should compel us all to admit that a considerable portion of the social legislation which was passed during the Democratic administration in the 1930's is here to stay, and there is not one word in the Republican platform which indicates any intention on the part of my party to repeal it.

Furthermore, intellectual honesty should compel us also to admit that the plans for such legislation in many instances were first made during the Hoover administration, and had it not been for the tragic economic collapse which confronted Hoover in 1932, for which he has received much unjustifiable blame, many of the reforms of the thirties would have developed under a Republican administration.

When I say that, I do not attempt to take any credit away from the Democratic Party which is due it, but I state what I think any student of the political history of that era must admit is true.

In contrast with the blind partisanship which characterized some of the speeches at the recent Republican convention, and I predict that there will be similar partisan speeches at the forthcoming Democratic convention, I would call your attention to the great speech of statesmanship and sound Republican philosophy which ex-President Herbert Hoover enunciated at the Republican convention at Philadelphia.

Time does not permit me to review it in detail but I recommend it to you for required reading if you seek understanding of the constitutional liberalism of the Republican Party. In passing, I would pause on this occasion only to quote the following paragraphs from President Hoover's Philadelphia speech:

"The problems which confront us far transcend partisan action and I do not propose to speak in that sense tonight.

"What is done here, what you do here, will affect the destiny of our country beyond any estimation of this moment. For you are more than ever before the trustees of a great cause, the cause for which this party was founded, the cause of human liberty.

"The only obstacle to the annihilation of freedom has been the United States of America. Only as long as the United States is free and strong will human liberty survive in a world frustrated and devastated by these two wars.

"It is our interest and, above all, in the interest of liberty throughout the world, that we aid in giving strength and unity to the nations of western Europe. It is only thus that we can restore a balance of power in the world able to resist the hordes from the Eurasian steppes who would ruin western civilization.

"There are other warning signs. Our reputed prosperity has begun to walk on two stilts: one is the forced draft of exporting more than our surplus through relief; the other is a great armament program. We cannot go higher on these stilts, or we will break a leg getting down.

"We should have no illusions. To the devasting Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, modern civilization has added two more. They are high taxes and inflation. They are close by.

"Therefore, with full compassion for those nations in difficulties, certain matters in aid to them must be recognized on both sides of the world.

"Our task is solely to aid their reconstruction. We can provide only bare necessities. There is no room for nonessentials, profligacy, or inefficiency.

"We must insist that reconstruction of western Europe be as a whole. That must include the restoration of the productivity of Germany, or Europe will die. We need neither forget nor condone Nazi guilt, but a free world must not poison its concepts of life by accepting malice and hatred as a guide. Otherwise, not only will our efforts fail, but the American taxpayer will be bled white supporting an idle and despairing German people.

"Our difficulty lies not so much with obnoxious Communists in our midst as with the fuzzy-minded people who think we can have totalitarian economics in the hands of bureaucracy, and at the same time have personal liberty for the people and representative government in the Nation. Their confused thinking convinces them that they are liberals—but if they are liberals, they have liberalism without liberty. Nor are they middle of the roaders as they claim to be; they are a half-way house to totalitarianism.

"They should note that in every one of the countries of Europe where 400,000,000 people are now enslaved by the Communists, it has been the totalitarian liberals who provided the ladders upon which the Communist pirates have boarded the ship of state.

"Great as your problems are, they are no greater than Americans have met before your time. You are no less able or courageous than they were.

"Therefore, I repeat, what you say and do here is of transcendent importance.

"If you produce nothing but improvised platitudes, you will give no hope.

"If you produce no leadership here, no virile fighter for the right, you will have done nothing of historic significance."

Thus, in keeping faith with the challenge and statesmanship of President Hoover's speech, I would reiterate that in the forthcoming campaign my party is not running against the New Deal.

To the extent that the Republican Party is running against anything, it is running against the record of the Truman administration. However, my party should do much more than run against the Truman record in this campaign. It must, and I am sure it will, wage this campaign in support of certain specific issues basic to the international security and domestic economic stability of our country, including specific administrative policies of government essential to attaining those objectives.

I offer to you the Republican platform adopted at Philadelphia as a broad outline of the Republican campaign. Oh, yes, I know that platform consists of an obvious reconciling and adjusting of divergent points of view within the Republican Party. If that were not true, then it would not have been the product, as it is, of democratic processes working within my party. If that were not true, then our Republican platform would be the product of machine politics, which it is not. We should recognize that if democratic processes are to function properly then political platforms, as well as legislation, must always be the result of fair compromises.

I am pleased to offer to this audience the 1948 Republican platform as a forward-looking, progressive statement not only of sound Republican principles, but also of a desirable political program for the United States for the next 4 years.

Of course, it is true that if it were left to my personal preference, I would modify some portions of that platform, and I would add other things to it which are not in it, such as a guaranty of civilian control of atomic energy developments.

However, in its entirety, I think our 1948 Republican platform is the most specific, progressive, and encouraging platform which any political party has offered to the American people in my lifetime. I think it clearly tolls the death knell of the "old guard" Republican philosophy as the dominant viewpoint of the Republican Party. I think it is a platform within whose framework constitutional liberals can accomplish, by way of sound, progressive social legislation, what I consider to be one of the primary objectives of representative government.

I pause for a moment on that point because, as a constitutional liberal, I wish to emphasize to this audience what I consider to be the basic tenet of Republican constitutional liberalism.

I insist that a constitutional liberal must at all times seek to protect the economically and politically weak from the exploitation of the economically and politically strong, but do it within the framework of a private-property economy and in keeping with the legal principles and guaranties of the Constitution, including its precious Bill of Rights.

I submit that the Republican platform adopted at Philadelphia seeks through its statement of policies to attain that objective of constitutional liberalism.

Time does not permit any lengthy review in this speech of the Republican platform. However, I do point with pride to the fact that our platform this year is concise, refreshingly specific, and free of the weedy verbiage which so frequently characterizes political platforms.

I do wish to comment briefly on a few sections of the platform. I think the preamble of the platform which takes the form of a declaration of principles is a statement of objectives of representative government worthy of study in every civics classroom of America. I think this declaration of principles sets the entire tone and progressive outlook of the platform. Permit me to quote a paragraph or two from it:

"To establish and maintain peace, to build a country in which every citizen can earn a good living with the promise of real progress for himself and his family and to uphold as a beacon light for mankind everywhere the inspiring American tradition of liberty, opportunity, and justice for all—that is the Republican platform.

"To this end we propose as a guide to definite action the following principles:

"Maximum voluntary cooperation between citizens and minimum dependence on law; never, however, declining courageous recourse to law if necessary.

"Our competitive system furnishes vital opportunity for youth and for all enterprising citizens; it makes possible the productive power which is the unique weapon of our national defense, and is the mainspring of material well-being and political freedom.

"Government, as a servant of such a system, should take all needed steps to strengthen and develop public health, to promote scientific research, to provide security for the aged, and to promote a stable economy so that men and women need not fear the loss of their jobs or the threat of economic hardships through no fault of their own.

"Our foreign policy is dedicated to preserving a free America in a free world of freemen. This calls for strengthening the United Nations and primary recognition of America's self-interest in the liberty of other peoples. Prudently conserving our own resources, we shall cooperate on a self-help basis with other peace-loving nations.

"Constant and effective insistence on the personal dignity of the individual and his right to complete justice without regard to race, creed, or color, is a fundamental American principle."

The platform then proceeds to commit my party to support a progressive stand on labor's rights, soil conservation, reclamation, power development, flood control, government finances, inflation, housing, veterans' care, civil rights, old-age benefits, and the other major domestic issues which we all know must be faced and solved by the adoption of progressive measures in the next and future Congresses.

The plank on education states, "We favor equality of educational opportunity for all and the promotion of education and educational facilities."

This plank is not as specific as I, and probably many of you, would write it.

However, I interpret it as an approval of the principle of Federal aid to education because I think it is clear that we cannot obtain the objective of equality of educational opportunity for all, to use the language of the platform, without the Federal Government supplying some financial support to those localities in the country which cannot finance those minimum standards of educational opportunity which good citizenship training requires for all of our boys and girls.

The last section of the platform deals with the issue which supersedes in importance all other issues confronting us.

It is the issue of international policy and the course we follow on that issue will determine not only whether we have peace or war but also will determine the form of our survival in the history of nations.

Shall we continue to fulfill our true destiny as a Government of free people capable of being the leading force in establishing a world order of peace; or shall we permit the trials, tribulations, and international exasperations of the moment to cause us to make one or both of two serious mistakes which powerful forces in this country seem bent on our making? There is no denying the fact that there are those in this country who would have us meet the international crisis which faces us by adopting a policy of blind nationalism and a program of isolationism which characterized our international policy for almost 20 years before Pearl Harbor.

Senator THOMAS and I, who have served in the Senate these past few years, know something about the power and influence of the isolationist forces in this country. They are not limited just to my party. However, I am willing to confess that since 1920 my party has been seriously jeopardized by the forces of isolationism. Nevertheless, during the past 8 years a clear majority of the Republicans in the Congress have demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that the international views of Wendell Willkie of 1940, Thomas Dewey of 1944, and of that great giant of the Senate, ARTHUR VANDENBERG have become the foreign-policy views of the Republican Party.

However, if there was so much as a lingering doubt about the repudiation of isolationism by the Republican Party, the platform on international policy which my party adopted in Philadelphia at our recent convention makes crystal clear that the foreign policy of our Government under a Republican administration will be based upon the recognition that my party is dedicated to the principle that we believe in collective security against aggression and in behalf of international justice through law.

There is another force at work in America which I think jeopardizes peace and freedom in the world as much as does blind nationalism. It is represented by the attitude of those who seem to think that we can win the peace by dictating the terms of peace.

Do not misunderstand me. I am unalterably opposed to adopting an appeasement policy in negotiations with Russia. I strongly favor building up our national defenses so that in a moment's notice we can defend and enforce the peace if Russia should persist upon a policy of aggressive action against the rights of free men in a freedom-seeking world.

Thus, as a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and in the face of much criticism, I worked for and supported what I considered to be the most fair and adequate military defense legislation which could be passed in the last session of Congress.

As a member of that Armed Services Committee, I have not blinded myself to the fact that it is of vital importance that we make perfectly clear to the world, including Russia, that we seek a justiciable settlement of all international issues through the peaceful procedures of the United Nations rather than by resorting to force.

I think that Members of the Congress, particularly those of us who serve either on the Armed Services Committees or on the Foreign Relations Committees, should be forthright enough to tell the American people that we are satisfied, on the basis of our knowledge of the facts which have come to us as members of those committees, that the only victor of a third world war, no matter how soon it might come, would be the victory of chaos.

If we should be forced into that war, then I want my country as prepared as it can be to defend our people and save as much for them for the future as is humanly possible. However, let us not forget that a third world war would bring unthinkable destruction and human suffering upon all nation participants. In fact, I do not see how there can be any innocent bystanders in another war.

Granted that we could win a military victory, but a bloody and costly one, over any nation or group of nations which might decide to wage war against us, I think the realistic fact is inescapable that what you and I enjoy as the American way of life with all of its freedoms and economic advantages would disappear from our country for many generations to come.

I say that because I think a third world war would result in a complete regimentation of our American life and in the complete bankruptcy of our economy.

Every other nation, including Russia, knows that a similar fate would be visited upon it. Therefore, I think the challenge of world statesmanship today calls upon the people and the leaders of the United States to check the trend toward war.

It is not as a partisan that I express this conviction, but it is my firm belief that a change of administration in November is of paramount importance from the standpoint of our international problems, because it would permit of a new approach to our international problems by new leaders who are not handicapped by past mistakes.

In saying that, I do not criticize anyone for mistakes which may have been made in some of our international negotiations. Mistakes would have been made if a Republican administration had been in control of the White House during the many international crises which have confronted us since Pearl Harbor. It is not fair nor right for us to ask the American people in this campaign to look through their hindsights at the mistakes which have been made and on the basis of those mistakes ask for the election of a Republican President, Vice President, and Congress.

It is not on that partisan basis that I stress the importance of a Republican victory but I do point out that we cannot escape the realities of the situation and therefore I think that a new administration, with new leaders, can best profit from the mistakes on international issues which have been made and can best assure the American people that there is still a chance of winning the peace and of averting war.

I think my party in its Philadelphia platform has laid down a program of international policy which recommends itself to all Americans. I shall not read it all, but I do wish to emphasize the following three paragraphs and I quote from the platform:

"We dedicate our foreign policy to the preservation of a free America in a free world of free men. With neither malice nor desire for conquest, we shall strive for a just peace with all nations.

"We believe in collective security against aggression and in behalf of justice and freedom. We shall support the United Nations as the world's best hope in this direction, striving to strengthen it and promote its effective evolution and use. The United Nations should progressively establish international law, be freed of any veto in the peaceful settlement of international disputes and be provided with the armed forces contemplated by the Charter.

"We pledge that under a Republican administration all foreign commitments shall be made public and subject to constitutional ratification. We shall say what we mean and mean what we say. In all these things we shall primarily consult the national security and welfare of our own United States. In all of these things we shall welcome the world's cooperation. But in none of these things shall we surrender our ideals or our free institutions."

The Republican platform focuses attention on three points upon which I think the American people need to ponder.

First, we make clear that we are dedicated to a foreign policy which seeks to preserve a free America in a free world of free men. We recognize that we cannot turn America into a vacuum of freedom.

If personal liberty and the dignity of the individual, which are the essence of freedom, are to be ground under the heel of aggressive police states in other parts of the world, such freedoms will not for long endure in America.

Further, we recognize in our platform and are committed to the proposition that the United Nations should progressively establish international law.

I hold to the view that the peace will never be won until we put into practice and operation the provisions of the United Nations Charter which make available to the nations of the world international judicial processes for settling many of the disputes which are creating the frightening crises confronting us this very hour.

I refer specifically to the World Court provisions of the United Nations Charter. In July 1945 I succeeded in securing the passage through the Senate of the United States of a resolution committing our Government to the acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in respect to all international disputes covered by article 36 of the statute of the International Court of Justice, which statute was made a part of the United Nations Charter.

My resolution at first was met with tactics of delay and opposition in the Senate but with the assistance of such forward-looking Senators as Senator THOMAS of Utah, who is associated with me on this program tonight, we were able to secure the adoption of my resolution committing our Government to the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in cases of international disputes in which an opposing nation had likewise accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court.

It is to be regretted that Russia is the only great power in the world today who has not committed herself to the policy of submitting international disputes of the nature of those covered by the World Court Charter to the World Court for decision.

However, the Republican platform recognizes the importance of our developing international law and I submit that since we signed the United Nations Charter, we have not exercised the leadership which we should have exercised in offering to submit many of our differences with Russia to the processes of international law provided for in the United Nations Charter.

Take, for example, the issue over Berlin. It would appear that at least on the surface Russia seeks to justify her position on alleged commitments on the part of the United States and Great Britain at Potsdam and possibly on commitments which our representatives are alleged to have made at Yalta.

The people of the United States, yes, the people of the world, are entitled, in the interest of peace, to have such an issue settled by international judicial processes rather than by the rattling of military forces.

Listen to what article 36 of the statute of the World Court, a part of the United Nations Charter, provides:

"1. The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force.

"2. The states parties to the present statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

"(a) the interpretation of a treaty;

"(b) any question of international law;

"(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

"(d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

"3. The declarations referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain states, or for a certain time.

"4. Such declarations shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit copies thereof to the parties to the statute and to the Registrar of the Court.

"5. Declarations made under article 36 of the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and which are still in force shall be deemed, as between the parties to the present statute, to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the period which they still have to run and in accordance with their terms.

"6. In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court."

Certainly the issues of Berlin fall within the provisions of the World Court section of the UN if all countries to the dispute would agree to submit the Berlin issue to the World Court for decision.

It is true that Russia might refuse but I think our Government should give her a chance to accept. In fact, I think that many of the differences between Russia and the United States should be submitted to the World Court for judicial determination because many of them involve justiciable issues, particularly suited to settlement by an international judicial tribune.

If Russia should persist in making her own interpretations and decisions as to what the Yalta, Potsdam, and other agreements mean and persists in resorting to force in an attempt to have her own way, then we must continue to prepare ourselves to meet that type of challenge to the world's peace.

At the same time, I think we should do all that we can to carry out the promise of the Republican platform to progressively establish international law as an instrument for solving our international disputes.

Further, let me point out that the pledge of the Republican platform that all foreign commitments should be made public and subject to constitutional ratification is of utmost importance to the development of a sound foreign policy.

I do not see how there can be any denying nor ignoring the fact that in recent years too many international agreements and understandings have been reached by the executive branch of our Government without the knowledge of the Congress of the United States or of the people of the country. Woodrow Wilson's clarion call for open covenants openly arrived at, which won universal approval of all of our people, has become but an echo of history in American foreign policy in recent years.

My party in its platform proposes to reestablish the check-and-balance feature of the Constitution in respect to international agreements and proposes to resolve all doubts in favor of the treaty-making procedures rather than resort to the legalistic defense which has been used as justification for the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam, for example, without submitting them to the Senate for ratification.

Thus, I conclude my discussion of the issues raised by the Republican platform by expressing the conviction that the progressive approach to our many problems, domestic and international, pledged by that platform, recommends a Republican victory in November.

In closing I would advise the politicians of both parties to remember that the forces of political education, the impact upon our people of world events with all their implications for the future, the strains and stresses of our complex living problems and the fears and sense of insecurity that gnaw at the hearts of most Americans these days, leave little patience for political platitudes.

It is solutions to specific problems and issues which the American people want from their politicians. It is less politics and more statesmanship which the people want. It is an exercise of honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues in accordance with the facts as they present themselves on specific issues that the American people want from their politicians. It is cause to effect reasoning rather than buck-passing ability and rationalization which the people want.

They are sick and tired of being told that depressions are part of the price we pay for liberty because they know it need not be so if more politicians would represent the people rather than have so many represent special interests which are still powerful enough in America to elect many men to office. The people know that there is no excuse for so many millions of our homeless being priced out of owning a home or being forced to pay triple prices for shacks that frequently are not so well constructed as chicken houses on a modern poultry farm. They know that the inflation boom which has turned the American dollar into a 50-cent piece, based on 1939 values, could have been and still could be checked in part by a Congress willing to recognize that free enterprise does not mean license for the owners of capital and sources of production to profiteer at the expense of the many as the result of a short supply created by an unbalanced war economy.

The people are disturbed by the encroachments upon inalienable rights set forth in the Constitution by powerful economic interests which are able to force through the Congress laws which transgress those rights. The people are beginning to see that many politicians are rationalizing legislation which invades the realm of inalienable rights by trying to convince the American people that the economic welfare of the country, the complex industrial system of the country, the material comforts of the country, the

uninterrupted production of the country justify and make reasonable a limiting of inalienable rights.

This materialistic approach to democracy is creating great tensions in our body politic. Many people are disturbed. Resentment is growing. All is not well in our democracy. Politicians and our political parties need to take heed of the fact that as the American people have risen in defense of inalienable human rights embodied in the spiritual values of democracy as epitomized in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution when those rights were endangered by totalitarianism abroad, so, too, will they in due course of time repudiate any attempt to transgress those rights through government by the privileged few at home.

We are witnessing in America today a resurgence of Hamiltonianism and a suppression of Jeffersonianism. It is not surprising that economic dislocations, inflationary prices, failure as yet to win the peace, labor excesses, monopolistic profiteering, inequitable taxes, Russian aggression, growing class-consciousness conflicts at home and abroad, the danger of another war, and the on-every-hand manifestations of greed and selfishness have left the average voter perplexed, disillusioned, and sick at heart over politics and politicians.

Our politicians will discover that the American people will never endure any form of economic fascism or any form of communism, because the people know that economic fascism, even by big business, and any form of communism, even by a class-conscious third party in America, will mean the end to personal liberty. The Lincoln view of the superiority of human rights over property rights is no political cliché in our American ideology of representative self-government. Any sacrifice of individual freedom to the economic advantage of the owners of property or to the economic comfort of the general public strikes at the roots of the inalienable personal rights set forth in our Constitution.

We cannot have those rights and eat them, too. We cannot respect them only when it is economically advantageous to do so and still preserve them. Lip service of praise for individual liberty, followed by legislation which sets forth procedures so restrictive in nature as to make effective exercise of individual liberty impossible, will never check encroachments upon the democratic way of life.

I think that in America today there is being renewed a struggle between Hamiltonian theories of political aristocracy and Jeffersonian theories of human rights; between the static constitution of John Marshall and the dynamic constitution of Holmes and Brandeis; between the exploitation of our people by a laissez faire economy and the paramount duty of a representative government to promote the general welfare by protecting the weak from the exploitation of the strong.

I like to put my view as to the trend in American politics, as I see that trend, in terms of a fight being waged by constitutional liberals on the one hand and political reactionaries and leftists on the other side. My definition of a constitutional liberal is a person who believes in applying the guaranties and legal principles of the Constitution to human rights and property rights in America. He is a person who believes in the good old Lincoln doctrine that we can best protect property rights by first protecting human rights.

A constitutional liberal recognizes that the ideology of communism cannot be reconciled with the liberalism of our Constitution because the dignity of the individual, the inalienable rights guaranteed to the individual by our Constitution, and the right to exercise a freedom of choice through a free ballot box in determining one's political destiny are all foreign to the ideology of communism.

The constitutional liberal asks the American people these days never to forget that the police state methods of communism, the totalitarianism of communism, and the principle of master rule by the state, on which communism is based, cannot be reconciled with the liberalism of our American Constitution.

I invite all forward-looking citizens to join with Republican constitutional liberals in opposing at every turn the political tactics of the communistic ideology as represented by the Wallace party movement in America. I urge all forward-looking Americans to join with Republican constitutional liberals in gaining a Republican victory in November 1943, so that we can start putting into effect the sound, forward-looking, progressive platform which my party adopted at its historic Philadelphia convention.

EXTRA SESSION SCORE CARD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I omitted mentioning an item a while ago. In yesterday's Washington Post there was printed a brief article entitled "Extra Session Score Card," giving the present status of legislation recommended by the President, indicating which bills have passed the House, which have passed the Senate, which have passed neither House, and whether hearings have been held upon any of them. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRA SESSION SCORE CARD

The White House yesterday issued what is called a score card for special session. It noted that "the legislation urged upon the Congress by the President is in various stages" and then gave this listing:

	Passed Senate	Favorably reported by House committee	Hearings held by this or previous Congress
1. Anti-inflation program.	No	No	Yes.
2. Housing bill	Yes	Yes	Yes.
3. Federal aid to education.	Yes	No	Yes.
4. Increase minimum wage.	No	No	Yes.
5. Social security: Increase persons covered and amounts of benefit.	No	No [1]	Yes.
6. Reform of Federal pay scales.	No	No	Yes.
7. Civil rights program.	No	(2)	Yes.
8. Correction of Displaced Persons Act.	No	No	Yes.
9. UN loan	Yes	Yes	Yes.
10. International wheat agreement.	No	(3)	Yes.
11. Restoration of funds for power projects.	No	No	Yes.

[1] Inadequate bill has passed House.
[2] Anti-poll-tax bill has passed House; antilynching bill has been reported by House committee.
[3] Does not require House action.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed. Under the order of the Senate, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service and for other purposes.

THE POLL TAX

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] a few moments ago asked unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the statement issued last night by the Republican leaders of the Congress.

Paragraph 7 of that statement reads as follows:

According to present intentions, the program for the first week will include Senate consideration of the anti-poll-tax bill, already passed by the House, in order that there may be a proper opportunity for all to vote in the November election.

Mr. President, in that connection I desire to invite the attention of Senators to Senate Joint Resolution 132, introduced on May 19, 1944, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on behalf of himself and 34 other Senators. That resolution, the title of which is "Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to removal of the requirement for payment of poll tax," reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State by reason of failure to pay a poll tax.

"Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The Senators who are now Members of the Senate and who joined with the Senator from Nebraska in the introduction of that resolution 4 years ago were the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

There were then in the Senate nine other Senators who joined in the introduction of the resolution, who are not at present Members of this body. They were former Senator Austin, of Vermont; former Senator Burton, of Ohio; the late Senator Davis, of Pennsylvania; the late Senator Johnson, of California; former Senator Nye, of North Dakota; former Senator Shipstead, of Minnesota; the late Senator Thomas, of Idaho; former Senator Weeks, of Massachusetts; and former Senator Willis, of Indiana.

The joint resolution was introduced on May 19, 1944. The Republican National Convention met at Chicago, and, on June 28, 1944, adopted this plank in its platform:

ANTIPOLL TAX

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections, and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

It is significant that the Republican convention adopted the same idea that the Senators did here, for undoubtedly many of them were present at the convention and asked that the problem be solved in that way.

When the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration had under consideration House bill 29, making unlawful the requirement of a poll tax as a prerequisite to vote in primary or other elections, I submitted my individual views as to what should be done. The Senate will find my statement in the binder which is on the desks of all Senators. I pointed out in the statement that during the past 6 years the House of Representatives had four times passed an anti-poll-tax bill by more than a two-thirds majority. I also pointed out that in order to obtain consideration of a poll-tax bill in the Senate the adoption of a cloture rule would in all probability be required, which likewise would require a two-thirds majority vote. I expressed the opinion that it would be very much easier to obtain the adoption of a constitutional amendment under a cloture procedure than it would be to obtain consideration of a bill which many Senators believed to be unconstitutional.

I shall not go back over the record, but there will undoubtedly be quoted in the course of time many Republican Senators, some of whom are now Members of the Senate, who sincerely believe that the bill as it passed the House of Representatives violates the Constitution of the United States.

In order to obtain cloture, in order to get the required two-thirds vote in the Senate to have the subject brought under consideration, it will make a good deal of difference to Senators to know what kind of a measure they will be asked to vote for. There are Senators who will not vote for cloture under any circumstances. They are opposed on principle to restricting debate. There are others who will vote for cloture even though they expect to vote against the bill. But the majority of Senators believe that they should favor a measure before they vote to close debate upon it.

I am quite confident that it would be much more feasible to propose a measure to amend the Constitution of the United States than to bring a bill before the Senate proposing to enact a law which many Senators believe would be unconstitutional. Therefore, I want to suggest to the Republican leadership that if they intend to bring forward a poll-tax bill and are anxious to get action upon it, if there can be a gentlemen's agreement that all after the enacting clause of the House bill shall be stricken out and provision for a constitutional amendment, such as was proposed heretofore, shall be substituted, I think that will expedite the consideration of the bill in this body. That is my judgment, based upon long service in the Senate. I have been credited with having some know-how with regard to getting bills through the Congress.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. If a constitutional amendment were adopted, it would require ratification by three-fourths of the States, would it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

I pointed out in my report, Mr. President, how quickly the equal suffrage amendment was adopted. It was adopted by 36 State legislatures within 15 months after Congress submitted the amendment to the States and became a part of the Constitution of the United States. It vitally changed the Constitution and the laws of 29 States in which women were not theretofore permitted to vote.

There are only seven States of the Union today where the poll tax applies, and I confidently predicted in the report—and I believe it to be true—that if a constitutional amendment on the question of the abolition of the poll tax were submitted to the States, it would be ratified in even a shorter time than was the case with respect to the equal-suffrage amendment. At the elections next November the members of the legislatures of practically all the States in the Union will be elected, and the legislatures will be in session in January and February. If a constitutional amendment is now submitted to the States, I predict it will not be a year before it will be ratified. That is why I think it is wise to take the action I have suggested.

Six years have been wasted in dealing with the poll-tax question. The House of Representatives, as I have stated, four times within the past 6 years has passed an anti-poll-tax bill by a majority of more than two-thirds, and there is no question that if the Senate strikes out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substitutes a provision for a constitutional amendment, the House would adopt it, and that would be the end of the controversy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Arizona if the constitutional amendment procedure were followed rather than consideration of the bill which is on the Senate Calendar, is he in any position to give assurance that the constitutional amendment would not be subject to filibuster?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not conferred with other Senators in regard to that matter. We all know that a two-thirds vote of the Senate is required to end a filibuster, if cloture is to be applied, and I am sure there will be much less difficulty in getting a two-thirds vote if the question is on the submission of a constitutional amendment than if it is on the question of agreeing to a bill which many Senators believe to be unconstitutional. That is simply common sense. I, myself, would not vote for cloture to bring the House bill before the Senate, but I would vote for cloture to bring a constitutional amendment before the Senate, and I know there are other Senators who feel exactly the same way about it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator any assurance that the House of Representatives would vote for a constitutional amendment of the kind he suggests?

Mr. HAYDEN. I know that by a two-thirds vote on four different occasions the House has passed a bill which did not involve the question of a constitutional amendment. With that record, it seems to me no Member of the House should object to referring a proposed amendment to the State legislatures, letting them settle the poll-tax question, exactly as they did the question of woman's suffrage.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has not made a recent canvass in regard to the matter, has he?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not made a canvass either in the Senate or in the House. I am submitting my suggestion for myself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator speaks of a two-thirds vote to get cloture. Does the Senator agree with me that even if we got cloture on the constitutional amendment to which the Senator referred, that would not stop a filibuster in the Senate? I asked that because of the fact that under existing rule XXII a filibuster may proceed on other items which are not considered measures under the existing rule of the Senate, such, for example, as the approval of the Journal. Therefore the filibuster could proceed on some other item, even though it might be possible to secure cloture on the particular proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure that the Senator is mistaken about that. If the Senate votes cloture, then each Senator is limited to 1 hour, and when all who desire to speak have concluded, the Senate votes. It has been the experience in the Senate with respect to cloture that after debate was closed the pending measure was passed in a very reasonable time. The difficulty is in getting the Senate in a position where it can vote for cloture.

Mr. MORSE. That is the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. That has nothing to do with a two-thirds vote. It merely has to do with the present state of the rules. As I pointed out in another report I made from the Committee on Rules and Administration, at the present time there is no limitation upon debate with respect to the approval of the Journal, and there is no limitation on debate

on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill. But once the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of a bill, then a cloture petition can be filed, and when it is filed, and two-thirds vote to close debate, debate is closed.

Mr. MORSE. That suggests the hypothetical question I wished to put to the Senator from Arizona, because I think there is great public misunderstanding throughout the country, as of this hour, as to the possibility of preventing a filibuster in this special session of the Congress. I think the President of the United States labors under the same misapprehension, if I read his statement correctly.

As the Senate rules now exist, a filibuster could be conducted, for example, on the Journal. I noticed that at the beginning of the session today the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] reserved the right to object to a unanimous consent request for approving the Journal. Before he would agree to a unanimous consent agreement to approve the Journal he sought to ascertain what the procedure was going to be on the part of the majority party in the Senate for the rest of the day. I assume the Senator had in mind that if today, for example, a motion was to be brought up making the poll tax the order of business it was the intention of the Senator from Georgia to proceed to discuss the Journal at some length. Under the existing rules of the Senate the Journal is not considered a measure within the rules. Therefore cloture would not apply to any motion to approve the Journal.

Until we can get over that parliamentary hump, the proposal of the Senator from Arizona—which on its face seems to be very plausible, I assure him—until we can get over that particular procedural hump, it seems to me it is foolish to talk about applying cloture to the proposed constitutional amendment upon which the Senator from Arizona comments.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator misunderstood me. I stated that in my opinion there would be no vote on an anti-poll-tax bill or anti-poll-tax amendment without the adoption of cloture, so far as I understand the situation in the Senate. As to the obstacles, I entirely agree with the Senator from Oregon. There is no dispute about the status of the rules as they have been interpreted up to this time. But I do say that in order to apply cloture, a two-thirds vote of the Senate is required, and in my judgment I think it would be easier to get two-thirds of the Senators to apply a limitation of debate if there were a gentleman's agreement that what we were going to vote on would be a proposed constitutional amendment, and not a bill which many Senators believe to be unconstitutional.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since I have come to the Senate I have heard that the Senate can do almost anything by unanimous consent. I should like to ask the Senator whether he is optimistic enough to believe it might be possible to get unanimous consent to pass a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to abolish the poll tax?

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not ask unanimous consent. All I can say is that I have seen gentlemen's agreements carried out. There was one when the cloture rule we now have in effect was adopted. There was a long and determined filibuster in the Senate against a shipping bill at the close of a session of Congress. At the beginning of the following session the Republican caucus and the Democratic caucus agreed that something should be done about the rules, and they adopted the present rule XXII. There was a gentleman's agreement that that rule as it was reported to the Senate would be adopted without change, and it was agreed that if any effort were made to change it, it would be voted down.

If a majority on the Republican side, particularly those who joined in the resolution that I have read to the Senate, will agree, there will not be any trouble about getting action, because they constitute the leadership of the Senate. Certainly if there can be an agreement that when the House bill comes before the Senate a majority of the Senate will support a motion to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substitute the proposal which was offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and 34 of his colleagues in the form of a constitutional amendment, the prospect for obtaining the required two-thirds vote for cloture will be vastly improved. Otherwise, I doubt if it will be possible to obtain a two-thirds vote.

Mr. MORSE. As the acting majority leader for the moment, I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Arizona that the problem of a filibuster is a problem on his side of the aisle. Therefore before he makes his proposal to the Republican leadership he should bring to us from his side of the aisle a definite agreement as to the terms and conditions under which a filibuster would not proceed. Until we have such a proposal I do not see how the Senator from Arizona can expect the Republican side of the aisle to proceed with his suggestion. I think it is up to the Democratic side of the aisle to enter into a gentleman's agreement among themselves as to the terms and conditions under which they will proceed to give consideration to a poll-tax measure, whether it be by way of a bill or by way of the Senator's proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has very kindly asked me to assume a position of leadership on my side, which I have no intention of doing. All I am trying to do is to give the Senator the benefit of some advice that is based upon my experience in the Senate, and to get things done. I have been complimented at different times on the fact that I had the know-how. Now I am giving the Senator some of that know-how. I am trying to tell the Senator that it would be easier, it would be less difficult, and just as effective to propose a constitutional amendment as it would be to undertake to try to pass the House bill. If the Senator does not care to accept this gratuitous advice of mine, very well. Nobody is compelling him to do that. I am not now making any bargain with the Senator concerning what we can do or will do. I am simply saying that it will be the part of wisdom for the Republican majority to adopt a course which will secure for them the most votes, if they want some action at this session of the Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arizona knows the extremely high regard in which I hold him, and I do appreciate his advice so far as it applies to me and my Republican colleagues on this side of the aisle.

In a real sense, however, the opinion of my good friend from Arizona amounts to passing the buck on this issue from the Democratic side of the aisle to the Republican side of the aisle, whereas the real cause of the deadlock on this issue is to be found in the fact that we have not up to date been able to proceed with poll-tax legislation either in the form of a constitutional amendment or by a bill, because of the constant threatened filibuster on the Democratic side of the aisle. Therefore I think it is not unreasonable for the Republican side of the aisle to make the suggestion which the junior Senator from Oregon has made to the Senator from Arizona, namely, that it is up to the Democratic leaders to come forward and present to us on the Republican side of the aisle a gentleman's agreement proposing the terms and conditions which the Democrats wish to offer for consideration of poll-tax legislation. Such a proposal should make perfectly clear that if we accept it there will not be any filibuster on the issue or if there is that a sufficient number of Democrats will join with us in applying a rule of cloture. To accomplish that result it may be necessary to change the Senate rule on cloture in order to include within the rule all matters of business such as a request for approval of the Journal. As I have already pointed out, the present rule XXII makes it impossible to apply cloture to debate on the Journal because it has been held that consideration of the Journal is not within the term "measure" as that term is used in rule XXII governing cloture.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that I did not get on my feet with any intention of "passing the buck." On the contrary I will not take the "buck" he has attempted to pass to me, and pass it along.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. First, the ultimate purpose is to abolish the poll tax.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Those who are in favor of abolishing the poll tax, as I understand, are very much concerned over the fact that if it is to be done by constitutional amendment—I do not think it has to be done in that manner, although I would be perfectly willing to vote for such an amendment—13 States can prevent the adoption of a constitutional amendment, although two-thirds or three-fourths of the people may be in favor of it. Still 13 States can block the adoption of such an amendment. It is said that perhaps they will not do so. I should like to have first the Senator's opinion as to whether the Legislature of the State of Arizona would be likely to adopt such a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am quite sure they would. The State of Arizona had a poll tax in effect for a number of years and decided that it was not in the public interest to continue it, and so did away with it.

Mr. TAFT. Since it is proposed to place a limitation of States' rights upon other States, would there not be a different feeling on the part of the individual States? That is the problem.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is no more so than the constitutional amendment dealing with the right of women to vote. Exactly the same argument could be made with respect to whether women should vote. Prior to the adoption of the constitutional amendment, that was a matter which each State determined for itself. But the Congress decided that women should be allowed to vote in all States, and the amendment was submitted and very promptly adopted. Although, as I said, there were 29 States in which women were not permitted to vote, yet they adopted the constitutional amendment within 15 months.

In this case there are only seven States in which the poll tax prevails.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the constitutional amendment method is the way to go about it, and always the Senator would have in reserve and could come back to, if there was a failure to adopt the constitutional amendment, the method which has been fooled with for many years, a method which to my mind will prove absolutely ineffectual at this session of Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Inasmuch as the Senator is arguing about cloture, does the Senator think it will be any easier to adopt a motion to take up a constitutional amendment than a motion to take up the poll-tax bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly, because in the case of the constitutional amendment, I know that Senators who feel as I do and think that the constitutional amendment method is the one to adopt would vote for a motion to consider a measure proposing a constitutional amendment.

Mr. TAFT. The question is not one of voting after a motion to take up is adopted. The question is whether we can ever reach a vote on the motion to take up. Can the Senator from Arizona give us assurance that we can more easily reach a motion to take up a measure proposing a constitutional amendment than a motion to take up the poll-tax bill itself?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what I have been saying all afternoon.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator give us any assurance on that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. All I know is how I feel about it and how many other Senators feel. I have heard Senators frankly say that they would battle to the last against the Congress invading by law the right of the States to regulate voting within their borders. On the other hand I have heard them say that they had no objection to submitting the question to the States by way of constitutional amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am, of course, not authorized nor would I presume to speak for the Democratic side on this matter. I will say, however, that this phase of the subject has been discussed in conferences which have been held by those who sit on this side of the aisle who are opposing, or proposing to oppose to the limit of our ability this statutory poll-tax measure as well as all bills labeled civil rights which invade the rights of the sovereign States. In my judgment there would be no long-drawn-out discussion in the Senate of the United States on a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to the people and to the States to eliminate a poll tax if those of us who are opposed to the statutory bill can have clear and definite assurance that the Senate would stand fast to its position in proposing this matter to the people and to the States through a constitutional amendment and against any effort to deal with it by statute.

There is a very common error which has been carefully generated in the minds of the people of the Nation with respect to our position on this bill. Through the insidious propaganda that brought this issue into being, started when it was born, and which has been constantly spread since that time, the matter of the poll tax as a tax has been magnified all out of proportion to its real importance. We here are not undertaking to defend the poll tax as such. My own State has no poll tax, and I am glad that it does not. There are those who have said that they think the tax was an onerous burden on the right to vote. I have never been able to endorse that statement.

The poll tax in my State was $1 a year—less than 2 cents a week. In this day of high State taxes and Federal taxes, when people say that a poll tax of a dollar a year is an onerous burden on the rights of a man to vote, such argument is to me sheer political poppycock. But it is an outmoded tax or method of raising revenue. I know of but one Member of the Senate who believes in the poll tax as such, and he believes in it for the purpose of the identification of the voter, and that is a very sound reason.

Mr. President, we do propose to use every parliamentary device available to us to assure us ample time to let the people of the Nation know what is really behind all this agitation for statutory repeal of the poll tax. We propose to use all the time that is necessary and available to us under any rule of the Senate to let the American people know all the implications inherent in the legislation. We will endeavor to bring to every citizen of the United States the knowledge and the awareness of the fact that if the Congress of the United States has a right by a simple statute to in effect repeal sections of the Constitution and wipe out a poll tax within a sovereign State by statute, it has a right to pass a bill to federalize all elections for all Federal officials. We propose to take the time necessary to let every person, even though he be a wayfaring individual, know that if the Congress has the right to pass this anti-poll-tax bill as a statute, it can and is likely to pass legislation that will put a little Federal agent, and a United States marshal, at every voting precinct in this land.

This is a fight to preserve the rights of the several States to handle their own elections without dictation from Washington, and the laws of seven States retaining the poll tax is merely incidental.

In this day of restless change, in this day of subversive activity, in this period when those in the Kremlin seem to have seized upon or created a political party in this country to use for their purposes, let Senators ponder whether or not they wish to have the power over elections concentrated in the central government in Washington. If this Nation were to come under the domination of some unscrupulous and ruthless President, Congress could easily pass a bill to take over the election machinery of the States and control elections from Washington. Let Senators consider how long the liberties of the people would survive under such circumstances.

It is ironical to have this bill brought forward in the guise of civil rights. It is a bill to take the control of elections from the State capitals, from the counties of the States and from the local precincts within the counties and federalize them. Such a course would toss into the laps of the gods every right of every American citizen.

Those who say that we are fighting to retain a tax of $1 are either closing their eyes or deliberately distorting the issue before the American people. We are fighting to retain in the several States the power over elections. This right of the several States was never challenged by anyone anywhere until a few years ago. I think I am correct in saying that the agitation to repeal the poll-tax laws of States by the Federal Congress was started by the Daily Worker. It is not a question of collecting a dollar poll tax even though the poll tax is the oldest of all taxes. Some seem to think that the word "poll" relates to the voting place in the precinct. It is from an old Anglo-Saxon word. It means a head tax. We are not defending the poll tax as such. We are defending the right of the States to govern their own elections and to keep Federal police and the Federal Government away from the voting places in the local precincts now operated under State laws.

If we can be given assurance that this matter will be proposed in the form of a constitutional amendment, I am sure that there will be no great difficulty in submitting such an amendment to the people of the United States. If Congress fails for this political claptrap and tries to enact such a law in the form of a statute, we shall resist it on this floor so long as we have the power and the right to do so. Some of us believe that we know our rights on the floor of the Senate.

I am glad to have the opportunity to make clear to the Senate our position on this question. Usually the attendance in the Senate is not good when one of these misnamed civil-rights bills is

brought up for consideration. The day before a measure of this kind is brought up, the headlines usually say, "Filibuster threatens in the Senate," and Senators betake themselves to the corridors, their offices, or some place other than the Senate Chamber.

Southern Senators have never fought over the $1 tax as such. We are fighting for the right to control our own elections in our own States. It is not merely a fight for Southern States. It is just as important to every American, whether he lives in Oregon, New York, or Michigan, as it is to a citizen of a Southern State. It is important to retain in each State the right to control elections if we are to protect our people and our form of government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand the argument of the Senator from Georgia. The Constitution provides that Congress may regulate the time, place, and manner of holding elections; and it has frequently done so. There may be a constitutional question involved in the meaning of the word "qualification," but so far as the manner of conducting elections is concerned, the Constitution gives Congress the right to regulate it, and it has frequently done so.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Ohio does not appreciate the weight of a precedent in the Congress, it is the only obvious thing I have ever seen that he could not understand.

It is proposed to create a precedent by telling the States what the qualifications of voters shall be. It is easy to follow that precedent with a bill to Federalize elections. We do not propose to submit to any such policy so long as we can resist it.

If we can have assurances that a constitutional amendment will be sustained by the Senate to the end, and that we shall not be compelled in conference to accept a statute, I think we can dispose of the question in short order. There will be some discussion. There will be no unanimous vote, but there will certainly be no prolonged debate, and the discussion will not require an unusual length of time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I made these remarks without consulting any other Member of the Senate as to what I intended to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit I wish to say that I had no idea that he would make any statement on this subject today.

Mr. HAYDEN. Other Senators will confirm my statement. I was simply trying to arrive at a method whereby the same result could be accomplished that is desired by those who sponsored the joint resolution which I have read without the great difficulty which I know would be experienced if we attempted to enact a statute. Inasmuch as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and a group of 25 or more of his associates in the Senate sponsored a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment, if they will stand by what they proposed in 1944 I am sure that they can get enough help from Republican Senators to give the assurance which the Senator from Georgia has asked.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wished to invite the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that article IV, section 4, of the Constitution provides that the United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government. The Constitution even spells "Republican" with a capital R, which is very impressive. So, in addition to what the Senator has said, there are further guarantees as to the form of government and as to the protection of the Federal Constitution. I am sure that the Senator from Arizona, recognizing the respect, if not reverence, in which we hold him, will still wish us to examine this proposal to determine whether or not it may be a Trojan donkey which is being presented for our consideration.

Mr. HAYDEN. It will be brought out that many eminent Republicans, including some of the most able lawyers who have ever served in this body, have said that this kind of bill is unconstitutional. The same view is held by Members of the House. I remember particularly a Member of the House from Maine, when I was a Member of that body, who made a very able argument to the effect that such a bill was unconstitutional, and that he would not support it. Senator Borah and other lawyers took the same position.

There are two sides to the question. It is clear, however, that if the Constitution were amended the question would be settled. It would not be necessary to go to the Supreme Court to have a determination as to whether or not the law which we passed was constitutional. A constitutional amendment would settle that question.

I am satisfied that it would be easier to get the required two-thirds vote—which will be necessary in any event—for a constitutional amendment than for a bill. For that reason, as a practical matter, hoping to see something accomplished, I have made these few remarks.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to make a brief observation. I am one of those who favor the abolition of the poll tax by the States, if possible, and by the Federal Government if we must.

I was the introducer, in 1941, of the original bill on this subject. That bill was amended in the Senate Judiciary Committee, by a subcommittee headed by one of the greatest Senators and one of the best Americans who ever sat in this body, Hon. George Norris, of Nebraska. The bill applied to primary as well as special and general elections.

No one esteems more highly than I do my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I know, of course, that he did not intend to include his colleagues in his reference to the Daily Worker. I introduced that bill because I believed in the principle. The Daily Worker had nothing to do with it. I introduced the bill because of my honest sentiments and conscientious beliefs. I have spoken in this body for it, and I have defended it on the platform. It has been before my constituents in elections ever since 1941.

While I regret that I am the only Senator from any of the 11 Southern States who feels as I do, I have as much right to a conscientious feeling and to my convictions as has anyone else to take the contrary position, which right I do not question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am perfectly well aware that the Senator drafted the bill which passed the House and was considered in the Senate 6 years ago. A similar bill has been before the Senate on four occasions.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this is what I am coming to: I believe in this bill. If this statutory method, which I believe to be legally and constitutionally possible, is the only way of getting the poll tax abolished, and is the only way of enfranchising, as a practical matter, the citizens of this country who are practically disfranchised because of the poll tax, then I am in favor of having this Congress exercise its power to strike down that disfranchisement.

However, I wish to say that it is an unhappy thing to have the valuable and the worth-while legislation recommended in the President's message, which this country wants, delayed because of an unfortunate and sharp schism in the Senate over this particular measure or kindred measures. The other aspects of the civil-rights program I shall pass upon when I see the bills, and I shall vote in accordance with what I think is right at the time when the votes come, after seeing the legislation which I am to vote upon at that time.

But if we could have an agreement here that instead of pressing for the statutory repeal of the poll tax, we could with only short debate submit to the States a constitutional amendment for the abolition of the poll tax, without any litigation in the courts being necessary, the matter could be settled by the people. That would seem to me, taking everything into consideration at the present time, to be the best practical approach to the elimination of the poll tax.

I hope, therefore, the salutary suggestion made by the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] will prevail. I was glad to see the favorable response which was indicated on both sides of the aisle here today. Certainly if that suggestion, so ably and wisely made by the able Senator from Arizona, is not adopted, the majority party, which has control of the Senate Calendar, should not, with all these other recommendations for imperative legislation which were made by the President—for example, the passage of a minimum wage law, and so forth, bring up the anti-poll-tax bill, upon which opinion is so sharply divided, before consideration of high prices, housing, and so forth.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from Florida. I assume that he will be through in a moment, and then of course I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I shall be through in a moment.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to ask a question now of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. Then I shall be glad to respond to a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. My question is this: If the proposed method is such a wonderful and salutary way of dealing with this problem, which has been before the Senate for so many years, I wonder why it was not followed by the Democrats when they had complete control of the situation in this body, as they did for such a long time. Can the Senator answer that question?

Mr. PEPPER. It might be that at that time the Senators on the other side of the aisle were not prepared to acquiesce.

However that may be, the Senator will understand that today we are not trying to read history, but we are trying to make it. So if anyone is at fault, let him receive the condemnation which the Senator would like him to receive.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Florida will agree with me, I am sure, that so far as reaching the final result is concerned, the method of adopting a constitutional amendment will be just as effective as the method of passing a law on the subject.

Mr. PEPPER. I stated a while ago that if, without a bitter, acrimonious fight on this floor, inasmuch as Senators are deeply divided in conscientious sentiment on this subject, we could pass within a few hours, or certainly within a day or two, at the outside, the proposed constitutional amendment, and if the other body would acquiesce—and we would know that it either would or would not in a very short time—then the matter could be submitted at once to the several States. With the legislatures of the States meeting within 2 or 3 years at the outside, I believe the amendment would be soon adopted. So, taking everything into consideration, I believe that would be the wisest and most practical approach to the problem now. As the original introducer of this proposed legislation, I should like to see it favorably disposed of in some way which would avoid holding up all these other measures, such as high prices and the other proposals of the President, which the Congress should be considering at the present time, and at the same time would permit the making of some reasonable progress toward the abolition of the odious as well as obsolete poll tax.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield to me, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to give his informal opinion, just as the Senator from Florida gave his informal opinion, in regard to the following question: If such a method were employed—in other words, the constitutional amendment method—and if such a constitutional amendment were adopted, what is his opinion as to the action which might be taken by the State of Georgia?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my State has no poll tax. We have eliminated it. But I would not undertake to speak for the general assembly of my State. I have no power to bind it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I realize that.

Mr. RUSSELL. My assembly adopted a new constitution for the State of Georgia, and that constitution eliminated the poll tax, which was an inheritance from colonial days.

Let me say that I was much interested in the observation of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] about the Constitution guaranteeing a republican form of government to the States, inasmuch as the poll tax was in existence when the present Constitution and form of government was adopted and, as a matter of fact, before then. All of the Original Thirteen States had poll taxes or even more rigid property qualifications when they agreed to accept the Constitution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Georgia is very well informed as to the feeling of the people of his State, of course. He has stated that the new constitution of the State of Georgia does not include provision for a poll tax. Let me ask whether it would be his opinion that in line with that precedent there would be a general feeling in Georgia in favor of the adoption of such a constitutional amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I am ever questioned about this statement, I wish this preface to appear: That I have no idea what the general assembly of Georgia would do on this question. If the assembly was not too hard pressed with local legislation I would guess the chances would be good that they would ratify such an amendment abolishing the poll tax.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, to the Senator from Georgia I would say that in my reference to the republican form of government I did not mean to convey any implication that that necessitated a poll tax or the elimination of it. I was, rather, addressing myself to the point that under the Federal Constitution the Federal Government has certain responsibilities in regard to the character of the Government, and might conceivably, under that responsibility, in the future, as it has in the past, exercise the power which the Senator felt was so objectionable, and I am inclined to agree with him as to the unfortunate consequences of the Federal Government intervening in local elections; but I am not of the opinion that the pending legislation on the poll tax will produce any serious violation of the general principle with which we are here concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course if there were a man who undertook to establish what was practically tantamount to a dictatorship within a State, I am sure that in such case the Federal Government owes some obligation to the citizens of such a State, who would be in danger of being oppressed by such a dictatorship; but certainly there is a great deal of difference between such a situation—an attempt by one man to proceed to destroy a republican form of government in a State, to establish a virtual dictatorship in a single State, and action under an alleged power to regulate and control elections generally throughout the 48 States by the Federal Government. Such action would constitute a threat against the republican form of government of all 48 States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is perfectly clear, as a result of this discussion, that Senators on this side of the aisle have been greatly impressed with the statements made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I respectfully suggest that it would appear that the next step in the consideration of this matter involves a formal offer by the leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle, which I assume could come following a discussion or conference among the Democrats, in regard to whether they wish to offer to the Senators on the Republican side of the aisle a proposal for a gentlemen's agreement in the form of a substitute for an anti-poll-tax bill. As acting majority leader I can give assurance that the leadership on the Republican side of the aisle would take under advisement such an offer.

It would also seem clear from the discussion today that in carrying out the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia, assurance should be given by the Democratic side of the aisle that no prolonged debate in the form of a filibuster would accompany a proposal to substitute the submission of a proposed constitutional amendment on the poll tax for the pending bill on the same subject.

It seems to me that until such an offer is made and such assurances given by the duly elected officials of the Democratic organization in the Senate, there is no further progress that we can make on the subject at this time. As acting majority leader for the moment, I am privileged to say that the Senators on the Republican side of the aisle will take under advisement any proposal on the matter which Democratic Senators wish to offer.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is very kind of the Senator, but I think that the way to get together is for both sides to go to work. My suggestion is that there be conferences on the Republican side of the aisle to find out how many there are who would favor abolition of the poll tax by constitutional amendment; then perhaps we can talk together. An agreement does not have to be reached by exactly observing all the formalities. I have seen much business transacted in the Senate through understandings, by knowing just where we are and what is going to be done. It can be accomplished in that way. I offer this suggestion on my own initiative. I hope that it will bear some fruit.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator will follow it up with further conferences on his side of the aisle.

DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, at the close of the last session of Congress

last month I indicated to the Senate certain reservations which I held with regard to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was approved at that time.

I was a member of the conference committee on Senate bill 2242, and I declined to sign the conference report, as a means of protesting against what I considered to be undesirable provisions of the bill.

At that time I announced that at the earliest opportunity I would urge amending legislation so that we might have a better law. Such an opportunity now presents itself in the form of a bill to amend the act of 1948, which bill I join with my colleagues, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. TOBEY], in presenting at this time. The bill will change the cut-off date, in defining the eligibility of displaced persons who are now in camps in the American zones of Germany and Austria, from December 22, 1945, to April 21, 1947.

The purpose of the amendatory legislation is twofold. It removes a discriminatory feature that was unjustified in view of the humanitarian motives which inspired the legislation. It makes the act more workable, because the date of April 21, 1947, corresponds to the date on which complete records were first maintained as to the population of the displaced-persons camps. It therefore removes the possibility of fraudulent applications which would have been possible by reason of the incompleteness of registrations prior to April 21, 1947.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like briefly to discuss the bill which is the unfinished business of the Senate, and which happened to be the unfinished business at the previous session, with the hope that we may dispose of it this afternoon.

Mr. President, at the close of the last session, in the rather hectic hours, there came up for consideration a bill which had been under consideration by the Congress and by the constituted committees of the Congress, and by the presidential board, the measure dealing with our aviation position. The closing hours did not permit final consideration of it, as the unfinished business, before the session terminated; which I trust may commend itself to the Senate as a reason why it may be disposed of this afternoon, without doing violence to any other understandings which may subsequently be reached as to the program for this session.

Since the adjournment of the Senate, additional reasons have multiplied as to the very great desirability of this proposed legislation. The situation in Berlin today, where we are seeking to transport by air all commodities essential to the maintenance of our position, may subsequently be vitally involved in the very measure here proposed, which deals exclusively with the further development of our air transport.

At the present time, undoubtedly American aviation enjoys a supreme position in the world so far as civil air transport is concerned, and, we trust and believe, so far as military aviation is concerned. I think I can say, however, without the possibility of successful contradiction, that that situation cannot continue unless we shall without delay take action of the character here contemplated. Not only is the situation in Berlin today a dramatic illustration of the vital character of civilian air transport, but also, within the past week, a foreign country, entirely through the medium of governmental subsidy, a governmental subsidy indirectly resulting in large measure from the grants of funds from our own Treasury, has completed for trial and test a jet air transport, which, day before yesterday, flew from London to Paris in 30 minutes. That would mean that, in the course of time it could in 5 hours cross the Atlantic, and that would mean that unless America takes action of some character to meet this challenge within the next 2 or 3 years the entire progress of American aviation may find itself stalled by the failure to develop new types of planes.

We have thus far maintained supremacy in air transport by the ingenuity and the organization of our own aircraft industry. It was the unanimous testimony of everyone concerned in aircraft and in air lines, and of every authority in our Government, who are in concurrence, that that situation has now reached an absolute impasse as a result of the cost of development.

To develop today a new type of aircraft, which is urgently needed, requires an expense of from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000. To get back the money from such development, 300 planes must be sold. There is no prospect whatever at the present time that any individual aircraft manufacturer would undertake the hazards which are involved. Therefore, as the result of studies of the past year made by the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, which is in complete and unanimous concurrence, and by the Presidential Aviation Policy Board, which was similarly unanimous, and as the result of the concurrence of every agency of our Government concerned, this measure was evolved in order that there might be a clarification of authority and a concentration of responsibility for the development by our Government of further types of air transport to be of auxiliary military service. This measure is specifically designed to that end, and it will permit the five agencies of our Government which are concerned to concentrate under an Aircraft Evaluation Board here provided, subject to the subsequent appropriation of money, which it is not contemplated could be appropriated at this session. In the meantime, during the next 5 months, preliminary studies would be made, so that, next January or February, the Aircraft Evaluation Board would be able to come before the Congress, no time having been lost meanwhile, and ask for an appropriation to carry on the initial development of a type of aircraft as to the development of which foreign countries are already 2 or 3 years ahead of us. Unless we now take action, we may, 2 or 3 years from now, find ourselves absolutely dependent upon the purchase of foreign aircraft or foreign-designed aircraft, in order to maintain air supremacy so far as the United States is concerned.

These are the reasons why I hope very earnestly, as the result of the intermediate developments, that this authority, which is unanimously recommended by everyone in our Government, by everyone in private industry concerned, and by all the Members of the Congress who have studied the matter in committee, may be given, and that we may get action on the matter this afternoon, after whatever discussion is desired by those who have any questions to ask.

POLITICAL NATURE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States delivered his message to the Congress explaining the reasons why this extraordinary session had been called and recommending to the Congress legislative proposals which he declared to be necessary for the preservation of our domestic economy and the maintenance of the economy and peace of the world.

The President's message was so blatantly political in all of its aspects and so amateurish and sophomoric from an economic standpoint as to insult the intelligence of the Congress and all people who pause to think for themselves.

Since the President has seen fit to attempt to use the Congress in a political campaign for his own political advantage, it seems entirely proper to view the President's message for what it is, namely, a pitiful appeal of a sinking politician for the continuance of political life. Not only does the message offer conflicting and impossible promises to every class, group, and contingent of our society, expressed in the vein of a political speech, but it was carried to millions of people over a national radio network at the expense of the American taxpayers under the guise of a national emergency. I know of no bolder use of the Public Treasury for campaign purposes. The prevailing opinion throughout the United States seems to have been that the President's calling of this extraordinary session was purely political. The message delivered to the Congress yesterday emphasizes the correctness of that opinion.

The President said that he had called the Congress into extraordinary session in order to deal primarily with high prices and with the housing shortage. He also said that production has increased and that we want it to increase still more. He pointed out that we have full employment, and that available materials are being used to the limit, that our full plant capacity is being utilized, thus recognizing that production in a free economy under a competitive enterprise system is today, as it has always been and as it always will be in the future, the basic answer to high prices. Yet, as a political sop to those who believe in a controlled economy, the President recommended every possible policy, practice, and control that would destroy the productivity of this country, which is the only basic economic answer to inflation.

First, he recommended that an excess-profits tax be reestablished. I doubt if any more devastating blow could be laid upon the productive efforts of the people of this country than the reimposition of an excess-profits tax. I doubt if a more effective method could be devised to increase and maintain high prices than to saddle the productivity of this country with an excess-profits tax. To destroy or take away the profit of producers simply destroys the ability of those producers to expand the production facilities of this country. Yet, the President in opening his political message had observed with amateurish candor and naive misunderstanding that all available materials and all plant capacity of this country were being fully utilized at this time. Frankly, I doubt if the President understood this economic inconsistency of his message.

Second, he recommended that consumer credit controls be imposed upon business. Every businessman who has had the slightest experience with mass production, which has been the magic key to the economic superiority of this country over all the nations of the world in both peace and in war, is keenly aware of the fact that the mass productivity of this country has been built upon and sustained by the extension and use of consumer credit. The regulation of consumer credit must inherently be lodged with the producer who extends that consumer credit in accordance with his business and competitive circumstances. That is a part of the essence of the enterprise system of this country and if allowed to work, it gives balance and stability to the national economy.

Third, the President recommended that the Federal Reserve Board be given greater authority to regulate bank credit. Again, I say that every man with any business experience appreciates the fact that the accumulation of capital assets which can be made available for bank credits is, in most cases, the only method by which plant facilities and raw materials can be increased, which means more production and consequently greater balance against inflationary trends. To impose burdensome controls upon bank credit is to restrict expansion of production, and thus lose the ballast that would bring the inflationary balloon to earth.

Fourth, the President recommended that authority be granted to regulate speculation on the commodity exchanges. I wonder if the President understands that the purchase and sale of so-called "futures" is nothing more nor less than another avenue of credit for the commodity producer. It is the purchase and sale of rights in future production that mark the trend of supply and demand, and in turn, regulate and balance production with demand. The purchase and sale of "futures" is a common and well proved method of spreading market activity over nonproductive periods and is in full accord with the American enterprise system. Of course, it is true that many speculators in the commodity market are financially injured or even financially destroyed by unforeseen circumstances, such as short production or surplus production, but such are the hazards of our competitive system, and the fact that there are financial casualties in this field of enterprise is no more argument for eliminating this field of business enterprise than for prohibiting the operation of automobiles because there are traffic casualties.

Fifth, the President recommended that authority be granted for allocation and inventory controls of scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production, or the cost of living. Now, I ask, does anyone know of any raw material that does not basically affect essential industrial production or does not have a direct bearing upon the cost of living? Under the President's own statement, this recommendation would include all raw materials, because, as I have already mentioned, he pointed out that all materials available were now being utilized in our productive efforts. I am sure we all understand that such controls imposed upon manufacturers and producers of consumer goods would be a devastating blow to the production program of this country and another boost for inflation.

Sixth, the President recommended that rent controls be strengthened and that larger appropriations be provided for enforcement of such controls. This recommendation followed on the heels of the President's previous statement that additional housing was one of the critical emergencies of this Nation and one of the reasons for calling this extraordinary session. Since the removal of rent controls from new houses, this country has witnessed and is today witnessing the greatest building program it has ever seen in its long history of expansion. Reimposing rent controls would, of course, destroy the incentive that is now promoting this tremendous building activity. Every city, town, and hamlet in this great country of ours is today a scene of feverish building activity. Every facility that can contribute to the building of more houses is being used. It should be remembered that the present building boom has developed during the past year and a half, since the removal of rent controls and other restrictions which the President would now reimpose. It should be remembered that for almost 5 years building in this country was at a standstill, and I now venture the prediction that we will balance our housing production with our demand in a shorter period than we were shut down under controls, notwithstanding the rapid increase of population and new families.

Seventh, the President recommended that stand-by authority be granted to ration those products in short supply which vitally affect the health and welfare of our people. He said that on the basis of present facts, and unless further shortages occur, this authority might not have to be used at all. It seems almost impossible that the President of the United States would be so lacking in the fundamentals of business experience and so lacking in an understanding of human nature as not to know that the shadow of statutory authority inherent in any rationing law would impair and seriously damage the productivity of this country, and cause a rush of buying and hoarding that would bring upon us such inflation as we have not yet imagined. The very existence of such a law would create the shortage which the President and his bureaucrats are looking for to impose controls and return to us the iniquitous era of black markets.

Eighth, the President recommended that price controls be authorized for scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production or the cost of living. The same may be said about the enactment of price-control legislation as has been said with respect to stand-by authority for rationing. Both would lead to the same horrible result. The demagoguery of the President in this proposal is emphasized by his statement that noninflationary wage increases can and should continue to be made by free collective bargaining. All wage increases, like all price increases, are inflationary, and both operate with equal force and effect. Merely because a wage increase can be absorbed by existing margins of profit does not mean that it is not inflationary. Simply because it does not result in a direct increase in the price of the related commodity does not mean that it is not inflationary. Even in these cases it means that the ability of the producer to expand production has been curtailed, and thus inflation encouraged.

Having disposed of inflation by these eight recommendations and thereby promised relief to all the people, the President then proposes that the Government launch itself upon a program of public spending for certain groups whose political support he hopes to get in November. He plugs for a housing bill which it is estimated would cost this country more than $150,000,000,000, in addition to some $20,000,000,000 which the Government already has in Government-owned housing and mortgage guaranties. Where is this vast amount of money to come from? The voters, who are the taxpayers, should understand that it is to come out of their pockets and be added to the national debt. What is to become of the Treasury surplus which Mr. Truman said we must build up through an excess-profits tax? It seems so academic that our already large national debt and continued national extravagance and wasteful spending are such important factors in existing inflation, that it is foolish to launch the Government upon a spending program of this magnitude, in direct competition with the greatest private building boom in all the history of the country.

As a further appeal to special groups, the President would have Congress continue public spending for the purpose of increasing Federal assistance to the States for educational purposes. No doubt, the President believes that this is a compelling appeal to the millions of school teachers of this country, but not only the school teacher but every other

citizen and taxpayer of this country will pay the bill through higher taxation, higher prices, and above all, the relinquishment of the right of the States to control their own local educational institutions. We know for a certainty that when the Federal Government takes over the financing of State educational systems and institutions, at the same time the Federal Government takes over control and regulation of those institutions, and thus another right of the people has been given up to the Central Government. As former President Hoover has suggested, those who favor such programs in the name of liberalism become liberals without liberty.

The President would continue his national spending program to increase benefits being paid under the old-age and survivors' insurance system.

Purely as a political gesture, he recommends that the minimum wage be increased to 75 cents an hour. I say this is a political gesture because few, if any, workers in the United States are earning less than the proposed minimum wage. As a practical matter, under present circumstances, there can be no possible necessity for the Federal Government to put a floor under wages.

The President would have the American people double the burden they have already assumed by taking in and caring for 400,000 additional displaced persons outside and above the normal immigration quotas.

He would increase our national spending by underwriting the construction of a permanent home for the United Nations.

He would guarantee, as another political promise for the votes of the American farmers, an export market of 185,000,000 bushels of wheat per year.

He would expand the socialism of Federal power production, and thus add to the already heavy financial burden the people of this country are now carrying for that purpose. This is, of course, another political promise to those who are so situated as to enjoy the results of public power at the expense of all the people; incidentally, another way to distribute the wealth of those who have to those who have not, and a perfect program for destroying competitive incentive and private business enterprise.

As a political enticement to Federal employees, the President recommends a further increase of Federal wages.

Finally, the President urges upon the Congress various and sundry measures to protect and expand what he chooses to term "basic civil rights of citizenship and human liberty." What greater basic civil rights of citizenship and human liberty can be bestowed upon any nation than the right to live in a free economy under a private and competitive system that has made America the envy of all the world? Yet, for low political purposes the President would appeal to race prejudice and incite race against race and class against class. In my own mind, I am thoroughly convinced that the President and his political advisers who hope to retain the New Deal administration in power, are far more interested in the votes of various minority groups of the industrial centers of the North than they are in bettering the condition of the Negro or any other minority group. To me, it is clear that the Constitution of the United States has not delegated to the Federal Government the powers which the President seeks under his so-called civil-rights program. But, in the true Rooseveltian philosophy the President hopes that the Congress will not be deterred by any constitutional doubts.

As political sop to the labor leaders, the President would have Congress repeal the Taft-Hartley labor law. Yet, he has resorted to the use of this law more than a dozen times since its enactment, in order to save his administration from embarrassment by the ruthless and unauthorized activity of labor racketeers who were originally invested with their power and arrogance by the practices and policies of the New Deal Party.

All in all, the President's program is one of continued higher and higher Federal spending on everything in order that the people shall do less and less for themselves, and the Government shall do everything for the people, such as insuring their health, federalizing their education, building their homes, boosting their wages, and raising the prices at which they sell, but at the same time lower the prices at which they buy. It seems to be assumed by the President that we are to forget that the Federal Government can give us nothing unless it first takes it from us. In short, the President's program is all things to all men.

INVESTIGATION OF HIGH MEAT PRICES

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, for more than a year I have tried at every opportunity to encourage effective action to curb dangerously rising living costs. Neither I, nor any American who has to pay food bills, needs a special message from the President to tell him that prices are high and constantly going higher. The price of meat is a good example—and an important example, since meat represents about 30 percent of the total food bill.

It is tragic to make a political football of this problem. We need to get at the facts and deal with them as Americans interested in a common cause.

For an example concerning these facts, last year the Department of Agriculture advised farmers to sell hogs and cattle light. How much effect would that have on the available supply of meat that might be obtained out of those animals? I have heard today that the Department of Agriculture has already proposed, or will propose, that the production of beef cattle be reduced a very substantial figure in this coming year. I do not know how authentic that information may be. I intend to check it. But can we regulate the supply and then expect the much maligned law of supply and demand to operate? During the past few days the prices of wheat, corn, and oats, have fallen very materially—it is said because of the prospects of a bumper crop in the United States and a crop surpassing expectations in Europe. What effect are these facts, if indeed they are facts, going to have on the price of meat?

In the light of these circumstances, what would be the effect of restoring OPA controls as the President proposes? I confess I do not know, and apparently the administration does not, for to date it has offered no specific suggestions.

Last year the Congress passed a bill to combat inflation, which became Public Law 395 on December 30, 1947. Under the provisions of that law it was proposed that the President take certain action when he felt that critical shortages were affecting the health or safety or national security or welfare of our people. That law provided that under such threatening circumstances the President could take the following steps: First, make a statement of the circumstances which he believed required price controls or rationing or any other Government action; second, outline a detailed procedure and program which the administration intended to follow; third, describe the extent to which the administration intends to go and the plans they intended to employ to combat the difficulty; and, fourth, provide—through the many agencies of the Government—a record of the factual evidence upon which the recommendations were based. Under this law, once the President had followed this logical fact-producing procedure, a congressional committee would be required to take action on his recommendations within 15 days.

That law has been in effect nearly 7 months during which time the President presumably has not believed the economic threat was sufficient to take the action suggested though prices have risen steadily. Then suddenly the President called a special political session of Congress and outlined several general proposals which he said should be adopted in view of rising prices. He apparently took advantage of only the first provision of the law, that is, he has made a statement of circumstances but he has not told us, or told the American people, whether or when or how the administration intends to apply price controls or rationing. He has not provided us with the factual evidence and information called for in this law. He has not told us to what extent the administration proposes to go or the specific formula to be employed—as the law outlines. The Congress, unfortunately, does not have the huge agencies or the 2,000,000 employees that are at the administration's command, and that are expected to be able to furnish much of this material.

The President has told us in a very general way that he would like to employ certain procedures and certain tactics in regard to high prices. Those are the same regulations that were employed once before. During the time they were in effect we had black markets, shortages, and constantly rising prices. That would seem to be sufficient evidence to demonstrate that these procedures are in themselves either ineffective or insufficient. It would, therefore, seem that the President should have used his agencies to determine a precise, detailed program so that the American people and the Congress could have some confidence that this serious matter was being approached realistically and effectively.

At the same time that the President issued a call for a special session of Congress he made several comments concerning our economic status. He pointed out that in the last 14 years farm income has been multiplied about six times; that wages and salaries have quadrupled and that the total national income, profits, and wages, are nearly five times as high as they were 14 years ago. The fact that we are now paying nearly four times as many Government employees as we were in 1933 and the fact that the Government is spending nearly 10 times as much money were not mentioned. Nor was the fact mentioned that each of those increases has brought with it an increase in prices of consumer goods.

In other words, Mr. President, the administration would attempt to take political advantage of the good things that may have ensued in the last 14 years, but it does not want to take the responsibility for the things that have happened that are not so good, which are now troubling the American people, and which are in part due to the good things that have happened.

Under these circumstances there would seem to be a question as to whether the very general request to return to methods once before proven ineffective is not primarily a political move.

I may say, Mr. President, that I believe it is solely and completely and entirely a political move. Therefore, it seems that the Congress is unfortunately required to use its own meager facilities to try to find out the facts and determine the best way to deal with this problem, since the administration has failed to take the action the Congress gave it the opportunity to take. I believe we can, right now, begin this program on one phase of high prices—the high price of meat.

Therefore, I shall, before concluding my remarks, submit a resolution requiring the Congress to inquire into the facts causing the deplorably high prices of meat so that the Congress will have immediately available the information which the administration has not provided, as the law requires that it should. It is unfortunate that the cooperation, once promised by the President, cannot be extended in this case so that the agencies of the Government would use their tremendous personnel and power to take effective, rapid action. Under the circumstances, we can only prepare for the time when a new administration will interest itself in high prices instead of politics.

Mr. President, these observations of mine are not highly partisan, although I am bound to admit that they appear to be so. I have tried to make them factual. The things I have stated here are in the books. But in order that I may bring to the support of the position I have taken an impartial point of view I should like to read briefly from an editorial in this morning's New York Times. The New York Times, as all Senators know, is one of the leading newspapers of the world. I believe its observations editorially are highly regarded and long have been and are looked upon in large part as impartial observations of public affairs. The title of the editorial, which I do not intend to read in full, but from which I desire to quote, is "Mr. Truman on Inflation." I read from the editorial as follows:

> The impression that Mr. Truman's anti-inflation program, presented to Congress yesterday, is likely to leave with many persons, we think, is that of a man trying to hit a specific target by standing off and throwing a handful of birdshot at it. Almost anyone who has ever heard the question of high prices discussed, it seems to us, could sit down with pad and pencil and, by jotting down a combination of the suggestions he had heard and remembered, produce about as satisfactory a balanced program as this. And if he was not troubled by considerations of political expediency, he might even score a large percentage of hits.

Mr. President, it will be noticed that many factors enter into the determination of the prices of commodities in this country, and to deal with some of them in a Presidential election year would be perhaps politically dangerous. But anyone who makes an impartial observation of the President's message on inflation, as evidently this editorial writer has, must come to the conclusion that the President has selected those things which might seem politically expedient, and eliminated those things which might have some dangerous political possibilities.

I read further from the editorial:

> The presentation by Mr. Truman of the background of the inflation problem was, it seems to us, almost inexcusably superficial and slipshod, considering the importance of the occasion and the subject.

Those are not my words. Those are the words from the lead editorial of one of the leading newspapers of the world.

I read further from the editorial:

> As to such proposals as the restoration of the excess-profits tax, the tightening of regulations on the commodity exchanges, the strengthening of rent controls, and drawing a line between inflation and non-inflationary wage increases—these suggest that the President, in formulating the program, may have been mildly under the influence of the recent epidemic of political conventions.

Those are not my words. They are the words of the editorial.

I read further from the editorial:

> Like the party platforms that came out of Philadelphia, it can be said that, while it may not have much to do with inflation, there is something in this document for everyone.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. When the editorial suggests that the President may have been "mildly under the influence of the recent epidemic of political conventions," does not the Senator think that probably the editorial writer had in mind that he was under the influence of the Wallace convention more than of his own?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is a pertinent inquiry; but I must confess that I am unable to answer it. It could very well be.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I believe the Senator from Connecticut was reading from a communication on the question of prices, in which communication the question was raised that the President himself, or rather the executive department, had not properly advised the Congress as to the facts and figures on the basic cause of the high cost of living. Is that correct?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Was that a letter?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is a statute of the Congress, signed by the President on the 30th of December 1947.

Mr. KILGORE. No——

Mr. BALDWIN. In the special session of the Congress last November, which was called to deal with inflation, one of the subjects contained in the agenda in the President's message, a specific formula was devised whereby the President could make an ascertainment of the facts, submit them to the Congress, and make specific recommendations. The law further required that the committee to which the recommendation was referred must act upon it within 15 days and make a report to the Congress.

Mr. KILGORE. I think the Senator is begging the question. I am asking the Senator from Connecticut from what he was reading just prior to the reading of the editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. BALDWIN. I was reading from notes which I had prepared for my own speech.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Connecticut is no doubt aware that the principal source of the statistics which the President is criticized for not furnishing the Congress is the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and that the Congress so reduced the appropriations that at the present time it is unable to give the figures with complete accuracy. I know that, because today I called upon the Bureau for certain figures on the cost of meats. I was informed that the Bureau was unable, under the present appropriations granted by the Congress, to keep the necessary men in the field, where the sale of meats was taking place, to furnish the basic figures for a study of the reason of the high cost of meats.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say in answer to that observation that that is a dodge which has been used constantly by this administration to avoid responsibility for doing the things which ought to be done. When we were considering the appropriations last year one department cut down the number of inspectors at the border so as to bring home to the people of the United States the charge that this economy-minded Congress was interfering with its services.

I can think of nothing more important than the consideration of prices of food. If the Bureau of Labor Statistics has not a sufficient number of men to do that particular job, let it take men off some other job which is not so important, and do this job. That is what an industrial corporation or an individual in business would do. The practice of claiming, every time a question is raised, that there is no appropriation to take care of the work, is ridiculous. The appropriations

for this Government are four times what they were in the last peacetime year before the war. Yet it is claimed that there is not sufficient money to operate the Government. The reason is plain, downright inefficiency. The people of the country will have an opportunity next November to correct that situation, and I feel certain that they will do so. So I say to my friend that if in the large appropriations which are made for the Bureau of Labor Statistics there is not sufficient money to do this particular job, the department should come to Congress and ask for it. Why did not the Bureau take employees off work which was not so important and put them temporarily on this work? That is what would have been done in any other business. But in the Federal Government if there is no work to occupy a particular group of employees, what do they do? They sit down and wait until some work comes along. There is no administrative organization whatsoever in the Government to handle the problem in a business-like fashion. As a result the Bureau makes the excuse that its appropriations have been reduced. That is an old argument which has been used over and over again, and will be used constantly throughout the campaign.

Again I ask, if the Federal Government has four times as much in the way of appropriations as it had in the last peacetime year before the war, why can it not do some of these jobs, particularly this job, which is of vital importance and significance?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no desire to contribute anything which might add to the heat which seems to be afflicting the Senator from Connecticut. However, it is true, as I am sure the Senator knows, that not only the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, but other divisions of that Department, presented their needs, as they assessed them, to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress at the session which adjourned in June. If they did not receive sufficient money from the Congress to do the work in which the Senator is interested, does the Senator contend that under the law the Bureau of Labor Statistics could invade some other bureau or division in the Department of Labor and take away from it men assigned to it or money appropriated specifically for some other bureau, in order to do the job about which the Senator is now speaking?

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that Congress has always been very meticulous with respect to the invasion by any other bureau of funds appropriated by Congress for a particular bureau, even though it might have the authority under the law to do so, which is extremely doubtful. When Congress earmarks money for a division, bureau, or department, it is supposed to be expended for the purpose designated. Now and then funds are available to be used in a flexible way; but I do not recall that in the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor, passed before adjournment, there was any such roving fund upon which the Secretary of Labor could call, or from which he could draw additional money for the benefit of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say in answer to the question of my distinguished friend that I do not understand that all the employees of the Bureau of Labor Statistics are concerned with finding out the prices of meats. I do not understand that they are all meat inspectors.

Mr. BARKLEY. Meat inspectors?

Mr. BALDWIN. The point which my friend raised was that there were not sufficient appropriations to take care of funds for meat inspectors. Meat constitutes 30 percent of the cost of living today. It seems to me since that is one of the essential items, if we want to find out the facts, there are other inspectors who might be temporarily assigned to that particular job. Every business organization is operated on that basis.

Mr. BARKLEY. The meat-inspection service is in the Department of Agriculture, and the meat inspectors are supposed to inspect the quality of meat going from one State to another which may affect the health of the people. Certainly the Senator would not contend that the Bureau of Labor Statistics could go to the Department of Agriculture and draw from it meat inspectors, who may be able to pass on the quality of meat or whether it is pure or adulterated or spoiled, but who may not be able to pass on the question of whether the price of meat is too high.

Mr. BALDWIN. The point I make is that if a government, which in the present peacetime year has the largest number of Federal employees it has ever had in any other peacetime year, cannot find somewhere in the Bureau of Labor Statistics sufficient personnel to do this job, then it is an ineffective, inefficient government. That is my sole point.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator will realize that Congress is always rather particular about appropriating money for divisions and departments. It earmarks it for certain purposes and delineates the duty of those who are employed under it. Certainly the Bureau of Labor Statistics has no pool in its own confines from which it may undertake to draw employees to do the work in undertaking to arrive at costs of production and the costs of consumers goods and other matters of that character.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator's experience is much longer and much greater than mine, but I ask him this question: Are all the employees in the Bureau of Labor Statistics concerned with the single matter of finding what is the price of meat?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course not.

Mr. BALDWIN. Or is there a group of investigators there who could be used to investigate the price of meat one day and the price of bread another day and the price of vegetables another day?

I come back to the point that it is very strange indeed that a Government agency with a certain number of employees and an able and intelligent man at the head of it cannot be conducted in such a way that statistics pertaining to such an important matter as the high price of meat cannot be obtained for want of funds sufficient to enable the employment of the necessary number of inspectors. Certainly there must be a sufficient number of inspectors in the Bureau.

Mr. BARKLEY. That raises the very natural question as to whether an employee in the Bureau of Labor Statistics who is an expert in regard to the price of clothing would be appropriately assigned tomorrow to determine how the price of meat is arrived at. I do not know about all the procedures in that Bureau, but I imagine that, as in any other well-organized bureau or division—and I am almost afraid to call it a bureau, for fear that the man who heads it may be called a bureaucrat, but at the same time it is the Bureau of Labor Statistics, created by Congress and called such by the Congress—there are experts qualified to look into and pass upon and report on the cost of various articles and consumers goods. Whether a person who is an expert on the cost of shoes would be properly assigned to the job of determining why the price of meat is high, I do not know. I do not think any of us here in the Senate would know. But I question the wisdom of the suggestion that because meat is a prime element in the cost of living, those who are investigating the cost of other things that go into the cost of living in this country should immediately be taken off their jobs and assigned to the job of determining why the price of meat is high. They may not be the best qualified persons for that purpose.

If the Senator could discover during this session—whether it is a long one or a short one—that there is not sufficient personnel in the Bureau of Labor Statistics to do the quick job of undertaking to find out why the price of meat is high, would the Senator vote for an additional amount necessary to enable the employment of the proper personnel?

Mr. BALDWIN. That would be one thing that the committee to be created under the resolution which I propose to submit could find out. That is another reason why the resolution should be adopted.

But this is the first information I have had and, so far as I know, the Senate has had that the particular agency upon which this particular statute calls—a statute which has been on the books since last December—does not have sufficient personnel to do the job to which I refer. Incidentally, let me say that the other day I heard it stated that employees are being added to the Federal pay roll at the rate of 500 a day. If that be so, there must be personnel somewhere to do this job.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, long ago I found out, as the Senator from Connecticut must have found out, that we cannot rely upon rumors and reports.

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes; and the statement in regard to the addition of 500 employees a day to the Federal pay roll is another thing which could be ascertained under the resolution to which I am addressing myself.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the resolution call for the appointment of a special committee?

Mr. BALDWIN. No; the investigation would be conducted by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that that committee will meet tomorrow to go into the question of holding hearings. It already has authority and facilities.

Mr. BALDWIN. I hope my resolution will be referred to that committee, so that it can consider the matter, along with other matters.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am always very happy to have a suggestion from my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, first I wish to say that when we passed the Reorganization Act and established certain committees, to which we gave all the authority necessary for various investigations, we sought to do away with special committees. I myself have felt for a long time that we have had too many special committees, and that they were taking away from the standing committees jurisdiction which they properly have under the rules of the Senate. So I think the Banking and Currency Committee already has authority to do what the Senator from Connecticut proposes in the resolution. I was a member of that committee for a long time, and it never lacked jurisdiction to look into any question which had any relationship to legislation which it was asked to consider.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am not talking about special committees; but I am asking why it is that, after the Congress has passed a specific law laying down a certain procedure for the President to follow, and after the President has signed that law and it is on the statute books, the President does not avail himself of the procedure outlined in that law? When he has all the Federal administrative agencies at his disposal, and when he is the head of a great many administrative agencies and bureaus and departments of all kinds, why is it that the Congress of the United States then has to go back and look into the matter in detail, although it has only limited resources at its disposal and although its job is not of an administrative character, but of a legislative character, for its job is to act upon the specific recommendations of the President, and not to inquire into all the facts and circumstances. Those are the things I am asking.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator referring to a law which was passed at the special session last fall?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not read that statute lately. What particular provision of it is the Senator criticizing the President for not carrying out?

Mr. BALDWIN. It contains a provision that whenever the President shall find that a particular commodity is in short supply and that the state of affairs is such that the health and welfare of the people are affected, he shall make a statement of fact concerning the matter, shall require the administrative agencies to develop the facts and the situation, and shall make a recommendation to the Committee on the Economic Report, which shall report to the Congress within 15 days. However, although the Congress began its session in January and although, as the President has said, all during that time prices have been going up, nevertheless not once during that time has the President availed himself of the provisions of that law.

Mr. BARKLEY. That raises the question whether any particular commodity has been getting in short supply and whether it is responsible for the increase in price. We know there has been a terrific increase of production in the United States, generally speaking, within the last 2 years and since the end of the war. We have full employment. We have almost complete utilization of our productive capacity. I do not refer particularly to meat. During the last year there has been, of course, a decline in the production of meat in the United States.

Mr. BALDWIN. There was a decline in the supply of meat because of the specific recommendations of the Department of Agriculture. That is in the record.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator referring now to the little pig era?

Mr. BALDWIN. No; I had nothing to do with the little pig era. We went through that. However, the last era we went through was not an era of killing the little pigs, but it was an era of keeping the pigs from getting big, which is a somewhat different matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand there is no particular virtue in the age of a hog.

Mr. BALDWIN. It is the size.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not make much difference, either to the hog or to humanity, as to how old a hog should be when it is butchered.

Mr. BALDWIN. It makes a difference to humanity.

Mr. BARKLEY. But be that as it may, if the President had found there was a shortage of hogs and therefore a shortage of meat, under the law to which the Senator referred, certainly no act of Congress could have increased the supply. No proclamation by the President could have increased it. If the President had made a recommendation based upon a shortage in the supply of hogs, and consequently a shortage in the supply of meat, does the Senator think the Congress, in the situation in which it then found itself, and in the remainder of the session, would have inaugurated legislation to curb or to regulate the price of meat?

Mr. BALDWIN. My recollection of the special session last November is that there was a good deal of sentiment on both sides of the aisle in favor of providing some sort of regulation, of enacting some sort of legal provision to take care of items that might be in short supply. My distinguished friend will remember that, in his message to the Congress at that particular time, the President did not specifically say that he wanted price controls restored. He said he wanted legislation which would give him control over rationing and allocation of items in short supply. Meat is one of the items which is now in short supply and that condition has caused the high price. We do not have in the country enough meat.

Mr. BARKLEY. Congress did not give the President even that stand-by authority.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Congress gave him specific authority in the bill I am talking about.

Mr. BARKLEY. If Congress had given him even the stand-by authority, he could in the present situation do a good job. Nevertheless, Congress certainly could not and did not pass legislation restoring price controls. I do not think there was anybody on either side of either branch of the Congress at that time who recommended or approved the reimposition of price controls as they originally were during the war and for a period following the war.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct. If I may interrupt my friend, that is why I say we passed at that time a bill providing that the President could pick out items he might find in short supply, and with respect to which, for that reason, there was a dangerous possibility of a rapid increase in price. Having picked out such items, he could then make specific recommendations to the committee for action to be taken. That law has been on the books since last December. The President signed it. He has never done anything about it in all that time. That is the method, if my good friend will let me say so, by which the Congress undertook to deal with the specific recommendation or with the particular recommendation made by the President in his message. He wanted some law by which to deal with items in short supply, and that is the provision we made for it. He has never availed himself of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Congress cannot avoid its own responsibility by saying the President did not point out some article of food and recommend a particular piece of legislation in regard to it. Congress has all the facilities the President has for obtaining information. It can obtain information from every department, every bureau, every Federal agency. It can ascertain the facts. The mere fact that the President might point out a shortage with respect to some particular article of food does not in my judgment relieve the Congress of its responsibility.

Mr. BALDWIN. If I may ask my friend a question, Does not the Constitution of the United States provide that the President shall execute the laws enacted by Congress? Is not that his job?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course.

Mr. BALDWIN. The law passed by the Congress provided a specific method of dealing with this particular question. The question I am asking is, Why did not the President use it? The law is upon the statute books.

Mr. BARKLEY. Based upon the information available, he may not have been able to report to Congress that there was a shortage in a particular commodity.

Mr. BALDWIN. He does not necessarily have to report that there is a shortage. He could have reported that the price of a particular article was going up and that therefore some action was required. He did not do that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have as always listened with a great deal of interest to what my friend from Connecticut has to say. There came to my mind several suggestions to make to him as he proceeded with his discussion. In the first place, he said, "What about these reductions of appropriations? Why do we not know something about that? Why can we not stop that?" I suggest to the Senator that the reports by the Appropriations Committees submitted to the Senate only a few months ago—in June, as a matter of fact—show distinctly why the situation is such in the Bureau of Labor Statistics that the Bureau does not now have sufficient money to send statistical gatherers into the field to get the material that is available.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. How large is the President's contingent fund? Does he have one?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The President cannot use the contingent fund for that purpose.

Mr. BALDWIN. How many departments and agencies could be called upon by him for information?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator would only pay attention to what has happened in the Senate, he would know that the Senate cut down or withdrew the President's contingent fund.

Mr. BALDWIN. How large a contingent fund does the President have?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know what it is at the present time, but whatever contingent fund may be given to the President is given to him for a particular purpose.

Mr. BALDWIN. It is given to him for contingent use, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, indeed.

Mr. BALDWIN. And this is a contingency.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. BALDWIN. If the President needed additional funds for the Bureau of Labor Statistics to enable the Bureau to employ additional personnel in order to furnish information in connection with the present session, he has a contingent fund and why did he not use it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assure the Senator he is quite wrong. That could not be done. If the Senator were a member of the Appropriations Committee, as I am, he would know that the Congress of the United States has specifically forbidden the switching of funds within a department from one agency to another.

Mr. BALDWIN. If I may, as a junior Member of the Congress, I would ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, this question: What is the purpose of the contingent fund? Is it not to meet contingencies?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The contingent fund had to do with national defense, not with domestic affairs. I may say to the Senator that consistently the Congress has been cutting appropriations in the very spots where we could hope to do something about this identical problem. For example, I call to the attention of the Senator the fact that the President in his budget submitted to the Congress last January recommended specifically an appropriation to enable the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a study of the price policies of the corporations controlling the commodities upon which the cost of living depends. The House of Representatives refused that appropriation. I sought to grant the authority, when the bill came to the Senate, and the authority was granted. It was written into the report. But when the bill went to conference the House conferees declined positively to allow an appropriation for that specific purpose. I suggest to the Senator that the reason the President's recommendation to conduct a study of the price policies of the profiteers was denied by this Congress was because this Congress has preferred to serve the profiteers rather than the people.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. BALDWIN. We shall come to that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say another thing to the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BALDWIN. The question we are dealing with here——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest that the Senator suspend until the Chair can enforce the rule of the Senate with respect to the occupants of the galleries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The Chair will indicate to those in the galleries that any further demonstrations, for any reason whatever, will result in a clearing of the galleries. The Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. BALDWIN. My resolution has nothing to do with the profiteering corporations to which my friend from Wyoming refers. I may feel just as strongly about them as he does; but what we are talking about here is why the President of the United States did not carry out a specific law of the Congress which gave him authority to make specific recommendations for action by the Congress with reference to commodities and products in short supply.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to tell the Senator.

First, I should like to suggest to the occupants of the galleries who conducted a little demonstration a moment ago that it might be well for them to withhold their demonstration until they cast their ballots in the ballot boxes next November. That will be the time to show what they want done.

Mr. BALDWIN. It will be a little difficult for them to know what Democrats to vote for.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I do not know, I think they will understand.

Mr. President, last November the President of the United States called Congress into special session, saying that there were two great public service needs which ought to be taken care of by Congress. The first was the control of inflation and the rising cost of living. The other was European recovery. Congress reluctantly took care of the latter subject. With respect to the former, it declined to act. Oh, to be sure, it passed a voluntary allocation bill. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] felt, judging from their expressions upon the floor, that the President was right and that something should be done regarding the high cost of living. They were not satisfied with the bill which was approved by the majority leadership and which was passed by the Senate. The Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Connecticut offered an amendment to which the Senator from Connecticut has now referred. I took part in the debate and at that time pointed out to the Senator from Connecticut that the amendment which he and the Senator from Vermont were offering was inadequate, that it could not possibly do the job, and that it would be much more simple, instead of postponing the job, to do it at that time. But it was not done. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report, whose duty it was to pass upon these questions, gave long and careful study to the problems. The Senator from Connecticut rose upon the floor, as the first regular session of the Eightieth Congress was coming to a close, and warned the majority leadership that something should be done. The Senator will recall it. He submitted a resolution which demanded an investigation, and he participated in the investigation.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Studies were made by subcommittees all over the country, from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast, and when they were completed there was not a single member of the committee who did not know about the shortage of meat and its increasing cost. There was not a single member of the committee who did not know that inflation had the people of the United States by the throat. There was a difference of opinion as to what should be done. The majority——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator pause there for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say that the very best we were able to get out of the Congress at that time—and my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has volunteered the statement that he himself was then not in favor of rationing—was the legislation to which reference has been made. I claim that a very effective piece of legislation, proposing a very logical way of dealing with the subject, was the amendment which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and I proposed.

I am coming to the question which I have asked many times before. Why has not that particular legislation been carried out? Can the President of the United States say, "This is a law of Congress, but I do not like it. I am not going to observe it; I shall not follow the procedure it provides"? I do not think the Chief Executive can do that. He has never taken one single step under that legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator give me time to reply?

Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reason for it was that the President knew, as did the Congress, when the amendment was offered, that shortages existed. The President never once withdrew his recommendation for positive legislation. The reason nothing was done is that the legislation was utterly inadequate. What we need is more adequate legislation to do the job. The Senator's amendment was merely a polite postponement of the solution of the problem; and I fear, from what he says, that we shall do some more polite postponing——

Mr. BALDWIN. What we must do is to find out the facts which the President ought to have found out and submitted to us, rather than to make a general over-all buck-shot attempt to deal with inflation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that all he has to do is to follow the advice which the President gave the Members of the Congress when he said, "Ask your wife about the cost of living; she will tell you."

Mr. BALDWIN. That is a very familiar phrase; I started my speech with it. It is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator referred to me a moment ago as having said that I did not favor rationing. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that I introduced a bill in the special session last year to carry out the President's recommendations. If those recommendations had been carried out and if the bill which I introduced had passed, we should not now be asked to consider the question. The bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and it made the same progress there that the familiar snowball makes in the hot hereafter.

Mr. BALDWIN. It made the same progress that the Republicans made in the 14 years of Democratic administration.

I am sure that my distinguished friend does not mean to imply that since the legislation which was proposed by the Democratic side of the Senate was not adopted and the legislation proposed by the Republican side of the Senate was adopted there was no obligation, therefore, on the President of the United States to carry out its provision. He does not mean to imply that, does he?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not make any such contention as that. Neither do I concede that the President of the United States has failed to carry out the intent or the provisions of the law.

Mr. BALDWIN. I most earnestly contend that he has failed.

Mr. President, a moment ago my distinguished friend from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said we all knew about the shortages and that the President could have made recommendations for——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; that Congress could have acted.

Mr. BALDWIN. I say that the President could have acted, under the law. Let me read to my distinguished friend what the law says:

> Whenever the President shall determine that there is or threatens to be a critical shortage of any raw material, commodity, or product which jeopardizes the health or safety of the people of the United States or its national security or welfare—

Whenever he makes such a determination, then he shall follow out the procedure of the law. If the Congress knew it, certainly the President knew it. The law contains the procedure. Why did he not make his recommendations?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. May I ask the Senator what the procedure is?

Mr. BALDWIN. Under the procedure provided for, the President makes a statement of the circumstances which, in his judgment, require the proposed conservation measures; a detailed method is provided for the administration of the proposed measures, including the additional budget and additional personnel necessary for their enforcement, and the proposed degree of curtailment, in current and prospective use of each such raw material, commodity, or product, by each processor, and/or user thereof, and a complete record of the factual evidence involved.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly.

Mr. MYERS. I served with the Senator on the committee in the eastern area of the United States. The Senator knows quite well that before we started the hearings we were all convinced that inflation was not only upon us but that prices were spiraling. We held hearings from New Hampshire to Florida. The Secretary of Agriculture appeared before us and told us there would be a meat shortage in the spring and summer of 1948. He told the Senator, and he told me, and he told the other members of the committee, "Prices of meats are going up in the spring and summer of 1948." We did not need to have the President recommend anything. The Senator had that information. Now I understand the Senator is proposing another investigation. We do not need an investigation. We need to do something about inflation. It has been investigated too much, and we already have the information, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. What does the Senator propose to do? What would he propose to do now? What is his recommendation to this Congress?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would accept the President's recommendation.

Mr. BALDWIN. What is the President's recommendation? Is there a bill here with the President's recommendation? What is that specific recommendation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator undoubtedly has a bill. But I am going back to last year. We were told that meats would be scarce, we were told that meats would rise in price. Now Senators come forward and want to blame somebody. Let us forget the past. Let us meet the problem now before us. Let us know that the cost of living is continuing to spiral, and let us do something about it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I agree with my friend wholeheartedly. Let us do something about it by an administration which has 2,000,000 Federal employees, and all the Federal bureaus at its disposal? Where are the recommendations this law provides for? That is what I am complaining about. Until we know the detailed recommendation, I am really at a loss to know how to proceed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will permit me, the majority party does not know how to proceed; it has no program. It cannot act without the President of the United States telling it what to do.

Mr. BALDWIN. Apparently the President could not act without the Congress, because he called us back into session.

Mr. HATCH. The Congress is the legislative branch.

Mr. BALDWIN. Where is the specific recommendation? Where are the specific recommendations? Are they coming from the President?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The recommendations were before the Banking and Currency Committee. They were before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. The majority said, "We do not want to do these things."

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator knows our Government is a government of compromise. We cannot get everything and agree on everything all the time. We have to take the best we can get.

I come back to the point that there is now on the books a specific law, which has been completely ignored by the present administration. There is a statement in the law that whenever the President finds there is a shortage he shall make a recommendation for certain action. There has been no recommendation. There was no proposal of a special session to deal with inflation until the President went to the Democratic National Convention. That is what I am complaining about. Why has not this law been observed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator desires to be accurate. The President did make his recommendation. He made a recommendation in his special message of November 17, 1947. There he spelled out the facts. He told us what the shortages were; he told us that prices were rising. We knew it, and the Senator from Connecticut knew it, and because he knew it he besought his majority colleagues to do something, to take some action. But his majority colleagues would not act. They would not accept the suggestion of the President, and they came forward with this voluntary allocation bill, which is merely a surrender to big business, to ration the public. Then the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Vermont, knowing very well that that was inadequate, offered an amendment, which was merely, as I said a moment ago, a polite postponement.

May I analyze the law for the Senator, the law, with his amendment, the one

he asked the President to carry out? This is what he asks:

Whenever the President shall determine that there is or threatens to be a critical shortage of any raw material—

He had already said so in November. He pointed out the shortage of housing at that time. He pointed out the rising price of meat. He pointed out that there was not enough to go around. So that was already done. But whenever he shall determine that—

he may prepare proposed measures for conserving such raw material—

He had prepared measures. They were here before the Congress. They were in the committee. The Senator from Kentucky, the minority leader, had introduced the administration legislation. There it was, to be considered, but it was thrown into the pigeonhole.

Mr. BALDWIN. Did it not call for rationing; for price control?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It called for standby power.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest that the Senator from Connecticut is privileged, under the rules, in the absence of unanimous consent, to yield for a question and for a question only. We have been exceedingly lenient, it seems to me, in the last hour. Senators who have interrupted the Senator from Connecticut have been carrying on a discussion quite outside the rules of the Senate. In the absence of unanimous consent I shall ask for a strict enforcement of the rules.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Connecticut had yielded the floor to me for this purpose.

Mr. BALDWIN. No; I had yielded to the Senator for a question; an observation. I am perfectly willing for him to make an observation, but I should appreciate it if the observation would pertain to the matter under discussion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I take it now that the acting majority leader and the Senator from Connecticut are resorting to a technicality to end this discussion. I shall not ask unanimous consent, though the Senator from Connecticut may, but when the Senator takes his seat, I shall take the floor and I shall proceed with the analysis of the very inadequate measure of the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to respond very briefly to the query raised by the Senator from Oregon. It is the understanding of the Chair that the rules of the Senate provide that a Senator having the floor can yield for a question and for no other purpose. If he yields for other than a question he will automatically lose the floor if any other Senator raises a point of order. The Chair therefore feels that the rules of the Senate, which govern the conduct of Senators on both sides of the aisle, should, on demand, by any Senator, be literally interpreted and enforced by the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may ask the Senator from Connecticut a question, Is it the desire of the Senator from Connecticut now to appeal to this rigid rule governing Senate debate in order to shut off this discussion? Is it becoming so annoying now to the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Connecticut that they desire to have me take my seat? I shall be very happy to do so, and I shall take the floor a little later.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I have sat here many an hour listening to his mellifluous and melodious voice, and I enjoyed it very much, and I am willing to continue the discussion on any terms which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming may suggest. I may say to him, however, that both of us are subject to the rules of the Senate, so if any Senator raises the question, we must abide by the rules.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is nothing the Senator from Wyoming ever has said, and I am sure nothing he ever will say on the floor of the Senate, which has been or can be annoying to the junior Senator from Oregon. However, so long as I am acting in the capacity in which I now am, it is my duty to carry out my instructions as acting majority leader. Therefore I wish to advise the Senator from Connecticut that I shall have to ask for enforcement of the rules. I think he is making a valuable contribution to the RECORD this afternoon, but if he yields I must ask him to yield for a question and a question only. Then when the Senator from Connecticut finishes his remarks, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming may speak in his own time. I have no desire to use any parliamentary tactics to deny the Senator from Wyoming a full opportunity to present his point of view. It is perfectly obvious, however, that we are working under a limitation of time in this special session, and it is the duty of the acting majority leader to call for strict enforcement of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I understand the Senator from Oregon to be acting under instructions?

Mr. MORSE. I am acting as majority leader in carrying out the policies of the majority party at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What a terrible spot to be in!

Mr. MORSE. One of those policies is, Mr. President, to abide by the rules of the Senate, and I raise the point of order, and shall insist on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to point out that the Senator from Connecticut has the floor. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BALDWIN. I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming if he will put his remarks in the form of a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Presiding Officer now has the whip hand, and I shall wait until I get the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I merely want to summarize my remarks, which, I think, have already been extended long beyond the patience of most Members of the Senate. In conclusion I want to say that whether we all like the particular bill which was passed by the special session last fall or whether we do not like it, nevertheless it is the law of the land. It does provide a specific method of dealing with shortages, with rationing, with allocations, and with prices. It was adopted in response to a message from the President which asked for limited rationing and limited controls and standby legislation. It does provide a logical, specific method of dealing with the problem, and it is my claim that since its enactment and since its approval by the President on the 30th of December 1947, he has made no recommendation with respect to it, or made no effort, nor has any Government agency made any effort to carry out its particular provisions. I say, Mr. President, that had he done so we would have been equipped now or long since with adequate information and specific recommendations from the administration itself as to how to deal with the problem of the high price of meat.

Mr. President, I should like to call a matter to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who has left the floor. The question was raised that employees were not available in the Bureau of Labor Statistics to secure information for Presidential recommendation in pursuance of the law on the subject of meat. I find from the appropriation bill that in this current year, that is in the year 1948 and 1949, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has an appropriation of $4,073,000. I find, Mr. President, that in the previous fiscal year, for 1947 and 1948, it had an appropriation of $4,073,794. So, cutting the appropriation of the Bureau of Labor Statistics $794 has made it impossible, according to the claim of my distinguished friends, for the Bureau to gather the information which will make it possible for the President to make the recommendations under this law.

Mr. President, I submit the resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 269), submitted by Mr. BALDWIN, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the present high prices of meat.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than February 1, 1949.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ATTITUDE OF GOVERNOR DEWEY TOWARD THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. BUCK obtained the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I have in my hand a clipping from the New York Times reporting an Associated Press dispatch appearing on page 3 of that newspaper, entitled "Tell of Dewey Role. Governor's Secretary, Senators ROBERTSON and TAFT Quoted."

WASHINGTON, JULY 27.—Senator ROBERTSON, Republican, of Wyoming—

For whom, of course, we in this body have a deep regard—

told reporters today that Governor Dewey had advised congressional leaders to stay around a week or so and then go home. He asserted Senator TAFT had carried Mr. Dewey's message to the policy committee.

At Pawling, N. Y., Governor Dewey's press secretary, James C. Hagerty, said:

"The Governor feels that the Congress should stay in Washington and give careful consideration to whatever was proposed in the President's message."

That is version No. 2. But we are not through yet.

Asked about consultations between Governor Dewey and congressional leaders Senator TAFT said:

"There has been more or less consultation with Dewey but not in detail."

He added that Herbert Brownell, Jr., Mr. Dewey's campaign manager, had conferred with congressional leaders.

Governor Dewey made no recommendations at all but was consulted, Senator TAFT stated.

So in one story of four paragraphs we have three different versions of the attitude of the leader of the Republican Party on the reconvening of the Congress. In all fairness, without any bitterness, I think that the leader of the majority party in this Congress would certainly do well to let the American people in on the secret of just which one of these versions is true.

THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I have responded to the call of the President for this special session of the Congress. When we adjourned a few weeks ago I think we all hoped there would be no extraordinary occasion justifying such a call. There has been practically no change in our domestic affairs since we adjourned and the call was not made to meet any foreign situation. The President has evidently concluded that we did not finish our work before we adjourned. He also has evidently decided that it is not a wise thing for us to adjourn when the two Houses agree; that the Executive should make that decision and not the Congress itself.

There will be much argument among the people of the Nation as to whether we were called here with the hope and expectation of accomplishing something really worth while or whether we were called for a purpose which reflects no credit upon the Chief Executive.

I think one suggestion made by the President in his speech accepting a renomination, at which time he announced that an extraordinary occasion had arisen and he was calling a special session of the Congress, was wholly unfair to the Congress. He set forth what he wanted the Congress to do and then stated to the world that it could be done within a period of 15 days if the Congress wanted to do it. This statement was made by a man who had been the Chief Executive for several years and in addition to that had had several years experience in this body. To attempt to make the great body of the American people, inexperienced in Federal legislation, believe that he was stating a fact and that the failure of Congress to do what he said was a practical thing to do, was much more than unbecoming; it was intended to reflect upon the integrity and energy of the Congress and to belittle it in the minds of the people.

In order that the people may better understand the situation, I think it might be well to inquire of the distinguished minority leader, the President's running mate in the next election, whether he agrees that the President's recommendations for civil-rights legislation, for instance, could be passed by this body within 15 days from the day we convene, even if we gave that legislation preference from the very beginning.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I call attention to the fact that the distinguished minority leader has now become the acting majority leader, inasmuch as he occupies the majority leader's seat. We welcome him to this side of the aisle.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say that I stepped across the aisle to talk to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUCK. I should like to continue.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. BUCK. No, Mr. President; I will not. I shall conclude in a few moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor and refuses to yield at this time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, what I said was that in order that the people may better understand the situation, I think it might be well to inquire of the distinguished minority leader, the President's running mate in the next election, whether he agrees that the President's recommendations for civil-rights legislation, for instance, could be passed by this body within 15 days from the day Congress reconvened, even if we gave that legislation preference from the very beginning. If the minority leader's answer should be in the affirmative, then I should like an expression from some of his distinguished colleagues on that side of the Chamber, such as the Senators from Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and other Senators who are opposed to the President's civil-rights program. The history of efforts to legislate upon this subject demonstrates, it seems to me, that there could be no hope of getting this legislation through this body in such a short period, and this must have been known by the President at the time he made his statement.

There were other statements made in that speech that were misleading. He was addressing the delegates who had a short time before selected him as their standard bearer for the next election. The delegates in their platform had declared:

The Republican Eightieth Congress is directly responsible for the existing and ever-increasing high cost of living.

The President declared that the Eightieth Congress had demonstrated that special privilege controlled the Republican Party. He undertook then to demonstrate this to his enthusiastic audience and to the country by showing what they had done and what they had failed to do. One of the things that was supposed to prevent the high cost of living was price control, and to the cheering delegates the President declared:

Time and time again I recommended the extension of price control before it expired on June 30, 1946. That price-control legislation didn't come to my desk until June 30, 1946, on the day on which it was supposed to expire, and it was such a rotten bill that I couldn't sign it.

Thirty days after that they sent me one that was just as bad, and I had to sign it, because they quit and went home.

What the cheering delegates and millions of people did not realize at the moment in connection with this "rotten bill" was that the Congress which "quit and went home" was not the terrible Eightieth Republican Congress that was controlled by special privilege, but was the Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress, the Congress of the people, the progressive Congress, the Congress which had the opportunity to do all the things the President in his message to Congress yesterday asked us to do in a period of 15 days. Maybe we ought not to feel so bad after all, about being charged by the President with being the worst Congress in the history of the Nation. But before leaving this subject suppose we take a look at the "rotten bill" which the Democratic Congress presented to the President. That bill had in it a provision denying the OPA the right to force anyone to sell a product at a loss. Perhaps that was what made it such a "rotten bill." The President must have been afraid that special privilege had gotten its foot in the door of the Democratic Congress.

Let us pursue the subject a little further and see how consistent the critic of this Congress has been upon this subject. The "bad bill" which the President was forced to sign because the Congress quit and went home restored the OPA to power but gave the President the right to end meat and other price controls at his pleasure. This Democratic Congress placed the matter of control squarely up to the President; and believe it or not, the President, by Executive order just before the election in 1946 took control off meat, and a little later took control off other important items. The so-called special privilege crowd must have gotten its foot into the

White House door as well as the door of the Democratic Congress.

There were some important things which the President and other Democrats left out of their speeches at the convention. They blamed the Republicans for the high cost of living. They gave credit to the Democrats for the recovery from the depression; but not a word was said by any of them about the increase in the Government debt and the increase in the annual budget. The truth is that the Government records show that the cost-of-living index stood at 97.6 at the end of 1932, and at the end of 14 years, when the Eightieth Congress came into control of legislation, that index stood at 153.3. Under the Democrats the cost of living had increased 57 percent. The Federal debt at the end of fiscal year 1932 was $18,200,000,000. By 1941 it had been increased to forty-seven billion eight hundred million, or more than two and one-half times in 9 years. Then came the war years, and by 1945 it stood at two hundred and forty-seven billion. The expenditures for 1932 amounted to a little less than five billion; by 1941 it had increased to nearly thirteen billion; and by 1946 it was a little more than sixty-five billion. These cobwebs which the Republicans have promised to clear away next year have certainly cost the people a great deal of money. The matter is too serious, however, to be treated lightly, too serious to be solved within a period of 15 days in midsummer. The President is in no position to do it. The country, as well as his party, has lost confidence in him as a leader and as an executive. He has succeeded in dividing the Democratic Party into three parts. One part is making a great effort to gild what it believes to be the Russian lily; another part has been forced into a corner where it desperately fights for the principle of States' rights; and the President, as the leader of the other part, calls this Congress, which he in desperation has called the worst Congress in our history, for the purpose of strengthening his own political position. He cannot escape responsibility for the bitterness existing among the political parties and factions, and this comes at a time when the whole world is in a turmoil, when a prayer for peace is on the lips and in the heart of every good American man and woman, and when unity should be the watchword. One thing is certain. The call of this Congress is not likely to be helpful in the progress we have made in eliminating racial and religious discrimination. If anything is done that will be helpful to the Nation it will be done under most difficult circumstances. If there be any extraordinary occasion existing in this country it is not one for this Congress. It is one for the people of the Nation in November, and I trust they will appreciate the opportunity that confronts them and give us a President who will make a new approach to the problems of the Nation.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL-TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil-transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if possible, I should like to dispose of the unfinished business today; but before doing so I think it would be well to ask for a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest to the Senator from Maine that the acting majority leader has been advised that there will be a series of speeches on his proposed legislation. I understand from the Secretary of the Senate that certain Senators interested in this bill have been informed that no action would be taken this afternoon and several of them have left the precincts of the Senate. In view of the lateness of the hour, I suggest that the Senator from Maine make such statements in support of his bill as he cares to make this afternoon, and that the Senate then take a recess and proceed with the discussion of his bill at the opening of the session tomorrow.

Mr. BREWSTER. Am I to understand that I may anticipate an opportunity to discuss the bill tomorrow?

Mr. MORSE. I am advised that it will be the pending business when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, following a recess tonight. It is very doubtful if there is any hope of concluding debate on the Senator's proposal this evening. In view of the lateness of the hour, I suggest that we proceed with the debate until perhaps 5 o'clock, and then take a recess.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, inasmuch as earlier in the session I made a statement regarding the bill, it would be better if we could take a recess at this time and take up the bill tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Maine withdraws his request for a quorum call.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 270) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That during the present special session of the Congress, in the interests of efficiency and conservation of time, no Senator shall speak more than once, on any subject, and no more than 30 minutes thereon.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be suspended for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The resolution constitutes a change in the rule of the Senate which requires a formal notice, and a resolution making such a change would have to lie over. It seems to me it would be unfair to try to adopt such a resolution at this time of day.

Mr. TOBEY. I concur in the Senator's thought. But would not the Senator think it a "blessed event" if we could obtain such a procedure in the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have often expressed my belief that the Senate rules should be modified in behalf of the prompt passage of legislation, but I doubt whether this is the proper way to do it.

Mr. TOBEY. I refer to the special session, particularly.

I wish the Senator would tell me how we could properly do what I have proposed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not like to be required to do that now. I might take more than the 30 minutes as provided by the Senator's resolution.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall come back to the Senator about the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GEORGE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under objection, the resolution will lie over for a day.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if there is no other business to come before the Senate at this time, I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday July 29, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 29, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 28, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou prayer-answering God, we are again invoking Thy blessing, beseeching Thee to make our minds and hearts the sanctuaries of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

Grant that daily we may strive to bring to fulfillment those spiritual ideals and aspirations which Thou hast implanted within our souls.

Enable us to release the hidden splendor of struggling humanity, emancipating it from everything that mars and degrades the image of God in which we have been created.

Fill us with a passion to lead men and nations out of the darkness of night into the radiant light of that new day which will be more blessed than our fondest hopes.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 28, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

DEATH OF JAMES E. WATSON, OF INDIANA

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, former Senator James E. Watson, of Indiana, passed away this morning. His death removes from the field of government and politics a figure that has been outstanding for half a century. From humble birth, James E. Watson rose to a position of influence in the affairs not only of his home State of Indiana and his Nation but of the world. For more than 40 years he was a power in the National House of Representatives and in the United States Senate. He was beloved by all his associates. He possessed a winning personality, a wealth of humor, and a keen mind, and he used these talents to the advantage of his own political party and in the interest of his country. His death leaves a void which will be hard to fill.

At this time, Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and myself, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 271), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and extreme regret the announcement of the death of Hon. James E. Watson, for 17 years a Senator from the State of Indiana.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased, together with a transcript of remarks made in the Senate in praise of his distinguished service to the Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement with regard to the resolution. I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a word by way of tribute to my long-time friend and our former colleague here, Senator Watson, of Indiana.

While, as everybody knows, we differed on many political questions that affected the country, I can say with pride that during my service in the Senate I have had no more devoted or esteemed friend than was Senator Watson.

I recall the first time I ever saw him before I came to the Congress in the first instance. Back in the days of the Chautauqua, when nearly every city or community of any size or importance had an annual series of entertainments and lectures, known as the Chautauqua program, Senator Watson, then a Member of the House of Representatives, came to my home city and delivered an address at what was then known as the Redpath Chautauqua. I have never heard a more eloquent or brilliant address than he delivered. I often referred to it, after I came to the Senate and became personally acquainted with him, as being one of the ablest and most inspiring addresses I had ever heard either on a Chautauqua or any other program. Senator Watson always, with the keen sense of humor and appreciation for which he was noted, thanked me for referring to the earlier address made by him before I ever became acquainted with him.

I cherished him as a personal friend. During his tenure here as leader of the Senate when the Democrats were in the minority, I was the object of many courtesies and many evidences of consideration on his part, and even after he left the Senate he took many occasions to renew and to fortify the friendship which had existed between us during our service here.

He was an able statesman. He was a partisan advocate, of course, for those principles in which he and his party believed. Sometimes the debates on those subjects became very intense, but never bitter, because Senator Watson had too fundamental a sense of humor and of the propriety of things to let his differences with his colleagues interfere with his good nature, his good humor, and his friendly attitude toward them.

I deeply mourn his loss, not only as an outstanding figure over a long period in the public life of the Nation but as a warm-hearted personal friend, and I express through these feeble remarks my profound sympathy for the members of his family. I want them to know that all the remainder of my life I shall cherish deeply the friendship which existed between Senator Watson and me.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to say a word to express the sense of sorrow I have at the news of the death of former Senator Watson. He was an old and close friend of my grandfather when they were Members of the Senate, and I had known Senator Watson since childhood days. I always thought him a wonderful man, because of his wholehearted interest in other people and in causes greater than himself, because of his patriotic love of country, because of his humor, and because of the fact that he never took himself too seriously.

Senator Watson was a fine example of an American public servant. He had friends in every corner of the United States who will be sorry to read the announcement of his death.

I wish to record my sense of grief at the news, and to extend my sympathy to those he left behind.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have learned with personal sorrow of the death of former Senator Watson. He was well and favorably known in the State of Missouri from which I come. My recollection of him brings back to my memory my own distinguished friend and law partner who served for some years as a Member of this body, the late Honorable Selden P. Spencer, of Missouri, who was a friend of Senator Watson.

Since my brief experience began here in Washington, it has been my privilege and pleasure to see Senator Watson on too infrequent occasions, because I always enjoyed being with him and valued highly his friendship.

He served as the majority leader of the Senate from 1929 to 1933. Notwithstanding his age he had an alertness and keenness of mind, and the humor to which reference has already been made today was always present with him.

I am sure, Mr. President, that in speaking today I voice the sentiments of many of my friends and neighbors in the State of Missouri when I express this word of sorrow and regret, and I join with the other Senators who have spoken in expressing to his family and to his other relatives my sympathy and sense of personal loss.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, hardly a thing in this historic Chamber seems the same today.

Back home in Indiana things must be different today, too, because Jim Watson is dead.

Jim was as much a part of this Chamber as are the desks on the floor.

He was as much a part of Indiana as are the willows on the banks of the Wabash.

James Eli Watson was born in Winchester, Ind., on November 2, 1864. It seemed appropriate to Senator Jim Watson's long political career that his eighty-fifth birthday would have fallen on the day when the Nation will next elect a President of the United States.

Senator Watson obtained his education in Winchester and at DePauw University in Greencastle, Ind.

He was admitted to the bar in Indiana in 1886 and practiced law in Winchester.

Jim Watson had been active in Indiana Republican politics from the time he was 17 years old.

It was just 56 years ago, though, that Jim first appeared on a ballot, and he lost that election. It was for Presidential elector on the ticket of Harrison and Reid.

He moved to Rushville, Ind., then and was elected on the Republican ticket to the Fifty-fourth Congress.

Senator Watson began his great public service in the House of Representatives on March 4, 1895.

Jim suffered another defeat 2 years later, but he came back to the Fifty-sixth Congress on March 4, 1899, and was reelected to the four succeeding Congresses.

He was not a candidate in 1908 for Congress, but he did run for Governor of Indiana, but was defeated by Thomas R. Marshall.

In 1916 Jim Watson became Senator Jim for the first time when he was elected to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Benjamin F. Shively.

He served continuously in this august body until March 3, 1933.

I could talk of Jim Watson's interesting life for hours, but most of my colleagues know the story of Uncle Jim.

He was kindly in all his undertakings.

He was keen of mind.

He was a great orator.

He was a leader.

He was a fine public servant who gave to his country the benefit of those great and many qualities which God had bestowed upon this gentleman from Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] for himself and his colleague [Mr. CAPEHART].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ALLOCATION OF PIG IRON FOR CERTAIN INDUSTRIES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of pig iron for certain industries requiring cast iron for the manufacture of products for residential housing, and copies of the requests for compliance therewith issued by the Secretary of Commerce to various pig-iron producers and manufacturers of pig-iron products (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

A letter from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONVEGNO INTERNAZIONALE PARLAMENTARI, GENOVA, ITALY

A letter from A. Tarchiani, Ambassador of Italy, conveying an invitation of the Chamber of Commerce of Genova, Italy, to the Congress of the United States to be represented in the Convegno Internazionale Parlamentari in Genova, Italy, September 14 through 17, 1948 (with an accompanying pamphlet); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Vincent O. Waldeck, National Chief Two-Timer, The Two-Timer Veterans Association, of San Diego, Calif., praying for the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Nixon un-American activities bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the executive committee of the Trades Union Council of the Liberal Party of New York, N. Y., endorsing the recommendations of the President to the special session of the Eightieth Congress; ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. BARKLEY introduced Senate bill 2910, to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 2911. A bill to revive and reenact as amended the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHERRY (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FEAZEL, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 2912. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2913. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BARKLEY also introduced Senate bill 2914, to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act by liberalizing benefits, by increasing amounts beneficiaries may earn without loss of benefits, and by lowering the age of eligibility of women beneficiaries, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

CONTROL OF INFLATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce a bill carrying out the President's recommendations with regard to inflation. I understand that the Committee on Banking and Currency had a meeting this morning with a view to holding some hearings on the subject, and I want to introduce this bill and have it referred to that committee for their consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received, and referred as requested.

The bill (S. 2910) to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BARKLEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a summary of the provisions of the anti-inflation bill introduced by me.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF ANTI-INFLATION ACT OF 1948

DECLARATION OF POLICY

The declaration of policy recognizes that existing inflationary conditions and maldistribution of scarce materials threaten to (1) impair the standard of living in the United States, (2) disrupt interstate and foreign commerce, (3) produce future deflation and unemployment, (4) undermine national security, and (5) obstruct the foreign policy of the United States.

It therefore provides that the Federal Government should pursue a comprehensive and coordinated anti-inflation program.

TITLE I. REGULATION OF CONSUMER CREDIT

When credit is created to finance the purchases of consumers, it means additional funds are added to the spending stream. Without an equivalent increase in the output of goods—an impossibility under present full-employment conditions—swelling the spending stream means additional upward pressure on prices. Consumers do not get more goods, but have to pay more for the goods they do get.

Title I calls for revival of regulation W, by which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System exercised control over consumer credit until August of 1947.

The approach involved in this regulation is to restrict the flow of consumer credit by limiting the capacity of consumers to borrow, rather than by curtailing the supply of credit available.

The basic requirements used are: (1) Minimum down payments that consumers have to make in purchasing any of the listed items (automobiles, cooking stoves, ranges, etc.); (2) maximum lengths of time over which installment payments can run. The higher the minimum down payment under (1), the larger the proportion of the purchase price the consumer must provide out of his own resources and the smaller the amount of credit creation inolved in the purchase. The shorter the maximum period under (2), the more rapid will the credit that is injected into the spending stream on behalf of the consumer be withdrawn again as the debt is paid off.

Both requirements mean less credit creation, less inflationary pressure than otherwise. They may work hardship on some consumers, but as part of an over-all attack on inflation, they will contribute to the welfare of consumers.

TITLE II. BANK RESERVES

The volume of credit banks can extend is limited by the fact that banks are required by law to hold a certain proportion of their deposits in the form of a reserve; only the remaining amount of their funds is available for lending and investing. For banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System—which includes those that do the bulk of the banking business in the United States—the proportion of deposits that is required to be covered by reserves is determined by the Federal Reserve Board.

By increasing this proportion the Board can exercise a restraining influence on the volume of credit extended to borrowers by member banks. To meet increases in reserve requirements, banks may be forced to forego using funds for loans they may otherwise make or sell some of their earning assets in order to procure additional reserve funds. Furthermore, a rise in reserve requirements means that a smaller portion of any new funds that are deposited with the member banks—as a result, say, of gold inflow from abroad—will be available for banks to use for loan expansion.

At present the Board has nearly exhausted the possibilities of restraining credit through changing reserve requirements. The reserve requirements for all banks under the Board's jurisdiction, except those in New York and Chicago, have been raised to their legal maximum, while only a 2-percent increase remains for the New York and Chicago banks.

This title would raise the legal maximum to which the Board could increase reserve requirements should conditions warrant it during the next 2 years. The new maximum would permit the Board to raise the ratio of required reserves to demand deposits by another 10 percentage points, and the ratio of required reserves to time deposits by another 4 percentage points. These percentage-point increases would apply to all member banks.

TITLE III. PRICES AND WAGES

Although fiscal and credit controls will contribute to a reduction in the general inflationary pressure, they will not, unless undesirably severe, eliminate the specific inflationary pressures affecting specific prices. To control those strategic areas where inflationary pressures are exceptionally strong, specific price and wage controls are necessary.

Prices

With respect to prices, the bill provides that maximum prices may be established for specific commodities when certain conditions are fulfilled.

Criteria for Price Control

A maximum price may be established whenever (a) the commodity is important in the cost of living or of production; (b) the price has risen or threatens to rise at least 20 percent above the June 1946 level or nearest representative period; (c) regulation of the price is practicable and enforceable; and (d) the public interest will be secured by such regulation.

Standards for Maximum Prices

(a) Maximum prices to be issued must be generally fair and equitable and will aid in controlling inflation.

(b) So far as practicable, maximum prices, when imposed, would be set at the level of prices prevailing in November 1947, or nearest appropriate period, with consideration given to (i) speculative fluctuations; (ii) changes in costs; (iii) changes in profits and other relevant factors.

(c) Industry consultation before issuing a price order is required except where immediately impracticable, when a temporary 90-day price order may be issued freezing the prices prevailing within 5 days prior to the issuance of such temporary freeze. The temporary freeze is then to be replaced by one based upon consultation.

(d) Orders may be issued providing that sellers of a commodity may not raise prices except after due notice not to exceed 30 days as may be specified. Public hearings may be held. Maximum prices may be issued at any time at levels lower than the increased prices.

(e) Maximum price orders are to be reviewed either on the initiative of the Government or at the request of industry advisory committees to be set up. Such reviews are to consider changes in costs and profits since June 30, 1946.

(f) Individual adjustment for hardship cases is provided to correct gross inequities where it will not impair compliance with the regulation.

(g) Agricultural prices: Maximum prices for agricultural commodities must be high enough to reflect the parity price or a comparable price established by the Secretary of Agriculture. In addition, a disaster clause exists for fresh fruits and vegetables.

Duration of Price Authority

The authority under this table is to terminate on June 30, 1950, or sooner by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress except that liability to prosecution for offenses will continue.

Judicial Review of Maximum Price Regulation

Virtually the same as under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

Penalties for Willful Violation

A fine of not more than $10,000 and/or a prison term of not more than 1 year.

Administration

The administration is vested in the departments specifically designated by the President.

Wages

This section establishes wage controls over employees only when a maximum price has been established affecting the employer and when the employer expects to use the wage (or benefit) adjustment as a basis for seeking price relief. In other words, under this section a covered employer may by voluntary action raise wages without regard to the act, except that he cannot for a period of 6 months use a nonapproved increase as a basis for requesting an adjustment in his price ceiling.

A temporary Wage Board is created, composed of two public representatives, two employee representatives, and two employer representatives. Requests for action by the Wage Board may be made to the Board at any time. In acting upon the request for approval the Board shall determine whether the wage increase or any portion of it is necessary: (1) To compensate for increases in the cost of living or prevent lowering of living standards, or (2) to correct inequities in the wage structure, or (3) to correct substandards of living, or (4) to maintain essential production at levels certified by the department.

TITLE IV. PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS

This title reenacts and amends section 2 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended, so as to give the President the powers listed below, to be used when and as needed to fulfill defense requirements, carry out United States foreign policy, or curb inflation. These powers expire June 30, 1950, unless previously terminated by the President or by concurrent resolution.

Priority powers over any material or facility.

Allocation and priority powers over any material or facility basically affecting production or the cost of living, after formal notice, public hearing, and such investigation as the President deems appropriate. The notice and hearing may be waived if the President finds that they would promote hoarding, speculation, or excessive consumption and thus defeat the purposes of allocation.

Inventory control powers, at the President's discretion, over any scarce material basically affecting production or the cost of living.

Existing export controls provided by section 6 (d) of the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, are extended to June 30, 1950.

TITLE V. RENT CONTROL

This title authorizes the Housing Expediter to establish maximum rents or reestablish regulation of rents wherever he thinks this is desirable. The basis for the rents to be established will be the same as the basis previously used except that he is given broad discretion to make adjustments "for such relevant factors as he may determine," including changes in property taxes and other costs.

The title authorizes the Housing Expediter to recontrol units occupied by permanent tenants in hotels, but does not give him authority over quarters in motor courts and similar facilities.

The title also authorizes the Expediter to recontrol units that previously had been decontrolled for any reason and also to bring under control units not previously controlled, such as new units provided by new construction or conversion. For units now brought under control or recontrolled the maximum rent with latitude for discretion, will be the last maximum controlled rent or the prevailing rents for similar controlled accommodations plus allowance for increases in the construction costs since 1939 in the case of new houses.

The title also authorizes suit for treble damages for overcharges and gives the Expediter authority to bring suit in the name of the United States Government. This authority is now vested solely in the tenant. The Expediter also is given authority to refer to the Department of Justice willful violations or evasive practices for appropriate criminal prosecutions.

TITLE VI. REGULATION OF COMMODITY EXCHANGES

Speculation on commodity exchanges has been an important factor in exaggerating inflationary pressures on the prices of essential agricultural commodities, and in causing unwarranted and harmful fluctuations in these prices. Under existing authorities, the Government has been powerless to curb such abuses. Title VI is designed to remedy this defect by giving the Secretary of Agriculture specific authority to regulate margins of trading on the commodity exchanges.

The practice of trading on margin has contributed in important degree to the speculative excesses in commodity trading. Following the extreme fluctuations in prices on the exchange during the past year the President and other officials repeatedly called to the attention of the exchanges the need to raise margin requirements. Only in response to strong pressure of public opinion did the exchanges belatedly and partially accede to the Government's request. Such action as they took was couched in terms that expressed their open resentment at being called upon to take the public interest into account in the regulation of their affairs.

To prevent the recurrence of such situations it is essential that the Government have power for direct preventive action. The authority over margins granted to the Secretary of Agriculture under title VI is limited by the requirement of an official determination that speculative trading is causing or threatens to cause unwarranted price fluctuations. Thus legitimate hedging activities on the exchanges are protected.

Title VI takes the form of an amendment to the present Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (42 Stat. 998; 49 Stat. 1491; 59 Stat. 205; 54 Stat. 1059). It would be administered through the agency already established for carrying out that act, and would use the existing powers and machinery of enforcement.

TITLE VII. MISCELLANEOUS

This title includes three important sections on the coordination of the anti-inflation program.

Section 701 provides that the President may issue any orders and regulations to agencies in the executive branch that he regards as necessary in order to have them exercise their powers in a manner to assist in accomplishing the objectives of the act. It also provides for quarterly Presidential reports to Congress on the progress that has been made in controlling inflation and on further legislative proposals concerning the control of inflation.

Section 702 creates an Anti-Inflation Coordinator in the Executive Office of the President who is to assist the President in the coordination of the anti-inflation activities of the various executive agencies. The Coordinator is to be subject to confirmation by the Senate.

Section 703 establishes an Anti-Inflation Advisory Board to advise the Anti-Inflation Coordinator with respect to the anti-inflation program. It is to include members who have had experience in business management, in agriculture, in matters relating to labor and in consumer problems. It is to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate.

In addition, title VII includes minor sections on separability, the authorization of appropriations, and the inapplicability of the Administrative Procedure Act.

THE SPECIAL SESSION AND PRICES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Special Session and Prices, broadcast by him July 28, 1948, over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co. and the Mutual Broadcasting System, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS AT THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator LUCAS at the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia, Pa., on July 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS AT THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Both Ends Against the Middle," delivered by him at the opening session of the Democratic National Convention, Philadelphia Convention Hall, July 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LEGISLATIVE SITUATION AND HIGH PRICES—BROADCAST BY SENATOR WILEY AND GEORGE E. REEDY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast regarding the legislative situation and the problem of high prices by himself and George E. Reedy, of the Arrowhead Network, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO—SECONDING SPEECH BY ROBERT S. BEE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech prepared by Robert S. Bee, to be presented in seconding the nomination of Senator JOHNSON for election to the Senate, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH OF CHARLES J. BLOCH AT THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION NOMINATING SENATOR RUSSELL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Charles J. Bloch, of Macon, Ga., vice chairman of the Georgia delegation to the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., nominating Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, as Democratic candidate for President of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CALL OF STATESMANSHIP IN THE POLITICAL WELTER—EDITORIAL FROM THE ATLANTA JOURNAL

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Call of Statesmanship in the Political Welter," published in the Atlanta Journal of July 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on civil rights, by George E. Sokolsky, published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY RALPH McGILL

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on civil rights, written by Mr. Ralph McGill, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD various editorials relative to the poll tax, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPAGANDA FEEDS ON FEUDS—ARTICLE BY DREW PEARSON

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Propaganda Feeds on Feuds in United States," by Drew Pearson, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is my intention to move in a few moments to take up the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

I might state briefly before I make that motion that H. R. 29 passed the House on July 21, 1947, by a vote of 290 in favor to 112 against. The bill came over to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and on April 30, 1948, the bill was reported to the Senate, and it is now on the calendar and ready for consideration.

I may state briefly that because we are pledged to support the bill, not only individually but as a party, I felt the legislation should have been considered in the regular session. Every Senator knows that the problems relating to foreign relations and domestic issued which were brought up then needed the immediate consideration of the Senate. For that reason it was impossible to bring up the poll-tax bill except in possibly the last few hours of the session, and we know what the fate of the measure at that time would probably have been.

Mr. President, regardless of the why or the how or wherefore of Congress coming back into special session, let me say that the President of the United States in Philadelphia and again in his message delivered at the joint session of the two Houses on Tuesday of this week stressed the need for consideration of this particular bill at this special session of the Congress which he has called.

The reason why we are proposing to take up the bill now primarily is this: In the first category of matters the President submitted to the joint meeting of the two Houses he included legislation dealing with inflation, and housing legislation. The Members of the Senate know that we passed a housing bill before we adjourned. The Members of the Senate know that if there is to be anything done with respect to inflation, legislation dealing with that subject must be processed through the committees and then brought to the floor of the two Houses for debate if it comes out of committees. We have already passed legislation to provide Federal aid to education. In the 11-point program presented by the President no measure which he suggested is ready for debate except this particular bill, H. R. 29.

So in view of the fact that this is one of the President's proposals, and one of the prime reasons why he has called the Congress into special session, I see no reason why action should not be taken on the bill; in fact, I believe we are foreclosed in that respect, whether we would like to bring it up or not, whether the attempt to bring it up is going to result in endless debate or is not going to result in endless debate. Any bill brought forward on the floor of the Senate usually involves considerable debate. I have seen bills having no relation whatever to the poll tax which have caused debate of great length on the floor of the Senate. So we cannot refuse to bring up the poll-tax bill for that reason.

Therefore, I think the only logical thing to do, in view of the fact that the President insists on debate being had on this issue and on the passage of the legislation, if possible, is to bring it before the Senate at this time. It should be brought up for the further reason that of all the matters suggested in his 11-point program it is the only bill available and ready for consideration.

So, Mr. President, in that spirit, and most hopefully, I now make the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 29.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Barkley	Holland	Reed
Brewster	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Tobey
Ecton	McKellar	Tydings
Ellender	McMahon	Umstead
Feazel	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Maybank	Wherry
George	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	Young
Hawkes	Myers	
Hayden	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina, if I may have unanimous consent that I shall not be taken from the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from California yielding to the Senator from South Carolina under the circumstances indicated? The Chair hears no objection.

CONTROL OF INFLATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say for the benefit of Senators who are not members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, in keeping with what the distinguished acting majority leader had to say about the anti-inflation program, that we considered the proposed bill this morning. For the benefit of Senators who are present, let me say that last winter the first portion of the bill, title I, was approved by our committee by a vote of 9 to 4 and passed by the Senate.

Title II of the great anti-inflation measure recommended by the President would apply to Federal Reserve banks. In view of the fact that there are approximately 7,000 Federal Reserve banks, and approximately 7,000 State banks, as the testimony showed, the question of States' rights was brought into the banking issue. It is the opinion of Mr. McCabe, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, that this provision of the bill could be made effective only by voluntary cooperation on the part of State banks, unless extended hearings were held and we went into the question fully.

I merely wished to keep the RECORD straight as to the problem of control of inflation, for which purpose Congress has been called back.

I thank the Senator from California.

PROPOSED CONTRACT WITH PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, my remarks will not require more than 5 minutes. I should like to be able to complete them. They involve a subject which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senate, because of the public policy involved.

When I was in the State of California recently I heard a report which seemed to me to involve a violation of good public policy. If the proposed action is followed in other instances I believe that both the Congress and the country should be concerned.

On July 26, when I returned to Washington, I wrote a letter to Vice Adm. William W. Smith, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, regarding the subject. I wish to read my letter to Admiral Smith and his reply to me. My letter to Admiral Smith is as follows:

JULY 26, 1948.

Vice Adm. WILLIAM W. SMITH,
Maritime Commission,
Commerce Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMIRAL: I have been informed, from what I believe to be a reliable source, that a proposal has been made, either orally or in writing, that the American President Lines board of directors give to Mr. George Killion, the present president, a 5-year contract at his present salary of $25,000 a year in order that no possible change in the national administration could affect his status.

I would like to inquire of you as to whether or not you know of any such proposal having been made, and whether the United States Maritime Commission has been requested to approve any such contract. It seems to me that a question of public policy is involved in any such proposal which would be subject to severe criticism by both the Congress and the public generally.

Awaiting your early reply, and with best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator.

Let me say parenthetically that Mr. Killion is a former treasurer of the National Democratic Party. I make no comments at this time as to the job he has done as president of the American President Lines, because I do not believe that is the immediate issue involved. The question is whether, by means of such contracts, whether they be for 3 years, 5 years, or 10 years, certain administration favorites can be protected in their jobs regardless of a change in the national administration.

Under date of July 27 I received a letter from Admiral Smith which I wish to read into the RECORD:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, July 27, 1948.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Replying to your letter of July 26, 1948, relative to the American President Lines and the request of the board of directors that Mr. George Killion, now president, be given a 5-year contract at a salary of $25,000 per year, I assure you that no communication from the board of directors has as yet reached the Commission.

On his last visit in Washington some 2 weeks ago Mr. Killion stated that the board of directors wished to forward a contract for the approval of the Maritime Commission, this contract to bind him as president for a period of 3 years. He stated that his board of directors would not forward such contract unless assured that it would be favorably received by the Maritime Commission. I replied to Mr. Killion that in my opinion he has demonstrated his ability as an efficient president of the company and that I had no objection to the forwarding of the contract by the board of directors. I assured him also that these were my personal observations and opinions and that they did not reflect the attitude of the Commission when the matter comes up for consideration.

Copies of your letter have been distributed to members of the Commission and it is my intention of discussing the matter with them this afternoon. If the proposed contract is received, I shall take it up with the Commission and keep you informed of any action taken by us.

Very sincerely yours,

W. W. SMITH, *Chairman.*

Now, I wish to say, Mr. President, that this is wholly an unsatisfactory answer, so far as I am concerned. The tenor of the letter, as I understand it, may not have been what was intended; the writer of the letter may not have meant to have the letter carry the idea it seems to me to convey, namely, that there is a possibility that the Commission might approve such a contract and might notify the Senate or the individual Senator concerned, who brought it to their attention, after the contract had been approved.

As I pointed out earlier, if such a thing can happen in this one case, then I do not see why the same policy could not be followed in numerous other cases; and then, instead of having a 3-year or a 5-year contract, they might give a 10-year or a 20-year contract; and certainly that would be circumventing the best interests of the country and the possible changes that a new administration would have every right to expect it might deem necessary to be made in the interest of the efficiency of the Federal Government.

I merely wish to serve notice on the Senate that I have called this matter to the attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and I have requested that he look into it. If this is to be a precedent for other Government corporations, I think the entire field should be surveyed.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Of course, I am intensely interested in the presentation which has been made by the distinguished Senator from California. The matter of jurisdiction just flashed through my mind, in view of the reference to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. In the absence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] I am acting chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Therefore, in order to make assurance doubly sure and to see that there is no leak in the dike, I propose to telephone Vice Admiral Smith and see that nothing of that sort is done until we have an opportunity to look into the matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Certainly.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say that I have no pride of jurisdiction. I do not wish to trespass on the rights of my friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that I am familiar with the matter, since it has been called to my attention by the Senator from California. There is no conflict of jurisdiction in this matter. It can very properly come before either or both the committees which have been referred to.

But I should like to add that, if there is to be a general practice of blanketing in favorites for a long period in the future, it does not seem to me that such a practice should be recognized by any incoming Congress as orthodox or legal or binding. Otherwise the will of the people could be completely thwarted by an expiring administration by blanketing in their key employees for a period of years, which in this case would extend over 4 years. As a matter of fact, if they could be blanketed in and given a contract for 4 years, I see no reason why such persons could not be given a contract for 10 years, or 20 years, or even for life.

If this is to be the practice—I am not saying that it is—I do not see why any new Congress or any new administration should consider such a contract as binding upon it.

WAGES AT THE BOSTON NAVAL SHIPYARD

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have recently received a letter from Mr. Edward F. Hines, secretary of the Charlestown Metal Trades Council, which presents in a very graphic and convincing manner what has been happening to the wages being paid the workers at the Boston Naval Shipyard. In this letter are parallel columns showing in one column the wages paid by the State of Massachusetts and in another column the wages paid by the Boston Naval Shipyard for comparable work. It is a sad story.

This is a matter involving the very livelihood of human beings and, in my opinion, it calls for the promptest possible remedial action. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTOWN METAL TRADES COUNCIL,
Hyde Park, Mass., July 26, 1948.

Hon. HENRY C. LODGE, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LODGE: The time has come when, of necessity, we must ask: What are you going to do about the chaotic condition which confronts the craftsmen and production workers of the Boston Naval Shipyard? Is the magnificent fleet of our United States Navy, which was built by our craftsmen in our naval establishments, to be a hollow, meaningless defender of the American way of life? As you are well aware, the cost of living has risen to such proportions that the words "American way of life" begin to take on a new, unfamiliar, unpleasant, and unhealthy aspect. Below is a table of wages which we wish you to examine:

List of wages paid by State of Massachusetts on public-works projects

	Per hour
Bricklayers	$2.50
Cement finisher	2.50
Plasterer	2.50
Carpenter	2.10
Electrician	2.30
Painter	2.00
Sheet-metal worker	2.15
Plumber	2.30
Steamfitter	2.00
Iron worker and rigger	2.15
Boilermaker	2.25
Common laborer	1.55

List of wages paid by Boston Naval Shipyard for comparable work

	Per hour
Bricklayer	$1.45
Cement finisher	1.39
Plasterer	1.45
Carpenter	1.42
Electrician	1.48
Painter	1.42
Sheet-metal worker	1.45
Plumber and steamfitter	1.42
Shipfitter	1.42
Iron worker and rigger	1.39
Boilermaker	1.42
Common laborer	1.06

It should be noted that an unskilled laborer working for the State of Massachusetts receives more than a skilled craftsman working in the Boston Naval Shipyard.

In addition to this, investigation will reveal that the navy yards at Norfolk, Va.; Washington, D. C.; and Charleston, S. C., have all been granted an additional increase in wages since the last inadequate increase of October 1947. This was accomplished by bringing the injustices and methods employed by the Navy Department to the attention of their elected representatives in both Houses of Congress. The Anderson law of 1862, which had worked fairly satisfactorily for a number of years, suddenly, under the present naval administration took on a new and detrimental meaning for civilian employees.

If this injustice can be corrected for other naval shipyards in the country, what is the matter with Massachusetts? With one of the oldest naval shipyards, namely, the Boston Naval Shipyard?

Why should a craftsman, producing identical work for our Navy in Boston, be paid $1.45 per hour as compared with $1.63 per hour on the west coast, all for the same work? In one craft for example, there are seven different rates of pay in the 12 naval establishments of the east and west coasts for the same work ranging from $1.38 per hour to $1.63 per hour.

Figures of the Department of Labor and Industries, Division of the Necessaries of Life, State of Massachusetts, indicate that the cost of living has increased 63.5 percent from January 1941, with an average figure of 37 percent increase in wages in the Boston Naval Shipyard in an 8-year period from 1940 to 1948. It can easily be seen that our employees, working for our Government, cannot maintain their families in the American way of which some of our statisticians boast, with such divergencies as exists between the wages paid and the cost of living. In addition, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics recently disclosed that it took from $3,004 to $3,458 for an average family of four to live modestly without any frills, whatsoever. The wages paid for a skilled man at the Boston Naval Shipyard would net him $3,190.80 for a year.

This puts our skilled men and their families in a pretty poor financial bracket. In order for our men to keep up with the above figures of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, they would have to receive a top rate of at least $1.60 per hour. To add to the plight of our already harassed fellow workers and their families is the additional reduction from their wages of 1 percent for retirement, which accounts for approximately 61 cents less take-home pay. In addition, the inadequate increase that we received in October 1947 places a number of our men in a new income tax bracket, which brought them a decrease in wages rather than an increase. All of these, together, constitutes a reduction in current buying power which in turn reduces the food on a table already depleted.

Again, we say that we do not wish to add fuel to the inflationary spiral; but, what family can survive when the cost of supporting that family exceeds the income about 2 to 1? The Congress has recognized this fact for a portion of its workers and investigation will prove that the surveys conducted for wage board employees would provide a living wage if based on fact and not conducted in secrecy, as it was.

We must, of necessity, inform you that there is tremendous pressure from all of the men in this shipyard to inform you of this chaotic condition. Therefore, we ask you, our elected representative, to join together with the other Members of Congress from Massachusetts to correct this iniquitous condition by granting an immediate 25 cents an hour increase for instant relief and press for an immediate resurvey for the Boston Naval Shipyard.

Respectfully yours,
EDWARD F. HINES,
Secretary.

THE MONTANA PLAN FOR VETERANS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to refer to a letter from Mr. Tom Davis, of Montana, who has received international recognition for his long and distinguished record of public service. Tom Davis has served our veterans and the businessmen of the Nation well and faithfully; and it is with great pride that the people of the United States, as well as those of Montana, give him credit. His letter concerns the Montana plan, which is devised to build business careers for veterans and to benefit all the people of his State of Montana by helping to develop the economy of the individual person in the individual community. The Montana plan interests us in this Eightieth Congress because the plan will be helpful to the interest of the citizens of all 48 States who wish to raise the standard of living of their people.

Mr. President, the Montana plan, which I have helped the veterans' organizations and Tom Davis, of Montana, to devise, is expected to increase the prosperity and security of every individual in the community of that State. Veterans, small-business men, and other members of the communities can increase their incomes and can benefit from the hundreds of thousands of economic opportunities that are waiting to be developed in Montana through private initiative and private enterprise.

To enable our veterans and small-business men to prosper and to attain new leadership for the benefit of all our people, we have sponsored in the United States Congress the bipartisan bill, Senate bill 1652, the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act, popularly called the Little Man's RFC Act. This act, which will implement the Montana plan and other State plans, is designed to enable the small-business men and the veterans in each community to develop gainful careers and businesses under our free-enterprise system—the system that has made us the greatest Nation in all human history.

I ask unanimous consent to have Tom Davis' letter and the Montana plan inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and plan were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUTTE, MONT.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: In your plan to develop our great West under such legislation as the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act, I consider it a privilege and an honor to be invited to join you and Senator BRIDGES, chairman of the important Senate Appropriations Committee; Senator BUCK, of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency; Senator CAPEHART, of the Senate Committee on Small Business; Senator DWORSHAK, of Idaho; Senator KNOWLAND, of California; Senator ROBERTSON of Wyoming; Senator CAIN, of Washington; Senator MORSE, of Oregon, the chairman of the Veterans' Subcommittee of the Senate Committee of Labor and Welfare; Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan; House Chairman WOLCOTT, of the Banking and Currency Committee; EDITH ROGERS, the chairman of the House Veterans' Committee; and the other 30 distinguished sponsors of this important legislation.

You have dramatically called attention to the unlimited opportunities for this program in the development of the economic resources of the West. You correctly state that millions of acres of dry land can be brought into production by irrigation. You point out that the development of the vast mineral resources and of hydroelectric power, and the bringing in of new industries, all under the American system of free enterprise and equality of opportunity, will bring prosperity to the 11 Western States. These States now have a population of 16,000,000.

Not only will the suggested program raise the level of prosperity of those 16,000,000, it will create support for 60,000,000 people at the same high level of prosperity when all of the resources are adequately developed. I favor the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act for all of the Western States; in fact, for the United States. But especially, I propose to make it effective in the State of Montana.

The economic prospects listed above represent some of the hopes I have for the development of Montana through the veterans' RFC. For that reason I am anxious to join in support of this legislation and to give it my wholehearted approval.

Yours very sincerely,
TOM J. DAVIS.

THE MONTANA PLAN TO BOOST STATE INDUSTRY

Montana is a young State, because it was admitted into the Union in 1889, and in its youth it possesses vitality, strength, and ambition. The eyes of the entire country are upon the progressive action we have initiated in our Montana plan. However, Montana's youth is not to be compared with its size. It is the third largest State in the Nation—it is larger than New England, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland combined. Known as the Treasure State, it is a blend of industrial scenes, mining ventures, and wind-swept prairies. There are untold opportunities in Montana, and under the Montana plan I am confident that we now can go forth to greater glory and for the enrichment of our people.

The people in the communities of the United States today have the greatest opportunity to prosper of all time. But simultaneously, they are being challenged by world communism—the most powerful force ever to be utilized by dictators to thwart individual liberty, initiative, and prosperity. The surest way for us to maintain our national strength and to ward off the advance of Communist imperialism and war is to increase the prosperity and economic security of all the people in our communities. It is the best—the only way—to make democracy, based on free enterprise, work.

NEW OPPORTUNITIES IN MONTANA

Agriculture

Livestock

The livestock industry of Montana represents one of the major industries of the State, supporting approximately one-half of the population and utilizing three-fourths of the land.

Further development of Montana's range country would result in a larger and better livestock industry. This will call for the development of a readily available water supply over the entire range country, for intelligent control of range pastures, and for units of land large enough for stock owners to support a herd of sufficient size to afford a satisfactory income. A cooperative cattle-breeding project would help improve herds. Montana could also excel in the production of horses, hogs, and sheep.

In the mountain and foothill farms, the raising of sheep and beef cattle may be combined with the growing of grain on the dry lands. Corn, grain, hay, sweet clover, and alfalfa, and other roughage may be profitably cultivated.

Wheat

Montana is recognized as producing the highest grade of hard spring wheat in the United States. There is a shortage of this type of wheat, and there is definite capacity for the accelerated production of this crop.

Potatoes

The quality of potatoes grown in Montana is exceptionally high, and the yield is satisfactory. On lands serviced by irrigation, soils are suitable for an increased production of potatoes.

Alfalfa and Clover Seed

Demand for alfalfa and clover seed is strong and will increase relative to the expansion of dairy herds. The opportunity exists to enlarge this industry in order to compete with the importation of seed peas from foreign sources.

Fruit

There is room for some further development of cherry orchards, depending mainly upon the water supply.

The production of fruits of high quality can be augmented. The growing of strawberries, cherries, apples, and grapes appears to be well adapted to the climatic conditions of some sections of the State. Expansion in this direction would make possible the construction of small plants for the canning or quick freezing of these fruits.

Agriculture, General Comments

In some counties of Montana farm incomes are comparatively low, due in part to the large number of part-time farmers. In other words, about one-half of the farmers devote about one-half of their available working hours to other occupations. The oportunity for a better livelihood and for increased incomes will present itself if a number of processing, manufacturing, and service activities related to farming can be developed. The following are a few examples: The establishment of sugar-beet refineries is a handsome prospect; the commercial cultivation of potatoes will most likely necessitate the establishment of a washing plant and additional warehouses; an increase in various species of seed production would mean the organization of several small seed-cleaning plants; in conjunction with the industry, there is the possibility of locating butter and cheese factories, a dried-milk plant or even a condensary; canneries and quick-freeze plants will come into existence if and when vegetables are produced in volume; and finally, but not conclusively, other possibilities include the building of warehouses and dehydrating plants to handle vegetables and eggs, a starch and glucose plant to exploit cull potatoes and low-grade wheat, and local stockyards or commission yards if there is a heavy livestock program and an adequate irrigation plan. Several small meat-packing plants could be supported under such a livestock program.

Dairying

The western part of Montana is well suited to dairying. Cheap feed of high quality, good pastures under irrigation, and favorable summer climatic conditions afford vast opportunities for the expansion of the dairy industry and the improvement of herds. Butter and cheese of a superior sort could be profitably manufactured.

An expansion of the dairy industry should stimulate the creation of the necessary processing industries—powdered milk, condensed milk, dried eggs, frozen foods, and other items, as well as cold-storage equipment.

Forestry

Forestry is one of the major industries of Montana. Careful forest management not only means an increase in the production of wood, but also conserves moisture for irrigation and other hydraulic purposes, helps to preserve farm soils, provides a home for wildlife, furnishes a constant and perpetual pasturage for domestic livestock, and aids the development of recreational advantages in Montana. Another important service that forests render is that of a windbreaker. If the velocity of wind is scientifically reduced, soil evaporation will diminish, and this may be a partial solution to Montana's evaporation difficulties.

Pine Manufacture

Most of Montana's ponderosa pine is cut and shipped to Middle Western centers for the construction of sashes and doors. This process could be conducted locally if the required plant were established. Ponderosa pine is becoming depleted too quickly. Other species, particularly larch, which have never been felled as rapidly as growth warrants, should be utilized. This will reduce the pressure on ponderosa pine.

Boxes and Containers

Opportunities exist in box manufacturing for packing fruits and vegetables. Better returns may be had through the manufacture of special types of containers for butter, eggs, cheese, and similar products. There is a suitable supply of timber for this type of manufacture, and several small plants could be readily established.

Safety Matches

Engleman spruce from Flathead County has all the desirable properties for the kind of wood needed in the making of the little "strike-on-box" safety matches. A factory could be located so as to produce this product economically and efficiently with a potential labor force of 450 persons.

As only the first two or three logs from each tree are suitable for match production, the integration of this industry with one requiring the consumption of the residue is both desirable and feasible.

Plywood

Larch and ponderosa pine from Flathead County are fitted for the manufacture of plywood. Larch makes an excellent plywood; however, it is not being produced commercially. Local markets consume 20,000,000 square feet of plywood annually, but there is not a single native producer of plywood. Consequently, a good opportunity exists due to ample raw materials and favorable markets nearby.

Pulp and Paper

Pulp and paper factories, integrated with a number of minor wood-using industries, could be operated successfully. Newsprint consumption in States within a logical radius of supply is approximately 30,000 tons a year. This market also requires wrapping paper, book and writing paper, tissues, and cardboard.

Finished Wood Products

In addition to regular lumbering operations and secondary industries, the making of finished products provides new horizons for economic betterment. Larch and Douglas fir can be used for ties and rough lumber, and larch can be made into plywood, laminated structures, or garden furniture.

Poles and Posts

Production of poles and posts from local forest and farm woodlots offers both full-time and part-time employment opportunities to farmers and other workers. The extension of telephone and electric power lines in rural areas throughout the Nation is creating a large demand for poles. Moreover, treating facilities for the poles or posts could be enlarged, hence bringing new chances for profit.

Christmas Trees

Christmas-tree cutting has become an important occupation in recent years. However, methods for felling should be encouraged that will protect growing forest stands and permit development to maturity.

Other Opportunities Related to Lumber

Fabricating or finishing some of the lumber (which today is shipped in a primary

state offers new job opportunities. For example, a collaboration is now manufacturing prefabricated houses and farm buildings as well as autos and autos.

Studies have been made for the establishment of a pulp and paper mill. Other than the main operation of the mill, subsidiary plants could utilize wood waste for by-products.

Substantial openings exist to manufacture a number of minor wood products. A few examples are as follows: Grain farms, which are used for bulkheading in the furrows to which grain is transported, toys, novelties, prefabricated houses, breakfast trays, bowls and garden furniture, and laminated wooden beams.

Recent research indicates the desirability of developing low-cost, cement-bonded building materials from sawmill waste. Such materials are lightweight, weather- and fire-resistant, and should prove a great boon in this region where comparable building material must be brought in at high freight costs.

Mining

The discovery of placer gold occasioned the first permanent white settlement in the State of Montana, and until 1890, mining was the largest industry of the State and its main support. Montana's outstanding mineral product is copper. There is also silver, gold, zinc, lead, and manganese ore. Also to be found are sufficient amounts of cement material, and building stone, sand and gravel. The future of the mineral industry in Montana appears bright, because of its unusual metal resources. Due to the fact that mining has usually been an individual business, there is ample opportunity for the small operator to develop the mineral deposits and to operate the mining properties. The improvement of transportation facilities and the generation of low-cost electric power are important factors in further development of these minerals.

Irrigation

The irrigated areas of Montana should be extended. These lands are the backbone of the whole agricultural enterprise. Irrigation makes possible a larger and more dependable crop, increases the yield and durability, makes possible a longer season for cultivation, and permits a greater variety of crops. It affords opportunity for greater diversity in all types of agricultural production, both crops and livestock.

Other than actual farming, irrigation enterprises create many new businesses that in turn help maintain villages, towns, and cities that live on the trade which irrigated districts create. Irrigation should, therefore, be developed over the entire State.

Chemicals from wood

In almost all industries utilizing wood there is a great deal of waste. Chemical conversion of this waste into explosives, rayon, cellophane, sugar, yeast, glycerin, and many other products is known to be possible. It is believed that small plants utilizing wood scrap could operate successfully in this region.

Yeast

The use of wood waste for producing Torula yeast, a protein material employed in stock feeding, presents a promising business venture in this State. The process is not expensive and is comparatively simple, and a market for this yeast exists in nearly every cattle-raising community.

Charcoal

There is a large demand for a high grade of industrial charcoal. Some of the advantages of charcoal manufacture would be that it provides off-season employment; creates a demand for a common, yet little-used, timber species; utilizes deformed trees which are unsuitable as sawlogs; and removes large quantities of deadwood, thereby decreasing the danger of forest fires. A simple charring process is now being conducted efficiently in several farms, but there is room for expansion in the manufacture of charcoal for industrial purposes.

Wool

It is easily possible to improve the quality of the wool now produced in Montana, and this finer grade of wool would find a ready market in the United States.

Power resources

Montana possesses enormous natural resources for the production of power. These consist of both hydroelectric power and the production of power from such fuels as coal, gas, and oil. Water power has been developed to a great measure, but greater gains may be obtained by the development from other sources and by other means.

Coal

This State has approximately 410,000,000,000 tons of coal and lignite—which constitutes 10% percent of the total reserves of this Nation. One decided advantage of lignite is that it lies close to the surface in almost horizontal beds with widths running up to 25 feet or more, which makes it easily accessible.

Not only can coal be used as a source of cheap power, but in these days of hasty establishing petroleum reserves, synthetic fuels extracted from coal can help to replenish our depleted stocks. The synthetic fuel industry offers a marvelous opportunity to develop the coal reserves for the benefit of the individual and of the entire country. Other important derivatives of synthetic fuels are the commercially important by-products which can be recovered. These generally constitute important raw materials for other industries.

Recreation

Montana has been graciously favored by nature, and every section of our State is rich in scenic, historic, and recreational attractions. An aggressive program of development and promotion would increase tourist expenditures in Montana. Existing facilities should be enlarged and modernized. Fish and game stocks need to be protected and replenished. Many possibilities exist herein to build small businesses and service enterprises such as hunting lodges, tourist resorts, hotels, sporting goods stores, restaurants, gas stations, garages, and theaters. Individual incomes could also be increased by penetrating scenic, but otherwise inaccessible, areas.

Miscellaneous

Another lucrative enterprise is the raising of poultry and turkeys. There is a ready market for fowl; therefore, hatcheries could be increased in number.

The yield and quality of many products can be effectively increased. Some of these are as follows: Sugar beets, beans, alfalfa and alfalfa seed, peas for canning and seed, and potatoes and seed potatoes. More persons in Montana could become interested in the growing of sugar beets, thus assuring a continuous flow of sugar beets to the refineries.

Montana State plan for economic development (a schematic outline)

The State plan is designed to develop, under the provisions of the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation, the resources of the State to promote the prosperity, welfare, and health of all its people. Career opportunities for veterans as well as continued full employment for others would be fostered through the development of needed new businesses, the modernized productivity of agriculture, the utilization of unused natural resources and the implementation of needed self-liquidating public projects.

The veterans' corporation or "little man's RFC," with authority to extend credit totaling $5,000,000,000, will direct its loans toward supplementing the loans of banks and other existing private lending agencies, and the capital needed will derive from existing public sources. No appropriations from Congress will be necessary, as only profitable self-liquidating projects will be considered.

Planning activities would be on a State, county, regional, or community level. The State planning board, with the assistance of a know-how committee composed of technical experts, would plan for the physical development of the State, cooperating with other State agencies in the preparation of programs. It would also assist regional and county committees (which would plan for county and regional projects), and community planning boards, giving technical advice and assisting in the coordination of State, county, and community plans. It would further extend technical assistance to individuals, new businesses, and projects.

Since the Veterans Economic Development program is essentially a grassroots program—designed to serve small business and industry and agriculture in the community—emphasis on planning would be on a community level. Thus, while the State planning board and know-how committee would engage in planning on a State-wide basis, their primary function would be to serve the interests of the communities and to bring to bear the cooperation of the Federal Government on local projects whenever advisable and necessary.

Because of this emphasis on local planning, the following outline on States and community planning will list specific opportunities for development and expansion under the section on community planning.

Foreign Aid

Ambassadors, ministers, and technical experts of friendly nations seeking our help under the Economic Cooperation Administration and other forms of aid have shown great interest in applying this State plan to their own countries. In their opinion, the plan will speed modernization of their economy and enable the people in their communities to become increasingly self-sufficient. This economic development plan will increase two-way trade between the people in the communities of the United States and of other countries for the increasing profit and security of all the people.

It is the belief of American authorities that the application of this plan in the communities of friendly countries will help provide a firmer foundation upon which our financial aid at government level to these countries will rest. Further, the State plan may be put into effect abroad without cost to the American taxpayers as no appropriations of public money are required.

Community Planning

1. Local planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups, agriculture.

2. Planning board sets up a know-how committee.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State planning commission or State know-how committee.

(a) Inventory to determine present and future economic needs, including preparation of town and agricultural maps on the following:

(1) Population distribution and trends.
(2) Property tax surveys.
(3) Land use.
(4) Zoning ordinances.
(5) Traffic studies.
(6) Recreational facilities requirements.
(7) Health and welfare survey.
(8) Community center redevelopments.
(9) Highway maintenance.
(10) Fire protection.
(11) Water supply.
(12) Housing.
(13) School system.

(14) Farming, acreages, crop production, livestock.
(15) Utility services.
(16) Transportation service—airport, etc.

(b) Uses facilities of Federal, State and regional agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.

4. Opportunities for development and expansion.

(a) Local industries:
(1) Needed expansion of existing industries.
(2) Needed new industries: (a) Research for new products; (b) use of captured enemy patents and new processes; (c) use of natural resources; (d) new industrial uses for agricultural products.
(3) Processing plants for local products.
(4) Assembling plants for local markets.
(5) Service industries.
(6) Retail trade.

(b) Land use:
(1) Land conservation: (a) Irrigation, surface and underground water resources; (b) reforestation; (c) erosion control; (d) soil treatment; (e) fertilizers.
(2) Water power development: (a) Utilities; (b) industrial uses; (c) agricultural purposes; (d) home.
(3) Agricultural practices: (a) New methods of farming and livestock improvement; (b) new farm enterprises and better use of land resources.

(c) Commerce:
(1) Sales development—new market centers in growing communities.
(2) Farm cooperatives.
(3) Export development opportunities.
(4) Shipping: (a) Assembly, processing, and warehousing facilities; (b) harbor improvements; feeder lines.
(5) Air transport.
(6) Trucking.
(7) Freight.

(d) Mining:
(1) Geological surveys.
(2) Development of mineral resources.
(3) New uses for mineral products.

(e) Tourist and recreational areas:
(1) Beaches and artificial ponds and lakes.
(2) Wood trails and roads, camping areas.
(3) Sports, fish, and game stocking.
(4) Restoration of historical areas, scenic improvement.
(5) Hotels, cabins, and restaurants.
(6) Stream and pond pollution control.
(7) Handicrafts.

(f) Public service (self-liquidating):
(1) Utilities and power development.
(2) Transportation of passengers: (a) Bus, (b) street car, (c) train, (d) air travel.
(3) Public health and welfare (self-liquidating):
(1) Medical clinics.
(2) Fire prevention.
(3) Sanitation: (a) Stream pollution abatement; (b) sewage disposal, (c) garbage disposal.
(4) Hospitals (improvement and/or expansion).

(h) Public works and public improvements (self-liquidating):
(1) Housing: (a) Multiple low-rental units, (b) prefabricated and industrial housing.
(2) Toll bridges.
(3) Parking areas and buildings.
(4) Municipal projects.
(i) Education (self-liquidating):
(1) Colleges, professional and trade schools (improvement and/or expansion).
(2) Housing to accommodate veteran students.
(3) Community recreation centers.
(4) Vocational and social guidance.
(5) Rural school program, consolidation and transportation.

State and Regional Planning

1. State planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups.

(a) Supplements and implements work of existing State planning agencies.

(b) Cooperates with and serves community planning boards.

2. Planning board sets up a State know-how committee composed of technical experts in various fields.

(a) Know-how committee gives technical advice to planning board, to community know-how committees, to county or regional committees, to individuals, to new businesses and projects.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State know-how committee or State planning commission.

(a) Takes inventory to determine present and future economic needs of State and geographical area, preparing State, regional, and county maps and statistical studies.

(1) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and regional departments and agencies for fact finding and making projective studies.

4. Planning board relates county, community, and intrastate regional plans to one another, thereby eliminating overlapping, confusion, and unprofitable enterprises and projects.

5. Planning board cooperates with other States on regional projects in same geographic area, such as power developments, land conservation, etc.

THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate for a few minutes on one item which was mentioned in the special message delivered to the Congress by the President a few days ago. He called upon us to ratify the proposed international wheat agreement during this special session. For that reason I should like to take a few moments to discuss some of the aspects of this proposal.

When this agreement was transmitted to the Senate for ratification, it was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, headed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who in turn referred it to a subcommittee whose chairman is the very able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. That subcommittee, composed of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], in addition to the subcommittee chairman, held quite extensive hearings on the proposed agreement. At the conclusion of those hearings, as I understand, the subcommittee decided not to favorably report the proposed agreement.

During the past few weeks we have heard a great deal from some quarters regarding the alleged negligence or obstinacy of the Eightieth Congress. It has been charged that this Congress is dominated by reactionaries or isolationists—or worse. Some of these critics appear to feel that every time the Congress has refused to grant any of the President's demands, that is new proof that dark and mysterious forces control the Republican Party.

I have mentioned these events regarding the International Wheat Agreement to show how absurd such charges are. Surely, the cause of international cooperation has no truer friends than the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the three Senators who are members of the Lodge subcommittee. Surely, the American farmer, particularly the wheat farmer, has no more stalwart champion than the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. If the Senate and its committee and subcommittee on this question have declined to recommend the ratification of the International Wheat Agreement, that action can hardly be attributed to a determination to turn their backs on the rest of the world.

At the present time I do not intend to discuss it in great detail. For the benefit of the public, however, I should like to mention several important reasons why in my judgment the International Wheat Agreement should not be ratified.

Before listing my objections, perhaps I should explain very briefly what is provided in the agreement. Basically, the agreement provides, so far as the United States is concerned, that we shall guarantee to supply not less than 185,000,000 bushels of wheat per annum to certain importing countries if they require it. On the other hand, they presumably guarantee us a market for not less than 185,000,000 bushels of wheat. Australia and Canada likewise guarantee to supply certain quantities of wheat annually to the importing countries which are parties to the agreement, and these same countries among them guarantee a market for the same quantities of Canadian and Australian wheat. Total quantities of 500,000,000 bushels of wheat annually are involved in this movement between 3 of the exporting countries and 33 importing countries. Two other major exporters, however—Argentina and Russia—are not included in the agreement in any way.

The price of the wheat would be permitted to fluctuate between certain limits, but not to rise above the upper limit or fall below the lower limit. The upper limit for the 5 years of the agreement is set at $2 a bushel, basis No. 1 Manitoba Northern Wheat in store Fort William/Port Arthur in Canadian currency. This works out to perhaps from $1.60 to $1.70 on the farm in this country. The lower limit changes from year to year by the terms of the agreement. Apparently it would work out to between $1.10 and $1.20 during the first year, and then go steadily down to between 70 and 80 cents during the fifth year. Presumably our policy makers imagined that wheat prices will tend steadily downward for the next 5 years. Probably any subsequent wheat agreement that might be entered into after the fifth year would be based on this 70- to 80-cent minimum on the American farm.

The immediate effect of ratification would be to knock down the price received for our wheat by about 50 cents a bushel or more. That much is certain. That is a definite loss which must be counted on. Those sponsoring the agreement contend that in the later years of the agreement we will, on the average, gain more from the minimum-price guaranties than we lose. Presumably they mean that on the average we will be able to get a better price for our wheat from our foreign customers with this agreement than without it. All our experience of recent years in international economic relations should tell us that

state) offers new job opportunities. For example, a cabinetmaker is now manufacturing prefabricated houses and farm buildings as well as boxes and crates.

Studies have been made for the establishment of a pulp and paper mill. Other than the main operation of the mill, subsidiary plants could utilize wood waste for by-products.

Substantial openings exists to manufacture a number of minor wood products. A few examples are as follows: Grain doors, which are used for bulkheading in the box-cars in which grain is transported; toys; boats; prefabricated houses; breakfast room, lawn and garden furniture; and laminated wooden trusses.

Recent research indicates the desirability of developing low-cost, cement-bonded building materials from sawmill waste. Such materials are lightweight, weather- and fire-resistant, and should prove a great boon to this region where comparable building materials must be brought in at high freight costs.

Mining

The discovery of placer gold occasioned the first permanent white settlement in the State of Montana, and until 1880, mining was the largest industry of the State and its main support. Montana's outstanding mineral product is copper. There is also silver, gold, zinc, lead, and manganese ore. Also to be found are unlimited amounts of cement material, and building stone, sand and gravel. The future of the mineral industry in Montana appears bright, because of its unusual metal resources. Due to the fact that mining has usually been an individual business, there is ample opportunity for the small operator to develop the mineral deposits and to operate the mining properties. The improvement of transportation facilities and the provision of low-cost electric power are important factors in further development of these minerals.

Irrigation

The irrigated areas of Montana should be extended. These lands are the backbone of the whole agricultural enterprise. Irrigation makes possible a larger and more dependable crop, increases the yield and durability, makes possible a longer season for cultivation, and permits a greater variety of crops. It affords opportunity for greater diversity in all types of agricultural production, both crops and livestock.

Other than actual farming, irrigation enterprises create many new businesses that in turn help maintain villages, towns, and cities that live on the trade which irrigated districts create. Irrigation should, therefore, be developed over the entire State.

Chemicals from wood

In almost all industries utilizing wood there is a great deal of waste. Chemical conversion of this waste into explosives, rayon, cellophane, sugar, yeast, glycerin, and many other products is known to be possible. It is believed that small plants utilizing wood scrap could operate successfully in this region.

Yeast

The use of wood waste for producing Torula yeast, a protein material employed in stock feeding, presents a promising business venture in this State. The process is not expensive and is comparatively simple, and a market for this yeast exists in nearly every cattle-raising community.

Charcoal

There is a large demand for a high grade of industrial charcoal. Some of the advantages of charcoal manufacture would be that it provides off-season employment; creates a demand for a common, yet little-used, timber species; utilizes deformed trees which are unsuitable as sawlogs; and removes large quantities of deadwood, thereby decreasing the danger of forest fires. A simple charring process is now being conducted efficiently on several farms, but there is room for expansion in the manufacture of charcoal for industrial purposes.

Wool

It is easily possible to improve the quality of the wool now produced in Montana, and this finer grade of wool would find a ready market in the United States.

Power resources

Montana possesses enormous natural resources for the production of power. These consist of both hydroelectric power and the production of power from such fuels as coal, gas, and oil. Water power has been developed to a great measure, but greater gains may be attained by the development from other sources and by other means.

Coal

This State has approximately 410,000,000,000 tons of coal and lignite—which constitutes 11½ percent of the total reserves of this Nation. One decided advantage of lignite is that it lies close to the surface in almost horizontal beds with widths running up to 25 feet or more, which makes it easily accessible.

Not only can coal be used as a source of cheap power, but in these days of fastly diminishing petroleum resources, synthetic fuels extracted from coal can help to replenish our depleted stocks. The synthetic fuel industry offers a marvelous opportunity to develop the coal reserves for the benefit of the individual and of the entire country. Other important derivatives of synthetic fuels are the commercially important by-products which can be recovered. These generally constitute important raw materials for other industries.

Recreation

Montana has been graciously favored by nature, and every section of our State is rich in scenic, historic, and recreational attractions. An aggressive program of development and promotion would increase tourist expenditures in Montana. Existing facilities should be enlarged and modernized. Fish and game stocks need to be protected and replenished. Many possibilities exist herein to build small businesses and service enterprises such as hunting lodges, tourist resorts, hotels, sporting goods stores, restaurants, gas stations, garages, and theaters. Individual incomes could also be increased by penetrating scenic, but otherwise inaccessible, areas.

Miscellaneous

Another lucrative enterprise is the raising of poultry and turkeys. There is a ready market for fowl; therefore, hatcheries could be increased in number.

The yield and quality of many products can be effectively increased. Some of these are as follows: Sugar beets, beans, alfalfa and alfalfa seed, peas for canning and seed, and potatoes and seed potatoes. More persons in Montana could become interested in the growing of sugar beets, thus assuring a continuous flow of sugar beets to the refineries.

Montana State plan for economic development (a schematic outline)

The State plan is designed to develop, under the provisions of the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation, the resources of the State to promote the prosperity, welfare, and health of all its people. Career opportunities for veterans as well as continued full employment for others would be fostered through the development of needed new businesses, the modernized productivity of agriculture, the utilization of unused natural resources and the implementation of needed self-liquidating public projects.

The veterans' corporation or "little man's RFC," with authority to extend credit totaling $5,000,000,000, will direct its loans toward supplementing the loans of banks and other existing private lending agencies, and the capital needed will derive from existing public money. No appropriations from Congress will be necessary, as only profitable self-liquidating projects will be considered.

Planning activities would be on a State, county, regional, or community level. The State planning board, with the assistance of a know-how committee composed of technical experts, would plan for the physical development of the State, cooperating with other State agencies in the preparation of programs. It would also assist regional and county committees (which would plan for county and regional projects) and community planning boards, giving technical advice and assisting in the coordination of State, county, and community plans. It would further extend technical assistance to individuals, new businesses, and projects.

Since the Veterans Economic Development program is essentially a grassroots program—designed to serve small business and industry and agriculture in the community—emphasis on planning would be on a community level. Thus, while the State planning board and know-how committee would engage in planning on a State-wide basis, their primary function would be to serve the interests of the communities and to bring to bear the cooperation of the Federal Government on local projects whenever advisable and necessary.

Because of this emphasis on local planning, the following outline on States and community planning will list specific opportunities for development and expansion under the section on community planning.

Foreign Aid

Ambassadors, ministers, and technical experts of friendly nations seeking our help under the Economic Cooperation Administration and other forms of aid have shown great interest in applying this State plan to their own countries. In their opinion, the plan will speed modernization of their economy and enable the people in their communities to become increasingly self-sufficient. This economic development plan will increase two-way trade between the people in the communities of the United States and of other countries for the increasing profit and security of all the people.

It is the belief of American authorities that the application of this plan in the communities of friendly countries will help provide a firmer foundation upon which our financial aid at government level to these countries will rest. Further, the State plan may be put into effect abroad without cost to the American taxpayers as no appropriations of public money are required.

Community Planning

1. Local planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups, agriculture.

2. Planning board sets up a know-how committee.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State planning commission or State know-how committee.

(a) Inventory to determine present and future economic needs, including preparation of town and agricultural maps on the following:

(1) Population distribution and trends.
(2) Property tax surveys.
(3) Land use.
(4) Zoning ordinances.
(5) Traffic studies.
(6) Recreational facilities requirements.
(7) Health and welfare survey.
(8) Community center redevelopments.
(9) Highway maintenance.
(10) Fire protection.
(11) Water supply.
(12) Housing.
(13) School system.

(14) Farming, acreages, crop production, livestock.
(15) Utility services.
(16) Transportation service—airport, etc.

(b) Uses facilities of Federal, State and regional agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.

4. Opportunities for development and expansion.

(a) Local industries:

(1) Needed expansion of existing industries.

(2) Needed new industries: (a) Research for new products; (b) use of captured enemy patents and new processes; (c) use of natural resources; (d) new industrial uses for agricultural products.

(3) Processing plants for local products.
(4) Assembling plants for local markets.
(5) Service industries.
(6) Retail trade.

(b) Land use:

(1) Land conservation: (a) Irrigation, surface and underground water resources; (b) reforestation; (c) erosion control; (d) soil treatment; (e) fertilizers.

(2) Water power development: (a) Utilities; (b) industrial uses; (c) agricultural purposes; (d) home.

(3) Agricultural practices: (a) New methods of farming and livestock improvement; (b) new farm enterprises and better use of land resources.

(c) Commerce:

(1) Sales development—new market centers in growing communities.
(2) Farm cooperatives.
(3) Export development opportunities.
(4) Shipping: (a) Assembly, processing, and warehousing facilities; (b) harbor improvements; feeder lines.
(5) Air transport.
(6) Trucking.
(7) Freight.

(d) Mining:

(1) Geological surveys.
(2) Development of mineral resources.
(3) New uses for mineral products.

(e) Tourist and recreational areas:

(1) Beaches and artificial ponds and lakes.
(2) Wood trails and roads, camping areas.
(3) Sports, fish, and game stocking.
(4) Restoration of historical areas, scenic improvement.
(5) Hotels, cabins, and restaurants.
(6) Stream and pond pollution control.
(7) Handicrafts.

(f) Public service (self-liquidating):

(1) Utilities and power development.
(2) Transportation of passengers: (a) Bus, (b) street car, (c) train, (d) air travel.

(g) Public health and welfare (self-liquidating):

(1) Medical clinics.
(2) Fire prevention.
(3) Sanitation: (a) Stream pollution abatement; (b) sewage disposal, (c) garbage disposal.
(4) Hospitals (improvement and/or expansion).

(h) Public works and public improvements (self-liquidating):

(1) Housing: (a) Multiple low-rental units, (b) prefabricated and industrial housing.
(2) Toll bridges.
(3) Parking areas and buildings.
(4) Municipal projects.

(i) Education (self-liquidating):

(1) Colleges, professional and trade schools (improvement and/or expansion).
(2) Housing to accommodate veteran students.
(3) Community recreation centers.
(4) Vocational and social guidance.
(5) Rural school program, consolidation and transportation.

State and Regional Planning

1. State planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups.

(a) Supplements and implements work of existing State planning agencies.

(b) Cooperates with and serves community planning boards.

2. Planning board sets up a State know-how committee composed of technical experts in various fields.

(a) Know-how committee gives technical advice to planning board, to community know-how committees, to county or regional committees, to individuals, to new businesses and projects.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State know-how committee or State planning commission.

(a) Takes inventory to determine present and future economic needs of State and geographical area, preparing State, regional, and county maps and statistical studies.

(1) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and regional departments and agencies for fact finding and making projective studies.

4. Planning board relates county, community, and intrastate regional plans to one another, thereby eliminating overlapping, confusion, and unprofitable enterprises and projects.

5. Planning board cooperates with other States on regional projects in same geographic area, such as power developments, land conservation, etc.

THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate for a few minutes on one item which was mentioned in the special message delivered to the Congress by the President a few days ago. He called upon us to ratify the proposed international wheat agreement during this special session. For that reason I should like to take a few moments to discuss some of the aspects of this proposal.

When this agreement was transmitted to the Senate for ratification, it was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, headed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who in turn referred it to a subcommittee whose chairman is the very able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. That subcommittee, composed of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], in addition to the subcommittee chairman, held quite extensive hearings on the proposed agreement. At the conclusion of those hearings, as I understand, the subcommittee decided not to favorably report the proposed agreement.

During the past few weeks we have heard a great deal from some quarters regarding the alleged negligence or obstinacy of the Eightieth Congress. It has been charged that this Congress is dominated by reactionaries or isolationists—or worse. Some of these critics appear to feel that every time the Congress has refused to grant any of the President's demands, that is new proof that dark and mysterious forces control the Republican Party.

I have mentioned these events regarding the International Wheat Agreement to show how absurd such charges are. Surely, the cause of international cooperation has no truer friends than the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the three Senators who are members of the Lodge subcommittee. Surely, the American farmer, particularly the wheat farmer, has no more stalwart champion than the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. If the Senate and its committee and subcommittee on this question have declined to recommend the ratification of the International Wheat Agreement, that action can hardly be attributed to a determination to turn their backs on the rest of the world.

At the present time I do not intend to discuss it in great detail. For the benefit of the public, however, I should like to mention several important reasons why in my judgment the International Wheat Agreement should not be ratified.

Before listing my objections, perhaps I should explain very briefly what is provided in the agreement. Basically, the agreement provides, so far as the United States is concerned, that we shall guarantee to supply not less than 185,000,000 bushels of wheat per annum to certain importing countries if they require it. On the other hand, they presumably guarantee us a market for not less than 185,000,000 bushels of wheat. Australia and Canada likewise guarantee to supply certain quantities of wheat annually to the importing countries which are parties to the agreement, and these same countries among them guarantee a market for the same quantities of Canadian and Australian wheat. Total quantities of 500,000,000 bushels of wheat annually are involved in this movement between 3 of the exporting countries and 33 importing countries. Two other major exporters, however—Argentina and Russia—are not included in the agreement in any way.

The price of the wheat would be permitted to fluctuate between certain limits, but not to rise above the upper limit or fall below the lower limit. The upper limit for the 5 years of the agreement is set at $2 a bushel, basis No. 1 Manitoba Northern Wheat in store Fort William/Port Arthur in Canadian currency. This works out to perhaps from $1.60 to $1.70 on the farm in this country. The lower limit changes from year to year by the terms of the agreement. Apparently it would work out to between $1.10 and $1.20 during the first year, and then go steadily down to between 70 and 80 cents during the fifth year. Presumably our policy makers imagined that wheat prices will tend steadily downward for the next 5 years. Probably any subsequent wheat agreement that might be entered into after the fifth year would be based on this 70- to 80-cent minimum on the American farm.

The immediate effect of ratification would be to knock down the price received for our wheat by about 50 cents a bushel or more. That much is certain. That is a definite loss which must be counted on. Those sponsoring the agreement contend that in the later years of the agreement we will, on the average, gain more from the minimum-price guaranties than we lose. Presumably they mean that on the average we will be able to get a better price for our wheat from our foreign customers with this agreement than without it. All our experience of recent years in international economic relations should tell us that

that hope is false. Frankly, I do not see how we can expect to receive better than a normal competitive price from foreign countries, unless we give our purchasers the money with which to buy.

Mr. President, I have three or four principal objections to this agreement. First of all, it seems perfectly clear from the agreement that the administration has completely abandoned any idea of trying to achieve parity prices for wheat moving in international trade. The wheat agreement might well be called a proposal to guarantee that we will never bring the price of wheat up to parity. Even when wheat prices are at their maximum, under the agreement they will be held below 75 percent of parity. When they are at the minimum provided for the fifth year of the agreement, they will be barely 33 percent of parity. The proponents of the agreement have laid great emphasis on the argument that it will guarantee the farmer a market for his surplus. If there is any such guaranty, it will provide him with that market at a price only one-third of what he is really entitled to receive. Furthermore, that market, even at such a low price, will not by any means take care of the entire surplus if our wheat crops continue at the level we have been experiencing.

My second objection is that in this agreement there is really no guaranteed market on which we can depend. Article V of the agreement provides an easy escape for the importing countries from the commitments of the agreement. This article permits any importing country to be relieved of its obligations if it can show the necessity to safeguard its balance of payments. In other words, any of the importing countries which have shortages of dollars need not import the quantities of wheat provided for in the agreement. Almost every one of the wheat-importing countries included in the agreement appears to suffer from a chronic dollar shortage. Certainly, practically all the principal western European countries have dollar shortages. That is why the Congress passed the ERP. If these countries had not been suffering from such dollar shortages, there would have been no need for the ERP. It is worth noting that most of the principal importing countries listed in this agreement are participants in the Marshall plan and, therefore, presumably, at present, qualify under article V, section 1, of the agreement. In short, if these countries do not desire to live up to their commitments to purchase our wheat, there is no way that we can make them do so under this agreement.

This point might be put in another way. So long as we continue to provide Europe with money, we can expect them to buy our wheat. If we do not continue the present system of foreign assistance, the wheat-importing countries can escape from their purchase commitments by pleading a dollar shortage under article V. The term of 5 years provided by the International Wheat Agreement is approximately the same as the duration of the original Marshall plan. This agreement makes no provision for selling our wheat after the expiration of the Marshall plan.

Thirdly, I should like to remind the Senate that this is not the first New Deal proposal which pretended to guarantee our farmers foreign markets for their products. Ever since 1934 we have had in operation something called the trade-agreements program. Under that program we have made numerous, severe reductions in our own tariff rates, supposedly in return for concessions by foreign countries, to benefit our export trade. Our own tariff structure has been reduced well over 50 percent. We have negotiated agreements with most of the countries participating in this proposed wheat agreement. The State Department and other sponsors of the trade-agreements program have frequently advertised the benefits supposedly gained for our export wheat business through the program.

If this trade agreements program has not given us a dependable export market for our wheat and flour, let me ask how we can rely on a new program—this international wheat agreement—to guarantee those export markets for wheat? We have already made extreme concessions in order to secure an export market for wheat. Why should we make new concessions in order to secure this same export market? At the conclusion of my remarks I should like to have inserted a list of the concessions supposedly obtained for our exports of wheat and flour under the various trade agreements already entered into. I should also like to insert a tabulation indicating which of the wheat-importing countries, parties to this international wheat agreement, have already signed so-called reciprocal agreements with us under the trade-agreements program, and which of the countries are participating in the ERP.

My fourth principal objection lies in the fact that this agreement would absolutely commit us to give preference to certain Communist puppet countries of eastern Europe in a share of our wheat exports. This is a truly astonishing fact.

By the terms of the wheat agreement, such countries as Poland and Czechoslovakia are guaranteed certain quantities of our wheat. By the terms of the agreement, we might easily find that we had to supply these countries with wheat or flour even though it meant we would not have enough left to meet our obligations to maintain the minimum ration in western Germany. It seems to me that this would be a very curious agreement to enter into at the height of a cold war. Right now we are in the midst of a supreme effort to feed the people of Berlin in order to maintain our diplomatic position. I hope and believe that effort will be successful. Fortunately, we do not suffer from a shortage of wheat and flour at present. If we should again have a shortage of wheat, however, we would be morally bound by this agreement to place the Communist regimes in eastern Europe ahead of the people of Berlin. We would have to tell our general in Berlin that we could not supply him because we had already agreed to supply the puppets of his enemies. If this is waging a cold war, I do not understand the meaning of the term.

Mr. President, I very much hope that ratification of this agreement will not be rushed through under the plea that we must accept every measure that has the label "international" on it. To say the least, we should be consistent in our diplomatic outlook. I cannot conceive how we can give preference to two nations behind the iron curtain over our own obligations in western Germany and Berlin. I certainly do not believe that this agreement is in the interest of the wheat farmer, and I have not heard any demand for ratification from the farmers of my State. Its immediate effect would be to cost the wheat farmer or the Federal Government at least 50 cents per bushel on exports of 185,000,000 bushels of wheat this year. In the long run, there is no indication whatever that this agreement will be any more successful than the trade agreements program in insuring us an export market for our wheat. Even if it did so, as I have pointed out, we would receive barely one-third of parity for such exports.

I have here a table showing the nations with which we have already negotiated trade agreements, which have also signed this wheat agreement. Under the terms of this wheat agreement, these trade agreement countries would import annually at least 390,000,000 bushels of wheat. For the last 14 years we have been promised that the trade agreement program would restore our export markets for wheat. If it has been as successful as its sponsors claim, there would not seem to be any need for this wheat agreement.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to include in the RECORD a list of the signatories of the international wheat agreement, and other items, including a table listing all concessions for our export trade in wheat and flour claimed to have been obtained by the State Department in various trade agreements which have been negotiated. These lists are compiled from official announcements of the State Department and the Tariff Commission.

If these concessions are as valuable as the State Department has claimed, there would seem to be no need for this international wheat agreement.

There being no objection, the list and tables referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Signatories of international wheat agreement which already have trade agreements with the United States, July 1948

Country:	Guaranteed purchases per annum (1,000 bushels)
Belgium	23,883
Brazil	19,290
China	14,697
Colombia	2,205
Cuba	8,267
Czechoslovakia	1,102
Ecuador	1,102
French Union and Saar	35,824
Guatemala	367
India	27,557
Lebanon	2,756
Mexico	7,349
Netherlands	30,680
New Zealand	5,511
Norway	7,532
Peru	4,042
South Africa	6,430
Sweden	2,756
Switzerland	7,349
United Kingdom	179,930
Venezuela	2,205
Total	390,834

Grains and grain products: United States concessions obtained for principal products

[Value in thousands of dollars]

Country	Effective date of agreement	Further definition of concession	Import treatment accorded United States products: Before agreement	Import treatment accorded United States products: After agreement
WHEAT				
Netherlands	Feb. 1, 1936	Milling wheat	Import quotas placed at 5 percent of annual Netherlands imports, at prices not above world prices.	
Switzerland	Feb. 15, 1936		Quota increased from zero to 1,180,000 quintals.	
Guatemala	June 15, 1936		0.2 quetzal per gross kilos	0.2 quetzal per gross kilos (bound).
El Salvador	May 31, 1937	Until and including Dec. 31, 1937	$5 per 100 gross kilos	$3 per 100 gross kilos (bound).
		After Dec. 31, 1937	$5.20 per 100 gross kilos	$5.20 per 100 gross kilos (bound).
United Kingdom	Jan. 1, 1939		2s. 0d. per quarter of 480 pounds (ad valorem equivalent, 4.8 percent).	Free.
Jamaica	do		2s. per 100 pounds, general rate; 6d. per 100 pounds margin of British preference.	Same (margin of British preference bound against increase).
Nigeria (colony and protectorate)	do		15 percent ad valorem	Same (bound against granting of British preference).
Canada [1]			30 cents per bushel	12 cents per bushel.
WHEAT FLOUR				
Cuba	Sept. 3, 1934	Wheat flour made wholly of United States wheat is accorded a preference of 40 percent.	0.91 peso per 100 kilos G. W. 30 percent of United States preference.	Same (margin of United States preference bound).
Netherlands	Feb. 1, 1936		Import quotas placed at 5 percent of annual domestic consumption in Netherlands at prices not above world price.	
Honduras	Mar. 2, 1936		0.12 lempira per gross kilo	0.12 lempira per gross kilo (bound).
Guatemala	June 15, 1936		0.03 quetzal per gross kilo	0.03 quetzal per gross kilo (bound).
Costa Rica	Aug. 2, 1937	Wheat flour, first quality	0.15 colon per gross kilo	0.15 colon per gross kilo (bound).
Ecuador	Oct. 23, 1938		0.15 sucre per gross kilo	0.075 sucre per gross kilo.
Venezuela	Dec. 16, 1939		0.40 or 0.30 bolivar per gross kilo	0.24 bolivar per gross kilo.
Bermuda	Jan. 1, 1939		12½ percent ad valorem; 12½ percent margin of British preference.	12½ percent ad valorem; 50 percent British preference.
Gambia	do		2s. 6d. per 98 pounds; 1s. 6d. per 98 pounds margin of British preference.	2s. 6d. per 98 pounds (British preference removed.)
Gold Coast	do		Free	Bound against granting of British preference.
Northern Rhodesia	do		8s. per 100 pounds; 6d per 100 pounds margin of British preference.	8s. per 100 pounds. (British preference removed.)
Nigeria (colony and protectorate)	do		2s. 3d. per 100 pounds	Bound against granting of British preference.
Sierra Leone	do		1s. per 100 pounds; 1s per 100 pounds margin of British preference.	1s. per 100 pounds. (British preference removed.)
Trinidad and Tobago	do		84 cents per 196 pounds; 48 cents per 196 pounds margin of British preference.	Same. (Margin of British preference bound.)
Newfoundland			Free	Free. (Bound against granting of British preference.)
Canada [1]			$1.35 per barrel	50 cents per barrel.

[1] Reduction accorded under most-favored-nation clause in agreement of Jan 1, 1936.
Source: U. S. Tariff Commission, May 1940.

SUMMARY OF THE CONCESSIONS SUPPOSED TO HAVE BEEN OBTAINED FOR OUR WHEAT AND FLOUR EXPORTS THROUGH THE GENEVA TRADE AGREEMENT

ANALYSIS OF GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE, SIGNED AT GENEVA, OCTOBER 30, 1947, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Extracts relating to concessions by foreign nations on American exports of wheat and wheat products

Page 5, Concessions obtained by the United States:

Grains and cereal products: The United Kingdom bound wheat duty free and barley at a 10-percent rate. The duties on cornstarch were reduced or bound, depending on type. France reduced the duty on wheat by 66 percent. China bound 15-percent rates on wheat and flour. The duties on oatmeal and prepared breakfast foods were bound. South Africa bound the duty on cereal food products, except oatmeal. Ceylon reduced the duty on prepared cereals.

Norway and Newfoundland bound wheat flour duty free. Benelux bound a 3-percent duty on wheat flour and agreed to a duty-free annual tariff quota of 50,000 metric tons for the Netherlands subject to monopoly fee and mixing regulation assurances. Milled rice and buckwheat were bound free with monopoly fee ceilings.

Cuba reduced the duty on wheat flour and provided that the new lower rate will apply on flour milled from wheat of any origin, and reduced the duty on wheat by 50 percent. Cuba also established a special tariff quota arrangement on hulled and semihulled rice and reduced duties on cornstarch and certain livestock and poultry feeds.

Page 28, Belgium-Luxemburg-Netherlands:

Agricultural products: Wheat flour was bound at 3 percent, with a tariff quota of 50,000 metric tons annually to enter duty free in the Netherlands and with maximum monopoly duty and maximum mixing requirements guaranteed.

Page 29, Other concessions:

Chief among these in trade volume was wheat, which is accorded free customs treatment and a bound maximum monopoly duty.

Page 62, China:

Agricultural products: The present duties of 15 percent ad valorem on wheat and wheat flour, for which China has also been an important market in most years, were likewise bound against increase.

Page 68, Cuba:

Agricultural products: On wheat flour, the United States rate was reduced to $0.63 per 100 kilograms. The new rate will apply to all wheat flour imported from the United States regardless of the origin of the wheat used therein, whereas wheat flour milled entirely from wheat grown in the United States has been dutiable at a rate of $0.78 per 100 kilograms and wheat flour milled in the United States containing imported wheat has been dutiable at the rate of $0.91 per 100 kilograms. Wheat imports were granted a 50-percent reduction in duty.

Page 79, France:

Agricultural products: The principal agricultural products on which concessions were obtained (with value of French imports from the United States in 1939 in parentheses) are: * * * Wheat (13,000,000 francs), * * *. Percentages of duty reduction on agricultural products are:* * * wheat, 66.

Page 98, Norway:

Agricultural products: Raw cotton and wheat flour were assured continued free entry and substantial duty reductions were accorded United States fruits.

Page 112, United Kingdom:

Agricultural products: Wheat and raw cotton were assured of continued duty-free entry.

Page 128, dependent territories of the United Kingdom:

It was agreed that in each of the territories (except Ceylon) named in schedule III of the trade agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States, signed November 17, 1938, the margin of preference, if any, on any product listed in that schedule will not exceed three-fourths of the margin existing on April 10, 1947, or 25 percent ad valorem (or a margin of specific or other duties equivalent to 25 percent ad valorem), whichever margin is the smaller. No margin need be reduced to less than 2 percent ad valorem (or a margin of specific or other duties equivalent to 2 percent ad valorem).

These reductions in preference margins will come into effect at the earliest practicable date and in any event not later than December 31, 1949. They may be made inoperative during the whole of any calendar year which immediately follows a calendar year in which the quantity of general purpose synthetic rubber required to be consumed in the United States under internal quantitative regulations exceeds 25 percent of the total consumption in the United States of natural, synthetic, and reclaimed rubber.

The territories covered in this concession include the British Caribbean colonies of the Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, Jamaica, Leeward Islands, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks and Caicos, Windward Islands, and Cayman Islands; the African and Mediterranean colonies of Cyprus, Gambia, Malta, Mauritius, Northern Rhodesia, Sierra Leone, and British Somaliland; and Fiji Islands, Hong Kong, Malayan Union, and British Solomon Islands. Nigeria and the Gold Coast, which were included in the last agreement, would not be affected since they have no preferential

duties. Ceylon, previously included, has a separate schedule in the present agreement.

The most important commodities concerned are wheat flour, grains, and other grain products.

Page 130, Newfoundland:

Food products: Wheat meal and flour, * * * were assured continued duty-free entry.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the United Kingdom is included in this list of countries which presumably require a total of 390,000,000 bushels a year. Even if we leave out the United Kingdom on the presumption that she will get most of her wheat from Canada and Australia, there remains a market of over 200,000,000 bushels in the countries with which we have negotiated trade agreements. In addition to these trade-agreement countries, five of the nations which have signed the International Wheat Agreement are participating in the European recovery program. They are Austria, Denmark, Greece, Ireland, and Italy, and they would account for an annual market of 89,000,000 bushels of wheat under the terms of this agreement. It would seem that so long as the European recovery program is in operation, we could count on filling their needs for wheat out of our surpluses. Another nation which has signed the wheat agreement is the Philippines, with which we have special trade relations, and which is a regular customer for our wheat. Following is a short tabulation showing the market provided for by these five European recovery program nations, plus the Philippines.

Country:	*Guaranteed purchases per annum (1,000 bushels)*
Austria	18,739
Denmark	1,470
Greece	18,739
Ireland	13,227
Italy	36,743
Philippines	6,246
Total	98,164

When all these nations are added up, we have accounted for about 97 percent of the total export market for wheat provided for in this wheat agreement. We, therefore, should be able to assure ourselves of at least 97 percent of this supposedly guaranteed market for wheat provided in the wheat agreement through the medium of these other programs which we already have in operation; namely, the trade-agreements program, the European relief program, and our special relationship with the Philippines. Under these circumstances, it is hard to see why an additional agreement and new concessions by our wheat farmers are necessary.

THE POLL TAX

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I rise to address the Senate on House bill 29, the so-called anti-poll-tax bill.

It was stated on the floor of the Senate yesterday that the bill affects only seven States, namely, the so-called poll-tax States. I respectfuly submit to the Senate that we shall go far wrong if we consider that this bill affects only those States which have poll taxes in effect. In reality it affects 48 States, because it seeks to control the suffrage clause of the Constitution of the United States.

I respectfully call the attention of the Senate to the fact in the very beginning that this is one of the most important and one of the most touchy subjects to be found in our form of government. It is a subject-matter with relation to which the framers of nearly all our State constitutions and of our own national Constitution have proceeded with great caution. When they came to consider the subject, almost invariably, instead of vesting the legislative bodies of the Government with power to prescribe and control what shall be the qualifications of electors, the people, through their organic law, have themselves prescribed those qualifications.

I desire to make the further point that it is not merely a matter of States' rights. That question is involved, but it cannot be dismissed as merely a question of States' rights as such. I think it affects the political integrity of the Nation and the preservation of constitutional government. It is one of the most serious and far-reaching questions that has ever come to the floor of the Senate; and it is a sad fact that the question has to be considered in a political atmosphere, with various organized groups—pressure groups, and some other groups with fine intentions, but misinformed—knocking on the door, standing on the steps, we might say, of the major political parties of the Nation with their demands that this legislation alone be passed at once. I think it is one of the saddest occasions in American history that the Senate of the United States should be called upon to pass on this matter under such circumstances.

I do not think it can be dismissed as being merely a matter of civil rights as such. I know that a great number of us, and, I think, all of us who are opposed to the bill, stand ready and willing at all times to see that the legal civil rights of all persons are not only recognized but are protected and preserved. I repeat this is not merely a matter of civil rights, as the term is ordinarily understood. The right to vote is a civil right. It is a legal civil right if the person meets the qualifications prescribed by law to become a qualified elector. That is the question. The law respects a person, the law protects him, once he has met the requirements for becoming a qualified elector.

Mr. President, that matter is something which requires specific definition. It requires specific instructions in the law as to just where that right begins. All our State constitutions and our Federal Constitution respect that right and protect it.

The real, true question involved in the bill I am discussing is whether or not a mere majority of the Congress of the United States has the constitutional authority to prescribe what shall be and what shall not be a qualification for voting in Federal elections.

Not in the attitude of seeking controversy, but in all sincerity, I challenge the proponents of this measure to come into court and state the book and page and line of any respectable legal authority they have, from whatever source, to sustain their position. I invite them now and ask them now to bring in the evidence, the legal documentary evidence, from the organic law, or from the courts of our land, which will sustai them on a sound basis. I do not believe they have the power to do that, and I do not believe they will be able to present respectable authority. On the contrary there is an abundance of authority for the other side of the question.

Mr. President, I ask that we always remember that this is not a political campaign matter we are considering. We are dealing with the Constitution of the United States. Let us remember also that we are dealing with one of the most delicate subjects within the Constitution.

Not many days ago I stood in Independence Hall in Philadelphia. I walked around the chamber there, remembering that was where the Constitution of the United States was written. I tried to picture in my mind where it was that Benjamin Franklin sat. I tried to picture where James Madison sat. I thought of the presiding officer, George Washington, and I felt that a political halo hovered around that place. I thought of the great document those men penned there, how, while the world scoffed, they wrote that instrument, and how it has become the object of admiration of all the world, and how we have grown. That towering city of millions was little more than a village then, and I thought how we have grown into a great Nation, the most powerful in the world.

I thought of the city of Washington, where meet the political leaders of the world. We control the commerce, we control the finance, we control the shipping lanes. We are actually the capital of the world, and have become such within a short span, only a few years, relatively speaking.

Soon after being in that atmosphere of reverence and thankfulness, surrounded in my imagination by these towering patriotic intellects, I heard the news of the call of this session of Congress. My thoughts shifted back then to the scene of the Senate floor, and I knew this bill would most likely be brought up for consideration. I picked out in my mind the towering personalities in this Chamber, and compared them in my mind with the patriotic personalities who once sat on the floor of Independence Hall. I can say in all sincerity that they compared favorably in intellect, in intelligence, in attainments, and, more than that, I think they compared well in patriotism.

But, thinking further about the Constitution, it seems to me, Mr. President, with all deference, that instead of trying to respect a sound Constitution and instead of trying to preserve a sound Constitution, this bill will be in effect a butchering of the Constitution.

Someone said that we must be practical, and that we must adopt a method that is expedient. Let me quote from the

words of George Washington himself. In the Constitutional Convention someone suggested that they must propose an expedient form of government, one which would be adopted and which would be sure to meet the popular approval. Trying to do something that will meet popular approval is not a new thing. Let me read what that great man said—and when I say "great" I reflect that of all the magnificent objects in the city of Washington, the most majestic here is that single shaft dedicated to the father of our country, the Washington Monument.

This is what Washington said on the floor of the Constitutional Convention when someone suggested, "We must be expedient and we must write a document that is popular." The reply was:

> It is too probable that no plan that we propose will be adopted. * * * If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and just can repair. The events then will be in the hands of God.

So now, regardless of the expediency of the action, regardless of how popular it may be on some fronts, let us raise a standard here to which the wise and the just can repair; then the event will be in the lap of the gods.

Mr. President, this bill provides, very briefly, that the payment of a poll tax shall not be a prerequisite to voting in elections for President, Vice President, Members of the Senate, and Members of the House of Representatives. This very question has come before other deliberative bodies. We are dealing now with the Constitution, and my whole argument will be based on and centered around the grave constitutional question which arises. This very matter of dealing with the qualifications of electors came before the Constitutional Convention. The men there passed on it—James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and others—and they decided that in our Government we would have a President and Vice President. They decided further that we would have a United States Senate. They then decided that we would have a House of Representatives.

The question then arose as to how the membership of the House was to be chosen, a most vital and most important question. The members of that convention decided that they should be elected by the people.

Then the question arose—and this was one of the most serious of all—who shall be the electors, the qualified electors?

There were three proposals. The first one was that it should be left to the Congress to decide as to who would be qualified electors. That is the very thing the pending bill proposes to do. But that plan was rejected. Incidentally, as I recall, the first plan, providing that the Congress should have this authority, had only one sponsor in the constitutional convention. Think of that.

The second plan proposed was that there should be written into the Constitution itself the definitions of who would be qualified electors to choose the Members of the House of Representatives. That plan was rejected.

The third plan was that definitions should be written into the Constitution, to the extent of saying, "This matter being so important, so highly controversial, we prescribe the rule that in all Federal elections in each particular State those who are qualified to vote in the most numerous branch of that particular State legislature shall be qualified to vote for the Members of the House of Representatives."

That is what they said. That is what they decided on. That is what they wrote into the face of the Constitution itself.

To bring that out more clearly, I shall read the exact words of article I, section 2. Remember these words were carefully chosen after selection had been made among the three proposals I have mentioned:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall—

Note the word "shall"—

> the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. President, I have not heard of anyone who even suggests that the Congress of the United States would have the power to prescribe the qualifications of electors in State elections; that it would have the power to prescribe the qualifications of electors who are to choose the most numerous branch of the individual State legislatures. I emphasize the point that no one, as I understand, claims that there is authority in the Congress to prescribe who shall be qualified electors in the various States in choosing the members of the most numerous branch of their State legislatures, and the Constitution of the United States says that the electors for the United States House of Representatives shall be the same as those provided in each State for the election of members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. President, if we have no power to change the State list how do we have the power to change the Federal list of electors when the Constitution of the United States plainly says that they shall be the same? With all deference, Mr. President, I do not believe that question will be successfully answered at any time during the course of this debate.

To quote further from the Constitution at this point, section 4 of article I does give the Congress a great deal of authority. It reads as follows:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections—

Let us get that clear, please. We are not talking about qualified electors, nor who shall be qualified electors. We are on another subject.

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Mr. President, I anticipate the argument will be made at great length here that under section 4 Congress has the authority, and that it has been established by many precedents, to go into all forms of regulating Federal elections and therefore the argument will be made that that includes the power—listen, we are talking about power, we are talking about authority—to go back to article I and change the qualifications of electors. I submit that this would be a mere argument.

To make the record full, the other provision of the Constitution which applies, article I, section 8, clause 18, is as follows:

> The Congress shall have the power * * * To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers—

"The foregoing powers." In other words, Mr. President, if there is no power in article I, section 2, which provides that the list of electors shall be the same, to change the qualifications of an elector, then there is no power to be gained from subsection 18. It is possible to revert to that provision of the Constitution and say that under it the power of Congress rises higher there than it does under section 2. Just like a stream can rise no higher than its source, clause 18 can rise no higher than is the grant of power, if any, in article I, section 2.

Now to make the record more complete——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. DONNELL. I wanted to ask the Senator whether he thinks the further provision of subsection 18 would in any sense alter his argument. Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States reads in its entirety as follows:

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

My inquiry is whether the latter part—namely, that which begins with the words "and all other powers"—would in any manner affect the Senator's very interesting argument?

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate very much the Senator's inquiry. I really have all of clause 18 written out before me and I intended to quote it all, the part I did not quote being "and all other powers vested"——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. It is a little difficult to state the matter in the form of a question. I want to assure the Senator that I did not in any sense mean to indicate that the Senator did not intend to discuss the entire clause, but I asked him the simple question that I now repeat, as to whether or not he thinks the latter part of clause 18 would in any sense affect his argument.

Mr. STENNIS. I clearly understand that. I read again the last part of clause 18: "and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the

United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

It is clear to me, especially when the word "powers" is used—whether it is foregoing powers or other powers vested by the Constitution—that there are no such powers that could possibly reach the matter of changing the qualifications of electors in Federal elections. That is very clear to me. I made thorough search in an effort to find something of substance which would make this clause have some bearing. It is my humble opinion that there are no such powers, be they "foregoing" or found elsewhere, which would permit the Congress to go back to article I, section 2, and prescribe what is or what is not a qualification for a voter to vote in Federal elections.

We come back again and again to the proposition that the Constitution of the United States provides that the qualifications shall be the same for electing members of the State legislature as for electing Members of Congress. Congress cannot possibly have any kind of power to prescribe what shall be the qualifications of electors to elect members of the lower branch of the Missouri Legislature. If that be true—and it is undenied, as I understand—how can Congress, under any clause, have the power to say that the Constitution is all wrong, and that we shall establish a list of qualifications for voters for Members of Congress, and that the Missouri Legislature can do what it pleases under the Constitution with respect to the qualifications of electors of the lower branch of the Missouri Legislature? It is proposed that we shall not follow the Constitution with respect to the question of qualifications. Mr. President, I do not see how we can pursue such a course. That is why I say that it is not a question of expediency. It is not a matter of what might be proper under certain circumstances. It is a matter of doing something "to which the wise and the just can repair." Those are George Washington's words, not mine. Then, as he says, affairs will be in the hands of God.

Another provision which has a bearing on this question is amendment X to the Constitution. We are still talking about powers:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Certainly that means something, particularly when we try to squeeze out an imaginary power from some of the other clauses of the Constitution, especially when we are pressed because of the expediency of the occasion. We might be inclined to lean over the line a little; but amendment X calls us back:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

With all deference to the author of this bill, whoever he may be, and to whoever might have helped draft the bill, I invite the attention of the Senate to the language of the bill itself, which I think admits on its face that it has no proper constitutional base. I refer to the language beginning in line 3 on page 1:

> That the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors—

That is what I call a legislative fiat. I raise the point now that the Congress of the United States has no power to interpret a word in the Constitution. That is a judicial function. We must take those words as we find them and give them their ordinary, commonly accepted meaning, with such additional meaning as has been given to them authoritatively by the judicial branch of the Government. This bill is a clever way of trying to get around article I, section 2, which I have been discussing, and transfer this question over into article I, section 4. The proponents of the bill are trying to escape from the point raised, that voters for Members of Congress and for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature must have the same qualifications. They propose to say, by legislative fiat, that a poll tax shall not be deemed a qualification. We shall come later to the historical meaning of that word. I am raising the point now that the proponents of the bill must resort to legislative fiat to try to give the run-around to article I, section 2.

Mr. President, I believe that we would have the same authority to say that the freezing point of water shall be 28° F. instead of 32°. That would be legislative fiat. We are trying, by force of language, to say that the requirement that a poll tax be paid shall not be deemed a qualification—

> but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections.

The word "manner" is used in the Constitution. When a State prescribes that certain qualifications shall be met before one can become a qualified elector, does such a requirement pertain only to the manner of holding an election? Let me make it clear that once a person becomes a qualified elector he is clothed with certain high rights and prerogatives. I want him to be protected as a qualified elector. He has met the requirements, and he is entitled to all kinds of protection. He is entitled to as much protection as the State government and the Federal Government can give him.

This is simply a legal question, based upon the Constitution of the United States. The bill flirts with words, and admits on its face, I believe, that the Congress does not have the authority to proceed on the merits, but must resort to a juggling of words, a mesmerization of words, in order to get some semblance of a legal basis on which to stand.

I shall shortly return to a discussion of the historical and legal meaning of the word "qualifications." With reference to the word "qualifications" it is said that the poll tax itself is unconstitutional. It is not said that the poll tax is a bad thing and ought not to exist. It is not said that the poll tax is obsolete. The proponents of the bill do not say that they believe that the poll tax should be abandoned as a matter of policy. They actually argue that the poll tax itself is contrary to the Constitution, and that therefore we have authority to enact the proposed law.

Let us look into the historical significance of that question. Is a land tax with reference to voting unconstitutional? Is the payment of a property tax of any kind as a prerequisite to voting, contrary to the Constitution of the United States? Or is the requirement that a voter own property of some kind contrary to the Constitution of the United States? Were not such requirements included in the word "qualifications" when it was used in the Constitution?

Let us see what the picture was when the word "qualifications" was written into the Constitution of the United States, in article I, section 2. Let us see what those men, the framers of the Constitution, were considering and what was in their legal minds and what was in their minds as the leading political thinkers of that day. Let us not convict them of ignorance. We know that those men had before them the constitutions of the various States. We know they were highly familiar with those laws, and that they were the most competent men of their times to pass on such a subject.

I shall turn now to page 101 of section 14 of volume 716 of the Senate committee hearings of 1943, which can be found in the Senate Library. I shall take up with the indulgence of the Senate, the requirements of the various States which were represented at the Constitutional Convention at the time when the Constitution was adopted. We are addressing ourselves now, Mr. President, to what the word "qualification" meant, as there used.

The State of New Hampshire, by its constitution of 1784, required that before its citizens could become qualified electors, they must pay a poll tax. That was required by the constitution of 1784. That is bound to have been within the knowledge of the framers of the Federal Constitution when they wrote that clause.

The State of Vermont required that before one could vote, he must be a freeholder, which, of course, as everyone knows, meant that he must own land.

At that time the State of Massachusetts, according to the Massachusetts Constitution, required that before one could vote—and let us remember, Mr. President, that these provisions were written in their organic law—he must have a freehold of an annual income of £3 or an estate of £60.

The great State of New York in its constitution of 1777 provided that one must have a freehold of £20 or be paying rent of 40 shillings or have a freehold of £100 in order to qualify to vote for State senator, or he must be a taxpayer or a freeman of Albany or of New York City. This was a part of the picture which was before the members of the Constitutional Convention. They had before them the words of the constitutions of the States I have named requiring what must be done in order to qualify one as a voter.

New Jersey required an estate of £50.

Pennsylvania required that in order to vote a man must be a taxpayer.

Delaware provided that in order to qualify, one must pay to the State and the county some tax.

Maryland required that he have a freehold of 50 acres of property or £30.

I find here a memorandum as to the situation at that time in Virginia. It states "qualifications as fixed by law." The Virginia Constitution did not require anything on the subject, but Virginia law required that in order to qualify as an elector, a person must be a freeman having 500 acres of land unsettled or 25 acres of settled land.

The Constitution of North Carolina required a freehold of 50 acres in a county for 6 months before the election, and also required that in order to qualify as a voter, one must have paid public taxes. In such case he might vote for the members of the State legislature.

In South Carolina in 1778 the requirement was a freehold of 50 acres as a qualification for electors.

In Georgia the requirement was property of £10 or that one be in a mechanical trade or be a taxpayer.

The other original States—those that did not have constitutional requirements on this subject—had various statutory requirements regarding it, all of which were along the line of requiring that one be a freeholder or have paid a tax on some kind of property.

Mr. President, inasmuch as this question was one of the most delicate and one of the most controverted questions which came before the Constitutional Convention, and inasmuch as those men of intelligence and information and learning were passing on that matter and were passing in a most serious vein on this vital question of who shall be a qualified elector to vote for Members of the Congress, when they finally settled on these words, "and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature," are we not sure in our minds that they knew what they were doing and that they knew what they were saying? They were not trying to write a new language. They were not trying to give an imaginary meaning to the word "qualification." I shall be able to show, later, that the word "qualification" runs all the way through the law. They were not trying to write a new language. They were creating a new government. They were prescribing one of the most serious tests that was to be laid down. They were prescribing who should be the ones qualified to choose Members of the House of Representatives. We know they used that word advisedly, with all this mass of information before them, and we know they gave that word a practical meaning and legal meaning. The law was full of it.

Now, later, on some kind of a theory, and merely because we do not believe that a poll tax should be required, can we in good conscience say that we do not believe that the payment of taxes—poll taxes or any other kind of taxes—was intended to be included in the word "qualifications"? As I see it, that is the only point of argument that the proponents of this measure could possibly have; and the door is absolutely closed in their face by the words of the Constitution, by its prior history, and by its subsequent legal development.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. North of Mason and Dixon's line there are seven States which still carry in their election laws the property requirements the Senator has just recounted as being the test of qualification originally adopted by all the States. All of them had some kind of property requirement. But there are seven States which now prohibit a pauper from voting. If a man or woman has, through misfortune, become so very poor that he or she has become a public charge and is declared to be a pauper, those seven States will not let such a person vote. That is a disqualification. Has any Member of the House or the Senate from those States come forward in the Congress and said, "We have tried to correct that injustice in our State; we do not think there should be any property test"? Such persons may be intelligent, they may be honest, they may be very much interested in government and anxious to vote, but they are poor, they are paupers, and are disqualified. Has any Member of Congress said, "We made that fight in our own State, and we come to the Congress now to wipe that restriction from the laws of our own States, so that in those seven States paupers may vote"? Has anyone ever heard that claim made in the Senate?

Mr. STENNIS. I really have not, no. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his illuminating question. I continue on with the idea as to what was in the minds of the framers of the Constitution of the United States when they used the word "qualifications." I turn back and read, merely for the benefit of the Senate, the actual words of the New York statute. It provides:

> Every male inhabitant of full age who shall have personally resided within one of the counties of the State for 6 months immediately preceding the day of election * * * if during the time aforesaid he shall have been a freeholder, possessing a freehold to the value of 20 pounds within the county, or have rented a tenement therein of yearly value of 40 shillings, and been rated and actually paid taxes to the State.

Paying taxes, rated for taxes, owning a freehold. The books are simply full of requirements of that kind, which were staring these men in the face when they solemnly declared:

> Whatever qualifications the State prescribes for voting in the most numerous branch of its legislature, those shall be the qualifications provided for voting for Members of Congress.

Listen now to Rhode Island. Rhode Island says:

> Every male citizen * * * of the age of 21 years, who has had his residence and home in this State for 1 year, and in the town or city in which he may claim a right to vote, 6 months next preceding * * * and who is really and truly possessed in his own right of real estate in such town or city in the value of $134 over and above all encumbrances, or which shall rent for $7 per annum over and above any rent reserved or the interest of any encumbrances therein being an estate in fee simple, fee tail, for the life of any person, or an estate in reversion, or remainder, which qualifies no other person to vote—

Notice the word "qualifies." They were talking about qualifying, and they said a person could not use an estate, if the same estate were used to qualify someone else to vote—

> which qualifies no other person to vote, the conveyance of which estate, if by deed, shall have been recorded at least 90 days, shall hereafter have a right to vote in the election of civil officers and on all questions in legal town or ward meetings as long as he continues so qualified.

Notice the word "qualified." What were they talking about? They were talking about persons who meet the requirements to enable them to vote for members of the State legislature in Rhode Island. What were the framers of the Constitution talking about? They were talking about those who were to be qualified to vote for Members of the House of Representatives. What did they say? They said that those who were qualified in the States to vote for members of the legislature should be qualified to vote for the Members of Congress. My point is that the Congress can do nothing about that. The State could not pass a law and say, "To vote in Federal elections this shall be the requirement, but in State elections this other measure shall be the requirement." The State could not do that. The Constitution would not let them do it, because it says the same qualifications shall be required.

By the same token, the Congress cannot do that, because it does not have the authority to depart from the standards set up by the State for their own legislature. I agree that is a Federal right. Surely, it is a Federal right, and it is by force of the Federal Constitution. I do not argue that the States as such have the right to fix the qualifications of electors for the United States Congress. The States do not have that right. They have the right to say who shall be qualified in their respective States to vote for the most numerous branch of the legislature. Then, when they have said that, the gavel has fallen, all time for debate has expired. The Constitution of the United States then, in these solmn words, comes along and says the Federal Government, the Congress or anyone else, "shall adopt in each State" the qualifications and the requisites as prescribed in such State for voting for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. When those electors vote for a Member of the House of Representatives, they are exercising a Federal right, they are voting in a Federal

election. That is a legal civil right, and I want them to have all the protection of the law. Section 4 of article I gives the Congress plenty of authority to afford them such protection. I raise the point here, though, that the Congress has no authority and no power to fall back upon section 2 of article I, where they have been plainly excluded. They have no power or authority to go back to anything contained in that section, and begin shuffling or trying to shuffle words, and saying that they do not mean this, or they do not mean that. What they mean is plain and unmistakable. I submit the framers of the Constitution meant exactly what they said, and said exactly what they meant.

Going back now a little further into the historical background with respect to the meaning of the word "qualifications" and with respect to the power of the Congress, I desire to call certain witnesses to testify on the subject. Perhaps we may waive the oath by reason of their prestige and reputation over the years for intelligence and patriotism which will supply the necessary requirements. I first call for the benefit of the Senate a witness whose name is George Mason. I shall ask him a few questions very briefly on this point. I want to ask him if he is the George Mason who wrote the Bill of Rights. His answer is, "I am." I ask: "Now, Mr. Mason, what do you say about the Congress regulating or altering the qualifications of electors?" In reply, reading from Madison's reports of the Convention, at page 386, George Mason says:

> A power to alter the qualifications would be a dangerous power in the hands of the Legislature.

Since the context shows that the subject under discussion was the National Government, when he speaks of the "Legislature" the reference of course is to the Congress. He says it would be "a dangerous power in the hands of the Legislature."

I next present as a witness James Madison, called the Father of the Constitution. I do not know that he altogether deserves the title, but, at any rate, he was present and knew what was said and what occurred. Taking now James Madison's statement from the Federalist, article 57, he raises this point:

> Who are to be the electors of these Federal representatives? Not the rich more than the poor; not the learned more than the ignorant; not the haughty heirs of distinguished name more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune; the electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States.
>
> They are to be the same to exercise the right in every State of electing the corresponding branch of the legislature of the State.

May I be permitted to repeat that language? It is not mine. It is the language of Mr. James Madison. He said they are to be the same. Note that word "same." It is used in the Constitution, article I, section 2, which says that they shall have the same qualifications.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall yield only for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. I note the Senator's use of the word "same" as occurring in section 2 of article I of the Constitution. I have before me a copy of that section, and I do not observe in it the word "same." Does it appear in the copy which the Senator has?

Mr. STENNIS. The word "same" does not appear in the text.

Mr. DONNELL. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator. Did I misunderstand him when I thought he said the Constitution used the word "same"?

Mr. STENNIS. I might have said that, thinking that the word "same" was there. The plain meaning is that the electors of Federal representatives shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the corresponding branch of the State legislatures. That certainly means "same," as I interpret it.

Mr. DONNELL. I simply inquired of the Senator in order to be sure that I correctly understood him.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, continuing in the course of bringing in witnesses on the question of what the word "qualifications" meant as used and the power of the Congress to go into the question, I now call forth one of the truly great men who graced the Supreme Court of the United States for almost 30 years, as I recall, the great Justice Story. He was overshadowed, in a way, during many of those years by the illustrious John Marshall. But in my humble opinion, no man ever made a greater contribution, so far as soundness is concerned, to American constitutional law than did Justice Story. I have here a quotation from him while he was discussing section 4 of article I of the Constitution, which refers to the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives. He said this:

> There is no pretense to say that the power in the National Government can be used so as to exclude any State from its share of the representation in Congress.

Of course, those words were used prior to the amendments following the War Between the States. Here is the sentence in which I am particularly interested:

> Nor can it be said with correctness that Congress can in any way alter the right or qualification of voters.

Of course, those words were all written after the Constitution was written, with the exception of the amendments following the War Between the States.

That brings to my mind this question: Suppose some State requires electors to have qualifications of various kinds which the Congress might think should not be required because of being too liberal or too extreme. Congress could not change the rule. That is what Justice Story said, and that is what the Constitution says. Congress cannot alter the right or qualification of voters in any way.

I shall now proceed further with the same thought. It is not my idea to speak too long. I am merely trying to cover a high point of the main constitutional argument which applies, as I see it. I want to say, before going into other cases, that all the way through, in all the literature in reference to the Constitutional Convention, in reference to the plans, the methods, and the efforts in connection with securing its adoption, one of the main themes of the argument was that on this highly important and delicate subject of who should be qualified electors the States would still have the right to say who should be qualified electors in their elections, and then the National Government, by the Constitution, adopted the test prescribed by the States as the test in Federal elections in the States.

They did not say the Congress would adopt it; they did promise that the Congress would always be reasonable about it. They said to the people of the States—and I am talking about the people, now—and to the men who were chosen for the specific purpose of adopting or rejecting that Constitution: "This is a matter about which you are not running any hazard, you are not taking any chance. It is forever sealed, unless it is changed by a constitutional amendment." I do not think anyone will find that statement controverted in any way, and to that extent, Mr. President, it was a solemn and serious compact.

Mr. President, I am sure those things meant something then. I believe they mean something today. I believe that is a serious thought that will find lodgment in the minds of the conscientious Members of this body when they come to reach a final decision as to how they shall vote.

Now I wish to call the Senate's special attention to one of the early cases on this subject.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has spoken about this compact. Is it not also a fact that the only way the compact can be changed is by and with the consent of three-fourths of the States of the Union?

Mr. STENNIS. Of course, the Senator is correct about that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The question I wish to ask the Senator is this: Can the integrity of the Constitution be maintained with respect to the qualified electors for Federal officers, for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and for President and Vice President, if a statute is passed providing that the payment of a poll tax is not a qualification, when the State constitution says it is? Would the integrity of the present language of the Constitution be maintained if such a Federal statute attempted to repeal that provision of the Constitution?

Mr. STENNIS. I think not.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, it would completely abrogate and nullify that provision of the Constitution which now provides that the qualifications of electors shall be the same, would it not?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I have before me a case decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, *Ex parte Yarbrough*, decided in 1884, reported in One Hundred and Tenth United States Supreme Court Reports, page 651. I invite the attention of the Senate to a reading of this case, and the other cases I shall cite.

Under section 4 of article I of the Constitution the Congress had passed a law with reference to the regulation of elections, and the petitioners in this case were convicted for intimidating a voter in a congressional election. The conviction was under a Federal law against interference and intimidation. The law was upheld by the Court as being valid under section 4 of article I of the Constitution, and the Court used the language I shall read from page 663:

> If this were conceded, the importance to the General Government of having the actual election—the voting for those members—free from force and fraud is not diminished by the circumstance that the qualification of the voter is determined by the law of the State where he votes.

That is merely a recognition of the law. No one disputed that. That is what the Court took to be the law. That was the plain understanding.

This is the main portion of the case I wish to quote:

> The States in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualification for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States—

This is the Supreme Court speaking—

> and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

That is where the word "same" to which I referred comes in. It was in this Supreme Court decision, rather than in the Constitution itself. But the meaning is logically inescapable that it is the same qualification, and the Court in this case upheld the Federal power; the decision was not adverse to the Federal Government, and in upholding the Federal power, it still laid down the qualification just as clearly as before. I shall read the last sentence again:

> They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

It will be noticed further how the Court uses over and over again the word "qualifications." All the way through the law, in the constitutions of the States, in the Constitution of the United States, and in the Supreme Court decisions, the word "qualifications" is used.

I have another case I wish to cite. I am skipping over a great number of cases in order to get down to the more modern ones. I am trying to keep from consuming too much time.

The next case was decided in 1937. It was the case of Breedlove against Suttles, found in Three Hundred and Second United States Reports, page 277. The facts were that a Georgia law imposed a poll tax on all inhabitants between the ages of 21 and 60, excepting the blind and females who do not register and vote. The State constitution provided that one could not register and vote unless he had paid the poll tax required. The petitioner sought to require the registrar of elections to permit registration for voting in the State and Federal elections without the petitioner having paid the tax.

Now let us understand the facts. The petitioner sought to have the registrar of elections register him to vote in both Federal and State elections without having first paid the tax. That case went to the Supreme Court of the United States. It was decided in 1937. The late Justice Butler rendered the opinion in that case. It was a unanimous opinion. Getting down to the gist of his actual holdings, he had this to say, speaking for the Court:

> To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment.

We are coming now to the question of the fourteenth amendment. It has been claimed by some that the adoption of the fourteenth amendment changed the picture.

> Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

Now getting down to specific words. What I have heretofore read are rather broad statements. We now get down to specific words. Mr. Justice Butler said for the Court:

> The payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting is a familiar and reasonable regulation long in force in many States.

That is direct and specific language by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1937.

> The payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting—

And that was the question involved; this is not a dictum—

> is a familiar and reasonable regulation long in force in many States.

Mr. President, while I am on that subject I want to bring up next the case that follows, the Pirtle case.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. Is the Senator from Mississippi taking the position that in the Breedlove case the Court in any way passed on the power of Congress to enact a law such as is proposed in the bill now before us dealing with the requirement that the poll tax be paid?

Mr. STENNIS. I think the main holding in the Breedlove case is that the poll tax is valid, that it can be required, that it is an accepted part of the qualifications, and has been down through the years. I think it is a direct holding to that effect.

Mr. DONNELL. But the Court was not holding, was it, that the Congress is without power to pass a statute to the effect that the requirement that a poll tax be paid shall not be deemed a qualification of voters? That question was not before the Court?

Mr. STENNIS. Of course, that question was not before the Court in that specific case.

Mr. DONNELL. Of course, that is the question, is it not, which is now before the Congress in this bill?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. And is it not true that the question which is now before the Congress in this bill was not before the Court in the Breedlove case? Is that not correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Of course, this bill, or no bill like it, was before the Court in that case. In that case there was an attempt to have the Court outlaw the poll tax, and the Court said that it was an accepted part of the qualifications of voters.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator this question: Am I not correct in my understanding that the Court, although it used the language which the Senator has read, was not passing on the question as to whether Congress has the legal power to pass an act of a general nature similar to that which is before us for consideration? Am I not correct in that statement?

Mr. STENNIS. My interpretation is that the Court did close the door again on that question, but there was no such bill, of course, before the Court as we have here today.

Mr. DONNELL. And is it not true that the Court was not passing on whether the Congress had a right to pass such a bill? Am I not correct in that matter?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. The Court was not passing specifically on that point.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the Court did in that case hold that the payment of a poll tax was a qualification for voting?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And if it is a qualification for voting, then the Constitution says that the States shall determine, and not the Federal Government, and therefore until there is constitutional power delegated to the Congress to pass such a statute, such a statute would be void.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is correct. I call attention also to the fact that the Court expressly excluded the operation of the fourteenth amendment with reference to the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, and expressly said that the requirement of such a tax did not deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment.

Mr. President, the next case I have is the case of Pirtle against Brown. The decision in that case was rendered by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth District. The case involved a special election in the State of Tennessee where the only office to be filled was that of a Member of the United States Congress—the House of Representatives. There was no State election involved. In that case the

appellant, Henry Pirtle, possessed all the qualifications required by the laws of Tennessee to entitle him to vote in this election, except that he had not paid his poll tax. For this reason the judges of the election declined to allow him to vote. That case went before the Circuit Court of Appeals on the single question. No other election was involved. No other question was involved except whether or not he would be qualified to vote in this Federal election, not having met the requirements of the State of Tennessee with reference to poll tax.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. I did not get the citation of the case.

Mr. STENNIS. Pirtle versus Brown, decided in 1941 by the Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, 118 Federal (2d), page 218.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. To make it brief, I will say that the Circuit Court of Appeals followed the Breedlove case and held that the man was not entitled to vote because he was not a qualified elector under the laws of the State of Tennessee, and therefore had no standing as a qualified elector to vote in a Federal election. It was expressly challenged there, as it had been in the Breedlove case, that the fourteenth amendment intervened, and that the poll tax was unconstitutional, unreasonable, and invalid, but the court handed down a decision in conformity to that in the previous case I cited.

That case was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. It went up on a writ of certiorari. I do not have the citation before me, although I can supply it. The Supreme Court of the United States, without rendering an opinion, dismissed the writ. In other words, it affirmed and upheld the lower court. I believe that the Supreme Court knew what it was doing. It was suggested by one of the witnesses who testified before a Senate committee that the Supreme Court of the United States was afraid to pass upon the question. The witness passed upon the question and gave his version of the Supreme Court decision. He stated that the case was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, and that the Supreme Court of the United States was afraid to pass upon the question, as were Members of the United States Senate.

I do not believe that to be true. I believe that the Supreme Court of the United States knew exactly what it was doing; and I believe that Members of the Senate—I am not engaging in flattery—are wrestling with their consciences and using their intelligence and patriotism, not to decide what may be expedient, but honestly and conscientiously to decide what is right, and what they should do under the Constitution of the United States. I have no doubt in my mind that when this question is finally settled a majority will vote against the bill, for the reason that it has no proper foundation under the Constitution of the United States as now written.

I wish to return briefly to something which I should have presented immediately following the statement by Justice Story. I wish to read briefly from references to senatorial debates when certain amendments to the Constitution were adopted following the War Between the States, and when the suffrage amendment to the Constitution was adopted. The record has been compiled by an esteemed gentleman from Washington by the name of Charles Warren, who testified before the Senate committee in 1943.

I wish to read briefly from page 87 of Division 14 of Senate Hearings, volume 716. This testimony was taken before the Senate committee in 1943. Mr. Warren gives a history of a part of the debate with reference to the fifteenth amendment. I have made research upon the idea which was in the minds of the Congress with reference to the adoption of the nineteenth amendment, which permitted women to vote. That is further evidence of the fact that the Congress did not consider that it had the power to say what should or should not be a qualification of an elector. Certainly if we have the authority to say what tax shall be a qualification, we have the authority to say that sex shall not disqualify a person.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. May I inquire whether this is the same Mr. Warren who is the author of the book entitled "The History of the Supreme Court of the United States"?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

A reprint of Mr. Warren's testimony was placed before the committee during the most recent hearings on the poll tax. I read from page 87, in the 1943 hearings:

Then arose that very heated condition growing out of the situation at the end of the war—

He is speaking of the War Between the States—

and if there was ever a time in our whole history, and especially in our whole legislative history, if there was ever a time that a claim should have been made that the United States Congress had any power to regulate the question of suffrage in the States, that claim would have been made during the debates over the civil-rights bill of 1866 and the debates on the fourteenth amendment in 1866. I want to read to you, at the risk of trespassing a little on your patience and your time, the very emphatic statements made by the Senators at that time, not only the Senators of the North and East but the Senators of the West—of course, there were no Senators from the South. With the exception of one Senator, there was not a single Senator on the floor of the Senate who claimed or contended for 1 minute that the States did not have the full control of the suffrage.

That is what an examination of the debates in 1866 showed. Only one man claimed that Congress had any control, or that the States did not have full control of suffrage.

The only exception to that statement was Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, and even he admitted that the State of Massachusetts had complete power to regulate suffrage with one exception; he did not think they had the power to deny suffrage to the Negro, but, with that exception—and how he worked out that exception is rather a mystery—but with that exception there was not a Senator who denied the full power of the State to regulate suffrage.

Let me recall to you who were the authors of that fourteenth amendment. When I said every Senator, North, West, and East, I meant to include every Senator, Republican and Democratic. Who were the authors of that fourteenth amendment?

First, it was constructed by a joint committee of 15 of the Senate and House, the Senate chairman of which was William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine, later President Lincoln's Secretary of the Treasury. The senior member and the man who took Senator Fessenden's place on the floor of the Senate when Fessenden was later ill, was Jacob M. Howard, of Michigan, and then followed John Harris, of New York; James W. Grimes, of Iowa; Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland; and George H. Williams, of Oregon.

I shall omit some of the historical references and skip to this paragraph:

This amendment was considered twice. The first two sections were considered separately and then as separate resolutions for separate amendments, and then they were later joined together and made articles of one amendment, the fourteenth amendment, as it now appears.

Mr. Warren cites what Senator Bingham said:

The second section excludes the conclusion that by the first section suffrage is subjected to congressional law.

That was the point. They had excluded suffrage as being subject to congressional law.

Mr. Warren continues:

In the Senate, this first section was discussed by Senator Howard, who was heading the committee in the absence of Senator Fessenden; and he states:

"The first section of the proposed amendment does not give to either of these classes the privilege of voting. The right of suffrage is not, in law, one of the privileges or immunities thus secured by the Constitution. It is merely the creature of law. It has always been regarded in this country as a result of positive local law."

Mr. Warren quotes Senator Howard:

"This section does not recognize the authority of the United States over the question of suffrage in the several States at all. Nor does it recognize, much less secure, the right of suffrage to the colored race. It leaves the right to regulate the elective franchise still with the States and does not meddle with that right."

I am not bringing out any point with respect to races. These words were spoken on the floor of the Senate before the adoption of the fifteenth amendment. That amendment, of course, covers the question fully. My point is that there was general recognition throughout the debate, with the exception of Senator Sumner, that there was no power in the Congress to specify what should be or what should not be the qualifications of electors, and that the fourteenth amendment did not attempt to give any such power.

I have before me quotations from a great number of Senators. They are to be found on pages 91, 92, and 93 of that portion of the volume to which I have referred. Mr. Warren has collected the statements of those who were Members of the Senate at that time.

I have one other case which I wish to discuss. It was passed on by the Supreme Court of the United States. I think it will be used as an argumentative proposition, wherein it will be contended that it is a basis for the passage of this bill. I am sorry, but I think this is a rather technical case. I do not mean to be technical in an argument, but the subject matter requires one to do so.

This is the case of the United States against Classic, which was decided by the Supreme Court in 1941. It is to be found in Three Hundred and Thirteenth United States Reports, at page 299. The opinion is written by Mr. Justice Stone, who later became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. It is a criminal case, based on two counts of an indictment found in a Federal district court, which originated, incidentally, in Louisiana, wherein it was charged that the commissioners of elections in conducting a primary election under Louisiana law to nominate a candidate of the Democratic Party for Representative in Congress, willfully altered and falsely counted and certified the ballots which the voters cast in the primary election. The case went up to the Supreme Court on that criminal charge, and the statute under which that prosecution was based was upheld by the Supreme Court. It extends the protection—and rightfully so—of the law to anyone who is a qualified elector in any State, who offers to vote or seeks to vote for the election of a Federal officer. I am entirely in harmony and in agreement with that law and with the Supreme Court's upholding of it, but we most emphatically deny that this language can in any way be construed as a basis for the authority of the Congress by mere majority to tamper with section 2 of article I of the Constitution in prescribing the qualifications of electors.

I wish to call attention to what Mr. Justice Stone said at page 309 of that case:

Section 19 of the Criminal Code condemns as a criminal offense any conspiracy to injure a citizen in the exercise "of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States." Section 20 makes it a penal offense for anyone who, acting "under the color of any law, willfully subjects, or causes to be subjected, any inhabitant of any State * * * to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States."

He goes on to state that those are founded under article I, sections 2 and 6.

On page 310 he further says:

Such right as is secured by the Constitution to qualified voters to choose Members of the House of Repesentatives is thus to be exercised in conformity to the requirements of State law subject to the restrictions prescribed by section 2 and to the authority conferred on Congress by section 4, to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Representatives.

Mr. President, my point is that Mr. Justice Stone there is extending the protection of the Constitution to such persons as are qualified electors. In other words, before one can come within the protection of this case—and it is rightful protection—one must come clothed in the garments of a qualified elector. It goes back to the same proposition, as the Court has so many times held, that in order to become a qualified elector one must meet the requirements of the law of the particular State. When one has done that, the Federal Constitution adopts him and clothes him with all the powers, privileges, and immunities of a qualified elector in a Federal election, and will protect him to the last limit of the law. That is what Mr. Justice Stone said. He uses the words "authority of the Congress" only when he is referring to section 4, and does so in referring to the regulation of the times, places, and manner of holding elections. That is exactly what this case holds.

In referring to section 2, he says:

Pursuant to the authority given by section 2 of article I of the Constitution, and subject to the legislative power of Congress under section 4 of article I, and other pertinent provisions of the Constitution, the States are given, and in fact exercise, a wide discretion in the formation of a system—

He is referring to the manner of holding an election. The States have been given wide powers. It is only in a few cases that their powers in that respect are limited. This case all the way through refers to the manner of holding elections, and it bottoms its authority on section 4. Whenever Mr. Justice Stone uses the word "authority" in this case, in referring to the authority that is being upheld, he is referring to the authority granted by section 4 of the Constitution, with reference to the manner of holding elections.

On page 314 we find the following:

We come then to the question whether that right is one secured by the Constitution. Section 2 of article I commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes.

Let me read that again, please. A part of this case will be used as a dictum, as the main basis for the asserted authority of the Congress to pass this bill. Here is what Mr. Justice Stone said:

We come then to the question whether that right is one secured by the Constitution. Section 2 of article I commands that——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, is the Senator now reading the dictum?

Mr. STENNIS. No.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator be kind enough to state what he anticipates will be the dictum which will be used as a basis for attempting to sustain the validity of this bill, if passed?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall indicate that.

My point is that this case all the way through recognizes the various standards which I have been maintaining throughout this argument. Here is what Mr. Justice Stone says on that point:

Section 2 of article I commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes.

He is there talking about the States, and he cites *Ex parte Yarbrough*, among other cases. That was the first one I cited.

Here is the dictum which will be used, as I understand. I do not mean to anticipate too much the argument which will be made, but this point has been argued to me. I understand this is to be used as the basis for authority in this case. Mr. Justice Stone said:

While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States, see *Minor* v. *Happersett*—

And he cites three other cases—

this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution, to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

In other words, the most favorable light in which this dictum could be considered Mr. Justice Stone still confines us to such authority and power as is to be found in section 4 and in clause 18 of section 8. Section 4 pertains all the way through to the "times, places, and manner of holding elections." I emphasize "manner." We cannot get away from the fact that historically and legally the word "qualifications," at the very time it was used and ever since that time, until this very day, has been considered by the best minds and by the courts as having the same meaning as the word "qualifications" found in section 2 of article I. So, by the most liberal interpretation of this dictum, as I understand, the learned Justice clearly limits the power of the Congress to section 4, relating to "times, manner, and places" and to clause 18, which refers to the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, or any other powers that are to be found within the Constitution.

Where are such powers to be found? Are they to be found in the fourteenth amendment? The Supreme Court of the United States says no. They have already looked there and they did not find them. Does a poll tax violate the privileges and immunities clause of the fourteenth amendment? The Supreme Court says no; they have already looked there and passed on that matter. Is a poll tax, within itself, merely the bare fact that it is a tax used as a prerequisite, therefore condemned? Does such a tax afford Congress any power to act? The Supreme Court of the United States in the Breedlove case says no, and more than that, the Court said it in the Pirtle case.

I now come to this point: The Pirtle case which I cited a while ago, which was passed on by the Supreme Court of the United States merely by closing the book and not rendering an opinion, was decided, it will be remembered, 6 months after the Classic case from which I have been quoting. In other words, whatever the law of the land was under the Classic case it was already the law for 6 months before the Pirtle case was decided; and in that case again, the Court said in effect that States do have authority to impose a poll tax; that it is a qualification. The Court falls back upon section 2 of article I. The Classic case sends us

back to section 2 of article I. I return to my statement, then, that the only possible way I can see by which the pending bill could be bottomed upon sound authority is to baldly state that qualifications and the poll tax have no relation one to the other. One may branch off into philosophy or into theory and say that, but when we come to the law of the land, when we go back to the Constitutional Convention, when we go back to the Constitution and the statutes of the various Colonies prior to the formation of the Union, when we go back to the wording of the Constitution based upon the facts as the framers of the Constitution found them, with all deference, I cannot see how it is possible so to play on language as to say that the legitimacy of the poll tax as a qualification is not written boldly into the Constitution.

But that is not all, Mr. President. The most distinguished constitutional lawyers who had responsibilities as high as ours, including Justice Story, Members of the United States Senate who were here following the War Between the States, and the members of the Supreme Court of some 10 or 12 years ago, indeed as it was constituted as late as 1941, all held the same view. The matter of qualifications is something Congress cannot touch; it is something that is written into the Constitution of the United States, and it has serious meaning. I respectfully submit that we are standing on holy ground upon which no one else has ever dared tread, and certainly this question should be most seriously considered by us.

That brings to my mind this point, Mr. President: If we pass this bill, it will be the first instance in the history of our Nation of the United States Government invading the field of Federal suffrage. If the Congress goes into that, and if the Supreme Court should uphold it, then the Congress will be in that field, unfettered, unbound, unregulated, and unrestricted, without any limitation, without any guide, and there will be no semblance of control over the present Congress or the membership of future Congresses. Do we want to do that? Do we want to take the responsibility of doing it? If we do, it should be done only after the greatest consideration and deliberation.

In colonial days, nearly all the Colonies had constitutions providing what the qualifications of electors should be. If we are willing to enter and tread on ground that few framers of State constitutions since that time have been willing to tread upon, if we are willing to enter upon it unrestrained—and we are not only involving ourselves, we are bringing our successors in—if we are willing to do more than the framers of the Constitution were willing to do, and if we are willing to enter upon this holy ground without a direct authorization of the people, we are doing something that every Supreme Court that has ever passed on the matter has carefully avoided intimating that we have the slightest suggestion of power to do.

I respectfully call the attention of the Senate to a state of facts that existed here only twelve short years ago. Along the line of treading on dangerous ground and of going into the sacred domain of suffrage, which no other Congress has ever before entered, I call the attention of Senators to the conditions that existed in 1936.

The Democratic Party swept this Nation like a forest fire and carried 46 of the 48 States. The membership of the fine group on my right was reduced, as I understand, to a scant 19 Members. There was a crushing and overwhelming Democratic majority at the other end of the Capitol. The leader of the Democratic Party sat in the White House. Certainly the party had as much authority as ever was vested in any political party. Suppose that such a law as is now proposed had been passed. Suppose they had not stopped with that, but had gone to extremes, under section 4, and passed all manner of measures with reference to the holding of elections, had established the machinery, and by law, by force, by intimidation, and otherwise, had dominated the elections in all of the States. That would have been legal if this poll-tax bill is legal. It shows the dangerous ground involved. Suppose those things had happened. Is it to be supposed that these gentlemen would be here today as Members of the United States Senate, elected to membership in this body under laws as they are today, under elections controlled by their own State laws, guided and protected by their own State police powers? In a short span of 12 years, which is a very short time, under our system, the Republicans have come back to power. They now have a very respectable majority in the Senate, having 51 Members. They control the other House. They dominate every committee in the Senate and the House of Representatives, having not only the chairmen of the committees, but the chairmen of all subcommittees. They are making a serious bid to elect a President of the United States. Could that have been done if an oppressive party had passed extraordinary laws of all kinds, which would have been legal if this poll-tax bill is legal? Do the Republican Senators think they could have made a come-back such as they have made under those circumstances? I do not think so.

Mr. President, I believe that in the calm reflections of a man's own private room, where he is his better self, if he thoroughly goes into the matter, strictly on a constitutional and legal basis, forgetting all the expediency of the occasion, his calm, deliberate conclusion would be that it is sound for Congress to stay out of this delicate and dangerous field of suffrage. More than that, we are bound by the organic law of the land. Rightly or wrongly, the Constitution says that this is one matter which the Congress itself, through legislation, shall not touch. If there be any serious doubt about it in any man's mind, would it not be an act of statesmanship—I do not say, "Would it not be expedient"—if there were a serious doubt about such a grave constitutional question, to say "I shall resolve this doubt against the bill." I submit it is a man's duty, if he reaches that conclusion, that he follow that course.

May I again remind the Senate of the admonition which came from George Washington when it was proposed that there be adopted some expedient that would meet the popular will. He said:

> No. Let us prepare a standard—

Referring to the Constitution of the United States—

> to which the wise and just may repair. The events then will be in the hands of God.

I conclude, Mr. President, by making some reference to another course which is open to the Congress. I mention it not as one who would personally favor it on a vote on the merits, but it is a course which is entirely constitutional. It is a course which is entirely safe. I do not plead today for the poll tax as such; I plead for constitutional government. It is the course which was mentioned yesterday by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who has filed individual views with reference to the bill. He filed in his report quotations from men who were distinguished in ability and honorable in their approach to all public questions. I want to reflect their sentiments and what they have said with reference to a constitutional amendment and to an anti-poll-tax bill.

I now quote from the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] in a statement which he made on the floor of the Senate on November 23, 1942:

> I am opposed to Senate bill 1280. To me the Constitution clearly provides that the qualifications necessary to vote for a Representative in Congress are the qualifications by the State to make one eligible to vote for a member of the most numerous house of the State legislature. I think that as it presently stands the Constitution clearly leaves this question to the States. If the National Government desires to exercise authority to declare different qualifications it should be done by an amendment to the Constitution and not attempted to be done by a statute which, in my opinion, is in contravention of the rule laid down in the Constitution.

I have here another quotation from the late Senator Shipstead, of Minnesota. He stated on May 15, 1944:

> I desire to state in a few words my view on House bill 7. I voted against cloture, and if the bill should come to a vote I would vote against the bill.

Then he quoted section 2 of article I, and said:

> The power to impose qualifications on voters is vested by the Constitution in the State itself. If the Congress has the right, under the Constitution, to remove one qualification, it has the right to remove all qualifications or to impose others. We are sailing on rough seas, with foggy weather, these days, and our compass is the Constitution.

He went on to say that if the bill should become law it would open the door to a mass of legislation now prohibited by the present construction of the Constitution. He further said it would place the welfare of the country and its population within the complete power of whatever faction happened to be in the majority.

There is the pitiful part, the sad part—whatever faction may happen to be in the majority.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, have we forgotten that it is the majority from which we must protect ourselves, even when we are temporarily a part of that majority ourselves?

I ask that question again: Have we forgotten that it is majorities from which we must protect ourselves? If we have forgotten that, then we have forgotten almost every line, every paragraph, and every page of American history, because somewhere on almost every page of the constitutional law of this Nation is the thought that we have constitutional guaranties which protect us from majorities. That is a deliberate part of our plan and, I submit, the soundest part. I verily believe that this bill would take the very foundation out of that protection, insofar as suffrage is concerned. I am no calamity howler, but somewhere down the years when oppressive majorities undertake to shake down other great foundation stones of this Government I believe that if this bill shall pass men can point back to the day it was passed and say, "Here is where the first crack started in the great wall of American constitutional liberty."

I say, Mr. President, that we stand on holy ground when we consider this bill. Let us tread carefully. Let us look to our own intelligence for a guide. Let us look to the Constitution as a guide, to those who wrote it, and to those who have passed on it since, and ask for the guidance of an even Higher Power, because it is the Constitution with which we are dealing, and one of the most delicate subjects of that entire instrument.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. In stating my question I wish to say to the Senator that I have listened very carefully to what I consider to be the very able argument the Senator from Mississippi has presented in support of his position on the constitutional question involved in the measure now being discussed.

The Senator has referred to the possibility of considering the disposition of the matter by way of submitting a constitutional amendment, if I understood him correctly, along the lines of the suggestion made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Assuming for the moment that that course of procedure were followed in the Senate on this issue, my question is, Does the Senator from Mississippi take the position that the other matters included in the President's civil-rights platform, such as the antilynching bill and the Fair Employment Practice Act, also involve, in his opinion, constitutional questions which would warrant their being handled by way of the submission of constitutional amendments, rather than by way of legislation?

Mr. STENNIS. That is a rather broad question. I am not now discussing the President's message as such, pro or con. I am defending, as I see them, the principles of our organic law, the Constitution of the United States. I am interested in the proposed constitutional amendment as being a way of solving the problem, what I have thought to be the only sound way of solving any problem in connection with this subject.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator's position, but if he will permit me to say so, without jeopardizing his right to the floor in any way whatsoever, I am trying to think ahead to what our total procedure in the special session may be on the whole question of civil rights.

Tentatively, I am inclined to share the Senator's view that careful consideration should be given to the suggestion that this particular issue might be determined procedurally by way of submitting a constitutional amendment, although my judgment on that is reserved. I am also aware of the fact that we have other civil-rights issues to face, and I was wondering whether or not the Senator from Mississippi had reached a conclusion as to whether he thought constitutional objection similar to those he is raising in connection with the anti-poll-tax legislation would be applicable to those pieces of legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. I feel that we should rise above the President's message and rise above party platforms and everything else, and decide this matter as a most serious constitutional question affecting the organic law of our land. I think the destruction of the protection afforded by article I, section 2, would be the beginning of the destruction of other parts of the Constitution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield the floor?

Mr. STENNIS. I feel that we should

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point a telegram which I have received from Mr. Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and one from Mr. Jennings Perry, chairman of the National Committee To Abolish the Poll Tax, both protesting the proposal for a constitutional amendment.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 28, 1948.*
>
> Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> We urge every Member of the Senate genuinely interested in abolishing the poll tax not to fall into the trap of supporting the proposal offered by Senator HAYDEN on the floor today to strike out all except the enacting clause of H. R. 29, the antipoll-tax bill, and substitute resolution to outlaw the poll tax by the device of constitutional amendment. It is our considered opinion that Congress has the constitutional authority and responsibility to eliminate poll-tax requirement by a statute such as that proposed in H. R. 29, which has already passed the House and has been approved by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. The abolition of the poll tax by constitutional amendment would require ratification by 36 State legislatures. We have grave doubt whether ratification can be obtained since the specious States' rights arguments will be made against the constitutional amendment in State legislatures just as they have been made in Congress year after year against H. R. 29 and its predecessors. Undoubtedly a poll-tax amendment would suffer the same fate as did the child-labor amendment passed by the Congress many years ago.
>
> Strongly urge Senate not to succumb to threat of a filibuster by compromising on this vital legislation.
>
> WALTER WHITE,
> *Secretary, NAACP.*

> NASHVILLE, TENN., *July 28, 1948.*
>
> Senator ROBERT TAFT,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> Please stand by Bender bill. Amendment alternative meaningless to millions down here who never have voted in their lives. Resolution would foreclose the solemn pledge of both parties and mock the right to vote. We have not had a free election for 50 years. Kindly pass Bender bill to give these voiceless millions now living a voice in their own land.
>
> JENNINGS PERRY,
> *Chairman, National Committee To Abolish Poll Tax.*

THE NEW DEAL AND HIGH PRICES

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, our country today does not need this session of the Congress. What it needs is a real President.

Let me cite a damning indictment of the entire New Deal and its relationship to the outrageously high prices which the American housewife is forced to pay for a basic food commodity.

Skyrocketing meat prices today lead the parade as the cost of living moves higher and higher. This is a matter of direct concern to every American family. Attempts have been made to fix responsibility for this situation upon several different groups. By some, the farmers are charged with profiting unduly. Others accuse the packers, and still others say it is the retailers who are profiteering. So far as I know, no one has yet pointed a finger at the real villain in the piece, Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture.

The official records of this agency reveal unmistakably that short-sighted planning and even downright stupidity by the Department have brought about such a situation that meat supplies are precariously low at a time when demand is at unprecedentedly high levels.

I have before me a tabulation prepared by Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture which reveals the livestock-production goals set by this agency during the last 10 years. It shows that since 1944 the numbers of cattle, hogs, and poultry on American farms have declined alarmingly, sacrificed to Department recommendations for decreased production, at a time when our human population was growing rapidly and the per capita demand for meat was the greatest in our history.

The current meat shortage and the resulting high prices were inevitable under the production programs which have been laid down by Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture in recent years, and even this year.

In 1944, for example, we had 85,573,000 head of cattle and calves on our farms. By the end of 1946, just 2 years later, this total had been reduced to 81,207,000 head.

Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture officially recommended that this total be further reduced to 78,500,000 by the end of 1947, and this goal was achieved. In 3 years' time the number of cattle in this country went from 85,572,000 head down to 78,500,000 head, though the population was increasing,

and the per capita demand was increasing every day. Farmers reported 78,564,000 head at the beginning of this year.

Now observe, Senators, that after we had had the political speech at Philadelphia and the political call of Congress into session, and after hearing all the talk about high prices as one of the major reasons for the call of the special session, only last week Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture set a further reduction in the number of cattle to 78,047,000 head for its 1948 goal. The Department has reduced it again this year by almost another half a million head of cattle. Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture last week recommended that virtually all the reduction—listen to this—of one-half a million head, be made in beef cattle breeding herds.

This recommendation has come from an administration which now seeks further control over the production and the marketing of farm commodities as a means of solving the twin problems of shortages and high prices. Every farm boy knows what apparently Mr. Truman's professional planners in the Department of Agriculture will not concede, that slaughtering breeding cows does not produce calves. The inevitable result of the Department's latest folly will be fewer cattle next year, an even more critical beef shortage, and almost certainly still higher prices.

Our cattle herds, destroyed by unbelievably stupid edicts, cannot be rebuilt overnight. The job will require years. But we should not delay for even one moment in making a start in that direction.

With a bumper corn crop in prospect—and a bumper crop of corn in my State alone is estimated to be almost 400,000,000 bushels—and with bumper crops and ample supplies of other feeds in sight, American farmers should be asked by their Government to increase cattle production rather than decrease it. They should be asked specifically not to market their breeding cows this year. And they should be asked to feed the cattle they do market to much heavier weights in order to alleviate the current meat shortage as much as possible.

Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture bungling has had a similar effect upon pork production. The Department did not stop simply with beef. It has run the gantlet of all the meat products.

In 1943, for example, spring-pig production totaled 74,223,000, while the fall-pig output was 47,584,000.

Three years later, by 1946, the Department's official goal was 51,651,000 spring pigs—that is a reduction of 23,000,000 head of pigs in 3 years—and 31,551,000 fall pigs. That is another reduction in 3 years' time of about 16,000,000 head of pigs.

Actual production was 52,392,000 spring pigs and 30,548,000 head of fall pigs.

Although production goals were increased in 1947, the number of pigs farrowed was approximately the same as in 1946.

By the fall of 1947 the meat shortage was becoming acute, and even Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture spokesmen were predicting that it would be still more critical in 1948.

How did they propose to meet this situation? The record shows that they asked the farmers to produce fewer spring pigs in 1948—a total of 50,000,000 as against 52,786,000 the previous spring.

The Department's fall pig production goal has been raised above last year's figure, to 34,400,000, but even this total is more than 3,000,000 below the 1942–46 average.

Are Senators concerned over the high prices of lamb chops and mutton? Those from the Western States know that in 1942 there were in this great Nation 55,150,000 sheep and lambs on our farms and ranges. Through careful planning this number had been reduced to 35,332,000 head by the end of 1947, a reduction at a time when demand was greatest, with population growing. By the planning of the great brain trusters in Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture they have succeeded in reducing sheep and mutton production from 55,000,000 in 1942 to 35,000,000 this year, and the downward trend continues.

The housewife who hopes to trim high living costs through the substitution of poultry and eggs for the beef and pork on the family dinner table will find little consolation in Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture 1948 production goals for eggs and chickens.

During the 1942–46 period, we had an average of 477,714,000 hens and pullets on the farms. During 1947 the Department set as its official goal a reduction in this number to 435,000,000, a reduction of almost 42,000,000.

Farmers complied, the Department's statisticians report, with the result that there were actually 435,665,000 hens and pullets on the farms by the end of the year. The Department's goal for 1948—unbelievable though it may seem in the light of the meat shortage—is a further reduction to 400,000,000 pullets and hens, making a total reduction in the last year of almost 50,000,000 head.

Egg production, which totaled 4,608,000,000 dozens in 1947, will be only 4,200,000,000 dozens in 1948 under Mr. Truman's Department's curtailed production program. In other words, the people of America will have an opportunity to buy 400,000,000 dozen fewer eggs because of the reduced production program.

These are not my figures. They are taken from the official records of the Department of Agriculture. They reveal that our own Government has engaged in a deliberate program of restricting poultry and livestock production at a time when the demand for these products is the heaviest on record.

Could it be that the real reason and purpose of these professional planners was to create shortages that they might seek, as they are doing in this special session, additional powers to deal with a crisis of their own making?

The theory of creating prosperity through scarcity is not new in the Department of Agriculture. "Bubblehead" Wallace's contributions to this philosophy were firmly embedded there during his days and the early days of the New Deal. They have been nurtured to full flower by his successors, including Mr. Truman.

We remember all too well the slaughter of millions of little pigs while the Nation went hungry, the plowing under of every third row of cotton while administration leaders shed crocodile tears over the "ill clad," and the curtailment of wheat and corn acreages while many of our people went without bread.

Some administration apologists may contend that the present meat shortage was brought about as the result of a short corn crop last year.

While it is true that this was a contributing factor, the RECORD will reveal that the deliberate program of reduced livestock production was set in motion long before 1947 and is being continued this year in the face of a record corn crop, as well as a record crop of wheat and oats, particularly corn and oats. I am not sure as to the wheat crop.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. We have one of the largest wheat crops ever produced in America. There is so much wheat going to market in my State today that the price of wheat, which was $3.18 a bushel in January, has dropped on the Chicago market below $2.22, which is below parity. Today in our State embargoes have been placed against certain places, and the price of wheat has gone 2 cents below parity.

Mr. JENNER. That much more shame must be heaped upon the little politician for calling a special session and trying to play politics with such a sacred thing.

Other administration spokesmen may say that our heavy grain exports to relieve other nations during the last 2 years made it impossible to feed a normal number of cattle, hogs, and poultry in this country. There is some truth in this argument, too; but the American people should have been told that the meat shortage would be aggravated, with resultant higher prices, if we undertook to ship more than a billion bushels of grain from this country in a 2-year period. Instead, they were told that we could safely export this amount without any visible effect upon our domestic economy.

Mr. Truman himself has repeatedly said that our relief program has not been a cause of high prices at home.

Only a few months ago, Mr. Charles Luckman's Citizens' Food Committee, the Department of Agriculture, the President's Cabinet Food Committee, and, indeed, the President himself, were beating the drums for increased grain exports to Europe.

The poultry industry was very nearly dealt a death blow through ill-advised recommendations for reducing poultry numbers and curtailing consumption of poultry in order to provide more grain for export.

Farmers were told to market their cattle and hogs at lighter weights as a further grain-conservation measure, with absolutely no regard for what this would do to an already critical domestic meat situation. We are reaping the whirlwind today in the form of shortages and higher prices. We cannot cure the price situation with respect to meat in a special session. We cannot cure it in a week. They have been working 10 years to destroy the food of the Nation.

Now Mr. Truman asks that he be given further authority over the production and distribution of American farm commodities. Gentlemen, are you "nuts"? The record reveals unmistakably that he and his Department of Agriculture aides for too long have had too much control over farm production.

It is already too late to solve the meat shortage in 1948. Unless action is taken immediately, it will be too late to make the situation much better in 1949.

First. The Government should urge farmers to increase the numbers of cattle, hogs, and poultry as rapidly as good management will permit.

Second. They should be asked to feed the livestock which they do market to much heavier weights as a means of alleviating to some degree at least the current meat shortage.

It would perhaps be too much to expect this administration to replace the Department of Agriculture's exponents of planned scarcity with men who have at least a rudimentary knowledge of farm economics.

I am confident, however, that this will be done next January when Governor Dewey is President of the United States.

Meanwhile, this Congress can best protect what remains of our livestock and poultry industry by refusing the President's requests for stand-by powers to control the marketing and distribution of meat and other foods.

Mr. President, I respectfully urge that the Senate Committee on Agriculture conduct a rigid, searching investigation into the facts I have just presented and determine once and for all the responsibility for the tragic economic condition in which our agricultural economy finds itself. Such investigation would reveal to the American housewife and to the fathers and the heads of the families who are paying these exorbitant prices, how the President is playing cheap politics with the prices our people have to pay for meat.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to discuss rather briefly House bill 29 and the motion that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator whether he will permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum. He has a most excellent speech which he has prepared to deliver to the Senate, and I should like to inquire whether he will permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum at this time.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator, but I prefer not to yield for that purpose.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss the motion to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 29, the so-called anti-poll-tax bill, which makes unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Section 2 of the bill provides that—

> It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to prevent any person from voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax—

And so forth. Mr. President, I do not undertake to enter into a legal discussion of this question on the same basis as that used by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] who preceded me, for he prepared and delivered to the Senate a very fine statement on the legal phases of this matter. So I shall not enter into a discussion of this subject with the idea of improving upon the speech delivered to the Senate by the Senator from Mississippi or with the idea of enlightening the Senate regarding the legal phases of the subject or the constitutional questions involved, because I think the Senator from Mississippi made a most excellent presentation of those matters.

However, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate what I believe to be the controlling constitutional provisions, because this bill raises very definitely a serious constitutional question.

In May 1944, as I recall the date, we debated, in connection with a bill then pending, substantially the same questions which are involved in House bill 29.

The provision of the Constitution which I think is definitely controlling, so far as the election of Members of the House of Representatives are concerned, is found in article I, section 2, which provides that—

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

So far as the qualification of electors is concerned, the same provision is found in the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, which provides for the election of Senators by popular vote. The words are identical. So, those who vote for Members of the United States Senate and Members of the House of Representatives in each State must have the same qualifications as those who, under the laws of the State, vote for members "of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

In my State of Tennessee that would be the house of representatives, because it is the most numerous branch of our State legislature.

Inasmuch as Tennessee is one of the remaining seven States which have poll-tax requirements, I wish to speak briefly regarding the Tennessee qualifications and requirements. I shall confine myself to a discussion of the laws of Tennessee on this subject, and not the laws of other States, because I have some familiarity with the laws of my State, but very little with the laws of other States.

Mr. President, in Tennessee, by law, all persons who vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the Tennessee General Assembly or State legislature, as expressed in the constitution, must pay a poll tax if they are over 21 years of age and under 50. The poll tax must be paid for the year preceding the election. The payment of the poll tax is not pyramided. It is not cumulative as is provided in some of the other States. In Tennessee the elector may vote by merely paying, in the year preceding the election, a poll tax of $1 or $2, according to the requirement in his county.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield, if I may do so without yielding the floor.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STEWART. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. EASTLAND. The poll tax applies to persons within what age limits?

Mr. STEWART. Our test tax date each year is January 10. For example, a person becoming of age before January 10, 1947, may vote in 1948 on payment of a poll tax. If he becomes of age after January 10, which is the test tax date, he may vote the following year without payment of a poll tax. Likewise, if a man becomes 50 years of age prior to the test tax date, the 10th of January of the year preceding any election, he is not required to pay a poll tax.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then a person over 50 years of age is not assessed a poll tax?

Mr. STEWART. No.

Mr. EASTLAND. Persons over 50 years of age vote in Tennessee, do they not?

Mr. STEWART. They do.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then how is the argument valid that the poll tax disfranchises people, when it does not apply to anyone over 50 years of age?

Mr. STEWART. The poll tax, as I have described, applies to all persons between the ages of 21 and 50, but it applies to no one over 50.

Mr. EASTLAND. The principal argument advanced here in support of the pending bill is that the poll tax disfranchises people. How could that be true, since it does not apply to those over 50 years of age?

Mr. STEWART. It applies only to those within the age limits I have stated. Certainly no poll tax is required of any person over 50 years of age. The Senator from Mississippi is entirely accurate in what he says. Nobody is disfranchised by reason of the poll tax.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. How much is the poll tax in the Senator's State?

Mr. STEWART. The various counties have different requirements, the maximum being $2. I think the constitution fixes it at $1, and provides that no county may require more than an equal amount.

That is, if the State requires $1, the amount fixed by the county may not exceed that amount.

Mr. EASTLAND. For what purpose is the tax levied? Is it not for the maintenance of schools?

Mr. STEWART. It is for the maintenance of schools. The money is paid into the school fund and is used to support the common or public schools of the State.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a fact that Negro schools are the principal beneficiaries of the tax?

Mr. STEWART. They are, indeed, but all schools benefit by it. We have both Negro and white schools. The money is paid into the county school fund.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. In the event the tax were invalidated, Negro education would suffer, would it not?

Mr. STEWART. It would suffer to that extent, just as all other education would.

Mr. EASTLAND. As a matter of fact, are those who urge the enactment of the pending bill and who appeal for its passage really friends of the Negro race and of Negro education?

Mr. STEWART. I have never thought so.

Referring now to the two provisions, the seventeenth amendment and article I, section 2, of the Constitution, the one relating to the election of Senators, the other to Members of the House of Representatives, these provisions were placed in the Constitution of the United States by the States themselves. Under our law and our Constitution, no rights are given to the Federal Government which are reserved by the States themselves. No rights are given to the Federal Government except those expressly granted to the Federal Government by the States. The Constitution, as adopted, included the first 10 amendments, comprising the Bill of Rights. The tenth amendment was, therefore, included as a part of the Constitution. It was all passed upon at the same convention. The tenth amendment provides:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Commenting upon that provision, the Supreme Court has said that the reservation of powers to the States, respectively, can only mean the reservation of the rights of sovereignty which they respectively possessed before the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, which rights they had not relinquished as a result of the adoption of the Constitution, and that any congressional legislation beyond the limits of the delegated power would constitute a trespass upon the rights of the States, or of the people, and would not constitute the supreme law of the land.

In this case, legislation is sought which would make it unnecessary for a voter to pay a poll tax in order to vote for Members of the Congress or for Presidential electors, contrary to the express provisions of law in my State of Tennessee and in other States of the Union, requiring that in order to vote a man must pay a poll tax. The proposal flies directly in the face of the tenth amendment. It is an effort by the Congress of the United States to pass a law prohibited by the Constitution itself, not only under the express provisions of article I and the seventeenth amendment, but also under the provisions expressly defining the qualifications of those who may vote for Representatives. It is also contrary to the tenth amendment to the Constitution, an additional safeguard, providing that powers not delegated by the States are reserved to the States, or to the people.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STEWART. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the bill provides that the payment of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in primaries and other elections is not and shall not be deemed a qualification for voters or electors.

Mr. STEWART. That expressly flies in the face of the constitutional provision which I have just read.

Mr. EASTLAND. I was getting ready to ask the Senator a question. In other words, it is an attempt, is it not, to have the Congress, under the Constitution, define what shall and what shall not be the qualifications of voters? Is not the attempt to pass the pending bill an effort to usurp a function of the Supreme Court? Is the question not a judicial one for determination by the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. STEWART. It is, of course, a judicial question.

Mr. EASTLAND. As a matter of fact, has not the Supreme Court of the United States held that the State is empowered to levy a poll tax, and to require it as a qualification for voters?

Mr. STEWART. That has been repeatedly held in years gone by.

Mr. EASTLAND. When the State determines the qualifications of an elector for the most numerous branch of the State legislature, such qualifications automatically apply to voters for Representative or Senator, or for Presidential electors, do they not?

Mr. STEWART. That is true. The Senator is correct in what he has said about the bill presenting a legal question. There is no question about its being properly a question for determination by the courts. It will probably go to the courts in the event the bill is passed. At the same time, even though we are a legislative body, we should not undertake to pass legislation which we think is unconstitutional. Without invading the province of the judicial department of the Government, we can, I think, following the law and its proper interpretation, enact statutes which we believe are not within the province of the judicial branch.

Mr. EASTLAND. How may the Congress determine what shall be a qualification? How can it say what a State cannot do in the exercise of its sovereignty?

Mr. STEWART. I think we may find the answer to that very clearly stated in the section of the Constitution which I just read, prescribing the qualifications of voters for Members of the House of Representatives, namely, that they "shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

We go, then, to the State, which elects the Members of Congress, to find out what are the qualifications of the electors.

Is not that a fair statement?

Mr. EASTLAND. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and I should like to ask him another question. This bill would make unlawful the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, Senators, or Members of the House of Representatives. The Constitution plainly says that Presidential electors shall be chosen by the States as the legislatures thereof may direct. In other words, the legislature of a State has supreme and exclusive authority to say how Presidential electors shall be chosen. That is provided by the Constitution of the United States. How can this bill say that a State legislature must meet certain conditions set down by the Congress in choosing Presidential electors? How can the Congress say who shall participate in elections for Presidential electors for the President and the Vice President of the United States?

Mr. STEWART. Congress certainly cannot go beyond the provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not exclusively within the hands of the State legislature to say how Presidential electors shall be chosen?

Mr. STEWART. I so interpret the Constitution. I think the Senator is correct about it. I have been confining my remarks chiefly to the provisions which I have mentioned, although I think the Senator is correct in what he says regarding the subject of the right of the State legislature to determine the method of selecting electors.

Mr. EASTLAND. The only exception which is grafted on is the provision that a man shall not be discriminated against. That is the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution, regarding race, creed, or color. The poll tax is levied on all alike, both white and black, is it not?

Mr. STEWART. There is no discrimination. It definitely applies to all citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color. There is no discrimination at all. It applies to everyone.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STEWART. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is not the main controversy not the payment of a poll tax, but to uphold the American system of government which, after all, is the primary duty, the first responsibility, of a Senator or of a Representative? If one will read the notes on the Constitutional Convention he will see that it is the very genius of the American system. It was considered essential to the preservation of our liberties that local control of local affairs remain in the States and in the hands of the people. This controversy involves the control of elections, the fixing of qualifications now in the hands of the people and of the States, and the centralization of authority in the Congress to regulate the affairs of all the American people.

Mr. STEWART. This bill, as certainly as time goes by each day, is an invasion of States' rights. It is an unwarranted invasion of States' rights. It is an invasion of the rights which the States retain to themselves, and it is an invasion of the rights expressly reserved in the Constitution from which I have just read.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator realize that under the new administration of the present distinguished Governor of South Carolina, who will be inaugurated in January, we shall have no more legislation such as this, but that in his hands the future of this country and the preservation of our system of Government is secure?

Mr. STEWART. That is purely a political question, but I certainly hope he will adhere to the principles of government as we understand them and have understood them for many years.

Mr. President, since the Senator from Mississippi has mentioned the discussions which took place at the time our Constitution was being debated and faith and confidence were being expressed therein by the members of the Constitutional Convention, I should like to read a little bit of the discussion that took place in 1787. I am reading from Formation of the Union, which is a book arranged and indexed by Mr. Charles C. Tansill, prepared under the general supervision of H. H. B. Meyer, Director, Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. It is a collection of documents relating to our constitutional history. These discussions are taken, I believe, from the transactions of the Constitutional Convention when they discussed this very question of voting and the control of elections. It is stated here as follows:

> Madison proposed to strike the clause out, which was done. He also proposed to omit the provision fixing the time when the legislature should meet.
>
> Morris—in favor of leaving the time of meeting to the legislature, and observed that if the time be fixed in the Constitution, it would not be observed, as the legislature would not be punctual in assembling.

That is a very interesting discussion. I read further:

> Gorham—in favor of the legislature's meeting once a year and of fixing the time. They should meet, if for no other business, to superintend the conduct of the Executive.
>
> Mason—in favor of an annual meeting. The legislatures are also inquisitorial and should meet frequently to inspect the conduct of the public officers.
>
> Article 4, Section 1: Electors to be the same as those of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.
>
> Morris proposed to strike out the clause, and to leave it to the State legislatures to establish the qualification of the electors and elected, or to add a clause giving to the national legislature powers to alter the qualifications.
>
> Ellsworth—if the legislature can alter the qualifications, they may disqualify three-fourths or a greater portion of the electors—this would go far to create aristocracy. The clause is safe as it stands—the States have staked their liberties on the qualifications which we have proposed to confirm.
>
> Dickinson—It is urged that to confine the right of suffrage to the freeholders is a step toward the creation of an aristocracy. This cannot be true.

They were debating the question that Federal electors must have the same qualifications as electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. Dickinson continued:

> We are all safe by trusting the owners of the soil; and it will not be unpopular to do so, for the freeholders there are the more numerous class. Not from freeholders, but from those who are not freeholders, free governments have been endangered. Freeholds are by our laws of inheritance divided among the children of the deceased, and will be parceled out among all the worthy men of the State; the merchants and mechanics may become freeholders and without being so, they are electors of the State legislatures, who appoint the Senators of the United States.

Mr. Ellsworth then said:

> Why confine the right of suffrage to freeholders? The rule should be that he who pays and is governed, should be an elector. Virtue and talents are not confined to the freeholders, and we ought not to exclude them.

Then Mr. Morris said:

> I disregard sounds and am not alarmed with the word aristocracy, but I dread the thing and will oppose it, and for this reason I think that I shall oppose this Constitution because it will establish an aristocracy. There cannot be an aristocracy of freeholders if they are all electors. But they will be, when a great and rich man can bring his poor dependents to vote in our elections—unless you establish a qualification of property, we shall have an aristocracy. Limit the right of suffrage to freeholders, and it will not be unpopular, because nine-tenths of the inhabitants are freeholders.

Then Mr. Mason said:

> Everyone who is of full age and can give evidence of his common interest in the community should be an elector. By this rule, freeholders alone have not this common interest. The father of a family, who has no freehold, has this interest. When he is dead his children will remain. This is a natural interest or bond which binds men to their country—lands are but an artificial tie. The idea of counting freeholders as the true and only persons to whom the right of suffrage should be confided is an English prejudice.

They proceeded to discuss this question, and a reading of the discussion is very interesting. I refer to the debate and quote from it because of the questions asked by the Senator from Mississippi, to point out that this problem of voting, this problem of placing qualifications upon the electors, has been one which has had serious consideration from the time those interested began to build this Government. It has always in the days gone by in all governments been a question of vital and extreme importance. We are not dealing with anything new, and as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] said in his able argument, it is a touchy kind of question. It is not one upon which we agree readily. It seems that at the times when it was debated those who engaged in discussing it seemed to spar with it and to touch one another lightly so far as the idea of tampering with this matter, which is certainly fundamental, was concerned.

We have adopted a Constitution which provides, and has provided throughout the years it has stood, that Members of the National Congress shall be elected from the States they represent, and that they shall be elected by those persons in the States who are qualified voters within the meaning of the statutes of the States. All the Federal Constitution provides is that they shall be those voters who elect the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

To repeat, in Tennessee—and that is the only State of which I have any intimate knowledge, so far as the laws governing electors are concerned—a voter must be 21 years of age, he must have resided within the State for 12 months, and if he moves from one county to another within the State, he must have resided in the new county for a period of 6 months. Those are the only qualifications, if the electors are of sound mind, except that they have to pay a poll tax, and our courts have held that that is a condition precedent to casting a ballot in Tennessee. That applies to the electors who select those who serve in the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

I do not see any exception to that. I do not see any way around that provision of the Constitution. I do not see how it can be circumvented or avoided. It looks to me as if it would require a construction of the Constitution, if I may say so, which would lack a great deal when it comes to the definition of the word "honesty." I do not believe this provision of the Constitution can honestly be evaded.

I now wish to read and comment briefly on some of the selections I have made from Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, eighth edition, volume 2:

THE RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE IN ELECTIONS

In another place we have said that, though the sovereignty is in the people, as a practical fact it resides in those persons who by the Constitution of the States are permitted to exercise the elective franchise. The whole subject of the regulation of elections, including the prescribing of qualifications for suffrage, is left by the National Constitution to the several States, except as it is provided by that instrument that the electors for representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and as the fifteenth amendment forbids denying to citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. (This amendment had the effect to abrogate all provisions in State laws and constitutions restricting the suffrage to white persons) (*Neal* v. *Delaware* (103 U. S. 370; 26 L. ed. 567)). See article by Dr. Spear, in 16 Albany Law Journal 272, in which, among other things, the force and scope of the new amendments to the Federal Constitution in their relation to suffrage are considered. Until recently the regulation and control of all elections, including elections for Members of Congress, and the punishment of offenses against election laws, has been left to the States exclusively. Congress, however, had undoubted authority to make such regulations as shall seem needful to insure a full and fair expression of opinion in the election of Members of Congress, and also to guard and protect all rights conferred by the recent amendments to the Federal Constitution. (*Ex parte Siebold* (100 U. S.

371, 25 L. ed. 717); *Ex parte Clarke* (100 U. S. 399, 25 L. ed. 715); *In re Coy* (127 U. S. 731, 32 L. ed. 274, 8 Sup. Ct. Rep. 1263); *United States* v. *Goldman* (3 Woods 167); *United States* v. *Gradwell* (243 U. S. 476, 61 L. ed. 857, 37 Sup. Ct. Rep. 407)). But Congress has no power to regulate primary elections at which candidates for the offices Senator and Representatives are nominated (*Newberry* v. *United States* (256 U. S. 232, 65 L. ed. 913, 41 Sup. Ct. Rep. 469); see also *United States* v. *Gradwell* (243 U. S. 476, 61 L. ed. 857, 37 Sup. Ct. Rep. 407)). A statute excluding Negroes from participation in primary elections has been held not to violate the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, it being held that the amendment only protects the right to vote at general and not at primary elections (*Chandler* v. *Neff* (298 Fed. 515); see also *State* v. *Carrington* (194 Iowa, 785, 190 N. W. 390); *Hodge* v. *Bryan* (149 Ky. 110, 148 S. W. 21); but see *Britton* v. *Board of Election Comm'rs* (129 Cal. 337, 61 Pac. 1115); *People* v. *Strassheim* (240 Ill. 279, 88 N. E. 821)).

In other words, the Constitution of the United States leaves the regulation of elections of all persons who hold public office in the State and in the municipalities under the laws of the State. The Federal Constitution does not touch that question. It does not undertake to interfere with the laws pertaining to the election of a governor of a State or members of the supreme court of the State or members of the judiciary in any capacity. It does not undertake to say what qualifications the electors shall have who vote for the mayor of a city or for county officers or for any other officers. The Constitution is completely silent upon that subject. But it does say, with respect to the Representatives in Congress—and it applies to both branches, since the seventeenth amendment—that they shall have the qualifications requisite to electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. That is the only qualification placed upon all those who vote to elect national officers, and that is the specific qualification which governs and controls.

The fifteenth amendment proceeds to say that no citizen shall be denied the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. That is not interfered with at all by the States. Under the laws of my State of Tennessee there is no provision governing the qualification of electors, except such law as applies to every citizen of the State regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

To continue reading from Cooley's constitutional limitations:

> Participation in the elective franchise is a privilege rather than a right, and it is granted or denied on grounds of general policy; the prevailing view being that it should be as general as possible consistent with the public safety. Aliens are generally excluded (an unnaturalized Indian, who has surrendered his tribal relations, is not a citizen nor entitled to vote, though born in the United States and a resident of a State. *Elk* v. *Wilkins* (112 U. S. 94, 28 L. ed. 643, 5 Supp. Ct. Rep. 41)), though in some States they are allowed to vote after residence for a specified period, provided they have declared their intention to become citizens in the manner prescribed by law.

The States may do that. The States may have special provisions as to an alien who has lived in the country a certain length of time, and who has expressed an intention to become a citizen. The Federal Government has nothing to do with that. The Federal Constitution has no provision that would interfere with such State law.

The fifteenth amendment, it will be seen, does not forbid denying the franchise to citizens except upon certain specified grounds, and it is matter of public history that its purpose was to prevent discriminations in this regard as against persons of African descent. Minors, who equally with adult persons are citizens, are still excluded, as were also women before the adoption of the nineteenth amendment (see Opinions of Justices (62 Me. 596); *Rohrbacher* v. *Mayor of Jackson* (51 Miss. 735); *Spencer* v. *Board of Registration* (1 MacArthur, 169); *Van Valkenburg* v. *Brown* (43 Cal. 43); *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. 162, 22 L. ed. 627); *Bloomer* v. *Todd* (3 Wash. Terr. 599, 19 Pac. 135); *Gougar* v. *Timberlake* (148 Ind. 36, 46 N. E. 339, 37 L. R. A. 644); *Coffin* v. *Thompson* (97 Mich. 188, 56 N. W. 567, 21 L. R. A. 662, and note); *Van Valkenburg* v. *Brown* (43 Cal. 43); *Spencer* v. *Board of Registration* (1 MacArthur (D. C.) 169)); and sometimes persons who have been convicted of infamous crimes are excluded (Story on Constitution (4th ed.) par. 1972).

The nineteenth amendment provides that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." This provision is within the power of amendment conferred by the Constitution and was validly adopted. (*Leser* v. *Garnett*, 258 U. S. 130, 66 L. ed. 505; 42 Sup. Ct. Rep. 217. Mr. Justice Brandeis, who delivered the opinion of the Court in this case, said: "The first contention is that the power of amendment conferred by the Federal Constitution and sought to be exercised does not extend to this amendment, because of its character. The argument is that so great an addition to the electorate, if made without the State's consent, destroys its autonomy as a political body. This amendment is in character and phraseology precisely similar to the fifteenth. For each the same method of adoption is pursued. One cannot be valid and the other invalid. That the fifteenth is valid, although rejected by six States including Maryland, has been recognized and acted on for half a century. * * * The suggestion that the fifteenth was incorporated in the Constitution, not in accordance with law, but practically as a war measure which has been validated by acquiescence, cannot be entertained.") Its adoption, by its inherent force, struck from the constitutions and statutes of the several States the word "male" wherever it occurred as a limitation upon the right of the citizen to vote. (*Groves* v. *Eubank*, 205 Ala. 174, 87 So. 587; *Brown* v. *Atlanta*, 152 Ga. 283, 109 S. E. 666; *State* v. *Walker*, 192 Iowa, 823, 185 N. W. 619; Opinion of the Justices, 237 Mass. 591, 130 N. E. 685. See also State ex rel. *Polk County* v. *Marsh* (106 Neb. 760, 194 N. W. 901. "The adoption of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States conferred upon women no greater or different right with respect to the exercise of the elective franchise than had heretofore been possessed and enjoyed by men under the constitutions and laws of the States." State ex rel. *Klein* v. *Hillenbrand*, 101 Ohio St. 370, 130 N. E. 29.)

In some States laws will be found in existence which, either generally or in particular cases, deny the right to vote to those persons who lack a specified property qualification, or who do not pay taxes. (See *Frieszleben* v. *Shallcross* (9 Houst. (Del.) 1, 19 Atl. 576, 8 L. R. A. 337 and note).) In some States idiots and lunatics are also expressly excluded, and it has been supposed that these unfortunate classes, by the common political law of England and of this country, were excluded with women, minors, and aliens from exercising the right of suffrage, even though not prohibited therefrom by any express constitutional or statutory provision. (See Cushing's Legislative Assemblies, sec. 24; also sec. 27, and notes referring to legislative cases; McCrary, Law of Elections, secs. 50, 73; *Clark* v. *Robinson* (88 Ill. 498). Drunkenness is regarded as temporary insanity. Idiots and insane persons are excluded in Alabama, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland (provided they are under guardianship as such), Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Convicted felons are excluded in Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Persons under guardianship are excluded in Florida, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin. Paupers are excluded in Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts (see Justices' Opinions, 124 Mass. 596), New Jersey, Rhode Island, and West Virginia. Persons kept in any poorhouse or other asylum at public expense are excluded in California, Colorado, Missouri, and South Carolina. Persons confined in public prisons are excluded in California, Colorado, Missouri, and South Carolina. Persons under interdiction are excluded in Louisiana, and persons excused from paying taxes at their own request, in New Hampshire. Capacity to read is required in Connecticut, and capacity to read and write, in Massachusetts. In Nevada every male citizen, except convicts and paupers, have the franchise; Mormons cannot be excluded by registration laws. *State* v. *Findley* (20 Nev. 193, 19 Pac. 241). It is otherwise in the Territories. *Murphy* v. *Ramsey* (114 U. S. 43, 29 L. ed. 61, 5 Sup. Ct. Rep. 747); *Innis* v. *Bolton* (2 Idaho, 407, 17 Pac. 264).

Wherever the Constitution has prescribed the qualifications of electors, they cannot be changed or added to by the legislature, or otherwise than by an amendment of the Constitution.

See *Green* v. *Shumway* (39 N. Y. 418); *Brown* v. *Grover* (6 Bush. 1); *Quinn* v. *State* (35 Ind., 485); *Huber* v. *Reiley* (53 Pa. St. 112); *People* v. *Canaday* (73 N. C. 198); *State* v. *Tuttle* (53 Wis. 45, 9 N. W. 791); *Tolbert* v. *Long* (134 Ga. 292, 67 S. E. 826, 137 Am. St. Rep. 222); *Coggeshall* v. *Des Moines* (138 Iowa, 730, 117 N. W. 309, 128 Am. St. Rep. 221); *State* v. *Monahan* (72 Kan. 492, 84 Pac. 130, 115 Am. St. Rep. 224, 7 Ann. Cas. 661); *Johnson* v. *Grand Forks County* (16 N. D. 363, 113 N. W. 1071, 125 Am. St. Rep. 662); *Livesley* v. *Litchfield* (47 Oreg. 248, 83 Pac. 142, 114 Am. St. Rep. 920. Ante p. 99, note). Compare *State* v. *Neal* (42 Mo. 119). Where a disqualification to vote is made to depend upon the commission of crime, the election officers cannot be made the triers of the offense. *Huber* v. *Reiley* (53 Pa. St. 112); *State* v. *Symonds* (59 Me. 151); *Burkett* v. *McCarty* (10 Bush, 758). It is not competent for the legislature to discriminate between voters and require that one class of them shall be taxpayers, while not making the same requirement as to the others. *Lyman* v. *Martin* (2 Utah, 136). But voters at municipal elections may be required to pay taxes before voting. *Buckner* v. *Gordon* (81 Ky. 665); *State* v. *Dillon* (32 Fla. 545, 14 So. 383, 22 L. R. A. 124).

Mr. President, on that point that the qualification of electors cannot be changed or added to by the National Legislature, or otherwise than by an amendment to the Constitution; we are controlled by the provisions of the Federal Constitution which say that persons who vote for Members of Congress in the different States must have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. We are bound to follow that provision and to be controlled by it. House bill 29 is not in accord with the provisions of the Constitution, and it is not only not in accord but it absolutely flies into the face of the constitutional provisions which say that electors for Members of Congress must have the same qualifications as electors who vote in the States under the provisions of State law for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. If we pass a law of the kind now proposed we are defying our own Constitution; we are violating our own Constitution.

Mr. President, I see no reason why such a law as here proposed should be passed simply for the purpose of satisfying or appeasing someone who is opposed to the poll tax which exists in a few States of the Union. So far as I am concerned personally, living in a poll-tax State, Tennessee, I should like to see the poll-tax law in my State repealed. I should be perfectly willing, and have so publicly expressed myself several times, to go along with those who want that law repealed. It is a provision of our State constitution, and the Supreme Court has upheld it, so that in Tennessee one of the prerequisites to voting for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature is the payment of the poll tax. I should be glad to see the tax repealed in my State, I repeat, but I do not think the Federal Government, the National Government, call it what you will, acting through the Congress has a legal and constitutional right to invade a State and undertake to change its laws, which for perhaps 150 years have stood the test of time and are the laws which were passed under the Federal Constitution shortly after it was adopted.

The Constitution of the United States is the same document now as it was when it was drafted. It is a flexible document. It is one under which we can all live. It is so flexible that sometimes I think it has been stretched a little bit too much. It seems that many want to take hold of it and test its flexibility just a little more. But I think we should confine ourselves seriously and earnestly to nothing more and nothing less than an honest construction of the greatest document that has ever been penned by the hand of man. It is a document under which our country has lived and grown great. It is the same document, with the amendments which have been added to it, that was drafted so many years ago.

When that document was drafted it provided that the Members of Congress should be elected by those who were qualified in each State to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The same words that were used when that document was drafted are now controlling. They have been in the document ever since it was drafted. They have been construed time and again. They have been looked upon to mean exactly what they say. It has been believed by those who are students of the Constitution that it means simply that no one can vote for a Member of the Congress who is not qualified to vote for a member of the most numerous branch of the legislature in his State. There is no other provision in the Constitution that overrides that language or repeals it or sets it aside. It is an express provision, and was placed in the Constitution, as I said at the outset of my argument, by the States, and is something which has been preserved to the States and never seriously questioned.

A moment ago I referred to a paragraph which I wish to repeat:

> In some States laws will be found in existence which, either generally or in particular cases, deny the right to vote to those persons who lack specified property qualifications or who do not pay taxes.

There is cited a case reported from the State of Delaware, found in 337 L. R. A., with footnotes:

> One of the most common requirements is that the party offering to vote shall reside within the district which is to be affected by the exercise of the right.

I believe that if the Congress has a right to abolish the poll-tax requirement in the States which still have the poll-tax law, it would also have a right to provide that it is not necessary to reside in the district, as might be required by the State as one of the qualifications for voters or electors before they could vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. If the National Congress has the authority to abolish the poll-tax requirement, it certainly has authority, by the same process of reasoning, it seems to me, to provide that it shall not be necessary for a person to reside in the district which is affected by the exercise of the suffrage.

If a State officer is to be chosen, the voter should be a resident of the State; and if a county, city, or township officer, he should reside within such county, city, or township. This is the general rule; and for the more convenient determination of the right to vote, and to prevent fraud, it is now generally required that the elector shall only exercise within the municipality where he has his residence his right to participate in either local or general elections. (The mere fact that one lives upon a steamer does not give him a voting residence at her home port, even though he has no voting residence elsewhere, and is unmarried. *Howard* v. *Skinner* (87 Md. 556, 40 Atl. 379, 40 L. R. A. 753); *Jones* v. *Skinner* (87 Md. 560, 40 Atl. 381, 40 L. R. A. 752). Residence is not changed by presence in and support at and by a State soldiers' home. *Wolcott* v. *Holcomb* (97 Mich. 361, 56 N. W. 837, 23 L. R. A. 215) and note on residence and attendance or presence at public institutions; see also to same effect *Powell* v. *Spackman* (7 Idaho 692, 65 Pac. 503.)

If we have the right, in the face of the constitutional provisions, which I have read and to which I have referred several times, to say that voters do not have to pay a poll tax when the State requirement is that they must pay a poll tax before they can vote for members of the legislature, then certainly we have the right to say that they do not have to reside in the State for 12 months, which is another provision of law in Tennessee, or that they do not have to be 21 years of age.

To take the converse of this proposition, we could just as well provide that voters must continue to pay a poll tax after they pass the age of 50 years. In other words, if we can break down this provision of law for one purpose, we can do it for practically any other kindred purpose.

Requiring him to vote among his neighbors, by whom he will be likely to be generally known, the opportunities for illegal or fraudulent voting will be less than if the voting were allowed to take place at a distance and among strangers.

That is one of the reasons why the right of a man to vote is confined to a particular locality. He must live in a certain precinct, so that those who conduct elections in most cases will know him. They will know who he is, and there will be less chance for fraud. If we have the right to override the provisions of the Consitution and enact a poll-tax statute, we have the right to provide that a man who resides in one portion of the State may vote in another portion of the State.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, without losing the floor, so that I may introduce a bill?

Mr. STEWART. I shall be glad to yield with that understanding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill amending certain provisions of the Social Security Act, in compliance with the recommendations of the President in his message on Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2914) to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act by liberalizing benefits, by increasing amounts beneficiaries may earn without loss of benefits, and by lowering the age of eligibility of women beneficiaries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BARKLEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, may I interrogate the Senator from Kentucky concerning his bill, without losing the floor? I ask unanimous consent to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. STEWART. As I understand, the Senator is introducing a bill providing, perhaps, among other things, that the old-age security benefits may be given to women who can qualify when they become 60 years of age, instead of 65?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a bill carrying out the recommendations of the President with respect to increasing the benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance system and reducing the retirement age for women from 65 to 60.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator is a little late. I introduced such a bill a day or two ago.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for his prescience, and also his cooperation.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. STEWART. Reading further from the text which I have been quoting:

And wherever this is the requirement of the Constitution, any statute permitting voters to deposit their ballots elsewhere must necessarily be void. (Opinions of Judges (30 Conn. 591); *Hulseman* v. *Rems* (41 Pa. St. 396); *Chase* v. *Miller* (41 Pa. St. 403); Opinions of Judges (44 N. H. 633); *Bourland* v. *Hildreth* (26 Cal. 161); *People* v. *Blodgett* (13 Mich. 127); Opinions of Judges (37 Vt. 665); *Day* v. *Jones* (31 Ca. 261); in re Opinion of Justices (80 N. H. 596, 113 Atl. 293); In re Contested Election (231 Pa. St. 131, 126 Atl. 199, 35 A. L. R 815); In re Right of Electors (41 R. I. 118, 102 Atl. 913).) The case of *Morrison* v. *Springer* (15 Iowa, 304) is not in harmony with those above cited. In North Carolina where the constitution provides that a voter at an election shall have resided in the State for 2 years, in the county 6 months, and in the election district, in which he offers to vote, 4 months next preceding the election, and that every person offering to vote shall be at the time a legally registered voter, and that the election shall be by ballot, a statute providing that absent voters who are duly registered may mail their ballots to be deposited in boxes in the district of their residence, was held to be constitutional. *Jenkins* v. *State Board of Elections* (180 N. C. 169, 104 S. E. 346, 14 A. L. R. 1247). See also *Jones* v. *Smith* (165 Ark. 425, 264 S. W. 950); *Straughan* v. *Meyers* (268 Mo. 580, 187 S. W. 1159); *Goodell* v. *Judith Basin County* (70 Mont. 222, 224 Pac. 1110); *Adams* v. *Flanagan* (201 App. Div. 735, 195 N. Y. Supp. 182, affirmed without opinion, 234 N. Y. 540, 138 N. E. 438). Under the constitution of Kentucky which provides that "all elections by the people shall be by secret official ballot, furnished by public authority to the voters at the polls, and marked by each voter in private at the polls, and then and there deposited," a statute authorizing voting by absentees is void. *Clark* v. *Nash* (192 Ky. 594, 234 S. W., 1, 19 A. L. R. 304). So far as the election of Representatives in Congress and electors of President and Vice President is concerned, the State constitutions cannot preclude the legislature from prescribing the "times, places, and manner of holding" the same, as allowed by the National Constitution—article I, section 4, and article II, section 1—and a statute permitting such election to be held out of the State would consequently not be invalid. Opinions of Justices (45 N. H. 595); Opinions of Judges (37 Vt. 665). But in Opinion of the Justices (80 N. H. 595, 113 Atl. 293), the court held that the validity of an election of a Senator or a Representative in Congress which depends upon votes given by proxy is so doubtful that it could not advise that legislation so providing would be valid. The court, after reciting the provisions of the Federal Constitution requiring that in elections for Representatives and Senators the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, said:

"The advice given in 1864 (45 N. H. 595) that voting for Representatives in Congress could be authorized in places other than those in which the voter was by the State constitution qualified to vote was based upon the proposition that the place where a voter was qualified to vote was no part of his qualifications as an elector. Giving a narrow construction to the term 'qualification,' it might be concluded that the requirement of the State constitution that the voter should present his vote in person related merely to the manner of voting and not to the qualifications of a voter. But the elector is not capable of voting for members of the most numerous branch of our legislature unless he is physically capable of attending the meeting and is there present in person. The requirements of the Federal Constitution that the electors of Senators and Representatives should possess the qualifications of electors of a class of legislators in the State would seem to imply that only those who by State law were permitted to vote for such legislators should have the right to vote for candidates for the Federal officers."

There are now constitutional provisions in New York, Michigan, Missouri, Connecticut, Maryland, Kansas, Mississippi, Nevada, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania which permits soldiers in actual service to cast their votes where they may happen to be stationed at the time of voting. It may also be allowed in Ohio. (*Lehman* v. *McBride* (15 Ohio (N. S.) 573).)

In Massachusetts provision is made by statute for voting by mail at biennial State elections of voters absent from the city or town where they are registered. (General laws, ch. 54, secs. 86–103.)

I read an excerpt from a footnote under the text from which I have read, which refers to the Constitution of Kentucky:

Under the Constitution of Kentucky, which provides that all elections by the people shall be held by secret official ballot furnished by public authority to the voters at the polls and marked by each voter in private at the polls and then and there deposited, a statute authorizing voting by absentees is void.

If we have the right to change the poll tax law of Tennessee, we have the right to provide that in the State of Kentucky voters in an election shall not be required to mark their ballots in private. We would have that right by the same process of reasoning by which we would have the right to fly in the face of the express provision of the Constitution on the proposition of the qualification of electors. We would have a right to do practically anything we wanted to do, however absurd it might appear to be.

There is a case from which I should like to read, reported in 45 New Hampshire, 595, commenting upon the same text from which I read with respect to fraudulent voting:

The advice given that voting for Representatives in Congress could be authorized in places other than those in which the voter was by the State constitution qualified to vote was based upon the proposition that the place where a voter was qualified to vote was no part of his qualifications as an elector. Giving a narrow construction to the term "qualification," it might be concluded that the requirement of the State constitution that the voter should present his vote in person related merely to the manner of voting and not to the qualifications of a voter.

There is another provision of the Constitution which affects the manner of voting.

But the elector is not capable of voting for members of the most numerous branch of our legislature unless he is physically capable of attending the meeting and is there present in person.

This is the Supreme Court of New Hampshire speaking.

The requirements of the Federal Constitution that the electors of Senators and Representatives should possess the qualifications of electors of a class of legislators in the State would seem to imply that only those who by State law were permitted to vote for such legislators should have the right to vote for candidates for the Federal officers.

Continuing to read from the text:

A person's residence is the place of his domicile, or the place where his habitation is fixed without any present intention of removing therefrom. (*Putnam* v. *Johnson* (10 Mass. 488); *Rue High's case* (2 Doug. (Mich.) 515); *Fry's Election case* (71 Pa. St. 302, 10 Am. Rep. 698); *Church* v. *Rowell* (49 Maine 367); *Littlefield* v. *Brooks* (50 Maine 475); *Parsons* v. *Bangor* (61 Main 457); *Arnold* v. *Davis* (8 R. I. 342); *Hannon* v. *Grizzard* (89 N. C. 115); *Dale* v. *Irwin* (78 Ill. 498); *Strugeon* v. *Korte* (34 Ohio St. 525); *State* v. *Savre* (129 Iowa 122, 105 N. W. 387, 113 Am. St. Rep. 452, 3 L. R. A. (N. S.) 455); *Erwin* v. *Benton* (120 Ky. 536, 87 S. W. 291, 9 Ann. Cas. 264); Story, Conflicting Laws, Sec. 43. As to what residence is sufficient, see *Kellogg* v. *Hickman* (12 Col. 256, 21 Pac. 325); *Kreitz* v. *Behrensmeyer* (125 Ill. 141, 17 N. E. 232); *Langhammer* v. *Munter* (80 Md. 518, 31 Atl. 300, 27 L. R. A. 330). That one should vote where he eats, not where he lodges, if at different places, see *Warren* v. *Board of Registration* (72 Mich. 398, 40 N. W. 553).) The words "inhabitant," "citizen," and "resident," as employed in different constitutions to define the qualifications of electors, mean substantially the same thing; and one is an inhabitant, resident, or citizen at the place where he has his domicile or home. (Cushing's Law and Practice of Legislative Assemblies, sec. 36; *State* v. *Aldrich* (14 R. I. 171). See also *Anderson* v. *Pifer* (315 Ill. 164, 146 N. E. 171, 37 A. L. R. 134). But in Louisiana it has been held that the term "residence" used by the Constitution in fixing the qualification of voters, does not mean domicile; that in the absence of proof that a person otherwise qualified has acquired a residence elsewhere, he must be considered to be a resident of the parish where his work requires him to stay, where he was born, and where he has always lived and voted; and that it makes no difference that he has never had in said parish any other home than a boarding house, while he has had in another parish a home where he has kept his wife and children, whom he has visited as often as he could. *Estopinal* v. *Michel* (121 La. 879, 46 So. 907, 19 L. R. A. (N. S.) 759). Where territory in which a voter has continuously resided up to the time of annexation to a municipality is annexed to or incorporated with it, his period of such residence is to be counted in determining his residential qualification for eligibility to office. *Gibson* v. *Wood* (105 Ky 740, 49 S. W. 768, 43 L. R. A. 699).)

Every person at all times must be considered as having a domicile somewhere and that which he has acquired at one place is considered as continuing until another is acquired at a different place. (*People* v. *Turpin* (49 Colo. 284, 112 Pac. 539, 33 L. R. A. (N. S.) 766, Ann. Cas. 1912 C. 724); *Welsh* v. *Shumway* (323 Ill. 54, 83 N. E. 549); *Elam* v. *Maggard* (165 Ky. 733, 178 S. W. 1065); *Carwile* v. *Jones* (38 Mont. 500, 101 Pac. 153); *In re Rooney* (172 App. Div. 274, 159 N. Y. Supp. 132); *Finn* v. *Board of Canvassers* (24 R. I. 482, 53 Atl. 633); *Clarke* v. *McCowan* (107 S. C. 209, 92 S. E. 479); *Seibold* v. *Wahl* (164 Wis. 82, 159 N. W. 546, Ann. Cas. 1917 C, 400).) That it is not a necessary consequence of this doctrine that one must always be entitled to vote somewhere, see *Kreitz* v. *Behrensmeyer* (125 Ill. 141, 17 N. E. 232). In North Dakota it has been held that "a domicile once gained does not continue until a new one is acquired for voting purposes, nor does a right to vote at a particular poll or district continue until the right to vote elsewhere is shown; but the shortest absence coincident with an intention to change the residence, defeats the right to vote at the former domicile." *Nelson* v. *Gass* (27 N. D. 357, 146 N. W. 537, Ann. Cas. 1915 C, 796).) As has been said by the Supreme Court of Nebraska: "One's residence is where he has established home; the place where he habitually is present, and to which, when he departs, he intends to return. The fact that he may at a future time intend to remove will not necessarily defeat his residence before he actually does remove." (*Berry* v. *Wilcox* (44 Neb. 82, 62 N. W. 249, 48 Am. St. Rep. 706); *White* v. *Slams* (89 Neb. 65, 130 N. W. 978, Ann. Cas. 1912 C, 518).) It has been held that a student in an institution of learning, who has residence there for purposes of instruction, may vote at such place, provided he is emancipated from his father's family, and for the time has no home elsewhere.

Putnam v. *Johnson* (10 Mass. 488); *Lincoln* v. *Hapgood* (11 Mass. 350); *Wilbraham* v. *Ludlow* (99 Mass. 587); *Perry* v. *Reynolds* (53 Conn. 527, 3 Atl. 555); *Berry* v. *Wilcox* (44 Nebr. 82, 62 N. W. 249, 48 Am. St. Rep. 706). Compare *In re Blankford* (241 N. Y. 180, 149 N. E. 415); *Seibold* v. *Wahl* (164 Wis. 82, 159 N. W. 546, Ann. Cas. 1917 C, 400); *Dale* v. *Irwin* (78 Ill. 170).

A different conclusion is arrived at in Pennsylvania. *Fry's Election case* (71 Pa. St. 302, 10 Am. Rep. 698). And in Iowa, *Vanderpoel* v. *O'Hanlon* (53 Iowa 246, 5 N. W. 119, 36 Am. Rep. 216).

In *Anderson* v. *Pifer* (315 Ill. 164, 146 N. E. 171, 37 A. L. R. 134), Justice Farmer, who delivered the opinion of the court said: "Whether a college student is entitled to vote because his permanent abode is at the place of the college is one of fact. One cannot have a residence in two places at the same time. *Dale* v. *Irwin* (78 Ill. 170). The mere presence of the student at the place of the college is not sufficient to entitle him to vote. His residence must be bona fide with no intention of returning to the parental home. College students entirely free from parental control, who regard the college town as their home, and who have no other home to return to in case of sickness or other affliction, are legal voters." (See also *Welsh* v. *Shumway* (232 Ill. 54, 83 N. E. 549).)

"If a man takes up his permanent abode at the place of an institution of learning, the fact of his entering it as a student will not preclude his acquiring a legal residence there; *Sanders* v. *Getchell* (76 Maine 158); *Pedigo* v. *Grimes* (113 Ind. 148, 13 N. E. 700); but if he is domiciled at the place for the purposes of instruction only, it is deemed proper and right that he should neither lose his former residence nor gain a new one in consequence theerof. *Vanderpoel* v. *O'Hanlon* (53 Iowa 246, 5 N. W. 119, 36 Am. Rep. 216).

"The question of residence, inhabitancy, or domicile—for although not in all respects precisely the same, they are nearly so, and depend much upon the same evidence—are attended with more difficulty than almost any other which are presented for adjudication. No exact definition can be given of domicile; it depends upon no one fact or combination of circumstances; but, from the whole taken together, it must be determined in each particular case. It is a maxim that every man must have a domicile somewhere, and also that he can have but one. Of course it follows that his existing domicile continues until he acquires another; and vice versa, by acquiring a new domicile he relinquishes his former one. From this view it is manifest that very slight circumstances must often decide the question. It depends upon the preponderance of the evidence in favor of two or more places; and it may often occur that the evidence of facts tending to establish the domicile in one place would be entirely conclusive, were it not for the existence of facts and circumstances of a still more conclusive and decisive character, which fix it beyond question in another. So, on the contrary, very slight circumstances may fix one's domicile, if not controlled by more conclusive facts fixing it in another place. If a seaman, without family or property, sails from the place of his nativity, which may be considered his domicile of origin, although he may return only at long intervals, or even be absent many years, yet if he does not by some actual residence or other means acquire a domicile elsewhere, he retains his domicile of origin." Shaw, chief justice, *Thorndike* v. *City of Boston* (1 Met. 242, 245). And see *Alston* v. *Newcomer* (42 Miss. 186); *Johnson* v. *People* (94 Ill. 505).

In *Inhabitants of Abington* v. *Inhabitants of North Bridgewater* (23 Pick 170), it appeared that a town line ran through the house occupied by a party, leaving a portion on one side sufficient to form a habitation, and a portion on the other not sufficient for that purpose. Held, that the domicile must be deemed to be on the side first mentioned. It was intimated also that where a house was thus divided, and the party slept habitually on one side, that circumstance should be regarded as a preponderating one to fix his residence there, in the absence of other proof. And see *Rex.* v. *St. Olave's* (1 Strange 51).

That persons residing upon lands within a State, but set apart for some national purpose, and subjected to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, are not voters. (See Opinions of Judges (1 Met. 580); *Sinks* v. *Reese* (10 Ohio St. 306); McCrary, Law of Elections, sec. 29.)

Mr. President, if Congress has a constitutional right to pass an anti-poll tax law, such as contained in House bill 29, concerning which a motion for consideration is pending, then Congress has a right to tamper with the laws of residence of voters and of citizens of various States. It would have the same right to provide, as I said a moment ago, that a man might live in one county and might vote in another. If Congress has the right to interfere with the poll-tax laws, it also has the right to do those other things.

I read further:

By the constitutions of several of the States it is provided, in substance, that no person shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his presence or absence, while employed in the service of the United States; nor while a student in any seminary or place of learning; nor while kept at any almshouse or asylum at public expense; nor while confined in any public prison. (See Constitutions of New York, Illinois, Indiana, California, Michigan, Rhode Island, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon, and Wisconsin. A pauper inmate of a soldiers' home comes within such provision. *Silvey* v. *Lindsay* (107 N. Y. 55, 13 N. E. 444). In several of the other States there are provisions covering some of these cases, but not all. A provision that no person shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his presence or absence in the service of the United States, does not preclude one from acquiring a residence in the place where, and in the time while, he is present in such service. *People* v. *Holden* (28 Cal. 123); *Mooar* v. *Harvey* (128 Mass. 219). Temporary absence from one's home with continuous intention to return will not deprive one of his residence even though it extend through a series of years. (*Harbaugh* v. *Cicott* (33 Mich. 241); Fry's Election Case (71 Pa. St. 302, 10 Am. Rep. 698); *Dennis* v. *State* (17 Fla. 389); *Wheat* v. *Smith* (50 Ark. 266, 7 S. W. 161); *State* v. *Sayre* (129 Iowa, 122, 105 N. W. 387, 113 Am. St. Rep. 452, 3 L. R. A (N. S.) 455); *Erwin* v. *Benton* (120 Ky. 536, 87 S. W. 291, 9 Ann. Cas. 264); *Nelson* v. *Gass* (27 N. D. 357, 146 N. W. 537, Ann. Cas. 1915 C, 796); *State* v. *Lally* (134 Wis. 253, 114 N. W. 447, 15 Ann. Cas. 242).)

Mr. President, if we could change the law which pertains to the qualification of voters for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, we could change the poll-tax requirement. The argument is just as plausible when applied to one as it is when applied to the other. If we could invade a State and deprive it of the rights, which it has from the powerful and explicit words of the United States Constitution, words which were placed there by patriotic Americans many years ago, words which speak so strongly and so eloquently, and which were intended to preserve to the States the right to define the qualifications of voters, then we could make the other changes to which I have referred. Certainly if we could make changes in the one case, we could do so in the other.

Mr. President, the step here proposed would be an invasion of States' rights, an invasion of rights which, as I have stated, the States have undertaken to preserve. I do not see how the framers of the Constitution could have stated their intention any more clearly or strongly. I believe they thought they were expressing themselves, by the use of that language, as strongly as it was possible for human beings to express themselves, and I believe they used words which they thought everyone in the future who spoke the English language would understand. I believe the framers of the Constitution thought those words would preserve to the several States the right to declare the qualifications of electors of the Members of the United States Congress and other United States officers. I do not believe there is any escape from that conclusion; and certainly there is no provision of the Constitution which interferes with that interpretation, as I see it and as I honestly believe it and understand it.

CONDITIONS TO THE EXERCISE OF THE ELECTIVE FRANCHISE

While it is true that the legislature cannot add to the constitutional qualification of electors, it must nevertheless devolve upon that body to establish such regulations as will enable all persons entitled to the privilege to exercise it freely and securely, and exclude all who are not entitled from improper participation therein. For this purpose the times of holding elections, the manner of conducting them, and of ascertaining the result are prescribed, and heavy penalties are imposed upon those who shall vote illegally, or instigate others to do so, or who shall attempt to preclude a fair election or to falsify the result. The propriety, and, indeed, the necessity, of such regulations are undisputed. In some of the States it has also been regarded as important that lists of voters should be prepared before the day of election, in which should be registered the name of every person qualified to vote. Under such a regulation the officers whose duty it is to administer the election laws are enabled to proceed with more deliberation in the discharge of their duties, and to avoid the haste and confusion that must attend the determination upon election day of the various and sometimes difficult questions concerning the right of individuals to exercise this important franchise. Electors also, by means of this registry, are notified in

advance what persons claim the right to vote, and are enabled to make the necessary examination to determine whether the claim is well founded, and to exercise the right of challenge if satisfied any person registered is unqualified.

Mr. President, if this bill should pass and should be upheld, it would be necessary in the State of Tennessee, I believe, to hold two separate elections. In the coming November when we shall elect a governor and 10 Members of the United States House of Representatives and 1 Member of the United States Senate, as well as numerous State officers, we would be compelled to have separate ballot boxes, because persons who then would vote for Governor of Tennessee would first have to pay a poll tax, and persons who would vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature who will be elected in November would first have to pay a poll tax, under the Tennessee law. On the same election grounds there would also have to be a ballot box in which persons could place their votes for United States Senator and Members of the United States House of Representatives. Many of those persons would not be qualified as electors for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, because they would not have paid their poll tax. Mr. President, how could such a situation be handled? Persons who had not paid their poll tax could not put their ballots in the box in which the ballots for Governor of Tennessee would go; but those who had not paid their poll tax would nevertheless insist that they had a right to vote for United States Senator and Members of the United States House of Representatives. So a separate ballot would have to be printed.

The confusion which would be caused and the chances for fraud which would be presented would be tremendous. I do not know how the matter would be worked out in a practical way; but certainly, as I was saying, those who had paid their poll tax could vote for governor and for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, because they would qualify under the State law to do so; but a group of persons who had not paid their poll tax might present themselves and might say, "House bill 29 is a law now, and we want to vote. Although we are not qualified to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, nevertheless, we want to vote for Members of the United States Congress."

Certainly the election officials would be confronted with a serious problem. It is something that would have to be worked out in advance, time permitting. There would have to be a separate set of election officers. I do not know whether there is any machinery provided in the State of Tennessee to take care of such a situation. It might be that one set of election officials would conduct two elections and supply two separate sets of ballot boxes as would be necessary if persons not be qualified under the provisions of the Constitution, to which I have referred, could vote to elect Representatives and Senators. They could not vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. They could not do that because the State of Tennessee would not permit it, they not having paid the poll tax. In that case it might be that a candidate for Senator or Representative would receive the necessary votes but would not be lawfully declared elected under the Constitution, he having been elected by persons not qualified to vote for the State legislature. That flies in the face of both the Federal Constitution and the State constitution.

When the constitution has established no such rule, and is entirely silent on the subject, it has sometimes been claimed that the statute requiring voters to be registered before the day of election, and excluding from the right all whose names do not appear upon the list, was unconstitutional and void, as adding another test to the qualifications of electors which the Constitution has prescribed, and as having the effect, where electors are not registered, to exclude from voting persons who have an absolute right to that franchise by the fundamental law. See *Page* v. *Allen* (58 Pa. St. 338). And compare *Clark* v. *Robinson* (88 Ill. 498); *Delis* v. *Kennedy* (49 Wis. 555, 6 N. W. 246, 381, 35 Am. Rep. 786); *White* v. *Multnomah Co.* (13 Oreg. 317, 10 Pac. 484). In *State* v. *Corner* (22 Neb. 265, 34 N. W. 490), it is said the voter has the right to prove himself an elector, register, and vote at any time before the polls close. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania laid down a rule in conflict with these cases, in *Patterson* v. *Barlow* (60 Pa. St. 54), which case is in harmony with those cited in the next paragraph.

This position, however, has not been generally accepted as sound by the courts. The provision for a registry deprives no one of his right, but is only a reasonable regulation under which the right may be exercised. *Capen* v. *Foster* (12 Pick. 485, 23 Am. Dec. 632); *People* v. *Kopplekom* (16 Mich. 342); *State* v. *Bond* (38 Md. 425); *State* v. *Hilmantel* (21 Wis. 566); *State* v. *Baker* (38 Wis. 71); *Byler* v. *Asher* (47 Ill. 101); *Monroe* v. *Collins* (17 Ohio St. 665); *Edmonds* v. *Banbury* (28 Iowa, 267, 4 Am. Rep. 177); *Ensworth* v. *Albin* (46 Mo. 450); *Auld* v. *Walton* (12 La. Ann. 129); *In re Polling Lists* (13 R. I. 729); *State* v. *Butts* (31 Kan. 537, 2 Pac. 518). As to the conclusiveness of the registry, see *Hyde* v. *Brush* (34 Conn. 454); *Keenan* v. *Cook* (12 R. I. 52).

A law closing registration 3 weeks before the election has been upheld. *People* v. *Hofman* (116 Ill. 587, 5 N. E. 596, 8 N. E. 788). Otherwise as to one closing it 5 days before: *Daggett* v *Hudson* (43 Ohio St. 548, 3 N. E. 538); and 10 days before; *State* v. *Corner* (22 Neb. 265, 34 N. W. 499).

Registration may be required at a city election where it is not required by State law. *McMahon* v. *Savannah* (66 Ga. 217). See *Com.* v. *McClelland* (83 Ky. 688).

Voter may be required to exhibit his poll-tax receipt, or make affidavit that he has paid the tax and lost or misplaced the receipt. *State* v. *Old* (95 Tenn. 723, 34 S. W. 690, 31 L. R. A. 837).

But a law attempting to invalidate ballots upon which the inspectors have neglected to mark their initials is void where the constitution provides that all persons having certain qualifications "shall be entitled to vote at all elections." *Moyer* v. *Van De Vanter* (12 Wash. 377, 41 Pac. 60, 29 L. R. A. 670).

Where statute provides that upon voter's taking a specified oath "his vote shall be received, such provision is mandatory. *Wolcott* v. *Holcomb* (97 Mich. 361, 56 N. W. 837, 23 L. R. A. 215).

An unregistered voter may be required to make affidavit as to his qualifications, stating them in full. *Cusick's Appeal* (136 Pa. 459, 20 Atl. 574, 10 L. R. A. 228).

Requirements in registration law must be reasonable. *Owensboro* v. *Hickman* (90 Ky. 629, 14 S. W. 688, 10 L. R. A. 224, and note).

Such regulations must always have been within the power of the legislature, unless forbidden. Many resting upon the same principle are always prescribed, and have never been supposed to be open to objection. Although the Constitution provides that all male citizens 21 years of age and upward shall be entitled to vote, it would not be seriously contended that a statute which should require all such citizens to go to the established place for holding the polls, and there deposit their ballots, and not elsewhere, was a violation of the Constitution, because prescribing an additional qualification, namely, the presence of the elector at the polls. All such reasonable regulations of the constitutional right which seem to the legislature important to the preservation of order in elections, to guard against fraud, undue influence, and oppression, and to preserve the purity of the ballot box, are not only within the constitutional power of the legislature, but are commendable, and at least some of them absolutely essential. And where the law requires such a registry, and forbids the reception of votes from any persons not registered, an election in a township where no such registry has ever been made will be void, and cannot be sustained by making proof that none in fact but duly qualified electors have voted. It is no answer that such a rule may enable the registry officers, by neglecting their duty, to disfranchise the electors altogether; the remedy of the electors is by proceedings to compel the performance of the duty; and the statute, being imperative and mandatory, cannot be disregarded. The danger, however, of any such misconduct on the part of officers is comparatively small, when the duty is intrusted to those who are chosen in the locality where the registry is to be made, and who are consequently immediately responsible to those who are interested in being registered.

All regulations of the elective franchise, however, must be reasonable, uniform, and impartial; they must not have for their purpose directly or indirectly to deny or abridge the constitutional right of citizens to vote, or unnecessarily to impede its exercise; if they do, they must be declared void.

In some other cases preliminary action by the public authorities may be requisite before any legal election can be held. If an election is one which a municipality may hold or not at its option, and the proper municipal authority decides against holding it, it is evident that individual citizens must acquiesce, and that any votes which may be cast by them on the assumption of right must be altogether nugatory. The same would be true of an election to be held after proclamation for that purpose, and which must fail if no such proclamation has been made. Where, however, both the time and the place of an election are prescribed by law, every voter has a right to take notice of the law, and to deposit his ballot at the time and place appointed, notwithstanding the officer, whose duty it is to give notice of the election, has failed in that duty. The notice to be thus given is only additional to that which the statute itself gives, and is prescribed for the purpose of greater publicity; but the right to hold the election comes from the statute, and not from the official notice. It has therefore been frequently held that when a vacancy exists in an office, which the law requires shall be filled at the next general election, the time and place of which are fixed, and that notice of the general election shall also specify the vacancy to be filled, an election at that time and place to fill the vacancy will be valid, notwithstanding the notice is not given; and such election cannot be defeated by showing that a small portion only of the electors were actually aware of the vacancy, or cast their votes to fill it. But this would not be the case if either the time or the place were not fixed by law, so that notice became essential for that purpose.

On the subject of implications, I wish to read also from Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, volume I, page 138, as follows:

The implications from the provisions of a constitution are sometimes exceedingly important, and have large influence upon its construction. In regard to the Constitution of the United States the rule has been laid down that, where a general power is conferred or duty enjoined, every particular power necessary for the exercise of the one or the performance of the other is also conferred. The same rule has been applied to the State constitution, with an important modification, by the Supreme Court of Illinois.

It has been said that certain other provisions of the Constitution, namely, article I, section 4, particularly, the fourteenth amendment, and perhaps the fifteenth amendment, by inference or implication, would convey the right to Congress to pass anti-poll-tax legislation. That is the reason I wish to refer to the decision by the Supreme Court of Illinois, reading as follows:

That other powers than those expressly granted may be, and often are, conferred by implication is too well settled to be doubted. Under every constitution the doctrine of implication is too well settled to be doubted. Under every constitution the doctrine of implication must be resorted to, in order to carry out the general grants of power. A constitution cannot from its very nature enter into a minute specification of all the minor powers naturally and obviously included in it and flowing from the great and important ones which are expressly granted. It is therefore established as a general rule that when a constitution gives a general power, or enjoins a duty, it also gives, by implication, every particular power necessary for the exercise of the one or the performance of the other. Story on Constitution, page 430. See also *United States* v. *Fisher* (2 Cranch, 358, 2 L. ed. 304); *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 4 L. ed. 579); *Northwestern Fertilizing Co.* v. *Hyde Park* (70 Ill. 634). In *First National Bank* v. *Union Trust Co.* (244 U. S. 416, 61 L. ed. 1233, 37 Sup. Ct. Rep. 734), the court after reviewing *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 4 L. ed. 579), and *Osborn* v. *Bank of United States* (9 Wheat. 738, 6 L. ed. 204), and considering the power given to Congress to pass laws to make the specific powers granted effectual, said: "In terms it was pointed out that this broad authority was not stereotyped as of any particular time, but endured, thus furnishing a perpetual and living sanction to the legislative authority within the limits of a just discretion, enabling it to take into consideration the changing wants and demands of society and to adopt provisions appropriate to meet every situation which it was deemed required to be provided for." See also *Smith* v. *Kansas City Title & Trust Co.* (255 U. S. 180, 65 L. ed. 577, 41 Sup. Ct. Rep. 243). Congress may establish banks for national purposes. *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 4 L. ed. 579); *Osborn* v. *Bank of United States* (9 Wheat. 738, 6 L. ed. 204); *Farmers & Mechanics National Bank* v. *Dearing* (91 U. S. 29, 23 L. ed. 114); *Smith* v. *Kansas City Title & Trust Co.* (255 U. S. 180, 65 L. ed. 577, 41 Sup. Ct. Rep. 243).

Continuing reading from the text:

"The implication under this rule, however, must be a necessary, not a conjectural or argumentative one. And it is further modified by another rule, that where the means for the exercise of a granted power are given, no other or different means can be implied, as being more effectual or convenient." (*Field* v. *People* (3 Ill. 79, 83). See *Fletcher* v. *Oliver* (25 Ark. 289).) In Nevada it has been held that a constitutional provision that the counties shall provide for their paupers will preclude a State asylum for the poor. *State* v. *Hallock* (14 Nev. 202, 33 Am. Rep. 559). The rule applies to the exercise of power by all departments and all officers, and will be touched upon incidentally hereafter.

Akin to this is the rule that "Where the power is granted in general terms, the power is to be construed as coextensive with the terms, unless some clear restriction upon it is deducible (expressly or by implication) from the context." (Story on Constitution, pp. 424–426. See *Du Page County* v. *Jenks* (65 Ill. 275).) This rule has been so frequently applied as a restraint upon legislative encroachment upon the grant of power to the judiciary, that we shall content ourselves in this place with a reference to the cases collected upon this subject and given in another chapter. (See post, pp. 173, 221.)

Another rule of construction is, that when the Constitution defines the circumstances under which a right may be exercised or a penalty imposed, the specification is an implied prohibition against legislative interference to add to the condition, or to extend the penalty to other cases. On this ground it has been held by the Supreme Court of Maryland, that where the constitution defines the qualifications of an officer, it is not in the power of the legislature to change or supersede to them, unless the power to do so is expressly or by necessary implication conferred by the constitution itself. (*Thomas* v. *Owens* (4 Md. 189). And see *Barker* v. *People* (3 Cow. 686); Matter of Dorsey (7 Port. 293); *Dickson* v. *Strickland* (114 Tex. 176, 265 S. W. 1012).)

Other cases recognizing the same principle are referred to in the following paragraphs:

The legislature cannot add to the constitutional qualifications of voters: *Rison* v. *Farr* (24 Ark. 161); *St. Joseph, &c. R. Co.* v. *Buchanan County Court* (39 Mo. 485); *State* v. *Williams* (5 Wis. 308); *State* v. *Baker* (38 Wis. 71); *Monroe* v. *Collins* (17 Ohio St. 665); *State* v. *Symonds* (57 Me. 148); *State* v. *Staten* (6 Colo. 233); *Davies* v. *McKeeby* (5 Nev. 369); *McCafferty* v. *Guyer* (59 Pa. St. 109); *Quinn* v. *State* (35 Ind. 483); *Clayton* v. *Harris* (7 Nev. 64); *Randolph* v. *Good* (3 W. Va. 551); *Morris* v. *Powell* (125 Ind. 281, 25 N. E. 221, 9 L. R. A. 326); *Ferbrach* v. *Drainage Dist.* (23 Idaho, 85, 128 Pac. 553, 44 L. R. A. (n. s.) 538, Ann. Cas. 1915 C, 43; *Coggeshall* v. *Des Moines* (138 Iowa, 730, 117 N. W. 300, 123 Am. St. Rep. 221); *State ex rel. Gilson* v. *Monahan* (72 Kan. 492, 84 Pac. 130, 115 Am. St. Rep. 224, 7 Ann. Cas. 661); *Johnson* v. *Grand Forks County* (16 N. D. 363, 113 N. W. 1071, 125 Am. St. Rep. 662); *Livesley* v. *Litchfield* (47 Oreg. 248, 83 Pac. 142, 114 Am. St. Rep. 920). Nor diminish them: *Allison* v. *Blake* (57 N. J. L. 6, 29 Atl. 417, 25 L. R. A. 480, and note); *Talbert* v. *Long* (134 Ga. 292, 67 S. E. 826, 137 Am. St. Rep. 222); *Coggeshall* v. *Des Moines* (138 Iowa, 730, 117 N. W. 309, 128 Am. St. Rep. 221); *State ex rel. Gilson* v. *Monahan* (72 Kan. 492, 84 Pac. 130, 115 Am. St. Rep. 224, 7 Ann. Cas. 661) But where the Constitution is silent upon the subject the legislature may prescribe the qualifications of voters. *State* v. *Dillon* (32 Fla. 545, 14 So. 383, 22 L. R. A. 124); *Plummer* v. *Yost* (144 Ill. 68, 33 N. E. 191, 19 L. R. A. 110); *State ex rel. Gilson* v. *Monahan* (72 Kan. 492, 84 Pac. 130, 115 Am. St. Rep. 224, 7 Ann. Cas. 661); *Hanna U. Young* (84 Md. 179, 35 Atl. 674, 34 L. R. A. 55); *Bonham* v. *Fuchs* (Tex. Civ. App.) (228 S. W. 1112); *Willis* v. *Kalmbach* (109 Va. 475, 64 S. E. 342, 21 L. R. A. (n. s.) 1009).

The legislature may regulate the exercise of the constitutional right to vote leaving the right itself untouched. They may, for example, make reasonable provisions for determining the age, length of residence, etc., of persons who offer to vote. Such regulations are valid, provided they do not amount to a denial or invasion of the right conferred by the Constitution. *Edmonds* v. *Banbury* (28 Iowa, 267, 4 Am. Rep. 177); *Southerland* v. *Norris* (74 Md. 326, 22 Atl. 137, 28 Am. St. Rep. 255); *Pope* v. *Williams* (98 Md. 59, 56 Atl. 543, 103 Am. St. Rep. 379, 66 L. R. A. 398, affirmed 193 U. S. 621, 48 L. ed. 817, 24 Sup. Ct. Rep. 573); *Capen* v. *Foster* (12 Pick. 485, 23 Am. Dec. 632); *State ex rel. Klein* v. *Hillenbrand* (101 Ohio St. 370, 130 N. E. 29, 14 A. L. R. 255); *State ex rel. Cothren* v. *Leon* (9 Wis. 279); *State ex rel. Wood* v. *Baker* (38 Wis. 71). Thus a statute requiring an applicant for registration as a qualified elector of a municipality to state his or her age has been held valid. *State ex rel. Klein* v. *Hillenbrand* (101 Ohio St. 370, 130 N. E. 29, 14 A. L. R. 255).

The legislature cannot add to the constitutional qualifications of an officer: *People* v. *McCormick* (261 Ill. 413, 103 N. E. 1053, Ann. Cas. 1915 A, 338); *Felbeleman* v. *State* (98 Ind. 516); *State* v. *Craig* (132 Ind. 54, 31 N. E. 352, 32 Am. St. Rep. 237, 16 L. R. A. 638); *State* v. *Goldthwait* (172 Ind. 210, 87 N. E. 133, 19 Ann. Cas. 737); *Barker* v. *People* (3 Cow. 686, 15 Am. Dec. 322). But see *State* v. *McAllister* (36 W. Va. 485, 18 S. E. 770, 24 L. R. A. 343); nor shorten the constitutional term of an office: *Howard* v. *State* (10 Ind. 99); *Cotton* v. *Ellis* (7 Jones, N. C. 545); *State* v. *Askew* (48 Ark. 82, 2 S. W. 349. But see *State* v. *Plasters* (74 Neb. 652, 105 N. W. 1092, 3 L. R. A. (n. s.) 887, 13 Ann. Cas. 154); *Botten* v. *Pinson* (77 W. Va. 412, 89 S. E. 985, L. R. A. 1917 A, 1244); nor practically abolish the office by repealing provision for salary: *Reid* v. *Smoulter* (128 Pa. 324, 5 L. R. A. 517, 18 Atl. Rep. 445); *People* v. *Howland* (155 N. Y. 270, 49 N. E. 775, 41 L. R. A. 838); nor extend the constitutional term: *People* v. *Bull* (46 N. Y. 57); *Goodin* v. *Thoman* (10 Kans. 191); *State* v. *Brewster* (44 Ohio St. 589, 6 N. E. 653); *Kahn* v. *Sutro* (114 Cal. 316, 46 Pac. 87, 33 L. R. A. 620); *Gemmer* v. *State* (163 Ind. 150, 71 N. E. 478, 66 L. R. A. 82). But see *State* v. *Plasters* (74 Neb. 652, 105, N. W. 1092, 3 L. R. A. (n. s.) 887, 13 Ann. Cas. 154). See also *Hill* v. *Slade* (41 Md. 640, 48 Atl. 64); but see *Jordan* v. *Bailey* (37 Minn. 174, 33 N. W. 778; nor add to the constitutional grounds for removing an officer: *Lowe* v. *Commonwealth* (3 Met. (Ky.) 237); *Brown* v. *Grover* (6 Bush, 1); *People* v. *Howland* (155 N. Y. 270, 49 N. E. 775, 41 L. R. A. 838); as by enacting that intoxication while discharging his duties shall be deemed misfeasance in office, *Com.* v. *Williams* (79 Ky. 42); but see *McComas* v. *Krug* (81 Ind. 327); nor change the compensation prescribed by the constitution: *King* v. *Hunter* (65 N. C. 603); see also, on these questions, post, page 388, note; nor provide for the choice of officers a different mode from that prescribed by the constitution: *People* v. *Raymond* (37 N. Y. 428); *Devoy* v. *New York* (35 Barb. 264, 22 How. Pr. 226); *People* v. *Blake* (49 Barb. 9); *People* v. *Albertson* (55 N. Y. 50); *Opinions of Justices* (117 Mass. 603); *State* v. *Goldstucker* (40 Wis. 124); see post, page 561, note.

A legislative extension of an elective office is void as applied to incumbents. *People* v. *McKinney* (52 N. Y. 374). Where the constitution limits the term, appointee under statute providing for holding during good behavior cannot hold beyond constitutional term. *Neumeyer* v. *Krakel* (110 Ky. 624, 62 S. W. 518).

It is not unconstitutional to allow the Governor to supply temporary vacancies in offices which under the constitution are elective. *Sprague* v. *Brown* (40 Wis. 612). But such vacancy does not arise by mere failure to hold the election. *Ijams* v. *Duvall* (85 Md. 252, 36 Atl. 819, 36 L. R. A. 127). Enumeration in constitution of certain modes in which vacancies arise does not prevent legislative creation of other modes. *State* v.

Lansing (46 Neb. 514, 64 N. W. 1104, 35 L. R. A. 124). Illness of Governor which disables him to perform his duties is such vacancy as authorizes the officer designated by the constitution to assume the powers and discharge the duties of the Governor until the disability is removed. *Barnard* v. *Taggart* (66 N. H. 362, 29 Atl. 1027, 25 L. R. A. 613). Where the term fixed by statute is unconstitutional, the tenure is at the will of the appointing power. *Lewis* v. *Lewelling* (53 Kan. 201, 36 Pac. 351, 23 L. R. A. 510).

Mr. President, I have some citations from one or two more authorities; for instance, from Story on the Constitution. First, I want to read an excerpt from the case of *Anderson* v. *Baker*, 32, 33, 34, 23 Maryland 531:

Among the absolute, unqualified rights of the States is that of regulating the elective franchise; it is the foundation of State authority; the most important political function exercised by the people in their sovereign capacity. Whilst "the right of the people to participate in the legislature is the best security of liberty and foundation of all free government," yet it is subordinate to the higher power of regulating the qualifications of the electors and the elected. The original power of the people in their aggregate political capacity, is delegated in the form of suffrage to such persons as they deem proper for the safety of the commonwealth; Brightly Election Cases (*Anderson* v. *Baker*, 32, 33, 34, 23 Maryland 531).

Quoting from Justice Story, treating of the same subject:

Every constitution of government in these United States has assumed, as a fundamental principle, the right of the people of the State to alter, abolish, and modify the form of its own government according to the sovereign pleasure of the people. In fact, the people of each State have gone much further and settled a far more critical question by deciding who shall be the voters entitled to approve and reject the constitution framed by a delegated body under their direction. (1 Story Constitution, ch. 9, sec. 581.)

From this it will be seen how little, even in the most free of republican governments, any abstract right of suffrage, or any original and indefeasible privilege, has been recognized in practice (ibid.). In no two of these State constitutions will it be found that the qualifications of the voters are settled upon the same uniform basis, so that we have the most abundant proofs that among a free and enlightened people convened for the purpose of establishing their own forms of government and the rights of their own voters the question as to the due regulation of the qualifications has been deemed a matter of mere State policy, and varied to meet the wants, to suit the prejudices, and to foster the interests of the majority.

The exclusive right of the several States to regulate the exercise of the elective franchise and to prescribe the qualifications of voters was never questioned, nor attempted to be interfered with, until the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was forced upon unwilling communities (the States then lately in rebellion) by the military power of the General Government, and thus made a part of our organic law; a necessary sequence, perhaps, of the Civil War, but nonetheless a radical change in the established theory of our Government. (Brightly Election Cases, author's note, pp. 42, 43.)

The right to vote is not of necessity connected with citizenship. The rights of the citizen are civil rights, such as liberty of person and of conscience, the right to acquire and possess property, all of which are distinguishable from the political privilege of suffrage.

The history of the country shows that there is no foundation in fact for the view that the right of suffrage is one of the "privileges or immunities of citizens." (McCrary Elections, p. 3.)

"The right to vote is not vested; it is purely conventional, and may be enlarged or restricted, granted or withheld, at pleasure, and without fault."

In *Blair* v. *Ridgely* (41 Mo. 161) the question at issue arose out of the provision of article II, section 3, of the Constitution of 1865 of the State of Missouri. By this section it was provided that no person should be deemed a qualified voter who had ever been in armed hostility to the United States, or to the government of the State of Missouri; that every person should, at the time of offering to vote, take an oath that he was not within the inhibition of this section, and that any person declining to take such oath should not be allowed to vote. The plaintiff, at an election held in the city of St. Louis on November 7, 1865, offered to vote, but refused to take the oath prescribed by the constitution. His vote being rejected, he brought his action against the judges of the election for damages. The case was taken to the supreme court of Missouri, where it was argued exhaustively, and with much learning, by eminent counsel, and the argument is to be found in full in the Reports of the Supreme Court of Missouri, volume 41. It was contended by the plaintiff that the section of the constitution in question was in violation of the Constitution of the United States, being a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law within the meaning of that instrument, and, in consequence, null and void. But the court held against this contention, drawing the distinction between laws passed to punish for offenses in order to prevent their repetition and laws passed to protect the public franchises and privileges from abuse by falling into unworthy hands. It is said by the court that—

"The State may not pass laws in the form or with the effect of bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, or laws impairing the obligation of contracts. It may and has full power to pass laws, restrictive and exclusive, for the preservation or promotion of the common interests as political or social emergencies may from time to time require, though in certain instances disabilities may directly flow in consequence. It should never be forgotten that the State is organized for the public weal as well as for individual purposes, and while it may not disregard the safeguards that are thrown around the citizen for his protection by the constitution, it cannot neglect to perform and do what is for the public good."

It was argued in *Blair* v. *Ridgely* that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall. 277), where it was held that this section of the Missouri Constitution, so far as it provided an oath to be taken by preachers, was in the nature of pains and penalties, and consequently void, was decisive of the Blair case. But the distinction between the right to practice a profession or follow a calling and the right to vote is clearly stated in the opinion of Judge Wagner, as follows:

"The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Cummings case proceeds on the idea that the right to pursue a calling or profession, is a natural and inalienable right and that a law precluding a person from practicing his calling or profession on account of past conduct is inflicting a penalty, and therefore void. There are certain rights which inhere in and attach to the person, and of which he cannot be deprived except by forfeiture for crime, whereof he must be first tried and convicted according to due process of law. These are termed natural or absolute rights. * * *

But is the right to vote or to exercise the privilege of the elective franchise a right either natural, absolute, or vested? It is certain that in a state of nature, disconnected with government, no person has or can enjoy it. That the privilege of participating in the elective franchise in this free and enlightened country is an important and interesting one is most true. But we are not aware that it has ever been held or adjudged to be a vested interest in any individual.

"Suffrage in the United States not being a vested right, it results that persons who have enjoyed and exercised the privilege, and who have been qualified electors, may be entirely disfranchised and deprived of the privilege by constitutional provision, and such persons are entirely without a remedy at law." (McCrary, Elections, p. 9.)

Such is the situation, may I observe, Mr. President, in this particular case, with respect to those who vote for Members of the Congress. They must be qualified to vote for members of the most numerous branch of their State legislatures. If they do not have such qualifications, then they cannot vote for Members of the Congress. Among the requirements and among the qualifications in a poll-tax State, at least in Tennessee, is the provision that the poll tax must be paid in the year preceding the election.

I continue reading from Cooley on Constitutional Limitations, eighth edition:

"The whole subject of the regulation of elections, including the prescribing of qualifications for suffrage, is left by the National Constitution to the several States, except as it is provided by that instrument that the electors for Representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and as the fifteenth amendment forbids denying to citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Participation in the elective franchise is a privilege rather than a right, and it is granted or denied on grounds of general policy, the prevailing view being that it should be as general as possible consistent with the public safety." (Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, 8th ed., Carrington, vol. 2.)

Mr. President, the fifteenth amendment is not involved at all in the consideration of House bill 29 because no one is being denied the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, which is right. But I point out that again an authority on constitutional law refers to the fact that the whole subject of the regulation of elections, including prescribing the qualifications for suffrage, is left by the Federal Constitution to the several States, and there is only one exception, which is the exception I have read forty-odd times, which applies to the election of Members of Congress, and they must be elected by those who are qualified to vote for members of the legislature.

If a man should be elected by electors who were not qualified to vote for members of the legislature in any State, he would certainly be in a very strange position. He would be the first man ever to be elected either to the Senate or the House of Representatives of the National Congress by persons who could not vote for members of the State legislature.

Another very ridiculous, ludicrous situation would obtain, as I described a moment ago, as I was drawing a verbal picture of what might occur on the election grounds. Suppose it should be necessary to have two boxes, one in which national officers might be voted for and one in which the State officers might be voted for. I am sure that most of the poll-tax States do not have any law which provides for two sets of election officers, and they would not have time to call the legislatures into session before the November election. Therefore, in addition to the legal objections, which are so persuasive, it seems to me, that nothing else need be argued; as a practical matter we would be in extreme difficulty with two elections being held for two sets of officers, which is certainly not provided for by any provision of law in my State, as I recall. We would have persons who were not qualified to vote for the members of the State legislature wanting to vote for Members of Congress in defiance of the Constitution; and we cannot repeal the Constitution by the passage of a bill which repudiates it. When people presented themselves at the polling places those who had not paid their poll taxes could not vote for members of the legislature or for governor, and those who could vote for governor and cast a ballot in one box would probably violate the law by undertaking to vote for a Federal officer in another box. I can see nothing but confusion to be brought about. Nothing of this sort was ever expected or intended, and throughout the years it has not been considered. I am sure that in the States which do not have any poll taxes only those are allowed to vote for the Members of Congress who are otherwise qualified to vote. If a non-poll-tax State has a provision, as some of them do, I understand, that certain things must be done to qualify electors to vote for Federal officers, they must be the things which qualify them to vote for candidates for the most numerous branch of the legislature. Non-poll-tax States have requirements for electors. In such States the poll-tax problem would not arise. In some States persons not qualified to vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the legislature would not be allowed to vote for Members of the Congress, while in other States, where the poll tax obtains, persons would be allowed to vote for Members of Congress who could not qualify under the same provisions of the State constitution to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. In other words, those States which do not have poll-tax requirements have other requirements which apply to electors in order that they may be qualified to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. By reason of the fact that they are qualified to vote for members of their legislature they can vote for Members of the Congress. So in such case there is no conflict. But in other States where the poll tax exists Members of Congress could be elected by persons who are not qualified to vote for members of the legislature.

Mr. President, may I inquire of the majority leader at what time he would like to adjourn or recess? I have perhaps a little more data to present which I should like to look over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should be very glad to accommodate the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. My understanding was that the Senator would speak until about 5 o'clock today.

Mr. STEWART. I thought I could be able to finish by that time. My difficulty is that I have additional data at my office, but do not have it before me now. I do not want to take the floor for the second time on the same subject. If I might have the floor on the convening of the Senate tomorrow, for about 30 minutes——

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator concludes his speech tonight he can speak a second time on the same subject tomorrow. I do not want to be placed in the position of carrying the Senator over until tomorrow with the idea of giving him an opportunity to speak more than twice on any one subject. If the Senator can conclude tonight I shall be glad to stay until he can do so.

Mr. STEWART. Would the Senator agree that I may resume the floor tomorrow if I do not consume more than 30 minutes?

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator wish to ask unanimous consent to that effect?

Mr. STEWART. I do not want to be placed in the position of speaking for the second time on the subject tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not see how that can be avoided unless the Senator should ask and receive unanimous consent to be recognized to speak when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow I may be allowed to speak for not to exceed 30 minutes, my speech at that time to be considered as being part of my first speech on the subject, and not to be charged as a second speech on the subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted by the Senate this afternoon, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 30, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 29 (legislative day of July 28), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona, a Foreign Service Officer of the Class of Career Minister, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Good Offices Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations on Indonesia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, the United States Special Representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the Representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

John J. Macdonald, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of class three, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Truce Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations April 23, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons to be Representatives of the United States of America to the Third Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held from October 18 to November 10, 1948, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

George V. Allen, of North Carolina.
Milton S. Eisenhower, of Kansas.
Luther H. Evans, of Texas.
Waldo G. Leland, of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick, of New York.

The following-named persons to be Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the Third Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held from October 18 to November 10, 1948, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Frank Capra, of California.
William H. Hastie, of the District of Columbia.
Mrs. Kathleen N. Lardie, of Michigan.
W. Albert Noyes, Jr., of New York.
George F. Zook, of Virginia.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

B. Harvie Branscomb, of Tennessee, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1951, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Karl T. Compton, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Harold W. Dodds, of New Jersey, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Martin P. McGuire, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1949, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Mark Starr, of New York, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1949, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARD

The following-named persons to be members of the Public Advisory Board, established under title I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

James Barron Carey, of the District of Columbia.
George Meany, of New York.
Allan Blair Kline, of Iowa.
Albert S. Goss, of Washington.
James George Patton, of Colorado.
Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.
Jonathan W. Daniels, of North Carolina.
Robert Henry Hinckley, of Utah.
Sarah Blanding, of New York.
George Houk Mead, of Ohio.
Eric A. Johnston, of Washington.
Arlon Everett Lyon, of Illinois.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Waldemar J. Gallman, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Myron Melvin Cowen, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Stanton Griffis, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

James Grover McDonald, of New York, to be Special Representative of the United States of America to the Provisional Government of Israel, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

George Wadsworth, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iraq, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

Edward R. Dudley, of New York, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Robert Alexander, of the District of Columbia.

Charles R. Enlow, of Kansas.

William Kling, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Edward H. Foley, Jr., of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury, in place of A. Lee M. Wiggins, resigned. (Mr. Foley is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.)

John S. Graham, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Edward H. Foley, Jr.

A. Miles Pratt, of Louisiana, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 20, with headquarters at New Orleans, La. (Reappointment.)

John J. Fitzpatrick, of Connecticut, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut, to fill an existing vacancy.

BUREAU OF THE MINT

George B. Gillin, of California, to be superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif., to fill an existing vacancy.

Gilroy Roberts, of Pennsylvania, to be engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa., to fill an existing vacancy.

These officers are now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Thomas Chalmers Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1952, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

David J. Coddaire, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term expiring April 15, 1954, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

William E. Willett, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term expiring June 30, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, United States Army, to be Director of Selective Service, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Ernest Gruening, of New York, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska. Reappointment.

Llewellyn M. Williams, of Alaska, to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska. Reappointment.

BUREAU OF MINES

James Boyd, of Colorado, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, terminating recess appointment, vice Royd R. Sayers.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Hon. Paul P. Rao, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. Roy W. Harper, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Hon. Samuel Hamilton Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Edward Allen Tamm, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

George L. Grobe, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York. (Mr. Grobe is now serving under an appointment which expired October 1, 1947.)

Cleon A. Summers, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma. (Mr. Summers is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 5, 1948.)

John B. Tansil, of Montana, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana. (Mr. Tansil is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.)

Joseph F. Deeb, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan. (Mr. Deeb is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 5, 1948.)

Harry O. Arend, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska. (Mr. Arend is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1948.)

Timothy T. Cronin, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin. (Mr. Cronin is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.)

Lester Luther, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

William Marvel, of Delaware, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

William M. Lindsay, of Kansas, to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas. (Mr. Lindsay is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1948.)

Paul B. Messick, of Delaware, to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware. (Mr. Messick is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.)

Harold K. Claypool, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio. (Mr. Claypool is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1948.)

Jack R. Caufield, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon. (Mr. Caufield is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 28, 1947.)

Frank C. Blackford, of New York, to be United States marshal for the western district of New York. (Mr. Blackford is now serving under an appointment which expired June 29, 1948.)

Thomas N. Curran, of Maine, to be United States marshal for the district of Maine. (Mr. Curran is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 29, 1948.)

Edwin D. Bolger, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan. (Mr. Bolger is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 31, 1948.)

John J. Barc, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Michigan. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired November 4, 1947.)

Bernard Fitch, of Connecticut, to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 29, 1948.)

Kehoe C. Shannon, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Carl H. Fleckenstine, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Alfred J. Plowden, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Swan Burrus, Jr.	Bernard E. O'Malley
Lewis McLaurine Williams	Paul Francke, Jr.

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

John B. Baldi
Arthur P. Burdon
John F. Laws

To be sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

M. Allen Pond

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948:

Erwin W. Blatter	Donald W. Patrick
Calvin B. Spencer	George G. Van Dyke
Bert R. Boone	Waldemar J. A. Wickman
Victor H. Haas	
Paul A. Neal	

Dental surgeon to be senior dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948:

Oscar Mikkelsen

Scientist to be senior scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948:

Howard L. Andrews

Assistant dietitians to be senior assistant dietitians (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948:

Engla J. Anderson
E. Grace Gibson
Myrtle M. Morris

The above-named officers were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Harold Heller, June 30, 1948.
Frederick G. Gillick, July 16, 1948.

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Robert W. Mowry, July 8, 1948.
Andrew G. Morrow, July 15, 1948.
Calvin W. Applewhite, June 29, 1948.
James B. Gilbert, June 29, 1948.
Elda M. Christensen, July 1, 1948.
Donald J. Ottenberg, July 2, 1948.
Robert O. Scow, July 22, 1948.
Ted E. Becker, July 1, 1948.
J. Carter Wright, June 29, 1948.
Harold H. Davidson, July 2, 1948.
Allen N. Koplin, July 1, 1948.
Frederick E. Phillips, June 30, 1948.
J. D. Leggett, June 30, 1948.
Richard A. Reiss, July 6, 1948.
Roland H. Corbet, July 1, 1948.
John H. Tuohy, July 1, 1948.
Frederick A. Thompson, Jr., July 5, 1948.
Councilman Morgan, July 1, 1948.
Eugene V. Nininger, July 3, 1948.
Edwin B. Thomas, July 1, 1948.
Jules Glenn, July 2, 1948.
Reed M. Broadbent, July 14, 1948.
Gerald Giges, July 6, 1948.
David M. Dunville, July 1, 1948.
William H. Gutstein, July 3, 1948.
Paul W. Rogers, July 15, 1948.
John J. Johnson, July 2, 1948.
John F. Montroy, July 24, 1948.
R. Raymond Green, July 1, 1948.

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Victor A. McKusick, July 1, 1948.
Gordon L. Farrell, July 8, 1948.
Richard A. Saavedra, July 2, 1948.
John M. Vogel, July 1, 1948
R. Guy Lewis, July 1, 1948.
David S. Wilder, July 1, 1948.
Glenn M. Gordon, July 1, 1948.
Arnold W. Pratt, July 2, 1948.
Robert L. Price, July 1, 1948.
John F. Lowney, July 23, 1948.
Albert L. Patrick, July 9, 1948.
Stewart M. Williams, July 1, 1948.
Edward A. Rogers, Jr., July 3, 1948.
McClain Johnston, July 1, 1948.
Milton Sheinbein, July 16, 1948.

To be dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective June 28, 1948:

Harry G. Trautman

To be scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective June 29, 1948:

Clarence M. Tarzwell

To be veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948:

William T. S. Thorp

Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:

Frederick J. Brady, August 20, 1948.
W. Palmer Dearing, July 10, 1948.
Leonard A. Scheele, July 10, 1948.
Thomas H. Tomlinson, Jr., August 22, 1948.
Alexander G. Gilliam, July 10, 1948.

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

David M. Gould, July 7, 1948.
Samuel C. Ingraham II, July 7, 1948.
Robert E. Miller, July 11, 1948.
Donald J. Birmingham, July 14, 1948.

Dental surgeons to be senior dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:

Bruce D. Forsyth, July 2, 1948.
John W. Knutson, July 2, 1948.
William P. Kroschel, July 2, 1948.
Ralph S. Lloyd, July 2, 1948.
George E. Jones, July 2, 1948.

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Malcolm C. Hope, September 19, 1948.
Russell W. Hart, August 1, 1948.

Senior assistant scientist to be scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date indicated:

Lewis J. Cralley, December 6, 1948.

Junior assistant nurse officers to be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective datea indicated:

Joan M. Norkunas, July 13, 1948.
Margaret M. Sweeney, October 20, 1948.

The above-named officers were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.):

To be lieutenant colonels

Lyman C. Duryea, MC, O283267.
Franklin H. Grauer, MC, O261176.
Alphonsus M. McCarthy, MC, O254260.

To be majors

Robert D. Anderson, MC, 0419558.
John F. Breslin, MC, O294499.
Parker B. Hollingsworth, MC, O317630.
Thomas W. Howell, MC, O374247.
James B. Neil, DC, O400175.
Allen D. Smith, MC, O355613.

To be captains

Thorwald R. Anderson, MC, O1765038.
James N. Brien, Jr., MC, O1735080.
Robert E. Broaddus, MC, O470773.
Roy E. Campbell, MC, O468727.
Edwin S. Grantham, MC, O474346.
Richard A. Hayden, MC, O460743.
Howard W. McCall, DC, O1735409.
Thomas F. Puckett, Jr., MC, O1785726.
Wallace K. Reese, Jr., DC, O401456.
Robert P. Reynolds, DC, O397674.
Van R. Richmond, MC, O368203.

To be first lieutenants

Richard P. Arlagno, MC, O945337.
Sherman L. Armstrong, Ch., O932956.
Stewart L. Baker, Jr., MC, O1725275.
Raymond W. Blohm, Jr., MC O945334.
Edward S. Brezina, MC, O945339.
Robert L. Chancey, MC, O1735731.
Charles A. De Kovessey, MC, O1718814.
James F. Donovan, MC, O1764805.
Warren D. Eddy, Jr., MC, O935825.
Robert J. Fanning, DC, O937340.
Roland L. Fowler, DC, O937728.
Frederic S. Glazener, MC, O945036.
Fay B. Graves, MC, O945338.
Richard L. Howard, DC, O1786105.
Thomas W. Jones, DC, O1735657.
Allen F. Kingman, Jr., MC, O945443.
Richard J. Maloney, DC, O945444.
Oliver A. Mays, MC, O473791.
Georges F. McCormick, MC, O1705957.
John C. Mebane, MC, O943979.
Frank L. Miller, MC, O1725000.
Venedict M. Osetinsky, MC, O479890.
Ellis Oster, MC, O1767351.
James F. Parker, DC, O1786021.
Thomas R. Plowright, MC, O1705360.
Thomas L. Robbins, MC, O945341.
Norman M. Scott, Jr., MC, O1705500.
John J. Sheridan, MC, O1736002.
James F. Stagg, MC, O945335.
Glenn E. Talboy, MC, O1785912.
Ross W. Warren, DC.
Daniel C. Wilkerson, Jr., MC, O945342.
David H. Wilson, MC, O945344.
Norris A. Wimberley, Jr., MC, O945345.
Samuel P. Wise III, MC, O936529.
John B. Zaontz, MC, O945346.
Branko K. Zec, MC, O932777.

REGULAR ARMY AND REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force of the United States in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

REGULAR ARMY

To be first lieutenants

Daniel J. Costello — Leonard Petkoff

To be second lieutenants

Paul L. Applin	Richard O. Palmer
John D. Caldwell	Duane E. Raph
Henry D. Doiron	John E. Reed
Ralph H. Girton	Howard T. Sagehorn
Ernest A. Hinojosa, Jr.	John J. Sarazen
Lee G. Knox	John E. Stringer, Jr.
Jere J. Lewis	Norman E. Sudnick
Dale E. Nielsen	Gus A. Wolman, Jr.
Manuel Olivera-Barroso	

REGULAR AIR FORCE

To be second lieutenants

George L. Ahrens	George C. McCleary
Thomas I. Allison	Jim T. Meredith
Hunter W. Anderson	James F. Moir
Robert E. Anderson	Bill A. Montgomery
Wilson K. Baker, Jr.	Winston E. Moore
James G. Barney	Richard J. Moran
Bertram D. Becker	Alfred W. Mullan, Jr.
Robert W. Bieber	Harry W. Neville
Buford C. Blount	Herman L. Peace
Randolph Blumberg	Edward M. Potter, Jr.
Warren W. Boone	Thomas S. Rea
Marion L. Boswell	Eldon S. Riley
William F. Boyle	Dean R. Rindy
Joseph X. Brennan	Robert Rotstan
Robert E. Brumm	Charles D. Schwalier
Robert B. Burns	Charles F. Schwaner
John M. Chapman	Orville O. Scroggin III
Ben H. Clements, Jr.	Clark B. Smith
John I. Daniel III	Mart G. Smith, Jr.
Walter B. Duff	Hermon P. Son
Frederick C. Eckmann	Paul R. Springer
Walter H. Escue	Alan B. Thomas
James E. Geary	George W. Thompson
Richard L. Haggard	Frank A. Titus
Philip O. Hertsgaard	Bobby J. Tooley
Harry D. Hink	Andrew J. Trammell
Robert P. Horn	George A. Voris
Richard W. Kane	Marvin M. Watkins
Ernest M. Kelly	Donald C. Winner
Joseph F. Kent, Jr.	Edwin N. York
Hugh W. McBride	

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lt. Thomas Alonzo Webb, AO50407, United States Air Force, with rank from June 1, 1948.

First Lt. Elwood Dean Storrs, Jr., AO56563, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 2, 1948.

First Lt. William George Morley, AO50408, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 4, 1948.

First Lt. Ward Ellsworth Protsman, AO27060, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Rean Lochry, AO27064, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Francis Hegenberger, AO27067, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Handford Lindsley Cummings, Jr., AO27081, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hal Lloyd FitzPatrick, AO27097, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Wallace Gourley Hynds, Jr., AO27099, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Arnold Horowitz, AO27105, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Frederick Bond, Jr., AO27109, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Paul Baker, Jr., AO27113, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Estes Farrar, Jr., AO27116, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Gifford Merrill Holden, Jr., AO27120, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Edward Reuler, AO27123, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. David James Crawford, 3d, AO27127, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hugh Campbell Parker, Jr., AO27129, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Arthur Summer, AO27134, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Henry Lee Warren, AO27137, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Standish Stoer, AO27144, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Albert Kellogg Stebbins, 3d, AO27149, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Edward Richards, AO27152, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Arthur James Steele, AO27153, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Maxwell Oscar Johnson, Jr., AO27155, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Byron Franklin Knolle, Jr., AO27166, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Kendall Russell, AO27167, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Russell Marks, AO27173, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Francis Lish, AO27175, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Ross Karr, AO27182, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Arthur Willis Walton, AO27186, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Warren Marshall Briggs, AO27187, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Offa Swann Nichols, Jr., AO27189, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Tuinenburg Preston, AO27192, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Arnold Reints, AO27195, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Roland Daniel Foley, Jr., AO27199, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Frank Freeman Marvin, AO27202, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harry Lee Maynard, AO27205, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Robert Jarrell, Jr., AO27206, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles William Clark, AO27208, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, United States Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Bobby Lee Marlow, AO27208, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Vergil Calvin Givens, AO27214, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frederic William Hartwig, AO27215, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Eugene Duvall, AO27217, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Martin Harvey Brewer, Jr., AO27218, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kelton Merrill Farris, AO27220, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Daniel Doremus Whitcraft, Jr., AO27221, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Will Coffey, Jr., AO27222, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Brierton Townsend, Jr., AO27223, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Derrick Raymond, AO27225, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Harlie Bacon, AO27243, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Roger Lundeen Johnson, AO27246, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Baird MacWherter, AO27250, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Winthrop Draper, AO27262, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Malcolm Nebeker Stewart, Jr., AO27266, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Atkinson Jones, 3d, AO27268, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Alfred Gardner Thompson, AO27269, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jack Graham Crouch, AO27270, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Richard Patrick Conniff, AO27271, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Robert Manlove, AO27274, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George Alexander Williams, Jr., AO27275, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Vernon Monroe Smith, AO27276, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Albert Roland Neville, Jr., AO27278, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ray Scott Basham, AO27280, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert McChesney Smith, AO27281, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William King Moran, Jr., AO27283, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Wauchope Crockett, AO27284, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harold Dow Swain, Jr., AO27286, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Chester Arthur Skelton, Jr., AO27287, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jeptha Hughes Evans, AO27299, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Bernard Moran James, AO27886, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Edward Barnett, AO27305, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), wth rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Franklin Case Davies, AO27306, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Henry Hull Stick, AO27307, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Graham Valpey, AO27311, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Marshall Glenn Coulter, Jr., AO27313, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Anthony Roberts Parrish, AO27314, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Sylvester Attinger, Jr., AO27315, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Earl Milton Thompson, AO27316, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with ranke from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Samuel Holtze, AO27317, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Orlando Holway 3d, AO27322, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Frank Gilbert, AO27325, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ralph Joseph Ford, Jr., AO27326, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. J. F. Allen, Jr., AO27330, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Lewis Gandy, Jr., AO27334, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Samuel Brown Adams, Jr., AO27335, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wendell Jackson Long, AO27337, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Bradley Chickering, AO27338, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert George Lindsay, AO27339, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Shelton Gillespie Spear, AO27340, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Richard Byrd Minor, AO27341, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Richard Golden, AO27351, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harry Randolph Patrick, AO27352, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Broomhall Swartz, AO27353, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Jack Chase Pettee, AO27354, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Jerome Avery, AO27358, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John William Storb, AO27360, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harrison Larkin, AO27366, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kingdon Alva Davidson, AO27368, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Goodman Lake, AO27372, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edgar Marvin Munyon, AO27377, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Billy Neel Hollis, AO27385, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Cecil Leland Rutledge, Jr., AO27386, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Sterling Wood, AO27387, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Paulle Eckert, AO27391, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Blount Craig, AO27392, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edmund Anthony Rafalko, AO27393, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Basil A. Brockles, Jr., AO27887, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Roy Leon Marston, AO27402, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Grant Harrison Fenn, AO27408, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Samuel Kenric Lemey, AO27409, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Duncan Gault, AO27414, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Thomas Bess, Jr., AO27417, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×Second Lt. Harold Howard Buth, AO27418, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Brown Rupert, AO27420, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John William Pauly, AO27424, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Adolphus Giles, AO27425, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Murray Field, AO27428, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clifford Edward Myers, Jr., AO27430, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Paul Clement Whelan, AO27439, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Edgar Walker Nichols, AO27443, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Calvert Lewis Estill, Jr., AO27444, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Wilson Patrick Hurley, AO27449, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John William Campbell, Jr., AO27450, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Henry Lee Cobb, Jr., AO27451, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Ernest James Davis, Jr., AO27455, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Jack Norman Hoffman, AO27459, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jesse Bethea Hearin, Jr., AO27460, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Denton Ledford, AO27465, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Edward McGlynn, AO27470, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Archie Rice Patterson, Jr., AO27472, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jack Harding Romney, AO27482, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jesse Cecil Gatlin, Jr., AO27483, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Russell Eugene Taliaferro, AO27500, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Irvin Daubert, AO27502, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Richard Wale Williver, AO27505, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Ewing Lawrence, AO27506, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Duer Ludlow, AO27510, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Malcolm Fitzpatrick, AO27512, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frederick Clifton Thayer, Jr., AO27513, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Clark Wayne, AO27517, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Walter Turbush Galligan, AO27518, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Lee Treester, AO27526, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Ray Bissell, AO27528, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Spearman Simpson, AO27532, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Francis Deacon, Jr., AO27533, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Allen Perez, AO27534, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Rowland Charles William Blessley, Jr., AO27536, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Ralph Alan Ellis, Jr., AO27537, Air Force of the United States (Second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edwin Harry Bailey, AO27538, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James John Rouch, AO27539, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clair Gene Whitney, AO27541, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harold Ballard Wohlford, AO27543, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Kenneth Lee Jackson, AO27549, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Jones Mason, AO27552, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Edward Pine, AO27557, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Wesley Sherwood, Jr., AO27559, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Charles William Cross, AO27561, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ray Stanley Jones, Jr., AO27572, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harry Richard Middleton, AO27573, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Kenneth Homer Werner, AO27574, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Finley Trimble, AO27586, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Edwin Godwin Kellum, AO27590, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Jacob Knight, AO27591, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Clarence Virgil Slack, Jr., AO27592, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Gale Breene, Jr., AO27596, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Scott Anthony Kuntz, AO27598, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Lewis Babin, AO27599, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Charles Edward Moran, AO27606, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Dirck deRyee Westervelt, AO27615, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Ralph Granik, AO27617, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Augustine Stephen Puchrik, AO27620, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Aloysius Lee, AO27621, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Gordon Mason, AO27625, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Morgan Seeger, Jr., AO27626, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Clarence Leslie Linton, AO27630, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Simpson Barton, AO27631, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Glen Chadwick Childs, AO27632, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Yale Francis Trustin, AO27633, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Roff Horner, AO27637, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Frederick Wadsworth Robinson, AO27638, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James David Morrison Morris, AO27644, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Chauncey Brooks Vandevanter, AO27647, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Rumley Wallace, Jr., AO27650, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Winthrop William Wildman, AO27654, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Branham Dillard 3d, AO27657, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Junior Godwin, AO27658, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Daniel Jack Nelson, AO27659, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Barrett English, AO27660, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Alfred Lewis Bailey, AO27662, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Peter Van Matre, AO27663, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Lorrin Carlton Peterson, AO27665, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Homer Robert Minckler, AO27671, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Thomas Farr, AO27676, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Joseph Rice Byron, AO27686, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Joseph Schibilsky, AO27687, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Ash Callahan, AO27688, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Theodore Mayer Fite, AO27690, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Cole Dempster Bacon, AO27691, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Edward Coulahan, Jr., AO27692, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Nat Dulaney King, AO27694, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Earl Dudley Bruton, Jr., AO27705, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Warren Hurdis, AO27706, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Ralph Francis Croal, Jr., AO27707, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Cannon Hanes, AO27709, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Louis Lyon Martin, AO27710, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ivan Leon Foster, Jr., AO27716, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Claudius daSilva Fingar, AO27717, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Rogers Eugene Miller, AO27718, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Max Findell, AO27720, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jacques George Beezley, AO27730, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Leon Alexander Dombrowski, Jr., AO27731, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles William Pratt, AO27742, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Earl Vane Wilkinson, Jr., AO27754, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Randolph Carrington Heard, AO27755, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Allen Evans, AO27757, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Valen Crowe, AO27758, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Marshall Pulliam, AO27762, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Pagenstecher Liebel, AO27763, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Devol Brett, AO27767, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Chester Val Braun, AO27768, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Price Smith, AO27769, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Benton Catron 4th, AO27770, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Elmer Resides Haslett, AO27890, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Norman Gardiner Sauer, AO27773, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Donald Einer Huseby, AO27776, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Walter Aaron Carter, Jr., AO27778, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Morton Spiegel, AO27780, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harry Grady Walker, Jr., AO27781, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frederick Corbin Blesse, AO27784, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alexander Otto Froede, Jr., AO27788, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Leonard William Lilley, AO27792, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Daniel Crawford Perry, AO27793, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Stewart Sylvester Stabley, Jr., AO27795, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Nathan Brown Chase, AO27799, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Francis McCaddon, AO27801, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Paul Kenneth Bullard AO27804, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George Elden Shaffner, AO27808, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harold Frederick Brenneman, AO27811, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Philip Brown, AO27817, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alfred Dixon Blue, AO27819, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×Second Lt. Harry Drake, AO27824, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wilbur Raymond Pugh, AO27826, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Elias Spragins, AO27827, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Slade Nash, AO27828, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Emmet Rochfort, AO27832, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Thomas O'Neal, AO27835, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Leslie Gerald, Jr., AO27841, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Paul Walker Field, AO27850, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Lyman Screven Willcox, AO27851, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Hanley Curtis, AO27854, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donovan Low McCance, AO27855, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hally Delmar Chesney, Jr., AO27865, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Robert Stickman, Jr., AO27867, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Jacksel Markham Broughton, AO27870, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Daniel Ely Farr, 3d, AO27878, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth Thompson Blood, Jr., AO27881, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Josiah Snow, 2d, AO27882, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Rodney Hugh Newbold, AO50409, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Dias Hippert, AO27884, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 6, 1948.

×First Lt. Jesse Henry Johnson, AO27885, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 7, 1948.

First Lt. Theodore Mark Jablonski, AO4133[illegible], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 9, 1948.

Capt. Anthony Joseph Rose, AO50412, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 10, 1948.

First Lt. Lloyd Gerald Miller, AO56567, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 12, 1948.

×First Lt. Lawrence Eugene Killion, AO56566, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 12, 1948.

Capt. Alvin Mathew Welbes, AO50413, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 13, 1948.

First Lt. Carl Edwin Fales, AO56569, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 13, 1948.

First Lt. George Drexel LeMay, AO38505, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 14, 1948.

First Lt. Herbert Richard Dahl, AO56570, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 16, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Rodney Thomis, AO56573, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 16, 1948.

×Second Lt. Lawrence Thomas Lawler, AO50414, United States Air Force, with rank from June 16, 1948.

Second Lt. Walter Eugene Julin, AO56575, United States Air Force, with rank from June 18, 1948.

First Lt. Harris Ong Poy, AO56576, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 19, 1948.

Second Lt. Alfonso Christopher Toler, AO56577, United States Air Force, with rank from June 21, 1948.

Second Lt. Don William King, AO50416, United States Air Force, with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Lewis Eugene Williams, AO50417, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Alphons Edward Kosciuszko, AO56578, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Ray Eugene Sterling, AO50418, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Francis Nee, AO38481, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Richard Van Sant, AO50420, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 24, 1948.

First Lt. Glendor D. McAdams, AO56986, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 27, 1948.

Second Lt. John Tilla Parish, Jr., AO50421, United States Air Force, with rank from June 27, 1948.

×First Lt. William David Small, Jr., AO38483, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 27, 1948.

Second Lt. William George Metsopoulos, AO56581, United States Air Force, with rank from June 27, 1948.

Second Lt. James Holte Hegg, AO56580, United States Air Force, with rank from June 27, 1948.

Capt. Gail Eugene Jacobson, AO56583, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 28, 1948.

First Lt. Harley LeRoy Grimm, AO56584, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 29, 1948.

First Lt. Delphin Randolph Hasty, AO56585, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 30, 1948.

First Lt. James Joseph Connolly, AO38484, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 30, 1948.

NOTE.—All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 29, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jacob S. Payton, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, we preface the deliberations of this day with ascriptions of praise unto Thee. Still true is Thy ancient promise, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength."

Strengthen our wills until we shall have power to deliver ourselves from all hidden despotisms. May we wait upon Thee, O Lord, until we shall be no longer content to accept the world as it is but as Thou hast said it should be. Make it clear to us through the renewal of our vision that we cannot substitute our own conceptions of righteousness for those of God nor practice error persistently enough to make it truth.

This day may Thy presence go before these Thy servants. May they be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might. This prayer we offer in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 27, 1948, was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and in one to include an editorial from the Minneapolis Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER EXTENDED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time I have for today be extended to 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the other special orders of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I know the House agrees with me that our maritime transportation should be carried in American bottoms.

I am including as part of my remarks an editorial from the Boston Record which is very illuminating. It shows that much of our relief commodities are being sent to foreign lands in foreign ships under foreign flags.

[From Boston Daily Record of July 26, 1948]

FOREIGN SHIPS GIVEN UNFAIR BREAK

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 20, 1948.*

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST,
Los Angeles Examiner:

There seems to be no limit to the ineptitude and folly of those who are managing our national affairs.

Congress is confronted by a problem affecting the American merchant marine which it will be its bounden duty to solve quickly and effectively.

According to advices from Washington, Capt. Granville Conway, personal representative of President Truman in arranging transportation of supplies to Europe under the Marshall plan, has stated that the only way in which American shipping firms can be assured of receiving their statutory minimum of the cargoes under that plan is for foreign transport companies to operate on an honor system.

Where those rapacious shipping interests are to find the honor to operate on, we have not been told.

Under the legislation enacted by Congress in connection with the Marshall plan, at least 50 percent of the recovery goods shipped to foreign lands shall be carried in United States vessels.

The fact that our Nation, the dispenser of billions of dollars of American wealth to other countries in effectuating the Marshall plan, has sufficient shipping of its own to transport all those supplies abroad did not carry with our legislators the weight which statesmanship and patriotism dictated.

On March 31, 1948, 933 ships were under charter by the Maritime Commission to various American companies. On June 30 of this year only 660 were being operated under charter. In other words, during the second quarter of 1948, ship operators returned 273 vessels to the Maritime Commission to be laid up, because of lack of cargoes.

And now Captain Conway, according to information from Washington, wants to submit our merchant fleet's minimum allotment rights under the Marshall plan to the tender mercies of the honor of our foreign shipping competitors.

Captain Conway is a native of Maryland. He first became connected with the American merchant marine in 1916. During the Second World War he rose to considerable prominence therein.

When Admiral Land resigned a few years ago as head of the Maritime Commission, Captain Conway was appointed to succeed him as War Shipping Administrator. On several occasions the captain was called upon to act as the direct representative of President Truman.

Recently the Cosmopolitan outfit took on a little American color when it bought a single American ship.

Some months ago, before the Marshall plan became law, President Truman called in Captain Conway and named him to direct the shipment of Marshall-plan supplies to Europe.

The question was then raised as to why Mr. Truman gave this post to the head of a shipping combine operating foreign vessels almost exclusively, instead of assigning it to a man connected with an American shipping organization.

Later on Captain Conway was made Mr. Truman's personal representative in connection with the shipment to Europe of Marshall-plan goods, in which capacity he has come forward, according to advices from Washington, with his fantastic honor system of guaranteeing to our merchant ships their 50-percent minimum of the Marshall-plan cargoes.

American shipping companies have maintained that the Marshall plan Administrator, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, should set up a bureau of transportation in his organization to be composed of operators of American ships, so that it will be certain that a minimum of 50 percent of the Marshall-plan cargoes shall be transported in American vessels, as the law provides.

Let it always be borne in mind that the law does not limit to 50 percent the participation of American shipping in the Marshall-plan traffic.

That participation can run as high as 100 percent, but the law stipulates that it cannot run under 50 percent. Our foreign competitors, however, are not respecting our 50-percent minimum allotment.

Mr. Hoffman has taken cognizance of our shipping men's efforts on behalf of a bureau of transportation in his organization, to the extent of designating Col. Arthur G. Syran as director of transportation of the Marshall plan.

Colonel Syran is a retired Army officer and evidently a thoroughgoing American, as indicated by his services to General MacArthur in Japan, where he exposed (to the general's amazement) a carefully laid plot of the Japanese to resume their prewar shipping operations in unfair competition with our own merchant marine, and by the firmness with which he has laid down the law to foreign shipping interests as to the observance of the Marshall-plan legislation giving our American merchant fleet a 50-percent minimum of the Marshall-plan cargoes.

His words and attitude clearly show the absurdity of Captain Conway's honor system of dealing with our foreign-shipping competitors, who are determined to reap the maximum profit from our largesse under the Marshall plan, and are equally determined that the American merchant marine shall be denied every dollar under that plan which it is possible for them to grasp.

It will be recalled the British newspapers demanded that all Marshall-plan supplies be carried by British ships. They even wanted us to give Britain American vessels to enable her to monopolize this traffic.

Moreover, we were denounced in British newspapers for even thinking of using American ships in the Marshall-plan traffic, since our doing so would reduce the amount of American cash which British shipping would receive.

And as if to emphasize their contempt for American intelligence, our British friends put forth even more fantastic proposals with regard to our role of long-eared Santa Claus under the Marshall plan.

Naturally, there is a great deal of resentment among American shipping concerns against Captain Conway's honor system for dealing with America's insatiable competitors.

Our legislators in Washington must give this shipping situation the instant consideration it calls for, and take all the steps necessary to protect the interests of the Republic by assuring that the American merchant marine shall not be victimized for the benefit of foreign lands under the Marshall plan.

WILLIAM GRIFFIN,
Editor and Publisher,
New York Enquirer.

THE LATE HON. JAMES E. WATSON

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, James E. Watson or Jim as he was most frequently called has passed beyond and in his passing, Indiana and the Nation has lost one of its most distinguished and honored citizens. He was first elected to fill an unexpired term after being nominated as a compromise candidate, in a nominating convention. Upon coming to the House of Representatives, from the District it is my honor to serve, he was selected by the Speaker at that time, Joe Cannon, as a promising young party member. He lived with Joe Cannon and received from him all the benefit of his storehouse of information and administrative ability. Jim was an apt student and his popularity within his district later sent him to the United States Senate. Here he served three terms from 1915 to 1933 and was majority leader of that body when he retired.

His service and influence within this period were widespread as he was truly a National figure. The problems of our Nation during World War I and the postwar period presented a challenge to our Congress which he ably assisted in meeting. When the history of this period is written, the name of Jim Watson will loom large as an outstanding American, who contributed much to our rise as a Nation.

As a citizen, and I did have that privilege of knowing him intimately as a fellow citizen, his affable personality and almost unbelievable capacity of remembering names made him one of the most loved citizens in Indiana. He was held in esteem and affection by all who knew him and his popularity transcended all party lines. He had, however, served his party with unfailing loyalty and had not missed a National Convention of the Republican Party in 60 years. The entire State of Indiana will mourn his passing and extend its heartfelt sympathy to his widow and children.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and profound regret that I learn of the death of James E. Watson, a former Member of this body and of the Senate.

The passing of Senator Watson recalls many memories to those of us who knew him and loved him through the years. To know Jim Watson, as he was affectionately called by his many, many friends, was to know a statesman.

Like other legislators who served their country for many years, whom we can recall in a few moments, Senator Watson contributed very much to the building of our United States.

In Indiana, where Senator Watson was born November 2, 1863, his name was and long will remain a household word. In the Nation he was and is known far and wide.

This is a day of mourning for Jim Watson among his beloved Hoosiers. It seems superfluous to cite instances in which he left his contribution to the progress of Indiana and to the Nation, so active was he in working for the welfare of his fellow Americans.

As a young lawyer from Rushville, Ind., Jim Watson came to Washington as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Fifty-fourth Congress, from 1895 to 1897. He served in this body continuously from 1899 to 1909. In 1916, before the First World War, he became a United States Senator and served continuously in that body until 1933, rising to the high and responsible position of Republican floor leader.

Thus, for 17 years he was a lawmaker, servant of the people and counselor to his colleagues and Presidents as a Senator, preceded by 12 years of like service in the House of Representatives—altogether 29 years.

So long, for so many years, was Senator Watson identified with Government and the Republican Party, that well it can be said he was born to Government and service of the people. Republican National Conventions through the years from 1912 saw him as a delegate from Indiana. He was chairman of the committee on resolutions in the 1920 convention, and back in 1912 floor leader for the supporters of William Howard Taft.

With the passing of Senator Watson, Indiana had lost a favorite son and America a great man. His contributions for good government are imperishable. They are an inspiration for us who carry on and for generations without number.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am shocked and grieved to learn of the death of my friend Senator James E. Watson. I join my colleagues in paying final tribute to an eminent son of Indiana, a great American, an illustrious public servant, who gave so generously of his extraordinary talents and energy through the many years he was a member of the United States Congress.

Jim Watson served the people of Indiana and the Nation in the National Congress for more than 40 years. His party loyalty and unusual ability were recognized by his colleagues by his elevation to majority leader, first in the House, and later in the Senate. His rugged Americanism inspired the members of his party and won the everlasting admiration of people everywhere. He was a statesman of the old school and his unselfish service helped build this country into the great Nation that it is today.

Volumes could be written extolling Jim Watson, for his talents were as unusual as his amazing physical energy and stamina. But above everything else, I shall fondly remember him for his generosity, his sincere and unfailing friendliness, his ready willingness to help and to serve.

Jim was equally at home with Presidents and with the common people of Indiana, whom he served so faithfully and well. People of all walks of life loved him, because he honestly loved his fellowmen and demonstrated it day by day. I believe Jim Watson could have said, as Will Rogers did, that he never met a person he did not like.

Jim Watson lived a longer and more fruitful life than most of us are given to enjoy. We who knew him intimately realize that his final years were fraught with failing health and the infirmities of advanced age. We know that only courage and a fighting heart sustained him in the closing years.

Even so, his passing seems untimely, and leaves me with a deep sense of personal loss. Indiana, the Nation as a whole, and the thousands of individuals whose lives he touched are the richer for his contributions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We on the Democratic side join with the Indiana delegation and our colleagues on the Republican side in expressing our deep regret at the passing of former United States Senator James Watson. It was my pleasure to know Jim Watson personally. He was a great and powerful figure for many years in the Congress of the United States. He wielded a powerful influence of a constructive nature.

I thoroughly agree with everything that has been said by the previous speakers about his unusual contributions. From our side we can also pay tribute to

him as a loyal party man. The two-party system in America under our constitutional form of government is, from a practical operation, for the best interests of such constitutional government or democratic government because it places responsibility upon whichever party the people, in their wisdom, desire to have control of our government, whether Federal or State. No matter what party we belong to we must respect the other major party from that deep, fundamental angle, as well as all members who are strong and loyal members of their party.

Jim Watson always commanded my attention and respect because of his loyalty to his party. He commanded my attention and respect as a great legislator. He commanded my attention and respect also as a great American. I had the pleasure of enjoying his friendship, which feelings I completely reciprocated. I am very sorry, I repeat, to hear of his passing and join, particularly with the Indiana delegation, in expressing keen regret.

I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement to the loved ones he leaves behind.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Someone has described the friendships that grow up between Members of the different parties here as the flowers that overhang the walls of party politics.

In all my service here I never knew a man with whom I enjoyed a more profound and unreserved friendship than I did with Senator Jim Watson, of Indiana. I remember when we were going through the same fiasco that is now taking place at the other end of the Capitol in 1922, when similar attacks were being made on the white people of the South, and the disgust expressed by him at that fiasco.

After he went out of the Senate our friendship continued, and even the last day he was in the House just before the recent adjournment we had a good, long, friendly talk.

I want to join in paying my tribute to Jim Watson, not as a party man, because he made you forget party. I do not remember that he and I ever discussed party politics. But I want to pay my tribute to him as a real American. I wish we had more such real Americans, with his determination, his stamina, his integrity, his love and devotion to America, in key positions all over this country today.

I am glad to pay my humble tribute and come, as it were, to lay a wild flower upon his bier.

His life was gentle and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world, "This was a man."

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I find myself called upon to speak in memory of a friend I have known and loved beyond most men of my acquaintance. Today on the floor of the House I learned of the death of my good friend, Senator James Eli Watson, of Indiana, who served in the House and Senate for more than a third of a century. I am deeply saddened. We pause here today to pay tribute to a grand and noble character and to pay a just and loving tribute to the memory of a distinguished Hoosier and a great American.

Jim Watson was a constant inspiration to me at our political gatherings and conventions. A towering symbol of unswerving principle and justice and kindness, fostered in a Hoosierland where people love such virtues. Brilliant in debate, fearless in a fight for a cause he thought was right, his loyal friendship and unselfish interest was a never failing source of strength and comfort over the years of our acquaintance.

In a wider less personal sense, Senator Watson's life was rich in contributions to the welfare of his fellowmen, was loved and honored by people all over the world. No man in our party or in our time has been more devoted to the cause of freedom and justice and the molding of our great country. His accomplishments will be an eternal shrine to his memory. I shall always remember Senator James Eli Watson as the embodiment of those stalwart characteristics that have gone into the building of a great nation.

Homeward, serenely he walked
With God's benediction upon him.

To his faithful and devoted wife, may the precious memories you cherish of your life together sustain and comfort you and your family now and in the days to come.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of James E. Watson, Indiana has lost a great son, the Nation has lost a great statesman, the Republican Party has lost a great leader, and I have lost a great friend.

My first acquaintanceship and friendship with Jim Watson began in 1912, when I had the distinct honor and pleasure of serving as his page in the Republican National Convention of that year, when he was the floor leader of the President William Howard Taft forces. That friendship has lasted throughout the years.

I have been thrilled by Jim Watson's great statesmanship, not only in this House but in the Senate of the United States, and then, finally, as an elder statesman who gave sound advice and valuable help to his party and his Nation. In his death, America has lost a gentleman of the old school, a political leader who believed in party responsibility, and, in turn, personal responsibility to his country. America is the better for Jim Watson's having lived.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I never served in the House of Representatives with the Honorable Jim Watson; he left here before I arrived in Washington. I met him however on numerous occasions. He was friendly, kind, and gave me good sound advice as a new Member of Congress; for this I shall always be grateful to him. Jim Watson was a great American. Jim Watson was a good legislator. He was interested in good sound government as our forefathers carried on under our Constitution. A personal word of commendation he was near and dear to all members of his college fraternity, and I refer to the Phi Kappa Psi; he regularly attended their alumni association meetings here in the District of Columbia, and our fraternity will greatly miss him for there we respected him and we honored him as we felt he was a great honor to us as a member of the Phi Kappa Psi fraternity. He was also blessed by sons who were Phi Psis. Our country will miss him and our country needs more men like Jim Watson.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and I ask that they appear in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SMITH of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 8 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include the remarks of Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING when he placed a wreath on the grave of Miss Susan B. Anthony, as the representative of the seven women in the Congress, and further to include two articles from the Rochester Times-Union describing the ceremonies.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include an article by him appearing in Planes, an official publication of the Aircraft Industries Association of America.

Mr. MCCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the American Legion at Manchester.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of disability re-

tirements of officers in the armed services.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on flood control and include a newspaper article.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Wednesday evening, July 28, at 10:45 p. m.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE STEEL SCRAP SITUATION

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months, I have frequently brought to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, and to the public, the extreme importance of replenishing our national reservoir of steel scrap. We recognize the necessity of stock piling of strategic and vital materials essential to our national security. One of the most strategic materials is steel scrap, since our production of steel is virtually dependent upon this ingredient.

Our present supply of scrap is at an all-time low because during World War II we shipped overseas 123,000,000 tons of steel and steel products. If we can recapture in steel scrap even a small fractional part of such tonnage, our steel production could be increased immediately by three to four million tons annually. It is toward this end that my committee has been working, since increased production is the only real answer to inflation.

It is estimated that approximately 10,000,000 tons of excess steel scrap is located in the bizonal area of Germany. I have been informed that General Clay has authorized the sale of 1,200,000 tons of this material, 440,000 tons of which has been earmarked for United States buyers. While this is a step in the right direction, I feel that additional allocations to this country should be set up without delay to assure us as speedily as possible a minimum of 2,000,000 tons. I also urge that all scrap obtained from Germany by any country be charged against that country's total allotment. I say this because I understand that contrary to the policy of the United States other countries have taken hundreds of thousands of tons of scrap out of Germany under the guise of booty or captured enemy material.

Some sound decision should also be reached in Germany so that the nations participating in the ECA program are not permitted to use money furnished by the United States to outbid American purchasers for scrap.

The Federal agencies charged with protecting our interests in this matter have apparently coordinated their activities under the Secretary of Commerce who is intensely aware of our scrap needs. Therefore, with the cooperation of General Clay, a satisfactory scrap-recovery program should be set up without further delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

GOOSEBERRY PROJECT, UTAH

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Secretary of the Interior on Gooseberry project, Utah, dated June 23, 1948—Executive Communication No. 1700—referred to the Committee on Public Works, July 26, 1948, be re-referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and the Committee on Public Works be discharged from further responsibility thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a column by George Sokolsky from the Harrisburg Evening News.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MUHLENBERG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

MEAT RATIONING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today renewing the proposal made by Senator FLANDERS and myself last January to ration meat. The impending shortages of meat are even greater than were anticipated earlier this year. The facts indicate that against a normal demand, based on present consumer income levels, estimated at 160 pounds a year, the supply will be about 145 pounds in 1948. We may be looking forward to $2 per pound for meat, instead of the present $1 per pound.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, I cannot yield, as my time is too short.

Mr. SHAFER. Does the gentleman know that the Army is now stock piling meat?

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, I cannot yield further now.

Mr. Speaker, two points of difference between the previous bill and this bill is that, first, this bill gives the President stand-by powers, not only for rationing, but for the allocation of meat at all levels of supply with the idea of distributing meat around the country fairly.

Secondly, this bill gives the power of rationing at wholesale levels and locally so that all income levels may have equal advantage of such supply of meat as is available, and so that the available meat may not be confined just to those with large incomes who can buy at these high prices.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman include hog meat?

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, I cannot yield to the gentleman at this time.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman include hog meat?

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, I cannot yield to the gentleman at this time.

Mr. Speaker, meat represents about 25 percent of the family's normal food budget. Food prices have gone up 60 percent to 100 percent depending on the item, since the war ended. If we really want to strike at inflationary food prices with respect to the high cost of living, we must strike at meat as the key sector of the whole problem.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] must have a very short memory about the rationing and price controlling of meat. The gentleman must know that rationing must go along with price control. The gentleman should remember that the Bureau of Labor Statistics in May 1946 issued a report that 85 percent of the meat markets, retail stores, had no veal; 80 percent had no pork or beef, and that after meat rationing and price control had been in effect for many months.

The meat cutters union of Chicago issued a report that Government rationing drove meat out of the market; that it made a meat bootleg industry. It is ridiculous to talk about rationing and price control of meat. It does not produce one more pound of meat.

I hope this silly argument about rationing and price control of meat will not continue, because it just does not produce meat. It makes for shortages.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. The record also shows that the per capita consumption of meat in America today is not only greater than it was before the war, but also greater than at any time in our history due to controls having been removed. And this

regardless of the exorbitant price of meat.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want a return of the OPA.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address given by the distinguished Speaker of the House at the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

REQUEST FOR FACTS ON RUSSIA AND GERMANY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include the text of a resolution at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today the question of deepest concern to the American people is the deterioration of our relations with Russia and the prospect of war over the situation in Berlin. The President has called Congress into extraordinary session but his message on the state of the Union said nothing on this subject.

Believing that a factual statement on the situation will help the people of the United States to understand the issues involved and contribute to their solution, I am today introducing the following resolution of inquiry:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable moment full information in response to the following questions:

1. What is the historical and legal basis for the United States to administer a sector of Berlin and to maintain ground communications therewith?

2. What is the substance of the argument of the Russians that we do not have such rights? Is it that we never had such rights, or that we have exceeded such rights, or that we have forfeited them? If either of the latter, in what respects do they allege that we have exceeded or forfeited them?

3. What is the historical and legal basis for Russia to maintain troops in, and to administer the affairs of that portion of Germany west of the Elbe River which was taken and occupied by troops of the United States, France or England prior to VE-day? What is the approximate area, and the approximate population of such territory?

4. What percentage of the industrial potential of prewar Germany is represented by: (a) East Prussia and that portion of eastern prewar Germany now under Polish administration, (b) the Russian zone in occupied Germany, and (c) the dismantling of plants in the three western zones (British, French, and United States) which have been allocated to Soviet Russia?

5. What is the status of the so-called Ruhr area with respect to the agreements of the four powers (United States, United Kingdom, France, and the U. S. S. R.) as to its administration by one or more of them?

6. What efforts have been made to clarify the status of that portion of prewar Germany now under Polish administration?

7. Do any covenants by the four powers (above cited) with respect to the occupation of Germany require further implementing agreements to make them effective? If so, what are they?

8. Have any actions taken by any one of the four powers been charged by any of the other powers (a) to be in violation of specific agreements entered into with respect to the occupation of Germany, or (b) to be beyond the scope of such agreements? If so, in what respects?

9. What efforts have been made to negotiate agreements for the economic and political unification of the four zones of occupied Germany? What obstacles or disagreements have prevented such an accomplishment and what have been the positions of the several powers thereon?

10. Would the trusteeship provisions of the United Nations Charter be applicable to Germany? Are there any agreements between the occupying powers which would bar such a course?

11. Is the present problem of administration in and supply for the sectors of Berlin one which may be brought before the United Nations or any of its constituent parts? If so, how?

12. What is the cost of administration and relief in Berlin to the United States, sector by sector, and what portion of the cost is due to the current supply by air? Out of what appropriations are these costs paid? Are other expenditures thereby reduced? What is the effect of such shift in costs?

INDUCTION OF MEN INTO THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, whatever may be the division in thought in this House on some of the important questions of the day, I think each and every Member of this House is of a single mind on one issue; that is, the welfare of the young men who are going to be called into the draft on August 30.

The time has arrived for us to express the hope, and to see that it is carried out, that we have the best trained, the best cared for, and the best equipped men to make up the finest armed force that the world has ever seen.

Three years ago, when the armies came back from World War II and disbanded, we immediately reverted to the ways of peace, and dropped many of our military and strategic positions. In my opinion, we let down our guard too abruptly and too often. The time has come to build up that strength again, to see that this great defensive force, which the Congress has approved and which the country so desires, is made indefatigable and invulnerable. We can do so by taking an interest in the young men, in the youth of America, who are to leave in the draft on August 30, and who are volunteering as recruits all over the country today, to make up this splendid patriotic force in the defense of our beloved country.

We voted to draft these boys and it is our duty to treat them fairly. I regret I have not heard as much concern expressed for their well-being as I did in 1940 when we passed the Selective Service Act.

What I would like to see is a committee appointed or a subcommittee designated to scrutinize the general military set-up when the training program really gets going.

That group would report back to Congress on the progress our trainees are making. It would examine how conditions are in the camps, and determine if our young men are receiving the moral guidance and spiritual uplifting they deserve along with their physical needs.

Yes, this Congress is the one responsible for the general welfare of the new American defensive force, and we should lose no time in adopting a vigilant attitude to assure its success.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

DISPLACED-PERSONS LEGISLATION

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, President Truman in accepting the Presidential nomination at the Democratic National Convention, referred to the displaced-persons legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress as anti-Catholic.

Mr. President, you have been misinformed.

I talked with the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward E. Swanstrom, of New York City, chairman of the National Catholic Resettlement Council, and as a result of our conversation he wrote me a letter, which I now hold in my hand, and from which I quote for the record:

WAR RELIEF SERVICES,
NATIONAL CATHOLIC
WELFARE CONFERENCE,
New York, N. Y., July 27, 1948.

Hon. FRANK FELLOWS,
Old House Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR MR. FELLOWS: Pursuant to our telephone conversation of this afternoon, may I tell you again that no Catholic authority in the United States, to my knowledge, has made a public statement that the so-called Fellows-Wiley displaced persons bill, which has become Public Law No. 774, is discriminatory as far as Catholics are concerned.

On the other hand, at the most recent meeting of the National Catholic Resettlement Council in Buffalo, I made a public statement to the press that we did not consider it discriminatory. More than 90 percent of the Lithuanians, about 40 percent of the Latvians and a very minor percent of the Estonians are Catholics. A very large percent of the Poles from east of the Curzon line are Catholics. These are the two groups—the Balts and the Poles—to whom your bill of necessity gave priority. If an opportunity is given to make this bill operative, a very fair proportion of Catholics will have an opportunity to resettle in the United States.

Of course, all of us would have preferred to see a date of April 21, 1947, before which the displaced persons would have had to be in the camps to be eligible, included in the bill rather than the present eligible date of December 22, 1945. The later date would have been fairer to all groups and elements within the camps.

For your information, I am enclosing a few press clippings on the statement that I made at our Buffalo meeting.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,
(Rt. Rev. Msgr.) EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Executive Director.

Enclosed in this letter from Monsignor Swanstrom were several newspaper clippings. I hold them in my hand.

No. 1 has this heading: "Charges that new DP law is Anti-Catholic denied" is from the Boston Pilot of July 24, 1948.

No. 2 has this heading: "Monsignor Swanstrom denies discrimination in DP law." This clipping is from the Denver Register of July 24, 1948.

No. 3 has this heading: "DP law called fair by Catholic group." It is from the New York Times for July 15, 1948.

The charge made by the President has no foundation in fact. He needs a new adviser on DP legislation, and I suggest that great care should be used that the successor be an honest man.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter dated July 9, 1948, from Robert P. Scott, secretary-treasurer, and copies of the resolutions passed by the Michigan Federation of Labor at its recent convention.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter dated July 1, 1948, from Barney Hopkins, secretary-treasurer, and copies of resolutions adopted by the tenth annual convention of the Michigan State CIO Council held in Grand Rapids, Mich., on June 21, 22, 23, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON asked and was given permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by herself at the recent Democratic convention.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next following the other special orders of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE DISPLACED PERSONS BILL

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in taking the floor at this time I wish to corroborate the statement made by the gentleman from Maine, chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration. Many misstatements have been made about the displaced persons bill. I happen to know that bill from A to Z. The act does not discriminate against any religious group; and I am making this statement, mindful that it is contrary to all the newspaper reports.

At the time the House bill was discussed on the floor I stated that the original Senate bill was and is a lot better than the House bill, as there were no religious groups mentioned in it.

My only objection to the act is that the House conferees forced upon the Senate the acceptance of the House version of mortgaging all future quotas. In other words, closing the doors to future migrants from the particular countries for years to come.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE, THE MARSHALL PLAN, AND HIGH PRICES

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the United States News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the purely political antics of President Truman in calling Congress back into session to consider his weak program to fight inflation, it is well for us to consider some of the basic causes of the high prices we suffer. If the people will consider these basic causes, they will see that Harry S. Truman and his predecessor in the White House have caused most of the inflation.

Take the price of food. If a man has to buy groceries for his own family and for the family next door, of course his food bill goes up. A lot of Americans do not know it, but they are paying the grocery bill of housewives overseas, as well as their own, through the policies followed by Roosevelt and Truman.

The American housewife, sorely beset with high prices, should realize that the housewives of Great Britain are paying only half as much for the necessities of life, due to the American subsidies poured out by Truman and Roosevelt.

I predicted years ago and as recently as 3 months ago that if we went along to any extent with the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan, prices would go up here. Now we can see the inevitable results of such a huge unconscionable waste of American money and resources.

Just take a look at how Great Britain is using Marshall plan funds and other funds borrowed or begged from America. The British Labor Government is using American money and materials in order to subsidize the groceries of the average British housewife. In other words, we Americans are not just paying our own grocery bill, high as it is, but we are paying, through taxes, the grocery bills of millions of housewives in Britain and likely in France, Italy, and elsewhere in the world.

The United States News and World Report, in its issue of July 30, has an authoritative report on the prices of food items in Great Britain. The statement is made that "food prices in Britain are only about half as high as in the United States."

In this article we learn that bread is 4 cents a pound in Britain, 14 cents a pound in the United States. Rib roast is 40 cents a pound in England and 77 cents a pound here. Butter is 30 cents a pound there and 91 cents a pound here.

This article proves, in a graphic way, what a cheap political stunt it was for Harry Truman to call Congress back into special session in a vain attempt to saddle Congress with the blame for higher prices. He knew and he knows that policies followed by him and his predecessor have run the cost of living up at home, while making them heroes abroad, temporarily. Incidentally, the special session, called for political reasons, added a couple of million dollars to the already high cost of government.

The American housewife can blame Harry S. Truman when she considers the high prices here. He it was who originated the so-called Truman doctrine. He it was who O. K.'d and pressured through Congress the so-called Marshall plan. The Truman administration has given away or lent some $22,000,000,000 since VJ-day. No wonder prices are low in England and high here.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the entire article from the July 30, 1948, issue of the United States News and World Report.

WHY FOOD IS CHEAPER IN BRITAIN

(Reported from London)

Food prices in Britain are only about half as high as in the United States.

British housewives pay 30 cents a pound for butter, 40 cents for rib roast, 48 cents for bacon, 4 cents for bread.

Big subsidies, United States help, and special deals with foreign suppliers are the secret of Britain's low prices.

At a time when food prices in the United States are reaching for the sky, it is startling to realize what the British, by comparison, are paying for their food.

The accompanying chart shows some of the price contrasts, but it does not show the reasons behind these contrasts. Gifts, subsidies, and special deals with suppliers help to explain.

Bread, for example, is bought by the British housewife at the equivalent of 4 cents a pound. The average American housewife pays about 14 cents for a pound loaf. Bread sells in Britain for less than a third of the United States price partly because the British Government is paying half the cost. It is able to do this by taxing the well-to-do to provide cheap bread for the masses of the people. It gets most of the grain from Canada under contract at $2 a bushel, with the United States helping to pay the bill. Bread has just been taken off the ration list.

Meat, a good grade of beef rib roast, costs the British housewife 40 cents a pound. That is about half the United States price. The British Government, by subsidy, pays about 16 cents of the cost of a pound of rib roast. The meat ration is 20 cents' worth each week. That means half a pound of rib roast or a pound of cheap grades of beef.

Britain is getting most of her beef from Argentina, at a price below United States costs. In payment, Britain uses sterling received in the sale of British-owned railways in Argentina.

Bacon, rationed at 2 ounces a week, sells in Britain at 48 cents a pound, as compared with more than 75 cents in the United States. A subsidy of about 18 cents helps to keep the price down and the first cost is low.

Canada is selling bacon to Britain at 36 cents. The United States gives Britain dollars with which to pay the bill. The United States taxpayer, thus, indirectly helps to make cheap bacon available to the British people.

Butter sells in Britain for 30 cents a pound, compared with around 90 cents in United States. The subsidy is about 20 cents. Bulk of the butter comes from Denmark and the Dominions and is paid for with sterling. The butter ration is 3 ounces a week.

Oleomargarine sells at 15 cents a pound and is subsidized at about 5 cents. Most of the fats used in making it are bought with sterling from Dominion and Empire sources. The ration is the same as that of butter. Thus, the British resident gets a total of 6 ounces of butter and substitutes weekly.

Potatoes, most of which are grown locally or bought abroad with sterling, were selling in the spring at about 3¼ cents a pound, but the price is falling. The subsidy is a little over half a cent a pound. In the United States potatoes are selling at about 6½ cents. Potatoes have been unrationed in Britain since last spring.

Eggs are bringing 60 cents a dozen in Britain, with a subsidy of about 20 cents. British prices are a little under United States prices. The ration is one egg a week for an adult. More for a child.

Milk of the best quality sells generally for around 20 cents a quart, about the same as the United States average. The subsidy is about 3 cents. Britain's milk is produced locally or bought with sterling in nearby countries. The supply for most adults is restricted, but the Government provides free milk for three-fourths of the children in elementary schools, and makes a pint available daily for about 3 cents to each child under 5 years of age and to every expectant mother.

On other essential foods the story is similar. Cheese, for example, sells for 18 or 20 cents a pound, tea for 68 cents. On these and other items, the Government is maintaining low prices by means of subsidies, United States gifts, and favorable purchase contracts. The average Briton gets about 17 percent less food than the average American, but the prices he pays are a lot lower.

The subsidies that keep down prices amount to around $1,500,000,000 a year, or about a seventh of the national budget. The Government, however, considers the money well spent. And United States gifts of about $1,000,000,000 a year to finance British buying abroad are a big help.

Food price spread

		United States	Britain
		Cents	*Cents*
Bread	pound	14	4
Rib roast	do	77	40
Milk	quart	20	20
Eggs	dozen	67	60
Butter	pound	91	30
Margarine	do	44	15
Bacon	do	76	48
Sugar	do	9	8

FEDERAL MINE INSPECTION

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 27, 13 miners lost their lives and 3 were injured in an explosion at King's mine, Princeton, Ind. There were 176 men in the mine at the time, but other crews were not endangered. It was the second serious explosion in 8 months at King's. The previous blast, last November, caused no deaths, but was followed by extensive fires, which closed the mine for more than 2 months.

Last year 111 coal miners were killed in an explosion at Centralia, Ill. Let me give you some of the statistics of death and injury in the coal-mining industry. In 1942 there were 1,471 fatal accidents and 69,564 nonfatal. In 1943 there were 1,451 fatal accidents and 66,594 nonfatal. In 1944 there were 1,294 fatal accidents and 65,900 nonfatal. In 1945 there were 1,079 fatal accidents and 59,350 nonfatal.

During the 5 years, 1942 to 1946, inclusive, there were total accidents of 322,637, of which 6,229 were fatal, leaving thousands of widows and dependent children. This record clearly demonstrates that every man who goes to work in a coal mine will be, statistically, killed or injured every 6 years.

Despite this terrible record, we cannot get mining laws enforced in some States, and we have been unable to get a Federal mine-inspection law passed in Congress with teeth in it.

I contend we face a national emergency. At this special session of Congress it is our duty to take up legislation which will prevent these explosions. I hope the Members of Congress will get an opportunity to vote on H. R. 3702, which I introduced in 1947. This bill will give Federal mine inspectors the power to close down unsafe mines for 30 days or until the mine is made safe by management, whichever may be the shorter period. After management has been notified by an inspector it will have 10 days to make the mine safe before orders are given to close the mine.

SAVE THE SCHOOLS

Mr. Speaker, we have in our country approximately 10,000,000 people who are practically illiterate, and nearly 5,000,000 of our school-age children are not attending any school. This is the direct result of our failure to provide sufficient opportunity to attend school. Our school problem has reached a crisis due to the tremendously increased birth rate of 13,000,000 babies born in the past 5 years. By 1951 there will be 6,000,000 more children under 5 years of age than there were in 1940. This increased number of children entering school each year constitutes an ever-increasing strain on school facilities.

The national public elementary and secondary educational plant needs will total about $6,600,000,000. The additional school enrollment will increase the number of school rooms to 240,000 which will cost $3,600,000,000. This will require at least 240,000 more school teachers. Old buildings will have to be replaced or repaired.

The costs of such a school building program cannot be met from current taxation without imposing too great a load. In order to expand and improve education plants, I am today introducing a bill which will give Federal aid to start this building program. This bill authorizes the appropriation of $248,000,000 to assist the States to construct, remodel, or repair public elementary and secondary schools.

There shall be allocated to each State under this title, first, $2,000,000 to each State and the District of Columbia, $98,000,000; second, $128,000,000 to be divided among the several States and the District of Columbia according to the number of persons 5 to 17 years of age; third, $22,000,000, an equalization fund which will go to States to produce $45 per person 5 to 17 years of age.

To be eligible for the benefits of this act, a State must give notice prior to January 1, 1950, of its intention to make application for such benefits. If no notice is given in the time specified the sums allocated to such State shall be available for proportionately increasing grants to other States.

Mr. Speaker I contend this is emergency legislation and should be brought up in this special session of Congress. This legislation is free from Federal control and will aid materially to strengthen at a most strategic time one of our first lines of defense—education.

A nation cannot be strong enough to lead the way in peace and democracy if it disregards the educational needs of its people.

Number of children 6 years of age as estimated by Bureau of Census

1940	2,054,000
1947	2,483,000
1948	2,672,000
1949	3,063,000
1950	2,875,000
1951	2,819,000
1952	2,757,000
1953	3,834,000
1954	3,501,000
1955	3,235,000

There were 429,000 more children 6 years of age in 1947 than there were in 1940.

This year, 1948, there are 628,000 more children eligible to enter school than there were in 1940.

Next year, 1949, there will be 1,000,000 more children of the age to enter school than there were in 1940 and 391,000 more than last year.

Number of children under 5 years of age as estimated by Census Bureau

1940	12,684,000
1947	17,275,000
1948	18,105,000
1949	18,278,000
1950	18,435,000
1951	18,466,000
1952	18,405,000
1953	17,103,000
1954	16,007,000
1955	15,076,000

There are now, in 1948, 5,421,000 more children under 5 years of age than there were in 1940. There will be an increase of 170,000 next year over this year.

This increase continues up to 1951 when it reaches a peak of almost 6,000,000 more children under 5 years of age than there were in 1940.

This increased number of children entering school each year constitutes an ever-increasing strain on school facilities.

Number of children of school age as estimated by Bureau of Census

Year	Number of children ages 6 through 10	Number of children ages 11 through 15	Number of children ages 6 through 15
1940	10,850,000	14,349,000	25,199,000
1947	11,628,000	12,841,000	24,469,000
1948	12,696,000	12,804,000	24,900,000
1949	12,868,000	12,800,000	25,668,000
1950	13,407,000	13,170,000	26,577,000
1951	13,891,000	13,429,000	27,320,000
1952	14,164,000	13,765,000	27,929,000
1953	15,226,000	14,227,000	29,453,000
1954	15,759,000	15,096,000	30,855,000
1955	16,113,000	15,674,000	31,787,000

In 1940 there were 10,850,000 children from 6 through 10 years old.

In 1948 this number had grown to over 12,600,000, an increase of 1,246,000.

By 1950 it will be 2,400,000 more than in 1940 and 1,300,000 more than 1948.

By 1955 there will be 16,113,000 in this age group, or 5,500,000 more than in 1940 and 4,000,000 more than at present.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING AND ITS CAUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we are assembled here at the call of the President, made at a Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia on July 15, 1948, in the heat of Democratic differences soon after the Democratic delegates of Mississippi and Alabama walked out of the convention because of the President's civil-rights program. This happened at 2 o'clock in the morning, when most of our people were sound asleep. The President said he would call us back in that early morning fracas of Democrats, but you and I only received our notice from over the radio and the newspapers. No Member of Congress received any official notice, yet we are here to learn what it is all about.

The high cost of living—we all know it is too high. Just ask your wife, who does the marketing, if you do not think so. Everything is too high. And the first direct cause is the cost of government. It is the highest on peacetime record, and going higher, higher, and higher. Who is responsible? No one more so than President Truman. No President asks for more money for government than President Truman. Who is responsible for that? President Truman and his predecessor. The greatest squandering administration ever known. A shame and disgrace to American frugality. A travesty to sound thinking. A burden to all our people. The President's budget last year of $39,600,000,000 was a disgrace: only a squanderer would submit it. Why do we have high prices and high cost of living? The greatest reason is high cost of government. Who is most responsible? President Truman and his predecessor. High government cost means high taxes. High taxes means less net earnings, less to spend, and higher prices. Keep up this high cost of government and we will go bankrupt; go bankrupt through inflation. The higher the cost of government the higher the cost of everything. The Treasury statement of July 26 says our national debt is $253,341,947,621.08.

Our greatest enemy is inflation, and the President is the greatest offender. Why? For his own personal pride, to gain votes, and to sit in the White House. Why do I say that? My reason is just this, read his message to Congress that he delivered on Tuesday, July 27, at 12:30 p. m. See what bait he throws out to the voters. Now read and think what the estimated cost is to the people of America:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM URGED BY PRESIDENT IN MESSAGE

President Truman yesterday asked Congress to pass legislation that would:

1. Control inflation	$100,000,000
2. Provide low-cost housing	5,000,000,000
3. Give Federal assistance to education	750,000,000
4. Increase social security benefits	200,000,000
5. Amend the Displaced Persons Act	5,000,000
6. Furnish funds to build permanent United Nations headquarters	65,000,000
7. Approve the international wheat agreement	250,000
8. Appropriate for a TVA steam plant	84,000,000
9. Raise Federal pay	15,000,000
10. Carry out the civil-rights program	50,000,000
11. Increase minimum-wage levels	5,000,000

He urged action on other measures if the Congress finds time. This secondary list includes:

1. A health program	$300,000,000
2. An amended Labor-Management Act	1,000,000
3. A long-range farm program	250,000,000
4. Stronger reciprocal trade agreements	5,000,000
5. A universal training program	$2,000,000,000
6. A National Science Foundation	30,000,000
7. The St. Lawrence waterway treaty	700,000,000
Total	9,680,250,000

Just think, he wants a program that will cost the country over $9,000,000,000 additional to what he is spending now. Is it not just ridiculous? To me it is suicide for our form of government. It is inflation of the worst sort. It spells higher prices. Higher, higher, higher the prices of everything. Higher taxes. Bust, bust, bankruptcy, ruination.

Our American people must realize, and do it soon, that they cannot look to the Federal Government for everything they want. They must send Congressmen here to Washington to help work this problem out, or we all loose when the Government goes broke. We must cut down cost of government, not increase it. You must elect a President this fall who will economize in government or we go broke, and lose all the fine things in life that the American people have and do enjoy—liberty, freedom, and independence. We must stop assuming the guardianship of all nations of the world. Let the United Nations Organization do that. I say to America, look after our own people before it is too late. This is sound advice, if I can give it to you, and it is imperative that you heed it.

THE USE OF FOREIGN SHIPS FOR THE SENDING OF RELIEF COMMODITIES TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 26, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] stated that it had been brought to her attention "that the administration is using foreign ships to send relief commodities to foreign countries and that our own ships are put into disuse." She then rightly reminded the House that looking after our own shipping is particularly vital. Today she again brought this matter to our attention.

Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, provided that at least 50 percent of commodities purchased in the United States for export to participating nations under the provisions of this act be carried by American-flag ships. Inquiry into the present working of this provision reveals the following:

At the initiation of the program it was not possible to comply strictly with the 50-percent requirement, but every effort was made to attain compliance within a reasonable time. At present, bulk shipments comply approximately with the law in the over-all picture.

It is difficult to determine exact figures for berth shipments, since the whole program is not yet under way. However, complete April statistics indicate approximate berth compliance with the law.

The Administrator of ECA, Mr. Hoffman, has assigned the handling of waterborne shipments to Col. Arthur G. Syran, Traffic Division, ECA. Colonel Syran is an experienced shipping man—highly recommended by the industry, and one who can be depended upon to see that the will of Congress is carried out with neither undue restrictions nor petty evasions. In this instance I am sure we can anticipate the administration of the law in accordance with the intent of Congress, and those of us specifically interested in American shipping will keep a close lookout to see that our ships do get every consideration to which they are entitled by law.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's message to Congress last Tuesday was the sequence of the call for a special session from the rostrum of a political convention. He said in effect that its purpose was to put Congress on the spot. His message was in the same vein. It was purely a maneuver of political demagoguery. After a tirade against high prices and housing scarcity, he proposed to perform miracles. He said if only Congress would give him the dictator powers of price control, rationing, and bureaucratic building of public housing the problems were as good as solved.

The President gave the impression that if given a public-housing bill the Government could perform the miracle of building the two and one-half million homes we are still short in a short time, shall we say, 6 months or a year. Now, everybody who thinks for a moment knows this is a physical impossibility for either Government or private industry. Moreover, we know from experience that with the Government in house building the bureaucrats would claim priorities and tie up 50 to 60 percent of the raw materials to do 10 percent of the construction, thereby wrecking the whole program—reducing it to less than one-half of our present production.

In 1946 we were short 5,000,000 homes. This was because the New Deal in the 10 years of the thirties built 500,000 homes a year less than we built in the 1920's. We were told in the thirties that we had reached the limit of our frontiers. We should build no more factories or homes but use and divide up what we had.

In 1946, with "Wyatt" Government controls, we were promised 1,200,000 homes. We got only 435,000. Then the Government building program bogged down completely. In 1947, when Congress lifted controls, we built 835,000 homes. This year we will build a million. At this rate we will be nearly out of the woods and breathing easier within a year. We are making far more progress than we have made, or would make, under Government controls. The President should have encouraged this phenomenal progress instead of beguiling the American people with his proposed miracles.

The President's remedy for high prices was in the same category. When he called the special session last November he asked for the same powers of standby rationing and price controls to prevent inflation—this, notwithstanding the fact that a short time before he had said that he would not want to go back to the police-state methods of controls in peacetime. At the same time he deliberately deceived the American people when he said that foreign aid and foreign shipments were not responsible for high prices. His Under Secretary of State, Mr. Lovett, refuted this in a simple but forcible manner a few days later. At the hearings on the interim-aid bill for the Marshall plan in November, when I asked him if he agreed with his Chief, he said, "You and I both know that we would not have $3 wheat in this country if we were not shipping 500,000,000 bushels abroad this year." If there should be any doubt about this, it was amply confirmed a few months later, in the spring of this year, when the forecast of the biggest European wheat crop in years immediately caused wheat to tumble to nearly $2 a bushel. The American housewife can be assured that our foreign aid is only one, but a substantial, element in our high-price situation.

Do not think for a moment that I say this because I am against the Marshall plan. I am for it and have been all the time. All I have been against was the waste, mismanagement, and misrepresentation under which it was handled until we set up the present independent agency. The American people are entitled to honest facts. Given these, they can be depended upon for full cooperation as a matter of enlightened self-interest.

How much better it would have been if, instead of asking for police-state powers and promising miracles, President Truman had said "Sure, the Marshall plan is partially to blame for high prices, but it is well worth the sacrifices you must make and the burden you must bear in this cold war against communism, if by them we can avert the devastating catastrophe of another world-wide shooting war. It will take us a little longer to get back to normalcy, but your patience will be well rewarded." Can there be any question that under such statement and leadership the American people would cooperate with each other and the Government to lick this inflation?

Of course, there are other causes of inflation. Among them are irredeemable currency, excessive Government spending, the wage-and-hour law, the spiral of wage increases, and so forth. Just take the last, the spiral of wage increases. These began in 1945 when President Truman and Henry Wallace—who was dominating both our foreign and domestic policy at that time—both came out with the new doctrine that wages could be increased without increasing prices. Any sane person knew that this would require a miracle. When every dollar that a consumer spends for the merchandise he buys represents 80 cents in labor bestowed upon it from the time the raw material leaves the field or the mine to the time of his purchase, it surely took a miracle to raise wages without raising prices. But the Government raised wages then, beginning with General Motors, which the great Wallace said should raise wages 25 percent. However, the miracle never materialized and, of course, prices had to rise. Henry admitted he had overlooked some things. Now President Truman takes the not only tenuous but ridiculous position that President Truman is entitled to the credit for high wages, but Congress must take the responsibility for high prices. This is, indeed, a new low in political demagoguery.

The truth of the matter is that Congress has done an outstanding job against inflation caused by President Truman's ineptitude. Right in his message against inflation the President asked for new legislation which, if it were all enacted, would add $20,000,000,000 to the national budget, causing inflation which would stagger the imagination.

President Truman grudgingly admits that Congress increased production by taking off controls, but he says nothing of the unlooked for and added demands on this production as being responsible for high prices. Even the much maligned Taft-Hartley Labor Act, which he would repeal, cut strikes down to one-third, saving American labor $1,000,000,000 and giving the consumer that much more goods, thereby cutting down inflation.

The President's message might get votes from the unwary, but it was destructive rather than constructive. It was a political speech. Ours is still a government by the people, and instead of a request for police-state powers we need a leadership that will be honest with our people, but will give them the facts and ask for their cooperation with each other and with the Government to solve our common problems patiently. We must get away from engendering class hatred by blaming nonexisting scapegoats and promising miracles in the pursuit of them. What we need is honest American realism in Presidential messages.

A CHANGE IS NEEDED

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this session of Congress has been called for political reasons, I deem it my duty to make a report of my findings in connection with a jaunt through 15 counties in Pennsylvania since the Republican National Convention at Philadelphia. I talked to all kinds of people, in all kinds of places, under all kinds of circumstances; steel workers, miners, farmers' wives, truck drivers, storekeepers, and so forth. This is the picture that presents itself: The Republicans want to, at long last, elect a Republican President. They are proud of their ticket and opportunity and they are going to vote in mighty numbers. The Democrats want a change. They do not want a Republican, but they want a change, and openly say everywhere, "We do not want Truman." So, with Henry Wallace in their party, and they wanting a change, you do not need to have much concern as to what is going to come out of it.

Out of all of it I get this: I have a great and abiding faith that the country is going to be saved by what happens after November. It seems people everywhere want to save what is left.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a letter from Omar B. Ketchum, director of national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in the other correspondence from the national legislative commission, the American Legion.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each newspaper articles.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several letters.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, James C. Haggerty, press secretary for Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York, announced yesterday:

> The Governor feels that the Congress should stay in Washington and give careful consideration to whatever was proposed in the President's message.

Governor Dewey's position not only as the executive of the Empire State, but as the leader of the Republican Party, commands respect. I know that the American people are happy to have some indication from the Republican standard bearer that he, too, is aware of the distressed circumstances in which the average American family now finds itself.

If Governor Dewey and the Members on the Republican side of the aisle think that the question of the high cost of living is not paramount in the minds of the American people today, they are in for a rude awakening. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] a few moments ago brought up the subject of rationing. However, I notice that he failed to mention the fact that during 1944, 1945, and 1946 the packing industry deliberately and willfully held back the supply of meats. Also he neglected to mention that today when the supply of meats is plentiful, the prices due to manipulations, are 40 to 50 percent higher than even the peak prices reached by the black market.

A previous speaker this morning was telling how he had gone around his district and spoken to people of all occupations and classes. If he did this, the first thing he was confronted with was their eagerness to bring prices down. Our people are being pushed into poverty and actual want due to excessive costs. The situation is intolerable, and a solution must be found quickly.

If Governor Dewey is sincere, if Governor Dewey has the interests of these millions of his fellow Americans at heart, he should do more than just request "careful consideration" by Members of Congress of the program as suggested by the Chief Executive. Governor Dewey should make haste to come to Washington and avail himself of the opportunity to talk with all the Members of Congress. I know the American people would be very reassured if the Governor would use his considerable influence and would testify before the various committees that are handling the problems presented in the President's message. Such appearances would carry much weight during this special session.

I hope that the Governor will see fit to grant us the opportunity of learning what proposals he may have to offer in this crisis. We shall all be grateful for his suggestions and for his help.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES SHOULD SHUT UP AND APOLOGIZE TO DR. CONDON

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Members of this House should be told again about the irresponsible behavior of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in continuing its ridiculous attack by press releases on Dr. E. U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. This conduct is reacting unfavorably on the reputation of the Congress throughout the Nation, as evidenced by many recent editorial comments.

On Monday of this week the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL], the acting chairman of the committee, held a press conference in which he again monotonously repeated those same unsubstantiated and now thoroughly discredited attacks on this distinguished scientist which were made public 6 months ago in a sensational press release of a subcommittee report. That report, you will recall, was dramatically released from the hospital bedside of Chairman J. PARNELL THOMAS as a matter of such importance that it demands immediate attention. On May 12, Mr. McDOWELL told the Members of this body that hearings would be held before Congress adjourned, but just at adjournment time—the committee having done nothing as usual—he announced they would begin August 1. Now this week he announces again that there will be hearings but omits naming a date.

The excuse for delay that they give is the illness of the committee chairman. If the committee really sincerely believes it has anything against Dr. Condon, is it not trifling with the national security to have delayed in this way? It has been some 15 months since attacks first began, over a year since Mr. THOMAS personally attacked Dr. Condon in popular magazines, and 5 months since the sensational March 1 publicity release. My answer is that the committee has no evidence to support its nasty insinuations. Then why in all fairness, does not the committee drop its publicity business and manfully apologize to Dr. Condon, instead of continuing to subject him to what the New York Times months ago aptly called punishment by publicity?

On July 15, while the Congress was in recess, the Atomic Energy Commission announced its findings on Dr. Condon after what was probably the most thorough study in a case of this kind ever made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I ask leave also to insert the Commission's statement on Dr. Condon in the RECORD. There never was any real reason for such an extensive investigation other than the publicity and atmosphere of the accusations of the House Committee on Un-American Activities—and it has resulted in an absolutely clean bill of health for Dr. Condon.

On July 22, 1947, on the floor of this House, over a year ago, discussing an early attack originating with this committee, I said:

> Rumormongering character assassins should put up or shut up.

I most emphatically repeat that challenge today. I suggest that since this committee has not been able to put up, in more than a year of publicity efforts to smear Dr. Condon, it should now shut up, in the most graceful way possible considering the disgraceful position in which it finds itself.

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

JULY 15, 1948.

The question before the Commission is the security clearance of Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. In view of Dr. Condon's past association with the atomic-energy project, this question arises under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act for reinvestigations of persons who were permitted access to restricted data by the Manhattan District. The question presented is whether Dr. Condon's clearance should be continued to permit him to have access to the restricted data pertinent to his duties as Director of the Bureau of Standards and related activities.

After examining the extensive files in this case the Commission has no question whatever concerning Dr. Condon's loyalty to the United States. What we have for consideration, therefore, is whether the continued clearance of this distinguished American scientist, whose loyalty is unquestionable, would constitute a security hazard to the atomic-energy program. Such a decision calls for a common-sense evaluation of the factors involved.

In considering the case the Commission has taken note of the prior association of Dr. Condon with the atomic-energy program, during which he was given access to information of a high degree of secrecy:

1. In 1940 Dr. Condon was appointed a member of the eight-man Uranium Subcommittee of the Uranium Section, National Defense Research Committee, which carried out the first over-all survey of problems related to developing nuclear energy from atomic fission for the defense program.

2. In 1941 and 1942 Dr. Condon served as associate director of research of the Westinghouse Corp., during the period when Westinghouse took a prominent part in the production of the first substantial quantities of pure uranium metal.

3. Also in 1942, Dr. Condon was appointed a consultant to the S–1 Executive Committee of the Office of Scientific Research and Development. This committee was charged with the responsibility for reviewing the basic program of the entire uranium project.

4. For a short period in 1943 Dr. Condon served as associate director of the Los Alamos Laboratory, at that time in the early stages of its organization as the unit of the Manhattan project which would finally turn out atomic bombs. While at Los Alamos he prepared a document known as the Los Alamos Primer, which was used as an introduction to the subject of the explosive use of fissionable material, to introduce to scientific and technical personnel coming to the laboratory the fundamental ideas under investigation.

5. In 1944–45 Dr. Condon worked at the Radiation Laboratory of the University of California at Berkeley, which was under contract with the Manhattan District.

6. In November 1945 Dr. Condon, having been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, took office in the position which he now occupies as Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

7. In December 1945 Dr. Condon was designated and thereafter served as Scientific Adviser to the Senate's Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

8. In 1946 Dr. Condon was named by the President as a member of the Evaluation Commission for Operations Crossroads, and in this capacity attended the Bikini tests.

During the war the Bureau of Standards conducted for the atomic-energy program of the Manhattan District certain work of types which the Bureau was particularly suited to perform. The Bureau has continued to perform for the Atomic Energy Commission similar work which can be best carried out by the Bureau. Thus in his position as Director of the Bureau of Standards, and in other related atomic-energy activities in which he would participate, Dr. Condon has need for access to certain types of restricted data. This meant that under the Atomic Energy Act Dr. Condon's security clearance required "reinvestigation"; that is, it was necessary for the FBI to investigate and report to the Commission on his character, associations, and loyalty, and for the Commission then to determine whether permitting him to have access to restricted data will endanger the common defense and security. In defining the question before the Commission it is recognized that, as is the case with thousands of other persons whose security clearances must be passed on by the Commission, Dr. Condon's clearance does not involve access to information on weapons, or production or stock-pile data, for the reason that his duties do not require that such access be given.

The five members of the Atomic Energy Commission have personally examined with care the entire record. Although its Personnel Security Review Board expressed the opinion on June 7, 1948, that action by the Commission on the case might appropriately be deferred, pending reasonably prompt action by the House Committee on Un-American Activities with respect to that committee's own investigation and hearing as to Dr. Condon, the Commission considers that in view of its statutory obligations this is a case which the members of the Commission should themselves decide, and that it is our duty to proceed at this time to such a decision.

The record before the Commission includes reports compiled in two FBI investigations. In a most detailed and exhaustive manner, these present a very full picture of Dr. Condon's character, associations, and loyalty, since the FBI interviewed over 300 persons to obtain information and its investigations were conducted by a large number of agents on a country-wide basis. In addition, the FBI supplied the Commission the pertinent information relating to Dr. Condon which it had obtained from the files of other Government agencies. The thorough and painstaking investigations by the FBI, and other relevant information available to the Commission, provide the basis on which it is the Commission's responsibility to determine the question of Dr. Condon's security clearance.

In considering the record, the Commission has found that, in the opinion of some persons, Dr. Condon's tact, judgment, and discretion appear to be subject to some degree of criticism. On the other hand there are statements by persons who have been closely associated with Dr. Condon during his long work on classified information, which indicate proper care on his part in assuring that unauthorized persons should not obtain access to classified information. The file contains unfavorable information of a relevant character concerning certain persons with whom Dr. Condon and Mrs. Condon have from time to time had contacts. The file also shows that Dr. Condon is a man of wide associations, and that his associates include many highly reputable members of the scientific community who have great confidence in him.

In deciding such matters, the Commission has a statutory responsibility to place in perspective the evidence, both favorable and unfavorable, and to decide whether the common defense and security of the United States would be adversely affected if the individual concerned continued to have that access to restricted data which is required by the nature of his duties.

On the basis of the voluminous record before it, the members of the Commission are fully satisfied that, in the terms of the statute, Dr. Condon's continued clearance for the purposes stated above "will not adversely affect the common defense and security" of the United States. The Commission considers that his continued clearance is in the best interests of the atomic energy program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in two instances to include editorials on civil rights and in the third an article on the United States merchant marine.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

VETERANS' HOMESTEAD ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if this special session of Congress is to be of benefit to America, it should devote itself, I think, to those questions of primary importance to our people. I believe it is generally conceded that the question of housing is one of the most, if not the most, pressing problems facing us.

On Monday I urged the House to take immediate action to pass the Veterans' Homestead Act.

There are a number of other housing bills pending in the House and Senate. Most of them are extremely controversial, and apparently have no chance of passing at this special session. The Veterans' Homestead Act is not a controversial bill. It has been endorsed by the authors and proponents of other housing legislation, as well as by many veterans' organizations, and by Members of Congress of both the Democratic and Republican Parties. It can be enacted at this session. If and when the Veterans' Homestead Act is passed, it will provide housing for veterans, not 2 years from now, or 4 years from now, but will provide housing for veterans now. It will also provide veterans' housing, both rental and purchase housing at prices they can afford to pay.

On July 27, 1948, Gen. John Thomas Taylor, the director of the American Legion's National Legislative Commission wrote a letter to Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House, and sent a copy to me, in which he urges the enactment of the Veterans' Homestead Act, which is now on the House Calendar. I insert this letter herewith as a part of my remarks, and call attention to that portion in paragraph two which refers to the Veterans' Homestead Act.

Again I earnestly urge the Members of the House to take quick action on this bill while there still remains ample time for its passage, and while the membership of Congress is still in a frame of mind to render constructive service during this session.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: When Congress adjourned on June 19, several bills in which the American Legion is particularly interested were either pending before congressional committees, had been favorably reported and were on the House or Senate Calendar, or had been passed by one branch of the Congress.

I enclose herewith a list of some of these items which are in accordance with official mandates of our two governing bodies, our national conventions and national executive committee, all of which had been given some consideration at the time of adjournment. Some of these bills are of vital importance to disabled veterans and their dependents, in view of the serious condition in which they have been placed by virtue of the fact that the cost of living has reached an all-time high. The American Legion bill, H. R. 4488, to create the Veterans' Homestead Act, is on the House Calendar, and, if enacted into law, would greatly improve living conditions of many veterans who have been seriously handicapped in their readjustment to civilian life by chaotic housing conditions. Present threats to the security of our country make it absolutely necessary that universal military training and the Mundt-Nixon bill to combat communism be promptly enacted into law.

On behalf of the American Legion, composed of 3,250,000 veterans who honorably served their country, and the American Legion Auxiliary, with a membership of approximately 1,000,000 wives, daughters, mothers, and sisters of war veterans, I strongly urge that the bills enumerated on the attached list be favorably acted on during the present session of the Eightieth Congress.

It will be greatly appreciated if you will call this letter, with its enclosure, to the attention of the House of Representatives, including their insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Commission.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION ON HOUSING AND HIGH PRICES

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has spoken from the heart the anxiety of the American people over soaring prices and the shortage of decent homes. The day before yesterday the majority pretended to listen politely, but with a deaf ear. Candidate Dewey did not even bother to turn on his radio.

But the housewife who buys the groceries knows that her budget has reached the breaking point. The patience of the veteran living with relatives and seeking a roof of his own for the wife and kids is at the boiling point. They now know that the President has exercised his full constitutional powers in their behalf. He has called back the Congress into special session; he has clearly stated the urgency of these problems; he has suggested legislation to meet them.

The prompt answer of the Republican majority in Congress was a political attack upon the President. They now propose to hold committee hearings, but the prospect for sincere cooperation in the housing-inflation fight is not bright.

Republican Members of this Eightieth Congress say that they are not bound to enact now the sections of the 1948 Republican platform on these critical issues. They say that job should be left for the Eighty-first Congress next year. But the people are not interested in technicalities or promises. They need help now. Moreover, they doubt whether the Republican Members of Congress seeking reelection will be any more inclined after the election to act in their behalf than they are today.

This Congress may reject the earnest plea of the President for immediate legislation on housing and high prices. The Republican Party may continue to place political subservience to the real-estate lobby and to the NAM above the crying needs of the people. If this happens, the only hope is to remember in November—and to assure President Truman of the cooperation next January of a Democratic Congress.

GEN. OMAR BRADLEY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, a great soldier, statesman, administrator, and leader has spoken with courage.

Long before Gen. Omar Bradley became Chief of Staff, I heard his distinguished predecessor, General Eisenhower state: "When true history has been written, among the names of the great will appear that of Gen. Omar Bradley." It is interesting to note that these two great generals concur in their views about the inadvisability of mixing the races in military units.

How anyone who has served in the Army can contend for abolishing segregation in military service is beyond my conception. The mixing of the races would place both whites and blacks, especially the Negro, at a great disadvantage. In retaining the segregation rule, colored troops vie with each other in attaining ranks. Were the units mixed it would be most difficult, if not impossible, for a Negro to receive even noncommissioned appointments to say nothing of officer ranks. We are shocked at the extent to which some individuals will go for political expediency. Since equal treatment is accorded all racial representatives in military service, there is no justification for the intermingling of the races.

At this, the first meeting of the House since the issuance of General Bradley's statement retaining segregration, in spite of the President's Executive order, I arise to commend General Bradley for his courage in continuing the policy of General Eisenhower on segregation in the interest of maximum military efficiency.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of discussion about emergencies. But there is one emergency that we do not have to talk about—we have known about it for years. That is the emergency existing in the public-school system today. The high cost of living has not improved this situation.

The stand taken by Governor Dewey at the governors' conference in New Hampshire last June has shocked the people of this country almost beyond belief. We cannot believe that any person who might be eligible to seek the Presidency of the United States could come out against the teaching profession, when they are only asking for small increases in salary and adequate funds for other expenses.

Salaries and operational expenses are small as compared with the expenses and allowances made in other departments of public service.

I feel rather pleased and encouraged however, to know that one more great organization in this country has taken a stand publicly for public education through their national commander, the Honorable James F. O'Neil of the American Legion.

Commander O'Neil, in his address before the National Education Association meeting in annual convention in Cleveland on July 6, came out strong for a special session of Congress to consider Federal aid to education. For that reason I am asking permission to extend at this point in the RECORD the complete address of Commander O'Neil, because I believe it warrants the attention of every Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY NATIONAL COMMANDER JAMES F. O'NEIL, OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, CLEVELAND, OHIO, JULY 6, 1948

I am delighted to be with you today, and bring you the greetings of the 3,000,000 members of the American Legion.

You of the National Education Association and we of the American Legion have many interests in common. We have formed a working alliance on many programs.

We join with you in promoting National Education Week, in order to acquaint the general public with the aims, needs, and achievements of our schools, and to stimulate popular interest in the Nation's educational system.

The American Legion, with its auxiliary, sponsors Boys State and Girls State, and a progression of the programs to the Federal level through the Boys Forum of National Government and Girls Nation. In these activities student leaders are encouraged to assume the duties, privileges, rights, and responsibilities of American citizenship. Twenty-four thousand outstanding youngsters will engage in these programs this year.

In cooperation with the schools of the land American Legion posts award medals and citations to students in recognition of the high qualities of character and scholarship at an age when youth is most impressionable. Our posts are guided by school faculties in making these awards.

With the approval of the Association of Secondary School Principals, the American Legion has developed the national high-school oratorical contest to inspire among students a keener understanding of the Constitution of the United States. As an incentive for participation in this program the American Legion awards scholarships worth $8,000 each year.

In addition, the American Legion contributes 20 college scholarships annually to orphan sons of veterans of World Wars I and II. Each scholarship is valued at $1,200.

NEA and the American Legion jointly promote flag education and the observance of patriotic holidays.

These are programs we mutually undertake as a public service. As one partner to another, the American Legion extends warmest thanks to you for your help and for your participation. We solicit your support and offer our own in widening these programs so that together we can build a better citizenship for tomorrow.

June 22 of this year marked the fourth anniversary of the signing of the GI bill of rights. The educational dividends from this measure already have exceeded the fondest hopes of Legionnaires who conceived and won its adoption as the primary instrument of veterans' readjustment.

Since June of 1944 1,122,000 veterans have attended colleges and universities under the GI bill. Another 694,000 are enrolled in trade and technical schools. More than 450,000 are taking on-the-job training and 242,000 are in institutional on-the-farm training.

I am sure you appreciate the tremendous advantages accruing from this program not only in terms of a better informed and better trained citizenry but—equally important—in the way of awakening the public to the importance of education and extending the reach of our educational system.

Certainly the superior performance of GI students indicates that the cost of the program will not begin to measure its value. This is one investment Uncle Sam will profit from for years to come.

Affording every inducement and opportunity for the development of intellect and talent has evolved as the primary goal of the American system of free education. Within the scope of this mission another and equally pressing job confronts our teachers of today. I refer to the job of instructing and impressing our boys and girls in the meaning and value of the American way of life.

The most important occurrence of our generation, and perhaps of the twentieth century, is the war of ideals now being waged by the forces of democracy and communism. The burden of resolving this conflict on freedom's side will fall largely upon the generation of Americans now attending schools. In the interest of their own survival and the survival of the moral and physical liberties we believe indispensable for right living, we must provide our young men and women with the knowledge and zeal they will need to meet the challenge of their time.

The American Legion sincerely hopes you will, as an organization and individually, prosecute without pause the campaign already begun to expand the role of teacher and school as agents of democracy. The vacuum of indifferent patriotism is too easily filled with subversive philosophies. It must be the task of all of us—schools, parents, churches, and civic organizations working together—to arm our children with certain knowledge about democratic doctrines.

Under our concepts, equality of opportunity is the fundamental basis of democracy. This cannot exist without equality of educational opportunities. We do not have equality of educational opportunity in America today, despite the fact we are the richest people on earth.

World War II gives us an example. Selective-service records show that 600,000 men were rejected for reasons of illiteracy. This is the equivalent of 40 divisions with supporting troops.

Another example is the wide range between States in their ability to finance an educational program. An eastern State, by expending 1.74 percent of its peoples' income, can provide $198 for each child in school. A southern State, by using 1.64 percent of its income, can yield only $44 per child in school. The poorer States can never hope to support broad curricula or health education which will adequately take care of the needs of their children or pay adequate salaries to their teachers on a basis comparable to that of wealthier States.

There is an old saying that "crime does not pay." There is no analogy between the pursuit of crime and pursuit of a teaching profession, but circumstances have placed the two occupations in about the same category in terms of revenue. Thousands of teachers are struggling along on salaries far out of step with the spiraling cost of living.

This country is guilty of a shameful neglect of those who are devoting their lives to the education of American youth.

For the aforementioned reasons the American Legion stands four-square behind proposed legislation to extend Federal financial support for schools.

It is our studied opinion that the school districts of the Nation should support themselves so far as they are able to do so, but that impoverished districts, wherever located, should have additional aid in the form of Federal grants. These grants should be conveyed without Federal domination of, or interference with, the existence of local control of schools.

We urged the Eightieth Congress to enact this Federal-aid program. So did the NEA and other organizations. We did not succeed.

Though the legislation failed of enactment in the last session of Congress, I see no reason to lose heart. NEA has suffered defeats before. So has the American Legion. We battled all out for universal military training legislation. We didn't get it. But we are not relinquishing efforts to have the draft superseded by UMT as soon as possible, as the most democratic and economical means of attaining peacetime training and preparedness.

That the school-aid legislation progressed as far as it did in Congress is a cause for hope. Let us rally to it. I pledge you the full support of the American Legion in endeavoring to put it over.

More specifically, I favor that Congress be recalled into session this summer to take up and pass legislation for Federal aid to schools, and resolve other major issues which Congress neglected to perform during the regular session.

The need for this is immediate and imperative. Precious time will be lost if Congress waits until next year to act.

Our educational standards must go forward. They must not be permitted to stand still or retreat.

The men and women who will be called upon to speak for America in meeting the crisis of tomorrow, are the boys and girls attending our schools today. The Nation will be directly accountable should it fail to assure the maintenance of education processes which would enable them to cope with their future responsibilities.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The statement just referred to, which Governor Dewey made at New Hampshire, has since been corrected in the press. I think the RECORD ought to be clear here that the governor denied the press statement as quoted, and that he did not say what the gentlewoman referred to.

Mrs. LUSK. May I reply to the gentleman that I will submit for the RECORD here a statement from the Governor of New Mexico, who took the side of the teachers in this discussion with Governor Dewey. Governor Mabry, of New Mexico, and Governor Warren, of California, took issue with Governor Dewey in that discussion. I can furnish you, I think, with a fairly accurate record of the statement.

Mr. McDONOUGH. However, that statement was incorrect.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from New Mexico has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED PROGRAM OF ACTION FOR CONGRESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members on both sides of the aisle are in agreement that prices are entirely too high and that runaway inflation is about to engulf us and wipe out the middle and lower classes of our society economically.

I do not see that anything is to be gained by recriminations of one party charging the other with the blame. The main thing is that the people of the Nation want something done to stop skyrocketing prices. This bickering is not lowering prices.

In talking with the leaders of both sides, it seems to me that there are certain areas of agreement. There are five or six things at least that can be done, which would tend to check inflation. About these there does not seem to be much controversy. So it seems to me that since we are convened in special session something might be done at least to give authority to require greater bank reserves, to control the commodity market, to put some check on consumer credit, to allocate steel, also, perhaps, to take some action against the monopolistic corporations which are setting a high-price pace. We should try to stop the monopoly fixing of prices.

These things can be done. Nobody wants to put on price controls and rationing unless and until everything else is tried. Even selective price control and rationing should be used as a last resort only.

So let us try to do something about these things which we agree on substantially while we are here in special session.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Alabama asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. S. R. Young, executive assistant to the Postmaster General.

SEX CRIMES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, since the adjournment of Congress, another brutal crime has been committed here in the District. A little 11-year-old girl was brutally attacked. This is one of a long series of such attacks here in the District. This once fair Capital City of the Nation has become the haven of sexual perverts and criminals. They are converging upon Washington in ever-increasing numbers.

If there is one place in this Nation where a little child can walk alone it should be here in the District of Columbia. It is dangerous for one to walk alone here at any hour of the day or night. These criminals have become so bold that they no longer wait for the cover of darkness to commit their atrocious crimes but carry them out in the broad open daylight.

In order to give better protection to the inhabitants of the District, I have just introduced a bill which will consolidate the Park and the Metropolitan Police. If this special session of Congress does only one thing it should enact this bill and have a reorganization of the police force of this District.

The conditions that exist here are a shame and disgrace to a civilized community. This Congress must demand that this condition be cleaned up and that it be done now. The adoption of only this bill will not do it but it will make a good start. Do not tell me that we must coddle these rapists and murderers; do not tell me that they do not know what they are doing; do not tell me that they must be sympathetically handled. There are three things that will stop it and these are: First, prompt capture; second, prompt trial; and third, prompt execution. These brutes will then think before they commit these acts if they know what is coming to them.

Nothing that I have said here is a censor or condemnation of the Metropolitan and Park Police. They have worked hard, under great handicaps, but there is divided authority. They have done well under great odds. Both the Park Police and the Metropolitan Police are undermanned. All of these men should be given good salaries and shorter hours. Law enforcement should be under one command. By the adoption of this bill, we will make a good start in this direction.

Let us protect the precious lives of the little girls of this community by the strong arm of law enforcement. Rape and murder of women and little children in the District of Columbia must stop. I trust that every Member will read a most striking editorial from the Washington Times-Herald, headed "Our Deadly Parks." I commend it to your most serious consideration:

OUR DEADLY PARKS

What kind of a town is this, that a little girl can't ride her bike in the park on a bright, sunshiny Sunday without having her throat cut by a sex maniac?

Washington's parks are world famous for their size, beauty, and variety. We have more parkland here than any comparable city in the world.

But what pleasure can we have in all this when parents have to warn their children never to go out into our parks alone? When a woman can't walk in them by day free of the fear of rape and murder? When man never knows but what he will be held up for his money and lose his life as well?

The thing that happened to 11-year-old Carol Bardwell, Sunday, can happen to anybody, anytime.

Just to remind you, consider the case of Frances Erickson, who went walking in Rock Creek Park on Sunday, August 6, 1944. Surely, she had a right to think that it was safe as she strolled along the footpath near Massachusetts Avenue Bridge with hundreds of people riding and walking within the sound of her voice. Yet she was robbed and stabbed to death.

The very week before the Erickson murder a sailor pulled a 15-year-old girl into the shrubbery in that same part of the park and brutally beat her in an attempt to rape.

When next you go riding in Rock Creek Park have a look at Pierce Mill, a landmark preserved for historic color and interest. Look at it a second time and remember that in its shadow one Sunday not so long ago a 16-year-old girl was seized and raped as she was walking home from a horseback ride.

HAUNT OF MURDERERS

Remember, too, that 50 yards from Pierce Mill, on August 29, 1943, the raped and mangled body of Mrs. Grace Grubbs was found. Next time you cross the K Street Bridge over Rock Creek, remember that a sniper in the bushes there shot and killed Hylan G. McClaine.

When you go down in East Potomac Park to the golf course, again, look up the spot out in the open field where Dorothy Berrum was strangled to death one night by Earl McFarland.

Look at the lagoon in front of the Pentagon where another dead woman was found a short time before that.

The record can be run on and on, back through the years. The sum of it all is plain: Our parks are the haunts of murderers and rapists, sex maniacs and perverts of all varieties, robbers and thieves. Our parks are far more dangerous than the city's streets.

The record being what it is you might think, therefore, that the most powerful and effective of all our police would be concentrated in them. The fact is exactly the opposite, thanks to Harold L. Ickes, ex-Secretary of the Interior.

TWO FORCES, NO SAFETY

The fact is that our 30,000 acres of parks in and around Washington are not protected at all by the Metropolitan Police. Our parks are not even in the District of Columbia, lawfully speaking. They are Federal territory claimed by the Department of the Interior, and their regulation and protection are the assignment of some 118 men called park police, who have no plainclothes detectives watching the park crowds. They have only about 50 men on foot to beat the bushes and only two men on horseback for the whole system, whose job is primarily to chase runaways on the bridle path. The others are on motorcycles or in autos mainly for traffic control.

Police cannot watch out for murderers in the shrubbery, when they are in cars hunting speeders.

As it works out, allowing for clerks and men on leave and out sick, the park police on duty at any given time average about 1 man per 1,000 acres.

HOW TO MAKE THEM SAFER

The solution is obvious. It is, of course, to put the 30,000 acres of Washington parks under the Metropolitan Police, send skilled detectives and foot patrolmen and most important of all, plenty of men on horseback with orders to go up all the little foot paths and back trails.

When this was last attempted, Ickes blocked it.

He loved the pomp and circumstance of commanding a traffic force to chase down people driving faster than Ickes thought they should.

How much murder and rape do we have to take before common sense can override that old fool's vanity?

Washington's parks today are deadly. The metropolitan force, with special horseback squads, are the only police who can begin to make them safe.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks and to include a letter.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include certain extraneous matter.

LONG-RANGE HOUSING BILL

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, only 63 more names are needed on discharge petition No. 6 to give the Members of the House the opportunity to vote for the long-range housing bill. I placed this petition on the Speaker's desk over a year ago. Today it is the one chance we have of passing legislation that is desperately needed.

I believe the Republican leadership is deliberately setting the date for adjournment in the fear that we will complete the housing discharge petition. Those who want to register their support for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill must sign the petition today.

As a Democrat, I know the Republicans are not going to pass any legislation they do not want to pass, and it is obvious from their statements that the Republican leadership is not going to pass any legislation in this special session. The only thing the Democrats can possibly get for the people of the country is the passage of the long-range housing bill. Everything else is "pie in the sky."

I especially appeal to the Members from the South. There are still two-thirds of the southerners who have not signed the housing discharge petition. With but one exception, every non-southern Democrat has signed discharge petition No. 6. The southerners alone can come to the rescue of the millions of men and women who live in slums.

The South can force this great piece of legislation to a vote.

We are today building houses that cost between fifteen and twenty thousand dollars. They are not within the reach of those 3,000,000 families who today find themselves homeless, most of whom are veterans.

The 5,000,000 families living in slums will never get out of them unless the TEW bill is passed.

I beseech you to sign this petition today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include a statement by Mr. Paul A. Porter before the Ways and Means Committee.

THE HOUSING SITUATION

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that some people and a few Members of Congress have very short memories. It is only a very few years ago that we had a housing bill in America, the Wyatt housing bill. It was supposed to produce homes for veterans.

What did it do? All it did was to raise the price of homes, raise the price of almost everything that went into the homes. Hence the veterans got fewer houses.

The only thing that a public-housing bill might do today would be to make more Federal money easy and cheap and to raise the price of everything that goes into a home just as the Wyatt housing law did Therefore we will have fewer homes and they will cost more money if the T-E-W bill is made law.

It would be a criminal offense on the part of this Congress to pass the socialistic housing bill such as the President and his socialistic advisers are recommending. Certainly the veterans of America and the American people today cannot afford higher cost of homes.

Let private industry take care of this business. They are doing a wonderful job. They built 830,000 homes in 1947. They will build a million homes in 1948 or three times more than was built in the years of planned public building of homes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by W. G. Palmer, president of the Texas & Pacific Railway, delivered before the Dallas, Tex., Traffic Club.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill introduced by himself.

THE ANTITRUST DIVISION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, in light of the happenings of the last 24 hours and the statement by the Attorney General I wish to call attention to a paragraph in my remarks of March 3 during the presentation of the Department of Justice appropriation bill. At that time I said:

I now comment on another rapidly growing division, that of the Antitrust Division that has been enlarged remarkably over 1940, the outlay being in that year $1,309,000. We have allowed $3,411,000 for 1949, an increase of $161,700 over the budget.

The Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Sonnett, testified that the present law provides all the needed authority to proceed against offenders, pleading only a lack of funds to enable him to act forcefully and effectively against trusts, cartels, and monopolies in restraint of trade in domestic commerce. The committee has provided funds in excess of those recommended by the President, and expects the Department to proceed to bring to book those charged with offense by the President in his recent messages, and thus justify our faith in them and their plea for funds.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman who is now addressing the House is a member of the committee which makes appropriations for the Department of Justice. The gentleman realizes, because he has already mentioned it, that this committee which makes appropriations for the Department of Justice in spite of the fact that the President did not recommend an increase in the budget figure for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, the gentleman's committee, the committee of which I am chairman, increased the amount for the Department of Justice, that is, that part which has to do with the Antitrust Division. Is not that a fact?

Mr. CLEVENGER. An increase of $161,700 over the budget.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. CLEVENGER. The President cut the budget for that item. We increased it.

Mr. STEFAN. And the committee in its report made it plain, and also during the hearings made it plain that we intended some action. It not that true?

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is exactly true.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the following excerpt from the report of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the Justice Department bill:

Antitrust Division: For this Division the bill includes the amount of $3,411,700—an increase of $1,011,700 over the current appropriation and an increase of $161,700 in the budget estimates. The appropriation of $2,400,000 available in the current fiscal year includes the amount of $250,000 for railroad-reparations cases, whereas the amount recommended for 1949 includes only $125,000 for this work, the net result being that the Division is allowed an increase for its regular activities of $1,136,700 rather than the apparent increase of $1,011,700 shown. The committee heard with some concern during the hearings for this Division a statement to the effect that concentration of economic power in American industry is at the highest point since the passage of the Sherman Act. Appropriations made by the Congress for this activity have in the past very closely followed the estimates presented by the Department and, at least during one recent preceding year, exceeded the estimates presented, which would seem to indicate that the committee has been rather consistent in its position of giving support to the Department in its effort to protect the free economy of this Nation through proper enforcement of the antitrust laws.

In overruling the Bureau of the Budget and including in the bill the full amount originally requested by the Department, the committee took full cognizance not only of the testimony hereinbefore referred to but also of the recommendation of the President in his state of the Union message to a joint session of the Congress on January 7 last, wherein he stated that "the appropriation of sufficient funds to permit the proper enforcement of antitrust laws is essential." The committee also feels that the Antitrust Division should do everything within its power to strengthen its position in antitrust litigation and to decrease the great number of consent decrees. If additional legislation is needed, it should be suggested to the Congress, although in answer to a query along this line during the hearings it was stated by Mr. John F. Sonnett, Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust activities, that he did not think that the problem—the broad problem—was one of additional legislation at this time. Whatever the problem may be, it should be solved. This Nation must free itself of monopolies, and it is up to the responsible department of Government to see to it that interests of the majority are protected. In granting the original request of the Department, the committee expects a more-than-normal expansion and acceleration of antitrust activities, particularly as they refer to food, clothing, and shelter.

The recently enacted Public Law 395 provides, among other things, for the priority allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production and authorizes a plan of voluntary agreements on the part of industry and business to carry out the purpose of the act. It is believed that some additional responsibility will be placed on this Division in the form of passing on the legality of these agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend the exact words of my chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska, Congressman STEFAN, before the House on presenting this bill March 3, 1948:

I do want to call your attention to the action of the committee with respect to the Antitrust Division. We did something which we rarely do and something which is generally not too popular with the House Appropriations Committee, that is, to increase an amount over the budget estimate. It was felt that in view of the seriousness of the antitrust work during this present time the Department should have its original request of $3,411,700 rather than the amount of $3,250,000 approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Sonnet, Assistant Attorney General, heading this Division, told us that the concentration of economic power in American industry is at the highest point since the passage of the Sherman Act. To me, this is a rather serious statement. The President, in his state of the Union message on January 7 last, stated that the appropriation of sufficient funds to permit the proper enforcement of antitrust laws is essential. A similar statement was made by the President in his state of the Union message in 1947. I want to point out, however, that from the fiscal year 1933 to and including the appropriations recommended for the fiscal year 1949, this Division requested of the Bureau of the Budget a total of $27,890,000. The budget reduced these annual requests to a total of $22,530,000, or a reduction of $5,360,000. On the other hand, during the same period the Congress on an average not only approved the amount requested through the Bureau of the Budget but increased these requests by $130,000. I can see no consistency in, on the one hand, advocating greater appropriations for this activity, and then, on the other hand, having the requests of this Division reduced by the Bureau of the Budget. It can be seen that, regardless of the party in power, Congress has generally supported the requests of the Antitrust Division. Furthermore, the President in his last state of the Union message stated that additional legislation should be considered to implement our present antitrust activities. When queried as to this point, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust work, told the committee, and I quote:

"I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that the problem as I see it, the broad problem, is one of additional legislation at this time. I think rather it is one of additional enforcement."

The Congress has in general approved the Bureau of the Budget amounts requested for this activity and is willing to go along with additional legislation, if needed, but it seems to me that what is now needed is a determined effort on the part of the administration to ferret out these monopolies and prosecute them to the limits of existing law. I feel that it is the responsibility of the administration to apprise the Nation of the threat of monopolies through vigorous prosecution and continuous publicity, rather than through the coming up to the Congress once a year and informing them that the antitrust situation is serious. Small business is the lifeblood of the economy of this Nation and the Congress must demand that it be protected.

MR. CLARK'S WAR ON HIGH PRICES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a news story from the New York Times of this morning, based on a handout from the Department of Justice. The headline is "Drive set to stop price-fixing plots." With such vague charges of plots the Attorney General is trying to shift responsibility for inflation from the disastrous policies of the Truman administration to unnamed criminals and malefactors.

Mr. Clark's shadowy charges have a very familiar ring. Just about a year ago he made these same vague charges and the same vague promises to prosecute with vigor. Let me read to you the headline of a news story from the Cleveland (Ohio) News of August 12, 1947. The headline is: "Clark hunts plots to keep prices up on food, housing." What has Mr. Clark found in his hunt during the last year, and what has Mr. Clark done about it? After a whole year of hunting his sleuths in the Department of Justice have discovered that prices are going up—a fact which any American housewife could have told them.

What steps does the Attorney General propose to take to meet this crisis situation? He announces that he will open new offices in Philadelphia, Jacksonville, and Kansas City and that he will increase the staffs in his field offices in New York, Boston, Cleveland, Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle. Does the Attorney General feel that all he has to do is to open a new office and he will scare prices down?

Here is the Associated Press dispatch as it appeared in the Cleveland News on August 12, 1947, almost 1 year ago:

CLARK HUNTS PLOTS TO KEEP PRICES UP ON FOOD, HOUSING

WASHINGTON.—Attorney General Tom Clark today ordered an investigation of food, clothing, and housing prices.

He instructed the Justice Department's Antitrust Division to determine whether conspiracies exist to maintain or to increase present prices in the food, clothing, and housing fields.

Jail sentences, rather than merely fines, will be sought for any violators, it was announced.

A Justice Department statement announcing Clark's action, said:

"Such conspiracies will be prosecuted criminally and in those cases the Justice Department will oppose acceptance by the courts of pleas of nolo contendere (no contest), and upon conviction of the defendants the Department will recommend jail sentences for the individual defendants and maximum fines against the corporations."

ACTION FOLLOWS PRICE STUDY

The statement said the investigation follows a 3 months' study of the present price situation by Assistant Attorney General John F. Sonnett, who took charge of the Antitrust Division in May.

Clark feels, it was added, that "the soaring high prices now continuing in the food, clothing, and housing fields, require that a new and more vigorous approach be undertaken in these fields."

Hence, it was stated, the decision to press for jail sentences for individuals violating the antitrust laws.

CIO ASKS NEW PRICE CURBS

Shortly before Clark's announcement, the CIO full-employment committee had issued a call for a special session of Congress to restore price controls.

The CIO pronouncement said there would be another round of wage demands if living costs continued to rise.

Clark recalled in his announcement that President Truman has repeatedly warned of dangers from rising prices.

Clark's statement said:

"In his state of the Union message in January, President Truman pointed out to the Congress that, despite half a century of antitrust law enforcement, one of the gravest threats to our welfare lay in the increasing concentration of power in the hands of a small number of giant organizations, and that today we find that to a greater extent than ever before whole industries are dominated by one or a few large organizations which can restrict production in the interest of higher profits and thus reduce employment and purchasing power."

In today's New York Times we have this latest contribution from Mr. Clark:

DRIVE SET TO STOP PRICE-FIXING PLOTS—CLARK EXPANDS HIS ANTITRUST FIELD SERVICE TO SCAN FOOD, CLOTHING, AND HOUSING

WASHINGTON, July 28.—As part of a drive against conspiracies to maintain or raise prices of food, clothing, and housing, the field service of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice will be materially expanded, Attorney General Tom C. Clark announced today.

New offices will be opened in Philadelphia, Jacksonville, and Kansas City, while the staffs of the field offices at New York, Boston, Cleveland, Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle are being enlarged.

Although the expansion is primarily intended to cope with conspiracies affecting the cost of living, the enlargement will also allow the division to deal with what Mr. Clark terms "the increasing concentration" of economic power in other areas.

Under the new program, the whole country will be covered, each field office attacking monopolies within the States it covers.

Expert attorneys from divisional offices will intermittently visit industrial regions to uncover any illegal price fixing and other violations of the antimonopoly laws. Specially designed lawyers and investigators will help small-business men to see that they have full opportunity and free competition.

"Continuing high prices and the growth of private economic power compel an antitrust survey throughout the country," said Mr. Clark. "The expanded field-office program will facilitate that survey and afford prompt action to meet these problems. Adoption of the program follows a study by Assistant Attorney General Herbert A. Bergson.

Mr. Bergson said that the Antitrust Division, which he heads, desired support and cooperation from everyone in the battle to smash monopolies, price-fixing conspiracies, and other restraints of trade.

"Some of the best leads" have come to the Division through letters from individuals, he explained. He promised an investigation of all complaints.

Rodolfo A. Correa will be the field-office coordinator, working under Mr. Bergson.

THE MEAT AND FEED SITUATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard comments here today relative to the meat situation. In the travels of those of us who have gone through the great Midwest during the past 5 weeks we have noted the greatest feed crop in history in the making, and a good part of it already harvested. If we will simply allow the law of supply and demand to take care of this meat production we will have a great improvement in the quantity of the meat supply and that in turn will operate to the benefit of the consuming public.

We have seen the price of oats, for example, go down 30 cents per bushel in the past month in my home town simply because of the great crop that is being produced today. We have also seen corn go down about one-fourth in price. If we institute again in any way price controls as far as meat is concerned, we will discourage the farmers from going ahead and producing more livestock toward taking care of the feed that today is in abundance throughout America. If left alone this problem will adjust itself. Just as houses today are being built in great numbers, by private enterprise throughout America and the housing problem is being licked, so will the meat shortage go out of the picture. Controls will destroy production, and production is the No. 1 answer to inflation.

ECONOMICS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, some years ago, I think about 1935, we raised the price of gold to $35 an ounce. The price index on commodities today, as published by the Government departments, shows about 166 of the 1925–29 price level. It should move up about 3 or 4 points more, or to about 169, in order to bring everything in line with the gold price of $35 an ounce.

The gold price was established in order to have a long-term effect on price levels. It is now having that effect on price levels. If you cut the agricultural income $1 you can figure your national income is going to drop $7. In other words, if you cut the agricultural income $10,000,000,000 next year you better figure on your national income dropping $70,000,000,000. If the national income drops $70,000,000,000 next year, you can bet that the next President will have plenty of trouble.

As a buyer I want a cheap price. As a seller I want a high price. So does every other person in the United States. Just sit in your labor conferences today as I have since I left here a few weeks ago. We find that the labor negotiator constantly argues for an increase in wages. The other fellow says, "I will have to increase my price if wages rise." The labor man says, "That is all right. We are not discussing prices. We are discussing wages. Let the prices go where they may; I want my increase in wages." He gets his increase in wages because the manufacturer has a market where he can sell his goods at the stepped-up price. He has a market to sell those goods because we have a pipe line running from the United States to other countries on a gift basis which moves goods out of this country if they do not sell here. We have substantially removed the forces of competition from the American private enterprise system, and unless that force of competition is reestablished, more and more people will move in the direction of collectivism and the substitution of something else for the private enterprise system which, as Republicans and Democrats, means that we have a tough job on our hands whether it is settled this year, next year, or 10 years from now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include certain extracts appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION IN NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I missed the opening roll call of this special session on Monday in order to remain in New York to accept the designation of the Republican Party in my district. It saved my ears from the ——— unfair attack upon the decent, progressive, and thoroughly American people of this country made that day by the Representative from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MULTER. It saved my ears from the ——— unfair attack upon the decent, progressive, and thoroughly American people of this country made that day by the Representative from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this is one of those border-line cases which would be as well left unsaid.

The Chair wants to say that of late personalities have been more or less indulged in in the House, which he regrets very much, because this does not make for the dignity of this great body. In the few days ahead there is a possibility there may be a great deal of political recrimination, and we must be unusually careful in our language.

In this particular instance, the Chair thinks the use of the word "offense" is a reflection upon the gentleman from Mississippi, and he requests that the gentleman from New York ask unanimous consent that the word be stricken from his remarks.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the word "offense" be stricken.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FEPC IN NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, twice before in this Congress, on March 11, 1948, and on March 15, 1948, I directed the attention of this House to the true facts with reference to FEPC in New York State. Nevertheless, the attacks upon its supporters continue to come from the Representative who some time ago on the floor of this House referred to some of his colleagues as mis-Representatives.

Who the mis-Representatives are will be determined by the people at the next election.

His statements to the contrary notwithstanding, the people of New York have not been punished by FEPC, and its supporters are not the blackguards he would have the world believe them to be.

The FEPC law in New York is better known as the Ives-Quinn law, bearing the name of that fine Republican gentleman IRVIN IVES, who was since elected junior United States Senator from the State of New York, and the name of that distinguished Democrat, Elmer Quinn, who is still serving as minority leader of the New York Senate. The bill was approved into law by the Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey, who has since been unanimously nominated by the Republican Party for the high office of President.

I know of no objection in New York State to the workings of that law, either as to the personnel administering it or as to its enforcement.

For the benefit of the "whiners," who label as "whining" the furtherance of the American principles of democracy, I say I speak for every shade of American thinking in my district. The only party that will not support me for reelection is the Communist-dominated and affiliated, Wallace-adopted American Labor Party, whose support I do not want.

Just as FEPC passed in New York with only 6 votes against it in the senate, and none against it in the assembly, I am sure that the vote in my State would be almost unanimous in support of approving FEPC on a national scale.

Those people are Americans, they are not racial minorities. They are the people who "fought our Nation's battles in times of war" and "sustained its institutions in times of peace." At least 75 percent of the people of my State are white Christians and I know that they would resent as much as I do the utterances which would attribute to them sentiments which are contrary to everything which we deem to be American.

The World War II dead and permanently disabled in my county alone exceed the total number of voters in 1946 in Mississippi. My county alone gave to the armed services in World War II almost eight times the total number of voters in Mississippi in 1946. They fought to preserve, among other things, this very congressional system in which we are participating.

No one will object to reasonable and sound, or even unsound, arguments being urged against any type of legislation offered to this House. Every opinion with reference thereto should be respected, if made with the sincere belief in the pertinence and truth of the facts relied upon.

It is time we stopped all belittling talk in this House about racial minorities and imaginary majorities, as well as all talk about white supremacy.

We have no room in this country for Aryans or totalitarians by whatever name.

Let us all be Americans, even in our differences, in the true sense of our founding fathers under the divine guidance of the one eternal God.

EUROPEAN CROPS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was in Europe. I returned late last evening. I listened with a great deal of interest to the words of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], who referred to crops.

I want to take this minute merely to report to the membership of the House that I traveled over hundreds of farms in Czechoslovakia, Austria, Germany, and France. On the day before yesterday, with Mr. Paul Hoffman, Administrator of the ECA; Mr. Averell Harriman, our roving Ambassador; and Mr. Foster, Mr. Harriman's assistant, as well as others, we visited very large and important farms in France, where wheat will yield at least 60 bushels to the acre.

I personally visited many farms in Brittany and Normandy, where, believe it or not, wheat will yield 90 bushels to the acre.

An agricultural expert in France told me, when we were in one field, that that particular field of wheat will yield 100 bushels to the acre.

For over 3 weeks while I was traveling in these foreign countries it rained incessantly. There was rain and cold weather. The grain was lodging in many places. But, during the past few days, we have had sunshine in Czechoslovakia and Germany, France, and many other places—and the harvest is on in full blast. The potato crop is excellent.

I was told by Mr. Ben Thibodeaux, our agricultural expert, and a very efficient one, that the yield of small grains and potatoes there will be perhaps the largest that Europe has enjoyed in many years.

I thought the membership of the House would be interested in this. Later I will have some other reports to make to the membership.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER and Mr. BEALL asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

CORPORATE PRICES AND PRICE CONTROL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, since the removal of price controls, corporate profits have increased tremendously. The last half of 1946 shows a tremendous increase over the first half of 1946. Corporate profits in 1947, after taxes paid, were $17,000,000,000 plus, the largest in the history of our country and about $6,000,000,000 more net profit than in 1946.

It is predicted that the corporate profits this year will exceed those of last year, making another all-time high. One of the lines of activities that has made and is making tremendous profits is steel. Yet, we read of a $9-plus increase in the price of steel only a few days ago.

That is going to have a tremendous effect upon the cost of living. That is going to have a tremendous effect upon all business activities that depend upon steel, directly or indirectly, in their manufacturing or in their business processes.

Another line of activity is the newsprint or wood-pulp industry. Companies in that particular field have been and are now making tremendous profits. That is having a very serious effect upon all companies who have to buy wood pulp or newsprint or any other kind of paper in connection with the conduct of their business. Particularly, it is having a serious effect upon the newspapers of the country.

I was amazed only recently when a representative of one of the biggest newspaper chains in the country called to see me and asked me to introduce a bill, which I have done, providing for a 7-cent coin, because they fear they will have to increase the price of their daily papers to 7 cents. That, in turn, has an effect upon circulation. That, in turn, has an effect upon the freedom of the press. We see how this vicious circle of upward prices not only has a serious impact upon the consumer but upon business and, in turn, temporarily, can have a serious impact upon the complete expression and full exercise of their constitutional right.

It seems to me that the steel industry of America is subject to severe criticism in putting through this increase of over $9 per ton, with the tremendous profits that they are making. It also seems to me that the large companies which manufacture wood pulp and newsprint are subject to justifiable criticism for having put through the recent increase only a week or 10 days ago.

My remarks are mainly to call the attention of the country to the fact of how the recent increases, particularly in those two lines, not only seriously affect the consumer, the purchaser, but have a serious effect upon tens of thousands of small independent businesses, and is having a serious impact upon the great newspapers of our country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

CONTROL OF INFLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I want to discuss with you an idea which I ask you to consider, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans. These are days when we must put country above party; national interest above self interest. We have acquired unity in foreign policy. To support our long-range foreign plans, we desperately need unity on domestic policy.

Over Berlin hang the clouds of world war III. In meeting that crisis we do not ask whether our foreign policy follows the Republican line or the Democratic line. We ask only that it follow the American line.

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY IDENTICAL

To sustain our foreign policy we must stay strong at home. If we allow the bubble of inflation to swell until it breaks, our foreign policy also collapses.

When the cost in dollars of a family's requirements, food, clothing, and rent, reach the highest point in our history, as the Department of Agriculture reported last week, the danger signals are flying. When the housewife has to pay $16.32 for the same items that cost $10 in 1946, the danger signals are flying. I submit that the time has come to form a bipartisan policy on inflation. We can do it. We can do it with a committee appointed by the President of the United States, a committee of men clearly without political motivation; men like Bernard Baruch, Cordell Hull, and the new president of Columbia University. He would, I believe, respond to a draft of this kind.

THE BREADBASKET COMMITTEE

We could call it the Breadbasket Committee; the committee to make it possible for the housewives of America to fill their breadbaskets and stay within their budgets.

Many of you disagreed with many of the things which the President of the United States said on Tuesday. I did not agree with many of them. But we all agree with one statement. Let me read it:

THE COMMUNIST HOPE

The Communists—

He said—

both here and abroad, are counting on our present prosperity turning into a depression. They are counting on economic collapse in this country.

We know those are true words. We know that unbridled inflation leads to collapse—boom and bust. We agree that if the Government can act, it must act.

I opposed the sudden lifting of price controls. I believed our wartime controls should have been lifted more gradually. But that is water over the dam. Prices have been decontrolled.

I doubt seriously whether we could breathe life back into the long-dead corpse of the price-control structure. Controls which cut down on production certainly are not the answer. But it also is no answer to say that families must eat less—many already are doing that, and men who eat less cannot produce more.

MEN WHO DO NOT EAT CANNOT WORK

No; it is no answer to say that men must eat less. Nor do we answer the problem of inflation when we allow the profits of some companies to swell from 50 to 85 percent above their 1946 levels, as shown by the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

We are not answering the problem of inflation when we sanction, by inaction, the growing trend toward monopoly control of prices—a trend pointed up this week by the Federal Trade Commission which showed that since 1940, big business had gobbled up little business by mergers to the tune of $5,200,000,000 in assets.

FARMER'S SHARE DIMINISHING

We are not answering the problem of inflation when the farmer's share of what the consumer pays for food drops to the lowest point in 5 years, as it did last month. I find it hard to reconcile a spread of several hundred percent between what a citrus grower receives for a grapefruit, and what I pay for it at breakfast. If you want figures, in May of this year, the annual cost of food for a family of three was $692 and of that amount the farmer who produced the

food got $346—just about half of what you paid. The dollar's worth of bread you buy puts only 18 cents into the farmer's pocket. He gets 54 cents out of your dollar's worth of milk. I cannot reconcile such figures with blaming high prices on the producer.

We are not answering inflation when we permit the gray market to add several hundred dollars to the price of a new automobile. Those dollars don't go into the pay envelopes of men who make the cars, nor into manufacturers' profits, nor the profits of legitimate agencies which distribute the cars.

OUR COMMON OBJECTIVE

You may disagree with some or all of these ideas. But we do agree on the objective of maintaining our prosperity; the objective of forestalling the depression for which the Communists so confidently hope.

I submit the idea of the Breadbasket Committee as a possible answer. It could work night and day, with the help of all pertinent committees of Congress and the best brains of the Nation. And ample precedents exist. During the war, we put our rubber problems into the hands of a disinterested committee; we asked Republicans and Democrats to work out our foreign policy together; Republicans and Democrats worked side by side in writing the Charter for the United Nations; on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Senator VANDENBERG sits across the table from Senator CONNALLY, and I have the honor and privilege of working with my distinguished colleague, an earnest Republican, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

This Breadbasket Committee would not try to fix blame on Republicans or Democrats. It would not try to elect or defeat any candidate. Its one purpose would be to dig into the causes of inflation and come up with solutions.

ACCEPTANCE BY THE PEOPLE

I believe the people of America would accept those solutions, as they accepted the Marshall plan, out of the knowledge that it was bipartisan policy.

We have met every challenge of our 172 years of history. But we are not going to meet this challenge by choosing up Democratic and Republican sides and throwing rocks at each other.

As Mr. Walter Lippmann observes this morning, if we go about solving inflation in terms of party politics, national unity is impossible.

ANY BETTER IDEAS?

If my breadbasket idea does not appeal to you, come up with a better idea. But let us not say that the problem is too big for us, or that the subject is too entangled in politics to tackle. To do that would be to turn our backs on every worried housewife and breadwinner in the Nation.

Let us start licking this thing before it really gets away from us. If you see merit in the "Breadbasket Committee," let us get it to work, and hold this Congress in recess until it reports, so that we can immediately go to work on whatever solutions it proposes.

But let us not say we are whipped. Americans have never yet found a problem too big for them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

THE PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks made by our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], I wish to say to start with that I happen to represent a district that has in it some of the largest and I might add the best paper mills in the United States.

It is an easy matter to get up here and pick out one or two industries and point to the profits they may make. I may say that I follow the profits of all large corporations as shown in the reports of the National City Bank of New York.

To be perfectly fair for the sake of the RECORD, I wish to point out that the profits of the paper pulp people have not been out of line with the profits of other corporations. In fact many other corporations have shown much greater profits. I just do not want to let the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts go into the RECORD unchallenged. I call attention to the fact at this time, and I repeat, it is easy enough to come in here and say some particular industry should be curbed. Why single out this industry? Who took the excess-profits tax off of corporations? What Congress did it? Did these bad Republicans do it? Or was it the Seventy-ninth Democratic Congress that took the excess-profits tax off?

At this late hour to come in here and criticize the paper and pulp people is not exactly cricket, according to my formula. I resent the picking out of this particular industry.

I repeat, the paper and pulp people have not made excessive profits when compared with the other industries of the country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is voluntarily defending his own industry, and I respect him for it. My remarks were simply to show the impact on the newspaper publishers.

Does the gentleman defend the steel industry?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am not familiar with the steel industry. I cannot get into the steel business. But I do defend the paper and pulp business.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman does not defend the steel industry?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I neither defend it nor attack it, but I do not wish to see the paper and pulp industry singled out for criticism. These paper and pulp people have had splendid labor relationship with their employees for many years. They made a great contribution to the war effort. They are entitled to the same consideration given all branches of industry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

THE OBLIGATIONS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the Members made inquiry a little while ago on whether or not I intended to utilize the time at my disposal this afternoon to make a valedictory address. Let me assure you it is not a valedictory. There is work to be done. I want to do my full share and for that reason I propose to discuss the issues which confront the country and Congress and make reply to the recommendations submitted to the special session by President Truman.

APPLAUSE FOR THE PRESIDENT

One of the afternoon newspapers in Washington mentioned specifically that among others the President was applauded by Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois. That is precisely correct. I have great respect for the office of the President. I have respect for the incumbent of the Presidency no matter who he may be and no matter to what extent I may disagree with his views.

For 16 years in all my public service I have done my utmost to generate respect and regard for all branches of the public service. One of the difficulties in the country today is a strange cynicism and suspicion with which too many people regard public officials and public office. There are some who deem it smart and clever to demean the Supreme Court, the Congress and the Presidency. They can be demeaned to the point where all faith in these established institutions is lost and then we shall go the way of all other republics in the world.

In my feeble way I seek always to dignify and to exemplify my faith in and regard for every high office in Government. It is only in proportion as this concept is diffused that we can be sure of the perpetuity of our Republic.

The respect for Government is the very foundation of its continuance.

THE PRESIDENT'S MANNER

Somehow there was a singular lack of warmth in the President's smile when he appeared last Tuesday with his message. His words carried no real conviction. At least that was my impression. It was so very diffusive. To be sure the President would have been conscious of the fact that he was invading the lair of that branch of Government which he referred to on occasion as "the worst Congress in our history." It embarrassed a great many of his personal friends and he must have been conscious of that fact that they were smarting under this criticism. Perhaps that was in his mind and contributed to a seeming uneasiness as he delivered his message.

A SINGULAR OMISSION

There was a singular omission in his message. Other than to say that the Communists would like to see our domestic structure weakened by depression, he did at no time allude to conditions abroad. Not a single reference was made to what we had been led to believe was a delicate foreign situation. One would reasonably suppose that when the Chief Executive under his Constitutional power summons the Congress into extraordinary session, he would say something about the extraordinary circumstances which exist in the world and which confront this country in its relations with the Soviet Union. For reasons best known to him he made no statement whatsoever on this subject despite daily headlines and visits from our own diplomatic officers abroad. It can, therefore, scarcely be argued that Congress was summoned into session for the purpose of giving attention to delicate international matters.

General Clay was here only a few days ago. As a matter of fact it was only on Friday of last week, just five days before the President's message to us that General Lucius Clay and the American Ambassador Mr. Murphy arrived in Washington in response to a special summons from here. They held a number of conferences. A few hours before General Clay visited with the President the Washington press carried a statement by the President that the prospects for world peace were excellent. That statement was made as I understand before he had a conference with General Clay.

General Clay honored the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House with a visit. Only a few members were present. The very genial chairman, CHARLES EATON, invited me to attend. For some three-quarters of an hour there was an opportunity to discuss with General Clay and Ambassador Murphy many aspects of the situation abroad. I asked a good many questions based upon the many weeks I spent in Germany last fall.

But, oddly enough, notwithstanding the hurried trip of General Clay to Washington, the Chief Executive who is the steward and director of our foreign policy failed to make any comment on conditions in his message. Who can deny that this is a bit singular, particularly so when 531 Members of the House and Senate had been summoned from the Territories and the 48 States of the Union into special session. Manifestly we are interested because it is vital to the destiny of our country and to the future of the young men who might be eligible for military service. We are interested in the delicacy of the situation and whether it is as precarious as we have been led to believe.

The President would have done well on this occasion to have said something to Congress about this matter. Inasmuch as he did not do so I reaffirm that we can reasonably suppose that matters are in such a state that they did not warrant a recall of the Congress into special session. I am sure I bespeak the sentiment of every Member of the House and Senate when I say that we would only too gladly remain in the Nation's Capital continuously if conditions abroad warrant. However, the President, has not confided to us on that matter and certainly no valid argument can be advanced that we are now here as watchdogs and monitors of affairs abroad.

THE DOMESTIC FRONT

History will bear witness that his message to the special session was monumental in the sense that it covered everything and contained a bewildering volume of proposals and recommendations. It occurs to me that the President really presented three programs instead of one.

The first of these might well be called his "must" program. We are quite familiar with that term. It would naturally embrace his recommendations on high prices and housing. In addition it would include his suggestions on excess profits, consumer credit controls, additional Federal Reserve power, standby rationing and price control powers, allocation and inventory-control controls, and curbs on speculation in the commodity markets.

His second program might be called an "urgent" program and would embrace the suggestions which he made on aid to education, modifications of the Social Security Act, changes in the displaced persons act, appropriations for the permanent home of the United Nations, the international wheat agreement, appropriations for power projects, revamping the Federal pay and classification scales and the civil-rights program.

Then comes what might be called the spare-time program, to which we might address ourselves if time is available after we had disposed of programs one and two. Here the President set down recommendations for an over-all health insurance program, the repeal and replacement of the Taft-Hartley Act, the long-range farm program, a modification of the Reciprocal Trade Act, the National Science Foundation, amendments to the antitrust act, universal military training, and the St. Lawrence seaway.

Who will deny that this is, indeed, a program of monumental proportions that would require months upon months for study and exploration not to speak of the crystallization of public sentiment because so many of these are of the highest controversy as every Member of this body so well knows.

THE PRESIDENT'S SENSE OF TIME

There is something whimsical in the statement made by the President in his Philadelphia acceptance speech to the effect that "they could do this job in 15 days if they wanted to—and they would still have time to go and run for office."

Here, indeed, is an amazing concept of what should be the deliberative processes of government where it relates to matters of broad policy involving not millions but billions of public expenditure.

Let me say here and now that one of the outstanding virtues of the Eightieth Congress was that for the first time in a great many years it took ample time to examine carefully and thoroughly into all proposals which were submitted and to dig relentlessly for the facts so that no grave mistakes might be made which could not be retrieved.

For the first time in years the Eightieth Congress restored representative government. It did not rubberstamp the proposals which came to it, and it quickly divested the Congress as an institution of the obloquy which goes with the appellation of rubber stamp which was used so freely everywhere in the country. People were in truth and in fact losing faith in Congress as a representative body, and it was the Eightieth Congress which restored that faith.

To be sure, the President came by this shotgun technique in the legislative field quite honestly. It is not at all surprising that he should believe that such a monumental program could be encompassed in so short a time, even if there was an occasion for it.

I remember so well the condition which prevailed in the first session of the Seventy-third Congress in 1933. It has been popularly referred to as the "100-day session." It was then that the plan was laid for a complete reorientation of government and for a change of governmental philosophy which we refer to today as the New Deal.

Speed seemed to be the only consideration. What was in the first bills which came from the executive branch seemed of secondary concern, even though the policies contained therein had a great impact upon our system of government.

I see my old friend and colleague, Representative DONDERO, shake his head in approval. He and I came here together. He, too, remembers so well those hectic days.

One of the first if not the first bill introduced in that celebrated special session was an act to maintain the credit of the United States Government. It became commonly known as the Economy Act. It sought to economize at the expense of the mail carriers of the country. It sought to economize at the expense of the veterans and hundreds of thousands of veterans were removed from the Federal roll.

I lived to see the day when virtually every phase of the Economy Act was expunged from the books. I was one of those who voted against it and was roundly chided by my own people for failure to support the President on some of the powers which he requested. Such was the hysteria and the emotion of that day.

But the important thing about that first act in 1933 was that it was presented to the Congress in typewritten form. Printed copies of the bill were not available. The Members had to take it or else. They did not know what was in it. They had no way of spelling out its implications. A special committee was created under the chairmanship of the very able Mr. Woodrum, of Virginia, to handle this legislation. It was, indeed, a precipitate shotgun approach to the serious business of legislating. There was so much of it that it is no wonder that Congress became known as a rubber-stamp body.

All that, the Eightieth Congress rolled back. It has taken time to examine into

legislation of a broad general character as well as every appropriation bill.

Last year as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations we conducted 7 weeks of hearings. We heard more than 400 witnesses. We took ample time to examine into the proposed expenditure of every dollar of the people's money. This is the solemn responsibility of Congress. It is why we are here. It is why we call this a representative government and when we fail in that capacity we lose our representative character.

It is, therefore, a bit astounding that the President should say to the whole country that his program, whatever he had in mind at Philadelphia, could be consummated in 15 days and then we could go home to the hustings. The people whose money we spend and who are affected by the legislation enacted by Congress have a different idea about the time which should be devoted to the exploration of legislation and particularly that which is so vital to the ultimate welfare of every man, woman, and child in the Nation. I fancy that the President will have to reexamine his ideas about our people on this.

PERMANENT CHARACTER OF SOME OF THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Next, let me observe on the permanent character of some of the matters which the President recommended Tuesday for consideration during this special session. Consider for a moment the St. Lawrence seaway. That issue has been on the doorstep of Congress for 16 years to my certain knowledge and, I suppose, a great deal longer. It will involve the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. Once it is authorized and funds appropriated and the construction of this seaway begins, it is a work which cannot be undone. It is easy enough to talk about the enactment of such a project along with others in 15 days, but it will embrace hundreds of millions of the taxpayers' money and, as everyone knows, it is highly controversial and public sentiment has by no means crystallized. Is that why the President called us back to Washington?

Consider universal military training. I have expressed myself in favor of this program but I would be less than candid if I failed to say that I was not insensible to the cleavage of opinion everywhere in this country on this vital issue. Who can forget how Congress was bombarded a few months ago with respect to this matter by those who were in favor and those who were opposed. It would involve training for all of the youth of the country, and once established, it will be here for a long time to come. We dare not make a mistake on a matter so important as all that notwithstanding my own opinion on the mater. Will it be said notwithstanding that this could be consummated along with other things in 15 days and is this one of the reasons why Congress was summoned into special session?

Consider the proposed amendments to the Antitrust Act. The Sherman Antitrust Act has been on the law books for 58 years. It has been amended from time to time and never has there been undue haste because it deals with competition, monopolies, restraints on trade, and more than that, it deals with the whole business and industrial structure of the country.

An example of how important it is, can be seen from the fact that as a result of the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the so-called Cement case. There is a prospect now for a complete change of the basing point system of pricing on cement, steel and other items which if finally consummated will result in a complete modification of pricing policies of industry which will work to the advantage of some sections of the country and to the decided disadvantage of others. It could have the effect of Balkanizing the country into different industrial sections. Is this the kind of a thing to be considered within a short space of time and is this the reason why Congress was called back to Washington?

Consider the bill to establish the National Science Foundation. I have no doubt that this measure may have some merit notwithstanding the fact that a good many professional men of my acquaintance are genuinely hostile to the idea for fear that it may ultimately bring about the regimentation of scientific and professional men throughout the country. Is this a matter to be considered in haste and at a special session of the Congress?

Consider the President's proposal for the repeal and replacement of the Taft-Hartley Act with what he calls something better in the field of management-labor relations. The Taft-Hartley Act has been on the statute books for some time. It is operating very well. It deserves a full and fair chance. It has diminished work stoppages which are so disastrous to continued production. It has exposed the communism issue in certain labor organizations of the country and received the approbation of people everywhere.

Taken by themselves the 10 essential items in the Taft-Hartley Act according to various polls have received the substantial approval of union and nonunion members alike but now comes the President to suggest that within a short space of time we repeal this act and fashion something else to take its place. If that were desirable or necessary it would require months upon months of hearings and study to do the job. One may, therefore, appropriately ask, is this the reason why the President summoned the Congress into special session?

Consider health insurance. It is a monumental bill which proposes the socialization of medicine and dentistry and contains a host of things which must be carefully spelled out if we are not to impede the high standard of health and the high standard of medical practice which obtains in this country.

I had opportunity to make a casual examination at least of socialized or panel medicine as it exists abroad and know a little something about the character of medical service which the common man enjoys in some of the countries of Europe. It cannot hold a candle to what we enjoy in the United States. It is a bill that provides for hundreds of millions of dollars in the form of grants and aid to States in addition to the administrative expenditure which would be involved in a program so far reaching as this.

Is this the kind of a thing to be consummated in a few days and is this one of the reasons why the Congress is called back into special session?

A similar argument can be made on his proposal for revamping Federal pay and classification scales. It can be made with respect to his proposal for aid to education and the requested appropriation for certain power projects. It can be made with respect to the international wheat agreement and to changes in the Social Security Act.

The very nature of these things and their possible impact upon the country since they are permanent legislation demands the same kind of consideration which this Congress has given to all other matters and it will take more than these to justify summoning Congress into extraordinary session.

POINTS OF AGREEMENT

Now it is only fair to say that there is a point or two of agreement between every Member of this House and the President. I refer to the fact that we are not insensible to the new tempo of the inflationary force which is abroad in the land. We know full well that inflation is moving us into a danger area. I, for one, believe that an issue of this kind does transcend partisanship. We are not insensible to the housing needs of the country. Moreover, I, for one, yield to no one in my concern for the future of this Nation. The first assignment which I had in the Seventy-third Congress in 1933 was membership on a select committee known as the Sabath Committee to Investigate Bondholders Protective Organization Committees to survey into the real estate security market as a result of the crash of 1929.

I was something of a youngster then and it was, indeed, an experience that is indelibly engraved on my recollection. That committee took testimony in all sections of the land. It filled 16 volumes of printed hearings. The final report which the committee filed was some 600 pages in length.

I can assure you it is no felicitious experience to be confronted with thousands of persons in all sections of the country clutching pieces of paper that were once valuable bonds and securities on real property. These were securities covering commercial buildings, theaters, apartments, and homes. These securities and their holders were victims of the crash. In many cases those securities were not worth a nickel on the dollar. They represented the lifetime savings of millions of people.

As a matter of fact there were some 9,000,000 investors in real estate securities and when the washout came, at least $11,000,000,000 worth of values on commercial real estate including apartments and perhaps another four or five billions in values on homes in the land were washed out.

No one can live through such an experience without having a sacred regard for the economic welfare of this country and I shall leave no stone unturned and I shall do nothing by word, deed, or act that will jeopardize the values and bring our economic house tumbling down over our ears. I am sure that every member in this body has an equal and abiding concern as he surveys conditions at home and will gladly support those things which in truth and in fact have some relationship to the principal issues of housing and high prices if legislation is necessary and if sound suggestions can be made which will improve rather than harm the country.

OUR OBLIGATIONS

At this point I am inserting two pages from the hearings on the independent offices appropriations for 1949 which were inserted by the Budget Bureau at the request of Representative WIGGLESWORTH. Members of that committee every year make a careful exploration of the direct and contingent obligations of the Federal Government so that we may know in some detail, the extent to which we are indebted and the extent to which we may be indebted if this blessed country should ever be visited by an economic dislocation again.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Public debt and other liabilities of the United States Government

As of Dec. 31, 1947:	
Direct public debt:	
Interest-bearing debt	$254,205,178,490.85
Matured debt on which interest has ceased	401,485,987.76
Debt bearing no interest	2,293,180,375.50
Total direct public debt	258,899,844,854.11
As of June 30, 1947:	
Contingent liabilities:	
Obligations guaranteed by the United States	89,520,185.16
Obligations issued on credit of United States:	
Funds due depositors by Postal Savings System	3,402,375,361.00
Federal Reserve notes (face amount)	23,444,193,468.08
Total contingent liabilities	26,936,089,014.24
Unliquidated obligations incurred against appropriations and contract authorizations	13,787,000,000.00
Loan guaranties outstanding:	
Insured housing loans—Federal Housing Administration:	
Title I insurance—primarily property-improvement loans	93,827,466.00
As of June 30, 1947—Continued	
Title II mortgage insurance:	
Sec. 203—mortgages on small homes	$2,402,494,605.00
Sec. 207—multifamily rental development	44,040,780.00
Title VI—mortgage insurance—war and veterans' emergency housing	1,335,224,549.00
Guaranteed war production and termination loans (V and T loans)—War and Navy Departments and U. S. Maritime Commission	3,218,000.00
Guaranteed loans secured by agricultural commodities — Commodity Credit Corporation	88,592,044.00
Agreements to participate in loans by commercial banks to business enterprises — Reconstruction Finance Corporation (including Smaller War Plants Corporation)	310,170,000.00
Loans advanced through agent banks — Export-Import Bank	192,835,479.75
Guaranteed loans to veterans of World War II under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended — Veterans' Administration: [1]	
Home loans	1,916,736,213.58
Business loans	52,989,789.16
Farm loans	76,050,160.69
Guaranteed premiums on life-insurance policies and guaranteed interest on policy loans to military personnel under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940—Veterans' Administration	7,494,870.00
Total loan guaranties outstanding	6,473,673,957.18
Insurance in force:	
Life insurance:	
United States Government life insurance	2,310,338,804.00
National Service life insurance	34,115,000,000.00
Marine and war-risk insurance—War Shipping Administration	98,950,000.00
As of June 30, 1947—Continued	
Insured deposits in commercial and mutual savings banks — Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	$73,000,000,000.00
Insured share accounts and creditor obligations of savings and loan associations — Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	6,749,109,000.00
Total insurance in force	116,273,397,804.00

[1] Reduction in loan guaranties outstanding resulting from partial payments is not reflected.

OVER-ALL FEDERAL PAY ROLL

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Now let me ask you about the over-all Federal pay roll.

As I understand it, from testimony of the Civil Service Commission, as of the beginning of this fiscal year there were in the United States about 1,849,871 civilian employees. It is anticipated that as of July 1, 1948, there will be 1,750,000, and that the same figure will apply as of June 30, 1949. Does that coincide with your views?

Mr. WEBB. That is substantially correct. Mr. Lawton has a statement there. I would like him to check those figures against his statement.

Mr. Chairman, you understand the seasonal nature of this employment?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do. If these figures are correct, then between July 1, 1947, and July 1, 1949, a period of 2 years, there will only be a drop of 99,000, and furthermore you do not foresee the reduction of a single worker on the Federal pay roll during the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. WEBB. If the Congress approves the national-defense program and the international program as recommended by the President, I do not think you will have a reduction in employees.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Does that include the 5.7 billion dollars for new legislation to which you referred?

Mr. WEBB. Yes, sir; although the number of employees are not in proportion to that and will not increase according to the amount of the money, because a lot of it will go for material.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. When you say there will be no reduction in personnel in fiscal 1949, does that assume that legislation putting into effect recommendations calling for $5,700,000,000 will be enacted?

Mr. LAWTON. It does not take into account new legislation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. So that if any part of that were enacted, it would very probably result in an increase?

Mr. LAWTON. There would be an increase. Any rationing program would cause an increase as well as the foreign-aid program.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not talking about the foreign-aid program. I am talking about all the items

Let me summarize them:

These figures are as of June 30, 1947, and may be modified somewhat as of June 30, 1948, but the aggregate total would be about the same. The first item is our direct public debt which is set down at nearly $257,000,000. The second item embraces contingent liabilities. That word "contingent" is, indeed, an interesting word that has had common usage since 1933. No matter how fancy the word, they are still obligations and

liabilities of this Government in case something should happen. You will note that they aggregate nearly $25,000,000,000 The third item is unliquidated obligations incurred against appropriations and contract authorizations and it totals nearly $14,000,000,000.

Now examine the next item. It includes all loan guaranties on housing to veterans and other items and totals about six and one-half billion dollars.

Finally note our obligations on insurance policies and bank deposits which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The total is $116,000,000,000. Now add our direct and contingent liabilities of all kinds and you can see that this Government is obligated directly and potentially for nearly $430,000,000,000. What a staggering figure it really is.

In the face of this direct, contingent and potential obligation of the Government which we serve and of the people whom we represent, how can anybody be other than anxious and concerned about the fiscal integrity of our country and the effect which any inflationary force may have thereon.

For this reason I approach my own responsibility with the utmost of caution. There are so many things in the President's recommendations which are no doubt socially desirable but the problem and the responsibility of the Congress is to determine always how far we can go and what things we can do now. It is our responsibility to determine what things we believe we cannot and dare not do now, no matter how desirable, for fear it may jeopardize our fiscal integrity and be the force which could start the country on the toboggan. To this responsibility I summon a prayerful approach as I consider with you the two principal items in the President's recommendations, namely, housing and high prices.

I am sure that some Members of this body look with favor on some of the social legislation proposed, but the question is, Do we consider them now in the face of uneasy conditions?

THE TESTIMONY OF MR. BARUCH

Before the President prepared his recommendations on housing, high prices, and inflation he could have done well to have gone back and examined the testimony of a great patriotic American whom I like to call Mr. Fixit. He is a great businessman in his own right. He is a sterling American. On many occasions when big difficulties arose in government he was called in and his advice was sought. He is a sort of friend in court. I refer to Mr. Bernard Baruch.

On March 25, 1946, he appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency. That was about 8 months after VJ-day. We in Congress, like other citizens, were wondering about the backlash of war and what it might do to our economic structure. We were seeking advice on every hand, and particularly expert advice. So Mr. Baruch was summoned to appear.

His testimony dealt with four broad policies, namely, production, prices, wages, and fiscal proposals.

What did he say about production. He said it must be increased. He said it was the law and the prophets and that without production his other suggestions were meaningless. He urged that surplus war goods be made available to build up our inventory of available goods. He urged that small business be stimulated to produce. He urged that work stoppages be eliminated so that production would not be obstructed. It was a fervent plea for more goods for more people in more places.

Is there anything in the President's program which relates directly to the stimulation of production? If anything, some of the President's proposals would, in my judgment, retard production and thereby add fuel to the fires of inflation.

In this connection I point out to you a statement in a release from the Department of Agriculture dated July 23, 1948, in which "the suggested (wheat) goal is 71,500,000 planted acres, about 6 percent less than estimates of this year's seeded acreage." It is only fair to point out that the Department endeavors to make a case for this reduction in wheat goals, but how can we decry inflation and high prices in one breath and pursue a policy for the reduction of the production of bread grains in another?

That same release indicates that "the Department recommends a beef-cattle breeding herd goal which would maintain not less than 15,500,000 head of beef cows on farms and ranges on next January 1. Achieving this goal would result in a further moderate decrease of about one-half million head below the number on the farms last January 1."

I presume there is an explanation for it but it is a little difficult for me to understand this calculated and planned reduction in breeding beef cattle now when steaks are well above a dollar a pound in all sections of the country. It is scarcely consonant with a policy of production and more production in order to meet the very problem which the President has placed upon the doorstep of the special session.

The second item on which Mr. Baruch testified was prices, and he said that Congress should continue controls only for 1 year. Now, mind you, that was in May of 1946, more than 2 years ago. He was rather emphatic about the time limit and yet the President comes before us now with the plea to give him authority for stand-by price controls and rationing.

The third broad observation by Mr. Baruch related to wages and he made a statement which should be emblazoned in the skies. Here it is. He said, "stop bunking the public by saying that wage increases can be granted without an increase in the price levels." The President was very careful to observe in his message to us that where noninflationary wage increases could be granted, it would be perfectly all right to do so. In all candor I ask you, is there such a thing as a noninflationary wage increase? It is an anomoly in itself. However, the President continues to popularize the idea that there can be noninflationary wage increases. It should be elementary to all that every dollar which goes into the financial and economic bloodstream of the country whether it is a wage dollar or a dividend dollar or any other kind of a dollar is inflationary when there is an abundance of money and a shortage of goods.

Incidentally it might be well to go back for a moment and ask who first initiated this fallacy of noninflationary wage increases. It was first announced by a well-known gentleman by the name of Henry Agard Wallace when he was the Secretary of Commerce in the present administration. Somehow he had obtained it from some report and very blithely announced to the world this new and fantastic doctrine. When economists and the press sought to ascertain the source of this new idea, Mr. Wallace was very noncommunicative but subsequently it developed that it came from a study prepared for a labor organization. This is the same Mr. Wallace who seeks the Presidency of the United States. I want to observe about him that as an individual I like him well enough but I will say now what I said recently in Detroit and in Milwaukee that because of his views and policies I regard him as the most dangerous single individual in the United States today. If the policies which he espouses ever become the policies and the fabric of this Government, it will spell doom to freedom and free enterprise in this the last free solvent republic on the face of the earth. I do not laugh him off because he is too dangerous. He is the one who first gave currency to this strange policy that there can be noninflationary wage increases.

Mr. Truman of course does not abide by his own views on this. You will remember that when the first demand for a horizontal increase in the steel industry threatened to disrupt production at the very time when every industry including the housing program was crying for steel and it looked as if a strike were imminent, it was Mr. Truman himself who arbitrated that controversy and then announced an increase in wages in the steel industry and an increase of $5 per ton in the price of steel.

Mr. Baruch was so eminently right that the business of bunking the public by talking about noninflationary wage increases is positively dangerous to our future economic security and it should be stopped.

The fourth item with which Mr. Baruch dealt in his testimony before the Banking Committee related to fiscal policies. Number one on his list was to stop increasing the money supply. That is simple enough. Stop increasing the money supply in order to check inflation. Mr. Baruch said also we should stop decreasing taxes until the budget is balanced. It remained for "the worst Congress in history" to balance the budget for the first time in 16 years. Mr. Baruch said cut Government costs to the bone. He elaborated on this by saying "that in time of inflation we should save and in time of deflation we should spend."

THE PRESIDENT'S VIEW

Now then, is this the President's view of inflation? Indeed, it is not. One might very well say that the President proposes in part to cure inflation by pouring gasoline on the fires of inflation to put them out.

The initial appropriation for the aid-to-education bill would be $300,000,000 per year and that is exactly so much placed in the spending stream of America. Is this the way to cure inflation? No matter how desirable aid to education may be—and I am frank to confess here and now that I was the cochairman of a joint committee with my good friend Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, to stimulate interest in this bill—but in every case it is a question of whether we should do it now.

I have no doubt that the minimum wage should be raised in some areas, but shall we do it now and add to the inflationary fever? I have no doubt that certain public power projects are desirable, but shall we do it now and shall we accede to the President's request for an additional $56,000,000 for projects on some of which the Appropriations Committee has held hearings and which were carefully considered.

Shall we modify provisions of the Social Security Act now and add so much more to the spending power of the country and feed the fires of inflation?

The National Health Insurance Act not only contains grants to States for more than $2,000,000, but it includes a hospital program which would divert material from the housing programs for which there is so much clamor. There would be so many more millions to enlarge the money supply at a time when there is still a shortage of so many goods. This is, indeed, a paradox that is difficult to understand because it is almost elementary that the way to cure inflation is to reduce the supply of money, restrict credit, and produce more goods for more people in more places. At so many points then the President has departed from this very simple and elementary formula which was presented to the Banking Committee of the House more than 2 years ago.

RELATION OF CERTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS TO INFLATION AND HOUSING

At this point it might be well to ask what bearing a modification of the reciprocal trade program at this time would have upon housing and high prices. The manifest answer would be none.

It is fair to ask what effect the creation of a National Science Foundation would have on housing and high prices and the answer would be exactly none.

It is fair to ask what effect a modification of the Displaced Persons Act would have on housing and inflation and the answer would be exactly none. And let me at this point make clear that I, for one, would favor a modification of the date in the Displaced Persons Act as originally suggested by the Judiciary Committee of the House and by Representative FELLOWS, of Maine, who did such an excellent job of piloting that measure through the Congress.

What effect would repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act have upon housing and inflation and the answer would be exactly none.

What effect would the civil-rights program which the President proposed have on housing and inflation and the answer would be exactly none.

Yet these and more too were a part of the recommendations which the President made to us and which can be esteemed to be a part of the reason for a summons of this Congress into special session.

1948 VERSUS 1933

It is rather informative to recollect and go back to the days of 1933 when Congress was summoned into special session to deal with the distressing conditions which then obtained in the land. These conditions were a matter of fact and a matter of record when I first came to the special session of the Seventy-third Congress to deal with these problems.

At that time we had exactly the reverse condition of that which obtains today. The country was in a deflationary spiral. Oats, corn, wheat, and cotton were selling at unbelievably low prices. My good friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] the majority whip, is one of the best farmers in Illinois and he knows full well the depression that was upon the land at that time. The problem was then how to raise prices. The problem today is how to reduce prices. The problem then was to boost wage rates. The problem now is to keep them in line with prices and other elements in our economy. Is it then not fair to say that if deflation was effectively treated by a certain program in 1933 that the exact opposite program would be the proper technique to apply in a time of inflation in 1948?

If the administration was right then it is wrong now, and if it is right now, it was wrong then.

As everyone so well knows, economists and others were called in to see what might be done about the deflation problem of 1933. At long last they proceeded on a very simple theory. It relates to money and it is not so abstruse as one might believe.

Let us start with a very elementary fact that when you say the price of an item has gone up it is another way of saying that the value of the dollar has gone down.

You might have looked at a new hat 30 days ago that could be bought for $10 and when you went back later you might discover that it was priced at $12 and quickly you say to yourself that the price has gone up. It is more correct to say that the purchasing value of the dollar has gone down.

Now then, we had the reverse situation in 1933. The problem was to raise the prices of agricultural commodities, to raise wage rates and to supply jobs for people who were unemployed.

How did they go about it? There were two approaches to cure the deflation of that period. The first was to pump money into the economic bloodstream of the country. Those were the days when we created that variety of alphabetical agencies to do the job.

Possibly you remember the civil works program under the direction of the late Harry Hopkins. The problem was how to get a billion or more dollars into the hands of consumers as quickly as possible without actually putting them on a dole. They were not very particular how it was done.

I remember so well going along the highways of the country. And I saw men cutting sod along the highway, placing it on a truck, hauling it a mile or two and putting it down again along the same highway.

In those days we had the glorified leaf-raking program. It added nothing to the permanent wealth of the country, but it pumped billions into the blood stream of the Nation.

In those days we had the public works program. What an array of schools, courthouses, recreation halls, and other things were built from one end of the country to the other whether they were actually needed or not. It was putting money into the hands of people.

In those days we had the National Industrial Recovery Act. Surely you remember the old blue eagle with a sheaf of arrows in one claw and an industrial wheel in the other.

For years I have been trying to find one of those blue eagle signs, but have been unable to do so, so completely was it obliterated from our economic life. It was the day of the blue eagle, the green light, and the dark-brown taste. Under the National Industrial Recovery Act we even made it possible for industrial and trade associations to violate the Anti-trust Acts with the benign sanction of the Federal Government.

People were urged to get together in industry and business and to work out codes of fair competition, establish wage rates and correlate prices. What great decisions they were. Do not you remember the pants presser in New Jersey who was making money pressing trousers for 25 cents a pair. Unfortunately for him the trade association under its code set 35 or 50 cents as the price for pressing pants and when our New Jersey pants presser refused to comply he was arrested and probably put in jail. I am sure our good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM] knows all the details of that celebrated incident.

You must remember the battery maker in York, Pa., who operated a modest plant where he manufactured storage batteries for automobiles. He kept his price where it had been but was in violation of the code price because he was not charging enough. They then said to him in effect that he must charge more or he would be violating the code and would have to be arrested and put in jail.

Remember the great sick chicken case in New York. The Schechter Bros. operated a poultry house in New York City. Evidently they were selling under the code. They were notified to operate by code prices which were higher. They refused to do so. Accordingly they were charged with violation and the case ultimately went to the Supreme Court of the United States.

It was heralded far and wide as you remember as the sick chicken versus the Blue Eagle. It was too bad for the Blue

Eagle because the sick chicken gave him the knock-out before the Supreme Court from which the fuzzy old Eagle never quite recovered.

We empowered the RFC to purchase stocks and capital notes, bonds and debentures in industries, businesses, and insurance companies. It become the greatest lending institution in history.

We conferred upon the Federal Reserve System authority to make direct loans to industry so that money would be available.

We passed the Silver Purchase Act which is still on the books. Under its provisions it was required that the Treasury purchase silver until the ratio of silver to gold in our monetary system was in the ratio of one to three and to issue greenback money. It not only pumped money into circulation but it was alleged that this might improve the purchasing power of silver-standard countries like Mexico, Peru, Bolivia, and China and help those nations absorb some of our surplus goods.

All these things and more we did to lick deflation in the early thirties and our problem and objective was to pump more money into the bloodstream of the Nation to make prices and wages go up.

Now, we did one other thing. We cheapened the dollar so that it would take more dollars to buy a hat, a bushel of wheat, a kitchen stove, or a basket full of groceries. It was the same logic which is applicable today. As I said before, when you say that prices have gone up, it is another way of saying that the value of the dollar has gone down.

Conversely, when you say that prices have gone down, it is another way of saying that the purchasing value of the dollar has gone up and that it takes fewer dollars to buy the same amount of goods that one had been able to buy before. What should be done about it. The answer was very simple.

We squeeze a few grains of gold out of the dollar, and obviously by diminishing the gold content you cheapen the dollar and it takes more dollars to buy an hour of labor, a bushel of wheat, or a pound of meat. In practice how should this result be accomplished? It was done by Executive order under the authority of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934.

It was a pretty startled Nation that woke up one day to find that the President had announced a program for the purchase of gold at $35 an ounce when the statutory price was a little over $21.

Just as it took more dollars to buy an ounce of gold it took more dollars to buy a given quantity of commodities, goods, labor, and services. That then was the program for defeating deflation in 1933, and if it was right then, why should not the reverse of that program be applied to defeat inflation in 1948? The answer—the real durable answer to inflation will be found not in building another jacket around the boiler in the form of price controls, rationing, inventory controls, and other legislative procedures, but in reducing the intensity of the fires under the boiler and that is a fiscal problem pure and simple.

Mr. Baruch knew it full well when he testified before the Banking Committee in 1946. That is why he said we should reduce the money supply and quit inflating the currency. That is why he said we should reduce Government expenditures to the bone so that there would be no deficit spending which would in turn require the issuance of bonds which in turn becomes the basis for a greater credit expansion.

In time of deflation you add money to the economic bloodstream and in time of inflation you take money and credit away from it. Therein lies the hope and the only hope of bringing about orderly balanced reduction in the cost of living.

Is that what the President proposed to do? He proposes to add more money in this time of inflation by asking for legislation and appropriations which will run into the hundreds of millions, yes, billions of dollars of public funds and aggravate rather than remedy the problem.

This Congress has certainly done its full share to check inflation without resorting to price controls, rationing, supply, controls, and controlled inventories, which will reinvoke black marketing, discrimination, and all the evils with which we became familiar only a few years ago.

By balancing the budget we put an end to deficit spending so that billions in new bonds would not have to be sold to bank and nonbank investors alike as a basis for a new credit expansion.

This Congress labored long and diligently to examine every dollar of public expenditure and cut it to the bone.

This Congress followed tried, true, and trusted remedies for the very condition of which the President complains, and as I survey the President's recommendations over and over again it becomes more and more difficult to understand.

MEASURES WHICH HAVE VIRTUE

There are two or three recommendations in the President's message which deserve careful consideration and they are embodied in a bill which has been presented to the Congress. One of these would authorize the reimposition of controls over consumer credit to be exercised by the Federal Reserve System.

This was in effect prior to early 1947 and was then modified by the Congress. But let us take a good look and see what we did. If you will examine the text of a very short law which deals with this subject, you will find that while Congress abrogated this authority it inserted a provision in the act to the effect that in time of national emergency the President can reimpose consumer credit controls.

Is this an emergency? The President says it is and, therefore, called us back into special session. If so, he can utilize existing law for the purpose of proclaiming that emergency and restore consumer controls.

His second recommendation would authorize the Federal Reserve System to increase the reserves of member banks of the System. This is an item on which Marriner Eccles of the Federal Reserve System testified before the Joint Committee on Economic Report. I have read his testimony very carefully several times and as recently as last week. Despite the disagreement which exists between different members of the Federal Reserve System I, for one, believe that this proposal has merit because it is an orthodox approach and should certainly be considered.

HOUSING

I must apologize to the membership for the length of this dissertation but there is one other item of importance which deserves attention because it is one of the principal recommendations of the President. It relates to housing.

A short while ago my good friend, Representative JENSEN, of Iowa, mentioned the Wyatt housing program. I see him nod now. Representative JENSEN, by the way, has been a contractor and a lumber merchant for perhaps a quarter of a century and knows a good deal about housing materials and the housing business. He is, in fact, a most capable person in this field.

Let us examine a little background on housing. I remember very well indeed the legislation that was enacted over the years in this field. In those distressed days of 1933 we began with the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to provide a reservoir of home mortgage credit. Then came the Home Owners Loan Act to take care of distressed home owners whose mortgages were in default. In 1933 and 1934 Congress created a public housing program and also created the Federal Housing Administration which is in operation today and so widely used for the insurance of mortgages. In 1944 we passed the so-called GI Act which contained a housing title. In 1946 we created the Office of Housing Expediter.

A Joint Committee on Housing consisting of 7 Members of the House and Senate made a pretty thorough exploration of this matter throughout the year and you can believe it or not but that committee is authority for the statement that we have expended or committed or incurred potential liabilities in the field of housing activities since 1932 which is now in excess of $20,000,000,000. It is a staggering sum and I would say now as categorically as I can that I shall want to be pretty sure about my ground in the housing field now before I shall approve additional legislation.

THE ACT OF 1946

You will remember quite well that in January of 1946 Mr. Wilson Wyatt, a very affable gentleman from Louisville, Ky., who nominated Senator BARKLEY for the Vice Presidency at Philadelphia and who was sometimes whimsically referred to as the sunshine salesman, came to Washington at the instance of the President and in a little while a grandiose housing plan was laid before Congress. It called for a Housing Expediter or housing czar. It called for hundreds of millions of funds which were committed to Mr. Wyatt's keeping. It conferred subsidy and insurance powers upon the Expediter. It had for its goal two and three-quarter million houses for 1946 and 1947, about one-half of which were to be completed in 1946. All save 250,000 of these projected houses were to be of permanent construction.

Congress armed Mr. Wyatt with broad powers and an abundance of money and then he sallied forth equipped also with the power to issue rules and regulations

to make housing bloom and grow faster than it ever grew before.

Mr. Wyatt quickly learned a lot of things. For one thing, he learned that it takes lumber and soil pipe and flooring and doors and plaster to build houses and that they cannot be built with red tape and directives. He found bottlenecks in securing bricks, soil pipe, flooring, and other items, and then, lo and behold, he found that OPA was standing in the way.

Such is the manner of Government agencies. In the case of brick manufacturers, the producers could not get manpower back into the brick plants unless they raised wages and they couldn't raise wages unless they could get an increase in the price of bricks. OPA said no and for a long time, as many as 300 brick plants were not in operation in the country. They had similar experiences with soil pipe and flooring.

I remember so well when Mr. John D. Small, Chairman of the Civilian Production Board, which became the successor of the War Production Board, came before the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations and there cried on the shoulder of the committee and ventilated his problems because OPA was standing in the way of stimulating the production of essential housing material.

What happened to Mr. Wyatt's noble experiment in housing notwithstanding the money and the authority which Congress conferred upon him? The whole number of houses under that program was less than one-half of what private industry will build in 1948, and private industry placed no special burden upon the public Treasury. Mr. Wyatt's homebuilding program died a natural death. It died of sheer inertia and the President made no particular effort to have it revived.

THE PRESIDENT'S NEW REQUEST

What the President is now requesting is legislation broad in scope which, as I recall, will commit this country to an expenditure over a period of 40 years of something in excess of $900,000,000.

Will it develop housing to meet the present need? I am not insensible to the need for housing. I doubt whether there has ever been a time in the history of the country when additional housing was not needed, but I can say to you that the fondest and most earnest supporters of the housing bill which the President requests do not expect it to build a single occupiable unit for 18 months or 2 years. Is that the way to meet a critical housing need for which Congress was called into special session?

What is this legislation which the President requests? It contains a billion dollars for slum clearance and an interesting provision to the effect that slums cannot be cleared unless public housing is first provided for the slum tenants who are dispossessed. I am for slum clearance and, as a matter of fact, have introduced a bill which I regard as workable in this field and which can be coordinated with State activities on a matching basis, but let us get over the fuzzy thinking which presently plagues the country and confuses slum clearance and housing.

Slums could be cleared and converted into parks and playgrounds. Slum clearance is one thing but housing is another. This bill contains a fund to institute yield insurance amounting to a billion dollars. It is designed to stimulate investment in large-scale housing by insurance companies over the country, but I am advised that they regard this provision as of doubtful force and unworkable. There is a provision for a revolving fund for public housing and the payment of annual subsidies to offset the low incomes of people so that they can occupy public housing plus a subsidy out of the public Treasury. As I recall, the subsidies are estimated at $32,000,000 for the first year and gradually go to $160,000,000 so that over a 40-year period about $6,000,000,000 or more is estimated for subsidies on public housing. There are provisions in the bill to build and equip plants to expedite the production of prefabricated housing. There is a provision for blanket mortgage insurance on 25 units or more to accelerate the construction of on-site prefabricated houses. There is a provision under which the Secretary of Agriculture can issue capital notes up to $250,000,000 for rural housing. Finally, there are provisions in the bill to liberalize and expand housing credit more and more notwithstanding the acts which have already been passed by the Congress. And to me these provisions contain danger signals because they are so at variance with the philosophy expressed by Mr. Baruch, and at variance with tried and tested methods for meeting inflation and preserving freedom.

HOME OWNERSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES

One would think from the loose talk which is heard that it requires an unusually fancy income to be a home owner. That is not what the Census Bureau of the United States says. Their 1947 census shows that there are 29,652,000 families in the United States today and that 15,250,000 are home owners. Do all of these home owners have a high rate of income? Not at all. The Census Bureau says there are 533,750 home owners whose total annual family money income is under $500 a year. There are 777,750 home owners whose total annual family money income is less than $1,000 a year. There are nearly 12,000,000 home owners in America whose total annual family income is under $5,000 a year. There is the picture of home ownership in the United States and it is a great thing to say that over 51 percent of the American families own their homes and it embraces families at all incomes and the number is growing.

THE RECORD OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

I am sure there must be millions of people who if they read some of the current literature on the subject of housing must conclude that no houses of consequence are being built and that the only builder who can do the job is the Federal Government. It is high time that the record be made clear to everyone. What then is the record? First, as a part of the record, let us look at our housing needs. The Joint Committee on Housing secured estimates from at least 15 different sources including labor organizations and others as to our housing needs. They ranged from 300,000 units per year to 2,000,000 units per year. There were a number of responsible estimates of 800,000 units per year. There, then, is an estimate of need.

And what has been done to meet this need? In 1947 private industry started and completed 849,000 housing units notwitstanding the manpower and material problems which they encountered. One may be able to build air castles in Spain out of the tenuous stuff of dreams but it takes brick and lumber and soil pipes and other things to build houses, and private industry has been building them. That was for 1947. What is the score in 1948? For the first 5 months the starts by private builders were more than 356,000 units. The latest figure I saw was for the month of June which came from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and indicates that for that month alone more than 92,000 houses were started.

Even the first 5 months of 1948 will show a 28-percent increase over 1947 and before the year is up it will go well above that figure.

Heretofore the peak year of housing construction was 1925 when 937,000 houses were built. We will beat that in 1948 and it will not be a bit surprising if we reach the million mark.

There is the answer to housing.

The Department of Labor says as of May that 2,064,000 persons are employed in the construction industry and that this exceeds May of 1947 by 200,000. Manpower is coming back and houses are going up. If the free-enterprise system has a fair chance it will meet this housing need and raise its construction level year after year until the job is done.

THE PRESIDENT'S IDEA

But now comes the President to ask for more housing legislation involving a 40-year commitment of the public credit which cannot produce any houses for a long time to come. The houses which private industry is building are real. They are not paper houses. They are not built of Federal red tape. They are substantial, and people live in them.

But the President now requests broadgauge legislation which can possibly and probably jeopardize the forward strides which we are presently making in the housing field.

Suppose this housing bill is superimposed upon what is now being done, what will be the result? It will step up and intensify demand and as demand is intensified it simply adds to the inflationary pressures which the President wants to cure. It will not increase the supply. It will intensify competition for the available manpower and materials and instead of reducing the cost of homes, it will increase it.

It will not mean more housing but more expensive housing.

But what the President wants will do something else. It will expand mortgage credit more and more on slender terms so that scarcely any owner equity is preserved, and thereby further feed the inflationary fire with which we are presently concerned.

In thinking of those who need housing, I want to think also of the 15,000,000 families who have an investment in homes today and who are home owners.

If by any mismove or mistaken course on our part we should bring the economic house tumbling down around our ears, do not forget that it will not only affect those who are seeking homes now but the millions who are home owners at the present time.

That is what happened in 1929 and God grant that this blessed country will never see a recurrence of that phenomena.

If by mistaken action, hasty and emotional judgment on the part of Congress we should jeopardize the values of this country, it will affect not only the millions of home owners but the millions of owners of business properties and the millions of owners of farms as well, and could be a disaster that would shake the country to its very roots.

Yes, my colleagues, I am as genuinely concerned as the President about present and future conditions in this country, and I shall do nothing by word or deed that will jeopardize its fiscal integrity and loosen the rock that might bring on the avalanche.

This is not my personal unsupported opinion. I call to witness an outstanding student in the Government who has been here for a long time. As I remember he came in 1934 and he has been here ever since. Once upon a time he was the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. He is no longer the chairman. It may be that his philosophy and his theories of Government and finance did not find favor in high places and not so long ago he was demoted from his position as chairman and permitted to remain on the Federal Reserve Board. I refer to the Honorable Marriner Eccles. It was on the 13th of April that he appeared before the Joint Committee on Economic Report, of which Senator TAFT is the chairman. I know from reading the testimony that our colleague, Representative HERTER was there and likewise Representative RICH. I know that others were there, and in the course of his long testimony Mr. Eccles addressed himself to home mortgage credit.

This is what he said, and let it sink into your memories:

> Congress is currently considering the continuance of easy mortgage credit for housing. Easy mortgage credit is one of the most inflationary factors in the domestic credit picture.

Read that carefully. He says that easy mortgage credit is one of the most inflationary factors.

And then he goes on and says "The housing shortage cannot be overcome by increasing the competitive pressures on scarce supplies of materials and manpower. They are the limiting factors on the volume of construction." Read that again. It is the old story. It takes manpower and materials to build houses.

Now it is proposed to put the Government in the housing business up to its ears on a 40-year basis at an ultimate expenditure of $9,000,000,000. To do what? To compete with private enterprise for the available materials and manpower and thereby jeopardize the program which is building a million houses a year in which people can live. Are we willing to take that risk and are we willing without far more careful exploration than has been manifest before to undertake this kind of a program with its further liberalization of mortgage credit and which may project us into difficulties which we cannot foresee? If it gets out of control then, of course, the economic structure of the Nation may tumble about our ears, and I, for one, would dread to contemplate that result.

If disaster should come, and God knows I am not defeatist or pessimist, just remember that disaster comes to all and not to just one group in the country. It would not take much of a recession to wipe out the thin and slender equities in hundreds of thousands of homes, and if we should carelessly invite that possibility we would be doing a tragic disservice to the very people who have a little nest egg and who are hoping to acquire a house.

Once more I feel the need for emphasizing the fact that we are moving toward the construction of 1,000,000 homes a year by private enterprise and in the face of that record, do we now propose to place pressures upon material and manpower and cause this program to bog down?

Already it is becoming manifest that the competitive factor is coming back into the housing field. I would be the last to deny that there have been houses built which contain poor material or do not represent in value the price that was paid therefor. I would be the last to contend that there are veterans and others who have not been imposed upon but I do say that by and large there is integrity in the construction industry of the country even as there is integrity in every other segment of the business enterprise of this Nation, and they are moving forward rapidly to lick the housing problem. They deserve a full and fair chance with the manpower and the materials which are available.

CONCLUSION

What then shall we say by way of summary? First, Mr. Truman suggests many proposals to us which have no relationship whatsoever to high prices and housing and which deserve long and careful consideration because they are attended by much controversy not only in Congress but throughout the country as well; second, one may reasonably conclude that Mr. Truman is endeavoring to cure inflation by pouring gasoline on the fire in the form of greater appropriations and expanding credit; third, he would cure inflation in part by imposing controls, curbs, and rationing, which can only resurrect the evils with which we were familiar in another day and which, in addition thereto, would be applied only to a selected group of items and would thereby further aggravate the unbalance in our whole price structure between one commodity and another. Finally, there are a few items which I believe deserve our earnest consideration because they constitute part of a tried and tested approach to the problem of inflation, namely, the field of money, credit, and production. This, then, is my story as I labored long and earnestly on the President's recommendations to this body. This is a feverish and fitful period and, in my humble judgment, the hope of preserving the solvency of this Republic lies in the caution with which the Congress approaches these problems free from bias, free from emotion, and, above all, free from haste.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LEGISLATIVE MUSTS OF THE NEW SESSION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the full 10 minutes because a very important conference of the majority of the House will take place very shortly. I think that is important because we are all eager to secure necessary legislation and wise legislation before we adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, the reception just given the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] shows how the membership of the House feels about the loss of the distinguished gentleman. His loss will be felt because of his eloquence and the vastness of his information and his statesmanship. It will be a tremendous loss not only to us but to the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, too many of us keep forgetting that the housing problem is primarily a veteran's problem.

The veterans' housing problem is today just about as acute as it ever was. Our home builders well may be proud of the large volume of homes and apartments which they are producing, but to the average veteran family these homes and apartments are hopelessly overpriced.

In addition to the barrier of high prices, veterans are facing a serious problem of obtaining favorable home-financing, or indeed, any financing at all. Many veteran families who can afford present-day home prices are unable to become homeowners because they cannot get a GI loan under the GI bill.

The housing bill passed in the closing minutes of the last session will not help solve the veterans' housing problem. Many believe there is nothing in that law which will help to bring down home prices and rentals.

Furthermore, I am told by many persons experienced in the field of home finance that the secondary market feature of that law will be of little, if any, help in making GI loans available to veterans. It is believed that the secondary market provided gives no relief to the lending institutions which are most deserving of relief. These are the lending institutions which have participated wholeheartedly in the GI loan program and as a consequence are now saturated with GI loans. Moreover, the new secondary market offers no assurance or incentive to other lending institutions sufficient to induce them to make additional GI loans available to veterans.

Members of the House, we must do something. To do our duty to our veterans we must give them a law which is primarily a veterans' housing law.

During the past year the Congress has considered a host of housing bills. Most of these bills have alleged to be in the interest of veterans' housing. But on closer inspection it is evident that other motives have been dominant in these bills—they have not been truly designed to really do something for veterans' housing.

There is only one bill I know of which is a veterans' housing bill in both name and fact and intent. This bill is H. R. 4488, the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948. It is an amendment to the GI bill of rights and some 29 companion bills were introduced by other Members of Congress. This bill has the sponsorship of the American Legion and was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, during the last session of Congress. Gentlemen, I urge that we make amends for all of our past sins of commission and omission in veterans' housing during a period of many years, and bring this veterans' homestead bill out on this floor for unanimous passage by the entire House.

To refresh your memories, let me repeat the things that the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948 will do for our veterans in need of housing.

The bill will give veterans homes at much lower costs. Through FWA grants and other positive features, the bill will reduce housing costs to veterans by as much as 20 percent.

The bill will give veterans the tools to master their housing problem through their own initiative. Through homestead associations chartered by the Veterans' Administration, veterans can go ahead in their own communities and build their homes without being forestalled by the contrary objectives of others upon whose cooperation they are now required to wait.

The bill assures veterans of the necessary financing. Through loans from the Veterans' Administration and through provisions which assure the availability of an adequate supply of capital for GI loans, home-seeking veterans can be certain of low-cost financing.

The bill will solve the rental-housing problem which is plaguing our veterans in urban centers. Homestead associations can begin immediately to plan and build apartment houses which will feature greatly reduced monthly rentals.

The bill provides very necessary credit aid to GI's who need farm housing. By making low-cost credit available to veterans through the Federal land banks and the Farmers Home Administration, the bill will fill a serious need in many of our farm communities where veterans are now unable to get the necessary financing to provide farm homes.

Necessarily, I have stated the bill's provisions in very general terms. But every point I have mentioned has been previously explained and supported by facts and figures which have been laid before this House. For the convenience of any of you gentlemen, my office will be glad to afford you references to the pages of the RECORD or the sources of other exhibits in which that material can be found.

In short, ladies and gentlemen, the veterans' homestead bill will finally accomplish what Congress should have done 3 years ago. The bill would supplant unrealized promises with real assistance toward assuring the efficacy and success of the aids to home-seeking veterans which Congress undertook to supply 4 years ago last month in enacting the GI home-loan provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

And let me emphasize this point—the bill does not call for huge Government expenditures. The costs of the homestead bill to the Government are extremely moderate. The great bulk of the funds which the bill would make available are not expenditures, but are self-liquidating loans which will be repaid to the Government with interest. The only direct cost involved is the $200,000,000 for FWA grants to aid homestead associations in land development and improvement, and even this cost will be spread over a number of years. I am proud that we have been able to offer a bill which will do so much for our veterans at so little cost.

The Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948 offers veterans a long-awaited square deal in housing. I am confident that those of you who will familiarize yourselves with its merits will join heartily with me in urging its immediate enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include as a part of my remarks a brief description I made of H. R. 4488 at the time our committee reported it unanimously:

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

VETERANS' HOMESTEAD HOUSING BILL

(H. R. 4488; to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for veterans of World War II homes, and the public facilities necessary therefor, through veterans' homestead associations, and to make available more adequate financing for the acquisition of homes and farms by such veterans. Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request). Introduced and referred November 18, 1947.)

Analysis: The revised reported version of H. R. 4488 amends the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to permit the Veterans' Administrator to charter veterans' homestead associations, composed of at least five veterans for the purpose of providing housing for veterans. Substantial aid would be given for the construction of multiunit housing to be rented or sold on a cooperative or mutual ownership basis. Average cost of each family unit limited to $10,000. Authority expires July 25, 1957.

Individual single-unit houses, either rural or urban, could be built by associations and sold to an individual veteran. Homestead associations could not supply permanent financing to purchasers of individual units.

Association financing to be obtained from Veterans' Administrator at an interest rate not more than one-fourth of 1 percent more than rate he is required to pay the Secretary of the Treasury for the capital required. Loans may be amortized over 40 years for rental multiunit housing and 32 years for housing held on a mutual or cooperative basis.

Authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to advance the following amounts:

One billion dollars per year for 5 years to Veterans' Administrator for loans to veterans' homestead associations and such other sums as are necessary to maintain a restricted secondary market for future title III home and farm loans;

Seven hundred and fifty million dollars per year for 5 years for Home Loan Bank Board to make investments in savings banks, cooperative banks, building and loan associations and similar institutions which are members of a Federal home-loan bank or are insured under title IV of the National Housing Act which will make GI loans of $9,000 or less more readily available to veterans (preference to be given in distribution of funds to those institutions in areas needing capital expansion for veterans' housing and willing to make 100-percent loans to veterans);

One hundred million dollars per year for 5 years to Secretary of Agriculture (acting through Federal land-bank loans or Farmers Home Administration loans) to provide farm-loan financing to veterans;

Two hundred million dollars to the Federal Works Administrator for grants, on the customary 50-percent matching basis, for sewer, water, and like facilities required for the housing.

Incontestability clause for GI loan guaranties is included to encourage participation in loan program.

The only nonreimbursable expenditure required will be the $200,000,000 for the use of the Federal Works Administrator in providing grants to the States in the construction of public and community facilities needed by the associations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

INFLATION AND OUR ELDER CITIZENS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 years ago I appealed to the Ways and Means Committee to draft legislation to alleviate the plight of our elder people and I addressed the House on the same subject. At that time I said:

> How far will the average old-age assistance go toward paying the grocery bill, the meat bill, and the clothing bill of these people today?
>
> We are so rich, we gave away billions to the other nations of the world after the First World War, eleven and one-half billions of which is still due and outstanding. Now we are contemplating giving more billions to these same nations. If we give them all they are asking, we will make gifts to these foreign nations amounting to more than ten billions more.
>
> What are we doing for our own people who have reached the age of 65? Under the present system we compel them to sign a pauper's oath. If they own their own homes, we compel them to execute a deed turning over their homes to the State. We charge them interest on whatever old-age assistance they receive, whether it is $30, $20, $15, or $10 a month or less; then if they do not pay the interest and the principal of the loan—which the States and the Federal Government wrongfully call old-age assistance—their homes are sold at public auction on foreclosure. I am told that in some States even the life insurance of our senior citizens must be turned over to the State before any so-called old-age assistance is given these American citizens.
>
> It is this unfair and ungrateful treatment of our fathers and mothers on the part of our Government, the richest in the world, that prompts me to appear here today on behalf of these good deserving folks, whom our Government has apparently forgotten in the mad rush of turning over our money and our substance to everybody else in the whole world.

I also compared the prices of food and clothing, as indicated in advertisements in the newspapers of the fall of 1939, when Hitler started on his rampage in Europe, with the prices of the same food items in the fall of 1945. In the fall of 1939, you could buy hamburger for 14 cents a pound, sirloin steak for 17 cents, veal chops for 17 cents, and leg of lamb for 19 cents. Slab bacon was only 9 cents a pound, and early potatoes 19 cents a peck. All standard brands of flour sold for $1.49 a sack. Bartlett pears were $1.49 a bushel, and prunes 69 cents a box, and oranges 15 cents a dozen.

Ladies' sport coats were advertised for $9.50 and $19.50; and, if you wanted fur trimming on the coats you could get them for $16.50 and $37.50. Men's suits with two pairs of trousers sold for $22.50 and $27.50, and they threw in a vest for good measure.

I do not intend to take up your time to list the prices you have to pay for those same items today.

But since that time, everything has gone up. Wages and incomes have gone up, as well as profits and prices. The only persons in our society who have not benefited and the only people whose income has remained dormant are our fathers and mothers, the people who helped to make this country what it is—the pioneers who suffered the hardships and self-denials that accompanied the building of this country.

Those of our elder citizens who are out of employment and have no other means of support have to exist on old-age pensions averaging less than $40 a month throughout the Nation. Some States pay their elder citizens less than $20 a month, and expect them to eke out an existence on a mere pittance at present inflationary prices for food and clothing and everything else that is necessary to keep body and soul together in our complex society. That is a tragic situation, and a shame on the American way of life.

In most States, before a person can get even the pittance of an old-age pension, the pensioner must sign a pauper's oath, and if he has any property he must turn it over to the State. They employ an army of snoopers and will not even let our elder citizens earn anything on the side, whether it is doing errands or baby-sitting, without deducting such meager earnings from the little old-age pensions they get. There have been cases where our old-age pensioners have performed their duty as American citizens by serving on the jury, and have bought a new suit so that they might make a good appearance as a juror—only to find that the amount of their fees as a juror was deducted from their old-age pension checks.

While we are here in special session, why cannot we do something to remedy this terrible situation? There are several discharge petitions on the Clerk's desk waiting for the signatures of the Members to bring out legislation for the benefit of our senior citizens. I appeal to you, my colleagues, all of you—Republicans, Democrats, and Dixiecrats—to step up to the Clerk's desk, sign one or more of these discharge petitions, and do something about this.

The Social Security Act now on the statute books has proved to be a failure. There are now over 7,000,000 men and women over 65 years of age who have been retired from their employment, who should be entitled to social-security benefits, but only about one-fifth of our people over 65 who are in need actually receive benefits under the law. More than 5,750,000 men and women over 65 in this great country who are in need receive absolutely nothing from the social-security fund, although there is more than $5,000,000,000 in the social-security fund at the present time—over five billions doing nobody any good, with almost 6,000,000 people over 65 in need of old-age benefits.

And those who do receive social-security benefits today average only about a dollar a day. That is something for all of us to contemplate.

On the subject of social security, in 1939 testimony was offered before the House Ways and Means Committee to the effect that families of retired workers got an average pension of only $6.40 a week. The Government has collected $9,000,000,000 in taxes for old-age pensions and survivors insurance. It has paid a billion and a half in pensions. It has borrowed and spent the other seven and a half billion on other things.

Can you imagine such a situation in this country that is giving billions to Europe and to China—our country that has already given billions upon billions to foreign countries and to their citizens, even to those who are seeking the downfall of our way of life.

We must do something to right the wrong we have done and are doing to our fathers and our mothers. We, who are giving billions to the relief of foreigners and to those of foreign ideologies, should do something to see that our senior citizens, our own fathers and mothers, shall receive a decent old-age assistance and decent social security. The average of a paltry $1 a day they are now receiving from their State and Nation is a blot on our escutcheon.

I appeal to those of you, my colleagues, who feel the same as I do about this tragic situation, to do your part during this special session to alleviate the suffering of our elder citizens by coming up here and signing one or more of the discharge petitions on the Clerk's desk, so that we can get legislation out on the floor of this House that can be passed, and thus right this wrong that has been perpetrated on our old folks. Let us do it now.

We should not adjourn this special session of Congress until we have done something to curb the rising spiral of inflation and rising prices; and we should not go home until we have done something to alleviate the plight of our senior citizens—and fathers and mothers.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what this report relates to.

Mr. EATON. The report will be on a bill covering the proposal to strengthen the United Nations.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In what respect?

Mr. EATON. By the loan of $65,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CONGRESS CAN HELP TO CHECK INFLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, let no Member of the Congress make a mistake about it—the high cost of living is a vital issue in every American household. It is now at an all-time high. Since controls were dropped 2 years ago the price index has gone up over 40 percent. The American family today expects the Congress to take steps which recognize the devalued condition of the American dollar and to do something about it.

We cannot afford to spend our time here using the present session as a political sounding board. The need for relief for the people is too urgent. I have talked to the housewife, the worker, the farmer, and the small-business man in Montana and they are all fearful that, if something is not done to halt the spiral of inflation, the results will be tragic indeed. It would be ironical if, in the midst of an era of full employment, we should have a depression. That, nevertheless, is a possibility if Congress refuses to meet this challenge of high prices.

We should tighten credit controls and try to attack this problem of inflation at the source. The fault does not lie with the small-business man but it does, in part at least, originate among the corporate giants whose price increases in recent months have sharply influenced the rising spiral of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H. R. 7076, a companion measure to a bill introduced in the Senate yesterday by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY. This bill provides for a 30-day cooling-off period for certain large corporations to show cause why prices should be raised. As the Congress knows we now have a cooling-off period for labor before it can call a strike. It is only fair, therefore, that corporate giants be made to assume their full responsibilities in the grave economic crisis now at hand.

The prices which 146,000,000 Americans pay for the basic commodities they must daily use all over the country are privately fixed by a few giant corporations.

The cost of living rises steadily, but corporate profits are rising even more rapidly. All corporate profits in 1947 rose 42 percent above what they were in 1946, although in 1946 they had reached an all-time high. The income after taxes of the 100 largest manufacturing

corporations in 1947 was 91 percent greater than in 1946, and during the first 6 months of 1948, the all-time record of 1947 was being broken by new profit highs.

Serious danger signals are appearing. Sales of 1,277 firms have fallen off 1.6 percent this year, according to the report of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the lower-income groups, according to the Federal Reserve Board, are dipping into their savings in order to live, extending their credit and going into debt. I do not see how the ordinary working family or those living on fixed incomes or those older citizens receiving a pittance for a pension, can live at today's prices.

This is the road to depression—rising prices, rising profits, dwindling savings, contracting purchasing power, narrowing markets, curtailed production, reduced employment, and then on over the "boom" to end in the "bust."

Mounting prices and mounting profits are undermining the purchasing power of the Nation and are setting the stage for a new depression all at the time when international recovery and world peace depend upon stopping inflation now.

To do this, it may not be necessary to restore all-inclusive price controls. It is necessary to recognize the fact that a few giant corporations have control over the production, the distribution, and the price of basic commodities upon which all American business depends. Put the spotlight of publicity on the pricing policies of these corporate giants and the brakes will be immediately applied to inflation.

The country does not realize the extent to which the people have become the subjects of private economic government. Three meat packing corporations produce 43 percent of all the meat distributed by packers throughout the country, and these same three corporations determine the price that people must pay for all meat.

Three steel corporations produce 49 percent of all steel ingots; three oil-refinery corporations produce 28 percent of all gasoline; three chemical corporations produce 66 percent of all chemicals, and in each instance these corporations actually set the prices for all other producers.

So it goes in other industries. Three corporations produce 67 percent of all farm machinery, 69 percent of all electric ranges, 75 percent of all window glass, 77 percent of all rubber tires, 80 percent of all copper, 87 percent of all gypsum board, 88 percent of all tin cans, and 91 percent of all primary aluminum.

In the case of 121 basic products universally used throughout the country, the total value of which, for each product, was more than $10,000,000 in 1937, more than 75 percent of the total output was manufactured by only four firms. When a few corporations secure control over so large a proportion of the production of any commodity, it is inevitable that they set the price not only for their own particular industry, but also for every other industry and every other business which uses these products as a raw material. Thus the price structure of American business, and, therefore, the cost of living, depends upon the private judgment of the private managers of the few corporations which have gained so tight a control over American production.

To deal effectively with inflation, and this includes high cost housing, it is necessary to deal with these concentrated giants. Their hand is on the throttle of American business. They have the power to turn it on and off. Experience has proved that it is idle to ask them to protect the public. No President from Mr. Hoover to Mr. Truman by politely using the prestige of the Presidency, has been able to persuade them to act in the public interest. They think only of their own welfare, yet when they increase prices in a dangerous situation like the present, they are acting against the welfare of the whole population and against the interest of every State and every community in the Nation.

Let us apply to them the same rule Congress has applied to labor. In the Taft-Hartley Act, and before that in the Railway Labor Act, Congress provided for a cooling-off period before a strike could take place. Why not a cooling-off period before the corporate giants which produce the bulk of our basic commodities may increase prices?

If the workers of the country are required by law to sell their labor for a certain period at a lower price than they believe they ought to have, why should not these huge corporations be compelled to hold the price line for a similar period until an appropriate Government agency can conduct a public hearing to review the reasons for the proposed price increases?

The national interest is paramount. We are dealing with the issues out of which depression and disaster for millions may arise. We are dealing with issues that directly affect world peace and national security. We cannot afford to drift. We must act to prevent the managers of the monopolist economic structure from pulling it down upon themselves and all the people.

I have, therefore, drafted a bill to provide that the price of all basic commodities, 30 percent or more of the total annual output of which is produced by five or less of all producers in any given industry, may not be increased until the producers desiring to make such increase shall have filed with the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Federal Trade Commission a notice of intention to increase prices, and until not more than 30 days after such notice a public hearing has been held by the Federal Trade Commission. At such public hearing it shall be the duty of the members of the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce to examine the applicant with respect to the reasons for the proposed increase.

Competition and free enterprise are being destroyed, States' rights insofar as the States are entitled to protect their own citizens are being undermined, and the people are being exploited by big business not so much because all big business wants monopoly but because concentration of control has proceeded so far that the private interests of the giant corporations are overriding the public interest. Only Congress can protect the people by holding inflation and preserving a competitive economic system.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing that this Congress had better wake up to the fact that the American people are watching to see what we are going to do and it is going to be their responsibility after this Congress adjourns to make their judgment as to what we do or as to what we may not do.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If the picture of the industries to which the gentleman refers as monopolies is as he has painted it, would the gentleman tell the House what is causing the scarcity and disappearance of risk capital?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that, contrary to what he has always advocated, I have not believed that there was an absence of risk capital in this country. I recall when the recent tax bill was debated—and I voted against it the last time as well as two times before that—that one of the arguments raised was that there was a lack of risk capital in this country. There is no lack of risk capital. There is all kinds of capital in the banks which can be used for almost any kind of business, and I am quite sure the gentleman will grant that particular thesis.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But the capital in the banks cannot be used as risk capital. It can be lent to industry today but it cannot be used as risk capital; and that is the catch in this thing, I may say to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not agree with the gentleman even there, that because this money is in the bank and has to be loaned that it cannot be used if the risk is worth while. I should think the businessmen would like to go to the banks to borrow money provided they can get that money on reasonable terms.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not a fact that most of our risk capital came from those income groups above the $25,000 level, and is it not also a fact that the progressive income-tax collections are such at the present time as to make it impossible for the people in those groups to invest as they previously did?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is a certain amount of truth in what the gentleman says; however, under the recent tax bill it is the people with incomes above $25,000 who get most of the benefits while the people in the lower brackets are the ones who get the least benefits, and those benefits have all been wiped out on account of the high cost of living and the steadily mounting spiral of inflation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is estimated by, I believe, the most capable men giving attention to this subject that it would require about $71,000,000,000 in current purchasing power to bring our industrial plant up to the 1930 level and, furthermore, the amount of capital invested per capita in productive enterprise is back to about the 1909 level. I want to say to the gentleman that this

is the most serious situation confronting the United States of America today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the gentleman that we are in a very difficult situation, but I do not think that industry is in such a serious condition as the great bulk of the American people because they are the ones who need the help and they are the ones Congress has consistently refused to give assistance to.

CALL OF THE CALENDARS ON MONDAY AND TUESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar in order on Monday next be dispensed with and that the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION CLEAR DR. E. U. CONDON

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for 15 long months we have witnessed an unparalleled publicity program by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in which the committee has attempted to smear the character and reputation of one of the Nation's most distinguished scientists, Dr. E. U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. In spite of a preliminary clearance, through an investigation requested by Dr. Condon himself on seeing certain attacks in the press in March of 1947 and conducted by Mr. W. Averell Harriman, then Secretary of Commerce and now Ambassador Extraordinary, in spite of clearance by the Loyalty Board, an investigation which he requested after the program was established; and now in spite of the clearance of the Atomic Energy Commission, after an exhaustive investigation the like of which has probably never occurred before—no doubt, a result of the atmosphere created by the House committee's publicity—in spite of all these investigations and clearances, backed by the FBI, we still see the committee continuing its oblique attacks by press releases.

What has this committee done in this case aside from publicity releases and press statements? The record will show nothing. It is high time that the facts and events in this shameful episode in congressional history were listed and the happenings of recent weeks revealed.

FIFTEEN MONTHS OF ATTACKS

First. March 1947: Two articles, replete with vague innuendoes, appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, indicating that Dr. Condon would be investigated.

Second. June 1947: Mr. THOMAS, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in a signed article in the popular magazine, American, attacked Dr. Condon and said that he would be subpenaed.

Third. June 21, 1947: Mr. THOMAS again repeated the above attacks in Liberty magazine of this date.

Fourth. July 17, 1947: A headline press release was made by the committee which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald repeating past attacks. This vicious smear was analyzed by me on the floor of the House—Smearing the Scientists: Attempt to Discredit Civilian Atomic Energy Control, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 22, 1947.

Fifth. March 1, 1948: A special subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities released a report in which it called Dr. Condon one of the weakest links in atomic energy, and pronounced judgment upon him. This report was allegedly a report to the full committee, and yet at least one member of the full committee admitted that he was never given a copy; it was released to the press in a theatrical fashion at the hospital bedside of Chairman THOMAS, shortly before the House was to consider the committee's appropriation. Its contents were described as a matter "of such importance that it demands immediate attention." The contents of this publicity blurb were analyzed by me on the floor of the House—Sabotage of American Science: the Full Meaning of Attacks on Dr. Condon, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 9, 1948.

In between these major publicity campaigns, the committee continued to emit a steady stream of lighter missiles and these press releases repeat all the old innuendoes.

The reaction of the Nation to the vicious report of March 1, 1948, should have settled this invidious publicity program of the committee, for the responsible press of the Nation, from coast to coast, lashed out at the tactics and procedures of the committee. These were summarized by the gentlewoman from California, the Honorable HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, on the floor of the House—Press Reaction to the Attacks on Dr. Condon, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 14, 1948. At the same time, eminent citizens and the distinguished professional societies and groups of the Nation protested bitterly this unwarranted and vicious treatment of so distinguished a scientist and citizen as Dr. E. U. Condon, and those who knew and had worked with him made clear their views of his integrity. These, too, were summarized by the gentlewoman from California, the Honorable HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, on the floor of the House—Societies and Citizens React to Attacks on Dr. Condon, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 15, 1948.

Meanwhile the committee announced that it would devote its entire staff to secure evidence to substantiate its March 1, 1948, attack. Perhaps galvanized by the flood of reaction, it decided to hold a hearing; April 21, 1948, was set, only to be canceled and indefinitely postponed. Members of the committee subsequently assured Congress that hearings would be held prior to its adjournment, but adjournment time came and no hearings had been held.

DR. CONDON COOPERATIVE

Throughout this period Dr. Condon did his best to help the committee—without avail. On July 9, 1947, for example, Dr. Condon addressed the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] the following letter:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My attention has been called recently to your article in the American Magazine in which you say that I will be subpoenaed to appear before your committee in connection with its desire to learn more about the American-Soviet Science Society. It will not be necessary to issue a subpoena as I will be happy to supply the committee with all the information I have. When two of your staff assistants called on me last March 1, I showed them my complete file on this subject and would gladly do so again. Also I am assured that officers of the society, and the Rockefeller Foundation which is sponsoring the society, will be glad to furnish any information you desire on this subject.

I shall at all times be glad to cooperate with your committee in any way that I can help in its highly important work.

Sincerely yours,
E. U. CONDON, *Director.*

To this day he has never received even the courtesy of a reply. Shortly after this letter on July 17, 1947, Dr. Condon addressed each member of the committee as follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There have recently been newspaper and magazine articles in which it was stated that the House Committee on Un-American Activities intends to investigate me. I think it is important that you should have a copy (enclosed herewith) of the letter I wrote to the chairman of this committee soon after these things were called to my attention.

I shall be happy to cooperate with the committee in every way. Please allow me to suggest the desirability of proceeding without delay because of the grave importance of the issues raised.

Sincerely yours,
E. U. CONDON, *Director.*

From a few he received acknowledgments, but nothing happened. Then on March 5, 1948, after the sensational March 1 attack, Dr. Condon, this time in person, practically forced himself on several members of the committee in their chambers at the conclusion of subcommittee session, renewing his standing offer to help, appear, cooperate, which he made 8 months before. But, as before, nothing came of that either.

DR. CONDON CLEARED REPEATEDLY

I will not go into the many times that Dr. Condon was cleared as a result of his association with many secret wartime projects, including clearance on the atomic bomb project, where he was under the supervision of Maj. Gen. Leslie Groves. Then there was the initial investigation, requested by Dr. Condon because of the press attacks of March 1947. This was prior to the establishment of the Loyalty Board program, and Mr. W. Averell Harriman reported himself satisfied as to Dr. Condon's integrity. When the Loyalty Board was established, Dr. Condon at his own request was again investigated and cleared with the concurrence of Mr. Harriman and the new Commerce Secretary, Mr. Sawyer. Finally, we have seen one of the most exhaustive and thorough investigations of all history undertaken by the Atomic Energy Commission: this investigation completely vindicates Dr. Condon of all the malicious smears, innuendoes, and

gossip that has been peddled for these last 15 months. That report bears repetition:

REPORT OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION AS RELEASED ON JULY 15, 1948

The question before the Commission is the security clearance of Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. In view of Dr. Condon's past association with the atomic energy project, this question arises under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act for reinvestigations of persons who were permitted access to restricted data by the Manhattan District. The question presented is whether Dr. Condon's clearance should be continued to permit him to have access to the restricted data pertinent to his duties as Director of the Bureau of Standards and related activities.

After examining the extensive files in this case, the Commission has no question whatever concerning Dr. Condon's loyalty to the United States. What we have for consideration, therefore, is whether the continued clearance of this distinguished American scientist, whose loyalty is unquestionable, would constitute a security hazard to the atomic energy program. Such a decision calls for a common-sense evaluation of the factors involved.

In considering the case, the Commission has taken note of the prior association of Dr. Condon with the atomic energy program, during which he was given access to information of a high degree of secrecy:

1. In 1940, Dr. Condon was appointed a member of the eight-man uranium subcommittee of the uranium section, National Defense Research Committee, which carried out the first over-all survey of problems related to developing nuclear energy from atomic fission for the defense program.

2. In 1941 and 1942, Dr. Condon served as associate director of research of the Westinghouse Corp., during the period when Westinghouse took a prominent part in the production of the first substantial quantities of pure uranium metal.

3. Also in 1942, Dr. Condon was appointed a consultant to S–1 executive committee of the Office of Scientific Research and Development. This committee was charged with the responsibility for reviewing the basic program of the entire uranium project.

4. For a short period in 1943, Dr. Condon served as associate director of the Los Alamos Laboratory, at that time in the early stages of its organization as the unit of the Manhattan project which would finally turn out atomic bombs. While at Los Alamos he prepared a document known as the "Los Alamos Primer," which was used as an introduction to the subject of the explosive use of fissionable material, to introduce to scientific and technical personnel coming to the laboratory the fundamental ideas under investigation.

5. In 1944–45, Dr. Condon worked at the radiation laboratory of the University of California at Berkeley, which was under contract with the Manhattan District.

6. In November 1945, Dr. Condon, having been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, took office in the position which he now occupies as Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

7. In December 1945, Dr. Condon was designated and thereafter served as scientific adviser to the Senate's Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

8. In 1946 Dr. Condon was named by the President as a member of the Evaluation Commission for Operations Crossroads, and in this capacity attended the Bikini tests.

During the war the Bureau of Standards conducted for the atomic energy program of the Manhattan District certain work of types which the Bureau was particularly suited to perform. The Bureau has continued to perform for the Atomic Energy Commission similar work which can be best carried out by the Bureau. Thus, in his position as Director of the Bureau of Standards, and in other related atomic energy activities in which he would participate, Dr. Condon had need for access to certain types of restricted data.

This meant that under the Atomic Energy Act Dr. Condon's security clearance required "reinvestigation"; that is, it was necessary for the FBI to investigate and report to the Commission on his character, associations, and loyalty, and for the Commission then to determine whether permitting him to have access to restricted data will endanger the common defense and security.

In defining the question before the Commission, it is recognized that, as is the case with thousands of other persons whose security clearances must be passed on by the Commission, Dr. Condon's clearance does not involve access to information on weapons or production or stock-pile data, for the reason that his duties do not require that such access be given.

The five members of the Atomic Energy Commission have personally examined with care the entire record. Although its Personnel Security Review Board expressed the opinion on June 7, 1948, that action by the Commission on the case might appropriately be deferred, pending reasonably prompt action by the House Committee on Un-American Activities with respect to that committee's own investigation and hearing as to Dr. Condon, the Commission considers that in view of its statutory obligations this is a case which the members of the Commission should themselves decide, and that it is our duty to proceed at this time to such a decision.

The record before the Commission includes reports compiled in two FBI investigations. In a most detailed and exhaustive manner, these present a very full picture of Dr. Condon's character, associations, and loyalty, since the FBI interviewed over 300 persons to obtain information, and its investigations were conducted by a large number of agents on a country-wide basis.

In addition, the FBI supplied the Commission the pertinent information relating to Dr. Condon which it had obtained from the files of other Government agencies. The thorough and painstaking investigations by the FBI, and other relevant information available to the Commission, provide the basis on which it is the Commission's responsibility to determine the question of Dr. Condon's security clearance.

In considering the record, the Commission has found that in the opinion of some persons, Dr. Condon's tact, judgment, and discretion appear to be subject to some degree of criticism. On the other hand, there are statements by persons who have been closely associated with Dr. Condon during his long work on classified information, which indicate proper care on his part in assuring that unauthorized persons should not obtain access to classified information.

The file contains unfavorable information of a relevant character concerning certain persons with whom Dr. Condon and Mrs. Condon have from time to time had contacts. The file also shows that Dr. Condon is a man of wide associations, and that his associates include many highly reputable members of the scientific community who have great confidence in him.

In deciding such matters, the Commission has a statutory responsibility to place in perspective the evidence both favorable and unfavorable, and to decide whether the common defense and security of the United States would be adversely affected if the individual concerned continued to have that access to restricted data which is required by the nature of his duties.

On the basis of the voluminous record before it, the members of the Commission are fully satisfied that, in the terms of the statute, Dr. Condon's continued clearance for the purposes stated above "will not adversely affect the common defense and security" of the United States. The Commission considers that his continued clearance is in the best interests of the atomic energy program.

NATIONAL REACTION

The editorial reaction of the press to this report by the Atomic Energy Commission reveals clearly where the Nation stands on this matter, what its evaluation of the House committee is, and what dangers confront the Congress in maintaining its honor and integrity before the Nation in the light of irresponsible committee tactics. •Typical of national reaction to the Atomic Energy Commission's report are the following editorials.

The New York Times on July 17, 1948:

CLEARANCE FOR DR. CONDON

The case of Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, has now reached a point where the Atomic Energy Commission considers him a good security risk, whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities is still gunning for him. The absurdity in this situation is that the AEC knows all the pertinent facts about Dr. Condon and that neither the committee nor its tireless chairman, Representative THOMAS of New Jersey, has ever produced anything against him but insinuations and innuendoes. The guardians of our most precious secrets are satisfied, but the House committee, which is scared of every public servant who has character, ability, and opinions of his own, is still engaged on what Bert Andrews, chief Washington correspondent of our neighbor, the New York Herald Tribune, has correctly described as a witch hunt.

What has Dr. Condon done? The record shows that he served his country as a teacher, as director of a corporation laboratory, as director for the Government of basic research in radar, as a member of the secret group which demonstrated the possibility of making atom bombs, as an adviser to the Senate committee which wrote the Atomic Energy Act, as an observer at the Bikini tests, and more recently, in his present position, in research connected with the nonmilitary uses of atomic energy. The AEC has now cleared him in spite of vague assertions that he lacks tact, judgment, and discretion. Not even the Thomas committee has questioned his loyalty. There is no shadow of evidence that he gave away secrets to the Russians or anybody else.

The Thomas committee may now proceed, as it threatens to do, after more than a year of baseless rumor-mongering. We think Dr. Condon will come out of any such hearing, for which till now he has asked in vain, with flying colors. But the question of the committee's procedure remains. If good and faithful servants, so judged by those who best know them and their work, are to be persecuted in this fashion our governmental research is likely to fall into the hands of drudges and time servers. Self-respecting scientists will look elsewhere. And the end result will be a deadly blow to our defenses, which from now on depend more and more on the best scientific minds we can enlist.

The Washington Post on July 18, 1948:

CONDON'S SECURITY

It would be refreshing to believe that the security clearance of Dr. Edward U. Condon by the Atomic Energy Commission meant an end to the character assassination of which he has been a long-suffering victim. Unfortunately the instigators of the smears directed against him never have paid much attention to the facts. Last March, on the basis of half truths and distorted evidence, the House Un-American Activities Committee made another of its periodic forays against Dr. Condon, implying that he consorted with Soviet agents and terming him "one of the weakest links in our atomic security." Despite the promises that he would

have an opportunity to answer the charges, Dr. Condon has not yet been offered that chance. At long last it appears that he will be permitted to testify in hearings beginning August 1, though the committee will have to change a lot of its spots if there is to be any confidence that the hearings will be fair.

The Atomic Energy Commission has taken the same attitude that any impartial body would take in reviewing the facts about Dr. Condon. He had, of course, already been cleared by the Department of Commerce loyalty board at his request before the smear was unleashed last spring. The Atomic Energy Commission had at its disposal two separate FBI investigations, one comprising more than 300 interviews. After satisfying itself as to his unquestioned loyalty, the Commission went further and examined two other factors of security, character, and association. It found that although there had been criticism of Dr. Condon's tact, judgment, and discretion, "statements by persons who have been closely associated with Dr. Condon during his long work on classified information * * * indicate proper care on his part in assuring that unauthorized persons should not obtain access to classified information." The clearance given him was unqualified.

This testament to Dr. Condon's reliability, though timely, comes only after repercussions throughout the scientific world. As Director of the National Bureau of Standards and as a former official in the atomic energy project, Dr. Condon occupies a respected position among scientists, and the persecution to which he has been subjected has been regarded widely as an attack on all individualism and unorthodox opinion. The damage is already recognizable in the reluctance of scientists to work for the Government. This condition, too, represents a threat to security which the Un-American Activities Committee can scarcely ignore. Indeed, if the committee is at all sensitive to the unfavorable light in which it has been cast, it could well afford to adopt a precept of the Atomic Energy Commission: "* * * to place in perspective the evidence both favorable and unfavorable." It can flout this principle only at peril of exposure as being interested solely in headline hunting.

The Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., on July 17, 1948:

THE MALICE OF GOSSIP COMES HOME TO ROOST

Today the House Committee on Un-American Activities stands explicitly disgraced. Its chairman, J. PARNELL THOMAS, and his fellow members have convicted themselves of irresponsible sabotage of character and reputation. They have shown themselves willing to ruin a man by innuendo, denying him every right of hearing and every rule of justice which protects the meanest thief or the vilest murderer in the land.

To frighten Congress into giving it money, or to promote military domination of atomic energy development, or perhaps for both reasons, the committee has used the vicious technique of back-fence gossip. It cannot be justified. It should not be permitted any longer to foul American air with the very Gestapo fears and Inquisition charges from which it was designed to protect us.

The case in point, of course, is that of Dr. Edward U. Condon, a distinguished scientist who is director of the Bureau of Standards. Dr. Condon is one of those physicists who gave the United States world leadership in atomic fission. Since 1940 he has had access to and has contributed to military and governmental developments of highly secret and important nature.

A week before the committee's request for a $200,000 appropriation to continue its activities came up in Congress, Mr. THOMAS issued his now infamous statement to the effect that Dr. Condon was "one of the weakest links in our atomic security." This charge it purported to sustain by innuendo and by quotation, out of context, of part of an FBI report concerning the scientist.

All this was March 1. Dr. Condon has been given no chance to defend himself. Now the United States Atomic Energy Commission has cleared Dr. Condon on the basis of "thorough and painstaking investigations by the FBI." The Commission concludes it has "no question whatever concerning Dr. Condon's loyalty to the United States."

The happiest thing about this turn of events—since no one had any idea that Dr. Condon was whatever the Un-American Committee tried to suggest he was—is the dilemma of the Un-American Committee itself. It can scarcely let the matter drop, since it already has set and postponed and tentatively set again hearings on Dr. Condon's case. And whatever Mr. THOMAS and his irresponsible cohorts produce at a hearing will make their position more despicable, if possible, than it is today.

This we hope is the last time the committee will try to assassinate character through hints, innuendo, and gossip's malice.

The San Francisco Chronicle on July 19, 1948:

DR. CONDON VINDICATED

The Atomic Energy Commission's thorough check of Dr. Edward U. Condon, its decision to allow him full access to any atomic information he wants to see, and its statement affirming confidence in his loyalty constitute a triumph of good sense. The hysterical smear attack on Dr. Condon made by Chairman J. PARNELL THOMAS of the House Un-American Activities Committee last March 1 is answered by the Atomic Energy Commission's sober action.

Chairman THOMAS accused Dr. Condon, Chief of the National Bureau of Standards, of being "one of the weakest links" in the chain of atomic security and attempted to make this accusation stand up by withholding information in his possession which disproved the charge. This amounted to a falsification of the facts, and it was widely and rightly condemned.

The full facts became public despite Mr. THOMAS' care in shielding part of them. Although he declared the Condon case was so important as to demand immediate attention, he has done nothing since to bring it out in the open where Dr. Condon might defend himself.

As far as Dr. Condon's standing with the American people is concerned, it is vindicated by the findings of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Thomas committee can direct its attention elsewhere.

The Dallas Morning News on July 17, 1948:

CONDON CLEARANCE ANNOUNCED AT LAST

Dr. Edward U. Condon is at last cleared as a man in every way worthy to be trusted with the life of the United States. That is the real meaning of dismissing charges of disloyalty against him.

To be sure, the investigation should have been carefully made as to Dr. Condon's fitness long ago. The fact that the investigation was not made probably grew out of the general feeling that the dear Russians were our revered allies and would do us no harm. Accordingly, an occasional contact with the Communists in society was a mark of broadmindedness and so on.

Now we know that every Communist is in some degree an undercover worker. The better Communist he is the better the spy. But the proof is, say our investigators, that Dr. Condon simply isn't the kind of man to give away atomic secrets.

Against the vague charge of disloyalty, the best rebuttal is the whole nature of the man. Under that test, Dr. Condon has stood up. We all know more about the way the Reds work now. Dr. Condon knows more about it, too. It is good to know that the country has lost nothing of value to even unintended indiscretion. Dr. Condon has conducted himself like a gentleman and a patriot while under fire. The report says, in effect, that he is exactly that—a gentleman and a patriot.

The Washington Evening Star on July 17, 1948:

DR. CONDON'S CLEARANCE

The Atomic Energy Commission's statement on Dr. Edward U. Condon ought to impel the House Committee on Un-American Activities either to correct itself regarding him or show good reason why it should not.

Some months ago the committee described Dr. Condon as "one of the weakest links in our atomic security" and cast serious doubt on his loyalty to the United States. It promised to hold a hearing on the subject, and he demanded one, but none has yet been held, though Chairman J. PARNELL THOMAS now asserts that something will be done along that line as soon as possible.

Meanwhile, in justice to Dr. Condon, the American people should acquaint themselves with the findings of the Atomic Energy Commission. Based on painstaking study and a voluminous record including material compiled in two exhaustive inquiries by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the findings may be summarized as follows: (1) The file contains unfavorable information concerning certain persons with whom Dr. and Mrs. Condon have occasionally associated; (2) it also shows that some individuals feel that his tact, judgment, and discretion seem open to a degree of criticism; (3) at the same time, however, testimony indicates that he has exercised proper care in safeguarding classified information; (4) his loyalty is altogether unquestionable, and (5) after placing all the evidence in perspective and weighing it carefully, the AEC is "fully satisfied" that his continued clearance for access to restricted data, far from adversely affecting security, "is in the best interests of the atomic-energy program."

Dr. Condon, of course, is an outstanding scientist who has made a distinguished contribution in the field of nuclear fission. In his capacity as Director of the National Bureau of Standards, he has to have access to certain types of secret information. The AEC has approved his clearance for the simple reason that it could find no sound argument against it, and for the further reason that his continued work with the atom is for the good of the country. His clearance does not cover data on A-weapons, but that remains restricted to him only because, as in the case of thousands of others connected with the atomic enterprise, his duties do not require access to the military phase.

In short, as far as the AEC is concerned, Dr. Condon is a loyal and able American who has not deserved to be branded as a weak link in our atomic security. Unless the House Committee on Un-American Activities can now prove otherwise, it ought to apologize to him and resolve never again to play fast and loose with any man's good name.

The New York Herald Tribune, on July 18, 1948:

CLEARANCE FOR DR. CONDON

The decision of the Atomic Energy Commission to give Dr. Condon access to restricted information in this most sensitive of Government agencies should remove any lingering doubt of his loyalty and trustworthiness. The Commission's report details the scrupulous care with which Dr. Condon was investigated, and the grave deliberation with which the information was sifted by the five Commissioners. From this scouting Dr. Condon has emerged clean and is adjudged an asset to the atomic-energy program.

The circumstances are assurance that this was no superficial examination of Dr. Condon's character and qualifications: For one thing, the Commission, being no more than human, must have deliberated in an oppressive awareness of J. PARNELL THOMAS and his Committee on Un-American Activities, ready to pounce at the first sign of a misstep. But even had Mr. THOMAS not been directly involved in the case the Commission's decision would carry conviction. Wherever security could be, by any stretch of the fancy, associated with a problem, the Commission has acted in the past with almost painful caution; if it moved at all in the case of Dr. Condon one can depend on it that it moved only over indubitably firm ground.

In spite of Mr. THOMAS's dour predictions, it is difficult to see how he can resume his violent attack upon Dr. Condon. The Commission has had access to all the information in Mr. THOMAS's possession, and no doubt a good deal more. Its action has been clear-cut and decisive. It would be to the best interests of everyone and everything concerned—the Committee on Un-American Activities, the atomic-energy program and Dr. Condon himself—if the books should now be closed upon this thoroughly unsavory cause celebre, which has already been damaging enough to the essential liaison between science and the Government.

These editorials sum up the rational and reasoned opinion of the country with respect to the position of the House committee in this matter. They take intelligent cognizance of the unprecedented and exhaustive investigations of the Atomic Energy Commission which has vindicated Dr. Condon's smeared but still unsullied reputation. They are aware of the dangers to the Nation of deterring scientists from Federal projects, for public-opinion polls, letters, and statements from scientists throughout the country have shown that our scientists are loath to hazard their good names in service which subjects them to congressional calumny and slander; and this means that this committee is endangering the security of the Nation, which depends on concerted and sustained developments in science for its military strength, by its publicity and propaganda maneuvers.

In short, what has the committee done? It ignores the successive clearances granted Dr. Condon throughout the war. It ignores the clearances resulting from investigations prompted by its press campaign, dismissing also the considered judgment of responsible officials in reviewing these clearances, officials such as Mr. W. Averell Harriman; Mr. Charles Sawyer, the Secretary of Commerce; the five public-spirited members of the Atomic Energy Commission which has worked closely with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, responsible for that astounding extensive investigation of Dr. Condon. As for its own activity, there is none. None, unless the committee proposes to justify its appropriations and existence by the tonnage of press releases that it has spewed out with reckless abandon and regurgitated with nauseating frequency throughout the last 15 months. That is its record. No diatribes, no excuses, no rhetoric can dispute this summation of its incredible, its shameful, its sickly conduct for 15 months in a matter of such importance that it demands immediate attention.

On July 22, 1947, on the floor of this House, over a year ago, discussing one of the earlier publicity tirades of this committee, I said: "Rumor-mongering character assassins should put up or shut up." I most emphatically repeat that challenge today. I respectfully suggest that since this committee has not been able to put up, in more than a year of publicity efforts to smear Dr. Condon, it should now shut up in the most graceful way possible considering the disgraceful position in which it finds itself. And it should have the decency to tender Dr. Condon a humble public apology.

CIVIL-RIGHTS ISSUE—NEED OF CHANGING METHOD OF ELECTING OUR PRESIDENT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who has a special order, may be allowed to extend his remarks at this point as he was unexpectedly called from the Chamber.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the civil-rights issue was toned down by President Truman in his message to Congress on July 27.

I am glad that he laid stress on the necessity of curbing destructive inflation and of enacting a long-range housing program—and indicated that he was not anxious for the civil-rights issue to be brought up in this special session of Congress.

I hope that the Congress, inasmuch as we have been called back in special session, will enact legislation that will stop the uncontrolled inflation which is about to engulf us. The high cost of living is going to destroy the economic status of the middle and lower class of people unless prices are stabilized. Measures can be taken, and they should be taken. I do not think we need general price control and rationing. These should only be tried as a last resort. Requiring larger reserves for bank loans, curbing consumer credits, regulating the commodity exchange, allocation of steel, and some other measures would help greatly, and, I think, would get our economy in order.

I hope very much that the civil-rights issue will not be pushed at this Congress, for being brought up would only add to the fire of prejudice and the disunity in our Nation.

This is the time when we need harmony and good will in our own country. Disruptions such as the civil-rights issue will hurt our position of world leadership in the cause of peace. Most of the matters embraced in the President's civil-rights program cannot be dealt with by legislation. I have always opposed, and will continue to vigorously oppose, the FEPC, the antilynch bill, and any nonsegregation provisions. The FEPC is, in my opinion, a dangerous step toward regimentation. It is of doubtful constitutionality and it certainly violates the rights of the employers of our Nation. It simply would not work—especially in the South. Any effort to put such a law in operation would cause widespread difficulty which would be very detrimental to the Nation.

The antilynch law is an unjustified encroachment on the rights of the States. Everybody abhors lynching, and of course lynching is murder under every State law. The adoption of the bill would be a step toward making every crime a Federal offense and removing the interest and responsibility of local people in the prevention of crime. The antilynch bill has been before the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, and I have always opposed it.

There is no real demand for antisegregation laws in the South. The Negroes of the South are not interested in this kind of legislation. They want schools, better economic opportunity, and houses. I hope their lot in these respects can be improved. It would not be in the interest of their own welfare to fan the fires of passion and disunity by espousal of Federal nonsegregation laws.

I am not one who merely howls and complains about the President's civil-rights program. When one criticizes he should have a remedy—and I think there is a remedy. The difficulty is in the method of electing a President. The present system of all of the electoral votes going to the candidate who has the majority of the popular votes makes a whipping boy of the South. The Democratic National Committee feels that the South is safe and does not consider us. The Republican National Committee feels that they cannot get any electoral votes in the South, so they do not give us consideration. The same situation exists to a degree in New England and certain Northern States where the Republican Party feels they are safe for their candidate. There is a way of resolving this difficulty. More than 3 years ago I filed a resolution changing the method of choosing a President. The resolution provides that the electoral votes of the States be divided between the Presidential candidates in proportion to the popular vote. A resolution almost identical with mine has now been passed by the Judiciary Committee. A similar resolution is sponsored on the Senate side by Senator LODGE. This is a nonpartisan matter and would not materially affect the balance between the two major parties. If this system had been in operation I feel certain we would not have had a civil-rights message. I also feel sure that both parties, in their platforms, would have given more consideration to the South and New England.

A two-party government is the only satisfactory way of operating a democracy. The present method of electing a President has caused us in this election to have four parties. We will never have two well-defined political parties, between whom the voters can make a choice, until an amendment similar to mine is adopted to the Constitution. Furthermore, this system would insure an equal distribution of the benefits of government and an opportunity for every section to be represented in high executive offices rather than just a few pivotal States. It may be expecting too much for this amendment to be considered at this special session, but if the special session lasts for any considerable time I hope it will be approved by Congress and submitted to the people.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 2, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1703. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1704. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation; in the total amount of $56,428,450 proposed for the fiscal year 1949 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Army (H. Doc. No. 735); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, the Committee on Public Works was discharged from the consideration of Executive Communication 1700, report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Gooseberry project, Utah, and the same was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 7056. A bill to strengthen the national defense by making it possible for persons drafted under the Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public Law 759, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) to choose the type of units in which they serve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 7057. A bill to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7058. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 7059. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 7060. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 7061. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 7062. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 7063. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain widows of employees who died in active service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 7064. A bill to provide for permanent pay increases for Government employees designated as unclassified or ungraded; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 7065. A bill to require payment to certain employees of the District of Columbia of additional compensation authorized by the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 7066. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the necessity of holding an election as a condition to the making of an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 7067. A bill to provide for a suitable building to be used for residential and office purposes by the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 7068. A bill to transfer the personnel, powers, and duties of the United States Park Police force in the District of Columbia to the Metropolitan Police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 7069. A bill to provide for a suitable building to be used for residential and office purposes by the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7070. A bill to provide for the allocation of meat; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 7071. A bill to authorize grants to the States to assist in the construction of elementary and secondary public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 7072. A bill to grant increased retirement benefits to enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps who were recalled from the Reserve or retired list and who served creditably in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7073. A bill to provide nonquota immigration status for certain adopted children of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 7074. A bill to amend section 5 of War Claims Act of 1948, relating to detention benefits payable to civilian American citizens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7075. A bill to amend section 6 (b) of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to compensation payable to individuals who, while held by the enemy as prisoners of war, were not furnished food in accordance with the terms of the Geneva convention; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 7076. A bill to check inflation and aid in preserving a competitive economic system by requiring publicity on the pricing policies of certain large corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 7077. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. J. Res. 438. Joint resolution requiring that notice be sent to the Members when the President convenes the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. J. Res. 439. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of Dr. William Crawford Gorgas, of Alabama, who achieved national distinction in the field of preventive medicine by conquering yellow fever, thus making possible the building of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. J. Res. 440. Joint resolution authorizing the use of foreign-relief appropriations for the purpose of making payments to States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 441. Joint resolution relating to the high cost of living and shortage of housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. Res. 705. Resolution providing for an inquiry on agreements and conditions in Germany and relations with other occupying powers, particularly Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 706. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate and study the scarcity in nonferrous metal scrap, particularly in aluminum; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7078. A bill for the relief of Frederick C. Cowell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7079. A bill for the relief of the county of Maui, T. H.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7080. A bill for the relief of Dick Walook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 7081. A bill for the relief of John D. Garrard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7082. A bill to continue in full force and effect patent No. 1,861,647; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7083. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Jan Dunikowski, Karolina Dunikowski, Wanda Octavia Dunikowski, and Janina Grospera Dunikowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. R. 7084. A bill for the relief of Enrico Colandrea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John Kaudy (formerly Stella Cappler); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 7086. A bill for the relief of John E. Tate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7087. A bill for the relief of George Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2132 By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, relative to giving highest preference for civilian employment to those veterans disabled in the service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2133. By Mrs. NORTON: Joint resolution of the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to proceed with all possible dispatch to the preparation and adoption of necessary legislation designed to encourage and make adequately effectual a comprehensive program of merchant shipbuilding in this country's shipyards and of expanding our merchant marine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2134. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of the mayor and common council of the city of New Britain, Conn., petitioning that the disposition by sale of the White Oaks housing project in New Britain, Conn., be postponed for a period of 6 months from August 1, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2135. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Alexander B. Farlinger, Jr., and others, of Evanston, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the repeal of military draft legislation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2136. Also, petition of M. P. Medina, of Cabanatuan, Philippine Islands, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to relief for the Barrio people of the Philippines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2137. Also, petition of James O. McDowell, founder, Arizona-United States Cancer Cure Society, Bisbee, Ariz., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the consideration of his discovery of the Arizona cancer salve for the cure of internal cancers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2138. Also, petition of W. G. MacNiece, city clerk, transmitting a petition of the Common Council of Unalaska, Alaska, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the negotiation of mail, freight, and passenger service for this area and with reference to H. R. 1608; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 30, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 28, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, Thou hast created us with a capacity to be like Thee in spirit. Grant that we may witness to the reality and sanctity of this kinship in all of life's divine and human relationships.

Purge us from everything that dwarfs and deadens our capacities for noble service. May we never be recreant to any of the duties of our high vocation as the servants of God and our beloved country.

Show us how we may appropriate and apply the spirit of the Master who went about doing good and inspired His followers to give their strength to the weak, their sympathy to the suffering, their substance to the poor, and their hearts to God.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 29, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF UNITED STATES SURPLUS PROPERTY IN FOREIGN AREAS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas as of June 30, 1948, together with a report of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner relating to the administration of title II of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON WAR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixteenth quarterly report of the Treasury Department on war contract terminations and settlements for the period April 1 through June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROGRESS REPORT ON SURPLUS-PROPERTY DISPOSAL

A letter from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly progress report of that Administration on the disposal of surplus property for the second quarter, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE POLL TAX

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate of yesterday, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is recognized for 30 minutes to speak on the pending motion to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield for that purpose?

Mr. STEWART. I do.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	McGrath
Barkley	Green	McKellar
Brewster	Gurney	McMahon
Brooks	Hatch	Magnuson
Buck	Hawkes	Malone
Butler	Hayden	Maybank
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Cain	Hill	Moore
Capehart	Hoey	Morse
Capper	Holland	Murray
Connally	Ives	Myers
Cooper	Jenner	O'Conor
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kem	Pepper
Dworshak	Kilgore	Reed
Eastland	Knowland	Revercomb
Ecton	Langer	Robertson, Va.
Ellender	Lucas	Robertson, Wyo.
Feazel	McCarthy	Russell
Ferguson	McClellan	Smith
Flanders	McFarland	Sparkman
Stennis	Thye	Wherry
Stewart	Tobey	Wiley
Taft	Tydings	Williams
Taylor	Umstead	Wilson
Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Young
Thomas, Utah	Watkins	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is entitled to the floor for 30 minutes. The Chair does not feel that the time consumed up to this point should be charged to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield for a question, or with the understanding that I do not lose the floor by yielding.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROPOSED RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. May I make an announcement for the information of Senators? It is our intention when the business of the Senate is concluded in this session today to recess until Monday next at noon.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES RELATING TO PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield on the condition that he does not lose the floor thereby?

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Virginia on condition that I do not lose the floor by doing so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on June 28, 1948, during the recent adjournment of the Congress, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures compiled material in the nature of an additional report on Federal personnel for the period April–May 1948.

The number of employees on the civilian pay roll of the Federal Government during May was increased by an average of more than 500 a day for the third consecutive month. The average has been nearly 500 a day since January.

Total civilian employment in May reached 2,066,297, an increase of 15,877 over April.

The May increase was divided almost equally between the civilian agencies, which reported a net increase of 7,433, and the Military Establishment, in which the net increase was 8,444. Of the total increase 6,653 were among industrial employees, and the remaining 9,224 were in the classified service and so forth.

Agencies reporting principal increases were Agriculture with an increase of 3,884, Interior with an increase of 1,914, Post Office with an increase of 2,537, Commerce with an increase of 224, Economic Cooperation Administration with an increase of 160, Maritime Commission with an increase of 163, National Labor Relations Board with an increase of 178, Tennessee Valley Authority with an increase of 357, and Veterans' Administration with an increase of 273.

Principal decreases were reported by Treasury with a decrease of 473, War Assets Administration with a decrease of 1,500, and Government Printing Office with a decrease of 109.

In accordance with the practice of the committee over the past 5 years this material is now prepared for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the material in the nature of an additional report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MAY 1948, AND COMPARISON WITH APRIL 1948

(The following report is compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I of the report shows personnel employed inside continental United States by agency. Table II shows personnel employed outside continental United States by agency. Table III shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States by agency. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the total Federal personnel for the month of May increased 15,877 from the April total of 2,050,420 to the May total of 2,066,297. (See table III.)

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment, there was an increase of 7,433 from the April total of 1,196,809 to the May total of 1,204,242.

Total employment for the National Military Establishment showed an increase of 8,444 from the April total of 853,611 to the May figure of 862,055.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 48 from the April figure of 827 to the May figure of 875.

The Department of the Army reported an increase of 4,423 from the April figure of 394,550 to the May figure of 398,973. Inside continental United States the Army increased its civilian personnel 5,132; outside continental United States it decreased 709.

The Department of the Air Force increased civilian employment 1,547 from the April figure of 117,305 to the May figure of 118,852. Department of the Air Force figures cover civilian personnel inside United States only; Department of the Army reports Air Force civilian personnel outside continental United States.

The Department of the Navy reported an increase of 2,426 civilian employees from the April figure of 340,929 to the May figure of 343,355.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Federal personnel within the United States increased 16,112 from the April total of 1,820,294 to the May total of 1,836,406. (See table I.)

Excluding the National Military Establishment, personnel inside continental United States increased 7,199 from the April total of 1,141,290 to the May total of 1,148,489.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for May was 687,917—an increase of 8,913 over the April total of 679,004.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 48 from the April figure of 827 to the May figure of 875.

Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States increased 5,132 from the April figure of 263,770 to the May figure of 268,902.

Department of the Air Force within continental United States increased 1,547 from the April figure of 117,305 to the May figure of 118,852.

The Navy Department within the United States increased its civilian employment 2,186 from the April figure of 297,102 to the May figure of 299,288.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Outside continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 235 from the April total of 230,126 to the May total of 229,891.

An increase of 234 was reported in the overseas civilian employment of the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment, from the April total of 55,519 to the May total of 55,753.

Total overseas civilian employment for the National Military Establishment decreased 469 from the April total of 174,607 to the May total of 174,138.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 709 civilian employees overseas, from the April figure of 130,780 to the May figure of 130,071.

The Department of the Navy increased its overseas civilian employment 240 from the April figure of 43,827 to the May figure of 44,067.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

Total industrial employment during the month of May increased 6,653 from the April total of 564,442 to the May total of 571,095. (See table IV.)

The departments and agencies, exclusive of the National Military Establishment, increased their industrial employment by 970 from the April figure of 21,795 to the May figure of 22,765.

The National Military Establishment increased its total industrial employment 5,683 from the April total of 542,647 to the May figure of 548,330.

The Department of the Army increased its industrial employment 3,111 during the month of May from the April total of 235,483 to the May figure of 238,594. Of this net increase 3,851 was within continental United States, while outside continental United States industrial employment of the Army Department decreased 740.

The Department of the Air Force industrial personnel inside United States increased 563 from the April figure of 69,226 to the May figure of 69,789.

The Department of the Navy increased its industrial employment 2,009 from the April figure of 237,938 to the May figure of 239,949.

The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS)			
Agriculture	73,656	77,399	+3,743
Commerce	37,346	37,467	+121
Interior	44,558	46,313	+1,755
Justice	25,896	25,857	+1
Labor	4,496	4,450	−46
Post Office	486,474	488,985	+2,511
State	7,572	7,576	+4
Treasury	89,477	89,002	−475
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	222	221	−1
Bureau of the Budget	612	593	−19
Executive Mansion and Grounds	91	96	+5
National Security Council	18	19	+1
National Security Resources Board	150	176	+26
Council of Economic Advisers	43	45	+1
Office of Government Reports	18	17	−1
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	47	50	+3
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Economic Cooperation Administration	113	273	+160
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,529	4,565	+36
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	
Philippine War Damage Commission	6	10	+4
War Assets Administration	23,743	22,266	−1,477
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	3	
Atomic Energy Commission	4,987	5,028	+41
Civil Aeronautics Board	579	602	+23
Civil Service Commission	4,091	4,120	+29
Export-Import Bank of Washington	116	121	+5
Federal Communications Commission	1,324	1,328	+4
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,119	1,111	−8
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	369	378	+9
Federal Power Commission	803	792	−11
Federal Security Agency [1]	33,333	33,292	−41
Federal Trade Commission	557	554	−3
Federal Works Agency	21,904	21,981	+77
General Accounting Office	9,262	9,232	−30
Government Printing Office	7,223	7,114	−109
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,681	11,714	+33
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,250	2,292	+42
Maritime Commission	7,170	7,332	+162
National Advisory Commission for Aeronautics	6,204	6,169	−35
National Archives	344	344	
National Capital Housing Authority	288	286	−2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	23	21	−2
National Gallery of Art	319	317	−2
National Labor Relations Board	1,602	1,780	+178
National Mediation Board	115	111	−4
Office of Selective Service Records	704	721	+17
Panama Canal	534	535	+1
Railroad Retirement Board	2,755	2,656	−99
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,615	5,550	−65
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,111	1,123	+12
Smithsonian Institution	503	507	+4
Tariff Commission	221	218	−3
Tax Court of the United States	126	126	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,697	15,054	+357
Veterans' Administration	200,327	200,594	+267
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,141,290	1,148,489	+9,632 / −2,433
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+7,199
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	827	875	+48
Department of the Army	263,770	268,902	+5,132
Department of the Air Force	117,305	118,852	+1,547
Department of the Navy	297,102	299,288	+2,186
Total, including National Military Establishment	1,820,294	1,836,406	+18,545 / −2,433
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+16,112

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[2] Includes 1,197 employees of Howard University and 102 employees of Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,111	1,123	+12
Smithsonian Institution	503	507	+4
Tariff Commission	221	218	−3
Tax Court of the United States	126	126	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,697	15,054	+357
Veterans' Administration	200,327	200,594	+267
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,141,290	1,148,489	+9,632 / −2,433
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+7,199
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	827	875	+48
Department of the Army	263,770	268,902	+5,132
Department of the Air Force	117,305	118,852	+1,547
Department of the Navy	297,102	299,288	+2,186
Total, including National Military Establishment	1,820,294	1,836,406	+18,545 / −2,433
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+16,112

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	1,695	1,836	+141
Commerce	2,800	2,903	+103
Interior	5,268	5,367	+159
Justice	434	435	+1
Labor	82	82	
Post Office	1,585	1,611	+26
State	14,306	14,314	+10
Treasury	640	642	+2
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Office of the Housing Expediter	25	26	+1
Philippine Alien Property Administration	157	132	−25
Philippine War Damage Commission	778	820	+42
War Assets Administration	420	397	−23
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	111	114	+3
Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	
Civil Aeronautics Board	19	20	+1
Civil Service Commission	5	5	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	
Federal Communications Commission	37	38	+1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3	
Federal Security Agency	1,327	1,341	+14
Federal Works Agency	398	428	+30
Housing and Home Finance Agency	42	39	−3
Maritime Commission	91	92	+1
National Labor Relations Board	8	8	

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Office of Selective Service Records	16	16	
Panama Canal	28,721	28,467	−254
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	19	17	−2
Smithsonian Institution	6	6	
Veterans' Administration	1,583	1,589	+6
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	55,519	55,753	+547 / −301
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+243
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army	130,780	130,071	−709
Department of the Navy	43,827	44,067	+240
Total, including National Military Establishment	230,126	229,891	−1,010 / +781
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−235

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	75,351	79,235	+3,884
Commerce	40,146	40,370	+224
Interior	49,776	51,690	+1,914
Justice	26,270	26,272	+2
Labor	4,578	4,532	−46
Post Office	488,059	490,596	+2,537
State	21,876	21,890	+14
Treasury	90,117	89,644	−473
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	222	221	−1
Bureau of the Budget	612	593	−19
Executive Mansion and Grounds	91	96	+5
National Security Council	18	19	+1
National Security Resources Board	150	176	+26
Council of Economic Advisers	44	45	+1
Office of Government Reports	18	17	−1
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	47	50	+3
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Economic Cooperation Administration	113	273	+160
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,554	4,591	+37
Philippine Alien Property Administration	150	134	−25
Philippine War Damage Commission	784	830	+46
War Assets Administration	24,163	22,663	−1,500

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	114	117	+3
Atomic Energy Commission	4,990	5,031	+41
Civil Aeronautics Board	598	622	+24
Civil Service Commission	4,096	4,125	+29
Export-Import Bank of Washington	118	123	+5
Federal Communications Commission	1,361	1,366	+5
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,122	1,114	−8
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	369	378	+9
Federal Power Commission	803	792	−11
Federal Security Agency [1]	34,660	34,633	−27
Federal Trade Commission	557	554	−3
Federal Works Agency	22,302	22,409	+107
General Accounting Office	9,262	9,232	−30
Government Printing Office	7,223	7,114	−109
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,723	11,763	+39
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,250	2,292	+42
Maritime Commission	7,261	7,424	+163
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,204	6,169	−35
National Archives	344	344	
National Capital Housing Authority	288	286	−2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	23	21	−2
National Gallery of Art	319	317	−2
National Labor Relations Board	1,610	1,788	+178
National Mediation Board	115	111	−4
Office of Selective Service Records	720	737	+17
Panama Canal	24,255	24,002	−253
Railroad Retirement Board	2,755	2,656	−99
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,634	5,567	−67
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,111	1,123	+12
Smithsonian Institution	509	513	+4
Tariff Commission	221	218	−3
Tax Court of the United States	126	126	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,697	15,054	+357
Veterans' Administration	201,910	202,183	+273
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,196,809	1,204,242	+10,183 / −2,750
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+7,433
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	827	875	+48
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	263,770	268,902	+5,132
Outside continental United States	130,780	130,071	−709
Department of the Air Force	117,305	118,852	+1,547
Department of the Navy	340,929	343,355	+2,426
Total, including National Military Establishment	2,050,420	2,066,297	+19,306 / −3,429
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+15,877

[1] Includes 1,197 employees of Howard University and 102 employees of Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Commerce	1,448	1,565	+117
Interior	5,968	6,628	+660
State	365	374	+9
Treasury	3,689	3,654	−35
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Atomic Energy Commission	226	226	−10
Housing and Home Finance Agency	2	2	
Panama Canal	2,068	2,033	−35
Tennessee Valley authority	8,004	8,263	+259
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	21,795	22,765	+1,045 −75
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+970
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	136,768	140,619	+3,851
Outside continental United States	98,715	97,975	−740
Department of the Air Force	69,226	69,789	+563
Department of the Navy	237,938	239,947	+2,009
Total, including National Military Establishment	564,442	571,095	+7,468 −815
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+6,653

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MORSE, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2915) for the relief of James A. Nelson Co., which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me so that I may submit a request that a committee may sit today?

Mr. STEWART. I yield for a brief statement or a question on condition that I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair cannot grant that immunity. Is there objection to the Senator from Tennessee yielding for the purpose indicated by the Senator from Michigan, without the Senator from Tennessee losing his rights thereby? The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may hold a hearing this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAIN AT THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator CAIN at the Republican National Convention June 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER AT THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Herbert Hoover to the Republican National Convention, which appears in the Appendix.]

A PREMATURE CALL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Premature Call," from the Washington Star of July 29, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

INFLATION—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to inflation, by David Lawrence, from the Washington Star of July 29, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

BETTER VOTE YOUR TICKET STRAIGHT—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Better Vote Your Ticket Straight," from the Washington Times-Herald of June 27, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

YOUNG REPUBLICANS—ARTICLE BY RAYMOND MOLEY

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Young Republicans," by Raymond Moley, from Newsweek for June 28, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BLUE-GRAY GAME

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article and editorial regarding the Blue-Gray Game, played in Montgomery, Ala., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, yesterday when the Senate recessed, I had completed the statement I was making, and today I desire to take only a portion of the time allotted me, for which I asked yesterday. I was particularly anxious to place in the RECORD as a part of my statement a paragraph from page 10 of the volume The Constitution of the United States, Its Sources and Its Application, written by Mr. Thomas James Norton, in which he comments on the latter part of section 2 of Article I of the Constitution, which provides that the electors in each State voting for Members of the House of Representatives shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Mr. Norton writes:

> The property qualifications of the voters in the different States, as well as other requirements, were so various that it was concluded to let the practice in each State determine who should be qualified to vote for a candidate for a seat in the National House of Representatives. "To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule," wrote Hamilton in the Federalist, "would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention."

Mr. President, I want to read into the RECORD the statement of Mr. Charles Warren, who gave testimony in the poll-tax hearings held before the Committee on the Judiciary on November 2, 1943. Mr. Warren, as everyone knows, is an outstanding authority on constitutional law, the author of many books of note, and a man whose opinion on constitutional questions is highly valuable.

First I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Warren's entire testimony, which occupies only some twenty-odd pages in the hearings, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES WARREN

Mr. WARREN. My name is Charles Warren. My business address is 710 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed in any way you choose, Judge Warren.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, honorable members of this committee: In order that you may not think that my argument on the constitutionality of this bill is colored by my personal views in favor of a poll tax, I desire to say that I consider that the requirement of a poll tax to make a man eligible to vote is, in fact, unjust and unreasonable and should be abolished by the sovereignty which created it and not by any other sovereignty, that is, by the State and not by Congress.

I was very much interested to read the printed hearings of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate covering hearings in 1941 and 1942. I had a personal interest in various references contained in that volume because a number of the witnesses who appeared in favor of the bill cited the case of Gov. William E. Russell, of Massachusetts, who succeeded in obtaining the abolition of the Massachusetts State poll tax as a requirement for voting after a very vigorous campaign back in 1901.

I said I had a personal interest in that statement because I have a very vivid personal memory of it and personal contact with it. As a very young man, I was appointed private secretary to the Governor of Massachusetts by Gov. William E. Russell. He was the first Democratic Governor we had had in Massachusetts for about 25 years and before my appointment I had, in the previous years, taken some part in Governor Russell's campaign for the abolition of the poll tax as a requirement for voting. His campaign in that respect was successful and the Legislature of Massachusetts abolished it. At that time certainly there was no intimation that the United States Congress had power to abolish it or that any request would be made to Congress to perform an act which at that time was supposed to be a futile act as not within the power of the Congress.

I make that preliminary statement so as to clear the minds of the members of the committee that my argument on the constitutionality has anything to do with my views as to the merits or nonmerits of a poll tax.

Before I go into any questions of detail, I should like to clear away a few of what I might call the debris which has rather clogged and interfered with the real questions at issue which I find in previous hearings. There has been a great deal of talk and argument, so far as I can make out, from the witnesses about the question whether the right to vote for Congress is or is not a Federal right secured by the Constitution. Well,

I didn't suppose there was the slightest doubt that it was a right secured by the Constitution. The proponents of this bill have devoted much time to what they call the Classic case 2 years ago to support that proposition. Why, the Supreme Court has held that for 40, 50 years, that the right to vote for Congressmen was a Federal right secured by the Constitution but the question here is: The right of whom to vote for Congressman? That is the issue here, not whether the right exists; of course it exists. The Constitution created the office of Congressman, a Member of the House. It prescribed when they should be elected. It prescribed who should elect them. So it must be a Federal right secured by the Constitution; but the question is, not whether it is a Federal right, but to whom is the right given?

There is another phrase which has been very loosely used all through the hearings in 1941 and 1942. I find in briefs and all through the hearings references to "Federal suffrage," and to the "rights of national citizenship." I was surprised to find a brief, signed by the dean of the Law School of Nebraska, I think, and concurred in by a group of law professors from Yale, Columbia, and Wisconsin, in which they referred constantly to the "rights of the citizens to vote." Then in their brief they speak later of the "right of Congress to prohibit the States from unduly restricting the rights of national citizenship." Later on they speak of the imposition by the State of proper qualifications for voting "which do not abridge the rights of national citizenship" and they refer later to "protecting the rights of national citizenship." (See testimony in 1941 and 1942, pp. 35-52.)

Now, that, of course, is an entire misapprehension. There is no right of national citizenship to vote. There were many citizens of the United States who could not vote in the past and who cannot vote today. A woman was a citizen of the United States. She possessed national citizenship—but she could not vote until 1920; and this idea that "national citizenship" confers a right to vote for Congress is, of course, entirely erroneous. The right to vote for Members of Congress is given only to such United States citizens as possess the qualifications for voting in the States for the most numerous branch of the legislature. That is the portion of United States citizens—that is the class of United States citizens—who can vote; but there is no right to vote vested in citizens of the United States in general; so that the issue is clogged and beclouded by using such expressions here as are used in this brief of these law professors.

With those preliminary very fundamental remarks about this right to vote for Members of Congress, I now want to take up a phase which is equally fundamental. I am not going to go into the details of the Federal Convention of 1787, what they said and what they did not say. I am not going to go into the details of discussions of recent cases in the Supreme Court. Those have been discussed at great length and, I feel, at unnecessary length in the testimony of some of the previous witnesses.

But I am going to take up now the question in detail of what this section 2 of article I of the Constitution does and does not do. First, at the risk of going perhaps further than is necessary with gentlemen of your distinction and legal knowledge, I am going to impress upon you once again, what article X of the Bill of Rights provides, the tenth amendment. We must not lose sight of that for an instant, in trying to ascertain what the section of the Constitution now involved really means. Article X says:

> "The powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

Now, what does this article X actually do? What is its function and what is its content?

In arriving at this method of disposing of the question of the right to vote in the Federal Convention of 1787, there was a threefold contest. The contest was between those members who wished a uniform qualification for electors (freehold property or otherwise) to be prescribed in the Constitution itself; there was another group of delegates who wished the power to prescribe to be vested in Congress, and there was still a third group who wished the Constitution to prescribe qualifications—not uniform qualifications but qualifications such as the respective States prescribed for their own people.

It was the last group who prevailed, and after 2 days of active debate, they left the Constitution in this respect as it now stands in (and I must trespass upon your patience by even reading again) this much-read section—section 2 of article I:

> "The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

You notice that that is not a grant of power specifically to the Congress of the United States. In fact, it is not a grant of power to anyone. It is a requirement of the Constitution for the formation of the new Government. The first part of it is a requirement that the people of the several States shall choose Members of the House of Representatives every second year. That was no relinquishment or delegation of power from the States. That was a constituent part of the formation of the new Government and was a command to the States to elect their Members of Congress every second year. That was a command. It was neither a delegation of power nor was it a prohibition. It was a command and is so referred to in the recent cases in the Supreme Court.

The second thing that section 2 did was: It vested a right in the electors in each State who have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature—a right in those persons in the State and those only who were entitled to vote for Members of Congress. That was not a delegation of power by the State because the State never had the power to vote, the State inhabitants never had that power to vote for Members of Congress because there were no such things. That was a direct provision in the establishment of the new Government and it did vest a right, but it vested a right in only certain people to vote for Members of Congress.

Now, the third thing that that section 2 contains is this: It contains undoubtedly an implied prohibition on the States against fixing for electors of the Members of Congress any different requirements for suffrage from those which they fixed for the electors of their own most numerous branch of their legislature, i. e., any qualifications which were not those requisite to render an inhabitant of their own State eligible to vote.

Let me repeat that. There is undoubtedly an implied prohibition that the States cannot establish qualifications for the electors of members of their own legislature which shall be different from those which they establish for electors of Members of Congress. That is neither a delegation nor a grant of power; that is an implied restriction, undoubtedly.

Now, is there in that section 2 any grant of power whatever? Not specifically, of course. I suppose there is, under the necessary and proper clause of section 8 of article I, an implied power to Congress to do certain things, but what is the extent of those implied powers? It is to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper "for carrying into execution" the above provisions of article I, section 2.

What are the provisions? I go back again. First, Congress undoubtedly has power to legislate so as to see to it that the States do elect Members of Congress every second year. Congress undoubtedly has the power to protect the right which the Constitution vested in such persons in the States as had the qualifications requisite to vote for members of the State legislature. Congress undoubtedly has that power, and thinks Congress has, under the necessary and proper clause, power to legislate so as to see that the States make the same provisions for qualifications of electors of Members of Congress as they do for electors of their own legislature.

Those are the only three things that can be done under article I, section 2, and those are the only three things on which Congress can act under the necessary and proper clause, and "carry into execution" under that clause.

Senator CONNALLY. Would it interrupt you if I asked you a question right there?

Mr. WARREN. No.

Senator CONNALLY. Is it your view or contention that in article I, section 2, where it says they shall elect Congressmen and the electors shall possess the same qualifications as the electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature, is that a constitutional fixation by the Federal Government of the absolute requirements to participate in the congressional election?

Mr. WARREN. I will say so—for those who are qualified.

Senator CONNALLY. That is what I mean. In other words, is it or not a fixation by the Federal Government of the qualifications of a man who wants to vote for Congressman and does it not become a Federal requirement that he must possess these qualifications before he can vote?

Mr. WARREN. Yes, sir; it is a Federal right.

Senator HATCH. The point he just brought out was what I was going to ask: Whether he meant the Constitution in this section does actually prescribe and fix the qualifications of voters.

Mr. WARREN. I haven't any doubt it does.

Senator HATCH. And that qualification is, of course, the same qualification that applies to the State legislature?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator HATCH. Following up that point, if that be true and the Constitution has actually fixed the qualifications, then any law that would either add to or take from the qualifications of the Constitution would violate that section of the Constitution?

Mr. WARREN. Not necessarily the qualifications as they existed in 1787.

Senator HATCH. The qualifications fixed by the Constitution, you say, are the same qualifications that the State fixes for its own representatives?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator HATCH. Now, if the State has a law, a poll-tax law, we will say, as a requirement for voting for State representatives and Congress would attempt to abrogate that, would it not, in effect, change that section of article I?

Mr. WARREN. I do not think so. I think that section refers to any qualifications that the States might fix for their own members of the legislature. No one would claim——

Senator HATCH. I don't believe you get my point.

Mr. WARREN (continuing). No one would claim, of course, that the qualifications were fixed as of the date 1787.

Senator CONNALLY. He did not mean that, I think you misunderstood him, if I may interpret it. If the Federal Government lays down the qualifications which require the same qualifications to vote for the State legislature, then any Federal legislation that would modify that would be in violation of that clause of the Constitution?

Senator HATCH. Yes.

Senator CONNALLY. That was his point. I think he was in entire agreement with you.

Mr. WARREN. Let me change one word, Senator. You say "If the Federal Government lays down."

Senator CONNALLY. When I said "the Government" I meant the "Federal Constitution."

Senator DANAHER. I would like to ask you a question if I may, sir. A moment or two ago you said, sir, that Congress may exercise the power of seeing to it that the State conducted an election every second year for Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WARREN. I said I thought that probably was within their powers under the necessary and proper clause; yes.

Senator DANAHER. Have you given any thought as to how Congress would cause the State to call such an election?

Mr. WARREN. No; that is beyond the present question, as to how Congress could act. I said it probably had the power to see that that portion of the section was carried into execution. How is another matter. That is not within the purview of the present bill.

Senator DANAHER. One other point. It seems to me in the light of one of your comments on the power that should be exercised that article I of section 2 does not say a State shall hold an election, it uses the word "chosen."

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator DANAHER. And it may make a very real difference in the manner of choice.

Senator CONNALLY. But when it says "electors," that is the implication.

Mr. WARREN. It is the implication, I should say, but I will not go into that because that is a little beyond the purview of my argument, and I was trying, at present, to establish what I consider the limits of the necessity and proper clause as applied to this section.

Senator MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have one question which I hope will be a brief question.

Judge Warren, do you attach any significance to the fact that in section 2 of article I the Constitution uses this language: "chosen every second year by the people." It seems to me that they could have used in place of the word "people," "chosen every second year by the legislators of the several States and the electors in each State shall have certain qualifications."

To me, the fact that the Constitution uses the word "people" is significant, and I just wondered if you wanted to comment on that at all.

Mr. WARREN. I suppose that they were synonymous. If a person is chosen by the people, he is the person who is elected by the people. I suppose that the choice by the people meant the choice by electors.

Senator MURDOCK. I don't mean to make any distinction between "choosing" and "electing" but it seems to me that the use of the word "people" there means something and that when we find a condition as we find it today in some States at least, where half of the people are disfranchised, that it probably would be a violation.

Mr. WARREN. I will take that up a little later in discussing what happened in connection with the fourteenth amendment. That argument, of course, was made by few selected Senators—only one as I recall—who claimed that universal suffrage was prescribed by the Constitution. Of course, the matter did not get very much further than a similar argument on that subject in connection with the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments—but I will take that up, later, I hope.

Now, going a little further, section 2, of course, contains no power specifically, of Congress to prescribe to the States who they shall qualify to vote for the members of their State legislatures and you have got to find such a power implied if anywhere under the necessary and proper clause. Let us see what the right of the State to prescribe the qualifications, the requirements for voting for its own legislature were when this section was under discussion and when it was adopted by the Convention and when it was adopted by the States.

Before 1787, the States had absolutely full and unlimited power to lay down any requirements which the people of the States, through the constitutions or legislatures of the States in their absolute discretion and judgment, desired in order to qualify anyone of their inhabitants to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature.

There was no limitation whatsoever. The State had the power, either in its constitution or in its legislature, as the case might be, to say to whom it desired to grant the vote for members of the legislature or from whom it desired to withhold the right, and when the people of the State had spoken in their constitution as to who should have the right to vote for members of the legislature, of course that was the last word.

You cannot get behind the people; and when the Convention of 1787 met, the people of nine States had spoken in their own States and fixed by their own constitutions the qualifications of those who should vote for members of their own legislature.

How could the Federal Convention get behind that action of the people of the States through their own constitutions? They did not attempt to meddle with the constitutions of the States in any explicit powers given in article I, section 2, and I can see no implied power under the necessary and proper clause which gave to the Congress the right to say to the people of the State who had already before devised and established their own constitutions, to say to the people of a State, "You shall not have the right to grant or to deny the right to vote for your own legislatures." Imagine that proposition put up to the members of the Federal Convention, that they were embodying in section 2, a denial to a State of its right through its own State constitution to establish the requirement of a State voter to vote for a member of a State legislature.

Why, it seems to me inconceivable, when you think of the jealousies of the States at that time and the extreme difficulty with which they were relinquishing any powers—and here they were not relinquishing specifically the power to qualify electors for the members of their own legislature. It is inconceivable that you can find an implied power under the necessary and proper clause to do that thing, to interfere with the sovereign right of the people to establish in their own constitution the right to vote for members of their own legislature.

In addition to that, of course, among the members of the convention, if any such proposition as that had been advanced it certainly cannot be found in any of the debates whatsoever as they were recorded by James Madison or King or Yates or Lansing or any of them. And how unlikely it was that it would be advanced.

The members of that convention had before them the actual restrictions which their State constitutions had put on the right of their State inhabitants to vote for members of the most numerous branch of their legislature. They had before their eyes the fact that New Hampshire, in 1784, had a requirement for the payment of a poll tax. They had before them that in Massachusetts, in 1780, its constitution required the possession of a freehold. They had the constitution of 1777 of New York, which required that a man should be either a freeholder or a taxpayer of New York or Albany. They had the constitution of New Jersey of 1776, which required that a man should possess an estate of £50. They had the constitution of Pennsylvania of 1776, that a voter for the legislature should be a taxpayer. They had the constitution of Maryland, which required that a voter for the State legislature should be a freeholder of 50 acres or the possessor of £50. They had the constitution of North Carolina of 1776, that he should be a freeholder or a taxpayer, and so on. They had South Carolina and Georgia, which had similar requirements for voting in their State constitutions. The full provisions for voting in the States may be found in convenient tabular form in the appendix to my testimony. It is reproduced from the very valuable book, The Constitutional History of the American People, 1776–1850, by Francis Newton Thorpe (Harper Bros., New York, vol. I, pp. 93–971).

In addition to that, they had the fact that acting under these constitutions, several of the States had also statutes prescribing certain qualifications which were allowed by the legislatures. They had all that before them, and yet it is asked now, "Why didn't they describe what they meant by 'qualifications'? Why wasn't there some debate on the use of that term?"

Answer is, of course, that every delegate from every State knew what his State constitution meant by "qualifications" or what his State legislature meant by "qualifications" and they certainly were not giving power to this new Government to define what their own State constitutions meant or to define what the State legislatures meant.

That was a matter for the State exclusively. No legislature can define the meaning of a word in its constitution, no one can define except the people of the State or the State judiciary, as to everything in connection with the construction and interpretation of section 2. There is an absolute absence of any right granted to Congress to decide or define what a State by its constitution or legislature could demand of one of its inhabitants in order to qualify him to vote for a State legislature.

The absence of anything of that kind shows clearly to my mind that the members of the Federal Convention never had any idea that they were giving any power to Congress to interfere with a State constitution or the State legislature.

Senator MURDOCK. May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Murdock.

Senator MURDOCK. If I have followed the judge's argument, it is this: That if Congress were in a position to say that a qualification fixed by a State statute or by the constitution of a State is unconstitutional, it would be exercising judicial power in the interpretation of a State law or a State constitution, and that the Congress has no such judicial power. Have I followed you correctly?

Mr. WARREN. Yes, sir.

Senator MURDOCK. I might say that that same suggestion was made a few days ago after the previous hearing by Senator McFARLAND, of Arizona. That was the first time that I had heard it made until you made it this morning.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; I am going to come to that a little later, but I am glad to answer that question now. At this point, perhaps, I will just throw in a suggestion analogous to that.

Not only is it not within the power of Congress to interpret the legal meaning of that clause, but it must also be true, if one thinks of it a little more carefully than some statements that I have seen in the record would indicate—it must also be absolutely true that if you cannot interpret a clause of the Constitution through the exercise of congressional power, you certainly cannot insert something into the section. I notice—and this is said with all due deference, because I suppose we are all entitled to differ, even with the Senators of the United States—I notice that Senator PEPPER in his argument says that "qualifications" means "reasonable qualifications." Of course, if Congress can insert the word "reasonable," it can insert the words "except poll-tax requirements" or any other words that it desires. The idea that Congress has the power not only to define the meaning of a word in the Constitution but to insert some other words that do not exist there—to my mind, if that is the congressional power, I see no limit to the exercise of it; none whatever.

Senator OVERTON. May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator OVERTON.

Senator OVERTON. You made it very clear that section 2 of article I declares that the qualifications of the electors for the House of Representatives shall be the same qualifications as for electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. If the two go hand in hand, you cannot have a set of qualifications for electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures and another set of qualifications for electors of the House of Representatives, so if Congress should enact a bill that would prohibit the prepayment of a poll tax as a qualification to vote, it would go further than merely to prescribe the qualifications of electors of the House of Representatives, it would be prohibiting the State from prescribing the qualifications for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Isn't that true?

Mr. WARREN. Unquestionably; and if it passed you would have to have at every polling booth two separate registers of electors.

Senator OVERTON. No; they would not. I beg your pardon, but you do not grasp my point. If the Congress of the United States can constitutionally prescribe any qualifications or can prohibit any qualifications for the House of Representatives, then the State must also make the same requirement with reference to the qualifications of electors for their legislature.

Mr. WARREN. I don't think Congress has the power to require the latter.

Senator OVERTON. I agree with you.

Mr. WARREN. And, therefore, I don't think it has the power to prescribe the former. I think unquestionably the two go hand in hand. If it has the power to do the former, it may have the power to do the latter. I don't suppose anybody in his wildest dreams would suppose that it had the power to restrict the States in prescribing qualifications for their own voters for their own legislatures.

Senator OVERTON. Just to repeat my thought again. I am reading from the Constitution:

"The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite to electors for the most numerous branch of the legislature"—so if Congress does declare that the prepayment of a poll tax shall not be a requirement then it prohibits the State from fixing the prepayment of a poll tax as a qualification for electors of their own State legislature.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator HATCH. Judge Warren, while you are on the discussion of Senator PEPPER, I am sure you are going to come to this, but it is a question I do want your answer to.

I do not think that the main contention of those who favor the legislation is that it must be a reasonable qualification, but rather, as I understand it, the contention is that the State cannot, under the guise of fixing a qualification, fix something which is not either in law or in fact a qualification and if it does, then the Congress is charged with a duty of enacting legislation prohibiting the fixing of whatever it might be which is not actually a qualification.

Mr. WARREN. Well, that is giving the Congress the power to define the word "qualification," which is purely a judicial function and power. To define a word, any word, in the Constitution of the United States is purely for the court. Congress can no more define a word than it can insert a word.

That is my contention, but Senator PEPPER contended in the hearings in 1941 and 1942 that, "in prescribing the qualifications of a voter, they must be reasonable qualifications, subject to the rules of reasonableness." (See testimony, pp. 23, 24, 25.) Of course, that is simply inserting a word into this section 2 of article I of the Constitution and if the Congress has power to insert one word it has power to insert others.

Senator CONNALLY. On that point, may I ask you one question, I don't want to interfere. If Congress should have the power to say what a reasonable qualification was, would it not amount to turning over to the Federal Government the whole question of qualifications?

Mr. WARREN. Of course.

Senator CONNALLY. And instead of leaving it to the State, as we think the Constitution did, if you grant Congress had supervision and can oversee what the State does, then you are turning over to the Federal Government the absolute control of suffrage.

Mr. WARREN. In other words, it is defining what a State in its own State or in its own constitution can do in qualifying its voters for its own legislature.

Senator CONNALLY. Absolutely.

Mr. WARREN. I now want to go into a historical discussion because it is a very valuable illumination on this question. So far as I have been able to ascertain, from 1789 down to 1865, there is no statement of any court, in any law book, in any legislative debate, or by any statesman that Congress had any such power to regulate suffrage in the States. Take the most extreme Federalist writer, for I suppose the man who made the largest claims for extension of Federal power was Mr. Justice Storey.

Mr. Justice Storey, in his Commentaries, written in 1833, describes this section—and discusses it very slightly because he says that there was no question that the States retained the full power over their own suffrage and, therefore, over the suffrage of their electors for Members of Congress. Storey's Commentaries (1933) states (vol. I, sec. 820), after treating at length in a number of sections, the subject of congressional power under article I, section 4, to regulate the "times, places, and manner" of holding elections for Senators and Representatives—

"There is no pretense to say that the power in the National Government can be used so as to exclude any State from its share in the representation in Congress. Nor can it be said with correctness that Congress can, in any way, alter the right or qualification of voters."

That was the situation down to the year 1865.

Then arose that very heated condition growing out of the situation at the end of the war and if there was ever a time in our whole history, and especially in our whole legislative history, if there was ever a time that a claim should have been made that the United States Congress had any power to regulate the question of suffrage in the States, that claim would have been made during the debates over the civil-rights bill of 1866 and the debates on the fourteenth amendment in 1866. I want to read to you, at the risk of trespassing a little on your patience and your time, the very emphatic statements made by the Senators at that time, not only the Senators of the North and East but the Senators of the West—of course, there were no Senators from the South. With the exception of one Senator, there was not a single Senator on the floor of the Senate who claimed or contended for 1 minute that the States did not have the full control of the suffrage.

The only exception to that statement was Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, and even he admitted that the State of Massachusetts had complete power to regulate suffrage with one exception; he did not think they had the power to deny suffrage to the Negro, but, with that exception—and how he worked out that exception is rather a mystery except that Senator Sumner used to insert the Negro into every bill that came along—but with that exception there was not a Senator who denied the full power of the State to regulate suffrage.

Let me recall to you who were the authors of that fourteenth amendment. When I said every Senator, North, West, and East, I meant to include every Senator, Republican and Democratic. Who were the authors of that fourteenth amendment?

First, it was constructed by a joint committee of 15 of the Senate and House, the Senate chairman of which was William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine, later President Lincoln's Secretary of the Treasury. The senior Member and the man who took Senator Fessenden's place on the floor of the Senate when Fessendon was later ill was Jacob M. Howard, of Michigan, and then followed John Harris, of New York; James W. Grimes, of Iowa; Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland; and George H. Williams, of Oregon.

And the members of that joint committee on the House side were Roscoe Conkling, of New York; George M. Boutwell, of Massachusetts; Henry T. Blow, of Missouri; John A. Bingham, of Ohio, the author of the first section of the amendment; Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont; E. B. Washburne, of Illinois; and two others—I forget where they came from. I think Grider, of Kentucky, was one of the lone two Democrats on the committee of the House. That was a very distinguished committee, who gave a great deal of thought to this amendment and, therefore, their views at this excited period when, if ever, the most extreme claims of Federal power would have been made, should give you some pause in considering this question.

This amendment was considered twice. The first two sections were considered separately and then as separate resolutions for separate amendments, and then they were later joined together and made articles of one amendment, the fourteenth amendment, as it now appears.

When what is now the first section of the fourteenth amendment was reported to the House, it was drafted by John A. Bingham, a Republican Member of the House from Ohio and in answering it on May 10, Mr. Bingham made these statements (this is on p. 2542 in the Congressional Globe if anyone wants to look it up.) Mr. Bingham said:

"This amendment takes from no State any right that ever pertained to it. The amendment does not give, as the section shows, the power to Congress of regulating suffrage in the several States."

And in the second section—that was the section, you remember, that reduced the representation of the States in case they denied to any person the right of suffrage—Bingham said:

"The second section excludes the conclusion that by the first section suffrage is subjected to congressional law."

In the Senate this first section was discussed by Senator Howard, who was heading the committee in the absence of Senator Fessenden—and he states (May 23, p. 3165, et seq.):

"The first section of the proposed amendment does not give to either of these classes the privilege of voting. The right of suffrage is not, in law, one of the privileges or immunities thus secured by the Constitution. It is merely the creature of law. It has always been regarded in this country as a result of positive local law."

As to section 2 (on p. 2766), Howard said:

"This section does not recognize the authority of the United States over the question of suffrage in the several States at all. Nor does it recognize, much less secure, the right of suffrage to the colored race. It leaves the right to regulate the elective franchise still with the States and does not meddle with that right."

In closing the debate, June 8, and just before the joint resolution was passed upon by the Senate, Senator Howard said (p. 3039):

"We know very well that the States retain the power which they have always possessed of regulating the right of suffrage. It is the theory of the Constitution. That right has

never been taken from them; no endeavor has ever been made to take it from them; and the theory of this whole amendment is to leave the power of regulating the suffrage with the people or legislatures of the States, and not to assume to regulate it by any clause of the Constitution of the United States."

Senator DANAHER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Danaher.

Senator DANAHER. Judge Warren, at the time that article I, section 2, was adopted as part of the Constitution, there was also a provision which read:

"Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union according to their respective numbers which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons including those bound to service for a term of years and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons."

Obviously, that recognizes a distinction between what were known then as free persons and others?

Mr. WARREN. I did not catch that.

Senator DANAHER. Obviously recognizing a distinction between those who were then known as free persons and all others.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator DANAHER. That section was repealed by section 2 of article XIV.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator DANAHER. And amendment XIV says:

"Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed, but when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State or the members of the legislature thereof is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such a State being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States or in any way abridged except for participation in rebellion and other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in proportion that the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of such male citizens 21 years of age in such State."

Do you doubt the power of Congress to enforce that section by appropriate legislation?

Mr. WARREN. It says, in effect, that if the State chose to deny the right to vote to any section of its inhabitants, it should have its representation to that extent lessened.

In fact, that was the whole basis on which that section 2 was finally adopted, that they recognized the right of the State to deny any person the right to vote but they said, "If you deny any such persons the right to vote, then that number of your electors and your representation shall, to that extent and in exactly that same proportion, be reduced."

Senator DANAHER. Do you not agree, sir, that by the fourteenth amendment, section 2, we specified qualifications as a basis upon which abridgment of apportionment could be predicated?

Mr. WARREN. No; I do not see that section 2 states anything about qualifications.

Senator DANAHER. It says they must be 21 years of age. Is that not a qualification?

Mr. WARREN. It says:

"Denied to any person being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States."

Senator DANAHER. Are those not qualifications, Judge Warren?

Mr. WARREN. No.

Senator DANAHER. What are they?

Mr. WARREN. A woman is a citizen of the United States; a minor is a citizen of the United States; a pauper is a citizen of the United States. There are plenty of citizens of the United States who have not the right to vote in a State, under the State constitutions. It has nothing to do with the question of being a citizen of the United States.

Senator DANAHER. Would we have the power, in your judgment, to deny representation—let us take, for example, the State of Texas—by reducing the number of Representatives in the House of Representatives on the basis that the right to vote is abridged as against citizens who are 21 years of age?

Mr. WARREN. Yes. Certainly you have got it specifically granted to you, the right to reduce representation. That is specifically granted by section 2 of the fourteenth amendment.

Senator DANAHER. So that if we were to amend this bill to say that if there be, in any State, a requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite for the privilege of voting and the right of any citizen being 21 years of age is thus abridged, all numbers of such persons so denied the right to vote shall be excluded from the basis of apportionment of representatives allotted to that State?

Mr. WARREN. Unquestionably.

Senator DANAHER. It may be a good answer to this whole bill.

Mr. WARREN. Unquestionably. I am not discussing what Congress could do under some other power than that in section 2 of article I of the original Constitution. I hope you will not confine any illustration to the State of Texas because I notice that the Senator from the State of Texas is temporarily absent from the room.

Senator MURDOCK. This argument and the same discussion as the colloquy between Senator Danaher and yourself happened before the Judiciary Committee of the House when I was a member of that. The argument was made there that the second section of amendment 14 really contemplated that the States may abridge the right of certain people to vote but that if such abridgment or denial did take place that Congress had a remedy by reducing the number of Representatives.

Mr. WARREN. And that was the only remedy at that time until the fifteenth amendment was passed. The fifteenth amendment was passed in order to get away from doing that thing and it was made a part of the Constitution that the Negro should not be excluded from voting.

Senator MURDOCK. You take the position, as I understand you, that under amendment 14, section 2, the exclusive remedy of Congress to meet such an abridgment by a State is the reduction of Representatives?

Mr. WARREN. And it is so stated. I was just going to read that.

Senator MURDOCK. Of course, the people who sponsor this anti-poll-tax law take the position that that is not the only remedy, that it is not exclusive.

Mr. WARREN. I would like now to pursue the statements made by the Senators who constructed the amendment because they are certainly very powerful. I think that the last quotation was from Senator HOWARD who reported the amendment to the Senate.

(I think that Senator Danaher may be interested in this.) When they first took up the second section of the fourteenth amendment, Senator Fessenden, who was then recovered from a slight illness and was, as I say, the chairman of this joint committee, made this statement. He was controverting at the time, I think, Senator Sumner. On February 7, 1866, he said (p. 704):

"The power exists now at the present time in all these States to make just such class or caste distinctions as they please"—

Senator Sumner was claiming it was a class distinction to exclude the Negro:

"The power exists now at the present time in all these States to make just such class or caste distinctions as they please. The Constitution does not limit them. The Constitution, in terms, gives us no power. It leaves to the States, as everybody knows, the perfect authority to regulate this matter of suffrage to suit themselves."

Later in his speech he describes what the second section means in requiring the reduction and he said (p. 705):

"It says to all the people of the United States you shall be represented in Congress, but, as we fear you may be governed by narrow views, as we fear you will do injustice to a portion of the people under your charge • • • we say to you that you shall not have political power any further than you show by your actions that you are disposed to let your charges participate in it."

Senator Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland, a very distinguished—one of the most distinguished lawyers at the Supreme Court bar—and who was the lone Senate Democrat on this joint committee of 15 in the Senate, speaking of the fact that at that time this question of suffrage of the Negro was not a southern question entirely because of the fact that of the States of the North and the East at that time there were only six who admitted the Negro to the right of suffrage for members of their own legislature. In other words, that the free Negro was not admitted to the right of suffrage in any of the States of the North and East except six, and Senator Johnson said, in pursuing that line of thought as to the complete power of the States at that time over the whole subject (p. 765):

"I suppose that even the honorable Member from Massachusetts [Senator Sumner], will not deny that it was for Massachusetts to regulate her suffrage before 1789, and if it was, she has the power still unless she has agreed to part with it by devolving it upon the General Government. Is there a word in the Constitution that intimates such a purpose? Who at that time, in 1787, denied that the State was clothed with the power of prescribing the qualifications for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? • • • The State and nobody else."

He then cited Federalist, No. 54:

"The right of choosing the allotted number in each State is to be exercised by such part of the inhabitants as the State itself may designate. Words could not have been adopted more obviously leading to the conclusion that in the opinion of the writers of the Federalist, the States were to have the sole right of regulating the suffrage."

Then, further down, he says:

"There is nothing innate in the right of suffrage. It depends wholly upon governmental regulation."

There was one other Democratic Senator not on the joint committee, but of considerable distinction, and I am citing these to show you that there was no difference of opinion between such prominent Republican Senators as Howard and Fessenden and the Democratic Senators, Reverdy Johnson and Senator Hendricks, of Indiana. Senator Hendricks said (p. 880):

"I ask the Senators the question: Have the States, under the Constitution, the right to control the elective franchise? Does any Senator question that? The Senator from Massachusetts does. He thinks that Congress may control the right of suffrage in the State, but it has not been a question of dispute whether the State had control of elective franchise. It is absolute and perfect."

Then Senator Sumner got up and he denied the right of a State to deny the Negro suffrage, but he went on to say that the State had entire control over the right of suffrage and could deny it by reason of condition of age, residence, character, education, property, and the payment of taxes, but he claimed it could not be applicable to color. So you see, even Senator Sumner would have denied the right of Congress to pass the present bill.

Coming along in the debate, we find Senator Wilson, who was the colleague of Senator Sumner from Massachusetts, said (p. 1255):

"The men who framed the Constitution made those State constitutions • • • they well knew what the qualifications were. Every State constitution provides for electors, prescribes the qualification for suffrage. The laws of the States provided for qualifications of electors. Every State, from the adoption of the State constitution to this hour, has claimed the authority and exercised it to settle the questions pertaining to suffrage. They never supposed that the Federal Government had the power to change it. They never gave that power and they never intended to give that power."

That is the statement of Senator Wilson, afterwards Vice President of the United States.

Then in closing the early debate on that section, Senator Fessenden, who was chairman of the joint committee that drafted it, made this statement (p. 1278):

"If I understand the Constitution at all, it has always been considered that the clause which I have read"—

That is, the second section of article I of the Constitution—

"acknowledged the right of the States to regulate the question of suffrage. I do not think it has ever been disputed. • • • The States have a perfect right today and they may exercise it as they see fit to make such rules as suit them with regard to the qualifications of electors."

I won't weary you by any further citations. When the fourteenth amendment was adopted, you will recall that it was claimed by some Republicans, I think by George H. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, who later became Secretary of the Treasury, that the first section denying to the States the power to abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States—although the contrary had been stated time and time again during the debate on this amendment—it was claimed that that privileges-and-immunity clause of the citizens of the United States denied to the State the power to restrict the right of suffrage, and when, in 1868, the fifteenth amendment was under consideration, Mr. Boutwell and some others thought it was not necessary to pass the fifteenth amendment in order to give the Negro the right to vote because they said it could be done by a simple act of Congress under the privilege-and-immunity clause, that is, by an act of Congress enforcing the privilege-and-immunity clause. That attempt was soon dropped. That bill was debated in the House but it was soon dropped, and the fifteenth amendment was adopted in order to establish the power by the Constitution.

The fifteenth amendment was passed, I think, in 1869. The idea that the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States denied in some way the right of the States to control suffrage, that idea prevailed for a number of years until, in 1875, there came along the Slaughterhouse cases; and in those cases there was laid down, you remember, for the first time the distinction between the rights of a citizen and a State and the rights of a citizen of the United States, as such, that is, the rights which grew out of some peculiar relation of an inhabitant of a State to the United States Government.

Then, you remember, very shortly after the Slaughterhouse cases, there came the case which, in fact, applied the general proposition that there was a distinction between the right of a citizen of a State and the right of a citizen of the United States per se, to the specific right of a woman to vote. That was the case of *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wallace 162). On March 29, 1875, in that case the extent of the distinction between the rights of a citizen of the United States and the rights of a citizen of a State with regard to voting was laid down and explained, and Chief Justice Waite said that the "fact that the right of voting could not grow out of citizenship alone was clear when you considered who was a citizen of the United States; everybody born here was a citizen of the United States and, therefore, if voting depended on citizenship, every child, every woman, every pauper, every criminal, every person born here would have the right to vote."

And he concluded:

"Certainly if the courts can consider any question settled, this is one. For nearly 90 years the people have acted upon the idea that the Constitution, when it conferred citizenship, did not necessarily confer the right of suffrage."

And, using those same words here in the year 1948, I should suppose that if any question had been settled in 134 years it was this question that the States alone possessed the right of control of suffrage.

Senator MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask this question?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Murdock.

Senator MURDOCK. Are you familiar with Public Law 712 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which was approved September 16, 1942, with reference to soldiers voting?

Mr. WARREN. Yes. I know there was such a law.

Senator MURDOCK. Section 2 reads as follows:

"No person in military service at time of war shall be required, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, to pay a poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof."

I assume from your statement here that you would take the position that that section is unconstitutional?

Mr. WARREN. Personally, I should not have had any doubt about it, except for the fact that the war power has received such immense extensions in recent years. Hence, I should not now be at all certain as to how far it extended in that direction. Except for the war power, everything that I have said on the present bill so far would certainly apply. I would have made precisely the same argument if I had appeared before this committee in connection with that bill in 1942, except that I would have frankly stated that I do not know in that respect how far the war power extends. I have about come to the conclusion that all my previous views regarding the extent of power of this Government in time of war must be canceled, and that, at the present moment, I do not know what there is which the Government cannot do if the war makes it necessary.

Now, I take up another branch of my argument. I dislike always, in arguing before a court, for I think it is a very disagreeable thing for the court and I am sure it is for you gentlemen, to cite passages from cases; and yet, tracing this idea that Congress had no power to control the right of suffrage in the State down through the years and decades, I must show how far this statement comes down in decisions by the Supreme Court. I will only cite a few cases to show that it comes down all through the line.

The first case under the legislation that grew out of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments was not decided by the Supreme Court until 1876. You remember there was a series of statutes purporting to enforce the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. A large portion of those statutes were declared unconstitutional because of the effort of Congress to apply them directly to acts of individuals instead of to acts of States, but there was the Enforcement Act of May 31, 1870; there was, of course, the Ku Klux Act of April 20, 1870; and there was the Federal Election Act of June 10, 1872, and there was the Civil Rights Act of March 1, 1875; and they all came before the Supreme Court sooner or later. Under them, many cases involving constitutional rights of citizens arose.

The first case was that of *The United States* v. *Reese* ((1876), 92 U. S. 214), decided in 1876. It involved the fifteenth amendment and the enforcement of it against persons who alleged the States to be discriminating in elections against them. The sections of the statute which were sought to be applied were held invalid because they were not appropriate legislation under the fifteenth amendment, but in the course of that case and decision, Chief Justice Waite said that—

"Before the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, it was possible for a State to exclude a man from voting because of his race, color, or otherwise."

He said:

"Before its adoption, this could be done. It was then as much within the power of the State to exclude citizens of the United States from voting on account of race and so forth as it was on account of age, property, or education."

Then came the *Minor* v. *Happersett* decision, which held that a State might exclude women from voting. Then passing down a long list of cases, there is, of course, the statement in the *Ex parte Yarbrough* case in 1884 (110 U. S. 56), a case, I think, that was cited 10 or a dozen times in the recent Classic case in which Judge Miller said:

"The States, in prescribing the qualification of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualifications for voters for those so nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. Judge Warren, if you desire, in the interest of conserving time, you can incorporate that in the record here as part of the record.

Mr. WARREN. I have only a few other citations. The decision in *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58), in 1900, answers the question, I think, that Senator Murdock asked. In discussing the right to vote for Members of Congress, Judge Gray said:

"They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress."

I call attention to a statement made in *Pope* v. *Williams* (193 U. S. 621), in 1904, which has some bearing upon one of the contentions made here by the proponents of the present bill. Justice Peckham says:

"A State, so far as the Federal Constitution is concerned, might provide by its own constitution and laws that no one but native-born citizens shall be permitted to vote, as the Federal Constitution does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone, and the conditions under which that right is to be exercised are matters for the States alone to prescribe, subject to the conditions of the Federal Constitution."

And I want to call to your attention the following words:

"The question whether the conditions prescribed by the State might be regarded by others as reasonable or unreasonable is not a Federal one. • • • The right of a State to legislate upon the subject of the elective franchise as to it may seem good, subject, we believe, to the conditions already stated being as unassailable, we think it plain that the statute in question violates this right."

We come down as late as 1915 to a decision in *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347). That was the Oklahoma Constitution case which arose under the fifteenth amendment; and in it Chief Justice White stated:

"It is true also that the amendment"—that is, the fifteenth amendment—"does not change, modify, or deprive the States of their full power as to suffrage, except, of course, as to the subject with which the amendment deals"—that is the subject of the Negro.

I want to call your attention particularly to a passage in Chief Justice White's decision, in which he points out what was the contention of the Government of the United States at that time, made through its Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. John W. Davis.

"The United States says that State power to provide for suffrage is not disputed although, of course, the authority of the fifteenth amendment and the limit on their power that is insisted on—hence no assertion denying the right of a State to exert judgment and discretion in fixing the qualification of suffrage is advanced."

That is, the Government, through the Attorney General at that time, did not even pretend or contend that the judgment and discretion of the United States in fixing the qualification for suffrage existed.

I am not going to discuss the Classic case. It has been discussed, I think, in testimony rather ad nauseam. I had rather supposed—and before this question came up, I read that case a number of times—I had not supposed that the case and its decision had anything whatsoever to do with the question of the right of the State to control suffrage. It was simply concerned with whether a primary election was an election within the meaning of the term "manner" of regulating an election as used in this fourth section of article I of the Constitution. I searched in vain, I searched in vain to find a single word in that decision that has anything whatsoever to do with the question of the right of suffrage. But you gentlemen are quite as capable, and probably more capable than I am, of knowing what that decision decides. I simply say that, so far as I can see, it decides nothing whatsoever pertinent to this question I am now arguing; and I had not supposed that, except for the fact it held that a primary election might be included within the term "election" as used in the Constitution, except for that decision, I had not supposed there was a single proposition or dictum or expression in that case that differed in the slightest from what had been held in case after case for 50 years before it.

I have finished what I had to say.

Senator CONNALLY. I agree with you that the fourteenth amendment does not give any power such as asserted in this bill but there are those that do. There are those who assert that the Constitution gives some power to Congress. But I want to call your attention to the fact in 1917, I believe it was, that in the seventeenth amendment for the popular vote for Senators, they reenacted, so far as the qualifications of Senators are concerned, the same clause as contained in section 2 of article I that—

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State elected by the people thereof for 6 years and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

I wanted to ask you whether or not there were any powers in the fourteenth amendment—if it would not, as far as Senators at least are concerned, be repealed by the subsequent insertion in the Constitution of the seventeenth amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Well, I should not have any doubt about that. I should say that when a word had been used in the original Constitution and at least silently construed—that is, no one ever claimed that the qualifications could not be decided by the States—I should say that a word in the seventeenth amendment meant precisely what it meant in the original Constitution. Whether it had the effect of repealing anything in the fourteenth amendment, I do not know. But I have frankly never given any consideration to that, believing so certainly and conclusively and impressively in the statements made by the Senators about the effect of the fourteenth amendment, so I cannot see that there is anything relating to the State rights over suffrage to repeal.

Senator CONNALLY. What I meant was this: That since the seventeenth amendment is specific that it deals with a single thing—the qualification of electors for Senators—and the fourteenth amendment having general terms and things of that kind, with the seventeenth amendment being subsequent to the fourteenth amendment, if there was anything in the fourteenth amendment, it would certainly have to yield to the seventeenth amendment, and even granting the proponents' views, you would have to have two boxes—you would have to have one for Congress and one for Senator and one for State officers, would you not?

Mr. WARREN. I should suppose so, but I do not think it is necessary on the basis of my argument.

Senator CONNALLY. Thank you.

Mr. WARREN. Just one minute. I suppose you are going to adjourn very shortly. I had not intended to cover this whole subject, of course, and I understand one of the great contentions of the proponents of this bill is that even if section 2 of article I gives no power, section 4, which authorizes Congress to adopt regulations as to time, place, and manner, gives the power to regulate the suffrage.

Of course, there is not a single decision of the United States courts from one end to the other that even intimates that manner of conducting an election includes the qualification of electors. But pass that by. If it does, what was the use of section 2? If the Constitution assumed to fix the qualifications of electors by section 2, why should it then pass section 4 and give Congress the right to change everything which it had already fixed in section 2? In other words, it is impossible that the two sections include the same subject matter, because by section 4, if it be true that "manner" includes fixing qualifications, then Congress has full power to do anything about qualifications and Congress has full power to override section 2. Is it conceivable that, having prescribed the qualifications for voting for Members of Congress in the Constitution itself by section 2, the Federal Convention then proceeded, only a day or two later, to adopt section 4, which, on the present theory, empowered Congress to alter or do away with any or all of the qualifications which the Convention had already established by the Constitution itself in section 2? It cannot be that the Convention was adopting two sections, one of which absolutely nullified the other. That is all I have got to say on that subject. If that argument can be overcome, and the fact that no decision of the Supreme Court has ever intimated that manner included regulation of suffrage, if those two arguments can be overcome, I cannot make them any clearer or more forcible and I am not going to take them up.

I have confined my argument purely to the meaning and construction and interpretation of section 2 of article I and, as I say, I cannot find in the legislative debates, in the courts, or in the writings of any lawyer, any attempt to assert that the States did not absolutely control the right of suffrage, until the question has arisen within the last few years and been encouraged by what some people think they find in the Classic case. If I am able to understand the English language, I cannot find there what they think they find; but I am not going into that because you gentlemen are fully competent to decide what you think the Classic case decides.

I wish to thank you gentlemen for your patience.

Senator CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to request the authority of the committee that the stenographer furnish Judge Warren a copy, at the earliest practical moment, of his remarks here and that he be accorded the privilege of inserting in full any matter that he has or embellishing what he has said to make it a full and complete statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered, Senator AUSTIN.

Senator AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to listen to Mr. Charles Warren on this subject. It has been a very illuminating discussion.

There is one point which, if he cares to talk on, I would like to hear his views on, and that is the use or definition of "qualifications" in the brief and in many arguments that have appeared in support of this proposal. The assertion appears that the requirement of the payment of a poll tax is not a qualification and that it is only a prerequisite or condition and that, therefore, this proposal does not offend the Constitution. Do you care to comment on that subject?

Mr. WARREN. When we go back before the Constitution, a qualification to vote meant whatever the State constitution or the State legislature required of a man in order to make him eligible to vote. Therefore, the qualifications which the Constitution speaks of, must mean what it meant in the States and what it meant in the States before 1787, i. e., such conditions, prerequisites or the existence of such other facts or conditions as the States thought it necessary to require before granting to an inhabitant the right to vote. I cannot see how it could possibly mean anything other than that. They were not originating a language. They were adopting the requirements with which they were perfectly familiar, which included the requirement of paying a poll tax; the requirement of possessing so much wealth or so much money and so forth. It was a question for the States exclusively to decide, what they should require of a man before they should render him qualified to vote.

I cannot see it in any other way than that, because if that is not so, then you must find a power of Congress to define a word in the Constitution, and I look in vain for any such power. That is purely a judicial question. Congress has, as I said at the opening, no more power to define a word in the Constitution than it has to insert a word in the Constitution, in fact, to define a word would, in many cases, be to insert it. Just as I said, Senator PEPPER wanted to prescribe reasonable qualifications, which is certainly an insertion.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MCFARLAND.

Senator MCFARLAND. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator CONNALLY?

Senator CONNALLY. I merely want to express my own appreciation, and I am sure all the other members of the committee are grateful to you for this very illuminating and unselfish argument you have made on this subject.

Mr. WARREN. I hope I have cast a few rays of light.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Murdock?

Senator MURDOCK. I have asked probably too many questions now. I do want to say I have thoroughly enjoyed the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator REVERCOMB?

Senator REVERCOMB. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Danaher?

Senator DANAHER. I think you might inadvertently have been led into error in reply to Senator CONNALLY's question. Surely you do not mean that the seventeenth amendment repealed the fourteenth amendment?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly not.

Senator CONNALLY. I did not make that qualification. It was as to suffrage only that the seventeenth amendment referred to.

Mr. WARREN. My answer was that I did not agree that the fourteenth amendment had anything to do with suffrage at all, so I did not think the seventeenth would repeal it;

but if the fourteenth amendment did have anything to do with State rights over suffrage, then I should say the Senator was correct in thinking that the seventeenth amendment might have repealed it. I would not make that too definite, because in a constitutional amendment I am rather inclined to think that if you are going to repeal some previous constitutional amendment you had better make it specific.

Senator DANAHER. One other question. Surely it is a fact that apportionment is still based upon the fourteenth amendment, section 2?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly. Apportionment of Representatives, you mean?

Senator DANAHER. Yes; and we have a census every 10 years for the purpose of counting the number of persons within the State upon which apportionment shall be predicated.

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Senator DANAHER. And when we passed the fourteenth amendment we certainly repealed explicitly that portion of article I of the original Constitution which had prescribed a distinction between free persons and all others who were to be counted for apportionment purposes?

Mr. WARREN. Precisely. It is precisely the same subject—just as was the repeal of the prohibition amendment. You probably could not have repealed that amendment by implication merely.

Senator DANAHER. I have enjoyed your discussion very much and I have appreciated your contribution so greatly I would like to ask your opinion on a hypothetical point.

Mr. WARREN. My opinion on hypothetical points is usually not very valuable.

Senator DANAHER. It is at least as valuable as the expert witness and I would like to have you comment, if you will, on this assumption:

Assume there were before us a bill which read as follows:

"Whenever any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision, or any person, whether or not acting under color of authority of the laws of any State or subdivision thereof, shall abridge in any way, the right of any citizen, being 21 years of age, to vote in any primary or election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof"—those words following exactly article XIV, section 2—"the number of Representatives from any such State wherein such abridgment exists, shall be reduced in the ratio that the number of such citizens whose right so to vote shall be abridged bears to the whole number of persons in any such State."

Mr. WARREN. I think I have explained to you what I believed section 2 of the fourteenth amendment permitted Congress to do. As to any particular bill, I must answer what I have several times answered to a similar question before the Supreme Court when they have asked me: Would you say that this law applies to such-and-such and such-and-such? I have invariably had to answer that I have enough difficulty in arguing this one case and I certainly will argue the other cases when I come to them.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Judge Warren.

Mr. STEWART. I shall now read certain excerpts from Mr. Warren's testimony. He stated:

I was very much interested to read the printed hearings of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate covering hearings in 1941 and 1942. I had a personal interest in various references contained in that volume because a number of the witnesses who appeared in favor of the bill cited the case of Gov. William E. Russell, of Massachusetts, who succeeded in obtaining the abolition of the Massachusetts State poll tax as a requirement for voting after a very vigorous campaign back in 1901.

I said I had a personal interest in that statement because I have a very vivid personal memory of it and personal contact with it. As a very young man, I was appointed private secretary to the Governor of Massachusetts by Gov. William E. Russell. He was the first Democratic Governor we had had in Massachusetts for about 25 years and before my appointment I had, in the previous years, taken some part in Governor Russell's campaign for the abolition of the poll tax as a requirement for voting. His campaign in that respect was successful and the Legislature of Massachusetts abolished it. At that time certainly there was no intimation that the United States Congress had power to abolish it or that any request would be made to Congress to perform an act which at that time was supposed to be a futile act as not within the power of the Congress.

I make that preliminary statement so as to clear the minds of the members of the committee that my argument on the constitutionality has anything to do with my views as to the merits or nonmerits of a poll tax.

Before I go into any questions of detail, I should like to clear away a few of what I might call the debris which has rather clogged and interfered with the real questions at issue which I find in previous hearings. There has been a great deal of talk and argument, so far as I can make out, from the witnesses about the question whether the right to vote for Congress is or is not a Federal right secured by the Constitution. Well, I didn't suppose there was the slightest doubt that it was a right secured by the Constitution. The proponents of this bill have devoted much time to what they call the Classic case 2 years ago to support that proposition. Why, the Supreme Court has held that for 40, 50 years, that the right to vote for Congressmen was a Federal right secured by the Constitution but the question here is: The right of whom to vote for Congressman? That is the issue here, not whether the right exists; of course it exists. The Constitution created the office of Congressman, a Member of the House. It prescribed when they should be elected. It prescribed who should elect them. So it must be a Federal right secured by the Constitution; but the question is, not whether it is a Federal right, but to whom is the right given?

There is another phrase which has been very loosely used all through the hearings in 1941 and 1942. I find in briefs and all through the hearings references to "Federal suffrage," and to the "rights of national citizenship." I was surprised to find a brief, signed by the dean of the Law School of Nebraska, I think, and concurred in by a group of law professors from Yale, Columbia, and Wisconsin, in which they referred constantly to the "rights of the citizens to vote." Then in their brief they speak later of the "right of Congress to prohibit the States from unduly restricting the rights of national citizenship." Later on they speak of the imposition by the State of proper qualifications for voting "which do not abridge the rights of national citizenship" and they refer later to "protecting the rights of national citizenship." (See testimony in 1941 and 1942, pp. 35–52.)

Now, that, of course, is an entire misapprehension. There is no right of national citizenship to vote. There were many citizens of the United States who could not vote in the past and who cannot vote today. A woman was a citizen of the United States. She possessed national citizenship—but she could not vote until 1920; and this idea that "national citizenship" confers a right to vote for Congress is, of course, entirely erroneous. The right to vote for Members of Congress is given only to such United States citizens as possess the qualifications for voting in the States for the most numerous branch of the legislature. That is the portion of United States citizens—that is the class of United States citizens—who can vote; but there is no right to vote vested in citizens of the United States in general; so that the issue is clogged and beclouded by using such expressions here as are used in this brief of these law professors.

With those preliminary very fundamental remarks about this right to vote for Members of Congress, I now want to take up a phase which is equally fundamental. I am not going to go into the details of the Federal Convention of 1787, what they said and what they did not say. I am not going to go into the details of discussions of recent cases in the Supreme Court. Those have been discussed at great length and, I feel, at unnecessary length in the testimony of some of the previous witnesses.

But I am going to take up now the question in detail of what this section 2 of article I of the Constitution does and does not do. First, at the risk of going perhaps further than is necessary with gentlemen of your distinction and legal knowledge, I am going to impress upon you once again, what article X of the Bill of Rights provides—the tenth amendment. We must not lose sight of that for an instant, in trying to ascertain what the section of the Constitution now involved really means. Article X says:

"The powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

Now, what does this article X actually do? What is its function and what is its content?

In arriving at this method of disposing of the question of the right to vote in the Federal Convention of 1787, there was a threefold contest. The contest was between those members who wished a uniform qualification for electors (freehold property or otherwise) to be prescribed in the Constitution itself; there was another group of delegates who wished the power to prescribe to be vested in Congress, and there was still a third group who wished the Constitution to prescribe qualifications—not uniform qualifications but qualifications such as the respective States prescribed for their own people.

The statement continues. I wish to point out particularly one or two things in the statement which I think are of particular interest and potency in connection with this debate. Mr. Warren's entire testimony before the committee was on the subject of the poll tax. I have already obtained permission to have his entire statement printed in the RECORD. However, I wish to read a few excerpts from it. He quotes from Mr. Story in his Commentaries in volume 1, page 820. Mr. Warren stated:

Story's Commentaries (1933) states (vol. I, sec. 820), after treating at length in a number of sections, the subject of congressional power under article I, section 4, to regulate the "times, places, and manner" of holding elections for Senators and Representatives:

"There is no pretense to say that the power in the National Government can be used so as to exclude any State from its share in the representation in Congress. Nor can it be said with correctness that Congress can, in any way, alter the right or qualification of voters."

In the statement made by Mr. Warren, which I have just read, he criticizes the brief signed by the dean of the Nebraska Law School and the professors from Yale, Columbia, and Wisconsin, in which they continually refer to the right of citizens to vote. He points out particularly that there is no right of a national citizenship

to vote, and that there were many citizens of the United States who at one time could not vote.

I invite attention to a paragraph at the bottom of page 107 of the book entitled "To Secure These Rights," published in the nature of a report by the President's Civil Rights Committee, in which it is said:

The extent of Federal power to protect the suffrage varies, depending on the type of election (State or National), the type of interference (whether it affects the voting procedure or is based on race or sex), and the source of interference (State and local officers or private persons). Among the specific sources of Federal power are: Article 1, section 4, which permits Federal protection of the procedure for voting in Federal elections against interference from any source; the fourteenth amendment, which supports protection against State interference with equality of opportunity to vote in any election; the fifteenth amendment, which supports action against State interference because of race or color with the right to vote in any election; and the nineteenth amendment, which supports action against State interference based on sex with the right to vote in any election.

Mr. President, in connection with that statement, in which a position contrary to that taken by the dean of the law school of the University of Nebraska is taken, I wish to point out that Mr. Warren's testimony explodes entirely the idea that there is a right of national citizenship to vote. His testimony continues in the pamphlet.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like to point out that Mr. Warren's testimony is of peculiar importance in that he is, as I said at the outset, one of the outstanding constitutional lawyers of the day. I think his testimony completely explodes the idea that the Congress has any right at all to interfere with the question of suffrage in any State. I emphasize again the provision of the Constitution that the election of the Members of the National House of Representatives—and later, by the seventeenth amendment, the same thing is said as to the election of Senators—shall be by those who are qualified in each State to vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. That is the determinative point in this matter, and the determination of those who are qualified to vote in each State for the most numerous branch of the State legislature must be made by the State itself. The passage of any law here, undertaking to define who can vote for Members of the Congress and, by such definition, undertaking to make up a group of persons who cannot comply with the requirement of the Constitution that those who are qualified to vote for Federal officers are those who are qualified to vote for the most numerous branch of the State legislature, would be in direct violation of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I think I have completed my statement. I have not taken the 30 minutes for which I have asked.

I now yield the floor.

MIDYEAR ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the midyear economic report of the President, transmitted to the Congress on July 30, 1948, with an accompanying letter of transmittal, which was read, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1948.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith a midyear economic report to the Congress. This is supplementary to the Economic Report of the President of January 14, 1948, and is transmitted in accordance with section 3 (b) of the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, The Economic Situation at Midyear 1948, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I had the privilege of reading this midyear economic report of the President last night.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a point of order; namely, that the clerk did not read the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Heretofore it has been the custom of the Senate to read only the letter of transmittal of reports required by statute to be submitted to the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was under the impression that the report was submitted to the Congress in accordance with law, and that it would require unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the view of the Chair that the law requires only the transmission of the report; and it is clearly the practice of the Senate to read only the letter of transmittal, and to refer the report to the appropriate committee having jurisdiction, which in this case is the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

That is the ruling of the Chair in connection with the matter. Of course, any Senator can appeal from the Chair's ruling.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I dislike to appeal from the ruling of the Chair. The Chair is always uniformly fair; but I was under the very distinct impression that the rule requires the reading of the report in its entirety.

However, the Senator from Ohio has the floor, and I do not make a motion in this connection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I had the privilege of reading this report last night, and I think all Members of the Senate will find it very interesting.

In reading the report, it is very difficult to see in the general economic situation any emergency which would justify the calling of a special session of Congress at this time.

In particular, I should like to call attention to the manner in which the report deals with the subject of housing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator from Ohio think it desirable to have the report read? If the Senator will yield to me, I shall move to have it read.

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think it necessary to have it read. As a matter of fact, the report is not very long. It is on the desk of each Senator; but rather intensive attention is required in order to understand it, so I would much prefer to read it myself, rather than to have it read out loud to the Senate, which does not listen very attentively to the reading of such matters.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Ohio has announced that he had the special privilege of looking at this report last night and studying it. It has been laid on our desks only in the last few minutes. I dare say that none of the rest of us have had the special privilege which seems to have been accorded the Senator from Ohio. I certainly have not seen it. There are 115 pages of the report. Certainly we cannot digest it in a few moments, so as to be able to comment very intelligently on the remarks of the Senator from Ohio about it.

Mr. TAFT. However, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to one particular portion of the report, so that when Senators read the report, they will pay special attention to that portion.

I may say that the report was transmitted to me by Mr. Nourse himself. I received it on my desk yesterday from Mr. Nourse, and therefore I was able to read it last night when I went home.

Mr. BARKLEY. I congratulate the Senator from Ohio on having that special privilege, not accorded other Senators.

Mr. TAFT. I imagine that it was transmitted to me because I am chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which was in close touch with the President's advisers, and which is required as a duty to pass upon the report and criticize it and submit a report on it to the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, buttressed by the remarks of the distinguished minority leader, again I ask the Senator from Ohio to yield, in order that a motion may be made to have the report read.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I see no particular value in having the report read. I should like to read some sections of it, so that when Senators read it, as I hope all Senators will, they will notice the bearing of this report on the one matter of housing and its consideration at the special session of Congress.

Mr. President, what I wish to call attention to is that on page 3 of his own report, the President says this as to housing:

Residential construction is expected to increase the total supply of dwelling units by more than a million during 1948—

That statement appears at the bottom of page 3.

I read further:

This high output—

I may say it is the highest output in the history of the United States—

has been accompanied by an increase in costs that is outrunning consumers' ability to pay for the housing they need.

In other words if the output is further increased this year by any emergency legislation it undoubtedly will increase building costs further. That is further borne out by the report of the Council of Economic Advisers to the President, on page 14 where they say:

Residential construction: About 450,000 new residential units in new buildings were started during the half year. Counting also conversions and alterations, more than a million units will probably be added to the residential supply during 1948.

This volume of residential construction is already straining the capacities of the construction industry in many areas and of producers of some construction materials, and is unquestionably competing with other primary national needs. (See appendix C, table 13.) This situation highlights what has become the chronic necessity of developing and applying new methods and substitute materials to the house-building industry.

I shall not read the remainder of it, which discusses other questions, and which suggests the need for further low-rent housing, in which I thoroughly believe. I believe very strongly that the House should have passed the Senate housing bill, but I do not think that construction can possibly start this year, nor under the facts stated by the advisers, should it start this year, because it would only add to the very serious inflation which is already existing. So that, merely as a question of whether it should be considered now or considered at the ensuing regular session, it seems perfectly obvious to me that the long-term program calling for the entrance of the Federal Government into the question of subsidizing low-rent housing presents substantial differences of opinion and should await the regular session, and that seems to me to be fully borne out by the report of the President himself, and it entirely removes the housing question from the emergency status.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. If the Senator would continue to read the statement on housing at the top of page 15, he would see that the report states as follows:

During the past year, the average price of new houses has risen about 20 percent, while average family income after taxes was only about 8 percent higher during the first half of 1948 than during the same period in 1947.

Does not the Senator think that that statement indicates the necessity for some legislation to curtail and curb the further rise in building costs, so that the average individual might be able to purchase a home? If the costs continue to rise, will they not rise out of sight and no houses will be purchased?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think the general question of prices is, if you please, Mr. President, an emergency matter. Our committees are thoroughly examining the matter. The Banking and Currency Committees of the House and Senate are examining the whole question of inflation, and I hope this Congress may take action on that matter. But, so far as the housing end is concerned, direct housing stimulation and the building of additional houses this year is in direct conflict, according to the President himself, with the whole problem of trying to check inflation. I was merely calling it to the attention of the Senate in order to show that the housing measure, as an emergency measure, seems to me to be clearly removed from the picture, and I think this session should devote itself so far as we can to the general question of inflation rather than to the question of trying to build a great many more houses this year, when already, according to the President himself, the present housing construction is the highest in history and is seriously increasing the cost of building materials and houses, and bringing about further inflation in that field.

Mr. MYERS. I understood the Senator in his opening remarks to say as he looked at this report, that the report itself indicated it was difficult to see any emergency which would necessitate the calling of a special session. I think the Senator began his remarks with those words.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. That passes over to the general question of inflation and of what can be done about inflation.

Mr. MYERS. Is the Senator in accord with the view that there was no necessity of calling a special session?

Mr. TAFT. That is my own opinion, yes, because in my judgment, the President has full power today to check inflation if he wishes to check it. We are perfectly willing to examine his proposals. We are perfectly willing to see if there are any more powers that might be granted to the President, but inasmuch as he is not using the powers he has, it is very difficult to hope that he would use any further powers.

Mr. MYERS. Would the Senator name the powers which would prevent the increase in the cost of housing by 20 percent?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I should certainly be very glad to do so. But the reason I think the President is not using the powers which are already in his hands is shown very clearly by his own approach to the problem. He does not want to stop inflation. Let me read what the President said at Philadelphia:

Confidence and security have been brought to the people by the Democratic Party. Farm income has increased from less than two and a half billion dollars in 1932 to more than $18,000,000,000 in 1947. Never in the world were the farmers of any republic or any kingdom or any other country as prosperous as the farmers of the United States; and if they don't do their duty by the Democratic Party, they are the most ungrateful people in the world.

That certainly is a very gracious appeal to the farmers of the Nation. He goes on:

Wages and salaries in this country have increased from twenty-nine billion in 1933 to more than $128,000,000,000 in 1947. That's labor, and labor never had but one friend in politics, and that is the Democratic Party and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

And I say to labor what I have said to the farmers: They are the most ungrateful people in the world if they pass the Democratic Party by this year.

That is another very gracious appeal to the electorate of this country for the return of favors apparently given by the party. But that is not my point. My point is this: The President is boasting of high farm prices, he is boasting of high wages, and then he turns round and says, "But of course the Republican Party is to blame for the high prices." How can he possibly take credit for high farm prices, Mr. President, without accepting on the other side the corresponding responsibility for high consumer prices? How can the Democratic Party be responsible for increased farm income and high wages, unless they also take responsibility for the high prices which inevitably must result from high farm prices and high wages?

The President in other words wants credit for those. He is not using his power to check inflation because he knows that if he did so farm prices would go down. He could not appeal to the farmer to show gratitude to the Democratic Party. He knows that wages would not go up. He knows very likely that to some extent there would be unemployment and, consequently, he does not want to stop inflation. He has power to stop inflation. What is the cause of inflation, anyway?

Mr. MYERS. I again ask the Senator to name those powers. What powers does the President have with which to stop inflation?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am not yielding. The Senator, in the first place, has to ask me to yield. I have not yielded to him. I object to a constant interruption without such a request.

Mr. MYERS. Very well. I shall return to the subject in my own time, if the Senator decline to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have not declined to yield. The Senator has not asked me to yield.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Five or ten minutes ago, I asked the Senator from Ohio to designate the specific powers which the President has, which if exercised would bring down the cost of living. I again ask him what specific power the President has with which to reduce and stabilize the cost of meats and the cost of foods. Rather than making political speeches, I think we should determine to address ourselves to the inflation which is upon us, forgetting past recriminations, forgetting who was responsible in 1946 or 1947. Inflation is here, the people expect us to do something about it now; and what are we in the Congress of the United States, in the month of July 1948 going to do about it? What are those specific and definite powers which the President

has which would stabilize the price of foods, particularly?

Mr. TAFT. One of the first powers which the administration has concerns the limitation of bank credit. Bank credit has increased during the past year six or seven billion dollars. That means, of course, that a bank, when it makes a loan, creates that much more money which goes into the market to bid up the price of goods. The causes of inflation do not lie in particular situations; they lie in the general increase of the purchasing power of the American people through all sorts of measures. They lie, of course, in exports. They lie in the increasing Government expenditures. They lie in the burden of Government taxes and in the increase of bank credit. The Federal Reserve Board has not even got the reserves up to the 26 percent which it is authorized by law to do. There is no question that by raising the rediscount rate and refusing to buy all the Government bonds, if the Government wants to sell them, it can very quickly check all bank lending. In fact, experts say that that must be done very delicately, and that if the power is used too violently it will start prices downward much more than is desired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What specific power has the President of the United States to prevent a bank from loaning money to a prospective borrower? He cannot order the Federal Reserve Board to give instructions to banks not to make loans. We all know that the making of loans is an inflationary element of our economy. But the Senator from Ohio has said the President can stop all that. I ask him, in good faith, to tell the Senate and the country what power the President of the United States has to prevent a bank in this country from making a loan to a borrower who applies.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the President has no such power. Is the Senator trying to avoid responsibility for the Federal Reserve Board?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not trying to avoid responsibility for anything. The Senator from Ohio started by saying that the President could do all these things.

Mr. TAFT. The President, without any question, can influence the general policy of the Federal Reserve Board. He has appointed every member of the Board. The particular bill which the Senator introduced asks us to give the Federal Reserve Board increased power to require the banks to increase their reserves.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it the attitude of the Senator from Ohio that the President of the United States could go beyond his powers, which are established by law, to lobby with the Federal Reserve Board to determine what it should do in individual cases?

Mr. TAFT. I think the President, in an emergency, can say to the Federal Reserve Board, "It is necessary to prevent inflation." Why can he not say that, as well as making political speeches to Congress? He would be more able to influence the Board by sound argument than by asking for powers which he knows no sensible Congress would ever grant to him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Supposing the Senator is correct. It is an ill wind that blows no good, because it offers the Senator from Ohio an opportunity also to make a political speech.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Kentucky was asking the question. He is apparently trying to dissociate the administration from any responsibility for what the Federal Reserve Board does or does not do.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am trying to get the Senator to be specific about the powers of the President of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. I included his natural influence and power with the Federal Reserve Board, a board which, after all, can raise the rediscount rate by refusing to buy all the Government bonds and can limit bank reserves. That is a power which we have already given. That is the over-all key power to control inflation and deflation in the United States, and it has been so used for many years. It was used in the 1920's. The Federal Reserve Board has been criticized for using it this way or that way when people thought it should have done something else and that it brought about deflation when it should not have done so. In the 1920's the Board at one point encouraged inflation when it should have been discouraging it. But that is a power which is already available to control inflation in the United States. That is No. 1.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Ohio just a moment ago to say that the President should exercise whatever influence he may have with the Federal Reserve Board and with the Treasury Department to abandon the Government's policy of purchasing Government bonds and supporting the price of Government bonds?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is an open question. He has power to do it. We have not required him to maintain Government bonds at par. He has the power with which to do it. Would that bring about undesirable results? That is the problem which our committee, as the Senator knows, has been studying, and as to which we have come to no conclusion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator to say that he thought the President had power to enforce sound anti-inflationary policies, and one of the powers which he mentioned was the power to abandon Government bonds in the market and let them go down in value. Does the Senator from Ohio recommend that policy?

Mr. TAFT. I would rather have that done than to place price controls on the American people; yes. I do not think it is necessary. I think that raising the rediscount rate, probably on short-term bonds, would be sufficient. As to a choice between that and the reimposition of price controls, I should prefer Government bonds to go below par.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Am I correct in drawing the conclusion now that the Senator from Ohio did not mean what he said a moment ago when he declared that the Federal Reserve Board could and should abandon the purchase of Government bonds?

Mr. TAFT. I did not say that, and I decline to yield further to the Senator, so long as he has misrepresented what I said.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appeal to the RECORD.

Mr. TAFT. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has declined to yield.

Mr. TAFT. The President has power to limit further the granting of extreme housing credit. We ourselves somewhat limited it last year. We refused to reenact title VI. It is pointed out by Mr. Eccles and in this report that some of the causes of inflation are the programs which have been in operation, and which are excellent programs in themselves. The difficulty is that we have been trying to operate so many different programs on such a tremendous scale that we have gone beyond the capacity even of the United States to meet the demand created by those programs. We have a program of shipment abroad, which is one of the main features of the pressure on our economy, as clearly indicated in the economic report. The report points out very clearly that while undoubtedly the general Marshall plan is highly desirable—

> The unfilled demands of the American market, with its enormous purchasing power, would sustain our prosperity for the present even if foreign markets were sharply reduced. We are deliberately subjecting ourselves to inflationary pressures on the domestic economy in the short run, in order to contribute to international security and economic stabilization in the long run.

No one wants to stop the housing program. We have many Government public-works expenditures. High prices are a result of the Government programs which have been particularly stimulated by the Government, and the hang-over from the war, resulting in building up the public debt and increasing by several billion dollars the currency of the United States which is still coming into the market.

I do not say that any one of those programs should be abandoned, but if we want to stop them it must be done gradually. With reference to some programs, we have granted money and the President has no power to stop its expenditure. But there are many other cases in which he could cut off 10 percent here and 10 percent there and indirectly reduce the pressure on the American economy. Incidentally, that is what his own economic advisers told him a while ago, apparently, before the session was called. The Wall Street Journal reports that the President's experts made a report to him, and I quote from the Wall Street Journal of July 17:

> Specifically, the President's experts were ready to tell him these are the best weapons:
>
> **Careful spending: The experts think there is water that can be eliminated in the Federal budget, especially in the military sections.**
>
> I think there are many other Federal programs where the President can deliberately hold back even the amount appropriated, which was somewhat less than what he asked. Certainly that should be so if we knew there was an emergency because of which we would have to change all our ideas.
>
> I read further from the Wall Street Journal:
>
> **Careful timing in Government spending: This means buying when commodities are relatively plentiful, delaying purchases when tight shortages develop. It also means using substitutes wherever possible. The experts hold that many shortages today are spot shortages. They can snowball if the Government buys heavily at the wrong time.**
>
> **Industry-labor cooperation: The Government should try to work with industry and labor to stop the price-wage spiral. The experts have no solutions for this now. They think education on economic facts of life is what's needed.**
>
> Housing runs about $7,000,000,000, the increase in bank loans runs from about five to seven billion dollars a year, the foreign-aid program amounts to about $7,000,000,000 a year. The export surplus this year, apart from foreign aid, will run about $8,000,000,000. Last year it was $11,000,000,000. Of course, that means that foreigners are buying $8,000,000,000 worth of our goods without putting a single pound of food or anything else into the market to meet that amount of purchases. In other words, the demand is increased by $8,000,000,000, with no increase in the supply. Of course that is an inflationary element. We gave the President full power to limit exports. All the exports, which run about $15,000,000,000, are not a part of the European aid program. In fact, about half of them go to other parts of the world. Certainly we should ration steel to South America and China before we begin to ration steel to the producers of the United States. There again the President has full power, under the export control powers we gave him, to cut down that tremendous push on the American economy, which tends constantly to drive up prices.
>
> Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?
>
> Mr. TAFT. I yield.
>
> Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator believe that the export of some steel to South America or China is probably responsible for the $10 a ton increase in the price of steel?
>
> Mr. TAFT. No; I do not. To a certain extent the price of steel is an artificially low price. It has gone up very much less than the prices of agricultural commodities, about 45 percent, compared to 150 percent for agricultural products. The demand for steel is still in excess of the supply, and might be even if we cut off exports. So that if we had a completely open market, as in wheat, the price of steel probably would be $50 a ton higher, which would be a very unfortunate thing, I think.
>
> Mr. MYERS. That is a problem which I cannot understand. The Senator has indicated that one power the President has is to restrict some of the exports, yet he admits that if he restricts them it will not decrease the cost of steel.
>
> Mr. TAFT. I do not think it would decrease the cost of steel today, because the demand from this country would still probably take up the entire output. However, there would then be many more products made of steel in this country. There would be more agricultural machinery, there would be other products, as to which the pressure for lower prices would very soon be heard.
>
> Mr. MYERS. We have had vastly increased production in the past 18 months, but the more the production, the higher the prices go.
>
> The Senator has mentioned restricting bank credit. The Senator has also mentioned some of the other programs which he himself says we cannot abandon, such as public works, in connection with which we might curtail a little here and there, but he does not advocate the abandonment of any of those programs. He has mentioned the restriction of bank credit. I should like to know what other specific powers the President has the exercise of which might stabilize the cost of living.
>
> Mr. TAFT. I have already listed some half dozen of the powers. He has power to limit the export of steel.
>
> Mr. MYERS. The Senator says that would not affect the cost of steel.
>
> Mr. TAFT. I do not think it would affect the cost of steel; I do not think the mere cutting off of the exports of steel probably would do more than merely balance the demand for steel, but the steel which was not exported would be used in the United States, there would be a much greater production of all the products made of steel, and the prices of those products, particularly where there is a completely free competitive market, would tend to go lower.
>
> Mr. MYERS. When the Senator mentions the powers the President has, will he suggest whether or not he recommends the exercise of those powers?
>
> Mr. TAFT. I do. I think the President should try to limit every one of these programs to a reasonable extent. If all the programs were limited by something like 10 percent—and I think most of them can be held back—it would take up a tremendous inflationary pressure in the United States. The matter cannot operate both ways; it is not possible to have high farm prices and not expect to have high consumer prices, or have high wages and not expect to have high prices. The President cannot possibly have it both ways. If we really desire to restrain inflation, we cannot do some of the things we might like to do, and so far as I am concerned, the whole Government program can be cut all along the line. I think we have appropriated too much. We all realize the pressure people brought to bear, but I think the Government budget is too great. I think all the programs should be limited, and I think the President can limit them if he wishes to do so.
>
> Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator recommend that we curtail the funds we appropriated for the Marshall plan?
>
> Mr. TAFT. I do, indeed; and I think they are being held back. I doubt very much if we will use the whole $7,000,000,000, and if we do not use them that will be an anti-inflationary element, and a very worthy one.
>
> Mr. MYERS. The Congress refused to curtail those funds, and the Congress determined the amount of the appropriation.
>
> Mr. TAFT. No appropriation of money forces the President to spend it. In the past year we appropriated about $39,000,000,000, and the President spent $36,500,000,000. I commend him for that.
>
> Mr. MYERS. The Senator wants the President to take the responsibility for curtailing the funds. Congress should have the courage to do what the Senator recommends.
>
> Mr. TAFT. I think Congress is to blame. I do not say the Congress is not to blame for inflation. Of course it is. I say that the programs we have insisted on, as has everybody else, are bringing about inflation, and we cannot hope to escape the necessary results of our own acts. But the President in every case has the right and power, if we have now reached a state of national emergency requiring the meeting of Congress in the midst of a political campaign, to review the situation in the light of that emergency, and he can make cuts in every one of these expenditures, where he has the legal power to do it.
>
> Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?
>
> Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maine.
>
> Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to take a little exception to what was said about the responsibility of the Congress, because the Congress very wisely placed limitations in the law. I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the provision of the Economic Cooperation Act, first, on page 2, where it is said:
>
> *Provided*, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.
>
> Then we went further, on page 12, under the heading "Protection of the domestic economy," and placed there a whole page of provisions as to the functioning of the program, with due regard to the problem:
>
> SEC. 112. (a) The Administrator shall provide for the procurement in the United States of commodities under this title in such a way as to (1) minimize the drain upon the resources of the United States and the impact of such procurement upon the domestic economy, and (2) avoid impairing the fulfillment of vital needs of the people of the United States.
>
> One can go on reading section after section of the act enacted under the wise supervision of the Committee on Foreign Relations relating to the protection of our domestic economy and the responsibility of the President therefor.
>
> Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator from Maine.
>
> Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?
>
> The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield for a parliamentary inquiry?
>
> Mr. TAFT. Yes, certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the business pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending business before the Senate is a motion to consider House bill 29.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that the poll-tax bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. LUCAS. I am surprised that the Senator from Ohio would contribute to the filibuster on the poll-tax issue.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that raises a question which I shall be glad to discuss somewhat. In the first place, I do not understand there is any filibuster against the poll-tax bill. Certainly, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to continue for 2 or 3 days the general debate on measures before Congress before we call the debate a filibuster and before we undertake to use the parliamentary means at our disposal to bring the question to a vote. That has always been true in the Senate. I must say that the speeches which have been made against the bill up to this time have been well prepared and devoted to the subject. I have felt that we should leave this week open for a general discussion of the poll-tax bill and for other matters upon which Senators, after some weeks' absence, desire to speak.

On Monday morning I hope we may be able to secure some kind of an agreement to vote. If not, we will try to use every means at our disposal to bring the poll-tax bill to a vote, certainly not later than Wednesday. I hope very much that by that time the Committees on Banking and Currency will have examined the President's proposals and perhaps other proposals, to determine whether there are any additional powers which ought to be granted by Congress to help him handle the economic situation.

I have pointed out that I think the President already has many of those powers, but there may be others which will appear upon examination. The things I think of mostly deal with the question of bank reserves. One reason why at the last session we did not act on the subject of bank reserves was that the President's advisers could not agree on what they wanted along that line. Mr. Eccles came before us with one plan for a new kind of 25-percent reserve in Government bonds, which was immediately repudiated by Mr. Snyder, and there never was any agreement on the part of Government officials as to what they wanted.

Now if they have reached an agreement—and I understand even today they have probably not reached an agreement—there still seems to be a serious doubt as to whether the provision in the bill introduced by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] increasing the reserves of member banks without increasing the reserves of nonmember banks is a feasible thing. And if it is not practical to do it in that way, then we have the serious legislative problem whether we have the power to increase the reserves of nonmember banks. So that, even in that respect, we do not know what will happen. But in that field I certainly would be perfectly willing to grant additional power. There may be something in the way of increasing the gold reserves against United States and Federal Reserve deposits. There may be something in the general field of limiting consumer credit.

I may say respecting consumer credit that last year the Senate passed a bill limiting consumer credit. The House did not pass it. The House did not pass it on the ground that Mr. WOLCOTT took the position that the President today can limit consumer credit if he chooses to declare the existence of a national emergency. I think there is probably pretty sound support for his position. The act which was passed expressly reserves his right to act, under the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, to limit consumer credit if he chooses to declare the existence of a national emergency.

Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. MYERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Alabama, but I should like to complete my statement. So there is a field of limiting credit in which the President may act.

I hope we may dispose of the pending measure by noon on Wednesday next. I hope that we may be able possibly to agree on legislation in this general field and on the other matters which the committees by that time may have processed. At least I am hoping that we may be able to adjourn by a week from tomorrow under those circumstances. But that is the general program which we have had in mind and have discussed.

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. I asked the Senator to yield so that I might make a brief comment on one point he made; that is, in connection with his statement to the effect that the President could control consumer credit by declaring the existence of a national emergency. It seems to me that is wholly inconsistent with the earlier statement which the Senator made that there was no emergency, and that the report of the President's economic advisers showed that to be true. However, I asked the Senator to yield for the purpose of making this statement with reference to the increase of the reserve requirement. Mr. Snyder testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning. Mr. McCabe and Mr. Eccles testified before that committee yesterday. I can say that they are in complete agreement with reference to the proposed legislation.

Mr. TAFT. If they are, that is good news to me. But there is that serious problem. As I understand, Mr. Snyder this morning expressed serious doubt whether there should be required an increase of reserves in the nonmember banks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That question was brought up by some members of the committee. It was brought up yesterday also, and with other witnesses, because the legislation that has been proposed does not require it for nonmember banks. Some members of the committee have suggested that it ought to be extended to nonmember banks.

Mr. TAFT. Did not Mr. Eccles testify yesterday that, in his opinion, it was absolutely useless to do it at all unless it was extended to nonmember banks?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Some said it should be extended to nonmember banks, but that it was a question for the Congress to decide whether it might be able to get that legislation through in this short session. The witnesses have all said that if the Congress would give them that power they would welcome it, and they would like to have it.

Mr. TAFT. I understand considerable objection has been raised among smaller banks, and considerable doubts have been expressed as to the constitutional power of Congress to increase the reserves of State banks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Eighty percent of the deposits of the country are in the member banks, even though the number of member and nonmember banks is the same.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have been very much interested in the discussion of the Senator from Ohio. I have never been particularly interested in the fixing of blame in this particular matter; I want to know what we can do. I heard the Senator from Ohio say that he had rather let the bonds of the United States fall than to impose price controls on the American people. I desire to ask the Senator if he now thinks the time is ripe when the United States Government should abandon the support of the Government securities?

Mr. TAFT. I would not be prepared to say yes or no at the present time. The matter is still under study. We have had bankers before us testifying that that position should be abandoned. I should think that the weight of opinion in banking circles, however, is that it should not be abandoned. Of course, there is this difficulty in restraining bank credit: If we maintain the open-market policy, if we are willing at all times to buy from the banks Government bonds at par, we practically remove any opportunity of controlling the banks. We can increase their reserves if we want to, but nearly every bank has Government bonds up to fairly close to 50 percent of its assets; and if at any time it can hand those bonds to the Government for cash, it has that cash available to turn around and lend the money. So we have that dilemma facing us. So long as we maintain the Government policy of keeping Government bonds at par and buying, which means buying from the banks, the Government bonds they own at par, it is almost impossible to devise a reasonable plan of restraining bank credit.

I think an increase in reserves would have some effect—and perhaps an increase in rediscount rates. One witness testified that if we were willing to increase the interest rate on short-term bonds, we could still keep the 2½'s at par and simply let the short-term bonds go down, gradually to be replaced by bonds at higher interest rates. We would simply have bonds at higher interest. The problem is a difficult one, but there is no question that the power already existing could be used absolutely to smash the economy. It goes that far. It is that powerful. If it can go that far, surely by delicate treatment of it we can to a certain extent reduce inflation and move toward a more stabilized economy.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, who I think was first on his feet.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask one question. I think everyone in the country is greatly interested in the question of the high cost of living and inadequate housing. I am wondering whether or not the Senator has any information from Governor Dewey as to where he stands with respect to what the Congress could do on the question of the high cost of living and the question of inadequate housing.

Mr. TAFT. I have no information.

Mr. LUCAS. It is very important that we find out, before we adjourn a week from Saturday, where the Republican candidate for President stands upon such important measures as we are now discussing.

Mr. TAFT. I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, 3 or 4 days ago the Senator from Ohio stated that he had consulted Governor Dewey with respect to the work of the session. Are we to understand that that consultation resulted in no information?

Mr. TAFT. I consulted him with respect to the statement which the Republican leaders issued. I so stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did he approve that statement?

Mr. TAFT. The only statement made by Governor Dewey appeared in the press, that in his opinion Congress should not adjourn last Wednesday, but should give consideration to the President's proposals, as we are doing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Governor agree with the Senator's prognostication that the Congress ought to adjourn a week from Saturday?

Mr. TAFT. I have no information on that subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. When the Senator rose he spoke about the economic report of the President, and read a sentence or two with regard to housing. He seemed to use that as an alibi against any action by this session of Congress on the subject of housing. The Senator knows that he very actively sponsored housing legislation in the last session, and that he was assisted by many other Senators, including myself. We passed what we felt was an adequate housing bill. The bill went to the other body, which is a coordinate branch of the Congress. Does the Senator feel that by a week from tomorrow the House of Representatives will pass the bill which he and I and others worked so strenuously to have enacted, and which the President specifically recommended in his message last Tuesday?

Mr. TAFT. I have urged them to do so; but I think their attitude is exactly what it was before, that they disagree with the bill. I think it is unfortunate that the House did not pass the bill.

There are many things which will come before the next Congress, and that is one which I shall continue to press with all the force at my command. That is not the present question. The present question is whether or not this is an emergency matter for this year. The President's report shows very clearly that it is not.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. We would not want to increase the number of houses constructed this year if we could. We have reached the limit of labor and materials; and pushing the program further would probably result in further increases in prices.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall have something to say on that subject a little later, in my own time.

I presume the Senator is speaking not only in his capacity as a Senator, but as chairman of the policy committee of the majority party in the Senate. I should like to inquire whether the remarks which he has made and the attitude which he assumes represent the attitude of the policy committee, of which he is chairman.

Mr. TAFT. I have not discussed with the committee this emergency question, because the report has just been placed before us. I do not think I can speak for the policy committee on the questions which the Senator asks.

Mr. BARKLEY. So the Senator is now speaking as an individual Senator, and not as chairman of his committee?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator feel that the Congress should adjourn this session, which has been called by the President in the exercise of his constitutional authority, without taking action upon these subjects? The President determined that an extraordinary occasion required an extraordinary session of the Congress. I grant that there may be differences of opinion, based somewhat upon political expediency, as to whether he should have exercised that authority, even though he was convinced that it ought to be exercised. But that is neither here nor there. The President exercised the sound discretion which the Constitution gives to him. Although the call of the President seems not to have met with the approval of the Senator from Ohio and his colleagues, the President exercised the power to call Congress. He has called it, and we are here. Does the Senator believe that if the Congress should adjourn a week from tomorrow it could pass, or will pass, any housing legislation, or any educational legislation? The Senator from Ohio sponsored an educational measure, with respect to which he received our assistance, which measure the President specifically recommended for adoption by the House. Does the Senator believe that by that time the Congress will enact that legislation, or housing legislation, or any substantial amount of legislation dealing with the subjects involved in the economic report referred to by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. Dealing with the general question of what the Congress may do, I might perhaps read first the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky himself, made just before Congress adjourned in June.

Mr. BARKLEY. Those remarks have been quoted in the statement issued by the Republican leaders.

Mr. WILEY. Let us hear them again and again.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am happy to acknowledge the compliment paid me by the Republican Party in using me as an authority. It is probably the most authoritative authority which it has used in regard to the whole subject. I am perfectly willing to have the Senator read my statement; and if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to comment on my own statement and the use made of it by the Republican majority, which seems to have difficulty in finding any reason except by quoting me.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky spoke the truth, and I think the inevitable truth, much as we may regret it. At that time the Senator from Kentucky said:

> I have done what I could to cooperate with the majority in bringing about an adjournment because I think if we sit here until after the convention, or if we sit here between the conventions, or after the two conventions, the entire time of the Congress will be taken up with political bickering and political legislation and political oratory, and I do not want that to be brought about. I want to finish what we can finish and adjourn the Congress, and I have tried my best to cooperate with the leaders on the other side to bring about an adjournment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I am not reading this statement merely to quote the Senator. I am only saying that that is inevitably the fact. So far as I know, no special session of Congress has ever been called in the midst of a political campaign, except, I believe, in one instance, when the President was not a candidate for reelection. Inevitably in such circumstances, it is exceedingly difficult for us to sit down and try to work out a legislative problem as it ought to be worked out. I think we worked out those problems in the last session probably as free from political bickering, and with as much dismissal of the political effect as was possible. I think the tone in the Senate has been very good.

So far as I am concerned, I take an interest in legislation, and try to make the legislation right. We cannot do that when every move is determined by political considerations. That is inevitably so in the midst of a political campaign. Therefore the decision which was made by our committee, which was the decision of the House and Senate leaders, and which was printed in the RECORD, was that we should not take up at this time any long-term program. After all, today there is an infinite variety of subjects with which Congress must deal. The Federal Government has its nose in everything, and we can never get through. If we were to consider the entire program, it would be a good job if we did it in 6 months, because the President raises all sorts of questions, and deals with a great many subjects, many of which require detailed consideration and study.

I think the only reasonable decision to make was that we would examine the President's proposals, and that if we should find that any of them arose out of an existing emergency which could be handled with reasonable dispatch, then we ought to handle them, but that we ought not to stay here through the campaign. Nothing would be gained by prolonging the session.

We have asked various committees to examine the President's proposals, not so much from the standpoint of their merits, but from the standpoint of whether they present emergency problems which ought to be dealt with now, and which cannot possibly wait until the next session of Congress. That is the general conclusion, and that is a conclusion drawn from the conditions which the Senator from Kentucky so aptly and well described in the statement which he made on June 17.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not retract any part of the statement I made on the 17th of June. At that time I was dealing with a session of Congress then in existence. I was dealing with a truthful statement when I said I had cooperated with members of the majority to bring about an adjournment prior to the meeting of the conventions because I felt that if we came back between the conventions, having escaped the Republican Convention, and then being on the verge of the Democratic Convention, if we then met for a week or two we would deal with nothing but politics, and if that session even recessed until after the conventions, with unfinished business, I felt that in view of the two conventions we would engage in a lot of politics. I felt that way about it. But in making that statement I in no way was attempting to foreclose the right of the President under the Constitution to call the Congress back into session if he chose to do so. I was talking about a hang-over session after the two conventions.

There is nothing in the Constitution which says that the President shall not call Congress into session during a political campaign. In my own judgment, I think the President is to be commended if, in spite of the fact that there is a political campaign under way, he felt that a special session was required in order to have action taken on the emergency matters he called to our attention in his message.

All of us know—the Senator from Ohio knows it, as well as the rest of us do—that without this session of Congress, on the record made by the Eightieth Congress in both sessions, certain matters might have been legitimate objects of discussion in the campaign between now and the election. If the President of the United States felt in all sincerity that Congress ought to take those matters out of the realm of political controversy by enacting legislation concerning them, he is to be commended for making that sincere effort rather than to allow things to drift along until they got worse, in order that we might have a campaign issue against the party represented by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. If that is what he thought——

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, I think that is what he thought.

The Senator has accused the President of playing politics in calling this session of Congress. I deny that charge, but if we may admit for the sake of argument that it is true, the Republicans of this Congress can play even smarter politics by carrying out his recommendations and placing the appropriate laws on the statute books.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I wonder whether he was consulted about the calling of the special session, before the day on which the President called it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I talked to the President on several occasions during the recess and between the conventions. I cannot say that I was particularly consulted about it, but I was advised about it before he addressed the Philadelphia convention. Does that answer the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. That answers the Senator. I understand the position of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator from Ohio will be equally frank, not only now but during the remainder of the session, as to what advice he gets from the Governor of New York.

Mr. TAFT. Inasmuch as the Senator from Kentucky is a candidate for Vice President, undoubtedly he will be consulted. Whether I shall be consulted is a matter that I am not prepared to pass on at the present time.

Mr. President, I rose only to outline the general theory of the session. I hope we may well be finished by the end of next week, if the committees do their job in time. If they do not get through that soon, we shall have to stay another week; but certainly I would hope that the 14th of August would be the limit of this session of Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator will yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A moment ago there was some discussion with respect to the power the President has to restrain credit, particularly by the manner in which the bonds of the United States are managed through the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department. I understood the Senator from Ohio to say at that time that he believed the President could act to hold inflation in check if he would persuade the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department to abandon the policy of supporting Government bonds. Did the Senator make that statement?

Mr. TAFT. No. I said that the Federal Reserve Board by raising the rediscount rates, by limiting its Government bond purchases, and by increasing the rate on short-term Governments could undoubtedly check the increase in bank loans, and that would have a substantial effect on inflation. Among those powers is the power to let Government bonds drop below par. Whether I would go that far, I would not say, but certainly it would stop inflation; and I would rather do that, so far as I myself am concerned, instead of imposing another price control, wage control, and rationing system on the American people.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would the Senator prefer to do that, rather than to impose selective control?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. Mr. President, that raises a question which was before us previously. The President says he wants selective controls. What are selective controls? According to the bill which has been introduced, what the President is asking for is unlimited power in his own discretion to impose selective controls. He says, "I will use it selectively." But the bill which has been introduced at his request covers unlimited power to fix prices in all fields of operation and to allocate and to ration any scarce materials whatsoever. That is the President's request.

We told him we might grant selective controls. That is what the Flanders bill did last year. It said, as I recall, "Here is power over grain for distilling, if you find that is necessary and if you send to Congress a message saying that here is a commodity which is in such short supply that there must be some kind of control." Then we said we would consider that and would consider granting specific controls.

But that is not what the President has asked us now. He has asked for unlimited controls.

So far as limited controls are concerned, there may be some fields in which there can be limited control which can be kept limited; but our general experience has been that that cannot be done. It is impossible to limit the price of meat unless one is prepared to limit the price of corn and the price of oats and the price of wheat. It is impossible to limit the price of meat unless one is prepared to go on and limit the price of chickens, because they go right along with meat.

No; only that; it is not only a theory, because in 1946 the President's charge against Congress—a Democratic Congress, I may say—concerning the Price Control Act was that the Congress then removed some things from control. "Therefore," he said, "I cannot control the others," and he himself on that account took off all the price controls which he could have continued until July 1, 1947. He took meat off of control just before the election, and he took the others off of control immediately after the election, before the Republican Congress could even return to Washington.

So when we talk about selective controls, that is just a smoke screen.

What the President is talking about is economic power to control and, even, to destroy everything in the United States, and power to control prices, including the power to reduce the prices of farm products. Of course, he will not do so. He will not exercise the power, even if we give it to him; but that is the power he is requesting.

If one thing is certain it is that when we had the last price control in effect we saw that unless wages are fixed, it is not possible to fix prices. The President admits that in a kind of mild way in his message, that, after all, he must have a little power to fix wages. I may say that the bill which has been introduced purports to deal with wages; but as a practical matter, when we examine it, we find that under it no one could fix wages. The Board would be able to consider wages, but under the bill there is no power to fix wages.

One thing that is certain is that if we are going into a planned economy, it certainly will not work unless we give the power to fix wages over half the manufactured products in the United States. So that when the question of selective control comes up, I say we can dismiss it as window dressing. What we want to know is, Are we going to authorize the President to impose a regimented economy on the United States, or are we going to rely on a free economy to get the protection necessary to meet the present situation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I, of course, do not at all agree with the Senator's appraisal of the President's program, but that is beside the point. What I should like to ask the Senator again is whether there is any form of inflation control which he would be willing to support with his great influence rather than permit Government bonds to decline.

Mr. TAFT. I am quite willing, as the Senator knows, to consider the various proposals for an increase in reserves, such as Mr. Eccles' plan with respect to a 25-percent reserve. I never even dismissed that from my mind, except that Mr. Eccles could not seem to get anybody in the Government or any banker or anybody else to support him in his plan for a 25-percent reserve in Government bonds. I am willing to consider the straight increase of reserves proposed in the Barkley bill. I am willing to consider any other general over-all powers affecting credit, because I think that in credit lies more the beginning of inflation than in anything else. I hope very much we may pass a bill which will deal with credit and which will give the President powers, so that if he does not want to go too far on the bond question, he can try the others. Up to date, I have not been convinced they are going to be very effective, so long as we insist on maintaining a rate of interest on bonds at par.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Ohio make any suggestion to the President as to how far we should go in allowing Government bonds to drop?

Mr. TAFT. That is a question which is still before the committee, and I am not prepared to make any recommendations at all in the inflation field. I hope by next Wednesday or Thursday the committees will act, and I am sure I shall in all likelihood agree with their action.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator hold out to the Members of Congress and to the public that this Congress will do anything about final enactment of the consumer-credit bill, which was passed by the Senate with the endorsement of the Senator from Ohio, but which has been held up in the House?

Mr. TAFT. I should like to have it passed, but, of course, the position of the House is that the President can take the necessary action now. That is based on this fact, which I think I might set forth, so that the Senate will understand: As Senators know, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System set up Regulation W imposing consumer-credit controls. That was done in accordance with the proclamation of the President, relying on the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When was that done? What was the date?

Mr. TAFT. It was during the war some time; I do not know just when.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the point—it was during the war.

Mr. TAFT. On August 8, 1947, the Congress passed Public Law 386, Senate Joint Resolution 148, which I shall read:

> That after November 1, 1947, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer-credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843, and no such consumer-credit controls shall be exercised after such date except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

So, if the President, under the Trading With the Enemy Act, is willing to declare a national emergency, then presumably he has the same power to issue regulation W today that he had during the war. Whether he had that power is just a little doubtful, if the Senator wants to know my opinion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I knew the Senator's position on that question.

Mr. TAFT. So far as I was concerned, I was in favor of passing a law dealing with the subject, but the President exercised the power once in time of war, and presumably his legal advisers would tell him he can exercise it again if he declares a national emergency, because the Trading With the Enemy Act said either war or national emergency.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that the Senator will agree with those who contend that the Trading With the Enemy Act may be used in time of peace to declare a national emergency, to do what one of the Houses of Congress has refused to do, and that it would be a proper exercise of Executive power.

Mr. TAFT. The House refused to do it, as I understand, on the ground that the President already had the power, so I do not think it can be said that the House has refused to give this power.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator thinks the House should give the President the power, does he not?

Mr. TAFT. Of course, as the Senator knows, the President in 1933 closed all the banks of the country under that same provision of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There was an emergency which was brought about by the unsound policies of the Republican Party—policies which are again being adopted, and which, if they are not stopped, will bring about the closing of the banks again.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the banks of the country need be alarmed by the Senator's threats. I am quite sure they will not be closed again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I make no threat. We, of course, adopted, during the New Deal, a bill which was sponsored by the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, providing a Federal guaranty of bank deposits—a measure which was opposed by the very same forces which are now opposing any step toward the regulation of inflation.

Mr. TAFT. I understand it was also opposed quite a bit by the President of the United States at that time, although he finally agreed, under the strong persuasion of the distinguished Senator from Michigan at that time, that he would sign the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was not the President who is now asking a Republican Congress to help him restrain inflation.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire to ask a question?

Mr. TOBEY. I desire to make a statement about 30 seconds long. Does the Senator want to get the statement or not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Thirty seconds would be very good.

Mr. TOBEY. Very well; here it comes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield from 30 seconds to 1 minute to the Senator from New Hampshire for a statement.

Mr. TOBEY. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I still have the floor. I should like to yield the floor. Before I do so I ask that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks an editorial in this morning's New York Times entitled "The 'Roll-Back' Bill."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "ROLL-BACK" BILL

Commenting yesterday on the President's appointment of Paul Porter, former OPA head, as his adviser on anti-inflation legislation, we suggested that the move seemed almost deliberately calculated to destroy at the outset any hope of cooperation on legislation in this field. If the naming of Mr. Porter did not accomplish this result, then the bill introduced yesterday by Senator BARKLEY, presumably reflecting the ideas of this adviser, should certainly do so. If any measure ever was put forward by an administration with its tongue in its cheek, this is such a measure. No intelligent Congress, Republican or Democratic, could possibly stomach this bill, and the administration must know it.

The proposed legislation includes the whole hodge-podge of recommendations contained in that part of the President's message dealing with rising prices and living costs. But that is not all. A pleasant surprise has been added by way of giving this legislation the authentic OPA touch. For it includes, as it were, an invitation to revisit that Alice in Wonderland of economics in which the country lived during the reign of OPA. That is the land of Let's Pretend, whose chief industries are statistics and regulations, in which high taxes and black-market prices don't count, and where the basic philosophy is that inflation that you can't see can't hurt you.

Those who may have wondered precisely what Mr. Porter's contribution to the anti-inflation campaign was going to be do not have to wonder any longer. The secret is out. Incredible as it may seem, the surprise is price roll-backs. Roll-backs would be applied to any cost-of-living item which has risen "or which threatens to rise" 20 percent

or more since June 1946 (when price controls were scrapped). Prices picked for the roll-back would remain under ceilings until June 30, 1950.

There is no magic, of course, by which the administration or any other human power can roll prices back, by word of command, to some appointed level. The term "roll-back" is simply a euphemism to describe a process whereby a producer is induced to sell his product at an agreed price, with the difference between that price and the market price made up to him by Government subsidies. And the cost of the subsidies? That, of course, is footed by the taxpayer.

Subsidies are to be distrusted under any conditions, and distrusted particularly when they come, as they come in the case of price roll-backs, in disguise. But the proposal to reintroduce them into the American economy at the present time represents a new high in economic futility. Britain has been chided by her critics for spending almost two billions a year since the war to hold food prices down. We can be charged with the even greater folly of having spent similar amounts to keep farm prices up. But, never until now has it been seriously proposed, here or anywhere else, that a nation's taxpayers shoulder the burden of subsidizing price inflation in one political area and price deflation in another, at one and the same time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, due to previous engagements, it is necessary that I be away from the Senate for the remainder of the day and until Monday. So I ask unanimous consent that I may absent myself from the sessions of the Senate until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

MIDYEAR ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. TOBEY rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire to make a comment?

Mr. TOBEY. I merely wish to say a word with reference to the discussion that just took place between the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and my colleague the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Regulation W was spoken of in that discussion, and I want to clarify a point on inflation which I think has some bearing on this special session and the attitude of the Congress, especially the House of Representatives.

Regulation W had expired. The Senate of the United States, through the medium of Banking and Currency Committee sponsorship and vote, passed in renewed form regulation W, and it is now in the House, where it reposes. It has a position similar to that of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and other bills, and it would seem, without criticizing the other House, which I esteem very highly, that anything that comes over from the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate having to do with inflation or credit or controls is "behind the eight-ball," it is a bar sinister. Now they tell us over there that they can pass the Trading With the Enemy Act and declare an emergency, recall that act, and instantly and automatically put into effect regulation W. If they want to follow regulation W, why the subterfuge? To pass it would be the simple thing to do, and we should then have taken one step in the inflation problem. But I am unable to understand the attitude of calling up the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, and asking the President to declare a national emergency, just to get regulation W. It is in their hands now. It has passed the Senate. Let the House pass it and let it become a law. In that way we shall be taking one step at least toward holding down inflation in this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield, if I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill was also passed by the Senate, and that that bill is now in the House.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from New Hampshire for his comment. I think it is eminently sound. It is just as sound as was the comment of the Senator from Ohio when he filed with the Senate of the United States on the 19th of December 1947, the interim report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in which credit control through regulation W was discussed. I think it altogether appropriate, Mr. President, that there be read into the RECORD at this point the language of the Senator from Ohio:

The committee agrees that one means of reducing inflationary pressures at this time is through restraints on excessive expansion of consumer credit.

This was the language of the Senator from Ohio in December 1947. Then he proceeds as follows:

Specifically, it approves for immediate enactment an extension of consumer installment credit controls similar to the system in effect under regulation W.

Voluntary efforts to curb the liberalization of credit practices, with consequent expansion of installment credit, have not been adequate, as is demonstrated by the prompt loosening of installment credit terms with the ending of regulation W on November 1, 1947.

The committee emphasizes that its endorsement of credit controls is directed only to the restraint of excessive granting of consumer installment credit at a time of inflationary pressures. It does not wish to see all installment credit prohibited, to the disruption of normal business activity.

This language contained in the report submitted by the distinguished Senator from Ohio was the consensus of opinion of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and it is my understanding that it represented also the judgment of the Banking and Currency Committee, of which the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is the chairman. In any event, the law authorizing it in time of peace, without any monkey business about the Trading With the Enemy Act, was passed by the Senate and has been held up in the House.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for approximately 2 minutes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I wish to speak to both my party and the Democratic Party. What I shall say is the voice of America, and I ask the Senate to heed what I am now about to read. It comes from the grass roots. It has punch and soul to it. Let both great parties take notice. I am getting heartily sick and tired of the jockeying for position going on in this Chamber and on Capitol Hill. People may not be dying, but they are suffering and are calling us to an accounting. Listen to this letter from the grass roots. Pardon the personal references, for I shall read it all:

PLYMOUTH, N. H.

The Honorable CHARLES WILLIAM TOBEY,
Senator from New Hampshire,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOBEY: Yesterday morning I heard over the radio the plans of the two parties to spend this session blocking each other and trying to get each other in bad with the public.

This morning I heard you quoted as saying that you felt the Republican Party should try to do something constructive.

It seemed to me like a ray of light. I hope you succeed. I am a Republican and want to be able to be proud of the Republican Party. Also I am an ordinary citizen and I think the housing situation, the cost of living, and the continuing spiral of rising prices, rising wages, rising prices, rising wages are a terrible menace to the economic security of the American people.

May I tell you a brief story of something that happened to us some years ago? We had a summer home at the beach and there were two men in the community who worked at intervals at our various house problems. When the cesspool suddenly ceased to act properly but instead, to our horror, began to back up, we called both these men, hoping to get speedy action. But they were very antagonistic and jealous of each other, and when either one suggested something to do to make that cesspool work the other at once explained that that remedy would never work.

The place was sandy; there was a tide problem; it wasn't simple; but we needed help and needed it at once. (Did you ever live in a house where the cesspool doesn't work?) After listening for some time while each told me why the other's ideas were all wrong, I finally lost patience. I got them together and said, "I do not care who solves this problem or how—what I want is for you to stop trying to prove each other wrong and get together and use your brains and your energy to work out a way to cure this condition."

And they did.

It is my belief that the American people today feel that way toward their public servants in the two parties, and that for both to ignore that feeling and just go on trying to get the other party in bad is both foolish and wicked at such a crucial time.

These are strong words but I think many people feel strongly. I do not know what you can do, Senator TOBEY, but I was very happy to hear that you had spoken up for some constructive, instead of destructive, program.

Very sincerely yours,
(Mrs. Royal) PERSIS D. BROWN.

JULY 27, 1948.

Mr. President, that is the voice of America, as I understand it. It is a cry out of a human heart, sick and tired

to death of these petty jealousies and petty ambitions of mere politicians. There are 140,000,000 people who are dying for one thing, and they are tired of waiting for it. I am speaking now of the people who are feeling the tragic burden of high prices and lack of adequate housing. They are wondering whether the Congress of the United States gives a damn about them except to get their votes at election time. This is the cry of a human heart, and we had better accept our trust, our obligation. The party which matches up to its trust and its obligation will be the party which God will favor. A word to the wise should be sufficient.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair again will state to the occupants of the galleries that the rules of the Senate prohibit any demonstration of any sort. The Chair earnestly requests our guests to obey the rules of the Senate.

PEOPLE ARE TIRED OF CONFUSION AND MISREPRESENTATION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from New Hampshire for his statement. I likewise join in the applause which we have heard. The letter which the Senator has read is a correct analysis of the situation which confronts the country. There are two kinds of politics. I am tired of hearing people say, when some Government official seeks to obtain action in the public interest, that he is merely playing politics. The playing of politics of which the Senator's correspondent and millions of persons throughout the United States are getting tired is the playing of politics which seeks to introduce confusion, misunderstanding, and misrepresentation of the issues. The Senator's correspondent in New Hampshire is correct. The cost of living and the lack of housing are two questions which are pressing upon the minds and the bodies of millions of Americans, and it makes no difference whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

I say, Mr. President, it is the duty of Congress to pass upon these problems. If we undertake to postpone action because of some fancied effect upon the result of the election, then the Congress is abandoning its constitutional functions. This is a legislative body. What matters it that Members may rise upon the floor and say the President, by Executive action, can do this or do that? What is wrong in the world is that the legislative function has been undermined, and only here in the United States do we have the opportunity to maintain the power of the people through their representatives to deal with the issues which affect the people. It is the highest degree of politics to undertake to serve the people.

I was reading from the report submitted by the distinguished Senator from Ohio in December 1947, recognizing the existence of inflation as long ago as that, and recommending one certain type of action.

Months have passed, and nothing has been done. There is complete agreement, at least in this body, between the joint committee which is headed by the Senator from Ohio and the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is headed by the Senator from New Hampshire, that this consumer credit bill should become the law. There is nothing partisan about that. There is no jockeying for position about that. That is the recommendation of two duly constituted committees of Congress, and everybody knows that the country is in the midst of inflation. Of course, these matters are not simple matters, but when the Senator from Ohio rises on the floor of the Senate and attempts to convince the country that the President by executive action, without any legislative action on the part of the Congress, can check inflation by throwing the bonds held by citizens of America upon the market and letting their price go wherever it might, I challenge him with his own language written in the majority report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it should be called to the Senator's attention that all E bonds, F bonds, and G bonds by their terms are redeemable, and of course would not be covered by any such action. The great bulk of the bonds which would be allowed to go below par are bonds held by the banks, certain long-term 2½ percent bonds, bought for long-term investment, which of course would be ultimately paid.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am perfectly well aware of that, but I am also aware of the fact that these E, F, and G bonds, held by the little people of the country under a provision of law which guarantees their full payment, are affected by what we do or do not do to maintain a sound economy in the United States. Those bonds are demand paper. The holders of those bonds may walk down to the Treasury any day and say, "I want my cash, 100 cents on the dollar," and get it.

PETTY POLITICAL MANEUVERING AN INVITATION TO DISASTER

O Mr. President, if we, by petty political maneuvering, in order to win a Presidential campaign and a congressional campaign, allow this economy to become so undermined that the bonds of the United States held by the banks are quoted below par, and the little people, seeing what is happening to the bonds, come marching up to the Treasury door and say, "Give me the cash," there will be created such a demand upon the resources of the United States for immediate cash payment as to bring about a collapse.

Mr. President, we are not dealing with a Presidential election; we are dealing with the very substance of free government. If it is not preserved here in the United States, it will be destroyed everywhere.

What does it mean when people are so confused that some thousands of them ally themselves with the so-called third party, the Progressive Party, which in a recent convention had only condemnation for the Government of the United States and only praise for the Soviet dictatorship? What does it mean when American young people are so confused in their minds that some are willing to give adherence to such an absurdity that an American party should become the defender of the totalitarian absolutism of the Kremlin? Does anyone think that confusion can be cleared up if the Congress of the United States, face to face with the inflation that is eating into the substance of our people, refuses to do anything because it says "Oh, the President has the power"?

Let me read what the Senator from Ohio said with respect to these bonds when he submitted the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the 18th of May, just a month before the adjournment, the hasty adjournment, of Congress, with its job undone. This is what the Senator from Ohio said:

There is a substantial question whether any increase in reserves can have any effect on bank credit so long as the banks hold such a large proportion of their assets in Government bonds, and so long as the Federal Reserve System maintains the policy of supporting the Government bond market at not less than par.

Here he raised the issue, Shall the Government support Government bonds at not less than par, or shall it not? Did he have any recommendation then for congressional action or for executive action? Would he recommend to a Republican President that he follow a policy of abandoning the support of Government bonds? This is what he said:

Some bankers and economists feel that this policy which uses Government power to hold down the interest rate should be abandoned—

Observe, it is carefully limited to "some bankers and economists." The sentence proceeds:

and perhaps must be abandoned. The committee expresses no opinion at this time pending completion of hearings on the whole question which it is now holding.

CONGRESS CANNOT PASS THE BUCK

If the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, on the 18th of May, through its majority leader, its chairman, was unwilling to recommend the abandonment of Government support of bonds, how can any leader in Congress excuse Congress from doing something about inflation control merely by saying that the President has the power, by abandoning the support of Government bonds, to stop inflation?

I was happy to hear the Senator from Ohio say it would also be the power to destroy the whole credit and structure of our Government. Of course it would, and that is why the Senator from Ohio did not recommend any such action as is now proposed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. The President has that power now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course he has.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator should make it clear that the Congress never told him to maintain Government

bonds at par. That was a policy which had been adopted by the Federal Reserve Board. They have power not to maintain Government bonds at par if they do not care to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, but I think it is a very sound policy that they are maintaining Government bonds at par, and the Senator from Ohio does not dare to say that they should be permitted to go below.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have waited for the Senator from Ohio to respond to that remark. He has not responded.

Mr. TAFT. I have already responded to it. I said to the Senator that I should hesitate to use the power. I should be quite willing to explore other methods, if they wanted other power, but I would rather use the power than impose upon the Nation a regimented economy through the fixing of prices, wages, and a return to rationing. I made it perfectly clear that such power, if pushed too far, might be the power to destroy. But it is not at all necessarily a power to destroy if wisely and temperately used. I think it is certainly open to debate and question as to whether it should be used, and I have not made up my mind on that point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, because I am quite sure that he will never make up his mind to abandon the bonds.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that I think a great many of us on both sides of the aisle recognize that the problem of high prices is of concern to the country and to the Congress, as well it should be. But I also think that it is important to the Congress and to the country that we be sure that the cure is not worse than the disease.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, that is so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. To put the Nation into a regimented economy and to take it down a totalitarian road would, in my judgment, be a cure that would be worse than the disease.

Now, calling the attention of the able Senator to Senate bill 2010, the bill introduced by the minority leader yesterday, presumably on behalf of the administration, I call his attention particularly to the sections therein relating to the conditions under which maximum prices might be set, and the discretionary powers which are given, and then I call his attention to section I on page 11 which provides: "or hoarding, in connection with any commodity which in its judgment are equivalent to, or are likely to, result in price increases inconsistent with the purposes of this title."

I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming, who comes from a great cattle producing State in the West, whether or not in his judgment this would give the President the power, which he indicated in October 1946 he would seek, to seize cattle on the ranges of the country if the ranchers were not willing and did not feel that they could afford to sell the cattle at OPA price ceilings? I ask whether the Senator thinks that this language would give to the Federal Government the power to go to the ranches and the ranges of the Nation and seize the cattle, something which had once before been advocated by the President of the United States, and whether the Senator thinks that is consistent with the free enterprise system.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed, following my earlier colloquy with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the following information which I did not have available at the time. I made some reference in my remarks to a speech by the President of the United States made in October 1946. I wish to read several paragraphs of that speech which appeared in the newspapers of October 15, 1946. This is from the Washington Post, which gives the text of the President's address. The President went on to say:

> Another remedy suggested by many people was to have the Government seize the packing houses. This offered no real solution, however, because the seizing of empty packing plants would avail us nothing without the livestock.
>
> Some have even suggested that the Government go out onto the farms and ranges and seize the cattle for slaughter. This would indeed be a drastic remedy, but we gave it long and serious consideration. We decided against the use of this extreme wartime emergency power of Government. It would be wholly impracticable because the cattle are spread throughout all parts of the country.

Mr. President, I wish again to call to the attention of the Senate that this was considered in the Cabinet of the President of the United States. They gave it long and serious consideration. It was turned down, not because of a constitutional question as to whether the Government of the United States had the right to go onto the farms and ranges of the country and seize the cattle, no. That question apparently did not bother the executive branch of the Government. The only reason, apparently, why it was turned down was that it would be impracticable because the cattle were scattered over too wide an area.

I say, Mr. President, we have come a long way in this country when in the Cabinet of the President of the United States consideration was given to that violent remedy.

Now let me read the next paragraph:

> It has also been suggested that we import dressed meat from other countries. This would do little good, however, because the amount of exportable dressed meat, not already contracted for, which could be brought to this country is very small in comparison with our demands. Anyway, we would not think of asking for this meager supply for ourselves, because the people of other countries must have it in order to exist. The figures show, for example, that during this year the people in England and France will consume, per person, only a fraction of the meat we consume.
>
> So all these and other proposals and recommendations as alternatives to the removal of controls on meat were carefully weighed and considered. They all had to be rejected.
>
> There is only one remedy left—that is to lift controls on meat. Accordingly the Secretary of Agriculture and the Price Administrator are removing all price controls on livestock, and food and feed products therefrom, tomorrow.

Mr. President, experience is a great teacher. We did have an opportunity to see how price controls would function. The able Senator from Ohio today has pointed out that experience in this country and the experience in the controlled economies of Europe have clearly indicated that it is not possible to control the price of a commodity effectively unless there is a willingness to control all the factors that go into the making up of that price. That requires the control of all the materials which go into the final end product. It requires control of wages.

Mr. President, if wages are frozen and a man in plant A has his wage frozen at $1.50 an hour and a man in plant B has his wage frozen at $1.75 an hour, there is a natural inclination, in order for the workers to benefit themselves, for them to move from plant A to plant B. The experience in England has clearly shown that the next inevitable step that must be taken, if there is to be a beginning of that type of a controlled economy in peacetime, is to freeze the worker to his job because plant A may be putting out a highly essential product when plant B is putting out somewhat of a luxury product. Therefore, it was found in England they had to issue the so-called control-of-engagements order, under which the Government can say to a firm, "We do not believe you are manufacturing an essential product. You are going to be put out of business. We are going to supply you with no materials." Then they say to the worker in that plant, "Whether you like it or not, the Government is going to have the power to assign you to a coal mine, to assign you to a railroad, to assign you to a farm." When that road has been taken, Mr. President, a long step has been taken toward a totalitarian government. I rather doubt whether it is possible to maintain free institutions over an extended period of time, as we have known them, if that route is followed.

Mr. President, I am making these remarks in no narrow, partisan spirit because under our constitutional form of government, as the able Senator from Wyoming has pointed out, we are the legislative body of this country, and it is our responsibility, when matters are presented such as the new price-control bill presented by the minority leader, apparently for the administration and on its behalf, to examine it carefully and to debate it, to point out its imperfections, to see whether in our judgment the cure being offered would be far worse for the American people than the disease which we all recognize. It we did not discharge our responsibility in that regard, I feel we would be remiss in our duty.

It has been charged at times in the past, and over the past 16 years particularly, that at times the Congress of the United States has been more or less a rubber stamp for the executive branch of the Government. We certainly do not want the Congress to be a rubber stamp

for this or any future administration. If we are, we also travel a good way down the road away from constitutional government.

I am making these remarks, Mr. President, merely to keep the record straight, to show that within a period of just 2 years proposals have been made which would have enabled the executive branch of the Government, for the first time in the history of the United States, to seize cattle and seize other commodities, as well as plants.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I first suggest to the Senator from California that he is mistaken in the assumption that the President made any such recommendation in 1946. I recall that the President did say that that suggestion had been made to him, and that he had rejected it.

Secondly, I say to the Senator I have not had an opportunity to read the bill which was introduced yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and therefore I am not in a position at this moment to judge the effect of any language that is contained in that measure.

CONGRESS SHOULD PLACE ITS DUTY TO THE PEOPLE BEFORE POLITICAL INTERESTS OF ITS MEMBERS

I do want to say, however, that I will not be in favor of granting any such power to the Executive. My point in the discussion here is not with respect to any specific policy. My point is that it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to serve the people before it adjourns to serve the interests of its Members who are candidates for reelection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to ask the Senator from Wyoming a different question from that just asked him by the Senator from California. In view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming relative to the totalitarian methods of the Kremlin, I should like to ask him a question, because I respect his judgment, and because he comes from the same territory from which I come. My question is whether he is favorable to price control as it was formerly imposed by the OPA?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not. I do not believe that OPA controls should be restored. I never have. I take a simple position with respect to this matter.

I have observed, let me say, that in these arguments which are made about details, the effort is always made to make it appear that those of us who believe that there should be some Government action are advocating a particular method which the inquisitor believes would be condemned by the public as a whole. I am not here at this moment discussing details. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska. I am talking about the fundamental basis upon which this issue of price and inflation appeals to the American people, and what the result will be if the Congress does not act.

CONGRESS TALKS ADJOURNMENT WHILE AMERICA CRIES FOR ACTION

The Senator from Nebraska belongs to the majority side. The Senator is the acting majority leader of the Senate. The Senator can use his influence with the majority membership, with the majority conference, to induce them to forget this notion of adjourning by a week from Saturday night, and try to induce them to stay here and work out in a nonpartisan manner legislation which the people of the United States are crying for.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it was in that spirit that I asked the nonpartisan question whether or not the distinguished Senator from Wyoming in arriving at an approach to the cure of high prices would support title III of the bill introduced by the minority leader. He has already stated that he has not read the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not read it.

Mr. WHERRY. And that he does not want to comment about it at this time. I understand his position in that respect. But I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that I am just as much interested in reducing the high cost of living as is any one else. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to consider any anti-inflation legislation that can be presented to either House of the Congress, and, regardless of the political maneuver which was indulged in when we were brought back into session, I am perfectly agreeable to take the position that the only thing we should do—and that applies not only to the leadership, but to individual Senators—is to pass constructive legislation at any time and anywhere if it will help cure fundamental causes of inflation. But it occurs to me that the only solution which has been presented time and again, or rather the main one, and it is contained in the economic report, and now it is brought forth by the minority leader in his bill, is again to impose price controls to a greater extent than has ever been done before.

I say respectfully to the senior Senator from Wyoming, who comes from a territory where food commodities are produced, that he knows that under the price-control system of 1946 production was curtailed. It did not add 1 pound of beef to the family table. It did not provide one suit of clothes for any member of the family. It destroyed production. It increased black markets. I hope the American public will not forget that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Just one moment, please. Will the Senator indulge me until I ask my question of him. What I am saying now is by way of prelude to my question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. I wish to keep the record clear.

Mr. WHERRY. Eighty percent of meat and meat products went to the black markets of the United States. It was impossible to secure hides. It was impossible to secure shoes. Those who needed it could not even secure insulin through the drug houses of the country. We certainly do not want a repetition of that condition, do we?

So I ask the Senator from Wyoming this question: In approaching the cure of this evil, which we should approach as Americans, and not as partisans, does the able Senator from Wyoming subscribe to price controls generally to bring about such a cure?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Congress of the United States must take some action to prevent steadily increasing prices.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that mean price controls?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will tell the Senator what I have advocated and what I have introduced. But, in the first place, I may say to the Senator I think he is in error if he interposes what he calls a nonpartisan suggestion by referring to the President's call of this extra session as a political maneuver.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It might not have been a political maneuver. I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that back in——

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator please get back to the issue.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That back in June 1946——

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator answer my question respecting price control?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On June 29, 1946, the President vetoed the OPA extension bill, and in his veto message I find this paragraph:

> As far back as September 6, 1945, I urged the Congress to pass an extension of the Price Control Act at an early date so as to avoid the uncertainties which have made control more difficult for the last few months. Had this been done there would now be no necessity for these last-minute decisions. I repeated my request to the Congress to extend price-control legislation, without crippling amendments, again and again, on January 21, 1946, May 22, 1946, May 25, 1946, and June 11, 1946.

PRESIDENT HAS REPEATEDLY CALLED FOR ACTION—CONGRESS CONTINUES TO DRIFT

It is true that the President addressed those calls to a Congress which was controlled by the Democratic Party. There is no doubt about that. But from that period he has been calling upon the Congress to act with respect to inflation and price control.

I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that it is not sufficient to say, as he has said many times forcefully and eloquently on the floor of the Senate, that the OPA Act was a terrible law. It is not sufficient to say that the bill introduced by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is a bad bill. The only answer is for the Senator to come forward with a bill which he proposes, because the issue is here. Shall we act, or shall we drift?

Mr. WHERRY. If I were to do that, would the Senator subscribe to the general provisions of the Price Control Act which we had, or the system proposed under the provisions of the bill which has been introduced?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator from Nebraska——

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator please answer my question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator from Nebraska to read the bill which

I introduced day before yesterday, Senate bill 2908, in which I propose a system by which I believe we could halt inflation now.

Mr. WHERRY. That has to do with excess——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am not here under cross-examination.

Mr. WHERRY. I have asked the Senator a question. He has asked me to bring forth a solution. The Senator from Wyoming speaks for the minority. He was a Presidential candidate and a Vice Presidential candidate. I ask him now, in the light of what he said—that we ought not to impose upon the young people of the country totalitarian controls—whether the sure cure for inflation is again to impose the OPA, or whether the cure lies in the provisions of the bill to which he refers. If I read the provisions of the bill correctly, it would give the President the power to establish allocations. It would give the President the power to establish the price of wheat, and to confiscate wheat at that price. Would the Senator go that far?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to the Senator from Nebraska, as I said to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that I have not read the bill, and I do not propose to be cross-examined with respect to its details. I say that the issue before us is not what the President presented but what the Senator and the Republican Party in control of Congress are willing to do. What do they propose to do to stop inflation? That is the issue.

Mr. WHERRY. The bill was introduced in the House and in the Senate, and hearings are being held on it today. Mr. Porter is advocating the passage of the bill. Certainly I have the right to ask the Senator, who is a Democrat, whether or not he is for the bill or for the general principles of a price-control act. The Senator has not answered the question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I have not answered it, because I stated that I had not read the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking about the general principles of a price-control act. Would the Senator subscribe to them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have introduced a price-control bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana. I recognize the fact that these inquiries are designed to go off in diversionary alleys, away from the central question. I shall return to it. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. At the present time we are considering price-control legislation. I have not spent much time on the floor of the Senate. I have been listening to the testimony of witnesses in respect to doing something about the subject rather than standing on the floor of the Senate talking about it.

I should like to ask the able Senator from Wyoming——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that the only reason I am here talking about this subject now is that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] took up considerable time of the Senate doing the same thing.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator one question, and then I shall go to the Banking and Currency Committee, where possibly we can do something about the problem. Would the Senator be willing to freeze all prices as of midnight last night, on all commodities in the United States?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In times past I have thought that that would be a very good plan. If we really want to stop inflation, there is one sure and certain way to do it, and that is to freeze everything—to freeze prices and freeze wages and salaries. On the 18th of June the Congress of the United States—this same Congress, controlled by Republicans complaining about inflation——

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator mind answering my question so that I may return to the committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will answer the Senator's question. He started this discussion. Let me finish it.

The Senator from Ohio and others are saying that the cause of inflation is the increased money supply. Nevertheless, the Congress passed a bill increasing the salaries and wages of Federal employees. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], whom I see in the Chamber, is the author and sponsor of a bill to impose a sales tax upon the people of the District of Columbia so that wages and salaries of District of Columbia employees may be increased. In other words, we have this same Congress increasing the money supply——

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator wish to answer my question or not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did answer it.

Mr. CAPEHART. The question is, Is the Senator in favor of freezing all prices as of midnight last night, or are we merely going to talk about the subject? I introduced legislation last December to do the job. Every member of the President's Cabinet appeared before the committee and talked against it. Are we sincere and honest about wanting to control prices, or do we only want to talk about it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Has the Senator yet succeeded in convincing the leadership of the majority?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am asking the able Senator from Wyoming his opinion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator says that he is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Has he convinced the Republican members of that committee that the proposed action should be taken? Let me say to the Senator that I think it would be an effective way of stopping inflation. I should like to read the Senator's bill, however, because I am not altogether certain that he may not have in it certain phrases which mean something different from what he intends.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is the same old answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor. Does the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Wyoming has taken at least 5 minutes, and has not yet answered my question. I introduced a piece of legislation last December to freeze all prices as of midnight on December 13. That bill is still pending before the Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because the Republican control of the committee will not support the Republican Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. My question to the Senator is, Will he support that particular piece of legislation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think there are more effective ways of doing what we want to do, without destroying or upsetting the economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. What are those effective ways? If we are to control prices, we must control them. They are either too high or they are not too high. If they are too high, let us freeze them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. One effective way is by means of the bill which I have introduced. The Senator is merely talking about a particular bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am talking about something effective, and that is to freeze prices so that they cannot go any higher. If anything could be more specific, more positive, and more to the point, and do the American people any more good than that, I should like to know what it is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator can induce his Republican colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee to report such a bill——

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator support it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And if he can induce the majority leadership to support such a bill, I think he will find no objection on my part.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator still has not said whether he would do what I suggested.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; because I wish to leave the way open to decide after I have seen the Senator's bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order that there may be orderly debate, the Chair wishes to point out that under the rules of the Senate the Senator from Wyoming has the floor. If other Senators wish to speak, they must first address the Presiding Officer, to have him ascertain whether the Senator from Wyoming will yield. If we follow the rules of the Senate in that connection, the Chair is sure there will be more orderly debate.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield for a question. I am trying to get my basic thesis before the Senate.

Mr. CAIN. I shall not detain the Senator very long. In company with the Senator from Indiana, I am trying to refer to the matters the Banking and Currency Committee is now discussing. I wonder whether the Senator is familiar with the President's proposal to reduce the rediscount rate of the Federal Reserve banks as a further restriction on bank credit. Let me ask the Senator whether he is in sympathy with the report and proposal in that connection made by the President.

INFLATIONARY EXPANSION OF CREDIT SHOULD BE RESTRAINED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am in sympathy with the principle. I have not read the language which attempts to carry it out. As a Member of the Senate, I know that language does not always correctly state objectives.

Mr. CAIN. Let me say that in the committee we are deeply troubled, because the President's proposal would result in increasing the reserve requirements of member banks of the Federal Reserve System, but without reference to the nonmember banks. All of us are fully aware that we have a dual banking system in this country, and it seems to some of us that it would be most unwise and potentially injurious to the Federal Reserve System of the United States to place it in a noncompetitive situation so far as the nonmember banks are concerned.

That is why I seriously raise the question as to how we can restrict the expansion of credit by restricting one portion of our great banking system, without taking similar action in respect to the other portion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The difficulty is, to use the Senator's words, that the Federal Reserve banks are now in a competitive position in regard to the State banks, with respect to increasing credit and promoting inflation.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that if the Congress undertakes to halt inflationary bank credit on the part of the Federal Reserve banks, the wisdom of that course will suggest itself to the nonmember banks, and they may fall in line.

It might be that upon reading the testimony which will be presented before the committee, I may come to the conclusion that an amendment of some kind to bring in the nonmember banks, too, if such an amendment could be drafted, would be desirable. I think it is tremendously important to stop the rise of credit, because that is where everyone agrees the additional inflation is coming from.

Mr. CAIN. Probably we are in agreement that if we stop the expansion of credit in one part of the banking system, if our efforts in that connection are to be effective in any way at all, the expansion of credit must likewise be stopped in the other parts of the banking system.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that would be desirable. But if we are not successful in spreading the control to the nonmember banks, nevertheless I believe it is far more desirable to pass the bill dealing with the member banks alone, rather than to allow bank credit to expand without restriction.

Mr. CAIN. Very serious consideration is being given to that specific proposal, but we are interested in the fact that Members of the Congress have found it necessary to raise these obvious questions——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. CAIN. Because no one in executive authority in this country has yet referred to what we are likely to do to the Federal Reserve System if we force an increase of its reserve requirements, without taking similar action in regard to the other parts of the banking system in the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to call attention to the fact that in the proposal submitted to us last year, the Government did ask for an increase in the reserve requirements of member banks and nonmember banks. The explanation which is made is that that request is not being made now because of the shortness of time and the feeling that there would be considerable opposition to the inclusion of nonmember banks. It was stated that for that reason they were not requesting it, but that if the Congress gave that power to them, they would welcome it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not being a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I am very happy to have the information given by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield for a further comment, I should like to call attention to the fact that when we speak of making this discrepancy between member banks and nonmember banks, actually we are not making any discrepancy. If there is a discrepancy, it already exists. In other words, the present powers vested in the Federal Reserve Board to set reserve requirements are now limited to the member banks. Consequently, so far as the competitive status is concerned, it already is established.

But we were told just this morning by Secretary of the Treasury Snyder that the State banks, the nonmember banks, have cooperated very nicely, and that the various State banking departments have cooperated, and that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has cooperated, and that heretofore they have not had any trouble in working out the situation cooperatively, and that they do not anticipate any trouble, even if we do not grant that additional power.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The great need is to place a restraint now upon inflationary expansion of credit. That should be done, in my judgment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Banking and Currency Committee hopes it can recommend something constructive. I wish to say in that connection that the Senator from Alabama is quite correct. As I recall, he said that Mr. Snyder, the Secretary of the Treasury, and yesterday, I think, Mr. McCabe, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said that they were not going to recommend what they would like to recommend—which is to cover all banks with increased reserve requirements—because of the opposition likely to be encountered. Yet, Mr. President, we have been told that what we face is a national crisis and emergency. So it seems a little strange to some of us that we should duck economic realities simply because someone might be opposed to taking the needed action.

PATRIOTIC AND INTELLIGENT ACTION NEEDED NOW

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my purpose in rising today was to call attention to the profound feeling which exists in the minds and hearts of millions of American citizens that in this country and in the world there exists a serious condition which can be solved only by the patriotic and intelligent action of the Congress of the United States. The Congress is the legislative branch of government. The President may propose, but only the Congress can dispose.

All through the world the underlying confusion in the minds of people is being manifested by radical action and by war. We are now in session, the competent democratic authority of the people of the United States, to act with respect to a condition, the existence of which is recognized by everyone. The cost of living is rising steadily. Congress has in many ways indicated its conviction that something should be done. Last June the Senate made clear that it believed there should be housing legislation, because it was of the opinion that millions of people in the United States are without roofs over their heads.

HOMELESS PEOPLE MORE IMPORTANT THAN POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

The distinguished Senator from Ohio joined in that belief and sponsored the bill, with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], a Democrat, and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], a Democrat, to provide a solution. He was anxious that the bill should pass the Senate. It has not passed the House. The question arises, if it was a desirable thing to solve this crying need of millions of people last June, why is it not a crying need to solve it now, in July? Or shall we say to those who need housing in the great cities, "Be patient; wait until after the election, and wait until a new Congress comes. Get whatever housing you can, in the meantime." That, Mr. President, is not serving the interests of the people.

"Oh," they say, "this inflation is caused by Government action, which increases the money supply and increases the demand." That is true. Of course, it is true. But it is Government action in which the Congress has joined the Executive. The Congress of the United States passed the draft bill. There was no opposition on the part of any party or party leadership here against the draft bill. The Congress passed the bill providing appropriations to build housing facilities for draftees. That was increasing the demand for commodities in short supply. The Congress of the United States, Democrats and Republicans alike, voted for the extension of the Air Corps. That creates a demand. The Government is using the taxpayers' money to buy materials in short supply to build housing for the draftees and to build equipment for the Navy and for the Army. That was the decision of both

parties. Can we now say, after the decision of the Congress has been rendered, "Cut the air force down 10 percent—that is the way to stop inflation?"

RISING PRICES AND PROFITS INCREASE THE COST OF GOVERNMENT AND DEFENSE

Why, of course, all we have got to do is to stop defense preparation, and we can cut out inflation. We can stop Government buying. But I call your attention, Mr. President, to the fact that when the United States Steel Co. just a few days ago increased the price of steel by $9.34 a ton it was increasing the cost of Government in the United States, because between 7 percent and 10 percent of all the steel produced in the United States goes to the Government. When the steel companies increase the price of steel by $9.34 a ton, they are increasing the cost of national defense. Shall we say, as a Congress representative of the people of the United States, "It means nothing to us; we are willing that this rising cost of government shall continue," particularly when we read in the report of the steel companies themselves that they are making greater profits than ever before in history?

There is no profit for the draftee, Mr. President. When the Government of the United States rests its hand upon the shoulder of a young man and says, "Leave your home, leave your business, leave your schooling, and go into the Army or the Navy," he goes, regardless of profit or loss. But the manufacturers who produce these commodities, which are needed in the national defense, raised their prices, and the responsible leadership of this Congress proposes to adjourn the Congress a week from Saturday night, in the face of that. That, Mr. President, is why I say there are millions of people in this country who echo the words that were read by the Senator from New Hampshire—do away with this factional brawling, do away with this petty criticism, this attempt to assess the blame for a condition that exists, for you were responsible, I was responsible, he was responsible. Whoever was responsible, the condition is here. The cost of living is higher than it ever was in all the history of the United States. The people can do nothing about it, but we can.

I say, Mr. President, if the Members of this Congress allow the session to adjourn without having done anything about it, they will hear about it at the ballot boxes in November. We are dealing with the fundamental principle of government, in the interests of the people. The interest of the people now demands that we halt the rising cost of living, that we stop those inflationary causes which we can stop. It is idle to say, "Abandon the European recovery program." That issue was fought out here. There were isolationists in both House of Congress who said, "That will increase the cost of living." But the Congress of the United States, echoing the words and the thought of millions of Americans, enacted the European recovery legislation because it was their conviction that the United States should do something to stimulate economic recovery in Europe in order to save the free political system. That is what we are dealing with, Mr. President. We are not dealing with the Presidential election. It does not make any difference whether President Truman is reelected or Governor Dewey becomes President. If we in the Congress have permitted the economic system to be undermined by our inaction, the people will pay the price, no matter who the President is. I suggest, Mr. President, that the alternative to the action of the Congress in the democratic method by legislation, will be the Executive method by directive.

The suggestion has been made here upon the floor that there are some in the Congress who say the way to check consumer credit is for the President to exercise a power that was granted in the Trading With the Enemy Act. He has asked for power in this iterim peace period, and the Congress refuses to grant it. Is that not a sidestepping of the issue? Nobody denies that unwise installment credit, by increasing the money supply and increasing the demand, will continue inflation. The fact is, and nobody can deny it, that production in the United States today is running far greater than it was when the shooting stopped. Civilian production has expanded in almost every line. We know that the production of wheat and corn, with the crops coming in, will be much greater than has been anticipated. Industrial production is higher than ever before. But the demands which we have created, out of necessity, are taking that increased supply. The demands for national defense, the demands for European recovery, are far beyond any other demand that is being exerted upon the productive supply of America. With so many people being employed, they have their demands. They are buying goods. But the Congress is willing to pile consumer credit upon a high money supply, and decline to act in order that its members may get back to their States or their districts so that they may run for reelection.

THIS CONGRESS CAN STOP THE PRICE SPIRAL—AVOID CONSEQUENT DEPRESSION—SAVE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT

O Mr. President, within a month certainly, this Congress could take effective action to hold prices. Congress could take effective action to provide housing. It is true, of course, that expenditures for housing also created a demand, but the alternative is to let people who need houses go without them. That is why we must necessarily step in with Government action.

History is clear, Mr. President. It has happened over and over again, that when we have a demand which exceeds supply, and prices rise, then inevitably there comes a time when there are some people in the economy who cannot buy at the high prices the things which are needed. They go out of the market. When they go out of the market, purchasing power is thereby limited. Then the demand for the products of the farm and the factories is cut down. Then business begins to hesitate and, finally, to die, and then comes a depression. That is the story, over and over again.

No one wants to restrain profit when a boom is on, hoping that somehow or other he may escape the inevitable result. But no one can escape the result now, Mr. President, because the debt of the United States, hovering around $250,000,000,000, is the greatest debt that was ever assumed by any people in history. True, we have reduced it somewhat, but not enough. We have chosen to decrease the receipts of the Federal Government at a time when we were increasing its expenditures. It was our deliberate act. It is an act which eventually promotes deflation and depression. We are laying here the groundwork for another crash; and if another crash comes, Mr. President, if another depression comes, as historically they have always come after a boom, then let us ask ourselves, How shall we save our democratic system of government, a free government, and a free economy? We do not realize the extent to which we have surrendered to a small group, power over our economy. The concentration of economic power in this country has become so great that we are now subject to private economic government. The private managers of a few giant corporations in almost every basic industry regulate the supply and fix the price.

WE STILL HAVE PRICE CONTROL—BY BIG BUSINESS

We do not have price control by the Government; we have price control by big business. Business management, Mr. President, over and over again, has pushed the desire for profit over the precipice. Not only will the managers of big business and the stockholders in these giant collectivist units pay the price, but the masses of the people of the United States will pay it.

TURN THE SPOTLIGHT ON PROFITEERS

Mr. President, I have a statement which I prepared and released to the press on July 19, last, in which I propose that we should authorize a public agency of the Government to scrutinize the increasing prices on basic commodities which are the subject of all living and of all American business. The Federal Trade Commission, under existing law, has the power to investigate the action of corporations in fixing prices. But the Congress denied the Commission an appropriation last June to do that work. It has the power, however, but it is a power which, under present law, can be exercised only after the fact. I propose in my bill that that power may be exercised before the fact, by prohibiting any increase in the price of basic commodities, the production of which is in concentrated control, until a notice of intention has been filed with the Federal Trade Commission, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, and until after a public hearing has been held.

GIVE BUSINESS THE SAME TREATMENT AS LABOR—A "COOLING OFF" PERIOD ON PRICE INCREASES

We have not hesitated to say in the Taft-Hartley Act and in the old Railway Labor Act that labor may not strike under certain circumstances. Congress has said that the price of labor shall be frozen for a period of time. That is what is known as a cooling-off period. I suggest that there be a cooling-off period on spiraling prices for basic commodities.

I do not ask that any power be given to the Federal Trade Commission to prohibit increases; I ask only that there be public scrutiny, so that the public may know the reasons for the increases and whether or not they are justified. That bill is before the Banking and Currency Committee. I understand that similar provisions have been written into the bill introduced by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement dealing with the subject may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR O'MAHONEY PROPOSES PUBLIC SCRUTINY OF PRICE INCREASES—COOLING-OFF PERIOD PROVIDED FOR LABOR SHOULD APPLY TO CORPORATE GIANTS, SAYS WYOMING SENATOR WHO IS DRAFTING BILL TO HALT INFLATION BY PROHIBITING PRICE ADVANCES BY CORPORATIONS CONTROLLING THE ECONOMY UNTIL AFTER PUBLIC HEARINGS BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The prices which 140,000,000 Americans must pay for the basic commodities they must daily use all over the country are privately fixed by a few giant corporations.

The cost of living rises steadily, but corporate profits are rising even more rapidly. All corporate profits in 1947 rose 42 percent above what they were in 1946, although in 1946 they had reached an all-time high. The income after taxes of the 100 largest manufacturing corporations in 1947 was 91 percent greater than in 1946, and during the first six months of 1948, the all-time record of 1947 was being broken by new profit highs.

Serious danger signals are appearing. Sales of 1,277 firms have fallen off 1.6 percent this year, according to the report Saturday of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the lower-income groups, according to the Federal Reserve Board, are dipping into their savings in order to live, and those whose savings are exhausted are finding their income insufficient to cover their necessities. The voluntary savings bond sale has not been a success, and voluntary allocation of materials is not meeting the needs of local business.

This is the road to depression—rising prices, rising profits, dwindling savings, contracting purchasing power, narrowing markets, curtailed production, reduced employment, and then on over the "boom" to end in the "bust."

Mounting prices and mounting profits are undermining the purchasing power of the Nation and are setting the stage for a new depression all at the time when international recovery and world peace depend upon stopping inflation now.

To do this, it is not necessary to restore all-inclusive price controls. It is only necessary to recognize the fact that a few giant corporations have control over the production, the distribution, and the price of basic commodities upon which all American business depends. Put the spotlight of publicity on the pricing policies of these corporate giants and the brakes will be immediately applied to inflation.

The country does not realize the extent to which the people have become the subjects of private economic government.

Three meat-packing corporations produce 43 percent of all the meat distributed by packers throughout the country, and these same three corporations determine the price that people must pay for all meat.

Three steel corporations produce 49 percent of all steel ingots; three oil refinery corporations produce 58 percent of all gasoline; three chemical corporations produce 66 percent of all chemicals, and in each instance these corporations actually set the prices for all other producers.

So it goes in other industries. Three corporations produce 67 percent of all farm machinery, 69 percent of all electric ranges, 75 percent of all window glass, 77 percent of all rubber tires, 80 percent of all copper, 87 percent of all gypsum board, 88 percent of all tin cans, and 91 percent of all primary aluminum.

In the case of 121 basic products universally used throughout the country, the total value of which, for each product, was more than $10,000,000 in 1937, more than 75 percent of the total output was manufactured by only four firms. When a few corporations secure control over so large a proportion of the production of any commodity, it is inevitable that they set the price not only for their own particular industry, but also for every other industry and every other business which uses these products as a raw material. Thus the price structure of American business and, therefore, the cost of living, depends upon the private judgment of the private managers of the few corporations which have gained so tight a control over American production.

To deal effectively with inflation, it is only necessary to deal with these concentrated giants. Their hand is on the throttle of American business. They have the power to turn it on and off. Experience has proved that it is idle to ask them to protect the public. No President from Mr. Hoover to Mr. Truman by politely using the prestige of the Presidency, has been able to persuade them to act in the public interest. They think only of their own welfare, yet when they increase prices in a dangerous situation like the present, they are acting against the welfare of the whole population and against the interest of every State and every community in the Nation.

Let us apply to them the same rule Congress has applied to labor. In the Taft-Hartley Act, and before that in the Railway Labor Act, Congress provided for a cooling-off period before a strike could take place. Why not a cooling-off period before the corporate giants which produce the bulk of our basic commodities may increase prices?

If the workers of the country are required by law to sell their labor for a certain period at a lower price than they believe they ought to have, why should not these huge corporations be compelled to hold the price line for a similar period until an appropriate Government agency can conduct a public hearing to review the reasons for the proposed price increases?

The national interest is paramount. We are dealing with the issues out of which depression and disaster for millions may arise. We are dealing with issues that directly affect world peace and national security. We cannot afford to drift. We must act to prevent the managers of the monopolist economic structure from pulling it down upon themselves and all the people.

I am, therefore, drafting a bill to provide that the price of all basic commodities 40 percent or more of the total annual output of which is produced by 50 percent or less of all producers may not be increased until the producers desiring to make such increase shall have filed with the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Federal Trade Commission a notice of intention to increase prices, and until not more than 30 days after such notice a public hearing has been held by the Federal Trade Commission. At such public hearing it shall be the duty of the members of the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce to examine the applicant with respect to the reasons for the proposed increase.

Care will be taken in drafting the bill to guard against evasions through the activities of corporate affiliates or subsidiaries, or other devices, and to protect from reprisal by big business producers those consumers who may give testimony.

Competition and free enterprise are being destroyed, States' rights insofar as the States are entitled to protect their own citizens are being undermined, and the people are being exploited by big business not so much because all big business wants monopoly, but because concentration of control has proceeded so far that the private interests of the giant corporations are overriding the public interest. Only Congress can protect the people by holding inflation and preserving a competitive economic system.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. MAYBANK obtained the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate the thought of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, but there are other Senators who wish to speak this afternoon, and I should prefer not to have a quorum called at this time.

Mr. President, I listened with much interest to the discussion early today of the President's economic report, and also to the various remarks made, not only today, but yesterday, in connection with inflation.

When in Philadelphia the President called the Congress to meet in session, I said then, and I believe now, that there would be but little done, and that it was entirely unnecessary for him to take that action.

As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to say that I voted for and supported legislation to control credits, which passed the committee 9 to 4, last spring, and passed the Senate. I was a member of the same committee when on six different occasions it reported the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which was passed by the Senate. I voted for other controls, because, above all, I deplore inflation, and hope that some means can be found to curb it.

However, Mr. President, Mr. McCabe, testifying yesterday morning, stated, in connection with title 2 of the new anti-inflation bill, that long and careful hearings should be held before such a measure was passed, because it affects 7,000 Federal Reserve banks on one side and 7,000 State banks on the other.

So, Mr. President, the housing legislation having passed the Senate last spring, and there being nothing else on the calendar to be considered, we are faced here with what the President suggested in Philadelphia in the way of civil-rights legislation.

I heard the President say on the radio that he would call Congress back into session and that the Senate could invoke cloture. In other words, the President wants to cut off debate. That is what he said on the radio from Philadelphia.

Cut off debate on what? On the poll-tax bill. Then what is next? The anti-lynching bill. Certainly cut off debate on that. Then what is next? The FEPC bill. Cut off debate on that bill. Then what is next? He will concoct some other segregation bills to send to Congress along the line of what he tried to do with the Army, but he did not get away with it.

Mr. President, I realize that under rule XIX I have two opportunities to speak on the pending measure. I realize that there are many distinguished Senators who desire to speak. So today I shall be reasonably long, but not too long. I direct my attention to the poll-tax measure which is before the Senate because my colleague the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has a resolution which he is going to bring up on Monday providing for the adjournment of Congress. He said before Congress reconvened that he would submit such a resolution. He has submitted it. So I hope that on Monday I may be able to help in my small way to bring about an adjournment of Congress so we can go home and the country can have peace and progress may be made throughout the country.

Mr. President, any Federal legislation calling for the repeal of any poll-tax laws in the several States is clearly unconstitutional. The right of qualifications for suffrage is a matter for the States and has been so since the founding of the Government. It justly should remain so.

Both political parties felt their responsibility under the Constitution of the United States to leave this poll-tax matter alone for the several States to handle under section 2, article 1, of the Constitution, which was written in 1787—that is, up until the Philadelphia conventions of 1948. As a matter of fact, in the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution the provision relating to voting requirements is reiterated. As Senators know, this amendment allowing United States Senators to be elected by direct popular vote was ratified in 1913. It is an exceptional point in that the provision as to the qualifications of electors appears again in this second place in the Constitution.

Should the Congress of the United States pass legislation concerning the poll tax as a voting qualification, it could, by the same precedent, determine all the voting qualifications in any or all of the various States.

The Constitution under which we now live has done a great work in building a Nation and holding it together. It has been good enough to tide us over all kinds of troubles. It is satisfactory for all the problems of today. Our future prosperity and safety require that we let it alone.

It is still true that the qualification for suffrage is, under constitutional government in America, a question for the individual States. If we are tiring of this healthy constitutional principle and wish further to amend the Constitution such action will, in my humble opinion, provide an opening wedge by which the Congress could drive even deeper into the sovereign sanctity of State rights.

The problem before us is not whether the poll tax is right or wrong. It is clearly a point of constitutionality. If the poll tax should be abolished, it is the constitutional right of the residents of the individual States so to determine. I am happy to note that there is a spreading tendency for the States themselves to do away with this tax. It remains in effect today in only seven States. There is growing sentiment for its repeal in even these few remaining States.

In my State of South Carolina, for instance, the constitution states that the tax is an educational one and is to be used for educational purposes within the State. The poll tax is a part of the revenue for the operation of all the public schools in South Carolina.

It is interesting to note, at this point, that the poll tax or "pole" tax, as it was called, was first levied in South Carolina in 1702 as an act of the general assembly to make Charles Town defensible. It seems that in those days the trouble was with the Indians. The assembly resorted to revenue by a pole—p-o-l-e—for the defense of Charles Town. Now, for a dollar a year, we are forced to defend our constitutional rights.

I should like further to observe that the poll tax is not levied today on women or anyone over the age of 60. It is not levied on anyone who takes an oath that he is not able to pay the tax. This leaves only about 30 percent of the voters who are called upon to pay this $1 a year, nonretroactive tax.

Under no stretch of the imagination can I see how the levying of a poll tax could in any way restrict the suffrage of voters.

Let us face the reality of this blown-up, exaggerated iniquity. For the privilege of smoking a pack of cigarettes we pay more than 7 cents in State and Federal taxes. For the privilege of providing a part of the educational facilities for our children—and in many cases it is the only tax paid—about 30 percent of our people pay $1 a year, which is less than 2 cents a week, in the form of a poll tax.

It is not for the retention of the poll tax that we oppose this legislation. We oppose it because a serious departure from governmental principles is involved—a clear invasion of the liberties of the American people. It is a process designed by and for politicians who would create political turmoil for their own benefit at the expense of an already overly abused South—a South which has been a political prisoner of war since 1865. It is time we repatriated our displaced sovereign rights without the ill-advised aid of vote-conscious meddlers.

In 1941 and 1942, particularly in 1942, I had the pleasure and the privilege of being in the Senate, and I attended the extended hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary at that time in connection with the anti-poll-tax legislation which had been introduced. I went through the filibuster which was had at that time. I see Senators present who were with me in that long filibuster, when we absented ourselves from the Senate so no quorum could be had. Finally, a motion was adopted to send out the Sergeant at Arms to bring us back to the Senate in order that a quorum could be had.

Mr. President, we won that fight. We fought for the principles of the Constitution. We are here to fight today for the same principles of the Constitution. Speaking for myself, representing in part South Carolina—and I feel I speak for the other Senators who have been together in meetings day after day arranging to combat this legislation—I say we are going to use every power we have, and invoke every rule that is available to us, and do everything we can to stop this proposed legislation because we know that if we break down in this fight and the proposed legislation is passed, it will be followed by civil-rights measures, more civil-rights measures, and still other civil-rights measures until we shall have no rights at all remaining.

Knowing that this would be the issue, I stated that the President's statement in Philadelphia with respect to the imposition of cloture, and his call of the Congress under the guise of stopping inflation, were totally unnecessary. Yesterday, in the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, his own appointees testified that extended hearings were necessary. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] read into the record a report of the Department of Agriculture calling for the production of fewer cattle, fewer head of poultry, and less wheat. The Senator who now occupies the Chair [Mr. YOUNG] comes from the great wheat-producing territory. The report of the Department of Agriculture advised the farmers to grow less wheat and less of other articles of food. At the same time it is said that we must stop inflation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I ask the Senator if he noticed the statement by Mr. Brannan, only recently appointed Secretary of Agriculture by the President, which statement was reported in the press last Monday. The Secretary of Agriculture was reported to have asked the farmers to store their grain and not put it on the market, in an effort to keep prices from dropping, which I interpret to mean an effort to keep prices up.

Mr. MAYBANK. I noticed the statement.

Mr. COOPER. Did the Senator read the statement?

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not read the details. I simply read the headlines. I could hardly believe what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] read, to the effect that the Department of Agriculture wanted to reduce the production of wheat, meat, poultry, and eggs, the very things which the poor people need.

Mr. COOPER. On the very day when we were called here to attack inflation and high prices, particularly high prices of meat, which are certainly affected by the price of grain, the President's appointee, the Secretary of Agriculture, was asking the farmers to keep their wheat in storage so that prices would be held up.

Mr. MAYBANK. Furthermore, as the Senator well knows, he asked that the acreage and amounts in years to come be reduced. It is utter nonsense. They want to return to Henry Wallace's theory of scarcity—kill the pigs and plow up the corn. It simply does not make sense. No one is more opposed to inflation than I am. But we cannot plant less wheat, have less poultry and less meat, and at the same time stop inflation by passing a law to ration what little there may be.

Mr. President, I digressed from the poll-tax statement because I wanted the RECORD to show clearly that it is my judgment that this special session was called for one reason, and one reason only, and that is to impose force bills upon the people of the South.

Last spring when the poll-tax measure was before the committee, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] asked various southern Senators to communicate with their governors and have prepared a brief and a record so that he, as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, along with others, could carry on the battle for us in that committee, which he so ably did. He made the minority report for the committee. Yesterday he spoke at length, and in my judgment delivered a speech which will be remembered for a long time, not only because of the able way in which he dealt with the constitutional question, but because of the righteousness of the speech, and the manner in which he delivered it.

At the time he asked my colleague the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and me to communicate with our Governor and have a statement prepared, I immediately did so. The attorney general prepared a statement of the situation in South Carolina. The junior Senator from South Carolina and I appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration to hear the statement delivered for the record.

At this time I shall read the statement. It is quite lengthy, but I wish to read it into the RECORD for the reason that the Senator from Mississippi desires the statement to be made a part of the RECORD. The Senator from Mississippi knows, as I know, that if the pending bill is passed—I am certain that it will not be, but if by chance it should be passed, the next step which the Southern States which have the poll tax will take will be to carry it to the courts. The attorneys general of the various States will carry the fight forward. I intend to read this statement; and at a later date I intend to read the entire hearings of 1942, together with the statements made by the then Governor of South Carolina, Mr. Jeffries, the then president of the senate, Senator Brown, and the present attorney general, John W. Daniel, plus the statements of many witnesses who appeared at the hearings, which extended over a long time. I intend to read those statements later, but at this time I shall content myself with reading the statement of the attorney general, so that Members of this body may be apprised as to what our laws are and what our attorney general thinks of the situation. If and when the bill is ever passed and we must go before the courts, there will be a record in the greatest record of all, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I now read the statement of the attorney general:

A STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR SOUTH CAROLINA IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED ANTI-POLL-TAX LEGISLATION

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND CONCERNING SOUTH CAROLINA'S POLL TAX

The practice, custom, and tradition of levying a poll tax in the State of South Carolina had its origin prior to the American Revolution. In 1702 the General Assembly passed an act for the purpose of raising revenue to be used in the defense of Charles Town. This act provided that £550 per annum be raised by a poll tax (spelled p-o-l-e). It provided for the payment of 20 shillings per annum by each man within the bounds of the town who was capable of bearing arms. It is interesting to note that this act also provided for the payment of 20 shillings per annum by every single woman or widow that was a housekeeper within the bounds of the town. Thus we find that from the earliest time the poll tax was used as a revenue measure which, indeed, it is today in South Carolina.

After 1702 the poll taxes were often levied by the Legislature of South Carolina, and by the year 1865 it had become the custom and accepted tradition of the people of the State as a means of raising revenue necessary for the support of the government. On June 13, 1865, Benjamin F. Perry was appointed provisional Governor of South Carolina by President Johnson (the Supreme Court of the United States having declared that the seceded States of the South had not been out of the Union). Governor Perry called a convention of the people of the State for the purpose of reorganizing the government of the State. An order for the election of delegates for the convention to meet in Columbia on September 13, 1865, was promulgated by Governor Perry. This convention was held as scheduled on September 13, 1865, and a new constitution for the State was proposed. Section 1 of article I provided as follows:

"The General Assembly, whenever a tax is laid upon land, shall at the same time impose a capitation tax, which shall not be less upon each poll than one-fourth of the tax laid upon each $100 worth of assessed value of the land taxed; excepting, however, from the operation of such capitation tax all such classes of persons as from disability or otherwise, ought, in the judgment of the General Assembly, to be exempted."

This new proposed constitution was actually adopted in 1868 and we find article IX, section 2, reading as follows:

"The General Assembly may provide annually for a poll tax not to exceed $1 on each poll, which shall be applied exclusively to the public-school fund and no additional poll tax shall be levied by any municipal corporation."

It is to be remember that at this point in the history of the State, South Carolina was under the rule of those who had migrated to the State of South Carolina for the purpose of personal gain, and Congress should take notice of the fact that these rulers considered the poll tax an important and necessary means of raising revenue within the State.

In 1876 Wade Hampton was elected Governor of the State of South Carolina, thus returning the official leadership of the State back to the citizens of South Carolina. Shortly thereafter the legislature passed an act providing for the collection of a poll tax referred to in the constitution of 1868 which is quoted above. This act was ratified on March 22, 1878, and reads as follows:

"That the several county treasurers shall retain all the poll tax collected in their respective counties; and it is hereby made the duty of the said county treasurers in collecting the poll tax, to keep an account of the exact amount of said tax collected in each school district in his county • • • and the poll tax collected therein shall be expended for school purposes in the school district from which it was collected."

We therefore find that since March 22, 1878, the poll tax has been earmarked for school purposes. The constitution of 1868 remained in effect until 1895. The people of South Carolina lived under this constitution (1868) which was adopted in a convention composed almost entirely of carpet-baggers, scalawags, and Negroes, and which contained a provision for levying and collecting from the people of the State the tax known as the poll tax. In 1895 the Honorable Benjamin Ryan Tillman led a movement for the adoption of a new constitution. The section dealing with poll tax in this constitution of 1895, which is to this date the constitution of the State of South Carolina, is article XI, section 6, which in part reads as follows:

"There shall be assessed on all taxable polls in the State between the ages of 21 and 60 years (excepting Confederate soldiers above the age of 50 years) an annual tax of $1 on each poll, the proceeds of which tax shall be expended for school purposes in the several school districts in which it is collected."

Article XI, section 4, of the South Carolina constitution, dealing with the "qualification for suffrage" reads in part as follows:

"Managers of elections shall require of each elector offering to vote at any election before allowing him to vote proof of the payment 30 days before any election of any poll tax then due and payable. The production of a certificate or of a receipt of the officer authorized to collect such taxes shall be conclusive proof of the payment thereof."

Thus we find that the poll tax is not a levy of recent years but rather that it is a source of taxation which has been used in the State of South Carolina since the American Revolution and even prior to the American Revolution when the State was a mere colony.

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation is in direct conflict with article I, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States in that it attempts to take from the several States a right guaranteed to the States by the Constitution. This proposed legislation, known and designated as H. R. 29, and entitled "An act making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers," is in effect changing the qualifications for electors for national officers in violation of article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States reads as follows:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature."

This section of the Constitution is clear and unambiguous. The framers of the Constitution wisely decided that the qualifications requisite for electors of the House of Representatives should be left entirely to the several States. It is true that the qualifications of these electors may not be the same in each of the several States, which itself shows that the framers of the Constitution did not desire uniformity.

The State of South Carolina has a poll tax of $1 which is provided for by article XI, section 6 of the constitution of 1895. This section of South Carolina's Constitution reads as follows:

"There shall be assessed on all taxable polls in the State between the ages of 21 and 60 years (excepting Confederate soldiers above the age of 50 years) an annual tax of

$1 on each poll, the proceeds of which tax shall be expended for school purposes in the several school districts in which it is collected."

This section of the State constitution shows clearly that the poll tax is purely and simply a revenue measure, even going so far as providing the purpose for which the proceeds of the tax may be used.

In order to insure the collection of the poll tax as provided in the constitutional sections above quoted, the framers of the State constitution deemed it advisable to require the proof of the payment of the poll tax, 30 days before any election, as a prerequisite and qualification for suffrage. This section of the constitution, designated as article II, section 4 (e), reads as follows:

"Managers of elections shall require of each elector offering to vote at any election, before allowing him to vote, proof of the payment 30 days before any election of any poll tax then due and payable. The production of a certificate or of the receipt of the officer authorized to collect such taxes shall be conclusive proof of the payment thereof."

The Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina held in *Mew* v. *Charleston & S. Railway Company* (55 S. C. 90; 32 S. E. 828), in construing this section of the constitution, as follows:

"This section prescribes the qualifications for an elector, as suffrage is the right to vote, and not the act of voting."

There we have the supreme court of the State declaring judicially that article II section 4 (e) specifically defines the qualifications for an elector.

From the above we find that in South Carolina the State constitution provides for a poll tax for the purpose of raising revenue for school purposes (art. XI sec. 6). We also find in the State constitution that qualification for suffrage is the payment of the poll tax provided for in the foregoing section. We now have clearly before us the qualifications of an elector for the House of Representatives as defined by the constitution of the State and judicially determined by the supreme court of the State of South Carolina. Let us now look at the Constitution of the United States and find what that document says with reference to the qualification of the electors of the House of Representatives. We find the answer in article I, section 2, of the United States Constitution, which reads as follows:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

From the foregoing we find that in order for an elector to vote for a person seeking election to the House of Representatives or the most numerous branch of the State legislature, the elector must be registered and in addition he must show "proof of the payment 30 days before any election of any poll tax then due and payable."

The Constitution of the United States in article I, section 2, clearly defines the qualifications of an elector voting for Members of the House of Representatives. This elector must have the qualifications of an elector voting for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. This section is mandatory. We therefore submit that it is beyond the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of the qualifications of electors for Members of the House of Representatives without doing violence to the solemn provisions of article I, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States. To do so would change the qualifications so defined by the constitution of the State of South Carolina and the Constitution of the United States.

Let us now look to the State and Federal courts for their construction of the sections of the Constitution quoted and discussed above. The Supreme Court of the United States has already judicially determined that a State may provide for the collection of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting without violating any of the provisions of the Federal Constitution. In the case of *Nolen R. Breedlove* v. *T. Earl Suttles, Tax Collector* (302 U. S. 277-284; 82 L. Ed. 252; decided December 1937); the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the right of the State of Georgia to collect a poll tax of $1 as a prerequisite to voting and specifically held that such requirement did not violate the equal protection of the laws, nor did it abridge the privileges and immunities as guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment. In passing upon the question the Court said:

"To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate." (*Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall 162, 170 et seq.; 22 L. Ed. 627, 629); *Ex Parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651, 664, 665; 28 L. Ed. 274, 275; 4 S. Ct. 152); *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 37, 38; 36 L. Ed. 869, 878; 13 S. Ct. 3); *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347; 362; 59 L. Ed. 1340, 1346; 35 S. Ct. 926; L. R. A. 1916 A, 1124).)

Mr. President, in view of the fact that I mentioned the State of Georgia, I may say the State has since that time repealed its poll tax. Certain other States have also repealed the poll tax. They have done it in a constitutional way, through the State legislatures, submitting constitutional amendments to the people. The subject has been before the legislature of my State for several years. Action was taken by one branch of the legislature one year, and by the other branch in another year.

I may say that in 1942 I myself said I thought the State should repeal the poll tax. I am not here advocating a poll tax, but I am opposing Federal interference with the State of South Carolina or with any other State. As I said a little earlier, the poll tax remains in but few States. I hope I shall see the day when perhaps all the other States, observing due process, will, in proper manner and in a constitutional way, through the legislature and through the ballot box, repeal those taxes. I hope, on the contrary, I shall never see the day when the Congress of the United States or the Federal Government will tell the people of my State or of any other State what they must do or what the Government is going to do to them.

In the same case the Supreme Court of the United States said, "The payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting is a familiar and reasonable regulation long enforced in many States and for more than a century in Georgia."

As to the constitutional requirement that evidence of the payment of the poll tax be offered as a prerequisite to voting, the Court said:

"That measure reasonably may be deemed essential to that form of the levy. Imposition without enforcement would be futile. Power to levy and power to collect are equally necessary. And by the exaction of payment before registration, the right to vote is neither denied nor abridged. • • • It is fanciful to suggest that the Georgia law is a mere disguise under which to deny or abridge the right of men to vote."

The Breedlove case, supra, is the final word from the Supreme Court of the United States with reference to the imposition of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, and we see by that case that such a requirement is in harmony with the United States Constitution. This case has been followed with approval since 1937 in the following cases: 68 Fed. Sup. 748; 164 Pa. (2d) 160; 207 S. C. 489; 163 Tenn. 370.

Again, in 1941, the Supreme Court of the United States, in an opinion by Mr. Chief Justice Stone, passing upon the meaning of section 2, article I, of the United States Constitution, said, in the case of *United States of America* v. *Patrick B. Classic* (313 U. S. 298; 85 L. Ed. 1368):

"Section 2 of article I commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes. The right of the people to choose, within its appropriate constitutional limitations, where in other respects it is defined, and the mode of its exercise is prescribed by State acts in conformity to the Constitution, is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution and hence is one secured by it to those citizens and inhabitants of the State entitled to exercise the right."

It is argued by some that the Classic case, supra, to some extent overruled the principles enunciated in the Breedlove case, supra. This position cannot be maintained, however, when the language of the Court and the authorities cited therein are carefully analyzed. It is important to bear in mind that the statute involved in the Classic case regulated only the manner of holding elections. The language used by the Court and relied upon by those who maintain that new and different legal principles were established by the Classic case is as follows:

"While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (citing cases), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.'"

To sustain this proposition the Court cited: *Ex parte Siebold* (100 U. S. 371; 25 L. Ed. 717); *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 663, 664; 28 L. Ed. 278; 4 S. Ct. 152); *Swafford* v. *Templeton* (185 U. S. 487; 46 L. Ed. 1005, 22 S. Ct. 783); *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58, 64; 45 L. Ed. 84, 88; 21 S. Ct. 17).

All of the authorities cited in the Classic case definitely hold that the several States have supreme power to prescribe the qualifications of the electors who are to vote for the most numerous branch of their legislatures, and consequently their Senators and Representatives in Congress. The first case cited, *Ex parte Siebold*, involves solely the question of the power of Congress to provide for the supervision of elections for Representatives in Congress by Federal marshals and their deputies, and by supervisors appointed by the Federal judges. These Federal officers were required to be present at the voting places and it was made a crime by an act of Congress for anyone to interfere with them in the disposition of their duties. The opinion of the Court did not touch upon the question of qualifications for suffrage or even refer to section 2 of article I. It was restricted solely to the power to regulate the manner of holding the election, as appears from the language in the opinion. This language is as follows:

"The clause of the Constitution under which the power of Congress, as well as that of the State legislatures, to regulate the election of Senators and Representatives is as follows: 'The times, places, and manner of holding an election for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators.'"

This expressly excludes the possibility that the Court considered section 2 relating to qualifications of electors as included in the power to regulate the "manner of holding elections." If this were not correct, reference would have been made to section 2 as well as section 4 of article I.

The second case cited in the opinion in the Classic case is *Ex parte Yarbrough*. In this case the Court expressly recognized the power of the States to prescribe such qualifications, saying that the States " • • • define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State."

If the language relied upon by those who did propose such legislation quoted from the Classic case had been intended to mean that Congress is empowered to "define who are to vote" at such elections, the Court certainly would not have cited the Yarbrough case in support of that proposition. In fact, the Yarbrough case is authority for the principle that Congress has no such power.

The next case cited by the Chief Justice in the classic case is *Swafford* v. *Temple* which involved the question whether a person qualified to vote under State laws, who is wrongfully denied that right, has a cause of action for damages arising under the Constitution of the United States. In answering the question in the affirmative the Court referred to the Yarbrough case, supra, and interpreted that opinion:

"That is to say the opinion was that the case was equally one arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States whether the illegal act complained of arose from a charged violation of some specific provision of the Constitution or laws of the United States, or from the violation of a State law which affected the exercise of the right to vote for a Member of Congress, since the Constitution of the United States had adopted, as the qualifications of electors for Members of Congress, those prescribed by the State for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State." (46 L. ed. 1007-1008)

It is significant to note that the Court says that the Constitution adopts the qualifications of electors prescribed by the State, not that Congress adopts same. Since the Constitution adopts them it necessarily follows that Congress is without power to alter this adoption or in any manner change the same.

The last case cited by the Chief Justice in the Classic case is *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* which also held that the right of a person qualified under State laws to vote for the popular branch of the legislature is also qualified to vote for Members of Congress and such right is protected by the Constitution. The opinion quoted with approval the proposition laid down in the Yarbrough case that the States define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature and the Constitution of the United States says that the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. The power of the several States to define these qualifications is supreme and paramount.

Certainly these cases cited in the Classic case should dispel any argument by the proponents of such legislation that the language in the Classic case was intended to overrule the principle long established in this country that the qualification of electors is to be prescribed by the several States.

The principles enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Breedlove case and in the Classic case were again affirmed on October 13, 1941, when the Supreme Court denied certiorari in the case of *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 Fed. 2d. 218 (certiorari denied 86 L. ed. 68; 62 S. Ct., Rep. 64)). In *Pirtle* v. *Brown* the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, in a unanimous decision based largely on the Breedlove case, held the poll tax requirement constitutional. Thus the Supreme Court again placed the stamp of its approval on the Breedlove case and approved it as the controlling authority to sustain the validity of the poll tax qualification in elections solely for congressional Members.

There are numerous State-court decisions sustaining the validity of the poll-tax qualification. Time and space will not permit a review of all of these authorities. Suffice it to say that in the following States the courts are unanimous in holding that failure to pay a valid poll tax imposed as a condition of voting has the effect of disqualifying the voter and rendering his vote invalid: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and South Carolina. (See Annotation A. L. R., vol. 139, p. 572.)

Congress itself has heretofore recognized the principle discussed above, for on two occasions Congress proposed amendments to the Constitution. The sole purpose of each was to restrict the unlimited reserved power of the States over suffrage. The fifteenth amendment prohibits denial of the right to vote "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." And the nineteenth amendment prohibits such denial "on account of sex." If Congress had considered that it possessed the power to prohibit such denial, there would have been no necessity for these two amendments, since a prohibitory statute would have obtained the desired results in each case.

In other words, Mr. President, if Congress had believed that women suffrage could have been put through without a constitutional amendment, it would have done it, in those days. If Congress had believed that the other amendment relating to race, color, and previous condition of servitude could have been put through without a constitutional amendment, it would have done so, likewise, in those days. But the Constitution had to be amended to cover those points, and it is my belief, and it is what the Supreme Court has stated, that the Constitution must be amended to cover the subject of the poll tax.

Thus by submitting those two amendments Congress has construed the Constitution as reserving in the States full power over the qualification of voters, and the States by ratifying same have placed a like construction thereon.

All that has been said with reference to the qualification of electors for Members of the House of Representatives applies with equal force to the qualification for electors for Members of the United States Senate, for the obvious reason that the seventeenth amendment to the United States Constitution so provides. This amendment reads as follows:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, selected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

From the foregoing we clearly see that the imposition of a poll tax by Constitution or statute, and the payment thereof as a prerequisite to voting has been judicially determined by many of the State courts and by the Supreme Court of the United States to be within the constitutional rights of the several States. We also find that Congress itself has interpreted the Constitution to mean that the qualification of suffrage is power reserved to the several States, and this interpretation has been accepted by all of the States. Conversely, we find that the qualifications of an elector voting for Members of the House of Representatives are specifically defined by the Constitution of the United States in article I, section 2, and that the qualifications for electors voting for Members of the United States Senate are specifically defined in the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It therefore necessarily follows that since these qualifications of electors are defined in the Constitution, any attempt on the part of Congress to limit, restrict, or enlarge these qualifications by congressional action would be clearly unconstitutional.

CONCLUSION

The principle is as old as the Constitution of the United States and as new as the most recent decision of the Supreme Court on the issue that there is no Federal suffrage. The power to create such suffrage was not one granted to the Federal Government in the Constitution. The several States are the source of the right of suffrage. It is their function and prerogative alone to deal with that right. This principle has always been regarded as one of the bulwarks of the liberty of the American people, because it guarantees them against the ability of a Federal administration to perpetuate itself in power through Federal control of the ballot boxes of the Nation.

Certainly this is not the hour in our history for Congress to propose legislation in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States, as well as the customs and traditions of the people of the several States, all of which have been mellowed by age; and such action on the part of Congress would merely divide the country over domestic issues, while at the same time war clouds are gathering for the third time within one generation.

Respectfully submitted.

J. STROM THURMOND,
Governor of the State of South Carolina.
JOHN M. DANIEL,
Attorney General for the State of South Carolina.

MARCH 22, 1948.

Mr. President, I wanted to say a word about what I understood might happen this afternoon, namely, that the Senate might adjourn or recess over Saturday. I understand that many Members have work to do in their offices. There have been many committee meetings which many of the Senators have had to attend. So I understand that there may be no session tomorrow. As the distinguished President pro tempore knows, we had a meeting of the Armed Services Committee on the first day of the session, which lasted all morning. General Hershey appeared before the committee. He is to select men for the Army and the Navy. He went into full detail. He even discussed the draft in the First World War, under President Wilson. He discussed it at length with all of the members of the committee, in connection with the Second World War, in which, of course, he was the citizen who was put in charge so that it would not be a military appointment at that time.

In other words, he was considered a citizen whose duty it was, back in 1940, 1941, and 1942, and continuing throughout the war, to get soldiers necessary for

the Army and the sailors necessary for the Navy. He went into a discussion of the pool, there being some 9,000,000 between the ages of 19 and 25 as he estimated, who would be forced to register. Then he went into a long, detailed statement about the number coming of age each month and each year. I have forgotten the figures.

We spent the time until, as I remember, the President was about to speak, or it was the next day. There has been so much to do this week that it is hard to remember what happened on each day. But we had the President's address, and perhaps we have not been in the Senate as much as we should have been, there has been so much going on in the committees particularly, and I can understand why many Senators want to attend to their mail and various appointments tomorrow, Saturday.

Yesterday we had a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which heard Mr. McCabe in the morning at 10 o'clock. Then we had to rush over to the Senate at 12 o'clock to listen to the discussion of what was to be done, and what bills were to be brought up. Finally it was decided that the poll-tax bill would be brought up. Then yesterday afternoon again the Committee on Banking and Currency had a meeting which lasted all afternoon. Unfortunately, I had to be present yesterday afternoon in the Senate to listen to the debate, and had to prepare the few remarks I have made today, so I missed that meeting. But the committee met, as I remember, at 2:30 o'clock, and had a long list of witnesses, and most of the members of the committee remained throughout the meeting. This morning we started the meeting at 10 o'clock, before I could get through with my mail, and the witness, as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] stated a while ago, was Mr. John Snyder, the Secretary of the Treasury, who testified on the anti-inflation bill, which concerns title I and title II.

Title I, of course, is the bill on consumer credit which we passed in the committee last March, I think it was. In fact, our committee tried to keep that section in a free conference report last July. I happen to be a member of the free conference committee, but the House struck that out. We labored long and hard to keep it in, but we could not succeed. Then we passed the bill and sent it to the House, and it has been there ever since. That is, title I. I supported it, and I am glad I did. I think it should have been agreed to.

Title II concerned certain Reserve banks and what interest charges they might make and what reserves they might have. It is quite a long title. The chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. McCabe, testified on it at some length, and he had with him a book with charts showing what would happen and what would not happen if it were adopted.

What concerned me, and what concerned the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and others yesterday, was what would be the reaction of the 700 State banks which would be covered under this title. I heard the Senator from Indiana discussing the matter here today, and he said he questioned the States' rights end of it, that it would enable the Government to go into a State and tell the State bank examiner what he could prescribe for a State bank; and Mr. McCabe said he questioned that, too.

After quite a discussion was had, I came to the conclusion that perhaps Mr. McCabe was right and that we should have hearings over a period of several weeks, so that we would not do anything that would endanger the right of bank examiners and of State banks and those in charge of State banks, because we must remember that the Federal Reserve interfered in the State banks some years ago, when it made a ruling cutting out the exchange right the State banks had, and ruling that a State bank without a State could not charge exchange, which disrupted many State banks and caused confusion, particularly among the smaller banks in the smaller towns. The 700 State banks under the Federal law are in all the States of the Union, but the 700 Federal Reserve banks have a great deal more money on deposit and on loan, with more resources, so that the proportion would not be 50—50 so far as money was concerned, but in actual numbers it would be.

After Mr. McCabe talked about that matter—and he was quite frank in discussing it—he advocated only the Federal legislation. I cannot quite figure how it is possible to have 700 banks in 48 States operating under one law and 700 State banks in 48 States operating under another law. Some are bound to be done harm, and some are going to suffer.

I am glad the committee is meeting again this afternoon. I saw the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] leave the Senate Chamber to go to the meeting, and, of course, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] asked the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] a few questions before he left, and he went to the committee meeting. I do not see any of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency at present on the floor of the Senate, and I presume they are in attendance at the meeting. I have attended every meeting except the one now proceeding. Of course at this time it is my duty to be present here. So, I realize the work Senators have had to do. I am personally familiar with the operations of only two of the committees. I am not a member of the Committee on Education and Labor or Civil Service, or the Committee on Public Lands or Welfare and Public Works or the Committee on Foreign Relation. I know the Committee on Foreign Relations and the members of that committee have been under great strain, with the European situation as it is. I realize that the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] offered a resolution, I think day before yesterday, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for very, very careful study.

So, when I take into consideration all the committees, and what Senators have had to do, and the many meetings they have had to attend, I realize that other Senators, like me, have many problems to handle, and when the President called the Congress back into session, there were many matters in the Departments about which our constituents had talked when we were at home, and which they wanted looked after. In fact, I may say that several delegations have been here from my State, and I was happy to have them here, but all that takes time.

I hope that tomorrow I may be able to catch up with some of my mail, and I feel certain that by Monday, when we reassemble, I may have that all out of the way. I understand that on Monday we are to have a vote on the joint resolution offered by my colleague [Mr. JOHNSTON] for adjournment. If that shall not be agreed to, I understand we are to continue to discuss the merits of the poll-tax bill. In the meantime, if I shall not be here, I shall be in attendance on the Committee on Banking and Currency or some other committee.

Now to review what perhaps might be done about the housing bill. Much talk has been had about the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It has been discussed in committee and on the floor of the Senate. Naturally, there would be much discussion concerning it. The bill was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency after months of hearings. Last year such a bill was reported from the committee by a one-vote majority. This year again a housing bill was reported from the committee by a one-vote majority. It was debated at great length. Several substitutions were offered for it. At one time the attempt was made to do away with everything in it except title VI. Some attempted to do away with the slum-clearance provisions of the bill. Some attempted to do away with the financing provisions of the bill. Some suggested that provisions for supplying funds to States and cities be deleted, but that title VI remain in the bill. I cast my vote six times on that bill in committee and in the Senate. Every time I voted I voted in favor of the bill. Every time I voted I voted in favor of veterans' housing.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] read from page 3 of the Midyear Economic Report of the President that about 1,000,000 dwelling units were going to be built during 1948. I agree with him that housing construction has reached an all-time peak.

I want to see the housing bill pass. If we do not pass it this year what assurance do we have that it will be passed next year? I think the thing to do is pass it now. Let the veterans have the housing. Let us pass title VI of the bill. Let us pass the provision with respect to slum clearances. If it is desired to have an amendment placed in the bill to the effect that funds shall not be used for construction until materials are available, very well. We want to be fair. We put such a provision in the road bill we passed 2 or 3 years ago. At that time a great argument arose over the scarcity of materials. When such a question comes up there is always talk of scarcity of materials. That was always the great argument used. As I remember, we passed a road bill providing $7,500,000 in 1945 to develop highways and streets, to develop farm marketing roads, forest roads, and all kinds of roads. The question that was raised then in the Senate is the same question that is raised now. It was contended that there was a labor shortage, that there was a shortage of labor skills. Of course, there was such a shortage at that time, toward the end of the war. A similar question arose respecting materials. What were we going to do by way of materials? An amendment was placed in the bill providing that the money could be spent when materials and labor were available. So there will be no misunderstanding, I will read the language appearing at the bottom of page 3 of the President's midyear economic report as follows:

> Residential construction is expected to increase the total supply of dwelling units by more than a million during 1948. This high output has been accompanied by an increase in cost that is outrunning consumers' ability to pay for the housing they need.

I agree with that statement. The cost of houses is becoming entirely too high. Construction costs are becoming entirely too high. But that is no reason why we should not pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. That is no reason why we should not pass the bill containing a provision whereby we would place a limitation on funds until materials are available. We can spend or loan so much money based on the materials and labor available because the veterans must have some help. The veterans who made it possible for us to be in this Chamber today, who fought the war, are entitled to some aid.

The Senator from Wyoming said today—and he said it very excellently—that we did not ask these boys whom we took from school or from college or from home any questions. We simply took them. The Congress took them and placed them in the war. While they were in the war, profits were made by others who stayed at home. I, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, voted to establish an excess-profits tax. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who was at that time the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, after hearings were held on the subject, proposed the excess-profits-tax measure which took away excess profits from the firms engaged in making war materials.

Now residential construction is reaching an all-time high. More than 1,000,000 dwelling units will be added during the year 1948. Think of that, Mr. President. But that is not doing any good to speak of to the veterans. It will benefit only those who have good credit or have the funds with which to build. Therefore, we should pass the housing bill.

The economic report of the President continues:

> For 2 years it has been asserted that if matters were left alone there would be so great an increase in production that it would take care of prices. Increasing the supply of goods is, indeed, to be sought through every practicable means. But historically no important inflation has been cured in that manner.

Of course, Mr. President, everyone has his own ideas as to how to cure inflation. I neglected to state that after Mr. McCabe testified yesterday in the Committee on Banking and Currency for quite some time and had given his views, Mr. Eccles came and gave his views. Then this morning Mr. Snyder gave his views. So most of those who write the economic reports have varying views, just as Senators on this floor have varying views.

The report says:

> But, historically, no important inflation has been cured in that manner; nor has this one, despite the fact that every factor of high profits, heavy market demand, and large funds available for investment has been favorable to the expansion of production.

Production has expanded. But I was surprised to find from the Federal Reserve report on yesterday—I do not know if other Senators have read it or not—that they estimate the expanded production on the basis of dollars, which, of course, is a rather difficult way to understand production because prices have been increased so that if there is 100 percent production, we will say, in some article on the basis of dollars, it might not be more than 20 or 25 percent more of actual goods. It is quite difficult to get down to the actual amount of production increase there has been.

Mr. President, I voted for the European recovery program. Such a program naturally would make certain things scarce in this country, but, even so, I would vote for it again, for I believe it has and will continue to stop the pressing forward and closer to us of the iron curtain, and that the program has been of real help to the European nations who were our allies in World War II—France, England, Holland, the Netherlands, and our friends in the Mediterranean countries, as well as our friends in the Scandinavian countries. Yes; I voted for ERP, and I would vote for it again if it were brought up again. I am frank enough to admit that I believe it has made for certain scarcities in this country. Some persons say that it has caused all the scarcities that exist. In that I do not agree. Some people, however, say it does not affect the economy of our country. Mr. President, it does. If we export 10 percent of the goods we produce, it will make a difference to us. That is the 10 percent that makes inflation. Take the item of lumber. Shipload after shipload after shipload has gone from the town from which I come. Where does it go? It goes to Holland, to England, to France, and to other countries. Does anyone mean to tell me that that does not make a shortage of lumber at home? Of course it does. But I am happy to have had the privilege and pleasure of voting for the European recovery program, and I would do it again if it would be necessary. I assert, Mr. President, that that program has had much to do with bettering conditions in western Europe today. But it has increased the cost of goods. It has caused tremendous exports of many scarce commodities.

Today there was considerable discussion about the price of steel. I was very much interested, because Senators were talking about the effect of the exportation of steel. Of course, we have exported a great deal of steel. We cannot obtain any recovery in Europe without basic commodities which we use. This is no relief measure. This is no UNRRA program that we are now conducting. America has assumed world leadership and responsibility. Former Secretary Byrnes, Secretary Marshall, and others, after months of careful study, and following the great work which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and other members of the Foreign Relations Committee did, set up the plan now in effect, known as the European recovery program. The Congress determined to go along to the end, and to use every effort to prevent another war. The Congress determined to build up the democratic nations of Europe and to revive Christianity.

When the Congress established the recovery program it created a "watchdog" committee to watch the administration of the program, to see that it was a real recovery program, and to see that the funds went for recovery, and not relief. The funds were not intended to be handed out to the Communists, but were intended for worth-while relief, to rebuild Europe so that again there would be Christian democracy in the world, and so that there would be nations with which we could trade.

The Committee on Foreign Relations suggested, and there was placed in the bill, a provision that the nations receiving aid should do away with trade barriers, and that to the best of their ability they should balance their budgets. The European Recovery Act was one of the greatest acts ever passed by Congress. If we are willing to fight to keep out of world war III by exporting materials, we must be reconciled to the fact that we shall feel the effect at home. It is far better to export such materials and bring back our friends so that we can trade with them in future years than not to export them. But there is no use in saying that the program does not affect us, because it does.

I read further from the economic report of the President:

> The policy proclaimed in the Employment Act requires us to devise and adopt positive measures to stop the inflation and secure relative stabilization. It is not too late for preventive measures, and we are not yet forced by the tragic consequences of depression to adopt measures which would interfere with our free economy far more than would any or all of the measures I have proposed. I realize that the anti-inflationary program I have offered will impede some business plans, will curb some profit opportunities, and may limit some wage advances. It is of the very essence of a plan to counteract inflation that this be done. All groups will ultimately benefit when it is done.

Mr. President, I do not take issue with those who say that the program might impede some business plans or curb some profit opportunities, because I realize that that will be necessary. I am in thorough accord with the statement with regard to employment. There has been no depression. There is no unemployment. There are more people working today than ever before. Wages are better today than they have ever been in the history of the country. It is true that prices are too high, but every time

wages are increased and everytime we increase the production of materials made by workers receiving increased wages, whether in the form of a tractor on the farm, or a loom in a cotton mill, naturally prices go up.

I wished to express my opinion about inflation. I am in agreement with those who believe that the European recovery plan has to a certain extent caused a little increase in prices, and will in the future cause a little increase in prices. But let me say again, so that there may be no misunderstanding, that I would vote for the European recovery plan every time, notwithstanding the increase in prices.

In 1943 I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with the War Department appropriation. I voted for one appropriation bill which contained an appropriation of $60,000,000,000 for the War Department. As I recall, there was an appropriation of $30,000,000,000 for the Navy. We spent nearly $100,000,000,000 in 1 year on the Army and Navy. As everyone knows, we now owe approximately $250,000,000,000. I suppose the total amount spent during the war would reach approximately $450,000,000,000, taking into consideration the taxes collected. So after voting for an appropriation of $60,000,000,000 for the Army to make weapons with which to shoot and kill people and to develop the atomic bomb—because the Manhattan project happened to be included in that bill—I am glad that I had the opportunity to vote for an appropriation of $4,000,000,000 to try to prevent a war.

I read further from the economic report of the President:

Employment in the first half of this year ran continuously above the level of a year ago. Some 850,000 workers were added to the labor force, yet unemployment in June was only 2,200,000—400,000 less than a year earlier. June civilian employment set a new record of 61,300,000.

Industrial production reached a new postwar peak in February, and after the work stoppage in coal mining approached it again in June. Improved industrial relations and high business confidence reinforced by increased Government commitments for foreign aid and defense give promise of continuing high-level output for the rest of the year.

There has been considerable discussion about labor. I am delighted to know that, according to the President, there are improved industrial relations, and that there is high business confidence, reinforced by increased Government commitments for foreign aid and defense.

Reading further from the President's economic report:

Agricultural production ran below the level of the first half of last year because smaller numbers of livestock and tight feed supplies have reduced the output of most livestock products. At midyear, our second largest wheat crop was being harvested, and generally favorable crop reports were high-lighted by an indicated production of over 3,300,000,000 bushels of corn—a new record. While such a crop could not remedy the meat shortage during the rest of this year, it would provide the basis for more ample supplies of livestock products in 1949 and thereafter.

I am delighted to know that the chances are that we shall have more livestock supplies in 1949. I hope that will prove to be a fact, and that the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture, about which I read in the press, will not take effect. That recommendation called for reduced production of beef cattle, hogs, chickens, and eggs. The President's report distinctly says that we have an excellent chance to increase production, because of the larger grain crops of 1949.

I read further from the President's economic report:

Consumer income ran at an annual rate of about $203,000,000,000, compared with $195,000,000,000 in 1947. Consumer income after taxes increased from a rate of $174,000,000,000 to a rate of $186,000,000,000.

Consumer expenditure, as a result of some buyer hesitation in the first quarter, increased less than disposable income, leaving a small increase in net consumer saving.

The distribution of income, according to the most recent data, has changed but little since 1946. A survey of families, however, showed half the Nation's consumer spending units falling substantially behind in the race of incomes with living costs during 1947. One-fourth of the family units spent more than they earned. Low-income people were spending past savings predominantly for current expenses, higher income people more often spending theirs for durable goods or converting them into residential or business investments.

Mr. President, that is exactly what I said—that the higher-income people would get the benefit of the 1,000,000-unit increase in dwellings.

I repeat:

Residential construction is expected to increase the total supply of dwelling units by more than a million during 1948.

Again I say there is no excuse for not enacting the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

As to the distribution of income, the report states that—

A survey of families, however, showed half the Nation's consumer spending units falling substantially behind in the race of incomes with living costs during 1947. One-fourth of the family units spent more than they earned. Low-income people were spending past savings predominantly for current expenses—

Imagine that, Mr. President; we find that they were spending not just what they were making but what they had saved—

higher income people more often spending theirs for durable goods or converting them into residential or business investments.

Consumer credit continued to expand during the first half of 1948.

Business investment took a larger share of the national output in the first half of 1948 than during 1947. Equipment outlays have been exceptionally high since the war; plant construction expenditures have increased less strikingly. Present indications are that such outlays will continue high throughout the rest of the year. Nonfarm inventories increased markedly during the first quarter of the year, when sales lagged, but leveled off in the second quarter as sales picked up.

Profits exceeded last year's average, reflecting higher prices for a high volume of output. First-quarter data, however, indicated a drop in profits of small manufacturing firms.

Mr. President, I repeat that, because I always have believed that this would be one of the biggest years of national income we ever have had, and so I had no hesitancy in voting for the tax-reduction bill, so as to take from the backs of the taxpayers some of the burdens they bore. I voted for that bill for several reasons. One was that we included in the bill the provision for the splitting of incomes between husbands and wives. The State of South Carolina and other States had such a provision on the basis of their original constitutions. In addition, the bill drops from the tax rolls thousands and thousands of income-tax payers. Of course, we know that we had a large surplus last year, and I figured that we would have approximately the same surplus this year, even with the reduction of taxes, because even then, as this report states—

Profits exceeded last year's average, reflecting high prices for a high volume of output.

The report goes on to say:

First-quarter data, however, indicated a drop in profits of small manufacturing firms.

I have understood that the large firms have made more money than ever, but that there are some small firms that have made less money. I am indeed sorry for that situation, and it should be reversed. I hope it can be reversed in the next quarter, and that if there is to be any lessening of profits, it will be among the large firms, rather than among the smaller ones. But of course the lack of various strategic materials, such as steel, lumber, and so forth, probably is responsible for this condition.

I read further from the report:

Net foreign investment, at less than half the rate of the last quarter of 1947, in part reflected decreases in exports and increases in imports in our trade with all continents. The foreign-aid program will increase our surplus of exports during the rest of the year.

Mr. President, I think the reason why much of the foreign shipments fell off at that particular time was that Army and Navy surplus war materials and materials handled by various other Government agencies, and certainly all the surplus property left over from the war, was shipped in 1946 and the early part of 1947. In fact, most of that business was done in the early part of that year. I think that is the reason why exports fell off. As the President's report points out here, I think the foreign-aid program will increase our surplus of exports during the rest of the year. In other words, it will increase from now on, because we are in the midst of the European recovery program; and although between the closing of UNRRA operations and the shipment of materials from the War Assets Administration, and the surpluses of the Army and the Navy there was a little lull, I am certain that shipments will materially increase now. There is already a good demand for lumber, logs, some cotton, and some textiles in my part of the country.

I read further:

Wages continued the third round of increases that began last fall though interrupted by the break in commodity prices. Most of the third round increases have roughly corresponded to the rise in cost of living since the previous contract.

Of course that is their report. In some cases I think that would be correct, but in some instances among white-collar workers and other classes of workers I think that would be incorrect. I do not think their wages have followed the increase in prices.

I read further:

Foreign aid and defense expenditures during the present fiscal year will increase pressure on the domestic economy.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that statement, because that is what I was claiming before I came to this part of the report. It is just my idea:

Foreign aid and defense expenditures during the present fiscal year will increase pressure on the domestic economy.

Of course it will increase pressure on the domestic economy. We cannot export cotton, wheat, corn, lumber, logs, steel, and various other critical materials, some of which are in short supply, without affecting the economy. But, Mr. President, if we are exporting them in connection with a program to put the European recovery plan into operation and to get Europe back on its feet, it will be well done.

I read further:

New defense expenditures will not be great during the next few months, but will rise thereafter. Both programs have a special impact upon such short-supply items as steel, other metals, and farm machinery, and will draw increasingly upon our already fully employed labor force. More adequate allocation authority is needed if we are to avoid progressively more serious disruptive effects of these programs upon supplies, prices, and the organization of production.

The reduction in income taxes will reduce Federal revenues by about $5,000,000,000 at the same time that expenditures will be substantially increasing under the new programs. The deflationary influence of recent Government cash surpluses will thus be replaced by the inflationary influence of additional expenditures on the part of consumers whose tax burdens are reduced.

The general outlook as to inflation shows conflicting influences. On the one side, the supply situation in a number of industries is improved over a year ago. Bountiful crops are in prospect. Postwar expansion programs are nearing completion in many lines of production, and we should experience a gradual increase in output from an enlarged and modernized industrial plant. Commendable caution continues to be shown by business in avoiding speculative overexpansion, and many leaders in both industry and labor can be applauded for the conscious restraint they have exhibited in their pricing policies and wage demands.

The immediate situation is dominated, however, by three interacting processes making for continued inflation. First, consumer demand for goods and services, business demand for investment goods, and demands arising from expanding Government defense and foreign-aid programs press strongly upon production. Second, we are currently in the midst of a round of substantial wage and price increases in major basic industries. These developments foreshadow continuing and ramifying effects on cost structures and prices in many related lines of production, on the cost of living, and on further wage demands. Third, credit expansion, partly a cause and partly a result of inflation, still persists.

The facts add up to a clear and disconcerting conclusion. In spite of some favorable factors, we are in the very midst of gathering inflationary forces, which day by day are imposing additional hardships upon countless families, and day by day are undermining the foundations of the remarkably high level of postwar prosperity that we have thus far maintained.

The hard facts of today leave no room for complacency. Though most people are optimistic about the immediate business outlook, lasting prosperity is not assured.

Mr. President, nobody can assure lasting prosperity. I was very much concerned to read in the paper that Mr. Eccles had predicted a depression, but on reading further I saw that he had merely predicted a depression, without saying when.

Even in the midst of the present prosperity, the average American sees that the value of his accumulated savings has declined, and that many of his neighbors living on pensions or fixed salaries are actually worse off than they were a year ago.

Let us note that, about that being incorrect. That is one reason why I said that, in many industries, wages and salaries did not keep up with price rises.

Looking abroad, we see that, despite great progress, many countries are still far below the living standards needed for sustained production and are dependent on outside help for any hope of further advance. We must be on our guard lest our national prosperity and security be undermined by inflation at home or by misery abroad.

Our American prosperity depends in part on world events, but far more on our own action or inaction right here at home. More than 90 percent of all the goods and services that we produce are for domestic purposes.

But thus far we have shown a blind disregard of the dangers that beset our path. Despite my repeated warnings and recommendations, we have not adopted adequate legislation for controlling inflation. The failure to control inflation effectively in the past makes it increasingly urgent that we adopt and apply vigorous measures to guide us safely from the uneven postwar boom to an era of sustained and stable prosperity.

We are now challenged to carry out the pledge to the American people contained in the Employment Act of 1946 that it shall be the policy of our Government to "utilize all its plans, functions, and resources • • • to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power," in an economy of free competitive enterprise.

It is no less important to take action to forestall a business collapse than it is to use Government measures to overcome a depression once it has arrived. Our success in this effort is essential for the reconstruction of a peaceful world.

Mr. President, we had a recommended program here, and the economic report was presented this morning. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] suggested it be read, but the Chair ruled that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] had the floor, as I remember. I was seated in the rear of the Senate Chamber and did not hear all that was said. Of course, no one questioned the ruling by the Chair. I do not say that it should have been questioned. No one questioned it, and the report was not read. I think at this time certain portions of the report should be read into the RECORD. I may read the recommended program:

[Excerpt from the President's message to the Congress, July 27, 1948]

Positive action by this Government is long overdue. It must be taken now.

That goes into all the President's recommendations.

Under the heading "The economic situation at midyear 1948," contained in the Midyear Economic Report to the President by the Council of Economic Advisers, we read:

I. EMPLOYMENT, PRODUCTION, AND PURCHASING POWER

We enter the second half of 1948 with our labor force fully employed, with total production high, and with inflationary pressures continuing. A review of some major economic events of the first half of 1948 will indicate where we stand and what trends can be foreseen.

THE COURSE OF EMPLOYMENT

The employment situation has continued strong, with the demand for labor so active that a relatively large inflow of additional workers was readily absorbed. There were about 850,000 more workers in the labor force in the first half of 1948 than a year ago, nearly double the rise that would have been expected on the basis of population changes and prewar trends. This increase was due mainly to the abundance of job opportunities at good wages, but it also appears that the pressure of living costs induced many housewives and teen-agers to seek jobs.

Total nonagricultural employment rose to record peacetime levels, while agricultural employment was somewhat below 1947.

Mr. President, that is a bad situation, when so many people have left the farms and when agricultural employment has gone down so much that it has become one reason for the lack of even more increased production. Production has been increased a great deal. Of course, farm machinery has displaced a great deal of farm labor. There are all kinds of farm machines, including the cotton-picking machine, which has itself replaced a great deal of labor. It is still regrettable to me to note that farm labor continues to decrease.

In June, civilian employment stood at 61,300,000, compared with 60,100,000 a year earlier. (See chart 1 and appendix C, table 7.) Thus, 60,000,000 jobs becomes a floor to be protected by every means possible in the future, no longer an objective that the faint-hearted said our business enterprise could not attain.

With more than 61,000,000 in civilian employment, the unemployment figures have continued low. There were 2,200,000 persons unemployed in June of this year, compared with 2,600,000 in June 1947. While some workers in certain areas had difficulty in finding suitable work, there has been no general unemployment problem. In fact, some employers have continued to have trouble in securing the types of labor they needed.

The broad underlying demand for additional workers has been felt in almost all major lines. Construction has been setting the pace, but significant gains have occurred also in manufacturing, finance, and services. Employment in mining, transportation, and public utilities, and Government has changed little. (See appendix C, table 8.)

On the other hand, the leather industry experienced a greater than usual seasonal down-turn this spring, followed by a substantial recovery in June. Employment in the

rubber industry has been declining steadily, averaging about 10 percent below the first half of 1947.

CHART 1. LABOR FORCE

Civilian employment in June exceeded 61,000,000 for the first time. Unemployment continued at a very low level.

There appears at this point in the report a chart with respect to employment in agriculture and nonagriculture and in the armed forces, and also with respect to unemployment. The report then continues with a lengthy discussion, as follows:

THE COURSE OF PRODUCTION

Total production has maintained very high levels. The output of industrial goods (including minerals and manufactured goods) for the 6 months was not quite 3 percent above the 1947 average level. (See chart 2 and appendix C, tables 11 and 12.) As to particular industries, the volume of construction and the output of electric and gas utilities have both been running considerably higher than last year. Transportation just about equaled the levels of a year ago. Basic industries such as steel, chemicals, and construction have operated close to present capacities. The petroleum industry has had difficulty keeping up with demand even though running with wide-open throttle. Consumers' goods continued, in general, at high-level production.

The short corn crop of 1947 resulted in a tight feed situation and, in combination with declining numbers of livestock, led to reduced marketings of livestock products in the first half of 1948. The total volume of farm marketings in the first half of this year was about 7 percent below the level of a year earlier.

The output of goods would have been even higher but for certain specific shortages—notably of fuel, electric power, freight cars, and steel. These shortages continue to impede expansion, but there has been some improvement over 1947.

While industrial disputes, particularly in coal mining, reduced output considerably in March and April, the return of coal mining to normal operation has resulted in a substantial improvement in industrial output during May and June. By midyear, industrial production approximately regained the postwar peak reached in February. The fragmentary evidence available indicates some improvement in labor productivity during the first half of 1948.

PRODUCTION PROSPECTS

The heavy demands of consumers, business, government, and foreign buyers for the output of American farms and industries emphasize the urgent need to expand production. The production outlook for the coming half year is good, but not significantly better than in the last half of 1947 or the first half of this year.

Since we are currently operating at maximum employment and maximum capacity in most fields, any further increase in production is dependent largely upon increased efficiency and improved technology. Such gains cannot be very great in the short span of a few months or a single year. Other factors such as weather, industrial relations, and business psychology are likely to have a far more influential short-run effect.

On these counts, the immediate prospect seems promising. Industrial relations, while disturbed in some industries, promise to be better than they were in the first half of the year, particularly since relatively few major wage contracts come up for negotiation in the late summer and fall. Forward commitments under the foreign aid and defense programs, added to the vigor of the domestic market, give confidence to merchants, manufacturers, and bankers.

In June 1948, there were 2,200,000 more persons working in nonagricultural employment than a year ago. The flow of materials, while still not adequate in the durable goods fields, should permit production to proceed with fewer interruptions than we have witnessed during the past year. There is a likelihood that nonagricultural production in the second half of the year may be slightly higher than it was in the first half.

In agriculture, the season of damaging floods is past, and present crop prospects are excellent. If the favorable weather we have enjoyed so far this season should continue, we may hope for a record-breaking corn crop and a general level of crop production rivaling 1946, the best previous year.

Animal products present a different picture. The number of cattle on farms and ranches has been declining since 1945. Dairy-cow numbers are down to prewar levels. Sheep numbers are the lowest in over 75 years. There are fewer hogs on farms than last year, and the spring pig crop was down 3 percent. The numbers both of laying hens and of young chickens are lower than a year ago. The combination of the reduced livestock population and the continuing tight feed supply means inevitably that the output of most livestock products will continue to run less than last year, until some months after the new corn crop comes in this fall.

Favorable crops may more than offset the unfavorable livestock prospect to make the total output of our farms somewhat higher than last year. But in the case of crops especially, much of this year's production does not come to market until next year. A bumper corn crop may even reduce this year's meat production by encouraging holding animals over for heavier feeding. Consequently farm marketings, in physical terms, will continue to run less than a year ago. For 1948 as a whole they will probably be down 3 or 4 percent. Domestic consumption of food for 1948 will show about the same decrease, around 3 percent on a per capita basis. Food exports will be down somewhat, but the reduction will be chiefly in cereals and, to a smaller degree, in edible fats and oils. Meat and most other livestock products, the shortage of which will be most keenly felt in coming months, have been exported in only relatively minor amounts.

Domestic food consumption will continue above prewar levels. But in relation to postwar levels of demand we must expect, during the remainder of 1948, a relatively tight supply of food, which is the largest component in the workers' cost of living.

THE FLOW OF GOODS AND PURCHASING POWER

The gross national product, that is, the total value of goods and services, which ran at an annual rate of $227,400,000,000 during the first half of 1947, and $235,900,000,000 during the second half, rose to an annual rate of $246,500,000,000 during the first half of 1948. (See appendix C, table 1.) The increasing flow of income and expenditures can best be shown in the accounts of consumers, domestic business, international transactions, and government.

CONSUMER INCOME, EXPENDITURE, AND SAVING

Consumer income: Personal income, which expanded at an annual rate of nearly $10,000,000,000 from the first half of 1947 to the second half, leveled off in 1948 at approximately the December rate of $208,000,000,000. (See appendix C, table 4.) Employment and wage rates continued to increase, but the upward trend in cash farm income was very slight.

TABLE 1.—*Per capita disposable income, current dollars and 1947 dollars*

PERSONAL INCOME AFTER TAXES

Period	Current dollars	1947 dollars[1]
1939	536	850
1946	1,127	1,283
Annual rates, seasonally adjusted:		
1947—First half	1,179	1,208
Second half	1,229	1,200
1948—First half[2]	1,274	1,209

[1] Deflated by the consumers' price index, which does not fully reflect changes in the cost of living of all groups of consumers.
[2] Estimates based on incomplete data.

NOTE.—The figures in this table are based on revised estimates and are different from those published in previous economic reports of the President.
Sources: Department of Commerce and Department of Labor. (See appendix C, table 6.)

Real per capita purchasing power dropped from 1946 to 1947, as stated in earlier reports. No measurable change occurred in the first half of this year, the rise in the over-all average of money income per person being just about offset by the rise in retail prices.

In a period of rising prices and high-living costs, the distribution of consumer income becomes increasingly important. Of particular significance is the progressive deterioration in the economic position of those individuals and families whose dollar incomes have fallen far behind in the race with rising prices. Comprehensive statistics on income distribution for the first half of this year are not available. A survey comparing 1946 and 1947 showed that 30 percent of all families (spending units) had no appreciable increase in dollar incomes and almost 20 percent suffered a reduction, during a period when consumer prices increased nearly 15 percent.

While the disappearance of large-scale unemployment and the increase in the number of gainfully employed persons per family tended to narrow the disparity among incomes during the war period and immediately thereafter, this trend has been arrested more recently. As there are relatively more people with fixed incomes in the lower income brackets than in the higher brackets, the favorable effects of full employment upon the distribution of income have been offset by the unfavorable effects of inflation during the past year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from South Carolina finish with the message today?

Mr. MAYBANK. I have omitted a great deal of the message concerning the poll-tax legislation which we fought in 1942, awaiting my other speech, under rule IX. I have been reading the President's economic report because I purposely wanted to retain the 1942 hearings and testimony before the Judiciary Committee at that time for my next speech.

Mr. WHERRY. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, I feel that unless there is something else to be brought before the Senate, and if the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has concluded, we might recess.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have 2 or 3 minutes to make a few remarks, and I should like to do it in my own time, if I might.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina yields the floor, and the Senator from Oregon is recognized.

THE FIRST WEEK OF THE SPECIAL SESSION—OBJECTIVES WHICH SHOULD BE ATTAINED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take just 2 or 3 minutes to express my views on the progress or lack of progress made to date in 1 week of the special session of the Congress.

I think it is obvious that, with the eyes of the Nation on Congress, certainly the first thing the President should have done before he called the special session of Congress was to call a special session of Democrats to see if any unity whatsoever could be obtained on any phase of the program for which he called the Congress back in session because, if anything has been demonstrated here this week, it has been the fact of a complete lack of unity on the Democratic side of the Senate.

We are confronted now with what is obviously the beginning of a prolonged filibuster on one section of the President's program; namely, the civil-rights section. I do not think the Congress should adjourn without the clear responsibility for this situation being placed on the Democratic side of the aisle because the Republican side all week, for hours past now, has been ready and willing to proceed to vote on a motion to take up for consideration House bill 29, the anti-poll-tax bill, but we cannot even secure action on that simple motion because the Democratic Members of this body, by their prolonged and quite irrelevant speeches on the subject, refuse to let us come to a vote.

I think it is very important that the people of the United States should place the responsibility where it belongs and should realize that good government in this Nation is going to be endangered so long as there is this great split between the White House and the President's own party in the Congress, and between the White House and the Congress as a whole. This illustrates very clearly the desirability of proceeding as rapidly as we can—and the first opportunity will be in November—to elect a President with a majority of his own party in the Congress.

Conditions being what they are, and the international crisis being what it is, the welfare of your country and mine, Mr. President, demands that the American people take action at a free ballot box at the first opportunity, to see to it that the deadlock between the White House and the Congress is brought to an end, so that we may put into effect the forward-looking program and platform my party adopted at Philadelphia.

I am aware of the fact that in the special session there is an opportunity for us at least to try to make a constructive march forward in an endeavor to put that platform into operation, but I think we have had a demonstration here for a week which ought to make crystal clear to the American people why in this special session of Congress we are stymied because it is perfectly clear that the President's party itself is not united behind him in going forward with the program he proposes.

I think on the basis of my record in the Senate I have demonstrated that I am sufficiently nonpartisan, at least when great nonpartisan issues are before the people, to put the blame for nonaction where it belongs. I am perfectly aware of the fact that if we stay in special session—and I underline the word "if"—then there is an obligation on this side of the aisle to make up its mind next week as to what issues we are going to press for final determination in this special session of the Congress.

I recognize that in this first week of the session it has been necessary for the committees of the Senate to give due consideration to the various proposals the President has recommended to the Congress and to the bills which are being developed and framed as a result of those proposals; but I say to the members of my party on this side of the aisle that they cannot escape the gaze which 145,000,000 American people are fixing on us these days, and by next week I am satisfied the American people are going to ask us in this body, "What is going to be your answer on the issues presented to you?"

Mr. President, if we are to proceed on the anti-poll-tax issue—and there is certainly justification for getting the civil-rights question out of the way at the beginning of this special session of Congress—then let us face that issue openly and frankly, and with a united determination to break the prospective filibuster which the Democrats in the Senate obviously contemplate imposing upon us. If our decision is to press for the civil-rights program, then, when we meet on Monday, let there be no more adjournments of the Senate until we break the filibuster, and if it means we have to stay here 24 hours a day for a week, the junior Senator from Oregon here and now says he is ready to remain.

If, on the other hand, after we consider this matter thoroughly, and the possibility of our disposing of a civil-rights program in the special session of Congress, we believe that there has been a sufficient demonstration of a united determination by a group of Democratic Senators to prevent the passage of a civil-rights program in this session of the Congress, let us say so openly and frankly to the American people, but let us also make clear to them, as Republicans, that, come January, when we have a Republican President and a substantial majority of Republicans in both Houses of Congress, we intend then to keep faith with the Republican platform plank on civil rights, adopted at Philadelphia, and at the regular session, press and put through a civil-rights program, so that under the Constitution equality will be afforded to all Americans, and let us break the filibuster at that time.

I have said before on the floor of the Senate that I think the best time to break a filibuster is at the beginning of a regular session. At one time I submitted a resolution which would give us an opportunity to proceed with such a program. In order to break the filibuster I suggested in January that we do something, which is long overdue, namely, proceed to amend the rules of the Senate so that a filibuster cannot be imposed on motions and questions which are now not under the rules of the Senate by precedent defined as "measures" within rule XXII. In other words, we must amend rule XXII so as to bring under the cloture meaning of that rule motions affecting the Journal and motions relating to any item of business that comes before the Senate, because until we adopt such an amendment, then of course those who will to filibuster can filibuster on a great many items that do not come within the definition of the term "measure," as its meaning has already been interpreted under rule XXII.

There is something else, Mr. President. We mean business in facing this filibuster evil in the Senate of the United States, and, as I have said before, it is an evil because it threatens majority rule. I say that, Mr. President, as one who, under the rule on occasion has debated at great length and has filibustered, but I have done so in order to protect the rights of the minority in the Senate.

If we are going to adopt a rule which would bring to an end the filibuster in the Senate—and we should adopt such a rule soon—then let us so amend the rules that minorities will not be trampled upon by a predominant majority in the Senate of the United States.

I refer again to my antifilibuster resolution which is pending on the books of the Senate, which would give, after cloture, a minimum of 2 hours of debate to every Member of the Senate, with the privilege of farming out a part or all of his 2 hours to any other Senator. I say that that important provision in my antifilibuster resolution will protect to the maximum extent necessary minority rights in the Senate. Until that is done, Mr. President, I, of course, would take the position, as I did on a past occasion, that we must protect the minority, so that adequate time for debate on the merits may be guaranteed.

Mr. President, if we decide next week that a clear demonstration has been made to the American people by a disunited Democratic Party in the Senate of the United States that a civil-rights program cannot be passed in this special session of Congress, then I think we should look into the question of prices and housing. My mail, and not only my mail, but several hundred telegrams I have received today, make perfectly clear that the consumers of America recognize that we are on the threshold of a great economic crash unless something is done and done speedily, about it. I have no doubt in my mind, Mr. President, that we cannot continue with this spiral of ever-upward higher prices and not find ourselves in a very serious economic condition within a very few months.

I say to the leadership of my party that I think the political history of America makes perfectly clear that, regardless of who is in control of the Congress and the White House at the time a great economic crash occurs, whatever party is in

control at that time receives, rightly or wrongly, the blame of the American people for the crash. We only have to go back a few years to the crash of 1932 for complete support of the observation I have just made.

If the economic spiral of ever-increasing prices continues, and we win the election in November, as I am sure we shall, and we do not take the necessary steps to do whatever Government can do to protect the consumers from the great economic hardships that inflation is causing them, we, the Republicans, are going to receive the blame if a crash occurs. We may find ourselves as early as 1952 out of office because of the fact that we did not do all we could have done or that the people think we should have done to prevent a crash. So I say to the leadership of my party that there is no escaping the fact that as we sit here in these historic days, from the standpoint of the future of the Republican Party, we are dealing with some very vital matters as to our future.

Of course, I believe that there should be a maximum of voluntarism in this country. I am at a complete loss to understand why the great industrialists of America, the great business leaders of America, the farm leaders and the labor leaders, and the leaders of various economic groups, cannot read the handwriting on the wall, because the script is large, Mr. President, and those who can see certainly should be able to read it if they have any intelligence at all left in their heads.

We cannot price millions upon millions of free Americans out of homes and not reap a repercussion of political consequences, no matter what party may be in power at the time. The fact is that today millions of Americans cannot buy homes. They cannot buy homes which are available, because they cannot afford to pay the prices the homes cost and they know, as we know, that most of such homes are overpriced—and mark my figures, Mr. President—at least 33⅓ percent, and in many instances more than 50 percent.

Oh, I would that a program of voluntarism for which we have pleaded in the Congress of the United States the past 2 years, would be made to work by those who can put it to work. The only ones who can put it to work are, of course, the leaders in the building-construction industry, including the leaders of labor. I wish to say to my labor friends, Mr. President, that they have everything to lose and nothing to gain by this constant pressure for higher and higher and higher wages. I realize, of course, that they must have the money with which to meet the high prices, but the fact remains that the constantly pressing up of wages is one, though only one, of the causes of this ever-increasing spiral.

I wish to say to American industry, and to those who have been reaping profits, exorbitant profits, from overpriced homes, that they will have none but themselves to blame when the crash comes and they find the homes dumped onto the market to the great economic detriment of the building industry.

Oh, I would that the leaders of industry and of labor and of agriculture had been cooperating for months past. Yes, Mr. President, under the legislation we passed in the last session of Congress, I would that the President of the United States had kept faith with us, had given us the cooperation for which he pleaded from us, and had called a series of conferences of the representatives of industry and labor and agriculture in an attempt to make a good-faith start toward putting a democratic system of voluntarism into operation. It has not been done. The result is that today we are faced with a serious economic crisis all over the land, and people are confused.

There is something more, Mr. President. Most American people are rapidly becoming exceedingly resentful. Let Senators read their mail. Let them read such telegrams as I received today. There can be no denying the fact that the American people are calling on the Congress of the United States for action. They do not know what action they want, because they, too, are not sure of the facts; but they are sure of one fact, which is that their savings are disappearing, their debts are climbing, and they cannot meet the high cost of living inflation is placing upon them.

Therefore, I am frankly willing, as I know my colleagues are on this side of the aisle, to let the answer to the one question which should determine our conduct in this session of Congress be determinative of the action we take. That question should be asked of each of us, and we should seek the answer. What are the facts about the economic crisis which confronts us? Secondly, what, if anything, can be done by legislation to answer those facts?

I am not one who takes the position that government is ever helpless to meet a crisis confronting its people. I am not one who takes the position that any legislation which seeks to impose reasonable restrictions upon greed and selfishness—legislation passed by the representatives of the people elected through a free ballot box—endangers democracy. We can unite as a people to protect our national safety and to make possible a free economy, as we did from Pearl Harbor to VJ-day, while prosecuting successfully a great war. I say that we can unite now—yes; even in the midst of an election campaign—as a Congress, to protect the economic interests of our people from a threat to their economy which I think is as serious, so far as the economy is concerned, as the threat which existed following Pearl Harbor. It is not so dramatic, it is not so easily understood, but the fact is that we must unite to win the peace on the home front as well as on the foreign front. I fear that today we are losing the fight in both places.

I did not want the Senate to adjourn this week end until I had at least voiced my prayer and expressed my hope that next week the leadership of my party—as I am sure it will—will decide which course of action will be taken at the beginning of the week—whether we shall proceed with the civil-rights legislation, or whether we shall accept the demonstration of the past week, which makes it perfectly clear that there is no intention on the part of the Democratic side of the aisle to permit a fair consideration of the civil-rights issue in the few short weeks we can be expected to remain in session during the special session. If the latter should be our decision, I think we should write out next week what we think can be done in the short period of time which is available to us.

Make no mistake, Mr. President. I know, and I think we can make clear to the American people, that in 2 weeks, 3 weeks, or a month we could not possibly begin to cover the manifold subject matters which the President submitted to us in his special-session message. We could not do a statesmanlike job on those many subjects in less than 6 months at the minimum. I believe that 9 months would be required to do a real job.

There are some things we can do. We can face the fact which presents itself with regard to credit. We can take note of the undeniable objective fact that installment buying in the United States has now reached the greatest height in all our history—greater than before the crash of 1929.

We can take note of some other objective facts. There is a great deal of uncertainty and rush for cover on the economic plane on the part of a great many persons who still possess some money. What can they do to hedge? That is the question they are asking. They are asking, "How can we preserve what we have been able to save?" When we see the people so restless in the economic field, we see the first signs of economic hysteria. So I think we can do something about bank credit.

As the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] pointed out earlier this afternoon, for months past the President of the United States could have done something about it. After all, we must do those things which will stop the cheapening of the dollar, because the basic problem is the problem relating to the value of the dollar. I believe that we have some credit controls which could be placed in operation, and I hope will be placed in operation, in order to prevent the further devaluation of the dollar. I am perfectly willing that the committee assigned to the task of considering the proposal shall come forward with facts supporting its conclusion, facing openly the question of allocation of scarce materials.

There is no doubt about the fact that that question is basic to our problem. Drive across the country, as I have, and see vitally needed building materials going into nonessential building, from coast to coast; see steel girders going up for race tracks and stadiums; recognize the tremendous waste when we are dealing with questions of essential use in a time of shortage of building material; recognize the great waste which has characterized building for the past 12 months, and you cannot deny the fact that the housing needs and rights of the American people justify a free government elected by free people in saying, "You cannot proceed to use vitally needed materials, which are in short supply, for such nonessential uses while millions of families go unhoused."

What is there about such a proposal which conflicts one iota with sound democratic principles of constitutional government? To the contrary, I say

that if we are to keep faith with the duties of representation as set forth in the Constitution, we, the Congress, can do no less than bring to bear reasonable and fair regulations upon our economy in such a period of crisis.

The question which faces us on this side of the aisle as we adjourn for the week end is, How far are we willing to go in recognizing the fact—and I say that it is the fact—that the voluntary system, without any regulation by Government during the past 12 months has resulted in a type of exploitation and profiteering on the part of some segments of our economy which our Government must halt by fair and reasonable legislation? I have no doubt that my party will do so next January. If it is possible in this short period of time to prepare the data so that we can act intelligently on the subject before adjournment, I think we should do so.

In conclusion, let me say that I believe that next week ought to bring forth a decision as to whether or not we are to recognize that the disunity of the Democratic Party is so great that we cannot succeed in passing a desirable legislative program at this session of Congress, and go home and take this issue to the American people in the election; or whether we are to decide to make an attempt to pass the minimum legislative program which can be passed in this special session of Congress, in the face of Democratic opposition, which will at least check, to the extent we can check by law, the threatening, rising, spiraling inflation which I think will end in an economic "bust" unless the Government does something about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29.

THE STOPPING OF INFLATION—RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am about to ask that the Senate take a recess until Monday noon. Before doing so, I should like to say, in response to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, that at that time the pending business will be the question which has just been stated by the distinguished occupant of the chair, the President pro tempore of the Senate. We shall proceed to consider that motion until we can either agree to it or terminate the discussion in some other manner.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon has made an eloquent plea for action. I assure him and other Members of the Senate, and also the American people, that so far as I am concerned, I subscribe once again to the statement issued by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], chairman of the policy committee, in behalf of the leadership on this side, that the Congress is ready and willing at this session to consider any legislation having to do with stopping inflation which can be processed through committees and brought to the floor for debate. I think all of us agree that that is the main problem, and that if anything can be done it will be done.

Certainly we have before us a bill which is being offered by the President of the United States. It was introduced by the candidate for Vice President on the Democratic ticket, and the bill is now being considered before the House committee. After the hearings are concluded in the House committee or in the Senate committee, if the proposed legislation is brought to the floor, it will be debated.

However, as we close this day's session, in view of the fact that the issue was raised this afternoon, it seems that if price ceilings are to be imposed and a complete over-all control of prices and wages is to be instituted, the sooner we on this side of the aisle find out whether the Senators on the other side of the aisle are or are not backing the President's program, the better it will be in the consideration of legislation along that line. I was dumfounded this afternoon, when we were trying to find out whether there would be cooperation in connection with this bill, to observe that time and time again the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] refused to answer the question whether he would support title III of the proposed legislation. Certainly if we are to have unity of action and cooperation, the least we should know is whether the Democratic Senators, those on the other side of the aisle, will back up this bill or whether they will not back it up. Certainly we have a right to know that; and, Mr. President, believe me, I, for one, am going to find out whether the Senators want it or whether they do not want it. If the Senator from Wyoming, who was mentioned as a possible candidate on the Democratic ticket for Vice President, is not in favor of this bill the sooner we find out what his remedy is for curing the meat situation, the better off all of us will be in settling the great issue that is confronting us now.

So, Mr. President, I think we should do a great deal of thinking between now and Monday morning. I am going to do so.

I say once again that, so far as I am concerned, whether it is a special session or not, whether it was called for any reason other than in the interest of the American people, I am ready—yes, prayerfully anxious—to do anything that can be done to promote the welfare of the American people at this particular time; and I shall lend what leadership and ability and industry I have to see that proper measures are brought out and, I hope, are passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, and then I hope they will receive the same kind of consideration when they reach the White House.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, August 2, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 30 (legislative day of July 28), 1948:

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hon. Aubrey B. Fennell, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. (Judge Fennell is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 7, 1948.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 3, district of Alaska. (Judge Dimond is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 10, 1948.)

SUPREME COURT OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Hon Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Emil C. Peters, term expired.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Edward A. Towse, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Albert M. Cristy, elevated.

Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii. (Judge Moore is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947.)

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 28, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, by Thy mercies we are spared and by Thy power we are sustained. Inspire us daily to live and labor in faithfulness and in the fear of the Lord. Establish within us those loyalties and integrities which cannot be shaken.

We pray that we may be more responsive to Thy voice, calling us to minister to the needs of humanity with hearts of compassion and hands of helpfulness.

Grant that our minds may be impervious to all thoughts of personal aggrandizement. Deliver us from every selfish propensity and from those attitudes which are alien to the spirit of the Master.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 30, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators desire to present matters for insertion in the RECORD. I feel that I should not be in a position of being accused of farming out time. I desire to comply with the mandate laid down by the President pro tempore at the beginning of the special session. Therefore I shall be glad to yield for insertions and

routine matters; but if Senators wish to make speeches, I trust they will do so in their own time.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the sixth special session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico for the period May 14 to 21, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIM PAID BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, the payment of a tort claim by that Commission under the Federal Tort Claims Act from the date of the enactment of that act through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from K. A. Parker, president, Louisiana Democratic Civic Association, New Orleans, La., praying for the confirmation of the nomination of A. Miles Pratt to be collector of customs for the port of New Orleans; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from May Taylor, of Denver, Colo., remonstrating against any increase in the number of Federal employees, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Workmen's Circle of the National Executive Committee, signed by Ephim H. Jashurin, president, and Joseph Baskin, general secretary, New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation submitted by the President to the special session of the Eightieth Congress; ordered to lie on the table.

A petition signed by sundry citizens of the States of New York and New Jersey, praying for the enactment of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, etc.; ordered to lie on the table.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Shanghai Refugee Council, Shanghai, China, praying immediate relief for 5,000 European displaced persons in Shanghai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRICE CONTROLS—RESOLUTION OF MONTANA STOCKGROWERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the sixty-fourth annual meeting of the Montana Stockgrowers' Association at Bozeman, Mont., May 13 to 15, 1948, protesting against price and rationing controls.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Resolution 16

"Price control

"Whereas President Truman has requested that Congress grant him authority to reinstate such price and rationing controls on food and other products as he deems necessary to regulate prices and consumption; and

"Whereas such regimentation was accepted by the American people as a war measure justified only by the danger to the Nation requiring emergency measures; and

"Whereas no such emergency can now be claimed to exist to justify such a sacrifice of individual rights and responsibilities, particularly when experience shows that the controls demanded are foredoomed to failure: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we again point out that production and efficient utilization provide the most effective controls upon prices and distribution, and we express our opposition to price and rationing controls."

This is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 16 adopted by vote of the members of the Montana Stockgrowers' Association in its sixty-fourth annual meeting at Bozeman, Mont., May 13, 14, 15, 1948.

Attest: E. A. PHILLIPS,
Secretary.

HIGH-VOLTAGE LINE FROM STERLING, COLO., TO NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the board of directors of the Nebraska Association of Rural Public Power District and Membership Association, Inc., at its regular meeting held July 26, 1948, favoring the appropriation of sufficient funds to cover the engineering and construction costs of building a high-voltage line by the Bureau of Reclamation from Sterling, Colo., to North Platte, Nebr.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is a dire shortage of electric power in the State of Nebraska due to the rapid increase in demand, the inability of the public power system (the hydros) to have had installed generating capacity sufficient to meet the need for electricity; and

Whereas this shortage of current, according to the estimates of well qualified persons will continue to be so serious and severe even after the plants now being rushed to completion by the Public Power System are put into operation in 1949, that use of electricity on the farms of Nebraska will have to be curtailed unless additional facilities are made available; and

Whereas this condition will continue until 1954, when it is expected current will be available to Nebraska from the Fort Randall project in South Dakota; and

Whereas the Reclamation Bureau has stated 30,000 kilowatts of electric energy from Bureau projects in Colorado could be made available by 1950–51 provided a transmission line is built from Sterling, Colo., to North Platte, Nebr., and thus materially relieve the situation; and

Whereas it has been the desire of the Bureau of Reclamation to construct said transmission line, as soon as funds were available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Association of Rural Public Power District and Membership Association, Inc., urges Congress, while now in session, to appropriate sufficient funds to cover the engineering and construction costs of building a high-voltage line by the Bureau of Reclamation from Sterling, Colo., to North Platte, Nebr.; and be it further

Resolved, That this association, representing and speaking for 33 rural electrification districts and associations in Nebraska, and the 65,000 farm and rural customers served by those projects, urgently requests the entire Nebraska delegation in Congress to place these resolutions before the proper congressional committees and to work diligently to secure the appropriation of said funds during this present session of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to Members of Congress, the rural electrification projects of Nebraska, and other interested persons and organizations.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE RUSSIAN ALLIANCE, INC.

During the delivery of the speech of Senator ROBERTSON of Virginia,

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Connecticut for an insertion in the RECORD with the understanding that I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). With the definite understanding that such yielding does not prejudice the rights of the Senator from Virginia to the floor, the request is, without objection, agreed to.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that yesterday afternoon, in Bridgeport, Conn., there was held a large meeting of American citizens of Russian extraction, several thousand being in attendance. Those present at that meeting adopted a resolution attesting to their loyalty to the United States of America as citizens, and to their belief in our fundamental principles of living and government, and in the American way of life.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That we, gathered here today, Sunday, August 1, 1948, in Stadler's Park, Bridgeport, Conn., comprising over 5,000 American citizens, and, as members of the Holy Ghost Russian Orthodox Church and the Carpatho Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, do hereby unanimously manifest and reaffirm our love and faith in the American way of life, and that we, as American citizens, are proud to demonstrate our complete loyalty to the United States Government, and to uphold the Constitution which guarantees us real freedom and equality. God bless America.

RUSSIAN ALLIANCE, INC.,
JOHN POPP, *Chairman*,
STEPHEN JANKURA,
Cochairman.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2916. A bill for the relief of Donato Dipinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 2917. A bill to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation and to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal field service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 2918. A bill for the relief of Emery and Eleanor Nussbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2919. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgages of certain veterans' housing corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. MORSE) introduced Senate bill 2920, to require payment to certain employees of the District of Columbia of the additional compensation authorized by the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2921. A bill for the relief of Antonia Raczyk Drozdowski; and

S. 2922. A bill for the relief of Helena B. M. Rebalska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY AT DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION SECONDING THE NOMINATION OF SENATOR BARKLEY

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the Democratic National Convention, seconding the nomination of Senator BARKLEY for the Vice Presidency of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

COL. JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him concerning the distinguished record of Col. James P. S. Devereux, United States Marine Corps, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY RALPH E. BECKER AT THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Ralph E. Becker, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, before the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia on June 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY H. GRAHAM MORRISON TO THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF TENNESSEE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. H. Graham Morrison, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, to the sixty-seventh annual session of the Bar Association of Tennessee on June 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three newspaper articles discussing the subject matter of Senate Resolution 200, relating to the counting of electoral votes, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX AND PROHIBITION—EDITORIAL FROM THE DAILY OKLAHOMAN

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Poll Tax and Prohibition," published in the Daily Oklahoman of July 31, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE QUESTION OF INFLATION—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to inflation, entitled "How Serious and How Sincere," written by Walter Lippmann, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PAPER DOLLAR—EDITORIAL BY FELIX MORLEY

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Paper Dollar," written by Felix Morley, and published in the Pathfinder of July 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW WORLD

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Priest Denies Charges DP Bill Is Anti-Catholic," published in the New World of July 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTIC ACTIVITIES IN UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON—EDITORIAL FROM THE SEATTLE POST-INTELLIGENCER

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The University and the Canwell Inquiry," published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—TESTIMONY OF MARRINER S. ECCLES

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Eccles Hits Back," published in the Washington Evening Star of Sunday, August 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TOLERANCE IN SOLUTION OF RACIAL PROBLEM—ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column entitled "Gradual and Expanding Tolerance Seen as Only Way To Solve Racial Problems," by Dorothy Thompson, from the Washington Star of July 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

By unanimous consent, on request of Mr. FERGUSON, the investigating committee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments granted permission to conduct the hearings.

By unanimous consent, on request of Mr. CAIN, the Committee on Banking and Currency was granted permission to sit during the session of the Senate today.

THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION—LETTER FROM JOHN W. STUDEBAKER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, by Mr. John W. Studebaker, former Commissioner of Education of the United States, which I believe it would be well worth while for every Member of the Senate to read.

I merely wish to point out that Mr. Studebaker for 14 years was Commissioner of Education, and made an outstanding contribution in that position for the benefit of education in the United States. I think some of the points he makes in his letter are of great concern to the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 30, 1948.*

Hon. OSCAR R. EWING,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: In my letter of resignation, dated June 14, 1948, addressed to the President, I stated the basic reason why it seemed inadvisable for me to remain longer in the Government service beyond July 15; namely, the impossibility of providing for the proverbial rainy day with the top salary allowed for the Commissioner of Education.

Now, however, I desire to supplement various communications I sent you and conversations I had with you while in office on matters having to do with your policies of organization and administration, for the purpose of pointing out again some of the implications of the program you have had under way during recent months.

In summary it is my considered opinion that if your purposes and program are carried out you will do great harm not only to proper and adequate work of the United States Office of Education, but indeed also to the vital need for Federal participation in the support of equal educational opportunity among the States.

Before going further I wish to say that in presenting certain facts and points of view herein, I do not feel the slightest personal animus toward you or anyone else, regardless of the extent to which I obviously share with educators and the people in general a deep anxiety concerning the functions and control of education.

While of course many of your policies and administrative procedures affect the other constituent or operating organizations of the Federal Security Agency (U. S. Public Health Service, Social Security and Welfare Administration, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Food and Drug Administration), I shall not presume to speak for them, although I know there exists great uneasiness and a markedly low morale among the personnel of all branches of the Agency. Nor do I wish here to write at length relative to the adverse effects of your program on education. I shall therefore confine my statements to some basic principles and a few illustrations.

A fundamental fault in your policies lies, it seems to me, in your failure to recognize that imaginative, competent, and productive work in any institution or agency is done by imaginative, competent, and zestful individuals who are happy in their work and who are eager to assume and carry responsibility, not by elaborate, regimental schemes of organization. Your program of administration therefore violates the great principle which has energized American life—the encouragement of personal responsibility; it violates the principle of decentralization and distribution of initiative and responsibility, which results in great strength and productivity in the Nation because there is great strength and productivity among its millions of individual citizens.

Your program develops frustration and a feeling of futility among the employed personnel because individuals and units of individuals in the agency cannot control the means to the ends for which they are responsible.

The most successful private and public enterprises are those in which to the maximum practicable extent the spheres of authority

and of responsibility of individuals and of units of individuals are kept identical. Your program leaves responsibility with people down the line in the organization, so to speak, but strips away from them the control of the essential means by which their responsibility must be executed. You vest authority in your immediate staff members, but they are not and will not be held responsible by the people for any shortcomings or failures of the operating organizations of the agency. As frustration and futility develop, responsibility for the exercise of initiative, for the use of judgment, for securing results, also tends to move up the line. Here we see at work what might be called bureaucratic statism within a government originally dedicated to the principle of individual responsibility and respect for personality. Thorough regimentation always has been and always will be destructive of individual responsibility, a quality vital to the continued progress of our country.

Let me illustrate. For many years, always I assume since the United States Office of Education was established 81 years ago, and I know during 7 (1934-41) of the 14 years while I was Commissioner of Education, the articles, bulletins, addresses on educational matters were written freely by the professional people in the Office of Education in their respective special fields and were published. Sensing their individual responsibility, these professional people sought advice from competent persons from time to time, even though they were writing in their own fields of competence. So far as I know there was never any difficulty or embarrassment experienced by the Office of Education as a result of this policy.

After Pearl Harbor and during the war, there was a willingness that the OWI should check and approve all public statements. We were at war and citizens generally accepted necessary wartime controls. We in the Office of Education naturally assumed that with the war ended such controls of professional writing would be relinquished. They were not only continued, but they have been made more sweeping, complete, and time consuming within the Federal Security Agency. Now, any statement written by anyone in the Office of Education to be presented to any group or audience outside the Office, must be submitted to someone on your immediate staff for approval. These approvals, of course, involve statements ranging all the way from articles on such technical questions as planning science classrooms to the more general problems of education.

A specific example may be cited. Last April one of the staff members of the Office of Education, a well-trained man, with excellent experience in secondary education, was invited to speak to the high-school principals of the State of Massachusetts. He was to speak on the subject Teaching Zeal for American Democracy. Under an appropriation by Congress for 1948 made to the Office of Education, specific reference was made by the Congress to the need for such a program and especially for an educational program that would make clear to our young people the nature and tactics of communism and other forms of totalitarianism.

This man in the Office of Education himself decided to read his address. He prepared it. Consequently, under your regulations the address had to be submitted to your staff for approval. A few paragraphs of the address stressed the importance of developing means of teaching high-school pupils what communism really is, how inimical it is to the free world. Your staff member in a written comment said in part, "Much of this is very good. However, the Office of Education should, I am convinced, leave to the State Department and to the FBI the task of exposing the tactics and dangers of Russian and native Communists and travelers."

Now in the light of the main purpose of Congress in making the afore-mentioned appropriation, an action obviously based on a clear recognition of the great need for an educational program that would adequately inform young people concerning the serious conflict between totalitarianism and freedom, is it not amazing that a leading educator in the United States Office of Education operating under a thoroughly bipartisan mandate of Congress should be told by one who had been put in a position to tell the Office of Education what it could and could not do, that the educational task of "exposing the tactics and the dangers of Russian and native Communists and travelers" should be "left to the State Department and the FBI"?

All of us in education fully appreciate the parts that the State Department and the FBI should play in exposing Communists. These agencies know what their parts are and they know their function is not to work with schools and colleges on the development of educational programs dealing with this problem. To accept the dictum that the educational "task of exposing communism" should be left to these agencies would be tantamount to not having this vitally important educational task done at all, at least so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

The result was that the man from the Office of Education abandoned the plan to present a written address. He had no time to try to revise it and to receive approval. He therefore held an off-the-record meeting with the Massachusetts high-school principals. In the meeting he said, ad libitum, all he had on his mind and heart about how education can help in the solution of a problem the magnitude of which is daily becoming more apparent to everyone. Thus, the representative of the Office of Education was able to express his opinion to the principals of Massachusetts, and that's what the principals wanted. They had not requested the opinion of someone on your immediate staff not known to them.

Another illustration. I made an address at the University of California at Los Angeles last March entitled "Education and the Fate of Democracy." Senator KNOWLAND, of California, as you know, is chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Federal Security Agency and the Office of Education. The Senator, being very much interested in the whole subject, had the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the address, among other things, about communism, I said the following: "Whether or not the Communist Party in this country should be outlawed, I do not presume to say. But of this I am convinced: That no avowed or proven Communist is fit to be entrusted with the job of inculcating the American way of life in any school; and I make that statement on the rather obvious ground that education for American democracy cannot be entrusted to the enemies of American democracy."

Since the Office of Education has had only a relatively small appropriation for printing, every reasonable economy has been exercised in carrying out the major purpose of the Office as provided in its basic act; namely, to diffuse information about education.

The California address was printed on one sheet of paper. I requested enough copies so that one copy could be sent to each college, one to each public and private high school, and one to each superintendent of schools. The Office of Education requisition for these copies, to be paid for by the Office (about $250), was held up by one of your staff for several days and was only approved after he and I had engaged in a vigorous discussion of the matter in which for the most part he was trying to convince me that such language as I used in the address should be toned down and that if the address were released (this in spite of the fact that it had already been printed in the public record), he felt sure it would bring unfavorable reaction from a large number of educators. It was released and distributed in May. I have heard no objection from anyone.

Last December, copy was read for a special issue of the monthly periodical School Life. The issue was to be devoted entirely to contrasting totalitarianism and freedom and in pointing up various educational implications of the conflict. I was away when the manuscript, in accordance with your regulations, was submitted to your staff for approval. It was reported to me later that there was very definite resistance by another one of your staff to the entire publication. It was finally published and has been a Government best seller ever since.

These are only two illustrations of the way in which your policies leave the professional people in the Office of Education responsible for achieving fruitful results in helping to improve American education while transferring to your immediate staff the authority to control the means and procedures by which these professional people carry their responsibility. This divorcement of responsibility and authority with respect to the work of the Office of Education necessarily results in the same divorcement in the divisions and sections of the Office and with all of its individuals. The result is a strange feeling of uncertainty and fear among employees. The whole scheme is well designed to devitalize and demoralize the staff.

Apparently you do not feel that your present, large, immediate staff can control, to the extent you desire, the detailed activities within the Office of Education and the other constituent organizations of the agency having to do with publications, editorial work, and information services. Accordingly under date of May 26, last, you had an order issued under which you propose to centralize in your office all personnel now engaged in such services in the various constituent organizations, including the Office of Education. Under the order you propose to transfer 17 people from the supervision of the Office of Education to the administrative supervision of the office of the Administrator, in spite of the fact that the appropriation that supports these people was made to the Office of Education.

I pointed out in my memorandum under date of June 12, 1948, the inappropriateness of the proposal and ways in which it would, if executed, work to the disadvantage of the services which the Office of Education is expected to render. My purpose here is merely to reinforce the arguments I made in that memorandum. In it I tried to make clear the intimate relationships which exist between the services of these people and the work of all other persons in the Office. Verbally I had reported to you and other members of your staff that it has been the plan of the Office of Education to decentralize as much as possible among the several divisions of the Office of Education these types of services rather than to build up a large central staff even within the Office of Education. Eighty-one years of experience in the Office of Education proved the validity of the plans as formulated. Therefore it is not surprising that there should be among the personnel of the Office of Education such an unfavorable reaction to your proposal.

There can be no honest claim to economy in the transfer of administrative control which you propose. The 17 persons in the Office of Education have been working as hard and as efficiently as people could work. Besides, they have been working intelligently and enthusiastically because they were closely associated with the other people in the Office to whose work their services are directly related. Merely to aggregate them with others in a centralized organization operating at a greater distance from those with whom they are expected to work and to put them under the supervision of someone on your staff who is not primarily interested in

education will certainly reduce both their efficiency and enthusiasm, so far as education is concerned.

In another order issued by your office under date of June 12, entitled "Agency Office of Publications and Reports" the following statements are made:

In accordance with the Administrator's memorandum of May 26, relative to information service the following should be understood by all concerned:

1. There will be a central information office under the direction of the Director of Publications and Reports.

2. Job classification sheets which have been applicable up to this time will be used until such time as it is possible to develop new sheets consistent with the organization to be established in the office of the Administrator.

3. As indicated in the original memorandum all persons will remain on the pay rolls of the constituents for the fiscal year 1949.

4. The 1950 budget will be prepared in such a way as to show in the Administrator's budget an Office of Publications and Reports consisting of the Office of Publications and Reports, Office of the Administrator, plus transfers made by the Congress from the Social Security Administration Informational Service. Other information jobs will be budgeted so that they will appear on the pay rolls of the constituents.

Apart from the gross weaknesses in the proposed arrangement which I have tried to point out in this letter and elsewhere, does it not seem even to you illogical that the constituent units of the Federal Security Agency should be expected to prepare and justify appropriation estimates to include persons to be carried on the pay rolls of the respective constituents to work in the fields under discussion, but to work under the direction of the Director of Publications and Reports on your staff? If it is logical and proper that these persons should be centralized into one unit for the Agency in general to be supervised administratively by your Director, would it not also seem logical and proper that they should be supported on a pay roll secured under an appropriation made in terms of the policy of administration which you propose to follow?

In other words, why do you propose to have them carried on the pay rolls supported by appropriations made by Congress to respective contituent units of the Agency, and then put them under the administrative supervision of someone on the Administrator's office staff? If they should be thus supervised (of course I do not believe they should) why are they not to be justified in the 1950 budget estimates as a part of the Administrator's office?

Under the arrangement you propose I do not see how Members of the Congress can act intelligently as they consider appropriations which must of necessity, be related to lines of organizational administration. Your plan seems to me to make nonsense of the serious efforts of Congressmen to consider requested appropriations in terms of the location of the direct responsibility for the administration of the functions to be supported by the appropriations.

No doubt you think of the Federal Security Agency as just one large monolithic welfare organization. Consequently you think of education as merely one phase of welfare. When the problem is understood, very few people will agree with your conception. But if you really believe that the relationships between social security and education, health, and education, and social security and health are exceedingly intimate and that education as a function in this country should be quite exclusively related to and integrated with health and welfare functions (I certainly do not), then you should ask the Congress for a single appropriation for a Federal Office of Welfare. But since the function of education is not a welfare function, since it necessarily represents a wide range of human interests and operates through well-defined agencies and institutions, it should be supported by an appropriation made to the United States Office of Education in terms of justifications presented to Congress and break-downs therein determined.

These are some of the evidences of how your policy and program seems to obliterate the identity and the unity of action of the respective constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency; namely, the United States Public Health Service, Social Security Administration, United States Office of Education, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration. There are others. Your order requiring the elimination of the words "United States" before the term "Public Health Service" and "Office of Education" in every case where it could be appropriately done; your suggestion that you did not see the sense in having an annual report for each of the constituent units, but only one for the Federal Security Agency as a whole; your policy to have yourself quoted in public releases even on technical matters of statistics and other reports of a factual character based on research of highly professional technicians instead of having these technicians and their immediate supervisors quoted exclusively, all point to a trend toward centralization which is, as I have stated above, destructive of morale, of initiative, and of the kind of productive work on the part of a large number of employees to which the tax-paying public is entitled.

Finally the capstone of the argument against the centralization of control which you are developing, at least so far as education is concerned, is to be found in the fact that you are admittedly a partisan politician. You work hard for your party. Personally I have the most wholesome respect for our party system of government in the United States. I have never met finer men and women than those elected by both major parties to membership in the National Congress. But there is a deep-rooted tradition in this country, born of the harrowing experiences of the centuries, that the function of education in a democracy should be completely removed from partisanship. Political party control of public education is destructive of democracy and has proved to be so down through the years and especially in recent decades in Italy, Germany, Russia, and Japan.

Being a partisan, you secure to the extent possible, as your immediate associates persons who share your partisanship. Under the direction of yourself and of these associates you move constantly to centralize all policies, all approvals, in short all control of the activities of the constituent organizations, including education. These controls contemplate the approval of personnel, of budgets, of substantive programs, and practically all details connected therewith. I am certain that such management of education on the Federal level is not what the great rank and file of the people of this country desire. On the contrary, they want the United States Office of Education to provide an adequate staff of competent professional educators who are in their positions to carry out the nonpartisan purposes for which the Office was established; they want a continuation of the devoted and completely nonpolitical professional service to American education that characterizes the work of the superior men and women who now comprise the staff of the Office of Education.

The American people may justly be proud of the personnel of the United States Office of Education. Every person in the office has been selected through Civil Service in open competition and solely on the basis of his personal and professional qualifications. In my 14 years of intimate association with the employees in the office, I never saw the slightest indication on the part of any one of them of any political party preference. Their lives are not actuated by partisanship; their backgrounds, their professional pride, their sense of obligation to true education in a democracy guide them in an unswerving devotion to the high calling of teaching. These are the kinds of people who in the Federal Government and in the States can really help education through schools and colleges to make its unique contribution to the preservation of our American free way of life. They are giving their lives passionately to that great objective. It isn't strange then that they, together with their colleagues throughout the country and citizens in general, regardless of political affiliation, should resent any attempts to color education with partisanship and cause its policies and processes to yield advantages to a political party.

This letter has become much longer than I intended. That is because there is so much to say on the subject.

I am sending copies of this letter to Dr. Willard Givens and Dr. E. B. Norton, who are, respectively, the executive secretaries of the National Education Association and the National Council of Chief State School Officers, organizations which, among many others, always have been active in efforts to secure a more adequate United States Office of Education and to insure such policies and methods of administration of educational activities in the Federal Government as would encourage sound programs of education in the States. I am also sending copies to the two chairmen of the Subcommittees on Appropriations for the Office of Education, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND and Representative FRANK B. KEEFE.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN W. STUDEBAKER.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS—LETTER FROM PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am indebted to the Reverend Father Ralph G. Kutz, of Festus, Mo., for calling my attention to a document of historic interest. It is a letter written by the Honorable Harry S. Truman, at that time a Senator from Missouri, to the editor of the St. Louis Star-Times, and published on the editorial page of that newspaper under date of March 6, 1944.

A tax bill had just been vetoed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Senator Truman complained that the language used by President Roosevelt in his veto message was unnecessarily harsh. Senator Truman wrote:

Had the President returned the tax bill with a plain statement that he did not think it produced enough revenue and would have to have one to cause a heavier tax return I don't think there is a doubt in the world but what both the Senate and the House of Representatives would have supported the veto, but when he attacked the integrity and the intelligence of the Senate and the House of Representatives he got just exactly what was coming to him. The vast majority of the legislative branch of the Government is just as hard working and just as patriotic as any other branch of the Government, and it is my opinion they are much more patriotic than some of the administrators who have been charged with the carrying out of the war effort on the home front. A little more common sense in the administrative approach to things that have to be done and a little less demagoguery for the purpose of appealing to the ignorant and uninformed would make it much easier to carry on the

war effort and to win the war that much more quickly.

Senator Truman continued further:

The bulwark of free Government is the elected legislative branch of the Government which holds the purse strings, and which has the power to levy taxes upon the people to meet the expense of the Government. I honestly think the founding fathers believed the Congress to be the most important branch of the Government or they would not have outlined its organization and its powers first in the Constitution.

May I interpolate that this reference to "the purse strings" is reminiscent of President Truman's impromptu remarks preceding his Jefferson-Jackson day dinner address, on February 19, 1943, when he declared: "Conditions are too grave in the world at this time to put a Congress in control of the purse strings of the country."

Senator Truman, in his letter to the Star-Times, paid his respects to the press of the United States in the following language:

Ever since I have been in the Senate it has been the policy of the majority of the press of the United States to make it appear that the legislative branch of the Government is made up of morons and that there are no men of intelligence in Congress. That policy has been pursued by the press of the United States and your editorial is no exception. When it was in the public interest for the Congress to cooperate with the President in carrying out the program to meet the depression the press almost unanimously called us a bunch of pin-heads and rubber-stamps, but when we assert any rights under the Constitution to control the appropriation of money and the levying of taxes we get exactly the same result. Now what is it you want—a dictatorship or a republic? For my own part I want a republic.

Finally Senator Truman summed up the proper relationship between the executive and regislative branches of the Government. He said, referring to President Franklin D. Roosevelt:

He must merit our respect just as we merit his, and demagogic veto messages will not create that respect.

I am glad to share this interesting letter with my colleagues of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD in full as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR, STAR-TIMES:

I read with much interest your editorial with regard to the Barkley incident, and I am somewhat surprised at your slant on that affair. No man on earth is perfect—I don't care whether he is President of the United States or the editor of a great metropolitan newspaper. There is not a possibility for any man to be right all the time, particularly when he has a big job to perform as the President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the armed forces has at this time.

The President has been consistently neglecting his political contacts ever since 1936, and in my opinion Senator BARKLEY should have kicked over the traces long ago. Remember, that in a republic politics is government. When you imply that the Congress has no intelligence and that it is merely a place where men of no brains congregate I rather think you are doing the bulwark of free government a slight injustice, to say the least.

Had the President returned the tax bill with a plain statement that he did not think it produced enough revenue and would have to have one to cause a heavier tax return, I don't think there is a doubt in the world but what both the Senate and the House of Representatives would have supported the veto; but when he attacks the integrity and the intelligence of the Senate and the House of Representatives he got just exactly what was coming to him. The vast majority of the legislative branch of the Government is just as hard working and just as patriotic as any other branch of the Government, and it is my opinion they are much more patriotic than some of the administrators who have been charged with the carrying out of the war effort on the home front. A little more common sense in the administrative approach to things that have to be done and a little less demagoguery for the purpose of appealing to the ignorant and uninformed would make it much easier to carry on the war effort and to win the war that much more quickly.

The administrative management of the whole program has been a headache, and I don't think anyone is in a position to know more about it than I am. It has been my job to find the weak points and suggest that they be remedied.

The bulwark of free government is the elected legislative branch of the government which holds the purse strings, and which has the power to levy taxes upon the people to meet the expense of the Government. I honestly think the founding fathers believed the Congress to be the most important branch of the Government or they would not have outlined its organization and its powers first in the Constitution.

I have always been of the opinion that the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives should not under any circumstances have any interest or any personal connections with the executive branch of the Government. I think it is our business to outline the policies and then follow them through by investigation to find out if these policies are being carried out as the people intended them to be carried out. I believe in party responsibility, and when we depart from party responsibility and a two-party system with a strong and virile opposition we will simply depart from free government.

No man in an executive position can carry on his program and the politics [sic] outlined by the legislative branch unless he has an administrative set-up which is loyal to him and which will work with him.

I think the President was right in taking members of the opposition party in his Cabinet when the war broke out. He was endeavoring to get full cooperation from all sections of the country, but when he puts the operation of the Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board in the hands of his bitter enemies he can expect to get the results he is now getting from the representatives of the people. These local administrators who are against the President make the enforcement of these distasteful laws just as hard and inconvenient to the people as they possibly can.

Ever since I have been in the Senate it has been the policy of the majority of the press of the United States to make it appear that the legislative branch of the Government is made up of morons and that there are no men of intelligence in Congress. That policy has been pursued by the press of the United States and your editorial is no exception. When it was in the public interest for the Congress to cooperate with the President in carrying out the program to meet the depression the press almost unanimously called us a bunch of pinheads and rubber stamps, but when we assert any rights under the Constitution to control the appropriation of money and the levying of taxes we get exactly the same result. Now what is it you want—a dictatorship or a republic? For my own part, I want a republic. I think Senator BARKLEY did a heroic thing and I think he did the right thing.

I have been a consistent supporter of the President and expect to continue that policy, but I have never hesitated to call attention to mistakes and bad administration when I know they exist. I shall continue to do just that. As I said in the beginning, no man is perfect and no man can be entrusted with too much power. The Congress is the only check on administrative mistakes and administrative power.

The Congress has given the President all the power and all the money he has asked for to meet every emergency as it has come up. They have done that for 11 years, and they will continue to do it. However, he must merit our respect just as we merit his, and demagogic veto messages will not create that respect.

HARRY S TRUMAN,
United States Senate.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask to whom the letter was addressed?

Mr. KEM. It was addressed to the editor of the St. Louis Star-Times, and appeared on the editorial page of that newspaper on Monday, March 6, 1944, page 10.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement with regard to the international wheat agreement, now pending before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since 1941, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and in my votes on the floor of the Senate, I have gone along, have supported in the main, the bipartisan foreign policy which we decided held the best prospects for a peaceful postwar world, and for the future prosperity and happiness and security of the people of the United States. I supported the United Nations Charter, the British loan, Bretton Woods, Greek-Turkish aid, the Marshall program, approving the principle in general that we could well afford to take the calculated risks involved in the interest of a better and safer world.

The most of these programs have been based on the United States giving much and taking little—aside from the calculated risks involved. I am not criticizing that at all. As I say, I went along, and am not voicing any regrets that I did so.

Now comes up the international wheat agreement, one of the few proposals which at least attempt to give some direct returns, in the future, to an important segment of the national economy of the United States. And I am disturbed to find a disposition in some quarters to reject the proposed agreement, almost, I might say, without real consideration of its purported merits and demerits.

The proposed agreement, in the nature of a treaty between the United States and 35 other nations, is a well-considered attempt by the 36 nations concerned to try out, for a 5-year period, a plan by which the three nations which ordinarily produce wheat in surplus quantities agree to supply 500,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat annually to the 33 nations which ordinarily have to import wheat if their people have enough bread to eat.

On the other hand, the 33 importing nations agree to take 500,000,000 bushels of wheat from the 3 exporting nations during the 5-year trial period. The United States share of wheat exports covered by the agreement is 185,000,000 bushels. That is considerably better than 100,000,000 bushels more than we can expect to export after the world gets going again, judging from past history. The other 315,000,000 bushels are divided between Canada and Australia.

It is true that Argentina and Soviet Russia, the other two big exporting nations, have refused to come into the agreement. Argentina stayed out, I take it, for economic reasons, gambling she can do better on her own. Russia's reasons for staying out, I take it, are more political than economic. What surplus Russia has we may expect her to use to further Russian political interests.

I am aware that our present foreign policy apparently requires that the United States, at times, consider the interests and policies of the rest of the world ahead of our own interests. But I do not understand that we are obligated to take either Russia or Argentina as our guides in all matters relating to our own welfare.

As of today, I would not say that our wheat growers would be satisfied with the range of prices provided in the agreement. These are, as the members of the committee know, a maximum of $2 a bushel (in storage at Fort William or Port Arthur, Canada) for No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat. According to the Department of Agriculture and Herman A. Praeger, president of the Kansas Farm Bureau, that would mean around $1.87 at Kansas City. According to the grain trade, $1.78 at Kansas City. The minimum would be $1.50 this marketing year (same basing points) and would drop 10 cents a year to $1.10 minimum the fifth year.

The prices for each year would be fixed by agreements between the governments; sales would be through private trade agencies, in theory at least. I will say that the grain trade and the millers have made very good arguments against entering into any such agreements. I am not particularly disputing the points they make. I realize the possibility that the agreement recognizes the possibility of state trading rather than private trading in international trade. I do not know whether this particular agreement will add much to that situation, under present world conditions, nor in the 5 years covered by this agreement. We are not living in an ideal world today, certainly not from the viewpoint of private enterprise.

I must admit also that even the maximum price under the agreement is below the Government support price for this marketing year. And that the minimum-price scale is below what wheat growers, at least, anticipate will be the support price during the period. And that will call for the Federal Treasury to make up the difference on such wheat as is exported under the agreement.

But I also would call your attention to the fact that we have the support-price guaranties without reference to this agreement. And I leave it to you if it would not be better for the Federal Government to have a guaranteed market for 185,000,000 bushels of export wheat, sold admittedly at some loss, than to have to take over the entire surplus and hold it, threatening thereby bigger holdover surpluses for each following year, and ultimately greater losses to the Treasury—and to our own wheat growers in the long run?

It is probably just a matter of a few years—perhaps not too many months—until the United States is going to face again the problem of wheat surpluses. The more we can export, the smaller the surpluses, and the less the necessity of Government controls of production and of marketing. It may well be that the private trade will fare better under this agreement than it will under the more stringent controls which could follow the piling up of undisposable surpluses.

In this connection I want to call your attention to two paragraphs from the Midyear Economic Report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, submitted to the Congress last week. I read the following, starting on page 44 of the report:

"Despite our high degree of industrialization, the tremendous importance of agriculture cannot be overlooked. The world shortage of foods and other products of agricultural origin, continuing up to this year, has had an immense inflationary impact upon the whole price structure through the relation that farm prices have to the cost of living and to industrial wages, prices, and profits. Although the full effects will not be felt for some time, greater abundance in basic agricultural crops should be of signal aid in the checking of inflation and progressive working out of stable relationships.

"That end," the report continues—and it is this paragraph to which I would especially direct your attention—"That end would not be promoted if the enlargement in supply of farm products were to coincide with some serious curtailment of demand to produce a collapse of farmers' incomes. Such a collapse shortly after World War I spread to rural merchants and bankers, to manufacturers of farm equipment and consumer goods, and to other commodity markets. But a repetition of such a debacle today is precluded by a policy of farm-income supports, implemented by procedures worked out and tested over the past 20 years, though not yet perfected."

Just two points in connection with that report. First, the danger of too low farm prices in their cumulative effect on the rest of the national economy; and, second, the fact that we already are pledged to price-support programs. Loans to the Federal Treasury may well be greater from supporting wheat prices if we do not have the export outlets which it is hoped this agreement will provide, than if the Government has to buy wheat without that export market.

I do not pretend to guarantee that this international wheat agreement will work out as intended. I admittedly am not as hopeful over all these international agreements as some other members of this committee. But I do say that if this committee is as strong for international agreements and promoting international trade as it has recorded itself in the past few years, it certainly should recommend this agreement favorably to the Senate.

I will say one thing more. When the National Grange and the National Farmers Union are in agreement, and both also agree with the American Farm Bureau Federation on some action to be taken, you may rest assured either that American agriculture is facing a desperate situation, or the proposition has a lot of merit from the viewpoint of these three great farm organizations. I hope the resolution is favorably reported to the Senate.

THE FARMER'S STILTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA EVENING WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Farmer's Stilts," published in the July 29, 1948, issue of the Omaha Evening World-Herald. While we may not agree with all the thoughts expressed in the editorial, I am sure it will be interesting to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER'S STILTS

There seemed to be a note of panic in the Department of Agriculture's request to farmers the other day to reduce next year's wheat acreage by 8 percent.

There should have been.

For it appears that the old problem of farm surpluses, which vanished during the war, is back with us again. This is it.

Bumper crops of wheat and oats are assured. A huge crop of corn is in sight. The latest Government estimate was 3,300,000,000 bushels, but some grain men are guessing that the crop may hit 4,000,000,000.

Grain prices, in consequence, have been skidding. Wheat has been selling in Omaha at $2.14 a bushel—but only because the seller could not find elevator space to take advantage of the Government loan of $2.24 a bushel. New corn is still selling at 10 cents a bushel over the loan price, but is likely to be down there soon.

Plainly, a lot of 1948's grain harvest is going to the Government, through the device of Government crop loans. Well-informed grain men think that eventually the Government will be the owner of about a billion bushels of the 1948 crop. If so, it will have about $2,000,000,000 invested in it.

In recent years, because of the abnormally heavy demand for food, the only crop the Government has had to buy in quantity has been potatoes. Potatoes may furnish a guide as to what will happen with grain.

In 1946 the Government spent $93,000,000 buying potatoes. In 1947 it spent $40,000,000. So far in 1948 it has spent about $16,000,000, and the potato harvest is just beginning. To get rid of its unwanted surplus, the Government has burned potatoes, thrown them in the ocean, and sold them at 15 cents a hundred to people who would promise to feed them to animals rather than eat them themselves.

The Government has exhorted farmers to raise fewer potatoes. But why should they? One Nebraska potato grower this year has raised 500 bushels of potatoes to the acre and sold them to the Government at $1.60 per bushel. It will take more than exhortation to make him give up a crop that returns $800 an acre.

The potato story, when repeated with grain, will be a lot bigger and more expensive. Intolerably expensive, maybe.

What's the cure?

Acreage control? Remembering the troubles of the 1930's, everybody shudders at the thought.

Chemurgy—that is, the use of farm products as industrial raw materials? This offers a shining prospect in time, but no short-term solution.

A theoretically ideal method of disposing of surpluses would be to do away with support prices and let the law of supply and demand operate. Sold cheaply enough, almost anything will be used, and certainly food. And, with the demand for food still great, it seems unlikely that prices would go so low as to be ruinous to the farmer.

Yet a case can be made for continuance of some sort of support. Labor has a backstop in its unions, the manufacturers of basic commodities have one in cartels and trade agreements, many smaller businessmen one in the various fair-price laws. Only the farmer, except for Government intervention, sells in a free market.

The Aiken-Hope Farm Act, passed by the last Congress to be effective next year, aims at eliminating the rigidity of farm prices by instituting a system of flexible price supports. The main question about the Aiken-Hope Act is whether it is flexible enough. It provides a floor of 60 percent of parity rather than the present 90 percent. Even 60 percent of parity may price some farm products out of the market, or at least encourage huge surpluses.

In the face of this situation, some of the self-appointed friends of the farmer in Congress seem to be out of touch with reality. They are demanding that the 90 percent of parity—and even more—be restored.

Such proposals are nothing short of madness. They would simply compound present insanities—such as the fact that there is too much grain, but grain is too costly to feed to

animals, so the animal population is abnormally low, and the housewife who wants to buy a steak can't afford one.

If matters go on as they are now, or even as they may be under the more sensible Aiken-Hope Act, catastrophe is all but inevitable. A catastrophe that will make the fiasco of the old Hoover Farm Board, which bought up surpluses until it went busted, look small.

The simple fact is that—the planners and the professional friends of the farmer to the contrary—agriculture cannot stay on stilts forever. The inexorable laws of economics will chop the stilts away, and the longer the chopping is postponed the worse the crash will be. The sooner agriculture becomes a normal part of the economy—with minimum safeguards against too great a shock—the better.

REDUCTION OF POSTAGE RATES ON RELIEF PARCELS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I wrote to Hon. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, under date of July 30, 1948, in relation to reduction of postage rates on relief parcels to countries behind the iron curtain.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 30, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: I am writing to you on the matter of a possible reduction of postage rates on relief parcels sent to individuals in lands behind the iron curtain. As you know, the Economic Cooperation Administration, as authorized by law, has enabled a 4-cent-per-pound reduction on parcel post rates for relief parcels going to the Western European nations participating in the European recovery program.

A few days ago, Mr. Hoffman, Administrator of E. C. A., in response to a letter of inquiry from me, stated that postage rate reductions could not be made on parcels going to people in Poland, for example, because Poland is not one of the participating countries as defined in the economic cooperation law. Therefore, at this time I should like to ask your kind and sympathetic consideration of my proposal that the Administration recommend a change in policy so that parcels going to the iron curtain lands can also be facilitated by postage rate reductions.

It seems to me that the following points justify such action:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC RELATIONS THROUGH PARCELS

1 The best public relations in the world for America and the American way of life consists in the relief parcels going abroad. It has been my experience during a European trip that the billions of dollars sent by the American Nation, as such, were comparatively unappreciated, whereas the hundreds of thousands of relief parcels sent by American citizens, as such, to their kin and acquaintances abroad, were tremendously appreciated. This proved to be a particularly powerful means of propaganda in the cold war when relief parcels were supplemented by individual letters sincerely written by American citizens to their kinfolk abroad.

I firmly believe that a pound of baloney sent in a relief parcel is worth 100,000 words of verbal baloney sent by American short wave to lands behind the iron curtain. Our verbal propaganda, surreptitiously heard by a relatively few people listening to radio sets, cannot possibly be compared in its limited effectiveness to the powerful appeal of United States relief parcels. I do not underestimate the value of verbal propaganda, but Europe's hungry stomachs are far more concerned with baloney that people can eat rather than baloney that they presumably hear.

CAPITALIZING ON ANTI-RUSSIAN SENTIMENT

2. The Russian cement in the iron curtain is apparently cracking. Marshal Tito's defiance of the Cominform indicates something of the tremendous unrest and dissatisfaction among the people supposedly under complete Russian domination. If we can get relief parcels through, we will serve to increase the bonds with our own land and further untie the bonds with Russia.

3. America fortunately this year is blessed with a superabundance of crops. If some of our abundance can be translated into relief parcels and sent to Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, untold good for United States relations can develop.

RELIEVING OUR CITIZENS OF HEAVY COSTS

4. If we can secure postage rate reductions on these relief parcels going to lands behind the iron curtain, we will help the millions of Americans who have relatives abroad to make additional shipments. I need not tell you what a heavy financial drain it is upon American citizens with relatives, for example, in Poland, who have to bear the very heavy charges for postal rates.

These American citizens with kinfolks in lands behind the iron curtain are taxpayers, and, after all, they, too, are paying for the cost of the Economic Cooperation Administration. It is only fair that they be not discriminated against in the postage rate-reduction policy as against Americans with kin in the western European countries, who are fortunately benefiting from the rate reduction.

PROMOTING SAFE, PROMPT DELIVERY

I feel that this policy of facilitating some of these relief parcels should be supplemented by our postal officials in doing everything possible to insure the safe and prompt delivery of these parcels in the iron-curtain lands.

LOYALTY OF OUR CITIZENS FROM EASTERN EUROPEAN LANDS LIKE POLAND

I know that I need not mention that Americans with kinfolk in these lands have proven their loyalty to our way of life. Moreover, to cite one country without in any way underestimating other countries, the people of Poland have throughout their history demonstrated their undying loyalty to the very principles of liberty and freedom which gave birth to our Nation. It seems to me that in the spirit of Kosciusko and Pulaski, yes, in the spirit of Kossuth, and all the other European patriots who helped give birth to freedom in America and/or in their own lands, we can maintain aflame the lamp of liberty and the hope of liberty behind the iron curtain by a policy such as I have recommended.

Thanking you for your kind attention to this subject, and assuring you of my highest esteem and of my appreciation of your always prompt and thorough response, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in the past few days there has been speculation expressed in the public press and otherwise as to whether, in view of the recent legislative history, it would be necessary for the President to send the names of the Atomic Energy Commissioners back to the Senate for confirmation. I can say, Mr. President, that there is not the slightest reason to believe that there is any necessity for the resubmission of any of the names of the Atomic Energy Commissioners for either appointment or confirmation.

On Saturday last I addressed a letter to the President of the United States setting forth the legislative history of House bill 6402, recently enacted, which extended the terms of the Commissioners. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 30, 1948.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Within the past few days several news stories have been circulated in the press and otherwise speculating upon the possibility that it might be necessary for the resubmission of the names of the Atomic Energy Commissioners for confirmation, under the Term Extension Act. While the terms of this Extension Act, H. R. 6402, seem unquestionably clear in providing that the terms of the present Commissioners are extended to June 30, 1950, without any necessity for reappointment; nevertheless, I respectfully submit certain legislative history to you for your consideration.

Under the terms of the act, H. R. 6402, which is identical with S. 2589, it is provided that—

"The term of office of each member of the Commission taking office prior to June 30, 1950, shall expire at midnight on June 30, 1950."

In the report on H. R. 6402 made to the House of Representatives by the House members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and in the report made to the Senate on S. 2589 made by the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it is stated as follows:

"The passage of this bill will immediately give assurance of uninterrupted continuity in office for 2 years and 2 months following the date of this report during which the present Commission can continue without disruption or without the necessity of reappointment."

In the debate on H. R. 6402 in the Senate, the following discussion was had between Senator CONNALLY and myself, found on page 9063 of the RECORD of June 19, 1948:

"Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

"Mr. CONNALLY. Under the arrangement [the arrangement to extend the terms until June 30, 1950], there would be no need of confirmation; would there?

"Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

"Mr. CONNALLY. In other words, this measure would automatically extend the present terms of office; would it?

"Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. We would simply take August 1, 1948, out of the calendar, really, and would insert in its place June 30, 1950.

"Mr. CONNALLY. So the Senate would not have to act on the question of confirmation; is that correct?

"Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is quite correct."

Again, on page 9072 of the RECORD of June 19, 1948, in a discussion between Senator BARKLEY and Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, the following question and answer occurred:

"Mr. BARKLEY. If the bill is passed, as I understand, it will extend the terms for 2 years without confirmation. Is that the fact?

"Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true."

As shown by the committee reports to each House of Congress on this measure and as established in the legislative history of the debate, it therefore seems clear beyond controversy that it was the complete understanding and clear opinion and intent of both Houses of the Congress that this measure would provide for the extension of the terms of Commissioners appointed prior to June 30, 1950, up to that date without the necessity of reappointment or confirmation. At no time was it advocated by any Member of either House of Congress that any other purpose or intent was contained in the legislation, and I assure you that it is my clear and firm opinion that this was the exact and unchallenged intention of the Congress in connection with this legislation.

I give you this history and these views because of the speculative stories that have become public. I regret exceedingly the recurring agitation of atomic-energy administrative matters, and I assure you that I shall continue my efforts toward orderly, vigorous development of our atomic-energy program so that its evaluation and progress can be free of bias or temporary expediency.

I have the honor to remain,

Respectfully yours,

B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Chairman,
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may ask a question or two?

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Florida be good enough to withhold his questions until we can have a quorum call?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Myers
Baldwin	Hill	O'Conor
Barkley	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Butler	Jenner	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Kem	Robertson, Wyo
Capper	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cooper	Langer	Smith
Cordon	Lodge	Sparkman
Donnell	Lucas	Stennis
Downey	McCarthy	Taft
Dworshak	McClellan	Taylor
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McKellar	Thye
Fenzel	McMahon	Umstead
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hayden	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is necessarily absent, attending the funeral services of a close friend.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senate has now been in session 1 week. After the Senate was ready to proceed with business and take up legislation, a motion was made by the junior Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29, the so-called anti-poll-tax bill, which all Senators, I believe, have heard discussed.

The motion to take up this particular piece of legislation has been debated for several days. I think it is quite obvious that if it is to be considered at this emergency session of Congress the subject matter of the legislation must be brought before the Senate without further debate.

The question of civil rights, and especially the question of the poll tax, is generations old. While it is true that each and every time the legislation is brought up for discussion and debate there are some new features, yet in general the legislation before us really has nothing new in it. It is my opinion that we could discuss this motion for days, and there would be little new evidence upon which those who wish to resist the motion to take up the bill could advance their cause. Certainly in all fairness the proponents of the anti-poll-tax legislation should have their day in court on the subject matter rather than on the motion to take up.

As acting majority leader I point out that time and again on other occasions, even though I did not agree with the subject matter involved, I did my level best to bring legislation before the Senate for consideration in order that it might be discussed, and that the Senate might take action.

So, in that spirit, Mr. President, in the spirit of full cooperation, in the spirit of fair play, in the spirit of permitting Senators who wish to discuss this measure to do so and to have a vote upon the subject matter, I wish to propose a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 5 o'clock this afternoon, the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon the motion now pending, which is a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election of national officers, and that the time between the hours of 3 o'clock and 5 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the motion, and controlled, respectively, by myself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the request which has been made by the Senator from Nebraska for cooperation in this matter. I like to cooperate with the Senator when it is possible to do so. However, I am afraid that I miss the sweet spirit of Christian charity with which it is said the request is clothed. I know of no reason why this matter should be brought to such an early conclusion. On Thursday of last week the Senator from Nebraska moved to proceed to the consideration of this measure. The motion has been before the Senate in two normal legislative sessions. I respectfully submit—and I am sure the RECORD will bear me out—that at least half the time has been consumed in the discussion of extraneous matters by those who say they are in favor of the bill which the Senator from Nebraska seeks to bring before the Senate.

Those who are opposed to this measure have discussed the merits of the questions and the reasons why the Senate should not proceed to the consideration of the bill at this time. The Senator from Nebraska stated, at the time he made his motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill, that there was no other legislation ready for the Senate to consider. I am quite sure that the calendar of the Senate will reflect the fact that no bills have been reported by the committees since that statement was made.

The Senator from Nebraska has referred to the fact that this was emergency legislation, being considered in an emergency session of the Senate. Mr. President, at the time of the ratification of the Constitution 159 years ago poll taxes or other property qualifications more onerous were required of all voters; and yet we are told that this is a great emergency, and for that reason we should agree to the unanimous-consent request.

Every one of the Original Thirteen States, at the time the States ratified the Constitution, had property qualifications for voting, most of them much more onerous than a dollar poll tax, in those cases in which the States did not have a poll tax.

Mr. President, we who are referred to slightingly, in the sense of opprobrium, as being southern Democrats, shall seek to find time to present our case to the country. I realize that this is a Presidential campaign year; and we do not desire to be caught between the upper and nether millstones of the two major parties fighting for votes of certain minority groups in this campaign. We shall not willingly surrender any right we have to present this question to the country. Therefore, I object.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what the Senator from Georgia has said may apply to the consideration of the poll-tax bill itself, but I cannot see how it applies to the motion to take up the bill. We

have spent 3 days on a motion to take up the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Two days. The Senator from Ohio himself used considerable time in discussing extraneous matters.

Mr. TAFT. If we were to spend 2 days on every motion to take up a bill in the Senate, we could never get anything done at any time.

What we are urging is that the motion to take up the bill be voted upon. Is the Senator willing to state any time at which he would be willing to vote on the motion to take up the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not care to commit myself at this time as to a time when we would consent to vote on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. We are operating under very unusual conditions. Though the cry of politics is being hurled all over the city, and the motives of every person are suspect, there are those of us who sincerely believe that we have a case against the bill, and that if we can ever get it across to the people of the United States, they will compel its withdrawal from consideration by the Senate.

We are laboring under tremendous handicaps. We who live in the South do not control the means of communicating news over the country. We do not control the press of the Nation, the commentators, and the airways, to influence public opinion. We ought to be able to debate a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill for 3 or 4 days without anyone complaining about it. This year we spent 5 or 6 weeks on the St. Lawrence waterway bill, and not once was the cry of "filibuster" raised. As soon as one of these political bills aimed at the South is brought up, almost before we have an opportunity to take the floor, the cry of "filibuster" is raised. It is raised in the newspapers; it is raised over the air waves; and the merits of the issue are completely obscured by the publicity which goes out about the alleged filibuster. We have never yet had a fair chance to get the merits of our position before the country, and every fair-minded Member of the Senate knows that to be true. So we do not propose to shackle ourselves, under the specious plea that is made, and preclude ourselves from utilizing the few opportunities made available to us.

Complaint is made about this so-called slow and tedious process, but by this process we propose to endeavor to get before the people the larger issue of importance of preserving the power of the several States to control their elections, rather than to endanger the rights of all the people by the creation of machinery for Federal control of elections from Washington.

That is why I object to the unanimous-consent request which has been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia objects.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection so that I may make a brief observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief observation, also.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Georgia has objected, and that is his position, I shall withdraw my request, because I feel that no further debate is necessary. I should like to make a brief statement regarding the pending matter, but I shall not do so if the Senator is going to object, if that is his position.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the unanimous-consent agreement requested a moment ago has been objected to, while I agree that a matter of judgment is involved, I believe that the time has arrived when we should attempt to limit the time on the motion to have the Senate take up the bill.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Georgia, for whom I have profound admiration, that he has a perfect right, as does each and every other Senator, to talk about the merits of the matter or to discuss objections to the proposed legislation; but, Mr. President, I submit to all Members of the Senate that it can be done under the debate on the subject matter itself, and my opinion is that that is where it should be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska state how much time he would be willing to give us to discuss the merits?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to wait a moment, please.

The concurrence of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate voting is required for the adoption of a cloture petition. I submit to the Members of this body that if two-thirds of the Senators voting feel that this proposed legislation is of such importance that it should be taken up, then we should abide by such two-thirds vote, and should proceed to discuss the merits of the bill. In such case, every right a Senator now has in connection with the motion will be available to him in connection with the bill itself, so far as concerns debating the merits of the measure and debating the procedure connected therewith.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to wait a moment, please, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, as to the emergency which has been referred to, I agree with the Senator from Georgia that I myself would not say that the point as to whether this particular piece of legislation is an emergency is not a debatable one. However, we are now in the midst of an emergency session of the Congress. We have been asked by the President of the United States to take up the civil-rights legislation as a part of the second category of legislation which should be passed. Because of that fact, I think it behooves us to bring up, as I stated at the beginning of the session, the only piece of proposed legislation I know of that is ready for consideration, which is the bill that is requested to be enacted on the subject of the poll tax.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. In a moment, please.

Mr. President, furthermore, I feel that if we are to have before us for consideration any other proposed legislation, inasmuch as a cloture petition could not be voted upon before Wednesday, under the rule, by that time certainly there will be other proposed legislation for us to consider. If two-thirds of the Senators present vote to adopt a cloture petition, we would be ready to discuss the proposed legislation to which it relates. If a two-thirds vote is not obtainable, then we could proceed to the consideration of any other proposed legislation which might come before us, under the recommendations of a committee.

I hope the Senator from Georgia will feel that I am doing this in justice and in fair play, under the sole theory that if there is anything new about the subject, if there is any evidence on which a case can be made for or against this particular piece of proposed legislation, the time to do so is in connection with the debate on the subject matter involved, and not in connection with a motion, the pendency of which prevents the subject matter itself from being considered and terminated one way or the other, either at this session or any other session of the Senate of the United States.

It is in that spirit and in that light only that I now send to the desk a cloture petition which I feel meets all the requirements of the rules. I submit the petition, and ask that it be read, and that the proper procedure be had relative to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, the Presiding Officer is required immediately to lay the cloture petition before the Senate. Without objection, it will be read by the clerk, instead of by the Chair.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

AUGUST 2, 1948.

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the pending measure, namely, the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national offices:

1. KENNETH S. WHERRY.
2. ROBERT A. TAFT.
3. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.
4. JOE MCCARTHY.
5. RALPH E. FLANDERS.
6. I. M. IVES.
7. HOMER FERGUSON.
8. GUY CORDON.
9. CLYDE M. REED.
10. W. E. JENNER.
11. ARTHUR CAPPER.
12. H. ALEXANDER SMITH.
13. B. B. HICKENLOOPER.
14. H. C. LODGE, JR.
15. JAMES P. KEM.
16. WAYNE MORSE.
17. EDWARD MARTIN.
18. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.
19. CLAUDE PEPPER.
20. ALBEN W. BARKLEY.
21. J. HOWARD MCGRATH.
22. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

Mr. WHERRY. I now yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is recognized. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I decline to yield at the present time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Georgia will yield to me for a moment. I previously tried to obtain the floor, when I requested the Senator from Nebraska to grant me the courtesy of yielding to me for a moment. But that courtesy was not accorded me by the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Florida without jeopardizing my rights to the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that the distinguished acting majority leader has seen fit to take a position which in effect operates to shut off one point of view which has not had so much as a moment's consideration on this floor. I do not mean the point of view of only one Senator, but I mean the point of view of a number of Senators representing various States which once had a poll tax requirement but which, in their sound judgment, have since terminated it as a prerequisite for their elections.

Mr. President, the distinguished acting majority leader may think he has been through the mill in this connection, but I wish to state that one does not have to be a Member of Congress to go through the battle on this question. At one time when I was a member of the Florida Legislature, this issue was a heated and controversial one on which numbers of our best citizens were alined, some on one side and some on the other. It was debated for days. It was decided with nothing like unanimity.

It happens that the junior Senator from Florida was one of those who supported the abolition of the poll tax, and successfully voted for abolition of the poll tax. Under the constitutional requirements of our State it was a legislative matter resting solely in the discretion of the legislature as to whether a poll tax should exist and, if it existed, whether it should be a prerequisite for voting.

Therefore, Mr. President, I speak from the point of view of one who comes from a State which has abolished the poll tax, after having had it for many years; and I also speak from the point of view of one who personally has advocated and voted for the repeal of the poll tax as a qualification for voting in the elections of his particular State.

Mr. President, I think it is unseemly indeed for a group of States, represented by a number of legislators, to preclude other Senators from presenting here, an explanation and statement of our position, which necessarily differs from that of other Senators, in their respective States, because as we view the matter, a question of fundamental constitutional law is involved, and one which we cannot ignore, and beyond that, questions of far-reaching policy are involved which, as we think may not be ignored, not solely from the standpoint of properly serving our own people and our own States, but of properly serving all the people of all the 48 States of the Union.

I regret exceedingly that the acting majority leader has taken such an arbitrary position, and I call to his attention and to the attention of numerous of my friends on the other side of the Chamber, and on this side likewise, who I notice signed the petition for cloture, that I sat here and listened, not merely for one day, but for days on end, to learned statements and erudite speeches by certain Members of this Congress, and I generally enjoyed those statements. In most particulars I thought they were justified in consuming the length of time that they consumed. I remember, if he will give me his attention a moment, the learned speech made by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] on the portal-to-portal question. I thought it was an excellent speech, and exhaustive. It went into every point which he thought and which I could think of that the Supreme Court might raise in looking at that legislation, which had as its origin and for its necessity a ruling of the Supreme Court. I shall not attempt to say how many hours the argument of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri consumed, but my recollection is it took five calendar days of the Senate's time. I did not think the time was wasted, and I did not get up and go out, leaving him to talk to empty benches. I did not decline to listen to his position. No one thought of trying to shut him off. To the contrary, we felt he was honoring us by giving a clear and exhaustive exposition of a matter which he thought was of great importance. Frankly, I agreed with him in his feeling that it was of importance.

I see another Senator over there, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to whom I listened hours on end—I would say probably 40 hours—in the 1947 session, on the subject of labor-industry relations. Nobody tried to shut him off. Nobody tried to preclude him from expressing his convictions which he thought were sound from the standpoint, I am sure, of serving not only the industry of his State, but the industry of the Nation. Whether I agreed with his convictions or not, I sat here and listened to them and gave him the courtesy of a chance to express himself.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, to whom I shall yield in a minute, that I think the statement I was proposing to make on this subject, after I had given it long study and had searched my conscience, as well as the records and the history of our Nation in this matter, should be made before a decision is reached as to whether this particular bill shall come up. My proposed statement goes, in the main, to the question of whether or not the subject matter should be dealt with under a statute, by way of the proposed bill, or under a constitutional amendment, as was so learnedly and ably suggested here the other day by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I think the time to make that decision, certainly a proper time, would be before the vote to take up the particuluar measure here offered, which is nothing but a bill which, if enacted, becomes a statute.

I want to say without rancor and without resentment that I am at a loss to understand the change in attitude of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, here serving as acting majority floor leader, because I have always thought he was rather generous in his attitude toward other Senators in his desire to see that their viewpoint was given fair expression. I do not believe by searching the RECORD in the nearly 2 years I have been here that the distinguished Senator can point to any one time when I have occupied the floor of the Senate in excess of 30 or 40 minutes, and those occasions have been very few. So it seems to me that ample time should be afforded, recognizing the fact that there are three groups on this side, one coming from poll-tax States, which are still laboring under the poll-tax requirement; the second coming from poll-tax States which are now moving to remove that requirement. I note that the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], coming from one of those States, is here prepared to state the viewpoint of those States, and of the Senators who come from those States. Then there is the third group, and it happens in my case peculiarly, that, as to the junior Senator from Florida, I think he is entitled to the courtesy of having a chance to express his position, which by many of his people may be questioned or misunderstood because they may think it differs from the position he took in the legislative halls at Tallahassee, whereas it does not differ, because of the vastly different issue prevailing here.

I must oppose this bill. I shall gladly support, not only here on the floor, but by my influence, for whatever it may be worth, for its adoption in my State, the submission of a constitutional amendment dealing with the matter. I must say, if I may be allowed one more minute before I sit down, that I am disappointed that the distinguished acting majority leader has not seen fit to grant us the courtesy of a hearing, when three times here on the floor before he submitted the cloture petition I asked for the courtesy of the chance to be heard and to explain a position which I think is worth explaining, and to have a chance to make my statement here on the floor of the Senate in my own time, but not at too great length. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 30 seconds?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield under the same understanding, to a brief statement by the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the same circumstances, the Senator from Georgia yields to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Georgia. The argument made by the distinguished Senator from Florida,

which I think is very fair and very honorable, certainly could be made against a cloture petition filed against the subject matter of the poll tax, and I certainly would agree with him, and I would be the last man in the Senate to make a motion to cut off debate on the subject matter before the United States Senate. But this cloture petition is filed only on the motion to take up, that is all. It is in a different category from the St. Lawrence seaway. In that case the question was on a motion to reconsider and to recommit. It is in a different category from the portal-to-portal legislation, in connection with which the information the distinguished Senator brought to the Senate proved very valuable, and on which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] delivered an illuminating speech.

I simply want to say—and I hope the Senator will not lose faith in the acting majority leader—that I do think it is a matter of judgment as to whether or not there has been sufficient time on the motion. I think there has been, but I would be the last man in the Senate to offer a cloture petition on the subject matter if I thought ample time had not been given for debate. I assure the distinguished Senator that if two-thirds of the Senate vote to sustain the cloture petition, ample time will be given to the distinguished Senator for the presentation of his argument.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield on the same terms?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, on the same terms.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to point out one other thing, that the Senator will have all day today, he will have all day tomorrow, and if cloture should be voted, he will have another hour after that to make all the remarks he wants to make on the motion to take up the poll-tax measure, without even debating the merits of the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. For a question?

Mr. PEPPER. Only for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask the able Senator from Georgia whether he proposes to address himself to the parliamentary situation now existing since the filing of the petition, and whether he thinks it would be effective to curtail the debate, even if it were adopted by two-thirds. Does the Senator propose to address himself to that parliamentary question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I intend to address myself to the parliamentary situation, after I have made a motion.

Mr. President, I desire to lodge a point of order against what purports to be a cloture petition. Before I do so, I desire to move the yeas and nays on the motion made by the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of H. R. 29.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia asks for the yeas and nays on the motion to take up House bill 29. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the adoption of the motion for the yeas and nays in any way affect the right on the petition which has been filed before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks not, although it does affect the right of the mover of the motion to withdraw it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Chair mean the motion to take up the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Chair rules, then, that the granting of the yeas and nays in no way affects the parliamentary situation, so far as the petition is concerned?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. So far as the Chair understands and can anticipate the situation, that is the Chair's view. The Chair cannot know what the Senator from Georgia has in mind. The Senator from Georgia has asked for the yeas and nays. There is a sufficient second, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the motion now pending before the Senate is the motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill, which has been made by the acting majority leader. The Senator from Florida would like to propound an inquiry as to whether the effect of an order for the yeas and nays would be that the motion would not be withdrawn except by unanimous consent, on the pending measure before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the Chair's understanding.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Florida, for exampie, should have ready to offer in the Senate an amendment to the aircraft bill, which is Senate bill 2644, the pending measure, a bill, I believe, which is being sponsored by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]—if the Senator from Florida wished to offer an anti-poll-tax amendment as an amendment to the pending measure, I should like to know whether, if the motion made by the acting majority leader should be withdrawn, such a proposed amendment to the pending measure would be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Chair has declared the yeas and nays in order, so the question is entirely moot.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is moot, but the Chair will answer it. Except as the pending motion submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is withdrawn. But it cannot be withdrawn now in view of the order for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PEPPER. Has the Chair announced the order for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to submit a point of order against this attempt to apply cloture to the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill. This question has been discussed in the Senate for a number of years, and all parliamentarians have universally held that a cloture petition would not lie against a motion to take up a bill. The cloture petition now presented undertakes by its terms to avoid this ruling by calling the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill a measure. Calling the motion a measure does not make it so. It is a confession of the weakness of the position of those who are undertaking to file the petition. They undertake to confuse the issue by labeling as a measure the motion to proceed to the consideration of the poll-tax bill. But the statement in the cloture petition does not alter the rules or the precedents of the Senate. The rule which applies in this case, Mr. President, is rule XXII of the Senate, paragraph 2, from which I read:

> If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure—

The whole crux of the matter is found in those two words "pending measure"—

> is presented to the Senate, The Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate—

And then the rule proceeds to outline the procedure which follows in the case of a cloture petition being filed upon a pending measure.

Mr. President, it has always been universally conceded that a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill was not a pending measure. Certainly it could not be a pending measure. A pending measure means substantive legislation, not any of the various collateral motions used as a means of operating the parliamentary machinery of the Senate.

I desire to point out a precedent in this matter, which is not direct, but which is certainly persuasive to the correctness of the point of order before the Senate. When the so-called FEPC bill was before the Senate in 1946 we had practically the same parliamentary situation, except that we were discussing a motion to correct the Journal instead of a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill. Those who sought to bring the debate to a close on that matter admitted that a cloture petition did not lie as against a simple motion of the Senate. It was undertaken to bring the bill to a vote by filing a cloture petition to the bill, although it was not before the Senate at the time. The Chair properly ruled that the bill was not before the Senate, and therefore that a cloture petition did not lie.

The rules of the Senate may be very vexing to us at times. All of us are wearied by long-drawn-out debate. We have had no long-drawn-out debate in this instance. The subject was presented to the Senate only on last Thursday. Speeches have been made relating to the economic condition of the country and to the European situation, and the only Senators who have discussed the merits of the question are those whom you are now seeking to gag with this cloture petition. The opponents of this bill have discussed only the issues involved in the proposed legislation, and half the time has been consumed by other Senators on other matters. The Rules of the Senate may be irksome at times, but they were not written to enable a majority of Senators to gag the minority on the floor until the minority have had every opportunity to present their case—oftimes the minority of today becomes the majority of tomorrow. The majority is not always right. The rules of the Senate have never contemplated precipitate action before Senators have full opportunity to express themselves.

Every rule of the Senate was written with a view to keeping the Senate a great deliberative body. There is no greater bulwark of constitutional government than is freedom of debate in the Senate of the United States. The founding fathers planned wisely, and those who sat in the first session of the Senate and wrote the rules wisely conceived of a time when there would be good reasons for men who were in the minority to talk until the voice of reason and justice could be heard. Our institutions of free government will be endangered if we ever permit minority groups and representatives of special privilege to force through legislation without allowing such adequate debate that the people of the Nation may be fully apprised of the nature and implications of the pending issue. It was never intended, under Senate rules, to deal lightly with the question of free debate in the Senate. It was never intended that a cloture petition should be applied to a mere motion in the Senate. If that were the case, certainly the authors of this rule would not have so carefully written the words "pending measure." A pending measure certainly cannot be a motion to proceed to consideration of a bill. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that any Senator has contended that a cloture petition would lie as against a motion to proceed. I know of the pressures to which the Chair might be subjected in making a ruling. For my part, I have implicit confidence in the sense of fairness and justice of the Chair and that he will adhere to the precedents of the Senate.

I submit the point of order, with full confidence of being sustained by the Chair, that a cloture petition would not lie at the present time. It is admitted, even in the efforts which have been made in this Congress to amend the rules to make a cloture petition apply to a motion, that it does not lie at the present time as the rules are now written.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. On the question of what is the pending measure, if this motion were agreed to, would there be any change in the law relating to legislative action? On the other hand, if the motion were rejected, would there be any change?

Mr. RUSSELL. A pending measure is a bill or other piece of legislation before the Senate. A mere motion to consider it cannot have the effect of law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Whether the motion be adopted or rejected, it cannot have any effect whatever.

Mr. RUSSELL. Rule XXII is very clear, Mr. President. I am willing to submit my case to the Chair on that point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia makes a point of order against the cloture petition.

The Chair would like to state that the subject is not new to him; it has been a matter of study for many years; and the Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules, I should like to make a statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will hear the Senator from California briefly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise merely so that the RECORD at least will be reasonably complete, and show that there is another point of view in this matter of rule XXII.

If we assume that the point raised by the Senator from Georgia is sound, and if we assume that some of the more recent precedents, which as yet have not been passed upon by the Senate itself, are correct, then I submit to the Senate that rule XXII is absolutely meaningless and there is no protection in the Senate of the United States at all. In each and every case, in order to circumvent rule XXII, a Senator need only conduct a filibuster against the motion to take up a bill, and, as we all know, a bill cannot be taken up unless a motion is made to take it up, except by unanimous consent. As a result, rule XXII would be absolutely meaningless, under those conditions.

I submit, Mr. President, that under the interpretation which appears in Webster's New International Dictionary the word "measure" means, according to subsection 11:

> A step or definite part of a progressive course or policy; a means to an end.

Certainly a motion fits into that category.

I call attention to the very able statement made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in his individual views on the amendments which had been offered to the cloture rule submitted by a number of Senators, including the junior Senator from California, at the time when the amendments to rules suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts were favorably reported to the Senate.

In the original debates in the Senate on rule XXII it seemed clear that at least the Senators who were here at that time thought that by a two-thirds vote they did have a means of controlling unlimited debate, and I submit, Mr. President, that if that contention is not followed, the Senate has surrendered into the hands of a single Senator the power to obstruct the legislative processes of government. That is more power than the Constitution gives to the President of the United States in the use of his veto, because a two-thirds vote of each House of the Congress can override a Presidential veto.

If this contention is allowed to stand without correction by the Senate, one Senator or two Senators, or a small handful of Senators, can completely upset the orderly processes of representative government.

The Senate was confronted by a filibuster at the close of the last session of the Congress, when two Members of this body were able to obstruct for a time the entire legislative process, among other business to block the Selective Service Act, which was vitally necessary to the national defense of this Nation. I said then, and I repeat today, that is too much power for any responsible person to want, and too much power for any irresponsible person to have.

Mr. President, I am quite frank to admit that there is a legitimate argument which can be made to sustain the contention that cloture should not apply by a mere majority vote. I have somewhat changed my views on that subject. I offered an amendment to the rule which would have permitted cloture to be applied by a majority vote of the entire membership of the Senate. I am willing to admit that there is certainly an honest difference of opinion on that score, and perhaps it would not be wise to go that far in amending the rules. But I say that if the contention made, that cloture does not apply to a motion, is allowed to stand, we actually have no rule XXII, and the Senate has no protection in conducting its business in an orderly fashion. For that reason I hope that the decision will be made applying cloture under the circumstances confronting us today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to intrude upon the time of the President of the Senate or impose my views upon him, except very briefly. I had to deal with these problems on two or three former occasions when I was majority leader, when efforts were made to secure consideration of anti-poll-tax and similar legislation. I have had to combat the effort to delay consideration by every means I thought within my power.

My attitude on the anti-poll-tax legislation is well known. My attitude on antilynching legislation is well known. I have made my views known here in the Senate and in speeches which I have made during much of my life. Nearly a generation ago the Legislature of Kentucky submitted to the people an amendment to our State constitution seeking to impose the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as indicating the right of a voter to cast his vote. I opposed that amendment to our State constitution, and the people overwhelmingly defeated it, and it is not in our fundamental law.

I had intended to call the attention of the Chair to the various definitions referred to by the Senator from California in regard to the meaning of the word "measure." There are many meanings of that word. A condition may exist requiring a remedy of some sort, whether legislative or otherwise, and it is a common thing to say that "steps ought to be taken" or "measures ought to be taken" to correct the condition, whatever it may be. I do not think there has been in the Senate any legal definition as to what a "measure" is, but colloquially we have been in the habit of referring to a bill as a measure, or to a resolution as a

measure; but when a bill or resolution is passed by the Congress and signed by the President, it is no longer a measure, it is an act. So that the definition of "measure" would not apply in that case.

I have not any doubt that when the Senate adopted the rule XXII it intended to make it possible for the Senate to bring to a termination debate upon any matter before it. If it be true that a measure is a step, among other steps, in a progressive course to bring about the consummation of some action, certainly a motion would be a measure within that sense. A motion to reconsider the vote by which a bill had passed would likewise be a measure within that sense.

I am merely urging that the Chair give consideration, if he has not done so, to that phase of the definition of "measure" in reaching his conclusion as to the validity of the petition which has been filed in order that we may bring this matter to a conclusion.

I have no desire to labor the point. I do believe that when the Senate adopted this rule it adopted it with the view and the intention and the conviction that it could bring any matter to a conclusion by the adoption of cloture. Since it was adopted, devices have been discovered and utilized by which the effectiveness of the rule is nullified, and I agree with the Senator from California—and I have said so heretofore when we were in the majority and when I was the majority leader—that the object of the rule is to bring to a conclusion a discussion upon a pending matter, and if we cannot bring it to a conclusion upon the preliminary motions which may be regarded as measures toward that end, then the effectiveness of the rule is completely destroyed, and the object of those who wrote it and adopted it has been completely defeated.

The object of all legislation is to secure action. The object of all rules is to bring about legislation within legislative bodies, and in any parliamentary assembly the object of rules is to facilitate the transaction of business and not unduly to obstruct it.

Having in mind the obvious intention of the framers of this rule and of the Senate when it adopted it, and the definition which is applicable, in my judgment, it seems to me that it is a proper procedure to file the petition at this particular time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from California mentioned the minority views which I filed on Senate Resolution No. 25 to amend the Rules of the Senate with respect to cloture. I should like to invite the attention of the Chair to a very significant fact in connection with that resolution. It was submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts on January 6, 1946, was considered in the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration for more than 2 months, and finally the resolution, as amended, to change rule XXII, which now reads that cloture may be imposed upon any pending measure, was reported, and as reported the words "motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business" were added to it.

It was the deliberate judgment of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, after careful study, that at the present time the Rules of the Senate do not permit a cloture petition to be filed either upon a motion to approve or amend the Journal or a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill. If the Chair were to reverse that position he would go directly contrary to the action taken by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which to my mind would be parliamentary hijacking, in which neither the Chair nor the Senate should indulge.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I want to submit only a brief observation upon this matter. The decision which the Chair is about to make is of grievous import to the country and possibly to the world. I am aware that the precedents favor the point of order made by the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in that decisions of previous presiding officers in the chair on other occasions sustain the point of order. However, Mr. President, every presiding officer, if I may say so, stands upon his own authority. He exercises his own power. He has the authority to make a decision in accordance with the rule, its language, and intent, which the distinguished presiding officer himself thinks is right and proper in course of his duty.

Mr. President, the language of rule XXII, of course, contains the words "pending measure." The pertinent portion of the language of the rule is:

> If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented to the Senate—

But, Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that the word "measure" was used synonymously with the word "matter." Any pending matter; any pending question; any pending measure; whichever one may happen to choose to use. Those who in 1917 were trying to correct the error that permitted a filibuster against the arming of merchant ships upon the eve of World War I, as requested by President Wilson, were not making merely a futile gesture that would leave a door wide enough for any filibuster to pass through. That group of Senators, in my humble judgment, as has been better said by others, intended to give two-thirds of the Senate the power to determine what is the pending business in the Senate, and when debate shall be brought to a close upon any pending question.

Mr. President, the first time cloture was applied was on the treaty of peace with Germany at the end of World War I. The second time it was applied was in respect of the adherence of this country to the World Court in 1927. This is the poll-tax measure today. It might have been the Marshall plan a month or two ago. It may be a peace treaty in this session or the next session of Congress. It may mean selective service. It may mean any measure, Mr. President, which goes to the power of the Government of the United States to act; and to say that four-fifths or five-sixths or nine-tenths of the Senate cannot determine what its calendar of business shall be, and cannot determine when debate shall be brought to a close is to give a minority the power to throttle and to strangle the legislative power, which means the functioning of the Government of the United States. No minority has the right to such power.

Today, so far as the rules are concerned, the question presents itself to the able Presiding Officer as to how he should rule upon this question, and he has the same prerogative that courts have and exercise to reverse their decisions when they become convinced that they are not correct or proper. I believe if the Chair had this question anew to decide, that there would be no question but that the Chair would decide that two-thirds of th Senate may determine what the Senate's business is, and two-thirds of the Senate may bring debate to a close.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I be permitted to make one very brief statement?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, dire pictures have been painted here, as in times past, as to the evils of unlimited discussion in the Senate of the United States. But it is a historic fact, Mr. President, that though there have been innumerable filibusters in this body—so designated by those who are on the majority side of the issue—and though there have been any number of occasions when we have all grown impatient on account of long speeches, Senators of the United States have so well recognized their responsibility in this body that no man can point to a really emergent piece of legislation necessary to the welfare of all the people of the country that has been defeated by what is called a filibuster. We are aware of our responsibilities here and as keenly alive to them as is any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, it is common custom in some quarters to refer to the Senators from the Southern States as "Claghorns," but I say that the Members of this body from the South, the present speaker excepted, measure up in patriotism and in ability to those from any other section of the land. We are aware of our responsibilities as Senators. But we do not propose to be kicked about as a political football in a political year if we can help it. I repeat that there has never been an important, a meritorious, an emergent piece of legislation in all the history of the Senate, with its unlimited debate, that has been killed by a filibuster. And over the years, though many hours have been sweated out here in night sessions, all necessary legislation has been enacted. This is neither an emergent or a necessary bill. The subject is shot through and through with politics and hypocrisy.

The rules of the Senate suffice when the majority is right, and when the minority has the courage of their conviction and know they are right, the rules of the Senate are broad enough to throw a protecting mantle about the minority until they have an opportunity to be heard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair begs the indulgence of the Senate to make a statement in connection with the ruling. The Chair is entirely conscious of the importance of the decision about to be rendered, as just indicated by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. The Chair wishes to state at the outset that he is deeply conscious of the importance of preserving the integrity of congressional procedures, which, in the Chair's judgment, transcends at this critical hour in the world's history any possible transient advantages which might come from ruling of a different character.

The Chair is also conscious of a very great personal embarrassment and difficulty in rendering the decision because of his well-known prejudice in respect to the basic issues involved. He favors the anti-poll-tax legislation. He believes that debate should come to an end after a reasonable period, and he emphatically agrees that the Senate should be in ultimate control of its own destiny.

In making the ruling which the Chair will shortly announce, he hopes that it may be entirely plain that he is not only putting aside all his own personal prejudices and predilections, but that he is also not undertaking, even by indirect inference, to rule upon the merits of the pending measure. He is dealing solely with what he considers to be his responsibility under oath, as an officer of the Senate, required to deal with the Senate on the basis of his best judgment and honest reflection of what the Senate rules require.

The Chair would like to make this very brief preliminary historical observation:

The cloture rule was adopted on March 3, 1917, by an overwhelming vote of 76 yeas and 3 nays, indicating the overwhelming belief of the Senate at that time in the necessity for some adequate control by the Senate, in the final analysis, of its own operations. The term used in the rule to define the matter upon which a cloture motion may be presented is "pending measure." From the debate on the question of the adoption of the rule it would clearly appear to the Chair that it was a bill, a specific act, which was contemplated to be the "pending measure."

The then Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Boies Penrose, preliminary to making an inquiry in connection with the resolution, said:

> The resolution provides a method of cloture for closing debate, and provides that the pending bill shall be the unfinished business of the Senate to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

No reference appears anywhere in the debate that it was the intention or purpose to bring within the scope of the rule a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill.

In November 1919, while the treaty of peace with Germany was under consideration, the then Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Hitchcock, presented a cloture motion on the reservations proposed to the treaty by the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, at that time chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. A discussion immediately arose as to whether the motion was in order, and what constituted the pending measure. The then Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, in the course of the debate, made the point of order that the pending measure was the treaty itself, and not the reservations, a point of order which was sustained by the President pro tempore, Senator Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa. An appeal from the ruling was laid on the table by a vote of 44 to 36.

There has been no direct ruling upon the specific question whether a motion to take up a bill is subject to cloture. It has been recognized and understood that such is not the case, on the ground that a motion cannot reasonably be construed to be a pending measure within the meaning of the cloture rule. This is evidenced by the fact that numerous resolutions have been submitted from time to time having for their purpose an amendment of the rule so as to give a privileged status to a cloture motion, and expressly making its presentation in order at any time upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business.

As Members of the Senate are aware, there is now pending on the Senate Calendar a resolution, Senate Resolution 25, favorably reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, which is designed to bring about such an amendment of the rule.

The Senate is familiar with the fact that the precedents of the Senate clearly indicate that a motion to approve the Journal cannot be brought within the jurisdiction of cloture action, and that conclusion has been very widely and generally accepted by all Senators with whom the Presiding Officer has ever conversed on this subject.

It seems to the President pro tempore that we come down to a very simple question, which does not require consultation with Webster's dictionary in order to know the answer. The rule provides that—

> If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented to the Senate—

And so forth. What is the "pending measure" at this moment? The pending measure is Senate bill 2644, a bill to provide for the development of civil-transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military services, and for other purposes. What is the purpose of the motion made by the able Senator from Nebraska, to which it is now being attempted to attach cloture? It is to create a new "pending measure." That is exactly the objective which the pending motion has in view. In the view of the Chair, in a reasonable interpretation of the English language the Chair is unable to believe otherwise than that the "pending measure" at this moment in the forum of the Senate is Senate bill 2644. It is not the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29.

The Chair notes in passing that, as the cloture petition was originally drawn, it read:

> To bring to a close the debate upon the pending motion—

Before being submitted, it was interlined to read:

> To close debate upon the pending measure, namely, the motion—

The President pro tempore finds it necessary, in conclusion, before announcing his decision, to state again that he is not passing upon the merits of the poll-tax issue, nor is he passing upon the desirability of a much stronger cloture rule in determining this point of order. The President pro tempore is not entitled to consult his own predilections or his own convictions in the use of this authority, however. He must act in his capacity as an officer of the Senate under oath to enforce its rules as he finds them to exist, whether he likes them or not, and whether he agrees with them or not. Of all the precedents necessary to preserve, this is the most important of all. Otherwise the preservation of any minority rights for any minority at any time would become impossible.

The President pro tempore is a sworn agent of the law as he finds the law to be. Only the Senate has the right to change the law. The President pro tempore feels that he is entitled particularly to underscore this axiom in the present instance, because the present circumstances themselves bring it into such bold and sharp relief.

In his capacity as a Senator, the President pro tempore favors the passage of the anti-poll-tax measure now. He has similarly voted upon numerous previous occasions. In his capacity as a Senator the President pro tempore believes that the rules of the Senate should permit cloture upon the pending motion to take up the anti-poll-tax measure; but in his capacity as President pro tempore the senior Senator from Michigan is bound to recognize what he believes to be the clear mandate of the Senate rules and the Senate precedents; namely, that no such authority presently exists.

The President pro tempore fully recognizes the implications of the resultant situation, as stated so eloquently by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. There is nothing new about those implications. They have been perfectly apparent to students of the Senate rules for many years. They mean that, in the final analysis, the Senate has no effective cloture rule at all. They mean that a small but determined minority can always prevent cloture, under the existing rules. They mean that a very few Senators have it in their power to prevent Senate action on anything. The Chair does not presume to pass upon what Senators may believe to be their justification for the use of such a power; he challenges no man's motives; he simply states the fact and what he believes to be the result of the fact.

The fact is that the existing Senate rules regarding cloture do not provide conclusive cloture. They still leave the Senate, rightly or wrongly, at the mercy of unlimited debate ad infinitum. The Chair repeats that this is no new discovery on his part. He repeats it has been frankly conceded by the Rules Committee of the Senate itself. It was conceded when this committee reported, on March 24, 1947—more than 1 year ago—Senate Resolution 25, which seeks to make the existing Senate cloture rule succeed in its purported power to permit two-thirds of the Senate to curb unlimited debate. That resolution has been on the Senate Calendar for 16 months. It has not been adopted. It is intended to prevent the precise purpose sought by

the pending point of order. Its presence on the Senate Calendar, by order of the Rules Committee, is, in the opinion of the Chair, complete proof that the Senate Rules Committee admits the validity of the pending point of order. The President pro tempore cannot be expected to cure, by an arbitrary ruling, the existing fatal defect in the cloture rule which the Senate itself has been invited, but has thus far declined, to cure.

It is the opinion of the present occupant of the chair in his capacity as senior Senator from Michigan that the Senate should adopt Senate Resolution 25, which makes the existing cloture rule mean what it purports to say, namely that, in extreme circumstances, two-thirds of the Senate can control the Senate's destiny. The Senate should not be impotent in emergency. If the Senate wishes to cure this impotence it has the authority, the power, and the means to do so. The President pro tempore of the Senate does not have the authority, the power, or the means to do so except as he arbitrarily takes the law into his own hands. This he declines to do in violation of his oath. If he did so, he would feel that what might be deemed temporary advantage by some could become a precedent which ultimately, in subsequent practice, would rightly be condemned by all.

The point of order is sustained. In making the ruling, the Chair recognizes the right of the Senate to make and interpret its own rules. The Senate has the right of appeal from the decision of the Chair. The Chair invites the Senate to exercise this right if it desires, even though the effort confronts much the same difficulties as does the present cloture petition.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I desire to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I did not yield for that purpose, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would appreciate it if the Senator from Virginia would permit the appeal to be made, so as to complete this particular procedure, with the understanding—if it is agreeable to the Senator from Ohio—that the Senator from Virginia shall be permitted to proceed before the vote is taken.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly. Of course, the appeal is subject to debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The appeal is subject to debate.

Mr. TAFT. I would appreciate it if the Senator from Virginia——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield, for the purpose of permitting me to appeal from the decision of the Chair?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Yes, if I may have unanimous consent that in yielding to permit the Senator's appeal to be made, for later consideration, I shall not lose any of my privileges of the floor, including the right to discuss the ruling and the larger implications of what we are considering. If such consent is granted, I yield under those circumstances.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to that effect. While I am asking it, I would also ask unanimous consent to be permitted to speak for not more than 2 minutes in making a very brief explanation of the purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair chiefly, of course, because it leaves the Senate in an almost impossible situation. A motion to take up is subject to debate and against it under the Chair's decision, a cloture petition cannot lie. Consequently there is no way by which this situation can be changed, except by physical exhaustion, by keeping the Senate in session day in and day out, which I hope will not be necessary, although we shall have to get to it next year unless this proposed change is made.

I appreciate the view of the President pro tempore as to what the word "measure" means—which, after all, is a very narrow question, and certainly is open to debate. I further appreciate the Chair's good faith in making the ruling. However, it is a question on which the Senate has never spoken and I believe the Senate should determine that question before forcing us into a position of having a filibuster on an attempt to change the rule, which perhaps would be even a more difficult matter, because every Senator interested in stopping any bill at all would oppose an attempt to change the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has appealed from the decision of the Chair. Therefore, the pending question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the decision of the Senate?

The Chair would like to add that he welcomes the appeal, because, as he indicated in his ruling, he feels that this is a matter on which the Senate itself must speak.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to permit me to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do so, if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I propound the following inquiry: If a motion is made to lay the appeal on the table, is that motion subject to debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No motion to table is ever subject to debate.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

If the motion to table the appeal is agreed to, then, of course, the result is to sustain the present occupant of the chair in his decision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the appeal is sustained, the Chair is overruled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking the question: If the appeal is sustained, is the decision of the Chair on the point of order overruled?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The decision of the Chair is overruled, under those circumstances; and the cloture petition is valid, if the Chair is overruled on this appeal.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, would it be mandatory, 1 hour after the Senate convenes on Wednesday, that the cloture petition be voted upon?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the judgment of the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to have the Chair restate the ruling just made. I am sure several Members of the Senate did not clearly understand it. Certainly I did not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair stated that if the appeal from the Chair's decision is sustained, the Chair is overruled, and the petition becomes valid, and the cloture procedure provided in the rule will proceed according to the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The appeal entered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio is debatable; is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is debatable.

Mr. RUSSELL. And if the appeal should be tabled, as indicated by the Senator from Nebraska, that would mean that the ruling of the Chair had been sustained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. And failure to lay the appeal on the table would in no wise preclude any Member of the Senate from debating the appeal made by the Senator from Ohio would it?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. TAFT. Under the ruling which the Chair has just made, would the Chair make the same ruling as to a cloture petition to close debate on the appeal by the Senator from Ohio from the decision of the Chair?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator restate his question?

Mr. TAFT. If a cloture petition is filed on the appeal by the Senator from Ohio from the decision of the Chair, will such cloture petition lie, under the rules of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not think so, because the same point would be involved as was involved in the original ruling.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan will state the inquiry.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it the ruling of the Chair that unlimited debate may be had on the appeal from the decision of the Chair, and that a petition for cloture to close such debate cannot be considered or voted on?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct as the Chair understands the situation.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FLANDERS. Will the Senator yield for a parliamentary question?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Am I correct in understanding that I can yield without losing the floor and without losing my rights?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can yield without losing the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I confess myself puzzled as to where we are now. In reading rule XX, I note that it says:

every appeal therefrom—

That is, from a decision of the Chair—

shall be decided at once, and without debate.

How does it come that we are not deciding at once and without debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The main appeal, which is the initial appeal made by the Senator from Ohio, is debatable. Any point of order secondary to that appeal is not debatable.

Mr. FLANDERS. Would the Chair mind referring the Senator from Vermont to the rule which gives that permission or states that condition?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair refers the Senator to rule XX, which he may read to himself, and be advised.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield under the same circumstances and assurances?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Under the same circumstances and assurances, I yield for a question, but I hope it will be brief.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who has studied this matter, a little bit superficially, perhaps, in the past 3 years, and as one who has listened to the eloquent statement by the President pro tempore of his views as to the meaning of the term "pending measure," I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia or the Senator from Georgia a question. I personally shall vote to sustain the ruling of the Chair if the appeal comes to a vote. My question to the Senator from Virginia is, In view of the ruling by the President pro tempore, and in view of the primary need of the Senate, itself, to be able to make rule XXII effective, would the Senator from Virginia or the Senator from Georgia object to a unanimous-consent request to take up Calendar No. 85, Senate Resolution 25, at the present time?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I asked the Senator from Virginia the question, in the first instance.

Mr. EASTLAND. Whether the Senator from Virginia objects or not, I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi objects. Whether the Senator from Virginia objects is now a moot question.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The Senator from Mississippi has already objected, so any answer on my part would be purely a moot proceeding.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I am sorry; I cannot yield any further. I have been trying to start for nearly an hour, and I should like to get to the debate of the pending subject today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to commend the ruling of the distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate as being both correct and courageous. It was correct because it followed the plain meaning of the English language in the Senate rule relating to cloture. It was correct because it followed established decisions by previous presiding officers on the same point. It was correct because it followed the decisions of the Rules Committee of the Senate, who so recently have said that cloture cannot be invoked on a motion, and have suggested that the rule be so changed that in the future such action may be taken. The ruling was courageous because the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] made an impassioned plea to the Presiding Officer, though admitting that previous decisions had been that cloture could not be applied to a motion. He said he was under the impression that the Presiding Officer felt a proper interpretation of the rule would require him to rule against the motion of the Senator from Nebraska, but he appealed to the Presiding Officer to give power to the majority here, inferring that the sentiments of the Presiding Officer were in line with what the majority wanted to do. I naturally assume, therefore, Mr. President, that if the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, who signed the cloture petition, should succeed in getting the Congress to pass an anti-poll-tax bill, he would make the same kind of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which, on every occasion when the question has been before it, has consistently ruled that the Congress has no legal and constitutional right and power to act.

Mr. President, special sessions of the Congress are ordinarily called for the consideration of a national emergency and ordinarily limit their action to matters falling within that general category. But the first legislation proposed for consideration at this special session has been a bill to repeal the poll tax in seven States in which that qualification of voters is written into the respective State constitutions. No one has contended, and I am sure no one will care to contend, that the President of the United States would have been justified in calling a special session of the Congress to take such action on the basis of a national emergency, and no one has contended, and I am sure no one will contend, that it was a national emergency which controlled the policy of bringing up an anti-poll-tax bill as the first legislative action to be taken by the Senate at this special session.

So, at the outset of my remarks today on the subject of the anti-poll-tax bill, I wish to make it crystal clear that neither I nor any other southern Senator had any choice whatever in saying what legislation should be first considered at this special session. I also wish to make it crystal clear that every Senator from the South who shall stoutly resist the pending proposal to do an unwarranted and an unconstitutional thing to seven Southern States will promptly yield to any request from the Republican side to end debate on the anti-poll-tax bill for the consideration of legislation deemed to be either directly or indirectly related to a national emergency. What has actually occurred since we convened on last Monday is an effort to create a national emergency through an unwarranted and unconstitutional act which will affect, as so brilliantly explained last Thursday by my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], not only seven Southern States but each and every one of the 48 States of the Union whose star is so proudly proclaimed upon the blue field of our national emblem, an emblem which one of my ancestors, Col. John Armistead, of Caroline, kept flying throughout the British bombardment of Fort McHenry in the War of 1812, an action which challenges the oath that I took and which all of my distinguished colleagues took before we were permitted to qualify as a Senator of the United States from the State we so proudly represent. I know all other Senators are as familiar with that oath as I am, but for the benefit of those who may not know its solemn character I now repeat that oath:

I, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

The portion of that oath which needs to be stressed on this historic occasion is the part which reads:

I take this obligation freely, without mental reservation or purpose of evasion.

To that I desire to add the concluding sentences of a full-page advertisement on the subject of freedom, published July 4, 1948, by John W. Anderson, of Gary, Ind.:

Why learn from alien tyranny—too late—what your departed freedom meant to you?

Why feel—some early day—the lasting scorn of children now your friends?

Would you have children know you missed your chance to pass along to them that freedom your more thoughtful fathers did not fail to pass to you?

Take one long look deep into a youngster's eager eyes, before you seal his fate.

Then pledge to him your faith, your high resolve—to live, and act, American.

Mr. President, I was deeply impressed by the remark of the President pro tempore of the Senate in ruling on the cloture issue, when he referred to the necessity of protecting the rights of minorities

and when he referred to the kind of oath he had taken and which all of us, as plain, ordinary Members of this body, have taken, to uphold the Constitution and to do what we think is right between God and our consciences. He stated that, regardless of the fact that, personally, he should like to vote for the poll-tax bill, regardless of the fact that he thought it would be a good thing to pass it, he could not bring himself to override the rights of the minorities in this body as they exist under the rules of the Senate.

That is the issue which I propose to discuss on this poll-tax question. Before I have concluded I shall quote from a brilliant speech made by a former President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in which he referred to the unique quality of our Government in its protection of minorities, saying that, through the division of powers between the Federal Government on the one hand and the States on the other hand, there were many instances in which a bare majority in the Congress could not override the minority in the States.

I am looking at this time at a distinguished friend from a Western State. I know what is in his mind regarding whether a bare majority, let us say, of this Congress shall override the wishes of his State on an economic problem which would vitally affect his State. I know that is in his heart as I speak.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the pending bill for the following reasons:

First. It is unconstitutional, as demonstrated by debates in the Constitutional Convention, by explanations of the Constitution in the Federalist papers and in State ratifying conventions, and by decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Second. It is unnecessary, because poll-tax payment as a prerequiste to voting is now imposed by only seven States where the trend is to eliminate the restriction by State action, as illustrated by the constitutional amendment which will be voted on in Virginia next year.

Third. It is undesirable, because it would create a confused situation in States which have the poll-tax requirement imbedded in their constitutions and because it would be another step in the direction of submerging the sovereignty of the States in an overpowering central government.

Let us first consider the history of the type of tax which is here involved and its association with the privilege of voting.

A point sometimes overlooked is that the poll tax came into being in this country not as a device for restricting suffrage, but as a liberalizing measure to increase the number of those eligible to vote.

When the Federal Constitution was adopted in 1789, only Vermont had universal suffrage. The general requirement for voting was ownership of property, usually real estate. The men who framed our Constitution knew that the State Constitutions adopted by Delaware, Maryland, and New Jersey in 1776, by Georgia in 1777, and by Massachusetts in 1780, all contained provisions that voters must be males, at least 20 years of age, who possessed a freehold or estate. In 1789, the year after it had ratified the Constitution, the State of Georgia liberalized its requirements by extending the vote to those who had prepaid taxes, even though they did not have the property-ownership qualification. Other States took similar action and the adoption of the poll tax was quite generally recognized as the first major step in expansion of the suffrage.

Specifically, we find the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776, section 6, limited the vote to freemen 21 years and over, resident for 1 year next before the election, and who had paid taxes during that time. This qualification as to taxes was expanded by the State's 1790 constitution.

The New York Constitution of 1777, article VII, in describing qualifications of electors, included the phrase "and been rated and actually paid taxes to this State." This was retained in the 1801 revision.

The North Carolina Constitution of 1776, article VIII, specified residence of 12 months before an election, and added, "and shall have paid public taxes."

The South Carolina Constitution of 1778 provided prepayment of taxes as an alternative to land ownership as a voting qualification.

It must be observed, too, that the men who drafted the Constitution did not overlook, but carefully considered, the various restrictions placed on voting at the time.

CONVENTION DEBATES

Thus, in the debates at the Constitutional Convention, as reported by Elliott, we find James Madison suggesting that there be a definite statement of qualifications placed in the Constitution, and expressing the opinion that the freeholders of the country—landowners—would be the safest depository of republican liberty.

It was recognized, however, that the qualifications fixed by the States were not all the same, and that a uniform rule would require changes in their basic laws which might hinder ratification of the Constitution. Consequently, the Committee of Detail, on August 6, 1787, recommended that, "The qualifications of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors of the several States, of the most numerous branch of their own legislatures"—volume 5, Elliott's Debates, page 377.

I digress, Mr. President, to comment on the question asked last Thursday by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] as to whether or not the word "same" was in the Constitution. No; the word "same" was not in the Constitution, but it was in the language of the committee which made the recommendation which was finally adopted as section 2 of article 1 of the Constitution. It is but another evidence, Mr. President, of the great wisdom and of the great skill of those who framed that instrument that not only did they set up a unique form of government, which has lasted longer than any other similar form of government in the world, and under which in a little over a century and a half we have become the most prosperous and, for the most part, the happiest people in the world, but it is also remarkable for the fact that they did not insert any unnecessary words. Gladstone knew what he was saying when he stated, in effect, that the Constitution was the greatest instrument ever struck off at a given time by the hand and purpose of man. It is simplicity itself, with no surpluses, boiled right down to the final analysis, and that is what we are coming to in this debate—what was this boiled down to and what did it mean?

The proposal of the committee on detail which I have just mentioned touched off a long debate, in which Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, advocated a uniform rule in the Constitution limiting the franchise to landowners. He objected to making the question of qualifications dependent on the will of the States, not because he thought they would unduly restrict the electorate, but because he feared they would be too generous in extending the privilege.

Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, warned, however, that the right of suffrage was a tender point, carefully guarded in the State constitutions, and that tampering with it might wreck the new National Government.

James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, also took issue with Morris. He said it would be difficult to settle on a uniform rule for all States, and he pointed in particular to the possibility that a disagreeable situation might arise if electors of the State legislature and Congress were not the same.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. For what purpose?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make some remarks for 7 or 8 minutes in the Senator's time without his losing the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I regret very much, but the Senator from Virginia was about an hour late in starting his remarks, and he is going to run out of his own time before the shades of night fall. I regret very much that I cannot give my time to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, because I do not have enough left for myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The Senator from Virginia declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Not a 7- or 8-minute question.

Mr. LUCAS. A very short question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I shall yield if it is a very vital question. I am trying to discuss a vital issue, and I hope the Senator will not ask me a question which is not relevant to what I am discussing.

Mr. LUCAS. It is hardly relevant, and yet in a way it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Let me yield after I finish the branch of the subject I am now discussing. I do not like to have broken up my discussion of the interpretation of the provision to which I have been referring.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that all these remarks be stricken from the RECORD in order that the Senator's thoughts on this very important matter will not be disconnected.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I want the Senator to understand that I should like the best way in the world to yield, but I lost an hour and a half in getting started. I have prepared a speech which I am trying to complete today, because I hope it is a logical discussion of what is at stake.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia declines to yield. The RECORD will stand. The Senator from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. I desired to interrupt the Senator in order to inform him and the Senate what Governor Dewey does not propose to do in connection with what the Senator is discussing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. "It would be very hard and disagreeable," Wilson said, as reported by Madison, "for the same persons, at the same time, to vote for Representatives in the State legislature, and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislature" (5 Ell. Deb. 385).

George Mason, of Virginia, also contended for the very point I am stressing today—that a power to alter the qualifications of voters would be a dangerous power in the hands of the National Legislature. Once the principle is established that the Congress can make such changes, the power used at one time to expand the electorate may be used at another to restrict it, and, theoretically at least, the restriction could be carried so far that we would have a despotism.

Mr. Mason called attention to the fact that eight or nine States already had abolished land-holding qualifications, although most of them continued to require some material evidence of the citizen's responsible interest in his Government.

At the conclusion of this debate the Morris proposal to limit the ballot to freeholders was defeated by a vote of seven States to one and the committee plan was adopted without a dissenting vote. Its language was changed only slightly, and became that part of section 2 of article I of the Constitution which reads:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Nowhere in the original body of the original Constitution will be found a restriction on the discretion of the States in fixing the qualifications of voters. There are some restrictions in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and nineteenth amendments. But, as I shall show, these restrictions do not cover the point at issue in considering this bill. It should be noted, too, that they were made effective by amending the Constitution, which is the only proper approach that should be taken by those who seek to eliminate the poll-tax requirement, and that is the approach which the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] indicated the southern Senators would not oppose if it was made at this special session.

The thinking of the men who wrote our Constitution is indicated not only by the Convention debates, but also by contemporary writings and statements.

We find, for example, that Thomas Jefferson favored payment of taxes as an alternative to holding land as a qualification for voters. In his draft for a proposed Constitution for Virginia, written in June 1776 while he was in Philadelphia as a member of the Continental Congress, Jefferson proposed:

> All male persons of full age and sane mind, having a freehold estate in (one-fourth of an acre) of land in any town or in (25) acres of land in the country, and all persons resident in the colony who shall have paid scott and lot to government the last (2 years) shall have right to give their vote in the election of their respective representatives.

In this same draft, incidentally, Jefferson proposed that—

> No person hereafter coming into this country shall be held within the same in slavery under any pretext whatever.

That, Mr. President, was proposed by Thomas Jefferson for the Virginia Constitution in 1776, and it was proposed to be written into the Federal Constitution in Philadelphia in 1787. It was primarily the State of Massachusetts and other maritime States that were bringing the slaves into the South which objected to that being written into the Constitution as proposed by the Representatives from Virginia, and they said that if that were put into the Constitution they would walk out of the convention before any constitution had been agreed to.

Jefferson gave a further exposition of his ideas on suffrage in his 1873 draft for a Constitution for Virginia in which he proposed:

> All free male citizens of full age, and sane mind, who for 1 year before shall have been resident in the county or shall through the whole of that time have possessed therein real property of the value of ——; or shall for the same time have been enrolled in the militia, and no others shall have a right to vote for delegates for the said county, and for senatorial electors for the district.

FEDERALIST INTERPRETATION

As has already been indicated, the members of the Constitutional Convention were conscious of the need to satisfy the people of the various States on this touchy subject of suffrage rights and it was one of the subjects which received attention in the Federalist papers which gave the most extensive contemporary exposition of the Constitution.

In No. 52 of the Federalist, written by either Madison or Hamilton, it was pointed out that the Constitution made the qualification for Federal electors the same as those of the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

> The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government.

The Federalist author continued:

> It was incumbent on the convention, therefore to define and establish this right in the Constitution. To have left it open for the occasional regulation of the Congress would have been improper for the reason just mentioned. To have submitted it to the legislative discretion of the States, would have been improper for the same reason; and for the additional reason that it would have rendered too dependent on the State governments that branch of the Federal Government which ought to be dependent on the people alone.

Mark the following words of the paragraph in the quotation:

> To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention.
>
> The provision made by the Convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State, because it is conformable to the standard already established, or which may be established by the State itself. It will be safe to the United States, because, being fixed by the State constitutions, it is not alterable by the State governments, and it cannot be feared that the people of the States will alter this part of their constitutions in such a manner as to abridge rights secured to them by the Federal Constitution.

Then, in the Fifty-fourth Federalist, which also may have been written by either Madison or Hamilton, it was remarked:

> The qualifications on which the right of suffrage depend are not, perhaps, the same in any two States. In some of the States the difference is very material. In every State, a certain proportion of inhabitants are deprived of this right by the constitution of the State, who will be included in the census by which the Federal Constitution apportions the Representatives.

Again in the Fifty-seventh Federalist the question was asked:

> Who are to be the electors of the Federal Representatives?

And the writer replied to his own question:

> Not the rich, more than the poor; nor the learned, more than the ignorant; nor the haughty heirs of distinguished names, more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States. They are to be the same who exercise the right in every State of electing the corresponding branch of the legislature of the State.

Discussing the subject of qualification of electors further in the Fifty-ninth Federalist, Hamilton wrote:

> It will not be alleged that an election law could have been framed and inserted in the Constitution which would have been always applicable to every probable change in the situation of the country; and it will therefore not be denied that a discretionary power over elections ought to exist somewhere. It will, I presume, be as readily conceded that there were only three ways in which this power could have been reasonably modified and disposed; that it must either have been lodged wholly in the National Legislature, or wholly in the State legislatures, or primarily in the latter and ultimately in the former. The last mode has, with reason, been preferred by the Convention. They have submitted the regulation of elections for the Federal Government, in the first instance, to the local administrations; which,

in ordinary cases, and when no improper views prevail, may be both more convenient and more satisfactory; but they have reserved to the national authority a right to interpose, whenever extraordinary circumstances might render that interposition necessary to its safety.

Note that Hamilton, always an advocate of strong central government and fearful of State encroachments, in attempting to win support for the compromise provisions of the Constitution which he had helped to frame claimed no more than that the national authority might interpose itself in the regulation of elections when "necessary to its safety."

He argued that giving the exclusive power of regulating elections for the National Government to the State legislatures would leave the existence of the Union at their mercy, since they could annihilate it simply by refusing to hold any election for national officials.

Turning then to the other side of the picture, he said:

Suppose an article had been introduced into the Constitution empowering the United States to regulate the elections for the particular States, would any man have hesitated to condemn it, both as an unwarrantable transposition of power and as a premeditated engine for the destruction of State governments?

Mind you, that is the great Alexander Hamilton, of New York, speaking. Today a cloture petition was signed by a very brilliant Member of the Senate, the political heir of Alexander Hamilton, of New York. He sent to the desk a cloture petition to shut off debate on what is involved in this question, and to bring the question to a prompt vote in the Senate. For what purpose? For the purpose of enacting a law by the Congress to regulate the qualifications of the voters in the States. Therefore I regret that this distinguished political heir of Alexander Hamilton is not at the moment in the Chamber, in order that I might bring to his attention what that master mind, that burning patriot, that architect of a great form of government, who helped to write this provision into the Constitution, said that it meant.

I continue to read from the statement of Alexander Hamilton:

The violation of principle in this case would have required no comment—

That is Alexander Hamilton, speaking about an effort of the Congress to fix the qualifications of voters.

The violation of principle, in this case, would have required no comment; and to an unbiased observer, it will not be less apparent in the project of subjecting the existence of the National Government, in a similar respect, to the pleasure of the State governments. An impartial view of the matter cannot fail to result in a conviction, that each, as far as possible, ought to depend on itself for its own preservation.

Alexander Hamilton said that the Federal Government would depend for its preservation upon section 4, by which the Congress may regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections to make sure that all the States have such elections; and that the States would preserve their integrity and sovereignty under section 2 of article I, which gives them the power of fixing the qualifications of voters, subject only to the restriction that they cannot impose on the electors or voters for Federal offices any different requirements than they impose on those who they say are qualified to vote for the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Continuing his discussion in the Sixtieth Federalist, Hamilton said that with the House of Representatives being elected directly by the people, the Senate by the State legislatures, and the President by electors chosen for the purpose by the people, there would be little probability of a common interest to cement these different branches in a predilection for any particular class of electors.

As to the Senate he said:

It is impossible that any regulation of time and manner, which is all that is proposed to be submitted to the National Government in respect to that body, can affect the spirit which will direct the choice of its members.

Further on in the same paper, discussing fears that elections might be manipulated in the interest of the "rich and the well born," Hamilton said the only way of securing such preference would be by prescribing qualifications of property either for those who may elect or be elected.

"But," he added, "this forms no part of the power to be conferred upon the National Government."

Again I say that I am sorry that the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is not present. I am afraid that he does not know what his patron saint Alexander Hamilton has said on this subject. Who knew more about the Constitution than did Alexander Hamilton? Who would rise in the Senate and say, "Alexander Hamilton was an old fogey. He had a befuddled mind. He thought he was trying to write something in the Constitution that he understood, but he did not know what he was talking about, and when he wrote this statement in the Federalist papers he did not know what he was talking about. This has no binding effect on us now in construing language" which to most of us appears to be so plain.

For whatever it may be worth I quote again what Alexander Hamilton said:

This forms no part of the power to be conferred upon the National Government. Its authority would be expressly restricted to the regulation of the times, the places, the manner of elections. The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked upon other occasions, are defined and fixed in the Constitution, and are unalterable by the legislature.

He was referring, of course, to this body. Alexander Hamilton wrote as clearly as English language could be expressed that the power to pass on the qualifications of voters was left expressly by the Constitution to the States, and he stated that such powers are unalterable by the legislature.

The clear distinction Hamilton made, in explaining that the Federal Government might regulate the time, the place, and the manner of holding elections but could not change the qualifications of the electors, was also recognized and emphasized by others.

RATIFYING CONVENTION DEBATES

In the Massachusetts convention, in answer to a query as to whether Congress might prescribe a property qualification for voters, Mr. Rufus King, a member of of the Federal Convention, said:

The idea of the honorable gentleman from Douglass transcends my understanding; for the power of control given by this section extends to the manner of elections, not the qualifications of the electors.

I am sorry that the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who today signed a cloture petition to bring about consideration of this very kind of bill to let the Congress pass upon qualifications of voters, is not present to hear me quote from his distinguished political ancestor, Mr. Rufus King, a member of the delegation from Massachusetts, who helped to write the language of the Constitution, and a member of the ratifying convention in Massachusetts who helped to interpret what that language meant. Are we to say that we know more than did Mr. Rufus King about what he meant in Philadelphia? Are we to say that we know more about what Mr. Rufus King meant when he urged Massachusetts to ratify this document? There were those in that convention who were fearful, just as the people of Virginia were fearful, that the Federal Government would gain too much power. They were complaining that the Federal Government should not have power to regulate the times, places, and manner of elections. Are we to assume that we know more about what he had in his mind; or are we going to go by what he himself said he had in his mind? If we are, here is what he said:

For the power of control given by this section—

He is debating how far the Federal Government could go—

extends to the manner of elections, not the qualifications of the electors.

And James Wilson, who had warned in the Federal Convention of the difficulty that might result if qualifications of State and national electors were different, had this to say in the Pennsylvania convention:

In order to know who are qualified to be electors of the House of Representatives, we are to inquire who are qualified to be electors of the legislature of each State. If there be no legislature in the States, there can be no electors of them; if there be no such electors, there is no criterion to know who are qualified to elect Members of the House of Representatives. By this short, plain deduction, the existence of State legislatures is proved to be essential to the existence of the General Government.

In the Virginia Convention, Wilson Nicholas, one of the delegates, said:

If, therefore, by the proposed plan, it is left uncertain in whom the right of suffrage is to rest, or if it has placed that right in improper hands, I shall admit that it is a radical defect; but in this plan there is a fixed rule for determining the qualifications of electors, and that rule the most judicious that could possibly have been devised, because it refers to a criterion which cannot be changed. A qualification that gives a right to elect representatives for the State legislatures, gives also, by this Constitution, a right to choose Representatives for the General Government.

All those who are familiar with what happened in the ratifying convention at Richmond know how Patrick Henry fought the ratification of the Constitution on the ground that it gave the Federal Government too much power; and this is one of the things that the question was raised about: Can the Federal Government pass on the qualifications of the voters; or can Virginia, as in the past, fix those qualifications, and the Federal Government just determine the times, places, and manner, if it wishes to do so, of holding those elections, where those who have the right to vote under the State law can then freely participate?

Wilson Nicholas was a member of the Philadelphia Convention. He came back to Richmond and explained the meaning of what had been done at Philadelphia. He gave the members of the Richmond ratifying convention most positive assurance that the Federal Government could not and never would undertake to pass upon and fix the qualifications of voters. Even with that assurance, Mr. President, the Constitution was ratified in Virginia by a majority of only eight votes. I am very proud of the fact that I had two ancestors in that convention, Col. James Gordon, of Lancaster, and his son, James Gordon, Jr., close friends of Madison. I am proud they voted to ratify the Constitution, and I am glad to stand here and inform the Senate what the men who ratified it had in mind when they did so, and how wrong it would be to ignore the intentions of the framers of the Constitution and the intentions of those who participated in the convention and to override the States and to assume a right which they themselves have, and then take the step of pulling out one stone of the foundation of our constitutional representative democracy.

Again, in explaining the plan to the North Carolina Convention, John Steele said:

Every man who has a right to vote for a representative to our legislature will ever have a right to vote for a Representative to the General Government. Does it not expressly provide that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? Can they, without a most manifest violation of the Constitution, alter the qualifications of the electors: The power over the manner of elections does not include that of saying who shall vote. The Constitution expressly says that the qualifications are those which entitle a man to vote for a State representative. It is, then, clearly and indubitably fixed and determined who shall be the electors; and the power over the manner only enables them to determine how these electors shall elect—whether by ballot, or by vote, or by any other way.

Mr. President, one would think that the Senate had just been confronted with the question as to whether we could change the qualifications of electors; but John Steele, as I recall, was a delegate from North Carolina to the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention, and he returned to his State convention to explain the meaning of what had been done at the Philadelphia Convention. The members of the State ratifying convention wished to know whether the Federal Government could change this procedure. He said to them, I repeat:

Can they, without a most manifest violation of the Constitution, alter the qualifications of the electors?

KEEPING FAITH WITH STATES

Mr. President, these excerpts from the debates in the ratifying conventions point to the correctness of the conclusion reached by Mr. Jesse F. Orton, New York attorney and student of constitutional law, who said in a brief on this subject prepared several years ago:

This sentence (in article I, section 2, saying electors shall have the same qualifications as electors of the most numerous branch of State legislatures), the only one on "qualifications," was obviously a material representation and also a solemn pledge, that each ratifying State would be permitted, as in fact it was commanded, to use in electing its Representatives the same qualifications used in electing the larger branch of its legislature. * * * This provision in section 2 of article I was definitely understood by each State as such a pledge and absolute assurance. Every State ratified the Constitution upon that express condition, many times repeated during the period of ratification. The pledge was irrevocable, except by amendment, approved by three-fourths of the States. It was also considered a wise provision for the Nation. The United States has never dishonored that pledge. To dishonor it now would be an act of perfidy.

Those are not my words; those are the words of a very distinguished attorney from New York City.

He goes on to say:

Few historical facts are more conclusively established than the fact that this pledge was made for the express and avowed purpose of obtaining the consent of the States to the adoption of the Constitution. It was repeated and emphasized in the Federalist, written chiefly by Madison and Hamilton, and in other writings and oral statements for the sole purpose of securing ratification. In the ratifying conventions it was used to satisfy any "doubting Thomas" that the States were absolutely protected in their power to control the suffrage in the election of Representatives.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of permitting me to ask unanimous consent to make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. With the understanding that I do not yield the floor or shall not lose any of my rights to the floor, I yield for the purpose of permitting a request to be made for an insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not raise any objection at this time, and I certainly do not wish to interfere with the Senator's right to the floor; but I wish to point out that the time is rapidly approaching when we may have to have a very rigid interpretation and enforcement of the Senate rules in regard to yielding, and it may also perhaps be necessary to begin to hold night sessions, so that the Senate may proceed with its business. I am not objecting at this time, though.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I shall yield this time, but from now until I conclude my remarks on this subject, I shall decline to yield any more.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand the Senator's position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington asks the Senator from Virginia to yield for the purpose of requesting unanimous consent for the insertion in the RECORD, without prejudicing the rights on the part of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With that understanding, the insertion will be made.

(Mr. MAGNUSON's request appears elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appriate heading.)

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Continuing the quotation:

Without this assurance, consent would have been refused by many of the States. With it, ratification was obtained in Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia by a vote of less than 53 percent of members present and voting.

In section 4, after providing, "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof," it was provided that "the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators." This grant of power to set at naught the election laws passed by the States in obedience to this command in section 4 met with more violent and angry protests probably than any other provision in the Constitution. Section 4 undoubtedly lost many votes of delegates who otherwise would have voted for ratification. If Congress had been given similar power to set at naught the action of the States with respect to qualifications, there is little doubt that nine States would not have ratified and the proposed Union would not have been formed.

All that, Mr. President, was a quotation from this distinguished lawyer in New York.

Certainly there is nothing equivocal about the language of article I, section 2, which says those who vote for national officers in each State shall have the same qualifications as those who vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. And section 4 of article I is precise in limiting the control of Congress to the times, places, and manner of electing Senators and Representatives.

The significance of these limitations is reinforced by the fact that as late as 1912, when the seventeenth amendment was proposed by Congress, providing for popular election of Senators, language was used identical to that of article I, section 2. This amendment says:

The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

This, mind you, Mr. President, was adopted after more than a century of experience with the suffrage provisions contained in the Constitution and also after there had been ample time to observe operations of the newer poll taxes which were adopted between 1875 and 1908.

It is a matter of record, however, that when the seventeenth amendment was

debated in Congress, no issue was raised on the right of the States to determine the qualification of electors. But, on the contrary, serious consideration was given to a proposal to take away from Congress, by amendment, the authority to alter the times, places, and manner of holding elections.

Searching elsewhere than in article I for constitutional justification for abolishing the poll-tax requirement, supporters of such legislation have sometimes cited article IV, section 4, which says:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

Analysis of this section as it was understood by those who wrote it tends, however, to strengthen rather than weaken the position of those who claim the States have a legitimate right to require tax payments as a prerequisite to voting.

In considering article IV, section 4, in No. 43 of the Federalist, Mr. Madison frankly raised the question whether or not the guaranty of a republican form of government might not "become a pretext for alteration in the State governments, without the concurrence of the States themselves." Answering his own question, he said:

If the General Government should interpose by virtue of this constitutional authority, it will be, of course, bound to pursue the authority. But the authority extends no further than to a guaranty of a republican form of government, which supposes a preexisting government of the form which is to be guaranteed. So long therefore as the existing republican forms are continued by the States, they are guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. Whenever the States may choose to substitute other republican forms, they have a right to do so, and to claim the Federal guaranty for the latter. The only restriction imposed on them is, that they shall not exchange republican for antirepublican constitutions, a restriction which, it is presumed, will hardly be considered as a grievance.

Those are the words of James Madison, explaining the meaning of that section of the Constitution. It will be noted that Madison believed that the guaranty applied to the forms of government existing in the States at the time the Constitution was written, and as I already have indicated, these governments included property or tax qualifications on the right to vote.

In Willoughby's authoritative book on the Constitution (1, 2d ed. 215) we also find him saying this with respect to article IV, section 4:

It will be noticed that the Constitution does not itself define the term "republican form of government." It has, however, always been an accepted rule of construction that the technical and special terms used in the Constitution are to be given that meaning which they had at the time that instrument was framed. This is but reasonable, for, in default of anything to the contrary, those who drafted the Constitution are to be presumed to have intended the words which they used to have that meaning they knew them to have. For a definition, then, of "republican government" we must discover what, in 1787, such a political form was considered to be. Certainly we may say that the governments of the Thirteen Original States as they existed at the time the Constitution was drafted must have been considered as illustrating the republican type. Furthermore, the constitutions of all those States which have been admitted to the Union since 1787 must be regarded as having been impliedly considered republican by Congress at the time of the giving of its assent to their entrance into the Union.

Also, discussing article I, section 4, in the Virginia ratifying convention, Mr. Madison explained:

It was found impossible to fix the time, place, and manner of the election of Representatives in the Constitution. It was found necessary to leave the regulation of these, in the first place, to the State governments, as being best acquainted with the situation of the people, subject to the control of the General Government, in order to enable it to produce uniformity and prevent its own dissolution.

And, considering the State governments and General Government as distinct bodies, acting in different and independent capacities for the people, it was thought the particular regulations should be submitted to the former and the general regulations to the latter. Were they exclusively under the control of the State governments, the General Government might easily be dissolved. But if they be regulated properly by the State legislatures, the congressional control will very probably never be exercised. The power appears to me satisfactory, and as unlikely to be abused as any part of the Constitution.

This, it will be noted, deals only with the times, places, and manner of holding elections and not with qualifications of voters since, under the provision of article I, section 2, a State could not attempt to dissolve the General Government by disqualifying voters without automatically dissolving its own government.

COURT DECISIONS

Now, let us see what our courts have had to say about the dividing line between State and Federal powers as applied to voters and elections.

After the adoption of the fourteenth amendment a woman in Missouri, where the right to vote was limited to males, sued the registrar because he refused to put her name on the list of voters. She contended she was a citizen of the United States under the amendment and that the State could not abridge her right as such a citizen to vote for Presidential electors.

In this case, reported as *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wallace 162) and decided in 1875, the Supreme Court denied her claim. The Court held that since she was a citizen, born of citizen parents before the amendment, her status with respect to voting was not changed by it, because the right to vote before the amendment was not necessarily one of the privileges or immunities of citizenship. This was demonstrated by the necessity for the fifteenth amendment, which protected the Negro from being excluded from voting because of his color but did not affect his wife, who remained debarred on account of sex. It took the later nineteenth amendment to remove that bar.

The fourteenth amendment, the Court said, "does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone."

Another issue raised in this case was whether or not the State, in refusing to allow women to vote, had failed to provide the republican form of government guaranteed by article IV, section 4.

On this point the Court said:

The guaranty is of a republican form of government. No particular government is designated as republican, neither is the exact form to be guaranteed, in any manner especially designated. Here, as in other parts of the instrument, we are compelled to resort elsewhere to ascertain what was intended. The guaranty necessarily implies a duty on the part of the States themselves to provide such a government. All the States had governments when the Constitution was adopted. In all, the people participated to some extent, through their representatives selected in the manner specifically provided. These governments the Constitution did not change. They were accepted precisely as they were, and it is, therefore, to be presumed that they were such as it was the duty of the States to provide.

Thus we have unmistakable evidence of what was republican in form within the meaning of that term as employed by the Constitution.

That is the language of the Court, Mr. President. I am still quoting from the Court's opinion:

As has been seen (in the argument that has gone before) all the citizens of the States were not invested with the right of suffrage. In all, save perhaps New Jersey, this right was only bestowed upon men and not upon all of them. Under these circumstances, it is certainly now too late to contend that a government is not republican, within the meaning of this guaranty in the Constitution, because women are not made voters.

While the Court in this instance was considering particularly the limitations in the State governments which prevented women from voting, the opinion delivered by Chief Justice Waite cited other types of limitation as well.

The opinion, at page 172, contained this summary statement:

When the Federal Constitution was adopted, all the States, with the exception of Rhode Island and Connecticut, had constitutions of their own. These two continued to act under their charters from the Crown. Upon an examination of these constitutions we find that in no State were all citizens permitted to vote. Each State determined for itself who should have that power.

Thus in New Hampshire, "every male inhabitant of each town and parish with town privileges, and places unincorporated in the State, of 21 years of age and upwards, excepting paupers and persons excused from paying taxes at their own request," were its voters; in Massachusetts, "every male inhabitant of 21 years of age and upwards, having a freehold estate within the commonwealth of the annual income of 3 pounds, or any estate of the value of 60 pounds"; in Rhode Island, "such as are admitted free of the company and society" of the Colony; in Connecticut, such persons as had "maturity in years, quiet and peaceable behavior, a civil conversation, and 40 shillings freehold or 40 pounds personal estate," if so certified by the selectmen; in New York, "every male inhabitant of full age who shall have personally resided within one of the counties of the State for 6 months immediately preceding the day of election * * * if during the time aforesaid he shall have been a freeholder possessing a freehold of the value of 20 pounds within the county, or have rented a tenement therein of the yearly value of 40 shillings, and been rated and actually paid taxes to the State"; in New Jersey, "all inhabitants * * * of full age who are worth 50 pounds, proclamation-money, clear estate in the same, and have resided in the county in which they claim a vote for 12 months immediately preceding the election"; in Pennsylvania, "every freeman of the age of 21 years, having resided in the State for 2 years next before the election, and within that time paid a State or county tax which shall have been assessed at least 6 months before the election"; in Delaware and Virginia, "as exercised by law at present"; in Maryland, "all freemen above 21 years of age having a freehold of 50 acres of land in the county in which they offer to vote and residing therein, and all freemen having property in the State above the value of 30 pounds current money, and having resided in the county in which they offer to vote one whole year next preceding the election"; in North Carolina, for Senators, "all freemen of the age of 21 years who have been inhabitants of any one county within the State 12 months immediately preceding the day of election, and possessed of a freehold within the same county of 50 acres of land for 6 months next before and at the day of election," and for members of the house of commons, "all freemen of the age of 21 years who have been inhabitants in any one county within the State 12 months immediately preceding the day of any election, and shall have paid public taxes"; in South Carolina, "every free white man of the age of 21 years, being a citizen of the State and having resided therein 2 years previous to the day of election and who hath a freehold of 50 acres of land, or a town lot of which he hath been legally seized and possessed for at least 6 months before such election, or (not having such freehold or town lot), hath been a resident within the election district in which he offers to give his vote 6 months before such election, and hath paid a tax the preceding year of three shillings sterling towards the support of the government"; and in Georgia, "such citizen and inhabitants of the State as shall have attained to the age of 21 years, and shall have paid tax for the year next preceding the election, and shall have resided 6 months within the county."

I am still quoting from the decision of Mr. Justice Story. The Court said:

In this condition of the law in respect to suffrage in the several States it cannot for a moment be doubted that if it had been intended to make all citizens of the United States voters the framers of the Constitution would not have left it to implication. So important a change in the condition of citizenship as it actually existed, if intended, would have been expressly declared.

That is the first case of the United States Supreme Court on this point. The decisions go right down the line, saying that if there had been anything anywhere in the Constitution that even looked in the direction of the Federal Government's having any control over qualifications in so vital a matter, as my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] said last Thursday—and I have quoted from a judge who said the same thing—in so tender a matter to the States as is the question of who shall vote, the first case said that the framers of the Constitution would not have left it to implication or guesswork; it would have been expressly written in. It was not written in, and, therefore, the first case says that it is not in there.

I ask the Senators to listen to the other cases, because I shall go down the line from the first case to the case cited by the Senator from Mississippi, which was decided in 1941, 6 months after the case was decided upon which some Members of the Senate are relying. The Supreme Court has never deviated, as I propose to show, from the first case right down to 1941, in holding in clear, express, and explicit terms, that the States have exclusive jurisdiction over fixing the qualifications of voters, and that there is nothing anywhere in the Constitution, by indirection, by implication, or in any other way, that can give this proposed power to the Federal Government.

The Court also noted that the Constitution of Rhode Island, which was adopted in 1843, contained qualifications for voting, including a property-ownership requirement.

I call attention to the fact that aside from the various property qualifications of the several States, the list of restrictions as cited in this court opinion included New Hampshire's denial of the vote to "persons excused from paying taxes at their own request"; New York's alternate requirement that voters who did not possess property must have "been rated and actually paid taxes to the State"; Pennsylvania's requirement that voters must pay a tax "assessed at least 6 months before the election" and the tax payment provisions of North Carolina, South Carolina, and of Georgia.

I hope the distinguished Senators from Connecticut will note, too, that at the time the Federal Constitution was adopted the right to vote in their State could be denied to anyone whom the selectmen refused to certify as having "quiet and peaceable behavior and civil conversation."

A little later on, Mr. President, I shall quote from the constitution of one of the great western States. It is not so far west as California, but it is near the Pacific coast. The constitution of that State provides that if anyone believes in polygamy or in anything which resembles what the Mormons used to believe in, he can never vote in that State. That provision is still in the constitution of that State. I have not heard anyone say that Idaho did not have the right to say who can vote in that State. No one has ever challenged that. I never heard anyone challenge the Constitution of Connecticut of 1803, providing that, in addition to paying taxes and residing in Connecticut, the selectmen—and I suppose that means the town council, or some such body—would have to certify that a man was quiet and peaceful in his behavior, and civil in his conversation.

Yet, after pointing out all these restrictions, Mr. Chief Justice Waite concluded that they were acceptable features of a republican form of government and were so recognized by the framers of our Constitution.

The decision of the Court in the case of Minor against Happersett, insofar as applicability of the fourteenth amendment to voting privileges was concerned, was influenced, of course, by the important slaughterhouse cases, which had been decided just 2 years earlier, in 1872.

SLAUGHTERHOUSE CASES

It was these cases which drew a clear line between national citizenship and State citizenship and established that the privileges adhering to one did not necessarily apply to the other.

The State of Louisiana had passed a law to regulate slaughterhouses near New Orleans and suit was brought on the ground that this law discriminated against certain citizens who had previously engaged in business, and that it therefore violated the fourteenth amendment.

More than a hundred pages in the reports—16 Wallace 36—were occupied by the Court's exhaustive analysis of the fourteenth amendment.

In its opinion, the Court said:

The first section of the fourteenth amendment, to which our attention is more specially invited, opens with a definition of citizenship—not only citizenship of the United States, but citizenship of the States. No such definition was previously found in the Constitution, nor had any attempt been made to define it by act of Congress. It had been the occasion of much discussion in the courts, by the executive departments, and in the public journals. It has been said by eminent judges that no man was a citizen of the United States except as he was a citizen of one of the States composing the Union. Those, therefore, who had been born and resided always in the District of Columbia or in the Territories, though within the United States, were not citizens. Whether this proposition was sound or not had never been judicially decided. But it had been held by this Court, in the celebrated Dred Scott case, only a few years before the outbreak of the Civil War, that a man of African descent, whether a slave or not, was not and could not be a citizen of a State or of the United States. This decision, while it met condemnation of some of the ablest statesmen and constitutional lawyers of the country, had never been overruled; and if it was to be accepted as a constitutional limitation of the right of citizenship, then all the Negro race who had recently been made freemen were still not only not citizens but were incapable of becoming so by anything short of an amendment to the Constitution.

To remove this difficulty primarily, and to establish a clear and comprehensive definition of citizenship which should declare what should constitute citizenship of the United States and also citizenship of a State, the first clause of the first section was framed.

That clause is the one reading—

All persons born and naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

The Court continued:

The first observation we have to make on this clause is, that it puts at rest both the questions which we stated to have been subject to differences of opinion. It declares that persons may be citizens of the United States without regard to their citizenship of a particular State, and it overturns the Dred Scott decision by making all persons born within the United States and subject to its jurisdiction citizens of the United States. That its main purpose was to establish the citizenship of the Negro there can be no doubt. The phrase "subject to its jurisdiction" was intended to exclude from its operation children of ministers, consuls, and citizens or subjects of foreign states born within the United States.

The next observation is more important in view of the arguments of counsel in the present case. It is, that the distinction between citizenship of the United States and citizenship of a State is clearly recognized and established. Not only may a man be a

citizen of the United States without being a citizen of a State, but an important element is necessary to convert the former into the latter. He must reside within the State to make him a citizen of it, but it is only necessary that he should be born or naturalized in the United States to be a citizen of the Union.

It is quite clear, then, that there is a citizenship of the United States, and a citizenship of a State, which are distinct from each other, and which depend upon different characteristics or circumstances in the individual.

We think this distinction and its explicit recognition in this amendment of great weight in this argument, because the next paragraph of this same section, which is the one mainly relied on by the plaintiffs in error, speaks only of privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, and does not speak of those of citizens of the several States. The argument, however, in favor of the plaintiffs rests wholly on the assumption that the citizenship is the same, and the privileges and immunities guaranteed by the clause are the same.

The language is: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

It is a little remarkable, if this clause was intended as a protection to the citizens of a State against the legislative power of his own State, that the words "citizen of the State" should be left out when it is so carefully used, and used in contradistinction to citizens of the United States, in the very sentence which precedes it. It is too clear for argument that the change of phraseology was adopted understandingly and with a purpose.

Of the privileges and immunities of the citizen of the United States, and of the privileges and immunities of the citizen of the State, and what they respectively are, we will presently consider; but we wish to state here that it is only the former which are placed by this clause under the protection of the Federal Constitution and that the latter, whatever they may be, are not intended to have any additional protection by this paragraph of the amendment.

If, then, there is a difference between the privileges and immunities belonging to a citizen of the United States as such, and those belonging to the citizen of the State as such, the latter must rest for their security and protection where they have heretofore rested; for they are not embraced by this paragraph of the amendment.

The first occurrence of the words "privileges and immunities" in our constitutional history is to be found in the fourth of the articles of the old Confederation.

It declares "that the better to secure and perpetuate mutual friendships and intercourse among the people of the different States of this Union, the free inhabitants of each of these States, paupers, vagabonds, and fugitives from justice excepted, shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several States; and the people of each State shall have free ingress and regress to and from any other State, and shall enjoy therein all the privileges of trade and commerce, subject to the same duties, impositions, and restrictions as the inhabitants thereof respectively."

In the Constitution of the United States, which superseded the Articles of Confederation, the corresponding provision is found in section 2 of the fourth article, in the following words: "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States."

There can be but little question that the purpose of both these provisions is the same, and that the privileges and immunities intended are the same in each. In the article of the Confederation we have some of these specifically mentioned and enough perhaps to give some general idea of the class of civil rights meant by the phrase.

Fortunately, we are not without judicial instruction on this clause of the Constitution. The first and the leading case on the subject is that of Corfield against Coryell, decided by Mr. Justice Washington in the Circuit Court for the District of Pennsylvania in 1823.

"The inquiry," he says, "is, What are the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States? We feel no hesitation in confining these expressions to those privileges and immunities which are fundamental—which belong of right to the citizens of all free governments, and which have at all times been enjoyed by the citizens of the several States which compose the Union, from the time of their becoming free, independent, and sovereign. What these fundamental principles are, it would be more tedious than difficult to enumerate. They may all, however, be comprehended under the following general heads: Protection by the Government with the right to acquire and possess property of every kind and to pursue and obtain happiness and safety, subject, nevertheless, to such restraints as the Government may prescribe for the general good of the whole."

This definition of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the States is adopted in the main by this Court in the recent case of Ward against the State of Maryland, while it declines to undertake an authoritative definition beyond what was necessary to that decision. The description, when taken to include others not named but which are of the same general character, embraces nearly every civil right for the establishment and protection of which organized government is instituted. They are, in the language of Judge Washington, those rights which are fundamental. Throughout his opinion they are spoken of as rights belonging to the individual as a citizen of a State. They are so spoken of in the constitutional provision which he was construing. And they have always been held to be the class of rights which the State governments were created to establish and secure.

Please notice that last phrase used by the Court:

They have always been held to be the class of rights which the State governments were created to establish and secure.

To continue quoting from the Court's opinion in the Slaughter House cases:

In the case of Paul against Virginia, the Court, in expounding this clause of the Constitution, says that the privileges and immunities secured to citizens of each State in the several States by the provision in question are those privileges and immunities which are common to the citizens of the latter States under their constitutions and laws by virtue of their being citizens.

The constitutional provision there alluded to did not create those rights, which it calls privileges and immunities of citizens of the States. It threw around them in that clause no security for the citizen of the State in which they were claimed or exercised. Nor did it profess to control the power of the State governments over the rights of its own citizens.

Note well that last statement of the Supreme Court:

Nor did it profess to control the power of the State governments over the rights of its own citizens.

But that is what the legislation now under consideration proposes to do.

Continuing with our citation of the Court's opinion:

Its sole purpose was to declare to the several States that whatever those rights, as you grant or establish them to your own citizens, as you limit or qualify, or impose restrictions on their exercise, the same, neither more nor less, shall be the measure of the rights of citizens of other States within your jurisdiction.

It would be the vainest show of learning to attempt to prove by citations of authority that up to the adoption of the recent amendments (that is, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth) no claim or pretense was set up that those rights depended on the Federal Government for their existence or protection beyond the very few express limitations which the Federal Constitution imposed upon the States—such, for instance, as the prohibition against ex post facto laws, bills of attainder, and laws impairing the obligation of contracts. But with the exception of these and a few other restrictions, the entire domain of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the States, as above defined, lay within the constitutional and legislative power of the States, and without that of the Federal Government.

Was it the purpose of the fourteenth amendment, by the simple declaration that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States to transfer the security and protection of rights which we have mentioned to the Federal Government? And where it declared that Congress shall have the power to enforce that article, was it intended to bring within the power of Congress the entire domain of civil rights heretofore belonging exclusively to the States?

All this and more must follow if the proposition of the plaintiff is sound.

For not only are these rights subject to the control of Congress whenever in its discretion any of them are supposed to be abridged by State legislation but that body may also pass laws in advance limiting and restricting the exercise of power by the States in their most ordinary and usual functions, as in its judgment it may think proper on all such subjects and still further such construction would constitute this court a perpetual censor upon all legislation of the States on the civil rights of their own citizens, with authority to nullify such as it did not approve, as consistent with those rights as existed at the time of the adoption of this amendment. The argument, we admit, is not always the most conclusive which is drawn from the consequences urged against the adoption of a particular construction of an instrument. But when, as in the case before us, those consequences are so serious, so far reaching and pervading, so great a departure from the structure and spirit of our institutions, when the effect is to fetter and degrade the State governments by subjecting them to the control of Congress in the exercise of powers heretofore universally conceded to them of the most ordinary and fundamental character, when in fact it radically changes the whole theory of the relations of the State and Federal Governments to each other and of both these governments to the people, the argument has a force that is irresistible in the absence of language which expresses such a purpose too clearly to admit of doubt.

Then, after pointing out that the Federal Government does unquestionably have responsibility for protecting the privileges and immunities of citizens under certain circumstances, such as when they are on the high seas or within the jurisdiction of a foreign government, the Court said it did not see in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments "any purpose to destroy the main features of the general system" of our Government.

The opinion concluded:

Under the pressure of all the excited feeling growing out of the war, our statesmen have still believed that the existence of the States with powers for domestic and local government including the regulation of civil rights, the rights of person and of property was essential to the perfect working of our complex form of government, though they have thought proper to impose additional limitations on the States and to confer additional power on that of the Nation.

But whatever fluctuations may be seen in the history of public opinion on this subject during the period of our national existence we think it will be found that this court, so far as its functions required, has always held with a steady and an even hand the balance between State and Federal power, and we trust that such may continue to be the history of its relation to that subject so long as it shall have duties to perform which demand of it a construction of the Constitution or of any of its parts.

UNITED STATES V. CRUICKSHANK

In 1876, the year after the case of Minor against Happersett was decided, Chief Justice Waite again emphasized the right as well as the obligation of the States to protect the privileges of their citizens.

In giving the Court's opinion in the case of *United States* v. *Cruickshank* (92 U. S. 542) he said:

The fourteenth amendment prohibits a St. te from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or from denying to any person equal protection of the law, but this provision does not add anything to the rights of one citizen as against another. It simply furnishes an additional guaranty against any encroachment by the State upon the fundamental rights which belong to every citizen as a member of society.

The duty of protecting all its citizens in the enjoyment of an equality of rights was originally assumed by the States, and it remains there. The only obligation resting upon the United States is to see that the States do not deny the right. This the amendment guarantees and no more. The power of the National Government is limited to this guaranty.

The only question, then, would seem to be whether the right of voting without paying a poll tax, when the State requires such payment, is such a fundamental right as the Court referred to.

UNITED STATES V. REESE

The Court removed any doubt on this point in another opinion handed down in 1876, following the Cruickshank case, to which I have referred. In the case of *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214) the Court said:

The fifteenth amendment does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone. It prevents the States, or the United States, however, from giving preference in this particular to one citizen of the United States over another on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Before its adoption this could be done. It was as much within the power of a State to exclude citizens of the United States from voting on account of race, and so forth, as it was on account of age, property, or education. Now it is not.

Please notice closely the last part of that statement. The Court said that before adoption of the fifteenth amendment a State had as much right to exclude a citizen from voting on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, as it had—and still has since passage of the amendment—to exclude on account of age, property, or education.

Plainly if the tax payment qualification is to be removed, it must be done as the color qualification was, by amending the Constitution.

I digress at that point to make another comment on the laws of New York State, where there is no poll tax, but where one must register before every election. We have permanent registration in Virginia. Once a voter is registered he remains registered so long as he remains a citizen of the State. However, I am told that in New York State a person is not permitted to vote unless he registers before every election. I am also told that more people are denied the privilege of suffrage in New York City alone because of this registration requirement than are denied the right of suffrage because of the poll-tax requirement in any one of the Southern States.

I am also told that in order to register in New York one must pass a literacy test which is equivalent to a seventh-grade education. Suppose we were to apply that New York test to Virginia, Mississippi, and Florida. I do not like to make public confession of this, because in the district which I formerly represented in the House, known as the Shenandoah Valley, there are a great many elementary schools, high schools, preparatory schools, and colleges. As farming areas go, it is a rather prosperous section, and as people go, the people of that section are fine people, and I am very proud of them. The chief recruiting officer in that area told me 2 years ago, when I complained of the fact that the Army was taking so few boys from Virginia, that in that district 42 percent of those who volunteered were rejected because they did not have the equivalent of a seventh-grade education. I said, "Then your tests must be too exacting, and your standards must be too high. Those boys have plenty of common sense and courage. They know how to shoot, and they would make fine soldiers. The tests must be too severe." He replied, "No; the modern army has a great many newfangled scientific devices, and if the boys are not educated we cannot use them."

What would happen to us in Virginia if the New York test were applied there? The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is one of those who wants to impose this bill upon us. He signed the cloture petition. He wants to bring the bill up with one day of debate on the motion. If cloture is obtained on the motion, there will be no doubt about cloture on the main issue after the preliminary issue is disposed of. We shall be told, "You can take 1 hour. If you cannot explain the issue in that time, it is too bad, but we are going to vote. We are in the majority; and whether you like it or not, we are going to cram the bill down your throats."

There are better schools in New York because through the years we have been made to pay tribute through the nose because of a high protective tariff, and because we have been compelled to sell our products from Virginia and the rest of the South on a world market, and buy what we consume under a highly protected tariff. Other States grew rich, while we were poor. My distinguished friend from Mississippi told me yesterday that only in the last decade had Mississippi recovered from the devastating effect of the War Between the States. It is complained that we have not adequate schools. It is complained that our people are not educated. Complaint is made against the poll tax. If we were to apply the same restrictions as are applied in New York, four times as many people would be disqualified as are now disqualified because of the requirement of payment of a $1.50 poll tax as a prerequisite.

But that is not the point. The Senator from New York would not want us to say what should be the qualifications for registration in New York, in Kansas, in Oregon, or in any other State. We must not go into the question of qualifications, whether a voter has lived in the State for 6 weeks, 6 months, or a year, or whether he can pass a literacy test. Senators from other States would not want us to go into those questions, but they think it is a fine thing to enact anti-poll-tax legislation. There are now only seven States which have a poll-tax requirement.

I have run through the interpretations as to the meaning of the language of section 2 of article I. It is proposed to ignore all the decisions of the courts as to what that language means, and force down our throats something which Senators from other States think we ought to have, regardless of whether we agree with them or not. I am not through with the court decisions on that point.

EX PARTE YARBROUGH

We come next to 1884 and a case styled *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U.S. 651). The unanimous opinion in this case was written by Mr. Justice Miller, the same distinguished jurist who wrote the opinion in the Slaughter House cases from which I previously quoted. This is a leading case which has been cited and relied upon by the courts in later cases involving the right to vote.

In this case Yarbrough and others were prosecuted for interfering with the exercise of the right to vote by certain qualified voters in an election of a Member of Congress from Georgia. They were charged with making violent attacks on those persons to prevent their voting. Yarbrough and the other defendants claimed they were not subject to Federal prosecution because the right to vote was conferred by the State.

In its opinion the Court said:

The States, in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualification for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State.

If that language does not mean what it says, I hope my distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who I understand will follow me and undertake to

uphold the right of the Congress to legislate, will tell me what the language means. In order to be sure that he has it well fixed in his mind, I shall read it again:

They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State.

I continue to read:

It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress. It is not true, therefore, that electors for Members of Congress owe their right to vote to the State in any sense which makes the exercise of the right to depend exclusively on the law of the State.

In short, in the Yarbrough case the Court held that the State may not prescribe qualifications for Members of Congress as such, but it does automatically determine what their qualifications shall be when it fixes the qualifications for electors of the popular branch of its own legislature. It is therefore clear that until the present Constitution be amended, the Federal Government cannot in effect fix qualifications for electors for State legislatures by prescribing qualifications of those eligible to vote in national elections. Of course that is what it would amount to, and certainly under the Constitution the qualifications have to be the same. No one, either here or anywhere else, has ever challenged that fact.

Putting the matter another way, we might say that the right to vote comes from the State. Once the right is granted, the Federal Government becomes its protector.

SWAFFORD V. TEMPLETON

The case of *Swafford* v. *Templeton* (185 U. S. 487) involved the question of whether a person qualified to vote under State laws, who is wrongfully denied that right, has a cause of action for damages arising under the Constitution of the United States.

In answering this question in the affirmative, the Court referred to the Yarbrough case, and interpreted that opinion in this way:

That is to say, the ruling was that the case was equally one arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or from violation of a State law which affected the exercise of the right to vote for a Member of Congress, since the Constitution of the United States had adopted, as the qualification of electors for Members of Congress, those prescribed by the State for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State.

It will be noted that the Court says the Constitution adopts the qualifications prescribed by the State—not that Congress adopts them. And, since it is the Constitution that adopts them, Congress is without power to alter this adoption.

If that is not so, I shall listen with great interest to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who says he is going to answer me. Let him explain where the power comes from, and how he can get away from the clear decision of the *Swafford case* (185 U. S. 487).

However, I am not through with the Supreme Court cases. I shall next take up the case of Gwinn and Beal against United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor by doing so?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator advise me about how much longer he will speak? The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has an adjournment resolution, which is a privileged matter. I would not wish to interrupt the Senator's speech, but I feel that if we can handle the adjournment resolution today, we really should do so.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I understand that the Senator from Nebraska wishes to have a general idea of when we are going to adjourn; is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. No. I should like to have a general idea of how long the Senator from Virginia will speak because I do not wish to break into his speech with another matter, even though it is privileged. So I should like to know the approximate length of time the Senator will speak or whether he would object to having us consider the adjournment resolution soon, after which he could continue his speech. Of course, the resolution is a privileged matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Will the distinguished acting majority leader give me until 5 o'clock, and then ask me how I am getting along at that time?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish the Senator to think for a moment that there is any desire to cut off his remarks in any way. I did not wish to break into his speech, of course. But inasmuch as he was about to make a new point, I wondered whether it would be possible to handle the adjournment resolution at the earliest possible time.

If the Senator from Virginia thinks he may conclude by 5 o'clock, I suggest that we wait until that time to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I shall do the best I can; but the distinguished acting majority leader will recall that I got started about an hour and 45 minutes after I expected to start.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly; I understand. I hope the Senator will take all the time he wishes to take.

Of course, I should like very much to have the Senate dispose of the adjournment resolution today, perhaps at 5 o'clock, if the Senator from Virginia can conclude by then. If not, he will continue tomorrow, of course.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I am taking some time on this matter because our friend the Senator from Oregon has asked that we put into the RECORD the points and cases on which we rely. I think it will be very helpful to do so; and then any Member of the Senate can read the cases in the speech as it appears in the RECORD, and can understand them, and then can say, if he so determines, as I think he should, "I misunderstood the situation; but now that I see what the framers of the Constitution had in mind and the basis on which the Constitution was adopted by the States, I must support my oath to uphold the Constitution, and there must not be any running out on that oath merely because someone begins to press me rather hard. Then I shall not say 'Yes, I took the oath, but I must change my oath at this time.'"

Of course, Mr. President, no Senator will go back on his oath. In other words, as my friend the Senator from Mississippi said last Thursday, this is a body of honorable men. So I wish to bring to their attention my viewpoint in regard to what is right, and then let them analyze it. God knows I think they love this country as much as I do. They want to see the principles of Jeffersonian democracy and constitutional liberty upheld. I do not have to indicate those matters to them. All I have to do is show the basis of the poll tax and the decisions of the courts and what the result would be if we unwittingly were led to say to the States, "We thought you had the right, but now you will fight for it successfully through the Supreme Court."

Mr. President, I was about to refer to the Gwinn and Beal case.

GWINN AND BEAL V. UNITED STATES

Again, in 1915 in the case of *Gwinn and Beal* v. *U. S.* (238 U. S. 347) Mr. Chief Justice White had this to say about the effect of the fifteenth amendment on State power (p. 362):

Beyond doubt, the amendment does not take away from the State governments in a general sense the power over suffrage which had belonged to those governments from the beginning, and without the possession of which power the whole fabric upon which the division of State and National authority under the Constitution and the organization of both governments rest would be without support and both the authority of the Nation and the State would fall to the ground. In fact, the very command of the amendment recognizes the possession of the general power by the State, since the amendment seeks to regulate its exercise as to the particular subject with which it deals.

NEWBERRY V. UNITED STATES

The authority of the Federal Government to regulate elections under article I, section 4 was further defined in 1921 in the case of *Newberry* v. *U. S.* (256 U. S. 232). Mr. Justice Pitney, speaking on behalf of Justices Brandeis, Clark, and himself, in a concurring opinion, which dissented on one main point in the case, said that section 4—

does not confer a general power to regulate elections, but only to regulate "the manner of holding" them. But this can mean nothing less than the entire mode of procedure—the essence, not merely the form of conducting elections.

And, in its majority opinion in this case, the Court said:

We find no support in reason or authority for the argument that because the offices were created by the Constitution, Congress has some indefinite, undefined power over elections for Senators and Representatives not derived from section 4. The Government, then, of the United States, can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given, or given by necessary implication.

Thus Congress may enact laws to protect the right to vote of those who are qualified by State law; but no power is expressly given, or given by necessary implication to say who shall be qualified to vote in the States.

BREEDLOVE V. SUTTLES

The first case directly involving poll taxes to come before the Supreme Court for decision was that of *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277) decided in 1937. In that case the plaintiff, a citizen of Georgia, attempted to vote in a State election and also in a Federal election held at the same time for a Representative in Congress. He was refused the right to vote in either election because he had not paid his poll tax. He then sued, contending the privilege of voting for Federal officials was one to which he was entitled, unrestricted by a tax unreasonably imposed through State invasion of his rights as a citizen of the United States.

Mr. Justice Butler, in the unanimous opinion of the Court, stated:

Payment of the tax as a prerequisite (to voting) is not required for the purpose of denying or abridging the privilege of voting. * * * Exaction of payment before registration undoubtedly serves to aid collection from electors desiring to vote, but that use of the States' power is not prevented by the Federal Constitution. * * * To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

That is a direct quotation from the decision of the Supreme Court rendered in 1915. Arguments were had in the Senate when an effort was made to put a half-way poll-tax provision in the draft bill. The Senator from Florida said the right to vote was guaranteed by the Constitution, and that the right to vote came from the Constitution. I said, "Oh, no! The States existed before the Federal Government was created. The States gave the Federal Government all its power. It had no power other than what it received from the States. State citizenship came first. It is possible to have dual citizenship. That may exist under the Federal Government, but the right to vote arises within the State."

The Constitution says:

The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

That applies to the election of a Federal official. Senators are now elected by direct vote of the people. The provision formerly applied to Members of the House of Representatives only. That is the thing we argued. I did not have this case before me, but I knew that was bound to be the law. I am now reading the express language of the Court.

Then, after citing four leading cases, including those of Minor versus Happersett and Ex parte Yarbrough, the Court stated:

The privileges and immunities protected are only those that arise from the Constitution and laws of the United States and not those that spring from other sources.

UNITED STATES V. CLASSIC

We now come to the case of United States versus Classic. As the Senator from Mississippi pointed out, that is the case upon whose dictum the proponents of the pending bill place the most reliance. It was only a dictum. Six months after that, as the Senator from Mississippi pointed out, the Supreme Court, in the Pirtle case, involving the specific question with respect to which reliance is had on the dictum in the Classic case, denied a writ of certiorari, putting its final stamp of approval on the clear decisions all the way down, as I shall mention them when I come to them, that the Congress never had any right to pass on the qualifications of voters, that it was always left to the State. There would not have been a Constitution if that provision had not been in it.

An examination of the hearings before House and Senate committees on anti-poll-tax bills discloses that some witnesses, with greater zeal for Federal action than knowledge of the history of the Constitution and the court decisions on the qualifications of voters, have relied upon the case of *U. S.* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299), decided in 1941. This case is somewhat similar to the Yarbrough case, involving prosecution of Classic and others for interfering with voters in a Louisiana primary election. The main point in the case was whether the constitutional protection applied to voters in a primary as well as to a general congressional election. The Court decided that it did.

But, the Court proceeded to cite the Yarbrough case, following the ruling in that case, in holding that the right to vote in either primary or general elections of Members of Congress was given only to persons qualified under State law to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature.

Mr. Justice Stone said:

Such right as is secured by the Constitution to qualified voters to choose Members of the House of Representatives is thus to be exercised in conformity with the requirements of State law, subject to the restrictions prescribed by section 2 and the authority conferred on Congress by section 4, to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections of Representatives.

We look then to the statutes of Louisiana here involved to ascertain the nature of the right which under the constitutional mandate they define and confer on the voter.

The Court also said in this case:

The right of the people to choose, * * * is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution, and hence is one secured by it to those citizens and inhabitants of the State entitled to exercise the right.

Then followed this paragraph, which mistakenly has been relied upon by advocates of Federal action:

While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (citing cases), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

In other words, the office of Representative in Congress was created by the Constitution, of course. But, the opinion still says that the States are authorized to legislate as provided by section 2, which is the only one that refers to qualifications of voters, and that this authority may be limited by the Federal authority under section 4 which covers only times, places, and manner of holding elections.

I am aware, of course, that in the cases of *Smith* v. *Allwright* (1944) (321 U. S. 649) and *Rice* v. *Elmore* (C. C. A. 4th, 1947) (165 F. (2d) 387), in which certiorari was denied in 1948 (16 L. W. 3314), the issue was raised of whether a State primary was an integral part of the State election machinery and whether denial of a right to participate in the primary was a denial of a constitutional or Federal statutory right for which redress could be sought through injunctive relief or damage.

But these cases merely emphasize the accepted fact that States may not deny the right to vote which is guaranteed by the Constitution to those who are qualified. There is nothing in either of these decisions which contradicts the position taken by the Court in other cases, that the States have the authority to determine what are the qualifications.

PIRTLE V. BROWN

One other case which may be mentioned is that of *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 Fed. (2d) 218). This grew out of the complaint of a citizen of Tennessee, otherwise qualified, who was refused the right to vote in a special election to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives because he had not paid his poll tax.

If there could be a more direct issue before the court than that, I do not know what it could be. That is the very issue before us now. He wanted to vote for a Member of Congress, and he had not paid his poll tax. The State officials said, "You cannot vote." The District Court found against him. The decision was affirmed unanimously by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, whose opinion followed closely the reasoning of Mr. Justice Butler in the Breedlove case.

The Supreme Court was asked to review the case, but, on October 13, 1941, the petition was denied, without any opinion or statement.

This case is highly significant because only a special election for a Member of Congress was involved, and the refusal of the Supreme Court to review it came as a great disappointment to those who had tried to discount the Breedlove case on the ground that both a State and a Federal election were involved.

As pointed out by the Senator from Mississippi last Thursday, the Supreme Court affirmed the ruling of the circuit court of appeals 6 months after it had decided the Classic case. So there was no question regarding what was involved. There was no question in the minds of those who were relying on dictum, pure and simple, and there is no question about it in this case.

As a matter of fact, in an appearance before a Senate subcommittee on behalf of a poll-tax bill which he had introduced and which was being considered at the time the case of Pirtle against Brown was pending, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] stated that this case would present an ideal test of the constitutional question, since the election was restricted to that of a congressional Representative. The patron of the bill criticized the decision which had been handed down in the circuit court, said that a writ of certiorari from the Supreme Court would be sought, and confidently predicted that it would be granted and the case reversed.

That was the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, before the Supreme Court had acted. He said, "It is an ideal test case. Certainly the court is wrong. The Supreme Court will change all this. Pass my bill now," as he said to the Presiding Officer this morning, "Rule now so that the bill may be brought up. Do not wait. The country is clamoring for this action. Do not let the meaning of the language disturb you. Do not let the precedents of previous Presiding Officers disturb you. Act now and let the majority have its way. Why should a minority hold up the wishes of a majority?"

Inherent in our Government is the protection of minorities on certain vital issues, and this is one of them.

The Court, however, as has been noted, denied the writ and thus placed its stamp of approval on the ruling in the Breedlove case even when no State election was involved.

The clarity of this rule is indicated by the fact that in the annotated edition of American Law Reports (vol. 130, p. 572) in reporting the case of Pirtle against Brown this proposition is stated:

> The courts are unanimous in holding that failure to pay a valid poll tax imposed as a condition of voting has the effect of disqualifying the voter and rendering his vote invalid.

That was the headline not of someone running for the House or the Senate or for the Presidency. That was the headline of an experienced syllabus writer of a large lawbook publishing firm who was engaged in putting down in black and white what he, as a lawyer and a codifier, understood the decision of the court to mean. I shall read it over again:

> The courts are unanimous in holding that failure to pay a valid poll tax imposed as a condition of voting has the effect of disqualifying the voter and rendering his vote invalid.

In support of this statement the annotation cites the Breedlove case, Pirtle against Brown and State court decisions from Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. The supreme courts of all those States have rendered decisions in line with this case.

I have cited an unbroken line of cases, Federal and State, all of which clearly and unanimously hold that the right to fix qualifications is vested by the Constitution in the States. It has been argued at times that the cases are not in point because Congress has not legislated on the poll tax and when it does legislate, its regulation will be paramount. How silly, since the Congress has no power except that conferred upon it by the Constitution. In this instance the power not only is not conferred, it is expressly reserved by the States in the Constitution.

The principle which must be applied was well stated by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *Hodgson & Thompson* v. *Bowerbank* (1809) (5 Cranch 303) when in discussing legislation dealing with judicial power he said:

> Turn to the article of the Constitution of the United States, for the statute cannot extend jurisdiction beyond the limits of the Constitution.

The framers of the Constitution familiar with the constitutions of the several States and the tax requirements they included, wrote into article I, section 2, a provision that the qualifications for electors for Members of Congress should be the same as the qualifications for the electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. Thus reserving to themselves that power, the States likewise bound the Congress, as much so as if the Constitution had expressly said: "The Congress shall pass no bill concerning the qualifications of persons voting for Representatives in Congress."

That there should be no doubt, in future years, of that fact, there was written into the tenth amendment this reminder:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

CARTER V. CARTER COAL CO.

The limitation on the powers of Congress was defined with clarity by the Supreme Court in the case of *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.* (298 U. S. 238) in which the Court said:

> The general rule with regard to the respective powers of the National and the State Governments under the Constitution is not in doubt. The States were before the Constitution; and, consequently, their legislative powers antedated the Constitution. Those who framed and those who adopted that instrument meant to carve from the general mass of legislative powers, then possessed by the States, only such portions as it was thought wise to confer upon the Federal Government; and in order that there should be no uncertainty in respect to what was taken and what was left the national powers of legislation were not aggregated but enumerated—with the result that what was not embraced by the enumeration remained vested in the States without change or impairment. Thus, "when it was found necessary to establish a national government for national purposes," this Court said in *Munn* v. *Illinois* (94 U. S. 113, 124), "a part of the powers of the States and the people of the States was granted to the United States and the people of the United States. This grant operated as a further limitation upon the powers of the States, so that now the governments of the States possess all the powers of the Parliament of England, except such as have been delegated to the United States or reserved by the people." While the States are not sovereign in the true sense of that term, but only quasi sovereign, yet in respect of all powers reserved to them they are supreme—"as independent of the General Government as that Government within its sphere is independent of the States." And, since every addition to the legislative power to some extent detracts from or invades the power of the States it is of vital moment that, in order to preserve the fixed balance intended by the Constitution, the powers of the General Government be not so extended as to embrace any not within the express terms of the several grants or the implications necessary to be drawn therefrom.

It is no longer open to question that the General Government, unlike the States, possesses no inherent power in respect of the internal affairs of the States and emphatically not with regard to legislation. The question in respect of the inherent power of that Government as to the external affairs of the Nation and in the field of international law is a wholly different matter which it is not necessary now to discuss.

While it may be said that the value of the case I have just cited is limited as a precedent by subsequent decisions questioning the validity of the conclusion then reached by the Court, the reasoning on the particular point we have under discussion remains valid.

This was recognized by the Court when it said as late as 1945 in the case of *Screws* v. *U. S.* (325 U. S. 91):

> The fourteenth amendment did not alter the basic relations between the States and the National Government. *United States* v. *Harris* (106 U. S. 629; in re Kemmler, 136 U. S. 436, 448): Our National Government is one of delegated powers alone.

So, it seems clear that the power to fix qualifications of voters, expressly reserved to the States by the Constitution, cannot be said to be abrogated by some implied power of Congress.

It may be said that prepayment of taxes has nothing to do with the fitness or capacity of a voter, any more than race, color, sex, or previous condition of servitude. But, if this is admitted, it only follows that the same constitutional process of amendment should be used to remove tax requirements that was used to remove racial and sex barriers.

As a matter of fact, that was the process proposed by the Republican Party platform of 1944, which stated:

> The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

I have not seen the text of the poll-tax plank of the 1948 Republican platform, but I have been told that all it says is, "We favor the abolition of the poll tax."

If the Republican Party was so firmly convinced that they had the constitutional right to eliminate the poll tax by congressional action, why in 1944 did they advocate action by constitutional amendment, and why in 1948 did they not say, "and to do it by congressional action as soon as we can get to Washington?"

If the poll tax is to be abolished, the constitutional-amendment method is the only constitutional way by which to proceed. That is the only reasonable course that can be taken by those too impatient to allow the States to settle this problem in their own way. It is the course advocated by George Washington in his Farewell Address when he said that if changes in the Constitution were considered necessary, "let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation."

Now let us take a look at the pending bill in the light of the Constitution background which I have so far developed.

The first section states that—

> The requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right and privilege of voting for said national officers.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi last Thursday paid his respects to those weasel words.

I should first like to call attention to the fact that the bill is made to apply to the choice of electors for President and Vice President, in the very face of the fact that the Constitution reserves to the States the exclusive power of determining the manner in which its electors shall be chosen and confers no power whatsoever on Congress to legislate on this subject.

Section 1 of article II of the Constitution provides:

> Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.

Under this provision, States do not have to hold elections to choose Presidential electors, and in the early days of the Nation some States had their legislatures choose electors, some chose them by districts and some by other methods, although at present the accepted method is to have the choice made by ballot of the whole electorate.

M'PHERSON V. BLACKER

Any doubt as to the latitude given the States in making their choice is removed by examination of the language used by the Supreme Court in the case of *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 27, 35) where Mr. Chief Justice Fuller said:

> The Constitution does not provide that the appointment of electors shall be by popular vote, nor that the electors shall be voted for upon a general ticket, nor that the majority of those who exercise the elective franchise can alone choose the electors. It recognizes that the people act through their representatives in the legislature, and leaves it to the legislature exclusively, to define the method of effecting the object.

Mr. Chief Justice Fuller also said in his opinion in this case:

> In short, the appointment and mode of appointment of electors belong exclusively to the States under the Constitution of the United States. They are, as remarked by Mr. Justice Gray *In re Green* (134 U. S. 377, 379 (33:951, 952)) "no more officers or agents of the United States than are the members of the State legislatures when acting as electors of Federal Senators, or the people of the States when acting as the electors of Representatives in Congress." Congress is empowered to determine the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they are to give their votes, which is required to be the same day throughout the United States, but otherwise the power and jurisdiction of the State is exclusive, with the exception of the provisions as to the number of electors and the ineligibility of certain persons, so framed that congressional and Federal influence might be excluded.

In this case the Court also quoted, with approval, from a report of the Senate Privileges and Elections Committee made in 1874, in which it was stated that "it is no doubt competent for the legislature to authorize the governor, or the supreme court of the State, or any other agent of its will to appoint these electors."

The Court said further:

> Whenever Presidential electors are appointed by popular election, then the right to vote cannot be denied or abridged without invoking the penalty (of having State representation reduced as provided in the fourteenth amendment), and so of the right to vote for Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of the State, or the members of the legislature thereof. The right to vote intended to be protected refers to the right to vote as established by the laws and constitution of the State. There is no color for the contention that under the amendments every male citizen of the United States has from the time of his majority a right to vote for Presidential electors.

It should be apparent, then, that even if justification could be found in the Constitution for the proposed legislation as applied to elections for Members of Congress, the same authorization could not be made to apply to the choice of electors of President and Vice President. Clearly, even the limited power given by section 4 of article I to deal with the times, places and manner of elections, cannot refer to the electors, who do not have to be chosen at an election at all, if the State should prefer some other manner of selection.

So, the ground which is attempted to be covered by this bill indicates how far the enthusiasm of its sponsors has led them astray from constitutional principles.

When the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] follows me in the debate I should like to have him discuss not only the cases I have cited concerning the interpretation of section 2 of article I of the Constitution, which provides that States shall have the right to fix the qualifications of voters, and that the only qualification required of a voter to vote for a Federal official are the qualifications required of the voter to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature, but I should like to have the Senator from Oregon discuss the provision in the bill by which it is proposed to force all the States to elect their Presidential electors in the same way. I just read to the Senate two recent decisions of the Supreme Court directly saying that the Federal Government could not move in to do such a thing. I should like to have the Senator from Oregon explain to the Senate how it is proposed to do such a thing, and how it is proposed that such action shall be made to stand up.

I now come very shortly to why I believe that, even if Congress had the power to do such a thing it would be very bad for everyone concerned if the attempt were made to exercise it.

That the departure of the authors of the bill from the intent of the framers of the Constitution is not entirely unconscious is also indicated by the clause in section 1 of the bill stating that requirement of a poll-tax payment as a prerequisite to voting—

> is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors • • • within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting for said national officers.

We have here what amounts to a confession by the authors of the bill that they cannot invade the right to fix qualifications of voters, which is so plainly given to the States by article I, section 2. So they try by a legislative declaration to remove the poll-tax requirement from the definition of the word "qualification" and then, by another declaration to brand it as "interference" with the manner of holding elections, thus bringing it under article I, section 4, where Federal authority could be asserted.

There are two questions to be considered here. First, is the poll-tax requirement such a qualification as was contemplated by the framers of the Constitution and which is permissible under article I, section 2? And second, can the Congress usurp a power which always has been conceded to belong to the courts by attempting to define and interpret the meaning of the wording of our Constitution merely to justify an extension of its own powers?

On the first point, we know that Webster defines "qualification" as "a condition precedent that must be complied with for the attainment of a status, the perfection of a right, and so forth; as the qualification of citizenship."

And "qualified voter" is defined as "one who possesses certain specific qualifications for voting, especially as to citizenship, age, and residence, and sometimes also as to literacy and ownership of property."

I can find no merit in the argument of those who attempt to say that when the authors of our Constitution wrote in the word "qualification" they had in mind only moral or intellectual qualities which would make the citizen competent to vote intelligently.

As I previously pointed out in this discussion, the possession of property or the prepayment of taxes was a prerequisite to voting in most of the States at the time the Constitution was adopted. And, in the Federalist (No. 60) Alexander Hamilton applied the word "qualification" in this connection when he spoke of "prescribing qualifications of property, either for those who may elect or be elected." Hamilton immediately added that—

> This forms no part of the power to be conferred upon the National Government. Its authority would be expressly restricted to the regulation of the times, the places, and the manner of elections. The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked upon another occasion, are defined and fixed in the Constitution; and are unalterable by the legislature.

The same understanding of the term "qualifications" is evident among those who participated in the constitutional convention debates. Thus (in Elliott's Debates, vol. 5, p. 385) we find that in discussion of article I, section 2, Mr. Gouverneur Morris moved to amend by striking out "beginning with the words 'qualifications of electors'," so as to "restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders." Continuing this discussion of a property ownership requirement for voters, Mr. Wilson thought it would be difficult to form any uniform rule of qualifications for all States. Mr. Mason observed that some of the States had "extended the right of suffrage beyond the freeholders," and that a power to alter the qualifications would be a dangerous power in the hands of the Legislature (Congress). James Madison was undecided whether the constitutional qualification ought to be freehold, but said the right of suffrage ought to be left to be regulated by Congress.

This interpretation of qualifications of voters has continued to be accepted to the present time. Thus in volume 29 of Corpus Juris Secundum (1941) in the article on elections there is a main heading titled "Qualifications and Disqualifications of Voters." Under this there is a subtitle "Payment of Taxes" and in this it is stated that unless required by the Constitution or statutes, payment of taxes is not a qualification for voting.

Also, in 18 American Jurisprudence—1938—in the article on elections and the subtitle "Qualifications," one of the requisites listed is "payment of taxes." In this it is stated:

Whether the adoption of the nineteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution had the effect of rendering women subject to a poll-tax qualification theretofore applicable to men only is a question which has been answered in the affirmative in some jurisdictions and in the negative in others.

I submit, therefore, that the Congress would be violating an elementary principle of law if it undertook, as this bill proposes to do, to enlarge its own powers by changing the meaning which the word "qualification" has achieved both by popular acceptance and judicial interpretation.

This is exactly the kind of action I believe Thomas Jefferson had in mind when he said:

In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

The bill's assertion that what the framers of the Constitution plainly recognized as a qualification for voting is not a qualification at all, is a legally unjustified twisting of language. But the following clause which says the requirement of poll-tax payment as a prerequisite to voting is a tax upon the right and privilege of voting for national officers is simply an untruth, insofar as it applies to existing State laws.

Of course, a poll tax imposed specifically on those who sought to vote in elections of Members of Congress would be an interference and a tax on the right and privilege of voting for national officers. But no State has attempted to impose such an unconstitutional tax.

What the States have done is to impose a tax which must be paid by those who wish to vote for State officers, including the most numerous branch of the legislature. When such a tax has been imposed, the Constitution of the United States makes it, under article I, section 2, a prerequisite for voting in congressional elections. So, if there is interference, it is interference by the Federal Constitution, and insofar as the tax is indirectly imposed on those who vote for national officers, it is imposed by the Constitution.

If the sponsors of anti-poll-tax bills have a legitimate grievance, it is against the Constitution of the United States and, as I previously said, they have a known and proper course of procedure. They can propose an amendment to the Constitution.

Before we take the other course proposed by this bill, it would be well for us to recall and consider carefully the words of Andrew Jackson who said in his farewell address:

It is well known that there have been those amongst us who wish to enlarge the powers of the general Government and experience would seem to indicate that there is a tendency on the part of this Government to overstep the boundaries marked out for it by the Constitution.

Its legitimate authority is abundantly sufficient for all purposes for which it was created, and its powers being expressly enumerated, there can be no justification for claiming anything beyond them.

Every attempt to exercise power beyond these limits should be promptly and firmly opposed. For one evil example will lead to other measures still more mischievous; and if the principle of constructive powers, or supposed advantages, or temporary circumstances shall ever be permitted to justify the assumption of a power not given by the Constitution, the general Government will before long absorb all the powers of legislation, and you will have, in effect, but one consolidated government.

Great old Andrew Jackson was speaking there. His voice comes down to us from long ago. Perhaps it is a voice crying in the wilderness, but in my opinion, it is a voice of warning to which we should listen. The words come to us from a wisdom gained by one closer to the founding fathers than we are. His voice warns us of the need for holding to the Constitution, and cautions us against the dangers of an overpowering central government.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the men who fought the Revolution and brought our Government into being fought to overthrow the very kind of government which some would now seek to establish?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. They did absolutely. They knew the kind of government they wanted. As I have pointed out, they told us what kind of a government they fought for and what kind of a government they were forming. If we want to know what kind of government they fought for, if we want to know what kind of government they framed, all we have to do is to listen to what they have said. But, of course, if we do not have ears with which to hear and eyes with which to see, the wisdom of the ages does us no good.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the statements made by the framers of our Government make it perfectly clear that they knew what the qualifications were in the several States, and that they wanted those qualifications to be the same for Federal electors? Is it not also true that one of the main reasons they so desired was that the power might remain distributed in the hands of the people, and not be concentrated in Washington?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Absolutely; and when I get to it—I hope not too late in the evening—I shall quote from a speech by Franklin D. Roosevelt extolling that very principle of our form of government and that very means of protecting minorities from what he called the oppression of a bare majority in Congress.

UNNECESSARY

Even though no constitutional question were involved, the first section of the bill, as I already have indicated, attempts to sidestep the constitutional issue by declaring that prepayment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting is not a qualification but that it is an interference with the manner of holding elections and is a tax on the right or privilege of voting.

Then, mounting the shaky platform thus erected, the bill in its second section proclaims that it shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to prevent any persons from registering or voting in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax.

The bill asserts that when such requirement is made it shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified to vote. It also forbids a State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to levy a poll tax or any other tax on the right or privilege of voting. The third section declares that it shall be unlawful "to interfere with the manner of selecting persons for national office" by requiring payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering; and the fourth section would make it unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the authority of a State or a subdivision of a State, to require payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

In short, the bill would forbid the enforcement of any requirement that a person must pay a poll tax before he is allowed to vote in national elections.

If sustained, that would likewise outlaw the requirement of payment of a poll tax on the part of those voting for members of the lower houses of State legislatures, because the Constitution requires that the qualifications be the same.

What would be the practical effect of this and what benefit would accrue to the Nation to justify such legislation?

I have pointed out earlier in the course of this argument that at the time our Constitution was adopted most of the States restricted the electorate by requiring ownership of property or as an alternative the prepayment of taxes. Later I shall have something to say about the philosophy which led to the use of these restrictions, their gradual disappearance, and then the reappearance of poll-tax requirements, primarily in the Southern States between 1875 and 1908.

But for the moment let us see just what is the status of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in the State.

In 1920 North Carolina started the parade away from the poll-tax requirement by amending its constitution to delete a provision that before a citizen was entitled to vote he must have paid his poll tax for the previous year. That ended the poll tax in North Carolina.

In 1933 Pennsylvania struck out of its constitution the section which had required that a voter must have paid within 2 years before an election some State or county tax assessed at least 2 months and paid at least 1 month before the date of the election.

An amendment removing the poll-tax prerequisite from the Louisiana Constitution was ratified in 1934 and was reinforced in 1940 with another amendment positively asserting that "the right to vote in any election shall not be affected by any requirement for payment of poll tax or for registration in a poll book in any form."

Florida repealed its law making the poll-tax payment a prerequisite for voting in 1937, and in 1941 the legislature abolished poll taxes entirely, although the Constitution of Florida still provides authority under which the legislature can levy a tax not exceeding $1 a year and make it a prerequisite for voting.

The most recently completed action to abolish the poll-tax requirement was taken by Georgia, which in 1945 repealed the statute making the payment a prerequisite to voting.

At the present time there are only seven States in which the poll-tax prerequisite to voting applies. They are Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

So the Congress is asked to use its legislative powers ostensibly to extend the franchise to a larger number of persons in only 7 States out of the 48.

It might be noted here that in 1937 the Arkansas Legislature submitted to the people a proposed amendment to abolish the poll-tax requirement, but it was rejected by popular vote in 1938.

Also, in 1943 the Tennessee Legislature passed two bills, one repealing the levy of a poll tax and the other repealing the statute making it a prerequisite to voting. The State supreme court held, however, that these laws were invalid because they were in conflict with the requirements of the State constitution.

It may also be noted that the Virginia Legislature completed action this year—1948—on proposed constitutional amendments which will be voted on by the people next year. These amendments not only would eliminate the poll-tax requirement from the constitution but also would insert a positive statement that—

No person shall at any time be required to pay any tax, assessment, or fee as a prerequisite to the right to register, renew his registration, or vote.

We have, then, a clearly indicated trend to abolish the poll-tax requirement by individual State action, as shown by the fact that five States have taken such action since 1920, and in three of the remaining seven the legislatures have gone on record one or more times as favoring such action.

Under these circumstances, it seems clear that the action proposed by the bill is unnecessary.

In considering the need for such legislation, I think we are justified in observing, too, that a poll-tax prerequisite for voting is more of a fancied than an actual injustice.

The registration before voting requirement in New York State disqualifies more potential voters in New York City alone than the poll tax does in the entire State of Virginia. If the larger the vote, the better the government, why place any restriction on voting? It is neither a small poll-tax payment nor registration that results in the failure of many people to vote. It is indifference to public affairs. Vast campaign funds are spent in every election in an effort to overcome that indifference.

Historically we have seen that the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting came into use in this country as a liberal alternative to the requirement that a citizen should be a landholder or property owner. It was regarded with some distrust by some of our founding fathers who feared that the colonist who owned nothing and so had little to lose might not hesitate to vote for irresponsible officials who would bankrupt the Government. It was defended, however, by those who recognized that in an undeveloped country there were those who had not had an opportunity to acquire many worldly goods but who deserved a voice in the Government. These liberals of their day were willing to trust the right of franchise to anyone who had made even a nominal contribution to the cost of maintaining his Government.

The modern trend is to substitute an educational test for a property test, and I have no quarrel with that, so long as the action is taken by the voters of the States in a constitutional manner.

But it still may be worth while for us to remember that John Stuart Mill, the English philosopher and economist, in his Considerations on Representative Government, not only recommended a direct capitation tax as a qualification for voting, but also suggested that a voter should be able to read and write and do simple problems in arithmetic.

Also, the distinguished American jurist, Judge Thomas M. Cooley, in his work on constitutional law, published in 1880, said:

Many of the States admit no one to the privilege of suffrage unless he is a taxpayer. • • • To require the payment of a capitation (poll) tax is no denial of suffrage; it is demanding only the preliminary performance of public duty, and may be classed, as may also presence at the polls, with registration, or the observance of any other preliminary to insure fairness and protect against fraud (p. 263).

Incidentally, Judge Cooley, writing before the Yarbrough case was decided, forecast the position taken by the Supreme Court by saying in his book:

The Constitution of the United States confers the right to vote upon no one. That right comes to the citizens of the United States, when they possess it at all, under State laws, and as a grant of State sovereignty.

Returning to the subject of how the poll-tax qualification has been viewed in the past, we may also note that an Encyclopedia Britannica article on vote and voting—eleventh edition, volume 28, 1911—mentions such qualifications of modern suffrage systems as age, periods of residence, and ability to read and write, and then says, on page 216:

But the most universal qualification of all is some outward visible sign of a substantial interest in the State. • • • This tangible sign of interest in the State may take the form of possession of property, however small in amount, or the payment of some amount of direct taxation.

Several years ago, when this same type of bill was before the Congress, I recalled having read a book Public Finance, by the great economist, Dr. Harley L. Lutz, of Princeton University, in which he had a chapter on the poll tax.

I wrote to Dr. Lutz and asked if he had changed his views. Under date of October 5, 1942, I received a reply in which he said:

With respect to the poll tax, I have never been able to sympathize with the usual academic position against this tax, and I tried to make that clear in the textbook to which you refer. I am still of the opinion that a poll tax is a useful feature of a revenue system, and that it is particularly so in those States which do not have great disparities of wealth and income.

I think the statistics of tax collection will bear me out in saying that there are many States in which a poll tax levied at a moderate rate will produce more revenue than either a graduated tax on so-called net income or a tax on inheritances and estates.

I am in complete agreement with you as to the sinister aspects of the proposal that the Congress shall assume authority to determine voting requirements in the several States. The trend toward complete Federal domination of the States and their local subdivisions must be counteracted with all the force at our command. If we add up the various manifestations of this trend, I think we have good reason to fear for the future of our Federal system, and if we permit the federalizers to destroy the basis upon which the Federal Government rests, it is my own conviction that the bulwark of our individual liberties will be destroyed also.

I pause to remind the Senate that that statement was made by Dr. Harley L. Lutz, a former professor of economics at Princeton University, who was writing to me back in 1942, urging me to stand fast to uphold the Constitution as the bulwark of all our rights.

Mr. President, it seems to me, less logical to attack the poll tax, which denies the vote to those who are financially able to make a small annual contribution to public education, but refuse to do so, than it would be to attack the restrictions which States have placed on

paupers, who might be glad to qualify if they had the money.

As compared with the 7 Southern poll-tax States, we find 13 States which deny the right to vote to paupers. These States include Louisiana, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia, from the southern group; but the list also includes Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and West Virginia. All those Northern States have a property test; and in those States, one who is a pauper cannot vote.

Perhaps it will be said that the man who has no money and is dependent on the State for his support should not be entrusted with the responsibility of choosing officials; but if so, is there not even better reason for denying the ballot to those who have the money but are too indifferent to meet the requirements set up by their State laws?

Then again, if we are to start a process of compelling States to allow persons to vote even if they have not met tax-payment requirements, should we not include, in addition to the seven poll-tax States, those eight States which do not now permit untaxed Indians to vote? If responsibility for payment of taxes is not, as the pending bill asserts, a "qualification" for voting, but involves an unjustified interference, then why not apply the same philosophy to the Indians, who at least should have no trouble meeting residence requirements?

In the Constitution of Idaho we find language denying the right to vote to anyone "who is a bigamist or polygamist, or is living in what is known as patriarchal, plural, or celestial marriage, or in violation of any law of this State, or of the United States, forbidding any such crime; or who, in any manner, teaches, advises, counsels, aids, or encourages any person to enter into bigamy, polygamy, or such patriarchal, plural, or celestial marriage, or to live in violation of any such law, or to commit any such crime; or who is a member of or contributes to the support, aid, or encouragement of any order, organization, association, corporation, or society, which teaches, advises, counsels, encourages, or aids any person to enter bigamy, polygamy, or such patriarchal or plural marriage, or which teaches or advises that the laws of this State prescribing rules of civil conduct are not the supreme law of the State."

There may have been a time when Utah did not approve these restrictions of suffrage in her sister State, but who is here to claim that the Congress has the power to intervene.

UNDESIRABLE

But, Mr. President, aside from being unconstitutional, unnecessary, and illogical, the proposed legislation is highly undesirable.

The fact must not be overlooked that in every one of the seven States in which poll-tax payment remains a prerequisite for voting, the requirement is imbedded in the State constitution.

To take Federal action, as proposed by this bill, before the people of the States have had a chance to change their constitutions can lead only to confusion; and it may be worse than confusion, because in Virginia, and no doubt in all of the seven States, it will be impossible to bring State legislation into conformity with national legislation on the subject prior to the November elections.

Under such circumstances, judges of elections could ignore the State law and follow the Federal statute, or could ignore the Federal statute and follow the State law, or could use their own discretion as to how the two could be successfully blended.

To conduct an election under such circumstances would be to invite a contest over the seating of any candidate certified by the States as having been duly elected.

We are not without precedent as to what can happen when State and Federal laws are not in harmony. During the War Between the States, the Congress declared vacant the seats of all Members of Congress who sided with the Confederacy. After the end of the war, the Southern States held elections and certified the results to Congress, but the Congress refused to seat those declared by their States to have been elected.

The issue was not settled until after adoption of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments and all States had brought their State laws into conformity therewith. Clearly, therefore, if the Congress deems it wise and desirable to enter the field of prescribing the qualifications of voters, the action from a decent regard for orderly processes, as well as regard for the clear provisions of the Constitution as it now exists, must be taken by means of a constitutional amendment. That fact was clearly recognized, as I have previously pointed out, by the drafters of the Republican Party platform in 1944.

The undesirability of this legislation extends beyond the specific confusion it would immediately cause, however. An important side effect of the passage of this bill would be to arouse, in the States against which it is directed, resentment which would hamper the progress which has been made by liberal elements within those States. That is why we find editorial writers and others in the South who have played leading parts in promoting better racial relations and improving social conditions, condemning this bill and other elements of the so-called civil-rights program.

For example, Hodding Carter, the Greenville, Miss., editor who won a Pulitzer prize in 1945 for his editorials on racial tolerance, has said he wishes the seven Southern States would abolish the poll tax, as five already have done, but he is unalterably opposed to Federal action.

Mr. Carter recently said in one of his editorials that the greatest danger from the proposed program "is that an angry, frustrated and fearful South may forget that the South's 10,000,000 Negroes had nothing to do with it. As in reconstruction, they may again be the longest victims of a resentment that should be directed not against them but those outside the South who harry us. Our targets should be the political cynics and the unrealistic zealots above the Mason and Dixon's line and the unyielding reactionaries below it, who have jointly brought us to this tragic pass."

Similarly we find Bishop John M. Moore, of Dallas, Tex., who has been an outstanding leader in the Methodist Church for half a century, condemning this bill in a letter published in the Christian Century, an independent religious journal with national circulation. Bishop Moore quoted assertions that a moral issue was involved in the poll-tax question and that political rights were being denied, and then said:

> The absurdity of these statements glaringly appears in the fact that every citizen in these States, Negro and white, is invited and expected to pay the poll tax without embarrassment or objection from anyone.
>
> Payment cannot be refused by the tax collector when it is offered by any white or Negro citizen of voting age and a poll-tax receipt must be issued. The poll-tax receipt is a passport to the ballot box and cannot be refused in an election. To omit those facts leads to misrepresentation, and they are omitted, while the charges "disfranchised" and "political rights denied" and "restoration" are published.

He also said in his letter that he saw no moral issue, "although as a Methodist preacher for 60 years and as a bishop for nearly 30, moral issues have been my field. It is my opinion," Bishop Moore continued, "that the bill would never have seen daylight had only a moral issue been involved." He said further:

> The bill is out-and-out political. The purpose is plainly to win the votes of Negro citizens now in northern cities and States by conferring what they call a favor upon the Negroes in the South. Every well-informed white and Negro knows that. The leaders of both parties in the North support the bill because each wants to carry New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and Detroit and their States.
>
> The anti-poll-tax bill is an indignity to many fine people. It is a meddling bill. It seeks to interfere with the historic rights and customs of seven fine American States. It reflects upon the intelligence, the moral sensibilities, the social consciousness and the political honesty of their best, most substantial and most responsible citizens. It seeks to reduce the electorate to the level of the indifferent and the incompetent. It is a low road to political power.

Those are the words of Bishop Moore, of Texas, a distinguished bishop of the Methodist Church. I was merely quoting his language. That is strong language from a churchman, and if a man like Bishop Moore could become so aroused over the implications of this bill I leave Senators to imagine the intensity of reaction on the part of less tolerant persons.

The Washington Post, as I need hardly remind the Members of the Senate, is far from a reactionary newspaper, and it has consistently urged broadening the base of our electorate.

Discussing the poll-tax question editorially on last March 29, however, the Post said this bill was "a bad piece of legislation."

The editorial further said:

> The bill owes its popularity to the fact that it seeks to bring about an overdue reform. We heartily agree with its sponsors that all taxes as prerequisites to voting should be abolished. The preferable method is action by the States. Since a few States are stubbornly holding out against abolition of this undemocratic requirement upon voters, however, we should be delighted to see Congress propose and the States ratify an anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution.

But then the editorial said—and note this carefully, coming from a newspaper which is opposed to the poll-tax limitation in itself—the editorial said this bill "is an attempt to amend the constitutional requirements as to the qualifications of voters by act of Congress."

Of course, that is all it is. The Washington Post has correctly named it.

Continuing to discuss this angle, the editorial said:

> The Constitution says in unmistakable terms that the voters entitled to choose Congressmen "in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." This does not give the States power to prescribe the qualifications of voters for Members of Congress as such. It simply makes use of the various yardsticks laid down by the States to serve a Federal purpose. Since that requirement of the Constitution no longer meets with public approval, it can be changed, but surely a constitutional amendment is the proper way to effect the change.

That is the opinion of this so-called liberal newspaper in the District of Columbia.

> The anti-poll-tax bill attempts to effect the desired reform by changing the meaning of words in the Constitution—an underhanded and undemocratic process.

Those are not my words, Mr. President. Those are the words of the editor of the Washington Post.

> It says that the requirement of paying a poll tax before voting "shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting." If this bill were law, citizens in the poll-tax States could vote for Congressmen without payment of a poll tax. But the same citizens could not vote for members of the "most numerous branch of the State legislature." The requirement of the Constitution as to who shall vote for Congressmen would thus be clearly defeated.

Concluding, the Post editorial said it recognized that it is more difficult to pass a constitutional amendment than a simple act of Congress. "But," it said, "expediency has seldom been recognized in the United States as a valid substitute for principle. At a time when we are engaged in a world-wide struggle against short cuts to power it seems especially deplorable that the Congress should be advancing so devious a scheme to accomplish a desirable reform."

Those are the words, Mr. President, of the Washington Post editorial writer.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that no one could accuse the Washington Post of having any prejudices or predilections in the matter? Is it not true that the Post has simply weighed the matter, has gone into the law and considered it, and has come to the inevitable conclusion which the Senator just read to the Senate?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. There is no escape from that conclusion, it undoubtedly is the fact.

That final statement suggests what I regard as the most serious angle of the undesirability of legislation such as this bill proposes.

It is highly dangerous in principle, because it is another step in the direction of submerging the sovereignty of the States in an overpowering central government and it opens the gates for an unlimited invasion of the powers which the Constitution carefully reserved to the States.

Thus, if the Congress can say by statute that a State cannot require prepayment of a poll tax by voters, there is no logical reason why it cannot by another statute say that the voting age shall be reduced to 18 or 16 or 12. Or it can outlaw length of residence requirements and restrictions on absentee voting. It can forbid the requirement of registration. In short, it can tamper with any or all the devices which have been used to prevent corrupt elections and to limit the voting to those who have some interest in the welfare of their government and some reasonable minimum of competence to judge between issues.

Or, conversely, the Congress could by legislation narrow rather than broaden the electorate by setting up qualifications which would limit the right of voting to a chosen few who would serve the wishes of those in office and start us on our way to a dictatorship.

Before we pass this bill I think it would be well for us to recall the statement made by Thomas Jefferson:

> In every government on earth is some trace of human weakness, some germ of corruption and degeneracy, which cunning will discover, and wickedness insensibly open, cultivate, and improve. Every government degenerates when trusted to the rules of the people alone. The people themselves therefore are its only safe depositaries. And to render even them safe, their minds must be improved to a certain degree. This, indeed, is not all that is necessary, though it be essentially necessary.

We should consider also the statement of Woodrow Wilson in his book on constitutional government in the United States, that "The question of the relation of the States to the Federal Government is the cardinal question of our Constitution."

There can be no doubt but that this bill strikes at the very heart of the doctrine of States' rights. In a representative democracy the most valuable, the most precious right any State can possess is the right to control its own election laws. Take that right away and they become helpless pawns in the hands of a Federal bureaucracy.

No one man was more instrumental than George Washington in bringing the 13 States together in a Federal Union. No one realized more clearly than he that such a Union would not be self-preserving and that its future would be hazarded if concessions originally made in the interest of harmony and cooperation should later be overridden. Hence his plea in his farewell address for its preservation, just as timely now as when spoken, in his admonition:

> The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.

Mark this:

> To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

A little later in our history——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, may I yield for a question without losing my rights on the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may yield. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the statement which the distinguished Senator has been reading. Does not the Senator agree that if this bill should be enacted and sustained by the courts it would effectively lodge in Congress the right to fix the qualifications of electors, because, if the Congress can say what is not a qualification, it can affirmatively say what is a qualification?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. There can be do doubt of that. Congress could say what could be done and what could not be done. If we can take over any part of the regulations of the States dealing with the qualifications of voters, we can go to any extreme upon which the majority in Congress at the time may decide.

Mr. EASTLAND. With respect to the statement of the great John Marshall, in his decision in the Marlyland case, a decision which has rung down through the years, would not that statement, in which the great Chief Justice said that whoever was wild enough to advocate breaking down the barriers that divide the States and compounding the American people into one common mass, apply to this bill which seeks to tear away the very vitals of State sovereignty?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. It all falls into the same general pattern which I have been quoting. I desire to quote at this time from Andrew Jackson, who gave similar advice in his farewell address as President. He said:

> My experience in public concerns and the observations of a life somewhat advanced confirm opinions long since imbibed by me, that the destruction of our State governments or the annihilation of their control over the local concerns of the people would lead directly to revolution and anarchy and finally to despotism and military domination.

Jackson also said in this address:

We behold systematic efforts publicly made to sow the seeds of discord between different parts of the United States and to place party divisions directly upon geographical distinctions; to excite the South against the North, and the North against the South—

Think of it; in his farewell address Jackson was warning us against that.

I continue quoting from Andrew Jackson:

and to force into the controversy the most delicate and exciting topics upon which it is impossible that a large portion of the Union can ever speak without strong emotions. Appeals, too, are constantly made to sectional interests, in order to influence election of the Chief Magistrate, as if it were desired that he should favor a particular quarter of the country, instead of fulfilling the duties of his station with impartial justice to all.

This is the farewell address of Andrew Jackson. He was not talking about this Presidential campaign. He further said:

But the Constitution cannot be maintained, nor the Union preserved, in opposition to public feeling, by the mere exertion of the coercive powers confided to the General Government. The foundations must be laid in the affections of the people: in the security it gives to life, liberty, character, and property, in every quarter of the country; and in the fraternal attachments which the citizens of the several States bear to one another, as members of one political family, mutually contributing to promote the happiness of each other.

Hence the citizens of every State should studiously avoid everything calculated to wound the sensibility or offend the just pride of the people of the other States—

I repeat those words:

Hence the citizens of every State should studiously avoid everything calculated to wound the sensibility or offend the just pride of the people of the other States.

He said further:

And they should frown upon any proceedings within their own borders likely to disturb the tranquillity of their political brethren in other portions of the Union. In a country so extensive as the United States, and with pursuits so varied, the internal regulations of the several States must frequently differ from one another in important particulars; and this difference is unavoidably increased by the varying principles upon which the American Colonies were originally planted; principles which had taken deep root in their social relations before the Revolution, and, therefore, of necessity, influencing their policy since they became free and independent States. But each State has the unquestionable right to regulate its own internal concerns according to its own pleasure; and while it does not interfere with the rights of the people of other States, or the rights of the Union, every State must be the sole judge of the measures proper to secure the safety of its citizens and promote their happiness and all efforts on the part of the people of other States to cast odium upon their institutions, and all measures calculated to disturb their rights of property, or put in jeopardy their peace and internal tranquillity, are in direct opposition to the spirit in which the Union was formed and must endanger its safety.

Motives of philanthropy may be assigned for this unwarrantable interference; and weak men may persuade themselves for a moment that they are laboring in the cause of humanity, and asserting the rights of the human race; but everyone, upon sober reflections, will see that nothing but mischief can come from these improper assaults upon the feelings and rights of others. Rest assured that the men found busy in this work of discord are not worthy of your confidence and deserve your strongest reprobation.

Andrew Jackson called a spade a spade, and I continue his words:

It is well known that there have been those amongst us who wish to enlarge the powers of the General Government and experience would seem to indicate that there is a tendency on the part of this Government to overstep the boundaries marked out for it by the Constitution. Its legitimate authority is abundantly sufficient for all the purposes for which it was created, and its powers being expressly enumerated, there can be no justification for claiming anything beyond them.

Every attempt to exercise power beyond these limits should be promptly and firmly opposed. For one evil example will lead to other measures still more mischievous; and if the principle of constructive powers, or supposed advantages, or temporary circumstances shall ever be permitted to justify the assumption of a power not given by the Constitution, the General Government will before long absorb all the powers of legislation, and you will have in effect, but one consolidated Government.

From the extent of our country, its diversified interests, different pursuits, and different habits, it is too obvious for argument that a single consolidated Government would be wholly inadequate to watch over and protect its interests; and every friend of our free institutions should be always prepared to maintain unimpaired and in full vigor the rights and sovereignty of the States, and to confine the action of the General Government strictly to the sphere of its appropriate duties.

Referring again to Woodrow Wilson and his ideas on constitutional government, we find him saying of the relation of the States to the Federal Government:

It is difficult to discuss so critical and fundamental a question calmly and without party heat or bias when it has come once more, as it has now, to an acute stage. Just because it lies at the heart of our constitutional system to decide it wrongly is to alter the whole structure and operation of our Government, for good or for evil, and one would wish never to see the passion of party touch it to distort it. A sobering sense of responsibility should fall upon everyone who handles it. No man should argue it this way or that for party advantage. Desire to bring the impartial truth to light must, in such a case, be the first dictate alike of true statesmanship and of true patriotism. Every man should seek to think of it and to speak of it in the true spirit of the founders of the Government and of all those who have spent their lives in the effort to confirm its just principles both in counsel and in action.

Continuing his discussion, Wilson said that—

The principle of the division of powers between State and Federal Governments is a very simple one when stated in the most general terms. It is that the legislatures of the States shall have control of all the general subject matter of law, of private rights of every kind, of local interests, and of everything that directly concerns their people as communities—free choice with regard to all matters of local regulation and development, and that Congress shall have control only of such matters as concern the peace and the commerce of the country as a whole.

He said we are apt to think of our American political system as distinguished by its central structure—its President and Congress and courts which the Constitution set up—but "as a matter of fact, it is distinguished by its local structure, by the extreme vitality of its parts. It would be an impossibility without its division of powers."

From the first—

Wilson said—

America has been a nation in the making. It has come to maturity by the stimulation of no central force or guidance, but by an aboundingly self-helping, self-sufficient energy in its parts, which severally brought themselves into existence and added themselves to the Union, pleasing first of all themselves in the framing of their laws and constitutions, not asking leave to exist and constitute themselves, but existing first and asking leave afterward, self-originated, self-constituted, self-confident, self-sustaining, veritable communities, demanding only recognition. Communities develop not by external but by internal forces. Else they do not live at all. Our Commonwealths have not come into existence by invitation, like plants in a tended garden; they have sprung up of themselves, irrepressible, a sturdy spontaneous product of the nature of men nurtured in a free air.

It is this spontaneity and variety—

He continued—

this independent and irrepressible life of its communities, that has given our system its extraordinary elasticity, which has preserved it from the paralysis which has soonor or later fallen upon every people who have looked to their central government to patronize and nurture them.

Later in the same lecture Wilson said that:

The division of powers between the States and the Federal Government effected by our Federal Constitution was the normal and natural division for this purpose. Under it the States possess all the ordinary legal choices that shape a people's life. Theirs is the whole of the ordinary field of law; the regulation of domestic relations and of the relations between employer and employee, the determination of property rights and of the validity and enforcement of contracts, the definition of crimes and their punishment, the definition of the many and subtle rights and obligations which lie outside the fields of property and contract, the establishment of the laws of incorporations and of the rules governing the conduct of every kind of business. The presumption insisted upon by the courts in every argument with regard to the powers of the Federal Government is that it has no power not explicitly granted it by the Federal Constitution or reasonably to be inferred as the natural or necessary accompaniment of the powers there indisputably conveyed to it.

Woodrow Wilson was a great teacher of history and of government. When I was a young boy in the history class I was studying Woodrow Wilson's The State, and also Bryce's American Commonwealth. From those two great writers I got the impulse to devote my life to public service. I have been a follower of Woodrow Wilson ever since, and I take pleasure in quoting him here today, because I think that next to Thomas Jefferson he has been one of the greatest expounders of democracy we have ever had. He continued in his lecture:

But the presumption with regard to the powers of the States they have always held to be of exactly the opposite kind. It is

that the States of course possess every power that Government has ever anywhere exercised, except only those powers which their own constitutions or the Constitution of the United States explicitly or by plain inference withhold. They are the ordinary governments of the country; the Federal Government is its instrument only for particular purposes.

Wilson also said:

The remedy for ill-considered legislation by the States, the remedy alike for neglect and mistake on the part of their several governments, lies not outside the States, but within them. The mistakes which they themselves correct will sink deeper into the consciousness of their people than the mistakes which Congress may rush in to correct for them, thrusting upon them what they have not learned to desire. They will either themselves learn their mistakes, by such intimate and domestic processes as will penetrate very deep and abide with them in convincing force, or else they will prove that what might have been a mistake for other States or regions of the country was no mistake for them, and the country will have been saved its wholesome variety. In no case will their failure to correct their own measures prove that the Federal Government might have forced wisdom upon them. • • •

Moral and social questions originally left to the several States for settlement can be drawn into the field of Federal authority only at the expense of the self-dependence and efficiency of the several communities of which our complex body politic is made up. Paternal morals, morals enforced by the judgment and choices of the central authority at Washington, do not and cannot create vital habits or methods of life unless sustained by local opinion and purpose, local prejudice and convenience—unless supported by local convenience and interest; and only communities capable of taking care of themselves will, taken together, constitute a nation capable of vital action and control. You cannot atrophy the parts without atrophying the whole. Deliberate adding to the powers of the Federal Government by sheer judicial authority, because the Supreme Court can no longer be withstood or contradicted in the States, both saps the legal morality upon which a sound constitutional system must rest, and deprives the Federal structure as a whole of that vitality which has given the Supreme Court itself its increase of power. It is the alchemy of decay.

Wilson concluded his lecture with the assertion that—

We are certified by all political history of the fact that centralization is not vitalization. Moralization is by life, not by statute; by the interior impulse and experience of communities, not by fostering legislation which is merely the abstraction of an experience which may belong to a nation as a whole or to many parts of it without having yet touched the thought of the rest anywhere to the quick. The object of our Federal system is to bring the understandings of constitutional government home to the people of every part of the Nation to make them part of their consciousness as they go about their daily tasks. If we cannot successfully effect its adjustments by the nice local adaptations of our older practice, we have failed as constitutional statesmen.

Coming still closer to the present time, we find the Governor of a great State who later became President of the United States having this to say on the subject of States' rights—and this is the language I told the Senate at the outset I would quote from the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He said:

As a matter of fact and law, the governing rights of the States are all those which have not been surrendered to the National Government by the Constitution or its amendments. • • • The proper relations between the Government of the United States and the governments of the separate States thereof depend entirely in their legal aspects on what powers have been voluntarily ceded to the Central Government by the States themselves. What these powers of government are is contained in our Federal Constitution either by direct language, by judicial interpretation thereof during many years, or by implication so plain as to have been recognized by the people generally.

I leave the quotation from Mr. Roosevelt a moment to remind Senators of what I said in my opening remarks. I quoted the plain language of the Constitution. I quoted the interpretation of the framers of the Constitution of that plain language. I quoted a long line of court decisions on the meaning of that plain language, decisions which have never been deviated from in a single instance. I told Senators, on the basis of all of that evidence, that Congress has no power to legislate on this subject.

I read again the admonition of our former President. Some of those who now call themselves disciples of the New Deal and followers of Franklin D. Roosevelt democracy are joining here on the Senate floor in signing the cloture petition and in their efforts to force upon us something which I have told the Senate is from every standpoint unconstitutional, unwarranted, unnecessary, and violative of States' rights. This is the language of Mr. Roosevelt:

What these powers of government are is contained in our Federal Constitution either by direct language, by judicial interpretation thereof during many years, or by implication so plain as to have been recognized by the people generally.

I continue to read the language of Mr. Roosevelt:

Fortunately for the stability of our Nation, it was already apparent (when the Constitution was adopted) that the vastness of our territory presented wide geographical and and climatic differences which gave to the States wide differences in the nature of their industry, their agriculture, and their commerce. • • • Thus, already it was clear to the framers of our Constitution that the greatest possible liberty of self-government must be given to each State, and that any national administration attempting to make all laws for the whole Nation, such as was wholly practical in Great Britain, would inevitably result in some future time in a dissolution of the Union itself. • • •

The preservation of this home rule by the States is not a cry of jealous Commonwealths seeking their own aggrandizement at the expense of sister States.

That is Franklin D. Roosevelt speaking. He continues:

It is a fundamental necessity if we are to remain a truly united country.

The whole success of our democracy has not been that it is a democracy wherein the will of a bare majority of the total inhabitants is imposed upon the minority, but because it has been a democracy where through a division of government into units called States the rights and interests of the minority have been respected and have been given a voice in the control of our affairs. • • • To bring about government by oligarchy masquerading as democracy it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must first be destroyed, except in mere minor matters of legislation. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever they seem in danger.

Thus it will be seen that this home rule is a most important thing, a most vital thing, if we are to continue along the course on which we have so far progressed with such unprecedented success.

The man from whom I have been quoting is Franklin D. Roosevelt. After outlining the rights granted by the Constitution to the Federal Government in this speech he said:

As the individual is protected from possible oppression by his neighbors, so the smallest political unit—the town is in theory at least, allowed to manage its own affairs, secure from undue interference by the larger unit of the county, which in turn is protected from mischievous meddling by the State. This is what we call the doctrine of home rule, and the whole spirit and intent of the Constitution is to carry this great principle into the relations between the National Government and the governments of the States.

Let us remember that from the very beginning differences in climate, soil, conditions, habits, and modes of living in States separated by thousands of miles rendered it necessary to give the fullest individual latitude to the individual States. Remembering that the mining States of the Rockies, the fertile savannas of the South, the prairies of the West, and the rocky soil of the New England States created many problems, introduced many factors in each locality, which have no existence in others, it is obvious that almost every new or old problem of government must be solved, if it is to be solved to the satisfaction of the people of the whole country, by each State in its own way.

There are many glaring examples of where exclusive Federal control is manifestly against the scheme and intent of our Constitution. It is to me unfortunate that under a clause of our Constitution itself primarily intended for an entirely different purpose, our Federal courts have been made a refuge by those who seek to evade the mandates of the State judiciary.

That is Governor Roosevelt speaking. I continue to quote from him:

I think if we understand what I have tried to make clear tonight as to the fundamental principles on which our Government is built and what the underlying idea of the relations between individuals and States and States and the National Government should be, we can all of us reason for ourselves what should be the proper course in regard to Federal legislation on any of the questions of the day.

Thus, Mr. President, in each generation since our Constitution was adopted, warnings have been sounded of the dangers of changing it except by amendment and, in particular, of the possible consequences of upsetting the delicate balance between the States and the Federal Government, and the legislative, the judicial, and the executive branches.

Because the warnings of Andrew Jackson and others were not sufficiently heeded, we found ourselves plunged into a fratricidal war. Our Nation and our constitutional government survived that conflict but only at a terrible price. And, incidentally, the States against which the pending legislation is directed still are paying installments on that price in the form of retarded economic development.

But, we have survived to the present and we know that history records no instance of an overnight destruction from within of a form of government which has existed for more than a century and a half. The process always has been slow and it has always been insidious. The leaders advocating the change have always concealed their direct purposes and the masses have accepted the change in the mistaken belief that they were going to get in the future something better than they had in the past.

Let us not be so misled now. If the poll tax has outlived its usefulness, and if the fact that certain States will not recognize that situation is sufficiently important to our national welfare, let us resort to the constitutional method of amendment.

But let us not do something which might pull a cornerstone from the base of our constitutional liberty.

Let us heed the words of Daniel Webster, speaking on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, when he said:

Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which united national sovereignty with State rights, individual security and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them, than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art, for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill. The bill would pay to District of Columbia employees and officers, and members of the Metropolitan Police and United States Park Service, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the same increase which other Federal employees received from the bill passed during the last session. It also carries a $500 increase for all teachers.

The cost is to be paid by lending to the District $5,800,000, to be paid back at such time and in such manner as the Congress may hereafter direct. I hope that the Congress will not call upon the District of Columbia to pay back this money, because of the fact that in my opinion that amount and more should be paid to the District of Columbia to help bear the expenses of the District. If the District should be called upon to pay it back, I sincerely hope that the Congress will wait until we receive the money from the British loan, and then call upon the District of Columbia for repayment.

Mr. President, I introduce this bill on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from South Carolina on behalf of himself and other Senators will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2920) to require payment to certain employees of the District of Columbia of the additional compensation authorized by the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Carolina if he is about to bring up a resolution relative to adjournment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will answer the Senator from Nebraska in this way: First, I should like to make a brief statement before I submit the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. If that is the purpose of the distinguished Senator, will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum? I feel that all Senators should hear the statement and be ready to vote on the resolution if it is called up. If the Senator will yield to me, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Baldwin	Hill	Murray
Barkley	Hoey	Myers
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Butler	Jenner	Revercomb
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Capper	Kem	Russell
Connally	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cooper	Knowland	Smith
Cordon	Langer	Stennis
Donnell	Lodge	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Taylor
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McGrath	Thye
Feamel	McKellar	Umstead
Ferguson	McMahon	Vandenberg
Flanders	Magnuson	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Hayden	Moore	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on last Wednesday, the first day when the Senate was open to do business, I submitted a concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress. I did so after considerable thought and consideration. In the first instance, when the President of the United States announced at the Democratic convention, in his acceptance speech, that he would call the Congress into extraordinary session, I immediately, then and there, announced to the Nation that as soon as Congress met, I would submit a concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress. I did so because I was convinced, in my mind, that we could not accomplish any good results by being in session at this particular time.

The President of the United States in his message to Congress asked that two particular things be done by the Congress, as Senators will find from reading his message to the Congress; first, something about inflation; and, second, something concerning the housing shortage in America.

Let us read his message, and from it we shall find that what I have said is true:

The urgent needs of the American people require our presence here today.

Our people demand legislative action by their Government to do two things: First, to check inflation and the rising cost of living; and, second, to help in meeting the acute housing shortage.

The President continued for four pages to discuss those two things. Bear in mind, Mr. President, that his message was only six pages long. On the fourth page the President had this to say:

I have called the Congress back primarily to deal with high prices and with the housing shortage. Delay on either of these items would be most dangerous. In addition, there are other important legislative measures on which delay would injure us at home or impair our world relations.

I therefore recommend that the present session, without allowing anything to interfere with its vital work on legislation concerning high prices and housing, take action on certain other important measures.

It will be noticed that he did not want to interfere with certain other important measures.

These measures can speedily be enacted now because of the amount of study already given to them by the Congress.

In my discussion before the Senate last Wednesday I called attention to the fact that I had already received information which convinced me the first thing to be taken up would be the anti-poll-tax bill. I do not have to tell Senators now that the bill is going to be brought up; it has already been brought up. It has been discussed since last Wednesday. In my opinion it will be discussed, the Lord knows how long, if we remain in session.

To realize our situation, it is necessary to be here and feel what is going on in this Chamber. Again, it is important to realize the feeling and condition of the people back home and the different attitudes of the people of the Nation concerning the issues in order to realize why we are hopelessly deadlocked today and why we shall remain so, as long as we are taking up anti-poll-tax, antilynching, FEPC, and other bills of that nature.

Mr. President, if you would but go down to South Carolina today and converse with individuals in that State; if you would then go over to Georgia or to Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee, Texas, not to forget Arkansas, you would find, on the part of the people in all those States, a burning desire to protect themselves against any encroachment upon what they consider a right of the States.

What difference does it make about the poll tax? So far as the poll tax itself is concerned, it will not prevent any person in my State from voting, if he wants to vote. It is only $1 a year, and it is not cumulative. It does not affect the primary election but only the general election. The Supreme Court in a recent decision said that the primary in my State is everything. But we are here fighting the poll tax because we feel that it touches a right belonging only to the State and not to the Federal Government. That being so, we find Senators opposing the poll tax. They will continue to fight it. The result will be that the Nation will be torn asunder by this issue. No good will be accomplished by the discussion. Finally, if it is desired to pass other legislation, the bill will be laid aside. Why is it we do not have before us at the present time some of the bills concerning housing conditions or bills designed to control rising prices? We are not going to have those bills.

I believe the President, having been a Senator for many years, should have known what would happen in the extra session. Some say he called it because of politics. I fear the reason it was called was just that. I want to give credit where credit is due, but, having been a Senator, the President should have known that we would get into this deadlock and that we would accomplish nothing.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield only for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do not wish to challenge the Senator's assumption that the session may be a futility, but since the Senator has referred to the question of inflation, and since those of us who have studied that subject the most realize that about all the Congress can do to prevent still greater inflation is to control the further expansion of credit, which is itself the equivalent of putting more money into circulation, does the Senator not think that I, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is handling that problem now, should vote to remain in session, to see whether the committee will bring out a worth-while bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I see it, nothing can be accomplished here that is worth while. I further predict that what will be reported by the committee in that field will only penalize the States that need more credit now. I mean by that that whatever measure is reported will be crippling and damaging to those who really need relief, and will thereby hurt certain sections of the Nation. It will be found that, where banking facilities are great, control will be exercised over everything. I ask Senators to take note of that prediction. For that reason, I do not believe any good can come from curtailing credit, which is the only suggestion that has been made.

Since last Wednesday what have we done? We have done nothing but discuss certain subjects which the people do not understand. They think we ought to lay the pending question aside, take up the necessary legislation, and return home. The President has said that within 2 weeks we ought to do the job. Senators know that legislation passed by the Senate of the United States is far-reaching. To pass price-control legislation would take more than 2 weeks. Consider the housing situation. We have had that question before us during the last year, and we did not pass the legislation in 2 weeks. It is now bottled up. Something should be done to relieve the housing situation, but we are between the Republican Convention, the Democratic Convention, and the election in November. Did Senators come to the Senate because they played politics? Is the President of the United States to receive any votes because he plays politics? We may as well face that question. The two parties are playing for position at the present time. We might as well face it and be done with it. This is no time for representatives of any nation to be called into session. There is discontent between the two great parties of our Nation. As I said in my speech last Wednesday, it might cause such a rift between the Democrats and the Republicans that no longer would we have any bipartisan program, so far as our foreign relations and affairs are concerned. It might tear us asunder, and probably, because of such feeling in the United States, it will cause to exist a Federal bed in which communism may sprout and grow. Causing a rift between the two great parties would jeopardize permanent peace and might sprout and grow into a third world war.

Mr. President, I still feel that to be true. That being so, I have a resolution asking for the adjournment of this Congress on Wednesday, the 4th of August, 1948. The reason why I have made the date Wednesday, August 4, 1948, is because the House has already recessed and will not meet until next Wednesday. The House could not act upon it before that time. If the Senate will recall, when I submitted my resolution it was to be taken up on Friday or Saturday, but the House of Representatives recessed on Thursday to return on Monday, today. Therefore, it was impossible to consider it on Friday. Another reason I made the date July 31 in the beginning was that, in my opinion, we already have a law which adjourns the Congress on the 31st of July. We passed a law known as the Reorganization Act in 1946. It was passed by the House and the Senate and signed by the President of the United States. Let me read section 132 of that law:

Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by the Congress.

No national emergency has been proclaimed by the President. The President knew that that law was on the statute books when he called us into session on the 26th day of July. The law was signed by him. Congress went into session on the 26th day of July. If Congress wants to remain in session, in my opinion, it should pass a resolution continuing the session. The Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Presiding Officer of the House have a right to call Congress back into session, according to the terms of our adjournment in June.

There is a serious question in my mind as to whether or not we have been legally in session after last Saturday. This is the first time the adjournment resolution has been called up.

Mr. President, I send to the desk my resolution, asking for only a slight modification by inserting "Wednesday, August 4" in place of "Saturday, July 31, 1948." I ask consideration of the resolution at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the resolution submitted by the Senator from South Carolina.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Con. Res. 60), as follows:

That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, August 4, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is not subject to debate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the chief clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JENNER (when his name was called). I have a pair with my colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is detained from the Senate on official business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I announce that the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is necessarily absent on important public business. Prior to his departure, he arranged a live pair on this vote with the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. The senior Senator from California had expected to be

present to announce his pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee, but is unavoidably detained. In his absence I desire to state that if present and voting, the senior Senator from California would vote "nay" and the junior Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from New Jersey, and the Senator from South Dakota would each vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is necessarily absent, attending the funeral services of a close friend.

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—13

Byrd	Hill	Maybank
Eastland	Holland	Russell
Fessel	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Fulbright	McClellan	
George	McKellar	

NAYS—58

Aiken	Hoey	Pepper
Baldwin	Ives	Revercomb
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Butler	Knowland	Smith
Cain	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McGrath	Thye
Donnell	McMahon	Umstead
Dworshak	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Martin	Watkins
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Flanders	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—25

Ball	Hatch	Sparkman
Brewster	Hawkes	Stewart
Bricker	Jenner	Tobey
Buck	Lucas	Tydings
Bushfield	McCarran	Wagner
Capehart	Malone	White
Chavez	O'Conor	Wilson
Downey	O'Daniel	
Gurney	Reed	

So the concurrent resolution was rejected.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the unfinished business, Senate bill 2644. The amendment is the anti-poll-tax bill, and I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

FIRST 1949 PRODUCTION GOAL RECOMMENDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the release from the United States Department of Agriculture respecting 1949 production goals. I call attention especially to the recommendation that the number of head of beef cows on farms and ranges be reduced by half a million head below the number on farms the 1st of last January.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST 1949 PRODUCTION GOALS RECOMMENDED BY UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

National goals for 1949 production of several important farm commodities, including a wheat-acreage-goal, while somewhat below this year's planted acreage, would at recent yields produce another crop of more than a billion bushels, are being recommended to States by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Other national goals suggested at this time are for rye, winter cover crop seeds, winter vegetables, dry edible peas, and beef cattle. The beef goal calls for careful culling of cattle numbers by January 1 in order to maintain healthy, well-balanced herds while increasing meat supplies in the months ahead.

These recommendations are being submitted to the State United States Department of Agriculture councils for local consideration and possible adjustment within the national pattern. State goals and final national goals will be announced later, following State review and recommendations.

Wheat: The suggested goal for wheat is 71,500,000 planted acres, about 8 percent less than estimates of this year's seeded acreage. With an average yield of approximately 15 bushels per acre, the 1938–47 average, production in 1949 would total 1,100,000,000 bushels. This would be in line with estimated domestic, export, and carry-over needs.

The goal seeks to bring about adjustments in areas of relatively low productivity without materially affecting total production. United States wheat acreage has increased markedly during recent years in response to war and relief needs. If farmers are to make the best use of the country's soil resources, however, a somewhat smaller acreage should be planted. Moreover, a better balance between soil-conserving and soil-depleting crops will actually assure higher productivity over a long period of years. Farmers are urged to provide for sufficient summer fallow and, in marginal areas, to begin reseeding to grass land which is not suited for sustained production of crops. The recommended wheat-acreage goal for 1949 would provide the opportunity for farmers to start the shift back to these better conservation practices.

Other considerations in arriving at the wheat goal were this year's increased carryover, prospects that the 1948 crop will be the second largest in history, and the possibility of smaller foreign demands because of improved crops in many importing countries. It is also pointed out that the wheat carryover next year may be even larger. Failure of Congress to ratify the proposed International Wheat Agreement, which would have guaranteed a substantial export market for United States wheat for 5 years, has cast doubt on our ability to maintain high-level production and exports.

Rye: The suggested goal for rye is 2,500,000 acres for harvest in 1949. This would be about 313,000 acres more than the indicated acreage this year. With average yields, production next year would be about 30,000,000 bushels. Competition from other crops for available land has caused a downward trend in the harvest acreage of rye for a number of years, but indications are that more rye would be used if larger supplies were available.

Beef cattle: The Department recommends a beef-cattle breeding-herd goal which would maintain not less than 15,500,000 head of beef cows on farms and ranches on next January 1. Achieving this goal would result in a further moderate decrease of about one-half million head below the number on farms last January 1. Better management, improved feeding practices and thorough culling are urged to put the cattle industry in better position to supply the meat requirements of an increasing population.

A slaughter goal of 32,000,000 head of all cattle and calves, for the year July 1948–June 1949 is recommended—in line with the beef cattle-breeding goal and the expected volume of cattle feeding. While this recommended slaughter would mean a further small decrease in breeding-herd numbers, it would provide a larger quantity of beef and veal than would be available if cattle numbers were held at present levels or increased. These beef and veal supplies will be needed in the months ahead, with pork production expected to be less than in the previous year and with meat demand expected to continue abnormally strong. The recommended slaughter would be about 7 percent less than the number of animals slaughtered in each of the last two similar 12-month periods, with feeding to heavier weights probably offsetting this to some extent. The goal is regarded as the most practicable one in view of the various factors which must be considered.

Winter cover crops: Harvested acreage and production goals for winter cover-crop seeds are: Austrian winter peas, 74,000 acres, 80,000,000 pounds; crimson clover, 108,000 acres, 25,000,000 pounds; hairy vetch, 129,000 acres, 30,000,000 pounds; common and willamette vetch, 103,000 acres, 50,000,000 pounds; common rye grass, 98,000 acres, 43,000,000 pounds; blue lupine, 57,000 acres, 50,000,000 pounds.

Goals represent substantial increases in production of all the seeds except rye grass. Stocks of all the others are at very low levels, and the 1948 crops are not expected to provide adequately for domestic requirements and exports. Increased production of the seeds is badly needed to restore the fertility of heavily cropped soil and to meet export demands, only partially filled in recent years.

Winter vegetables: Acreage guides for 1949 production of 15 winter vegetable crops total 281,750 acres. With average yields, this acreage would result in a production about equal to that of 1948, although it would be 3 percent less than the acreage available for harvest in 1948. Recommendations include harvested acreage increases of 5 percent for carrots and 20 percent for peppers. Suggested acreage reductions are: 10 percent for snap beans and celery: 15 percent for escarole; 5 percent for cabbage and lettuce; and 3 percent for shallots. No changes are recommended for lima beans, beets, cauliflower, kale, green peas, spinach, and tomatoes.

Dry edible peas: The recommended goal is 225,000 acres of dry edible smooth peas, which, with normal plantings of wrinkled peas, would total 350,000 acres. With average yields, this acreage would produce about 2,500,000 100-pound bags of smooth peas. Foreign demand has slowed noticeably during the past year. Production areas are primarily in Idaho, Colorado, and Washington, with smaller acreages in California, Michigan, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, and Oregon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a comment on the insertion made in the RECORD by the Senator from Ohio. The release of the Department of Agriculture covered many commodities, including hogs, cattle, wheat, poultry, and other items. In most all of them the goal set by the Department of Agriculture represented an increase in production. We all know that the hog population at this time is below what it has ever been, or that it approximates the low ebb in the production of hogs, due largely to the shortage in the corn crop upon which hogs are fed.

It is true that the high price of cattle has induced many farmers to sell their dairy cattle, and to sell also their cows which have been used for breeding purposes, and that is a perfectly natural reaction to high prices in the field of cattle. It has been desirable and no doubt is desirable that the breeding type of cattle be preserved as much as possible on the farm because it takes from 2 to 2½ years to produce beef cattle which are marketable, unless sold as veal. So that in the goal set by the Department for cattle the question of undertaking to stabilize the production of cattle through the breeding process, which is the only way to stabilize it, has been taken into consideration in the goal set by the Department.

In the case of hogs, the Department has recommended that there be an increase of 10 percent in the hog population of the country because there is a large crop of corn this year upon which to feed them, and therefore it would be justified, and that increase in the production of hogs and the consequent increase in the production of pork would offset any apparent decrease in the production of beef cattle due to the reasons which I have suggested.

I wanted to make that comment because I think it ought to be done in explanation of at least some of the goals set by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, following my statement subsequent to the insertion by the Senator from Ohio of a release from the Department of Agriculture in regard to cattle, I wish to insert a brief memorandum with respect to various articles, including grains, livestock, poultry, dairy products, and winter vegetables.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL GOALS

The Department of Agriculture's goals constitute recommendations to farmers on the basis of which they can plan their coming year's crop operation. They are advisory to and not mandatory on farmers.

The guiding principle in formulating goals for 1949 was to start toward a postwar readjustment. It is directly related to the recent price-support legislation which contemplates lower support price on many commodities in the coming years.

GRAINS

Wheat: In the case of wheat, acreage goals contemplate some smaller demand upon American grain supplies resulting from the increased production capacities of European nations. Specifically, it is designed to encourage withdrawal from production of the marginal producing lands upon which we have placed such a serious strain in our efforts to reach maximum production of all types of grain during the world food crisis. But our goal still calls for a production at average yields of about 1,100,000 bushels—a high figure compared with most years in the past.

Rye: The Department recommended a 313,000-acre increase in rye.

Grass and cover crop seeds: It recommended substantial increases in the production of all grasses and cover-crop seeds.

ALL MEATS

Hogs: On March 15 the Department urged farmers to increase their production of fall pigs by at least 10 percent more if possible. This was reemphasized in a special plea on July 20. This request is based on the excellent prospect for a substantial corn and feed crop.

Beef: The Department's recommendations for the coming year are designed to indicate to farmers and ranchers the need for stabilizing the number of breeding cattle. The aim is to keep slaughter at a reasonably high level, while at the same time preparing the way for a swing back toward larger breeding herds and larger meat supplies for the future. The Department is also urging farmers and ranchers to take advantage of the good feed crops now in sight and feed to heavier weights in order to produce as much as possible from the numbers on hand.

Poultry: The Department now contemplates a request to farmers for an increase in poultry on farms for the coming year. This increase is justified by the anticipated expanded supplies of grain and poultry feed. The increase is also necessary to help maintain the levels of supply of meat and poultry at as high a level as possible in relation to the active demand.

Dairy: With respect to dairy, the Department has steadily encouraged farmers to maximize dairy production and will surely ask for as large an increase next year as dairy cow numbers will warrant—which is another reason for wanting to stabilize cattle numbers.

WINTER VEGETABLES

It recommended a production of approximately the same as for 1948 although expecting to reach that production with 3 percent less number of acres.

The production of dry edible peas was reduced because of the noticeable slowing down of demand. The production will be still well above prewar level.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Nebraska has kindly consented to permit me to speak for a minute or two to express a protest against the motion I understand the acting majority leader is about to make, namely, a motion to recess or adjourn until tomorrow at noon.

I appreciate that one lone voice in the Senate in opposition to a motion to recess is not going to have much effect, but I call the attention of the Senate to an opinion of mine that there are millions of people throughout the Nation who I think will share the protest I here now make about any adjournment without a night session, because I think that a great majority of the people of the United States believe that in this extraordinary emergency session of the Congress we should stay here and do the people's business.

I want the RECORD to show that I shall continue to protest these recesses at 6 o'clock, or 6:10, or any similar hour, so long as this special session continues, because I think the Republican majority should make very clear to the Democrats that we are here to do the people's business, and that we intend to hold the Senate in session each night until 11 p. m., until we transact the people's business. In view of what is perfectly obvious to us as the Democratic strategy in this session, I do not think the Republican majority can justify recessing at least before 11 p. m. each day, in its endeavor to move as rapidly as possible to transact the business which should be transacted in this special session of the Congress.

I am perfectly willing to admit that most of the speeches we have heard on the pending motion, namely, the motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill, have been speeches, up until this hour, which have been on the merits of the bill itself, and, in my judgment, they have been exceedingly able speeches. However, each and every one of them could have been made on the merits of the anti-poll-tax bill itself once we took it up. In my opinion that is when they should be delivered, rather than upon a motion to determine whether or not we should even take up for consideration the anti-poll-tax bill.

As one lone Senator on this side of the aisle, I respectfully recommend and suggest to the leadership of my party on this side of the aisle that I think the time has come when clear notice should be given to the Democratic side of the aisle that from now on until this special session adjourns we intend to hold the Senate in session every evening until such time as it becomes clearly demonstrated that it would probably be more appropriate to proceed even with 24-hour sessions, Mr. President, so that we can transact the people's business at this session of the Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to associate myself in toto with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. We are now in the second week of a special session of the Congress. Not only the Senate but the country is entitled to know something of what

the program before the special session is to be. I wanted to interrogate the acting majority leader, and the chairmen of committees who are upon the floor, so that we might be informed about what is in store for the Senate.

The first matter the President recommended dealt with high prices. May I ask the acting majority leader, or the chairman of the appropriate committee if I am correct in assuming that hearings are now being held on that proposed legislation, or at least that the subject is being considered by the proper committee?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe that a statement to that effect was made about as forcefully and clearly as could be made when we started the session. I know the statement I made included the fact that one piece of legislation that was recommended by the President was the so-called civil-rights legislation, and that the only legislation ready for immediate debate was one of the civil-rights bills which are now on the calendar, and that one of them would be taken up—until when? Until committees of the Senate had properly processed and reported to the Senate legislation on other subjects. I said that whenever one of the committees reports back favorably to the Senate a bill dealing with any of the proposals submitted by the President, and it came to the calendar, then we would be ready for debate. As I understand, the committees have not yet reported any legislation relative to the first category, and we are still on the civil-rights measure which was contained in the second category the President recommended.

Hearings are being held by committees. I understand that Mr. Porter, who is one of the witnesses for the administration on the so-called anti-inflation measure, appeared before a House committee. He also appeared today before the Senate committee. Other witnesses will be called, and when and if legislation is finally reported favorably it will be ready for consideration. In the meantime we expect to continue the debate on the bill, the consideration of which has been moved.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if I understand correctly, then hearings are being held before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the question of high prices?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. And hearings are also being held in the House.

Mr. PEPPER. The second question raised by the President relates to housing. I wish the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would not leave the floor, because I am going to ask whether or not the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, expects to call any committee meeting to deal with the minimum-wage law and possibly some of the other legislation the President has recommended? At least that is one subject within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. I have no intention of doing so at the present time.

Mr. PEPPER. So then we have the statement from the policy leader of the Republican side, who is also the chairman of the committee, that although there are pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare several different bills relating to the minimum wage, there is not even to be a committee meeting to consider the subject while this special session is in progress. That is the kind of clarity I wanted to get on all these subjects.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has answered the questions propounded by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say relative to housing that legislation respecting it has been considered and no doubt will be considered. Whether it will be reported favorably I cannot say.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is a committee considering at this special session of the Senate any further legislation?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to supplement my statement by saying that the Senate passed the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, and that measure is now in the House. The legislation to which I had reference has to do with some corrective matters upon which I understood some evidence was being adduced.

Mr. PEPPER. There is no further consideration by any Senate committee, then, being given to legislation?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who is a member of the committee.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should merely like to say for the information of the Senator from Florida and of the Senate that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, of which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is chairman, is and has been meeting since Wednesday of last week twice daily. The subject of what further might be done in the field of housing legislation is being seriously considered by that committee, bearing in mind that the Senate itself passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill during the last session of the Congress.

In this connection, I should like to point out that one of the difficulties confronting us is that Mr. Eccles, who for 13 years has been charged with watching inflationary trends in this country, Mr. Paul Porter, who is presently the coordinator for the administration, and Mr. Snyder, who is the Secretary of the Treasury, have all, but in different degrees, called to our attention the inflationary threat involved in the proposed passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Your committee, consisting of both Democrats and Republicans, is endeavoring to determine from those qualified and conscientious witnesses to what degree the bill in question is conducive to further inflation, and whether or not the threat of such inflation offsets the virtues included in the legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. That is the kind of information I wanted to get.

Mr. CAIN. It is the hope of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, that by the end of this week an affirmative position will be taken in the field of housing and on the price question.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me——

Mr. WHERRY. I intended to make a motion to recess.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, we have already cleared up several questions. I simply wish to run briefly through the seven or eight recommendations of the President. I should like to know whether or not any Senate committee is giving consideration to these subjects. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has clarified the matter by saying that he is not going to call his committee together, and that no minimum-wage proposal is to be recommended to the Senate.

I should also like to know about social security. Is the Committee on Finance considering the President's recommendations with respect to social-security legislation?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall make a final answer to the Senator's questions, in the light of the statement which I made on Friday night. So far as I am concerned, this Congress will remain in session so long as any constructive legislation on any of the President's proposals might come from the committees for consideration by the United States Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall conclude by saying that the next question relates to displaced-persons legislation. I do not know whether any committee is considering that point, but that is one of the recommendations of the President.

The next question is the wheat agreement. That was recommended in the form of a treaty. I do not know whether the Foreign Relations Committee——

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the Senator a member of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. PEPPER. I am not a member. I do not know whether the Foreign Relations Committee is considering the question or not.

Another question is the TVA appropriation, to build stand-by power plants. I do not know whether the Appropriations Committee of the Senate is considering that question or not, but I am trying to find out.

Another subject is the Federal pay bill. I do not know whether or not any Senate committee is considering the President's recommendation in that connection.

I thought we were entitled to know what progress, if any, was being made. Of course, the last item is the civil rights program. I believe that in due course we should be advised as to what action is being taken or is contemplated.

I thank the Senator for helping to the extent that he has helped me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. With regard to social-security legislation, I introduced a bill last week on that subject, which was referred to the Finance Committee. The Chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], has announced that there will be no action by that committee on that subject at this session.

Mr. PEPPER. That clarifies two of the points.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am sure that these points will be clarified as we proceed with the work of the Senate. Let me say again that so far as I am personally concerned, any legislation which is processed through the committees and receives their favorable consideration will be brought up on the floor of the Senate for discussion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that that committee is now considering, and has been considering, the wheat agreement. We held a session yesterday. We are to have another tomorrow. There appeared before us the Secretary of Agriculture and representatives of the State Department. That problem is receiving the best possible attention of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. I think it is generally known that I am opposed to discrimination in any form. I wish to protest against the way in which estimable Senators from the South are being discriminated against in the United States Senate. They wish to be heard on the question of bringing up the anti-poll-tax bill, and I believe that they are deserving of the same honor which I recently received when I wished to express my views on the draft. The Senate remained in session continuously to listen to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and myself. I should say that we were a team. I do not wish to say that either of us was the leader. I do not desire to take more credit than I give to the Senator from North Dakota. But certainly if the Senate can honor two Senators in that way, it should pay the same respect to a greater number of our colleagues, who happen to come from below the Mason and Dixon's line.

So, Mr. President, I believe that the proposal of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the Senate remain in session until 11 o'clock is utterly inadequate. It would be a reflection upon the oratorical ability of other Senators for us to adjourn at 11 o'clock. I am firmly convinced that the Senate should remain in session continuously until those Senators have had an opportunity to be heard, as I had an opportunity to be heard, without interruption.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that the President of the United States will send to the special session of Congress a recommendation that, with respect to western power and reclamation projects and transmission lines, the budget cuts of the last session be restored. I ask the Senator from Nebraska, who is the able chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in connection with these matters, whether or not, if such a request is submitted, he will suggest that the Appropriations Committee hold a hearing on the subject?

Mr. WHERRY. I will answer the Senator from Washington with the observation that I believe that recommendations with respect to such projects have already been submitted to both the House and Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I had no knowledge of that fact.

Mr. WHERRY. They are now being considered by the House.

A little earlier I made the statement that if any new evidence were submitted that warranted opening up any of these recommendations, I felt that our committee, if and when the House sent the bill over, would give it consideration. The appropriations must first be processed in the House. I believe that my statement is a very fair one, and I believe the Senator from Washington will agree that appropriations for such projects will be given consideration if and when they come from the House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

NIGHT SESSIONS—RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it has been the practice not to hold night sessions until the Senate has been notified of them. For that reason it is not contemplated to have a night session tonight for any purpose. When and if we contemplate night sessions, announcement will be made so that Senators will know what the program is.

Mr. President, the majority party is doing everything within its power in this short space of time to consider the program suggested by the President. Senators may have our assurance that if and when constructive legislation is favorably reported from committees it will be considered. I hope that the questions which have been asked this evening will be clarified, and that we can proceed on that basis.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 3, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 2 (legislative day of July 28), 1948:

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be members of the Displaced Persons Commission for terms ending June 30, 1951:

Ugo Carusi, of Vermont.
Edward M. O'Connor, of New York.
Harry N. Rosenfield, of New York.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry F. Grady, of California, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Greece, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece.

H. Lawrence Groves, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
Frederick J. Cunningham, of Massachusetts.
Harrison Lewis, of California.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 5 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

George Lybrook West, Jr., of California.
Charles Gilbert, of New York.
Don A. Gribble, of Vermont, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

James R. Riddle, of Alabama.
Ernest V. Polutnik, of Montana.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from January 1, 1947:

Donald E. Ullery

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. Howard Lambdin, pastor of St. Luke's Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal and everlasting Father, grant unto us Thy holy guidance as at this noon hour we turn our minds and wills toward the vital matters of our national life.

We ask Thy blessing on each and every Member of this House of Congress, for they have grave responsibilities. Give them courage to face their problems and wisdom to help solve them in the best possible manner. May they put their trust in Thee, as our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded. They committed their ways and hopes unto Thee, and Thou didst lead them to victory and to triumph.

So today we commit ourselves unto Thee and pray for victory in the cause of righteousness and truth. May we be faithful doers of Thy will today and every day, and thus may we help to build Thy kingdom.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 29, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2462. An act to amend sections 2 and 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Central Intelligence Agency.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. National Archives.
7. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
8. Office of Selective Service Records.

SUSPENSIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to respond generally to an inquiry that a number of Members have addressed to me. They have asked me whether or not any suspensions will be called today. I now announce that there will be no suspensions today.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on House Joint Resolution 212.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, the people want something done about the ever-mounting prices for food and other necessities. The people want an end to the inflationary spiral of the cost of living.

If the present high cost of living is due to shipping our surplus farm products and other necessities out of this country to foreign lands, then let us do something to curb the excessive exports so that the supply at home will exceed the demand and thus bring prices down.

If inflation of our national debt and the currency has brought about high prices and is now blowing the top off the National Treasury, then let us do something to stop the inflation of our national debt and our currency.

If bank credits should be restrained to bring prices down, then let us do something to restrain those credits.

If Government departments and agencies are competing with private industry to boost prices for food, clothing, and other necessities higher and higher, then by all means let us pass legislation to stop all further invasion of private industry by Government departments and agencies.

With the price of wheat and corn and meat going higher and higher in the market place because of greater and greater scarcities of these products, let us stop the Agriculture Department from advocating the planting of less wheat and raising less cattle, such as they advocate in their release of July 23, 1948.

And whatever we do, let us stop trying to pass legislation at this special session that the other body in the other end of the Capitol can talk to death.

If the administration is sincere about restoration of consumer credit controls, regulation of inflationary bank credit, and control of speculation on the commodity exchanges, why was not Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman of the Federal Reserve System Board of Governors, ready to testify on these subjects and controls before the Senate and House Banking Committees a week ago? When Mr. McCabe was asked to testify before these committees, he is reported to have told the committees that he could not possibly be ready to testify for another week.

If the administration is sincere about restoration of such controls to curb the inflationary spiral and reduce prices, why was not the Secretary of the Treasury ready to testify before these committees a week ago? Instead, Secretary Snyder is reported to have said, when asked to testify last week before the proper congressional committees, that he would not be prepared to testify until after Mr. McCabe made his appearance before the committees.

If the President has emergency powers to reimpose controls over consumer credit to be exercised by the Federal Reserve System, let us spell it out for him and demand that he exercise his powers in that respect.

But let us not adjourn this special session of Congress until we have done something to curb the inflationary spiral and to stop these ever-increasing prices that are a plague on the American people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and two tables.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News.

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Independence (Kans.) Daily Reporter.

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. SCRIVNER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each extraneous material.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MATHEWS) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an extract from a news letter and a short bill she is introducing today.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Sunday Star.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' FLIGHT TRAINING

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, it would appear from evidence presented by the operators of flight training schools in my district that the administration of veterans' flight training is not functioning as was intended by the Congress.

It seems to me that the proposed screening of applicants is more severe than was intended, but even more serious than this is the fact that through administrative methods applications are piling up without action either pro or con thereon. The largest schools in my district have succeeded in getting approximately only one student each accepted during the past 2 months. Efforts should be made to correct this situation without delay as schools in my area face either voluntary closing down or bankruptcy if this situation is to continue. I quote here some telegrams covering this subject, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your cooperation in protesting the perversive prejudice shown by Veterans' Administration against flight-training applicants, namely, in interviews and screening, will be deeply appreciated.

ALBERT A. GABARDI.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *July 30, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully request that you investigate arbitrary curtailment of veterans' flight training by Veterans' Administration. Students who now apply for flight training are receiving rejection forms from Veterans' Administration, which read: "Flight training is considered avocational and recreational."

MERTON B. HASKELL,
Haskell Flying Service.

HUNTINGTON PARK, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congress should act at once to force the VA's hand to act on pending applications for flight training. My affairs have been tied up for 5 weeks awaiting their decision. Neither do they have any procedure for me to use in following up my case.

ROY GEORGE EKER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DOWNEY, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Is there anything you can do to promote congressional action which will cause the VA to formulate a policy and act upon my application for schooling under Public Law 346? I filed month ago for flying training. No response pro or con. Imperative I know real soon.

E. C. FLORES.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.

ANAHEIM, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Imperative you protest to the Veterans' Administration of their arbitrary attitude in screening flight applicants. Very low percentage being approved. Your immediate attention to this matter imperative.

GEORGE F. OWNS,
Cypress School of Aeronautics.

NORWALK, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It is important that something be done to bring about action from the VA in approving or disapproving flying-school applicants who apply under Public Law 346. They have no policy for screening. They have no instructions for procedure for either the school or the applicant. Their voluntary delay is costly to all involved. Veterans who acted on school's solicitations are demanding reimbursement from school for $10 physical-examination fees which VA required before their applications were filed.

SOUTHERN CAL FLYERS,
Cranford Airport.

LIBERALISM

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, when a voter takes other people's money to vote for a political candidate it is a crime called bribery, but when he votes for a candidate because that candidate promises to take other people's money and give it to him after the election, that is a virtue called liberalism. Why is this?

RESERVE REQUIREMENTS OF BANKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the leadership of the two bodies will do with respect to the request as it has been submitted to raise the reserve requirements of the banks, but we can well afford to give that some thought before we vote in favor of it, provided it is recommended. If reserve requirements are raised, the banks can call loans to get the necessary money or they can sell Governments bonds. My guess is that they will sell Government bonds by the billions, and let loans ride as long as possible and produce higher income than from bonds. The Federal Reserve will have to support the bond market, and as it buys those bonds it increases the reserves of the banks. The banks can move into a position to make further inflationary loans. That is something we had better think about before we vote in favor of the single proposition of increasing reserve requirements of the member banks.

As far as I am personally concerned, I am telling the people in my district that if they have marketable Government bonds they had better watch the bond market, and if they have to sell any pretty soon, they had better sell them now. I am here referring to marketable Government issues and not to the nonmarketable savings issues.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE MEAT SHORTAGE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD today some information relative to the Department of Agriculture. It is amazing that under the regulations and requests of the Department of Agriculture the number of cattle in this country has been reduced by 7,000,000 in the last 5 years. They are asking for a further reduction this year of 517,000 in the breeding stock in the face of a beef shortage.

The record will also show, and you can take it from the Department's own figures, that there has been a reduction of about 20,000,000 sheep in this country in the last 5 years. There has been a marked reduction in the number of hogs and cattle. I would like to know why such a program is being carried on in the face of an expanding population, which in the last 10 years has increased by about 1,500,000 each year.

There are some 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 more people in the United States today with mouths to feed, yet there seems to be a planned program in the Department of Agriculture which says that you can have prosperity with scarcity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one, to include an editorial from Iron Age, entitled "To His Fingertips," a letter from a father to his son; and, in the second, to include an editorial from the Bristol Courier entitled, "Let Us Have the Facts."

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the high cost of living can, and must, come down. It can be done by just good common-sense methods—methods of equality for all—give and take. Give advice to those who are getting too much of the world's goods, and if they do not heed, then take a little from them. This applies to business, labor, and agriculture, and any other occupation—lawyer, doctor, minister, and so forth. The law made years and years ago should apply. That law is termed the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as ye would that men should do unto you."

I shall cite just one change today. For instance, the Government guarantees that the farmer should get $2 a bushel for wheat. Well, that may not be excessive, with his high labor cost, but the great mass of American consumers should not have to pay more than $2 a bushel for wheat when he guarantees the farmer that amount by his Government, which, by the way, is the people of America. We are almost guaranteeing to feed the world. All wheat shipped out of our country is given away by ERP, or the Marshall plan, or call it ECP, if you choose. They, to me, are all the same. On the international wheat agreement, which ratification was requested in the

President's summons of the extra session of Congress, under this agreement we were pledged to export 185,000,000 bushels of wheat a year for 5 years at prices ranging from $1.10 to $2 a bushel. This subsidy was estimated to cost the United States $150,000,000 during the year ending July 1, 1948. Some subsidy for America to pay to give wheat to foreigners. If it had been to feed the starving, I would have been for it, but no such evidence was given.

The President is responsible for the head of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, being appointed. He is the right arm of the Truman administration in the Agriculture Department. Several years ago you paid 12 cents for a large loaf of bread. Today the same loaf costs 21 cents. That is the greatest item of food we have—bread, bread, bread. Everybody likes it, everybody needs it. Bread is the staff of life. That is why so much is used every day. Its cost has risen almost 100 percent in price; in some instances more than 100 percent. The President takes credit to the farmer for raising the price of wheat and wages that goes into the loaf of bread. Now he blames us Republicans for the high cost of the bread to the consumer. Is that right? Is that just? I ask you, Is that honest? You Americans who use bread ask yourselves the question, Who raises your high prices higher? Bread from 12 cents a loaf to 21 cents a loaf. But, bread eaters, that is not all; if we can give bread to foreigners, why should not we cut the cost to Americans if necessary? Is the Agriculture Department suggesting that? Oh, no. Let me show you what Mr. Truman and his Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, are proposing doing to the next year's wheat crop just because we are producing too much wheat in the United States. This is what they propose to do in regulating wheat production for 1949:

	Acres
1948 wheat acreage in United States of America	77,715,000
1949 proposed wheat acreage	71,500,000
The Department of Agriculture demands less acreage be planted	6,215,000

Why? To keep wheat scarce so the price of bread will stay up, I suppose, so that we can guarantee the farmer $2.14 to $2.20 a bushel subsidy at Philadelphia. Suppose the 6,215,000 acres taken out of cultivation would yield 30 bushels to the acre on the average. That would mean production of 186,450,000 bushels more of wheat; that should reduce the cost of wheat to the baker and, in turn, the cost of bread to the consumer.

But the administration does not want to do that. They want to make wheat more scarce. Does it make sense to you housewives who have to pay 21 cents a loaf for bread? You have the answer—no; a thousand times no. But your President Truman is running the Agriculture Department that way. I say it is time for a change.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in each, to include certain addenda.

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee I feel it a great privilege to take the floor to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our distinguished and able chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON.

While I have served on this powerful committee only during the Eightieth Congress, I feel that I have been especially favored in working with the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative KNUTSON, in his revenue program. Under his expert leadership the Congress has reduced taxes $4,800,000,000 despite three Presidential vetoes, with 71 percent of the tax relief going to those with incomes under $5,000; 7,400,000 wage earners in the lowest brackets removed from the tax roll; married couples allowed to divide their income for tax purposes, and special relief provided for persons over 65 years of age, and for the blind. A bill to extend social-security coverage has also been passed by the House and is now pending in the Senate. This record alone is a tribute to the man, and to his leadership. His name is a worthy addition to the roll of illustrious men who have attained the chairmanship of the powerful Ways and Means Committee.

Congressman KNUTSON'S career as a man and as a statesman is typical of the American way of life. He emigrated to this country from Norway at an early age. His honesty, perseverance, industry, and integrity have made for him an honored place in his community and in his State. He has served his country well in the House of Representatives for 31 long years. My best wishes follow him for many more years of public service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in each, to include a newspaper article.

Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I arise at this time to address the House on the subject Old-Age Pensions. In my opinion, if there is one subject that constitutes an emergency, calling for action by this special session of the Congress, it is this very subject.

I know of no greater need, Mr. Speaker, than the need for more adequate security for our deserving elder citizens. I know of no field where the need is greater and where the efforts of the Congress thus far have come so far short in meeting the need.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] and myself are extending our joint remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD today on this subject. I trust every Member of the House, and particularly the House leadership will read this extension carefully.

The people of this country are calling loudly upon the Congress for a decent American old-age pension. They are sick and tired of this meagre hodgepodge called old-age assistance. A decent old-age pension will not seriously aggravate inflation as might appear to some of us, because the small incomes of our elders, even after they receive a decent pension, will not be a serious factor in the matter of inflation. Pensions, or our excuse for pensions called assistance, have always been entirely inadequate. Now, with 58-cent dollars, they are intolerable. The need is too great to ignore. The people want action. In addition to that a majority of the Members of this House have joined together in a written friendly request for action. Mr. Speaker, if there is one piece of legislation that should have the attention of this special session of the Congress, it is this very matter. Let us enact a decent American old-age pension. Let us do it now.

PROGRESS UNDER LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Strike idleness in 1947 and 1948 was far less than in the record year of 1946, and also less than 1945. Approximately 3,700 stoppages occurred in 1947 in which 2,170,000 workers were involved as against 4,985 stoppages in 1946 in which 4,600,000 workers were involved. Idleness amounted to 34,600,000 man-days in 1947 as compared to 116,000,000 man-days in 1946. At an average daily wage of $8 American workers lost $928,000,000 due to work stoppages in 1946, in comparison to a loss of $276,800,000 in 1947.

Since the Labor-Management Relations Act became effective strikes have decreased substantially. Work stoppages under the old law average 415 per month in 1946. They have been cut to 219 under the new law.

Work stoppages

Month	1946	1947	1948
January	337	321	175
February	290	296	200
March	440	381	225
April	504	479	273
May	376	471	273
June	388	379	310
July	463	315	
August	560	326	
September	409	219	
October	516	219	
November	344	178	
December	168	119	
Total	4,985	3,683	

	Number of strikes	Workers involved	Man-days idle
Aug. 22 to Dec. 31, 1947	781	220,000	3,100,000
January–June 1947	1,400	1,150,000	23,800,000
July–August estimate	375	390,000	4,000,000
Total	2,51	1,730,000	31,700,000

The record shows that under the new law wages have continued to rise, more leisure time has been made available through a shorter workweek and average hourly earnings also have increased. Wages have increased 7.4 percent and prices have increased 7.1 percent since the passage of the act.

Labor is making these gains through peaceful, collective bargaining, whereas before the new labor law gains were more frequently made through costly strikes.

The President and my opponent want to repeal this act. If this act is repealed we will return to the following labor abuses. I know you would not want to see or hear of these labor abuses again.

First. Milk spoils in labor row because milkers refused to join the union.

Second. Army sergeant picketed because he did not think he had to join a union to run a one-man butcher shop.

Third. Sixty carloads of lemons dumped in citrus strike.

Fourth. Sheep must be sheared by union sheep shearers.

Fifth. Wholesaler who had been in business 50 years in Philadelphia, Pa., was given 15 minutes to get off the street unless his clerk joined the union.

Sixth. A truckload of produce was returned home because the driver would not pay the union $53 to unload—Riverside, N. J.

Seventh. Union stops the delivery of oil to two veterans unless they pay initiation fee of $37.50 on a certain date, after that date it would be $75.

Eighth. A shipyard worker in San Francisco was forced to give $1 to the Democratic Party and was discharged for saying he would give the Republican Party $2.

Ninth. Union refuses to let marines act as pallbearers for one of their own killed in line of duty when he was brought back for reburial.

Tenth. Communist labor leaders closed down Allis-Chalmers plant in Wisconsin whose employees were engaged in vital defense work for the Navy in time of war.

Eleventh. The union labor leaders on Dock Street, Philadelphia, demanded the right to tell the wholesalers when they could enter their own place of business.

Twelfth. Two hundred and forty-seven thousand five hundred pounds of oranges were dumped because of strike, which were to have been used by the Government in defense and lend-lease programs.

Thirteenth. Innocent people were injured and their property was damaged in Pittsburgh, Pa., due to open warfare between two unions.

Fourteenth. Building trades in Chicago refused to erect a building because the stone was cut by union labor in the Bloomington-Bedford limestone district of Indiana.

Fifteenth. Seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars worth of asparagus was dumped in one pile in California.

Sixteenth. Lady lost $3,000 in the turkey business because she would not hire union turkey pickers.

Seventeenth. Eighty thousand tons of spinach lost due to labor tie-up.

Eighteenth. A Richmond, Va., farmer had to pay union men $7 for 1 hour's work to unload a load of apples.

Nineteenth. Union stops sailor from going into the wholesale business because he wanted to buy his own truck and hire his own union driver.

Twentieth. Cafe employees refused to join union in Burbank, Calif., and as a result there was stench bombing, acid throwing in patrons' cars, tires and seat cushions slashed on employees' cars, roofing nails put in the streets in front of cafe and five plate windows were broken.

Twenty-first. Pigeons and mice were turned loose in New York department store, by pickets.

Twenty-second. A New York wholesaler was attacked and badly beaten by two men because he was selling to certain chain stores.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POTTS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from today's New York Herald Tribune.

SUPPORT PRICES AND INFLATION

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I have just submitted for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial appearing in this morning's New York Herald Tribune entitled "Support Prices and Inflation."

I think it would be well for all of us, particularly the Committee on Agriculture, to read that editorial. We all recall the days of the early New Deal when farmers were being paid not to grow this and not to grow that and for killing off every other head of cattle and every other hog, and so forth. Now we have a turn-about, and when we have a tremendous surplus, as for instance, of potatoes, they get paid to grow more of that particular crop. It is a vicious circle in which the housewife and the city folks get no benefit whatsoever.

I think this is a very worth-while editorial, and for that reason I have asked to insert it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address by Senator CAPPER.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include substantiating evidence.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Grand Haven Tribune.

Mr. BUCK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was granted permision to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper editorial.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after the legislative business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of the day and all special orders heretofore entered I may proceed for 20 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXPORTATION OF TEXTILES FROM CUBA

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks on the question of Cuba's licensing of exportation of textiles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 9 the Cuban Government passed a regulation requiring a license upon all textiles imported into Cuba. The imposition of this license or tax upon textiles is of great importance to our country as a whole, but particularly to the South and more especially to my district, the largest textile district in the world. Cuba is a great country. Relations between our two countries have been most pleasant. They might be compared to that of a larger and smaller brother. From our viewpoint the imposition of this license seems ill-advised. We have been in the textile business for generations. Spinning and weaving of cotton goods have been developed to the very highest degree. Machinery of the last word has been installed in our textile plants and those who work in them possess skill and ability, producing results almost beyond belief. While maintaining a high-wage level and providing unprecedented conveniences and advantages to textile workers, the finished products have been kept within reasonable price levels. Until comparatively recent times Cuba has not gone in for the manufacture of textiles. It is believed she does not possess sufficient spindles and looms now to supply required textiles for her people. The levying of this new license fee would work to the disadvantage of the citizens of Cuba by raising the price of textiles there and depriving the citizens of the fine textiles from the States. At the same time the market for our textiles would be seriously impaired if not altogether lost. We need the Cuban market for our textiles in order to assure uninterrupted, profitable employment for our people. Cuba needs our textiles so as to receive necessary clothing for her people at a price they are financially able to pay.

Today I conferred at length with the State Department about this grave problem and am happy to report that continuous friendly negotiations are now going on between the two governments, following the note of protest filed soon after the imposition of the import license.

We have reason to believe and sincerely hope that presently the Cuban Government will greatly modify, if not altogether repeal, the import license. The ability to negotiate with other nations and to effectuate satisfactory solutions of controverted problems without serious difficulty or even a threat of war, is the goal toward which all nations should strive.

IDLEWILD AIRPORT

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisian?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest of this Congress and the people of our country in national defense, I think it is proper that we should take notice of the dedication of the Idlewild Airport in the city of New York on last Saturday. It is one of the largest airports in the world. The Air Force sent its latest jet fighters and heavy bombers in a thundering, low-level parade during the aerial demonstration dedicating New York's new $200,000,000 international airport, and I am sure that every one who was there was greatly impressed with the magnificent demonstration by our Air Force. I was especially impressed with the skill in flight formation of the National Guard and the Naval Reserve fliers who participated in that magnificent demonstration. I am sure that those fliers will be just as successful in combat, if necessary, as they were in formation.

On that occasion the Governor of New York and the President of the United States were present. Governor Dewey said:

> The 4,900-acre Idlewild Airport, largest in the world, was a demonstration of what men of good will can do, surmounting technical obstacles, local prejudices, and even suspicion and obstruction.

President Truman said that this was a demonstration of our determination to remain strong in the cause of peace. I assume, Mr. Speaker, that there were unofficial Russian observers, and I hope that their report on this magnificent air-power demonstration has reached Moscow by this time.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the majority leader asked unanimous consent that the Rules Committee might have until tomorrow night to file a privileged report. Up to now the Rules Committee has not met and I wonder whether they are going to bring in a rule making in order a bill to bring about a reduction in the high cost of living, and also a rule on a housing bill. The ever-increasing cost of living is such that the American people cannot stand it any longer. I hope the majority leader realizes that something must be done without delay to reduce the high—yes, the criminal high cost of living and also provide real housing for the thousands upon thousands of our ex-servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, within the last few days due to the crusade of the housewives against the high prices of meats the prices of some meat cuts have been reduced, but I feel this lowering of prices is only temporary notwithstanding that the storage warehouses are jammed with meats. Despite the plentiful warehouse supply, I am satisfied that the big packers in conjunction with the National Association of Manufacturers, will not permit the majority to enact legislation which would bring about a real reduction in the cost of meats and meat products. From what I have heard and observed since Congress reconvened, I am convinced that this Republican-controlled Congress will not be permitted to enact any legislation at this special session and will force adjournment without the passage of any legislation to relieve the people from the high cost of living or to provide decent living quarters for those desperately seeking homes. If relief is not forthcoming, the consumers will be obliged to follow the suggestion of one of the Republican Presidential candidates to eat less. They have been eating less and will continue to eat less for the next 4 months when they will elect men to the Congress who will not be controlled by the avaricious, profit-greedy combines, special interests and trusts to whom you are subservient and who seem to control your action.

Mr. Speaker, if it is the purpose of the request of the majority leader to permit the Committee on Rules to file rules on these two important relief measures, naturally I am in favor of such request and I hope the Republican majority will heed the general demand and plea of the American people to be relieved from the intolerable conditions that now exist.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. If I have the time I will gladly yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has the time.

Mr. SABATH. Before I forget it, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

THE BLUE AND GRAY CRADLE ASSOCIATION

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, last week, the noted columnist, Drew Pearson, in his syndicated column, told something about the Blue and Gray Cradle Association of Montgomery, Ala., which city is in the congressional district that I have the honor to represent. He cited the progress that has been made in the South by those who are helping to bring about better relations between all sections of the Nation and between the white and colored races.

The history of the Blue and Gray Cradle Association is an interesting one. The idea was developed by Champ Pickens, who serves as general manager, and who is a great sportsman and an enthusiastic supporter of the University of Alabama football team, known throughout the Nation as the Thin Red Line, but which in more recent years has come to be known as the Red Elephants.

When Wallace Wade was coaching at the University of Alabama, Champ Pickens was instrumental in securing a bid for the University of Alabama to represent the East in the Tournament of Roses at Pasadena, Calif. Alabama was enthusiastically received on the coast and, since that time, has represented the East many times in this classic tournament. The fighting qualities and sportsmanship of these players endeared the university to the West, and the Nation, with the result that thousands of students from the East, and other sections of the Nation, enrolled at Alabama.

Realizing the good will that could be brought about by athletics, Champ Pickens sold the late William Gunter, mayor of the city of Montgomery, upon the idea of forming the Blue and Gray Cradle Association to sponsor a Blue and Gray championship football game to be known as the North versus South and to be played annually in Montgomery, the Cradle of the Confederacy. While the football game was to be the chief annual sporting event of the association, other sporting events were arranged between individuals and clubs represented by selected and outstanding players from the North and the South.

The unique feature of this football game is that none of the players are paid anything and that the entire proceeds, beyond the actual expenses, are devoted exclusively to charity. The Blue and Gray Cradle Association is a nonprofit organization and its officers and members throughout the Nation receive no benefit other than the satisfaction of doing something worth while to cement relations between the North and South and to aid charity.

After the death of Montgomery's beloved Mayor Gunter, each succeeding mayor, Cyrus B. Brown, David Earl Dunn, and John L. Goodwyn, as the representative of the city government, has taken a keen interest in this great work. At the present time Fred A. Duran is president, W. B. Paterson, Sr., vice president, Frank Rosa, treasurer, and Frank E. Boyd, secretary. All of these men give freely of their time and talents toward attaining the objectives of the association. The programs for the big game are sold by the Lions Club, the proceeds being given to aid the blind.

This annual football game has the reputation of having, upon both the North's and South's squads, the outstanding football talent of the Nation. The selection of the players also is unique in that each player is a senior. At these games more All-American players have been seen together upon the field than at any other one football game in the Nation. During the war years it was necessary to use, in addition to seniors, other outstanding players.

Each year, two, or more often, three outstanding football coaches of the South, and an equal number from the North, are selected to coach their respective teams and they, with the players, meet in Montgomery prior to the game where both squads are received with open arms by the people of the city.

The Blue and Gray football game is played on the last Saturday of each December, in order that it may not interfere with the other bowl games. Many of the sports writers, commentators, and fans who attend the other games on the first of January make it a point to stop over in Montgomery for this classic event. There has been so much interest in the game that it has been broadcast by national hook-up for several years, and during the war was broadcast by short wave over the world.

This game is outstanding in that it is not played on a commercial basis. The players all feel that they are making a worth-while contribution to a worthy cause and give their all. While the South generally has more rooters, every good play by the northern squad receives the plaudits of the crowd. I have never heard of a northern player who did not want to return to Montgomery for another game. Oftentimes you find southern boys who are attending school in other sections of the country playing with the North squad, and northern boys for a like reason, playing on the South squad.

If we are to remain a great nation, this spirit of friendship must prevail. Somehow I think that the pattern for this spirit must have started in April 1863 when a little group of southern women visited a cemetery near Columbus, Miss., and there decorated the graves of their Confederate dead. One lady of the group, after she had decorated the graves of her two sons who had lost their lives in defense of the South's cause, was seen walking toward a corner of the cemetery where lay buried two unknown Union soldiers. One of the group asked her what she was doing: "Do you know whose graves those are?" "Yes, indeed, they are two Union soldiers—they are Yankees," said the mother of the two soldiers, "I do not forget they are nameless graves marking where two northern soldiers lie buried, but somewhere in the North, in some little city, or village, or perhaps in some lonely farmhouse, a mother, or a young wife, or a sweetheart, mourns for them, just as you and I grieve for the loss of our loved ones." She went on to the unmarked graves and stooped over and tenderly spread her flowers over them. "We bring these flowers," she said, "to express our love and devotion to our dead—our heroes of the South. These unknown soldiers of the North lying here in our churchyard are also dead, but when the war is over and peace comes again, we shall call them ours, so here are my lilacs and roses, red, white, and blue for both alike." "And mine," "and mine," "and mine, too," said the other women as they added their flowers on the unmarked graves of the northern soldiers in the corner of the little southern churchyard.

Each succeeding year the women of Columbus repeat this beautiful deed for southern and northern soldiers alike.

We members of the Blue and Gray Cradle Association thank Drew Pearson for his tribute to the spirit that prompts the creation of the Blue and Gray Cradle Association and know that in the days to come this kindness upon his part will go far toward bringing about unity for which we all hope and strive.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a newspaper article and in the other an address he delivered in Chelsea, Mass.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter he sent to some constituents.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the other special orders now on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SEGREGATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 7056, making it possible for persons drafted under the Selective Service Act of 1948—Public Law 759, Eightieth Congress, second session—to choose the type of units in which they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that as a member of the Armed Services Committee I have found it necessary to introduce such legislation, but in my opinion it is important that such an act become the law in the interest of the very safety of our country.

For a number of years it has been popular for the leaders of both the Republican and Democratic Parties to stir up the miscalled civil-rights bills every election year. Everyone recognizes that such measures have been brought up and agitated in the past for the purpose of obtaining the vote of the Negro and other minorities in the northern cities. Such a practice is destructive to the best interests of America. It has always caused strife and ill feeling, and in my opinion has been harmful all along, and is becoming more so. In the past, however, there has been no real determined effort to force the breaking down of segregation. During the present Congress we have seen the President of the United States appear before this Congress and urge the breaking down of segregation between whites and Negroes. This was a follow-up of his written message some months ago, striking at segregation between the races. Now, as never before, it seems that the leaders of the Democratic Party are determined to strike at the system which has prevailed in my section throughout the history of this Nation. Some few may be conscientious, but I am sure that the vast majority would do this in an effort to obtain votes in the coming election. This is tragic.

Mr. Speaker, the racial question is one that has plagued nations throughout the history of the world. It is one of the prime causes of strife in many European countries today. It is the cause of much strife in northern cities today. I do not know that there is any perfect answer to the question, but I am sure that the segregation of the races, as provided by custom and by law in the Southern States, is the best method of handling this difficult problem, difficult in other regions but not in the South. We have no real problem there, and will not have, unless those who agitate this question for their own personal gain succeed in trying to upset the balance by the use of Federal force. It will be a sad mistake for this Congress ever to take such action.

Mr. Speaker, such efforts as have been made by the President of the United States to get this Congress to pass such legislation is bad enough, but on the 26th day of July, the President issued an order having to do with breaking down segregation in the armed services. He followed this Executive order with a statement in the press that the order was issued for the purpose of eventually breaking down segregation in the armed services. I say that such an order breaks faith with the conscientious Members of the Congress who regretted deeply having to vote out the Draft Act for those in charge of the armed services in the consideration of the Draft Act led members of the committee to believe that no such action would be taken. Relying upon these assurances the Draft Act was passed; it was passed because it appeared then, and it now appears, that the very safety of our Nation is dependent upon adequate armed services. Thousands of our young men have volunteered for service because of their patriotism and in their willingness to do their part. A great number of volunteers have come from the South, and they took such action, relying upon the continuation of the segregation practices of the Army. Now

we see the Commander in Chief, by Executive order, breaking down such practice, in spite of the statements of those who know, or should know, what is essential to maintaining the best Army possible.

Our military leaders recognize that we cannot destroy segregation in the services at this time. General Bradley, in a speech in New York City on the 18th of January 1948, stated as follows:

Our free democratic traditions of equal opportunity, civil rights, and the freedom of the individual to assert himself against institutions, is too strongly implanted in our young men to warrant anything but a democratic Army. And while greater control is required in the armed forces than in other fields of employment, I believe this authority can be exercised fairly, intelligently, and judiciously without impairing a man's basic human rights.

Our best chance for the realization of any army that will mirror this tradition in human rights, lies in the recruitment of officers and men whose intelligence and integrity assure respect for the dignity of the men with whom they work. Yet to attract these officers and men, we must be able to offer them the emoluments, opportunities, and privileges that they would have in civilian life.

In a statement dated June 28, 1948, Secretary Royall stated as follows:

The question of integration involves a vital problem of social reform to be achieved first by the people of the United States and then by the United States Army.

Testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee in April, General Eisenhower described the Army as "one of the mirrors that reflect America," and said, in effect, that as long as there is race segregation in American civilian life, the Army will have to follow that pattern.

It is reported that General Bradley told a news conference at Fort Knox, Ky.:

The Army is not out to make any social reforms. The Army will put men of different races in different companies. It will change that policy when the Nation as a whole changes it.

The bill which I have introduced attempts to give enlistees and those who subsequently volunteer the right to choose to serve with members of their own race upon their specific request. It simply preserves freedom of choice in the individual as to the race of the military unit in which he is forced to serve. The enactment of such a bill does not deprive any other individual citizen of a single right, real or imaginary. If, at the time of registration or induction, any young man declares that he prefers to serve with his own kind, this proposal assures him of that privilege. The same identical right would be allowed those of any and all races of our people, whether belonging to the majority or whether called a minority. It would not discriminate against any citizen or group of citizens. It would not take away anything from anyone. It could not harm or injure anyone. It would not deny any individual the right to serve in units composed of mixed races if he so desires and is ordered to do so. It would not change the present policy of assignments used by the Army and Air Corps.

Mr. Speaker, does the President mean that a Negro has a right to serve in a white company, and that he will see to it that he can serve in such a white unit, but that the white boy does not have the right to serve in a white unit; that the Negro has the right under the Constitution to share the association of white boys, even those who do not wish to associate with him, but that the white youth has no right to associate with whom he pleases and to be free from association with those he does not wish to associate?

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Armed Services Committee for a number of years. We, on that committee, recognize that we face a grave situation today. Now, as perhaps never before, we need to be united. Now, as never before, we do not need strife in the Nation, and certainly we do not need strife within our armed services themselves. Would it not be tragic for members of the armed services to have to spend a great deal of their time and of their force trying to maintain an unnatural system foisted upon them by the unwise decision of the President? It must not be.

Mr. Speaker, the very safety of our country demands the passage of H. R. 7056, which I have introduced. It is needed to keep faith with the Members of the Congress who supported the draft bill, because they believed it necessary to save our country. This bill must be passed to keep faith with the thousands of southern boys, and northern boys, too, for that matter, who have volunteered in the armed services, relying upon the system of segregation being maintained therein. Mr. Speaker, it is needed to keep peace within the armed services themselves.

The provisions of this bill are unfair to no one. That Negro who prefers to serve in an all-Negro unit may do so, and it is my belief that most of them would prefer an all-Negro unit, and it permits the white youths to choose companies of their own race, and then those who may want to serve in mixed units may do so. In my opinion, the all-black units and the all-white units will far excel those units that are mixed, judging by those citizens who preach amalgamation of the races that I have observed. I firmly believe that in view of the President's Executive order and his statement as to its intent, it is absolutely necessary that the Congress enact H. R. 7056, so that our armed services will not be torn by dissention in this time of great danger. I urge all to get behind this measure before our country is destroyed from within. We cannot afford to permit the armed services to be torn by dissension because of anybody's desire to win an election.

REDUCTION IN PAY FOR PERSONNEL OF ARMED SERVICES

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, is there a Member of Congress who is willing to propose a reduction in pay now for the personnel of our armed services? Obviously the answer is "No."

But, Mr. Speaker, do you know that every single person in the service, from the lowliest rank to the highest brass in the Army, in the Navy, in the Marine Corps, and in the Air Corps, will suffer a pay cut next January? It will be all-embracing. That is the law as it stands today, and I am not mistaken about it.

Mr. Speaker, what an injustice and what a shattering blow this will be to the morale of our men and women in our armed services, a blow not only to those stationed here in the United States but also to those stationed at far distant places of the globe. And what can be said to those whose terms of service are at or near the expiration point? Can you imagine that they will be receptive to pleas to reenlist, or in the case of commissioned Reserve officers, to accept a further tour of duty?

Mr. Speaker, I know of nothing that can have a more demoralizing effect than a pay reduction, which would not only be totally unexpected but absolutely unwarranted.

Mr. Speaker, serious damage to our national defense can only be averted by congressional action at this special session. A very short and simple bill, House Joint Resolution 431, which I introduced on June 16, 1948, can be passed by both Houses of Congress in less than 1 hour. This bill would only maintain the present scales of pay for all service personnel.

Mr. Speaker, let us meet our responsibility in this important matter without any delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remark in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

AMENDMENT TO PRESENT DP BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the steering committee on the Republican side whether they are going to bring in a DP bill to offset and do away with the inequalities and the proscriptions contained in the Revercomb-Wiley bill which we passed in the previous session. It is generally accepted that the wrongs of that bill should be righted and despite the denials made on the floor and elsewhere I maintain that that bill contains some very invidious discriminations, geographic discriminations, occupational discriminations, racial-religious discriminations and particularly a calendar discrimination that relief is imperative. Because the cut-off date, for example, was set at December 22, 1945, only a few months after the shooting stopped, great injustice was done. The International Refugee Organization and General Clay are of the opinion that the cut-off date should be as of the date when the camps were closed officially, namely, April 21, 1947. That earlier cut-off date shuts off many, many deserving DP's, DP's of the type that would make good citizens in this fair land of ours.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Would the gentleman want everybody to come over here who wants to come over from the other side?

Mr. CELLER. Of course not. I want the deserving to come in. I would welcome the DP's who suffered immeasureably at Hitler's hands. That would be a matter of humanity. But also these delayed pilgrims have the courage, the stamina, the integrity, the willingness to work, and fullest appreciation of the liberties that America accords her citizens. Their admission would be a matter of enlightened self-interest.

I remind my Republican colleagues that Governor Dewey is for all-out relief of the DP's, and I remind my Democratic colleagues that our platform contains promise of relief along the lines I suggest.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 1948, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the United States Office of Education, I received a copy of a letter written by John W. Studebaker, former Commissioner of Education, addressed to Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency.

The newspapers throughout the country have given much space to this letter. In order that the public and the Members of Congress may have the benefit of the information contained in this letter, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of these remarks. The letter itself is self-explanatory.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 30, 1948.*

Hon. OSCAR R. EWING,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: In my letter of resignation, dated June 14, 1948, addressed to the President, I stated the basic reason why it seemed inadvisable for me to remain longer in the Government service beyond July 15, namely, the impossibility of providing for the proverbial "rainy day" with the top salary allowed for the Commissioner of Education.

Now, however, I desire to supplement various communications I sent you and conversations I had with you while in office on matters having to do with your policies of organization and administration, for the purpose of pointing out again some of the implications of the program you have had under way during recent months.

In summary, it is my considered opinion that if your purposes and program are carried out you will do great harm not only to proper and adequate work of the United States Office of Education, but indeed also to the vital need for Federal participation in the support of equal educational opportunity among the States.

Before going further, I wish to say that in presenting certain facts and points of view herein, I do not feel the slightest personal animus toward you or anyone else, regardless of the extent to which I obviously share with educators and the people in general a deep anxiety concerning the functions and control of education.

While, of course, many of your policies and administrative procedures affect the other constituent or operating organizations of the Federal Security Agency—United States Public Health Service, Social Security and Welfare Administration, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Food and Drug Administration—I shall not presume to speak for them, although I know there exists great uneasiness and a markedly low morale among the personnel of all branches of the Agency. Nor do I wish here to write at length relative to the adverse effects of your program on education. I shall therefore confine my statements to some basic principles and a few illustrations.

A fundamental fault in your policies lies, it seems to me, in your failure to recognize that imaginative, competent, and productive work in any institution or agency is done by imaginative, competent, and zestful individuals who are happy in their work and who are eager to assume and carry responsibility, not by elaborate, regimental schemes of organization. Your program of administration therefore violates the great principle which has energized American life—the encouragement of personal responsibility; it violates the principle of decentralization and distribution of initiative and responsibility which results in great strength and productivity in the Nation because there is great strength and productivity among its millions of individual citizens.

Your program develops frustration and a feeling of futility among the employed personnel because individuals and units of individuals in the Agency cannot control the means to the ends for which they are responsible.

The most successful private and public enterprises are those in which to the maximum practicable extent the spheres of authority and of responsibility of individuals and of units of individuals are kept identical. Your program leaves responsibility with people "down the line" in the organization so to speak, but strips away from them the control of the essential means by which their responsibility must be executed. You vest authority in your immediate staff members, but they are not and will not be held responsible by the people for any shortcomings or failures of the operating organizations of the Agency. As frustration and futility develop, responsibility for the exercise of intiative, for the use of judgment, for securing results, also tends to move "up the line." Here we see at work what might be called "bureaucratic statism" within a government originally dedicated to the principle of individual responsibility and respect for personality. Thorough regimentation always has been and always will be destructive of individual responsibility, a quality vital to the continued progress of our country.

Let me illustrate. For many years, always I assume since the United States Office of Education was established 81 years ago, and I know during 7 (1934–41) of the 14 years while I was Commissioner of Education, the articles, bulletins, addresses on educational matters were written freely by the professional people in the Office of Education in their respective special fields and were published. Sensing their individual responsibility, these professional people sought advice from competent persons from time to time, even though they were writing in their own fields of competence. So far as I know there was never any difficulty or embarrassment experienced by the Office of Education as a result of this policy.

After Pearl Harbor and during the war, there was a willingness that the OWI should check and approve all public statements. We were at war and citizens generally accepted necessary wartime controls. We in the Office of Education naturally assumed that with the war ended, such controls of professional writing would be relinquished. They were not only continued, but they have been made more sweeping, complete, and time consuming within the Federal Security Agency. Now, any statement written by anyone in the Office of Education to be presented to any group or audience outside the Office must be submitted to someone on your immediate staff for approval. These approvals, of course, involve statements ranging all the way from articles on such technical questions as planning science classrooms to the more general problems of education.

A specific example may be cited. Last April one of the staff members of the Office of Education, a well-trained man, with excellent experience in secondary education, was invited to speak to the high-school principals of the State of Massachusetts. He was to speak on the subject Teaching Zeal for American Democracy. Under an appropriation by Congress for 1948 made to the Office of Education, specific reference was made by the Congress to the need for such a program and especially for an educational program that would make clear to our young people the nature and tactics of communism and other forms of totalitarianism.

This man in the Office of Education himself decided to read his address. He prepared it. Consequently, under your regulations the address had to be submitted to your staff for approval. A few paragraphs of the address stressed the importance of developing means of teaching high-school pupils what communism really is, how inimical it is to the free world. Your staff member in a written comment said, in part, "Much of this is very good. However, the Office of Education should, I am convinced, leave to the State Department and to the FBI the task of exposing the tactics and dangers of Russian and native Communists and travelers."

Now, in the light of the main purpose of Congress in making the afore-mentioned appropriation, an action obviously based on a clear recognition of the great need for an educational program that would adequately inform young people concerning the serious conflict between totalitarianism and freedom, is it not amazing that a leading educator in the United States Office of Education, operating under a thoroughly bipartisan mandate of Congress, should be told by one who had been put in a position to tell the Office of Education what it could and could not do, that the educational task of exposing the tactics and the dangers of Russian and native Communists and travelers should be left to the State Department and the FBI?

All of us in education fully appreciate the parts that the State Department and the FBI should play in exposing Communists. These agencies know what their parts are and they know their function is not to work with schools and colleges on the development of educational programs dealing with this problem. To accept the dictum that the educational "task of exposing communism" should be left to these agencies would be tantamount to not having this vitally important educational task done at all, at least so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

The result was that the man from the Office of Education abandoned the plan to present a written address. He had no time to try to revise it and to receive approval. He, therefore, held an "off the record" meeting with the Massachusetts high-school principals. In the meeting he said, ad libitum, all he had on his mind and heart about how education can help in the solution of a problem the magnitude of which is daily becoming more apparent to everyone. Thus the representative of the Office of Education was able to express his opinion to the principals of Massachusetts, and that's what the principals wanted. They had not requested the opinion of some one on your immediate staff not known to them.

Another illustration. I made an address at the University of California at Los Angeles last March, entitled "Education and the Fate of Democracy." Senator KNOWLAND, of California, as you know is chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Federal Security Agency and the Office of Education. The Senator, being very much interested in the whole subject, had the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the address among other things about communism, I said the following: "Whether or not the Communist Party in this country should be outlawed, I do not presume to say. But of this I am convinced: That no avowed or proven Communist is fit to be entrusted with the job of inculcating the American way of life in any school; and I make that statement on the rather obvious ground that education for American democracy cannot be entrusted to the enemies of American democracy."

Since the Office of Education has had only a relatively small appropriation for printing, every reasonable economy has been exercised in carrying out the major purpose of the Office as provided in its basic act; namely, "to diffuse information about education."

The California address was printed on one sheet of paper. I requested enough copies so that one copy could be sent to each college, one to each public and private high school, and one to each superintendent of schools. The Office of Education requisition for these copies, to be paid for by the Office (about $250), was held up by one of your staff for several days and was only approved after he and I had engaged in a vigorous discussion of the matter in which, for the most part, he was trying to convince me that such language as I used in the address should be toned down and that if the address were released (this in spite of the fact that it had already been printed in the public record), he felt sure it would bring unfavorable reaction from a large number of educators. It was released and distributed in May. I have heard no objection from anyone.

Last December, copy was ready for a special issue of the monthly periodical School Life. The issue was to be devoted entirely to contrasting totalitarianism and freedom and in pointing up various educational implications of the conflict. I was away when the manuscript, in accordance with your regulations, was submitted to your staff for approval. It was reported to me later that there was very definite resistance by another one of your staff to the entire publication. It was finally published and has been a Government "best seller" ever since.

These are only two illustrations of the way in which your policies leave the professional people in the Office of Education responsible for achieving fruitful results in helping to improve American education while transferring to your immediate staff the authority to control the means and procedures by which these professional people carry their responsibility. This divorcement of responsibility and authority with respect to the work of the Office of Education necessarily results in the same divorcement in the divisions and sections of the Office and with all of its individuals. The result is a strange feeling of uncertainty and fear among employees. The whole scheme is well designed to devitalize and demoralize the staff.

Apparently you do not feel that your present, large, immediate staff can control, to the extent you desire, the detailed activities within the Office of Education and the other constituent organizations of the agency having to do with publications, editorial work, and information services. Accordingly under date of May 26, last, you had an order issued under which you propose to centralize in your office all personnel now engaged in such services in the various constituent organizations, including the Office of Education. Under the order you propose to transfer 17 people from the supervision of the Office of Education to the administrative supervision of the Office of the Administrator, in spite of the fact that the appropriation that supports these people was made to the Office of Education.

I pointed out in my memorandum under date of June 12, 1948, the inappropriateness of the proposal and ways in which it would, if executed, work to the disadvantage of the services which the Office of Education is expected to render. My purpose here is merely to reinforce the arguments I made in that memorandum. In it I tried to make clear the intimate relationships which exist between the services of these people and the work of all other persons in the office. Verbally I had reported to you and other members of your staff that it has been the plan of the Office of Education to decentralize as much as possible among the several divisions of the Office of Education these types of services rather than to build up a large central staff even within the Office of Education. Eighty-one years of experience in the Office of Education proved the validity of the plans as formulated. Therefore it is not surprising that there should be among the personnel of the Office of Education such an unfavorable reaction to your proposal.

There can be no honest claim to economy in the transfer of administrative control which you propose. The 17 persons in the Office of Education have been working as hard and as efficiently as people could work. Besides, they have been working intelligently and enthusiastically because they were closely associated with the other people in the office to whose work their services are directly related. Merely to aggregate them with others in a centralized organization operating at a greater distance from those with whom they are expected to work and to put them under the supervision of someone on your staff who is not primarily interested in education will certainly reduce both their efficiency and enthusiasm, so far as education is concerned.

In another order issued by your office under date of June 12, entitled "Agency Office of Publications and Reports," the following statements are made:

In accordance with the Administrator's memorandum of May 26, relative to information service the following should be understood by all concerned:

1. There will be a central information office under the direction of the Director of Publications and Reports.

2. Job classification sheets which have been applicable up to this time will be used until such time as it is possible to develop new sheets consistent with the organization to be established in the office of the Administrator.

3. As indicated in the original memorandum all persons will remain on the pay rolls of the constituents for the fiscal year 1949.

4. The 1950 budget will be prepared in such a way as to show in the Administrator's budget an Office of Publications and Reports consisting of the Office of Publications and Reports, Office of the Administrator plus transfers made by the Congress from the Social Security Administration Informational Service. Other information jobs will be budgeted so that they will appear on the pay rolls of the constituents.

Apart from the gross weaknesses in the proposed arrangement which I have tried to point out in this letter and elsewhere, does it not seem even to you illogical that the constituent units of the Federal Security Agency should be expected to prepare and justify appropriation estimates to include persons to be carried on the pay rolls of the respective constituents to work in the fields under discussion, but to work "under the direction of the Director of Publications and Reports" on your staff? If it is logical and proper that these persons should be centralized into one unit for the Agency in general to be supervised administratively by your Director, would it not also seem logical and proper that they should be supported on a pay roll secured under an appropriation made in terms of the policy of administration which you propose to follow?

In other words, why do you propose to have them carried on the pay rolls supported by appropriations made by Congress to respective constituent units of the Agency, and then put them under the administrative supervision of someone on the Administrator's office staff? If they should be thus supervised (of course I do not believe they should) why are they not to be justified in the 1950 budget estimates as a part of the Administrator's office?

Under the arrangement you propose I do not see how Members of Congress can act intelligently as they consider appropriations which must of necessity be related to lines of organizational administration. Your plan seems to me to make nonsense of the serious efforts of Congressmen to consider requested appropriations in terms of the location of the direct responsibility for the administration of the functions to be supported by the appropriations.

No doubt you think of the Federal Security Agency as just one large monolithic welfare organization. Consequently, you think of education as merely one phase of welfare. When the problem is understood, very few people will agree with your conception. But if you really believe that the relationships between social security and education, health and education, and social security and health are exceedingly intimate and that education as a function in this country should be quite exclusively related to and integrated with health and welfare functions—I certainly do not—then you should ask the Congress for a single appropriation for a Federal office of welfare. But since the function of education is not a welfare function, since it necessarily represents a wide range of human interests and operates through well defined agencies and institutions, it should be supported by an appropriation made to the United States Office of Education in terms of justifications presented to Congress and break-downs therein determined.

These are some of the evidences of how your policy and program seem to obliterate the identity and the unity of action of the respective constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency; namely, the United States Public Health Service, Social Security Administration, United States Office of Education, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration. There are others. Your order requiring the elimination of the words "United States" before the term "Public Health Service" and "Office of Education" in every case where it could be appropriately done; your suggestion that you did not see the sense in having an annual report for each of the constituent units, but only one for the Federal Security Agency as a whole; your policy to have yourself quoted in public releases even on technical matters of statistics and other reports of a factual character based on research of highly professional technicians instead of having these technicians and their immediate supervisors quoted exclusively, all point to a trend toward centralization which is, as I have stated above, destructive of morale, of initiative, and of the kind of productive work on the part of a large number of employees to which the taxpaying public is entitled.

Finally the capstone of the argument against the centralization of control which you are developing, at least so far as education is concerned, is to be found in the fact that you are admittedly a partisan politician. You work hard for your party. Personally I have the most wholesome respect for our party system of government in the United States. I have never met finer men and women than those elected by both major parties to membership in the National Congress. But there is a deep-rooted tradition in this country, born of the harrowing experiences of the centuries, that the function of education in a democracy should be completely removed from partisanship. Political party control of public education is destructive of democracy and has proved to be so down through the years, and especially in recent decades in Italy, Germany, Russia, and Japan.

Being a partisan, you secure to the extent possible, as your immediate associates, persons who share your partisanship. Under the direction of yourself and of these associates you move constantly to centralize all policies, all approvals, in short, all control of the activities of the constituent organizations, including education. These controls contemplate the approval of personnel, of budgets, of substantive programs, and practically all details connected therewith. I am certain that such management of education on the Federal level is not what the great rank and file of the people of this country desire. On the contrary, they want the United States Office of Education to provide an adequate staff of competent professional educators who are in their positions to carry out the nonpartisan purposes for which the Office was established; they want a continuation of the devoted and completely nonpolitical professional service to American education that characterizes the work of the superior men and women who now comprise the staff of the Office of Education.

The American people may justly be proud of the personnel of the United States Office of Education. Every person in the Office has been selected through civil service in open competition and solely on the basis of his personal and professional qualifications. In my 14 years of intimate association with the employees in the Office, I never saw the slightest indication on the part of any one of them of any political party preference. Their lives are not actuated by partisanship; their backgrounds, their professional pride, their sense of obligation to true education in a democracy guide them in an unswerving devotion to the high calling of teaching. These are the kinds of people who in the Federal Government and in the States can really help education through schools and colleges to make its unique contribution to the preservation of our American free way of life. They are giving their lives passionately to that great objective. It isn't strange then that they, together with their colleagues throughout the country and citizens in general, regardless of political affiliation, should resent any attempts to color education with partisanship and cause its policies and processes to yield advantages to a political party.

This letter has become much longer than I intended. That is because there is so much to say on the subject.

I am sending copies of this letter to Dr. Willard Givens and Dr. E. B. Norton, who are, respectively, the executive secretaries of the National Education Association and the National Council of Chief State School Officers, organizations which, among many others, always have been active in efforts to secure a more adequate United States Office of Education and to insure such policies and methods of administration of educational activities in the Federal Government as would encourage sound programs of education in the States. I am also sending copies to the two chairmen of the Subcommittees on Appropriations for the Office of Education, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND and Representative FRANK B. KEEFE.

Respectfully yours.

CONGRESS CAN PREVENT FURTHER DANGEROUS INFLATION—OR DISASTROUS DEFLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, like many other Members, I was in hope this extra session of Congress would not be called.

But we are here now, and faced with one of the gravest responsibilities that has ever rested upon the American Congress.

This dilly-dallying around, trying to stir up trouble for the white people of the Southern States, instead of passing the legislation that is necessary to save this country from disaster, is like Nero's fiddling while Rome burned.

We are faced with the most dangerous economic situation that ever confronted this country, and that is disastrous inflation or the greater calamity of a precipitate deflation, such as we had in 1921 and in 1929.

There is one way, and one way only, in which both of these disasters can be prevented. Prices in a free economy are governed by two things: The volume of the nation's currency and the velocity of its circulation. Today we have the greatest volume of currency and the most rapid velocity of circulation this country has ever known.

The Constitution vests in the Congress the power to "coin money and regulate the value thereof."

The Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses can prevent unlimited inflation, or disastrous deflation, by bringing out and passing a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act by placing a floor beneath which the currency cannot be deflated and a ceiling above which it cannot be inflated, and also providing that if these reserve banks undertake to do what they did in 1921 and in 1929, deflate the currency below the danger point, then the Government can issue United States notes, just as Abraham Lincoln did during the War Between the States—except that we would put a gold reserve behind it—and guarantee to the American people that there will not be a spiraling of runaway inflation, or another disastrous depression.

This is the most serious and pressing problem with which the country is confronted.

Congress should act now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from further consideration of S. 866.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentlewoman for that purpose. The majority leader has already stated that there will be no suspensions today; and, under the practice of the House, suspensions must be cleared through the majority leader. The gentlewoman is not recognized for that purpose.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Under paragraph 1 of rule XXVII it is in order, is it not, for the Speaker to entertain a motion to suspend the rules?

The SPEAKER. Yes, it is within the discretion of the Speaker, and the Speaker states that he will not recognize any Member for that purpose without clearing it through the majority leader, and using that discretion merely refuses to recognize the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Today is the first Monday in August, and under the aforementioned rule individual Members may move to suspend the rules and pass important legislation. Do I understand clearly then that the Chair is exercising his discretion in denying the House to vote on the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, even under the procedure requiring a two-thirds vote of the Members present?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the rule has existed for more than 50 years, and in accordance with the procedure which has been followed by not only the present Speaker but every other Speaker, the Chair does not recognize the gentlewoman from California for that purpose.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of S. 866.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentlewoman for that purpose.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION AT MIDYEAR 1948—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1948.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith a midyear economic report to the Congress. This is supplementary to the economic

report of the President of January 14, 1948, and is transmitted in accordance with section 3 (b) of the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, The Economic Situation at Midyear 1948, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I was home over the week end, to find myself confronted with a real problem. My wife had been trying to get a plumber all week. So I tried, and I tried four different plumbers, and I could not get a plumber. She tried to get an electrician, and I tried two electricians but could not get one. She wanted a carpenter, and I could not get a carpenter. I am afraid if I had called a painter or plasterer I would have had the same experience.

Will someone tell me how I can get an electrician, a plumber, or a carpenter? I need one. They are all so busy on new construction around Cleveland that they are not available for ordinary service calls.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I can tell the gentleman exactly how he can get one. Just have another Republican depression, when all the people are out of work, and we will get plenty of them.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure that the gentleman from Texas knows more about depressions than any of us Republicans. His party found a hole in the ground and by the time they finished they made it deeper than the Grand Canyon. It was deep enough to handle all the pigs and potatoes they plowed under for a dozen years.

The reason why I could not get a plumber or an electrician was just this—they were all working on private construction jobs—putting up buildings too expensive for the folks who need them most. There are 5,298 new homes going up in my community—most of them are between ten and fifteen thousand dollars. Veterans just getting started in life cannot afford these houses. The result is that we are putting up new places that folks cannot live in and you cannot get people to repair the ones that folks must live in.

INFLATION CONTROL

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7062) to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that purpose.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state a pertinent parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under paragraph 1 of rule 27——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already answered that inquiry, as submitted by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the civil-rights program. Ever since I came to Congress I have been one of the most active opponents of the things included in the President's so-called civil-rights program.

While there are other points in the civil-rights program, the most controversial are: First, the enactment by Congress of an antilynching law; second, Federal legislation to abolish the poll tax; third, Federal legislation to eliminate segregation; fourth, passage of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act.

These proposals, first, violate the Consituation; second, are an encroachment on States' rights; third, are wrong in principle; and, fourth, will not work in practice.

The program was inspired by agitators who want to make the South a political whipping boy. Not all who favor the civil-rights program are Communists, but it is certainly true that all who are Communists do favor it. They have now set up Henry Wallace as their straw man spokesman. They use him to help create prejudice and confusion for their own ends.

The program seeks to establish racial and social equality where none was decreed by the laws of God. Enactment of such proposals into law would add chaos to the already existing confusion in the national picture at a time when all of our energies should be devoted to a solution of problems of the greatest magnitude, both at home and abroad. All of those proposals have a political inspiration, which seeks the votes of the minority groups in the big cities of the North and East in order to perpetuate their sponsors in office. They are an invasion of the principles of States' rights as conceived by that great Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, and followed through the years by those of us who cling to Jeffersonian principles.

There is no need for such legislation because the history of the progress of racial relationships in the South, where such problems are said to be acute, reveals that much has been done to solve them. The Negro has no better friend than the southern white man. We give him work to earn his livelihood. We feed and clothe him when he cannot provide for himself. We supply him with medical care and drugs when he is ill. We provide educational facilities for his children, contribute to the construction of his churches, advise with him when he is troubled. His progress has been remarkable in the last 80 years. All of that is contrasted with the treatment the Negro receives in the North where none save his own kind cares what becomes of him.

So much controversy has arisen over the Truman civil-rights program that it might shed some light on the subject to review its history briefly. The civil-rights doctrine originated in the minds of a few misguided zealots, whose clamorings to get political recognition from certain minority groups resulted in the establishment of a Fair Employment Practices Commission by Executive order in 1941. More will be said about that later.

The first major step in the formation of the civil-rights program occurred when President Truman appointed a Committee on Civil Rights in December 1946. After more than a year that committee submitted a 178-page document which serves as a basis for the program.

In his state-of-the-Union message delivered to Congress January 7, 1948, the President discussed, among other things, the question of so-called civil rights, and stated he would send a special message to the Congress on that subject.

On February 2, 1948, the President sent the special message.

The civil-rights program became a major point of controversy at the Democratic National Convention in July 1948, and split the Democratic Party into segments. Its submission as a subject to be considered by the Congress at this special session has resulted in a situation that has delayed consideration of important legislation in the other body.

Let me discuss each of the four mentioned proposals briefly:

First. Antilynching.

The record of lynchings in the United States during the past 50 years shows in 1900 there were 115; in 1910, 76; in 1920, 61; in 1930, 21; in 1940, 5; 1944, 2; 1945, 1; 1946, 6; 1947, again only 1 lynching. The figures show that lynching has practically disappeared in America without a Federal antilynching law. Therefore, there is no need for such a Federal statute.

On the other hand, the vociferous advocates of an antilynching law make no suggestion that there be a Federal statute enacted against murder, rape, robbery, theft, burglary, and so forth.

In New York City, where a large part of the agitation for a Federal antilynching law comes from, in 1946 there were 325 murders, 14,525 other felonies, and a total of 697,734 crimes reported to the police. That is the record of one city in 1 year. Yet among the 140,000,000 people in the entire United States there were only 6 lynchings.

Lynching is another form of murder and is prohibited by statute in every State in the United States. Why do not the advocates of an antilynching law seek Federal legislation to punish the commission of other forms of murder and other felonies? Obviously, in view of the record of New York City and other metropolitan centers in the United States, the crimes are so commonplace there is no vote-getting glamour in seeking Federal statutes for the punishment

of crimes generally. Equally obviously, the demand is raised all out of proportion to the justification, based on the record that lynching has almost entirely disappeared in this country.

Do not those victims of murder, robbery, rape, and so forth, have some civil rights? Certainly. Again, they have no spokesman for their rights seeking the enactment of Federal laws for punishment of the offenders, because there is no political benefit accruing from such a program.

Second. Abolition of the poll tax.

Only 7 States in the 48 levy a poll tax as a means of registration to establish eligibility for voting. In many of them, including Texas, most of the revenue derived is devoted to the maintenance and operation of the public schools. If the people of Texas want to abolish the poll tax and substitute some other requisite to vote, that is their business; but I am opposed to the Federal Government telling Texas how and what to do about it.

A law enacted by Congress to abolish the poll tax is unconstitutional, in my opinion. The Constitution provides in article 1, section 2:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Numerous cases have been decided sustaining my viewpoint. In Breedlove against Suttles, decided by the United States Supreme Court in 1937, Mr. Justice Butler, speaking for the Court, said:

> Payment as a prerequisite is not required for the purpose of denying or abridging the privilege of voting. It does not limit the tax to electors; aliens are not there permitted to vote, but the tax is laid upon them, if within the defined class. It is not laid upon persons 60 or more years old, whether electors or not. Exaction of payment before registration undoubtedly serves to aid collection from electors desiring to vote, but that use of the State's power is not prevented by the Federal Constitution.

Other cases have followed the principle announced in that case.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. Certainly, I yield to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. I want to pay my respects to the gentleman from Texas for the fight he has made on the floor of this House for constitutional government. I also want to congratulate the gentleman on the fine attendance record he has had in the last session of the Congress. I understand he is one of the few Members of this body who has a perfect attendance record.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman.

Enactment by Congress of a law to abolish the poll tax would be an invasion of the rights of the States to establish their own electoral systems.

The poll-tax issue is another one of those that is raised for pure vote-getting purposes by those in the North and East who are agitating for a Federal law on the subject. The issue is politically inspired to get the votes of a minority group in the big city areas in doubtful States. That is where the cry to abolish the poll tax comes from.

I could go on at length discussing this subject but to do so would unduly burden you. Let me direct your attention to the fact that I led the debate on the floor of the House in opposition to the proposal on July 21, 1947, when that subject was up for consideration. The speech I made on that occasion in opposition to the legislation contains a full analysis of my views on the subject and the law in support of my position.

Third. Federal legislation to eliminate segregation.

Segregation is not discrimination. It is a means of affording people of all races an opportunity to be and associate with their own kind. It avoids friction. It promotes harmonious relationships. It prevents discord. It eliminates opportunities for disagreement and strife.

What does elimination of segregation by law mean to the average citizen? It means that the American would be prohibited from choosing his associates in the church, in the school, in fraternal organization, in every walk of social life. It means that you and I must accept as associates in our daily lives persons of race and color other than our own regardless of our personal feelings in the matter. In order to eliminate segregation and to prevent discrimination it would result in the establishment of a Federal bureau with gestapo powers. The employees of such an agency would have a right to tell the free American citizen with whom he could associate regardless of the citizen's personal desires in the matter. Carried to its ultimate conclusion, the agents of such a bureau could require the churches to accept membership from those it did not want. It could compel us to send our children to school with companions other than their own seeking. It could require us to occupy the same travel accommodations, the same hotels, and eat at the same restaurants in company of persons we did not voluntarily choose.

All of those things could be done in the name of civil rights. To do them would be to disregard the rights of a majority of the people.

Fourth. The FEPC.

The establishment of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission by law to prohibit discrimination in private employment would be a terrible imposition on the American people. It would simply mean this: that no employer could employ or discharge persons from employment without being supervised by agents of that bureau. It would mean that the employee would be required to work side by side with individuals he would not associate with except by compulsion. Assume 75 percent of the population in a given town were white and 25 percent black. Under such a law every employer would have to accept one-fourth of his employees from among the colored race regardless of the nature and type of employment. If a merchant had four clerks, one of them would have to be a Negro. If a contractor wanted to hire four carpenters, one of them would have to be a Negro. If a board of school trustees wanted to employ four teachers, one of them would have to be a Negro.

Illustrations of this nature could be noted in countless numbers.

We have a history in the establishment of an FEPC. In 1941, by Executive order, the President of the United States established an FEPC. That organization was broadened and enlarged in scope and number of employees during the ensuing years. In 1944 it employed more Negroes than whites; had Negroes supervising white employees within the agency; paid the Negroes an aggregate salary larger than it paid the white employees; required employees of the agency to use the same rest-room facilities regardless of their race; ordered the railroads of the Nation to employ Negroes indiscriminately as engineers, firemen, and conductors regardless of qualifications. The activities of that Commission resulted in strikes, riots, and other friction between whites and Negroes of this country.

That agency existed when I took the oath of office as Congressman in 1945. One of the first things I did as a new Congressman was to call together a group of other new Members to discuss ways and means to eliminate the FEPC. As a result, we set upon a course to do everything possible to prevent further enlargement of that bureau and to eliminate it as soon as possible. Those of us who opposed the continuation of the FEPC were continually devising ways and means to destroy it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman knows something of my very high appreciation of him as a public servant and of the fine service he has rendered here as a Member of this House. May I say to the gentleman, however, that I particularly appreciate the work he has done toward stopping the FEPC, which, if it should ever become law, will paralyze the industry of this country, because the act itself is a drive against the institution of private property. I do not believe there is any Member of the House who has contributed more to the resistance of that measure than the gentleman who now addresses this body.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

The chance to kill the FEPC came during my first term in Congress. H. R. 5890, a bill to make appropriations for certain agencies of the Government, was called up on the floor of the House for consideration. The bill provided for money to continue the FEPC to the end of the fiscal year. I made the point of order that struck that sum of money from the bill and forced the agency out of existence. It has not been revived since.

My record of opposition to the proposals in the civil rights program is well known to all Members of this House and to all others who have been regular readers of the newspapers. I have helped arrange and attended many meetings in protest of specific proposals in the civil rights program. On the numerous occasions when Members of the House, such as Messrs. MARCANTONIO, ISACSON, and

POWELL, offered amendments to various bills seeking to write into those bills language in keeping with the civil rights program, I have always been on the floor and active in my opposition to their amendments. I have been instrumental in notifying other Members what was taking place and getting them to vote against those amendments. As a result of our concerted activities no such proposal has been enacted into law in the last 4 years.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. As chairman of a group of 78 southern Congressmen who have organized to fight the so-called civil rights program, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas for having helped set up our organization and for the effective service he has rendered.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

I was one of the 78 Members of the House who formed an organization to oppose actively the President's civil-rights program after he delivered his message to the Congress on February 2 of this year. I feel that our opposition in the past has been effective in preventing enactment into law of any of the legislation sought to be adopted. I expect to continue my opposition to such a program as long as I am in Congress and afterward so long as I am able to oppose it.

Let me call your attention to the slogan of those who foment this civil-rights hysteria, "equality." One of the great purposes of the Constitution was to secure the blessings of liberty so that men could be free to be different and realize their differing ambitions with their differing abilities; not to achieve an impossible equality among unequal human beings. Every proposal seeking to give a man a right to do something which as a freeman he cannot secure for himself, results in imposing burdens and restraints on the freedoms of others. We must watch and defeat every effort to create by law the right in one man to compel others to associate with him or accept obligations to him in the realm of private enterprise and private life. We must realize that freedom of association in work and in leisure is one of our most precious liberties.

Let us recall the words of the late Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Brandeis, whom no one could rightfully accuse of intolerance or prejudice. He wrote:

> The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings, and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure, and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.

To sum it up, in the name of civil rights the proponents of this program would violate the very fundamentals of the Bill of Rights and force on the individual an association with persons and conditions of living not of his own choosing. In short, it would deprive the individual of his right to live under his own vine and fig tree in his own way. These things he would have to surrender to bureaucratic control and dictation from Washington, where some Government agent could tell him whom he should employ, what he could do and with whom he must associate. Thus, in the name of civil rights they would destroy the very liberties upon which this Government was founded and under which it has grown to be the mightiest nation in the history of the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to join my distinguished colleagues in congratulating the gentleman on the splendid speech he has made and I also want to join them in saying that I know of no Member of the House who has been more diligent and more sincere in his fight for the preservation of American and southern institutions than he has been. I want to repeat what the gentleman said in the first part of his speech to the effect that the Negroes have made great progress in the South and at this time call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the progress the Negroes have made in the South has been due to the aid and understanding of the white man of the South, that it is due in no way to these paid political agitators of the North and East who are trying to destroy constitutional democratic American Government.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I reiterate, with all of the emphasis at my command, I have opposed the civil-rights program. I am now opposed to the program. I will continue my opposition to that program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include articles by Samuel B. Pettengill.

Mr. ARNOLD (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CURE FOR HIGH PRICES UP TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the great peril confronting this country is inflation; high prices follow in its wake. Inflation can be more devastating than war. This is no time for a dog fight between the President and Congress. The people are demanding that we get together. Our common enemy is inflation and economic chaos will result if we take no steps to arrest it. We faced an enemy in 1941 as a united people and achieved a great military victory. We did not consider the problem as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans. We cannot win the economic battle as partisans; it must and will be won as Americans without reference to politics.

The moment has arrived for our leaders to sit down together and make an effort to solve the problem jointly. Why jockey for political position when the economic welfare of all the people of this great Nation is at stake? And let us not be too much concerned about who is to get credit. There will be plenty of it for both political parties and you can bet that the people will know who is responsible.

There has been considerable talk in and out of Congress about high prices; many charges and countercharges have been made as to the responsibility for the present situation; there has been a lot of name calling. However, two facts stand out: One, That prices continue to rise as dollars multiply in a market where production cannot keep up with demand; and, two, that there are some areas of agreement and the people are asking the President and Congress to get together.

On the part of the Congress its responsibility is to consider the President's request in a spirit of fair play and within its jurisdiction. It is the duty of the President to represent all of the people in an effort to solve the problem on the basis of economics and not politics. There is something more important than securing political office and that is the protection and security of our people under a free economy. The whole world looks to us for assistance. If inflation destroys our economy, socialism and communism will take over.

The root cause of the continuing price rise is the inflation of money. Our money supply was greatly expanded during the war and even since the war it has continued to increase out of all proportion to production. Figures indicate that up to the first of this year the supply of money is three times that of 1939 or up 200 percent, while the supply of goods to be purchased with that money is up only 71 percent. So the immediate job before us is to cut down the accelerating supply of money. How can this be done?

Drastically reduce Government spending. The President can, on his own order, stop the flow of free and easy money that Government has been pumping into our economic system—before the war, during the war, and since the war. Last January he submitted the biggest peacetime budget in the history of this country and he was highly critical of a Republican Congress that tried to cut it.

Mr. President, here is a challenge. Congress is not interested in your recommendations that call for the spending of more billions of dollars. It is greatly concerned about the continued rise in prices and in the shortage of housing. But you, Mr. President, can immediately stabilize the price situation by:

First. Reduce the foreign aid spending program temporarily.

Second. Slow down the armaments program.

Third. Halt Government employment and reduce the pay rolls by 500,000.

Fourth. Delay enforcement of the draft law until 1949.

Fifth. Stop all Government spending except for absolute essentials.

Here are just a few of the things that you can do, Mr. President, to stop the spiral of inflation if you are sincere in your statements about reducing high prices. Free and easy money policies of the administration have brought on the present extraordinary occasion.

The President knows that while he spends billions for armaments, billions for foreign aid, increases Federal employment, and authorizes the shipment of needed commodities abroad, prices will continue to rise. We must achieve a balance between money and goods. Under existing policies it is difficult to see how this can be done. In good conscience the President cannot take credit for high wages and big profits and at the same time charge that this condition has created an "extraordinary occasion" that requires the Congress to convene in special session.

Congress, too, has some responsibility and it should act to curb credits and require that banks increase reserves. In fact it should apply brakes wherever it deems it necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week end the newspapers carried streamer headlines, "Treasury and Commerce Department still harboring Red spies" and "Representative REES to name U. S. workers 'who ought to be fired'" and "Two high officials accused as aides of Red spies," with their alarming revelations.

But before the Eightieth Congress adjourns, I want the Members to know that there is one department in which the known or reasonably suspected subversives, Communists, fellow travelers, sympathizers, and persons whose services are not for the best interests of the United States, have been swept out. That is the Department of State. For this job the people of the United States can thank to a great extent, in the order in which the work was done: First, Congressman BARTEL J. JONKMAN, of the Fifth District of Michigan, who on July 10, 1946, was appointed a committee of one—from the Committee on Foreign Affairs—to investigate communism in the State Department; second, the people themselves, who on November 5, 1946, elected a Republican Congress, and third, Mr. John E. Peurifoy who, after that election, was appointed to the office of Assistant Secretary of State for Administration, which includes hiring and firing of personnel, on January 23, 1947. Since the date Mr. Peurifoy took charge of that office 134 such persons were either separated from the Department or separated themselves from the Department, so that, Mr. Peurifoy tells me, the Department of State is now free from persons of whom it is known or there is reasonable cause to believe that they are security risks.

Before Mr. Peurifoy took office the previous administration had discharged only one such person and that was also after the aforesaid election, when the old administration apparently became panicky because of the oncoming Republican Congress. They had known practically all the facts on this person and his dismissal had been recommended 8 months before.

A short review of the history of this cleaning-out process, I think should be made for the record.

On July 10, 1946, when I was appointed a committee of one, I made inquiry outside of the State Department as to persons within it whose alleged affiliations or sympathies with Communists might make them a security risk. Within 24 hours I had a list of 35. I then called the State Department and made an appointment for the next day at my office.

The then Deputy Assistant Secretary Panuch told me at that meeting that 79 employees had been discharged, 26 as aliens, 13 for not having 15 years of citizenship, and 40 for being security risks or pinks and reds, as he called them. At the end of this meeting, however, on incisive questioning he admitted that some of the 40 might have been fired for mere incompetence, but he was unable to give the number of each. I requested a letter giving me a break-down which he promised. In 2 days I received his letter with a lot of unrelated, useless information, but not a word on the 40 persons discharged.

I immediately called him on the telephone, told him of the evasion and said, "I'll be in your office at 10 tomorrow morning and I want to see those files of the persons discharged." He answered they were secret, private files, and I would not be permitted to see them. I retorted, "I'll be there at 10 and will discuss that then." I was at his office at 10 and a half dozen files were lying ready for me, including one on Carl A. Marzani. All of these names I had on my list of 35. These files had been prepared by a security committee of six persons chosen for that purpose from within the Department. This committee had recommended in March—4 months before—that five be discharged and one cleared. I asked, "Why have not the five been fired?" and as to the one that was cleared I am not quarreling with the result, but you proceed on the policy that the danger of a security risk must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. You give the employee the benefit of the doubt. That is a dangerous policy for the safety of 145,000,000 people.

In other words, your policy should be that if there is reasonable cause to believe that an employee is a security risk he should be separated at once unless the Secretary of State himself, in writing, overrides the verdict and orders his retention. That would be giving the Government the benefit of the doubt and a sound policy. But again why haven't these five been fired 4 months ago? His answer was that they were entitled to an examination by the civil-service board before they could be discharged. I answered, you have never submitted their names to the Civil Service Commission, but under the McCarran law recently passed that is unnecessary and the Secretary of State, regardless of the civil-service laws, can discharge any person in the Department whenever he deemed that such person's services are not for the best interests of the United States. He countered that this law was unconstitutional. I think I convinced him that the law was constitutional, but did convince him that it was not for him as an administrative officer to raise that question, especially when the security of 145,000,000 people might be at stake.

But, I said in the same breath, "I'll just have to report that you are ignoring the law because of its unconstitutionality, and now I want to see the files of the 40 or those of them that you did discharge as security risks." Then the Deputy Secretary broke down completely and admitted that there was not even one that had been fired for security-risk reasons and he said, in the same breath, "but I will go along with you on the policy of giving the Government the benefit of the doubt if you will keep the list of names secret; I'll fire Carl Marzani and Mr. X tomorrow and the others in due course if you will keep the names secret so we can fire them under the provisions of the McCarran law." I at first hesitated, but finally agreed. I did examine more files and found that about 40 had been recommended for dismissal, including nearly all of the 35 on my list, but, of course, no one had actually been dismissed.

Did Deputy Administrator Panuch fire Marzani on the morrow? No; he did not.

I inquired on the third day and while I could not reach Mr. Panuch, nor his chief, Mr. Russell, I was informed nothing had been done. It later developed on the trial of Marzani, hereafter referred to, that, instead, he told Marzani that as long as he, Panuch, and Russell were in charge he, Marzani, was O. K. Be that as it may, I immediately realized that I had only a deputy assistant secretary's promises and that he might just have been playing horse with me to get out of a tight spot. So, on July 18 I addressed a letter to Secretary James F. Byrnes, stating the deplorable condition in the Department with reference to these security risks, the dire need of a policy along the lines I had indicated and requested an immediate answer as to what he was going to do about it.

His response was a long distance telephone call from, I think it was Ocean City. He said my letter had been read to him over the telephone and was an education to him and he had been in Paris and did not know of the alleged subversives in his department, or the McCarran law, but if I would hold off until Monday—this was Friday—he would be back in Washington and make this matter his first order of business. I said, "I certainly hope you will, and I'll play along, but, Mr. Secretary, the situation is terrible and I sure hope you will act on Monday without fail." He then made this revealing reply, "Well, you must know, Congressman, that it is a difficult matter to do wholesale firing of

people merely because they belong to what is here a minority party when that same party is the sole and dominant party of a great country with which I have serious and difficult diplomatic negotiations." My reply to that is immaterial. Official Washington was astounded when I publicized this statement. Suffice it to say that on Monday, Tuesday, and so forth, nothing was done.

On the 29th day of July I received a bland letter from Assistant Secretary Russell that certainly I would not want them to use gestapo methods. This was just 4 days before Congress was to adjourn. I realized that they realized that the New Deal was in control of the Congress, of the Supreme Court, as well as the executive branch. The New Dealers in the State Department were riding high and apparently laughing at a lone Republican Congressman, acting as a committee of one, worrying about the security of the country. When I reported to the Committee on Foreign Affairs a high-ranking member said, "Congressman JONKMAN has done more effective work in 3 weeks without a dollar of expense money than some large committees with substantial appropriations have accomplished in 3 years."

But, my friends, while I had succeeded in exposing a deplorable condition, I had failed to eliminate a single person, even Carl Marzani, from the Department. After this report, realizing that vital statements such as of Secretary Byrnes, above, and a few others, should have more proof than my word against his, I, on August 2, wrote a letter to the Department saying that such statements had been made and were probably the cause of nonaction, to see if they would deny them. But the answer came back baldly, without denial of such statements, that upon sufficient proof they would take action, but certainly I would not want them to use gestapo methods. This was on August 9, after Congress had adjourned, and about the same time I read in the newspapers that the Department had fired the Americans on guard, the Security Committee, instead of firing a single Red.

Now comes the second act in the drama. On November 5 the people of the United States elected a Republican Congress. Immediately there was consternation and hysteria among the New Dealers in the Department. Marzani was called in by Panuch and asked to resign. But Marzani would not resign. He was told, "We've got this d—n congressional pressure on us," and "It's just this congressional pressure," and "with a Republican Congress there's going to be trouble." But Marzani would not resign. So on December 20, just before the Republican Eightieth Congress convened, he was not only fired under the McCarran Act, but indicted for having falsely sworn that he was not a Communist, and later was duly convicted. All the facts of his conviction were there or deducible from the report I had read in July and which, as I said before, was 4 months old. If the people had not elected a Republican Congress, the State Department would probably still be giving me the horse laugh. When action to serve the people and our security was needed in March and July there was no response, but in December there was plenty of action for their own security. In fact, they overdid it, but in just one spot.

It is significant that when Secretary Byrnes was replaced by General Marshall as Secretary of State the following January, Russell and Panuch resigned with Byrnes.

Immediately upon the appointment of Secretary Marshall, or to be exact, 2 days later upon the appointment of John E. Peurifoy as Acting Assistant Secretary—he was later made Assistant Secretary—I went to see General Marshall with Congressman MUNDT, of South Dakota, and asked him what the policy would be and started to give Secretary Marshall the history. Mr. Peurifoy was there. Soon Marshall said, "I'm familiar with these facts, Mr. JONKMAN, and I am going to give Mr. Peurifoy instructions in your presence that I am in favor of the policy you have advocated. I am giving him instructions in your presence that if there is reasonable cause to believe that anybody in the State Department is a security risk I want the Government to have the benefit of the doubt and have such person discharged and he does not have to come back to me for further instructions. It is his responsibility from now on."

So John Peurifoy took on the third act in the drama on January 23 and he has done a grand job. I know that he has the respect and confidence on both sides of the aisle. There may have been an occasional difference with his judgment. After all his is a most difficult task. He cannot proceed on suspicion, rumor, hearsay, or innuendo. On the other hand he must act on reasonable cause for belief. On this minds may differ. I have found him to use sound discretion and judgment. Most of the persons I had on that original list have been eliminated. A few have been retained. But, as I said in the beginning, in all he has patiently but persistently cleaned 134 security risks out of the Department. In addition to that many new applicants constituting security risks have been kept from getting into the Department. Mr. Peurifoy informed me last week that the Department is now free from known or reasonably suspected risks. I wish we had a John Peurifoy in every branch and agency of the Government with delegated powers such as Secretary Marshall gave him. Then we would see a far more thorough house cleaning than will come from the President's $25,000,000 loyalty program.

I want to say that I go home from the Eightieth Congress with far more confidence in the personnel of the State Department than I did from the Seventy-ninth Congress 2 years ago. About the only bad taste I have is a libel suit for a half a million dollars started by Mr. Panuch against the Times-Herald and myself. That does not worry me except that it costs money to hire defense lawyers. But even that is a trifle to the pleasure of writing finis to the job assigned to me as a committee of one over 2 years ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CONGRESS CAN DO SOMETHING ABOUT INFLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in the lack of action taken by the Congress in relation to the needs of the American people. There has been too much hysteria, personal recriminations, and politics and not enough effort to try and do something tangible about the high cost of living.

With steel, paper, meat, cement, cigarettes, and many other prices going up we do nothing but talk and blame one another for the present precarious situation. Talk and inaction have never yet solved a problem. The time for positive action is now and the people are looking to us as their duly-elected Representatives to help them in their distress.

I do not know the complete answer to the problem of inflation but there are two steps which I think this special session should consider. One is to restore regulation W to curb consumer credit and to cut down the tremendous and dangerous overexpansion in this field.

As everyone here will recall regulation W was abolished by an act of Congress and signed by the President under Public Law 386 on August 8, 1947. Since then, the Senate of the United States has passed in renewed form regulation W and it is now—and has been for some time—in the House Banking and Currency Committee. I think it imperative that this measure be considered and I call upon the Banking and Currency Committee to report it out to us at the earliest moment.

The other step is to hold hearings on the O'Mahoney-Mansfield measure which has been introduced in the Senate and House and is known as H. R. 7076 in this body. Under this bill, a cooling-off period of 30 days would become mandatory for the large corporations before they could raise prices. In this period, the corporations would have to appear publicly before the Federal Trade Commission and prove that the contemplated price raises are necessary. As everyone knows, the steel industry recently raised its price on steel over $9 a ton. This, in turn, will be reflected in increased prices for cars, refrigerators, building materials, and many other items and the net result will be to further boost the spiral of inflation.

These are extraordinary times. With the United States Government spending billions on an armaments program, more billions for foreign aid, thus draining goods out of this country, there is little opportunity for the operation of a free law of supply and demand. Such a situation calls for governmental assistance at this time so that scarce materials can be allocated and so that continual and unnecessary price raises by big corporations can be stopped.

It does not make any difference now who, if anybody, is responsible for higher prices for the farmer, higher wages for some of the workers, or higher profits for the large corporations. Calling each other names and blaming the other political party does no one any good but only helps to make a bad situation worse. It is time for this Congress to forget party labels and to bend its collective ability to the task of tackling an onerous job and to stay in session until we come up with a workable solution to the high-cost-of-living problem.

By our actions to date and the talk of an adjournment by August 7 this Congress is making a sorry spectacle of itself. The people will not be fooled by the play acting we are going through nor will they be happy over the carefully arranged, predetermined anti-poll-tax show being put on by the actors in the other body.

The people of the United States know what is going on and this Congress in trying to fool them is only fooling itself. The people know what they are paying for meat, milk, cars, cigarettes, canned goods, refrigerators, and all the other things they must have to live. They hear the Congress talk, talk, and talk and they feel their pockets, look at their shrinking bank accounts, notice how their bonds are being cashed in, and ponder over their bills as they become due. Then there are the people whose incomes are below a livable minimum and the people living on fixed incomes, annuities, and pensions. What are they saying, what are they contemplating doing, what are they thinking?

The people know all the facts about the high cost of living because they cannot escape them. All our double talk about stabilizing the debt and the dollar, trade balances and export controls, and raising the bank reserves and rediscount rates means nothing to the people who are trying desperately to make both ends meet. What does mean something to them is meat at $1 a pound, cigarettes at 20 cents, $5,000 houses at $11,000 or more, and all the other items they must or should have. These people, our constituents, are watching to see what we will do in their behalf. They are watching this Congress as they never have watched another one. They know—if some Members of this body do not—that their responsibility for what we do or do not do begins on our adjournment and their decision will be made on November 2, 1948. A do-nothing Congress will then get what it deserves and a do-something Congress will get what it merits.

Both the Congress and the President are partially to blame for the present inflation—but only partially. The real cause of our present difficulty lies in the cost of financing a world war. We increased our debt during the war from approximately $40,000,000,000 to approximately $300,000,000,000. This was necessary to buy the material to support our armies, navies, and air force all over the world. The colossal sums needed could not be raised by taxation. Had that been possible, there would be no inflation today. If the bonds could have been sold directly to the people inflation probably could have been avoided but that, too, was impossible. Most of the money was raised by selling bonds to our banks and the result was a flood of printing-press money. We paid huge sums to keep our war economy going but we manufactured a bare minimum of civilian consumer goods. With the great money supply and a lack of civilian goods to spend it on the result was a mild inflation which only controls kept in line.

When controls were abandoned—and both the President and the Congress were to blame—inflation really set in and has been traveling upward at a dizzy pace since. The same thing happened, to a lesser degree, after World War I and was eventually followed by deflation. The pattern, after both World Wars, is essentially the same, but the effects this time are far greater and potentially more destructive.

The fate of our own country, as well as the world, may lie in the balance. Economic stability here will be of tremendous value to the rest of the globe in its efforts to achieve a sound economic base which will give strength to governments and security to their peoples. If inflation really develops into a "bust" here—as Marriner Eccles has stated it would—we will, in an era of full employment, have laid the ground work for conditions far worse than they were in the 1930's.

Mr. Speaker, the facts pertaining to our economy today are startling. According to the July 1948 issue of "Economic Indicators" published by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report it is stated that:

First. In 1939, corporate profits after taxes, were $5,000,000,000, in the first quarter of this year at an annual rate of $19,700,000,000, an increase of $14,700,000,000 or 294 percent. In 1939 compensation of employees was $47,800,000,000, and in the second quarter of this year at an annual rate of $134,500,000,000 or 181.4 percent increase.

Second. Corporate dividend payments were in 1939, $3,800,000,000 and the first quarter of this year, at a rate of $7,500,000,000, or nearly twice as much, but in 1939, undistributed profits were only $1,200,000,000, and in the first quarter this year, at the rate of $12,200,000,000 or more than 10 times as large as in 1939.

Third. In 1939 employees' compensation was 66 percent of national income; in 1947, 63 percent, and in the second quarter of this year at the annual rate of only 61.7 percent.

Fourth. Consumer credit outstanding was in May this year 6.3 percent of national income compared with 5.7 percent in 1946. Consumer credit outstanding, increased $3,600,000,000 from December 1946 to $13,800,000,000 in May 1948, and is rapidly mounting.

Fifth. Proprietors' and rental income jumped from $14,700,000,000 in 1939 to an annual rate of $53,600,000,000 in the second quarter of this year, an increase of $38,900,000,000 or almost 265 percent.

Sixth. Taking consumers' prices from 1935–39 as 100, in May this year, prices of all items compiled by the Department of Labor for moderate income families in large cities, were 170.5; for food 210.9; for clothing 197.5 and rents were 116.7.

Seventh. In 1946 average family money income before taxes was: Lowest income fifth, $835, second fifth, $2,023, third fifth, $3,050, fourth fifth, $4,201, highest fifth, $8,921.

Eighth. Average weekly earnings in May of this year were $51.98 in manufacturing, while in April they were $38.40 in retail trade; $49.33 in bituminous coal mining, and $67.58 in private building construction.

The Federal Reserve Board reports that about 3,000,000 spending units who had savings January 1, 1947, had none by New Year's this year, and a quarter of consumers spent more than their income last year.

In addition to the facts and figures already given I should like to call attention to a survey made by United Industrial Associates, Inc., of Washington, D. C. This survey was undertaken by a private firm of consulting engineers and was published in the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press under date of July 26, 1948. With building costs increasing, with veterans in Montana and elsewhere finding it extremely difficult to get GI loans—which the Government guarantees up to $4,000—from the banks, this survey presents a startling picture. There are too many veterans and too many low-income families affected by the housing shortage and it is necessary, in my opinion, that the Congress consider this question quickly and objectively. We all know what the effects of living in overcrowded, unhealthy, and limited quarters will be. We all know what tensions can arise from living with relatives. We all know that if housing conditions and shortages are not corrected that crime, juvenile delinquency, disease, and broken families will result. The future of America lies in our homes and there is no reason why Government and business, working together, cannot arrive at a sensible solution to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the survey referred to follows:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of July 26, 1948]

HOME PRICES AT NEW HIGH: $4,599 HOUSE IN 1939 NOW $11,094

WASHINGTON.—The price of homes in the United States reached a new high in June, a survey by a private firm of consulting engineers showed Sunday night.

United Industrial Associates, Inc., of Washington, revealed the results of what it said was the latest in a series of surveys it has made on housing prices.

These figures show that the price tag on the average house and lot in June was $11,094, compared with $9,749 a year ago and $4,599 in 1939.

The firm emphasized that its figures were the prices of homes, not construction costs.

"New houses represent only a fraction of the total houses sold in the market, and builders sell their new houses at the market price rather than the cost of construction," the firm said.

In June, the firm said, housing prices were highest in Los Angeles, Calif., Chicago, New York, and Boston, where the average is now $13,000.

"Kansas City, Mo., is the only remaining city where an average house can be bought for less than $7,000," the firm said. The firm gave these figures on its survey:

City	June 1939	June 1947	June 1948	Percent increase since June 1947
Boston	$5,588	$12,300	$13,612	10.7
Chicago	5,282	11,350	13,114	15.5
Cincinnati	5,637	9,327	10,120	8.2
Detroit	4,445	7,549	8,393	11.2
Indianapolis	3,110	6,236	7,884	26.2
Kansas City, Mo	2,511	5,648	6,505	15.2
Milwaukee	4,373	8,763	10,157	15.9
St. Paul-Minneapolis	3,526	7,918	9,036	14.1
New York City	6,000	11,479	13,391	16.7
St. Louis	2,942	5,780	7,752	34.1
San Francisco	4,210	9,979	10,928	9.5
Washington	5,835	11,357	12,352	8.8
National average	4,599	9,719	11,094	14.5

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks an article entitled "About Terms for GI Home Loans" taken from the United States News and World Report of August 6, 1948:

ABOUT TERMS FOR GI HOME LOANS

Tightening of mortgage credit is making it harder for veterans to get loans for buying or building homes. Banks and other lending institutions are making fewer insured or guaranteed loans to veterans. In addition, larger down payments are being demanded. This is partly because of relatively low interest rates involved, and partly because of the difficulty of disposing of these mortgages through secondary mortgage markets.

A number of veterans, however, are still succeeding in financing homes. Some of these are financed under the GI bill of rights, others through mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration. The Veterans' Administration is approving GI home loans at a rate of nearly 30,000 a month. This compares with a rate a year ago of about 51,000 a month. In addition, many veterans are getting homes entirely through private financing channels, without any assistance from the Government. These private lenders include savings and loan associations, insurance companies, banks, and other institutions.

IS CONGRESS MAKING IT EASIER FOR VETERANS TO GET LOANS?

Not at this time. In fact, Congress has made it harder in some ways for veterans to get home loans, by dropping title 6 of the National Housing Act. Under that title, no longer in effect, Government insurance of mortgages could be obtained under more favorable terms and up to 90 percent of the cost of homes.

WHAT HAS CONGRESS DONE TO EASE HOME-LOAN CREDIT?

Congress recently passed legislation designed to provide more financing for veterans' homes by restoring in the Government a secondary mortgage market for VA- and FHA-supported mortgages. This authorizes the Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to buy some of these mortgages. But a number of restrictions are written around such purchases.

For one thing, a lending institution can sell to FNMA only 25 percent of its mortgages insured by VA or FHA since April 30, 1948. Thus, large amounts of old mortgages cannot be turned into cash to provide new loans. Big mortgages for apartments and rental developments cannot qualify for sale. And the mortgage holder must certify that each mortgage sold to FNMA covers houses that meet FHA building standards. Because of these and other restrictions, many lenders and veterans' groups say that this secondary market will be of little value in providing more credit for veterans' homes.

EVEN SO, CAN VETERANS GET HOME LOANS NOW?

Yes, if they can meet certain requirements. But veterans must show that they have wages or other income to enable them to meet monthly payments on loans.

WHERE DO VETERANS APPLY FOR LOANS?

A veteran wanting a home loan does not go directly to the Government. Instead, he goes to a bank, a savings and loan association, an insurance company, or some other lender. In some cases, the lender will agree to put up the money without Government backing. But, if not, two types of Government financing are available to qualified veterans who can get loans. One is a VA guaranty under the GI bill of rights, available only to veterans of World War II, and the other is FHA mortgage insurance, available to both veterans and nonveterans.

In many cases, lenders now are unwilling to make loans entirely under VA backing. Instead, they are demanding that part of veterans' mortgages be insured by FHA and the rest of it guaranteed by VA, with its lower interest rates.

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN INSURED AND GUARANTEED LOANS?

FHA operates a system under which it backs up a home loan through a mutual insurance system. That is, the borrower pays 4½ percent interest on the loan plus one-half of 1 percent as a mortgage-insurance premium. Any losses through defaults are paid off from this insurance fund, with no cost to the Government. But VA makes an outright guaranty of a certain share of a home loan that it backs. The borrower pays only 4 percent interest on this loan. Any loss resulting for the Government is paid out of the United States Treasury.

IS A DOWN PAYMENT ALWAYS REQUIRED?

The down payment is a matter that is worked out by the lender and the borrower. A year ago, it often was possible for a veteran to buy a home without any down payment. This usually involved the combined financing of VA and FHA. But, today, lenders almost invariably require veterans to make down payments.

UP TO HOW MUCH CAN BE BORROWED?

This varies in individual cases, and is decided by the lender. On a GI home loan, VA will guarantee up to 50 percent of the loan, with a limit of $4,000 to its guaranty. That is, it will back $3,500 of a $7,000 loan, but no more than $4,000 of a loan for more than $8,000.

FHA now will insure up to 80 percent of its valuation of a home, based upon long-term values instead of current costs. That means a limit of $8,000 on a house valued at $10,000 by FHA appraisers. Slightly larger insurance sometimes can be obtained on a new home approved by FHA before construction starts.

HOW LONG A TIME IS GIVEN TO REPAY?

In the majority of cases, VA and FHA loans must be repaid in full in 20 years, through fixed amounts of monthly payments. Some of these loans, however, can run for as long as 25 years.

HOW LARGE ARE MONTHLY PAYMENTS?

The payments, of course, vary according to the amount of the loan and the number of years that it runs. Take, for example, the case of a veteran buying a $12,000 home, with a $2,000 down payment. That would leave a mortgage of $10,000, to be paid off in, say, 20 years, on which the Veterans' Administration would place a guaranty of $4,000. The monthly payments of interest and repayment of principal would come to about $59 a month. This would not cover such things as insurance and taxes. If this same mortgage were insured in part or in full by FHA, the monthly carrying charge would be higher.

ON WHAT BASIS ARE APPRAISALS MADE?

For GI home loans guaranteed under the GI bill, appraisals must be made by persons approved by VA. These appraisers check to see that the costs of houses do not exceed what is considered their "reasonable value." Present high costs are taken into consideration in determining reasonable values.

FHA appraisers follow a different method when determining the amount of this agency's mortgage insurance. Until recently, FHA appraisals could take into consideration necessary current costs. But the authority to approve this type of loan, under title 6 of the National Housing Act, was not extended by Congress. So present appraisals must be based upon long-term values. This formula, however, has been eased somewhat to meet present conditions. FHA's appraisals put emphasis on economic soundness. And valuation is based on prices that typical buyers would be warranted in paying for homes for long-time use or long-term investments.

In concluding, I appeal to the Congress for action on these vitally important questions of today. We should not adjourn until we have faced up to our responsibilities.

The times are perilous and the days for decision are limited.

(Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain excerpts and extraneous matter.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WANTED: HOMES FOR THE HOMELESS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, not on Shangri-La or Mars but here in the United States and particularly for the 1,307 people of Chelsea, Mass., who are being kicked out of their lodgings to make way for a bridge.

Homes for the dispossessed, not in 1848, or 1958, but now.

Unless we put roofs over the heads of these men, women, and children, the Nation will be forced to the lamentable conclusion that the organized minority which puts property rights above human rights has seized power again.

A mass eviction of 1,307 people in a city of 42,000, people who are working not only to make a living for themselves but to provide assistance to the people of many other nations. Is it not incongruous that our people are asked to do so much with so little regard for their elementary needs?

I am amazed and angered that the desperate problem of housing in the United States is considered with such indifference by the majority party in Congress whose sworn duty it is to work for the common welfare. It is with serious misgivings that I view their claims that they should be entrusted with the responsibility of governing our people.

This is not an academic problem which faces us. It will not be solved by statistics. The real-estate lobby, powerful as it is, cannot make the sun and rain and cold and snow stand by while it has its way. It cannot avert, even if it were so minded, the social frictions, the deterioration of morale, the danger to health and life itself, which are inherent in the stubborn refusal to recognize that we are dealing with human beings and their imperative needs.

Our great and powerful democracy stands challenged on many fronts, but no one of these threats is more serious than the question of its will to do right by its own people.

It is not a question of means, but of purpose. By concentrating on the tree instead of the forest, special interests are even unwittingly undermining the confidence of the people in their Government. I say that those responsible have much to answer for, unless they face up squarely and sincerely to the realities of life in the United States in this year of 1948.

The crisis in housing cannot be postponed.

It is here.

It must be met.

I cite you the predicament of Chelsea, Mass. It is of an emergency nature which no one in his right mind could deny. Maybe it is a special case, but it is symptomatic of the dark and festering sore which is breeding much danger for our society. Perhaps there are some who will refuse to look at the facts and by not seeing them pretend that they do not exist.

The plight of Chelsea brings these bleak facts into sharp and anguished focus.

I wish that you could see pictures of the women with children in their arms who stormed the city hall at Chelsea, waving 113 eviction notices, which give them only until September 1 to move. These are but the vanguard of the 1,307 people who will be dispossessed.

Most of these women were sobbing, some in grief, some in anger. Some were expectant mothers, some have invalids in their families, but all were women, their protective instincts aroused by that which they feared and could not understand. These lives, this true wealth of our Nation, forced to get out to make way for a bridge, with no substitute accommodations available for them.

If you saw this sight I am certain that most of you would forget pride and prejudice and preferment and move swiftly to meet the challenge. Fixed and rigid attitudes would melt and the Members of this House, by whatever compromise or adjustment might be necessary, would provide adequate housing for our displaced fellow Americans.

This House cannot adjourn and close the door to mercy.

In Chelsea it all began with a bridge, authorized by the Legislature of Massachusetts, to cross the Mystic River, connecting Chelsea with Charlestown, Mass. The bridge is necessary to relieve a traffic bottleneck. It is a high-level bridge. Many, many homes must be razed to clear the long approaches to the bridge.

Sounds simple in terms of engineering.

As a preliminary, the bridge authority issued pieces of paper called eviction notices, and the victims were left to shift for themselves.

Of course, there is a chance that an injunction may stave off these evictions. But an injunction is hardly calculated to provide homes.

This is where the Federal Government has the opportunity and the duty to step in and help before the winter comes.

White House, War Assets Administration, War Department, Navy Department, Federal Housing Administration, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and many other agencies—out of these many resources there must be some response to this urgent call for help for the evacuees of Chelsea, Mass., and through this Congress for the millions of Americans who are worried about the housing shortage, in the name of a Government which is representative of the people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Southern Agriculturalist entitled "Life on the Farm," written by one of his constituents.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in six separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MY RECORD IN CONGRESS

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, this is the last time that I shall have the opportunity to address this House, for I am a candidate for United States Senator from Louisiana, for the next regular term of office, in the Democratic primary to be held on August 31, 1948.

For the past 8 years I have represented the Third Louisiana District in Congress excepting the time I served in the United States Army as a private after having resigned my membership from Congress. My record will show, I believe, that I have been diligent, competent, energetic, and faithful in my duties. While naturally my work has been primarily concerned with matters pertaining to my congressional district, I have devoted much time and attention to subjects of interest and importance to the welfare of Louisiana as a whole. I am proud of our great State which offers such great promise of future development. To the residents of my district, and to those living in other congressional districts of Louisiana who may not know me nor my record, I wish to take this occasion to acquaint them with my work in Congress, which I hope may be the means of causing them to favor my candidacy for the United States Senate.

AGRICULTURE

The people of the Third Congressional District are to a large extent dependent upon agriculture for a livelihood. Our rich lands, fertilized by the accumulation of the soils of the Mississippi Valley, are most adaptable to the production of sugarcane, rice, cotton, sweetpotatoes, truck crops, and numerous other agricultural products. Realizing the importance of agriculture, I am constantly devoting attention to the best development of our farm resources, as well as the expansion and development of our livestock and dairy industries. I believe that my record in behalf of agriculture is well known and that I have the good will and confidence of the farmers of my district.

SUGAR

Those connected with the sugar industry, which means so much to the economic welfare of Louisiana, are familiar with my work in its behalf. They know of my leadership in the adoption of necessary legislation, particularly the recent Sugar Act passed by Congress. This act brought more stability and security to the sugar industry than at any time in its history and will be in effect until December 31, 1952. It allows Louisiana and Florida a production quota of 500,000 tons of sugar annually, providing the largest percentage quota increase of any of the domestic areas and permits Louisiana to grow practically all the sugarcane it is now capable of producing, at the same time continuing benefit payments. It was through my efforts that the fair wage and fair price determination provisions of the former sugar act were retained, in keeping with the wishes of the industry.

AID FOR SMALL FARMERS

I have been especially sympathetic to the cause of the small sugar farmers. Through my efforts it was possible to have all sugarcane growers share for the first time in payments on blackstrap molasses and as a result they are enjoying an additional revenue of around 60 cents per ton for sugarcane, which they never received before.

During the labor shortage World War II occasioned I was instrumental in obtaining the service of thousands of prisoners of war for farm work in Louisiana. Without this labor it would have been impossible to harvest our cane crop. During the war I gave much attention to the shortage of farm equipment confronting the farmer and was able to secure for them necessary machinery, trucks, tires, and other items they required for the cultivation and harvesting of the cane crop.

More recently I assisted in obtaining fertilizer for the 1948 cane crop. A serious shortage developed, but through contacts with the Department of Agriculture officials and manufacturers, we were able to relieve the situation.

The sugar industry throughout the years has been unsettled because of its position in international trade; it has frequently been used as a political football. Sugar legislation is the most complicated of all agricultural legislation in Washington. It is only through constant study and experience that one becomes competent in the handling of the various complex problems. I am glad of the knowledge that I have gained in this connection which enables me to be of the greatest possible service.

RICE

Louisiana produces over one-third of the rice that is grown in the United States. Vermilion Parish, in my district,

is the largest rice-producing parish in the country, and rice is also produced in every other parish in the Third Congressional District. The rice farmers and the industry in general have enjoyed prosperity during the last few years. Many of our citizens are engaged in the farming, milling, and marketing of rice. They are aware that I have been active and successful in looking after their interests.

The rice industry has been confronted with many problems during and since World War II, and I have given much attention to these matters. My efforts have been directed toward seeing that adequate markets are made available and fair prices maintained. I have fought the efforts of the Government to assist the production of rice in other countries in competition to our own industry. I opposed the unreasonable Government set-aside policy of allocating American rice to other nations on a basis which greatly limited our domestic supply. This was a blow to the movement to increase the per capita consumption of rice in this country. I have repeatedly pointed out that the per capita consumption must be raised and new uses found for rice if we are to avoid surplus rice production in normal periods.

Last year when the rough-rice market was paralyzed, due to harvesting difficulties and lack of adequate storage space, and the situation was steadily growing worse, I flew to Washington from Louisiana, as Congress was then in recess. After conferences with officials of the Department of Agriculture, a program was worked out by which the Government agreed to purchase a large quantity of rice for foreign relief. This action accelerated the market for rough rice, the mills began to buy, and the Louisiana rice growers were saved from a ruinous loss. Only recently, together with other Members of Congress from rice areas, I headed the movement to prevent the Government from arbitrarily reducing the price to be paid for export rice to foreign countries. If this had occurred it would have resulted in a break in the rice market, and our farmers, as well as millers, would have suffered a great loss this season.

COTTON

The cotton growers will have the benefit of support prices for 1948 of 92½ percent of parity price. Since the indications are of a large crop of cotton this year, this support price may prove valuable in preventing a break in the prices. I worked to help bring about this support price.

SWEETPOTATOES AND SIRUP SURPLUS

The sweetpotato industry in south Louisiana has made great strides. The sirup industry has been in existence since sugarcane was first produced in this country. The war brought about a dislocation in these two industries, placing them in danger of having to curtail operations or stop them altogether. I assisted, with other interested Congressmen, in helping to remove the surplus on sweetpotatoes. We are now assisting the sirup producers to sell the large surplus they have on hand to the Economic Cooperation Administration. I am confident we will be successful.

FARM LEGISLATION

I have advocated and worked for:

First. Support price for cotton.

Second. Parity income for farmers.

Third. Scientific research to discover new uses for farm products.

Fourth. Low interest rate on farm loans.

Fifth. Better farm-tenant program.

Sixth. More stability for family sized farms.

Seventh. Soil-conservation program.

Eighth. Long-range agriculture program.

Ninth. Inclusion of farm wages in determining price of agricultural commodities.

And all other legislation beneficial to the interest of the farmer.

COMMENDED BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Some time ago a constituent of mine wrote the Secretary of Agriculture about my activities in Congress on agricultural matters and I am very glad to produce the Secretary's letter in reply:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 1, 1948.

MR. RAY BREAUX,
Lafayette Parish Farm Bureau,
Carencro, La.

MY DEAR MR. BREAUX: I received your inquiry in behalf of farmers of your section, relative to the activities of Congressman JAMES DOMENGEAUX in agricultural matters.

I have had occasion to observe Congressman DOMENGEAUX's work on many occasions and I can say with the utmost sincerity that he is most energetic, progressive, and effective in representing the farming interests of the Nation and particularly those of the Third Congressional District of Louisiana.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX was very active and forceful in adoption of the present Sugar Act. He is especially helpful to the small farmers. Through his efforts these farmers were able for the first time to share in payments on blackstrap molasses and now enjoy an additional revenue of around 60 cents a ton on sugarcane.

We have felt that in rice matters Congressman DOMENGEAUX has constantly protected the best interests of the farmers, millers, and distributors. When the rice industry faced a crisis last year, due to a paralyzed market for rough rice in the face of an approaching new crop, Congressman DOMENGEAUX, then in Louisiana during the recess of Congress, flew to Washington and conferred with Department of Agriculture officials. Out of these conferences grew a program by which the Department was able to arrange for the purchase of rice for relief purposes abroad.

The sweetpotato people also have a real friend in Congressman DOMENGEAUX, who has likewise faithfully looked after the interests of the cotton industry, the truck farmers, and others engaged in agricultural endeavors.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX has frequently conferred with me and it has been a pleasure to cooperate with him.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

When I first came to Congress 8 years ago, REA was an infant. Notwithstanding the shortage of materials resulting from the war, this program has developed to the extent that thousands of farms in my congressional district and numerous thousands elsewhere are now serviced with electricity. I hope to see the day when every farm in Louisiana and throughout the Nation will be able to obtain electric service. Farm life must be made easier so as to encourage more people to stay on the farms. Just as soon as it is humanly possible to do so, those living on farms everywhere in the United States should be able to enjoy the same electrical conveniences as those in the towns and cities. I have always supported adequate appropriations to maintain and develop this service and will continue to do so.

SEA-FOOD INDUSTRY

Louisiana is widely famed for its delicious sea foods. Much of the commercial fishing centers in my congressional district, which borders on the Gulf of Mexico, and its numerous bays, lakes, and bayous. Thousands of our people make a livelihood from the production and marketing of shrimp, oysters, and other sea food. This brings to them and to our State many millions of dollars annually.

Throughout my service in Congress I have constantly devoted time to looking after the welfare and development of the steadily growing sea-food industry. I have done this because I realize the Gulf of Mexico offers to our people an inexhaustible means of wealth. No one knows how great the possibilities are. I am confident, however, that the income of our citizens can be increased many millions of dollars a year through scientific and intelligent approach to the various problems confronting the fishing industry. We must determine with accuracy just what these resources are and how best to utilize them. I have recently proposed legislation that I have every reason to believe can be passed at the next session of Congress, which will provide an appropriation of $500,000 for the purpose of providing the necessary research work in behalf of the fishing industry of the Gulf coast. Due to wartime activities and shortage of personnel it has been difficult to collect fishery statistics in that area.

The oyster industry can be greatly expanded. At the present time we do not use more than 10 percent of potential tidal bottoms which could be utilized for oyster production. The Louisiana oyster industry has expanded in the past few years, but mass mortality of oysters has seriously threatened the continued existence of that industry.

CRABS

Louisiana could produce more crab meat than any other State, yet it falls much below Maryland and Virginia in this respect. We could increase our crab production tremendously. No study of a biological nature has been made of the menhaden; still there was a greater poundage of menhaden produced in the United States in 1946 and 1947 than any other species of fish. Only a small percentage of this came from the Gulf, although it is well known that menhaden are abundant in these waters.

This may be a critical period in the shrimp fishery. The shrimp catch has remained about the same, notwithstanding the fact there have been many new boats added for shrimp fishing. We have not learned sufficient about the biology of the shrimp, and it is estimated that an annual production valued at $100,000,000 is in prospect if properly developed.

Very little is known of the life history of such valuable sport and commercial fishes as speckled trout, redfish, croakers, sheephead, mullet, and tarpon. The passage of this bill that I have introduced, together with an appropriation, will make it possible to increase our sea-food production many millions of dollars. I pledge myself to work untiringly to secure the passage of this legislation.

MEXICO SHRIMP IMPORTATIONS

Louisiana shrimp interests are being menaced by the increasing importation of Mexican shrimp. Mexico enjoys an advantage because of cheap labor. To protect the many producers and packers in Louisiana and other Gulf States, I have introduced legislation providing that the total importation from Mexico of fresh, iced, canned, and processed shrimp into the United States in any one calendar year shall not exceed the largest total quantity of such importations during any calendar year between January 1, 1942, and December 31, 1945. Imports restricted to this period would be relatively small.

OYSTER REHABILITATION

The Louisiana oyster industry sustained heavy losses in the Mississippi River flood of 1945. I succeeded in having a bill enacted for an appropriation of $50,000 for a survey to be made by the Fish and Wildlife Service to determine the extent of this damage and method of rehabilitating the beds. After this survey is completed I will endeavor to secure additional funds so as to reimburse those oyster producers who suffered this loss.

I am particularly gratified by the passage of this legislation because it establishes a precedent that the Government must be responsible for damages that may be sustained through the use of flood-control projects, such as the Atchafalaya-Morganza-Bonne Carre spillway.

The sea-food industry in Louisiana has enjoyed much prosperity during the last few years. I am glad that I have been able to contribute in many ways to the welfare and development of this great industry, and I pledge my continued efforts in this direction.

WATERWAY AND FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control and improvement of our waterways are most important to the safety and success of our people. Louisiana, particularly the Third Congressional District, until recent years has suffered from disastrous inundation, and flood control is a subject close to all of us. The Mississippi River and its tributaries drain approximately one-third of the United States, and much of these waters eventually descend on Louisiana. Much progress in protecting our area against floods has been made, but much remains to be done.

ATCHAFALAYA BASIN—MORGANZA SPILLWAY

Of foremost importance to flood control in our area is the need for completing work on the Atchafalaya spillway. Congress recently appropriated some $6,000,000 toward completing the project.

PROJECTS AIDED

I have constantly devoted my efforts in behalf of flood control, improvement of waterways, and establishment of new facilities. In this connection I might refer to the Bayou Carlin-Delcambre Canal; Bayou Lafourche; Bayou Boeuf; Bayous Little Caillou, Grand Caillou, Dularge, and Terrebonne; Bayou L'Eau Bleu; Teche-Vermilion program which recently received an additional appropriation of $600,000; Schooner Bayou, and other necessary projects.

I opposed, together with the people of the Morgan City-Berwick area, the inadequate floodgate proposed by the United States engineers in Bayou Boeuf. I will continue my efforts to have an adequate lock constructed instead.

Our people are seriously dependent upon our networks of bayous and other streams not only for adequate drainage but in their everyday pursuits. It is my plan and purpose to eventually secure an authorization and appropriation for the dredging of our many streams that flow into the Gulf, so as to afford our people the opportunity for full utilization of these waterways.

For quite some time I have been working with the people of the parishes of Assumption and Terrebonne to assist them in securing fresh waters in Bayou Lafourche at Napoleonville. The United States engineers are now studying this proposal and as soon as it is recommended I will continue my efforts toward securing the necessary funds to complete this project.

WATER HYACINTH AND ALLIGATOR GRASS ERADICATION

The problem of the water hyacinths and alligator grass which congest so many streams in Louisiana and other States is a matter of much concern. These water plants interfere with our drainage, obstruct navigation, menace health, and are killing our fish and wildlife. They cause many millions of dollars of damage to the State. I have realized this problem and in February of 1945 I secured an appropriation of $78,000 to make it possible for the United States engineers, the Department of Agriculture, the United States Public Health Service, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife of the Interior Department to conduct a comprehensive study and survey of the problem in order to find means of eradicating this menace once and for all. This scientific study and survey are now being made. Experimentation in the use of chemicals is under way, and I hope that within a short time an economical and practical method may be found, through these agencies, to do the job of extermination. I have a bill pending to appropriate $25,000,000 over a period of years for this purpose. The reports from the departments will be in shortly, and in the next Congress it is my plan to secure at least $5,000,000 to start the program of killing the water lily and alligator grass in all of our streams.

VETERANS

I am particularly happy to be of assistance to veterans and their dependents. I feel that the veterans, who made great sacrifices, are entitled to every consideration that the Federal Government is able to give them. I have always given close attention to their needs and have been able to help thousands of ex-servicemen who have written to me about their problems.

I had the privilege of serving as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which afforded me the opportunity of taking part in the preparation and enactment of much veteran legislation, including the GI bill of rights.

VETERAN BONUS

I advocate a veteran bonus; the payment of which is a direct responsibility of the Federal Government. My plan would pay the veteran $3 for every day spent while in the service in this country, and $5 for every day spent while in foreign service. In other words the veteran who served 3 years in any branch of the armed forces, two of which were overseas would receive $4,745.

WHAT VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS SAY

The best evidence of my service and achievements in behalf of the veterans and their dependents is contained in the following letters from national representative of major veterans' organizations:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1948.

MR. J. ELLIOTT CADE,
Past Vice Commander, the American Legion, Department of Louisiana,
Abbeville, La.

DEAR MR. CADE: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 6, asking for the legislative record of Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, the Congressman from the Third Louisiana District.

As you know, he is a World War II veteran and a member of the American Legion.

In addition to the voting record, which I am attaching hereto, I might add that he has taken a very active interest in legislation affecting veterans, and in particular bills which we have requested him to introduce on our behalf. During the Eightieth Congress he introduced for us H. R. 1342, exempting from income tax individual income up to $5,000 earned in certain taxable years following discharge; and H. R. 3691, providing for the continuance of compensation of pension payments and subsistence allowance for certain children of deceased veterans of World War I and World War II during education and training.

When he was a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee he visited a number of veterans' hospitals in connection with the inspection program authorized by that committee and as a result of which there was a complete reorganization of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration.

I trust this is the information which you desire.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Commission.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1948.

Mr. SIDNEY DAIGLE,
Past Commander DAV,
Lafayette, La.

DEAR MR. DAIGLE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 1, requesting information as to the legislative record of the Honorable JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Representative of the Third Louisiana District. In reply please be advised that so far as veterans' legislation is concerned, we of the DAV have found Congressman DOMENGEAUX most helpful and cooperative.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX has always taken special interest in the welfare of veterans and has sponsored much legislation in their behalf. This included the increase granted in the rates of compensation, pension, and retirement pay of veterans of both World Wars and their dependents. He is author of a bill to extend to children of men who died in World War II the educational benefits of the GI bill of rights. He has sought tax relief for veterans of World War II, and the enactment of a measure which he introduced in Congress has made it possible for veterans to have priority in purchasing surplus boats, 65 feet in length or under, from the Government.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX was formerly a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in which connection he was particularly active. He took a prominent part in adoption of the GI bill of rights and as a one-man subcommittee inspected various veterans' hospitals. His recommendations for improved conditions undoubtedly influenced to a considerable extent the reorganization of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration. His record as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was excellent from the viewpoint of veteran organizations. He is now a member of another committee, but has retained his great interest in veterans' legislation.

I hope this information will be of assistance to you in your chapter.

Yours very sincerely,
FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Director for National Legislation.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1948.

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to advise that to the best of my knowledge and belief Representative JAMES DOMENGEAUX, of Louisiana, has a most favorable record in the Congress of the United States with respect to legislation affecting veterans and dependents of veterans. This office, as legislative spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, has always found Mr. DOMENGEAUX sympathetic and cooperative to our legislative program.

No effort has been made by this office to appraise Mr. DOMENGEAUX's record on legislation other than that which affects veterans and their dependents because it is not within the province or jurisdiction of this office to judge a Member of Congress except on his record dealing with veteran affairs. Mr. DOMENGEAUX was at one time a member of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation which handled the bulk of veteran legislation in the House of Representatives and his record as a member of that committee was excellent from the viewpoint of veteran organizations.

Very truly yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM, *Director.*

AMVETS,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1948.

MY DEAR MR. DOMENGEAUX: In behalf of the American Veterans of World War II, better known as the AMVETS, I wish to take this means of expressing the appreciation of our organization for your efforts in Congress in behalf of the veterans and their dependents. We have observed your outstanding record in veterans' legislation matters and we are also familiar with the assistance you have given so many veterans with their individual problems. As you are yourself a veteran you are in an excellent position to best understand our views and our needs.

We are particularly grateful for your work in sponsoring legislation increasing the rates of compensation, pension, and retirement pay for veterans of both world wars and their dependents. You are also to be commended for the introduction of a bill to provide income tax relief for veterans of World War II.

You recognized a duty the Nation owes to the memory of the men who died in World War II, by introducing legislation to extend to their children the educational benefits of the GI bill of rights.

You made it possible, through another measure in Congress, for veterans of World War II to have priority in the purchase of surplus boats of 65 feet in length or under, and you took a very active part in the enactment of legislation enabling veterans to convert their terminal leave bonds into cash.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs you had a prominent part in the preparation and adoption of the GI bill of rights. Also as a member of the committee your energetic and thorough inspection of veterans' hospitals and your recommendations in this connection were followed by the reorganization of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration, a step which had long been necessary.

We are very glad to take this opportunity to express our thanks.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT E. MCLAUGHLIN,
National Legislative Director.

I took an active part in the enactment of legislation to provide housing facilities for veterans. I was also active in the movement to provide terminal leave payments and to convert these bonds into cash. Through my efforts several additional offices of the Veterans' Administration were established in Louisiana to better meet local requirements.

MUSKRAT INDUSTRY

Large numbers of our citizens depend upon the fur industry for their livelihood. Muskrat fur trapping is a very important one in the Third Louisiana District. I have looked after the interests of the trappers at all times, particularly in the matter of a just return for their labor and securing for them fair prices for their skins. During OPA days I made a determined fight for lifting the ceiling price on muskrat fur, as the ceiling that had been established was creating a black market and working hardships on those engaged in trapping.

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

I consider that it is necessary for the Federal Government to assist our schools. I recognize that our teachers throughout the Nation are underpaid for the great work and responsibility that they shoulder. The problem involved in providing proper educational facilities and adequate salaries for teachers has become too extensive for the States to bear alone. There is no good reason why the Federal Government should not help in this matter. It is a national problem like health or safety or highways. It is a matter of national interest and national responsibility. Of course, we must guard against Federal control of schools. Bills that Congress considered during this session provide this safeguard. I regret that Congress did not enact these bills into law. I pledge and promise myself to see that this legislation is reintroduced in the next Congress and will work untiringly for its successful enactment.

FREE SCHOOL LUNCHES

Without the aid of the Federal Government, Louisiana and other States, would not be able to give free school lunches to our school children. The Federal Government has contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly to the State of Louisiana for this purpose and you may be assured that I will continue my efforts in seeing that these appropriations are continued so that school children of our State may be assured of appetizing and nutritious school lunches.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

It is the duty of the Federal Government to look after the welfare of our old people who need help. Surely they should not be forced to face privation and disaster after they have worked hard all of their lives. The Government can and should give them the assurance of security in their last years.

The Federal Government now contributes up to $25 per month payment for the old folks and the blind and up to $13.50 per month for dependent children. I am glad to state that only a few days ago Congress adopted legislation which will increase Federal payments to the old folks and the blind $5 a month and to dependent children $3 a month.

Our State has long struggled with the problem to furnish aid to the aged, the blind, and dependent children. Without Federal cooperation State aid would amount to comparatively little. If increases are to be granted, as have been planned in Louisiana, and elsewhere, it is necessary that the Federal Government offer additional benefits. The action of Congress makes this possible.

AUTHOR OF OLD-AGE PENSION BILL

When I first came to Congress in 1940 I introduced an old-age pension bill which would have provided at least $30 per month. This represented a substantial sum at that time, but because of the high cost of living today this amount is not adequate. For that reason I have introduced another bill known as H. R. 6638 which would provide direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $60 per month to citizens 60 years of age or over.

I am sure that you realize that in Louisiana today over half of the money that goes toward paying an old-age pension is paid by the Federal Government. I am glad to state that I have voted and advocated these payments and will continue my efforts toward assisting the old people of the State.

TIDELANDS

The protection of the rights of the States to submerged lands within their respective boundaries is of vast importance to Louisiana. The income from these lands, through oil leases and otherwise, go to the State and parishes and make many public improvements possible, as well as contributing greatly to the financial support of our schools. Recently the United States Supreme Court held that these tidelands belonged to the United States instead of to the respective States. Louisiana stands to lose over one billion dollars by this decision.

LEADS FIGHT

Shortly after the United States Supreme Court decision I introduced legislation in the House of Representatives for the purpose of having the Congress declare these lands belong to the States. The House of Representatives recently passed a measure which included the provisions of the bill I introduced. Unfortunately the Senate failed to vote on this legislation. As this is so important to the State of Louisiana, and since we stand to lose over $1,000,000,000, which is ten hundred thousand million, I, in the new Congress next year, will do everything in my power to reenact this legislation with the hope that it will successfully pass the Congress.

TAX REDUCTION

Tax reduction is necessary for the health of the American economic system and as a precaution against depression periods.

I voted for the income-tax reduction bill in Congress this year because it was greatly needed for relief of the American taxpayer from an excessive tax burden. I will continue to vote for tax reduction at every opportunity, providing it does not impair our national security and stability.

American business should be granted every opportunity to exercise free enterprise and initiative, with the least possible Government interference. Small business should be especially protected. There has been entirely too much Government regulation of business, even in time of war. I have consistently opposed moves toward business regimentation by the Federal Government, and have opposed legislation that would endanger small business because of monopolistic policies.

I have frequently criticized bureaucratic government and warned against increasing Federal control. The Government is intended to be the servant of the people, not the people the servants of the Government. States' rights must be respected and the principle of local government recognized to the fullest extent. The Federal pay roll should be watched carefully and all possible reductions made, consistent with good public service.

THE SOUTH AND CIVIL RIGHTS

I have fought at every opportunity the so-called civil-rights program recently advocated by the President at the expense of the South. I will continue to do so, for this is a matter that strikes at those natural rights which we in the South enjoy as a heritage from our forefathers, who established the principles of States' rights and self-government.

Prominent in the civil-rights program is the proposal for Fair Employment Practices Committee. This would mean Federal control over private business; the right to say whom a businessman should employ, regardless of race or color. The FEPC would destroy initiative and free enterprise.

The civil-rights program is opposed to segregation of the white and Negro races. If this idea was put into effect it would be a body blow to the South and to her people who know best how to handle the Negro situation.

Those who argue for antilynching legislation and an anti-poll-tax law, the abolishment of segregation, or for the FEPC disregard the fact that the first three would be an illegal invasion of States' rights and the latter an encroachment upon the fundamental conception of free enterprise.

The whole South must join in this fight, for those things which the South hold sacred are in danger of being destroyed. You can depend upon me to make this fight to the bitter end.

MY SERVICES APPRECIATED

I am very much gratified over the numerous expressions of appreciation regarding the services I render. The following extracts are taken from some of the many letters, telegrams, and other communications addressed to me by my constituents and others from my district:

It is with pleasure I write to express my gratitude for your approval of the Federal aid to education bills. We of Terrebonne Parish hope that no complications will arise to prevent you from giving them your continued support.

MRS. ODESSA BARIN,
Schriever Route, Box 126.

Be it resolved, That the teachers of Terrebonne Parish commend Representative JAMES DOMENGEAUX and express their appreciation to him for the interest that he has taken in the affairs of the teachers and children of the State and Nation. (From resolution adopted by Terrebonne Parish Teachers Association, Marguerite E. Watkins, chairman.)

GERMANY, *January 2, 1945.*

I really admired your action in resigning from Congress to join the Army as a private. I'm sorry you had to get out on a medical discharge, but I feel that a guy like you can do us more good in Washington than as a private anyway.

Lt. WILLIAM J. DODD
(Now Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana.)

Thank you and your office for the splendid cooperation in getting adequate housing here for veterans. With the completion of the apartments at the airport and the 118 which were recently constructed on the campus, I feel that the problem is well on the way toward being solved. We deeply appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

JOEL L. FLETCHER,
President of Southwestern Louisiana Institute.

My people join with me in expressing their appreciation and thanks for the fine cooperation given to the town of Thibodaux in getting planning money from the Federal Works Agency for our city projects. Accept personal thanks from me.

CHAS. E. DELAS, *Mayor.*

I received a copy of your remarks on increased pay for servicemen. I am proud to know that you are still fighting for us and for our people at home. I am one of the happiest soldiers in the service to know that I have not been forgotten by our Congressman.

Pvt. PAUL J. BREAUX.

It is with pleasure I write to thank and congratulate you for your good work and your support as a Member of Congress from Louisiana in increasing the pay for men in our armed forces. I felt proud to show all the boys in our company how you have done your part in passing the bill we have been waiting for so long. You will never be forgotten.

Pvt. CLAUDE JUDICE.

I wish to thank you for the help you gave me in obtaining for my son, Charles L. Broussard, his subsistence pay while attending the Acme Neon Institute in Chicago. Charles is very appreciative also of your kindness in this matter and sends his best regards.

MRS. J. L. BROUSSARD,
New Iberia, La.

The Lafayette Parish World War II Veterans' Association extends its thanks and appreciation for the assistance and splendid cooperation which you have rendered in our campaign for veterans' housing and fair rent rates.

CHARLES PERILLOUX,
President.

Your efforts to secure an effective priority rating for the owners of power boats in the fishing industry is very much appreciated by the owners and operators of such boats.

C. E. KING,
THE MORGAN CITY REVIEW,
Morgan City, La.

The Jeanerette Chamber of Commerce wishes to express its thanks for your prompt efforts in helping us to maintain the dairy at the Iberia Live Stock Experiment Farm. It is our hope that the experimental farm will be allotted sufficient funds for continuation.

L. C. LAMPO, JR.,
Secretary-Manager, Jeanerette Chamber of Commerce.

I want to thank you for your interest and good work in behalf of the United States postal employees' H. R. 5089. This increase in pay is much needed by all. We know we can always count on you for a helping hand.

JOSEPH E. BLANCHARD,
Postmaster, Raceland, La.

Thanks for everything, and if I can ever repay you in any way for the interest you are taking in me, all you have to do is tell me what I can do for you.

RUFUS W. FONTENOT,
New Orleans.

I wish to thank you for your telegram received today about my son, Wilson M. O'Niell, who is in England in a hospital. Your news was very welcome, and I assure you Anne and I both appreciate your efforts in the matter.

W. MCKERALL O'NIELL,
Franklin, La.

At our recent Louisiana parent-teacher convention in Lafayette, our organization reaffirmed its belief in the urgent need of Federal aid to education. We appreciate all your efforts in helping to secure this legislation.

MRS. W. S. VINCENT,
President.

I really believe this editorial represents the opinion of a great majority of the people of this section. (Editorial referred to appeared in Lafayette Daily Advertiser of June 18, 1946.

commending Members of Louisiana delegation in the House of Representatives for voting to override the Presidential veto of tax-reduction bill. It stated in part: "Congressman JAMES DOMENGEAUX was lined up with the Louisiana delegation and the Democrats who crossed the party line in the effort to save some money for the overburdened taxpayer. The Third District is to be congratulated that its Congressman had the welfare of the people at heart and that he was not concerned in the expediency of politics.")

A. P. ELLIOTT,
Lafayette, La.

You have read my wishes in your demands on President Truman regarding rice and sugar. I am as yet wondering why the unadulterated discrimination against southern farmers. Glory to you.

DR. A. A. COMEAUX,
Abbeville, La.

I wish to take this means to tell you that your vote on matters of importance have coincided with my views most of the time and have met with my hearty approval.

G. O. PHARR,
New Iberia, La.

I want to take this means of thanking you for all that you have done for me in settling a travel claim. Final payments have been received.

JOHN R. REAUX, *Veteran,*
Lafayette, La.

With reference to our phone conversation and the wires we exchanged, I wish to express my appreciation for the efforts you put forth and the manner in which you kept us posted on developments. Your bill on the oyster situation is causing much favorable comment from the oyster people around here, and it is another act for which you are being highly commended.

DONALD BOLLINGER,
Lockport, La.

I was very much interested and impressed by the speech you delivered in Congress and wish to tell you that this country needs your type of Representative in Congress who is not afraid to express his beliefs. Keep up the good work. We are with you.

GUST CATSULIS,
New Iberia, La.

Just to let you know I deeply appreciated your prompt attention and answer to my inquiry. Mrs. Duhon and I both thank you for your kind and courteous service.

J. O. DUHON, M. D.,
Lafayette, La.

At a recent meeting of our organization we discussed with elation the manner in which you supported the passage of our retirement bill. We unanimously resolved to take the pleasure and the privilege of thanking you for your interest in our legislation.

ABRAHAM KOKOCINSKI,
President,
CLARENCE O. LEBLANC,
Secretary,
Branch 1760, National Association of Letter Carriers.

The board of directors of the Lafayette Chamber of Commerce unanimously endorse your splendid effort to have flood-control appropriations restored by President. Activation and completion of these important works are economically justified and should provide beneficial returns to State and Nation. We commend your action and offer our continued help to further this cause.

LAFAYETTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
LEE G. LAFOSSE,
Secretary-Manager.

We want to thank you for the special effort and attention you have shown in behalf of the sirup manufacturers of Louisiana. We will be glad to furnish any information you may need.

C. S. STEEN SYRUP MILL, INC.,
J. WESLEY STEEN,
Abbeville.

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for the work you have been doing in behalf of the Louisiana sirup manufacturers. The situation is very serious with quite a number of us, and unless we get some relief through the Government purchasing a large quantity of the 1947 crop it is going to be tough sledding. Please keep up the good work; I am sure you will do all that you can to help out.

HALL GRAIN & SYRUP CO.,
H. T. HALL,
Manager, New Iberia.

I want to let you know that the people around here are for you. They appreciate the things you have done for us in Congress.

LYDIA COMEAUX,
Milton, La.

I want to thank you on behalf of the Vermilion Parish Teachers' Association for your support.

NOAH LANGLINAIS,
President, Indian Bayou, La.

I want to commend you on the stand you took relative to increasing the pay of men in the armed forces. I have two sons in the country's service. Needless to say I am proud of them, but I too think the boys who have had to give up their home life deserve an increase in pay. So again I congratulate you on your noble stand.

MRS. LLOYD B. MILLER,
Abbeville, La.

This is to express the sincere appreciation of the large segment of the rice industry which we represent, for your untiring efforts and the splendid contribution which you made in having the administrative agencies of the Government provide an export allocation for rice, principally for shipment to Cuba. This allocation, although long and unnecessarily delayed, will permit millers and exporters to dispose of the surplus from the 1947 crop, and enable producers to prepare for the 1948 crop with some assurance of being able to obtain a fair price.

THE RICE MILLER'S ASSOCIATION,
W. M. REID,
Executive Vice President.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the favor rendered my son, Edward, and myself. It is nice to have friends that you can depend on when you are in trouble and that is exactly what you have done for us. Edward was in the Marines and wounded three times, and is still a little nervous. Not receiving his pay did not help matters at all. Through your kind efforts the check has been received.

LARRY LOGAN, *Lafayette, La.*

I was fortunate enough to read a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which you put up a fight for the soldiers' increase in pay. May I congratulate you for the work and effort put forth on that bill. I hope every father and soldier in the Third District realize the good work you have done.

J. J. PRINCE,
Lafayette, La.

Thanks for your vote and support of farm bloc bill regarding new formula for parity price. Keep up the fight we know you can put up and will. We appreciate your work.

LAFAYETTE PARISH FARM BUREAU,
S. A. CALLAHAN,
President, Lafayette, La.

Your brilliant work played an important part in winning the game. Congratulations. We are solid behind you.

A. O. RAPPELET,
Houma, La.

I want to thank you for your efforts in the matter of automobile deal discounts before the House Small Business Committee. Your interest and efforts in this matter are very much appreciated and I hope you will continue them toward a just settlement.

JOS. A. DAIGRE,
President, New Iberia Austo Co., New Iberia.

I want to sincerely thank you for your wholehearted efforts which resulted in the announcement of decontrol of all types of shrimp. In behalf of the industry and your many friends here, and for myself, please accept sincere thanks.

JULIAN MCPHILLIPS,
Chairman, Shrimp Industry Advisory Committee.

Moved by Mr. Howard Olivier, seconded by Mr. Roy LaBauve, that the police jury of Iberia Parish extends its expression of gratitude to United States Representative JAMES DOMENGEAUX for his good work in trying to have Government controls removed from sugar and rice. Motion carried. (From minutes of meeting of police jury of Iberia Parish, November 14, and submitted by Marcul Deblanc, secretary and treasurer.)

It is with gratitude that I express my sincere appreciation for your continued and successful effort concerning the dredging of the mouth of Bayou Lafourche. I cannot overemphasize the value of this project and what it means to our industry and I take pleasure in assuring you that I and the community will be ever grateful.

E. MILTON EGLE,
Golden Meadow, La.

OFFICE POLICY

Since I have been in Congress I have followed certain policies which have enabled me to render careful and able service to my constituents:

First. Answer mail promptly.

Second. I never ask "For whom did you vote in the last election?" I ask, "What can I do to help you?"

Third. Always remember that each day is a day closer to the next election when an accounting must be made.

Fourth. There is no unimportant problem to the constituent who seeks the aid of his Congressman, and if it is important to my constituent it is important to me.

Fifth. There are no factions or political lines after the vote is counted. A good Congressman is everybody's Congressman.

Sixth. It does not matter who you are, what you are or where you came from. If you think enough of me to ask my help, I think enough of you to do all I can to help.

Seventh. I cannot do everything, but I do everything I can.

Eighth. A direct question justifies a direct answer. It must either be "Yes" or "No."

Ninth. You may not agree with me but you will always know where I stand.

Tenth. I am hired by the people of the Third District to represent them. It is a 24-hour job. I have no other business or interest, except that of being a good Congressman—and being a good Congressman takes undivided attention and time. I will carry on these same policies should I be elected to the Senate.

THANK YOU

Louisiana has been good to me—I was born a poor boy and worked my way through school. I have had some little measure of success. My people who are of French and Irish blood have lived in Lafayette Parish for over 200 years; they joined with the Anglo-Saxons of north Louisiana to fight for the South—a close blood relative, Gen. Alfred Mouton, gave his life to the cause at the battle of Mansfield.

I present this record as proof of my ability to fill a higher public office. I greatly appreciate the honor the people of the Third Louisiana Congressional District conferred upon me when they elected me to represent them in Congress, and the approval of my work as expressed by my overwhelming re-election for the past three terms to office. I hope that I have the opportunity of rendering still more service to the State and Nation as a Member of the United States Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EVINS, for 3 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. COOPER, for 3 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. PRIEST, for remainder of week, on account of important business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2482. An act to amend sections 2 and 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451, U. S. C., 718b), as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), under previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 4, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1705. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of pig iron for certain industries requiring cast iron for the manufacture of products for residential housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1706. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the tenth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1707. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the progress report for the second quarter of 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1708. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the sixteenth quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period April 1 through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1709. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report including the name of each claimant, a statement of the amount claimed and the amount awarded, and a brief description of the claims against the Central Intelligence Agency during the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1710. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certified copies of acts of the Sixth Special Session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, May 14 to 21, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1711. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 totaling $11,305,800 (H. Doc. No. 736); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1712. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Navy Department under the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 7088. A bill to extend the benefits of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 to certain employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia not covered by that act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 7089. A bill for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a post office at Winchester, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 7090. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Iuka, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 7091. A bill to provide certain equitable adjustments in disability compensation and pension to meet the rise in the cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7092. A bill for the relief of Claire M. Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 7093. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stamatia Lymberopoulos and Leonidas Stavrou Limperopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7094. A bill for the relief of 29 Latvians who entered the United States on July 22, 1948, at Provincetown, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 7095. A bill to record the lawful admission of Ibrahim Wadie Harb to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 7096. A bill for the relief of George N. Weaver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7097. A bill for the relief of certain Latvians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2139. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Genevieve Hartig Toth and others, of Osceola, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to building a lasting peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 3, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 28, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal God, who art the light of all that is true, the strength of all that is good, and the inspiration of all that is beautiful, we thank Thee for the joys which cheer us and for the trials which teach us to put our trust in Thee.

Help us to discipline ourselves to obey Thy will more perfectly, for in the doing of Thy will is our peace. Make us victorious over those despondent and cynical tempers of mind which at times eclipse our faith.

May we accept the Master's overtures of counsel and companionship in order that we may carry on courageously. Grant that His principles of righteousness and justice may be the foundation on which we are seeking to build a more glorious nation and a better world.

In His name we bring our petitions. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 2, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AS TO NIGHT SESSION, ETC.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make one or two announcements for the benefit of Members of the Senate. In view of the fact that we are still on the motion to take up House bill 29, on which motion a cloture petition to limit debate was filed, and since several speeches are to be made, including at least one or this side of the aisle, to be delivered by the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], running to the constitutionality of the bill—and I know of two or three Senators on the other side of the aisle who would like to speak on that point—we will endeavor to keep the Senate in session, if it meets with the approval of the Members of the Senate, until 10 o'clock tonight. Announcement about night sessions after that will be made tomorrow. So I trust all Senators will take notice and will be on the floor listening to the constitutional arguments, which I think should

be made on the subject matter of the bill rather than on the motion to proceed to its consideration, but, because of the parliamentary situation, the speeches will have to be made on the motion.

I should also like to state to Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle that it is expected that a conference will be called tomorrow by our chairman, and for that reason, and the additional reason that a night session will be had tonight, if our plans are carried out, the Senate will convene tomorrow at 1 o'clock p. m., instead of 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. President, I should also like to make a statement relative to the cloture petition and the signatures attached thereto. At the time the petition was presented yesterday I thought that all Senators on either side of the aisle who wanted to join in it might go to the desk and have their names attached, but a strict interpretation of the rule foreclosed that. Therefore, I should like to say that several other Senators who would have liked to sign the petition did not have an opportunity to affix their signatures to it, one of whom is the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and others no doubt could be mentioned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the other Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] also desired and asked to sign the petition, but was foreclosed for the reason stated by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to be perfectly fair about it. It was my intention that all Senators who desired to do so might sign the petition, but, as I have said, under a strict interpretation of the rule, that could not be done. A number of Senators who would have liked to have signed the petition did not have an opportunity to affix their signatures to it.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TUMON BAY AREA (GUAM)—RESOLUTION OF GUAM CONGRESS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a copy of a resolution adopted by the Guam Congress protesting against the acquisition of the Tumon Bay area, Guam, for military purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims for damage caused by naval vessels which have been settled by the Navy Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED TO UNITED STATES NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of claims for damage caused to United States naval vessels by the Navy Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents in the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Claude A. Blair, of Springfield, Mass., relating to old-age assistance, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROTEST AGAINST FURTHER ENCROACHMENT OF GOVERNMENT IN HOUSING BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Oregon State Medical Society protesting against any further encroachment of the Federal Government in the housing business.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the health and medical care of the indigent and semi-indigent have been and continue to be a major concern of the medical profession; and

Whereas the housing of the individual is one of the important factors in the preservation of health and the prevention of disease; and

Whereas the advocates of Federal paternalism are proposing, on the basis of sentimental appeal and play upon humanitarian emotions, a vast program of public housing ostensibly to meet the needs of the indigent and semi-indigent; and

Whereas this program is deceptive in that it does not provide housing for the chronically ill, the indigent, the unemployable, the casual worker, or the very low wage earner, since they cannot make the regular payments required by the contract, even with exemption from State and local taxes; and

Whereas the proponents of this legislation openly admit that this program will put the Federal Government permanently into the business and control of all housing, with the elimination of private housing; and

Whereas similar public housing programs have been disastrous failures throughout Europe, in that they did not produce more houses, they did not produce houses for the poor, they did not remove slums, and they did not reduce the prevalence of disease, but did become dangerous drains on the national treasuries; and

Whereas these European government housing programs were one of the principal means by which socialistic cabinets and parliaments captured control; and

Whereas similar tendencies have already appeared in the propaganda machines of many housing authorities in this country, in the political corruption involved in the placement of housing projects, and in the selection of tenants: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this body record its unqualified opposition to any further encroachment of the Federal Government in the housing business.

BLACK CANYON PROJECT OF BOISE-PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, when the Department of Interior appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949 was considered during the second session of the Eightieth Congress, a cut of $175,000 was made in budget requests for the Black Canyon project of the Boise-Payette division in Idaho. Commissioner Straus and Regional Director Newell of the Bureau of Reclamation have advised settlers on this project that unless this money is appropriated, 6,000 acres will not get water this coming year.

I urge the President and Budget Bureau to resubmit and the Appropriation Committees to approve this small but vital appropriation request during this special session, so that we may fulfill our portion of the contract made with these Idaho farmers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, an article from the Boise Valley Herald on July 29, 1948, entitled "Project Settlers Hold Remonstrance Meet," a letter from A. Cornell, which is typical of the many I have received from people in the Middleton area, and a resolution from the Black Canyon Settlers' Organization.

There being no objection, the editorial, letter, and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boise Valley Herald, Middleton, Canyon County, Idaho, July 29, 1948]

PROJECT SETTLERS HOLD REMONSTRANCE MEET

A hundred and twenty-five Black Canyon settlers filled the Sand Hollow community hall last night to remonstrate with Congress over the delay in providing the final $175,000 for the completion of their already much too long delayed irrigation project. The part of the project affected by this spirit of congressional crawfishin' economy lies north and northeast of Middleton. It comprises 100 farm units. The trunk-line ditches are ready for the water; and provisions have already been made for financing the construction of the wasteways, and the contract has been let, we understand, for this construction.

Unless the $175,000 is allowed on or before August 5, the very vital lateral-system part of the project will be in default and the long-awaiting settlers will not be able to proceed with their work for next year's crops.

The last night meeting passed a resolution petitioning Congress to correct its error it made in its effort to economize, and replace the amount once promised, but now held in abeyance, so that the settlers can go forward with their work.

BOISE VALLEY HERALD,
Middleton, Idaho, July 30, 1948.

Senators DWORSHAK and TAYLOR.

MY DEAR SENATORS: I asume you are aware that the United States Government entered into a contract with what we know locally as the Black Canyon irrigation district to construct its project for the purpose of supplying water for crop growing within the limits of its metes and bounds. I assume you are aware that settlers, as their part of fulfilling that contract, have had to plan ahead (for years ahead) and be in readiness to apply themselves and their working resources to the limit of their economic ability as well as their physical ability, and that by far the major part of that planning—which in most cases is for the balance of their life expectancy—is predicated on that contract in which the United States Government pledges its honor and its credit to fulfill.

I assume, Senators, that you accept the premise that when a contract is entered into relative to any project, that the obligations apply to the project as a whole, a unit, and not merely to a part or fraction of it.

Whether or not there was a time limit set for the completion of the project, it was a reasonable and prudent assumption that the completion of the secondary or minor part of the work would proceed with the same directness that had been given to its primary or trunk-line part, and that it devoived upon the settlers to lay their plans and order their work accordingly.

The above observations being obvious, it seems to me equally clear that it is the duty of every Congressman to do all he can do to see to it that the Government proceeds to fulfill its part of the Black Canyon project contract.

Respectfully,

A. CORNELL.

BLACK CANYON SETTLERS' ORGANIZATION

We, the members of this organization, being assembled in special session on this 28th day of July 1948, and being each personally and vitally interested in the prompt completion of the construction of the lateral system of the Black Canyon irrigation district, hereby adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation requested a rock-bottom amount of $1,725,000 to continue in an orderly fashion the construction program in the Payette division of the Boise project; and

"Whereas $1,263,625 of the requested amount was for features which were contract obligations of previous date, or which would necessarily have to be constructed or expended ahead of the remaining lateral system, or in conjunction with work already under construction; and

"Whereas the estimated cost of the remaining lateral system is $450,000 and under the existing appropriation there will be only $261,375 available for expenditure for these laterals, and because of this, schedule 2, which includes the laterals north of Middleton, Idaho, will not be contracted and built; and

"Whereas by not building schedule 2 of the fourth unit laterals, 6,000 acres of very fine land will be forced to remain idle, dry, and dusty sagebrush area, and approximately 100 farm families will be deprived of the living which they so fully expect in 1949; and many of these families, being already residents of the area, will be subjected to extremely hard times and undue hardships; and

"Whereas the Bureau of the Budget approved $1,700,000 for the 1949 fiscal year construction program of the Payette Division, the Senate made an earnest effort to restore $250,000 of the $300,000 which the House had cut from the proposed amount, and the conference (for reasons unbeknown to us) compromised on $1,525,000; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation proposes to open bids on August 5, 1948, for these laterals, but will not award contracts except for schedule 1 unless the $175,000 is restored to our appropriation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Congress be urged to set precedent aside, and during this special session and not later than August 5, 1948, restore the $175,000 so desperately needed; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to each of the Idaho Members of Congress to impress them of the urgency and importance of this matter and to request that they leave nothing undone which might aid in favorable congressional action in our behalf. Also, copies shall be forwarded to the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Idaho; commissioner of reclamation, State of Idaho; secretary-manager, State Reclamation Association; director, Bureau of Reclamation, Region 1; manager, Bureau of Reclamation, Central Snake River district; and to chambers of commerce and various individuals who have shown much interest in this project."

C. E. FRIESEN,
Chairman, Caldwell, Idaho.

Attest:

H. W. VAN SLYKE,
Secretary.

CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of the declaration of 19 national civil-rights, labor, church, Negro, Jewish, professional, and trade organizations meeting in Washington, D. C., July 22, 1948, on call of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. I send it to the desk and request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

I trust the declaration will have the support and approval of the Senate, and I call the attention of the Senate to the statement made by Walter White, secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in his letter of transmittal to me:

We submit this declaration to you in the hope that you will give it your careful attention and support the efforts to extend democratic rights to all American citizens, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. Such action by the Congress following the issuance of the Executive orders by President Truman in this area would do much to restore faith in the democratic process at home and to rebuild and firmly establish American prestige abroad.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACT NOW ON CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION—DECLARATION OF 19 NATIONAL CIVIL-RIGHTS, LABOR, CHURCH, NEGRO, JEWISH, PROFESSIONAL, AND TRADE ORGANIZATIONS MEETING IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY 22, 1948, ON CALL OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

The special session gives the Eightieth Congress a third chance to fulfill the urgent needs of the American people. The Congress can now complete the business left unfinished on its calendar and make a genuine contribution to the freedom and equality of all Americans by enacting the pending civil-rights legislation. At the same time, the Congress can demonstrate to the American people that the civil-rights pledges in the 1948 platforms, as well as the 1944 platforms, are not empty phrases and mere campaign promises.

Almost a year has passed since the historic report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights exposed the many areas of American life where the rights guaranteed by our Constitution are being flagrantly denied to millions of Americans. The President's Committee called for a program of legislative action "to secure these rights."

The national conventions of the major parties to which the Members of the Congress owe political allegiance have committed themselves to the passage of the civil-rights bills. The major parties now have an opportunity to demonstrate to the American people the sincerity and integrity of their campaign pledges.

The organizations joining in this statement represent outstanding church, labor, Negro, Jewish, veterans, and other civic organizations. We are mindful that the special session will be limited in duration but we are completely convinced that the legislative program we urge upon the Congress is a wholly reasonable and practical program capable of enactment now. Neither a filibuster nor any other legislative device can prevent enactment of this program if the Members of Congress are determined to carry out their convention promises.

We are mindful also that other important gains for civil rights can be made by the President acting under his constitutional authority. We are confident that President Truman will fulfill his promise to the Congress by issuing forthwith the Executive order providing for the abolition of segregation and discrimination in all Federal agencies, including the armed services of the United States, and thus give unmistakable leadership to the civil-rights program in the Congress. Specifically we urge:

1. FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE LEGISLATION

S. 984, a national act against discrimination in employment, which was sponsored in the Eightieth Congress by four Democratic and four Republican Senators, and has bipartisan sponsorship in the House. In a democracy the right to earn a living without racial or religious discrimination is a prime essential.

2. POLL TAX

As a nation, we have urged citizens in other countries to vote in national elections. Yet, here at home we have denied to 10,000,000 of our own citizens—6,000,000 whites and 4,000,000 Negroes—the right to exercise their franchise. Therefore, we strongly urge the Senate to pass the anti-poll-tax bill, H. R. 29, which has already been passed by the House.

3. SEGREGATION IN INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION

The Powell bill to end segregation in interstate transportation has been introduced in the House. Americans must be able to travel anywhere in their country without humiliation.

4. LYNCHING

More than 5,000 persons have been lynched by mobs in America. Certain States have been neither willing nor able to punish lynchers. Federal action is imperative. We reject the Ferguson bill reported out by the Senate Judiciary Committee. We call upon the special session to enact an antilynching bill embodying the features included in the Case bill, now on the House Calendar.

5. DISPLACED PERSONS

We call for the passage of remedial amendments to the Displaced Persons Act that will increase the number of admissible DP's to 400,000, will eliminate the provisions that discriminate against Jews and Catholics, and strike out conditions that are administratively unworkable.

We call upon President Harry S. Truman and upon the titular head and Presidential candidate of the Republican Party, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, to exert to the utmost their influence upon their parties to prevent any parliamentary or political trickery designed to sidetrack these guaranties of basic human rights and to see to it that these measures are enacted at this session of the Congress.

The following organizations and delegates participated in the conference and approved the above statement: National Council of Negro Women, Mrs. Jeanetta Brown; CIO, George L-P Weaver; Odd Fellows, Henry P. Slaughter; Beauty Culture League, Cordelia G. Johnson; United Automobile Workers, CIO, William Oliver and Paul Sifton; Alpha

Kappa Alpha Sorority, Norma Boyd and Mrs. Elsie Rumford; American Jewish Committee, Alex Brooks; National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses, Mrs. Lotis C. Campbell; Friends Committee on National Legislation, C. Lloyd Bailey; American Veterans Committee, Robert L. Carter; American Civil Liberties Union, Mary Baldinger; National Council for Permanent FEPC, Roy Wilkins; Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, Herman Edelsberg; National Association Negro Milliners, Hair Stylists, and Dress Designers, Mabel Lewis; National Alliance Postal Employees, William C. Jason, Jr.; National Medical Association, C. Herbert Marshall; International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL, Charles Zimmerman; American Jewish Congress, Sanford Bolz; NAACP, Henry Lee Moon, Walter White, Jesse Dedmon, Edward R. Dudley, Leslie Ferry.

Attending as observers also were Walter J. Mason of the American Federation of Labor and Miss Margaret Garrity of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES RELATING TO PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures relating to Federal personnel.

I call attention to the fact that the civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government totaled 2,092,301 for the month of June. This was a net increase of 26,004 over the number of employees in May. The increase averaged 866 a day.

This increase was the largest for any month since January 1945 in the midst of the war. It was exceeded in only five scattered months during the depression years 1930–37 inclusive, when public pay rolls were used to absorb unemployment. It was the sixth consecutive monthly increase in the current calendar year. It was the fourth consecutive month in which the increase averaged more than 500 per day. It brought the total increase for the first half of the current calendar year to 96,913 for an average daily increase since December 31, 1947, to more than 530.

The June figure closed the Government's fiscal year 1948 with a civilian employment average in the executive branch of 2,032,600 for the entire year. This annual average was nearly 60 percent of the 3,463,420 average in the war peak year of 1943. It was approximately 95 percent of the annual average requested by the President for fiscal year 1948.

These statements are based upon figures in the monthly report on Federal civilian personnel in the executive branch for June 1948 published today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. The report shows that employment inside continental United States increased 29,143 during June, and outside the continent it decreased 3,139. It shows that of the net increase 5,487 were so-called industrial employees. It shows that of the net increase 16,313 were in the civilian agencies of the Government, and that 9,691 were additions to the civilian pay rolls of the Military Establishment.

In response to numerous requests for historical information on the growth of Federal employment the committee in this report publishes the best information available to it for the years since 1884. In that year according to the Civil Service Commission total civilian employment of the Government was 131,308. June 1948 employment in the Post Office Department alone was more than three times this figure.

There being no objection, the additional report was ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, JUNE 1948, AND COMPARISON WITH MAY 1948

(The following report is compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments for the Federal Government. Table I of the report shows personnel employed inside continental United States, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table III shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, by agency. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns. Table V is an additional chart inserted in the report for June for information. It shows civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government from 1884 to 1948. See chart for explanation of figures and for sources.)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures the total Federal personnel for the month of June increased 26,004 from the May total of 2,066,297 to the June total of 2,092,301. (See table III.)

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment there was an increase of 16,313 from the May total of 1,204,242 to the June total of 1,220,555.

Total employment for the National Military Establishment showed an increase of 9,691 from the May figure of 862,055 to the June figure of 871,746.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 109 from the May figure of 875 to the June figure of 984.

The Department of the Army reported an increase of 2,999 from the May figure of 398,973 to the June figure of 401,972. Inside continental United States the Army increased its civilian personnel 6,337; outside continental United States it decreased 3,338.

The Department of the Air Force increased civilian employment 2,251 from the May figure of 118,852 to the June figure of 121,103. Department of the Air Force figures are for civilian personnel inside continental United States only; the Department of the Army reports Air Force civilian personnel outside continental United States.

The Department of the Navy reported an increase of 4,332 civilian employees from the May figure of 343,355 to the June figure of 347,687.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Federal personnel within the United States increased 29,143 from the May total of 1,836,406 to the June total of 1,865,549. (See table I.)

Excluding the National Military Establishment, personnel inside continental United States increased 16,107 from the May total of 1,148,489 to the June total of 1,164,596.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for June was 700,953, an increase of 13,036 over the May total of 687,917.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 109 from the May figure of 875 to the June figure of 984.

The Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States increased 6,337 from the May figure of 268,902 to the June figure of 275,239.

The Department of the Air Force within continental United States increased 2,251 from the May figure of 118,852 to the June figure of 121,103.

The Department of the Navy within the United States increased its civilian employment 4,339 from the May figure of 299,288 to the June figure of 303,627.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Outside continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 3,139 from the May total of 229,891 to the June total of 226,752. (See table II.)

An increase of 206 was reported in the overseas civilian employment of the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment, from the May total of 55,753 to the June total of 55,959.

Total overseas civilian employment for the National Military Establishment decreased 3,345 from the May total of 174,138 to the June total of 170,793.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 3,338 civilian employees overseas, from the May figure of 130,071 to the June figure of 126,733.

The Department of the Navy decreased its overseas employment 7, to the present total of 44,060.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

Total industrial employment during the month of June increased 5,487 from the May total of 571,095 to the June total of 576,582. (See table IV.)

The departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment increased their industrial employment by 1,283 from the May figure of 22,765 to the June figure of 24,048.

The National Military Establishment increased its total industrial employment 4,204 from the May figure of 548,330 to the June figure of 552,534.

The Department of the Army increased its industrial employment 206 during the month of June from the May figure of 238,594 to the June figure of 238,800. Of this net increase 3,884 was within continental United States, while outside the United States industrial employment of the Army Department decreased 3,588.

The Department of the Air Force industrial personnel inside the United States increased 1,297 from the May figure of 69,769 to the June figure of 71,066.

The Department of the Navy increased its industrial employment 2,611 from the May figure of 239,947 to the June figure of 242,558.

The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	77,399	83,249	+5,850
Commerce	37,467	37,963	+496
Interior	46,323	50,310	+3,987
Justice	25,837	25,852	+15
Labor	4,450	4,431	−19
Post Office	488,983	496,822	+7,837
State	7,576	7,685	+109
Treasury	89,002	88,730	−272
WAR DEPARTMENT			
Army	268,902	275,239	+6,337
Air Force	118,852	121,103	+2,251
NAVY DEPARTMENT	299,288	303,627	+4,339
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	875	984	+109
Department of the Army	268,902	275,239	+6,337
Department of the Air Force	118,852	121,103	+2,251
Department of the Navy	299,288	303,627	+4,339
Total, including National Military Establishment	1,836,406	1,865,549	+29,143
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+16,313
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	221	214	−7
Bureau of the Budget	593	582	−11
Executive Mansion and Grounds	66	63	−3
National Security Council	19	22	+3
National Security Resources Board	176	232	+56
Council of Economic Advisers	45	44	−1
Office of Government Reports	17	17	
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	70	74	+4
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Economic Cooperation Administration	273	492	+219
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,569	4,542	−27
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	
Philippine War Damage Commission	10	7	−3
War Assets Administration	22,266	16,772	−5,494
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	4	+1
Atomic Energy Commission	5,028	5,027	−1
Civil Aeronautics Board	602	612	+10
Civil Service Commission	4,120	4,101	−19
Export-Import Bank of Washington	121	123	+2
Federal Communications Commission	1,328	1,341	+13
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,111	1,092	−19
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	378	383	+5
Federal Power Commission	792	809	+17
Federal Security Agency [1]	33,292	33,215	−77
Federal Trade Commission	554	574	+20
Federal Works Agency	21,981	22,112	+131
General Accounting Office	9,232	9,170	−62
Government Printing Office	7,114	7,074	−40
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,711	11,691	−20
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,292	2,301	+9
Maritime Commission	7,332	7,128	−204
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,160	6,279	+119
National Archives	344	341	−3
National Capital Housing Authority	286	285	−1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	21	9	−11
National Gallery of Art	917	922	+5
National Labor Relations Board	1,780	1,993	+213
National Mediation Board	111	109	−2
Office of Selective Service Records	721	742	+21
Panama Canal	535	643	+108
Railroad Retirement Board	2,656	2,599	−57
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,550	5,366	−184
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,123	1,149	+26
Smithsonian Institution	507	510	+3
Tariff Commission	218	219	+1
Tax Court of the United States	126	126	
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,054	15,223	+169
Veterans' Administration	200,594	203,855	+3,261
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,148,489	1,164,596	+22,681 −6,574
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+16,107

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	875	984	+109
Department of the Army	268,902	275,239	+6,337
Department of the Air Force	118,852	121,103	+2,251
Department of the Navy	299,288	303,627	+4,339
Total, including National Military Establishment	1,836,406	1,865,549	+29,143
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+16,313
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	221	214	−7
Bureau of the Budget	593	582	−11
Executive Mansion and Grounds	66	60	−36
National Security Council	19	22	+3
National Security Resources Board	176	232	+56
Council of Economic Advisers	45	44	−1
Office of Government Reports	17	17	
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	70	74	+4
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Economic Cooperation Administration	273	492	+219
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,569	4,542	−27
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	
Philippine War Damage Commission	10	7	−3
War Assets Administration	22,266	16,772	−5,494
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	4	+1
Atomic Energy Commission	5,028	5,027	−1
Civil Aeronautics Board	602	612	+10
Civil Service Commission	4,120	4,101	−19
Export-Import Bank of Washington	121	123	+2
Federal Communications Commission	1,328	1,341	+13
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,111	1,092	−19
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	378	383	+5
Federal Power Commission	792	809	+17
Federal Security Agency [1]	33,292	33,215	−77
Federal Trade Commission	554	574	+20
Federal Works Agency	21,981	22,112	+131
General Accounting Office	9,232	9,170	−62
Government Printing Office	7,114	7,074	−40
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,711	11,691	−20
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,292	2,301	+9
Maritime Commission	7,332	7,128	−204
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,160	6,279	+119
National Archives	344	341	−3
National Capital Housing Authority	286	285	−1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	21	9	−11
National Gallery of Art	917	922	+5
National Labor Relations Board	1,780	1,993	+213
National Mediation Board	111	109	−2
Office of Selective Service Records	721	742	+21
Panama Canal	535	643	+108
Railroad Retirement Board	2,656	2,599	−57
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,550	5,366	−184
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,123	1,149	+26
Smithsonian Institution	507	510	+3
Tariff Commission	218	219	+1
Tax Court of the United States	126	126	
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,054	15,223	+169
Veterans' Administration	200,594	203,855	+3,261
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,148,489	1,164,596	+22,681 −6,574
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+16,107

[1] Exclusive of personnel of Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Includes 1,008 employees of Howard University and 87 employees of Columbia Institute for the Deaf.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	1,836	1,854	+18
Commerce	2,903	2,982	+79
Interior	5,367	6,028	+661
Justice	435	436	+1
Labor	82	83	+1
Post Office	1,611	1,593	−18
State	14,314	14,234	−80
Treasury	642	656	+14
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Economic Cooperation Administration		79	+79
Office of the Housing Expediter	26	26	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	132	140	+8
Philippine War Damage Commission	820	101	+81
War Assets Administration	367	357	−10
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	114	117	+3
Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	
Civil Aeronautics Board	10	10	
Civil Service Commission	5	5	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	
Federal Communications Commission	28	30	+1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3	
Federal Security Agency	1,341	1,337	−4
Federal Works Agency	428	453	+25
Housing and Home Finance Agency	39	43	+4
Maritime Commission	92	91	−1
National Labor Relations Board	8	9	+1
Office of Selective Service Records	16	16	
Panama Canal	28,467	22,834	−633
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	17	16	−1
Smithsonian Institution	6	6	
Veterans' Administration	1,589	1,596	+7
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	55,753	55,959	+983 +777
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+206

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army	130,071	126,733	−3,338
Department of the Navy	44,057	44,050	−7
Total, including National Military Establishment	229,891	226,752	−4,122 +983
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−3,139

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	79,235	85,103	+5,868
Commerce	40,370	40,935	+565
Interior	51,690	56,338	+4,648
Justice	26,272	26,288	+16
Labor	4,532	4,514	−18
Post Office	490,596	498,415	+7,819
State	21,890	21,919	+29
Treasury	89,644	89,386	−258
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	221	214	−7
Bureau of the Budget	593	582	−11
Executive Mansion and Grounds	96	60	−36
National Security Council	19	22	+3
National Security Resources Board	176	232	+56
Council of Economic Advisers	45	44	−1
Office of Government Reports	17	17	
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	70	74	+4
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Economic Cooperation Administration	273	571	+299
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,595	4,568	−27
Philippine Alien Property Administration	134	142	+8
Philippine War Damage Commission	830	908	+78
War Assets Administration	22,633	17,129	−5,504
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	117	121	+4
Atomic Energy Commission	5,031	5,030	−1
Civil Aeronautics Board	622	632	+10
Civil Service Commission	4,125	4,106	−19
Export-Import Bank of Washington	123	125	+2
Federal Communications Commission	1,356	1,380	+14
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,114	1,095	−19
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	378	383	+5
Federal Power Commission	792	809	+17
Federal Security Agency [1]	34,633	34,552	−81
Federal Trade Commission	554	574	+20

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Federal Works Agency	20,466	20,580	+114
General Accounting Office	8,233	8,170	−63
Government Printing Office	7,114	7,074	−40
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,753	11,734	−19
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	.....
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,292	2,301	+9
Maritime Commission	7,424	7,219	−205
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,169	6,279	+110
National Archives	344	341	−3
National Capital Housing Authority	286	282	−4
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	21	8	−13
National Gallery of Art	317	322	+5
National Labor Relations Board	1,788	1,992	+204
National Mediation Board	111	109	−2
Office of Selective Service Records	737	758	+21
Panama Canal	24,002	23,477	−525
Railroad Retirement Board	2,696	2,599	−97
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,367	5,382	+15
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,123	1,149	+26
Smithsonian Institution	513	516	+3
Tariff Commission	218	219	+1
Tax Court of the United States	126	126	.....
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,054	15,223	+169
Veterans' Administration	202,183	205,451	+3,268
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,201,242	1,220,555	+23,436 / −7,123
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+16,313
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	875	984	+109
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	268,902	275,239	+6,337
Outside continental United States	130,071	126,733	−3,338
Department of the Air Force	118,852	121,103	+2,251
Department of the Navy	343,355	347,687	+4,332
Total, including National Military Establishment	2,066,297	2,092,301	+36,465 / −10,461
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+26,004

[1] Exclusive of personnel of Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Includes 1,608 employees of Howard University and 87 employees of Columbia Institute for the Deaf.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Commerce	1,865	1,605	+40
Interior	6,628	7,770	+1,142
State	374	380	+6
Treasury	3,654	3,630	−24

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Atomic Energy Commission	220	217	−0
Housing and Home Finance Agency	[1]	[1]	.....
Panama Canal	2,053	2,007	−46
Tennessee Valley Authority	8,263	8,437	+174
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	22,765	24,048	+1,302 / −79
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+1,283
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	140,619	144,503	+3,884
Outside continental United States	97,975	94,387	−3,588
Department of the Air Force	69,789	71,086	+1,297
Department of the Navy	239,947	242,558	+2,611
Total, including National Military Establishment	571,095	576,582	+6,154 / −3,667
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+5,487

TABLE V.—*Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, 1884–1948*

(This table of Federal employment by years represents the best and most complete figures on this subject available to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. It is included in this report, the final monthly report on Federal personnel by the joint committee for fiscal year 1948, in response to numerous requests for historical information on the growth of Federal employment. It will be noted that the earliest year included is 1884. The Civil Service Commission advises that Federal employment information prior to this date cannot be calculated accurately from its records, which were established as of this date. It should be noted further that the basis for calculations has been changed from time to time. For this reason those making use of the table should check the footnotes closely.)

EMPLOYMENT BY YEARS, 1884–1929, AS OF THE END OF THE FISCAL YEAR, JUNE 30 (EXCEPTIONS NOTED)

Year:	*Employees*
1884	131,308
1891	[2] 166,000
1892	[2] 171,000
1893	[2] 176,000
1894	[2] 180,000
1895	[2] 189,000
1897	[2] 192,000
1899	[2] 208,000
1901	[2] 256,000
1903	[2] 301,000
1904	298,858
1905	309,615
1906	326,855
1907	337,751
1908	352,104
1909	367,794
1910	384,088
1911	391,350
1912	395,460
1913	469,879
1914	482,721
1915	476,363
1916	480,927
1917	517,805
1918	[3] 917,760
1919	842,314
1920	[4] 691,116
1921	[4] 562,382
1922	537,317
1923	515,772
1924	521,941
1925	532,798
1926	536,342
1927	527,126
1928	540,257
1929	557,169

AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT BY FISCAL YEARS, 1930–48

Year:	*Employees*
1930	[4] 583,066
1931	594,305
1932	583,119
1933	575,128
1934	625,226
1935	715,981
1936	825,063
1937	859,668
1938	[4] 834,022
1939	884,556
1940	953,895
1941	[5] 1,164,463
1942	1,723,459
1943	2,795,608
1944	[5] 3,121,153
1945	3,465,420
1946	3,110,989
1947	2,334,208
1948	2,032,600

[1] Approximate.
[2] Nov. 11, 1919; partially estimated.
[3] As of July 31.
[4] Basis of compilation (fiscal years 1930–37): Number of persons having Federal appointments in the last day of each month (revised).
[5] Basis of compilation (fiscal year 1938 to January 1941): Number of civilian employees actually receiving pay on the last pay roll of each month (revised).
[6] Basis of compilation (January 1941 to September 1943): CSC Form 3257, number of paid civilian employees as of last day of each month.
[7] Basis of compilation (September 1943 to fiscal year 1948): Monthly personnel report to Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures; number of civilian employees as of the last day of each month.

Sources: 1884–1929: U. S. Civil Service Commission employment figures, compiled from monthly personnel reports as of the end of each month (revised).

1930–43: U. S. Civil Service Commission average employment figures, compiled from monthly personnel reports as of the last day of each month.

1944–48: Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures average employment figures, compiled from monthly personnel reports as of the last day of each month.

Footnotes at end of table.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2923. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ilan Zuc; and

S. 2924. A bill for the relief of Cesare Buia, Gabriela Buia, and Daniela Buia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCMAHON:

S. 2925. A bill for the relief of Alfred Fulga, his mother, Aurelia Filipescu, and the latter's nurse, Stallana Istrate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2926. A bill for the relief of Helena Vieira de Sa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF BOEING AIRPLANE CO. CONTRACTS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, a strike is going on at Seattle, Wash., at the Boeing Airplane Co. The labor conciliator has found in favor of the employees, but the company refuses to settle. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution calling for the cancellation of contracts with the Boeing Airplane Co. until such time as that company lives up to the recommendations of the Labor Board.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61), was received, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas a labor dispute now exists between the Boeing Airplane Co. and Aeronautical Industrial District Lodge 751, chartered by the International Association of Machinists as exclusive representative of all its employees in this plant; and

Whereas the National Labor Relations Board Trial Examiner has fully investigated this dispute and has issued his decision calling upon the Boeing Airplane Co. to immediately bargain collectively and to reinstate all striking employees without prejudice or discrimination; and

Whereas in spite of the recommendations of the National Labor Relations Board Trial Examiner the Boeing Airplane Co. not only refuses to bargain collectively but has locked out the union members and is using every possible device to destroy this union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the Department of the Air Force cancel all contracts with the Boeing Airplane Co. until said company ceases its antilabor policies and complies with the NLRB trial examiner's decision.

UNIFICATION OF WESTERN EUROPE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from Life magazine and a statement by Paul G. Hoffman regarding unification of western Europe, which appear in the Appendix.]

KEYNOTE SPEECH OF GOVERNOR GREEN, OF ILLINOIS, AT REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the keynote speech delivered by the Honorable Dwight H. Green, Governor of the State of Illinois, while acting as temporary chairman of the Republican National Convention, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECLARATION OF STATES' RIGHTS BY SOUTHERN DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a declaration on States' rights adopted at the Southern Democratic Convention at Birmingham, Ala., July 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATES' RIGHTS AND CIVIL RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY RALPH T. CATTERALL

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "States' Rights and Civil Rights," by Ralph T. Catterall, of Richmond, Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

DOLLARS, PRICES, AND YOU—STATEMENT BY EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Dollars, Prices, and You," issued by the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SPECIAL SESSION—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman Tries To Debauch Congress," published in the New Hampshire Morning Union of July 17, 1948, and an editorial entitled "A Desperate Device, published in the Concord (N. H.) Monitor of July 16, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

A HISTORY OF PROGRESSIVISM—ARTICLE BY W. K. KELSEY

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A History of Progressivism," written by W. K. Kelsey and published in the Detroit News of July 31, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION IN WISCONSIN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the agricultural and industrial position of Wisconsin, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials endorsing the equal-rights amendment, which appear in the Appendix.]

WAGES AND SALARY INCREASES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a full and understandable measure of concern is evident throughout the District of Columbia because wages and salary increases were not approved when the Federal Pay Act was passed in June by the Congress.

Most people are in agreement that District employees were and are entitled to the increases. I share that sentiment. Some people feel so keenly about the matter that they think the increases should be granted by reducing needed services, or by a reduction in the personnel force, or through a loan from the Federal Treasury. I am quite properly in strong opposition to any of these approaches.

During the session of yesterday the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], for himself, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], introduced S. 2920, a bill to authorize a loan from the Federal Treasury to the District of Columbia in the sum of $5,800,000, to be used in providing wage and salary increases to approximately 17,000 District employees. This loan would bear no interest, and would be repaid on terms and dates to be determined by some future Congress.

Senate bill 2920 is a companion bill to a measure introduced recently in the House. These measures have been thoughtfully considered by the Fiscal Subcommittee of the Senate District Committee, and its considered opinion is that an attempt to increase the salaries and wages of District employees through a non-interest-bearing loan from the Federal Treasury is undeserving of favorable consideration or action, and would result in serious and inexcusable injury to the District and its employees if enacted into law.

Mr. President, on Saturday last the press requested my opinion concerning the proposal just offered in the House, in answer to which I issued a brief statement, which I should like to have unanimous consent to have included in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This proposal would only establish a precedent which can't be justified. A way must be found through which to provide satisfactory salary and wage rates through tax-revenue sources. If we were to grant increases now through a Federal loan, it could be done again in the future and such action would obviously result in curtailing or eliminating needed public services or by reductions in personnel. It would be a disservice to workers to raise their pay now and dismiss them a short time later.

The District Committees of the House and Senate, have recommended legislation which would increase the salaries and wages of all District employees, while providing tax revenues with which to meet a very large obligation. The revenue legislation has been temporarily defeated in the Senate. Until this or similar legislation is approved, there is no reason to hope that desired and legitimate pay increases can be granted. The Nation's Capital City simply can't expect to get something out of nothing. No other city should be so careful to pay its own way.

I think and hope that Senate and House committees will begin early in the next session to concentrate on the involved financial problem which confronts the District. I have every reason to believe that the Congress will set sufficient time aside through which to publicly debate the issue. If it does, I shall take for granted that the Congress will provide and authorize revenues which are sufficient to meet the needed current operational requirements of the District.

Whenever adequate revenue is available, I feel strongly that approved salary and wage increases should be made retroactive to the date of passage of the 1948 Federal Pay Act. Until revenue is available I must oppose any proposal which is certain to offset its purely temporary good through long range and lasting harm.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the appeal of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] from the decision of the Chair holding that the cloture motion on the motion to take up House bill 29 was not in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is ready to proceed, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Downey	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McFarland	Thye
Ecton	McGrath	Tobey
Ellender	McKellar	Tydings
Fessel	McMahon	Umstead
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hawkes	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

PHILADELPHIA: CORRUPT AND NOT CONTENTED—ARTICLE BY DICKSON HARTWELL

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my rights to the floor will not be interfered with in any way and that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a very brief statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Alabama yields to the Senator from Connecticut under the conditions stated by him.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I noticed in Collier's magazine under date of August 7, 1948, a most interesting article entitled "Philadelphia: Corrupt and Not Contented." The article is by Mr. Dickson Hartwell. The subtitle is:

After 81 years of graft and corruption, the good people of Philadelphia are beginning to ask pertinent questions about their city government. The answers are not calculated to please anybody.

I read in the press recently that the Republican candidate for the Presidency is to make a trip to Kansas City some time during the campaign to discuss the subject of bosses. I think that is a fine subject, and I hope he takes a refresher course by stopping off in Philadelphia on his way West.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA: CORRUPT AND NOT CONTENTED

(By Dickson Hartwell)

AFTER 81 YEARS OF GRAFT AND CORRUPTION, THE GOOD PEOPLE OF PHILADELPHIA ARE BEGINNING TO ASK PERTINENT QUESTIONS ABOUT THEIR CITY GOVERNMENT—THE ANSWERS ARE NOT CALCULATED TO PLEASE ANYBODY

The sickest city in the land is Philadelphia. It is suffering from the longest case on record—81 years—of the dread malady known as machine politics.

Philadelphia has every known symptom of the ailment and some that are brand new. It has a self-sustaining political machine that would be the envy of old Tammany—and a freshly uncovered financial shortage estimated at $300,000 to $1,000,000. It is run in secret by a one-party city council that holds two sessions—a private one at which some of the councilmen are advised to vote a certain way, and another one in public, when they follow the advice.

In Philadelphia motorists in restricted parking zones pay off many of the cops with a quarter, or even use old parking tickets as camouflage tags on their cars. Summonses are ignored (in one recent month there were 2,989 such cases in traffic court) or handed to a district committeeman to fix. In one court 9 of every 10 summonses were fixed before they ever got to the court. It is a city of petty crimes, small-time gamblers, and five-and-dime shakedowns, where too often a citizen's first protection is not the law, the courts, or the police, but his ward leader.

Philadelphia's political machine is simple enough. It is called Republican, but this is only a label. It has no political philosophy except to win elections with whatever promise, slogan, or chicanery it believes will succeed. Its guiding principle: Do a man a favor and you've got his friendship; do two favors, and you've got his vote.

To this principle, the cornerstone of power, the machine is dedicated. Most public officials and even many of the janitors hold their jobs because they can do favors or get out the vote. "A magistrate who doesn't play ball with the machine," a Philadelphia judge said recently, "can count on 5,000 votes, and that's all. Without 350,000 you can't win." Playing ball means refraining from carefully investigating certain cases; fixing tickets for ward leaders; springing Saturday-night drunks from jail; and tipping the scales of justice just very lightly for certain gamblers, tavern keepers, and miscellaneous miscreants who, as registered voters, become first citizens on election day.

The average Philadelphia citizen soon grows to believe that the only man who can get things done is the ward leader. Citizens who vote right, contribute right, and don't complain are seldom troubled by government inefficiency. Yet most Philadelphians haven't known the satisfaction of clean streets, unbroken pavements, unpolluted air and water, alert, impartial police, and a rigidly enforced sanitary code.

Without political influence the ordinary citizen is helpless. In 1946 a maiden lady living on Master Street despaired of persuading her landlord to repair a leaking roof and appealed to the city in writing. Nothing happened. The following year she wrote the mayor begging him to please do something. What the city did was to condemn the property, and the nonpolitical maiden lady was requested to vacate it forthwith. Because of Philadelphia's acute housing shortage this shut-up-or-get-out technique is most effective. That request was issued a year ago. The roof still leaks. But the spinster hasn't peeped since.

This kind of treatment develops in Philadelphians a stoic patience. One citizen in the summer of 1939 installed an oil burner and requested the fire marshal's inspection, which is required by law. He received a card stating the inspection would be made on a certain day. He waited at home but was stood up. Another card came, with the same result. His vacation came and went and fall arrived. There were more cards, but no official. In desperation he turned on the furnace without an O. K. That was in 1939. The furnace inspection still has not been made. But every few weeks for the past 9 years this good citizen has received a post card notifying him that the arrival of the inspector is imminent.

At the moment, though, the under dog is having his day. One of the most interesting political experiments in the history of American municipalites has been the Committee of Fifteen, which was appointed by Philadelphia's Mayor Bernard Samuel. Before the elections last fall city employees, restive for wage increases, were held in line by fulsome promises. When the city machine was reelected the demands became insistent. With the treasury empty and borrowing capacity vanishing, the mayor had to take the heat off. He handed the problem to a committee composed mainly of business and civic leaders.

This Committee of Fifteen, headed by Arthur Binns, top Philadelphia realtor, had two jobs: (1) To determine who should get a raise and how much, and (2) to find the money. Given less than 3 months to make a report, the committee was expected to suggest a face-saving compromise and fade out. But the 15 had other ideas. On March 1 they filed a revolutionary report showing how the city could add $5,000,000 to its income in 1948, mainly by aggressive, efficient collection of wage taxes and water rents. They showed how fire and police department streamlining alone might save $2,000,000 in 1949, and recommended a thorough efficiency check on all departments.

By way of padded pay rolls, the 15 reported city employment of approximately $150,000 worth of matrons to make beds in fire houses for many firemen who sleep at home. They found 211 janitors on the pay roll at city hall annex, one-third more than required in comparable commercial buildings. They discovered policemen working as typists, messengers, cleaners, and clerks—and some not working at all—and about 100 firemen assigned to the fire marshal's office, a spot generally regarded as among the city's less serious fire hazards. These and other revelations brought a clamor for the committee to continue, though its work was officially ended.

An even stronger impetus was the go-ahead signal from County Sheriff Austin (Aus) Meehan. Gargantuan, 300 pounds, and bald, Meehan became topman in Philadelphia politics last election when he defeated Dave Harris for control of the Republican city committee, which runs the town.

Meehan is simon-pure honest himself, and he finds it hard to believe that people he knows and likes will actually steal. As a contractor, he does little business in Philadelphia but a great deal elsewhere. He gives away his salary as sheriff, $15,000 a year, every payday to the first people who touch him.

When the question of continuing the 15 arose, he realized that two vulnerable spots in city government might be the office of the receiver of taxes, which collects the city's money, and the department of supplies and purchases, which lets contracts.

The 15 quickly showed that the department of supplies and purchases was operating on a 6-hour workday; that the annual report required by the city charter had not been made in nearly 7 years with no accounting for some $40,000,000 spent; that it took an average of 31 days to place an order, and longer—from 60 to 90 days—to pay for it, causing the city to lose up to $30,000 a year in cash discounts. There were no trained buyers, purchases being made by bookkeepers and clerks.

Nowhere in Philadelphia is intimacy with petty theft and light larceny more evident than in the magistrates' courts. Top magistrates' pay is only $5,500 annually. But some stretch-a-penny Philadelphia magistrates manage on such a salary to maintain homes which at first squint resemble the palace of a movie queen.

How this financial necromancy is accomplished is indicated in the story of a certain Philadelphia magistrate.

This magistrate, it appears, sees gamblers through slightly rose-colored glasses. He could not find it in his heart to think ill of horse players and numbers operators—especially when they were so grateful for kind treatment. When they were brought before him he discharged them in droves. In more serious offenses, where required by law to hold them for a higher court, he imposed instead a fine of, say, $100. Then after witnesses and prosecutor had left the courtroom he would, in direct violation of the law, secretly reduce the fine or let the offender go scot-free.

Not all Philadelphia judges are dishonest, but some who are not are strangely careless. Among the more odious local rackets was one involving the solicitation of advertising for the convention program of a so-called firemen's organization. It was a smooth deal, engineered by a notorious promoter who had a Better Business Bureau record dating back to 1921. He collected $34,292 in a year for a program never published, and he used for a mailing address and phone calls the city hall officers of a respected municipal court judge.

PETTY CRIME IN THE SUBWAY

Small crime thrives in Philadelphia like weeds in an untended cabbage patch. In the cavernous, ill-lighted subway system, a check-up showed 69 crimes in 6 months. Almost all of them were against lone women and most of them were committed practically under City Hall. Newspaper typesetters were constantly setting the same headlines: War on Crime, Crush Numbers Racket, New Crime Drive, Crime Crack-Down, Clean-Up Drive.

A typical crime drive is the 7 years' war against the world's largest outdoor crap game on the Philadelphia docks. It once earned its operators $10,000 a month. This game rented out a soft-drink concession and ran an extension cord to a city lamp post for free electricity. On January 31, 1940, police started a concentrated effort to break it up. By July 13, last year, 19 raids and 358 arrests later, police admitted that the racket had not yet been cleaned up.

To every rookie on the Philadelphia police force it must be apparent that "enterprise" pays off. Although illegal, business side lines are not uncommon. One cop has a jewelry business and carries a small case of samples with him while on duty. Another has contracted carpenter jobs. Another operates an automobile agency in a suburb, although recently he cautiously transferred title to his son. Still another serves as bouncer in his brother's saloon, even while on duty.

Most erring police enter less formal avenues of trade, however. At a busy midtown corner one police official collected 25 cents from a store for every customer he permitted to park illegally. Other cops deal directly with the consumer. All-day parking in some half-hour central city zones can often be arranged for a flat $1 a week. Obviously a cop with 10 or 15 such steady customers has a happier financial outlook.

Some Philadelphia police are above pecuniary considerations. Pleasant associations and freedom from onerous routine are often preferred, like teaching ceramics on city time to neighborhood children, chauffeuring the wife of a prominent business executive or guarding the home of a local Philadelphia judge, a personage worth the full-time services of six policemen working around the clock in three shifts. Since the judge's protectors would be bored if they had to stand constantly with guns at the ready, they are said to be relieved by such light housekeeping duties as cooking, chauffeuring, butlering, and lawn cutting.

To get ahead in the department, it is quite helpful for a Philadelphia cop to have the support of his ward leader. In some precincts he can get the best details. No patrolman desiring a transfer can feel certain of getting it through police channels. If he's smart he may go to his ward leader. His assignments are usually considered to be an accurate barometer of his political influence. The special plain-clothes details are regarded as the aristocracy; the peasants are the district cops. Promotions are sometimes given on merit, but today there are very strong indications that the going price is $500.

The third largest city in the country has an airport but very poor hangar facilities. There is not even an adequate shop where an engine can be repaired. The runways are too short for some of the big modern planes. Philadelphians have no adequate air service to many important cities. Air time to many others, like Boston and Chicago, is snail-slow. From Philadelphia to Miami it is 10½ hours, while the time from nearby Washington to Miami is 3½ hours by air.

One reason for such retarded growth was an early effort to get graft from the construction of two airports, on opposite sides of the city, instead of merely from one. And one result of this has been that neither port has had enough money to operate efficiently. A second is the machine's deep suspicion of Democratic money which is regarded as tainted even when it comes from such an obviously unselfish enterprise of the Federal Government as an airport.

This distrust of Federal funds has had a profound effect on Philadelphia's housing shortage (there are 112 families for every 100 dwellings). In an unguarded prewar moment, Federal funds were accepted for a Philadelphia housing project. The project embraced several square blocks, and when the ward leader stopped one morning to watch demolition begin he became suddenly aware that several thousand voters he had been nursing for years had been forced to move out of his district. His screaming could be heard in Camden.

Another Federal offer of $19,000,000 was made for 3,500 homes. The city turned it down.

It isn't that Philadelphia doesn't want improvement. The city boasts many commendable projects which, unfortunately, were never finished. The Locust Street subway, begun 20 years ago, is still boarded up. Under the Schuylkill River there is a four-track tunnel built 15 years ago for $6,500,000, to relieve congested traffic. The tunnel has never been opened. Razing of the Chinese Wall, the horrendous structure for railroad tracks running to the center of the city, has been periodically announced for more than 22 years. The Delaware River Bridge was built a generation ago without proper approaches and stands today as a monumental answer to the question, How careless can you get?

WATER POLLUTED WITH CHEMICALS

The port of Philadelphia, for 133 years the greatest in the United States, is slipping rapidly with a postwar drop from second to fourth place. The water is fetid with gases and chemicals, and the floating matter in it is bad for ships' condensers. Among the wastes sometimes dumped into the river is a highly inflammable substance, a gas that is readily ignited and burns upon the surfaces at docking spaces. Some Philadelphians drink this water; shipowners and captains hate it.

The machine has kept Philadelphia broke. Despite Nation-wide skyrocketing of property values, the city's assessed real-estate valuation dropped $700,000,000 between the depression of 1932 and the boom of 1948.

The hodgepodge of assessments is unbelievable. In some districts the poor have been soaked so heavily that assessments have been more than 150 percent of sales prices, while higher-priced homes are assessed as low as 40 percent of sales price.

Nor do all assessors make an effort, as required by law, to keep the assessments near actual value. One tenement assessed at $4,500 earns its owner $2,700 rents annually. In the twenty-sixth ward a typical house assessed for $4,200 10 years ago sold for $3,250. Recently this house was resold for $8,600 but its assessment was unchanged. In the thirty-fifth ward a check of 161 homes shows that 10 years ago their assessment represented 97 percent of their sales value. When resold recently the average assessment was only 54 percent of sale price. Students of municipal government regard this as unsound.

Contented Philadelphians seldom live in the city; they reside and vote in lovely, well-run suburbs. The Philadelphians most concerned with the present state of the city are the vast and impotent middle class and the poor who are awed by power. They don't want any trouble.

But neither do they want a city where so many bars and restaurants are without adequate fire extinguishers; where cops shake down auto-parked spooners; where some of the county detectives are machine committeemen; where one hospital is so crowded with mental and tubercular patients who don't belong there that its facilities are limited by 40 percent, while another hospital operates at only 10 to 30 percent of capacity; where statistical evidence of crime is confused by records listing snatched purses and picked wallets as lost, and thug-beaten citizens as accidents; where an unheeded garbage scow sinks slowly into the Schuylkill; where an occasional fire inspector takes $10 to $65 to pass an oil or gasoline tank installation, and where some inspectors' agents of the bureau of buildings ask $5 to $50 to approve business signs.

They don't want city employees to hold two city jobs, as some do, and work at neither. They don't want to pay $153,000 a year unnecessarily because the council refuses to refund airport bonds. They don't want an annual $600,000 expenditure for police stations, unless they get a reasonable benefit from it.

The people of Philadelphia are not contented with these affairs. They have merely suffered them. How long they will continue to suffer is a question that not even the politicians can answer.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN AT THE ANNUAL REUNION OF TENTH PENNSYLVANIA VOLUNTEER INFANTRY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my rights to the floor will not be interfered with in any way, and that I may be permitted to yield to

the Senator from Pennsylvania for a very brief statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted, and the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I rise to call briefly to the attention of my colleagues the ceremonies held by the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry in Pittsburgh last Saturday, the 31st of July, in commemoration of its baptism of fire.

That was an event of historic importance. It was not only a great milestone in the record of a celebrated military outfit but it also marked the beginning of the fighting that gave the United States control of the Philippines. It will be recalled that Admiral Dewey's victory at Manila started the course of the United States to leadership as a world power.

Great volunteer units fought side by side with famous Regular Army outfits in the Philippine campaigns. Such brilliant military leaders as Pershing, Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur, Krueger, Bradley, and hundreds of others gained their first experience in the art of handling troops under fire in those faraway islands.

The old Eighth Army Corps, of which the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry was a part, had some outstanding commanders: Merritt, Anderson, Otis, the elder MacArthur, and many others. Under their leadership American ingenuity and courage was displayed at its best. Victory was attained on every front.

The roll of the various outfits of the old Eighth Army Corps in the Philippines is most interesting. It is as follows: Astor Battery of New York, First California, California Heavy Artillery, First Colorado, First Idaho, Fifty-first Iowa, Twentieth Kansas, Thirteenth Minnesota, First Montana, First Nebraska, Nevada Cavalry, First North Dakota, Second Oregon, Tenth Pennsylvania, First South Dakota, First Tennessee, Utah Light Artillery, First Washington, and First Wyoming.

With the exception of the Astor Battery they came from the National Guard and all were volunteers—real, stalwart Americans.

I shall close with a short statement by Colonel Hawkins, commander of the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteers, concerning the transportation of his regiment in its Malolos campaign. He said:

> It was necessary to stop the advance long enough to get the wagon trains through to the various organizations. As far as the transportation facilities of the Tenth Regiment were concerned, while not extensive, they were found to be fairly satisfactory. Two four-mule teams sufficed to carry the reserve ammunition, amounting to 200 rounds per man, each soldier carrying 150 rounds in his belt and on his person. Eleven caribou carts and a few pony carts, carrying 3 days' subsistence, the necessary cooking utensils for the companies and a small amount of extra baggage, were also furnished.

Fifty years have brought an enormous difference in military operations. Transportation is faster and fire power more deadly.

Thinking the Members of the Senate might be interested in further comment on this subject and, in order to save their time, I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a speech which I delivered to the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteers at Pittsburgh on Saturday, July 31, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL REUNION OF THE TENTH PENNSYLVANIA VOLUNTEER INFANTRY, PITTSBURGH, PA., SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 31, 1948

This is a great day for the men of the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry.

It is the fiftieth anniversary of a brilliant exploit in the glorious annals of American valor. It is a memorable date in the military history of the United States. It marks an important milestone in the progress of freedom and civilization.

Fifty years ago tonight the world was startled by news of a battle that was fought 12,000 miles from here—between Spanish regulars and American volunteers.

A little-known and untried regiment—the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—had received its baptism of fire, and to their everlasting glory these boys from the cities, towns, and farms of southwestern Pennsylvania had stood their ground.

In a raging Philippine typhoon they had met and repulsed a terrific attack launched by a superior force of veteran soldiers with years of battle experience.

The enemy was better trained and better equipped. But there was a difference between the two forces that decided the issue. The Americans were superior in spirit, courage, and loyalty. They were fighting for an ideal. They offered their lives in defense of honor, justice, and freedom.

After that victory at Malate—which we commemorate today—the regiment was acclaimed by the proud title of "the Fighting Tenth."

It is appropriate on occasions such as this to turn back the pages of history. Let us go back for a moment to America of 50 years ago.

At that time the United States had enjoyed peace for more than a third of a century. Its Army was small; its Navy was scattered. It had no supply or transportation system. Staff exercises and troop maneuvers were unknown.

The United States had no ambitions beyond its own borders. We were truly at peace with all the world.

Our people were content in the pursuit of happiness. They sought to attain security through self-reliance, hard work, and thrift. They reached for higher cultural and spiritual standards by practicing the virtues of right living and devotion to religion.

Near our shores there was conflict in Cuba where the people were in revolt against the cruel tyranny of their Spanish rulers. Liberty-loving Americans were indignant over the inhuman treatment of the Cubans by the Spanish. However, regardless of our sympathies, no official protest was made. No action was imminent.

Thus, February 15, 1898, dawned as another peaceful American day. No war clouds darkened the sky. Then during the night America was shocked by the news that the battleship *Maine* had been destroyed in Habana Harbor. It was there on a peaceful mission. In its destruction, 266 brave American sailors lost their lives. The American people were outraged. They demanded an explanation.

Days that made history moved on with giant strides.

Diplomatic relations with Spain were broken. On April 21, Congress passed a resolution that the people of the island of Cuba "are and of right ought to be free and independent."

War was declared against Spain. The President asked for 125,000 volunteers. Young Americans everywhere sprang to the colors. The National Guard was activated. On the morning of April 28, 1898, the Tenth Pennsylvania, together with other units of the Pennsylvania Guard, were mobilized in sleet, snow, and ice at Mount Gretna. They started to equip, drill, and train.

On May 1, 1898, the Nation and the world were electrified by word flashed from the Pacific. Admiral Dewey had met the Spanish Fleet in Manila Bay and had completely destroyed it. The American Republic was now a world power. It had gained new prestige among the great powers of the world. It had assumed new obligations.

Time moves on—

May 18 was a day of intense excitement at Mount Gretna when it became known that the Tenth Regiment had been ordered to San Francisco, and then to the Philippines to join Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt's army. The whole camp turned out to wish them Godspeed.

At Harrisburg they were greeted by the Governor, his wife, and practically all of the population of the capital city. The trip across the continent took 8 days and nights. The men traveled in day coaches without a hot meal during the entire trip.

In every State through which they passed thousands of enthusiastic people turned out to greet the Pennsylvania boys. The regiment reached San Francisco May 25 and marched to Camp Merritt through streets jammed with cheering thousands. There equipping and training continued.

Time moves on at a rapid pace.

June 14 the boys of the Tenth boarded the *Zealandia* for the Philippines. Stopping at Honolulu they were enthusiastically greeted by the people of the newest American Territory. Passing historic Corregidor, they arrived in the Philippines July 17. Four days later men waded ashore and training continued in that far-off tropical jungle.

On July 31, while the Tenth was on outpost duty in front of Manila, came that bloody battle in which the American volunteer wrote his name indelibly upon the pages of military history. In the fiery heat of battle lasting friendships were created with the Utah Battery and the Third United States Heavy Artillery, which supported us so magnificently.

Then came historic August 13 when Manila fell to the United States. That ended 300 years of Spanish rule in the Philippines.

The drudgery of occupation duty followed. Manila was unsanitary. There was malaria and typhoid fever. Dysentery and other tropical diseases exacted their toll.

Peace with Spain was established but there was dissatisfaction among our former comrades of the Philippine Army. They rebelled against occupation by the United States. On the night of February 4, 1899, they made an attack upon Manila along a 17-mile front. For about 2 months the Tenth and other units fought and marched forward. It rained every day. There were rivers to cross and towns to conquer. The Filipinos were well equipped and held on stubbornly, but this great army of veterans could not be stopped.

Malolos, the native Philippine capital, fell on March 31.

The attack was made in a blinding rainstorm. But the Americans attained their objective. April 14, the Tenth was moved to Cavite.

Again, time moves on—and on July 1 the Fighting Tenth boarded the steamship *Senator*, homeward bound. It had covered itself with glory. It had always taken its objective. It had received the highest commendation of its commanders, and the finest tribute from its fighting companions of other units. It had been cited in orders.

There were great outfits in the old Eighth Army Corps. Let us refresh our memories by calling the roll of the volunteer units fighting with us in the Philippines: Astor Battery, First California, California Heavy Artillery, First Colorado, First Idaho, Fifty-first Iowa, Twentieth Kansas, Thirteenth Minnesota, First Montana, First Nebraska, Nevada Cavalry, First North Dakota, Second Oregon, First South Dakota, First Tennessee, Utah Light Artillery, First Washington, and First Wyoming.

With the exception of the Astor Battery they came from the National Guard and all were volunteers.

They were all stalwart Americans. They were unselfish soldiers. They were the proper men to establish the peace and dignity of America.

We were on the *Senator*, in mid-Pacific, when on July 18, the sad news was received that our beloved and gallant leader, Col. Alexander Leroy Hawkins, had answered the last great roll call.

We knew that he was a sick man when he led us in battle, but his leadership meant so much to us, and he knew it. He sacrificed himself for those of his command and his country.

It was a real inspiration to see Colonel Hawkins at the head of an advancing line. His coolness under fire; his friendly advice; his fine discipline; his love of country and his devotion to duty all endeared him to his men. He will always be remembered as our hero and our inspiration.

Arriving in San Francisco we were met by a delegation from western Pennsylvania. We were mustered out of the service August 22 and then made another memorable trip across the continent. Thousands greeted us.

In Pittsburgh, August 29, 1899, we were welcomed by the President of the United States and other distinguished statesmen and soldiers of that period, and by our friends and loved ones.

The Tenth was truly a cross section of America. Rich and poor; rural and city; educated and noneducated; farmer, laborer, skilled artisans, and professional men were all found in the ranks. They went back into their old places in civilian life, and they have made good. They served in peace as they fought in war. All have taken an active part in making America the greatest nation in the history of the world.

We have not forgotten our military duty. Veterans of the old Tenth served in the Mexican border campaign and World Wars I and II.

During World War I, at one time, a former member of the old Tenth of Philippine days was in command of a port and seven others were in command of regiments. A total of 47 were in the service. Three served in World War II. Five had served in the Civil War. No other American outfit has such a thrilling record.

The regiment has been promptly reorganized after each war. It is now the One Hundred and Tenth Infantry, which took a glorious part on the battlefields of France in both world wars. It is again in the National Guard of Pennsylvania. Many of the sons and grandsons of the old outfit are now carrying on in the fine and patriotic traditions of the old Fighting Tenth.

The Spanish-American War veteran asked little from his Government. His pay was small. He was handicapped by poor equipment and lack of supplies. It was 20 years before any of them received a pension or any governmental help. It was 25 years before the promised travel pay was received.

It is most proper that we meet here today to honor our old colonel and the members of our regiment who have passed to their reward. We honor their memories. Their record is their greatest monument.

But if these records are to endure for all time, our country, as they knew it and loved it, must be preserved.

That calls for a rededication of our lives to the principles in which they believed accompanied by work and sacrifice.

Now as to the future. To keep America as our buddies knew it, certain duties and obligations must have our attention.

I would like to suggest the following:

1. The country must be kept solvent and financially solid. The people of a country cannot long be free and independent if they are debt ridden and heavily taxed. We must curtail government in America. It now costs us too much. We spend more for government than we do for food.

2. Our people must know their obligations to the Nation. As Americans we have obligations as well as rights. We must always realize that the Government is the servant of the people and not their master. To keep it that way we must ask less from the Government and do more for ourselves.

3. We must remember always that it is the American way for a man to be rewarded for his ability, persistence and initiative. That has made America a land of opportunity. Government must keep out of business because that deprives Americans of opportunity.

4. The freedom of the individual has made the American the superior workman, the greatest inventor, the most skilled manager, the foremost in culture and religion and the bravest soldier of the world. Freedom is a sacred thing. It is founded on the teachings of the Bible. Freedom cannot be limited to one class, one religion, one color or one section. It must belong to all or none will have it long.

5. America is a big country. We require large organizations, but we must not let them become so strong and powerful that they may destroy the sacred liberty and independence of the individual. This applies to government, business, and labor organizations. Local government is self rule. Small business is the strength of the American economy. Local labor organizations know the needs of their membership. All in their respective fields, local government, little business and the small labor organizations, must be protected.

6. Our houses of worship should be filled because it is there we are taught the virtues upon which our Government rests. Our form of government cannot live without the church. A totalitarian government cannot prevail if the church is strong and militant. Tolerant religion is our strength.

7. There must be a crusade against the law evader, the chiseler, and the racketeer. Crime now costs us more than all our contributions to the church, education, and welfare. If we are to take our proper place in world leadership we must put our house in order.

8. America can only be strong if our people are imbued with American ideals. These include tolerance, obedience to the law, and hard work at the job of our choice. No one has the right to the protection of America if he is not imbued with American ideals. Those who would destroy America should be sent elsewhere. Our country is only for those believing in America. Above all else, America must be first in our hearts.

Lastly, let us dedicate the remainder of our days to building a stronger and better America through advocating peace, good will, tolerance, thrift, courage, hard work, and the love of God.

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES OF THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. With the understanding that it will not interfere with my right to the floor, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, am today addressing to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] as chairman of the Subcommittee on Senate Special Investigations relative to the rather startling information which has been brought out relative to the action of one Oscar R. Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, in imposing censorship on Dr. Studebaker, who was then Commissioner of Education.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 3, 1948.

Senator HOMER FERGUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Senate Special Investigations, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FERGUSON: Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor-Federal Security of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, has brought to my attention a letter written to Oscar R. Ewing, administrator of the Federal Security Agency, by Dr. John W. Studebaker, recently Commissioner of Education. In his letter to Mr. Ewing, Dr. Studebaker makes very serious and startling statements concerning the administrative policies of the Federal Security Agency. Dr. Studebaker also lists grave charges that top-level censorship within the agency has restricted the Office of Education in its legitimate and proper efforts to proclaim the hostility of the Communist Party to the concepts of American education in which our free and democratic institutions are rooted.

I do not need to tell you that in recommending an appropriation for the Federal Security Agency it never was intended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations that funds should be used to pay the salaries of a supervisory staff which might frustrate the Office of Education in its honest attempt to combat Communist philosophy through the public schools of the Nation. If Dr. Studebaker's charges are true, there has been a breach of trust tantamount to betrayal within the Federal Security Agency. Immediate and drastic action is called for if any officials within the agency are thwarting the efforts of the Office of Education to foster through public education a decent respect for the American way of life and an honest antagonism to the totalitarian forces that threaten the free peoples of the world.

Senator KNOWLAND and I have conferred on the Studebaker letter, a copy of which was forwarded to the Appropriations Subcommittee for appropriate action. It is our desire that you use the good offices of your committee to explore the soundness of the charges which have been made concerning high-policy decisions of the Federal Security Administrator. We believe that you and the members of your committee can render valuable service to the American people by making a fair appraisal of the charges which Dr. Studebaker has uttered and which Mr. Ewing is reported to have denied.

The Senate Appropriations Committee will undertake at once a study of the budgeting practices of the Federal Security Agency to determine if hidden transfers of funds within the Agency are weakening the effectiveness of the Office of Education and other constituent parts, as Dr. Studebaker's letter alleges. Such transfers of funds within departments and agencies of government have been practiced frequently in recent years to provide money for unwholesome, centralized bureaucracy which Congress would not support by direct appropriation and which could

not exist under responsible administration of government.

Very truly yours,

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is very startling and very serious to hear the charges made against Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, who is the pet of the White House. From reports, I gather that he is now one of the principal individuals conducting the President's campaign. It is a most serious thing for him to attempt to stifle any criticism of the infiltration of communism in the schools of the country, and to place a man like Dr. Studebaker under wraps. That was one of the reasons why Dr. Studebaker resigned as United States Commissioner of Education. My hat goes off to Dr. Studebaker.

Some day some one will have to answer for the infiltration of communism into some of our schools and colleges. No. 1 on the list should be Oscar R. Ewing. If the President of the United States means what he says about communism as a whole, then he should today demand the resignation of Oscar R. Ewing as Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, because any man who in an official position such as his, who tries to prevent sunlight from reaching the nooks and corners of communism is not worthy of the post he holds. What Mr. Ewing has done in this instance calls for immediate and drastic action by the President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall be glad to yield if I can.

Mr. HILL. With the understanding that it does not interfere with my right to the floor, I shall be glad to have the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator seen the letter which Dr. Studebaker has written to Mr. Truman?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has it been placed in the RECORD? If not, I hope the Senator will place it in the RECORD. I think it should go into the RECORD by all means.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand that it was placed in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I have yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire. I do not believe he has finished. Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire to yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree entirely with what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire said about Mr. Ewing. I believe that Mr. Ewing should by all means be forced to resign. But let me ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. What can Congress do in the matter? What steps can we take?

Mr. BRIDGES. The only step I know of is to change the administration.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is what I am getting at. After January 20, Hon. J. Strom Thurmond will be President of the United States, and we are going to clear men like Oscar Ewing out of the Government.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad that the objective of the Senator from Mississippi is to clear out of the Government men like Ewing. I do not agree with him as to who will be President of the United States after January. I might have rather definite ideas on that subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator will not agree with me, but the American people will. The American people are for preserving the integrity of their State institutions and their system of government. For that reason Governor Thurmond will sweep the country.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the Senator as to the need for a change. I do not agree with him as to who is to be President of the United States after January 20, but I do agree that there will be a change. I think probably it will be a gentleman from New York who will be President of the United States at that time. Nevertheless, we can agree on a common objective of ridding some of the governmental departments of certain individuals who now head them. When we think of the present communistic threat in the world, when we see communism creeping into our school systems and into some of our colleges, and when we see what has been brought out by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in the very far-reaching investigation which he is conducting, and then see someone who is the pet of the White House, and who, as I read the other day, is one of the two brain powers Mr. Truman is employing to conduct his campaign——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from New Hampshire certainly does not believe that the Governor of New York would clean Communists out of the Government service, when New York, for all practical purposes, is a Communist State. Communists control the politics of the State of New York. We should not go to New York to get Communists cleaned out of the Government. In fact, most of the Communists we now have here are from the State of New York. If the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire will follow to its logical conclusion the very able argument which he is making, he will take the stump for Governor Thurmond.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that so far as I know there are no Communists in the State administration in New York. I think Governor Dewey has a very outstanding record in that connection. I admit that there are a great many Communists in New York, and that too many of them have wormed their way into governmental departments in Washington.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is certainly mistaken about there being no Communists in the government of the State of New York. The Senator well knows that a high appointee of Governor Dewey came before the Senator's committee, the Committee on Armed Services, and advocated what another Republican Senator said was treason. The Governor of New York has never taken any action against him.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not countenance Communists in Government service, whether in the government of the State of New York or elsewhere. I say that certainly, so far as I know, in the State government of New York there are none.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, inasmuch as the distinguished Senator has made that statement—and I know he is sincere in making it—he has just one course open to him; there is just one thing he can do to serve his country well, and that is to join the great States' rights movement and elect J. Strom Thurmond President of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have seen some queer things happen, so far as consistency is concerned. I remember the day when, before the Senate Appropriations Committee, the State Department, representing the administration, asked for $400,000,000 to fight communism in Turkey and Greece. I supported it, and I am glad I did. But let me say that on the same day, before the same committee, the same State Department and the same witnesses asked for $26,500,000 to continue the shipment of lend-lease to Russia. There are some queer things going on here in Washington and in this country. When we have a very able United States Commissioner of Education who has enough American blood in his system to wish to caution the educators of the country against the infiltration of communism in our school systems and our colleges, and when one Oscar Ewing, the pet of the President of the United States, puts the quietus on it, it is time Mr. Ewing was disposed of and went back home, where he belongs, or some place where he can do no harm. [Manifestations of applause by the occupants of the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must remind the occupants of the galleries that no demonstrations are allowed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. Yes, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee which is conducting the investigation of communistic activities may be permitted to hold hearings during the meetings of the Senate for the remainder of the present session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Next, Mr. President, I wish to advise the Senate and the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], that I have just received his letter in relation to the investigation of Mr. Oscar R. Ewing and the Federal Security Agency or anyone connected with it. I wish to assure the Senate that immediately we shall proceed with that investigation, so that we may advise the Senate and the public of the facts. I think it is exactly in line

with what we are doing today in relation to how the Government is conducted so far as Communists and communistic activities are concerned.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Michigan on the fine job he is doing as chairman of the committee investigating communism. Some of the things that are being brought out in that connection are really startling. Every American, regardless of party or who he is or where he comes from, every American who has any real American blood in his system, should offer up a prayer of thanks to the Senator from Michigan and his committee for the splendid job they are doing in bringing out these facts in regard to influences which are attempting to undermine the very foundations of the American Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee thanks the Senator from New Hampshire for his kind remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield to me, with the same understanding as to his right to the floor, let me state that I have kept up with what the distinguished Senator from Michigan has been doing in regard to the committee of which he is the chairman, and I desire to state that he is to be very greatly congratulated on the fine work he is doing. He is doing a splendid job. It is good American work; it is carrying out the American doctrine of government; it is against the foolish "isms" in which of late so many persons in this country have been indulging. I wish to congratulate him as strongly as I know how on the splendid work he is doing, and I wish him every success. Let me say that I shall undertake to give him any aid it is possible for me to give.

I congratulate both the Senator from Michigan and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], with whom I have served so long. I congratulate him on the splendid work he is doing and especially on the work done this morning. I congratulate both Senators.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Small Business Committee and the Senate Investigating Committee which are conducting these hearings, I thank the Senator for his remarks. We hope these committees will be able to carry through, so that they may advise the Senate and the public just what the conditions are.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know they will.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the appeal of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] from the decision of the Chair holding that the cloture motion on the motion to take up House bill 29 was not in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am unalterably opposed to the bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers. I am one of the Members of this body who have banded themselves together to use every parliamentary means and every power at their command to prevent the passage of this bill.

Mr. President, this bill seeks by statute to modify, to amend, and to change a clear, definite, and positive provision of the Constitution of the United States. This bill would, by means of legislative fiat, change the Constitution of the United States. The Congress has no power under the Constitution to pass such a bill. To do so would be to rape the Constitution of the United States; and if the Congress should once commit this rape, it would be opening wide the door; no one could foretell how many other illegitimate interferences there might be by the Congress with the fundamental law as embodied in the Constitution, how many rapes there might be of the rights of the States as safeguarded and protected by the Constitution, how many rapes there might be of the rights of minorities as guarded and protected in the Constitution.

Mr. President, I do not believe a poll tax should be a prerequisite for voting. In my State of Alabama, I have long advocated repeal of the poll tax as such prerequisite by the State. But this is a matter that belongs to the State. Action can be taken and should be taken only by the State. We know that in the early days and for many years in the history of our country, many of the States required the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite for voting in those States. Practically all the States have had some such qualification, and some of the States have had a more stringent, a more burdensome qualification, namely, the ownership or the holding of property.

Great progress has been made in the removal of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. In 1901 the State of Massachusetts repealed the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. I notice the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is now sitting as the acting majority leader of the Senate. He doubtless recalls that for over a hundred years, down to as late as 1901, his State had a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. It was only under the leadership of the then Governor, William Russell, that in the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts the fight was made and the poll tax as such prerequisite was repealed.

Today in the State of Vermont the payment of a poll tax is still a prerequisite for voting in town elections, but most of the States, as I have said, have removed this prerequisite. In the South, very definite progress has been made in the removal of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

In recent years, as we know, North Carolina, Florida, Louisiana, and Georgia have removed the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

Some 2 or 3 years ago the Legislature of Tennessee sought to remove the poll tax, and passed a statute to that effect. It happened, however, that the Supreme Court of Tennessee held the statute unconstitutional and therefore ineffective. But it showed that in Tennessee efforts were being made to remove the poll tax.

As we know, in the State of Virginia, a constitutional amendment has been submitted to the voters to remove the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

In my State of Alabama all veterans, and there are thousands of them, are today exempted from payment of any poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

So a great advance has been made in the elimination of the poll tax as such prerequisite.

As the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in his fine speech on Thursday, brought to the attention of the Senate, article I of section 2 of the Constitution of the United States declares as follows:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

How could any language be clearer? How could any prescriptions be more definitely or more unequivocally stated than are the prescriptions in section 2 of article I? It would seem as we read the section that even a fourth-grade child in school could have no trouble in ascertaining the clear intent and the clear meaning of the words of the section. "He who runs may read" the section without experiencing any difficulty as to the clarity of its meaning. The section simply, clearly, definitely, positively, absolutely says—what? That the electors who shall vote for Members of the House of Representatives of the Federal Congress in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. President, it would seem that nothing could be clearer than the language in this section of the Constitution. We must recall that in 1787 when the language was written the States were absolute sovereigns. They had joined in the Declaration of Independence. They had proclaimed their independence of the British Crown. They had fought through eight long, terrible, and bloody years to win their independence, and they stood absolutely independent and free from any other sovereignty on this earth. Their own sovereignty was full, complete, and absolute.

So they gathered in Philadelphia in their sovereign capacities, through their delegates to write the Constitution of the United States. The question was, How much of their sovereignty would they yield to the Federal Government? The Federal Government was not in being; it had no existence; it had no sovereignty. The only sovereignty it could have would be such sovereignty as was granted by the sovereign States of that time. Anyone who is at all familiar with the history of the writing of the Constitution knows how jealous were the several States of their sovereignty and how reluctant they were to yield very much of their sovereignty to any Federal government. Mindful of their sovereignty, zestful and

determined insofar as possible to keep within their own hands as much of that sovereignty as they could, and still have a Federal Government to meet the problems which had to be met by a central Federal Government, what did they do? They provided that every State should have two Senators; two Members in this body, no matter how large or how small the State might be, no matter what the population of the State might be, no matter what the economic power of the State might be, what its industrial development or its financial development or its agricultural development might be. No matter what might be the status of a State in its power, its influence, its ability to influence other States and other persons in other States, every State in the United States should have equal representation in the Senate, should have two Senators. Then, as Senators will recall, they went one further step, and provided that no State should have its representation in this body reduced or taken away from it without the consent of that State. This meant that no matter how small the State might be, how weak, how ineffective, how uninfluential it might be, it would have equal representation in this body; it would have two Senators along with the two Senators of the most powerful, the wealthiest, and the greatest State in the United States.

Mr. President, they did not stop there. The sovereign States, in their resolve and their determination to make secure the primary authority of the States, provided in the Constitution, before they yielded any sovereignty to the Federal Government, that State legislatures could originate amendments to the Constitution. That was one more step taken by the sovereign States to insure the primary authority of the States. They did not stop there. They went even further and provided that before the Constitution of the United States could be changed in any way whatever, before there could be one iota of alteration, before one single word could be taken out of that instrument, it had to be done by amendment, and that the amendment had to be ratified by three-fourths of the States of the Union. As we know, ratification by three-fourths of the States means that it must be by both houses of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

Then, Mr. President, after the delegates representing the sovereign States had finished their work of writing the Constitution, putting in all the safeguards to insure the primary authority of the States, they closed the Constitution by writing into it the declaration that the Constitutional Convention acted "by the unanimous consent of the States" present. They wanted the people to know at that time, and wanted all succeeding generations to know, including the Senators sitting here in the year of our Lord 1948, some 160 years after the Constitution was drafted, that it was these sovereign States which had drafted and formulated the Constitution.

Furthermore, Mr. President, even after the sovereign States, through their delegates at Philadelphia in the Constitutional Convention, had written into the Constitution all these safeguards, all these protecting clauses to insure the primary authority of the States, the people themselves—the people back home, who had the final say, who held the final authority in the matter, and without whose voting consent there could be no Constitution—were not quite satisfied. They could look down the years, and they could see that there might be some trick of legerdemain, some resort to parliamentary tactics, whereby someone wishing to rush through some proposal, unwilling to go through the lawful and orderly processes set out and ordained in the Constitution for its amendment, would seek to read into the Constitution powers for the Federal Government which the framers of the Constitution and which the sovereign States never intended the Federal Government should have, which the framers and the sovereign States never intended should be yielded by the sovereign States to the Federal Government.

So, before the people in their State conventions were willing to ratify the Constitution, to make it effective, and bring into being the Federal Government, they said, "We must have the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights," and, as we know, when the Constitution was finally ratified it was well and thoroughly understood that the first 10 amendments to it would be adopted. Let me read the ninth amendment. It specifically declares:

> The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights—

That means the enumeration of certain rights in the Federal Constitution for the Federal Government—

> The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

The people insisted that, as a condition of their ratification, the Constitution should contain the ninth amendment, absolutely retaining in them the rights not specifically enumerated as rights of the Federal Government.

But the people did not stop with the ninth amendment, as Senators know. They insisted also on the adoption of the tenth amendment, and the tenth amendment was put in as a result of their insistence on a general safety clause for the rights of the State and the people. I am sure the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who has thoroughly studied this matter, will agree with me that we might call this amendment the great safety clause of the Constitution. What does the tenth amendment provide? It declares:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Could any language be stronger or more definite in absolutely safeguarding and protecting the rights of the States and the people from encroachments by the Congress of the United States or the Federal Government, on those rights?

We recall, Mr. President, that even with all these safeguards in the Constitution itself to which I have called attention, and even with the agreement to adopt the ninth and tenth amendments, there was a great battle in most of the States over the ratification of the Constitution. At that time, the three most powerful and the three most influential States were Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia. In their State conventions, because of the fear that the sovereign States might be giving up too much sovereignty, that they might be putting too much power in the hands of the Federal Government, only 53 percent of the votes were for ratification.

As we recall, two of the foremost patriots of the Revolution, Patrick Henry, who sounded the tocsin of war and gave us the battle cry of the Revolution, and George Mason, who wrote the Virginia bill of rights, which gave us our Federal Bill of Rights, and the bill of rights in every State constitution—both these great patriots who had done so much to win our independence from the British Crown, to win our freedom, opposed the ratification of the Constitution. They felt as did many of their compatriots, that there might be too great a surrender of sovereignty on the part of the States, that there might be too much yielding of power to the Federal Government.

I emphasize these points because the history of the ratification of the Constitution shows clearly that if the sovereignty of the States and the rights of the States had not been positively recognized in the Constitution, if all these safeguards and protections for their sovereignty and their rights had not been put into the Constitution, the Constitution would never have been ratified, and we would never have had a Federal Government.

Mr. President, as we know, mankind had struggled through the centuries to break arbitrary power in the hands of a king. The high-water mark of this struggle to break down this arbitrary power and to bring about the distribution of this power into the hands of the people was reached when we fought the American Revolution.

The framers of the Constitution knew that the States, with their State governments, county governments, city governments, and town governments, were the citadels of local self-government. They knew that their concept of government by the people required full and plenary recognition of the rights of the States. If the people were to hold and exercise the power of government there had to be this recognition of the sovereignty of the States.

They were fighting against a pool of centralized arbitrary power at the seat of government. They were fighting to keep the well springs of our system of Government in the hands of the people, in the local communities, at the crossroads, in the hamlets, the towns, and the cities. What would it have availed the people to break the tyranny of the British Crown had they themselves then set up here in Washington a government with central arbitrary power? They were determined, after all the long sacrifice they had made and all their bitter suffering, to reserve the power in their own hands. To do this, I repeat, they knew that they had to maintain the rights of the States, because within the States are

the citadels of this power. It is in the States that this power must reside. It is in the States that this power can function. And it is only in the States that this power can be preserved.

Mr. President, for 150 years, in fact not until this anti-poll-tax bill first appeared, no record can be found that anyone ever questioned the provisions of article I, section 2 of the Constitution that the electors who vote for Members of Congress shall have the qualifications of the electors who vote for the most numerous branch of the several State legislatures.

When the fourteenth amendment was submitted by Congress there was no thought, no suggestion that the Congress could step in and by legislative enactment fix or modify or change or prescribe the qualifications of the electors for Members of Congress or the qualifications of the electors for President and Vice President.

Mr. President, in order that we may understand and fully appreciate how fixed and set was this acceptance of the fact that Congress had no power to legislate as to the qualifications of these electors, I call to the attention of the Senate that when Congress met in December 1865, the then leader of the House of Representatives was Mr. Thaddeus Stevens of the State of Pennsylvania. Perhaps in all the history of the House of Representatives it has never had a more complete master than was Thaddeus Stevens. When the House met Thaddeus Stevens outlined the program with reference to the Southern States, as to what should be done to them, as to what should be done about the situation that grew out of the War Between the States. Among other things Mr. Stevens said:

> The future condition of the conquered power depends upon the will of the conqueror.

He said further that the conquered provinces were to be admitted as States—

> Only when the Constitution has been amended so as to secure the perpetual ascendancy of the party of the Union.

That, of course, meant the Republican Party. He continued, and this is the gist of his feelings at that time as the leader in the program of dealing with the Southern States:

> Every government is a despotism. • • • The Constitution has nothing to do with it.

That is the program for the Southern States.

> I propose to deal with you—

That is, the South—

> entirely by the laws of war. The conquered people have no right to appeal to the courts to test the constitutionality of the law. The Constitution has nothing to do with them or they with it.

In other words, Mr. Stevens said that so far as the Southern States were concerned they were out from under any protection of the Constitution; they held no rights given by the Constitution. All the safeguards, all the guaranties accorded to the other States, he said, then were denied to the States of the South. He said they had no standing whatever under the Constitution; that they had no right to go into court to raise any constitutional question.

Mr. Stevens said that the Southern States were but conquered provinces. But when he came to the question of suffrage what did he do? Did he introduce a bill to prescribe the qualifications of the electors for the Congress of the United States? Did he seek to resort to statutory enactment? No. He recognized, that although the Southern States, according to his view and his version, might not have rights under the Constitution, every other State in the United States had rights under it, and that he could not do violence to the Constitution without doing violence to rights of the States of the North, the States of the East, and the States of the West. He recognized the clear language of the Constitution that the qualifications of electors for Members of Congress were the qualifications fixed by the States for the electors for the most numerous branch of the legislature. He did not dare propose that the Congress seek to set aside the Constitution, or seek to change the Constitution, or amend or modify or rape the Constitution by any legislative act.

So Mr. Stevens and his lieutenants in the Congress, even though they were seeking changes respecting suffrage to apply primarily and almost wholly to the South, did not dare ignore the Constitution of the United States and seek to reach their ends by a statute to be passed by Congress. He and the other leaders of the Congress at that time submitted the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States. They changed the Constitution in the one way that the Constitution can be changed, in the only lawful, orderly, and constitutional way, and that is by constitutional amendment. That is why the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States were submitted.

Mr. Stevens and the other leaders recognized that, no matter what the difficulties might be about a change in the Constitution, no matter what delays there might be, or what question there might be as to whether or not such amendments might be ratified, the only way the Constitution could be changed was by constitutional amendment; and that was the course and the procedure that they followed.

So, Mr. President, as I have said, for more than 160 years we have lived under the express language of the Constitution. I might say 160 glorious years, because in all the annals of human history there is no story quite so glorious as that of the progress, advancement, and happiness of the American people under the Constitution of the United States. There is nothing to surpass the freedom which our people have enjoyed to seek their own pursuits, to follow the dictates of their own minds, to advance their own interests and bring about their own development, to acquire and hold whatever their capacity, their genius, and the sweat of their toil might entitle them to.

Mr. President, it is a grave thing when it is proposed to open the door to rape the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Alabama is making a very able argument, to which I am listening with considerable interest. There is no doubt in the Senator's mind, is there, that prior to the adoption of the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution it was admitted on every hand that the States could place any limitation on suffrage that they desired to place? They could require a property qualification, or a qualification as to race, as did New York and some of the other States.

Mr. HILL. Some States had a religious qualification.

Mr. EASTLAND. There was a religious qualification in certain States.

The fifteenth amendment provides that a person shall not be disqualified because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. We later adopted the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits disqualification because of sex. It permitted women to vote. If Congress has the right to enact an anti-poll-tax bill and say that a poll tax shall not be a qualification, why was it necessary to amend the Constitution of the United States in those two instances, by adopting the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. If Congress could have said by a simple act that race should not be a qualification for voting, and that sex should not be a qualification for voting, it was a futile thing to amend the Constitution, as was done when the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments were adopted. Does the distinguished Senator agree with me?

Mr. HILL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. While the Senator was necessarily absent from the Chamber, I commented on the situation in Congress at the time the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments were submitted. I quoted certain language of Thaddeus Stevens, who, the Senator will recall, was the master of the situation in the House of Representatives. Thaddeus Stevens had said that so far as the Southern States were concerned they had no rights under the Constitution, that the Constitution had nothing to do with them. He said that all the safeguards in the Constitution, all the protections and guarantees for the States, were null and void so far as the Southern States were concerned. Yet in spite of Thaddeus Stevens' feeling with respect to the Southern States, and although he was seeking to take an action in connection with suffrage which was largely confined to the South, he did not even suggest that that action be by legislative statute. He recognized that the Constitution was a protection of the rights of the States of the North, the East, and the West and even if his views were to be accepted—that the South had no rights under the Constitution—he did not attempt to violate the Constitution. He and the other

leaders submitted the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Section 1 of article II of the Constitution provides that Presidential electors shall be chosen by the State "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct." The bill provides that a poll tax shall not be a qualification for a voter for President or Vice President. To begin with, we do not have candidates on the ballot for President or Vice President. The bill also provides that a poll tax shall not be a qualification for a voter for candidates for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors. Does not the Senator agree that it is the plain meaning of the Constitution that the legislature of a State may determine the terms and conditions for choosing the State's Presidential electors?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is again correct. In fact, in our early history the legislature itself, in some of the States, chose the electors.

Mr. EASTLAND. The legislature has that right today. If it is done by suffrage, the only limitation on the power of the States to fix the qualifications of electors are the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments. If the bill were constitutional, the Federal Government would have the authority to go into the State, to go behind the State legislature and engraft terms on the power of the State legislature to choose Presidential electors.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. Of course, the Congress has no such power.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is unheard of under the American system.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the bill goes much further than purely Federal elections. It says it is limited to the election of Representatives in the Federal Congress or of Senators in the Federal Congress, or of candidates for President or Vice President, or candidates for electors for President or Vice President; but the Constitution says that the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures must be the identical qualifications of voters for members of the Federal House of Representatives, and under the seventeenth amendment, for United States Senators.

Mr. HILL. I was coming to that in a moment. I will say to the Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. Those qualifications must be identical. If Congress can engraft qualifications there, then the Congress of the United States would be fixing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi is exactly right; and then the Congress would, by legislative act, amend, change, and modify the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. If this bill is enacted, we are bound to have to come to the conclusion that when the States adopted the Constitution, they surrendered to the Congress of the United States the power to choose State officials who exercise State prerogatives exclusively.

Mr. HILL. Yes; and they have nothing whatever to do with the Federal Government.

Mr. EASTLAND. The mere statement of that premise shows the patent unconstitutionality of this measure; does not the distinguished Senator from Alabama agree as to that?

Mr. HILL. I agree 100 percent with the distinguished Senator. The unconstitutionality of the measure is patent on the face of it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi referred to the seventeenth amendment. We recall that that amendment to the Constitution was adopted in 1913. That was 126 years after the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. After 126 years, when the people of the United States saw fit to change their method of electing United States Senators, when they desired to have their Senators elected, not by the legislatures, as provided in the original Constitution, but directly by the people themselves, what did they provide? They provided, in the seventeenth amendment, as follows:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

Then there is this language:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

The people adopted the same, the identical language for the qualification of electors for the United States Senate that was adopted for electors for Members of the House of Representatives at the very beginning. In other words, they ratified and reaffirmed the wisdom of the founding fathers and of the Original States in providing that the qualifications of the electors for Members of the Congress should be the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. I think it can be said here that had the seventeenth amendment made any change in the fixing or determination of those qualifications, it would never have been ratified by the people of the United States. The people were determined that these qualifications should remain, to be fixed by the States, and not by either the Federal Constitution or the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, as we know, for half a century some of the finest, most patriotic, and noblest women in our country, joined by splendid, outstanding, patriotic men, carried on the campaign for the removal of sex as a qualification for voting; they carried on the campaign to have women given an equal right to vote with men. But if we examine the record we do not find anywhere that any leader in that great cause for woman suffrage ever suggested that women could by legislative enactment be granted the right to vote. That campaign, which was carried on for over half a century, recognized at all times the Constitution of the United States and particularly section 2 of article I of the Constitution in its full purport and its full integrity; and that campaign, from the day of its beginning until its successful conclusion, was always a campaign for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. As we know, when the nineteenth amendment was ratified and became a part of the Constitution, women were put upon an equal basis with men so far as sex is concerned in the matter of the qualifications for voting.

So, Mr. President, as I have said, when the fourteenth amendment was submitted and ratified, when the fifteenth amendment was submitted and ratified, when the seventeenth amendment was submitted and ratified, and when the nineteenth amendment was submitted and ratified, the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States ratified and reaffirmed the integrity of section 2 of article I of the Constitution of the United States and the integrity of section 1 of article IV of the Constitution of the United States.

They ratified and reaffirmed the fact that Congress has no power in any way to legislate with reference to the qualifications of the electors. Congress cannot subtract from those qualifications, Congress cannot add to those qualifications. Congress can do absolutely nothing so far as those qualifications are concerned. The Constitution of the United States, in clear and positive language, makes it definite and certain that those qualifications shall be fixed by the States.

Mr. President, in opposing the anti-poll-tax bill, we who oppose it, we who fight so bitterly against it are not only fighting for the protection of the rights of the States, but we are also fighting to save our dual form of government—to save the American Republic.

In the very beginning, article I, section 2, vested in the State governments the power over suffrage. Without the possession of this power in the States, the whole structure upon which the division of state and national authority under the Constitution and the organization of both governments rests would be without support, and the authority of both State and Nation would fall to the ground. Surely, after 160 years of the tried and proven wisdom, of the tried and proven effectiveness of this section, it is most unfortunate that now, in the heat, passion, and confusion of an election campaign, when a President of the United States is to be elected, when a third of the Members of this body are to be elected, when all the Members of the House of Representatives are to be elected, and when State officials are to be elected, this question, which strikes at the very foundation-stones of our dual system of government and which would tear down the very structure of our Government, should be injected into the Senate of the United States. It is no time for the consideration of a matter so serious, so important, so fundamental to the lives, the liberties, and the rights of the people of the United States. The matter should be laid aside and no further consideration given under the temper and heat of this hour, to such a fundamental proposal striking at

the very base of the temple of American rights and American freedom.

Mr. President, there appeared before the Senate committee when it was considering the anti-poll-tax bill one of the ablest constitutional lawyers I have ever known, Mr. Charles Warren, of this city. He made one of the clearest, one of the most erudite and profound analyses of section 2 of article I I have ever read. At this time I want to call that analysis to the attention of the Senate. Before doing so, I shall read a very brief biographical sketch of Judge Warren, in order that we may know who he is and by what authority he speaks. I read:

> Judge Warren is a graduate of the Harvard law school. He has a doctor of laws degree from Columbia University. He was a former associate of Moorfield Storey, whom many of us will recall as an eminent lawyer in Boston, Mass. He has been in Washington since 1914 and was, from 1914 to 1918, an Assistant Attorney General of the United States. He has been a lecturer at Princeton, Cornell, the University of Illinois, the University of Rochester, Boston University, the University of Virginia, William and Mary, Northwestern University, and the University of Chicago. He has been an overseer of Harvard College, a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society and of the American Society of International Law, and he is at present an honorary vice president of that society. He is a member of the Academy of Arts and Letters.

I may say Judge Warren makes clear that he is opposed to a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting and that he thinks the States should remove the poll tax as such prerequisite. In fact, he told the committee he was the private secretary to Gov. William E. Russell, of Massachusetts, in 1901 when the Governor waged the fight in that State for the repeal of the poll tax. Judge Warren, as a very young man, as private secretary to Governor Russell, took an active part in that fight to have Massachusetts repeal her poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

Judge Warren, testifying before the committee, quoted section 2 of article I. I think the section is like the words of Scripture. It will stand quoting and requoting, and then perhaps quoting again; so that if the Senate will bear with me, before I proceed to discuss Judge Warren's analysis of the section, I shall read it:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Judge Warren then goes on to say:

> You notice that that is not a grant of power specifically to the Congress of the United States. In fact, it is not a grant of power to anyone. It is a requirement of the Constitution for the formation of the new Government. The first part of it is a requirement that the people of the several States shall choose Members of the House of Representatives every second year. That was no relinquishment or delegation of power from the States. That was a constituent part of the formation of the new Government, and was a command—

A command. Later in my remarks I shall call attention to the Classic case in which Mr. Justice Stone, afterward Mr. Chief Justice Stone, used that exact word and this exact expression—

and was a command to the States to elect their Members of Congress every second year.

That, as Judge Warren said, was a command.

It was neither a delegation of power nor was it a prohibition. It was a command and is so referred to in recent cases in the Supreme Court.

That includes the Classic case to which I shall refer.

Then Judge Warren goes on as follows:

> The second thing that section 2 did was: It vested a right in the electors in each State who have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature—a right in those persons in the State and those only who were entitled to vote for Members of Congress.

In other words, as Judge Warren makes clear, it vested this right in the electors in the States to vote for Members of Congress. Judge Warren continues:

> That was not a delegation of power by the State, because the State never had the power to vote, the State inhabitants never had that power to vote for Members of Congress, because there were no such things.

There was no delegation of power. A State could not delegate a power which it did not possess. Certainly a State did not have any power to elect Members of Congress, because, until the formation of the Federal Government, there was no such thing as a Congress of the United States, and, of course, there were no Members of Congress.

Judge Warren continues:

> That was a direct provision in the establishment of the new Government, and it did vest a right, but it vested a right in only certain people to vote for Members of Congress.
>
> Now, the third thing that that section 2 contains is this: It contains undoubtedly an implied prohibition on the States against fixing for electors of the Members of Congress any different requirements for suffrage from those which they fixed for the electors of their own most numerous branch of their legislature, i. e., any qualifications which were not those requisite for it to render an inhabitant of their own State eligible to vote.

That is an implied prohibition. The State was prohibited from establishing any kind of a qualification for electors for Members of Congress different from the qualifications of electors for the most numerous branch of the legislatures.

Judge Warren continues:

> Let me repeat that. There is undoubtedly an implied prohibition that the States cannot establish qualifications for electors of members of their own legislature which shall be different from those which they establish for electors of Members of Congress. That is neither a delegation nor a grant of power; that is an implied restriction, undoubtedly.
>
> Now, is there in that section 2 any grant of power whatever? Not specifically, of course. I suppose there is, under the necessary and proper clause of section 8 of article I, an implied power to Congress to do certain things, but what is the extent of those implied powers? It is to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper "for carrying into execution" the above provisions of article I, section 2.

What are the provisions? I go back again. First, Congress undoubtedly has power to legislate so as to see to it that the States do elect Members of Congress every second year. Congress undoubtedly has the power to protect the right which the Constitution vested in such persons in the States as had the qualifications requisite to vote for members of the State legislature. Congress undoubtedly has that power; and I think Congress has, under the necessary and proper clause, power to legislate so as to see that the States make the same provisions for qualifications of electors of Members of Congress as they do for electors of their own legislature.

Those are the only three things that can be done under article I, section 2, and those are the only three things on which Congress can act under the necessary and proper clause, and "carry into execution" under that clause.

Mr. President, let us go a little further into section 2. I think no one will contend—surely I have never found anyone who has ever contended—that Congress has any power to prescribe for the States whom they shall qualify to vote. Certainly no one has ever contended that Congress has any power to prescribe the qualifications for the electors who vote for members of the State legislature or other State officers or officials. As I said earlier in my remarks, before 1787 the States had absolutely full and unlimited power to establish any requirements which the people of the States, through their constitutions or legislatures, in their absolute discretion and judgment, desired in order to qualify any one of their inhabitants to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. There was no limitation whatever upon the State, because, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, the State was absolutely sovereign, it had full and plenary sovereignty, it was subject to no other sovereignty, no other power, it was the complete master of itself, of its own actions, of its own constitution, of its own laws, of its own electors, of its own legislature, of its own officials.

As we know, at the time the Constitution was being written, back in 1787, most of the States, at least nine of them, had spoken and fixed by their own constitutions the qualifications of those who should vote for the members of their own legislatures. We cannot forget, Mr. President, in considering this matter, that the delegates from these States knew exactly what those qualifications were in their States. They knew exactly what they were doing when they prescribed that those qualifications fixed by the States should be the qualifications for the electors for Members of the House of Representatives. It was with knowledge of these qualifications that the delegates acted in the drafting and the formation of the Constitution in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia.

What were these qualifications? A list of the States with their qualifications is given. The list is taken from volume I, pages 93–971, of the Constitutional History of the American People, 1776–1850, by Francis Newton Thorpe, published by Harper Brothers, New York. What were the qualifications these delegates adopted and which they ratified

when they put this provision in the Constitution? I think my distinguished friend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in his able speech set out the table of these qualifications, but Senators are very busy, and some of them may not have had a chance to look at the RECORD, so I am going to take a few minutes to go over these qualifications at this time.

The first State is the great little State of New Hampshire, from which some of the Minute Men came in the early days, the men who fought the battles of the Revolution in order that the Constitution might be born, the rights of the States safeguarded, and, most of all, that the power might reside in the hands of the people, and not in a central, arbitrary government here in Washington. That is what those Minute Men died for, those boys from up in the hills and mountains of New Hampshire.

What were the qualifications in New Hampshire? A voter had to have the privilege of the town, and had to be a freeholder. He had to own property; he had to own real estate. But the qualifications in New Hampshire did not stop there. They went further, and what do Senators suppose a voter had to do? He had to pay a poll tax, the very tax we are discussing now. Voters in New Hampshire had to pay a poll tax when this provision was written into the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to his colleague?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my colleague for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask my very able colleague if it is not a fact that in New Hampshire even at this date there is a poll-tax charge, and that the person who fails to pay that tax is ineligible to vote?

Mr. HILL. I had the Library of Congress prepare for me a summary of the poll-tax laws of the States of New England, and my colleague's statement certainly applies to town elections in Vermont. I am not sure, however, from this compilation, that it applies in the State of New Hampshire. It is necessary to pay a poll tax in New Hampshire, as I recall, in order to get a driver's license, in order to run an automobile, and to do other things in that State. But according to this compilation prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, I am not sure that the payment of a poll tax is absolutely a prerequisite to voting in New Hampshire. I am going to ask my colleague from Alabama, while I continue with the qualifications of the other States, to look through this memorandum and check carefully on New Hampshire and the requirements for voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to insert the memorandum in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. HILL. No, I do not ask that now. I am willing to have my colleague check on the State of New Hampshire.

The next State in the list is the State of the granite hills, the beautiful little State of Vermont, from which we get wonderful maple sugar, a State whose sons also played a heroic part in the War of the Revolution. When the Constitution of the United States was being drafted, in order to vote in Vermont a man otherwise eligible to vote—of course no women could vote—in order to meet the prerequisite, had to be a freeholder, he had to own property, and today, as I have said, even at the present moment, in the State of Vermont, in order to vote in a town election one has to pay a poll tax; the payment of a poll tax is a prerequisite to voting.

The next State is the great old Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the State of Samuel Adams, John Hancock, John Adams, John Quincy Adams, Dr. Warren, and the other great heroes of the Revolution. In order to vote in Massachusetts the requirement was that one must own a freehold with an annual income of £3, or an estate of £60. One had to be a property owner in order to vote in Massachusetts. They did not let one off with paying a poll tax of a dollar or a dollar and a half; a voter had to be a property owner.

In the State of New York the voter had to be a freeholder of £20, paying rent of 40 shillings. He had to have a freehold of £100 in order to vote for State senator. They seemed to prescribe a greater prerequisite for voting for State senator than for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature, which meant they prescribed a greater prerequisite for voting for State senator than was required for voting for a Member of the Federal Congress.

In New Jersey one had to own an estate of £50; he had to be a property owner.

In Pennsylvania the voter had to be a State or county taxpayer.

In Delaware the citizen in order to exercise the right to vote also had to be a State or county taxpayer.

In Maryland the voter had to be a freeholder of 50 acres, or have property worth £30 pounds.

We come now to Virginia, a State which did not have any kind of property or tax-payment qualification.

In North Carolina the voter had to own a freehold of 50 acres in a county, and must have owned it for 6 months before the election. It was also a requirement that the voter had paid his public taxes. If the citizen had not paid his public taxes he could not vote.

In South Carolina the voter had to be a freeholder of 50 acres or a town lot, or he had to pay taxes equal to the tax on 50 acres. That is, if the voter did not own 50 acres, he must, as a requirement for voting, have paid a tax equal to the tax on 50 acres.

In Georgia the voter had to own property in an amount of £10, or have a trade as a mechanic, or be a taxpayer.

The State of Kentucky was not one of the 13 original States, but it is included in the list, so I shall refer to it. In order to be a voter in Kentucky a citizen had to be a taxpayer. Kentucky came into the union in 1792, only 3 years after the formation of the Federal Government.

In Tennessee, which was admitted shortly thereafter, a voter had to be a freeholder.

Mr. President, these were the qualifications the States imposed respecting their electors when the Constitution was being drafted, when the delegates from the States were busy writing that document at the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia. They knew what these qualifications were, and therefore when they wrote into the Constitution that the qualifications for electors for Members of the House of Representatives should be the qualifications for the electors for the the most numerous branch of the State legislatures, they knew exactly what they were doing. They knew exactly that as of that moment they were writing those qualifications into the Constitution as the qualifications for electors for Members of the House of Representatives. There can be no doubt that it was clear to them exactly what their actions meant.

When we consult Madison's notes we find that there were three schools of thought in the Constitutional Convention with reference to the matter of qualifications of electors to vote for Members of Congress. Of course, we know that Mr. Madison took the most voluminous notes of any member of the historic convention which gave us the Federal Constitution. Those notes have been compiled for us by Jonathan Elliot, and were published by J. B. Lippincott in Philadelphia in 1907. I have before me volume V of Elliot's Debates on the Federal Constitution, and in a moment I shall read from page 385.

One school of thought felt that the qualifications should be prescribed in the Constitution itself.

The second school of thought felt that the qualifications should be left to Congress; that the Constitution should provide that the Congress should have the power to prescribe the qualifications.

The third school of thought, which as we know prevailed in the Constitutional Convention, was that the qualifications for the electors should be those fixed by the States for the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

We turn to Mr. Madison's notes, as compiled by Mr. Jonathan Elliot, and, reading from volume V, page 385, we find this:

> Mr. Gouverneur Morris—
>
> From New York, as we recall—
>
> moved to strike out the last member of the section, beginning with the words, "qualifications of electors," in order that some other provision might be substituted which would restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders.

In other words, Gouverneur Morris not only wanted the Constitution to fix the qualifications for the electors but he wanted at least one of those qualifications to be that the elector should be a freeholder, that he should own property. So Gouverneur Morris moved to amend the proposal to write in the qualification that the electors should be freeholders.

> Mr. Fitzsimons seconded the motion.
>
> Mr. Williamson was opposed to the motion.
>
> Mr. Wilson—
>
> One of the ablest men in the Constitutional Convention, then spoke. In

that connection, Mr. President, and before I read what these men said, I think I shall call to the attention of the Senate the committee which brought in the provision in section 2 of Article I. It was termed, in the language of the Constitutional Convention, "The Committee of Detail."

The Committee of Detail was composed of Mr. Rutledge, of South Carolina; Edmund Randolph, of Virginia; Nathaniel Gorham, of Massachusetts, who was chairman of the Committee of the Whole; Oliver Ellsworth, and James Wilson, of Pennsylvania. John Rutledge, as we recall, was offered a place on the first United States Supreme Court, and was afterward appointed Chief Justice of the United States. Edmund Randolph, we recall, was George Washington's first Attorney General. Later Oliver Ellsworth was Chief Justice of the United States, and James Wilson was a member of the President's Cabinet.

Where could there have been found at that time in all the world, or where could there be found today in all the world, a committee of abler or more distinguished lawyers and students of government, or more capable political draftsmen than the men who constituted the committee which wrote section 2 of article I? Where could a more brilliant galaxy of stars in the field of statesmanship be found than these great lawyers, students of the philosophy of government, students of human nature, men of common sense and wisdom, who constituted the committee which wrote section 2 of article I?

I was about to read that after Gouverneur Morris moved to amend the committee provision leaving to the States the fixing of the qualifications for electors of Members of Congress, so as to require that the electors be freeholders, or so as to make sure that they were property owners before they could vote for Members of the House, Mr. Fitzsimons seconded the motion. Mr. Williamson opposed it. Then Mr. Wilson, of Pennsylvania, one of the ablest men who sat in that Convention rose and made this observation, according to Madison's notes:

> This part of the report was well considered by the committee, and he (Mr. Wilson) did not think it could be changed for the better. It was difficult to form any uniform rule of qualifications for all the States. Unnecessary innovations, he thought, too, should be avoided.

When I quote that language about unnecessary innovations, I come back to my statement of a few minutes ago, that Mr. Wilson and the other delegates gathered there to write the Constitution knew exactly what the qualifications were as fixed by their own State constitutions. So when Mr. Wilson was speaking about no innovations, he was impliedly, at least, making a plea for the qualifications fixed in his own State of Pennsylvania, and fixed by the constitutions of the other original States.

Mr. Wilson went on to say:

> It would be very hard and disagreeable for the same persons, at the same time, to vote for representatives in the State legislature, and to be excluded from a vote for those in the national legislature.

All of us have many times been in polling booths to vote. We know that the words spoken by Mr. Wilson were not only true in 1787, but that they are just as true today. Can Senators imagine the disorder, the confusion, the uncertainty that would be thrown around the exercise of a right which is the most sacred right, perhaps, possessed by any American citizen, the right to the ballot, if there were one set of qualifications for electors for Members of Congress, President, and Vice President, and another set of qualifications for electors of State legislatures and State officers?

While I do not believe that the very practical question raised by Mr. Wilson was the controlling one in the drafting of article 1, section 2, those men, being men of common sense, men with a keen, profound knowledge of human nature and the ways of people and of events, were undoubtedly persuaded by the consideration of how impractical it would be to have varying qualifications for the different electors.

Mr. Wilson having made his statement, Gouverneur Morris, the author of the motion, rose. I read further from Madison's notes:

> Such a hardship—

That is, being a freeholder or the owner of property, because that is what his motion provided as a qualification—

> would be neither great nor novel. The people are accustomed to it, and not dissatisfied with it, in several of the States. In some, the qualifications are different for the choice of the governor and of the representatives; in others, for different houses of the legislature. Another objection against the clause as it stands is that it makes the qualifications of the national legislature depend on the will of the States, which he thought not proper.

He was unwilling to recognize this right in the State. Mr. Morris was unwilling that this power should continue to be vested in the State. He wanted it in the Federal Government.

Then Mr. Ellsworth, of Massachusetts, rose and said that he thought the qualifications of electors stood on the most proper footing. Note this language:

> The right of sovereignty was a tender point and strongly guarded by most of the State constitutions. The people will not readily subscribe to the National Constitution if it should subject them to be disfranchised.

He was arguing against Mr. Morris' motion to make the ownership of a freehold a qualification.

> The States are the best judges of the circumstances and temper of their own people.

Notice that language. The States—the people back home, the people who gather in the State capitols, the people who go to the ballot boxes back in the hamlets, the communities, and the crossroads—"are the best judges of the circumstances and temper of their own people." Would anyone dispute that today?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend the Senator from Maryland for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama whether the asking of a question or two at this point would divert him from the very able argument he is making?

Mr. HILL. To be frank with the Senator, it might depend on what the question is, and the line of thought the question relates to.

Mr. TYDINGS. It would be along the same line.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has quoted section 2 of article I of the Constitution, which provides that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors to the most numerous branch of the State legislature. I wish to ask the Senator whether he has heard any person advance the thought that the Federal Government has the power or the legal right, if you please, to tell the States what shall be the qualifications of the electors in each State, for its own State officers.

Mr. HILL. In answer to the Senator's question, I shall say that shortly before the Senator was able to reach the floor of the Senate today, I made the flat, categorical statement that if anyone had ever, anywhere, claimed that power for the Congress of the Federal Government, I had never been able to find it or to hear of it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

I should like to ask another question. If no one has advocated that the Federal Government has the power to fix the qualifications of the electors in the separate States in voting for their own State legislatures, then how can it be contended, from a strictly constitutional standpoint, that the electors in each State can, even in voting for Federal officers, under the wording of the Constitution, be other than those persons who are qualified by State law to vote for their State legislatures?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland, who is one of the ablest and best lawyers in this body, has put his finger on the heart of this whole matter. Of course the Senator by his very question implies the answer. Since the Federal Constitution says that the qualifications shall be those fixed by the States, and since the Congress cannot fix the qualifications for the electors in the States, the Congress has no power to fix the qualifications of electors for the Members of Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. Therefore I should like to ask the Senator whether all wise men—and I use the term "wise" in its broadest sense—must approach this question as we must, in acting in accordance with our duty, approach all questions, namely, not from the standpoint of what we would like the Constitution to be or what we would like the system of elections to be or what improvements we might make in it if we were writing it over again; but in the absence of any amendment to the contrary, from the standpoint of voting on this and all other propositions which come before the Congress in strict accordance with the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator from Maryland is absolutely correct. It is not only our duty, but we took an oath to fulfill and meet that duty; and on this proposition we are in the same position in which the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], found himself yesterday in connection with his ruling. He, as a Senator, as an individual, and as a citizen holds one view of the matter; but the Senate rule takes an entirely different view. So he, under his oath as the President pro tempore of the Senate, maintained the integrity of the Senate rules, and handed down his decision, not according to his wishes, not according to what he wished to see done or what he would have done, but according to what the law of the Senate is.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the able Senator from Alabama whether, quite aside from the necessity of checks and balances in the Constitution, he recognizes from a purely abstract point of view based on the premise of justice and equality alone, if we were without the Constitution, we could justify the fact that Delaware, one of the smallest States in population in the country, has two United States Senators; and New York, the largest State in the country in population, has two United States Senators, thereby making the vote of one man or woman in Delaware equal to the votes of 45 men or women living in New York State, for the same high elective Federal officers?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. I may say to him that earlier in my remarks I discussed that very proposition—in other words, how the States, in their jealous regard for their rights and in their determination to secure the primary authority of the States in the Government, wrote into the Constitution the provision that every State should have equal representation in the Senate of the United States, and that no State should be denied its representation without its consent. I discussed that point. The Senator from Maryland is exactly correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator, therefore, if what we are dealing with here primarily is not what we might consider if we were not bound by any constitutional restrictions—in which event the Senator from Maryland would favor the abolition of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting, for I am opposed to them as a matter of principle, but I do not have the right, under the Constitution, do I, I ask the Senator from Alabama, to go into other States and say, "If you want that system of government, I, as a Senator representing a State in the United States Senate, have the power under the Constitution to define the qualifications the electors must have in your State to elect persons either to the Federal House of Representatives or the Senate"—either in the State of Alabama or in any other State of the Union?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct; the Congress does not have that power, and, as I said, for Congress to try to assert that power is to rape the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend the Senator from Tennessee for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask a question. The Senator has been examining this matter very extensively, as shown by his speech. I wish to ask him whether he has ever known a Federal court of any kind to hold that under the Federal Constitution there exists in Congress a power to legislate by implication?

Mr. HILL. Not only have I not known any court to render such a ruling, but I may say to the Senator that a little later in my remarks I hope to come to the question of court decisions, and discuss the decisions of the courts, all of which affirm and ratify the proposition that Congress has no power to fix these qualifications, but that they are fixed by the Constitution, which prescribes that they shall be the qualifications fixed by the States for their electors for the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Mr. McKELLAR. My investigation of the matter was made some time ago; but, so far as I recall, I have never seen a district court decision, a circuit court decision, or a Supreme Court decision in which a judge has ever indicated that there was any ground on which he could base a decision that there were in the Constitution implied powers under which Congress could legislate. I have never seen a decision of any kind—not even a decision by a judge who might be called "off" in his mind—in which it was held that there was sufficient ground for such a contention. I would challenge any Senator who believes there is an implied power of action in the Federal Constitution. Only such powers are granted as are provided in definite words and very plain and clear language. So I would challenge any Senator to point to a single decision of that sort by any judge, whether a judge who was perfectly himself, or even imperfectly himself. I certainly have not seen such a decision; and I do not believe any other Senator can say he has ever seen such a decision holding that there is any implied authority to act under the Federal Government. Such implied authority simply does not exist in the Constitution.

Mr. HILL. The decision is not in the books, I may say.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not in the books.

Mr. HILL. It is not to be found. It does not exist.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask one question to lay a foundation so I may ask the Senator another question. If the anti-poll-tax bill should be passed, would it not be a patent attempt on the part of the Government of the United States to define the qualification in a certain respect of electors in the States of the Union?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. If that be so, and if the Federal Government can fix the qualifications of electors in the separate States in this one regard, what is there in the Constitution—in or out of it, for that matter—by express or implied statement, to prohibit the Congress from fixing all the qualifications of all the electors in every State in the Union, and eliminating completely the right of the States in that particular field of endeavor?

Mr. HILL. The Senator's question is so well stated by him that it answers itself. Once the Congress enters into this field by fixing any qualification, adding to or subtracting from any qualification fixed by the States, then there is no limit at all on the Congress; the Congress can go into the whole field with reference to all qualifications of electors.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it is a well-settled policy of law that what a government can give, a government can take away. Therefore, if the Congress has the right to fix the qualifications of electors in the individual States, then it has the right to take away the qualifications. Just as it may add a new qualification, so it may subtract one.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Under that authority, if carried far enough, it would be possible to discriminate not only against a certain race or color, but to discriminate upon a property basis or on almost any other basis. The logic is inescapable that once the right of the Federal Government to fix qualifications of the electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature is acknowledged in one respect, there is nothing that I know of in the Constitution, if that be good law, that prohibits the Federal Government from fixing the qualifications in every respect; and no man knows how strict as well as how liberal ultimately the qualifications might be.

Mr. HILL. The men who wrote the Constitution 160 years ago fully recognized the proposition so ably stated by the Senator from Maryland. That is one reason why they wrote article I, section 2, as they did. The Senator from Maryland referred to the fact that what a government can give, it can also take away. As I stated earlier in my remarks, there was no Federal Government in 1787. Whatever sovereignty the Federal Government now has, whatever sovereignty the Federal Government obtained under the Constitution, was given it by the States. The States were the supreme sovereignties.

Mr. TYDINGS. They were the mother and father.

Mr. HILL. In that convention, as the Senator from Maryland suggests, they were the mother and the father. They were the creators of the Federal Government. The history of the drafting of the Constitution shows clearly the States did not intend to give to the Congress or to the Federal Government either by constitution or by legislative enactment any power to fix the qualifications, but

they, the sovereign States, the creators, intended to keep that power in their own hands.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator first for yielding to me, and I shall make one observation, which is, that in this particular regard the creators of the Federal Government, the States, attempted to make certain in two express provisions that what we are now considering could never be done by the Federal Government. In the first place, it said——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend for a moment, the Chair wants to caution the Senator from Alabama that he is limited to yielding for a question, and for a question only, not for an observation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am asking a question.

Mr. HILL. I yield only for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am asking the question of the Senator from Alabama if it is not so that in two respects the States made it doubly certain that the particular provision which we are now considering would not be good law if passed by the Federal Congress, and if those two respects are not as follows: First, in section 2 of article I, it was expressly provided that the State should be the judge of the qualifications of electors to the most numerous branch of the legislature, and therefore of the officials of the Federal Government; secondly, after having done that expressly, is it not so that in the tenth amendment the States made it doubly sure that there was no power to do this conferred on this child which the States themselves had created? They said, "Not only have we put it in expressly, but we say in addition that all the powers not herewith expressly given to the Federal Government are reserved to the States and to the people thereof." So, if there was any question on the one hand that there had been a hiatus in the powers which the States kept for themselves, they put it in express language so there would be the clincher, as it were, to remove it from the realm of speculation.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. I called attention earlier in my remarks to the fact that the founding fathers had written into the Constitution safeguards to protect the States, such as the one that every State should have equal representation and should not have that representation taken away from it without its consent; the one that the States have the power to originate amendments to the Constitution; the one that no amendment can become a part of the Constitution until at least three-fourths of the States, meaning both houses of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, have ratified it. In spite of those safeguards, the Senator knows, that even then the people would not ratify the Constitution until there was, so to speak, a gentlemen's agreement that the first 10 amendments to the Constitution would be adopted, including not only the tenth amendment to which the Senator has referred, but also, as the Senator knows, the ninth amendment, making the right of the States doubly sure. I referred earlier in my remarks to the tenth amendment, so far as the States are concerned, as the great safety clause of the Constitution. As the Senator has said or implied by his question, the States were insistent that that great safety clause be written into the Constitution in order to protect their rights.

In connection with the questions which the Senator from Maryland has asked me, it is interesting that the next member of the Convention to whose remarks I find my attention called is Col. George Mason, of Virginia. As I said earlier, he was the author of the Virginia bill of rights from which came the Federal Bill of Rights and the bill of rights in the State constitutions of every State in the Union. As I recall, Woodrow Wilson, who was no mean draftsman himself, declared that he would rather have had the honor of penning the Virginia bill of rights than any document ever penned by the hand of man.

Here is what Col. George Mason, of Virginia, had to say in connection with what the Senator from Maryland and I have been discussing:

> The power to alter the qualifications would be a dangerous power in the hands of the Legislature.

Of course George Mason was speaking of the National Legislature. He was speaking of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The founding fathers knew what they were doing when they wrote the Constitution. They did not want the Congress to have this power. George Mason said it would be a dangerous power for the Congress to have. So they wrote, in clear, explicit, positive, and definite language that the power should reside in the States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I shall yield in a moment. In that connection I should like to read another sentence, and then I shall yield to the Senator for a question. The Chair seems to be very much perturbed for fear that the Senator from Maryland might not ask me a question, that his remarks might be in the form of an observation rather than an inquiry.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I make the parliamentary inquiry, if the Senator from Maryland wishes to elicit information from the Senator from Alabama and propound a question, has the Senator from Maryland the right to rise and perform that humble role as often as he shall see fit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present Presiding Officer wishes to assure the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Alabama that so long as he is in the chair he will carry out the rules of the Senate as they exist. He wants all Senators to have their rights. The Senator from Maryland is privileged to rise at any time to ask the Senator from Alabama a question, a question only, unless he receives unanimous consent to make other remarks, without jeopardizing the rights of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Chair for his ruling, and I assure him that all the statements which the Senator from Maryland will make will be in the form of interrogatories.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has it ever occurred to the Senator from Alabama that if the Federal Government had the right to fix the qualifications of electors in the separate States of the Union, with public antipathies in certain parts of the country being what they were at the close of the Civil War, the probabilities are that by legislative fiat all of the South would have been deprived of any vote at all to elect persons to represent them in the Congress of the United States?

Mr. HILL. I discussed that question a little earlier in my remarks. I want to say that there is much merit in the purport of the Senator's question.

Mr. President, to continue, Mr. Butler, a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, made this significant statement:

> There is no right of which the people are more jealous than that of suffrage.

Thus emphasizing, fortifying, and reaffirming the idea that the determination of the qualifications of electors should remain in the hands of the people of the States and that the Congress should have no power over the qualifications of such electors.

Mr. President, I shall read from the statement of Mr. Dickinson. He was a gentleman of rather reactionary views, but I think we should have his views, since we are studying this whole subject. Mr. Dickinson had a very different idea with regard to the tendency toward vesting the right of suffrage in the freeholders of the country. He considered them as the best guardians of liberty and the restriction of the right to them "as a necessary defense against the dangerous influence of those multitudes, without property, and without principle, with which our country, like all others, will in time abound." He very strongly favored the writing in of a qualification that electors must be property owners.

In reply to Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Ellsworth had this to say:

> How shall the freehold be defined? Ought not every man who pays a tax vote for the representative who is to levy and dispose of his money? Shall the wealthy merchants and manufacturers who will bear full share of the public burden be not allowed a voice in the imposition of them? Taxation and representation ought to go together.

Then we come to the man who is known as the father of the Constitution, James Madison. Mr. Madison said:

> The right of suffrage is certainly one of the fundamental requirements of republican government and ought not to be left to be regulated by the legislature.

Of course, when Mr. Madison used the term "legislature," he was speaking of

the National Legislature; he was speaking of the Federal Congress. Then he continued:

The gradual abridgment of this right has been the mode in which aristocracies have been built on the ruins of popular forms. Whether a constitutional qualification ought to be a freehold would depend much upon the probable reception such a change would meet in the States where the right was exercised by every description of people, and in several of the States a freehold was now a qualification.

There was Mr. Madison saying that the Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives, certainly should not have any power to fix, prescribe, or determine the qualifications of electors for Federal officers. On the question as to whether a freehold or property ownership should be prescribed as a qualification, Mr. Madison, being a very wise and very practical man, expressed the view that that might well be determined upon the question as to how such a qualification would be received back in the States. In other words, Mr. Madison, the father of the Constitution, who had done so much in the drafting of the Constitution, and bringing it into being, was thinking as any other wise and practical man would have done in the same circumstances in terms of securing the ratification of the Constitution. He made it very clear that the Congress should have no power to prescribe or fix the qualifications of electors.

It is interesting to note that when the vote came on Gouverneur Morris' motion to prescribe in the Constitution the qualification of possessing a freehold, the motion was voted down, and it was voted down by a vote of 7 to 1. One State only voted for it, the little State of Delaware. Delaware voted aye. New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina voted no. Maryland was divided, and Georgia was not present and voting.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Alabama whether, since his arguments, as I assume they do, go primarily to the passing of a statute by the Congress, he would be prepared to join in support of a constitutional amendment which would be directed to the States for the purpose of abolishing the poll tax as a qualification for voting.

Mr. HILL. At the present time I cannot assure the Senator that I would join him in submitting a constitutional amendment to the States, but I will say to him that the constitutional amendment method is the only way by which this question can be constitutionally and lawfully handled. The only way, under the Constitution, in which this step can be taken is by a constitutional amendment.

The Senator was not able to be on the floor during the whole of my remarks, but I brought to the attention of the Senate earlier in my remarks the fact that there was a campaign in this country for half a century, led by some of the finest and most patriotic and noblest women of the Nation, joined by some of the most outstanding and patriotic men, to give to women an equal right with men to vote, and in all the more than half a century of that campaign it was never suggested that the Congress should try to amend the Constitution by legislative fiat so as to give the women the right to vote. The whole campaign was based on and in behalf of an amendment to the Constitution, and, as we know, that campaign finally culminated in success when the nineteenth amendment was ratified and became a part of the Constitution of the United States, providing that the right of citizens to vote should not be denied on account of sex.

So, without committing myself at this particular time to a constitutional amendment, as I have said to the Senator, it is the only way, unless we rape the Constitution or attempt to rape it, by which this step can be taken.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my colleague from Alabama for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Regardless of the Senator's own personal views with reference to amendment of the Constitution, is it not true that the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], speaking in behalf of the southern bloc of Senators, did propose one day last week that, in the event the majority should agree to proceed by the amendment route and would assure that the Senate would stand by such a proposed amendment in conference, not only would there not be any prolonged discussion of such a proposal, but that he had assurance that a great number of the southern Senators, I believe he said half or more, would actually vote for the submission of such a constitutional amendment?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct, and speaking for myself, if such a proposition shall be submitted in a sincere, bona fide fashion, I shall give the matter my most earnest and careful consideration.

Mr. President, as we know, Mr. Rufus King, who was a member of the Constitutional Convention, kept notes of the proceedings of the Convention. His notes were nothing like as voluminous or complete as were the notes of James Madison, but they do throw much light on many different questions which came before the Constitutional Convention. The notes of Rufus King are to be found in the volume entitled "Formation of the Union," which, incidentally, was authorized to be printed by the Congress of the United States back in 1926, and which contains the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the resolutions of ratification of the conventions of the different States, Mr. Madison's notes, Mr. King's notes, and other notes and commentaries and data with reference to the Constitution. I turn to page 873 of that volume, and I find this quotation from the notes of Rufus King dated August 7, 1787, when the phrase "electors to be the same as those of the most numerous branch of the State legislature" came before the Convention, Mr. Morris offered an amendment.

Having been voted down on his first amendment, he did what Senators sometimes do when they lose on a first amendment. Mr. Morris exercised his right and offered a second amendment, and the second amendment provided for adding a clause to article I of section 2, giving to the National Legislature, that is, to the Congress, power to alter the qualifications.

There we had by this amendment of Gouverneur Morris, of New York, the issue squarely presented to the Constitutional Convention, to give to the Congress, the National Legislature, the power to alter the qualifications as fixed by the States.

When Mr. Morris offered his amendment, Mr. Ellsworth, of Massachusetts, according to Mr. Rufus King's notes, arose and said:

If the Legislature—

That is the Congress; he was speaking, of course, of the National Legislature—

can alter the qualifications they may disqualify three-fourths, or a greater portion, of the electors. This would go far to create aristocracy—the States have staked their liberties on the qualifications which we have proposed to confirm.

Could anything be clearer than those words of Mr. Ellsworth in showing the intent and the purpose of the framers of the Constitution not to lodge in the Federal Congress the power to fix these qualifications. As Madison said, they thought that would be a dangerous power; they were afraid of such power being put in the hands of the Congress, and they were resolved that the power should remain back in the States, in the hands of the people of the States. So Mr. Morris' amendment went the way of his first amendment, which means that the amendment was overwhelmingly rejected, as Mr. Rufus King advises us.

Mr. President, as we know, one of the greatest minds of that period, beginning with the War of the Revolution and coming on down through the Articles of Confederation, and the drafting of the Federal Constitution, and even in the administration of our Federal Government in the early days of George Washington, was the brilliant, profound, magnificent mind of Alexander Hamilton. Perhaps this country has never known a more penetrating or more incisive mind than that of Alexander Hamilton. As we know, Hamilton was not a democrat, and I am using the word with a little "d." He did not believe in, he did not have faith in, the capacity of the people to govern themselves. He believed in a strong central government. He thought it was necessary to have central, arbitrary power concentrated in the Government in Washington. He went so far that many speak of him as a monarchist. And surely we know that in the plan which he submitted to the Constitutional Convention he provided for life tenure for the Chief Executive, the President of the United States. As I recall, he provided for certain hereditary rights; for many things that were to be found under the arbitrary central power of the governments of the kings and the monarchies of the nations of Europe.

Mr. Hamilton, writing about the Constitution—and we must remember what his feelings and his views were—had this to say in chapter 52 of the Federalist:

I shall begin with the House of Representatives. * * * The first view to be taken of this part of the Government, relates to the qualifications of the electors and the elected.

"The qualifications of electors." He went straight to the very question we are discussing here today, because he knew what the whole question involved, so far as determining what our Government was, and what it would be down through the years. He knew it went to the whole question of our dual system of government, the whole question of the structure of our Government, of a divided authority between the Federal Government and the State governments. The brilliant mind of Hamilton knew what he was talking about. He goes on to say:

Those of the former—

That is, of the House of Representatives—

are to be the same—

That is, the qualifications are to be the same—

with those of the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government. It was incumbent on the convention, therefore, to define and establish this right in the Constitution.

In other words, the Constitution had to say what these qualifications were, and by whom they would be prescribed. Hamilton then continues:

To have left it open for the occasional regulation of the Congress would have been improper for the reason just mentioned. * * * The provision made by the Convention—

That is the provision now written into section 2 of article I—

The provision made by the Convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State—

He said—

because it is conformable to the standard already established or which may be established by the State itself.

There was the leading Federalist, there was the outstanding Nationalist in the days of the beginning of our Government, proclaiming in his writings in the Federalist that this method must be satisfactory to the States, because under the Constitution as written it was left to the States.

Again Mr. Hamilton said, speaking about the Constitution:

Its authority would be expressly restricted to the regulation of the times, the places, and the manner of elections.

He was referring there, of course, to section 4 of article I, which is entirely different from section 2 of article I, section 4 of article I has nothing whatever to do with the qualifications of electors, as I shall hope to point out a little later in my remarks. Then Mr. Hamilton proceeds to say:

The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked upon on other occasions, are defined and fixed in the Constitution and—

Senators, in the words of Mr. Hamilton—

are unalterable by the legislature.

What Mr. Hamilton was saying to the Congress, to the United States Senate, was, "Thou canst not pass such a bill as that which is now proposed to the Senate for consideration, making unlawful the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting." That was what Mr. Hamilton was saying.

One of the greatest authorities in this country on the Constitution, and one whose viewpoint and feelings were definitely always toward the nationalistic theory, toward the idea of the centralization of power in Washington, whose views and feelings were always in favor of a centralized power of government, was Judge Story. Let me give the Senate his words, written in his commentaries. I quote from volume I, section 820, of Story's Commentaries. Judge Story declared:

There is no pretense to say that the power of the National Government can be used so as to exclude any State from its share in the representation in Congress.

That was written before the fourteenth amendment. It was true when Judge Story wrote it, because it was before the adoption of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution.

Judge Story goes on to make this categorical statement:

Nor can it be said with correctness that Congress can in any way alter the right or qualification of voters.

Mr. President, I could go on indefinitely citing other great authorities. All of them hold fast without deviation to the proposition that the Congress has no power whatever in any way to alter, fix, prescribe, add to, or subtract from any qualification for any elector. The Constitution itself commanded that those qualifications should be the qualifications prerequisite for voting for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

It is interesting to note that when the Constitution went back to the States for ratification by the State conventions, certain questions were asked in some of the States about article I, section 2. The Constitution had to be ratified by at least nine of the States. In the Massachusetts convention there was a doubting Thomas by the name of Dr. John Taylor, from the town of Douglass, Mass. He wanted to be very sure about this thing. He wanted to make certain. He was fearful that section 4, the section with reference to the times, places, and manner of holding elections, not the section with reference to qualifications, might give Congress the power to prescribe a property qualification for voters in the sum, as he said, of 100 pounds. He inquired of Mr. Rufus King, who, it will be recalled, was a member of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia and also a member of the Massachusetts convention, whether or not under section 4 Congress could in any way go into the question of qualifications. Mr. King, one of the leading members of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, had this to say:

The idea of the honorable gentleman from Douglass transcends my understanding, for the power of control given by this section extends to the manner of election, not to the qualifications of the electors.

We find that quotation from Mr. King in volume II of Elliot's Debates, pages 49 to 51.

In the Pennsylvania convention, James Wilson who had been one of the outstanding men in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, made this statement:

In order to know who are qualified to be electors of the House of Representatives—

That is, the Federal House of Representatives. They were considering the Federal Constitution, which was to bring into being the Federal House of Representatives—

In order to know who are qualified to be electors of the House of Representatives, we are to inquire who are qualified to be electors of the legislature of each State. If there be no legislature in the States there can be no electors of them. If there be no such electors, there is no criterion to know who are qualified to elect Members of the House of Representatives. By this short, plain deduction the existence of State legislatures is proved to be essential to the existence of the general government.

Could anything be clearer, more positive, or definite than that?

Mr. Wilson went on with reference to section 4, the section with reference to times, places, and manner, not the section as to qualifications:

If the Congress had it not in their power to make regulations, what might be the consequences? Some States might make no regulations at all on the subject; and so the existence of the House of Representatives, the immediate representation of the people in Congress, depends upon the will and pleasure of the State governments. We find upon examining this paragraph that it contains nothing more than the maxim of self-preservation.

In the Virginia convention the question arose, and Mr. William Nicholas, one of the delegates, had something to say. As I recall, Mr. Nicholas was not a member of the Philadelphia convention which wrote the Constitution, but he was a member of the State convention. Mr. Nicholas said:

If, therefore, by the proposed plan, it is left uncertain in whom the right of suffrage is to rest, or if it has placed that right in improper hands, I shall admit that it has a radical defect. But in this plan—

That is, the Constitution, because that was the plan before them—

there is a fixed rule for determining the qualification of electors, and that rule, the most judicious that could possibly have been devised, because it refers to a criterion which cannot be changed—

When he said "a criterion which cannot be changed" he meant that in this year of our Lord 1948 it could not be changed by the Congress of the United States; that it stood unless the Constitution itself were amended.

Mr. Nicholas went on to say:

A qualification that gives a right to elect representatives for the State legislatures gives also, by this Constitution, a right to

choose Representatives for the General Government.

In North Carolina, Mr. John Steele, who was a member of the ratification convention, wished to make this matter absolutely clear, so there could never be any question in anyone's mind about what North Carolina was doing when it ratified the Constitution. Here is what Mr. Steele said:

Who are to vote for them?

Of course, he was referring to the Members of the House of Representatives. Then he said:

Every man who has a right to vote for a representative to our legislature will ever have a right to vote for a Representative to the General Government. Does it not expressly provide—

By the word "it," he means the Constitution, of course—

that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? Can they, without a most manifest violation of the Constitution, alter the qualifications of the electors?

When he says "they," he means the Congress. One hundred and sixty years ago, John Steele, a member of the convention in North Carolina considering the ratification of the Federal Constitution, was saying to us, "You gentlemen of the Senate, you gentlemen of the Congress of the United States, cannot touch these qualifications of the electors without a most manifest violation of the Federal Constitution."

Mr. Steele went on to say:

The power over the manner of elections does not include that of saying who shall vote.

Of course, all of us should understand that. Section 2 of article I deals with the "who" of the electors. Section 4 of article I deals with the "how" of the elections.

Mr. Steele went on to say:

The Constitution—

Speaking of the Federal Constitution, of course—

expressly says that the qualifications are those which entitle a man to vote for a State Representative. It is, then, clearly and indubitably fixed and determined who shall be the electors; and the power over the manner only enables them to determine how these electors shall elect—whether by ballot, or by vote, or by any other way.

The view expressed by Delegate John Steele, in the North Carolina convention, was confirmed by Delegate William R. Davie, who also had been a delegate to the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia.

The meaning of section 2 of article I was so clear, that the question was not even raised in the conventions of Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware, and Georgia; and so far as the reports show, in New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Maryland no question was raised about the section. As I have previously said, it was so clear that even a fourth-grade school child on reading it would know what it meant.

Mr. President, as to the resolutions passed by the several States in ratifying the Federal Constitution, we find that in none of those resolutions was any question raised about section 2 of article I. It was so clear that there was no question to be raised. It was ipse dixit; it spoke for itself.

However, it is interesting to note that in referring to section 4 of article I, by which certain powers are given to the Congress with reference to the fixing of the times, places, and manner of holding elections, some of the ratifying resolutions did raise questions; and it is interesting to note that in each case where such questions were raised, those States in their resolutions ratifying the Constitution wished to make certain that Congress knew that they felt that Congress should never exercise the power given under section 4 of article I unless the States had failed to function in prescribing the times, places, and manner of holding elections.

Mr. President, we find that on February 7, 1788, the State of Massachusetts, when it ratified the Constitution, recommended, in its resolution of ratification, that Congress do not exercise the power vested in it by the fourth section of the first article; but in cases where a State shall neglect or refuse to make the regulations therein mentioned or shall make regulations subversive of the rights of the people to a free and equal representation ir. Congress agreeably to the Constitution. Massachusetts was saying to Congress, "Keep your hands off this matter unless the States fail to function in this connection; keep your hands off it unless necessity requires you to act."

South Carolina, in its resolution of May 27, 1788, declared:

And whereas it is essential to the preservation of the rights reserved to the several States and the freedom of the people under the operations of the general government that the right of prescribing the manner, time, and places of holding elections to the Federal legislature should be forever annexed to the sovereignty of the several States, this convention does declare that the same ought to remain, to all posterity, a perpetual and fundamental right in the local government, exclusive of the interference of the General Government—

That is, the Federal Government—

except in cases where the legislatures of the States shall refuse or neglect to perform and fulfill the same, according to the tenor of the said Constitution.

Then the great State of New York embodied a recommendation in its resolution of ratification. What did that recommendation say? What did it say, Mr. President, to you and me? Remember, they were talking to us. It said they ratified the Constitution "in full confidence that the Congress will not make or alter any regulation in this State respecting the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators or Representatives, unless the legislature of this State shall neglect or refuse to make laws or regulations for the purpose or from any circumstances be incapable of making the same."

The historic State of religious freedom, the little State of Rhode Island, ratifying the Constitution on May 29, 1789, copied without change the New York declaration, and added, after the final word of it, a comma and the words "and that in those cases such power will only be exercised until the legislature of this State shall make provision in the premises." They took the entire New York resolution, strong as it was, and then added the clause, "If we should neglect or fail to do our part to make these regulations with reference to the times, places, and manner, you can do it; but you can do it only up to the time we shall function, and ourselves make the regulations."

All this shows how jealous the States were, how jealous the people were to preserve to the States and to the people their rights.

Mr. President, I spoke earlier in the day in the course of my remarks of the submission, ratification, and adoption of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. When those amendments were submitted none of those who were in control of the Congress, no authoritative voice in this body with but one lone exception expressed the view that Congress had a right in any way to alter or fix or add to or subtract from the qualifications of electors as prescribed by the States.

I have the floor, Mr. President. The distinguished acting majority leader wished to ask me a question that dealt with the proceedings of the Senate. I was very happy to answer that question of the acting majority leader, but I have not yielded the floor. This matter is of such importance that I am loath to yield the floor until I have tried to fully state the case.

I said earlier, speaking of Thaddeus Stevens and other leaders in the House, that no leader there suggested that Congress had any right to alter or fix in any way the qualifications of electors. Therefore, in performing their duty as Members of Congress, true to their oaths as Members of Congress, they had submitted the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution. There was in the Senate, however, one exception. That exception was the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Charles Sumner. So far as I have found, he at no time gave any substantial reason for his position, but he took the position that Congress had power to regulate suffrage so far as the one proposition of denying suffrage to the colored man was concerned. He admitted that the States had exclusive power so far as any qualifications with reference to age, residence, character, education, property, the payment of a poll tax, the payment of any other tax, or with reference to the ownership of property or a freehold, or any qualification of that kind were concerned. Senator Sumner admitted that Congress had no power in any way to alter or add to or subtract from or in any way whatever deal with those qualifications except as to the one qualification of race.

Mr. President, Senator Sumner, taking that position, we can imagine that when the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments were under consideration in the Senate, and when these amendments were under consideration in the House of Representatives, there was much debate, there was much discussion, there were many exchanges of views by the different Senators and the different Members of the House on the question as to whether Congress has any power so far as fixing or altering the qualifications of electors is concerned.

A joint committee was created to draft the fourteenth amendment. The committee was composed of Members of both the House and the Senate. All the members of the committee came from either the North, the East, or the West, for at that time the South had no representation, no voice, in the Congress of the United States, and, therefore, had no representation on the committee. The chairman of the committee, which was composed of 15 Members of both the House and Senate, was Senator William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine. We recall that Senator Fessenden was later Secretary of the Treasury under Abraham Lincoln. The ranking member of the committee, on the Senate side, who took Senator Fessenden's place at various times, due to the fact that Senator Fessenden was in ill health and was not always able to be present, was Senator Jacob M. Howard, of Michigan. Other members of the committee were Senator John Harris, of New York; Senator James W. Grimes, of Iowa; Senator Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland; and Senator George H. Williams, of Oregon.

Among members of the joint committee, on the House side, were Roscoe Conkling, of New York, George M. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, Henry T. Blow, of Missouri, and John A. Bingham, of Ohio. Mr. Bingham, I believe, is credited with being the actual draftsman or author of the first section of the fourteenth amendment. Other members from the House were Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, and E. B. Washburne, of Illinois. I believe the record discloses that Kentucky had representation in the person of Representative Grider.

The amendment came up for consideration on the floor of the Senate and, of the House. Turning to page 2542 of the Congressional Globe, which, at that time, was the authentic publication of the debates of the Senate and the House, we find this statement by Representative John A. Bingham which he made on the floor of the House of Representatives with reference to the fourteenth amendment:

This amendment takes from no State any right that ever pertained to it. The amendment does not give, as the section shows, the power to Congress of regulating suffrage in the several States.

Mr. Bingham then referred particularly to the second section of the proposed amendment. Senators will recall that the second section does not attempt in any way to prescribe qualifications; it does not in any way attempt to fix qualifications for electors; it does not give to Congress any power to legislate with reference to qualifications, but simply, solely, and only provides that where suffrage is denied to certain citizens the States may be penalized for such denial by having their representation in the House of Representatives reduced.

Referring to the second section, Mr. Bingham said:

The second section excludes the conclusion that by the first section suffrage is subjected to congressional law.

In the Senate the first section was discussed by Senator Howard, acting chairman of the joint committee. On May 23, 1865, he had this to say:

The first section of the proposed amendment does not give to either of these classes the privilege of voting. The right of suffrage is not, in law, one of the privileges or immunities thus secured by the Constitution. It is merely the creature of law. It has always been regarded in this country as a result of positive local law.

In other words, where the section speaks of guaranteeing certain privileges and immunities, Senator Howard made it clear that those privileges and immunities did not apply to, had no reference to, and did not in any way include any right of suffrage.

This indicates that in 1865, when the Senate was considering the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, the men who were its authors, proponents, and advocates held fast to the same proposition in the matter of qualifications of electors which had been expressed and had been so stoutly proclaimed in 1787 by the framers and authors of the Constitution of the United States.

As to section 2, Senator Howard said—and I am reading now from page 2766 of the Congressional Globe:

This section does not recognize the authority of the United States over the question of suffrage in the several States at all. Nor does it recognize much less secure the right of suffrage to the colored race. It leaves the right to regulate the elective franchise still with the States and does not meddle with that right.

In closing the debate, on June 8, and just before the joint resolution was passed upon by the Senate, Senator Howard said, at page 3039 of the Congressional Globe:

We know very well that the States retain the power which they have always possessed of regulating the right of suffrage.

Remember, Mr. President, I am quoting the words of the man who, on this floor, was charged with the responsibility of piloting through the Senate the fourteenth amendment. In speaking, he was not only speaking for himself, but for the entire committee of 15 members who had worked with him and had jointly with him drafted the fourteenth amendment.

He proceeded to say:

We know very well that the States retain the power which they have always possessed of regulating the right of suffrage. It is the theory of the Constitution.

Says Senator Howard, speaking for the committee—

That right—

That is, the right of suffrage—

has never been taken from them; no endeavor has ever been made to take it from them, and the theory of this whole amendment is to leave the power of regulating the suffrage with the people or legislatures of the States and not to assume to regulate it by any clause of the Constitution of the United States.

Could any language be stronger than these words I have quoted from Senator Howard, spoken some 77 years after our Government came into being.

What did Senator Fessenden have to say about this matter? He was the chairman, and Senator Howard was the acting chairman during Senator Fessenden's illness. He confirmed exactly what Senator Howard had said. He stated:

The power exists now at the present time in all these States to make just such class or caste distinctions as they please.

He was referring, of course, to Senator Sumner's position that the Congress could legislate if suffrage were denied to a Negro because he was a Negro.

The power exists now at the present time in all these States to make just such class or caste distinctions as they please. The Constitution does not limit them. The Constitution, in terms, gives us no power.

Whom did he mean by "us?" He meant the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Congress. He said:

It leaves to the States, as everybody knows, the perfect authority to regulate this matter of suffrage to suit themselves.

Then he went on to say, in speaking of section 2:

It says to all the people of the United States you shall be represented in Congress, but, as we fear you may be governed by narrow views, as we fear you will do injustice to a portion of the people under your charge * * * we say to you that you shall not have political power any further than you show by your actions that you are disposed to let your charges participate in it.

That is referring to section 2 of the fourteenth amendment that there could be this penalty in the amendment, but that it stopped at that penalty, and did not give to the Congress any power to exercise any jurisdiction over the qualifications of electors.

On this committee of 15 there was one Democratic Senator, who happened to be the Senator from Maryland, Senator Reverdy Johnson. He said:

I suppose that even the honorable Member from Massachusetts (Senator Sumner) will not deny that it was for Massachusetts to regulate her suffrage before 1789, and if it was, she has the power still unless she has agreed to part with it by devolving it upon the General Government. Is there a word in the Constitution that intimates such a purpose?

That is, the purpose of giving such a power to the Federal Government.

Who at that time, in 1787, denied that the State was clothed with the power of prescribing the qualifications for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? * * * The State and nobody else.

The right of choosing the allotted number in each State is to be exercised by such part of the inhabitants as the State itself may designate. Words could not have been adopted more obviously leading to the conclusion that, in the opinion of the writers of the Federalist—

And here the Senator was quoting from the Federalist, as I should have said—

the States were to have the sole right of regulating the suffrage. There is nothing innate in the right of suffrage. It depends wholly upon government regulation.

As we know, up until the adoption of the nineteenth amendment, in 1920, in a majority of the States of the United States no woman, no matter how brilliant, or how able, or how well educated, or how devoted, or how patriotic she might be, no matter what her contributions to the public welfare might have been, could vote.

Senator Hendricks, of Indiana, said:

I ask the Senators the question: Have the States, under the Constitution, the right to control the elective franchise? Does any Senator question that? The Senator from Massachusetts does.

That was Senator Sumner, as I have said.

He thinks that Congress may control the right of suffrage in the State, but it has not been a question of dispute whether the State had control of elective franchise. It is absolute and perfect.

Here are the words of Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts. He was a colleague of Senator Sumner, both were from the same State. This is what he said:

The men who framed the Constitution made those State constitutions; they well knew what the qualifications were.

I think that is the exact language I used earlier in my remarks. I am quoting now from Senator Wilson:

Every State constitution provides for electors, prescribes the qualification for suffrage. The laws of the States provided for qualifications of electors. Every State, from the adoption of the State constitution to this hour, has claimed the authority and exercised it to settle the questions pertaining to suffrage. They never supposed that the Federal Government had the power to change it. They never gave that power, and they never intended to give that power.

In closing his speech in the debate Senator Fessenden, the chairman of the committee, said, speaking directly of section 2 of article I, the very one we have been discussing this afternoon:

If I understand the Constitution at all, it has always been considered that the clause which I have read—

That is, the second section of article I of the Constitution—

acknowledged the right of the States to regulate the question of suffrage. I do not think it has ever been disputed. * * * The States have a perfect right today and they may exercise it as they see fit to make such rules as suit them with regard to the qualifications of electors.

Yet, Mr. President, despite all this history, despite all the undisputed, unquestioned facts in this matter, and although for 150 years no one ever questioned the fact that the fixing of the qualification of the electors was in the hands of the States, we are confronted today with the proposition of having the Congress forget, ignore, disdain all the history, all the facts, all the laws, and the Constitution itself, and by legislative fiat seek to deal with the question of the qualification of the electors.

Congress has no power to pass an act to define the Constitution, or to define any section of the Constitution. Congress can no more pass a law to define any provision or clause or section of the Constitution than it can pass a law to insert a word or words or a clause, or language of any kind in the Constitution. Surely no Senator would arise on this floor and contend that Congress had a right by legislative enactment to insert any words, any language, into the Constitution of the United States. Yet that is exactly what Congress would try to do if it sought by legislative enactment to define by a bill such as this anti-poll-tax bill a section, clause, or provision of the Constitution. It has no more right to define than it has the right to insert.

I have previously referred to the fact that citizenship in itself does not carry with it the right of suffrage. As I said, for nearly 130 years after the foundation of our Government, in the majority of the States of the United States women were denied the right of suffrage simply because of their sex. They were citizens of the United States. They were just as much citizens as were the men of the United States. Minors and infants and children are citizens of the United States. Unfortunate people who have had their seats of reason dethroned, who no longer possess their minds, are citizens of the United States. Felons in penitentiaries are citizens of the United States. Citizenship does not in and of itself confer any right of suffrage. Certainly suffrage is not a natural right. The caveman did not have any right of suffrage. He did not have anyone for whom to vote. It was not until governments were organized among men that there could be any right of suffrage. Suffrage is a right conferred by government, and it happened that when the framers of the Constitution conferred that right on certain persons, and only on certain persons, those certain persons were the ones on whom the States had conferred the right to vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. That is this whole proposition.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my colleague from Alabama for a question only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The Senator from Alabama yields to his colleague for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before my colleague gets away from the fourteenth amendment, with respect to which he has so ably presented the debate which took place at the time the amendment was pending in Congress, I wish to ask him if it is not fact that section 2 of the fourteenth amendment very clearly shows that the States have the right within themselves to exclude certain persons from voting, or at least to prescribe certain qualifications which, if not met, exclude such persons, because the first section provides that no law shall be passed, but the second section provides that if the States exclude these persons from voting, then they shall be penalized by having their representation reduced.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. The section not only says that the right is in the State to deny the suffrage to certain persons, to give it only to the people to whom the State in its wisdom sees fit to give it, but the fourteenth amendment ratified and reaffirmed in its very words that very right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to his colleague?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question only.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My question relates to the point the Senator has just been making respecting the privileges or immunities of citizenship. Again, is it not true that the first section of the fourteenth amendment provides that any law passed by any State denying the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States is void and of no effect, and yet, after so providing, section 2 of the amendment recognizes the right of the States to keep away from the polls persons who do not meet certain qualifications?

Mr. HILL. Thus making it clear that the privileges or immunities provided for in section 1 of the amendment do not in any way include or encompass the right of sovereignty. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. President, just a word about section 4 of article I. I shall not dwell on this provision, because the Supreme Court has made very clear that this section, dealing with the times, places, and manner of elections and giving Congress the power to act with reference to times, places, and manner, has nothing whatever to do and is in no way whatever germane or relevant to section 2 of article I, which deals with the question of qualifications. The Supreme Court has made section 4 clear, and I do wish to call attention to the decisions of the Court, because I think any discussion of this subject should have some reference to that section.

In 1931, in *Smiley* v. *Holm* (285 U. S., 355, p. 366), the Court spoke through its Chief Justice, Charles Evans Hughes. I think no one will dispute that Charles Evans Hughes will stand in the front rank among the great Chief Justices of the United States. I shall never forget the last appearance of Chief Justice Hughes before a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives. I can never forget the drama of that moment—the spontaneous, overwhelming outpouring of tribute by all the Members of both the Senate and the House, irrespective of party lines, irrespective of whether they were Democrats or Republicans. They paid a wonderful, heartfelt, heart-stirring tribute to this great Chief Justice.

It has been my good fortune in the days I have been in Washington to know some of the members of the Supreme Court. I know the high regard in which they hold Charles Evans Hughes. I know their estimate of the greatness of the man, the power, magnitude, and profundity of his intellect, his great capacity for the dispatch of business, for orderly procedure, for making certain that the Supreme Court of the United States carried on its high functions in the best of American traditions.

The Supreme Court spoke through Chief Justice Hughes in 1931. That was not too long ago to refer to the case as a recent case. The Court had this to say about section 4 of article I, the section dealing with the times, places, and manner of elections:

The subject matter is the "times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives." It cannot be doubted that these comprehensive words embrace authority to provide a complete code for congressional elections, not only as to times and places, but in relation to notices, registrations, protection of voters, prevention of fraud and corrupt practices, counting of votes, duties of inspectors and canvassers, and making and publication of election returns; in short, to enact the numerous requirements as to the procedure and safeguards which experience shows are necessary in order to enforce the fundamental right involved. * * * All this is comprised in the subject of "times, places, and manner of holding elections," and involves lawmaking in its essential features and most important aspect.

In this case Chief Justice Hughes had made clear that we can have our Federal Corrupt Practices Act; that we can make sure that the times, places, and manner be provided, so that the electors may duly and lawfully, and in an orderly manner, cast their ballots. That, however, has absolutely nothing whatever to do with the question of who the electors shall be, or the question of prescribing the qualification of the electors.

In other words, as Chief Justice Hughes makes clear, section 4 of article I simply prescribes the power of Congress to set forth, if necessary, the mechanism of the election. But that does not deal at all with the question of who shall be the electors. The section deals only with the orderly procedure, and the properly protected mechanism for the elector who is provided for in article I, section 2, to perform his duty of casting his ballot for a Member of the House of Representatives or a Member of the Senate.

As I stated earlier, section 4 of article I deals with the "how" of the election. It has nothing whatever to do with section 2 of article I, which deals with the "who" of the elector. They are two entirely different subjects.

Mr. President, I have quoted from the framers of the Constitution, showing how clearly and definitely they understood section 2 of article I to mean that the qualifications should be prescribed by the States and not by the Congress. I have quoted from the debates on the fourteenth amendment, showing that the authors and the advocates and proponents of that amendment held fast to the views of the framers and founders of the Constitution, that the Federal Government could not fix, prescribe, or alter the qualifications, and that the whole question of qualifications was left solely and entirely in the hands of the States.

Now I wish to turn for a moment to the decisions of the courts of the United States, because we shall find that the court decisions emphasize and confirm and ratify the clear language of section II of article I and the views of the framers of the Constitution, as well as the position taken by the authors of the fourteenth amendment.

There are many cases from which I could quote, all of which in sum and substance clearly hold to the proposition that the qualifications shall be prescribed by the States, and that the Congress cannot alter or change those qualifications.

Perhaps the first case to which I shall call attention will be the case of *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. 162), decided on March 21, 1875. In that case the extent of the distinction between the rights of a citizen of the United States and the rights of a citizen of a State with regard to voting was laid down and explained.

Chief Justice Waite of the Supreme Court declared that the fact that the right of voting could not grow out of citizenship alone was clear when one considered who was a citizen of the United States. He said that everyone born here is a citizen of the United States; and therefore if voting depended on citizenship, every child, every woman, every pauper, every criminal, every person born here would have the right to vote. Mr. President, I call this case to the particular attention of my colleague from Alabama, because it deals with the very question which he and I were discussing a few moments ago.

Chief Justice Waite concluded as follows:

Certainly if the courts can consider any question settled, this is one. For nearly 90 years the people have acted upon the idea that the Constitution, when it conferred citizenship, did not confer the right of suffrage.

The next case to which I shall refer—and it is one of the best known cases—is that of *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 56), decided in 1894. The decision was handed down by Mr. Justice Miller. He said:

The States in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualifications for voters for those eo nomine. They (the States) define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It—

Meaning, of course, the Constitution of the United States—

adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

Mr. President, there are many of these cases, and I shall not cite all of them. Let me come now to the case of *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58), decided in 1900, so it may be called a twentieth century case. In discussing the right to vote for Members of Congress, Mr. Justice Gray said:

They define—

He had been referring to the States, and he means the States—

who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State.

It—

Meaning the Constitution of the United States, of course—

adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

Then in the case of *Pope* v. *Williams* (193 U. S. 621), decided in 1904, we find that Mr. Justice Peckham, in speaking for the Court, said:

A State, so far as the Federal Constitution is concerned, might provide by its own constitution and laws that no one but native-born citizens shall be permitted to vote, as the Federal Constitution does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone, and the conditions under which that right is to be exercised are matters for the States alone to prescribe, subject to the conditions of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. President, let me call the attention of the Senate at this point to these words from the decision by Mr. Justice Peckham:

The question whether the conditions prescribed by the State might be regarded by others as reasonable or unreasonable is not a Federal one. * * * The right of a State to legislate upon the subject of the elective franchise, we believe, to be unassailable.

Then in the case of *Gwinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347), decided in 1915, a case which is known as the Oklahoma Constitution case, we find that the decision was handed down by Mr. Chief Justice White. It will be recalled that at one time he was a distinguished Member of the United States Senate, representing the great State of Louisiana in this body. While a Member of the Senate, he was named Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. In the case of Gwinn against United States, in referring to the fifteenth amendment, Mr. Chief Justice White declared:

It is true also that the amendment does not change, modify, or deprive the States of their full power as to suffrage, except, of course, as to the subject with which the amendment deals.

Of course, Mr. President, the amendment dealt with the one subject of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

So the Court said that all of this reservoir of rights remained in the States, except as to the one proposition covered by the fifteenth amendment, which was, just as it says, an amendment to the Constitution, and not a legislative fiat of the Congress of the United States.

I am delighted to see that the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], whom I hold in such high esteem, has been able to leave his committee and come to the floor of the Senate. He, as a profound student of the Constitution, has from the very beginning taken the position that the Congress had no power to act so far as the qualification of electors is concerned, and that the only way Congress can bring about any change in the matter of the qualification of electors is by the submission and ratification of an amendment to the Constitution, in the manner and according to the procedure provided in the Constitution. That has been the position of the Senator from Arizona from the very beginning. As a member of the committee considering the legislation, he ably and indefatigably held fast to that position, presenting to the committee what to me were absolutely conclusive arguments showing that it had no power to report to the Senate the so-called anti-poll-tax bill, and showing that the only thing the committee could do under the Constitution of the United States, acting as the agent of the Senate, was to submit to the Senate a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am sure the distinguished Senator is acquainted with the system followed in the State of New Hampshire. The question is whether, in

promoting the anti-poll-tax bill, its sponsors are guilty of sectionalism. The bill would not touch the situation in New Hampshire. It is aimed exclusively at the Southern States. The law in New Hampshire, as the Senator knows, provides that the payment of a poll tax shall not be made a prerequisite for voting, but when a voter presents himself to register, in order to become entitled to vote, if he has no property, he must be assessed a poll tax. If he has property he must first be assessed for his property, plus a poll tax. While he need not pay the poll tax in order to vote, it must be assessed, and if he does not pay it he is liable to a jail sentence. I am sure the distinguished Senator brought out the fact that in the State of Alabama, as in my State, there are no criminal penalties for nonpayment of the poll tax.

Mr. HILL. Nor are there, I may say to the Senator from Mississippi, in any of the other Southern States.

Mr. EASTLAND. I think the great State of New Hampshire uses a very unique system. It says in effect, "We have no poll tax; we would not be guilty of such a thing, for which we condemn the Southern States"; yet in that State, before a man is qualified to vote, he must be assessed with a tax, and if he does not pay it he is liable to prosecution.

Mr. HILL. He is liable to go to jail, to be placed behind the iron bars.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator know that the State of New Hampshire publishes a handbook on tax collection, in which it is stated that when a voter fails to pay his poll tax, and incites other people not to pay a poll tax, he shall be arrested and prosecuted criminally as a public example, so that others will be constrained to pay their taxes?

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator that I had the Library of Congress check that matter for me a day or two ago. What the Senator has said about the State of New Hampshire and its requirements with reference to the poll tax seems correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a manifestation of sectionalism that a bill such as the anti-poll-tax bill should be brought before the Senate?

Mr. HILL. New Hampshire does not make the payment of a poll tax a prerequisite for voting but does seem to require the assessment as a prerequisite.

Mr. EASTLAND. The State of New Hampshire requires the assessment of the tax as a prerequisite for voting. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statutes and the constitution of the State of New Hampshire. Does not the Senator believe we are dealing in the rankest kind of sectionalism, something that should be beneath the dignity of the Senate of the United States, in bringing forward a bill aimed at the legal provisions of certain States of the Union, while similar provisions, worded only slightly differently, as in the case of the State of New Hampshire, exist, to which the anti-poll-tax bill would not apply? Exemptions are made in such States which point with scorn at my State. It is the rankest kind of sectionalism and partisanship.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator, as I said earlier in my remarks today, certainly at this time, when parties and factions and groups and individuals are engaged in a heated political campaign and are struggling for votes, no such measure as this should be before the Senate.

Mr. President, I had just quoted the language of Chief Justice White in the case of Gwinn against United States. It is interesting to note that Chief Justice White in his decision referred to a statement in the argument made at the time by the Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. John W. Davis. We recall that Mr. John W. Davis, while a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, was also an outstanding member of the Judiciary Committee of the House. He was later appointed by President Woodrow Wilson to be Solicitor General of the United States. He is one of the great lawyers of the country, one of its outstanding constitutional lawyers. Chief Justice White embodies the statement by Mr. John W. Davis, submitted by him as Solicitor General of the United States, for the Government of the United States, in these words:

The United States—

The United States Government is speaking through its Solicitor General—

The United States says that State power to provide for suffrage is not disputed, although, of course, the authority of the fifteenth amendment and the limit on their power is insisted on—hence no assertion denying the right of a State to exert judgment and discretion in fixing the qualification of suffrage is advanced.

If Mr. Davis were speaking today he would include the nineteenth amendment.

Speaking for the Government of the United States, he was saying that the Government advanced no assertion that in any way denied to the States the right to exercise their judgment and discretion in fixing the qualifications of suffrage.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], in his presentation on Thursday, referred to the Breedlove case. He stated that the suggestion that a poll-tax payment as a qualification for voting in a State or Federal election is unlawful appears to be of recent origin. He further said:

Probably the first case to reach the United States Supreme Court is *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 227), decided in December 1947. The plaintiff, a citizen of Georgia, attempted to vote in a State election and also in the Federal election held at the same time, for a Representative in Congress. He was excluded from both elections, having failed to pay the poll tax.

Mr. Justice Butler rendered the unanimous decision of the Court, and here is what the Court unanimously declared:

To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

Approximately 2 years after the Breedlove decision came the Pirtle case, which arose in the State of Tennessee out of an election held in that State on the 13th day of September 1939 for a Member of Congress. There was no State election at all, as I recall; it was a special election for a Member of Congress. The plaintiff in that case was fully qualified, except for one thing: He had not paid his poll tax. He came to the polls, although he had not paid his poll tax, and demanded the right to vote, but was excluded by the election officers and denied the right to vote on the ground of such nonpayment. He brought suit in the Federal court. The suit finally went to the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Sixth Circuit, in which judgment against the plaintiff was rendered in a unanimous decision of the three sitting judges, affirming the judgment against the plaintiff as rendered by the lower court. The opinion of the court of appeals follows the opinion of Justice Butler in the Breedlove case to which I have referred.

When the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit rendered a decision against the plaintiff in the Pirtle case the plaintiff asked for a writ of certiorari from the Supreme Court of the United States. That court, without any opinion—it did not even dignify the petition for a writ of certiorari by an opinion or by a statement of any kind—forthwith proceeded to deny the petition for the writ of certiorari, which of course confirmed the decision of the circuit court and the decision of the lower court.

Mr. President, there is one other case to which I wish to call attention, and that is the so-called Classic case, which is to be found in volume 313, United States reports at page 307. The decision was rendered by Mr. Justice Stone, later Chief Justice Stone, of the Supreme Court of the United States. The decision was rendered before the decision in the Pirtle case. Justice Stone, stating the opinion of the Court, said:

Two counts of an indictment found in a Federal district court charged that appellees, commissioners of elections, conducting a primary election under Louisiana law, to nominate a candidate of the Democratic Party for representative in Congress, willfully altered and falsely counted and certified the ballots of voters cast in the primary election. The questions for decision are whether the right of qualified voters—

I emphasize the words "qualified voters," showing clearly that the case did not go into the question of who was qualified to vote; it did not go into the question of the qualifications of voters, but dealt with qualified voters as such, with no question as to their qualifications.

The questions for decision are whether the right of qualified voters to vote in the Louisiana primary and to have their ballots counted is a right "secured • • • by the Constitution," within the meaning of sections 19 and 20 of the criminal code, and whether the acts of appellees charged in the indictment violate those sections.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Qualified by whom? By the States or the National Government?

Mr. HILL. By the States, of course.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the test.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. Justice Stone makes that clear. He goes on to say:

The charge based on these allegations was that the appellees conspired with each other and with others unknown to injure and oppress citizens in the free exercise and enjoyment of rights and privileges secured to them by the Constitution and laws of the United States, namely (1) the right of qualified voters—

The Court uses those words again—

who cast their ballots in the primary election to have their ballots counted as cast for the candidate of their choice.

He proceeds and quotes directly from article I of section 2 of the Constitution. I shall not reiterate it; I have quoted it several times. He states further, and I ask Senators to listen to this, because this is the gravamen of the case:

Such right as is secured by the Constitution to qualified voters—

That is, the right of qualified voters to have their votes honestly counted. It is said that what was involved in this case was the right of voters who were qualified by the States to have their votes honestly counted. That is what the case involved.

Such right as is secured by the Constitution to qualified voters to choose Members of the House of Representatives is thus to be exercised in conformity to the requirements of State law subject to the restrictions prescribed by section 2—

That, of course, is section 2 of article I, about which we have been talking, and which Justice Stone sets out on the same page just ahead of these words—

and to the authority conferred on Congress by section 4—

That is, section 4 of article I—

to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Representatives.

Justice Stone further said:

The right of qualified voters to vote at the congressional primary in Louisiana and have their ballots counted is thus the right to participate in that choice.

We come then to the question whether that right is the one secured by the Constitution. Section 2 of article I commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes.

The qualifications prescribed by the Constitution are those prescribed by the States for the electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

There can be no question, Mr. President, that the reading of the Classic case shows clearly and without basis for any dispute that the court was not dealing with the question of qualifications, but, on the contrary, the Court, not once but several different times, reiterated that the qualifications were to be fixed by the States, and that the question was the right of the qualified voters to have their ballots honestly counted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he proceeds to another subject?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my colleague. He and I had some discussion earlier in my remarks about the State of New Hampshire, and I submitted to him a digest prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress with reference to qualifications in the New England States, particularly with reference to the question of the poll tax. I shall be very happy to yield to my colleague for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask a kind of two-headed question. First, whether in the Senator's opinion the tax as imposed by the State of New Hampshire is not a burden upon voting; and, second, if it is, whether or not the proposed anti-poll-tax legislation goes to that tax.

I understand that my colleague asked me to check the digest as to New Hampshire. Briefly, if I may say so, the tax is levied upon every inhabitant of the State of New Hampshire from 21 to 70 years of age, whether he is a citizen of the United States or an alien. The husband is made liable for the payment of the wife's poll tax if, when it was assessed, they were living together as man and wife. Certain individuals can get exemptions, such as insane persons, paupers, or the widow of any soldier, sailor, or marine who served in time of war, but in the event such person does ask for an exemption and it is granted, then he becomes ineligible to vote.

Furthermore, in the event the person does not pay the tax, he may be imprisoned and made to work at 50 cents a day, paying $2.50 a week to the jailer for his keep, which would leave him, if he works a 6-day week, 50 cents a week. In other words, he would have to work 4 weeks for $2, to pay off the tax.

Now, I ask the Senator whether in his opinion that does impose upon the people of New Hampshire a burden upon their right to vote, even though it is indirect, so far as the poll tax is concerned?

Mr. HILL. I think it undoubtedly imposes a burden, and it goes much further than any Southern State, as the Senator knows, because no Southern State would send a man to jail, or put him behind bars, for not paying a poll tax. New Hampshire puts him to work in jail for nonpayment of the poll tax.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question. I want to be protected in my rights, and I yield only for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator know that the case is stronger than the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has indicated. Take the case of a farmer with property in New Hampshire. He is not only assessed for the amount of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, but he is assessed with the taxes for his property. That is the price of suffrage.

Mr. HILL. In other words, as the Senator from Mississippi well states, it not only includes the assessment for the poll tax; it includes assessments for all other taxes—State, county, town, local subdivision, and all other taxes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator notes that the amount is $2, assessed on every person from 21 to 70 years of age, and a married man has to pay his wife's tax. I wonder if the Senator would compare the burdensomeness of that tax, levied on every person, alien or citizen, from 21 to 70 years of age, $2 a year, for which he can be imprisoned, with the poll tax in our own State of Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that in our own State of Alabama the poll tax is levied only on those from 21 to 45 years of age, and a person reaching the age of 45 is then and there, for the rest of his or her life, exempted from the payment of any poll tax. So of course the imposition by the State of New Hampshire is far more burdensome than any poll tax that I know of in any Southern State.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. War veterans in New Hampshire may apply for exemption from the payment of poll tax. But if they make such application and are given the exemption, then they are not eligible to vote. How does that compare with the situation in Alabama?

Mr. HILL. The situation in Alabama is exactly the contrary. The State of Alabama has expressly exempted the veterans from the payment of any poll tax. As the Senator well says, in New Hampshire a veteran may have his tax deferred or be exempted from it, but if that happens, he does not have the right to vote, whereas in Alabama the veteran is expressly exempted from payment of the poll tax so far as his right to vote is concerned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask the Senator if that applies to the veterans of all wars.

Mr. HILL. It applies to all the veterans.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the Spanish-American War?

Mr. HILL. And the Spanish-American War. It applies to that war and to World War I and to World War II. It applies to all the wars, in fact.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And to the Civil War?

Mr. HILL. Yes; and the War Between the States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I stand corrected. I wonder if my colleague would yield for another question concerning the State of our colleague the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] with reference to its poll-tax requirement.

Mr. HILL. I shall be delighted to yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I notice that in Massachusetts a poll tax is required of every male inhabitant above the age of 20—and there is no upper limit at all—so long as he shall live, whether he is a citizen or an alien——

Mr. HILL. They do not live very long up there, do they?

Mr. SPARKMAN. And in the collection of such poll taxes the local assessors and the registrars for voting exchange lists one with the other.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for about 2 minutes so I

may have the opportunity to correct a manifest error?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield with the understanding that I do not lose the floor by doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama yields to the Senator from New Hampshire with the understanding that he does not lose the floor by doing so.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I was in the District Committee room and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] came in. I asked him who was talking. He said, "Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN are just talking about the New Hampshire poll-tax law." And I ran in here quickly to put out the fire.

Now, anticipating that at some time this question would come up, due to the fact that my very highly esteemed and loved friend, JIM EASTLAND, had talked to me about it off the record, and believing that he would try to bring that subject into the discussion, without any malice aforethought, without any premeditation, I called on the telephone Mr. George Duncan, one of our tax commissioners, one of the best tax men of the country, and he sent me the letter which I hold in my hand, which came in an hour ago. I just want to read it, and I hope it will settle for all time the misinformation given out by the suggestion of the two Senators from Alabama who have just now been speaking.

The letter is from Jaffrey, N. H., dated July 31, 1948, and is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: It has been called to my attention that in the course of the current debate on the abolition of the poll tax as a prerequisite of voting, it has been stated that payment of a poll tax is a necessary qualification for voting in New Hampshire. This is not true.

New Hampshire imposes a poll tax on all persons between the ages of 21 and 70, with some exceptions, but that imposition and payment of the tax have no connection with the right to vote, except that, when a new voter is establishing his right, the fact that a poll tax has been assessed against him is important evidence of residence.

The right to vote is stated in article 28, part I, of the New Hampshire Constitution, in pertinent part as follows: "Every male inhabitant of each town, and parish with town privileges, and places unincorporated, in this State, of 21 years of age and upwards, excepting paupers and persons excused from paying taxes at their own request, shall have a right, at the biennial or other meetings of the inhabitants of said towns and parishes, to be duly warned and holden biennially forever in the month of November, to vote in the town or parish wherein he dwells."

That is the end of the quotation of the statute.

Of course, the amendment to the Federal Constitution granting women the right to vote in effect has eliminated the word "male" above; but the word never has been removed by amendment.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE H. DUNCAN,
Commissioner.

I hope that my friend and fellow traveler sitting before me—and when I say "fellow traveler" I refer to our trip to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco—will accept that letter as a full explanation, and that it will settle for all time, to his satisfaction, that by no stretch of the imagination does New Hampshire make the paying of a poll tax a prerequisite to voting in the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. If the Senate will be indulgent with us, so that we may clear up this matter, and with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor by doing so, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. TOBEY. For myself I will say that I am very generous with somebody else's time, and shall be happy to give my consent.

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to yield with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor by doing so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as the Senator who now is occupying the seat of the majority leader, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Alabama has the floor, and I ask whether I am correct in understanding that he cannot continue to make his speech if he yields to permit other Senators to make speeches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Therefore I would most respectfully object to any other speech on the part of the Senator from New Hampshire. I happen to know Mr. Duncan. He runs a very good drug store.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, one minute. That is a libel on Mr. Duncan. He owns a good drug store, and it is a community asset. But far more, he is probably the best posted authority in our State on the statutes pertaining to taxation and the constitution, and widely recognized as such.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] may yield to me for a few moments so I may reply to what my able and warm friend, the Senator from New Hampshire has just said. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama not lose the floor by so yielding, or that he will not be prejudicing his rights in any way by doing so.

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi if by doing so I will not lose any of my rights.

Mr. EASTLAND. And I should also like to ask unanimous consent that what I now propose to say will not be considered to be my first speech on the matter of the anti-poll-tax legislation.

Mr. HILL. Of course, Mr. President, this is a matter which lies entirely in the hands of the Senate. But it would seem to me that in view of the fact that the Senate permitted me to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire in order that he might make a statement in reply to what had previously been said, and in view of the fact that the Senator from New Hampshire referred very directly to the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], in fact I think he even referred to him as a "fellow traveler" referring to the trip which the two Senators took together to the United Nations Conference, it would seem entirely fair and proper that the Senator from Mississippi should have the right to make a statement in reply to the Senator from New Hampshire. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that without in any way interfering with my right to hold the floor, the Senator from Mississippi may be allowed to speak.

Mr. EASTLAND. And I also ask unanimous consent that what I have to say now will not count as being my first speech on the subject of the matter under discussion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Mississippi reply briefly, or does he intend to make a speech?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am not going to make a speech. I am going to reply for a moment or two to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall make no objection.

Mr. EASTLAND. I make the request with the understanding that what I say shall not count as my first speech on the appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is recognized under the conditions he has stated.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, my distinguished friend from New Hampshire said that the statement had been made on the floor of the Senate that the payment of a poll tax was a prerequisite to voting in the State of New Hampshire. That statement has not been made. It was not made by the Senator from Mississippi, and it was not made by the Senator from Alabama. What we did say—and I say that it is not covered in the letter that the Senator from New Hampshire received from his State—is that the assessment of the tax is a prerequisite for voting in the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. It is not by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. EASTLAND. Now, Mr. President, here is an article which appeared in the Washington Star of Sunday, June 13, 1948, written by a very distinguished writer, in which he discusses the poll tax in the State of New Hampshire. He discusses the system that is used there.

Mr. TOBEY. What is his name?

Mr. EASTLAND. He discusses the system which is used there.

Mr. TOBEY. What is his name?

Mr. EASTLAND. Fletcher F. Isbell.

Mr. TOBEY. Did the Senator supply him with the information?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I did not supply him with the information. However, the Senator will remember that I talked to him on the telephone, and he placed on the telephone a very distinguished lawyer from his State, a gentleman who the Senator from New Hampshire said was a very distinguished lawyer, and I am sure he is. I asked him that question, and he agreed that the assessment of the tax is a prerequisite to vote in that State, but that the statute says that the payment of the tax is not a qualification, which we have made plain in every word that has been said.

This is what the gentleman says:

An irritated resident of Lyme, N. H., in 1944 wrote a New York newspaper: "In all the talk about poll-tax States, I don't believe New Hampshire was ever mentioned. In New Hampshire the tax in the past has been $2 per voter, but now (this year) they have added a $3 soldiers-bonus tax. Many can't vote for $5. Many who can are not going to vote because they can't consider a vote being worth a full $5.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the Senator that that is entirely erroneous. It is a figment of the imagination, and nothing else.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to read the article. I do not take issue with what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire says, but this gentleman quotes the statutes of his State and the constitution of his State.

Mr. TOBEY. But he is an ignoramus.

Mr. EASTLAND. If he is, the statutes are certainly not misquoted.

Mr. TOBEY. He has misquoted the statute. There is nothing in the statute that says that.

Mr. EASTLAND. In a few minutes I shall read the provisions. I continue reading from the article:

The vexed New Hampshireman voiced an impression common to many in his and other New England States. They know that, in actual practice, they have to pay poll taxes to vote. They never hear their States mentioned in demands for Federal anti-poll-tax legislation. New Hampshire officials deny any specific statute requires payment of their poll tax as a voting qualification—and they are correct to the letter. But:

1. No rural resident without property may vote in New Hampshire without having paid his poll tax.

2. No rural resident, with property or not, may vote without being assessed for his poll tax. He might possibly make payment after the election, but, once assessed, he must pay or suffer penalties.

Let me read that again:

No rural resident, with property or not, may vote without being assessed for his poll tax. He might possibly make payment after the election, but, once assessed, he must pay or suffer penalties.

The article further states:

These situations are accomplished not by one law, but by several which interlock. They produce the effect while enabling the statement that poll-tax payment is not a voting requisite. This situation apparently is what the State attorney general's office means when it says, "It is generally understood that the current tax should be paid before a person may vote, but it is not a specific requirement."

Mr. TOBEY. That is exactly right.

Mr. EASTLAND. I continue reading from the article:

JAIL TERM PROVIDED

The basic law is article 31 of the State constitution. It provides that rural citizens must be either assessed or taxed in order to vote. In the case of a farmer with property this means that the cost of his vote is the amount of his assessment. When the assessor comes to a man with no property above the statutory exemption, however, the citizen may remark that it seems he cannot qualify as an elector, as he owes no taxes.

"Not at all," the assessor may reply. "You are between the ages of 21 and 70. Under the law I must assess you for a head or poll tax of $2. That qualifies you." (Although New Hampshire was the highest poll-tax State in the Union in 1944 and 1945, when the levy was the $5 complained of by the Lyme resident, the tax has since been lowered to its prewar $2.)

The tax is payable on demand, without notice, if the collector chooses. He may seize and sell a delinquent's property to get the money.

Under the Constitution the assessment must be made. It is not a qualification, but the tax must be assessed, and the assessment is a prerequisite to vote under section 31.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is wrong in his interpretation; the correspondent is wrong; and the newspaper is wrong. The whole thing is wrong.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not intend to argue with the written word of the constitution of the State of New Hampshire. I read on:

If there is no property he can arrest the citizen and throw him into the county jail or house of correction, where he has to work out the tax at the rate of 50 cents a day, while paying $2.50 a week board. On a 6-day week a citizen thus can be jailed and worked 4 weeks in order to pay his poll tax.

As a matter of fact, I know that they do not arrest people in New Hampshire for nonpayment of the poll tax, any more than they arrested and prosecuted people in my State for nonpayment of the road tax when we had a road tax in my State.

I continue reading:

These are revised 1942 statutes. Tax Collecting in New Hampshire, an instruction book for the State's collectors written in 1941 by William F. Howes, makes no bones about the course of action expected toward subversive anti-poll-tax characters: "An arrest should be the last resort, but sometimes—as in a case where a person who has refused to pay is inciting others to do likewise—it is not only justifiable but commendable as a salutary lesson to others in law enforcement."

I know that regardless of the statement in that book, no one is prosecuted in the State of New Hampshire for nonpayment of the poll tax, but the law authorizes it. The law in my State does not authorize, but specifically forbids, criminal prosecution for nonpayment of the poll tax.

I continue reading:

With this sort of backing, collectors in some of the smaller towns accompany selectmen when they make their annual inventories of polls and property, and collect on the spot. Mr. Howes says this practice has been especially popular in lumber towns, where the woodsmen, living in company quarters, have no chance to avoid listing or payment.

Such drumhead collection is optional with the official, however. In such a case a propertyless rural resident, assessed in the early part of the year, may fancy he is going to vote in November before he pays the $2. He reckons without another law. It orders each assessor to compile by June 1 a list of all poll taxes he has levied against persons having no property, and the collector to collect these taxes at once.

Taxpayers with property wait until fall, when they may pay their poll taxes with their property levies. Even the stern Mr. Howes has a qualm about this. He remarks of the spring immediate-payment list, "It would seem advisable to include all poll-tax payers in such a list, instead of discriminating between the have's and the have-not's."

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

There is only one way a nonexempt inhabitant of New Hampshire may avoid paying a poll tax. If he really is almost penniless, he may ask abatement. The instant he does, he really loses his right to vote. Still another law specifically bars him.

New Hampshire is not the only northern poll-tax State, and there are others elsewhere, such as Nevada, with its $2 levy.

Then he discusses the poll tax in other New England States—Connecticut, $3; Maine, $3; Massachusetts, $3; New Hampshire, $3; Rhode Island, $1; and Vermont, $1. I judge those are not qualifications for voting, and that their assessment is not a prerequisite to voting.

The writer continues:

There is no doubt that New Hampshire likes its poll tax. Except for occasional grumblings such as those from Lyme or the lumber camps, it is supported by the bulk of the citizenry. Mr. Howes puts the reasons: "Without doubt, it is the fairest and most equitable levy that can be made."

In that statement I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

I read further:

"It is the only contribution that many residents are called upon to make toward the running expenses of their home town—and there is no $2 investment that brings so much in return."

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say there is the whole thing in a nutshell. It is a head contribution, to pay the expenses of running the town. The lumberjacks are there for perhaps 60 or 90 days, and the tax grabs them before they move to the next town or State; that is all.

Mr. EASTLAND. But section 31 of the Constitution of New Hampshire, as quoted by the article—if the article is in error, I do not know, of course——

Mr. TOBEY. It quotes both the law and the constitution.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have the floor. The article states that the payment of the poll tax is not a prerequisite to voting. That is absolutely true; in New Hampshire it is not a prerequisite to voting. The article did not say that the assessment and payment of the tax was a prerequisite to voting.

Mr. TOBEY. And it is not.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is a statement which I made on the basis of the article and the statutes as compiled by the Library of Congress, and the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama referred to that compilation a few moments ago. That states that the assessment of the tax is a prerequisite. If we are wrong about that, then this gentleman has misquoted the law and the Constitution of New Hampshire. He purports to quote the New Hampshire Constitution and the New Hampshire statutes. I do not know whether he has correctly quoted them. Of course, I have not read those statutes. I know that he represents them to be as he has set them forth in the article.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, Shakespeare once wrote a play, Much Ado About Nothing——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have the floor.

I could not take issue with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire as to whether the article is correct, but I know this gentleman quotes the statutes of New Hampshire, and I know it is verified by the Library of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of June 13, 1948]

NEW ENGLAND STATE TAXES VOTERS BUT ESCAPES CRITICISM

(By Fletcher F. Isbell)

An irritated resident of Lyme, N. H., in 1944 wrote a New York newspaper: "In all the talk about poll tax States, I don't believe New Hampshire was ever mentioned. In New Hampshire the tax in the past has been $2 per voter, but now (this year) they have added a $3 soldier's bonus tax. Many can't vote for $5. Many who can are not going to vote because they can't consider a vote being worth a full $5. Of course, it's worth more, but why should one have to purchase it?"

The vexed New Hampshireman voiced an impression common to many in his and other New England States. They know that, in actual practice, they have to pay poll taxes to vote. They never hear their States mentioned in demands for Federal anti-poll-tax legislation. New Hampshire officials deny any specific statute requires payment of their poll tax as a voting qualification—and they are correct to the letter. But:

1. No rural resident without property may vote in New Hampshire without having paid his poll tax.

2. No rural resident, with property or not, may vote without being assessed for his poll tax. He might possibly make payment after the election, but, once assessed, he must pay or suffer penalties.

These situations are accomplished not by one law, but by several which interlock. They produce the effect while enabling the statement the poll-tax payment is not a voting requisite. This situation apparently is what the State attorney general's office means when it says, "It is generally understood that the current tax should be paid before a person may vote, but it is not a specific requirement."

JAIL TERM PROVIDED

The basic law is article 31 of the State constitution. It provides that rural citizens must be either assessed or taxed in order to vote. In the case of a farmer with property this means that the cost of his vote is the amount of his assessment. When the assessor comes to a man with no property above the statutory exemption, however, the citizen may remark that it seems he cannot qualify as an elector, as he owes no taxes.

"Not at all," the assessor may reply. "You are between the ages of 21 and 70. Under the law I must assess you for a head or poll tax of $2. That qualifies you." (Although New Hampshire was the highest poll-tax State in the Union in 1944 and 1945, when the levy was the $5 complained of by the Lyme resident, the tax has since been lowered to its prewar $2.)

The tax is payable on demand, without notice, if the collector chooses. He may seize and sell a delinquent's property to get the money. If there is no property he can arrest the citizen and throw him into the county jail or house of correction, where he has to work out the tax at the rate of 50 cents a day, while paying $2.50 a week board. On a 6-day week a citizen thus can be jailed and worked 4 weeks in order to pay his poll tax.

HANDBOOK ADVICE

These are revised 1942 statutes. Tax Collecting in New Hampshire, an instruction book for the State's collectors written in 1941 by William F. Howes, makes no bones about the course of action expected toward subversive anti-poll-tax characters: "An arrest should be the last resort, but sometimes—as in a case where a person who has refused to pay is inciting others to do likewise—it is not only justifiable but commendable as a salutory lesson to others in law enforcement."

With this sort of backing collectors in some of the smaller towns accompany selectmen when they make their annual inventories of polls and property, and collect on the spot. Mr. Howes says this practice has been especially popular in lumber towns, where the woodsmen, living in company quarters, have no chance to avoid listing or payment.

Such drumhead collection is optional with the official, however. In such a case a propertyless rural resident, assessed in the early part of the year, may fancy he is going to vote in November before he pays the $2. He reckons without another law. It orders each assessor to compile by June 1 a list of all poll taxes he has levied against persons having no property, and the collector to collect these taxes at once.

Taxpayers with property wait until fall, when they may pay their poll taxes with their property levies. Even the stern Mr. Howes has a qualm about this. He remarks of the spring immediate-payment list, "It would seem advisable to include all poll-tax payers in such a list, instead of discriminating between the 'have's' and the 'have-not's.'"

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

There is only one way a nonexempt inhabitant of New Hampshire may avoid paying a poll tax. If he really is almost penniless, he may ask abatement. The instant he does, he really loses his right to vote. Still another law specifically bars him.

New Hampshire is not the only northern poll-tax State, and there are others elsewhere, such as Nevada, with its $2 levy. But the Federal bill to abolish the tax as a voting requirement is a current issue, and since it is so worded that New Hampshire's interlocking statutes are untouched, they become of special interest.

The complete poll-tax line-up in New England as of a fairly recent period was:

State and date assessed	*Amount*
Connecticut, Oct. 1	$3
Maine, Apr. 1	$3
Massachusetts, Jan. 1	$3
New Hampshire, Apr. 1	$2
Rhode Island, June 15	$1
Vermont, Apr. 1	$1 plus

In Vermont each town adds to the levy of $1 by imposing a poll tax of its own. Indignant denials sometimes issue from Hartford that the Connecticut levy is a poll tax, because it is known there as an old-age assistance tax, from the use made of the revenue. It is, however, a true poll tax, being levied on every poll or head in the State between 21 and 60. The denials are recognition of the undesirable connotations that have built up around the phrase "poll tax," plus possibly some confusion of the word "poll," meaning head.

These undesirable connotations illustrate, incidentally southern indifference to psychological warfare until an explosive point is reached. Southern States could have given check to their poll-tax opponents years ago merely by following Connecticut's example and changing the name of tax to its revenue use. In all Southern States the money goes entirely or partially for public support, and the levy could as correctly be called a school tax. The explanatory difficulties of a committee to abolish the school tax would be considerable.

There is no doubt that New Hampshire likes its poll tax. Except for occasional grumblings such as those from Lyme or the lumber camps, it is supported by the bulk of the citizenry. Mr. Howes puts the reasons: "Without doubt, it is the fairest and most equitable levy that can be made. It is the only contribution that many residents are called upon to make toward the running expenses of their own home town, and there is no $2 investment that brings so much in return."

Both New England and Southern States thus seem in agreement on the fair nature of the tax, its use as a prerequisite to other privileges being the only argument. New Hampshire requires poll-tax payments directly before a citizen can get an automobile driving license, register a car, or get a hunting or fishing license; and indirectly before a farmer or lumberman may vote. It collects strictly, under threat of debtor's prison.

SOME DON'T ENFORCE IT

Six Southern States do not touch sports or livelihoods with it, but make it a prerequisite to Democratic primary and general election voting. South Carolina requires it only in the formality of the general election. The tax is not charged for voting, but for school and sometimes other revenue and all affected citizens owe it whether they vote or not, or even if they have lost the privilege of voting by a felony conviction. No State, however, forces payment. The voting attraction is the only incentive to collection.

In the past, few realists have had much doubt that the anti-poll-tax bill, already passed by the House, would fail to pass the Senate on a show-down vote. Its opponents place heavy reliance on constitutional arguments. It is true the bill's constitutionality is so doubtful, at charitable best, that the Supreme Court could sustain it only by the unlikely procedure of reversing itself in the 1884 case of ex parte Yarbrough, a landmark decision for State control of the franchise. But some supporters of the bill want a law regardless of its constitutionality or lack of it and they probably have the votes.

If the bill is enacted, some of the seven affected States probably would accept the statute without contest. Repeal movements have made headway in some, notably Tennessee, Virginia, and Arkansas.

COURT REVERSAL POSSIBLE

But the people of some States may object to being told what their voting requirements must be. This is reaction or American independence, depending on the point of view. If these States do go to the Supreme Court, past decisions of that body indicate their chances of invalidating the act are better than even.

But they do not have to. Regardless of the way these events may transpire, the present bill is an open sieve. Language more watertight than now used must be found if it is to achieve the effect desired by proponents. For any recalcitrant State that wants to take advantage of it has the New Hampshire example.

The present bill would prohibit payment, not assessment, of a poll tax as a voting requirement. It thus does not touch New Hampshire, even if it is enacted and sustained by the Supreme Court.

Neither would it touch any State which:

1. Repealed its poll tax voting requirement.

2. Made tax assessment, in general, a qualification instead, as does New Hampshire for its rural citizens.

3. By another statute levied a per capita tax without reference to voting, as do all the New England States.

4. By still another statute made the tax payable on demand at time of assessment, at option of the collector, as does New Hampshire.

The difficulty faced by the bill's backers is that they cannot amend the bill now to stop this route of egress, or later try to invalidate it in the Supreme Court, without snarling the constitution of at least one Northern State, perhaps a half dozen.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I asked the Library of Congress to compile for me data and information with reference to poll taxes as levied in the six New England States. The information compiled for me by the Library of Congress is dated April 8, 1948, and is signed by Mr. Norman J. Small, State law section; in other words, he is head of the section of the Library of Congress which has jurisdiction over questions arising under State laws. In reference to that data, compiled by the Library of Congress, I must say that in my long experience with the Library of Congress I have found it to be a most thorough and accurate institution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from Oregon that if New Hampshire has a poll tax—and I am inclined to believe, on the basis of the representations made here this afternoon, that New Hampshire does have a poll tax—and if some other States north of the Mason and Dixon's line have a poll tax—and I am inclined to assume, at least for the time being, on the basis of the representations made here this afternoon, that they have—then the argument of some of the opponents of the anti-poll-tax measure that those of us who favor it seek to discriminate against the South, falls to the ground?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think this bill is so written and so drafted and its wording is such that it is aimed directly at the poll tax in Southern States; and I do not think that the language of this bill would cover or affect the poll tax which has been referred to in the other States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Alabama disagree with the Senator from Oregon that the purpose of the pending bill is to eliminate the poll tax as an inhibition upon a voting privilege; and if what the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] have just said is true in regard to the New Hampshire requirement—namely, that it does affect the right to vote—the bill automatically would eliminate any restriction in New Hampshire on the right to vote, so far as a poll tax is concerned?

Mr. HILL. Although that may be the intent and purpose of the bill, it does not follow that the language would cover the poll tax in the other States. It does not follow that the language—and, of course, the Court would be guided by the clear language of the bill—would cover the other States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now that it has been rather well established, I think, that perhaps the heaviest poll tax levied in the entire Union is levied by the State of New Hampshire, followed rather closely by the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts——

Mr. HILL. And I hope my colleague will not forget Vermont.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; Vermont also; and West Virginia also levies a poll tax, so I am informed, and imprisons those who do not pay it, I believe—inasmuch as those States have been shown to have the burdensome poll tax, even though they get around it by imprisoning people, rather than by making the payment of it a prerequisite to voting, will this language of the bill reach those States:

That the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering—

And so forth and so on. Will that language reach a single one of those States?

Mr. HILL. That language will not reach those States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. How could there be any doubt about it? How could it possibly reach New Hampshire, when the bill states that it relates to the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting, whereas New Hampshire requires that the tax must be assessed, and the assessment is a prerequisite to voting. We are dealing with sectionalism of the rankest kind, Mr. President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the observation which has been made by the Senator from Mississippi—and I agree with his observation—that the bill would not reach the New Hampshire poll tax, does the Senator from Alabama have any objection to broadening the pending measure, if it does not cover the other poll tax, so as to make it cover it?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the truth is that the measure is not the pending business. The Senator from Alabama states again, as he did at the beginning that he is unalterably opposed to the measure and any part or parcel of it.

With reference to the question as to the New Hampshire situation, let me say I have referred to the brief prepared for me by the Library of Congress. I think at this time I should call attention to one or two sections of it relative to New Hampshire:

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Upon whom levied: On every inhabitant of the State, from 21 to 70 years of age, whether a citizen of the United States or an alien. A husband shall be liable for the payment of his wife's poll tax if, when it was assessed, they were living together as man and wife (Rev. Laws (1942), ch. 73, pars. 1, 6. Laws 1944. Ex. ch. 5).

Then it goes into the question of exemptions:

Exemptions: Paupers, insane persons, the widow of any soldier, sailor, or marine who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in any war in which the United States was engaged, veterans of any war in which the United States has been engaged who record with the selectmen or assessors of the town in which they live their pension certificates or their certificates of honorable discharge, and veterans disabled in consequence of service in such wars whom the town assessors or selectmen, in their discretion, exempt. The term "veteran" includes members of any woman's auxiliary service which was subject to and under military law (Rev. Laws (1942), ch. 73, secs. 1-2, 4; Laws 1943, ch. 173; 1944 Ex. ch. 5).

Rate: $2 (Rev. Laws (1942 ch. 73, sec. 1)).

Collection: Poll taxes are assessed on April 1 by town selectmen or city assessors and are payable to the collector on demand and without previous notice. Interest at 10 percent is charged on all taxes not paid on or before December 1 after assessment. The proceeds of such taxes are retained by the respective towns, cities, or counties. Remedies for collection include the seizure and sale of personal property sufficient to pay said taxes, or, if no personal property can be found, the arrest and commitment of the delinquent taxpayer to the county jail or house of correction. When any person is so committed to the county jail or house of correction where there is a workshop connected, he shall be credited for his labor therein at the rate of 50 cents per day, to be applied on the amount of his tax and costs of commitment. He shall be required to pay the jailer of the institution board at the rate of $2.50 per week, the same to be earned in the employ of said institution. Suit may also be instituted against a delinquent taxpayer for the amount of any taxes owed; and wages may be attached for payment. (Rev. Laws (1942) ch. 31, sec. 6; ch. 74, sec. 1; ch. 75, sec. 1; ch. 77, secs. 1, 10-12; ch. 80, secs. 1-2, 10-11, 43.)

It seems clear from that language that a man may be put in jail in New Hampshire for not paying his poll tax, just as he may be put in jail for not paying his other taxes. Certainly, unless that statute has been changed or modified—and there is absolutely no evidence to the effect that it has been changed or modified—if he does not pay his poll tax or other taxes in New Hampshire, either one or the other, he goes to jail.

Now:

Payment a prerequisite: (1) Every applicant for a permit to register a motor vehicle shall furnish to the issuing officer a tax collector's receipt for the payment of any poll tax for which he is liable for the preceding year, or make oath that he has paid said taxes or has been relieved from such payment because of exemption or abatement; provided that a permit may be issued if the selectmen or assessors certify that in their opinion the applicant should be granted such permit even though he has not paid said taxes (Rev. Laws (1942) ch. 116, sec. 63; Laws 1947 ch. 105).

Then, under "Payment a prerequisite," there is a second section:

(2) Every applicant for a resident hunting, fishing, or trapping license shall furnish to the issuing officer a tax collector's receipt for the payment of a poll tax for the preceding year, or make oath that he has either paid said tax or has been relieved from such payment because of exemption or abatement. However, a license may be issued if the selectmen or assessors certify that in their opinion the applicant should be granted such license even though he has not paid the tax (Rev. Laws (1942), ch. 247, sec. 4; Laws 1943, ch. 52).

Here is an important section entitled "Relation of Payment of Poll Tax to Voting":

A person excused from paying taxes at his own request is disqualified from voting; but he may become qualified as a voter by tendering payment of all taxes assessed against him during the year prior to his offer to vote to the moderator, collector of taxes, or to one of the selectmen of the town in which he lives and has his home; and, at the time he offers to vote, present evidence of such tender (Rev. Laws (1942), ch. 31, secs. 1, 4-5; Const., art. 28).

That seems to be the clear law of the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. President, at the time I was somewhat diverted from my main argument to take a little excursion into the State of New Hampshire to see if we could determine here the question of the payment of poll taxes in that State. I was

about to discuss the question of electors for President and Vice President of the United States. Up to this time we have been talking largely about electors who vote for Members of the House of Representatives and for Members of the United States Senate. But certainly I think we should turn our thoughts for a few moments to the question of electors for President and Vice President of the United States. As we know, the only provision of the Federal Constitution relating to the power of appointment of electors is contained in article II, section 1, of the Constitution, which confers upon and vests in State legislatures plenary power over the method, except as to the time of choosing the electors. In other words the States under the Constitution of the United States have full power over the question of electors, the question of who are to vote for President and Vice President, with the single exception of the time of choosing electors. The second clause of the section provides as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: But no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.

The third clause reads as follows:

The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States.

So, Mr. President, nothing can be clearer than the effect of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States which I have just quoted. In drafting and adopting the Constitution, the States were not conferring powers on themselves. In the course of this debate, I have sought to emphasize time and again that the States were not conferring powers on themselves. They were reserving powers already possessed, and conferring them upon their own State legislatures.

By these provisions in the Federal Constitution the States delegated to Congress the power only to determine the time of choosing electors, while they conferred on their own respective State legislatures the exclusive power to direct the method and manner in which the electors should be chosen or appointed. There is no requirement that they shall be chosen by the people or that they shall be elected by the people, but, if so elected, the qualifications which the legislature may prescribe for those privileged to vote are left entirely to the States. The whole matter, as I have said, with the exception of the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they are to vote, is left entirely with the States. In fact, Mr. President, history reminds us that in the first Presidential election, in 5 of the 11 States which had then ratified the Constitution the appointment of electors was made by the State legislatures.

The State legislatures did not see fit to delegate this power to the people or to place the power in the hands of some other authority. They did not see fit to give the power to anyone else. They simply proceeded to exercise that power themselves and, in 5 of the 11 States, they proceeded to appoint electors.

In the case of *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 36 L. ed.), in construing the second clause, Mr. Chief Justice Fuller said:

The Constitution does not provide that the appointment of electors shall be by popular vote, nor that the electors shall be voted for upon a general ticket, nor that the majority of those who exercise the elective franchise can alone choose the electors. It—

Meaning, of course, the Constitution—

recognizes that the people act through their representatives in the legislature, and leaves it to the legislature exclusively to define the method of effecting the object.

The object being to elect the electors.

At page 877 of 36 Law Edition, Chief Justice Fuller of the Supreme Court had this to say:

In short, the appointment and mode of appointment of electors belong exclusively to the States under the Constitution of the United States. They are, as remarked by Mr. Justice Gary in the case of *In re Green* (134 U. S. 377, 379), "no more officers or agents of the United States than are the members of the State legislatures when acting as electors of Federal Senators, or the people of the States when acting as the electors of Representatives in Congress."

Congress is empowered, as I have said, to determine the time of choosing electors, and the day on which they are to cast their votes, which must be the same day throughout the United States. Mr. Justice Gray goes on to say:

Otherwise the power and jurisdiction of the State is exclusive, with the exception of the provision as to the number of electors and the ineligibility of certain persons.

When Justice Gray referred to the ineligibility of certain persons he was referring to that provision of the Constitution which says that no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be appointed an elector. The framers of the Constitution did not think that officers or officials of the Federal Government should act as electors in naming the President and Vice President of the United States. With this exception, the plenary power to determine who the electors shall be is vested in the States.

The opinion of Chief Justice Fuller also quotes a report of a committee of the Senate. The Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, which met in 1874, stated:

It is no doubt competent for the legislature to authorize the governor or the supreme court of the State or any other agent of its will, to appoint these electors.

We find a committee of the Senate saying that under the plenary power provided in the Constitution of the United States, the State legislature may provide that the governor of a State shall appoint the electors for President and Vice President. The legislature can even provide that the supreme court of a particular State shall make these appointments; in other words the power of the legislature is so complete that it can even go into the judicial branch of the State government and have the supreme court make the appointment of electors.

After referring to the provision of the fourteenth amendment penalizing State representation in the House of Representatives where the right to vote at any election is denied or abridged except for crime, the Court said, further:

The first section of the fourteenth amendment does not refer to the exercise of the elective franchise, though the second provides that if the right to vote is denied or abridged to any male inhabitant of the State having attained majority and being a citizen of the United States, then the basis of representation to which each State is entitled in the Congress shall be proportionately reduced. Whenever Presidential electors are appointed by popular election, then the right to vote cannot be denied or abridged without invoking the penalty.

"The right to vote intended to be protected refers to the right to vote as established by the laws and constitution of the State," declares Chief Justice Fuller in his opinion.

Then he proceeds:

There is no color for the contention that under the amendment every male inhabitant of the State being a citizen of the United States has from the time of his majority a right to vote for Presidential electors.

Such a contention would be absolutely unsound, would be absolutely unwarranted, would have no justification at all, under the clear language and the clear provision of the Constitution of the United States, which leaves all this power of fixing qualifications of these electors in the hands of the State.

It is clear, Mr. President, that nowhere does the Constitution confer on Congress any power to supervise or in any manner interfere with the State legislatures in directing the manner of the appointment of a State's presidential electors or in saying who may vote in elections to choose them, for the legislature determines the method of selection, and prescribes who may vote.

There is absolutely nothing in the record, nothing in the debates at the time the Constitution was under consideration in the Philadelphia Convention, and nothing in any of the debates when the fourteenth, fifteenth, seventeenth, or eighteenth amendment was under consideration by either the House of Representatives or the Senate; there is nothing to be found in any language of any court in all these United States, from the beginning of our Government down to date, which in any way disputes or in any way questions the fact that this power to set the qualifications for these electors rests in the States. This power is a fixed right in the States under the Constitution, absolutely definite and certain.

Mr. President, in my remarks a little earlier I referred to Justice Story, and I should now like to call the attention of the Senate to a few words to be found in Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, eighth edition, Carrington, volume 2. Mr. Cooley, a great and universally accepted authority on the Constitution, declared:

Among the absolute, unqualified rights of the States is that of regulating the elective franchise; it is the foundation of State authority; the most important political function exercised by the people in their sovereign capacity. Whilst "the right of the people to participate in the legislature is the best security of liberty and foundation of all free government," yet it is subordinate to

the higher power of regulating the qualifications of the electors and the elected. The original power of the people in their aggregate political capacity, is delegated in the form of suffrage to such persons as they deem proper for the safety of the commonwealth; Brightly Election Cases (*Anderson* v. *Baker* (32, 33, 34, 23 Md. 531)).

Then he quotes from Justice Story.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. With the understanding that it will not interfere with my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska to put something into the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nebraska may proceed.

(At this point Mr. BUTLER addressed the Senate regarding Indian estates, which appears elsewhere in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska I had quoted from Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, in which he quoted Justice Story, to whom I said I had referred earlier in my remarks. I wish to quote further from Justice Story at this point:

Every constitution of government in these United States has assumed, as a fundamental principle, the right of the people of the State to alter, abolish, and modify the form of its own government according to the sovereign pleasure of the people. In fact, the people of each State have gone much further and settled a far more critical question by deciding who shall be the voters entitled to approve and reject the constitution framed by a delegated body under their direction. (1 Story, Constitution, ch. 9, sec. 581.)

Then Mr. Cooley says:

From this it will be seen how little, even in the most free of republican governments, any abstract right of suffrage, or any original and indefeasible privilege, has been recognized in practice (ibid.). In no two of these State constitutions will it be found that the qualifications of the voters are settled upon the same uniform basis, so that we have the most abundant proofs that among a free and enlightened people convened for the purpose of establishing their own forms of government and the rights of their own voters the question as to the due regulation of the qualifications has been deemed a matter of mere State policy, and varied to meet the wants, to suit the prejudices, and to foster the interests of the majority.

The exclusive right of the several States to regulate the exercise of the elective franchise and to prescribe the qualifications of voters was never questioned, nor attempted to be interfered with, until the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was forced upon unwilling communities (the States then lately in rebellion) by the military power of the General Government, and thus made a part of our organic law; a necessary sequence, perhaps, of the Civil War, but nonetheless a radical change in the established theory of our Government. (Brightly Election Cases, author's note, pp. 42, 43.)

He quotes the Brightly election cases, author's note, pages 42 and 43. He says, that the fourteenth amendment was a radical departure, a radical change in the established theory of our Government, that theory being, of course, to leave to the States the plenary power as to the qualification of electors. And then, as I have said and reiterated, and again reiterate, when those who advocated this change sought to bring it about, they never for 1 minute proposed to try and make the change by legislative enactment, by legislative fiat. They recognized that under the Constitution of the United States the only way the change could be made was by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and therefore they submitted the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. Cooley continues:

The right to vote is not of necessity connected with citizenship. The rights of the citizen are civil rights, such as liberty of person and of conscience, the right to acquire and possess property, all of which are distinguishable from the political privilege of suffrage.

Senators will notice that Mr. Cooley there departs from the use of the word "right" and uses the word "privilege"; not even conceding that there is any right to suffrage; that it is a privilege conferred by government, and under our Federal system conferred by the States.

The history of the country shows that there is no foundation in fact for the view that the right of suffrage is one of the "privileges or immunities of citizens."

I have discussed that earlier, Mr. President, in connection with the fourteenth amendment, and shall not go into it at this point.

"The right to vote is not vested, it is purely conventional, and may be enlarged or restricted, granted or withheld, at pleasure and without fault."

Then Mr. Cooley cites the case of *Blair* v. *Ridgely* (41 Mo., 161). He continues:

In *Blair* v. *Ridgely* (41 Mo. 161), the question at issue arose out of the provision of article II, section 3, of the Constitution of 1865 of the State of Missouri. By this section it was provided that no person should be deemed a qualified voter who had ever been in armed hostility to the United States, or to the government of the State of Missouri; that every person should, at the time of offering to vote, take an oath that he was not within the inhibition of this section, and that any person declining to take such oath should not be allowed to vote. The plaintiff, at an election held in the city of St. Louis on November 7, 1865, offered to vote, but refused to take the oath prescribed by the constitution. His vote being rejected, he brought his action against the judges of the election for damages. The case was taken to the Supreme Court of Missouri, where it was argued exhaustively, and with much learning, by eminent counsel, and the argument is to be found in full in the Reports of the Supreme Court of Missouri, volume 41. It was contended by the plaintiff that the section of the constitution in question was in violation of the Constitution of the United States, being a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law within the meaning of that instrument, and, in consequence, null and void. But the court held against this contention, drawing the distinction between laws passed to punish for offenses in order to prevent their repetition and laws passed to protect the public franchises and privileges from abuse by falling into unworthy hands. It is said by the court that—

"The State may not pass laws in the form or with the effect of bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, or laws impairing the obligation of contracts. It may and has full power to pass laws, restrictive and exclusive, for the preservation or promotion of the common interests as political or social emergencies may from time to time require, though in certain instances disabilities may directly flow in consequence. It should never be forgotten that the State is organized for the public weal as well as for individual purposes, and while it may not disregard the safeguards that are thrown around the citizen for his protection by the constitution, it cannot neglect to perform and do what is for the public good."

In other words, that the general weal of the State, the public good, and the welfare of all the people comes ahead of the individual.

It was argued in *Blair* v. *Ridgely* that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall. 277), where it was held that this section of the Missouri Constitution, so far as it provided an oath to be taken by preachers, was in the nature of pains and penalties, and consequently void, was decisive of the Blair case. But the distinction between the right to practice a profession or follow a calling and the right to vote is clearly stated in the opinion of Judge Wagner, as follows:

"The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Cummings case proceeds on the idea that the right to pursue a calling or profession is a natural and inalienable right and that a law precluding a person from practicing his calling or profession on account of past conduct is inflicting a penalty, and therefore void. There are certain rights which inhere in and attach to the person, and of which he cannot be deprived except by forfeiture for crime, whereof he must be first tried and convicted according to due process of law. These are termed natural or absolute rights. * * * But is the right to vote or to exercise the privilege of the elective franchise a right either natural, absolute, or vested? It is certain that in a state of nature, disconnected with government, no person has or can enjoy it.

"That the privilege of participating in the elective franchise in this free and enlightened country is an important and interesting one is most true. But we are not aware that it has ever been held or adjudged to be a vested interest in any individual.

"Suffrage in the United States not being a vested right, it results that persons who have enjoyed and exercised the privilege, and who have been qualified electors, may be entirely disfranchised and deprived of the privilege by constitutional provision, and such persons are entirely without a remedy at law. (McCrary, Elections, p. 9.)

"The whole subject of the regulation of elections, including the prescribing of qualifications for suffrage, is left by the National Constitution to the several States, except as it is provided by that instrument that the electors for Representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and as the fifteenth amendment forbids denying to citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

If Judge Cooley were writing these comments on constitutional limitations today, he would have to include the nineteenth amendment; but these commentaries were written before the nineteenth amendment, and therefore he did not include the nineteenth amendment, which, as we know, is the woman-suffrage amendment.

Participation in the elective franchise is a privilege rather than a right, and it is granted or denied on grounds of general policy, the prevailing view being that it should be as general as possible consistent with the public

safety. (Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, 8th ed., Carrington, vol. 2.)

In Morse on Citizenship we find a commentary along the same lines as those of Mr. Cooley. Pomeroy on Constitutional Law, section 535, is to the same effect. I read from Pomeroy:

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Article I, section 2:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Article I, section 4:

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

Article I, section 8, clause 18:

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER COURTS

To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State, and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate. The privileges and immunities protected are only those that arise from the Constitution and laws of the United States and not those that spring from other sources. *Breedlove v. Suttles* (302 U. S. 277, 283); *Pirtle v. Brown* (118 Fed. 2d 218, certiorari denied by Supreme Court, 62 Sup. Ct. Rep. 64); *Huber v. Reily* (53 Penn. St. 112); *Minor v. Happersett* (21 Wall. U. S. 162, 170); *United States v. Reese* (92 U. S. 214, 217, 218); *United States v. Cruikshank* (92 U. S. 542); *McPherson v. Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 38, 39); *Anderson v. Baker* (23 Md. 531); *Ex parte Yarborough* (110 U. S. 631, 664, 665); *Blair v. Ridgely* (41 Mo. 63); *Guinn v. United States* (238 U. S. 347, 362, L. R. A. 1916 A. 1134); *Ex parte Stratton* (1 W. Va. 305); *Kring v. Missouri* (107 U. S. 221); *Hamilton v. Regents* (293 U. S. 245, 261); *Washington v. State* (75 Ala. 582).

Mr. President, we are considering today whether there shall be brought before the Senate a piece of legislation which several Senators have characterized as sectional, and which certainly many people in the United States feel to be directed at one section of the country. Many people feel this legislation to be inspired by political pressure and conceived for political purposes. Without in any way questioning the motives or the good intentions of the authors of the bill, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate at this time a few words from an address which, by order of the Senate, is read to the Senate on one day of each session. It is an address which commends itself so strongly and so impressively to the heart and mind of every American, and sets up so many guideposts for the direction of our feet, that the Senate has ordered that it shall be read on the 22d day of every February. I refer to the Farewell Address of George Washington. President Washington, we remember, as he relinquished the office of President of the United States, addressed these words to the American people, reminding them that he had given of the best of over 25 years of his life to the service of his country, reminding them of the deep and abiding affection which he felt for them and for the new government which had been brought into being. We recall that in that address President Washington referred to himself as an old and affectionate friend. He said he was offering to his countrymen—of his day and of every day, to you and to me, to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to the people of all the United States—the counsels of an old and affectionate friend. In that address he said to us:

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize.

Washington was reminding us that our unity, the unity of the people of the United States, is the main pillar of these dear and cherished and treasured possessions of ours.

He went on to say:

But, as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your National Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

This was George Washington speaking more than 150 years ago. Today those words come with a new emphasis, with a new timeliness, with a new eloquence, yea, with a new warning.

We have been speaking here of events which transpired in Philadelphia where the Constitution of the United States was drafted, there in the very hall in which the Declaration of Independence was written.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I was attempting to develop the latter part of my remarks. I hope the Senator will make his question a brief one.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is the Senator going to speak of some events which occurred recently in Philadelphia?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly what I am coming to now. I say to the Senator from Mississippi that I believe he was necessarily absent from the Chamber or unavoidably detained a few moments ago when I read to the Senate the words of George Washington in his Farewell Address, when he commended to us the unity of our Government, the unity of our people.

Mr. EASTLAND. But I was referring to the events of the past 30 days.

Mr. HILL. I shall come to that. I have been moving rather fast this evening. If the Senator will be a little patient with me, I shall come to what he has in mind.

First, let me repeat these words from Washington's Farewell Address:

But, as it is easy to foresee, that from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth—

That is to say, the truth that the main pillar of our blessings and of our cherished possessions is the unity of our Government and the unity of our people.

Washington continues:

As this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies—

Internal and external enemies—

will be most constantly and actively—

Mark well the following words:

(though often covertly and insidiously) directed—

Again I say, these words from George Washington come to us today with a new emphasis, a new meaning, a new significance, a new timeliness, and a new warning.

In the very city of Philadelphia about which we have spoken so often today, the city in which the Declaration of Independence was written, the city in which the Constitution of the United States had its birth, we saw a political party gathered, denouncing practically everything that the American Government is doing and praising all that the Soviet Communist Government is doing. We saw a recognized political party here in the United States, a party with Communists and fellow travelers and those who are in the bed with Communists and fellow travelers, denouncing our American Government and singing its hosannas to the Communist Government of Russia. A few years ago I think most of us would have been astounded even to have contemplated that there would be in existence in America such a political party. We know that there are some in our country who cannot see, or who refuse to see, the true picture in the world today, the threat to peace and the threat to America. We build the peace, or war will come, war that will consume our people with fire and death, sear the earth, leave behind the shattered buildings and blackened ruins of our cities, engulfing all that is beautiful and free, and destroying God's richest blessings. There are some who either cannot see or who will not see that true picture. They are like those who could not see or who refused to see the awful menace of Adolf Hitler and the Japanese war lords. There are those, as I have said, who met in Philadelphia, giving their aid, their encouragement, their help, to the things for which Communist Russia stands, to the actions the Communist Government is taking today to defeat the peace of the world and to carry on its cold war against the United States of America and against all the freedom-loving peoples and freedom-loving nations of the world.

These people here in America aid and further and abet communism, while Russia's aggressions and Russia's stubborn refusal to cooperate under the United Nations Charter impede the building of the peace of the world at every turn and move the world toward war.

The hope for the peace of the world lies in the strength of the United States of America, in the unity of our people and the leadership of our country. Only if America remains strong—strong in her domestic economy, strong in her armed might, strong in the unity, the determination, and the will of her people—can we hope that Russia will change her course and be willing to come to agreement for the peace of the world. Yet today we see that the Communists and their fellow travelers in the United States and all those who play their game seek to sow confusion, promote discord, and confound agreement. They would separate us. They would divide us. They would turn us one against the other. They would split us into many parties and factions, just as they did in those European nations that have fallen their prey. The Communists, their fellow travelers, and those who play their game would destroy our strength. They would make us weak—weak at home and weak abroad—so weak that the other peace-loving nations would be afraid to rely upon us or our commitments, and would be afraid to associate themselves with us or work with us or follow our leadership for the building of the peace of the world.

My plea to America today is to adhere to the words of George Washington, words proclaiming that the main pillar in the edifice of our independence, of our tranquillity at home, of our peace abroad, of our safety, of our prosperity, and of that very liberty which we so highly prize, is the unity of a democratic government and the unity of a free people.

Let us be done, Senators, with these measures, brought here in the heat of a political campaign and under the pressure of political expediency, which distract and misguide our people, which separate and divide us, and which open the way for the destruction of the fundamental rights of the States and the fundamental rights of the people of all the United States. Let us be done with these measures.

Let us stand united. Strong and resolute in our unity, let us support squarely the rights of the people of the United States and the rights of the States of the United States that our Government may be preserved. Let us stand squarely upon the Constitution of the United States—rock of freedom, ageless and enduring foundation of our rights, our hopes, and our democratic faith.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Downey	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McFarland	Thye
Ecton	McGrath	Tobey
Ellender	McKellar	Tydings
Fenzel	McMahon	Umstead
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hawkes	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

FRACTIONATED INDIAN HEIRSHIP LANDS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD following my remarks a statement which I have prepared relating to the deplorable condition now existing with respect to the administration of the estates of deceased Indians by the Office of Indian Affairs.

So far as the interests of various estates owned by individual Indians are concerned, in most instances, the shares received are too small to be of any practical value. For example, in one of the estates which has been probated, the common denominator used in designating the shares of the various heirs was 56,582,064,000. Some of the shares are so small that $750 in lease rentals must be collected before an heir will receive one cent as his or her share. Checks are not usually issued for less than $1. Therefore, if this practice is followed, it will be over 1,600 years before sufficient funds will accumulate to the credit of a particular heir from a given estate so that a check may be issued. In one estate, that of Joseph Renville, or Akipa, a Sisseton Indian, of South Dakota, who died in 1891, the appraised value of the estate is $1,200, but it was estimated by the Interior Department in 1939, after 48 years, that $2,400 had then been expended in connection with the probate proceedings. If the estate were sold at the appraised value, some of the heirs would receive as little as $0.016. This demonstrates quite clearly the immense amount of administrative work caused by the present state of the titles to the allotments. The Indians are at present making very little, if any, use of such scattered holdings.

Nowhere is the insidiousness of the Bureau's control over Indian affairs more serious or more dangerous in its potentialities than in the matter of fractionated Indian heirship lands.

I regard this as a matter of the greatest importance and I earnestly trust that it will receive the attention which it so urgently deserves. No action will be proposed at this special session, but I hope Senators may find the statement I have prepared helpful in formulating a constructive proposal that can be considered early in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRACTIONATED INDIAN HEIRSHIP LANDS

When Congress passed the Dawes Act in 1887 and subsequent acts to implement this program, it anticipated the gradual and complete liquidation of all the Indian reservations in the United States. However, the period from 1934 to the present has seen the complete reversal of the expressed will of Congress and the American people through th retention of all land held in Indian reservations and, in some instances, expansion of these reservations. Thus, the Indian Bureau has completely disobeyed the mandate given it and acted in a fashion contrary to the legislative enactment.

The most flagrant example of this disobedience and dereliction of duty is to be seen in the problem of the "heirship lands." These are lands of deceased allottees which have passed again under the power of the Indian Bureau after having been originally freed therefrom. Instead of selling such lands and dividing the proceeds among the heirs, the Indian Bureau has retained them, rented or leased them, and used them for its own purposes. Thus, the continuance of control over Indian lands has been maintained in deliberate contradiction to the congressional will. The Indian Bureau has, in fact, hypocritically maintained that the heirship system, with its endless fractionation of holdings, has been all to the advantage of white men and encouraged their use of the land rather than the Indian's use of it. Nothing could be further from the truth.

If it were not so tragic, the situation has all the elements of a comic opera. Here, on the one hand, is the Indian Bureau crying its eyes out over the poor Indian and the continuous increase in heirship land which it avers will become prey to white exploitation, while, on the other hand, all the Bureau has to do is to sell the lands and divide the proceeds among the heirs. It should be obvious to anyone that the Indian Bureau is simply holding on to these heirship lands for the purpose of keeping its control at the expense of the Indians, the public, and the taxpayer. This is contrary to every principle of decency and of public welfare, and constitutes the rankest sort of discrimination against our Indian fellow citizens.

In the interests of the public welfare and of justice it is imperative that we take action now to remedy this intolerable misuse of our national land resources. We cannot afford to have these large areas of heirship lands to remain under the control of a bureaucratic organization interested only in its own benefit. The Indian Bureau asserts that "no really adequate and effective solution has yet been found (for the heirship problem), though the search has been intensively pursued." This is an example either of wishful thinking or of purposeful prevarication. Of course there is a solution for this problem—a solution so simple that it needs only an honest administration of the Indian Bureau to carry it out.

This solution lies in the dissolution of all special status adhering to Indian lands and the granting of full liberties in the buying and selling of individual lands to all the adult members of our citizenry of Indian descent. Heirship problems would vanish overnight if these lands were immediately

put up for sale and the proceeds divided among the heirs in proportion to their shares.

There is only one thing hindering the application of this solution. That obstacle is the present administration of the Indian Bureau which, having grown fat on the proceeds of its ill-gotten gains, stubbornly refuses to recognize that the public is calling for immediate action to remedy this intolerable situation. When a new administration takes over the Federal Government next January, then, and then only, will it be possible to remedy this grave situation and remove these intolerable discriminations against the property of our Indian fellow citizens.

THE HEIRSHIP TANGLE WORKS AGAINST THE CONSERVATION OF NATIONAL RESOURCES

The present heirship situation represents the natural tendency to aggrandize itself which has indelibly marked the Indian Bureau under the New Deal.

The heirship lands contain an unassessed but indubitably enormous value in terms of unrealized potential natural resources. Where it does not suit the Indian Bureau to lease or rent out the use of these lands and their resources, the United States as a whole suffers a corresponding loss of use of its potential wealth. Some heirship land has valuable timber which has been eaten up by beetles, or otherwise deteriorated, with a dead loss of all the potential wealth of lumber involved. Some of the heirship land has, from neglect of its Bureau administrators, suffered gulleying, wind erosion, and loss of the valuable top soil. To restore such submarginal land will require the activities of other Federal agencies whose efforts might have better been spent elsewhere. Some of the heirship land again undoubtedly contains valuable but unexploited mineral deposits awaiting badly needed use by the Nation for national defense and strategic purposes. Again the heirship land, like other Indian lands under control of the Indian Bureau, pays no local taxation and this item alone mounts up to a formidable sum when the entire United States is considered.

Nor do our losses stop there. The loss to the general taxpayer must also be considered. Not only do we have the Indian Bureau withholding heirship land from local taxation, but it is taxing the general public in order to do it. In other words, the Indian Bureau compels you and me to pay taxes in order that it may control tax-free land for its own uses. The gigantic waste of clerical assistance in the administration of these lands constitutes a fundamental item in the expense of the Indian Bureau which must be met by annual appropriation of millions of dollars from the Public Treasury. How much longer can Congress afford to pour this money down the rat hole of bureaucracy? Isn't it about time something was done?

Administration of heirship lands constitutes a major excuse for the Indian Bureau to continue its existence. Clearly, it is the part of common sense to stop this waste of the public substance at once by putting a new administration into power in this country. Under a Republican administration the affairs of heirship lands will be wound up at once through the honest policy of removing Government control from Indian lands. These lands will be considered as any other citizens' lands are in this country, as disposable by open sale and by disposition of the proceeds to the heirs in proportion to their holdings. The leakage of public funds would be stopped at once, the heirship lands thrown open to taxation, and the tax burden of supporting this intolerable bureaucracy would be removed from the citizens of this country. This is not a matter which would be like the Dutch boy plugging up the hole in the dike with his finger, but would represent the building of a permanent storm wall against the increasing possibility of bankruptcy which the future growth of Indian heirship lands could easily entail.

THE INDIAN BUREAU KEEPS ITS OWN COUNSEL AND THE NATURE OF ITS ARBITRARY ACTS IS NOT GENERALLY KNOWN

The Indian Bureau is in the peculiarly advantageous position of being able to control and censor all information regarding its transactions in the administration of Indian affairs and of heirship lands. Because of the rural location and somewhat isolated position of most Indian reservations, it is difficult to have any impartial reporting of what goes on in agency offices. Even when outside observers do make inquiry, the best they can get are hand-outs representing previously prepared defenses of the Indian Bureau and of its special interests. The temptation to conceal disadvantageous facts, when there is no other check up, is overwhelming for any bureaucratic organization. This holds true also for financial transactions, particularly in the case of the Indian Bureau. The result of this situation is an amount of skullduggery in all its forms which is almost unimaginable. For, like the Russian Soviet Government, the Indian Bureau has set up an "iron curtain" about itself and its activities which no one can penetrate. Even the General Accounting Office has no idea of the nature of the Indian Office transactions.

In recent years, under the guise of an economy measure, the Bureau has cut down its statistical staff to one man so that it will easily be able to plead ignorant on details which it would not like to divulge. It must, indeed, be obvious that any agency of this size cannot have its statistical work handled by one man. This is only another link in the chain of evidence regarding the cynical lack of responsibility and common honesty which characterizes the Indian Bureau under its New Deal administration. For how can Congress know what is going on in the matter of heirship lands when the very information needed for intelligent corrective legislation is withheld by the Indian Bureau?

The arbitrary handling of heirship matters, along with other Indian affairs by the Indian Bureau, runs through all the details of administration. Since identity of the heirs to a particular property is determined by the Bureau at its own pleasure and the amount of shares of each heir are entirely at its disposition, the Bureau can locate heirs or not, as it sees fit. At its own will the Bureau obtains their consent to the leasing of heirship properties, whenever its own convenience is suited, and can dispose of the lands to the tribe, by trade or by other arrangement of consolidation. At its own pleasure, again, the Bureau may allow the heirship lands to lie idle and completely withdrawn from any productive use under the specious plea that Congress will have to legislate before any action can be taken. Income from rentals and leases is accounted for, or not, at the pleasure of the Bureau, in each instance, thus making it possible for huge sums to be accumulated by local agencies which are not accounted for publicly. Who can call the Indians citizens when they are subjected to such bureaucratic arbitrariness as this? Yet this is all concealed from the public by the Indian Bureau's own iron curtain. Within the limits of its own self-imposed secrecy the Indian Bureau can do absolutely what it pleases with the heirship lands, exploiting them for its own purposes where it wishes, and disposing of them as it finds conditions convenient.

THE INDIAN HEIRSHIP PROBLEM IS ONE OF THE COMPLEXITIES OF BUREAUCRACY WHICH URGENTLY STANDS IN NEED OF SIMPLIFICATION

It is a cardinal principle of government nowadays that simplification of functions is of the utmost importance in solving the stupendous problems of administration arising from overelaboration of Federal agencies and bureaus. In the interest of efficiency, honesty, and economy in Government it is absolutely necessary to pare down the innumerable branches and vines which have grown up in the administration. Many agencies of the Federal Government overlap in functions and needlessly confuse the situation with wasteful competition among themselves. At present, the Hoover Commission, for example, is trying to prepare a plan for reducing this tremendous burden of Federal bureaucracy. What, then, of the Indian heirship lands which exceed in complexity most other problems of governmental administration?

It is admitted by all parties concerned that the administration of heirship lands is becoming more complex each day. Fractionation of each heirship plot continues indefinitely as heirs die and numerous new heirs arise for each of the deceased. Take for example, the situation of the heirs of Nice Knife on the Crow Reservation, Mont., who died in 1890 and received Allotment No. 1211 on April 5, 1938. Among his numerous heirs the following may be noted: Walks in the Night had 2,857,680 parts out of 65,318,400, but is now deceased and his heirs are not determined. Another heir was Mary Hill Big Hair who had left 12 heirs of her own, each receiving from 20 to 1 parts out of 60. Of these heirs Aloysius Big Hair, with one part out of 60, died and left 4 heirs, while Peter Big Hair, with 1 part out of 60, passed away with 5 heirs of his own. And so it runs down the list. It can be seen that with such a situation a premium would be put on the nondetermination of heirs.

To add to this confusion the Indian Bureau, under the Wheeler-Howard Act, has encouraged the organization of collective enterprise on an exclusive Indian basis (in theory at least) on each reservation. This has led to the development of a large number of puppet Indian governments on reservations which, in reality, are but the tools of the Indian Bureau. By means of its control over funds, the heirship lands, loans, and other devices, the Bureau maintains a rigid but concealed control over these Indian tribal groups. The multiplication of these Indian corporation charters and constitutional tribes has led to a tremendous complexity in connection with the administration of heirship lands. Using the prospect of obtaining heirship lands as a bait, the Indian Bureau can easily secure the ready obedience of the tribal puppets. It is vital for the Bureau to keep as much of these lands as possible under its own direct control, although it constantly hints at restoration to tribal land status. Thus, the system of probate for Indian heirs is so utterly foreign to common practice in the United States that it almost appears to be a foreign importation.

On the face of it, the heirship tangle is nothing more than the impasse resulting from the unwillingness of the Indian Bureau to carry out the congressional mandates for allotment of all Indian reservations. This unwillingness to do what it is ordered to do by law is absolutely inexcusable in a Federal agency, yet it has had the encouragement and abetment of the present administration to the detriment of both efficiency and morale in the public service. The public has come to assume a skeptical attitude on the whole Indian problem because of the maladministration of just such affairs as the heirship lands.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE HEIRSHIP LANDS CONSTITUTES RANK RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

The present policy of administering heirship lands represents an impossible future for the Indian in the United States. It is plainly evident that if you keep Indian lands for Indians only, eventually all non-Indian citizens will suffer increasing discrimination as time goes on. As the Navajo Indians increased during the last 75 years, large tracts of land have been added to the reservation which now comprises parts of four States. This process of expansion exclusively for Navajos cannot continue indefinitely without vitally infringing on the land ownership, not only of whites, but of other Indian tribes in

Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah. The solution of the problem of Indian wardship cannot be found in piling new kinds of restrictions on Indian property such as heirship entails. The policy of the present Indian Bureau to hold on to the heirship lands under the false plea that the law will not allow it to dispose of these lands by public sale, unless to properly qualified Indians, i. e., Indians under Bureau control, is a parallel to the expansion of the Navajo lands. Heirship status simply creates new ways by which the Indian Bureau can hold its control over land which was meant to be free from all special control and to be owned in fee simple by its Indian and white occupants under the full enjoyment of their constitutional citizenship rights.

In its essence the Indian Bureau policy of holding on to heirship lands is as racially discriminative as restrictive covenants, since the Indian Bureau refuses to allow heirship lands which it deems Indian to be sold to members of any other race. The United States Supreme Court has recently made a decision that restrictive covenants in which landowners agree not to sell property to Negroes or other nonwhites are not constitutional. How, then, can the Indian Bureau turn around and guarantee by restrictive covenant, of its own making, that certain land shall be conveyed to Indians only, and to members of no other race? The answer is that it cannot legally do so, and that its policy in these matters is not only unconstitutional, but is morally indefensible as rank racial discrimination. No, of course the Indian Bureau makes its covenants only with its puppets, tribal governments set up by it and entirely amenable to its will. There is no right, no law, which guarantees to members of one race ownership forever of property within the United States. The Indian Bureau clearly has not a foot on which to stand in its pursuit of such a discriminative policy.

ADMINISTRATION OF HEIRSHIP LANDS SHOWS GOVERNMENT REGULATION RUN WILD

The handling of heirship lands by the Indian Bureau actually portrays one of the worst phases of the New Deal period, namely, the trend toward excessive Federal regulation of the business of the individual. In some respects this trend has a resemblance to the totalitarian philosophies of the Fascist and Communist governments of Europe which regulate the individual in a police state. Whether or not the devices instituted under the Wheeler-Howard Act by the Indian Bureau really constituted part of some Communist conspiracy to sovietize the United States will probably never be known. The facts, however, are indisputable that the heirship lands were originally allotted and designed to make Indians full citizens free from wardship. The Indian Bureau, on the contrary, has remanded these lands to a direct control by the Federal Government with an ostensible view toward reincorporating them under tribal control and ownership. This would amount to communalization of land originally designed for private ownership by act of Congress.

Again recurring to the Navajo case, we have reason to notice the notorious Dreifkoff plan for the industrialization of the Navajo which received the general endorsement of Secretary Krug. This plan envisioned a tribal commune to handle all business affairs of its members and to drive out all individual enterprise from the reservation. Thus, the complete control on the part of the Indian Bureau over affairs on the Navajo Reservation could be maintained under the guise of tribal enterprise. Admittedly, this represents a tendency dangerous for all our citizens, both Indian and white.

Heirship lands are not distributed through all of the Indian reservations. They are most important in the reservations from the Dakotas westward and, as such, represent a golden opportunity for the Indian Bureau to foist communal ownership theories in areas where none originally existed (in contrast with the Pueblo Indians of the Southwest). The principle of private ownership of property had made great headway among the Indians of the Northwest, and they were on a fair way to becoming citizens, rather than wards, when the New Deal stepped in about 1934.

It is still quite evident that the Indians of the Northwest do not want communal ownership under the Indian Bureau as their permanent status, but the control which the Bureau has over the heirship lands offers a powerful weapon to force such communalization. Most evidence goes to show that these Indians want private ownership of property, but what can they do when the Indian Bureau decides to make heirship lands part of the projected future tribal estate? Everything on these reservations operates to increase the dependence of the Indians upon the Bureau, loan funds, increasing indebtedness for gratuity expenditures, and above all, the administration of increasing acreages of heirship lands by the Bureau.

It is quite evident by now emancipation of the Indians will not come about so long as the present administration holds power. For how can the Indians escape from the status of wards when large portions of their lands are willfully retained by the Indian Bureau in the form of heirship lands? The policy of the Indian Bureau, through its administration of heirship lands, is to increase the special responsibilities of the Federal Government for the Indians. The administration of heirship lands is quite evidently on the debit side of the ledger and will continue to be so until a new administration comes into power and takes over Indian affairs.

CONCLUSION

In this discussion I have reviewed several phases of the heirship problem and have shown how they all fit into a concerted plan to defeat the assimilation of the Indians into American citizenship. The heirship lands act against the best interest of the United States in our conservation of resources, in our policy of freedom of the press and free dissemination of information, in the pathological overexpansion of bureaucracy in the Federal Government, in its rank racial discrimination, and in its exemplification of Government regulation run wild. The heirship problem is only one phase, but an extremely important one, of the entire Indian policy of the New Deal and its rejection of the principle that Indians shall become full citizens.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, President Truman in his recent message to the joint session of the Congress on July 27, 1948, recommended a "comprehensive health program based on health insurance."

There is nothing new in this proposal, or in Mr. Truman's espousal of it. On November 14, 1945, Mr. Truman, in a message to Congress, advocated a compulsory health-insurance system which, he solemnly assured the Congress, is not "socialized medicine." Later the President let the cat out of the bag. In his message on the state of the Union on February 7, 1948, Mr. Truman stated: "Our ultimate aim must be a comprehensive insurance system to protect all our people equally against insecurity and ill health." In order "to protect all our people," the scheme must be compulsory. So there is no question where Mr. Truman stands on socialized medicine. Apparently he finds this term distasteful. Nonetheless, he has decided to go "all out."

We also know, by way of contrast, where Mr. Dewey stands. In some extemporaneous remarks before the House of Delegates of the Oregon State Medical Society in Portland, Ore., on May 1, 1948, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey stated his position very clearly and in language anyone may understand:

Compulsory socialized medicine is no good. It cannot be done. Accordingly I have spent the last two years of my life knocking down every proposal that anybody has made to regiment the medical profession and the people of America through any program of socialized medicine. * * * I don't want to run the risk of happening to the health of our people what has happened to the health of every group of people which has tried to drag the medical profession down to the Socialists' level. You won't drag anything up. You will enlarge the volume of medical care but utterly destroy the quality of medical care the minute you try that process.

Again Governor Dewey said:

This idea which has been shared by the last two occupants of the White House that you can improve medical care by passing a law must be stopped. We must get vast broad educational ideas to the people as to the quality of care that now exists and, as to a greater program that is going forward by men of medicine, we must have a program all can take a share in. Let's get some good public-relations men and get the businessman to do his share and get the lawyers and the labor leaders and everybody else. They are the ones who will lose most of all, if freedom in medicine is ever lost.

The issue between the two major candidates for President of the United States is clear and clean cut. Mr. Truman believes as an "ultimate aim" there must be a compulsory comprehensive insurance system to apply to all our people. Governor Dewey believes that "compulsory socialized medicine is no good." For my part, I believe that the position of the Republican candidate, Governor Dewey, is sound, backed up by theory and experience. I believe the ideas of the Democratic candidate, President Truman, are a distinct threat to the medical and allied professions as we now know them and to our American way of life.

The advances in public health in the United States already made show that our basic institutions are sound. Existing shortcomings—and some are admitted—can be corrected within the framework of our time-tried, time-tested system of nonpolitical medicine. Relying in the future, as in the past, mainly upon individual initiative and personal cooperation, we may reasonably expect the health of the people of the United States to continue to improve.

There are two ways of life competing for supremacy in the world today. One is the Russian system, based on the Marxian principles of the abolition of private enterprise as the means of production. The other, the American system, is based on the principles of free enterprise, and personal initiative. Our English friends are trying to combine the two with conspicuous lack of success. Under the Marshall plan England is receiving from us more than one-third of our total gifts to western Europe. These goods and commodities produced under our free-enterprise system, are going forward to England as free-will gifts from the American people because the English tell

us that under their present regimented economy, which now includes socialized medicine, England is not producing enough to maintain a fair standard of living for her own people.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to yield until I finish my prepared address. I shall then be glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Socialized medicine is not new. Nations throughout the world have for decades been experimenting with one form or another of government-sponsored programs. Germany, for example, adopted a socialized-medicine plan in 1883 when Bismarck was forging his "golden chain" around the necks of the German people. Australia followed with a similar program in 1888. Britain took the first step in 1911, and completed the socialization of medicine when the Socialist majority in Parliament passed the National Health Service Act, which went into effect on July 5 of the present year. This legislation is designed to unify medical and auxiliary services in an insurance scheme directed by the state and supported by compulsory contributions by all citizens. In other words, Britain has achieved that point which Mr. Truman now describes as his "ultimate aim."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate, invited the Brookings Institution, the outstanding research organization famous for its impartiality, to prepare a report on the issue of compulsory health insurance. The conclusions and recommendations furnished the Senate committee came as a bombshell into the camp of the advocates for socialized medicine, who have been extolling the virtues of various foreign systems.

These are some of the conclusions reached in the report published in April, 1948:

First. Probably no great nation in the world has among its white population better health than now prevails in the United States.

Second. The United States, under its voluntary system of medical care, has made greater progress in the application of medical and sanitary science than any other country.

Third. The nonwhites in the United States have materially poorer health than the whites, but the evidence does not indicate that this condition is primarily or even mainly due to unavailability or inadequacy of medical care.

Fourth. The advances in health among both the whites and nonwhites that have been made in the United States in the past four decades do not suggest basic defects in the American system.

The learned professions of the United States have always enjoyed a distinction not found in any other field of human endeavor. The clergyman, the lawyer, the physician, and the dentist have always dealt directly with humanity. A personal relationship is the touchstone of their service to mankind. To the present day in the United States no man has intervened between them and those who sought their aid, counsel, service, and assistance. Contrary to the claims of the advocates, schemes for socialized medicine place a middleman between the doctor and the patient. For my part, I hope the learned and respected profession of medicine, as well as its allied professions, will be able to withstand this onslaught on its cherished heritage. If they are unable to do so, what does the future hold for the other professions?

The Republican Eightieth Congress has been unusually alert in matters connected with the health of the American people. It established a National Heart Institute within the United States Public Health Service to fight America's No. 1 killer, diseases of the heart and circulation. It provided $500,000 to the Research Institute to combat these diseases which affect 1 person in every 16 and cause 1 out of every 3 deaths.

It authorized a National Institute of Dental Research, the functions of which in the dental field are similar to the Heart Institute.

In addition, it provided $28,400,000 for the National Cancer Institute to study the disease of cancer and to disseminate knowledge on how to reduce its terrible toll of lives.

Furthermore, it passed a bill establishing a National Science Foundation to develop and encourage a national policy for scientific research and scientific education, and to initiate and support scientific research in medical and other sciences. The National Science Foundation bill passed by the Congress was vetoed by President Truman for reasons best known to himself. These measures are directed to the improvement of the health of all our people, without resort to socialism.

After all, the American way of life has given us the American standard of living—the envy of the rest of the world.

I am proud to say, the Republican Congress in all of these acts has been alert to protect the American way, to cherish and preserve it for our children and our children's children.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Montana is not present. I should like recognition.

Mr. KEM. I want the RECORD to show that I am very glad at this time to answer any questions which the Senator from Montana or any other Senator may desire to ask.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to inquire who has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. The Chair has already recognized the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I notice that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has returned to the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor. He has yielded for a question.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MURRAY. The able Senator from Missouri has told us where the Republican candidate for President stands on the problem of compulsory health insurance. He has also told us where President Truman stands on that subject. I should like to ask the able Senator to tell us where the candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket stands on this question.

Mr. KEM. I am unable to advise the Senator from Montana. I am sure that the able candidate for Vice President can speak for himself.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a statement published by the Republican candidate for Vice President, Governor Warren of California, which statement appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A3824. In that statement by the candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket, the Governor of California has completely endorsed compulsory health insurance. It seems to me that if the able Senator from Missouri knows where the Presidential candidate on the Democratic ticket stands on that very important subject, he ought also to know where the Governor of California stands.

Mr. KEM. I cannot say, of course, what was in the minds of delegates to the Republican National Convention; but that may be one reason why Governor Dewey was selected as the standard bearer for the Republican Party, over other candidates for that nomination.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana has further questions, I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. MURRAY. For the enlightenment of the Senator from Missouri, I should like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the statement made by Governor Warren, which statement was published in Look magazine of recent date. I have not the date at the present time, but I shall furnish it for the RECORD shortly.

Mr. KEM. I suggest that the Senator from Montana read the statement which he has in mind. It may be that some Members of this body might care to comment on it at this time.

Mr. MURRAY. I can do so, Mr. President.

The Governor of California said:

For the past 5 years I have been trying to find a way for ordinary California families to keep themselves from going broke when serious illness strikes someone in their homes. I have had a lot of encouragement from husbands and wives who know from their own human experience how a huge wad of unexpected doctor and hospital bills can wreck a lifetime of frugal planning. I have also had a lot of discouragement from groups that push aside the simple, human catastrophe of serious illness and see only the reasons why nothing much can be done about it.

I am convinced the people of my State want a plan that will protect ordinary families from being wrecked by the costs of serious illness. Any plan that is fair and that will do the job will be accepted.

PLAN TO GUARD FAMILY NEST EGG

Any change that will improve a plan either before or after it is adopted will be welcomed. I would not object if the date on which a plan goes into effect is set far enough ahead to give the medical and hospital facilities of California time to make fully ready for it. My mind is open as to the details. It will not be closed until the ordinary family can look at the family nest egg without fear that serious sickness may gobble it up next day or week or month.

I often wonder just how many people even in California are clear in their own minds about what I have proposed to do. A blizzard of propaganda has hidden the simple facts about my proposal, about what the plan is and what it is not. Certainly the American people as a whole do not know how we propose in California to become the Nation's first State to solve this problem.

It seems important to me that both Californians and people in other States understand how we hope to have this State, standing on its own feet, help its citizens to help themselves to keep serious illness from wrecking homes. Sudden, serious illness is as much a wrecker of homes in other States as it is in California. The threat is national. But there are very strong reasons why this particular social problem can be better solved by States than by the Federal Government. Some assistance to the States from the Federal Government may prove to be needed. But the closer the solution is tailored to each State's needs, the better it is likely to work. Our experience can be of help to other States.

I doubt whether many citizens really know the whole problem of human sickness and health in their own State. California is a fairly typical, progressive State in handling these problems, so, first, let's look at the whole picture there.

In California, as in most other States, we have accepted the broad humanitarian principle that no one will be left to sicken and die for lack of help because they cannot afford treatment. No one questions this principle. Questions arise only about how it should be applied. Many of these questions have been settled by common-sense agreement, and are no longer debated in public and legislative forums.

THE STATE HELPS DISEASE VICTIMS

For instance, we have agreed that the State and its subdivisions will help individuals and families that have been hit by tuberculosis if they are not able to help themselves. We tax people who have fortunately escaped this universal scourge to aid its victims. That is the decent, humane thing to do, we all agree.

We take much the same view of mental diseases. They are a human misfortune that springs from the strenuous pattern of our social life. We recognize the humanitarian common sense of mutual cooperation through our State and local governments in sharing the burdens of the misfortune of mental illness.

We accept the idea that people who fall sick with any one of dozens of ailments, and have no money to pay for treatment, shall be treated free at city and county and State hospitals and their out-patient clinics. We sometimes call these people the medically indigent, and use the disagreeable word "pauper" regarding them. The learned and disagreeable words do not change the human facts. These people are our own, and we take care of them, all of us willingly paying taxes to carry a human burden we humanly acknowledge. But we go a step further.

The statement made by the Governor of California continues. In the course of his statement he endorses the compulsory-insurance system.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that since the Senator from Montana is placing part of the statement in the RECORD——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order. I demand the regular order. The Senator from California has not been recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. I continue with the statement made by the Governor of California:

Not many years ago, after a debate that reminds me of the one now going on in California, we accepted the simple principle that a breadwinner who is injured while he labors shall be treated for his injuries and paid during his days of enforced idleness. The cost of this assistance—we call it workmen's compensation—is met by a levy on employers through an insurance system. But the simple fact is that we all help pay for it in the purchase prices of the goods and services we buy. Although workmen's compensation was bitterly fought with all the mustn't-do-this-or-that slogans, it is now taken as a matter of course.

Recently, almost without dissent, we broadened our unemployment-insurance law to provide benefits for workers who lose wages because they are sick, not because they are laid off or dismissed. This extension of the unemployment-insurance principle to cover wage losses due to illness made simple sense to the people of my State.

The principle that no one shall lack medical care because they can't afford it has a partner principle. It is that people who can afford to pay for their own medical care shall pay for it themselves, without burdening other citizens. So we have two principles: 1. Mutual sharing of responsibility for the unfortunate; 2. Self-reliance for the fortunate.

These two simple principles are as old as America, and likely much older. To me they are basic ideas about the ways and means by which human beings live together in good fortune and bad luck.

SLOGANS CONFUSE ISSUE

Certainly, they are a lot older than the ideas behind the mustn't-do-this-or-that slogans used to postpone their application. They were accepted as good human principles long before anyone heard of socialism or Fascist regimentation. I confess it disturbs me deeply to hear these ideological blackjack slogans used to frighten forthright citizens out of responding to their American instinct to do something about misfortune when they see it.

What I have said so far is the background to my own thinking about a plan that will keep serious illness from wrecking homes. We have solved the problems of mutual sharing of the costs of sickness and injury on a wide scale and in a variety of ways. Yet there is one important part of the problem we have not solved. We have not found a way to put the principle of mutual sharing to work to help families of such moderate incomes that the costs of serious illness are likely to push them down into a lower social group.

Economic disaster is always close enough to these families, which are the great middle bulk of our society that does most of the hard work. Both the welfare and the outlook of this great middle bulk are profoundly important. Society loses part of its stability when one of these families is compelled to give up its self-reliance. It loses something almost as important when the parents in such a family are forced to abandon reasonable ambitions for their children. I can show you what I mean in a personal way.

WARREN TELLS OWN STORY

I was born and raised in a small California town. My father worked for the railroad, and his pay was never much more than he had to have to pay the family bills for a healthy family. But he and mother squeezed enough out of that pay to send me to college.

I was older before I realized that if my father's health hadn't been perfect during those years, I would have been like most of the other boys in my town. I would never have got to college at all. That means a lot to me, but it isn't the whole story, either. My father had his heart set on sending me to college, so I could have a better chance than he had. If his health had failed, I think he might have been a heartsick man, too.

My parents had the good luck to have good health. As Governor of California, I have learned a lot about families that had bad luck, and about what the bad luck of serious illness does to ordinary families. Not the well-off or the poor families. They are always taken care of by themselves or society. But the families in between, whose self-reliant efforts make the wheels of society go round; the families that just naturally want a peaceful, productive community with no nonsense about isms or get-rich-quick schemes.

Let's look at a family I was told about recently. They lived in San Mateo County, which is just south of San Francisco, and had been doing very well. They'd bought a small home, and got a good loan from the bank on it because they had savings of their own to put into it, and the husband had a fine record. They have one son and one daughter, and the children were doing excellent work at school.

Then the mother came down with a very serious heart ailment. It was curable, but the kind of thing that means months of hospital care and expensive treatment. By the time she was well enough to care for her family again, they'd lost the home and he had borrowed every cent he could. The strain was too much for the husband and he did what you know a lot of perfectly good human beings do, if you're honest with yourself about it. He drank too much. He lost his job, and along with it a fine chance for promotion that he'd earned by being a good, responsible workman.

I don't know what is going to happen to that fine family, but my experience with human problems has long since convinced me that four whole lifetimes have been seriously damaged. And that's just one case out of hundreds in California, and out of thousands in America. That kind of tragedy is as familiar as apple pie.

Right now I can hear one of my mustn't-do-this-or-that critics saying: "Yes, but if they had shown the foresight to subscribe to a voluntary health insurance plan they would have been all right."

Of course they would have been all right if they had done any one of several things they did not do, and perhaps could not do. I can see that if every ordinary family always had the foresight and the means to do what hindsight says they should have done, then they wouldn't get into much trouble. The hard fact is they don't have such foresight.

What I cannot comprehend is why some of our best people do not understand the real question society must answer in this problem: How can we help families of moderate income to have the means and the foresight to protect themselves against the tragic consequences of unexpected, serious illness?

The plan I have recommended in California requires that all employees already covered by our unemployment insurance act and all public employees pay 1 percent of their salary or wages up to $3,000 a year into a health-service fund. This means that the worker making $200 a month would pay $2 a month. The worker making $250 a month or more would pay $2.50 a month. These contributions would be matched by the employers. Provision is made to include others who may wish to join the system. It is my

hope that eventually we can work out methods by which all families of moderate income can participate.

Contributing members of the fund, and their dependents, will be assured payment in full of the costs of hospital and laboratory services, with certain reasonable restrictions, and the costs of medical care in hospital cases. The plan is designed to protect families against the more costly kinds of serious illness, not to provide for sickness involving only home visits by the doctor or office visits by the patient. The very important relationship between doctor and patient in the home and in the physician's own office is not disturbed.

M. D.'S TO WORK AS NOW

Furthermore, my plan does not call for any change in the traditional relationship between the doctor, the patient, and the hospital. My belief in the virtue of these traditional relationships is so deep that the plan expressly provides they are not to be changed. Patients are free to choose their own doctor and hospital, just as they do now. Doctors and hospitals are left free to select the patients they want to care for.

There is nothing in the plan to compel employees to use the benefits of the system if they prefer not to. It is carefully provided that the well-to-do can take their benefits in money indemnities to pay their own doctor bills if they wish to do so.

The bill I am sponsoring to put the plan into effect expressly provides that no system shall be created for dispensing medical or hospital care by the State through doctors employed by the State. So, far from regimenting or socializing medicine, the plan expressly prohibits State medicine.

The method for payment of doctors and hospitals is borrowed from the successful experience of private hospitals and medicine. It is the fee-for-service system used by voluntary medical and hospital service plans.

I emphasize this because I want it understood that the California proposal is anything but a revolutionary scheme. It represents the minimum change that must be made to make sure people in moderate circumstances will not be bankrupted by serious illness.

The plan supports the highest standards and ethics of the medical profession in a practical way. The California Health Service Authority it establishes is directed to offer needed scholarships for postgraduate medical study when funds are available. I hope that in this way we will be able to improve medical standards in communities where surveys have shown they are too low. There are no hidden strings tied to these scholarships.

One further point. The plan will not disturb existing group voluntary plans or insurance policies that provide equal or superior protection to the limited number of families that can be covered by them. Voluntary action has made a splendid contribution toward the solution of this problem. I have watched its growth with warm feeling. Yet, as Governor of all the people of my State, I have had to say that voluntary action is not enough. Tragic facts made known to me in the day-to-day administration of my office have forced me to the reluctant conclusion that it will never be enough.

I think I have said enough about the plan and its background to convince Look's readers that it is designed to solve the very real problem of payment for the unexpected costs of serious illness, and not to interfere with the methods of professional treatment. Now I would like to say why I think there has been so much opposition to my proposals, and how I feel about this opposition.

I'd like to have you sit down in my chair in the Governor's office for a little while so you will get my point of view.

Let's take a fairly typical day. On my appointment list for 11 in the morning is Dr. So-and-So. He's an old friend. I am proud to have many old friends in the medical profession. Dr. So-and-So is a sincere man who holds the humanitarian ethics of his profession close to his heart. He is the good Samaritan if I have ever known one. The respect and admiration of his professional colleagues has made him their spokesman, and he is genuinely troubled as he takes a chair across my desk.

DOCTOR'S FEARS UNFOUNDED

Dr. So-and-So is fearful of what my prepaid medical service plan will lead to for his profession. He has no very specific objection to the bill I have offered to put the plan into effect. I have yielded to every reasonable objection. But the plan, he says, may be the basis on which some later, less responsive governor will adopt the kind of system of state medicine that proved a destructive failure in Germany and New Zealand. I am, he says, letting the camel of socialization get his head inside the tent of free enterprise. It is socialism, regimentation, compulsion that he fears.

As Dr. So-and-So explains his objections to my plan, my hand reaches for a letter that came to me that same morning. I try to explain to Dr. So-and-S that his fears are probably not well grounded. But what I say is not convincing to the good doctor. That is understandable. There is really no bone of contention between us. I believe as deeply in free enterprise as he does. There is no flaw in my admiration for his profession, and he knows it.

Finally I fished out the letter I have been thumbing and hand it across the table to him. It's a very ordinary letter, carefully written in pencil on paper from a ruled tablet. The erasures that show on the coarse paper bear witness to the soul searching that went into writing it. It tells again the same old tragic tale of serious illness and wrecked lives, and pleads with me not to drop my health-service plan. Dr. So-and-S reads it carefully, then looks up at me questioningly.

"Which argument would weigh more with you?" I ask. "The argument in that letter or the argument you have given me?"

Take another day. A delegation of insurance men call to impress upon me that my plan is not exactly insurance in the actuarial sense. They bring along an expert to make a learned, mathematical argument. I explain to them as carefully as I can that we can't make a start on the basis of exact insurance principles because no one has had enough experience with exactly this problem. We've got to start the plan with equal percentage contributions to get the experience. If we waited until after we got the experience, we'd never start the plan.

The argument drones on, and again I find myself reaching for a letter. I get them almost every day. They aren't the sort of thing acturies deal with—they're human stories, not dry figures. This time I read the letter aloud. "Which argument would weigh the most with you gentlemen?" I ask.

WE CANNOT NEGLECT PROBLEM

There it is as I see it from the Governor's chair in California. Tragic human need versus long-reaching fear of foreign ideologies, and the knife-sharp theories of experts. I do not discount the fears, and the experts are of great service in their special fields.

But I am wholeheartedly convinced that in our struggle to prevent our democratic processes from being infected with foreign ideologies we cannot afford to run away from any of the basic problems of American life.

We must prove to the world that the American system can solve these problems through the application of democratic procedures. But first of all we must prove it to ourselves. To prove it to ourselves we must have faith that our institutions are so practical, so adjustable, and so responsive to every situation that we can make them fully serve our needs, whatever they may be. After that we must have the will to do whatever should be done.

With such determination, we will be willing to face human facts, even unpleasant human facts. We will not hide behind slogans that are easy to repeat but have no real application to the facts. Such slogans are dangerous to progress.

It is, in my opinion, the misfortune of our times that too many men in public life use slogans to promote or oppose ideas, as if ideas were commodities. Ideas are not commodities. They should not be built up or torn down by slogans, as if they were a new brand of breakfast food. Ideas can be tested only with facts.

SLOGANS DON'T TEST FACTS

My attempts to do something practical about the fact that serious illness wrecks homes have taught me that slogans are the lazy man's way of slaughtering an idea he is unwilling to test against the facts. And that slogans are the designing man's way of defeating an idea he knows he cannot successfully meet on the facts. The experience has increased my determination to solve this problem despite the sloganeers.

I think it is very important that something be done now about the catastrophe of sudden, serious illness in ordinary homes. We have, now, a period of good times and moderate social tensions. We have time to cut and fit and alter and improve a solution to the problem, learning as we go along. We have an opportunity to do this in the States, close to the people who are affected. We can have the advantages of flexibility and intimate contact that the Federal Government can never hope to have.

I do not like to sound alarms about the future. But I would be less than honest about this matter if I did not caution my mustn't-do-this-or-that critics. If times change, we may all be compelled to accept hasty and radical measures that can be avoided if we act now.

That, Mr. President, is the statement of the Vice Presidential candidate of the Republican Party regarding health insurance.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for the trouble he has taken in reading that interesting article by Governor Warren. The Senator was taking me to task because I said I did not know what Governor Warren had said on this particular matter. After listening to the article, I see it is entirely erroneous to say that in that article Governor Warren proposed or advocated what Mr. Truman is proposing and advocating, which is a comprehensive, compulsory Federal system. Governor Warren makes it clear by reiteration. He states time and time again that he is speaking as the Governor of California, that his proposal is applicable to California, and that he is advocating a system of that kind for his State.

Mr. President, I think it was Mr. Justice Holmes who said that the beauty of the Federal Union is that each State may be used as a laboratory for social and political experiments. So far as I am concerned, if Governor Warren and the citizens of California desire to experiment with the plan, as Governor Warren says, that is perfectly all right with me, and it is perfectly all right with the people of my State, so far as I know. Governor Warren says, clearly and specifically, that we do not have sufficient experience to establish the plan on a scientific actuarial basis, that they must feel their way along. If they want to use the State of California as a laboratory for that purpose, that is fine. There has been some experience with the idea in certain countries of the world, which has not been very satisfactory; but if the people of California want to try it, all right. But, Mr. President, it is entirely another thing to pass laws in the Congress of the United States which will impose a compulsory, comprehensive Federal system of health insurance on every State of the Union, whether the people want it or not.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I wanted to say something further, and then I shall be glad to yield for a question.

It is also perfectly apparent in the article which the Senator from Montana has read that the thing which impresses Governor Warren regarding the system is the personal cooperation among citizens who want to spread the risk. There is no reason in the world why people cannot spread the risk. There are a great many cooperative organizations, associations, and societies, some of which are doing business on a national basis, which will enable people who want to join to spread the risk, and I think some are doing that very adequately and very well. But that, also, Mr. President, is an entirely different thing from establishing a comprehensive, compulsory, Federal system which Mr. Truman says is his ultimate aim.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not true that many State medical associations either already have established or are in the process of establishing machinery whereby certain classes of people may take advantage of the spread in the risk, as the Senator has so ably explained?

Mr. KEM. I think that is quite correct, and they no doubt recognize the difference in fundamental conditions in different States which require an entirely different system of treatment. That, if I may again borrow the language of Justice Holmes, illustrates the beauty of our Federal Union.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator further yield for one more question?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The Governor of California, in his statement explaining his position, mentions industrial insurance. That, also, is altogether a State institution which spreads the risk and is weighted according to the hazards of employment in a particular State or area in general, is it not?

Mr. KEM. It varies as the geographical districts of the United States vary. I thank the able Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make a brief observation in reply to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois, sitting as acting minority leader, said he wanted to make a reply to 2 or 3 minutes to the Senator from Missouri. I am under very definite instructions to attempt to get my speech out of the way tonight, because it represents the point of view of an extensive group on this side of the aisle; but, if there is no objection, I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, because I know what he is going to discuss and that what he says will be germane to the issue now pending before the Senate.

I want briefly to reply to the Senator from Missouri in connection with the colloquy which has been going on between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. When he says that the Vice Presidential candidate, from the State of California, is not in favor of a health-insurance program——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I have only 5 minutes, and I regret I cannot yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his courtesy.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I tried to get the Senator from Missouri to yield to me some time ago but was unsuccessful.

When the Senator from Missouri says that the Vice Presidential candidate of the Republican Party is not in favor of compulsory health insurance, he fails to understand, or cares not to understand, the article which was read into the RECORD by the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. Furthermore, Mr. President, Dr. Marjorie Sharron, legislative consultant in Washington, D. C., at one time held a position under the Republican National Committee having to do with health insurance; I understand she was later an adviser to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and who, I am now advised, is an adviser to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] on health matters. If I am incorrect in these assertions, I want to be corrected. Dr. Sharron had this to say about Governor Dewey and Governor Warren on this particular question:

> Dewey has come out strongly in the past 2 years against compulsory health insurance. Warren has come out even more strongly, and for a much longer time, in favor of such insurance. Dewey has promised to make Warren a full partner in his administration, if elected. Warren counts not only on the time-honored statutory job of President of the Senate, but also on new functions said to have been promised him by Dewey. Warren for years has been trying to put over compulsory health insurance in California and has failed, but he is still for it. One must ask at this time what effect it will have on Dewey if both are elected. They have a party platform commitment to extend the Democratic social-security benefits. I think that plank was included as a vote getter—

Like a great many other planks adopted by the Republican Convention:

> I understand Warren regards health insurance in that light. The Democrats are already committed to Federal health insurance legislation, and are more than likely to include it in their platform to attract the labor vote. How long do you think the Republicans will abide by the Dewey opposition to Federal health insurance? How soon will he adopt Warren's views as a matter of political expediency?

Mr. President, it is not a question of Mr. Warren yielding to Mr. Dewey upon this very important question of national health, but this adviser to the Republican National Committee and to Republican Senators questions whether or not Dewey will not yield to Warren as a matter of political expediency.

When Governor Dewey comes into the State of Missouri in the approaching campaign I can hear the Senator from Missouri, and as the Senator introduces the Governor, say something like this:

"I am introducing to this great audience in Missouri the next President of the United States, a man who is unalterably opposed to socialized medicine."

Then a month later the Vice Presidential candidate, Mr. Warren, will come along, and when the distinguished Senator from Missouri presents Mr. Warren to an audience in Missouri he will say, "I am now presenting Mr. Warren, an individual who is absolutely for compulsory health insurance."

I am sure that he will do that, because the Senator from Missouri is a man of frankness and candor, and he will not hesitate to tell the people of Missouri exactly where these two gentlemen stand upon this important issue, as he told us here tonight where Governor Dewey stands upon this extremely important question affecting the national health of all our people.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. President, that the Senator from Missouri made a political speech tonight. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] made a political speech last week, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made a political speech a few days ago, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] has made a political speech, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has made a political speech at a time when the issue before the Senate of the United States is one of the great question of civil rights, involving the poll tax. Not a single Senator on this side of the aisle, except, perhaps, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who answered the distinguished Senator from Ohio briefly the other day, has made a political speech.

I mention this because I contend seriously that this battle on the poll tax, so far as the Republicans are concerned, is a mere sham and a delusion. They do not intend to pass the bill at this special session. They never intended to when they brought it before the Senate, yet they keep Senators here late at night for shadow-boxing purposes. Mr. President, the Republican leadership is not sincere about this great issue. The Republican majority do not propose to adopt any of the President's proposals on the high cost of living and inadequate housing. Why, under such circumstances do they continue to remain here? Why do they not adjourn this special session instead of keeping us here day after day debating the poll-tax issue which they know cannot pass?

I will say that most of the Senators on this side of the aisle have really debated

the issue. They have not fooled around with political speeches, as has been done on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. President, the Republicans in Congress are not fooling the American people as they seek to drive a wedge in the Democratic Party upon this sham battle on the poll tax. The people back home understand the situation; they know exactly what is going on. They are expecting constructive action and unless the Republican-controlled Congress gives it to them the majority party is going to hear plenty from them before the coming Presidential campaign is over.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I have been very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from Illinois. I recall that Junius said, a long time ago, "Assertion is merely nugatory."

No matter how many times the Senator repeats that the article of Governor Warren is an outright endorsement of Mr. Truman's proposal of a Federal, compulsory, comprehensive system of health insurance, it does not make any difference; the article is there, it will appear in the RECORD, and anybody can read it and see exactly what Governor Warren said.

I think the Senator from Illinois is a lawyer. One might be inclined to doubt it sometimes when listening to his speeches, but my understanding from the Congressional Directory is that he is.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator would not know whether I was or not, because he would not understand.

Mr. KEM. I admit, Mr. President, that I am uncertain, but I think I recall having read in the Congressional Directory that the Senator was engaged in that calling at one time.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

Mr. KEM. I decline to yield. The Senator from Illinois is undertaking to tell the Members of this body what I will do and what I will think when Governor Dewey and Governor Warren come into my State, and if I am called on to take part in their meetings.

Mr. President, the best evidence, which lawyers always want, is here. The Senator from Illinois did not ask me what I thought or what I would do, but he undertook to state it. This I take to be clearly secondary evidence, as the lawyers say, and not the best evidence.

Mr. President, so that the RECORD may be clear, I should like to say for the benefit of the Senator from Illinois and anyone who listened to his secondary evidence about what I would do or say in a hypothetical case, that here now is the best evidence. If Governor Dewey came into my State, I should be proud to introduce him as an opponent of socialized medicine, and socialism, incidentally, in other forms. I should be glad to say that Governor Dewey had stated on public occasions that socialized medicine was no good.

When Governor Warren comes into my State I shall be glad to say, "Governor Warren has been, and is, an outstanding humanitarian. He is perfectly willing to experiment in his own State with various forms of humanitarianism. He says, for example, that the evidence and experience affecting socialized medicine are not complete, but he is willing to try it in California. He is willing that in this instance his own State of California be used as a laboratory for such an interesting experiment. This is, of course, a different thing from a Federal system."

So, Mr. President, that is the best evidence of what I will say in the hypothetical situation which the Senator from Illinois has conjured up.

In this connection it is interesting to speculate, first, whether Mr. Truman, as the Democratic candidate, will go into the Southern States in this campaign; into Georgia, Mississippi, and Alabama, for example; and, second, if he does so, just how he will be introduced by the able and eloquent Senators from those States, respectively.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 1 O'CLOCK P. M. WEDNESDAY

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the acting majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this evening it take a recess until the hour of 1 o'clock p. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is made.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the appeal of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] from the decision of the Chair holding that the cloture motion on the motion to take up House bill 29 was not in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, so that there will be an understanding at the beginning of my speech as to the position I shall take in regard to yielding during the course of my remarks, and for the reasons I shall hereafter set forth, I hereby advise the Chair, and any successor to the present occupant of the chair who may be in the chair during the course of the evening, that a request of the junior Senator from Oregon to yield should be replied to by the Chair in the language, "The Senator declines to yield." I think we will save a great deal of time if we have that blanket ruling and that understanding at the beginning.

I am sure my colleagues in the Senate know that that is not the usual rule, self-imposed in this instance, under which I debate in the Senate, because I know of no Member of the Senate who finds it more pleasing to yield in the course of debate than the junior Senator from Oregon. However, I am in a very peculiar position in making this speech tonight because of the fact that I find myself, and those whom I represent in this argument, in a position where we might be subject to the very fair criticism that we were aiding and abetting a filibuster, if I did not adopt and apply that rule. It is perfectly obvious that the controversial points which I shall raise in the course of my remarks, about which reasonable men can differ, can lead to scores of questions time consuming in nature, and therefore we on the Republican side of the aisle would find ourselves in fact consuming a great deal of time to the delight, the enjoyment, and the satisfaction of our good friends on the opposite side of the aisle.

The only reason it has been decided that this speech should be made in support of the major premise relating to the anti-poll-tax legislation which we urge this special session of Congress to adopt, is that those of us who are the proponents of the bill believe it to be constitutional. If we did not believe it to be constitutional we would not urge upon the Senate of the United States the passage of the bill.

We find ourselves further in the situation that in the debate on the constitutionality of the bill—and that is what up to date the discussion on the anti-poll-tax bill for the most part has dealt with—the negative side of the proposition has been set forth by three very able day-long speeches made by distinguished colleagues in the Senate representing that side, and up until this moment the affirmative case in support of the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill has not been made a matter of record in the debate. Some of us had a conference and some of the leaders on this side of the aisle honored me with the suggestion that over last week end I prepare a statement in connection with the constitutionality of the proposal and present it when the opportunity was made available to me on the floor of the Senate. I believe my colleagues know that for many hours, in fact for days, indeed since last Friday, I was ready, prior to the preparations I made over the week end, to make a preliminary statement on the constitutionality of the measure, but since the convening of the Senate on Monday, this is the first opportunity I have had to put in the RECORD the affirmative side of the case on the constitutionality of the measure.

Mr. President, my speech will involve some dry and technical discussion of constitutional points, and the main purpose of the speech is to make it a part of the RECORD. I want to say to my good friends who have honored me by their presence at least this long in the speech, that no offense will be taken by the junior Senator from Oregon if they do not stay through it, because I am making it solely for the purpose of the RECORD for future reference, so that my colleagues may read it when we proceed further with the parliamentary situation in connection with this proposed anti-poll-tax legislation.

At the outset, I want to say that I think it would not be fair of me, in fact I think I would show an unsportsmanlike lack of appreciation for the speeches which have been made by good friends of mine on the other side of this proposition, if I did not compliment the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for what I consider to be the very able arguments they have presented in support of their point of view—which I think is a mistaken point of view, but nevertheless their point of view—that the anti-poll-tax bill pending before the Senate is unconstitutional because according to their sights it contravenes article I, section 2, of the Constitution. I think the speeches they have made in support of their position will deserve a fitting place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. President, for the study of students of constitutional law and lawyers generally, as we proceed in the years ahead to face the weighty constitutional problems which will arise from time to time, and the great contest that is always going on in the field of constitutional law over the proposition of whether or not the Constitution of the United States is to be interpreted as a static, literal document, or whether it is to be interpreted as a dynamic, liberal document, subject to adjustment and to changing conditions that confront the American people from decade to decade.

I desire to say as the first premise I lay down in my remarks, Mr. President, that there is a wide difference between the constitutional law philosophy entertained in the mind of the junior Senator from Oregon and that presented by the three distinguished Senators who have presented the majority argument in support of their contention that the bill is unconstitutional. I have listened to them, I have read the cases which they have cited, and I contend and submit that not a single case have they cited which is directly on the nose, so to speak, as lawyers use that term, because of the fact that Congress has not passed such legislation as would have to be passed in order to bring about the type of Supreme Court interpretation and determination which would afford an answer to the question as to whether or not their narrow and literal interpretation of the Constitution is the one the Supreme Court would adopt.

The point I make, and the first point I stress, is that here again in this debate on the meaning of the Constitution we see that great clash between two historic views as to what that document is; the view, on the one hand, of the Brandeises and the Holmeses and the Cardozos that it is a dynamic document which lays down the framework of a constitutional, representative form of government, adjustable to changed social conditions as they confront the American people from decade to decade, and the other literal, narrow point of view that the Constitution of the United States is the product of a dead historic hand.

I do not accept that view, Mr. President. I say that students of the Constitution are predominantly of the opinion that the trend is clear, and has been now for almost a quarter of a century, that that great document is not a static instrument, but it is a dynamic instrument, its terms to be adjusted and interpreted in accordance with existing social determined by the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I desire to make very clear that that does not mean that the junior Senator from the State of Oregon takes the position that the Constitution is subject to judicial amendment, that it is subject to amendment by the judiciary through interpretation, because in many writings, while I was occupying a chair in a law school, I tried to draw the distinction between a liberal interpretation of the Constitution and the idea that the Supreme Court has any implied or alleged right to amend that document by judicial interpretation. I deny the Court has any such power.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I take the position that the terms, principles, and concepts of the Constitution, as we find them in black and white in that document, are to be applied by the Court in the light of the state of facts involved in a given case, as the Court finds them to be. After all, we cannot separate the true meaning of a legal principle from the dynamics of a set of facts which raise the principle into litigation.

I suggest, in the second place, that in their discussion of legal principles in certain cases which my good friends of the opposition have cited in the course of this argument, they have not called the attention of the Senate, to the extent that I think it should be called if we are to get the true meaning of those decisions, to the operative legal facts on the basis of which the decisions must be read. Legal principles laid down in any judicial decision must be read, interpreted, and subsequently applied in terms of the limitations of the framework of the operative facts which gave rise to the case in the first instance. I respectfully submit that my good friends have fallen into the common error of taking out of the context of a decision here and there a paragraph now and then, and laying it down as applicable to a set of hypothetical facts which they raise in connection with the anti-poll-tax situation, when what they should do is refer the principle to the operative facts of the decision which gave rise to its penning in the first instance.

The third proposition which I wish to lay down is that the Constitution, too, must be read in its entirety. Article I, section 2 needs to be read, as I shall endeavor to point out by language which we can find in Supreme Court decisions, in terms of the other sections of the Constitution and in terms of the other powers which the Constitution makes clear are delegated to the Federal Government, and through it to the Congress.

My good friends of the opposition in this debate, have, I think, taken the position that article I, section 2, should be considered as the sole language of the Constitution which has any reference whatsoever to the anti-poll-tax legislation. They have conveniently overlooked certain other sections of the Constitution to which I shall allude, and which I shall discuss in some detail in the course of my remarks. In particular have they overlooked certain sections of the Constitution which place upon the Congress of the United States the right and the power to enact legislation carrying out the powers delegated to the Congress within that basic organic law.

Mr. President, I would be thoroughly intellectually dishonest if I took the position that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] did not raise some serious questions as to the constitutionality of this proposed legislation which ought to be resolved in favor of its constitutionality before any individual Senator votes for it. So far as I am concerned, I agree not only with the Senator from Alabama, but with the three speakers of the opposition, on the proposition that if a Member of this body has a serious doubt as to the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill, then in accordance with his oath of office he certainly should not vote for it. We can have a meeting of the minds, I think, on that point, because I agree with the Senators who have spoken that if any Senator honestly believes that there is a serious question as to the constitutionality of any piece of legislation which comes before this body, then in accordance with his oath of office he should vote against such legislation, for I think the primary and all-important responsibility of each one of us is to carry out to the letter the full meaning of the oath which we take to uphold the Constitution. I have never voted, and so long as I am a Member of this body I shall never vote, for a piece of legislation with respect to the constitutionality of which there is doubt in my mind.

I would be intellectually dishonest, too, Mr. President, if I took the blind attitude that I think reasonable men should not or cannot disagree over the points of constitutionality which Senators have raised. I can understand how reasonable men can disagree on this point; but the fact that I appreciate the point that reasonable men can disagree over the question of the constitutionality of this particular bill does not mean that I have any reasonable doubts as to its constitutionality. My study has convinced me that the bill is in keeping with the Constitution. It is because I believe that it is in keeping with the Constitution that I have been working as hard as I have for consideration of the subject by way of legislation rather than by way of constitutional amendment.

I have mentioned the point of handling the problem as was suggested in the first instance in this debate by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], through the medium of a constitutional amendment. I want the RECORD to show the decision which I have reached as to that procedure. After thorough consideration of the proposal of the Senator from Arizona I have decided that we should not seek to solve the problem in the first instance by way of a constitutional amendment.

I have reached that conclusion for two reasons: First, because I am satisfied that a constitutional amendment is not necessary insofar as constitutional objections to the pending legislation are concerned. In other words, I am satisfied that a direct approach by way of legislation or statute can be used by the Congress as a solution to the civil-rights program.

In the second place, I have reached that conclusion because I believe that minority groups who in my opinion have been greatly imposed upon now for many, many years past, in the sense that their full civil rights under the Constitution have been denied them because of the existence of such infringements upon their right of franchise as a poll tax, have the right to look to the elected representatives of the people of the United States to correct that injustice by way of direct legislation rather than by trying to avoid facing it squarely and directly by resorting to the time-consuming, delaying device of a constitutional amendment.

I am satisfied that if we should accept the proposal of the Senator from Arizona to get out of the particular parliamentary box in which we now find ourselves by way of submitting a constitutional amendment, it would be many years before the constitutional amendment would be adopted.

I cannot prove that, and I hasten to have the RECORD show that I admit that I cannot prove it. But with the exception of the suffrage amendment, constitutional amendments have consumed long periods of time in our history. When we have, as has been made perfectly clear in the course of this debate, the strong opposition of a small minority to granting this civil right to millions of Americans to whom the right is now denied, I am inclined at least to take the position that it is a reasonable conjecture that it would be a good many years before the requisite number of States would approve such a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of that conclusion on my part, I shall not be a party—and I have so told the leaders on this side of the aisle who have talked to me today in private conference about it—to any proposal at this session of Congress to get out of the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves, by way of submitting a constitutional amendment. I say that because I think the great majority of the American people have the right to have their elected representatives face this issue squarely by way of the passage of an anti-poll-tax bill.

Mr. President, let us assume the hypothetical—and I am well aware that it is certainly hypothetical—that the Congress at this session or at any future session should pass a statute on the subject. No constitutional right would be denied anyone in this country, because under our balance-of-power representative system of government, with its checks and balances, in the last analysis the Supreme Court would be the final judge on the basis of legislation which would directly raise the constitutional point as to whether the bill passed was constitutional. For those of us who honestly believe, as I do and as the proponents of this bill do, that it is entirely constitutional, it is quite proper to take the position that we are willing, with that conviction to let the issue finally be determined by the Supreme Court.

Then, Mr. President, we shall not have to engage in the interesting pastime of lawyers of trying to piece together quotations from a series of Supreme Court decisions, when not a single one of those decisions rests on a set of operative facts that make it possible to rest a decision directly "on the nose," so far as the legal problem is concerned. The only way we can have the particular constitutional question finally determined without equivocation and without any question as to whether it is directly applicable to the facts involved is for the Congress to proceed to pass this proposed anti-poll-tax legislation, and then let the Supreme Court in the course of litigation render a direct decision on the question.

I wish to add, so that no one will misinterpret me or misquote me, that I do not offer that as a line of procedure to be followed by any Member of this body who has an honest and sincere question as to the constitutionality of this bill. To such Senators I say, "If that is your honest opinion, then you should vote against the anti-poll-tax bill."

Mr. President, I believe that on the basis of the authorities as they exist, the conclusion should be reached by individual Senators, if they will carefully analyze the cases and carefully trace the history of constitutional developments throughout the Constitutional Convention, that this bill is in fact constitutional.

I now proceed to address myself to the major question, whether this anti-poll-tax bill is constitutional.

Last Thursday, when the able and distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] discussed House bill 29, the anti-poll-tax bill, on the floor of the Senate, he made a statement with a portion of which I find myself in complete and hearty agreement. He said:

> It was stated on the floor of the Senate yesterday that the bill affects only seven States, namely, the so-called poll-tax States. I respectfully submit to the Senate that we shall go far wrong if we consider that this bill affects only those States which have poll taxes in effect. In reality it affects 48 States.

Mr. President, I completely agree with the Senator from Mississippi on that premise. The bill affects 48 States, and in my judgment it affects the civil rights of every man, woman, and child in this country, because it goes to the basic question of the most precious right I think we have—the right to exercise a free ballot at a free ballot box without the type of restriction on that freedom that is characterized by the poll tax. When all is said and done, we cannot get away from the great question of civil rights involved in this issue—the question as to whether we are now to give equality of meaning to the Constitution to all our citizens and whether we shall put into practice the sound doctrine of American jurisprudence, that there should be uniformity of application of law when it comes to the basic rights of all our citizens. I submit that so long as there is this infringement upon a basic right, we are not giving equality of application of the Constitution to all our people.

In order to prove my point, I do not have to dwell, I think, on the unrest or the deep-seated resentment or the fertile ground for spreading the seeds of communism in this country which is being developed because of the fact that up until now both major parties, Democratic and Republican alike, over the years have not enacted legislation which would protect all the American people and afford them equality of civil rights under the Constitution. I am very happy that under the leadership of my party in the past few years a valiant and determined effort has been made in the Congress of the United States to pass legislation which will carry us nearer the social and political ideal of equality of constitutional rights for all our people, irrespective of race, color, or creed.

I heartily disagree with the statement made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] a few minutes ago when he sought to place upon the Republican Party the responsibility for the failure to pass civil-rights legislation. I am very fond of the Senator from Illinois. I recognize his difficulties and the difficulties of other Democratic Senators in the coming campaign who have a record in favor of civil-rights legislation. But if there is one thing which has been clear in this special session of Congress—and let the American people understand it thoroughly—it is that the full responsibility for the failure in this special session of Congress up until this hour to pass civil-rights legislation rests on the shoulders of the Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle.

What does the record show? It shows that for days we have been debating—the anti-poll-tax bill? Not at all, Mr. President; we have been debating the question of whether a motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill shall be allowed to come to a vote on the floor of the Senate. I think the American people will see through that, in due course of time; and when they do, they will understand that there is no basis at all for the position taken by the Senator from Illinois that the responsibility rests on the Senators on the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. STENNIS. What is the pending order of business? What is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair, holding that the cloture motion filed on the motion to take up House bill 29, the anti-poll-tax bill, was not in order, stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the cloture petition was submitted, and the appeal from the Chair's ruling on the cloture petition is now before the Senate because we could not get the Democratic side of the aisle to agree to let us vote upon a motion to proceed with the consideration of the anti-poll-tax bill. That cannot be erased from the RECORD. That is the RECORD, and the responsibility clearly rests on the Democratic side of the aisle for the tactics which have been used in order to prevent a debate on the merits of the anti-poll-tax bill. If I seem to be unduly critical, it is not with any personal feeling that I make the criticism. I recognize the rights of my Democratic friends under the rules of the Senate. They have not violated those rules so far as their rights under them are concerned.

I want to say to my good friend from Illinois in regard to the little speech he made a few moments ago, which I submit would be subject to at least the interpretation that he was seeking to place the blame for the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves on the Republican side of the aisle, that I hope, come January, he will join with us under a Republican administration in seeing to it that rule XXII is so modified that the word "measure" will be clarified and made to encompass any motion, any item of business, pending before the Senate, so that cloture will be applicable. I want the American people to understand that there is no way of breaking a filibuster in the Senate of the United States in my honest judgment if a substantial number of Senators join in conducting the filibuster, so long as rule XXII remains on the book as it is. There is a great deal of talk about breaking the present filibuster, if a true filibuster develops, as we all know it will develop if we continue to press for action on the anti-poll-tax bill, but, as I have said to some of my colleagues—and I have found none of them who disagreed—under rule XXII, if 10 or 11 or 12 Senators actually combine in a determined effort to prevent a vote from ever taking place in this special session of Congress, because of the limitation of time resting upon us, I think it would be a physical impossibility to break the filibuster.

I think a well-organized group of 10 or 11 or 12 Senators speaking in relays, with all the opportunities rule XXII affords them to filibuster on various items, which under the precedents cannot be classified as measures, can talk here for the rest of the summer. Therefore, as I have said to some of my colleagues, if we really want to do something about breaking the filibuster tactics in the Senate of the United States, there is only one way to do it. I also said that, in an article in Collier's magazine 2 years ago. That way is, at the beginning of a regular session, to make the modification of rule XXII the first item of business, and then go to work in the regular session of Congress with a determination to stick it out for as many days and weeks, and if necessary, months as may be necessary, until the rule is amended. Given time, a filibuster can be broken, because 145,000,000 American people will eventually come to understand the close relationship between the rules of the Senate and their civil rights. The pressure, I think, will be overwhelming in support of any concerted effort on the part of the majority under those circumstances to modify the rule. But it should be done, Mr. President, as I said the other day, in a manner in keeping with the proposals and the protections contained in my antifilibuster resolution.

I recognize, too, as I have more than once said on the floor of the Senate, that majorities can become tyrannical. Under our system of government we constantly must be on the alert to protect the minorities from tyrannical and steam-rolling tactics of majorities. That is why I think it is so important that when we proceed to amend rule XXII we shall do it by way of an antifilibuster resolution which will guarantee, after a cloture petition has been filed, that each Member of the Senate will have at least a minimum of 2 hours of debating time, with the right and the privilege of farming out all or part of such time to any colleague. Such a procedural reform would allow in round numbers approximately 8 days of debating time on any issue pending before the Senate after cloture had been filed upon it. Keep in mind, Mr. President, that ordinarily cloture is never filed and should never be filed, and that it is difficult to get a cloture petition adopted by the Senate, unless a clear showing can be made that there has been adequate time already given for debate on the merits of an issue. After that time has elapsed, if there has been added to it approximately 8 days of further debating time, I do not see how anyone in good reason can argue that minority rights are not protected under that type of antifilibuster rule.

I say, Mr. President, there is no chance in my judgment of breaking the contemplated filibuster in this special session of Congress, unless we are willing to proceed now to tackle the problem of rule XXII. In view of the obvious limitations of time forced upon us by the special session, and in view of the obligations resting upon us in connection with the oncoming political campaign, which in my judgment will be one of the most historic in all our history, I do not think the American people expect us to remain here all summer in order to break the filibuster, by way of attempting to modify rule XXII this summer. It would be difficult to get some of them to see the relationship between this procedural problem and the passage of civil rights legislation. Once they do, once they come to understand it, then I think they will highly approve whatever parliamentary procedure we may subsequently adopt in the special session of Congress in order to transact, to the extent we are allowed to transact it by the Democratic side of the aisle, the business we can transact in the people's interest.

I think the RECORD will make it clear on the basis of the language I have used, but because I have been speaking extemporaneously I want to make certain that the RECORD is clear that I have not charged up to this moment any filibuster has been conducted in this special session of Congress. I have not charged it, Mr. President, because I honestly believe no filibuster, in fact, has been progressing on the floor of the Senate. I have no doubt that in discussing the merits of the issue as they see it, the Senators who have spoken in support of the contention that the pending bill is unconstitutional have made a point of speaking at length, but that is their right. I sometimes think, especially when we are dealing with a question so complex as is this one, that repetition, reiteration, and cumulative effect are perfectly legitimate in argument and debate. I have no objection to the lengthy speeches which have been made thus far on this particular issue. On the other hand, there is not a Member of the Senate who does not know, in fact, some of our good friends on the other side in private conversation are frank to confess it, and we know it to be true, that there is a determination on the other side of the aisle to use to the maximum extent permitted by the rules all their rights and privileges to prevent a vote taking place on any of the civil-rights legislation which may be proposed by Senators on the Republican side of the aisle. I think that also should be clear for the RECORD.

Hence, Mr. President, speaking only for myself, and for no one else on this side of the aisle, on this particular point, I hold to the view, knowing what I know to be the strategy and the plan of a substantial number of Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle, that we have no hope in this special session of Congress of passing this particular civil-rights legislation or any other civil-rights legislation. I usually know when I am licked, Mr. President. Sometimes I do not. But on this particular issue I think I do. I am willing to confess that because of the advantages which the present rules give my opponents on civil-rights legislation I do not have any chance. If those of us who are in support of civil-rights legislation have no chance of having any such legislation passed in this special session of Congress, I intend, after I have made my case on the merits of the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax legislation, and have double checked to find, as I am sure I shall find, a continued determination on the part of a substantial number of Democrats to prevent a vote from ever taking place on the poll-tax legislation or any other civil-rights legislation in this session of Congress, to advise my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, for whatever my advice may be worth, that we had better face the reality that we cannot pass any civil-rights legislation in this special session of Congress and then proceed to give consideration to other items contained in the President's agenda.

I think it has been of service to the country to follow the course of action we have thus far followed in the special session of Congress, not only because it has been made very clear where the responsibility rests for our inability to pass civil-rights legislation, namely, squarely on the Democratic side of the aisle, but time has been afforded during the consideration of the subject so that our committees can complete their hearings and discussions on the issues which involve inflation, housing, and the other items presented to us in the President's message.

I say that tonight——

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am refusing to yield.

I say that tonight because I think the time has come for some of us to tell

the American people why in all probability it will be necessary to set aside civil-rights legislation and proceed to give consideration to the other issues and see if there is anything we can do by way of passing any reasonable, fair, and workable legislation on other subject matters which will not cause a greater inflation than that which is already sweeping the country.

Mr. President, returning to the question of the constitutionality of the pending bill, I should like to say that in the seven States which exact the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections, Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, reside, according to the 1940 census, 20,874,383 persons—one-seventh of the population of the entire United States. The poll tax has an immediate—and all too often—paralyzing effect on their privilege and opportunity to participate in the American electoral process. Ten million, about half of them, are disfranchised outright by the poll-tax requirement. Those who do succeed in voting are put to great disadvantage. In many States they have to pay the tax in considerable advance of the election date at a time when interest in politics and elections is at the lowest ebb. Many people not familiar with the operation of the poll tax do not realize that. The date at which the poll tax must be paid, or prior to which it must be paid, if they are to vote in a subsequent election, is frequently fixed so far in advance of the election that there is very little interest at the time, and thousands of people by oversight fail to pay the poll tax, only to discover, when the issues of the campaign start to rise in their State that they have lost their right to vote because some months previously thereto they did not pay the poll tax.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator reconsider and yield to me on that point?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry. I shall not yield on any point. I shall be very glad to hear the Senator from Mississippi at a later time, after he has had an opportunity to read my speech. But if I start yielding on this speech I shall certainly be aiding and abetting a prolonged debate on the other side of the aisle in opposition to ever coming to a vote on the poll-tax issue.

In many States, unless the citizen is a property owner, he receives no notice whatever of the deadline for paying the tax.

Yes, I agree with the junior Senator from Mississippi that a bill to abolish the poll tax is a matter which affects 48 States, because any device which systematically disfranchises 10,000,000 people, one-fourteenth of the citizens of this country, affects all of us in a very serious way. The poll-tax requirement goes to the very heart and core of the electoral process, the democratic process of our Government. Corrective action by the Congress, I submit, has been long overdue.

In my judgment, the effect of disfranchising American citizens en masse by means of the poll tax goes even further. Its consequences extend considerably beyond the confines of our geographic boundaries. The existence and operation of the poll tax have been a continuous source of embarrassment to our Government in its international relations. Time and time again, when representatives of the United States have been working to establish or support democratic elements in Europe or elsewhere in the world, they have had the ground literally cut out from under their feet by a barrage of antidemocratic propaganda conveyed by word of mouth, newspaper, and radio to the effect that if democracy is so wonderful, if it works so well, why does not America extend it to the millions of its own citizens who are kept away from the ballot box because of the poll tax.

Mr. President, as an ardent opponent of the third-party movement in America under the leadership of Henry Wallace, because I cannot accept the motivations of the party and because it is my personal conviction that whether Mr. Wallace appreciates it or not, his party has become a great medium for the spread of communistic propaganda in America, I say, nevertheless, that I cannot ignore the fact that the failure on the part of both major parties in years gone by to pass civil-rights legislation has given subversive elements fertile opportunity to spread the vicious propaganda that minority groups in the United States cannot look to the major parties for protection of their civil rights under the Constitution. That is the way communistic propaganda works in this country. I, of course, categorically contradict their charge. I take the position that the Republican Party has submitted and is submitting to the American people a sound program of civil rights. I have only to cite the platforms of 1940 and 1944, and now the great forward-looking progressive platform of 1948 we adopted in Philadelphia. I submit that if we could have gotten away from the obstructions that are thrown in our path by Democratic leadership, and in the Senate of the United States, the minority groups of this country, long past, would have had their rights protected to a great degree by a Republican majority in the Congress.

I make this point, nevertheless, Mr. President, that there is no denying the fact that one of the propaganda arguments the Communists are using, particularly among the colored people, is that they must turn to a third-party movement in order to gain protection for their civil rights, and freedom from the restrictions upon their right to exercise the franchise at a free ballot box, without the obligation of paying a poll tax.

They are making political hay, too, Mr. President. I know great Negro leaders who are just as patriotic, just as devoted to the principles of our constitutional form of government, as is any Member of the Senate, who are greatly alarmed about the threat of the spread of communism among members of their group in some of the great industrial centers of the United States. Every Senator who is within the hearing of my voice I think shares the same conclusion, that there is a concerted drive going on among the minority groups, on the part of subversive communistic elements, trying to convince them that their only hope for the full enjoyment of their constitutional rights is to be found in a repudiation of both the major parties. That is one reason why I think every American, who holds as dear as I do the constitutional freedom which it is our privilege to enjoy under our form of government, should devote his attention and his interest to the question of meeting that propaganda by seeing to it that the legal steps necessary to guarantee these rights are taken by the duly elected representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, in his very able and scholarly speech in the Senate—and I am most sincere in using those words—the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] purported to show that the framers of our Constitution deliberately wrote article I, section 2, on which he bases his entire argument, so as to perpetuate restrictions on the suffrage. This is the oft-quoted section which reads:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The Senator from Mississippi said:

> Let us see what the picture was when the word "qualifications" was written into the Constitution of the United States, in article I, section 2. Let us see what those men, the framers of the Constitution, were considering and what was in their legal minds and what was in their minds as the leading political thinkers of their day. • • • We know that those men had before them the constitutions of the various States.

I have no disagreement with the historical facts the Senator points out in continuing his argument. The various States did at that time, as he pointed out, have various forms of property or tax restrictions on the suffrage in their constitutions. But I want to support and underline the words of the late Senator George Norris in the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee of the Seventy-seventh Congress on an anti-poll-tax bill practically identical with H. R. 29, the bill we are seeking to have passed during the special session of the Congress. That eminent constitutional lawyer and liberal Senator said:

> Those who believe the proposed legislation is unconstitutional rely on the statement of a historic fact that, when the Constitution was adopted, all of the original States had property or tax qualifications. This ignores entirely the testimony of scholars which clearly demonstrates why that fact alone does not prove the right of Congress today to forbid such requirements for voting in Federal elections. It seems to us that this regulation is subject to the criticism which Mr. Justice Holmes leveled against the use of history when he said:
>
> "It is revolting to have no better reason for a rule of law than that it is laid down in the time of Henry IV. It is still more revolting if the grounds upon which it was laid down have vanished long since and the rule persists from blind imitation of the past." (Holmes: The Path of the Law, in Collected Papers, p. 187.)

> We think also Justice Holmes was right when, in discussing the situation in *Missouri v. Holland* (252 U. S. 416, 413), he said:
>
> "It [the Constitution] must be considered in the light of our whole experience and not merely in that of what was said a hundred years ago."

In his attempt to justify the perpetuation of restrictions on the suffrage, the Senator from Mississippi cited certain discussions in the Constitutional Convention as showing the intent of the founding fathers to set for all time conditions that existed in that day. To be sure, he is correct in saying:

> This very matter of dealing with the qualifications of electors came before the Constitutional Convention. The men there passed on it—James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and others • • •.
>
> • • • the question arose—and this was one of the most serious of all—who shall be the electors, the qualified electors?
>
> There were three proposals. The first one was that it should be left to the Congress to decide as to who would be qualified electors. That is the very thing the pending bill proposes to do. But that plan was rejected.
>
> The second plan proposed was that there should be written into the Constitution itself the definition of who would be qualified electors to choose the Members of the House of Representatives. That plan was rejected.
>
> The third plan was that definitions should be written into the Constitution to the extent of saying, "This matter being so important, so highly controversial, we prescribe the rule that in all Federal elections in each particular State those who are qualified to vote in the most numerous branch of that particular State legislature shall be qualified to vote for the Members of the House of Representatives."
>
> That is what they said. That is what they decided on. That is what they wrote into the face of the Constitution itself.

But I want to point out that the bill to abolish the poll tax does not attempt to give Congress power to prescribe qualifications for voting. I suppose in a very real sense that is the crux of the difference between the Senators on the other side of the aisle and those of us who take the position that our anti-poll-tax bill is constitutional. Of course, if we accepted the definition and interpretation of the word "qualification" as used in the Constitution, as it is contended for by the Senators who allege that our bill is unconstitutional, there would be no debate. But I sincerely contend that their interpretation of the meaning of the word "qualification" in the Constitution, as I hope to show before I finish, is an erroneous interpretation of the word. On the contrary, our bill seeks to remove a limitation on those qualifications which was not in the minds of the founding fathers and which was reimposed relatively recently under historical conditions which are in no way comparable to those of 1789.

Let me dwell on that point, Mr. President. The word "qualification," if the historical argument is to be used, which is the argument employed by the Senator from Mississippi must be interpreted in light of the conditions that existed at the time the founding fathers used the word. Thus, as I have said, what we are seeking to do by our bill, is to remove a limitation upon those qualifications which was not in the minds of the founding fathers, and which limitation was reimposed relatively recently under historial conditions which are in no way comparable to those of 1789.

In 1789, the States which had taxpaying qualifications for voting did not look upon them as restrictions of suffrage. That is the basic point in the debate. We are talking now about a limitation on suffrage, and my argument at this point is that the restriction, that is, the taxes, to which the Senator from Mississippi referred in his historical argument as being in existence at the time the Constitution was adopted, were not restrictions upon suffrage. The founding fathers did not have that in mind. Therefore, as I said in my earlier remarks in the course of this speech, if the historical argument is to be used, then those who use it must apply the premises of that argument to the operating facts existing at that period in history to which they refer if they want a conclusion to be drawn in accordance with their contention. I emphasize that point because it is that shift in the logic on the part of Senators who are contending that the bill is unconstitutional, it is that shift in their logic as they present their meaning of the word "qualification" which I submit is not supported on the basis of historic fact. On the contrary, our founding fathers talked of and thought of it in terms of liberalizing the right to vote, of liberalizing suffrage, of not restricting it and putting further limitations upon it. Just the contrary was the approach and the intention of the founding fathers.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida was not on the floor when I advised the Chair that he should reply to all requests that I yield by saying that I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The present occupant of the chair will say to the junior Senator from Oregon that he was not in the Chamber at the time the Senator began his speech. The Chair is now advised that the Senator at that time stated that he would not yield to anyone until he had concluded his speech.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sorry I did not know of that situation.

Mr. MORSE. I repeat, Mr. President, that in 1787, the States which had taxpaying qualifications for voting did not look upon them as restrictions of suffrage. They were expansions of it—part of the evolution from the freehold requirement to universal suffrage. Even the freehold qualification, at the outset, was broadly democratic. In England, with its huge estates, freehold voting was part of the feudal system. In America, limitless free land gave it a totally different aspect. Landownership was not a criterion of wealth, but of permanent attachment to the community. The freehold requirement excluded vagabonds, migrant settlers, and indentured servants. As the country filled up and more people became shopkeepers and mechanics, the rights of suffrage were expanded by allowing taxpayers and the owners of personal property to vote. The Constitution was written in the midst of a steady progression from the freehold requirement to universal suffrage. Article I, section 2, was looked upon as an automatic guaranty that the rights of national citizenship would be safeguarded by the devotion of the people to their rights as citizens of the individual States.

I repeat that sentence, because I think it is rich in meaning so far as understanding the theory from which the junior Senator from Oregon is arguing the constitutionality of the bill. Article I, section 2, was looked upon as an automatic guaranty that the rights of national citizenship would be safeguarded by the devotion of the people to their rights as citizens of the individual States.

This is clearly revealed in what Madison wrote about this section of the Constitution in the Federalist:

> Who are to be the electors of the Federal Representatives? Not the rich, more than the poor—
>
> "Not the rich more than the poor." Is that true in the poll-tax States today?—
>
> Not the learned, more than the ignorant—

Is that true in the poll-tax States today? This is Madison writing in the Federalist at the time the great document was being forged and hammered on the anvil of the experience of the Thirteen Colonies into the greatest governmental document for protecting the rights of freemen ever written by the hand of man.

> Not the haughty heirs of distinguished names, more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States. They are to be the same who exercise the right in every State of electing the corresponding branch of the legislature of the State.

That statement by Madison can be repeated today in 41 States of the Union. In seven it is no longer valid. And why not? Because Madison was mistaken when he said in the Federalist:

> It cannot be feared that the people of the States will alter this part of their constitutions in such a manner as to abridge the rights secured to them by the Federal Constitution.

I take the position that when, subsequent to the adoption of the Constitution, poll taxes were imposed as limitations upon suffrage, the acts imposing them did not conform to the historic theory that was in the minds of the founding fathers when they wrote article I, section 2, into the Constitution, because they were thinking in terms of a national universal suffrage in which discrimination would not favor the rich over the poor, or the learned over the ignorant, or the haughty over the humble sons of more obscure citizens, to use Madison's language. But some of the States have digressed from Madison's theory and the theory of the other founding fathers, when seven poll-tax States have not continued suffrage restrictions of colonial days; but have reimposed them only about 50 years ago

with the avowed purpose of decreasing the vote.

Let us look at another of the statements of the Senator from Mississippi. He said:

When we go back to the statutes of the various colonies prior to the formation of the Union • • • when we go back to the wording of the Constitution based upon the facts as the framers of the Constitution found them, I cannot see how it is possible so to play on language as to say that the legitimacy of the poll tax as a qualification is not written boldly into the Constitution.

In answer to the Senator from Mississippi on that point, let me say that at the time of the Constitutional Convention the whole trend was toward broadening the franchise rather than toward placing restrictions upon it. If the Senator from Mississippi is going to quote history, he should quote that fact. In 1789, it was possible for the poll tax to represent a step forward, a lightening of the restrictions on voting, compared with the property restrictions of earlier days. In the spirit of 1789, therefore, we should be moving toward removal of all restrictions on the franchise.

Prior to the Declaration of Independence, the right of suffrage in this country, as elsewhere, was limited for the most part to landowners. The first cautious steps to extend the right were taken in 1776, when North Carolina reduced the restrictions on voting for the lower house of the State legislature to payment of a property tax. Pennsylvania substituted tax payment for property ownership as the condition of voting in all elections.

In the same year the Virginia bill of rights, written by George Mason, declared that the right to vote should be granted to all who showed "sufficient evidence of common interest in and attachment to the community." This became the dominant American theory of voting rights, though it left unsolved how to judge "evidence of common interest."

In 1784, New Hampshire reduced the voting requirements to the payment of a small poll tax. In 1791, Vermont entered the Union with free manhood suffrage; and in 1792 Kentucky followed suit. In the same year New Hampshire abolished the poll tax as a requirement of voting—subject let the record be clear, to the extent to which the record made this afternoon in the colloquy between the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] shows that to a restrictive extent there is at least some remnant of a poll tax still in the State of New Hampshire. If the constitutional provision read by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], purportedly out of the State constitution of New Hampshire, was correctly quoted, then I would be the first in the Senate to say that I think there is some form of poll tax still remaining in New Hampshire, still applicable as a restriction in some degree upon the right of suffrage in New Hampshire. As I said this afternoon, if that is the fact, then, of course, it is my contention that our anti-poll-tax bill is equally applicable to New Hampshire, and illustrates quite clearly no intention on the part of the proponents of the anti-poll-tax bill to discriminate against any section of the country for the sake of discriminatory purposes alone. The only reason we are pressing for the anti-poll-tax bill is that we think that the poll tax imposes a restriction, in conflict with the spirit and intent of the Constitution, upon approximately one-fourteenth of our population; and we want to see such restriction removed wherever it exists, both in the South as well as in any New England State or any Western State, or any other State.

As I have stated, in 1792, according to my research, New Hampshire abolished the poll tax then existing as a requirement of voting. In 1796 Tennessee provided that residence alone, as well as property ownership, could qualify a voter.

By 1787, when the Constitutional Convention met, four States had already substantially broadened the base of suffrage, and a number of others were soon to do so.

I want to return for a moment to a point I previously quoted from the Senator from Mississippi—his concern as to what was "in their—the framers of the Constitution—minds as the leading political thinkers of that day."

The framers of the Constitution were considering how to form a more perfect Union, while also establishing a government which would guarantee to its citizens the rights for which they had so recently fought the American Revolution. In the matter of suffrage, they had to make a compromise acceptable both to the more conservative States and to the more progressive States. This compromise, embodied in article I, section 2, provided that Congress would accept the qualifications which each State might impose for the most numerous branch of its legislature, that is, the most liberal requirement then existing.

This compromise was essentially liberal in character, as the trend in most States was toward broadening the franchise. This is borne out by the fact that after 1819, all new States adopted free manhood suffrage. In the older States, the road to free suffrage traversed the following general stages: From a real-property to a general tax requirement; thence to a poll tax unconnected with property ownership; finally to a free vote dependent only on residence and good character. By the end of the Civil War, the poll tax as a requirement of voting was found in the South only in Georgia, which has since abolished the poll tax.

What some of the founding fathers thought of limitations on suffrage is indicated by Madison's Notes of Debates.

When Elbridge Gerry, delegate from Massachusetts, declared:

The evils we experience flow from the excess of democracy—

He was answered by George Mason, of Virginia.

Mr. Mason—

Said Madison—

argued strongly for an election of the larger branch (the House of Representatives) by the people. It was to be the grand depository of the democratic principle of government.

He was followed by James Wilson, of Pennsylvania. To quote Madison again:

Mr. Wilson contended strenuously for drawing the most numerous branch of the legislature immediately from the people. He was for raising the Federal pyramid to a considerable altitude, and for that reason wished to give it as broad a basis as possible. No government could long subsist without the confidence of the people.

Then came James Madison himself:

Mr. Madison considered the popular election of one branch of the National Legislature as essential to every plan for free government.

When the compromise embodied in article I, section 2, was proposed, Gouverneur Morris objected. He wanted the franchise limited to landowners, just as the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Virginia pointed out in their speeches. However, Benjamin Franklin protested. As reported by Delegate McHenry:

The venerable Franklin opposed to this the natural rights of man, their right to an immediate voice in the General Assembly of the whole Nation, or to a right of suffrage and representation.

Franklin pointed out that—

One British statute excluded a number of subjects from suffrage. These immediately became slaves.

Judge Ellsworth, of Connecticut, declared, according to Madison:

The people will not readily subscribe to the National Constitution if it should subject them to be disfranchised.

Mason, of Virginia, pointed out that—

Eight or nine States have extended the right of suffrage beyond the freeholders. What will the people there say if they have been disfranchised?

Butler, of South Carolina, declared:

There is no right of which people are more jealous than that of suffrage. Abridgments of it tend to • • • a rank aristocracy.

Mr. President, I say that the founding fathers had to give ground to men like Gouverneur Morris; but in accepting the qualifications for voting set by the States, it was clearly not their purpose to limit the suffrage, as the poll tax does now. It was their purpose, rather, to forbid restrictions on it by a Congress in which men like Morris might hold the upper hand, to avoid compulsory uniformity, and to use the expanding suffrage of the States as the most effective guaranty of a broad base for the Federal Government, to adopt national, universal suffrage. That was the trend. That was the objective. I think it was the obvious intent of the founding fathers.

It has been repeatedly contended on the floor of the Senate that the sum involved in the poll-tax payment is a trifling one—a mere dollar or two. Curiously enough, however, the States which require the payment of a poll tax are those which, in relation to the national average, have the lowest per capita income. Let us have a little light on that subject. Probably there are more recent figures—in fact I have one group of figures which I found since I prepared this speech, but the last ones to come to my attention were those published by the Department of Labor in October 1946. These are sufficient, however, for my purposes tonight.

When the country was in the trough of the depression in 1933, the list of average per-capita-income payments showed that Mississippi, to take the lowest income State, had $123 per annum, against a national average of $368. Stated in another way, the average Mississippian earned only about one-third as much as the average American did. Now I ask, Mr. President, whether a $1 or $2 poll-tax payment is a trifling sum if it constitutes as much as 2 percent of the annual income of a voter? Even in 1945, when income was comparatively high, the average resident of a so-called poll-tax State had to spend a significant percentage of his income in order to vote, particularly, if he was in a State which permitted the accumulation of poll taxes, and was confronted with a situation in which he had to pay back poll taxes before he could vote.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a table showing the per-capita-income payments for poll-tax States for 1929, 1933, 1939, 1941, and 1945, as derived from the Monthly Labor Review for October 1946, on page 497.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Per capita income payments for poll-tax States

	1929	1933	1939	1941	1945
United States	$680	$368	$539	$668	$1,150
Virginia	422	266	402	565	903
South Carolina	252	167	261	354	693
Tennessee	349	199	295	413	813
Alabama	285	154	242	339	700
Mississippi	273	123	201	283	556
Arkansas	305	152	246	332	651
Texas	465	257	401	497	917

Source: Derived from Monthly Labor Review, October 1946, p. 497

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, following the table just offered, a table which is to be found on page 116 of the hearings of the Senate Judiciary Committee on Senate bill 1280, a forerunner anti-poll-tax bill. This table shows the per capita income, by States, for the year 1940. It is taken from the Survey of Current Business, the August 1941 issue, published by the Department of Commerce.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Per capita income, by States, for the year 1940

[From Survey of Current Business, August 1941 issue, published by the Department of Commerce]

Alabama	$264
Arizona	478
Arkansas	253
California	819
Colorado	551
Connecticut	864
Delaware	836
District of Columbia [1]	1,022
Florida	465
Georgia	321
Idaho	470
Illinois	691
Indiana	551
Iowa	471
Kansas	418
Kentucky	320
Louisiana	350
Maine	504
Maryland [1]	703
Massachusetts	757
Michigan	656
Minnesota	526
Mississippi	195
Missouri	499
Montana	579
Nebraska	444
Nevada	950
New Hampshire	560
New Jersey [1]	852
New Mexico	306
New York [1]	814
North Carolina	335
North Dakota	385
Ohio	644
Oklahoma	354
Oregon	586
Pennsylvania	624
Rhode Island	730
South Carolina	281
South Dakota	334
Tennessee	325
Texas	452
Utah	487
Vermont	542
Virginia [1]	455
Washington	633
West Virginia	401
Wisconsin	537
Wyoming	638
United States	573

[1] Before computing per capita incomes, salaries and wages, and total income were reduced in the District of Columbia and New York, and increased in Maryland, Virginia, and New Jersey to account for residents of the latter States employed by establishments located in the District and New York.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is very interesting to note that this table and also the table previously submitted for the RECORD show an extremely low per capita income in the poll-tax States, and therefore a relatively high percentage of that income, comparably speaking, taken for poll-tax purposes. I do not dwell at any length on that argument, other than to say that one of the realities of the situation is that the imposition of a poll tax is an economic obstacle to voting, in poll-tax States, because of the exceedingly low per capita income of the average people in those States. When we are talking about an income of $133 for a year, a poll tax of even $1 is a substantial sum to a person who finds himself so low in the economic strata of our country that his annual income is only $133 a year. In such cases we cannot ignore or brush off quite so easily as the opponents of the anti-poll tax bill would brush off, the economic obstacle to voting which is presented by a poll tax.

The proponents of poll taxes make no serious claim that they were intended, or are in fact used, as true taxing measures. Let us not forget this point, Mr. President. If Senators do not remember anything else I say in the course of this argument, I wish them to remember this point. When they read the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which are at all relevant to this problem, they will find—at least, I have found—that without exception the Court is proceeding on the assumption and theory—and rightly so, as far as the language of the acts is concerned—that the poll tax laws are truly taxing measures. Until the Congress of the United States by direct legislation squarely "on the nose" passes legislation—because, as the Court has pointed out, it is a legislative problem, not a judicial one, to determine this question of policy—which makes very clear that it is the policy of the Congress to look upon poll taxes as an infringement of the right of franchise, I do not see how we can get behind the decisions of the Supreme Court.

Let me repeat that in another way, for I say that is another one of the basic premises we must consider in determining the question of constitutionality, at least to the extent that the decisions being offered by the Senators of the opposition have a bearing on the subject. The court has proceeded on the assumption that State poll-tax laws are true taxing measures. It is my theory that when we determine national congressional policy in regard to poll taxes as being a restriction upon the franchise, there will then for the first time—and not until then—be before the Supreme Court a set of operative facts which will make it possible for the Court judicially to determine whether article I section 2, of the Constitution contains within the word "qualifications" a constitutional meaning which prohibits the passage of an anti-poll-tax law by the Congress. Every time it has been possible to get it before the Court thus far, in any of the cases cited by my friends of the opposition, if I read the cases correctly, the Court has been passing upon a State law which, in the light of the circumstances of the case, was passed as a "true taxing measure," to use the language of the court.

I submit that if poll taxes make for or contribute to the raising of revenue, it is purely incidental. This is clear from the fact that most if not all the statutes or State constitutional provisions imposing the tax prohibit its payment by anyone other than the person taxed, a prohibition not general in tax statutes, and from the fact that no effort is generally made or provided for the collection of delinquent taxes. The sole penalty for delinquency is disfranchisement, with the possible exception of the alleged poll taxes existing in some of the New England States which were discussed in the colloquy that took place on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, to which I previously alluded in these remarks.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to refer to a brief digest of poll-tax provisions of State law as submitted in the testimony of the Senate from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] in March 1948, when he testified in support of House bill 29. He pointed out:

1. The seven poll-tax States are Alabama (1901), Arkansas (1908), Mississippi (1890), South Carolina (1885), Tennessee (1350), Texas (1903), Virginia (1901).

I think the historical record is clear, that the laws of all these States were passed obviously for the purpose of limiting suffrage, when the whole trend at the time the constitutional fathers, as I have previously pointed out in these remarks, wrote article I, section 2, was to enlarge the franchise in order to establish universal suffrage. That was the trend, but because of the compromises which had to be arranged, particularly in order to satisfy men in the convention such as Gouverneur Morris, the compromise of article I, section 2, was agreed upon.

In his testimony, the Senator from Florida further pointed out:

2. The rates per year are: Alabama, $1.50; Arkansas, $1; Mississippi, $2, Virginia, $1.50; South Carolina, $1; Tennessee, $1 in some counties, and $2 in 72 others; Texas, $1.75.

3. The maximum in Alabama is $36 for citizens 45 and over who previously never were able to pay; in South Carolina there is a penalty of $2.12 if in arrears above $1: Mississippi, the tax is cumulative up to $5; in Virginia the maximum is $5 per taxpayer who is in arrears as much as 3 years.

4. Most of the people technically are now in arrears. A husband and wife in Virginia may have to pay as much as $10 if they fall behind for 3 years. In recent years, the textile workers' union in Danville, Va., campaigned among their members until each one in arrears saved the $5 necessary to pay the taxes (a total of 3,000 paid this amount). The union members in Madison City, Ala., saved money for years until they paid on the average $12 to $21.

5. Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and Tennessee must amend their State constitutions to repeal the State poll-tax requirements. In view of the fact that between 1909 and 1943 only four States have actually repealed or removed the requirement, the odds are strongly against removing it in the seven States in the next few years in view of the arduous procedure necessary to amend the respective State constitutions.

6. In Mississippi, the poll tax can be a lien against assessable property. Everybody is liable to pay it and condemnation proceedings may be taken against such property.

Senator PEPPER proceeds:

Now, I am nearing the conclusion here. I also offer, Mr. Chairman, a statement showing the way the vote in the several States declined as soon as the poll tax was imposed, and also the way the vote in the several States increased as soon as the poll tax was taken off.

In my State of Florida in a white primary in 1928, 100,000 more citizens voted in my senatorial race than voted 2 years before in 1926, the last election preceding the abolition of the poll tax, and I have here another—I have it in the data that I will not detail to this committee, because I am sure others have presented such information. Let us take the State of Louisiana, and I am talking here about white primaries. In Louisiana, the total number of registered voters increased by 44.5 percent after the poll tax was removed. The women's vote—the women's vote in a white primary increased by 77 percent, and the votes cast in two gubernatorial white primaries increased 64 percent over the averages over the two preceding ones, and the one senatorial primary, which was also a white primary after repeal, showed a 90-percent increase in the number of registered voters. So, I am putting this, Mr. Chairman, not upon any reference to any class or any section or any religion or any nationality or national origin: I am putting this upon the basic principles of democracy. It affects men and women, and as far as that is concerned, it adversely affects far more white people than it does colored people, if you want to get down to a distinction as between the two.

Mr. President, I do not think that is conclusive, but I think the statistics are certainly sufficiently clear to support the inference that the elimination of the poll tax in several States has resulted in an increase in the number of persons voting at the next election, and supports what I think is the obvious conclusion that the poll tax serves in fact and in effect as a limitation upon suffrage.

Of course, the defenders of the poll tax insist that it is a qualification for voting in Federal elections within the meaning of section 2 article I, of the Constitution which provides:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Actually, of course, the poll tax is no more a true qualification to determine a prospective voter's inherent ability, understanding, or capacity to exercise the high privilege of citizenship involved in voting than would a requirement that the prospective voter be baldheaded, or stand 6 feet tall in his stocking feet, or have a net annual income of $10,000,000. Neither of these things has anything whatever to do with the capacity of a voter and cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered a qualification within the meaning of our Constitution. If a State can say that the payment of $1 is a qualification, what in the world would hinder it from exacting $100 or $1,000, or any other arbitrary sum it desires? As Madison, one of the founding fathers, wrote:

> We may define a republic to be, or at least may bestow that name on, a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure, for a limited period, or during good behavior. It is essential to such a government that it be derived from the great body of society, not from an inconsiderable proportion, or a favored class of it.

The origin of the poll tax, and the way in which it has operated, shows only too clearly that it is not, and was not intended to be a bona fide qualification. Its intended purpose, and its intended result, was to eliminate or greatly restrict a particular element of the citizenry from the use of a free ballot.

The Senate Judiciary Committee considering, during the Seventy-seventh Congress, House bill 1024, a bill substantially the same as the one under discussion, made an exhaustive investigation and study of this question. In its report dated October 27, 1942, favorably recommending the bill, which was practically identical with the pending bill, it wrote:

> We think a careful examination of the so-called poll tax constitutional and statutory provisions, and an examination particularly of the constitutional conventions by which these amendments became a part of the State laws, will convince any disinterested person that the object of these State constitutional conventions, from which emanated mainly the poll-tax laws, were moved entirely and exclusively by a desire to exclude the Negro from voting. They attempted to do this in a constitutional way but, in order to follow such a course, they deemed it necessary to even prohibit the white voter the same as they did the colored voter and hence they devised the poll-tax method which applied to white and colored alike. In other words, the poll-tax laws were prohibitive to all people, regardless of color, who were poor and unable to pay the poll tax.
>
> We desire to call attention to the Virginia constitutional convention which submitted an amendment which was afterward adopted to the Constitution of Virginia by which it was intended to distranchise a very large number of Virginia citizens. We think this convention can be regarded as a fair sample of other conventions in other poll-tax States. Hon. Carter Glass was a member of that convention. Near the beginning of the convention Senator Glass made a speech in which he outlined in very forceful language what the object was, after all, of the convention. He did this in his usual commendatory method of getting at the real cream in the coconut. Near the beginning of the convention he made a speech in which he said:
>
> "The chief purpose of this convention is to amend the suffrage clause of the existing constitution. It does not require much prescience to foretell that the alterations which we shall make will not apply to 'all persons and classes without distinction.' We were sent here to make distinctions. We expect to make distinctions. We will make distinctions."
>
> Near the conclusion of the convention, Senator Glass delivered another address in which he referred to the work already performed by the convention. He said:
>
> "I declared then [referring to the beginning of the convention and the debate on the oath] that no body of Virginia gentlemen could frame a constitution so obnoxious to my sense of right and morality that I would be willing to submit its fate to 146,000 ignorant Negro voters [great applause] whose capacity for self-government we have been challenging for 30 years past."
>
> There is no doubt but what Senator Glass stated the real object the convention had in view. The fact that his remarks were received with great applause indicates that his fellow members of that convention agreed with him and that the real object they had in view, and which they believed they could accomplish, was disfranchising "146,000 ignorant Negro voters."

The intention of the framers of the Virginia Constitution, as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, is typical of other States adopting the poll-tax requirement, and I would say that they have certainly succeeded in achieving their object.

The votes cast in the 1946 general elections for Members of the United States House of Representatives in States requiring a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting was tragically small as compared with those in non-poll-tax States. To take two typical States, one a so-called poll-tax State and the other a non-poll-tax State, will show what I mean.

I have before me a table showing the votes cast in Mississippi and Minnesota in the 1946 congressional election and indicating the population in 1940 by congressional districts, the total vote cast in the 1946 election, and percentage of population voting.

Mr. President, let us take a view of the results in Mississippi. Let us take a district which I shall call district 1, in which there were 263,367 persons, as shown by the population statistics, 5,429 of whom were eligible to vote. Two and one-tenth percent voted.

Let us take a corresponding district in the State of Minnesota, which I shall call district 1, containing 318,154 persons, of whom 96,345 voted, or 30 percent, as contrasted with 2.1 percent in Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator reconsider and yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon stated at the outset of his remarks that he would like to continue with his speech without interruption, and he has previously declined to yield to the Senator from Florida. For that reason the Chair is quite certain that he would not desire to yield at this time.

Mr. MORSE. The Chair correctly states my position. No one regrets more than I do the parliamentary situation in which I find myself, because, by inclination and practice, I am always willing to yield while speaking on the floor of the Senate. But under the particular circumstances in which we find ourselves in this debate, and because we have no desire to be of any assistance whatsoever in carrying on a prolonged debate at the direction of the Senators on the other side of the aisle, I shall continue to insist on my right to complete my statement, and then I shall be very glad to answer such questions as may be put to me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, since he has been interrupted at this point?

Mr. MORSE. For what purpose?

Mr. WHERRY. When the Senator comes to a place in his speech where he feels we might permit the Senate to conclude its work for today, provided unanimous consent be given that the Senator may have the floor to finish his speech when the Senate meets tomorrow, would the Senator advise me of that point in his address so that I may make the motion?

Mr. MORSE. I am aware of what the Senator from Nebraska has in mind, Mr. President, because he has spoken to me with reference to it. I am trying to finish my speech as rapidly as I can. I am speaking and reading as rapidly as it is physically possible for me to do, because I do not want to consume any more time than is necessary to make the case which we think has to be made on the affirmative side of this proposition. I have been waiting for some days to make the speech. I do not see how I can possibly finish it tonight, unless the Senate wants to continue in an exceedingly long session, to which I have no objection. I am perfectly willing to remain here and complete the speech.

The acting majority leader has suggested that he thinks that when I come to an appropriate place in my speech, namely, the end of the branch of the subject I am now discussing, he would like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock, with the understanding that I be privileged to take the floor and complete my speech at that time. If the Senator wishes to put that request at the present time so that Senators now present can go home while I finish this portion of my remarks, I have no objection, if I do not jeopardize my right to the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order that the Chair may correct the statement of the junior Senator from Oregon, he will state that a unanimous-consent request has already been agreed to that the Senate meet at 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. I accept the correction.

Mr. WHERRY. I now propose the unanimous-consent request that when the Senate meets tomorrow the junior Senator from Oregon be recognized to conclude the address he is making at this time, and which he will conclude for the day in the next few minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does that indicate that the Senate is to take a recess in the immediate future? Of course, some of us must remain here——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is that when the junior Senator from Oregon arrives at an appropriate place in his speech he may desist with the understanding that he will be recognized when the Senate meets at 1 o'clock p. m. tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Reserving the right to object, I certainly have no objection to the Senate recessing at this time, but the distinguished Senator from Oregon is in a parliamentary pillbox from which he fires on all Senators and their speeches on the floor, and refuses to accept any counterfire. I think it is a little unfair to keep us here if the Senator is not going to yield. If we are to recess, let us recess at this time. I am sure we are at a very appropriate place in the Senator's remarks, since he will have the floor tomorrow, occupying the same place of vantage.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will permit me to make an observation, my reason for suggesting that the Senator from Oregon conclude tomorrow was the fact that I stated at the beginning of the session today that the Senate would remain in session at least until 10 o'clock. Several Senators have planned on the hour of 10 o'clock as the recess hour, so I believe we are quibbling over a molehill. If the Senator from Oregon could see his way clear, now that we have interrupted him, to permit the Senate to recess now, we would like to do it. If not, I can repeat the unanimous-consent request when he comes to the particular place in his remarks where he thinks he can stop.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that on the particular topic I am now discussing, there is one page, plus a couple of tables I shall ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD. I do not think it will take me more than 3 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under those conditions, I shall not object, but some of us who had wished to interrupt the Senator from Oregon at times were compelled to remain here tonight; but if he is to occupy only 3 minutes longer I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Nebraska is agreed to. The junior Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I shall look forward with anticipation to the firing that comes from his pillbox after I finish tomorrow. I have already explained why I am following what for me is the extraordinary course of not yielding during the presentation of my formal remarks, but there will be time on the floor to ask such questions as the Senator may wish to ask me when I conclude.

Mr. RUSSELL. I confess it is extraordinary for the Senator from Oregon to take that position, because he usually joins freely in debate. But he realizes the impossibility of Senators coming back to each point he has raised in the debate. I did not hear his preliminary statement. I understand that because of the fact that he did not want to be accused of participating in any filibuster he asked not to be interrupted. I assumed it was because of the weakness of his case.

Mr. MORSE. Knowing the Senator from Georgia as I do, if he can find weakness in my case, he is not going to be stopped by the fact that he has to read my remarks in order to find it, and I am perfectly willing to have the strength of my case submitted to the Senator from Georgia for rebuttal.

Now, returning to the effect of a poll tax on the number of people who vote in an election for Members of the House of Representatives, I ask permission to have inserted at this point in my remarks a table which draws a comparison between the State of Minnesota and the State of Mississippi in the congressional elections of 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Votes cast in Mississippi and Minnesota in 1946 congressional elections

	Population, 1940, by congressional districts	Total vote cast, 1946 election	Percent of population voting in election
MISSISSIPPI			
1. Rankin	263,367	5,429	2.1
2. Whitten	231,701	6,491	2.8
3. Whittington	435,530	4,195	1.0
4. Abernethy	201,316	10,617	5.0
5. Winstead	201,466	7,122	2.7
6. Colmer	319,635	6,445	2.0
7. Williams	470,781	10,245	2.2
MINNESOTA			
1. Andresen	318,154	96,345	30.0
2. O'Hara	305,559	91,434	29.0
3. MacKinnon	321,987	111,519	34.0
4. Devitt	309,925	88,702	28.0
5. Judd	321,859	114,614	35.0
6. Knutson	334,781	96,548	28.0
7. Andersen	305,139	88,536	29.0
8. Blatnik	291,041	106,665	37.0
9. Hagen	288,845	78,242	27.0

Mr. MORSE. I shall read only the percentages, that is, the percentage of population voting in the Mississippi districts as compared with the percentage

voting in the Minnesota districts. Here they are. In Mississippi 2.1 percent, 2.8 percent, 1 percent, 5 percent, 2.7 percent, 2 percent, 2.2 percent.

Compare that, Mr. President, with the percentage of voters who went to the polls in a non-poll-tax State such as Minnesota: 30 percent, 29 percent, 34 percent, 28 percent, 35 percent, 28 percent, 29 percent, 37 percent, 37 percent.

I do not argue a direct cause and effect relationship between the existence of a poll tax in Mississippi and the percentage of voters who went to the polls, but I do argue that we cannot exclude the presence of the poll tax in Mississippi in any explanation of that exceedingly low percentage of voting in Mississippi.

When we add to that table, Mr. President, other tables of comparable nature from other poll-tax States, I submit that there is sound basis for the conclusion that the poll tax results in men being sent to the Congress of the United States by an exceedingly small percentage of the citizens of a State, whereas, in my judgment, if their full rights were given under the Constitution, and they could enjoy the advantage of a free ballot box without the obstacle of a poll tax, a much larger percentage would register their views as to who should represent them in this representative government.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks another table taken from the 1948 hearings of our Judiciary Committee on House bill 29, showing the effect of the poll tax repeal in increasing voting in Florida, Arkansas, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, being States used for comparable purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECT OF POLL-TAX REPEAL IN INCREASING VOTING—FLORIDA AN EXAMPLE

Florida repealed the poll tax in 1937. The following table contrasts the increase in the vote in Florida between the 1936 Presidential election (that is the Presidential election immediately before and immediately after repeal) to the change in the vote in the remaining poll-tax States in the same elections:

[All figures rounded to nearest 1,000]

State	Presidential vote, 1936	Presidential vote, 1940	Percent increase
Florida	328	485	48
Alabama	276	294	7
Arkansas	179	202	13
Georgia	261	313	7
Mississippi	162	176	9
South Carolina	115	97	[1] 16
Tennessee	476	523	10
Texas	843	1,041	23
Virginia	355	347	4

[1] Decrease.

Source: World Almanac, 1948, pp. 251-278.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that another table of the same order taken from the Judiciary Committee hearings for this year on this particular point be printed in the RECORD, including the footnote to the table.

There being no objection, the table and footnote were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statistics

Voting State	Year tax adopted	Record of vote		Percent reduction
		Before adoption	After adoption	
Florida	1889	1888 66,600	1892 35,000	47
Mississippi	1890	117,000	52,000	56
Tennessee	1890	304,000	265,000	13
South Carolina	1895	1892 70,000	1900 51,000	28
Louisiana	189-	1896 101,000	1899 68,000	33
North Carolina	1900	1900 292,000	1904 207,000	29
Alabama	1901	165,000	102,000	34
Virginia	1901	266,000	136,000	49
Texas	1903	401,000	221,000	45
Arkansas	1908	151,000	115,000	24

During this period there was an average increase of one-third of the population.

Louisiana repealed its poll tax in 1934. The voters in 1932 were 268,000 and in 1940 were 372,000 or a 36-percent increase.

North Carolina repealed its tax in 1920. Between 1920 and 1928, the vote rose from 538,000 to 3,636,000 or 18 percent.

Florida repealed its poll tax in 1937. Between 1936 and 1940 the vote rose by 46 percent from 327,000 to 485,000.

In 1940, here were in the 8 States, including Georgia, 13,660,000 eligible persons and only 3,000,000 or 22 percent paid the poll tax; 10,600,000 citizens of voting age did not vote. In 1942 the poll-tax vote fell to 829,000 or 6 percent of the eligible population.

A comparison of adjoining States for 1944 is illuminating. In 1944 North Carolina had 21 percent of its eligible population voting and South Carolina with a poll tax only 5 percent. In 1946 West Virginia with no poll tax had 542,000 persons voting and Virginia with a much larger population had only half as many voting.

In 1946 less than 9 percent of the eligible population voted in the seven poll-tax States in comparison with 13 percent for the four States which repealed the tax requirement in recent years and 47 percent for the non-poll-tax States.

In Louisiana the total number of registered voters increased by 44.5 percent; the women's vote increased by 77 percent and the votes cast in two gubernatorial primaries increased 64 percent over the average for the two preceding ones and the one senatorial primary showed a 90-percent increase, after repeal.

In Florida the average number of votes cast in two senatorial primaries increased by 140 percent over the average for the four preceding ones and the one gubernatorial primary showed an increase of 91 percent over the four preceding.

Mr. MORSE. Thus I say, Mr. President, that we all know that the vote is lighter in a non-Presidential election year. In Georgia, the poll-tax requirement was repealed in 1945. Although the vote cast in 1946 was considerably below that in the 1944 election, yet it was substantially above that in the previous off-year election of 1942.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing the votes cast in Georgia in the 1942 and 1946 congressional elections, the first one being at the time of the existence of a poll tax, the second one being after the removal of the poll tax.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Votes cast in Georgia in 1942 and 1946 congressional elections

	Votes cast, 1942 [1]	Votes cast, 1946 [2]
District 1	7,109	20,971
District 2	3,794	10,896
District 3	4,824	8,961
District 4	5,108	8,476
District 5	9,558	54,013
District 6	5,775	13,568
District 7	5,172	7,575
District 8	4,785	8,983
District 9	10,467	14,815
District 10	5,303	16,404

[1] P. 252, Congressional Directory, May 1943.
[2] P. 246, Congressional Directory, January 1948.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this table shows that in the fifth district more than five times as many votes were cast in 1946 as in 1942. There was no increase in population commensurate with the increased vote. Population is therefore not the answer. I believe the true answer lies in the removal of the poll-tax barrier which thereby released a part of the dammed up white as well as Negro voters, making it possible for that backlog of voters, restricted by the, shall I say, log jam of a poll tax, from going to the polls prior to the repeal of the Georgia poll-tax laws in 1945, to cast their votes.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point tables contained in the remarks of the Honorable Richard P. Gale, a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Minnesota, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 12, 1942, showing the congressional vote and percent of population voting in elections and primaries in poll-tax States in 1940, as well as in non-poll-tax States. There are two tables, Mr. President, with footnotes, in the compilation.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congressional vote and percent of population voting in elections and primaries in poll-tax States, 1940

State, congressional district, successful candidate	Population 1940 by State and congressional district	Final press figures on vote in Democratic primary	Estimated percent of 1940 population voting in primary	Total vote cast in election	Percent of 1940 population voting in election
Alabama:					
1. Boykin	297,473	[1] 11,089	8	25,566	
2. Grant	356,553	(2)	(2)	33,433	9
3. Steagall	303,837	[3] 22,036	9	22,987	8
4. Hobbs	283,622	(2)	(2)	28,258	10
5. Starnes	294,539	[4] 38,466	14	31,967	11
6. Jarman	251,757	[5] 24,687	10	18,881	8
7. Bankhead	285,138	(2)	(2)	39,064	14
8. Sparkman	300,112	(2)	(2)	29,020	10
9. Patrick	459,930	[6] 31,775	7	40,002	9
Total	2,832,961				

Footnotes at end of table.

Congressional vote and percent of population voting in elections and primaries in poll-tax States, 1940—Continued

State, congressional district, successful candidate	Population 1940 by State and congressional district	Final press figures on vote in Democratic primary	Estimated percent of 1940 population voting in primary	Total vote cast in election	Percent of 1940 population voting in election
Arkansas:					
1. Gathings	423,152	[1] 37,522	10	33,127	8
2. Mills	222,974	(2)	(2)	26,105	12
3. Ellis	177,476	(2)	(2)	29,626	17
4. Cravens	242,165	(2)	(2)	28,999	12
5. Terry	293,023	[3] 28,784	13	36,097	12
6. Norrell	303,301	[4] 18,910	9	27,972	9
7. Harris	287,206	[5] 38,077	13	26,994	9
Total	1,949,387				
Georgia:					
1. Peterson	335,654	[6] 31,419	9	26,948	8
2. Cox	273,436	(7)	(7)	20,081	7
3. Pace	357,295	(2)	(2)	22,882	6
4. Camp	280,472	(7)	(7)	25,609	9
5. Ramspeck	487,552	(2)	(2)	41,724	9
6. Vinson	289,404	(7)	(7)	21,967	8
7. Tarver	308,761	(2)	(2)	37,344	12
8. Gibson	255,139	11,626	[13]	24,454	10
9. Whelchel	235,420	10,240	[14]	30,164	13
10. Brown	300,500	(7)	(7)	18,530	6
Total	3,123,723				
Mississippi:					
1. Rankin	263,367	(2)	(2)	19,330	7
2. Doxey	231,701	(2)	(2)	16,930	7
3. Whittington	435,590	(2)	(2)	13,864	3
4. Ford	291,316	[15] 15,554	8	15,329	8
5. Collins	261,466	(2)	(2)	24,079	9
6. Colmer	319,635	(2)	(2)	26,879	8
7. McGehee	470,781	(2)	(2)	29,799	6
Total	2,183,796				
South Carolina: [17]					
1. Rivers	289,482	[18] 33,956	12	16,904	6
2. Fulmer	361,933	[19] 44,990	13	15,126	4
3. Hare	304,379	[20] 60,049	21	16,085	5
4. Bryson	339,858	[21] 74,524	23	24,482	7
5. Richards	251,137	[22] 45,308	18	14,997	6
6. McMillan	353,016	[23] 52,176	15	12,197	3
Total	1,899,804				
Tennessee:					
1. Reece (R.) [24]	385,747	(2)	(2)	57,628	15
2. Jennings (R.) [25]	420,146	(2)	(2)	72,937	16
3. Kefauver	331,120	[26] 25,489	9	51,431	17
4. Gore	320,012	(2)	(2)	43,655	13
5. Priest	385,944	[27] 31,554	9	48,957	13
6. Courtney	213,939	[28] 27,610	12	24,536	11
7. Pearson	260,693	(2)	(2)	25,590	10
8. Cooper	248,992	(2)	(2)	34,762	14
9. Davis	358,250	(2)	(2)	58,261	16
Total	2,915,841				
Texas:					
1. Patman	206,803	[29] 55,205		27,036	9
2. Dies	231,069	[30] 56,392		43,597	13
3. Beckworth	292,631	[31] 56,688		43,139	15
4. Rayburn	260,239	[32] 42,533		46,333	18
5. Sumners	198,564	(2)	(2)	66,662	17
6. Johnson, L. A.	262,735	(2)	(2)	33,546	13
7. Patton	249,721	(2)	(2)	30,950	10
8. Thomas	528,961	[33] 71,430		94,724	18
9. Mansfield	353,317	[34] 45,133		52,754	15
10. Johnson, L. B.	286,110	(2)	(2)	48,442	17
11. Poage	251,852	[35] 39,163		37,227	15
12. Lanham	286,132	[36] 37,445		54,108	19
13. Gossett	279,924	[37] 58,680		51,970	19
14. Kleberg	368,764	[37] 52,557		59,009	16
15. West	334,616	(2)	(2)	34,428	10
16. Thomason	230,700	(2)	(2)	34,516	15
17. Russell	230,010	[38] 55,602		45,456	20
18. Worley	239,736	[39] 56,978		52,573	22
19. Mahon	275,339	[40] 54,138		53,510	19
20. Kilday	338,176	[41] 45,345		56,447	17
21. South	258,425	(2)	(2)	53,360	21
Total	6,414,824	[42]			

Footnotes at end of table.

Congressional vote and percent of population voting in elections and primaries in poll-tax States, 1940—Continued

State, congressional district, successful candidate	Population 1940 by State and congressional district	Final press figures on vote in Democratic primary	Estimated percent of 1940 population voting in primary	Total vote cast in election	Percent of 1940 population voting in election
Virginia:					
1. Bland	250,621	(2)	(2)	22,513	9
2. Darden, Jr.	332,864	(2)	(2)	29,800	9
3. Satterfield	309,756	(2)	(2)	36,026	12
4. Drewry	243,165	(2)	(2)	19,832	8
5. Burch	301,157	(2)	(2)	25,641	9
6. Woodrum	301,988	(2)	(2)	44,115	15
7. Robertson	239,048	(2)	(2)	40,292	16
8. Smith	318,495	(2)	(2)	41,829	13
9. Flannagan	360,679	(2)	(2)	56,528	16
Total	2,677,773	1,128,130			
Total	29,998,109			1,729,682	7
Average poll-tax district	307,668			22,175	7
Average non poll-tax district	306,674			128,162	42

AVERAGE PRIMARY VOTE—1940

	1940 population	Votes cast	Percent of population voting
13 computable districts	307,411	[43] 31,047	[10]
South Carolina	316,634	[44] 53,314	17
Texas	305,468	[47] 51,956	17

[1] 108 of 240 precincts (45 percent), the Montgomery Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala., May 9, 1940.
[2] No opponent.
[3] 178 of 248 precincts (78 percent), the Montgomery Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala., May 9, 1940.
[4] Complete—the Montgomery Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala., May 9, 1940.
[5] 266 of 277 precincts (96 percent), the Montgomery Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala., May 9, 1940.
[6] 269 of 277 precincts (97 percent), Mobile Register Mobile, Ala., May 9, 1940.
[7] 274 of 306 precincts (90 percent), Arkansas Democrat, Little Rock, Ark., Aug. 28, 1940.
[8] 178 of 277 precincts (78 percent), Arkansas Democrat, Little Rock, Ark., Aug. 14, 1940.
[9] 220 of 316 precincts (70 percent), Arkansas Democrat, Little Rock, Ark., Aug. 28, 1940.
[10] 310 of 311 precincts (99 percent), Arkansas Gazette, Little Rock, Ark., Aug. 14, 1940.
[11] Average for 5 districts.
[12] Lacking 1 precinct in 1 county in district of 18 (10 percent), Savannah Morning News, Savannah, Ga., Sept. 13, 1940.
[13] 20 counties, 20 reported, 5 complete, Savannah Morning News, Savannah, Ga., Sept. 13, 1940.
[14] 19 counties, 11 reported, 2 complete, Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Ga., Sept. 12, 1940.
[15] Average for 4 districts.
[16] 191 of 202 precincts (95 percent), Jackson Clarion Ledger, Jackson, Miss., Aug. 29, 1940.
[17] No poll tax required in South Carolina primaries.
[18] 197 of 199 precincts (99 percent), the News and Courier, Charleston, S. C., Aug. 29, 1940.
[19] 234 of 248 precincts (94 percent), the Charleston Evening Post, Charleston, S. C., Aug. 28, 1940.
[20] 312 of 327 precincts (95 percent), the Charleston Evening Post, Charleston, S. C., Aug. 28, 1940.
[21] 258 of 262 precincts (95 percent), Spartanburg Herald, Spartanburg, S. C., Aug. 29, 1940.
[22] Complete (100 percent), Spartanburg Herald, Spartanburg, S. C., Aug. 29, 1940.
[23] 1 precinct missing (100 percent), Spartanburg Herald, Spartanburg, S. C., Aug. 29, 1940.
[24] Republican candidate nominated by convention.
[25] 198 of 234 precincts (85 percent), Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., Aug. 2, 1940.
[26] Practically complete (estimated 95 percent), Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., Aug. 2, 1940.
[27] 238 of 261 precincts (91 percent), Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., Aug. 2, 1940.
[28] 11 counties, 11 reported, 8 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[29] 11 counties, 11 reported, 6 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[30] 8 counties, 8 reported, 5 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[31] 7 counties, 6 reported, 3 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[32] Harris County complete official. The Houston Chronicle, Houston, Tex., July 31, 1940.
[33] 15 counties, 14 reported, 5 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[34] 6 counties, 5 reported, 2 complete, Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex. July 29, 1940.
[35] 5 counties, 5 reported, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Fort Worth, Tex., July 29, 1940.
[36] 15 counties, 15 reported, 6 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[37] 19 counties, 18 reported, 12 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[38] 12 counties, 12 reported, 11 complete, Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex., July 31, 1940.
[39] 28 counties, 28 reported, 19 complete, Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex., July 31, 1940.
[40] 25 counties, 23 reported, 12 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[41] Bexar County complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[42] Average for 3 districts.
[43] Based on 11 districts in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee, where 84 percent of precincts reporting; Average of 26,479; hence, 100 percent estimated to equal 31,606; plus 2 districts in Alabama and Georgia reporting 100 percent and averaging 28,003; 2 districts in Georgia, 1 in Tennessee, and all in Texas excluded as noncomputable.
[44] Average for 14 computable districts.
[45] 4 districts, 96 percent of precincts reporting—average of 53,380; hence, 100 percent estimated to equal 55,600; plus 2 districts reporting 100 percent and averaging 48,742.
[46] No primary, candidate nominated by convention.
[47] Incomplete.

EXHIBIT 14.—*Congressional vote and percent of population voting in 1940 election, by non-poll-tax States*

State and successful candidate	District	1940 population	Votes cast for successful candidate	Percent of 1940 population	Total votes cast	Percent of 1940 population
Arizona:						
Murdock	(1)	499,261	99,424	20	139,784	28
California:						
Lea	1	306,986	103,547	33	111,306	36
Englebright	2	218,062	71,033	33	71,040	33
Buck	3	409,404	135,461	33	148,859	36
Rolph	4	313,190	75,369	24	138,634	44
Welch	5	321,346	119,122	37	124,365	39
Carter	6	356,509	131,584	37	137,032	38
Tolan	7	256,952	72,838	28	131,353	51
Anderson	8	416,212	148,180	35	153,536	37
Gearhart	9	358,101	99,700	28	99,764	28
Elliott	10	415,762	125,845	30	130,965	31
Hinshaw	11	384,969	170,504	44	177,306	46
Voorhis	12	348,129	99,494	29	155,421	44
Kramer	13	400,911	127,167	32	168,120	42
Ford, T. F.	14	302,511	73,137	24	113,802	38
Costello	15	334,229	94,435	28	168,155	50
Ford, L. M.	16	443,470	188,049	42	195,434	44
Geyer	17	279,113	75,109	27	114,763	41
Johnson	18	292,311	75,932	25	136,106	46
Sheppard	19	367,362	84,321	23	160,571	40
Izac	20	349,088	69,574	20	136,812	39
Colorado:						
Lewis	1	322,412	110,078	34	170,354	53
Hill	2	319,067	76,899	24	144,340	45
Chenoweth	3	308,950	70,842	23	136,111	44
Taylor	4	172,847	44,065	25	74,221	43
Connecticut:						
Kopplemann	1	450,189	109,880	24	202,870	45
Fitzgerald	2	269,312	63,021	23	120,220	45
Shanley	3	323,756	84,439	26	157,217	48
Downs	4	418,284	91,192	22	185,699	44
Smith	5	247,601	62,783	25	114,340	46
Maciora	(1)		407,898		782,593	
Delaware:						
Traynor	(1)	266,505	68,205	26	134,778	51
Florida:						
Peterson	1	476,820	88,158	18	88,164	18
Green	2	388,053	68,797	18	77,170	20
Sikes	3	306,264	36,562	12	36,570	12
Cannon	4	436,825	84,594	19	112,410	26
Hendricks	5	280,452	49,715	17	65,929	23
Idaho:						
White	1	224,516	62,107	28	100,106	44
Dworshak	2	300,357	60,804	23	131,530	44
Illinois:						
Mitchell	1	140,527	34,641	25	65,781	47
McKeough	2	612,641	155,688	25	302,625	49
Kelly	3	575,799	148,382	26	290,151	50
Beamer	4	223,304	74,977	34	96,536	43
Sabath	5	112,116	35,637	32	50,177	45
Maciejewski	6	641,719	187,360	29	333,646	52
Schuetz	7	914,053	229,161	25	449,954	49
Kocialkowski	8	123,743	40,074	32	51,706	41
Dewey	9	215,175	56,809	26	106,622	50
Paddock	10	625,359	199,418	32	325,246	52
Reed	11	385,207	128,645	33	199,226	52
Mason	12	298,072	90,744	30	149,682	50

[1] At large.

EXHIBIT 14.—*Congressional vote and percent of population voting in 1940 election, by non-poll-tax States*—Continued

State and successful candidate	District	1940 population	Votes cast for successful candidate	Percent of 1940 population	Total votes cast	Percent of 1940 population
Illinois—Con.						
Allen	13	188,433	65,698	35	97,201	52
Johnson	14	204,940	60,909	28	116,360	54
Chiperfield	15	217,334	65,639	30	116,409	53
Dirksen	16	278,682	79,780	28	137,347	49
Arends	17	176,337	56,712	32	92,814	53
Sumner	18	238,134	64,409	27	121,153	51
Wheat	19	288,001	75,953	27	159,624	53
Barnes	20	162,528	44,824	27	86,631	53
Howell	21	287,279	67,986	29	131,636	56
Schaefer	22	340,343	98,162	27	182,543	51
Arnold	23	243,130	64,072	26	125,593	52
Heidinger	24	171,396	49,731	29	92,781	53
Bishop	25	262,420	66,165	26	137,656	52
Day	(1)		2,050,466			
Stratton	(1)		2,030,006			
Indiana:						
Schulte	1	290,198	71,606	24	117,753	40
Hallleck	2	279,887	87,602	31	150,942	54
Grant	3	298,117	73,914	25	144,122	48
Gillie	4	288,662	80,260	28	138,416	48
Harness	5	267,263	78,691	29	143,891	54
Johnson	6	281,124	80,393	29	154,084	55
Landis	7	285,772	81,632	29	156,378	55
Boehne	8	305,344	87,141	29	156,102	51
Larrabee	9	272,343	71,624	26	140,851	52
Springer	10	289,196	80,725	28	152,708	53
Larrabee	11	286,711	79,059	28	152,044	53
Ludlow	12	260,092	70,954	27	153,128	55
Iowa:						
Martin	1	265,513	70,120	28	116,160	46
Jacobsen	2	321,511	75,774	24	145,072	45
Gwynne	3	268,042	69,425	24	109,134	40
Talle	4	250,752	66,691	27	118,249	47
LeCompte	5	268,900	66,940	25	125,658	47
Cunningham	6	313,157	70,707	23	135,235	43
Jensen	7	261,793	71,632	27	122,577	46
Gilchrist	8	284,021	64,687	23	111,284	39
Harrington	9	315,579	67,017	21	131,884	42
Kansas:						
Lambertson	1	264,680	64,766	24	106,141	40
Guyer	2	248,592	75,630	24	136,446	44
Winter	3	269,574	60,281	24	109,352	41
Rees	4	269,271	58,183	28	92,130	44
Houston	5	347,351	58,486	24	111,387	45
Carlson	6	251,805	69,627	28	114,329	45
Hope	7	260,965	75,349	28	117,867	44
Kentucky:						
Gregory	1	251,346	60,777	24	60,777	24
Vincent	2	254,347	69,905	27	69,905	27
O'Neal	3	385,392	96,253	25	160,306	41
Creal	4	280,669	53,561	20	95,008	34
Spence	5	225,426	51,054	23	86,933	38
Chapman	6	260,438	74,463	22	123,163	36
May	7	288,766	44,185	15	77,759	27
Bates	8	247,613	61,881	20	106,617	35
Robsion	9	463,650	69,415	17	112,428	27
Louisiana:						
Hébert	1	280,600	58,234	21	58,234	21
Boggs	2	327,645	56,026	17	56,026	17
Domengeaux	3	269,762	27,681	10	41,014	15
Brooks	4	318,513	33,704	11	35,713	11
Mills	5	325,374	33,462	10	33,462	10
Sanders	6	353,295	41,173	12	41,173	12
Plauché	7	308,526	28,518	11	28,518	11
Allen	8	340,160	28,904	12	28,904	12
Maine:						
Oliver	1	290,336	55,569	19	87,521	30
Smith	2	276,895	57,152	21	88,486	32
Fellows	3	280,166	46,732	17	70,666	25
Maryland:						
Ward	1	195,427	36,057	19	66,871	34
Cole	2	334,068	113,495	21	173,718	52
D'Alesandro	3	306,226	38,540	12	62,693	20
Meyer	4	276,856	50,120	18	88,564	32
Sasscer	5	288,820	58,418	20	82,276	28
Byron	6	319,016	60,037	19	112,296	35
Massachusetts						
Treadway	1	272,454	72,709	27	137,387	50
Clason	2	291,886	76,373	26	120,101	41
Casey	3	294,400	72,330	25	133,519	45
Holmes	4	291,547	70,542	24	132,660	45
Rogers	5	337,619	120,435	35	158,028	47
Bates	6	356,253	88,834	24	124,048	48
Connery	7	309,642	90,666	29	144,561	47
Henley	8	291,837	71,127	24	128,345	44
Eliot	9	313,337	81,523	26	156,446	50
Tinkham	10	286,595	78,029	27	132,124	46
Flaherty	11	212,644	68,041	32	81,220	38
McCormack	12	285,502	97,388	33	124,580	42
Wigglesworth	13	287,356	92,651	32	142,448	49
Martin	14	294,764	65,780	23	121,621	42
Gifford	15	260,392	73,358	28	126,940	44
Michigan:						
Tenerowicz	1	352,977	87,451	25	109,516	31
Michener	2	283,648	72,235	25	116,027	40
Shafer	3	283,352	74,614	26	120,137	42
Hoffman	4	242,239	65,666	27	108,191	44
Jonkman	5	305,988	63,240	21	121,412	39

EXHIBIT 14.—*Congressional vote and percent of population voting in 1940 election, by non-poll-tax States*—Continued

State and successful candidate	District	1940 population	Votes cast for successful candidate	Percent of 1940 population	Total votes cast	Percent of 1940 population
Michigan—Con.						
Blackney	6	379,423	77,346	20	151,409	40
Wolcott	7	314,368	73,925	23	113,408	36
Crawford	8	294,842	68,265	23	111,634	38
Engel	9	296,861	82,343	28	92,674	31
Woodruff	10	218,768	52,685	24	85,103	39
Bradley	11	224,551	48,187	21	94,945	42
Hook	12	200,262	47,429	24	92,491	46
O'Brien	13	357,777	68,983	19	122,744	34
Rabaut	14	586,457	210,463	21	136,373	35
Dingell	15	382,309	85,239	22	137,722	36
Lesinski	16	371,666	73,956	20	125,756	34
Dondero	17	419,607	82,805	20	151,310	36
Minnesota:						
Andresen	1	318,154	88,814	28	136,993	43
O'Hara	2	305,859	66,610	22	135,817	44
Gale	3	321,987	69,854	20	146,885	46
Maas	4	309,935	68,526	22	116,473	37
Youngdahl	5	321,859	79,491	25	152,500	47
Knutson	6	334,781	84,023	25	136,527	41
Anderson	7	305,139	65,958	22	130,110	43
Pittenger	8	291,041	74,521	26	137,618	47
Bueckler	9	263,845	48,999	17	112,580	40
Missouri:						
Bonnjue	1	232,484	62,461	27	123,584	53
Nelson	2	282,964	77,922	27	144,720	51
Duncan	3	291,744	77,424	26	145,181	50
Bell	4	243,843	72,331	29	120,524	49
Shannon	5	234,285	63,202	27	116,611	50
Bennett	6	288,849	78,746	27	146,648	51
Short	7	313,435	86,547	28	145,891	47
Williams	8	276,634	64,263	23	125,533	45
Cannon	9	284,757	80,591	28	108,108	38
Zimmerman	10	315,691	69,859	22	121,614	39
Sullivan	11	327,287	85,722	26	153,832	47
Ploeser	12	503,738	127,006	25	235,687	47
Cochran	13	299,253	82,447	32	127,699	43
Montana:						
Rankin	1	235,899	56,616	24	168,668	44
O'Connor	2	323,597	83,101	26	134,007	41
Nebraska:						
Copeland	1	260,456	64,431	25	115,955	45
McLaughlin	2	269,973	68,760	25	121,429	45
Stefan	3	264,118	60,561	23	113,275	43
Curtis	4	256,266	66,966	26	116,084	45
Coffee	5	261,076	63,025	24	108,573	42
Nevada:						
Scrugham	(1)	110,247	32,714	30	50,746	46
New Hampshire:						
Jenks	1	244,491	57,982	24	113,416	46
Stearns	2	247,033	55,530	22	104,790	42
New Jersey:						
Wolverton	1	370,229	97,547	26	175,912	47
Wene	2	226,169	60,392	27	115,809	51
Sutphin	3	286,838	76,048	26	146,967	51
Powers	4	294,331	69,834	24	124,870	42
Eaton	5	329,305	82,840	25	148,682	45
McLean	6	328,344	78,361	24	142,433	43
Thomas	7	283,041	82,287	29	127,296	45
Canfield	8	305,875	72,197	23	123,180	40
Osmers	9	292,576	91,352	31	145,670	50
Hartley	10	292,947	64,669	22	113,821	39
Vreeland	11	290,529	61,666	21	110,333	38
Kean	12	309,482	67,996	22	126,665	41
Norton	13	271,807	92,356	34	131,654	48
Hart	14	278,408	84,538	30	129,494	46
New Mexico:						
Anderson	(1)	531,818	106,972	20	182,057	34
New York:						
Hall, L. W	1	348,971	276,873	33	429,326	51
Barry	2	317,553	216,309	26	469,710	50
Pfeiffer, J. L	3	177,667	42,884	24	60,723	34
Cullen	4	295,310	36,595	18	65,838	32
Heffernan	5	260,159	63,295	24	114,723	44
Somers	6	511,317	130,391	25	228,130	44
Delaney	7	183,725	50,189	27	68,954	37
O'Toole	8	341,210	217,599	24	383,035	42
Keogh	9	473,557	92,559	20	160,460	34
Celler	10	210,553	57,286	27	80,208	38
O'Leary	11	227,020	46,616	20	94,440	42
Dickstein	12	76,307	17,176	24	33,846	48
Capozzoli	13	92,148	16,534	19	29,235	31
Edelstein	14	113,520	26,455	23	46,498	41
Kennedy, Michael J	15	112,491	26,314	23	44,095	39
Pheiffer, W. F	16	148,476	31,020	21	63,731	43
Simpson	17	237,564	53,316	22	104,280	43
Kennedy, Martin J	18	141,997	31,151	22	59,075	42
Bloom	19	294,046	71,018	24	113,048	38
Marcantonio	20	129,881	25,254	19	40,414	31
Gavagan	21	424,410	108,139	25	170,992	40
Lynch	22	207,253	44,296	21	73,759	36
Buckley	23	762,668	190,396	24	337,284	44
Fitzpatrick	24	742,687	161,577	21	338,985	46
Gamble	25	402,065	125,412	31	196,043	49
Fish	26	277,240	68,715	25	132,525	48
Rockefeller	27	415,120	65,618	30	113,228	52

EXHIBIT 14.—*Congressional vote and percent of population voting in 1940 election, by non-poll-tax States*—Continued

State and successful candidate	District	1940 population	Votes cast for successful candidate	Percent of 1940 population	Total votes cast	Percent of 1940 population
New York—Con.						
Byrne	28	257,392	89,592	35	155,070	60
Cluett	29	234,124	82,328	35	129,224	55
Crowther	30	234,421	66,159	28	120,683	52
Kilburn	31	223,568	58,727	26	94,034	42
Culkin	32	217,691	71,782	33	104,370	48
Douglas	33	263,165	72,412	27	128,286	49
Hall, E. C	34	280,274	93,966	33	137,580	48
Hancock	35	328,776	97,688	30	171,926	52
Taber	36	215,675	64,597	30	108,259	50
Cole	37	241,026	78,630	32	118,060	49
O'Brien	38	339,667	92,866	27	179,063	53
Wadsworth	39	249,708	73,346	30	121,449	50
Andrews	40	433,691	119,972	27	196,440	45
Belter	41	265,578	62,843	24	120,178	45
Schwert	42	250,818	64,270	26	109,343	41
Reed	43	235,913	67,520	29	108,500	45
Merritt	(1)					
Robinson	(1)					
North Carolina:						
Bonner	1	239,040	36,722	15	39,573	16
Kerr	2	265,297	41,217	14	41,217	14
Barden	3	251,370	33,760	13	45,008	18
Cooley	4	358,573	57,610	16	72,536	20
Folger	5	323,217	53,778	17	66,659	21
Bradley	6	314,659	55,549	18	70,808	22
Sheridan	7	316,296	41,663	13	48,831	15
Burgin	8	340,457	57,879	17	86,111	25
Doughton	9	310,225	60,875	20	89,162	29
Bulwinkle	10	481,132	87,156	18	124,892	26
Weaver	11	341,385	75,763	22	109,867	
North Dakota:						
Burdick	(1)	641,935			430,285	
Robertson	(1)		111,125			
Ohio:						
Bender	1	308,578	84,622	27	146,004	47
Young	2	313,409	77,769	25	138,179	44
Elston	3	439,058	103,291	23	196,293	45
Hess	4	245,130	65,534	27	113,209	46
Holbrook	5	163,561	48,040	29	79,113	48
Jones	6	207,229	52,769	25	101,026	49
Clevenger	7	302,686	93,415	28	143,682	47
Davis	8	183,187	49,218	27	93,823	51
Brown	9	368,693	86,950	23	158,883	43
Smith	10	180,482	48,217	27	81,915	45
Claypool	11	181,117	43,548	24	80,946	45
Vorys	12	388,712	91,767	23	178,882	46
Baumhart	13	219,310	62,442	28	102,716	47
Harter	14	531,489	121,637	23	231,580	44
Secrest	15	199,609	57,359	29	97,592	49
Thom	16	372,099	92,409	25	164,698	44
McGregor	17	254,315	69,102	27	125,445	49
Imhoff	18	321,626	79,718	25	146,384	45
Kirwan	19	441,240	122,075	28	197,091	45
Sweeney	20	282,616	72,395	25	107,000	38
Crosser	21	305,434	79,602	26	93,200	30
Bolton	22	668,650	165,322	24	291,595	42
Bendtr	(1)					
Young	(1)					
Oklahoma:						
Disney	1	416,863	93,366	22	159,141	36
Nichols	2	239,001	80,551	33	80,881	34
Cartwright	3	320,322	68,344	21	86,489	27
Boren	4	324,641	69,040	21	97,686	30
Monroney	5	397,385	93,457	23	129,148	32
Johnson	6	342,241	52,338	22	74,681	31
Massingale	7	180,547	39,884	21	56,970	30
Rizley	8	206,434	48,737	24	90,545	44
Rogers	(1)					
Oregon:						
Mott	1	523,594	145,675	28	213,143	41
Pierce	2	210,991	44,332	21	79,705	38
Angell	3	355,699	84,275	24	169,654	48
Pennsylvania:						
Sacks	1	252,131	64,596	26	104,791	42
McGranery	2	239,193	62,844	26	103,138	43
Bradley	3	272,577	77,436	28	122,636	45
Sheridan	4	273,964	74,488	27	118,117	43
Smith	5	296,060	76,724	26	137,499	46
Myers	6	293,854	82,550	28	135,092	46
Scott	7	304,555	59,416	20	155,886	51
Wolfenden	8	310,756	70,601	23	138,219	54
Gerlach	9	285,248	55,919	20	106,730	37
Kinzer	10	348,130	72,843	21	126,274	36
Bolund	11	301,243	65,368	22	124,199	41
Flannery	12	441,518	101,854	23	170,159	40
Fenton	13	355,218	68,501	19	139,993	39
Moser	14	241,884	48,140	20	85,941	35
Rutherford	15	212,979	54,981	26	91,085	43
Rich	16	244,920	61,167	25	101,159	41
Ditter	17	289,247	75,006	26	120,530	42
Simpson	18	215,352	46,595	22	80,925	38
Kunkel	19	324,857	74,420	23	136,726	42
Jarrett	20	286,430	64,188	22	110,200	38
Walter	21	260,496	82,530	32	93,520	36
Haines	22	286,835	60,848	21	110,985	39
Van Zandt	23	285,060	57,627	20	101,296	35
Snyder	24	285,956	54,631	19	96,474	34

[1] At large.

EXHIBIT 14.—*Congressional vote and percent of population voting in 1940 election, by non-poll-tax States*—Continued

State and successful candidate	District	1940 population	Votes cast for successful candidate	Percent of 1940 population	Total votes cast	Percent of 1940 population
Pennsylvania—Continued						
Faddis	25	255,523	58,442	23	95,801	37
Graham	26	341,221	64,669	19	126,942	37
Tibbott	27	428,490	75,243	17	145,751	34
Kelley	28	363,411	88,772	19	193,998	35
Rodgers	29	252,353	80,147	20	92,441	36
Scanlon	30	276,948	62,450	22	124,549	45
Weiss	31	318,884	76,819	24	137,854	43
Eberharter	32	266,706	62,121	30	90,553	44
Mcardle	33	287,977	70,824	25	128,725	45
Wright	34	322,134	75,004	23	139,341	43
Rhode Island:						
Forand	1	338,883	87,327	26	151,844	45
Fogarty	2	374,465	87,253	23	162,179	43
South Dakota:						
Mundt	1	485,529	135,406	28	227,373	47
Case	2	157,132	47,051	30	71,178	45
Utah:						
Granger	1	256,388	62,654	24	109,675	43
Robinson	2	293,925	80,874	29	137,206	46
Vermont:						
Plumley	(1)	359,231	80,637	25	140,477	39
Washington:						
Magnuson	1	412,689	113,988	28	185,098	45
Jackson	2	299,757	66,314	25	115,523	43
Smith	3	258,301	60,529	23	109,459	42
Hill	4	244,908	58,493	24	98,496	40
Leavy	5	274,754	67,582	24	121,849	44
Coffee	6	275,782	71,536	26	113,870	41
West Virginia:						
Ramsay	1	251,333	72,717	29	136,632	49
Randolph	2	299,167	77,045	26	133,956	45
Edmiston	3	316,917	79,441	25	141,251	45
Johnson	4	323,202	82,679	26	157,470	49
Kee	5	315,725	81,903	27	130,126	42
Smith	6	378,630	105,927	28	171,689	45
Wisconsin:						
Bolles	1	293,974	69,276	23	124,122	42
Sauthoff	2	319,069	60,481	19	138,842	43
Stevenson	3	290,719	54,457	19	118,399	40
Wasielewski	4	375,418	57,381	15	161,125	43
Thill	5	391,467	73,728	19	166,159	42
Keefe	6	284,114	66,821	23	116,371	41
Murray	7	295,305	58,696	20	113,749	39
Johns	8	329,815	49,008	15	111,000	33
Hull	9	294,618	61,009	21	115,609	39
Gehrmann	10	263,088	50,776	19	106,026	40
Wyoming:						
McIntyre	(1)	250,742	57,030	23	106,883	43

[1] At large.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, I intend to conclude my remarks for this evening with this summary statement. I sought in this part of my speech to show, first, that I think when we come to interpret any section of the Constitution, including article I, section 2, we must remember that we have to consider the Constitution in its entirety, and we have to look to make certain whether there are other restrictions within the Constitution that bear upon article I, section 2.

In the course of my remarks tomorrow I shall take the position and argue the point that article I, section 2, must be read in light of other restrictions which will be found in the Constitution, particularly in connection with amendments 14 and 15.

Second, I sought to point out in my remarks tonight that we must decide, when we are considering a constitutional question, whether or not we are going to make a liberal, dynamic approach to the Constitution, whether we are going to look upon it as an instrument subject to adjustment of the changing trends of social conditions, or whether we are going to look upon it simply in its literal sense as the product of a dead historic hand.

Next, Mr. President, I sought in my remarks to point out that at the time the Constitution was written the trend, the objective, the point of view of the Constitution fathers was to work in the direction of a national universal suffrage, and instead of imposing further restrictions on the right of suffrage, the result of the Constitutional Convention was to remove theretofore existing restrictions, and it was not until some years later that there was reimposed upon the right of suffrage in this country the poll tax as a limitation upon suffrage itself. Furthermore, that the tax and the property restrictions on suffrage which existed at the time the Constitutional Convention was in session were in the process of being lifted by the States that were parties to the Constitutional Convention.

Lastly, Mr. President, I have sought to point out in these remarks that we cannot escape the fact that the poll tax is an effective economic barrier to a free franchise, and it does, in fact, have the effect of disfranchising people who, under the Constitution, should be recognized as free citizens. It does have the effect of having Members of Congress elected to this body by an exceeding small percentage of the adults of their States in contrast with the much higher percentage of voters who go to the polls in poll-tax-free States.

Tomorrow, in the course of my remarks, Mr. President, I shall proceed to discuss some of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court previously cited and discussed by my good friends on the opposition side of this issue, but I shall endeavor to point out that I think that in many respects the decisions are not subject to the application my good friends have given to them.

With that statement I conclude for the evening.

RECESS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, may I ask to what hour the unanimous-consent agreement provided that we should recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in my motion I was about to state the hour to which the recess would be taken.

We have now, as I understand, concluded the business of today's session, so I now move that the Senate, under the order previously entered, take a recess until tomorrow at 1 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 4, 1948, at 1 o'clock p. m.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 28, 1948)

The Senate met at 1 o'clock p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou gracious Benefactor, who art ever making us the beneficiaries of Thy bountiful providence, we rejoice in the glad assurance that Thou wilt not withhold from us anything that is needful if we walk uprightly and that where Thou dost guide Thou wilt provide.

We pray that this assurance of Thy goodness may kindle within our hearts a more vivid sense of social responsibility. Help us to understand that the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" must be answered conclusively in the affirmative.

Fill us with a longing to minister unto all who are finding the struggle of life so difficult. May we seek to bring about a more ethical and equitable distribution of the blessings of life.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 3, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 737)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control of the District of Columbia for the period January 1 to June 30, 1948, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the East Twenty-fifth Assembly District of the Independent Progressive Party of California, San Francisco, Calif., signed by J. Canterbury, chairman, praying for the enactment of legislation providing price controls, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by religious, labor, and civic leaders at Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the prompt enactment of civil-rights legislation; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by religious, labor, and civic leaders at Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the arrest of Communist Party leaders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADEQUATE HOUSING FOR WORLD WAR II VETERANS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Catholic War Veterans, Inc., an outstanding group of patriotic citizens, and endorsed by the Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, in annual convention at Hagerstown, Md., May 7 to 9, 1948. The resolution emphasizes the need of adequate living facilities for veterans of World War II.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS, INC., ENACTMENT OF FEDERAL HOUSING AID BILL

Whereas the most crying need of World War II veterans of today is that of adequate living facilities; and

Whereas a conservative estimate yields a figure of only 710,000 new dwelling units slated for completion this year, but with over 2,000,000 American families in need of adequate housing it is evident that, at present construction rate, several years will be required for construction to come abreast of present needs unless direct Government actions are taken; and

Whereas the major part of the 700,000 dwelling units now under construction are designed for sale at prices not within the reach of the vast majority of veterans today; and

Whereas the National Department of Catholic War Veterans, Inc., has gone on record endorsing passing of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill and has petitioned the aid of the various State departments in obtaining passage of that legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of Maryland implement the program of the national department by going on record as favoring direct Government aid on the Federal, State, and municipal levels in the solution of this pressing crisis, Federal action taking the form of congressional enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill or some similar piece of legislation, with State and municipal action consisting of the appointment needs of veterans in Maryland and Baltimore with the view in mind of rendering complete data to the Federal Government so as to facilitate the carrying out of the provisions of whatever Federal legislation may be enacted; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Senators, and Representatives from Maryland's six districts, the Governor of Maryland, and the mayor of Baltimore City.

THOMAS M. BAILEY,
Department Commander.
GEORGE W. BLUM,
Department Adjutant.

The above resolution endorsed by the Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, department convention assembled in Hagerstown, Md., May 7–9, 1948.

JAMES P. AUBREY, Sr.,
Department Commander, Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, Takoma Park, Md.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Acting Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 2927, to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE POLL TAX

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate to state what the parliamentary situation is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In response to the inquiry, the Chair will state that the pending question is on the appeal of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] from the decision of the Chair holding that the cloture motion on the motion to take up House bill 29 was not in order. Under the order of the Senate of yesterday, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for an announcement?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPORT AND CONSIDERATION OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, subsequent to the conclusion of the business of the Senate today, any committee now considering proposed legislation recommended in the recent message of the President to the Congress be authorized to report a bill thereon; that any such bill may be deemed to have been read twice and to have gone over one legislative day, and that a motion on tomorrow to proceed to its consideration may be in order.

I ask further unanimous consent that, subsequent to the conclusion of the day's business, the Secretary be authorized to receive a message from the House, that any bill received therefrom shall be deemed to have been read twice, and that likewise a motion on tomorrow to proceed to its consideration shall be in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska state the request again?

Mr. WHERRY. All we are asking is unanimous consent that any bill reported subsequent to the recess or adjournment following today's session shall be considered as having been reported for the calendar so that we may proceed to take it up tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO NIGHT SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield further, I wish to announce to the Members of the Senate that there will not be a night session tonight. Already there has been released by the chairman of the Policy Committee the reasons for not having a night session, and also, I think, a statement as to what can be expected so far as our program for tomorrow is concerned. Before a motion to recess or adjourn is made today I shall have an additional statement to make to the Members of the Senate, but at this time I think all that is necessary is to say that when the Senate concludes its work today there will be a recess or adjournment, and it is not contemplated that there will be a night session.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the appeal of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] from the decision of the Chair holding that the cloture motion on the motion to take up House bill 29 was not in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on completing my remarks yesterday——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion?

Mr. MORSE. I was just about to announce that I shall find it necessary to decline to yield for any purpose until I complete my remarks—and I say this with regret to my good friend the Senator from Connecticut, as I am sure he understands. As I said last night during the course of my formal remarks on the pending subject, I shall not yield for any purpose, for two reasons: First, because I think it of importance that the Republican side of the aisle make its statement in the RECORD with continuity as to its position on the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax legislation. Second, as I said last night, we have no desire on this side of the aisle, and certainly the present speaker has no desire, to aid or abet in any way prolonged debate by way of what is commonly known as a filibuster. Nevertheless, for the RECORD and for future reference I think it important at this time that a statement, of unbroken continuity, be placed in the RECORD, setting forth the position of the proponents of the anti-poll-tax bill as to its constitutionality and as to its merits from the standpoint of being sound civil-rights legislation.

Further by way of recapitulation, Mr. President, I think it is important that once again I call the attention of the American people to what I think is the realistic parliamentary fact which confronts us in this special session of Congress. As I said in my remarks last night, and I repeat it today, I think it has been clearly demonstrated in this special session of Congress that there is no chance of passing any anti-poll-tax legislation, and the reason why there is no chance of doing that is the obvious fact that we are confronted with a concerted movement on the part of a group of Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle to use, to the maximum extent the rules permit, their parliamentary privileges in the Senate.

The American people should thoroughly understand that when a group of Senators—5, 6, 10, 11, or 12—make up their minds to prevent the passage of legislation, the archaic rules of the Senate give them the power to succeed in their attempt. So, in my judgment, there is no chance of passing any civil-rights legislation at this special session of Congress, be it anti-poll-tax legislation, FEPC legislation, antilynch legislation, or any other section of the President's civil-rights program, so long as there is the clear, obvious, and announced determination on the part of leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle, representing those who have the power in their hands, to prevent the passage of any civil-rights legislation by the exercise of their full parliamentary rights. So long as the Democrats take that position, we cannot break a filibuster in this special session of Congress. We cannot break it because time does not permit. We cannot break it because physically it is impossible to break it due to the fact that a small group of Senators, resting between their separate speeches, can wear down the majority, because the majority has to be on hand for quorum calls and for sudden votes which may be requested.

Therefore, Mr. President, as I said about 2 years ago in an article which I published in Collier's magazine entitled "D-day on Capitol Hill," I think there is no chance at all of eliminating what I consider to be the filibuster evil under the rules of the United States Senate, unless at the beginning of a regular session of Congress—and I proposed it in the article—the majority party in the Senate makes up its mind to amend rule XXII of the Senate rules.

As I pointed out in that article, the American people should understand that under rule XXII, which refers to the filing of a cloture petition on a measure, the petition is not applicable to motions, such as the motion to take up the anti-poll-tax legislation which was pending before the Senate prior to the appeal that was taken from the ruling of the Chair on cloture.

The Presiding Officer of this body, in what I am sure will be recognized in the years ahead as a historic ruling in the Senate the other day—and a statesmanlike ruling it was, too—pointed out to the Senate that the fundamental issue before us is the problem of amending rule XXII.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of my remarks at this point the article I published some 2 years ago in Collier's magazine, discussing that very problem, and pointing out then that what we should do in the Senate of the United States is to proceed to amend the rule at the beginning of a regular session. I said we should do so the first day of a regular session, and subsequent to the writing of the article, I submitted in this body an antifilibuster resolution by which I sought to accomplish the purpose which I think we must accomplish, namely, amend rule XXII, so that a cloture petition can be filed on any question pending before the Senate, such as a motion to take up a bill, or a motion to approve the Journal, or any other type of motion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

D-DAY ON CAPITOL HILL

(By WAYNE L. MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon)

On the floor of the Senate a small band of willful men had been holding up Senate action on a bill to promote equal employment opportunity for all Americans, regardless of race, religion, or color. A clear-cut majority of the Senate favored the principles of the bill. President Truman, on behalf of the Democrats, had asked for the legislation. The Republican Party platform of 1944 had pledged itself to the principles of the measure. Nevertheless, a group of southern Democrats had banded together to talk the bill to death. Hearing it, a young veteran burst out to me:

"But, Senator, it's dictatorship."

The air in the Senate was fervid with oratory. Senator WALLACE WHITE, of Maine, the Republican leader, defended the filibuster, although not a party to it, by stating that: "There may be times and circumstances in which minorities can in one way alone successfully resist the power of a temporary majority."

My veteran friend was bewildered. "If the Senate's rules allow a minority to control it," he asked, "where's democracy in Congress?" And if we don't have democracy in Congress, how can we preserve democracy in the United States?

Millions of people are asking these same questions. Not only because they have witnessed the disgraceful spectacle of filibustering in the Senate, but also because in the House of Representatives they have seen the principle of majority rule stifled by the small but powerful Rules Committee.

It is common knowledge that 7 members of this 12-man committee wield what amounts to dictatorial power over the entire House. These men have time and time again prevented important measures from being properly considered in debate by the House as a whole, or even from reaching the House floor.

The theory behind the Rules Committee is that it should act as a traffic director on the legislative highway. In actual fact, the committee has become an obstruction to orderly traffic. Like feudal barons who levied a toll upon those who used their roads, the committee often allows bills to come before the House only on the condition that certain amendments be written into them. It frequently usurps the functions of the regular legislative committees by conducting hearings on bills that already have been carefully studied by the proper legislative committee and not confining itself, as it should, to questions of procedure.

UNFAIR CONTROL OF LEGISLATION

There have been notable occasions when the Rules Committee, in effect, has originated legislation, although it was never contemplated that it should exercise this privilege. Recently, it will be recalled, the House Labor Committee approved the kind of bill it thought would contribute to labor peace. But a majority of the Rules Committee favored the Case bill, which the legislative committee had rejected. So it ruled that the Case bill be considered by the House rather than the Labor Committee's bill.

The job of the Rules Committee is to report to the House, in conjunction with a bill, a resolution setting the terms of debate upon the measure. Often the committee blocks the legislative road completely by failing to give a bill the right of way to the House floor under any rule of debate. Sometimes the committee works its will upon the entire House membership by imposing "gag rules" that restrict the time allowed for debate and the circumstances under which amendments may be offered.

There is no hope for government by the majority in Congress until the rules are thoroughly overhauled to free the House and the Senate from the legislative tyranny of a willful minority in either branch. These two infections of the body politic—the powers of the Rules Committee and the filibuster—are sources of intolerance and reaction. The Rules Committee must be assigned its original role of traffic director for House bills, and the Senate must adopt rules empowering a majority to end a filibuster.

It must be made clear to the voters that their substantive rights in the passage of all sound legislation needed in the interests of the general welfare cannot be separated from their procedural rights in attaining passage of such legislation. The people must be made to realize that the archaic rules of Congress permit self-seeking minority blocs to defeat legislation the people want without letting it come to a vote.

Most writers dip their pens in despair when they attempt to make suggestions for remedying these two evils. They point out that any resolution to reform the House Rules Committee would be referred to that committee itself—which group could be expected to protect its dictatorship by quietly filing the proposal.

They call attention to the fact that the Rules of the Senate have been carefully devised to protect the filibuster. A third plus one of the Senators can now prevent cloture—put a limit on the length of time a Senator may talk—thereby allowing a filibuster to continue until the legislation against which it is directed has been withdrawn or emasculated. Thus, most critics say it is almost hopeless to propose a resolution to eliminate the filibuster because the proposal itself would be subject to the filibuster technique.

The Senate has a Rules Committee, too. Although it does not have the sweeping powers possessed by the House Rules Committee, it does have jurisdiction over any proposal to change the rules and procedures of the Senate. Judging from the past, this committee could be counted upon to bury alive any proposal referred to it which seeks to reform the procedures of the Senate in the interest of majority rule.

EXAMPLE IN SELF-DEFENSE

A good example of the way the Rules Committees of both Houses protect what they believe to be their vested interests is the action which they took in passing upon the resolution setting up the La Follette-Monroney committee to make recommendations for the reorganization of Congress.

Since early 1945 this committee has been making an exhaustive study of various proposals for the reorganization of Congress, and it recently submitted a splendid report on the subject.

However, although the report presents sound proposals for reorganizing most other congressional committees, it makes no recommendations whatsoever in regard to the House Rules Committee, and says nothing about the colossal waste of congressional time occasioned by the filibuster. The omissions are startling, but no fault of the La Follette-Monroney committee.

The resolution that set it up was rewritten by Senate and House Rules Committees specifically to prohibit the special committee from making "any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, and/or precedents of either House."

But the problem is not as hopeless as the experts seem to think it is, provided enough Members of the Congress have the will to make the fight. The situation calls for a two-front attack in both Houses of Congress. The time to attack is on the first day of the new Congress next January.

On the first day of a new Congress the House adopts the rules that will guide it for the next 2 years. Usually the rules of the last Congress are accepted without change, by a routine motion. But that need not be the case. During that brief period on the opening day between the time that the Speaker of the House opens the session of the new Congress and the time when the House passes a motion adopting the rules of its previous session with whatever changes it may wish to authorize, the Rules Committee is temporarily stripped of power.

Hence it is at this time that the proponents of majority rule must strike their blows against the dictatorship of the committee. They must be prepared to offer at precisely the right moment an amendment to the rules depriving the committee of its broad powers over legislation, limiting it to the task of directing legislative traffic on the House floor.

This proposal would become pending business of the House, open to full debate on the floor and not subject to reference to the Rules Committee. The changes would become effective if approved by a majority of the House.

If the majority of the Members of the new Congress elected next November really want to establish majority rule in the House and be freed from the dictatorial domination of the Rules Committee, let them stand up and be counted on the opening day of the new session.

A similar fight for democracy should be waged in the Senate on the first day of the next session of Congress. On that day all Senators who believe in the establishment of majority rule in the Senate should support a resolution aimed at preventing any future filibusters. By a majority vote such a resolution can be made the subject of Senate business and disposed of without reference to committee. There is little doubt, of course, that the introduction of such a resolution will be vigorously opposed by the defenders of the filibuster. The sponsors of Senate rule by the minority already have made themselves clear. During the recent FEPC filibuster, Democratic Senator Tydings, of Maryland, stated: "The rule of the majority. The rule of votes. Majority to Hades * * * Let us not fool ourselves with the silly thought that majorities are always right."

Democratic Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, rejected the idea of "a pure democracy, where every man's vote would be counted on every issue," and then later referred to the filibuster as a "bulwark against oppression by a mere popular majority."

WILL USE OBSTRUCTIVE TACTICS

It is clear that these Senators will wage a last-ditch fight against antifilibuster legislation with their customary weapon, the filibuster. However, a filibuster can be defeated. The recent FEPC filibuster could have been broken if a serious attempt to do so had been made by the Democratic Senators.

At that time the Democratic majority in the Senate, supported by many Republicans, recessed the Senate between 4 and 6 o'clock each afternoon during the filibuster, and on Friday afternoon recessed until each following Monday at noon. The Democratic administration made public statements in support of the FEPC, but took no effective action against the filibuster. No Democratic Senator and only a few Republican Senators were willing to join in my suggestion at that time to hold the Senate in continuous session for 24 hours a day for as many days, weeks and months as might be necessary to break it. An opportunity to establish, once and for all, majority rule in the Senate was passed up. It should not happen again.

Under the filibuster with all its insidious effrontery, the principle of rule by a majority is denied the people in the determination of congressional policy. I do not say that the majority is always right; but I do say that under our form of representative government a minority of Senators should not be permitted, by means of the filibuster, to block legislation favored by the majority. If the majority passes legislation which the people of the country do not favor, it must answer to the voters of the country for their action on that legislation, and the voters will then have a chance to send men to the Senate under instructions to repeal any legislation that the people do not want.

There is no way to smash a filibuster but to exhaust the filibusters by forcing them to speak day after day for 24 hours a day.

In a very real sense a filibuster is an endurance test. If a majority of the Senators really want to free themselves from the dictates of a willful minority they must be willing to take the time and undergo the physical strain that may be necessary to abolish once and for all the filibuster travesty.

If a majority of the present Senate really doesn't want to make that fight, then the voters should start finding it out in the 1946 elections. They should see to it that they send back to the Senate men pledged to make that fight. For my part, I am determined that the fight shall be made. But it cannot be made without the assistance of Senators in both parties. It will not be a pleasant fight. But with demonstrated public backing, it undoubtedly would end quickly.

FOR THE DIGNITY OF THE SENATE

When continuous sessions were proposed as the only effective method of beating the recent FEPC filibuster, the criticism was made that the procedure was beneath the dignity of Senators. That, of course, was pure nonsense. Nothing could be more undignified than the manner in which the Senate record is disgraced with long-winded ranting and meaningless talk during a filibuster. My proposal for continuous sessions of the Senate has been criticized as too dramatic. That argument is without weight. It is highly important that this issue be fully dramatized in order to impress upon the American people its vital importance to their legislative rights.

There are two reasons why it is important that the fight to pass an antifilibuster resolution should be waged at the beginning of the next session of Congress. First, it should be conducted concurrently with the fight to establish majority rule in the House in order that public attention may be focused on the same basic issue, namely, the need of democracy in both Houses of Congress.

Second, if the resolution is followed by a filibuster, it will not hold up any other legislation, since none will be ready for Senate action. It would be very difficult to break a filibuster near the close of a session, because the unity of action required on the part of Senators is difficult to obtain when so many of them are anxious to recess and go home. It is likewise difficult to wage a successful fight against a filibuster in the middle of a session, since the argument is always made that taking the time to defeat a filibuster blocks actions on other legislation vital to the welfare of the country.

One rule in political strategy, as in boxing, is never to telegraph your punches. But this fight involves more than political strategy. This is a fight to establish the people's rights to democratic procedures in their Congress, and it is important that the people themselves should become understanding participants. Everyone should know months ahead of time that January 7, 1947, or whatever day Congress reopens, will be D-day on Capitol Hill—Democracy Day for reasserting and reestablishing majority rule in the Congress of the United States; Duty Day for all Members of Congress to restore representative government to the legislative processes of Congress.

If majority rule is to characterize the procedures of Congress, the voters of this country must make that clear to congressional candidates in November. Either we are going to reestablish the principle of majority rule in our Congress or we are going to continue to drift into government by minority interests and bloc pressures. This is another test of liberalism versus reactionism.

It is important that the American people recognize that our form of government can protect their rights only so long as they keep it strong and effective. Representative government is not a machine that works automatically. It is but a set of rules and principles which the people by their own consent have decreed shall be binding upon their own conduct. These principles cannot work unless they are administered by men and women responsive to the will of the voters who elected them.

The people must be ever watchful against institutions—like the filibuster and powers of the House Rules Committee—which permit the perversion of free government by self-seeking men. If the people relax their vigilance, they may lose the fruits of democracy which promote the greatest good for the greatest number within the framework of our private-property economy.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the article, as I said again in my remarks last night and I want to repeat it today, we must make clear to the American people the relationship between the rules of the Senate and their substantive rights in connection with needed social legislation. In some way, somehow, we must enable every man and woman on the streets of America to understand that the rules of this body have a direct relationship to their liberties and freedoms. We must get them to understand that under rule XXII of this body such power is vested in a small group of men in the Senate of the United States—and it is always an ever-changing group—that five, six, seven, or eight, or more Senators who want to league themselves together can successfully block the passage of any piece of legislation they want to block. The only way we can ever remove this great danger to our national welfare is for a Republican majority in the Senate, come January 1949, to do what I suggested in the Collier's article we should have done in January 1947, namely, make up our mind to change rule XXII in such manner that a cloture petition can be filed on any pending question, be it a measure as now interpreted under rule XXII, or a motion affecting any other item of business.

Mr. President, I shall dwell on this point a while longer, because, as I said last night, I want the American people fully to understand why we are blocked in this special session of Congress in the passing of civil-rights legislation. We are blocked because, in my judgment, a group of Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle have, under the rules, the power to block the passage of such legislation. I have every reason to believe, as every other Member of the Senate has reason to believe, as the words in the RECORD spoken from the lips of one of their leaders at the special session already show, that they have served notice on the Senate of the United States that they intend to use the rules to the extent of their application in an endeavor to block the passage of civil-rights legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will not yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon has announced that he will not yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President in view of that parliamentary situation which confronts us, I repeat what I set out in the Collier's article, I repeat what I have said to Republican groups since the writing of that article, that come January 1949, we as a Republican majority in the Senate of the United States, must deliver the American people from the encroachment—which I consider the filibuster power in the Senate of the United States to be—on their rights, welfare, and interests.

I heard the Presiding Officer of this body—and I am sure he will not object to my saying so—in discussing the problem, point out with the crystal clearness that always characterizes his pronouncements, that it is not safe in time of great national crisis to have the rules of the Senate in such form that a small group of men can balk the passage of needed legislation to meet a great national crisis. I agree with the Presiding Officer of this body.

From this forum I remind the people of the country today, Mr. President, that the cloture petition rule in the first instance was found necessary because of the great crisis which then confronted the Nation. It goes back to the dark days of 1917 when the Senate of the United States was threatened to be tied up by a filibuster which endangered the very security of the Nation. The cloture rule was adopted to block that filibuster.

Subsequently thereto interpretation of rule XXII developed whereby the precedents have been well established, as the Presiding Officer pointed out the other day, that the word "measure" in rule XXII is not applicable to a motion, and, therefore, motions to approve the Journal or motions to take up an item of business are not subject to the application of a cloture petition.

I say, Mr. President, that we must change that rule, and we must use the record of this special session of Congress on the anti-poll-tax bill and the concerted drive on the part of the Democratic side of the aisle to block the passage of that bill as our exhibit A to the American people of the necessity of adopting a modification of rule XXII, so, as I pointed out in the Collier's article, cloture will be applicable even to a motion to approve the Journal.

Mr. President, I do not like to take a licking any more than anyone else does, but one is called upon sometimes to be realistic enough and honest enough to admit when he is licked. I am perfectly willing here and now to say that in my opinion the proponents of an anti-poll-tax bill in this special session of Congress are licked. I do not think there is any chance of getting through this special session of Congress an anti-poll-tax bill.

Some might say, "Why do you not try to amend rule XXII in this special session of Congress?" I think there are two very good reasons why that cannot be done. In the first place, the time limitation itself would prevent it, because we would be confronted with a filibuster on any proposal to amend rule XXII. I think that is perfectly obvious. We shall need to have a rather long bracket of time in which to beat such a filibuster, and time does not permit in the special session of Congress.

I think we should also be sufficiently realistic to say that we cannot imagine anything the Democrats would relish more than to have us stay here in a long drawn-out fight in an attempt to break a filibuster on a proposal to modify rule XXII, with a great, historic political compaign in the offing, because as a Republican Party we also have the great responsibility of making clear to the American people the importance of a Republican victory in November in the interests of our national welfare. As Republicans we have the responsibility of making clear to the American people that the irreconcilable conflict and controversy between the White House and the majority in the Congress must be brought to an end, and, I will add quickly, Mr. President, that the conflict between the White House and a large number of Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle must be brought to an end. It is not good for our Government. It is not safe, in my opinion, for sound representative government that this conflict between the Congress and the White House, which is the natural result of having the Congress of one political complexion and the White House of another, should longer continue. I think that this campaign is so important in making clear to the American people the importance of a Republican victory in November that I believe we should pass as quickly as we can on the vital issues facing the country relating to housing and inflation, matters which are bringing great suffering to the American people from the standpoint of the high cost of living, and then go into that campaign, assuring the American people that if they will give us a Republican President and a Republican Congress in November we will proceed immediately after the election to put into effect and practice the great progressive, forward-looking platform which my party adopted at Philadelphia.

Mr. President, I think we must be frank enough to say to the American people that we do not propose to be caught in a political trap, or in a parliamentary situation of prolonging the special session of Congress in a fight over a filibuster to modify rule XXII of the Senate, thereby putting ourselves out of the position in which we can give to the American people, as we should, all the help we can in reaching their decision as to how to vote in November.

I think it is important that the Republican Members of this body, at the earliest opportunity, go out into the country and carry these campaign issues to the American people in order to assure a Republican victory in 1948. That is why I say it is unrealistic to suggest that in a special session of Congress time permits the breaking of a filibuster over the proposal to modify rule XXII. Therefore I shall join with my Republican colleagues, now that we shall have demonstrated by the end of this day the impossibility of passing any anti-poll-tax legislation, in recognizing that fact and proceeding to other items on the agenda, giving the American people the assurance that, come January, we intend to make the first order of business the modification of rule XXII. At that time we will fight to a finish any filibuster that develops in the Senate in opposition to a modification of that rule.

Before I proceed to discuss some of the cases which have been stressed by my good friends of the opposition on the constitutional issue which is before us, I should like to invite attention to the fact that there are increasing indications that, through the judicial process, the true meaning of the Constitution, particularly the fifteenth amendment, is going to be put into application. I invite attention to an item which appears on the first page of this morning's New York Times. It reads as follows:

NEW MEXICO INDIANS GET RIGHT TO VOTE

SANTA FE, N. MEX., August 3.—A special three-judge Federal court ruled today that a New Mexico constitutional provision denying the right to vote to Indians was contrary to the United States Constitution.

The decision, in effect, gives the voting privilege in New Mexico to Indians.

The court ruled that New Mexico's law providing that "Indians not taxed" may not vote contravenes the fifteenth amendment of the United States Constitution, which assures a ballot for everyone of voting age regardless of race, creed, or color.

The far-reaching decision was made in a suit that had been filed in behalf of Miguel H. Trujillo, an Isleta Indian, living at the Laguna Pueblo. It charged that Eloy Garley, clerk of Valencia County, had refused to register Trujillo before the New Mexico primary election on June 8.

I have not read the decision, but I shall do so as soon as I can get it in my hands. I cite that case as applicable to the discussion before us only to the extent that it is another brick in the great judicial wall of protection of civil rights that is being built by the courts of America. It is another brick in that wall similar to some other decisions which I shall discuss later in my remarks. I am satisfied that legislation such as our anti-poll-tax legislation will be sustained by the United States Supreme Court when directly before the Court for decision.

That is one reason, among others, why I am opposed to the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] early in the special session that we lay aside the anti-poll-tax bill and substitute therefor a proposal for a constitutional amendment.

I am opposed to that approach because I am satisfied, in the first instance, that an anti-poll-tax bill is constitutional. If I did not think so as I said

last night, Mr. President, I would not be asking my colleagues to vote for it, because I take the position that a Senator who has any doubt as to the constitutionality of any piece of legislation which is called up for a vote in the Senate should, in keeping with his oath of office, vote against the legislation. But I submit that a study of the cases and a careful study of the Constitution will remove any doubt as to the constitutionality of anti-poll-tax legislation.

In the second place, I am opposed to the constitutional-amendment approach because I believe that it would result in years of frustration, years of delay in giving to 10,000,000 people in this country the franchise right to a free ballot, to which they are clearly entitled under the Constitution. I say that because I am satisfied that a terrific campaign, even in the Southern States which have abolished their own poll-tax legislation, would be carried on in order to prevent the ratification by the States of such a constitutional amendment. It does not take very many States to block it.

Therefore, I say that the challenge of statesmanship in regard to anti-poll-tax legislation is to pass the bill pending before the Senate and then give to the courts of the country, in accordance with our system of checks and balances, and in accordance with the judicial rights of our courts under the Constitution, an opportunity to render a decision squarely in point involving the interpretation of an anti-poll-tax bill itself. As I stated last night, up until this time the litigation which has reached the Supreme Court on this issue has been what we call mixed litigation, at best. It has involved mixed questions of interpretation of State law and State election problems in relation to article I, section 2, of the Constitution. There has not been before the Supreme Court a bill passed in accordance with the enabling clauses of various sections of the Constitution, in a case dealing directly with the poll-tax issue, which raises the question as to whether or not such a bill falls within the legislative power of Congress, for example, in carrying out its obligations under the fifteenth amendment.

Most of my constitutional argument today—but not all of it—will rest upon the powers and duties of Congress under the fifteenth amendment. I think it is interesting to note that in the New Mexico decision announced in the New York Times this morning, and apparently rendered yesterday, that court considers the fifteenth amendment as the basis for declaring null and void the constitutional provision of the State of New Mexico which sought to deny to Indians the right to vote because they did not pay taxes.

During the past few days there have been very learned discussions on the floor of the Senate as to whether the Congress has the authority under our Constitution to enact legislation such as that proposed in House bill 29. This is not a new area of discussion. The niceties of the legal questions have been argued in committees of Congress and on the floors of both Houses from time to time for about 6 years now. There have been able and eminent lawyers on both sides of the question. In the light of this fact, I think that every Member of Congress is going to have to be his own constitutional lawyer on this question. It is rather clear that the majority of both Houses have consistently believed—and so voted—that Congress has the constitutional authority to abolish the poll tax insofar as it affects the election of Federal officers.

Let me take just a moment to review the history of this legislation. In the Seventy-seventh Congress, the House passed House bill 1024, an anti-poll-tax bill similar to the measure now under discussion, by a vote of 252 to 84 on October 12, 1942. During the Seventy-eighth Congress, the House on May 25, 1943, again passed House bill 7, similar to House bill 29, and sent it over to the Senate by a vote of 265 to 110. Again, the House during the Seventy-ninth Congress resolved its doubts about the constitutionality of this proposed legislation and passed House bill 7, on June 12, 1945, by a vote of 251 to 105. The bill I now speak in behalf of was passed by the House, after full hearings before the Committee on Administration, by a vote of 290 to 112, on July 21, 1947.

Committees of the Senate have given full and careful consideration to the constitutionality of this proposed legislation, and have repeatedly reported it to the Senate. Extensive hearings, at which many eminent constitutional lawyers appeared and testified, were held by the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1942. I was not a Member of this body at that time, but I understand that the late Senator George Norris, a member of the committee and a distinguished lawyer in his own right, went into those hearings with very serious reservations in his own mind regarding the constitutionality of this proposed legislation—the power of Congress to abolish the poll-tax requirement by statute. After listening to countless witnesses who appeared and after making his own painstaking legal research, Senator Norris was not only convinced that Congress did have the constitutional power and responsibility for eliminating these taxes, but he himself wrote the majority report and led the fight on the floor of the Senate for the bill during the fall of 1942. I recommend that historic debate and the report of Senator Norris' Judiciary Committee in 1942 to any of my brethren who may have any doubts as to the constitutionality of this bill. In the Seventy-eighth Congress the Senate Judiciary Committee found that legislation such as House bill 29 was constitutional, and the committee reported the then pending bill to the Senate. House bill 29 was itself considered at length by the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, and was reported favorably in the Senate on April 30, 1948.

I mention these facts simply to show that in the light of the legislative history of anti-poll-tax legislation in this and preceding Congresses, a substantial majority of the Members have come to the conclusion, and I think a very sound one, that this proposed legislation is constitutional.

I have some views on this question which I should like to discuss.

First, a large number of cases have been cited by the opponents of this proposed legislation in an attempt to show that it cannot be constitutionally enacted by the Congress. But not a single one has been, or can be, cited to show that House bill 29 is unconstitutional, for the simple and incontrovertible reason that the Supreme Court of the United States has never had an occasion to pass on whether an act of Congress such as is proposed in House bill 29, abolishing the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a Federal election, is or is not constitutional. That question has never been before the Court. We can argue from now until doomsday, Mr. President, about the cases that involve what I call mixed litigation, cases which involve the application of poll-tax laws to both State and Federal elections; but, as I said last night, all the Court has to do is to pass on the fact that the measure is offered as a true taxing measure, in order to eliminate from its discussion or consideration any other facet of the case. Let the Congress pass an anti-poll-tax measure under its alleged constitutional power to protect the ballot of free citizens in a national election for Federal officers, and then the Court will have to lay down a decision directly "on the nose" of our problem. I am satisfied that, if the Court is given such a set of facts, there will be no escape from a decision that the bill is constitutional, because in my judgment the Court will find that poll taxes contravene the fifteenth amendment.

Mr. President, the Constitution affords a number of bases on which the Congress may, in my opinion, properly and constitutionally enact a statute abolishing the poll-tax requirement.

Section 4 of article I requires that—

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

This grant of power is further implemented by broad legislative authority contained in section 8 of article I of the Constitution, which empowers Congress—

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

Before I conclude, I shall have something to say about the power of the Congress to perpetuate a republican form of government; but I call especial attention to this enabling clause of article I of section 8 of the Constitution, which gives the Congress the clear constitutional power and places upon it the constitutional duty of passing whatever laws are necessary to carry out the provisions of the Constitution. It is vital in America today to preserve a republican form of government; and in my judgment we cannot preserve, in the true constitutional sense, a republican form of government if 10,000,000 supposedly free citizens are denied a free ballot box in a national election. That is a vital constitutional issue, Mr. President, and I submit that when the Supreme Court has an opportunity to pass on it directly by way of interpreting and applying the constitutional powers under an anti-poll-tax bill passed by the Congress, the Court will find that the enabling clauses are a part of the basis for the constitutionality of the act.

These two broad provisions—section 4 of article I and section 8 of article I—have constituted the basis of a number of Federal statutes designed to rid the elective machinery of certain evils and burdens. The Federal Corrupt Practices Act is one, and the act, passed during the recent war exempting members of the armed services from the payment of poll taxes, is another example. Both those examples, and likewise the exemption which is sought under the bill now under discussion, rest upon the constitutional power to regulate the manner of holding elections.

Let me repeat that, Mr. President, because I desire to dwell at some length on the anti-poll-tax bill which, in fact, we passed when we enacted the soldier voting measure during the war. I want to connect the constitutional theory of such acts as the Corrupt Practices Act and the Soldier Voting Act, with its anti-poll-tax provision, to sections 4 and 8 of article I of the Constitution. Therefore, I repeat the reading of those two sections. Section 4 says:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Section 8 says:

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

Mr. President, Members of this body I am sure would be enlightened, and some, I think, no little amused, if they would read the debates as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the time the Corrupt Practices Act was under consideration, and at the time the soldiers vote bill was under consideration. They would find a remarkable similarity between the arguments then made and the arguments now made by the opponents of an anti-poll-tax bill. It was contended by the opponents in those debates that the prerogatives and the rights of the States were being infringed and impinged upon by such legislation. I think there is only one place to meet the issue of States' rights. Let the record be perfectly clear that I shall defend States' rights as granted under the Constitution as vigorously as any other Member of the Senate, but I shall not read into the Constitution, as I submit many of my colleagues do, the vesting in the States of rights which in fact were delegated to the Federal Government under the Constitution.

I say sections 4 and 8 of article I of the Federal Constitution delegated broad powers to the Congress of the United States in protecting national elections. In my view, it is impossible to read those sections and give any other meaning to them. Therefore, from time to time in the past the Congress of the United States has seen fit to enact legislation in the very face of arguments that such legislation, which would keep pure the national elections by way of congressional law, impinged upon States' rights.

Now a word or two about the soldier-vote bill that was passed during the war. The bill contains an anti-poll-tax provision. The bill, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, and I shall go to it in a minute, was a Republican bill. I want to say to the proponents of the anti-poll-tax legislation throughout the Nation, and I want to say to some of those in minority groups who from time to time raise questions as to the good faith of the Republicans in connection with civil-rights legislation, that we can stand on the record of our support of civil-rights legislation. Let us see whether or not the Democrats can.

The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] offered an amendment to the soldier-vote bill to eliminate the poll-tax restriction. Let me go to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It speaks for itself. I turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1942, at which time the soldier-vote measure was pending before the Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator yield merely for an inquiry? Is the Senator going to put the page number in the RECORD at this point, so it will make it easier to find?

Mr. MORSE. I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 25, 1942, starting on page 6970. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] said:

> Mr. President, I do not desire to prolong the argument. I merely wish to add that the junior Senator from Illinois is not concerned or is not attempting in any way to interfere with the election, the method of holding the election, or the conduct of the election in any State.
>
> I wish to reiterate what I stated yesterday, the Federal Government, by vote of this body, has reached into the sovereign States and said to the young manhood of the States, "You register and present yourselves for service wherever you are told to go by the Federal Government." Many of them left without paying a poll tax, many of them left without registering their right to vote at home. By no choice of theirs, by no act or thought of theirs, they are scattered all over the world, and this body, which by its vote created the situation by which they find themselves throughout the world, can do well to remove the simple restrictions which deprive them of the right to participate in the choice of those who shall in the future occupy seats in this body, while we talk about spreading four freedoms throughout the world after the war.
>
> We have told our people that soon, I understand, we will have another bill under which we will register more of our citizens. We say they can no longer live as usual, think as usual, or have business as usual, but by our conduct apparently we are going to say to them, "We are going to conduct our political restrictions as usual," notwithstanding what we do about their vote. We may say that we love the soldier, and that we want every soldier to have the right to vote, but when one votes against giving him the right to vote in a primary, or against removing a simple restriction, he proves the depth of his love and affection for the men in the armed services. We have no desire to attempt to interfere in any State, but the rights of those men rest in this body, and I am ready to have the record made on the pending amendment.

This is the Republican Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] making a speech in support of his amendment to eliminate the poll-tax requirement from the soldier-vote measure.

The Senator from Illinois brought out very clearly in his remarks, as it was brought out in other remarks made during the debate, that there was a clear duty vested in the Congress of the United States to see to it that the arbitrary restrictions upon suffrage represented by the poll tax should be removed from the men in uniform. On what theory? On the theory that it interfered with States' rights? On the theory that the proposal was unconstitutional, as has been alleged here throughout the debate on House bill 29? No; but as Senator BROOKS said, on the theory that it is the clear duty and the obligation of the Congress to protect the rights of soldiers to vote in national elections. I say on the theory that under amendment 15 of the Constitution the Congress has a clear duty to pass legislation to protect the right of suffrage of free citizens. That was a Republican proposal, and it was fought for by the Republicans on the floor of the Senate during that historic debate.

Let us look at the record in connection with the vote on the proposal. I have said so many times—I cannot say it too often—that the test of a man's political philosophy, the acid test of his constitutional liberalism, is to be found in his votes in the Congress of the United States. What he says is not so important; what he says is important only if he backs up his statements with votes which support them. Many people, for long years past, Mr. President, have been playing political football with the civil-rights issue in the United States. I would not say that my party has been free of such hypocrites; we have had some of them. But at any time I will lay the Republican record on civil rights alongside of the Democratic record and have no fear as to what an impartial jury of independent voters will say when they come to study and to pass judgment upon the record. I say that because the record is perfectly clear that the Republicans for many years past have attempted to put through civil-rights legislation, and such legislation as Congress has been able to put through has been put through with Republican votes.

During the war the anti-poll-tax provision of the soldier-vote bill came from a Republican Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. How did the Senate vote on it? That is a good test of where Republicans and Democrats stand on the issue of civil rights. That, in my judgment, is the test of where people stand on civil-rights matters, at least insofar as true support of anti-poll-tax legislation is concerned. The Brooks amendment was called up for a vote on August 25, 1942, as shown on page 6971 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day. Let me make plain what amendment I am talking about. I am talking about

the amendment which proposed to relieve the soldiers from a poll-tax restriction in casting their votes in a Federal election for national officers. That was the issue. It was crystal clear, unequivocal, calling for a vote as to where a man stood on that civil-rights issue. The roll was as follows: Those voting "yea" were: Bone, Brewster, Bridges, Brooks, Brown, Capper, Danaher, Downey, Johnson of California, Johnson of Colorado, Kilgore, La Follette, Lodge, McCarran, McFarland, McNary, Maloney, Mead, Murray, Norris, Pepper, Reynolds, Rosier, Schwartz, Stewart, Taft, Thomas of Idaho, Thomas of Utah, Tunnell, Vandenberg, Walsh, White, Wiley.

Counting the number of Republicans in light of the few Republicans who were in the Senate in 1942, it will be seen that the Republicans in the Senate by a large majority voted to protect the precious civil right that our soldiers should be freed of the restriction of a poll tax on their suffrage.

Let us look at the "nay" votes: Andrews, Bailey, Barkley, Byrd, Clark of Idaho, Clark of Missouri, Connally, George, Gerry, Green, Guffey, Hayden, Herring, McKellar, Radcliffe, Russell, Smathers, Truman, Tydings, Van Nuys.

Mr. President, I am willing to let that record speak for itself as to who believed in delivering on civil-rights legislation. I am willing to let that vote speak for itself as to whether those of us on the Republican side of the aisle are fighting and voting for civil-rights legislation, and whether, in the main the Democrats are merely talking for it. I am willing to let the vote of the President of the United States, when he served as a Member of this body as a Senator from Missouri, in opposition to the proposal offered by the Senator from Illinois to protect the soldiers from a poll tax in the national election, during the war, speak for itself as to whether he means to deliver on civil-rights legislation. We cannot go behind that vote. I repeat, Mr. President, that I shall judge the political record of a man not on what he says, but on both what he says and how he votes to back up what he says.

Mr. President, we Republicans have made other fights for civil-rights legislation, and we have backed up our speeches with our votes. Let me for a moment refresh the memories of Senators as to what I think was a rather historic fight, as time will prove, in the Eightieth session of Congress, when Democratic representatives, in the main, in the Senate of the United States, from 16 Southern States, offered to the Senate for ratification a compact which would have empowered, with congressional approval, 16 Southern States to establish regional schools of higher education based on the principle of segregation, which they sought to make Federal policy by getting the Senate to approve, if they could, that compact. I make no apology to the American people for leading the fight against that compact on the ground that the compact section of the Constitution did not require the approval of that type of compact. I pointed out in the debate, and I have no fear of successful contradiction on that point, that one of the obvious motivations of that fight was to enable its proponents to get themselves in a position so that when civil-rights legislation involving racial questions in the field of education reached the United States Supreme Court they could point to the Senate of the United States as having placed its stamp of approval on a policy of segregation in higher education in the United States. I have already said, and I now repeat, that I have no intention to interfere with State policy in the field of education, but when the Senators from 16 Southern States sought to have the Senate place its stamp of approval, by way of ratification, on that compact, which had embodied in it the principle of segregation, I had no hesitation in leading the fight against that transgression on what I think is a precious civil right, because never by my vote will I put my stamp of approval on segregation in free public schools in America.

I know something about schools which are attended by all races. I went through the grade school in the city of Madison, Wis., known as the Greenbush School, which was located on the edge of the slum area of Madison, Wis. There attended that school throughout the 8 years I was there boys and girls from all races of that area, many Negro children, many Jewish, Greek, Italian, Polish, indeed attending that school was a cross-section of the great melting pot which America is.

It is difficult by way of self-analysis and introspection to determine how one comes to hold certain views which he entertains on certain social questions, but I am satisfied, as I analyze my own thinking, that the whole background of my constitutional liberalism is to be found in the conditioning and the training and the understanding of democracy I learned in 8 years in the Greenbush School in Madison, Wis.

Never, Mr. President, with my vote will I deny what I think is a precious civil right in this country, the right of any child to go to a public school irrespective of any attempt to discriminate against him because of race, color, or creed. Democracy will never remain strong in America unless we drive from our midst intolerable prejudice against people because of their race, color and creed. I may add that the civil rights principles of the Constitution are on trial before the world today. As I said last night, our attitude in this country in not taking a courageous and forthright forward step to eliminate discriminations practiced against the civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution is developing a hotbed for communism in the United States.

There is not a southern Democrat, there is not a northern Democrat, there is not a Republican in the whole Congress who hates and despises the Communist ideology more than does the junior Senator from Oregon. The way to meet a threat to democracy is to make democracy work so well that the propaganda of the Communists will not mislead or deceive a single American. Many of them are now being deceived, many of them are being misled. Many Americans, I fear far too many, are going to register a protest vote this fall by voting for the third party because of their opinion that we are not putting into effect as rapidly as we should the full guarantees of the Constitution.

Oh, here is a chance, by the passage of this anti-poll-tax bill, which, as I have said, we shall not be able to pass because of the parliamentary tactics of the Democratic side of the aisle—to answer the third party advocates on the question of whether or not we are going to march forward and prohibit further discrimination because of race, color, or creed.

Mr. President, we defeated the attempt to have the United States Senate approve the policy of segregation in higher education in this country. The vote was close, but the fact remains that the major fight against it came from the Republican side of the aisle. I think it is clear from the RECORD that the only effective blow struck in defense of civil rights in the Eightieth Congress was struck by those of us on the Republican side of the aisle who succeeded in preventing the Senate ratification of the compact to which I have referred. Therefore I say to the proponents of civil-rights legislation, that is another bit of evidence of the good faith and the sincerity of purpose of the Republicans in the Congress of the United States in delivering on civil-rights legislation, in backing up their talk with their votes.

Now, for the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a portion of the final soldier vote law which was enacted in 1942, and which contained an anti-poll-tax provision protecting our men in the armed services from the type of infringement upon suffrage which poll taxes constitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the law was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[PUBLIC LAW 712—77TH CONG.]
[CH. 561—2D SESS.]
[H. R. 7416]

An act to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence

Be it enacted, etc.,

SPECIAL METHOD OF VOTING IN TIME OF WAR

SECTION 1. In time of war, notwithstanding any provision of State law relating to the registration of qualified voters, every individual absent from the place of his residence and serving in the land or naval forces of the United States, including the members of the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, the Women's Navy Reserve, and the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, who is or was eligible to register for and is qualified to vote at any election under the law of the State of his residence, shall be entitled, as provided in this act, to vote for electors of President and Vice President of the United States, United States Senators, and Representatives in Congress.

SEC. 2. No person in military service in time of war shall be required, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, referring again to the Corrupt Practices Act and to the soldier-vote measure, I wish to repeat that both these statutes rest upon the constitutional power to regulate the manner of holding elections no less than do the exemptions which are sought under the pending bill. The Federal Government has the inherent right to "insure its own preservation" for, as pointed out in the dissenting opinion of Justices Brandeis, Clark, and Pitney in *Newberry* v. *United States* (256 U. S. 232, at 281)—

> The election of Senators and Representatives in Congress is a Federal function; whatever the States do in the matter they do under authority derived from the Constitution of the United States. • • • [Any other conclusion] would be to leave the General Government destitute of the means to insure its own preservation without governmental aid from the States, which they might either grant or withhold according to their own will. This would render the Government of the United States something less than supreme in the exercise of its own appropriate powers; a doctrine supposed to have been laid at rest forever by the decisions of this Court in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 405, et seq.); *Cohens* v. *Virginia* (6 Wheat. 264, 381, 387, 414); and many other decisions in the time of Chief Justice Marshall and since.

It should be recalled that in McCulloch against Maryland, supra, Chief Justice Marshall, that great expounder of our Constitution, had observed—Fourth Wheaton, 316, 424—that—

> No trace is to be found in the Constitution of an intention to create a dependence of the Government of the Union on those of the States for the execution of the great powers assigned to it. Its means are adequate to its ends, and on those means alone was it expected to rely for the accomplishment of its ends. To impose on it the necessity of resorting to means which it cannot control, which another government may furnish or withhold, would render its course precarious, the result of its measures uncertain, and create a dependence on other governments which might disappoint its most important designs, and is incompatible with the language of the Constitution

I apply that language Mr. President, to the power of the Congress, through the enabling clauses to which I have heretofore referred, to pass legislation which will protect the national suffrage of 10,000,000 American people now denied that protection by existing poll-tax laws.

I say, Mr. President, that these quotations from two landmarks in our constitutional history make it abundantly clear that the revisionary power conferred upon the Congress by section 4 of article I of the Constitution, to regulate the "manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives," was intended to and does authorize the Federal Government to take all steps deemed by it to be necessary and proper to insure that the election of its officers shall conform with true democratic principles; shall be without fraud, corruption, or pernicious political activities attendant upon the exercise by the people of their highest privilege; and that substantial portions of the populace in the several States shall not be disfranchised by a pseudo qualification bearing no reasonable relation to their fitness to vote.

I dwell upon that criterion, Mr. President, because when we do get this matter before the Supreme Court there is no doubt of the fact that it will give an interpretation of the word "qualification," as contained in article I, section 2 of the Constitution, in regard to which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], as well as my friend the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], dwelt at such great length. The court will have to give an interpretation to the word "qualification." What will be its text?

As a lawyer, I suggest that one of the things the court will look into is the relationship between the poll tax and the qualification or capability or ability of a man to vote. Do Senators know what I think the court will say respecting that? Dangerous as predictions are for a lawyer even to suggest in attempting to prophesy a court decision, I think the court will be bound to find that there is no relationship between the poll tax and the ability of a man to vote. I think the court will pierce the veil of sham which the poll tax is, and will not let the States hide behind that veil under the pretext that the poll-tax requirement is a qualification under article I, section 2. To the contrary, I think the court will say that qualification under article I, section 2, has to have some reasonable relationship to the ability to vote if it is to in any way limit the right to vote.

There is no such relationship, I submit, when a poll tax is imposed on an individual under the pretext that it defines his qualifications to vote. I think the court will tear the veil from the face of the poll tax and recognize that the Congress of the United States has the obligation and the power under the Constitution to protect free citizens from that type of restriction upon what ought to be recognized as a guaranty of free suffrage.

Thus I say, Mr. President, that to make sure that there should be no doubt on this score, the framers of our Constitution wisely inserted a "necessary and proper" clause specifically authorizing the Congress, "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers." Under that enabling clause, under the power therein given to preserve the republican form of government, if it were desired to put it on no other basis, I submit that the court would find that the exercise of our power in passing an anti-poll-tax law met all constitutional requirements.

I have already pointed to the fact that 10,000,000 citizens of the United States are disfranchised by the poll-tax requirement and shown that its abolition in Georgia resulted in an immediate and substantial increase in the number of voters who participated in the elections when not hindered and impeded by the poll-tax requirement. Moreover, the difference in the size of the electorate in poll-tax States as compared with that in non-poll-tax States generally, fully demonstrates that the republican form of government contemplated by the Constitution is nonexistent in the poll-tax States.

The report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights at page 38 carries a chart, Suffrage in Poll-Tax States. It shows that of the potential voters who voted in the 1944 Presidential elections, 68.74 percent voted in the then 40 non-poll-tax States while only 18.31 percent voted in the 8 poll-tax States. In 1944 Georgia required the payment of the poll tax, and therefore her statistics are included in the table.

Section 4 of article IV of the Constitution provides:

> The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

It is well settled that questions arising under this clause are political, not judicial, in character, and thus are for consideration of Congress and not the courts. *Ohio ex rel. Bryant* v. *Akron Metropolitan Park District* (281 U. S. 74, 80 (1930)), citing *Pacific States Teleph. Co.* v. *Oregon* (223 U. S. 118 (1912)), *O'Neill* v. *Learner* (239 U. S. 244, 248 (1915)).

I recognize that this is a technical point of law to the layman, and hence, even at the expense of time, I want to reiterate it, because I think it is one of the points that my friends of the opposition have overlooked in their entire discussion of the constitutionality of a proposed anti-poll-tax bill. I said last night, for example, that in my judgment, our power to pass an anti-poll-tax law rests in part under the political powers of the Congress. Thus section 4 of article IV of the Constitution, which reads "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government" raises what the Court has called a question political in character and not judicial. What does that mean? It means that very broad and wide powers are given to the Congress of the United States to pass legislation which in its judgment is necessary, and which it is empowered to pass under the enabling sections of the Constitution, to protect, preserve, and perpetuate a republican form of government.

I think I can hear the Supreme Court say it is not for the Court to dictate to the Congress of the United States what steps it should take to preserve, perpetuate, and protect a republican form of government, because that is basically a political question which primarily vests in the wise judgment and discretion of the elected representatives of the people. I think I can hear the Court say that, if in the exercise of their wisdom in the legislative branch of government they come to the finding of fact that the existence of a poll tax endangers free suffrage in America, it rests within their political power under section 4, article 4, of the Constitution to pass an anti-poll-tax bill, and by so doing they exercise their right to preserve a republican form of government.

That is an additional premise on top of my premise respecting amendment 15, Mr. President, on which I base my argument that an anti-poll-tax bill would be declared by the Supreme Court to be constitutional. It is not for the Court, as the precedents which I have cited

clearly indicate, by way of judicial action to amend the Constitution by means of an interpretation, by saying that a bill which Congress passed to protect, preserve, and perpetuate a republican form of government is unconstitutional, because if it did, then in a very real sense it would be substituting itself as the legislature, on a question which it has already recognized in its decisions is political and not judicial in character.

Of course, I do not mean that we can pass any sort of legislation we might want to pass under section 4 of article IV of the Constitution. I mean that on this subject, too, the well-established judicial rule of reasonableness will prevail. In my judgment, under this section the Court would have to find that the law we passed was highly capricious and arbitrary, bearing no reasonable relationship whatsoever to the power granted under the section before it would be justified in declaring it to be unconstitutional. I do not believe that the Court could possibly so find in this instance, because, in my humble judgment, the existence of a poll-tax restriction on suffrage which has the effect, as I pointed out in the statistics presented last night, of disfranchising 10,000,000 supposedly free American citizens is a serious threat to the perpetuation of a republican form of government. Therefore I say to my friends who are puzzled—and I can understand their puzzlement—over this constitutional question, that they should reconsider the meaning of section 4, article IV, of the Constitution and refresh their recollections of the decisions which I have cited thereunder. I submit that Congress has the constitutional mandate, as provided in section 8 of article I, to "make all laws which shall be necessary for carrying into execution powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States," to restore a republican form of government to the people of the seven poll-tax States by enacting House bill 29.

The Senate Judiciary Committee, on October 27, 1942, in its report on House bill 1024, which was also an anti-poll-tax bill, practically identical with House bill 29, said the following in its excellent report on the bill:

> Can we have a republican form of government in any State if, within that State, a large portion and perhaps a majority of the citizens residing therein are denied the right to participate in governmental affairs because they are poor? We submit that this would be the result if under section 2, article I, of the Constitution, the proposed law is held to be unconstitutional. The most sacred right in our republican form of government is the right to vote. It is fundamental that that right should not be denied unless there are valid constitutional reasons therefor. It must be exercised freely by free men. If it is not, then we do not have a republican form of government. If we tax this fundamental right, we are taxing a Federal privilege. We might just as well permit the States to tax Federal post offices throughout the United States.

I say that House bill 29 is authorized by the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution. That amendment provides as follows:

> SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
>
> SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

I pointed out in my comments last night that there is no doubt as to what the purpose was for calling the constitutional conventions in several of the poll-tax States at the time their constitutions were amended in order to put into them a poll-tax provision. A distinguished former Member of this body, the beloved Carter Glass, of Virginia, in the speeches from which I quoted last night, made perfectly clear the purpose in Virginia. When he spoke to the convention in Virginia he made it very clear that the convention had been called to discriminate against approximately 146,000 ignorant Negroes in Virginia. We cannot erase the record of history, and that is what the record of history shows was the dominant motivation which produced the poll-tax laws and the constitutional amendments in the several States which sought to solve the problem by way of a constitutional amendment.

Mr. President, with the passage of an anti-poll-tax bill by the Congress, and thereafter a direct raising of the issue before the United States Supreme Court on the question of the constitutionality of such legislation, I have no doubt as to the inescapable conclusion which the Court must reach; namely, that the power vests in the Congress of the United States to carry out the mandate of amendment XV of the Constitution:

> SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
>
> SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

I say that a thoroughly prepared case before the Supreme Court on the true meaning of amendment XV can lead to no other decision than the right of the Congress to protect national suffrage of free citizens from the type of restriction and imposition on that basic right which the poll taxes constitute in the States which have them.

Let us take a look at the history of the fifteenth amendment for a moment. This amendment was proposed to the legislatures of the several States by the Fortieth Congress on February 26, 1869, following the dark days of the Civil War. It was declared to have been ratified March 30, 1870. It is not simply a coincidence that shortly after this date the payment of a poll tax as a requirement for voting became a qualification in those States having a large percentage of Negro voters. Tennessee was the first State to adopt the requirement, in 1870; Virginia in 1875.

I digress for a moment to emphasize a point which I think needs to be reemphasized in this debate. We have heard a great deal from members of the opposition about the tax requirements and the property requirements which existed at the time the Constitution was adopted. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the adoption of poll taxes as a restriction on voting, designed definitely and with purpose to prevent certain people from voting, and to disfranchise them, followed the Civil War, subsequent to the adoption and ratification of the fifteenth amendment. They were adopted by the Southern States having a large number of Negro citizens as a way, they thought—and it has worked for a great many years—of getting around the fifteenth amendment. They were adopted in the hope that if and when the issue reached the Supreme Court, they might prevail under an interpretation of the word "qualification," as it is found in article I, section 2. But, Mr. President, as I said last night, we are still waiting for a case squarely on the nose, so that the Court clearly can interpret the meaning of qualification under section 2, article I, in relation to the exercise of Federal power by the Congress to protect national suffrage through the medium of an anti-poll-tax bill. So I say that the issue as to the constitutionality of such a bill cannot now be settled by the Supreme Court, because the Court must have before it a congressional enactment which clearly raises the question whether it infringes on the constitutional power in consideration of the word "qualification" as it appears in section 2, article I. I am not afraid of the result when the Supreme Court is given a chance to render a clear-cut decision on that issue.

That is why I think that, although it is pertinent to discuss the border-line cases on this problem, which thus far have been passed upon by the Supreme Court, they are not binding or sound precedents on the present issue, because the only way we can obtain a decision on the issue is to get it before the Court. But it has not been before the Court, and we shall not get it before the Court until under the fifteenth amendment, we, the Congress, proceed to carry out what I think is the clear mandate of that amendment to see to it that under section 2 of amendment fifteen the necessary laws are passed to protect all free citizens from discrimination or abridgement or denial of their rights on the basis of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Mr. President, I rest my argument on this point on the proposition that that is exactly what a poll tax does. It abridges free suffrage. It denies, on a discriminatory basis, on the basis of race, color, or creed, the right of approximately 10,000,000 American citizens to cast a free ballot unless they meet certain highly arbitrary restrictions imposed upon them through a poll tax.

As I was saying, Mr. President, Tennessee was the first State to adopt the requirement, and did so in 1870; Virginia in 1875; Florida, 1885; Mississippi, 1890; Arkansas in 1892; South Carolina in 1895; Louisiana, 1898; North Carolina, 1900; Alabama in 1901; Texas in 1903. It is a long, long way from 1787 to 1903, Mr. President. The Georgia constitutions of 1865 and 1877 made the payment of all taxes a prerequisite to voting in general elections; but in 1908 its constitution was amended so as to make the payment of the poll tax a requirement for voting in the primary election also. This statement appears in the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee Hearings on

Senate bill 1280 in July 1942, at page 253 in the testimony of Henry H. Collins.

Seven of the 11 States which originally had poll taxes still retain their poll-tax requirements. The Negro population of those States alone amounts to 5,449,186 on the basis of the 1940 census. In round figures that is about one-third of the entire Negro population of the United States.

I have already alluded to the findings contained in the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee regarding the original purpose of these poll-tax requirements, namely, to disfranchise Negro citizens. I wish to quote very briefly from the report again, to show that these taxes, at their very inception, violated Federal statutes:

At page 5, the report states:

> It ought to be borne in mind also that many, if not all, of these constitutional amendments in the poll-tax States are in direct conflict with the statutes under which these States were readmitted to the Union under the act of Congress of June 26, 1870 (16 Stat., p. 62). The provision which refers to Virginia reads as follows:
>
> "The constitution of Virginia shall never be so amended or changed as to deprive any citizen or class of citizens of the United States of the right to vote, who are entitled to vote by the constitution herein recognized, except as punishment for such crimes as are now felonies at common law, whereof they have been duly convicted under laws, equally applicable to all the inhabitants of said State: Provided, That any alteration of said constitution, prospective in its effect, may be made in regard to the time and place of residence of voters."
>
> It therefore follows that these State poll tax constitutional amendments were in direct violation of this statute and therefore absolutely unconstitutional.
>
> It seems perfectly plain that the object of this poll-tax provision in the State constitutions was not to prevent discrimination among the citizens but to definitely provide for a discrimination by which hundreds of thousands of citizens were taxed for the privilege of voting.

Mr. President, the principal purpose behind these State poll-tax requirements being the disfranchisement of a large number of Negro citizens, which purpose is today still being achieved, it is submitted that such poll-tax laws are violative of the express language, purpose, and intent of the fifteenth amendment; and the Congress should proceed to eliminate these sham "qualifications" under the specific authority granted it under section 2 of the amendment "to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." *James* v. *Bowman* (190 U. S. 127, 137); *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214); *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347).

Chief Justice Marshall, in the celebrated case of McCulloch against Maryland, from which I have already quoted, laid down a basic principle in American constitutional law when he declared that "the power to tax is the power to destroy." States cannot levy or exact a tax on a Federal instrumentality or function. Yet we have the anomalous situation of State governments requiring a tax as a condition to exercising the highest and most basic right in a democratic society—the right to cast a ballot for the President, the Vice President, and Members of the Congress.

Action by the courts is not the only avenue for the redress of this wrong or the only protection against the danger implicit in permitting a State to tax a Federal function. That Congress of its own initiative can enact legislation to safeguard and preserve the structure and very existence of government is a proposition too elementary to require argument. If the States under the guise of setting up a "qualification" for voting, levy a $1 tax on the right of a Federal elector to vote—and I have already shown that certain States through their poll-tax requirements have compelled, and continue to compel, their citizens to spend as much as 2 percent of their annual income in order to vote in Federal elections—what is there to hinder such States from exacting a larger proportion, or, conceivably, to reduce it to the absurd, all the earnings of the prospective voter? If there were no other constitutional basis for the enactment of House bill 29, the implied power of a sovereignty to protect itself from destruction would alone afford ample constitutional authority and justification.

Mr. President, I wish to turn now to the group of cases about which we have heard so much in the very able arguments presented by the Senators of the opposition. First, I think the RECORD should contain at this point a very brief digest of those alleged leading cases. I take such a digest from a report of the Senate Judiciary Committee, after having checked the decisions and read them very carefully and after having satisfied myself that the digest in fact sets forth an accurate thumbnail sketch of the decisions themselves.

First let us turn to *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. Repts. 277), decided December 6, 1937. The dates are important in this discussion, and I should like my colleagues to keep them in mind. The action was brought to determine whether or not the appellees, State officials, had acted unlawfully or illegally in refusing to register a white man aged 28 to vote for Federal and State officers at primary and general elections, for the reason that he had neither made poll-tax returns nor paid any taxes. The opinion of the Court was perfectly proper, in my opinion, in view of the fact that the appellant demanded that the State official qualify him to vote in a State election as well as a Federal election. But I think the Court arrived at an erroneous conclusion, because it had erroneously judged the nature of the right to vote for a Federal official. The Court thought the nature of the right or the source of the right to vote for a Federal official was the State itself. Surely the State is not the one to grant a Federal privilege. The Court said:

> Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State.

In the second case, *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (C. C. A., 6th Ct., 118 Fed. Repts., 2d ed., 218), decided March 8, 1941, certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court. The issue in this case was whether the State could condition a right to vote for a Representative in Congress in an election, not a primary, because the citizen had failed to pay a poll tax. It was not a State election and not a primary, and the citizen had qualified in every way except to pay the tax. The State levied the tax and set up the method of collection. It had experienced difficulty in getting it collected, and burdened the franchise with the duty to pay the tax, as a method of collecting it. It was therefore a condition precedent to the exercise of the right to vote. The Court held that the right to vote in a national election is conditioned upon such terms as the State wants to impose, and, using the Breedlove case as a precedent, about the right conferred by the State, the Court said such right was conferred save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments with respect to race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and other provisions of the Constitution. It was a unanimous opinion by three judges of the circuit court.

The gentlemen of the opposition have laid great stress on the Breedlove and Pirtle cases. If I were in their position and honestly believed, as I am sure they honestly believe, that an anti-poll-tax law is unconstitutional, as a lawyer I certainly would stress for all it is worth their argument on the Breedlove case and on the case of Pirtle against Brown. Those cases are what I call fringe cases. They approach the issue in question, but they are not cases on all fours with the issue we now face.

The first case, as I have pointed out, involves a question in which a State law is mixed up with a Federal election. The second case is a court of appeals case relying upon the Breedlove case, even though the Classic case, which I shall shortly discuss, came in between. It was disposed of in what manner? By denial of a writ of certiorari by the Supreme Court. I think my lawyer friends of the opposition have done a masterful job in creating the impression in this body among some of my colleagues that Pirtle against Brown represents a decision by the United States Supreme Court on the merits of the issues involved. Lawyers know that reasons for denying certiorari rest in the bosom of the Supreme Court. Lawyers know that it is a pretty weak precedent to cite, if all that can be cited in support of their position in a case is the fact that the Supreme Court denied a writ of certiorari. I would be the last in this Chamber to cast any reflection to any degree whatever on the Supreme Court, but it is important that the American people understand the procedure of the Supreme Court. There are many reasons why the Supreme Court may deny certiorari, and it is generally recognized that one of the most common reasons is that because the agenda of the Court is so large, the docket of the Court is so extensive, the mass of cases the Court is called upon to decide in a given term is so great, that the Court must follow a selective process. It has to meet a timetable, and very frequently—and I do not think there can be any denial of this fact—it denies certiorari, not because it does not think the issues involved in a case should in due course of time be litigated, but because the time element does not permit. It follows a selective process in acting upon petitions for writs of certiorari. It is not uncommon at all to have a writ

denied in one term of Court, and to have the identical issue involved in another case at the next session of the Court taken up by the Court by granting a writ in that case. Therefore I am not saying that Pirtle against Brown should not be cited by the gentlemen of the opposition; it should, of course, be cited. It has some weight in the argument. But I am saying that the mere fact that a writ of certiorari was denied in Pirtle against Brown does not constitute a ruling by the United States Supreme Court on the merits of the issue involved in this debate. There will not be a Supreme Court decision on the merits of this great constitutional issue until a congressional act is before the Court in the form of an anti-poll-tax bill seeking to lift the restriction upon the privilege of voting now imposed upon some 10,000,000 citizens by way of a poll tax.

The next case is that of *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299), decided May 28, 1941. The gentlemen of the opposition make considerable point of the fact that the denial of a writ of certiorari in the Pirtle case follows the decision in the Classic case. I do not think that is particularly relevant, because the Classic case speaks for itself. I shall not claim and I do not want to claim too much for the Classic case. I may say to my good friends of the opposition, however, that as a lawyer I somewhat enjoyed the speed with which they passed over the Classic case and laid all the emphasis of their argument on the Breedlove and Pirtle cases. That is good lawyer technique. I understand it. I do not want to give any greater emphasis to the Classic case than I honestly think it deserves, but I do want to say, and I do not think the statement can be denied, that so far as concerns the language of the Court in discussing the general merits of the problems before us in this constitutional argument, it is, in fact, the last pronouncement of the Court on the subject, because the mere denial of a writ of certiorari in the Pirtle case did not, in fact, involve any discussion on the part of the Court by way of a decision on the issue itself which confronts us. But the Classic case, like the Breedlove case and the Pirtle case, is still a border-line case, and I claim no more for it than that. As such, however, it is deserving of some attention on the part of my colleagues.

In the Classic case, the charge was that the election officials had violated sections 19 and 20 of the Criminal Code by wilfully ordering and falsely counting and certifying ballots cast in a primary in Louisiana for a Representative in Congress.

The Court said:

> The questions for decision are whether the right of qualified voters to vote in the Louisiana primary and to have their ballots counted is a right "secured by the Constitution" within the meaning of Sections 19 and 20 of the Criminal Code, and whether the acts of the appellees charged in the indictment violate those sections.

Chief Justice Stone, after citing cases, said:

> The right of the people to choose their elective officers is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution, and, hence, is one secured by it to those citizens, inhabitants of the State, entitled to exercise that right.

He continues:

> While in a loose sense the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the State—

Citing cases—

this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4, and it has some general power under article I, section 8, of the Constitution to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers. Section 4 authorizes Congress to regulate the times, places, and manner of electing Representatives.

In *United States* v. *Mumford* (16 Fed. 223) the Court said:

> There is little regarding elections that is not included in the terms "times, places, and manner," and Congress could legislate generally in respect to general elections.

Mr. President, my good friends of the opposition like to talk about the language in the Classic case as being dictum. I do not share their characterization of the language as dictum. I shall not quibble about that; but, nevertheless, the language of Chief Justice Stone in the Classic case is the last formal pronouncement by way of court discussion of the question of the power of Congress in the field of national elections. The opponents of the anti-poll-tax bill may characterize it in any way they want; but they cannot erase it; and the Supreme Court has not, as yet, by any specific language, retracted or repudiated the language of Chief Justice Stone in the Classic case. Note to what he refers. Note his reference to those powers in section 4 of article I and in clause 8, section 18, of article I, which I discussed at some length earlier in my remarks this afternoon. When it comes to tracing the trend of constitutional law under a conception of the Constitution as a dynamic document, do I not think there can be any doubt about the fact that in the Classic case the Court made very clear to the Congress of the United States that there is vested in it a great residual power to pass legislation that will protect free suffrage in the United States.

I should welcome the opportunity, Mr. President, to stand before the Court in support of the constitutionality of an anti-poll-tax law and discuss with the Court its own language in the Classic case. I do not think there is any way the Court could possibly get over, behind, or around that language, and I do not fear that the Court would revoke or reverse the position which it took in the famous Classic case. No, Mr. President, I do not propose in this debate to let my good friends of the opposition forget the Classic case. I know they would like to do it, because I know the language of the Classic case gives them great trouble in their thinking when they seek to sustain what I consider to be a fallacious proposition, that an anti-poll-tax bill would be unconstitutional.

Let us go into the case for a moment, because I think it not only proper and right but very important to have a very full discussion of the Classic case in this debate.

On page 310 of the decision, the Chief Justice said:

> Article I, section 2, of the Constitution commands that "The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." By section 4 of the same article, "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations except as to the places of choosing Senators." Such right as is secured by the Constitution to qualified voters to choose Members of the House of Representatives is thus to be exercised in conformity to the requirements of State law, subject to the restrictions prescribed by section 2 and to the authority conferred on Congress by section 4 to regulate the times, places, and manner—

And manner—

of holding elections for Representatives.

My good friends of the opposition like to quote the first part of that sentence, and then, with falling voices, skim over the second part. The second part of that sentence also is pregnant with great constitutional meaning, and calls attention to the fact that the right discussed in the first part of the sentence is, however, subject to the right and authority conferred on Congress to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Representatives.

On page 311 the Chief Justice said in the Classic case:

> Pursuant to the authority given by section 2 of article I of the Constitution and subject to the legislative power of Congress under section 4 of article I and other pertinent provisions of the Constitution, the States are given, and in fact exercise, a wide discretion in the formulation of a system for the choice by the people of Representatives in Congress. In common with many other States, Louisiana has exercised that discretion by setting up machinery for the effective choice of party candidates for Representatives in Congress by primary elections and by its laws it eliminates or seriously restricts the candidacy at the general election of all those who are defeated at the primary. All political parties, which are defined as those that have cast at least 5 percent of the total votes at specified preceding elections, are required to nominate their candidates for Representatives by direct primary elections. (Louisiana Act No. 46, regular session, 1940, secs. 1 and 3.)
>
> The primary is conducted by the State at public expense. (Act 46, supra, sec. 35.) The primary, as is the general election, is subject to numerous statutory regulations as to the time, place and manner of conducting the election, including provisions to insure that the ballots cast at the primary are correctly counted, and the results of the count correctly recorded and certified to the secretary of state, whose duty it is to place the names of the successful candidates of each party on the official ballot. The secretary of state is prohibited from placing on the official ballot the name of any person as a candidate for any political party not nominated in accordance with the provisions of the act. (Act 4o, sec. 1.)
>
> One whose name does not appear on the primary ballot, if otherwise eligible to become a candidate at the general election, may do so in either of two ways: by filing nomination papers with the requisite number of signatures or by having his name "written in" on the ballot on the final election.

Then the Chief Justice proceeds to discuss the Louisiana statute and corresponding constitutional provisions of the State of Louisiana. On page 313 of the decision the Chief Justice proceeds as follows:

> The right to vote for a Representative in Congress at the general election is, as a matter of law, thus restricted to the successful party candidate, at the primary, to those not candidates at the primary who file nomination papers, and those whose names may be lawfully written into the ballot by the electors. Even if, as appellees argue, contrary to the decision in *Serpas* v. *Trebucq*, supra, voters may lawfully write into their ballot, cast at the general election, the name of a candidate rejected at the primary and have their ballots counted, the practical operation of the primary law in otherwise excluding from the ballot on the general election the names of candidates rejected at the primary is such as to impose serious restrictions upon the choice of candidates, by the voters, save by voting at the primary election. In fact, as alleged in the indictment, the practical operation of the primary in Louisiana is and has been since the primary election was established in 1900, to secure the election of Democratic primary nominee for the Second Congressional District of Louisiana.
>
> Interference with the right to vote in the congressional primary in the Second Congressional District for the choice of Democratic candidate for Congress is thus, as a matter of law and in fact, an interference with the effective choice of the voters at the only stage of the election procedure when their choice is of significance, since it is at the only stage when such interference could have any practical effect on the ultimate result, the choice of the Congressman to represent the district. The primary in Louisiana is an integral part of the procedure for the popular choice of Congressman. The right of qualified voters to vote at the congressional primary in Louisiana and to have their ballots counted is thus the right to participate in that choice.

Then there follows language which I prophesy here today, Mr. President, will become historic legal language in this great fight for civil rights in the United States because it is language on which I think a powerful argument can be based in the Supreme Court once we pass an anti-poll-tax bill. The Chief Justice said:

> We come then to the question whether the right is one secured by the Constitution. Section 2 of article I commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes. The right of the people to choose, whatever its appropriate constitutional limitations, where in other respects it is defined, and the mode of its exercise is prescribed by State action in conformity to the Constitution, is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution, and hence is one secured by it to those citizens and inhabitants of the State entitled to exercise the right. * * * See *Hague* v. *CIO* (307 U. S. 496), * * * giving the same interpretation to the like phrase "rights" "secured by the Constitution" appearing in section 1 of the Civil Rights Act of 1871. * * * While in a loose sense the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States—

Citing cases, including the Breedlove case; and I shall dwell on that citation for a moment.

Sometimes when one picks up a United States Supreme Court decision and reads it, he knows that the Court has omitted reference to a very important case on the same subject matter which had previously been decided by the Supreme Court. This does not happen often but it does happen. The reader is astounded to discover that the case he is reading nowhere mentions the previous case. So as a lawyer he is puzzled; he does not know whether the Court has overruled the previous decision or whether it thinks the present decision is in conformity with the previous decision. In such instances the situation presents to the lawyer advising his clients a very perplexing problem.

The Court here cites the Breedlove case, the case on which the opposition lays so much emphasis, showing perfectly clearly that the Chief Justice had in mind the Breedlove case when he enunciated what I say is historic legal language, because immediately after citing the Breedlove case the Chief Justice said:

> This statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution, to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

Citing cases. No one can argue with me as to whether or not the Supreme Court was cognizant of the Breedlove case when the Chief Justice wrote that historic language. Of course he was cognizant of it. He cited it. I think he made just as clear in that language as he could that the States are not free, under the sham of qualification, to pass any law restricting the right of suffrage they may want to pass. On the contrary, I think the Classic case is ample legal precedent for supporting the argument until such time as the Supreme Court rules directly on the issue when it comes to decide an anti-poll-tax law passed by the Congress, that the right of the State under article I, section 2, is subject to the restrictive rights of the Congress in section 4 and in section 8 of article I.

I go further, Mr. President, and say that it is perfectly clear that this decision can be cited in support of the proposition that the right of the State under article I, section 2, of the Constitution, insofar as qualification is concerned, must be exercised in conformance with and subject to the right of Congress to pass legislation under the other enabling clauses of the Constitution, including amendment 15, protecting the right of suffrage of free Americans from the type of restriction that clearly impinges upon a free ballot box by way of a poll tax.

Senators were talking last night about shooting away at my argument. Shoot all they will, Mr. President, they cannot erase from the Classic case that language of the Supreme Court. Shoot all they will, they cannot cite language from the Supreme Court in a case that retracts the language of the Classic case.

From the standpoint of a legal argument, the only attempt they made—and I respectfully submit it must be classified by lawyers as a feeble attempt—was to cite denial of a writ of certiorari in the Pirtle case. I do not know, and no one else knows, all the factors that entered into the denial of that writ of certiorari. Lawyers who are familiar with the procedure of the United States Supreme Court know that the Court does not have to give any reason for denying certiorari. As we lawyers say, their reasons rest in their own bosoms.

We know it was not so many years ago that the Supreme Court was under severe attack because of the long delay in disposing of its docket. And again I offer no disrespect to the Court when I point out that it is a fact that the denial of writs of certiorari following the public discussion of the condition of the docket of the Supreme Court increased at a very rapid rate. There are those who are of the opinion that the Court, after that criticism, exercised to a greater extent its selective powers in determining what cases it would pass upon in a given term of court, and denied writs of certiorari, possibly as a means of speeding up action on its docket. At least the fact remains that we do not know in a given case, in the absence of any explanation of the Court, the reasons behind a denial of a writ of certiorari, because frequently all we read is "writ denied."

So I say, there stands the language of the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court in the Classic case, and I think it is rich with constitutional meaning when we apply it to the constitutional problem before us.

The Chief Justice proceeds on page 315 to say:

> Obviously included within the right to choose, secured by the Constitution, is the right of qualified voters within a State to cast their ballots and have them counted at congressional elections. The Court has consistently held that this is a right secured by the Constitution.

Citing cases.

> And since the constitutional command is without restriction or limitation, the right, unlike those guaranteed by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, is secured against the action of individuals as well as of States.

Citing cases.

> But we are now concerned with the question whether the right to choose at a primary election, a candidate for election as Representative, is embraced in the right to choose Representatives secured by article I, section 2. We may assume that the framers of the Constitution, in adopting that section, did not have specifically in mind the selection and elimination of candidates for Congress by the direct primary any more than they contemplated the application of the commerce clause to interstate telephone, telegraph, and wireless communication, which are concededly within it.
>
> But in determining whether a provision of the Constitution applies to a new subject matter, it is of little significance that it is one with which the framers were not familiar. For in setting up an enduring framework of government they undertook to carry out for the indefinite future and in all the vicissitudes of the changing affairs of men, those fundamental purposes which the instrument itself discloses. Hence we read its words, not as we read legislative codes which are subject to continuous revision with the changing course of events, but as the revelation of the great purposes which were intended

to be achieved by the Constitution as a continuing instrument of government.

Citing cases.

That the free choice by the people of representatives in Congress, subject only to the restrictions to be found in sections 2 and 4 of article I and elsewhere in the Constitution, was one of the great purposes of our constitutional scheme of government cannot be doubted.

That is the third time in his decision the Chief Justice points out these restrictions over and above the rights granted in section 2, article I. In his decision the Chief Justice constantly refers to the powers of congressional restriction found elsewhere in the Constitution, including section 4 and section 8, making very clear that section 2, article I, is in fact in the form of words of limitation, as we lawyers say. They are subject to the modifications and restrictions of language qualifying them, to be found elsewhere in the Constitution. They do not confer a blanket right, nor the power to set up any so-called qualification the State wants to; but it is clear in itself, it seems to me, that section 2, article I, must be administered by the States in conformance with the other restrictive clauses of the Constitution, such as amendment 15, which give clear power to the Congress of the United States to pass legislation that will protect suffrage in national elections.

So the Chief Justice says:

Subject only to the restrictions to be found in sections 2 and 4 of article I, and elsewhere in the Constitution, was one of the great purposes of our constitutional scheme of government cannot be doubted. We cannot regard it as any the less constitutional purpose, or its words as any the less guaranteeing the integrity of that choice, when a State, exercising its privilege in the absence of congressional action—

Have we heard the gentlemen of the opposition stress that sentence, Mr. President? I cannot find a word in their speeches about the importance of that sentence. According to my sights on this constitutional question it is very important language. Let me repeat it.

We cannot regard it as any the less the constitutional purpose, or its words as any the less guaranteeing the integrity of that choice, when a State, exercising its privilege in the absence of congressional action, changes the mode of choice from a single step, a general election, to two, of which the first is the choice at a primary of those candidates from whom, as a second step, the representative in Congress is to be chosen at the election.

Nor can we say that that choice which the Constitution protects is restricted to the second step because section 4 of article I, as a means of securing a free choice of representatives by the people, has authorized Congress to regulate the manner of election, without making any mention of primary elections. For we think that the authority of Congress, given by section 4, includes the authority to regulate primary elections when, as in this case, they are a step in the exercise by the people of their choice of representatives in Congress.

Let those of the opposition try to erase that language from the Supreme Court decision. That is the last language which the Supreme Court has handed down on the power of Congress under section 4 of article I of the Constitution. That language is not changed by denial of a writ of certiorari in the Pirtle case. That language is clear notice to the Congress of the United States that section 4 of article I is wealthy in power so far as the right of Congress to take action in protecting the people of the United States in their right of suffrage is concerned. Dictum, is it, Mr. President? Squarely on the nose is that language as to Federal power over primary elections in States, which was one of the questions raised in the Classic case.

The language which I have just read has no semblance of dictum. It is decisive language, bearing upon congressional power under section 4 of article I. A part of my constitutional argument in support of the constitutionality of anti-poll-tax legislation is based upon my contention that, under section 4, Congress has the power vested in it to take the steps necessary to protect national suffrage, which is being imposed upon by poll-tax restrictions under the sham and guise of qualifications in accordance with section 2, article I.

I am not worried about what the Supreme Court will say on this constitutional question, if the opposition will let us get a case before the Supreme Court based upon an actual congressional act prohibiting poll taxes. I think that is a fair proposition. I do not mean that they should vote for an anti-poll-tax bill if they do not believe it to be constitutional, but I do mean that I think it is fair, after they have had their say on their point of view concerning the constitutionality of such legislation, that they give the rest of us, who sincerely believe that it is constitutional, the opportunity to pass it through the Senate and an opportunity then to start it on its way, in accordance with our system of checks and balances in government, to the Supreme Court for final decision.

I do not interpret motives, nor do I assign motives. I simply wish to say that I do not see how there is any escaping the fact that there are many opponents of anti-poll-tax legislation who are not very anxious to have a bill get before the Supreme Court, in view of the language of the Classic case. I have a hunch—and one cannot be blamed for having hunches—that there are a good many opponents of anti-poll-tax legislation who have grave doubt as to whether or not their arguments as to the alleged unconstitutionality of such legislation would survive a Supreme Court test, in view of the language of the Classic case.

The Chief Justice went on, on page 317 in the decision, to say:

The point whether the power conferred by section 4 includes in any circumstances the power to regulate primary elections was reserved in *United States* v. *Gradwell*, supra, 487. In *Newberry* v. *United States*, supra, four Justices of this Court were of opinion that the term "elections" in section 4 of article I did not embrace a primary election, since that procedure was unknown to the framers. A fifth Justice, who with them pronounced the judgment of the Court, was of opinion that a primary, held under a law enacted before the adoption of the seventeenth amendment, for the nomination of candidates for Senator, was not an election, within the meaning of section 4 of article I of the Constitution, presumably because the choice of the primary imposed no legal restrictions on the election of Senators by the State legislatures to which their election had been committed by article I, section 3. The remaining four Justices were of the opinion that a primary election for the choice of candidates for Senator or Representative were elections subject to regulation by Congress within the meaning of section 4 of article I. The question then has not been prejudged by any decision of this Court.

To decide it we turn to the words of the Constitution read in their historical setting as revealing the purpose of its framers, and search for admissible meanings of its words which, in the circumstances of their application, will effectuate those purposes. As we have said, a dominant purpose of section 2, so far as the selection of representatives in Congress is concerned, was to secure to the people the right to choose representatives by the designated electors, that is to say, by some form of election. Compare the seventeenth amendment as to popular election of Senators. From time immemorial an election to public office has been in point of substance no more and no less than the expression by qualified electors of their choice of candidates.

Long before the adoption of the Constitution the form and mode of that expression had changed from time to time. There is no historical warrant for supposing that the framers were under the illusion that the method of effecting the choice of the electors would never change or that, if it did, the change was for that reason to be permitted to defeat the right of the people to choose representatives for Congress which the Constitution had guaranteed. The right to participate in the choice of representatives for Congress includes, as we have said, the right to cast a ballot and to have it counted at the general election, whether for the successful candidate or not. Where the State law has made the primary an integral part of the procedure of choice, or where in fact the primary effectively controls the choice, the right of the elector to have his ballot counted at the primary is likewise included in the right protected by article I, section 2. And this right of participation is protected just as is the right to vote at the election, where the primary is by law made an integral part of the election machinery, whether the voter exercises his right in a party primary which invariably, sometimes or never determines the ultimate choice of the representative. Here, even apart from the circumstance that the Louisiana primary is made by law an integral part of the procedure of choice, the right to choose a representative is in fact controlled by the primary because, as is alleged in the indictment, the choice of candidates at the Democratic primary determines the choice of the elected representative. Moreover, we cannot close our eyes to the fact, already mentioned, that the practical influence of the choice of candidates at the primary may be so great as to affect profoundly the choice at the general election, even though there is no effective legal prohibition upon the rejection at the election of the choice made at the primary, and may thus operate to deprive the voter of his constitutional right of choice.

This was noted and extensively commented upon by the concurring Justices in *Newberry* v. *United States*, supra, 263–269, 285–287.

Unless the constitutional protection of the integrity of elections extends to primary elections, Congress is left powerless to effect the constitutional purpose.

Note that, Mr. President, because we must not forget that many of the same arguments we have been hearing in opposition to congressional interference, so-called, with State election laws as they relate to poll taxes were made in an attempt to prevent Federal interference,

so-called, into primary elections. That is why this decision of Chief Justice Stone is, in my judgment, so applicable to the issue before us. Of course, it is a fringe case, a borderline case; but, nevertheless, it deals with the interpretation of congressional power over elections, and it recognizes the right of Congress to take a look into procedures that involve primary elections, because the primary elections so frequently determine who the final congressional representative shall be. So Mr. Chief Justice Stone says:

Unless the constitutional protection of the integrity of elections extends to primary elections, Congress is left powerless to effect the constitutional purpose, and the popular choice of representatives is stripped of its constitutional protection save only as Congress, by taking over the control of State elections, may exclude from them the influence of the State primaries. Such an expedient would end that State autonomy with respect to elections which the Constitution contemplated that Congress should be free to leave undisturbed, subject only to such minimum regulation as it should find necessary to insure the freedom and integrity of the choice.

What do you suppose, Mr. President, he means by the use of the words "freedom and integrity of choice"? I think they, at least, are a peg on which to hang an argument that, after all, we do not have freedom of choice and we cannot have integrity of choice, either, when 10,000,000 people find themselves restricted as to their freedom to exercise a free ballot.

Mr. Chief Justice Stone further said:

Words, especially those of a Constitution, are not to be read with such stultifying narrowness. The words of sections 2 and 4 of article I, read in the sense which is plainly permissible and in the light of the constitutional purpose, require us to hold that a primary election which involves a necessary step in the choice of candidates for election as representatives in Congress, and which in the circumstances of this case controls that choice, is an election within the meaning of the constitutional provision and is subject to congressional regulation as to the manner of holding it.

I agree that this case deals with a primary election problem. But I also contend that it deals with the inherent power of the Congress, under section 4 of article I and under the fifteenth amendment, to step in and see to it that the necessary regulations are imposed by Congress to protect free suffrage in any instance in which a State adopts a method or manner of conducting elections which impinges or infringes upon the rights guaranteed by the Constitution as to elections. I do not think we can get away from that point. There is no reversal of that language of the Chief Justice, and it is not dictum. Its language bears directly upon the issue involved in this case.

Chief Justice Stone further said:

Not only does section 4 of article I authorize Congress to regulate the manner of holding elections, but by article I, section 8, clause 18, Congress is given authority "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof." This provision leaves to the Congress the choice of means by which its constitutional powers are to be carried into execution.

That cannot be erased, and I know of no reversal or retraction of that language. In my judgment, it is a clear notice upon the Congress that this decision by the United States Supreme Court recognizes the power, as I have argued in this debate, of the Congress to enact legislation which will protect the suffrage of free citizens; and it seems to me it recognizes by a clear, logical application of the language of the Court to article I, section 2, that that section contains words of limitation subject to the powers of the Congress over elections, vested elsewhere in the Constitution. That is a part of the very heart of the argument I am trying to make clear. It is a part of the very basis of the argument I would urge upon the Supreme Court if I were pleading the constitutionality of an anti-poll-tax bill before that Court. I think the Court would recognize the applicability of that language to the constitutional issue before us.

So I repeat for purposes of emphasis that Chief Justice Stone said:

This provision leaves to the Congress the choice of means by which its constitutional powers are to be carried into execution. Let the end be legitimate; let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional. *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 421). That principle has been consistently adhered to and liberally applied, and extends to the congressional power by appropriate legislation to safeguard the right of choice by the people of representatives in Congress, secured by section 2 of article I.

Mr. President, I think the excerpts I have read from the opinion of Chief Justice Stone in the famous Classic case lay the basic framework and foundation for my argument that the word qualification in section 2, article I, is a word of limitation, subject to the powers over elections given to the Congress in sections 4 and 8 of article I and also in the fifteenth amendment.

But in the Classic case there is a dissenting opinion, not dealing with the particular points I have been stressing. The dissenting opinion is by Mr. Justice Douglas.

There is certain language in the dissenting opinion which I think is worthy of notice in this debate, recognizing, as I do, of course, that it is the language of a dissenting opinion. The lawyers in the Senate Chamber know that the history of constitutional law in this country is one containing many pages which disclose that the dissenting opinions of one decade frequently become the majority opinions of succeeding decades. Therefore, I think this point of view, at least, of Mr. Justice Douglas as set forth in his opinion in the Classic case should be made a part of my remarks. At page 330 of that case, he said:

The important consideration is that the Constitution should be interpreted broadly so as to give to the representatives of a free people abundant power to deal with all the exigencies of the electoral process. It means that the Constitution should be read so as to give Congress an expansive implied power to place beyond the pale, acts which, in their direct or indirect effect, impair the integrity of congressional elections. For when corruption enters, the election is no longer free, the choice of the people is affected. To hold that Congress is powerless to control these primaries would indeed be a narrow construction of the Constitution, inconsistent with the view that that instrument of government was designed not only for contemporary needs but for the vicissitudes of time.

So I agree with most of the views expressed in the opinion of the Court. And it is with diffidence that I dissent from the result there reached.

The disagreement centers on the meaning of section 19 of the Criminal Code, which protects every right secured by the Constitution. The right to vote at a final congressional election and the right to have one's vote counted in such an election have been held to be protected by section 19 (*Ex parte Yarbrough*, supra; *United States* v. *Mosley* (238 U. S. 383)). Yet I do not think that the principles of those cases should be, or properly can be, extended to primary elections. To sustain this indictment we must so extend them. But when we do, we enter perilous territory.

We enter perilous territory because, as stated in *United States* v. *Gradwell* (243 U. S. 476, 485), there is no common-law offense against the United States; "the legislative authority of the Union must make an act a crime, affix a punishment to it, and declare the court that shall have jurisdiction of the offense" (*United States* v. *Hudson* (7 Cranch 32, 34)).

Thus he proceeded to dissent on the ground of a difference with the majority over an application of section 19 of the Criminal Code, but not on the broad principles laid down by the Chief Justice, which I have cited at considerable length, in regard to the powers of Congress in respect to national elections.

There are other cases I intended to discuss and other authorities to which I contemplated referring, but I have spoken at much greater length than I had any thought I would when I started this discussion. I have laid down at least the major premises on which I rest my constitutional argument. With the permission of the Senate, rather than take the time of the Senate to cite the further authorities, I ask to insert as part of my remarks certain material which I shall describe.

First, for review purposes, I should like to have inserted at this point in my remarks the digests to which I have referred, dealing with the Breedlove case, the Pirtle case, the Classic case, and the Edwards case, the so-called California "Okie" case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the digests were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONALITY

1. *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277), decided December 6, 1937: This action was brought to determine whether or not the appellees, the State officials, had acted unlawfully or illegally by refusing to register a white man aged 28 for voting for Federal and State officers at primary and general elections because he had made neither poll-tax returns nor paid any poll taxes. The opinion of the Court was perfectly proper in view of the fact that the appellant demanded the State official to qualify him to vote in a State election as well as a Federal election.

The Court arrived at this erroneous conclusion because it had erroneously judged the nature of the right to vote for Federal officials. The Court thought the nature of the right or the source of the right for a Federal official was the State itself. Surely, the State is not the one to grant a Federal privilege. The Court said "Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State."

2. *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (c. C. A., 6th Ct. (118 Fed. (2d) 218)), decided March 8, 1941, and certiorari denied by the Supreme Court: The issue in this case was whether the State could condition a right to vote for a Congressman in an election, not a primary, because the citizen had not complied, or had failed to pay a poll tax. It was not a State election and not a primary and the citizen had qualified in every way except pay the tax. The State levied the tax and set up the method of collection, having had difficulty in getting it collected, they burdened the franchise with the duty to pay the tax, as a method of collecting. It was therefore a condition precedent to the exercise of the right to vote. The court held that the right to vote in a national election is conditioned on such terms as the State wants to impose, and using the Breedlove case as a precedent about the right conferred by the State, said such right was conferred save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments on race color, or previous condition of servitude and other provisions of the Constitution. (Unanimous opinion of three judges.)

3. *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299), decided May 28, 1941: In this case the charge was that election officials had violated sections 19 and 20 of the Criminal Code by wilfully altering and falsely counting and certifying the ballots cast in a primary in Louisiana for a Representative of Congress. The questions for decision were whether the rights of qualified voters to vote in Louisiana and to have their ballots counted is a right secured by the Constitution and whether the appellees violated the sections of the code. Stone said, after citing cases going back to *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651) that the right of the people to choose their elective officers is a right "established and guaranteed by the Constitution and hence is one secured by it to those citizens and inhabitants of the State entitled to exercise the right."

He continued: "While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (cites cases), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution, 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.'"

Section 4 authorizes Congress to regulate the times, places, and manner of electing representatives in *United States* v. *Mumford* (16 Fed. 223, C. C., Virginia, 1883).

The Court said there is little regarding an election that is not included in the terms "time," "place," and "manner" and that Congress could legislate generally in respect to general elections.

In the Classic case, Justice Douglas went further on to say: "The important consideration is that the Constitution should be interpreted broadly so as to give the representatives of a free people abundant power to deal with all the exigencies of the electoral process. It means that the Constitution should be read so as to give Congress an expansive implied power to put beyond the pale, acts which in their direct or indirect effect, impair the integrity of congressional elections.

In the California "Okie" case, Justice Jackson in a concurring opinion (*Edwards* v. *California* (314 U. S. 181)): "We should say now, and in no uncertain terms that a man's mere property status, without more, cannot be used by a State to test, qualify, or limit his rights as a citizen of the United States."

The Breedlove case does not distinguish between rights of citizens as State or Federal electors, and the Pittle case is an effort to strike down the poll-tax restriction in Federal elections by judicial reasoning without the exercise of Congress of its power to regulate such elections.

In the Classic case Douglas went on to say that sections 2 and 4 of article I are an arsenal of power ample to protect congressional elections from any and all forms of pollution.

Mr. MORSE. Then, after only a brief mention of it, I shall ask shortly to have inserted in the RECORD certain arguments in support of the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill as submitted by some unquestionably outstanding authorities on constitutional law, in a memorandum entitled "The Case for the Constitutionality of the Pepper Anti-Poll-Tax Bill." I am not offering it as yet. I want first to describe it, if I may. The introduction of the pamphlet reads as follows:

INTRODUCTION

Too often constitutional questions are raised simply to obstruct or delay. In consequence many laymen have come to regard them with impatience as the occasion for a lawyer's game of matching precedents with little relation to actualities. When those who discuss such questions remember that the Constitution primarily embodies great principles of government, that it is indeed "a charter and not a document," constitutional issues assume a new importance. To discuss them in the light of history and political philosophy as well as of the law as formulated by the courts results not only in a more just understanding of the particular issue but also in a quickened sense of the meaning and value of our scheme of government. Such a discussion is of value to lawyers and laymen alike.

It is in the spirit of broad statesmanship that the supporters of the constitutionality of the Pepper anti-poll-tax bill have discussed the specific constitutional questions propounded to them by the Senate committee in charge of that bill. These questions are framed in narrow terms, but no satisfactory answer could be found without consideration of the history of the Constitution and the political philosophy of its founders.

The Pepper bill itself (S. 1280), the constitutional questions posed by the commitee, and the three principal statements in answer to those questions are printed in this pamphlet. The first statement is a memorandum, purposely brief, signed by 10 outstanding legal scholars, 6 of them connected with the poll-tax States either by birth and education or by recent affiliation. These signers are George Gordon Battle, of North Carolina and Virginia, long the leading southern member of the New York bar; Walton Hamilton, of Tennessee, now professor of constitutional law in the Yale Law School; Myres McDougal, of Mississippi, also of the Yale Law School; Leon Greene, of Louisiana and Texas, now dean of Northwestern University Law School; Robert K. Wettach and M. T. Van Hecke, dean and ex-dean of the law school of the University of North Carolina; Lloyd K. Garrison, dean of Wisconsin Law School; Charles Bunn, of the Wisconsin Law School faculty; Walter Gellorn, of Columbia University Law School; and Edwin Borchard, specialist in public law and professor in the Yale Law School.

The statement of Irving Brant is that of an outstanding student of the Constitution, who is also a political philosopher. Mr. Brant is the author of Storm Over the Constitution.

Mr. Morrison, the author of the third statement, has long been professor of constitutional law in Tulane University, and is now a practicing lawyer in New Orleans. Like Mr. Brant, he makes use of constitutional history in his statement, but uses it as the constitutional lawyer rather than the political philosopher. Because his statement will appear in full in the Lawyers Guild Quarterly it has been somewhat abridged for printing in this pamphlet, but no alteration of the meaning has been made.

These three statements all reach the same conclusion, but their authors travel different roads, and so their arguments supplement and strengthen each other. They constitute an important contribution to the understanding of the meaning of the Constitution, and of the plan of our forefathers in establishing a republican form of government.

These statements are in answer to a series of questions which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], then chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, propounded at the Judiciary Committee hearings on the so-called Pepper anti-poll-tax bill. I simply want to read the questions, because they show that the papers presented in answer to the questions bear directly on the great issue of this debate; namely, the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill.

The first question the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] propounded to these gentlemen was this:

Whether or not the drafters of the Constitution adopted, for the Federal election of the House of Representatives, the qualifications that might be laid down, whatever they were, by the legislatures of the several States.

The second query was:

Does this section recognize the right of the separate States to fix the qualifications of the electors by failure to make any reference whatsoever to those qualifications?

The third query was:

Does this justify the inference that again the right to fix the qualifications of the voters is a State right?

The next query was:

Is this not tantamount to acknowledgment by the Congress and by the States, when the nineteenth amendment was submitted and approved, that the fourteenth amendment did not prohibit the States from denying or abridging the right to vote?

And then, the next question that arises is, whether since there are only eight States which now have the poll-tax requirement, the object sought by this bill might not more effectively be attained by a constitutional amendment which should provide that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of any property qualification or poll-tax requirement?

Mr. President, these legal scholars, recognized authorities in the field of constitutional law, wrote answers, in the three memoranda which comprise this pamphlet, to the questions which the Senator from Wyoming put to them, and I ask unanimous consent to have the contents of the pamphlet printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PEPPER ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL

[77th Cong., 1st sess.; S. 1280; in the Senate of the United States, March 31, 1941, Mr. PEPPER introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary]

A bill concerning the qualification of voters or electors within the meaning of section 2, article I, of the Constitution, making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or general election for national offices

Whereas the requirements in many jurisdictions that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote at primaries or elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, have deprived many citizens of the right and privilege of voting as guaranteed to them under the Constitution, and have been detrimental to the integrity of the ballot in that frequently such taxes have been paid for the voters by other persons as an inducement for voting for certain candidates; and

Whereas these requirements have no reasonable relation to the residence, intelligence, ability, character [education, maturity, community-consciousness, freedom from crime], or other qualifications of voters; and

Whereas such requirements deprive many citizens of the right and privilege of voting for national officers, and cause, induce, and abet practices and methods in respect to the holding of primaries and elections detrimental to the proper selection of persons for national offices: Now therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or elections for said offices, within the meaning of section 2 of article I, of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and elections for said national offices and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting for said national offices.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to prevent any person from voting or registering to vote in any primary or election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified to vote in such primary or election. No State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision shall levy a poll tax or any other tax on the right or privilege of voting in such primary or election, and any such tax shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified from voting at such primary or election.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to interfere with the manner of selecting persons for national office by requiring the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void.

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the cover of authority of the laws of any State or subdivision thereof, to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1942.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The fact that you have presented this memorandum on the constitutional question, and the fact that I have discussed this matter on numerous occasions with Senator PEPPER, the sponsor of the bill, prompts me to take advantage of this opportunity to pose the constitutional questions that seem to appear to some of the members of the committee, in the hope that those witnesses who, hereafter, undertake to testify upon constitutional questions, will endeavor to answer these questions.

Now, the bill, itself, shows on its face a question of the interpretation of section 2, article I, which has arisen in the minds of the sponsors, as well as in the minds of the committee. Now, this provision of the Constitution reads as follows:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

It is obvious, from the language, that the drafters of the Constitution, in providing in this clause the qualification of those who should choose the Members of the House of Representatives, said, in so many words, that these electors should have the qualifications requisite for the elector of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The query is this: Whether or not the drafters of the Constitution adopted, for the Federal election of the House of Representatives, the qualifications that might be laid down, whatever they were, by the legislatures of the several States.

Now, the next section of moment there is section 4, of article I, which reads as follows:

"Time, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may, at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations except as to the places of choosing Senators."

It would seem to be clear, from this provision, that the drafters of the Constitution recognized the right of the respective State legislatures to fix the time, places, and manner of holding elections, but reserved to the Congress the right by law, to make or alter such regulation except as to places of choosing electors.

Query: Does this section recognize the right of the separate States to fix the qualifications of the electors by failure to make any reference whatsoever to those qualifications?

Then we come to article II, section 1, second clause:

"Each State shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress, et cetera," the electors spoken of, of course, being Presidential electors, and it was recognized by the drafters of the Constitution that the legislatures of the respective States have complete authority to direct the manner of election of such presidential electors.

Query: Does this justify the inference that again the right to fix the qualifications of the voters is a State right?

Then, I am prompted to call attention to the fourteenth amendment and to the nineteenth amendment, both of which have already been mentioned in this testimony this morning.

The portion of the fourteenth amendment which seems to be of significance is this:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

Obviously, this provision has the effect of making all native-born or naturalized persons in the United States citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside.

The question, then, arises as to whether or not the next sentence, which raises a prohibition upon the State, and prevents the State from abridging the privilege or immunity of the citizens, whether that is a prohibition upon the State to make a property qualification or a poll-tax qualification as the basis of the right to vote.

In construing this, the question will arise whether the nineteenth amendment does not have a bearing, because the nineteenth amendment, which was adopted many years after the fourteenth amendment, reads:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

Query: Is this not tantamount to acknowledgment, by the Congress and by the States, when the nineteenth amendment was submitted and approved, that the fourteenth amendment did not prohibit the States from denying or abridging the right to vote?

And then, the next question that arises is, whether, since there are only eight States which now have the poll-tax requirement, the object sought by this bill might not more effectively be attained by a constitutional amendment which should provide that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of any property qualification or poll-tax requirement?

I leave that to the constitutional experts.

Dr. RICE. As to that last question raised, I can only say, momentarily, that the history of child-labor protection is perhaps a nice parallel. Congress tried to prevent child labor by two specific acts, both of which were held to be unconstitutional, and then a constitutional amendment was proposed which never received sufficient strength and finally Congress ratified a bill which has gone into effect.

Senator O'MAHONEY. In other words, the Constitution occasionally is flexible?

Dr. RICE. The Constitution grows.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The committee will be in recess until tomorrow morning at 10:30 o'clock.

Whereupon, at 12:30 o'clock p. m., the committee recessed until 10:30 o'clock the following morning, Saturday, March 14, 1942.

MEMORANDUM

This memorandum is directed to answering briefly certain questions affecting the constitutionality of S. 1280, a bill to eliminate poll-tax requirements in Federal elections. The question as raised by the chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary considering the bill, are appended hereto. In answering these questions, this memorandum deliberately avoids discussion of controversial points not essential to the determination of the constitutionality of S. 1280.

Query 1. "Whether or not the drafters of the Constitution adopted, for the Federal election of the House of Representatives, the qualifications that might be laid down, whatever they were, by the legislatures of the several States."

The answer is "yes"; but such an affirmative reply leaves unresolved the crucial issues.

The basic issue is not whether the States have power to prescribe the qualifications for the Federal suffrage. The Constitution provides that to vote in congressional elections the voters shall have "the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." The basic question is whether the payment of a poll tax is a "qualification" for voting in the constitutional sense.

The Constitution looks to the substance and not to the form. Cf. *Nixon* v. *Condon* (286 U. S. 73). The Constitution does not authorize the States, under the guise of prescribing voting qualifications, to impose, contrary to the laws of Congress regulating Federal elections, restrictions on the Federal franchise that have no reasonable relation to a citizen's qualification to vote. If the payment of a poll tax has no rational relationship to the citizen's capacity to participate in the choice of public officials, it need not be treated by the Congress as a qualification within the meaning of the Constitution. A poll-tax requirement imposes a restriction on the citizen's right to vote, but if it is not a qualification in the constitutional sense, then it is within the power of Congress in regulating Federal elections to override such a restriction on the right of a qualified citizen to vote. As Justice (now Chief Justice) Stone stated in *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299, 315), "While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (citing cases), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution, to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.'"

In *Edwards* v. *California* (314 U. S. 181), the Supreme Court unanimously held that a State could not deny entry to a citizen of the United States merely because he was indigent. The majority of the Court resting their decision upon the commerce clause rejected the suggestion that the State police power could be exercised, as California had attempted to exercise it, to discriminate against citizens because of their indigence. Four of the Justices were of the opinion that, apart from the commerce clause, such discrimination was in violation of the rights of national citizenship as guaranteed both under the original Constitution and the privileges and immunities clause of the fourteenth amendment. One of them, Mr. Justice Jackson, in his concurring opinion, stated broadly (314 U. S. 181, 184–5):

"We should say now, and in no uncertain terms that a man's mere property status, without more, cannot be used by a State to test, qualify, or limit his rights as a citizen of the United States. * * * The mere state of being without funds is a neutral fact—constitutionally an irrelevance, like race, creed, or color. I agree with what I understand to be the holding of the Court that cases which may indicate the contrary are overruled." Whatever might have been true in times past, there is no doubt a serious question today how far property may properly be regarded as a reliable index of or even a rough and ready guide for determining the educational qualification, civic worth, or community loyalty of the citizen.

But a poll-tax requirement clearly has much less relationship to a citizen's capacity to perform the civic responsibility of voting than has a property test. The most shiftless of men may pay the tax because he found a $5 bill upon the street. The worthiest citizen may prefer to feed his family. In truth it is difficult today to establish any real or substantial relationship between the poll-tax requirement and the civic worth or capacity of the citizen. Until the Congress acts, the courts may hesitate to disturb State electoral practices because of their own views of the logical requirements of the Constitution. But any such hesitancy upon the part of the courts to upset State practices of doubtful constitutionality would be dispelled by congressional action. It would seem clear, therefore, that the poll-tax requirement need not be regarded by the Congress as an electoral qualification within the meaning of the Constitution giving the States the power to fix qualifications for the Federal suffrage, cf. *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (312 U. S. 277).

The Congress has affirmative power to regulate Federal elections to protect the rights of citizens under the Constitution and to guard against fraud and corruption in the exercise of the Federal franchise. The right of citizens to vote at congressional elections, subject only to such limitations as may be legally imposed by the State or Federal Government in conformity with the Constitution, is a right secured by the Constitution, which the Congress is empowered to protect by appropriate legislation. (*United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299, 314–315, 320).) Otherwise the rights of qualified voters could be set at naught. Assuming that certain restrictions on the suffrage which are not genuine qualifications in the constitutional sense may be imposed by the States in the absence of congressional action, such restrictions do not escape the Federal power to preserve the integrity of Federal elections and to protect the rights of constitutionally qualified voters. In the exercise of its powers over Federal elections, it is altogether fitting and proper for the Congress to prohibit State poll-tax requirements if in the judgment of the Congress such requirements unduly restrict the rights of national citizenship and make for fraud and corruption in Federal elections.

It is unnecessary to consider in this memorandum whether the State poll taxes are invalid in the absence of Federal legislation on the ground that they violate the rights of national citizenship secured by the original Constitution or by the fourteenth amendment. It is sufficient to affirm the power of the Congress to nullify such State statutes in the exercise of its power to regulate Federal elections and to protect the rights of constitutionally qualified voters. It is sufficient to affirm that should the Congress exercise its power in the premises, the courts in our judgment would sustain and uphold the action of the Congress.

Query 2. "Does this section (art. I, sec. 4) recognize the right of the separate States to fix the qualifications of the electors by failure to make any reference whatsoever to those qualifications."

Answer: We may assume an affirmative answer to this query. The power of the States to fix qualifications, however, is limited, as explained in our answer to query 1, by (1) the inherent meaning of the word "qualifications" as used in the Constitution, and (2) the power of Congress to protect the integrity of Federal elections and the rights of constitutionally qualified voters.

Query 3. Relates to article II, section 1, clause 2 of the Constitution which provides that "Each State shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct" the presidential electors.

While Congress could not question the right of a State legislature to provide the manner of appointment of Presidential electors, a State legislature in exercising that right must exercise it in conformity with the requirements of the Constitution. If the legislature provides for the appointment to be made by the process of election, that election, like a primary election for congressional candidates, "involves a necessary step in the choice of candidates" for national office "which in the circumstances of this case controls that choice" (*United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299, 320)), and that choice must be made in a manner that does not offend the Constitution or such legislation as the Congress may reasonably deem appropriate to protect the rights of constitutionally qualified voters from discrimination and invasion. Article II, section 1, clause 2 of the Constitution does not authorize the State legislature to fix arbitrary conditions to the right to vote for Presidential electors which have no relation to the voter's worth or ability.

Query 4. Relates to the privileges and immunities clause of the fourteenth amendment; and to the effect of the nineteenth amendment upon its interpretation.

Answer: The right of a qualified voter to vote subject to the limitations imposed by the Constitution, is a right secured by the Constitution itself prior to the adoption of the fourteenth amendment, and that right may be protected by appropriate congressional legislation (*United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299, 315, 320)). That right has only been fortified and strengthened by the privileges and immunities clause of the fourteenth amendment. The imposition by the States of proper qualifications for voting does not abridge the rights of national citizenship, either under the original Constitution or the fourteenth amendment. But restrictions which are not qualifications in the constitutional sense cannot survive congressional action to protect the rights of national citizenship under the original Constitution or the fourteenth amendment. It is unnecessary to consider whether a poll-tax requirement or a property test is invalid under the Constitution or the fourteenth amendment in the absence of Federal legislation.

The nineteenth amendment merely took note of the fact that sex was historically recognized as an appropriate qualification. It decreed that thereafter the right to vote should not be denied on account of sex either by the United States or by the States. It applied to State as well as Federal suffrage. It certainly throws no light on whether a State poll-tax requirement should be regarded by the Congress as a qualification in the constitutional sense for voting at a Federal election. The nineteenth amendment, which was designed to broaden the suffrage, certainly was not intended to take away any power the Congress might otherwise have to protect the rights of national citizenship.

If the poll tax is not a legitimate qualification for the Federal suffrage in the constitutional sense, the Congress has the power to eliminate it and protect the rights of national citizenship. A constitutional amendment is not necessary to achieve a result within the existing power of the Congress.

George Gordon Battle, Walton Hamilton, Myres S. McDougal, Leon Greene, M. T. Van Hecke, Robert K. Wettach, Lloyd K. Garrison, Edwin Borchard, Walter Gellhorn, Charles Bunn.

STATEMENT OF IRVING BRANT ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF S. 1280, BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE, JULY 30, 1942

The poll tax, employed as a restriction upon the right of suffrage, directly violates two provisions of the Constitution and comes within the regulatory powers of Congress under three other provisions.

It violates and can be abolished by Congress under article IV, section 4, which says that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

It violates and can be abolished by Congress under the Fourteenth Amendment, which says that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

It comes within the regulatory powers of Congress, and can be abolished, through the combined effect of article I, section 2, and the 18th clause of article I, section 8. The original jurisdiction arises from section 2, which says that in the election of the House of Representatives, "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

It comes within the regulatory powers of Congress, and can be abolished, under article I, section 4, which gives Congress power to regulate the "time, places, and manner" of electing Members of Congress.

All of these clauses have back of them the broad authority of the eighteenth clause of article I, section 8, which empowers Congress to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested in the Government of the United States. From that eighteenth clause Congress also derives independent power of legislation to protect the Federal Government in its constitutional independence and supremacy. That would include the power to control Federal elections.

To pursue this last point first, the Federal Government, by the terms of the Constitution, is a republican government, a government of the people, and a supreme government in all that comes within its scope. This carries with it, implemented by the "necessary and proper" clause, the right of the Federal Government to insure its own perpetuation, its independence of State control, its supremacy over the States in Federal affairs, and its status as a government of the people of the United States. If the Constitution did not contain a single word on the subject of congressional elections Congress would have plenary power to regulate them as a part of the implied power of a supreme government to maintain its supremacy, of an independent government to maintain its independence, of a republican government to maintain its republicanism.

However, it is not necessary to rely on this implication. The election of Members of Congress is specifically made a Federal matter by sections 2 and 4 of article I—section 2 setting up the qualifications of electors, section 4 regulating elections.

Article I, section 2, bears upon S. 1280 in two respects, first as to the nature of governmental power over Federal elections, whether it is primarily a Federal power or a State power; second, as to the scope and meaning of the proviso that congressional electors shall have the same qualifications as electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

It has been argued, by opponents of S. 1280, that because of the way congressional electors are defined the fixing of their qualifications is a State right and that any intervention of the Federal Government in that field is a Federal interference with a right of the States. To show the fallacy of that argument, we need but ask from what source the States derive this supposed right. It stems entirely from the Federal Constitution. Therefore it is not a State right at all, but a use by the Federal Government, for Federal purposes, of certain State electoral machinery. This has been the ruling of the United States Supreme Court and it was the opinion of those who wrote the Constitution. James Madison made it clear in No. 52 of the Federalist when he said:

"The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government. It was incumbent on the convention, therefore, to define and establish this right in the Constitution."

In the Newberry case Chief Justice White called sections 2 and 3 of article I "reservoirs of vital Federal power constituting the generative sources of the powers of section 4," and Justice Pitney, agreeing on this point in his dissent from the decision, declared for himself and Justices Brandeis and Clarke: "For the election of Senators and Representatives in Congress is a Federal function; whatever the States do in the matter they do under authority derived from the Constitution of the United States." The same position was taken by Chief Justice Stone for the majority, and Justice Douglas for the minority, in *U. S.* v. *Classic* (decided in 1941).

Section 2, therefore, does not appear in the Constitution as a State right to define Federal electors, but as a definition and establishment of a Federal right in terms of State law. When Madison discussed this subject in 1787, he had no fear of the effect of it. "It cannot be feared," he wrote in Federalist 52, "that the people of the States will alter this part of their constitutions in such a manner as to abridge the rights secured to them by the Federal Constitution." Madison misjudged the future, but in the very act of expressing his mistaken belief that the rights of State citizenship would not be abridged by the States, he made it plain that misuse of section 2 by the States would be an abridgement of Federal citizenship. Thus, at the very dawn of consitutional history, we have an answer to the question which next presents itself—whether, having defined a Federal electorate in terms of a State electorate, the Federal Government is bound to accept anything, no matter what its nature, that a State chooses to call a qualification for voting.

The answer to that must be "no," for three reasons:

1. Any other answer would imply that the Constitution is not an organic whole, but that one section of it can be lifted out and interpreted without regard to any other section or to the general nature of the entire law.

2. The mere fact of placing an affirmative clause in the Constitution gives the Federal Government the power and duty of policing that clause, to see that it is obeyed in accordance with its true substance and purpose as a part of the fundamental law.

3. In the understanding of any law, words must be given their true meaning. A qualification for voting is not simply the ability to dodge an arbitrary or unnatural disqualification. It must bear some reasonable relationship to the purpose for which electoral qualifications are set up. It must be a test of fitness harmonizing with American principles of government and bearing a living relationship to the period in which it is in vogue.

That brings us to the specific question whether the States, in restraining the right of suffrage by means of a poll-tax requirement, have set up a qualification for electors within the meaning and purpose of article I, section 2; and, furthermore, whether such a restraint upon suffrage comes within the power of Congress under other provisions of the Constitution.

What did the framers of the Constitution have in mind when they drafted article I, section 2? Did they intend to establish a broad and democratic base for the election of representatives, or a narrow and aristocratic base? Or did they simply turn the matter over to the States with no thought of what the States might do?

You will notice, first, that this section accepts the qualifications of the "most numerous" branch of the State legislature. The reason for that was that in some of the States a broader right of suffrage existed in the election of the larger house of the legislature than of the smaller. In this distinction, the larger body stood for the rights of the people, the smaller for the rights of property. These words were put into the Constitution, therefore, to insure a broad suffrage for the maintenance of popular rights by the House of Representatives, while the Senate, chosen by State legislatures, was expected to have more regard for property rights.

The popular intent in framing section 2 was further emphasized by the fact that in the process of adopting this clause, the framers of the Constitution voted down a motion to limit the right of voting to freeholders of land. The recorded debate shows that the purpose and expected result was to broaden the right of suffrage for all time. James McHenry read this section of the Constitution to the Maryland Legislature on November 29, 1787. This is what he said about it:

"It was objected that if the qualifications of the electors were the same as in the State governments, it would involve in the Federal system all the disorders of a democracy; and it was therefore contended that none but freeholders, permanently interested in the Government, ought to have a right of suffrage. The venerable Franklin opposed to this the natural rights of man—their rights to an immediate voice in the General Assembly of the whole Nation, or to a right of suffrage and representation."

Franklin was not the only one who spoke thus. No man in that convention believed that in writing article I, section 2, they were simply leaving it to the discretion of the States whether few or many citizens should be allowed to vote.

Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, advocating the adoption of this provision, said: "The people will not readily subscribe to the National Constitution if it should subject them to be disfranchised."

George Mason, of Virginia, advocating its adoption, said: "Eight or nine States have extended the right of suffrage beyond the freeholders. What will the people there say, if they should be disfranchised?"

Pierce Butler, of South Carolina, advocating its adoption, said: "There is no right of which the people are more jealous than that of suffrage. Abridgments of it tend [as in Holland] to * * * a rank aristocracy."

Even the opponents of section 2 had the same opinion of its effect. Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, opposing this provision, said: "Give the votes to people who have no property, and they will sell them to the rich who will be able to buy them." John Dickinson, of Delaware, opposing the provision, warned against "the dangerous influence of those multitudes without property and without principle with which our country, like all others, will in time abound."

Because of differing State laws and differing opinions, it was easier to provide for uniformity between State and Federal qualifications than for Federal uniformity among the 13 States, but both in the phraseology employed and in the choice of alternatives the purpose of section 2 was revealed, and the purpose was to establish a broadly democratic base for Federal elections. Madison described the result to the people of America in No. 57 of the Federalist:

"Who are to be the electors of the Federal representatives? Not the rich, more than the poor; not the learned, more than the ignorant; not the haughty heirs of distinguished names, more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States."

The record shows conclusively that article I, section 2 was adopted, not in recognition of any State right to define Federal electors, not to disclaim Federal responsibility, not to open the way to the disfranchisement of American citizens, but as a convenient means of assuring the right of suffrage to the great body of the people without overriding existing State laws which, on the whole, conformed to the standards of that day. Whenever Congress, by virtue of its power to make

necessary and proper laws, elects to enforce article I, section 2 by ending an arbitrary and unnatural disqualification of voters, it will but carry out the declared purpose of the framers of the Constitution to base congressional elections upon the great body of the people, rich and poor alike.

The fathers of our country could not visualize the coming of a time when the people would be corruptly deprived of their rights in State elections, and thereby cause Federal rights to be lost. Put they did look ahead to a time when the conduct of State governments might cause Federal suffrage rights to be lost, and they provided against it in article I, section 4. This section gives Congress power, by law, to regulate the time, places, and manner of electing Members of Congress, and to alter State laws on the subject. The debates in the Constitutional Convention show that the principal purpose of this clause was to make Federal authority paramount in Federal elections and to guard them against corruption. Rufus King, of Massachusetts, said that failure to give Congress this power would be "fatal to the Federal establishment." The words, "time, places, and manner," were not used narrowly. Madison said: "These were words of great latitude." It was impossible, he said, to foresee all the abuses that might arise from an uncontrolled discretion in the States. Whenever the State legislatures had a favorite measure to carry, he said, "they would take care so to mold their regulations as to favor the candidates they wished to succeed."

Under section 4, Congress has acted from time to time to prevent corruption in Federal elections. The poll tax is an agency of wholesale corruption, employed by political machines to debauch and control both Federal and State elections. The Virginia poll-tax requirement of the 1870's was described in the debate on its repeal as having "opened the floodgates of corruption." Poll-tax corruption was a prime factor in the repeal of the requirement in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania.

The poll tax corrupts elections in two ways, by a conditional disfranchisement of the voter, and by what amounts to an absolute disqualification.

The corrupting influence of the conditional disfranchisement is due to the fact that the disqualification can more easily be removed by an agent of political corruption than by the victim of the disfranchisement. Either in accordance with State law or in violation of State law, corrupt political machines buy up poll-tax receipts for those whose votes can be controlled. Citizens who cannot be controlled may be disfranchised by leaving their names off the assessors' books. If the law requires poll-tax payment several months before election, postdated receipts are given to the henchmen of the corrupt machine.

Relatively complete disfranchisement results from various forms of trickery in the writing of the law. In some States the tax is made cumulative, so that, although the yearly rate is small, the total is an impassable bar to voting. In some States it is unlawful to make any effort to collect the tax, which emphasizes the fact that it is not a revenue measure nor even a financial test, but a planned system of disfranchisement. The effect is to corrupt the election by the very development Madison said section 4 was to guard against, a slanting of it by State legislatures "to favor the candidates they wished to succeed." The corruption is the deeper and more pernicious because it aims, by legal trickery, to favor a particular class of candidates in successive elections.

Against the power of Congress to prevent corruption by forbidding poll-tax restrictions it has been argued that this method is unconstitutional because other and lesser measures might be employed to the same end. Those who argue thus would overturn the definition of the "necessary" and "proper" clause given by Chief Justice Marshall in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* and followed by the Supreme Court without deviation for a century and a quarter.

Observe what happens when you place sections 2 and 4 together, and consider them in relation to each other. Treated as broad and positive powers, they fit snugly together and complement each other. If Congress abolishes the poll-tax requirement under section 4, to prevent corruption, it thereby restores the breadth of suffrage contemplated by the framers of the Constitution when they drafted section 2. If you act under section 2 to defend the rights of citizens, you thereby put an end to the corruption which section 4 guards against. But if you hold that either of these sections takes away the power of Congress to act under the other section, you nullify the purpose of both.

One need not, I believe, go beyond these clauses of the Constitution to find ample power in Congress to put an end to the misuse of the poll tax in Federal elections. Yet this is a narrow approach. When the Constitution is treated as an organic whole, the constitutionality of S. 1280 ceases to turn upon the sections dealing with electoral processes and becomes a matter of the fundamental rights of American citizenship and the fundamental nature of American Government. The basic question is whether the millions of voters disfranchised by poll taxes are deprived of one of the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States guaranteed to them by the Constitution. Still more basic, but unnecessary to prove because it includes the last, is the question whether this denial of the rights of citizens goes so far as to subvert the republican form of State government made obligatory by the Constitution. For purposes of discussion, these two matters are interrelated. Anything that subverts republican government takes away the privileges and immunities of citizens. Anything that denies the constitutional rights of citizens in matters of government has a tendency to subvert the republican form of government founded upon those rights. Qualifications of electors laid down by State legislatures must harmonize with the constitutional rights of citizens.

Is the right to vote a privilege inherent in American citizenship? Franklin must have thought so when he made it still more basic, declaring that the right to vote is one of the natural rights of man. Jefferson must have thought so in 1824 when he said of his own State of Virginia: "The exclusion of a majority of our freemen from the right of representation is merely arbitrary, and a usurpation of the minority over the majority."

We are likely to be misled on this subject by the fact that property and taxpaying qualifications for voting were once universal in America, and were but slowly eradicated. Of this it may be said, first, that there is no basic resemblance—rather, indeed, a contrast—between the modern poll tax, used as a method of disfranchisement, and the early poll tax which was a true revenue measure and had the effect of extending the right of suffrage. In the second place, the failure to recognize a right at any given time does not prove its nonexistence; and, third, the absence of a right at one time does not prove its nonexistence later.

The rights of American citizens are not static. They are alive and growing, and the more slowly they grow the more surely they are established. Slow growth means a testing of principles in the face of opposition. The privileges and immunities protected by the Constitution are not merely those which were universally acknowledged in 1787 and 1868. They are the accumulated rights and privileges of the whole period in which they were developed, from the days of Protagoras down to the present moment. The poll tax as a weapon against the right to vote is not a recurrence to the property qualifications of 1787. It is a return to the principles of the Greek slave state of the time of Aristotle, who said, as paraphrased by Montesquieu: "It was only by the corruption of some democracies that artisans became freemen. * * * a well-regulated republic will never give them the right and freedom of the city." Poll-tax disfranchisement is based on the argument against a broad suffrage set forth by Gouverneur Morris in the Constitutional Convention and denounced and rejected by that body. Said Morris: "The time is not distant when this country will abound with mechanics and manufacturers [by which he meant factory workers]. * * * Will such men be the secure and faithful guardians of liberty?" The founders of our country rejected that doctrine. The Constitution rejects it. But the poll tax accepts it. The poll tax is a device for turning mechanics, factory workers, sharecroppers, tenant farmers, poor landowners, and day laborers back to the condition of servitude which Aristotle and Gouverneur Morris and the Bourbon kings of France thought them fitted for.

I wish now to call attention to the contrast between the modern poll tax and the early American property qualifications for voting. The American colonies were settled in protest against feudal land monopoly. Early land ownership in America was the badge not only of good citizenship, but of democratic equality. It was associated with the doctrine of Montesquieu that in a well-regulated republic, wealth should be divided as evenly as practicable and land holdings should be small and equal. It was associated also with the feeling of those who lived upon the land that it was the source of all things good.

When the colonists first adopted the laws limiting the suffrage to landed freeholders, it produced a near approach to universal suffrage for free adult males, because practically all freemen were freeholders. As land rose in value and men turned to industrial pursuits, disfranchisement resulted. The right to vote was therefore broadened by admitting freemen who paid taxes. The levying of any new tax increased the number of electors. The New Hampshire poll tax of 1784, and other later poll taxes, were laid for the specific purpose of increasing the number of voters. The franchise was broadened further by extending it to citizens who worked upon the public roads or served in the militia. The fundamental test was not wealth, but evidence of devotion to the state, and when the turbulent frontier pushed westward, that evidence was finally found in the simple fact of residence and citizenship. All of this was part of the American march toward universal free manhood suffrage, which has been a part of the original constitution of every State admitted to the Union since 1819, and, until reversed by the modern poll tax, had been accepted by every other State of the Union except Georgia.

This whole evolutionary process toward universal suffrage was a mere writing into American history of the doctrine laid down by Franklin in 1787 that the right to vote is among the natural rights of men. The modern poll tax is an attempt to reverse the processes of political evolution.

Even more directly, the modern poll tax violates the principle of majority government upon which our Constitution is founded. Here there is no evolutionary process, no gradual recognition of public rights under changing conditions. Majority rule has always been the basic principle of American Government. Madison put the matter clearly in 1821 when he declared himself against any property qualification for voting, saying: "It violates the vital principle of free government that those who are to be bound by laws ought to have a voice in making them, and the violation would be more strikingly unjust as the lawmakers became the minority."

Madison was protesting against the Virginia law limiting the franchise to landowners. But that law, when first adopted, extended the franchise to more than nine-tenths of the adult free males of the colony. It was only when the States lagged in changing their laws to meet changing conditions that they came into conflict with the vital principle of republican rule. These early practices and trends are diametrically opposed to the principle of the modern poll tax, which not only runs counter to the evolutionary development of the rights of American citizens, but also nullifies the fundamental principle of republican government—the rule of the majority.

Madison warned in No. 39 of the Federalist against the easy habit of calling everything a republic that was not a monarchy or a pure democracy. It is impossible, he wrote, to find the distinctive characteristics of the republican form except by recurring to principles. By that test, he wrote:

"We may define a republic to be, or at least may bestow that name on, a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure, for a limited period, or during good behavior. It is essential to such a government that it be derived from the great body of the society, not from an inconsiderable proportion, or a favored class of it."

Under that definition by Madison, the republican form of government does not exist today in eight States of the American Union. The government of those eight States, therefore, cannot be in accord with the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States.

Here we have something more than a denial of the individual right of the individual citizen to a share in his own Government. It is a denial also of the general public right to majority government in the several States, and to a national government based upon the great body of the people. The poll tax takes away from the individual his constitutional right to help write the laws by which he is governed. It takes away the right of the individual to share in the formation of a collective majority. It takes away the constitutional right of the entire society to enjoy the privilege of majority government.

The fourteenth amendment forbids the States to abridge these privileges, and Congress, under that same amendment, is empowered and enjoined to protect them. The Federal Government is required by the Constitution to maintain the republican form of government in the States. Government by a minority is not the republican form of government which our forefathers created, the only republican government known to our Constitution. It is no answer to say that citizens can obtain the right to vote by paying up their poll taxes. In the State of Alabama, a farmer who has spent his cash income raising a family, buying clothing and shoes for his children, paying for a small farm and keeping up his property taxes, may by default of poll taxes during this period find himself in a position where he must pay $72 cash to regain the franchise for himself and his wife. That is a lifetime disfranchisement, which bears no relationship to his qualifications as a citizen. The fourteenth amendment has little meaning if it does not extend to the cure of such a denial of American rights and perversion of republican government.

The question has been asked why, if the fourteenth amendment covers the voting rights of citizens, it was necessary to adopt the nineteenth amendment in order to extend the right of suffrage to women. That is an excellent negative illustration of the principle of evolutionary growth in the privileges of citizenship. The nineteenth amendment was necessary because the organic growth of the right of suffrage had been confined to men. Similarly, the fifteenth amendment was needed to enfranchise Negroes because the organic growth of the right of suffrage had been confined to white men. Let us suppose that men and women had enjoyed equality at the ballot box from the beginning of American history, that in the colonial period they had been disfranchised to an equal extent by property qualifications, and that each broadening of the right of suffrage had applied equally to men and women. We should then have attained, by 1868, not universal manhood suffrage, but universal suffrage regardless of sex. Then, we'll say, about the year 1919 some State passes a law forbidding women to vote, disfranchising at one stroke half of the entire electorate, taking away a right which they had enjoyed from the foundation of our country. Do you think it would take a nineteenth amendment to wipe out that denial of the privileges and immunities of citizens?

Thus you have four separate provisions of the Constitution, all harmonious, all supplementing each other, under any or all of which Congress has power to abolish the poll-tax restriction upon the right to vote in Federal elections. It has not only the power but the duty. I can hardly do better in closing than to quote the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Jackson in the unanimous decision by which the Court denied the right of California to exclude a citizen from its territory because of his indigence. He said: "We should say now, in no uncertain terms, that a man's mere property status, without more, cannot be used by a State to test, qualify, or limit his rights as a citizen of the United States." There you have in one sentence the judicial and moral verdict upon the poll tax.

STATEMENT OF JAMES T. MORRISON

I. THE FOUNDING FATHERS CONTEMPLATED AND AUTHORIZED CONGRESS TO LEGISLATE ON THE QUALIFICATION OF ELECTORS

In order to determine the intention of the founding fathers in drafting section 2 of article I of the Constitution, it is necessary to turn for a moment to the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention. The archetype of this section appears in the plan for a constitution submitted to the Convention by Mr. Pinckney. In the Pinckney plan, the provision appears as follows:

"ART. 3. The members of the House of Delegates shall be chosen every — year by the people of the several States; and the qualification of the electors shall be the same as those of the electors in the several States for their legislature." (5 Elliot's Debate, p. 129.)

This provision first came up for consideration in the Convention on Thursday, May 31, 1787, when it was proposed "that the members of the first branch of the legislature ought to be selected by the people of the several States." This resolution was opposed by Messrs. Sherman and Gerry, who favored election by the legislatures. Messrs. Mason, Wilson, and Madison, however, argued for the resolution, and it was carried by a vote of 6 to 2.

The question was again adverted to in Committee of the Whole on June 6, when Mr. C. C. Pinckney moved "that the first branch * * * be elected by the State legislatures, and not by the people." This time Mr. Rutledge joined Messrs. Gerry and Sherman in arguing for election by the State legislatures and Colonel Mason and Messrs. Dickinson, Read, and Pierce joined Wilson and Madison in arguing for election by the people. The Committee of the Whole defeated the proposed change by a vote of 8 to 3.

Again, on Thursday, June 21, the proposition was brought up and, according to Mr. Madison, "General Pinckney moved 'that the first branch, instead of being elected by the people, should be elected in such manner as the legislature of each State should direct.'" After considerable discussion, this proposal was finally rejected by a vote of 4 to 6. * * *

Finally, on Tuesday, August 7, the question of the qualification of electors was again taken up in a consideration of the report of the committee of detail. The committee had proposed the following as the constitutional provision:

"The qualification of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors, in the several States, of the most numerous branch of their own legislatures."

Mr. Madison reports that "Mr. Gouverneur Morris moved to strike out the last members of the section, beginning with the words 'qualification of electors,' in order that some other provision might be submitted which would restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders." This motion provoked considerable debate in the Convention. Mr. Wilson argued that this clause was carefully considered "and he did not think it could be changed for the better. It was difficult to form any uniform rule of qualification for all the States. Unnecessary innovations, he thought, too, should be avoided. It would be very hard and disagreeable for the same person at the same time, to vote for representatives in the State legislature, and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislature."

* * * * * *

Finally, and conclusively, the Convention, on June 21, 1787, flatly rejected a proposition that would have placed the qualifications of voters exclusively within the discretion of the State legislatures on grounds incompatible with a surrender of the power to prescribe qualifications by the National Government. On that date, pursuant to prior notice, C. C. Pinckney moved "that the first branch, instead of being elected by the people, should be elected in such manner as the legislature of each State should direct."

This resolution was vigorously attacked:

"Hamilton considered the motion as intended manifestly to transfer the election from the people to the State legislatures, which would essentially vitiate the plan. It would increase the State influence which could not be too watchfully guarded against.

"Wilson considered the election of the first branch by the people, not only as the cornerstone, but as the foundation of the fabric. The difference was particularly worthy of notice in this respect, that the legislatures are actuated not merely by the sentiment of the people, but have an official sentiment opposed to that of the general government, and perhaps to that of the people themselves.

"King enlarged on the same distinction. He supposed the legislatures would constantly choose men subservient to their own views, as contrasted to the general interest, and that they might even devise modes of election that would be subversive of the end in view. He remarked several instances in which the views of a State might be at variance with those of the general government * * *."

Mr. Pinckney's motion was defeated by a vote of 6 to 4. (Prescott—Drafting the Federal Constitution, pp. 208 ff.)

Here, then, is a perfectly clear expression by the Convention that the State legislatures should not be permitted to exercise an exclusive discretion as to the qualifications of electors of national officers because "they may even devise modes of election that would be subversive of the end in view," which certainly the language of article I, section 4, of the Constitution does not override.

While the Constitution as finally submitted did not "restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders" as Gouverneur Morris proposed, it

did omit the significant phrase that the qualifications of electors "shall be the same, from time to time," as those of the electors in the several States, leaving the provision merely to read:

"Electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

This highly significant omission can be explained only on the basis of the objection urged by Gouverneur Morris in convention on August 7, "that it makes the qualifications of the National Legislature depend on the will of the State, which he thought not proper."

The significance of the omission of the requirement that the qualifications of electors "shall be the same, from time to time" as those of the electors in the several States, and of the refusal of the Convention to grant the State legislatures exclusive discretion with regard to national elections, because the State legislatures "might even devise modes of elections that would be subversive of the end in view," is made even more apparent by the inclusion of clause 1 in article I, section 4, providing:

"The time, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators."

These two clauses read together, particularly in light of Mr. Madison's notes on the discussion in the Convention, and the fears of the fathers that the State legislatures "might even devise modes of elections that would be subversive of the end in view," show clearly an attempt to synchronize the view of Mr. Wilson that "it was difficult to form any uniform rule of qualifications for all the States. Unnecessary innovations • • • should be avoided." With Gouverneur Morris' objection "• • • it makes the qualifications of the National Legislature depend on the will of the State, which he thought not proper." The Constitution as finally worked out provides no uniform rule of qualification, makes no innovations and gives to the State, in the first instance, regulatory powers with regard even to national elections; but it heeds Gouverneur Morris' objections by retaining in Congress the power "to make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

Finally, if there was any question but that the founding fathers did not intend to surrender completely to the States the fundamental democratic power of determining the qualifications of voters, it is erased by the plain language of article I, section 8, subsection 18:

"The Congress shall have power • • • to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution • • • all • • • powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States."

Not only is the regulation of the "time, place, and manner of holding elections" a power specifically and expressly vested in the Congress by article I, section 4, but the determination of the qualifications of voters is a power unquestionably exercised by the Government of the United States in article I, section 2 of the Constitution itself. The very exercise of the power by the Constitution proves conclusively that it is one "vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States," from which it inevitably follows that Congress has the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying (it) into execution."

It has been urged that article I, section 4, clause 1 should be restricted to the mechanics of election and that it does not apply to the substance thereof or to the qualifications of electors. But this view is totally inacceptable in light of the history of article I, section 2, as set out above. It would, indeed, be strange if the founding fathers, whose wisdom and political sagacity in creating a document of enduring strength, permitted in this single instance an aberration which reserved to the National Government the right only to tinker with the mechanics of election while leaving entirely within the discretion, one might almost say, within the caprice, of the States complete power over the substance thereof. But there is nothing in the Constitution to indicate that the founding fathers were so shortsighted. They must have known, for instance, that Massachusetts from 1631 to 1664 had a law declaring that "for time to come noe man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politicke, but such as are members of some of the churches within the lymitts of the same," and that in the colonial period from which the country was then but just emerging "Baptists, Quakers, Roman Catholics, and Jews frequently found themselves excluded from political rights."

Certainly it cannot be suggested that the founding fathers meant to perpetuate such a theocratic system, or to make it possible for it to gain a foothold or to endure as a result of individual State action. Indeed, the Convention was already split on the question of property qualifications by pressure from the rising mechanics and merchant class, who were opposed to the property qualification. The record of the Convention makes it clear that it was in order not to disturb the delicate balance achieved in the several States between the proprietary and mechanics classes that the compromise incorporated in article I, section 2 was hit upon and adopted. It represents an acceptance for the time being only, of the status quo; it does not even suggest that the adjustment made shall be permanent; indeed, it was purposely designed to permit of change; and certainly it does not even imply that only the individual States can change it. To the contrary, words which did imply exclusive power in the States to alter the qualification of voters were significantly omitted after Gouverneur Morris' objection "that it made the qualifications of the National Legislature depend on the will of the States, which he thought not proper." To turn this clause, then, into a surrender of power by the National Government to the States is to miss the point always insisted upon by the fathers, that the National Government must prescribe the qualifications of its voters, and to defeat the whole purpose of its inclusion in the Constitution, for it is obvious that if the purpose of the clause were to surrender the power to the States, it need never have been included in the Constitution at all, or would have been phrased in unambiguous language such as was used in giving the State legislatures exclusive jurisdiction, with certain exceptions, over the qualifications of Presidential electors.

That article I, section 4, clause 1, was neither intended nor understood to be the innocuous procedural regulations of election machinery ascribed to it by later writers, appears clearly from the storm of controversy which arose over its inclusion in the Constitution. This controversy was so heated that Hamilton felt constrained to devote two numbers of the Federalist to this clause of the Constitution (Federalist, Nos. 59 and 60). In this connection, he said:

"This provision has not only been declaimed against by those who condemned the Constitution in the gross, but it has been censured by those who have objected with less latitude, and greater moderation; and, in one instance it has been thought exceptionable by a gentleman who has declared himself the advocate of every other part of the system."

Certainly such a hue and cry was not raised over whether the Federal Government had the power to open the polls at 7 in the morning rather than at 8, or the power to declare that elections should be held on the first Tuesday after the second Monday of November, or the 31st of May, or even whether the election should be held in the precincts, counties, or special districts, or where not; and certainly Hamilton himself was not thinking purely in the terms of such mechanical devices when he declared the importance of the provisions to be as follows:

"I am greatly mistaken, notwithstanding, if there be any article in the whole plan more completely defensible than this. Its propriety rests upon the evidence of this plain proposition • • • every government ought to contain in itself the means of its own preservation. Every just reason will, at first sight, approve an adherence to this rule, in the work of the convention; and will disapprove every deviation from it which may not appear to have been dictated by the necessity of incorporating into the work some particular ingredient, with which a rigid conformity to the rule was incompatible. Even in this case, though he may acquiesce in the necessity, yet he will not cease to regard and to regret a departure from so fundamental a principle, as a portion of imperfection in the system which may prove the seeds of future weakness and perhaps anarchy.

"It will not be alleged, that an election law could have have been framed and inserted in the Constitution, which would have been always applicable to every probable change in the situation of the country; and it will, therefore, not be denied, that a discretionary power over election ought to exist somewhere. It will, I presume, be as readily conceded, that there are only three ways in which this power could have been reasonably modified and disposed: That it must either have been lodged wholly in the national legislature, or wholly in the State legislatures, or primarily in the latter and ultimately in the former. The last mode has, with reason, been preferred by the Convention. They have permitted the regulation of elections for the Federal Government, in the first instance, to the local administration; which, in ordinary cases, and when no improper views prevail may be both more convenient and more satisfactory; that they have reserved to the national authority a right to interpose, whenever extraordinary circumstances might render that interposition necessary to its safety.

"Nothing can be more evident, than exclusive power of regulating election for the National Government, in the hands of the State legislatures, would leave the existence to the Union entirely at their mercy. They could at any moment annihilate it, by neglecting to provide for the choice of persons to administer its affairs. It is to little purpose to say, that a neglect or omission of its kind would not be likely to take place. The constitutional possibility of the thing without an equivalent for the risk, is an answerable objection. Nor has any satisfactory reason been yet assigned for incurring that risk."

II. S. 1280 IS CONSTITUTIONAL AS WITHIN THE UNDISPUTED POWER OF CONGRESS TO PROTECT THE PURITY OF THE BALLOT

S. 1280 expressly provides that—

"The requirements • • • that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote • • • have been detrimental to the integrity of the ballot in that frequently such taxes have been paid for the voters by other persons as an inducement for voting for certain candidates; and • • •

"Whereas such requirements • • • cause, induce, and abet practices and methods in respect to the holding of primaries and elections detrimental to the proper selection of persons for national offices • • •."

This amounts to a direct finding by the Congress that abolition of the poll tax is essential to the protection of the purity of the ballot in Federal elections. Such a legislative finding is not subject to impeachment by the courts, certainly not where supported by evidence, and the peculiar susceptibility of the poll tax to corrupt practices in elections is a matter of common knowledge, too well known to require extended discussion.

Nothing can be clearer than that Congress possesses the power to legislate to protect the purity of the ballot in elections for national officers. The principle was completely settled and has never been deviated from since the first case to come before the Supreme Court raising the question (*Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651)).

• • • • • •

It will be argued that the poll tax, be it a device for ever so much corruption, is immune from congressional interference, because, as a "Qualification requisite for elections of the most numerous branch of the State legislature," the power is expressly granted to the States by article I, section 2, of the Constitution to impose it as a qualification for the electors of national officers. But this is a fallacy to which at least three answers may be given:

1. Any such argument must assume that article I, section 2, grants to the States an exclusive power over the qualifications of voters for national officers, an assumption which the first part of this memorandum has demonstrated to be fallacious.

2. The Constitution expressly grants Congress plenary authority to regulate the "manner of holding elections." As said by the circuit court in *United States* v. *Munford* (16 Fed. 223):

"If Congress can provide for the manner of elections, it can certainly provide that it shall be an honest manner; that there shall be no repression of voters and an honest count of the ballot."

It should be clear, then, without going further, that the plenary authority with regard to the manner of conducting elections exercised by Congress under article I, section 4, supersedes even an exclusive State authority (if such it is) to prescribe qualifications.

3. Since the Classic case there is no longer any doubt but that the right to vote in national elections is one dependent on and secured by the Constitution—specifically by article I, section 2 thereof. This being so, it inevitably follows that Congress, under article I, section 8, clause 18, as well as under article I, section 4, is empowered to protect the exercise of such right against fraud, coercion, violence, or corruption. • • •

Again, the power of Congress to legislate upon matters within the scope of its authority is plenary under the very terms of the Constitution itself, which provides that:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof • • • shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby; any thing in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Hence, it is clear that an act of Congress passed pursuant to the Constitution is "the supreme law of the land," superior to its obligation to a State law or constitution, even although it, too, is passed pursuant to the Constitution of the United States. This has been decided in innumerable cases by the Supreme Court. • • •

And so here, too, with respect to S. 1280, even granting that the Constitution in article I, section 2, places the determination of the qualifications for voters in national elections exclusively in the States—yet when Congress exercises its undoubted power to protect the purity of the national ballot under article I, section 4, and under article I, section 8, clause 18, the exercise of which conflicts with a state power, the latter must, under our constitutional system, yield to the paramount power of Cohgress.

III. S. 1280 IS AUTHORIZED BY THE FIFTH SECTION OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Perhaps no power of Congress has been so little understood and so little exercised as that conferred upon the Congress by the fifth section of the fourteenth amendment. Like the spending power recently rediscovered in connection with the social security and agricultural adjustment programs, and the war power resurrected only in periods of national emergency, the enforcement power, as it may be called, of the fourteenth amendment has lain dormant since its first flurry of activity during the reconstruction period. But the failure of Congress to exercise this power must not be permitted to mislead, either as to its scope, or its importance; for the provision is pregnant with possibilities. This section merely provides that—

"The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

On its face, this provision is innocuous enough. But when it is considered that these words relate back to, and grant Congress the power to enforce, as against abridgments by States, such broad and comprehensive concepts as "Privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States"—deprivations of "life, liberty, and property without due process of law"—and denials of "the equal protection of the law"—then the tremendous scope of the latent congressional authority can be appreciated.

The significance of the tremendous scope of authority proposed to be conferred upon the Congress by this fifth section of the fourteenth amendment did not escape the Congress which proposed the amendment. It was consciously intended to confer broad and new powers, not theretofore possessed under the Constitution, on the Congress. Senator Howard, in introducing the resolution proposing the fourteenth amendment in the Senate, speaking for the joint Committee of Fifteen who drafted the proposal, said, in speaking of the fifth section:

"Here is a direct affirmative delegation of power to Congress to carry out all the principles of all these guaranties, a power not found in the Constitution" (Congressional Globe, 19th Cong., 1st sess., p. 130).

Its importance was emphasized by the attacks made upon the fifth section in the House. Mr. Hendricks said of it:

"When these words were used in the amendment abolishing slavery, they were thought to be harmless, but during this session there has been claimed for them such force and scope of meaning as that Congress might invade the jurisdiction of the States, rob them of their reserved rights, and crown the Federal Government with absolute despotic power. As construed, this provision is most dangerous."

A student of the period has commented on it as follows:

"These unequivocal statements by the representatives of the two parties leave little room for doubt as to the purpose of the section, or of the power to be conferred on Congress. What the one regarded as essential to the amendment to make it effective, the other regarded as dangerous."

The bearing of this on the constitutionality of S. 1280 is, of course, immediate, direct, and simple. The Classic case has held fully, finally, and decisively that—

"The right of the people to choose (i. e., the elective franchise in national elections) • • • is a right (privilege) established and guaranteed by the Constitution • • •."

This being so, it must inevitably be a "privilege or immunity of citizens of the United States" within the first section of the fourteenth amendment, and as such, under the fifth section thereof: "Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article," including abridgments of "privileges • • • of citizens of the United States"—i. e., abridgments of the elective franchise in national elections. As said by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Strauder* v. *Virginia:*

"A right or an immunity, whether created by the Constitution or only guaranteed by it, even without any express delegation of power, may be protected by Congress (*Prigg* v. *Com.* (16 Pet. 539)). So in *U. S.* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214, 23 L. ed. 563) it was said by the chief justice of this court: 'Rights and immunities created by or dependent upon the Constitution of the United States can be protected by Congress. The form and manner of the protection may be such as Congress in the legitimate exercise of its legislative discretion shall provide. These may be varied to meet the necessities of the particular right to be protected.' But there is express authority to protect the rights and immunities referred to in the fourteenth amendment, and to enforce observance of them by appropriate congressional legislation."

It is the fact of congressional exercise of its power under the fifth section of the fourteenth amendment to prevent abridgments by States of the right or privilege of citizens of the United States to exercise the elective franchise in national elections that distinguishes this situation from those presented in *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* and *Pirtle* v. *Brown*. In each of these cases the Court was asked to strike down the State requirement of payment of poll taxes on their own motion, and without implementation by Congress. This the court quite properly refused to do. As pointed out in the early case of *Ex parte Virginia:*

"All of the amendments derive much of their force from this latter provision. It is not said the judicial power of the General Government shall extend to enforcing the prohibitions and to protecting the rights and immunities guaranteed. It is not said that branch of the Government shall be authorized to declare void any action of a State in violation of the prohibitions. It is the power of Congress which has been enlarged. Congress is authorized to enforce the prohibitions by appropriate legislation. Whatever tends to enforce submission to the prohibitions and to secure to all persons the enjoyment of perfect equality of civil rights and the equal protection of the laws against State denial or invasion, if not prohibited, is brought within the domain of congressional power.

"Nor does it make any difference that such legislation is restrictive of what the State might have done before the constitutional amendment was adopted. The prohibitions of the fourteenth amendment are directed to the States, and they are to a degree restrictions of State power. It is these which Congress is empowered to enforce, and to enforce against State action, however put forth, whether that action be executive, legislative, or judicial. Such enforcement is no invasion of State sovereignty. No law can be, which the people of the States have, by the Constitution of the United States, empowered Congress to enact. This extent of the powers of the General Government is overlooked, when it is said, as it has been in this case, that the act of March 1, 1875, interferes with State rights. It is said the selection of jurors for her courts and the administration of her laws belong to each State; that they are her rights. This is true in general. But in exercising her rights a State cannot disregard the limitations which the Federal Constitution has applied to her power. Her rights do not reach to that extent. Nor can she deny to the General Government the right to exercise all its granted powers, though they may interfere with the full enjoyment of rights she would have if those powers had not been thus granted. Indeed, every addition of power to

the General Government involves a corresponding diminution of the governmental powers of the States. It is carved out of them."

In the present case, therefore, quite a different situation will prevail when the constitutionality of this statute is presented for adjudication. Unlike the situation which prevailed in the Breedlove and the Pirtle cases, Congress will have spoken. It will have declared, in effect, that the requirement in some of the States for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in national elections is an abridgment of a right or privilege of citizens of the United States, established and guaranteed by the Constitution. It will have prohibited the States from imposing through its legislatures and enforcing through its administrative and executive officers the abridgment found to exist. In so acting, Congress will have complied to the letter with the provisions of the fifth section of the fourteenth amendment in enforcing the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States as defined in *United States* v. *Classic*, in *Ex parte Yarbrough* and by Mr. Justice Bushrod Washington in *Corfield* v. *Coryell*. Under such circumstances no court will declare the act of Congress unconstitutional.

IV. CONCLUSION

The attention of the committee has so far been directed exclusively to justifying the power of Congress to prescribe the qualifications of voters in nations' elections. I should like, for just a moment, to direct the attention of the committee to the implications of the converse of that proposition—that the authority to prescribe the prerequisites to voting is a power resting exclusively in the legislature of each State over which the Congress has absolutely no control. These implications are, to say the least, startling, and, I submit, certainly not outside the boundaries of possibility, and even probability.

It must be recalled that the only constitutional restrictions on State abridgments of the elective franchise are contained in the XV and XIX amendments prohibiting the denial of the right to vote because of:

1. Race,
2. Color,
3. Previous condition of servitude, or
4. Sex.

It must be assumed, if the converse of the proposition here supported is true, that the individual States can impose any qualification on voting except such as violate the above prohibitions. Hence, Massachusetts could well reenact its statute of 1631, that "for time to come noe person shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politicke, but such as are members of some of the churches within the lymitts of the same."

There is no prohibition against the States establishing religious qualifications for voters. Montana could provide that only Catholics could vote; Nebraska that only Spiritualists; South Carolina only Lutherans, and Congress would be powerless to interfere. Moreover, Kansas could provide that only those who subscribed to the principles of the Communist philosophy possessed the qualifications requisite for voting; Idaho that only Fabian Socialists could vote; Indiana that only those who accept the principles of the corporative state; and Louisiana only members in good standing of the share-the-wealth clubs, who accepted the principles of every man a king, possessed qualifications entitling them to vote for Members of Congress. There is no constitutional prohibition against the imposition of any of the above qualifications—yet does any person seriously believe that the National Government would for a moment countenance such qualifications? And let no one say "It can't happen here"—it is now happening and has happened in too many parts of the democratic world.

Again, a number of States already disqualify from voting inmates of State-maintained charitable and eleemosynary institutions. It is but a step from this for States so inclined to disqualify recipients of WPA and social-security benefits. Already the cry is being raised in many sections of the country that such beneficiaries should be disqualified from voting. If Congress cannot outlaw the poll tax neither can it outlaw a disqualification based on receipt of benefits.

Thus the argument that Congress cannot constitutionally interfere with qualifications for voters in national elections established by the State legislatures reduces itself to an absurdity, and lays the foundation for a dissolution of the Union, for, obviously, it is impossible to adopt a separate constitutional amendment (such as the XV and XIX) to prohibit every deleterious qualification of voters that the ingenuity of the States can devise that would, as Mr. King pointed out on June 21, 1787, "be subversive of the end in view" in the establishment of the National Government.

Thus it appears that S. 1280 is constitutional from every point of view, and, indeed, that the position that Congress has no authority to prescribe the qualifications of voters in national elections leads to absurd and totally inacceptable conclusions. Perhaps this memorandum can but be concluded in the words of the venerable Benjamin Franklin, whose views on the qualifications of voters are particularly appropriate in view of the horrible and desperate war we are now waging. "It is of great consequence that we should not depress the virtue and public spirit of our common people; of which they displayed a great zeal during the war, and which contributed principally to the favorable issue of it. He related the honorable refusal of the American seamen, who were carried in great numbers into the British prisons during the war to redeem themselves from misery or to seek their fortunes, by entering on board the ships of the enemies to their country; contrasting their patriotism with a contemporary instance, in which the British seamen made prisoners by the Americans readily entered on the ships of the latter on being promised a share of the prizes that might be made out of their own country. This proceeded, he said, from the different manner in which the common people were treated in America and Great Britain. He did not think that the elected had any right, in any case, to narrow the privileges of the electors." (Madison's Notes on the Debates on the Federal Constitution. Debate of August 7).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the question of the constitutionality of an anti-poll-tax bill has been considered by a great many lawyers in the United States, particularly by lawyers who have been representing the various minority groups vitally interested in and conversant with the need for anti-poll-tax legislation. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People had, as of counsel on the subject, three outstanding colored attorneys, William H. Hastie, Leon A. Ransom, and George W. Crockett, Jr., assisted by Leslie Perry. They prepared what I considered to be an exhaustive and very able and sound brief on the subject of the constitutionality of anti-poll-tax legislation. Section 4 of the brief deals with the subject The Poll-Tax Requirement Is Not a Qualification Within the Meaning of Section 2, Article I, of the Constitution, and section 3 deals with the subject H. R. 7 Is Authorized by the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

In view of the fact, Mr. President, that I have stressed throughout my argument in support of the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill many of the points raised in this brief, I ask permission to have sections 3 and 4 of the brief printed as part of my remarks, because I agree with the contents of the brief, particularly sections 3 and 4. I repeat that the brief was prepared by counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

There being no objection, the sections 3 and 4 of the brief were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

III. H. R. 7 IS AUTHORIZED BY THE FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

In addition to the constitutional provisions already discussed, it is evident, too, that at least insofar as the Negro citizens of the Nation are involved, the enactment of H. R. 7 is authorized by the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution. This amendment provides that:

Section 1: The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2: The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Ratification of this amendment was completed in 1870, and it is no mere coincidence that shortly after this date the poll-tax-payment requirement as a qualification for voting mushroomed into prominence and became indigenous to those States having the bulk of the country's Negro population.[1] The requirement was first adopted in Tennessee in 1870; then Virginia followed in 1875; Florida, 1885; Mississippi, 1890; Arkansas, 1892; South Carolina, 1895; Louisiana, 1898; North Carolina, 1900; Alabama, 1901; and Texas, 1903. (See the statement of Henry H. Collins, "The poll tax in the South after 1865," subcommittee's hearings on S. 1280, at p. 253.) Only 7 of the 11 original poll-tax States now have a poll-tax requirement; North Carolina, Florida, Georgia, and Louisiana have abolished their requirement. But these 7 remaining poll-tax States not only have substantial Negro populations,[2] but their combined Negro population totals 6,534,113, or more than half of the Nation's Negro citizens.[3]

We are not, however, relegated to the use of statistics to demonstrate that the primary purpose of the poll-tax requirement in these States was, and is, the disfranchisement of the Negro population. The great mass of testimony presented at the subcommittee's hearings on S. 1280 verifies this conclusion. Indeed, the Judiciary Committee's report to the Senate, recommending the passage of that bill, expressly so found. Its findings on this point are so strong and so well stated that extended quotation therefrom seems justified:

"We desire to call attention to the Virginia constitutional convention which submitted an amendment which was afterward adopted to the constitution of Virginia by which it was intended to disfranchise a very large number of Virginia citizens. We think this convention can be regarded as a fair sample of other conventions in other poll-tax States. Hon. Carter Glass was a member of that convention. Near the beginning of the convention Senator Glass made a speech in which he outlined in very forceful language what the object was, after all, of the convention. * * * Near the beginning of the convention he made a speech in which he said: 'The chief purpose of this convention is to amend the suffrage clause of the existing constitution. It does not require much prescience to foretell that the alterations which we shall make will not apply to all persons and classes without distinction. We were sent here to make distinctions. We will make distinctions.'

"Near the conclusion of the convention, Senator Glass delivered another address in which he referred to the work already performed by the convention. He said 'I declared then (referring to the beginning of the convention and the debate on the oath) that no body of Virginia gentlemen could frame a constitution so obnoxious to my sense of right and morality that I would be willing to submit its fate to 146,000 ignorant Negro voters [great applause] whose capacity for self-government we have been challenging for 30 years past.'

"There is no doubt that what Senator Glass stated is the real object the convention had in view. The fact that his remarks were received with great applause indicates that his fellow members of that convention agreed with him and that the real object they had in view, and which they believed they could accomplish, was disfranchising '146,000 ignorant Negro voters.'

* * * * *

"It ought to be borne in mind also that many, if not all, of these constitutional amendments in the poll-tax States are in direct conflict with the statutes under which these States were readmitted to the Union under the act of Congress of June 26, 1870 (16 Stat., p. 62). The provision which refers to Virginia reads as follows: 'The constitution of Virginia shall never be so amended or changed as to deprive any citizen or class of citizens of the United States of the right to vote, who are entitled to vote by the constitution herein recognized, except as punishment for such crimes as are now felonies at common law, whereof they have been duly convicted under laws, equally applicable to all the inhabitants of said State: *Provided*, That any alteration of said constitution, prospective in its effect may be made in regard to the time and place of residence of voters.'

* * * * *

"It seems perfectly plain that the object of this poll-tax provision in the State constitutions was not to prevent discrimination among the citizens but to definitely provide for a discrimination by which hundreds of thousands of citizens were taxed for the privilege of voting and that, therefore, under section 2 of article I of the Constitution, it seems plain that such a provision in the State constitution, or State law, was simply a subterfuge to accomplish other aims by resorting to the so-called qualification clause in section 2 of article I of the Constitution. It is likewise equally plain that at the end of the War Between the States when these States were readmitted to the Union, they were readmitted under a statute of Congress which provided explicitly that the constitutions of the States 'shall never be so amended or changed as to deprive any citizen or class of citizens of the United States of the right to vote.'

"It is therefore plain, under all the circumstances, that the so-called poll-tax laws of the State bringing about such a disqualification to its citizens in the exercising of suffrage is in clear violation of the laws of Congress in addition to being a violation of the Constitution of the United States."

If then, the primary purpose of these State poll-tax requirements is, as the committee stated, the disfranchisement of a substantial portion of the Nation's colored population; and since, as the hearings on S. 1280 have indisputably demonstrated, this purpose has been and continues to be effectively achieved; it is readily apparent that these State enactments constitute an intentional denial or abridgment of "the right of [Negro] citizens of the United States to vote * * * on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Hence, they are violative of the express prohibition contained in the fifteenth amendment and the Congress is specifically authorized by section 2 of that amendment to strike down all such State abridgments by the adoption of such corrective and counteracting legislation as H. R. 7. (See *James* v. *Bowman* (190 U. S. 127, 137); *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214); and *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347).)

IV. THE POLL-TAX REQUIREMENT IS NOT A QUALIFICATION WITHIN THE MEANING OF SECTION 2, ARTICLE I, OF THE CONSTITUTION

Those who challenge the constitutionality of H. R. 7 rely upon the last clause in section 2 of article I of the Constitution. This section provides:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."[4]

These opponents of the bill contend that the language of the above article confers upon the States the power to determine who shall participate in Federal as well as State elections; that this power is uncontrollable, except as it has been modified by the fourteenth and nineteenth amendments; and that any further encroachment upon this power of the States must be amendments to the Constitution. In support of their position they rely upon the Supreme Court's decision in *Breedlove* v. *Suttle* (302 U. S. 277) and the later refusal by that Court to grant a writ of certiorari to review the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 F. (2d) 218). A close examination of these decisions, however, fails to indicate any support for such a broad proposition.

The Breedlove case concerned the validity, under the fourteenth and nineteenth amendments to the Constitution, of the Georgia poll-tax requirement. Petitioner, a white man, applied to the registrar to register "for voting for Federal and State officers at primary and general elections." The statutes of Georgia required that any person proposing to vote, should first subscribe to an oath that he had paid his State's poll tax. Petitioner, who had not paid the tax, demanded that the registrar administer the oath to him and omit all reference to the poll tax. Upon the registrar's refusal, petitioner requested the trial court to issue a writ of mandamus compelling the registrar to comply with his request. The trial court's refusal of the writ was affirmed by the Georgia appellate court and later by the United States Supreme Court.

The rationale of the Supreme Court's decision is, we submit, readily discernible from the above underlined quotation taken from its opinion. The petitioner in challenging the validity of the Georgia poll-tax requirement did so, not as a Federal elector, but as a State and Federal elector; he sought to register for both State and Federal elections. As we have seen (supra), it is not a privilege automatically inhering in United States citizenship that one be allowed to vote in Federal elections; and, certainly, there is no such privilege as to State elections. Also we have seen that nothing in the fourteenth amendment prohibits a State from imposing a poll tax, as a taxing measure, so long as it appears on its face to be a reasonable taxing measure. And there likewise is nothing in either the fourteenth amendment or in the nineteenth amendment that prohibits a State from making the payment of reasonable taxes a prerequisite to registering or voting in a State election. Since then, petitioner, insofar as the State election was concerned, was challenging a State statute of undoubted constitutionality as applied to him, the Supreme Court concluded that his claim should be denied.

The difficulty opponents of H. R. 7 seem unable to overcome in properly interpreting the Breedlove and Pirtle decisions stems from the Supreme Court's failure to restrict its opinion on this point. The particular language in the Breedlove opinion which has occasioned this misconception is the following:

"To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment (or the nineteenth amendment). Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate" (302 U. S. 277, 283).

Those who rely upon this language as supporting power in the States to condition the exercise of the Federal franchise upon the payment of State poll taxes, point out that the Court's opinion does not qualify the word "voting"; it does not say that payment may be made "a prerequisite of voting" in State elections only. And, of course, the Court's subsequent denial of certiorari in the Pirtle case lends color to this interpretation.

But did the Court intend to decide that the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments constituted the only restrictions upon the States' power to set forth the qualifications or the conditions precedent which should determine those privileged to vote in Federal elections? The answer, we submit, must be in the negative; both reason and authority militate against any such holding. Some significance must be attached to the Court's reference in the above quotation to "other provisions of the Federal Constitution." These "other provisions," together with their significance were quite forcefully pointed out by the Court's later opinion and decision in *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299), quoted supra, page 9.

[1] The Georgia constitutions of 1865 and 1877 made the payment of all taxes a prerequisite to voting in general elections; but in 1908 the constitution was amended so as to make payment of the poll tax a requirement for voting in the primary election also.

[2] Alabama's total population is 2,832,961 of which 983,200 are Negroes; Arkansas' total is 1,949,384 of which 482,578 are Negroes; Mississippi's population totals 2,183,796 which includes 1,074,578 Negroes; South Carolina's population of 1,899,804 includes 814,664 Negroes; while Tennessee's 2,915,841 includes 508,736 Negroes; 924,391 Negroes are included in Texas' population of 6,414,824; while Virginia's total of 2,677,773 includes 661,449 Negroes. (All figures taken from the United States Census, 1940.)

[3] The term "potential voters" might well be used instead of citizens since, according to the 1940 census, "The highest proportion [of native born persons above 21 years], 99.8, was found in four Southern States—North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi." In Alabama and Tennessee, 99.7 percent of the population, 21 years and over, was native born; Virginia, 99.5; and Texas, 96.1 (Series P-10, No. 5, Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940.)

[4] A similar provision is found in the seventeenth amendment providing for the popular election of Senators. The evident purpose of thus defining the Federal electorate in the several States in terms of the State electorate in those States was to insure the broadest and most democratic base administratively possible for the election of Federal officers—a policy with which the present State poll-tax requirements is at direct variance. This point is fully developed in the statement of Irving Brant before the Subcommittee on S. 1280 (Hearings, pp. 209–211) and the brief of the National Lawyers' Guild (Hearings 241, 246–247), and will not be enlarged on here.

Admittedly, however, this explanation of the Breedlove decision in terms of its application to State elections only does not reconcile the denial of the certiorari in the Pirtle case, where a Federal election only was involved. Also, it does not take into account the fact that certiorari was denied in the Pirtle case after the decision in the Classic case. All of which, we think, serves to emphasize what we have said before, namely, that the only logical explanation for this seeming conflict in the Supreme Court's actions in these cases is the fact that poll-tax statutes appear on their face to be bona fide tax measures, and the requirement that they be paid as a condition to voting also appears on its face to be a reasonable method of collecting the tax. It is only when the purposes or motives of the States in adopting this means of collection is presented—which were not considered in the Breedlove case—that the viciousness and illegality of the scheme is demonstrated. The Supreme Court, however, seems committed to the view that purposes or motives are "beyond the scope of judicial inquiry (*Magnano Co. v. Hamilton* (292 U. S. 40, 44)); but cf. *Child Labor Tax Case* (259 U. S. 20, 38, cited supra, p. 14)). Any petition seeking to eliminate these requirements as qualifications for Federal electors by showing their true purpose and effect must, therefore, be presented to the Congress as the only branch of the Federal Government capable to consider and deal adequately with the whole issue.

We have stated above that reason supported our conclusion that the power exercised by the States in setting forth the qualifications of electors for the most numerous branch of their legislatures and, by virtue of section 2 of article I of the Constitution, for Members of the Congress also, was limited by other constitutional provisions besides the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments. The reason inheres in the nature of our dual system of government. To hold that the States alone, and subject only to the constitutional mandate that no qualification be based upon sex, color, race, or previous condition of servitude, may determine who shall vote for Federal officers would, when carried to its logical extreme, be tantamount to denying to the National Government the only means by which its continued existence and the orderly conduct of its constitutional functions might be assured. For obviously, if the States alone are to have the final word on who shall be Federal electors, they may, by the imposition of qualifications stringent, unreasonable, and having no relation whatever to one's character or fitness to vote, exclude so many voters that the Federal electorate will be reduced to nil. Indeed, that is precisely the condition the poll-tax qualifications have produced. For example, the State of Rhode Island with 424,876 citizens 21 years of age and over, cast 319,649 votes for Presidential electors, or 75 percent of the potential vote in 1940. While Georgia, on the other hand, with a potential voting population of 1,768,969 citizens 21 years of age and over, only cast 312,539 votes, or 18 percent of its potential vote. (See chart on pp. 289–290 of subcommittee's hearings on S. 1280.) Nor is it any answer to this argument to urge that since the States can reduce the Federal electorate only by reducing the State electorate for the most numerous branch of the State legislature, reduction of the latter to a point where it ceases to be a means of insuring a republican form of government within the State would bring into operation section 4 of article IV of the Constitution, which provides that:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

The short reply to any such contention is that the above comparison between the size of the electorate in a poll-tax and in a non-poll-tax State, being typical, demonstrates conclusively that a republican form of government as contemplated by the Constitution does not now exist in the poll-tax States; and accordingly the Congress, pursuant to the general constitutional mandate to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the • • • powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States," is authorized to restore a republican form of government to the people of these poll-tax States by enacting H. R. 7. For the simple, evident, and indisputable truth is that the poll-tax requirement is not and never was intended by its sponsors to be a qualification or a gage of the citizen's fitness to participate in representative government. Therefore it should be abolished.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons we urge that this committee recommend to the Senate passage of H. R. 7.

Respectfully submitted.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE.
NEW YORK, N. Y.
Of counsel:
WILLIAM H. HASTIE,
LEON A. RANSOM,
GEORGE W. CROCKETT, JR.
OCTOBER 1943.

Mr. MORSE. With that, Mr. President, I am about to conclude my remarks on the subject by saying to the gentlemen of the opposition that I consider it has been a great privilege to join issue with them on the subject. I am sure that they will share my opinion that we have fought it out on highly professional grounds, as lawyers should, and, as lawyers, I am sure they also agree with my point of view that in due course of time, if we are allowed to pass an anti-poll-tax bill in the Senate, our argument will be settled once and for all, by that repository of constitutional decisions, the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I close with the prayer and the plea that the Senators on the other side of the aisle, after completing their case on the merits of this issue in accordance with what I think, in the clear contemplation of the people of the country, should be the practice of the United States Senate, will agree to allow a vote to be taken on the bill, so that we may start the issue on its way to final constitutional determination by the men who, under our three-branch check-and-balance system of government, have the solemn obligation of passing finally on constitutional questions.

With that statement, that prayer, and plea, I close my remarks on this subject.

Mr. President, I should like now to say a few words regarding another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 by providing a secondary market for GI loans, so to speak, in respect to the purchase of houses by veterans. I shall not take the time to read the remarks which I intended to make at the time of introducing the bill but shall simply ask permission to have the bill printed in full in the body of the RECORD, to be followed by the statement which I intended to deliver on the floor of the Senate when I introduced the bill, including reasons for the enactment of a bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the bill, together with the statements presented by the Senator from Oregon, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2927) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is hereby further amended as follows:

(1) Change the number of section "511" thereof to read "512"; and

(2) Immediately after section 510 thereof insert the following new section:

"SECONDARY MARKET

"SEC. 511. (a) The Administrator is authorized, empowered, and directed, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consistent with this act, to purchase, at a price equal to the unpaid principal plus accrued interest, hereinafter referred to as 'par,' any residential real-estate loan guaranteed under sections 501, 502, or 505 (a) of this title: *Provided*, That, (1) such loan is offered to the Administrator for purchase within 5 years of the date of its origin by the lender to whom the evidence of guaranty was originally issued, (2) the amount of unpaid principal, plus accrued interest, of any loan guaranteed before September 1, 1948, shall not exceed $12,000, (3) the original amount of any such loan guaranteed on or after September 1, 1948, shall not exceed $7,500, (4) the loan shall not be in default at the time of purchase, (5) the seller shall enter into an agreement with the Administrator that at the option of the Administrator the seller will service the loan in return for a service charge at such rate, not in excess of 1 percent per annum of the unpaid balance, as may be provided in such agreement, (6) no mortgage, if insured after September 1, 1948, shall be purchased by the Administrator unless the mortgagee certifies that the housing with respect to which the mortgage was made meets the construction standards prescribed for insurance of mortgages on the same class of housing under the National Housing Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may sell any loan purchased under this section at a price not less than par, with the primary right of repurchase reserved to the original mortgagee: *And provided further*, That no mortgage shall be purchased by the Administrator from any one mortgagee (1) unless such mortage is secured by property used, or designed to be used, for residential purposes and (2) if the unpaid principal balance thereof, when added to the aggregate amount paid for all mortgages purchased and held by the Administrator from such mortgagee pursuant to authority contained herein, exceeds 66⅔ percent of the original principal amount of all mortgages made by such mortgagee which are guaranteed under sections 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

"(b) For the purpose of this section the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Administrator such sums as he may request from time to time between the effective date of this section and the expiration of the period of time in which loans may be offered for purchase pursuant to the terms of this section. Such sums, together with all moneys received by the Administrator under this section, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States in a special deposit account, to be disbursed through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department. On sums so advanced by the Secretary of the Treasury, less those amounts deposited in miscellaneous receipts under subsection (d) hereof the Administrator shall pay semiannually to the Treasurer of the United States interest at the rate or rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the deposit.

"(c) In order to make such sums available to the Administrator the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use, as a public-debt transaction, the proceeds of the sale of any security hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended are hereby extended to include such purposes.

"(d) The Administrator shall from time to time cause to be deposited into the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, such of the funds in the special deposit account referred to in subsection (b) hereof, as in his judgment are not needed for the purposes hereof, and after the last day on which the Administrator may purchase loans under this section, he shall, with due allowance for outstanding commitments, cause to be so deposited all sums in said account, and all moneys received thereafter, representing the repayment or recovery of the principal of obligations purchased pursuant to this section. Interest collected by the Administrator in excess of the amount payable by the Administrator to the Treasurer pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, together with any miscellaneous receipts or credits the disposition of which is not otherwise provided for herein, shall constitute a reserve for payment of losses, if any, and expenses incurred in the liquidation of said loans. Without regard to any other provisions or limitations of law or otherwise (except the provisions of this title) the Administrator shall have authority in carrying out the functions hereby or hereunder vested in him to exercise any and all rights of the United States, including without limitation, the right to take or cause to be taken such action as in his judgment may be necessary or appropriate for or in connection with the custody, management, protection, realization, and liquidation of assets, to determine the necessary expenses and expenditures and the manner in which the same shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for and audited, to invest available funds in obligations of the United States, to make such rules, regulations, requirements, and orders as he may deem necessary and appropriate, and to employ, utilize, compensate, and delegate any of the functions hereunder to such persons and such corporate or other agencies, including agencies of the United States, as he may designate."

SEC. 2. Title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) In section 301 (a) (1) strike out the following: "or guaranteed under section 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended"; and

(2) Strike out the period at the end of section 302 thereof, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That after September 1, 1948, the Association shall not be authorized further to purchase loans guaranteed under sections 501, 502, and 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended."

The statement presented by Mr. MORSE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I have introduced today a bill designed to allow veterans to take advantage once again, easily and in numbers, of the home-loan provisions of the GI bill of rights.

It is necessary legislation; it is simple, single-purpose legislation; it will actually put money into the Treasury of the United States, rather than drain out funds in the form of subsidies. I shall explain briefly what this bill (S. 2927) proposes and why it is needed. I trust this great body will pass this bill with a minimum delay.

In what were literally the closing minutes of the last session of this Congress, some 6 weeks ago now, we passed legislation designed to reestablish secondary markets for GI home-loan mortgages. This was necessary because, after the Government's secondary market for these mortgages had been allowed to lapse in 1947, there was a marked and alarming decrease in the number of GI home loans. The veterans simply could not find lenders when the lenders could not find a secondary market.

The action of 6 weeks ago established a secondary market in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, where it had existed prior to midsummer of 1947. Actual working experience with the legislation has shown, however, that it is unnecessarily restrictive and that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is tending to handle the problem in a way which underlines the restrictions.

The present bill (S. 2927) establishes a secondary market for GI home-loan mortgages in the Veterans' Administration, where we originally had intended it should be, where the veterans want it and where the operating personnel is primarily concerned with veterans' needs and rights and not with banking technicalities.

S. 2927 would authorize the Veterans' Administrator to purchase GI home-loan mortgages at par within 5 years of the date of issuance. Where such a loan had been guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration prior to September 1, 1948, the amount of unpaid principal, plus accrued interest, could not exceed $12,000. The original amount of any loan guaranteed on or after September 1, 1948, could not exceed $7,500. The service fee established under the bill would not be more than 1 percent. S. 2927 provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide the Administrator with the funds necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill; that these shall be kept in a special deposit account with the Treasurer of the United States; and that the Administrator shall pay interest to the Treasurer at a rate to be established by the Secretary of the Treasury. This is a type of operation with which we are all familiar.

Nothing is wrong with the GI bill of rights, as such, but the veterans' home-loan program has declined alarmingly because of the lack of a proper secondary market. S. 2927 has the single purpose of again making the GI bill of rights effective. It is the kind of housing legislation which this extraordinary session can, and should, pass because it is not involved in the great disputes which rage around other suggested housing legislation. The market operation which it proposes will not cost the Government a cent; the record shows that the Government actually has made money on all such mortgage operations in the past.

This proposal has the backing of veterans' groups. Its benefits to the veterans are obvious. It should be noted that the building industry, building labor, and the community as a whole also would benefit since increased GI home-loan activity obviously will mean increased veterans' home building all over the United States. This bill provides a simple key to opening up a great volume of housing for a great number of veterans. This bill should be passed

The following reasons may be cited for the enactment of the bill:

1. Public Law 864, Eightieth Congress, second session, (S. 2790 introduced by Senator JENNER) established a secondary market in the Federal National Mortgage Association for loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. As the bill was passed by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this authority would have been placed in the Veterans' Administration. However, by an amendment submitted by Chairman WOLCOTT in the House the authority was placed in the Federal National Mortgage Association. In this bill it is proposed to end the authority of FNMA to purchase GI loans and place the authority in the Veterans' Administration. The VA guarantees the loans and should be authorized to purchase them when offered by the original lender. Such loans should not be tied up with big banking operations of the type handled by the RFC and its subsidiaries.

2. As passed by the Senate, Public Law 864 would have allowed the purchase of 66⅔ percent of all GI mortgages offered by any one mortgagee. As changed by the House and subsequently confirmed by the Senate this authority was reduced to 25 percent and as now interpreted by the FNMA that 25 percent is based on those mortgages made after April 30, 1948. This bill would allow the purchase of 66⅔ percent of all GI loans made by any one mortgagee regardless of the date on which they were guaranteed. The restricted authority of FNMA as contained in Public Law 864 is no more than a drop in the bucket and would not even approach a solution of the problem of providing an adequate secondary market for GI loans. The institutions now holding a great volume of these loans need liquidity such as is afforded by an adequate secondary market in the Federal Government.

3. Public Law 864 as interpreted by FNMA does not allow for the purchase of any mortgages made before April 30, 1948. This bill would provide for the purchase of a percentage of any GI loans guaranteed prior to September 1, 1948 provided the outstanding obligation does not exceed $12,000. Under Public Law 864 loans made after April 30, 1948, could be purchased provided they did not exceed $10,000. Under this bill we would limit the amount of such mortgages to $7,500 guaranteed in the future. The reason for these provisions is that we cannot unreasonably restrict the purchases of mortgages heretofore made because the veterans already have them. The institutions already have them in their portfolio and they need a market for them in order to make new loans to veterans for lower priced houses in the future. We are definitely limiting future loans to lower priced houses for the veterans.

4. Under Public Law 864 the lending institution from which the FNMA purchased GI loans could be allowed not more than one-half of 1 percent for servicing the loans for the FNMA. In this bill we would leave it to the Veterans' Administration to determine the amount of the service fee provided it did not exceed 1 percent of the unpaid principal.

5. Under Public Law 864 the FNMA was authorized to purchase loans of both the FHA type and the GI type up to $300,000,000. Under this bill we authorize the Veterans' Administration to procure necessary sums from the Treasury and directs that he shall in turn deposit in the Treasury in a special deposit account any funds received by the Veterans' Administration. According to past history of such home-guaranty actions of the Federal Government, it is indicated that this provision of the secondary market in the VA will not cost the Federal Government any money but rather that the Government will make money.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this morning I made the statement that there would not be a night session and that a statement with reference to recessing or adjourning the Senate would be made at the appropriate time.

I want to state at this time for the RECORD that it has become crystal clear that until the Senate's rules on cloture are amended it is impossible to take action on House bill 29, the anti-poll-tax bill. Therefore, the holding of a night session in which to attempt to do the impossible is hypocrisy in its rankest form. I think we should be honest and truthful not only to ourselves but to the American people in making our decision. It was determined this morning by the majority conference that a vote on cloture is out of the question, apparently, until the rules of the Senate are amended so as to provide that a cloture petition may be filed not only on a bill or measure, but on motions, so that all barriers, including dilatory motions, which prevent the Senate's proceeding to the consideration of important legislation, may be outlawed, so to speak.

I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration when it reported the so-called Knowland resolution to change the cloture rule so as to eliminate dilatory motions in connection with a bill. It is my understanding that it is the intention to appoint a committee to study remedial amendments to the rule, and it is our feeling that at the beginning of another session, the session next January, if possible, we should proceed in good faith to change the rule, and should make that subject the first order of business, so that we may be able to apply cloture in connection with a motion as well as the subject matter of a bill.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I make this statement only for the reason that I made the announcement this morning that there would not be night sessions, because it is thought that continued night sessions would accomplish nothing, that they would be futile. We therefore decided that the proper course is to adjourn so that we may have a morning hour tomorrow for the consideration of legislation which may be reported under the unanimous-consent order which has been entered today, and which otherwise might have to lie over. I hope we may be able to consider such important legislation as I hope will come from the Committee on Banking and Currency dealing with anti-inflation and other matters which are now before the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Just one other matter. I shall yield to the minority leader, because I think it is a courtesy which should always be extended. I regret to state to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] that I have told many Senators that there would be an immediate adjournment, and asked them to delay offering routine matters or inserting articles in the RECORD until tomorrow morning, if they would agree to that, and all to whom I spoke did agree. Therefore I yield to the minority leader, and I beg other Senators not to ask me to yield to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desired to have the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is correct in what he says; he did request that I not ask him to yield. I thought he might appreciate confirmation of his statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I do; I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BARKLEY. My reason for suggesting the absence of a quorum, which I do without taking the Senator from the floor, although under the rules it would deprive him of the floor, is that I may want to ask him a question or two or make a statement with regard to what he has said. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for that purpose. I say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and also to the other Members of the Senate, that I would rather the Senator would ask me his questions now, because I intend to make a motion that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would rather have a larger attendance.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I merely wanted the Senate to know that I intended to make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that, and it was in connection with that that I suggested the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bricker	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Wyo
Brooks	Jenner	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Cain	Kilgore	Stennis
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Taylor
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Fazzel	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	
Hatch	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the minority leader for an observation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that without taking the Senator from Nebraska from the floor I may not only ask him a question, but make a brief observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Nebraska, the acting majority leader, has said in regard to the present status of the rules of the Senate. There is no need to reiterate what has happened here in the past. When I was confronted with the same situation which confronts him I repeatedly stated that I favored an amendment to the rules of the Senate so that it would not be impotent when a well-organized group of a few Senators, or many, as the case might be, could, if they wished, tie up legislation indefinitely.

The other day when the Chair ruled against the cloture petition filed by the Senator from Nebraska, I then took the position, which I felt was justified, that when the Senate adopted rule XXII it really thought it was bringing about the termination of debate on any matter which was pending before it, which was the subject of extended debate, which has come to be known as a filibuster. I still entertain that viewpoint. But the Chair ruled otherwise, and there is now an appeal from that decision pending.

I do not know how long it will take to amend the rules of the Senate. There has been a resolution on the calendar for 17 months to amend the rules of the Senate. So far as I recall, no effort has been made to bring that resolution before the Senate for consideration, and no motion has been made to take it up. I realize that on such a motion the same course could be pursued as on the motion now pending. But sooner or later the Senate, it seems to me, must determine that it must lift from itself the pall of impotence in which it finds itself now, and in which it may find itself even when a motion is made to take up a resolution to amend the rules.

Surely, the Senate of the United States, which is regarded here and throughout the world as the greatest, and sometimes I have said, the most deliberative body in the world, which has come to be the last remnant of real democratic action in a legislative sense, cannot forever go on and admit that it is impossible for it to adopt rules under which it may proceed. Therefore I not only am now, but have been in the past, and shall continue in the future, so long as I am a Member of this body, to be earnestly in favor of an amendment of the Senate rules that will make it possible for the Senate to function under any conditions which may arise in the deliberations of this body and in the consideration of legislation. It is a situation and a condition which does not prevail in any other legislative body in the world. No State legislature is handicapped by any such impotence as that which now afflicts us.

I recognize the sincerity and the good faith of those who have precipitated this situation by exercising the right given to them under the rules of the Senate. Yet in spite of the sincerity which we accord to them, I think they themselves must admit that we cannot forever go along as a deliberative body without some halter upon unlimited debate or unlimited delay in the consideration of legislation.

So I wanted to say to the Senator from Nebraska, that, notwithstanding the fact that for 17 months there has been on the calendar a resolution to amend the rules—and no effort has heretofore been made to bring it up—and I presume no effort is to be made to bring it up at this session—whenever it comes up, at this session or at the next session, I am in favor of such an amendment of the rules as will make it possible for the Senate of the United States to function as an ordinary legislative body. So much for that.

Now the Senator from Nebraska is proposing to move to adjourn this day's session. I wanted to make this observation before he moved to adjourn, because it would be impossible to make it after such a motion. We have been here now several days debating the motion to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29. The cloture petition was filed, or an attempt was made to file a cloture petition on Monday. The Chair held it could not be filed under the rule because it was not a "measure" within the meaning of the rule. From that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] appealed. That appeal is debatable no less than the motion itself is debatable, and theoretically we are now debating the appeal from the decision of the Chair. If the motion to adjourn prevails, the motion to take up the bill lapses, and the appeal of the Senator from Ohio from the decision of the Chair also lapses, and what we have been doing here for now nearly a week will end in futility, because the whole thing lapses and goes down in defeat, since the motion itself to consider the anti-poll-tax bill will lapse on a motion to adjourn, if it is adopted. For that reason I felt the Senate ought to know the effect of its vote to adjourn today.

So far as I can see, the situation is just the same as it was when the Senator from Nebraska made his motion last week. There is no business now on the calendar which was not on it then. The Senator, I think, hopes that there will be something on the calendar, maybe tomorrow. But it is not on it now. We have heard rumors that a joint committee has been appointed—not a bipartisan committee, but a joint committee of the Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses, a joint Republican committee of those two committees—to survey the situation to see whether some kind of legislation might be brought forth. It is probably not within my mouth to question the propriety of calling a partisan subcommittee, instead of a bipartisan subcommittee, as frequently and usually is done. But be that as it may, we do not know what will come out of that joint Republican committee.

I understand the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate has proceeded today to hold further hearings on the question of inflation and the cost of living. We do not know how long the committee will consider that subject, nor what they will bring here tomorrow or any other day. So that today, so far as the calendar is concerned, the situation is precisely what it was when the Senator from Nebraska made his motion last week. I wanted the Senate to understand that if we vote to adjourn today, we vote to nullify all we have done up to now on H. R. 29, and we go right back to where we were when we started. There will be a morning hour tomorrow, and it will be in order, for any Senator who feels it his duty to do so, to question the approval of the Journal, and that is debatable. Whenever it is brought in question, no other business can be performed by the Senate until the Journal is approved. So we find ourselves again tied into a bowknot in respect to the procedure of the Senate; all of which, in my judgment, without regard to politics or predilections, the American people will regard as a travesty upon free enterprise in the way of legislation before the Senate of the United States.

I do not believe any Senator can gainsay the suggestion that the American people do not understand all the maneuvers and all the parliamentary devices the Senate may resort to in order not to transact its business. Regardless of who may be responsible for it, I think the whole Senate of the United States will lose in the esteem of the American people if we do not find a way by which to legislate in any circumstances that may arise in the Senate of the United States. Therefore I wish to say that when the Senator makes his motion to adjourn, in view of the effect of an adjournment I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote upon the motion.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yielded with the firm commitment that I would yield only to the minority leader. Fifteen or twenty Senators have asked me for time to make insertions in the RECORD, and they very graciously have consented to wait until tomorrow. For that reason I am foreclosed from yielding to any other Senator at this time. I regret it; but in view of the fact that that announcement has been made, I must stand by that agreement, because I want to be absolutely fair so long as I am the acting majority leader.

Mr. TOBEY. I was merely going to help the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly want help, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. I think the Senator needs it.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps I do. I am not through yet.

Mr. President, I was one member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration which reported the resolution to which the minority leader has referred. I am in total agreement with what he said about the rule. He emphatically has brought to the attention of the American people the fact that when 15 or 20 or 30 Senators unite in an effort to prevent a vote by endless debate, we cannot do a thing; and that the present rules of the Senate relative to cloture do not apply to a motion.

At least we have done one thing this week. We have demonstrated to the American people that until the rules of the Senate are changed there can be endless debate if a sufficient number of Senators band themselves together to thwart a vote by the use of the rules. I think the American people know that. I hope they do, because I think they should know the truth about the situation which confronts us in this special session. I think they should know that we knew when we started that in a special session of 12 or 15 days it would be an absolute physical impossibility to break endless debate on a question so controversial as is the poll tax.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, until I finish my remarks.

I agree with the distinguished majority leader that in times gone by, while I have been a Member of this body, he has done the very thing which we are attempting to do now. We are telling the people of the country that we are not going to hold night sessions. To my way of thinking, to do so would simply be hypocrisy.

I am going back to my State, and to the city of Omaha, and tell those who are interested in the anti-poll-tax legislation that I did my level best to bring it to a vote, and that we could not obtain a vote because of the rules of the Senate. I want to be honest about it. I do not want to say that I instituted night sessions for 2 or 3 nights when I knew when I did so that we would have to abandon the effort because we could not accomplish our purpose. Let us be honest. Let us tell the American people the truth. I am not going to be the one who moves for night sessions. This question arose because of requests that there should be no night session tonight. I will not subscribe to a policy which deceives the American people. We are going to tell them the truth, and that is the truth.

With respect to adjournment, I agree with the minority leader that when the motion to adjourn is agreed to we shall get back to the unfinished business. In the morning hour motions may be made. Senators may do as they please about adjournment. Senators who wish to offer amendments to any legislation, including the poll-tax amendment, may offer such amendments to any legislation which is considered by the Senate.

Mr. President, my firm belief is that the majority in their conference this morning took the right course. I subscribed to it. In fact, I advised it. So I am ready now to make the motion to adjourn.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I agreed not to yield to any Senator other than the minority leader. He was on his feet a moment ago. If he wishes me to yield again, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is too late now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is unavoidably detained, would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—69

Aiken	Fulbright	Morse
Baldwin	Gurney	O'Conor
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hayden	Revercomb
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Hill	Robertson, Wyo
Brooks	Hoey	Russell
Buck	Holland	Saltonstall
Butler	Ives	Smith
Byrd	Jenner	Sparkman
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Capper	Kem	Stewart
Connally	Knowland	Taft
Cooper	Langer	Thye
Cordon	Lodge	Tobey
Donnell	McCarthy	Tydings
Dworshak	McClellan	Umstead
Eastland	McFarland	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Feazel	Maybank	Wiley
Ferguson	Millikin	Williams
Flanders	Moore	Young

NAYS—16

Barkley	Lucas	Pepper
Downey	McGrath	Taylor
Green	McMahon	Thomas, Ok'a.
Hatch	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	
Kilgore	Myers	

NOT VOTING—11

Bushfield	McCarran	Wagner
Capehart	Malone	White
Chavez	O'Daniel	Wilson
George	Reed	

So Mr. WHERRY's motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 5, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. Howard Lambdin, pastor of St. Luke's Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal and everlasting Father, we invoke Thy divine guidance upon us as we begin the official duties of this day. Enable us, we pray Thee, in a world of many voices, to hear now and always the "still small voice within"; not only may we hear it, but may we heed it as well.

The demands made upon our lives are many and our responsibilities are great. Help us, dear Father, to remember that we are Thy children and also that we are Thy workmen. Thou art depending on us to be "laborers together with Thee" for the building of Thy kingdom on earth.

Save us from selfishness, which would keep us from such sacred service, and increase our devotion to the highest good that we may become the servants of righteousness.

We pray Thy blessing on our land and our Nation, on the President of these United States, and on the Members of the Congress, and on all others who help to carry the responsibilities of leadership. May a great integrity of character be with all of our leaders, and may they be men and women after Thine own heart.

Hasten the day, O Lord, when a just, honorable, and desirable peace shall come to all nations on our earth, when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Bless us this day and every day; and when, good Father, our days of labor are over, grant to each of us safekeeping with Thee. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 2, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Post Office Department.
6. Housing and Home Finance Agency.
7. Office of Selective Service Records.
8. Veterans' Administration.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, in June 1947, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was much disturbed about the shipment of oil to Russia from this country because we knew there was a shortage of oil to take care of the needs of the Army and Navy and the civilian needs of last year's very cold winter. Consequently, the committee held hearings at that time to inquire into the situation.

There were then loading on the Pacific coast three tankers flying the Russian flag. These were American-owned tankers loaned to Russia under lend-lease and which she refused to return to us. Yet here they were in our waters, and we were filling them with our own much-needed oil for shipment to the same country which refused to return these ships to us.

One of the witnesses called at the hearings was Mr. William C. Foster, Under Secretary of Commerce. The amazing part of his testimony was the utter disregard which he displayed of a request of the chairman of the committee made to him by telephone that the ships be not licensed to sail. The Commerce Department seemingly expedited the licenses because they were issued the same morning that the chairman requested they be held up. The testimony on the point is as follows:

Mr. BRADLEY. In relation to the ships we have loading out in my district, Long Beach, San Pedro, and so on, for Russia, did I understand you to say that it is the intention of the Department to grant the export licenses so that those ships can load and get away?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir; there are three ships out there at the moment, and we have actually issued the licenses on those three.

Mr. BRADLEY. I was interested because I have had a great many inquiries along that line, and there is nothing confidential in that information.

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing. No, sir.

Mr. BRADLEY. Thank you.

Mr. FOSTER. That was licensed this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. That was licensed this morning; after I made a request on behalf of this committee that they not be licensed to go you licensed them to go this morning.

Mr. FOSTER. That's right, sir. I still have no official request from the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a telegram, don't you?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Didn't you get that?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not had any telegram from the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

Mr. FOSTER. I have had no telegram from the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. You received one signed by the chairman, didn't you?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I called you about it.

Mr. FOSTER. You called me and told me over the phone that you were sending one.

The CHAIRMAN. And I told you I was making a request then.

Mr. FOSTER. And I said I would be very glad to take it into consideration, as we do all such requests.

The CHAIRMAN. The consideration you gave was that after the request was made you licensed it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct, sir.

This morning's news clarifies the picture. William W. Remington, accused of giving Government information and material to Elizabeth T. Bentley, erstwhile Russian spy and Communist, is the director of the Commerce Department's export-programs staff. Now the reason for the haste in licensing these oil-bearing ships is apparent. We have a tie-up between the Commerce Department and Russia and a cabal to sell America down the river to Russia and to use our own ships to do it.

I respectfully suggest to the House Committee on Un-American Activities that it undertake an investigation of the licensing of those ships by the Commerce Department in the light of what has come to view in the last few days.

Last winter the veterans in my district living in Quonset huts were very cold from lack of fuel oil. Now they can understand the reason.

DALLAS COUNTY'S FIRST 1948 BALE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it should be of interest that the first bale of the 1948 cotton crop was the best ever produced and prepared for market in Dallas County, Ala., and was sold at auction July 28, at $1.14 per pound, or $525.54 for the bale.

Of course, the sale of the first bale of each new crop is quite an event, and the price bid is no criterion of the regular market, but when the market history records millions of bales that have been sold in the routine way on the regular market for 5 cents a pound, or $20 a bale, or less, the record price paid for this first bale must have thrilled the hearts of the grower and ginner because of the tribute to their skill and diligence. It is also strong incentive for emulation.

May I read you the gist of the first-page article from the Selma Times-Journal:

Dallas County's first bale of 1948 cotton was auctioned at 10 a. m. Wednesday at the Cotton Exchange at a record-breaking price of $1.14 per pound, paid by Anderson Clayton Cotton Co.'s representative, Ned Culverhouse. The bale was classed as strict middling with a 1.31-inch staple and weighed 460 pounds. It was consigned to the Dallas Compress.

Bidding opened at 73 cents by I. J. Hix, representing the Selma Retail Merchants Association, the compresses, cotton buyers, and other friends of the farmer who stated that a premium price had been assured by these groups. The bid leaped to 75 cents on Culverhouse's nod and R. B. Woodfin of the R. B. Woodfin Cotton Co. entered the bidding, continuing neck and neck with Culverhouse until the bale finally touched the $1.14 mark, unprecedented in local cotton history. Other bids were recorded as the cotton buyers pushed the bale upward.

W. P. Welch, auctioneer, called attention to the fact that it was produced on the J. A. Minter place, 12 miles east of Selma, by Andrew Harrison, Negro tenant, who received $525.54 for the bale. It was ginned on one of the latest and finest gins in the State, and the only gin in Alabama having a lint cleaner through which cotton passes after being ginned to remove all trash.

BEST NEW BALE

Cotton men said that the bale was the best new bale ever brought to Selma as to grade and staple.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Ralph H. Cameron, a Biographical Sketch," by James M. Barney, Arizona historian.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY FUNDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 1948, when the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 was before the House for consideration, I asked the following question of Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM, chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways of the Committee on Public Works, who was in charge of the bill on the floor:

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $500,000,000 as Federal aid to the several States for fiscal years 1950, 1951, and 1952.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is right.

Mr. WELCH. Is there anything in this bill that would preclude a State highway commission from allocating any part of the funds allocated to a State to be used within an incorporated city and county?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Not at all (there is) the portion allocated for the counties and the portion allocated to the urban areas.

Mr. WELCH. I desire to congratulate the Committee on Public Works, its splendid chairman, and committee for bringing this constructive measure to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of this clear and concise answer on the part of the Committee on Public Works which reported this bill to the House, the State Highway Commission of the State of California has interpreted the law so as to prevent the city and county of San Francisco from receiving benefits under this act.

San Francisco is a city and county. The city and county embrace identically the same territory and are one. That San Francisco is a county in every sense of the word has been so decided by the Supreme Court of the State of California.

In this bill Congress authorized a total of $1,500,000,000 to be allocated to the several States over a period of 3 years. The State of California is receiving its proportionate share annually. Therefore the city and county of San Francisco is entitled to its proportionate allocation of the sums allocated to the State of California.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, can it be possible that this Congress will yield to the importunate pressure that is being exerted upon it to divert a huge amount of building material and labor from the home-building industry to be used for the construction of a palace for UN to house Stalin's agents, and thus deprive the families of our veterans of many thousands of vitally needed homes, and to still further fan the flames of inflation?

It is now beyond dispute that Stalin has a horde of agents in the UN, and all the other international organizations, but particularly the UN, directing American Communists to overthrow the United States Government. Read the testimony of Robert C. Alexander, Assistant Chief, Visa Division, Department of State, before the Revercomb committee. There is much other evidence.

Do you suppose that Stalin would have nominated, through his representative, Trygve Lie for Secretary General of UN if Stalin had not been sure that Trygve Lie is a dyed-in-the-wool Communist and supporter of his?

Mr. Marriner Eccles, for many years Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and one of the best informed men in the United States on our national finances, disapproved before the Banking and Currency Committee yesterday the spending of any money for housing the UN at the present time. He further stated that this matter should be delayed until we see what develops in the international situation.

In talking with the Members about this proposal, I am convinced that the vast majority of them are opposed to it. Many of them, however, have indicated they intend to vote for it merely for political reasons.

America will rue the day that this bill passes, if it should pass.

Who is bidding for the radical vote now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. MCGARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief letter and statement.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

VETERANS' HOUSING

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under the GI bill the Congress gave the veterans of World War II credit to the amount of $120,000,000,000 by the provision granting each veteran a $4,000 loan guaranty. Of this huge sum only $7,000,000,000 has been used.

I charged President Truman with failure to use the powers vested in him to see that this bill worked and I charge the Veterans' Administration with deliberately side-stepping and ignoring their duty to aid the veteran in securing housing or homes. The Veterans' Administration has made it practically impossible to secure loans from local banks because of their unnecessary red tape.

The President says that the T-E-W bill is the answer to the veterans' housing problem. This bill will only supply low-cost-rental housing for the low-income group and, therefore, will not supply any houses for the public to purchase.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my own remarks in the RECORD entitled "Truman's Misrepresentations to Veterans," and I hope that all of the Members of this House will read these remarks because they do show up the failure of this administration and the truth about the T-E-W bill.

TRUMAN'S MISREPRESENTATION TO VETERANS

I have with due respect restrained myself from more than passing comment on President Truman's previous messages to the combined Houses of Congress, but this I can no longer do and keep my self-respect in the eyes of my folks back in Pennsylvania.

Patiently I listened Tuesday, July 27, for some words of wisdom upon which I could rally, with my colleagues, to the Chief Executive's suggestions to solve some of the Nation's ills. All I heard was the same buck-passing charges aimed at Congress in an anemic effort to cover his own shortcomings and failures as President of the United States.

What sheer demagoguery was the President's words in a continued effort to fool the veteran about housing. Listen to what he said:

A good housing bill, Senate bill 866, known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, passed the Senate on April 22. This bill would provide aid to the cities in clearing slums and in building low-rent housing projects. It would give extensive aid to the private home-building industry. It includes provision for farm housing and research to bring down building costs. It contains many other provisions, all aimed at getting more housing at lower prices and at lower rents.

He continued:

This is the bill we need. We need it now, not a year from now.

If this legislation is passed this summer, it will be possible to start immediately the production of more houses of the kind our families need, at prices they can afford to pay. If it is not passed now, the Eighty-first Congress will have to start all over again with a new housing bill. In that case, we might lose a full year in meeting our national housing need.

Those words constitute a despicable misrepresentation of fact to the veterans of this Nation.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act, better known as the GI bill, was passed by the Congress in 1944. It provides $120,000,000,000 credit for housing of veterans and the Veterans' Administration says to date only $7,000,000,000 has been contracted for, leaving a balance of $113,000,000,000 still there for the use of veterans.

Oh, I know, charges will be made that the bill has not worked. That prices are too high. That the banks will not lend the money without substantial down payments.

All of these charges may be true and contribute to an existing condition, but for more than 2 years President Truman has had it within his power to make the bill work and he has not done one thing about it.

Under the War Powers Acts and under the Constitution, the President is charged as Chief Executive to see to it that our legislation does work, or do something about it.

I charge that the Veterans' Administration is and has deliberately sidestepped and ignored the veterans' housing problems and furthermore that the President of the United States has failed to see to it that the multi-billion-dollar housing provision of the GI bill has functioned properly.

Have you ever heard of the West Virginia housing plan? The President has. The Veterans' Administration has. I admit it is only one of many good plans now being employed to give the veteran housing, but it is working today in West Virginia and several other States where enterprising corporations have taken an aggressive step. This plan calls for corporations to construct housing for their veteran employees to whom it is sold without profit through facilities of local financing institutions, using GI guaranties. The housing is constructed by private enterprise.

I have tried vainly to get the Veterans' Administration to seek the help of corporations in solving their veteran employees' housing problems. I have been told that the VA is solely an administrative office and that it cannot promote any one part of the GI bill. But every day on the radio I hear a tremendous propaganda program promoting the retention of war insurance by vets.

I am advised that there are more than 4,000,000 veterans employed by corporations. The West Virginia plan is not suggested as a cure-all, but it is working successfully in several States. In the 3,000-word rehash of New Deal tripe that I endured Tuesday I did not hear one practical suggestion to solve the housing problem.

The T-E-W bill, last session known as the wet bill and currently referred to as the T-E-W-WET bill, was declared to be the bill to do the job. Let us look at the record. On page 159 of the T-E-W bill hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee one of the sponsors of the bill, Senator TAFT, in reply to a question said, and I quote:

May I say this T-E-W bill has nothing to do with the shortage of houses. The public housing has nothing to do with the emergency or the present shortage of houses. It is solely a social-welfare program like the long-term educational program.

Thus Senator TAFT, one of the authors of the bill, repudiates the President's contention that the T-E-W bill will alleviate the housing shortage.

You will remember the President said this bill will start immediate production of the kind of houses our families need. Yet Senator TAFT during the debate on the T-E-W bill in the Senate said, and I quote:

It takes a long time to buy land and decide where houses are to be built and to get together all the parties concerned, both local and Federal. I should guess that it would take nearly 10 years to complete this program.

Is that immediate housing for veterans?

At another point in the debate Senator TAFT said, and I quote:

In public housing there must be a metropolitan housing authority, contracts must be worked out, and plans must be drafted and shown to the Federal authority before a contract can be made. So I should say it would require a full year to get started on any public housing project.

Thus on Senator TAFT's own statement low-rent housing under the T-E-W bill could not be started until late in 1949 or early in 1950. Is that immediate housing for veterans?

Then, during the debate on the Senate floor we find in the RECORD admission that the extension of title VI of the FHA, the private enterprise section of the bill, was tacked onto this omnibus monstrosity to insure passage of the federally subsidized public housing section of the bill.

Members of Congress who have been closest to this legislation recently issued a report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Senator TAFT was chairman of that committee, and my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Michigan, Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT, able chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, was vice chairman. On page 34 of the report I find, and quote:

So far as stabilization is concerned, it would be better to concentrate publicly promoted housing construction in periods of low employment.

Senator TAFT said on May 17 during debate on the public-works bill, and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

We cannot add $7,000,000,000 worth of houses in a year to all the other programs and still hope that finally we shall be able to prevent inflation.

He continued to say that if we do follow a plan of public spending during a period of high employment and maximum use of materials it would result in a general increase in all costs, a general increase in the price of every kind of material for which industry competes, and a competition of labor and materials which would seriously embarrass the country.

In his very opening statement President Truman said that he had called this special session to curb inflation and to do something about housing. We all know that materials and workers are being employed to the maximum. We know that we are starting new houses at the rate of about 1,000,000 a year right now. If we accede to the President's demands we defeat the very purpose for which he says he has called this special session. I am confident the learned gentlemen who comprised the Joint Committee on the Economic Report weighed much more carefully their conclusions than did the President his contentions.

I recently saw a documented statement showing that 6,000,000 persons have been housed with new construction since the end of the war. This figure was arrived at by multiplying the number of new permanent housing units constructed since the end of the war—2,000,000—by the average family of three.

Last year 840,000 new housing units were completed. In the first 6 months of this year, 449,700 have been started. This figure is 23 percent more than the first 6 months of 1947. That is pretty potent proof that housing is being constructed in the good old American way, by private industry.

I find that the FHA reports that the average cost of a house insured by that agency is $7,900. With a $1,000 down payment that would cost about $50 a month to finance, including all carrying charges, interest, and amortization. If the average cost was $7,900 then considerable of this housing must have been at a cost less than $7,900.

I find in the joint committee's report, on page 34, this statement:

The report contains an unsupportable statement that "most of the housing is being built for families in the higher income brackets." The Bureau of Labor Statistics has just released information concerning new nonfarm one-family homes for which construction was started during the second quarter of 1947. Half of these homes cost less than $6,700 to build and 20 percent of them cost less than $9,250. Only 10 percent cost $9,250 or over. While these are building costs, not selling prices, it is clear that the situation they depict does not even remotely resemble that suggested by the report.

The President said that most of the housing now being built for sale or rent is priced far out of reach of the moderate-income family. This does not seem to be borne out by facts.

Now, what about this T-E-W bill that the President has recommended? My study has revealed:

First. It will increase the cost of government and the tax burden in conflict with the announced policy of the Congress to reduce Government costs and taxes—involves expenditures and commitments totaling $9,602,500,000, $6,400,000,000 of which is direct subsidy for Government-owned housing. It will cost each man, woman, and child in the United States $68.

Second. It bypasses the Appropriations Committee of the Congress. The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is authorized to draw in excess of $9,000,000,000 from the Federal Treasury without prior appropriation by Congress. Of this, $6,950,000,000 could be drawn without prior appropriation by Congress under terms which commit the Congress to subsequent approval. Two billion six hundred and ten million dollars would be made available without any appropriation procedure whatsoever. This is a wholly unprecedented and unthinkable departure from the principle of congressional control of public purse strings.

Third. It makes the Administrator of HHFA virtual dictator over the home-construction industry, and gives him dictatorial powers with respect to housing over the lives of millions of American families.

Under the powers conferred on him in title III and with money made available ostensibly for housing research under that title, he will have the power to develop a great political propaganda machine to control completely the housing industry and home ownership in this country. It opens the door wide for perpetuation and enlargement of this bureaucratic control. Scientific research should be placed in the hands of scientifically trained and scientifically minded men and should never be trusted to the domination of a political agency.

Through his power as supervisor of the Home Loan Bank Board and as president and sole repository of all the powers of the National Home Mortgage Corporation, created by the bill to support the secondary market, he has unlimited power to expand or contract home-mortgage credit. He can strangle the industry at any time it suits his fancy. He can deny the privileges of home ownership by arbitrarily restricting mortgage credit.

His power to allocate 500,000 units of public housing to the various States would give him great political power and patronage.

Fourth. Socialized Government-owned housing does not clear slums. Although the original United States Housing Act required that an equivalent number of slum houses be removed for every public housing unit constructed, less than one-third of the 155,000 units of public housing built to date were constructed in slum areas.

Areas of our metropolitan cities which have become blighted with slums which can be rehabilitated by enforcement of local sanitary and building laws should be improved in this fashion. The city of Baltimore has, in a short time, improved more than 8,000 units in this fashion, at a cost to the city of less than $50,000, and made them available at monthly rentals substantially lower than public housing rents and with no subsidy by the Federal Government.

If there are other areas in which the process of physical deterioration is so advanced as to render it impractical to rehabilitate them, local government has the power to condemn such areas, promulgate a plan for their redevelopment, and resell to private individuals or corporations for redevelopment in accordance with the building restrictions established. It is not necessary to substitute a paternalistic government-ownership ideology for the American way of life in order to clear slums.

Fifth. Contrary to the claims of its proponents, the bill does not in fact serve the housing needs of the lowest income group. Senator TAFT said on the floor of the Senate that families in need of welfare relief assistance would not be eligible to live in public housing. Only those who have steady employment will be eligible to occupy the public housing units contemplated by the bill.

Sixth. It is highly inconsistent for the Congress, which has appropriated $5,300,000,000 for European relief program in order to fight the "isms" abroad, to consider seriously spending $6,400,000,000 or more for the introduction of a socialistic idea imported from Europe.

I have given considerable thought and study to veterans' housing and I am firmly convinced that the laxity of the President to use existing legislation and powers already granted him has worked to the disadvantage of the veteran. His message is pretty good evidence that he plans to continue these deplorable tactics in the coming campaign.

If the President really means business about getting housing for veterans let him instruct the Veterans' Administration to vitalize their home-loan-guaranty section and make workable such plans as the West Virginia plan. Vets want houses, not buck-passing excuses.

Proof has been offered here to show that the President apparently hasn't the slightest idea what is in the T-E-W bill. Every evidence indicates it will not and cannot build houses until late 1949 or 1950. That kind of legislation has no place in a special session of Congress.

Further evidence substantiates the charge that the T-E-W bill is inflationary and if passed by this special session would be diametrically opposed to the reasons advanced by the President for calling this session.

Construction materials and manpower are being used now to the utmost. Public construction must be deferred until periods of low employment and abundance of materials.

I would be derelict in my duty as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee if I did not expose the political chicanery of the President's speech in his obvious attempt to woo the veteran vote.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PENSIONS FOR THE AGED

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the subject of pensions for the aged is, in my opinion, one of the most important matters which this session of the Congress might give its attention.

I found, on my recent visit to my district, that a great number of people, both old and young, are interested in this matter. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is one of the subjects that was called to my attention, and I might say that there seems hardly anybody but who would be most happy to see this Congress provide a respectable old-age pension.

The American people are interested in this very vital problem because they have many who are near to them, friends, neighbors, and relatives, who are aged and who are sorely in need of help because of their inability to carry on with the amount now being granted. They know of our generosity in appropriating and scattering our billions all over the world for the relief and support of others. And the American people are asking why is it that we do not take care of our own distressed aged people.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the American people are unanimously in favor of a respectable and decent pension being provided for those who, in the declining years of their life, need our help, and this thinking represents the high character standard of our American citizenship, and, thank God, most Americans are of such high standard.

So today I am calling upon the Congress to bring out legislation at this special session to grant an increase in old-age pension. I do insist that the dire situation existing among many of our old people constitutes one of the important matters that could be considered at this extraordinary session.

I, for one, am pleading with the leadership and the membership generally to enact now a generous old-age pension. There has been too much conversation about it already, and certainly if we can attempt to iron out the problems of all the world, we surely can spend some time on the problem of our aged people. Our performance in providing funds for other causes is abundant proof that it can be done. The need for such a program is known to all of us.

Our duty, therefore, in this crucial matter is inescapable. The time for action is now. And I know the American people will applaud any action taken by this Congress to provide aid to those who need our help, and are trying to exist on the pitiful amounts that are now granted. This is one piece of legislation that I feel certain will meet with the hearty approval of all of our people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News.

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Johnstown Tribune.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in the first to include a radio address delivered by the Speaker of the House over the American Broadcasting Co. on Friday, July 30; and in the second to include a statement by Hon. Clare Boothe Luce, former Member of the House, before the Republican Convention in Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that the speech in which Clare Boothe Luce attacked me at the Republican Convention?

Mr. ARENDS. I would not know.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a radio speech by Senator CAPPER, and in the other an editorial.

PRICE OF DAIRY FEEDS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently I noticed a vivid and graphic picture, a news photo, which showed the granaries of the country are so filled with wheat that it is flowing all over the streets, and they are piling it in the fields out in Nebraska and Kansas.

Also, has come the announcement that there is to be a record corn crop which will overshadow everything that has ever been heard of before in American farm production.

In view of these facts, there can be no excuse from this time on for high prices of dairy feeds in the northeastern section of the United States. Our farmers have to pay outrageous prices for grain in order to produce milk and dairy products for the big cities of the country.

The Northeast must be allowed to participate in some of the benefits that should be expected to come as the result of all this surplus wheat and corn.

The big grain manipulators of the country have made millions from the exorbitant rates our dairy farmers are paying for grain they have not time to raise themselves. The farmers I represent are at the mercy of these wheat and corn barons and that is why we are having so many forced sales of farms in my section.

The wire pullers on the grain market may think New York State dairymen can afford high feed prices but they cannot. Unfortunately the farmer has to meet the terrific cost of production. While his milk check is better than it used to be, he still has not surplus money enough to pay tribute to the boys who dictate the high grain prices out in the Middle West.

I have said this before and I am saying it again that the cost of dairy feeds is too high. Bring that down and the farmer will benefit by a decent margin of profit, the consumer will benefit by a reasonable price for bottled milk and the profiteers will scurry for cover.

Lower grain prices will bring down the cost of meat, too. In fact the entire cost of living will be favorably affected by the action, if it is taken, of those who have thus far succeeded in keeping grain away out of reach of the pocketbooks of all our farmers who so desperately need it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is most encouraging and gratifying to see the splendid progress which is being made in some sections of the country in providing special housing for wheel-chair veterans. I wish to include at this point a dispatch I have from Needham, Mass., telling of the fine work which is being done in providing a community of houses for wheel-chair veterans in this suburb of Boston. As you well know, the Congress passed Public Law 702 this year, which provides for a grant up to $10,000 toward the purchase of a house specially constructed to meet the needs of these cases. The cost above that figure may be financed under the regular provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. I am happy to know that this work, which is so important to these handicapped men, is going forward so promptly.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that I could say the same for housing for our able-bodied veterans. There has been pending on the Union Calendar for some months the so-called veterans' housing bill, H. R. 4488, which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and which has the sponsorship of the American Legion.

This bill will provide housing for veterans at prices they can afford to pay, and at the same time will involve a minimum cost to the Federal Treasury. If we solve the housing problems for veterans, we will have solved 90 percent of the general housing problem. I would like to summarize the provisions of this bill and urge once more that Members give most careful consideration to it:

First. Relies on initiative and individual effort of the veteran.

Second. Will provide housing at prices veterans can afford to pay; limits average cost per dwelling unit to $10,000.

Third. Rental and multiunit housing as well as construction of individual homes is provided.

Fourth. Applies to all veterans of World War II, urban or rural.

Fifth. Makes provisions for community facilities where not otherwise furnished.

Sixth. All expenditures except those for community facilities are on a reimbursable basis.

Seventh. Interest rates at 4 percent or less, with amortization periods as long as 40 years.

Eighth. Channels funds to lending institutions which need money to make GI housing loans.

Ninth. Gives special attention to needs of veterans on the farm.

Tenth. Includes the incontestability clauses to encourage participation of lenders.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about passing housing legislation for veterans. Let us pass this—the only bill that gives veterans houses.

[From the New York Times of August 1, 1948]

"WHEEL-CHAIR TOWN" RISES NEAR BOSTON

NEEDHAM, MASS., July 31.—A community of houses built around a wheel chair is springing up in this suburb of Boston.

The houses are designed so the veterans can maneuver about unhampered by the usual architectural restrictions. Doors are a foot and a half wider to permit free passage of wheel chairs, and there are no thresholds.

A concrete ramp leads into the house instead of steps, and another ramp connects the kitchen and garage. The garage attached to the house, is about 5 feet wider and longer than the usual one-car stall. That enables the veteran to wheel right up to his specially equipped automobile.

The bathroom wash bowl and mirrors are set low so the occupant can shave while seated in his chair. The shower stall is extra wide.

The idea for the community project originated after Charles A. Cimino, a builder, sold a house, constructed for normal use, to Joseph Villa, a crippled veteran, then noted it was impossible for him to get around without assistance.

"I saw if the house ever caught fire while he was home alone he would never get out," Mr. Cimino said. "So we got together with an architect and planned a house best suited for paralyzed veterans."

Two houses are occupied and five others are under construction. Lots are staked for about 23 more houses.

Mr. Cimino said that cost of the houses ranged from $15,000 to $20,000, adding:

"We're trying to keep it a community just for these boys. I'm going to give them an acre of land on the project where they can build a gymnasium."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after any other special orders that may have been entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, your Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda in the Executive Departments, of which I am chairman, has recently completed an exhaustive investigation of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. Investigators for the committee have gone carefully into the records of the Bureau's activities, and your committee has conducted extensive hearings, in the course of which a considerable volume of evidence has been adduced.

I shall insert in the RECORD a copy of the report which a majority of the committee is returning, for I consider it urgently important that every Member of this body be immediately informed of the amazing facts which our inquiries have disclosed.

The evidence clearly reveals shocking bureaucratic intrigue, willful violation of Federal law, withholding of vital information from committees of Congress, and deliberate intimidation of private citizens where sheer propaganda alone has been insufficient to direct public opinion. As an incident to the main purpose of the inquiries I believe it has been shown that high Federal officials who have no practical qualifications, but who were apparently appointed for their socialistic leanings and ability as political propagandists, have proved grossly incompetent in their assignments.

The reclamation service since its inception has played an indispensable part in the development of the vast arid and semiarid areas of our Western States. Until the advent of the present clique in power which undertook to make the service a tool for the further entrenchment of bureaucracy that agency enjoyed the highest reputation for competence and integrity. In recent years, however, experienced engineers, qualified to administer the service efficiently, have been supplanted by propagandists who have prostituted the agency for their own selfish bureaucratic ends.

I know every Member of this body will insist that the Reclamation Bureau direct its energies and the public funds which Congress entrusts to it not for the expansion and entrenchment of a power-hungry bureaucracy, but for the development of our great western empire. I urge, therefore, that every Member study this report thoughtfully with a view to undertaking immediately the complete house cleaning in the agency which is indicated.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the majority report of this committee may be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The report referred to follows:)

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AUTHORIZED TO INVESTIGATE PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA AS IT RELATES TO THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION OF THAT DEPARTMENT

Based upon extensive field investigations your committee has been conducting hearings since April 27, 1948. Upon the evidence adduced the most shocking and amazing story of bureaucratic intrigue has been unfolded. Incompetency, evasion of the intent of the Congress, disregard for the truth, deliberate withholding of material information from the committees of Congress, willful violation of Federal law, are a part of the sordid story thus far presented to your committee. Many charges and countercharges had been made in relation to the Bureau of Reclamation and high officials within the Bureau. Your committee gave careful study to these charges before embarking upon the investigation which is the subject of this interim report. We were concerned lest such an investigation might be injurious to the great reclamation projects of the West. Your committee at that time and now recognizes the contribution that has been made by the West to the economy of the Nation, and also it recognizes the contribution of reclamation to the advancement of the welfare of that segment of our Nation.

Also, the committee recognizes the need that reclamation projects be expeditiously completed as they have been authorized and planned by the Congress and that further planning and construction are necessary in the immediate future if the resources and productive potentialities of the West are to be fully realized and contribute further to the welfare of our people; not only for those who live within the 17 reclamation States, but the Nation as a whole.

However, if the vision of those who have planned the development of the resources of our Western States is to become a reality, then drastic changes in personnel, planning, and ideologies must be effected in the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior. Let it suffice to say that many of the career employees and engineers within the Bureau of Reclamation have contributed much to the reputation in the past of this department of Government as an outstanding and successful construction and operating unit. These same men today fight against heavy odds to maintain that reputation and many have left, or are now threatening to leave, the Department unless changes are made to restore the original concept of reclamation. We shall not burden this report with the conception or history of reclamation. Conceived in 1902 during the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, its history until recent years has been one of great accomplishments.

Recognizing the need for the development and completion of projects in the 17 reclamation States, the Eightieth Congress appropriated the largest sums ever made available to the Bureau of Reclamation (see exhibit No. 1 attached).

FALSIFICATION OF CARRY-OVER

Deliberate falsification by a high Government official, Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, is apparent from the records of official hearings before committees of Congress. The testimony had to do with carry-overs in the Central Valley project for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947. So that the testimony may be understood, the term "carry-over" should be defined.

"Carry-overs," as referred to herein, means those funds appropriated in one fiscal year for reclamation projects and unspent at the end of the fiscal year and available as free money to carry on and pay for actual work to be performed in the next fiscal year. (See letter, Michael W. Straus, Senate hearings, pt. 2, H. R. 3123, p. 29, 1948.)

The Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation had admonished the employees of the Bureau of Reclamation on frequent occasions against large carry-overs. We cite but a few of the admonitions.

At the Salt Lake City conference held in July–August of 1947 Secretary Krug made the following statement:

"However, we are going through a period now when we will have to take that risk. We will never get them to understand that very large carry-overs are a necessary part of our program because when they look at that ten, fifteen or twenty million dollars whatever it is, they will have their mouths watering and they can't help but say, 'Well, you birds have got that in the kitty; you go out and use that this year and then come in and ask for more.'

"Mike and the rest worked hard and the boys are sitting back there on the fence now, waiting and saying, 'I told you so.' And they will be after us when we go in there again.

"That means that every regional director is going to be responsible for laying out his program for spending the money he has and the carry-overs and if he has money he has not spent he is going to have to have one hell of a good excuse. Just any excuse in the world is not going to be any good, or even a good one."

At the same Salt Lake City conference Commissioner Michael W. Straus made the following statement (p. 33):

"So the watchword and the policy upon which we will embark today will be to drive forward on all of the multiple phases of our program and without compromise of standards, go ahead and build until we go broke."

Upon request of the Bureau of the Budget in its preparation of the President's Budget for the fiscal year 1948, region 2 of the Bureau of Reclamation advised that the estimated carry-over for the Central Valley for the fiscal year 1947 would be $10,722,162. The figure of $10,722,162 was adopted by the Bureau of the Budget and was contained in the President's budget.

It should be borne in mind that these were the figures furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The President's budget asked for $20,000,000 new money which, together with the free money in the estimated carry-over, would have provided $30,722,162, for performance of additional work during the fiscal year 1948. Under the date of April 9, 1947, the Commissioner's office requested by teletype from Sacramento an estimate of the unobligated balance available for the Central Valley project as of July 1, 1947. We quote from the teletype:

"The following items are requested for each project for which construction is programed in 1948, whether or not appropriation for 1948 was requested:

* * * * *

"(4) Your estimate of unobligated balance available July 1, 1947."

The Sacramento office replied that the amount of the unobligated carry-over for Central Valley would be $25,000,000.

The amount of $10,722,162 had been testified to by the Bureau of Reclamation officials before the Appropriations Subcommittee of the House prior to the receipt of the adjusted figure of $25,000,000. However, the revised figure was received by Commissioner Straus prior to the report of the Interior bill by the House subcommittee. It is the opinion of your committee that proper administrative practice, if not common honesty, should have impelled Commissioner Straus to have communicated the new figure to the House committee. Such steps, however, were not taken.

The action thus far related raises grave doubts as to the administrative integrity of the Commissioner. However, the most glaring example of deliberate distortion of the truth in an apparent attempt to mislead the Congress is that which appears in the records of the Senate hearings regarding the same item.

Commissioner Straus testified before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on May 19, 1947, after having received the teletype advising him that the estimated carry-over would be $25,000,000. But again, with utter disregard of the information furnished him by the only source from which it was obtainable, Mr. Straus testified the estimated carry-over would be $10,722,162. We quote from the record in the Senate proceedings (pp. 1062 and 1063).

"Senator KNOWLAND. As I get the picture, on page 51 of the hearings, they show estimated unobligated balance June 30, 1947, $10,722,162.

"Mr. STRAUS. That is right."

Page 1063:

"Senator KNOWLAND. All right, Mr. Straus, we will start and continue only for a very short time because I am interested in the other members of the committee getting the story.

"I would like to pursue this for the record: Is the figure which we had previously quoted of $10,722,162 the unobligated balance as of June 30, 1947?

"Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir."

Your committee, without reservation, condemns this act of Commissioner Straus in withholding full information from the Congress. It should be noted this testimony was followed by corroborative statements by other Bureau officials.

If the Congress is to function as the controller of the purse strings of Government it must, and should, be able to rely upon representatives of the executive branch to present full, true, and complete facts to its committees. Disregard of the Congress, such as is here exposed, reveals the tendency to supplant the legislative branch of Government with a dominating bureaucracy.

That officials, the subject of investigation by your committee, hold the Congress in contempt can best be evidenced by their own statements.

At the same Salt Lake City conference, Secretary Krug made the following statements:

Page 555:

"This program is probably closer to my heart than any other in the Department of the Interior, and as Mike pointed out to you, for some strange reason people up in Congress don't trust us like they used to, so both of us took quite a beating on the Bureau of Reclamation program this year.

"We put days and days and days in of explanation as to why there should be carry-overs on these projects and how much they were and why we didn't spend the money and why we were asking for money and would we be able to spend what we were asking for plus the carry-over, and we looked at them with a bland face and said, 'Sure, we will be able to spend our carry-over and we are asking for more.'"

Page 556:

"Of course, going along with those limitations will be a loss in personnel we can never replace. Those are the sort of obstacles they throw in your face when they expect you to do a job.

"It occurs to me it is like the days of the war in Washington, when perhaps a businessman would come to town to find out something or try and get something done. He had a job to do and he would say this is the damnedest place he had ever been in.

"They get a target for you to shoot at and then they proceed to throw a lot of obstacles in your path so you can't hit it and then to top it off, they tie a hundredweight on your foot and tell you to get over there the shortest possible way you can find."

Commissioner Straus made the following statement at the Salt Lake City Conference:

Pages 38 and 39:

"Also, I know that we've got some restriction on force account and other unsought handcuffs from the Congress, and we will be talking a lot about them this week."

Page 662:

"Mr. STRAUS. I mind such an occasion before the Appropriations Committee, when there was a lot of questions asked and no matter what the question was we said we could do it. There were some asinine questions."

Statements such as quoted above, made by high executive officials including a member of the President's Cabinet, are most reprehensible.

There can be but one conclusion as to the purpose and the effect of such conduct. We believe their objective was to instill in the minds of the employees and supervisors of the Bureau of Reclamation a contemptuous disregard of the Congress.

They endeavored through Bureau propaganda to place responsibility of the failure of the Bureau of Reclamation upon the Congress. Here truly is Federal thought control in operation with sinister motives.

CENTRAL VALLEY SHUT-DOWN

The Congress has authorized the development and construction of the great Central Valley project in California. Two hundred million dollars appropriated by the Congress have been spent in the development of the project. It is estimated that at least $200,000,000 additional will be spent before it is completed. The completion of the project at the earliest possible date has been the will and intent of the Congress, based upon estimates of progress anticipated during fiscal years.

On the basis of the best estimates obtainable, the Congress appropriated funds to carry the projects through the fiscal year 1948. The total made available to the project was approximately that requested by the President's budget, based upon estimates from the Bureau of Reclamation. In spite of this, in sheer defiance of Congress and the Budget Bureau, the Bureau of Reclamation shut down five important contracts as of November 30, 1947, because of alleged exhaustion of funds, and with only 4 days' prior warning that the projects were in any difficulty. Chairman KENNETH WHERRY, of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, was formally advised on December 1 by Commissioner Straus that no funds were available for the contracts.

All previous reports from the Bureau of Reclamation regarding the finances of the project had been optimistic in nature.

That these projects were shut down as a result either of gross mismanagement or in a deliberate attempt to embarrass the Congress, or both, is shown in Commissioner Straus' own testimony. Under questioning before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Commissioner Straus admitted that although the five contracts were closed down on November 30, 1947, on the pretext that no further funds were available, no one outside the Bureau was advised prior to November 26, 1947, that the alleged exhaustion of funds was impending. (See hearings, Senate Appropriations Committee, 80th Cong., 2d sess., Bureau of Reclamation, p. 193.)

Further evidence that the shut-down was a deliberate and premeditated attempt on the part of Bureau officials to embarrass the Congress, rather than being a matter of real necessity, is shown by the testimony of the committee's chief auditor that at the time of the shut-down there was some $7,000,000 in unexpended balance available for the contracts (see Watson's exhibits A and B), and that Bureau books had been juggled, either intentionally or otherwise, so that the funds would appear to be exhausted, when in fact they were not. The $7,000,000 which had been juggled away from the projects would have been sufficient to carry them to February 1, 1948, or beyond.

Furthermore, in bringing about this exhaustion of funds, the Bureau violated the apportionment of the Bureau of the Budget, and stands accused by that agency of having given it insufficient data on which to base its apportionment. This is borne out in testimony of James E. Scott, Bureau of the Budget, in joint hearings before the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations, Eightieth Congress, first session, on the Bureau of Reclamation appropriations, pages 29 and 30, which read as follows:

"Senator CORDON. Now let us carry that thing on. Is it your reasoning that the Bureau of the Budget in the case of continuing contracts, such as exist in substantially all public works, has no obligation whatever to apportion those funds either monthly or quarterly inasmuch as the funds are to be

expended on account of a contract authorized by law?

"Mr. SCOTT. We hold that it is the duty of the Bureau of the Budget to apportion these funds.

"Senator CORDON. Under what law?

"Mr. SCOTT. Under that law.

"Senator CORDON. You just said it did not apply, it was an exception.

"Mr. SCOTT. No; I did not say that. I think Senator O'MAHONEY said that.

"Senator WHERRY. What do you say, Mr. Scott?

"Mr. SCOTT. I say this law applies to the funds of the Bureau of Reclamation and accordingly we apportioned them as promptly as we could secure from the Bureau of Reclamation sufficient information to enable us to do at least a half-baked job of apportioning them.

"Senator WHERRY. This was a half-baked job.

"Mr. SCOTT. It certainly was, because we did not have the supporting data upon which we could do an intelligent job.

"Mr. JENSEN. From where do those data come?

"Mr. SCOTT. The Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

* * * * *

"Senator CORDON. And that being a mandate, then it is up to the Department, if I understand you, to so arrange the work and to so control the contracts as to make no greater expenditure of money within any quarter or other allotment than the amount allotted by the Bureau of the Budget; is that correct?

"Mr. SCOTT. That is right.

"Senator CORDON. In your opinion has the Bureau of Reclamation followed your allotment and apportionment?

"Mr. SCOTT. That is not a matter of opinion, that is a matter of fact; they have not."

Upon the shutting down of the projects the Bureau of Reclamation propaganda machine went into action. The Congress was vilified, and charged with failure to provide sufficient funds for construction, in a studied attempt to divert blame from themselves. These attacks were made in spite of the fact that in excess of $7,000,000 was available for construction (see Watson's exhibits A and B); in spite of the fact that the Congress had made available substantially the amount of funds requested by the President; in spite of the fact that Richard L. Boke, regional director in charge of the Central Valley projects himself had on November 1, 1947, stated sufficient moneys were on hand to operate until February 1, 1948.

Representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation disagree with your committee auditors in regard to the freezing of funds in the amount of $4,000,000 for salaries of employees.

It is the claim of the Bureau of Reclamation that such was a proper action under the Antideficiency Act.

Testimony of competent witnesses before the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations is in conflict with that of the officials of the Bureau of Reclamation and in agreement with your committee auditors. We quote from the Senate hearings.

Floyd D. Peterson, budget examiner, Bureau of the Budget, testified, as is shown on page 852, as follows:

"Senator DOWNEY. As a matter of moral obligation, would you not think it would be highly absurd to freeze $4,000,000 to pay employees up to July 1 while you were closing down all your contracts?

"Mr. PETERSON. It would appear so.

"Senator DOWNEY. And you do not know anything in the antideficiency law that would require that in any event, do you?

"Mr. PETERSON. No, sir. As long as they complete the service of the fiscal year as intended by Congress in making the appropriation.

"Senator DOWNEY. And as long as they did not violate any limitation imposed by the Congress, and as long as they kept within the moneys appropriated by whatever methods would be necessary if the contracts were put on a custodial basis, and also as long as they took care of the item that would be due each of these employees if they were discharged to cover their vacation allowance; is that right?

"Mr. PETERSON. That is right."

Arthur B. Focke, attorney for the Bureau of the Budget, testified as is shown on page 870, as follows:

"Mr. FOCKE. My name is Arthur B. Focke.

"Senator DOWNEY. Will you please state your official position in the Bureau of the Budget?

"Mr. FOCKE. I am chief attorney in the Estimates Division of the Bureau of the Budget.

"Senator DOWNEY. Do I understand you are one of the only two attorneys who carry the legal burden in the Bureau of the Budget?

"Mr. FOCKE. That is correct.

"Senator DOWNEY. Mr. Focke, I assume you are entirely familiar with the history and data making up this transaction that we have been discussing here this morning?

"Mr. FOCKE. In general, Senator; yes.

"Senator DOWNEY. Do you agree with Mr. Peterson that under the apportionment that was made by the Bureau of the Budget on those funds—referring to the apportionment of $2,000,000 for each of the last three quarters—that was only a general appropriation or a general apportionment and did not apply to any particular funds?

"Mr. FOCKE. Yes, sir, Senator, if enough money was reserved to take care of the obligations, such as terminal leave and such employees as might have been necessary to operate the project in whatever condition it was to be maintained.

"Senator DOWNEY. Do I understand from your opinion to us that there was no obligation under the antideficiency statute to retain any particular sum for pay roll for the last 7 months, so long as sufficient amounts were retained to pay vacation leaves and to provide for the payment of such employees as would be required if the project was shut down?

"Mr. FOCKE. I know of nothing in the Antideficiency Act which would require maintaining any more funds than that in reserve."

Stephen E. Rice, legislative counsel, United States Senate, testified as follows, as shown on page 872:

"Senator WHERRY. Will you give your full name to the reporter, please.

"Mr. RICE. My name is Stephen E. Rice, legislative counsel to the Senate.

"Mr. Chairman, Senator DOWNEY asked me to express my opinion, as legislative counsel, as to whether there would have been a violation of the Antideficiency Act if they had not set aside this $4,000,000 for pay roll.

"In view of the fact that $2,000,000 was set aside for the last two quarters without being earmarked for salaries, or any other particular thing, I know of nothing in the Antideficiency Act that requires the Bureau of Reclamation to set aside this $4,000,000 for salaries.

"It seems to me that a more common-sense interpretation of the Antideficiency Act would be that they would set aside a sufficient amount for salaries for custodial employees only if they were going to shut down the project, and the rest of the money that was available would be available generally for whatever the appropriation was given for.

"In other words, I agree with Senator DOWNEY'S construction and Mr. Focke's construction.

"Senator DOWNEY. Are there any questions?

"Mr. O'BRIEN. I will agree too, if we were going to shut down the project. That would have been the proper procedure, but the Bureau of Reclamation certainly was not getting ready to shut down the Central Valley project.

"Mr. RICE. I was not talking about the procedure. I am talking about the technical and legal interpretation of the Antideficiency Act.

"Mr. O'BRIEN. I will subscribe to that.

"Mr. RICE. The statement has been made that it would have been considered a violation of the Antideficiency Act if this money had not been set aside for these salaries. I disagree with that statement. I do not think that is correct."

It is interesting to note that Mr. O'Brien, who agreed with the testimony of Mr. Rice, is Thomas J. O'Brien, one of the legal staff of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The record is replete with the facts and details of the accomplishment of this costly fiasco.

As stated above, on November 1, 1947, Mr Boke, regional director, according to his own testimony, estimated that sufficient funds were on hand to carry the Central Valley project until February 1, 1948. However, about the middle of November 1947 conferences were held relating to the exhaustion of funds for construction. On November 20, 1947, with apparent knowledge of the alleged critical condition of funds for project construction, Richard Boke, regional director of region 2, with utter disregard of his responsibilities to the Bureau of Reclamation, the Government, and the people of the valley, left Sacramento for a vacation. We are hard-pressed to comprehend how long a manager of a $400,000,000 industry would retain his position if under a similar alleged precarious situation he would walk out from the business for the purpose of vacationing at Carmel-by-the-Sea. However that may be, the responsibility of this debacle lies largely with Mr. Boke.

Much has been said in relation to delays in completion of the Central Valley project. Let us examine the record. In 1947 the shut-down by the Bureau of Reclamation on five major contracts on the baseless theory that funds were exhausted, has occasioned a delay of months in providing water to the thirsty lands of the Central Valley, with perhaps a loss to water recipients of millions of dollars. Claims by contractors resulting from the shut-down amounting to $1,900,000 have been filed against the Government. In 1946, by reason of a Presidential freeze, these projects were shut down between August and November. Regarding the shut-down by the President, Commissioner Michael W. Straus said at that famous Salt Lake City conference (p. 37, Salt Lake City conference):

"Mr. STRAUS. I know perfectly well that there was a Presidential freeze order imposed on reclamation that lasted from August 2 into November, through the best part of the construction season in many reclamation areas last summer. And the Bureau and I also denounced it and cried out against it until it was lifted. But, nevertheless, I know it set us back."

The shut-down of the projects in 1947 climaxed what in the opinion of this committee is a most dangerous practice and the precedent is condemned in the hope that in the future the administrative heads will heed the condemnation.

On June 10, 1947, Regional Director Boke sent a memorandum to R. S. Calland, his Assistant Regional Director, which read in part as follows:

"This morning I spoke to you concerning Secretary Krug's last-minute instructions to me on the construction program. He stated very clearly that he would like to see us spend our available funds by January 1. He also stated that he wanted a personal report from me in the immediate future. I shall leave it up to you as to what date you feel we can give the Secretary a construction personal report. However, I imagine we might count on doing so about July 1."

Thereafter Mr. Calland on June 17 sent a memorandum to all concerned which read in part as follows:

"JUNE 17, 1947.

"Memorandum for all concerned (R. S. Calland)

"Subject: Means of effectuating the regional director's responsibilities for construction on programing and execution, region 2.

"1. For reasons valid or otherwise, the construction program in the region has fallen far behind schedule. Because of failure to meet estimated progress large amounts of appropriated funds have remained unspent at fiscal year ends. This fact has brought severe criticism upon us from the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner, from members of congressional appropriations committees, and from others.

"2. The heavy carry-over from the current fiscal year (1947) plus an appropriation in the order of amounts recently passed by the Senate and House of Representatives will give us a total of funds available for fiscal year 1948, which is far above that required to meet our current rate of spending. The Secretary and the Commissioner are insistent that 1948 funds be spent early in the year—by January 1, if possible. We are concerned here lest we end the fiscal year with another carry-over. The situation represents a challenge to our construction ability. The Bureau's reputation as a construction agency is literally at stake. As local custodians of this reputation all means at our command must be employed to meet this challenge."

It should be noted from the above "the Secretary and the Commissioner are insistent that the 1948 funds be spent early in the year—by January 1, if possible."

Here are instructions to dissipate the funds 6 months prior to the end of the fiscal year; a direct violation, in the opinion of your committee, of the spirit and the letter of the Antideficiency Act. Also, this is a willful disregard of the admonition of the Appropriations Committee which was well known by the Bureau of Reclamation, as is found in the records of the Salt Lake City conference of 1947. Commissioner Straus made the following statement at that conference:

Page 69, Salt Lake City conference record:

"Mr STRAUS. The House committee did say, as an expression of opinion and as a piece of legislative history, but did not write down into law, that they did not want to entertain deficiencies and could not entertain deficiencies."

We are of the opinion that the action taken was in utter defiance of the Congress as evidenced by the testimony of Richard Boke before your committee (appearing in testimony of June 9, 1948):

"Mr. WADSWORTH. One other thing. Do you think that the sending out of this appeal to the effect that the money should be spent, all of it, the new appropriation and the carry-over, by January 1, do you think that in doing that you were carrying out the intent of Congress?

"Mr BOKE. No, sir, I do not."

The record shows that on August 31, 1945, Mr. Straus, then Assistant Secretary of the Interior, prepared for Secretary Harold L. Ickes a statement of Mr. Boke's education and experience. This statement was intended to persuade Mr. Ickes as to Boke's fitness for the job of director of region 2. Mr. Straus' ultimate purpose in this is also clear, namely, to place the vast Central Valley project in the hands of a propagandist for the Bureau's socialistic policies. Despite this recommendation of Mr. Straus to Secretary Ickes, as contained in the following letter, your committee has reached the conclusions, based on incontrovertible evidence, Mr. Boke does not possess the qualifications necessary to administer the gigantic Central Valley project.

The following is a copy of the letter referred to:

OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT
SECRETARY, UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, August 31, 1945.

Memorandum for the Secretary.

For your convenience in appraising and interviewing Richard L. Boke, who has been mentioned in connection with our Central Valley problem, I provide this biographical sketch.

Richard Lathrop Boke, a native-born Californian, is 36 years old. He specialized in economics, biology, and literature (at Antioch College, 1927 to 1931). He is of good family with some independent means.

He engaged in forestry work for the Ohio State forestry department and engineering construction work for G. A. Fuller Construction Co. He did some publicity work prior to his first Federal employment which happened to be for you in the Office of Indian Affairs, laying out of a Mexican Springs erosion-control station on the Navajo Reservation. Subsequently his Federal employment went forward with the Soil Conservation Service until he became its regional director, with headquarters at Albuquerque. When the war came, he joined the Nelson Rockefeller Inter-American Affairs Committee and worked through South America on procurement and land resource and food work, later going to the Foreign Economic Administration as chief program director for the purchase of food supplies for import into the United States, and as administrator in budget work. He returned to the Department of the Interior at the end of last year, through my efforts, when Director Charles Carey, of California, stated that he could find no man in the Bureau of Reclamation qualified to head up the regional operation and maintenance and land-use planning work in the Central Valley.

He has devoted over 10 years primarily to resource and land-use planning (virtually our biggest Central Valley problem), and, as a section chief in Sacramento, has intimate knowledge of over a year's standing on our current problems. He is definitely a strong personal believer in acreage restriction, for I have examined him on that score. I know that he is a public-power advocate, but I have never examined him on that policy, as his position gave him no administrative responsibility for power policy.

His outstanding accomplishment, as one of the new school of thought that we are injecting into the Bureau of Reclamation, is that he succeeded where others either failed or were unwilling to make an attempt, in coming to an agreement with at least some districts in the San Joaquin Valley for selling water with acreage restrictions. Until on his own initiative, under Carey's guidance, he made this attempt, the Bureau and the Department had accepted the frequently proclaimed thesis that Central Valley water could not be sold with acreage restriction. After 5 months of personal contact with some irrigation districts, he negotiated the southern San Joaquin municipal utility district proposed contract, which will be a pattern under which a half dozen similar contracts may be entered. This effectively shatters the California solid front against acreage restrictions and, in my opinion, is the only positive progress in recent years, policywise, in the Central Valley.

Boke is distinctly not one of our regulation reliable, noncrusading reclamation engineers, and his original arrival in the Bureau of Reclamation was accomplished with considerable difficulty in one of the better jobs (present salary $6,750). He has demonstrated determination, as well as tact, in his position to date. He has had wide Federal administrative experience and has never held a position of comparable responsibility to that now being discussed. We have no other regional director in the Bureau of Reclamation as young or with as short a background in the Bureau; or, to my knowledge, no other person in the Bureau qualified for the position now being discussed.

MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Assistant Secretary.

It is the conclusion of this committee after full hearings and careful study of the record that:

1. There was a clear design to exhaust the funds of the project in the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1948;

2. Such a design—spelled out and promulgated by high officials of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, at the Salt Lake City conference—to spend until we go broke, is a direct, deliberate, and premeditated violation of the Antideficiency Act;

3. There was serious mismanagement of the Bureau's accounts and gross errors in the statement of accounts payable;

4. From the record we cannot escape the conclusion that the shut-down was a deliberate conspiracy to discredit the Congress of the United States without regard to the consequences;

5. Such acts by Bureau officials were a deliberate attempt to put pressure on the Congress for deficiency appropriations although not needed at the time;

6. The shut-down has cost the residents of the valley and the Government of the United States millions of dollars, and materially delayed the vital project;

7. The shut-down was unnecessary and sufficient funds were available to carry the projects forward until February 1, 1948.

PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA

In consideration of the dissemination of propaganda by the Bureau of Reclamation it is well to consider section 201, of title 18, United States Code, passed July 11, 1919, which reads in part as follows:

"No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, either before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation."

It is the opinion of your committee that the Bureau has deliberately and willfully gone beyond its proper and lawful public information function. It has expended undetermined sums in propaganda designed to generate public approval of official policies. It has disseminated material craftily planned to smear and discredit its critics and to undermine the influence of Members of Congress who, in the performance of their duty, would expose questionable practices of the Bureau. The evidence strongly indicates that the Bureau's entire public relations policy has been designed to influence and coerce Congress on pending legislation dealing with the powers, objectives, and ideology of the Bureau.

Your committee has assembled a voluminous file of publications, releases, speeches, and other propaganda material prepared and distributed by the Bureau, or printed by its supporting groups and distributed through regular Bureau channels. A large number of pamphlets on technical subjects have been carefully written in laymen's language with clever emphasis upon the complexity of the problems involved. The implication is clear that the Bureau should be given blanket

authority without inquiring too closely into what the Bureau does or how it affects the real interests of the Nation.

One of the many publications to come to the attention of your committee is entitled "They Subdued the Desert." The publication was prepared by Barrow Lyons while serving as Chief Information Officer of the Bureau of Reclamation. Mr. Lyons toured the 17 reclamation States during October and November of 1946, writing this story as told to him "by the men who apply water, till the land, and feed their flocks and herds."

A close examination of the publication leads your committee to the conclusion that it was sheer propaganda and not even of the subtle variety generally encountered under similar situations.

Articles were written in a manner that would influence class against class, liberal against conservative, and inject into the minds of readers ideologies sponsored by some of the planners within the Bureau.

All this was done at Government expense.

Commissioner Straus testified as follows regarding the volume:

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it the function of the Government of the United States to furnish information to the public about a man's reputation? A private citizen?

"Mr. STRAUS. The effort in that publication—well, wait. I don't want to appear to dodge that question.

"Mr. HARNESS. Why don't you answer that question?

"Mr. STRAUS. I think I am trying to now.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. What have we come to?

"Mr. STRAUS. No; I do not think it is a prime function. I do not think it is a function; let me just state that. I do not think it is a function.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Why did you do it?

"Mr. STRAUS. That was done—I do not know whether it was a criticism of him, but it was done in an effort to get a cross-section view of the thinking of the water users in 17 States. That was the endeavor, the target.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. I would criticize it just as much if it had praised this man to the skies. What have we come to when the Government of the United States publishes far and wide estimates of individual citizens and does it at public expense? What have we come to?

"Mr. STRAUS. I have had some experience with that end result, Mr. WADSWORTH.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, have you any observation to make about the soundness of such a governmental activity?

"Mr. STRAUS. I have been criticized at great length as an individual by the Government of the United States.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly; we all have. I have been criticized at great length, but, to my knowledge, I have never been criticized at the expense of the taxpayer.

"Mr. STRAUS. I have.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. What have you got to say about this? Do you think that is a proper function of Government?

"Mr. STRAUS. I think the effort, the overall effort, of that publication is a proper function of Government. I regret that there is any criticism of any individual in it.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. I am glad to hear you admit that much. Would you regret some of these observations about citizens had they been in the tone of glorious praise?

"Mr. STRAUS. Well, my primary control point would be whether it was factual or not.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. That is not the point. You may believe that the thing may be a fact, but should the Government publish it?

"Mr. STRAUS. I think the Government should know the thoughts of——

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Itself?

"Mr. STRAUS. Of itself, yes; and of the people it is serving, too—the water users in my case.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, that opens up a remarkable vista. If that policy may be pursued without criticism by the Government of the United States, then every citizen of the United States may be subject to analysis as to his character and reputation in governmental publications. Isn't that right?

"Mr. STRAUS. That has been my experience.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at public expense.

"Mr. STRAUS. I think at public expense. My qualifications have been examined rather thoroughly—broadcasted——

"Mr. WILSON. You mean before you became a public servant?

"Mr. STRAUS. And since.

"Mr. WILSON. Not since, before. You are subject to public talk when you get to be a public servant.

"Mr. STRAUS. I was thinking of 'since,' Mr. Wilson.

"Mr. WILSON. Well, did your Government ever spend any money advertising you around, before you got into public office?

"Mr. STRAUS. Not that I recall; no.

"Mr. WILSON. Good or bad?

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Remember. These people are private citizens.

"Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. They do not hold public office. We all admit—you admit, I admit—that we are subject to criticism——

"Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. By anybody.

"Mr. MANASCO. Everybody.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. But here we have the Government of the United States, at the expense of the taxpayers, publishing estimates of the characters of people who are private citizens.

"Mr. STRAUS. Don't you think, Mr. WADSWORTH, that the fact that my understanding was that clearly it was agreed to and accepted and corrected by those individuals has a bearing on this?"

Page 2237:

"Mr. WADSWORTH. We have reached a pretty turn when the Government of the United States, in official Government publications, presumes to estimate or analyze the character and reputation of a private citizen, whether with his consent or not.

"I could not suspect such a case, but some bureau of the Government might say that 'WADSWORTH is a pretty good fellow,' and would ask me had I any objection to that being published in a governmental publication. I might be tempted to say, 'No, I have no objection,' but would it be right?

"Mr. STRAUS. Under those circumstances——

"Mr. WADSWORTH. It would not."

We find that Government employees on Government salary and at Government expense have prepared highly controversial material for private organizations. One such document (American River Development) contains the statement: "If you want a multiple-purpose dam at Folsom, with canals, power plant, and related works to insure maximum benefits, write your Congressman and Senators."

The Bureau denies its employees attached this statement to the pamphlet which otherwise was fully written by Bureau employees. Nevertheless, the pamphlet in great numbers has been distributed by the Bureau of Reclamation in direct violation of the Criminal Code above cited. Commissioner Straus in several addresses in California by clear implication urged that pressure be put upon the Congress to bring about legislation favorable to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Governor of the State of California criticized the Bureau of Reclamation for issuing propaganda in an attempt to confuse the people of that State about Folsom Dam.

In expressing himself regarding the controversy between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, over the construction of the reservoir, Governor Warren declared:

"The Army has authority to build the dam. And we are coming right up to the time in a couple of months when we will go before Congress to ask for appropriations and the Bureau is telling the people we will be robbed of our birthright.

"This gets the people confused until they don't know what is best for them. It is outrageous. We don't care who builds the dam as long as it is built."

The conflict between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in regard to Folsom Dam is not consistent with proper administrative practice. The Congress has acted and has authorized construction by the Army engineers. Any change in that program should be suggested directly to committees of the Congress. It is highly improper to inflame the citizens of the American River District against the Army engineers in the hope that they should by bitter protest prevail upon the Congress to transfer that Department's function to the Bureau of Reclamation. Sound government and legislation cannot be predicated on such a basis.

Throughout the Bureau of Reclamation in key administrative posts, not only in Washington but in the regions, are men whose backgrounds are in the field of publicity and public relations. "Selling" the public on social theories and ideologies rather than construction of great engineering projects is apparently high on the agenda of this agency of Government.

Such a fact is revealed in the testimony of Leon Hostetter, a former employee of the Bureau.

Mr. Hostetter, a competent and highly trained engineer, resigned his position to enter into employment with private enterprise. He had been disillusioned by activities within the Bureau. He testified that when he attempted to discuss his engineering problems with the Fresno office, he would find Bureau personnel "out making speeches." This fact, he said, delayed the projects.

In discussing his resignation with one official of the Bureau in California, Mr. Hostetter testified as follows:

"Mr. HOSTETTER. Mr. Nordholm expressed amazement that I would resign from the Bureau of Reclamation.

"Mr. BOW. Will you tell us just what the conversation was?

"Mr. HOSTETTER. I said I didn't know why anyone would be surprised, especially in view of the fact that I was accepting a position which was much more to my advantage than staying with the Bureau. He said that he thought that it was peculiar to him, and he could not do it because he wanted to be a member of the organization which would preside over the social changes in Central Valley. I told him, Mr. Nordholm, that I had no interest under heaven in such business; that I am an engineer, and that I expected to continue to be an engineer, and if I could not be that in the Bureau, I would have to go elsewhere. The unfortunate thing is that I have no witness for that, but you just have my statement.

"Mr. HARNESS. Did this man elaborate on what social changes he had in mind?

"Mr. HOSTETTER. No, sir; I didn't give him any opportunity to state it. I am an engineer, and, as I told him, I am not interested in social changes of any kind.

"Mr. HARNESS. He wanted to belong to the organization when the social changes took place?

"Mr. HOSTETTER. As I remember his words, the organization which would preside over the social changes in the Central Valley.

"Mr. HARNESS. Do you have any idea what he had in mind?

"Mr. HOSTETTER. No, sir; I don't, other than the fact that on a previous trip he expressed great admiration for the progress made in Russia."

Your committee further reports its concern regarding the employment of Robert Burns Read. Mr. Read, describing his qualifications

in his application for employment, stated: "I developed a style of newswriting which contrived to present fairly subtle ideas in simple language."

Mr. Read also submitted the fact that he had for 5 years, on a voluntary basis, prepared publicity material for the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee at 68 Post Street in San Francisco, Calif.

This group, with which Mr. Read stated he was officially associated, has been certified by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive, in his report in the loyalty investigation.

The House Un-American Activities Committee reports on the organization in part as follows:

"The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited as a Communist front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 1311, dated March 29, 1944. Attorney General Clark included the group on his list of 'subversive' organizations furnished for use of the Loyalty Review Board. The executive secretary and members of the executive board of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee were cited April 16, 1948, for contempt of Congress; they were indicted April 1, 1947, and convicted June 27, 1947."

Mr. Read is still on the Bureau pay roll and Mr. Boke testified that he, Mr. Boke, was undisturbed.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Read as well as Sam Woods, another information man, served in an executive position with an organization which openly supports all Bureau activities.

There is a strong implication from the record before us that the Bureau of Reclamation has been active in the organization and operation of propaganda-front conferences. The committee staff has been directed to further investigate the subject.

Commissioner Straus openly admitted that statements for outside witnesses have been prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation staff. These witnesses appeared to influence legislation.

From the records of the Salt Lake City conference we find that the Bureau not only has prepared statements but has stimulated outside witnesses (p. 314, Salt Lake City conference):

"Mr. MARKWELL. We not only made it clear and made as strong an indication and appearance as we could, but we also stimulated outside witnesses to do that."

Even though the Appropriations Committee of the Congress sought to eliminate much of these improper activities, the Bureau has regarded the limitations of the committee as a "name plate" function and has carried on, evading the intent of Congress and distorting the law to meet their own ends, by shifting the information personnel over to other portions of the pay roll. Just how this was accomplished, was explained by Commissioner Straus at the Salt Lake City meeting, as follows (p. 89 of the Salt Lake City conference):

"The Senate put in a limitation that applies to a function under the label of 'Information,' by reducing the language in the previous last year's bill that put a limitation of $150,000 and cut that to $50,000, making a national limitation on information work, so announced and so labeled and so set up administratively, of $50,000.

"Pursuant to that limitation that prevailed when the bill was passed there was a radical reduction in the size of the Office of the Director of Information and parallel reductions in the field.

"The reductions were not spread to the over-all money, the salaries and expense money in the bill, but the limitation was put specifically on that name-plate function.

"There were two regional officers of information who were preserved on salary and expense accounts, Regions 1 and 2, and the other regions were informed of the legislation, the appropriation action, and were instructed to make what disposition they saw fit of their regional information agents that heretofore had been charged to salaries and expense, it being pointed out to them that it would not be enough to merely put the same information on a centralized project roll, that they would have to change the description and carry it in some other way that came within the limitation."

Further evidence of the manner in which the Bureau willfully evaded the evident intent of Congress to curtail the agency's publicity activities is seen in the statements of Acting Chief Information Officer Leonard Mosby, at the same meeting. This is illustrated by the following extract (pp. 447 and 448 of the Salt Lake City conference):

"Mr. VERNON. Were there any limitations, such as paralleled the Personnel Act?

"Mr. MOSBY. We have been unable to find them. So far as I can see; I have not had an opportunity to examine the entire bill. I believe the restriction is in the first section on salaries or administrative expenae and it says that no more than $50,000 shall be spent in connection with information out of this appropriation.

"Related to that is the appropriation of $3,500,000 for administrative expense.

"Mr. VERNON. Can we consider we are free to expend whatever funds are necessary for information out of project funds?

"Mr. MOSBY. Yes, sir; I think so.

"Mr. VERNON. I have in mind particularly in the opening preamble to the reclamation section which says what these funds are being used for, which goes for information and making recordings and so on and so forth and yet with that limitation further on down.

"Mr. MOSBY. It turns on the word, what this appropriation means, and that means $3,500,000."

The extent to which officials of this agency of Government have gone to legislate for themselves is best found in the statement of one of the high officials (Chief Engineer) in the Salt Lake City conference, and we quote:

"Mr. YOUNG. There was a legal procedure involved there and we even went so far as to perjure ourselves to get ourselves out of the woods. It didn't amount to anything in money, but the principle is there."

Your committee expresses amazement that in an open conference of Bureau officials attended by the Commissioner and his staff and by a member of the President's Cabinet, the Secretary of the Interior, there should be an admission of perjury. In spite of this admission your committee staff found no action either to prosecute or discipline.

Your committee has directed the committee staff to vigorously continue investigation of the propaganda activities within the Bureau. Violations of the Criminal Code to date will be called to the attention of the Attorney General. All future violations will also be reported to the proper authorities in an effort by the committee to put an end to these practices.

The committee deplores, but will not be deterred by, attempts of Commissioner Straus to obstruct its investigatory efforts, through intimidation of Bureau employees. Examples of such attempts by the Commissioner are seen in the following teletypes which Commissioner Straus sent to the Denver office when it was learned that committee investigators were active in that region. The teletypes follow:

Washington to the following:

MAY 3, 1948.

To Chief Engineer; attention, Young, regional director; attention, Batson.
W-DN 411.
W-DN 217.
Subject: Interviews with Harness committee investigators.

Please air mail attention 400 two copies of a brief report of each interview with Bureau employees by HARNESS or other congressional committee investigators. These reports should have attached copies of any tabulations or other material furnished investigators.

The Chief Engineer will please advise all other office heads in Denver of this request.

STRAUS, *Commissioner.*

Washington to the following:

MAY 4, 1948.

W-DN7 220.
W-DN 414.
To Chief Engineer; regional director, Denver.
Subject: Interviews with Harness committee investigators.

Re W-DN 411 and W-DN 7: Supplementing my teletype of yesterday, all employees of the Bureau of Reclamation are expected to make full disclosure of factual information to authenticated investigators of the Harness committee or other congressional committees.

The reports of interviews requested are to be brief and factual and to high light the information requested so as to enable us to coordinate properly all information and data given the investigators.

STRAUS, *Commissioner.*

Similar instructions were sent to the Sacramento office when it was learned investigators were active in the California region. Investigators who had worked in both areas testified that Bureau employees who had been cooperating in the investigation were frightened by the teletypes, with the result that the investigators' efforts were seriously hampered, and their work of obtaining evidence made much more difficult.

This is considered but another example of bureaucratic intrigue to hamper and frustrate the Congress in its attempt to perform its constitutional function.

CONCLUSION

In this interim report your committee has outlined but a few of the matters of which it feels it must take cognizance.

Full opportunity was given to Bureau officials to answer charges made against them. Some attempts to answer have been made and appear in the records. However, the findings in this report are based on incontrovertible facts.

Witnesses appeared before the committee who are presently employed or who are retiring from the Bureau. Some were critical of the operations of the Bureau and its officials. The committee wishes to commend those persons who, through pride of their organization and through patriotic motives, risked personal retribution in presenting these facts.

Other witnesses employed by the Bureau engaged in evasion, double talk, and distortion in an apparent effort to conceal facts from your committee. Such conduct by Government employees cannot be tolerated.

In the hope that this committee may through its efforts and subsequent reports to the Congress assure the proper use of appropriated funds and bring about the efficient and economical management of the Bureau of Reclamation we shall, as indicated, continue our investigation.

Approved:

FOREST A. HARNESS (Indiana), *Chairman.*
JAMES W. WADSWORTH (New York).
HENRY J. LATHAM (New York).

NOTE.—Exhibits referred to in this report will be a part of the printed hearings.

MINORITY VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE MANASCO

In my opinion, the charges that have been made against the officials of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation are not sustained by the evidence. On the contrary, the record discloses that many obstacles were placed in the way of the Bureau carrying out the laws as prescribed by the Congress. It is clear that there is intense opposition to the 160-acre limitation and public-power provision of the reclamation laws that have stood unrepealed for more than 45 years. The propaganda that has been spread by that opposition throughout the Central Valley of California has, unfortunately, necessitated the Bureau to spend considerable time and effort in combating erroneous and misleading statements concerning the applicability of the laws. Gov. Earl Warren, the Republican Vice Presidential nominee, pointed out an example of such propaganda to the Senate Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations. At page 1014 of the transcript of the hearings on H. R. 6705, before that subcommittee, Eightieth Congress, he testified as follows:

"It was recognized in 1933 by the proponents of the Central Valley project in California that the sale of electric power from the project to only one possible customer would not result in the best financial return; and, in the long run, this is bound to be true. Although, at the present time, the private company is desirous of obtaining project power and is no doubt willing to pay a fair price for it, this has not always been the case and may not be so in the future. For example, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. circulated a letter, dated December 12, 1933, to stockholders and bondholders of the company, which stated in part as follows: 'At present there is a surplus of power in all California. This company has 10 powerhouses shut down, and its engineers report enough power available to take care of all growth until 1945. This means that there is no market for additional power and that the revenue which the proponents so freely predict cannot possibly be earned.'

"Contradictory to the foregoing claim of the company, it should be pointed out that nearly 500,000 kilowatts of additional capacity were installed by 1945 and that over 600,000 kilowatts of additional generating capacity have been installed since December 1933 and are presently in operation to meet still growing power demands in its service area.

"It should also be pointed out that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., in appearing recently before the Federal Power Commission for a license to construct additional hydroelectric facilities, put in evidence its construction program of new generating capacity for the ensuing 3 years, amounting to 1,439,700 kilowatts. In view of this large addition of generating capacity, it is quite evident a corresponding increase of main transmission facilities will be required.

"The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has consistently opposed Federal appropriations for transmission lines claiming, among other things, that it has ample facilities to transmit the power generated at Shasta and Keswick power plants to points of utilization. Studies by the engineering staff of the State engineer show that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. does not now have sufficient primary transmission-line capacity to dependably transmit south from Shasta substation the power output from the Shasta and Keswick plants of the Central Valley project and the output of the Pitt River plants of the company. Additional primary transmission facilities are required for such purposes."

Many assertions are made throughout the record that the Bureau officials engaged in dishonest and false propaganda. The substantive proof, however, is totally lacking in that respect. No specific instances have been shown where any false or misleading statements were issued by the Bureau of Reclamation or its officials. In fact, an adverse witness, testifying with respect to an article written by a Bureau information official, stated that the article was factually correct. This same witness, when questioned by the chairman as to whether he ever heard any Bureau official urge people to support or object to any pending legislation said that he had not, and that the only thing he heard in that respect was a statement by Regional Director Boke to the effect that the 160-acre limitation was the law and that it would be enforced.

After listening for many weeks to testimony presented to the committee investigating the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, it is most difficult to draw a line as to what is true and what is propaganda. Thousands of pages of testimony and documentary evidence were presented to the committee, voluminous reports were submitted by the committee staff, ample opportunity was afforded those who were opposed to the conduct of the Bureau of Reclamation in carrying out the obligations imposed upon it by the Congress to present their views.

Many charges were made against representatives of the Bureau that they were flagrantly violating the laws of the Congress. However, it is my opinion that the principal objection to the conduct of Bureau employees was based on the fact that they were carrying out the duties imposed upon them by acts of Congress to see that the 160-acre limitation and the public power provisions of the law were observed in the Central Valley of California.

Differences of opinion were expressed as to whether or not the acts of Congress restrict furnishing water to the family-sized farm unit. I gathered from the statements of some of the witnesses in the early part of the hearings that about the only hope they had of correcting the 160-acre limitation was to change the national administration from the office of Chief Executive down to the Bureau heads in the Department of the Interior. Since the hearings were concluded, with the exception of the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior, the great Republican Party held its convention in Philadelphia and in its platform instead of going on record as favoring repeal of the 160-acre limitation the platform endorses the principle of family-sized farm units, which in some instances could mean farms of 30 acres or less. When the selection for the position of President and Vice President was made, the hope of those who would like to see the public power policies of this administration and the 160-acre limitation removed must have been dashed upon the rocks of political oblivion.

Governor Warren, the candidate for Vice President, has been outspoken in public statements and in statements before congressional committees supporting the family-sized farm units to be furnished water by the Bureau of Reclamation and also in favor of the public power policies of the Bureau as directed by acts of Congress. Governor Dewey is also on record as approving the family-sized farm units as evidenced by his complete endorsement of the Republican platform. I point out these things because of the fact that the major part of this record is devoted to testimony concerning the carrying out of those laws, and the insistence of Bureau officials that they be enforced. I think anyone could draw the conclusion upon reading the hearings that the principles involved in this controversy are not personalities but policies laid down by the Congress. Any Bureau head or subordinate who faithfully carried out the provisions of law as laid down by the Congress would have met with the same difficulties and would have had the same opposition as the present Bureau representatives, whether he be engineer, lawyer, accountant, or what not. A large amount of testimony dealt with the question of whether or not the head of the Bureau of Reclamation and his principal assistants should have been engineers. To my mind these positions should be filled with capable administrators. Having a degree in engineering, law, or any of the arts does not necessarily qualify a person for an administrative position. The presidents of some of the greatest industrial corporations in our Nation today are lawyers, yet under the contention of many of the antagonists of the Bureau, if carried into effect in private industry, only engineers would be qualified to head manufacturing firms. The record also shows that administration of the reclamation laws is a tremendous task in itself, there being over 803 pages of laws which govern the operation of the Bureau and it might well be said that the head of the Bureau should be a lawyer. Since a lot of bookkeeping and accounting is involved it might well be said that the head of the Bureau should be a certified public accountant. In view of the fact that lands must be classified under the law and repayment to the Government is dependent, to some extent, on the value of the crops, it might be said that the head should be an agriculturist.

Due to the enormous cost of these reclamation projects some taxpayers might wonder if it would not be advisable to turn the project back to the States and let them complete construction and administer the program. The Central Valley project will eventually cost over $400,000,000 for the benefit of the owners of approximately 1,000,000 acres of land. I am wondering if the taxpayers of New York, Indiana, and Michigan are willing to continue to appropriate huge sums of interest-free money for the benefit of a few.

The opponents of the Central Valley project will not be satisfied by merely removing certain personnel in the Bureau of Reclamation. They will not be satisfied until the law under which the ideologies here involved have been repealed, or nullified by failure to carry them out by the heads of the Bureau. The ideologies are written in the law. The removal of these officials for enforcing the law may tend to intimidate future officials and if the precedent were carried into other bureaus of the Government those who do not like to pay taxes might, by intimidation and otherwise, get the collectors of internal revenue to nullify the acts of Congress.

Much ado has been made over the question of whether or not representatives of the Government falsified the carry-overs in the 1948 budget. After hearing all the testimony, I think a person who wanted to take either side could find testimony to back up his belief.

To my way of thinking, the principal difficulty encountered by members of this committee and other committees of the House and Senate arose from the question of whether or not carry-overs meant additional appropriations, or whether it meant completion of work previously authorized. Apparently, many people have been misled to believe that the carry-overs were hidden appropriations to be used any way the bureau heads could, or any way they so desired.

The truth is, the carry-overs represented appropriations for work previously authorized and which should have been completed, but due to material shortages, weather conditions, and manpower shortages, were not completed as scheduled and had to be carried in the next fiscal year. The cost of the work, however, remained the same. These carry-overs in no way affected the proposed completion dates of the projects, or the total amount of work involved. If the contractor could complete the work that is scheduled to be completed in 1952 by the latter part of this year without any additional cost to the taxpayers of the United States, it is difficult to see how anyone could oppose such rapid completions. The estimates made some 8 or 9 months before the end of the fiscal year as to the amount of work that will be unfinished at the end of the fiscal year, can only be a guess, and the evidence shows that when the Bureau officials were testifying before the Senate subcommittee, they knew that the money which constituted the carry-overs would be required to pay contract earnings, in addition to the moneys needed for new work that would be undertaken. The money was actually used

up in the next fiscal year, and I do not believe any falsification has been shown.

I realize that the Congress should be diligent in following the appropriations made for the executive branch of the Government, and oppose a government by bureaucracy as much as any member of the committee. However, I think we face a grave danger from the Congress itself if we fail into the philosophy of administration of laws by the Congress itself under our democratic system of government. Of necessity, the executive departments must execute the laws passed by Congress, and if they fail to execute these laws properly, Congress should take cognizance of that fact and try to bring them in line; but, if the Congress itself attempts to administer the laws we are headed down the highway of totalitarianism.

Much of the evidence presented by the committee's investigators was hearsay and highly opinionated, but even a considerable portion of this was successfully refuted by the Bureau's witnesses. A statement was offered for the record entitled "Fifty Statements and the Facts," and although it was not placed in the record, it was orally presented by Bureau witnesses and points out some of the erroneous statements that were put in the record.

It developed in the hearings on June 29, that there is an unfortunate fight, which up to now has been kept under cover, between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineers, which was very disturbing. It was most unfortunate that two agencies of the Government, charged with the obligation of preserving natural resources, should be fighting each other. Instead of fighting each other, I think they should both be working for the common good. It is somewhat refreshing to know that Congress is now trying to resolve those difficulties, and I sincerely trust that the Congress will be able to do so without undue pressure from each agency.

Considerable testimony was offered concerning the so-called shut-down of the Central Valley project on November 30, 1947. The earlier testimony in the RECORD left the impression that all work on the project had stopped and that the Bureau of Reclamation was maintaining its full pay roll while everything was at a standstill. As the testimony developed, however, it was conclusively established that the Bureau of Reclamation did not order any shut-down of work, but expected all work to continue on the project even though the funds were exhausted. In fact, it was on this basis that the principles of the antideficiency law were applied. Only four contractors did shut down, all the others continuing work in anticipation of supplemental appropriations, which the Congress very expeditiously provided. The charge was made that this shut-down was planned so as to embarrass the Congress and that work was speeded up by the Bureau to effect that result.

My impression from the testimony is that the work continued in its normal course, in the most economical and efficient rate of construction. The invalidity of those charges is evidenced by testimony elsewhere in the record that the Bureau instead of speeding up construction was slowing down construction in order to enforce the signing of repayment contracts. Evidence was offered by the Bureau, which to me seemed quite conclusive, to the effect that the Bureau had to continue its organization to supervise the work that had not stopped. That constituted a substantial amount of work, and I believe the Bureau would have been grossly derelict in its duty if it disbanded its organization and closed the project down. In fact, I do not believe it would have been authorized under the law to do so.

It seems to me that the facts are simply this: That the Bureau needed $20,000,000 of new money for the fiscal year 1948 to carry out its program. Its carry-over funds which remained from the previous fiscal year were needed to complete the work previously programed for that year. When Congress appropriated only $9,000,000 instead of the $20,000,000 needed, it was obvious that the work could not continue throughout the whole fiscal year. The record here also shows that the Congress was advised of that fact prior to the time it made its appropriations. It is interesting to note that Congress later not only made up the difference, but appropriated nearly $2,000,000 more than was originally requested.

Some testimony was presented to the effect that there was some $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 available on November 30, 1947, to pay contractor earnings on the Friant-Kern canal after that date. The Bureau's witnesses, however, point out that even if there were no statutory restrictions on the use of that money, which apparently there was, work elsewhere on the project would have had to be stopped. True, some misjudgments were made in the hurried efforts to get out the required notices as to the status of funds, but, even with the hindsight now available, it is evident that work could have continued only a few days longer.

As to the statements concerning claims against the Bureau by contractors arising out of the exhaustion of funds, the record does not show any such claims. It appears that the four contractors who stopped work sought to obtain relief legislation from the Congress, but as yet that has not been granted. The Bureau denies any legal liability.

The reclamation laws are so voluminous and complex that no fair appraisal of the activities of the Bureau can be made without a thorough understanding of those laws. The reclamation program, in accordance with authorized laws and the annual appropriations, provides aid in the development of western land and water resources for the primary purpose of increasing opportunities to develop family-sized irrigation farms, and for improved family livelihood to rural and urban population in the irrigated areas of the 17 Western States. Those policies of the Congress have been implicit throughout 46 years of legislative history. While the great dams, canals, power plants, and transmission lines which the Bureau of Reclamation has designed and constructed are monuments to engineering skill, they are but the instruments by which the Congress has made possible the administration of its policies for extending the human opportunities which are reflected in the rapidly expanding population of the West in both the rural and urban areas.

As reported to the committee of the Congress, more than $1,000,000,000 has been invested, to date, in the construction of Federal reclamation projects. Authorized projects require for their completion more than 3.3 billion dollars additional. On the 58 projects in operation, serving some 5 million acres with irrigation water, including 21 projects with power facilities having in excess of 2 million kilowatts of capacity, there are 95,000 farm families. The authorized program under construction will extend irrigation services to an additional 10 million acres, which will comprise 70,000 family-sized farms. Those projects will provide 4¾ million additional kilowatts of hydroelectric power capacity. In recent large appropriations for reclamation, the Congress has evidenced its desire that the Bureau drive this work rapidly to completion. Especially is this true of the Central Valley project.

Since 1902 the laws enacted by the Congress to regulate the Federal reclamation program properly and wisely have provided in such a manner that this great program will result in engineering works so designed and so operated as to effect the human purposes which are fundamental in our democratic way of life. The Bureau of Reclamation, by law, is made responsible for many aspects of the program, in addition to the strictly engineering construction activities, and the Bureau, by law, is authorized to employ personnel qualified to meet these nonengineering responsibilities. Among such nonengineering activities are the settlement of projects and, in cooperation with agricultural agencies, aid to project settlers in developing new irrigation farms. Another important nonengineering responsibility is securing the repayment of project costs in keeping with the water users repayment ability.

The laws of the Congress require that the Bureau of Reclamation so plan and administer the projects and the facilities constructed as to comply with our basic democratic objectives of encouraging family-sized farming and preference to public bodies in the marketing of electric energy.

Although the chairman, from time to time, advised the witnesses against the Bureau that the hearing was not concerned with the merits or demerits of the statutory provisions of the reclamation law, a very substantial portion of the record is devoted to discussions of the views of individuals in that respect. It was not until about June 4, 1948, more than a month after the hearings began, that the record was furnished with a factual description of the statutory functions of the Bureau of Reclamation. The so-called social activities against which some witnesses testified as propaganda turn out actually to be the administration of the declared policy of every Congress, Democratic and Republican alike, since Theodore Roosevelt first sponsored the reclamation law in 1902. Moreover, it was made plain that the information activities under criticism are conducted under substantive directives from the Congress and with public funds made available for the dissemination of information.

I am of the view, however, that one particular publication merits the censure of the committee and the Congress. This publication is a 162-page mimeographed document entitled "They Subdued the Desert," by Barrow Lyons, then the Chief Information Officer of the Bureau of Reclamation. The publication consists of reports of a series of interviews with irrigation farmers throughout the West, together with editorial comment by the author. The fact that the author has included reports from persons both favorable to and critical of the Bureau of Reclamation does not justify the expenditure of public funds for gratuitous reports and analyses of the social philosophies of private citizens.

Also, a large amount of testimony was devoted to speeches made by the Commissioner of Reclamation, particularly to certain speeches made at Richmond and Sacramento, Calif., concerning the American River development. While there is little or no evidence that these or other speeches were in violation of the Antilobbying Act, I am of the view that responsible public officials should maintain a higher degree of alertness with respect to the implications of their public appearances, in order that their vulnerability to possible censure be minimized.

It is quite apparent that most of the criticism of the Bureau of Reclamation has had its inspiration in two sources. One source is opposition to the steadfast insistence of Bureau officials in carrying into effect the excess-land and public-power provisions of existing law. The other source is a not unnatural professional prejudice on the part of some engineers against a reorganization which had had to be geared to a highly expanded program of water and power development and which quite properly has included some nonengineers in certain top positions of administrative supervision and direction.

The record of these committee hearings supports the view that officials of the Bureau of Reclamation generally have been doing their work as directed by the Congress. The publicity may, at times, have been indiscreet, but it was not unlawful. There is no evidence that Federal funds were wasted or misspent, that accounts were falsified,

that financial conditions were misrepresented, or the Bureau officials engaged in any unlawful acts.

It is important that the Congress view these charges and the evidence presented in the light of their political implications. If the Congress believes that the laws should be changed or repealed, such action should be taken in accordance with the constitutional methods prescribed. Ours is the greatest Government on the face of the earth, and we should keep it that way. We should not sacrifice its great principles to the wishes of any particular group. The Halls of Congress should not be used to avenge disappointed expectations, to forward schemes of personal ambition, to gratify private malice, to strengthen or destroy the power of a political party, or to punish the opposition or to repress its dissensions.

Over a period of many years there has been a growing tendency in our country for the people, the States, and local political subdivisions to come to the Federal Treasury to solve all problems and pay for all domestic improvements. Until recently a great number of our people thought that Federal money came free and not from the pockets of those who were to benefit by its use. Our people are now groaning under a heavy tax burden and unless they slow down on their requests for Federal assistance the tax burden will get higher. For a long time many of our citizens have labored under the delusion that Federal funds and air were the only free things on the earth. We now begin to realize that even the air is not free, for someone has to work to provide the food to furnish the body energy to inhale air. Thus nothing under the sun is free, and the sooner all our people learn this truth the better off we will be.

There has been a lot of complaint in the Central Valley area about the acreage limitation and the contracts that force excess landowners to dispose of their land if the land is to receive supplementary water. These people should know by now that if they are to water at the Federal trough, they must be governed by Federal control. Regardless of what we preach, wherever Federal funds go, Federal control is not far behind, and if our State governments are sincere about opposing Federal control they had better awaken to the true situation and start solving some of their own problems, or sooner or later the Federal Government will have taken over all their functions, and the taxpayers will insist in doing away with State government altogether in order to reduce the cost of government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the National Association of Chambers of Commerce entitled "Federal Spending Is the Greatest Single Cause of Inflation."

SHALL WE REENACT THE EXCESS-PROFITS TAX?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, President Truman today recommends the Congress reenact the wartime excess-profits tax, repealed in 1945 by a Democratic Congress and signed by President Truman. He says we made a mistake then and we should correct that mistake now in order to check inflation. Was the Congress right when it repealed the wartime excess-profits tax, or is the President right now? The answer to this question is to be found in the results obtained by repealing that tax. What were those results?

Mr. Speaker, when we repealed the wartime excess-profits tax we permitted American business corporations generally to retain $4,000,000,000 that the Government had been collecting each year from them, and to plow that amount back into business expansion. This proved a stimulating shot in the arm for American business and resulted in—

First. A tremendous business expansion, almost a boom, where a recession had been predicted by the President and his advisers.

Second. Five million three hundred thousand new jobs were created by this business expansion, boosting employment levels to an all-time high, reaching the 60,000,000 job goal that F. D. R. had set for 1950, almost 3 years ahead of the time set.

Third. Our national production index was boosted 15 points. This great increase in production should have resulted in decreased prices, but it did not, largely because we exported to Europe last year $14,000,000,000 worth of scarce goods—steel, farm machinery, tractors, food, coal—instead of our normal exports to Europe of $4,000,000,000 worth of goods.

Fourth. This business expansion also resulted in an actual increase in Treasury receipts, ending the fiscal year June 30, 1948, with the unprecedented Treasury surplus of eight and one-fourth billion dollars.

Now, Mr. Speaker, should we reverse the trend we started in 1945? Do we want to undo the good we accomplished then? Shall we now bring on the depression we anticipated but avoided in 1945, with its consequent unemployment, reduced production, lower wages, business failures, and so forth—all of which are part of a depression? I say this Congress can give but one answer to the President's request to reenact the wartime excess-profits tax, and that answer is "No."

THE RISING SPIRAL OF INFLATION

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my urgent hope that Congress will not adjourn this special session without first having done something to curb the rising spiral of inflation and to halt the soaring cost of living. The people of this country are watching to see what we will do. They are entitled to expect that we will do something. While they may be interested to know who or what is responsible for the present high cost of those things which they need, they are much more interested in finding a solution to the very vexing problem which confronts them. It is all very well for members of each political party to point the finger of blame at the other—and in that connection I do not contend that the factual background of the present condition should not be made known. Our people should be informed so that they may draw their own conclusions. But in the few remaining days of this special session the people want positive action which will afford them relief. If Congress does not act it will have been derelict in its duty. It is my understanding that legislation restricting the easy flow of money and credits will be introduced. If that is so, I trust that we shall have an opportunity to vote upon such legislation and I sincerely urge my colleagues to support it.

THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty, as it is certainly my pleasure, to call to the attention of the Congress that today, August 4, has been formally designated as Coast Guard Day. Appropriate celebrations are being held throughout the country to mark the anniversary of this organization, which is almost as old as the Nation itself.

The Coast Guard, or rather its ancestor, was instituted by Alexander Hamilton in 1790. Through all the years since, it has served the Nation gloriously in war and faithfully in peace.

The United States is, and should be, the world's leading maritime nation. Its need for the various services of the Coast Guard continues to grow. Its dramatic character is frequently emphasized in the daily press; its day-by-day routine is sometimes overlooked. It is fitting, therefore, that a special day should be set to emphasize the importance to the welfare of our country of the loyal and patriotic service quietly and effectively given us by 20,000 of our finest citizens.

I am including by your permission a brief editorial appearing in the New York Times of August 3, 1948:

COAST GUARD ANNIVERSARY

The First Congress in 1790 approved the expenditure of $10,000 for the securing of 10 cutters which, manned by "respectable characters," would enforce the Tariff Act of 1789. This Revenue Marine or Revenue Service, as it was variously called, was merged in 1915 with the Life Saving Service to form the Coast Guard. Through the years it has

taken over other functions, including lighthouse work, and marine inspection and navigation.

This week, on the 158th anniversary, the 17,000 men and 2,500 officers who make up the Coast Guard complement, are still the "respectable characters" called for by Alexander Hamilton in his recommendation as Secretary of the Treasury. The Guard's wartime strength was nearly 180,000, and each one knew pride in the oldest of the Nation's armed services that has functioned continuously since its founding.

They knew pride in the service's heritage and they were in turn the object of the Nation's pride, for the Guard's combat war record was splendid. Then, as now in peace, the men of the service honor the pledge in their motto, Semper Paratus.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have observed, as a member of the Agricultural Committee, the fact that the Department of Agriculture, as well as other agencies of the Government, are tremendously in favor of the school-lunch program in order to get rid of surpluses. I have consequently accused them for some time of using the children's stomachs as garbage cans to get rid of a lot of surpluses that the Government has on hand.

I now find that my charges are confirmed by the fact that a lot of schools are turning back their aid from the Federal Government for school-lunch programs for the very good reason the Government is supplying them with a lot of old stuff, with a lot of surplus commodities that they are purchasing on the open market in order to keep the prices up.

Let no one dispute the fact that this administration is doing everything humanly possible to keep prices high. The responsibility should be placed where it belongs—on the present administration. What we need down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue is just plain horse sense and common honesty.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Sunday Bulletin]

SOME OF PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOLS COOL TO LUNCH SUBSIDIES—NOT SURE THEY WANT UNITED STATES FUNDS DOUBLED OVER LAST YEAR'S

Pennsylvania's public schools can get twice as much Federal money for school children's lunches this year as they spent last year—but school officials by no means are sure they want it.

This situation emerged yesterday following announcement from Harrisburg that the Federal lunch program in the coming term will pour $3,372,869 into Pennsylvania.

The amount made available last year was $2,000,000, but so many school districts failed to take part in the program that approximately $350,000 was returned to Washington.

WANTS RATE INCREASED

Announcement of the increased Federal funds for the State was made by Miss Frances L. Hoag, head of the lunch program for the State department of public instruction, who deplored the fact that the 9-cent rate for individual lunches has not been increased.

The money is used, she explained, to help defray the costs of nutritious meals for school children. For example, the average cost of a luncheon platter approved by the Federal Government for the lunch program is 23 cents. The Government will pay 9 cents toward the meal, leaving a balance of 14 cents to be paid by the individual child.

Even though the cost is lowered by Federal aid, including gifts of food in addition to the money, many school districts take no part in the program.

Other districts, including Philadelphia, participate 100 percent.

CITY SCHOOLS GET BULK

"Philadelphia schools probably get the bulk of the Federal funds coming to Pennsylvania," said Add B. Anderson, secretary of the board of education.

"All our schools that have cafeterias take part in the program," he said, "and all schools, even those without cafeterias, take part in the program whereby the Federal Government pays 2 cents toward the cost of every half pint of milk bought by school children.

"We serve 29-cent lunch platters in our cafeterias at a cost to the pupils of 20 cents—the 9-cent difference being paid by the Government," Anderson said.

Asked about the possibility of higher meal costs, mentioned by Miss Hoag in suggesting that the 9-cent Federal payment be increased, Anderson replied:

"The school board would be extremely reluctant to raise cost of meals to children. We are studying methods by which we hope to be able to effect economies."

MANY PREFER OTHER FOOD

Where Federal lunch money aid has received a cold welcome, in some other school districts the reason frequently given is that pupils themselves pass up the wholesome meals prepared with Federal aid and prefer to spend their money on such items as hamburgers and soft drinks. Many children refuse to drink the plain milk provided with Federal aid, insisting on chocolate milk.

Most frequently heard of all is the complaint about the food that the schools must accept from the Federal Government if they sign up for the lunch-fund program. It is good and wholesome food, but sometimes not what children would order.

Much of the food is surplus. Some of it is bought by the Government to maintain farm prices. Huge shipments of walnuts, raisins, or potatoes arrive at the schools and must be used. Then there are powdered eggs, familiar to all veterans and still being disposed of as war surplus.

"Imagine our country schools trying to serve powdered eggs to farm children who can get all the fresh eggs they want right at home," one county school official said.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

FEDERAL JUDGE J. WATIES WARING

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for me to break my silence on the high-handed, unjudicial, ungentlemanly, outrageous, and deplorable conduct of a member of the Federal bench in South Carolina. His name is J. Waties Waring. I have had an almost irresistible impulse to make a statement long before but have feared that my motives might be misconstrued as favoring some particular candidate in the Senate race now being heatedly waged in South Carolina.

However, since this matter has now been brought into the open, I feel that I can safely discuss the man. He is as cold as a dead Eskimo in an abandoned igloo. Lemon juice flows in his frigid and calculating veins. By means of the FBI and the United States marshals, he has lampooned, lambasted, and vilified with unparalleled vituperation the comfort and ease of the outstanding members of the bar of South Carolina. At times he has literally banished some of them from his court by force. He should be removed by the force of a boot, if necessary, from office, because he is a disgrace to the Federal judiciary of the United States.

Every lawyer in South Carolina lives in mortal fear of this monster and everyone who reads this speech will thank God that I made it because I am speaking for the vast majority of the bar of Scuth Carolina.

Vast numbers of lawyers have abandoned practice in the Federal court because of this individual.

I am not complaining about his decision permitting Negroes to vote. I think anybody, whether he is a lawyer or not, could see that the Federal courts were going to permit the Negroes to vote in South Carolina primaries. The Awkright case was the signal for this. And, personally, I have felt for many years that we have had thousands of qualified Negroes in South Carolina who should be permitted to vote in our primaries. However, I did not feel then and I do not feel now that illiterates, white or black, should be permitted to vote, and I have on many occasions advocated an educational requirement for the right to vote. I was the first person that I know in South Carolina pubic office to advocate a secret ballot in general elections, and as everybody knows, Negroes have always voted in general elections in South Carolina and everywhere else in the Nation.

However, in the interpretation of what a judge considers to be law, whether he is right or wrong, he does not have to go through a metamorphosis and become a monster. The law should be interpreted with dignity. The law should be interpreted so that people will have a respect for law. Judge Waring's miserable conduct in issuing orders has been nothing short of star-chamber procedure. But his clumsy handling of a delicate situation has hurt the case of the Negro in South Carolina. This is unfortunate and I trust will not long obtain. Unless he is removed, there will be bloodshed. I prophesy bloodshed because he is now in the process of exacting a pound of flesh from the white people of South Carolina because through his own actions he has been ostracized from their society.

I charge that Waring's decisions are so political, he is hopeful for a promotion to the circuit court of appeals if

by some curious twist Lightweight Harry Truman should slip into the White House for another term.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Who appointed this judge?

Mr. RIVERS. Do not ask me that. I will answer in this way, however: We have an organization now and we do not have to follow the screwballs who stole the Democratic Party.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

WANTED: SIGNATURES ON DOUGLAS T-E-W HOUSING DISCHARGE PETITION

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the first to sign the Douglas petition to discharge the House Banking and Currency Committee and the Rules Committee and to force the consideration of the T-E-W long-range housing bill that is so badly needed at this time. The passage of this bill is point No. 2 on the President's "must" program.

There should be no doubt in any Member's mind that the only way that we can bring this bill up for consideration is by signing the discharge petition. The signatures on the discharge petition will reveal the true friends of low-cost housing in the Eightieth Congress.

It should be plain to every one of us that the people of the Nation will get relief on housing in no other way except by forcing the issue and obtaining the 218 signatures that are required to force a vote. Our veterans and the people in the low-income groups are disappointed and disillusioned over the shortage of houses and apartments for rent. The crisis in rental housing is here now—the people are tired of listening to the housing lobbyists: they will ask each one of us "What have you done about housing?" It will do no good for any Congressman to give these people a harangue based on real-estate-lobby propaganda. The real-estate interests complain that the T-E-W bill is socialistic, communistic, and subsidization of a small group of our citizenry, and therefore it is un-American and uneconomical.

To answer that argument I can simply state that for many years we have been subsidizing the farmers, and is it any less American to bail out industrial workers and city dwellers?

The T-E-W bill authorizes the construction of 50,000 low-cost housing units annually for 10 years, and has a provision for public assistance in large-scale building developments.

The Eightieth Congress was quick to give relief to big business and to the big profit makers by reducing income taxes. They were also quick to peddle out billions of dollars for relief for Europeans under the European recovery plan, but now when it comes to giving relief to our own American citizens who are in the low-wage earner group and must rent because they cannot afford to buy these high-priced and inflated houses, they are being shunted aside with the cry that "it is subsidization, socialistic and communistic, therefore un-American."

We have appropriated billions of dollars for the country's defense system and for security of our Nation. Is it not just as important and vital for our security internally to provide housing for our citizens?

If any Member of the House has any doubts as to the need of low-cost housing, then I invite him to come to the cities of Detroit, Hamtramck, Highland Park, and Dearborn, Mich., and see for himself the slums in which our people are forced to live. Let him see if he can find a house or an apartment for rent at a price that the low or middle income groups can afford. Let him see how three and four families are cramped together in an old dilapidated one-family shack; and then they will understand why we have so much juvenile delinquency, and why there is such an increase in crime, disease, and civil and labor unrest.

We who have signed the discharge petition are not dreamers, crackpots, or do-gooders. There is a crisis in the national housing situation. These are real conditions, inescapable conditions, which confront a substantial portion of our population. You cannot close your eyes to the facts.

America's housing situation has become a national emergency, and the time for debate, for knuckling under to private real-estate interests has long passed. We need only 60 more signatures to the discharge petition; we must not leave here without solving the housing problem.

The American Legion, by official mandates of the national conventions and national executive committee, has recommended this legislation. From the Legion's letter of July 27, 1948, I quote the paragraph on housing:

H. R. 4488, the American Legion bill to create the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, was reported to the House May 3, 1948, and is on House calendar. This bill would greatly relieve the chaotic housing conditions faced by veterans in their desperate efforts to secure by rental or purchase housing at prices they can afford to pay. At its meeting in May 1948 the national executive committee of the American Legion adopted a mandate supporting the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill provided the provisions of H. R. 4488 were included as an amendment to that bill. Any housing legislation enacted during this session of Congress should be amended to include the provisions of H. R. 4488, as presently on the House calendar.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on July 28, 1948, wrote as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1948.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: During the second session of the Eightieth Congress the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in accordance with resolutions adopted by national conventions in 1946 and 1947, strongly urged favorable action by the House of Representatives with respect to a housing bill, S. 866, or a companion bill, H. R. 2523. It was the belief of our officers and delegates in national convention that this legislation offered the greatest encouragement toward the development of a program that would help to solve the shortage of low-cost and low-rental housing.

In the absence of favorable committee action, the Veterans of Foreign Wars joined with other groups in attempting to bring this legislation out on the floor of the House through use of the discharge petition. Letter appeals were addressed to Members of the House of Representatives requesting their signatures on discharge petition No. 6, which would relieve the House Banking and Currency Committee from further consideration of the bills. Approximately 160 signatures were obtained before the second session adjourned June 19, 1948.

Congress has now been called back into special session to consider, among other things, housing legislation. In view of the housing situation, and the failure of Congress to reach a decision on housing legislation during the second session, the Veterans of Foreign Wars again solicits your cooperation with respect to S. 866 or H. R. 2523 by signing discharge petition No. 6, if you have not already done so.

We remain of the same opinion that this legislation is the best proposal yet advanced toward solving the shortage of low-cost and low-rental housing.

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

The letter that I received last Friday from the city of Dearborn, Mich., and a statement made by the mayor of Detroit, the Honorable Eugene I. Van Antwerp, should be read and seriously considered by every Member of Congress. I herewith enclose the letter and the statement:

CITY OF DEARBORN,
HOUSING BUREAU
July 27, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, *Congressman,*
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SADOWSKI: One of the reasons for which the President of the United States has called a special session of Congress is to enact some sort of legislation affecting housing throughout the United States. The wisdom of calling a special session at this time has been questioned by many honest Americans, but no one in my opinion can honestly question the wisdom of working on the problem of alleviating the critical housing shortage which now exists and has existed for the past several years throughout the United States. The State of Michigan is no exception. In all of our industrial areas and most of our rural areas, there is and has been an unusual shortage of homes, especially for rental purposes. Many of our veterans of World War II who have returned home have found themselves without a proper place to live. Many

of these young men and women while fighting our shooting war had the hope of returning home and living the American way of life. Today these people are disappointed and disillusioned. Compelled by the shortage of homes they have doubled up with friends and relatives; they have sought refuge in basements, attics, temporary and inadequate housing of various kinds. Private industry has done a magnificent job in building, but in spite of its tremendous work it has not approached the solution of our shortage; and as we all know, the houses that have been built so far are price-tagged so high that the average veteran and, I daresay, the average wage earner finds it beyond his ability to purchase. Something must be done and done very quickly to restore the confidence of our people, particularly the veterans, in the integrity of the Government.

During the Eightieth Congress there were several bills introduced whose aim was to meet this crisis. The Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948 (H. R. 4488) and the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill were two of the outstanding ones in the opinion of this writer, either of which would have at least made an honest effort to defeat the continuing shortage. As you gentlemen know, both of these bills failed to pass.

May I urge you now, as a citizen, a taxpayer, and a public official of the city of Dearborn, Mich., that you give your utmost consideration to the problem of housing, and for God's sake and for the sake of our returned war heroes and the families of our heroes who will never return, that some desirable housing will be passed during this special session.

Very truly yours,

PETER KARAPETIAN.

MAYOR VAN ANTWERP SUPPORTS TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to testify in favor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

I am here today because I consider the severe housing shortage Detroit's most serious unsolved problem.

The failure of this productive Nation to provide an ample supply of standard housing units for its returned war veterans and other homeless citizens is illogical and inexcusable.

The housing shortage in Detroit is worse today than at any time since VJ-day, 2½ years ago.

The Federal housing survey of Detroit a year ago showed a vacancy rate for rental units of one-tenth of 1 percent.

Although no survey has been taken since that time, all indications are that we have a zero vacancy factor today.

The Detroit Housing Commission, with more than 12,000 rental units under its control, is in a position to judge the severity of the shortage.

A special study of the turn-over rate in three temporary war housing projects shows clearly that the pressure for housing has been increasing steadily right up to the present moment.

The three projects selected consist of 1,569 units of poorly constructed, temporary apartments heated with coal stoves and equipped only with coal-fired cooking stoves and hot-water heaters.

There is a serious fire hazard at these projects. They are of flimsy construction, drab and unInviting in appearance, and stand on barren mud flats. Although constructed by the Federal Government as part of the war effort and now operated by the city, these units are pretty close to the level of slum housing.

They are the least desirable public housing units in Detroit and the first ones in which a vacancy factor would be noticed in the event that the housing shortage eased even slightly

Total turn-over in these three projects were as follows:

1945	867
1946	332
1947	240

For the first 4 months of 1948 the rate has remained at the 1947 level.

Total turn-over for the 12,000 units of public housing in Detroit has been less than 100 units per month for the past year and a half.

In addition, there has been a sharp increase in applications for housing at the commission's tenant selection office, in spite of efforts by the department to discourage applications.

With a total of 3,651 qualified applicants for public housing now on file with the housing commission, the department could lock up the doors of its tenant selection office and still have a backlog of prospective tenants that would take three full years to accommodate.

The backlog of applications would top 5,000 except for the fact that 2,365 were canceled out 3 months ago because they had remained inactive in the files for periods of 2 to 4 years.

Applications for housing are only accepted from the very lowest income group and from veterans of World War II.

There has been a wide distribution of pamphlets designed to discourage applicants for public housing and the tenant selection office has been moved to a remote address near the edge of the city.

In spite of these steps, the flood of applications continues and seven out of every eight qualified applicants for public housing in Detroit at the present time are being turned down.

The department cannot even consider the plight of the average nonveteran factory worker in Detroit whose income makes him ineligible for public housing.

The tremendous cost of this housing shortage in terms of money and also in terms of human suffering is not easy to estimate.

The city is now looking for a large vacant store or factory for the establishment of its seventh emergency housing shelter to care for the homeless families that find themselves on the street with their furniture in a pile.

In spite of primitive sanitary facilities and communal living quarters, these emergency shelters have filled up rapidly and taken on the character of permanent housing projects.

May I cite the case of one typical Detroit factory worker to show how costly the present housing shortage is?

Andrew Adams is the head of a family of nine and is employed at the Chevrolet Motor Car Co. at a weekly wage of approximately $65.

Mr. Adams was a self-supporting citizen who had received no welfare assistance or charity until his eviction from a rented home on December 15, 1946. The family was evicted because the home was purchased by a veteran.

For the past year and 5 months the Detroit Welfare Department and several private social agencies have worked continuously trying to find a place for the Adams family to live. All these efforts have failed because there were no vacancies for a family of this size.

The situation of the family today is this: Mrs. Adams and four of the children are living with a sister at one address. Mr. Adams and the oldest son are living in a room at another address. Two of the daughters are being boarded out at two other addresses.

The complications due to breaking this family up into four segments because of their housing problem made welfare assistance by the city of Detroit necessary.

The taxpayers of Detroit are now paying a total of $134 a month in rent alone to keep this family going in four separate establishments.

Due to this unusual arrangement other costs were added to the family's budget and further supplementary financial aid was required from the welfare department.

Due entirely and exclusively to the Adams family's housing problem, the taxpayers of Detroit during the past 17 months have had to provide a total of $2,446.30 in welfare assistance.

The official report of Mrs. Viola Wickstrom, the welfare department case worker, has this to say:

"The separation of this family into four separate units has had serious consequences. Mrs. Adams talks of suicide and Mr. Adams visits his wife less and less as their visits result in constant quarreling over the lack of a home. The entire family have been growing farther and farther apart. Mrs. Adams, who is a motherly and very domestic person, has keenly felt the loss of her home and family."

I cite this case for the purpose of illustrating the double-barreled effect of the housing shortage—first, the cost to the public in dollars and cents, and second, the demoralizing effect on one of the city's productive factory workers.

Many instances come to mind of husbands who have been forced to ship their wives and children to distant parts of the country and take up residence in a hotel or rented room.

Every sort of shack, shed, and trailer has been pressed into service in Detroit by families who are struggling to maintain some semblance of a home.

Hundreds of applicants for public housing bring signed statements by competent medical authorities stating that the health of one or more members of the family is in serious jeopardy. Yet the city is powerless to help them.

A sizable portion of the absenteeism from the city's factories has been attributed to the long, fruitless efforts of families to find rental housing vacancies.

An instance was brought to my attention a few days ago of an unfortunate truck driver who lost his job because of the housing shortage. He had the temerity to permit his wife and three children to use his employer's truck as a place to sleep at night. They had no other home.

The official census figures show that 37,360 families in Detroit are living doubled up or in makeshift housing.

So much for the picture as it exists today.

What are the prospects that the problem will cure itself without any Federal assistance?

They are very dim.

In Detroit during the 14 months ending March 1, 1948, a total of 6,900 new dwelling units were completed as compared with a total of 25,175 new families created by marriage.

Thus we are moving toward a solution of the problem in reverse gear, leaving entirely untouched the job of unscrambling the 37,000 Detroit families that are living doubled up and providing standard housing for the 46,000 Detroit families living in slum conditions.

The sad postwar record of the private home building industry hardly needs amplification from me.

The industry as a whole is seriously sick, just as any industry is sick when it fails in its primary purpose, namely, the sale of an acceptable product in sufficient quantity and at a price within the reach of a majority of its potential customers.

In the face of the most serious housing shortage in the Nation's history, the home building industry is producing in small quantity for the higher income groups only. The complete facts about this unfortunate condition have been described in detail by

analysts of such publications as Fortune magazine and the Wall Street Journal.

Very few of the new home buyers in Detroit during the postwar period are happy about the transaction they have made.

The typical comment of the man in Detroit who has just purchased a new home goes like this:

"I shouldn't have bought the house because I cannot afford it. But what else could I do? I didn't have any place for my family to live."

Most of the new home buyers in Detroit have acted under pressure of serious personal housing problem.

A worker at the Dodge plant came to me about his housing problem last week. He was spending $45 a week out of a $65 weekly pay check to keep his family of five in two rooms of a second-class hotel.

He was in an extremely upset frame of mind and could easily have been led into making an unwise purchase of a home priced far beyond his means.

New homes being built in Detroit, therefore, represent only about a third of the current demand, and with prices at their present high level it appears likely that the needs of most of the potential customers will never be satisfied.

There are several other factors that will make our housing emergency particularly critical during the years immediately ahead.

The Housing Commission operates over 6,000 units of temporary war housing which is rapidly wearing out and under the law must be torn down starting July 25, 1949.

The impossibility of turning these families out in the street under present conditions should be obvious. Very few of these families have accumulated the funds to make a down payment on a new house.

Another problem that haunts us is the plight of the 7,220 families that will be made homeless in Detroit during the next 3 years by the construction of the Lodge and Ford Expressways and other public improvements that have been programed and money appropriated for.

It seems almost incredible, yet entirely within the bounds of possibility, that our great $60,000,000 expressway construction program might have to be called off or postponed because of the housing shortage.

A large percentage of the 7,220 families to be displaced by public improvements are low-income tenant families for whom public housing would appear to be the only answer.

Condemnation awards paid for slum properties in the path of the expressways go to the absentee landlords. The tenant families that are evicted are simply left standing on the sidewalk with no place to go and no funds with which to provide themselves with shelter.

In the face of a severe housing shortage any municipal government that ignored the plight of these evictee families would be morally bankrupt.

Bad as things are today, Detroit would appear to be heading into much more serious trouble if we allow the housing problem to drift and rely on the vague hope that the shortage will cure itself.

Private enterprise left entirely to itself is not doing the big job that needs to be done.

In what way will the Taft-Ellender-Wagner law hurt private enterprise?

The small speculative home building has plenty of work to do today and always will have.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner law, attacking the problem from a half dozen different angles, will bring into the field the big insurance firms and encourage the growth of large housing corporations.

Also this carefully thought out, bipartisan housing measure will permit cities to continue the all-important slum-clearance job that was begun under the United States Housing Act of 1937.

Under its provisions, private enterprise will also be given an important share of the slum-clearance and urban-redevelopment task.

Sound community planning in Detroit and every other large city of the United States hinges to a large extent on the enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

It would appear that the enactment of this law is being delayed largely because the small home builders and real-estate interests are obsessed with a phobia relating to public housing.

The only people who will be hurt by the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and by public housing are those real-estate interests who are reaping excessive profits due to the housing shortage.

The slum landlord and the speculative home builder will suffer only insofar as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill expands the construction of homes and increases the total supply of homes.

These interests will then no longer be able to charge for their product "all that the traffic will bear."

To that extent they will suffer.

The real opposition to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill comes from those real-estate interests that have a direct financial stake in prolonging indefinitely the present housing shortage.

Otherwise, private enterprise has nothing to fear from the law and, in fact, those builders who are really interested in serving the needs of their country will thrive under it.

They have said that public housing does not pay taxes and that it acts as a burden on the taxpayers who live in private housing.

This particular fairy story has been so widely circulated that I suppose there are some who actually believe it.

As far as Detroit is concerned, the facts are these:

During the current fiscal year the Detroit Housing Commission has paid a total of $.70,456 in taxes to the city of Detroit, or $50.66 for every dwelling unit of public housing.

This makes the Detroit Housing Commission the tenth largest taxpayer in the city of Detroit.

A survey of 162 typical slum dwelling units in Detroit shows that the average local tax payment per unit was $24.68, or less than half the amount of taxes paid for each public housing unit.

Average rent for a Detroit housing project unit is $33.02 per month, including heat and utilities, as compared with an average $10 to $60 per month which the typical slum dweller pays to house his family in a single room.

Slums are an expensive luxury for any city. They fall far short of paying their own way in terms of tax revenue and they make it possible for landlords to extract extortionate rents from our citizens who are least able to pay.

Let's take a typical slum rooming house at 4264 Orleans Street, Detroit.

According to the records of the Detroit welfare department, the 35 single rooms in this ancient structure rent for an average of $11 per week per room. Most of the rooms are occupied by families with children.

Thus a rooming house with an assessed valuation of $12,400 brings in gross revenue to the landlord of $18,490 per year.

Is it any wonder that some real-estate interests are opposed to slum clearance?

There is nothing unusual or new about the exploitation of human misery for profit by slum landlords.

It simply bears repeating at a time when the objectives of the Federal low-rent public-housing program are under attack.

They have accused public housing of sloppy and inefficient management.

This is another myth promulgated by the real-estate interests and without any foundation in fact.

The financial balance sheet of the Detroit Housing Commission over a period of 10 years of operation should be sufficient answer.

For the current fiscal year the balance sheet shows an average shelter rent for public housing in Detroit of $24.98. Without any Federal subsidy payments at all, this would have been $25.60.

The Detroit Housing Commission's record on collections of $19,500,000 of rent has been 99.83 percent perfect.

That hardly sounds to me like sloppy administration

I see no reason for any public official, Federal or local, to make any apologies for the job done by public housing.

It was intelligently planned and carried out and now has behind it a proven record of 10 years of successful operation.

It has been said that public housing is the gateway to socialism or communism.

Let me ask you one question.

If an agent from Moscow was looking for recruits for the Communist Party where could he spend his time to the best advantage?

Would it be at a public-housing project where low-income families pay a reasonable rent for adequate, sanitary housing and are putting away a nest egg against the day when they will be able to buy their own home?

Or could he work to better advantage in the slums of our cities where large families live amid filth and disease and where an extortionate rent is collected for damp, dark, ramshackle dwellings?

Public housing does put slum families on the road to home ownership.

Even at present-day prices, more than 39 percent of all families that moved out of Parkside project in Detroit during the past year purchased their own homes.

Is it likely that an agent from Moscow would have found any Communist recruits among those families?

The answer is clear.

Communism could take over in America some day.

Communism feeds on misery and on the failure of governments to meet the needs of their people.

Our failure to meet and solve this critical housing shortage would help communism. Our failure to clear the slums and put our municipal finances on a sound basis would gladden the hearts of the Communists. Our failure to hold families together and provide a cheerful, healthy environment for our children would meet their approval.

We can stop the spread of communism in America easily—we can help do it by giving every American a decent home to live in and at a fair price that he can afford to pay.

I hope that you will report promptly and favorably on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill.

Also I wish to enclose a letter that I received from G. Mennen Williams, Democratic candidate for Governor of Michigan.

JULY 29, 1948.

The Honorable GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SADOWSKI: As you undoubtedly know, men, women, and children are sleeping in automobiles or other makeshift shelter. Husbands and wives are breaking up because they can't find a single roof to cover them. Children are sick and dying because of inadequate housing.

These things are happening right here in Michigan, United States of America, to people who can afford to pay the rent.

While the President has presented many important matters for your consideration, the matter of housing is as pressing as any, and immediate action can be taken. The House of Representatives has before it the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which the Senate has already passed. There have been

full hearings on this bill, including testimony on the Michigan situation. Everything is ready to go.

As a veteran, as a citizen, and as a candidate for Governor, I urge that you do everything in your power to see that this bill is enacted into law during the present session.

Very truly yours,

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include excerpts.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Gail Sullivan.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a letter from a constituent, and in the other a newspaper article on housing.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Denver Post.

Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two different instances and include extraneous material and a bill he has introduced.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech he made.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an article from the Washington Daily News and in the other a speech by Peter Campbell Brown, executive assistant to the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. LUDLOW (at the request of Mr. MADDEN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. LUSK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping from the New York Democrat.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

FEDERAL BARGE LINES

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a companion bill to S. 2912, introduced by a group of bipartisan Senators; namely, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FEAZEL, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. SPARKMAN.

This bill provides for adequate financial capitalization of the Federal Barge Lines and the Inland Waterways Corporation by increasing the capitalization in the amount of $18,000,000. This legislation is most vital since it affects the entire Mississippi River, its tributaries and subsidiaries for barge and river transportation service.

Unfortunately for thousands of businesses and millions of people, due to lack of funds, the Federal Barge Lines has had to curtail operations on the Mississippi River, has gone further by removing barge service on the Warrior River in Alabama, on the Missouri River from Kansas City to Omaha.

Along the same line, even greater damage has been done, by an embargo being placed by the Federal Barge Line on the city of Baton Rouge, one of the most important industrial centers in America; on Greenville, Miss.; and on Helena, Ark.

All of this adds up to but one thing—that through lack of funds the Federal Barge Line and the Inland Waterways are dying a slow but sure death. This will mean, Mr. Speaker, an increase in freight rates and that thousands of thousands of small businesses will go out of business because they will be unable to compete due to lack of water barge service, together with prohibitive freight rates.

Every Congressman and Senator in the entire Mississippi Valley, and even going to the East and to the West is affected by this, because his constituents are suffering today, and will suffer a great deal more as this slow but creeping paralysis kills one of the most vital and necessary transportation facilities of this Nation; namely, the Federal Barge Lines.

I call on the Congressmen on both sides of the aisle to get behind this urgent and immediate legislation in a bipartisan effort in order to overcome this calamity in our vital transportation system.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on Senate Joint Resolution 157.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE POLL TAX

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, we can help end the filibuster which is going on in the Senate if the Judiciary Committee will report out House Joint Resolution 229, which has been in committee since July 7, 1947.

I introduced this resolution last year because it carried into effect a covenant made with the people of our Nation in the Republican national platform adopted at Chicago in 1944 which reads:

> The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections, and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

If there is a sincere desire to abolish the poll tax as a condition of voting this is the most feasible way of doing it.

This question has been filibustered for 20 years and now is the time for us to pass an anti-poll-tax bill that the Senate will accept. I am certain 36 State legislatures will promptly make this law a part of the Constitution.

HIGH PRICES

The President wants price ceilings, rationing and limited wage controls. We have tried these controls before. Most of us remember the empty shelves and meat counters. Many could buy no meat and some could not even buy lard to fry potatoes. Many articles entered the black markets. Production fell off because producers would not produce at a loss. We had a difficult time making price controls and rationing work in wartime, let alone making them work in peacetime.

Who really wants price controls, and all they involve? Does the farmer want price controls? Does he want the Government to roll back his income to whatever level the bureaucrats deem sufficient? Does the worker want price controls? Does he want the Government to set a price on labor, freeze his wages and prevent collective bargaining? Does the businessman want price controls? Does he want to have a Federal official tell him that he must sell his products below cost or that he must stop producing or go in the red, lay off workers, or cut their wages? This is what we had in 1945 and 1946. This is what the American people protested against in 1946 when they could not buy the things they needed and wanted because farmers and businessmen refused to produce at a loss.

Who wants price controls? The black marketeer is the only one who really wants to return to the days of easy profits from greedy people who were willing to break the law to get what they wanted.

Exports are booming and are one of the chief reasons for the shortage of goods. Money and materials going to aid Europe are basically responsible for today's inflation. The American people could have more autos and more housing if the steel and other building materials and manpower were not being used to supply Europe under the Marshall plan. Therefore we should stop exporting goods to foreign countries of which we have a short supply.

Congress gave the President powers to control exports. But he has not seen fit to use these powers.

HOUSING

Congress took the housing problem from the bungling New Dealers; freed the building industry of stifling rules and regulations; stimulated construction through Federal guaranties of building loans; assumed a large part of the responsibility for veterans' loans; and gave war veterans priority in home building and rental of new houses.

In 1946, under New Deal regimentation and confusion, we only completed 437,800 dwelling units. Mr. Wilson Wyatt was placed in charge of the housing problem. Congress armed Mr. Wyatt with broad powers and an abundance of money. However, he quickly learned a lot of things. He learned that it takes lumber, soil pipe, doors, flooring, and plaster to build houses and that they cannot be built by red tape and directives. He found that the OPA stood in the way of getting building materials. Three hundred brick plants shut down because they were unable to get manpower unless they raised wages. They had similar experiences with soil pipe and flooring. Well, Mr. Wyatt's home-building program died a natural death, and they only produced less than one-half of what private industry will build in 1948 and private industry placed no special burden upon the Public Treasury.

In 1947, under Republican free enterprise and sound Federal aid, 835,100 units were completed, and in 1948 a million dwelling units will be completed in the biggest building boom of all time. Under private industry, in the month of May, we had 2,064,000 building tradesmen at work, which exceeds the month of May 1947 by 200,000.

If we return to socialized housing with the Government controlling all of the building materials, prices will rise. Most of the building materials will go to the cities for slum clearance and there will be very little materials left for us who reside in small cities and towns. Our carpenters, bricklayers, and painters will have to go to the cities to get work.

The President asks for more housing legislation involving a 40-year commitment of the public credit which cannot produce any houses for a long time to come. The houses which private industry is building are real. They are not paper houses. They are not built of Federal red tape. They are substantial, and people live in them.

If by any mismove or mistaken course on our part we should bring the economic house tumbling down around our ears, do not forget that it will not only affect those who are seeking homes now but the millions who are home owners at the present time. If by mistaken action, hasty and emotional judgment on the part of Congress we should jeopardize the values of this country, it will affect not only the millions of home owners but the millions of owners of business properties and the millions of owners of farms as well, and could be a disaster that would shake the country to its very roots.

Yes, I am genuinely concerned about the present and future conditions in this country, and I shall do nothing that will jeopardize its fiscal integrity and loosen the rock that might bring on the avalanche.

The housing shortage cannot be overcome by increasing the competitive pressures on scarce supplies of materials and manpower. They are the limiting factors on the volume of construction. When more materials and manpower are available we will be able to build more houses and not until.

Emphasis has been placed upon construction of homes within the ability of veterans generally to pay. The average sized veteran home mortgage guaranteed by the GI bill is $5,756 and over 1,000,000 veterans have secured mortgage loans aggregating more than $7,000,000,000.

We are licking the housing shortage in the American way. If free enterprise system has a fair chance it will meet this housing need and raise its constructive level year after year until the job is done.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SOUTH DAKOTA'S NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to do one little bit toward correcting a popular misconception. I suppose in the minds of many people South Dakota is thought of as the State without very many trees and without mountains.

In the Rocky Mountain area of the National Forest Service there are 17 national forests. Two of them are in the magic mountains of South Dakota, the Black Hills. In the report for the fiscal year ending June 30, the Harney National Forest in South Dakota ranked first of all forests in the Rocky Mountain region in receipts, turning into the Federal Treasury $168,434.72 for the sale of stumpage and grazing fees.

In second place was the San Juan Forest of Colorado, with $161,000. But in third place was South Dakota's other national forest, the Black Hills National Forest, with $145,548.99.

Thus, within the 17 national forests in the Rocky Mountain region the 2 forests of South Dakota ranked first and third in receipts of the entire 17.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I congratulate the gentleman as a member of the Committee on Appropriations for knowing what is going on in these national forests and for seeing to it that they pay their way, or at least try to.

Too many people in this country are expecting everything for nothing.

I commend you and your associates out there for trying to see that South Dakota's national forests pay their way in this country, because if other States would do likewise we would not have the great national deficit that we now have.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. It will be noted that these two forests contributed $313,000 in receipts to the National Treasury for the fiscal year ending June 30, which is many times their cost of operation.

THE PAPER AND PULP INDUSTRY IS OF GREAT IMPORTANCE IN THE ECONOMY OF OUR COUNTRY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the fact that on Thursday the minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK, in a speech on profits being made by corporations took it upon himself to single out and criticize the paper and pulp industry as one of two industrial groups was wholly unwarranted.

Let us look at some of the facts in connection with the paper and pulp industry:

First. There is four times as much newsprint imported each year into the United States as is produced in the United States. This newsprint is imported free of duty. Then, just how is our Democratic minority leader going to lower the profits of the producers of paper in foreign lands?

Second. The profits of the paper and pulp companies were very small for many years and in some years losses were experienced.

Third. The profits of the paper and pulp companies have not been anywhere near as high as the profits of many other companies, so why single this industry out for criticism? Business reports show these profits and anyone interested can easily find out the facts. The paper and pulp industry is one of the important industries of our Nation.

Fourth. The paper and pulp industry is an industry that has had most excellent

labor-management relations in our district.

Fifth. The commercial use of paper and pulp has been greatly expanded. New uses in the line of cartons, wrappers, and paper boxes to replace wooden boxes have increased the volume of the paper and pulp business. The use of byproducts of the paper and pulp industry is constantly being expanded.

Sixth. The question then is, Do you think it is fair to be putting the economic strait-jacket on one industry like the paper and pulp industry, and not ask the rest of the corporations of our country to follow the same formula? Do you wish to lower the wages in the paper and pulp mills of our country?

Seventh. It appears rather ridiculous to see the minority leader complain about the price of a commodity where over 80 percent of it is being imported. We may not like the price of bananas that are all imported, but are we in a position to tax the banana grower?

Eighth. The paper and pulp people made a great contribution to the war effort and are entitled to the same legislative consideration given other industries. The industry is one of the large industries of our Nation.

All prices are high. This includes the cost of government. So long as over 80 percent of the newsprint is imported something besides talking about the American paper and pulp industry will have to be proposed.

I again repeat, the paper and pulp people and the thousands of people working in this industry should not be subjected to any legislative action that is not accorded to the employees of and to every and all other industries of our country. Newsprint is now only 5 percent of the total paper and paperboard produced in the United States.

In report No. 22 of the United States Tariff Commission we find the following teble which shows that over 80 percent of the newsprint is imported:

TABLE 5.—*Newsprint paper: United States consumption, production, and imports for consumption, 1925 and 1927–46*

Year	Consumption	Production		Imports for consumption		
		Quantity	Percent of consumption	Quantity	Percent of— Consumption	Percent of— Production
	1,000 tons	*1,000 tons*		*1,000 tons*		
1925	3,631	1,863	51.6	1,448	47.8	92.7
1927	3,447	1,527	44.0	1,967	57.7	131.0
1928	3,565	1,415	39.7	2,157	60.5	152.4
1929	3,798	1,469	37.1	2,423	63.8	171.9
1930	3,665	1,226	35.0	2,280	65.0	185.9
1931	3,280	1,233	36.7	2,067	63.0	171.8
1932	2,881	1,047	36.2	1,792	62.2	171.2
1933	2,673	928	34.7	1,794	67.1	193.2
1934	3,094	990	32.6	2,210	71.4	223.3
1935	3,340	948	28.4	2,383	71.4	251.5
1936	3,528	938	25.7	2,752	75.2	293.3
1937	3,968	976	24.6	3,317	83.6	339.9
1938	3,296	832	24.5	2,275	67.6	273.3
1939	3,548	954	26.9	2,615	73.7	274.0
1940	3,746	1,056	28.2	2,763	73.7	261.5
1941	3,584	1,045	29.6	2,982	75.8	285.2
1942	3,731	967	25.8	2,921	77.9	302.0
1943	3,535	811	23.0	2,637	74.8	325.0
1944	3,190	721	22.6	2,491	78.1	345.7
1945	3,394	726	21.4	2,669	78.6	367.9
1946	4,190	771	18.4	3,492	81.6	452.8
1947	4,682	826	17.7	3,857	82.3	479.1

The following table is from report No. 22 of the United States Tariff Commission:

TABLE 3.—*Newsprint paper: Summary of United States supply and consumption, 1925–46*

Year	Population	Production	Imports for consumption	Exports	Total year-end inventory [1]	Apparent consumption	
						Total	Per capita
	Thousands	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*Lbs.*
1925	114,867	1,863	1,448	23	151	3,031	52.8
1926	116,532	1,667	1,851	19	241	3,459	59.4
1927	118,197	1,527	1,967	19	286	3,447	58.3
1928	119,862	1,415	2,157	11	282	3,565	59.5
1929	121,526	1,469	2,423	19	298	3,789	62.5
1930	123,091	1,226	2,280	10	289	3,505	56.9
1931	124,113	1,233	2,067	10	269	3,280	52.9
1932	124,974	1,047	1,792	8	218	2,881	46.1
1933	125,770	928	1,794	11	266	2,673	42.5
1934	126,625	90	2,210	23	336	3,094	48.9
1935	127,521	948	2,383	22	304	3,340	52.4
1936	128,429	938	2,752	15	221	3,658	57.0
1937	129,357	976	3,317	17	629	3,968	61.4
1938	130,275	832	2,275	6	334	3,296	52.2
1939	130,878	954	2,615	13	341	3,548	54.6
1940	131,948	1,056	2,763	44	370	3,746	56.8
1941	133,212	1,045	2,982	70	393	3,584	59.1
1942	134,528	967	2,921	42	489	3,731	55.6
1943	136,084	811	2,637	35	378	3,535	51.6
1944	138,101	721	2,491	31	356	3,209	46.5
1945	139,621	725	2,669	44	273	3,429	49.1
1946	141,229	771	3,490	31	312	4,190	59.3
1947	143,500	826	3,957	28	385	4,682	65.3

[1] As of Dec. 31. Published in U. S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business. Includes stocks at mills, in publishers' warehouses, and in transit.
[2] Preliminary.

Source: All years except 1926 from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce. 1926 production from News Print Service Bureau.

Another excerpt from the same report No. 22 reads as follows:

SUMMARY

Since the time when wood became the most important raw material for the manufacture of paper, the United States has been the world's largest producer and consumer of paper of all kinds taken together. Its output has far exceeded in volume the output of any other country, and for many years its consumption of paper has been greater than production, the deficit imported consisting almost entirely of newsprint.

In 1904 newsprint formed about 30 percent by weight of the total paper and paperboard produced in the United States, but by 1923 this proportion had dropped to 20 percent and by 1943 to less than 5 percent. The quantity of newsprint consumed in 1943 was nearly four times domestic output, approximately 77 percent having been imported; the proportion was 82 percent in 1946.

The following table on page 11 of report No. 22 of the United States Tariff Commission presents the facts as to the world sources of newsprint:

TABLE 1.—*Newsprint paper:[1] Production, by principal producing countries, 1927, 1929, and 1931–46*

[In thousands of short tons]

Year	Canada	United States	United Kingdom	Finland	Germany	Newfoundland	Sweden	All other	Total
1927	2,083	1,517	615	209	565	203	239	942	6,364
1929	2,725	1,469	637	217	623	266	275	1,117	7,319
1931	2,227	1,203	719	241	540	295	260	1,312	6,622
1932	1,919	1,047	790	254	480	272	237	1,287	6,276
1933	2,022	928	830	285	412	271	266	1,407	6,421
1934	2,695	990	940	316	446	316	272	1,457	7,342
1935	2,765	948	970	329	464	336	296	1,518	7,628

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Newsprint paper:[1] Production, by principal producing countries, 1927, 1929, and 1931–46*—Continued

[In thousands of short tons]

Year	Canada	United States	United Kingdom	Finland	Germany	Newfoundland	Sweden	All other	Total
1936	3,225	938	1,004	402	525	328	282	1,513	8,217
1937	3,674	976	1,033	449	521	353	303	1,653	8,961
1938	2,699	832	954	457	512	268	278	1,585	7,555
1939	2,927	954	848	519	415	308	305	1,516	7,793
1940	[3] 3,504	1,056	(4)	(3)	(3)	353	152	(3)	(4)
1941	[3] 3,520	1,045	(3)	(3)	(3)	345	(3)	(3)	(3)
1942	[3] 3,257	967	(3)	(3)	(3)	277	(3)	(3)	(3)
1943	[3] 3,046	811	(3)	(3)	(3)	236	(3)	(3)	(3)
1944	[3] 3,040	721	(3)	(3)	(3)	273	(3)	(3)	(3)
1945	[3] 3,394	725	(3)	(3)	(3)	333	(3)	(3)	(3)
1946	[3] 4,143	771	(4)	(4)	(3)	363	(3)	(3)	(3)
1947	[3] 4,447	826	288	297	72	373	302	1,048	7,651

[1] Figures for countries other than the United States may include grades and kinds of newsprint paper which differ from "standard newsprint" made in the United States or imported into it.
[2] Preliminary.
[3] Not available.

Source: Canada—Dominion Bureau of Statistics; United States—U. S. Bureau of the Census; all other countries—News Print Service Bureau.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have the honor of serving as chairman of a select committee of this House on newsprint and paper supply. While it is my opinion that the manufacturers of newsprint and paper at the present time are in a profitable business and are making a profit which compares with the profits made by other corporations, the truth is that for many, many years the manufacturers of newsprint and of other papers, not only in the United States but in Canada as well, operated without profit, and at great loss to many of those concerns. A great many of them went through bankruptcy and liquidation. The average price over the years has been fair, to say the least. I think the gentleman's remarks are well taken.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

As a newspaperman, if you are satisfied with the situation, I am sure everyone else should be satisfied with it. The only point I make is that it is a big industry in many parts of the United States. It is a big industry in my own district. I do not like to see it singled out. If anyone wants to approach the problem, the only thing to do is to do something somewhere else, because 82 percent of our supply last year came from outside the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include official tables from the United States Tariff Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There was no objection.

PROFITS IN THE NEWSPRINT BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we all agree with the observation made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] about bankruptcies, but we do not agree that they have been happening in recent years. The bankruptcies to which the gentleman refers occurred between 1929 and 1932, and they occurred in tens of thousands of businesses, and many small independent businesses were wiped out, whereas the large ones were able to reorganize and come forward now to where they are earning tremendous profits. But it is the effect which their business now has on other businesses, to which I referred in my remarks the other day, particularly our newspapers. Between 1929 and 1932, tens of thousands of farms were foreclosed. Tens of thousands of homes and tens of thousands of independent small businesses were completely wiped out. People lost their entire life savings. Over 6,000 banks closed their doors. So we all agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] who is one of the outstanding leaders in the Republican Party in the country, and particularly in this body, but we Democrats further assert the truth, lest the people forget, and lest the gentleman from Ohio forgets that these wholesale bankruptcies took place while the Republicans were in control. It was under a Democratic administration that this country was brought back to health and prosperity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed very much the comments made by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] who evidently has not spent as much time as he usually does in checking his figures and facts. Otherwise, he would learn that the most difficult period in the entire history of the newsprint and paper manufacturing business, and especially the period of bankruptcies and low prices, was not between 1929 and 1932, but during the Democratic Administration of a man by the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in 1933 to 1939. The real reason why newsprint prices went up so rapidly was because of the war, and a reduction in production, not only in Canada but a complete reduction of all sorts of newsprint in Europe.

I would also like to say, in behalf of our Canadian friends to the north, that while American publishers are able to purchase their newsprint supplies at from $96 to $100 a ton f. o. b. New York, the world market price is approximately $200 per ton.

Much of this production could be diverted and sold in the world market, instead of being shipped to the United States; and I think that the Congress of the United States and the publishers of this country should be appreciative of the fair treatment we have received from our friends to the north, the Canadians.

CAUSE OF THE DEPRESSION

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in the discussions that we are having this morning, I think we should be fair and stick to the facts. The depression was not caused by Mr. Hoover, neither was it accentuated by Mr. Roosevelt; rather, the depression was caused by the war that the Democrats promised to keep us out of back in 1916.

Let us be fair.

THE GREAT DEPRESSION

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well to remind our good friend and colleague from Massachusetts, the Democratic whip [Mr. McCORMACK] of certain facts which seem to have slipped his mind.

I am sure the country has not forgotten, if the gentleman from Massachusetts has, that more farm foreclosures and more foreclosures of American homes and businesses occurred during this New Deal administration than at any time while the Republicans were in power. The rich men were saved by the New Deal, but the common men by the hundreds of thousands lost their homes and farms and their businesses, while the New Dealers were shedding elephant tears about them but did very little for them except to give them a job on WPA at starvation wages in order to garner their votes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE F. O. B. MILL PRICE SYSTEM

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, once again a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States has resulted in the overruling of established precedents which will have a very decided effect upon our economy. I refer to the Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner against Cement Institute, et al., cases, decided April 26, 1948, the majority opinion being by Justice Black in which Justice Douglas and Justice Jackson took no part, and to which Justice Burton dissented. The effect of this decision has been forcibly called to my attention by W. Adam Johnson, executive vice president of the New Haven Chamber of Commerce, and by Charles M. A. Costello, president of C. Cowles & Co., of New Haven, manufacturers of motorcar hardware, mountings, and lamps. This decision has already resulted in changes in the selling practices of a number of producers of steel and the United States Steel has promised changes from the multiple basing point system to an f. o. b. mill price system. This would make it impossible for the Connecticut manufacturers to compete on a price basis with concerns located near steel mills, and with the present shortage of steel, the steel mills will be inclined to supply the manufacturers much closer to them than those removed from them. The situation applies not only to Connecticut concerns but to all fabricators of steel that are not favorably geographically located with regard to the steel source, with the result that they may face extinction at the hands of more favorably located competitors.

The Hon. Lowell B. Mason, of the Federal Trade Commission, in a speech made May 14, 1948, before the Marketing Club of the Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard University—although careful to state that he is talking as an individual, and not uttering the official views of the Federal Trade Commission—discussed this matter but undoubtedly his views as such individual are no different than as a member of the Federal Trade Commission. Commissioner Mason makes some rather illuminating statements wherein among other things he says:

I believe that freight absorption is out. By that I mean it will be a violation of the merchant law for anyone to use a systematic pricing system which allows him to pay the freight out of his own pocket in order to sell in a competitor's territory. This affects every basic industry in the United States.

The Commissioner also indicates that the Government will probably attack the pricing system of heavy commodities where the freight is a large percentage of the cost of the article to the purchaser such as iron, steel, lime, rubber, glass containers, builders' supplies, farm equipment, ice, road machinery, paint

and varnish, business furniture, liquefied gas, auto parts, ladders, paper and pulp, structural clay products, china and porcelain, reinforcing materials, vitrified clay, sewer pipe, antifriction bearings, wholesale food and grocery products, end-grain strip wood blocks, construction machinery, paper bags, lye, and wholesale coal. It appears also as though this principle may be extended to most every commodity. The Commissioner further ventures the opinion that—

> There will be a decentralization of users of basic products. Fabricators will gravitate to the points of production of their basic materials.

Senator HOMER CAPEHART, on May 20, 1948, introduced a resolution—Senate Resolution 241—which was agreed to on June 12, 1948, providing that the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete inquiry into, first, the existing legislation concerning Government policy affecting the activities of the Federal Trade Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission and the impact of these policies as interpreted by the Supreme Court with particular relation to the basing point or freight equalization system of pricing and the impact upon small and large business and upon the consumers of the United States of the maintenance or discontinuance of said system; and, second, into the status of business enterprise in the United States, seeking to determine the extent and character of economic concentration and the effect of such concentration, and the status of free competitive business enterprise as affected by transportation and Federal trade regulations.

The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 15, 1949.

The purposes of the Capehart resolution directly affect the welfare of broad segments of our population whose special knowledge and particular interest require full consideration in the investigation. To insure access to such knowledge and interest, the committee shall consult with persons representing industry, agriculture, labor, and consumers' problems.

The Senate committee under the chairmanship of the Indiana Senator, has already had an organization meeting and the chairman has explained that since the Supreme Court decision there has been confusion among businessmen all over the country as to the meaning of the decision as applied to them and this confusion has been extended to economists, lawyers, and financial writers. Out of this confusion, manufacturers of all types of products are anxiously seeking answers to questions such as: "Will the Supreme Court decision make it illegal for a seller to pay any part of the freight charges to the buyers' destination—which he may consider essential to meet competition?" Or, stated another way, "Did the Court outlaw a universal delivered price by a manufacturer?" "Is it illegal for a candy-bar manufacturer to sell his product so that it will retail throughout the entire United States for a nickel a package? Or should the candy bars sell at varying prices according to freight charges?" "Will the Supreme Court decision help or cripple small business?" "Will the evils of monopoly be aided or impeded?" Also, "Will the Court's decision increase or decrease the price the consumer must pay for finished goods?"

The Senate committee proposes to study these and similar questions from every angle and to ascertain what price-fixing policies will best serve the competitive forces of free enterprise and the economic stability of the Nation.

To assist in making this inquiry, the committee has set up an advisory council of 25 members representing labor, agriculture, buyers, and sellers in both heavy and light goods industries, under the chairmanship of Dr. Melvin Thomas Copeland, director of business research for the Harvard University School of Business Administration.

It is my intention to introduce a resolution calling for an investigation of this matter, but in view of the situation, I believe it would be mere duplication and additional unwarranted expense for the House to create such a committee, in view of the fact that the Senate has launched this hearing under the able direction of Senator CAPEHART, and expects to do considerable preliminary work this summer and hold hearings at various points in the early fall. It is the opinion of responsible businessmen in my congressional district that this new pricing policy if continued in force and with legal bars against absorbing transportation charges, will eliminate competition from more distant points and actually create monopolies in the sections surrounding the sources of supply thus protected. It will practically limit the sales of each company to points near its own plant which will finally result in the closing and relocation of many mills and factories. Furthermore, that this pricing policy will arrest the development of low-cost production and distribution and deprive consumers of a free choice of suppliers because of higher transportation costs on purchases from more distant sources. It will cost consumers more money, and as these costs vary according to the distance, consumers will be unable to compute their costs in advance.

I believe that this is a matter in which all Members of the House should be vitally interested, for if this new price policy is to be pursued it will undoubtedly bring about a serious dislocation of our economy and imperil the future of business in the New England area as well as other sections of our country which are not located near a strategic point.

CORPORATE EARNINGS AND RESERVES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in discussing the question of bankruptcies and profits of corporations, I must not let this opportunity pass without reminding the House that a very big force is now at work in connection with corporate procedure which ties directly into wage negotiations, where the negotiators representing organized labor call for the balance sheets and operating statements of the company which is being negotiated for wage increases. Corporate management is up against a force with which it never had to deal before. If wages are to be advanced from time to time purely on the basis of the current earnings of the corporation, then I raise the question, where are the reserves to come from which will tide corporate industry over in times of low prices or of red figures? This is something we can well afford to pay some attention to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

BANKRUPTCIES

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks made here today in reference to the number of bankruptcies that have occurred during the Republican and Democratic administrations. I have not read for a long time of any of the penny auctions being had on any of the farms of the country while the hangman's noose hung ready for those who bid over 1 cent. In my opinion, it is well that our good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] called attention to the change that has occurred during the Democratic administration.

During the twenties and the early thirties the only person who had a lucrative job in my district was the referee in bankruptcy who became fat and well to do. Finally and in due time we had a Democratic referee in bankruptcy and the poor fellow almost starved to death. Congress, realizing the situation, changed the law, and in my district as in yours we no longer have referees in bankruptcy, and a roving referee working out of Cleveland makes infrequent trips to my district covering Akron and vicinity to handle the few bankruptcies that occur.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day in the life of a very able man who is so modest as not to disclose in his biography when he was born. I refer to LOUIS GRAHAM, Republican, of Beaver County, Pa., whose anniversary this is.

I am sure all of us hope that he is not any older than he looks, that we may long have the pleasure of his company and the benefit of his advice and counsel, than which there is no better, as is recognized to be a fact on both sides of the aisle. Many happy returns, Louis.

NEWSPRINT

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was amusing to me to listen to the discussion in reference to the high cost of newsprint. I happen to live next door to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], in whose district are located a lot of paper mills. Going up through there I found mountains of old newsprint stacked up. A couple of weeks ago when I was driving back home all that newsprint was burned up. I was told that the reason for burning up the old newsprint was to keep the price of that commodity up.

Now, talking about farms and farming, my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] must admit that when the Democratic Party came into power the farmers in Wisconsin were broke in 1932 but since then they have made a lot of money, by reason of prosperity under the Democratic administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

STOP THE INFLATIONARY SPIRAL NOW

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I know that the farmers of New York State, like the farmers of the rest of the country, will be very interested to know that the cause of the last depression was World War I; but I assure you that none of the people of New York State are interested in who is responsible for what. They do not care where the blame should be placed.

They would like to see this session of Congress do something and enact some positive legislation which will stop the inflationary spiral that now exists and legislation which will cause the housing that we need for our veterans and for the people of this country to be constructed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why does not the President exercise the power that he now has? If he did, we would not have such high prices. If he would do something instead of going around the country and blowing a lot of hot air, he could remedy the situation.

Mr. MULTER. The President has indicated to this Congress what he needs to implement his powers and to give to the people of the country what they need. It is up to us to give it to them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on Federal thought control by his colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

MISSISSIPPI DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Democrats of Mississippi, in convention assembled, ratified the nomination of Governor Thurmond, of South Carolina, for President of the United States and Governor Wright, of Mississippi, for Vice President.

They called on the Members of Congress from Mississippi to state whom they would vote for in case no one gets a majority of the electoral vote and the election is thrown into the House of Representatives, in which case we would have to vote for one of the three highest ones.

I am glad to answer that question now. In such a case, I shall vote for Governor Thurmond. He is not only the ablest man in the race, but he is the only one who is pledged to oppose and to veto the Communist program with which Congress is now being annoyed, including the FEPC and other measures covered by the so-called civil-rights program. Mr. Truman has agreed to sign it, Mr. Wallace is pledged to sign it, and Mr. Dewey has already signed it as Governor of New York—thereby imposing on the people of New York a program of Communist regimentation that is literally dreaded by real Americans throughout the rest of the country.

I know that some will try to tell you that Governor Dewey would not sign a national FEPC bill, but in the words of Brann, the great iconoclast, "You cannot explain a dead cat out of the family cistern."

The same man from New York who piloted this vicious measure through that legislature is now a Member of the other body, has introduced the same bill there, and got it reported out of the committee. It is now pending before the Senate; and my opinion is, if it were passed and Governor Dewey were President, he would sign it.

Now, let me show you what it means. We are investigating certain Communists before the Committee on Un-American Activities. When chased out of Washington they invariably gravitate into New York.

If they seek employment, their employer cannot ask one of them where he came from, under the laws of New York.

They cannot ask him what his name was—before it was changed by court order or otherwise—under the laws and regulations in force under the Dewey administration in the State of New York. They cannot ask him what his wife's name was, although he may have married a Russian Communist or a Russian spy, as some of these individuals have that we have had before the committee. You cannot ask him that question under the laws and regulations of the State of New York.

You cannot even tell him that this organization celebrates the Fourth of July, under the laws and regulations of the State of New York.

You cannot ask him what organization he belongs to, although he may be a member of the Communist Party.

Governor Thurmond would veto that measure and guarantee to the American people that we are not going to adopt this communistic program, known as the civil-rights program, including this vicious FEPC with which the people of New York are now being punished and with which the people of the United States were being punished a few years ago under an Executive order that was placed on them here in Washington and would be in force today, perhaps, if it had not been that we killed the appropriations and prevented its being perpetuated. I say it is about time that we join hands, support Governor Thurmond and Governor Wright in this battle to save America for Americans.

SUSPENSION OF RULES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 707 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the second session of the Eightieth Congress it shall be in order for the Speaker at any time to entertain motions to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1, rule XXVII; it shall also be in order at any time during the second session of the Eightieth Congress for the majority leader or the chairman of the Committee on Rules to move that the House take a recess, and it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of the second session of the Eightieth Congress to consider reports from the Committee on Rules as provided in clause (2) (b), rule XI, except that the provisions requiring a two-thirds vote to consider said reports is hereby suspended during the balance of the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for suspension of the rules as provided under clause 1, rule XXVII, which requires a two-thirds vote to consider a bill under suspension, and will permit, during the balance of the session, upon recognition by the Chair, any report to be brought up, and considered, by a majority vote.

I think the resolution speaks for itself. It is the customary action in the closing days of any session. The adoption of this resolution is necessary in preparation for adjournment.

LEGISLATION IN THE SPECIAL SESSION TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER A GAG RULE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the resolution that is before us is one of the

worst gag rules that has been brought to the floor of the House. It even surpasses in viciousness the rule you passed in the last session of Congress.

I do not know whether the Members have listened to the reading of this obnoxious, yes, reprehensible rule and understood what it aims to do. The resolution that was originally introduced and considered by the Committee on Rules yesterday, provided "that during the remainder of this week it should be in order for the Speaker at any time to entertain a motion to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1 of rule XXVII. That was for the remainder of this week. But after the great Committee on Rules started to consider conditions, they felt that it did not go far enough, so they insisted that the rule be amended and that it provide not only for suspension of the rules for the remainder of this week but to apply for the balance of this session. Bear in mind—for the remainder of this session regardless as to how long it will continue.

Under this rule the Members of the House will be deprived of their rights under the regular rules, and any bill that comes in here that is approved by the big four of the House and approved, of course, by the National Association of Manufacturers, cannot be taken up under the 5-minute rule and considered under the usual procedure as any bill that the Constitution and the rules of the House provide and it is our right to consider.

I fully appreciate that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and other Republican gentlemen will call attention to the fact that similar procedure has been followed in the past but invariably the action was on minor legislation and not on legislation of such great import as that which the public is demanding today.

Any bill that is taken up under suspension of this rule naturally will have to be voted upon as is. We will not have the right or privilege of offering any amendments whatsoever. Not only that but the rule providing for the suspension of the rules will permit only 20 minutes' debate on each side, and even precludes a motion to recommit, a motion which never in my recollection the minority never has been deprived to make. The rule, in fact, completely gags the minority.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the House of Representatives in the Sixtieth Congress. That was 42 years ago. At that time Mr. Joseph Cannon, known as Uncle Joe, was the Speaker of the House of Representatives. He was known as the czar. He was the House. He was the Congress of the United States.

But with all his power, somehow or other the Republican powers that be in the present House of Representatives are trying to exceed his ruthlessness in depriving the membership of their rights.

When the country was informed of Speaker Cannon's usurpation of power and that it was used for the purpose of protecting the special interests, the country was aroused, and his party, your party, the Republican Party, in the election for the Sixty-second Congress was defeated, and the people called upon the Democratic Party to serve so that legislation in the interest of the masses and in the interests of the country would receive consideration.

With your activities and your ruthlessness today I am satisfied that what happened to your party then will happen to you again. The same fate awaits you in the coming election.

Of course, from time to time I try to advise you as a friend not to go so far, not to get drunk with power or completely ignore the rights and interests of the American people, and not to be controlled by the vested interests as represented by the National Association of Manufacturers.

I try to urge you that you should legislate in the interests of the American people, at least at times.

In desperation the President has called a special session for the purpose of bringing about a reduction in the high cost—yes, the criminally high cost—of living. At the same time he wants us to provide decent low-cost housing for ex-servicemen and the millions of American citizens who are seeking homes, who are homeless and cannot obtain a decent place to live.

You are ignoring the President's recommendation to legislate to curb and reduce the high cost of living, to control inflation, to provide low-cost housing, to increase social-security benefits, to increase minimum-wage levels, to carry out the civil-rights program, and to strengthen the antitrust laws. What are you going to do? You are going to consider only legislation that carries the approval of the vested interests, the National Association of Manufacturers, its affiliates and so-called institutes, who seem to completely control you and that are secretly agreeing on the prices they will charge the public for their commodities and products. You will not consider legislation that does not carry the stamp of approval of the manufacturers, contractors, housing and real-estate lobbies that have been infesting the Capitol for the last 2 years, delaying the consideration of and seeking to defeat the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill and thus deprive the American people of decent homes at decent prices and rentals.

Now, I am candid and honest in my belief that you are making a serious mistake in your failure to give consideration to the important measures recommended by the President, in the interest and welfare of our Nation and for the relief of the milked and mulcted people.

I am not in the confidence of the big four in this House. I do not know what legislation you will bring out, but judging the future by the past, I have a strong suspicion that you will ignore these appeals of the President and appeals on the part of suffering consumers and the public in general, and that you will not pass any relief legislation that would bring about the reduction of the high cost of living that has gone up 40 percent since you came into power. You will not pass legislation to reduce the cost of food, which, in many instances, has increased from 100 to 200 percent, nor will you be permitted to pass a real housing bill that would provide homes and rentals at reasonable prices to the people in the lower-income brackets.

REPUBLICANS HAVE PLACED THE INTEREST OF WEALTH ABOVE HUMAN NEEDS

It appears to me that instead of doing something to reduce the high cost of living and to provide food for people of low income, you are devoting your time in feeding them with scares and buncombe as to food shortages and communism, notwithstanding the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, and a Federal grand jury, according to press reports today, after spending over a half a million dollars and the grand jury having called over 200 witnesses, have failed to find any cause for alarm or evidence justifying any indictments, with the exception of a few of the officers of the Communist Party. Five of your investigating committees are extremely busy seeking to prejudice the minds of the American people with these nonexistent scares for the purposes of distracting their attention from the pledges and promises you made in 1946 to reduce the high cost of living and the failure of the builders and the contractors to erect decent low-cost homes and to provide low-rental housing. No, you cannot make them forget despite the extraordinary efforts you are making not in a three-ring but in a five-ring circus. People will realize that it is clowning in an attempt to take their minds from the real serious conditions that have been inflicted upon them by reason of your giving the industries the privilege to do as they pleased and to charge the public as much as they pleased. The sad fact is that you have placed the interest of wealth above human needs and the people know it in your failure to legislate to alleviate the distressing conditions.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman what provisions of the Constitution would be violated by the adoption of the pending resolution.

Mr. SABATH. The Constitution gives the House the right to adopt rules for its guidance and orderly procedure in the consideration of legislation. Under this rule, that right is taken away from the membership of the House, because they are deprived of any right whatsoever to try to improve, change, or modify any legislation that may be brought in here under this vicious gag rule that is now before us.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not true that legislation can be brought before the House by the adoption of the ordinary rule? We are not limited to considering legislation which may come up under suspension only.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, yes. If the gentleman will familiarize himself with the rule, the rule provides that the Speaker will have the right to call up any bill under suspension, without the two-thirds vote which is generally required under the rules of the House. That is a thing the gentleman should bear in mind.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from South Dakota has read the pending rule.

Mr. SABATH. I do not yield any further to the gentleman. I may yield later on.

I have promised some time to others. How much time have I consumed, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 12 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if time would permit, I would be delighted to answer some of the reckless statements made earlier in the day by many of you Republican gentlemen that the bankruptcies and foreclosures that took place in 1933, 1934, and 1935 were during a Democratic administration. With this statement you may be able to mislead some uninformed people, but not the intelligent voters who know that these foreclosures and bankruptcies started in 1932 and continued during 1933, and even in 1934, as a result of the Republican Hoover panic which lasted up to 1933. Yes, businesses and plants went into bankruptcy and a majority of them were closed, homes and farms were foreclosed, but this was all remedied as speedily as possible after President Roosevelt was sworn in and a Democratic Congress was able to begin legislating.

You have tried in many ways to unload your guilt for the high cost of living upon the President. You failed and deliberately omit that in 1946 you and the National Association of Manufacturers assured the American people that there would be plenty of everything and at a much lower price if the Price Control Act was repealed. The National Association of Manufacturers, through paid page advertisements, directly assured the people they would voluntarily reduce the prices on meats and all necessities of life if the Price Control Act was repealed. You do not call attention to the fact that these pledges and promises made by you and the various associations and institutes have not been carried out, nor do you deny that instead of reducing the prices as you promised when you came into control of the House you have, as I stated before, increased the cost of living by 40 percent and the cost of food from 100 to 200 percent.

To justify the continuous, outrageous, ever-increased cost of living the manufacturers, the suppliers, the lobbyists and propagandists are from time to time creating a scare of shortages on meats and meat products, steel, oil, lumber, sugar, and soap notwithstanding that the warehouses are bulging with surpluses, which gives these combines an excuse to continuously increase their prices. Personally, I feel that if all your sins of omission and commission, your smears and mud slinging could be wiped out it would create a shortage of soap.

The fact is, as many of you Republicans have admitted, we have greater production and greater crops than ever before in the history of our country. Consequently, your charges that the high cost of living and the prevailing high prices are due to our exporting are foolhardy and without foundation because it is absolutely necessary for our country to export in order to get rid of the tremendous,—yes, extraordinary—surpluses we have on hand in nearly every line.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Chicago Times and a telegram from the commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and also two additional letters bearing on the high cost of living and the shortage of housing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me, I insert a telegram from Henry L. Warner, commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Chicago, Ill, calling attention to the desperate need of housing by Illinois veterans, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 28, 1948.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Illinois veterans desperately need decent housing. Your attention directed to our letter May 15 including report on shameful housing conditions in Illinois. State organization Veterans of Foreign Wars seriously perturbed over stubborn opposition of group in Congress against adequate housing legislation. Request you get Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill on floor and vote for it. Thousands of veterans will retaliate at polls unless housing legislation is enacted at special session.

HENRY L. WARNER,
Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative director, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in a letter addressed to me on July 28, 1948, advises of the steps taken by his organization in its effort to obtain the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, and presently urges that additional Members of the House sign the discharge petition which would permit the consideration of the bill at the special session of Congress. Approximately 160 signatures were obtained before the House adjourned for the second session of the Eightieth Congress. I include Mr. Ketchum's letter for the record, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1948.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: During the second session of the Eightieth Congress the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in accordance with resolutions adopted by National Conventions in 1946 and 1947, strongly urged favorable action by the House of Representatives with respect to a housing bill, S. 866, or a companion bill, H. R. 2523. It was the belief of our officers and delegates in National Convention that this legislation offered the greatest encouragement toward the development of a program that would help to solve the shortage of low-cost and low-rental housing.

In the absence of favorable committee action the Veterans of Foreign Wars joined with other groups in attempting to bring this legislation out on the floor of the House through use of the discharge petition. Letter appeals were addressed to Members of the House of Representatives requesting their signatures on discharge petition No. 6 which would relieve the House Banking and Currency Committee from further consideration of the bills. Approximately 160 signatures were obtained before the second session adjourned June 19, 1948.

Congress has now been called back into special session to consider, among other things, housing legislation. In view of the housing situation, and the failure of Congress to reach a decision on housing legislation during the second session, the Veterans of Foreign Wars again solicits your cooperation with respect to S. 866 or H. R. 2523 by signing discharge petition No. 6 if you have not already done so.

We remain of the same opinion that this legislation is the best proposal yet advanced toward solving the shortage of low-cost and low-rental housing.

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM, *Director.*

Mr. Speaker, the great Chicago Sun-Times, a people's newspaper, carried a very factual editorial in its issue of July 28, 1948, entitled "Priorities for Congress" which I am sure will be very informative and enlightening to the people of the country. It gives real facts and I recommend its reading to place the responsibility for the lack of legislative action to relieve the people from the high cost of living and the housing shortage. It is as follows:

PRIORITIES FOR CONGRESS

President Truman in his message to Congress yesterday set up a table of priorities which he thinks the special session should observe in considering legislation.

First of all, he wants Congress to act on inflation and on housing. Several times he repeated that these were the principal reasons for calling Congress back. He urged Congress "not to be distracted from these central purposes."

The people, staggering under the highest cost of living in the American record, will certainly agree with Mr. Truman. Many would be willing to settle for these two programs alone.

If Congress acts to check inflation and to counteract the housing shortage, the special session will have been justified even if nothing else is done.

On the other hand, unless Congress does act on these two critical problems, no other legislation that may be passed, or speeches made, or political maneuvers executed, can compensate for a cynical neglect of the matters closest to the average citizen's interests.

So it is important, in judging congressional behavior, to keep the table of priorities in mind.

If, for example, Republicans and southern Democrats carry out the strategy which some are reported to be considering—if they seek to tie up the session immediately with a battle royal over civil rights—they will be ignoring the people's most urgent needs just as surely as if they returned a flat "no" to the request for action on inflation and housing.

Civil rights are important. Mr. Truman made no bones about his uncompromising stand for an antilynching law, an anti-poll tax law, and other measures previously recommended. He proved his sincerity by issuing two epochal executive orders initiating a vigorous attack upon racial discrimination in Federal employment and the armed forces.

But civil rights are not important to the exclusion of everything else. While this legislation ought to be passed, nobody should be fooled if an ostensible move to pass it becomes the means by which the critical problems of inflation and housing are shunted on a sidetrack.

Next to inflation control and housing, Mr. Truman ranks three welfare measures: Federal aid to education, a 75-cent minimum

wage, increased social-security benefits. In a sense, these three proposals are part of the inflation problem. Those concerned—our schools, low-income workers, and retired persons—are all victims of inflation.

Next on the list come three measures affecting foreign policy: a decent bill for the admission of displaced persons, a loan to finance construction of the United Nations headquarters, and ratification of the international wheat agreement.

In the fourth category of urgency Mr. Truman places civil rights, public power appropriations, and revision of Federal salary scales.

Finally, he flings back at Congress the rest of his program including a national health bill and revision or repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. This is for the record. Mr. Truman evidently doesn't expect or demand action in these fields at the current session.

The President's anti-inflation program is essentially the same one which he recommended 8 months ago and which the Republican leadership of Congress rejected as unnecessary. What has happened during these 8 months proves conclusively that the Republicans were wrong.

They said free-wheeling prices would stimulate production, that high production would bring prices down. It didn't.

They said businessmen could be counted on to hold prices in check by voluntary restraint. They haven't.

Now it is being argued that price control won't get at the true causes of inflation, such as the state of the budget and the heavy demands, foreign and domestic, upon our output.

There is some truth in this, no doubt. But when a doctor is called to attend a patient with a raging fever, the first thing he does is try to check the fever. America has a raging fever of inflation. The first job is to check it.

Governor Dewey is making a studious effort to keep aloof from events in Washington. He should be warned that in the long run he can't do it. As the leader of his party, he bears an inescapable responsibility for the actions of that party in Congress.

Should the Republicans again turn their backs on the people's struggle with high prices and inadequate housing, the voters will rightly conclude that the Republican nominee for President was an accessory before the fact.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 30 contains some timely language which I commend to my colleagues in the House of Representatives. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. TOBEY] addressing the Senate, pleaded for an abandonment of party politics until something could be done about the tragic burden of high prices. I subscribe whole-heartedly to the thoughts expressed by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and I implore the leadership of this House to permit the reporting of legislation which will help the families of the United States to rid themselves of a gnawing worry.

It is true that no one is starving. But the great bulk of American families are sorely pressed and are finding great difficulty in maintaining their existence. They have a right to expect that we shall do something in their behalf.

When the President called this special session, I entertained the same doubts with regard to legislation as many of you did. I am ready to admit there are controversial issues in which the Democratic Members and the Republican Members honestly differ.

But, I say in all sincerity, I did feel confident this special session would seriously consider the issue of high prices, and I hoped constructive action would be forthcoming. Now, with the days passing and the talk of early adjournment growing louder, I feel frightened.

I have heard Members express the wish to get back to their districts in order to campaign for reelection. On what issue can you campaign, if you have done nothing about the most pressing problem of the hour?

This session of Congress has been preoccupied with what appears to be efforts to fix the blame for the present high prices. For myself, I can assure you I entertain strong feelings on this point. However, I do not believe it is fair to state that the American people at this moment are not too much concerned over who is to blame—and we waste precious time standing here screaming denunciations at each other.

What the American family man wants—and what he has a perfect right to expect—is that we—representatives of the people—will do something about it and now.

I can well recall the great pleas which were made in behalf of free enterprise and individual initiative; the great results which were promised if the laws of economics were allowed to function unrestricted. It is quite true that many American wage-earners and housewives were lured by those siren songs and wished for an end of all controls.

Controls were abandoned, but the tragic fact is that prices then did not seek a lower level. Prices soared higher and are still on the way up. Where they will stop no one can predict with any degree of certainty.

In Providence, the capital city of my State, food prices—the all-important item in the family budget—have soared to unbelievable heights. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has informed me that prices of all foods combined have risen more for Providence since 1935–39 than for any New England city or for the United States as a whole.

The Bureau uses the prewar period, 1935–39, as a base period and considers this period as 100 in its index. In Providence, as of June 15, 1948, the index for all foods stood at 220. Consider that for a moment—over 100 percent. The 1939 dollar worth less than 50 cents in purchasing food for the family table.

If you consider that fact soberly, how can you feel we have any right to waste our days in political bickering, or return home without having acted?

We have been able to work out a plan for securing a bipartisan foreign policy. That it is working is a credit to both great parties. But why in the name of heaven cannot we abandon party politics long enough to work out a bipartisan program for reducing prices, at least in the cost of food?

Our neighbor to the north, if my memory serves me correctly, during the war adopted a system of price controls patterned after the price-control set-up in the United States. After hostilities had ceased, Canada inaugurated a selective decontrol program, but here under the tremendous pressure of the NAM and others, the Congress threw out all controls. The results speak for themselves.

Our people are now reading news stories containing food prices in Canada. They are substantially lower than food prices in the United States. As a result our people are aroused, and rightly so.

A great trust has been placed in us. The American people want more than a lot of high-sounding phrases and handshaking during the coming political campaign.

They expect us to measure up to the claims we have made on the subject of our ability and honesty in representing our constituents. If this Congress fails to do something about prices—it is going to be mighty hard for many Members of this House to face those constituents during the weeks before November 2.

I mentioned a while ago the bipartisan foreign policy with which we are striving to maintain the dignity of the United States abroad and promote the peace and prosperity of the world.

I think all of us are in agreement on the vital importance of that foreign policy—and on the need for promoting stability abroad.

All Americans are conscious of the very important position this Nation occupies in world affairs and the part it is playing in determining the destiny of millions throughout the world.

We seek to sell democracy abroad through every possible means. But, it has always been my sincere conviction that we can best win the world to the democratic way of life by demonstrating that true democracy works here in the United States.

To be convincing to the people of other nations—our foreign policy must be supported by the confidence of the American people.

I would call the attention of the House to the serious threat to that policy which is engendered by the present concern over high prices.

Many people in the United States are becoming confused. Their confusion stems from the difficulty they are encountering in providing adequate food for their families. It is a fact that many families are unable to maintain an adequate diet. And these people are reading stories charging that our present foreign policy is responsible for high food prices.

If both political parties are willing to support our present foreign policy; then I submit to you the leaders of both parties must put forth an extraordinary effort to dissolve the confusion which is growing in American families.

I insist that the present high cost of living is not a purely domestic problem. It threatens stability at home; it endangers our efforts abroad. It plays smack into the hands of Communists who, I honestly believe, gloat over the prospects of still higher prices—believing they will one day soon bring on a bust which will disillusion the great army of average Americans and make fertile soil for the growth of ideas of government which we distrust.

If we fail in this—our greatest responsibility—I fear the results will be tragic.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Illinois did not see fit to yield a little further when I was interrogating him, so I have asked for this time to follow through the line of thinking he has suggested.

In the first place, the gentleman from Illinois suggested that some constitutional rights were being violated by the adoption of this resolution, but when I asked him what rights he was not able to point out how any constitutional provision was being violated.

It is true, of course, that we are here proposing to make it in order during the remainder of the session for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules for the consideration of bills but they will require passage by a two-thirds vote. If the membership of the House wants by a two-thirds vote to suspend certain rules, that is clearly within the privilege of the membership.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. This resolution may be adopted by a majority vote.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true but any legislation brought up under suspension will require a two-thirds vote for passage.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; it would take a two-thirds vote under suspension.

The thing that the gentleman from Illinois missed completely, of course, is that all during the session, twice a month suspensions may be called in the discretion of the Speaker and the leadership, and certainly he must recognize that if an adjournment resolution is adopted, under the rules of the House, for the last 6 days of the session suspensions are in order. It is contemplated at the time this resolution is here presented that the session will not last any longer than the 6 days contemplated in the rules.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So the adoption of this rule merely supplements the established procedure of recognizing suspensions at the end of the session and is in keeping with the ordinary principles of the House and is a practice which has been followed for many, many Congresses.

It should also be pointed out that the rule is not exclusive. The rule does not say that no legislation may be considered except under suspensions of the rules; legislation can come in by the adoption of an ordinary rule. This merely makes it possible for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules. It is not exclusive, so the House is not forfeiting the right to consider legislation in the normal fashion.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, there is not anything arbitrary about this resolution. The rules of the House are strictly adhered to and the House will be permitted to work its will. If a majority of the House does not want to do this it will not be done.

My friend from Illinois, former chairman of the committee with whom I had the honor of serving for many years, and I served as a member of the committee under him when he was chairman, he knows this is not an unusual proceeding.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan in his long service on the Committee on Rules, did he never experience a situation where the members of the Rules Committee on the minority side, then the majority, brought in many matters under suspension of the rules during the closing days of a session?

Mr. MICHENER. Oh, yes. When we wrote the rules and provided that the last 6 days should be suspension days, the matter was thoroughly argued, and it was considered that those last days should be suspension days, in order to meet the exigencies which arise during the last days of a session.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman name, during the 6 years I was majority leader, one controversial bill or one bill of general interest, even during the last 6 days of a session, that we considered under suspension of the rules, thereby denying the author of an amendment the right to present it and denying the minority the right to present their views, and the inherent right of a motion to recommit? Name one bill of importance or of a controversial nature during the 6 years I was majority leader.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, I do not have all that material here, but it is obtainable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a list of the bills considered under suspension of the rules during the 6 years that the gentleman from Massachusetts was majority leader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

(The list referred to follows:)

SUSPENSIONS, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

(Numbers in parentheses refer to pages in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD)

H. R. 6999. Pipe line and barge channel across Florida. Failed to pass House under suspension of rules. June 1, 1942 (4774). The vote was: ayes 85, noes 121.

H. J. Res. 319. Declaration of war against Bulgaria. Passed.

H. J. Res. 320. Declaration of war against Hungary. Passed.

H. J. Res. 321. Declaration of war against Rumania. Passed.

H. R. 4. Compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans. Passed.

H. R. 5726. To amend the Sugar Act of 1937. Passed (9286).

H. R. 6682. To suspend processing tax on coconut oil. Passed (4774–4779).

H. R. 6128. To amend act to expedite housing in connection with national defense. Failed of passage under suspension of rules (9281) December 1, 1941. The vote was—ayes 83, noes 70.

S. 1840. To supplement Federal Aid Road Act. Amended and passed House under suspension (8121–8137).

H. R. 7349. Making appropriations for Department of Agriculture for month of July. Passed (5953–5960).

H. J. Res. 254. Declaration of war against Japan. Passed (9520–9537).

H. J. Res. 256. Declaration of war against Germany. Passed (9665, 9666).

SUSPENSIONS, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

H. R. 1366. Temporary additional compensation in postal service. Passed (2002), March 15, 1943.

H. R. 1660. Overtime compensation to certain Government employees. Passed (2911–2922), April 5, 1943. The vote was—yeas, 224; nays, 107.

H. R. 2703. More uniform provisions in veterans' laws. Passed (6207–6216), June 21, 1943.

H. R. 2798. To amend act relating to Federal aid for post roads. Passed (5498–5504), June 8, 1943.

H. R. 2936. To authorize $200,000,000 to expedite housing for national defense. Passed (6202–6207), June 21, 1943.

H. R. 3646. To amend Canal Zone Code. Passed (5337–5340), June 5, 1944.

H. R. 4115. Employment preference for veterans, widows and wives of disabled veterans. Passed (3501–3507), April 17, 1944.

S. 972. To amend section 7 (c) of act of May 21, 1920, relating to the Navy. Passed (6203–6202), June 21, 1943.

S. 1432. To extend Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939. Passed (6195, 6211, 6213, 6215), June 19, 1944.

H. J. Res. 147. To continue Commodity Credit Corporation and increase its borrowing power. Passed (7059–7035), July 2, 1943.

SUSPENSIONS, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

H. R. 6800. To amend First War Powers Act of 1941. Passed (10218), July 26, 1946.

H. R. 1654. Trade marks, registration and protection. Passed (1725), March 5, 1945.

H. R. 3118. Priorities for Veterans' Administration. Passed (5518–5521), June 4, 1945.

H. R. 4230. Circuit Court of Appeals and district courts. Passed (2362), March 18, 1946.

S. 191. Hospitals and public health centers. Passed, amended (10204–10215).

S. 619. Vocational education. Passed, amended (10221), July 26, 1946.

S. 936. Emergency flood control. Passed amended (4840–4846), May 21, 1945.

S. 2085. To amend title V, Housing Act. Passed, amended (10219), July 26, 1946.

H. R. 6917. To provide site acquisition for Federal buildings. Failed (debate 10199–10204), July 26, 1946. The vote on division was—ayes 65, noes 58; on roll call—ayes 160, noes 129.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, this particular action today is a most unusual proceeding, in spite of all the allegations that it is very customary for the Congress to vote to suspend the rules at the close of a session.

In the first place, under the resolution adopted by this House before the recess last month, this session does not end until about the 31st of December. Therefore, we are a long way from 6 days before the close of this session.

In the second place, every one who has sat in this Chamber for any length of time knows that under all custom and precedent we never suspend the rules and gag the minority and limit debate to 20 minutes to a side on the passage of highly important or controversial bills.

It has been widely announced in the press by the Republican leadership that there will only be one bill taken up at this session. They refused to do anything about considering the general housing bill that is now pending before the Rules Committee and can be brought before this House in 30 minutes.

So the only purpose of this gag-rule method limiting debate to 20 minutes on a side, denying amendments to any Member of the House and preventing the minority from offering a motion to recommit, is to take up the inflation-control bill under suspension of the rules.

I believe the soaring cost of living to more than $1 a pound for meat and 80 cents a pound for butter, and the record high cost of all food, clothing, and other things, requires more than 40 minutes of the Congress' time to find a solution to the problem.

Yet if you vote for this resolution at the present time you will be voting to give only 40 minutes' time without amendment, modification, or recommittal to the most important subject—inflation—that is in the minds of everybody in our country.

The matter of inflation control should not be a partisanship matter. It is not going to be only the Democrats who are going to be hurt if the cycle of inflation continues to run, it is not going to be just the Republicans who are going to be hurt; it is going to be 135,000,000 people, many of whom do not know or care nothing about party politics.

When this Congress, by passing this obnoxious gag resolution, limits to 40 minutes discussion on the Nation's No. 1 problem, then I think you ought to go on record and state emphatically that you are unwilling to give any reasonable amount of this Congress' time to attempting to help solve this great problem. Mr. Speaker, the record vote on passage of this gag resolution will clearly show which Members, and which party is unwilling to take the required amount of time to work out fair and effective legislation to deal with the pressing problem of inflation.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. In addition to many of the fine points that the gentleman from Oklahoma makes with reference to this resolution, it will do another thing: It will put the stamp of approval of this Congress on adjourning within 6 days' time, whether or not anything is done.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I remark at this point that the pending resolution, of course, does not limit the congressional session to 6 days. I regret very much that the gentleman has not read the resolution. Of course, the argument that it will stifle the action of the House is wrong, because it permits the House to work its will by a majority vote instead of a two-thirds vote.

I am not at all certain that the gentleman who has just spoken, the gentleman from Oklahoma, is in position to speak for the Republican leadership as to what legislation may or may not be presented to the House for consideration. I am sure that some of the bills which he has fostered, which he has supported, and which he is, in a way, responsible for bringing before us in the past, have resulted in the unpleasant condition which is responsible for the inflationary situation which exists today. I am sure that same type of legislation will not receive the approval of this Congress or of the thinking people of America any longer.

Every citizen of this country, every Member of Congress, is just as much interested, let me say to the gentleman, in doing something about present high prices and in reducing the high cost of living as he may be. But, there are a great many people in America who know why we have high prices, and one of the great reasons is the enormous cost of maintaining the Federal Government which now takes nearly 25 cents out of every $1 of the American people's income in taxes to support it; this gigantic, sprawling bureaucracy which the gentleman helped to create, and which he wants to now expand by enacting the legislation that the President has requested.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Under the privilege the gentleman from Massachusetts has granted me, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio, who has mentioned my name several times in debate, if he intends to bring in the inflation-control bill under suspension of the rules?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know. The bill has not been reported out. I am not a member of that committee, but the gentleman is. He ought to know whether that committee reported any legislation out or not; at least, I hope he knows what is going on in his own committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman said he could not speak for the Republican leadership, but he ought to be able to answer that question.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The committee has not acted at all, but I am not a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. McCORMACK. He says he does not know about the 6 days. The majority leader clearly intimated by his observations that this was brought up because the session would not last longer than 6 days, so the gentleman from Ohio challenges the statement made by the majority leader of his own party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this resolution is introduced for the purpose of preventing any amendment being offered to any bills that might be brought up this week, or during the remainder of the session, which bills will depend upon the agreement made by the Republican leaders, and also to take away from the minority party its inherent right to a motion to recommit which, from time immemorial, this body has recognized resided in the minority party in order for the minority party to make its record on which to go to the people of the country. We had a spectacle in the closing week of the last session only several weeks ago when, for all practical purposes, representative government in this Chamber was suspended. I sat, elected as a Member of this body, as did all other Members, and the majority in this body, the Republican Party, put through the same kind of a resolution, as a result of which all I or any other Member could do was vote "yes" or "no," no matter what bill was brought up, and no matter how important it was, and no matter how wide might be the interest in this body, or among the people. No Member of this body could rise in his seat and offer an amendment. We were denied that opportunity.

Furthermore, the minority party was denied during that week its inherent right to offer a motion to recommit. What were some of the bills that were considered during the last week of the last session under suspension of the rules? H. R. 6777, relating to the social-security law. Many members wanted to offer amendments to broaden coverage and to increase the benefits set in 1939 to offset, at least partially, the drastic increase in the cost of living since then. Social security under present Republican-NAM high prices is little more than hollow mockery. The Democratic Party wanted to offer a motion to recommit. We were denied that opportunity under the suspension of the rules.

Another bill passed under suspension was H. R. 3748, relating to veterans' dependents. Many Democratic Members wanted to offer amendments to improve that bill. We were denied the opportunity.

In the case of H. R. 5588, relating to disabled veterans' compensation, the same thing applied.

Other bills passed under suspension of the rules, thereby depriving the membership of the House of the opportunity of offering perfecting amendments, included:

Senate Joint Resolution 117, relating to the International Labor Organization.

H. R. 6247, relating to United States Air Force.

S. 418, relating to stream pollution.

Senate Joint Resolution 203, relating to mineral land purchase.

House Joint Resolution 412, relating to the merchant marine.

House Joint Resolution 413, relating to the merchant marine.

H. R. 6527, relating to school enrollments.

S. 1322, relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation. There was a deep interest in this bill. Every Member was denied the right to offer an amendment, and the Democratic Party was denied its right to offer a motion to recommit.

H. R. 6959, the housing bill. We know the phony housing bill that was passed. Every Member was denied the right to offer an amendment, by this device, never intended by the House to be used in that way. It has a proper use, but not an improper use as was made during the last week of the last session.

On the housing bill we were denied the opportunity of offering any amendment—even those sponsored by a Republican leader of the other body and approved by a majority of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The Democratic Party was denied the opportunity to offer a motion to recommit.

H. R. 6916, the postal employees' pay raise bill. We know the inequities contained in that bill. None of us was afforded an opportunity to offer an amendment, and the Democratic Party was denied the right to offer a motion to recommit.

Other bills passed under suspension were:

S. 2281, relating to air parcel post.

S. 2376, relating to agricultural commodities.

H. R. 6501, relating to prototype aircraft.

H. R. 5904, relating to the Virgin Islands.

S. 1260, relating to motor carriers.

Then there was H. R. 6712, the Revenue Revision Act of 1948, which was long advertised as the Republican contribution toward a major overhaul of the wartime tax structure. The folly of this procedure, as used by the Republican majority is that this technical tax revision bill making 80 important changes in the tax laws passed with only 40 minutes of debate.

I agree that this resolution has a proper purpose. There is no question about that, and nobody challenges it, but it has been improperly exercised, and abused in such a manner that, as far as the last week of the last session is concerned, for all practical purposes representative government in this Chamber was suspended.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, I thank the gentleman for pointing out that in the last session of Congress we passed so much constructive legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did I say "constructive"?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; all of those measures.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the gentleman's word. He has the right to use it, but he should not put into my mouth words I did not use.

Mr. HALLECK. All right; now may I say to the gentleman——

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not consider the ersatz Republican housing bill constructive. I consider it represensible. If the gentleman wants me to go into that, I will do so, but if he will use that as his own word and make it an expression of his own thought, all right.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman is referring to certain measures that were acted upon under suspension.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am referring to the unreasonable exercise of the right of suspension.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will permit me, may I say that before that resolution was adopted in the last session I asked unanimous consent for the accomplishment of the same thing, to which the minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] reserved the right to object, and then he went on to say this.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does not the gentleman believe he had better have this discussion with the gentleman from Texas? I do not even know what the gentleman is going to say.

Mr. HALLECK. This is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I just happen to have it here before me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman ask me a question? Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] give me some of his time?

Mr. HALLECK. I thought the gentleman had yielded to me. I shall proceed in my own time and shall enlighten the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, there is no question about yielding my time. The gentleman from Indiana knows that himself.

I will yield the balance of my time to the gentleman. Go ahead. Take my time. If you think that I have not been acting within my rights, I am big enough to let you place your own construction on the situation.

But the gentleman knows that when we yield it is usually for a question or a brief observation, and not to take up another gentleman's time.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman and I always get along very well, and I certainly would not transgress on your prerogatives, so I will say what I have to say in my own time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield for a question to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] so as to keep my two friends on an equal basis.

Mr. MONRONEY. Not only would I say that they are gagging every Member on the floor of the House by limiting debate to 20 minutes on each side on two important measures, but this morning it was announced that they were refusing to hear the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Commerce on the inflation-control program being considered in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

So the committees, as well as the House itself are being gagged.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to inquire—What is the purpose of this particular resolution? Is it not the intention that, if a bill comes out of the Committee on Banking and Currency, to take it up under suspension of the rules? Is it not the purpose to take up whatever legislation may be acted upon at this session under suspension of the rules?

Suspension of the rules has a definite and legitimate purpose. Where a bill comes up and only a small group is opposed to it, and the great majority are in favor of it, suspension of the rules is resorted to on unanimous-consent day. Even in the last 6 days of a session it is very seldom resorted to with reference to a matter of general import to the people, and where there are honest and substantial differences between the Members.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at least under such circumstances the minority party is given the right to offer a motion to recommit. If a closed rule is brought in, the right to make a motion to recommit is not taken away.

Lest we forget, let us go back 2 years ago when the National Association of Manufacturers and the Republican Party promised the people of America that, if price controls were removed, within 60 days everything would be in plentiful supply and we would have prices lower than under OPA. Time passed.

It is now 2 years later. Are the people paying less than they did 2 years ago? Has the cost of living declined during the last 2 years? Has the Republican Party kept its promises to the people which they made 2 years ago?

The answer is strongly and emphatically "No." The over-all increase in the cost of living is now 40 percent higher than it was 2 years ago, and in the case of foodstuffs, it is from 60 to 100 percent higher than it was 2 years ago.

Yes, lest we forget—let me show you an advertisement which appeared in the Chicago Sun of February 18, 1946, signed by the National Association of Manufacturers, in which they say "You don't want your savings to melt away! Or the value of your life insurance to dwindle!" I wonder what the people think today as to whether or not there has been a dwindling in their savings and in the value of their life insurance.

Here is another advertisement, one of these big paid ads by the National Association of Manufacturers, which appeared in the Washington Post of April 18, 1946, "Paging Mr. Bowles." I wonder if now they would put an advertisement in paging Mr. Bowles, who at that time said that the removal of price controls would sharply increase the cost of living.

Here is another advertisement on "Why legitimate packers cannot buy cattle," signed by the American Meat Institute of Chicago. Here is what they say:

> Only removal of OPA pricing and related regulations, including subsidies, will put cattle and beef back into normal channels—from the farm to the table—at fair, competitive prices for all.

I wonder what the people think now as they look back, about the increase in the cost of living, particularly the price of meat, which has gone up nearly 100 percent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have only a couple of minutes left. If the gentleman will yield me some of his time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman talks about 2 years ago. My memory goes back to 2 years ago. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not remember when they were serving horse meat in the hospitals in Boston and the gentleman from Massachusetts protested

and asked that something be done about it; that these laws under which we were operating, which were done away with by a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President, were producing this shortage of meat. Are they still using horse meat in the hospitals?

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman admit that the over-all increase in the cost of living has gone up over 40 percent in the past 2 years?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are prices lower now than they were 2 years ago?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, speaking of blackmarket prices that the American people had to pay 2 years ago to get the food and the goods they wanted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, my, my! I cannot imagine——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Are they still eating horse meat in the hospitals in Boston?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman cannot outtalk me. He can outtalk others but he cannot outtalk me. The greatest brain of the Republican Party, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], admits now that prices are lower than they were 2 years ago. Well, every housewife is an expert economist on the fact that the cost of living has gone up perceptibly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will you answer the question that I asked you?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to say anything other than nice things about my friend. Personally, when I am down here talking, I talk about his party and my party, but the gentleman knows I have such an affection for him that if we must have a Republican from his district again, I hope it is the gentleman from Ohio. Of course, we prefer a Democrat, but if we must have a Republican, I want him.

Here is another full-page ad in the New York Times of July 3, 1946, by the National Association of Manufacturers, in this campaign of 2 years ago, whipping up the public against these controls. This advertisement promises:

If OPA is permanently discontinued, the production of goods will mount rapidly and, through free competition, prices will quickly adjust themselves to levels that consumers are willing to pay. • • •

Then, as production gets rolling again, supply will catch up with demand • • • prices will be fair and reasonable to all • • • quality will be improved • • • black markets will disappear • • • and America will enter the period of prosperity that everyone has been hoping for.

I have here another full-page ad of the National Association of Manufacturers from the Washington Post of May 4, 1946, with a caption in 2-inch block letters, "Would you like some butter or a roast of beef?" The ad then goes on to suggest this answer:

Remove price controls on manufactured goods, and production will step up fast. Goods will then pour into the market and, within a reasonable time, prices will adjust themselves naturally and competitively, as they always have, in line with the real worth of things. This is the way you can get the goods you want at prices you can afford to pay. Write your Congressman your views today.

The NAM, and the other high-pressure groups, did not limit their endeavors to stimulating correspondence against OPA. They carried their fight for immediate end of price controls directly to the congressional committees.

Mr. Robert Wason, president, National Association of Manufacturers, told the House Committee on Banking and Currency on March 18, 1946:

Remove price controls on manufactured goods, and production will step up fast. Goods will then pour into the markets and, within a reasonable time, prices will adjust themselves naturally, as they always have, in line with the real worth of things. Competition has never failed to produce this result. • • •

Prices are fixed by competition in free markets, not by the money supply. And what is this competition in free markets?

It is the effort of every manufacturer to meet the wishes of the American housewife, the effort to give her what she wants, at a price she thinks is fair. That is real price control.

Price control by the American housewife: This is the kind of price control that assures that the right things get made in the right quantities.

Price control by the American housewife: This is the kind of price control that assures maximum production, jobs, and prosperity for all.

Price control by the American housewife: This is the kind of price control that has made America great, and the only kind that can keep America great.

In a radio address on February 26, 1946, this same gentleman assured the American people:

Historically we have never gotten run-away prices on a rising production. • • •

Prices should be returned to American housewives.

The ceilings the housewife sets, everyone in industry and agriculture must set. • • •

Stripped of all economic prattle, what we are contending for, therefore, is that you, and not the OPA, should be putting the ceiling prices on the things you want.

Another spokesman from the joint high command of big business and the Republican Party, Mr. J. Howard Pew, president of Sun Oil Co., testified before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on April 4, 1946:

Price increases will stimulate increased production, which quickly will bring prices back into balance. If prices go up too fast, consumer resistance will check them.

Mr. Speaker, what has actually happened? Since April 1, 1946, the price of crude oil at the wells in the United States has gone up from $1.20 a barrel to $2.60.

Many other assurances of the good faith of industry in keeping prices down, and promises not to charge all that the traffic would bear, were then made.

On March 3, 1946, Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, said:

We've got a gang in power who thinks solely of the consumer, and usually in terms of protecting him.

On March 28, 1946, Nelson said that if Wyatt's veteran-housing program were dropped, the home-building industry would—

produce a home, not a fox hole; a house you can afford, not a remodeled barracks.

According to the Baltimore Sun of September 11, 1946, Mr. Ira Mosher, of the NAM—chairman of the board of NAM—said:

We have quite completely failed in convincing the public that our aims are for its good as well as for ours.

The doubts of the people about the NAM aims now have been amply clarified and fully justified.

Al Guckenberger, executive secretary, New York State Food Merchants Association, after OPA price controls were lifted, on October 14, 1946, stated:

Prices • • • will level off shortly as they had begun to do last August before controls were reimposed.

Arthur Bruce, president National Lumber Manufacturers Association, in testimony before a congressional committee, said:

I am personally of the opinion that we would be better off if the Office of Price Administration were to die a natural death June 30.

Need I remind the House that lumber in July 1947 had swept upward 73.4 percent over the 1945—price control—average? When Mr. Bruce said we would be better off it is quite clear the "we" did not include the homeless veteran.

Mr. Richard Colgan, executive vice president, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, in congressional testimony urged:

I think the flow of [lumber] production would be so great so soon that there would be a competitive price on the market.

Yet a year and a half later we find Mr. Colgan's "competitive price" two and one-half times the 1939 average.

On February 3, 1946, Mr. John E. Jaeger, president of the National Association of Retail Grocers, told the American Wholesale Grocers Association:

We [retail grocers] feel that the time has arrived when • • • action must be taken • • • to prevent renewal of the Price Control Act • • •. [Competition] will • • • benefit the consumer by making available ample food at reasonable prices.

On July 9, 1946, Robert R. Wason, president of the NAM, said:

If OPA is finally dead, women • • • will now use the canned meats and other goods they have on their shelves to see them through any temporary period of price rises.

Also said:

If OPA is eliminated entirely, prices of automobiles may be expected to reach normal within 6 months, while rents might take at least a year.

The business and financial editorial writers were advance scouts in the battle to wipe out OPA.

The Wall Street Journal, one of the principal mouthpieces for big business and high finance, started as early as 1945 for outright repeal of OPA, and carried on its campaign to its successful conclusion.

On September 24, 1945, an editorial stated:

This newspaper does not believe that the lifting of price controls will be followed by any horizontal price rise.

A month earlier the Journal editorialized on August 29, 1945:

So we think the choice must be to get rid of price control and to make a beginning on that riddance by throwing out the formulas.

On December 14, 1945, the Journal restated its opposition in terms remarkably similar to the slogans of the National Association of Manufacturers:

As we have said and repeat, the immediate removal of Government control from both prices and wages is the only practical way out of this dangerous impasse. Their removal would unquestionably mean temporarily high prices for many varieties of goods but temporarily only, for there is no more effective price regulation than production in volume.

On January 9, 1946, an editorial of the Wall Street Journal suggests that manufacturers would have a moral responsibility that has been found so deficient in actual practice:

Industries and trade cannot evade price responsibility when they escape the clutches of OPA, whether that happens 6 months too soon or 6 months too late. (Our own belief is that the ceiling prices have already survived too long.)

On January 31, 1946, the Journal announced its unequivocal opposition to all attempts to retain modified price controls:

It is to be hoped that no modification of the price-control law, which its misguided friends may offer, will persuade Congress to extend its life. A much better alternative would be to make an end of it at once.

Ralph Robey, writing in Newsweek of April 29, 1946, said:

Let's put an end to the OPA and get rid once and for all of the creeping inflation which is certain to continue so long as the CPA remains in existence.

There certainly is nothing creeping about the racing inflation of today—more than 2 years after Mr. Robey offered his advice.

Nor could even the academic world remain detached from the anti-OPA fray of 1946. The following prize piece of price nonsense is taken from an article in the Consumer and Financial Chronicle of March 21, 1946, by Mr. Harley L. Lutz, professor of public finance, Princeton University:

The most effective remedy for high prices is high prices, when they are established in a free and open market.

Republican Members of Congress echoed these views of business leaders over countless pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It would be unfair for me to select any one, or even a few, of my Republican friends for quotation without giving proper credit to them all for the demise of price controls. Perhaps the best proof of the truth of my observation is the following statement from an address by a ranking Republican Member of the other body on February 5, 1948—only a few months ago—before the Middle Atlantic Lumbermen's Association:

I do not need to remind the membership of this association that it was the Republican leadership in the Senate and the House that was responsible for ending OPA, so that we could once more get our production machinery into gear.

Mr. Speaker, in direct contrast have been the solemn and prophetic pleas of President Truman that the Congress take the required steps to protect the people from inflation. In his state of the Union message of January 21, 1946, the President warned:

Today inflation is our greatest immediate domestic problem. • • • If we expect to maintain a steady economy we shall have to maintain price and rent control for many months to come.

In an extraordinary appeal to the Senate on May 23, 1946, President Truman again urged:

I earnestly repeat my earlier request that the Congress quickly re-enact the stabilization laws without amendments that would jeopardize economic stability.

After trying diligently to administer a basically defective statute, the President finally took the only course. In his statement on wage and price control on November 9, 1946, he said:

There is no virtue in control for control's sake. When it becomes apparent that controls are not furthering the purposes of the stabilization laws but would, on the contrary, tend to defeat these purposes, it becomes the duty of the Government to drop the controls. • • •

The real basis of our difficulty is the unworkable price control law which the Congress gave us to administer.

A few months later, President Truman again warned of the dangers of exorbitant prices in an address before the Associated Press annual luncheon, in New York, on April 21, 1947:

There are some who say that prices are not too high, so long as buying stays at high levels.

From the human standpoint, I reject this argument. It provides no answer to those living on fixed incomes such as teachers, civil servants, and widows.

There is one sure formula for bringing on a recession or depression. That is to maintain excessively high prices. Buying stops; production drops; unemployment sets in; prices collapse; profits vanish; businessmen fail.

Maintaining his watchful eye over the Nation's economy, the President called Congress back into special session and on November 17, 1947, presented a nine-point program to halt rising prices with the following reminder of what failure to act might mean:

If we neglect our economic ills at home, if we fail to halt the march of inflation, we may bring on a depression from which our economic system, as we know it, might not recover.

When the Republican Congress failed to respond to the urgency of the times, the President again appealed for action in his state of the Union message on January 7, 1948:

High prices must not be our means of rationing.

We must deal effectively and at once with the high cost of living.

We must stop the spiral of inflation.

I trust that within the shortest possible time the Congress will make available to the Government the weapons that are so desperately needed in the fight against inflation.

Speaking in the interests of the people, President Truman—when the Republican Congress again refused to heed his warning by adjourning without taking action to halt skyrocketing prices—again fulfilled his constitutional duty by summoning the Congress into special session. He patiently and earnestly and modestly reminded us last week how right he has been all along on this vital problem. The President said:

There are still some people who repeat the old argument which was used by those who killed price control 2 years ago. They said that if we would only take controls off, production would increase, prices would go down, and there would be more for everybody at a lower cost.

The record shows unmistakably that this argument was false. • • •

Positive action by this Government is long overdue. It must be taken now.

Mr. Speaker, this is a summary of the record on price control and the present soaring cost of living. Responsibility is clear—not only with regard to the premature end of OPA, but also for the failure now to correct that original mistake by giving the American people the relief from high prices which they so sorely need, and which their President has sought for them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of discussing the resolution which is before us, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the majority leader.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I assure the House that I am not going to use 20 minutes. After all, my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is just engaging in a lot of shadow-boxing in which he likes to indulge and which we always enjoy.

The gentleman referred with some vigor to the suspension of representative government. I might say to him that I saw representative government suspended here for 14 years, under the New Deal. In that era measures were sent up here by the Executive and given approval when they were not yet even in print. It was under the New Deal that we had suspension of representative government. The people of this country now have a Congress that is responsive to their will, a Congress that really represents them and is subservient to no one man or group of individuals. The people are glad they have such a Congress. They are very happy that it is a Republican Congress. We have restored representative government in the United States. In the course of his remarks the gentleman undertook to upbraid the majority leadership for calling up a certain number of measures under suspension of the rules in the closing days of the last session. I would remind the gentleman that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD discloses that I asked the minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] about the adoption of that particular resolution, and indicated to the gentleman from Texas that I was going to ask unanimous consent for its adoption. He suggested to me that I tell him as nearly as I could what measures we had in mind to call up under suspension of the rules or

might possibly be called up in that manner. I went to the minority leader's office and I gave him that list. When I subsequently asked unanimous consent for the adoption of the resolution, the gentleman from Texas reserved the right to object and said—and it is in the RECORD of June 17, page 8634:

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Indiana was good enough this morning to state to me generally, and I think rather fully, the bills that the Speaker would in all probability recognize for suspension. They are all agreeable to me except one. Since the action of the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning, and the high-handed manner in which that committee acted in not allowing a Member of the minority, as I understand, to even make a motion or say anything, I could not agree to this request, if it involves a bill of the far-reaching significance as the so-called housing bill.

If that is to come in the list I shall be constrained to object, and if I did not there would be another who would.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it comes with poor grace to complain of action that was taken under suspension of the rules when the minority leader was informed in respect to every one of them and he had said for the RECORD that they were all agreeable to him insofar as calling them up under suspension was concerned, except one.

Furthermore, the present session is supposed to be an extraordinary session of Congress.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] objected because the gentleman brought in a rule that would kill and did kill the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill and substitute for it a fraudulent housing bill?

Mr. HALLECK. I read the RECORD as to why the gentleman from Texas objected and certainly the gentleman can understand it as well as I. There was nothing in the list of bills which was just read by the gentleman from Massachusetts that led him to object.

Whether or not the majority of the Members of this body are going to vote for the adoption of this resolution I do not know, but I think they will. As a matter of fact, there is nothing new in this procedure. I read the RECORD before. I hesitate to take the time of the Members to read it again, except that there has been such an attempt to arouse a lot of excitement here that I feel I should make further reference to it.

The gentleman from New York, Mr. O'Connor, was chairman of the Rules Committee in 1938 and presented this same kind of resolution for adoption on that occasion and there was not even a record vote. The now Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] raised some question about it.

Mr. O'Connor said:

Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution brought in toward the close of a session. Its purpose is to expedite the business of the House. It provides that suspensions shall be in order on any day instead of on the first and third Mondays and during the last 6 days of a session.

All during a session bills are called under suspension, as the established rules of the House provide.

Some question was raised as to whether or not the Republicans had ever followed this procedure. The gentleman from New York, Mr. O'CONNOR, said:

The Republican Party took the same course we are taking today. I served with the gentleman on the Rules Committee and the gentleman may trace back the history of this Congress for many years and I doubt if there can be found a year in which an identical rule was not brought in.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I should like to conclude my statement.

As I say, I do not know why there should be all this excitement over this proposal to expedite the business of Congress. Even the President himself said that we could do all that was needed to be done in 15 days. That makes this kind of resolution all the more necessary I do not, however, see why it was that it was not until a full week after we had been called into session that any of the President's advisers came up to tell us about the particular bills the President wanted. He called this an emergency situation. The President said this was an emergency situation. If that be true, then certainly there is more reason for the adoption of this resolution in this kind of session than there would be in a regular session. Why then is the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] complaining about the committee's not hearing a lot of witnesses he said they should hear? What does he want—a filibuster in his own committee against legislation dealing with prices? It would seem that he does. I can hardly believe that, however. In any event, you could not hear all of those witnesses and get through in the 15 days that the President said ought to be time enough to do all that he thought needed to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one thing further. There has been talk here about important bills being called up under suspension of the rules. Why, one of the bills that raised inquiry in 1938 when this type of resolution came up was the so-called reorganization bill—the same reorganization bill that stirred this country to its very foundations, a reorganization bill which was subsequently defeated by a then Democratic Congress. At that time the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] pointed out that resolutions of this sort generally came at the end of a session. And he said he would like to know if the session was going to last 2 days, 2 weeks, or 2 months. The then Democratic majority leadership would not even tell him that much. So do not get so excited about it. It is the same old story. As long as you are on the "giving out end," you kind of enjoy it, but when you get to the point where the same procedures you followed all through the years are invoked by the Republican majority in order to try to bring about expeditious consideration of the matters before us, you cry out until you can b. heard clear across the country. I do not think any one will be very much impressed.

Mr. Speaker, there has been talk about the price-control measure and statements to the effect that it is contemplated it will be brought up under suspension of the rules. Now, I do not know at this moment what is going to be brought up under suspension. Even if this resolution is adopted, the price-control matter could be brought up under a rule. When we came here at the opening of the last session and Mr. Truman came up here with that long program of his, I made the statement then—and I never heard anyone dispute it since—that if you wrapped them all up in one package and sent it down to the White House there would not be 25 Democratic votes to send it there and what is more, if we did send it down there the President would probably veto it. I do not know whether you gentlemen on the other side of the aisle would have courage enough to try to bring CPA back under a motion to recommit or not. I have heard you talk about it, but, if I understand the sentiment that exists, you would not have enough votes for that sort of a police-state proposal to make a corporal's guard. Why then all this shadow-boxing?

We Republicans said that we were not for the police-state method that the President himself decried at one time. That is where we stand. We make no apology for it, and we need make none. The people overwhelmingly approve our position.

The committee is holding hearings on these matters that have been stated to us to be most important. I have confidence in the committees and, beyond that, I have confidence in the ultimate judgment of the Congress of the United States as to what ought to be done. You can talk all you want about the merits of these various proposals and you can talk about how debate will be limited. The fact is that the debate has been raging for days, weeks, and months in the Congress, in the press, and over the radio. Everyone has been talking about it.

When we decide what needs to be done within the contemplation of the necessities of this special session, the measures will be brought out here and you will all get a chance to vote on them.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I was called from the room while the able gentleman from Massachusetts was delivering his keynote speech for the opposition. Did he call attention to the fact that when we had price control it was impossible to buy meat, potatoes, eggs, butter, shirts—in fact everything? You could not buy anything and people were queueing up in line all over the country trying to get food and buy enough to keep body and soul together.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman neglected also to point out that it was the President himself who took off the OPA controls just before the last election. He took them off in the face of an aroused electorate. But I am not going to get into a debate about the merits of the various things that have been and may be proposed. This is not the time nor the place for it. I might point out that when some of these statements were made, and some people thought that prices would be dropping, it was expected that national defense would cost from three to five billion dollars a year. Now it is costing $14,000,000,000 a year, with the resulting impact that such expenditures has on our national economy. I do not think it was in contemplation that we would be engaging in various aid programs running into billions and billions and billions of dollars, involving the export of tremendous quantities of goods of all kinds in this country, having, as that has, its impact upon our whole economy. As I say, one could go on at great length arguing these issues, but this is not the time for it.

This resolution is in order; it is properly here; it follows time-honored practices in the House of Representatives, and after the gentlemen on the other side have had their opportunity to try and make another political speech to the country, and get a chance to vote, the smoke will all clear away and we will go on to accomplish the best that we can in the best interest of the country. Whatever we bring in here you can be pretty sure there will be a lot of votes on the other side of the aisle for it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is the majority leader, and he is being credited with being the real leader of the Republican Party, of course. He states that he does not know what legislation will be considered. Now, I presume that is due to his modesty. Can he tell us whether he will bring in that legislation that will bring about a reduction in the high cost of living?

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the gentleman from Illinois, for his enlightenment, that there are 245 Republican Members. There is no one man, no two or three men, who run the affairs of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives. We have Members on the legislative committees, and they are able men and women, who are doing a good job in the interest of the country. They have a voice, an important voice, in what is done. It is not up to me to dictate to them what they should do, and I am quite sure the Speaker would fully agree with me in that respect, because that is the way we operate. There is no dictatorship over here. We get together, we talk things over, and then we decide what to do, and generally we go ahead and do it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 216, nays 122, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—216

Abernethy	Gamble	Merrow
Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Meyer
Andersen, H. Carl	Gearhart	Michener
Anderson, Calif.	Gillette	Miller, Md.
Andresen, August H.	Gillie	Miller, Nebr.
Angell	Goff	Mitchell
Arends	Goodwin	Muhlenberg
Arnold	Graham	Mundt
Auchincloss	Griffiths	Murray, Wis.
Bakewell	Gross	Nicholson
Banta	Gwinn, N. Y.	Nixon
Barrett	Gwynne, Iowa	Norblad
Bates, Mass.	Hagen	O'Hara
Beall	Hale	Patterson
Bender	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips, Calif.
Bennett, Mich.	Hall, Leonard W.	Potter
Bennett, Mo.	Halleck	Potts
Bishop	Hand	Poulson
Blackney	Harness, Ind.	Ramey
Bogga, Del.	Harvey	Rankin
Bradley	Hébert	Reed, Ill
Bramblett	Herter	Reed, N. Y.
Brehm	Heselton	Rees
Brophy	Hill	Reeves
Brown, Ohio	Hinshaw	Rich
Buck	Hoeven	Richlman
Buffett	Holmes	Rivers
Burke	Hope	Robertson
Busbey	Horan	Rockwell
Butler	Hull	Rogers, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenison	Rohrbough
Carson	Jenkins, Ohio	Ross
Case, N. J	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Ill.	Sadlak
Chadwick	Jones, Wash.	Sanborn
Chenoweth	Jonkman	Sarbacher
Chiperfield	Judd	Schwabe, Mo.
Church	Kearney	Schwabe, Okla.
Clason	Kearns	Scott, Hardie
Clevenger	Keating	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Coffin	Keefe	Scrivner
Cole, Kans.	Kersten, Wis.	Seely-Brown
Cole, Mo.	Kilburn	Simpson, Ill.
Colmer	Knutson	Simpson, Pa.
Corbett	Kunkel	Smith, Kans.
Cotton	Landis	Smith, Maine
Coudert	Larcade	Smith, Ohio
Cox	Latham	Smith, Wis.
Crawford	LeCompte	Snyder
Crow	LeFevre	Stefan
Cunningham	Lemke	Stevenson
Curtis	Lewis, Ky.	Stockman
Dague	Lewis, Ohio	Stratton
Davis, Ga.	Lichtenwalter	Sundstrom
Davis, Wis.	Love	Taber
Dawson, Utah	McConnell	Talle
Devitt	McCowen	Tibbott
D'Ewart	McCulloch	Tollefson
Dolliver	McDonough	Towe
Dondero	McDowell	Twyman
Ellis	McGarvey	Van Zandt
Ellsworth	McGregor	Vorys
Elsaesser	McMahon	Vursell
Elston	McMillen, Ill.	Wadsworth
Engel, Mich.	Mack	Welchel
Fellows	Macy	Whittington
Fisher	Maloney	Wigglesworth
Fletcher	Manasco	Williams
Foote	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Tex.
Fuller	Mason	Wolcott
Fulton	Mathews	Wolverton
Gallagher		Woodruff

NAYS—122

Albert	Boggs, La.	Burleson
Allen, La.	Boykin	Byrne, N. Y.
Andrews, Ala.	Brooks	Camp
Battle	Brown, Ga.	Carroll
Beckworth	Bryson	Chelf
Bell	Buchanan	Combs
Blatnik	Bulwinkle	Cravens
Crosser	Jones, Ala.	Pace
Deane	Jones, N. C.	Passman
Delaney	Karsten, Mo.	Patman
Dingell	Kee	Peden
Donohue	Kelley	Peterson
Doughton	Kennedy	Philbin
Douglas	Kilday	Pickett
Durham	King	Poage
Eberharter	Kirwan	Preston
Engle, Calif.	Klein	Price, Fla.
Feighan	Lane	Price, Ill.
Fogarty	Lanham	Rains
Folger	Lea	Rayburn
Forand	Lesinski	Redden
Gordon	Lodge	Rogers, Fla.
Gorski	Lusk	Rooney
Gossett	Lynch	Sabath
Granger	McCormack	Sadowski
Grant, Ala.	McMillan, S. C.	Sheppard
Gregory	Madden	Sikes
Hardy	Mahon	Smathers
Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield	Smith, Va.
Harris	Marcantonio	Somers
Harrison	Miller, Calif.	Spence
Hart	Miller, Conn.	Teague
Havenner	Mills	Thompson
Hays	Monroney	Vinson
Hedrick	Morgan	Walter
Hobbs	Morris	Welch
Holifield	Morrison	Wheeler
Huber	Multer	Whitten
Jackson, Wash.	Murdock	Winstead
Jarman	O'Brien	Worley
Johnson, Okla.	O'Toole	

NOT VOTING—91

Abbitt	Flannagan	Norton
Allen, Ill.	Garmatz	O'Konski
Andrews, N. Y.	Gary	Pfeifer
Barden	Gathings	Phillips, Tenn.
Bates, Ky.	Gore	Ploeser
Bland	Hartley	Plumley
Bloom	Heffernan	Powell
Bolton	Hendricks	Priest
Bonner	Hess	Regan
Buckley	Hoffman	Richards
Canfield	Isacson	Riley
Cannon	Jackson, Calif.	Rizley
Celler	Javits	St. George
Chapman	Jenkins, Pa.	Sasscer
Clark	Jennings	Scoblick
Clippinger	Jensen	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Tex.	Short
Cooley	Kean	Stanley
Cooper	Kefauver	Stigler
Courtney	Keogh	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kerr	Thomas, N. J
Dawson, Ill.	Lucas	Thomas, Tex.
Dirksen	Ludlow	Trimble
Domengeaux	Lyle	Vail
Dorn	MacKinnon	West
Eaton	Meade, Ky.	Whitaker
Elliott	Meade, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Evins	Morton	Wood
Fallon	Murray, Tenn.	Youngblood
Fenton	Nodar	
Fernandez	Norrell	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Gary against.

Mr. Clippinger for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Fallon against.

Mr. Nodar for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Scoblick for, with Mr. Priest against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. Andrews of New York for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Sasscer against.

Mrs. Bolton for, with Mr. Cooper against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Gore against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Bloom against.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Isacson against.
Mr. Gathings for, with Mr. Chapman against.
Mr. Vail for, with Mr. Bland against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Rizley with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Youngblood with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Wood.
Mr. Morton with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Whitaker.
Mr. MacKinnon with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Flannagan.
Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Fernandez.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Riley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 737)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from October 1, 1947, to March 31, 1948, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

Previous reports of the National Advisory Council were transmitted to the Congress on March 1, 1946, March 8, 1946, January 13, 1947, June 26, 1947, January 20, 1948, and May 18, 1948, respectively. In addition to the First Special Report on the Operations and Policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, submitted on May 18, 1948, previous reports on the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank were included in the reports of January 13, 1947, June 26, 1947, and January 20, 1948, respectively.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 3, 1948.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement in support of the tax bill he introduced this morning.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD regarding a bill he introduced today to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. McMAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication from a civic association.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HOUSING

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the existence of a critical housing shortage throughout our Nation is well known to each of us. I have been deeply concerned about the failure of the House to give consideration to this matter.

Early in June I called attention to the urgency of the need and it was generally understood then that the committee would report to the House a comprehensive housing bill. Subsequent developments are well known. A so-called housing bill was presented, but in a form which miserably failed to constructively approach the problem and in a manner which prevented any amendments to broaden it or improve it.

There is a pressing need for permanent extension of title VI of the National Housing Act and for a better secondary mortgage market. However, there is wide divergence of opinion concerning the propriety of Federal assistance in connection with slum clearance and subsidized housing for low-income families. While the elimination of slums and decent housing for American families are clearly matters of public interest, the opponents of public housing point to the fact that new construction is now proceeding at a rate which fully utilizes our production of building supplies.

It has long been my feeling that the entire House membership should be given an opportunity to participate in and listen to full debate on all the various proposals for coping with the housing problem. To keep housing legislation bottled up in committee deprives the House membership of any opportunity to work out constructive legislation which is so vitally needed.

I have today signed the petition to discharge the committee from further consideration of the matter. I hope that a sufficient number of my colleagues will join with me to bring this matter to the floor so that it may be debated and disposed of during the current special session.

SOMETHING MUST BE DONE TO PROTECT SOCIAL - SECURITY BENEFICIARIES FROM THE FIRES OF INFLATION

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the President in his message to the joint session of the Congress on July 27, described the people who depend upon the benefits being paid under the old age and survivors' insurance system as victims of inflation. Truer, more forceful words were never spoken. It is ridiculous to suggest, yes it is cruel to say that an elderly man and his wife can exist on the average old-age retirement benefit of $39 a month, or that a widow with two children can keep body and soul together with $49 a month.

Since the present level of benefits was set in 1939, we have had this fantastic rise in the cost of those basic necessities which social-security recipients could barely afford even before the price rise. Immediately after the delivery of the President's message I introduced H. R. 7044, to increase old age and survivors' insurance benefits by approximately 50 percent and to make certain other noncontroversial liberalizing changes in the social-security system.

Mr. Speaker, it can be taken for granted that the Republicans in control of both Houses of Congress can expect to reap the fury of an enraged and unsympathetic electorate far greater in numbers than the 2,000,000 recipients now actually receiving benefits under the Social Security Act. There can be no argument against the President's recommendations since everybody knows that the present high cost of living admittedly weighs heaviest on those who are subsisting on social-security benefits and old-age pensions. These people are the lowest on our economic scale and their need for relief is most pressing, since they are in distress and unable otherwise to help themselves.

Indeed, the 63,000,000 employed persons at the present time doubtless includes a great many people who are eligible for social-security retirement benefits, but who simply cannot afford to leave their job—despite age and poor health—under the present inadequate benefits and the Republican NAM high prices.

The healthy financial condition of the old-age and survivors' insurance fund, together with the strengthening provisions in the bill I have introduced, clearly make possible these adjustments in the Social Security Act. Mr. Speaker, although this bill was introduced more than a week ago, as yet there has not been a single meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means for the consideration of this pressing problem. I am sure that the old people of the country, as well as those who are now contributing toward a more pleasant and secure old age, will be justly indignant at the neglect of this

Republican Eightieth Congress responsible for their minimum welfare.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona, and Mr. MITCHELL asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CROSSER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of enforcing peace.

THE ISSUES OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, Congress has been reconvened in special session for the purpose of solving a number of important problems which directly affect the people's welfare and America's national security.

The issues which confront us may be classified under the following major categories: First, inflation; second, housing; third, labor legislation; fourth, civil rights; and, fifth, social welfare. Each of these five problems has a direct bearing on our economic well-being and on the future of democracy. Each of these problems was grossly neglected by the Eightieth Congress during its two regular sessions.

It is my hope that Congress will accept its responsibilities to the Nation during this special session and take courageous and constructive legislative action—action which is long overdue.

The record of the Eightieth Congress to date has been one of miserable failure and broken campaign promises. The Republican majority failed the people during both regular sessions; it failed the worker, farmer, small-business man, veteran, and consumer. It refused to formulate a program of prosperity and security for the people, choosing instead to cater to corporate wealth and vested interests by adopting class legislation and granting tax hand-outs to the wealthy.

The special session now gives to the majority party an opportunity to redeem itself by doing something constructive for a change. I hope that the Republican leadership has the wisdom to utilize this chance, and I am sure that the American people share my views.

I will use the few minutes at my disposal to discuss briefly each of the big issues of the special session, and urge what in my opinion seems to be the logical course of action to follow. I will begin with the question of inflation and the need for adequate legislation to control it.

CHECK INFLATION—PREVENT DEPRESSION

Mr. Speaker, the present economic situation is dangerous and pregnant with economic disaster. There is much uneasiness among the people, and they have ample cause for alarm. Ever-rising prices, swollen corporate profits, declining mass purchasing power, the increase in credit buying, and dissipation of wartime savings are the forerunners of depression—of another 1929 economic catastrophe which will cause untold suffering and misery for the people.

The danger signals of depression are all around us, as the Midyear Economic Report of the President—July 1948—clearly indicates. Prices are still rising—the cost of living is now 75 percent higher than in 1939. Food prices have increased 123 percent. Clothing costs have doubled. Rents are up 13 percent.

Corporate profits continue to increase, and have now reached the all-time high of $30,500,000,000 before taxes and $18,600,000,000 after taxes. Consumer purchasing power has declined, under the impact of this inflation, to the point where over 25 percent of all families are spending more than they earn. Credit buying has now reached the record high of $14,000,000,000—the people's savings of the war years have been dissipated in a majority of cases in order to enable them to buy the necessities of life.

This depression-breeding situation is a double-edged sword which is wrecking our economy. On one hand, inflation is reducing the worker's take-home pay, squeezing the small-business man, lowering the farm parity ratio between money received and paid out, and undermining the people's living standards. At the same time, the fires of inflation eating at vital parts of the Nation's economy are paving the way to depression, which will mean malnutrition, hunger, unemployment, broken national health, and human misery.

My colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have told us time and again that inflation-control legislation is unnecessary. They still repeat that unsound argument that was used when they killed price and rent control. They argue that no control means more production, and this in turn means lower prices.

It is true that more production is the eventual and only permanent answer. However, the present emphasis upon production is of such a nature that controls are necessary.

American industry should be reorientated toward the production of houses, cars, refrigerators, radios, schools, highways, hospitals, and consumer goods to raise living standards and provide security for our people, instead of being mobilized for a world armament race.

But we are spending over $14,000,000,000 a year for national defense, and over $6,000,000,000 for foreign economic and military aid. In other words, we are using over half of the National Budget for armament and foreign assistance, and three-fourths of the Budget for war and the effects of war. Until we reduce our expenditure for armaments and foreign grants, some inflation-control legislation is imperative. Otherwise, the result will be depression and economic collapse.

The situation requires swift and statesmanlike action, and it is later than we think. As Marriner S. Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, told the Senate Banking Committee on July 29 of this year:

> We certainly are going to have a bust. When, I cannot say. You can only moderate it now.

Congress cannot afford to follow its usual do-nothing policy with respect to this grim threat to our economy. We should adopt a complete program of inflation-control legislation during this session, including legislation to control credit, to allocate scarce commodities and control prices of such commodities. We should pass a genuine rent-control law and reimpose the excess-profits tax.

One or two of these things alone will not do the job. We must enact this entire program, and any half-way measures will not serve.

I wish to make my position absolutely clear on this question. Inflation has produced enormous corporate profits, but has undermined the people's purchasing power. This means shrinking markets and eventual depression. I have supported price and rent control in the past, and today urge anti-inflation legislation and the reimposition of the excess-profits tax as measures to prevent depression and to promote national security.

ADOPT T-E-W HOUSING BILL

Housing has become the number one social problem in the United States—in fact, the situation is today so bad that it has become a national disgrace. There are still nearly 3,000,000 families in this country who are living doubled up with friends and relatives; 50 percent of these homeless families are veterans' families. Two-thirds of all rural dwellings are classified as substandard, and 40 percent of all city homes fall into the same category.

The only solution to this problem is the adoption of a constructive and workable long-range housing bill to remedy the present acute housing shortage and meet our long-term housing needs. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, which has been bottled up in committee during the whole life of the Eightieth Congress, is a sound measure. More than a year ago I signed the discharge petition on this bill which still remains on the Speaker's desk, and I call upon the House today to bring this measure to the floor and pass it during this special session.

REPEAL THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

The Republican majority could make a real contribution to the cause of industrial peace and American democracy during this session, if it would lay aside its lynch-labor attitude and repeal the Taft-Hartley antilabor law. This measure, written and crusaded for by the National Association of Manufacturers, is one of the most vicious measures ever adopted by the Congress of the United States.

The Taft-Hartley Act is contrary to American ideals and the principles of

our Constitution. It has restricted the rights of labor which were earned over half a century of struggle—the rights to organize, bargain collectively, and strike as free men and women. It has opened the way to the use of injunctions and the National Guard as well as units of the Regular Army to break strikes. It has served to handcuff the working men and women of America in the interests of big business, has created labor unrest, caused unnecessary strikes, and retarded industrial production.

The Republicans justified the adoption of this law on the grounds that it was necessary to preserve industrial peace. Events have proved that this argument was false—a fact that most reasonable and unbiased persons recognized during the debate in Congress over the Taft-Hartley law. The road to industrial peace is to be found, not in repressive antilabor legislation, but in measures which eliminate the conditions that create labor unrest.

In the interest of friendly labor-management relations, Congress should strike from the statute books the Taft-Hartley law, and direct its efforts toward the formulation and adoption of a comprehensive program to benefit labor.

We should raise the minimum wage to provide at least 75 cents per hour and strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. We should expand and liberalize the provisions of the unemployment compensation laws to cover all workers, and provide payments in the amount of at least $25 for 26 weeks. We should extend the Social Security Act to cover all workers, and adopt an adequate pension law to give workers security in their old age. Congress should adopt a labor-extension program of education and strengthen our labor conciliation services.

With respect to my stand on labor issues I want to make the record clear. The NAM-sponsored Taft-Hartley law is a vicious and un-American measure. I opposed it from the beginning and I now demand its repeal. I condemn strike-breaking by injunction and the use of the National Guard and other Army units in labor disputes. Congress can best promote industrial peace by raising the minimum wage, by liberalizing unemployment compensation, and by providing economic security to the worker.

EXTEND CIVIL LIBERTIES AND ENCOURAGE DEMOCRACY

America has a great heritage of freedom and equality, and the individual liberties guaranteed by the Constitution are precious American rights. Yet we must admit that the American ideal still awaits complete realization. As the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights points out, millions of Americans are denied the right to vote today, minorities are discriminated against with respect to employment, education, and economic opportunity on account of race, color, and religious creed. Racial segregation exists in the armed forces and in many large cities. Minority groups are victims of lynching and other forms of mob law.

Neither can we ignore the fact that today efforts are being made to curtail civil liberties in America. The House has cited 10 prominent Hollywood artists for their personal political beliefs rather than any overt acts. The eminent atomic scientist Dr. Edward U. Condon, has been slandered and persecuted by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as have many other prominent Americans. The so-called subversive activities control bill, which is one of the most dangerous measures ever seriously considered by Congress, passed the House. Only strong public protest has prevented its passage in the other body.

In the name of Americanism, Congress should exercise calm judgment in the face of public hysteria, and refuse to be stampeded into passing legislation to restrict civil liberties. In the name of democracy, we should adopt legislation to guarantee full political, economic, and social rights to every American.

My stand is in accord with Thomas Jefferson, who said:

I swear on the altar of God eternal hostility to all forms of tyranny over the minds of men.

Congress must reject all legislation which curbs civil liberties—Congress must extend civil rights by adopting anti-poll-tax, anti-lynching, and FEPC legislation during this session.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION NEEDED

There is a vast amount of sound social legislation pending before the Congress which deserves consideration. Millions of old folks in America are living under conditions of poverty and near starvation, and a comprehensive and liberal old-age pension law is needed.

Recent reports show that there are 10,000,000 illiterates in America, and that many children are denied educational opportunities. Passage of the Taft Federal-aid-to-education bill would help correct this situation.

Two-thirds of our people are not receiving adequate medical care, and the Murray-Wagner health-insurance bill offers a practical solution to this problem. The social-security law should be extended to cover every person in America, including the farmer and self-employed. Positive action on these and many other social problems are long overdue, and Congress could contribute much to the future welfare of the Nation by placing such measures on the agenda.

These are the issues, Mr. Speaker, which now confront the special session of the Eightieth Congress. They are vital issues which demand constructive action. They are issues the Republican majority has chosen to dodge and sidestep since January of 1947. These issues which affect the people's interest must not be dodged or ignored any longer. It is no longer a question of saving face on the part of some political leaders—it is a question of prosperity or depression. The well-being of our people and the health of our economy are at stake.

It has been said that the special session is putting the majority party "on the spot" in that they are faced with the dilemma of fulfilling the campaign promises in their platform or repudiating them by inaction. Actually, it is the bipartisan coalition which is on the spot—the coalition which adopted the Taft-Hartley law, the Knutson tax law, and other reactionary measures during the regular session. But the question of prosperity or depression is more important than partisan or bipartisan politics, and I call upon my colleagues in both parties to take action now to guarantee prosperity, civil liberties, economic security, and democracy to all the people.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, from the press, I observe that since there is at present no housing law in this country, this session of Congress will probably enact the National Housing Act, which passed in the closing days of the regular session of the House. This bill, H. R. 6950, now being considered by the Senate, is inadequate and insufficient to meet the country's housing needs, especially in those States which are experiencing marked increases in their population.

The housing problem deserves top priority in our Congressional agenda. If the Federal Government fails to face this problem by providing adequate housing legislation at this time, it is incumbent upon the States to pass legislation to encourage the construction of houses at a State level. So desperate is the lack of appropriate housing in many of our States today the various States can no longer wait and hope for action by the Federal Government, when Congress gives no indication of constructive activity.

In my own State of Arizona, we are faced with a very real problem of providing housing for the thousands of veterans who have come to our fast-growing State to lay the groundwork for their futures. I sincerely hope that Arizona will enact a State housing law which will encourage the construction of homes especially for veterans and their families. I, for one, shall continue to stress the need of a State housing authority backed up by laws which will encourage the construction of private homes. If necessary, I believe the State should guarantee loans in the nature of mortgage insurance in a similar manner as is provided by the Federal Government in the contemplated national housing act.

If the housing problem is to be left largely to the initiative of the States, I believe it necessary that the Federal Reserve Board relax its rules and regulations in order to facilitate discounting on mortgage loans for homes, particularly for veterans, thus making it possible for the States to carry out their programs.

I had hoped, but apparently in vain, that Congress would tackle the serious task of enacting a sound and workable law that would guarantee homes for our citizens. If we are merely to go through the motions of passing a law which merely scratches the surface of the problem, as a last resort before adjourning, we must at least take steps to make it

possible for the States to take care of the problem and supplement the work of the Federal Government. I am sincerely hopeful that Arizona will take the initiative on her housing problem where this Congress has left off. For every dollar invested by the State in providing houses for her residents which are adequate to the American standard of living, the returns will be multiplied in terms of continued progress, prosperity, and happiness. Without decent homes within their financial possibilities, Americans cannot enjoy nor contribute in a full measure to the benefits of our way of life.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

STATE RIGHTS VERSUS TOTALITARIANISM

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years, it has become highly popular for public officials in certain sections of our country to point the finger of scorn at the white people of the South.

This has become such a politically profitable pastime in other sections that both major political parties have been persuaded to write into their party platforms antisouthern planks, and to dedicate themselves to the complete destruction of southern economic and social institutions.

We say to them:

Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eyes, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast the mote out of thy brother's eye. Matthew 7: 3.

It is a sad commentary on American politics when the Democratic Party—saved from oblivion more than once by the South, and led by a man who owes his position to the white people of the South—places its best friends on the altar of political expediency.

The South will not—it cannot—go along with the vicious platform adopted by the National Democratic Convention at Philadelphia. We have been betrayed in the house of our fathers. We, who have been most faithful of all to the Democratic Party, felt the indignities of the present party's ingratitude, when our interests were subordinated to permit the adoption of a resolution offered by men from States in which not even the justices of the peace are Democrats.

The National Democratic Party leadership has joined the Dewey and Wallace crowds, and is playing cheap politics with public welfare.

Both major parties have unconditionally surrendered to selfish Negro and alien minority groups of the so-called doubtful States, and are both screaming for passage of legislation which they know to be unconstitutional per se, and contrary to the best interests of the United States.

I, of course, have reference to the so-called civil-rights legislation.

The enactment of any or all of these vicious proposals—with which we are all familiar—could have no effect other than to again fan into flames the expiring embers of racial hatred, and to create sectional divisions among our people at a time when national unity is synonymous with national self-preservation.

Passage of these measures would cut the heart from our Constitution. Yet they are advocated by many good and patriotic Americans. This is not difficult to understand, because those who would force this crown of thorns down upon the heads of the white people of the South have resorted to trickery, deceit, and misrepresentation in their efforts to destroy the meaning of the Constitution.

They have so colored the barbs that they would thrust into the flesh of constitutional government that all who dare take issue with their vicarious arguments are promptly labeled as demagogues, bigots, and race baiters.

Nothing, of course, could be more alien to fact. These arguments were answered for all time by the immortal Georgian, Henry W. Grady, who said:

The future holds a problem, in solving which the South must stand alone; in dealing with which she must come closer together than ambition and despair have driven her, and on the outcome of which her very existence depends. This problem is to carry within her body politic two separate races, and nearly equal in number.

And further:

This burden no other people bears today—on none has it ever rested. Without precedent or companionship, the South must bear this problem, the awful responsibility of which should win the sympathy of all mankind and the protecting watchfulness of God alone, even unto the end.

Mr. Speaker, these are not merely the beautiful words of an idle dreamer. They carry with them the awful significance of the burden which has been that of the South since the shameful days of reconstruction and will continue to be the problem of the South alone. We neither need, seek, nor desire assistance; nor do we welcome interference which we know will only revive old hatreds, and will set us back a hundred years in our progress.

The greatest of all Negroes, Booker T. Washington, pointed out that:

Brains, property, and character for the Negro will settle the question of civil rights. The best course to pursue in regards to the civil-rights bill in the South is to let it alone. Let it alone, and it will settle itself.

It cannot be denied that the Negro has made great progress in the South—perhaps more than any other people in a like period of time anywhere. We of the South are proud of these great strides which our Negro friends have made. But, Mr. Speaker, they have accomplished this solely with the aid and understanding of the southern white man. Permit me to point out that none of their progress has been due in any way or to any extent to any help or contributions from the crowd that today is posing as friends of the Negro by advocating this un-American legislation.

None of this progress was due to the NAACP, the Civil Rights Congress, the National Negro Congress, or any other of these self-styled crusaders. Their only love for the Negro is based upon his political value at the moment.

Apart from the disastrous effects upon the South and her people, as well as upon the Nation as a whole, the legislative monstrosities which make up the so-called civil-rights program are of much more and further-reaching consequence.

Those who agitate for the passage of this program speak in glowing platitudes of human rights, individual dignity, and civil liberties.

It seems that they never get around to paying tribute to the document which has, through the years, preserved the dignity of the individual, and guaranteed human rights and civil liberties to all of our citizens—the Constitution of the United States. For its preservation the blood of thousands—even millions—of patriotic American citizens has been spilled; yet, by these acts those agitators would deny that democratic heritage to our people.

The founding fathers of our great Nation embodied in their Constitution a system of checks and balances—a division of governmental power—between the individual States and the Federal Government which they thought would preclude for all time to come the consequences of nationalization. To avoid the possibilities of power concentration and usurpation, they very wisely and deliberately delegated certain specified powers to the Federal Government and reserved the balance of authority to the individual States. Nowhere in the Federal Constitution did its framers provide for Federal intervention into private or social affairs, nor did they ever intend that the States be divested of their sovereignty.

It is provided by the Constitution that—

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

Yet, in utter disregard of this clear-cut statement of intent on the part of the framers of our Constitution, the President of the United States and both major political parties today demand the destruction of individual State sovereignty, and the invasion of private lives by governmental order.

Chief Justice Marshall once said:

No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States, and of compounding the American people into one common class.

In his farewell address, George Washington, the first President of the United States, stated the case against Federal intervention into State affairs:

The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Step by step, Mr. Speaker, organized minorities with selfish interests are striving to break down the lines which separate the States.

No representative government since the birth of civilization has existed successfully for so long a time as has the democratic constitutional Government of the United States, though we are still young in the sisterhood of nations. The system under which we live—the division of powers under our Constitution between the States and Federal Government—has been the chief contributor to the continuation of our democratic form of government, and our Constitution is the pillar on which that system rests.

In 1922, Mr. Speaker, the German Government was built upon a constitution patterned largely after that of the United States. Her people enjoyed a democratic representative form of government, and she had begun to bid for her proper place in world society. But gradually minority groups began to infiltrate into the organisms of her Government, continually working to undermine the local self-government of her people, and to centralize all authority in Berlin. We are, of course, familiar with the manner by which Hitler seized control of the federal police system and set up a totalitarian state there. The sequel to that story has been written in the blood of 40 nations.

Thomas Jefferson, in his first inaugural address, stated the creed of the Democratic Party, to which it has adhered consistently until this very day, in these words:

> The support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-Republican tendencies.

Abraham Lincoln, the great emancipator, and father of the present day Republican Party, held:

> To maintain inviolate the rights of the States to order and control under the Constitution their own affairs by their own judgment exclusively is essential to the preservation of the balance of power on which our institutions rest.

And again:

> No man who has sworn to support the Constitution can conscientiously vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, however expedient he may think it.

No, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party headed by President Truman is not the party of Thomas Jefferson; nor is the Republican Party of Thomas Dewey the same party that was founded by Abraham Lincoln. Their parties are now in the hands of power-hungry usurpers and pretenders.

It has been argued that Truman is carrying out the policies of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. But, Mr. Speaker, I challenge anyone to show that Roosevelt or any other American President ever sent to the Congress any such message as the so-called civil-rights proposals of President Truman. Franklin Roosevelt, on the contrary, joined his illustrious predecessors in warning his people against over centralization of government. He said:

> We are safe from the danger of • • • departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever it seems in danger.

How different are the views of the little man who succeeded him.

No, the Democratic Party of Harry Truman is not even the Democratic Party of Franklin Roosevelt.

We of the South who refuse to follow these political backsliders are not party bolters or rebels. We who balk at being continually trampled underfoot by the so-called leadership of the Democratic Party are not bolting the Democratic Party; we have waited too long for that. We were read out of that party at Philadelphia by power-crazed demagogs grappling for the support of selfish minorities. For the first time since the war for southern independence, the South is asserting her full political self-determination.

Be not deceived, the South will not support Harry Truman, Tom Dewey, Henry Wallace, or any other candidate for President who has deserted the principles of orderly, local self-government, guaranteed by the Constitution of our forefathers.

There is but one ticket for those who wish to see the continuation of constitutional States' rights government—and the Birmingham convention gave us that ticket.

The South will vote Democratic. She will vote for the only Democratic ticket offered which has endorsed and advocated the principles of the Democratic Party. Governors Thurmond and Wright are real Democrats who recognize the constitutional rights of local self-government free from bureaucratic interference. They, and they alone among the candidates, advocate a return of State capitols and county courthouses to the States and away from the banks of the Potomac. They, and they alone, advocate the continuance of the kind of democratic government which has made this Nation the world's citadel of freedom and guardian of liberty.

The States' Rights Convention in Birmingham offered a challenge to all lovers of freedom and self-determination. It offered a challenge to all who have the courage to place principle above expediency, and to Democrats and Republicans alike who wish to support the structure of constitutional government. I am confident that the people of the South, as well as those who live in other sections, still have the courage of their forefathers, and will fight to the end for the preservations of the fundamentals in which they believe.

In closing, I would like to recite to you the words of a distinguished American and defender of constitutional liberties, Daniel Webster, who stated:

> Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow grain again, and ripen to future harvests. It will be but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with States' rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Colosseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them, than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for a very fine address. He has distinguished himself in his first term in Congress and is a credit to his constituency and to the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I wish to say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that he has made a timely talk on the need for returning to constitutional government. True, the aisle divides us on many things, but on the question of maintaining constitutional government and the need for doing so if we are to remain a free people, there is no difference between us. I recall how the people of the South, after Appomatox and the Boys in Grey—returned home in tatters—took up the task of building anew and repairing the devastation resulting from one of the greatest wars of all time and that they did not receive a single cent from the Federal Government in order to accomplish that great task. They did it through their own perseverance. I have great admiration for the South. I have said on more than one occasion that I consider the agricultural South and the agricultural Midwest to be the backbone of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman, and want to state to him that I am familiar with the splendid fight which he has made over the years since he has been in Congress for the preservation of constitutional government.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I want to add to others in congratulating the gentleman on one of the best presentations of the subject I have heard in this House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after disposition of the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the Republican policy in China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DO SOMETHING TO HALT RISING PRICES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, do something to halt rising prices before the bubble bursts, while there is still time in this special session of the Congress.

The people will surely take it out on those who are supposed to represent them but who spend their time trying to pass the buck instead of fighting shoulder to shoulder to hold the line against inflation.

Far more important than any political consideration is the threat to the economic well-being of the Nation.

Experts have warned us that a crash is inevitable if the hands-off policy is continued.

The breadwinners and the housewives of the Nation knew this long ago. In every kitchen of the working people, after the children have gone to bed, husbands and wives sit up late struggling with the job of bridging the widening gap between the conservative pay envelope and the runaway cost of living.

It just cannot be done without the help of Congress.

Businessmen who should know better, because they went through the whole terrifying experience of boom and bust once before, cry to the heavens at the mere suggestion that the Congress try to help the ailing patient.

"Let the fever run its course," they say, having no constructive suggestions to offer

They will cry even louder when the purchasing power of the people falls so far behind that business suffers.

A little corrective action now can save the situation and prevent the more drastic measures which will be required if we permit the problem to get completely out of control.

Make no mistake about it, some form of control, voluntary or imposed, is needed Some people would have us think that our economy is absolutely free, which it is not. There are degrees of control and there is a difference between private and public controls, but some control is essential.

The subtle admission of that primary fact came to light when Secretary of the Treasury Snyder testified before the Senate Banking Committee on July 30 that:

> I have always believed that our chief reliance for the control of inflationary bank credit lies in the good judgment of the individual bankers in the 15,000 banks in the United States.

In order that the Secretary's remarks of that day be placed in their proper perspective, may I add that he also said:

> I believe that it is urgent in the national welfare that consumer credit control legislation be enacted as soon as possible.

On October 30, 1947, a United Press report from Washington stated:

> Representative THOMAS J. LANE, Democrat, of Massachusetts, today urged the administration to exert every influence on the Nation's bankers to get them to make only sound loans after Federal credit controls expire Saturday.
>
> LANE said that the United States is on the road to boom-and-bust which will wreck both the domestic economy and the foreign-aid program unless prompt steps are taken.

We are nearer to that disastrous showdown than we were on October 30, 1947, and what has been done to avert it?

Twice the President has called special sessions to enact such legislation as would be necessary to alleviate the distress of the American people.

And yet, no sooner was this present session called to order than a few Members pressed for an immediate adjournment, in complete defiance of public opinion.

The people are worried and angry. Something must be done to bank the fires of inflation before the mounting pressure causes an explosion which would rock the foundations of our constitutional government.

A war, a boom, a depression, another war. This has been the "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness" enjoyed by a generation of Americans.

Can they take another depression?

Gentlemen, this is a serious moment. Forewarned as to reefs toward which our economy is drifting, this Congress must take the helm. It cannot adjourn. It cannot turn its back on its responsibilities. A job remains to be done.

It would be easy for me, as a Democrat, to spend all of my time in fixing the blame for our present woes on the Republican majority of this House. I know full well that they in turn would engage in the same political maneuver with an eye not to the national welfare but to the spoils of a political victory in November.

This is no time, however, in which to play politics.

The stability of the United States and the peace of the world depend upon our willingness or our refusal to take immediate and decisive action on inflation.

Shadow-boxing with this issue will not solve it and such tactics will not fool the people.

Some blame our aid to Europe or the appropriations for defense.

Most people blame the war for inflation. Others blame big business or labor. This is begging the question. We must find not scapegoats but a remedy.

The President has suggested certain selective controls over prices and allocations. Others prefer a tightening up on bank credit and curbs on installment buying. Total consumer credit in June 1948 reached an all-time peak of over $14,000,000,000. The opposition calls for a free market in which prices would be able to find their own level through the operation of the so-called law of supply and demand. But the American economy is virtually working at capacity, and any further increase must be a slow and gradual process.

Meanwhile, rising prices are taking their human toll in lowered standards of living, in the inability to finance education, in the deterioration of housing, in the sacrifice of necessary dental and medical care; and, in the case of those who must live on pensions, fixed incomes, and social-security payments, actual denial of life-sustaining foods.

The wholesale price index has broken through the record ceiling for inflation which was reached in 1920, after the end of the First World War.

Last year the purchasing power of the dollar was only 68 cents. Today it is down to 60 cents, even a shade less as of this moment.

This bears most heavily on the millions of Americans in the lower income brackets.

The frantic bidding of the people with money for the things which were not available during the war, or for the replacement of durable items which have been used longer than they were meant to be used, is pushing the cost of living sky high and out of the reach of millions.

There are tens of billions of dollars in new money and new savings that can be cashed quickly demanding goods that are not available in sufficient supply. With three times as much spendable money, and only one and a half as much to buy, prices threaten to double. They have not yet but they are on the way.

And that can lead to bust and ruin.

Look at the facts:

The amount of paper money and metal coins in circulation has increased from $7,600,000,000 in 1939 to $28,900,000,000 in 1947. There is $21,300,000,000 more cash on the loose than there was before the war, $3.80 in cash now for every $1 then.

Time deposits or bank accounts on which we can draw amount to $56,300,000,000 contrasted with $27,100,000,000 in 1939. This represents an increased reserve of $29,200,000,000 available when and if ready cash becomes exhausted.

Very few people owned Government bonds in 1939. At the end of 1947 they possessed $31,000,000,000 of E bonds.

In cash, time deposits, and bonds, the American public had only $34,700,000,000 in 1939. By the end of 1947, this total had increased to $116,200,000,000. This is a jump of $81,500,000,000. In terms of dollar purchasing power, the American people have $3.06 for spending for every dollar they had in 1939. Even if this figure is modified in order to compensate for the lowered value of today's dollar, the increase in demand, as represented by money, is considerably greater than it was in 1939.

This money demand, as posed against supply of goods and services, is pushing the cost of living far, far too high. The

white-collar worker, the salaried worker, the older person retired and living on dividends or pension or annuity, is in desperate straits.

These reserves are being used up and installment buying is on the increase. If this continues, the end of the line is in sight. But credit keeps up the pressure on prices just as much as cash did. It must not reach the point of exhaustion, for then the whole Nation will plummet to a crash in an economic tailspin. In the absence of thrift and frugality on the part of those earning $3,000 a year and more, pressure on prices will go on to the breaking point. Far better to impose gradual restrictions on credit now as a means of holding the line until supply nears demand than to leave all to chance.

The average American is not versed in the intricacies of economics.

But from his own practical experience as a worker and as a consumer who is trying to keep a home and family together, he knows that something must be done.

Apart from his own difficulties in making both ends meet, even with the best management on his part, he senses with unerring instinct that economic anarchy threatens his Nation and the peace of the world.

He holds that Congress is responsible for constructive leadership to solve the situation.

He will not be satisfied with inaction or half-hearted, token measures designed to deceive him.

He wants national unity on this serious domestic problem. I believe that he is right in his insistence on bipartisan teamwork to bring down the cost of living at this special session of his Congress.

Only in this spirit can it be done.

The American economy is dangerously close to the edge of the spiraling road where the drop is sharp and deep.

It is essential that we control this wild and irresponsible joy ride before it leads to disaster by applying the brakes of credit control.

Not as the back-seat drivers called Democrats and Republicans, but with the single and united purpose of saving the people of the United States from being carried over the precipice of inflation to depression.

We cannot afford a repetition of 1929 in 1949.

The people are watching and judging the actions of this special session. They will not accept excuses for failure.

Halt inflation or the roof will fall in.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes, to discuss the question of the loyalty of Government employees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

INFLATION CONTROL

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Banking and Currency at this moment is in executive session to report out a bill covering some form of inflation control. For the purpose of the RECORD, in view of the fact that the matter may come before the House tomorrow, I should like to present some of the arguments that have been made in our committee up to this point, together with some statistics that will bear out the answers, so that this material will be available for the ready reference of the Members tomorrow.

CONSUMER-CREDIT CONTROL

Republican attack: The President has power to control consumer credit. When Executive Order 8843 was repealed by Congress, power was left to the President to revive regulation W if he would declare a state of national emergency. The President has given an emergency as the reason for reconvening Congress, so why does he not issue a proclamation declaring a state of national emergency and revive regulation W?

Answer: Consumer credit control is only a relatively minor point in the overall inflation-control program. In times of peace the President should not be asked to declare a national emergency for a relatively minor matter like this. The Republicans have always criticized the President for abusing his emergency powers. Do they now propose a reversal of this policy question?

The President has requested authority to reestablish consumer-credit controls on numerous occasions. His request has been endorsed by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, headed by Senator TAFT. Following the President's request of last November, a bill to give the Federal Reserve Board the necessary authority passed the Senate, but is buried in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

BANK-CREDIT CONTROL

Republican attack: The President has the power to increase the rediscount rate of the Federal Reserve banks and to stop the Government's support of the bond market and thereby check inflation.

Answer: The President has no such powers.

The rediscount rate is set by the boards of directors of the 12 Federal Reserve banks with the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The President has no power to determine their decisions.

The decision whether the open-market policy is to be continued or not is made by the open-market committee of the Federal Reserve Board, consisting of all the Board members and the presidents of five Federal Reserve banks. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board is chairman of this committee, and the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York is vice chairman of the committee. The committee's policies are determined in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury.

The members of the Federal Reserve Board are appointed by the President, but the President has no right to recall them during their stated terms of office.

It is an outright misrepresentation of facts to say that the President has the power to increase the rediscount rate or to stop the Federal Reserve Board from supporting the bond market.

The proposal to discontinue Government purchases of Government bonds is dangerous and irresponsible. Approximately $70,000,000,000 in Government securities are held at present by the 15,000 banks in this country. If market support would be discontinued, there is no way of telling how far bonds would drop. An end of the open market policy would not only effect negotiable (larger) bonds, but would spread inevitably to the E, F, and G bonds also, which are redeemable at par, because it would undermine confidence in all Government securities.

An increase in the rediscount rate alone would not stop the present credit inflation. Most industrial corporations are making such exorbitant profits at the present time that a small increase in the discount rate would not stop them from borrowing money on which they can earn a much higher rate of return.

The following is an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, July 30, 1948:

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator to say that he thought the President had power to enforce sound anti-inflationary policies, and one of the powers which he mentioned was the power to abandon Government bonds in the market and let them go down in value. Does the Senator from Ohio recommend that policy?

Mr. TAFT. I would rather have that done than to place price controls on the American people; yes. I do not think it is necessary. * * * As to a choice between that and the reimposition of price controls, I should prefer Government bonds to go below par.

EXPORT CONTROLS

Republican attack: Our large exports are one of the two main reasons for inflation. The President has powers to control exports but does not use them properly.

Answer: To blame the inflation on our exports is ridiculous. In 1947 we exported only 4.1 percent of our total national product and in 1948 we will export only 2.5 percent.

While our exports are substantially larger than they were before the war, our total national product is so much larger that we have, on the average, almost twice as much available for domestic consumption as we had before the war. All critical materials and foodstuffs are now under export control.

The tables on the attached sheets show how little of total production we are exporting in some critical fields. Moreover, a large part of exports is required under the Marshall plan, the keystone of our foreign policy. Do the Republicans propose to abandon the Marshall plan, which was adopted by an overwhelming majority of both parties in the Eightieth Congress?

United States gross national product, exports including reexports, general imports of merchandise, and the net export-import surplus in relation to gross national product, 1936–38, 1946, 1947, and first quarter 1948 at annual rate

[In billions of dollars]

	Gross national product	Exports	Imports	Net export-import surplus	Ratio of net export-import surplus to gross national product
					Percent
1936–38	88.8	3.0	2.5	0.5	0.58
1946	203.7	10.2	4.9	5.3	2.6
1947	231.8	[1] 15.3	5.7	9.6	4.1
First quarter 1948	244.3	[1] 13.2	7.1	6.1	2.5

[1] Including civilian supplies to our armed forces overseas for distribution in the occupied areas.

Exports of scarce commodities

Commodity	1939		1947		1948 estimate	
	Total supply	Percent exported	Total supply	Percent exported	Total supply	Percent exported
Lumber (billion board feet)	25.7	4.1	37.9	3.0	37.1	1.8
Motor fuel (million barrels)	64.0	6.0	745.0	4.3	791.0	3.2
Heating fuels (million barrels)	162.0	18.9	316.0	8.2	372.0	4.8
Finished steel (million tons)	35.0	7.1	63.0	10.3	65.0	7.6
Soil pipe (1,000 tons)	417.0	3.2	577.0	1.0	570.0	.9
Hardwood flooring (million board feet)	505.0	2.4	687.0	.3	830.0	.2
Meat (billion pounds)	18.3	1.2	24.7	1.1	22.7	.6

OPA HISTORY

Republican attack: The President and the Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress are responsible for having removed price controls in 1946.

Answer: The President and the large majority of Democrats in the House and Senate fought a last-ditch battle in the summer of 1946 to retain adequate price control. More than 90 percent of the Republicans under the leadership of TAFT, WHERRY, WOLCOTT, and HALLECK made an all-out effort to destroy price control.

The President vetoed the first OPA extension bill, passed on June 29, because it presented not a choice between continued price stability and inflation, but only a choice between inflation with a statute and inflation without one. The President stated:

> The bill continues the Government responsibility to stabilize the economy and at the same time destroys the Government's power to do so.

The President signed the second OPA extension bill on July 25, 1946, with reluctance. The President signed the bill because, as he said:

> I am advised that it is the best bill Congress will now pass.

He warned:

> If it appears that all the efforts of the Government and people will not be sufficient under the present legislation, I shall have no other alternative but to call the Congress back in special session to strengthen the price-control law.

The act as passed tied the President's hands completely and made it impossible to continue effective price control.

The meat incident: The act decontrolled, among other things, meat and livestock until August 20, but allowed reimposition of controls if the Price Decontrol Board so decided. In the face of soaring meat prices, the Decontrol Board reestablished ceiling prices in August, but the only result was that meat disappeared completely from the markets, and Congress had given OPA not enough money to wipe out the black markets into which meat disappeared. The President's decision to remove all meat controls on October 14, 1946, was forced by the combination of an unworkable law, a conspiracy on the part of the industry, and the lack of funds to enforce controls.

In his radio address on the night of October 14, 1946, President Truman said:

> The responsibility (for the meat shortage) rests squarely on a few men in the Congress who, in the service of selfish interests, have been determined for some time to wreck price controls no matter what the cost might be to our people. * * *
>
> The real blame * * * lies at the door of the reckless group of selfish men who, in the hope of gaining political advantage, have encouraged sellers to gamble on the destruction of price control.
>
> This group, today as in the past, is thinking in terms of millions of dollars instead of millions of people. This same group has opposed every effort of this administration to raise the standard of living and increase the opportunity for the common man. This same group hated Franklin D. Roosevelt and fought everything he stood for. This same group did its best to discredit his efforts to achieve a better life for our people.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that on these matters it is not so important to try to assess the blame at this time as it is to come out with effective controls that may be able to do the job. I am just a bit leery as to whether or not the rather flimsy measures that have been proposed in our committee will be sufficient to meet the task.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WHAT ABOUT THE LOYALTY PROGRAM OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, within the past several days the Nation's attention has been directed to allegations that during the war certain Federal employees carried on subversive activities and furnished Russian agents with confidential or restricted material. In view of these and other recent developments in the foreign situation, I think it is well to review the record and determine whether Government officials now employed approved such persons for appointments with the knowledge that there was a reasonable doubt as to their loyalty. The American people are also entitled to know whether the present loyalty policy of the executive branch is designed to adequately protect our national security.

I am particularly interested in these Federal employees loyalty matters because of my responsibility as chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. While it is not within my province to determine whether Federal employees are guilty of espionage or sabotage, I am most concerned regarding the policy which permits employees to remain on the pay roll or be employed when there is reasonable doubt as to their loyalty. I believe it is in the public interest to illustrate the policy of the Federal Government with respect to employee loyalty matters by documented evidence which is in the possession of the Government and which was ignored at the time these Federal employees were appointed. The reason I am addressing the House at this time and giving these facts is to allow the people of the United States to judge whether the present Federal employees loyalty policy meets with their approval.

In testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, Elizabeth T. Bentley mentioned Nathan Gregory Silvermaster as leader of the largest group of alleged disloyal Government employees. I am not in a position to know whether these charges regarding espionage can be supported but I can say that several of the former Government employees she named were good prospects for such activities, and this was known to Government officials at the time these employees were on the Federal pay roll.

Silvermaster was a former employee of the Maritime Labor Board, Department of Agriculture, Board of Economic Warfare, Treasury Department, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and War Assets Administration. On April 3, 1942, he applied for a position with the Board of Economic Warfare, subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission, which is the agency charged with the responsibility of determining the loyalty of applicants for Federal positions. Exhaustive investigations were conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Civil Service Commission. Evidence submitted in the Commission's investigation covered several hundred pages, and it is too lengthy to review here in detail. However, on May 22, 1942, an official of the Civil Service Commission, after reviewing the reports of investigation, made the following recommendations:

> It is my conclusion that Silvermaster is definitely either an active member of the Communist Party or so directly allied with their leaders and interests in the San Francisco Bay area, if not on a national scale, as to color and affect his service for the Federal Government. It is felt that by reason of these attachments, his continued employment in his present capacity or at all by the Federal Government can only serve to advance the cause of the Communist Party in its ultimate design to disrupt America's political and economic texture.

The investigation of Silvermaster covered a period from 1916, when he entered the United States from Russia, up to the year 1942. Scores of competent witnesses were interviewed at a half dozen places in the United States. Almost without exception those who themselves were not Communists or identified with Communist front organizations stated that he was an enthusiastic supporter of the Soviet Communist order to replace the American form of government. A good share of these witnesses identified him variously as a radical, a Communist, an active member of the Communist Party, or as active in a San Francisco unit of the Communist Party under the party name of "Serge Komov." His close friends and acquaintences, including his lawyers and doctors, according to the investigation, were either known Communists or known to be active in organizations labeled by the Attorney General as subversive. He made several material incorrect statements on his application designed to conceal his activities. This is only a part of the evidence reported in the investigation, but that which reflected on Silvermaster's questionable loyalty is documented and the testimony well corroborated. On July 1, 1940 he transferred to the Department of Agriculture from the Maritime Labor Board. The confidential files of the Agriculture Department during his employment there contained correspondence between officials of the Resettlement Administration and officials of the San Francisco section of the American Legion.

The American Legion reported that Silvermaster had close associations with Sam Darcy, west coast Communist functionary. Further, that he was a member of the Fillmore section of the Communist Party. Also that he was active in protesting the discharge of California State employees who had been dismissed because of radical activities. The Legion reported that many of his associates are of doubtful loyalty and that one of the American Legion officials had reviewed Mr. Silvermaster's doctoral thesis and found it to be extremely pro-Soviet.

The Commission's investigation shows that at the time Silvermaster's present wife received a divorce from her former husband, a question arose as to the custody of their child. Mrs. Silvermaster's former husband apparently believed she would marry Silvermaster, and because he apparently doubted Silvermaster's loyalty the following stipulation was incorporated in the interlocutory decree, which was entered on July 10, 1929:

> Both parties agree that neither shall remove the child from the United States without the consent of the other party given in writing, and the parties agree that the child shall be educated in the accepted American principles in the spirit of American freedom and democracy, and that he shall not be exposed to communistic or antireligious teachings.

This is a rather strange stipulation in a divorce decree, unless there was a reasonable doubt as to whether Silvermaster was a loyal American.

While the Commission's investigation was in progress, Military Intelligence investigated Silvermaster who was then on detail from the Department of Agriculture to the Board of Economic Warfare. G–2 was interested in Silvermaster because of his access to confidential information which the Board of Economic Warfare received from the Military Establishment. After its investigation, G–2 recommended the Board of Economic Warfare to remove Silvermaster from their offices. Officials in the BEW handed G–2's investigation to Silvermaster to answer, and then advised G–2 that the charges against Silvermaster were unfounded. Meanwhile, Silvermaster was called before the Civil Service Commission to explain his activities which had been uncovered during the investigation. Much of the evidence he admitted.

At this point the investigation was dropped. Silvermaster remained at the Agriculture Department. Later, however, in December of 1944 top officials presently employed in the Civil Service Commission, over the objections of subordinate officials, approved Silvermaster's transfer to the Treasury Department because, in the words of the Commission:

> There was no reasonable doubt as to his loyalty to the United States.

From here on Silvermaster transferred from one agency to another with relative ease, and his salary rapidly increased from $6,500 per annum to $10,000 a year at the War Assets Administration, from which he finally resigned voluntarily in November 1946. In all, Silvermaster worked for the Federal Government approximately 11 years, for which the people of the United States paid him more than $50,000. At retirement age he will be eligible to receive from the Government an annuity of approximately $500 a year.

This Silvermaster case is typical of many of those employees mentioned before congressional committees recently. For all the good these investigations did, they might as well have not been conducted. I do not care how much evidence of disloyalty is obtained by our Government investigators, if the policy-making officials and appointing officers do not have the courage to remove or refuse to employ persons about whom there is a reasonable doubt as to their loyalty, such investigations are a farce and the hundreds of millions of dollars spent for them by the American people have been wasted.

Testimony before the Un-American Activities Committee also included Donald Niven Wheeler, an employee of the Office of Strategic Services, who was a member of the alleged spy ring headed by Victor Perlo. Over the adverse recommendations of officials of the Civil Service Commission which were based upon evidence that Mr. Wheeler had followed the Communist Party line to such an extent as to affect adversely his suitability for Government employment, the Civil Service Commission, in October 1942, found Wheeler eligible for Federal employment. During the course of the investigation, it was established that he was a member of several Communist front organizations, one of which was identified by the Attorney General as subversive, and that he was admittedly sympathetic to such organizations, and further, that he had followed the Communist Party line during its various shifts prior and subsequent to the Hitler-Stalin pact.

Various competent witnesses identified Wheeler as extremely radical and not fit for any responsible or confidential position in the Federal service. It is interesting to observe that one of the witnesses contacted during the investigation of Wheeler was William Ludwig Ullman, in the Treasury Department, who was also alleged to have been a member of a spy ring. Mr. Ullman stated the following concerning Mr. Wheeler:

> I think he is a loyal American citizen. I do know, however, that his name appeared on the Dies list which was publicized some time after he left here, but I never knew of any reasons to doubt his loyalty. I never heard him offer any views on world politics or discuss such matters at all.

On the basis of this kind of evidence, Mr. Alfred Klein, chief law officer of the Civil Service Commission, recommended Wheeler's eligibility and stated:

> His activities and associations which are listed on the unfavorable side are characteristic of many liberals and does not necessarily mean that he is a Communist or Communist sympathizer.

Mr. Farrar Smith, another official of the Civil Service Commission, agreed with Mr. Klein's recommendation. The Civil Service Commission reviewed the case and unanimously agreed that Mr. Wheeler was eligible for Federal employment.

I have talked with many persons who appear to be surprised to learn that William W. Remington, an employee of the Commerce Department, could be considered for, or actually transferred to, other strategic positions in the Federal Government while under investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for subversive activities.

This has been the policy ever since the Federal Employees' Loyalty Program began in 1939, and exists at the present time. I have called attention to this situation on numerous occasions. In fact, it was one of the principal reasons that prompted me to introduce the Federal employees' loyalty bill, which passed the House by a big majority on July 15, 1947. Under that legislation, it would be impossible for a person to be appointed to a Federal position while under investigation for subversive activities. The Commission and the executive branch at the hearings on this measure objected to that provision in the bill and stated that it had always been the practice to employ persons or transfer employees subject to investigation, even when there was derogatory information concerning the loyalty of such persons.

Testimony before the Civil Service subcommittee in July 1946 showed that employees remained for years in strategic, confidential, and responsible Government positions although their loyalty was seriously questioned.

Time and time again these matters have been brought to the attention of the executive branch. Beginning in

1944, I repeatedly urged the then chairman of the House Civil Service Committee to investigate derelictions of duty by officials in the executive branch in employing persons of doubtful loyalty. Finally, in the summer of 1946, a three-man subcommittee was appointed to study the Federal employees' loyalty program. I was designated as a minority member of this subcommittee. Hearings were rushed and secret, evidence was glossed over, testimony of some competent witnesses ignored, and a rather superficial report was made, to which I took strong exception.

These hearings were made available to the Department of Justice. Competent witnesses mentioned critically Government top-level handling and clearing of many Federal employees, some of whom were then on the Federal pay roll. At the time of the hearing in July 1946, at which a representative of the Department of Justice was present, witnesses testified that Nathan Gregory Silvermaster was still employed by the Federal Government, and that he had been appointed over the objections of officials of the Civil Service Commission, whose conclusions had been based upon the evidence I have mentioned above. One witness stated that Mr. Silvermaster insisted upon an investigation of his suitability prior to his transfer from the Department of Agriculture. It was pointed out that if the Civil Service Commission cleared him, he could transfer without losing his position with the Department of Agriculture. However, even if a strong loyalty case were made against him and he stayed with the Department of Agriculture, the Commission would have no authority to remove him. Since Silvermaster appeared to be satisfactory to the officials of the Department of Agriculture he could probably remain there as long as he desired. It happened, however, that his precautions were unnecessary. The Civil Service Commission cleared Silvermaster and he was at liberty to transfer to any department or agency of the Government.

On the basis of these hearings the President appointed a committee to study the problems of Federal employees' loyalty. Did he name outstanding and recognized authorities on subversive activities such as J. Edgar Hoover or one of his assistants? Did he name a Member of Congress on the committee? He did not. He began by naming as Chairman a special assistant to the Attorney General who had little qualifications. He named as other members of his committee various Federal officials who were responsible for the then existing Federal employees' loyalty policies. After months of delay the committee filed its report which stated in effect that everything was fine. The American people could rest easy. There were no employees of doubtful loyalty on the Federal pay roll. The Canadian Government spy case could never happen in the United States.

In March 1947 the President issued his Federal Employees' Loyalty Executive Order. The only new feature was the creation of a host of loyalty boards within the agencies. Also, a Loyalty Review Board was created. Was it a strong independent Board? Was its existence based on legislation outlining congressional policy? No; it was to be under the Civil Service Commission and its officials, whose do-little-or-nothing policy on Federal employment loyalty matters prompted the first congressional investigation back in 1946. We were right back where we had started.

The question has been asked me many times how persons like Silvermaster and his kind get on the Federal pay roll. Let me give you several examples of what happened during the war and what is happening today.

In 1941 the head of a war agency publicly stated that he would abide by the decisions of the Civil Service Commission with respect to loyalty matters concerning employees in his agency. Mrs. Rose Eden applied for a position in this war agency. I shall not go into detail as to the information obtained during the investigation. However, in his opinion on the case, Mr. Alfred Klein, chief law officer of the Civil Service Commission, made the following statement:

> A reading of the record leaves the reader with the strong conviction that Mrs. Eden has been an almost religious follower of the Communist Party line and may even be a member of the Communist Party.

These are strong words from Mr. Klein. The Commission held that Mrs. Eden was unsuitable on loyalty grounds for Federal service and suggested to the head of this war agency that this employee be removed. The director of personnel of this war agency wrote to the Civil Service Commission and stated the following:

> This is in reference to your letter of August * * * in connection with the case of Mrs. Rose Eden. We have also a previous letter from you addressed to our agency in which you suggest that Mrs. Eden's employment be terminated. After careful consideration and examination of the facts concerning this case, we have decided to retain Mrs. Eden in our employ.

Thus, the loyalty investigations become window dressing to lull the American people into a false sense of security.

Another example. During the war, an employee, Alice Dannenberg, was appointed to a position in a Federal agency, subject to investigation. Without reviewing in detail the evidence which was in the possession of the Government, Mr. Alfred Klein, chief law officer of the Civil Service Commission, stated:

> Miss Dannenberg has, by her own admissions, placed herself in radical and communistic company. In the light of all the information in the record relative to Miss Dannenberg's activities and associations, most of which was obtained directly from Miss Dannenberg herself, it is apparent that, if not actually communistic, she has marked Communist sympathies and many Communist associations which raise considerable doubt concerning her entire suitability for Government employment. I, therefore join with the Investigations Division in recommending her ineligibility and removal.

Two other top staff officials, including the chief examiner, agreed with Mr. Klein, and the Civil Service Commission unanimously ordered her removal. The Commission then requested the employing agency to terminate Miss Dannenberg's employment. Did the agency take appropriate action? It did not.

Two months later under pressure from top officials in the agency concerned, the Civil Service Commission reviewed the case, and the same Civil Service Commissioners who had approved Miss Dannenberg's removal now reversed themselves and approved her appointment. No additional evidence had been obtained.

A new statement prepared for the Commissioners contained the following:

> The report of the personal investigation is overwhelmingly in favor of this employee.

Of course, this change of policy may have been affected by the fact that according to a note attached to the memorandum the head of the agency had requested that this case be reviewed.

In its second letter to the agency, the Commission stated:

> On reconsideration, it is the conclusion of the Commission that the questions involved in the case may be resolved in favor of Miss Dannenberg, and no objection will be made to her continued employment.

Of course, I had always thought the American people desired that in loyalty matters involving Government employees, questions of doubt be resolved in favor of our Government. This I consider quite important. On the basis of this incident, the entire policy of the Civil Service Commission was changed and all subordinate officials of the Commission were advised by a confidential memorandum that in the future the head of this agency was to be furnished "a report of information on every investigated case prior to final decision of the case." This, in my judgment, reflects seriously upon the integrity of the Civil Service Commission in its relationship with Federal agencies on employee matters, and becomes a device to nullify loyalty investigations. I wonder how many other such agreements are in existence at the present time?

Another example. During the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Civil Service Committee in 1946, testimony corroborated by competent witnesses who were personally familiar with the situation cast further doubt upon the integrity of some Government officials. It appears that upon several occasions an agency's investigators not connected with the Civil Service Commission reviewed the confidential files of the Commission and then confronted witnesses with their testimony in an effort to get these witnesses to change their statements.

Some time ago a personnel director in one of the Federal agencies conferred with Mr. Alfred Klein, chief law officer of the Civil Service Commission, in an effort to determine what the Commission's policy was with respect to the loyalty of Federal employees. According to an interoffice memorandum in the files of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Klein stated:

> In the course of our conversation, the personnel director took occasion to remark that the Commission is not consistent in its actions. As illustration he pointed to cases

in which there is a voluminous pro-Communist or fellow-traveling history and we nevertheless find the individual eligible, perhaps because the individual is in an important position. At the same time, he says, the Commission will order the dismissal of an individual who happens to have signed a Communist petition in 1939 at the request of someone, the record of the individual being otherwise clear in all respects.

I agree with this personnel director, but it is an understatement of the facts to say that the Commission's loyalty policy is inconsistent. To say the least, it is confusing, haphazard, and almost completely irresponsible.

Several months ago I called attention to Mr. Jesse Epstein, a regional director of the Federal Public Housing Authority on the west coast. Mr. Epstein assumed his position in June 1945, and is still employed by the Federal Public Housing Authority. The FBI conducted an investigation of him in 1942, which revealed that at least eight reliable witnesses stated while in college and subsequently he was a member of the Communist Party or was actively associated with Communist-front organizations and publications. A subversive check at a metropolitan police department shows him on a list of known Communists. Subsequent to 1942, he has been investigated several times by Government agencies. These reports were and are available to the Civil Service Commission and to the FPHA. More recently the joint legislative fact-finding committee on un-American activities of the Washington State Legislature held hearings in January and February 1948 with respect to subversive activities in the State of Washington. Two former self-avowed Communist Party members identified Jesse Epstein as a member of the Communist Party with whom they had close association.

These witnesses stated that they had been to Communist Party meetings with him, and that he was introduced at such meetings as Comrade Epstein. One witness in particular stated:

> Jesse Epstein was down there on what was explained to me as a functionary of the Communist Party trying to guide us.

According to the latest information the Loyalty Board of the Federal Public Housing Authority has cleared Jesse Epstein, and the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission has rendered an advisory opinion that there was no reasonable doubt as to his loyalty to the United States. At any rate, despite all of the derogatory information which raises a reasonable doubt of Epstein's loyalty to the United States, he has remained on the Federal pay roll since 1945, at an average salary of about $9,000 a year.

Recently I have found other cases involving employees of doubtful loyalty, which further illustrates what the executive branch is withholding from the American people. For example, some time ago the Civil Service Commission, which is generally responsible for determining the loyalty of Federal employees, received information raising a question regarding the loyalty of an employee. Several Government officials recommended that this employee be removed from her position. The report on the case reached Washington and the Investigations Division of the Commission also recommended the employee's removal. Later, the Commission reversed these findings, rated the employee eligible and closed the case.

A few months later the loyalty of another employee who works in the San Francisco office of the Civil Service Commission was questioned. This employee, Mrs. Evelyn Crawford, was investigated and a report forwarded to Washington by the regional director. He stated that it would not be advisable to take a more drastic action in the case of Mrs. Crawford than was taken in the previous case, because the evidence was no more damaging, and the Commission would have extreme difficulty in vindicating itself if Mrs. Crawford were removed and the other employee retained. After reviewing the evidence, the Investigations Division recommended that Mrs. Crawford be removed on the basis of the following information.

In September 1929, this employee married Matthew H. Crawford, reputed to be an active Communist in California. Among the organizations of which he was a member were the executive committee of the National Scottsboro Action Committee and the advisory counsel of the San Franciso Communist Workers School.

At one time it was reported he was the treasurer of the Communist Party in San Francisco. His associates in these and other Communist-front organizations included such well-known Communists as Joseph Brodsky and William Z. Foster, the latter presently under indictment by a Federal grand jury in New York for activities against the United States. Further, the information in the possession of the Commission contained a police department record showing that Mrs. Crawford attended Communist Party meetings with her husband in San Francisco. The records of the highly reliable Office of Naval Intelligence indicated that Mrs. Crawford was an active Communist member who keeps under cover.

The investigation further showed that Communist meetings were held in the Crawford home and neighbors stated they believed the Crawfords to be Communists and that Communist literature urging the election of Browder for President was circulated from their home.

Carrying a recommendation for removal from both the Investigations Division and the Director of Personnel, the case of Mrs. Crawford then went to the Commission's top staff men. Mr. Klein stated:

> So far as Mrs. Crawford is concerned, I do not think the record justly supports the conclusion that she is a Communist or Communist sympathizer. The real question then is whether the association with her husband is in itself sufficient to raise a reasonable doubt as to her loyalty. • • • In the present case we have no showing that Mrs. Crawford is anti-Communist or that her views on political questions differ from those of her husband's.

On the basis of this reasoning, this Commission official concluded that the record merited an eligible rating. The case then went to Mr. Smith, assistant to the Chief Examiner, who agreed that Mrs. Crawford should be declared eligible, but he devoted most of his comments to criticisms of the regional director in San Francisco. He stated:

> Your attention is called to the district manager's recommendation. I am amazed by its contents, because this is the first time I have seen a recommendation from a responsible subordinate official of the Commission which included a statement that reflects seriously upon the very integrity of the Commissioners themselves.

Apparently what amazed this top staff official was the fact that the regional director had stated:

> I cannot guarantee Mrs. Crawford's dependability from the standpoint of loyalty any more than I can guarantee the dependability of the other employee in this respect. Therefore, so long as the other employee is retained in our service without regard to the information obtained through the investigation of her record, I would recommend that Mrs. Crawford be retained in our service without regard to the information obtained through the investigation of her case.

The Commissioners then agreed that an explanation was required from the regional director for his letter to the Commission, so at Government expense the regional director was brought to Washington to show cause why he had expressed an honest opinion to the Commission.

Meanwhile, the Crawford case was referred to the head of the Legal Division of the Commission, who recommended that she be removed. In view of this difference of opinion, it was agreed that the case would be returned to the regional director who was to interview her. However, Mrs. Crawford's memory had not improved. She did not know whether her husband was a Communist or not. She had never seen any evidence that would indicate that he was a member of the Communist Party. She stated that Louise Thompson, a well-known Communist, was an old friend of 20 years' standing, and that she had visited Louise Thompson in her home in Chicago, but she did not know whether Mrs. Thompson was a Communist. Mrs. Crawford stated that Langston Hughes had been a recent visitor in her home. The record shows that William Patterson had been a visitor in the Crawford home. All these associates are well-known Communists.

The case of Mrs. Crawford eventually arrived in the Investigations Division and again her removal was recommended. Finally, despite the information raising considerable doubt concerning her loyalty, and the adverse recommendations of subordinate officials, the Commission reached the absurd conclusion that she was suitable for Government employment.

One Commissioner stated:

> There is little if any real evidence that Crawford is a Communist.

The 1948 report of the Joint Fact Finding Committee of the California Legislature on Communist Front Organizations states that a reception was held in honor of a reputed Communist leader, and among those sponsoring the reception which was for the benefit of the Communist California Labor School were Mr. and Mrs. Matthew Crawford.

Mrs. Crawford has been employed by the Civil Service Commission at San Francisco for the past 8 years, and at present is Assistant Chief, Placement Services Section. She occupies an important position in which she exercises control over the selection and placement of Federal employees. She has access to confidential information relating to employment and investigation of Federal employees.

Now the question is: What was the policy of the Civil Service Commission in approving for Government employment persons whose loyalty to the United States is questionable? In my judgment, the reasoning of the Civil Service Commission and its final action in this case is typical of its policy during the past 7 years. We find the Commission ignoring evidence and disregarding information contained in reports of investigation which raises a reasonable doubt with respect to the loyalty of certain Federal employees.

In these and other cases we find Commission officials stating that there is little if any evidence to justify the removal of employees whose investigations contain little if any favorable information. It has always been my opinion that where there is a reasonable doubt regarding the loyalty of a Federal employee, the question should be resolved in favor of the Government.

But over this period of time what has the Civil Service Commission told Congress with respect to its policies? One of the Civil Service Commissioners testified before a House appropriations subcommittee as follows:

> In connection with all our investigations we are keeping this policy in mind; if we find anybody who has had any associations with Communists or the German Bund, or any foreign organization of that kind, that person is disqualified immediately. All doubts are being resolved in favor of the Government.

Upon other occasions when this Commissioner has been questioned about this policy of the Civil Service Commission, he has replied:

> It is absolutely sound today, and is the same fundamental policy we are following. • • • We do not conceive it to be our function to ask the people of this country to take a chance on an individual employee because it has not been established that he really belongs in jail instead of in a Government job.

The cases which I have submitted are examples of how this alleged policy is put into operation. Apparently the real policy of the Commission and the executive branch is to tell Congress one thing and do another.

This is the record. These are the facts which have been withheld from the American people and more recently been denied the Congress through a Presidential directive ordering the departments and agencies to refuse congressional requests regarding reports, records, and files relating to the loyalty of Federal employees and prospective employees. With or without charges of espionage and spy rings the performance to date is one of which the American people cannot be proud.

With the foreign situation in a highly inflammable state, we can ill afford the luxury of employees of doubtful loyalty on the Federal pay roll, and we can less afford a policy in the executive branch which I have demonstrated has existed for the past several years.

On the other hand, we must not become hysterical and discharge everyone who has had a liberal thought or who has talked with a Communist or who has been seen with a Communist, but certainly we must not turn our faces away from the facts. Government employment is a trust and privilege. We must give more than lip service to the principle that American people are entitled above all to have in Government service only those loyal to the United States with doubts resolved in favor of the Government.

In my opinion, the record requires an explanation. In the near future I shall request the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to conduct hearings with respect to present policies, procedures and activities of the various department and agency loyalty boards. Those top Government officials who have ignored the facts contained in reports of investigation raising serious doubts regarding the loyalty of Federal employees should explain their actions.

The real answer to these Federal employee-loyalty problems is both an effective removal procedure in the case of employees of doubtful loyalty and adequate means of preventing the initial employment of such persons.

Let me not be misunderstood. I realize this is a serious matter. I am in favor of seeing to it that every person suspected with subversive activities or views, is given adequate consideration. No one would deny them of every right to which they are entitled. On the other hand the hundreds of thousands of loyal employees in the Federal Government, as well as the American people to whom all Government employees are responsible for their services, are entitled to protection against any and all persons of doubtful loyalties and subversive views.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorials from the Christian Science Monitor, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and the Washington Daily News.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Messrs. MACKINNON and LUCAS (at the request of Mr. GWINN of New York), on account of official business for the Committee on Education and Labor, at the request of Hon. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR., chairman.

VETERANS' FLIGHT TRAINING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been enormous interest among the Members of Congress in the subject of flight training, and the regulations, issued by the Veterans' Administration, which they believe are too strict and not in accordance with the law.

Because of this interest I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and give a short résumé of what has been done by our Committee on Veterans' Affairs in this regard. I think the Members will get a good deal of solace from the promises of General Gray. We will have to take further action if the change of policy does not help the veterans receive this flight training to which they are entitled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I wish to inform the Members of Congress—and a great number of them have asked me about it—that our committee has held two closed hearings in the past 2 days, at which time the subject of aviation flight training under the so-called GI bill of rights was gone into most thoroughly.

As witnesses we had before us Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. H. V. Stirling, Assistant Administrator for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, and other officials from the Veterans' Administration under whose direction the flight-training program is handled.

The specific matter under consideration was the interpretation of Veterans' Administration Instruction No. 1, dated June 30, 1948, which dealt with the application of the provision of Public Law No. 862, Eightieth Congress, prohibiting expenditure of Government funds for courses avocational or recreational in character.

This Public Law No. 862, Eightieth Congress, contained the following proviso and limitation:

> *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation for education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, shall be expended for tuition, fees, or other charges, or for subsistence allowance, for any course elected or commenced by a veteran on or subsequent to July 1, 1948, and which is determined by the Administrator to be avocational or recreational in character. For the purpose of this proviso, education or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly or related aviation courses in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation, shall not be considered avocational or recreational.

The instruction sheet when received in the various regional offices of the Veterans' Administration became the subject of varying degrees of interpretation, with a resultant lack of approval of many applications for flight training.

General Gray testified that he had just returned from an extensive trip across the country and that he was unaware, until he reached Washington, of any divergence among his regional managers in their interpretation of the instruction, and he did not know heretofore that there had been instances where additional instructions over that particular directive had been issued by certain branch offices. In this regard, General Gray stated:

If there are instructions contrary to these instructions—and I learned possibly that there had been this morning—I will rescind them at once.

Continuing, General Gray said:

Let me say again, as I have said before, and I would like to reiterate it for emphasis, that it is most unfortunate that in this trip of mine across the continent twice since this instruction was issued no one has brought it to my personal attention in the field, and, therefore, I was not cognizant of the fact that there was this difficulty until I was advised a couple of days ago of your desire that I be up here at 10 o'clock today, and when I asked what it was all about I was told yesterday that it was along these lines, and in order that I might become acquainted with what you had questions on I asked Mr. Stirling to meet me here this morning. I have found that these conditions did exist. They were not brought to my attention in the field, and I am going to do my level best to correct them.

During the discussion before the Committee a great deal of consideration was given to a phrase in the instruction sheet which provided that an elementary flight or private pilot course elected by a veteran in an approved school shall not be considered avocational or recreational in character if the veteran submits to the regional office complete justification that such course is in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation. It was maintained by members of the Committee that the term "complete justification" was entirely too all-embracing and that its application by the regional managers had resulted in a virtual stoppage of new entrants in flight training courses.

Assistant Administrator Sterling disclosed that the key officials from the various regional offices of the Veterans' Administration were being brought to Washington for a meeting on Sunday, August 8, at which time General Gray and his officials will present the viewpoint of the Administration regarding flight training.

BLAIR HOUSE AND BLAIR-LEE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Blair House and Blair-Lee House comprise one of our Government's whitest white elephants as they stand today. These two beautiful buildings are now used by our State Department to accommodate guests visiting our shores from foreign countries. They serve this useful purpose only about one-fourth of the year, and the greater part of the year they simply stand idle.

Meanwhile, one of the most important of our public offices has no place available for living quarters. Our Vice President must scramble for living accommodations where he can find them. He has no regular residence provided for him by our Government. I am certain that most of our people are completely unaware of this fact.

If there were an official residence for our Vice Presidents, this would make for far greater dignity and importance for the Vice Presidency than we have achieved at any time in our history.

One of the candidates for the Presidency has already stated publicly that he will give his Vice Presidential running mate a larger share in the handling of Government problems than any previous Vice President has ever received. If this candidate is elected, and there is some reason to believe that he will be, the location of the second in command directly across the street from the White House will be a splendid step. It will make possible an effective two-man team doing the hard work of the Presidency and Vice Presidency without undue effort.

If it were possible to utilize either the Blair House or the Blair-Lee House by establishing an official residence there directly across the street from the White House, the Vice President would be in a position where he could really participate in the planning and counseling which might be most valuable to the Nation. In fact, such a residence in close proximity to the White House might well contribute to the establishment of closer relations between the two responsible heads of our executive department and make possible a continuity of policy in the event of a Presidential disability.

I believe this is entirely feasible and have asked the State Department to furnish me with the number of persons housed and the number of man-days during which housing was provided in connection with that number of persons at each of the two houses during 1947 and 1948. They are as follows:

Fiscal year 1947

Category	Number of official visits	Number of persons involved	Man-days of housing provided
1. Heads of state and ranking foreign officials:			
Blair House	11	75	310
Blair-Lee House	6	31	165
2. Foreign guests invited to the United States under the program for the international exchange of persons: Blair-Lee House		57	126
Total number of persons involved and man-days of housing provided during the fiscal year 1947		163	539

Fiscal year 1948

Category	Number of official visits	Number of persons involved	Man-days of housing provided
1. Heads of state and ranking foreign officials:			
Blair House	3	19	67
Blair-Lee House	8	46	205
2. Foreign guests invited to the United States under the program for the international exchange of persons: Blair-Lee House		38	133
Total number of persons involved and man-days of housing provided during the fiscal year 1948		103	405

The State Department has stated that these two houses are utilized for miscellaneous official functions such as luncheons, dinners, and receptions. The following table shows the number of these during the years 1947 and 1948:

	Fiscal year 1947	Fiscal year 1948
Functions for foreign officials other than those given specifically in connection with the program for the international exchange of persons	45	76
Functions specifically in connection with the program for the international exchange of persons	22	23
Total	67	99

The general upkeep of the property is already an item on our taxpayer's list as are the salaries of the help who take care of the houses as is seen from the following:

MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL AND THEIR SALARIES

The following is a list of the regular personnel employed for maintaining the houses and the annual salaries of each for each of the fiscal years 1947 and 1948:

Title of employee	Annual salaries	
	Fiscal year 1947	Fiscal year 1948
Housekeeper-hostess (Blair and Blair-Lee Houses)	$4,400.40	$4,560.68
Cook (Blair and Blair-Lee Houses)	2,400.00	2,160.00
Assistant housekeeper (Blair-Lee House)	1,954.00	2,020.54
Janitor-horseman	1,954.00	2,020.54
Parlor maid	1,455.60	1,503.00

In addition to the regular employees listed above, butlers, chambermaids, kitchenmaids and waiters are hired by the day as required.

From the above, it is reasonable to assume that one house can serve the purpose for which both are being used now. In addition to utilizing our resources to the best advantage, this is an opportunity for our Government to take a step forward in the development of our governmental techniques. If the Vice President is to be a regular member of the team instead of a utility outfielder, he ought to be sitting right there on the bench instead of up in the grandstand. And we certainly should consider him to have housing priority over our visiting dignitaries.

Let us put one of these houses to good use by taking it from the Department of State and getting it ready for regular "War-r-en-Tear."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 5, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1713. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting copies of a resolution adopted by the Guam Congress on May 1, 1948, concerning land acquisition for military purposes in the Tumon Bay area, and a letter of transmittal signed by the Honorable Simon A. Sanchez, secretary, House of Council; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1714. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of recoveries collected by the United States for damage caused to naval vessels that were settled under the act of December 5, 1945 (Public Law 248, 79th Cong., 1st sess.) during the fiscal year 1947–48; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1715. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of claims for damage caused by naval vessels which were settled under Public Law 417 during the fiscal year 1947–48; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1716. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1717. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control covering the period January 1 to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 707. Resolution making in order motions to suspend the rules, motions for a recess, and the consideration of reports from the Committee on Rules; without amendment (Rept. No. 2451). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EATON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 212. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 2452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2453. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2454. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. Senate Joint Resolution 157. Joint resolution to provide for the regulation of consumer credit for a temporary period; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7098. A bill to amend section 2 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 7099. A bill relating to actions in the District of Columbia for breach of promise to marry; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa:

H. R. 7100. A bill to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7101. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 the qualifying age for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7102. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act by liberalizing benefits, by increasing amounts beneficiaries may earn without loss of benefits, and by lowering the age of eligibility of women beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGARVEY:

H. R. 7103. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 7104. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 7105. A bill to exempt admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 7106. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 7107. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of Stonington, Conn.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 7108. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 7109. A bill to reimpose the excess-profits tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 7110. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgages of certain veterans housing corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 7111. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence; to provide for the notification thereof to foreign governments; to provide for the assumption by the government of Puerto Rico of obligations under the treaty with Spain on December 10, 1898; to define trade and other relations between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the calling of a convention to frame a constitution for the government of the island of Puerto Rico; to provide for certain mandatory provisions of the proposed constitution; to provide for the submission of the constitution to the people of Puerto Rico and its submission to the President of the United States for his approval; to provide for the adjustment of property rights between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the maintenance of military, coaling, and naval stations by the United States on the island of Puerto Rico until the termination of the war between the United States and Germany and Japan; to continue in force certain statutes until independence has been acknowledged; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 7112. A bill to provide emergency relief for livestock farmers in drought-stricken areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 7113. A bill to promote the development in the area of the Central Valley Federal reclamation project, California, of reasonably sized, owner-operated farms; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7114. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. J. Res. 442. Joint resolution on recognition of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 7115. A bill for the relief of August Henrikson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7116. A bill for the relief of Egon Newman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7117. A bill for the relief of Peter I. Tirbak, Ekaterina Tirbak, and Igor Tirbak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 7118. A bill for the relief of Jack Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2140. The SPEAKER presented a petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 16, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1948

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all goodness, we are again coming unto Thee in prayer, encouraged by every gracious invitation in Thy holy word and compelled by many needs which Thou alone canst supply.

Wilt Thou bless in some special way the chosen representatives of our Republic who have been entrusted with the affairs of Government. May they daily come to the sacrament of public service richly endowed with clear judgment and wise decision.

Help us to believe that it is our high calling as a nation to bring the blessings of democracy and freedom to all mankind. Hasten the day when the chasms which divide the numbers of the human family shall be bridged by friendship and good will.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 4, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader will be kind enough to give the Senate some idea of what is contemplated in the way of business today.

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as the Senate adjourned last night, we are proceeding in the morning hour. There will not, of course, be a call of the calendar. There are several matters which I think should be taken up. I have been informed almost hourly that there would be ready a bill from the Banking and Currency Committee, and I had hoped it would be here by this time and that it could come up immediately for consideration and discussion. I think that will happen before long. So it was my idea that the Senate should proceed with the business of the morning hour, such as the introduction of bills, insertions in the RECORD, and short statements which Senators might like to make. There are one or two Senators who would like to make speeches, but I hope that we may be shortly able to take up the bill, which I am satisfied will be reported, provided unanimous consent can be obtained for its consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to have the acting majority leader, if he will, enter into a unanimous-consent agreement as to the order of business at the conclusion of the morning hour. I have no desire whatever to delay the business of the Senate; indeed, I am anxious in every way to expedite it, and I think we could expedite it greatly if there were a unanimous-consent agreement as to the status of business under the application of the Senate rules upon the conclusion of the morning hour.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection to proposing a unanimous-consent agreement if it will expedite the business of the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the morning business, or at not later than the hour of 1 o'clock, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and that the Presiding Officer thereupon lay before the Senate the unfinished business; namely, Senate bill 2644, the civil transport aircraft bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I inquire, What is the effect of the unanimous-consent agreement? Does the bill referred to become the pending business?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; at the conclusion of the morning business, or not later than 1 o'clock.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to make a further inquiry, if the Senator will permit me. Then that bill will have the status of any other bill that comes before the Senate as the unfinished business.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; it will be the pending business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the request, but I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. At the conclusion of the morning business, would not the unfinished business be automatically laid before the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. Ordinarily it would at 2 o'clock; but if the agreement is entered into, then it would come before the Senate at not later than 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is correct.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

REPORT ON LABOR DISPUTE IN BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 738)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Lester Giffen, of Wendover, Utah, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide price controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by AMVET Post No. 14 of World War II, of Macon, Ga., favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate housing for veterans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Serena Flavin, of Glen Carbon, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing relief for the teachers and the Glen Carbon Public School, Illinois; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A cablegram in the nature of a petition from the Council of Voluntary Agencies, United States Zone, APO 407, urging immediate action to implement the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTROL OF PRICES, ETC.—PETITIONS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference numerous petitions signed by sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation relating to rising prices, rent control, housing, minimum wage, social security, and labor, and I request that one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petitions will be received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and one of the petitions will be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached.

The petition is as follows:

We, the undersigned, members of local 181, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, Hazleton, Pa., urge that the special session of Congress take action on the following important issues:

1. Cost of living: Measures should be adopted to control rising prices, which have increased 30 percent since the end of OPA in June 1946.

2. Rent control: The present rent-control law should be strengthened and extended beyond the present deadline.

3. Housing: Congress should provide Federal aid for low-cost housing and local slum clearance by passing the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

4. Minimum wage: The minimum wage, which has not been changed since 1938, should be raised from 40 to 75 cents an hour.

5. Social security: The social-security law of 1935 should be amended to increase the amount of benefits paid and to extend the number of workers covered by the law.

6. Labor legislation: Congress should take action immediately to repeal the vicious Taft-Hartley Act, which has needlessly complicated union-management relations at the expense of organized labor.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF FRANKLIN, N. H.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a telegram signed by Eugene S. Daniell, Jr., mayor of Franklin, N. H., embodying a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Franklin relating to the high cost of living.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANKLIN, N. H., *August 3, 1948.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolution relating to the present high cost of living

Whereas the cost of food (particularly meat), clothing, and the other necessities of life has risen so rapidly as to sharply reduce the living standard of the citizens of this city, and to seriously endanger the welfare and health of many; and

Whereas Congress is now in session and both major political parties have pledged a remedy to this situation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Franklin unanimously urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to take immediate and effective steps to remedy this situation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by telegram to Senators CHARLES W. TOBEY and STYLES BRIDGES and Congressmen CHESTER E. MERROW and NORRIS COTTON for whatever action they deem most expedient.

Approved.

EUGENE S. DANIELL, Jr., *Mayor.*

Passed August 1948.
A true copy.
Attest:

MILDRED S. GILMAN,
City Clerk.

REQUEST FOR HEARING ON HOUSING AND ANTI-INFLATION MEASURES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a telegram which I have received today from H. W. Fraser, chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association, asking to be heard on any new housing measure or anti-inflation measure which may be considered at the special session.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. J. J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Railway labor regards as imperative the passage of adequate housing and anti-inflation measures before the special session adjourns. I urge you and your associates on behalf of a million and a quarter railroad workers to press for action on these two basic problems. We must have good laws on both if our economy is to avoid increasing difficulties in the months immediately ahead. Our people desire to be heard on any new housing measure or any anti-inflation measure which this special session may consider. Please address reply to 1412 East Pikes Peak Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colo. Same telegram to the Honorables CHARLES W. TOBEY and J. J. SPARKMAN of the Senate and JESSE P. WOLCOTT and BRENT SPENCE of the House.

H. W. FRASER,
Chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association.

RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE ADDITIONAL REPORTS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Relations With International Organizations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is presently engaged in a study and analysis of all legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress, first and second sessions, dealing with United States relations with international organizations.

The subcommittee expects to present this material in the form of a report to the Senate within the next 6 weeks. Inasmuch as we do not now know definitely what additional legislation of this type may be enacted by the present special session, and inasmuch as the duration of the special session is still uncertain, I request unanimous consent to file additional reports of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during the recess period.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2928. A bill for the relief of Seweryn Cajtung, Masza Cajtung, Ryszard Cajtung, Stefa Pizyc, and Frania Goldberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2929. A bill for the relief of Victor A. Gorenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2930. A bill for the relief of Miklos Kenedi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BALL introduced Senate Joint Resolution 239, to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS TO FILE REPORT

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations this morning, the committee agreed unanimously that in view of the over-all situation it would be wise to ask for an extension of time for that committee in which to make its final report on the Taft-Hartley Act. The present requirement is that we make our report by January 2, 1949. It was unanimously agreed that that would not give us sufficient time, and that it would be difficult to get the members of the committee back in December of this year. We have agreed unanimously to ask for an extension until March 1, 1949. It does not require additional funds. The committee has sufficient funds with which to carry on for the extra 2 months. I am sure we can make a better report if we do not have to proceed with only a partial committee working on it here in December. I send to the desk a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent that the rules be suspended so that it may be immediately considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 239) to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 403 of Title IV of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by striking out the words "January 2, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "March 1, 1949."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXPOSURE OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of the exposure of Communist activities in government, which appears in the Appendix.]

JAMES E. WATSON

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem in tribute to the late Honorable James E. Watson, former Senator from Indiana, by Mark E. Winings, of Elwood, Ind., which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPHUS DANIELS BY L. P. McLENDON

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to the late Josephus Daniels by Mr. L. P. McLendon, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL-TAX FILIBUSTER—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Poll-Tax Filibuster," published in the New York Times of July 31, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SPECIAL SESSION OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Week on Capitol Hill," from the New York Times of August 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

FILIBUSTERS IN THE SENATE—EDITORIAL FROM THE TAMPA (FLA.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Filibusters in the Senate," published in the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR PEPPER, OF FLORIDA—EDITORIAL FROM THE JEWISH FLORIDIAN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator CLAUDE PEPPER," published in the Jewish Floridian (Miami, Fla.), July 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTES TO KENNETH W. SIMONS, LATE EDITOR OF BISMARCK (N. DAK.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him and a statement by M. J. Connolly, secretary of the North Dakota Automobile Club, and assistant secretary of the Greater North Dakota Association, in tribute to the late Kenneth W. Simons, editor of the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, which appear in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT—STATEMENT BY FARM LEADERS

[Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement

signed by A. S. Goss, master of the National Grange; Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation; and James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, relative to the International Wheat Agreement, together with a synopsis of questions and answers relating thereto, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE LIBERTY BELL—ARTICLE BY FRED BRENCKMAN

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Liberty Bell" written by Fred Brenckman, and published in the National Grange Monthly, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRATIC PARTY PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY DORIS FLEESON

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Impulse to Suicide," written by Doris Fleeson and published in the Washington Evening Star of August 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSUMER CREDIT OUT OF HAND—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Consumer Credit Held 'Out of Hand'," written by Greg McGregor, and published in the New York Times of August 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

REIMPOSITION OF CURBS ON CONSUMER CREDIT—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "One Inflation Check," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of July 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA FEEDS ON AMERICAN FEUDS—LETTER FROM W. J. LITTRELL

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by W. J. Littrell of Laurel, Miss., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE THIRD PARTY—ARTICLE BY ALFRED BAKER LEWIS

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Following F. D. R.'s Policies: Third Party Hit," written by Alfred Baker Lewis, a member of the American Federation of Teachers, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED NOMINATION OF WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS TO BE PRESIDENT

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD telegraphic correspondence between Chester Bowles, Leon Henderson, and Walter Reuther, and Mrs. Elliott Dexter, of Encino, Calif., regarding the proposed nomination of William O. Douglas as Democratic nominee for President, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT—STATEMENT BY ALVIN A. BURGER

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Alvin A. Burger entitled "Federal Civilian Employees Keeps Going Up," which appears in the Appendix.]

HIGH PRICES AND THE COST OF LIVING

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain letters and telegrams addressed to him relative to proposed anti-inflation and other legislation as well as a letter addressed by him under date of August 3, 1948, to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], which appear in the Appendix.]

STATES' RIGHTS AND CIVIL RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY J. A. THIGPEN

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "States' Rights—Civil Rights. What Is It All About?" written by J. A. Thigpen, member of the House of Representatives of Mississippi, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE J. WATIES WARING

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on August 3, 1948, there appeared in the Charleston News and Courier, in my native city, an article which says that a statement by me in connection with the appointment of Judge J. Waties Waring was not correct. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"COTTON ED" SMITH'S SON SAYS MAYBANK NOMINATED WARING

LYNCHBURG, August 2.—There may be some confusion in other parts over the currently hot question of "Who recommended Judge Waring?", but not the slightest doubt exists in the mind of Farley Smith, son of the late Senator Ellison D. (Cotton Ed) Smith.

Recommendation of Federal judges rests with each State's senators, Mr. Smith said, adding that at the time of Judge J. Waties Waring's appointment (December 19, 1941), South Carolina's Senators were his father and Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK.

"It most assuredly was not my father who recommended him and there was only one other man who could have done so: Senator MAYBANK."

The issue was raised the last time by United States Representative W. J. BRYAN DORN, a candidate for Senator MAYBANK's Senate seat. In a campaign speech at Greenwood on Wednesday, Mr. DORN referred to a previous statement by Senator MAYBANK that Judge Waring was appointed on the recommendation of Senator Smith.

Then Mr. DORN said he had talked with "Smith's son and daughter and they were shocked and amazed" that their father's name "was brought into the race in such a manner."

Tonight Senator Smith's son, Farley, now a candidate for election to the State house of representatives, said Mr. DORN had quoted his sentiments in the matter with complete accuracy.

"Everybody knows that my father was an outspoken critic of President Roosevelt's New Deal," Mr. Smith declared. "President Roosevelt attempted to 'purge' him in 1938. Roosevelt told my father in the presence of witnesses that he (Senator Smith) would never get to name anybody to another Federal job.

"After that, my father couldn't have had a post-office clerk appointed. His last appointment of a Federal judge was Judge Alva Lumpkin.

"Any statement that my father recommended Judge Waring is absolutely erroneous.

"Furthermore, Waring was not my father's first, second, third, fourth, or fifth choice. If Waring's name had gone down as No. 1 on my father's list he never would have been appointed.

"Anybody who had my father's stamp of approval would have been marked for defeat from the start.

"There were only two people who could have made the recommendation: My father and Senator MAYBANK, and it wasn't my father."

A newspaper account dated November 28, 1941, and published in the News and Courier, said that Senator Smith, cognizant of his unpopularity with the New Deal, refused to recommend any single individual. Instead, he prepared a list of 10 lawyers whom he considered "well qualified" and sent them to Senator MAYBANK.

The newspaper account said that "Senator MAYBANK, waiting to submit a list, is believed to have taken his senior colleague at his word and said, in effect, 'O. K., Waties Waring suits me'."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, at no time have I stated that the appointment of Judge Waring was made solely upon the recommendation of Senator Smith. I stated, "I joined with Senator Smith in recommending the appointment of Judge Waring, who at that time was conceded to be a stanch and loyal Democrat of the Jeffersonian school." I further stated that Senator Smith had recommended Mr. Waring to be judge before I was ever a United States Senator.

Mr. President, I have the official documents showing the basis for my statement, as follows:

Exhibit 1: The original letter signed by the Attorney General.

Exhibit 2: My reply to the Attorney General's letter.

Exhibit 3: The Attorney General's reply to me.

Exhibit 4: The letter the Attorney General wrote to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator Van Nuys, January 9, 1942, copy of which I obtained from Mr. Young, of the committee, yesterday.

I ask that these letters be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., November 7, 1941.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Pursuant to our conversation this morning, there is attached a list of names that were submitted to this Department in November of 1940 by former Senator Byrnes for consideration in connection with the judicial vacancies in South Carolina.

On October 1 of this year Senator Smith called at this office and submitted a list of names for consideration. This list is also attached. There is some duplication in the names.

There is also attached a summary of such information as we have on each of these candidates.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

EXHIBIT 2

NOVEMBER 10, 1941.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Thanks for sending me the list of persons recommended by Senator Smith for judge in South Carolina.

I would agree to the confirmation of any one of the gentlemen named by Senator Smith, or any lawyer in South Carolina, who, after investigation, is nominated by the President.

The first vacancy created was in the eastern district. The second man on the list recommended by Senator Smith is Mr. J. Waties Waring, of Charleston. I join in this recommendation by Senator Smith of Mr. Waring for judge of the eastern district.

As to the appointment of a judge for the eastern and western districts, the headquarters of this judge are in Columbia. I recommend for the appointment Mr. George Bell Timmerman, of Lexington, S. C. Lexington is approximately 15 miles from Columbia.

The name of Mr. Timmerman does not appear on the list submitted by Senator Smith, but I know that Mr. Timmerman has been a friend and political supporter of Senator Smith, and I feel satisfied he will have no objection to him. His qualifications are testified to by many lawyers and judges, whose endorsements have been filed with the Department.

Sincerely yours,

BURNET R. MAYBANK.

EXHIBIT 3

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., November 14, 1941.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: Thank you very much for writing me about your suggestions for filling the vacancies in South Carolina, which I shall discuss with the President at the earliest opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE.

EXHIBIT 4

JANUARY 9, 1942.

Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee of the Senate, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There is now pending before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate a nomination in favor of Hon. J. Waties Waring to be United States district judge for the eastern district of South Carolina, and a nomination in favor of Hon. George Bell Timmerman to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of South Carolina. These nominations were submitted to the President after careful investigation and study, following the recommendations of both Senators of South Carolina.

On October 1, 1941, Senator E. D. Smith, together with his son, Mr. E. D. Smith, Jr., who, I understand, serves as his secretary, called at this Department to discuss the appointments and left a memorandum containing nine names. The Senator stated that the selection of any one of the names mentioned would be highly agreeable to him. In response to a request that he name his first three choices, he designated Mr. Christie Benet, Mr. Waties Waring, and Mr. Angus H. Macaulay. There is attached a photostatic copy of the memorandum which Senator Smith left, with notations made as to these choices. This was done in his presence and at his direction.

Thereafter, Senator Smith from time to time wrote a letter in behalf of other prominent lawyers of South Carolina, indicating that he would interpose no objection should they be selected for one or the other of these judicial posts. On November 27, Mr. Linton M. Collins, Acting Assistant to the Attorney General, saw Senator Smith in his office. At that time the Senator urged that some action be taken early, and mentioned the names of Mr. Waring and Mr. Timmerman, indicating that they were acceptable. At the request of Mr. Collins, Senator Smith wrote a letter on that date, in which he stated that he would have no objection to the confirmation of Mr. Timmerman. A photostatic copy of that letter is attached for your information.

On the morning of December 4, I personally called upon Senator Smith at his office and advised him that after careful study of all the candidates I believed that Mr. Waring and Mr. Timmerman were the best choices and that I would recommend their nominations. He gave me full assurances that he would interpose no objection to their confirmation and indicated that he thought they were splendid selections.

This information is forwarded to you for your consideration in connection with the confirmation of these nominations. I sincerely hope that there may be an early approval by your committee, followed by favorable action in the Senate.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, after Senator Smith had made the recommendation, Mr. Benet called on me at the Governor's Mansion while I was Governor, just before I became United States Senator, and again called upon me in Washington, and asked me to help in every way I could to have Mr. Waring appointed.

After Mr. Benet requested me to cooperate with Senator Smith in having Mr. Waring appointed, and since Mr. Waring was Senator Smith's second choice, I agreed. While I cooperated with Senator Smith, never once did I speak to President Roosevelt regarding the appointment, nor did I discuss the matter with him at any time.

Let me add that I have the greatest respect for the memory of my former distinguished colleague, Senator Smith, and I know if he had lived he would verify my statement. He and I worked together in the United States Senate for more than 4 years without any dissension.

In justice to myself, I felt I should call attention to the records of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and the Department of Justice.

I have the records showing the executive nomination, the notice of the hearing, and the confirmation.

I might say that the records of the Committee on the Judiciary, which I read in the committee, show that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], was the chairman of the subcommittee, and that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the distinguished chairman of the committee, was present at the meeting, the other member of the subcommittee having been Senator Murdock, of Utah, who is no longer a Member of the Senate.

I am certain that the Senator from Arizona is fully familiar with the facts I have stated. He called on me to come to the meeting, but I did not go, and he called Senator Smith to attend the meeting, and Senator Smith appeared at the meeting in behalf of Judge Waring. That is the record of the Committee on the Judiciary. I have already submitted the correspondence for the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1 minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in regard to the nomination of Judge Waring, to which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has just referred, I wish to state that I was appointed by the then chairman of the Judiciary Committee to be chairman of a subcommittee to consider this nomination, and notice was given of the hearing on the nomination, as provided for by the rules of the Judiciary Committee. No one appeared at that hearing. I telephoned the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and asked him if he cared to appear; but he informed me that he was willing to stand by whatever the then senior Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Smith, might recommend in regard to the nomination. The senior Senator from South Carolina appeared before the full committee in behalf of Judge Waring, and endorsed his nomination. It is my opinion that the nomination of Judge Waring would not have been confirmed had Senator Smith not approved it. I say that because of the high esteem in which Senator Smith was held by the members of the Judiciary Committee and by the Senate.

THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. LODGE. The first matter I desire to read is an editorial from the New York Times under date of Wednesday, August 4, 1948, entitled "The Wheat Agreement." Inasmuch as this is one of the matters now pending in the Congress, I believe Senators will be interested to hear this brief editorial which I think succinctly expresses some of the reasons why this matter should not be taken up now. I am not speaking of its fundamental merits for the future. I read the editorial, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 4, 1948]

THE WHEAT AGREEMENT

Commenting on the nine "miscellaneous" matters listed by the President last week as requiring legislation at the present special session of Congress, we expressed the opinion here that with respect to five of them there seemed to us to be no good reason for rushing action. Mr. Truman's demand for ratification by the Senate of the proposed International Wheat Agreement is typical.

This proposal for setting up of what can best be described as a Government-sponsored wheat cartel was described by Senator VANDENBERG the other day as "one of the most complicated and controversial agreements ever submitted for our consideration." The plan, he pointed out, was not sent to the Senate for ratification until April 30, last, and approval was called for by July 1. Yet last week Mr. Truman said he had "good

reason to believe that it can still be made effective if ratified promptly."

It is difficult to understand why immediate action should be asked. Since July 1, to complicate matters, Britain, Canada, Australia, Ireland, New Zealand, and Denmark have bowed out on the agreement (though it is conceivable that they might be induced to return if we ratified) and our Department of Agriculture has announced its goal for the 1948–49 wheat crop, calling for a reduction in wheat acreage. There is nothing in the Department's announced program to indicate that its plans were based in any way on approval of the wheat agreement.

Senator VANDENBERG's comment that the proposed agreement is highly controversial is not an overstatement. Under its terms Canada, Australia, and the United States as exporting countries (two of the largest, Russia and Argentina, have elected to remain on the outside) would contract to sell to the importing member countries 500,000,000 bushels of wheat annually at prices fixed by upper and lower limits. The American export quota is 185,000,000 bushels. For 1948–49 the maximum price is $2, the minimum $1.50. What it would come down to at the present time is this: The $2 maximum, which would be the effective price for us, is figured on No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat laid down at Fort William, Canada. Its equivalent in Kansas City is around $1.88. But under our own farm support program the price of wheat at Kansas City is guaranteed today at approximately $2.24 a bushel. Obviously if the Government is going to sell wheat at $1.88 for which it has to pay $2.24 itself, this implies a subsidy of 36 cents on each bushel exported. We would thus be whipsawed, as it were, between two subsidies. With one we would be supporting domestic prices, with the other reducing prices on 185,000,000 bushels of export grain.

As it happens, there is not the slightest pressure, other than vocal, on us to make a decision this month or next, or even next year or the year after. The reason is to be found in the Marshall plan. It was originally estimated by the Economic Cooperation Administration that wheat exports for the coming crop year would be around 300,000,000 bushels. Reports from Washington yesterday indicated that as a result of the unexpected improvement in the grain outlook here and the unexpectedly large amounts of grain being sought by importing countries the goal had been raised tentatively to 450,000,000 buahels and might go higher. These figures should effectively dispel any illusions that only by jumping blindly into such a permanent export policy as that embraced by the wheat agreement can this country avoid a catastrophic wheat carry-over at the end of the coming crop year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts still has the floor.

HOUSING AND SUBSISTENCE NEEDS—LETTER FROM MSGR. DANIEL J. DONOVAN

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, under a separate heading in the RECORD I should like to read a letter which I have received from a constituent of mine on another point. This letter comes from the Very Reverend Monsignor Daniel J. Donovan, and it contains so much wisdom and understanding that I feel I should make it available to all the Members of the Senate, so I shall read it. It is very brief:

BOSTON, MASS., *July 29, 1948.*

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: Today I forwarded to Senator SALTONSTALL a copy of a flier distributed by the Communist Party of Massachusetts at the doors of the textile manufacturing buildings in this district. I am sorry that I have not another copy of it to send you, for I know you would like to see it. It was an appeal to the readers to write to the national legislators regarding proposed measures in the present session of Congress.

Waving aside the pro-Soviet features of the article, I do feel, nevertheless, that the current indifference of our legislators in Washington to the housing and subsistence needs of millions of low-salaried citizens is appalling. I am sure that other millions like myself are convinced it is the most effective way to multiply Communists and communistic sympathizers in our land.

To us who are thoroughly anticommunistic, but whose close experiences with ordinary people give us a sad understanding of their present grave needs of adequate housing and of income enough to buy the basic foods, fuel, and clothing, the present situation is ominous.

I feel it makes no difference at all to the man in the street, including myself, who called the present session of Congress, or what his motives were. The essential fact is that there is a crying need for relief in those two important phases of life for our citizens—housing and reasonably fixed purchasing power to get the material necessities of life.

To make such essentials the football of partisan politics at this time is to invite the scorn of millions of our citizens and to increase resentment among those suffering to the point where they will turn in desperation to communism for the relief that our traditionally sound parties could have attempted to give them.

With kindest feelings of personal esteem for you, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
(Very Rev. Msgr.) DANIEL J. DONOVAN,
St. James Rectory.

Mr. President, I have assured Monsignor Donovan of my complete sympathy with his viewpoint and of my strong conviction that we must take practical and effective action on the vital problems of which he writes.

SOLICITOR GENERAL PHILIP B. PERLMAN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maryland is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I desire to present for the RECORD the outstanding services and accomplishments of Mr. Philip B. Perlman since he has been the Solicitor General of the United States and to present briefly the record before the Supreme Court and in other respects that he has made since he has occupied that high office.

It will be recalled that the President sent Mr. Perlman's nomination to the Senate on January 31, 1947. He was confirmed July 26, 1947, and sworn in on July 31, 1947, 6 months after his nomination reached the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary dealing with the matter, held up the nomination for 3½ months before beginning hearings, until the last week of the first session of the Eightieth Congress.

On the floor of the Senate, on the last day of the session, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] further delayed the confirmation of the nomination, but fortunately it was finally disposed of before the Senate adjourned.

I now present to the Senate the record Mr. Perlman has made since he was confirmed. During the October 1947 term of court Mr. Perlman personally argued a total of 12 cases before the Supreme Court of the United States. One of the cases was not decided, and was set for reargument in the October 1948 term. Of the 11 cases decided, Mr. Perlman was successful in 8, and in each one of the 3 adverse decisions he lost the case only by a vote of 5 to 4 in the Supreme Court.

During the term the Government had a total of 69 cases for argument in the Supreme Court. The Solicitor General was in general charge of all these cases, and made the assignments of counsel for the arguments. The Government won 51 of the 69 cases tried in that term of court. The Solicitor General and his staff accounted for 37 of the arguments, and the other arguments on these cases were made by attorneys for other divisions of the Department of Justice and from other governmental agencies.

Mr. Perlman, the Solicitor General, argued about one-third, or almost 33 percent, of all the cases handled by his office for the Government. Only two other lawyers argued as many as six cases each, so that Mr. Periman argued twice as many cases in the Supreme Court as the highest number by any other Government attorney during the term.

Among the cases argued and won by Mr. Perlman were the three cases involving the constitutionality and application of the Renegotiation Acts, a decision that involved sums in excess of $10,000,000,000; the case involving the constitutionality of the Rent Control Act; the cases involving the enforcibility of racial restrictive covenants on real property; and the two cases in which the Supreme Court held that the Government has the right to subpena and use records, the keeping of which is required by law, without automatically granting immunity from prosecution under the Compulsory Testimony Act.

During the term the Solicitor General filed in the Supreme Court 29 petitions for writs of certiorari, of which 19 were granted. On the other hand, 305 petitions for writs of certiorari were filed against the Government, and a brief was filed in each one of these 305 cases. The Supreme Court denied 283 of these petitions, granting but 22.

The Baltimore Sun of Thursday, June 24, 1948, contains an article by Mr. Robert W. Ruth entitled "Record Made by Perlman—Solicitor General Wins 51 of 69 Cases for United States in Year." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD MADE BY PERLMAN—SOLICITOR GENERAL WINS 51 OF 69 CASES FOR UNITED STATES IN YEAR

(By Robert W. Ruth)

WASHINGTON, June 23.—Philip B. Perlman, United States Solicitor General, has played a leading role in helping establish one of the most impressive records ever marked up by the Justice Department during a single Supreme Court term.

The Baltimorean, who outranks all other Marylanders in the executive branch, has now been in Washington almost a year. He was sworn in on July 31 after a prolonged battle with Senator FERGUSON (Republican, of Michigan) over his confirmation, and even then his name was narrowly squeezed in for Senate approval during the closing rush of Congress last year.

Attachés of the Justice Department and the Supreme Court assert that he is serving with distinction, that the Justices have gotten to know the Marylander well through his frequent appearances before the high tribunal, and that he fits well into the tradition of able men, such as William D. Mitchell and John W. Davis, who have held the Solicitor General's job.

WON 51, LOST 18 CASES

In terms of statistics, Mr. Perlman's record looks well even against the background of an unusually successful year of Department litigation before the Supreme Court.

Of the 69 cases handled through the Department and actually decided by the Court, the Government was successful in 51, unsuccessful in 18. In the memory of one Court official, this is as good as the Department has ever done.

According to Tom C. Clark, Attorney General, the Department won more antitrust cases than during any other term.

Although Mr. Perlman himself appeared in few trust cases, he and his staff argued 37 cases. Of these, 3 were set over for reargument, 24 won and 10 lost—a much above average record.

PERLMAN APPEARED PERSONALLY

In sharp contrast to his immediate predecessor, J. HOWARD MCGRATH, present Democratic Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Perlman has gone personally before the Court in case after case, which has built up for him a reputation as a hard worker.

He himself has argued 12 cases, about a third of the total presented by his staff. His score runs: eight won, three lost, and one set for reargument.

Appearing in cutaway and striped trousers, speaking clearly and with dignity—although he is not a facile talker—Mr. Perlman has fought through the following cases decided in the Government's favor:

Three involving the validity of the Renegotiation Act—the Government's war powers authority to renegotiate contracts was upheld, thus legalizing Federal collection of more than $10,000,000,000.

RACIAL REALTY AGREEMENTS

Unenforceability of racial restrictive covenants—a 6-to-0 decision barred courts from enforcing real-estate agreements which raise racial barriers in all-white neighborhoods.

Validity of the Rent Control Act—a decision setting aside a Cleveland District Court ruling declaring the 1947 Rent Control Act invalid on grounds the country is "in fact" at peace, thus rendering the War Powers Act inapplicable.

Habeas corpus writs sought by enemy aliens—under nineteenth-century statute the Government can deport enemy aliens during war. In this case the German aliens resisted when the Government started to deport them after the war. The Government had contended it was not physically possible to deport them during the conflict. The Supreme Court upheld the Government view that the aliens could be deported after the war.

Cases involving production of documents, which might incriminate—an individual has a right to refuse to produce papers which might incriminate him. An exception, however, is a public document. The Supreme Court sustained the Government view that OPA requirements that businessmen keep sales records kept those records from being private records that need not be produced if they incriminate.

According to Arnold Raum, senior member of Mr. Perlman's staff, the renegotiation, racial covenant, and rent cases were particularly important.

Mr. TYDINGS. In conclusion I should like to say that those who care to examine into the facts will find that no Solicitor General of the United States has ever had a more successful record during the short time he has occupied that office than has Mr. Perlman. I make this statement because I think he is entitled to have it made, considering the long delay between the time the nomination came to the Senate and 6 months later, when the nomination was confirmed.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I hope to see the international wheat agreement voted out favorably because to postpone it is, I believe, to kill the agreement. The market has fallen materially since the agreement was negotiated, and we should not forget that the wheat which we are pledged to supply under the Marshall plan we shall have to buy, no matter what the price, and it can be applied on our commitments under the wheat agreement. This combination probably will never happen again. I feel that to fail to ratify this agreement at this session is a desertion of American agriculture. I do not intend to be guilty of doing so.

CLIFFORD K. BERRYMAN

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I learned this morning that today, August 4, marks the sixty-second anniversary of the arrival in Washington from Kentucky of a very great and influential man, Clifford K. Berryman, of the Washington Evening Star, and I should like to pay my compliments to him and to his profession.

In the American political tradition, few commentators have had more influence than the political illustrators and caricaturists. It was one of them, Thomas Nast, who gave us the symbols for our two great parties.

Cliff Berryman, both by the span of his years and the brilliance of his work, has been as responsible as any other for the maintenance of that tradition.

His pen is barbed, but it is guided always by the warmth of deep human feeling. It has always been a constructive influence. His cartoons are editorials of great significance to national affairs.

VETERANS' FLIGHT-TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a statement I presented to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on August 3, 1948, in connection with its executive session on the interpretation of Public Law 862, Eightieth Congress, by the Veterans' Administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR C. WAYLAND BROOKS, OF ILLINOIS, TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS ON AUGUST 3, 1948

Perhaps no other Member of Congress has been closer to the veterans' flight training program than I have. It, therefore, comes as a distinct shock to me to be informed by many of my constituents that the Veterans' Administration has so obviously misinterpreted and misapplied the intent and will of Congress, as expressed in the amendment to the proviso in Public Law 862, Eightieth Congress.

Despite the fact that Congress expressly provided by this statute (Public Law 862, 80th Cong.) that GI flight training courses, in cases where veterans elected them in connection with their present or contemplated business or occupational activities, shall not be considered as avocational or recreational, nevertheless, many field officers are misunderstanding or misapplying rulings from the Veterans' Administration central offices by arbitrarily stating that GI flight training courses are avocational or recreational and a veteran shall therefore not be entitled to elect them.

This unwarranted interpretation is being accomplished in two ways—first, Veterans' Administration regional offices, relying upon General Gray's Instruction No. 1 of June 30, 1948, are demanding that the veteran must show complete justification for electing the courses, going so far in certain instances to demand affidavits from present and prospective employers as the basis for complete justification. Secondly, Veterans' Administration regional offices, because they are unwilling to use the authority delegated to them by the Administrator to interpret and apply complete justification, are refusing to pass judgment for GI flight training courses which are pending stating that they will not rule thereon without more explicit and understandable instructions from the Veterans' Administration central office.

It was never my intention and I am sure it was never the intention of my colleagues in the Senate or of the Members of the House to pass the amendment to the proviso of Public Law 862, Eightieth Congress, to give to the Veterans' Administration and its regional and branch offices unrestricted right and power to pass judgment on the motives of veterans in the use of their entitlements for GI flight training or any other courses. It was our sole intention to empower them to declare certain courses avocational or recreational where they were obviously so with the distinct exception that this power should not extend to GI flight training courses where such courses were designed to give to the veteran instruction or training for his present or contemplated occupation. In other words, both the Senate and House were considering what the veteran expected to do and the word "contemplated" was intended to imply that the veteran was thinking about pursuing such an

occupation. Rarely is a contemplated occupation one which has a promised job waiting completion of a training. The contemplated occupation of a medical student is the practice of medicine, even though no hospital has offered him a post on its staff. The contemplated occupation of a law student is the practice of law and does not assure a position in a law firm. It is an unprecedented twisting of ordinary language, as contained in Instruction No. 1, which states that a veteran while still a trainee cannot have a contemplated occupation unless he has an affidavit in his hand from a prospective employer.

Accordingly, I feel that the central office of the Veterans' Administration should rescind all of its instructions applicable to GI flight training and replace them with new instructions which will more clearly, accurately and fairly give to veterans their rightful entitlements. To these ends, I believe that an affidavit from the veteran to the effect that he wishes to elect GI flight-training courses "in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation" should be adequate and should entitle him to enroll in the course he elects without delay. Only by taking such action immediately can grave injustice to the veteran be averted.

THE POLL TAX

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, yesterday during the debate certain figures and statistics were given relative to Mississippi, with reference to our primary elections and other matters. At that time there was no oportunity to correct the figures or to submit other figures which make the picture more complete. For that reason I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared relative to this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the debate on H. R. 29, certain figures were cited relative to the State of Mississippi. Without questioning the authenticity of the figures, it is only fair to point out that virtually all of those cited with reference to Mississippi were either out of date or present a distorted picture of the actual condition.

At one point the per capita income of citizens of Mississippi was listed at $123, as compared with a national average of $368. I should like to call attention to the Department of Commerce estimates for the year 1945, which list the per capita income of citizens of Mississippi at $556, as compared with a national average of $1,325. It is evident from this comparison that Mississippi's income is increasing at a greater average than that of the Nation as a whole.

There are those of us in the South who contend that our section has too long been held in a type of economic bondage that corresponds in some respects to the type of political bondage that might result if various types of ill-considered legislation were to be allowed to become law.

Figures were presented showing the percentage of the population participating in general congressional elections in Mississippi in 1946, and much was made of the relatively low percentage of the population of the various districts which participated in these general elections. I should like to point out that there was no opposition to any of the seven nominees cited in this chart. Naturally, only a small fraction of the qualified electorate took the trouble to cast a ballot.

In Mississippi, elections are decided in the primaries. In 1946 there were four congressional seats contested in the primaries, and I submit the percentages of this vote, as a fairer test:

District	Population	Primary vote	Percentage
1. Rankin	269,367	25,208	9.2
5. Winstead	261,466	28,227	10.8
6. Colmer	319,635	44,623	13.9
7. Williams	470,781	39,364	8.4

Even the congressional primaries are not a fair test of the voting strength of Mississippi, however. With the exception of an occasional district judgeship, no other elective offices are at stake in these primaries. In the vast majority of our States, all types of State, district, and local offices are elected in the same primaries and general elections which choose Members of Congress.

In Mississippi our State and local officers are chosen at 4-year intervals. The most recent primary, which chose nominees for all offices from governor down to constable, was held in August of 1947. In this primary 365,228 citizens cast votes for governor, in contrast with 191,806 who participated in the last State-wide congressional primary.

There are no exact figures available as to the number of qualified electors for the Democratic primary, but an official, authoritative estimate places this figure at 560,000. This figure includes those who were declared not eligible to vote for reason of not having paid poll taxes. So it can be seen that actually 65 percent of the qualified electors participated in the general primary. That figure, I submit, compares favorably with most of the States of the Union.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] indulged in rather extended comments on the President's national health insurance program. I believe we all remember that quite recently Mr. Bernard Baruch made some remarks quite different in tone from those delivered by the Senator from Missouri. He said in part, referring to the problem of paying for medical care:

> Nothing has been suggested so far, which promises success, other than some form of insurance covering these people by law and financed by the Government, at least in part—what some would call "compulsory health insurance."

Because Members of the Congress, who are well aware of the excellence of Mr. Baruch's advice on various matters may not be aware of the fact that Mr. Baruch's father, Dr. Simon Baruch, was one of the Nation's pioneers in physical medicine and may not be thoroughly aware of Mr. Baruch's long and expert acquaintance with the field, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Dr. Howard Rusk, entitled "Baruch Committee Spurs Aid to Physically Handicapped," which appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times, be set forth in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks. The article succinctly describes what a remarkable job has been done for the physically handicapped in the amazingly short period of 5 years by the Baruch Committee on Physical Medicine. It is just one more evidence of Bernard Baruch's great service to the American people. It is evidence, too, that when Mr. Baruch talks of the economics of medicine he is speaking as one who knows the field.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARUCH COMMITTEE SPURS AID TO PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED—MAJOR OBJECTIVES SET 5 YEARS AGO REACHED—MANY SCHOOLS COOPERATE IN PLAN

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

Of 20,000,000 men examined for selective service during the last war, more than three-quarters of a million were found to have gross physical disabilities, such as amputations, blindness, deafness, a congenitally short leg, club foot, or a withered arm, disabilities requiring intensive physical rehabilitation. Realizing that another large group of disabled persons would be discovered in case of another draft or universal military training, Bernard M. Baruch, in his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee last March, advocated "some compulsory means of rehabilitating youths with physical and mental defects that can be corrected."

Mr. Baruch's recommendation is based on a long-time interest in the problems of handicapped persons. A man noted for his ability to concentrate on a single task until it is accomplished, he was convinced during the early days of World War II that full use was not being made of the specialty of physical medicine in the rehabilitation either of the war disabled or the far greater number of civilian handicapped. Consequently, in October 1943, he invited a committee of 40 scientists, headed by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, chancellor of Stanford University, to draw up a plan for the development of physical medicine for this country, and in 1944, founded the Baruch Committee on Physical Medicine in memory of his father, Dr. Simon Baruch, the first professor of hydrology at Columbia University, and one of the Nation's pioneers in physical medicine.

Major objectives of the committee were: (1) to increase the number of physicians trained to teach and use physical medicine; (2) to provide for more extensive basic and clinical research in physical medicine; and (3) to insure its proper use in relation to wartime rehabilitation and peacetime preparedness.

ALL OBJECTIVES ACHIEVED

In the annual report of the committee, issued last week, Dr. Frank Krusen, director, asserts that those major objectives have been achieved in less than 5 years.

The effect of the committee's efforts on increasing opportunities for training physicians and other personnel in physical medicine, the first objective, is shown by the fact that, when the committee was organized, there were only five approved residencies or fellowships in physical medicine available annually in three medical centers. Today there are 70 such residencies and fellowships available annually at 34 medical centers. Compared with 30 medical schools then offering instruction in physical medicine, there are now 60, just double the original number. Many physicians trained under Baruch fellowships are now teaching in large medical centers or directing programs in Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Since the establishment of the committee the American Board of Physical Medicine has been organized and officially recognized by the American Medical Association as the sixteenth medical specialty.

SIMILAR PROGRESS RECORDED

Similar progress has been made in the achievement of the second objective, providing for more extensive basic and clinical research. The report, in addition to summarizing the general advancement in physical medicine, outlines current research being carried on in 12 leading medical colleges in the therapeutic utilization of the science of physics through the use of heat, cold, light, water, electricity, massage, muscle reeducation, therapeutic exercise and physical rehabilitation.

Gains in insuring the proper use of physical medicine in relation to wartime rehabilitation and physical preparedness are made evident by the fact that rehabilitation and physical medicine services have been made a regular service in all military and VA hospitals, and are gradually being introduced on a wider scale in civilian medical centers.

ALLOCATIONS ARE LISTED

Although there have been a few pioneer civilian rehabilitation centers, such as the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled, the Milwaukee Curative Workshop and the Cleveland Rehabilitation Clinic, that have done outstanding work, such facilities prior to the war were limited in number, were found only in large cities and were not associated with medical schools or general hospitals. There are, today, however, some 150 communities that have or are planning civilian rehabilitation centers. Most such communities are following the recommendation of the Baruch committee that these centers be medically directed and be associated with civilian hospitals and medical schools if possible.

Of the original allocation of $1,250,000, $400,000 was given to Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons for a model research and treatment center, $250,000 to the Medical College of Virginia for a center specializing in hydrology, and $250,000 to New York University College of Medicine for a center devoting special attention to the structural mechanics of the body. Smaller amounts were given a number of other universities for special research products.

The major centers, which are being developed over a 10-year period, are designed to serve as models for medical schools and hospitals both in this country and abroad. With Mr. Baruch's experience, wisdom and vision, and the great need for increasing services to the physically handicapped, it is easy to see why the major objectives of the committee have been accomplished in such a short time.

BOYS' FORUM ON NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the American Legion for the excellent service it is performing for the youth of this Nation through the Boys' Forum on National Government which the Legion sponsors annually. I am particularly conscious of the value of this Legion activity because yesterday I had the pleasure of lunching with two outstanding young men attending the forum from the State of Montana. They were chosen to represent the several hundred who, in my State, were eager participants in the "Boys' State," sponsored by Montana units of the Legion. These fine young men, who have told me how much this trip has meant to them, are James Woodburn of Bozeman, Mont., and Robert Davis of Dillon, Mont.

I can think of few better ways of building Americanism than by bringing these young men directly in touch with our State and national legislatures and by having them meet the men in charge of the various departments of our Government. The Legion is letting them see our democratic processes in action. Thereby, the American Legion insures a real understanding of how American democracy works. To my mind this is one of the most effective ways of preventing totalitarianism from gaining any sort of foothold in this country of ours. As our young men become acquainted with the working mechanisms of free enterprise, both in business and in Government, there can be no question but that they will value it far above any other way of life.

I know my colleagues in the Senate will want to join with me in complimenting the American Legion for this outstanding work.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, Government officials and Government agencies forever complain that the constant criticism they get from the Congress and the press makes the life of a public servant intolerable. It is hard to recall an occasion when anyone closely associated with the executive branch lamented the fact that a Government agency was suffering from too little critical scrutiny.

This is precisely the complaint made in an article entitled "The Atomic Energy Act: Public Administration Without Public Debate"—which appears today in the University of Chicago Law Review.

Until recently its author, Herbert S. Marks, was General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission. Even before he held that office, Mr. Marks had been intimately identified with the State Department's work on atomic energy, notably the Acheson-Lilienthal Report.

He has been and is a stanch supporter of the McMahon Act, and of Mr. Lilienthal and his associates on the Atomic Energy Commission. But he suggests that the success of our entire atomic energy program is endangered because it does not enjoy the invigorating corrective effects of the kind of broad critical public scrutiny which this country gives to all other governmental affairs.

We have recently observed a striking example of this hands-off attitude of which Mr. Marks writes. In the debate over extension of the terms of the Atomic Energy Commissioners, vague anonymous opinions were cited against confirming Mr. Lilienthal for a 5-year term by the proponents of the 2-year extension bill.

I tried repeatedly and in vain to get a full airing of these anonymous opinions, and to get an open debate on the issue of confirmation so that the entire Congress and the public might have the facts and form a judgment upon them—as they do in other public matters. No one would join issue with me.

Mr. Marks' article discusses this and other examples of unhealthy public indifference to the problems of atomic energy. Open debate and criticism of Government affairs is traditionally our main safeguard against arbitrary or incompetent Government officials and agencies. Mr. Marks believes, as I do, that our atomic-energy program is in good hands. But it is the essence of democracy that no public official and no public agency is above having his activities fully and openly debated and criticized.

The requirements of secrecy, Mr. Marks insists, are not so strict as to prevent adequate public scrutiny and debate of atomic energy affairs. And I can testify from my own intimate experience of atomic energy in the past 3 years that—contrary to popular impression—there is a great deal more about this subject that is completely open to the public than secret. The necessarily secret areas must of course be kept secret. But today enormous areas that are legitimately open are simply unknown to the public.

This article seeks to diagnose the causes of the present conditions and to suggest means by which they may be corrected. I hope the article will be read widely and thoughtfully, especially by members of the Congress and the press. For in the first instance it is up to the Congress and the press to find ways by which our traditional democratic processes can be made to work in this field as in any other.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Atomic Energy Act: Public Administration Without Public Debate," written by Herbert S. Marks and published in the summer 1948 issue of the University of Chicago Law Review, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION WITHOUT PUBLIC DEBATE

(By Herbert S. Marks[1])

I

In the midst of noise it is difficult to perceive areas of silence. Since the appointment of the Atomic Energy Commission in October 1946, millions of words have been published about the administration of the McMahon Act.[2] But the very quantity of material has obscured the fact that critical analysis and insight have been negligible. Even more remarkable, the range of issues which has excited any active public debate has been exceedingly limited despite the many intrinsically controversial questions with which the Atomic Energy Act is concerned.

Actions of the Atomic Energy Commission that are the subject of press release are duly reported in the newspapers—but rarely with more penetrating comment or follow-up than that which accompanies the society news.

[1] Member of the District of Columbia and New York bars. Former assistant general counsel, War Production Board; special assistant to the Under Secretary of State; and most recently general counsel, Atomic Energy Commission. The author is deeply indebted to Mr. John G. Palfrey, a member of the legal staff of the Atomic Energy Commission, for his invaluable assistance and suggestions throughout the preparation of this article. The opinions expressed, however, are the personal views of the author.

[2] 60 Stat. 766, 42 U. S. C. A., sec. 1810 (Supp. 1947). The act became law August 1, 1946. The President appointed the five members of the Commission on October 28, 1946. The properties of the Manhattan Engineer District were formally transferred to the Commission by Executive Order 9816 on December 31, 1946. It was not until April 9, 1947, that the recess appointments of Commissioners were confirmed.

The old argument over military versus civilian control has some continuing vitality; whether or not the secrets of the atomic bomb are being securely kept also gets attention; the patent provisions of the law and their administration are discussed in professional quarters.[3] The list could be extended but not significantly.

Of late a handful of informed appraisals have appeared concerning such matters as the relationship of the Commission's program to business,[4] the Commission's special problems with respect to loyalty investigations, the status of research at Oak Ridge.[5] What is strange, however, is not so much the infrequency of perceptive commentary: the striking fact is that neither in depth nor scope is the public discussion which prevails for other Government affairs even approximated in the field of atomic energy.[6]

Most recently the congressional controversy over the reappointment of the Commissioners might have been expected to stimulate critical review of the broad field of operations of the Atomic Energy Commission. In fact, however, what has been observed in these legislative proceedings is little more than a series of election year maneuvers.[7]

The absence of wide debate and criticism concerning the administration of this far-reaching law is a phenomenon unique in the conduct of important public affairs. There are, of course, strong reasons for this peculiar situation. Some, like the requirements of secrecy, will appear obvious; others may appear more subtle. The significance of the unusual present conditions will be clearer, however, if first viewed in the light of the normal attitude toward public affairs.

II

Throughout its history this country has cherished a principle from which we have rarely tolerated departure. We have believed that the chief protection of society against incompetence, unfairness, and corruption in Government is the unlimited opportunity for public scrutiny and protest. We have believed also that this is the chief means of assuring that officials will pursue the course upon which the public is set. Sixty years ago Lord Bryce observed "a healthy and watchful public opinion" as a commonplace of the American political system: "Mischief is checked in America more frequently than anywhere else by the fear of exposure or by newspaper criticism in the first stage of a bad scheme."[8] And in a current opinion the United States Supreme Court quotes Bentham's century-old observation: "Without publicity all other checks are insufficient; in comparison of publicity all other checks are of small account."[9]

In observance of this principle, the physical and social sciences could find their most important common ground. "Science," says a distinguished physicist, "is not a field in which error awaits death and subsequent generations for verdict—the next issue of the journals will take care of it."[10] Perhaps the test of our faith is our firm belief that it is the fatal weakness of communism and all other forms of totalitarianism that they can find no substitute for the self-correcting process of open discussion and criticism which is the democratic tradition.

We pay a high price to maintain this tradition. Ordinarily, there is no need to encourage criticism of large government enterprise; the danger is rather that it goes too far. The able administrator is harassed and disgusted; the timid administrator is paralyzed; public affairs suffer from endless delays Yet even in the conduct of the war agencies, whether civilian or military, we have insisted upon this principle. On balance we have always been convinced that the price was not too high. Nevertheless, in the case of the administration of the Atomic Energy Act critical debate has been largely absent.

The lack of critical discussion by no means signifies an inactive atomic-energy program. We know that the Atomic Energy Commission operates a capital investment of $3,000,000,000; that it spends well in excess of a half-billion dollars annually; that directly or indirectly it employs 60,000 people; that it has important business relations with hundreds of business concerns and educational institutions; and that its regulatory activities affect business, the press, and other private institutions. We profess to know that there is no activity of government more important than the Atomic Energy Commission, by which, presumably, we mean that there is none which now or potentially affects us so vitally.[11]

Nor is it really possible that the absence of debate and criticism is simply a reflection of the high public respect and confidence which the present Commission and its staff rightly commands. Our theory and practice are such that it is a matter of indifference whether Government officials are able and incorruptible public servants—a David Lilienthal or a General Groves—or suspected machine politicians. We subject both classes to the gantlet.

The public servant, on his part, is rarely aware that the pressures and attacks from which he suffers during all his official life are frequently a source of strength and almost always a source of guidance. It is public pressure which helps weed out incompetent associates when official inertia would retain them. It is an interested, critical public which often supplies the only adequate forum for resolving conflicts between executive agencies, between Congress and the Executive, or between Government agencies and special interests. Above all it is the public reaction to what he does or fails to do which tells the administrator what is expected of him. It is his duty to provide leadership but leadership in the direction of the public's expectations.

But how can the Atomic Energy Commission be responsive to the impulses and expectations of a society which in relation to this subject matter are not expressed, which seemingly are not even felt? The men who compose the Atomic Energy Commission have been conscious of the vacuum in which they operate and have sensed the dangers which it

[1] On March 15, 1948, Senator WHERRY, majority whip, introduced and spoke in favor of a bill to return atomic energy to military control (94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3477 (March 25, 1948)). The most sensational security case during the past year concerned the revelation that prior to the appointment of the Commission, two Army sergeants personally appropriated highly secret documents from the Los Alamos reservation. See statement to the Senate of Senator HICKENLOOPER, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on July 7, 1947 (93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8494 (July 9, 1947)). On patent matters, see Ooms, Atomic Energy and United States Patent Policy, 2 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Nos. 9 and 10, at p. 28, and Nos. 11 and 12, at p. 30 (1946); Miller, the First Official Report on AEC Patent Problems, 4 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, No. 3, at p. 77 (1948); Newman and Miller, Patents and Atomic Energy, 12 Law and Contemporary Problems, 746 (1947); American Bar Association, Section of Patent, Trade-Mark and Copyright Law, committee reports to be presented at annual meeting September 1947, p. 11; First Report of Atomic Energy Commission Patent Advisory Panel, Atomic Energy Commission Press Release No. 56, September 21, 1947.

[4] Atomic Energy—1948, Business Week, April 10, 1948, p. 47.

[5] The New York Herald Tribune recently ran an impressive series of articles on the Atomic Energy Commission's loyalty investigations and on general conditions at Oak Ridge, see New York Herald Tribune May 19, p. 1, May 20, p. 5, May 20, p. 22, May 24, 1948, p. 18. On loyalty investigations cf. O'Brian, Loyalty Tests and Guilt by Association. (61 Harv. L. Rev. p. 592 at p. 598.)

[6] Cf. Report of the Chairman of the American Society of Newspaper Editors Standing Committee on Atomic Energy, Editor and Publisher, April 24, 1948, at p. 22. The New York Herald Tribune, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and Business Week show signs of reaching a level of reporting and comment in the field of atomic energy comparable to that which exists in other areas of public affairs; cf. New York Post, May 26, 1948, p. 41: "The Herald Tribune (is) one of a few United States papers which realizes what atomic energy—and atom bombs—mean to the future of the world." As examples of high quality reporting and comment on atomic energy matters see, Editorial, A Year of Civilian Control of Atomic Energy, 4 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, No. 2 at p. 33 (February 1948) and Atomic Energy—1948, supra, note 4.

[7] Under sec. 2 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 the terms of the Commissioners first appointed expire on August 1, 1948. The President on April 20, 1948, renominated the five members of the Commission for new terms commencing August 1, 1948, giving to the chairman, Mr. Lilienthal, a 5-year appointment, the longest permitted under the system of staggering prescribed in the act. The Republican leadership in the Congress countered President Truman's move by proposing bills, S. 2589 and H. R. 6402, to extend the terms of the five Commissioners automatically for 2 years from August 1, 1948, thereby giving to the President elected in November 1948 power to appoint an entirely new Commission during the next Presidential term. The ground asserted by the Republican leadership for this action was the necessity for a further period of probation for the over-all evaluation of the atomic energy program and its theory of operation. See S. Rept. 1342, 80th Cong., 2d sess., May 17, 1948; H. Rept. 1973, 80th Cong., 2d sess., May 18, 1948. A minority led by Democratic Senator BRIEN MCMAHON filed a report strongly attacking the bills, among other reasons, as a blow to the spirit of political nonpartisanship in which the entire program was conceived and established under the original act.

[8] 2 Bryce, the American Commonwealth (2d ed.), p. 321.

[9] *In re Oliver* (68 S. Ct. 499, 506), quoting from 1 Bentham Rationale of Judicial Evidence 524 (1827).

[10] J. Robert Oppenheimer, Physics in the Contemporary World, 4 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, No. 3, p. 65 at 68 (1948).

[11] For a general summary of the Commission's work see address of David Lilienthal, The Business Side of the Atom, before the Chamber of Commerce of Boston, Mass., March 18, 1948 (Atomic Energy Commission press release). As to regulatory activities of the Commission, the agency has issued regulations governing commerce in the raw materials, uranium and thorium (12 Fed. Reg. 1855, Mar. 20, 1947); regulations governing commerce in facilities for the production of fissionable materials (12 Fed. Reg. 7657, Nov. 18, 1947); and the Commission's security-guidance service is similar in effect to the Government censorship practiced during the war. See Third Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, S. Doc. 118, 80th Cong., 2d sess., at 27 (1948).

portends. For many months in their reports and speeches, they have made eloquent pleas to the public to get educated about and take an active interest in atomic energy.[12] Mr. Lilienthal has warned that without such active participation in these fateful matters the substance of democracy is lost."[13]

To these pleas the most common public response appears to be: "What is it that they want us to know? Why don't they tell us? Then we may know what to do."[14] The pleas have somewhat puzzled the public; the public response has somewhat puzzled the Atomic Energy Commission.

Meanwhile the normal interplay of forces between the Government and the governed does not take place. In the field of atomic energy, the process which has always been our main reliance for a healthy direction of national effort is virtually nonexistent.

III

Nor have any adequate substitutes for the usual processes of public criticism been found, although the two that are sometimes referred to as assuring a measure of public accountability, the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Commission's public advisory committees, are certainly of great value.[15]

We know from its reports to the Congress that the joint committee, established by the McMahon Act and composed of nine Members of the Senate and nine Members of the House, is generally interested in all activities of the Commission [16] as required under that law. We may assume, too, that it takes a critical attitude toward these activities and that the Commission benefits from this attitude.[17] But there has been even less public discussion and comment about the joint committee and its work than there has been about the Commission. Fortunately, the joint committee includes some of the leading Members of both Houses.[18] But just as we rely upon the self-correcting process of public scrutiny in the case of all agencies of the executive branch, good or bad, so, too, we may be apprehensive of an arm of the Congress, however distinguished its Members, whose activities are not the subject of public debate. As long as this condition lasts, it must not be assumed that the joint committee will provide an adequate device to assure public accountability in any usual sense. The unreviewed action of 18 legislators is not likely to be better than the unreviewed action of 5 administrators. In fact, such a situation could easily lead to an unwholesome domination of executive action by a small group of legislators which would not be tolerated if the public were alert and critical.

The advisory committees, too, are important in establishing connections between the atomic-energy program and the country at large. The General Advisory Committee, created by the McMahon Act, and the numerous other committees set up by the Commission as authorized by that law, bring to bear upon the problems of the atomic-energy program the diverse talents of leaders in many phases of American life.[19] But however valuable this form of participation by outsiders may be, it is not a substitute for the kind of public scrutiny to which we have been accustomed. It is, indeed, as different from what we have relied upon in the past as it would be to preserve the principle of jury trial in criminal proceedings but to permit the trials to be conducted in secret without the presence of press or public.

IV

Perhaps the requirements of secrecy are such that there can be no public participation in the problems of atomic energy in any customary sense. As the question is subjected to analysis, however, this answer may appear less clear. At all events while secrecy may seriously inhibit debate, that factor alone hardly accounts for the silence of the interests that are directly affected by the atomic-energy program.

Ordinarily the reaction and response of special groups, favorable or unfavorable, to any particular Government action give rise to and sustain public debate. With limited exceptions, nothing of this sort has happened in the atomic-energy program. In a variety of ways the Commission's program has an important daily effect upon national life. Procurement of raw materials, letting of contracts, construction and operation of plants involving hazardous, new industrial processes and hazardous industrial waste products, administration of regulatory powers—all these activities and many others in this $3,000,000,000 enterprise are in fact affecting the public at many points.

These Commission actions fall in areas of public sensitivity which, judging by the experience of all other Government agencies, should produce a vocal response from those groups which are disappointed by Commission decisions. Indeed, some decisions of the Commission occur in the most sensitive areas of public concern. The effect which Commission action has upon the press itself is the best example.

Under section 10 of the Atomic Energy Act the Commission is given broad powers to control the dissemination of restricted data. Simply stated, practically all information relating to atomic energy is classed as restricted by the Atomic Energy Act. The Commission is authorized to remove information from this category whenever it concludes that it may be published without impairing the national security. We need not concern ourselves here with the question which is sometimes raised as to whether the law is merely an official secrets act or whether it includes broader censorship powers.[20] The press and the publishing industry have apparently accepted the principle that whether or not the act, strictly construed, applies to unofficial as well as official secrets, they will publish nothing in the face of advice by the Commission that publication would be

[12] For example, addresses of David E. Lilienthal, Atomic Energy Is Your Business, before a community public meeting in Crawfordsville, Ind., September 22, 1947; Democracy and the Atom, before the American Education Fellowship, Chicago, November 28, 1947; The People, the Atom, and the Press, before the New York State Publishers Association in New York, January 19, 1948; Atomic Energy—Where Do We Stand Today? before the Radio Executives Club in New York, February 5, 1948; also the address of Sumner Pike, Imperatives in Atomic Understanding, before the National Education Association, in Cincinnati, Ohio, February 17, 1948; and addresses of W. W. Waymack, Education in the Atomic Age, before the Institute of Higher Education in Nashville, Tenn., July 31, 1947; and Atomic Energy Implications, before the Illinois Welfare Association, in Chicago, Ill., November 26, 1947. (Atomic Energy Commission press releases.) See also Third Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, op. cit. supra, note 10 at 26–28.

[13] David E. Lilienthal, Democracy and the Atom, supra, note 10 at 8.

[14] See, e. g., letter to the editor, What Do the Scientists Wish Us To Know, from L. McDonald, New York Herald Tribune, February 23, 1948.

[15] See Lilienthal, The People, the Atom, and the Press, op. cit. supra, note 10 at 14–16, and Waymack, Atomic Energy Implications, op. cit. supra, note 11 at 10. See also Third Semiannual Report of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, op. cit. supra, note 10 at 31–32, 34.

[16] First Report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to the Congress of the United States, H. Rept. 1289, 80th Cong., 2d sess., 1948. The committee was created by section 15 (a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, See also reports on S. 2589 and H. R. 6402, supra note 6.

[17] "The very fact of the existence of the Joint Congressional Committee is security against the exercise of arbitrary power by the Commission, while we on the Commission, vested with a kind of quite terrible responsibility find in it a great reassurance." Lilienthal, The People, the Atom, and the Press, op. cit. supra, note 11, at 16.

[18] "The present membership of this 18-man permanent committee is an indication of the importance Congress itself assigns to it in charting the difficult policy course ahead. Its chairman is Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, a former Governor of that State, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, an experienced administrator as well as legislator. Its vice chairman is Representative W. STERLING COLE, of Ithaca, in this State, who, as you know, is among the most respected and influential Members of the House, with long experience in matters of national security. The committee includes the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY, of Michigan, and Texas; it includes Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, who as chairman of the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy in the 79th Cong. sponsored the Atomic Energy Act and who follows with keen interest the international situation on atomic-energy control; it includes Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKEN, of Colorado, chairman of the Finance Committee. On the roster of the committee are other men of both chambers, most of whose names and reputations are familiar to you. In all, the committee is unusually broadly representative of the country, both geographically and in its group interests." Lilienthal, The People, the Atom, and the Press, op. cit. supra, note 11 at 15.

[19] The list, membership, and functions of the numerous advisory committees are set forth in the Third Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, op. cit. supra, note 6 at 31–38. The general advisory committee was established by section 2 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. The other advisory groups were set up by the Commission pursuant to section 12 (a) (1) of the act.

[20] See Newman, Control of Information Relating to Atomic Energy, 56 Yale L. J., 769 (1947), and Newman and Miller, The Control of Atomic Energy, ch. 10 (1948). These writers take the position that the prohibitions on disclosure in section 10 apply equally to official and unofficial information falling within the broadly defined category "restricted data." While this view may be an accurate statement of the effect which the draftsmen intended, neither the statute nor the legislative history seem sufficiently explicit on the point to avoid a question of statutory construction if the issue is ever tested. In that event, it is to be anticipated that questions of constitutionality would also be raised.

prejudicial to the national security.[21] In short, for practical purposes, they seem to have accepted in the field of atomic energy an arrangement somewhat similar to the one which existed more generally during the war under the Office of Censorship.

This voluntary restraint on the part of the press and the publishing industry, and their wholehearted cooperation with the Government in maintaining security, are deserving of highest praise. But what is surprising is that there has not even been any open debate concerning the details of administration. How does it happen that the public bickering between press and Government over the scope and details of censorship so frequently observed in connection with the war agencies does not occur here?[22] Are we then to conclude that the Commission's "security guidance" has been so satisfactory to the press that there has never been occasion for debate concerning it or public notice of the debate? Considering the diversity and character of the American press, there must be other explanations for the unbroken silence that exists in this area of legitimate discussion.

There are many other areas of activities and many incidents in the atomic-energy program where, despite secrecy, lively concern and comment on the part of the public might be expected but where almost none has occurred. The Commission's decisions with respect to its Clinton laboratories is a good illustration.

In May 1947 the Commission publicly announced that the contractor for the Clinton laboratories at Oak Ridge would be changed because the then contractor was unable to manage the laboratory unless it was transferred to a new location remote from Oak Ridge.[23] It was explained in the release that "the Clinton laboratories constitute a vital part of the atomic-energy program and certain projects at Clinton are among the most important in this field." "After comprehensive review," it was said, "the Commission has concluded that in the light of the over-all research and development program in atomic energy the work of the Clinton laboratory must continue at Oak Ridge." In September 1947 it was publicly announced that a new contractor had been selected for the Clinton laboratories.[24] In addition to naming the new contractor, it was announced that 14 southern universities and a score of industries and industrial representatives would participate in the important research, development, and training programs at the laboratory. Then came a sharp change in direction. On January 1, 1948, the Commission announced a drastic realinement in the September arrangements for the Clinton laboratory.[25] Important work conducted at or contemplated for that location would be transferred to Chicago. In addition, the contractual arrangements originally forecast in the September release were to be fundamentally altered and a third contractor was to enter the picture. All these changes were duly reported in the Commission's release.

The three public releases of May, September, and January described major decisions concerning major industrial interests, major university interests, major geographic interests, major alternatives of national policy. It is not at all clear from the face of the three releases that they are consistent with one another. Were any other important Government agency to issue three such announcements about one of its main operations, the press and affected interests would immediately engage in a storm of public discussion. Such discussion would occur if only because the watchful journalist would discern that on their face the three announcements appear to be contradictory. But such discussion would even more certainly occur in the case of other agencies because important decisions and successive changes in them would inevitably disappoint or, at least, disturb some of the special interests affected by them. It seems highly improbable that the Commission, alone among Government agencies, possesses a Solomon-like faculty for always harmonizing and satisfying all affected interests.

The point of this recital is not to suggest that the Commission's actions as reflected in these announcements were wrong. The point is that almost no one among our individualistic, normally critical public was impelled to debate them openly. No one was impelled to debate them, even though on the face of the releases themselves, without going further for information, there was ample material to excite public discussion.[26]

V

Secrecy is certainly the most important factor in accounting for public inertia in relation to the administration of the Atomic Energy Act. The requirements of security altogether remove from public view certain activities and certain problems of the Atomic Energy Commission. In addition, there is everywhere an air of secrecy which seems impenetrable, even when it is not. The mere mechanics of securing a pass into a commission installation for a routine interview appears formidable, even for the visitor who knows he is entitled to the pass. The areas of information that are shut off for reasons of security inevitably seem to obscure those which are open. No matter how much the questioner may be assured that he can understand what he needs to know without access to what is hidden, he always has a lurking uneasiness that his interpretation of what is in sight will be distorted by what is unknown.

Much of the subject matter—even that which is completely open—is technically complex, and therefore hard to understand. It is not only complex; it is totally unfamiliar. One of the Commissioners has suggested that the subject of atomic energy is less complex than taxation.[27] But when Franklin wrote, "Nothing is more certain than death and taxes," he gave expression to a thought already thousands of years old. The background of ancient familiarity, not to mention suffering, makes it relatively easy to do in the field of taxation what the Commission urges us to do here, that is, distill "out of very complex and superficially bewildering things, relatively simple, quite comprehensible basic issues that the people are capable of understanding."[28]

There is, moreover, a general frame of mind which inhibits the active curiosity without which scrutiny and debate does not take place. A taboo-like quality attaches to atomic energy, which is perhaps no more than another way of saying that the immense proportions of the new physical force, the seeming magic and real mystery connected with it, its tradition-shaking consequences, and the wails of secrecy and epic drama which surrounded it from the first, make of it a subject from which we instinctively shy away.

Also important in suppressing curiosity is the belief that to ask questions in this field is unpatriotic. We have come to feel that because it is wrong to disclose secret information, it is somehow wrong and possibly illegal for the uninitiated to seek information about the subject. Thus, a Washington taxi driver, on being asked by a fare to go to the Public Health Building (the Commission headquarters), inquires "That's where the Atomic Energy Com . . ." and then exclaims, "Oh, I mustn't mention that."

In addition, large and important sectors of the public and the press seem to have been restrained from any generally critical scrutiny of the administration of the Atomic Energy Act, perhaps unconsciously, by a sense of partisanship. These sectors of press and public joined in the fight to secure enactment of the McMahon bill.[29] Hardly had the bill become law before another fight took place over the confirmation of the President's nominees for membership on the Atomic Energy Commission. The same forces, construing the opposition to the President's nominees as a renewal of the original effort to defeat the McMahon bill, again joined to support the President's appointments.[30] That the bill was enacted after a notable unanimity in the vote of the Senate committee which sponsored it, and that confirmation was voted by overwhelming majorities, were regarded not as evidence of the weakness of the opposition, but rather of the strength of the forces that were marshaled in support. Ever since, the feeling has persisted that at the first opportunity these original opponents would reassert themselves to destroy the McMahon Act. In these circumstances, the supporters of the Atomic Energy Act and of the President's nominations to the Commission seem to have assumed that any display of critical attitude toward the administration of the law would play into the hands of these opponents.

[21] It was—and is—evident that the public communications media of the Nation desire overwhelmingly to avoid harm to the national defense and security through publication of restricted data. There is a heavy continuing demand for security guidance service * * *. (Third Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, supra, note 10 at 27.)

[22] Compare the immediate reaction to Secretary Forrestal's recent proposal to establish a voluntary system of censorship in connection with security matters in general. See e. g. Security Consciousness, editorial, the Washington Post, page 4B, Mar. 29, 1948.

The first significant criticism on Commission policy in this connection appeared at the end of May. See editorial: "Policy in Secret, New York Herald Tribune, May 28, 1943, at page 22.

[23] Atomic Energy Commission press release "Joint Statement of United States Atomic Energy Commission and Monsanto Chemical Co. at Oak Ridge, Tenn." May 28, 1947.

[24] Atomic Energy Commission press release No. 57 "Clinton National Laboratory established at Oak Ridge," Sept. 25, 1947.

[25] Atomic Energy Commission press release No. 80, "Atomic Energy Commission Consolidates Reactor Research and Development at Argonne, National Laboratory near Chicago; enters new contract for Clinton National Laboratory at Oak Ridge and adds Chemical Engineering Development at that Laboratory," Jan. 1, 1948.

[26] It was not until many months after the release of January 1, 1948, that critical public discussion of the Clinton Laboratories decision began to occur. See, e. g., Why Morale Sags at Oak Ridge, New York Herald Tribune, May 24, 1948, p. 18.

[27] W. W. Waymack, Atomic Energy Implications, op. cit., supra, note 11, at 6.

[28] Ibid.

[29] A summary of these events can be found in Newman and Miller, "The Control of Atomic Energy," chapter 1 (1948).

[30] During the opening remarks of the Senate debate on the confirmation of the Commissioners and the General Manager in March 1947, Senator HICKENLOOPER speaking of Mr. Lilienthal described the very significant and widespread "editorial approval of his appointment of leading newspaper editors of both major parties from coast to coast" (93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2451, March 24, 1947).

There may be other factors at work in preventing the free play of the normal forces of public scrutiny and criticism. Because so many of the barriers are intangible, it is extremely difficult to assess their relative importance. But secrecy, security, complexity, unfamiliarity, self-restraint—whether occasioned by taboos, suppression of curiosity, or partisanship—together compose a formidable array. We may hopefully agree with Mr. Lilienthal that "there is nothing in the nature of atomic energy, nor in the necessary requirements of secrecy in certain areas of knowledge that prevents the people as a whole from exercising their historic role of judging what shall be the course of public policy."[31] But the people are not now exercising that historic role and it is plain that if they are to do so very special exertions will be required of them.

VI

The fact that the traditionally powerful forces of scrutiny and criticism do not now exist in this field in itself suggests the difficulty in devising a program to create for the Atomic Energy Commission the public environment of other governmental agencies. A beginning has been made in the speeches of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission during past months. The awareness of the problem that they reflect, and the emphasis they have given in many forums to the need for public interest and education should contribute materially to the creation of a climate favorable for public action.

It will also help if we become conscious of misconceptions that have interfered with the normal process of scrutiny and criticism. Active curiosity, far from being improper or illegal, is a normal, lawful public responsibility.[32] It has been asserted on behalf of the Commission that "by and large the sources of information on public issues are already open."[33] And it is a fair estimate that the official material so far made available by and about the Commission compares in quantity and content with the official material that is made available about other large Government operations in a comparable period of operations.[34] Here and there one will see the censor's hand in the official material concerning the Commission's activities. But such material is mainly distinguished from the information about other Government agencies in that it has not been illuminated by public reaction.

It takes active curiosity on the part of the press and public to give meaning to official handouts no matter how enlightening the Government tries to make them. The official material of other Government agencies is subjected to searching public analysis and questioning which uncovers and evaluates the reasons behind decisions and the consequences implicit in them. Because of security restrictions an effort to subject the available materials about the Commission to the same treatment would sometimes be frustrating. Surprisingly often, however, the results would be illuminating.

It should be understood that the general public on the one hand and the Commission on the other have different responsibilities in respect to security. It is the duty of the Atomic Energy Commission under the law to see to it that those things are kept secret which in the interest of national security should be kept secret. It is the duty of the public to cooperate with the Commission in this effort, and this the public has been doing with remarkable effectiveness.[35] But, as the Commission itself has repeatedly asserted, it is also a public responsibility to find out and to understand those things which need not be kept secret. This can only be accomplished through incessant questioning.

The Atomic Energy Commission is no more omniscient than any other Government Agency in its capacity to determine precisely what information within its vast area of nonsecret knowledge the public needs to know. It is the duty of a democratic public to direct to its Government every question that its curiosity provokes. It is the Atomic Energy Commission which must bear the responsibility of deciding whether an answer to any particular question may prejudice the national security.

Once this relationship is clearly defined, it will be possible for the public to begin to develop insights about the atomic energy program. Such insights can come about only through a constant interchange between the Government and the people. The questions raised in congressional hearings, in congressional debates, in news stories and editorials, the questions raised by all manner of special interests—these and the Government's answers to them, and the further questions thereby suggested, can produce a broad and endless process, through which understanding will evolve and influence will ultimately exert itself.

This process is especially necessary if the public is to overcome the difficulties growing out of the complexity and unfamiliarity of the subject matter. The Acheson-Lilienthal report and the Baruch proposals on international control of atomic energy were understood clearly enough in the course of the extensive discussion that they provoked. In comparison, the official material which has been published about the Atomic Energy Commission seems less complex. Once the same process of scrutiny, questioning, and discussion which illuminated the proposals on international control is brought to bear upon the available information in the domestic field a comparable measure of understanding can result.

Not only is it essential that there be an active curiosity about the atomic energy program—a curiosity which expresses itself in incessant questioning—there must also be a willingness to criticize. Partisanship that exercises a restraint upon legitimate criticism out of a fear that such criticism will aid the enemies of the McMahon Act defeats its own purposes. The sectors of the press and public which thus refrain from critical comment are the very groups which by virtue of their participation in the fight on the McMahon bill and on confirmation acquired an informed background on atomic energy. In refraining from criticism, these groups have no doubt spared the Commission a considerable amount of annoyance. But they have deprived the administration of the Atomic Energy Act of a much more important source of strength—the strength that comes from constructive exposure of weakness and error and the opportunity thereby created for correction.

In any effort to quicken the forces of public scrutiny and criticism, account must be taken of the attitude of public officials toward these forces, and particularly toward the quest for information which these forces stimulate. The usual but never tolerable condition of a Government official is one of continual harassment by a seemingly specious, unfair, and unsympathetic press and public. That this condition makes officials wary and that it often makes the process of getting information from a public agency difficult is not surprising. The fear of embarrassment which the official or his agency may suffer as a result of disclosing information can be a more important factor in deciding whether or not to answer a question than the public need for an answer.

These considerations are as relevant to atomic energy as to any other subject. The staff of the Commission will be conscious that what they say may be used to discredit them, in ways that are frequently unfair and always painful. The members of the Atomic Energy Commission have urged earnestly and often that the public take a critical interest in their work. It should not be thought, however, that the express recognition by the Commissioners and their staff of the need for scrutiny will make the path of the questioner and potential critic easier than it would be with any other public agency. A party in power may assert that a strong opposition is essential to democracy; but it cannot be expected willingly to supply what might be used as ammunition by its opponents.

In the case of the Atomic Energy Commission, there is, moreover, a special hazard to

[31] Lilienthal, Democracy and the Atom, supra, note 11 at 8.

[32] Actually, the criminal sanctions of sec. 10 (b) (3) of the Atomic Energy Act apply to attempts to acquire information involving or incorporating "restricted data" only when the act is done "with intent to injure the United States or with intent to secure an advantage to any foreign nation." It can hardly be imagined that such intent could be read into any normal efforts of press and public to secure information about atomic energy. On the other hand, the provisions relating to disclosure of "restricted data" (sec. 10 (b) (2)) include sanctions when the person has "reason to believe" that the above consequences will ensue.

[33] Lilienthal, Atomic Energy Is Your Business, op. cit. supra note 8 at 11.

[34] The list includes the following: (a) Commission Reports to Congress: The First Semi-Annual Report of the Commission, 80th Cong., 1st sess., S. Doc. No. 8, Jan. 31, 1947; the Second Semiannual Report of the Commission, 80th Cong., 1st sess., S. Doc. No. 96, July 24, 1947; the Third Semiannual Report of the Commission, supra note 10. (b) Congressional hearings: Independent offices appropriation bill for 1948. Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, U. S. Senate, 80th Cong., 1st sess. on H. R. 3839 (1947); hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 2d sess., on the supplemental independent offices appropriation bill for 1949, p. 747, et seq. See also H. Rept. No. 589, p. 8, independent offices appropriation bill for 1948, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947); H. Rept. No. 1618, p. 2, first deficiency appropriation bill 1948 (1948); H. Rept. No. 2245, p. 2, supplemental independent offices appropriation bill for 1949 (1948); hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on labor relations at Oak Ridge, Tenn., 80th Cong., 2d sess, March 1948. (c) A large number of reports and documents released by the Commission, including 1,700 individual declassified documents made available to the public through the Office of Technical Services of the Department of Commerce; over 75 statements for press and public giving facts of new developments; reprints of public speeches made by members of the Commission; and reports of advisory boards of the Commission; namely, Report of the Medical Board of Review, June 20, 1947, and the Report of the Patent Advisory Panel, Sept. 17, 1947. See Third Semiannual Report of the Commission, supra note 10 at pages 24–28 for a description of such material.

[35] Public compliance with the law has been so effective that thus far there has been no real court test of the extremely difficult evidentiary questions that would arise in any public criminal trial for alleged unlawful disclosure of secret information. cf. Haydock, Some Evidentiary Problems Posed by Atomic Energy Security Requirements, 61 Harv. L. Rev. 468 (1948); see also Note, Secret Documents in Criminal Prosecutions, 47 Col. L. Rev. 1356 (1947).

the process of debate and criticism. The line between what must be secret and what can be open is not a sharp one. When areas of information involving possible embarrassment are probed, the temptation must always be present to draw the line so that embarrassment will be avoided rather than to draw the line only where the reasonable requirements of security dictate. The danger is not that the Atomic Energy Commission or its staff would thus act deliberately. The danger is rather of unconsciously confusing the needs of security with the desire for self-protection from critical comment.[*] During the war, journalists developed a sixth sense which enabled the press to tell whether the Government's releases and its response to questions were really as full and frank as security would permit. This experience may ultimately be repeated in the field of atomic energy. But it will not be repeated as long as it continues to be possible to say that "only about a dozen newspaper reporters in the United States are equipped to write about atomic information accurately and with understanding."[*]

VII

The absence of public scrutiny and criticism which the Atomic Energy Commission has so far experienced will not last indefinitely. The deep and powerful forces which have made our public alert and vocal in other public affairs will sooner or later assert themselves in this field. The question is not whether this will happen but when and in what form. If too long delayed, our atomic-energy program will almost certainly grow so far out of touch with the American environment that when the forces of criticism finally begin to operate with their customary vigor they will produce drastic upheavals. Deprived of the continuous, corrective effects of public review, the atomic-energy program will have developed so much that is weak and unsound that the public dissatisfaction which then seeks drastic change will be justified. By then the administration that is thus destroyed may not be worth saving. If this should happen, not only will the continuity essential to the success of the undertaking be destroyed, but the public, without the knowledge gained by prior participation in the problems of atomic energy, will not be in a position to insure the establishment of a sound administration in its place.

Any practical measures that may be proposed now for releasing the normal forces of critical scrutiny and debate will seem modest as compared with the proportions of the problem. What is important is that the process commence. The best hope for constructive change lies in recognition of the fact that once started this process which is so close to our most basic traditions will find its own strength, and its own new channels for growth.

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, an editorial entitled "Wrong Timing," appearing in the Washington Post for August 1. Frequently I do not agree with the editorial conclusions of this newspaper; but in this instance I think the conclusions expressed are substantially correct and truly reveal the present situation existing in Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRONG TIMING

The chief defect of the President's comprehensive program for control of inflation is that it has come too late to meet the needs of the immediate future. The Washington Post believes that rationing and price controls should have been retained for a much longer period after the war as a means of limiting consumption expenditures and checking price increases. However, there were two very good reasons for the premature scrapping of the OPA control system: (1) Public disaffection and (2) defective administration for which public hostility was in part responsible.

If an effective system of selective price and rationing controls could have been retained until wartime shortage of civilian goods had been made good, and if, concurrently, strenuous efforts had been made to absorb surplus cash created by war financing through retirement of bank-held Federal debt and sale of Government securities to nonbank investors—if these things had been done, then the transition from a controlled to a free price system could have been effected with much less danger of a sudden sharp upward spurt of prices. But the choice has been made: the potential inflation represented by dammed-up purchasing power—a legacy of deficit financing—has been activated, and is raising already inflated prices to even higher levels.

Furthermore, the rise in prices since the last prewar year has been very uneven. Increases have been greatest in foods and certain so-called soft consumer goods, thereby swelling the incomes of farmers and producers of such goods. Wage increases, too, have been uneven; some workers have secured additions to income that have more than offset rising living costs, while many white-collar workers and recipients of annuities and fixed incomes have been left far behind in the race to keep abreast of rising living costs.

The stresses and strains resulting from such fundamental dislocations call for readjustments of price relationships, not for plans to freeze prices at present levels or to roll back prices to some arbitrarily set date recommended by the President. In fact, it is impossible to undo by legislative decree what has already been done, even if the objective appeared to be desirable. For price roll-backs would either force high-cost producers out of business and inaugurate a new era of scarcity or necessitate heavy subsidies at the expense of taxpayers to enable production to go forward.

The sensible alternative is to concentrate on plans to prevent further additions to consumer purchasing power while permitting market forces of demand and supply to correct the distortions of the price structure that have resulted from our inflation splurge. As Marriner Eccles warned when testifying before the Senate Banking Committee, such adjustments are bound to be unpleasant, but it's too late to find a pleasant solution of the inflation problem. The method of dealing with inflation that best meets present needs is an indirect over-all method of control designed to curb inflationary expansion of bank credit by giving Federal Reserve authorities permissive powers to control consumer credit and increase the reserve requirements of member banks.

Such checks are, of course, of limited efficacy, and insofar as the reserve proposals are concerned, a rather crude and inequitable device for checking expansion of bank lending. Nevertheless, the mere possession of such powers, even if they were not exercised, would have a restraining effect on bank-loan expansion. These controls have the further advantage of being orthodox methods of restraint that look toward the future instead of back to the past. Moreover, they strike at the root causes of inflation by attempting to prevent further increases in the amount of money available for the purchase of goods.

If the budget can be kept in balance, and if we succeed in avoiding credit inflation through a combination of limited credit controls and voluntary banker efforts to restrain loan expansion, inflation can be fought to a standstill. But it cannot be done overnight, nor can it be done without a good many painful shifts in price relationships that reimposition of direct price controls would only defer and make more painful in the long run.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM FOR AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, it has been my privilege during the Eightieth Congress to serve as chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. In this connection I handled in the Senate, in both the first and second sessions of the Eightieth Congress, legislation relating to the welfare of the American farmer.

With the endorsement of the Illinois Agriculture Association and other leaders of farm groups, and at my request, Dr. H. C. M. Case, head of the department of agricultural economics, University of Illinois, College of Agriculture, took leave temporarily from the university to come to Washington to act as my chief adviser while handling these important agricultural appropriations.

Subsequently he served as chief adviser to the agricultural legislative committee of the Senate during the hearings on and writing of the long-range program relating to American agriculture.

Dr. Case brought to us his mature judgment which enabled him to make a most valuable contribution to the farmers of Illinois and of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an explanation written by Dr. Case of the farm program enacted by the Eightieth Congress.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASE EXPLAINS EIGHTIETH CONGRESS FARM PROGRAM

(By Dr. H. C. M. Case, head of the Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois College of Agriculture)

The new farm legislation passed in the last hours of the Eightieth Congress is essentially a long-range price-support program. The new act provides for a flexible farm price support program to become effective in 1950. It passed the Senate by a vote of 79 to 3. The House bill had provided for a stopgap measure that would continue until July 1950 most of the price-support measures now in existence

The bill that was finally passed by both Houses of Congress is a combination of the two bills. It provides that the price support of basic farm commodities—i. e., corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts—will be continued at 90 percent of parity until the 1949 crop is marketed or June 30, 1950. At that time the long-time flexible farm price support program will come into effect for these commodities.

The provision to support the prices of the so-called Steagall commodities at 90 percent of parity was a wartime measure designed to encourage increased production of the commodities deemed to be in greatest demand. When this act was passed, it was not anticipated that it would continue under normal peacetime conditions.

NEED LONG-TERM PROGRAM

The Senate bill assumed that, since the war was over, provision should be made for a desirable long-time price-support program. However, the compromise with the House bill supports milk and its products, hogs, chickens and eggs at 90 percent of parity until December 31, 1949. At the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, other Steagall commodities will be supported at 60–90 percent of parity until December 31, 1949.

Under the new act, tobacco will be supported permanently at 90 percent of parity with marketing quotas. The 1949 crop of wool will be supported at 90 percent of parity, but the future support for wool will be 60–90 percent of parity, the objective being to encourage an annual production of 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool.

In the new legislation, wool is given special consideration in order to stabilize the sheep industry at a level to meet a substantial part of our needs without relying upon the uncertainty of wool imports. At the present time the world demand for wool has forced the price to a high level.

The support for wool will probably not be effective until the world consumption of wool falls much below the present level. At present the domestic production of wool has fallen below 300,000,000 pounds, or to the lowest point in 47 years.

EFFECTIVE IN 1950

The long-time features of the bill, which becomes effective in 1950, provide that when there is a normal supply of any of the 6 basic commodities, corn, wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco, the price will be supported at 75 percent of parity. In addition, as the supply of a product increases by 2 percent, the price support drops 1 percent until it reaches 60 percent of parity when the supply of the product reaches 130 percent of normal production. Also as the supply falls to 70 percent of a normal supply the price support rises to 90 percent of parity.

A thought back of this long-time flexible price-support policy is that, under the schedule provided, farmers will receive a larger total income for a large production than for a small production. This situation is desirable for consumers, who want abundant production, since it encourages farmers to produce a large output of food. Further, a definite floor below which the prices of these commodities will not be permitted to fall will have a stabilizing influence on the market price.

When the price of a farm commodity breaks seriously it is probably due in a measure to farmers' hastening to sell their products before prices sink lower during a downswing in prices. The actual floor under prices at a given level may have the effect of increasing the price at harvesttime in the case of grain by perhaps 10 percent or more when supplies are unusually high.

FARM INCOME VERSUS NATIONAL ECONOMY

Furthermore, the reasoning may be that when prices of farm products sink below 60 percent of parity, as they did in the early thirties, it will disrupt the entire national economy because farmers, as well as others, cease to be normal purchasers of other goods and services. This action leads to heavy unemployment and reduces the consumers' purchasing power for farm products.

It is to the interest of the Nation not to allow prices of farm products to fall to extremely low levels; in fact, it is essential, in order to maintain our national economy, to prevent net farm income from sinking to low levels.

When the long-range price support goes into effect a new parity price formula also becomes effective. As is true of present parity prices, the new parity price formula is based on the relationship of the prices of all products farmers sell to the prices of the commodities farmers buy. Also, the relationship between the prices of these two groups of commodities in the period of 1909–14 is still used as a base period.

The difference between the old and new parity formulas is simply this: The old formula makes use of the relationship between prices of individual farm commodities in the period of 1909–14. Because of changes in methods of production, improvement in crop yields, and many other factors, that period does not reflect present-day price relationships.

AUTOMATIC FORMULA

The new formula takes into account the relationship of the price of the individual farm product to the average price of all farm products for the 10 immediately preceding years. This procedure keeps the parity prices of individual farm products adjusted to changing price relationships. It is an automatic formula that each year adds the new year and drops the oldest of the 10 preceding years as a basis for determining the parity price of individual farm products.

The change from the old to the new parity formula changes the parity prices for individual farm products. In general, the parity prices of livestock and livestock products are increased, while the parity prices of grain and cotton are reduced slightly. However, the average parity prices for all farm products as a group are the same under the old and new parity formulas.

The act further provides that, when the parity price of a farm product under the old and new formula is more than 5 percent of the old parity price, the adjustment to the new parity price will not exceed 5 percent of the old parity price in any one year.

The price support bill also provides for the support, at prices up to 90 percent of parity, of commodities other than the six basic ones. For this purpose such funds will be used as may be provided to the Secretary of Agriculture. The so-called section 32 funds, which represent 30 percent of our import duties, are made available for farm price-support operations. In 1947–48 these funds amounted to $135,000,000. At the present time $75,000,000 of this total are assigned to the school-lunch program, leaving about $60,000,000 to be used to support various commodities.

SUPPORTS FOR PERISHABLES ALSO

The Commodity Credit Corporation, of course, is permitted to support prices of products within reasonable limits if the products are storable and can be handled without too great a carrying charge. Section 32 funds, however, may be used to help support the price of perishable products. As a matter of fact, they represent a larger amount than has been used in any year except for subsidy payments made during the war years to hold down prices of food products.

Some features of the Senate bill dealing with the reorganization of agencies to handle various services that the Government renders to farmers were eliminated from the bill in the conference between the Senate and the House. It was the intent of the Senate bill to place more responsibility on local farm people for directing the operations of the various agencies through which the Federal Government deals directly with individual farmers.

However, the price-support legislation which was retained in the bill accepted by both Houses is constructive in affording a transition from the present wartime price program to a sound long-time price-support program. The essential feature of the long-time program is that the support varies inversely with the supply of the product. This provision should give farmers adequate opportunity to adjust their production in line with changes in demand, because the price supports, which will be higher for products in short supply, will stimulate production of those commodities.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM FOR HOUSING AND ANTI-INFLATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD copies of telegrams sent by the American Federation of Labor, the CIO, the Railway Labor Executives Association, and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen to various Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, particularly the chairmen of the two Committees on Banking and Currency, and also to the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. WHERRY), the Senator from Kentucky, the present speaker, and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. MCGRATH), in regard to pending proposed legislation dealing with housing and the high cost of living.

All these telegrams were sent on Wednesday, August 4, 1948.

On Wednesday, August 4, newspapers for the first time made it authoritative that the Republicans in Congress intended to substitute very narrow, ineffective, inefficient bills for the bills proposed by the President on, first, housing; and, second, anti-inflation.

All American labor organizations therefore promptly wired that they desired to testify on the subject. This was an effort to prevent the substitution of plausible and specious legislation in place of true and effective legislation.

Although the telegrams went to the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Senate and House, and to the Republican leaders in both Senate and House, bills are being reported out of committees without giving American labor or any other organizations a chance to be heard.

This is an unprecedented action in congressional history—the rushing of legislation through committees without giving those who request an opportunity to be heard any such opportunity.

The telegrams came from the leaders of organizations whose members and their immediate families constitute at least one-third of the entire population of the United States.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEGRAMS FROM AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

AUGUST 4, 1948.

To Senator TOBEY:

Press reports indicate that housing legislation is now being considered which would not include such essential features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as public housing,

[*] The Washington Post recently referred to "past military efforts to cover up mistakes under the guise of security and the tendency of some officers to classify virtually everything controversial as 'top secret'." Op. cit. supra, note 21. It is at least open to question whether it is fair to suggest that the military is any more subject to this temptation than the civilian administrator.

[*] See report of the chairman of the American Society of Newspaper Editors Standing Committee on Atomic Energy, Editor and Publisher, Apr. 24, 1948 at p. 22.

slum clearance, and rural housing. We strongly urge that your committee hold fast to all of the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. If any housing legislation other than S. 866 should be considered by your committee, we respectfully request that we be given an opportunity to state our views on this all-important question.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

AUGUST 4, 1948.

To Congressman JESSE WOLCOTT:

Press reports indicate that housing legislation is now being considered which would not include such essential features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as public housing, slum clearance, and rural housing. This organization is strongly on record as favoring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as it passed the Senate. If your committee should consider any housing legislation which does not include all of the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, we respectfully request that we be given an opportunity to state our views on this all-important question.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

TELEGRAMS FROM LABOR ORGANIZATIONS TO CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS REQUESTING OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY BEFORE BILLS ARE REPORTED OUT OF COMMITTEE

1. Telegram from H. W. Fraser, President of Railway Labor Executives Association, to Senators CHARLES W. TOBEY, J. J. SPARKMAN, Congressmen JESSE P. WOLCOTT, BRENT SPENCE:

"AUGUST 4, 1948.

"Railway labor regards as imperative the passage of adequate housing and anti-inflation measures before the special session adjourns. I urge you and your associates on behalf of a million and a quarter of railroad workers to press for action on these two basic problems. We must have good laws on both if our economy is to avoid increasing difficulties in the months immediately ahead. Our people desire to be heard on any new housing measure or any anti-inflation measure which the special session may consider. Please address reply to 1412 E. Pikes Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colo., H. W. Fraser, chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association."

2. Telegram from Alexander F. Whitney, president of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, to Senators TAFT, WHERRY, BARKLEY, MCGRATH; Congressmen MARTIN, HALLECK, RAYBURN, and MCCORMACK:

"AUGUST 4, 1948.

"Due to pyramiding in prices which are forcing a reduction in standards of millions of the common people and a serious housing shortage, it is imperative that adequate laws be enacted to immediately relieve these serious situations and I urge that immediate public hearings be held to permit testimony from well-informed and interested people. I desire to personally testify before the appropriate committees and will greatly appreciate an early reply advising day and hour I may be heard.

"A. F. WHITNEY,
"Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen."

AUGUST 4, 1948.

Send the following telegram to Senator ROBERT TAFT, Senator of the United States, Washington, D. C., and JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. Charge to the CIO, 718 Jackson Place, Northwest:

"When the Congress adjourned in June it left behind an unprecedented record of unfinished business. Bills to meet the needs of the American people were ignored, pigeonholed, or amended beyond recognition. The special session of Congress called by President Truman gave Congress an opportunity to rewrite its record. Food that cost $1 in June 1946 now costs $1.47. Other necessities, like clothing, which cost $1 in June 1946, now costs $1.25. The doubling up of many American families, due to the housing shortage, is a crime. With both political parties committed to the passage of civil rights legislation, the effect of Senator VANDENBERG'S ruling prevents this issue from coming to a vote.

"The Congress of Industrial Organizations was informed this morning that, due to a decision of the Republican policy committee, the Congress will adjourn Saturday, having heard, outside of Government witnesses, only the representatives of the banking fraternity on the all-important question of inflation.

"The phony filibuster successfully conducted by the southern Democrats is a decided contrast to the prompt squelching by the Republican leadership of the recent filibuster led by Senator LANGER to include a civil-rights program in the recently enacted Selective Service Act. Senator VANDENBERG'S ruling, which allowed the filibuster to continue, makes a mockery of the deliberative process and, in view of the arbitrary adjournment date, made it easy for the Republican Party to do nothing effective to control inflation, to do nothing to provide decent homes for the returned veterans, to do nothing to protect and extend the civil rights of all the people.

"Although it would appear that there is no need for long hearings to establish the need for anti-inflation legislation, the meaningless bill now being considered makes it mandatory for organizations representing the public interest to be heard. Senator CAPEHART has publicly stated that the people were not interested in the cost of living. He claimed that there were no requests to testify on the need for legislation to halt the upward inflationary spiral, despite the fact that the CIO and many other groups representing the average American have requested time to be heard on this subject.

"In the interest of the general public, we urge that you as leaders of the Republican Party exercise your influence to hold Congress in session in order to hear the views of President Philip Murray on inflation, Secretary-Treasurer Carey on the civil-rights program, Vice President Rieve on the excess-profits tax bill introduced by Congressman DINGELL, and the need for enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill by Vice President Reuther. This special session of Congress cannot afford to adjourn without establishing this record on which the American people will vote November 2.

"I would appreciate an early reply so that if Congress is to stay at work and do its job we can inform our membership and arrange for the appearance of our witnesses.

"JAMES B. CAREY,
"Secretary-Treasurer of the CIO."

AUGUST 4, 1948.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

We were shocked to be informed today that the CIO has been denied an opportunity to testify during the hearings being conducted by your committee on proposed anti-inflation legislation.

The 6,000,000 members of the CIO and their families are suffering daily what may properly be described in the language of the Republican Party presidential candidate as "frightful impositions" caused by the high and rising cost of living resulting from uncontrolled inflation that, if continued, is bound to result in bust and depression. We believe our testimony would be of interest and value to your committee. In any event, we feel that we should have an opportunity to present it on its merits and under circumstances that will make it possible for the members of your committee to test its validity by questioning.

More shocking than the abrupt cloture invoked before opportunity had been given to us or to other organizations to present facts, opinions, problems, and criticisms of pending legislation is the reason stated for breaking off hearings, namely, a decision by the Republican policy committee that, rain or shine, inflation or no inflation, the Congress must adjourn next Saturday night.

Most shocking is the statement that only "Government witnesses" would be heard and the unprecedented classification of private bankers whose banks happen to be members of the Federal Reserve System as "Government witnesses." As we understand it, they are members of the Federal Reserve System purely for regulatory purposes.

The discrimination in favor of the bankers on the one hand, and against other citizens and their organizations on the other hand, is an unfortunate precedent which, we prefer to believe, you personally would not seriously defend.

We urge you to reconsider and to support our request to Senator TAFT and Speaker MARTIN that Congress be kept in session until effective action has been taken on the emergency items of inflation, housing, and civil rights.

We will appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience.

JAMES B. CAREY,
Secretary-Treasurer, CIO.

THE PRESIDENT'S ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement issued today by the President at his press conference.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, I am reporting to the Congress concerning a labor dispute which recently existed in the bituminous coal industry.

The significant facts concerning this dispute may be summarized as follows:

The dispute involved the administration of a collective-bargaining agreement known as the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement of 1947, which was signed by the United Mine Workers of America and certain coal operators and associations. The dispute grew out of the dissatisfaction of the union with the failure of the trustees of the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund, established by the agreement, to begin the payment of benefits. In accordance with the terms of the agreement the union had appointed Mr. John L. Lewis as trustee of the fund, the operators had appointed Mr. Ezra Van Horn, and these two had selected Mr. Thomas E. Murray as the third trustee. The trustees were unable to agree upon any plan for the amount of benefits to be paid out of the fund or the eligibility of miners for such benefits. Mr. Murray therefore resigned from his office as trustee. The continued failure to begin payment from the fund resulted in a work stoppage.

On March 23, 1948, I signed Executive Order 9939, creating a board of inquiry pursuant to section 206 of the Labor Management Relations Act. I requested the board to report to me on or before April 5, 1948. The board held public hearings on March 26, 29, and 30, and filed its first report with me on March 31, 1948. That report advised me fully of the facts of the dispute and indicated that the stoppage had "precipitated a crisis in the industry and in the Nation as a whole." A copy of that report is attached.

I therefore requested the Attorney General, in accordance with the provisions of section 208 of the Labor Management Relations Act, to petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for an injunction. An injunction was granted by Justice T. Alan Goldsborough of that court on April 3, 1948. It restrained the union from continuing the strike which the court then found was in existence, ordered the union to instruct all members to return to their employment, and further ordered the union and the operators to bargain collectively.

Following the issuance of the injunction on April 3, 1948, there was a gradual return of miners to work. Compliance with the provisions of that injunction and substantially normal production in the bituminous coal mines was obtained on or about April 26, 1948.

Soon after the issuance of the injunction of April 3, 1948, the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES was selected by the two remaining trustees as the new third trustee under the agreement. Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. Lewis, as trustees, approved a plan for beginning payment of benefits under the fund. Mr. Van Horn withheld his approval and challenged the legality of the action of the majority of the trustees in a proceeding instituted in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. On June 23, 1948, Justice Goldsborough dismissed the complaint filed by Mr. Van Horn and held that the plan of Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. Lewis for beginning payment of benefits under the fund was legal.

As a result of the settlement of the dispute over the fund, the Attorney General, pursuant to section 210 of the Labor Management Relations Act, requested the court to discharge the injunction. The injunction was discharged on June 23, 1948.

The Board of Inquiry was reconvened subsequent to the issuance of the injunction, pursuant to section 209 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, and submitted its final report to me on June 26, 1948. A copy of the report is attached.

It should be noted that this dispute is distinct from that with respect to which I created a board of inquiry on June 19, 1948, by Executive Order 9970, and which made its report to me on June 24, 1948. That board was created because of the imminent expiration of the 1947 contract between the United Mine Workers of America and the bituminous coal operators, and the consequent threat of a stoppage of work. A new contract covering most of the industry was agreed upon by the parties prior to the expiration of the old contract and no injunction was sought. A new contract for the remainder of the industry was subsequently negotiated. Since the report of the second board contains a comprehensive summary of the entire chain of events concerning both disputes, a copy of its report is attached to this message for the convenience of the Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 5, 1948.*

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Negro Looks at Civil Rights," which appeared in the Danville (Va.) Register.

I desire to call particular attention to the excerpt this editorial contains from an article written by Mr. Davis Lee, Negro publisher of the Newark (N. J.) Telegram.

I regard this statement as one of the most accurate and clearest presentations I have even seen of the racial controversy. I think it is especially timely and fitting and should be read by every patriotic American who is so deeply interested in the problems confronting our Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEGRO LOOKS AT CIVIL RIGHTS

It is unfortunate that most of the news discussing race relations comes from professional agitators who have, or think they have, something to gain from creating animosity while talking rabidly about discrimination and, in the same voice, good will.

As publisher of a newspaper with a large circulation and a corresponding influence, Davis Lee, Negro publisher of the Telegram, of Newark, N. J., which has some 500,000 Negro readers in the Southern States, grew less willing to accept the preachments of agitators concerning racial relations in the South. He decided to do a bit of investigating personally. Last Sunday he reported to his readers in a comprehensive article on the editorial page. Some excerpts which reflect his objective approach to the problem and provide sound counsel were called to our attention by the Bedford Democrat, which also was impressed by Publisher Lee. Keeping in mind that the comment is that of a distinguished champion of Negro advancement, and that it was printed in New Jersey, the Telegram editorial takes on added significance.

"I have just returned from an extensive tour of the South. In addition to meeting and talking with our agents and distributors who get our newspapers out to the more than 500,000 readers in the South, I met both Negroes and whites in the urban and rural centers.

"Because of these personal observations, studies and contacts, I feel that I can speak with some degree of authority. I am certainly in a better position to voice an opinion than the Negro leader who occupies a suite in downtown New York and bases his opinions on the South from the distorted stories he reads in the Negro press and in the Daily Worker.

"The racial lines in the South are so clearly drawn and defined there can be no confusion. When I am in Virginia or South Carolina I don't wonder if I will be served if I walk into a white restaurant. I know the score. However, I have walked into several right here in New Jersey where we have a civil-rights law, and have been refused service.

"The whites in the South stay with their own and the Negroes do likewise. This one fact has been the economic salvation of the Negro in the South. Atlanta, Ga., compares favorably with Newark in size and population. Negroes there own and control millions of dollars' worth of business. All of the Negro business in New Jersey will not amount to as much as our race has in one city in Georgia. This is also true in South Carolina and Virginia.

"New Jersey today boasts of more civil-rights legislation than any other State in the Union, and State government itself practices more discrimination than Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Georgia. New Jersey employs one Negro in the motor vehicle department. All of the States above-mentioned employ plenty.

"No matter what a Negro wants to do, he can do it in the South. In Spartanburg, S. C., Ernest Collins, a young Negro, operates a large funeral home, a taxicab business, a filling station, grocery store, has several busses, runs a large farm and a night club.

"Mr. Collins couldn't do all that in New Jersey or New York. The only bus line operated by Negroes is in the South. The Safe Bus Co. in Winston-Salem, N. C., owns and operates over a hundred. If a Negro in New Jersey or New York had the money and attempted to obtain a franchise to operate a line he would not only be turned down, but he would be lucky if he didn't get a bullet in the back.

"The attitude of the southerners toward our race is a natural psychological reaction and aftermath of the Civil War. Negroes were the properties of these people.

"Certainly you could not expect the South to forget this in 75 or even a hundred and fifty years. That feeling has passed from one generation to another, but it is not one of hatred for the Negro. The South just doesn't believe that the Negro has grown up. No section of the country has made more progress in finding a workable solution to the Negro problem than the South. Naturally southerners are resentful when the North attempts to ram a civil-rights program down their throats.

"The entire race program in America is wrong. Our approach is wrong. We expend all our energies, and spend millions of dollars trying to convince white people that we are as good as they are, that we are an equal. Joe Louis is not looked upon as a Negro but the greatest fighter of all time, loved and admired by whites in South Carolina as much as by those in Michigan. He convinced the world, not by propaganda and agitation, but by demonstration.

"Our fight for recognition, justice, civil rights and equality, should be carried on within the race. Let us demonstrate to the world by our living standards, our conduct, our ability and intelligence that we are the equal of any man, and when we shall have done this the entire world, including the South, will accept us on our terms. Our present program of threats and agitation makes enemies out of our friends."

The findings of Publisher Lee are just what any well-informed southerner, white or colored, has known all along. The only difference is that Publisher Lee has chosen to state plainly facts which agitation distorts, and which any Negro leader of lesser standing could not declare without subjecting himself to vituperation and charges of being "a white man's Negro."

Both white and colored people of the Nation must come to understand, and quickly, that much of the agitation attempting to break up their friendship and cordial relations is inspired by persons at home and abroad who have no interest whatever in seeing southern whites and Negroes march toward a firmer economic base and to higher economic base and to higher standards of living for both races.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter just received from a Montana constituent who is typical, I am sure, of thousands of mothers in America. I strongly urge my fellow Members of the Congress to give her letter their careful attention. They will find it, as I have, a most graphic presentation of the overwhelming problems now besetting America's

families. Upon reading it, they will be convinced that so far as our people are concerned, we are truly confronted with a national emergency. They will, I hope, join with me in recognizing that it is our duty to stay on the job until we have passed legislation which will solve the overwhelming problems confronting the mothers of Montana and of the Nation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUTTE, MONT., *July 28, 1948.*

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY.

DEAR SIR: I just heard Senator TAFT and Representative HALLECK speaking on their attitude toward the problems posed for the special session by President Truman.

Among other statements made by Representative HALLECK was one to the effect that many prices including that of haircuts were going down, and I am wondering how long since he has had one, and at which shop in which State he got it, certainly not in Butte, Mont. They also spoke of all the protection they have given the veterans and their dependents; I would surely like to see some of it. I very well know that my husband, a veteran of World War I, has received none of these despite the fact that due to a service-connected heart condition he has been unable to work at a gainful occupation for over 2 years, for this disability he is rated at 30 percent and allowed compensation at the rate of $41.40 per month; this completely disregards his dependents which include a wife and eight minor children. He is a man who worked steadily as long as he was able, and would gladly work now were he able, instead he has to stand helplessly by and watch his children be deprived of the necessities of life because the aid to dependent children in the amount of $130 a month which I receive simply won't provide more than a mere existence at today's high prices. Have you ever tried feeding, clothing, housing, and supplying medical, dental, and optical care on an income per person of $17 a month? Try it. Then you won't wonder why so many of our youth can't meet the physical requirements of our armed forces.

In the face of conditions such as these, can you with a clear conscience, vote to adjourn this special session without taking action to rectify these conditions?

If you can, my suggestion is that you at least act to supply gas chambers such as the Nazis had to eliminate people such as us, as being far more merciful than a slow death from malnutrition, which is sure to be our fate if inflation is allowed to continue unchecked.

My people have been giving their lives and services in defense of this democracy for over 130 years. I wonder if they could see the state of the common man now, if they wouldn't consider their sacrifices as being just wasted energy.

Hoping that I will have your answer soon, I remain,

Yours truly,

PATRICIA BURNS
(Mrs. Patrick J. Burns).

CLAIMS OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR AGAINST ENEMY NATIONS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, a statement in the National AMVET, the official publication of the AMVETS of World War II, for August 1948, pertaining to the question of claims of American prisoners of war against enemy nations, is of particular interest now to a great number of former prisoners of war in Maryland and other States.

It calls attention to the fact which some of us noted with deep regret, that Public Law 896, enacted during the closing days of the second session of the Eightieth Congress, failed to provide administrative or other necessary costs to effectuate the legislation.

Because it points so definitely to the need for action in this respect, I ask that the AMVET statement be placed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUICK SETTLEMENT OF POW'S CLAIMS URGED

WASHINGTON.—Failure of the Federal Government to move promptly in setting up legal machinery to handle the claims of American prisoners of war against enemy nations brought an urgent demand for action from AMVETS this month.

Commander Edward C. Corry appealed personally to Director James E. Webb of the Federal Budget Bureau urging that the liquidated assets of enemy aliens be used to provide the necessary money for meeting these claims.

Corry pointed out that the Government already has upward of $70,000,000 in such assets available for transfer to the newly authorized War Claims Commission created by Congress for the express purpose of adjudicating the claims of American POW's.

Although the War Claims Commission was established under Public Law 896, as passed by the Eightieth Congress, Commander Corry called Mr. Webb's attention to the fact that no appropriation is included in the law.

Said Corry:

"Inasmuch as we feel this is an urgent problem for those veterans who paid such a high price in suffering for our victory and because they have waited patiently since 1945 for this Commission, it is felt by AMVETS that the Bureau of the Budget should now take whatever steps may be necessary in fulfilling the intent of Congress that an appropriation be made."

The new law applies particularly to the claims of prisoners who suffered cruel and inhuman treatment in violation of the Geneva covenants.

The bulk of such claims, of course, are against the Japanese Government.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL-TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil-transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I appeared before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and presented to that committee certain facts regarding the destruction of food in America, which is now taking place under the authority of the Department of Agriculture. It has been recognized that one of the major problems facing this country today is the high cost of living. The President of the United States apparently felt that this problem was serious enough to use it as one of the excuses for calling Congress back into session.

I was not at all surprised to hear the President last Tuesday in his message to the joint session of Congress ask for a restoration of price controls and rationing. Soon after assuming my duties in the Senate, it became evident to me that the present New Deal administration had no other method to offer to meet the high cost of living than through the rigid controls of our economy, and it was determined to reinstate them even though our experience under OPA demonstrated that controls in peacetime would retard rather than increase production.

I am not disputing the statement of the President that the cost of living today has reached fantastic heights. Nor am I questioning the wisdom that some action should be taken to remedy the situation. I do differ with the administration, however, on what method should be taken.

Rather than restore price controls, which President Truman once described as "police-state methods," and revive the black markets in this country, I think it would be much more sensible to examine the policies of the New Deal administration over the past 16 years which have contributed to high prices and then make necessary adjustments.

One of the first acts of the New Deal administration 15 years ago was the deliberate devaluation of the American dollar through the abandonment of the gold standard, followed in rapid order by the creation of numerous alphabetical agencies, whose principal functions were the redistribution of wealth along socialistic patterns through the medium of 14 years of deficit financing.

This philosophy became so brazen that the New Deal apostle, Harry Hopkins, coined his memorable phrase, "We will tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect and elect."

One overlooked factor contributing to the high cost of living is the high cost of government, which today requires for its support an average of 31 cents out of every earned dollar.

The New Deal administration has completely ignored the historical fact that continued excessive Government expenditures lead to ruinous inflation. In fact, the President in his message to the Congress still ignored this economic principle when, in one sentence, he urged the Congress to take action on the high cost of living, and at the next moment called for additional Federal spending on a gigantic scale and an enlargement of Government subsidy programs.

The policy of the administration has been not only to continue but in many instances to further enlarge the payment of Government subsidies to farmers as well as to numerous industrial corporations. Actually we are today spending annually hundreds of millions of dollars subsidizing industry during the period of the greatest prosperity our country has ever experienced. Many of these subsidies could have been eliminated or at least drastically reduced during recent years, yet no suggestion is made along these lines. Even today we have on our Senate calendar bills calling for subsidy payments to the mining industry, the aviation industry, and to many other groups. All these bills have the enthusiastic support of Senators on both sides of the aisle, many of whom are here today criticizing the high cost of Government.

In his message the President endorsed the principle of raising wages in industry, and again claimed this could be done without necessitating increased prices. At the same time, he recommended and urged increased wage levels for Government employees; however, in this instance, as Chief Executive of the greatest corporation in the United States, the Government itself, he admits his inability to perform the miracle and requests Congress to appropriate additional sums, making no effort to absorb the wage increase in the normal income of the Government.

The President points out that production in industry has not reached the expected goals in meeting supply and demand; however, he makes no reference to the fact that it was the New Deal administration which recommended reducing the 44-hour week immediately following the war to prevent at that time the depression predicted by the brain trust.

To further demonstrate the lack of sincerity on the part of the present New Deal administration in taking adequate steps to reduce the cost of living, notably the housewife's food basket, I wish at this time to present some examples of a policy now being used by the New Deal administration deliberately to hold prices up. I refer now to the farm price-support program which the President, if he were sincere, would have requested Congress to revise on a realistic basis.

This program is a byproduct of Henry Wallace's brainstorm under which he advocated plowing under every third row and killing every fourth pig to remove the agricultural surpluses of the country. To show how this program works to keep prices up, I shall cite a few examples.

The first example I cite is that of potatoes.

At the very moment I speak here, agents of the Department of Agriculture are swarming over the potato-producing areas of the Nation, buying from the farmers potatoes at a price averaging $2.75 per hundredweight. Since the Congress adjourned in June, I have spent considerable time watching this wasteful program function. I would recommend that each Member of the Senate who is interested in the high cost of living visit some of these agricultural areas and see for himself these programs in operation.

I had previously felt that my knowledge of this program was reasonably complete, but I was both amazed and disgusted, as were the farmers themselves, with the policy of our Government in its methods of administering this program.

I saw farmers delivering strictly U. S. No. 1 potatoes to the Government at the delivery centers and receiving in return a price of $2.75 per hundredweight. The purchases were being conducted by a group of Government buyers on the spot.

At the same location other Government agents were offering for resale these same potatoes to other farmers and in many instances to the same farmers who produced them, for the ridiculously low price of 1 cent per hundredweight. The principal condition to the contract which the farmer signs when purchasing these potatoes for 1 cent per bag is that he will not allow any of them so purchased to be used for human consumption. He is allowed only to feed these strictly No. 1 potatoes to domestic animals.

In plain language, it was perfectly legal under this contract to feed these potatoes to any livestock, whether they be cattle, hogs, or dogs, but under no circumstances could he allow his children to eat them, regardless of the need. I have witnessed the dumping of hundreds of bags of good edible potatoes into the hog lots. This procedure is comparable to that which is being carried out all over the Nation right now while we debate the high cost of living.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator name the farmer to whom he has been referring?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, because I am not criticizing the farmers. I am criticizing the administration. If the Senator from Illinois wants to verify my statement, he can obtain records from the Department of Agriculture, or if he will come to the State of Delaware I shall be glad to take him for a ride in my automobile and show him where it occurred.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not care to take an automobile ride with the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the Senator's own State of Illinois the same thing is going on.

Mr. LUCAS. I asked the Senator a simple question. He made the statement that he could prove that the Government was buying potatoes from certain farmers and selling them right back to the same farmers, and I asked him to name one farmer, which he refuses to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because I am not criticizing the farmers.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not, either.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall read a letter from the Department of Agriculture in connection with the question, because the Senator from Illinois seemed to be in a little doubt——

Mr. LUCAS. I am not in doubt about anything. All I am asking is that the Senator name one farmer. I do not care anything about hearing a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture. The Senator has made a statement, and I think he ought to give me the information requested.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not criticizing any farmer. Of the 1948 crop, all of which has been dug since Congress adjourned on June 20, the Government has disposed of 3,410,000 bushels of strictly No. 1 potatoes in the manner in which I have indicated, for which the Government has paid from $2.75 to $2.90, for the farmers to dump into the hog lots at one penny a bag.

The Secretary of Agriculture who appeared before the committee yesterday admitted all these things. I am not bringing in the names of the farmers involved, because it is not the farmers' fault.

Mr. LUCAS. Whose fault is it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is the fault of the Congress and the President of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very happy that the Senator has included the Congress of the United States, because the Congress, as the Senator well knows, continued the support program over the protest of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and other Senators who sought a program at the last session which would take care of the very situation about which the Senator from Delaware is complaining. We discussed the potato question for days, and after the Senate passed a long-range farm program which would have effectively dealt with the question, the Republicans in the House refused to go along with the bill and brought back the same old 90-percent parity guaranty on basic and nonbasic commodities. So the Secretary of Agriculture has a mandate from the Republican Congress to do exactly what he is doing with reference to potatoes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad the Senator from Illinois has brought that up, and I want at this time to call his attention to the fact that I voted against this unsound program while the Senator from Illinois voted for it, as did every Democrat except one on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not know what he is talking about with respect to the farm program I am discussing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The President of the United States criticized the bill by saying it was not liberal enough to the farmers.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not speaking of what the President of the United States did; I am talking about what Congress did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And I am talking about what the Senator from Illinois did.

Mr. LUCAS. I am talking about what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] who was the leader of a long-range farm program containing flexible parity provisions, proposed, which would have taken care of the very situation to which the Senator is now referring. He could not get it through because the House of Representatives, led by the distinguished Representative from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, would not let the bill pass. The House sent this bill back with the same old support program. Now the Senator from Delaware criticizes the Agriculture Department for the potato situation, when all that it is doing is acting under a mandate of this Congress, and nothing else.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Illinois think that if the Secretary of Agriculture had not been acting under a mandate of the Congress his actions would have been different?

Mr. LUCAS. Of course. If the Congress had given him flexible authority to deal with the potato situation and with the citrus-fruit situation, with raisins, chickens, eggs, and every other basic and nonbasic commodity, of course, the situation would have been different from what it is at the present time. If there is any responsibility in connection with the potato question or with respect to any other nonbasic commodities, and the Government has to go into the taxpayers' pockets to pay a subsidy, the responsibility rests with the Republican-controlled Congress, because it had an opportunity to correct the situation. The Committee on Agriculture, headed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont after investigations throughout the country, brought back a program which was adopted in the last days of the session, because of the courage of the Senator from Vermont. He had difficulty in getting the policy committee to accept the bill, but it was finally overwhelmingly passed by the Senate. The House refused to go along with it, and so the identical support program was brought back. We agreed to continue the bill providing 90 percent of parity on basic and nonbasic commodities for 1 year, and that is why the potato situation is as it is today. That is the only reason.

I challenge the Senator to show where the Secretary of Agriculture is exceeding his authority under the mandates laid down by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Illinois to remain in the Chamber for a few minutes, because I am going to discuss a part of this program over which the Congress did not give the Secretary of Agriculture a mandate and under which food is being removed from the American markets.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to remain.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I emphasize that I stood on the floor of the Senate at the time the agricultural program was up for discussion and denounced it as economically unsound. I voted against it. I live in an agricultural county which ranks third in agricultural production east of the Rocky Mountains, and rates ahead of any county in Illinois. The Senator from Illinois and every Democrat on the other side of the aisle voted for the program, with the exception of one, so there is no use criticising the Eightieth Congress or the Republican Party. There is nothing in the law instructing the Secretary of Agriculture to destroy food. I said at the time that the program was unsound, and I repeat, it is still unsound, but it is absurd for the President to ask for price controls when at the same time the Government is supporting those prices at artificially high levels. It cannot be done.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Rather an observation. I am not going to debate the issue the Senator is discussing. The only thing I am trying to get straight in the minds of the people is the potato question. As I understood the Senator, he was attempting to lay the responsibility and assess the blame upon the Department of Agriculture for what was going on in the disposition of surplus potatoes. My only point is that whatever goes on with respect to potatoes, the Secretary of Agriculture is following the mandate laid down by the Eightieth Congress in the last session. That is the point I wish to make, and that is the point the American people ought to have made clear. Instead of blaming the Department of Agriculture, the Senator should lay all the responsibility on the Congress of the United States where it legitimately belongs, and not upon the executive branch of the Government which is compelled under the Constitution to execute faithfully the laws the legislative branch enacts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I still say, Mr. President, and without excusing the actions of the Congress at all, either my party or the other, that the major part of the responsibility for this program does lie with the Secretary of Agriculture. There is nothing in the law anywhere which says that the Secretary of Agriculture shall destroy these potatoes, or sell them for the prices being received. We are now operating the European recovery program, under which we are feeding Europe, and why are not any of these potatoes shipped to Europe?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows that many of the potatoes are not the kind that can be shipped. There is a potato raised in Alabama, many of which were destroyed last year, about which a great fuss was made all over the country, a peculiar potato that had to be shipped in a refrigerator car and be in New York within 3 days after it was dumped on the ground. But the growers could not get refrigerator cars, and the potatoes had to be destroyed. It is necessary in most cases to dehydrate them in order to send them to Europe, and that is not being done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think the Senator from Illinois can tell me much about potatoes. I handled potatoes for 25 years before I came to the Senate. The potatoes in Virginia, North Carolina, Maryland, and Delaware cannot be exported satisfactorily, it is true. But those potatoes can be stored in warehouses in the United States, and they will keep until the middle of winter, and will still be good enough to eat. I have eaten such potatoes.

The potatoes the Government buys, which are produced in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, or anywhere in the northern section, are good for export, but they were not exported. For instance, during the period when the Luckman committee was in control, which was advocating the conservation of food in America, over 1,000 cars of good northern potatoes which could have been exported, were given to the alcohol companies free of charge, and as if that were not attractive enough, the Government paid out additional money to get them to take them off their hands.

Potatoes were exported last year to the Argentine, to Buenos Aires, which is twice the distance potatoes would go if they were shipped to Europe. I know potatoes can be exported, and the Senator from Illinois need not tell me they cannot. They have been exported by the Department of Agriculture, to South American countries, during the winter months, good potatoes, that could have gone to Europe, and the interesting point is that they were sold for shipment to people in South America at prices lower than those the Department of Agriculture was allowing the American housewife to pay for them.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a very interesting observation, but what I am saying, in substance, is that in spite of the criticisms the Senator is making against the Department of Agriculture if potatoes were sent abroad and were rotting, for example, on the docks at Southampton, the information would be sent all over this country, and the Senator from Delaware would be the first to rise and criticize the Department of Agriculture in case they lost some carload lots.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, why should they rot on the docks? Let the people eat them. Potatoes are now being rationed in Europe. The potatoes I am referring to could have been shipped to Europe. There is no one in the Department of Agriculture who can convince me otherwise. If they can go to South America, they can go to Europe, and I know they can be exported. Any man who has ever handled potatoes will agree with that. I do not refer to the southern potatoes, but the southern potatoes now being destroyed could be held in warehouses and the American people could use them while the northern potatoes could be exported. This would have eliminated the necessity of scraping the bottom of the American grain bins.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the Senator is absolutely opposed to any kind of a support program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I believe in a support program, but not one which supports any agricultural commodity or any industry—at artificially high levels, especially during a period of our greatest prosperity.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator vote against the Aiken bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, and the Senator from Illinois voted for it.

Mr. LUCAS. That is typical of the political philosophy of most of the eastern Republicans.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is all right; I am still condemning it, and the Senator from Illinois is upholding it. The same program can be carried out under the Aiken bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In order to keep the subject out of politics, I should like to say that Governor Dewey has publicly announced that a long-range farm bill should be the cornerstone of a good farm program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I said at the time the bill was under discussion, as will be found if Senators will read the RECORD, and I repeat now, that I believe we should have a sound agricultural program. I have been as close to agriculture as has any other Senator, but I do not think any agricultural program which guarantees a margin of profit is economically sound. An agricultural program is supposed to keep the farmers from going bankrupt in hard times, or tide them over an emergency. It is not supposed to guarantee them a profit, and $2.75 or $2.90 a bag is a big price for potatoes. Farmers can make a great deal of money growing them at that price if they have a reasonable yield. Any potato grower will verify that. Do not forget that the American housewife is caught in the middle of this program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Was the Senator from Delaware present yesterday when Mr. Brannan, the Secretary of Agriculture, testified?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was present, yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator hear him say he was unalterably opposed to the subsidy program upon potatoes, but was carrying out the mandate of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I heard him say that it should be revised, but he failed to tell what his program was. I asked him if he would join with me in saying that the program should be repealed or revised, and I am still waiting for his answer.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course he does. He could not be against subsidies on potatoes without desiring a change in the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The point I am making is that the Senator cannot put the blame on the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Secretary of Agriculture does not have to destroy these potatoes under any law. I have said before, and I repeat again, there is no justifiable reason for the destruction of good food in America.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was interested in the remark made by the Senator from Vermont about the endorsement given by Governor Dewey to the farm program. As I understood him, he said Governor Dewey favored a long-range agricultural program. Does that mean that the Governor has specifically endorsed the Aiken bill?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it means that.

Mr. HATCH. He did not refer to it by name, but merely said he favored a long-range program.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, he referred to the specific price support and the bill which was approved by this Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To continue what I said before; when these potatoes are sold to the farmers it is perfectly legal under the contract of sale to the farmers to feed the potatoes to any livestock, whether they be cattle, hogs, or dogs, but under no circumstances could he allow his children to eat them, regardless of the need. In recent weeks I have witnessed the dumping of hundreds of bags of edible potatoes in the hog lots. The procedure is comparable to that which is being carried out all over the Nation right now while we debate the high cost of living.

Out of this year's potato crop alone the Government has disposed of 3,410,000 bushels of strictly No. 1 potatoes in the manner I have just described. This is not the whole story. In addition, the Government has purchased over 5,000,000 bushels of potatoes which have been diverted to the distillers of this country, for which the Government has actually paid out money to get the distillers to take them off its hands.

The loss to the Government to date on the 1948 white-potato crop alone is approximately $16,000,000, the bulk of which has been sustained since Congress adjourned June 19, 1948. It is ironical to read in the Government reports that large quantities of potatoes were being dumped into alcohol plants in Philadelphia at the very moment when, on the other side of the city of Philadelphia, the Democratic Party was adopting a platform endorsing this unsound program, and at the same time loudly proclaiming its sympathy to the American housewife, who is obliged as a result to pay continued high prices for potatoes. While the Democratic Convention was in progress in the city of Philadelphia, on the other side of the city the distilleries were actually dumping over 100 cars of good potatoes, and the Government paid out approximately $10,000 to get the distillers to take those potatoes off their hands.

ANOTHER FOOD ITEM

Our Government has spent in recent months $32,000,000 to make certain that the eggs purchased by the housewife will not drop in price. The eggs purchased under this program have been disposed of principally in foreign-occupied areas and at a loss of over $24,000,000. This loss in itself is not so much as the effect such operations have on the cost of a purchase at the grocery store by the housewife.

I hope the Senator from Illinois will not leave the Chamber just now. We are reaching a particularly interesting point.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Delaware has any question he wishes to direct to the Senator from Illinois, I shall be glad to answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It so happens that the part of the program I am discussing now is not mandatory on the Department of Agriculture. It is not written into law. For instance, I shall now call attention to the fact that early this year when the market price for prunes began to decline the Government began purchases. There is nothing in the law which says the Secretary of Agriculture must support the price of prunes.

Mr. LUCAS. Well, the Senator from Delaware just does not know the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Secretary of Agriculture himself confirmed this fact that while he has the power to do it if he wishes, it is not mandatory.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Delaware will recall what we wrote into the ERP legislation with respect to prunes, raisins, and other California fruits.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, but that does not make the support of such fruits mandatory.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Delaware knows that Congress wrote into the ERP legislation provisions with respect to California fruits and commodities, as applied to that program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Where is the language with respect to prunes mandatory?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from California is on the floor. He offered an amendment, which I understand the Senator from Delaware supported, giving the citrus growers and prune and raisin growers of California the right to dispose of their surplus crops under the ERP program in order that the needy European people might get them. I believe the Senator from Delaware supported that amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois is just a little of base. I appeared before the committee, as I believe the present occupant of the chair, the President pro tempore, will confirm, and protested against that amendment, as I thought it was unsound. I voted against the amendment on the floor of the Senate. As I remember the Senator from Illinois voted for it.

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly did. I thought it was a very good thing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know the Senator from Illinois thought it was a very good thing. But to show how it is working out, I will say that immediately the Government entered the market and purchased over 140,000,000 pounds of prunes under that provision of the law, at a cost of $15,000,000. These in turn were diverted for foreign consumption in foreign occupied areas at a loss of over $9,000,000 to the American taxpayer. They were sold with the proviso that under no circumstances should they be offered for resale in the continental United States, while at the same time, and as a consequence, the retail price of prunes to the American housewife immediately started to rise.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Delaware should not be talking to me. He should be talking to the Senator from California, who knows all about this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought the Senator from Illinois was interested, because he defends this program and supported the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Delaware is mistaken. I did not offer an amendment respecting prunes. I am trying to take care of the corn, wheat, soybean, and hog producers in Illinois.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will come to them in a moment, and show what is being done with respect to them.

Mr. LUCAS. Well, the farmers in my part of the country are doing pretty well. I do not know how they are doing in Delaware under the able leadership of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I agree with you the farmers in Illinois are doing all right under this program, but how about the housewives in Chicago? The farmers in both States do better when managing their own affairs.

Mr. LUCAS. If so, they are doing very, very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I repeat, it will be better for everyone in the country when the Government takes itself out of this situation, and the producers are permitted to manage their own affairs.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; let them go back to a condition such as we had in 1932, when they turned the black acres loose and managed their own affairs.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say that if a great many of the Government regulations are dispensed with the farmers will produce the food the country needs. I call your attention to another food product.

In the early part of this year the market on dried raisins indicated weakness, and again the Government entered this market—which is something the Senator from Illinois said he agreed with and approves—and purchased 170,000,000 pounds of dried raisins—again disposed of them with the understanding that they could not be resold in the continental United States. No, Mr. President, the American housewife cannot be permitted to buy them. The raisins are here and could be made available to her at a reasonable price; but, no, she cannot buy them. The Government purchased 170,000,000,000 pounds of dried raisins at an approximate cost of $16,000,000 and diverted them from the normal trade channels, sustaining a loss in this instance of over $7,000,000. Immediately the retail price for dried raisins started to rise. We deduct a little additional from the American housewife's husband's pay envelope to pay for this loss so as to hold up the price.

Mr. LUCAS. What would the Senator from Delaware have done with the surplus prunes and raisins in California?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would have let the American people buy them.

Mr. LUCAS. Suppose no one had bought them, then what would the Senator have done?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we have reached the state where no one would buy these food products at a reasonable price, then I would say that the Senator from Illinois, and the President of the United States, have wasted a lot of time talking about the high cost of living.

Mr. LUCAS. How about the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who offered the amendment? He was interested in the matter of whether the producers in California were going to lose money on these crops.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois can ask the Senator from California and secure a reply from him. I will say that the proposal was a rather interesting one to me. Everyone seems to be concerned about the farmer around election time.

Mr. LUCAS. Everyone but the Senator from Delaware. He apparently is not concerned about the farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, the Senator from Delaware is concerned about the farmer, because if this kind of practice is continued we will have no agricultural program. Do not overlook the fact that the citrus products were bought from the dealers. The farmers had previously sold these products to the dealers. The harvest season was past. It was merely a matter of bailing out a bunch of dealers, using the farmers as an excuse. I have a list showing every single dealer from which the products were bought, and the prices paid to them.

Mr. LUCAS. The farmers have done pretty well under the so-called New Deal program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If they can be made to forget how much of the huge national debt has been charged up against each one of them, yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The farmer has been pretty well satisfied.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This November will tell us how well satisfied they are. The farmers were not satisfied 2 years ago.

Mr. LUCAS. He was not satisfied 2 years ago with the OPA because of what Republicans promised if it were abolished.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps you will find out how well satisfied the farmer is after November 2.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Delaware knows, and I know, that the farmer has more money in the bank now, is more prosperous, and his living conditions are much better than ever before. There is more rural electricity available to him, he has more refrigerators, washing machines, telephones, and more of the good things of life than he ever had in the history of America, and that improvement has come about under a Democratic administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with what the Senator has said respecting the improvement in the farmers' situation, but do not forget that these improvements are charged up against him in our national debt. That is another reason I say there is no justification for a subsidy at this time either to the farmer, industry, or any other group.

Mr. LUCAS. Ah, but what would the farmers' condition be had it not been for the program laid down by the Democratic administration back in 1933, when farmers all over the country, even in Delaware, were bankrupt; when a judge in Iowa was taken off the bench and threatened with hanging because he signed decrees of foreclosure? Had it not been for the imagination and courage shown by the Democratic administration, which entered upon a legislative program in 1933, for the improvement of the condition of the people of the country, the farmer never would have pulled out. Under the Republican theory just now being advocated by the Senator from Delaware he would have been unable to get out from under. Apparently the Senator from Delaware wants the farmers to go back to the condition in which they were in 1931, 1932, and 1933 when we had the worst depression in the history of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When the Senator refers to 1932, all he can think of is "depression." It is no more correct to charge that depression, which was world-wide, against the Republican Party than it would be now to charge World War II against the Democratic Party just because they happened to be in power.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure that is what the Senator would like; to go on back to the 1932 depression, because every political view he represents on the floor of the Senate demonstrates his reactionary viewpoint upon government. He would like to go back. But I want to remind the Senator that nothing is static in this world, and that things move on regardless of the Senator from Delaware and myself. The country cannot stand still. It cannot go back. We must move forward.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with you, things do change. That is the reason the Republicans are coming back into power.

Mr. LUCAS. We will wait and see about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will describe their operations in another commodity—the market price for grapefruit juice began to decline from the wartime price level. Again the Government rushed into the market and purchased 1,500,000 gallons at a cost of $2.25 per gallon and immediately offered it for resale to be distributed outside this country at slightly less than 40 cents per gallon, sustaining a loss of $3,000,000, and pushing the retail price of this product to higher levels.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to finish this statement.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator called me back. I was ready to leave, and he called me over here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad the Senator is over here. I should like to finish this statement.

On the transaction to which I have referred the Government lost $3,000,000, and the price of grapefruit juice began to rise.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois and ask, Does he believe that the program I am describing should continue? It is not mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to continue it. Does the Senator believe that he should do so?

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator, if he had been a citrus grower, if he would have taken any money for grapefruit juice under those circumstances?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I had been a citrus grower, I would have sold it, just as the citrus growers did. I am not criticizing the producers, as I stated in the beginning. I criticize the policy of the administration; and I point out to the Senator from Illinois—which he can check if he wishes—that the farmers have very little chance under the potato program, and many other programs, other than to sell to the Government, because all the private buyers who used to handle those products have been forced out of business. On the eastern shore of Virginia today, where 10,000 to 12,000 cars of potatoes are moved, we find very few private buyers left, because they cannot stay in business. No private buyer can operate in competition with the Government, which is handling the taxpayers' money, and does not care how it handles it. The farmers are forced to go into this program.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Government decided that the retail price for honey was not high enough, so it purchased 11,800,000 pounds at an approximate cost of $1,500,000 and shipped it outside this country. A loss of approximately $1,000,000 resulted, and the American housewife was forced to pay a higher price.

On June 30, 1946, the ceiling price on wheat was $1.74 a bushel. At the present time the Department of Agriculture has buyers in the Midwest supporting the market for wheat at an average of $2 a bushel. The Secretary of Agriculture has advised the farmers to store their wheat in the warehouses and to withhold it from the markets until such time as arrangements can be made with the Government buyers at the support prices.

The American housewife cannot expect the price of bread to decline so long as the Government insists upon maintaining the price of wheat at the present level.

The same statement made in reference to wheat applies with equal force in the corn market. In this instance the Government has announced a parity price at $1.59 per bushel, which is 17 cents per bushel higher than the maximum ceiling price prevailing during the war.

With the Government pledged to support the price of corn at these high levels, the American housewife cannot expect to buy cheaper pork and beef.

The Government has announced that it will support the wool market around 43 cents a pound. The 43-cent price is about 20 percent higher than the average price for which this commodity sold in the preceding 10 years. So long as this program remains in effect, you cannot expect cheaper woolen products.

Cotton is an essential product for every American home. In the preceding 10 years, including the war years, the average price which the American farmer received for cotton was 18 cents per pound. Today the Government is supporting the cotton market at approximately 28 cents per pound, or an increase over the preceding 10-year price of 50 percent.

How can the American housewife entertain any hope that under the administration's program she will be able to buy cheaper clothing? I wish someone in the administration or someone on the other side of the aisle would explain to me how it is mathematically possible to roll back prices to a level as recommended by the President, not to exceed 20 percent over the June 30, 1946, price, and at the same time continue a program under the Department of Agriculture whereby the administration itself supports the markets at levels greatly exceeding those figures. The administration has resisted every effort on the part of Congress or anyone else to modify this program.

After the ceiling price was removed on sugar, under a free market the price began to adjust itself at a reasonable level, and the market conditions indicated that the retail price would gradually become stabilized at a normal level.

The import quota was fixed on January 2, 1948, at 7,800,000 short tons, but as soon as the markets began to indicate weakness this import quota was reduced by the Department of Agriculture on February 26, 1948, in the amount of 300,000 tons. In the bulletin announcing that reduction in the import quota the Department pointed out that sugar prices in the United States had declined to a level below those prevailing while ceiling prices were in effect; therefore the import quota was being reduced to strengthen the market. They wanted to be sure that the market would not go down.

On May 26, 1948, a further reduction of 500,000 tons in the import quota was made by the Secretary of Agriculture and again the same reasons were given; namely, to check a declining market. Obviously the administration was determined that the sugar prices should remain high.

In every instance the Department's action of reducing the quota was followed by increased sugar prices, which completely contradicts the statement of the administration that it is concerned with the high price which the housewife pays for her sugar.

I have been advised that the Department of Agriculture has belatedly recognized that perhaps it has overdone this cutting back and either has recently or expects to in the very near future revise this quota upward.

I was advised yesterday that a third change has been made, as of July 26, and that the quota has now been revised upward.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Has the Senator discussed eggs and poultry?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am coming to eggs and poultry.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Delaware, I understand, is very much interested in those commodities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall reach it shortly.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to hear what the Senator has to say on that subject, because eggs and poultry have been treated in similar fashion with potatoes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I invite the attention of the Senator from Illinois to something which he perhaps does not know. So far as I know, not a single farmer in the State of Delaware has ever been subsidized in connection with poultry.

Mr. LUCAS. Let the Senator go ahead and talk about eggs and poultry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. First I ask, Can the Senator from Illinois say the same thing about his constituents?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is in that business, and he knows all about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, I am proud to say that our farmers have been doing all right without the support of the Government.

MEAT

The Government is supporting the price of pigs, beef, cattle, veal, sheep, chickens, and turkeys all at prices higher than the ceiling prices which prevailed during the war. To further aggravate the situation, the administration has recently announced a program for stock piling meats for future Government use and is launching its purchases for this stock piling during the current summer months, at a time when prices are extremely high, and during the months of lowest normal production.

Evidently the administration is determined to prove its statement that the American housewife will not be able to get meats.

I now yield to the Senator if he wishes to make comment. I should like to know how his farmers in Illinois are doing.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not need to ask me about my farmers in Illinois. He is making the address. All I am trying to do is to elicit some information about poultry and eggs. The Senator is an expert on that question. I know that the Government has subsidized the poultry dealers of the country under the 90-percent guaranty of parity in connection with nonbasic commodities. I was wondering whether or not the Senator had benefited as a result of that provision of the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Delaware has not benefited a single penny.

Mr. LUCAS. Many poultry raisers throughout the Nation have.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not benefited a single penny. Furthermore, to my knowledge not a single farmer in the State of Delaware has called on the Government for a subsidy on poultry.

Mr. LUCAS. That is very fine. I congratulate the Senator from Delaware. The Senator from Delaware will not deny that the law applies equally to the poultry farmers of Delaware as it does to the farmers in every other section of the country. If there was any subsidy coming to the farmers of Delaware, I presume they might take just a little of it if they had the opportunity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois says that they had the opportunity. I have pointed out that they have not taken advantage of the opportunity. If he wishes to prove otherwise, let him produce the record.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. At the present time the Government is supporting the price of eggs in the Midwest, but it is supporting them at 35 cents a dozen, which is a long way from the 75 or 80 cents which the consumer is paying for them. Somewhere between the price of 35 cents and the price of 80 cents there is about 45 cents which is lost in handling, transportation, profits, and other charges. I am glad that the Senator gave me an opportunity to point out that when the eastern consumer complains about the

high cost of eggs, we should not blame the farmer for it, nor Government price support, because the support is 35 cents a dozen.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not blaming the farmer, because laws are enacted in Congress. The President of the United States and the Congress together should assume responsibility. I am not criticizing the farmers for participating in this program. I have made that plain from the beginning. I am not criticizing them any more than I would criticize consumers in the cities during the war who bought food products when they were being subsidized by the Government. They had no choice. But I do criticize the economic soundness of the program. I think we have a right to criticize it. Otherwise the facts will not be brought out. I do not believe that it is sound to continue a program which supports at such high levels any agricultural commodities. I objected to the same thing in connection with industrial subsidies on numerous occasions. Many times the Senator from Illinois has complained at the large amount of money which industrial corporations are making. He will find that I was voting against him on industrial subsidies. I was one of the group of Senators—and we did not have the assistance of the Senator from Illinois, unfortunately—who in the closing days of the last session opposed the subsidy bill for the aviation industry; and I joined with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] in opposing a subsidy bill for the mining industry. I wish on that occasion we had had the enthusiastic support of the Senator from Illinois. I am opposed to subsidies, either to industry or to agriculture, at all times of prosperity. I do not think they are economically sound.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has a right to his position, of course.

If he will further yield, for one last remark by me, and then I shall cease and desist, let me say that when the Senator began his able address on the subject he evidently wished to leave the implication, and it seems to me that he has continued to try to do so, that the Department of Agriculture is to blame for all the bungling about potatoes and what not. What I maintain is that the Secretary of Agriculture is acting under the authority granted him by the Congress of the United States; and what he has done is what he has been required to do by the law which was passed at the last session of Congress.

I repeat that if the courageous Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] had had his way in the Congress, and if the Congress had passed the Aiken bill, with the flexible provisions so far as concerns parity on basic and nonbasic commodities, we would not have the trouble which now exists with respect to potatoes, chickens, eggs, and other nonbasic commodities which the Senator from Delaware has been discussing.

If there is any responsibility or blame to be placed, I repeat that it is to be placed upon the Eightieth Congress for its failure to adopt the program recommended by the committee headed by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Some of that responsibility may rest on the Eightieth Congress, but I call attention to the fact that the Senator from Illinois was one of the Senators who voted for the action which was taken and the President himself endorsed the program.

Mr. LUCAS. I was strongly in favor of the program advocated by the Senator from Vermont, and even some of the chicken and egg farmers thought that program was all right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, the Senator from Illinois supported that version of the program.

Mr. LUCAS. At the time when the final version was brought in, I could do nothing else; it was brought in at midnight, during the last hours of the session, and we had no choice; it was a question of either taking it or having nothing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All Senators were at liberty to vote against it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Aiken program itself was not before us for a vote at that time; we had to choose between either adopting the conference report or having nothing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois could have voted against it if he wished to do so. Regardless of the sympathy that is expressed in speech the vote is what counts. I know the Senator will agree with me as to that.

Mr. LUCAS. From a parliamentary standpoint, the Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And the Senator from Illinois and other Senators voted, on the floor of the Senate for the program I am criticizing today.

It is true that, under the law, the Secretary of Agriculture has to buy the potatoes. I am not criticizing him for that, and I never have. But I do criticize him for destroying them needlessly.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Delaware for that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Secretary of Agriculture does not have to destroy those potatoes. With a little more research, he could find ways in which they could be utilized.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish the Senator from Delaware would advise the Secretary of Agriculture about that matter. I know he would welcome the Senator's advice and counsel in regard to what to do with perishable potatoes, when it is impossible to get sufficient iced cars in which to ship them at certain times of the year, and so forth.

FUEL OIL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, another commodity to be mentioned in this connection is fuel oil. Both fuel oil and gasoline are high in price and scarce. Last winter this country was faced with a serious shortage of fuel oil, which was attributed primarily to the lack of transportation facilities. This was difficult to understand in view of the fact that our transportation facilities were adequate during the war to take care of both our wartime needs and our domestic requirements. This situation was even more difficult to understand since we have unlimited reserves of fuel oil in Arabia awaiting transportation.

An explanation can best be found in a report of the Maritime Commission which discloses the following facts:

At the beginning of World War II there were under the United States flag 447 tankers of all types. At the end of World War II there were under the American flag 764 tankers. During the period between the end of the war and May 1, 1948, the Maritime Commission sold and delivered to foreign nations 148 tankers, including some of our latest designs, at a loss to our taxpayers of approximately $200,000,000. This reduced our tanker fleet to approximately the prewar level, which was not adequate to take care of the additional volume of fuel oil now being currently required.

Recognizing its error somewhat late, the Maritime Commission, as of April 1, 1948, was frantically rushing construction of 27 new tankers, the expense of which will again largely be borne by the taxpayers.

I could go on indefinitely naming various commodities, the prices of which are kept high by Federal intervention; but from these examples it should be evident to everyone that it is impossible for the cost of living to be reduced so long as these unsound practices are continued. Price ceilings would be ineffective and mathematically impossible as I have pointed out, unless supplemented by consumer subsidy payments, as they were during the war period. As all of us know, subsidy payments by the Government, either at the consumer or producer levels, result in merely transferring a portion of our present-day grocery bill to the charge account of our children and grandchildren. When we compare the present-day prices with the prices existing prior to the removal of price ceilings, we should not overlook the fact that in the maintenance of the lower retail prices prevailing during the war period, the Government spent about $5,009,000,000 in consumer-subsidy payments to maintain those prices. That cost is now a part of our huge national debt.

I denounce this Government program as economically unsound and contrary to our American principles. There never has been, nor will there ever be, any excuse for the waste and destruction of food in America so long as some of our citizens are in need. I ask any member of this Senate to tell me how the high cost of these essential food and clothing products can be reduced by mere price controls without making some downward revision in this agricultural program or else resorting to direct subsidy payments.

As I have already said, my criticism of this program is not directed against any of the farmers who are participating in these sales or purchases. I know that most of the farmers would prefer a free economy and their own liberty of action. I personally have always been an advocate of a sound agricultural program; but it is my contention, and I have so expressed myself on many occasions, that any agricultural support program which equals or exceeds the cost of production is economically unsound and encourages waste and inefficiency.

The purpose of a support program should never be to guarantee a margin

of profit, but it should be used only as an instrument to which the farmers could resort in times of a national emergency. There is no justifiable reason for paying a subsidy to any group, whether they be farmers, laborers, consumers, or manufacturers, during times of national prosperity.

This inflationary program of supporting agricultural products at fantastically high levels, with the resultant high cost of living, is in reality benefiting no one. Every time the Government, through its purchases, increases the cost of agricultural products, as described, the result is a corresponding increase in the cost of living to the housewife. This in turn requires her husband to demand an increase in wages from his employer; the manufacturer for whom he is working must then increase his prices; and, to complete this inflationary cycle, the farmer, who must purchase these manufactured products, is required to pay the corresponding increase.

It is the height of political and economic nonsense for us to stand here today and promise the American farmer continued high support levels for his products, and at the same time promise the American housewife a reduction in the high cost of living. It just cannot be done under the American system of free enterprise, and the sooner we recognize it, the better it will be for the American people.

Also, Mr. President, let us not lose sight of a recent Supreme Court decision which asserted that the Government will always retain the right to control that which it subsidizes.

REVIEW OF ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS RELATIVE TO NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have a report to make, and I believe it should be made at this time, so as to acquaint the Congress and the people with the steps taken by the Eightieth Congress on measures necessary for the national security.

From time to time we hear statements and read articles criticizing the Eightieth Congress for failing to conceive and execute constructive legislation to meet the many vital domestic and foreign problems which face our country. I am mindful, of course, that this is not exactly a new tactic. So far as I can recall, each of the 79 preceding Congresses has been similarly criticized—especially in presidential election years. In fact, I do not believe our national history contains a single instance in which an outgoing Congress has been blessed with Nation-wide acclaim or an E either for effort or for excellence. Notwithstanding the woeful forebodings of this long line of congressional critics, our Nation has continued its unparalleled progress, and has remained the best country in the world in which to live, and in which to make a living. And so, while I am deeply conscious of the wholesome and stimulating effect of sound and impartial criticism, I do not feel greatly alarmed as I listen to or read the unflattering barrage which is directed toward the record of this Eightieth Congress by either the heavy howitzers or the light guns of the hostile artillery.

Yet, as the chairman of a committee which has been charged with responsibilities of the utmost significance to the safety and well-being of this Nation and its people, I feel that it is both appropriate and necessary that I should strive to reassure the men and women of this country as to the manner in which these responsibilities have been met. I also feel that it is incumbent upon me, as the nominal spokesman for the 12 other members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, to make the record perfectly clear insofar as it concerns the months of diligent, thorough, painstaking and thoroughly unselfish effort which they have devoted to the cause of national security, and the energetic and prompt cooperation which their efforts have met on the floor of the Senate.

On that basis, therefore, I shall address myself to a brief review of the specific achievements of the Eightieth Congress in the field of legislation promoting the national security. Not only do I believe the Members of this Congress are entitled to have these facts made known, but I also believe the people of the United States are entitled to some definite reassurance on this vital subject. I think this latter aspect of the matter is particularly important in view of the hazardous and uncertain international situation existing today.

If we go back to the opening days of the Eightieth Congress, we recall that we were in the process of demobilizing and disbanding the most powerful military force ever assembled by any nation. As an after effect of a long and bitter war, there was an overpowering national urge for speed in the demobilization and reconversion process. As a result, as this Congress assembled it found our armed services badly depleted and disorganized. Further, the character of war had changed so radically that the entire problem of national defense required a complete restudy and a radical change in approach. At the same time, the Congress was convening for the first time under the far-reaching procedural changes specified in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. In view of these factors, I believe it is entirely fair and accurate to say that no Congress was ever faced with more difficult and vital problems in the field of national security than was this Congress when it first assembled in January 1947.

The first step was to organize the Committees on Armed Services in the Senate and House, and assume the functions and records previously held by the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs. The promptness and effectiveness with which that committee was organized and proceeded to transact its business is a major tribute to the sincerity, the ability, and the spirit of public service of its membership. The problems with which they had to prepare to deal were not only of overriding national importance, but they were vastly complex and difficult. They covered not only the complicated technique of modern war on land, at sea, and in the air, but they involved also the vital fields of personnel, equipment, organization, and national resources. To summarize, the Committee was called upon to integrate and deal with an intricate yet vital series of questions which had theretofore been dealt with on a piecemeal and fragmentary basis.

At the outset it became apparent that the Nation's basic organization for national security was outmoded, and was no longer sound in the light of our wartime experiences. The two-department system, built around the Navy Department and the War Department, was utterly inadequate to meet the demands of modern weapons and equipment. The importance of air power had become too decisive to warrant its further retention as a part of the War Department. It is quite true that this problem was not a new one, but previous efforts to effect a change in our basic organization through some form of unification or integration had been unsuccessful. Plainly, therefore, the first task of the Committee was to find some unification pattern that would start us on the road to a better coordinated and integrated Military Establishment. The long and exhaustive hearings which led to the presenting of the National Security Act of 1947 to the Eightieth Congress, and the searching scrutiny given to that legislation by both the Senate and House membership, are now matters of history. Suffice it to say that definite and prompt action was taken on this very fundamental issue, and the newly created National Military Establishment was brought into being and set in operation.

I am aware, of course, that the so-called Unification Act has been criticized. It has been contended that we have no unification; that the services not only are not coordinated, but that there is constant bickering and jealousy among them. I should be the last one to completely gainsay this adverse comment. But at the same time I insist that the National Military Establishment has made great strides toward its goal. And I further insist that as one studies the almost staggering magnitude of the problem, he must recognize that a remarkably competent job is being done. It is only when the observer considers how utterly and completely our old organization lacked cohesion and coordination that he appreciates the progress that has been made. In the popular mind, the passage of any sort of unification law should bring about an immediate and evident result. But I submit that such a concept fails completely to appreciate the vast amount of preliminary organization, planning, cataloging, and other administrative preparation which must precede any operation of this magnitude, if it is to be conducted in a sound and orderly manner.

Permit me to give a few examples of the problems peculiar to the unification of our armed services, and to outline what is being done to meet them. As a case in point, it would seem, at first glance, that a unified procurement plan could be put into effect at once. Yet, on closer examination, it becomes immediately obvious that a standard cataloging system must first be developed

before there can be any unified procurement, except in the case of a relatively few basic items. The preparation of such a system was inaugurated at once, it is well along toward completion, and in the end will be of major significance. Notwithstanding the large amount of preliminary work which is essential before coordinated procurement can become a reality, it should be noted that under purchase assignments in effect on May 1, 1948, more than 64 percent of the total dollar value of purchases by the National Military Establishment will be carried out under single-service assignments, as compared with only 16 percent a year previously. Similarly, a study of the activities of the Research and Development Board in coordinating our research and development programs, the creation of the Military Air Transport Service to assume the functions previously carried out by duplicate facilities operated by the Air Force and the Navy, the studies of the Gray committee on civilian components, the studies of the Hook Service Pay Commission in the field of uniform pay to the armed services, the effective action taken by the Interdepartmental Space Board in consolidating space utilized by the three services, the detailed plans and the preliminary steps already taken by the Medical and Hospital Services Committee, the Civil Defense Planning Unit, the manifold activities of the Munitions Board, and the steps toward standardization of forms, administrative controls, physical standards, and medical procedures lead one to the conclusion that much sound and businesslike progress is being made, and that spectacular and poorly planned measures are being avoided.

Aside from the need for unification in the top organization of the armed services, a number of other legislative steps were necessary if the lessons learned from the war were to be used to their full advantage. In the field of procurement, existing procedures and laws governing Federal purchasing were not uniformly suitable to the needs of the vast purchasing programs of the military services. During the war some of the outstanding purchasing experts of the country were available to the armed forces in carrying out procurement activities. These individuals, in collaboration with procurement experts of the Government, suggested certain changes in basic procurement responsibilities for the armed services which would improve the methods and techniques previously in use. This led to the preparation and passage of House bill 1366, which has assisted materially in bringing about many of the improvements in purchasing methods now in effect, or planned, in the Military Establishment.

To turn to another field, the war demonstrated a need within the medical departments of the services for a new corps of personnel which would perform the many nonmedical functions which are a part of any large health or hospitalization program. The lack of such a corps of specialists led to the draining away from strictly professional duties of many doctors and dentists whose services were needed in their own particular fields. To correct this situation the committee recommended and the Senate approved the Medical Service Corps bill, which was enacted as Public Law 337. There is no doubt but what this action by the Congress represents an important step forward in meeting the critical problem of furnishing adequate medical support for the armed forces without at the same time placing an impossible burden on the number of doctors available to meet civilian needs.

Other bills to improve the medical service available to our troops were also passed. House bill 1943 placed the Nurse Corps on a permanent basis and established our military nurses as commissioned personnel. Also, a bill to equalize the retirement benefits between members of the Army Nurse Corps and the Navy Nurse Corps was passed, and enacted as Public Law 517. In July 1947 the Army and the Navy were faced with a serious situation in which many of their qualified doctors and dentists were leaving the military service to take advantage of the greater opportunities offered by private practice. Senate bill 1661, to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the military services, was recommended by the committee and promptly passed by the Congress.

Another important piece of legislation in the field of personnel was the so-called WAC-WAVE bill, which gives regular commissioned and enlisted status to women in the armed services. The history of the last war shows not only that our manpower resources were strained to the limit, but also that there are many skills and positions with the armed services which women can fill more effectively than men. It is therefore not only essential, but fair and just, that women in the armed services should be given a permanent, rather than a purely temporary status.

As our studies of the procedures in effect within the three services continued, it became increasingly apparent that one of the outstanding examples of lack of uniformity in the treatment of common problems by the Army, Navy, and Air Force was the variety of systems followed in the procurement, assignment, and promotion of officers. The fundamental difference lay in the fact that the Navy operated on a system of promotion by selection, whereas the Army and Air Force operated on a system of promotion by seniority. Many other policies governing the treatment of commissioned personnel were equally divergent as between the three services. After a detailed study of this very complex situation, the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 was recommended to the Senate, and was promptly enacted, to become Public Law 381. This legislation may be looked upon as a major step in the revision of the laws governing the Military Establishment—a step which had repeatedly been tried in past years, but without success.

Not all the legislative action taken by this Congress in the field of national security dealt with all three of the services. Frequently either the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force had problems which were peculiar to but one of them. As an example, the top organization of the Navy Department required extensive change if the operating procedures so successfully used during the war were to be retained. To bring this about, the committee recommended Senate bill 1252, a bill to reorganize the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations and to create the Office of the Chief of the Matériel Division. This bill was promptly considered by the Senate, and was enacted as public law on March 5, 1948. Similarly, the newly created Air Force required legislation which would establish for it a system of military justice. This was accomplished by the prompt enactment of Senate bill 2401.

Turning for a moment to a completely different field, a consideration of the legislation enacted by this Congress to provide for more adequate planning for industrial mobilization is of major interest, and serves to emphasize the variety of the problems related to national security. During the war the services had developed, either directly or indirectly, many large industrial facilities which could not be operated during peacetime, but which would again be vital in any future war effort. Other committees of the Congress had examined various phases of this problem. Coordinating its work with these other groups, the Committee on Armed Services began to implement the different recommendations, as a result of which two bills have been enacted. Senate bill 1198 established an industrial stand-by facility plan, built around some of the plants which were operated during the war. These plants will be continued in operation, if possible, either through contracts or by the departments. If this cannot be done, these plants will be maintained in such condition as will make them readily available in the event of a future national emergency. In addition to the maintenance of the plants themselves, a far-reaching plan for the maintenance of the machine tools needed to operate these and similar plants has been inaugurated.

Subsequent to the enactment of this industrial stand-by facility plan by the Eightieth Congress, another and far more basic piece of legislation dealing with the subject of industrial preparedness was recommended by the committee and passed by both Houses. Senate bill 2554, which was enacted as Public Law 883, extended the scope of industrial-reserve planning to include a great many surplus industrial facilities which were in danger of being sold for scrap, or completely destroyed insofar as their original purposes were concerned. These plants had been built during the war at great cost to the Government. Their loss or their deterioration would have been a major blow to our future military-industrial potential, and has wisely been precluded by the passage of this bill to insure their proper maintenance in cases where these installations cannot be sold or leased with a suitable security clause. I believe that even the least charitable of the various critics of this Congress would concede that in the event of another national emergency the rapid conversion to a wartime basis made possible by these two laws will be of immeasurable value to the Nation, and represents a marked advance in our plans for industrial readiness.

In the field of surplus property, the committee recommended, and the Congress passed, two important measures. The first had to do with the disposal of the hugh network of surplus military airports which had been established throughout the Nation during the war. These airfields constituted an almost priceless national resource, yet they were deteriorating rapidly because no civilian air lines could afford to purchase and maintain them. To the same extent, they were too expensive to permit of their purchase by local governmental agencies. Yet the national interest demanded that every effort should be made toward keeping the maximum number of these installations in operation. After a long study of this very intricate problem, the Committee on Armed Services recommended, and the Congress promptly enacted, the Surplus Airports Act, which will insure that this vital network of airfields shall be retained in operation for the benefit of the public.

A similar problem was presented by the large numbers of military posts, camps, and stations which were being declared surplus by the armed forces. Many of these properties had been acquired during the war, and their disposal presented no particular difficulty under the terms of the Surplus Property Act. However, a considerable number of these installations had been owned by the Federal Government for many years. Some of them dated back to the very early days of the Nation's history. In numerous cases, they had been closely identified with the nearby civilian community for generations and had unquestioned historic value, or public value for park or recreational purposes. Most important of all, these properties were not becoming surplus as the result of the ending of World War II; they were becoming surplus because the redeployment of our armed forces in this modern age was far different from what it had been in the days of the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, and the Indian wars. The Surplus Property Act proved inadequate to provide for the disposal of these old forts in a manner consistent with the best public interest. Numerous local communities were greatly disturbed at the possibility of these historic old properties losing their identity, or being put to uses not consistent with the interests of the local community. Yet the fact remained that these properties were owned by the Federal Government, and as such belonged to all of the Nation's taxpayers, rather than to only those of the local community.

A fair solution to this very vexing question presented one of the most difficult, though perhaps not important, of the problems faced by the committee. After an extensive and complete investigation, S. 2277 was recommended to the Senate, and was promptly enacted, to become Public Law 616. This law has but recently gone into operation, and no disposals have been made under it as yet. However, the executive agencies report that rapid progress is being made, and that the legislative action taken by the Congress will adequately meet this situation. The Surplus Airports Act and the Old Forts Act thus represent two laws which differ most remarkably in content from other legislation in the field of national security, yet their importance cannot be minimized.

The Airports Act provided a means of transferring to States and their political subdivisions many airfields which otherwise would have deteriorated. This law has strengthened the aviation facilities of the country to a major degree, and has provided a reservoir of bases and fields which will be invaluable in the event of another national emergency. The Old Forts Act has provided an instrument which will permit sites which are of undying historic value to be retained for public use, and will permit other properties to be used to meet the growing need for additional parks and recreational areas near many of our metropolitan areas, while at the same time safeguarding the financial interest of the Federal Government in each instance.

With respect to the civilian components of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, I believe it is perfectly accurate to state that this Congress has provided them more legislative support than has been the case at any time in the past. The committee has taken the position that a sound defense structure must rest upon a well-trained and well-equipped reserve. The Congress has supported the committee vigorously in this view, and has accepted each implementing recommendation made by the committee. The number of approved bills which benefit the civilian components is too large to permit of detailed discussion of each, but I shall mention several which warrant special attention.

One of the more serious handicaps with which the members of the civilian components were required to cope was the fact that they received no medical care or hospital benefits if injured during 30-day training periods, as contrasted with extended active duty. S. 1470, which was enacted as Public Law 678, corrected this situation and placed the members of the civilian components on a basis comparable to that of the regular personnel in this regard.

As regards pay for inactive-duty training for the civilian components, the Army for many years has had authority to pay members of the National Guard for armory drills, but had no corresponding authority as regards its other Reserve components. On the other hand, the Navy has had this authority with respect to members of the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve. So to remove what was a serious handicap to the training of the Organized Reserve of the Army and the Air Force, S. 1174 was introduced by the committee and passed by the Congress, giving those components the same status as the Organized Reserve of the Navy and the Marine Corps, and the National Guard. At the same time, the size of the Guard and the Organized Reserve has been materially increased. Also, legislation setting up a retirement system for members of the civilian components who maintain a prescribed standard of training and activity over a period of 20 years was enacted. The Selective Service Act of 1948 places great emphasis upon the importance of membership in organized units of the Reserve components, and provides specific means for building up and maintaining a better standard of training and readiness for active duty. In fact, the whole concept of the position to be occupied by the civilian components in our scheme of national security has been greatly changed for the better through the legislative action taken during the past 2 years, with the result that our country's ability to defend itself has been greatly improved.

The Selective Service Act of 1948 was introduced late in May of 1948, and received full and complete consideration on the floor of both Houses of this Congress. This legislation is of fundamental importance to this Nation and its people. It marks the second instance in the history of our Nation when a law of this type has been enacted in time of peace. The fact that this legislation was enacted only a little more than a month ago makes it unnecessary for me to review its provisions at this time. But I should like to emphasize again the painstaking and exhaustive work which was done on both sides of the Capitol in the formulating of this vital measure, and to point out that few legislative measures have had more careful and conscientious effort devoted to them by any Congress. Regardless of our personal opinions on the matter, I feel that the high standard of thought and attention devoted to the formulation and consideration of this vitally important measure is a tribute to the membership of this Congress which cannot be taken lightly.

In accordance with section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Armed Services—as is the case with other committees—has taken positive action looking toward maintaining appropriate surveillance over matters which come within its jurisdiction.

The committee established a subcommittee charged with making a continuous study of all policies, programs, activities, facilities, requirements, and practices of the armed services and agencies exercising functions related to them, and the administration thereof in all respects. The appointment of such subcommittees is a wise and necessary procedure, and adds great strength to our governmental structure. Yet critics who measure the contribution of a Congress solely in terms of the number of bills which it enacts too often lose sight of the great burden which the Congress imposes upon itself in maintaining watchfulness over the manifold activities which so closely and vitally affect our people.

I have reviewed but a few of the steps taken during the past 2 years in the field of legislation affecting our national security. There are many more which I have not mentioned. I should, therefore, like to have unanimous consent at this time to insert in the RECORD, following my remarks, a complete tabulation

showing all the measures promoting our national security which the Eightieth Congress has enacted into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD following my remarks a complete tabulation of the moneys appropriated by the Eightieth Congress for national-security purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. GURNEY. I should also like to point out that, in the final analysis, the present Congress, like any other Congress, should be judged not by the quantity of the legislation which it enacts, but by its quality and its contribution to the public well-being. With this thought in mind I can assure the Senate that the tabulation which I have just inserted in the RECORD reflects none of the hours of detailed hearings and consideration devoted by the Committee on Armed Services to numerous legislative proposals which were, in the end, rejected by the committee, or held for further study.

I think that the Nation should know that one of the greatest strides taken by the Eightieth Congress was to make national defense a truly national and truly bipartisan problem. Never, in all of the hearings which I attended, and never, even behind the closed doors of the committee in executive session, did I witness the spectacle of party against party on any of the issues of national security. True, there were divisions of opinion, but always they were honest ones, and always they were on both sides of the table, reflecting the true feelings of the individuals. At no time did I see the partisan divisions which were evident elsewhere.

If this be an accomplishment, if the Congress can be commended in having achieved this sort of national unity, I hope that the Senate will forgive me my pride when I humbly suggest that this high plane of cooperation was achieved during a Republican Congress.

In conclusion, may I reiterate my reasons for speaking in this vein, and at this time? I hold to the American tradition that fair and impartial criticism is a stimulating and wholesome thing. Yet I also hold to the belief that it is disturbing and unfair to our people to permit unfair and biased criticism to go unanswered. I also feel a Congress that has devoted so much time and unselfish effort to matters dealing with our national security, should have its accomplishments made perfectly clear. To that end, and confining myself to matters of national security, I have outlined in small part the conditions which have faced the country during the past 2 years, and what the Eightieth Congress has done in the interest of our national welfare in dealing with these conditions. I have confined myself to facts, because even the most biased individual cannot argue against the plain truth. The record speaks for itself, and I for one am proud of that record.

EXHIBIT A

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.

[Committee on Armed Services, U. S. Senate]

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
S. 158	Pepper	Dade Monument replica: To permit the making of a replica of the General Dade Monument which is presently located on the grounds of the United States military reservation at West Point and to present such replica to the State of Florida for erection in the Dade State Memorial Park.	June 17, 1948	Public Law 663.
S. 220	Gurney	Easement in certain lands in Virginia and Maryland: To enable the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to install and operate communication lines across certain small strips of land in the naval proving grounds at Dahlgren, Va., cross the railroad right-of-way between Fredericksburg and Dahlgren, Va., and across the railroad right-of-way between Indian Head and White Plains, Md.	Mar. 21, 1947	Public Law 18.
S. 221	do	Easement in lands in the Norfolk Navy Yard: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey a perpetual easement in certain lands, and to provide authority for the Secretary of the Navy to transfer title with perpetual easement to certain personal property, to the Virginia Electric & Power Co.	do	Public Law 19.
S. 231	do	Camp Gillespie, Calif., right-of-way: To grant a right-of-way to the city of San Diego for the construction and operation of a water pipe line through land within the boundaries of Camp Gillespie, a Marine Corps auxiliary airfield located in San Diego County, Calif., to enable San Diego to assure its inhabitants of an adequate water supply.	Apr. 15, 1947	Public Law 32.
S. 234	do	Easement in lands, Bibb County, Ga: To convey an easement to the Central of Georgia Ry. Co. for the installation and operation of a railroad spur track across approximately 0.33 acre of land at the naval ordnance plant at Macon, Ga.	Mar. 7, 1947	Public Law 13
S. 235	do	Easement in lands in Los Angeles, Calif: To drain Bixby slough, an inland lake that has no outlet to the ocean. Under present conditions, several of the streets in the vicinity of the lake are flooded during the rainy season and traffic is disrupted.	do	Public Law 11.
S. 239	do	Naval and Military Academy Board of Visitors: To provide a uniform procedure for the appointment of members and functioning of the Boards of Visitors to the U. S. Naval Academy and to the U. S. Military Academy.	June 29, 1948	Public Law 816.
S. 276	do	Mileage and other travel allowances: To provide statutory authority for the use of the official mileage tables prepared by the Chief of Finance, War Department, in the payment and settlement of mileage or other travel allowance accounts of all military personnel—of enlisted personnel as well as of officers.	Mar. 26, 1947	Public Law 21
S. 295	do	Army personnel detailed as students: To extend permanent authority presently contained in the National Defense Act to permit the Secretary of the Army to detail personnel of the armed forces as students in educational institutions, industrial plants, or hospitals, without limitations as to the number that can be so detailed. It is further expanded to cover the Reserve components of the Army and requires service on active duty for such Reserves immediately following the completion of the course of training.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 670
S. 321	do	Pay increase for cadets and midshipmen: To authorize an increase of 20 percent in the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the U. S. Military, Coast Guard, and Naval Academies.	June 20, 1947	Public Law 96.
S. 364	McMahon and Baldwin	Surplus airports: To encourage and permit the transfer of federally owned surplus airports and airport facilities and equipment to public agencies by the War Assets Administration. Such transfers would be without reimbursement and would include both the aviation and nonaviation facilities connected with the airports. It also provides for the transfer of certain surplus personal property in the custody of the War Assets Administration which may be needed in the administration and operation of airports transferred by this legislation.	July 30, 1947	Public Law 289.
S. 709	Tydings	Civil War battle streamers: To authorize the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations authorizing regiments, and other units, in the Army of the United States to carry Civil War battle streamers, including those granted for service with the Confederate States, with their colors or standards.	Mar. 9, 1948	Public Law 437
S. 758	Gurney	National Military Establishment: To create an over-all structure to insure a more coordinated and efficient approach to the problems of national defense. In addition to the strictly military aspects of this legislation, a National Security Resources Board was established to plan for future mobilization, and a Security Council was established to advise the President on all matters, civilian or military, pertinent to the national security.	July 26, 1947	Public Law 253.
S. 946	Saltonstall	Selective Service Records Office: The bill provided for the establishment of an Office of Selective Service Records; the transfer to this Office of all property, records, personnel, and unexpended balances of the appropriations of the Selective Service System; and the continuance of the confidential nature of selective-service records with a provision for penalties for violations of these confidences.	Mar. 31, 1947	Public Law 26.

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
S. 929	Gurney	Soldiers' Home regulations: To relieve the Inspector General of the Army from personally performing certain annual inspection duties at the United States Soldiers' Home, Washington, D. C.	Jan. 27, 1948	Public Law 401.
S. 1107	do	Arming of American vessels: To provide permanent authority for the arming of American vessels in time of national emergency.	June 29, 1948	Public Law 817.
S. 1174	do	Pay for Organized Reserve Corps: To provide uniform standards for inactive-duty training for all Reserve components of the armed forces; to authorize inactive-duty training pay for members of the Reserve Corps of the Army in order to facilitate the procurement, training, and readiness for mobilization of members thereof; and to make several incidental changes in the provisions of the National Defense Act pertaining to the Reserve components of the Army.	Mar. 25, 1948	Public Law 460.
S. 1195	do	Foreign duty tours: To repeal present provisions of law which limit the tour of duty of officer and enlisted personnel of the Army and the Air Force in certain foreign-duty stations to a maximum of 2 years.	Mar. 8, 1948	Public Law 436.
S. 1196	do	Leases on stand-by plants: To broaden and make uniform the authority of the War and Navy Departments to lease Government property and to permit the transfer of certain plants, machinery, and equipment to their custody, without reimbursement to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the War Assets Administration.	Aug. 5, 1947	Public Law 364.
S. 1214	do	Naval Officers Training Act amendments: The so-called Holloway plan for a naval and Marine Corps officer candidate-training program was embodied in Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess. A number of technical errors in the act were later corrected by a series of amendments contained in Public Law 71, 80th Cong., 1st sess. It is the purpose of the bill S. 1214 to further amend Public Law 729 so as to facilitate some of the administrative procedures and to clarify the status of certain of the officers commissioned pursuant to the original act.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 675.
S. 1215	do	Conversion of vessels: To remove the limitation on the amount that can be expended for the conversion of any one naval vessel during any 18-month period, and to authorize the conversion of certain vessels.	Aug. 1, 1947	Public Law 319.
S. 1252	do	Organization of the Navy Department: The status of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations and of his principal assistants and of the Office of the Chief of Naval Material are now governed by Executive Order 9635, dated Sept. 29, 1945. The purpose of the legislation is to establish by statute the authority now being exercised under the Executive order and to repeal any existing statutes in conflict with this legislation. Permanent legislation is necessary because the Executive order under which these offices and positions now exist and function will become inoperative when title I of the First War Powers Act expires 6 months after the termination of the present war.	Mar. 5, 1948	Public Law 432.
S. 1298	do	Household effects of civilian employees: To validate payments previously made by disbursing officers covering the shipment of household effects of civilian employees where the shipment was made to other than the new duty station of the employee. It also provides for reimbursement to civilian employees where disbursing officers have recovered payment for such expense in the past as is contemplated by this legislation, and further provides relief for disbursing officers for payments made by them and which this legislation validates.	May 12, 1948	Public Law 623.
S. 1302	Johnson of Colorado	Surplus athletic equipment: To authorize the War Assets Administrator to transfer, without charge, any surplus property which is suitable for athletics, sports, or games by the youth of the country to "States, their political subdivisions and instrumentalities; to public and governmental institutions; to nonprofit or tax-supported educational institutions and organizations; to charitable and eleemosynary institutions and organizations; to nonprofit associations, groups, institutions, and organizations designated to promote, support, sponsor, or encourage the participation of the youth of the country in athletics, sports, and games."	June 16, 1948	Public Law 652.
S. 1470	Gurney	Medical care for reservists: This legislation is of a temporary nature and is intended to cover reserves of the Army and of the Air Force, who might be injured or contract disease during training periods prior to the official termination of the war.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 678.
S. 1520	do	Postal account shortages: To permit the Navy Department to reimburse the Post Office Department for any loss of funds due to embezzlement, errors, or for other losses due to acts of commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps who might be designated custodians of postal effects by competent authority.	June 17, 1948	Public Law 664.
S. 1525	do	Transportation for Government and other personnel: Permanent legislation to replace temporary wartime legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to provide transportation by motor vehicle or water carrier to and from their places of employment for personnel attached to or employed by those Departments. The bill contains a clause proposing that during any period of war this authority may be extended to personnel attached to or employed by private plants engaged in the production of material for the Departments.	May 28, 1948	Public Law 590.
S. 1528	do	Gifts to schools and other institutions: To authorize the Secretaries of the various military services to accept gifts for museums, libraries, schools, cemeteries, etc., under their respective jurisdiction, which can be of use to such institutions; it further provides for the expenditure of any moneys donated to the United States for a specific purpose without securing the express authority of Congress. Such expenditures will be limited to use by the designated institutions, and shall be subject to the terms and conditions of the gift.	Mar. 11, 1948	Public Law 439.
S. 1551	Green	Anchorage housing project: To expedite the sale of this property in order that the Miller Co. may construct on the property a housing project which can be used by officers and families of the Atlantic Fleet which is based at Newport. Approximately 27,000 naval officers and personnel accompany that portion of the Atlantic Fleet which has Newport for its base.	June 16, 1948	Private Law 353.
S. 1571	Gurney	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: America's present laws relating to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The more pertinent changes which the bill makes are: (1) The number of members is increased from 15 to 17; (2) the Chairman of the Research and Development Board of the National Military Establishment will automatically become a member of the Committee. There are several other minor changes of a technical nature in order to be in accord with present law.	May 25, 1948	Public Law 549.
S. 1581	Hawkes	Port Newark Army Base, N. J.: To give the Secretary of the Army authority to enter into an agreement with the city of Newark, N. J., extending the time for payment of certain installments on the purchase price of the Port Newark Army Base.	Apr. 15, 1948	Public Law 483.
S. 1633	Ives	Marine Band at New York: To authorize the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and perform in the parade of the American Legion to be held in New York City on Aug. 30, 1947.	July 30, 1947	Public Law 278.
S. 1641	Baldwin	Women's Armed Services Integration Act: To include women officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force on a basis similar to that which proved successful during World War II for the wartime Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. A maximum authorized strength of 1,000 officers and 17,500 enlisted women is provided for the Army and 1,000 officers and 10,000 enlisted women for the Navy-Marine Corps, based on a Regular Army strength of 51,000 officers and 875,000 enlisted and a Regular Navy of 50,000 enlisted personnel.	June 12, 1948	Public Law 625.
S. 1661	Morse	Pay increase for doctors in armed services: The armed services and the Public Health Service are currently experiencing great difficulty in securing and retaining an adequate number of physicians, surgeons, and dentists. The purpose of the bill is to alleviate the shortage by offering as an inducement a salary increase of $100 per month to all active Regular medical and dental officers and to all non-Regular medical and dental officers who are now on duty on a volunteer status, or who hereafter voluntarily come on active duty during the 5-year period following the effective date of this section. It also provides authority to appoint qualified dentists and doctors of medicine in the Army and Navy in grades up to that of colonel in the Army and captain in the Navy.	Aug. 5, 1947	Public Law 365.

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
S. 1673	Gurney	Relief of James Y. Parker: To correct an administrative error within the War Department which resulted in the failure of James Y. Parker to be promoted to the rank of major while a prisoner of war of the Japanese and to validate certain payments made to him.	Feb. 27, 1948	Private Law 184.
S. 1695	do	Navy public works bill: To authorize the appropriation for construction required by the Department of the Navy.	June 16, 1948	Public Law 653.
S. 1696	Tydings	Army public works: To authorize the appropriation for construction required by the Departments of the Army and the Air Force.	June 12, 1948	Public Law 626.
S. 1723	Gurney	Midshipmen from Canada: Public Law 168, 77th Cong. (55 Stat. 589), provides that the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to permit, upon designation of the President of the United States, not to exceed 20 persons at a time from American Republics and not to exceed 3 at a time from any country to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy. This law further prescribes that persons receiving instruction under this authority shall receive the same pay and allowances and, subject to such exceptions to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, shall be subject to the same rules and regulations as other midshipmen at the Academy. Such persons shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or grade in the U. S. Navy by reason of their graduation. Public Law 551 amends present law to authorize the inclusion of persons from the Dominion of Canada along with persons from other American Republics without any increase in numbers and under the same provisions.	June 1, 1948	Public Law 564.
S. 1783	do	Retention of disabled Army personnel: To permit the retention of certain disabled personnel of the Army of the United States beyond the statutory termination date of their appointments in order to complete their hospitalization or treatment.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 680.
S. 1790	do	Longevity credit for service prior to 18: To amend present law so as to make permanent the temporary provision which authorizes that service in the Army, including the Air Force, Navy, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, or in any Reserve component thereof prior to the attainment of 18 years of age, shall be credited for longevity pay, where it has been excluded solely for this reason.	do	Public Law 681.
S. 1791	do	Camp Phillips, Kans., transfer of lands: To retransfer to the Department of the Army certain lands and improvements thereon which had previously been transferred by the Department of the Army to the Veterans' Administration.	do	Public Law 682.
S. 1794	do	Reflecting pool in Houston, Tex.: To authorize the construction of a reflection pool on the grounds of the naval hospital, Houston, Tex., and to authorize the Navy to accept the pool as an unconditional gift to the United States from the donors, the Houston Council, Navy League of the United States.	Apr. 9, 1948	Public Law 479.
S. 1795	do	Relief of Army officers from inspection duties: To relieve officers of the Inspector General's Department of the Army of certain inspection requirements prescribed in sec. 1 of the act of Apr. 20, 1874.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 683.
S. 1799	do	Preservation of frigate *Constellation:* To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to restore the U. S. S. *Constellation*, as far as may be practical, to her original condition, and to accept contributions and donations for that purpose. It further authorizes the Secretary to give or sell parts of the U. S. S. *Constellation* not suitable for retention as souvenirs to clubs, associations, and individuals making contributions for restoring the ship. Only contributed funds to be utilized for the restoration of this vessel.	Mar. 13, 1948	Public Law 442.
S. 1799	do	Protection of service uniforms: To extend the application of the law prohibiting the wearing of the uniform by unauthorized persons to include the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.	Apr. 15, 1948	Public Law 484.
S. 1802	do	Medal of Honor to unknown American: To authorize the President to award, in the name of the Congress, a Medal of Honor to the unknown American soldier of World War II who is to be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery, at Arlington, Va.	Mar. 9, 1948	Public Law 438.
S. 1861	do	Exemption of vessels from certain requirements: To extend temporarily the exemption of certain vessels with unusual characteristics of the Navy and Coast Guard from statutory requirements concerning navigation lights, where the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of Coast Guard vessels, shall determine that by reason of such unusual construction it is not possible for such vessels to comply with existing statutes.	Mar. 5, 1948	Public Law 433.
S. 2077	do	Kearney, Nebr., land exchange: To effect the transfer to the United States of approximately 440 acres of land located within the boundaries of the Kearney Army Airfield, Kearney, Nebr., owned by the city of Kearney, in exchange for approximately 17 acres of federally owned land contiguous to that airfield, together with certain surplus buildings and other improvements located on that land and upon city-owned land adjacent thereto.	June 1, 1948	Public Law 565.
S. 2223	Hickenlooper	Promotion of General Groves: To promote Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, and upon his retirement to advance him without any increase in retired pay to the honorary rank of lieutenant general.	June 24, 1948	Private Law 394A.
S. 2233	Gurney	Easement in lands in naval air station, Alameda, Calif.: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant an easement on certain Government-owned property for the construction and operation of a water main which in part will service the United States naval air station at Alameda, Calif.	May 25, 1948	Public Law 551.
S. 2281	do	Recreation center, Great Lakes: To permit the Secretary of the Navy to accept a park to be constructed by the Army and Navy Union without cost to the Federal Government. This park will be for the use of patients at the United States naval hospital located at Great Lakes, Ill. It will provide an outdoor recreational area for their use.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 688.
S. 2297	Robertson	Surplus Property Act of 1944, amendment: To amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, first, to permit the War Assets Administrator to transfer to State and local governmental agencies surplus real estate suitable for use as public parks or recreational areas, or as historical monuments, and, second, by giving State and local governments a higher priority than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with regard to certain real properties. Conveyances made for use as public parks or recreational areas shall be at 50 percent of fair value, and those made for historic monuments shall be made without monetary consideration.	June 10, 1948	Public Law 616.
S. 2400	Gurney	Stoppage of work on certain vessels: Under a provision of the Second Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946 those combatant vessels which were more than 20 percent complete as of Mar. 1, 1946, are required to be completed. Public Law 600 provides the President with authority to remove from the mandatory operation of that act, which necessitates their completion, 13 named vessels consisting of 1 battleship, 1 cruiser, 2 destroyer escorts, 7 destroyers, and 2 submarines. The cessation of construction will suspend present obligations against the Treasury to an extent of over $300,000,000. It is intended that a portion of this sum will be used if appropriated to institute a new shipbuilding and conversion program of advance-design ships.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 690.
S. 2401	do	Military justice, Air Force: To grant authority to the U. S. Air Force similar to that of the U. S. Army and U. S. Navy for the administration of military justice.	June 25, 1948	Public Law 775.
S. 2405	Baldwin	Scientific positions in the Military Establishment: To permit the Secretary of Defense to establish 6 additional positions of a professional and scientific character for duty within the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The top salary placed on these positions is $15,000 per year and they will be utilized primarily by the Research and Development Board.	June 24, 1948	Public Law 758.
S. 2433	Gurney	Mystic River bridge: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass.	June 16, 1948	Public Law 658.
S. 2554	do	National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948: To establish statutory authority for the maintenance or control of a pool of Government-built essential and strategic plants, machine tools, and industrial manufacturing equipment to be available for national defense purposes and war production in event of a possible future emergency.	July 2, 1948	Public Law 883.

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
S. 2592	Gurney	Lands in Puerto Rico: To authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to return certain lands in Puerto Rico to the owners. This land was deeded to the United States, without cost, during the early part of the war on condition that it be reconveyed when no longer needed for purposes of national defense.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 663.
S. 2593	do	Right-of-way at Pungo, Va.: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant the Commonwealth of Virginia, without cost, a right-of-way across lands of the former naval auxiliary air station, at Pungo, Va., in order to widen State Secondary Route No. 615 at a point contiguous to the station.	June 16, 1948	Public Law 659.
S. 2621	do	Federal Prison Industries: To authorize the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks.	June 29, 1948	Public Law 821.
S. 2655	do	Selective Service Act of 1948: To increase the authorized strength of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to bring the strength of the services up to these authorized ceilings by means of a selective-service program calling for the drafting of 19- to 26-year-olds for a period of 21 months' active service with the armed services; and to strengthen the Reserve components by means of a program of enlisting 18-year-olds for a period of 1 year of active service with the armed forces, followed by transfer to the Reserve components.	June 24, 1948	Public Law 759.
S. 2668	Hatch	Transfer of Army horses: To authorize the transfer without compensation from the U. S. Army to 4 different military institutes in the United States of Army horses which are now on loan to those institutions for use in the ROTC program.	June 29, 1948	Public Law 823.
S. 2747	Morse	Panama Railroad Company: To authorize the incorporation of the Panama Railroad Company and to provide an appropriate charter.	do	Public Law 808.
S. 2770	Gurney	Assistant to Chief of Engineers: To fix the rank of the officer who is serving as assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river, harbor, and flood-control work in the grade of brigadier general, to require that the position shall not be charged against the authorized strength of general officers of the Army, and to provide that his pay, allowances, and mileage and travel expenses should be paid from the appropriations for the works on which he is engaged.	June 25, 1948	Public Law 777.
S. 2830	Morse	Tin smelting: To amend the act of June 28, 1947 (Public Law 125, 80th Cong.), to extend from June 30, 1949, until June 30, 1954, or until such earlier time as the Congress shall otherwise provide, the powers, functions, duties, and authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (1) to buy, sell, and transport tin, tin ore and tin concentrates; (2) to improve, develop, maintain and operate by lease or otherwise the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.; (3) to finance research in tin smelting and processing, and (4) to do all other things necessary to accomplish the foregoing.	June 29, 1948	Public Law 824.
S. J. Res. 207	Saltonstall and Gurney	Navy sesquicentennial: To provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to carry out appropriate ceremonies.	Apr. 26, 1948	Public Law 498.
H. R. 450	Bates of Massachusetts	Marblehead Military Reservation: Providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, upon payment to the United States of the sum of $5,000, of property generally referred to as the Marblehead Reservation.	May 16, 1947	Public Law 70.
H. R. 774	Bland	Condemned ordnance: To extend to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority heretofore exercised by the Secretaries of War and of the Navy under legislation enacted in 1896. The earlier act referred to, permits the service Secretaries, in their discretion, to loan or give obsolete or condemned combat material to certain designated veterans' organizations and other nonprofit institutions.	Feb. 27, 1948	Public Law 421.
H. R. 1260	Peterson	Canal Zone Retirement Act amendment: To extend to certain annuitants retired under the Canal Zone Retirement Act prior to July 29, 1942, the privilege of having their annuities recomputed under the new method of computation contained in the act of that date if such computation would result in increased benefits.	Aug. 4, 1947	Public Law 345.
H. R. 1275	Cole of New York	Medical care of naval personnel: Authorizes the payment for medical treatment of officers in the naval service while in an authorized leave status.	May 4, 1948	Public Law 511.
H. R. 1341	Anderson of California	Naval postgraduate school authorization, Monterey, Calif. (H. R. 1341 substituted on Senate floor for S. 229): To provide additional facilities which are urgently needed for the postgraduate training of naval officers.	July 31, 1947	Public Law 302.
H. R. 1358	Andrews of New York	Naval Plantations Act amendment: To make permanent Public Law 377, 78th Cong., with further restrictions. Public Law 377 is a temporary wartime statute, which authorizes the use of funds appropriated for the subsistence of naval personnel, in the management and operation of farms and plantations on land subject to naval jurisdiction outside of the continental limits of the United States. Public Law 149 extends the same authority to the War Department and limits production to fresh fruits and vegetables.	July 1, 1947	Public Law 149.
H. R. 1359	do	Civil Engineer Corps of Navy: To increase the authorized strength of the Corps of Civil Engineers from 2 to 3 percent of the total active list of the commissioned line officers of the Navy.	May 16, 1947	Public Law 62.
H. R. 1362	do	Temporary appointment counted for promotion: To correct an inequity now existent by authorizing members of the U. S. Navy and Marine Corps to count all active service rendered as warrant or commissioned officers in the Navy or Marine Corps for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer.	June 30, 1947	Public Law 134.
H. R. 1363	do	Pay Readjustment Act amendment regarding annulled marriage: To eliminate the required repayment to the Government of increased allowances paid to service personnel by reason of a dependent spouse in cases where a marriage in good faith is subsequently annulled or set aside from its inception.	May 15, 1947	Public Law 53.
H. R. 1365	do	Chief of Chaplains in the Navy: To establish a permanent Chief of Navy Chaplains and to authorize the Chief of Naval Personnel to designate from the Navy Chaplain Corps an officer not below the rank of commander to be chief of the corps.	do	Public Law 56.
H. R. 1366	do	Procurement of supplies and services: Provides for a return to normal purchasing procedures through the advertising-bid method on the part of the armed services, namely, the War Department, the Navy Department, and the U. S. Coast Guard. It capitalizes on the lessons learned during wartime purchasing and provides authority, in certain specific and limited categories, for the negotiation of contracts without advertising. It restates the rules governing advertising and making awards as well as fixing the types of contract that can be made.	Feb. 19, 1948	Public Law 413.
H. R. 1367	do	Construction of experimental submarines: To authorize construction of experimental submarines by lifting a statutory provision limiting the availability of balances of funds appropriated for "Increase and replacement of naval vessels."	May 16, 1947	Public Law 63.
H. R. 1368	do	Civilian officers and employees on Guam: To include civilian officers and employees of the U. S. Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 (Missing Persons Act).	do	Public Law 64.
H. R. 1369	do	Under Secretary of Navy permanent: To amend existing law so as to establish permanently the offices of Under Secretary of War and Under Secretary of Navy.	May 15, 1947	Public Law 57.
H. R. 1371	do	Marine Corps officers for supply duty: Permits the Secretary of the Navy to assign captains, majors, lieutenant colonels, and colonels of the Marine Corps to supply duty only and provides for their lineal position and precedence, and authorizes their being carried as additional numbers in their respective grades. It would establish the number of officers to be so assigned and would preserve the precedence of those assigned to supply duty.	July 1, 1947	Public Law 150.
H. R. 1375	do	Clothing allowance in cash for clothing in kind to enlisted men: To authorize the President to substitute a cash allowance for clothing in kind for the Army, Marine Corps, and Marine Corps Reserve and to place the Marine Corps under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy with regard to clothing allowance.	do	Public Law 158.
H. R. 1376	do	Transportation of dependents and household effects: To authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases.	do	Public Law 161.
H. R. 1379	do	Naval postgraduate school authorization: To provide legislative authority for postgraduate instruction and training of commissioned officers of the naval service.	July 31, 1947	Public Law 303.

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
H. R. 1361	Andrews of New York	Decorations from neutral nations to officers and enlisted men of the armed forces: To authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems from the governments of neutral nations, and to allow such personnel to wear permanently any foreign decorations which have been, or may be, bestowed pursuant to the provisions of that act.	May 15, 1947	Public Law 58.
H. R. 1644	Keating	Gold star lapel buttons: To provide for a distinctive gold star lapel button for issue to widows, parents, or next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives while serving in one of the armed services of the United States in World War II.	Aug. 1, 1947	Public Law 309.
H. R. 1562	Johnson of California	Federal aid for soldiers' and sailors' homes: To increase, from $300 to $500 per capita per annum, until June 30, 1951, the Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of veterans hospitalized in such homes, who are eligible for such care in U. S. Veterans' Administration hospitals and homes.	May 18, 1948	Public Law 531.
H. R. 1605	Andrews of New York	Date of appointment as commissioned officer: To clarify present law governing the appointment of additional officers in the Regular Army. The law does not, in any way, increase Army promotions or result in additional Army officers.	May 15, 1947	Public Law 61.
H. R. 1621	Johnson of California	Boy Scouts' World Jamboree: To authorize the War Department and the State Department to assist the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France during July and August 1947.	Apr. 14, 1947	Public Law 31
H. R. 1967	Andrews of New York	Easement in land in U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla.: To provide a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a Federal-aid farm-to-market highway along the west boundary of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla.	June 30, 1947	Public Law 135.
H. R. 1845	Mrs. Smith of Maine	Military leave for Federal employees: To unify the existing laws pertaining to the granting of military leave to permanent and temporary indefinite employees of the United States or the District of Columbia, who are members of the Reserve components of the various services, including the National Guard.	July 1, 1947	Public Law 153.
H. R. 1943	do	Army and Navy Nurse Corps: To establish an Army Nurse Corps and a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Medical Department of the Regular Army and to establish a Navy Nurse Corps as a component part of the Medical Department of the Navy.	Apr. 16, 1947	Public Law 36.
H. R. 2225	West	Fort McIntosh, Tex. (H. R. 2225 substituted on Senate floor for S. 739): To authorize the War Assets Administration to transfer a portion of Fort McIntosh, Laredo, Tex., along with certain personal property, to the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, without reimbursement or exchange of funds.	July 25, 1947	Public Law 235
H. R. 2248	Andrews of New York	Easement in land in Camp Livingston, La.: To provide a perpetual easement on the Camp Livingston Military Reservation to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. to cover a relocation of its transmission line and to convey by quitclaim deed a tract of land for a reconstructed substation.	July 1, 1947	Private Law 44.
H. R. 2276	do	Olympic Games: To permit the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to augment the national Olympic effort in all sports by authorizing the participation of their personnel in the games. Also to make such authorization permanent in character but placing a monetary limitation on both the Army and Navy for expenses incident thereto.	do	Public Law 159
H. R. 2314	do	Lump-sum payments to survivors of deceased officers. To establish additional beneficiaries to whom lump-sum aviation bonuses may be paid in the event of the death of aviation officers who have not designated beneficiaries.	July 25, 1947	Public Law 236.
H. R. 2339	do	Army mail clerks: To eliminate certain unnecessary authority within the War Department to pay additional compensation to enlisted personnel designated as mail clerks.	June 30, 1947	Public Law 136.
H. R. 2339	Mrs. St. George	Highland Falls filtration plant: Authorizes a lump-sum payment of $5,500 by the United States to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant.	June 12, 1948	Public Law 627.
H. R. 2744	Brooks	Retirement: Establishes a permanent and more expeditious method of eliminating substandard officers of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force. Places the personnel of the Army and the Air Forces on a par with personnel of the Navy, insofar as (a) years of service required for voluntary longevity retirement is concerned, and (b) retirement in the highest temporary rank. Establishes longevity retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components predicated both on time spent on active duty and satisfactory service performed during periods of inactive duty.	June 29, 1948	Public Law 810.
H. R. 3033	Andrews of New York	Easement in lands in Hawaii: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant a perpetual easement for 28 small parcels of land in the vicinity of Pearl Harbor Naval shipyard to the Territory of Hawaii for highway and utility purposes.	July 22, 1947	Public Law 212.
H. R. 3055	do	Utilities and related services: To authorize the War and Navy Departments to sell utilities and certain related services to welfare activities and private persons residing in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities, provided such utilities are not otherwise available.	July 30, 1947	Public Law 284.
H. R. 3056	do	Easement for road in Bibb County, Ga.: To provide authority for the Secretary of the Navy to convey an easement to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., for the construction and operation of a public road and the installation of equipment of public-utility service across the naval ordnance plant at Macon, Ga.	July 21, 1947	Public Law 207.
H. R. 3124	Mrs. Bolton	Marine Band in Cleveland, Ohio: To authorize the Marine Band to attend the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic at Cleveland, Ohio, Aug. 10 to 14, 1947.	June 30, 1947	Public Law 141.
H. R. 3127	Mathews	Obsolete ordnance to State homes: To make State homes for former members of the armed forces eligible for loan or gift of condemned ordnance, guns, and cannon balls, under the act of May 22, 1896, as amended.	July 31, 1947	Public Law 304.
H. R. 3191	Andrews of New York	Personnel under Missing Persons Act: To amend Public Law 201, 79th Cong., in order to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 143) to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while those forces were in the service of the armed forces of the United States.	July 25, 1947	Public Law 241.
H. R. 3215	do	Army and Navy Medical Departments, revised: To establish in the Medical Departments of the Regular Army and Navy a Medical Service Corps with a Reserve component, to be composed of pharmacists, sanitary engineers, optometrists, psychologists, bacteriologists, business administrators, and similar skills.	Aug. 4, 1947	Public Law 357.
H. R. 3241	do	Retirement of certain Navy officers: To authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers.	July 11, 1947	Public Law 178.
H. R. 3262	do	Easement in lands in Long Beach, Calif.: To grant a perpetual easement to the city of Long Beach, Calif., in two strips of land each 20 feet wide and 600 and 330 feet long, respectively. Both of these parcels lie within the site of the Navy housing project at Long Beach and adjacent to the west side of Santa Fe Ave.; the proposed easement is to be granted for street and utility purposes.	July 21, 1947	Public Law 208.
H. R. 3303	do	Volunteer enlistments (H. R. 3303 substituted on Senate floor for S. 1218): To establish a permanent system of volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment designed to fit the future variable requirements of the Army. It further authorizes certain benefits to enlisted men for the purpose of encouraging enlistment and reenlistment in the Regular Army on a career basis, and terminates the payment of mustering-out pay and reduces the minimum age for enlistment in the National Guard from 18 to 17.	June 26, 1947	Public Law 128.
H. R. 3394	do	Remains buried outside the United States: Authorizes the return of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the next of kin as well as the homeland of the deceased. Also authorizes the Secretary of War to exercise discretionary authority in directing the disposition of group and mass burials and directs the permanent overseas burial of unknown American World War II dead. Further permits the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas for United States military cemeteries.	Aug. 5, 1947	Public Law 368.
H. R. 3416	Sikes	Pensacola National Monument, Fla.: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to receive certain surplus lands presently owned by the Departments of the Army and the Navy and to develop them as a national monument, or in the discretion of the Secretary, to designate them for use as a State historical park. The areas included in this bill are Old Forts San Carlos, Barrancas, Redoubt, and Pickens, comprising approximately 13 acres of land.	July 2, 1948	Public Law 878.

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
H. R. 3484	Case of South Dakota	Transfer of Remount Service: To insure the maintenance of a Nation-wide horse-breeding program by transferring certain records, property, and civilian personnel of the Remount Service of the Quartermaster Corps, War Department, to the Department of Agriculture.	Apr. 21, 1948	Public Law 494.
H. R. 3501	Andrews of New York	Abolishing terminal leave: To amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to grant to all military and naval personnel equal treatment in the matter of leave, and to correct certain inequities and defects which have arisen in the administration of the present act. It also provides for the lump-sum payment for accrued leave in certain cases. It will incorporate all existing law concerning leave with changes into one act.	Aug. 4, 1947	Public Law 359.
H. R. 3629	do	Surplus property to Panama Canal: To authorize the War Department and the Navy Department to transfer to the Panama Canal materials, supplies, tools, and equipment of every character, including structures, vessels, and floating equipment, which are surplus to the needs of the Department having title thereto and which may be certified by the Governor of the Panama Canal as necessary for the care, maintenance, operation, improvement, sanitation, and government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone.	July 2, 1947	Public Law 100.
H. R. 3645	Gross	Gettysburg National Military Park: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept on behalf of the United States approximately 4 acres of non-Federal land within the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park.	Jan. 31, 1948	Public Law 404.
H. R. 3735	Sikes	Santa Rosa Island: To authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey to Okaloosa County, Fla., a tract of land on Santa Rosa Island in that county.	July 2, 1948	Public Law 885.
H. R. 3830	Short	Promotion and elimination of officers: To reestablish a permanent promotion system for the armed forces; to make necessary improvements to the present Navy system of promotion by selection; to change the present Army system of promotion by seniority to a selection system and, insofar as is practicable at this time, to make uniform the promotion systems of the two services.	Aug. 7, 1947	Public Law 381.
H. R. 3883	Bartlett	Transfer of vessel *Hygiene:* To authorize the transfer, without exchange of funds, of the vessel *Hygiene* from the Department of the Army to the Territory of Alaska for use as a floating health clinic within Alaskan waters.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 709.
H. R. 4017	Blackney	Armed Forces Leave Act bonds redeemable: To amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong.) to provide that bonds issued under that act may be redeemed in cash at any time after Sept. 1, 1947, to permit future claimants to request settlement and compensation entirely in cash, and to extend the time within which applications for settlement and compensation under the act may be made to Sept. 1, 1948.	July 26, 1947	Public Law 254.
H. R. 4032	Andrews of New York	Delegation of powers to Secretary of the Navy: To authorize the President of the United States to delegate certain descretionary powers which he now has to the Secretary of the Navy. These powers are: (1) Retirement of officers upon the completion of 30 years of service; (2) retirement of officers upon the completion of 40 years of service; (3) retirement of officers for disability resulting from an incident of the service; (4) retirement of officers for disability not the result of an incident of the service; (5) removal of the charge of desertion from the records of the personnel of the Navy.	June 17, 1949	Public Law 668.
H. R. 4090	do	Nurses retirement benefits: To correct a situation whereby a group of retired Army and Navy nurses is paid according to a lower schedule than is currently in use for the majority of retired Army and Navy nurses.	May 7, 1948	Public Law 517.
H. R. 4272	Welch	Headstones for unmarked graves: To give statutory authority to the Secretary of the Army to furnish headstones or markers for the graves of all persons who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States, including the Union and Confederate Armies.	July 1, 1948	Public Law 871.
H. R. 4308	Andrews of New York	Decorations from foreign governments: To insure that former officers and enlisted men of the armed forces, as well as those now in the services, may receive decorations, orders, and medals tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics.	Aug. 1, 1947	Public Law 314.
H. R. 4490	do	Salvage facilities: To authorize the Navy Department, either by contract or through its own facilities, to provide adequate offshore salvage facilities in American waters and in areas where our vessels may operate.	May 4, 1948	Public Law 513.
H. R. 4721	do	Repairs to naval vessels: To repeal the act of July 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 482), which provides that not more than $450,000 can be spent in any 18 consecutive months on repairs and alterations to any one ship, and earlier laws which set comparable limitations. These laws are not now in effect since they were suspended during the war until the end of the first fiscal year following the expiration of the war.	June 12, 1948	Public Law 628.
H. R. 5035	Jonkman	Marine Band at Grand Rapids, Mich.: To authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic.	May 18, 1948	Public Law 592.
H. R. 5036	Kersten	Marine Band at Milwaukee (H. R. 5036 substituted on Senate floor for S. 2094): To authorize the President to permit the Marine Corps Band to attend and give concerts at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held in Milwaukee, Wis., from Sept. 22 to 25, inclusive, 1948.	June 24, 1948	Public Law 763.
H. R. 5283	Hardy	Surplus sand at Fort Story: To authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of surplus sand on Government-owned land at Fort Story, Va., by sale, upon such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him.	June 10, 1948	Public Law 619.
H. R. 5298	Johnson of California	Civil Air Patrol: To establish as permanent law the Civil Air Patrol as a volunteer civilian auxiliary to the U. S. Air Force; to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to accept and utilize the service of the Civil Air Patrol; to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make available to Civil Air Patrol, by gift or by loan, sale or otherwise, obsolete or surplus aircraft, aircraft parts, material, supplies, equipment, and facilities of the Department of the Air Force.	May 26, 1948	Public Law 557.
H. R. 5344	Andrews of New York	Retired pay of certain enlisted men and warrant officers: To prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, which will alleviate an unjust situation which has affected approximately 3,000 retired enlisted men and warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 709.
H. R. 5758	Potter	Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, amendment: To permit certain payments to be made to surviving brothers, sisters, nieces, or nephews of deceased members and former members of the armed forces.	do	Public Law 710.
H. R. 5805	Blackney	Mustering-out payment: To extend the time for filing claims for payment under the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to Feb. 3, 1950.	May 19, 1948	Public Law 530.
H. R. 5836	Andrews of New York	Easement at Fort Myers, Fla. (H. R. 5836 substituted on Senate floor for S. 2291): To authorize a perpetual easement over certain lands adjacent to the Fort Myers Army Airfield in Florida.	June 3, 1948	Private Law 330.
H. R. 5870	do	Allowances for war dead escorts: To provide increased allowances for the escorts of repatriated war dead.	do	Public Law 599.
H. R. 5882	Anderson of California	Surplus property for educational purposes: To authorize donations by the armed services, for educational purposes, of such equipment, materials, books, and other supplies as may be obsolete or no longer needed within the National Military Establishment.	July 2, 1948	Public Law 880.
H. R. 5983	Andrews of New York	Medical Services Corps Act (H. R. 5983 substituted on Senate floor for S. 2956): To remove certain restrictions on the source of appointments of pharmacists, optometrists, and other related specialists to the Navy Medical Service Corps.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 716.
H. R. 6039	do	Appointment of Army and Air Force generals: To provide statutory authority for the appointment in the permanent grade of general in the Regular Army of Omar Nelson Bradley, general of the U. S. Air Force of Carl Spaatz, and admiral in the U. S. Navy of Raymond A. Spruance.	June 20, 1948	Public Law 791.
H. R. 6633	Fletcher	San Diego land exchange: To authorize exchange of lands and interest therein between the United States and the city of San Diego, Calif.	July 2, 1948	Public Law 891.

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
H. R. 6098	Andrews of New York	Filipinos at the Naval Academy: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit Filipinos, not exceeding 4 in number at any one time, to receive instruction at the Naval Academy.	June 24, 1948	Public Law 752.
H. R. 6767	do	Officer Personnel Act amendment: To extend the time before which certain officers now serving in the grade of admiral in the Navy and general in the Air Force and Army must be reduced in rank.	June 28, 1948	Public Law 804
H. J. Res. 90	do	Former naval reservists in Philippines: To eliminate present discrimination against certain former naval reservists in the Philippine Islands.	May 15, 1947	Public Law 50.
H. J. Res. 92	do	Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to present the Distinguished Flying Cross, with accompanying ribbon, to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, U. S. Navy, in recognition of his heroic action as commanding officer of the Navy dirigible, U. S. S. *Shenandoah* at the time of its destruction during a violent storm on Sept. 3, 1925.	June 30, 1947	Private Law 35.
H. J. Res. 95	Cole of New York	Lt. Gen. Roy Stanley Geiger: To promote posthumously the late Lieutenant General Geiger, U. S. Marine Corps, to the rank of general in the U. S. Marine Corps.	do	Private Law 36.
H. J. Res. 110	Andrews of New York	Naval Academy appointments: To correct technical errors in Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess., and to provide for the appointment to the Naval Academy, by the Secretary of the Navy, of 100 men annually from enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, and 100 men annually from the enlisted men of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve.	May 16, 1947	Public Law 71
H. J. Res. 167	Gavin	Service rendered under Selective Service: To recognize and publicly acknowledge the gratitude of the people and the Government of the United States for patriotic service rendered by many uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System during the war.	June 30, 1947	Public Law 133.

EXHIBIT B

Military and naval appropriations, 80th Cong., 1st and 2d sess.

Act	Military Establishment	Air Corps	Naval Establishment
Military Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 267, approved July 30, 1947	[1] $5,482,509,603	(2)	
Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 251, approved July 30, 1947	[2] 600,045,349		$16,736,701
Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 299, approved July 31, 1947	330,000		
First Deficiency Appropriation Act, Public Law 45, approved May 1, 1947	766,201,375		1,740,720
Navy Department Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 262, approved July 18, 1947			[4] 3,268,766,199
Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 393, approved Dec. 23, 1947	[3] 340,000,000		
Total, 80th Cong., 1st sess	7,189,126,327		3,303,243,527
Military Functions Appropriation Act, 1949, Public Law 776, approved June 24, 1948	[5] 5,805,607,162	$896,811,000	
Department of the Navy Appropriation Act, 1949, Public Law 753, approved June 24, 1948			3,749,999,250
First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 519, approved May 10, 1948	[7] 140,083,488		[8] 2,657,000
Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 547, approved May 21, 1948	25,000,000	[9] 648,100,000	[10] 315,000,000
Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1949, Public Law 793, approved June 28, 1948	[11] 1,300,000,000		[12] 31,337,200
Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 785, approved June 25, 1948	92,700,000		
Total, 80th Cong., 2d sess	7,316,290,650	1,544,911,000	4,118,353,450

[1] In addition, contract authorizations totaling $454,000,000.
[2] Air Corps funds in this act included in Military Establishment total.
[3] Includes $200,000,000 "Government and relief in occupied areas."
[4] In addition, contract authorizations totaling $248,000,000.
[5] For "Government and relief in occupied areas."
[6] In addition to Department of the Army, this act includes funds for the Department of the Air Corps, which are shown in column 2, and also funds for Office of Secretary of Defense, National Security Council, and National Security Resources Board, which are included in the total under Military Establishment, column 1. In addition, includes for Department of the Army, contract authorizations totaling $220,000,000.
[7] Includes $143,000,000 for "Government and relief in occupied areas."
[8] In addition, contract authorizations totaling $4,100,000 with authority to liquidate such contracts out of balances on hand.
[9] In addition, contract authorizations totaling $1,687,000,000.
[10] In addition, contract authorization totaling $585,000,000.
[11] For "Government and relief in occupied areas."
[12] In addition, contract authorizations totaling $50,000,000.

Recapitulation

	80th Cong., 1st sess.	80th Cong., 2d sess.	Total
Military Establishment	[1] $7,189,126,327	[2] $7,316,290,650	[3] $14,505,417,007
Air Corps	(4)	[5] 1,504,911,000	[5] 1,504,911,000
Naval Establishment	[6] 3,303,243,527	[7] 4,118,353,450	[8] 7,421,596,977
Grand total	10,492,369,884	12,939,555,100	23,431,924,984

[1] In addition, $454,000,000 contract authorizations.
[2] In addition, $220,000,000 contract authorizations.
[3] Air Corps funds included in the Military Establishment figures of $7,189,126,327.
[4] In addition, contract authorizations of $1,687,000,000.
[5] In addition, $248,000,000 contract authorizations.
[6] In addition, $642,100,000 contract authorizations.

CURRENT STATUS AND HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE POWER CONTRACTS—COST OF POWER—PRIMARY CONTRACTORS—WITHDRAWAL RIGHTS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA FROM HOOVER (BOULDER) DAM—AND OF THE BASIC MAGNESIUM PLANT LOCATED AT HENDERSON, NEV.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the great interest in the seven Colorado River Basin States regarding the current status of the water and power rights and development prompts me to request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the recommendations, conclusions, and a summary of the facts pertaining to the status of the electric power leases, withdrawals, and costs at Hoover—Boulder—Dam; also the current status of the Basic Magnesium plant located at Henderson as determined by the Subcommittee on Basic Magnesium of the Special Senate Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BASIC MAGNESIUM PLANT DISPOSAL

(Joint report of the Subcommittee on Basic Magnesium Plant of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and the Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments pursuant to S. Res. 75, March 1947)

Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program: Owen Brewster, Maine, chairman; Homer Ferguson, Michigan; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; John J. Williams, Delaware; George W. Malone, Nevada; Harry P. Cain, Washington; Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico; Claude Pepper, Florida; J. Howard McGrath, Rhode Island; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: George D. Aiken, Vermont, chairman; Homer Ferguson, Michigan; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Iowa; John W. Bricker, Ohio; Edward J. Thye, Minnesota; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; Irving M. Ives, New York; John L. McClellan, Arkansas; James O. Eastland, Mississippi; Clyde R. Hoey, North Carolina; Glen H. Taylor, Idaho; A. Willis Robertson, Virginia; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland

Subcommittee on Basic Magnesium of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program: Homer Ferguson, Michigan, chairman; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; George W. Malone, Nevada; Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland; George Meader, counsel

Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Homer Ferguson, Michigan, chairman; Bourke B Hickenlooper, Iowa; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; John L. McClellan, Arkansas; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland; Miles N. Culehan, counsel

(Letter of transmittal)

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman, Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: There is transmitted herewith to the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments a report of the Joint Committee of the Subcommittee on Basic Magnesium of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and the Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments concerning the management and operation and prospects of disposal of the Basic Magnesium plant at Henderson, Nev. This report incorporates the findings and recommendations by the joint committee as the result of the hearing.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER FERGUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and Subcommittee on Basic Magnesium of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

INTERIM REPORT ON THE BASIC MAGNESIUM PLANT AT HENDERSON, NEV.—INTRODUCTION

Early in 1947, Senator GEORGE W. MALONE (Republican, Nevada) recommended that the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program conduct an investigation of the Basic Magnesium plant at Henderson, Nev. Senator MALONE urged that both the efficiency of operation of the plant and the deficit in the operation of the plant at the expense of the United States taxpayers, together with the apparent delay in securing firm contracts for Hoover Dam low cost power for use at the plant, be explored, as well as the possibilities of the disposal of this $140,000,000 war investment to the best interests of the State of Nevada, the Southwest, and the United States at a whole.

Five-man subcommittee

Accordingly, in February, a five-man subcommittee of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program was appointed to exercise the jurisdiction of the committee in the investigation of certain aspects of the management and operation of the Basic Magnesium plant. It was understood that this subcommittee would work in conjunction with the standing Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. It will be noted that the membership of the two subcommittees is identical with respect to three of the members of each subcommittee.

This investigation was preceded by two other investigations by Senate committees; early in the war, the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program—and under the chairmanship of Senator, now President Truman—through a Subcommittee on Light Metals and Aircraft—under the chairmanship of the then Senator Mon C. Wallgren, now Governor of the State of Washington—conducted an investigation into the construction of the Basic magnesium plant at Henderson, Nev., and its operation by Basic Magnesium, Inc. That investigation culminated in a report, filed later as a part of the Committee's Report on Magnesium, filed with the Senate on March 13, 1944, as Report No. 10, part 17, of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

In November 1944, shortly after all production of magnesium had ceased, but while the plant was still producing large quantities of chlorine, badly needed for the war effort, a Subcommittee of a Special Committee to Investigate Industrial Centralization, established pursuant to Senate Resolution 190 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, held hearings in Las Vegas, Nev. This subcommittee was under the chairmanship of Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, and its hearings are reported as part 5 (Nov. 27 and 28, 1944), of the hearings of that special committee. No report of this subcommittee was filed, but it is apparent from the hearings that the committee was concerned about the possible postwar commercial use of the plant.

Basic Magnesium subject of committee interest

It is thus apparent that almost from its inception the Basic Magnesium plant has been the object of special interest on the part of the United States Senate. The joint subcommittees (hereinafter referred to as the Committee) of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program and the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of course, expected that administrative agents would use due diligence in protecting the interests of the Government in all of their activities. However, there can be no excuse for failure to act diligently and effectively with respect to the Basic Magnesium plant on the ground that it was not called to the attention of the administrative agents having functions to perform with respect thereto. This plant has been in the spotlight of congressional attention from its beginning. This fact should have constituted notice to all administrative personnel that an accounting would be expected of the discharge of their functions.

Hearing dates

In addition to the investigative work and the assembling of facts on the part of the staffs of both subcommittees, joint public hearings were held as follows: May 29, 1947, Washington, D. C.; June 24, 1947, Washington, D. C.; June 25, 1947, Washington, D. C.; August 21, 1947, Las Vegas, Nev.; August 22, 1947, Las Vegas, Nev.; January 5, 1948, Las Vegas, Nev.

The purpose of this report is to make available to all concerned a summary of the facts developed in the committee's investigation, together with a statement of conclusions and recommendations, which, in the judgment of the committee, based upon the facts it has developed, will serve the best interests of the country in any future final disposition to be taken with respect to the Basic Magnesium plant.

The purpose of the hearings was to develop the facts with respect to the management and operation of the Basic Magnesium plant and the housing development adjacent thereto, as well as the present status of plans for the disposal of the Government's interest in these facilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The amount of low-cost power available for industrial use within the Hoover (Boulder) Dam area—and the conditions surrounding its use, will determine not only the ultimate value of the Basic Magnesium plant facilities—but also the industrial value of the entire area to the State of Nevada, the Southwest and to the Nation.

The necessary transportation, industrial, and domestic water supply and many of the raw materials are available.

In the interest of efficiency of operation, and to secure the maximum benefit to the Nation as a whole, the State of Nevada, and the southwestern area, the joint committee recommends:

1. That the Basic Magnesium plant be disposed of to private industrial operators at the earliest possible time for the reasons: First, that the property may remain upon the tax rolls of the county and State of Nevada (now approximately $102,000 annually); and, second, in the interest of efficient operation. Experience has demonstrated that neither the Federal Government nor a State can operate such industrial enterprises efficiently; that they become political footballs; and that the net result is an unhappy condition for all concerned when such operation is attempted. The committee is convinced, from the information developed during the hearings, that such disposal can be made almost immediately when the Colorado River Commission of Nevada has made the necessary arrangements for the availability of industrial power under the proper conditions.

2. That the Colorado River Commission apply for and secure a minimum of one-third of the electrical energy to be generated at the Davis Dam, now under construction on the Colorado River approximately 50 miles below Hoover (Boulder) Dam, to be utilized in conjunction with Hoover Dam power. This power can then be utilized in conjunction with the Hoover Dam power in the proportion of about 2 to 1—that is, 1 kilowatt-hour from Davis Dam to 2 kilowatt-hours from Hoover Dam—thereby providing reciprocal stand-by power and automatically eliminating the necessity for the purchase of such stand-by energy. The Congress has already appropriated the necessary funds for the construction of the transmission line from Davis Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant area.

3. That the two power transmission-line systems connecting Hoover Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant (now the property of the War Assets Administration) be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation which is constructing and will operate the Davis Dam transmission lines.

With the Bureau operating both transmission systems in conjunction in a manner to provide reciprocal stand-by power, the cost of purchasing such additional stand-by power will be almost entirely eliminated.

Under no foreseeable conditions should the Hoover Dam-Basic Magnesium transmission lines be delivered to a separate agency or company—since the result could easily be an additional service charge.

4. That the Colorado River Commission take over the generator at Hoover Dam known as N-7 generator—which was installed during World War II for the purpose of furnishing power belonging to the State of Nevada and other contractees to the Basic Magnesium plant for the manufacture of magnesium for war purposes.

5. That since the Colorado Commission of Nevada is the sole agent of the State of Nevada in the withdrawal of the electrical energy allotted to the State, the commission determine at the earliest possible date the rate per kilowatt-hour that such electrical energy will be available to prospective users in order that sale of and the full use of the plant may be expedited.

6. That legislation be introduced in the Congress of the United States for the purpose of allocating to the United States-Mexico-Colorado water treaty that part of the cost of Davis Dam regulatory storage properly chargeable to and guaranteed to be furnished by the international treaty.

At the present time the entire cost of the Davis Dam water storage necessary to make the treaty effective is charged to power and will be paid for by the power users of that particular area. The cost of the combination Hoover-Davis Dams firm electrical energy delivered to the Basic Magnesium plant should be approximately 3 mills per kilowatt-hour—this rate would then be reduced by whatever amount of the cost of Davis Dam regulatory storage is found to be properly chargeable to the United States-Mexico international treaty, and should have a considerable effect upon the industrial feasibility within the area.

7. That the War Assets Administration continue watching closely the cost of administration. Since the cost of such administration has been reduced from a net loss of nearly $200,000 per month at the first hearing date, May 1947, to approximately $3,000 on January 4, 1948, the date of the final hearing, it is believed that the project can be operated upon a paying basis with the present power users and when additional power is sold a profit should be realized.

8. That little difficulty will be experienced in disposing of the basic magnesium units for private industrial purposes when the Colorado River Commission and the War Assets Administration carry through the above recommendations—and the firm power is available to such industrialists at approximately 3 mills per kilowatt-hour—and while there has been unusual delay in such procedure, the committee strongly recommends that the units be transferred to private industry at the earliest possible date so that the property may remain on the tax roll and also be operating and available for emergency work.

These eight recommendations embody, for the most part, the preliminary recommendations made to the War Assets Administration following the first hearing in May 1947.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The wartime power contract covering the generator N–7, while it may have been justified under the exigencies created by the emergency, was certainly a bad contract from a long-range point of view, and has left the Government in a position of being required to make substantial payments until 1966 and receiving nothing in exchange therefor since 1945. Since it is probable that some power contracts will be entered into in the future to supply the plant, the committee earnestly recommends that the lesson to be learned from the wartime contract not be forgotten and that the same pitfalls be avoided.

2. There has been unjustifiable procrastination and delay on the part of administrative agencies—primarily Defense Plant Corporation and Reconstruction Finance Corporation—in taking steps to dispose of the Basic Magnesium plant, representing an investment of $140,000,000 of taxpayers' money for war purposes. In March 1944, when the plant was producing at its peak rate of 120,000,000 pounds of magnesium annually (112 percent of rated capacity), it was clear, first, that the plant would not be needed for magnesium production, either for the war or for postwar peacetime production, and, second, that it would have to be disposed of either as a going concern for postwar uses other than magnesium production or salvaged by dismantling and sale of the usable fixtures and personal property and either sale or abandonment of the residue. Although adequate power and authority at all times existed in the administrative agencies to take steps for disposal, no effective action was taken. The committee was amazed to learn that even at the date of hearings Reconstruction Finance Corporation was still in the process of taking an inventory, no steps had been taken to arrange for low-cost firm power, an accounting for the cost of operation was still incomplete, and no written leases were in effect. The committee was further amazed to learn that War Assets Administration apparently was not cognizant of the fact that the State of Nevada had a withdrawal privilege on a large amount of firm power at cost at the switchboard.

3. The interests of the taxpayers were disregarded in the failure of the administrative agencies. Defense Plant Corporation and Reconstruction Finance Corporation, until February 1, 1947, and War Assets Administration subsequent to that date and up until the time of the committee's investigation and hearings, to take effective action toward efficient and economical operation of the plant in semistand-by condition which has resulted in a net direct operating loss to the taxpayers estimated to be from one million to two and one-half million dollars annually. The committee is gratified that the War Assets Administration, after first taking the position that it was impossible to reduce the net operating losses at the Basic Magnesium plant, now estimates that as of September 1947 the net operating deficit will be reduced to the rate of $25,000 monthly.

4. The committee recommends that the disposal of the townsite be considered as an integral part of the whole problem and that no disposal thereof should be made which would interfere with or hinder the ultimate solution to the entire problem. The testimony of the witnesses as to the effect of the sale of the townsite independently, and the recommendations of the Industrial Research Corporation on the disposal of the town site should be carefully weighed by the responsible officials before a decision is reached and action is taken.

5. The committee is of the opinion that the suggested acquisition by the State of Nevada is unsound for several reasons. First of all, the evidence seems to clearly indicate that the State is not in a financial position to either acquire the plant or to underwrite the maintenance loss which might occur. Second, it is questionable whether the State ought to risk public funds in a speculative profit-making or loss-taking enterprise. Third, experience has shown that publicly operated enterprises of the character ordinarily handled by private capital have not been outstanding successes, and fourth, the committee feels that it is not necessary for the State to engage in this private business activity in order to accomplish the real benefits for this State in which it does have an intense interest, namely, the development of industry within its borders which would enhance the wealth of the State and employment of its citizens.

6. The committee is of the opinion that the best disposal plan presented is multiple occupancy of the plant with retention of central control of utility services in one responsible authority at least until it may be possible to dispose of these utilities to all of the plant occupants jointly. It is, of course, essential that disposal of individual units of the plant should not in any way interfere with complete utility service to the entire plant since such a disposal would defeat the ultimate goal.

7. It is apparent to the committee that low-cost firm power is an absolute essential to the successful disposal of the plant. No source of low-cost firm power seems available other than the State of Nevada, and therefore, immediate steps should be taken ultimately to secure such low-cost power from the State. The committee feels that a certain synchronization of action is essential in the matter of securing this power, since it requires 3 years for Nevada to withdraw sufficient power, it also requires approximately 3 years to install additional generating facilities and the State of Nevada cannot withdraw its share of power until it is guaranteed against loss by bond from its proposed consumer. The committee further recommends that immediate action be taken to secure an interim power contract, in order to provide a source of power during the period which will be required for Nevada to get its power, and that such contract should of course contain the most favorable terms possible, and certainly terms more favorable than in the previous power contracts. The committee recommends that serious consideration be given to the possibility of tying in Davis Dam power when available in order to have standby power to prevent power shut-downs. In the negotiations for interim power it should be understood that the contract will in no way interfere with, or increase the time required for Nevada's withdrawal of power, since this would defeat the very purpose desired. The committee feels that whatever steps possible should be taken to secure for the State of Nevada the power generated by N–7, since the Government is liable for the amortization payments on this unit until 1966 and this would seem to be an equitable solution to this situation. In any event, if this is not possible, a serious effort should be made to secure an increase in the rate of payment made for the use of N–7, in order to reduce the present loss being sustained by the Government. If it is possible, under all of the circumstances, the committee recommends that serious consideration be given to the transfer of the transmission facilities owned by the Government to the Bureau of Reclamation.

8. War Assets Administration has taken the position that the appraisal and utilization study made by the Industrial Research Corporation should remain confidential and for the sole use of War Assets Administration. This position seems to be based upon the belief on the part of War Assets Administration officials that if the information contained in the report was available to prospective tenants or customers of War Assets Administration, War Assets Administration would be unable to negotiate a bargain as favorable for the Government as it could if the report were withheld. The committee disagrees on grounds of policy with War Assets Administration in this regard. With possible exceptions which the committee cannot now foresee, the committee believes that all information in the possession of the Government bearing upon the desirability, feasibility or profitableness of a transaction with the Government should be available to individuals and corporations desiring to transact business with the Government. Whatever may be the proper attitude with respect to transactions in private enterprise, the committee believes that public property should be dealt with openly and with full knowledge available to all prospective customers and not by concealment of facts bearing either upon the economic soundness of the enterprise or the price to be paid. Accordingly, the committee recommends that the industrial survey report be made public and available to all who may be interested in its contents.

9. The committee is impressed with the possibility of disposing of the Basic Magnesium plant as a going concern to actual operators and avoiding any Federal or State operations where taxes are lost to the State and inefficient operation is inevitable. The rapid expansion in population and the industrial development in the Southwest has a tendency to interest the establishment of production facilities either by new companies or by existing companies whose production operations have heretofore been concentrated in the East. The establishment of an electrochemical or electrometallurgical center with the Basic Magnesium plant as its nucleus seems, to the committee on the evidence before it, to be feasible. The committee has been informed that several large and well-established chemical companies intend to establish operations near the southwestern market. The unfortunate and, so far, unsolved so-called "smog" condition in the Los Angeles area has caused such companies to hesitate to invest large sums of money in establishing new facilities in the Los Angeles area. Henderson, Nev., being approximately 335 miles by rail from Los Angeles, is one possible desirable location for electrochemical and electrometallurgical companies desiring to serve the southern California market. In estimating costs and ability to compete, the primary unknown factor is the cost of power, which is one of the basic elements of cost in the electrochemical and electrometallurgical industry. An assurance of low-cost power might offset a disadvantage in other elements of cost which would induce companies to locate at Henderson, Nev., in the Basic Magnesium plant. The benefit to the State of Nevada, whose population is approximately 150,000, and which is practically devoid of manufacturing or industrial operations, would be tremendous. The benefit to the United States as a whole, resulting from a development of a hitherto undeveloped area and in the dispersal of industrial operations and in the realization of a substantial return from a large war asset, would, likewise, be tremendous. The committee, therefore, believes that the possibilities of disposing of the Basic Magnesium plant as a going concern should be fully and effectively explored and exploited. Nevertheless, the committee believes that against the above-stated desirable objective must be carefully weighed the continuation of large operating losses, and for that reason urges War Assets Administration to intensify its effort to dispose of the Basic Magnesium plant as a going concern and come to a conclusion as speedily as possible to the end that, if disposal as a going concern is not achievable, salvage operations can be commenced without undue delay.

A SUMMARY OF THE FACTS PERTAINING TO ELECTRICAL ENERGY

1. That the availability of low-cost power will determine the value of the Basic Magnesium plant. Such low-cost power might well mean the difference between the scrap value of the plant and its value as a going concern in the manufacture of chemical, electrochemical and electrometallurgical products, as well as other material peculiarly fitted to that area.

2. That the State of Nevada has a withdrawal privilege on approximately 750,000,000 kilowatt-hours per annum of electrical energy from Hoover Dam under special conditions more particularly outlined under the contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and the primary allottees of the power from the dam. More specifically, the State of Nevada and the State of Arizona are each entitled to 17.6259 percent of the firm power generated at the dam.

The cost of such power so withdrawn at the dam based upon 1947 costs would be 1.22 mills per kilowatt-hour for "falling water" plus the generating cost equalling approximately a total of 2 mills per kilowatt-hour at the switchboard.

3. That it is necessary that interim power be secured for the use of tenants at the Basic Magnesium plant during the period required to secure Nevada's allocation of power direct from Hoover Dam. The time delay is from 6 months to 3 years, depending upon the amount of electrical energy applied for.

4. That upon proper application, Nevada could become the user of at least one-third of the power to be generated at Davis Dam which would amount to approximately 300,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy. Such energy will be available about the year 1950–51 which coincides with the time required to withdraw the State's allocation of power from Hoover Dam. Such an allocation of power would amount to 1,050,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy available to the State of Nevada from the two sources.

5. The Eightieth Congress appropriated money for approximately 70 miles of transmission lines between Davis Dam and Hoover Dam. The Hoover Dam power plant now has transmission lines running to the Basic Magnesium plant. If the above-projected transmission line from Davis Dam should be constructed to the Basic Magnesium plant and then connected with the two circuits already constructed from Hoover Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant, there would be three independent transmission circuits from two independent sources of power which is considered, from a construction standpoint, an exceptionally safe arrangement, needing little if any stand-by power.

6. With the above three independent power circuits constituting the power transmission facilities from two independent sources operating under the control of the Bureau of Reclamation which department now controls both dams, the power allocated to Nevada could then be used and operated as reciprocal stand-by power, and little if any stand-by power would be necessary to facilitate or care for the operation of the Basic Magnesium plant facilities.

7. That to coordinate the power from the two sources in the ratio of about 1 kilowatt-hour of energy from Davis Dam to two or more kilowatt-hours of energy from Hoover Dam would result in the right proportions for efficient operation.

8. That the advent of the Davis Dam power upon the completion of that project at about the time the State of Nevada's allocation should be withdrawn from Hoover Dam could well eliminate any penalty for existing transmission lines rendered idle through the withdrawal of Nevada's allocation of electrical energy from Hoover Dam. The Board of Arbitration provided for in existing regulations under the Boulder Dam Project Adjustment Act to pass on inequities, obviates any necessity for delay in such withdrawal.

9. That the Colorado River Commission of Nevada is the legally designated agency that may apply to the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw Nevada's allocation of power, and is authorized to require such arrangements as may be necessary to safeguard the State from loss by the prospective user of such electrical energy.

10. That to assure current operation at the Basic Magnesium plant it is necessary for the Colorado River Commission of Nevada to immediately negotiate with the primary power allottees for such interim power as may be required for the use of tenants pending the availability of the essential part of the State's allocation of electrical energy.

11. That the contract between the Government, the State of Nevada, and the primary allottees for power from Hoover Dam making available a portion of the State of Nevada's share of the power for use at the then new wartime Basic Magnesium plant contained a provision, approved by the State of Nevada, that such power reverted to primary allottees immediately after the war ended.

This proviso placed the State of Nevada in such position that they now must again observe the time limit in withdrawing power for any peacetime operation, and if such proviso were strictly construed with interim power not available it could destory the usefulness of the Basic Magnesium plant during the 3-year period required to legally withdraw Nevada's allotment of power.

12. That in 1946 a 5-year contract for interim power was entered into with the Southern California Edison Co. and the State of Nevada. In such contract Nevada agreed to relinquish its rights to make an effective withdrawal of Nevada's allocation of power during the life of the contract, thereby effectively preventing the State from utilizing its own low-cost power for an additional 2-year period.

13. That the tenants at the plant are currently paying roughly two and one-half times the rate per kilowatt hour for power that it costs the Los Angeles Southern California Edison Co. and the bureau of light and power at the dam 10 miles away.

14. That the representatives of the bureau of water and power, and of the Southern California Edison Co. agreed, at the hearings in Las Vegas on August 21, 1947, to recommend to their companies that they enter into negotiations with the Colorado River Commission of Nevada for a new interim power contract pending the availability of Nevada's share of Hoover and Davis Dam power supply.

15. That all evidence showed conclusively that the value of the wartime plant to Nevada, to the Southwest, and to the Federal Government is dependent upon a power supply at a price enough below that available at tidewater so that it can be utilized in the production of the chemical, electrochemical, and electrometallurgical products and other materials—pay the freight to the markets, and leave a margin of profit.

SUPPORTING AND HISTORICAL DATA AS DISCLOSED BY THE RECORD

A permanent and adequate supply of power for industries which might be located in the Basic Magnesium plant requires the making of two arrangements.

First. Generating capacity must be provided in the Boulder power plant so that the State of Nevada can make available power which it has the right to withdraw from use by primary power allottees.

Second. Provision must be made for stand-by capacity so that emergency outages as well as normal outages for inspection and maintenance can be provided for.

The State of Nevada should acquire what is known as the N7 generator installed during the war to furnish power to the Basic Magnesium plant and the cost would be much less than installing a new one—and, in addition, time is an important factor.

An additional new unit in the Boulder plant would cost about $5,000,000. The annual charges in connection with such a unit will be approximately as follows:

Amortization	$193,000
Provision for replacements	57,700
Operation and maintenance	50,000
Total	300,700

In addition to paying the above generating charges, the State of Nevada would also be required to insure the payment of the falling water charges, which at the present time are at the rate of 1.22 mills per kilowatt-hour. On the basis of an annual usage of 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours, the generating charges would amount to approximately .75 mill per kilowatt-hour, or a total cost of 2 mills per kilowatt-hour for power supplied at a high voltage bus at the Hoover power plant before provision is made for stand-by capacity.

Unless an unusually high load factor type of load can be secured for Basic Magnesium, more than 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year cannot be practically handled by one additional unit in the power plant, if all of the power is to come from this source. Four hundred million kilowatt-hours is about twice the present usage at Basic Magnesium.

Davis Dam, 1950

With the estimated completion by 1950 of the Bureau of Reclamation's hydroelectric development at Davis Dam, it appears that possibilities for securing an adequate supply of power at Basic Magnesium with stand-by capacity will be present in a manner not heretofore contemplated. With the completion of the Davis plant, the Bureau of Reclamation will undoubtedly find it convenient to arrange for stand-by for that plant and the connected plant at Parker Dam. Ways and means of fully interchanging power from these two Bureau developments with the

Hoover power plant would undoubtedly be advantageous to the Bureau of Reclamation. It would appear, therefore, that some reasonable agreement could be reached whereby both the Bureau of Reclamation and the industries at the Basic Magnesium plant could be provided with stand-by capacity.

Cost of power, Hoover-Davis Dams

The State of Nevada has made application for 200,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year from the Davis Dam. If use at Basic Magnesium should increase beyond 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year to the extent that these 200,000,000 kilowatt-hours from Davis were required, the resulting cost per kilowatt-hour would be somewhat as follows:

400,000,000 from Hoover at 2 mills	$800,000
200,000,000 from Davis at 4½ mills	900,000
Total for 600,000,000 kilowatt-hours	1,700,000
	Mills
Average cost per kilowatt-hour	2.83

In the event that the N-7 generator can be secured by the State of Nevada, then the cost of power should be even lower than the 2.83 mills per kilowatt-hour and the time interval should also be reduced.

If a new unit is ordered for Hoover within the next 6 months, however, it is probable that power from that unit will become available about the same time that power is available from Davis Dam.

The Bureau of Reclamation in its request for an appropriation, which has now been granted by Congress, for the fiscal year 1948, included an item for starting construction of a transmission line from Davis Dam to Hoover Dam. That line will now be constructed. With present contemplated deliveries of materials, it is probable that this line will also become available at about the same time that the Davis power plant is completed. Other arrangements necessary to provide a firm source of power must be initiated at an early date if all arrangements are to be effected as outlined.

Assuming that these arrangements will be made, there still remains the question of an interim power supply for the industries at Basic Magnesium for the next 3-year period, or such part of that 3-year period as is required for the withdrawal of the Nevada power. Apparently the only possibility for such a supply lies in suitable arrangements with the southern California allottees of Hoover power. Negotiations for such power supply would be the responsibility of the State of Nevada.

The 1946–47 rate of power from the Hoover power plant covering falling water only was 1.22 mills per kilowatt-hour for the firm power and 0.376 mills per kilowatt-hour for the secondary power.

The generating costs to deliver the power using this falling water and delivering the power to the switchboard would be about three-quarters of a mill per kilowatt-hour. This is for the generating equipment, on about a 60-percent load factor. This cost would be graded down as the load factor goes up.

The transmission lines to take this power from Hoover Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant at Henderson where the power is used, were financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The equipment at Hoover Dam was installed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The N-7 generator was put in by the Bureau of Reclamation and its cost underwritten until 1966 by the RFC. The 220,000-volt switchyard equipment was put in by the Bureau of Reclamation under the same arrangement. The cost amounted to about $4,000,000 for the equipment installed by the Bureau only.

Coordinate Hoover-Davis Dam power—Reduce stand-by

In the use, then, of this power, and in coordinating the use of the Davis Dam power with the Hoover Dam power to make the lowest possible rate to the Basic Magnesium plant and to make for full utilization, it is necessary to build this transmission line from Davis Dam to Hoover Dam or to the Basic Magnesium plant.

Three circuits are involved here. Very seldom does any industrial establishment have three circuits available and also a source of stand-by furnished by a coordination of supply from two sources. That should provide for the lowest possible cost for power and highest guaranty of continuity of delivery.

It was important in this hearing to make a determination how low-cost firm power could be made available on long-term contracts because there now exists a demand for such power, and the possibility of an oversubscription in the next few years. If such oversubscription should become a fact there is the future prospect of another development upstream commonly known as the Bridge Canyon, so it appears that there is a never-ending source of power development on the Colorado River if properly coordinated.

The transmission lines from Hoover Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant are about 12 miles long, and the contemplated power line from Davis Dam will be approximately 70 miles in length. The Bureau of Reclamation will control and operate the 230-kilovolt transmission line from Davis Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant. At present there are also two kilovolt circuits to Hoover Dam which were constructed by the RFC, and included with this equipment are three banks of transformers of 75,000 kilovolts each, which cost about $400,000 each. This expensive equipment requires very specialized technique in its care and use.

There are, therefore, two reasons why these transmission lines could appropriately be turned over to the Bureau of Reclamation by the RFC to operate in connection with the other transmission line from Davis Dam. They could be operated at a minimum of cost because the Bureau of Reclamation is now equipped and properly staffed to operate. They have had some 40 years of experience in building and operating such equipment and the training of men therefor. In the event of break-downs they have the available equipment for replacement and by over-all control have the facilities to coordinate the power from the various installations on the Colorado River.

If the present owning or operating agency should turn control of these lines over to the Bureau of Reclamation, any transmission charges from Hoover Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant might be eliminated; at least any cost that did arise would not be chargeable to the Colorado River Commission or the State of Nevada. If any charges did arise, they would rightfully belong to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Bureau of Reclamation has the duty to coordinate the use of all available power supply on the Colorado River, not only as to Hoover Dam but as to Davis Dam also upon its completion, to Parker Dam, as will also be the case if Bridge Canyon is constructed in the future. With the Bureau's general control, they then are in a better position than any other agency to allocate and control any incidental costs that might arise.

Hoover Dam

The Federal Government has followed a long-adopted principle by publicly financing irrigation districts in disposing of the power generated by their projects—and leased the use of the water released through the dam to municipalities and power companies for the generation of power. Such was the case in the building of the Hoover Dam.

The Black Canyon (Hoover) Dam is 727 feet high, its crest length is 1,282 feet. Its thickness is 45 feet at the top and 660 feet at the base. Lake Mead, the reservoir formed back of the dam, is 115 miles long and has an area of 146,500 acres and stores 32,359,274 acre-feet of water. The ultimate expected installations will require for driving the generators fifteen 115,000 horsepower and two 55,000 horsepower vertical hydraulic turbines. The generator equipment will comprise eleven 60-cycle and four 50-cycle units, each rated 82,500 kilowatts, two 60-cycle 40,000 kilowatt generators and two 2,400 kilowatt house generators driven by two 3,500 horsepower Pelton water wheels which will provide station-service energy. The main turbines each exceed in capacity the largest previously manufactured units; namely the 90,000 horsepower units built for the Dnieprostroy plant in Russia.

On January 1, 1947, twelve of the 82,500 kilowatt and one of the 40,000 kilowatt units had been installed. When the plant is complete the total installed capacity, including house units, will be 1,332,300 kilowatts.

Boulder Canyon project

The Boulder Canyon Project Act (H. R. 5773) became law in December 1928. It was put into effect by public proclamation in June 1929, and the contract for construction of the dam, powerhouse and incidental works was awarded in April 1931, by the Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, the Government's agent under the act, after securing firm contracts from the sale of power and water to repay the cost with interest over a 50-year amortization period. The dam and appurtenant works required 5 years to construct and the first power was generated in October 1936.

The principal features of the original act pertaining to the generation of electric power were as follows:

The Government would install power units as required by purchasers; 50-year contracts, subject to readjustment at the end of 15 years and each 10 years thereafter, all to be entered into by the Secretary of the Interior with States, municipalities, corporations, political subdivisions, and private companies for the sale (or lease) of water or electric energy at rates adequate in his judgment to assure payment of all expenses of operation and maintenance of the dam, power plants, and appurtenant structures, and the repayment to the United States, within 50 years from the date of completion, of the cost, plus interest at 4 percent (the cost of the generating machinery plus 4 percent compound interest to be repaid the Government in 50 yearly installments); the ownership of the property to remain forever vested in the United States.

Advances were made by the Secretary of the Treasury for construction and were to be limited to $165,000,000; $70,000,000 to the dam, $39,000,000 for power plants, $38,500,000 for the All-American Canal, and $17,700,000 for interests during construction. Final costs are not yet available.

Expenditures for the canal are to be repaid by the land benefited as provided under the Reclamation Act, and $25,000,000 of the total expenditures are allocated to flood control repayable out of 62½ percent of the revenues in excess of those required for operating and maintenance expenses, interest, and amortization as described above.

In June 1930 Secretary Wilbur announced that contracts had been signed for leases of the falling waters on the basis of firm electric power at the rate of 1.63 mills per kilowatt-hour, a rate sufficient to provide revenues in accordance with the requirement of the act.

Contracts and dates

The original Boulder Canyon Project Act was approved December 21, 1928. The power

contracts entered into under the original act were as follows:

Lease of power privilege, United States, city of Los Angeles, and Southern California Edison Co., dated April 26, 1930, as amended September 23, 1931.

Contract for electric energy, Metropolitan Water District, dated April 26, 1930, as amended May 31, 1930.

Contract for electric energy, the Los Angeles Gas & Electric Corp., dated November 12, 1931.

Contract for electric energy, Southern Sierras Power Co., dated November 5, 1931.

Contract for electric energy, city of Pasadena, dated September 29, 1931.

Contract for electric energy, city of Glendale, dated November 12, 1931.

Contract for electric energy, city of Burbank, dated November 10, 1931.

In addition to this, a contract was entered into with the State of Nevada for initial delivery of energy to the customers of the State, such as Southern Nevada Power Co. and Lincoln County Power District No. 1:

Schedule of allocations

	Percentage of total firm energy
State of Nevada	18.0
State of Arizona	18.0
Metropolitan Water District	36.0
City of Los Angeles	14.9054
Southern California Edison Co.	7.2
Southern Sierras	.9
Los Angeles Gas & Electric	.9
City of Burbank	.5896
City of Glendale	1.8367
City of Pasadena	1.6182

In the event the State of Nevada or Arizona would not use the total amount allocated to it, the city, the Southern California Edison Co., Los Angeles Gas & Electric Corp., and Southern Sierras Co. agreed to take and/or pay for the amounts unused by the States in the ratio of 50 percent, 40 percent, 5 percent, and 5 percent, respectively. The total firm energy declared available at the time of beginning operations was 4,330,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year, diminishing annually by 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours. After the project was repaid with 4 percent interest each of the States of Arizona and Nevada was to receive 18¾ percent of such excess revenues and the balance was to be kept in a separate fund to be expended within the Colorado River Basin, as prescribed by Congress.

Rates: The primary allottees agree to pay 1.63 mills per kilowatt hour for firm energy and 0.5 mill per kilowatt-hour for secondary energy delivered at transmission voltage at Hoover Dam. Rates were subject to readjustment, upward and downward, as the Secretary would find justified by competitive conditions at distributing points for competitive centers.

Major features of lease: The power plant would be operated (under general supervision of a director appointed by the Secretary) by the city and the Southern California Edison Co. as lessees. Allottees would compensate the United States for the use of the leased machinery and equipment installed in the power plant, maintain in operating condition, and provide for repairs and replacements. The compensation for the use of machinery was to be based on repayment within 10 years with interest at 4 percent.

BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1940

The principal items of the Boulder Canyon Project Act pertaining to the generation and sale of electric power have been, to a large extent, revised under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940.

Allocations and contracts

In conformity therewith and pursuant thereto, many contracts have been entered into by allottees and users of electrical energy, and following is a list of contracts now in existence:

Power contract, Metropolitan Water District, dated May 29, 1941.

Power contract, Nevada-California Electric Corp., dated May 29, 1941.

Power contract, State of Nevada, dated May 29, 1941.

Power contract, city of Burbank, dated May 29, 1941.

Power contract, city of Glendale, dated May 29, 1941.

Power contract, city of Pasadena, dated May 29, 1941.

Power contract, Arizona Power Authority, dated November 23, 1945.

NOTE.—The city of Los Angeles purchased the Los Angeles Gas & Electric Corp. and acquired its rights of that party to Boulder contracts. The Southern Sierras Co. changed names to Nevada-California Electric Corp.

The allocations under the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act changed slightly to account for the 50,000,000 kilowatt-hours that were allocated to the city of Los Angeles and the percentages resulted as follows:

	Percent
State of Nevada	17.6259
State of Arizona	17.6259
Metropolitan water district	35.2517
City of Burbank	.5773
City of Glendale	1.8475
City of Pasadena	1.5847
City of Los Angeles	17.5554
Southern California Edison Co.	7.0503
California Electric Power Co.	.8813

The city of Los Angeles, the Southern California Edison Co., and the Nevada-California Electric Corp. continued to be obligated to take and/or pay for any allocation of the State of Nevada or Arizona unused by either in the following ratio of 55 percent, 40 percent, and 5 percent, respectively.

Rates: Firm and secondary energy

Rates are readjusted annually to account for actual costs of operation and maintenance, availability of secondary energy, and other miscellaneous items, with the following resulting energy rates:

Year of operation	Firm energy rates	Secondary energy rates
	Mills per kilowatt-hour	*Mills per kilowatt-hour*
June 1 to May 31—		
1937–38	1.163	0.340
1938–39	1.163	.340
1939–40	1.163	.340
1940–41	1.163	.340
1941–42	1.163	.340
1942–43	1.172	.343
1943–44	1.190	.357
1944–45	1.254	.398
1945–46	1.244	.392
1946–47	1.220	.378
1947–48	1.257	.413
1948–49	1.343	.454

STATUS OF THE BASIC MAGNESIUM PROJECT, JULY 14, 1948

Subsequent to the investigations and preliminary report of the special subcommittee, which included hearings in Washington, D. C., and in Las Vegas, Nev., through 1947 and January 1948, the Colorado River Commission of Nevada has informed members of the subcommittee that the three principal recommendations of the subcommittee had been adopted and were being put into effect:

1. That the Colorado River Commission had applied for one-third of the power to be generated at Davis Dam—65,000 to 70,000 kilowatts of electrical energy—to be utilized in conjunction with Hoover Dam power.

2. The second letter of intent to the Colorado Commission of Nevada from the War Assets Administration to transfer the Basic Magnesium plant to the State of Nevada contained a provision (section 21) that the transfer of the property to the State "shall be made subject to the agreement to permit the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior to negotiate for the acquisition of the entire transmission system." Congress included the necessary provisions in the 1948 appropriation legislation to transfer the Bureau.

3. That the Colorado River Commission had arranged to take over the N7 generator at Hoover Dam—and that the Commission had applied for the State of Nevada's allotment of power so that within a minimum of time the commission could make firm contract commitments to industrialists and prospective users of power at a definite rate per kilowatt-hour and horsepower year in accordance with the load factor and pertinent contract features.

The proper proportion of the cost of construction of the Davis Dam properly chargeable to the international water treaty between Mexico and the United States through the necessity of reregulation of the Colorado River water supply is now being computed and I will introduce the proper legislation in the United States Senate in the Eighty-first Congress in 1949 as announced earlier this year.

Practically the entire capacity of the Davis Reservoir as now designed would have been necessary for reregulation in any case according to the information now available so that with the proper legislation the cost of Davis Dam power be materially reduced.

State ownership

The subcommittee of the national defense committee recommended that the Basic Magnesium plant be sold and transferred direct to private industrialists, which would have been a very simple matter if the Colorado River Commission of Nevada had been in position to have made contracts for a firm power supply at a stipulated cost within the range of feasibility for such industrial uses within the area. However, since the commission had not made the necessary arrangements to enter into such contracts, and since the War Assets Administration has transferred the plant to the State of Nevada through a letter of intent and acceptance procedure, I intend to cooperate with the Governor of Nevada, who is chairman of the commission, in every possible way to further the success of the undertaking.

Through transfer to the State the approximately $102,000 annual taxes have been lost to the State and county—and past experiences with State ownership and operation of large industrial enterprises have not been happy.

The investigation and hearings by the subcommittee disclosed there is little doubt that the plant units can be disposed of in a very profitable manner when the Colorado River Commission has completed its work in connection with the proper withdrawal and coordination of the low-cost power supply necessary for the operation of the units.

The work of the commission in this connection should be diligently pursued toward the objective of disposal of the plant units to private industry and return to the tax rolls of the State and county and operation in the regular business field.

Letter of intent

The letter of intent, dated March 17, 1948, and signed and accepted by the Colorado River Commission on March 31, 1948, follows (transfer of the Basic Magnesium plant by the War Assets Administration to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada):

MARCH 17, 1948.

COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION,
Carson City, Nev.

(Attention Gov. Vail Pittman.)

GENTLEMEN: Reference is made to the proposal dated October 7, 1947, wherein the War

Assets Administration, acting for and on behalf of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under and pursuant to Reorganization Plan I of 1947 (12 F. R. 4534), and the powers and authority contained in the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 765), and WAA Regulation One, as amended (11 F. R. 408), hereinafter called seller, offered the State of Nevada, acting by and through its Colorado River Commission, hereinafter called purchaser, an opportunity to negotiate for the purchase or lease of the entire holdings of the United States Government known as Plancor 201, Basic Magnesium plant, located at Henderson, Nev. On November 5, 1947, the Colorado River Commission, through its secretary, Mr. Alfred Merritt Smith, advised that such commission, at a formal meeting held on October 7, 1947, had determined that it desired to negotiate for the purpose of taking over this property. Subsequent to negotiations, it was determined that the entire facility would be sold and transferred to the State of Nevada, acting by and through its Colorado River Commission, upon the following terms and conditions:

1. Title shall be vested in the Colorado River Commission in absolute fee ownership with the purchaser being obligated to pay the seller at the time of the execution of the instruments of transfer. One dollar in cash and thereafter, as an additional consideration all of the net rentals, revenues, or other emoluments derived from the operation of the property through sale, lease, or otherwise (except returns on minerals) for a period of 20 years, or until a sum of $24,000,000 has been paid to the seller, whichever is earlier.

2. The conveyance of the property shall be in absolute ownership with the purchaser having the full right of sale or lease of the property conveyed to it, or any part thereof, subject to the approval of the seller upon terms and conditions to be mutually agreed upon.

3. The seller shall reserve all minerals and mineral rights for its exclusive benefit and all income from such minerals or mineral rights, either through bonuses, royalties, or sales, shall go to the seller. This reservation shall be subject to the understanding that any development of the property for mineral purposes shall be conducted in such manner as to not unreasonably interfere with the use of this property as an industrial site.

4. Seller shall retain title to all chapels located within the boundaries of this facility. The ultimate determination as to which denomination may purchase these chapels shall be made by the Chief of Chaplains in accordance with the provisions of War Assets Administration Regulation 5, Order 16. The seller shall also retain title to the hospital and adequate grounds therefor. It is proposed to transfer the hospital to Rose de Linn Hospital, a corporation, with agreement that hospital facilities be made available to Henderson residents.

5. Net rents, revenues, profits, and other emoluments shall be turned over to the seller for the period of years hereinabove set out, as proceeds of this disposition, within the meaning of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and shall be deemed to mean all gross rent, revenue, and other emoluments of any kind received by the purchaser in leasing, operation, or sale of all or any part of the facility and including, but not limited to, furnishing utilities or rendering services in connection with the operation of the facility, less deductions for (a) the usual and ordinary costs (including direct labor, materials, and overhead) of current upkeep, insurance, maintenance, and operation of the facility by the purchaser; (b) administrative costs at the facility not to exceed quarterly the sum expended for such costs during the last quarter of 1947 which has been estimated to be $50,000; (c) costs of promotional work and other activities in obtaining tenants or making sales, which costs shall not exceed $20,000 per year. Administrative costs allowable in (b) above shall be limited to the following departments: Executive, cashier, purchasing, accounting, billing and statistics, personnel, time-keeping and pay roll and disposal negotiations and which include the following expenses: Salaries of the above departments, travel expenses of employees on official business, office supplies and expenses, postage, telephone rental and tolls, telegrams, auditing expenses, legal and collection expenses, taxes (other than ad valorem), bad debts, and sundry general expenses. Any administrative costs not covered by the foregoing shall be subject to the approval of seller.

6. In the event the revenue produced from the property through sale, lease, or operation does not provide sufficient funds for the proper upkeep and maintenance of the property, the purchaser shall have the right and option at any time to (a) supply the deficiency in the amount necessary for upkeep and maintenance from its own funds, or (b) to reconvey the plant and property to the seller subject to such dispositions as may have been made and such leases as may be outstanding upon 3 months' written notice of its intention, and in the event the option to reconvey is exercised the purchaser shall, upon reconveyance being effected, be released from any and all further responsibility with respect to the property.

7. An arbitration committee shall be appointed for the purpose of settling any controversial questions of fact that may arise in carrying out any of the provisions of this letter of intent. This arbitration committee shall consist of three persons; one to be appointed by each party to this letter of intent and the third to be appointed by the senior judge of the circuit court of appeals for the Ninth Federal Circuit. If either party hereto shall refuse or neglect to appoint an arbitrator within 30 days after the other party shall have appointed an arbitrator and served written notice thereof upon the other party requiring it to appoint an arbitrator, then, upon request to the senior judge of the circuit court of appeals for the Ninth Federal Circuit, said judge shall appoint such arbitrator within a period of 20 days. The finding or an award of a majority of the arbitrators shall be binding upon the parties.

8. It is understood and agreed that seller shall be granted 1 year from and after the date of the execution of this letter of intent, or until the Nevada State Legislature shall meet and enact legislation to permit the Colorado River Commission to sell or dispose of subject facilities, whichever date may first occur, within which to obtain a bona fide purchaser for this entire facility from private industry who will agree to continue the operation of the plant in productive industrial enterprises. In the event seller procures such a purchaser from private industry within the period hereinabove set out purchaser agrees to reconvey same to such purchaser as seller may designate upon 60 days' written notice. The entire electric transmission and distribution systems, the water supply system, and the sewerage disposal system which are covered by that certain letter of intent entered into by and between the War Assets Administration and the Colorado River Commission on September 16, 1947, are hereby excluded specifically from the transfer provided for in this paragraph. In the event this facility is reconveyed to seller within 1 year under the provisions of this paragraph, an accounting shall be made at the time of such reconveyance.

9. At any time after 3 years from the date of the execution of this letter of intent, the arbitration committee, duly appointed as hereinabove set forth in paragraph 7, may meet at the discretion of the seller and determine on an equitable basis the total minimum payment to be made by purchaser under the terms of this agreement, which shall in no event exceed $24,000,000.

10. In the event the revenue produced from the property, whether through sale, lease, or operation, is not adequate to provide sufficient funds for payments to seller as hereinabove set out in paragraphs 5 and 9 and extraordinary maintenance as provided in paragraph 14 for a period of 3 years, seller shall have the right to require reconveyance of the property upon 3 months' written notice to purchaser by the seller.

11. Purchaser shall be obligated to promote and develop sales or leases for the property in good faith at no less than the minimum values to be established and if such values are adhered to seller will approve the disposal. If at any time seller should determine that purchaser is not exercising diligence and reasonable effort in disposing of any of the property, seller shall serve notice to that effect on purchaser and call upon purchaser to appoint an arbitrator to meet with two other arbitrators, as provided in paragraph 7 hereof, who shall constitute an arbitration committee for the purpose of determining if the purchaser has not been promoting disposal of the property in good faith and with diligence. Should this arbitration committee find that the purchaser is unable to fulfill its obligation in this respect, then seller shall have the right to either (a) develop bona fide disposals for any part of the property in line with the minimum value and upon recommendation of such disposal purchaser will consummate the disposal immediately, seller to receive the net proceeds from all disposals after allowable deductions set forth in paragraph No. 5 herein, or (b) seller may require the purchaser to reconvey all the property which has not been sold subject to any outstanding leases.

12. The Munitions Board has placed a portion of this facility under the provisions of the National Security Clause. In the event the Munitions Board does not remove this restriction prior to the date of actual transfer, purchaser hereby agrees to accept this facility subject to all conditions contained therein.

13. On such portions of the property or facilities to which the national security clause is not applicable, the purchaser shall have the right to erect structures or make any improvements it may desire on the property, subject to the approval of seller, and shall have the right to deduct from any rents, revenues, or any moneys received from the lease of such new structures or improvements, (a) interest at the rate of 5 percent per annum on the amount invested on any construction and improvements, and (b) 5 percent per annum of the cost thereof for the amortization of the same with any balance remaining to be considered as a part of the gross rents, revenues, and emoluments from the facility.

14. The purchaser shall establish a fund in the amount of $300,000 for the purpose of providing extraordinary maintenance and other contingencies not covered by existing leases. This fund shall be created by permitting the purchaser to reserve not in excess of $75,000 for any 1 year from the net rents, revenues, and emoluments. Any expenditures made from this fund shall have prior approval of seller and this fund shall become the property of seller in the event of reconveyance.

15. Purchaser shall be required to remit within 45 days after the close of each quarter year the net rents, revenues, and other emoluments received from the property after deduction from such net revenues, one-quarter of the annual amount of the extraordinary maintenance fund as set out in paragraph 14 above, all such remittances to be accompanied by proper accounting statements signed by a duly authorized representative of purchaser. Should there remain no net rents, revenues, or other emoluments at the close of a quarter after allowable deductions are made, a proper accounting statement to that effect shall be submitted. Purchaser shall further be required to submit to seller within 120 days after the close of each calendar year a statement duly certified by the State auditor of the State of Nevada, or a certified public accountant selected and compensated by the purchaser, and approved by seller, verifying or correcting the accuracy of the quarter-annual statements submitted by the purchaser for such calendar year. In the event that it is found there has been an error in the net revenue paid or due, it shall be adjusted at the time of the next quarter-annual statement.

16. Any sums remaining in operating maintenance funds provided for hereinabove at the time of final settlement will be turned over to the seller along with any other moneys which may be due at that time, provided that the total amount to be paid to seller pursuant to this letter of intent shall not exceed the sum of $24,000,000 as required in paragraph 1 hereof.

17. Purchaser shall be responsible for necessary insurance coverage, taxes, maintenance, and other expenses of this facility from and after the date that purchaser is put into possession of this property. The minimum insurance requirements shall be approved by seller but in any event there shall be ample coverage on all leased portions of the plant and all buildings and facilities essential in its operations.

18. Included at the present time in plant inventories are certain items of machinery, equipment, and spare parts which are not considered to be essential to future operation of subject facility. Title to such items shall be retained in seller and seller shall dispose of and remove such items at its own expense. There are other items of machinery, equipment, and spare parts presently located at subject facility which are considered to be a part of the realty or which may be essential to future use, operation, maintenance, or disposal of the plant. Title to the latter machinery, equipment, and spare parts shall be conveyed to purchaser. Plant site records at the date purchaser is placed in possession of the premises adjusted by mutual agreement as to the surplus items, will be the basis of such conveyance of title to purchaser. Opportunity will be granted to purchaser to verify plant site records but such verification, as well as determination of surplus and transfer of title shall be completed within 6 months from the date of this agreement.

19. The seller shall not warrant, expressly or impliedly, that future use by purchaser or others of any equipment, machinery, or other facilities incorporated in or others of any process to be practiced at said plant, is free from patent infringements or obligations to pay royalties, and does not assume any liability to protect, defend, or save harmless purchaser or others against any claims, demands, or causes of action predicated on such use arising out of any United States patent. Purchaser agrees to hold harmless and defend the Government in any suit under any United States patent directed to the sale of the future use of any equipment, machinery, or other facilities incorporated in or at any processes to be practiced in said plant or for the collection of profits, damages, or royalties arising out of such sale or use. Purchaser assumes and agrees to indemnify the Government against any and all existing obligations (including obligations to pay royalties) affecting the future use, transfer, or resale of the equipment, machinery, or other facility which were entered into expressly or impliedly by seller with the approval or on behalf of Defense Plant Corporation or Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Seller reserves any secret processes, technical information, and know-how which may have been developed in the operation of subject plant for the production of magnesium, except insofar as purchaser or its nominee might desire to use such secret processes, technical information, and know-how for the production of magnesium at the Basic Magnesium plant located at Henderson, Nev. In the event such secret processes, technical information, and know-how are made available to purchaser for the production of magnesium at captioned facility purchaser agrees not to disclose such secret processes, technical information, and know-how and to impose like obligations on its successors or nominees.

20. A complete list of leases, options to purchase, and all agreements of every kind and character heretofore made by representatives of the United States Government, to other than the purchaser, shall be supplied to purchaser by seller, and such leases and agreements shall be assigned to the purchaser by appropriate assignment agreements effective as of the date of delivery of possession of the premises hereunder; and purchaser agrees to take this Government-owned facility subject to all commitments so listed and assigned.

21. The transfer of this property shall be made subject to the agreement to permit the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior to negotiate for the acquisition of the entire transmission system. Such acquisition shall be subject to the provisions of a letter of intent entered into by and between the parties hereto dated September 16, 1947, when letter of intent shall be suspended upon the execution of this agreement. In the event this facility shall be reconveyed to seller prior to termination of the letter of intent dated September 16, 1947, such contract shall be reactivated and remain in full force and effect until the termination date thereof.

22. Six months after the execution of the firm power contracts under which an adequate supply of power will be assured for the operation of this facility, purchaser will submit a concrete plan for advertising sale of this facility. This plan shall be submitted to seller for approval. In the event seller approves the plan submitted, purchaser hereby obligates itself to advertising the facility for sale in accordance with such plan within 4 months from the date of such approval. Failure to comply with this provision shall be cause for termination of this agreement or reconveyance of the property to the seller at its option.

23. Seller shall place purchaser in possession of the premises on a date to be determined mutually by War Assets Administration and purchaser, and the purchaser from after such date shall be responsible for all maintenance and upkeep of the property.

24. It is mutually agreed that seller shall retain the right to keep a representative or representatives on the premises until the full purchase price is paid or for such shorter term as may be determined by seller. Such representative or representatives shall have control over seller's interest in this facility and purchaser shall consult with this representative regarding all matters requiring the approval of seller. Seller shall vest such representative or representatives with adequate authority to make decisions and sign documents at the plant site which will facilitate all actions. Purchaser further agrees to furnish adequate office space together with necessary heating, light and such other usual facilities essential to the operation of an office to seller's representative without cost.

25. Purchaser will obtain at its own expense and affix to the quitclaim deed transferring title such revenues and documentary stamps as may be required by law, and will pay all recording fees incidental to recordation. Seller will make available for purchaser's inspection and use such abstract of title and other title papers as are in its custody, and will cause to be transferred to purchaser whatever title insurance policies seller now has covering the plancor involved, but it is understood that seller will not be obligated to furnish any later or continuation title report, title insurance, or pay for any title expense pertaining to this transaction.

26. Upon the expiration of the present agreement between seller, Southern California Edison Co., and the Department of the Interior, providing for the use by the Southern California Edison Co. of sections G-7 and T-7 located at Hoover Dam and the assumption by Southern California Edison Co. of the generating costs pertaining thereto, seller will transfer to purchaser, on a mutually agreeable basis, whatever rights seller may have to the use of said electrical equipment.

27. Purchaser warrants that it has not employed any person to solicit or secure this sale upon any agreement for a commission, percentage brokerage or contingent fee.

28. Purchaser agrees that in the performance of the terms of this sale that it will comply with and give all stipulations and representations required by applicable Federal laws, and that it will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

29. No Member of or Delegate to Congress or Resident Commissioner shall be admitted to any share or part of this sale or to any benefit that may arise therefrom.

30. It is understood and agreed that when and if you accept and approve this letter of intent, a formal contract, in accordance with the provisions hereof, will be drawn and executed as promptly as possible.

31. This letter of intent is executed in quadruplicate and it is requested that you indicate your acceptance hereon by having the chairman and secretary of the Colorado River Commission execute and return to this Administration three counterparts hereof.

Sincerely yours,

COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION.

Requested loan for housing repair

A request has recently been received by the War Assets Administration from the Colorado River Commission of Nevada for an advance or a loan of $35,000 for deferred maintenance on the Henderson housing project "to be repaid from the first net proceeds from the operation of the project." The amount is to be added to the maximum purchase price of $24,000,000, making the total maximum amount of $24,035,000.

The War Assets Administration reports informally that apparently the request can be granted under certain conditions, but if such a request were repeated it might result in tighter control of the operation of the plant by the Commission.

The matter of operation and maintenance was covered in at least 2 of the 31 paragraphs in the letter of intent. Paragraph 6 provides that "In the event the revenue produced from the property through sale, lease, or operation does not provide sufficient funds for the proper upkeep and maintenance of the property, the purchaser shall have the right and option at any time to (a) supply the deficiency in the amount necessary for upkeep and maintenance from its own funds, or (b) to reconvey the plant and property to the seller subject to such dispositions as may have been made and such leases as may be outstanding upon 3 months' written notice of its intention."

Section 10 further provides that "In the event the revenue produced from the property, whether through sale, lease, or operation, is not adequate to provide sufficient funds for payments to seller as hereinabove set out in paragraph 14 for a period of 3 years,

seller shall have the right to require reconveyance of the property upon 3 months' written notice to purchaser by the seller."

POWER WITHDRAWAL BY THE NEVADA-COLORADO COMMISSION FOR USE WITHIN THE STATE OF NEVADA

The following correspondence in relation to the further withdrawal of Nevada's allocation of power generated at Hoover (Boulder) Dam; and is in line with the recommendations of the Special Subcommittee of the Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program:

DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER,
Los Angeles, July 2, 1948.

Hon. JULIUS A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KRUG: Under date of May 6, 1948, the State of Nevada, acting through its Colorado River Commission, notified the city of Los Angeles and this department as an operating agency at Hoover Dam power plant that the State would require for its use at the power plant on June 1, 1951, 82,500 kilovolt-amperes additional generating capacity. This notice was given pursuant to article 17 (1) of the contract for the operation of Boulder power plant, dated May 29, 1941. Nevada's requirement in this regard, as stated in the notice, has been transmitted to the director of power at Boulder City, Nev.

To meet this requirement the State of Nevada stated in the notice its willingness to take over the obligations incident to sections G–7 and T–7 at the power plant if that section is made available for its use on June 1, 1951, when the present arrangement with Southern California Edison Co., relative to the use of the sections, terminates. Nevada's offer to take over the obligations connected with sections G–7 and T–7 is subject to there being effected certain changes in the rights and obligations of the Metropolitan water district of southern California related to the sections. The district has informed Nevada that it will acquiesce in the desired changes.

This department, pursuant to its duties as operating agent for the United States at the Hoover Dam power plant, recommends and requests that as early as is appropriate you make arrangements for the use, commencing June 1, 1951, of those sections for Nevada, such use being subject, of course, to the rights of the Metropolitan water district of southern California.

Although War Assets Administration, as the successor to Defense Plant Corporation, is primarily responsible for sections G–7 and T–7, and should be a party to the negotiations for their use, this recommendation and request is addressed to you as the one having the authority to arrange for such use.

Respectfully,

SAMUEL B. MORRIS,
General Manager and Chief Engineer.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1948.

Mr. SAMUEL B. MORRIS,
General Manager and Chief Engineer
Department of Water and Power,
Los Angeles, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. MORRIS: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 2, relative to effectuating changes in the use of sections G–7 and T–7 in the Hoover Dam power plant looking toward the use of these sections for Nevada, commencing June 1, 1951.

Negotiations to effectuate the necessary arrangements with regard to these sections will be conducted by Regional Director Moritz, with the assistance of Regional Counsel Coffey. As you suggest, the War Assets Administration will be a party to these negotiations.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. WARNE,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, July 26, 1948.

Hon. JESS LARSON,
Administrator, War Assets Administration.

MY DEAR MR. LARSON: In connection with the use of sections G–7 and T–7 in the Hoover Dam power plant, I enclose for your information a copy of a letter dated July 2, 1948, from Mr. Samuel B. Morris, General Manager and Chief Engineer, Department of Water and Power of the city of Los Angeles, together with a copy of this Department's reply thereto.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. WARNE,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I expect to follow through and keep the Senate of the United States and my own State of Nevada advised of the progress of this program.

STATEMENT ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF WATER DIVISION AND COMPACTS IN THE SEVEN STATES OF THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN, INCLUDING A DEFINITION OF THE TERMS LOWER AND UPPER BASINS, LOWER AND UPPER DIVISIONS, COLORADO RIVER COMPACT, AND THE BOULDER DAM PROJECT ACT IN SUPPORT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 145, INTRODUCED TO FACILITATE THE CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT AND BENEFICIAL USE OF THE WATER AND POWER OF THE COLORADO RIVER SYSTEM

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in view of the pending legislation for the continued development of the Colorado River Basin States through the development and beneficial use of the waters of that great river system, and my extreme interest in such continued development dating back to the introduction of the Swing-Johnson bill later—1928—to become the Boulder Dam Project Act, I am prompted to request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point my statement made before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The statement was made in connection with Senate Joint Resolution No. 145, which was introduced to facilitate such development.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE W. MALONE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA, ON COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 145

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I will make my statement brief since I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, Dams, and Electric Power of the Public Works Committee and must return to that meeting.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to show, in support of Senate Joint Resolution 145 in which I joined, that no State of the seven States in the Colorado River Basin, including my own State of Nevada, has a definite allocation of water under the existing conditions.

COLORADO RIVER COMPACT

The Colorado River Compact divides the water of the Colorado River System between the upper and lower basins. This compact was approved by six of the States of the basin in accordance with the provisions of the Boulder Dam Project Act before the construction of a dam could be started. I will present the evidence upon which I concluded that an agreement between the lower basin States on the division of the water allocated to that basin is impossible. Therefore, the only logical remaining method would be through a court of competent jurisdiction.

The statement made by Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, is a very fair outline of all of the history of the project that he has reviewed. I have not read the brief by Senator MCFARLAND, but I assume it outlines all of those things which were done by the commissions and the Members of the Congress of the United States during the hectic days of 1927 to 1928 when the Boulder Dam project was finally passed and marked the first major development on the Colorado River System.

Many of the things, however, that we would probably each recall are subject to interpretation. Each State, at the time I first attended the Commission meetings early in 1927, had its own water and power set-up, including their own engineers; and it soon became apparent that there was no way of getting anything done except to go along with the compact and amend the then Swing-Johnson bill to treat the interested States fairly in the division of the water and power benefits from the project. I, therefore, as secretary of the Colorado River Commission for Nevada, directed all of my efforts, with the power of the State of Nevada behind me, to that end.

AGREEMENTS

Mr. Chairman, it will be found as you delve into this matter that not only is it impossible to make new agreements, but the old agreements already made, including the interpretation of the original Colorado River Compact will be questioned and, no doubt, submitted to the court many times in the future for interpretation.

At that time I was State engineer of Nevada, engineer member of the Public Service Commission, and Secretary of the Colorado River Commission. We found immediately that the original bill did not provide any benefits from the project for the States of Arizona and Nevada where the project was located, that it was simply a power development and water storage on the Colorado River for the sole benefit of California.

Mr. Chairman, it has been evident to me since the first water meeting I attended in Los Angeles, Calif., early in 1927, before I became a member of the Nevada-Colorado River Commission, that the lower basin States would never agree upon a division of the waters of the Colorado River.

The reason was perfectly obvious; there was more land than water, and that the limit of any State's development is the limit of that State's water supply.

I do not want to see any State injured through any action of the Federal Government, and certainly not by any action of mine. Therefore, since an agreement is very unlikely, an adjudication by a court of competent authority seemed the only way.

ORIGINAL CONFERENCES

I want to mention in particular some men that were in this fight from the beginning. One was in your own State, Mr. Chairman—Mr. Delph Carpenter. Mr. Carpenter wrote the Colorado River compact I was informed on the best of evidence at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in 1922, with Herbert Hoover as chairman of the Seven Basin States Organization. It was the first real organized attempt to develop the Colorado River through a division of the water through a compact signed by a representative of each State on November 24, 1922.

I have often chided Delph Carpenter about the compact, that no one could understand it, therefore he was probably going to get it adopted. I personally felt that as long as no State was discriminated against in the matter of water division and the benefits from the power development, which was the purpose of the nine amendments that I offered at that time, that we would get the first step in the development of the river. Then the rest would be growing pains; and I think, Mr. Chairman, that that is exactly where we are now. We anticipated these growing pains, and the next step must be taken just as carefully as the first step, which was the development at Boulder Dam, now known as Hoover Dam. Each step must be just as carefully worked out so that no State will be injured without its day in court.

In the beginning, the men on the committee included Senators McNary, of Oregon, Thomas, of Idaho, Johnson and Shortridge, of California, and Kendrick, of Wyoming, as well as Pittman and Oddie, from my own State of Nevada; Dill, of Washington, and Henry Ashurst, of Arizona, were on the then Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the Senate (now the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs). These men wanted to start the development of the Colorado River. Over in the House was Leatherwood, of Utah, Arentz, of Nevada, Morrow, of New Mexico, Lewis Douglas, of Arizona, and White, of Idaho. They are all men who have gone on other jobs or have since died, but they did do this initial job and, Mr. Chairman, it was a good job. Senator HAYDEN is the only Member of the United States Senate who was a member of this body and this committee on January 20, 1928, when I first appeared before it on behalf of the Boulder Dam development.

SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 186, SEVENTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT

There is one thing that I would like to clear up for the benefit of the committee, and I am sure that everyone knows it, if they would review the Colorado River compact. There are five States in the lower basin—not three—and, by the way, this Senate document to which I refer was prepared by me in 1927. It was then printed as a Senate document in 1928. It is called Senate Document No. 186, Seventieth Congress, second session. It is still used as a reference work by many of the commissions. I did not prepare it alone. The State engineers of the other six States in the basin assisted me in the work through acting as consultants, as well as the Bureau of Reclamation engineers.

Senator MILLIKIN. What is this document now that you are talking about, Senator?

Senator MALONE. Colorado River Development, Senate Document No. 186, Seventieth Congress, second session. On page 31 of that document, you will find the definition of the upper and lower divisions and of the upper and lower basins. Much has been said about upper and lower basins and I think an explanation would be helpful. The Colorado River Basin is a seven-State affair, and the term "upper division" means the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The "lower division" means the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada. Lees Ferry is the dividing point between the divisions.

"The term 'upper basin'"—and this is where a misunderstanding exists—"means those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico and Utah and Wyoming"—you see, Utah and New Mexico come into the upper basin—"within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lees Ferry."

BASINS AND DIVISIONS

The first is an arbitrary division and the next is a drainage division. The lower basin then; instead of only meaning just the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, means those parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system below Lees Ferry. So, there are five States interested in the division of the waters of the lower basin, instead of only three States, which further complicates this situation and, as a matter of fact, the advance consent given by the United States Senate in the Boulder Dam project for a water-division treaty could not be binding upon all of the States of the lower basin even if it had been agreed upon and ratified by the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, since Utah and New Mexico were excluded.

International water obligations

We all are familiar with the compact. It is provided that out of that upper basin States, the 7,500,000 acre-feet and the lower basin States 7,500,000 acre-feet, and the additional 1,000,000 acre-feet come the international water obligations. They were determined by treaty as coming out of the waters of both basins equally, after certain surplus water allocated to the lower basin may be exhausted.

To pass the Swing-Johnson bill at that time it was necessary to have a six-State ratification paragraph put in it, because, as CARL HAYDEN has just said, Arizona did not until much later ratify the seven-State compact. There has never been, I want specifically to point out, a lower-basin agreement in accordance with the approval (advance) of the Water Division, in the Boulder Dam Project Act, found on page 9 of this Senate document. There was an advance approval by the United States Senate for the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada to enter into an agreement dividing the 7,500,000 acre-feet annually apportioned to the upper basin—paragraph (a) of article III of the Colorado River compact plus certain surplus water, but the States never agreed so the provision remained ineffective.

THE ADVANCE APPROVAL—INTERSTATE COMPACT—NEVER RATIFIED

"There shall be apportioned to the State of Nevada 300,000 acre-feet and to the State of Arizona 2,800,000 acre-feet for exclusive beneficial consumptive use in perpetuity, and (2) that the State of Arizona may annually use one-half of the excess or surplus waters unapportioned by the Colorado River compact, and (3) that the State of Arizona shall have the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of the Gila River and its tributaries within the boundaries of said State, and (4) that the waters of the Gila River and its tributaries, except return flow after the same enters the Colorado River, shall never be subject to any diminution whatever by any allowance of water which may be made by treaty or otherwise to the United States of Mexico but if, as provided in paragraph (c) of article III of the Colorado River compact, it shall become necessary to supply water to the United States of Mexico from waters over and above the quantities which are surplus as defined by said compact, then the State of California shall and will mutually agree with the State of Arizona to supply, out of the main stream of the Colorado River, one-half of any deficiency which must be supplied to Mexico by the lower basin, and (5) that the State of California shall and will further mutually agree with the States of Arizona and Nevada that none of said three States shall withhold water and none shall require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses, and (6) that all of the provisions of said tri-State agreement shall be subject in all particulars to the provisions of the Colorado River compact, and (7) said agreement to take effect upon the ratification of the Colorado River compact by Arizona, California, and Nevada."

I will call the chairman's attention to the fact that New Mexico and Utah are left out of this provision, and there never was such a compact entered into even by the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada; so naturally the provision in the act is null and void, since no action was ever taken by such States.

I will not read the remainder of the agreement but simply cite it for reference. I do not think it is necessary to put anything further in the record on that subject, since it has never been ratified, and is not effective.

I want to call attention further that the two basins are in the same situation, that is to say, while the water is divided between the upper and lower basins by the compact, and also the upper and lower divisions, that there has never been any division or allocation of the water between the lower basin States which include five States, and as between the upper basin States, which include four States, and until such a division is made by the consent of the States concerned, then it is my conclusion that no State, including my own State of Nevada, could say that it really had any specific amount of water.

On page 36 of this document, under an explanation by Delph E. Carpenter, of Colorado, appears a review of the Colorado River compact. Delph Carpenter was well and favorably known among the old-timers, and perhaps not by the more recent participants because he has been practically paralyzed for the last 15 years. However, he was one of the most brilliant men that I ever had the opportunity of knowing. In his explanation or review of the Colorado River compact, he says that provision was made that all future controversy between two or more States of each group are specifically reserved for separate consideration and adjustment by separate commissions or by direct legislation, whenever such questions may arise, if they ever do. Also, appropriations of water are covered.

COLORADO RIVER COMPACT AND APPROPRIATIONS

The West is very careful about anything that affects appropriations of water. Present perfected appropriations of water are not disturbed, but such rights take their water from the apportionment to the basin in which they are located. In other words, if California or Arizona and Nevada claimed that they had used water and it was theirs by appropriation, it would come out of the lower basin water and the upper basin States would not be affected.

On page 98 there is provision for future appurtenment of water. In the "Disposition of the waters of the Colorado River under the Colorado River compact", by Delph E. Carpenter, as found on page 98 of the same document, we have this provision; it is a very learned explanation of the entire document, but sufficient for this testimony I cite a paragraph on the first page:

"The Colorado River compact allocates 16,000,000 acre-feet to uses in the United States and sufficient for the international burden, whatever it may be, and then sets apart the unallocated surplus for future apportionment by the States after 40 years."

The 16,000,000 acre-feet adds up to seven and one-half million allocated to the upper basin, the four upper basin States, and seven and one-half million to the lower basin States, the five States that I mentioned, and not the three, and then 1,000,000 acre-feet in addition to the lower basin if it is available. If there is additional water, it would be called unallocated surplus and would not be under the compact apportioned until after 40 years.

"In other words, the compact specifically allocates 16,000,000 acre-feet plus the international burden, as designated burdens upon the whole supply of the river and then dedicates the unallocated surplus to future apportionment between all seven of the States. Of the 16,000,000 aggregate 7,500,000 plus 1,000,000 acre-feet per annum (beneficial consumptive use) is permanently allocated to the lower basin. These permanent allocations include all water necessary to supply all present appropriations, wherever the same may be and whether from the main stream or from the Green, the Gila, or any other tributary."

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is not my language. It is the language of the man who wrote the compact and whom I consider one of the most brilliant attorneys in the United States, certainly on water matters. That is his explanation of the compact, which he himself wrote and which the representatives of the seven States of the basin signed at that time, and which was later to become a highly controversial matter. Finally, the Boulder Dam Project Act was passed based on the approval of the six States of the basin, as already outlined.

DELPH E. CARPENTER—COLORADO

Total water available in the entire basin for apportionment, out of which would come this unallocated surplus and the water for any international treaty, is estimated in the beginning on page 33 on the "Disposition of the waters of the Colorado under the Colorado River compact," by Delph E. Carpenter, the water is supplied, reading from his explanation:

"The river is supplied by its tributaries from the Green to the Gila. Without tributaries there would be no river.

"The water supply of the river consists of all water which of nature and undisturbed by works of man would pass Yuma, the point below the last tributary. It is impossible to tell the exact amount of this total supply in any year, owing to interference by diversions, but it has been estimated at from 20,000,000 to 24,000,000 acre-feet average.

"This aggregate natural water supply may be divided into (1) that part entering the river above Lees Ferry and contributed by those streams which drain the upper basin; and (2) that part entering the stream between Lees Ferry and Yuma and contributed by streams which drain the lower basin."

You see, he again emphasizes that basins mean drainage, and drainage above Lees Ferry is the upper basin and the lower basin means that area draining to the river below Lees Ferry. Divisions mean an arbitrary division of the four States above Lees Ferry and the three States below Lees Ferry.

Any subsidiary compact of the lower basin would be, according to Mr. Carpenter, "the water available to the lower basin, water there originating and Lees Ferry delivery, is to be used in the lower basin to care for the lower-basin allocation, 8,500,000 acre-feet, and the entire international burden, unless there is a deficiency for international supply, in which case the waters allocated to each basin are to be called upon to the extent of one-half of the deficiency."

Mr. Carpenter says:

"The States of the lower basin should enter into a subsidiary compact making (1) local allocation of the aggregate 8,500,000 acre-feet (out of the whole river supply) allocated to the lower basin by the compact; (2) provision for supplying the entire international burden, if, when, and for the amount by treaty determined; and (3) disposition of the unallocated surplus pending and subject to future allocation between the seven States. They should also make provision for temporary use of allocated water escaping from the upper basin, without prejudice to the rights of the upper basin."

That is the five lower-basin States.

INDUSTRIAL ENCYCLOPEDIA—11 WESTERN STATES

Mr. Chairman, in order to save the time of the committee, I also prepared—and it seems I have a habit of preparing reports for reference over the past 20 years—what is called an Industrial Encyclopedia of the 11 Western States. That was edited and published in 1944; the data included in it, however, is up to 1943. I would like, in order to make available the included reference work on the Colorado River, to make a part of the record beginning in 1922, "November 24, Colorado River compact, executed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., Herbert C. Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, acted as chairman of the Seven Colorado River Basin States Conference." It enumerates from that date the Colorado River development events up until 1944.

Senator MILLIKIN. Will you make clear to the reporter exactly what you want put in there, and it will be put in.

Senator MALONE. Yes; I will.

(It is as follows:)

"1922: November 24, Colorado River compact, executed at Santa Fe, N. Mex.; Herbert C. Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, acted as chairman of the Seven Colorado River Basin States Conference.

"1923: C. H. Birdseye and United States Geological Survey party survey canyons.

"1924: Weymouth report rendered in eight manuscript volumes.

"1924: Second Boulder Dam bill (Swing-Johnson) introduced in Congress.

"1924: Cosby report on Colorado River issued.

"1925: The State of Nevada, by legislative act, March 13, 1925, approved the Colorado River six-State compact.

"1925–26: December 21, third Swing-Johnson bill introduced in Congress, H. R. 6251. Identical bill, S. 1868, was introduced by Senator JOHNSON in the Senate about this date. H. R. 6251 was replaced February 27, 1926. These two bills are referred to as the third Swing-Johnson bill.

"1927: Special advisers made report to the Secretary of the Interior.

"1927: Conference of lower division States—Arizona, California, and Nevada—at Los Angeles attended by the Colorado River commissions of the three States (new Nevada Colorado River Commission).

"1927: Conference of Governors on Colorado River.

"1928. Fourth Boulder Dam bill—Boulder Canyon Project Act (Swing-Johnson bill) introduced in both Houses of Congress.

"1928: January 20, GEORGE W. MALONE, report and testimony before the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the United States Senate, title of the report, 'Boulder Canyon Lower Colorado River Power and Water Set-up,' Nevada Colorado River Commission. The report and the testimony recommended that nine amendments be made to the then pending Swing-Johnson bill.

"1928: Senate Document No. 186, Colorado River Development, December 11, Seventieth Congress, second session, by GEORGE W. MALONE, State engineer of Nevada.

"1928: The fourth Swing-Johnson bill was passed by the Senate December 14, by the House December 18, including eight of the nine amendments proposed by the Nevada Colorado River Commission, and approved and signed by President Coolidge, December 21.

"1929: The State of Utah signed the Colorado River Compact.

"1929: President Hoover issued proclamation declaring six-State ratification of Colorado River Compact in effect and declaring Boulder Canyon Project Act effective this date, June 25, 1929.

"1929: July 5, 1929, Nevada submitted bid for all of the power to be produced from Boulder Dam, together with a use curve showing ultimate use for 483,000 horsepower for mining, agriculture, and electrochemical products to support the State's request for a withdrawal provision for power to use in the State. The withdrawal provision was later inserted in the power contracts and the bid was withdrawn.

"1929–30: Biennial report—State engineer of Nevada—covering developments to date including legislation and amendments to the original Swing-Johnson bill.

"1930: Contract signed by Secretary Wilbur with Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for delivery of water April 24. Contract signed by Secretary Wilbur with Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for electrical energy April 26, amended May 31, providing withdrawal of power by Arizona and Nevada to extent of 36 percent, in accordance with the amendments to the Swing-Johnson bill proposed by the Colorado River Commission of Nevada.

"1930: Contract signed by Secretary Wilbur with city of Los Angeles and Southern California Edison Co. for electrical energy April 26, amended May 28, and Department of Water and Power of City of Los Angeles, made party to contract in addition to city of Los Angeles, providing for the withdrawal of power for use within the States of Arizona and Nevada in accordance with amendments to the Swing-Johnson bill finally known as the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

"1930: Second deficiency appropriation bill appropriating $10,660,000 to start Boulder Dam work passed by House and Senate July 3.

"1930: July 7, 1930, the Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, issued an official order to Dr. Elwood Mead, Commissioner of Reclamation, to 'start work on Boulder Dam today.'

"1930: Secretary Wilbur drives first spike starting railroad and construction of Boulder Dam at Las Vegas, Nev., September 17, and issues order that dam be called Hoover Dam.

"1931: $15,000,000 appropriated by Congress for construction of dam.

"1931: Bureau of Reclamation opens bids for construction of Boulder Dam and powerhouse March 4 and awards contract to Six Companies, Inc., which starts work March 11.

"1932: $23,000,000 appropriated for continuing construction of dam.

"1932: The engineers divert the river, November 14.

"1933: $46,000,000 appropriated for construction of dam.

"1933: Secretary of Interior, Harold L. Ickes, announced that the name of the dam would again be Boulder Dam. Start concrete pouring in dam. Diversion tunnels, coffer dams, excavation for the dam completed.

"1934: Penstock tunnels completed; installation of 30-foot diameter outlet pipes started.

"1935: January—Conference of the seven States of the basin, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, and California. The conference was held at Phoenix, Ariz., on a further division of water from the Colorado River. Arizona has never signed the Seven-State Compact and now wants to secure a contract for water.

"1935: Complete pouring concrete in dam February and start storing water.

"1935: February—Report of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada; 'Including a study of proposed uses of power and water from Boulder Dam,' 1927 to 1935.

"1935: Boulder Dam starts to impound water in Lake Mead February 1.

"1935: Last concrete placed in dam May 29.

"1935: President Franklin D. Roosevelt dedicates the dam September 30.

"1936: First generator goes into full operation October 22.

"1936: Second generator goes into operation November 14.

"1936: Third generator goes into operation December 28.

"1937: Two more generators go into operation March 18 and August 16.

"1938: Storage reaches 24,000,000 acre-feet and Lake Mead stretches 115 miles upstream.

"1938: Two more generators go into operation June 26 and August 31; total 7.

"1939: Storage reaches 25,000,000 acre-feet, more than 8,000 billion gallons.

"1939: Two more generators, June 19 and September 12; total 9. Installed capacity reaches 700,000 kilowatts, making Boulder's hydroelectric power plant the largest in the world.

"1940: Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act, providing for the acceptance of $300,000 annually to each of the States of Arizona and Nevada in lieu of the 37½ percent provided for in the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and eliminating the periodical readjustment of the sale price of power.

"1940: Three more generators ordered.

"1940: All-American canal placed in operation.

"1940: Metropolitan water district's Colorado River aqueduct successfully tested.

"1941: One additional generator began operating in October.

"1942: Two more generators began operating in August and December.

"1942: Basic Magnesium, largest magnesium plant in the world, began taking power from Boulder Dam and water from Lake Mead.

"1943: Rated capacity of power plant of 952,300 kilowatts operated at overload in June to produce more than 1,000,000 kilowatts.

"1943: Basic Magnesium takes more than 100,000,000 kilowatt-hours in June.

"1943: Industrial service report—11 Western States, August, by the Industrial West Foundation, GEORGE W. MALONE, managing director.

"1944: Additional generator scheduled for operation in October."

Senator MALONE. To make clear my next point and to show the highly controversial nature of the Boulder Dam legislation as introduced under the Swing-Johnson bill as early as 1923, and finally passed and called the Boulder Dam Project Act late in 1928, as explained by Senator HAYDEN, I would like to make a part of the record excerpts from the 1929–30 biennial report of the State engineer of Nevada. This simply shows the recommendations that were made for amendments to the pending Swing-Johnson bill and those accepted at the time, and has a direct bearing on the next point I am about to make, ending on page 87 and beginning on page 86.

Senator MILLIKIN. Again, you will make that clear to the reporter?

Senator MALONE. Yes.

(It is as follows:)

"The Boulder Dam Project Act as finally passed, including the power contracts, provides revenue for Arizona and Nevada in lieu of taxes and power to use for the development of the States. According to the Secretary of the Interior the revenue derived will amount to over $700,000 to each State annually after the completion of the project, and each State can withdraw, if, as, and when wanted, up to 117,000 firm horsepower of the electrical energy for use in the State, paying cost at the switchboard when so withdrawn. It is thought that the use of this power will increase the taxable wealth of the State several millions of dollars.

"When the State (GEORGE W. MALONE, State engineer and Colorado River commissioner) administration took over the work of the Colorado River Commission early in 1927 the then pending Swing-Johnson bill, proposing to construct the Boulder Dam on the Colorado River, did not provide any revenue for the States of Arizona and Nevada, nor power from the project to develop those States, but did provide that the All-American Canal in Imperial Valley, costing $38,500,000 should be paid for by revenue from the power from the project in addition to the dam and power plant. Provision was later made for the lands benefited to underwrite the cost of the project. (One of the amendments to the Swing-Johnson bill—later the Boulder Dam Project Act—offered by GEORGE W. MALONE).

"By unanimous action of the Commission, early in 1927 it was agreed to make a thorough study of the Colorado River set-up, employing such assistance as found advisable, to determine the exact position the State should take relative to the pending legislation for the development of that river, so that our position would be found to be fair to all concerned and supported by the facts.

"SAN FRANCISCO POWER CONFERENCE—GEORGE W. MALONE, CHAIRMAN

"Accordingly a conference was called for the three lower basin States, Arizona, California, and Nevada, in San Francisco, November 19 to December 16, 1927, at which time the power angle of the undertaking was thoroughly reviewed and a report subsequently issued for Nevada (by the State engineer of Nevada, chairman of the conference) definitely determining the effect of such development and making certain definite (9) recommendations for the protection of our State and to aid the legislation by gaining the support, insofar as possible, of the upper basin States. The State engineer acted as chairman of that conference.

"The conference, in addition to the members of the Colorado River Commission of the three lower States, included such outstanding power experts as H. W. Crozier, consulting electrical engineer, employed by our Commission; E. S. Scattergood, chief engineer of the Los Angeles Bureau of Power and Light, and L. S. Ready, former engineer for the California Railroad Commission, employed by Los Angeles; Charles Cragin, chief engineer of the Salt River project, Arizona, and B. F. Jacobsen, consulting engineer of Los Angeles, employed by Arizona.

"From the results of this conference a report was made, January 1, 1928, by the Nevada Colorado River Commission, known as the Boulder Canyon lower Colorado River power and water set-up, and from the conclusions drawn from this report nine definite recommendations were made, all calculated to distribute the benefits from the project among the interested States in an equitable manner.

"NINE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE THEN PENDING SWING-JOHNSON BILL

"On January 20, 1928, the State engineer of Nevada (GEORGE W. MALONE) appeared before the United States Senate Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation and presented a statement made up from this report, including the nine recommendations, viz:

"1. That Nevada and Arizona should benefit from the proposed development, at least to the extent that she would benefit if developed by private capital, second only to Government payments and any reasonable reserve.

"2. That the power be not sold as low as the repayments to the Government will permit, but should be sold at a competitive figure comparable with the cost of power available elsewhere for these markets.

"3. That arrangements be made for the sale of the power so that fair offers may be had, and that legitimate bidders be not handicapped.

"4. That suitable readjustment periods be arranged for the power charges per kilowatt-hour and also for the proper charges for other service rendered.

"5. That proper charges be made for other service rendered flood control, silt control, irrigation-water storage and domestic-water storage.

"6. That the States shall have the right to withdraw, upon proper notice, certain blocks of power to be used within their own States.

"7. That a board be arranged for, from the three lower States, to assist the Secretary of the Interior, or any agency supervising the sale of the power and other service rendered, in an advisory capacity to fix the proper charges per kilowatt-hour for power and proper charges for other service rendered.

"8. That an attempt be made to equalize in some manner among the three States the benefits of reclamation financing.

"9. That after the Government advancement is entirely repaid the benefits from this development accrue to the States.

"The State engineer was then cross-examined at length by members of the Senate committee, which testimony appears in full in the hearings before the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, United States Senate, Seventieth Congress, first session, on S. 728 and S. 1274. (January 20, 1928.)

"Senate Document No. 186 (70th Cong., 1st sess.), Colorado River Development, containing 200 pages and 67 maps and illustrations, was prepared by the Nevada State engineer to make available to our Senators and Congressmen complete information for use in the congressional fight. This report was subsequently printed by the Government as a Senate document and was widely distributed as the official document on the Colorado River development.

"EIGHT RECOMMENDATIONS ACCEPTED

"When the Swing-Johnson bill was finally reported out of the Senate committee, and including the amendments on the floor of the Senate, eight of the nine recommendations were included in the legislation as finally passed and called the Boulder Dam Project Act, and, together with the power contracts made by the Secretary of the Interior in conformance with the act, as amended, provide:

"1. That 37½ percent of all the money the project makes above the payments due the Government each year after construction is finished is to be paid to Arizona and Nevada. The Secretary of the Interior has announced that those payments will amount to over $700,000 per year to each of the States. (Would at this time—1948—have amounted to more than $1,500,000 annually to each State if the 1940 Adjustment Act had not been passed.)

"2. That the power be sold at a competitive price.

"3 That the Federal Water Power Act be made a part of the act insofar as determining between conflicting bidders is concerned, so that any agency may bid for the power (priority to States and municipalities).

"4. That there shall be a readjustment of the charges for power after the first 15 years from the date of signing the contracts and every 10 years thereafter, either up or down, as the competitive price may indicate.

"5 That a charge be made for domestic water in Los Angeles and other southern California cities. (No charge was included in the original act.)

"6. That the States shall have the right to withdraw, upon certain notice, 18 percent or 117,000 firm horsepower each for use in the States (now approximately 140,000 kilowatts). This power can be withdrawn and turned back when not needed and withdrawn again as often as necessary by giving such notice and paying the cost at the switchboard when used.

"7. That an advisory board to assist the Secretary in the construction, management, and operation of the project, consisting of one duly authorized Commissioner from each of the seven States, may act in an advisory capacity with the Secretary of the Interior. (GEORGE W. MALONE was appointed by the Secretary for the State of Nevada.)

"8. That the All-American canal, costing $38,500,000, shall be underwritten by the lands benefited and not be paid for by the power from the dam. (This increases the revenue of the States, and investigations shall be made by the Government in Arizona, Nevada, and the upper basin States to determine feasible irrigation projects for development.)

"Recommendation No. 9, providing for turning the project over to the States when the cost to the Government has been repaid was not included in the act. It was said that while that policy had been adopted in the case of irrigation districts it would be 50 years before the Government would be repaid, and during that time a general policy toward this type of project would be adopted.

"In connection with the Nevada amendments, we quote, in part, from a dispatch

from Washington over Universal Service, which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner of September 19, 1930, viz:

"The outstanding features of these amendments were the provision for revenue for Arizona and Nevada from the project in lieu of taxes after its completion, and the privilege of withdrawing power at cost at the switchboard for use in those States when needed. The original Swing-Johnson bill did not provide either revenue or power for the States of Arizona and Nevada, wherein the project is located, and this fact formed the basis for objection to the project.

"At a hearing of the United States Senate Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation held in Washington, January 20, 1928, GEORGE W. MALONE, secretary of the Nevada Colorado River Commission, made nine recommendations for changes in the bill as offered, all those recommendations being calculated to distribute the benefits of the project among the interested States.

"Eight of these recommendations were included in the Boulder Dam Project Act as finally passed and, as a result, Arizona and Nevada each will receive, according to the Secretary of the Interior, a revenue of over $700,000 annually after the project is completed. In addition, through these amendments, Arizona and Nevada will be allowed to withdraw such amounts of power as they may need within their States up to 117,000 firm horsepower, paying cost at the switchboard for its use."

BOULDER DAM ADJUSTMENT ACT, 1940

Senator MALONE. Before I make my next point, and the last one, there was what was called the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act of 1940, with which I think the Chairman is familiar, since it was agreed to by the seven States. To save the time of the committee, I would like to have the explanation of that amendment, which it really was, an amendment to the Boulder Dam Project Act, called the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act of 1940, incorporated in the record, beginning with the heading "Precedent" on page 88, and ending on page 90, as marked.

Senator MILLIKIN. Do you want the tables in there?

Senator MALONE. No, Mr. Chairman; they simply outline the payment over the years. They would not be a part of it.

(It is as follows:)

"PRECEDENT

"The precedent for the 'revenue in lieu of taxes' from a Federal power development within a State was founded in the long-adopted principle in the revenue from the sale of public lands, and from the oil and gas leases located on the public lands, providing for 37½ percent of such revenue to be paid direct to the State in which such lands are located, on the theory that where such lands are held by the Federal Government the State cannot levy taxes but is entitled to a proportion of any income in lieu thereof. The Boulder Canyon Project Act, in section 4, paragraph (b) of the original act, provided for 37½ percent to be paid to the States of Arizona and Nevada wherein the project is located.

"In order to insure adequate provision for the States it was further provided in section 5, paragraph (a) of the act that 'contracts made pursuant to subdivision (a) of this section shall be made with a view of obtaining reasonable returns and shall contain provisions whereby at the end of 15 years from the date of their execution and every 10 years thereafter, there shall be readjustment of the contract, upon the demand of either party thereto, either upward or downward as to price, as the Secretary of the Interior may find to be justified by competitive conditions at distributing points or competitive centers.'

"The above provisions of the original act, approved December 21, 1928, provided the foundation for the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act of 1940, which was negotiated by the seven Colorado River Basin States and approved by the States of Arizona and Nevada, paying $300,000 annually to each of the States of Arizona and Nevada in lieu of the 37½ percent provided for in the original act.

"KILOWATT-HOURS—COST—REVENUE

"Table No. 10 prepared annually by the Bureau of Reclamation in determining the rates to be charged for power from the Boulder Canyon project for the ensuing year applies to the fiscal year 1943–44 and shows at a glance the expected number of kilowatt-hours of firm and secondary energy for sale from 1943 to 1987, inclusive, and the actual sales for the years 1937–42. (Table No. 10 p. 88 of section VIII–A—Power Section of the Industrial Encyclopedia, published in 1944.)

"It shows the price per kilowatt-hour (1.190 mills for firm and 0.357 for secondary power) necessary for both firm and secondary energy to provide the annual operation and maintenance, amortization payments to the Government, and the $300,000 to each of the States of Arizona and Nevada agreed upon through the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act.

"REVENUE TO NEVADA AND ARIZONA—ORIGINAL ACT

"At the original price per kilowatt-hour agreed upon in contracts for the power under the original Boulder Canyon Project Act passed in 1928, 1.63 mills for firm power and 0.50 for secondary, the return for the fiscal year 1943–44 would have been increased by approximately $2,000,000, 37½ percent of which—or approximately $800,000—would have been added to the $600,000 annual payments to the States of Arizona and Nevada, agreed to under the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act, making a total to the two States of $1,400,000 or $700,000 each.

"The 1.63 mills per kilowatt-hour for firm power established in the original contracts was based on the availability of oil at that time to the 'distributing points or competitive centers' at $0.75 to $0.80 per barrel. The price of such oil is now quoted (1944) at $1.10 per barrel, which would indicate an upward adjustment of the price per kilowatt-hour in 1945 at the end of the 10-year period under the original Boulder Canyon Project Act. However, since the Adjustment Act has been accepted, no such additional revenue can now be secured. (The price of oil is now approximately $2 per barrel.)

"TABLE 11.—*Comparative revenue to the States of Arizona and Nevada under the original and under the adjusted Boulder Canyon Project Act*

Price per barrel of oil	$0.80	$1.10	$1.35
Assumption kilowatt-hours per barrel	500	500	500
Annual revenue to Arizona and Nevada under 1928 Boulder Canyon Project Act and power contracts	$1,400,000	$2,345,000	$3,123,000
Annual revenue to Arizona and Nevada under 1940 Adjustment Act [1]	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000

[1] $600,000 annual payments in lieu of taxes accepted by the States of Arizona and Nevada in place of the more than $3,000,000 annual revenue provided under the original Boulder Canyon Project Act.

Source—Bureau of Reclamation.

"ADJUSTMENT ACT

"The principal items of the Boulder Canyon Project Act pertaining to the generation and sale of electric power have been, to a large extent, revised under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940.

"One of the principal revisions of the Boulder Dam Project Act under the 'Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940' referred to above was the acceptance by the States of Arizona and Nevada of a definite annual payment of $300,000 each, in place of the 18¾ percent as provided under the Boulder Canyon Project Act passed in December, 1928, which, according to the Bureau of Reclamation would have paid to the two States over the 50-year period $62,468,000, or an average of $624,680 to each State annually. This lesser amount was accepted presumably on the theory that the oil and gas used to generate the power 'at distributing points or competitive centers' would cost less in 1945, the date of the first 'readjustment of the contract,' than when the contract was first made.

"The Boulder Canyon Readjustment Act authorized and directed the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate 'charges on the basis of computation thereof for energy generated at Boulder Dam,' during the period from June 1937 to May 31, 1967. This, in addition to other net revenues, was to be adequate for the following purposes:

"1. To meet the cost of operation and maintenance and replacement.

"2. To provide $500,000 annually for additional development of the Colorado River.

"3. To provide $300,000 annually each for Arizona and Nevada.

"4. To repay the Treasury with interest at 3 percent loans for the construction of the project, exclusive of the $25,000,000 allocation to flood-control payment which is to be deferred until the end of the 50-year period subject to such action as Congress might then determine.

"The cost of generating equipment is to be repaid with interest at 3 percent within 50 years from the installation date. On May 29, 1941, the rate for firm power was reduced from 1.63 mills to 1.163 mills, and the rate for secondary power was reduced from 0.5 mill to 0.34 mill.

"These rates are subject to adjustment from time to time as conditions warrant.

"Another item of importance in the Adjustment Act is provision whereby the Government may arrange for an exchange of power to the Metropolitan Water District from the Parker and Davis Dams in place of the Boulder Dam power allotted it. This provision makes possible an over-all efficient operation of the plant in Black Canyon and the nearby downstream plants. The city of Los Angeles and the Southern California Edison Co. are established as United States operating agents for the Boulder power plant.

"ELECTRIC ENERGY ALLOCATION

"The basic firm energy has been allocated as follows: 17.6259 percent each to Arizona and Nevada; 35.2517 percent to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for pumping water through its Colorado River aqueduct; 17.5554 percent to the city of Los Angeles; a total of 4.0095 percent to Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena; 7.0503 percent to the Southern California Edison Co.; and 0.8813 percent to the California Electric Power Co. Energy allocated to, but not used by, Arizona and Nevada, and subject to withdrawal by them upon giving proper notice, has for the present been assigned to other users as follows: 55 percent to the city of Los Angeles; 40 percent to the Southern California Edison Co.; and 5 percent to the California Electric Power Co. The California Pacific Utilities Co. of California has contracted for a maximum of 20,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year and the Citizens Utility Co., of Kingman, Ariz., has contracted for a maximum of 50,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year of the present unused portion of the Metropolitan Water District's power allotment. These contracts run until 1954, at which time the Metropolitan Water District may need its full allotment.

"HISTORICAL

"Boulder Dam, officially named Hoover Dam by the then Secretary of the Interior Ray Lyman Wilbur, and changed back to Boulder Dam again by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes when he took office in 1933 (and changed again to Hoover Dam by Congress last year), was the first of the federally financed, large, multiple-purpose projects to be authorized by Congress and constructed by the Government in the 11 Western States, and the only one in the entire United States on which the cost was completely underwritten before construction was begun.

"The Boulder Canyon Project Act was passed by the United States Senate on December 14, 1928, by the House on December 18, and signed by President Calvin Coolidge on December 21, and made effective through proclamation by Herbert Hoover in June 1929. It, together with the contracts for the use of the power provided for in the act, definitely set the precedent for a State in which a project is located to receive a cash benefit in lieu of taxes, and for withdrawal of power to be used within the State when and if needed, even though such power might be used elsewhere in the meantime.

"The above review traces the history of the Colorado River and its development in some detail, together with its effect upon that growth of the Southwest and the 11 Western States, from the date of the discovery of the region by Francisco de Ulloa in 1539 to the use of Boulder Dam by the Basic Magnesium Co. of more than 100,000,000 kilowatt-hours from the completed Boulder Dam in June of 1943."

Senator MALONE. One of these amendments—and I will not try to explain all of them, because they are a matter of history and ready reference—but they all were directed toward the division of the power and the revenue features of Boulder Dam, now known as Hoover Dam, between Arizona, California, and Nevada. The dam is located between Arizona and Nevada, and the contracts were largely made for the sale of power in California. There was no development at all near the dam then available in either Arizona or Nevada.

In lieu of a direct sale of power to the States of Arizona and Nevada—the two States were given a withdrawal privilege to secure 36 percent of such power if, as, and when needed.

Mr. Chairman, we were laboring and sweating blood over the construction of Boulder (Hoover) Dam, just like they are doing now on the water division. It was important to each of the States to start the river development just as it is now very important to each of the States that a division of the water be made. If a division by compact is impossible, then the only recourse is to a judicial body. That is the reason that I joined in the resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 145.

ALL-AMERICAN CANAL NOT PAID FOR BY POWER FROM DAM

In the original Swing-Johnson bill was included the All-American Canal. For 5 years, every time Boulder Dam project was mentioned, the All-American Canal was a part of it. I came into the picture new and fresh in early 1927, and was chairman of the Lower Basin States Power Conference for several months. We met 40 days in San Francisco at one time and debated the entire problem in a very friendly conference, but no actual agreement came out of it. You will understand that there were just too many claims.

That All-American Canal always bothered me. I prepared amendments to the bill which were offered by Senators Pittman, Oddie, and others, both in committee, and on the floor of the Senate. In the debate in the committee, Senator Johnson was in his prime at that time, and everyone admits that, whether they agreed with Senator Johnson or not, he was a fighter. He said to me in cross examination, "We would be glad to give Nevada and Arizona money in lieu of taxes if there were such an amount of money available, but there is no such amount."

I said, "Senator," which is all a matter of evidence at that time, I think January 20, 1928, "what about the All-American Canal?" "It has no more to do with the Boulder Dam project than any other reclamation project. Why pay for it out of Boulder Dam power? In our State when we want a reclamation project, we borrow the money from the Government, build the project, and repay the Government over a period of years." That is exactly what the committee did. They took the All-American Canal out of the picture, which left the $37,500,000; then I went on to explain that there would be no ditches to clean in Imperial Valley once the river cleared up and washed the silt out of the river so that the $500,000 a year expended in cleaning the ditches would be unnecessary, and that will be available money.

Then, $1,000,000 per year was being expended in rebuilding levies along the lower Colorado, because with 150,000 second-feet flow the valley (Imperial) was endangered, but with the Boulder Dam storage project holding the flow to 40,000 second-feet the 1,500,000 or at least a large part of such expenditure would be saved. So, as a result, they gave us, Arizona and Nevada, 37.5 percent of all of the money the project made above the payments due the Government each year when amortization payments should start. The Secretary of the Interior announced that these payments amount to $700,000 per year to each State.

REVENUE IN LIEU OF TAXES COMPROMISE

In the Adjustment Act, Arizona and Nevada accepted $300,000 a year in lieu of the $700,000 per year to each State and then went on to make other adjustments to which all seven States agreed. The revenue payments being based upon the cost of oil for steam power—the payments to each State would have been more than one and one-half million per year at this time if the original act had not been amended. I recommended that such an attempt be made to equalize in some manner among the three States, the benefits of reclamation and financing. What they actually did, was to require the All-American Canal costing $38,000,000, to be underwritten by the lands benefited in Imperial Valley. I note that this Readjustment Act also increased the revenue of the upper basin States, and provided that an investigation shall be made by the Government in Arizona and Nevada and the upper basin States to determine feasible agricultural projects for development. No projects have ever been paid for out of power or are being paid for out of power due to that amendment which I suggested to the then Senate Reclamation and Irrigation Committee on January 20, 1927.

NO SPECIFIC RIGHT TO WATER WITHOUT AGREEMENT

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I am very desirous of seeing fair play, not only for California and Arizona but for my own State of Nevada. The 300,000 acre-feet of water that we are supposed to have allocated to our State was always simply taken for granted since it was not very much water, and therefore, no one ever paid it much attention, but we do not at this time have any water allocated to the State of Nevada through agreement by the lower basin States and neither does California or Arizona under the compact; and since there has been no agreement between the lower basin States, either under the provisions of the Boulder Dam Project Act or otherwise, which I want to emphasize again includes 2 States that have not been mentioned, New Mexico and Utah, then it is wide open, except for the appropriations that are mentioned by Delph Carpenter, original appropriations already put to use, which would come out of the basin where the State is located.

I want to say again that all of these men that were in the fight—and I remember them all kindly; Delph is paralyzed and only his wife can understand him when he tries to talk; Mr. Scattergood, one of the finest engineers that I ever saw, and Bill Matthews, an attorney for Los Angeles, who is kindly remembered, and many others that I am unable at the moment to name—all contributed their share as they went through. They were fighting for their State but ready to concede something here and there to make the compact work, and to start the river development.

Senator MILLIKIN. I want to get this very clear. Does not Nevada claim the right to 300,000 acre-feet of water?

Senator MALONE. We do claim it, but it has never been a part of any agreement. There have been conferences over a long period of time. I must have attended 30 or 40 such conferences during the 8¼ years I was State engineer of Nevada, and Colorado River Commissioner, I should say, one such conference was held for several weeks in your city of Denver; but no agreement was ever reached.

Senator MILLIKIN. Let me pursue the matter a little further. Does not Nevada at this time claim the right to 300,000 acre-feet?

Senator MALONE. A claim is all it is. There is no right, and nothing could ever be attached as a right, because there has been no agreement between the States.

Senator MILLIKIN. As of this time, Nevada has no fixed right of any kind to water out of Colorado River?

Senator MALONE. No; and no other State has. Therefore, this matter is very complicated, and it is a matter then of interpretation of the compact, and even Delph Carpenter's learned discussion would have no bearing except to enlighten some of us in our conferences and in our discussions with each other, as to what the author of the compact had in mind, which might or might not affect the court's interpretation.

Senator MILLIKIN. May I ask this, Senator: You raised a very interesting angle in this business. Do your views coincide with those of the Senior Senator from Nevada?

Senator MALONE. Unfortunately, I think he is in the hospital, and I have not discussed this with him, but we did agree that the only way there could be an equitable division of the waters, as a matter of fact, if a project were to be constructed now in any State, that would take a large amount of water, the only way such a division probably could be secured within a reasonable time would be by a court adjudication. I cannot speak for him now as to his current opinion. I understand that he submitted a written statement.

Senator MILLIKIN. Do your views coincide with those of the Governor of Nevada?

Senator MALONE. That I could not say, because I have not conferred with him on this particular matter. I understand Mr. Smith, who took my place as State engineer of Nevada, and worked for me a number of years before that time, will be here Saturday.

Senator MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the California representatives whether they have the same theory of Nevada's rights as those expressed by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. SHAW. I might add to what Senator MALONE has said, Mr. Chairman, that Nevada does have two contracts with the Secretary of the Interior, naming the quantities of 300,000 acre-feet in the aggregate, qualified by the clause "subject to availability for use in Nevada." That does to some extent throw the matter again wide open. Nevada, I believe, considers that the quantity named is within reasonable limits and is properly to be expected to belong to Nevada.

This, I think, might be said on the subject, and I think Senator MALONE would probably go along with the idea, that so long as there is no compact and no adjudication, everyone in the lower basin is subject to being sniped at, and subject to having political determinations either in the executive departments or in Congress affect the working out of actual projects either to Nevada's benefit or detriment. The same is true as to Arizona and as to California.

Senator MILLIKIN. I think that we are still missing the point that I am driving at. I think Senator MALONE has made it very clear. The Chair would like to know whether California is in agreement with the statement of Senator MALONE to the effect that Nevada, at the present time, has no right to 300,000 acre-feet or any other number of feet of water from the Colorado River.

Mr. SHAW. It has contracts. We are then bound to determine whether those contracts confer a right. There has been debate on that subject as to whether they confer water rights or whether they are something of a different category.

Senator MILLIKIN. Has California resolved its views as to whether it does or does not have a right? I am speaking of Nevada's right, if it has one.

Mr. SHAW. I am unable to answer that question positively.

Senator MALONE. I might clear that matter up further. I did not mean that the State of Nevada has not advanced a claim, and I do not mean that California has not advanced a claim, and that Arizona may have advanced a claim, but I do mean that none of us have any particular amount of water that we can say unequivocally belongs permanently to Nevada or any other State until a compact is signed by the lower basin States, or the water has been adjudicated by a competent authority.

Senator MILLIKIN. I think the Senator has made that clear. The reason I am probing this, I have been under the opinion that it was conceded by all parties that Nevada had a right to 300,000 acre-feet of water, and, of course, if that is not correct, we certainly should throw all of the clarification we can on it.

Senator MALONE. In every conference I have sat in, Mr. Chairman—you see out of the seven and one-half million and the additional million to the lower basin States, the 300,000, a small amount, was generally taken for granted but there has been nothing agreed upon officially or signed; so, if someone did question it, some new man representative of Arizona or California or Utah or New Mexico, in the lower basin, it would throw a cloud on any claim we have, and if it were never adjudicated and no compact ever signed giving us 300,000 acre-feet, then financing any projects under it would be serious.

Senator MILLIKIN. I may have misinterpreted the Senator's testimony, but the impression is that the Senator himself has thrown a doubt on it, and if that is not correct, that ought to be made very clear.

Senator MALONE. That is correct. I myself believe implicitly that even your own State of Colorado has no specific amount of water that it can call its own in the upper basin until you would either agree by compact between the four upper basin States or until it has been adjudicated by a competent authority.

Senator MILLIKIN. I would like to ask the representatives of the upper States whether there is any claim that Nevada does not have 300,000 acre-feet of water by way of fixed firm right?

Mr. BREITENSTEIN. We concede that the Nevada contract gives her the right to use 300,000 acre-feet of the Colorado River water. When you talk about a right, Senator, we get into complications. A water right is a right of use, and it is not a right to a can of tomatoes.

Senator MILLIKIN. I suggest that under the compact that is not at all correct. The purpose of the compact, one of the purposes of the compact, was to avoid the necessity for us to mature a right by use.

Mr. BREITENSTEIN. Your compact defines beneficial consumptive use of water. Now, Nevada has the right, as we see it, to use beneficially or consume beneficially 300,000 acre-feet of water per year.

Senator MILLIKIN. Is that contested by any of the States in the upper basin?

Mr. BREITENSTEIN. Not that I know of.

Senator MILLIKIN. Is that contested?

Mr. BREITENSTEIN. I have never heard of that contested by any person speaking for an upper basin State.

Senator MILLIKIN. How about the States in the upper division?

Senator MALONE. Would Mr. Breitenstein identify himself for the record?

Mr. BREITENSTEIN. My name is Jean S. Breitenstein. I am a lawyer, and I am attorney for the Colorado Water Conservation Board, which is the water agency of the State of Colorado charged with the protection of or conservation of water resources of the State.

Senator MALONE. I would like to ask Mr. Breitenstein a question. Does the upper basin have anything to do whatever with the division of the lower basin water?

Mr. BREITENSTEIN. No, sir.

Senator MALONE. What difference does it make whether you advance a claim to the water allocated under the compact to the lower basin, or that you do not? The upper basin States have no interest in the lower basin water.

Senator MILLIKIN. Well, the Chair's purpose was to find out whether Nevada's right, if she has one, has been generally accepted or whether it has been a matter of opinion and possibly conflict.

Senator MALONE. I want to say again, that the upper basin States have only one obligation, and that is to turn down 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually, or 75,000,000 acre-feet in any 10-year period. The lower basin States have nothing whatever to do with the waters remaining in the upper basin and the upper basin States have nothing to do with the 7,500,000 turned down to the lower basin.

Senator MILLIKIN. I was not proposing to raise that question. I was simply trying to find out what the state of opinion is around here as to all of the States on the river, as to whether Nevada has a fixed right to a certain amount of water.

Now, as I understand it, the upper basin States do not challenge that right. If I am not correct in that, I would like to have someone correct me. As I understand it, California has not yet matured her conclusions as to whether that is or is not correct. Is that right?

Mr. SHAW. There are legal questions involved there as to the nature of these contracts from the Secretary of the Interior that I would rather not attempt to express a view on without pretty careful consideration, Senator.

May I add two thoughts, if you please. In a sense, each of the States on an interstate river has a right to equitable apportionment, that is, a right to a share of the whole use of the river. Now, that is something which must be taken into account in answering your question. I would like to make a little comparison. The State of Nevada has a secretarial contract under section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. It has two contracts aggregating 300,000 acre-feet. The States of Utah and New Mexico have no such contracts. Their position is therefore less advanced and less secure and less definite than that of the State of Nevada.

Senator MALONE. Could I ask a question of the witness? Are you referring to the paragraph that I read, where the Congress of the United States merely consents to a division of the waters, that that gave us a claim?

Mr. SHAW. I was not referring to that paragraph.

Senator MALONE. Will you tell me the one to which you refer?

Mr. SHAW. I was referring to the law of equitable apportionment, and that is something—if I may just complete the thought—undetermined and unadjudicated and still in full consideration of the Senator's question must be taken into account.

Senator MILLIKIN. Will you hold up just a moment? Does Arizona challenge the right of Nevada to 300,000 acre-feet?

Mr. CARSON. No; we do not. We have put in the Arizona contract this clause:

"Arizona recognizes the right of the United States and the State of Nevada to contract for the delivery from storage in Lake Mead for annual beneficial consumptive use within Nevada, for agricultural and domestic uses, of 300,000 acre-feet of the water apportioned to the lower basin by the Colorado River compact, and in addition thereto, to make contract for like use of one twenty-fifth of any excess or surplus water available in the lower basin and unapportioned by the Colorado River compact, which waters are subject to further equitable apportionment after October 1, 1963, as provided in article III (f) and III (g) of the Colorado River compact."

Now, since Utah and New Mexico have been mentioned here, I would like to read the next paragraph in this contract.

Senator MILLIKIN. This is a contract between Arizona and the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. CARSON. Yes.

Senator MILLIKIN. What is the date of that contract?

Mr. CARSON. The 9th of February 1944. It was ratified by the Arizona Legislature:

"Arizona recognizes the rights of New Mexico and Utah to equitable share of the water apportioned by the Colorado River compact in the lower basin and also water unapportioned by such compact; and nothing contained in this contract shall prejudice such rights."

Mr. SHAW. Would you be kind enough to read the next section?

Mr. CARSON. That was (g).

Now, I would like to offer this entire contract for the record.

Senator MILLIKIN. It will be put in the record.

Mr. CARSON. It appears on page 240 of the Bridge Canyon project hearings on Senate bill 1175.

Mr. ELY. We have already entered that as an exhibit to our testimony.

Senator MILLIKIN. Since it has been offered, would that be sufficient?

Mr. CARSON. I would like to have it entered.

Senator MILLIKIN. Put it in at this point, even at the risk of encumbering the record. I do not like to have to make all sorts of cross-references all of the time to find the material.

Mr. CARSON. All right.

Then, in Arizona's view Nevada has a firm right to 300,000 acre-feet, plus one twenty-fifth of the surplus which comes from our half of the surplus, and the division is made in the lower basin by virtue of the California Limitation Act in article IV of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, which the Senator from Nevada did not read, but which limits California to 4,400,000 acre-feet.

Now then, that leaves for Nevada and Arizona the balance of the 7,500,000 acre-feet of III (a) water apportioned to the lower basin, plus that small part of Utah and New Mexico, which are in the lower basin, and there is no dispute between Arizona and Utah or New Mexico over that water, nor with Nevada.

Mr. SHAW. Could I have paragraph (b) of that contract read?

Senator MALONE. I would like to have section (h) read.

Mr. SHAW. With the chairman's permission, I would like to read into the RECORD the subsection of this contract immediately following the two which counsel for Arizona read.

Senator MALONE. Is this a contract or is it something adopted by the State legislature?

Mr. SHAW. It is a secretarial contract, approved by the State legislature of Arizona:

"Arizona recognizes the right of the United States and agencies of the State of California to contract for storage and delivery of water from Lake Mead for beneficial consumptive use in California, provided that the aggregate of all such deliveries and uses in California from the Colorado River shall not exceed the limitation of such uses in that State required by the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and agreed to by the State of California by an act of its legislature, upon which limitation the State of Arizona expressly relies."

Now, I wish to make these two comments. Obviously, the formulas adopted in this contract for recognition of the rights of Nevada, Utah, and New Mexico and California are wide open to the questions, the legal questions, which have been presented. They are not self-defining numerical quantities in all respects. They are subject to the provisions of section 10 of the same contract, and "neither article 7 which contains these three subdivisions which have been read, nor any other provision of this contract shall impair the right of Arizona and other States and the users of water therein to maintain, prosecute or defend any action respecting, and is without prejudice to, any of the respective contentions of said States and water users as to (1) the intent, effect, meaning, and interpretation of said compact and said act; (2) what part, if any, of the water used or contracted for by any of them falls within article III (a) of the Colorado River compact; (3) what part, if any, is within article III (b) thereof; (4) what part, if any, is excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact; and (5) what limitations on use, rights of use, and relative priorities exist as to the waters of the Colorado River system; provided, however, that by these reservations there is no intent to disturb the apportionment made by article III (a) of the Colorado River compact between the upper basin and the lower basin."

We, on the part of California, and I do not want to have any mistake about this, do not challenge the right of the State of Nevada or the privilege of the State of Nevada, or whatever you may call it, to use 300,000 acre-feet of water. Nevada, however, without any adjudication, is standing out here deriving what comfort it can from this contract, but without any definition by any court or any compact of its exact rights.

GOV. VAIL PITTMAN'S LETTER—NO LOWER BASIN COMPACT

Senator MILLIKIN. I believe, Senator MALONE, I should bring to your attention the letter of Governor Pittman of May 10, 1948, to this subcommittee. In the course of the letter the following appears:

"Nevada is seriously concerned as to the effect of congressional action upon the promotion and development of projects in the other States in the lower basin, which may have undesirable repercussions upon Nevada's allotment of water and power.

"In the absence of an effective allocation of water between the States of the lower basin, these States may rely upon their respective State water codes, and their rights as established by priority of beneficial use could result in depriving Nevada of a part of the water to which the State is entitled under the Colorado River compact and section 4 (a) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. The amount of water Nevada would receive under this agreement (300,000 acre-feet), while very small compared with the proposed allocations to Arizona and California, is vitally important to the welfare of southern Nevada. The danger of loss of a portion of this water to Nevada is accentuated by the necessity of supplying water to the Republic of Mexico as required by the Mexican Water Treaty of 1945.

"Nevada has a contract executed by the Secretary of the Interior under the project act for 17.6259 percent of all firm hydroelectric power produced at Hoover Dam. The necessity of conserving as much of this energy as possible is of the greatest importance to Nevada. The electric power is imperatively needed for present operation and development of natural resources in mining and irrigation, which are rapidly expanding, and for the operation of Basic Magnesium project which is now being acquired by Nevada from War Assets Administration where industries of great benefit to the State and to the national welfare are in operation; and others are negotiating for space and power."

I shall make the whole letter available to you, Senator, but here is another part that I want to refer to:

"Nevada's past experience conclusively leads me to believe that a three-State compact or agreement cannot be reached and further discussions will prove futile. Our State for many years has spent much time and money in efforts to bring the three-State compact into being, completely without results. At last Nevada discontinued negotiations and on March 30, 1942, contracted directly with the Bureau of Reclamation for 100,000 acre-feet of water from Lake Mead storage as water was urgently needed for the wartime Basic Magnesium project. Meantime, Arizona petitioned Secretary Ickes for a contract of withdrawal of up to 2,800,000 acre-feet from the main stream, that State's entire allotment, less certain deductions and qualifications in the contract. This led Nevada to contract for an additional 200,000 acre-feet, the limit of our right under the authorized three-State contract. The right is only for withdrawal of stored water when it is available.'

Now, for whatever bearing that may have I thought that you should have that directly before you.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. No doubt the governor sent me a copy, but in the press of other business it did not reach me. It has not been called to my attention. He says the same thing in his letter that I have just said for the record. What I want to say again is that I appreciate very much the protection afforded by the contract that the Legislature of Arizona has ratified, but as you can see, California still leaves the gate wide open, and the only way it could bind the State of Arizona would be through a compact with Nevada, ratified by the legislatures of both States, and even then the remaining three States of the lower basin would in no way be bound. I think California questions the 4,400,000 acre-feet limitation indicated by the Boulder Dam Project Act, and there are various ways, you understand, that you can compute water. One might be through gross diversions, and others through beneficial consumptive use, and you will find that in Delph Carpenter's explanation of the compact it is always beneficial consumptive use. Arizona, for example, computes their use of the Gila River waters in a certain manner—other computations use a different formula—neither I nor the State of Nevada can say what method should be used, but a court of competent jurisdiction can resolve the question.

Consumptive use means that in Colorado, for example, or the upper basin, you could and probably will divert the water, a considerable part of it, several times, and you have in Colorado one of the highest duties of water of any State in the West, primarily because you have such a large return flow. I am talking about beneficial consumptive use; I think it is only a little over an acre-foot or between an acre-foot and 2 acre-feet per acre. Whereas, if it were diverted and never returned to the stream system, it might be several times that, but your return flow is such that your beneficial consumptive use is very low.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO WATER TREATY

I want to say a further word about this. Highly complicating this entire picture is the 1,500,000 acre-feet allocated to Old Mexico. That has been ratified by the Senate of the United States and it is duly signed, and there is nothing that anyone can do about it. I examined personally the lands in Old Mexico in 1927 and 1928. I have a peculiar habit of looking at things that I have to do something about. They never at any time, in my judgment, irrigated over 30,000 to 40,000 acres at one time, but they had about 200,000 acres under cultivation due to irrigating a part of it for 2 or 3 years, and then shifting to other parts of the land.

But now instead of the three-quarters of a million acre-feet, which is at least 100,000 acre-feet more than anyone thought they would ever be allocated and certainly that much more than they had ever utilized at any one time prior to the construction of the dam, they get 1,500,000 acre-feet. The 1,500,000 acre-feet must come from some place. It immediately dissipates any idea that there is going to be any large unallocated surplus, or maybe even very little of that 1,000,000 acre-feet that is allocated to the lower basin, in addition to the 7,500,000 acre-feet to the lower basin to be delivered at Lees Ferry by the upper basin. Through all of the negotiations—and you understand that I am not passing on these questions—we tried to meet the necessary problems in the interest of harmony and to get development started on the Colorado River, feeling that the rest of it would be growing pains—just like we are going through now. I do not want to hurt any State in the basin, either the upper or lower basin.

Therefore, I want it clearly understood that in my opinion there is not now any allocation to any specific State in the basin. I know the Secretary of the Interior has made these contracts, and they have made them with California, and they are about to make them or have made them with Arizona, and they have made two with us, but the Secretary of the Interior in the last 15 years has had a habit of taking on a good deal of authority—and I think the chairman is fully familiar with all of the ramifications of that habit—and that all of the Department's actions do not have the weight of law.

The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, was entirely unfamiliar with water law in the West, and this is no disparagement of him, and the present Secretary, Mr. Krug, is entirely unfamiliar with our methods of water use in the West, and therefore it comes back to the old saying, "No one can talk quite so convincingly on a subject as someone entirely unhampered by the facts."

ONLY LOWER BASIN COMPACT OR AGREEMENT CAN DIVIDE THE WATER

I cannot settle this problem between Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah. Only those States can settle it through a compact—or the rights can be adjudicated by a competent authority.

I want to make this point, that Delph Carpenter, when he says what the compact

means—and he leaves for the moment aside what the States ratified—he is just like GEORGE MALONE or our chairman or anyone else; he is just 1 out of 140,000,000 making up the United States. What he says, and he wrote the compact, and he evidently meant it to mean that it included the Gila River, and it included every stream and every foot of watershed in it and to be based on beneficial consumptive use, but nevertheless, that is only Delph Carpenter, and I have the highest regard for him. We used to call him the "silver fox of the Rockies." However, the questions of fact must still be left to the court if there is a disagreement.

MOVE ONE STEP AT A TIME—GROWING PAINS

What we did at that time seemed right to us, but there are so many interpretations of even the compact itself, as you have seen here this morning, that it is my earnest opinion that the way to save time and to utilize the waters of that basin, in view of the fact that I agree wholeheartedly with the Governor, who has, along with Tom Smith, our State engineer, sat in these conferences almost continuously since I left the Commission, that there would probably never be an agreement between the lower basin States in the division of water.

I concur in that position, and I think my friends from Arizona and California would also concur. Therefore, it is very important that the Government of the United States not assist anyone, Nevada, Arizona, California, New Mexico, or Utah, in establishing priorities that might be inimical to the rights of any other State until such determination is made either by compact or adjudication.

I have been advised that if a compact is not possible the quickest way to determine the rights would be through an adjudication by the Supreme Court, and should not hold us up, perhaps, more than a year, which, in view of the fact that the Boulder Canyon project was held up 7 years, even after Mr. Hoover called the States together in Santa Fe, N. Mex., since it has taken the States of the West many years on all major projects to arrive at the proper solution, the time element would not be out of line when the importance of the subject is considered.

What I am saying is that rather than deprive California and Arizona and Nevada or any other State of their proper rights, 1 year more or less is relatively unimportant, and if they are unable to do it for themselves, there should be a competent body to do the job. Now, it did make some difference in my thought on the subject when the Bureau of Reclamation came in and said that they were going to pump the water from Parker Dam to central Arizona instead of taking it out of the Bridge Canyon, because if it were taken out of Bridge Canyon, I think the Governor of Nevada, Mr. Vail Pittman, has very well covered it, that would divert a large amount of water without any adjudication, compact, or determination of rights above Boulder and Davis Dams where power is developed and then used for irrigation; and, of course, acts as flood control. They are truly multiple-purpose dams, but it would change materially the matter of repayments by reducing the power development upon which the project was originally financed.

I want to make this one point again. Not in any part of the lower river basin with which I am familiar has power developed on the main stream been used to finance an irrigation district. The Bridge Canyon project, if it is built, will produce a lot of power. The water will go through the Bridge Canyon, then on through Hoover and Davis Dams. The power will be available to the basin States, wherever it can be economically transmitted. I understand at Parker it will take about a third of this power to pump the water back into central Arizona. Approximately one-third of the power is used for that purpose, and then the revenue from the power, the power is fixed at a price that will repay the Government for the Central Arizona project. It is an exact parallel, as I see it, to the All-American canal that the Congress rejected, through denial of the use of Boulder Dam revenue with which to repay the Government for the cost of the All-American canal.

I am not suggesting what should be done. I am merely outlining what has been done, and I think in order to meet the future developments on the river it is necessary for the committee to know what has been done and what precedents have been established and the real points at issue.

I heartily agree with the Senator, the chairman, in his conclusion that if you are going to write a book on this subject, you had better do it during the first 2 weeks before you become burdened with details, or else you had better wait several years, because once you begin to find out the real problems, you will be very reluctant to make a definite decision between the States on water rights. As a matter of fact, on none of these things, either in the Industrial Encyclopedia of the Eleven Western States, or in Senate Document 186 have I drawn conclusions. I have merely put down the evidence, so that anyone can refer to the documents as interpreted by the men on the job at the time, and the actions of the Congress of the United States, and make up their own mind.

I want to adopt that attitude all of the way through. As we go along certain precedents are set and become common procedure—fair to the States involved—so that Congress has finally established a definite method of procedure.

The reason that I joined with other Senators in the joint resolution then was because the necessary adjudication, in the absence of a compact, could be made only by the Supreme Court in my opinion, since I felt that the States would never make it. Just as my Governor has said in his letter. He had not communicated with me before writing the letter, but we agree on principle.

Mr. Chairman, unless there are further questions, I think that that concludes my statement.

Senator MCFARLAND. There is just one matter that I would like to call Senator MALONE's attention to, and I am sure that he is familiar with it, and that is (b) under article IV of the compact, which reads:

"Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes."

Then I would like to ask him if he is not familiar with the fact that the Colorado-Big Thompson in Colorado is financed largely from power generated?

Senator MALONE. I am referring to the power developed on the main lower basin stream where two or more States are interested; also following a compact or an adjudication the amount that any one State might divert would be determined.

Senator MCFARLAND. I do not care to go into it any further.

Senator MILLIKIN. I think that that is extraneous to the immediate matter.

Senator MALONE. I am entirely familiar with the provision which the Senator just read.

Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly clear that not a single one of the seven States in the entire Colorado River watershed has a firm right to the use of any specific amount of water until such time as the water allocated to the upper and lower basins, respectively, under the Colorado River compact has been divided between the States in the respective basins either through interstate agreements or compacts—or by a court of competent jurisdiction.

It is equally clear to me that the lower basin States, Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah will not, within any reasonable time, agree upon such a division. I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, joined in the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution No. 145 to hasten the further development of the Colorado River.

Senator MILLIKIN. Thank you very much, Senator.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this outline contains a rather complete record of progress of the Colorado River development with appropriate references in the interest of a better general understanding of the subject and a full ultimate development of that great river system.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it is my desire to address the Senate on the subject of bringing inflation under control. Before doing so, however, I wish to report favorably from the Committee on Banking and Currency House bill 6959 to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, and I submit a report (No. 1773) thereon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the bill just reported by the Senator from Vermont is the housing bill, is it not?

Mr. FLANDERS. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I feel that since the bill has been reported it should be a matter for debate as early as possible in the Senate. Therefore, if no Senator wishes to suggest why I should not do so, I shall ask unanimous consent, and now do ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6959.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to that procedure, but I think probably in fairness to the Members of the Senate there should be a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. I was just about to state that if any objection was raised, I should be glad to suggest the absence of a quorum, although perhaps it would not be necessary to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether there will be any objection.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished acting majority leader and the distinguished minority leader that a Member of the Senate is going to object to consideration of the bill. I further wish to state that I shall insist upon a quorum call in order that the Senator interested may be protected. He is a Member on this side of the aisle.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I understand that I do not lose the floor by this procedure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will not lose the floor.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lodge	Taylor
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is necessarily absent in the State of Tennessee, because of a primary and general election which is being held today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the quorum call I had proposed a unanimous-consent request temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business and proceed to the consideration of House bill 6959. At that time it was suggested by the chairman of the committee [Mr. TOBEY] that he thought possibly an objection would be made to the present consideration of the bill. I did not know that when I proposed the unanimous-consent request. I now renew the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Housing Act of 1948."

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require a production of residential construction and related community development sufficient to remedy the serious cumulative housing shortage, to eliminate slums and blighted areas, to realize as soon as feasible the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, and to develop and redevelop communities so as to advance the growth and wealth of the Nation. The Congress further declares that such production is necessary to enable the housing industry to make its full contribution toward an economy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. The policy to be followed in attaining the national housing objective hereby established shall be: (1) Private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can; (2) governmental assistance shall be utilized where feasible to enable private enterprise to serve more of the total need and (3) governmental aid to clear slums and provide adequate housing for groups with incomes so low that they cannot otherwise be decently housed in new or existing housing shall be extended only to those localities which estimate their own needs and demonstrate that these needs cannot fully be met through reliance solely upon private enterprise and upon local and State revenues, and without such aid.

TITLE I—FHA TITLE VI AND TRANSITIONAL PERIOD AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

TITLE VI AMENDMENTS

(a) Section 603 (a) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$5,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,750,000,000 except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased to not to exceed $6,150,000,000";

(2) By striking out the second proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That no mortgage shall be insured under section 603 of this title after April 30, 1948, except (A) pursuant to a commitment to insure, issued on or before April 30, 1948, or (B) a mortgage given to refinance an existing mortgage insured under section 603 of this title and which does not exceed the original principal amount and unexpired term of such existing mortgage, and no mortgage shall be insured under section 608 of this title after March 31, 1949, except (i) pursuant to a commitment to insure issued on or before March 31, 1949, or (ii) a mortgage given to refinance an existing mortgage insured under section 608 of this title and which does not exceed the original principal amount and unexpired term of such existing mortgage:".

(b) Section 608 (b) (3) (B) is amended by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That the principal obligation of the mortgage shall not, in any event, exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located; and".

(c) (1) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) is amended by striking out "$1,500 per room" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,100 per family unit";

(2) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) is amended by striking out the colon and the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(d) Section 609 is amended—

(1) By striking out all of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding purchase contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator providing for the purchase and delivery of the houses to be manufactured, which contracts shall provide for the payment of the purchase price at such time as may be agreed to by the parties thereto, but, in no event, shall the purchase price be payable on a date in excess of 30 days after the date of delivery of such houses, unless not less than 20 percent of such purchase price is paid on or before the date of delivery and the lender has accepted and discounted or has agreed to accept and discount, pursuant to subsection (1) of this section a promissory note or notes, executed by the purchaser, representing the unpaid portion of such purchase price, in which event such unpaid portion of the purchase price may be payable on a date not in excess of 180 days from the date of delivery of such houses:".

(b) By striking out the first and second sentences of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost, exclusive of profit, of manufacturing the houses, which are the subject of such purchase contracts assigned to secure the loan, less any sums paid by the purhaser under said purchase contracts prior to the assignment thereof. The loan shall be secured by an assignment of the aforesaid purchase contracts and of all sums payable thereunder on or after the date of such assignment, with the right in the assignee to proceed against such security in case of default as provided in the assignment, which assignment shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator; and the Administrator may require such other agreements and undertakings to further secure the loan as he may determine, including the right, in case of default or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses then owned and in the possession of the borrower."

(c) By adding at the end of subsection (f) the following new sentence: "The provisions of section 603 (d) shall also be applicable to loans insured under this section and the reference in said section 603 (d) to a mortgage shall be construed to include a loan or loans with respect to which a contract of insurance is issued pursuant to this section."

(d) By adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(l) (1) In addition to the insurance of the principal loan to finance the manufacture of housing, as provided in this section, and in order to provide short-term financing in the sale of houses to be delivered pursuant to the purchase contract or contracts assigned as security for such principal loan, the Administrator is authorized, under such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe, to insure the lender against any losses it may sustain resulting from the acceptance and discount of a promissory note or notes executed by a purchaser of any such houses representing an unpaid portion of the purchase price of any such houses. No such promissory note or notes accepted and discounted by the lender pursuant to this subsection shall involve a principal obligation in excess of 80 percent of the purchase price of the manufactured house or houses; have a

maturity in excess of 180 days from the date of the note or bear interest in excess of 4 percent per annum; nor may the principal amount of such promissory notes, with respect to any individual principal loan, outstanding and unpaid at any one time, exceed in the aggregate an amount prescribed by the Administrator.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to include in any contract of insurance executed by him with respect to the insurance of a loan to finance the manufacture of houses, provisions to effectuate the insurance against any such losses under this subsection.

"(3) The failure of the purchaser to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of any note or notes executed by the purchaser and accepted and discounted by the lender under the provisions of this subsection, shall be considered as a default under this subsection, and if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the lender shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance, as provided in subsection (d) of this section except that debentures issued pursuant to this subsection shall have a face value equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan plus interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of default to the date the application is filed for the insurance benefits.

"(4) Debentures issued with respect to the insurance granted under this subsection shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date application is filed for the insurance benefits and shall bear interest from such date.

"(5) The Administrator is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this subsection, in addition to the premium charge authorized under subsection (h) of this section. Such premium charge shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the original principal of such promissory note or notes and shall be paid at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator."

(e) Section 610 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Administrator is further authorized to insure or to make commitments to insure in accordance with the provisions of this section any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any of the so-called Greenbelt towns, or parts thereof, including projects, or parts thereof, known as Greenhills, Ohio, Greenbelt, Md., and Greendale, Wis., developed under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, or of any of the village properties under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and any mortgage executed in connection with the first resale, within 2 years from the date of its acquisition from the Government, of any portion of a project or property which is the security for a mortgage insured pursuant to the provisions of this section."

(f) Title VI is amended by adding after section 610 the following new section:

"SEC. 611. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under other sections of this title, and in order to assist and encourage the application of cost-reduction techniques through large-scale modernized site construction of housing and the erection of houses produced by modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Administrator as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"(2) cover property, held by a mortgagor approved by the Administrator, upon which there is to be constructed or erected dwelling units for not less than 25 families consisting of a group of single-family or two-family dwellings approved by the Administrator for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That during the course of construction there may be located upon the mortgaged property a plant for the fabrication or storage of such dwellings or sections or parts thereof, and the Administrator may consent to the removal or release of such plant from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may approve;

"(3) involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(A) not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the completed property or project, exclusive of any plant of the character described in paragraph (2) of this subsection located thereon, and

"(B) not to exceed a sum computed on the individual dwellings comprising the total project as follows:

"(i) $8,100 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each single-family dwelling, and

"(ii) $12,500 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each two-family dwelling.

"With respect to the insurance of advances during construction, the Administrator is authorized to approve advances by the mortgagee to cover the cost of materials delivered upon the mortgaged property and labor performed in the fabrication or erection thereof;

"(4) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time: *Provided*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest, not exceeding 4½ percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, if he finds that the mortgage market demands it. The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"(c) Preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for veterans of World War II and their immediate families and for hardship cases as defined by the Administrator shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(d) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 608 shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

TITLE II AMENDMENTS

(g) Sections 203 (b) (2) (B) is amended by striking out "$5,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,300."

(h) Section 203 (b) (2) (C) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$8,600" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,500";

(2) By striking out "$6,000" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,000";

(3) By striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,000."

(i) Section 203 (b) is amended by striking out in paragraph No. (3) the following: "of the character described in paragraph (2) (B) of this subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "on property approved for insurance prior to the beginning of construction."

(j) Section 203 (b) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) (C), inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or," and adding the following new paragraph:

"(D) not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 90 percent of the appraised value, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance (or 95 percent if, in the determination of the Administrator, insurance of mortgages involving a principal obligation in such amount under this paragraph would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities for families of moderate income), of a property, urban, suburban, or rural, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence the construction of which is begun after March 31, 1949, and which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That the Administrator may by regulation provide that the principal obligation of any mortgage eligible for insurance under this paragraph shall be fixed at a lesser amount than $6,000 where he finds that for any section of the country or at any time a lower-cost dwelling for families of lower income is feasible without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability: *And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages insured under this paragraph the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 10 percent (or 5 percent, in the case of a 95-percent mortgage insured pursuant to this paragraph (D)) of the appraised value in cash or its equivalent, or shall be the builder constructing the dwelling in which case the principal obligation shall not exceed 85 percent of the appraised value of the property."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph No. (3), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 30 years in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(3) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph No. (5), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 4 percent per annum in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(k) (1) Section 203 (c) is amended (1) by striking out in the last sentence the words "section or section 210" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "title"; and (2) by striking out in said sentence (i) the words "under this section", and (ii) the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

(2) Section 603 (c) is amended by striking out in the next to the last sentence the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

(l) Section 204 (a) is amended—

(1) By striking out, in the last sentence, the following: "prior to July 1, 1944,";

(2) By inserting between the first and second provisos in the last sentence the following: *"And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages which are accepted for insurance under section 203 (b) (2) (D) or under the second proviso of section 207 (c) (2) of this act, there may be included in the debentures issued by the Administrator on account of the cost of foreclosure (or of acquiring the property by other means) actually paid by the mortgagee and approved by the Administrator an amount, not in excess of two-thirds of such cost or $75 whichever is the greater:".

(m) (1) Section 207 (b) is amended by amending paragraph numbered (1) to read as follows:

"(1) Federal or State instrumentalities, municipal corporate instrumentalities of one or more States, or limited dividend or redevelopment or housing corporations restricted by Federal or State laws or regulations of State banking or insurance departments as to rents, charges, capital structure, rate of return, or methods of operation; or",

(2) Section 207 (c) is amended by amending the first sentence to read as follows:

"(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage on any property or project shall involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(1) not to exceed $5,000,000, or, if executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph numbered (b) (1) of this section, not to exceed $50,000,000;

"(2) not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed, including the land; the proposed physical improvements; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Administrator: *Provided*, That, except with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph numbered (b) (1) of this section, such mortgage shall not exceed the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project, exclusive of public utilities and streets and organization and legal expenses; and

"(3) not to exceed $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use."

(n) (1) Section 207 (h) is amended by striking out, in paragraph numbered (1), the words "paid to the mortgagor of such property", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund."

(2) Section 204 (f) is amended by inserting in clause numbered (1), immediately preceding the semicolon, the following: "if the mortgage was insured under section 203 and shall be retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund if the mortgage was insured under section 207."

TITLE I AMENDMENTS

(o) Section 2 is amended:

(1) By striking out "$165,000,000" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$175,000,000";

(2) By striking out "$3,000" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,500";

(3) By striking out the first proviso in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided*, That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $10,000 and having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure used or to be used as a hotel, apartment house, dwelling for two or more families, hospital, orphanage, college, or school:".

(4) By striking out the last sentence of subsection (b).

SEC. 102. In order to aid housing production, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans to and purchase the obligations of any business enterprise for the purpose of providing financial assistance for the production of prefabricated houses or prefabricated housing components, or for large-scale modernized site construction. Such loans or purchases shall be made under such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Corporation may determine: *Provided*, That to the extent that the proceeds of such loans or purchases are used for the purchase of equipment, plant, or machinery the principal obligation shall not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of such equipment, plant, or machinery: *And provided further*, That the total amount of commitments for loans made and obligations purchased under this section shall not exceed $50,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and no financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless it is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

SEC. 103. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of section 500 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"And provided further*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest than otherwise prescribed in this section for loans guaranteed under this title, but not exceeding 4½ percent per annum, if he finds that the loan market demands it."

TITLE II—SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI HOME LOANS AND FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION INSURED MORTGAGES

SEC. 201. Section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "which are insured after April 30, 1948, under section 203 or section 603 of this act, or guaranteed under section 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "which are insured after April 20, 1948, under title II, or title VI of this act, or guaranteed after April 30, 1948, under section 501, or section 502, or section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended."

SEC. 202. Paragraph (E) of the proviso of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause No. (2) the figure "25" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "50."

TITLE III—HOUSING RESEARCH

SEC. 301. To assist in progressively reducing housing costs and increasing the production of better housing, and in making available necessary data on housing needs, demand, and supply, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall—

(a) undertake and conduct a program with respect to technical research and studies to develop, demonstrate, and promote the acceptance and application of new and improved techniques, materials, and methods which will permit progressive reductions in housing construction and maintenance costs, and stimulate the increased and sustained production of housing. Such program may be concerned with improved and standardized building codes and regulations and methods for the more uniform administration thereof, standardized dimensions and methods for the assembly of homebuilding materials and equipment, improved residential design and construction, new and improved types of building materials and equipment, and methods of production, distribution, assembly, and construction, and sound techniques for the testing thereof and for the determination of adequate performance standards, and may relate to appraisal, credit, and other housing market, data, housing needs, demand and supply, finance and investment, land costs, use and improvement, site planning and utilities, zoning and other laws, codes and regulations as they apply to housing, other factors affecting the cost of housing, and related technical and economic research;

(b) prepare and submit to the President and to the Congress estimates of national housing needs and reports with respect to the progress being made toward meeting such needs, and correlate and recommend proposals for such executive action or legislation necessary or desirable for the furtherance of the national housing objective and policy established by this act, together with such other reports or information as may be required of the Administrator by the President or the Congress.

(c) encourage localities to make studies of their own housing needs and markets, along with surveys and plans for housing, urban land use and related community development, and provide, where requested and needed by the localities, technical advice and guidance in the making of such studies, surveys, and plans.

SEC. 302. In carrying out research and studies under this title, the Administrator shall utilize, to the fullest extent feasible, the available facilities of other departments, independent establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government; and the Secretary of Commerce or his designee shall hereafter be included in the membership of the National Housing Council. The Administrator is further authorized, for the purposes of this title, to undertake research and studies cooperatively with agencies of State or local governments, and educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations. The Administrator shall disseminate the results of research and studies undertaken pursuant to this title in such form as may be most useful to industry and to the general public.

SEC. 303. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE IV—RENTAL HOUSING AIDS FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME AND VETERANS

MORTGAGE INVESTMENT AIDS; VETERANS' COOPERATIVES

SEC. 401. (a) Section 207 (c) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of paragraph No. (2) as amended by this act, inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and adding the following new proviso: *"And provided further*, That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph No. (2), a mortgage with respect to a project to be constructed in a locality or metropolitan area where, as determined by the Administrator, there is a need for new dwellings for families of lower income at rentals comparable to the rentals proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project (or, in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporation, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members) may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed, except that in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II, the principal obligation may be in an amount not exceeding 95 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed; and."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of the second sentence, inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and adding the following: "except that with respect to mortgages insured under the provisions of the second proviso of paragraph No. (2) of this subsection, which mortgages are hereby authorized to have a maturity of not exceeding 40 years from the date of the insurance of the mortgage, such interest rate shall not exceed 4 percent per annum."

(3) By adding the following additional sentence at the end thereof: "Such property or project may include such commercial and community facilities as the Administrator deems adequate to serve the occupants."

(b) Section 207 (g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the number "2" appearing in clause (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "1."

(c) Section 207 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(q) In order to assure an adequate market for mortgages on cooperative-ownership projects and rental-housing projects for families of lower income and veterans of the character described in the second proviso of paragraph numbered (2) of subsection (c) of this section, the powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association, and of any other Federal corporation or other Federal agency hereafter established, to make real-estate loans, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, or partial interests therein, may be utilized in connection with projects of the character described in said proviso."

EQUITY INVESTMENT AIDS

SEC. 402. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new title:

"TITLE VII—INSURANCE FOR INVESTMENTS IN RENTAL HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME

"AUTHORITY TO INSURE

"SEC. 701. The purpose of this title is to supplement the existing systems of mortgage insurance for rental housing under this act by a special system of insurance designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing at rents within the capacity of families of moderate income. To effectuate this purpose, the Administrator is authorized, upon application by the investor, to insure as hereinafter provided, and, prior to the execution of insurance contracts and upon such terms as the Administrator shall prescribe, to make commitments to insure, the minimum annual amortization charge and an annual return on the outstanding investment of such investor in any project which is eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided in an amount (herein called the 'insured annual return') equal to such rate of return, not exceeding 2¼ percent per annum, on such outstanding investment as shall, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, be fixed in the insurance contract or in the commitment to insure: *Provided*, That any insurance contract made pursuant to this title shall expire as of the first day of the operating year for which the outstanding investment amounts to not more than 10 percent of the established investment: *And provided further*, That the aggregate amount of contingent liabilities outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure made pursuant to this title shall not exceed $1,000,000,000.

"ELIGIBILITY

"SEC. 702. (a) To be eligible for insurance under this title, a project shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The Administrator shall be satisfied that there is, in the locality or metropolitan area of such project, a need for new rental dwellings at rents comparable to the rents proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project.

"(2) Such project shall be economically sound, and the dwellings in such project shall be acceptable to the Administrator as to quality, design, size, and type.

"(b) Any insurance contract executed by the Administrator under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the project and the investor for such insurance, and the validity of any insurance contract so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an investor from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such investor.

"PREMIUMS AND FEES

"SEC. 703. (a) For insurance granted pursuant to this title the Administrator shall fix and collect a premium charge in an amount not exceeding one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year for which such premium charge is payable without taking into account the excess earnings, if any, applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment. Such premium charge shall be payable annually in advance by the investor, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Administrator under this title at par plus accrued interest: *Provided*, That, if in any operating year the gross income shall be less than the operating expenses, the premium charge payable during such operating year shall be waived, but only to the extent of the amount of the difference between such expenses and such income and subject to subsequent payment out of any excess earnings as hereinafter provided.

"(b) With respect to any project offered for insurance under this title, the Administrator is authorized to charge and collect reasonable fees for examination, and for inspection during the construction of the project: *Provided*, That such fees shall not aggregate more than one-half of 1 percent of the estimated investment.

"RENTS

"SEC. 704. The Administrator shall require that the rents for the dwellings in any project insured under this title shall be established in accordance with a rent schedule approved by the Administrator, and that the investor shall not charge or collect rents for any dwellings in the project in excess of the appropriate rents therefor as shown in the latest rent schedule approved pursuant to this section. Prior to approving the initial or any subsequent rent schedule pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall find that such schedule affords reasonable assurance that the rents to be established thereunder are (1) not lower than necessary, together with all other income to be derived from or in connection with the project, to produce reasonably stable revenues sufficient to provide for the payment of the operating expenses, the minimum annual amortization charge, and the minimum annual return; and (2) not higher than necessary to meet the need for dwellings for families of moderate income.

"EXCESS EARNINGS

"SEC. 705. For all of the purposes of any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, 80 percent of the excess earnings, if any, for any operating year may be applied, in addition to the minimum annual return, to return on the outstanding investment but only to the extent that such application thereof does not result in an annual return of more than 5 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year, and the balance of any such excess earnings shall be applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment: *Provided*, That if in any preceding operating years the gross income shall have been less than the operating expenses, such excess earnings shall be applied to the extent necessary in whole or in part, first, to the reimbursement of the amount of the difference between such expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and such income, and, second, to the payment of any premium charges previously waived hereunder.

"FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

"SEC. 706. With respect to each project insured under this title, the Administrator shall provide that, after the close of each operating year, the investor shall submit to him for approval a financial and operating statement covering such operating year. If any such financial and operating statement shall not have been submitted or, for proper cause, shall not have been approved by the Administrator, payment of any claim submitted by the investor may, at the option of the Administrator, be withheld, in whole or in part, until such statement shall have been submitted and approved.

"PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

"SEC. 707. If in any operating year the net income of a project insured under this title is less than the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return, the Administrator, upon submission by the investor of a claim for the payment of the amount of the difference between such net income and the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return and after proof of the validity of such claim, shall pay to the investor, in cash from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, the amount of such difference, as determined by the Administrator, but not exceeding, in any event, an amount equal to the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return.

"DEBENTURES

"SEC. 708. (a) If the aggregate of the amounts paid to the investor pursuant to section 707 hereof with respect to a project insured under this title shall at any time equal or exceed 15 percent of the established investment, the Administrator thereafter shall have the right, after written notice to the investor of his intention so to do, to acquire, as of the first day of any operating year, such project in consideration of the issuance and delivery to the investor of debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year. In any such case the investor shall be obligated to convey to said Administrator title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and, in the event that the investor fails so to do, said Administrator may, at his option, terminate the insurance contract.

"(b) If in any operating year the aggregate of the differences between the operating expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and the gross income for the preceding operating years, less the aggregate of any deficits in such operating expenses reimbursed from excess earnings as hereinbefore provided, shall at any time equal or exceed 5 percent of the established investment, the investor shall thereafter have the right, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, to convey to the Administrator, as of the first day of any operating year, title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and to receive from the Administrator debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(c) Any difference, not exceeding $50, between 90 per centum of the outstanding investment for the operating year in which a project is acquired by the Administrator pursuant to this section and the total face value of the debentures to be issued and delivered to the investor pursuant to this section shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Administrator to the investor from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund.

"(d) Upon the acquisition of a project by the Administrator pursuant to this section, the insurance contract shall terminate.

"(e) Debentures issued under this title to any investor shall be executed in the name of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Administrator, by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. Such debentures shall be dated as of the first day of the operating year in which the project for which such debentures were issued was acquired by the Administrator, shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the insurance contract was executed, but not to exceed 2¾ per centum per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, and shall mature on the 1st day of July in such calendar year or years, not later than the fortieth following the date of the issuance thereof, as shall be determined by the Administrator and stated on the face of such debentures.

"(f) Such debentures shall be in such form and in such denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and may include such provisions for redemption as shall be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be issued in either coupon or registered form.

"(g) Such debentures shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, shall be payable out of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, which shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed, as to both the principal thereof and the interest thereon, by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the Housing Investment Insurance Fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or the interest on any debentures so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon, to the extent of the amount so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such debentures.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real and other property by the United States, the Administrator shall have power, for the protection of the housing investment insurance fund, to pay out of said fund all expenses or charges in connection with, and to deal with, complete, reconstruct, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, make contracts for the management of, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash or credit or lease in his discretion, in whole or in part, any project acquired pursuant to this title; and, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator shall also have power to pursue to final collection by way of compromise or otherwise all claims acquired by, or assigned or transferred to, him in connection with the acquisition or disposal of any project pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract for hazard insurance, or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of any project acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such purchase or contract does not exceed $1,000.

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 709. The investor, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, may terminate, as of the close of any operating year, any insurance contract made pursuant to this title. The Administrator shall prescribe the events and conditions under which said Administrator shall have the option to terminate any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, and the events and conditions under which said Administrator may reinstate any insurance contract terminated pursuant to this section or section 708 (a). If any insurance contract is terminated pursuant to this section, the Administrator may require the investor to pay an adjusted premium charge in such amount as the Administrator determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges which such investor otherwise would have been required to pay if such insurance contract had not been so terminated.

"INSURANCE FUND

"SEC. 710. There is hereby created a housing investment insurance fund which shall be used by the Administrator as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. For this purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Administrator such funds as the Administrator shall deem necessary, but not to exceed $10,000,000, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, inspection and other fees, service charges, and any other income received by the Administrator under this title, together with all earnings on the assets of such housing investment insurance fund, shall be credited to said fund. All payments made pursuant to claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, cash adjustments, the principal of and interest on debentures issued under this title, expenses incurred in connection with or as a consequence of the acquisition and disposal of projects acquired under this title, and all administrative expenses in connection with this title, shall be paid from said fund. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all approved claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, and, in the event said fund fails to make any such payment when due, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the investor the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Moneys in the housing investment insurance fund not needed for current operations under this title shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of said fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed by, the United States. The Administrator may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under this title. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 711. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Administrator under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 712. The Administrator may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title, including, without limiting the foregoing, rules and regulations relating to the maintenance by the investor or books, records, and accounts with respect to the project and the examination of such books, records, and accounts by representatives of the Administrator; the submission of financial and operating statements and the approval thereof; the submission of claims for payments under insurance contracts, the proof of the validity of such claims, and the payment or disallowance thereof; the increase of the established investment if the investor shall make capital improvements or additions to the project; the decrease of the established investment if the investor shall sell part of the project; and the reduction of the outstanding investment for the appropriate operating year or operating years pending the restoration of dwelling or nondwelling facilities damaged by fire or other casualty. With respect to any investor which is subject to supervision or regulation by a State banking, insurance, or other State department or agency, the Administrator may, in carrying out any of his supervisory and regulatory functions with respect to projects insured under this title, utilize, contract with, and act through, such department or agency and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 713. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

"(a) 'Investor' shall mean (1) any natural person; (2) any group of not more than 10 natural persons; (3) any corporation, company, association, trust, or other legal entity; or (4) any combination of 2 or more corporations, companies, associations, trusts, or other legal entities, having all the powers necessary to comply with the requirements of this title, which the Administrator (i) shall find to be qualified by business experience and facilities, to afford assurance of the necessary continuity of long-term investment, and to have available the necessary capital required for long-term investment in the project, and (ii) shall approve as eligible for insurance under this title.

"(b) 'Project' shall mean a project (including all property, real and personal, contracts, rights, and choses in action acquired, owned, or held by the investor in connection therewith) or an investor designed and used primarily for the purpose of providing dwellings the occupancy of which is permitted by the investor in consideration of agreed charges: *Provided*, That nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting the inclusion in a project of such stores, offices, or other commercial facilities, recreational or community facilities, or other nondwelling facilities as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or desirable appurtenances to such project.

"(c) 'Estimated investment' shall mean the estimated cost of the development of the project, as stated in the application submitted to the Administrator for insurance under this title.

"(d) 'Established investment' shall mean the amount of the reasonable costs, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, carrying out all works and undertakings for the development of a project and shall include the premium charge for the first operating year and the cost of all necessary surveys, plans, and specifications, architectural, engineering, or other special services, land acquisition, site preparation, construction, and equipment; a reasonable return on the funds of the investor paid out in course of the development of the project, up to and including the initial occupancy date; necessary expenses in connection with the initial occupancy of the project; and the cost of such other items as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the development of the project, (1) less the amount by which the rents and

revenues derived from the project up to and including the initial occupancy date exceeded the reasonable and proper expenses, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, operating and maintaining said project up to and including the initial occupancy date, or (2) plus the amount by which such expenses exceeded such rents and revenues, as the case may be.

"(e) 'Physical completion date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which the Administrator determines that the construction of the project is substantially completed and substantially all of the dwellings therein are available for occupancy.

"(f) 'Initial occupancy date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which 90 percent in number of the dwellings in the project on the physical completion date shall have been occupied, but shall in no event be later than the last day of the sixth calendar month next following the physical completion date.

"(g) 'Operating year' shall mean the period of 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date and each succeeding period of 12 consecutive calendar months, and the period of the first 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date shall be the first operating year.

"(h) 'Gross income' for any operating year shall mean the total rents and revenues and other income derived from, or in connection with, the project during such operating year.

"(i) 'Operating expenses' for any operating year shall mean the amounts, as approved by the Administrator, necessary to meet the reasonable and proper costs of, and to provide for, operating and maintaining the project, and to establish and maintain reasonable and proper reserves for repairs, maintenance, and replacements, and other necessary reserves during such operating year, and shall include necessary expenses for real-estate taxes, special assessments, premium charges made pursuant to this title, administrative expenses, the annual rental under any lease pursuant to which the real property comprising the site of the project is held by the investor, and insurance charges, together with such other expenses as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of the project, but shall not include income taxes.

"(j) 'Net income' for any operating year shall mean gross income remaining after the payment of the operating expenses.

"(k) 'Minimum annual amortization charge' shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment, except that, in the case of a project where the real property comprising the site thereof is held by the investor under a lease, if (notwithstanding the proviso of section 703 (a) hereof) the gross income for any operating year shall be less than the amount required to pay the operating expenses (including the annual rental under such lease), the minimum annual amortization charge for such operating year shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment plus the amount of the annual rental under such lease to the extent that the same is not paid from the gross income.

"(l) 'Annual return' for any operating year shall mean the net income remaining after the payment of the minimum annual amortization charge.

"(m) 'Insured annual return' shall have the meaning ascribed to it in section 701 hereof.

"(n) 'Minimum annual return' for any operating year shall mean an amount equal to 3½ percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(o) 'Excess earnings' for any operating year shall mean the net income derived from a project in excess of the minimum annual amortization charge and the minimum annual return.

"(p) 'Outstanding investment' for any operating year shall mean the established investment, less an amount equal to (1) the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge for each preceding operating year, plus (2) the aggregate of the excess earnings, if any, during each preceding operating year applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization in accordance with the provisions of section 705 hereof."

SEC. 403. Sections 1 and 5 of the National Housing Act, as amended, are hereby amended by striking out "titles II, III, and VI" wherever they appear in said sections and inserting in lieu thereof "titles II, III, VI, and VII."

TITLE V—SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY TO AID HOUSING COST REDUCTIONS

SEC. 501. In extending financial assistance under this title, the Administrator shall give consideration to the extent to which the appropriate local public bodies have undertaken a positive program of encouraging housing cost reductions through the adoption, improvement, and modernization of building and other local codes and regulations so as to permit the use of appropriate new materials, techniques, and methods in land and residential planning, design, and construction, the increase of efficiency in residential construction, and the elimination of restrictive practices which unnecessarily increase housing costs.

LOANS

SEC. 502. (a) To assist local communities in eliminating their slums and blighted areas and in providing maximum opportunity for the redevelopment of project areas by private enterprise, the Administrator may make temporary and definitive loans to local public agencies for the undertaking of projects for the assembly, clearance, preparation, and sale and lease of land for redevelopment. Such loans (outstanding at any one time) shall be in such amounts not exceeding the expenditures made by the local public agency as part of gross project cost, bear interest at such rate (not less than the applicable going Federal rate), be secured in such manner, and be repaid within such period (not exceeding forty-five years from the date of the notes or bonds evidencing the loans), as may be deemed advisable by the Administrator. Such loans may be made subject to the condition that, if at any time or for any period during the life of the loan contract, the local public agency can obtain loan funds from sources other than the Federal Government at an interest rate lower than provided in the loan contract, it may do so with the consent of the Administrator at such time and for such period without waiving or surrendering any rights to loan funds under the contract for the remainder of the life of such contract, and, in any such case, the Administrator is authorized to consent to a pledge by the local public agency of the loan contract, and any or all of its rights thereunder, as security for the repayment of the loan funds so obtained from other sources.

(b) To obtain funds for loans under this title, the Administrator may, on and after the 1st day of July 1948, issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, in an amount not to exceed $10,000,000, which limit on such outstanding amount shall be increased by $200,000,000 on the 1st day of July 1949, and by further amounts of $200,000,000 on the 1st day of July in each of the years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, respectively.

(c) Notes or other obligations issued by the Administrator under this title shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Administrator issued under this title and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

(d) Obligations, including interest thereon, issued by local public agencies for projects undertaken pursuant to this title, and the income derived by such agencies from such projects, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States.

CAPITAL GRANTS

SEC. 503. (a) The Administrator may make capital grants to local public agencies to enable such agencies to make land in project areas available for redevelopment at its fair value for the uses specified in the redevelopment plans. The aggregate of such capital grants with respect to all the projects of a local public agency which are assisted under this title shall not exceed two-thirds of the aggregate of the net project cost, and the capital grants with respect to any individual project shall not exceed the difference between the net project cost and the local grants-in-aid required with respect to the project pursuant to section 504.

(b) The Administrator may, on and after the 1st day of July 1948, contract to make capital grants with respect to projects to be assisted pursuant to this title aggregating not more than $100,000,000, which limit shall be increased by further amounts of $100,000,000 on the 1st day of July in each of the years 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952, respectively. Such contracts for capital grant shall be made subject to the condition that no funds shall be disbursed by the local public agency prior to July 1, 1949, in payment for the purchase of land in connection with the project being assisted under the contract. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all capital grants contracted for under this title, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to provide for such payments.

REQUIREMENTS FOR LOCAL GRANTS-IN-AID

SEC. 504. Every contract for capital grant under this title shall require local grants-in-aid in connection with the project involved which, together with the local grants-in-aid to be provided in connection with all other projects of the local public agency on which such contracts have theretofore been made, will be at least equal to one-third of the aggregate net project costs involved (it being the purpose of this provision and section 503 to limit the aggregate of the capital grants made by the Administrator with respect to all the projects of a local public agency which are assisted under this title to an amount not exceeding

two-thirds of the difference between the aggregate of the gross project costs of all such projects and the aggregate of the total sales prices and capital values referred to in section 510 (f) of land in such projects).

LOCAL DETERMINATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 505. Contracts for financial aid shall be made only with a duly authorized local public agency and shall require that—

(1) the redevelopment plan for the project area be approved by the governing body of the locality in which the project is situated, and that such approval include findings by the governing body that (i) the financial aid to be provided in the contract is necessary to enable the land in the project area to be redeveloped in accordance with the redevelopment plan; (ii) the redevelopment plans for the redevelopment areas in the locality will afford maximum opportunity, consistent with the sound needs of the locality as a whole, for the redevelopment of such areas by private enterprise; and (iii) the redevelopment plan conforms to a general plan for the development of the locality as a whole;

(2) when land acquired or held by the local public agency in connection with the project is sold or leased, the purchasers or lessees shall be obligated (i) to devote such land to the uses specified in the redevelopment plan for the project area; (ii) to begin the building of their improvements on such land within a reasonable time; and (iii) to comply with such other conditions as the Administrator finds are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title;

(3) there be a feasible method for the temporary relocation of families displaced from the project area, and that there are available or are being provided, in the project area or in other areas not less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the families displaced from the project area, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings equal in number to the number of such displaced families: *Provided*, That, in view of the existing acute housing shortage, each such contract shall further provide that there shall be no demolition of residential structures in connection with the project assisted under the contract prior to July 1, 1950, if in the opinion of the local governing body such demolition would result in undue hardship for the occupants of the structures.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 506. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator, notwithstanding any other law, shall—

(1) appoint a Director of Urban Redevelopment to administer under his general supervision the provisions of this title;

(2) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended as of the date of enactment of this act;

(3) maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended as of the date of enactment of this act, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Administrator as the making of loans and capital grants and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government;

(4) make an annual report to the President, for transmission to the Congress, for each fiscal year, ending on June 30, to be transmitted not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such report is made.

(b) Funds made available to the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this title shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this title shall be available for any of the purposes of this title, and all funds available for carrying out the functions of the Administrator under this title (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administrator in connection with the performance of such functions.

(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

(1) sue and be sued;

(2) foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any project or part thereof in connection with which he has made a loan or capital grant pursuant to this title. In the event of any such acquisition, the Administrator may complete, administer, dispose of, and otherwise deal with, such project or part thereof: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local law of the inhabitants on such property;

(3) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any real property so acquired and owned;

(4) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, upon such terms as he may fix;

(5) obtain insurance against loss in connection with property and other assets held;

(6) subject to the specific limitations in this title, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, amount of capital grant, or any other term, of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this title;

(7) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this title such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this title will be achieved. No provision of this title shall be construed or administered to permit speculation in land holding.

(d) Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any contract for services or supplies on account of any property acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such contract does not exceed $1,000.

SEC. 507. If the land for a low-rent housing project assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is made available from a project assisted under this title, payment equal to the fair value of the land for the uses specified in accordance with the redevelopment plan shall be made therefor by the public housing agency undertaking the housing project, and such amount shall be included as part of the development cost of the low-rent housing project.

SEC. 508. The President may at any time, in his discretion, transfer to the Administrator any right, title, or interest held by the Federal Government or any department or agency thereof in any land (including buildings thereon) which is surplus to the needs of the Government and which a local public agency certifies will be within the area of a project being planned by it. When such land is sold to the local public agency by the Administrator, it may be sold at a price equal to its fair value for the uses specified in accordance with the redevelopment plan: *Provided*, That the proceeds from such sale shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

PROTECTION OF LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 509. In order to protect labor standards—

(1) any contract for financial aid pursuant to this title shall contain a provision requiring that the wages or fees prevailing in the locality, as determined or adopted (subsequent to a determination under applicable State or local law) by the Secretary of Labor, shall be paid by any contractor engaged on the project involved; and the Administrator may require certification as to compliance with the provisions of this paragraph prior to making any payment under such contract;

(2) the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the act of June 13, 1934 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 40, secs. 276b and 276c), shall apply to any project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this title;

(3) any contractor engaged on any project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this title shall report quarterly to the Secretary of Labor, and shall cause all subcontractors to report in like manner, within 15 days after the close of each quarter and on forms to be furnished by the United States Department of Labor, as to the number of persons on their respective pay rolls on the particular project, the aggregate amount of such pay rolls, the total man-hours worked, and itemized expenditures for materials. Any such contractor shall furnish to the Department of Labor the names and addresses of all subcontractors on the work at the earliest date practicable.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 510. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

(a) "Redevelopment area" means an area within which a project area is located and of such extent and location that the total area is appropriate for development or redevelopment.

(b) "Redevelopment plan" means a plan, as it exists from time to time, for the development or redevelopment of a redevelopment or project area, which plan shall be sufficiently complete (1) to indicate its relationship to definite local objectives as to appropriate land uses and improved traffic, public transportation, public utilities, recreational and community facilities, and other public improvements, and (2) to indicate proposed land uses and building requirements in the project area: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall take such steps as he deems necessary to assure consistency between the redevelopment plan and any highways or other public improvements in the locality receiving financial assistance from the Federal Works Agency.

(c) "Project" may include (1) acquisition of land within (i) a slum area or other deteriorated or deteriorating area which is predominantly residential in character, or (ii) any other area which is to be developed or redeveloped for predominantly residential uses and which prior to such development or redevelopment constitutes a deteriorated or deteriorating area or open urban land which because of obsolete platting or otherwise impairs the sound growth of the community or open suburban land essential for sound community growth; (2) demolition and removal of buildings and improvements; (3)

installation, construction, or reconstruction of streets, utilities, and other site improvements essential to the preparation of sites for uses in accordance with the redevelopment plan; and (4) making the land available for development or redevelopment by private enterprise or public agencies (including sale, initial leasing, or retention by the local public agency itself) at its fair value for uses in accordance with the redevelopment plan. For the purposes of this title, the term "project" shall not include the construction of any of the buildings contemplated by the redevelopment plan, and the term "redevelop" and derivatives thereof shall mean develop as well as redevelop.

(d) "Local grants-in-aid" shall mean assistance by a State, municipality, or other public body, or any other entity, in the form of (1) cash grants; (2) donations, at their cash value, of land, demolition or removal work, or site improvements in the project area; and (3) the cost or cash value of the provision by a municipality or other public body of parks, playgrounds, and public buildings or facilities (other than low-rent public housing) which are primarily of direct benefit to the project and which are necessary to serve or support the new uses of land in the project area in accordance with the redevelopment plan.

(e) "Gross project cost" shall comprise (1) the amount of the expenditures by the local public agency with respect to any and all undertakings necessary to carry out the project (including the payment of carrying charges, but not beyond the point where the project is completed), and (2) such local grants-in-aid as are furnished in forms other than cash.

(f) "Net project cost" shall mean the difference between the gross project cost and the aggregate of (1) the total sales prices of all land sold, and (2) the total capital values (i) imputed, on a basis approved by the Administrator, to all land leased, and (ii) used as a basis for determining the amounts to be transferred to the project from other funds of the local public agency to compensate for any land retained by it for use in accordance with the redevelopment plan

(g) "Going Federal rate" means the annual rates of interest (or, if there shall be two or more such rates of interest, the lowest thereof) specified in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 20 years or more, determined at the date the contract for loan is made. Any contract for loan made may be revised or superseded by a later contract, so that the going Federal rate, on the basis of which the interest rate on the loan is fixed, shall mean the going Federal rate, as herein defined, on the date that such contract is revised or superseded by such later contract.

(h) "Local public agency" means any State, county, municipality, or other governmental entity or public body which is authorized to undertake the project for which assistance is sought. "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States.

(i) "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

TITLE VI—LOW-RENT HOUSING

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND DETERMINATIONS; TENANCY ONLY BY LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

SEC. 601. (a) The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following additional subsections to section 15:

"(7) In recognition that there should be local determination of the need for public low-rent housing, the Authority shall not make any contract for financial assistance pursuant to this act with respect to any urban low-rent housing initiated after July 1, 1948—

"(a) unless the public housing agency has submitted an analysis of the local housing market demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Authority (i) that there is a need for such low-rent housing which cannot be met by private enterprise; and (ii) that a gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed low-rent housing and the lowest rents at which private enterprise is providing (through new construction and existing structures) a substantial supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing toward meeting the need of an adequate volume thereof; and

"(b) unless the governing body of the locality involved has approved the provision of such low-rent housing, and the contract for financial assistance provides that the Authority shall approve the maximum income limits to be fixed with respect to the admission and continued occupany of families in such housing, and that such maximum income limits as so approved shall at no time be changed without the prior approval of the Authority.

"(8) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for urban low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1943, shall provide that a duly authorized official of the public housing agency involved shall make periodic written statements to the Authority that an investigation has been made of each family admitted to the low-rent housing project involved during the period covered thereby, and that, on the basis of the report of said investigation, he has found that each such family at the time of its admission (a) lived in an unsafe, insanitary, or overcrowded dwelling or had been displaced by a slum-clearance or land assembly and clearance project or by off-site elimination in compliance with the equivalent elimination requirement hereof, and (b) had a net family income not exceeding the maximum income limits theretofore fixed by the public housing agency (and approved by the Authority) for admission of families of low income to such housing: *Provided*, That the requirement in (a) shall not be applicable in the case of the family of any veteran or serviceman (or of any deceased veteran or serviceman) where application for admission to such housing is made not later than 5 years after July 1, 1948.

"(9) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for urban low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall require that the public housing agency make periodic reexaminations of the net incomes of families living in the low-rent housing project involved; and if it is found, upon such reexamination, that the net incomes of any families have increased beyond the maximum income limits theretofore fixed by the public housing agency (and approved by the Authority) for continued occupany in such housing, such families shall be required to move from the project.

"(10) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for urban low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall require that, as between families of equally low income otherwise eligible for admission to such housing, the public housing agency shall not discriminate against any such families because their incomes are derived, in whole or in part, from public assistance. In selecting tenants the question of greatest need shall be given due consideration."

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law except provisions of law hereafter enacted expressly in limitation hereof, the Public Housing Administration, and any State or local public agency administering a low-rent housing project assisted pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937 or title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it under said acts where such action is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such housing accommodations are administered.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

SEC. 602. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) By adding the following new subsection to section 10:

"(g) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall require that the public housing agency in selecting tenants shall give preference, as among applicants eligible for occupancy of the dwelling and at the rent involved, to families of veterans and servicemen (including families of deceased veterans or servicemen), where application for admission to such housing is made not later than 5 years after July 1, 1948. As among applicants entitled to the preference provided in this subsection, first preference shall be given to families of disabled veterans whose disability is service-connected."

(b) By adding the following new subsection to section 2:

"(14) The term 'veteran' shall mean a person who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable. The term 'serviceman' shall mean a person in the active military or naval service of the United States who has served therein on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947."

(c) By adding the following sentence at the end of section 2 (1): "In determining net income for the purposes of tenant eligibility, the Authority is authorized, where it finds such action equitable and in the public interest, to exclude amounts or portions thereof paid by the United States Government as pension or other compensation for disability or death occurring in connection with military service."

COST LIMITS

SEC. 603. The first sentence of section 15 (5) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "No contract for any loan, annual contribution, or capital grant made pursuant to this act shall be entered into by the Authority with respect to any low-rent housing project completed after January 1, 1948, having a cost for construction and equipment of more than $1,250 per room (excluding land, demolition, and nondwelling facilities); except that in any city or metropolitan district, as defined by the Bureau of the Census, the population of which exceeds 500,000 and in Alaska, any such contract may be entered into with respect to a project having a cost of construction and equipment of not to exceed $1,500 per room ($2,200 per room in the case of Alaska), excluding land, demolition, and nondwelling facilities, if in the opinion of the Authority such higher cost per room is justified by reason of higher costs of labor and materials and other construction costs: *Provided*, That if the Administrator with respect to any contract for financial assistance made before December 31, 1951, finds that in the geographical area of the low-rent housing project involved (i) it is not feasible under the aforesaid cost limitations to construct the project without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability, and (ii) there is an acute need for such housing, he may prescribe in such contract cost limitations which may exceed by not more than $250 per room the limitations that would otherwise be applicable to such project hereunder."

PRIVATE FINANCING

SEC. 604. In order to stimulate increasing private financing of low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects, the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) The last proviso of subsection (b) of section 10 is repealed, and subsection (f) of said section is amended to read as follows: "Payments under annual contributions contracts shall be pledged as security for any loans obtained by a public housing agency to assist the development or acquisition of the housing project to which the annual contributions relate."

(2) The following is added after section 21:

"PRIVATE FINANCING

"SEC. 22. To facilitate the enlistment of private capital through the sale by public housing agencies of their bonds and other obligations to others than the Authority, in financing low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects, and to maintain the low-rent character of housing projects—

"(a) Every contract for annual contributions (including contracts which amend or supersede contracts previously made) may provide that—

"(1) upon the occurrence of a substantial default in respect of the covenants or conditions to which the public housing agency is subject (as such substantial default shall be defined in such contract), the public housing agency shall be obligated to convey to the Authority the project, as then constituted, to which such contract relates;

"(2) the Authority shall agree to reconvey the project, as constituted at the time of reconveyance, to the public housing agency by which it shall have been so conveyed or to its successor (if such public housing agency or a successor exists) upon such terms as shall be prescribed in such contract and as soon as practicable: (i) after the Authority shall be satisfied that all defaults with respect to the project have been cured, and that the project will, in order to fulfill the purposes of this act, thereafter be operated in accordance with the terms of such contract; or (ii) after the termination of the obligation to make annual contributions available unless there are any obligations or covenants of the public housing agency to the Authority which are then in default. Any prior conveyances and reconveyances shall not exhaust the right to require a conveyance of the project to the Authority pursuant to subparagraph (1), upon the subsequent occurrence of a substantial default.

"(b) Whenever such contract for annual contributions shall include provisions which the Authority, in said contract, determines are in accordance with subsection (a) hereof, and the annual contributions, pursuant to such contract, have been pledged by the public housing agency as security for the payment of the principal and interest on any of its obligations, the Authority (notwithstanding any other provisions of this act) shall continue to make annual contributions available for the project so long as any of such obligations remain outstanding and may covenant in such contract that in any event such annual contributions shall in each year be at least equal to an amount which, together with such income or other funds as are actually available from the project for the purpose at the time such annual contribution is made, will suffice for the payment of all installments, falling due within the next succeeding 12 months, of principal and interest on the obligations for which the annual contributions provided for in the contract shall have been pledged as security: *Provided*, That such annual contributions shall not be in excess of the maximum sum determined pursuant to the provisions of this act; and in no case shall such annual contributions be in excess of the maximum sum specified in the contract involved, nor for longer than the remainder of the maximum period fixed by the contract.";

(3) Section 2 (10) is amended to read as follows:

"(10) The term 'going Federal rate' means the annual rate of interest (or, if there shall be two or more such rates of interest, the lowest thereof) specified in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 20 years or more, determined, in the case of loans or annual contributions, respectively, at the date of Presidential approval of the contract pursuant to which such loans or contributions are made: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this act, the going Federal rate shall be deemed to be not less than 2½ percent";

(4) Section 9 is amended by striking the period at the end of said section and adding a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That in the case of projects initiated after July 1, 1948, loans shall not be made for a period exceeding 40 years from the date of the bonds evidencing the loan: *And provided further*, That, in the case of such projects or any other projects with respect to which the contracts (including contracts which amend or supersede contracts previously made) provide for loans for a period not exceeding 40 years from the date of the bonds evidencing the loan and for annual contributions for a period not exceeding 40 years from the date the first annual contribution for the project is paid, such loans shall bear interest at a rate not less than the applicable going Federal rate.";

(5) Section 10 (c) is amended by striking the period at the end of the last sentence and adding a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That, in the case of projects initiated after July 1, 1948, contracts for annual contributions shall not be made for a period exceeding 40 years from the date the first annual contribution for the project is paid: *And provided further*, That in the case of such projects or any other projects with respect to which the contracts for annual contributions (including contracts which amend or supersede contracts previously made) provide for annual contributions for a period not exceeding 40 years from the date the first annual contribution for the project is paid, the fixed contribution may exceed the amount provided in the first proviso of subsection (b) of this section by 1 percent of development or acquisition costs.";

(6) The first sentence of section 10 (c) is amended to read as follows: "Every contract for annual contributions shall provide that whenever in any year the receipts of a public housing agency in connection with a low-rent housing project exceed its expenditures (including debt service, administration, maintenance, establishment of reserves, and other costs and charges), an amount equal to such excess shall be applied, or set aside for application, to purposes which will effect a reduction in the amount of subsequent annual contributions.";

(7) Section 14 is amended by inserting the following after the first sentence: "When the Authority finds that it would promote economy or be in the financial interest of the Federal Government, any contract heretofore or hereafter made for annual contributions, loans, or both, may, with Presidential approval, be revised or superseded by a contract of the Authority so that the going Federal rate on the basis of which such annual contributions or interest rate on any loans, or both, respectively, are fixed shall mean the going Federal rate, as herein defined, on the date of Presidential approval of such revised or superseding contract: *Provided*, That contracts may not be revised or superseded in a manner which would impair the rights of the holders of any outstanding obligations of the public housing agency involved for which annual contributions have been pledged.";

(8) Section 20 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. The Authority may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $800,000,000. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Authority with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations by the Authority. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes or other obligations of the Authority issued hereunder and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of the securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.";

(9) Section 2 (5) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) The term 'development' means any or all undertakings necessary for planning, land acquisition, demolition, construction, or equipment, in connection with a low-rent housing or slum-clearance project. The term 'development cost' shall comprise the costs incurred by a public housing agency in such undertakings and their necessary financing (including the payment of carrying charges, but not beyond the point of physical completion), and in otherwise carrying out the development of such project. Construction activity in connection with a low-rent housing project may be confined to the reconstruction, remodeling, or repair of existing buildings."

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 605. Section 10 (e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the following after the first sentence thereof: "with respect to projects to be assisted pursuant to this act, the Authority is authorized, in addition to the amount heretofore authorized, to enter into contracts, on and after the 1st day of July 1948, which provide for annual contributions aggregating not more than $32,000,000 per annum, which limit shall be increased by further amounts of $32,000,000 on the 1st day of July in each of the years 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952, respectively: *Provided*, That the contracts for annual contributions with respect to projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall not provide for the development of more than 500,000 dwelling units without further authorization from the Congress."

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 606. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By adding to section 6 the following new subsection:

"(e) With respect to all projects under title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, references

therein to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall include all amendments to said act now or hereafter adopted.";

(2) By deleting from the proviso in section 10 (a) and in section 11 (a) the following: ", unless the project includes the elimination" and substituting the following: "unless, subsequent to the initiation of the project and within a period specified by the Authority, there has been or will be elimination";

(3) By amending the second sentence of subsection 13 (a) to read as follows: "The Authority may bid for and purchase at any foreclosure by any party or at any other sale, or acquire (pursuant to section 22 or otherwise) any project which it previously owned or in connection with which it has made a loan, annual contribution, or capital grant; and in such event the Authority may complete, administer, dispose of, and otherwise deal with, such projects or parts thereof, subject, however, to the limitations elsewhere in this act governing their administration and disposition.";

(4) By renumbering sections 22 to 30, inclusive, so that they become sections 23 to 31, inclusive.

SEC. 607. Any low-rent or veterans' housing project undertaken or constructed under a program of a State or any political subdivision thereof and with the express purpose indicated in the State legislation of converting the project to a project with Federal assistance (if and when such Federal assistance becomes available), shall be approved as a low-rent housing project under the terms of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, if (a) a contract for State financial assistance for such project was entered into prior to January 1, 1949, (b) the project is or can become eligible for assistance by the Public Housing Administration in the form of loans and annual contributions under the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and (c) the State or the public housing agency operating the project in the State makes application to the Public Housing Administration for Federal assistance for the project under the terms of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided*, That loans made by the Public Housing Administration for the purpose of so converting the project to a project with Federal assistance shall be deemed, for the purposes of the provisions of section 9 and other sections of the United States Housing Act of 1937, to be loans to assist the development of the project.

TITLE VII—FARM HOUSING

ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

SEC. 701. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized, through such agency officers and employees as he may determine and subject to the terms and conditions of this title, to extend financial assistance to owners of farms in the United States and in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and in Puerto Rico, to enable them to construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace dwellings and facilities incident to family living on their farms to provide them, their tenants, lessees, sharecroppers, and laborers with decent, safe, and sanitary living conditions as specified in this title.

(b) For the purposes of this title and the acts amended hereby, the term "farm" shall mean a parcel or parcels of land operated as a single unit which is used for the production of one or more agricultural commodities and which customarily produces such commodities for sale and for home use of a gross annual value of not less than $400. The Secretary shall promptly determine whether any parcel or parcels of land constitutes a farm for the purposes of this title whenever requested to do so by any interested Federal, State, or local public agency, and his determination shall be conclusive.

(c) In order to be eligible for the assistance authorized by paragraph (a), the applicant must show (1) that he is the owner of a farm which is without a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling and related facilities adequate for himself and his family and necessary resident farm labor, or for the family of the operating tenant, lessee, or sharecropper; (2) that he is without sufficient resources to provide the necessary housing on his own account; and (3) that he is unable to secure the credit necessary for such housing from other sources upon terms and conditions which he could reasonably be expected to fulfill.

LOANS FOR DWELLINGS ON ADEQUATE FARMS

SEC. 702. (a) If the Secretary determines that an applicant is eligible for assistance as provided in section 701 (c) and that the applicant has the ability to repay in full the sum to be loaned, with interest, giving due consideration to the income and earning capacity of the applicant and his family from the farm and other sources, and the maintenance of a reasonable standard of living for the owner and occupant of said farm, a loan may be made by the Secretary to said applicant for a period of not to exceed 33 years from the making of the loan with interest at a rate not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the unpaid balance of principal.

(b) The instruments under which the loan is made and the security given shall—

(1) provide for security upon the applicant's equity in the farm and such additional security or collateral, if any, as may be found necessary by the Secretary reasonably to assure repayment of the indebtedness;

(2) provide for the repayment of principal and interest in accordance with schedules and repayment plans prescribed by the Secretary;

(3) contain the agreement of the borrower that he will, at the request of the Secretary, proceed with diligence to refinance the balance of the indebtedness through cooperative or other responsible private credit sources whenever the Secretary determines, in the light of the borrower's circumstances, including his earning capacity and the income from the farm, that he is able to do so upon reasonable terms and conditions;

(4) be in such form and contain such covenants as the Secretary shall prescribe to secure the payment of the loan with interest, protect the security, and assure that the farm will be maintained in repair and that waste and exhaustion of the farm will be prevented.

LOANS FOR DWELLINGS ON POTENTIALLY ADEQUATE FARMS

SEC. 703. If the Secretary determines (a) that, because of the inadequacy of the income of an eligible applicant from the farm to be improved and from other sources, said applicant may not reasonably be expected to make annual repayments of principal and interest in an amount sufficient to repay the loan in full within the period of time prescribed by the Secretary as authorized in this title; (b) that the income of the applicant may be sufficiently increased within a period of not to exceed 10 years by improvement or enlargement of the farm or an adjustment of the farm practices or methods; and (c) that the applicant has adopted and may reasonably be expected to put into effect a plan of farm improvement, enlargement, or adjusted practices which, in the opinion of the Secretary, will increase the applicant's income from said farm within a period of not to exceed 10 years to the extent that the applicant may be expected thereafter to make annual repayments of principal and interest sufficient to repay the balance of the indebtedness less payments in cash and credits for the contributions to be made by the Secretary as hereinafter provided, the Secretary may make a loan in an amount necessary to provide adequate housing on said farm under the terms and conditions prescribed in section 702. In addition, the Secretary may agree with the borrower to make annual contributions in the form of credits on the borrower's indebtedness in an amount not to exceed the annual installment of interest and 50 percent of the principal payments accruing during any installment year, up to and including the tenth installment year, subject to the conditions that the borrower's income is, in fact, insufficient to enable the borrower to make payments in accordance with the plan or schedule prescribed by the Secretary and that the borrower pursues his plan of farm reorganization and improvement or enlargement with due diligence.

This agreement with respect to credits of principal and interest upon the borrower's indebtedness shall not be assignable nor accrue to the benefit of any third party without the written consent of the Secretary and the Secretary shall have the right, at his option, to cancel the agreement upon the sale of the farm or the execution or creation of any lien thereon subsequent to the lien given to the Secretary, or to refuse to release the lien given to the Secretary except upon payment in cash of the entire original principal plus accrued interest thereon less actual cash payments of principal and interest when the Secretary determines that the release of the lien would permit the benefits of this section to accrue to a person not eligible to receive such benefits.

OTHER SPECIAL LOANS AND GRANTS FOR MINOR IMPROVEMENTS TO FARM HOUSING

SEC. 704. In the event the Secretary determines that an eligible applicant cannot qualify for a loan under the provisions of sections 702 and 703 and that repairs or improvements should be made to a farm dwelling occupied by him or his tenants, lessees, sharecroppers, or laborers, in order to make such dwelling safe and sanitary and remove hazards to the health of the occupant, his family, or the community, the Secretary may make a grant, or a combined loan and grant, to the applicant to cover the cost of improvements or additions, such as repairing roofs, providing toilet facilities, providing a sanitary water supply, supplying screens, or making other similar repairs or improvements. No assistance shall be extended to any one individual under the provisions of this section in the form of a loan or grant or combination thereof in excess of $1,000 for any one unit or dwelling owned by such individual or in excess of $2,000 in the aggregate to any one such individual, and the grant portion with respect to any one unit or dwelling shall not exceed $500. Any portion of the sums advanced to the borrower treated as a loan shall be secured and be repayable in accordance with the principles and conditions set forth in this title. Sums made available by grant may be made subject to the conditions set out in this title for the protection of the Government with respect to contributions made on loans by the Secretary. In the case of such loan or grant with respect to a dwelling not occupied by the owner of the land, the Secretary may, as a condition precedent to the grant, require that the landowner enter into such stipulations and agreements with the Secretary and the occupants of the dwelling as will make it possible for the occupants to obtain the full benefits of the grant.

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND RESEARCH

SEC. 705. In addition to the financial assistance authorized in sections 701 to 704, inclusive, the Secretary is hereby authorized to furnish to all persons, without charge or at such charges as the Secretary may determine, technical services such as building plans, specifications, construction supervision and inspection, and advice and information regarding rural dwellings and other farm buildings. The Secretary and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator are authorized to cooperate in research and technical studies in the rural-housing field. In furnishing such services and information, the Secretary may utilize, through the Agricultural Extension Service, the facilities and services of State agencies and educational institutions.

PREFERENCE FOR VETERANS

SEC. 706. As between eligible applicants for assistance under this title, the Secretary shall give preference to veterans (defined for the purposes of this title to mean persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II).

LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES AND COMMITTEES TO ASSIST SECRETARY

SEC. 707. (a) Wherever a local public agency now exists or may be hereafter created which possesses authority to assist low-income persons and families outside of urban areas to obtain decent, safe, and sanitary housing and related facilities, the Secretary is authorized, and after agreement with such agency is directed, to utilize the facilities of such local public agency for the purpose of making the benefits of this title available to the eligible owners or operators situated upon farms (as defined in section 701) lying within the boundaries of said local public agency.

(b) Wherever the facilities of a local public agency are not utilized, the Secretary may utilize the services of any existing committee of farmers operating (pursuant to laws or regulations carried out by the Department of Agriculture) in the county or parish where the farm is located. In any county or parish where the facilities of a local public agency are not utilized and in which no existing satisfactory committee is available, the Secretary is authorized to appoint a committee composed of three persons residing in the county or parish. Each member of such committee shall be allowed compensation at the rate of $5 per day while engaged in the performance of duties under this title and, in addition, shall be allowed such amounts as the Secretary may prescribe for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses. One member of the committee shall be designated by the Secretary as chairman. The Secretary shall prescribe rules governing the procedure of local public agencies and committees utilized pursuant to this section, furnish forms and equipment necessary for the performance of their duties, and authorize and provide for the compensation of such clerical assistance as he deems may be required by any committee.

(c) The local public agency or committee utilized pursuant to this section shall examine applications of persons desiring to obtain the benefits of this title and shall submit recommendations to the Secretary with respect to each application as to whether the applicant is eligible to receive the benefits of this title, whether by reason of his character, ability, and experience, he is likely successfully to carry out undertakings required of him under a loan or grant under this title, and whether the farm with respect to which the application is made is of such character that there is a reasonable likelihood that the making of the loan or grant requested will carry out the purposes of this title. The local public agencies or committees shall also certify to the Secretary their opinions of the reasonable values of the farms. The local authorities and committees shall, in addition, perform such other duties under this title as the Secretary may require.

GENERAL POWERS OF SECRETARY

SEC. 708. (a) The Secretary, for the purposes of this title, shall have the power to determine and prescribe the standards of adequate farm housing, by farms or localities, taking into consideration, among other factors, the type of housing which will provide decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for the needs of the family using the housing, the type and character of the farming operations to be conducted, and the size and earning capacity of the land.

(b) The Secretary may require any recipient of a loan or grant to agree that the availability of housing constructed or improved with the proceeds of the loan or grant under this title shall not be a justification for directly or indirectly changing the terms or conditions of the lease or occupancy agreement with the occupants of such housing to the latter's disadvantage without the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 709. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall have the power to—

(a) make contracts for services and supplies without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, when the aggregate amount involved is less than $300;

(b) enter into subordination, subrogation, or other agreements satisfactory to the Secretary;

(c) compromise claims and obligations arising out of sections 702 to 705, inclusive, of this title and adjust and modify the terms of mortgages, leases, contracts, and agreements entered into as circumstances may require, including the release from personal liability, without payment of further consideration, of—

(1) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants for loans who have agreed to assume the outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary under this title; and

(2) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants for loans who have agreed to assume that portion of the outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary under this title which is equal to the earning capacity value of the farm at the time of the transfer, and borrowers whose farms have been acquired by the Secretary, in cases where the Secretary determines that the original borrowers have cooperated in good faith with the Secretary, have farmed in a workmanlike manner, used due diligence to maintain the security against loss, and otherwise fulfilled the covenants incident to their loans, to the best of their abilities;

(d) collect all claims and obligations arising out of or under any mortgage, lease, contract, or agreement entered into pursuant to this title and, if in his judgment necessary and advisable, to pursue the same to final collection in any court having jurisdiction: *Provided*, That the prosecution and defense of all litigation under this title shall be conducted under the supervision of the Attorney General and the legal representation shall be by the United States attorneys for the districts, respectively, in which such litigation may arise and by such other attorney or attorneys as may, under law, be designated by the Attorney General;

(e) bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or other sale or otherwise to acquire the property pledged or mortgaged to secure a loan or other indebtedness owing under this title, to accept title to any property so purchased or acquired, to operate or lease such property for such period as may be necessary or advisable, to protect the interest of the United States therein and to sell or otherwise dispose of the property so purchased or acquired by such terms and for such considerations as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable and to make loans to provide adequate housing for the purchasers of such property;

(f) utilize with respect to indebtedness arising from loans and payments made under this title all the powers and authorities given to him under the act approved December 20, 1944, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes" (58 Stat. 836), as such act now provides or may hereafter be amended;

(g) make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

OBLIGATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 710. The Secretary may issue notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to make loans under this title but not in excess of $25,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1948, an additional $50,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1949, an additional $75,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1950, and an additional $100,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1951. The notes and other obligations issued by the Secretary shall be secured by the obligations of borrowers and the Secretary's commitments to make contributions under this title and shall be repaid from the payment of principal and interest on the obligations of the borrowers and from funds appropriated hereunder. The notes and other obligations issued by the Secretary shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the notes or obligations by the Secretary. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Secretary of Agriculture issued hereunder and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act are extended to include any purchases of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

SEC. 711. In connection with loans made pursuant to section 703, the Secretary is authorized, on or after July 1, 1948, to make commitments for contributions aggregating not more than $500,000 per annum and to make additional commitments on or after July 1 of each of the years 1949, 1950, and 1951 which shall require aggregate contributions of not more than $1,000,000, $1,500,000, and $2,000,000 per annum, respectively.

SEC. 712. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary (a) such sums as may be necessary to permit payments on notes or other obligations issued by the Secretary under section 710 equal to (1) the aggregate of the contributions made by the Secretary in the form of credits on principal sums due on loans made pursuant to section 703 and (11) the interest due on a similar sum represented by notes or other obligations issued by the Secretary; (b) an additional $1,000,000 for grants made pursuant to section 704 on or after July 1, 1948, which amount shall be increased by further amounts of $2,500,000, $4,000,000, and $5,000,000, on July 1 of each of the years 1949, 1950, and 1951, respectively; and (c) such further sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of sections 701 and 712, inclusive, of this title.

TITLE VIII—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. (a) Effective upon the date of enactment of this act, the Housing and Home

Finance Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $16,500 per annum, and the members of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner shall each receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

(b) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "Federal Housing Administration;" immediately after the semicolon which follows "United States Housing Corporation": *Provided*, That, as to the Federal Housing Administration, the audit required by section 105 of said act shall begin with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, and the exception contained in section 301 (d) of said act shall be construed to refer to the cost of audits contracted for prior to July 1, 1948.

SEC. 803. In carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties—

(a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Administrator may make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out such functions, powers, and duties and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. The Administrator may delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees as he may designate, and may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. The Administrator shall cause to be prepared for the Housing and Home Finance Agency an official seal of such device as he shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

(b) The Public Housing Administration shall sue and be sued only with respect to its functions under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, as amended. The Public Housing Commissioner may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall hereafter be made hereunder, and shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees of the Public Housing Administration as he may designate; and make such rules and regulations as he may find necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. Funds made available for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Administration (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administration.

(c) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board (which term as used in this section shall also include and refer to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board), the Federal Housing Commissioner, the Public Housing Commissioner, and the National Home Mortgage Corporation, respectively, may, in addition to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities conferred elsewhere in this act—

(1) with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, accept and utilize equipment, facilities, or the services of employees of any State or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization and, in connection with the utilization of such services, may make payment for transportation while away from their homes or regular places of business and per diem in lieu of subsistence en route and at place of such service, in accordance with the provisions of 5 U. S. C. 73b–2;

(2) utilize, contract with, and act through, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, any Federal, State, or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, and any funds available to said officers for carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties shall be available to reimburse any such agency or organization; and, whenever in the judgment of any such officer necessary, he may make advance, progress, or other payments with respect to such contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes;

(3) make expenditures for all necessary expenses, including preparation, mounting, shipping, and installation of exhibits; purchase and exchange of technical apparatus; and such other expenses as may, from time to time, be found necessary in carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase or contract by said officers (or their agencies), respectively, for services or supplies if the amount thereof does not exceed $300: *And provided further*, That funds made available for administrative expenses in carrying out the functions, powers, and duties imposed upon the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (except those imposed pursuant to titles II and V hereof), the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, by or pursuant to law may at their option be consolidated into single administrative expense fund accounts of said officers or agencies for expenditure by them, respectively, in accordance with the provisions hereof.

ACT CONTROLLING

SEC. 803. Insofar as the provisions of any other law are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall be controlling.

SEPARABILITY.

SEC. 804. Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this act, all powers and authorities conferred by this act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. Notwithstanding any other evidences of the intention of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the controlling intent of Congress that if any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act or its applications to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provisions of this act, or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 212) to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CONTROL OF INFLATION

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the President of the United States has called us together in extraordinary session to take measures for stopping the continued advance of inflation. The existence of inflation is no longer denied by anyone. We no longer speak of it as a prospective danger, as did many, even when it was in full activity in the initial stages. With our characteristic American ability to change our mental attitudes at the drop of a hat, we have shifted from thinking of inflation as a prospective danger into the mood of concluding that it has gone so far that a bust is inevitable. We did not take seriously enough the building up of a situation which might more easily have been remedied in its first stages, and we regard as inevitable consequences, which in a later stage, might still perhaps be brought under control by wise, resolute, and difficult decisions and actions.

The President has not only called us into session to consider this grave situation, but has likewise presented an administration bill which he desires that we enact into law. It is our duty to analyze that bill and see if it meets the requirements of practicability and effectiveness.

Before doing so, it is well to make clear to ourselves the structure and mechanism of inflation. The structure of inflation is based upon a large and growing supply of money seeking in the market for a restricted or more slowly growing supply of things to buy. The solutions of the problem therefore seem to lie in bringing the money supply under control, increasing the supply of things which the holders of the money seek to purchase, imposing voluntary restraints on the desire to purchase, or imposing involuntary restraints on the ability to purchase, as by rationing.

When this situation of increased money and restricted supply of things to be purchased, which situation may be called the structure of inflation, arises, there is a distinct and active mechanism by means of which prices are increased. This mechanism is the well-known cost of living, wage, profit, price spiral whose third revolution we are now enduring.

Remedies conceivably lie in the restriction of the money supply and the increase in production of things to be bought. It is likewise conceivable that if voluntary or involuntary brakes are put upon the mechanism of the spiral of inflation, a better opportunity may be given to bring money and goods into balance.

With these thoughts in mind, let us examine the administration bill.

Title I relates to the regulation of consumer credit. Consumer credit is one of the means by which the money supply is increased. As we all realize, a major part of the money available to the United States consumer, whether for business or personal purposes, is not in the form of paper money or metal coins. It is largely composed of bank deposits generated by the extension of bank credit. One of the elements in this expanded credit and consequent deposits is consumer credit, made up in large measure of charge accounts and installment credit.

At this point I should like to call the attention of Members of this body to the monthly publication Economic Indicators prepared for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by the Council of Economic Advisers and printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Each Member of the Senate receives, or should receive, this publication each month as it is printed. On page 29 are statistics and charts indicating the growth of consumer credit, and particularly the growth of installment credit which has risen since the end of the war from around $2,400,000,000 to $7,000,000,000. This is a substantial increase in the money supply. It is particularly dangerous in that it assigns future income to present purchases. On December 17, 1947, the Senate wisely passed Senate Joint Resolution 157 restoring the authority to the Federal Reserve System to bring consumer credit under control. Most unwisely, in my judgment, the House did not concur in that bill, and in consequence this important and dangerous increment to the money supply has been allowed to go on. This is a responsibility which the Congress must bear rather than the administration.

Title I in the administration bill, S. 2910, which seeks to remedy this condition seems to be well thought out and should have our earnest consideration. It may well be that amendments may be introduced by the Banking and Currency Committee, but I would hope that the committee would report it out to the Senate and that the Senate will repeat its wise course earlier this year and pass it on for a more judicious consideration by the House.

Title II of the administration bill relates to bank reserves. By a mechanism which I assume to be understood in general terms by the Members of this body, the extension of bank credit can be controlled by limiting bank reserves. That authority is vested in the Federal Reserve System. The limits of possible action of this sort have nearly been reached, and the bill proposes to make legal for a period of 2 years still further increases in reserve requirements.

There are many who have felt that by this means alone the money supply could be reduced and inflation arrested. This is true. It is in fact only too true. By drastically curtailing the extension of bank credit, it is possible to reduce the money supply and end an inflation, but it is a matter of extreme difficulty to do this in any measured and controlled way. The relationship between the volume of credit resulting from a given restriction on reserves is not a mathematical relationship. It is a psychological relationship in large measure, and arises through the hopes, fears, ambitions, and recklessness of millions of prospective borrowers, as well as through the medium of the mental reactions of the lenders.

As another way to control reserves, the Federal Reserve System can alter the rediscount rate. The Treasury can likewise affect interest rates by the terms on which it offers its securities for public sale, particularly the short-term paper. It could indubitably arrest the inflation by allowing the long-term bonds to seek a natural level, instead of maintaining them at par through unlimited purchase by the Federal Reserve System. The latter three measures do not require legislation to put them into effect. Of the three, the unpegging of Government bond prices is the most dubious and the most likely to lead to a train of undesired consequences. This brings us as legislators back to the proposal to raise the limits on reserve requirements as the particular responsibility for the consideration of this Congress.

The Banking and Currency Committee has under consideration both the proposal in this bill, which is supported by the present chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and also the earlier proposal for special reserves offered by the then chairman, Mr. Marriner Eccles, to the committee some months ago. Both proposals merit consideration. Either proposal must be administered very carefully if disaster is to be avoided, and by disaster I would mean results unexpectedly sudden or unexpectedly drastic coming from a given degree of reserve control. Mr. President, I may say that, since I prepared these remarks, it appears evident that both Mr. Eccles, the remainder of the Board, and the Secretary of the Treasury have agreed on the administration program.

Testimony so far given before the Banking and Currency Committee seems to indicate that within the administration itself there was formerly a confusion of counsels so that it, until this time, has been unwise to make recommendations as to the control of bank credit. With these confused counsels, it is not strange that the Congress was unable to meet administration desires with regard to bank credit control. We must now, however, take this matter in hand as our own responsibility, and enact legislation for the guidance of the administration in this important field of money supply.

One other point needs careful consideration. It is the considered opinion of the former head of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. Marriner Eccles, that the entire banking system of the country must be brought under these new reserve requirements. If not, he feels assured that the Federal Reserve System itself will be seriously weakened by the handicaps placed on the member banks, as compared with nonmember banks. The present Chairman of the Board of Governors, Mr. Thomas McCabe, testified that he was willing to take that chance. More recent action of the Board of Governors supports the view that new reserve restrictions must apply to nonmember as well as member banks. There are questions of constitutional law involved which are being considered by the Banking and Currency Committees and on which the Houses of Congress will have to pass judgment.

I mentioned earlier the delicacy and danger in entrusting the control of inflation entirely to Government action in the field of supply of bank credit. The delicacy required is great. The danger is great. I can only express my present view with regard to this by saying that I feel confident that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is well aware of the delicacy and the inherent danger and can be depended upon to act cautiously and wisely if the additional authority is given it.

Title III of the administration bill deals with prices and wages. This is the most contentious title in the bill. In view of the break-down of price ceilings and the broad expansion of black markets in the later months of OPA, general opinion will assuredly be lined up against this proposal, although it is, on its face, the obvious way to deal with price increases.

Last fall, as the result of the price hearings, and in the early weeks of the second session of this Congress, I was convinced of the possibility and the wisdom of indirect price control by means of rationing. I do not now believe that that remedy for the high cost of living is practical.

The proposals, which were supported by Mr. JAVITS, of New York, in the House and myself in the Senate, related to the rationing of meat; and so far as I was concerned, these proposals were based on a particular situation which existed at that time, and from which present conditions differ in important respects.

At the time when meat rationing would have been effective we had finished with the second round of wage and price increases. There was a pause in the upward rise of the cost of living, or at least a slowing up of the rise which was in evidence from December through April. Of the factors which contributed to the preceding rise to the then existing higher level and to the subsequent rise, food was by far the most important; and in food, the element of meat and meat products constituted the most uncontrollable factor. It seemed clear at the time that if this uncontrolled element could be brought under some measure of control it might be expected to stabilize for a considerable period the whole cost of living. Could that have been done, it seemed reasonable to expect that organized labor might refrain from initiating the third round of wage increases based on the rising cost of living. With organized labor refraining from further demands, it seemed reasonable to expect that business would refrain from further price increases and might even, in the case of those industries and businesses which were in a good profit position, offer substantial price reductions. This would in turn and in time affect the cost of living in a favorable way and help to stabilize our whole economy. We might perhaps have put an end for an extended period to the whole inflationary process by thus putting brakes on what I have called the machinery of inflation. Could

this have been done, sufficient time would have been granted to attack in an orderly and successful way the fundamental factors of purchasing power and production which were out of line with each other.

The possibility of thus bringing inflation under control appeared the more sure, since important business groups showed a willingness to play their part. In the fall, for instance, the Ford Motor Co. and the International Harvester Co. both made substantial reductions in the price of their products. Some weeks later General Electric announced reductions in the cost of the items of their output which went into consumer use, particularly in the case of electrical household equipment. The largest lumber company in the world, the Weyerhaeuser Co., announced a decrease of 10 percent in the cost of lumber. Business did show a willingness to go along with the program.

Furthermore, William Green, for the American Federation of Labor, in an editorial in the January issue of the American Federationist made certain significant statements. With much else that was sensible, he said:

> Because the practice of tail-chasing gets us nowhere, the American Federation of Labor has urged unions to base demands for wage increases on increases in output. Such union efforts need the cooperation of management and individual managements need the cooperation of others in the industry. All need the cooperation of credit and banking agencies, and these agencies, in turn, need the cooperation of those controlling our fiscal policies and governmental appropriations.
>
> Some representative of a responsible national interest could call together representatives of all functional groups, so that all could have a common understanding and agree upon how to deal jointly with problems of inflation and then accept responsibility for doing their specific shares, including periodic reports on progress. These reports should be reviewed by the national representative group for the purpose of evaluating progress and adjusting the program.
>
> This is the democratic way forward which would strengthen—not weaken—free enterprise.

Thus spoke the President of the American Federation of Labor. There was therefore an encouraging measure of cooperation by industry and by one of the great branches of organized labor. There was no cooperation on the part of the Congress in the part it had to play in giving a measure of stability to the cost of living, on which the whole project for slowing up the machinery of inflation was based. The meat-rationing bills were never reported out of the two committees of the House and Senate to which they were referred. The opportunity was lost. In my judgment, the opportunity does not now exist for accomplishing the same results that might have been accomplished 6 or 8 months ago. The expected and feared third round of inflation is still in progress. There is no visible tapering off on which an arrest of the rise of the cost of living might be based. Furthermore, with the unfortunate experience which the industry leaders in the lowered-price movement suffered, they might not feel justified in supporting the project a second time.

Ford and International Harvester were forced by rising wage and material costs to raise their prices again. Weyerhaeuser met with no response from other members of the great lumber industry who sat cynically by to see how long Weyerhaeuser would stick it out. General Electric was faced with further rising costs of material and labor, which made the continuance of their program impossible.

It may be that the group of conditions which made meat rationing favorable at the time it was proposed will recur at some future time or that other means of price control of a restricted group of foods or commodities may be selected with similar grounds for useful result. In my own judgment, that fortunate combination of circumstances does not now exist. Price control would soon break down because the useful, widespread effects would not meet with the same evidently useful results and the same widespread support of manufacturers, organized labor, and consumers that might have been expected some months ago.

I am frank to say that the wage section of title III puzzles me. Reading it with all the intelligence that I can muster, I cannot make it out a project for wage control at all. It seems to be just another section of the price-control undertaking relating to the conditions under which prices will be permitted to rise in case wage advances have been voluntarily or involuntarily granted. This looks to me very much like an artfully mistitled section of a title III which really relates to price control and price control only. The proposed wage board can disapprove of an unwise wage increase, but it cannot forbid it. All it can do is to say "Tut! tut!" This is unfortunate, since the matter of restraint in wage increases is the nucleus of the problem of the inflationary spiral.

In brief, there is nothing in title III that I would be willing to support on the basis of any information or experience available to me at the present moment.

Perhaps something can be said in favor of title IV—priorities and allocations. The proposals relate, it would seem, more directly to capital goods and the raw materials for them than to the consumer goods which are such an intimate part of the inflationary spiral. The Chief Executive certainly asks for tremendous power over a section of the economy which is of great importance but which is not as vitally concerned as are the consumer-goods industries and consumer-goods materials—like those relating to food, clothing, and shelter. The power asked for is indeed enormous if the word "facility" in this title means what I suppose it to mean—namely, factories, warehouses, and productive machinery.

There is no product or group of products which appear to need allocation and inventory control as much as do raw and semifinished iron and steel. Such pressing needs as freight cars and housing must be supplied. As to housing, there is need for a flow of pig iron to pipe foundries and of steel rod to nail mills which shall balance out with the available supply of other materials and of the labor supply to give a maximum construction of housing units without inflationary effects.

Title V relates to rent control. It was the intent of the Rent Control Act of 1948 gradually but definitely to relinquish this element of the cost of living to the responsible control of State and local governments. This to my mind is a wise and appropriate policy. It is wise because the centralized administration of rent control has resulted in such abnormalities and injustices as to make it doubtful whether proper centralized rent control is at all feasible. It is appropriate because houses, the cost of building and maintaining them, and the rents received for occupying them, are not materials or facilities in interstate trade in which the Federal Government must in the nature of the case enter as the controlling agency. Federal rent control has proved highly unsatisfactory. If the local assumption of responsibility provided for in the present law is not satisfactory, the responsibility for the bad conditions goes right back to the citizens of the State in which the bad conditions exist. In this situation in which interstate relationships do not exist, the citizens of the local community must hold their own government responsible.

Title VI relates to the regulation of commodity exchanges. Here is another controversial question on which I must confess that my own point of view has changed with further study of the problem. I am no longer convinced that speculation can for a long period of time keep a commodity market above its natural level. It may indeed maintain it for a longer than natural period at a high level, in which case it will naturally drop to a deeper and longer-extended low level after the impossible task of maintaining it has been given up. It has to be remembered that the bear influences in the great commodity markets are as active as are the bull operators.

What I am inclined to believe is that there are waves of speculation in which large numbers of amateur speculators become involved, whose operations tend to make the ups and downs of the market more violent than they would otherwise be. If further controls of such markets as the grain exchanges are undertaken, I have become convinced that a part of the objective should be to control the ease of access to speculation on the part of the general public rather than to restrain professional operations. I know that this is not the popular point of view, but it is one which I have come to accept.

It is perhaps appropriate to call attention to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in its purchases, particularly with relation to the purchases of grain. If this Government body were a private individual or firm, it would lay itself open very strongly to the suspicion that its purchases, in their timing and volume, were made with an eye to the effect of those purchases on the price of the commodity. These interests, unfortunately, may be in reverse from those of the consumer and taxpayer. There seems to have been at times an endeavor to maintain the price of wheat, as an example, to the detriment of the taxpayer in the bill he has had to pay for relief and to the detriment of the consumer in its effect on his cost of food. If the exchanges are to be controlled, I suggest that investigation should also be made as to controlling the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It is astonishing that the only clear reference to action reducing food costs appears to be this dubious one of curtailing commodity exchange margins. Price supports and production quotas would seem to be due for a thorough analysis and overhauling, from prima facie evidence. In spite of the fact that food, almost completely agricultural in origin, is the most intractable element in the cost of living, the administration bill passes it hastily by. Perhaps it is too hot a subject. Perhaps Republicans as well as Democrats dare not look the problem of food prices in the face. Your speaker's knowledge and experience has lain with industry rather than with agriculture since he ceased farm work as a boy of 16; but he cannot help wondering if we may not be leaving a major source of high living costs unexamined and uncorrected. Should not the House at least recede from its position on the Aiken bill and permit that to come into full effect January 1 of 1949?

I wish to corroborate what might be inferred from the emphasis of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on the price of potatoes and the destruction of potatoes, to say that among my own constituents there is no single situation which makes housewives and their husbands more angry than seeing a load of low-priced potatoes for feed going past the house when they are having to pay prices far larger than any price they ever expected to pay for a bag of potatoes. If I understand the Aiken bill—and I do not claim to understand it from beginning to end, because perhaps that requires a specialist—I am clearly convinced that that bill would remove the abuses which exist in the present price-support policies which have been legislated with regard to potatoes.

So much for the administration bill. Only a small part of it is useful and it cannot be expected to play a major part in the control of inflation. Let us now take a broader view and see what else can be done.

We may well wonder whether we are not misapprehending our present economic situation as being a temporary crisis for which crisis remedies may properly be proposed, when instead of that our inflation is, in fact, a chronic evil which must be expected to be endemic in any condition of long continued high employment and production. This I believe to be true, and I regret to say that with the best thought I have been able to bring to the problem, I have been coming to the conclusion that the fundamental remedies lie only in part within the jurisdiction of Government and that a large burden of the responsibility of control lies with organized labor and with industry.

Can we have full employment without inflation? We can easily see how the full employment, which has now lasted for years, tends toward inflation. We can see that when a worker is confident of getting a new job if he looks for one and decides to quit his old one, he will be quite insistent when he seeks for an increase in his wage rate, whether he makes that demand directly as an individual or through the labor organization to which he belongs. We can also see how, when workers are fully employed and pay rolls reach unprecedented heights, the manufacturer and the merchant, in the face of this unprecedented purchasing power, feel no particular necessity for reducing prices or keeping profits under control. They likewise feel less necessity for resisting wage demands if access to a reservoir of credit is wide open. That many firms have been content with moderate profits is a tribute to their long-range judgment, but this high quality is by no means universal and is not the ruling factor in these inflationary times. Full employment, therefore, is the fertile soil in which thrive and flourish wages, profits, and resulting prices, resulting high cost of living, and a finally resulting demand for still higher wages. This is the mechanism of inflation which we commonly call the inflationary spiral.

It is easy to see how a considerable pool of unemployment, say six or eight million out of our present employment of 60,000,000 would tend to slow down or reverse this inflationary movement. If an employed workman were not sure of another job, he would not be so insistent on higher wages. With a considerable percentage of his potential customers unemployed, the manufacturer or merchant would lack assurance that increased prices would bring increased profits to him instead of a prospective loss. He could not safely raise prices without losing his market.

Shall we, then, reluctantly accept unemployment as a cure for inflation? Or shall we try other ways? Let us examine some of these other ways.

The inflation spiral generates an increasing supply of purchasing power but under the conditions assumed and now existing, that purchasing power meets a stationary or only slowly rising output of goods and services. Remedies, therefore, would seem to lie in decreasing purchasing power or increasing the output of goods and services, or both.

The Government can do something about the supply of purchasing power. It can balance its budget; it can do better than balance its budget, it can accumulate a surplus. This reduces purchasing power. It can use that surplus either to pay off indebtedness or to be held as a Treasury surplus. If the indebtedness paid off is held by the Federal Reserve Banks, the purchasing power remains extinguished. If it is bank held, then there is still an opportunity to reduce the current purchasing power in the market by reducing the volume of outstanding bank credit, which constitutes the major portion of our money supply.

The accumulation of this budgetary surplus can be done by increasing taxation or reducing Government expenditures, or both. Increasing taxation draws money away from those who are taxed and thus prevents them from spending as much. This is anti-inflationary. Another expedient is available, but not as yet tried in this country. We can impose compulsory saving in lieu of increasing taxes. There would then be an opportunity to expand taxpayers' purchasing if deflation gets out of hand. Reduced expenditures mean the elimination of workers from Government jobs and their return to private business. This can result in increased civilian production. This also is anti-inflationary.

There are other methods by which government can reduce purchasing power which we have already considered. It can recover and exercise its powers to control installment buying, though this Congress refused permission to the administration to do so. It can, in connection with the refinancing of the national debt, raise the interest rates for business as a whole, thus cutting down the extension of credit. It would be difficult to do this without lowering Government bonds below par, so that this possibility is one which is not immediately attractive. It can raise reserve requirements for the banking system to a point where the total of outstanding loans is arrested or decreased. In fact, by these and other means, the Government can clearly restrict the available credit to such an extent indeed as to surely end an inflation. Then why not do it?

The answer to this question is quite simple, and I have already stated it. Let me state it again. Doing it is a very delicate operation indeed. The line between overdoing it and underdoing it is difficult to discover. As I have said earlier, the factors involved are largely psychological rather than mathematical. If the means of credit restriction employed show too little result, there is danger that the addition of another increment to credit restriction may result in a definite and disastrous slump, which involves unemployment, underproduction, and real distress. Government can end inflation. There is no question about that. The question is, can it do it safely? About that there is a great deal of question indeed. We are not without experience in this matter. The Government feared inflation in 1937. Early in the year it took measures to prevent it. Inflation was promptly squelched, but so were employment, production, and recovery. The Governors of the Reserve Board, in their sphere of activity, may surely be counted on to proceed with greater caution.

So much for the reduction of purchasing power. This is the less attractive of the two methods anyway. By far the more attractive is some method by which more goods are produced to meet the available purchasing power.

The Government can do something about this. In general, the increase in our standard of living, resulting from higher production per man-hour of our workers, has not been a result of longer hours or harder work on the part of those employees in production and distribution. On the contrary, we work far fewer hours than we did a generation ago, and our work physically is far easier. The higher production and the higher

standard of living have been obtained by better business management, improved and cheaper products, and more productive machinery and methods. The basis of our improvement in output, therefore, largely depends on a heavy and wise investment of profits in the development and manufacture of new products, with new equipment, and by new methods.

To revive this process, which is the long-time and time-tried method of improving the material condition of the inhabitants of this country, is dependent largely on tax policies appropriate to the undertaking. To devise and put into effect these tax policies must be a matter of continued study by the responsible committees of Congress and of willingness by the House and Senate to put them into effect. That willingness will not exist unless a substantial part of the electorate has become convinced of the general social value, and the particular value to them, of profits of industry wisely directed to this social end.

In this connection industry has definite responsibilities. In addition to those for conservative pricing which have already been mentioned, they have to see that profits are wisely used in increasing their productive capacity. It is admittedly difficult to do this, since the great business profits about which we read are in many cases unavailable as actual cash for purchases and investment. Without increase in the physical amount of inventories, of work in process or of accounts receivable, dollar signs against all these items may have very large increases, and those increases would all go to swell the profit side of the profit-and-loss statement. Yet in reality these increases, due to inflation, represent in many cases a necessity for bank borrowing, and do not at all represent funds which can be drawn on either for dividends or for reinvestment, in spite of the fact that they appear on the profit side of the ledger.

It is therefore not going to be easy in all cases to apply what look like excellent profits to this desirable purpose of increasing productive capacity by wise investment.

There is a further complication. Many conservative firms properly take into account the fact that their reserves for depreciation and obsolescence are based on replacement costs of earlier years, which will have to be very materially raised in view of present costs of machinery and equipment. With that in mind, there has been a very understandable tendency to increase depreciation allowances. The unfortunate thing is that the very act of doing this is one of the incentives for price increases where at least price maintenance is highly desirable. The effort to protect the company against inflation, therefore, tends to increase the inflation against which protection is sought. In its own way this action parallels that of the wage earner who seeks by higher wages to compensate for an inflation which his higher wages will only encourage. Would it not be wise for both groups to rely on the wisdom of action which seeks to arrest the spiral rather than to put more pressure behind it?

What can labor do to increase the output of goods? As has been said in connection with industry, the real contribution to increasing the standard of living has been made by industry itself in improved management, equipment, and product. Is there anything that labor, organized and unorganized, can do? There is something that the workers can do.

With full employment and with our current equipment and business organization, we have reached the limit of production on the basis of the 40-hour week. This is the rock bottom on which the whole machinery of inflation is founded. With that limitation on output, nothing that is done in the way of increasing incomes will do more than increase prices, except as wage increases to the higher paid enable them to take away a still larger share from the underpaid. Inflation can bring a net advantage to the higher paid; but, as the immoral nature of that advantage is clearly seen, we may feel assured that the process will become unsatisfactory to many of those who are now so ardently pursuing it.

But if increased incomes only increase prices for the community as a whole, what can labor do about increasing output? Has the time not come for the body of workers to consider this question? What matters most, leisure or goods and services? If we want to preserve our leisure, the only way we can increase our goods and services is by the slow process of the accumulation of profits applied to more efficient production. If, on the other hand, we wish a more rapid increase in the material good things of life, the remedy is near at hand. The remedy is longer working hours.

Those working hours are, of course, always available under the penalty of overtime payment. That overtime payment would have to be given up in most industries before it would be possible to run the extra hours. Do the working people of this country care enough for more goods and services to work longer hours without overtime? That is not a question for the management group to decide. It is a question for the workers, organized and unorganized, to decide for themselves: whether or not they want the Fair Labor Standards Act amended to permit this. We may well remember that this act was passed in a time of acute unemployment to spread work. Is it appropriate to a time of full employment?

The question has been raised as to whether longer hours would have any beneficial effect on prices. This is to say, would they have any effect on reducing inflation? The effect would not be as direct or easily understood as would the effect on the standard of living. There would, however, be definitely a beneficial effect possible on the price level.

There are very few manufacturing or mercantile firms in which the present working week could not be moderately increased without increases in salaries, in taxes, in insurance, in depreciation, and in numerous others of the fixed expenses. This means that the longer hours would reduce unit costs and could reduce prices. The reductions in costs are not great enough to take care of time and a half for overtime in most industries, but on a full-time basis they would make possible a definite reduction in prices in most industries.

As previously stated, this decision lies in the hands of labor and not of management.

Business and labor then have a heavy responsibility and it is to be found primarily in the negotiations for wages and working conditions, which are continuously going on between these two groups. The demand is for statesmanship of a high order, between both the employers and employees.

As a matter of fact these negotiations, particularly in the case of the nation-wide industries and the nation-wide labor organizations, are no longer private matters. They cannot be. The whole well-being of all the people depends on arriving at wise decisions in all such cases.

A fallacy which leads to harmful demands is that corporate profits can be redistributed to employees on a generous scale. Those profits in 1947 amounted to about $28,700,000,000 before taxes—a very tidy sum indeed. Why not distribute the greater part of that in increased wages? For one thing the Government needs the $11,700,000,000 it collected in taxes, and the added billions it collected in double taxation on the dividends paid to stockholders. Furthermore dividends must be paid if capital is to flow into production in a free economy; and as we have already seen, about the only hope for a continued rise in living standards, apart from longer hours and increased worker efficiency, is a revived flow of profits into new materials and products and more efficient plant and equipment.

The most serious soul-searching must be done by the unions with the more highly paid membership who customarily spearhead the demands for still higher wages. These unions should rest on their oars. It is the low-income groups who must come up. As they are left farther and farther behind they have to concentrate all their energies on the bare necessities of minimum food, clothing, and shelter. They are lost as customers. They become a menace to prosperity. They are the hapless, hopeless means by which inflation in due time ends in a bust.

But equally responsible are the employers. The manufacturer or merchant, in these delicate times, whose profits permit reasonable dividends and reinvestment, who yet raises his prices to more than offset wage and material increases—such a man is likewise driving our inflation into a disastrous and inescapable bust.

In accepting these hard facts, are we throwing the free-enterprise system overboard? At first sight, it looks as though we are. It was Adam Smith's conviction that the summation of all the selfish activities, of all the factors in business operations, resulted in the general good. It would appear that we can no longer hold to that point of view, when we ask business and labor to make their decisions with the general interest in mind, as well as their own immediate self-interest.

We have one recent example of labor negotiations which bears the earmarks of having been decided, in part at least, on the basis of the general interest. I am referring to the contract recently negotiated between General Motors and the United Automobile Workers. To the extent that the general interest did enter into these negotiations, were the interests and the principles of private enterprise thrown overboard?

This is an important question. Should we say that grim necessity is leading us away from private enterprise or that only lip service can be rendered to that principle in guiding our decisions?

As for myself, I do not believe that this recognition of the general interest involves the neglect of the private interest. I hold the opposite view and for a very simple reason. The private interest is involved in the public interest. If the public interest is not served, the private interest ends in disaster. What we are faced with here is the distinction between short-range private interests and long-range private interests. As we grow in experience and intelligence, we should see further and further into our long-range interests, and except as we do this, our short-range interests will lead us into disaster.

Our safety thus depends on the development of statesmanship in our people as a whole. Only thus can we escape continued and ultimately explosive inflation, which will lead into social revolution with its accompanying physical distress and lowered standard of living to the people as a whole. We have a great challenge laid before us. That challenge we must meet with courage, with wisdom, and with determination.

Mr. President, I wish it were possible for me to present more simple means for controlling inflation. I wish it were possible, as perhaps our President hoped, for us to be called into session, pass a law, and then go home with the job done. Such a simple remedy is impossible. It is impossible because the cause and the responsibilities are broad-spread over the whole Nation and all of its citizens; and many areas of personal responsibility cannot be reached except by devices of totalitarian control which we have never tried even in wartime. The remedies can only be applied by a government whose citizens are able and willing to do their part.

To summarize, the fundamental remedies lie in the increase of production to meet an adequate but controlled purchasing power, in the interim control of the wage-cost-profit-price spiral while these longer-range adjustments are being made, and in wise fiscal controls which must be applied more slowly but can be applied more safely than the more drastic monetary remedies. I have already suggested the titles of S. 2910 which will be useful in this regard. They relate to the regulation of consumer credit and the control of bank reserves or other means of restraining the expansion of credit. This is not enough.

We have a responsibility for wages laid on organized labor and for prices laid on business which must be conscientiously met in the long-range self-interest of both labor and business. Neglect of these will start the machinery of depression.

The worker must ponder and accept the means of increased production, so far as hours of work are concerned, while he and the ordinary citizen gain understanding of the tax reforms on which their material improvement ultimately depends.

With these conditions met, government in its fiscal and monetary policies, and particularly in its fiscal policies, can lay the foundations for the more long-range solution to the problems involved in controlling the destructive process of inflation and redirecting its elements to the advantage of our society.

This is a hard way. We only deceive ourselves if we trust ourselves entirely to easier ways. Intelligence, good will, and courage will win.

THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1948

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there have been so many questions asked in regard to the Agricultural Act of 1948, which was passed by the Congress last June, that I desire at this time to discuss some of the purposes and the provisions of this act.

There has been some misunderstanding created concerning this legislation due to the fact that the interpretations of some people seem to have been based upon an analysis of the original bill, which was introduced for the purpose of holding hearings and obtaining testimony from experts and farm leaders, rather than upon the law as it was finally approved by the Congress.

I am not going to attempt a section-by-section analysis of the law now because this ground has been well covered by Chairman Hope of the House committee, and a comprehensive statement thereon will be found on pages A4564 to A4567 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Rather, I wish to discuss the reasons for certain provisions of the bill and the effect which those who sponsored the measure believe that such provisions will have upon the agricultural and general economy of our country.

Everyone recognizes the fact that a healthy agriculture is essential to the general welfare of our entire economy. We know from experience that when agriculture becomes distressed our whole economy is in very serious trouble.

We know from experience that when agriculture does not produce sufficient quantities of food and fiber to meet the needs of our consumers, our industries, and the export demand, the effect upon prices is definitely inflationary and it becomes more difficult for low-income persons and those living on fixed incomes to make both ends meet.

It is common knowledge also that the United States has for over a century been using up its capital assets or the natural resources of the soil and that this practice must now be reversed if we as a Nation are to continue to be self-sustaining.

It was with these facts in mind that your Senate Committee on Agriculture proceeded with the development of a new and expanded agricultural program.

It is upon titles II and III of the Agricultural Act of 1948, which titles were titles III and IV of the bill S. 2318 as approved by the Senate, that I shall concentrate my remarks today.

Title I of the Agricultural Act of 1948 is the measure which was approved by the House and which, in general, continues the wartime support of basic and a few nonbasic commodities for one more year or until January 1, 1950, after which time the long-range price support program of the Senate will take effect.

As I have indicated, it was clear to the members of the committee that a well-rounded agricultural program should be one which would restore and maintain our soil resources, would provide our people with an adequate production of food and fiber at a fair cost, and would yield sufficient income to the farmer to enable him to maintain the farm and facilities at a high level of productive capacity and give him an income sufficient to support his family on a level comparable to that enjoyed by other economic groups.

Both Senate and House committees held extensive hearings on a long-range agricultural program. We did this under instructions and authority given us by the Congress in the summer of 1947.

While the committees of both Houses gave much consideration to all factors essential to a long-range farm program, the House placed greatest emphasis on the development of a long-range policy for land use and improvement.

The Senate devoted its main efforts toward a reorganization and consolidation of the soil-conservation agencies of the Department of Agriculture and toward the development of a long-range price-support program.

It was the opinion of the Senate committee that the cornerstone of a long-range farm program must be the assurance of an adequate income to the farmer.

Without a fair income it would be idle to talk of farm improvements and other things which require money.

It is also clear that a stabilized farm income is necessary if we are to achieve adequate production to meet consumer needs.

In adopting a long-range farm price-support program, the Congress has laid the cornerstone for what promises to be a most comprehensive and stable farm economy.

The two Houses of the Congress did not have the time necessary to develop and agree upon a long-range land-use policy and an expanded soil-improvement program.

Unlike the price-support program, which was urgent, a broadened land-use program was not necessary at this session to prevent our going backward.

In fact we are already making progress in the field of maintaining and improving our soil resources under existing laws.

The Soil Conservation Act of 1935 and the Triple-A Act of 1938, under which the agricultural conservation program now operates, are still the basic law of the land and progress is being made by both the Soil Conservation Service and the ACP in their fields.

The long-range price-support program, as approved by this Congress, may have its minor faults, but in it are permanently established certain indisputable principles which must endure.

Under the Agricultural Act of 1938, the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to support the prices of corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, and rice at prices ranging from 52 to 75 percent of parity. In 1941 peanuts were also included in this list.

These six crops are known as basic commodities. They are so called because they are produced in exportable quantities and are storable for reasonably long periods.

The other 151 kinds of agricultural commodities commonly produced in the United States are known as nonbasic commodities.

Many of these nonbasic commodities greatly exceed the basic commodities in dollar value. However, only a few of them are produced in exportable quantities and only a few lend themselves to long periods of storage without serious deterioration.

Many nonbasic commodities have been supported at 90 percent of parity during the war years under the provisions of the Steagall amendment of July 1, 1941.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry recognized the desirability of permanent support levels for many nonbasic as well as the basic commodities.

Before setting up definite formulas for the support of farm commodities, it was found advisable to revise the criteria upon which farm-support prices are based.

Since support prices and the parity principle were first established in 1933, a percentage of parity has been used as the basis for extending such supports.

The base period established for the determination of parity prices for farm products was the years 1910–14.

At that time prices received by farmers were more in line with the prices received by other groups of our economy than at any other time.

This base period was wisely chosen, but as time went on changing conditions and methods of production made it inequitable or unfair to many farm commodities.

New crops which were of minor importance during that 5-year period, 1910–14, became of major importance, while the development of new machinery, the change in consumer appetites, and scientific advancements had an effect upon production costs and other factors in the agricultural field.

Under legislation authorized by the Congress in the last 15 years, many different base periods have been used for various agricultural commodities which are commonly produced in this country, and for which the original base period of 1910–14 proved to be unfair.

In fact, the 1910–14 base period became so out of line that at the present time only 47 of the 157 principal agricultural commodities produced in this country are using that period.

In order to bring the different farm commodities into the proper relationship with one another, it was felt wise to modify the parity formula in such a way that parity prices for various commodities would not constantly be getting out of line.

Provision is made, therefore, in the Agricultural Act of 1948 for a new parity formula using the latest 10 years as an adjusted base period.

Inasmuch as the original 1910–14 period is still the most equitable in relating agriculture as a whole to other factors of our economy, we tie the 10-year moving period to the 1910–14 period by means of a simple formula.

Under this formula, the average price for a farm commodity for the preceding 10 years is taken.

This is divided by the percentage which farmers received for all crops during this 10-year period in relation to the price received during the years 1910 to 1914.

The result is multiplied by the percentage of prices which farmers pay today in comparison with their costs during the 1910–14 period.

Several examples of the working of this formula are given in Representative HOPE's analysis of the bill, so I shall not elaborate further on this subject.

Suffice it to say that we believe the new parity formula will establish the proper relationship between the various agricultural commodities, and it will not be necessary to establish new base periods for different commodities from time to time.

This formula has been worked out in the light of experience over the last 15 years. It will not in any way change parity prices for agriculture as a whole. It will simply change the relationship between different agricultural commodities from year to year.

Having established a new parity formula, it was then necessary to determine at what percentage of parity it was best to support agricultural commodities.

Contrary to the opinions of some, the farm support price program is not intended to guarantee the farmers cost-plus or even cost of production. It simply establishes a floor below which prices cannot fall, thus guaranteeing him against a complete collapse of the market and bankruptcy.

Your committee approached the determination of a price-support level with two principal objectives: First, to secure adequate production of those commodities which we need most, while discouraging overproduction of commodities which might happen to be in surplus; second, to seek for the farmer a fair percentage of parity of income, rather than to maintain a high level of support for specific commodities.

It has been found since the war that 90 percent of parity support for certain commodities amounts to an incentive to overproduce, while discouraging a desirable change to the production of commodities which are in short supply. The question of potato support prices has been referred to very frequently. I think there should be some explanation concerning the potato situation. I wish to say that if it were not for the support price given to potatoes some 6 or 7 years ago, potatoes now might conceivably be completely priced out of the market.

It will be recalled that at the beginning of the war, when industry was offered production incentives, agriculture was also offered production incentives. The Congress said to the farmers, "If you will produce more potatoes, even at the cost of converting your farm to the production of potatoes and buying the expensive machinery necessary, so that as a Nation we may save more grain for shipment overseas, then we, the Government, will guarantee you 90 percent of parity for the duration of the war and for 2 years thereafter."

In a few short years the farmers of the United States found out, with the aid of the incentive price, how to produce approximately 70 bushels of potatoes more to the acre. We are now producing more potatoes than we need; but in supporting the price of potatoes today the Government is simply carrying out an agreement which it made with the farmers in 1941, 7 years ago. That mandatory 90 percent support level ends with this year's crop, and next year the support will undoubtedly drop. The potato growers themselves have asked to have the price level lowered, because they realize that they are getting the bad end of public opinion by overproducing this particular crop and then expecting the Government to take it off their hands.

Mr. President, the committee aimed at an average support price level of 75 percent, which means that the farmer's income should not go below 75 percent of parity.

To achieve this, the long-range portion of the new act provides that the basic commodities should be supported within the range of 60 to 90 percent of parity for each commodity. I refer to the basic commodities—just six of them.

The level of support will be determined largely by the supply of the commodity according to a formula provided for in the law. When a crop becomes in heavy surplus, the support level goes lower, in order to discourage further overproduction. As supplies become short, the support level rises, in order to encourage production of commodities in short supply.

The only exception to this formula is found in the case of tobacco which, as a result of an amendment adopted on the floor of the Senate, will be supported at 90 percent of parity to cooperators so long as marketing quotas remain in effect.

Irish potatoes, as I have mentioned, shall be supported at such a level between 60 and 90 percent of parity, as the Secretary of Agriculture may consider necessary to attain an adequate supply.

With regard to wool, in consideration of the growing shortage in the world's supply, the Secretary is directed to support the price of wool at a level which will encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool. This will likely mean a support level of 90 percent of parity for a few years at least. For the first time the wool grower can now look forward with the assurance that he will not be ruined in his effort to make the United States more nearly self-sustaining with respect to this strategic commodity.

The Secretary is authorized to support the price of nonbasic commodities at any level up to 90 percent of parity, taking into consideration, first, the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor; second, the price levels at which other commodities are being supported; third, the availability of funds; fourth, the perishability of the commodity; fifth, its importance to agriculture and the national economy; sixth, the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation; seventh, the need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets; and, eighth, the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand.

In other words, in supporting the price of potatoes or peaches or any other perishable commodity, the Secretary of Agriculture can require that culls be kept off the market. The reason for that is that in the past it has been reported that the Government has bought first-grade commodities, to keep them off the market and to support the price, and then those who have benefited by that procedure have dumped their culls on the market, in place of the others. That is a bad practice, and we think we have found a way to control it during the operation of this law.

The potato growers were particularly anxious to have placed in the bill greater controls over the marketing of commodities of inferior quality.

I wish to quote here from a statement I made on June 16 during consideration of Senate bill 2318, which will make clear the reason why the committee did not provide a fixed formula for the support of nonbasic commodities as well as for the basic commodities:

> A question entered the minds of the committee as to whether we should designate certain crops which should be supported at from 60 to 90 percent of parity, as the basic commodities are to be supported under the requirements of the bill.
>
> Then we realized that there were 151 farm commodities which were not basic. We did not know where to draw the line.
>
> We expect that important commodities—and I include field peas, beans, potatoes, soybeans, barley, and oats—will be supported at the same rate as the basic commodities, which is 60 to 90 percent of parity.
>
> But there are other nonbasic commodities, such as summer squash, which we would not want to support even at 10 percent of parity.
>
> Then there are peppers and tomatoes.
>
> Producers of various commodities have come to me suggesting that the commodity they produce should be supported.
>
> They were mohair producers from Texas, honey producers from Iowa, Minnesota, and other States, and producers of hops.
>
> We felt we had to leave such products to the discretion of the Secretary, but it is the belief of the committee that commodities which correspond closely to the Steagall commodities should be supported at a rate of from 60 to 90 percent of parity.

We believe that as a result of the adoption of a modernized parity formula, which will establish a proper relationship among agricultural commodities, and as a result of the setting up of a support price level which is tied to the supply, there can gradually be brought about a conversion of production from commodities which are in surplus to a greater production of commodities which are in short supply.

Operating normally, the Agricultural Act of 1948 will tend to encourage the marketing of grains, which promise to be in fairly heavy surplus in the not distant future, in the form of dairy products and meats, which are now in short supply.

An indirect but very important effect of encouraging the marketing of surplus grain in the form of meat, milk, and poultry, is that such a method of marketing will provide employment for many more people. When grain is marketed in the form of these products not only is a greater amount consumed, but more labor is required not only on the farm but in processing plants, merchandising establishments, and the services, besides providing the consumer with a higher standard of living.

In the event that all other means of holding down surpluses fail, the provision for quotas as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1948, is still retained but it is expected that quotas will be used only as a last resort in times of extreme depression or exceptionally large surpluses. Under the new law, quotas on grains may be voted when the total supply in the country reaches 120 percent of a normal supply as determined by formulas provided for in the act.

Quotas on cotton marketing may be proclaimed when the total supply reaches 108 percent of a normal supply.

Tobacco production, which has been under quotas for some years, will remain under the quota system until voted out by the producers themselves according to the provisions of the 1938 law, as amended by the 1948 act. Quotas on grains and cotton may also be voted when the average farm price does not exceed 66 percent of parity during three successive months of a marketing year.

It is believed that quotas will seldom be resorted to on grain because of the encouragement which the act provides for the marketing of grain in the form of meats, dairy, and poultry products. In the event that it is necessary to impose quotas on any crop, it would naturally follow that the farm income of the producers of such crop would drop because of the lower production permitted. Therefore, in order to make sure that farm income will not drop to unreasonably low levels, the Agricultural Act of 1948 provides that a 20-percent premium will be added to the support floor level whenever quotas are in force.

The law, however, does not permit support prices to exceed the 90 percent of parity level, except in the interest of national security. It is provided that whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines, after a public hearing, that national security requires a support level greater than 90 percent of parity, he may prescribe such level as "is necessary in order to increase or maintain the production of any agricultural commodity in the interest of national security."

There is also an escape clause provided for in paragraph (F), section 201, which will permit the Secretary, after public hearings, to adjust the parity price of any commodity should it be found that the parity price of such commodity is seriously out of line with other commodities. It is believed that this provision will seldom, if ever, need to be resorted to. The revision of the formula for determining parity prices will result in lowering the price of certain important commodities as much as from 10 percent to 20 percent below what they would be under the old parity formula or the one which is being used at present.

In order that such drop may not be too abrupt, the act provides that there shall be no reduction in 1 year greater than 5 percent of the old parity price during the transitional period. This provision will enable the producers of the surplus crops to convert to the production of other commodities over a reasonable period of time without incurring undue losses in the support level. Of course, after conversion from surplus production to the production of more needed commodities takes place, there will be a tendency for all agricultural commodities to find an equitable and comparable price level.

Some confusion has been created through printed articles criticizing the act for not providing the forward-pricing. The original bill before the Senate Agriculture Committee did not contemplate forward-pricing, but the act as passed by the Senate and agreed to by the House will permit forward-pricing of farm commodities.

Under the act, the Secretary can announce before planting time the minimum percentage level at which basic and nonbasic commodities will be supported. It is evident that critics of this provision of the bill have drawn their conclusions from the bill originally introduced rather than the act which was finally approved.

There has also been some criticism of the act by those who believe that it will force the Government extensively into the business of buying and selling farm commodities in supporting farm prices. These critics also have been drawing their conclusions from the bill which was introduced rather than the act itself. The act provides that the Secretary "is authorized to support prices of agricultural commodities to producers through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations."

This provision, authorizing the support of prices through payments, should go far in enabling the Secretary to keep out of the business of actually buying, taking title to, and selling farm commodities and thus hold to a minimum the amount of money necessary for the carrying out of the purposes of this act.

It was the intent of the Senate Agriculture Committee in writing the bill to encourage the handling of farm commodities through normal channels of trade to the maximum extent practicable. In fact, the committee believes that all means of securing markets for surpluses through the regular channels of trade should be exhausted before direct support should be resorted to. I quote from the last sentence of section 302 (a) of the act which reads:

> The Secretary shall in all cases give consideration to the practicability of supporting

prices indirectly, as by the development of improved merchandising methods, rather than directly by purchase or loan.

The Secretary is authorized to support prices for both basic and nonbasic commodities through the Commodity Credit Corporation, but it is further provided:

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not carry out any operation to support the price of any nonbasic agricultural commodity (other than Irish potatoes) which is so perishable in nature as not to be reasonably storable without excessive loss or excessive cost.

It is not intended that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall engage in the business of supporting commodity prices, where substantial losses may be expected. Any support operations of nonbasic commodities upon which losses may reasonably be expected are to be carried out by the Secretary through other means available to him, such as those provided by section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, and for this purpose the act provides that section 32 funds may accumulate to the extent of $300,000,000.

The act also provides means by which the Commodity Credit Corporation may dispose of any commodities acquired by it for certain purposes and at such prices as are provided for in the act.

Such means of disposal are found in section 302 (a) (4) h, which I quote:

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at less than (1) a price determined on a pricing basis for its stocks of such commodity on hand, which makes due allowance for grade, type, quality, location, and other factors and which is reasonably calculated to reimburse it for costs incurred by it with respect to such stocks; (2) a price half-way between the support price, if any, and the parity price of such commodity; or (3) a price equivalent to 90 percent of the parity price of such commodity, whichever price is the lowest, except that the foregoing restrictions shall not apply to (A) sales for new or byproduct uses; (B) sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil; (C) sales for seed or feed if such sales will not substantially impair any price-support program; (D) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or of nonbasic perishable commodities where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage; (E) sales for the purpose of establishing claims against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity; (F) sales for export; (G) sales of wool; and (H) sales for other than primary uses.

It is believed that the disposal methods so prescribed will interfere with normal markets to a minimum degree if at all.

Mr. President, besides the Agricultural Act of 1948, the Eightieth Congress has enacted other legislation which will contribute greatly to the eventual completion of a sound program for agriculture.

Crop insurance will play a very important part in any complete program.

Unfortunately, the initial attempt at crop insurance authorized by the Congress in 1938 resulted in a loss of nearly a hundred million dollars, principally on cotton.

The Eightieth Congress has revised the Crop Insurance Act, putting it upon a sound experimental basis.

So far, the new program has proven workable and has operated without loss.

In a few years' time, we should know enough about crop insurance to broaden this program to a great degree.

The Eightieth Congress has also approved a new charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which gives permanent status to this important agency of Government, and with an authorization of $100,000,000 in capital stock.

One of the most important acts of this Congress intended to promote a prosperous agriculture has been the authorization of $800,000,000 in loans for rural electrification.

This is by far the largest authorization for this work given by any Congress.

At this rate, it will not be long before all farms in the United States, which can feasibly be provided with electric light and power, will have such light and power made available to them.

Large increases have also been made in appropriations for expanding a State-Federal secondary-road program.

Such an expansion in the farm-to-market highway program, which is five times as large as that appropriated for in any previous year, will greatly benefit both the farmers and consumers.

The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act was amended in June 1948 with the expectation that greater impetus will be given to the ownership of farms by those who now occupy them as tenants.

Many other laws of lesser importance have been enacted in the interest of a prosperous agriculture.

Our work is not done, however, but we have made remarkable strides in the right direction.

We still have before us further consideration of a general land-use policy and soil-improvement program.

The organization of the United States Department of Agriculture requires further examination in the interest of economical and efficient operation.

A competent committee of the Hoover Commission is now engaged in making such study and will undoubtedly have valuable recommendations to make to the Eighty-first Congress.

The entire farm credit structure should be thoroughly reviewed with a view to providing adequate agricultural credit efficiently and at the least cost.

We have the problem of getting food from the farm to the consumers, particularly low-income consumers, at more reasonable cost and by equitable distribution with the least possible disturbance to the normal channels of trade.

The study of American agriculture is and should be a never-ending process, but I state unequivocally—and the record bears me out—that the Eightieth Congress has made remarkable progress toward a more productive and prosperous agriculture.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a brief statement.

MAW ATTACK ON DEWEY WILL HAVE LITTLE EFFECT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, recently, attention has been focused upon statements alleged to have been made by Governor Dewey, the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States, relative to a school teachers' lobby.

The Democratic National Committee has issued statements by two New Deal governors, Governor Gruening, of Alaska, who is there by appointment of a Democratic President, and Governor Maw, of Utah.

The intent unquestionably was to turn the teachers of the United States against the Republican candidate. Governors Maw and Gruening are the committee's star witnesses. They were brought in to offset the Dewey denial.

The attempt of the Governor of my State, Herbert B. Maw, to picture Governor Dewey of New York as the enemy of the school teacher, through giving out what Mr. Maw claims were the remarks of Governor Dewey at a governors' conference held recently, has not been generally accepted at face value. His statement has been discussed by the famous veteran political writer, Gould Lincoln, in a feature article appearing in a recent issue of the Washington Star, an independent newspaper. Said Mr. Lincoln:

Even for election year midsummer politics this is on the childish side. Governor Dewey is the Republican nominee for President, otherwise neither Governor Maw nor the Democratic committee would have thought up such a charge. The school teachers of New York are better paid than the teachers in any other State of the Union or anywhere else in the world. The present salaries of the teachers are the results of increases given during Mr. Dewey's 6-year tenure of office as governor.

The Maw charge grows out of a desire to make political use of the antagonism of some of the more radical school teachers for Mr. Dewey because the New York Governor sponsored the Condon-Wadlin law enacted by the New York Legislature and approved by Governor Dewey which prohibits strikes by public employees. This was passed when public-school teachers in Buffalo were on strike.

It is not clear whether Governor Maw and the Democratic National Committee are in favor of permitting strikes by public employees, including school teachers. Perhaps it would help to clear the air if they would individually or collectively make a statement on that question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator knows, of course, that in the Taft-Hartley law there is a prohibition against striking by any Government employee. That law was voted for by a majority of the Democrats in the Senate. The same provision has been contained in a number of appropriation bills which have been approved by all the Democrats in the Senate. So that Governor Maw's position seems to be somewhat different from that of most of the Democrats in the Senate, at any rate.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for calling that fact to my attention.

I regret that the Governor of my State has brought himself into this controversy. It is not a pleasant thing to call to the attention of the people of the United States outside of Utah who may be fooled by what he has said, several facts in connection with the Governor.

In Utah he is regarded as a "coattail" governor, a governor who came into power in two elections on the coattails of Franklin D. Roosevelt. At each election Governor Maw ran from 48,000 to 50,000 votes behind his ticket—only getting by by narrow margins. This was generally regarded as a repudiation by thousands of Democrats who knew his record while he was a member of the State Legislature of Utah.

As far as Utah voters are concerned, no serious attention need be paid to what Governor Maw has said about Governor Dewey. It will not hurt Governor Dewey's chances in that State at all.

To the rest of the country it should be said that Governor Maw is the same person who made the charge that the Republican Congress was squeezing the lifeblood out of reclamation in the West and that it was destroying this program. It will be remembered that he said this in spite of the fact that the Eightieth Congress has made larger appropriations for both water and power development in the West than any other Congress in the history of the United States. The Republican record cannot be successfully challenged.

Governor Maw will also be remembered for making ultraconservative speeches at governors' conferences held outside Utah, while at home he so conducted himself that he became, and still is, the darling of radical New Dealers.

The article written by Mr. Lincoln is very interesting and instructive. I believe it is of sufficient interest that all Members of the Congress should have an opportunity to read it. I therefore request Mr. President, that the entire article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTACK ON DEWEY AS FOE OF TEACHERS IS CHILDISH—CAPITAL MADE OF BAN ON STRIKES BY NEW YORK PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

(By Gould Lincoln)

Utah's Governor Maw, through the Democratic National Committee, or vice versa, is undertaking to picture Governor Dewey of New York as the enemy of school teachers.

Even for election year midsummer politics this is on the childish side. Governor Dewey is the Republican nominee for President, otherwise neither Governor Maw nor the Democratic committee would have thought up such a charge. The school teachers of New York are better paid than the teachers in any other State of the Union or anywhere in the world. The present salaries of the teachers are the results of increases given during Mr. Dewey's 6-year tenure of office as Governor.

The Maw charge grows out of a desire to make political use of the antagonism of some of the more radical school teachers for Mr. Dewey because the New York Governor sponsored the Condon-Wadlin law enacted by the New York Legislature and approved by Governor Dewey which prohibits strikes by public employees. This was passed when public school teachers in Buffalo were on strike.

AIR SHOULD BE CLEARED

It is not clear whether Governor Maw and the Democratic National Committee are in favor of permitting strikes by public employees, including school teachers. Perhaps it would help to clear the air if they would individually or collectively make a statement on that question.

The Democratic administration, which has ruled in Washington for nearly 16 years, has been opposed to strikes by Goverment employees and properly so. President Truman, Governor Dewey's opponent in the Presidential race this year, has no use either for strikes by employees of those privately owned agencies which vitally affect the life of the American people. Indeed, Mr. Truman went so far as to ask of Congress legislation permitting him to draft railroad workers into the armed services so as to give him absolute power to keep them at work when a railroad strike was ordered.

It is a strange move now for the Democratic national organization to seek to indict Governor Dewey for being opposed to strikes by school teachers and other employees of the State. Governor Dewey, as a matter of fact, has an excellent record as Governor in his dealings with and attitude toward organized labor.

EWING HIT IN CHARGE

While this fantastic charge of unfriendliness to school teachers is laid against Governor Dewey, the Truman administration is accused by John W. Studebaker, for years United States Commissioner of Education, of preventing the Office of Education from "exposing the tactics and dangers of communism" in public and other schools. Mr. Studebaker complains that censorship was imposed on him and the Office of Education by Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, and also an officer of the Democratic National Committee. Mr. Ewing was a strong supporter of the nomination of President Truman and wanted to be his running mate.

Mr. Studebaker protested vigorously against this censorship. More recently he sent copies of a letter in which he made these charges against Mr. Ewing to members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. It was only on July 15 that Mr. Studebaker retired as Commissioner of Education. He charged that efforts were being made to soft-pedal the teaching of anticommunism in the schools.

The Office of Education is a part of the Federal Security Administration. If Mr. Studebaker's charges are true, it is another indication that the Democrats are playing up to the "Pinks" if not the Reds.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not intend to do more than state very briefly the present situation with respect to housing.

There are two bills before us, both substitutes for the House bill. I think that undoubtedly the debate on the subject will last some time, and Senators will wish to consider the bill so that they may understand exactly what the issues are. Therefore I shall not press for a vote this evening. When the Senate recesses, perhaps at 6 or 7 o'clock, it will recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. I hope that we may reach a vote on the housing question as early as possible tomorrow.

Mr. President, the general situation is that the House passed a bill before the recess in June, House bill 6959. That bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

The subcommittee of that committee prepared a bill, which appears in the so-called committee print which is before the Senate, and which I think Senators will find on their desks. That bill incorporates various portions of Senate bill 866, which was passed by the Senate and ignored by the House. I think it contains one or two provisions of H. R. 6959, and contains one or two additional measures which have come up attempting in general to straighten out difficulties which have arisen in the housing situation. I shall speak somewhat more at length on the bill a little later.

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, however, rejected the subcommittee report, and by a vote of 7 to 5, I think it was, and substituted instead the original Senate bill 866 as it passed the Senate. So that the Senate now has before it H. R. 6959, with a committee amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting S. 866. It is my understanding the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. MCCARTHY) will offer the subcommittee substitute which appears in the committee print, and the main issue in the Senate therefore will be between S. 866 as recommended by the committee as a substitute, and the subcommittee substitute.

The principal difference lies in the fact that the subcommittee substitute does not include any low-rent subsidized housing, nor does it include the urban redevelopment. Those are the main differences between the bills.

I merely desired to state the situation. I shall deal later with what is in the bills.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to propound one question. Is the bill which has now been reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency in the identical language of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which was passed in the last days of the last session?

Mr. TAFT. I think there are some minor differences. For instance, the paraplegic section has already been passed in a different bill, and I think there are one or two other changes.

Mr. TOBEY. There is no salient change at all.

Mr. LUCAS. No important changes?

Mr. TAFT. No.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I think I can answer rather more specifically the question asked by the Senator from Illinois. We eliminated section 603, which is the most inflationary provision in the T-E-W bill. Title II of FHA has demonstrated such strength that the inflationary 603 referring to poor-family housing is not required. We have also made certain corrections in the secondary mortgage-market provision, commonly known as the Jenner bill, passed on the last day of the regular session to replace title II of the T-E-W bill. I will say that the Jenner bill has met with administrative difficulties, and the changes we have made are changes which were suggested by the subcommittee in the subcommittee bill.

As stated, we also eliminated title VIII of the T-E-W bill, the paraplegic provision.

Mr. McCARTHY obtained the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. President, there is an admonition of the Scriptures to avoid vain repetitions. The action contemplated by taking a vote this afternoon is in my judgment another vain repetition. Here on my desk is paper, here are books, here are pamphlets, here are hearings, here is evidence, coming down through the years, 3 or 4 years, and embodied in these and many more I could bring here are countless and endless data and voluminous testimony on housing.

The Senate took these data to heart and twice passed a bill favoring the issues which are deleted from the housing bill by the substitute of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. So the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, as handled by the special committee, came in devoid of the two salients, namely, public housing and slum clearance, and those of us who from conviction believe that this Nation needs public housing and slum clearance to make a start in this great improvement in human affairs, stand solidly against the substitution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to call the Senator's attention to another very important provision left out of the substitute, that is, the one relating to rural housing.

Mr. TOBEY. I was just coming to that. That was considered on the floor of the Senate and adopted by the Senate last spring.

Here is the issue, Mr. President. We are going to vote today or tomorrow on whether, under the aegis of the Senator from Wisconsin, we shall strike from the housing bill provisions for public housing, slum clearance and urban rehabilitation. I think the issue is perfectly clear. I believe that the vote was 49 to 33 the last time the question was voted on, in April or May, when the Senate repudiated the effort to strike out public housing. We have taken our stand. Now gentlemen come to us and say, "If you pass this bill you will have no public housing."

Mr. President, I do not like ultimatums, and never did. They sometimes breed war. But I accept that challenge, wherever it comes from, that "If you pass this bill with public housing and slum clearance in it, which twice was passed, you are not going to get any housing legislation." But Mr. President, whoever is saying this may be playing poker. Let us find out who is controlling the interests of humanity in this country. Where has government of the people, for the people, and by the people gone if one man, the head of a powerful committee of one branch of Congress, may say, "We will not let the people's representatives vote on public housing, slum clearance, and urban rehabilitation"? That is the essence of the matter before us, and that is the issue. On that issue I accept the challenge. And I will see those from whence that challenge comes—well, Senators know where—in any part of the Capitol, any time. [Laughter.]

Now ladies and gentlemen in the galleries, and the public at large, and the Congress, let me say that there is just one duty on us this afternoon: That is to back up the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; repudiate any substitution for it, and carry it through, as we are all pledged to do, both great parties having pledged themselves to it, having expressed their deep interest in public housing for the common people of the country, and let us give homes to people who are underprivileged, so they can say, "It is a good land after all. Thank God for the privilege of living in America where home life is placed over everything else."

As Calvin Coolidge, when he was at the other end of the Avenue, so well said:

> Look well to the hearths of America. There all hope for our safety lies. If anything happens to the hearthstones, to the homes, the roofs over the people's heads, and if there will not be decent living there and an era of good feeling and contentment, look out for your country, my friends.

I believe it not only ought to be a matter of politics with us, but a principle of our religion.

Some 2,000 years ago it was said:

> Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ.

He, Paul, also said:

> We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves.

Is that not so? If anyone thinks it is not so there is something wrong with him. And, Mr. President, there is something wrong with any group or with any party that is not moved by those words.

We are here only 60 or 70 years, and then for us there will be no tomorrow on earth. Let it be said of the Eightieth Congress in this brief session: "They measured up to a great trust, they kept faith with the common people; they carried through consistently what they have done twice before."

A bas! Get out with your substitutes! We stand by the great principles of humanity, adequate public housing and slum clearance.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Hampshire takes his seat will he yield to me?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is there anything that has occurred since the Senate adjourned that should change the vote of anyone who voted for this bill during the last session of Congress?

Mr. TOBEY. By no stretch of the imagination could I conceive of anything.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator, of course, has followed this matter very closely, and I was wondering whether or not he believed there was anything in the question of economy or politics or anything of that kind which would create any different vote from what we had here in the closing days of the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. TOBEY. The answer is "No." I may say to the Senator, while I am on my feet, that in my 15 years in both branches of Congress I have never seen any measure which had such a broad, bipartisan approach and support as there has been to this housing measure on the floor of the Senate of the United States. The record will show that.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from New Hampshire accepts the challenge of one individual in the Congress who has prohibited the representatives of the people from voting their convictions one way or the other upon what seems to me to be one of the most vital questions that face the American people today.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Taylor
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments, one labeled A and one labeled B. I should now like to call up amendment A and ask for its immediate consideration. In view of the length of the amendment, I ask unanimous consent that its reading be waived, and that it be printed in the RECORD. Senators will find the amendment on their desks in the committee print of House bill 6959, beginning on page 55 and continuing through page 94.

Before proceeding with this method of calling up the amendments, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] to the fact that, as they know, there are various ways in which we can get a vote between the two bills at this time. I believe that the clearest way is by calling up my amendments, as perfecting amendments to the House bill, as I propose to do unless there is objection on their part, so as first to perfect the House bill, and then let the Senator from Vermont make his motion to substitute the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am not clear as to the parliamentary procedure suggested. By unanimous consent the "measure"—or whatever term it was decided the other day to use—before the Senate, I understand to be the housing bill, as reported, which is House bill 6959, with a somewhat modified Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as an amendment, in a measure of substitution. Just what status does the proposal made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin have?

Mr. McCARTHY. May I give the Senator the picture?

Mr. FLANDERS. I am making a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request made by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator from Vermont reserving the right to object?

Mr. FLANDERS. I am inquiring as to the parliamentary situation, to find out whether or not such a course is feasible. I am directing the question to the Chair.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I merely asked for consent to print the amendment in the RECORD and waive its reading, because of the length of the amendment, and because Senators have the amendment on their desks.

Mr. FLANDERS. As I understand, that has been agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am calling up a perfecting amendment to the House bill, House bill 6959, at this time. As I stated, I do not feel strongly about handling it in this manner. If the Senator from Vermont has any serious objection, I should be glad to consider it. By following this procedure, which, of course, I have the right to follow, we can perfect the House bill by offering two amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that the Senator offer a substitute for the committee substitute. It seems to me that then the issue would be clear.

Mr. McCARTHY. The reason I have not done so is that a number of Senators feel that they would be obliged to offer perfecting amendments to the committee substitute.

Mr. TAFT. That is all right.

Mr. McCARTHY. A great deal of time would be wasted by so doing. I think we shall have a much clearer issue if we first offer our subcommittee bill in this fashion, as a substitute for the House bill. The only way I can do that——

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish. The only way I can do that, I think, is to offer it in the form of perfecting amendments. I have split the bill into two amendments. That will give us precedence in voting. As I say, I do not feel strongly about it. A number of Senators have told me that they would like to dispose of this issue first.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I very much fear that the Senator from Wisconsin is going to get us into an interminable parliamentary tangle. I am very much in favor of the revised Taft bill which the Senator wishes to offer as a substitute for what the committee actually reported.

There is only one clear, safe procedure to follow. First we have a House bill, and then we have a committee amendment to the House bill. Unless the Senator from Wisconsin offers a complete substitute for the committee amendment, there will be confusion about the voting, and we shall wind up with a futility. I beg the Senator from Wisconsin not to follow the procedure which he has indicated, by offering a number of separate perfecting amendments. Let us do the job with one amendment. The Senator has the entire bill before him. We discussed it in committee. The Senator knows what members of the committee are with him, and we know what is in that bill. I beg the Senator to proceed with the substitute, and have a clear-cut test, because in essence the bill which I want the Senator to offer as a substitute eliminates the public housing and redevelopment features of the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The remainder is a revision of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which the distinguished Senator from Ohio told us this morning was in his opinion an improvement over the original bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I did not say that. Later I shall make plain what I said.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. We know that there are many good features in the bill which the Senator from Wisconsin is sponsoring, and which I am prepared to support; but unless he offers it as a substitute, we shall be in a parliamentary tangle, and we shall not know whether we are going or coming, by the time we act on a number of different amendments, and have the question raised as to amendments in the second degree and amendments in the third degree. Something we want may be ruled out as an amendment too far removed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am glad to have the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio and the suggestion of the Senator from Virginia. I believe those suggestions are well taken. For that reason, Mr. President, I now offer amendments A and B as one amendment, as a substitute amendment, not for the original House bill 6959, but as a substitute for the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

The amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act be cited as the "Housing Act of 1948."

TITLE I—FHA TITLE VI AND TRANSITIONAL PERIOD AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

TITLE VI AMENDMENTS

(a) Section 603 (a) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$5,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,750,000,000 except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased to not to exceed $6,150,000,000";

(2) By striking out the second proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That no mortgage shall be insured under section 603 of this title after April 30, 1948, except (A) pursuant to a commitment to insure issued on or before April 30, 1948, or (B) a mortgage given to refinance an existing mortgage insured under section 603 of this title and which does not exceed the original principal amount and unexpired term of such existing mortgage, and no mortgage shall be insured under section 608 of this title after March 31, 1949, except (i) pursuant to a commitment to insure issued on or before March 31, 1949, or (ii) a mortgage given to refinance an existing mortgage insured under section 608 of this title and which does not exceed the original principal amount and unexpired term of such existing mortgage: *Provided further*, That no mortgage shall be insured under section 608 of this title unless the mortgagor certifies under oath that in selecting tenants for the property covered by the mortgage he will not discriminate against any family by reason of the fact that there are children in the family, and that he will not sell the property while the insurance is in effect unless the purchaser so certifies, such certifications to be filed with the Administrator; and violation of any such certification shall be a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not to exceed $500:".

(b) Section 608 (b) (3) (B) is amended by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That the principal obligation of the mortgage shall not, in any event, exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located; and".

(c) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$1,500 per room" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,100 per family unit"; and

(2) By striking out the colon and the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(d) Section 609 is amended—

(1) By striking out all of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding purchase contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator providing for the purchase and delivery of the houses to be manufactured, which contracts shall provide for the payment of the purchase price at such time as may be agreed to by the parties thereto, but, in no event, shall the purchase price be payable on a date in excess of 30 days after the date of delivery of such houses, unless not less than 20 percent of such purchase price is paid on or before the date of delivery and the lender has accepted and discounted or has agreed to accept and discount, pursuant to subsection (i) of this section a promissory note or notes, executed by the purchaser, representing the unpaid portion of such purchase price, in which event such unpaid portion of the purchase price may be payable on a date not in excess of 180 days from the date of delivery of such houses;".

(2) By striking out the first and second sentences of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost, exclusive of profit, of manufacturing the houses, which are the subject of such purchase contracts assigned to secure the loan, less any sums paid by the purchaser under said purchase contracts prior to the assignment thereof. The loan shall be secured by

an assignment of the aforesaid purchase contracts and of all sums payable thereunder on or after the date of such assignment, with the right in the assignee to proceed against such security in case of default as provided in the assignment, which assignment shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Administrator; and the Administrator may require such other agreements and undertakings to further secure the loan as he may determine, including the right, in case of default or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses then owned and in the possession of the borrower."

(3) By adding at the end of subsection (f) the following new sentence: "The provisions of section 603 (d) shall also be applicable to loans insured under this section and the reference in said section 603 (d) to a mortgage shall be construed to include a loan or loans with respect to which a contract of insurance is issued pursuant to this section."

(4) By adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) (1) In addition to the insurance of the principal loan to finance the manufacture of housing, as provided in this section, and in order to provide short-term financing in the sale of houses to be delivered pursuant to the purchase contract or contracts assigned as security for such principal loan, the Administrator is authorized, under such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe, to insure the lender against any losses it may sustain resulting from the acceptance and discount of a promissory note or notes executed by a purchaser of any such houses representing an unpaid portion of the purchase price of any such houses. No such promissory note or notes accepted and discounted by the lender pursuant to this subsection shall involve a principal obligation in excess of 80 percent of the purchase price of the manufactured house or houses; have a maturity in excess of 180 days from the date of the note or bear interest in excess of 4 percent per annum; nor may the principal amount of such promissory notes, with respect to any individual principal loan, outstanding and unpaid at any one time, exceed in the aggregate an amount prescribed by the Administrator.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to include in any contract of insurance executed by him with respect to the insurance of a loan to finance the manufacture of houses, provisions to effectuate the insurance against any such losses under this subsection.

"(3) The failure of the purchaser to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of any note or notes executed by the purchaser and accepted and discounted by the lender under the provisions of this subsection, shall be considered as a default under this subsection, and if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the lender shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance, as provided in subsection (d) of this section except that debentures issued pursuant to this subsection shall have a face value equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan plus interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of default to the date the application is filed for the insurance benefits.

"(4) Debentures issued with respect to the insurance granted under this subsection shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date application is filed for the insurance benefits and shall bear interest from such date.

"(5) The Administrator is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this subsection, in addition to the premium charge authorized under subsection (h) of this section. Such premium charge shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the original principal of such promissory note or notes and shall be paid at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator."

(e) Section 610 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Administrator is further authorized to insure or to make commitments to insure in accordance with the provisions of this section any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any of the so-called Greenbelt towns, or parts thereof, including projects, or parts thereof, known as Greenhills, Ohio; Greenbelt, Md.; and Greendale, Wis., developed under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, or of any of the village properties under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and any mortgage executed in connection with the first resale, within 2 years from the date of its acquisition from the Government, of any portion of a project or property which is the security for a mortgage insured pursuant to the provisions of this section."

(f) Title VI is amended by adding after section 610 the following new section:

"SEC. 611. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under other sections of this title, and in order to assist and encourage the application of cost-reduction techniques through large-scale modernized site construction of housing and the erection of houses produced by modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Administrator as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"(2) cover property, held by a mortgagor approved by the Administrator, upon which there is to be constructed or erected dwelling units for not less than 25 families consisting of a group of single-family dwellings approved by the Administrator for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That during the course of construction there may be located upon the mortgaged property a plant for the fabrication or storage of such dwellings or sections or parts thereof, and the Administrator may consent to the removal or release of such plant from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may approve;

"(3) involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(A) not to exceed 80 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the completed property or project, exclusive of any plant of the character described in paragraph (2) of this subsection located thereon, and

"(B) not to exceed a sum computed on the individual dwellings comprising the total project as follows: $6,000 or 80 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each single-family dwelling.

"With respect to the insurance of advances during construction, the Administrator is authorized to approve advances by the mortgagee to cover the cost of materials delivered upon the mortgaged property and labor performed in the fabrication or erection thereof;

"(4) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time: *Provided*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest, not exceeding 4½ percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, if he finds that the mortgage market demands it. The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"(c) Preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for veterans of World War II and their immediate families and for hardship cases as defined by the Administrator shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(d) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 608 shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

TITLE II AMENDMENTS

(g) Section 203 (b) (2) (B) is amended by striking out "$5,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,360."

(h) Section 203 (b) (2) (C) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$8,600" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,500";

(2) By striking out "$6,000" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,000";

(3) By striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,000."

(i) Section 203 (b) is amended by striking out in paragraph numbered (3) the following: "of the character described in paragraph (2) (B) of this subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "on property approved for insurance prior to the beginning of construction."

(j) Section 203 (b) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) (C), inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or", and adding the following new paragraph:

"(D) not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 90 percent of the appraised value, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance (or 95 percent if, in the determination of the Administrator, insurance of mortgages involving a principal obligation in such amount under this paragraph would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities for families of moderate income), of a property, urban, suburban, or rural, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That the Administrator may by regulation provide that the principal obligation of any mortgage eligible for insurance under this paragraph shall be fixed at a lesser amount than $6,000 where he finds that for any section of the country or at any time a lower-cost dwelling for families of lower income is feasible without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability: *And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages insured under this paragraph the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 10 percent (or 5 percent, in the case of a 95 percent mortgage insured pursuant to this paragraph (D)) of the appraised value in cash or its equivalent, or shall be the builder constructing the dwelling in which case the principal obligation shall not exceed 85 percent of the appraised value of the property."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph numbered (3), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 30 years in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(3) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph numbered (5), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 4 percent per annum in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(k) (1) Section 203 (c) is amended (1) by striking out in the last sentence the words "section or section 210" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "title"; and (2) by striking out in said sentence the words "under this section."

(2) Sections 203 (c) and 603 (c) of such act are amended by striking out in the last sentence and in the next to the last sentence, respectively, the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

(l) Section 204 (a) is amended—

(1) By striking out, in the last sentence, the following: "prior to July 1, 1944,";

(2) By inserting between the first and second provisos in the last sentence the following: "*And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages which are accepted for insurance under section 203 (b) (2) (D) or under the second proviso of section 207 (c) (2) of this act, there may be included in the debentures issued by the Administrator on account of the cost of foreclosure (or of acquiring the property by other means) actually paid by the mortgagee and approved by the Administrator an amount, not in excess of two-thirds of such cost or $75 whichever is the greater:".

(m) Section 207 (b) is amended by amending paragraph numbered (1) to read as follows:

"(1) Federal or State instrumentalities, municipal corporate instrumentalities of one or more States, or limited dividend or redevelopment or housing corporations restricted by Federal or State laws or regulations of State banking or insurance departments as to rents, charges, capital structure, rate of return, or methods of operation; or."

(n) Section 207 (c) is amended—

(1) By amending the first sentence to read as follows:

"(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage on any property or project shall involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(1) not to exceed $5,000,000, or, if executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, not to exceed $50,000,000;

"(2) not to exceed 80 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed, including the land; the propesed physical improvements; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Administrator: *Provided*, That, except with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, such mortgage shall not exceed the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project, exclusive of public utilities and streets and organization and legal expenses: *And provided further*, That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph No. (2), a mortgage with respect to a project to be constructed in a locality or metropolitan area where, as determined by the Administrator, there is a need for new dwellings for families of lower income at rentals comparable to the rentals proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project (or, in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporation, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members) may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed, except that in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II, the principal obligation may be in an amount not exceeding 95 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed; and

"(3) not to exceed $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, except that in the case of projects of the character described in the second proviso of section 207 (c) (2), if the Administrator finds that the needs of the members of any such corporation could more adequately be met by per room cost limitations, the mortgage may involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed $1,800 per room for such part of such project as may be attributable to dwelling use."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of the second sentence, inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and adding the following: "except that with respect to mortgages insured under the provisions of the second proviso of paragraph No. (2) of this subsection, which mortgages are hereby authorized to have a maturity of not exceeding 40 years from the date of the insurance of the mortgage, such interest rate shall not exceed 4 percent per annum."

(3) By adding the following additional sentence at the end thereof: "Such property or project may include such commercial and community facilities as the Administrator deems adequate to serve the occupants."

(o) Section 207 (g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the number "2" appearing in clause (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "1."

(p) Section 207 (h) is amended by striking out, in paragraph No. (1), the words "paid to the mortgagor of such property", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund."

(q) Section 204 (f) is amended by inserting in clause No. (1), immediately preceding the semicolon, the following: "if the mortgage was insured under section 203 and shall be retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund if the mortgage was insured under section 207."

(r) Section 207 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(q) In order to assure an adequate market for mortgages on cooperative-ownership projects and rental-housing projects for families of lower income and veterans of the character described in the second proviso of paragraph No. (2) of subsection (c) of this section, the powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association and of any other Federal corporation or other Federal agency hereafter established, to make real-estate loans, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, or partial interests therein, may be utilized in connection with projects of the character described in said proviso."

TITLE I AMENDMENTS

(s) Section 2 is amended:

(1) By striking out "$165,000,000" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000,000";

(2) By striking out "$3,000" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,500";

(3) By striking out the first proviso in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $10,000 and having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure used or to be used as an apartment house or a dwelling for two or more families;";

(4) By striknig out the last sentence of subsection (b).

SEC. 102. In order to aid housing production, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans to and purchase the obligations of any business enterprise for the purpose of providing financial assistance for the production of prefabricated houses or prefabricated housing components, or for large-scale modernized site construction. Such loans or purchases shall be made under such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Corporation may determine: *Provided*, That to the extent that the proceeds of such loans or purchases are used for the purchase of equipment, plant, or machinery the principal obligation shall not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of such equipment, plant, or machinery: *And provided further*, That the total amount of commitments for loans made and obligations purchased under this section shall not exceed $50,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and no financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless it is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

SEC. 103. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of section 500 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*And provided further*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest than otherwise prescribed in this section for loans guaranteed under this title, but not exceeding 4½ percent per annum, if he finds that the loan market demands it."

TITLE II—SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI HOME LOANS AND FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION INSURED MORTGAGES

SEC. 201. Section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "which are insured after April 30, 1948, under section 203 or section 603 of this act, or guaranteed under section 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "which are insured after April 30, 1948, under title II, or title VI of this act, or guaranteed after April 30, 1948, under section 501, or section 502, or section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended."

SEC. 202. Paragraph (E) of the proviso of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause No. (2) the figure "25" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "50."

TITLE III—STANDARDIZED BUILDING CODES AND MATERIALS

SEC. 301. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall undertake and conduct technical research and studies to develop and promote the acceptance and application of improved and standardized building codes and regulations and methods for the more uniform administration thereof, and standardized dimensions and methods for the assembly of home-building materials and equipment.

SEC. 302. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator shall utilize, to the fullest extent feasible, the available facilities of other departments, independent establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government, and, notwithstanding any other law, shall appoint a Director to administer under his general supervision the provisions of this title.

SEC. 303. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE IV—EQUITY INVESTMENT AIDS

SEC. 401. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new title:

"TITLE VII—INSURANCE FOR INVESTMENTS IN RENTAL HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME

"AUTHORITY TO INSURE

"SEC. 701. The purpose of this title is to supplement the existing systems of mortgage insurance for rental housing under this act by a special system of insurance designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing at rents within the capacity of families of moderate income. To effectuate this purpose, the Administrator is authorized, upon application by the investor, to insure as hereinafter provided, and, prior to the execution of insurance contracts and upon such terms as the Administrator shall prescribe, to make commitments to insure, the minimum annual amortization charge and an annual return on the outstanding investment of such investor in any project which is eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided in an amount (herein called the 'insured annual return') equal to such rate of return, not exceeding 2¾ percent per annum, on such outstanding investments as shall, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, be fixed in the insurance contract or in the commitment to insure: *Provided*, That any insurance contract made pursuant to this title shall expire as of the first day of the operating year for which the outstanding investment amounts to not more than 10 percent of the established investment: *And provided further*, That the aggregate amount of contingent liabilities outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure made pursuant to this title shall not exceed $1,000,000,000.

"ELIGIBILITY

"SEC. 702. (a) To be eligible for insurance under this title, a project shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The Administrator shall be satisfied that there is, in the locality or metropolitan area of such project, a need for new rental dwellings at rents comparable to the rents proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project.

"(2) Such project shall be economically sound, and the dwellings in such project shall be acceptable to the Administrator as to quality, design, size, and type.

"(b) Any insurance contract executed by the Administrator under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the project and the investor for such insurance, and the validity of any insurance contract so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an investor from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such investor.

"PREMIUMS AND FEES

"SEC. 703. (a) For insurance granted pursuant to this title the Administrator shall fix and collect a premium charge in an amount not exceeding one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year for which such premium charge is payable without taking into account the excess earnings, if any, applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment. Such premium charge shall be payable annually in advance by the investor, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Administrator under this title at par plus accrued insert: *Provided*, That, if in any operating year the gross income shall be less than the operating expenses, the premium charge payable during such operating year shall be waived, but only to the extent of the amount of the difference between such expenses and such income and subject to subsequent payment out of any excess earnings as hereinafter provided.

"(b) With respect to any project offered for insurance under this title, the Administrator is authorized to charge and collect reasonable fees for examination, and for inspection during the construction of the project: *Provided*, That such fees shall not aggregate more than one-half of 1 percent of the estimated investment.

"RENTS

"SEC. 704. The Administrator shall require that the rents for the dwellings in any project insured under this title shall be established in accordance with a rent schedule approved by the Administrator, and that the investor shall not charge or collect rents for any dwellings in the project in excess of the appropriate rents therefor as shown in the latest rent schedule approved pursuant to this section. Prior to approving the initial or any subsequent rent schedule pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall find that such schedule affords reasonable assurance that the rents to be established thereunder are (1) not lower than necessary, together with all other income to be derived from or in connection with the project, to produce reasonably stable revenues sufficient to provide for the payment of the operating expenses, the minimum annual amortization charge, and the minimum annual return; and (2) not higher than necessary to meet the need for dwellings for families of moderate income.

"EXCESS EARNINGS

"SEC. 705. For all of the purposes of any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, 50 percent of the excess earnings, if any, for any operating year may be applied, in addition to the minimum annual return, to return on the outstanding investment but only to the extent that such application thereof does not result in an annual return of more than 5 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year, and the balance of any such excess earnings shall be applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment: *Provided*, That if in any preceding operating years the gross income shall have been less than the operating expenses, such excess earnings shall be applied to the extent necessary in whole or in part, first, to the reimbursement of the amount of the difference between such expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and such income, and, second, to the payment of any premium charges previously waived hereunder.

"FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

"SEC. 706. With respect to each project insured under this title, the Administrator shall provide that, after the close of each operating year, the investor shall submit to him for approval a financial and operating statement covering such operating year. If any such financial and operating statement shall not have been submitted or, for proper cause, shall not have been approved by the Administrator, payment of any claim submitted by the investor may, at the option of the Administrator, be withheld, in whole or in part, until such statement shall have been submitted and approved.

"PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

"SEC. 707. If in any operating year the net income of a project insured under this title is less than the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return, the Administrator, upon submission by the investor of a claim for the payment of the amount of the difference between such net income and the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return and after proof of the validity of such claim, shall pay to the investor, in cash from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, the amount of such difference, as determined by the Administrator, but not exceeding, in any event, an amount equal to the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return.

"DEBENTURES

"SEC. 708. (a) If the aggregate of the amounts paid to the investor pursuant to section 707 hereof with respect to a project insured under this title shall at any time equal or exceed 15 percent of the established investment, the Administrator thereafter shall have the right, after written notice to the investor of his intentions so to do, to acquire, as of the first day of any operating year, such project in consideration of the issuance and delivery to the investor of debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year. In any such case the investor shall be obligated to convey to said Administrator title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and, in the event that the investor fails so to do, said Administrator may, at his option, terminate the insurance contract.

"(b) If in any operating year the aggregate of the differences between the operating expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and the gross income for the preceding operating years, less the aggregate of any deficits in such operating expenses reimbursed from excess earnings as hereinbefore provided, shall at any time equal or exceed 5 percent of the established investment, the investor shall thereafter have the right, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, to convey to the Administrator, as of the first day of any operating year, title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and to receive from the Administrator debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(c) Any difference, not exceeding $50, between 90 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year in which a project is acquired by the Administrator pursuant to this section and the total face value of the debentures to be issued and delivered to the investor pursuant to this section shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Administrator to the investor from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund.

"(d) Upon the acquisition of a project by the Administrator pursuant to this section, the insurance contract shall terminate.

"(e) Debentures issued under this title to any investor shall be executed in the name of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Administrator, by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. Such debentures shall be dated as of the first day of the operating year in which the project for which such debentures were issued was acquired by the Administrator, shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the insurance contract was executed, but not to exceed 2¾ percent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, and shall mature on the 1st day of July in such calendar year or years, not later than the fortieth following the date of the issuance thereof, as shall be determined by the Administrator and stated on the face of such debentures.

"(f) Such debentures shall be in such form and in such denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and may include such provisions for redemption as shall be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be issued in either coupon or registered form.

"(g) Such debentures shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, shall be payable out of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, which shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed, as to both the principal thereof and the interest thereon, by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the Housing Investment Insurance Fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or the interest on any debentures so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon, to the extent of the amount so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such debentures.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real and other property by the United States, the Administrator shall have power, for the protection of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, to pay out of said fund all expenses or charges in connection with, and to deal with, complete, reconstruct, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, make contracts for the management of, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash or credit or lease in his discretion, in whole or in part, any project acquired pursuant to this title; and, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator shall also have power to pursue to final collection by way of compromise or otherwise all claims acquired by, or assigned or transferred to, him in connection with the acquisition or disposal of any project pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract for hazard insurance, or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of any project acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such purchase or contract does not exceed $1,000.

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 709. The investor, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, may terminate, as of the close of any operating year, any insurance contract made pursuant to this title. The Administrator shall prescribe the events and conditions under which said Administrator shall have the option to terminate any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, and the events and conditions under which said Administrator may reinstate any insurance contract terminated pursuant to this section or section 708 (a). If any insurance contract is terminated pursuant to this section, the Administrator may require the investor to pay an adjusted premium charge in such amount as the Administrator determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges which such investor otherwise would have been required to pay if such insurance contract had not been so terminated.

"INSURANCE FUND

"SEC. 710. There is hereby created a Housing Investment Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Administrator as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. For this purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Administrator such funds as the Administrator shall deem necessary, but not to exceed $10,000,000, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, inspection and other fees, service charges, and any other income received by the Administrator under this title, together with all earnings on the assets of such Housing Investment Insurance Fund, shall be credited to said fund. All payments made pursuant to claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, cash adjustments, the principal of and interest on debentures issued under this title, expenses incurred in connection with or as a consequence of the acquisition and disposal of projects acquired under this title, and all administrative expenses in connection with this title, shall be paid from said fund. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all approved claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, and, in the event said fund fails to make any such payment when due, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the investor the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Moneys in the Housing Investment Insurance Fund not needed for current operations under this title shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of said fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed by, the United States. The Administrator may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under this title. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 711. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Administrator under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 712. The Administrator may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title, including, without limiting the foregoing, rules and regulations relating to the maintenance by the investor of books, records, and accounts with respect to the project and the examination of such books, records, and accounts by representatives of the Administrator; the submission of financial and operating statements and the approval thereof; the submission of claims for payments under insurance contracts, the proof of the validity of such claims, and the payment or disallowance thereof; the increase of the established investment if the investor shall make capital improvements or additions to the project; the decrease of the established investment if the investor shall sell part of the project; and the reduction of the outstanding investment for the appropriate operating year or operating years pending the restoration of dwelling or nondwelling facilities damaged by fire or other casualty. With respect to any investor which is subject to supervision or regulation by a State banking, insurance, or other State department or agency, the Administrator may, in carrying out any of his supervisory and regulatory functions with respect to projects insured under this title, utilize, contract with, and act through, such department or agency and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 713. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

"(a) 'Investor' shall mean (1) any natural person; (2) any group of not more than 10 natural persons; (3) any corporation, company, association, trust, or other legal entity; or (4) any combination of two or more corporations, companies, associations, trusts, or other legal entities, having all the powers necessary to comply with the requirements of this title, which the Administrator (i) shall find to be qualified by business experience and facilities, to afford assurance of the necessary continuity of long-term investment, and to have available the necessary capital required for long-term investment in the project, and (ii) shall approve as eligible for insurance under this title.

"(b) 'Project' shall mean a project (including all property, real and personal, contracts, rights, and choses in action acquired, owned, or held by the investor in connection therewith) of an investor designed and used primarily for the purpose of providing dwellings the occupancy of which is permitted by the investor in consideration of agreed charges: *Provided*, That nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting the inclusion in a project of such stores, offices, or other commercial facilities, recreational or community facilities, or other nondwelling facilities as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or desirable appurtenances to such project.

"(c) 'Estimated investment' shall mean the estimated cost of the development of the project, as stated in the application submitted to the Administrator for insurance under this title.

"(d) 'Established investment' shall mean the amount of the reasonable costs, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, carrying out all works and undertakings for the development of a project and shall include the premium charge for the first operating year and the cost of all necessary surveys, plans and specifications, architectural, engineering, or other special services, land acquisition, site preparation, construction, and equipment; a reasonable return on the funds of the investor paid out in course of the development of the project, up to and including the initial occupancy date; necessary expenses in connection with the initial occupancy of the project; and the cost of such other items as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the development of the project, (1) less the amount by which the rents and revenues derived from the project up to and including the initial occupancy date exceeded the reasonable and proper expenses, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, operating and maintaining said project up to and including the initial occupancy date, or (2) plus the amount by which such expenses exceeded such rents and revenues, as the case may be.

"(e) 'Physical completion date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which the Administrator determines that the construction of the project is substantially completed and substantially all of the dwellings therein are available for occupancy.

"(f) 'Initial occupancy date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which 90 percent in number of the dwellings in the project on the physical completion date shall have been occupied, but shall in no event be later than the last day of the sixth calendar month next following the physical completion date.

"(g) 'Operating year' shall mean the period of 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date and each succeeding period of 12 consecutive calendar months, and the period of the first 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date shall be the first operating year.

"(h) 'Gross income' for any operating year shall mean the total rents and revenues and other income derived from, or in connection with, the project during such operating year.

"(i) 'Operating expenses' for any operating year shall mean the amounts, as approved by the Administrator, necessary to meet the reasonable and proper costs of, and to provide for, operating and maintaining the project, and to establish and maintain reasonable and proper reserves for repairs, maintenance, and replacements, and other necessary reserves during such operating year, and shall include necessary expenses for real estate taxes, special assessments, premium charges made pursuant to this title, administrative expenses, the annual rental under any lease pursuant to which the real property comprising the site of the project is held by the investor, and insurance charges, together with such other expenses as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of the project, but shall not include income taxes.

"(j) 'Net income' for any operating year shall mean gross income remaining after the payment of the operating expenses.

"(k) 'Minimum annual amortization charge' shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment, except that, in the case of a project where the real property comprising the site thereof is held by the investor under a lease, if (notwithstanding the proviso of section 703 (a) hereof) the gross income for any operating year shall be less than the amount required to pay the operating expenses (including the annual rental under such lease), the minimum annual amortization charge for such operating year shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment plus the amount of the annual rental under such lease to the extent that the same is not paid from the gross income.

"(l) 'Annual return' for any operating year shall mean the net income remaining after the payment of the minimum annual amortization charge.

"(m) 'Insured annual return' shall have the meaning ascribed to it in section 701 hereof.

"(n) 'Minimum annual return' for any operating year shall mean an amount equal to 3½ percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(o) 'Excess earnings' for any operating year shall mean the net income derived from a project in excess of the minimum annual amortization charge and the minimum annual return.

"(p) 'Outstanding investment' for any operating year shall mean the established investment, less an amount equal to (1) the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge for each preceding operating year, plus (2) the aggregate of the excess earnings, if any, during each preceding operating year applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization in accordance with the provisions of section 705 hereof."

SEC. 402. Sections 1 and 5 of the National Housing Act, as amended, are hereby amended by striking out "titles II, III, and VI" wherever they appear in said sections and inserting in lieu thereof "titles II, III, VI, and VII."

TITLE V—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. (a) Effective upon the date of enactment of this act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $16,500 per annum, and the members of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner shall each receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

(b) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "Federal Housing Administration;" immediately after the semicolon which follows "United States Housing Corporation": *Provided*, That, as to the Federal Housing Administration, the audit required by section 105 of said act shall begin with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, and the exception contained in section 301 (d) of said act shall be construed to refer to the cost of audits contracted for prior to July 1, 1948.

SEC. 502. In carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties—

(a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Administrator may make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out such functions, powers, and duties and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. The Administrator may delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees as he may designate, and may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. The Administrator shall cause to be prepared for the Housing and Home Finance Agency an official seal of such device as he shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal. The Secretary of Commerce or his designee shall hereafter be included in the membership of the National Housing Council.

(b) The Public Housing Administration shall sue and be sued only with respect to its functions under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, as amended. The Public Housing Commissioner may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall hereafter be made hereunder, and shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees of the Public Housing Administration as he may designate; and make such rules and regulations as he may find necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. Funds made available for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Administration (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administration. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law except provisions of law hereafter enacted expressly in limitation hereof, the Public Housing Administration, or any State or local public agency administering a low-rent housing project assisted pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937 or title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it where such action is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such housing accommodations are administered, and, in determining net income for the purposes of tenant eligibility with respect to low-rent housing projects assisted pursuant to said acts, the Public Housing Administration is authorized, where it finds such action equitable and in the public interest, to exclude amounts or portions thereof paid by the United States Government for disability or death occurring in connection with military service.

(c) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board (which term as used in this section shall also include and refer to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board), the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, may, in addition to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities conferred elsewhere in this act—

(1) with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, accept and utilize equipment, facilities, or the services of employees of any State or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization and, in connection with the utilization of such services, may make payments for transportation while away from their homes or regular places of business and per diem in lieu of subsistence en route and at place of such service, in accordance with the provisions of 5 U. S. C. 73b–2;

(2) utilize, contract with, and act through, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, any Federal, State, or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, and any funds available to said officers for carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties shall be available to reimburse any such agency or organization; and, whenever in the judgment of any such officer necessary, he may make advance, progress, or other payments with respect to such contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes;

(3) make expenditures for all necessary expenses, including preparation, mounting, shipping, and installation of exhibits; purchase and exchange of technical apparatus; and such other expenses as may, from time to time, be found necessary in carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase or contract by said officers (or their agencies), respectively, for services or supplies if the amount thereof does not exceed $300: *And provided further*, That funds made available for administrative expenses in carrying out the functions, powers, and duties imposed upon the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, by or pursuant to law may at their option be consolidated into single administrative expense fund accounts of said officers or agencies for expenditure by them, respectively, in accordance with the provisions hereof.

ACT CONTROLLING

SEC. 503. Insofar as the provisions of any other law are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall be controlling.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 504. Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this act, all powers and authorities conferred by this act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. Notwithstanding any other evidences of the intention of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the controlling intent of Congress that if any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act or its applications to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provisions of this act, or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to make an inquiry which perhaps I should address to the Chair. Several Senators who have an amendment to offer to the bill are interested in this point. Would the suggestion made by the Senator from Wisconsin preclude us from offering a separate amendment to the bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know the parliamentary rules too well, so I would ask the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well; I address my inquiry to the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entitled to offer amendments to the committee substitute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me suggest that if the Senator does what he now proposes to do, if he offers a complete substitute for the committee substitute, both substitutes will be open to amendment before the final vote, of course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. And a Senator may offer an amendment to either the committee substitute or to the McCarthy substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, some days ago, at the request of the Senate leadership, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] appointed a three-man subcommittee to discuss the question of housing with the House Banking and Currency Committee. In accordance with that suggestion, the Senator from New Hampshire appointed the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] to meet with the House Banking and Currency Committee. We met with them. Several of the other members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee were present. We thought we had a rather fruitful discussion.

The House Banking and Currency Committee leadership took the position at that time that a special session is not the time at which to pass slum-clearance legislation or long-range public housing legislation. Regardless of whether we agree or disagree with that position, that was their position. They are very firm in that position.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the House leadership advised him that they did not feel that this special session was the time at which to pass legislation providing for slum clearance and public housing?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. Is that what the Senator said?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me refresh the Senator's memory for a moment, if he will permit, and let me ask him if this is true: Does the Senator ever remember any time since he has been a Member of the Senate when the House leadership even condescended to smile on legislation on that subject? As a matter of fact, they have had a rod in pickle as to those matters, to be used against them whenever they showed their heads. They have doomed them to extinction, so far as they are concerned, always.

Mr. McCARTHY. As the Senator recalls, I submitted proposed legislation on slum clearance last year; and the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] submitted proposed legislation very similar to it. At the time when we considered the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, as the Senator knows, I submitted various amendments to the public housing features of that bill.

Finally we compromised. As the Senator knows, I supported the slum-clearance and public-housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. So I wish that understood.

Mr. TOBEY. Of course, but the point is that in the past the House leadership has never favored that. It has not changed a bit. I wish the Members of the Senate to have that point clearly in mind.

Let me say, if the Senator will permit a question for 30 seconds, that if Senators wish to handle this matter properly, they should vote down every single amendment, in order to keep public-housing and slum-clearance provisions in the bill. Senators must not be deceived by words and verbiage that would result in removing those features from the bill. We should provide for public housing and for slum clearance; and in order to do that, we should vote down every amendment which would remove those provisions from the bill.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. President, as I have stated, the House leadership took the position that they would not accept public-housing legislation at this time or slum-clearance legislation. One of the members of the House of Representatives Banking and Currency Committee telephoned to me within the last 10 minutes and called to my attention one of the reasons why they take that position. He called my attention to part of the Republican Party platform dealing with housing, namely:

> We recommend Federal aid to the States for local slum-clearance and low-rental housing programs only where there is a need that cannot be met either by private enterprise or by the States and localities.

That is a different approach from the one you have been fighting for. Whether that approach would meet with the approval of the Senator from New Hampshire, I do not know; but again I point out that the House states bluntly that it will not accept slum-clearance legislation or public-housing legislation at this time. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire understands my point.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I understand.

Mr. McCARTHY. So the point is that if we are to have any housing legislation at this session, at least the House will not agree to have slum-clearance and public-housing provisions included in it.

We now have before us what the subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has agreed upon. We feel that the thing this bill will accomplish, above all else, will be the stimulation of the production of low-cost housing. By this bill we shall make the loans for lower-cost housing much more liberal than they previously have been made. We attempt to tighten up credit on the more expensive homes.

Let me review the bill briefly. First of all as to title VI—the much-disputed title—we have dropped from that title the section dealing with "for sale" housing. We felt that was too inflationary and that it stimulated the production of the more expensive types of homes.

However, we have retained section 608, the one dealing with rental housing. We provide for an additional $800,000,000 authorization.

I may say that we have talked to any number of men in the Housing Administration; and although their position is that they favor, as does the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], slum clearance and public housing, nevertheless they tell us that unless section 608 is reactivated there will be a great slump in home building during the present year. I think there is no doubt about that.

We have retained section 609. That is the section dealing with loans to prefabricated housing manufacturers. Substantially the only change which has been made, as compared with the law now in existence, is one to make it possible for the prefabricated housing manufacturers to get the loans which Congress intended them to get.

I may say that everything we have in this bill, everything that it contains, I believe, is endorsed 100 percent by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and, I believe, by everyone else interested in housing. If I misstate the Senator's position, I hope he will tell me so. I think the position the Senator from New Hampshire takes is that although everything we provide for in this bill is good and although it is an improvement over those sections of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill previously referred to, nevertheless the bill is incomplete unless public housing and slum clearance are provided for.

One of the new provisions we have made in this bill is for a 95-percent guaranty of loans on homes which cost $6,300 or less. Of course, the purpose is obvious. It is, in effect, to force contractors to concentrate on the lower-cost homes, because unless we make loans easier to

obtain on such homes, many persons will not be able to buy them, and there would be no use in building less expensive homes.

We have retained section 610, which merely has to do with the insurance of loans on war housing and loans on Greenbelt housing and loans for the purchase of the TVA village properties. I understand the Appropriations Committee has taken action indicating congressional desire that there be a disposal of those TVA villages.

We have retained section 611 of the T-E-W bill, but have made one major change, feeling that 611 as presently contained in the T-E-W bill is too inflationary. The maximum cost of a home under 611 of the present bill I believe is $9,000 or thereabouts. We have reduced that to $7,500. We have reduced the construction guaranty from 90 percent to 80 percent in an attempt to make that particular section of the bill less inflationary. I undertsand there is still some difference of opinion as to whether we should enact this section even in its present form, but our subcommittee unanimously agreed we should, in view of the fact that it concentrates solely on cheaper housing.

I might say I invite Senators to interrupt me at any time as I run through the measure, if they feel I am not making the provisions clear.

The title II provisions are substantially the same as title——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield merely for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I am not quite clear as to which draft the Senator is reading from in giving the numbers. I do not find those numbers in either of the drafts before me on the desk.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am referring to House bill 6959.

Mr. FLANDERS. The committee print, if the Senator will excuse me.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; it is the committee print.

Turning to page 55, under title I we deal with title VI of the National Housing Act. I know it is confusing. I am referring to what is in title I of the committee print, which deals with title VI of the National Housing Act. That is the emergency section which was passed during the late days of the war.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Before leaving this particular title, will the Senator point out the difference between the substitute he is offering and the committee substitute? Wherein is there a distinct difference?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator knows that we have three bills before us.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. We have the House bill, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and our subcommittee bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the Senator asking for a statement of the difference between this and the House bill, or between our bill and the T-E-W bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am asking for the difference between this and the House bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. The House bill has nothing in it whatever in regard to title VI, the reason for that being that the House sent over a separate bill extending title VI. Their bill extending title VI also included the so-called for-sale housing. We have eliminated that, so that practically the only difference is that we have elimninated the liberal loans on the for-sale housing. We have cut the authorization also from $1,600,000,000 to $800,000,000. The Housing and Home Finance Agency tell us that with the elimination of the for-sale housing, the authorization of $800,000,000 instead of $1,600,000,000 is sufficient.

Again the purpose is to keep the contractors from concentrating on the more expensive houses, and to try to make the bill less inflationary.

Passing to title II, one very important change is there made. It will be recalled that in the closing days, the Senate passed what I believe is known as the Jenner bill, a bill providing for a secondary market and also setting up a veterans' cooperative.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to suggest that wherever the Senator refers to any part of the bill, he give the page number. There is a good deal of confusion in the minds of those not familiar with this draft, as to the bill titles and the titles of the original housing act.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Vermont. I am referring now to page 64, title II amendments, which also refers to title II of the National Housing Act. I may say in passing in connection with this, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] contacted the committee during the construction of the bill and urged additional aid for veterans in the veterans' cooperative, and additional aid by way of a secondary market. His intelligent help in that regard was very much appreciated by myself and by the other members of our subcommittee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. There is considerable difficulty and I think some confusion as to how long the Senate will continue in session and as to whether or not there will be a vote on any of the pending measures. I am not sure from what certain Senators have said whether we will be able to adjourn at a certain hour, and whether any votes will be taken. In order to clarify the matter, if the Senator will permit, I suggest that the Senate continue in session as long as it would like to do so, but not vote on any of the amendments until tomorrow at 1 o'clock.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the acting majority leader trying to get rid of my audience?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I want the audience to remain. However, I feel that in order to expedite matters, with other legislation coming before us, that if we could remain in session as long as we care to debate the issue tonight, I would then make the suggestion that the Senate convene tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m., the debate to continue from that hour until 1 o'clock, the time to be divided equally between the proponents and opponents, to be controlled for the proponents by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and for opponents being in charge of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. By so doing, even though the debate were exhausted, as we hope it may be, by the time the session ends tonight, the amendments would then be printed and would be on the desks, and Senators would know exactly what they were voting on tomorrow, without any difficulty.

If the Senator from Wisconsin will yield further, I may say that I took this suggestion up with the acting minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] with the idea of ascertaining whether he thought such a request would meet with favor. I should like to ask him whether he feels that such a unanimous-consent request should be made, and whether, if made, he believes unanimous consent would be given?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to the acting majority leader that I have canvassed the situation pretty well on this side of the aisle. Senators on the floor have no serious objection to such a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. In order to make it binding, it would be necessary to waive a quorum call. I should like to ask the distinguished acting minority leader whether he would feel that Senators on his side of the aisle would be willing to do that, in order to get the request before the Senate immediately.

Mr. LUCAS. I should, of course, very much dislike to do that. Under the circumstances, however, if the Senator from Nebraska wants to take the chance, the Senator from Illinois will also take a chance.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me, I ask unanimous consent that a quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Secondly, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 1 o'clock tomorrow the Senate vote upon the pending measure, together with any amendments thereto, that amendments offered shall be germane to the subject matter, and that when the Senate recesses at the conclusion of this afternoon's session, it reconvene at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow. Further, I would include the provision that the time between the hours of 11 a. m. and 1 p. m., shall be equally divided between proponents and opponents of the measure, to be controlled for proponents by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and for opponents by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I know what the Senator intends, but I doubt if he included both the bill as reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency and the amendments now being submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes; I include the bill reported, the substitute committee bill, and all amendments thereto, to be voted on at 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is our intention also to remain in session at least until 7 o'clock tonight, if it takes that long, to debate the amendments now before the Senate. At that hour I should like very much if possible to recess, if we reach that hour, in view of the fact that we are to reconvene at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the two Senators from Oregon [Mr. CORDON and Mr. MORSE] and the two Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. CAIN] intend to propose an amendment to the substitute bill offered to the pending bill by the Senator from Wisconsin, and if that substitute bill does not prevail, then, to the substitute bill reported by the committee. I send to the desk the amendment proposed to be offered, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Wisconsin has a very good bill which should be acceptable to everyone. It has been ably explained. If the Senator from Wisconsin will accept an amendment I should like to offer at this time, which would do away with the tax on trailers, since 90 percent of them are now used for housing, I shall be glad to offer it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator's amendment provides that the tax imposed by subsection (b) shall not apply in the case of trailer-coaches of the housing type sold prior to July 1, 1950, and after the close of the month in which falls the date of the enactment of this subsection.

May I inquire of the Senator from Nevada as to the amount of the tax which is now imposed on that type trailer?

Mr. MALONE. It is 7 percent, the same as on automobiles. As a matter of fact, the Government itself takes most of the trailers for housing for veterans, because trailers are mobile and can be moved readily from place to place.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, while I cannot very well speak for the entire subcommittee which is responsible for the drafting of the bill, I personally think there is nothing objectionable in the Senator's amendment, and I should not oppose it personally. I do not know what position the other members of the committee will take.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment. It can be called up later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield for that purpose, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada offers an amendment to substitute for the committee substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, which the clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. —. Section 3403 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The tax imposed by subsection (b) shall not apply in the case of trailer coaches of the housing type (including parts or accessories therefor sold on or in connection therewith or with the sale thereof) sold prior to July 1, 1950, and after the close of the month in which falls the date of the enactment of this subsection."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think that amendment should lie over for consideration tomorrow, and not be voted on at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. According to the Chair's understanding of the unanimous-consent agreement, it is implicit that there be no amendment voted on this afternoon. That is the Chair's understanding of the agreement.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, continuing my remarks, I believe I had previously stated that the title II amendments on page 64 of the committee print are substantially the same as the title II amendments of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, except for the attempt to concentrate on the lower cost homes and to tighten up credit on the more expensive home.

There is one other very important change. The veterans' cooperative measure passed by this body in the closing days of the last session provided guaranteed loans to veterans' cooperatives. Apparently, because of an oversight, there was no change made in the old room limitation. The room limitation was $1,350. Obviously such a limitation cannot be applied at this time. Originally we had increased that to an $8,100 per unit limitation. However, the commissioner of housing of New York, through the office of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and with the Senator, called our attention to a very sizable project which is under construction in New York by the United Veterans' Mutual Housing Co., Inc., known as Bell Park Gardens. If I am incorrect in my statements, I hope the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] will correct me. I understand that much planning has gone into that particular project. I understand that veterans have paid down some money. I understand there are commitments from a bank in the amount of—I do not know how many millions of dollars, but I believe it is over $7,000,000. The commitments have been made at 3½ percent interest.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I simply desire to cite some facts pertaining to the particular project to which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin refers. The first of such projects, an 800-apartment garden-type project, planned for Bayside, Queens, under section 608, at the beginning of this year, on the basis of $1,800 per room, cannot be built at any lesser mortgage figure. Some 600 veterans have made down payments averaging $1,000, almost $600,000 being now on deposit. One of the largest New York banks made a $7,250,000 mortgage commitment at 3½ percent, an interest rate no longer available. An option on the 40 acres of land was obtained at the very reasonable price of $8,000 per acre. Anyone who is familiar with that section of New York knows that that is a very reasonable price. A reputable contracting firm agreed to construct the project at figures which have since increased. All of this was based on the $1,800 per room mortgage then available under section 608, and the good faith and prestige of the State of New York—its word to some 600 individual veterans who are willing to help themselves by personally financing their own apartments without one cent of public funds as a means of obtaining badly needed housing within the private-enterprise system—now hang in the balance.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I understand that loan commitments have been made totaling in excess of $1,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. IVES. The amount is $7,250,000.

Mr. McCARTHY. That commitment has been made at the rate of 3½ percent. Since the increase in interest rates, I gather that the bank would be very happy to get out from under the contract. A firm contract was made with a builder. Since that time costs have increased, and I assume the building contractor would be happy to have a release of that contract.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out that unless this provision in the present statutes is made, this whole project will go down in defeat and failure, and there will be no project.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what I was coming to. Unless we pass some housing legislation at this time, that is just one of the projects which will be dropped. It can be multiplied by 50, 100, 500—I do not know how many times. But unless we pass some housing legislation, the building of homes for veterans will cease over night.

For the record, and so that the FHA may be thoroughly apprised of what the Senate has in mind, I wish very briefly to detail the amendments we made to the bill, to cover Bell Park Gardens and other like projects.

There was an $8,100 per unit limitation, but we find in these cooperatives that it is often necessary to have apartments of 5 or 6 or 7 rooms. In such a situation obviously a per-unit limitation is unworkable. We have therefore provided that where a veterans' cooperative is concerned, the head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency may shift from the per-unit limitation to a per-room limitation of $1,800 per room, and that will take care of the situation in Bell Park Gardens and countless other like situations.

There is another substantial change, and I think this is especially important

in view of the Federal Reserve Board's recent memorandum issued to the member banks to tighten up on home loans. With the Federal Reserve System tightening up on home loans, and many State banks following that lead, as they often do, we find that in many areas it is almost impossible to get loans for low-cost homes. So what we are doing in this bill at this time—and this meets with the approval of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who originally introduced the bill—is to increase the secondary market from 25 percent of the portfolio to 50 percent.

We have taken title I from the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which deals almost exclusively with what is known as title I, class 3 homes. There are very few of those in large cities; they are rural and semirural homes. We have increased the loan limitation from $3,000 to $4,500. The T-E-W bill increased the authorization from $165,000,000 to $175,000,000. In this bill we have increased it to $200,000,000. In other words, there is a $35,000,000 increase in the authorization. The loan being a 10-percent loan, the increase of value of low-cost homes covered by this increase would total $350,000,000. Again, that is aimed toward inducing the contractors to get down in the low-cost housing field.

I think we have one of the most important sections of the bill, from a long-range standpoint, on page 74, starting in line 18, entitled "Standardized Building Codes and Measurements." As all Senators know, the Joint Housing Committee, which spent many thousands of dollars traveling across the country attempting to study thoroughly the housing situation in order to find out what the really serious road blocks in the way of housing were, agreed, I think, unanimously, that one of the most serious road blocks in the way of low-cost housing is the greatly outmoded cost-increasing restrictive codes in some 2,000 different metropolitan areas. We feel that this has contributed to keeping the building industry roughly 50 years behind the times.

We think this situation cannot be corrected except with some Federal cooperation, so in this bill we set up within the Housing and Home Finance Agency a section whose sole job will be to work toward the standardization of codes and the standardization of measurements and building materials. That, of course, calls also for some research, which will cost money, how much we do not know, but regardless of how much it costs we feel it will be money very well spent. It will call for research in connection with accomplishing these two objectives, namely, standardization of codes and standardization of building materials. It does not call for any other research except that type of research.

We have taken the yield-insurance program from the T-E-W bill in toto and put it in this bill on page 75. There is a great deal of difference of opinion as to how much good this yield-insurance program may do. So far we have met with no one who says it will do any harm. As Senators know, simply stated, the yield-insurance program merely says to the equity investor—not the man who borrows money, but the equity investor, "If you will build rental units and set the rent to yield roughly 3½ percent on the investment, we will guarantee you a 2¾ percent return." It is not anticipated by our committee or by the Bureau of the Budget that this will cost the taxpayer a single cent. A number of insurance companies say this will induce them to come into the rental market and start to producing cheaper rental housing.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Has the committee made a study to determine whether or not the renters can pay the rent which will yield the rate of interest the Senator is mentioning on the money invested by the trust funds?

Mr. McCARTHY. How low in rentals the equity investor can get I do not know. In one city he may produce rental units which will rent at $60, in another city rental units which will rent for $35 or $40. We know that if we take the formula the FHA uses in setting rents on section 608 projects, and compare that with the formula used in setting rents under the yield insurance plan, there will be a saving of 20 percent, I think it is, at any rate, it is a substantial saving. These are not my figures, they are figures from the Deparment, and I have used them in the RECORD heretofore.

Let me briefly explain. In setting the rental on the section 608 projects, in view of the fact that the builder must borrow the money and pay interest on it, and pay insurance, they must set a higher return than as though he were using his own money. The return is roughly 6 or 6½ percent, according to the formula used. Actually if one will sit down and take his pencil he will find it is 8 or 9 percent. In other words, in the section 608 projects rental units are being produced in which the rents are set to yield an 8 or 9 percent return. If we can get investors to come in under this yield insurance section of the bill, we will have rental units on which the return will be only 3 or 3½ percent, and it will produce units that will rent for less money.

Mr. WATKINS. If the rental is not sufficient to make the return, the United States Government then will have to pay the difference, will it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. We have gone into this matter very thoroughly, and the Bureau of the Budget has gone over it. If times are even seminormal, or even with a depression, it is not estimated that this will cost the taxpayers anything, for the reason that the returns are set to yield 3½ percent.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not think the Senator caught my question. Assuming that the rentals, with the premiums, or whatever is charged for the insurance, are not sufficient to take care of what will have to be made up under the insurance program, the Treasury of the United States will have to make up the difference, as I understand.

Mr. McCARTHY. If we had a depression so great that these rental units were empty, or if the renters could not pay a rental to yield 3½ percent, the Treasury Department would have to make up that deficit. Before that happens, however, every section 608 project in the vicinity will be empty, and the Government itself will be really in the housing business. So that before it costs us anything under the yield insurance plan we can be quite certain that we will have taken back every section 608 project. I do not think that will happen.

Mr. WATKINS. My observation is that in the event the returns on rentals are not sufficient to make up the insured income, the Treasury Department will have to take care of it, anyway, and it will in effect be a subsidy.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct, I will say to the Senator, but——

Mr. WATKINS. What is the difference between that and the public housing provision under which some help is provided for the low-income group?

Mr. McCARTHY. First let me give the reason for yield insurance. Many insurance companies under their charters, under their contracts with their policyholders, under various State laws, cannot go into the field of building rental housing. This type of bill will enable them to do that. There have been very extensive studies, starting back with the Taft committee in 1944, and as yet we have had no witness come before the committee and say that this plan will cost the taxpayer money. Now with that unanimity of feeling I cannot feel that we need to be too disturbed about it. There is no doubt that if we get such a depression that every apartment house in the country is empty, and every renter is unable to pay his rent, then certainly this project will cost money. But if that time comes, we would not be much disturbed about this matter.

Mr. WATKINS. I will ask the Senator whether a study has been made to determine whether or not these apartments can be rented at a sum which the low income group can pay, and which will still yield the amount of guaranteed return?

Mr. McCARTHY. Such a study has been made. I might say we are deeply indebted to Columbia University for the aid it gave. They lent us Mr. Jones full time. They gave us unlimited help. I will say that a study has been made, and that all of us who gave some time studying this particular proposition are fully convinced that the equity investor who is satisfied to take 3½ percent on his money can produce rental units for less than the man who borrows money and pays 4½ percent, pays an insurance premium, and who must make a profit. The purpose of this is to get cheaper rental units, and try and get equity money in the market. As we all know there is practically no equity money in the market today and I think until we do get equity money into the market we will have difficulty in getting rents down.

Mr. WATKINS. Has the Senator received any explanation from firms or institutions which have this type of money as to whether they are willing to enter into a program of this kind?

Mr. McCARTHY. At the time of the hearings on the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill only one of the insurance companies said it would commence building under this particular program. Since that time we went over the matter with all the major insurance companies to find what their objection was to the yield insurance program in the original T-E-W bill. They had some minor objections, none of any great importance. They were mostly questions of bookkeeping. We think we have successfully met those objections. We have been led by various insurance companies to believe we have done so. While we have no firm commitments by any insurance companies that they will start to build, we feel that this program will at least open the door to let them come in and build. In other words, we are in a position where nothing can be lost and everything can be gained.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it the Senator's opinion, then, that this particular provision will furnish the means for housing such as the public housing feature of the T-E-W bill seeks to provide?

Mr. McCARTHY. Very definitely not.

Mr. WATKINS. It is not intended to accomplish that purpose?

Mr. McCARTHY. Very definitely not. At least it would not provide rental units for the group that I would like to see taken care of by way of public housing.

We have the same salary provisions that were in the T-E-W bill that was passed by the Senate, and we also have a provision for the eviction of over-income tenants in the present 190,000 public housing units. We do not provide that they must be evicted instanter. We provide that the FPHA, the local housing agency, shall evict them in an orderly manner, and I understand they have a program of evicting 5 percent each month on 6 months' notice.

I have one amendment which I have taken the liberty of adding to the bill without having first consulted the other two members of the subcommittee. I do not believe they are present. If they disagree with this amendment, I shall feel forced to remove it from the bill. I hope they will agree to it.

First, I propose to give the reason for the amendment. I have had countless numbers of veterans and veterans' wives call on me and tell me that they go to these federally financed projects. They apply for an apartment. Everything is all set. They can get the apartment until they make the mistake of saying that they have one or two children. Once they mention children they are ruled out as far as getting an apartment is concerned.

The main reason why we are furnishing these liberal loans to stimulate the production of rental housing is so that the veterans and their families and the rest of our lower-income groups can be properly housed, and if a man can apply for a Federal loan, take advantage of all these Federal funds, and then say, "I am going to defeat the purposes of the bill by having an absolute bar against anyone who is raising a family," then there is no need of passing any housing legislation at all.

I shall read my proposed amendment:

Provided further, That no mortgage shall be insured under section 600 of this title unless the mortgagor certifies under oath that in selecting tenants for the property covered by the mortgage he will not discriminate against any family by reason of the fact that there are children in the family, and that he will not sell the property while the insurance is in effect unless the purchaser so certifies, such certification to be filed with the Administrator; and violation of any such certification shall be a misdemeanor punishable by fine of not to exceed $500.

In closing, Mr. President, I will say that while I, myself, supported the slum-clearance provision, spent weeks drafting what I thought was a good slum-clearance provision, while I supported the public housing provision as it was finally written, and I voted for it then, and I would vote for it again. I will say I know the one way in which we can kill all housing legislation and make sure that there will be no housing legislation at this session, is to include a public housing and slum-clearance provision in the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have been very much interested in reading the program of Mr. Eccles for preventing inflation, and in connection with housing I notice this provision in his program:

> Housing: The Federal Government should not, by what seem to me political reasons, encourage a housing program in excess of the amount of labor and materials available and encourage further inflationary trends.

I should like to ask whether or not the Senator from Wisconsin feels that the measure he proposes does take those trends into account.

Mr. McCARTHY. What we have tried to do is to redraft the bill in the light of what has happened since the original introduction of the bill, taking into account the inflationary forces. That is the reason why we have liberalized the loans on the lower cost housing. We tried to tighten up the credit on the more expensive homes.

Mr. BREWSTER. So as to encourage the more moderate classes of homes, having consideration for the so obviously limited supply of materials that the President's board reported was available.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is true. And in effect what I think it will do, is to channelize the scarce materials into the cheaper, lower cost homes, because if a contractor cannot sell a $14,000 or $16,000 home under the liberal loan provision that we all of us had in mind some time ago—if we say, "You can no longer get these liberal loans for the expensive homes, but we will make the loans more liberal for the homes that cost five or six or seven thousand dollars," what will happen is that the scarce material will be channelized into that type of housing where it is most needed.

Mr. President, I think that covers substantially all the bill. Again I urge the Senate——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Would it be safe for any Senator to conclude that the Senator from Wisconsin is in fact recommending the passage at this time by the Senate of an improved Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, less public housing and slum clearance?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that is a fair statement. I might say that we had the very intelligent assistance of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in redrafting the sections of the bill, keeping in mind his view that some provisions of the original bill were very inflationary.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield

Mr. FLANDERS. The things which are left out of the committee print are those he mentions, namely, urban redevelopment and public housing; also farm housing; also a strong provision for research in the reduction of housing costs, rather than the limited provisions in this bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that he and I and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr TAFT] met prior to the introduction of the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The Senator and I agreed—in fact, all four of us unanimously agreed—that the farm-housing section of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill was the most badly drafted section of the bill, that it was not really a farm-housing provision at all. The Senator and I agreed at that time with the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Ohio that instead of submitting that type of inadequate, badly thought out, so-called farm-housing legislation we should strike the farm-housing provision, and that in place thereof we should have a section to the effect that the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Agriculture Department should study the question of farm housing and recommend to the Congress what they would consider a sensible farm-housing provision, in the light of the changed conditions since the farm-housing section was drafted in 1944.

Let me make this clear: I am not criticizing the farm-housing section as of 1944. Perhaps as of that time it might have been well, but the Senator and I agreed that it should not be in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, so I wish the Senator would not use that as an argument against what we are doing here.

Mr. FLANDERS. But the Senate disagreed with us.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. In the opinion of the junior Senator from Wisconsin title VII, covering farm housing, was very badly drawn, was it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. Very badly drawn in the light of conditions of 1948, not in the light of 1944 conditions, when it was originally drawn.

Mr. CAIN. Yet title VII appears to be presently before us, as a result of the action which a majority of the Banking and Currency Committee took this morning. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. Did the Senator from Washington correctly understand the Senator from Wisconsin to say that he and the Senator from Vermont have been in agreement that that title should be

stricken from what has always been called the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] met in the Banking and Currency Committee room, and we agreed that instead of having that particular section in the bill we should substitute a section providing for study by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Agriculture. I am sure that if the Senator from Vermont will sit down and study the farm-housing section he will be as convinced as I am that it is completely deceptive, and that it would do the farmer no good at all. It was drafted in 1944.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that he should address his objections to that provision not to me, but to the United States Senate, which put it in the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in closing——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Let me return for a moment to my original inquiry. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Wsconsin that the recommendation to which he is presently addressing himself includes every possible incentive to the acceleration of housing construction in this country?

Mr. McCARTHY. In the lower-price field. There is no incentive whatever for the construction of more expensive homes. I think it includes every conceivable incentive for the production of low-cost homes.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is asking the Senate, therefore, for a good many reasons, temporarily to lay aside the controversial social and welfare questions of low-rent housing and slum-clearance, in favor of enacting legislation which will immediately accelerate housing construction.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; and I am asking the Senate to take into consideration the condition which exists as of today. If we vote public housing and slum clearance into a bill, regardless of how wholeheartedly we may favor those two things, that means that we shall have no housing legislation at all, because I know that the House leadership is not bluffing when it says, "We will not take any public housing or slum clearance." I had hoped that it would at least take slum clearance. I think the proposed slum-clearance program is a good, sensible program, which we should ultimately adopt. I believe that ultimately we should adopt a public-housing program. But I believe that we should make an about-face as to the type of tenants to whom the units are made available. But I do not believe that anything is to be gained by going into a lengthy discussion of that question.

I may be mistaken, but I understand that there will be introduced, either by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] or some other Senator, at the beginning of the next session, a long-range public housing and slum-clearance provision. I hope to work with other Senators on that program. I hope that possibly a sensible slum-clearance-public-housing provision, either along the lines of the present Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, or along the lines suggested in the Republican platform, which is a different program, will be enacted.

Let me repeat that if we put slum clearance and public housing into this bill, we are saying to the 800 veterans who have deposited $1,000 each to get an apartment in the Bell Park Gardens——

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish. We shall be saying to those 800 veterans, and saying to a countless number of other veterans all over the country, "This year you shall not have housing, because of our feeling that unless we can get public housing and slum clearance we will not take anything." Despite the fact that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and every other Senator, so far as I can determine, wholeheartedly endorses every single provision in my proposed amendments, I think it would be extremely short-sighted and vicious for this body to say to the veterans of this country that because of our emotional feeling about public housing—and I know that the Senator from New Hampshire is very sincere—we are not going to take any housing. We shall be saying to those veterans, "We are not going to help you at all unless we can get a few federally owned and operated apartments."

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, addressing myself to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, there are two or three subtitles which I wish to take up with him.

The first is his dogmatic statement—I know that he is sincere—that unless we take this bill, we can get nothing. On that basis he has been assiduously interviewing Senators and trying to get votes by saying, "If you do not take this, you get nothing." That is very far from the truth. I challenge that statement. Where is the authority for it? Who told the Senator that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will give the Senator my authority.

Mr. TOBEY. Come across.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sure that if the Senator will check the matter he will agree with me. I have been informed that the majority of the House Rules Committee will not at this time take a bill with public housing or slum clearance in it. I am sure that they are serious.

Mr. TOBEY. I know that they are serious. So am I.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe that the Senator also feels that they are serious.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from New Hampshire? Was it not——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator yield? Will Senators please address the Chair?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Wisconsin yielded to me, did he not?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Wisconsin yields to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. On that basis I address myself to the Senator from Wisconsin, and ask him who is this House leadership. Who are they? Is it JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Representative from Michigan? Is it RALPH A. GAMBLE, of New York; is it JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., the Speaker of the House? Who is it? I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to name them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to do so. There is no question about this matter. I think Representative WOLCOTT represents the majority in the House of Representatives in matters of housing, and he has authorized me to say that they simply will not accept public housing provisions. He told us this, and the Senator from New Hampshire was present, I believe. He said, "We will give you gentlemen of the Senate a blank check in drafting housing legislation if you will keep out of this bill provisions as to public housing and slum clearance, and if you do not go too far in the research section."

Both the Senator from New Hampshire and I may disagree as to the wisdom of that; we may think that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] should be in favor of public housing and slum clearance. But the point is that, as of today, we face a situation in which we shall not get housing legislation of any sort unless we proceed along those lines.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I have a feeling of compassion in my heart for the Senator from Wisconsin for what is coming to him right now. What he is saying to us, Mr. President, is that some pooh-bah in the House of Representatives has said to us, "Unless you take this, you get nothing."

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, no.

Mr. TOBEY. That is what the Senator said he said.

Let me complete my statement, Mr. President. Does not the Senator know that the entire House Banking and Currency Committee voted out the bill with public-housing and slum-clearance provisions in it; but then, by the subtle influence of some leadership over there, which I think I can name, they went to the chairman of the Rules Committee and told him what should be done, and he obeyed the orders; and as a result, the will of the people and the democratic process are set at naught, and one man's will is to rule; one man, sitting at the door of legislation says, "They shall not pass."

Mr. President, in this democracy of ours, if we are to see to it that, as Lincoln said at Gettysburg, "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth," then I say that if we bow to that challenge from the House of Representatives and let them put this over, then every piece of legislation coming to the Senate in the future can be the subject of similar high-handed, high-binding methods. Mr. President, for myself I refuse to accept it.

The Senator from Wisconsin knows that the bill containing public-housing and slum-clearance provisions was reported by the House committee; but now it is strangled in the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, and the will of the Senate and of the House committee and of the people of the country is thwarted.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator should not scold me.

Mr. TOBEY. I was simply telling the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me make clear that I did not intend, and never have intended, to intimate that the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Representative WOLCOTT, speaks for himself alone. I think he is speaking for a vast group of Republicans.

Mr. TOBEY. I will tell the Senator who he is speaking for.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will please address the Chair.

Mr. TOBEY. I addressed the Chair. I wanted to tell the Senator who they were.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator to wait just a minute, please.

As I said, Representative WOLCOTT is speaking for the majority; and there are a number of Members of the House of Representatives who have been firmly convinced that, in view of the tremendous shortage of building materials, it would be disastrous to the home-building program if we were now to commence a public-housing program. They look at the present administration of many of the public housing units. For example—begging the pardon of the Senator from Michigan—they can look at the unit in Detroit, in which until 3 months ago at least, a man making $24,000 a year was living—in a subsidized apartment—and was paying $45 a month for it, while at the same time we had come before us at our committee hearings in Detroit any number of veterans' widows who had 2 or 3 children and were living with them in one-room, basement apartments. There are in that project a considerable number of men making over $10,000 a year, while veterans are walking the streets, looking for a place in which to live. One veteran told me he was paying $15 a week for one basement room for himself and his wife and their two children—while a man making over $10,000 a year was paying $45 a month for this subsidized housing.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator.

The Senator has aroused my righteous indignation. I share with him the same kind of indignation that he has for such an extravagant situation as the one he has described, but the Senator from Wisconsin knows that is not a matter related to this bill. That is a matter of administration, and it can be corrected as such. It does not involve this proposed legislation.

Will the Senator from Wisconsin please confirm the statement I make now; will he please state whether I am correct in saying that the House Banking and Currency Committee, chairmaned by the Honorable JESSE WOLCOTT, of Michigan, reported the bill with public housing provisions in it and slum clearance provisions in it; and is it the Senator's understanding and knowledge, and is it not confirmed now by me, that thereafter the House Rules Committee said, "Regardless of whether it was reported by the committee, it will never come up on the floor of the House"; and the Senator himself was told, "It is either this or nothing."

If that be true, and if we accept it and act in accordance with it, the democratic processes will have gone by the wind. The Senator knows that to be so. JESSE WOLCOTT is a friend of mine, and I esteem him highly; but he is not alone in this matter. In my opinion, it is a triumvirate; it is the Speaker of the House, JOSEPH W. MARTIN; and CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, sometime candidate for President; and JESSE WOLCOTT. Those are the big three, and they issue the dictum, "They shall not pass."

I suggest that if we bow to them we shall be saying, "Whenever you want to block something in the future, just play the same game."

Mr. President, let us find out who is running this country. If we accept the attempt that is made in this case, the result of our action will be that the people will be the victims of an oligarchy composed of from one to three men.

Mr. McCARTHY. My point is—and the Senator will agree with me, I think—that if no housing legislation is passed, that will be just as bad——

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I refuse to yield until I finish this sentence.

I started to say that the men who have been mentioned by the Senator from New Hampshire are highly respected by me. I think the Senator's statements are very unfortunate. The Members of the House of Representatives who take that position are just as serious in doing so as we are in taking the position that we take. As a matter of fact, they have good reason to feel justified in their position. When they look at the situation in public housing, as I have said, they find that the situation is extremely foul. We cannot blame the present Administrator too greatly, I believe. The conditions which brought about the present situation were largely beyond his control. During the wartime period we had a great parade of public housing administrators. We had thrown into public housing many jobs and different kinds of bookkeeping systems, all of which helped create the present chaotic condition. But the point is that today, when those men look at public housing they see that it is not being administered as it should be. They know it is not being administered for the individuals about whom the Senator is concerned. They find that public housing is now being administered for the benefit of a favored few.

The matter of money is important. The General Accounting Office called in what they considered to be one of the top accounting firms. The Members of the House of Representatives can look at the report of that accounting firm, which shows that, as of that time, the Public Housing Administration kept no record of receipts, no record of expenditures, no record of accounts due, no record of accounts payable. They can look at those matters; and they can find, for example, that someone in the Public Housing Administration entered on the books an item of $647,000, or thereabouts; and when questioned about it by a committee headed by one of the Democratic Senators, that man said, "Well, we had to enter it to balance the books." That is the type of administration that has been had.

Moreover, they can look at reports to the effect that in the Los Angeles area, $97,000 worth of lumber and scarce material simply disappeared; and when the Administrator was questioned about it and was asked whether he knew whether it went to someone's lakeshore home, or was stolen, or just what happened to it, he said, "I do not have any idea."

When those men see public housing so badly administered, I do not think we can question their motives when they say it will not solve the housing problem to give that same administration additional billions of dollars and when they refuse to accept public housing.

I think it is very unfair of the Senator from New Hampshire to question the motives of the Members of the House of Representatives who take a position contrary to his.

I repeat that if, as the Senator from New Hampshire says, those men are blocking housing legislation in the manner in which the Senator from New Hampshire claims they are, then the Senator from New Hampshire also is blocking it by saying that unless we pass public housing legislation we shall have no housing legislation.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator yields to the defense. The charge made by the Senator from Wisconsin is that the Senator now speaking is equally guilty with the triumvirate or anybody else in the House in blocking housing legislation. That is the charge. Here comes the answer. The fact remains that nothing of the sort is true in the slightest degree. All the Senator from New Hampshire is trying to do in his Committee on Banking and Currency is to report a bill reflecting the views of the Senate, a bill thrice passed by the Senate embodying both slum clearance and public housing. I may say, after having conferred with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], that he is in favor of the bill.

What the Senate is going to do is this: They are going to pass a separate bill tomorrow, which will be in accordance with their views. The matter will be taken care of 100 percent.

Coming down to the question of unfairness, all I ask is that the fairest thing

in the world, the democratic process, be enthroned in this day and generation under the Capitol dome. All we ask for is that the bill be passed here by the Senate, be sent to the House, and go to conference. Under the rules of the House and Senate, that is where it should go.

But the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin said, "I know it never will go to conference; they will not let it." So we are met with the dictum, "You can not take this bill to conference", and the democratic processes are set at variance, in effect nullified. Let the bill pass in the Senate and go to conference; then let the minds of the conferees work, and let them produce what we want, which is a piece of legislation pro bono publico. That is what we propose to do. If that is unfair, make the most of it. I can not follow the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator from New Hampshire will bear with me, he speaks of the democratic processes. We have certain rules in the House, the same as here. There is a rule that the bill must go to the Rules Committee. If the Rules Committee sees fit, it will report the bill and it will go to the floor. That rule has been in existence ever since the establishment of Congress. It has been in existence under both Democratic and Republican administrations. We have never seen fit to change the rule.

Mr. TOBEY. We have nothing to do with it here.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say that if the majority of the Rules Committee say the bill shall not go to the floor, it will not go to the floor. That is the democratic process—the majority rule. The majority of that committee feel as strongly, if not more strongly against the recent use of public housing than you feel for it. Apparently the majority of that committee are committed against public housing as it is now administered. That is their right. They feel this program should not be passed at this time.

I call the Senator's attention to this, and I ask whether if I am correct: If we pass the public-housing section, that will not produce a single unit within the next year. If I may refresh the Senator's memory on that, we have had testimony before us. I am sure if he will check with the FPHA they will tell him so. They will tell him the only public-housing units that can possibly be activated before July 1 of next year would be some of the 15,000 units that had been planned but not built prior to the war. They will tell the Senator, I am sure, that not a single public-housing unit can be obtained within the next year, if this bill is passed.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator.

Everything is a matter of growth. The child from conception through the 9 months in the mother's womb, until it is born into this world, is a matter of growth. The apple blossom, up to the fully matured fruit, is a matter of growth. Legislation that starts with a great objective for human happiness and human prosperity is a matter of growth. We conceive the idea, we pass a bill in the Senate; the House passes it, the President signs it, and it becomes a law and, lo and behold, the mechanics are started whereby a great, Nation-wide slum-clearance project can come into effect. Of course it takes time, but it is elementary that the longer we wait, the longer it will take.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from New Hampshire and I must agree that if he is successful he will have done perhaps more than anyone else to make it impossible for these 800 young men, veterans in Bell Park Gardens, to live in decent homes as well as other hundreds of thousands of veterans in a like situation. Do not get me wrong. I am not accusing the Senator of malice. I do not know of any man who has a warmer heart than the Senator. I hate to see it so badly misdirected.

If I may close on this, I may say that if the Senator is successful in carrying through the line of action which he is now advocating, it will mean there will be thousands, perhaps millions of veterans who simply will not have a decent place in which to live, as the result of the action taken by the Senate here today. We have a bill before us, of which I am sure the Senator heartily approves. I am sure he will agree that it will channelize scarce materials into the construction of cheaper homes. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that if my bill is passed, many veterans next year will be paying less rent than they would pay had this bill not been passed. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that under my bill an unlimited number of veterans' cooperatives can be established for the production of cheap housing, both for rental and for sale, and that, unless the bill is passed, that will be impossible. Again I say that with the great consideration which the Senator has for the poor man, realizing that this is a poor man's bill, he help us get it through the Senate even though it does not contain everything he desires. In view of the consideration which the Senator has for the poor man, I sincerely hope he will reconsider and will not take action which would endanger any and all housing legisation at this time.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 30 seconds only?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. YOUNG rose.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I inquire who has the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire, if he addresses the Chair, or the Senator from North Dakota, if he addresses the Chair. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, did the Senator from North Dakota wish me to yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG. No; I have a speech I should like to make.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall be through in a minute.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin does not move me a bit by his impassioned plea, because his premises are entirely wrong, and therefore his conclusions are wrong. All these things for veterans about which he talks are in the bill the committee offers, including the uniform building codes, the agreements about materials. Nothing is lost. They are in the bill. But so far as this question goes, let us get down to brass tacks. The bill provides a mutual housing proposition for veterans. That is not going to be lost. It is going to go through. The Senator from New York knows it is going to go through, and so does the Senator from Wisconsin. I will state how it is going to go through.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. IVES. I do not think the Senator from New York knows that it is going to go through.

Mr. TOBEY. He knows it is intended to go through.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York has been advised that the committee of which the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is chairman is going to consider it, and that it is expected the committee will vote favorably upon it. The Senator from New York hopes very much that it will be passed by the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. I think that, as nearly as anything is certain beyond death and taxes, I can assure the Senator it will be passed. He has a good case. We in the committee are all for it, and it will go through. It will not be lost. Nothing virtuous or good or fine or worth while in housing will be lost by passing the bill the Senator from Vermont and I sponsor and which the Senate has passed thrice before.

So I want to thank my colleague for his many courtesies in yielding. Under great stress of tempers and dispositions the best of feeling prevails. I make the prediction that tomorrow at 1 o'clock when it comes time for the portcullis to fall, the distinguished Senate will live up to its custom, its mores, and its work last May, that it will again pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and send it to the House, and say, "Let the housing bill go to conference, under the democratic processes, or else let the responsibility be on your heads."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to Senate bill 2927, a bill which I have already introduced in the special session of the Congress, dealing with GI housing. I should appreciate it very much if the Senator overnight would give his personal attention to the bill. It is the present intention of the junior Senator from Oregon to offer Senate bill 2927 tomorrow as a substitute for title II of the bill which the Senator has reported. I do not want to take time tonight to discuss it, but I have had inserted in the RECORD my reasons for supporting Senate bill 2927. I would appreciate it if my good friend from New Hampshire would check it over so we may discuss it tomorrow morning prior to the convening of the Senate.

The particular portion of title II of the bill to which I take exception will be found on page 28, line 12, providing that no loan may be purchased if made prior to the effective date of the act. The difficulty which confronts the GI's involves the accumulation of loans in the banks in connection with purchases prior to the effective date of the act, and unless they can find a secondary market for their paper the GI's will not be helped very much by title II of the Senator's bill.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I find that the bill to which the Senator adverts was not referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, but to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. I am a member of that committee. The bill was made ready at a late hour yesterday afternoon; in fact, at the very close of my speech yesterday on another subject I introduced the bill along with my explanatory remarks. It has been impossible to get a meeting of my committee in time to attempt the consideration of the bill. I am sure there will certainly be no serious objection on the part of the Senate or of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee to looking over the bill to see the points it contains involving the provision of the Senator's bill in connection with the subject.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall be very glad to do that, and will guarantee to give an answer to the Senator in the morning. I hope to be able to cooperate heartily.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber during the prior discussion, but was present during most of it. Do I correctly understand that there has been a public announcement by the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the Speaker of the House, and the Rules Committee that if the Senate shall pass the bill—the passage of which was one of the reasons we were called into session—involving and containing provisions relating to slum clearance and public housing, the House will not accept the bill? Is that correct?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] said he was told by Representative WOLCOTT that the bill would not go to conference and the democratic process would not be carried through.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have been told that a majority of the Rules Committee are against it. I have a definite impression that that is a correct statement. We also can canvass our Banking and Currency Committee to find out what type of legislation will come through, and we find that nothing but a bill with public housing can pass thru that committee. I tried to make similar canvass of the Rules Committee of the House. I am told that for what are considered by them good and sufficient reasons they will not pass a public housing bill which, during a period of scarcity, might disrupt the whole building industry. Whether they are right or wrong, I do not know, but that is the way those men feel, and they do have some good reasons to feel that way. I know a majority of the committee will not favor a bill which contains public-housing and slum-clearance provisions. I think every Senator here knows that to be so. Every Senator knows, if the Senator from New Hampshire is successful on the floor of the Senate in having his amendment accepted, that there will be no housing legislation passed by the House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to inquire of the Senator from Wisconsin whether it is the case—I do not say it is not the case—that since the Senate has on many occasions expressed a desire to have in a housing bill slum clearance and public housing in some degree, why it would not be better for the Senate to have the members of the Rules Committee turn down the Senate measure? I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will answer that question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair would like to have the debate proceed in order, if it is humanly possible.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from New Hampshire gladly yields to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Rules Committe of the House has already turned down such a bill. If we send it to them the second time I am firmly convinced they will do the same thing again.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then the public is to understand that the reason public housing and slum clearance are not in the housing bill is because a majority of the Rules Committee is opposed to it. I think we ought to get this clear. Is it a majority of the committee, or a majority of the Members of the House?

Mr. McCARTHY. Do not ask me to delve into the minds of the Representatives. We both know that the Rules Committee has once refused to report the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It is completely senseless therefore, in the closing days of this session, to say we will give them the same measure in the hope that they will change their minds.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am not arguing the merits of the question. I want to place the responsibility for the failure of slum clearance and public housing where it belongs, not on the United States Senate, which has approved such measures, I think, three times.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Washington and to my friend from Wisconsin that the Rules Committee turned thumbs down. Let it stand that way; but let us send the bill over and let it go to conference. There is nothing dogmatic in our position. We should let the conference prevail. Is not that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. In spite of the fact that I have been listening with the greatest care, even when two or three Senators were speaking at once, the thing which is not clear in my mind and on which I should like to interrogate the Senator from Wisconsin is this: Has notice been served upon us that the House will not allow a bill to go to conference which contains provisions regarding public housing and urban redevelopment?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have been served no notice. Any one who will read the RECORD will know that we now have a housing bill before us, a bill which the House Rules Committee has already refused to report. The Senator's solution of the housing shortage is to send the House the same bill which the Rules Committee, exercising the power which it is entitled to exercise, has refused to report. I have been informed by Representative WOLCOTT that a majority of the Rules Committee has not changed its mind. From my contact with the Rules Committee, I do not believe the members have changed their minds. I have not been served any public notice by anyone.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I inquire whether the Senator knows it to be a fact that the Rules Committee has no authority over the question whether a conference will be granted in the case of a difference between the two Houses on the subject?

Mr. McCARTHY. I should suggest that the Senator ask one of the older parliamentarians that question.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I inquire of any Senator who has any knowledge on that subject?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Washington for the purpose of answering the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have had some experience in the House. I know of no time when the Rules Committee has had any authority to determine whether a bill should go to conference.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I think the RECORD will show that some time ago the Senator from Wisconsin said he was authorized to state that the bill would not go to conference. I think the Senator has told me in debate that he was told by the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee that the bill would not go to conference.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am firmly convinced that the bill would not go to conference. I know that a majority of the members of the House Rules Committee are against the Senator's idea of what should be contained in a public-housing bill. The majority does not know of any emergency calling for the construction of more public housing to be administered as the present units are being administered. We both know that we can pass a good housing bill which will help the poor man. We know that if we send over to the House again the same bill which we sent there previously, there will be no housing legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit

the Chair to submit what he believes to be a pertinent observation?

Mr. TOBEY. I should be delighted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has not interrupted the debate, because no point of order has been made, but the Chair feels, in fairness to the rules of the Senate and to the Senate, and by way of suggestion to the Senators themselves, that one of the very fundamental points in our established procedure is that Senators shall not refer to Members of the other branch of the Congress or to proceedings therein.

There is no specific rule on the subject; but Jefferson's Manual, as carried in our own manual, and as used as guidance for our conduct, reads as follows:

> It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House, or the particular votes or majorities on it there, because the opinion of each House should be left to its own independency, not to be influenced by the proceedings of the other; and the quoting them might beget reflections leading to a misunderstanding between the two Houses.

May the Chair respectfully say that the precedents of the Senate are legion on this subject, and without a single exception of which the Chair is advised, whenever a point of order has been made against reference to Members of the other House, the point of order has been sustained. The Chair could put a number of decisions of that character into the RECORD if it were deemed desirable.

There can be no question about the nature and extent of these precedents. The Chair feels that there has to be some latitude in the application of the precedents and procedures when, as in the present instance, it is the question of some pertinence, in respect to our own discussion, as to what the attitude of the House may be. But the Chair would like to beg of Senators, in continuing this debate, to stay, so far as possible, within the spirit of this clear and essential rule, so that if a point of order is subsequently made Senators will not be taken by surprise.

The Chair submits these observations in the greatest of good faith and without any reflection on any Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. May the Senator from New Hampshire say that he thanks the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate for his admonition, and for his tolerance in this debate? The only excuse or justification the Senator from New Hampshire would have would be that he has a deep, passionate, and earnest feeling in the matter, because when I reflect that this very far-reaching piece of legislation has three times come before the Senate, of which I am proud to be a Member, and the Senate has three times passed the legislation, it is difficult to keep from projecting my mind across the Capitol when I see barriers raised, and from almost saying, "Thou art the man, the guilty person."

Without more ado, I guarantee to the distinguished presiding officer that I shall be governed entirely by his admonition, and I thank him for calling my attention to the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. YOUNG obtained the floor.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I have been waiting since almost high noon to make a 10-minute speech, and I am rather reluctant to yield further.

Mr. MYERS. Very well.

PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I desire to address myself briefly to two of the points which President Truman gave as his reasons for the calling of this special session of Congress.

The first point I wish to discuss is the long-range agricultural bill requested by the President in his special message. Apparently Mr. Truman, because of his heavy political schedule in recent weeks, overlooked the fact that Congress had passed a long-range farm program which was signed by him. That bill, in my opinion, was the most constructive piece of legislation that any Congress had passed for many years looking toward the future security of those engaged in the farming occupation. It had then and has now the complete support of all three major farm organizations.

It is a bit difficult to understand why the President would now be asking for a long-range farm program when one has already been passed which meets with the complete approval of the farmers of the United States and the major farm organizations, and I should like to state that it had nearly the unanimous support of the Republicans in both Houses.

The second point to which I wish to address myself briefly is on the matter of alleged high prices for farm commodities, also covered in President Truman's call for a special session of Congress. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a front-page story in this morning's Washington Post under the following headlines: "Hog prices reach new high; Brannan asks positive action."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONGRESS GETS WARNING—HOG PRICES REACH NEW HIGH; BRANNAN ASKS POSITIVE ACTION

While live hog prices were setting a new all-time high at Chicago yesterday, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan told Congress meat prices will go higher through the summer "unless some positive action is taken."

Hog prices at Chicago hit $31.50 a hundred pounds, 40 cents above the previous high mark reached Monday. Continued scarce supplies from country feeders accounted largely for the upturn.

Brannan told the Senate Banking Committee meat supplies will continue tight and added:

"We can expect little relief from the price pressures now current until the closing months of 1949."

The committee is studying the anti-inflation program recommended by President Truman. Republican leaders have said Congress will not provide the President with the rationing and price control authority he asked last November and again at the extra session.

Brannan insisted an analysis of the current situation indicates immediate measures should be taken to bring "meat prices under control and to make meat available to all our people."

"We are handicapped by the fact that the necessary authority to do this was not granted last November, or even last January," he said.

Brannan said meat consumption is likely to average somewhat lower next year than in this, perhaps about 140 pounds per person, compared with the estimated current rate of 145 pounds.

The Secretary said the principal reduction will be in beef. Pork supplies, he said, should be somewhat larger and all meat prices are likely to "average higher next year than this year."

Brannan said average per capita food consumption in the Nation will run about the same in 1949 as in 1948. This is about 12 per cent above that of the prewar years 1935–39.

Meanwhile, the Agriculture Department said Thanksgiving turkeys will cost more than ever this year. The holiday birds retailed at about 60 cents a pound last November here in Washington.

The Department also said there is no prospect of lower chicken and egg prices before next year.

Mr. YOUNG. This article, Mr. President, is based on the testimony of Secretary Brannan before the Senate Banking Committee yesterday. Mr. Brannan, according to this article, told the Banking and Currency Committee that immediate measures should be taken to bring meat prices under control and to make meat available to all our people. "We are handicapped by the fact that the necessary authority to do this was not granted last November or even last January," he said. This position taken by Secretary Brannan indicates either a total lack of information on the past program of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to food production or it is a statement that only a pure demagog would make while in possession of the facts, as I believe Mr. Brannan was. I believe Mr. Brannan is fully aware of the fact that the United States Department of Agriculture in setting its goals for 1948 production of grains and all meats actually asked for a drastic reduction. Mr. President, let me quote from the first paragraph of a press release put out by the United States Department of Agriculture as of October 22, 1947:

> A national goal of 50,000,000 pigs for the spring of 1948 was suggested to farmers today by the United States Department of Agriculture, which at the same time re-emphasized its request for feeding hogs to lighter weights. This goal compares to the 1947 pig crop of 53,000,000 pigs, a reduction of 3,000,000 or nearly 6 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the end of my remarks the full press release by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the United States Department of Agriculture deliberately set out about a year ago to reduce the supply of not only pork but all other meats. The farmers complied with these regulations, and as a result, we are now short of meat and consequently prices have risen. In this same bulletin setting 1948 production goals for farmers, the United States Department of Agriculture asked for the following additional reduction in food supplies. Let me quote just a part of them:

> Egg production, 1947 goals, 4,559,000 dozen of eggs; 1948 goal, 4,200,000 dozen. Chickens to be raised, 1947 production, 742,047,000; 1948 goal, 693,104,000; turkeys, 1947 production, 34,667,000; 1948 goal, 30,507,000—

That was actually requested by the Department of Agriculture—

> slaughter cattle and calves, 1947 production 36,000,000; 1948 goal, 32,000,000.

Mr. President, I have tried to demonstrate that the United States Department of Agriculture clearly set out a year ago to reduce the meat supply available to the American people for 1948. Some of it perhaps was justified to make more grains available for European aid, but I sincerely object to statements such as that by Secretary Brannan yesterday which are designed to appeal politically to the consumers of the United States without telling them the true facts.

Let us see if all this reduction in meat supplies was justified even for European aid, in the light of present circumstances. On July 1, 1947, we had a carry-over of 83,813,000 bushels of wheat and on July 1, 1948, we had a carry-over of 194,890,000 bushels. Thus while the administration was planning to reduce the meat supplies available to the consumers, they actually, through total lack of wisdom and understanding, created nearly 2½ times the wheat carry-over of a year ago—a wheat carry-over which is already burdensome to American wheat producers. That extra carry-over of wheat would have raised enough hogs to have provided all the extra meat American consumers wanted.

Mr. President, the American farmer is doing his level best to meet the consumers' needs, and I think doing a remarkable job of it; one which would never be accomplished if price controls were again placed upon products which the farmer produces. For example, in 1938, after 5 years of New Deal administration, the average consumption of meat in the United States was 126 pounds per person. In 1947, even though handicapped severely by the war years, the farmers made available to the consumers 155 pounds of meat per person, or a gain of nearly 30 pounds for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Secretary Brannan, even though he has no farm background, should know as Secretary of Agriculture that it takes several months to increase the production of poultry. The production of pork can be tremendously stepped up within a period of only a year. In the matter of beef, that is a longer range program. The imposition of price controls would very seriously hamper increased production of beef, and, in my opinion, would only stave off the evil day.

This Nation is favored with one of the biggest grain crops ever produced in its history. European grain production also is practically double that of last year. This abundant grain crop can and will produce abundant and reasonably priced meats for the consumers of the United States if not hampered and restricted by price regulations, and, even worse, ill-advised United States Department of Agriculture programs.

Mr. President, to give some indication of how drastic the grain prices have dropped in the last 6 months, let me read the following telegram received yesterday from R. F. Gunkleman, one of the leading grain dealers in North Dakota. This telegram was in response to a request on my part to give me grain prices as of February 1, 1948, and as of August 1, 1948. The telegram reads:

FEBRUARY 1.

MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate:

> January 31 Card Fargo heavy wheat $2.71 plus, up to 38 cents protein premium; No. 2 yellow corn, $2.35; top malting barley, $2.53; No. 3 white oats, $1.19; No. 2 rye, $2. Today's close same. Grains: Wheat, $1.95 protein premiums up to 36 cents—

That is a drop of about $1 a bushel in wheat, or approximately 30 percent—

> corn, $1.68—

Which is very much below 6 months ago—

> barley, $1.33—

Again about 30 percent reduction—

> oats, 55 cents—

Which is about a 50-percent reduction—

> rye, $1.34. Grain markets demoralized due to heavy receipts.

R. F. GUNKELMAN.

Mr. President, this telegram gives a clear picture of how grain prices have dropped in the last 6 months, and even in the face of this production and abundant supplies, the President of the United States is asking for price controls when he, coming from a farm State, should know that these abundant and far cheaper grains will automatically be translated in a matter of months into abundant meat supplies—that is, if not hampered, as I stated, by a police state of regulations.

Perhaps I should go a bit further to state that practically all grain prices are below parity. That means under yardsticks set up by the United States Congress practically all grains are now below the cost of production, and in several instances below support levels. The answer to abundant and reasonable food prices is not to be found in either police-state regulations or special sessions of Congress called for purely political reasons. All we need to do is to let the farmers produce as they want to, unhampered by administration goals which in one year seek to reduce the food supplies of the American consumers, and when they have accomplished these goals of reducing supplies, then to ask for price controls. The answer, in my opinion, is a constructive program not only of increased production of meats but all other food supplies.

This can and will be accomplished if the administration does not again actually ask for short supplies.

Greatly increased poultry supplies can be had within a matter of months. Pork supplies can be greatly increased within a matter of a year, and beef supplies, through large-scale feeding of the abundant and cheaper supplies of grain, will also, in the matter of 6 months, greatly increase.

It does not, Mr. President, require a political session of Congress to accomplish this. All we need is a little common sense and constructive action on the part of the administration. Demagogic speeches by administration officials high in the United States Government designed purely as an appeal for votes from uninformed people is doing a real injustice not only to the United States farmer, who is doing a remarkable job in producing foods, but also to the consumers and all else concerned.

EXHIBIT A

SPRING PIG GOAL FOR 1948 IS ANNOUNCED

A national goal of 50,000,000 pigs for the spring of 1948 was suggested to farmers today by the United States Department of Agriculture, which at the same time reemphasized its request for feeding hogs to lighter weights. This goal compares to the 1947 pig crop of 53,000,000 pigs, a reduction of 3,000,000 or nearly 6 percent.

Officials stated that much larger quantities of grain could be saved by feeding hogs to lighter weights this winter and next spring than by asking for a greater reduction in pigs to be produced next spring. They said the suggested figure is the highest level of 1948 spring pig production they believed could be justified as a goal in view of the extent to which drought cut the 1947 corn crop and considering the present and prospective needs of European nations for cereals. On the other hand, they emphasized, that with prospects for smaller output of other meats in 1948-49, pork production for that period should be maintained at as high a level as can be justified with available feed supplies.

In setting the goal of 50,000,000 pigs, the Department recognized that, in view of the present feed situation, this number is about as many as can be expected next spring, and it is not likely that a goal requesting more would be attained. Officials pointed out that 1948 spring pigs will make our pork and lard supply from October 1948 through March 1949 and will get the greater portion of their feed from the 1948 corn crop, which with average weather would be much larger than this year's crop.

1948 goals with comparisons

Livestock	1937–41 average	1942–46 average	1947 indicated	1948 suggested goal	Percent 1948 goal is of—		
					1937–41 average	1942–46 average	1947 indicated
Milk produced on farms.....mil. lbs...	107,855	119,179	120,000	120,000	111	101	100
Eggs produced on farms.....mil. doz...	3,255	4,552	4,559	4,200	129	92	92
Hens and pullets on farms Jan. 1 thous. head...	377,566	477,714	436,525	400,000	106	84	92
Chickens raised (farm produced)....do....	665,436	866,443	742,047	690,104	104	80	93
Turkeys raised (farm produced)....do....	30,636	37,162	34,667	30,507	100	82	88
Sows to farrow, spring.....do....	7,034	9,502	8,709	7,936	105	84	91
Spring pigs.....do....	46,501	59,120	53,151	50,000	107	85	94
Cattle and calves on farms Jan. 1...do....	67,488	92,114	81,420	76,252	113	83	94
Slaughter.....do....	24,640	31,300	28,000	32,000	129	102	114
Sheep and lambs on farms Jan. 1...do....	46,879	43,404	32,242	31,500	67	73	97

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] to the brief comment I am about to make. I call his attention, as I did that of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], to my bill S. 2927, which deals with GI housing problems. I would say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I would appreciate it if he would examine the bill between now and the session tomorrow, because I here and now reserve the right to offer S. 2927 as an amendment to his substitute bill, as well as to the housing bill reported to the floor of the Senate by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

It will not be possible to have a hearing on my bill S. 2927 by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare between now and the time we meet tomorrow. A meeting simply cannot be arranged because many Senators are busy on other affairs; but we can, I think, since the subject matter is covered in two substitute bills now pending before the Senate, consider it on the floor of the Senate.

The reason I shall offer the bill as an amendment is that I think that neither one of the housing bills now pending covers the points which should be covered as presented in S. 2927, because they do not, in my judgment, give to the GI's the secondary market for their paper which they must have if they are going to secure the necessary loans from the banks with which to pay for houses, or build new houses.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] if he will before tomorrow morning obtain an informal expression from the Veterans' Administration or the Bureau of the Budget, or some other agency, as to roughly the amount of authorization which would be required, and roughly the total amount of loans which would be covered by the Senator's bill. I have glanced over it three times and frankly I am confused as to the effect of the bill. I am not asking the Senator to do it tonight, but if he could before the Senate convenes tomorrow obtain an expression from some of the Government agencies, either the Bureau of the Budget or the Veterans' Administration, I would certainly appreciate it.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that I shall endeavor to secure the information he desires.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have not had the privilege of reading the Senator's bill. Of course we have in the pending legislation a provision for secondary mortgages for GI loans. We are liberalizing the provision which was made during the last night of the last session. There is a danger involved in connection with this matter. There are now, counting FHA loans, something like $7,000,000,000 of mortgage paper guaranteed by the FHA or by the Veterans' Administration in the hands of the banks. We simply cannot invite the Government to take that all over. The limitation contained in our bill is $840,000,000, which goes fairly far. The Senator may think that the provisions are not quite liberal enough; yet there is serious danger that the banks will try to unload on the Government all the poorest veterans paper they have. I believe that members of the committee in both the House and Senate feel that the question must be approached with a great deal of care.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I certainly share the reservations expressed just now by the Senator from Ohio. As he knows, I being a member of his committee, we had those fears when the so-called Jenner bill was before us. However, I am advised—I hope correctly—that with some modification of lines 12 and 13 on page 28 of the bill we can meet the need for a secondary market now required by the veterans without running serious danger of having $7,000,000,000 worth of such paper dumped on the market. All I can say is that the various veterans' organizations have called to my attention the fact that the bill we passed in the closing hours of the previous session of the Eightieth Congress is not giving the veterans the relief which they need by way of a secondary market.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is quite correct. Of course, this provision does liberalize the terms. It doubles the number that any bank may sell.

RECESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, under the order already entered, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, August 6, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 5, 1948:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in Paris, France, beginning September 21, 1948:

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont.
John Foster Dulles, of New York.
Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York.
Philip C. Jessup, of New York.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in Paris, France, beginning September 21, 1948:

Benjamin V. Cohen, of New York.
Ray Atherton, of Illinois.
Willard L. Thorp, of Connecticut.
Ernest A. Gross, of New York.
Francis B. Sayre, of the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. Howard Lambdin, pastor of St. Luke's Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, which art in Heaven, we bow in quiet reverence before Thee today as we turn our minds to thoughts of highest levels. We desire to draw closer to Thee, that we might hear Thy voice giving us encouragement and wise guidance as we begin our activities in this day's session.

Our minds get disturbed and confused with many problems—hard-to-solve problems—and with many responsibilities—difficult and trying ones to our ways of thinking—yet, dear Father, we know we can come to Thee for that extra strength which we feel we need in the turmoil of these days.

We know that if we will but trust Thee Thou wilt see us through successfully, even through the hard places which seem to grow more numerous from day to day.

We ask Thy blessing on us all, and on all the peoples of our Nation whom we seek to serve honestly and with appreciation of their confidence in us. May we strive to do our part to bring about a real peace on earth, with good will toward men of all nations, and help to establish good feeling and brotherly kindness in the earth. We pray in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Owing to the business before the House today, the Chair will not entertain requests for 1-minute addresses, but will receive requests for extensions of remarks.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 12 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 190, introduced by him on April 27.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by George Sokolsky.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. McGARVEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. KEATING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill which he is introducing today.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune under the heading "The Fake Emergency," and in the other an editorial, The Great Blunder.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article he prepared for the Christian Century magazine.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the State-aid director.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by the minority whip, Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, which appeared in the Newark Sunday News August 1.

TRAIN NEW TROOPS NEAR THEIR HOMES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we are not at war, and there is no need for some of the practices which were considered advisable in the training of troops during the war.

I refer particularly to the Army's wartime method of breaking up the contingent of draftees from a city, town, or district and scattering it to points remote from the place of induction.

As an example, a man now employed as a secretary by me was sent with a group of 60 inductees from his home city of 85,000 population in Massachusetts to Camp Devens, also in Massachusetts, for 3 days. He was shipped to Miami Beach for basic training, and thence to Jefferson Barracks, Mo., for advanced training.

All this could have been done at Camp Devens or at one of the other training centers in New England.

Perhaps the Army's intent was to sever any lingering connection with homes immediately and completely. Perhaps it was to emphasize the national unity of our armed forces by assembling, as far as possible, a cross section of the Nation in each military unit. In any case, dispersion was realized.

During World War I, an original division like the Twenty-sixth or Yankee Division was composed almost entirely of Massachusetts men. Certain companies or batteries were made up of men coming from the same city. This developed a local or regional pride among the various divisions.

However, in the case of the man drafted from Massachusetts in World War II, who spent 6 months at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., which had a constantly changing military population of over 40,000, in all that time he met only 3 men from his home city in Massachusetts. And his city sent thousands of men to the Army.

We are faced with a far different situation today. We are simply training men for peacetime military service. They are not on the assembly line leading to inevitable combat. The inescapable urgencies of war are not with us.

I believe that one of the reasons why so many young men rushed to join the National Guard was not only to escape the continuous training and formal military life which they would be subject to as draftees but for the opportunity offered of taking such training at armories and camps either located in or near their communities.

Furthermore, they considered the National Guard as an arrangement whereby they could fulfill their obligations to national defense without interruption of their home life, their work experience, or their education.

There is no doubt that much of the opposition to the general idea of compulsory military training comes from the mothers of the United States. Unless the exigency of war is near and the need for such training is clearly and unmistakably evident, they oppose a policy which roots youngsters of an impressionable age out of their homes and into the segregated military life, divorced from the normal restraints and constructive influences of home life.

There are others, such as clergymen and educators, who fear that such dislocations would damage the social pattern of our national life.

It is not my purpose to argue against the idea of military training itself, because national defense requires a certain amount of cooperation and sacrifice.

Rather I seek some adjustment whereby the needs of the services will be met without a complete severance of home ties.

To that end I ask that the Secretary of National Defense assure the Congress and the country of a change in policy whereby the trainee shall be assigned to a camp as close to his home as is possible.

This will enable the trainee to visit home at least on week ends or will enable his folks to visit him.

Such a recognition of human needs on the part of the military will do much to develop a democratic army and will strengthen relationships between the military and the civilians.

The young men and their families ask for this small concession which will not interfere with the training part of the preparedness program.

I cannot see how the military can object to it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

TALK, TALK, EVERYWHERE—BUT NOT A BIT OF HELP

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 27 this special session of Congress heard the President's message and his recommendations for action by this Congress to control inflation and to solve the housing problem. An apt description of what has transpired in Congress since, can be put in these words, "Talk, talk, everywhere—but not a bit of help." We have heard in the Halls of Congress, and on the radio, and read in the press, every conceivable reason for our distressing economic plight. Everyone and everything has been blamed for the soaring prices and the lack of housing, but no solution has been brought to the floor of this House in the form of a bill which it can enact into legislation.

Yesterday a motion was adopted, permitting the passage of legislation under a suspension of the rules which would preclude debate and amendments and preclude motions to recommit any bills that might be offered. The motion was offered we were told because we are now going into the closing days of this special session. The majority leader of the House then told us that he did not know what the program was for those closing days. I hate to think that the motion was offered and passed because those in control of this House are fearful that somebody might come up with a good idea and offer it as an amendment to a pending bill, as a result of which we might stop the rising cost of living or possibly solve the housing shortage.

Repeatedly on the floor of the House we have been told that this country is not suffering from a high cost of living, but that it is suffering from the high cost of government.

I have carefully reviewed the history of legislation in the Eightieth Congress. I have been unable to find any legislation proposed seeking to eliminate the cost of social security, of unemployment insurance, of veterans' benefits, or of national defense. Nor have I seen any proposed legislation providing that the members of one political party in Government office should be paid any less than the members of any other party. Nor have I seen a single piece of legislation providing for the elimination of any of the services that are so necessary to the proper management and operation of our Government.

Let us stop all this talk. Let us get down to business. Let us do something.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the News and Courier, Charleston, S. C., of August 4.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts in each.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix.

THE LATE HONORABLE W. W. VENABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he will make one exception to the rule previously announced, in order to permit the announcement of the death of a former Member.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, the people of Mississippi, and especially the Fifth Congressional District, were saddened and grieved to learn of the passing on Monday, August 2, 1948, of a former Member of this House, and one of our most distinguished and beloved citizens, the Honorable W. W. (Webb) Venable, who served the Fifth Congressional District of Mississippi, which I now have the honor of representing, from January 4, 1916, to March 3, 1921.

Judge Venable began the practice of law in Meridian, Miss., where he formed the firm of Bordeaux and Venable. He served as prosecuting attorney of Lauderdale County from April to October 1910, at which time he was appointed district attorney. On January 1, 1915, he resigned, having been appointed to the bench. He served as judge of the tenth judicial district of Mississippi from 1915 until his resignation in December 1916 when he was elected as a Democrat to the Sixty-fourth Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Samuel A. Witherspoon. He was devoted to duty, and served ably and with distinction in every position to which he was honored.

In mourning his passing, the Meridian Star, one of Mississippi's greatest newspapers, stated:

Termed by the late President Woodrow Wilson as "one of the great statesmen of his time," Mr. Venable won national attention in the Congress for his ability in debate and oratory. His speech in defense of President Wilson after the end of World War I was considered one of the most classic addresses ever made before the Congress.

Throughout his life, Judge Venable was a student of law, literature, philosophy, and religion. He was a man of the highest Christian character, and for years before his death was a teacher of the Martin Bible class of the Clarksdale, Miss., Baptist Church. He was considered by all who knew him as one of the most outstanding attorneys in Mississippi. His passing has brought great sorrow to Mississippians, and our State and the Nation have lost one of their most distinguished citizens.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to the memory of William Webb Venable, late Representative from Mississippi, who was born in Clinton, Hinds County, Miss., on September 25, 1880, and died on August 2, 1948.

He was my devoted personal friend. We were classmates at Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss., where we both graduated in the class of 1898. The following year, we both attended the University of Mississippi, where he took a postgraduate course, and where I was graduated from the law department. After teaching school he was graduated from the law department of Cumberland University at Lebanon, Tenn., in 1905 and began the practice of law at Meridian, Miss. He was successively prosecuting attorney of Lauderdale County, district attorney, and circuit judge. He resigned as judge in December 1916 when he was elected from the fifth district to the Sixty-fourth Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Samuel A. Witherspoon and reelected to the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses. He served from January 4, 1916, to March 3, 1921. Upon his retirement from Congress, he moved to Clarksdale, Coahoma County, Miss., in the district that I represent, where he practiced law from 1921 until his death.

Judge Venable was well-prepared for the practice of law and unusually well-equipped for service as a Member of Congress. He was well-educated, and as a student of history and government was broadly and liberally informed. He was preeminently a student and well-versed in jurisprudence.

His father, the late Dr. A. A. Venable, was not only president of Mississippi College when he and I enrolled as freshmen in that institution, but was the teacher of Greek and theology. Like his father, he was a Baptist and a great teacher, having taught the Men's Bible class of the First Baptist Church at Clarksdale, Miss., for a quarter of a century.

Webb Venable was a good citizen. He was a patriot. He was devoted to his profession and to his country. No man was more greatly esteemed or highly respected in Mississippi than he.

He was an able lawyer, a capable statesman, and he was devoted to the service of the community in which he lived and the State in which he resided. I counted him among my best friends for more than half a century. His passing is a distinct loss to Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. I too would like to join with my colleague from Mississippi in paying tribute to the memory of Webb Venable. It was not my privilege to know Mr. Venable so well personally but I knew him by reputation, and that reputation was indeed good. He was an outstanding figure in the political history of Mississippi. He was an outstanding lawyer. He was known as one of the most able lawyers ever produced by our State. He was a fair man and like his minister father before him, he was a Christian man. As evidence of his Christian leadership he taught the men's Bible class in the Baptist Church of Clarksdale, Miss., for many, many years.

Mr. Venable was generally recognized throughout Mississippi as a leader, as a good lawyer, and as a Christian character. I deeply mourn the passing of this outstanding Mississippian.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was not my privilege to have known Judge Venable personally, but I will say that I was of course familiar, as every other Mississippian was, with the great work that he has done for the State of Mississippi and for the Nation. I join with my colleagues and friends and with the people of the State of Mississippi in mourning his untimely passing.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve with the distinguished former Member from Mississippi, Mr. Venable. I remember him as a young man. I think his ability as an orator has already been referred to. He made one of the most brilliant speeches during his short term as a Member of the House that I have ever heard on the floor of the House.

Mr. Venable was a fine man and a great American.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the Mississippi Delegation may have the privilege of extending their remarks on this subject at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor may hold hearings this afternoon during sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances and to include a speech by Assistant Secretary of State Allen, a radio address by Mrs. Dorothy Fuldheim, and a telegram from A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Mrs. LUSK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include excerpts from a letter of a constituent.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS (H. DOC. NO. 738)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, I am reporting to the Congress concerning a labor dispute which recently existed in the bituminous-coal industry.

The significant facts concerning this dispute may be summarized as follows:

The dispute involved the administration of a collective-bargaining agreement known as the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement of 1947, which was signed by the United Mine Workers of America and certain coal operators and associations. The dispute grew out of the dissatisfaction of the union with the failure of the trustees of the United Mine Workers of America welfare and retirement fund, established by the agreement, to begin the payment of benefits. In accordance with the terms of the agreement the union had appointed Mr. John L. Lewis as trustee of the fund, the operators had appointed Mr. Ezra Van Horn, and these two had selected Mr. Thomas E. Murray as the third trustee. The trustees were unable to agree upon any plan for the amount of benefits to be paid out of the fund or the eligibility of miners for such benefits. Mr. Murray therefore resigned from his office as trustee. The continued failure to begin payment from the fund resulted in a work stoppage.

On March 23, 1948, I signed Executive Order 9939, creating a Board of Inquiry pursuant to section 206 of the Labor Management Relations Act. I requested the Board to report to me on or before April 5, 1948. The Board held public hearings on March 26, 29, and 30, and filed its first report with me on March 31, 1948. That report advised me fully of the facts of the dispute and indicated that the stoppage had "precipitated a crisis in the industry and in the Nation as a whole." A copy of that report is attached.

I, therefore, requested the Attorney General, in accordance with the provisions of section 208 of the Labor Management Relations Act, to petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for an injunction. An injunction was granted by Justice T. Alan Goldsborough, of that court, on April 3, 1948. It restrained the union from continuing the strike which the court then found was in existence, ordered the union to instruct all members to return to their employment, and further ordered the union and the operators to bargain collectively.

Following the issuance of the injunction on April 3, 1948, there was a gradual return of miners to work. Compliance with the provisions of that injunction and substantially normal production in the bituminous coal mines was obtained on or about April 26, 1948.

Soon after the issuance of the injunction of April 3, 1948, the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES was selected by the two remaining trustees as the new third trustee under the agreement. Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. Lewis, as trustees, approved a plan for beginning payment of benefits under the fund. Mr. Van Horn withheld his approval and challenged the legality of the action of the majority of the trustees in a proceeding instituted in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. On June 23, 1948, Justice Goldsborough dismissed the complaint filed by Mr. Van Horn and held that the plan of Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. Lewis for beginning payment of benefits under the fund was legal.

As a result of the settlement of the dispute over the fund the Attorney General, pursuant to section 210 of the Labor Management Relations Act, requested the court to discharge the injunction. The injunction was discharged on June 23, 1948.

The Board of Inquiry was reconvened subsequent to the issuance of the injunction, pursuant to section 209 of the Labor Management Relations Act, and submitted its final report to me on June 26, 1948. A copy of the report is attached.

It should be noted that this dispute is distinct from that with respect to which I created a Board of Inquiry on June 19, 1948, by Executive Order 9970, and which made its report to me on June 24, 1948. That Board was created because of the imminent expiration of the 1947 contract between the United Mine Workers of America and the bituminous coal operators and the consequent threat of a stoppage of work. A new contract covering most of the industry was agreed upon by the parties prior to the expiration of the old contract and no injunction was sought. A new contract for the remainder of the industry was subsequently negotiated. Since the report of the second Board contains a comprehensive summary of the entire chain of events concerning both disputes, a copy of its report is attached to this message for the convenience of the Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 5, 1948.*

JUNE 26, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Board of Inquiry appointed by you under Executive Order No. 9939 to consider a labor dispute between United Mine Workers of America and the coal operators and associations, pursuant to the national bituminous coal wage agreement of 1947, submitted to you a written report on March 31, 1948.

As reported by us, the dispute grew out of the failure to activate a trust fund for the payment of pensions to miners. This trust fund was created by said wage agreement of 1947, which also provided that three trustees were to operate and administer the fund. The trustees were to be appointed one by the miners, one by the operators, and these two to select a third trustee. The miners selected Mr. John L. Lewis; the operators Mr. Ezra Van Horn; and these two in turn selected Mr. Thomas E. Murray. The trustees were unable to agree upon a plan to activate the fund or any portion thereof for the payment of pensions. Mr. Murray resigned, and with Mr. Lewis and Mr. Van Horn in complete disagreement, the fund, amounting to over $30,000,000 at that time, could not be activated, and out of this situation grew a work stoppage in the mines, as delineated in our report.

Since the filing of our report, Senator STYLES BRIDGES has been designated as a third trustee. Senator BRIDGES thereupon submitted a resolution for the activation of this trust fund for the payment of pension, and Mr. Lewis approved the resolution offered by Senator BRIDGES, but Mr. Van Horn withheld his approval. This led to the filing by Mr. Van Horn of a complaint against his fellow trustees in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, in which complaint he challenged the legality of the action taken by his fellow trustees. On the 22d day of June 1948, the Honorable T. Alan Goldsborough, District judge, before whom said complaint was pending, entered a decree in substance validating the action taken by trustees Lewis and Bridges and entered summary judgment in their favor, dismissing the complaint of Trustee Van Horn.

We are advised that the coal operators signatory to the wage agreement of 1947 have accepted the action of Judge Goldsborough. The dispute over the activation of the trust fund for the payment of pensions has therefore been settled.

We are further informed that a satisfactory wage agreement has been negotiated between the operators and the miners for the year 1948, and all the matters in dispute have been adjudicated or negotiated to a final and satisfactory settlement.

Our final report is therefore concluded upon the settlement of this dispute by the parties.

Respectfully submitted.

SHERMAN MINTON.
MARK ETHRIDGE.
GEORGE W. TAYLOR.

PROTECTING THE NATION'S ECONOMY AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That in order to protect the Nation's monetary, banking, and credit structure, and interstate and foreign commerce, against increased inflationary pressures, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are authorized, notwithstanding the act of August 8, 1947 (Public Law 336, 80th Cong.), to exercise, up to and including March 15, 1949, consumer-credit controls in accordance with and to carry out the purposes of Executive Order No. 8843 (August 9, 1941) insofar as it relates to installment credit.

All the present provisions of sections 21 and 27 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (relating to investigations, injunctions, jurisdictions, and other matters), shall be as fully applicable with respect to the exercise by the Board of Governors of consumer installment credit controls as they

are now applicable with respect to the exercise by the Securities and Exchange Commission of its functions under that act, and the Board shall have the same powers in the exercise of such consumer installment credit controls as the Commission now has under the said sections.

SEC. 2. (a) The third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by changing the first sentence of such paragraph to read as follows:

"Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 35 percent against its deposits and reserves in gold certificates of not less than 40 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation: *Provided, however*, That when the Federal Reserve agent holds gold certificates as collateral for Federal Reserve notes issued to the bank such gold certificates shall be counted as part of the reserve which such bank is required to maintain against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation."

(b) The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "25 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "40 percent."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To suspend for a period not exceeding 30 days, and from time to time to renew such suspension for periods not exceeding 15 days, any reserve requirements specified in this act: *Provided*, That it shall establish a graduated tax upon the amounts by which the reserve requirements of this act may be permitted to fall below the level hereinafter specified: *And provided further*, That when the reserve held against Federal Reserve notes falls below 40 percent, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall establish a graduated tax of not more than 1 percent per annum upon such deficiency until the reserves fall to 32½ percent, and when said reserve falls below 32½ percent, a tax at the rate increasingly of not less than 1½ percent per annum upon each 2½ percent or fraction thereof that such reserve falls below 32½ percent. The tax shall be paid by the Reserve bank, but the Reserve bank shall add an amount equal to said tax to the rates of interest and discount fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

SEC. 3. Section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the sixth paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion, may by regulation change the requirements as to reserves to be maintained pursuant to this section against demand or time deposits or both (1) by Member banks in central Reserve cities, or (2) by member banks in Reserve cities, or (3) by member banks not in Reserve or central Reserve cities, or (4) by all member banks; but no such change shall have the effect of requiring any such member bank to maintain a reserve balance against its time deposits in an amount equal to more than 7 percent thereof, or a reserve balance against its demand deposits in an amount equal to more than 29 percent thereof if such bank is in a central reserve city, 23 percent thereof if in a Reserve city, or 17 percent thereof if not in a Reserve or central Reserve city. No change in reserve requirements made under authority of this paragraph shall continue in effect after March 31, 1949."

Amend the title to read: "Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the tremendous importance of this measure I was wondering if the gentleman from Michigan would agree or ask unanimous consent that the time may be extended somewhat more than 20 minutes on a side. A great many Members on this side, I will say to the gentleman, desire to make some remarks, not only extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the leadership have told me that they have other things to do today. The issues in this resolution are quite simple and are, I think, quite well understood.

There are only three provisions in the resolution, one of which was discussed quite at length on the floor, with respect to the gold-reserve requirement. I do not know that there should be any objection to the reimposition of consumer-credit controls by the minority, because the President stressed the necessity for that in his message. That subject has been before the House on various occasions. The provision in the bill with respect to the increase in the reserves of the banks is a very simple problem which should not be controversial.

I hope the gentleman will not insist upon extending the time because of that situation. As a matter of fact, we have made statements to the Senate leaders that we would try to get this resolution over to them very early in the afternoon in order that they might have a committee meeting and determine what they would do, in the hope that they would be able to dispose of the matter this afternoon.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is not my purpose to make the request myself. I was wondering if the gentleman himself would make the request that we might have an additional 10 or 15 minutes on a side.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am inclined to think at the present time that 40 minutes altogether would probably be ample to cover the whole situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Further reserving the right to object, do I understand that the gentleman refuses to extend the time?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No request has been made to extend the time yet. I am not in a position at the present time to ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the Chair recognize a Member to ask unanimous consent to extend the time?

The SPEAKER. Another request is pending before the House at the present time. The question is, Shall a second be considered as ordered?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will not object to that.

The SPEAKER. Those are the parliamentary rules which the Chair must observe.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that a second be considered as ordered?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the Chair recognize me to submit a unanimous-consent request that the time be extended?

The SPEAKER. The Chair of course dislikes to refuse to put the request, but may he inquire if the gentleman from Massachusetts has consulted the majority leader about this?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have not.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. There has been no consultation with me about this matter at all. I say this in no way of criticism of the action of the minority leadership, but it came to me as a complete surprise. As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has pointed out, we hope to dispose of this matter and get it over to the Senate so action can be expedited. It has been said all along that this is a great emergency that requires prompt action. In addition, we have the United Nations proposal, in which there is much interest, and which we expect to dispose of today also. As far as I am concerned, I think, as the gentleman from Michigan has pointed out, that this matter has been debated, and the principles involved are known to all of us, and it seems to me that in the interest of expediting the work of the Congress and our work here today the time as allotted under the rules will be sufficient for the discussion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, continuing my parliamentary inquiry, I would never ask anything that I could not entertain myself. That is one policy I attempt to follow through life. Under the rules, 40 minutes of debate are allowed on this proposition. It seems to me that an extension to 1 hour, half an hour on a side, is not going to cause any serious delay, but it will give an opportunity for Members to be heard. It is not that we are thinking in terms of hours of debate, but a reasonable period should be allowed to give some Members the opportunity to express themselves. That is what I had in mind. I recognize that we should have gone to the majority leader, but there are times when the leaders on that side do not come to us, and we just accept that.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why not let the Members extend their remarks in the RECORD, and everybody will read them tomorrow, and it will have the same effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have such a warm regard for my friend from Pennsylvania that I would not undertake to give him the answer his inquiry would properly and from a tolerant angle deserve.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman should not hesitate to express himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, then, if the Chair will recognize me for that purpose——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it having been developed, apparently, that unanimous consent will not be granted, he feels it would be unwise to ask it, when there is no possibility of its being granted.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is why I submitted my parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SABATH. Do I understand the Members are precluded and denied the right——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will submit a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SABATH. Are the Members denied the right to ask unanimous consent to extend the time? Have we not the right at least to ask that, and should that not be considered by the Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has stated that he feels that in view of the fact that it would be impossible to secure that unanimous consent it would be futile for the Chair to present the question.

Mr. SABATH. So the Chair rules on that theory——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not made any ruling.

Mr. McCORMACK. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Chair as a Member of the House himself adopts that position?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not adopting that position, neither is he objecting to the extension to 1 hour. He is not the one who would object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why not let me submit the unanimous-consent request so that the Chair will not be in the position of indirectly objecting?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not recognized the gentleman for that purpose as yet. The Chair will state that he is at all times ready to assume his responsibility for the maintenance of the rules of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that this bill would come up under a rule so that it might be subject to amendment. There are two provisions in the bill: One to change the reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks and put them back to their previous level—40 percent gold, so-called backing for Federal Reserve notes, and 35 percent for Federal Reserve bank deposits.

The claim is being made by the opposition that this would so contract the credit and currency as to seriously hamper the ability of the Federal Reserve Board to manage the Federal debt.

I want you to listen to these figures. The Federal Reserve has an excess of gold reserves at the present time amounting to $4,600,000,000. There can be made available from the Treasury an additional $1,300,000,000. The sum of the two is capable of a credit expansion of anywhere between, roundly, seventy-four and eighty-nine billion dollars.

So the claim that is going to be made by the opposition that this would hamper the Federal Reserve authorities in their efforts to maintain the bond market and to control the Federal debt is without foundation.

The other provision in this bill has to do with installment credit. That is the provision which I would have asked to have stricken if the bill had been brought in so that it could have been amended.

What this bill does is to actually limit the purchasing power of those people who buy under the installment plan to about what it was in 1937. In other words, they cannot buy any more goods under this bill than they were able to buy in 1937.

As a matter of fact, per capita, they would be able to buy less, because of the increase in population. I believe that is hitting just a little bit too low below the belt.

I voted against the measure which reduced the gold reserves which were required to be held against Federal Reserve notes and Federal Reserve bank deposits. My position on this matter at the present time is this. The raising of the reserves to their previous level will have no effect on inflation or the ability of the Treasury to manage the Federal debt.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] a statement by the President of the United States as well as copies of several telegrams from various labor organizations in connection with the housing legislation and the high-cost-of-living legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a statement by Hon. Marriner Eccles, for many years Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in regard to the pending bill.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the special session of the Congress has been called by the President for the purpose of enacting legislation that would aid in controlling the dangerous inflationary tendencies that now exist.

In his message he made 10 suggestions for legislation which he thought the Congress should enact in order that this dangerous condition might be controlled. Many of these proposals were incorporated in the bill H. R. 7062, which the Committee on Banking and Currency considered for a few days. But after consideration of that bill, as has been customary in that committee, another and entirely different bill was drawn out of the hat. It was not considered by the committee. It was reported by a partisan vote.

This is the greatest problem for solution that has been submitted to the American people in a decade. It is a question that deserves the deep consideration of the Congress. It deserves their study and their deliberation, and yet it is brought to the House under a suspension of the rules, with 20 minutes' debate on each side, and with no opportunity to amend the bill. This character of consideration violates every democratic process.

This bill is totally inadequate to meet present conditions. The President has asked for bread and the Congress has again given him a stone. I think it is an affront to the intelligence of the Congress and every liberal principle that they only have the opportunity to vote this bill up or down after practically no debate.

I think I can say the Federal Reserve Board is utterly opposed to the bill. I have a devastating statement here from Mr. Eccles, in regard to some of the provisions of the bill, and in this respect he speaks for the Board. It is true the bill continues regulation W that would regulate installment buying and consumer credit. Those who have administered these measures say that that would be totally inadequate unless accompanied by other measures that would have the effect of controlling inflation.

The bill authorizes the increase in reserves against bank deposits by 3 percent. The member banks now have in their possession $65,000,000,000 in Federal securities. They could sell about $3,000,000,000 of those securities and comply with this increase in the reserves and still have $62,000,000,000 in their portfolios. The effect of this increase would be negligible.

The bill provides that gold certificates against Federal Reserve deposits shall be increased from 25 percent to 35 percent, and that gold certificates against Federal Reserve notes shall be increased from 25 percent to 40 percent. This provision will eventually weaken the authority of the Federal Reserve System in supporting the bond market of the United States, which involves its faith and credit. After the last war the public indebtedness of the United States was about $21,000,000,000 and the bonds of United States bore 4½ percent and were nontaxable. There was no support of these bonds by the Federal Reserve and they dropped to 80 percent of par. We can well feel a deep apprehension of what might result at the present time to Government securities yielding 2½ percent which are taxable when the public debt amounts to $250,000,000,000 if the market support were removed.

It is a dangerous measure, one that may be fraught with great peril to the economy of America and one whose ultimate result cannot now be foreseen.

Because of the inadequate consideration of this bill and because of the perils that lurk in it, I shall vote against it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Under the permission granted me, I include the statement of Mr. Eccles:

STATEMENT OF HON. MARRINER ECCLES BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE IN REGARD TO THE INCREASE IN THE GOLD RESERVES AGAINST FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES AND FEDERAL RESERVE BANK DEPOSITS

Restoration of the previous ratio of required gold certificate reserves held by Federal Reserve banks of 40 percent against Federal Reserve notes and 35 percent against Federal Reserve bank deposits has been proposed to your committee as an anti-inflationary measure. This proposal would make no contribution whatever to the fight against inflation. It would not sterilize new acquisitions of gold nor would it give the Federal Reserve System any additional powers to curb inflationary expansion of bank credit.

The present reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks stand at a uniform level of 25 percent. Congress established them at this level in consequence of the wartime expansion of currency and Reserve bank credit. The previous requirements of 40 percent against notes and 35 percent against deposits, incorporated in the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, were largely arbitrary.

To restore the prewar levels now would only entail needless operating difficulties for some of the Federal Reserve banks. The combined banks at present hold gold certificates amounting to 50.6 percent of their total note and deposit liabilities, or approximately $6,000,000,000 in excess of the proposed higher requirements. Thus, they would not prohibit Reserve banks from providing member banks with additional funds on which to base a considerable further expansion of bank credit.

If Reserve banks were to be prevented by this device from issuing currency and member banks were thus unable to supply currency to their customers, it would precipitate the kind of money panic which the Federal Reserve System was created to prevent. Likewise, if the Federal Reserve System, because of an artificial limitation, were unable to supply credit to member banks, the results could well be demoralizing in the Government bond market.

Although the Reserve System as a whole has gold certificate reserves in excess of the proposed higher requirement, there is considerable variation among individual Federal Reserve banks. As a practical operating matter, these banks cannot permit the ratios to go down to the vanishing point and hence require a working margin of at least 3 percentage points.

If the higher requirement were restored, some Federal Reserve banks would have a substantial deficiency, others would be below or close to the necessary operating margin, while still others would have a large excess.

Reserve banks with a deficiency would be obliged to sell some of their Government securities to or to borrow from Reserve banks which had an excess. The reserve position of the individual Federal Reserve banks is constantly changing with seasonal and other movements of funds in the economy. Therefore, the proposal would entail operating difficulties and constant inconvenience without accomplishing any useful purpose.

Expansion or contraction of Reserve-bank credit should be determined by the needs of the economy and not by the amount of gold certificates which Reserve banks happen to have, which in turn is contingent upon international movements of gold.

Likewise, inability to supply credit to member banks would compel the System to withdraw support from the Government securities market and perhaps even to sell securities which it now holds at whatever prices or yields they would bring in the market.

The Reserve banks do not control the amount of currency which the public wishes to hold. It is the depositors of the banks and the recipients of checks who determine the volume of outstanding currency. They create the demand and member banks come to their respective Federal Reserve banks to obtain such amounts of currency as their depositors or others presenting checks may desire to have.

If the Reserve System were unable to meet demands for currency it would jeopardize public confidence and might lead to runs on banks and to hoarding of currency, such as occurred in 1931.

It is already within the System's power to invoke such drastic measures. The System has rejected such a course because of the possible disastrous effects on the entire financial situation of the country.

The proposal would appear to be designed to force the Federal Reserve System to abandon support of the Government securities market and thus bring about sharp increases in interest rates. It is inconceivable that Congress or the public desire either to create a run on the currency or collapse of the bond market. If that were the will of the majority, it should be done openly and frankly and not by indirection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted, I include the statement of the President:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

AUGUST 5, 1948.

It now appears that the Eightieth Congress is determined to take no effective action on the proposals which I have submitted to curb high prices and to protect the average American citizen against the certain prospect of increased living costs.

I have been informed that the Republican leadership has decided that the Congress will not be allowed to consider really effective measures to stop high prices. Republican leaders reached this decision without obtaining the full information the administration was prepared to offer in connection with my recommendations. In fact, the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency refused a request for three Cabinet members to be given an opportunity to testify before the committee.

The Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and Interior were and are now prepared to testify. The Secretary of Agriculture was prepared to offer a program directed to the problem of excessive food prices. The Secretary of Commerce was prepared to discuss with the committee the question of shortages of industrial materials and what could be done to correct the situation. The Secretary of the Interior was prepared to submit a program dealing with the proper distribution and prices of coal, heating oil, and other fuels. The committee of the House refused to receive the views of these members of my Cabinet. In the absence of such basic information I do not see how the committee can make an intelligent decision on issues which so gravely affect the welfare of the American people and their standard of living.

Following the same pattern the Ways and Means Committee of the House refused to give any consideration to the recommendation for an excess-profits tax, which is necessary to offset the inflationary effects of the tax bill passed last spring. The chairman of this committee has not even called a meeting of the committee since the Congress reconvened.

It would appear that the Republican leaders are unwilling to extend to the Congress an opportunity to vote on the issues of direct price control, the authority to impose allocations and priorities, and the other elements of a balanced program which I submitted to the Congress, including provisions to strengthen and reinforce rent control.

It now appears that so far the Congress has failed to discharge the tasks for which I called it into special session. It is my hope, therefore, that the Republican leadership will reconsider their present plans for quick adjournment and will take action upon the recommendations I have submitted.

There is still time for the Congress to fulfill its responsibilities to the American people. Our people will not be satisfied with the feeble compromises that apparently are being concocted.

TELEGRAMS FROM THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

AUGUST 4, 1948.

To Senator TOBEY:

Press reports indicate that housing legislation is now being considered which would not include such essential features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as public housing, slum clearance, and rural housing. We strongly urge that your committee hold fast to all of the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. If any housing legislation other than S. 866 should be considered by your committee we respectfully request that we be given an opportunity to state our views on this all-important question.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

AUGUST 4, 1948.

To Congressman JESSE WOLCOTT:

Press reports indicate that housing legislation is now being considered which would not include such essential features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as public housing, slum clearance, and rural housing. This organization is strongly on record as favoring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as it passed the Senate. If your committee should consider any housing legislation which does not include all of the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill we respectfully request that we be given an opportunity to state our views on this all-important question.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

TELEGRAMS FROM LABOR ORGANIZATIONS TO CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS REQUESTING OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY BEFORE BILLS ARE REPORTED OUT OF COMMITTEE

1. Telegram from H. W. Fraser, president of Railway Labor Executives Association, to Senators CHARLES W. TOBEY, J. J. SPARKMAN; Congressmen JESSE P. WOLCOTT and BRENT SPENCE:

AUGUST 4, 1948.

Railway labor regards as imperative the passage of adequate housing and anti-inflation measures before the special session adjourns, I urge you and your associates on behalf of a million and a quarter of railroad workers to press for action on these two basic problems. We must have good laws on both if our economy is to avoid increasing difficulties in the months immediately ahead. Our people desire to be heard on any new housing measure or any anti-inflation measure which the special session may consider. Please address reply to 1412 East Pikes Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colo.

H. W. FRASER,
Chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association.

2. Telegram from Alexander F. Whitney, president of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, to Senators TAFT, WHERRY, BARKLEY, MCGRATH; Congressmen MARTIN, HALLECK, RAYBURN, and MCCORMACK:

AUGUST 4, 1948.

Due to pyramiding in prices which are forcing a reduction in standards of millions of the common people and a serious housing shortage, it is imperative that adequate laws be enacted to immediately relieve these serious situations and I urge that immediate public hearings be held to permit testimony from well-informed and interested people. I desire to personally testify before the appropriate committees and will greatly appreciate an early reply advising day and hour I may be heard.

A. F. WHITNEY,
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

AUGUST 4, 1948.

Send the following telegram to: Senator ROBERT TAFT, Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C., and JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

"When the Congress adjourned in June it left behind an unprecedented record of unfinished business. Bills to meet the needs of the American people were ignored, pigeonholed, or amended beyond recognition. The special session of Congress called by President Truman gave Congress an opportunity to rewrite its record. Food that cost $1 in June 1946, now cost $1.47. Other necessities like clothing, which cost $1 in June 1946, now cost $1.25. The doubling up of many American families, due to the housing shortage, is a crime. With both political parties committed to the passage of civil-rights legislation, the effect of Senator VANDENBERG'S ruling prevents this issue from coming to a vote.

"The Congress of Industrial Organizations was informed this morning that, due to a decision of the Republican policy committee, the Congress will adjourn Saturday having heard, outside of Government witnesses, only the representatives of the banking fraternity on the all-important question of inflation.

"The phony filibuster successfully conducted by the southern Democrats is a decided contrast to the prompt squelching by the Republican leadership of the recent filibuster led by Senator LANGER to include a civil-rights program in the recently enacted Selective Service Act. Senator VANDENBERG'S ruling, which allowed the filibuster to continue, makes a mockery of the deliberative process and, in view of the arbitrary adjournment date, made it easy for the Republican Party to do nothing effective to control inflation, to do nothing to provide decent homes for the returned veterans, to do nothing to protect and extend the civil rights of all the people.

"Although it would appear that there is no need for long hearings to establish the need for anti-inflation legislation, the meaningless bill now being considered makes it mandatory for organizations representing the public interest to be heard. Senator CAPEHART has publicly stated that the people were not interested in the cost of living. He claimed that there were no requests to testify on the need for legislation to halt the upward inflationary spiral, despite the fact that the CIO and many other groups representing the average American have requested time to be heard on this subject.

"In the interest of the general public, we urge that you as leaders of the Republican Party exercise your influence to hold Congress in session in order to hear the views of President Philip Murray on inflation, Secretary-Treasurer Carey on the civil-rights program, Vice President Rieve on the excess-profits-tax bill introduced by Congressman DINGELL, and the need for enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill by Vice President Reuther. This special session of Congress cannot afford to adjourn without establishing this record on which the American people will vote November 2.

"I would appreciate an early reply so that if Congress is to stay at work and do its job we can inform our membership and arrange for the appearance of our witnesses.

"JAMES B. CAREY.
"Secretary-Treasurer of the CIO."

AUGUST 4, 1948.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We were shocked to be informed today that the CIO has been denied an opportunity to testify during the hearings being conducted by your committee on proposed anti-inflation legislation.

The 6,000,000 members of the CIO and their families are suffering daily what may properly be described in the language of the Republican Party Presidential candidate as "frightful impositions" caused by the high and rising cost of living resulting from uncontrolled inflation that, if continued, is bound to result in bust and depression. We believe our testimony would be of interest and value to your committee. In any event, we feel that we should have an opportunity to present it on its merits and under circumstances that will make it possible for the members of your committee to test its validity by questioning.

More shocking than the abrupt cloture invoked before opportunity had been given to us or to other organizations to present facts, opinions, problems, and criticisms of pending legislation is the reason stated for breaking off hearings, namely, a decision by the Republican policy committee that, rain or shine, inflation or no inflation, the Congress must adjourn next Saturday night.

Most shocking is the statement that only Government witnesses would be heard and the unprecedented classification of private bankers whose banks happen to be members of the Federal Reserve System as "Government witnesses." As we understand it, they are members of the Federal Reserve System purely for regulatory purposes.

The discrimination in favor of the bankers on the one hand and against other citizens and their organizations on the other hand is an unfortunate precedent which, we prefer to believe, you personally would not seriously defend.

We urge you to reconsider and to support our request to Senator TAFT and Speaker MARTIN that Congress be kept in session until effective action has been taken on the emergency items of inflation, housing, and civil rights.

We will appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience.

JAMES B. CAREY,
Secretary-Treasurer, CIO.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, this Congress was called into session to deal with the mounting effects of inflation. While the call was obviously political, the problem of inflation is not political. Indeed, inflation is the most complex economic problem of the age in which we live.

Its solution or nonsolution will determine the future of the people of this country and affect the whole world. So it certainly is a problem that deserves the patient, sober, and careful consideration of the membership of this House.

I should like to vote for a bill that would approach this problem constructively and effectively, but I have been unable to convince myself that the measure before us does more than temporize with this problem.

This bill reminds me of the inflation-control bill before us last December. When that bill was before the House I made this statement:

There is one thing Congress can do about inflation that would be worse than no action at all. That is to pass an anti-inflation bill that does not touch the root cause of inflation.

You know what happened after that bill was passed. The price level kept right on going up and it is going up now. Neither the cause or causes of inflation were at all halted by that measure.

There is a very evil byproduct of this business of temporizing with inflation. I would like to discuss that angle in the very limited time now at my disposal.

There are shrewd people in this country who understand what inflation is doing to the value of money. The longer we postpone coming to grips with this situation the longer the span of time given to speculators and profiteers to outwit the poor and the trusting people of the country and separate them from real property. Here is one of the ugliest payoffs of inflation. All you need to do to see how this evil operates is to recall what happened in Germany during their inflation in the early twenties. There the humble people who relied on government promises found themselves after the inflation with baskets full of worthless currency while the shrewd and unscrupulous came out owning the real wealth of the nation.

Every time we take action that temporizes with inflation the message goes out to the trusting people that Congress has done something toward really halting inflation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Nebraska one additional minute.

Mr. BUFFETT. I think we should tell the people frankly that the present cruel inflation has been created over a 15-year period and its consequences cannot be evaded.

We could go on from there and declare that Congress is going to recover and again carry out its responsibility to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

As the first move we should set up a bipartisan monetary commission to go to work on this complex problem. A monetary commission, to be appointed by the President, Speaker of the House, and President pro tempore of the Senate, could carefully appraise and study the whole range of inflation's ramifications. It could get at the roots of the present inflation and formulate a program to work us out of this fearful situation.

It certainly should be clear to all Members of the House now that little progress can be made on this problem in an atmosphere continually supercharged with political considerations.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that charges and countercharges, plus demogogic appeals of all kinds will continue to muddy the waters and make a cool and dispassionate approach to this problem almost impossible if its consideration is limited to committee hearings and floor debate.

A bipartisan monetary commission could assemble the facts on this matter and work out a pattern for its solution free from the unsettling developments of the political arena. With the commission's program in hand the Congress could enact the legislation necessary to restore stable money to the American people.

America desperately needs a money which will give the producer an assurance that when he saves dollars and tries to provide for his future he holds a repository of value having a reasonably permanent and stable purchasing power.

Mr. Speaker, a monetary commission established now would demonstrate to the country that this Congress was going at the job of ending inflation in a constructive, nonpartisan, and businesslike fashion.

Bills providing for the monetary commission have been introduced. I hope this proposal will get serious consideration before we go home from the special session.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include excerpts.)

GOVERNMENT-BOND PRICES MUST BE SUPPORTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the people who own United States Government bonds have a right to expect the Government to make it possible for them to redeem their bonds 100 percent with interest at all times.

If we pass this bill there is one provision that will jeopardize the policy of the open-market committee of the Federal Reserve System in supporting the prices of bonds. That is the second part wherein it is proposed to increase the reserves on the Federal Reserve notes from 25 percent as at present to 40 percent and to increase the reserve requirements behind Federal Reserve bank deposits to 35 percent from the present 25 percent. That is going to lower the amount of gold which is available to support the bond market and will weaken the cushion that is now being used to support the bond market. If that is true to the extent many of us believe it is, it will in all probability cause a flight from Government bonds to dollars and from dollars to tangible property. Then we will be in a real inflation.

That is what I am afraid this bill will bring about. It is the most dangerous provision I have ever seen written into a bill involving our entire economy. The prosperity of the people depends upon a good currency. We cannot have a prosperous country without a good, sound, stable currency. When the people get the idea that their bonds are not going to be supported by the Government as the Government promised them it would support their bonds, I am apprehensive that some serious things might happen, and the inflation we now have is minor as compared to what it will be then.

This is so serious I ask you to consider what the effect might be on the Government-bond market and the bonds that are now owned by millions of people in this country who bought them with the understanding and the promise of the United States Government that they could always get their money back 100 cents on the dollar. It is a dangerous bill and I expect to vote against it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therein a very remarkable, able, and clear portion of the committee's report headed "General statement."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

HIGH PRICES ARE THE RESULT, NOT THE CAUSE, OF INFLATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest, clearest statements on the current economic situation in the United States I have come across appears in the report 2455 on this bill by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. With the permission of the House, I insert it in my remarks at this point in the RECORD at this time.

The statement follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

In considering the program presented to Congress in the President's message of July 27, 1948, Congress agrees that one of the basic problems confronting the American people is inflation with its resulting high prices. It recognizes that the Government should take the leadership in stabilizing the value of the American dollar to the end that prices may be adjusted. It considered that a sound economy in the United States is the key to world stability, prosperity, and peace.

High prices are not the cause but the result of inflation. They reflect depreciation in the value of the dollar. Causes for such depreciation of the value of the American dollar are well known. Every effort should be made to remove them. Basically these causes are the easy-money policies of the Government and the unusually heavy demand by foreign countries for American goods.

It may be recalled that almost all the efforts of the Government since 1933 have been to make money and credit easier. The end result of our efforts between 1933 and 1940 were to lick a depression. From 1940 until VJ-day in 1945 the object of Government was to win the war. In order to lick the depression the Government found it necessary to augment the credits which were customarily made available through private sources. It increased the supply of money and credit to restore purchasing power and the demand for both consumer and producer goods. It made available billions of dollars for public and private works as an aid to employment. For years Government expenditures exceeded Government revenue. Deficit financing was taken for granted. Debt increased by billions each year. To make money and credit easier this debt was monetized. The Government provided that this debt could be used as collateral for the issuance of money. Debt and money was brought into such close affiliation that the value of the currency largely depended upon the size of the debt. As debt increased and money became more plentiful, money became less of value. As a consequence prices and purchasing power rose.

As we entered the war it was considered necessary to continue these easy money and credit policies to finance war production. Deficit financing increased daily. National debt increased to an unprecedented $279,000,000,000. Wages rose. Farm income rose. Corporate earnings rose. National income was rising as the national debt increased. Because our farms and factories were producing for war there was a scarcity of consumer goods. Our people could not use their purchasing power, consequently savings per capita rose to all-time highs. The influences created by previous attempts during the depression to make money and credit plentiful were unfortunately continued. On VJ-day we found ourselves with an exceedingly large amount of savings and high earnings. Private debt could be liquidated easily from current income. Following VE-day the administration contemplated a postwar depression which never materialized. To meet this mythical depression they took further steps by reducing gold reserves of the banks to make money and credit easier.

It is difficult for anyone to admit mistakes. When mistakes are made those in responsible positions of the Government should be courageous enough to admit the mistakes and do everything possible to correct them. Instead, Government policies were inaugurated and maintained which inspired inflationary spirals and which in practice have proved that a politically managed economy is the opposite of American principles and can only result in possible economic chaos and disaster.

A strong, sound America is necessary to world stability and peace. There is nothing wrong with the United States that production and sound fiscal policies will not correct. Fiscal policies of the Government since VE-day have not been sound. They have been conducive to economic and financial uncertainty. They have inspired inflationary tendencies which make it necessary now for the Government to take drastic measures. The American form of government is only as effective in meeting crises as the administrators of the Government are courageous in utilizing the powers over which they have control. For years the President and the Federal Reserve System have had the powers to stabilize our economy. Judicious use of these powers would have prevented present high prices. Judicious use of these powers from now on can prevent higher prices and can result in economic and financial stability. Political expediency should not control action in this respect. The measures taken by Government to make money and credit easier, to cheapen the value of the dollar, to raise prices, were altogether too successful in the postwar period.

Almost every one of the acts passed by the Congress to lick a depression and win a war is still on the statute books and is being fully utilized by the administration to maintain a cheapened dollar and higher prices. It naturally follows that a reversal of these processes will bring about an appreciation of the value of the dollar, lower prices, economic and financial stability. The administration has not used the powers to stabilize our economy, which powers have been called repeatedly to the attention of those responsible for the administration of the laws. Instead of reversing the policies which have lead to inflation, the administration has insisted upon maintaining these policies but has consistently tried to offset their evil effects by new and untried controls over our economy. Instead of using the orthodox methods at its disposal to stabilize the American dollar and our economy, the administration asks for price controls, for allocation controls, and priority controls. These proposed panaceas for the ills of our economy should be studied in the light of past painful experiences. Price controls, allocations, and priorities are a mere palliative to ease the symptoms of inflation. They do not cure. They cannot be administered without serious set-backs to our productive effort. They beget a vast brood of contradictions and uncertainties. They promote black markets and tax evasions. Production and more production is the key to economic stability. We cannot have high production when price, priority, and allocation controls are being maintained. The memories of the people are not so short as not to recall that, with OPA price control, rationing, allocation, and priorities, the economic structure was brought to the brink of chaos. We emphasize the fact that it is impossible to have such restrictions and at the same time have full production. This committee is fearful that, if authorized, such powers would be used as ineffectively and as injudiciously as before. We are fearful that the consequence of their reimposition would be similar chaos and uncertainty.

Our economic equilibrium is balanced on very sensitive scales. Production at the present time is at an all-time high. We cannot afford for political purposes to throw our economy out of balance and possibly destroy the influences which are now at work to balance demand with supply. Marriner S. Eccles, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, testified that "the program—the President's—taken as a whole seems to me to be more of a political program than an economic one because there is in the program action called for which would be very inflationary."

None of the witnesses appearing before the committee on the President's proposed program were able to state specifically how the powers asked for would be used. Some of them testified that the measures requested were in themselves inflationary. None denied that to delegate to the President any of the powers which he asked for would reestablish the police state, the existence of which he deplored when by Executive order he removed price controls in November 1946.

The committee has been of the opinion that if there were deficiencies in the powers which the President and the Federal Reserve had to stabilize the economy, sympathetic consideration would be given to recommendations to correct the situation. The request of the President's message for further credit controls by the Federal Reserve System constituted the first formal proposal submitted by the administration to this committee in respect to primary bank reserve requirements. Although these reserve requirements have been, except in the case of the central reserve city banks, at the legal maximum since November 1, 1941, no formal request has previously been made for an increase in reserve authority. This authority has been granted in this bill. This authority together with the powers which the President and the Federal Reserve have had throughout the years are ample if judiciously used to stabilize prices. They constitute the means by which sound fiscal policies may be effectuated and thereby one of the basic causes for high prices may be removed.

Under the Anti-Inflation Act of 1947 (Public Law 395, 80th Cong.) the President was given specific powers to control our exports. Not an ounce of goods could be exported without a license granted by the Department of Commerce under this authority. At the time this authority was given to the President, this committee in its report (H. Rept. No. 1160, 80th Cong.), stated as follows:

"The committee believes there are two basic reasons for domestic high prices. First: Prevailing money and credit policies, and second the unusually large foreign demand for American goods in short supply. Consistent with this view, the committee provides in the joint resolution for the continuation of export controls. It is their belief that these controls should be exercised by the President in such a manner as to adjust exports to domestic stability."

This committee now is of the opinion that if export controls had been used in such a manner as to minimize the impact of excessively large demands by foreign countries for American goods in short supply prices of consumer goods would be much lower than they are today. In summary, the committee states that since the causes of high prices are recognized the cures can be found. First, the shortage of goods against high purchasing power can be corrected by encouraging maximum production; second, the excessively large costs of Government which might result in further deficit financing must be lowered in every way possible.

The easy-money policies of the administration must come to an end. All segments of our economy must be informed that it henceforth will be the policy of Government to restrict nonproductive credit to the fullest extent practicable. Coordination of effort to this end must be established between the responsible departments of Government and the Federal Reserve System. No legislation in addition to that provided in this bill is needed in the foreseeable future to enable the administration to stabilize our money and our economy but at the next session of Congress a full review of laws now on the statute books having to do with credit and money should be made with a view to encouraging a coordinated program and to further effectuate the purposes of this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this phony bill which does not make any single effective approach to controlling inflation is here in good faith or in expectation that it will pass. It is a political effort, in my opinion, to force the Democrats to vote against the bill so that they may say the Democratic minority failed to give the President authority to control inflation.

This bill does not do anything effective in controlling inflation.

On this bill the great Republican mountain has "labored" for 2 weeks and has brought forth two little tiny mice.

One is to provide for installment credit controls only until March 1949. This would barely give time to print the forms and put the regulations into effect, so it cannot possibly have, standing alone, any effect in bringing down the already skyrocketing cost of living.

The only other affirmative thing that this resolution attempts to do is to increase reserves of members of the Federal Reserve banks by 3 percent on demand deposits and 1 percent on time deposits.

The President asked for 10 percent reserve and they are giving him a third of a loaf. So I say this resolution could not possibly have any real effect whatsoever in stemming or even slowing down the disastrous spiral of inflation that is going on.

You are merely giving the giant of inflation a tiny tap on the wrist to stop this run-away cost of living.

But, this resolution does contain the most dangerous provision that I have ever seen brought in. No single witness testified or advocated it. Yet we find it in the resolution. It is a move, cleverly concealed and camouflaged, to destroy the open-market operations of a Federal Reserve bank in the handling of our $250,000,000,000 debt.

That is the greatest debt that any government in the world's history has ever had to carry. The safe management of it is the cornerstone of our capitalistic system, and yet by this cleverly concealed dagger you destroy the successful open-market operation and the debt management policy of this country at a time when we have this staggering public debt.

The purpose of this, gentlemen, is to force up the interest rate on Government bonds. Already through this country there is a cadre of wealthy men that are demanding more and more return from Government bonds, and it is those that are trying to force the Government to raise its present long-term interest rate from 2½ to perhaps 3½, and probably by the time when the cycle is over to even 6 percent.

By reducing the funds of the Federal Reserve banks to support Government bonds at par, and to maintain the 2½ percent interest rate, this bill will shift from the Government the right to fix the interest rate on its bonds that it will pay—and will put the Government at the mercy of the big investors to demand what interest they wish to receive.

This could be done, as this bill provides, by reducing the funds of the Federal Reserve market operations by over 450 percent in this resolution. You thus cut the supporting Federal Reserve funds for supporting Government bonds from $40,500,000,000 down to $10,000,000,000 or $12,000,000,000.

If you do not think that this 450 percent fund reduction could precipitate a raid on the Federal Reserve by the big holders of Government bonds, cashing their 2½ percent and waiting for the 3½ percent, then you will miss your guess.

You remember the depression of 1893 when the failure of the Jay Gould corporation caused a panic. You remember the stock market crash in the fall of 1929. Gentlemen, you are playing with matches in a powder factory by this action of the Congress which might precipitate the great panic of 1948 or 1949.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being given this opportunity to say a word on this measure before us when the time for debate on the floor is so limited. Yesterday I voted against the provision for suspension of rules during the closing hours of this special session. In fact, I voted about the 17th of June against a similar resolution and for the same reason. I know it is customary to use that procedure toward the end of a session, but there seems to be—from the wording of the resolution yesterday—an unusual reason for that course at this time. The procedure can be used for more than one purpose.

But my objection that day last June and yesterday is this: That in both cases it made it possible for the majority to bring before this House the most tremendously significant bills, giving only a few minutes of debate on measures that require much more consideration, and not permitting the minority to offer any amendments whatsoever. That very thing happened last June, and it is happening today exactly as I feared it would. Now, what do we find before us today. We have before us Senate Joint Resolution 157, and not a single opportunity for any Democrat to offer an amendment, and only 20 minutes of the 40 minutes given to the minority party to debate the bill on the floor of the House. Mr. Speaker, some bills are more significant than others. This is one of the most significant measures affecting our domestic economy for good or bad that I have seen in my 12 years here. It is fraught with greatest power, for benefit or harm, and yet we in the minority are forced to take it or leave it.

And yet it is not a simple question of take it or leave it, for this bill is said to be in answer to the President's request. It is called an anti-inflation bill. It is a composite measure. It contains some things that I would like to vote for. It does make a sort of answer to the President's plea. It does limit consumer credit and bar installment buying, but it counteracts those two Presidential requests by its main features. As a Democrat, opposed to this bill in general, not only because of the limited debate on it but because of its dangerous possibilities, I am forced to vote against it, in spite of the fact that it contains a small portion of what the President asked of this Congress. As the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman SPENCE, implied, "The President asked for bread and Congress has given him a stone."

Some years ago I was very reluctant to see the gold reserves dropped from 40 percent to 25 percent, during the war. I am a believer in sound money, but that does not mean that I think we ought to up the gold reserves as this bill does, at this time and all at once from 25 percent to the original 40 percent. I know we ought to move in the direction of a stable and sound currency, but we ought to move cautiously, with the welfare of the masses of people at heart. This bill, when enacted into law, will undoubtedly help the rich and increase the interest rate generally, including the money that Uncle Sam borrows.

One of the preceding speakers, although he had too little time to develop it, correctly implied that this legislation requires much careful study by the best minds that can give it the whole-hearted and disinterested study which it merits. Are we not rather casually, if not carelessly, tinkering and tampering with that which is at the very basis of our economic structure? I would want a very skillful surgeon to perform an operation on my heart or any other vital part of me if absolutely necessary, and I would want him to know his business. I am told that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board are opposed to the chief provisions of this bill. Are these informed officials wholly wrong?

If my colleagues are correct in the fear expressed, that this measure will shake the United States bond market and prevent the United States Government from maintaining its bonds at par, then we are indeed doing a cruel and very unworthy thing to say in effect to the millions of American citizens owning bonds: "Your Government will be unable to keep your bonds at par, and it is cruel but best policy all around to let things take their course as we follow another policy." I am not enough of an authority on financial matters to know whether it is inevitable and absolutely necessary for America to have to pass through the economic wringer after every great war, as happened after the First World War. I had hoped there might be another way, by which it could be avoided, but I believe that this legislation will make the old way inevitable. Of course, "all that goes up must come down," but there is a lot of difference between plunging down to crash or coming down by parachute.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has now under consideration the legislation to curb inflation and start the high cost of living downward.

Senate Joint Resolution 157 is the answer of the Republican leadership to the demand of millions of Americans that something be done to curb inflation. Senate Joint Resolution 157 was substituted by the Banking and Currency Committee for H. R. 7062, introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman SPENCE, the ranking minority member of that committee. H. R. 7062 contains 40 typewritten pages setting out the primary recommendations of President Truman and his advisers, a practical plan to curb inflation.

The Republican majority of the Banking and Currency Committee have for all practical purposes tossed the President's recommendations in the wastebasket and have submitted the resolution now under consideration which is nothing more than a feeble and ridiculous effort to mislead the American people to the thought that the leadership of this special session is making an effort to reduce the cost of living.

This resolution comes to the floor of the House under a gag rule which limits debate to 40 minutes—20 minutes on each side—and furthermore prohibits any amendments to be offered from the floor of the House which amendments would improve or make this so-called anti-inflation legislation effective.

One hundred and forty million Americans are crying for relief from high prices and today we witnessed the spectacle of the congressional leadership restricting debate on this No. 1 problem of our country to a brief 40 minutes. This special session of Congress should remain in session and thoroughly debate the inflation problem in an effort to produce a practical bill that will adjust our economy and start the cost of living downward. This problem cannot be solved in 40 minutes' debate and possibly not in 4 days' debate, but the time of the Members of this Congress is of minor importance compared to the misery and grief high prices are causing the American people today.

This feebie effort of Senate Joint Resolution 157 compares favorably with the skim-milk misleading housing legislation which was passed at 3 o'clock Sunday morning, June 20, 4 hours before adjournment of the regular session of Congress. It was my hope that when the President called this special session that the majority Members of this Congress would have talked to the people back home and returned to Washington with the intention of doing something about the high cost of living and inadequate housing. Judging from the bill now under consideration, our special session will adjourn with these two urgent problems still calling for solution.

The lack of legislation dealing with these two issues may mean depression and disaster for millions within the next few years. Inadequate anti-inflation legislation may directly affect the people of the world and our national security. Congress must cease drifting on these issues.

Today we do not have price control by Government, but we have price control by big business. The cost of living rises steadily, but corporate profits are rising even more rapidly. Corporate profits in 1947 rose 42 percent above what they were in 1946 when they had reached an all-time high. The income, after taxes, of the 100 largest manufacturing corporations in 1947 was 91 percent greater than in 1946, and during the first 6 months of 1948, the all-time record of 1947 was being broken by new profit highs. It is apparent that the leadership of the Eightieth Congress fears to do anything that will disturb these corporate giants in their march for profits. The propaganda being circulated is to make labor the whipping boy for these unheard-of profits.

One of the first acts of this Congress was to pass the Taft-Hartley Act which provided a cooling-off period for labor. Why does this Congress hesitate in providing a cooling-off period for giant corporations which produce the bulk of our basic commodities from increasing prices?

I wish now to quote from a distinguished Republican United States Senator who has taken issue with his own party on their lack of action to legislate against inflation. Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, has made the following statement:

> There are 140,000,000 people who are dying for one thing and they are tired of waiting for it. I am speaking now of the people who are feeling the tragic burden of high prices and lack of adequate housing. They are wondering whether the Congress of the United States cares about them except to get their votes at election time. This is the cry of a human heart, and we had better accept our obligation. The party which matches up to its trust and its obligation will be the party which God will favor. A word to the wise should be sufficient.

Senate Joint Resolution 157, which this House is now offering to solve inflation, will be a monumental disappointment to the 140,000,000 people whom Senator TOBEY referred to in his above statement.

I shall cast my vote against this resolution because it does not even make a start toward legislation that might reduce the cost of living and save our economy.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not even scratch the surface of the imminent and perilous problems of inflation. It would be impossible to deal with these grave and complex questions in such perfunctory and cursory fashion.

High prices are unconscionably burdening the rank and file of the American people, but I could not possibly fully analyze this measure at this time because its provisions and implications widely affect every segment of the economy.

I have intensively studied money and banking questions with special relation to their impact upon our free-enterprise system for management, labor, and agriculture for many years. There are no questions in the field of economics so complex, so difficult, so intricate, so challenging to correct accurate analysis as monetary questions. Yet this bill seeks in a few paragraphs to tamper and meddle with the delicate mechanism which governs and controls money, credit, commercial paper in its relation to the Federal Reserve System, reserves for gold certificates and outstanding notes and other matters which lie at the heart of our monetary and banking operations and practices.

I believe such action is most unwise and perilous at this or any other time without the most careful and exhaustive study and surely no one will contend that the House has given mature consideration or adequate study and reflection to these vital and difficult questions.

The results can and well may be disastrous—lack of adequate credit, dislocation of the Government bond market, hasty deflation, industrial stagnation, and unemployment. I regard these provisions to be fraught with the possibility of gravest danger to the economy.

The restriction of installment buying at this time cannot be justified economically or morally or socially or in any other way. It will merely impose new and unnecessary checks and perhaps hardship upon our consumers, small-business men, and industry. It will react against our veterans who are seeking installment purchases to furnish their homes and procure essential household appliances and equipment. It will unreasonably and unnecessarily curb and obstruct purchase of essential commodities by every single class of the American people save those who are in a position to pay cash on the line for what they buy, or who can put up in cash a very substantial portion of the purchase price.

Since I do not believe that this bill is a solution, in any respect, for current inflationary conditions, because I believe it is unfair and inequitable to American consumers and purchasers, because I believe it dangerously meddles with extremely delicate monetary and banking mechanisms, afflicts small business and industry with unnecessary and unwarranted restraints, I am constrained to vote against the pending measure.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely unfortunate that the membership of this House has given itself only 40 minutes to debate the tremendously important legislation which is now before this body.

I desire to enter my vigorous protest against not only the time allotted for debate, but against the parliamentary tactics used by the majority leaders who have brought up this important measure under a so-called suspension of the rules. Such parliamentary procedure denies to the minority membership of this great body their right to either amend or to cast their vote for the RECORD upon a motion to recommit. In such perilous times as these, we should put aside partisan politics in an endeavor to legislate proper anti-inflation controls in the national interest.

In the resolution now before us, I should be more than willing to support the measures embodied in sections 1 and 3 without reservation. I should like to point out, however, that sections 1 and 3 of the pending resolution of and by themselves are relatively unimportant devices to curb the present inflationary pressures which are bearing down upon us. However, I cannot and will not vote for this measure in view of the dangerous provisions contained in section 2 of this resolution. This section is clearly designed to deprive and to deny the Government the right to support Government bonds in the open market. The real dangers of section 2 of this resolution cannot be too strongly emphasized. Realistically, psychologically, and actually, the enactment of this type of legislation at this time may send our already tottering economy plunging into the abyss of depression and despair. Many of us remember what happened to the Liberty bonds after World War I. If the procedure is followed as indicated by section 2 of this resolution, there is a strong probability that present Government bonds will soon drop below par and that eventually interest rates on Government bonds will increase materially.

It is well known that the cost of the service of our present public debt at present interest rates exceeds $5,000,000,000 annually. It takes only simple arithmetic to prove that an increase in the interest rate of 1 or 2 percent on outstanding Government bonds will increase this service charge from 50 to 100 percent, or to put it another way, instead of $5,000,000,000, we shall be forced to pay seven and one-half to ten billions of dollars as a service charge for the payment of interest to meet outstanding governmental bond obligations. These are only a few of the factors and of the dangers attendant upon the passage of section 2 of this resolution. Time does not permit further elaboration. It is sufficient to say, however, that this is a most dangerous practice and is not supported by any responsible authority either in the Department of the Treasury or in the Federal Reserve Board.

In addition to the reasons above outlined, there is another reason why I cannot support this resolution. Actually, it does nothing to curb the upward inflationary spiral. In my opinion, it is a makeshift, hurry-up, do-nothing program designed for political purposes to lull the people into a false sense of security. There has been no real effort on the part of the Republican leadership to meet, even to a reasonable degree, the program submitted by the President of the United States to curb inflation. To say the least, the President's program is extremely moderate, and in my opinion represents the very minimum that ought to be done in this fight against inflation.

No, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership will not fool the people of America by the passage of this makeshift legislation. In the months to come they will know that it will not and cannot give them the relief which they need so desperately.

THE MAKESHIFT REPUBLICAN CREDIT CONTROL BILL IS DANGEROUS AND WILL NOT STOP INFLATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I opposed the outrageous gag rule I surmised that, under this rule, you would bring in and force through this makeshift bill which is before us today. This, under the pretense that it will arrest the spiral of inflation and might reduce the intolerable increase in the cost of living.

I was not mistaken in your determination to fool the American people. The bill before us was reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee by 16 Members without any hearing and, under the rule, 419 Members are deprived of any opportunity to amend the provisions in any way. You have even refused to extend the debate by 10 minutes. What a high-handed procedure this is.

Personally, I would like to vote for section 1, which tends to temporarily restrict installment buying until March 15, 1949. However, it will take at least several months to put this plan into effect and in this short time I feel it will be ineffective and will not accomplish the recommendations of the President.

At the time you repealed the restriction on so-called installment buying, I warned you that it would have an inflationary effect and would be unjustified from any point of view. I questioned you then that, if people could not buy for cash when they were employed, how would it be possible for them to make payments if conditions and their earnings were not as favorable as they are at the present time?

Other provisions in the bill relative to the restriction of an additional gold reserve are bound to bring about dangerous conditions because it will preclude the Government from protecting the Government securities and bonds. It may create fear and result in dumping of these bonds by the public and especially the bankers. Without the support of the Government, the manipulators would hammer down the prices of these bonds the same as they succeeded in doing after the First World War. This notwithstanding that we have assured the public they would be protected in their investment of Government bonds.

That this legislation will be instrumental in bringing about a reduction in the high cost of living you cannot maintain, because it will not. You have given industry the power to fix prices, which you call stabilizing the prices. However, industry has miserably failed to carry out its pledges and promises. Instead of stabilizing or reducing prices,

they have continuously—even to this day—increased to the point where they are now the highest in the history of our Nation.

You say that high prices are due to the cheap money. No, the high prices are due to the fact that you have authorized all the industries to increase their prices notwithstanding that in 1947 they salted away $17,000,000,000 in profits after all taxation. And for the first 6 months of this year their profits were still soaring and have increased by an additional 18 percent as reported in today's papers. So it is not because of cheap money, but because of avarice on the part of the profiteers whom you protect and to whom you gave the privilege of charging the consuming public not only what it will stand but even what it cannot stand.

I fear that this bill, as explained by the Democratic members of the committee, is a dangerous one and will not stop inflation nor the high cost of living, but may affect the values, as I have stated, of Government bonds that are held by 60,000,000 American people. This bill might increase the interest rate on the future needs of the Government as well as private industry because of the restrictions on the reserve provisions embodied in this bill.

I recollect when President Wilson in 1919 and 1920 urged the Federal Reserve and bankers of our country to restrict the credits to manipulators, hoarders, and gamblers who were outrageously and shamefully boosting the prices of sugar up to 28 cents a pound because they were in control of it and many other commodities. Instead of restricting the loans to these speculators and hoarders, banks started to curtail the credit of legitimate business, but the speculators and hoarders could obtain their loans for months thereafter. Not, however, on the first floor of the bank, but on the second floor where they would be charged a 4- to 6-percent commission, which these speculators could and did pay because of the tremendous profits they were making on their hoarded commodities.

The restriction in your bill will not accomplish the purpose of the President to arrest the inflationary spiral nor the increased cost of living. For this reason, I am constrained to oppose and vote against this bill. If you Republicans would take an interest in the welfare of our country and heed the appeals of the general public you would not bring in this makeshift bill, but would take a few weeks to prepare a bill that would actually relieve conditions, stop the high cost of living, and bring the needed relief to the consuming public so that the women would not feel obliged to organize in every section of our land to stop buying meat and meat products in the hopes of forcing down the prices of meats, butter, milk, and other foodstuffs in order that the American people might obtain enough food to exist at prices their pocketbooks can stand.

We passed a bill to eliminate the unfair tax on oleomargarine which the poorer people are obliged to buy because they cannot afford to pay 90 cents a pound for butter. However, its consideration is being held up in the other body by the dairy trust.

You could easily devote 10 days or 2 weeks to bring in a decent housing bill, but I understand that you are going to bring in another housing bill that again will not aid in the construction of low-priced homes or bring about lower rentals.

You have time enough to pass the bill to increase the minimum wage from 40 to 75 cents an hour which, due to the high cost of living, is necessary in order that the American people of low income may live and exist.

You have time enough to bring in a decent social-security bill which the President has recommended and urged.

You have time to pass a fair-employment-practices bill and a bill to increase old-age pensions.

No, you are deaf to the appeals and needs of the public and are going to adjourn without adopting any of this legislation, because the vested interests that you serve have no regard for the rights and needs of the American people.

We still have 3 months before the election and I am sure that if you would remain here 10 days or 2 weeks longer we could easily pass these relief measures and you would not need as much time at home to campaign. In fact, staying and voting for these bills would do you more good than your 3 months of campaigning, trying to explain to the people—which you cannot—your failure to act and how you are subservient to the vested interests instead of to your constituents.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I believe we who are Members on the minority side in this fight should be permitted to say without question that we are proud of our membership on the Committee on Banking and Currency. I regret the action of the leadership in this instance in forcing us to pass upon a resolution of this importance, touching a problem of this magnitude, in a 40-minute debate. I believe those on the majority side who are not members of this committee and have not been permitted to hear the testimony on such a technical question ought to join us in that regard. When you are asked about it at home you are going to be unprepared as a result of this limitation of debate to answer some of the questions that are raised about this legislation. I regret very much that I cannot go with the majority in this instance, because I would like to cooperate in bringing out an effective piece of legislation, but because I am opposed to this procedure and because I am fearful of the possible results mentioned by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] I shall vote against this resolution.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join my colleagues on the minority side on the House Committee on Banking and Currency. This measure contains 3 sections. Section 1, relating to consumer installment credit, is not the same as the return to regulation W in all of its previous forms. It is rather a watered-down or diluted version of the former regulation W. This section covers consumer installment credit for a 7-month period.

Section 3, as far as the recommendations of the President that the Federal Reserve Board be given greater authority to regulate inflationary bank credit especially pertaining to bank reserves. The proposed amendment increases by three points the requirements as to bank reserves of all member banks but makes no application to any increase in nonmember bank requirements. These apply to demand deposits and merely one point on time deposits. Whether this amount is adequate or not is problematical.

The really controversial section is section 2, the gold-reserve section. In making any change in the present gold reserves base we could be playing with a powder keg. Yesterday afternoon, before the House Banking Committee, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, opposed this section of the measure. He asked for the opportunity for further study of this provision. It was not before us when Mr. McCabe, Mr. Evans, or Mr. Eccles appeared before our committee. It was not in the recommendations by the President before the committee. We on the minority side are asking that, since under the rules debate is rather limited and an insufficient time is provided for a full and adequate discussion of this problem, we vote it down and bring this bill in under a rule and give sufficient time for full and complete analysis of its effects. I think we will live to regret any action we take today that may cause a break in the Government bond market in the months ahead. The squeeze play could be put on, and it can be put on still further. Psychologically all the factors are there. This is a dangerous device. It was not recommended, and there has not been time to have thorough analysis by competent economic analysts. Certainly we reduced the reserves from 40 and 35 to 25 percent in 1945, but to increase the gold reserves at this time is highly questionable and explosive.

I am of the opinion that the members on the minority side of the Banking Committee are following good logic in asking that the Members of the House be given the opportunity to consider a better analysis of the consequences of this section. There is no way under the procedure we are following at this time whereby we can vote for any part of this resolution that we favor. We must either vote for it entirely or against it.

The increase in the gold reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks as now proposed by the House Banking and Currency Committee would make no contribution whatsoever to the fight against inflation, but if adopted, might be of disastrous consequences to the economy as a whole.

Although at the present time all Federal Reserve banks combined are holding gold certificate reserves in excess of the proposed new requirements, these reserves are unevenly distributed among the 12 Federal Reserve banks, and the reserve of several banks would be insufficient to cover the new requirements.

Furthermore, the new requirements might jeopardize the ability of some Reserve banks to supply credit to their member banks and compel the Federal Reserve System to abandon support of the Government bond market.

The proposal, while completely ineffective in the fight against inflation, might precipitate a run on the currency and the collapse of the bond market.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since I have no opportunity to speak on this measure, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that "the mountain has labored and brought forth a mouse."

Instead of reporting a measure to stabilize the currency and thereby prevent a spiral of runaway inflation, and at the same time protect the American people from the disasters of a precipitate deflation, this measure is brought forth, which I fear may result in plunging this Nation into such a depression as we experienced in 1921, during the Harding administration, or in 1929, during the Hoover regime.

The Committee on Banking and Currency could have easily written provisions into the bill putting a ceiling on the amount of currency, including Federal Reserve notes, and thereby protecting this Nation against runaway inflation; and at the same time it could have put a floor under the volume of the currency by establishing a minimum below which it could not be reduced by providing that if the Federal Reserve banks withdrew a sufficient amount of their notes from circulation to reduce the volume below that point, the Government should issue a sufficient amount of United States notes, with a gold reserve behind them, to hold the currency at the minimum prescribed by the law.

As I have pointed out before, prices in a free economy are governed by the volume of the Nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation. When that volume gets as high as it is today, with the present velocity of circulation, we witness a spiral of inflation. When that volume is reduced below the danger point, even with a medium velocity of circulation, we crash into a depression as we experienced in 1921 and 1929.

Since this bill is being rammed through under the suspension of the rules, we have no opportunity to amend it to protect the American people against the dangers of a disastrous deflation—and I feel very doubtful if it is going to protect them against a further spiral of inflation.

If this motion is voted down, then I hope the bill will be brought in under a rule that will permit amendments, in order that we may adopt such changes as will stabilize the currency within a given range, and protect this country against either a runaway inflation or a disastrous deflation.

The American people are entitled to this protection at the hands of the Congress, in which the Constitution vests the power to "coin money and regulate the value thereof."

Besides there is a grave question whether or not the provisions of this law will not result in unjust discriminations that will be detrimental to our dual banking system, especially in Mississippi and other agricultural States—if not the entire Nation.

I have just received the following telegram from Mr. Frank E. Allen, president of the Mississippi Bankers Association:

JACKSON, MISS., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. JOHN RANKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Mississippi Bankers Association greatly concerned over possibility of requiring increased reserves of banks requirement to include nonmember banks as well as member banks of the Federal Reserve System.

Members of our association are unalterably opposed to any increase in reserve requirements and more particularly to the extension of the authority of Federal Reserve in this regard to nonmember banks.

Such a step would be entering wedge in destruction of dual banking system.

Mississippi bankers have been diligent in control of bank credit to avoid contributing to inflationary trend.

Taking everything into consideration, I think the best thing the House can do is to vote this motion down, and let this bill come before the House under an open rule that will give us ample opportunity for debate and amendments.

The interest of the entire Nation is at stake in this legislation; and I for one cannot vote to ram it through under suspension of the rules in its present form.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority in control of affairs in Congress today arbitrarily and in entire disregard of the people's interest and welfare brings forth a bill to accelerate and inflame the inflationary pressures which already ravage the Nation.

This they do in the face of the President's recommendations personally delivered to the special joint session of Congress, and in defiance of economic law. It is a booby trap, explosive and dangerous, which, if passed on to the President, I hope he will not touch or have anything to do with it. Suspicions are rife that the bill is purposely so worded and planned as to cause the Democrats, under suspension of the rules, to vote against the measure, so that the Republicans can charge the Democrats with killing a bill which, supposedly, the President wanted. The fact of the matter is that this bill does not reflect the President's ideas except in minor detail. Senate Joint Resolution 157 and the report by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] are misnomers. Instead of aiding in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures, there is grave danger of fanning to destructive ferocity the flaming spiral of higher prices, already unbearable to all except the wealthy who can pay the tariff.

The restriction placed upon the Federal Reserve Board by reducing the support authority from $45,000,000,000 to about $10,000,000,000 means but one thing—higher interest rates upon refinanced Government bonds, $50,000,000,000 worth of which will be maturing shortly. This interest burden will be passed on to the average taxpayer. The bond clipper will increase his holdings of the higher-rate certificates with his high-price profits reinforced with the recent income-tax reduction bonus. The average taxpayer will enjoy only the privilege of paying by way of taxation the increased cost of Government financing. Portfolios of big corporations swollen with undistributed excess profits will be disgorged for the purpose of buying up bonds now held by the average citizen at 2½ percent. These and other corporations—banking, insurance, and investment—will follow the lead in absorbing the new issues bearing interest at 2 percent or perhaps 3½ percent.

The gold clause of the bill has aroused the opposition of committee members, because they fear the ultimate effect upon our economy, especially upon those least able to withstand the shock.

It is no concern of mine nor of the Democrats if the so-called sound-money party, the Republicans, want to commit hara-kiri. What I am worried about is that they will drag the entire country down to destruction with themselves.

I must act on the side of safety; therefore I shall have to vote in opposition to this bill.

LET US BE A DELIBERATIVE BODY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we were called back to this special session for the purpose of dealing primarily with two important problems. One of those is to stop the inflationary spiral. We have heard a great deal about who is to blame for it and who is not to blame for it, and what is to blame for it. The people of this country are not interested in talk. The people of this country want us, this Congress, to do something—something positive—something immediate. You cannot do it in 40 minutes of debate. Actually, you will be wasting 40 minutes of time, so far as controlling inflation is concerned, when you devote the time to discussing a bill that obviously makes no attempt to touch upon the real problem that confronts us.

The House Banking and Currency Committee on July 29 opened public hearings with an announcement by the chairman that the hearings were called for the purpose of considering inflation controls.

We heard in our committee three sets of witnesses, Mr. Porter representing the President, the representatives of the Federal Reserve Board, and the Secretary of the Treasury.

Other members of the President's Cabinet asked leave to come before the committee and tell us their views about this

problem and how it should be solved. They were given no opportunity to be heard. Labor organizations asked but could not get permission to come before our committee.

I received a telegram from the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, reading as follows:

I have been directed by A. F. Whitney, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, to appear before your committee in support of real anti-inflation legislation. Have requested many times orally and in writing opportunity to appear for maximum of 10 minutes. Have been denied. Am therefore appealing to each committee member to reconsider and make it possible for labor and other organizations of American citizens to be heard on this vital subject of Nation-wide urgency.

It is hard to believe that on a problem of such great importance any committee of this House would refuse as little as 10 minutes to the representatives of great labor organizations for a presentation of their views.

I understand that this is the only piece of legislation that this House is going to be permitted to vote upon in connection with this all important problem. The President in his message submitted an eight-point program, and on July 29, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] introduced a bill encompassing that program. The bill now before us covers but two of those eight points. The committee has given it no consideration. If you vote for this motion, this House will lose the opportunity to consider it.

There has been a decided effort on the part of some Members of this House to create the impression that restricting bank credit and consumer credit will solve the entire problem. The record is clear, however, that no one can honestly pretend that any such result can come from enactment of this legislation of so limited a scope.

In the last minutes of the public hearings before our committee we were presented with the bill now before this House. It does permit the restoration of consumer credit controls. It also permits the Federal Reserve banks to increase member bank reserves, but not to the extent that the Federal Reserve Board has recommended.

The unfortunate part of it however, is a provision that had not theretofore been considered in any respect by the committee. This new provision requires the Federal Reserve banks to increase gold reserves from 25 to 35 percent for gold certificates and from 25 to 40 percent for Federal Reserve notes. The Treasury Department is opposed to such a provision and the Federal Reserve Board is opposed to such a provision.

The only persons who can favor such a provision are those who desire to compel the Federal Reserve Board to withdraw from the Government bond market its support. In other words, those who support this change in gold reserve requirements, while talking glibly about stabilization are actually by this measure attempting to force the prices of Government negotiable bonds down under par, demoralizing the market and creating lack of confidence on the part of the public in the financial stability of our Government.

The inflationary effects of the measure will be terrific. What is worse, however, is that it will force up the interest rate on future Government securities which must be issued to redeem maturing bonds.

The committee itself had no proper opportunity to consider the consequences that might flow from the enactment of this legislation. No opportunity was afforded to call witnesses who could shed light upon the subject.

Nevertheless, the committee hearings were ended late on the afternoon of August 4, and the committee immediately convened in executive session and this bill sent to the floor by a strictly party vote. It is most regrettable that a problem of such vital importance, to the solution of which both parties are pledged by their platforms, should be made a political football.

Now this House is asked to suspend the rules and pass this bill with only 20 minutes allowed to those opposed to it. Their request for an extension of an additional 10 minutes has been refused on the ground that haste is necessary.

The problems of this country are far too important to be dealt with in any such manner. If the proponents of this bill are sincere, let them give us a bill providing for the consumer credit and the bank credit restrictions. I predict the bill will pass with a minimum of debate and with little opposition.

Let them give us a separate bill covering the gold reserve requirements sought to be imposed by this bill, and give us time to fairly debate it and vote upon it as a separate measure.

The proponents of this bill no doubt are fearful that under such procedure they could never prevail upon this Congress to pass a bill imposing the proposed gold reserve requirements.

If we vote down this motion the proponents of this bill will be compelled to present it under an open rule at which time not only this but all of the other recommendations of the President for control of inflation can be debated, and proper amendments offered, so that this Congress can enact into law measures that may at least stop the inflationary spiral and halt any further rise in the cost of living.

Let us be a deliberative body as intended by our Constitution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to myself.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are all agreed that there are two basic reasons why prices are high. One is a policy of cheap money and credit which has predominated since 1935 anyway, for very laudable purposes, up to perhaps 1945, VE-day. All of our activities from 1935 to VE-day in the field of finance and credit were first to lick a depression and second to win the war.

We were more successful in our attempts to depreciate the value of the dollar and in our attempts to increase the national income, with the attendant high prices caused by such an increase in the national income, than we thought we might be.

These measures which the President and the Government recommended and which the Congress passed during that 10-year period did increase the national income, increase purchasing power and savings. They did increase all of the pressures which we find today contributing to inflation and high prices. The mistake which was made by the Government is that in 1945 following VE-day, it did not hold our economy at that level and announce that from then on the Government would adopt a reversal of policy which would tend not only to stabilize our economy and our prices at the level enjoyed in 1945, because even then it appeared necessary to tighten credit and restrict the volume and velocity of credit and money to a point where we would deflate sufficiently to bring about economic stability. Instead of that, in 1945, some economists in Government guessed that we were going to have a postwar depression. In consequence, a message was sent to Congress asking for a reduction in the gold reserves of the banks.

From 1913, when the Federal Reserve Act was originally passed, until June 1945, Federal Reserve banks were compelled to keep a 40 percent gold reserve behind the issuance of Federal Reserve notes, and a 35 percent gold reserve behind their deposit liability. To broaden the base, in order that the gold base could be expanded, both in the field of money and credit, the Congress at that time reduced those gold reserves from 40 and 35, respectively, to 25 percent. That had a tendency, psychological and otherwise, it had an influence, to continue the inflationary spiral which had started previous to that because of the pent-up savings and high incomes which we were enjoying. When the effects of that were known, we should have restored these gold reserves to 40 and 35 percent, respectively from the statutory 25 percent. That at least would have been an indication that it was the policy of Government to tighten up on credit, stabilize prices, stabilize our economy, strengthen America in her position of world leadership.

We gave study to this question last December, and in a bill which we reported out, which did not pass the House because we could not get the required two-thirds majority, this same provision was included.

I would not discuss this at length were it not for the statements made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN], which might indicate that the action taken by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House and the action which we hope will be taken by the House today, will have a disastrous effect upon Government bonds.

We have said in our report that this economy of ours is being balanced on very sensitive scales. I do not think we want the word to go out to the public, and to those whose obligation it is to manage our debt, that the statements made by the gentlemen I have mentioned reflect the policy of this Congress, and are necessarily reflective of a decline in the Government bond market.

As of this hour, in consequence of what the Committee on Banking and Currency did yesterday in this respect, and in respect to the other limited authority to increase reserve requirements, short-term Government issues today remained steady in price. There was no change in short-term issues; but the long-term bond market reacted to the action taken by the Committee on Banking and Currency, as it should have reacted, and the bond market as of this hour today has gone up from one-eighth to one-quarter of a point. I think that is a complete answer to the statements made by these gentlemen that this is going to be disastrous to the Government bond market. The immediate reaction was to cause the bond market to go up.

Have in mind also that there is now in the aggregate against Federal Reserve deposit liability and Federal Reserve notes not 40 percent but actually a gold reserve of 51 percent. So this disastrous consequence which we hear of today cannot possibly be activated until pressure on gold reserves would bring the actual reserves down to the 40- and 35-percent limitations to which we restored them. We think the net result of the action which we hope to take today will be the psychological effect which it will have upon the stabilization of our money, of our currency, of the dollar, and prices, and that it reflects a reversal of policy. Instead of utilizing the powers which the Government now has to further extend credit, further extend the volume of our currency, and further increase prices, from now on it is going to be the policy of the Government to stabilize our economy, stabilize the value of the American dollar, and stabilize prices. That is the purpose of this bill.

We have authorized the increase of bank reserves by 3 percent against demand deposits. The President's representatives, and the bill which would carry out the President's objectives, would have increased the reserve requirements 10 percent. It was quite generally agreed that if the Federal Reserve were to raise the reserve requirements of the banks by 10 percent it would result in such a sale of Government bonds by the banks, it would result in such a large volume of outstanding loans being called by the banks, that there would be danger that this country would be plunged into the depths of a depression. When we asked the representatives of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury what uses they would put these powers to—would they raise the reserve requirements one-half of 1 percent, 1 percent, 8 percent, or 10 percent—Mr. McCabe, Mr. Evans, Mr. Eccles, Mr. Snyder could give our committee no information whatsoever on the kind of increase that was expected in the foreseeable future.

The highest increase at any one time in Reserve requirements during the past 12 years was when they raised them by 3¼ percentage points.

Have in mind also that the bank reserve authority has been exhausted since 1941 except in the central Reserve city banks, namely, New York and Chicago and these reserves can still be increased by 2 percent to 26 percent. Since 1941 this Congress has never been asked to increase the authority, to increase primary reserve requirements, until the President's message came down to us on the 27th of last month. In the President's message is found the first formal request to the Congress to authorize the Federal Reserve to increase primary reserve requirements. In consequence of the fact that the maximum increase in Reserve requirements at any one time during the past 12 years has been a little over 3 percent, the fact that this program has been static since 1941; the fact that we could not obtain any information as to the amount that the reserve requirements would be raised, we have given them in the bill we hope will pass today what we think is a reasonable and valuable contribution toward making financial stability and the lowering of prices. I am assured that if these powers and the powers which they have are used judiciously we can stabilize our economy and bring prices down.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, due to the short time allowed for debate and my inability to get time in order to debate this measure, I am constrained nevertheless to express my views at this time on this major problem of inflation as it is not by any means gotten on to a solution by this bill. I am in favor of a much broader anti-inflation program of which this bill is only a small part. This bill proposes to enact two of the items of the President's anti-inflation program, those relating to consumer credit and bank credit.

I have shown my own views with respect to the control of the runaway cost of living by introducing a meat rationing bill with Senator FLANDERS as far back as last January, and introducing it again during this special session—H. R. 7070—with added powers to the President for rationing not only at the retail level but also at the wholesaler and producer level.

In addition to controls over key items in the cost of living, such as meat, and other key items of raw or unfabricated materials like steel which affect the cost of living through the products which go into it, I would also favor much broader powers of allocation at the source over such items. I do not feel that these powers will make a police state as the President once said, nor do I share the fears of some of my colleagues about their causing regimentation. I do believe it best to develop and administer controls which will not result in the flight of goods from the markets as was the case with the artlessly administered meat controls in 1946.

In any anti-inflation program there should be a complete review and overhauling of the law providing support prices for agricultural products. In this Congress there was appropriated for the AAA farm-support program alone $265,500,000, and other large sums are being utilized through the Commodity Credit Corporation to support already very high farm prices.

Management-labor cooperation is also essential in order to maintain the coordination between wages and the purchasing power of the dollar.

Those of us who believe that these are among the basic measures needed to curb inflation must not relent in our fight. The issue is not settled by any means.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill, Senate Joint Resolution 157, as amended.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 264, nays 97, answered "present" 1, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—264

Abernethy	Gary	Mitchell
Allen, Calif.	Gathings	Morton
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Muhlenberg
Allen, La.	Gearhart	Mundt
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
Anderson, Calif.	Gillie	Nicholson
Andresen, August H.	Goff	Nixon
Angell	Goodwin	Nodar
Arends	Gossett	Norblad
Arnold	Graham	O'Hara
Auchincloss	Grant, Ind.	Pace
Bakewell	Griffiths	Passman
Banta	Gwynne, Iowa	Patterson
Barrett	Hale	Peden
Bates, Mass.	Hall,	Peterson
Beall	Edwin Arthur	Phillips, Calif.
Bender	Hall,	Pickett
Bennett, Mich.	Leonard W.	Ploeser
Bennett, Mo.	Halleck	Plumley
Bishop	Hand	Poage
Blackney	Hardy	Potter
Boggs, Del.	Harness, Ind.	Potts
Bradley	Harrison	Poulson
Bramblett	Harvey	Preston
Brehm	Hébert	Price, Fla.
Brooks	Herter	Ramey
Brophy	Heselton	Redden
Brown, Ga.	Hill	Reed, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Hinshaw	Reed, N. Y.
Bryson	Hoeven	Rees
Buck	Hoffman	Reeves
Bulwinkle	Holmes	Rich
Burke	Hope	Riehlman
Burleson	Horan	Rivers
Busbey	Hull	Rizley
Butler	Javits	Robertson
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenison	Rockwell
Camp	Jenkins, Ohio	Rogers, Mass.
Carson	Jensen	Rohrbough
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Ill.	Sadlak
Chadwick	Jones, N. C.	Sanborn
Chelf	Jones, Wash.	Sarbacher
Chenoweth	Jonkman	Sasscer
Chiperfield	Judd	Schwabe, Mo.
Church	Kean	Schwabe, Okla.
Clason	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Clevenger	Kearns	Scrivner
Coffin	Keating	Seeley-Brown
Cole, Kans.	Keefe	Shafer
Cole, Mo.	Kersten, Wis.	Sikes
Colmer	Kilburn	Simpson, Ill.
Corbett	Kilday	Simpson, Pa.
Cotton	Knutson	Smith, Kans.
Coudert	Kunkel	Smith, Maine
Cox	Landis	Smith, Va.
Crawford	Lanham	Smith, Wis.
Crow	Latham	Snyder
Cunningham	Lea	Stefan
Curtis	LeCompte	Stevenson
Dague	LePevre	Stockman
Davis, Wis.	Lemke	Stratton
Dawson, Utah	Lewis, Ky.	Sundstrom
Devitt	Lewis, Ohio	Taber
D'Ewart	Lichtenwalter	Talle
Dolliver	Lodge	Taylor
Domengeaux	Love	Tibbott
Dondero	McConnell	Tollefson
Doughton	McCowen	Towe
Durham	McCulloch	Twyman
Eaton	McDonough	Van Zandt
Ellis	McDowell	Vinson
Ellsworth	McGarvey	Vorys
Elsaesser	McGregor	Vursell
Elston	McMahon	Wadsworth
Engel, Mich.	McMillan, S. C.	Weichel
Fallon	McMillen, Ill.	Welch
Fellows	Mack	Wheeler
Fenton	Macy	Whitten
Fernandez	Maloney	Whittington
Fisher	Manasco	Wigglesworth
Fletcher	Mansfield	Williams
Folger	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Ind.
Poote	Mason	Winstead
Fuller	Mathews	Wolcott
Fulton	Merrow	Wolverton
Gamble	Meyer	Woodruff
Garmatz	Michener	Youngblood
	Miller, Md.	
	Miller, Nebr.	

NAYS—97

Albert	Grant, Ala.	Miller, Calif.
Andrews, Ala.	Hagen	Mills
Battle	Harless, Ariz.	Monroney
Beckworth	Harris	Morgan
Bell	Hart	Morris
Blatnik	Havenner	Morrison
Bloom	Hays	Multer
Boggs, La.	Hedrick	Murdock
Boykin	Heffernan	O'Brien
Buchanan	Hobbs	O'Toole
Buckley	Holifield	Patman
Buffett	Huber	Pfeifer
Byrne, N. Y.	Isacson	Philbin
Cannon	Jackson, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Carroll	Jarman	Rains
Celler	Johnson, Okla.	Rankin
Combs	Jones, Ala.	Rayburn
Crosser	Karsten, Mo.	Rooney
Davis, Ga.	Kee	Sabath
Dawson, Ill.	Kelley	Sadowski
Deane	Keogh	Sheppard
Delaney	King	Smathers
Dingell	Kirwan	Smith, Ohio
Donohue	Klein	Somers
Douglas	Lane	Spence
Eberharter	Larcade	Teague
Engle, Calif.	Lesinski	Thomas, Tex.
Feighan	Lusk	Thompson
Fogarty	Lynch	Walter
Forand	McCormack	Wilson, Tex.
Gordon	Madden	Worley
Gorski	Mahon	
Granger	Marcantonio	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Miller, Conn.

NOT VOTING—67

Abbitt	Gore	O'Konski
Andrews, N. Y.	Gregory	Phillips, Tenn.
Barden	Gross	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Priest
Bland	Hartley	Regan
Bolton	Hendricks	Richards
Bonner	Hess	Riley
Canfield	Jackson, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Chapman	Jenkins, Pa.	Ross
Clark	Jennings	St. George
Clippinger	Johnson, Tex.	Scoblick
Cole, N. Y.	Kefauver	Scott,
Cooley	Kennedy	Hugh D., Jr.
Cooper	Kerr	Short
Courtney	Lucas	Stanley
Craven	Ludlow	Stigler
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	MacKinnon	Trimble
Dorn	Meade, Ky.	Vail
Elliott	Meade, Md.	West
Evins	Murray, Tenn.	Whitaker
Flannagan	Norrell	Wood
Gallagher	Norton	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vail and Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr. for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. MacKinnon and Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. Canfield and Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Cravens and Mr. Clippinger for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Abbitt and Mrs. Bolton for, with Mr. Norrell against.

Mrs. St. George and Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Gross and Mr. Ross for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Short and Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Gregory against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Richards.

Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Riley.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Priest.

Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Cooper.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Chapman.

Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Bonner.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Wood.

Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Kefauver.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the joint resolution was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed, Senate Joint Resolution 157.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 239. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two copies of letters written to Mr. HALLECK and to Speaker MARTIN, signed by a number of Members of Congress.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD an article that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of August 4 concerning the new type of education in Poland instituted by the Russian-dominated regime, and also to include an article on the freedom of Poland.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein two articles from the last edition of the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the New Jersey Legislature.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include five separate editorials.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I asked permission to insert in the RECORD an article on the works and spirit of William L. Ward, of Westchester. I am advised by the Public Printer that it exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and will cost $213. Notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the excess, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] may have an indefinite leave of absence on account of being in the naval hospital.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances; in one to include remarks on the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 157, and the other to include remarks on the farm program and soil conservation.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE INFLATION CONTROL BILL

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I voted against this bill today which has proceeded from the House Banking and Currency Committee, this bill allegedly to curb inflation. I voted against it because I consider it a fake, by which I mean that in its purpose it will fool the people. God knows they have been fooled long enough by this Congress.

To put forth this piece of legislation to curb inflation is like sending an infant to do the work of a man. I predict that the purpose claimed for it will not be accomplished, that inflation will continue, the people will continue to suffer, and that one day they will rise in their wrath and smite those who are responsible for it. If the leadership of the Congress does not intend to do what is obviously necessary in this special session, we might just as well go home and save the taxpayers' money. I hope the President will veto the bill and will tell the country his reasons for so doing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. HARVEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS LOAN

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. J. Res. 212) to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SMITH of OHIO. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House that this motion has not been formally and specifically authorized by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say, in order to clarify the situation, that it is possible for the chairman of a committee to offer the motion on his own responsibility and if he does the Chair will recognize him.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in House Concurrent Resolution 75, passed unanimously by the House of Representatives December 10, 1945, and agreed to unanimously by the Senate December 11, 1945, invited the United Nations "to locate the seat of the United Nations Organizations within the United States"; and

Whereas the General Assembly on December 14, 1946, resolved "that the permanent headquarters of the United Nations shall be established in New York City in the area bounded by First Avenue, East Forty-eighth Street, the East River, and East Forty-second Street"; and

Whereas, pursuant to authorization of the Congress in Public Law 357 of the Eightieth Congress, the "Agreement Between the United Nations and the United States of America Regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations" was brought into effect November 21, 1947, defining the rights and obligations of the United States and the United Nations with respect to the above-mentioned site; and

Whereas plans have been prepared for construction on said site of permanent headquarters of the United Nations to cost not more than $65,000,000, and the United Nations is ready to proceed with such construction as soon as financing can be provided; and

Whereas the present temporary headquarters of the United Nations are inadequate for the efficient functioning of the Organization and retention of its headquarters in the United States can be assured only by the erection of adequate permanent facilities; and

Whereas owing to the current critical dollar shortage, the other member nations are not able to provide in cash at present their respective shares of the cost of constructing the permanent headquarters; other methods of borrowing the necessary funds have been found impracticable; and the permanent establishment of the headquarters of the United Nations in this country will result directly and indirectly in substantial economic benefits to the United States from the expenditures of the Organization and its member nations; and

Whereas in view of the foregoing considerations, the United States representative at the seat of the United Nations in response to an inquiry of the Secretary-General of the United Nations regarding the possibility of a United States Government loan, informed the Secretary-General, with the authorization of the President, by note dated October 29, 1947, that the President would recommend to the Congress the authorization of a loan from the United States to the United Nations for the construction of the headquarters in an amount not exceeding $65,000,000; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations, by resolution of November 20, 1947, authorized the Secretary-General to negotiate such a loan with the appropriate officials of the United States Government, expressly recognizing that such loan would require the approval of the Congress; and

Whereas the United States Representative to the United Nations has negotiated and signed, on behalf of the United States an agreement with the United Nations in the form set forth below, providing for an interest-free loan of not more than $65,000,000 from the United States to the United Nations to be repaid in annual installments, and said agreement is, by its terms, to become effective on notification to the United Nations that the Congress, with the approval of the President, has made available the funds necessary to be advanced in accordance with the provisions of the agreement: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, or the making available of funds as provided in section 4 (b) hereof to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement, set forth below, between the United States of America and the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., on March 23, 1948, with such changes therein not contrary to the general tenor thereof and not imposing any additional obligations on the United States or relieving the United Nations of any obligations, as the President may deem necessary and appropriate:

LOAN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

It is hereby agreed by the Government of the United States of America and the United Nations as follows:

(1) Subject to the terms and conditions of this agreement, the Government of the United States will lend to the United Nations a sum not to exceed in the aggregate $65,000,000. Such sum shall be expended only as authorized by the United Nations for the construction and furnishing of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in its headquarters district in the city of New York, as defined in the Agreement Between the United States of America and the United Nations Regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., on June 26, 1947, including the necessary architectural and engineering work, landscaping, underground construction and other appropriate improvements to the land and approaches, and for other related purposes and expenses incident thereto.

(2) Such sum, or parts thereof, will be advanced by the United States through the Secretary of State, to the United Nations upon request of the Secretary-General or other duly authorized officer of the United Nations and upon the certification of the architect or engineer in charge of construction, countersigned by the Secretary-General or other duly authorized officer, that the amount requested is required to cover payments for the purposes set forth in paragraph (1) above which either (a) have been at any time made by the United Nations, or (b) are due and payable, or (c) it is estimated will become due and payable within 60 days from the date of such request. All sums not used by the United Nations for the purposes set forth in paragraph (1) will be returned to the United States through the Secretary of State when no longer required for said purposes. No amounts will be advanced hereunder after July 1, 1951, or such later date, not after July 1, 1955, as may be agreed to by the Secretary of State.

(3) All sums advanced hereunder will be receipted for on behalf of the United Nations by the Secretary-General or other duly authorized officer of the United Nations.

(4) The United Nations will repay, without interest, to the United States the principal amount of all sums advanced hereunder, in annual payments beginning on July 1, 1951, and on the dates and in the amounts indicated, until the entire amount advanced under this agreement has been repaid as follows:

	Amount
July 1, 1951	$1,000,000
July 1, 1952	1,000,000
July 1, 1953	1,500,000
July 1, 1954	1,500,000
July 1, 1955	2,000,000
July 1, 1956	2,000,000
July 1, 1957	2,000,000
July 1, 1958	2,000,000
July 1, 1959	2,000,000
July 1, 1960	2,500,000
July 1, 1961	2,500,000
July 1, 1962	2,500,000
July 1, 1963	2,500,000
July 1, 1964	2,500,000
July 1, 1965	2,500,000
July 1, 1966	2,500,000
July 1, 1967	2,500,000
July 1, 1968	2,500,000
July 1, 1969	2,500,000
July 1, 1970	2,500,000
July 1, 1971	2,500,000
July 1, 1972	2,500,000
July 1, 1973	2,500,000
July 1, 1974	2,500,000
July 1, 1975	2,500,000
July 1, 1976	1,500,000
July 1, 1977	1,500,000
July 1, 1978	1,500,000
July 1, 1979	1,500,000
July 1, 1980	1,500,000
July 1, 1981	1,500,000
July 1, 1982	1,000,000

However, in the event the United Nations does not request the entire sum of $65,000,000 available to it under this agreement, the amount to be repaid under this paragraph will not exceed the aggregate amount advanced by the United States. All amounts payable to the United States under this paragraph will be paid, out of the ordinary budget of the United Nations, to the Secretary of State of the United States in currency of the United States which is legal tender for public debts on the date such payments are made. All sums repaid to the United States will be receipted for on behalf of the United States by the Secretary of State.

(5) The United Nations may at any time make repayments to the United States of funds advanced hereunder in excess of the annual installments as provided in paragraph (4) hereof.

(6) The United Nations agrees that, in order to give full effect to section 22 (a) of the agreement regarding the headquarters of the United Nations referred to in paragraph (1) above (under which the United Nations shall not dispose of all or any part of the land owned by it in the headquarters district without the consent of the United States), it will not, without the consent of the United States, while any of the indebtedness incurred hereunder is outstanding and unpaid, create any mortgage, lien or other encumbrance on or against any of its real property in the headquarters district as defined in said agreement. The United Nations also agrees that the United States, as a condition to giving its consent to any such disposition or encumbrance, may require the simultaneous repayment of the balance of all installments remaining unpaid hereunder.

(7) The effective date of this agreement shall be the date on which the Government of the United States notifies the United Nations that the Congress of the United States, with the approval of the President, has made available the funds necessary to be advanced in accordance with the provisions of this agreement.

In witness whereof, the Government of the United States of America, acting by and

through the United States Representative to the United Nations, and the United Nations, acting by and through the Secretary-General, have respectively caused this agreement to be duly signed in duplicate at Lake Success, N. Y., on this 23d day of March 1948.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WARREN R. AUSTIN,
United States Representative to the United Nations.

For the United Nations:

TRYGVE LIE,
Secretary-General.

SEC. 2. Sums advanced to the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2) of the aforesaid loan agreement shall be disbursed by the United Nations for the purposes for which such sums were advanced within 90 days after their receipt from the United States. Any funds not so disbursed within that period shall be returned to the United States through the Secretary of State within 30 days thereafter.

SEC. 3. So long as the headquarters district is used as the seat of the United Nations, nothing in this resolution shall be deemed to limit the control and authority of the United Nations over such district as exercised pursuant to Public Law 357, Eightieth Congress: *Provided, however,* That in the event such district is, for whatever reason, no longer used as the seat of the United Nations, the United States shall, in addition to any rights it enjoys under paragraph (6) of the aforesaid loan agreement and section 22 of the Headquarters Agreement (Public Law 357, 80th Cong.), be entitled to recover from the land and buildings in the headquarters district, in advance of all other creditors of the United Nations, any indebtedness incurred under the loan agreement which is then outstanding and unpaid.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $65,000,000 to accomplish the purposes of this joint resolution. Amounts received in repayment of such loan shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $25,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution and of the loan agreement referred to in section 1 in such manner, and in such amounts, as the President shall determine, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest, for advances made by it hereunder from funds made available for the purposes of this joint resolution and of the loan agreement set forth in section 1.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. BLOOM. No.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify. Is anyone on the Democratic side opposed to the resolution? [After a pause.] Is anyone opposed to the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the resolution and I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

INVITATION EXTENDED BY UNANIMOUS ACTION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on the 5th of September 1945, I introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution which was numbered House Concurrent Resolution 75. The resolution read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United Nations be, and hereby are, invited to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America.

That resolution was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House on the 10th of December, 1945, and on the same day, by unanimous consent, that resolution was considered and passed by the House of Representatives unanimously. On the next day, December 11, 1945, the resolution was considered and passed unanimously by the Senate of the United States.

Accordingly, the concurrent resolution inviting the United Nations to the United States was adopted by the Congress without a dissenting vote after being called up by unanimous consent in both bodies.

The proposal before us today is a further step in implementing this invitation which was extended to the United Nations. The invitation was accepted at the time the resolution was adopted. It was regarded as one of the factors taken into consideration by the United Nations Organization in coming to the United States. It is inconceivable to me that today, at this stage in the history of world affairs, having invited the United Nations to the United States, without objection in either body of the Congress, that we should now hesitate at all in making the loan necessary for the erection of the buildings to house the organization.

The resolution now before us should pass by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, most of us believe in United Nations and pray that it will be successful. But just as its benefits will be shared by all participating nations, so should its cost be shared. By the terms of this measure the cost is not shared. Absence of provision for fair interest means that the United States, over the period of the loan, is actually donating the entire sum.

The dangers of the inflationary cancer are decried on every hand. This afternoon this House, having concocted a salve, approved the enactment of that salve into law. But salves do not cure cancer. The cause is too deep seated.

A principal cause of our inflationary cancer is our foolish belief that we can and should play Santa Claus to the world—dissipating our resources carelessly without regard to the consequences.

We will continue to suffer inflation until we come to our senses as to Government expenditures. Here is a good place to start. Defeat this nonemergency measure now. Then, for the next session, work out a plan whereby, if there must be this gift to United Nations, the giving is shared by such nations as Russia, Argentina, South Africa, and others, all of whom are in better condition financially than we are.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill by which it is proposed that the United States loan to the United Nations $65,000,000 to build a headquarters in New York City. The loan is to be repaid over a period of about 30 years, at the rate of about $2,000,000 a year. It does not provide for interest; in other words, the loan will not carry interest.

Mr. Speaker, on December 17, 1945, I made a speech in which I said this in regard to the United Nations Organization:

> We must not expect too much from this Organization at once. I shall not expect anything but friction in the United Nations Organization for the first 10 years. If they accomplish much of anything, I will be surprised. But if they can hang together for 10 years we may begin to see cooperation.

I said this not in the spirit of pessimism but in the spirit that we must not hope for too much from the United Nations immediately. Consequently, I have not been disappointed. I think they have accomplished much good. We are still hanging together notwithstanding the abuse of the veto by the Soviets and other discouraging features.

I also said at that time that it is high time not that we not stand toe to toe with the Soviets in a threatening attitude but that, sitting across the table from them, we look them straight in the eye and tell them that we mean to uphold our ideals just a little bit more than they mean to propagandize their ideologies. It was more than a year after that that we began to live up to that. We did begin to look them straight in the eye with the Greece-Turkey loan and other measures and tell them that we meant to uphold our ideals. It is true we are just in the beginning of that difficult program but we have made a start. We should not give up because the going is rough.

We are still hanging together. We must consider that this building of the United Nations site is a part of the great world peace movement which, Mr. Speaker, is still our only hope to avoid a catastrophic and annihilating war perhaps sometime in the next generation. I think that only if we carry that point in mind do we have the proper perspective on this loan. It is one of the things that some people may say is not so necessary. I do not say it is vital to the survival of the United Nations but it is one of the things we should do in order to carry out that great plan. Such a viewpoint will give us a somewhat different concept of it.

I said the loan is to be for $65,000,000. Remember that this year we appropriated over $6,500,000,000 for what was practically the same plan, to achieve world peace, 100 times as much. We should not be penny-wise and pound-foolish. I do not think there will be much quarrel about the loan itself. It seems to me the difficulty, if any, is about the interest. Nevertheless, I think that is a sound financial transaction. The people of New York City in reliance on the congressional invitation of 2 years ago have spent $13,000,000 for a site. Together with the buildings there will be an investment of $78,000,000.

Various estimates have been made of what we can sell the property for if the United Nations should disintegrate. We have something in the nature of a first mortgage. The construction will carry in mind conversion to business use. It is located in the business section with ample transportation facilities. Most of the surrounding properties have already doubled in value. The estimates of salvage value if the United Nations should disintegrate run all the way from $50,000,000 to $60,000,000 to $70,000,000. Suppose we take the $70,000,000, that would mean we would have $5,000,000 more than what we have in there. If the United Nations should disintegrate within a year, that would mean that we would have a profit on it. We would be absolutely safe. We would be absolutely safe without any cost or loss for 10 years. But suppose we discount all of that and take the lower estimates. The point I want to put across is that the interest is going to amount at 1.875 percent to $600,000 a year. Inasmuch as we contribute 40 percent of the United Nations' budget we would have to pay 40 percent of that anyway if they paid interest. That would mean $240,000 that we would have to pay at all events. So, Mr. Speaker, it is costing us $360,000 a year for what? Three hundred and sixty thousand dollars a year to insure that the United Nations survives. Is not that worth that investment? Every year we are out $360,000 and no more than that. I would not like to have my children or my grandchildren say that for such a little sum I have done something that discouraged the United Nations Organization. I hope we are out the $360,000 each year for the whole 30 years. For if the United Nations survives for that length of time it will be an outlay which will not only return a hundred, a thousand, or a millionfold but returns in lives and money beyond calculation.

I have not said a word about the other benefits that will accrue. For instance, the business coming to the United States which they say will amount to between $300,000 and $500,000 a year. The saving that we will make by not having to send our whole delegation to some place in Europe and pay their transportation and expenses wherever they may have to meet which is another $300,000 to $500,000.

I say looking at it in that light it is a sound financial transaction and in view of the fact that it will only cost us $360,000 a year to keep the United Nations alive, we should not hesitate to vote for this measure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is thinking and talking as a hard-working and thrifty individual. He is talking about dollars, when he ought to be talking about lives and the future welfare of our Nation. During the war you will all remember, when Russia was in danger of destruction by Hitler, we began to help her and Stalin, and if it had not been for our help, perhaps that country and that philosophy of communism would not be in the picture today.

During the last few months the Congress of the United States has appropriated billions and billions of dollars to end communism. We have Communists here in the Federal Government, according to the recent press. There have been many of them down here in the executive departments. They moved in with the New Deal, and they have never moved out. Today the President refuses to give a Senate committee the files so that it may check charges of communism, just as earlier he refused to give a House committee the files from FBI so that it might check on known gangsters. So we are trying to overthrow communism with our money and with our voices, and soon perhaps by sending our men to fight again on foreign soil, this time under direction of UN, but we are doing very little to get Communists out of the administration—to actually get them out. They have been here, to my own personal knowledge, something like 10 years. They have been carried along on the Federal pay roll and have been given good jobs, positions, and power. Now, what do we propose to do here at home while we are fighting communism abroad? We are going to buy a piece of real estate in the State of New York. One of the tenants will be Russia, and one of the philosophies that will be taught and advocated and made secure there on American soil will be communism. By this bill, we provide a home for Communists who may be brought here by Russia; we give them sanctuary. As in the days of old, a murderer might flee and find safety in a refuge, so we today, seeking to destroy communism—or at least to hold it in check so it may not destroy us—by this and our previous moves give to Communists a citadel of refuge. With $65,000,000 we erect here on American soil an international safety zone, as it were, over which we will have no jurisdiction, in which Communists may live and thrive and from which top Communists may direct their campaign to destroy us.

If that is not foolish, if that is not downright foolish, silly, and absurd, to give an enemy of our country, the Communists, a home in America, a home over which we will have no jurisdiction at all, then I do not know how to characterize this action.

We are still the simple-minded, gullible Uncle Sam. We build up Russia and communism. Now by this bill we give both a beachhead on American soil.

Do you not realize that when you give this land to the United Nations you are taking it out of the United States and it becomes foreign soil. Russia and the representatives of Russia on it can do what they please. Just a little while ago we learned from the press reports from the State Department itself, that there are Communists who are coming here through the United Nations and teaching here their philosophy.

I am frank to say that according to the investigation that the Labor Committee has held, you will find plenty of Communists who have been getting their orders from abroad making trouble for American workers, depriving them of their right to work. So now we give them a foothold in America. We establish a sanctuary for them and we put them in a place where we cannot later touch them. Instead of having them coming from Moscow, we bring them over wholesale as employees of the United Nations and then we let them go out free of any authority and free from any supervision by the State or Federal authorities and carry on their dirty work.

If that is not silly and absurd, I would like to know what it is. I might just as well ask a burglar who intends to rob me to come in and occupy the spare bedroom in my home and say "I cannot touch you as long as you stay there," and then when I go to sleep have him steal all my goods or assault me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 on National Security of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I receive hundreds of letters from all over the country urging that my committee take action to strengthen the United Nations. I therefore was pleased when our distinguished chairman the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] held open hearings by the full committee on this vital subject.

Distinguished men and women from all walks of life gave us their views as to what, in their judgment, could and should be done. After receiving suggestions from Mr. Austin, our United States representative to the United Nations, and after consultation with officials of the State Department, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 202, which is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) the Congress hereby reaffirms the policy of the United States of endeavoring to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations and the strengthening of its member nations.

(b) The President is hereby respectfully advised that it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Government should take steps to strengthen the United Nations by means of the following:

(1) Continuance of efforts on the part of the United States, by agreed interpretations and procedures or by amendment of the

Charter, to liberalize the voting procedure in the Security Council by such steps as the elimination of the veto in applications of the provisions of chapter VI for the pacific settlement of disputes and in voting on the admission of states to membership in the United Nations;

(2) Promotion of agreements contemplated by article 43 of the Charter to provide armed forces for the purpose of enabling the Security Council to maintain international peace and security, and for the development of international confidence which will permit urgent steps to be taken toward regulation and reduction of armaments, on the basis of effective and enforceable safeguards which will protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions and will develop world security;

(3) Development of the potentialities of the General Assembly for promoting cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security;

(4) Encouragement of the fullest practicable use by every nation of the organs, agencies, and facilities of the United Nations for the fulfillment of the purposes and principles of the Charter;

(5) Continuing consultation with other member nations of the United Nations, as may be desirable and feasible in the light of the progress made in strengthening the effectiveness of the United Nations through the foregoing steps, upon the amendment of the Charter through recommendation of the General Assembly under article 108, or if necessary, review of the Charter at an appropriate time by a general conference called under article 109 or by the General Assembly;

(6) Association of the United States with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based upon self-help and mutual aid and as affect its national security;

(7) Encouragement, support, and assistance, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter, of free nations in their firm determination to defend their independence and liberty against aggression under article 51.

I believe this resolution met with the general approval of the State Department and our representative to the United Nations, and the substance of it, in many respects, was adopted by the full Foreign Affairs Committee when we voted out unanimously a statement of policy on this subject.

At the same time we included several other subjects intended to strengthen the United Nations, one of which was the $65,000,000 loan to the United Nations by the United States for headquarters in New York City, which is now before us.

I was one of those who felt that we should at this special session, when passing the loan bill, also pass the statement of policy, adopted by our committee, and took part in consultation with our leadership, urging this be done. However, because of the limited nature of the special session it was thought best to pass only the loan bill at this time. We were given assurance, however, and a statement was issued to the press, to the effect that the other matters contained in our package bill, including the statement of policy, would be given top priority as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January. With that assurance my Foreign Affairs Committee adopted the following resolution which states our position with reference thereto:

More than a year ago the Committee on Foreign Affairs began studying afresh a question which is disturbing millions of Americans, namely, how to strengthen the United Nations so that it can become a mechanism able to settle disputes between nations equitably and effectively on the basis of world law, and with sufficient moral and military force to prevent aggression and maintain peace.

After the most thorough public review of the subject since the San Francisco Conference, including extensive hearings at which many of the most distinguished and thoughtful men of our time presented their views, the committee prepared and on June 9, 1948, reported unanimously H. R. 6802, a bill to strengthen the United Nations and promote international cooperation for peace. It contained a comprehensive statement of policy and provisions for enlarging and strengthening American representation and assistance to the United Nations, adoption of a convention granting necessary privileges and immunities for delegates and staff of the United Nations, and a $65,000,000 loan for facilitating construction of the United Nations headquarters on the selected site in New York City.

Members of the committee believe that the most important part of the bill is the statement of policy with respect to improvements in the practices, procedures, and structure of the United Nations which we should strive for if it is to be made capable of functioning as intended. However, because of the fact that this special session was called by the President to consider only certain limited matters, including the headquarters loan; and because the consideration of H. R. 6802 which in large part is outside the designated scope of the session would make it difficult for the leadership to refuse consideration of many other matters also outside that scope; and in view of the fact that the House leadership has given assurance that the remainder of H. R. 6802 will be brought up for consideration by the House early in the next regular session, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has voted to report favorably Senate Joint Resolution 212, which is essentially the same as sections 8 and 9 of H. R. 6802, approving the United Nations headquarters agreement and authorizing $65,000,000 for the loan.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the unanimous invitation of the Congress for the United Nations to locate its headquarters in this country was accepted in the face of strong opposition. Thereafter Rockefeller donated a site which cost more than $3,000,000, and New York City has expended or will expend upward of $13,000,000 as its contribution. Despite the suggestion of a powerful and obstreperous member of the organization that its headquarters be removed to Europe, and although many delegates were doubtful of the propriety of meeting in Paris in September because of the fear that a serious effort toward this end might occur, I do not believe there is danger of such a change. I do not believe that failure to promptly erect headquarters buildings in New York would create such danger. I am, however, very much afraid that more delay in proceeding with this project after, as has been explained, the ground has been excavated, would create an impression of lack of faith in the United Nations which might prove quite serious.

I have repeatedly expressed the opinion on this floor and elsewhere, even as early as the convening of the Dumbarton Oaks conference, which laid the ground work for the San Francisco conference where the United Nations Charter was signed, that the United Nations or some similar organization must succeed if civilization is to survive. I also expressed it on the day before as well as the day the San Francisco conference convened. In fact, I wrote my friend, Dr. Clanton W. Williams, a history professor at the University of Alabama, on September 15, 1942, as follows:

Some sort of world court, league of nations, international army or international political force will be necessary after this war and we must do whatever is necessary to provide it.

I still believe this very strongly, and since the United Nations is now in being I think it simply must succeed. I believe it behooves us all, every peace-loving person and nation, to contribute everything possible thereto. Certainly the Congress of the greatest Nation in the world cannot run any risk whatever of creating lack of faith that this will occur. There are many other reasons which argue compellingly for the passage of this legislation, but I am impressed that this is probably the strongest one and that it alone justifies its passage.

This loan was referred to a moment ago as a gift. Instead, it is an excellently secured loan from which many benefits will flow, many of which have been discussed. I wish to emphasize, however, that it is not really a loan of $65,000,000. This is true because the United States contribution toward United Nations expense is 39.89 percent. It would be much more if actually based on ability to pay. Incidentally a movement to increase it would have undoubtedly occurred but for the probability of this loan. Therefore if the loan were obtained from another source we would contribute approximately $26,000,000 toward its repayment, and an appropriate comment on the criticism that it is noninterest bearing is that approximately 40 percent of it will be loaned to ourselves. Certainly the advantages which will flow to this country in the enhancement of our leadership in the United Nations, the approximately $20,500,000 which come annually to our shores because of its presence here, and the saving in travel and communications estimated at $300,000 annually will fully compensate us for interest on the remainder, to say nothing of numerous other benefits.

No, we cannot run the risk of either decreasing our prestige in this great organization or contributing toward the loss of faith in it which might cause its failure. This might result should we not implement our invitation and the action of John D. Rockefeller and the city of New York by the passage of this legislation. Therefore I am delighted that it is under consideration and hope and believe the vote against it will be small indeed.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, in adopting the pending measure, the Congress will not only be taking one more step toward carrying out an agreement made in good faith with the United Nations, but it will also be serving the best interests of our Government and our people.

The agreement referred to was made and entered into at Lake Success, New York, on June 26, 1947, between our Secretary of State as the representative of the United States Government and the Secretary-General of the United Nations as the representative of that body. In this agreement, reduced to writing and signed by the respective representatives, it was stipulated that the Government of the United States would lend to the United Nations a sum not to exceed $65,000,000. This sum to be used for the construction and furnishing of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the city of New York. The resolution before us today authorizes the appropriation of the amount necessary to carry out the terms of the agreement.

The agreement further provides for the advancement to the United Nations of parts or installments of the fund from time to time as the work of construction progresses. It also stipulates that the loan shall be repaid, without interest, to the United States in annual installments of from $1,000,000 to $2,500,000 each, the dates for such repayments being set forth in the body of the written contract. The writing also contains a provision that all sums not used by the United Nations for the purpose required shall be returned to the United States.

Protecting the interests of the United States is a clause in the agreement providing that the United Nations shall not, without the consent of the United States dispose of, mortgage, create any lien upon nor encumber all or any part of its real property in the United Nations' headquarters district while the debt owing to the United States remains unpaid. The United States may, as a condition to giving its consent to any sale or encumbrance, require the immediate payment of all unpaid installments.

The agreement was evidently carefully drawn, and with the intent to safeguard the United States from any material loss. It may be urged by some people that we will sustain a considerable loss by foregoing interest on the loan. As a matter of fact we lose nothing. The United States is not a lending agency. It is not engaged in the loan business for profit. Making no interest charge is merely foregoing a profit, not losing something the Government already has or owns. The Government is merely accommodating the United Nations and making no charge for the accommodation. The loan is secured and every dollar of it will be repaid.

Why should we not cheerfully and willingly aid in building up, strengthening and giving prestige and dignity to the one great Organization in which the free people of all the world trust for lasting peace and security? Especially is this true since the Organization at our invitation has indicated its intention to make its home and headquarters on American soil.

The United States Government was prompt and diligent in its efforts to induce the United Nations to locate its headquarters in America. On June 26, 1945, the United Nations Charter was adopted at the conference in San Francisco. On December 10, 1945 this House passed House Concurrent Resolution No. 75 inviting the United Nations to locate its headquarters within the United States. This resolution was adopted by the Senate on the following day. The vote in both branches of the Congress was unanimous.

On February 14, 1946, a resolution was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations accepting the invitation of the United States to establish its permanent headquarters in this country. By the same resolution temporary headquarters were established in the New York City area. Later in the year Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., offered to donate funds necessary to purchase a site in New York, and on December 14, 1946, the General Assembly adopted a resolution accepting the offer. A site covering approximately six city blocks in New York City was purchased with the funds so generously provided by a patriotic American.

This Congress by the enactment of Public Law 7, Eightieth Congress, has exempted the gift of Mr. Rockefeller from gift taxes, and by Public Law 357, passed unanimously by both Houses of the same Congress, has authorized the President to bring into effect the United Nation's headquarters agreement to which I have referred.

Financing the construction of the headquarters buildings is now the problem facing the great organization we invited to our shores, and the resolution we have under consideration today offers the logical and certainly commendable solution.

As is clearly set forth in the Foreign Affairs Committee report accompanying the resolution to the floor, it was not only found to be impracticable but impossible to finance construction through contributions from member nations. Thorough investigation also developed the impossibility of negotiating a loan from private sources or banking institutions. The Export-Import Bank lacked authorization, and such a loan was beyond the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

If we should fail to pass the pending resolution the result, in my judgment, would be disastrous. It would mean our repudiation of the solemn agreement made with the United Nations by our Secretary of State. It would mean the disruption and probable abandonment of all plans of the United Nations for construction of headquarters buildings. It means that the American Government will at once be the object of severe criticism by other nations over the world, especially by those other nations that invited and wanted the United Nations headquarters within their borders. It would mean our forfeiture of the trust and confidence of many nations and peoples who have heretofore respected our word as they did our bond. And finally, it might very easily mean that the United Nations, finding itself unable to finance the construction of its headquarters here, will abandon its New York site and start a search for another location in another land.

I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that it is now and will always be to the advantage of the United States to have the headquarters of the United Nations within our borders. By the same token, it would be to our disadvantage to have them elsewhere. This is the one country in the world in which the headquarters should be permanently located. The Organization is now with us. We must keep it with us.

I hope the pending resolution will be adopted without a dissenting vote.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the American people have shown in numerous polls and otherwise that they are overwhelmingly behind the United Nations as the world's best and perhaps last chance for peace.

The majority has just won a great national debate in which the question was, Shall we tell the Russians to take it or leave it on our proposals to amend the United Nations Charter, or get out of the United Nations, or do we want to try to make the United Nations work as originally designed, if possible.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House today is an effort to clothe those words with actions and to redeem the prestige and authority of the United States, especially with reference to the invitation that was extended to the United Nations by giving it a suitable home here.

I invite any Member of the Congress to go out to the United Nations headquarters at Lake Success and see the "salt mine" in which they work—most of the staff, especially the personnel in the lower echelons, work in an abandoned factory building without natural light or air for most of the personnel. Then, to say whether or not we are acting as host to the world's great hope for peace or suitably accommodating the assemblage of nations which by our invitation is located in the United States.

As to the merits of the proposal—first, the city of New York and the State of New York and a private citizen of the United States have undertaken this project together. The site, worth $8,500,000, has been donated. The city and State of New York have put up over $13,000,000 for site improvements and similar items—that is probably going up to $20,000,000 before this project is completed—and the United States here is asked to loan—I emphasize that—loan $65,000,000. If it does not, we will have in New York City what I have called before and I call again "a Black Hole of Calcutta," on which the site has been completely excavated and which is waiting for something to be put on it, and that something will be the United Nations' buildings to be financed by this loan.

As to the merits of the loan itself; the loan will be repaid out of the regular budget of the United Nations. I do not think that has been made clear. The United States contributes not most of the money but only about 40 percent to that budget. The reason for the loan having been made interest free is as a

straight quid pro quo on a business basis. Income from the expenditures in the United States of the United Nations delegations and others who come here to the United Nations is estimated at about $20,500,000 a year. If the question had been: "Shall the United Nations headquarters be paid for outright by a special levy on the United Nations?" would it not have been logical to suppose that the United States would have been asked for a greater proportion of the amount than is shown by its contribution to the normal administrative budget of the United Nations? Let us say the United States would have been asked for at least 60 percent, and with some justice. Instead of paying more than our share of the administrative budget then, into a special building fund, we are making an interest-free loan.

As to the value of the property itself, the Foreign Affairs Committee was very careful on that point and has two appraisals of the property as proposed to be completed. One of these is by the coordinator of construction of New York City, Hon. Robert Moses, who has an enviable reputation. He values the project, on the most conservative estimate, as being worth from 50 to 60 million dollars. Not satisfied with that alone, we also got an appraisal from the head of a leading private real estate firm in New York City, Mr. Charles F. Noyes. He says:

> Furthermore, at this time it is my opinion that all real-estate experts will agree that if anything should happen in the future and the Government finds that it owns the property through foreclosure of the $65,000,000 loan, the loan could be salvaged and probably without loss to the Government.

The loan agreement, which the House is called upon to approve, and the pending bill protect the United States by making this as nearly as may be a first mortgage. If the United Nations ceases to exist, for any reason, the land and the buildings become the property of the United States, so it is a business matter. It is a loan and as well and intelligently secured as practicable.

One final point: Would it not be anomalous for us, as has been said by the gentleman from Michigan, to be spending billions of dollars for armament, and then to bridle at $65,000,000, a loan with adequate security, which we are asked to make in the cause of peace; and in the cause of enabling the institution for peace to have a haven in the one place in the world where we know it will be safe, in the United States? Are we not a generous enough host to extend to the United Nations Organization which is here in response to our own invitation in which the hope for peace of hundreds of millions of people is wrapped up, just that degree of hospitality?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the United Nations and still trust that it may hold the last great hope for peace. The only question in my mind is whether this is the time or the place to construct this building. In my judgment it is neither.

Who is going to occupy this building? Will they be Communists? Will they strive for cooperation or confusion? We are not certain, and I maintain that until we are permitted to inquire, investigate, and know who will occupy this building we should not divert this $65,000,000 worth of critical material and scarce labor to constructing a building of this type when our own American citizens and veterans cannot get the construction they need for ordinary homes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] referred to the excavation of the basement and likened it to the Black Hole of Calcutta. Well that is just too bad. I can think of several things with which the hole could be filled and it is not $65,000,000. I am not willing to use already scarce material and labor to provide a bung for that hole.

The hole never should have been dug until they knew definitely whether or not they were going to secure this money to construct the building.

I think it should also be pointed out that the donation of this site for the United Nations headquarters removes $8,000,000 from real-estate taxes in the city of New York. Who is going to make up this loss in revenue? Furthermore, no provision is made to provide schooling or health protection for the school children who will come into this area under this program. Neither is there provision for fire or police protection. Since this site does not have the protection of the police and fire departments of the city of New York, the question arises, would a fireman or a policeman be covered by insurance if he should be ordered out to fight a fire or pursue a criminal in an area not having fire and police protection as provided for in the metropolitan area.

Another feature is the diversion of steel. Those of us living in less populated areas are not confronted with this vital subject, but it is mandatory that steel be used in the New York area for the construction of apartment buildings. In this program we see the diversion of this critical and high-priced commodity going into the construction of a building which could easily be postponed, at the expense of much-needed houses for our own American citizens. In fact, would it not be the part of wisdom to wait until a building slump might arise, as some seem to fear is inevitable, and then use this public-construction program as a means of providing employment to those engaged in the construction and manufacturing of buildings and materials.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to emphasize that I am not opposed to the United Nations Organization, but on the contrary have tried in every way I know to strengthen its authority by attempting to have the Greek-Turkish situation, as well as the Palestine question, referred to them for action. I am really sorry that the UNO was ever invited to come to America. In my opinion it will bring foreign intrigue along with it. The idea of stating that if we have it here in America we can watch and keep check on it is silly. The present exposé of communistic infiltration into high places of our Government shows how silly such an argument is.

We should also remember that the Brooklyn Navy Yard is directly across the street from the proposed UN headquarters and that with a pair of field glasses practically every operation of this navy yard can be viewed from this proposed building. I am more inclined to believe that foreign agents would be able to keep a much closer check on our navy yard operations than we would be to keep a check on them. I therefore repeat that, in my opinion, this is not the time nor the place to construct this building, especially since they already have a place to meet and are getting along very well in their present quarters.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, all hope and pray that the United Nations may continue to function, gain in power, and to preserve peace; but it is an experiment, and as such it would seem that we should look ahead.

I am going to vote for this appropriation because it is the only way we now have to that end, but I feel that a provision should have been inserted in this resolution to the effect that if the United Nations should unfortunately blow up the buildings could be converted to housing purposes. In order to do that there should be inserted a provision placed in the measure providing that all UN structures should be such as to lend themselves to conversion to housing.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. There is a provision for the United States to repossess this property should the United Nations go out of existence.

Mr. KNUTSON. But it might cost all the buildings were worth to reconvert to living quarters.

Mr. JAVITS. The main building is an office building.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well and good, but let the other buildings be so arranged that they could, without too much cost, be converted to apartments. In that way we could salvage a considerable part of this money and at the same time relieve our housing shortage by that much.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, to propose that we give the United Nations $65,000,000—it is presently dignified by being called a loan—to build a temple in New York is nothing short of ridiculous.

Housing is one of the most important questions now before the American people. Sixty-five million dollars would build 6,500 $10,000 homes for veterans. To go into the material and labor market now for this useless construction will drive prices up to that extent because it will compete in an already short market.

We are requesting all political subdivisions to withhold all construction, unless it is absolutely imperative, and let a maximum of materials and labor go into housing. That is as it should be. It is unbelievable that we would consider this proposal at this time when inflation and the high cost of living concerns us very much. We do not hear any complaints about their present quarters at Lake Success. From what I have seen around the country, I feel sure there are surplus war buildings; I have in mind abandoned airfields, that could be made suitable for their use at much less cost, if it is determined that we want it permanently in this country.

Marriner S. Eccles, whose judgment all of us respect, advises us in our fight against inflation and high prices, to "encourage States to cut down spending and let the Federal Government set an example;" and further, "Don't let political reasons lead the Government into backing a housing program in excess of materials and labor available."

Now in the face of existing conditions, you propose a $65,000,000 building that in no sense is necessary. And I believe we should delay this $65,000,000 building until we can investigate the charges of communism that have been hurled at the United Nations by responsible people. The State Department has informed committees of Congress in so many words that the United Nations is a hotbed of communism and is being used as a vehicle for entry of thousands of Communists into this country contrary to the laws of the land.

I can think of a hundred reasons why this $65,000,000 should not be spent for building at this time, and I have not heard one good reason in support of the proposal.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on my side.

Mr. Speaker, this bill—Senate Joint Resolution 212—provides for the construction of a building in New York City to house the United Nations Organization. It would divert from the home-building industry a huge amount of building material and labor and thus deprive many thousands of families of homes.

Mr. Marriner Eccles, whose qualification to speak on this question cannot be challenged, testified before our committee that the erection of this building in New York City "is something that could be deferred; that the United Nations seem to be housed in a manner in which they can operate and it would seem advisable to defer that until we know a little bit more about the international situation and the United Nations relationship to it and until such time as there are more building materials and labor available, because any construction, of course, competes with all other construction."

Mr. Eccles is so right in this. The venture would intensify competition for material and labor in the building industry. This would be decidedly inflationary.

The proponents of the bill say the amount of inflation that would be created would be small and that the merits of the proposal outweigh its evils. I deny this.

The menace of recognizable actual and potential inflation and the immediate need for constructing a building for housing the United Nations Organization are just about as 1,000,000 is to 0.

But worse than that is the fact the erection of this elaborate United Nations palace in New York City would provide a permanent home in the United States for Stalin's agents. It would provide a solid base for them to carry on their satanic work of destroying our Government and institutions. The International Organizations Immunities Act and the United Nations Headquarters Site Agreement Act would firmly establish this base. Under these acts Stalin's agents cannot be touched.

Mr. Robert C. Alexander, Assistant Chief, Visa Division, Department of State, whose knowledge of the subject upon which he speaks cannot be questioned, testified before the Revercomb committee:

> You can assume that all of the countries behind the iron curtain are going to fill up their missions with Communists or Communist agents. You take that for granted. You do not assume that they will send persons not in sympathy with their governments.

Of course, to expect anything else would be plain asininity. Every person that is now in the United Nations Organization or that will become attached to it in the future coming from behind the iron curtain is, or will be, an agent of Stalin, whose sole task is to overthrow the Government of the United States and bring our people under his heel.

Mr. Alexander in the testimony referred to, said there were approximately several hundred persons of a subversive character brought into the United States by the United Nations.

Would Stalin have nominated, through his representative, Trygve Lie for the position he now holds, Secretary General of the United Nations, had he not been certain beyond peradventure that Trygve Lie is a Communist and amenable to his dictates? I pause to give any Member in the House opportunity to assert that Stalin would recommend the appointment of anybody who is not subservient to his will to any position. No one has risen.

All this is bad enough, but we should not be so naive as to believe that Russia is the only contributor of Communists to the United Nations. Communism is a powerful force in France and other European countries. That it exercises a degree of control over the appointment of persons from those countries to the United Nations, and all other international organizations, will not be denied by anyone who knows the facts. Certain it is that there is a measure of cooperation of the communistic forces from those countries in the United Nations Organization with Stalin's agents. Exactly the same thing is true of the Latin American countries where communism is becoming powerfully entrenched.

I assert that the United Nations is the haven of the world Communist movement with, of course, Joseph Stalin as its head. The United Nations is serving him in good stead in directing his spy network in this country which is at last coming to light. Housed in New York City the United Nations becomes the very ultima ratio for the communistic overthrow of the United States by violence and force.

It is a deception to call this a loan. Every Member of Congress knows, or ought to know, that the United States would in all probability pay practically all of the cost. I was amazed at the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] that the transaction would cost the United States only between three and four hundred thousand dollars a year. The money would have to be raised by a public debt transaction. At 2.107 percent interest, the average rate on all interest-bearing debt, the transaction would cost the United States taxpayers more than $4,000,000 for the first 3 years.

The political authority of our Government has almost continuously for about 30 years pursued a policy of directly or indirectly expropriating the produce of our labors and gratuitously handing it over to political authorities in Europe and other countries. First there were the loans made to foreign countries in connection with World War I.

Then there were the foreign securities sold to private citizens in the 1920's which securities were salable only because the political authority controlling the Government approved them and encouraged their sale. The heavy losses suffered by the investors in those securities must be directly charged to the policy of the political authority of that period.

Then came the gold-purchase program in 1933 and 1934. The pockets of the American people were picked to the tune of many billions of dollars for the payment of enormous premiums on gold purchases. Lend-lease came next. Then postwar II gratuities to foreign countries and finally we have the 5-year projected Marshall plan. The total would greatly exceed $100,000,000,000.

The trend of increasing expropriation of American producers and gratuitously handing the fruit of their labors over to foreign political authorities, which are now practically all collectivist states, is definitely upward and becoming more and more a permanent fixture upon the American economy.

When the above facts are considered in connection with the Federal debt, unconscionable taxes and the deep-seated political corruption in which the United States is now mired, it would be anyone's guess as to what the ultimate money cost of the United Nations' structure would be to our taxpayers. It is reasonably certain that we will pay much more than the principal amount of $65,000,000 and it should surprise no one if it should cost us roundly $100,000,000 in the next 34 years, the alleged life of this euphemistically designated loan.

I am unalterably opposed to this bill because it would rob many families of

needed homes, intensify inflation, and give Stalin's agents a foothold that we might never be able to disestablish.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. I think the gentleman would be interested to hear that there is such competition for building labor in the New York area now that certain building mechanics are demanding overtime which brings their weekly rate of pay to $240.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I have always thought it would have been better for the United Nations and its effectiveness if its headquarters had not been located in the United States or any of the other major powers. It is more easily subject to national pressures, or at least the other strong nations fear that it will be unduly influenced by the host nation. Our forefathers were extremely wise when they set up the United States Government in an area, the District of Columbia, independent of any of the units comprising the new organization.

Or, if the United Nations were to be in America, it would have been better to have it almost anywhere else than New York City, our least American and most European city.

But the headquarters is here and at the invitation of the Congress and the Executive. We have made a commitment. I do not see anything for us to do but to vote the loan, which is a sound loan, and assist the United Nations in getting suitable quarters in which to work. Let us do everything within our power to assist it in becoming the kind of organization that can do the job the war weary and apprehensive peoples of the earth want it to do—establish justice and settle international disputes peacefully.

Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that it did not prove possible to bring before the last session or this session the whole bill, H. R. 6802, of which this resolution today represents only one of five main provisions. They deal with all aspects of the functions of the United Nations and of the United States relations to the United Nations. All of these provisions are necessary. Anything less is piecemeal legislation.

The statement of policy in section 1 of the act was drawn with the greatest care, and commands the support of all the various groups in our country which have been most active in studying and promoting sound proposals for international organization for peace. It is not all that many want, but I believe events will prove it sound and the first real forward step since San Francisco. May I read the statement of policy:

SEC. 1. * * *

(b) It is the policy of the people of the United States through constitutional processes to strive to accomplish the aims and purposes set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and to strengthen the United Nations by—

(1) Confirming the status of the United Nations in its site within the United States with appropriate privileges and immunities, facilitating its headquarters-building program, and increasing the effectiveness of the United States in the work of the United Nations;

(2) Seeking by voluntary agreements, interpretations, and practices to improve the functioning of the United Nations, to liberalize the voting procedures in the Security Council, and to eliminate the veto on all questions involving pacific settlement of international disputes and situations, and the admission of new members;

(3) Pressing for agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter, and for agreements to achieve universal control of weapons of mass destruction, and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces under adequate safeguards to protect complying nations against violation and evasion;

(4) Encouraging, and associating the United States with, such regional and other collective arrangements for self-defense as are consistent with the Charter, are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid between free nations, and affect the national security of the United States; and making clear the determination of the United States to exercise the right under the Charter of individual or collective self-defense in the event of any armed attack against a member affecting the national security of the United States; and

(5) Initiating consultations with other members concerning the need for and possibility of so amending the Charter as to enable the United Nations more effectively to prohibit and prevent aggression or other breaches of the peace.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of the committee was reluctant to bring out just the headquarters loan without the remaining sections of H. R. 6802. However, in view of the special circumstances prevailing, the committee agreed to do so, accompanying the bill with the following statement of explanation:

STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS REGARDING SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 212, THE UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS LOAN

More than a year ago the Committee on Foreign Affairs began studying afresh a question which is disturbing millions of Americans, namely, how to strengthen the United Nations so that it can become a mechanism able to settle disputes between nations equitably and effectively on the basis of world law, and with sufficient moral and military force to prevent aggression and maintain peace.

After the most thorough public review of the subject since the San Francisco Conference, including extensive hearings at which many of the most distinguished and thoughtful men and women of our time presented their views, the committee prepared and on June 9, 1948, reported unanimously H. R. 6802, a bill to strengthen the United Nations and promote international cooperation for peace. It contained a comprehensive statement of policy, and provisions for enlarging and strengthening American representation and assistance to the United Nations, adoption of a convention granting necessary privileges and immunities for delegates and staff of the United Nations, and a $65,000,000 loan for facilitating construction of the United Nations headquarters on the selected site in New York City.

Members of the committee believe that the most important part of the bill is the statement of policy with respect to improvements in the practices, procedures, and structure of the United Nations which we should strive for if it is to be made capable of functioning as intended. However, because of the fact that this special session was called by the President to consider only certain specified matters, including the headquarters loan; and because the consideration of H. R. 6802 which in large part is outside the designated scope of the session would make it difficult for the leadership to refuse consideration of many other matters also outside that scope; and in view of the fact that the House leadership has given assurance that the remainder of H. R. 6802 will be brought up for consideration by the House early in the next regular session, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has voted to report favorably Senate Joint Resolution 212, which is essentially the same as sections 8 and 9 of H. R. 6802 approving the United Nations headquarters loan agreement and authorizing $65,000,000 for the loan.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on the joint resolution before us.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this bill as I feel that to do otherwise, even under present conditions, might appear to be a direct slap at the United Nations, the success of which is so important to all of us.

I regret that this matter of building a headquarters for the United Nations has come up at the present time due to the large quantities of building material which will be diverted from home building for the purpose of the United Nations headquarters.

The materials likely to be used by the United Nations would construct about 8,000 separate homes for the people of the United States and it would seem preferable in many ways to utilize these materials for such homes and let the United Nations organization continue to function in its temporary quarters at Lake Success. I know that these temporary quarters are not suitable, yet I am inclined to think that housing for our own people right now might well take preference over the provision of an adequate and suitable home for the United Nations.

I favor the United Nations and, under ordinary conditions, would approve of this legislation without a qualm of conscience. Now, however, while voting for it, I wish that it might have been postponed for a year or two.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 212, providing for a $65,000,000 interest-free loan to the United Nations for a permanent headquarters in New York, is a matter of deep concern to both myself and the constituents of the Third District of Connecticut.

During the past few months, I have been the recipient of considerable correspondence from constituents in my district advocating favorable passage of this legislation. These constituents have expressed not only their deep concern for a permanent headquarters for this Organization but their sincere hope that the ultimate benefits to be gained by such Organization situated within the bounds of these United States, will far overshadow the expense of providing them with adequate housing facilities and headquarters.

Our participation in two major world wars in the past 25 years, and the sacrifices freely made by our people, in the loss of their beloved ones, support of every Government loan drive, and their physical efforts in support of national defense, have brought forcibly to their minds the ray of hope for some peaceful solution of the world's problems. These people, who have given their all, certainly do not wish to again see us embroiled in major conflict, and they are unquestionably sincere in their opinion that such ray of hope lies in the continuation of the United Nations Organization.

The sum of $65,000,000 to be expended for adequately housing this Organization is relatively insignificant compared to the sacrifices that have been made by our people to fight and gain victory in the past two major world wars. Such victory is hollow without having achieved by it a permanent and lasting peace for all the peoples of the world.

I do not feel that this Congress has any intention of diminishing the ray of hope held by our people for some form of enduring peace. To my mind, the nurturing of the present United Nations Organization, and confining such headquarters within the bounds of our United States, will be a proper step in the right direction. The Organization has had a rather stormy career, but we must not lose faith. After the adoption of our own Federal Constitution there were many who were skeptical concerning its future.

It is therefore my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will pass this very worthy legislation, which is of such vital importance to the well-being and morale of our people, without further delay.

The eyes of millions of peace-loving Americans are upon us; in fact, Mr. Speaker, the eyes of peace-loving peoples of the world are upon us. It therefore behooves us to fulfill their earnest hope and desire for a continued and permanent peace.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, it is quite possible even under the most tragic and difficult conditions ever confronting mankind that we approach this problem by piecemeal, but there is only one approach which will finally bring us to anything that is sound in the way of a conclusion and in the way of action, and that is to observe and understand the problem as it is in all its parts.

Our Foreign Affairs Committee some months ago was under great pressure from all parts of the country asking us to do something to strengthen the United Nations as the foundation of a new world civilization. We called for witnesses, and we had a magnificent company of leading men and women from all over this Nation representing great fundamental interests, who gave us a very informative and rational set of remarks and arguments. We prepared then a bill which included, among other important things, this loan for $65,000,000. That bill unfortunately fell down in the pressure of ending up the meeting of the Congress in June. So we are here today face to face with a responsibility from which there is no escape.

If we turn this proposal down, we will announce to the world that this Congress has turned its back on the position which the people, the Congress, and the administration have assumed up to now in the support of and welcome to this great world organization. So, I ask you men and women of this body when you vote here today to bear in mind the tremendous responsibilities that rest upon you in giving housing to this vitally important United Nations organization.

We are not giving away $65,000,000; we are investing it on a mortgage. We have substantial security. We can take charge of the buildings any time we have to. There are at least four great buildings proposed. One of them will be 41 stories high, and obviously it can be converted at short notice if necessary for business purposes.

The State of New York and the city of New York have already spent over $13,000,000 to advance this enterprise. Mr. Rockefeller, who, as you know, is in somewhat straitened circumstances, has contributed over $8,000,000 toward this. If we let the organization build the building, we would have to put up 40 percent of it anyway, and if we loan it we will get it back in time in full, and our mortgage interest will then be canceled.

In closing, I come back to where I started. You stand face to face with the most tremendous challenge to your resources of brains and character and patriotism and understanding that has ever confronted mankind.

I plead with you in the name of human freedom not to drive this institution across the Atlantic and put it under the control and power of the Russian Communist program; as it surely will be if it goes over there. We have them here. Let us keep them here. Let us keep our eye on them. Let us put the force and power and intelligence of our Nation behind this thing. Let us let the world know that we believe in world civilization; that we believe it can be done.

We have the center of a new world civilization here. Let us house it properly. Let us support it properly. We are for it against all comers. In God's name, let us stand up today and face this situation from the world point of view—from the point of view of world humanity and the spiritual challenge which it makes to us whether we shall enthrone slavery or freedom in this Nation and throughout the world.

As for me, I am for this. I am going to vote for it and I hope and believe all Members will be equally intelligent and vote for it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 164; noes 27.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-six Members are present, a quorum.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HOUSING—ANSWERING THE ARGUMENTS MADE AGAINST T-E-W BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, all agree that the housing shortage is still acute. The proponents of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill contend it will be the best means for dealing with the housing shortage and for establishing a national housing program for the next 10 years, while its opponents, including those in the House, have made three contentions:

First. All the available men and materials for housing construction are already being utilized; second, private industry is building enough to meet the emergency; and, third, the T-E-W bill will have an inflationary effect. It will be useful to answer these points in turn:

First. That present housing construction is already utilizing all the men and materials available. This contention will not stand examination because while private residential construction in the first 6 months of 1948 totaled $3,100,000,000, nonresidential construction and public construction totaled $3,600,000,000. Of this amount, $1,650,000,000 of commercial construction was not alone for factories but was for stores and offices, many of which we could well do without. Furthermore, social and recreational construction alone—the bowling alleys and the swimming pools and race tracks—reached a volume of $80,000,000 in that period—an increase of 110 percent over the same period in 1947. The materials supply situation has been improving very markedly—for example, at the end of May 1948, stocks of hardwood flooring were two and one-half times what they were in 1947 and stocks of oil burners five and one-half times. There are still shortages of cast-iron soil pipe, nails, cement, and steel, but as to these I have already pointed out the large-scale diversion of men and materials to nonessential construction.

The manpower situation has also improved very markedly, and no effective argument can be made of shortage of manpower in view of the large amount of nonresidential construction still going on. In 1947 the Congress took off the controls on commercial construction, and in 1948 on social and recreational construction as well. Tables bearing out these points follow at the end of these remarks. The uncontrolled building of such structures at a time of great

national emergency in housing can hardly be understood by any veteran who risked his life for his country during the war and who, 3 years after the war, is still living doubled up with relatives.

The T-E-W bill is also criticized because it will put the Government in the housing business to compete for scarce men and materials. But it will do nothing of the kind. It provides for only a maximum of 100,000 units of public housing per annum; this is 10 percent of present housing construction and would be 7½ percent of the construction expected under the T-E-W bill. That is the least which can be done to bring a share of the new housing within reach of those in the lower income brackets who need it most. T-E-W will reduce costs and accelerate private construction; it will not compete with it.

Second. Private industry is doing the job. Even if this were true, it is a fact that the housing produced is not within the price range, either for sale or rental, of those in the middle- and lower-income levels who need it most. The average price of a home around New York City is $13,000, veterans generally cannot pay more than $6,000. Housing starts in June 1948 decreased about 4 percent from those in May 1948. Not less than 30 percent of the housing construction in the country was done prior to March 31, 1948, under mortgage-insurance provided by title VI of the National Housing Act. It is freely predicted even by real-estate interests that 100,000 additional home units will be lost this year because title VI went out March 31, 1948, and it is estimated that total housing completions this year will not be much more than 900,000 units. In the face of an immediate demand from two to four million veterans living doubled up with relatives, an answer from the housing-construction industry is hardly business as usual.

Third. It is said that the T-E-W bill would be inflationary in its effect. This must be premised on the absolute expenditure involved. Commitments under the T-E-W bill are a maximum of $160,000,000 of subsidies per year with a total of $1,610,000,000 to $2,610,000,000 of insurance authorization, and $1,310,000,000 to $1,560,000,000 of revolving loan funds generally considered collectible; there is general agreement on the United States being committed for the insurance authorizations whether or not T-E-W passes. That leaves a maximum of $160,000,000 yearly in subsidies. There is no such outcry, however, as meets this expenditure for housing lower-income families, when it comes to aiding certain special interests. It is, therefore, interesting to compare the expressed fears of inflation due to a housing bill with the following appropriations made by the Eighteith Congress:

Rural electrification	$636,000,000
Soil conservation	203,000,000
AAA farm support program	265,500,000
Reclamation projects	156,000,000
Flood control, rivers and harbors	900,000,000
Federal aid to highway construction	1,147,000,000
Foreign aid and the ERP	7,000,000,000
Total	9,301,500,000

Certainly any expenditure at a time like this is inflationary. Yet any one of the great expenditures I have mentioned could certainly not rate superior to housing. The inflationary effect of the T-E-W bill, such as it is, is not the fault of housing but of our over-all general responsibilities. How can it be said to be inflationary to build permanent assets like homes as against farm support payments that will go in the banks as money where there is already plenty of money. Housing in order to meet a basic emergency is an elementary need of the American people, and certainly should not be discriminated against.

To sum up, first, the T-E-W bill remains the only comprehensive housing bill before the Congress. It is the only bill which to the country will mean a sustained long-range construction program to meet its housing needs, as well as a prompt start on a broad enough scale to really help in the housing emergency. Second, private industry is not doing, and cannot do, the job of meeting the emergency all by itself, and the worst thing which is happening to the private-construction industry in its effort to meet problems greater than its capabilities is the way in which it is earning public disapprobation—the housing industry ought to be out fighting for T-E-W. Finally, in a monetary sense, housing is no more inflationary than rural electrification, soil conservation, flood control, and aid to highway construction. It is at least as important, if not more so, than these activities. Nor can we say that anything is inflationary that adds to the real assets of America with the tangible values which are added by housing. The shortage of men and materials is an excuse, not a reason, for we are diverting a big part of the men and materials available for construction to nonresidential construction, including social and recreational. The T-E-W bill, promising a sustained production program of homes for 10 years at least, will naturally bring in its wake a great broadening of the production of construction materials and the entry of many thousands of additional workers into the industry because of the security and stability which it will afford. There is no substitute for the T-E-W bill and for the acceptance of national responsibility for the people's welfare which it implies.

TABLE 1.—*Value of new construction put in place, by type, first 6 months of 1947 and 1948*

[Millions of dollars]

Type of construction	First 6 months— 1948	1947	Percent change
Total new construction	$7,684	$5,677	+35.4
Total private	6,064	4,432	+36.8
Residential building (nonfarm)	3,100	1,933	+60.2
Nonresidential building (nonfarm)	1,651	1,504	+9.8
Social and recreational	80	38	+110.5
Industrial, commercial, and all other	1,571	1,466	+7.2
Farm construction	200	160	+25.0
Public utilities	1,113	833	+33.6
Total public	1,620	1,245	+30.1

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics and U. S. Department of Commerce.

TABLE 2.—*Production of construction materials, composite index, by month for the years 1946, 1947, 1948*

[1939 monthly average = 100]

Month	Year 1946	1947	1948
January	89.5	124.6	131.5
February	87.2	124.0	121.5
March	109.1	132.7	140.3
April	120.4	138.2	142.9
May	125.3	141.2	143.7
June	129.2	139.7	-------
July	134.6	142.8	-------
August	147.9	147.6	-------
September	142.1	140.1	-------
October	150.8	139.0	-------
November	139.5	138.6	-------
December	125.9	136.5	-------

NOTE.—This composite index includes 20 materials.
Source: U. S. Department of Commerce.

TABLE 3.—*Building materials in short supply as reported by field offices of the Federal Housing Administration on September 1, 1947, and July 1, 1948*

Materials	Number of offices reporting shortages As of Sept. 1, 1947	As of July 1, 1948
Gypsum products	41	31
Hardwood flooring	21	4
Millwork	32	14
Iron and steel pipe	29	23
Plumbing fixtures and materials	32	16
Cast-iron soil pipe	14	+16
Nails	21	+23
Electrical products	10	2
Sheet metal	14	6
Felt	12	2
Wood siding	8	5
Finish lumber	8	3
Plywood	3	0
Hardware	4	1
Plaster and materials	8	2
Heating equipment	4	1
Cement	4	+7
Steel	4	+9
Other	23	21

Source: Federal Housing Administration.

TABLE 4.—*Labor causing construction delays because of short supply as reported by field offices of the Federal Housing Administration on September 1, 1947, and July 1, 1948*

Type of labor	Number of offices reporting shortages As of Sept. 1, 1947	As of July 1, 1948
Bricklayers	39	30
Plasterers	30	23
Carpenters	17	6
Plumbers	15	10
Electricians	6	2
Painters	4	2
Other skilled labor	12	9
Common labor	5	3

Source: Federal Housing Administration.

TABLE 5.—*Changes in proportion of construction workers employed in private residential construction, by month, January through June 1948*

Month (1948)	Estimated number (in thousands)	Percent privately financed new residential construction
January	1,870.9	45.7
February	1,730.7	41.9
March	1,804.9	37.1
April	1,966.4	36.8
May	2,049.0	36.1
June	[1] 2,182.0	36.9

[1] Preliminary.
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. DONDERO]. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE PROBLEM OF RISING PRICES

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the president of the Retail Food Dealers' Association of California, who lives in Los Angeles and whose name is Mr. Fred A. Baughan, talked to me about certain aspects of the problem of rising prices. He made a trip through some 36 of the 48 States, always inquiring on the points I am about to put in the RECORD. He had gathered together, as a result of that trip, certain figures which I now give you in lump form. I thought they were interesting and that I should bring them to the attention of the Congress.

It is a very easy matter for us, or for our constituents, to say that prices have risen and to blame these rises upon one cause or another. It is a common trait that we should overlook one of the principal factors in the rising prices, and one that should not be overlooked. So I rise today to put into the RECORD these figures.

In 1942 the population of the United States was 134,664,924 people; in 1946, the last available date for which I have these figures, the population had risen to 141,228,693 people.

In the first of these 2 years which I am now comparing, the Federal Government collected in taxes $5,948 836,402, but 4 years later the Federal Government alone collected from the taxpayers of the United States $44,238,590,336.

We have a tendency again, in discussing taxes, to think only of the taxes imposed upon the people by the legislative body of which we are a part, the Congress of the United States. State and local taxes are paid by the same people who pay the rising costs of living.

In 1942 the actual amount of local and State taxes collected from the people was $9,685,000,000. In 1946 they had approximately doubled, to $17,500,000,000. This is the only figure in which any estimate has been necessary. The greater part of that figure is actual, but in order to provide it for all the States a very conservative estimate was made of a 75 percent increase, which was proven to be less than the increase in almost all the States available. For example, the increase in my own State is 400 percent. Therefore, when we take only 75 percent for the national average, that is, I think, conservative.

Thus the taxes collected per capita in 1942 were $116 per person; the taxes collected per capita 4 years later, and less than those collected now, were $438 per person, or four times the amount of the first figure.

I come now to consumer sales, which are the purchases by people who speak of their concern over the rising cost of living. That figure has not changed materially. The amount in 1942, exclusive of taxes, was $75,255,163,598, and the amount in 1946 was only $81,931,409,604. Thus, consumer purchases, exclusive of taxes, between the 4 years, increased only from $558.60 to $580.10 per person. I call this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that this is an increase in those 4 years in the actual cost of the things purchased themselves of only $21 per person in the United States. When, however, you include the taxes in the cost of consumer goods, the per capita cost on these consumer items rose from $674.50 to $1,017.20. Now, putting that into the simple language with which I think we must approach all of these problems of inflation and of rising costs, we should not try to provide complicated solutions for what seems to be complicated problems, but to provide the simple solutions which will eventually solve them with courage and cooperation from the people. What this means to us is that 43 percent of the present cost of living represents taxes; State, Federal, and local. We can do something about the expenditures of government.

I desire to add to this only the comment of my friend, Mr. Baughan, who prepared these figures. Turning for the moment to poetry, he says:

The high cost of living is only a joke;
It's the high cost of government which is keeping us broke.

Mr. Speaker, the figures, to which I referred above, are as follows:

	1942	1946
Population, Bureau of the Census	134,664,924	141,228,693
Federal taxes collected	$5,924,836,402.00	$44,238,590,336.00
State and local taxes collected	9,655,000,000.00	17,500,000,000.00
Total taxes collected	15,579,836,402.00	61,738,590,336.00
Tax collected per capita	116.00	438.00
Consumer sales ex tax	75,255,163,598.00	81,931,409,604.00
Consumer sales per capita	558.60	580.10
Consumer sales including taxes	90,834,999,999.00	140,670,000,000.00
Per capita cost of Government and living	674.60	1,017.20

NOTE.—It is seen that consumer sales have increased only $21.50 per capita in 1946 over 1942, and is due to higher standards and greater purchasing power. Cost of living on the same standard is actually much lower. Taxes, on the other hand, representing the cost of government, have increased $321.40 per capita, and of course do not represent the increase in bonded debt of the many political subdivisions making up the governmental structure of these United States of America.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 12 minutes.

ONE CENTRAL LOYALTY AGENCY NECESSARY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the recent disclosures made by Congress by the admitted Communist, Mrs. Elizabeth T. Bentley, and the verification of these allegations by the former editor of the Daily Worker, Louis Budenz, and T. Whittaker Chambers, I feel it necessary to again call attention to one of the most shocking examples of the ineffectiveness of our Government security system.

Some time ago, I called attention to the fact that George Shaw Wheeler was employed by the War Department in the Allied military government in Berlin. It is not intended at this time to restate all of the now well-known facts regarding Mr. Wheeler's activities. However, for the benefit of those individuals who are still not entirely clear on Communist techniques and double talk, there are a few points which I should like to make for the record:

First. While George Shaw Wheeler is vigorously denying that he is disloyal, he does not state whether or not he is pro- or anti-Communist, pro- or anti-Soviet, or pro- or anti-American foreign policy with regard to the preservation of American principles in the war against communism. In fact, he does not state just what it is that he is not disloyal to.

Second. Mr. Wheeler states that the "Civil Service Commission held a full hearing on my loyalty and I was cleared." I now call upon the Civil Service Commission to furnish to Congress the complete record of the Wheeler case, showing the basis of that clearance and the names of those who used their influence to clear Mr. Wheeler, as well as the methods by which this was accomplished. As in the Remington case before the Ferguson committee, it will be interesting to determine from the record how these individuals accomplished the task of manipulating the appointments and clearances of their colleagues.

Third. In his letter printed in the Washington Post of July 9, 1948, Mr. Wheeler states that he got his job in Czechoslovakia from the National Socialist administration of the Ministry of Education, and not from the Communists. He states that he is lecturing in English to college students, in the field for which he is trained, "classical, liberal economics." He states, further, that "the Congressman assumes that my living in a country means that I approve of all that happens in it."

Few people doubt the impossibility of an American citizen's teaching American principles in a university which is under the domination of the Communists. Surely these lectures are sanctioned by the Communist leaders in such a country. The known techniques of the Russian police state make Mr. Wheeler's protestations that he is teaching the American viewpoint to students in a Russian-controlled state obviously false. It is apparent that Mr. Wheeler is teaching with the consent and guidance of the Soviet Government. In view of this, I am led to wonder about the nature of the "classical, liberal economics" which Mr. Wheeler disseminates in what he calls the American way.

In regard to Mr. Wheeler's statement that "the Congressman assumes that my living in a country means that I approve of all that happens in it," the best indication of his disapproval would be a condemnation of the Communist overthrow of the legally constituted government of Czechoslovakia. There is certainly no doubt in the minds of any loyal Americans regarding the conditions in Czechoslovakia, and if Mr. Wheeler cannot find strenuous criticism of the Soviet practices there, then there is little likelihood of his finding anything wrong with them anywhere.

More important than any single case of disloyalty to American principles by a Government employee, however, is the whole problem of the security clearance of Federal personnel. At the present time, there are many security and investigative offices, employing thousands of persons, at a cost of countless millions of dollars, all engaged in investigating employees and applicants for employment in the Federal service. In spite of the mountainous sum of money and load of persons engaged in the task, we have the repeated cases of the George Wheelers, the Remingtons, Silvermasters, and all the rest. This blundering overlapping and duplication of ineffectual investigative procedure must be done away with and replaced by a single, effective, speedy, and economical office which will clear all Federal personnel once, and thereafter merely bring the case up to date.

There is at present a constant reinvestigation of persons each time they move from one Government job to another.

A typical example of this "investigation by confusion" would be that of an individual whose chronological record of employment might be as follows: Having received his original appointment with the Treasury Department, his background would be investigated by that agency. Sometime later, upon transferring to the War Production Board, his background would be investigated by the Civil Service Commission. Seeking advancement, a transfer to the War Department would cause his background to be investigated by the Counterintelligence Corps. Pursuant to an Executive order, his position might be reallocated to the State Department where his background would be investigated by that agency. Upon enlistment in the Navy, his background would be investigated by the Office of Naval Intelligence. Resuming civilian employment, he is appointed to the Atomic Energy Commission and his background is investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. At this point, his background has been investigated six times. At no time has the information concerning his date and place of birth, education or former employment varied. Yet, ignoring the records already compiled, or believing them to be inadequate, Federal agents repeatedly criss-cross the entire country verifying facts and interviewing witnesses, which, when once accomplished should eliminate the need of repetitious verification.

I propose that all the existing governmental investigative records be consolidated and placed under the jurisdiction of one agency which will have the sole responsibility for clearing personnel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the spirit moves me, as a result of listening to the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], to make a few observations, again—accent on "again"—before the end of this special session, which is very rapidly approaching in response to the wishes of the Republican leadership.

There are certain facts that the Republican Party cannot escape today and will not be able to escape during the next 3 months, and which the people should not be permitted to forget. One is that for 55 months prior to June 30, 1946, under the leadership of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, one of the greatest men of all time, and who will always be one of the greatest men of all time as long as mankind exists, the Democratic Party held the line against inflation. For 3½ years prior to June 30, 1946, during the war period, the over-all increase in the cost of living was 6.6 percent. Today the over-all increase in the cost of living since June 30, 1946, when price controls went off, is 40 percent. In other words, the cost of living during the last 2 years has increased nearly 7 times what it increased during the preceding 3½-year period. That is fact No. 1.

The second fact is that the Democratic Party enacted legislation that held the line. During the war we were shipping abroad more food for nonmilitary purposes than we have shipped abroad during the last 2 years, and we held the line. The argument that Government purchases are the cause of the increase in the cost of living in the light of that is entirely fallacious in itself. We had the courage to pass legislation in the interest of the people, and we held the line. We had great commitments during the war. We had to purchase and send abroad food for nonmilitary purposes during the war. If we include military purchases, and they were taken out of domestic consumption, the drain was many times greater during the war than it has been during the last 2 years. This includes the export of food, meat, and the other things our Government purchased.

Of course, where there are no controls and there are shortages of essential things that the people need, prices are going to increase, but the fact is during the war that there was effective price control and prices were not increased.

We had the illustration of speculation on the grain markets, that happened only after price control was taken off. There was no speculation during the war with price control on, because we kept the prices stationary. We held the line in the interest of the people. The speculator in wheat and in other commodities came in only after price controls were taken off. There was no such speculation while price controls were on. So the indisputable fact is that for 55 months the over-all increase under the Democratic administration under the leadership of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt was 21 percent, of which 6.6 percent during the last 3½ years of that 55 months, from the time the late Franklin D. Roosevelt issued the hold-the-line order, when the little-steel formula was put into operation in February, or about February, of 1943.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has mentioned wheat and speculation in wheat. I take it that he has mentioned it with reference to the price of wheat and the effect on the price of wheat.

I have here the paper from my home town in Indiana. On the front page there is a statement from the county agricultural conservation committee pointing out the support-price program and how the farmers may avail themselves of it.

It goes on to say that the support price in my home county on wheat is $2.14 a bushel.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask the gentleman whether he voted for the support-price program?

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will let me conclude. On the last page of the paper is the market quotation furnished by the Farm Bureau Cooperative on wheat. It is $2.02 a bushel. In other words, as of today, wheat in Indiana is going into the market from the farms at a price 12 cents below the support price, which as the gentleman knows, is 90 percent of parity.

I might say in respect to the support-price program that I voted for it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman's last observation certainly defeats any purpose that he had in making his inquiry of me, so far as the support-price program being put through under a Democratic administration when the gentleman himself voted for it.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Massachusetts apparently completely misinterprets what I have in mind. I simply want to point out that wheat which is one of the basic crops and probably along with corn, the most important factor affecting meat prices, dairy prices, and poultry prices, as well as the cereals that we eat directly, is reaching the point where the supply is catching up with the demand so that the cash price to the farmer is 12 cents below the support price which is 90 percent of parity.

I might point also, because I think it is significant although I am not professing to see the whole high-price situation cleared up by itself overnight, because I know better than that, but I might point out that the support price on oats which is another important factor in the cast-of-living index is 72 cents per bushel, and the farmer is getting 63 cents for oats in Indiana today.

Mr. McCORMACK. The fact remains that the over-all increase in the cost of living during the last 2 years is 40 percent higher than it was on June 30, 1946.

I will yield to anyone on the floor to deny that statement.

So far as the price of meat is concerned, it is 60 percent to 80 percent higher as well as being higher with reference to other foods. But I am taking the over-all figures, including clothing, rent, and everything else. It is 40 percent higher than it was 2 years ago, or a little over 2 years ago when price controls were on.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], because I happened to refer to him.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I am honored that he should have thought it necessary to say something when I simply pointed out the fact that Government spending amounted to 43 percent of the cost of living.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will come to that. The gentleman himself voted for that Government spending, did he not? You voted for the present budget appropriation?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman probably overlooked the fact that we are now spending less than we are taking in.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are we?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I mean, are we spending less than we did before?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. We are spending less than we are taking in.

Mr. McCORMACK. That may be true, but that is no credit to the gentleman's party. That is due to the increase in income taxes and increase of revenues from all sources.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I do not understand what the gentleman is objecting to. Is the gentleman objecting to the money spent for national governmental expenses? However, I want to say that that is not what I wanted to talk to the gentleman about.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is talking about Government expenses.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. You are talking about Government expenditures.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; you are. I have not come to that, yet.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. All right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had not come to that subject yet. You were talking about it. You voted for the appropriation?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. And you voted for the wartime appropriations, did you not?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Some of them, but not all of them.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman voted for all these Government appropriations which were made, and which are now claimed as one of the main contributing factors in this inflation.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thought you did. What I wanted to say to the gentleman seriously is that he is perpetuating, I think unintentionally, that incorrect idea that the OPA prices, that is, the prices limited arbitrarily, actually represented the prices at which people were buying the things they had to buy—consumer things; forgetting that the OPA had created the greatest black market this Nation has ever had, and that while the OPA had some very fine and beautiful ideas——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. DONDERO]. There are other special orders, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman be given some extra time, with the consent of the people who have special orders.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be glad to yield and take my time later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman sees my point. There is no use talking about controlled prices when you cannot buy things at that price.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will agree there was a bad black market, but anybody who was caught would be punished and jailed; but what about the gray market that exists now? What about the legalized robbery that is going on? Take automobiles, for instance. Try to buy an automobile, and note the prices of second-hand automobiles.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I never believed that two wrongs made a right.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are people highjacking on steel with their inside connections. We know what the situation is. We have a gray market. I call it a red market, because gray is a nice looking color and we like to look at it. If you and I are gouged in buying an automobile, or we have got to pay two or three hundred dollars a ton for steel in some small business, when we should be able to buy it for $90 or $100, we are not seeing gray. We are seeing red. So I call it a red market.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I agree with the gentleman. I think that kind of gouging is just as bad as for the Government to gouge, or anybody else. But I do wish the gentleman would answer what I said about people being unable to buy for that price, because that is serious. You see, here is the Government subsidizing the people, taking the money out of the taxpayer's pockets to pay for something that other people buy, and then they had to go to the black market to get those things.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I will agree that the subsidy should be included; but, including that, it would be only a minor part of the sharp increase that has taken place during the past 2 years. No one could say that the payment of subsidies which were made should not indirectly be charged up as a part of the cost. To undertake to say that is not so would, in my opinion, be a violation of intellectual honesty. But, including that, it would not be a very important factor. It certainly would not amount to the 40 percent over-all increase in the cost of living. It might amount to about 3 percent on the prices at that time, or 5 percent at the outside.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Regardless of how the Republicans may try to explain this inflationary condition that has occurred, the fact remains that in my district 2 years ago factory workers had bank savings accounts; they had War Savings bonds; they had money in their pockets and money in the bank. Two years later, 2 years after the Republicans took control of Congress, my people have no money in their pockets, no money in the bank, and they have no more war bonds. They have cashed everything. It took all of their savings in addition to their salaries in order to live, since the Republicans took over the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, let me give an illustration of some prices under OPA, lest we forget:

Porterhouse steak: In stores other than chain stores with annual gross sales under $250,000, AA or Choice, 55 cents a pound; A or Good, 51; B grade, 44; C grade, 37 cents a pound; D grade, 33.

Chain stores and all stores with annual gross sales over $250,000; AA or Choice porterhouse steak, 53 cents a pound; A or Good, 49; B grade, 42; C grade, 36; D grade, 32 cents a pound.

Here is a whole book of all the prices that a friend of mine very kindly sent to me, and it brings back fond memories of bygone days that would still exist if it were not for the Republican Party.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very much interested in the very factual recital of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts. I was also interested very much in his plea to the Republican leadership for an extra 20 minutes of the Congress' time to consider this tremendous problem of inflation, which was denied to him by the Speaker of the House himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was denied. Leave it that way.

Mr. MONRONEY. However, the gentleman was denied the right to put the request.

Mr. McCORMACK. Leave it that it was denied. We did not get the extra time.

Mr. MONRONEY. All right, leave it that way. But the fact is that here we are, 12 minutes after 3 p. m., with, I believe, 26 Members on the floor, listening to special orders.

Mr. McCORMACK. In justice to the Speaker, I know he wanted to give it but it was denied, so we did not get the 20 minutes. As a matter of fact we ought to have had a couple of hours.

Mr. MONRONEY. And here at 3 o'clock in the afternoon we have no legislative business before us. So we perhaps could have found some time adequately to discuss the problem of inflation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Plenty of time. And even worse than that, there was no opportunity to offer amendment, and they did not give to the minority even the customary right of offering a motion to recommit to get itself on record.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Wisconsin is a pretty progressive man. I hope the gentleman will ask me no question on which I may have to take issue with him.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am seeking enlightenment from the gentleman from Massachusetts. I listened with great interest to the prices of meat, particularly, and other things back in the days when they were much lower than they are today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Back in the sweet days.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I understand that this year we have prospects of bumper crops not only in this country but things look pretty good in Europe along that line too, comparatively.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us all hope it is there. We know it is here.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. We all know we certainly need everything Providence can give us there. What I understood was——

Mr. McCORMACK. I have not started my speech, you know.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The Department of Agriculture recommended as a target to aim at for 1949 a cutting of breeding cattle by half a million head and cutting wheat acreage by 8 percent. I am wondering if that is not a reversion to the plowing-under policy, an attempt to keep the supply down and the price up; and I am just wondering what explanation the Secretary of Agriculture may have for it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Assuming the gentleman's premises are correct, I will say frankly I am unable to answer. Certainly the gentleman would not say that this administration is trying to keep prices up. Whatever the reason is it is not that. I assume the gentleman's premises are correct. Of the facts involved in his inquiry I have no knowledge.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am quoting from a release made by the office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly it would not be to keep prices up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 5 minutes allotted me today may be used tomorrow afternoon after any previous special orders, rather than this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, President Truman called Congress back into session to enact a legislative program in the interests of the American people. Two of the most important pieces of legislation the President asked for were legislation to control inflation and passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill to provide homes for the homeless and for slum clearance.

It is now abundantly clear that this Republican Congress has no intention of taking the necessary steps to check inflation and save the consumer and business from the depression toward which we are surely headed.

It is also now abundantly clear that the Republican leadership in Congress will not permit the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill in this special session of Congress—or in the next Congress if they are again in control.

They spend these precious days trying to justify their failure to act—their refusal to legislate in the interests of the people whom they are privileged to represent.

No amount of phony excuses can obscure the facts for the American people. Inflation is producing higher and higher profits for a few and a steadily lowered standard of living for the many. The high and rising prices that inflation represents has decreased the buying power of the wage earner and all those living on fixed incomes, with the result that millions of families today are not able to balance their budgets. They are using up their savings and going into debt.

People are being priced out of the consumer market.

This is the stuff out of which depressions are made. If this is allowed to continue, and it is in fact accelerating, our entire economy will come tumbling down about our ears.

It is this depression that the President has asked us to prevent. And that is the job of this Congress.

Prices, wages, and profits have gotten hopelessly out of line. We must reestablish a balance or suffer the consequences. Those consequences involve not only the immediate happiness and well-being of the American people but world-wide economic stability and peace.

The American people cannot use Republican excuses to pay their grocery bills.

If indeed the President has, as some Republican Members claim, the power to control prices without Congress having to pass any additional legislation, it is up to this Congress to protect the American people by staying in session and seeing to it that the President uses these powers to which they vaguely refer. If, in fact, he had such power and did not use it, he ought to be impeached.

But this nonsense of claiming that the President has powers to control inflation is a phony excuse for doing nothing, and they know it.

Or if the commodity-support program is the cause of high prices, as some Republican Congressmen claim, why does not the Republican leadership bring in a bill to reduce commodity price supports or to do away with the program altogether?

They do not because they know this is a phony argument—an argument which they are preparing for use in the next few months to corral a few votes in the cities, being careful, of course, not to use it among the farmers.

If foreign aid is the basic cause of high prices as some Republicans in Congress claim, why does not the Republican leadership bring in a bill to cut off all foreign aid—stop all exports?

They don't because they know this is the phoniest argument of all. They will use it all the same to avoid talking about their failure to check inflation.

But I do not today wish to discuss the high cost of living but to answer the speech made by the distinguished Republican from Illinois which was made over the radio July 29, 1948, and in the House of Representatives on July 30. His speech was a series of trumped-up excuses to dish out to the American people in the coming campaign for the Republican's failure to pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

Why is this carefully prepared set of excuses being built up?

Because there are at least 3,000,000 families without homes, many of whose members will vote in November.

How are these people living? They are doubling up with friends and relatives and strangers so that more than 6,000,000 families are living in cramped and demoralizing circumstances. Every year there are at least 400,000 new families with no place to go to establish their homes. They must also double up with other families or live in trailer camps, garages or other make-shift accommodations. They, too, must be told why the Republican leadership is keeping them in these conditions. They too have votes.

The Republican leadership in this special session of Congress does not have the courage to sit down and meet the housing problem squarely, and then—they are so terribly busy working out ways and means to play politics, to flimflam the American people, to get votes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have the spectacle and the country has the spectacle of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill passing the Senate, which bill deals with slum clearance, public housing, low-cost housing, and rural housing. The leadership of this body says that is socialistic, and yet the Republican Party put it into their platform only a few weeks ago in Philadelphia. They come out for slum clearance and low-cost public housing in their platform.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows very well that when the Republicans pass legislation to help the higher-income brackets, that that is free enterprise, but when the Democrats try to help those in the low-income brackets that is socialistic.

The American people are pleading for action on housing, and they are getting speeches instead. No wonder the American people have lost confidence in the Eightieth Congress.

I take it that the speech by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] before this body and on the radio is the last word of the Republican leadership on the T-E-W bill, not only for this session but in any other session in which they control the majority vote. I am surprised at the stand of the gentleman from Illinois on this matter—after his championship of the people on so many scores, and after his close working relationship with those who believe in the rights of the people.

I find the gentleman's remarks on housing especially unbelievable, but then he is a good soldier and I suppose he is only coming to the rescue of his party.

The gentleman from Illinois seeks to leave the impression that if we will just leave private industry alone, there will be all the houses the American people need and anyway the need isn't very great; a need upon which no two authorities can agree.

The gentleman from Illinois implies that Government does more harm than good when it concerns itself with housing. Was not the biggest housing production in the 20's when the building industry was left alone? In the 30's the Government invested $20,000,000,000 in housing and what did that produce? To show how ineffective the Federal Government is in this field, the gentleman from Illinois makes fun of the Wyatt program and says that it was only after we got rid of it that we got any housing. In other words, he tries to leave the impression that if we pass the T-E-W housing bill, we won't build any houses, and even if the T-E-W bill were desirable—this is not the time to pass it, for it would increase inflation. That is the climax of the argument—the grand climax—and here the gentleman from Illinois seeks to leave the impression that the administration is sadly remiss in even asking for the passage of the T-E-W bill at this time. Therefore, the gentleman from Illinois and the Republican Party are protecting the American people in preventing the passage of the T-E-W bill. And the American people ought to stand up next November and say, "Well done."

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is an intelligent man and a very skillful orator and he is very often right. But he is not serving the American people when he seeks to excuse the Republican Party for blocking the passage of the T-E-W housing bill and no amount of skill can cover up the facts for the American people. Six million families who find themselves living doubled up cannot be satisfied with speeches or excuses. The 5,000,000 families living in slums will not be impressed with his arguments.

IS THE TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL INFLATIONARY?

The gentleman from Illinois claims that he is opposed to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill because it is inflationary. This is the latest argument in a long and devious line of arguments of those who have consistently opposed slum-clearance, low-cost housing, and low-cost public housing.

It ill becomes the party that does not believe in controls—the party that stands by while profits continue to mount and the standard of living of the vast majority of the American people steadily drops—to come up now with this inflation argument.

Remember it is the Republican Party which has cut the taxes of the rich and the profiteers to such a degree that there now appears to be no money to pay off our World War II debt.

The Republican Party does not seem to be concerned over this inflationary pressure or they would reimpose the excess-profits tax as the President has asked them to do. No, they only wring their hands over inflation when it comes to building houses for the homeless.

Not to pass the T-E-W housing bill is the most inflationary action this Congress can take in the field of housing.

Four hundred thousand new families add to the demands for housing every year in a market where 3,000,000 families are already on the waiting list—and 5,000,000 city families are buried in the slums—not to speak of farm families.

The opponents of the T-E-W bill do not want a large production at low prices. They want a limited production at high prices.

We must fight inflation blow by blow where it counts. This aimless milling around must stop. We cannot legislate ourselves back to the good old days even if we could agree on what period we would be willing to call the good old days. We must rather seek out and cure maladjustments in our economy, in prices, in incomes and production, using a scalpel instead of a cleaver. That is the only way we can discharge our responsibility for the security and well-being of our country and the people in it.

Inflation, like its twin, depression, does not mete out even-handed justice to all alike. The burdens these twin dangers impose upon our people are felt more heavily by those who can least afford to bear them. The problem of meeting the needs of those who are suffering from the effects of inflation must be faced as squarely as we face the problems of meeting the needs of depression victims by relief where relief is needed. That means providing price relief to the consumer at the lower levels, building up production of the things needed at those levels and in every other possible way remedying the maladjustments in the price and income level that the current inflationary spiral is intensifying.

High prices alone are not the problem: If wages and income and prices mounted evenly across the board for everybody we would merely be using dollar bills for pennies. The fact is that, relatively, prices for some things, particularly foods, are rising more rapidly than the incomes of the people that need them. And the prices of certain manufactures, such as steel, are rising more rapidly than can be supported by sustained demand. In brief, the maladjustment of wages, prices, and profits, rather than their levels, are the basis of our problem, and these maladjustments are now threatening the security of the vast majority of our people.

The remedy is not to label all consumption inflationary or assume that any production is equally effective as a cure for inflation.

We need not concern ourselves with the price of breast of guinea hen, but we must be concerned with the price of stew meat.

We must not seek to step up production of $30,000 homes to relieve a housing shortage for people who make $3,000 a year.

We need price control where it counts, and we need production of those things that the great majority of the people need. We must not mistake full employment for healthy prosperity if that employment is not productive of the needs of the people. Full employment in the time of the Pharaohs produced coffins for kings but not peace and security for people. And full employment here in America today if it is confined to making luxuries for the few instead of necessities for the many will prove equally meaningless for the people.

Full employment of all construction workers on houses for inflation's profiteers would aggravate, not cure our difficulties. Those workers and materials are needed to solve the housing shortage of our lower-income groups, our veterans and other younger people who have no homes and who cannot get them at present prices. The T-E-W bill, which will put people to work on the housing problem where it will do the most good, is therefore a bill for fighting inflation through production—production where production counts.

The gentleman from Illinois in opposing the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill on the basis that it is inflationary quotes Mr. Marriner Eccles, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the former Chairman of that Board.

It is interesting to note in passing that Mr. Marriner Eccles is a New Deal appointee, and of course we remember that the gentleman from Illinois is a Republican.

In interpreting Mr. Eccles' remarks before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Illinois is about as accurate as Republicans usually are when they try to interpret New Deal Democrats.

Mr. Eccles said:

> Congress is currently considering the continuance of easy mortgage credit for housing. Easy mortgage credit is one of the most inflationary factors in the domestic credit picture. * * *. The housing shortage cannot be overcome by increasing the competitive pressures on scarce supplies of materials and manpower. They are the limiting factors on the volume of construction.

I agree with Mr. Eccles 100 percent but I would point out to the gentleman from Illinois that if Congress would enact the allocations, priorities, and price-control program the President has asked for, competitive pressures on scarce supplies of materials and manpower would be regulated in the widest interests of the American people and would serve those who need to be served most.

In a letter which Mr. Eccles sent to the Banking and Currency Committee on April 5, 1948, on the subject of the

Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, he had this to say:

The Board is particularly concerned about three proposals contained in these bills: First, creation of a Government-financed secondary market for mortgages already underwritten by the Government; second, continuation of the undesirable mortgage-insurance program under title VI of the National Housing Act; and third, addition to title II of the National Housing Act of a permanent program of excessively easy mortgage credit.

The gentleman from Illinois and the Republican majority in the House of Representatives voted for and passed in this session of Congress those very parts of the T-E-W bill to which Mr. Eccles objected. They voted for each and every one of the proposals Mr. Eccles said were inflationary.

The gentleman from Illinois voted for a secondary-market provision which was passed by the Republican House of Representatives in H. R. 6959 and S. 2790. Indeed, the secondary-market plan adopted in the latter bill contains none of the anti-inflationary limitations which were proposed in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

The gentleman from Illinois voted for the continuation of title VI of the National Housing Act, which was passed by the Republican-controlled House of Representatives as a part of H. R. 6959. Apparently he was not afraid of inflation when he voted for title VI a short few weeks ago.

Finally, the Republican House of Representatives, presumably including the gentleman from Illinois, voted for and passed a provision for 95-percent mortgages under title II of the National Housing Act, which Mr. Eccles opposed as inflationary. This was passed by the House as a part of S. 2790. Thus, it appears that each of the provisions which the gentleman from Illinois claims he opposes because they are inflationary have been voted by the gentleman from Illinois and his colleagues.

They have voted for those parts of the housing program that Mr. Eccles opposed as inflationary but are objecting to that part of the program he did not consider to be inflationary—slum clearance and low-cost public housing—as indeed they are not.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System did not oppose slum clearance, and they did not oppose low-rent public housing. Indeed, they could not raise such objections because the public-housing program provides low rents and does not involve inflationary expansion of bank credit.

The facts are that the Republican majority in the House of Representatives has bowed to every demand of the real-estate lobby and the construction industry, but it is unwilling to adopt the noninflationary public-housing program which would provide homes for the homeless and take 5,000,000 families from out of the slums.

Before leaving this subject of inflationary pressures, I would like to point out that a majority of the Senate, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the House Banking and Currency Committee have felt that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill should be adopted.

Inflationary pressures result from an excess of demand over supply. We can never meet the demand for housing unless we increase production of houses people can afford to live in. Only by building houses, more than 1,500,000 houses a year, for a period of years, will we meet the inflationary demand for housing. The longer we defer construction, the longer we continue inflationary pressures. Those who support the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill hold to the view that the best way to meet inflation in the housing field is to increase production and keep housing production at high levels.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield for a suggestion?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would be interested in hearing the gentlewoman discuss the materials out of which the homes will be built. That is one of the points that has been raised about the housing problem, the lack of materials available for building houses.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. We can go into that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield there?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentlewoman will remember that last year the Republicans voted to lift controls off of materials on amusement places. Under the Democrats we were not letting these big firms go out and build every kind of building they wanted whether it was necessary or not. We were channeling materials into the building of homes. The Republicans lifted those controls completely and the result is that there is much more construction in dollar volume of buildings that could very well wait until the future, more dollar volume of such construction than there is in the construction of homes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Exactly. Amusement centers, movie houses, pool rooms, night clubs, office buildings, luxury hotels are all competing with home building for building materials.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield to anyone—I am sorry, but I want to get along. I want now to take up the question of past expenditures for housing.

PAST EXPENDITURES FOR HOUSING

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said that since 1932 we have committed or expended or incurred liabilities in the field of housing activities of more than $20,000,000,000. Now this is certainly an impressive figure when viewed from a distance, but like many pictures painted on a very large canvas, if we stand close to it its defects become obvious to the eye.

If you got the impression, as you probably did, that the Government has spent or contracted to spend $20,000,000,000, you have been misinformed and misled. Let us take a look at some of the items that have been added together to produce this total:

First, money the Government has actually spent;

Second, money which the Government has loaned, which will be repaid with interest;

Third, money which the Government has loaned which has already been repaid;

Fourth, money which private individuals have borrowed from private banks on mortgages to buy or build homes, under the protection of a Government guaranty. This is the FHA—a $9,000,000,000 program under which not 1 penny has been spent.

Fifth, money which private individuals have not yet borrowed for these purposes, but may borrow at some future time and seek to have insured under existing law; and

Sixth, as if these were not enough, a billion dollars of such insurance authorization of which not a single penny has been used or can be used at the present time.

You do not have to be a financial expert to know that a total made up by adding amounts like these is as meaningless as adding up the numbers on a page of your telephone book.

Here are the facts as published by the Special Joint Committee on Housing, in House Document 1564, part 2:

First. The total amount actually spent from money appropriated out of the Treasury for the housing programs from 1932 through June 30, 1947, was about $2,600,000,000, $1,800,000,000 of which was for war housing.

Second. Of all of these programs, not a single one is operating at a net loss or cost to the Government except those which were specifically intended by the Congress to operate in that way—such as the war housing program, which was as much a war expenditure as the purchase of tanks or ammunition.

Third. The various insurance programs—which account for half of this imposing $20,000,000,000 figure—far from operating at a loss, are building up substantial reserves out of their income. For example, FHA has now written more than $12,000,000,000 insurance, and hundreds of thousands of families have benefited from its program. Its net insurance payments have been a small fraction of 1 percent, and out of its income reserves have been built up which total more than $175,000,000.

So much for Mr. DIRKSEN'S $20,000,000,000 bogeyman which he arrived at by adding together all of the contingent liabilities in addition to actual expenditures of the Federal Government in housing. This $20,000,000,000 cost would only have had to have been paid by the taxpayer if the entire economy of the country had collapsed. Thanks to the Democrats it did not.

It is hardly cricket to leave the impression with the American people that housing from 1932 to 1947 has cost them $20,000,000,000.

One of the programs in which the taxpayer invested in the thirties and which bailed out 1,000,000 distressed home owners in America was the home owners' loan program instituted by the Democratic administration in the thirties and

budgeted in Mr. DIRKSEN'S $20,000,000,000. The liquidation of the program is being completed without loss to the taxpayer.

THE WYATT PLAN

In 1946 a Democratic Congress created the Office of the Housing Expediter. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] correctly states, Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the former mayor of Louisville, was called to Washington by President Truman to fill this post.

The gentleman from Illinois in his criticism of the Wyatt program, tried to imply that Mr. Wyatt stopped, rather than gave impetus to building activity.

But the record is clearly the opposite.

Mr. Wyatt breathed life into the construction industry. Because of his program we witnessed the greatest short-time expansion of home building in our Nation's history. Because of the stimulus he gave to the production of building materials we were able to build in 1947 the number of homes to which the gentleman from Illinois now points.

The end of World War II found this country facing a housing shortage of unparalleled magnitude. Careful study of the situation after VJ-day indicated that during the next few years, solely to meet the emergency needs of veterans, a minimum of some 3,000,000 homes would be needed. This did not take into account the volume of need for housing, apart from the problems of veterans.

Mr. Wyatt came to Washington early in January 1946. During his first month here he consulted with more than 30 major national groups, including home builders and real estate groups, veterans' organizations, the Chamber of Commerce, National Conference of Mayors, the A. F. of L., the CIO, the Producers Council. The emergency program he recommended early in February was based on his discussions with these groups.

The program as it finally emerged later in 1946 was basically a private enterprise program operating under various Government controls and stimuli. Except for 200,000 units of temporary housing involving reuse of surplus war structures, the program did not involve any powers to build houses as such. Its major objectives were:

First. To stimulate production of building materials.

Second. To assure that housing received a proportionate share of such increased material production.

Third. To insure that veterans got the benefits of these actions.

The accomplishment of these objectives depended on use of various controls of a wartime nature, including priority measures and price control adjustments while demand and supply were brought into balance. Reinstitution of limitations on nonhousing construction was an important part of the program to prevent the gobbling of materials by nonresidential construction. Also, emergency financing measures with liberal Government mortgage aid were included to provide ready sources of credit for the home seeking veteran as well as production credit for private builders.

Mr. Wyatt's plans were based on an awareness of the complicated nature of the emergency problems in housing, and a realization of the fact that drastic and emergency measures would be necessary to overcome them.

The program only remained in existence for a little over 5 months, rather than the 2 years originally proposed. Yet, despite this, the actions taken under it were of major importance in the rapid postwar recovery of the home-building industry.

THE WYATT PROGRAM EXCEEDED PREDICTIONS AS TO HOME-BUILDING PRODUCTION IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD

Despite a general acceptance of the fact that between one and one and a half million new homes would be needed annually for at least 10 years, and despite the emergency needs of the 14,000,000 demobilized veterans, spokesmen for the home-building industry and construction experts were not optimistic in late 1945 regarding the number of units which might be started in the early postwar period.

In November 1945 Joseph E. Merrion, of the National Association of Homebuilders, indicated that the best the industry could hope for during the coming year was to start 500,000 units.

Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards was quoted in the Washington Post on November 5, 1945 to the effect that "Present prospects for production in 1946 do not exceed 400,000 units." At about the same time the F. W. Dodge Corp.'s Bulletin, Construction in 1946, contained a forecast that "total residential building in the entire United States is apt to approximate 325,000 units in 1946."

The Veterans' Emergency Housing Program refused to accept these gloomy forecasts and reflected a much greater confidence in the American productive system. It set a goal of starting 1,200,000 units in 1946, about one-fifth of them to be temporary units and trailers. The idea of establishing goals was similar to the wartime practice of using goals as production incentives. Thus the goal for 1946 was deliberately set at a far higher figure than the then existing estimates of homebuilding industry's productive capacity and the potential building materials supply. The goal for conventionally built housing was not high in comparison with peak output of the twenties. And in the 20 intervening years, the general advance of American technology, of labor productivity and of housing need would not appear to make these housing goals excessive. Actually the homebuilding industry had not made technological changes and improvements in productivity comparable with other industries such as manufacturing or mining. Moreover materials production was at a very low level in 1945. But the program placed major emphasis on measures to increase materials production and it was hoped that the establishment of a high housing goal would in itself act as a powerful stimulant to production.

Results of the Wyatt program:

A. HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

The period during which the VEHP was in existence witnessed the greatest short-time expansion in home building in our Nation's history. The number of new privately financed permanent homes started in 1946—662,500—was the highest for any year since the record years of the 1920's. The last full year before our entry in World War II, 1941, a year of better-than-average home building saw only 619,000 such privately financed units started, as well as 96,000 publicly financed; the year during which World War II ended saw only 207,000 such started. The largest number of units ever started in 1 year was 937,000 in 1925.

In addition to the 662,500 privately financed new permanent homes started in 1946, there were approximately one-third of a million housing units of other types, including temporaries, trailers, and conversions, to bring the total number of starts during the year to about a million units of all types. It should be noted that it took 6 years after the end of World War I to achieve the 1925 record pace, and the 1946 achievement occurred in the first full year after the war ended. This compares with the first full year after World War I—1919—when a total of 405,000 units were started; the next year, 1920, the volume fell sharply to 207,000 as rising costs priced housing out of the market. That is what is going to happen again, let me say to the Republicans, unless this Congress passes legislation to control run-away prices, and passes a long-range, sensible housing program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Despite the low level of construction in early 1946, and the smaller number of homes started in 1945 and completed in 1946, 1946 saw the completion of 642,000 units, two-thirds of them new permanent structures.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] certainly left clearly with me the impression that in 1946 there were only starts in housing. He says you cannot live in starts. Everybody agrees you cannot live in starts, but we see that houses were completed in 1946 and that the record was very acceptable.

Statistics for 1946 reveal that home starts met or came close to meeting the original program goals for each segment of the program except for prefabricated housing, and the extent by which the 1946 starts fell short of the Wyatt goal is a measure of the extent to which industrialized housing did not come up to expectations.

Despite major changes in the program by the end of 1946, the beneficial results of many of the actions taken persisted and will have permanently useful effects. The measures taken to aid in rehabilitating the building materials industries through plant rehabilitation, aiding new factories to open and aiding in reopening closed factories are showing their results

even now in the continued high output of many materials.

Also the construction limitation order continued in effect from March 26, 1946, until June 30, 1947, during which period $2,400,000,000 in commercial construction was denied approval.

Just think how few houses we would have had if the Republicans had had their way and there had been no check on commercial construction. In fact, I think one of the reasons the Republicans attacked the Wyatt program so vigorously, was just that there was a check on commercial construction. If this action had not been taken there is little doubt but that commercial construction during the postwar years would have preempted a much larger share of the available materials and left less for housing, as indeed it was already doing in the period from VJ-day until the construction limitation order was issued 8 months later.

With the aid of the recovery in homebuilding achieved during 1946, and the monumentum achieved by year's end, homebuilding in 1947 proceeded at an even more rapid rate. Of vital assistance to this achievement was the continuing high level of material production, and the continuing availability of liberal Government financial assistance through the FHA title VI as well as the GI home loan program.

In 1947, 835,000 homes were completed; 370,200 of these homes were started in 1946 during the Wyatt program. There were 849,000 starts in 1947—of these only 92,000 were rentals. Anyone who knows what people are looking for realizes what this means.

If it had not been for the Wyatt program we would be building only the small number of houses today the building industry predicted we could or would build.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] left the impression that the money spent in the Wyatt program—$400,000,000, was wasted. This money was used for premium payments to industry to increase the production of building materials. The gentleman from Illinois is not the only one who knows that houses have to be built out of materials.

B. MATERIALS PRODUCTION

A truly significant aspect of the short-lived Wyatt program was the remarkable accomplishment in improving materials production. The Department of Commerce Composite Index of Building Materials Production shows total 1946 production was 40 percent higher than 1945 with production rates in late 1946 at or close to all-time highs for many materials. These unprecedented production increases, achieved under extremely adverse conditions in the reconversion period are a tribute to and an example of the effective ccoperation of industry, labor, and the Government in meeting a critical national problem through the leadership of Mr. Wyatt as Housing Expediter.

Most building materials industries emerged after VJ-day as casualties of a war economy. Their normal markets had been cut off many months before by necessary wartime restrictions on nonessential construction; wherever possible their productive capacities had been diverted to war production. Where this had not happened they had lost workers to war industries as well as to the armed forces and had been shorn of raw materials and new equipment as well as their usual markets.

For example: Production of clay brick had averaged 4,200,000,000 brick from 1937 to 1940. Brick was considered of little importance in military and temporary wartime construction. Production fell steadily during the war years; output in 1945 was 2,300,000,000, and stocks had fallen to a fifth of the traditional level of a billion bricks. Many of the plants which had remained open were badly depreciated, needing new equipment; many of the closed plants were obsolete. About 350 out of 800 brick plants were closed.

The problem was chiefly one of bringing back closed plants into production and of accelerating the rehabilitation and mechanization of plants that were operating, expanding their capacity, hiring and training additional workers, and encouraging overtime work.

Aid was given the industry through priorities in obtaining new equipment, aid in recruiting and training labor, price increases under the OPA, and a premium payment plan for extra brick production.

Results were obvious by mid-1946. Some 120 closed plants were reopened in 1946 and a number of new plants brought into production. Total output for 1946 was 4,860,000,000 brick, the best year in the industry since 1930, with the exception of 1941 when production slightly exceeded that for 1946. By year's end production on an over-all basis was believed to be adequate in relation to demand.

There are other equally dramatic stories of production increases, all of them the result of an enormous amount of work and effective cooperation on the part of industry, labor, and government under the leadership provided by the veterans' housing program.

For many materials impressive records were achieved. By late 1946, monthly production rates were at an all-time high for some, such as gypsum board and lath, asphalt roofing, some plumbing fixtures, and housing-type radiation. Others, such as lumber, nails, brick, and structural clay products, were at near record monthly levels by this time.

THE OPA COOPERATED WITH WYATT ON PRICE CHANGES

Between VJ-day and the end of price control in November 1946 OPA made about 500 industry-wide or area-wide price ceiling adjustments with respect to building materials and their components as well as some thousands of individual adjustments for specific producers. In many cases OPA proceeded in accordance with its normal pricing standards, particularly in increases required to meet increased production costs. In many instances, the actions were initiated by Mr. Wyatt's recommendations. Price changes on building materials were necessary for three general purposes:

First. To lift price restrictions imposed during the war as a means of holding production for civilian use to minimum levels—as in the case of gypsum lath and housing grades of plywood. Ceilings on these were set at low levels to prevent diversion of manufacturing facilities needed for producing wartime items.

Second. To absorb increases in production costs as with clay products and millwork.

Third. To make low end items sufficiently profitable to justify unusual increases in output as in the case of nails, builders hardware, and electrical wiring devices.

Mr. Wyatt specifically included authority to recommend such prices as part of his original program in the full knowledge that such adjustments would be necessary in the process of reconverting the building materials industry.

HOUSING DESIGN STANDARDS AND METHODS WERE LOCALLY APPROVED

From the beginning it was required that all applications for permits to build and to use priorities to obtain materials which were being specially set aside for veterans' housing, meet certain minimum standards similar to those used by the FHA. All applications were, however, locally reviewed in local FHA offices and not in Washington. The minimum standards were designed to assure that veterans would not be cheated, and they were standards presumably acceptable to the home-building industry since they were similar to those used by FHA in approving applications for mortgage insurance.

The only new designs and methods that had to be approved in Washington were those relating to industrialized housing, and then only in cases in which manufacturers had requested a guaranteed market or a Government loan. Other than such cases, the requests were handled in local FHA offices.

It is not true that detailed plans had to be submitted. Floor plans and general lay-out were required.

Also, as a result of a complaint that some builders were not following the plans they had submitted, in June 1946 provision was made for FHA inspection of construction to assure that the structure conformed with the plans submitted and upon which a price ceiling had been set at which the house could be sold or rented to a veteran.

LOW-COST HOUSES AND RENTAL HOUSING

Surveys of veterans' needs in 1946 indicated that about half of those seeking housing on the then current market wanted to rent rather than to buy. Moreover, these surveys showed that the median rental they thought they could afford was $43 and the median sales prices of housing they could afford ranged around $5,500.

Thus, the Wyatt program proposed channeling the largest part of materials into low and moderate cost sales and rental housing. It was proposed to do this through price controls over materials, building sites, and housing both new and existing—the Congress refused to enact legislation which would enable controls to be placed on the price of existing housing. Moreover, the program visualized the use of extensive measures to stimulate production of materials as well as homes in recognition of the fact that "production is the long-range solution to inflation."

It was also recognized by Mr. Wyatt from the outset, as he reported to the President, that an "inflationary spiral would be fatal to the housing program" not only with respect to achieving low-cost housing, but also in its effect on the size of the housing market. Thus, the hope of achieving volume construction of low-cost homes was necessarily related to the maintenance of a stable price structure and prevention of excessive rises in prices, not only for houses and building materials, but for the economy in general.

The institution of VHP-1 on March 26, 1946, restricted home construction during the remainder of 1946 to homes to sell for not more than $10,000 or to rent for not more than $80 per month. Within these limits every effort was made to obtain as much rental housing as possible and to assure that the majority of homes would be available at prices within the reach of veterans. For many reasons, including the situation in the economy in general, this well-intentioned effort to keep prices down was not overly successful. However, undoubtedly this action did keep sales and rent prices for new homes below the levels they would otherwise have reached in an uncontrolled market.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield at this point with reference to the material matter?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield only for a question, because I really want to get along with this.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I might make the observation that the gentlewoman has asked for the unusual privilege of talking beyond 1 hour and no one on this side objected.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I asked to speak beyond the 40 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In addition to the 40 minutes that the gentlewoman had, she asked for an additional half hour which would make the time much more than the customary hour allowed by the House and no one on this side objected.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentlewoman.

It came to my attention the other day that the export of lumber in the last quarter amounted to 200,000,000 more feet. In other words, on that basis, for a year, we will be exporting 800,000,000 board feet.

In view of the fact that export controls are entirely within the control of the administration and the Department of Commerce, does not the gentlewoman think that the material situation might be improved if some consideration was given to limit the export of this construction lumber?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I think that is a good question. As I remember it, we are exporting lumber, but we are also importing lumber.

The lumber which we are exporting we can afford to export in order to get the lumber which we need so desperately and which we must import. I cannot answer the gentleman right off, but I say if it is wrong, I am not defending it. If it is wrong, then we ought to exercise controls.

But I want to say to the gentleman that my remembrance from studying that particular aspect of the matter is that what we are exporting is not hurting us. In return we are importing many, many times over, lumber which is not readily available here, which we do not grow here, or which we do not have enough of here.

May I ask the gentleman from Colorado if he would prefer for me to talk about the building production record or the housing need?

Mr. CARROLL. I suggest that the gentlewoman from California talk about the need for housing.

THE RECORD ON HOUSING NEED

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois invites the American people to look at the record to find out how much housing we need. He says that Congress set up a joint committee of Senators and Congressmen to survey the housing problem and that this joint committee secured estimates of housing need from at least 15 different sources. The highest estimate was 2,000,000 units per year while the lowest was 300,000.

Now, it is true that the joint committee did obtain these different estimates, as the gentleman from Illinois says. What he failed to tell, however, is that the investigators whose findings he talks about were not all estimating the same thing. Some of them were studying just the urban part of the housing problem, while others were studying not only the urban housing problem but included farm housing in their considerations. Some of them were looking at the problem for a 5-year period while others were trying to determine how much housing we would need over a 10- or 15-year period.

There were bound to be differences in their conclusions as to how many houses were needed in the various periods, and these differences are clearly brought out in the complete record, which the gentleman from Illinois failed to make use of.

The gentleman from Illinois was not even fair to the National Association of Real Estate Boards. The association was responsible for the low estimate of 300,000 units which the gentleman cites but the association was not talking about housing need—they were talking about the number of houses that could be sold and they were probably being very realistic for if we continue to produce housing exclusively at high prices, we will be lucky to sell even that many. However, even Mr. Herbert Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, has admitted that the desired objective to fill our housing needs might equal as many as 1,500,000 new units per year, if we were trying to produce decent housing for all American families.

But the gentleman from Illinois makes his most glaring omission from the facts of the record when he fails to tell the American people what conclusion the joint congressional committee arrived at itself after surveying the findings of all these other investigators. What the joint committee decided is made completely clear in its final majority report dated March 15, 1948. Now this report consists of only 30 printed pages and is written in very simple and straightforward language which leaves no doubt as to the committee's conclusions.

What the gentleman from Illinois did not quote, I would like to quote—from page 8 of this report in which the committee is presenting its findings on our present and prospective housing needs.

They say:

Our present housing problem is of long standing. While developments attributable to World War II have contributed to the intensity of our present problem, the current shortage actually has been accumulating over a long period of years when the volume of new-housing construction was less than the net increase in new families.

In the spring of 1947 there were 2,800,000 families living doubled up with other families. The vast majority of these families have been forced to accept these unsatisfactory living arrangements because of the acute housing shortage. An additional 500,000 families are living in temporary housing, trailers, rooming houses, and other makeshift accommodations. Moreover, during the last year, even with the sharp expansion of home building, the net number of new families formed greatly exceeded the number of new homes provided. Finally, a very substantial proportion of our existing supply of housing falls far below minimum standards of decency.

Where the report refers to a substantial proportion of our existing supply of housing which falls far below minimum standards of decency, they are talking about the 5,000,000 families who are today living in slums.

The report further states:

The most recent information which has been released by the Bureau of the Census as to the status of the housing inventory leads this committee to conclude that we should have a construction program that will produce at least 15,500,000 nonfarm units between now and the end of 1960. This would call for the average annual construction of not less than 1,285,000 nonfarm units. In addition, there is a large need for better housing in farm areas. This makes it clear that for many years at least 1,500,000 houses should be built annually in the United States.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to commend the gentlewoman for her remarks, and to say that her whole statement before this body today is completely corroborated and substantiated by the bipartisan action of the Senate of the United States in the passage of S. 866, in which they said:

The pending bill—

Referring to S. 866—

which was reported favorably by this committee on April 24, 1947, is a bipartisan measure, resulting from several years of intensive study and exhaustive hearings by various committees of the Congress.

With reference to the shortage which you just mentioned, in this report it says:

While the volume of housing construction has increased sharply during the past 2 years, the completions of new housing, even at this expanded rate, continue to lag behind the net increase in number of families—

Of which the gentlewoman has just spoken—

and it is well known that the prices or rents of these new houses have been beyond the means of far too large a proportion of the population.

This bears out what the gentlewoman has said:

As a result, overcrowding and doubling up have continued widespread, and the country has been at a virtual stalemate on the critical problems of slum removal and basic and permanent improvement of the housing conditions of the American people.

May I say to the gentlewoman from California that on a radio debate last night over a national network as we debated this with some of the Republican Members of this body, the polls coming in from the people—and the polls will not be complete for some time yet—showed that over 74 percent of the people were in favor of the program which the gentlewoman from California is presenting here today. I desire to commend her very highly for her interest and activity in this matter.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

I know that the program is bipartisan. We arrived at these findings together. This bill has passed, actually passed the Senate four times. It is blocked today in the House of Representatives by the Republican leadership.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield for one question?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I will. I frankly do not understand the Republicans and I cannot understand why the Republican leadership in the House at this time will not pass it. I do not understand why the distinguished gentleman from Illinois places himself in a position of approving of that blockage, because I have great respect for the gentleman from Illinois; and I hope that nothing I have said today has given any contrary impression. I have respect for his intelligence and for his ability and for his oratory.

I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Why is it that the minority party when it controlled the Congress all those years up until January of 1947, did not enact into law the program for which the gentlewoman speaks and the program that the President recommended to the Congress be enacted at this special session?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not excuse that lack of action; I do not excuse it for 1 minute. Just as I compliment the Republicans every time I think they are right I do not excuse them in this instance. I think we should have passed it. The fact is the bill is more needed now than ever. The housing situation has become more acute. Boys returned from the war for 4 years have been living doubled up with relatives, friends or strangers unable to have their own homes. They are resentful and rightfully so. The passage of this bill will not create homes overnight but every day that it fails of passage delays for that much longer the housing that is needed, keeping families that much longer out of their own homes and living that much longer under conditions that are unhealthy.

Mr. CURTIS. I am firmly convinced that the gentlewoman believes in the argument she is making and I am delighted to hear her say that her party in all the years they have controlled Congress should have enacted the legislation that the President requests we now enact in the special session in 15 days.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman from Nebraska is not quite fair when he draws in that 15-days stuff. This is not a new subject that is being discussed now for the first time. Never has there been a bill that has had so many hearings and about which there has been so much discussion and for which there is so much public support.

Mr. CURTIS. No; it has been here since 1930.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. It has been here since 1944. That is when we began hearings on a long-range housing program. Nineteen hundred and forty-four was the year Congress first began those hearings. I believe it was 2 years later, 1946, that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill was first introduced as a result of those hearings. It passed the Senate. It did not pass the House.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Just a minute.

Mr. CURTIS. It was way back in 1930 that President Roosevelt said that one-third of the people of America were ill-housed.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. That is not the point. The point I am talking about here is the long-range housing program, the permanent housing program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. We put through low-cost public housing under President Roosevelt. We put through slum clearance, too, under President Roosevelt. We have three or four projects in my own district. One of the first ever put through was in my district, so there is no point to the argument that it has not been done, for it has been, even though the Republicans opposed us. We had to do it by legislation on appropriation bills, we had to have the Rules Committee bring in rules permitting it to be in order on appropriation bills.

Then in 1946 when the Wagner-Taft-Ellender bill passed the Senate it got stalled in hearings here in the House even though we were in control because the Republicans insisted on points of order. As soon as 12 o'clock was reached and there was not a quorum present in the committee they would raise points of order; as many as three times they raised them. Once Senator TAFT appeared before the committee and could be given only 10 minutes because a Member of his own party made a point of order against continuing. The bill was passed in the Senate but it was stalled in the House by Members of his own party.

We have this bill here this year. It has passed the Senate. It lay for months in the House committee. Finally it was passed out of the committee by a combination of Democrats and three or four Republicans. Then it got tied up in the Republican-controlled Rules Committee, and they will not let out a rule to bring it up. The only thing they did let out finally was the insignificant bill that eventually was passed in the last session. There is your legislative history.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. That is the legislative history. The gentleman from Massachusetts, as usual, is correct and he recites the legislative record in detail. I was simply trying to be very generous to the other side in not offering all of this detail. Of course, I take it for granted that the other side of the aisle will acknowledge the fact that under President Roosevelt the Democratic administration passed the first low-cost housing in the country.

I am talking about the T-E-W bill—a very important program that affects all of us. It affects the Democrats and Republicans alike. But whatever happened in the past, whoever was responsible, the fact is that today we ought to pass this bill—now—in this session of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to find out from the Republican leadership if they still think slum clearance, public housing, and low-cost housing as contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is socialistic? That is their objection here, yet the Republican Party put that in its own platform only a few weeks ago. I wonder where the country is going to be if through any great misfortune the Republicans win next fall so far as housing is concerned; never mind anything else.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Maybe one of the Republicans could answer that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wonder if Governor Dewey and Governor Warren agree with the Republican leadership in the House that this type of legislation is socialistic and why they have not spoken out. Why have they not said something while this special session is going on about the high cost of living? They are the Republican candidates and they are both governors.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that that is the old theory, the pre-McKinley theory, you get more votes if you do not take a stand on very many issues. The fewer issues you take a stand on the more votes you get. That way you can be all things to all people.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentlewoman would like to make a correct statement. She said that the administration spent $400,000,000 on the Wyatt housing program.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I said that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] quoted a figure of $400,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentlewoman just said a minute ago that after spending $400,000,000 on the Wyatt housing bill the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said that it had fallen flat, as I remember it. The truth of the matter is that before the administration had spent even a small fraction of that $400,000,000 the Wyatt housing program became such a mess and was producing no homes to speak of that they dropped the thing like a hot potato. In other words, it fell of its own weight because it was built on a bad foundation. Now, I want to answer my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman is arguing on my side. The gentleman is saying that Mr. Wyatt accomplished all that he did on very little money. Well, that was marvelous, that was wonderful. The record is here to show what he accomplished. You cannot dispute it.

Mr. JENSEN. It was a complete failure.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman cannot dispute the housing figures for 1946. No amount of argument on the other side of the aisle can dispute the figures on the increased production of building materials. No amount of argument can do that. Let us not argue any more. Now did the gentleman want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentlewoman should ask Mr. Wyatt if it was not a complete flop.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Does the gentleman want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I want to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts knows that the Republicans did not pass and adopt a platform at Philadelphia for the Democrats to administer, because it has been proven that everything they attempt to administer they mess up and it gets into politics and they make a complete flop of the whole thing. When we get into power after next January, we will put in a housing program, I think, that will be administered properly.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not.

Mr. JENSEN. And we will build houses.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says he thinks they will.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to ask my friend if he believes in slum clearance and if he believes in low-cost public housing.

Mr. JENSEN. As a social measure, I do.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Does the gentleman believe in it?

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman vote for it?

Mr. JENSEN. As a social measure, a limited slum clearance, administered by honest people.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman vote for low-cost public housing?

Mr. JENSEN. Properly administered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Properly administered.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, but not by this gang of fumbling New Dealers that do not know how to administer anything properly. You would have a Silvermaster and a Currie and a few others administer that program.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very easy for my friend to deal with the subject in that manner, with the real estate lobby dominating down here for the last 18 months, with the power lobby dominating, with the National Association of Manufacturers and the Meat Institute lobbies. The record is very clear as to whom the gentleman and his party respond to, and that is every nefarious lobby trying to wrest money at the expense of the people.

Mr. JENSEN. I would rather be associated with those boys than with the gang the gentleman is associated with.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to answer the question put by the gentleman from Massachusetts when he said, "Why do not you Republican leaders tell us where you stand? He was referring to Governor Warren and to Governor Dewey. Now, I think the record ought to show where they stand and the country ought to know that the present titular leadership of the Republican Party is not in harmony with the membership of this body. I would like to read just a moment for the RECORD. This is an interview by Joseph A. Loftus, a reporter for the New York Times, on June 21, 1948. He interviewed Governor Warren when he attended the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia.

In this interview Governor Warren said that "Some of the fundamental problems of the American people were left unsolved (by the Eightieth Congress.)." The Times states that Governor Warren specifically deplored the failure of the Eightieth Congress to enact housing legislation.

These statements by Governor Warren should be widely circulated in the halls of Congress, in the RECORD, and in speeches by the Members of Congress who support the President's program on housing.

In conjunction with that, last night, as I mentioned to the gentlewoman from California before, we had a radio debate, and I said to an outstanding Member of this body in the Republican party, "How do you square your philosophy with the statement of your own leadership?" What he said is typical, and this is what we ought to get to the people: "Well, after they are elected, we will change their viewpoints."

I am reminded, when the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, spoke, when we were talking about the power projects in the West, when Governor Dewey was campaigning in Oregon, we said, "How do you square your viewpoint with the Governor's declaration in Oregon?" He said, "The Governor is only a Presidential candidate."—the RECORD will bear me out in this—"and he is not controlling this body." The people have got to know that the leadership believes one way and the membership acts another within the Halls of this Congress.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

And now if I may get on with the facts in reply to the speech of the gentleman from Illinois. The Special Joint Committee on Housing makes it clear that at least 1,500,000 houses should be built annually in the United States for at least the next 10 years.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] makes the usual Republican slur at the Federal Government. This is the usual all-inclusive indictment in which the Republicans indulge and to which we are now accustomed. The gentleman from Illinois says that the houses that are being built now are not paper houses—made from Federal red tape but they are real houses. People live in them, he says.

Now, I do not know exactly to what the gentleman from Illinois is referring. I suppose he means by "real houses" the houses that were built by private industry in 1947. I would like to remind the gentleman that houses in 1946 were also built by private industry. I would also like to remind him that the building industry was helped by the Government in 1946 and 1947 and 1948, and to inform him, if he already does not know it, that in this special session the Republicans will bring in a bill which will propose further aid to the building industry.

So I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that the building industry does need aid. The whole question is where and how the aid is given; is it given in such a way that it helps all the people or just a segment of the people?

I would also like to remind the gentleman from Illinois that people not only live in the houses to which he refers—people have to pay for them, too, and they are paying three or four times more than what they are worth; that the prices prevent the vast majority of veterans and other families who are in the greatest need from obtaining their own homes.

Furthermore, some of these "real homes to which the gentleman from Illinois refers, which have been built with Government assistance because of Federal loans to private builders, are so badly built that to all intents and purposes they are not real homes. And to prove what I say, I refer the gentleman to the number of grand-jury investigations and indictments against builders for defrauding their customers.

I would like to also remind the gentleman from Illinois that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Michigan, in opposing a limited secondary market for GI loans, said that many of the houses built

under these loans without the benefit of FHA inspection were practically shacks, and I agree with the gentleman from Michigan in this statement 100 percent.

The United Industrial Associates tells us that a typical home cost $4,599 between 1935 and 1939; cost $9,745 in June 1947; and $11,094 in June 1948.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois how he intends to continue this totally uneconomic market.

I would also like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he thinks the refusal of the Republican leadership to control inflation protects the taxpayers' money.

THE BUILDING-PRODUCTION RECORD

The gentleman from Illinois seeks to get over the thought to the American people that if Congress would just leave the building industry completely alone, the American people will have all the housing they need, and he implies they will have homes, of course, at a price they can afford to pay. To try to prove he is correct, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] points to the record of the building industry during the twenties. He says that builders of the country, without any Government interference, built a lot more houses then than they did in any similar period.

This is supposed to be the clinching argument as to why the Republicans should not pass the T-E-W bill. Of course, the building program in the twenties in no way touched the slums of America and in no way provided housing that the low-income groups could afford. But the gentleman from Illinois does not go into that.

I want to make it clear that I am not attacking the building industry but I think we ought to face facts. We cannot solve the housing problem or indeed any of our problems unless we do face facts. Now it is arrant nonsense to talk about Government keeping out of the housing field. The Government is in the housing field now up to its neck.

The Republican leadership in this Congress has brought in bill after bill which have provided Federal aid for the building industry. Who are they kidding when they say the Government ought to keep out of the housing business? The whole question, I repeat, is what to do in order to accomplish what goals.

But to get back to the speech of the gentleman from Illinois where he refers to the accomplishments of the private builders in the 7-year period from 1922 to 1929.

The private builders of that day did build 5,632,000 dwelling units from the end of 1922 to the end of 1929, or an average of more than 800,000 units a year.

Of course, the gentleman from Illinois fails to note that in the 7 years that immediately followed from 1930 to 1936, this same industry put up only 1,457,000 units or an average of only a little more than 200,000 units per year. It was able to produce only 93,000 units in the year 1933 or only one-tenth as much as in the peak year of the bygone period the gentleman from Illinois likes to talk about. And, in fact, the building industry did not begin to recover from this pitifully low point of production until 1936 and 1937 when the much-despised Federal Government aid began to pull them out of their doldrums.

I have another point or two that I would like to make as long as we are talking about what the building industry has done in the past and is now doing. The first is that whenever we talk about the present rate of construction of houses in this year 1938, which will be around 900,000 units, we certainly are entitled to make the point that this record will be as good as the peak record made back in 1925. But I am not as complacent about the point as is the gentleman from Illinois. During the 23 years since 1925 most American industries have shown vast increases in productivity. Look at the record of agriculture, of automobiles, refrigerators, radios and nearly everything else you can think of. Can you imagine Detroit setting its 1925 production as its goal for the future? Why do we have to be satisfied that housing is as good as it was 23 years ago? I say it isn't good enough. The gentleman from Illinois has lost sight of the fact that our population has greatly increased since 1925, increased some 25,000,000 and today we have an average of 400,000 new families a year seeking homes.

Another point that I would like to bring out in this same connection is that the very production record of the private building industry in this country is an argument for the kind of long-range approach to the housing problem that we find in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. As I have said, the building industry produced 937,000 dwelling units in 1925, whereas 8 years later in 1933, production was down to only 93,000 units. It is that boom-or-bust pattern, that cycle of violent ups and downs that characterizes the building industry and it is that behavior that needs to be studied and corrected.

When we have found out what causes these violent swings and can take remedial steps, we will be able to stabilize the building industry so that its production can be a steady stream of dwelling units designed to meet the needs and pocketbooks of the American people. The T-E-W bill would set up the means for conducting research into the economic behavior of the building industry and would set into motion some of the long-range planning that is so obviously needed to correct our housing troubles.

The gentleman from Illinois says, and I quote:

> We shall gradually go over the million mark each year and that is so far beyond the dreams of any Government agency that it's not even funny.

Now when he said that, the gentleman from Illinois must have been napping because just a few moments before he got through criticizing Mr. Wyatt and what the gentleman likes to call Mr. Wyatt's grandiose plan for building houses faster. The gentleman from Illinois reminds us that Mr. Wyatt's ambition was to build 2,750,000 dwelling units in 2 years. The gentleman from Illinois says we will gradually go over the million mark. Mr. Wyatt said we could get 1,500,000 in the second year.

If it had not been for the Wyatt program under this administration which so greatly stimulated the production of building materials, the record of home construction in 1947 to which the gentleman from Illinois now points could never have been achieved.

The building industry cannot afford to build low-cost rental houses for those who are now living in the slums.

It is no economy to refuse to clean out the slums. Slums corrupt the mind and spirit, breed divorce, delinquency and disease and the taxpayer pays for these slums when he is required to pay higher taxes in support of bigger jails, increased court expenses because of the higher divorce rate, reform schools for children and bigger county hospital wards and mental institutions.

The slums will never be cleaned out if we leave it all to the building industry. The Republicans ought to know that private industry must make a profit.

The Bureau of Census shows that in 1946, two out of every three city families had total family incomes of less than $3,500 a year, and more than two out of every five less than $2,500 a year.

I challenge the Republicans to show us where the building industry is today constructing houses to meet the needs of those seeking homes in these income brackets.

COST OF THE TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

And lastly, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] seeks to alarm us by charging that the cost of the long-range housing bill will reach the astronomical figure of $9,000,000,000. In this case, although it seems to me too high, I will not quarrel with his figure so much as with his reasoning. What he has done is to represent the cost of the program as the sum of the maximum possible amounts that could be expended over a period of almost half a century. If this line of reasoning had been applied to other programs to which the Government is committed, which of them would ever have been adopted? In the whole host of good things that the Federal Government does and properly should do for the general welfare of its citizens and the country, there must be an eventual total cost. But we never consider that ultimate total cost as a present financial obligation of the Government. The maximum expenditure will be in the year 1953—$265,000,000—thereafter there will be a drop of one hundred and sixty-five million a year—after another 5 years there will be another drop.

Representatives of both parties have sponsored and supported many kinds of legislation for the benefit of the veterans. Yet I have never heard it charged that since most of the 15,000,000 veterans will be with us for 40 years, and expenditures for veterans' benefits already approximate $7,000,000,000 annually, we should reckon the cost of these benefit programs at $280,000,000,000. No one would vote for a program of that magnitude, I am sure. Heaven knows what it may cost to maintain the Department of Agriculture for the next 40 years, but I hear no one demanding that it be abolished. To me this demonstrates the absurdity of applying such a total cost theory to the long-range housing program. That is not the way to figure Government expenses. Instead it is the way to conjure up hobgoblins to frighten and mislead the uninformed.

To save ourselves a lot of arithmetic—even if the gentleman from Illinois' figure of $9,000,000,000 were correct, that would average out to $225,000,000 a year over the 40-year period. That does not seem to me excessive. I do not think it would seem excessive to the millions of families who need housing today, or to those who will need it next year, or 10 or 20 years from now. Surely it would not seem excessive to Mr. TAFT, the chairman of the Republican policy committee, who has said in the Senate, that if we had to spend $500,000,000 a year to solve the housing problem, the cost would not be too great in proportion to the total expenditures of the Government. Indeed, it did not appear excessive to the Senate, which has twice passed the bill with these facts in mind. I think it would not seem excessive to the House, if the Republican leadership would permit us to vote on it.

The $9,000,000,000 figure cited by the gentleman from Illinois as the cost of the T-E-W bill cannot be proved out. It may include among other things:

First. Six billion four hundred million dollars as the maximum possible total annual contributions over a 40-year period for extension of the low-rent housing program at a maximum rate of $160,000,000 per year.

Second. One billion six hundred million dollars additional FHA title VI insurance authorization for the insurance of home-mortgage loans made by private lending institutions to private individuals. No estimated annual cost.

Third. One billion dollar FHA insurance authorization for yield insurance of large-scale rental-housing projects. No estimated annual cost.

Fourth. One billion dollar authorization for loans to cities for slum clearance and urban redevelopment. These loans are repayable with interest.

Fifth. Five hundred million dollars for a 5-year program of non-recurring lump-sum capital grants for slum clearance. One hundred million dollars per year for 5 years.

Sixth. Five hundred million dollar authorization for purchase by National Home Mortgage Corporation or mortgage loans already insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government. No estimated cost.

Mr. Speaker, I plead again to the Members of this House to bring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill to the floor for a vote, by signing the discharge petition.

The American people want the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. They want to clear out the slums and make it possible for every family to have a decent home.

This Congress will regain the confidence of the American people if it passes the T-E-W bill which has the official endorsement of both parties.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE WEST

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of my reasons for asking for this time is to ask the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] if she informed the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that she was going to make the speech she has just concluded.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I did.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to use the balance of my time to speak about the observation made concerning the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department.

As a Representative from the West, may I say that the gentleman from Iowa and his committee have done more for western development than any committee in the history of the Republic. Twice as much money was appropriated for rural electrification by the Eightieth Congress than was appropriated by any other Congress in the history of REA. Forty-two percent of all the money they have ever received, and they have been in existence 14 years, has been appropriated by this Republican Congress. The farm wife who has been waiting a long time for electricity to light her home, run the washing machine and the radio, and provide her household with refrigeration is grateful for this splendid record on REA made by the Eightieth Congress.

The committee headed by the gentleman from Iowa has done more and furnished more funds for western development, both irrigation and power, than any committee in any other Congress. The appropriations made by his committee for reclamation and power development are twice as large as those made in any other Congress. I resent these insinuations made in political speeches on this floor to the effect that the gentleman from Iowa and the Republican leadership in this Congress are trying to choke off this very worth-while program.

The figures speak for themselves. The West has had a better break under this Republican Congress than under the administration-controlled Congresses.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON (at the request of Mr. CURTIS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the address of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE], I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL POWER POLICY

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONDERO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, in response to the remarks of the preceding speaker, I should like to say that whatever I said with reference to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] was not in the spirit of any individual criticism, because it is true that under his chairmanship of that important committee there is no question that the appropriations for the West have increased over the last fiscal year.

The point I was making is that we are now more and more getting into the question of changing the power policy of this Nation. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa would agree with me that he is not in agreement with my position nor with some of the things which Governor Dewey advocated in Oregon.

May I say to explain this point further that actually in the great power projects of the West, there has been a reduction of appropriations for power lines for the transmission of power and there is developing within the Halls of the Congress a movement in favor of the private power utilities who want to purchase power at the bus bar of the great multiple-purpose dams of the West.

I think the gentleman from Iowa would agree with me that there is contemplated a change in that program. Therefore, we ought to understand what the issue is—not that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has been cutting appropriations for the completion of these dams heretofore instituted, but a change in the power policy of this Nation which I think is of fundamental importance for this reason. The money to build these great multiple-purpose projects came from the people and the Treasury of the United States. We did not build them to create monopolies. We did not build them to turn them over to private power utilities for their private gain.

We built them for the benefit of the people; in order to provide ample electricity at low cost.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman referred to appropriations to complete power projects. That is not a fair inference. The Congress has provided money to start new dams and reservoirs. A great many new dams and reservoirs have been started, and they will benefit the territory that the gentleman is interested in.

Mr. CARROLL. I think if the gentleman were a little bit more familiar with the record he would know that what I had reference to and of course the gentleman from Iowa will corroborate my

statement, is, for one example, the Great Coulee Dam. I also had reference to the Central Valley Authority and the Colorado Big Thompson and other great projects either completed or now under construction.

All of those dams have had appropriations made for them in years past. There is nothing new about this. There is nothing new about the power policy at all.

Mr. CURTIS. But there have been a great many new dams started.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman is condemning me and any Member of the House of Representatives or anybody in America who is bound and determined to defend private enterprise, free and honest private enterprise, then I certainly am willing to accept his condemnation.

I am going to defend free enterprise from the peanut vendor on the corner to the biggest corporation in the United States against Government encroachment.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman has stated the case completely insofar as his viewpoint and mine differ on the sale of public power generated by the great dams of the West. That statement emphasizes our differences and I think we understand one another.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, I will stand on that statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN), for the week of August 2 to 7, on account of official business.

To Mr. CRAVENS (at the request of Mr. GATHINGS), for an indefinite period, on account of death in the family.

WHAT WILL YOU BUILD HOUSES WITH?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the question of materials which I discussed with the gentlewoman from California, one point should be clarified. Contrary to the gentlewoman's impression, the 800,000,000 board feet of lumber which it is estimated will be exported from this country during the current year at the current rate of export, is not being exported as a barter proposition in return for other lumber we need. Most of it is being exported to the ECA countries of Europe, particularly England, and much of it is not a matter of barter but a matter of gift.

It so happens that I am one of those who believe Congress should do everything it can that will actually get sound results in the way of housing. One of the questions which must be answered is how and where we will get the materials and labor for building the houses. You cannot build houses with words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has expired.

DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIAL POWER

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the discussions this afternoon have been extremely interesting to every Member of this House. I want particularly to discuss the question of the steam-power plant that has been proposed for the Tennessee Valley, and the taking advantage of the natural resources of this country. However, I certainly do disagree with those who feel that this Government should build in any part of this country new generating steam plants which have nothing in common whatever with the original purpose of either flood control, irrigation, or reclamation. We know the original purpose of the Tennessee Valley Authority was flood control, yet we find, through the medium of legislation that has been filed here only in recent days, and the great effort to have it enacted into law, for an authorization for a steam-generating plant. Who for? For the great industries located somewhere down in the Tennessee Valley.

Those of us who come from the New England area are somewhat familiar with the history of the past, and the migration of industry from our part of the country to other parts of the country because we could not compete with them in the production of goods or the employment of labor at their low wages and other conditions that were favorable to them. As far as I am concerned, I shall oppose to the utmost the appropriation of any public money that will be for the benefit of great industrial plants in this country at the expense of the rest of the public. This is an attempt to spend public money to build a steam generating plant at a total estimated cost of over $80,000,000. Such a plant will come in direct competition with the industries in my part of the country who not only have to pay the costs of building their own generating plants themselves and maintaining them, but also their share of the cost in taxes of these publicly built plants with the taxpayers' money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Peter Campbell Brown, executive assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, delivered before the New York Bar Association at Lake Placid on July 1. The extra cost of this matter will be $159.75. Notwithstanding that, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. Garet Van Antwerp III.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 6, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 7119. A bill to grant increased retired pay to certain disabled enlisted men of the Regular Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 7120. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7121. A bill to provide nonquota immigration status for the alien parents of American citizens and to expedite admission of certain adopted children of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7122. A bill to amend the Hawaiian organic act to prevent the loss of nationality, by reason of continuous residence for 5 years in a foreign state, of certain persons declared to be citizens of the United States under such act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 7123. A bill to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 7124. A bill to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 7125. A bill appropriating funds to initiate construction of flood-protection works at Rutland, Vt.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 7126. A bill for the establishment of the National Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana (by request):

H. R. 7127. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution authorizing the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor to report periodically on labor conditions in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 7128. A bill for the relief of the alien Gheorge Ion Dimian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 7129. A bill for the relief of Gaspare Vallone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 7130. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cardella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2141. Mr. HART presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, requesting the Congress of the United States to adopt necessary legislation to encourage and make adequately effectual a comprehensive program of merchant shipbuilding in the shipyards of this country and of expanding our merchant marine, which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 6, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, August 5, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who wert the God of our fathers, we rejoice that Thou art also the God of their succeeding generations. When we go up and down the courts of memory, there comes to us the glorious testimony that Thou hast placed at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace.

We humbly confess that again and again we put all of our trust and reliance in human ingenuity, only to find that our efforts are futile and fruitless. Grant that we may yield ourselves unreservedly to Thy spirit in order that our lives may be transformed and touched to finer issues.

May that day speedily dawn when truth and righteousness shall be triumphant and men and nations everywhere shall give themselves in a glad and willing obedience to the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords in whose name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 5, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6939) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Chair state the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is operating this morning under a unanimous-consent agreement which the Chair will read:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Friday, August 6, 1948, at the hour of 1 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending and upon any amendment that may be proposed to the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and upon the final passage of the said bill: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on said calendar day of August 6, the time between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 1 o'clock shall be equally divided between the proponents of the committee amendment and the opponents thereof, and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The immediately pending amendment is that offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] to the so-called McCarthy substitute for the committee substitute.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who is in charge of the time of the proponents of the measure, and also of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, who is in charge of the time for the opponents of the measure, if it will meet with their approval for me to suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be charged equally to each side. I think it will not take more than about 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I am very reluctant to assent. We are short of time anyway.

Mr. WHERRY. It is immaterial to me, but I thought that, in the interest of saving time, it would be well to have as many Senators as possible present so as to avoid the duplication of questions later.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire agree?

Mr. TOBEY. I agree.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Feazel	Lucas
Baldwin	Ferguson	McCarthy
Ball	Flanders	McClellan
Barkley	Fulbright	McFarland
Brewster	Green	McGrath
Bricker	Gurney	McKellar
Bridges	Hatch	McMahon
Brooks	Hawkes	Magnuson
Buck	Hayden	Malone
Butler	Hickenlooper	Martin
Byrd	Hill	Millikin
Cain	Hoey	Moore
Capehart	Holland	Morse
Capper	Ives	Murray
Connally	Jenner	Myers
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Kem	Pepper
Dworshak	Kilgore	Reed
Eastland	Knowland	Revercomb
Ecton	Langer	Robertson, Va.
Ellender	Lodge	Robertson, Wyo.
Russell	Thomas, Okla.	Watkins
Saltonstall	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Smith	Thye	Wiley
Sparkman	Tobey	Williams
Stennis	Tydings	Wilson
Taft	Umstead	Young
Taylor	Vandenberg	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is absent on important public business in the State of Tennessee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

To whom does the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin and I have conferred, and I yield to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Five minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, at the outset, I desire to clear up two misapprehensions which were developed in the debate of yesterday. The first grew out of the impression of the distinguished Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] that I planned to object to the consideration of the bill. What I said, or intended to say, in the committee, had to do with the proposal that we would try to agree to a bill that might be passed by unanimous consent, and I said that if the bill carried the public-housing feature I would have to object; that I could not see that bill adopted by unanimous consent without voicing my objection to it.

The other had to do with the statement I made when the Senator from Wisconsin yielded to me, about what the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] had told our committee. The words I used created the impression that the distinguished Senator from Ohio had told us that a bill without public housing and without slum clearance was better than a bill with it. That was not what I meant. What I meant to say, and all I meant to say was that with respect to comparable features of the bill which is now the McCarthy amendment, and similar features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which is the committee amendment, I understood the Senator from Ohio to say that, in his opinion, the revision of the language in the McCarthy substitute improved the same and similar provisions of his original bill.

Mr. President, as I indicated yesterday, there are some very good features in the McCarthy substitute. In my opinion, there is more benefit in that substitute for veterans than in the original bill the Senate passed at the regular session. We carry in this bill the same provision concerning veteran cooperatives that was in the other bill, but the McCarthy substitute places the emphasis upon cheaper houses, and in that respect it is in the interest of a veteran who might be able to finance a $5,000 or a $6,000 house but could not finance one costing $10,000 or more.

Under the McCarthy amendment our farmers can share equally with their urban friends in this program and the farmer who wants to build a house can get the same type of aid under this bill as any city man can get.

I admit that any Government guaranty of home mortgages is to some extent inflationary. I suggested to our committee that we include in our report—I have not yet seen it, but I hope it is contained in it—a statement to the effect that construction is now at an all-time high; that homes built under these high costs may not be worth as much 5 years from now as they are now, and that no one who does not urgently need a house should take advantage of this Government financing plan to get one, because, after all, there is nothing in the bill that gives someone something for nothing. He assumes the obligation of paying for what he gets, and eventually he will either pay for the house or, when the foreclosure comes, he will lose his equity in it.

I favor the McCarthy amendment because it does not include the public housing feature of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, nor does it include the slum-clearance feature. I would have no objection to including the slum-clearance feature, but under the original bill that program was not going to be started until next year, and if we want to start it next year there will be ample time next year to provide the authorization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I know of no subject that has ever been presented to the Senate which has received more earnest consideration from the committees of both branches of the Congress. For more than 4 years committees have been at work upon this problem. In 1944 and in 1945 there was appointed a Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development, of the Senate Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, the subcommittee being headed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. That committee held hearings for many months. From the hearings thus held the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill was formulated, which was later submitted to this body and passed by it almost unanimously. That bill, Senate 1592, was then sent to the House, where it was pigeonholed by the same forces that are now objecting to the passage of a measure similar to the one which is presently before the Senate. The report accompanying the introduction of S. 1592 recommended the improvement and extension of the FHA mortgage programs; a yield insurance program; a housing research program; a program of Federal loans and contributions to communities for urban redevelopment; an extension of the present low-rent housing program; and a clear statement of our national housing policy. While not making any recommendations as to the form of farm housing legislation, it emphasized the need thereof.

At about the same time the Taft committee was holding hearings, a Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning held hearings on postwar housing. That committee, which was known as the Colmer committee, came to the same conclusion as did the Taft committee, that dwelling units of a character that could be built under the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill should be built. Then the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency considered the subject as presented to it when S. 1592 was introduced by its three authors. That committee not only relied upon the evidence which was adduced before the special Taft committee, but it held hearings of its own, and as a result of those hearings they recommended the provisions which were incorporated in S. 1592.

Let me refer to the exact language used in the report made by the so-called Colmer committee of the House:

> This committee on July 3, 1945, issued a special report on the subject of Postwar Public Works and Construction, and in the report recommended that the Government extend its facilities on research and information; that it make efforts to improve the building code situation; that it provide assistance in the technical development and financing of housing; that it improve and extend the FHA mortgage insurance programs; that a yield insurance program be considered to attract new equity investment into housing, and that the Federal Government extend the present low-rent housing program.

I read further from that report with particular reference to the low-cost housing program:

> While the committee still believes, as stated in its seventh report, that public works should be held to a minimum now, it noted one exception to this principle. That exception is the provision of housing for low-income families, including veterans' families. In the normal course of events, industry has built housing for upper-income families and relied upon a filtering-down process to provide housing for the lower-income families. Despite all the efforts of the Housing Expediter, he has not been able to get enough low-rent housing for the low-income families of veterans, or other low-income families, for that matter. The long hearings and the detailed report of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing point up the need, developed in some detail in this committee's seventh report, of public housing to meet this immediate problem of housing for veterans in the lower-income brackets. It is recommended that renewed attention be paid to this problem as soon as Congress reconvenes.

As I indicated a few minutes ago, S. 1592, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, was passed by the Senate and failed to pass the House of Representatives during the Seventy-ninth Congress. When the Eightieth Congress convened, it was necessary to introduce a new housing bill. Accordingly S. 866, more commonly known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, was introduced. Hearings were again held by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and in its report accompanying S. 866 the following recommendations were made: A declaration of national housing policy; a housing research program; improvement of the FHA mortgage-insurance programs and their extension to meet the needs of lower-income families; a yield-insurance program; a program of Federal loan and annual contributions aid to localities for urban redevelopment; an extension of the public low-rent housing program; and a farm housing program.

Senators will recall that a joint committee on housing consisting of Members from both the Senate and the House was created. Let me read a summary of the findings and recommendations which that committee made after holding hearings over a period of many weeks in Washington and in many parts of the United States:

> This committee was set up as a joint committee of both the Senate and the House at the end of the first session of the Eightieth Congress in July 1947 to make a thorough study and investigation of all phases of the housing problem. This committee, beginning with September 10, 1947, and continuing through January 28, 1948, held 51 days of hearings in 33 cities and heard 1,286 witnesses. The testimony alone takes up 6,100 printed pages. In addition, various members as subcommittees of the committee conducted special investigations on basic housing problems, and made detailed reports on such topics as the high cost of housing, slum clearance, building materials, and the effects of taxation upon housing. The final report of the committee filed March 15, 1948, essentially represented an endorsement of the basic programs contained in S. 866. More specifically, the report recommended the prompt enactment of comprehensive housing legislation, including a program providing a direct attack upon the basic problem of high housing cost through a program of housing research, and special FHA and RFC insurance and loan aids for modernized methods of construction both on site and through the prefabrication process; a secondary market for FHA and GI loans; revision and improvement of FHA's insurance programs to meet the needs of lower-income families and veterans; a yield insurance program; a program of Federal loan and subsidy assistance to urban redevelopment; a program to extend public low-rent housing; and a program of Federal loans and subsidy aids for farm housing. Following this report, a series of amendments to S. 866 were introduced by Senator FLANDERS, one of the members of the committee, to carry out such recommendations of the joint committee as called for modification and improvement of the S. 866 provisions as previously reported by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Senators will remember that when S. 866 was considered by this body the so-called Flanders amendments were presented to that bill by way of a substitute and extensive debate ensued on the issue of the over-all housing bill. The Flanders substitute was really and truly the same as S. 866 with the exception of a few minor and technical amendments to make the bill conform to some of the recommendations of the joint Senate-House committee heretofore referred to. Efforts were then made to amend the bill, striking out the title dealing with public housing. I am sure that all of us will recall that the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who sits at my right at the moment, led the fight to have public housing eliminated from that bill.

The bill which is now under consideration is a very important measure. It contains most of the provisions of S. 866 as amended by the so-called Flanders substitute. It provides facilities to assist every segment of our society, not only those able to help themselves but also people in the lower-income groups. We passed similar legislation on two occasions. The first measure, as I indicated a moment ago, was pigeonholed by the House. During the last session the Senate passed Senate bill 866. What happened to it? It went to the House. Hearings were held, and the Committee on Banking and Currency of that body, by a vote of 14 to 13, as I recall, reported the bill favorably for consideration by the House. What is its status before the Rules Committee of the House? There it rests with an ultimatum that it shall not be reported to the House for consideration.

Mr. President, I read in some of yesterday's newspapers that the same obstructionists who have been keeping Senate bill 866 pigeonholed in the Rules Committee made the statement that unless a bill is sent to the House of Representatives by the Senate without public housing, no housing legislation will be adopted.

I say that that is an insulting ultimatum. We have passed the bill twice. Let us pass it thrice and put the responsibility where it belongs—at the doorstep of the House Republican leadership now in control.

Mr. President, I did not intend to go into too many details on a subject that has been so extensively debated on this floor, but I would like for a few minutes to discuss the housing problem in the terms in which the American people think of it—in terms of their need for homes in which to live as Americans should, in which children can get a fair start in life, and which will provide the aspirations which all of us must have to make life worth living. I am thinking of the needs of nearly 3,000,000 families who do not have any homes at all, but are crowded in, most of them involuntarily, with their in-laws and other families, and of the 500,000 families living in trailers, rooming houses, temporary housing, and other makeshift accommodations. I am thinking of the needs of more than 5,000,000 families in cities and surrounding areas, whose homes fall below decent standards for living. I am thinking also of the families on the farms whose homes are shacks which should be replaced or, at a minimum, need major repairs in order to make them livable. I am not even counting the great majority of farm homes which do not have the sanitary facilities which have become so essential for safe living in our cities, even though I deplore the lower housing standards we seem to accept for farm people.

Not even the best housing legislation we could enact is going to solve the housing problem for 10,000,000 families overnight. That is why we must consider legislation that looks ahead into the future and not try to solve a long-range problem with short-run, emergency measures. It is obvious that when you extend the solution of present problems into the future, you are also going to have to take into account the future increase in demand, losses in supply, and the deterioration of additional housing to the point where it should be replaced; and, finally, in order to bring about a normal relationship between need and supply, it is important that there is a sufficient amount of housing available for rent or sale to give American families some flexibility within their price range and to make it possible for them to move about without having to be plagued with the difficulties of obtaining housing or being separated for long intervals.

Now, what are the facts about housing needs? I know of no better place to turn to than the majority report filed just last March by the Joint Committee on Housing, which was created by this Congress to study the housing problem. I should add that these findings corroborated earlier conclusions reached by other committees, particularly the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment in 1945 and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in 1946 and 1947, and that its estimates of need were determined after careful consideration of other estimates from a variety of sources. Data obtained from the Bureau of the Census reports as to population and housing inventory provide the basis of these estimates of need.

Putting aside farm needs for the moment, America will need 15,441,000 new homes by 1960 to provide decent homes for the 39,500,000 families which the Bureau of the Census estimates we will have by that time. That means 1,285,000 homes a year. Discounting the considerable number of farm dwellings that can be rehabilitated, we shall need 200,000 farm homes a year—bringing the total up to 1,500,000 new homes annually.

It will take over 7,000,000 nonfarm homes, or more than 600,000 units a year, just to bring the present supply up to the shelter requirements of American families and to provide a 4-percent effective vacancy rate. Before the war, real-estate people used to think the supply was normal when 5 percent vacancies existed. That is about all we have been doing in this country for the last quarter of a century. Over the long pull, housing construction has just been keeping ahead of the increase in number of families. We have done practically nothing to replace the slums—to replace the losses from fire, demolition, and floods. That is all we will do during the coming years if we do not make a comprehensive attack on the housing problem through effective legislation. If that is all we do, we will have more, instead of fewer, slums, for houses wear out every year.

If we really meet America's housing needs, if we really want to eliminate the slums that imperil the health and morale of several million of our people, we are going to need another 8,000,000 homes during the next 12 years, or nearly 700,000 homes a year, to provide replacements for urban and suburban slum dwellings which are presently or will become substandard, for dwellings lost by fire, demolition, and floods, and for temporary dwellings, most of them built during the war for only short-time use.

Despite the findings of the joint committee and of other congressional committees, there are still those who say we can solve this housing problem without enacting comprehensive housing legislation. Despite the record of festering urban slums and dreary rural shacks, there are those who say that if Government will just let things alone (except provide a little credit assistance), everything will work out all right.

I am conscious of the record that the private building industry has built up since the war. I hope that private builders will start a record-breaking million homes this year, as everything seems to indicate. I am in favor of the credit aids from the Federal Government which are contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which will help them achieve and maintain that record.

But I see nothing in the present situation that offers the hope that even with these credit aids, the private building industry will be able to achieve and maintain the production necessary to fill the enlarged goals that have been envisioned by the Joint Committee on Housing. Neither does the joint committee.

Let us take a look at the record. The previous peak in home building was reached 23 years ago, away back in 1925, when 937,000 dwelling units were started. Then construction began to slide down, helping to take the whole economy with it, until, in 1933, 93,000 homes, only 10 percent of the peak volume, were produced. Conditions in 1925 were very similar to what they are today. Homes were being built at prices and rents which only a small portion of American families could afford to pay. When that limited demand was filled, and when people who had over-extended themselves in a desperate search for homes became unable to meet mortgage payments, home building started down the toboggan slide. The result was that average housing production during the two decades before the war was only 500,000 homes a year, just enough to keep up with the increase in families and not enough to take worn-out and other bad houses out of use and send them to the junk yard.

This example which all of us remember characterizes the history of home construction, and this history will not change until one fundamental characteristic of the industry as it existed then and exists today is changed. That characteristic is that not enough people can afford new housing at the prices and rents at which it is made available to permit a sustained production sufficient to meet American needs. There are two ways of assuring enough housing for the

American people—one is through a public-housing program; the other is to bring the costs of private housing down, in relation to incomes, so that there will be enough demand to sustain the high rate of production which America needs. I think our emphasis should be on the latter. I think the Government should utilize its resources fully to help private enterprise get its costs down. I would like to see this filtration theory we hear about work, but it will work only if you pour in enough new houses to crowd out the slums at the bottom.

It is hardly germane to say that the costs of housing have not increased any more than other prices, although there is good evidence that building costs, and the selling prices of both new and used houses, have exceeded the general rise in the costs of living and income. What is important is that new houses cost too much today to sustain production at the levels needed, just as they did in the thirties and twenties.

What is needed is for the home-building industry to catch up with the modern industrial parade. It needs to develop mass-production methods to serve the mass markets awaiting for it. It needs to have the shackles of outmoded building codes and restrictive practices removed. The Federal Government can help in two principal ways. It can adapt its credit aids to the needs of builders using modern production methods. This is done in S. 866. And it can inaugurate a program of research into new methods, materials, and techniques, and to encourage their adoption. This is done in S. 866. The authority would be, and should be, broad enough to permit the Government to cooperate with home building in all aspects of housing, from the improvement of production methods in the factory down to the modernization of building codes. Congress will have ample opportunity to control the extent of these activities from year to year through the appropriations procedure.

I am hopeful that with the improved credit aids to private industry and a broad program of research, private enterprise will, in time, be able to take care of the housing needs of most of the American people. But I do not believe that with these aids private enterprise will be able to assume the burdens unaided of clearing out the festering slums in our cities. The changes in methods of production and distribution which we hope to see accomplished will not be sweeping or rapid enough to permit any early solution, by private enterprise, of the problems of low-income families living in urban slums or in the bad housing in our rural areas. Any comprehensive housing program must deal with these problems, too, if it is to accomplish decent homes for all American families. So the modest programs in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill of Federal assistance for slum clearance and public housing and of direct credit and subsidies for the improvement of farm homes are essential parts of that bill.

I have heard it said that the way to clear slums is to get rid of them, but nobody has ever explained to me how private builders are going to be able to buy up slumland at its present costs, remove the old houses, and then replan and redevelop the areas with homes which people can afford to buy. Private builders will do as they always have done, and do their building on raw, inexpensive land. The essence of the urban redevelopment program contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is for the Government to share with local communities the excessive costs of acquiring and clearing slum areas so that the cleared land can be made available, primarily to private builders, at prices which represent a fair value at its new use.

Neither has anybody ever explained to me how private builders are going to provide decent homes at prices and rents which present slum dwellers, or other low-income families can afford to pay. The people who have talked so glibly about the fine workings of the filtration theory have recently come along with some figures which, assuming certain things happened, purported to show that private enterprise was building for low-income families. I am sure those figures are small comfort to the low-income veteran looking for a place in which to live, or to the low-income family huddled together in a decaying tenement. They certainly are not believed by 90 percent of governors, mayors, and prominent individuals, including a majority of those connected with the home-building industry, who, according to a report issued by the Joint Committee on Housing, said that private enterprise would not be able to provide decent homes for all low-income families within the foreseeable future.

If, as opponents of this bill attempt to prove, 20 percent of the houses built last year finally were priced at $4,500 or less, they are not in localities of greatest housing need or else they are shacks which are substandard to begin with, or soon will be. There are certainly no such numbers of decent homes in Washington or in my home city at that price. A recent census survey indicates that the average prices at which new homes are being sold today in Washington is $13,000 to $15,000. This is beyond the means of four-fifths of the families in Washington.

There is only one way I know of at the present time to hope that these families will have decent homes in which to live, and that is through public assistance.

The only other argument against public assistance for slum clearance and public housing programs that deserves serious consideration is that these are problems that the local communities can and should solve. The fact is that most cities cannot afford to take on the additional burden and that the few cities which can will be able to handle only a part of the problem. The governors and mayors who replied to the joint committee questionnaire sent out by Senator WAGNER agreed that the cities and States could not take care of all the needs of low-income families, and only a few thought they could go beyond local tax exemption for public housing projects. Their judgment is sustained by the report, Coordination of Federal and State Taxes, filed by Senator BRICKER. This report describes the financial strains being imposed upon the cities and States by higher costs of services, by the necessity for making up for wartime postponement of replacements, maintenance work, and new construction, and by the inflexibility of their principal source of revenue—real-estate taxes. It is sustained by the heavy bond flotations of municipalities and by the increase in interest rates on such issues. It is obvious that if we leave the problem of slums and bad housing exclusively to the local communities, it will not be solved. I believe that the Federal Government, together with the local communities, has a responsibility for the people's housing needs. I think it needs to be concerned with the health and character of its people. I think it has some responsibility of seeing that children start out in life with the equality of opportunity that only decent homes can provide.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise on time generously furnished by the junior Senator from Wisconsin, not to discuss the pending legislation, but to give a short explanation of an amendment intended to be proposed jointly by the Senators from Oregon and Washington. At the time of the disastrous Columbia River floods, the Congress most generously acted to furnish emergency stopgap housing for those who were flooded from their homes and who lost even all personal belongings. Local groups have worked feverishly since that time to see that all sufferers had some sort of accommodations.

It is now the consensus that local housing authorities in Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., can, if certain federally owned housing projects and demountable housing units in the area be transferred to the local housing authorities, furnish reasonably permanent housing for the flood sufferers as rapidly as present stopgap facilities must be vacated. The plan proposed will effect a savings in funds provided for stopgap housing which will, in my opinion, be several times the value of the properties sought to be transferred under this amendment. The amendment simply provides for the transfer to the Vancouver local housing authority of two public housing projects together with 500 demountable units located in the area, all having a value of approximately $450,000; and for the transfer to the Portland local housing authority of two public housing units having an estimated value of $275,000.

This amendment has been drafted after consultation with the Housing and Home Finance Agency and local housing groups, both public and private. Any additional financing can be worked out within the fabric of existing law and at a saving to the Government of several times the value of the property sought to be transferred and utilized.

I hope my colleagues will support us in this effort.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield. I have only 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I shall take only 1 minute, Mr. President.

I wish to say that I join in everything the senior Senator from Oregon has said, and I add the point that the amendment we are offering makes possible an effective implementation of legislation which the Congress has already passed. This amendment will make it possible to carry out the aims and objectives which we have already sanctioned and approved in the legislation passed in the closing hours of the last session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Either the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Wisconsin will now be recognized.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire yields to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] to whom he allots 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, from the Midyear Economic Report of the President, which was transmitted to us the other day, I read at the bottom of page 14 the following statement:

> The unusually high level of current demand for houses has combined with the unique character of the building industry to push home buyers' costs far more above those prevailing after World War I than consumer incomes have risen in the same time span. During the past year, the average price of new houses has risen about 20 percent, while average family income after taxes was only about 8 percent higher during the first half of 1948 than during the same period in 1947.

So, Mr. President, inflation is becoming more pronounced in the housing field, as in every other field; but all we are attempting to do here this morning, all we shall do if we adopt the McCarthy substitute, is to reduce the total demand for housing.

What is the real meaning of that statement? Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, vice chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, when testifying before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on August 4, 1948, had this to say:

> A good example of the demand problem is in the field of housing. The point has been made that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is inconsistent with an anti-inflation program because it would add to demand.
>
> This point is not well-founded. If there is a shortage of housing, and if this is contributing to excessive housing costs in the same way that a shortage of food would contribute to excessive food costs, then the production of more housing is anti-inflationary in the same sense that the production of more food would be anti-inflationary. It may well be that, for a time, we cannot divert much more labor and materials to the total production of housing in view of other competing national needs. But let us make sure that they are competing national needs, and not competing nonessentials. And even then, there would still remain the question of the composition of the housing that is being produced. It would still be sound and desirable to produce relatively more low-rent housing for veterans and others of modest means, and relatively less high-priced housing for families who can get along very nicely for a while with what they already have. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is designed basically for this purpose, although this is not true of the "Title VI" provisions contained in the bill. Thus, under present circumstances, talk about damping down the demand for housing is discriminating and mistaken until one breaks the demand down into various types. Some types of housing should be expanded, other types should be contracted.

So, Mr. President, the country is demanding low-rental housing because the country needs it.

The Senate on three separate occasions, I believe, voted for public housing and for low-cost rental housing. The public officials of Pennsylvania, Republican and Democrat, in State government and in municipal government, have favored, and still recommend, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The newspapers of Pennsylvania make the same demand.

Let me read now an editorial appearing in the Republican Philadelphia Inquirer on August 3:

CONGRESS SHOULD PASS HOUSING BILL

It would be folly to expect Congress, in the short space of the present special session, to give consideration to all the problems touched upon by President Truman's hodgepodge program. There is simply no time for the study that would be required.

One subject, however, is an outstanding exception. That is housing.

This problem has been already exhaustively investigated by both Houses of Congress. At least three congressional committees have conducted full-scale hearings on housing relief, and one committee traveled all over the country studying the subject.

There is surely not one aspect of housing needs that has not been examined in Washington. The conclusions reached by various experts in the field have gone into the makeup of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to promote low-cost housing.

The Senate has already passed the bill. It is locked up in the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and there are many indications that the House would promptly approve it if the committee would only release it.

There is no excuse for adjourning the present session without favorable action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner law. On many other proposals before Congress the Members can find reason for doing nothing at this time.

But they will not be able to convince the people that they are doing the right thing by killing off housing relief.

Too many persons have suffered acutely by reason of the housing shortage and the high prices of available houses and apartments to shrug away this subject.

One of the greatest double-crosses of our times has been perpetrated upon the American people in the matter of housing relief.

There is hardly a politician, from President on down, who has not promised to do something, since the day the war ended, to solve the housing problem. The problem is as unsolved as ever.

The Truman administration has mangled the subject of housing relief. It has periodically promised the construction of millions of homes and has gone through the motions of appointing housing commissions and expediters, but those millions of homes remain unbuilt.

Unable to work out anything on its own, the administration has all but washed its hands of the problem and turned it over to Congress. That body has had an exceptional opportunity to demonstrate its determination to accomplish something where the President failed, by pushing to passage the Taft-Ellender-Wagner law.

Opponents of Government-stimulated low-cost housing, however, spearheaded by an indefatigable real-estate lobby, have managed thus far to keep that law from passage.

The results are visible on all sides, in the continuing scarcity of homes, particularly in the low-cost field. Veterans who returned to the accompaniment of promises that homes would be found for them are still living doubled up in houses other than their own. Rental dwellings are almost impossible to locate in many sections and home-seekers are frequently compelled to buy houses priced above their means, simply because they have no other choice.

Favorite argument of the real-estate lobby in opposing the T-E-W bill was to the effect that the housing problem would solve itself, without Government aid. But it has not worked out that way.

So it is now objected that the housing bill would be inflationary, which is a fashionable term for almost anything that is disliked. If this objection is valid it would hold against virtually every public improvement, too, and we might find highway and sewer construction labeled inflationary.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill would help thousands of families to obtain decent homes at moderate cost. It is urgently needed. It could be passed quickly, without any further debate. The Republican majority in the House will be making a grave mistake—a political mistake—if it permits this bill to die.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate should pass this bill. I believe the Senate overwhelmingly favors the bill; but one or two Members of the other House say to the Senate of the United States, "Unless you bow to us, unless you strike out the provisions we oppose, we will not even appoint conferees. You, the Senate of the United States, must accept dictation from us, from one or two men. Housing legislation is dead for 1948 unless you accept our dictation."

So, Mr. President, the issue is much deeper than the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; it is deeper than the McCarthy substitute; yes, it is deeper than the housing legislation. The issue before the Senate of the United States is whether a few men in one House of the legislative branch of government can stymie and throttle the legislative processes. The issue is the preservation of constitutional government. The issue is the integrity of the Senate of the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope and trust that the McCarthy substitute will be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks an address I made nearly 2 years ago, on December 12, 1946, before a regional convention of the National Association of Housing Officials. In that address I predicted—quite accurately, it now turns out—how dark the prospect was for decent housing legislation in this Eightieth Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DARK OUTLOOK FOR HOUSING

(Speech by United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, at regional convention of National Association of Housing Officials, Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, December 12, 1946)

It should be a source of satisfaction to you men and women of NAHO to know that

the entire country is now painfully conscious of a problem you have been concerned over for these past many years, the problem of providing homes for our people at prices they can afford.

You are in the position today of the prophet who foresaw the doom, of the meteorologist who had predicted the deluge, of the courier who had brought the warning, only to be ignored until the catastrope had struck.

Having told the Nation for these past many years that our housing situation was becoming alarming, that firm, bold, imaginative steps should be taken to meet a need which was sure to come, you can sit back now, if you like, and point to your record of warning and say "I told you so." There is always some satisfaction in that.

But there's not satisfaction enough—not, I am sure, when considered in relation to your sincere concern over the problem and your sincere desire to see the job of housing our people met with forthright vigor. Patting yourselves on the back for how right you were will not solve the ills you warned against.

There is danger in it, too. By reminding people that you had tried to tell them years ago of a catastrophe which is now upon them, you risk their ire for not having told them in more emphatic terms. The insurance agent who reminds you the day after your fortune is lost in a fire that he had tried unsuccessfully to sell you fire insurance is likely to earn your undying antagonism for not having knocked you down, sat on your chest, and made you buy his product.

I'll have a little bit more to say later about this phase of your history—this business about having foreseen the danger and of having pointed to some of the solutions. First, however, I want to touch on the subject on which I have been asked specifically to speak: The legislative phase of the housing problem.

I wish today I could be a bearer of glad tidings; I wish I could start my speech with a direct promise to you that in the field of housing legislation—and, thus, in housing generally—everything is going to be all right.

But wishes do not build houses and wishes do not pass legislation, and any note of cheer which may creep into my remarks is, I am afraid, largely coincidental.

The cold, hard facts, from the legislative standpoint, are pretty cheerless. There will undoubtedly be legislation in Washington soon bearing on housing, but, speaking for myself, I am afraid it will be the wrong kind.

First, I see little prospect, at this present moment, for any legislation soon to resume the type of low-rent slum-clearance housing programs which were so successful before the war. Second, I see little if any prospect for legislation such as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft long-range national housing bill to stimulate private-enterprise capital in the housing field into the all-out efforts we know are necessary.

I may be overly pessimistic; I hope I am wrong. But I want to speak what is on my mind and speak it freely, and it is this: that the Congress now beginning to assemble in Washington, flushed with an astounding political victory at the polls, seems to be convinced it was elected for only one purpose—to end governmental "interference," that's the term they use, in almost every field of endeavor in which the Government became interested in the past 14 years.

That includes housing.

The outlook for legislation involving housing includes, as I see it now from signs which are pretty evident in Washington, the removal of all construction controls yet remaining on the books, letting industrial and commercial builders grab the materials, and the end or virtual end of rent control through substantial increases or perhaps the abdication of Federal control in favor of State control. There may be, too, some liberalization of FHA mortgage-insurance coverage designed to maintain present inflationary real estate trends yet a little longer. These are the wrong types of legislation. For the rest, I think Congress, as it is now talking and thinking, means to let housing find its own way out of the morass. It will undoubtedly seek to starve out Federal agencies now concerned with housing and give the real estate industry the program that industry so long has espoused—laissez faire and the devil take the hindmost.

The fellow the devil is going to take—used to be known as GI Joe. He'll get the worst deal, because his needs are the worst. But the public generally is going to suffer with him.

To understand why I consider the immediate future for progressive housing legislation so very dark, I want to take you back only six short months or so. To my mind, our rosy postwar future collapsed just about then, with the collapse of effective inflation control. And our housing outlook, I fear, started on its way to what also begins to look like a collapse—one, I hope which might be avoided even yet.

You all know the history of the OPA debates in Congress, the results of them, and the start we made then toward our present crisis.

But something happened then that you may not have watched very closely. You may not have noticed. Perhaps only politicians paid it very much attention.

When the House of Representatives passed the first price-control renewal bill back before Easter, it was a very worried collection of Congressmen who saw that bill go to the Senate. The men who put through the amendments designed to cripple OPA were scared. They knew those amendments if upheld, meant the end of effective price control. They had a big spree on the House floor while voting through those amendments but when the bill went to the Senate they began to worry over the effects of their action come election day.

Then they went home for Easter vacation, and when they got back, they weren't nearly so scared any more. No one back home seemed to be too upset by these OPA votes. Very few constituents ganged up on their Congressmen to demand an explanation for killing—or trying to kill—effective inflation control.

That was significant. It gave those Congressmen willing to see inflation let loose upon us the courage they needed to stay in the fight. When the first bill was vetoed, they took a chance on voting the same amendments a second time. Prices began to rise, of course, inflation came upon us creepingly at first, then with giant steps, and still the resentment was slow in rising back home. Then began the producer strikes, as more and more industries looked to the end of price and inflation control completely. The meat crisis burst upon us. The people, so slow to rise in anger as their savings and their earnings began to shrink under the inflationary pressures, suddenly became aroused—

Meat—they must have meat.

Well, they got meat, and the pattern which up to then had been emerging gradually, suddenly traced itself out in indelible ink.

Those Congressmen who had voted so gleefully for the crippling of controls, who had thereupon suffered untold anguish over the political repercussions they feared from their OPA votes, found themselves being reelected overwhelmingly.

Now every Member of Congress, and you can take my word on this, is acutely conscious of his record, particularly his voting record which is down in black and white and easily consulted. When reelected, therefore, he assumes his record has been approved by the voters in his district. He likes to assume that every vote in his record has been approved.

Consequently, among a majority of those Congressmen coming back next month there is an inclination to believe that their voters have resoundingly approved, among other things, the murder of price control, and with it the hobbling of housing; the refusal to put price ceilings on existing homes and thus head off the disgraceful real-estate inflation we have since experienced; the critical attitude they displayed toward the housing program generally and their general antipathy to controls of any kind.

It is my personal belief, and I think you agree with me, that these men were reelected in spite of rather than because of their votes on those particular issues. But these Congressmen don't seem to think so. They point to the election returns as their mandate to pursue similar policies for two more years.

I admit the motivation is strong. For the people have done little if anything to convince their individual Congressmen—those who were reelected—of the errors of some of their ways.

And that's why I consider the future of housing legislation so dark. Meeting the housing crisis requires planning, direction, channeling of materials—Government interference, if you will. And this doesn't fit in with the talk we are hearing around Washington of complete decontrol of everything, including housing.

In view of this feeling, how, I ask, if we couldn't get the national housing bill out of the House Banking and Currency Committee last session, are we going to get it out this time? If the people showed such little concern over things as fundamental as the price of food and the loss of their savings and earnings, what incentive is there for conservative-minded anti-Government-interference Congressmen—Government interference, meaning affirmative Government action of any kind—what incentive do they have now to vote for something as communistic as this bill was supposed to have been?

No incentive at all, that I can see, unless you and others like you get a whole lot busier than you have been up to now in seeing to it that the people know what this bill is all about.

It would be presumptuous for me here today to tell you men and women of NAHO the facts about housing—you know them backward and forward.

You know that long before the war made the problem so acute, so visible, so personal even to families in the middle and high income brackets, that we had a frightful deficit of necessary livable housing for our people in this country. You know that about 40 percent of all our homes are 30 years or more old; and 20 percent are at least 40 years old; that more than 30 percent of all homes lack either toilets and baths or inside plumbing of any kind or need major repairs—that about 6,000,000 dwelling units are needed today to meet the barest minimum standards of health and decency for families now living in disgraceful slums, and that millions of new families are being formed with no immediate prospect for housing they can afford; that the 116,667 slum clearance units in public housing programs of the past and the 360,000 or so permanent war housing units were but a drop in the bucket from the standpoint of need and that little if any progress has been made by private enterprise up to the war toward meeting the needs of those above the public housing income level. In 1940, for instance, less than 500,000 homes were built privately.

And you know, too, that even the record-breaking construction era we are now passing through is not even beginning to meet the

problem. One million two hundred thousand units—that was the goal for residential construction in 1946. Of these 700,000 were to be of conventional construction—and we are just about meeting that goal, getting that many under way. It's a real achievement. But it is far from enough. The goal of 250,000 temporary units which was set for this year will also probably be met. There again, we have achievement, real achievement. The industrial housing goal is not being met this year, apparently, and I'm afraid the next Congress will see to it that this program gets even less encouragement next year than it has received this year.

I think it's too bad that industry itself has shown such a great reluctance to go into this field without overwhelming governmental guarantees against loss. I think, too, that the Government itself, as represented by RFC, has been unnecessarily cautious.

But RFC's caution is merely a reflection of the apparent feeling of the new Congress. And Congress considers itself a reflection of the feeling of the people.

In these days of Gallup polls, it is not enough just to try to convince your Congressman; you've first got to convince the voters.

I said earlier that I was going to refer again to your organization and others like it, and the efforts you made over the years to warn of the coming crisis in housing, warnings which fell largely on deaf ears.

Please forgive me for being perhaps an unmannerly guest, but I don't think you did as good a job as you should have done, as good a job as you can do.

For instance, let's look at this Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, which died so ignobly in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Is there anyone here who thinks it communistic? Is there anything in it which has not already become an accepted part of American housing tradition? Is there anything communistic about building Government-financed low-rent housing for those in the very lowest income bracket? Senator TAFT didn't think so. He spoke for the bill, he sponsored the bill, he particularly endorsed this small phase of the bill calling for Government action in a field where private enterprise cannot possibly make money.

But when the cry arose in the House and in the House Banking and Currency Committee over the communism of this phase of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, how many of you men and women—known in your own communities, respected there, recognized as persons who know a whole lot more than the general public about the problem of housing—how many of you, I ask, wrote to your newspapers disputing the irresponsible criticisms emanating out of Washington, and which those newspapers published, calling the national housing bill communistic because of its very small portion devoted to public housing? Did you appoint yourselves committees of one each to nail the lies and defend the truth?

How many veterans—then, as now, bitterly disillusioned in their search for living quarters—did you personally talk to and explain this bill, its provisions, for instance, for very long term, high percentage, FHA loans on new housing; its provisions for urban redevelopment encouraging insurance companies and others to build modern rental housing on land now useless to housing because it is so high in price, even though covered now with slums costing your cities thousands and millions in municipal services, policing, health, and other costs?

Did any of you members here today from Pittsburgh tell your newspapers and business interests there, as they watch the slow deterioration of your golden triangle, how this bill could make into an overnight reality the ambitious program of Mayor Lawrence for redevelopment of the lower downtown area, with the Federal Government investing in Pittsburgh's future? In New York, in my city of Philadelphia, elsewhere in this region, you men and women of NAHO know what this bill could do to restore our blighted areas with modern rental housing which would be privately built, privately operated, and profitable. Have you told your town of these possibilities?

If that is communism, Senator TAFT never thought so. Has Senator TAFT suddenly turned Bolshevist?

Senator TAFT is a recognized leader of the Republican Party in the Senate and, too, in the whole Congress. He has real influence. Yet it is significant to me that his influence was not sufficient to get this bill through the House, where it was held up largely by Members of his own party.

As long as your own Congressmen think the real-estate interests opposing any and all types of progressive housing legislation speak for all, or even a majority, of the people in their districts, then there is no chance for the new Eightieth Congress to do a thing about housing but do what real estate asks—turn it loose completely to find its own way.

I am reminded of what happened a year ago when housing construction was, in effect, turned loose. Controls were lifted. Ceilings were off. The housing built during that period from September 1945 to January 1946, is now on the market—much of it, that is—and it is still waiting buyers. Why? Because the builders, as if by magic, all began concentrating on the lush, high-profit, high-priced field.

About 28 percent of all homes begun then, during the free market period, were designed to sell at more than $10,000. Yet, it is significant, that after controls were reestablished last January, only 2 percent of new homes were priced at more than $10,000.

In Washington, today, there is home after home begun during the free market period and still for sale at prices ranging from $23,000 to $29,000. They are nice houses. They have not just one or one and a half bathrooms—they have two and three baths. The baths are all tile. They have copper plumbing, slate roofs, screened porches, perhaps electric dishwashers and air-conditioning. They have everything.

These, incidentally, appear typical of the houses for veterans put up in Washington during the free market period. The same was largely true in other cities.

Most of the veterans I know are looking for places a little less pretentious. I think they believe they could get along with only one bathroom and could perhaps tolerate asbestos or asphalt roofing. Conceivably they could manage with only galvanized plumbing and get along without the electric dishwasher, at least for a while. I think they would put up with many such hardships in order to obtain homes they could afford. During the free market period, they weren't getting such houses. And now, with relaxed controls, many are finding they still cannot get them. A $10,000 ceiling is helpful, but most veterans, I think, want homes at $4,000, $6,000, and $8,000.

They'll get them, too—if they can hold out long enough. I think it's a sorry shame, though, that they—who have already waited so long—must wait now for a collapse in real estate in order to buy such homes—and it is altogether possible that if a collapse comes, the veteran may not have the money to buy any kind of a home.

Yes, as I said, the legislative outlook for housing is dark. But it does not have to remain so. There is nothing in the Constitution which says that once you elect a Congressman for 2 years you are powerless to influence his votes. Lobbying is still legal; in fact, we've set up official rules and regulations for it now. Everybody can have a lobby and everyone can be his own lobby.

I believe we can still have progressive housing legislation in the next Congress only if the people, first, are thoroughly convinced they want it, and if they then convince their Congressmen they want it. It's up to people who know the facts to see to it that the people get those facts.

In other words, it's a job for you.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

To whom does the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in his recent speech to the Congress, the President of the United States said he had called us into emergency session for two fundamental reasons. The first was that he wanted the Congress to consider the question of inflation; and, second, and most importantly, he wanted the Congress to pass legislation which would accelerate the building of residential houses in this country at this time. I think it reasonable and proper to quote from the President's speech a few sentences of his on the subject of housing. The President said:

The second reason why I have called the Congress back is that our people need legislation now to help meet the national housing shortage.

We desperately need more housing at lower prices—prices which families of moderate income, particularly veterans' families, can afford to pay. We are not getting it.

Even more urgently, we need more rental housing, especially low-rent housing. We are not getting it.

Most of the housing now being built is for sale, or for rent, at prices far above the reach of the average American family.

Up to that point in his declaration of purpose on the subject of housing the President had not referred to either slum clearance or public low-rent housing. The reason for his failure to do so up to that point in his speech is obvious because the President and the Congress and the public want more houses at lower prices, and they want them immediately. The President knows, as does every thinking Member of the Congress, that the passage of comprehensive legislation to provide for public low-rent housing and slum clearance would not result in the construction of additional units of housing in this country during the period of time ending more than several years from now.

This Congress, in dealing with the housing situation—and let us not forget that we came back to try to do something about it—is faced with a very practical situation. On the 22d day of April the Senate passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and sent it to the House of Representatives. The Senate was obviously in support of that legislation, and would have liked to have it enacted. That measure remains before the House of Representatives, where, for reasons sufficient to its membership and leadership, the bill has not as yet been passed.

Today we are being asked, in the face of a declared emergency by the President, to send to the House of Representatives this committee bill, a piece of proposed legislation which the House has already had before it, on which it has taken no action, and on which we have reason to believe the House will take no action at this session.

Therefore, it is obvious that to adopt the committee recommendation is to take an unwarranted risk that we shall come out of this special emergency session of the Congress with no housing legislation at all.

I know that the chairman of our Banking and Currency Committee, who takes an opposing view, will agree that the McCarthy amendment, which will stimulate more housing at lower costs, is an improved version of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill in every single, solitary respect, except that it does not include the social and welfare provisions affecting public housing and slum clearance.

Mr. TOBEY. And rural housing?

Mr. CAIN. And rural housing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired. To whom does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter, dated last July 30, and addressed to me by Rear Adm. J. E. Maher, United States Navy, Chief of Base Maintenance, Navy Department, regarding the effect of the housing situation on the morale and reenlistment of Navy personnel. This letter from Admiral Maher is in reply to an inquiry I addressed to the Navy Department regarding housing, especially as to its effect on Navy personnel in the Newport, R. I., area. The letter is a long one and the time allotted me prevents me from reading it all. I shall read a few sentences, however.

The housing shortage is considered one of the more important factors presently affecting morale and reenlistments of Navy personnel. Other factors such as pay, separation of families during sea duty, nonadaptability to service life, etc., enter into the picture but it is believed that unfavorable living conditions, occasioned by the housing shortage, have the greatest adverse effect. This is borne out in a letter from the Chief of Naval Personnel, dated September 23, 1947, to the Chief of Naval Operations which is quoted in part as follows:

"The housing problem both as it affects officers and enlisted personnel is a matter of vital importance to the entire Navy. Inadequate or nonexistent housing is an immediate cause of generally low morale, expediency transfers, prospective lowered reenlistments, hardship discharges, changing of orders, high rate of emergency leaves, and other administrative problems requiring expenditure of time, money, and loss of manhours.

He then proceeds to give various examples and illustrations.

"This bureau has estimated that 75 percent of all transfer requests received from petty officers (approximately 200 per month) stem from the lack of adequate housing. It has become almost 'routine' to receive requests for transfer back to sea after a few months' of shore duty and the reason is always 'no housing.' Examples of men receiving their first tour of shore duty since before the war and not being able to live with their families are legion. Obviously, such men are neither contented nor efficient.

"The unrest prevalent throughout the Navy because of the housing shortage is vividly portrayed in the stream of correspondence received daily in the Bureau of Naval Personnel. All bureaus, departments, and branches of the Navy are being affected now. The expected decline in personnel strength in the near future will make the full utilization of every available man a matter of concern to every member of the Navy. Improvement of the critical housing situation will stretch the Navy's dollars farther and will make available thousands of man-hours of work now being lost.

"From congressional sources, from fathers and mothers and from wives, this Bureau receives a continuing flow of letters pointing out the need for housing, charging lack of interest in the welfare and morale of our men and asking what we intend to do about the situation. Such feeling has a positive and definite effect upon morale. * * *

"Since VJ-day, because of the Nation-wide housing shortage, dependent housing has become one of the greatest morale factors in the Navy."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GREEN. In view of that fact, I ask unanimous consent to have the whole letter printed in the RECORD immediately following these brief remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1948.

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: In response to your inquiry, I submit herewith information on the effects of the housing shortage on morale and reenlistments of Navy personnel.

The housing shortage is considered one of the more important factors presently affecting morale and reenlistments of Navy personnel. Other factors such as pay, separation of families during sea duty, nonadaptability to service life, etc., enter into the picture but it is believed that unfavorable living conditions, occasioned by the housing shortage, have the greatest adverse effect. This is borne out in a letter from the Chief of Naval Personnel, dated September 23, 1947, to the Chief of Naval Operations which is quoted in part as follows:

"The housing problem both as it affects officers and enlisted personnel is a matter of vital importance to the entire Navy. Inadequate or nonexistent housing is an immediate cause of generally low morale, expediency transfers, prospective lowered reenlistments, hardship discharges, changing of orders, high rate of emergency leaves, and other administrative problems requiring expenditure of time, money, and loss of manhours. As an example the enlisted discharge section receives approximately 800 requests for hardship or dependency discharges per month. Of this number some 20 percent of the requests are based on inadequate housing, and unsatisfactory housing conditions, undoubtedly, are a contributing factor in many others. In addition, many personal visits, telephone calls, and personal letters are received daily in the Bureau of Naval Personnel with requests for discharge or change of duty because of housing conditions. No figures are available on the number of personnel who fail to reenlist because of unsatisfactory accommodations. However, the problem is one of constant concern to major commands ashore and afloat as is evidenced by reports, queries, and suggestions received in the Bureau, and it is a known fact that reenlistments are curtailed by lack of a place for families to live. Requests for transfers from one duty station to another so that the man concerned could be near his family have reached a new high.

"This bureau has estimated that 75 percent of all transfer requests received from petty officers (approximately 200 per month) stem from the lack of adequate housing. It has become almost routine to receive requests for transfer back to sea after a few months of shore duty and the reason is always 'no housing.' Examples of men receiving their first tour of shore duty since before the war and not being able to live with their families are legion. Obviously, such men are neither contented nor efficient.

"The unrest prevalent throughout the Navy because of the housing shortage is vividly portrayed in the stream of correspondence received daily in the Bureau of Naval Personnel. All bureaus, departments, and branches of the Navy are being affected now. The expected decline in personnel strength in the near future will make the full utilization of every available man a matter of concern to every member of the Navy. Improvement of the critical housing situation will stretch the Navy's dollars further and will make available thousands of man-hours of work now being lost.

"From congressional sources, from fathers and mothers, and from wives, this Bureau receives a continuing flow of letters pointing out the need for housing, charging lack of interest in the welfare and morale of our men and asking what we intend to do about the situation. Such feeling has a positive and definite effect upon morale."

The Chief of Naval Operations in endorsing this letter to the Secretary of the Navy on October 3, 1947 commented in part, as follows:

"The Chief of Naval Operations is acutely aware of the need for large-scale recruiting and reenlistments if the enlisted strength of the Navy is to be maintained. The effectiveness of the Navy in the years ahead will depend largely on the numbers and caliber of the men enlisted during the next 12 months.

"The Chief of Naval Operations feels that in peacetime, when the total number of personnel is limited by appropriations, we cannot afford to pursue policies which induce our best men to return to civilian life. It is incumbent upon the Navy, particularly in view of the present international situation, to insure that the limited funds provided for national defense are used most efficiently. It is considered that this calls for taking all possible steps to attract and retain high caliber enlisted personnel. An extraordinary effort toward removing factors causing the lowered morale described in the basic letter appears to be mandatory.

"Since VJ-day, because of the Nation-wide housing shortage, dependent housing has become one of the greatest moral factors in the Navy. Despite the fact that considerable funds have been expended in providing dependent housing, the need continues to be urgent and its effect upon morale extremely critical. The Chief of Naval Operations feels that it would be unrealistic to expect that future appropriations for housing construction, a gradual lessening of the civilian housing shortage, or possibly a less favorable civilian labor market will solve the personnel problem. This problem must be dealt with much sooner than any of these factors can operate. The improved morale sought here must be brought to bear on the reenlistment and recruiting programs of the present fiscal year. Further, it is considered that with their present pay, our enlisted personnel will, as was the case before the war, be unable to compete in the civilian market for adequate accommodations, even when housing is not in short supply."

The above-quoted matter has been determined to be inapplicable as of the present date.

Naval personnel are seldom able to remain in one locality long enough to compete for housing with permanently located civilians. Most Naval personnel coming to an area where there is a housing shortage find that rental housing within their means does not become available to them, because of the prior interest of permanently located civilians, until a large portion of their tour of duty in the area has expired. This type of experience is particularly unfortunate in its effect on the morale of enlisted personnel coming from extended tours of sea duty to shore duty with the expectation of at least a short period of normal family life. Their expectation is seldom realized and their reaction all too often is to want to give up the Navy as a career.

In most instances, naval personnel, both officers and men, veterans of World War II, have no choice but to report for duty where ordered and are forced to be separated from their families because suitable housing cannot be found. Many others are occupying accommodations far below acceptable standards such as trailers, tourist cabins, etc. These men cannot exercise an option available to former servicemen—that of moving to another locality—without leaving the Navy.

The housing problem described above has the maximum impact upon the most valuable and highly trained personnel. It is a fact that most experienced enlisted men in the Navy are married. Percentages of men in the various pay grades, who are married, as computed by the Bureau of Naval Personnel, are as follows: Chief petty officers, 81 percent; petty officers, second class, 31 percent; petty officers, first class, 61 percent; petty officers, third class and below, 8 percent.

Although enlisted personnel in the chief petty officer and petty officer, first class categories are those most affected by the housing shortages, it does not follow that these men are the ones who fail to reenlist. Most of these men are now accepting unsatisfactory living conditions because of their seniority in and loyalty to the service and the large equity which most of them have in retirement income. The present rating structure of the Navy is markedly unbalanced showing shortages in the lower petty-officer ratings and excesses in the higher ratings and nonrated men. The Navy's most serious problem in enlisted personnel acquisition is that of inducing its first enlistees to reenlist. These men, although not directly affected by the housing shortage, since most of them are not married are nonetheless affected by the state of morale of the senior petty officers. The man considering a first reenlistment takes into account his probability of satisfactory living conditions, etc., in the future. He expects to marry and have a family. If he sees that the Navy's senior petty officers are not able to have a satisfactory family life, he is not likely to commit himself to a Navy career. However, the attracting of Navy career men in large numbers is a most important factor in the national defense—particularly when we consider the possible rating structure of the Navy about 10 to 15 years hence when present senior petty officers have retired.

For every man who can be induced to reenlist, the Government saves the thousands of dollars required to train a recruit, and the Navy gains the services of a trained man. Once a man has reenlisted the chances of his making the Navy his career are quite high. His each subsequent reenlistment saves the cost of training a recruit. In short, if we can have a Navy of career men, we shall be able to make the maximum contribution to the national defense at a minimum cost. Conversely, if most of our personnel fail to reenlist, we shall be able to make only a minimum contribution at high cost.

The policy of the Navy with regard to the providing of housing accommodations for its personnel is determined by the Navy's responsibility for the national defense. The Navy endeavors to provide housing for its personnel in all cases where the lack of such housing is found to be detrimental to naval efficiency. In accordance with this concept, before World War II, when no critical housing shortage existed, the Navy felt justified in expending public funds only for construction of such housing as was necessary to provide for the residence on-station of certain key personnel required, in the public interest, to be available at all times, and for personnel attached to isolated stations.

During and subsequent to World War II, the housing situation became acute. During the war the housing shortage was alleviated to a considerable extent by the construction of numerous Government housing projects in the vicinity of the principal military installations. Since the war, the Navy has made extraordinary efforts to provide such housing for its personnel as can be justified in the interest of national defense within the limits of funds available. As of January 1, 1948, these efforts resulted in the creating of 2,711 family units by construction (mostly at isolated stations, which have highest Navy housing priority) and 1,638 units by conversion of suitable existing buildings on stations in localities having high Navy housing priority. In addition, a total of 7,054 units of all types have been built overseas.

In order to provide a maximum number of quarters with available funds, suitable existing buildings in localities where the need has been greatest have been converted into apartments whenever the unit cost was found to be less than new construction.

It is realized that it is impossible to secure funds in an amount sufficient to provide new or converted housing for all naval personnel during a period of Nation-wide housing shortage. However, it is desired to point out that new construction of public quarters would result in a substantial saving of public funds when observed from a long-range viewpoint. Service personnel occupying public quarters forfeit their rental allowances. Public quarters are therefore self-amortizing by savings effected in the appropriation "Pay and subsistence" from which rental allowances are paid to those personnel who must seek housing accommodations other than public quarters.

In March 1947 the Navy completed a survey of defense housing needs within the continental limits. At that time it was determined that 21,237 units were required to meet Navy needs in the most congested defense areas. For various reasons, principal of which was the limit of funds available in the appropriation specifically designated for maintenance of rental housing, the total was reduced to 10,385 units. These were requested from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency by letters dated March 26, 1947, and October 13, 1947. As of this date, approximately 7,000 of these units have been transferred to the Navy; the remainder, approximately 3,300 units, are the subject of dispute between the Navy and local interests.

In the absence of appropriations for new construction, it was considered that acquisition of defense housing projects was the only practicable and the most economical means of providing housing for married naval personnel attached to permanent naval shore establishments. Present law requires the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to dispose of defense housing as expeditiously as possible. Transfer to the Navy is effected without exchange of funds. It is therefore considered imperative that the Navy should make every effort to acquire those projects presently in dispute.

In this connection, the Navy has requested transfer of the Tonomy Hill project at Newport, R. I. The transfer of this project is being delayed because of conflict with local interests. The Navy has an urgent need for housing in the Newport area. A recent survey reveals that there is a 196-unit deficiency for shore-based officer personnel and an 823 unit deficiency for shore-based enlisted personnel. Consideration of only the number of shore-based personnel does not give a realistic picture of the number of Navy families dependent on the Newport-Quonset area for housing as there are 20,000 fleet personnel attached to ships and carrier squadrons based in this area for whom no provision for housing has been taken into account. It is estimated that 7,500 of these fleet personnel desire family housing.

A market analyst from the Federal Housing Administration is presently conducting a housing survey of the Newport area in conjunction with the Navy. The survey is being undertaken with special reference to the housing requirements in this community, both Navy and civilian broken down into appropriate categories, with some conclusion as to the portion of the need that can be met by private industry and recommendations as to how the balance of the need might be met. Consultations will be held with local business and civic interests as well as representatives of the municipal government. It is hoped that this survey will present a solution to the housing problem in the Newport area.

I shall be very happy to furnish you with any additional information you may require.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. MAHER,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
Chief of Base Maintenance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Wisconsin yields 2 minutes to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from New Hampshire also yields 2 minutes, making 4 minutes in all, to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment submitted by the Senators from Oregon [Mr. CORDON and Mr. MORSE] and the Senators from Washington [Mr. CAIN and Mr. MAGNUSON]. The subject matter of the amendment has not been considered by the committee. We have had no report from the Federal agencies involved, and we have had no estimates, so far as I know, of the amount of property that will be turned over to the housing authorities in the States of Washington and Oregon by Federal agencies. It is not a relief measure; it is not a charitable grant. We are turning this property over to local housing authorities. They will get title to the property without any cost whatever, and they will be permitted to charge rent to the flood victims. They will not have to remain

on the property nor comply with the terms of the bill more than a day, a week, or a month.

It is a proposal which should be given some study. We should not start to give away Federal property amounting probably to millions of dollars without any more consideration than can now be given to it on the floor of the Senate. I have 4 minutes in which to discuss and to oppose an amendment which was submitted last night. It was not even printed until this morning. In all fairness, if the amendment had merit, I would favor it. I have no lack of sympathy for the flood victims. We have voted millions for their relief. This is not that kind of a measure. It is a measure granting to municipal housing authorities, without cost, valuable property of the United States, including 2,005 dwellings in one project alone, the university homes project. It may be the right thing to do, but it should not be done in the last moments of the session under the existing circumstances. I am opposed to the amendment.

I may say that if we are to enter into a field of this kind in the Congress we have projects in Utah running into millions of dollars. There would be just as much justification for turning those projects over to the municipalities of Utah, Salt Lake City, Ogden, and other municipalities so as to give preference to veterans who are now without homes and transfer the properties to them without cost.

Under this amendment, rentals would be collected. It would be a money proposition for the municipal housing authorities in the two States of Washington and Oregon. I think, in common justice and fairness, the Senate ought to give the matter adequate consideration before agreeing to such an amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It is my understanding that during the recent regular session of the Congress, many bills were blocked because, as contended by many Members of this body, we should formulate a long-range program which would treat equitably all comparable cases. In the instant case, is it not questionable whether we are showing a preference with respect to this particular transfer in comparison with other proposals which have been shelved in the past?

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator is entirely correct. There were proposals from Idaho and from my own State of Utah relating to measures of this kind. They were opposed on the ground that no general policy had been adopted by the United States with reference to the disposal of property.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired. To whom does the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from New Hampshire have combined to yield a total of 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to submit an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon does not seem to be present at the moment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then the Senator from Wisconsin yields 30 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio for 30 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we have before us one of the two important measures to be considered at this session of the Congress. This is a peculiar session. It is a session called in the midst of a political campaign. It is not subject to ordinary rules. We cannot treat legislation in the ordinary way. When we returned we had the choice of opening the session to all legislation, of treating it as a regular session, of getting the committees going and putting all the machinery into action. If that were done, there was no hope that we could finish probably short of 2 months, at least.

Furthermore, the President then submitted a program which, if we had undertaken to consider it in detail, would easily have required 6 months before we could have taken up all the important measures, which involved many differences of opinion and which, after all, had not been neglected by Congress, but which in most cases simply involved disagreements between the Congress and the President. In that situation we were in the same position as were those who were in charge of the machinery of Congress in making a decision, and we made it in the statement which we issued at that time. I read from that statement, in part:

> In the President's program there is very little of an emergency nature. Most of the social welfare legislation proposed is of a permanent character—

And that applies to public housing—

> which can be considered more thoroughly next winter. The Democrats controlled Congress for 14 years, professing the greatest interest in social welfare legislation. Now they say that they failed to deal adequately with social security, education, health, and housing and blame the Republicans for not enacting the program they failed to enact during 14 years.
>
> We believe, therefore, that this session should be limited to a short period as suggested by the President himself, and our efforts will be devoted to completing the session as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I notice that yesterday the President referred to the fact that the House committee had refused to hear some of the Cabinet Members. We asked the Government to present all the witnesses they had, last Wednesday, but in many cases they were not ready. Mr. Bremer testified before our committee publicly, and was given the right to and has filed, I think, a statement with the House committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I am sorry, but I have no time, under the rule, to yield.

Continuing the statement:

> We will carefully examine all of the President's recommendations to determine whether there are any matters which can be dealt with promptly on an emergency basis.

On the particular question of housing we said:

> During the first week also, committees of both Houses will give further consideration to the housing problem and any proposals in respect thereto. Much already has been done to solve that problem. Stimulated by the legislation adopted by the Eightieth Congress, a million new dwelling units are being constructed this year, and their construction practically exhausts the materials and labor available for the purpose. This is more than twice the number of dwelling units constructed when the Truman administration, with every emergency power and millions of subsidy funds, was fumbling with the situation.

We may well remember that we gave the President every power to act. He established an administration under Mr. Wyatt which turned out to be such a complete failure that the President canceled the whole business and turned back four-fifths of the money which we had appropriated.

> We are deeply concerned with a long-range program increasing still further the number of homes to be constructed, but such a program involves serious complications and differences of opinion which cannot be dealt with adequately at this special session.

Mr. President, before signing that statement, I canvassed as thoroughly as I could the position of the House leaders who had opposed public housing, and I found that their position was still the same. It became clear to me that if that controversy were precipitated we would be here for several months. It was a permanent, long-range program, and, like many of the other things proposed by the President, it could be more adequately dealt with at the regular session.

So far as I myself am concerned, I propose to introduce at the next session a bill reinstating the general program of public housing and slum clearance, including rural housing, which is practically the same as the subsidized system which I am proposing for the cities.

So, Mr. President, the truth is that if we want the session to finish, we have substantially to agree with the House. It may be that the House is justified in its position, but the Constitution provides that no bill can pass unless the House, as well as the Senate, agrees to it. Both Houses have a veto on legislation. Doing the best I can, and with a sincere desire to put through a public-housing program, I recognize that it cannot be done at this time. Therefore we sought to develop a bill which would do everything that could be done without becoming involved in an extremely controversial long-term question of public housing.

We have probably built as many homes this year as we could have hoped to build if we had a public-housing program. The President's report, from which I read a few days ago, shows very clearly his own view that we have had a very successful housing program. He said:

> Residential construction is expected to increase the total supply of dwelling units by more than a million during 1948. This high output has been accompanied by an increase in costs that is outrunning consumers' ability to pay for the housing they need.

His advisers further say:

> This volume of residential construction is already straining the capacities of the construction industry in many areas and of producers of some construction materials, and is unquestionably competing with other primary national needs. This situation highlights what has become the chronic necessity of developing and applying new methods and substitute materials to the house-building industry.
>
> On the demand side, a distinction needs to be drawn between essential need and capacity to pay current costs. The basic housing needs of a growing population in the face of a serious and cumulative shortage would be sufficient to sustain the present level or even a higher level of home building for many years to come. But only a few years at most would be required to saturate the demand of those who can acquire houses at current costs, and that saturation would portend a serious downswing in residential construction.

What we have in this bill attempted to do is to develop and assist all private construction possible of as cheap houses as can be built under private construction. We have eliminated the main feature of the proposal which was made last year by the House and which, in fact, was in both bills at that time, to continue section 603 under which builders could borrow 90 percent of the value of one-, two-, and three-family houses and could build on a shoestring without having to put up any capital. That was the most inflationary feature of the program, and we eliminated it from this particular bill. While, according to the figures of the Department of Commerce, there have been built many more cheap houses than I thought would be possible, houses which, I assume, are mostly in rural areas and suburban districts, costing less than $3,250, exclusive of land, yet in general there have been too many houses built of the $10,000 to $12,000 class under section 603. We have eliminated that section so as not to encourage further the building of such homes.

The bill contains amendments to title I providing for a limited type of insurance for houses costing $4,500. The figure was $3,000, but we raised it to $4,500. Such houses can be built in the South and in rural districts. To a considerable extent we may hope that it will encourage the building of very cheap homes. A $4,500 home can be bought or rented by a man with a family, receiving an income of approximately $2,250. That gets down to a point which will cover today most of the 14,000,000 industrial workers and a great many others.

The amended title II provides special inducements for builders to construct homes costing not less than $6,000, which certainly is the very lowest price at which houses can be built in any urban community in the North. There is a special inducement offered by giving to the builders of such homes mortgages up to 85 percent. That is not the same as section 603, which provides for 90 percent, but it will require builders to put up some capital. It will require them to put up a much smaller percentage of the capital than if they built $10,000 or $12,000 homes. In other words, the effort is to stimulate the building of two $6,000 homes instead of one $12,000 home. Obviously it is no more inflationary to build two of $6,000 value than one of $12,000 value, and twice as many people will be taken care of. The general tenor of the bill is designed to encourage the construction of the cheaper homes.

The other main defect in the housing program has been the difficulty of getting anyone to build houses for rental; that is, larger scale projects on which the houses can be rented to a number of families. There was practically no success under title II of FHA in getting such rental houses built. The only sign of some kind of rental housing occurred under section 608, title VI, which is, I think, perhaps somewhat too liberal for builders, but under that some building of house rental projects was undertaken. So we have decided to continue section 608, hoping it may encourage the building of rental housing rather than the building of houses for sale, the sale of which is forced on many veterans who should not have to buy them, and who would prefer to live in rental housing.

In accordance with the general recommendation of the President regarding the need of developing new methods of building, cheaper methods of building, we also continued section 609, which encourages the construction of prefabricated homes, and section 611, which encourages the construction of a vast number of homes under prefabrication plans on the site, a special method which is hopefully adopted, although we reduce the mortgage which could be given on such homes to about $6,000, or limit the total cost of the house to about $7,500, as compared with $9,000 or $10,000 as the section formerly provided.

There are other provisions, for instance, the yield-insurance provision, proposing to insure insurance companies on equity investments, which was contained in both bills. It is an experiment. I do not think it is inflationary, because I do not believe any insurance companies are going ahead on that line for a year, probably, anyway. It will take a long time for them to get the State laws in shape, and make all their plans, and for the Government to work out the details. Yet I think it is an experiment worth adopting. Incidentally, it is not inflationary, because it merely takes the savings of people which have been paid in insurance policies, and invests them in this undertaking, instead of their being invested in some other form of construction program.

Mr. President, leaving out the public housing subsidies feature, which I think is necessary in dealing with the very lowest-income groups, the purpose of the bill is to exhaust, without inflationary effect, every means of accomplishing the desired objective on a private basis, through the insurance principle, turning the whole intention to the construction of cheap houses, and encouraging no longer the building of the more expensive houses.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the secondary market provision. Last year the Senate passed the Jenner bill, which provided for the use of "Fanny May," the Federal National Mortgage Association, set up by the RFC, which has been used before for the handling of secondary mortgages, to provide a secondary market for FHA mortgages. We passed the bill last year to give them more money for that purpose, up to $840,000,000.

There was a limitation in the bill, however, which provided that banks could sell to "Fanny May" only about 25 percent of the mortgages they had made since last April. That has proved to be a very considerable limitation. The current bill increases that to 50 percent of the mortgages made since last April. We are of course more interested in future mortgages than in past, and it happens that there are some seven billion dollars of these mortgages outstanding in the hands of the banks today, and the interest rate is going up. These mortgages bring in as a rule only 4 percent interest, and there is a danger that they will dump the whole amount on the Government if they use up the $840,000,000 at once on older mortgages. We are interested in providing a secondary market so that new mortgages can be made.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is offering as an amendment his bill, S. 2927. I think it would be unfortunate to adopt that bill. In effect it sets up a new secondary market in the hands of the Veterans' Administrator, who would be authorized to buy mortgages in any amount. I do not think there is any limit on the amount of money which the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to give him. I believe there is not any limit on the total dollar value of what a veteran may buy, so that the Veterans' Administrator is likely to be swamped with demands for billions of dollars of these mortgages. The Senator is somewhat more liberal, in providing 66⅔ percent instead of 50 percent so far as the mortgages which may be made by any bank are concerned.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will yield on that point, I am perfecting the bill by making the percentage 50 percent.

Mr. TAFT. On that point, then, the figure is the same, and under the Morse amendment the Administrator could buy mortgages which had been made for the last 5 years. I think it would be dangerous. We have tried to work out the best and most liberal provision consistent with not involving the Government with more than $840,000,000, and I think it would be unfortunate if this particular amendment were agreed to.

Mr. President, I have one amendment to the McCarthy amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, at the end of line 21, before the quotation

marks, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a comma, and the words "or not to exceed such percent per annum, not in excess of 5 percent, as the Administrator finds necessary to meet the mortgage market."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the $6,000 house to which I referred, under title II, was limited to a 4-percent interest rate. I am afraid it would be difficult to fix the limit at 4 percent, since the rate has gone up, and the bill authorizes the Administrator to raise the rate from 4½ to 5 if he finds it necessary. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will not accept the amendment as a part of his amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. The amendment is acceptable to the other members of the committee, and therefore I accept it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. How much more time have I, Mr. President?

Mr. FLANDERS. I am rising for necessary information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 9 minutes more.

The Chair understands the Senator from Wisconsin accepts the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio, and it becomes a part of the amendment now pending.

Mr. FLANDERS. I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the fact that there is no page 66 in the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I am sorry. I was using the committee print we had yesterday.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator's amendment was drafted in accordance with the committee print of yesterday. Page 66 refers to the committee print.

Mr. TAFT. It is on page 13, at the end of line 21, instead of on page 66, as I previously stated.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I say to the Senate in all sincerity that, because of the position of the House, no matter how we handle this matter, if we want a housing bill, I think the conferees, if there should be a conference, would, in the end, have to agree to a bill which did not include subsidized public housing in country and city. That is my conclusion, although I have done everything to persuade the gentlemen who are opposed to it in the House to the contrary. Under the circumstances, the House, being a coordinate body with the Senate, I think we gain nothing by being insistent. We could prolong this battle and stay here for some time, but the result, I believe, would be the same. In the interest of accomplishing what we want to accomplish, in the interest of obtaining the things which I believe are necessary, aside from the subsidized housing programs, I think the Senate would be wise to adopt the McCarthy amendment, and I urge very strongly that the Senate do so.

I shall be very glad to yield now to the Senator from Kentucky, if he wishes to ask any questions.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Ohio was talking about the Secretary of Agriculture not appearing before the committee. He was scheduled to appear before the committee on a day when the consideration of the wheat agreement in the Committee on Foreign Relations remained unfinished, and he had to go back before that committee to appear on that subject, which prevented him from appearing before the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. TAFT. He has appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; he has appeared before us.

Mr. BARKLEY. He has appeared before that committee?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Ohio intimated that he had not appeared.

Mr. TAFT. The Secretary said in a public statement yesterday that he had been refused opportunity to appear before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator said the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. He did appear before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and testified, and was cross-examined by the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to refer to an amendment which the Senator from Ohio agreed to last spring when we had the housing bill before us, and which was then adopted. It is noncontroversial in character. It makes it possible for States such as Massachusetts and, I believe, New York, who have their own State housing programs, to come under the benefit of this proposed law. The amendment is to be found on page 129 of the committee bill, section 607. I think the Senator from Ohio is familiar with the language. I have already spoken to the Senator from Wisconsin about it. He has agreed to accept it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is the page?

Mr. LODGE. Page 129 of the committee bill, section 607. It is a principle to which the Senator from Ohio gave his approval last spring when we had the housing bill before us.

Mr. TAFT. I certainly have no objection to it.

Mr. LODGE. Then, will the Senator from Wisconsin accept the amendment, which is the language contained on page 129 of the committee bill, section 607?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have discussed the amendment with the other two members of the subcommittee, and it is acceptable.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. The amendment begins in line 5, on page 129, and runs over to line 4 on page 130. My request, Mr. President, is that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin be modified so as to include that language.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] will be modified as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and as agreed to by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to offer Senate bill 2927 as a substitute for title II of the McCarthy substitute bill, beginning on page 21.

Mr. President, if we really want to do the job that needs to be done for the veterans on secondary markets for their loans, this amendment will do the job. I think the veterans of the country have the right to expect us to keep faith with our promise to make loans available to them for housing. This amendment will do just that.

With regard to the argument of the Senator from Ohio as to whether or not this amendment will result in dumping of existing paper, my answer is it will not. In the first place, these institutions need to make loans, and could not continue as lending institutions if they dumped their portfolios on the Federal Government.

Secondly, when the Federal Government created a secondary market through the RFC there was no evidence of dumping. This point is further borne out by the fact that only when it was reliably rumored that the secondary market in the RFC would be abolished, the lending institutions rushed to sell their loans to the Government. What the lending institutions need is assurance that there will be a market for the loans. My amendment gives them that assurance and that market.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks at this point my answers to a series of questions bearing upon my amendment. Two minutes does not give me the time to present a detailed discussion of the subject.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS REGARDING FEDERAL SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI LOANS

1. Question. What is needed to back up the veterans' home-ownership program established in the GI Act?

Answer. A full secondary market in the Federal Government whereby original lenders will be afforded an opportunity, when necessary, to sell loans made to GI's.

2. Question. Should this secondary market be established in the RFC or in the Veterans' Administration?

Answer. It does not matter where the market is placed, provided it is an open and full market. The Veterans' Administration would be preferable because it guarantees the loans.

3. Question. Should the authority to purchase GI loans include those heretofore made as well as those hereafter made?

Answer. Yes. Institutions already having large portfolios of these loans must have an outlet for such loans in order to make new GI loans.

4. Question. What is the main advantage of a Federal secondary market?

Answer. The primary advantage is the psychological value of a Government-sponsored secondary market. When supported by a secondary market in the Federal Government, a primary market is induced, by the aforesaid, among the large aggregations of capital, such as the large life insurance companies and other trustees.

5. Question. What volume of loans has already been made?

Answer. Approximately $7,000,000,000.

6. Question. Would lending institutions dump all of these loans on the Federal Government?

Answer. No. In the first place, these institutions need loans and could not continue as lending institutions if they dumped their portfolios on the Federal Government.

Secondly, when the Federal Government afforded a secondary market, through the RFC, there was no evidence of dumping during that period. This point is further borne out by the fact that only when it was reliably rumored that the secondary market in the RFC would be abolished did lending institutions rush to sell such loans to the Government.

7. Question. Would a full, free open market in the Federal Government for GI loans cost the Government any money?

Answer. No. The Government pays approximately 2.09 percent for its money, and these loans return 4 percent. Even if the lending institution were allowed a 1-percent service charge, the Government would still get a return on its funds invested in the purchase of GI loans in excess of that which it has to pay for money. Historically, it has been shown that the Government's mortgage operations have been profitable to the Government, instead of a loss.

8. Question. Can the Home Loan Bank System or the Federal Reserve System purchase GI loans?

Answer. No. The Federal Reserve System is set up for short-term credit and therefore cannot take such loans. The Home Loan Bank Board System only lends on such loans put up by the lending institutions as collateral, and then only in a very limited amount, not to exceed 25 percent of the paid-in capital of the lending institution.

9. Question. What is a reasonable servicing fee?

Answer. The agency providing the secondary market should be authorized to pay up to a maximum of 1 percent for servicing of the loans, i. e., collecting payments of principal and interest, paying taxes, etc. This is a usually accepted rate, and the average institution would not be able to service such loans without a loss at a rate lower than this.

10. Question. In creating a secondary market in the Federal Government, should additional safeguards be prescribed with regard to the character of the loan, the value of the home, or protection of the veteran in general?

Answer. This would not be necessary. The GI Act, as amended, now provides that any loan guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration should be secured by property of reasonable value, and should be appraised by an appraiser appointed by the Veterans' Administration. If the loan is sound as originally made, then it would be sound for purchase by the Federal Government under the secondary market set-up.

11. Question. Should the provision for a secondary market cover any loans regardless of the amount of the mortgage, if heretofore made?

Answer. Yes. Only with such an open market as that could lending institutions in many sections have a liquidity in their portfolios sufficient to warrant their making GI loans in the future. However, under S. 2927 we limit the amount of loans heretofore guaranteed to $12,000, as a reasonable limitation.

12. Question. Should there be any limit on the amount of the mortgage which could be purchased, if hereafter made?

Answer. Yes. It would be well to encourage lending on houses of limited cost in the future. It is therefore suggested that the purchase of loans hereafter be limited to those not exceeding $7,500, in order to bring to the veteran low-priced homes in the future.

13. Question. Is it true that the GI has been gypped on his home-loan purchases through faulty construction or otherwise?

Answer. No. The Veterans' Administration records show that they have received complaints on less than one-half of 1 percent of the total loans made. Even this amount could have been materially reduced if the Veterans' Administration had functioned in accordance with the provisions of the GI Act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the question addressed to me by the Senator from Wisconsin inquired yesterday as to the total amount of loans which would be covered by the bill being considered and as to the amount of authorization which would be required.

The total amount of loans which would be covered are the aggregate of $7,000,000,000 loans so far guaranteed by the Administrator and the dollar aggregate of loans so guaranteed over the months to come. The current monthly aggregate approximates $150,000,000.

As to the total authorization which will be necessary, I presume the Senator means how many of these loans will be offered to the Government for purchase from time to time. The Senator must know that no accurate estimate in that regard is possible. The aggregate to be offered will be dependent from time to time chiefly upon the alternative income yield which the institutions holding eligible loans can realize in the event they sell the allowed portion of their loans for recommitment in other obligations which would afford them more attractive media of investment. The Senator will recognize further that we have deliberately framed the bill along lines which encourage retention of outstanding loans, rather than along lines which would impel lenders to rush to the Government with their portfolios, as is the case in the alternative measures proposed or enacted along this line.

The best example and parallel which can be afforded the Senator is that experienced during the period from September 1946, through June 30, 1947, when an entirely open market, not even limited by the percentage of 50 percent proposed in the bill under consideration, was available to lenders. Up to May 1947, after some 8 months of operation, and with a total of around $4,000,000,000 outstanding over that period, less than $50,000,000 in such loans had been offered to RFC, despite the fact that its commitment arrangement encouraged and even compelled the offering of these loans to the Government. It is true that during the period from May 1 through the close of the market on June 30 an approximate additional $100,000,000 was purchased or committed for by RFC but that rush eventuated from the rumor that the action taken on June 30, 1947, by the Congress to eliminate the market, was in prospect. I think that we can, therefore, view with some confidence that so long as lenders are assured the assistance of such a market along the lines framed by this bill the tendencies they have demonstrated in the past to retain these loans in their portfolios will be the controlling factor and the Government need not fear that the offerings of lending institutions will in any way near approximate the maximum permitted by the bill.

It must be borne in mind further that even were the Government to be obligated to purchase a considerable dollar volume of these loans the result will be a greater profit rather than a greater loss to the Government. This stems first from the fact that the Government is already committed on its guaranty to nearly 50 percent of the amount of each individual loan and such guaranty will undoubtedly exceed any loss likely to eventuate due to the purchase of these loans under any foreseeable conditions, and secondly, from the fact the Government will net a yield of about 1 percent per annum on the aggregate amount of its purchases because of the spread between outlay and income.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a table showing the total outstanding FHA and GI mortgages, showing very clearly the need for my amendment.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total outstanding FHA and GI mortgages

FHA insured mortgages (1934 to date)	$9,795,000,000
GI home loans approved (face value of mortgages)	[1]7,601,000,000
Total	17,396,000,000

RFC OPERATIONS (FIGURES COVER LAST 10 YEARS)

FHA mortgage purchases:	
Purchased to date (June 30, 1948) (of which all except $44,563,000 repaid or sold)	$318,999,000
Outstanding commitments to purchase	241,998,000
GI home-loan-mortgage purchases (of which $133,644,000 are still held)	148,880,000

[1] About $3,400,000,000 of this total is guaranteed by VA.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask to have printed at this point in my remarks a statement headed "GI loans down 43 percent."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GI LOANS DOWN 43 PERCENT

In June 1947, 52,695 veterans applied for GI home loans; this June only 30,199 applied, a decrease of 43 percent. The unbroken downward trend in applications began last October, after applications had reached a peak of 52,700 loans in September. Here is convincing evidence of the failure of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act home-loan provisions to meet the needs of veterans at

this time. The 4-percent rate and the lack of an adequate secondary market have combined to block the original intent and assurances of Congress when this act was passed.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks statistics showing mortgages insured or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mortgages insured or guaranteed by Veterans' Administration—Purchase and commitment contracts combined

MONTHLY DATA

[In thousands of dollars]

Month	Authorized		Canceled, amount	Undisbursed, amount (net change) [1]	Disbursed amount	Repaid or credited, amount	Unpaid balance, amount (net change) [1]
	Number	Amount					
1946:							
October [2]	3	13			13		13
November	99	537		138	419		419
December	387	2,114		299	1,815	2	1,813
1947:							
January	954	5,313	10	574	4,729	11	4,718
February	1,194	6,629	82	−151	6,698	38	6,660
March	1,852	10,535	41	1,669	8,885	67	8,818
April	2,784	16,065	346	3,252	12,467	107	12,360
May	3,652	21,801	79	7,188	14,534	157	14,377
June	14,228	98,707	235	68,353	18,119	221	17,898
July [3]	14	[4] −806	9	−17,311	16,496	237	16,259
August	0	[4] −42	718	−15,817	13,057	370	14,687
September	[4] −12	[4] −8	657	−13,868	13,143	417	12,726
October			670	−9,513	8,843	883	8,460
November			335	−6,604	5,699	467	5,202
December		1	407	−4,921	4,515	396	4,119
1948:							
January		[4] −208	754	−3,116	2,054	612	
February			570	−2,640	2,070	480	
March		8	207	−1,690	1,491	638	
April			222	−1,427	1,205	672	
May			201	−1,130	929	619	
June			1,485	−2,641	1,156		

CUMULATIVE DATA (END OF MONTH)

1946:							
October	3	13			13		13
November	102	570		138	432		432
December	489	2,685		437	2,248	3	2,245
1947:							
January	1,443	7,998	10	1,011	6,977	13	6,964
February	2,637	14,627	92	859	13,676	52	13,624
March	4,489	25,162	133	2,468	22,561	119	22,442
April	7,273	41,227	478	5,721	35,028	226	34,802
May	10,926	63,028	557	12,909	49,562	383	49,179
June	25,148	149,735	792	81,262	67,681	604	67,077
July	25,162	148,929	801	63,951	84,177	841	83,336
August	25,162	148,887	1,519	48,134	99,234	1,211	98,023
September	25,150	148,879	2,176	34,326	112,377	1,628	110,749
October	25,150	148,879	2,846	24,813	121,220	2,041	119,209
November	25,150	148,879	3,181	18,809	126,889	2,478	124,411
December	25,150	148,880	3,588	13,888	131,404	2,874	128,630
1948: June	25,150	148,880	7,027	1,244	140,309		133,644

[1] Net change applies to monthly data.
[2] Authority created.
[3] Authority ended.
[4] Decreases due to adjustments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me one more minute?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for one more minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the McCarthy substitute I must announce that I will have to vote against it, not only because of its demerits but also because of the parliamentary procedure which is being used in connection with it. Some of us on this side of the aisle are being asked to eat political crow filled with political poison. We are being asked to swallow our convictions and reverse the vote we cast just a few months ago in support of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I say the place to work out any compromise on this legislation is in conference. Under the statesmanship of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] we passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill last spring. It was a sound bill then. It is a sound bill now. The Senator has safeguarded it with all the conditions and checks necessary to prevent socialization of housing in this country.

Mr. President, I will not go back on the vote previously cast in the Senate, because one thing I stand on as a constitutional liberal is a record of consistency in the Senate of the United States. The place for the Republican side of the aisle to adjust differences on this issue of housing is in conference, and then let the conferees give us their last best compromise on the issue. We should stand on our rights and our convictions in the Senate and not let leaders in the House dictate to us the form in which our legislation must be sent to the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the deep sincerity with which the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] have approached this matter. However, when the T-E-W bill was before the Senate in the first instance I voted in favor of it. I believe that the provisions in it for low-cost housing and slum clearance will be extremely helpful to the people of the State of Connecticut. Therefore I support that bill again.

In the second place, Mr. President, had the entire membership of the House had an opportunity to pass upon this question and to express their legislative will and had voted against it, I would feel entirey different than I do. But since the entire membership of the House has never had an opportunity to vote upon the T-E-W bill, I feel that an opportunity should be presented to them.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall support the T-E-W bill again, and vote against the minority amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I inquire how much time the Senator from Wisconsin has left.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. And how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Twenty-eight minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the two Senators from Oregon [Mr. CORDON and Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and myself have an amendment pending to the bill. It is in the nature of an emergency amendment. It involves the housing of the so-called disaster-relief families, victims of the Columbia River flood catastrophe of some weeks ago. Inasmuch as my time is limited I cannot discuss the amendment, but I want the RECORD to show my argument on the matter which contains several figures and statistics showing the absolute necessity of doing something for the housing of those families at this time. We all regret that we have to place the amendment on the bill, but it seems vital and necessary that we do so.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I have prepared on this subject be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the statement referred to will be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The statement prepared by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

ARGUMENT FOR TRANSFER OF HOUSING TO PORTLAND-VANCOUVER AUTHORITIES

About 5,300 families were made homeless by the Columbia River June floods in the Vancouver-Portland area. Most of these flood victims were living in Vanport—a Federal war housing project.

In both Portland and Vancouver an extremely tight housing situation prevailed even before the flood. These 5,300 families—over 20,000 people—therefore, confront an impossible situation. Winter is coming on, stop-gap housing is inadequate, and the prospect of permanent home construction, at prices they can afford, is dark, indeed.

Too, Vancouver and Portland face a serious community problem. Flood victims are now housed in war-constructed temporary housing, in trailers, and in homes where the private owners have rented rooms to help meet the emergency. Unless plans are developed now for rehousing these people in permanent construction, what is presently called temporary or emergency housing will become permanent. Both communities then will find themselves saddled with highly undesirable slum areas.

Both Portland and Vancouver have recognized the problem and want to do something about it. Through their Housing Authorities they want to meet this problem themselves. They are merely asking us to give them the opportunity to do so.

The amendment I have offered will give Vancouver and Portland an opportunity to devise a permanent solution to the housing emergency created by the Columbia River flood. It provides that title to certain federally owned temporary housing units and land be transferred to these housing authorities. Two thousand nine hundred and ninety-three units constructed during the war and 457 acres are affected.

These units were erected to house war workers. The law requires they be dismantled and disposed of by January 1, 1950. All houses involved are now fully occupied. Unless a plan for replacing them with permanent construction at reasonable cost is devised, the units will probably still be occupied in 1950.

During the war the land involved was the site of temporary housing for war workers. The housing situated there has been torn down and removed. Streets, sewers, and other utilities have already been dedicated to the city of Vancouver. On this site the Vancouver Housing Authority proposes to build permanent houses. As these permanent structures are completed families now housed in temporary quarters will be given an opportunity to occupy new homes—either by purchase or rental.

We have a precedent for transferring title to these local public agencies. All Senators will recall that on June 18 of this year we passed the so-called McGregor bill, H. R. 5710. This bill gave colleges and universities title to temporary war housing located on property owned or leased by them. The total number of housing units involved was approximately 129,000—far greater than the number affected by the amendment we are discussing.

The junior Senator from Washington, the senior Senator from Indiana, Mr. CAPEHART, and the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. REVERCOMB, among others participated in the discussion advocating passage of the McGregor bill. They emphasized the fact that transfer of temporary housing to colleges and universities would actually save the Federal Government money—in the long run. As the junior Senator from Washington stated on that occasion, and I quote from page 8717 of the RECORD:

"I may say to the Senator from West Virginia that if this property is conveyed to American educational institutions, the institutions will assume the burden of maintenance and repair; and the Senator from West Virginia is conclusively correct when he understands that a great deal of money will be spent by the Federal Government for the maintenance of the property."

The property we now propose conveying to Portland and Vancouver Housing Authorities will likewise entail outlays for maintenance and repair by the Federal Government. The communities in the flood area will assume these costs. To the extent of the transfer, the Federal Government will be out of the housing picture in the area. The communities themselves will be given a workable opportunity to solve their own problems.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope this amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, because of the exigencies of the situation, a situation which is very tense, and because of the fact that time is so extremely precious due to the great demand on the part of Senators for time to speak, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and I have agreed to ask the Senate to give us eight more minutes.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement heretofore entered into with respect to the time of voting at 1 o'clock be modified, so that instead of at 1 o'clock the vote be taken at 1:08, and that the rule requiring the call of the roll to establish the presence of a quorum be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and the order heretofore made is amended accordingly.

Mr. TOBEY. It is understood that the time will be divided equally between the Senator from Wisconsin and myself.

I now yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the able chairman.

About all any of us can do in the brief time allotted to us is to record our views and convictions relative to the issue involved here today. If there is anything that means a better America, it is to put the families of America in better homes and in decent environment. If there is anything that will aid in curtailing juvenile delinquency in America, it is the creation of more wholesome home and community conditions under which the children of America may grow to adulthood.

It seems to me that a fundamental issue has been presented here. Do we favor the more liberal point of view? Do we favor the more democratic governmental policy? Do we favor a program of greater assistance in affording adequate, decent rural and urban homes to the people of the country? Or do we favor a policy that will minimize, curtail, and limit the assistance which the Government of the United States may afford to the people of the country in getting decent homes or housing? Indecent housing is a public shame today.

Mr. President, slum clearance, rural housing, and the expansion of the housing program would be aided, progressed, and forwarded by the committee amendment. By the McCarthy amendment that program would be curtailed and restricted. It seems to me that when the simple issue is presented to the Senate of the United States, if we really appreciate what it means to America, her present and her future, we will give our unqualified support to that program and that bill which will give the greatest housing assistance to the people of the country.

For that reason I shall support the committee bill and oppose the amendments.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I think it is well for the Senate to keep in mind, first, what heretofore has been done with reference to this legislation. The Seventy-ninth Congress passed this same legislation. The House failed to act on it. In the first session of the Eightieth Congress the Senate passed it again, and the House failed to act on it. Then there was appointed a joint committee between the two Houses to make a study of the housing situation. That committee held hearings all over the country, and then issued a report. That report was agreed to unanimously, with the exception of two items, and, as I recall, on those two items only two Members dissented. They were the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER], who dissented on the public housing and rural housing sections of the report.

Following that, amendments were prepared and offered in the Senate to Senate bill 866, in keeping with the recommendations of the joint committee, which consisted of 7 Members of both Houses, 4 Republicans from each House and 3 Democrats from each House. Those amendments were agreed to in the Senate.

Then there was prepared and offered to the Senate the rural housing substitute for the recommendation of the committee. That was prepared and offered by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The Senate agreed to that rural housing provision as a substitute for the recommendation of the joint committee.

All those provisions are carried today in the bill which is before the Senate. Four provisions are not carried in the McCarthy substitute, namely, public housing, slum clearance, research, and rural housing. There is not a single provision in the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin which would give any help whatsoever to any of the farmers of the country in building houses. That is one of the crying needs of any housing program. We cannot hope to have an adequate over-all building program unless we include something for the farm population.

I agree that the provisions of the McCarthy amendment are good so far as they go. I think every member of our committee agrees that they are good so far as they go. But I should like to call attention to this point: If we pass the bill as the committee has recommended it, and get the conference to which we are entitled between the House and the

Senate, every single clause, every single provision, every single word in the McCarthy substitute will be available at the conference table, to be placed in the bill if the conferees see fit to do so.

We are entitled to a conference. That is all we are asking for. The legislative procedures which have been established give us the right to expect a conference between the two Houses on this legislation. No person has the right to set himself up as an absolute dictator over legislation and say that no conference will be granted. We are entitled to a conference, and that is all we are asking for. Regardless of the threats which have been made, as reported on the floor of the Senate, I believe that we shall get a conference if we pass this bill as the committee has recommended it.

We have been threatened before. For example, we were told, when the Senate passed a bill for consumer credit controls, that the House would never accept it, that we would never get an agreement to it, that we would never get a conference. But there was sent back here a few days ago—only yesterday, in fact—a bill from the House agreeing to consumer credit controls; and this morning our committee accepted those consumer credit controls, and we are going to send the bill back to the House, where the House will accept our amendments or ask for a conference.

We were told at the end of the last session that unless we agreed to the House housing bill, without change, there would be no housing legislation. But in the very last minutes of that session we saw a housing bill come back, regardless of how inadequate it was.

I believe that we will get the conference to which we are entitled if we stick by the committee and by the former action of the Senate, and pass the bill that has been reported.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I do not plan to argue at this time the complete question of the advisability of public housing or some of the other things which are left out of the proposed substitute. However, I do wish, for the benefit of Senators on this side of the aisle—those on the other side can engage themselves as they please—to read the section on public housing in the Republican Party platform:

> Housing can best be supplied and financed by private enterprise; but government can and should encourage the building of better homes at less cost. We recommend Federal aid to the States for local slum clearance and low-rental housing programs only where there is a need that cannot be met either by private enterprise or by the States and localities.

I briefly call the attention of my Republican confreres to the fact that our platform provides for subsidies. The bill provides that there shall be no interference or competition with any private-for-profit construction; and certain guaranties are made to local housing authorities set up under the laws of the States involved.

I wish now to address myself briefly to a more serious problem. Yesterday the Presiding Officer of the Senate read from page 324 of Jefferson's Manual. This is not a binding rule of the Senate. It is good advice from a Democratic statesman whom we all respect, whether we be Democrats or Republicans. I should like to read that paragraph again:

> It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House, or the particular votes or majorities on it there—

This is the part which I wish to emphasize—

> because the opinion of each House should be left to its own independency, not to be influenced by the proceedings of the other.

I am aware that there are practical problems involved in our sending our own bill to the House of Representatives in spite of the fact that there have been repeated statements that no bill containing public-housing provisions will be considered by the House. However, I wish to say that I have no doubt in my own mind that, nevertheless, the House of Representatives would permit any bill we might pass to go to conference. It is inconceivable that the House would not allow any bill we might pass to go to conference. The implications of such action on the part of the House would be so serious that the House would not wish to face them.

I simply ask the Senate to follow the recommendations of that great statesman, Thomas Jefferson, and make up its own mind, and send the bill to conference. I have every confidence in the established conference procedure, and that we can bring out of the conference legislation which will be appropriate to the situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. TOBEY. I inquire, how much time have I remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire has 15 minutes, plus an additional 4 minutes, or a total of 19 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I might suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that in view of the fact that he has 19 minutes and I have 14 minutes, I wish he would use up 4 minutes of his time, so as to equalize the amount of time remaining to each side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin also has 19 minutes, under the extension of the time limitation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, before going into any discussion of the over-all matter before us, I desire to offer a modifying amendment to the substitute bill which now is under consideration.

This amendment would substitute for the Administrator's estimate of the value of these veterans' projects, when completed, his estimate of December 31, 1947, replacement costs. The latter basis is the one used in the new section 608 and all present bills on the subject, and is, I am informed, recommended by the FHA as a more practical noninflationary basis of valuation. This will make it possible for veterans' projects already planned under December 1947 estimates to be expeditiously developed under FHA assured mortgages under section 207 (c).

So, Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment, which is in line with the description I have just given. The amendment has been agreed to by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, in line 4, it is proposed to strike out "will be the value of the project"; in line 5 it is proposed to strike out "when the proposed improvements are completed" and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "as the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I accept that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New York then becomes a part of the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, now to get down to the over-all proposition which is facing us, let me say that I yield to no one, either in or out of the Congress of the United States, in my advocacy of and in my desire for slum clearance and public housing. It is the only way I know of by which the slums can be cleared and decent, livable dwellings can be provided for those in the lowest-income groups. In line with this attitude, during the last session of this Congress I supported the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; and I opposed, so far as I was able to do so, all other housing legislation which appeared now and then and which was calculated, in my opinion, to defeat the purposes of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. My record on this matter is definite and indisputable.

But, Mr. President, in this special session we are not faced with that situation. Today we are faced with quite a different situation. W are now faced with a situation in which this Congress must pass some kind of workable, effective housing legislation. As I see it, Mr. President, for us of the Senate at this time to stand on our constitutional rights—and I do not deny them—and, in our position as an independent legislative body, to insist upon what we may believe to be our prerogative to pass legislation very similar to or identical with the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, would be a grave mistake. All of us know what happened to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill in the House of Representatives. All of us know that even if this matter were to go to conference, as it easily might, the chances are that there would be no public housing and no slum clearance legislation enacted by both Houses of the Congress at this session. Moreover, if we pursue such a course, which I have indicated, and pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill with those provisions in it, we shall jeopardize the chance of obtaining any housing legislation whatever.

We know what happened at the last session; we know that we got no housing legislation worthy of the name out of that session; and we can well recognize, if we are realists at all in legislative matters, that, with the same kind of Senate action now, the very same result can reasonably be expected to occur now.

Mr. President, may I have a little more time allotted to me? I should like to complete what I have to say.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from New York as much more time as he may need, although I hope he will make his remarks brief.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, as I understand it, the provisions of the substitute amendment are even better than those of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, aside from matters pertaining to slum clearance and public housing. The substance of the substitute bill in its present form is absolutely indispensable.

So I am going to be realistic; and in order to help insure that we get some housing legislation, which is vitally needed and which we must have at this time, I propose to vote and intend to vote for this substitute bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Am I to understand that the junior Senator from New York speaks to this subject not only for himself but also for the Governor of New York?

Mr. IVES. No; the Senator from New York wishes to make very clear that he is speaking only for himself. The Senator from New York has not discussed this question with the Governor of New York, either lately or at any other time.

However, the Senator from New York would point out that the record of the Governor of New York on public housing and veterans' legislation speaks for itself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from Wisconsin yielding any further time?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. TOBEY. I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on former occasions I have expressed my deep convictions with reference to this legislation. Obviously within the time limitation under which we now work, it is impossible to go into further detail regarding the matter at this time.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] seems obsessed with the idea that the President of the United States has asked Congress to pass adequate housing legislation for political reasons and with political motives. If the Congress of the United States, which adjourned in June, or at least a coordinate branch of the Congress, the Senate of the United States, had given the House of Representatives an opportunity to vote on what the Senate passed, the President of the United States in all likelihood would not have been compelled to call Congress back in order to pass adequate legislation. The Senator from Ohio apparently has surrendered his position on the question; whether out of conviction or of expediency I do not know, and I am not concerned; but it seems to me unfortunate, to say the least, that the Congress as a whole without regard to any political implications, without regard to any issues which may be drawn from its action or its failure to act, is denied the opportunity to vote on the sort of housing bill it might easily vote to enact if given an opportunity.

The Senator from Ohio may surrender his position, either through conviction or expediency or at the point of a shotgun, but I do not myself propose to surrender my convictions upon the housing situation. It seems to me it is a denial of the democratic process of legislation for any man or any group of men in any legislative body to deny their own members the right to pass upon a bill the Senate has passed and sent to them, by saying they will not even allow it to go to conference if we pass it again.

The Senator from Ohio referred the other day to a report the President sent to the Congress. He had the privilege, which none of the rest of us enjoy, of seeing that report 24 hours before it was made available to the rest of us, through the courtesy of one of the members of the committee. But the housing referred to in that report and the housing the Senator from Ohio now uses as an alibi, so to speak, for not supporting the pending bill as reported by the committee, do no good to the low-income groups of the country. Under that program no veteran can build or buy a house. The veterans of the country have asked us to provide them houses, or to provide them the possibility of building or buying houses. Instead of giving them a house, we do not even give them a dugout or a pillbox. The low-income people of the country have asked Congress to make it possible for them to buy or build houses or to acquire them. We not only do not give them a house or the opportunity to have a house; we do not even allow them a trailer or a tent or a shed in which they may house themselves and their families.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, there is no politics in this. I voted for public housing in the bill that passed the Senate in June. I shall vote for it today. I voted for slum clearance then, and I am for it now. We know that those who own the slums will never remove them. They will not tear them down and build new houses for those who are compelled to occupy them because they cannot obtain better houses in the communities and cities in which they live. The only way by which they will ever be removed and decent housing conditions provided for millions of our people who cannot help themselves now because of their economic inability will be for the Government of the United States to help in the process of their removal and their replacement with decent houses.

I could go into a great deal of detail about the desirability of that, but I do not have the time to do it. When this question was before the Senate at the last session, the McCarthy amendment or substitute was defeated by a vote of 49 to 35. Surely a majority of the Senate is not now to be intimidated by a threat from any source as an excuse for reversing its position taken only a few weeks ago.

Does the Chair indicate that my time has expired?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Chair for giving me that admonition. I shall vote against the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, and with great pleasure and deep conviction vote for the bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces that the Senator from New Hampshire has 11 minutes at his disposal, the Senator from Wisconsin 10 minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, when the pending bill was before the Congress in the latter days of the regular session, I was more than happy to follow the leadership of the Senator from Ohio in promoting what was known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I am amazed at this particular time to find the distinguished Senator from Ohio reversing himself, primarily as he says upon the theory that it is an inflationary bill. If it is an inflationary bill today, it was an inflationary bill when we passed it only a few weeks ago. What has happened here is not economic inflation but political inflation that has taken hold of some of the Members who are ready to reverse the position they took a few weeks ago. I am amazed to find my friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], saying that the Republican candidate for President has said nothing to him or apparently to anyone else on the floor of the Senate about the great controversial question of housing that exists in this country today.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not have the time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, has telegraphed Governor Dewey as to where he stands upon this, and asked him whether he will not say something. That telegram has been unanswered. A. F. Whitney, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, sent a similar message. His telegram remains unanswered. Walter Reuther, a leader in the Congress of Industrial Organizations, has also telegraphed Governor Dewey. His telegram remains unanswered by the nervous man in Albany, N. Y.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has told the country time and time again where he stands upon housing legislation, and with all the sincerity I possess, I believe the great Governor of New York owed it to the Congress and to the people of the country to make a statement upon this controversial issue which is before the Senate.

He is the leader of the Republican Party at the present time. He is the candidate for President upon the Republican ticket. When an issue so vital, so important to millions of people in the low-income groups of the Nation, is before us as it is today, I seriously contend that the gentleman representing the Republicans in the great campaign to come should have spoken out as clearly and as definitely and as bravely as the President of the United States has spoken upon the issue. As I said before, it is not a question of inflation, it is a question of political expediency or political inflation at this moment, when we find Senators who have acted with courage in the past reversing their position now. I have never known a man more courageous than the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Everyone knows where he stands on every question. It probably was a great detriment to him in the Republican convention at Philadelphia that he has always been courageous in discussing and voting on measures, regardless of what they were, and regardless of the outcome but today I confess I am somewhat puzzled at this sudden change of heart. Today we find him reversing his position on a bill which he sponsored and which caused many of us to follow him in the fight we had upon the question of housing.

I shall not retreat, Mr. President, upon this important question. My convictions were with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and those who voted in the majority at that time, and I shall maintain that position by the vote which I shall cast today.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as one who supported every part of the housing bill which was passed by the Senate at the last session, which included public housing and slum clearance, I rise today to support the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. If I believed for a moment that this Congress, before it adjourns, could pass the bill reported by the committee today, I would support the committee's position. However, I am thoroughly convinced that as a practical matter, if we send back to the House of Representatives the bill upon which it has refused to act up to this time, a bill similar to this committee bill, that it will not act upon the bill, and we will adjourn without any helpful legislation upon this subject.

I am in favor of slum clearance and public housing at this time. Ordinarily, I would not be in favor of the Government's going into the business of building houses, but I know there are many families without homes, and, therefore, a situation is presented requiring Government help.

I have always taken the position that private endeavor, so far as it can meet the needs of our people and a growing country, should be left alone if it can in fact meet the situation and the needs of the people. But when the national requirements extend beyond the ability of private investment to proceed and beyond private means to build, then I think the Government should step in and help to quickly solve a widespread and pressing problem.

We face here a very practical question on this bill, and that is, Shall we take half a loaf or none? Shall we get a bill passed, a law enacted, with some good in it, though not all that we want, or shall we so act as to get no bill and consequently no help whatsoever?

Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield me another minute?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield one more minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much additional time does the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. One minute.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have before me a telegram which I desire to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I do not have time to read it. It deals with the need of financing housing for veterans in my State. I hope sincerely that the bill which will be passed by the Senate today will be passed also by the House and that it will meet the needs of the veterans and other persons.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *August 6, 1948.*
Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

An announcement has been made today by the Public Housing Administration re offering for sale the homes comprising the Ordnance Park project, in compliance with the provisions of the Revercomb bill, S. 2268. In connection with this announcement we have learned that these homes can be financed only to the extent of 80 percent. We, the veterans of Ordnance Park, request your assistance in securing the benefits that Congress has plainly indicated it thinks veterans should have, that is, combination FHA and GI financing of veterans' homes so that younger veterans who have not had time to accumulate the required down payment, but who, nevertheless, are good credit risks, can provide themselves and their families with adequate homes. We find in an extensive survey, comprising all of the local FHA approved mortgagors, that there is not a single one of these institutions that will write a combination GI-FHA loan. The only thing they offer is straight title II, 80-percent loans at 4½-percent interest. We feel that the intent of Congress in this matter is perfectly clear—that veterans should be permitted to buy homes on a combination FHA-GI loan or section 610 (90 percent at 4 percent) and we feel that the lower interest rate for the GI loan of 4 percent is the determining factor for these financial institutions refusing to make these loans and we feel that while they are enjoying the benefits of the FHA financing that they should not be permitted to ignore some of the FHA plans and concentrate on the ones which provide them with the most advantageous returns. We respectfully and urgently request you to try with every means in your power to have Congress clearly indicate that any financial institution who is writing FHA loans must write section 610 and GI loans or not write any FHA loans at all. Unless action is taken to make these lending institutions comply with all the FHA financing plans, the greater majority of the people of Ordnance Park will be unable to buy the homes that they now occupy because, to speak plainly, they do not have the necessary $1,200 to $1,500 in cash which is required under title II and is not required under a GI-FHA combination loan. Upon contact with several of the national veterans' organizations, we find that this is a condition that is not confined to the Kanawha Valley. To further substantiate the survey that we have made on the lending institutions we quote the following excerpts from an article in the Charleston Gazette Thursday morning, August 5. "The houses also are eligible for financing under the GI-loan plan which originally would have permitted a veteran to borrow almost 100 percent value on the house. While this combination FHA and GI financing plan is still approved by the Government, it is doubtful if any of the veterans will be able to find a lending institution to accept a combined loan according to a survey yesterday of a dozen different companies—not a single company official interviewed said they would be willing to go along with this plan. FHA loans to purchasers of houses in Ordnance Park will be insured under a 4½-percent interest rate. To qualify for buying one of the properties, a veteran must have available a down payment of about $1,200 to $1,500."

Under the terms of the Revercomb bill, these houses are being sold at the 1941 construction cost. In 1941 title VI financing was available to anyone purchasing a home provided he met the required credit qualifications and in one instance, here in St. Albans, in 1941 homes were sold under title VI with no down payment, the down payment being amortized over a 3-year period. This was known as the Belvil Park project of St. Albans. We feel that in spite of the considerable advance in construction costs which makes these houses a preferred mortgage risk at these prices, that the certified FHA mortgagors are discriminating against the veterans and are attempting to obtain higher interest rates than Congress contemplated the veteran paying for homes in this price bracket, and again, we urge you to help us secure our lawful rights and benefits. We feel that we are a part of the citizens of the United States whose credit is pledged to guarantee all FHA loans and we feel that financial institutions who are enjoying the security afforded to them by Government guaranties of their loans should be forced to follow the will of Congress and make loans under all plans that are authorized. Your record of splendid cooperation with us on veterans' housing assures us that effective action will be taken on this appeal.

Respectfully,
VETERANS' TENANTS ORGANIZATION,
Ordnance Park, St. Albans, W. Va.
FRANK D. BARKALOW, *President.*
J. E. SHIPP, *Secretary.*
FRANK LOHNSTEIN.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly. As previous speakers have pointed out, I have supported all the measures which heretofore have been presented for slum clearance and public housing. I twice supported the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and I propose to support hereafter all legislation containing the purpose of that bill. But I recognize that, as has been brought out in the debate, we are facing a condition, not a theory. I feel that it is vitally important that we pass housing legislation at this session, going as far as we can go in agreement with the House. It is positive progress to pass the pending amendment even without the slum-clearance and public-housing features, which I am convinced would never pass the House at this emergency session.

It is a very difficult vote for me, but I shall support the McCarthy amendment which is supported by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who I know has made every possible effort to bring about an agreement between the House and the Senate. I think it is a sound approach, and I shall support it from that standpoint. I do not feel for 1 minute that I am surrendering my allegiance to slum clearance and public housing, but even if such legislation were passed at this session we would not have time to get it working before the next Congress. So I shall support the McCarthy amendment, because I think it is the right choice of alternatives in this emergency session.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield a half minute to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, during the recent session no long-term program has been outlined for real-estate needs. In view of the fact that an amendment is now pending to this measure which would perhaps change drastically the situation in that respect, I am impelled to offer an amendment to the McCarthy substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. His amendment will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin has 5 minutes and the Senator from New Hampshire has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to myself 4 minutes.

Let me, first, compliment the statesmanlike approach to the problem by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. He has for years been fighting for slum clearance and public housing. At this time he recognizes that we must adopt the McCarthy amendment or have no housing legislation at all.

I want also to compliment the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the other Senators who have felt so strongly in favor of public housing and who now are voting for the substitute bill prepared by Senators BRICKER, BUCK, and McCARTHY because they also recognize that a vote against the McCarthy amendment is a vote against any and all housing legislation, regardless of how they personally feel about public housing.

I point out—and if I am incorrect, I hope the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] will correct me in the 8 minutes which remain to him—that there is not a single objection by either the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] or the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] or any other Senators to anything in the McCarthy amendment. It is a poor man's housing bill. It liberalizes loans for low-cost housing; it liberalizes loans for veterans' cooperatives; it increases the secondary market. Unless these things are done, a year from now the housing situation will be much more acute than it is today. Unless we adopt the McCarthy amendment we shall have no housing legislation. After all, it is extremely ridiculous for this body to say that our solution of the housing problem is again to send to the House the identical bill which we sent it 4 months ago. A majority of the House Rules Committee has decided that that bill is not wanted. There has been an attempt in the House to have more than half of the House membership sign a petition to compel the Committee on Rules to report the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill in its present form, so that it may be acted on by the House. Despite tremendous pressure, the House has fallen far short of getting that number, which indicates that a majority of the House itself does not at this time want public housing.

I spent months drafting a slum-clearance provision. After we perfected by amendment the public-housing section I supported the public-housing section. However, I am not voting for it today because we all know that is the most effective way to prevent any housing legislation at this session. I am sure that the Senator from New Hampshire recognizes that unless we adopt the subcommittee amendment which is known as the McCarthy amendment, just as certainly as we are here today there will be no housing legislation. Let me cite one example of what will happen. In the State of New York, there are presently under construction 800 units in one veterans' cooperative project. The Commissioner of Housing in New York has told us, through the office of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], that unless we pass this legislation they cannot complete construction of that project. We can multiply that example by 200 or 300 or 500 in other sections of the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. TOBEY. For how long?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For 8 minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, first I wish to say that I welcome sincerely to the Senate the goodly group of the Members of the House of Representatives who are in the rear of the Chamber, who have come over for edification and understanding.

Mr. President, I rise today in earnest opposition to the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. He has waved the bogey of no housing. I cannot for a minute agree. The only question before the Senate is as to whether or not it will reopen or reject its long-held position in favor of housing legislation under the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

The Senator from Wisconsin has done a good job in polishing up a few sections of—guess what, Mr. President—the T-E-W bill. Yes; all that the Senator from Wisconsin has done is propose a substitute that will benefit the builders and those wealthy and moderately well-to-do people who can afford to buy their own homes. But what is done about those many fellow Americans who, through no fault of their own, are in no position at this time to enter into loan contracts, no matter how liberal the terms may be? The answer is, absolutely nothing.

The Senator from Wisconsin said, with a quaver in his voice and pathetic pseudo sympathy, "This is a poor man's housing bill." What a distorted understanding he represents. The poor would be denied under the McCarthy substitute. There would be no public housing, no slum clearance, for long-range purposes. I deplore this omission. But more important, Mr. President, the Senate itself shares my attitude, for three times the Senate of the United States has recorded itself for the inclusion of public housing and slum clearance.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin makes a pseudo effort on the Senate floor, but there is the RECORD of last April. He voted "No" on public housing. Trust the friends of public housing, and not its enemies.

Mr. President, the McCarthy substitute expressly omits any aid to rural housing. The Russell-Young amendment, adopted on the floor of the Senate, provides for long-term loans and subsidies, in some cases, to aid the farmers of the Nation. I regret this omission also.

Briefly, I have told the Senate what the McCarthy substitute does not contain. Let me say, conversely, that with a few technical variations, House bill 6959, as the committee amended it to conform to the T-E-W bill as passed by the Senate, contains all that the McCarthy amendment does and much more. The Senator rose and said that I would doubtless agree that the bill he brought before us has all the good qualities of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. All the Senator has done has been to gut the bill, to take the guts out of the bill, cut the heart out of it, and there is only the skeleton left. The heart of the bill is public housing and slum clearance for the little people of this country.

Now let us show up this inconsistency here today. I wish slowly to list what the committee bill provides, which the Senate will undoubtedly adopt, after rejecting the inadequate McCarthy substitute, will do for the homeseekers of America. It will provide:

First. Public housing: Authorizing up to 500,000 units of public low-rent housing to be undertaken over a 5-year period.

Second. Slum clearance: A 5-year program with loans to cities and some Federal subsidies.

Third. Farm housing: Providing long-term loans at low interest and subsidies where needed to bring increased building of homes on farms; originated and carried through by the true friends of the farmers of outstanding merit, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Fourth. Provide a secondary market for GI home loans and Federal Housing Administration—insured mortages.

Fifth. Extends FHA mortgage operations in varying degrees for different types of housing.

Sixth. Provide aids in connection with equity and mortgage financing, and

for cooperative ownership housing, particularly veterans' cooperatives.

Seventh. Provide for a special $1,000,000,000 (B) program of yield insurance, to be administered by FHA, and designed to encourage direct investment by institutional and other large-scale investors in rental housing for families of moderate income.

The issue is crystal clear. A vote for the McCarthy substitute is a complete reversal of the long-held Senate position as to housing.

I cannot believe that this, the so-called greatest deliberative body in the world, will permit this to happen. Reject the McCarthy substitute and let the T-E-W bill as amended go into fair and competitive conference with the House. Let the democratic processes prevail.

Mr. President, in the back of this Chamber, around the walls, is a great group of distinguished Members of the House of Representatives. Let me say to these gentlemen that I am talking to them. They have been denied by their House leadership the right to vote on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Their Rules Committee chairman would not let them vote on it. They know that beyond peradventure. Let the democratic processes prevail.

Mr. President, a just and comprehensive housing program will result if we follow this procedure. Then that great bipartisan coalition which has consistently labored for adequate housing will be upheld. Remember, Senators, your previous votes, when by 49 to 37 you sustained public housing.

The Senator from Ohio, for whom I have a deep affection, said, "I am going to wait until next year and then we will bring the bill in." Let me say to my colleagues, why wait until next year? Eventually, why not now?

We are here today, this is our day, this is our duty and privilege. God grant that we may measure up to it. What about next year? Some of us will not be here. I urge my colleagues to use their prerogatives while they have the opportunity.

Mr. President, down in Mobile Bay, during the Civil War, or I may say during the War Between the States, Admiral Farragut was told that he could not run through the bay, that it was full of torpedoes. His reply was one that has stood for all time as a classic American utterance, "Damn the torpedoes. Full speed ahead."

Mr. President, I, a Senator from New Hampshire, say to the Senate of the United States, "Damn the torpedoes." We said we were for public housing and slum clearance, and voted that way three times. Now let us do it again and give new hope to troubled people.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has expired on the side of the Senator from New Hampshire. The Senator from Wisconsin has 1 minute.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to postpone vote on public housing until January, because we must recognize facts. The House is opposed to public housing. The only result of our voting it again and having it go to conference would be to keep the Congress in session indefinitely. I have made an examination which in my opinion shows that we will accomplish nothing if we send the bill to conference. Our conferees would finally yield, and we would have exactly what we have now. Under present conditions the only possibility of getting housing legislation, as I see it, is to pass the bill as proposed to be amended.

I have not reversed my position, as the Senator from Illinois said, on farm housing, because we provide for farm housing in the title I amendment. The one thing that is postponed is decision on the question, which is a vital and very controversial question, whether we shall have federalized, subsidized housing. I am for it, but I say what is proposed is the only way possible by which we can enact legislation now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has expired on both sides of the question under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOBEY. Will not the timekeeper look and see if he has not made a mistake of 15 seconds in the time coming to me? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has also kept the time and all time has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lodge	Taylor
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair asks the Senate please to be in order, and asks the Senate's guests please to be in order.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, on all amendments that may be called up either to the committee substitute or to the McCarthy substitute.

The immediate question pending is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] to the so-called McCarthy substitute for the committee substitute. The question is on the adoption of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am authorized to announce that that amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MALONE. I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senator from Nevada has withdrawn the amendment.

Mr. MALONE. I withdraw the proposed amendment relieving the 7-percent tax on trailer housing at the request of the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], with the understanding that the matter will be considered next year with a general reorganized tax bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No debate is in order. The amendment is withdrawn.

Any further amendment can be called up which any Senator wishes to call up, which may be pending.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I call up amendment lettered "A," offered by myself for my colleague [Mr. MORSE] and the two Senators from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. CAIN], which I have already explained.

Mr. WATKINS. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment called up by the senior Senator from Oregon, on which the Senator from Utah asks for the yeas and nays. Is there a sufficient second? The request not being sufficiently seconded, the yeas and nays are not ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be called up?

Mr. MORSE. I call up Senate bill 2927 as an amendment, and ask that the clerk be directed to call attention to the perfections within the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon calls up his amendment, which is Senate bill 2927, as modified. The clerk will state the modifications.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 18, after the word "if", the amendment is modified by inserting the word "guaranteed"; on the same page, line 22, after the word "prescribed", the words "for insurance of mortgages on the same class of housing under the National Housing Act, as amended:" are stricken and in lieu thereof the words "by the Administrator:" are inserted; on page 3, line 1, after the word "par", the words "with the primary right of repurchase reserved to the original mortgagee;" are stricken, and on the same page, line 9, after the word "exceeds", the figure "66⅔" is stricken and the figure "50" is inserted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as perfected, to the McCarthy substitute. The Senator from Oregon asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be called up? If not, the question is on the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS (when Mr. GEORGE's name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is unavoidably detained. If he were present he would vote "nay" on this measure. If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. McFARLAND (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is absent by leave of the Senate. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is absent on important public business in the State of Tennessee.

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—48

Ball	Gurney	Reed
Brewster	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Holland	Smith
Butler	Ives	Stennis
Byrd	Jenner	Taft
Cain	Kem	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	McCarthy	Thye
Capper	McClellan	Umstead
Cordon	McKellar	Vandenberg
Donnell	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin	Wherry
Eastland	Millikin	Wiley
Ecton	Moore	Williams
Ferguson	O'Conor	Wilson

NAYS—36

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Baldwin	Hill	Murray
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kilgore	Pepper
Cooper	Knowland	Russell
Ellender	Langer	Saltonstall
Feazel	Lodge	Sparkman
Flanders	Lucas	Taylor
Fulbright	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Green	McMahon	Tobey
Hatch	Magnuson	Young

NOT VOTING—12

Bushfield	McCarran	Stewart
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	Maybank	Wagner
George	O'Daniel	White

So Mr. McCARTHY's substitute for the committee substitute was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6959) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized and directed to make all necessary clerical and technical changes, including changes in section numbers and cross references in the engrossed amendment to the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the National Housing Act (H. R. 6959), today passed by the Senate, be printed as passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee which drafted the amendments to House bill 6959 be authorized to file a report at some time before the session ends, and that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 239) to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 212) to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the Pacific War Memorial, New York City, N. Y., signed by Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., praying that VJ-day and VE-day be set apart, not as holidays, but as days of work and prayerful remembrance for those who had a part in achieving victory in World War II, and so forth, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THIRTY-THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the thirty-third annual convention of Kiwanis International at Los Angeles, Calif., in convention in Los Angeles, Calif., June 6–10, 1948.

These resolutions cover a series of subjects which are fundamental to the continuing growth and expansion of the Nation. It is a very human, very forthright, very able set of resolutions, so I am asking that they be printed in the RECORD.

HAWAIIAN AND ALASKAN STATEHOOD

Whereas Hawaii and Alaska are now territories of the United States of America, and steps have been taken to secure statehood for each of these territories: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in view of present world conditions, and because such statehood would be mutually beneficial, we petition the Congress of the United States to give prompt consideration to the admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States of the Union.

UNITED NATIONS

Whereas the nations of the world are still confronted with the fundamental problems affecting world stability, programs for peace, improvement of health, educational and cultural conditions throughout the world, all of which brought into being the United Nations Organization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International assembled in its thirty-third annual convention in Los Angeles, Calif., reaffirms its confidence in the purposes and its wholehearted support of the United Nations and of the constructive work which it is endeavoring to do; and be it further

Resolved, That Kiwanis clubs throughout our two nations be urged to continue to study the organization and workings of the United Nations and the world problems with which it is dealing, and that definite expressions of opinion on such matters be forwarded by clubs and districts to the Board of Trustees

of Kiwanis International for submission when proper to our United Nations representatives and to our national law-making bodies to the end that an early, equitable and lasting solution of the colossal problems of a chaotic world may be found.

COMMUNISM

Whereas upon the North American Continent two great English speaking nations, the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada, have been blessed by Divine Providence and have prospered spiritually and materially; and

Whereas the ideology of communism is being pressed upon the people of both of our nations and has, through deceit and misrepresentation, operated in such a manner as to threaten the overthrow of representative government; and

Whereas the condition of world affairs, especially between the United States of America and Russia, has drawn us into an organized cold war, which is being prosecuted by Russia in an endeavor to foster among our people the ideology of communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International in convention assembled in Los Angeles does hereby denounce and condemn communism, and be it further

Resolved, That by precept and action we exert ourselves to do all that is possible to eradicate communism, and if those who claim to be or are known to be Communists, refuse to be amenable to our free advances, that then by legislative enactment they be refused employment in national, State, municipal or county government; and be it further

Resolved, That Kiwanis International call upon all member clubs to request their respective legislative bodies to enact adequate laws to protect the citizens of each respective State and province from subversive communistic activities and influences; and be it further

Resolved, That every Kiwanis club be called upon to conduct a vigorous campaign to inform the citizens of their respective communities that the price of our continued freedom is eternal vigilance against the menace of communism; and that every Kiwanis club call upon our citizens to exercise their right of ballot; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, to the Governors of all States of the United States and its Territories, to the Premiers of all the Provinces of Canada, and to all the members of the various legislative bodies.

NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS

Whereas Kiwanis International at its thirty-second annual convention held in Chicago, Ill., in 1947, expressed itself as favoring the adoption without delay by the Congress of the United States of a plan of universal military training; and

Whereas the conditions which prompted the taking of that position are not only still present but the situation has become more serious: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International reaffirm its stand favoring the early adoption of a plan insuring successful military defense of all democratic principles; and be it further

Resolved, That Kiwanis International continue its efforts to develop an informed public opinion supporting every national action essential to the complete defense of this country; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of Kiwanis International to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives.

CITIZENSHIP

Whereas there is throughout Canada and the United States a general apathy toward the fundamentals and the democratic principles of our constitutions and an alarming tendency to draw from our democratic depositories without replenishment; and

Whereas the various elements of our nations are not as yet united in understanding and the support of our democratic processes and way of life and many of our citizens are misled by false ideologies seeking to undermine and destroy not only our governments but all other governments opposing their philosophies; and

Whereas the focal point of this fight for the preservation of our freedoms and way of life against these encroachments is in the minds of our youth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the thirty-third annual convention of Kiwanis International assembled at Los Angeles do recommend and urge that renewed emphasis be laid upon the inculcation in the minds of our youth of an intelligent understanding and appreciation of our constitutional principles and procedure throughout our entire educational system as a source and safeguard of our freedoms and way of life.

CONSERVATION

Whereas Kiwanis International has long appreciated that conservation of our natural resources is fundamental to the welfare of our national economies, and mindful of the many practical programs now being carried on by various agencies looking toward further and better conservation and fertility measures: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That we commend these agencies for their work and we urge our clubs to cooperate with them to the end that perpetuation and replenishment of our natural resources may be maintained.

UNDERPRIVILEGED CHILD

Whereas one of the earliest activities of the clubs of Kiwanis International was in the aid and assistance rendered to children who, because of conditions beyond their control, were deprived of those things which are normal and expected in the life of the average child; and

Whereas the efforts of our clubs in the field of underprivileged child work have contributed not only to the betterment of our communities but to the development of unselfish character in Kiwanians; and

Whereas the need for underprivileged child work is as great today as in the early days of our organization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International reaffirm its interest in work for underprivileged children and that the over 2,815 clubs of Kiwanis International and the nearly 190,000 members be urged, not only to continue, but to expand their efforts in behalf of underprivileged children in our two countries to the end that these children may enjoy the attributes of normal childhood and grow into strong, healthy, loyal, and useful citizens.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Whereas one of the very serious problems facing the people of these two great nations is that of traffic control, in that fatalities, casualties, and property damage are on the increase; and

Whereas this problem is complicated by archaic, complex, conflicting, and often misunderstood traffic regulations; and

Whereas there are available through interested agencies, basic, uniform, model traffic ordinances: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend that Kiwanis clubs in each State and Province use their influence with local legislative bodies to bring about the adoption of uniform traffic ordinances for the protection of life and property within their jurisdictional areas; and be it further

Resolved, That while commending the introduction of driver education courses into the curricula of thousands of secondary schools within the service area of Kiwanis International, we recognize the necessity of providing more opportunities for the training of prospective drivers of motor vehicles and we urge on local Kiwanis clubs the desirability of sponsoring such courses in communities which have not offered this service in their local high schools; and be it further

Resolved, That in view of the seriousness of this problem throughout the area covered by Kiwanis International, we urge that each Kiwanis club make the general problem of traffic regulations and safety an important part of its program, and that appropriate committees be appointed to implement this resolution.

SUPPORT OF CHURCHES

Whereas the first object of Kiwanis International is to give primacy to the human and spiritual rather than to the material values of life; and

Whereas the second object of Kiwanis International is to encourage the daily living of the Golden Rule in all human relationships; and

Whereas communism is atheistic and materialistic in its concepts and is committed to the destruction of the human and spiritual foundations upon which our civilization is based: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International, in convention assembled, rededicates itself to the encouragement and support of our churches in their spiritual aims.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 2919) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgages of certain veterans' housing corporations, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1774) thereon.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 6, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 212) to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 2931. A bill for the relief of Kostas Kallinikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2932. A bill for the relief of Francesco Alvino; and

S. 2933. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cardella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2934. A bill for the relief of Virgil L. Hesterly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. McKELLAR) introduced the following bills, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and appear under a separate heading:

S. 2935. A bill to provide for the compensation of civilian employees within the Federal Government, and for other purposes; and

S. 2936. A bill to provide for the classification of all nonpostal civilian positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.)

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2937. A bill for the relief of certain Latvians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL COMPENSATION AND POSITION CLASSIFICATION ACTS OF 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference two bills, one to provide for the compensation of civilian employees within the Federal Government, and for other purposes; the other, to provide for the classification of all nonpostal civilian positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes. I request that they be printed in full in the RECORD, together with a statement I have prepared explaining and analyzing them. I might add that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service intends to have a hearing on the bills, and I invite any Senator desiring to testify to be ready next week and the weeks following, in order that we may have the bills ready when the Congress reconvenes in January.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred, and the bills, together with the statement presented by the Senator from North Dakota will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills (S. 2935) to provide for the compensation of civilian employees within the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and (S. 2936) to provide for the classification of all nonpostal civilian positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, were each read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2935

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as "The Federal Compensation Act of 1949."

SEC. 101. Compensation for all classes of positions of the Federal Government except the postal field service will be determined on the basis of the compensation being paid in the competitive area.

SEC. 102. The area to be included in determining the compensation will be that area from which the personnel supply is drawn, and which forms the competition for the Federal Government in that area.

SEC. 103. It is the policy of the Federal Government to administer compensation so as to compensate employees as close to the competitive rate for their level of difficulty within their occupation as is compatible with the requirements of a compensation trend line, and the internal alinement of classes of positions. To effectuate this policy, compensation rates will be determined on the basis of a competitive trend line. The trend line will be fitted to the competitive area sampling so as to pay the greatest number of employees as close to the competitive rate for their level within their occupation as is possible in the light of administrative requirements, and the nonmonetary benefits and detriments affecting competition.

SEC. 104. In drawing the competitive trend line, the factors to be considered in addition to the rate data will be those advantages and disadvantages of working for the Federal Government as compared to those advantages and disadvantages of working for other organizations in the competitive area. The trend line drawn on the basis of the data alone will be adjusted upward or downward, to the extent that advantages and disadvantages of working for the Federal Government differ from those in the competitive area. This adjustment will be computed insofar as practicable in terms of actual monetary advantage, but will also include such "judgment" factors as tenure of position, steadiness of employment, attractiveness of the work, and any other factors which directly affect the competition in the area.

SEC. 105. It is the policy of the Federal Government that it should have neither a competitive advantage nor disadvantage with private organizations in the area, when all factors affecting competition are considered.

DUTIES OF ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 106. (a) There is hereby established an organization in the executive branch to be known as the Federal Compensation Administration headed by an Administrator, who will establish compensation rates for all positions in the Federal service consistent with the provisions of this act. These rates will be adjusted from time to time, not less frequently than in 12-month intervals, to reflect changes in the competitive rates. The heads of the departments and agencies shall detail to the Federal Compensation Administration, at its request for temporary service under its direction, officers or employees possessed of special knowledges and skills required in the collection of compensation data in the various competitive areas.

(b) The Administrator shall have the power to prescribe rules, regulations, and methods of procedure to effectuate the purposes of this act. Administration shall be vested in two boards composed of five members each, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Two members of each board are to be appointed from recommendations submitted by recognized national employee organizations.

BOARD TO ESTABLISH RATES

SEC. 107. (a) There is hereby created within the Federal Compensation Administration two boards. One board shall have authority to set up methods of procedure to establish fair and equitable salary and wage rates for all Government employees except those in the postal service. This board shall have power to request assistance from all governmental agencies in the proper discharge of its duties.

(b) The second board shall have authority to establish a research division and an appeals method and such board shall hear appeals and make final determinations, and it shall be charged with investigating inequities and inequalities due to geographic locations, climatic conditions, industrial occupations and hazards, and accessibility, with decisions to be rendered employees not later than 90 days after hearings have been held.

SEC. 108. The compensation schedule for the various competitive areas and occupational groupings shall be developed on the basis of surveys conducted. These compensation schedules will consist of 19 grades, each carrying a range of 5 steps. The third or middle step will be set as the prevailing trend of rates in the competitive area, as determined by the analysis of the survey data. The first, second, fourth, and fifth step rates will be established by the Administrator, but in no case shall the fifth step exceed the third of the next highest grade. These step rates will recognize differences in individual performance. The step rate assigned to an individual will reflect his performance in the position he holds.

SEC. 109. Compensation for night-shift work, overtime, and holiday work shall be established in accordance with the prevailing practice in the competitive area.

SEC. 110. Within 1 year of the enactment of the Position Classification Act, surveys shall have been conducted for all competitive areas and compensation schedules established and applied.

SEC. 111. Any individual whose compensation at the time of the initial installation of this act is above the range of pay established for the new appropriate grade for his position and class will retain such compensation, providing he remains in the same position.

SEC. 112. The various hazards existing in the Federal Government shall be defined and grouped into hazard levels, and a differential established for each hazard level. When an individual performs duties under hazardous conditions, he shall be paid a differential for actual work time under such hazard.

SEC. 113. (a) Upon installation of this act, all existing compensation and pay legislation for Federal employees in conflict with this act shall be superseded: *Provided*, That the following salary table shall be used as an intermediate salary medium until such time as the new grades shall have been established: *Provided further, however*, That all present grades in the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, first shall have added to each step the sum of $270 above the amount of the basic salary steps within each grade established under Public Law 900 of the Eightieth Congress: *Provided further, however*, That in each case where the salary and grade are translated into the following table, the salary shall be, after adding the $270, an amount nearest equal to the appropriate salary contained in this table:

	Per annum salary				
Grade 1	$2,000	$2,075	$2,150	$2,225	$2,300
Grade 2	2,375	2,450	2,525	2,600	2,675
Grade 3	2,750	2,825	2,900	2,975	3,050
Grade 4	3,125	3,200	3,275	3,350	3,425
Grade 5	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900
Grade 6	4,000	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
Grade 7	4,500	4,600	4,700	4,800	4,900
Grade 8	5,000	5,100	5,200	5,300	5,400
Grade 9	5,500	5,600	5,700	5,800	5,900
Grade 10	6,000	6,100	6,200	6,300	6,400
Grade 11	6,500	6,600	6,700	6,800	6,900
Grade 12	7,000	7,100	7,200	7,300	7,400
Grade 13	7,500	7,600	7,700	7,800	7,900
Grade 14	8,000	8,100	8,200	8,300	8,400
Grade 15	8,500	8,600	8,700	8,800	8,900
Grade 16	9,000	9,200	9,400	9,600	9,800
Grade 17	10,000	10,200	10,400	10,600	10,800
Grade 18	11,000	12,000	13,000	14,000	15,000
Grade 19	16,000	17,000	18,000	19,000	23,000

(b) In all cases where the rates of compensation are on an hourly or per diem basis the sum of $270 additional shall be prorated on a percentage basis to conform to the general design and provisions of this act.

AUTOMATIC PROMOTIONS

SEC. 114. Employees allocated to grades 1 through 4, inclusive, shall receive automatic within-grade salary accretions, one step at a time, each 9 months until they have attained the top step within the grade. Employees in grades 5 to 15, inclusive, shall receive automatic within-grade salary accretions, one step at a time, each 12 months until they have attained the top step within the grade. Employees in grades 16 and 17 shall receive automatic within-grade salary accretions, one step at a time, each 18 months until they have attained the top step within the grade. Employees in grades 18 and 19 shall receive automatic within-grade salary accretions, one step at a time, each 24 months, until they have attained the top step within the grade.

Two years after having attained the top of the grade, employees shall be given opportunity for advancement to the next higher grade through the medium of a noncompetitive examination, vacancies to be filled from resulting promotional registers and vacancies shall not be otherwise filled until such registers have been depleted down to grade 85. The Civil Service Commission or its successor agency is hereby delegated authority and direction for conducting such examinations. Due consideration shall be given to longevity, effective job performance, and other factors which will serve to develop initiative, leadership, and related qualities. All other factors being equal, seniority shall govern the decision.

COMPENSATORY TIME

SEC. 115. When emergency needs of the service require employees to perform service in excess of regular workday or on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays, they shall be allowed compensatory time to be paid at the rate of 90 minutes for each hour of service for such service on 1 day within 5 working days next succeeding the Saturday or Sunday and within 30 days next succeeding the holiday: *Provided*, That the head of the agency may, if the exigencies of the service require, authorize payment of overtime to employees for services performed overtime on Saturdays and Sundays in lieu of compensatory time: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to employees on special duty or work assignment. Emergency compensatory time shall not exceed 1 week.

OVERTIME

SEC. 116. If the needs of the service require, employees may be employed in excess of 7 hours per day and for such overtime service they shall be paid on the basis of 150 percent of the annual rate of pay received by such employees. In computing compensation for such overtime employment, the annual salary of compensation for such employees shall be divided by 1,771, the number of working hours in a year. The quotient thus obtained will be the base hourly compensation, and one and one-half times that amount will be the hourly rate of overtime pay: *Provided*, That employees paid on an hourly basis shall be paid at the rate of 150 percent of that hourly rate for all services in excess of 7 hours per day: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to employees who are on special duty or work assignment: *Provided further*, That in case the compensatory time earned exceeds 7 hours, the balance of such compensatory time shall be granted on the following day.

NIGHT DIFFERENTIAL

SEC. 117. Employees who are required to perform night work shall be paid extra for each hour of such work at the rate of 20 percent of their base hourly compensation, computed by dividing the base annual salary by 1,771. Night work shall be defined as any work performed between the hours of 6 o'clock p. m. and 6 o'clock a. m.: *Provided*, That such differential for night duty shall not be included in computing any overtime compensation to which the officer or employee may be entitled.

SEC. 118. This act shall supersede all provisions of existing laws in conflict with the provisions herein contained but in no event shall any of the benefits including the right to appeal an efficiency rating, as provided in Public Law 880, approved November 26, 1940, and the right to receive within-grade periodic accretions, as provided in Public Law 200, approved August 1, 1941, be contravened.

SEC. 119. This act shall become effective July 1, 1949.

SEC. 120. This act shall apply to all positions and persons employed in the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government except those in the postal field service.

S. 2936

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be cited as the "Position Classification Act of 1949."

SEC. 101. There shall be a uniform position classification system for all personnel and management purposes in the Federal Government, except in the Post Office Department field service. To accomplish this objective, positions shall be grouped into classes on the basis of actual duties performed, as determined by periodic inventories. The heads of departments and agencies are directed to determine the duties of the positions and allocate such positions to established classes.

SEC. 102. Position classification shall provide a comprehensive and orderly system of grouping positions into classes on the basis of actual duties performed. These classes shall serve as a basis for personnel and management functions, including recruitment, placement, skills utilization, promotion, pay, training, organizational planning, budget, and in maintaining records and controls, such grouping of positions into classes to achieve uniformity in classification and in personnel management among the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

SEC. 103. Definitions:

(a) The term "position" means a combination of duties capable of being performed by one person and may be either occupied or vacant.

(b) The term "class of positions" means a group of all positions sufficiently similar with respect to actual duties performed that they can be treated alike for all personnel and management purposes.

(c) The term "class specifications" means a complete, written record concerning the facts with relation to a class of positions, and includes all information necessary in the use of such class for all personnel and management purposes.

(d) The term "class title" means a short, systematic, and descriptive phrase identifying the class and is as indicative as possible of the kind and level of the work performed.

(e) The term "series of classes" means a group of classes which differ only in the level of difficulty of the work performed, and do not vary in kind of work performed.

(f) The term "duties description" means a description of the actual duties performed in the various positions assigned to the class.

(g) The term "required knowledges and skills" means knowledges and skills which are minimum requirements that an incumbent must posess for the successful accomplishment for the duties in the position allocated to this class.

(h) The term "objective evidence of the possession of the required knowledges and skills" means the primary or secondary evidences that indicate the possession of the knowledges and skills required.

(i) The term "internal alinement" means the arrangement of classes of positions into a series of grades on the basis of the difficulty of the duties performed in each class.

(j) The term "evaluation of a class to a difficulty level" means the assignment of classes of positions to a series of levels based upon difficulty. It is the measurement of difference in degrees of difficulty of duties of classes and is expressed in "grades."

SEC. 104. It shall be the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency to:

(a) Establish policies, regulations, procedures, techniques, and practices in connection with position classification in the Federal Government, departments and agencies consistent with the provisions of this act.

(b) Approve and maintain manuals of approved class specifications to assure comparability of classification standards among all Federal Government departments and agencies.

(c) Make final determination of the classes to be recognized, the titles to be used, the duties description, knowledges and skills required, objective evidence of possession of such knowledges and skills, and the valuation of each class to a difficulty level.

(d) Provide for the staffing, training, and technical assistance to be given to Federal Government departments and agencies on position classification matters.

(e) Periodically inspect the allocation of individual positions to approved classes in the departments and agencies to assure consistency in the application of position classification standards, principles, techniques and procedures, and direct nonretrcactive revision of misallocated positions.

SEC. 105. It shall be the responsibility of the head of each Federal Government department and agency within the provisions of this act to:

(a) Periodically collect information concerning the duties actually performed in each individual position in the activity.

(b) On the basis of the duties performed, group positions into approved classes as established in the Federal Government Manual of Class Specifications. The allocation of positions to existing approved classes will be made by the departments and agencies and do not require the prior approval of the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency.

(c) On the basis of the duties performed, prepare class duties descriptions and other sections of the class specifications for proposed classes of positions. The proposed classes of positions will be submitted to the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency for approval and inclusion in the Federal Government Manual of Approved Class Specifications. (Under ordinary circumstances, the proposed class specifications will not be used by departments and agencies as a basis for any personnel action until the class has been (1) written and evaluated by the department or agency, and (2) approved by the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency. In emergency situations, the proposed class specification may be used as a basis for personnel action, provided the class specification is submitted to the Civil Service Commission within 1 month after the first use of the proposed class specification. Such actions will be subject to nonretroactive revision, based on the final determination by the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency.)

(d) Maintain a current inventory of the allocation of positions to classes by periodic review and resurvey in accordance with prescribed procedures and practices.

SEC. 106. To assure uniform classification nomenclature throughout the Federal Government, the class title designations, as indicated in the approved class specifications, will be used for all personnel and management purposes. Organization titles, where they differ from the title on the class specification, may be used unofficially within the department or agency, but should not appear on official instruments.

SEC. 107. The range of work in the Federal Government is herein divided into 20 levels of difficulty. All classes of positions will be evaluated on the basis of the duties performed in the class and will be assigned to 1 of these 20 levels of difficulty.

SEC. 108. (a) Upon approval of this act, the departments and agencies of the Federal Government will prepare duties descriptions for proposed classes of positions at the earliest date for submission to and approval by the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency. The Civil Service Commission shall establish dates for the submission of classes by each department and agency.

(b) At expiration of 1 year following approval of this act, all classes of positions not then approved by the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency under the terms of this act will be evaluated by the department or agency into one of the 19 levels of difficulty.

SEC. 109. This act supersedes all conflicting provisions of existing laws pertaining to classification of positions in the Federal Government.

SEC. 110. This act shall take effect July 1, 1949.

SEC. 111. This act shall apply to all positions in the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government except those in the postal field service.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LANGER UPON INTRODUCING CLASSIFICATION AND COMPENSATION BILLS

Today I have introduced two bills. One establishes a realistic and modern classification system for the entire Government nonpostal service, and the other devises methods for payment of salaries and wages in Government service.

The classification bill calls for 19 grades, instead of the more than 40 grades being used today, and provides sufficient flexibility for any purpose. It removes all consideration of pay from the Classification Act and clarifies the basic principle of position classification and its uses in the light of recent experience gained during the war period and even more recently. Of importance, it prescribes the functions of the departments and agencies as against the functions of the central controlling agency.

Position classification and pay are in separate bills because they are two distinct subjects. Combination of the two has had the effect of reducing position classification only to terms of pay when in reality it must serve multiple uses if efficient personnel management is to be accomplished. Because of this past close association of classification and pay, the classification system has obviously failed to fulfill all of its rightful uses, such as in recruitment, training, budget planning, efficiency determination, reduction in force processes, and others of its multiple uses.

The present Classification Act, while sound in principle, has been used to reduce its function to a personalized pay control. Evidences of this practice become apparent when one views the use of the present classification system, as it is practiced, for reductions in force, recruiting, displaced career employee program, efficiency determination, budget planning and control, organization planning, promotions, and even pay. The present titles and descriptions have only haphazard relationships with the duties as they are performed, and there is, for the most part, no attempt to classify positions into classes.

The bill also places the various functions of the position classification process where experience has demonstrated they must be placed if performed correctly. The Civil Service Commission is now in the process of writing classification standards for the entire Federal Government. This is obviously an impossible task to attempt, since the Civil Service Commission has neither the staff nor can it possibly obtain complete information to make these classification standards sufficiently objective to be useful. Departments and agencies have the large majority of the classification analysts and also have, or could obtain, the detailed information necessary to produce meaningful and objective descriptions of classes of positions. As it is now practiced by the Commission, the "class standards" are of necessity so broad they serve no useful purpose. These standards can best be described as "generalized descriptions of grade levels" and serve no useful purpose in the grouping of positions.

The proposed classification bill provides legislation whereby positions can be grouped into classes so that they will furnish a "cornerstone" for accomplishment of all personnel and management actions. The Federal Government is by far the most complex organization in the Nation. It is imperative that current facts be known concerning duties of each of the millions of positions in the Federal Government. To obtain this information, these positions must be grouped on the basis of the duties of each position. The positions whose duties are sufficiently similar that they can be treated alike for all personnel and management purposes are grouped together into a class of positions. With this class, it is then possible to perform the various personnel and management functions on a large scale, objectively and effectively. This grouping enables technicians to determine the knowledges and skills required for each position, pay can be determined, transfers can be made, efficiency determined, training be given with directness, budgets be controlled, and all the personnel and management functions performed efficiently. Such a grouping of positions into true classes is a necessary first step in the solution of the many problems we experience today.

Such bill to be effective must eliminate the "classification jargon" and substitute the objective description of duties of each class. The large majority of the present classification staffs must be retrained from the position gradification approach to "true class" approach. The personnel management functions, now practically impossible to perform under the present system, thereupon will become possible.

The difficulties of the displaced career employees' program rested primarily in the fact that the titles carried by DCE's and the people they were to replace were meaningless. The DCE regulations then forced replacement of individuals by DCE's who, though they might carry the same title, could not perform the duties. Because of this, the agencies balked and evaded and even seriously retarded the process.

Reductions in force based on present titles proved that titles, for the most part, are meaningless and cannot be used in reduction-in-force process. Many an agency stayed up at night classifying positions quickly, though crudely, into homogeneous classes so that reductions in force could be accomplished without ruining the efficiency of their operation.

Recruitment in terms of broad generalities instead of homogeneous classes has reduced the recruitment process of the Federal Government to a game of "selective certification" or legalistic evasions and subterfuge on the part of Government agencies to keep their agencies operating in spite of the unrealistic recruiting process.

An adequate determination of efficiency in the Federal service has been made impossible by the lack of homogeneous classes. Efficiency determination must be on the basis of specific duties and not generalities. This can be done only by being based on the homogeneous classes which objectively define the duties of positions by means of class specifications.

Effective budget control is impossible when the facts cannot be determined concerning the duties of each individual position. In such an organization, these facts cannot be known without a classification process of grouping positions into homogeneous classes.

The Federal Government will be pared to a minimum efficient working force mainly by cutting a few positions here and a few positions there. The fat lady must be reduced all over and amputation of the arm or leg in large segments will cripple instead of make more healthy. With meaningful classification, it then becomes possible to perform budget planning and control on a realistic basis. This is impossible without a uniform position classification process which groups positions into homogeneous classes and objectively describes them.

Effective training cannot be accomplished on a wide scale unless each individual can be trained for the specific duties he is to perform. In the Federal Government, this can only be done on a wide scale if the duties of each position can be determined by a position classification system.

And so on, throughout all other personnel and management functions, it is clear that the duties must be known concerning the positions and in such a large organization they can only be known through a position classification system which groups those positions into homogeneous classes and objectively describes them.

EVALUATION OF CLASSES INTO DIFFICULTY LEVELS

These classes once determined must be evaluated into levels of difficulty so that they may be used effectively for various purposes, among which is compensation.

This bill proposes 19 levels of difficulty expressed in terms of grades.

It should be observed that all positions in the Federal service are evaluated into the same 19 grades. This aids in Government-wide comparability of evaluation and eliminates the variety of services which have served no useful purposes and have even had harmful effects on the management of personnel.

The number of difficulty levels depends upon the range of difficulty encountered in the organization and the number of distinguishable and useful levels that exist. A system having an excessive number of difficulty levels forces meaningless slight differentiations. A system having too few levels causes classes of easily distinguishable levels of difficulty to be forced into the same grade, causing inequities.

Experience has shown that there exists in the Federal service about 19 distinguishable levels of difficulty from the least difficult class to the most difficult class.

It should be observed that the bill proposes one system of position classification for all classes of positions in the Federal service. This includes the trades and crafts, the military, the foreign service, and many others, including the various organizations which in the past for various reasons have accomplished exemption from the Classification Act.

The most controversial inclusion will probably be the inclusion of all military positions under the Classification Act. At first thought, this seems rather unusual, but study reveals compelling reasons why it should be done.

Military positions account for roughly one-third of all Federal positions at the present time. It has been generally accepted that, in modern warfare, seven out of eight of the military never engage in combat. These seven are engaged, for the most part, in civilian-like pursuits, such as supply, transportation, communication, and other supporting functions in which the duties are all duplicated or closely resemble the civilian pursuits.

The grouping of positions into homogenous classes is just as imperative for good management in the military as in the civilian organizations. The necessity of war waste in manpower management no longer is meaningful when large military establishments seem to have become permanent parts of our Federal service. In addition, the line between military and civilian duties has shifted so markedly until the true military make up only a small percentage of even those in uniform.

The passage of the provisions of this position-classification bill will not, in itself, assure adequate position classification in the Federal service. It is believed that its provisions will go far in promoting good position classification. There must be a parallel change in the philosophy and the motives of those who take part in the process. Good position classification was easily possible under the terms of the Classification Act of 1923, as has been evidenced in a few Government agencies. In practice, however, the position-classification process in the Federal service became one of position gradification and personalized control. The new bill, by separating pay and making realistic placement of classification functions, provides the basis and encouragement for improvement. A parallel change in the administration of position classification must be made in both the Civil Service Commission and the majority of the departments and agencies. It has been demonstrated that such a change is technically possible and even quickly and efficiently accomplished in large-scaled agencies and departments.

The Federal Government is today the largest single employer in this country. The compensation program has to be designed to provide uniformity of position pricing, for a gigantic sprawling organization engaged in everything from research on nuclear energy to selling cigarettes to soldiers.

The objectives of this act are to provide for pricing of the Federal Government positions in such a way that the general rate level in each labor market conforms to the general level of rates prevailing in the labor market area.

The general level of rates paid in the Federal Government should be kept in satisfactory relation to the rates paid by private industry in the same labor market from which the employees are drawn, thus eliminating the contention that the Government pays less for the same class of work and responsibility.

Informal estimates indicate that, if Federal Government workers were paid on the basis of prevailing trends of the community, an eventual saving of approximately one billion dollars a year would result. At present, approximately 40 percent of the civilian Federal employees are paid on the basis of prevailing wages in their labor market. These employees are primarily in recognized trades and crafts and have been exempted from the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, by section 5 of the act.

Furthermore, this bill will establish Federal employees on an equitable basis and provide a uniform and systematic treatment of their compensation.

This act will establish the Federal Government compensation scales on a competitive basis in all areas. It will offer no undue competition to small-business men by increasing labor cost to them. It provides for a flexible system which may be adjusted rapidly when need arises.

A range of steps is established for each of the 19 pay levels to permit recognition of differences in individual performance. The step rate assigned to an individual will reflect his performance in the position he holds rather than his length of service or his state of need.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution establishing a legislative program for each session of Congress to be drafted by the majority leaders of the House and Senate after consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the various standing committees of the two Houses, the legislative program to contain a definite but flexible schedule of dates for the completion of committee and floor action by each House upon all appropriation bills and upon other major legislation. I have had this concurrent resolution prepared for submission now in the hope that between now and the start of the regular session in January it may be studied by individual Members of Congress and by individuals and organizations interested in the improvement of congressional machinery. Then next year I intend to resubmit the concurrent resolution, at which time I hope to have available the comments and the suggestions of all such students of congressional procedure.

I request that a statement I have prepared outlining the purposes of the concurrent resolution and the need for it, together with editorials from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Philadelphia Bulletin, Philadelphia Inquirer, Lock Haven Express, and the American Butter Review commenting on the original proposal I made in a speech in Stroudsburg, Pa., which led to the submission of this concurrent resolution, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement together with the editorials presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That as soon as may be practicable after the beginning of each regular and special session of the Congress, the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the standing committees of their respective Houses, shall jointly—

(a) conduct a study to ascertain the nature and extent of pending proposals for legislation of major public importance (other than appropriation bills);

(b) prepare a program (referred to hereinafter as the legislative program) for the orderly and expeditious completion of legislative action upon such proposed legislation and upon all regular appropriation bills for all agencies of the Federal Government, which legislative program shall include a proposed schedule of dates for the completion of committee and floor action by each House upon each such measure; and

(c) transmit to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, for publication, printing, and distribution to all committee chairmen, a report which shall contain a review of the major business for consideration by the Congress during such session, and a statement of the legislative program proposed for the completion of action thereon.

SEC. 2. At least once in each period of 30 calendar days during each such session, the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the standing committees of their respective Houses, shall jointly—

(a) conduct a study to ascertain what, if any, changes in the legislative program in their opinion are necessary;

(b) prepare such revisions in such program as they may deem necessary; and

(c) transmit to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, for publication, printing, and distribution to all committee chairmen, a report which shall contain a review of the progress made toward the completion of the legislative program, a description of changes in such program deemed necessary, and such revisions in the time schedule originally fixed as they may consider to be necessary and proper, together with a statement of their reasons for such revisions.

SEC. 3. Upon transmittal as provided in sections 1 and 2, the legislative program, and each revision thereof, shall be printed as a document of the House to which it was transmitted. The Public Printer shall print additional copies of each such document in such number as may be required for sale by the Superintendent of Documents to the public.

The statement and editorials presented by Mr. MYERS were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, UPON INTRODUCING SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH AN ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE IN ORDER TO AVOID AN ADJOURNMENT JAM ON MAJOR LEGISLATION

I have today submitted a Senate concurrent resolution to put Congress on a legislative timetable.

Those of us who have served in the Congress over a period of years have all been appalled, I think, at the last-minute rush which faces us at the end of every session. This bill is an attempt to do something about it.

The resolution provides that the majority leaders of the Senate and House, as soon as practicable after the beginning of each regular and special session, and after consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the standing committees of their respective Houses, shall come forward with a definite time schedule of proposed action on each appropriation bill and on other legislation of major importance.

Obviously, such a schedule could not be final and inflexible. The resolution, therefore, provides that the majority leaders of the two Houses and the chairmen and ranking members of the standing committees whom they consult, are to review this schedule—known as the legislative program—every

30 calendar days and to revise it in the light of developments.

The legislative program established under this resolution would be published, as would any changes or revisions made in it from time to time, and this schedule would then stand as a goal for the Congress to achieve in acting on major legislation. With this goal before us, we may—and I certainly hope we can—avoid, to a large extent, the utter chaos which has marked the adjournment of the last few regular sessions of the Congress, particularly, and which has also been rather typical of adjournment over the years.

This idea germinated from the spectacle we had here in the week before the Republican National Convention opened in Philadelphia when the Congress was trying to do in a few continuous day-and-night sessions work which had piled up over a period of 18 months.

Not long after we adjourned, I made a speech before the Kiwanis Club at Stroudsburg, Pa., where I first proposed this method of putting Congress on a schedule so that as many of the appropriation bills and as much other major legislation as possible could be enacted early in a session, rather than allow them to pile up for the adjournment rush.

In that speech, I described how we sat here day and night with conference committees trying desperately to reach agreement at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning of Sunday, June 20, on such important issues as the long-range farm bill; how we were debating for 4 hours in that all-night session a bill affecting the mineral-mining industry, and how Members were awakened from their catnaps in the cloakrooms to come in and vote on highly controversial and vitally important bills, one after another.

I described the scene as one of weary, exhausted, sleepless, punch-drunk, confused, overworked Congressmen and Senators required to make snap judgments or surrender deep-seated convictions in order to allow Congress to adjourn and still enable the Government to function.

I added, "It is unfair, it is cruel, it is inhuman, and it is certainly against the public interest to require exhausted men to act on legislation vitally affecting every business and industry, every segment of the population, and the very safety and security of the Nation and its people under such circumstances. This Congress has been in session off and on for a year and a half and many important bills introduced early in the first session went into conference 18 months later, at 2, 3, or 4 o'clock in the morning of the last day of the last session. In conference, weary and exhausted men, one eye on the clock, had to make far-reaching decisions, sometimes on the basis of snap judgment, sometimes by surrendering on basic principles and convictions."

The reaction to that speech and to the proposal I made in it for the establishment of a flexible, but definite, schedule of staggered action on appropriation bills and other major legislation was gratifying. Many newspapers picked up the proposal and commented on it approvingly in editorials. I have received so many such endorsements of the plan that I have had this concurrent resolution prepared for introduction now in the hopes that between now and the start of the regular session in January it can be studied by individual Members of Congress and by those individuals and organizations interested in the improvement of congressional machinery. Then next year I intend to reintroduce the bill and hope to have available the comments and the suggestions of all such students of congressional procedure.

The resolution, as now drawn, places upon the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House the primary responsibility for drafting a schedule of action. That is where the responsibility belongs. However, they are to be guided by the chairmen of the various standing committees and the ranking members of those committees from both parties. No formal committee, such as we have set up on the legislative budget, is necessary in this instance, since it is the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House who jointly share the responsibility for drafting the legislative program. The program would include a proposed schedule of dates for the completion of committee and floor action by each House upon each measure considered of sufficient importance to be included in the legislative program.

If this were done, all the Members of Congress and the public would know soon after a session of Congress convenes what the over-all program of the majority includes in the way of major legislation. I might say in passing that this would be one way for whichever party is in the majority next year to prove the sincerity with which it regards the party platform on which its members had campaigned. That is a matter of secondary consideration, however.

Most important, this resolution would require a definite scheduling of action on each of the appropriation bills. We have seen, in the last two sessions, particularly, the piling up of appropriation bills and their final enactment at the very last moment of the session. The entire executive branch of the Government was thrown into a state of indecision last year by virtue of the fact that departments could not plan ahead until their appropriations were passed.

In July 1947, as we entered the 1948 fiscal year, the Congress required the executive agencies to function for nearly a full month in the new fiscal year without knowing how much money they were going to have for their work or what functions were to be eliminated entirely. Thousands of employees were furloughed, and many career technical experts took other jobs as a result of this procrastination by Congress. If we had had, at that time, a definite legislative program before us from the start of the year in January, I doubt very much that the Appropriations Committees would have found themselves with so many bills still in committee long after the fiscal year had begun.

I am not speaking now in criticism of individuals; I am criticizing the outmoded system of operation. We all know how really hard the Members of both Appropriations Committees work. Yet, the Senate Appropriations Committee, for example, could hardly complete action on an appropriation bill and report it out for Senate action until it has received the bill from the House, and if the House waits until July 11 to act on an appropriation bill which was supposed to go into effect July 1, obviously the Senate committee cannot do its jobs as it would like to do it.

Now if we knew soon after the start of the session that the majority leadership of the House and Senate, after consultation with the heads of the standing committees, believed that the Treasury-Post Office bill, for instance, could be completed in the House committee by February 15 and in the House by February 25 and in the Senate committee by March 20 and in the Senate by April 1 and in conference by April 15—and these are just dates pulled out of the air—then I am almost sure that we would adhere to such a schedule. The same would be true of the other appropriation bills. And if the majority leadership, after consultation with the leaders of the standing committees involved, had decided early in 1947 or early in 1948 that the long-range farm bill could be acted upon by a certain definite date, then I am positive we would not have had the long-range farm bill come out of conference at 4 o'clock Sunday morning, June 20, in the dying moments of the second regular, and presumably last, session of the Eightieth Congress.

Housing legislation was high up on the "must" list throughout the Eightieth Congress, and there again matters dragged until the morning of Sunday, June 20, and then we ended up with no housing bill anyway. If a time schedule had been in effect for housing legislation from the start of the Eightieth Congress nearly 2 years ago, I don't think the House committee would have ignored the problem until sometime in June of this year when it first began holding hearings.

It was my original intention to include in this resolution a provision that if any specific aspect of a bill, particularly an appropriation bill, is so controversial that the committee handling it cannot resolve the issue in time to have the bill reported out on schedule, that the controversial feature be stricken from the bill with the intention of taking it up later in a supplemental bill. Thus, an entire appropriation bill would not be held up by discussion and debate and controversy over one small part of it. Something like that was done this year in regard to some of the defense appropriation items. I had contemplated making such a policy the rule in this resolution, but in trying to reduce it to language in the resolution, found that there was no easy and practical formula. For instance, if we were to require that the chairman of the committee offer a motion to strike the disputed portion from the bill without prejudice pending its later inclusion in a supplemental bill, we might find the Senate Appropriations Committee disagreeing over an item in one of the big appropriations measures, striking out that item for later consideration and then never receiving back from the House a supplemental appropriation bill to which this item could be properly attached. And, of course, the Senate cannot initiate appropriation bills.

It is my thought that instead of reducing to language any specific formula for dealing with this particular problem, that we leave up to the majority leaders of the two Houses and the chairman and ranking members of the two appropriations committees the responsibility for agreeing, perhaps only informally, that there should be a "catch-all" supplemental appropriation bill near the end of each session which would contain these various disputed items. Then there would be no hesitancy in dropping them from the regular bills so that these bills could be passed early in the session.

One very important contribution to our lawmaking procedure to follow from the orderly passage of appropriation bills under a flexible schedule would be the achievement of a practical means for eliminating what we have frequently agreed was an undesirable practice, and that is the placing of legislative riders on appropriation bills. The Legislative Reorganization Act disallows them, but we have them nevertheless. We have them only because of the urgency surrounding the enactment of most appropriation bills, which usually come to the White House at or near the last minute. It is a rare instance in which a President feels safe in vetoing such a bill. If the bill were enacted early in the session and contained a rider objectionable to the President, he could veto the bill in the safe knowledge that there was plenty of time for the reenactment of a proper bill. Faced with this situation, few Members of Congress would press for the inclusion of riders on appropriation bills.

I sincerely hope the Members of Congress will give serious study to the proposals outlined in this resolution and will come back

here in January with constructive suggestions on the methods by which these proposals could be carried out. I will welcome suggestions from Members of Congress and from all students of our governmental machinery for improving the resolution. I don't think there could be any opposition to its basic purposes.

Although I have not previously made any particular effort to promote this plan, there have, as I said, been numerous editorial comments in the newspapers approving it in basic outline as described in news stories of the address I made before the Stroudsburg Kiwanis Club on June 23.

The Philadelphia Bulletin thinks the idea a good one, but fears that even if Congress adopted such a plan it might not follow it. It points to the difficulties we experienced here the past 2 years on the legislative budget. I think the situation is somewhat different in that we do know rather accurately what vital long-range legislation faces us as we start a session of Congress, but we cannot possibly know all the details of a $40,000,000,000 budget thrown at us early in a session and therefore cannot—or have not been able to—come up immediately with a sensible and informed legislative budget.

The Philadelphia Inquirer, in commenting editorially on the suggestion for a legislative program, said the establishment of such a policy "would avert the harm to the public that comes from hasty, ill-considered action—or lack of action—in the final frenzied sessions."

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette said that the present policy of the Congress in allowing major legislation to lie untouched for as long as 18 months and then coming to grips with it at the very last minute is "evidence of archaic procedure which a Congressman would not tolerate in his own business." It believes this proposal could spare the Nation "snap judgments and the surrender of principle which are all too often associated with the exhausting closing hours in which Congress seeks to make up for months of procrastination."

Other comments have been along similar vein.

I certainly hope we can arrange the tremendous work load of Congress, a load which grows annually and often seems impossible for the Congress to carry, so as to allow us at least to legislate in calm and sensible fashion. Letting all major bills coast along until the last minute and then having them thrown at us in staccato tempo does not contribute to such a goal.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of July 6, 1948]

GUN-POINT LEGISLATION

Whatever else may be said of the Eightieth Congress, it wasn't lazy. It enacted about 895 public laws. The trouble was that this Congress, like its predecessors, tried to enact too much of its legislation at one time—just before adjournment.

Perhaps there is no way to avoid a legislative log jam in a session's final hours, since Congress always has at hand far more bills than it can expect to consider. But by setting up a definite schedule of staggered action on its most important items, Congress could spare itself a lot of grief and the Nation a lot of half-baked legislation.

Pennsylvania's Senator MYERS has made such a proposal. In a recent address in Stroudsburg, Pa., he declared that the last-minute log jam could be avoided if Congress set approximate dead lines for action on each of the major appropriation bills and on such important measures as those concerning housing and a farm program.

The Senator cites a good precedent—the definite time limitation set upon a legislative budget in the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946. There is no reason why other bills shouldn't also be scheduled on a definite timetable.

In that way, the Nation might be spared snap judgments and the surrender of principle which are all too often associated with the exhausting closing hours in which Congress seeks to make up for months of procrastination.

The Eightieth Congress was in session off and on for 18 months. Yet many of the items with which it came to grips in the closing hours had been pending since early in the session. That is evidence of archaic procedure which a Congressman would not tolerate in his own business.

If our system of government is to command the respect and emulation of other peoples, we must stop what Senator MYERS calls "legislation at gun point." As a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator is advantageously situated to advance this excellent idea.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin]

REFORMING CONGRESS

Senator MYERS' description of the last hours of the Eightieth Congress fits that of most legislative bodies that have preceded it. Vital legislation is allowed to pile up, and then there follows an unseemly scramble in the last hours to get it through. As the Pennsylvania Senator says, "Weary, sleepless, and exhausted Congressmen and Senators make snap judgments in order to enable Congress to adjourn."

The Senator suggests the spectacle could be avoided if Congress set up a flexible and staggered schedule for action on regular appropriation bills. It is the piling up of these appropriation bills, which must be passed if the Government is to function, that causes the jam at the close of the session.

The only trouble is that Congress might not keep such good rules if it made them. The Reorganization Act passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress called for a budget to be made by Congress by February 15 of the session which begins in January. The Eightieth Congress didn't keep the rule.

On paper it is easy enough to adopt the sensible reforms the Senator wants, and which are needed. It is another matter to get Congress to follow them.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

FOR ORDERLY LAWMAKING

The hectic confusion in which Congress jammed through legislation in the last days of the session just ended has made it clearly evident that there is still a great need for perfecting the legislative machinery.

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS did not exaggerate when he recently described the process as "utter chaos." He joined a long list of other students of government in urging steps to avoid a repetition in future Congresses.

The Pennsylvania Senator proposed that a schedule of action on appropriation bills should be adopted, to remove them from the last-minute jam.

Much of the responsibility for delays and frantic eleventh-hour action on bills lies with committee chairmen, who keep measures buried for months, and then let them out to compete with other legislation in the last few weeks of the session.

Establishment of a firm policy of early and orderly disposal of legislation of all kinds would go far toward preventing a pile-up in the closing weeks. More important, it would avert the harm to the public that comes from hasty, ill-considered action—or lack of action—in the final frenzied sessions.

[From the Lock Haven (Pa.) Express of June 24, 1948]

JAM SESSIONS

Senator MYERS makes good sense with his suggestion that Congress should never again put on such a last-minute show of beating a deadline as was given with the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress last week.

Pennsylvania's senior Senator thinks Congress could set up a flexible, staggered schedule for regular appropriation bills and thus avoid the last-minute legislative jams which have become a regular feature of our lawmaking.

Round-the-clock sessions, in which Congressmen strain to get through their required work before the hour of adjournment certainly do not promote sound, well-considered legislation. Senator MYERS, who knows more about it than we do, says "weary, exhausted, sleepless, punch-drunk, confused, overworked Congressmen and Senators are required to make snap judgments or surrender deep-seated convictions in order to allow Congress to adjourn and still enable the Government to function."

We agree with his thought that it is not in the public interest to let exhausted men act on legislation which vitally affects every business and industry, every part of the population, and the safety and security of the Nation.

We hope his remedy can be applied and that it will be effective. Certainly it should not be too difficult for Congress and the Government departments to set up a tentative schedule of early-session deadlines for acting on all routine and regular appropriations. The scheme won't work if the schedule is too tentative and too flexible, however. That old dodge of turning the clock back might be started in midsession instead of on the last day.

[From the American Butter Review for July 1948]

CHANGE CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURE

Closing days of the recent session of the Eightieth Congress presented a picture which in one direction at least strikingly reflects the crying need for procedural change—and change entirely without regard to which political party holds the balance of power. This is in the spectacle, many times before seen, of a mass of legislation—much of vital importance in both the national and world-wide scene—caught in a chaotic jam before a scheduled adjournment date.

Crowded into this latest last-minute rush, some imperative measures emerged only at the expense of fully adequate consideration and in less than satisfactory form, while others failed to emerge at all. Altogether, a far from orderly example of the processes of democratic government.

Among those legislators moved loudly to rebel against this situation was Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who has called for adoption by the Congress of a flexible and staggered schedule for action on regular appropriation bills and the putting into practice of all other means to avoid disruptive bottlenecks.

Says Senator MYERS, referring to the closing June session:

"While we are trying to convince the rest of the civilized world that the American political system is a good one to emulate, we had this spectacle of legislation at gun point.

"Weary, exhausted, sleepless, punch-drunk, confused, overworked Congressmen and Senators were required to make snap judgments or surrender deep-seated convictions in order to allow Congress to adjourn and still enable the Government to function.

"It is unfair, it is cruel, it is inhuman, and it is certainly against the public interest to require exhausted men to act on legislation vitally affecting every business and industry, every segment of the population, and the very safety and security of the Nation and its people under the circumstances.

"This Congress had been in session off and on for a year and a half and many important bills introduced early in the first session went into conference 18 months later at 2, 3, or 4 o'clock in the morning of the last day of the last session."

Who in his right mind could, with means of correction so readily at hand, permit such condition to continue? Surely it is long past time for new procedures.

FAILURES OF THE REPUBLICANS IN THE SPECIAL SESSION OF CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Failures of the Republicans in the Special Session of Congress," delivered by Senator LUCAS on August 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EQUITY FOR LABOR AND CAPITAL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HAWKES

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Equity for Labor and Capital, delivered by him before the Congress of American Industry, at New York City on December 9, 1938, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CAPPER BY HARRY W. COLMERY

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the occasion of the birthday celebration of Senator CAPPER, by Harry W. Colmery, at Topeka, Kans., July 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COL. EDWARD RICKENBACKER

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD remarks by George E. Stringfellow at the commencement exercises at the College of South Jersey, at Camden, N. J., on June 11, 1948, in presenting Col. Edward V. Rickenbacker for the degree of doctor of laws, the address delivered by Colonel Rickenbacker in accepting the degree, and also the citation by Dr. Arthur E. Armitage on the same occasion, which appear in the Appendix.]

LT. GEN. ROBERT L. EICHELBERGER—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Japanese Voice Sincere Regrets as One of Conquerors Departs," published in the New York Times of August 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS—EDITORIAL BY MAYNARD KNISKERN

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Issue of Civil Rights Today Has Lost Its Essential and Primary Meaning," written by Maynard Kniskern for the Springfield (Ohio) Sun, and reprinted in the Atlanta Journal of August 2, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

VIEWS OF THE DAIRY INDUSTRY COMMITTEE ON REGIMENTATION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter opposing regimentation, written by the Dairy Industry Committee, dated July 29, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEMASONRY AND COMMUNISM

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled Freemasonry and Communism printed in a special committee report adopted by the Grand Lodge of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of Maryland, which appears in the Appendix.]

TVA STEAM PLANT—LETTER FROM S. R. FINLEY

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated August 2, 1948, from Mr. S. R. Finley, general superintendent of the power board of the city of Chattanooga, Tenn., addressed to Hon. JOHN TABER, a Member of the House of Representatives, with reference to power needs in the TVA area, which appears in the Appendix.]

A NEGRO LOOKS AT CIVIL RIGHTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE DANVILLE (VA.) REGISTER

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Negro Looks at Civil Rights," published in the Danville (Va.) Register of August 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CURING A HANG-OVER—EDITORIAL FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Curing a Hang-Over" from the Wall Street Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SPECIAL SESSION

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by a constituent relating to the Republican record in the special session of the Eightieth Congress, as well as an editorial entitled "Speaking of 'Cheap Politics,'" from the Miami News of July 29, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR GREEN, OF ILLINOIS, AT ANNUAL ENCAMPMENT OF ONE HUNDRED AND NINTH ANTIAIRCRAFT ARTILLERY BRIGADE

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Gov. Dwight H. Green, of Illinois, at Governor's Day officers' luncheon for the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade, Illinois National Guard, on August 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE WATER RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MALONE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, because of the great interest in the flood-control policy of the United States—its extent, cost, and benefits—I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me containing the tentative plans for conservation and development of the water resources of the United States.

I am submitting this statement as chairman of the Flood Control Rivers and Harbors, Dams and Electric Power Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee. This statement is of particular interest at this time because of the public interest in conservation and development through flood control, rivers and harbors, and dams and electric power as a source of revenue to repay the Government costs.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE WATER RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Conservation and development of our water resources is of paramount importance. Included in this statement are the surveys and estimates of cost made by the Chief of Army Engineers, Department of the Army, as a tentative long-range objective to be carried out in accordance with economic feasibility and the judgment of the Congress of the United States.

Few realize that we do have a broad foundation for our water resources development and that comprehensive plans have been initiated for such development. In 1927 Congress recognized the importance to our growing Nation, of coordinated data covering the still undeveloped wealth of national resources in our river basins. It authorized the Corps of Engineers to undertake such studies of all of our principal river basins to determine the needs and possibilities of developing basins for flood control, navigation, irrigation and related water uses. The majority of these river basin surveys were completed by the Corps of Engineers during the ensuing 10-year period. These surveys have formed the factual basis for most of the Federal flood control legislation which has been adopted during recent years; they have served as the basic engineering plan for control and use of the waters of the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and they have been utilized as the major source of factual data and specific plans for river basin improvement by the former National Resources Board and by many State and local agencies.

Modern students of water resources development also frequently overlook the parts played by the long-established Federal departments, such as the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, and the Corps of Engineers. The first Act of Congress recognizing Federal responsibility and jurisdiction in water resources development was passed in 1824 and provided for improvements in the interest of navigation on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. This work was assigned to the Corps of Engineers and subsequently over the years Congress has expanded the functions and responsibilities of the engineers to include improvements on a broad scale for the development of river basins for the primary purposes of navigation and flood control with corollary beneficial water uses.

The Bureau of Reclamation has likewise been engaged since 1902 in the development of our water resources in the primary interest of irrigation and reclamation with other corollary purposes such as flood control and power development to repay the cost of such development. The Department of Agriculture has been making steady progress in the conservation of water resources on the land by means of proper land use and conservation practices and other water retardation measures. The Federal Power Commission has added to this coordinated approach to water resources development by investigating and furnishing advisory assistance in the field of hydroelectric power as an integral part of the most beneficial utilization of our water resources.

These Federal agencies, in carrying out their parts of the over-all Federal program for conservation and use of our water resources in response to authorizations by Congress, have been engaged in almost continuous review of the river basin studies to keep them in phase with changing conditions. As a result of these continued studies, we now have available up to date, general comprehensive plans of improvement for essentially all of the rivers of the United States.

I have requested the Chief of Engineers to furnish me a report summarizing the status of and the plans for conservation and development of our Nation-wide water resources. This report summarizes the growth of the Federal interest in the development of our water resources, sets forth the legislative basis under which Federal planning and execution of water resources improvements is proceeding, and indicates the responsibilities of the various existing Federal agencies for this work. It also summarizes in concise form the problems and potentialities of all of the rivers of the United States; the type, status, and cost of the plans of improvement as well as the specific advantages which would accrue to the Nation from accomplishment of the plans.

Briefly, the estimates of cost are summarized as follows:

	Cost
1. Works already completed	$4,779,700,000
2. Projects under construction	4,593,000,000
3. Projects definitely planned	18,980,900,000
4. Projects planned for the long-range future	29,152,600,000
Total	57,506,200,000

Item No. 1, works already complete, consists of useful elements of all phases of water resources development projects which have been completed throughout the United States and are now in operation. To provide a comparison of work accomplished with that remaining to be done, the cost of completed parts of the over-all plan of improvement is estimated at $4,779,700,000. Item No. 2, projects under construction, consists of works which are now actually under construction by the Federal Departments in cooperation with local agencies in all parts of the country, at an estimated total cost of $4,593,000,000.

Item No. 3, projects definitely planned, consists of improvements required at this time or to meet the needs of the immediate future which have been planned to the extent that some have been authorized by Congress, some are included in reports now before Congress, and the plans for others are now in course of preparation. The cost of these definitely planned improvements is estimated at $18,980,900,000. Item No. 4, projects planned for the long-range future, consists of plans which have been prepared looking toward ultimate development of water resources which may prove justified over the long-range future. These plans may serve as a guide to proper long-range development and are set forth to give approximation of the probable cost of full water resources development at about $29,152,600,000.

This summary shows in brief that the plans for development of the water resources of the United States will be about 16 percent complete with the completion of work now under way. Definite plans for development which are now ready in the form of authorized projects, reports to Congress, or plans in course of preparation, will include projects with a total cost of about $18,961,000,000. These projects and plans represent a measure in monetary terms of most of the works that would be justified at present or in the prospective future—say in the next 20 to 25 years; and they form a part of longer range plans that point the way to ultimate river-basin development.

With respect to the benefits which will be obtained from this development it is interesting to note that the projects which have already been completed afford average annual savings in flood damages prevented totaling about $343,000,000, according to the Corps of Army Engineers. These plans are estimated to produce transportation savings totaling $475,000,000 annually, and they will permit the development of nearly 60,000,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power, in the interest of repayment of costs to the Government. About 17,000,000 acres of land may be irrigated under these plans and about 15,000,000 acres of potential farm land will be furnished adequate drainage.

The problem of accomplishing the development of our water resources, although of tremendous size, is not an insurmountable problem because very substantial progress is shown by the magnitude of work completed and under way. It should be borne in mind that most of this work has been accomplished in the last 20 years, during which the Nation has also participated in a world war when all civil works activities were practically at a standstill. The benefits and advantages which will accrue from a long-range program of water-resource development as estimated will far exceed the cost. In fact prosecution of a sound program of river basin development may ultimately be essential to our survival as a nation. Ancient civilizations, such as that of the Incas of the Andes, found it necessary to build great public works, such as terraces and aqueducts to conserve meager resources of mountain water and soil, in order to maintain themselves. The cost of those ancient works would be enormous by present-day standards in man-hours of labor, but they were essential to the needs of their time. This Nation with its abundance of resources of soil and water can insure its future by continuing with a far-sighted program for the conservation and use of these resources in accordance with economic feasibility.

The summary presented by the Chief of Engineers furnishes for the first time to my knowledge a picture of the full scope and magnitude of the problem of conserving and developing the water resources of the United States. I believe that it is of such importance and general interest that I present it in full at this time for the particular benefit of those of us who recognize that only by a sound fully integrated approach can we hope to secure the optimum use of the natural wealth with which our country has been endowed.

SUMMARY OF PLANS FOR CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE WATER RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

I. THE RIVERS

1. The continental area of the United States comprises the basins of over 160 separate rivers, and the valleys of innumerable small streams, which flow east and west to the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, southward to the Gulf of Mexico, and north to pass through Canada and reach Hudson Bay and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. These rivers and their basins range in magnitude from coastal estuaries draining a few square miles to the great Mississippi-Missouri, the longest river system in the world, which, with its tributaries, drains the entire inland basin lying between the Rockies and Appalachians, including over 40 percent of the area of the United States.

2. The fact that the greater part of the present area of the United States lies within fertile river valleys is responsible in large measure for the rapid settlement of this country and for its present national development. Other parts of the New World were explored and occupied by white men 100 years before the first permanent settlements in North America, but most of these other areas lacked the fertile soils and abundant waters to be found in this part of North America and were soon outstripped in settlement and development.

3. Beginning with the first settlement at the mouth of the James, and continuing with the westward movement of population across the Great Plains and Rocky Mountains and down the valley of the Columbia to the Pacific, the rivers of the country have afforded pathways through the continental wilderness and have given direction to its conquest. In time of war the rivers have been routes of invasion leading into the heart of the country, and in more recent times have been secure harbors for the building of ships of war for use in distant seas. Small settlements established at strategic river junctions in colonial days have grown to be the greatest industrial centers in the world, and river basins which less than a century ago were almost uninhabited now support populations which run into the millions. These same rivers, whose flow over long periods of geologic time has actually formed the land of America, are still the most important resources of this Nation.

II. GROWTH OF FEDERAL INTEREST

4. With the increasing growth of the Nation, the need for controlling, conserving, and using wisely the resources afforded by the rivers has become more and more evident. Problems and potentialities of the river basins which were relatively minor considerations or nonexistent in a sparsely settled agricultural country have become of foremost importance to a growing industrial nation.

5. These problems and potentialities and their national character have been recognized progressively by the Congress of the United States. As early as the First Congress, an act was passed for the marking of harbors and waterways by the Federal Government to improve the safety of navigation, and the power of Congress to legislate with reference to navigable waters of the United States was definitely established in 1824 by the Supreme Court in the case of *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*. The first definite River and Harbor Act for the improvement of rivers was passed in 1824, and that work was placed under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers of the Army, and has been performed by that Federal agency continuously since that time—for almost a century and a quarter. The Swamp and Overflowed Land Grant Acts of 1850 were an initial effort of the Federal Government toward river-basin development, as they turned over to the various States large areas of public lands subject to the requirement that they would be improved by drainage and flood protection. Initial cognisance of flood control as a problem of national interest occurred in 1879, when the Mississippi River Commission was created by act of Congress, and the Federal Government has participated in flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River since that time.

6. In 1888 Congress appropriated funds for surveys for determining the extent to which the arid regions of the United States could be reclaimed by irrigation and for selection of reservoir sites for the storage of water, and directed that this work be performed under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. The initial Reclamation Act under which Federal reclamation activities are being prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation in that part of the United States west of the ninety-seventh meridian was passed by Congress in 1902.

7. The Federal Power Act was originally enacted in 1920 in an initial effort to establish a degree of Federal regulation over the development and distribution of hydroelectric power, and functions of the Federal Power Commission established thereby have been clarified and expanded by subsequent acts of Congress.

8. Severe floods in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi in 1927 resulted in the passage of the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, which adopted the present comprehensive plan for flood control in the alluvial valley which had been prepared by the Corps of Engineers in accordance with a Presidential directive.

9. Meanwhile, in 1925 the Congress had authorized the Secretary of War, through the Corps of Engineers, and the Federal Power Commission to prepare an estimate of cost of surveys of rivers of the United States "with a view to formulation of general plans for the most effective improvement of such streams for the purposes of navigation and the prosecution of such improvement in combination with the most efficient development of the potential water power, the control of floods, and the needs of irrigation." An estimate of surveys required and their cost was submitted to Congress in 1926 and was published as House Document No. 308, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session. The River and Harbor Acts of 1927 and 1928 adopted and authorized surveys of essentially all of the rivers of the United States in accordance with House Document No. 308.

10. The great majority of these comprehensive "308" river-basin surveys were completed by the Corps of Engineers during the ensuing 10-year period. Consequently when, after a series of destructive floods in various parts of the country, Congress began considering the Nation-wide scope of the flood problem, published reports were available to congressional committees which contained definite plans for flood control in most of the major river basins of the United States. With this mass of factual information available Congress was able to draft and pass the Flood Control Act of 1936 which established flood control generally throughout the Nation as a Federal activity and authorized a large number of specific flood-control projects to be prosecuted by the Corps of Engineers at an estimated cost of $310,050,000. This act also recognized the need for works in river basins for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil erosion prevention and made the Secretary of Agriculture responsible for such improvements. This act, therefore, with subsequent flood-control acts in 1937, 1938, 1939, 1941, 1944, and 1946, provides the basic legislative authority under which flood control and related river-basin improvements are being accomplished by these Federal agencies all over the United States.

11. The comprehensive river-basin surveys prepared by the Corps of Engineers pursuant to House Document No. 308 not only formed the factual basis for general Federal flood-control legislation, but were of basic value to the Congress in 1933 when the Tennessee Valley Authority was established by legislative action; as the engineering plan for control and use of the waters of the Tennessee River and its tributaries, which has been developed by TVA, is essentially that set forth by the Chief of Engineers in his report published in House Document No. 328, Seventy-first Congress, second session. The "308 Surveys" were also utilized, as the major source of factual data and specific plans for river-basin improvement, by the National Resources Board established by the President in 1934 and by its successor, the National Resources Committee. Extensive use has been made of these surveys by many State and local agencies concerned with water-resources planning.

12. In the Flood Control Act of 1944 programs of watershed improvement were authorized in 11 river basins for prosecution under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. In carrying out this work the Department of Agriculture utilizes its agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; and actual works of improvement are accomplished by local soil-conservation districts located in the river basins under consideration. In the same Flood Control Act of 1944 Congress recognized the close interrelation of flood control and drainage by providing that the term "flood control" should include channel and major drainage improvements. This act of 1944 also provided for coordination of plans for water-resource development between the various Federal agencies concerned with such improvements; and for more positive coordination and cooperation with affected States. The Flood Control Act of 1944 set up the procedure by which coordination with the States would be accomplished.

13. The acts of Congress which have been summarized briefly in the foregoing paragraphs afford an adequate legislative basis for planning for development and use of the water resources of the Nation; and prescribe the Federal agencies by which such plans may be accomplished to any extent desired by the Congress and the people of the United States.

14. In carrying out its part of the over-all Federal program for conservation and use of the water resources of the United States the Corps of Engineers in accordance with congressional authority has been engaged in continuous review of its river-basin studies to keep them up to date and in phase with changing conditions. In addition, surveys of other specific rivers for flood control and related purposes have been authorized by the Congress. In carrying out these studies close coordination is maintained with other Federal agencies with respect to river-basin problems which are under their jurisdiction, and with the States and local agencies of the respective river basins. As a result of these continuing studies the Corps of Engineers now has available up-to-date comprehensive plans of improvement for essentially all of the rivers of the United States.

III. RIVER PROBLEMS AND POTENTIALITIES

15. The great natural resources represented by the water and land of the river basins is not a permanent asset which will renew itself. When these resources are expended or lost they are in most cases lost forever. Arid and eroded lands of China and the Middle East, which once were well watered and fertile, point to the long-range future that may be anticipated if resources of land and water are not preserved. While such conditions are not imminent in the basins of most of our rivers there are too many instances where the destructive natural forces of flood, wind, and erosion, speeded up by rapid and often unwise development and exploitation, have created serious conditions which can be rectified only at great cost and over a long period of time. In most instances, however, great resources remain which can be controlled and conserved at reasonable cost for the benefit of present and future generations.

16. Because of the wide diversity of the rivers of the United States it is difficult to summarize the water problems and potentialities of the Nation. These vary according to geographic regions and even differ widely in separate parts of a single large river basin. Each river basin requires separate study. However, as a result of a review of studies of the Corps of Engineers covering the rivers of the entire country, the major water problems are summarized in the following paragraphs to give a general picture of the objectives of water-resource development.

17. Floods: (a) Floods occur on all the major rivers of the United States, and are among the most destructive of the forces of nature. They may also be the source of great benefit if their water can be controlled and put to beneficial use. Flood problems on the rivers of the United States range from the slowly rising inundations, which formerly covered thousands of square miles of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River, to the flash type of floods from the bare hillsides of western basins, such as that of the Los Angeles River, which are heavily laden with rocks and debris. Floods on the rivers of the United States are not a new phenomenon; the records of DeSoto's expedition reveal widespread flooding in the Mississippi Valley at a time when the primeval forests and native prairie grasses covered the entire Mississippi River Basin. However, the inevitable settlement and development of river valleys has brought a new realization of their destructiveness, and improper land use has contributed to the intensity of floods.

(b) Flood control works have been constructed by the Federal Government in most of the major river basins and on a number of smaller streams. In view of the spectacular nature and destructiveness of floods which still occur, the effectiveness of existing flood-control works in preventing flood damages is often overlooked. For example, the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River has not suffered severe flooding since 1927 and the system of levees and floodways passed safely to the Gulf of Mexico the great flood of 1937 which devastated the Ohio Valley. The system of Federal levees around Lake Okeechobee in Florida withstood hurricane-driven floods on that lake in 1947 and prevented repetition of a disaster like that of 1928, when over 2,000 people were drowned in the Everglades area adjacent to Lake Okeechobee. Reservoirs constructed in the Allegheny Basin above Pittsburgh have, on a number of occasions, greatly reduced flood damages in that area, although the system is not yet complete. It is estimated that existing flood-control works all over the country now operate to prevent an average annual flood loss of over $343,000,000 on the basis of present price levels and the present degree of river-basin development.

(c) The flood problem is not solved, however, and destructive floods continue to occur in most of the river valleys. On the basis of actual flood occurrences, flood damage surveys, and flood magnitudes and frequencies, it is estimated that the remaining average annual flood damage to be anticipated throughout the country under present conditions is about $468,000,000. This toll of damage will vary from year to year. For example, thus far in 1948 flood damages, including the destructive flood in the Columbia River Basin, have been below normal; while in 1947 damages in the upper Mississippi, Missouri, and South Florida areas alone greatly exceeded the long-term average for the entire country.

(d) The geographical distribution of the national flood problem, expressed in average annual flood damage, is shown in table No. 2, herewith.

18. Navigation: Navigation has been an important use of the rivers of the United States since the Colonial period; and many of the rivers such as the Hudson, the Mississippi, and the Sacramento in their natural states afforded useful waterways for the commerce of the time. As industry grew in the river valleys and agricultural development expanded in the river basins, public demand for low-cost water-borne transportation resulted in the provision by the Federal Government of modern navigable channels on the major rivers suitable for such improvement. At this time navigable channels with a depth of 9 feet extend from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes via the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers; and channels with similar depths extend up many other rivers. The Ohio-Mississippi River system, developed for 9-foot navigation by canalization, is surpassed in tonnage moved only by the Panama Canal and the channels connecting the Great Lakes. Federal navigation projects have been obtained by open channel improvements such as dredging, channel construction works, and snagging; and by canalization by means of locks and dams. These inland waterways transported

9,000,000,000 ton-miles of cargo in 1929, and this movement has increased to 28,000,000,000 ton-miles in 1946. This vast water transportation system results in large annual savings to the public through reduction in transportation costs to shippers and receivers of cargo. At this time there is an increasing demand for deepening parts of the inland waterways to 12 feet to obtain the benefits of heavier tows and modern equipment. The Corps of Engineers is also charged with the improvement of harbors on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts, and on the Great Lakes, which are the terminals of these waterways. These deep-water harbors and connecting intracoastal waterways are not being considered as a part of this report.

19. Hydroelectric power: Development of hydroelectric power has become an increasingly important potentiality of the rivers of the United States. Hydroelectric power developments which have been constructed by private interests, and by the Federal Government in connection with projects for flood control, irrigation, and navigation, have an aggregate installed capacity of 17,127,000 kilowatts. In its studies of possible river basin development, the Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with the Federal Power Commission, gives consideration to the possibilities for concurrent and future development of the rivers' remaining waterpower potential. These studies show that the feasible water power which remains undeveloped on all rivers of the United States, except the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes connecting channels, would permit the installation of an aggregate capacity of 79,965,000 kilowatts. Much of this potential power would not be economical for development at the present time; and for physical and economic reasons it may never be practicable to develop all power potentialities. At present when power development at a reservoir being constructed by the Corps of Engineers is found feasible and economical, a power installation is provided when authorized by Congress. In cases where power development at a project is not justified at present but may in the opinion of the Department of the Army and Federal Power Commission be needed in the future, provisions for future power development are incorporated in flood-control dams. The general distribution of hydroelectric power potentialities according to geographical regions of the United States is shown in table No. 2 herewith.

20. Irrigation: (a) Water for irrigation of agricultural land is one of the most important uses of the rivers of the United States which lie west of the ninety-seventh meridian. Federal activities in connection with this important water use in the West are under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. The Bureau has made comprehensive studies of this problem and is now actively engaged in the prosecution of many Federal irrigation projects. The work of the Corps of Engineers for flood control and other purposes is coordinated with the reclamation work of the Bureau of Reclamation in a number of western river basins; and comprehensive river basin studies of the Corps of Engineers consider irrigation in its relation to other river improvements.

(b) It has been estimated that there are about 28,300,000 acres of land in the western part of the United States which have been reclaimed for agricultural use by irrigation. Of this amount some 5,000,000 acres are included in existing Federal irrigation projects while the remainder has been reclaimed by local interests and agencies. It is difficult to state the definite extent of irrigable land that remains as its suitability for development depends upon water-supply limitations and land characteristics. However, studies of the Corps of Engineers, made in connection with its flood-control surveys, and reports of the Bureau of Reclamation show that there are some 22,700,000 acres of potentially irrigable land remaining to be developed in the western part of the United States.

(c) In addition to the irrigable potentialities in the West, there are large areas in southeastern Texas and in Louisiana and Arkansas where supplemental water for rice land is practical. These rice lands, usually in coastal or alluvial areas, aggregate about 1,600,000 acres; and it appears that some 2,200,000 acres of additional rice lands could be brought into production by a combination of flood protection, drainage, and water supply. Supplemental water supplies are needed in many localities to improve the production of existing lands.

(d) The geographical distribution of irrigation and watering of rice land potentialities is shown in table No. 2 herewith.

21. Drainage and water control: (a) Drainage improvements are an essential part of flood control in many instances, and in accordance with congressional authority the Corps of Engineers includes major drainage improvements in its flood-control programs. Since the Department of Agriculture is responsible for land conservation and watershed improvement measures, an interdepartmental cooperative procedure has been devised to define the responsibilities and extent of activities of the Corps of Engineers and of the Department of Agriculture in planning and execution of complete drainage improvements. In general, the Corps of Engineers is responsible for major drainage outlets and the Department of Agriculture for drainage on watershed lands. Thus the two agencies can proceed in coordination to cover the entire field of drainage and flood control, except in cases where drainage is part of the Federal irrigation projects, where it is prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation.

(b) The magnitude of the drainage problem throughout the United States has been summarized in general terms by the Department of Agriculture as follows:

	Acres
(1) Lands on farms of the Nation that are too wet for full production or for any production at all	29,000,000
(2) Irrigated lands in the West needing drainage to control the water table and prevent damage from alkali salts	8,000,000
(3) Wet lands never cleared for farming or opened for cultivation of crops that are suitable for bringing into agricultural production	20,000,000
Total	57,000,000

The improvement by drainage of lands of existing farms is largely within the province of the watershed improvement programs of the Department of Agriculture and local agencies; but the Corps of Engineers is involved to the extent of improving or providing major drainage outlets. In its studies for flood-control programs, the Corps of Engineers has found that there are about 24,000,000 acres of lands which can be reclaimed for agricultural use by a combination of flood protection, drainage, and control of water levels. This includes most of the nonproducing wet lands included in the Department of Agriculture summary given above. The geographical distribution of the land suitable for improvement by drainage is shown in table No. 2 herewith.

(c) Since much of this land susceptible of improvement by flood protection and drainage is of a highly productive type, when properly developed and used, it represents a valuable national resource for development as the need arises. The lands of this type are to be found largely in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi, and in the Atlantic southeast and Gulf coastal areas; although scattered areas occur in almost all parts of the country. In its approach to the problem of land improvement and reclamation by drainage and water control the Corps of Engineers recognizes that it is neither possible nor desirable to drain all swamp and marshland. Large areas should remain and be preserved in their natural state for the preservation of important fish and wildlife resources. And in all cases the dangers of over-drainage, which have in some instances resulted in unwise development and in loss of land, should be avoided.

22. Watershed improvement: The Department of Agriculture has completed preliminary examinations of 154 river basins or parts of basins, and 18 detailed surveys for watershed treatment programs. It has watershed treatment programs under way in 11 river basins in accordance with congressional authorizations, extending from the upper Potomac in the East to the Trinity River in Texas, and surveys of over 40 watersheds are under way at the present time. These include comprehensive surveys of the Missouri River Basin, and of such diverse watersheds as those of the Merrimack in New England, and of the Rio Grande in New Mexico and Colorado. The importance of this phase of river-basin improvement is fully recognized in comprehensive river-basin plans being prepared by the Corps of Engineers, and works proposed by the Department of Agriculture in watersheds will effectively complement the works proposed by the Corps of Engineers for control of rivers and major tributaries. Watershed treatment programs include measures for conservation of soil, improved land use, reforestation and establishment of vegetative cover, check dams and farm ponds; and other means to conserve the soil and water on the lands of the river basins.

23. Other problems: There are numerous other problems and potentialities associated with the development of the water resources of the United States, which vary in magnitude and importance between the various sections of the country and in the separate river basins. These include the provisions of water supply for municipal and industrial use; pollution control and abatement; preservation of fish and wildlife; improvement of public health and sanitation; development of recreational areas and facilities. Consideration is being given to these matters in preparation of all comprehensive plans for water-resource development; and agencies of the Federal Government such as the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Public Health Service, as well as State and local agencies, are proceeding with specific plans of improvement, and are cooperating with the Corps of Engineers in the development of comprehensive river-basin plans.

IV. PLANS OF IMPROVEMENT

24. The Corps of Engineers has prepared comprehensive plans for the conservation and development of the water resources of most of the major rivers of the United States. Other Federal agencies such as the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Public Health Service have also prepared comprehensive plans in their particular fields of water-resource development and improvement. In addition many State and local agencies throughout the United States have developed local plans of improvement and have completed or initiated projects which fit in with the over-all plans of the Federal agencies. This review of plans for conservation and use of water resources takes into consideration as completely as possible the works under way and contemplated by all Federal and local agencies.

25. The comprehensive plans for water-resource conservation and use which are summarized in this study include works of the following general types:

(a) For flood control: Storage reservoirs, levees, floodwalls, flood channel improvements, floodways, spillways and pumping stations.

(b) For navigation: Open channel improvements by dredging, jetties, bank revetment and contraction works; and canalization by means of lock and dam structures.

(c) Power development: Dams, penstocks, generators, and transmission lines in some cases.

(d) Irrigation: Storage reservoirs; major canal systems; pumping plants, headgates, water-distribution systems, and land leveling and improvement.

(e) Drainage: Canals, levees, pumping stations, control structures and water conservation areas.

(f) Watershed treatment: Check dams, farm ponds, establishment of vegetative cover, reforestation, contour plowing, and improved land-use practices.

(g) Pollution abatement: Reservoir storage to increase low water flow; sewage treatment plants; facilities for treatment of industrial waste; mine-sealing operations.

(h) Other features: Wildlife refuges; recreational facilities; and measures for control of malaria and other diseases and for improvement of public health.

(i) Multiple-use projects: In many cases single project features serve a number of uses, such as a reservoir which stores water for flood control, irrigation and development of power.

26. In a brief discussion of plans for conservation and use of water resources of the United States it is impracticable to list the hundreds of specific projects that would be involved, and it is possible only to summarize and show the status and magnitude of the plan, as follows:

(a) Completed works: Useful elements of all phases of water-resource development projects have been completed throughout the United States and are now in operation. To provide a comparison of work accomplished with that remaining to be done the cost of completed parts of the over-all plan of improvement is estimated at $4,779,700,000.

(b) Projects under construction: Projects are now under construction by the Federal Government in cooperation with local agencies in all parts of the country, with an estimated cost of $4,593,000,000.

(c) Projects definitely planned: Improvements required at this time or to meet the needs of the immediate future have been planned to the extent that some have been authorized by Congress; some are included in reports now before Congress, and plans for some are now in course of preparation. The cost of these definitely planned improvements is estimated at $18,980,900,000.

(d) Future plans: In addition to the foregoing, plans have been prepared looking toward ultimate development of water resources which may prove justified over the long-range future. These plans which may serve as a guide to proper long-range development, are set forth herein merely to give an approximation of the probable cost of full water-resource development at $29,152,600,000. A break-down of the status and cost of the comprehensive plan according to major geographical divisions of the United States is given herewith as table No. 1.

27. Since the full scope of certain future plans such as those of the Department of Agriculture for watershed improvement and those of the Public Health Service for pollution control and abatement, which are to be accomplished jointly with local interests, is not fully defined at this time, the ultimate program for complete river basin development will probably include additional measures not covered by this summary. The program as shown, however, is believed adequate to serve as a general measure of the long-range requirements for sound river-basin development.

28. Accomplishment of the complete program of development represents a task of great magnitude. Nevertheless, over a period of time it is entirely practicable and within the range of demonstrated capabilities of the Nation. For example the appropriations by the Congress for the fiscal year 1949 for public works of the type summarized in this study will aggregate more than a billion dollars. On this basis the program could be accomplished within the lives of present generations. The grand total cost shown above should also be considered in relation to work completed and under way; which will indicate that, with completion of work now under construction, about 16 percent of the total job will be complete. When one considers that practically all of the work completed has been accomplished in the past 40 years and that all of the work under construction was initiated during the past 10 years, a proper time perspective for the over-all plan of improvement may be obtained.

29. The part of the over-all plan of improvement set forth in the summary as "projects definitely planned" with a total estimated cost of $18,981,000,000, including work which has been authorized by Congress to date for all types of river-basin improvement, affords a reservoir of projects which can be undertaken to the extent deemed advisable by Congress to meet the most urgent needs of the present and prospective future. Many of these projects have present economic justification and information on them is available to the Congress in reports submitted by the Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies. This part of the over-all plan includes most of the projects necessary to provide a well-rounded program of river-basin development for the next 20 or 25 years. Any plan of this magnitude can be accomplished in an effective manner only if the planning and constructing agencies of the Federal Government can proceed under an orderly program, which continues at a fairly uniform rate over a period of years.

30. The grand total cost of comprehensive plans for conservation and use of the water resources of the United States, including work completed and under way, may be divided among the various functions of the plan approximately as follows:

Flood control	$12,295,200,000
Navigation	6,233,100,000
Hydroelectric power	24,086,900,000
Irrigation	8,681,600,000
Drainage	375,400,000
Watershed treatment	4,012,000,000
Pollution control	1,365,800,000
Preservation of fish and wildlife and recreation	456,200,000
Total	57,506,200,000

Table No. 3 herewith gives a break-down of costs by geographical regions of the United States.

31. The foregoing break-down has been estimated to show an approximate division of total cost among the various functions of river-basin development. It should be borne in mind, however, that in many instances the same works perform several functions and the project features and functions are so closely interrelated, as is the case of navigation and flood control on the lower Mississippi River, that an actual separation of project costs is not practicable. The division of cost assigned to flood control includes most major drainage improvements as the two functions are so closely related; and the part of the cost assigned separately to drainage is that of works purely for local drainage and water control necessary to take advantage of major drainage outlets. The division of cost assigned to hydroelectric power development is large in this case because of the greater facility of assigning definite monetary values to power developed, than to certain other phases of water-resource development, and because of the large amount of hydroelectric power available for ultimate development on the rivers of the country.

V. ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PLANS

32. The comprehensive plans for river basin development which are summarized in this study provide a basis for conservation and use of practically the entire water resources of the United States. The accomplishments of the over-all plan with respect to five of its major functions are summarized in table No. 2 herewith by geographical regions of the United States. These may be summarized briefly for the entire United States as follows:

(a) Flood control: Floods which can occur under existing conditions on the rivers of the United States will produce average annual flood damages, estimated at present price levels and at present degrees of river valley development, of over $466,000,000 annually. It is seldom possible, within the realm of practical engineering and economics, to prevent all of the flood damages that will occur on any river; and this is equally true for the flood damage remaining on a Nation-wide scale. The planned flood-control works, however, together with those under construction and not yet effective, would, when ultimately completed, prevent 75 percent of this remaining flood damage. This degree of protection, if it could be obtained at the present time or near future, would result in savings from flood damages prevented, of $356,000,000 annually on the average. In addition to the effect of the planned improvements in preventing flood damage, they would produce large benefits by eliminating hazards to human life, and by preventing the indirect losses to business and agriculture and to the general economy which accompany floods. These indirect losses include disruption of business, transportation delays and detours, interruption of public services and utilities, dangers to public health, and general dislocations in the economy which extend far beyond the actual flooded areas. With the growth and development of population and industry in the river basins, flood damages will undoubtedly increase, and benefits of adequate flood protection will likewise increase.

(b) Navigation: The over-all plan would result in the ultimate improvement of all navigable rivers, and would extend the benefits of economical water-borne transportation to the principal agricultural and industrial areas of the Nation. It is difficult to estimate the benefits that will result from such improvements that will extend far into the future, but on the basis of present development and requirements it is estimated that all waterway improvements existing and contemplated in the over-all plan of development would produce transportation savings of about $475,500,000, annually, when ultimate development is reached. These savings are based on detailed estimates for completed works and on preliminary data for planned future improvements for which it is not practicable to make detailed estimates at this time. The greater part of this commerce that would be carried by the inland waterways would be bulk commodities, for which rapid transit is not essential, such as coal, ore, grain, bulk petroleum products, and fertilizers. For example, the extension of efficient barge navigation along the Missouri and other western rivers would provide a means for economical shipment of fertilizers and fuels into a vast agricultural region.

(c) Hydroelectric power: As indicated previously in this study there remains in the

river basins of the country a feasible potentiality for the development of 79,965,000 kilowatts of power, over and above that now installed. The river basin plans summarized in this study contemplate the development of about 75 percent of this undeveloped resources, or about 56,540,000 kilowatts. Such a large development of power would of course take place over a long period of time in phase with the developing power requirements of industry and population generally and as other aspects of water resource development are carried out. This power potentiality of the Nation is one of its most valuable resources, on which much of its future industrial development will depend. The amount of hydroelectric power that can be developed in connection with other projects for water resource development is an essential part of any summary of this problem; and is given here to complete the survey of river potentialities. Procedures are now in effect for development of hydroelectric power by both public and private agencies and continuing procedures for development and disposal of this resource are matters for determination by the Congress.

(d) Irrigation: The plans of the Bureau of Reclamation for irrigation of western lands, which are related to water resource plans of the Corps of Engineers and which have been included in this summary, contemplate that some 16,200,000 acres of new land will be brought into production by irrigation, and that supplemental water will be provided for a large part of the area now under irrigation. The new land to be reclaimed by irrigation is about 70 percent of the land suitable for this purpose. The benefits of irrigation are well illustrated by present areas in the West where green agricultural valleys contrast with vast dry areas usable only for range land, or with no agricultural value, when dependent upon inadequate annual rainfall. In such areas irrigation water means the difference between rich farming land and desert. In addition water would be provided for about 70 percent of the 2,200,000 acres of potential ricelands.

(e) Drainage: As indicated in table No. 2 with this report there are nearly 24,000,000 acres of wet land which appear suitable for agricultural purposes. This does not include all of the swamp, marsh, and overflowed land in the United States as much of it at land is not suitable for agricultural use, or could be developed only at a prohibitive cost. In addition much of the wet land should remain in its natural state to serve its natural purposes of providing areas for storage of flood waters, natural reservoirs for replenishment of ground water tables, and as areas for the preservation of fish and wildlife and natural vegetation. Plans included as a part of the over-all plan of river basin improvement contemplate drainage of about 15,300,000 acres of land, or about 60 percent of that wet land which appears suitable for agriculture. This large acreage would be improved and developed gradually over a period of time as the growth of requirements for additional land evolves.

(f) Watershed treatment: Works for improvement of watersheds, which are completed, being provided, and contemplated, include such measures as improvement of existing vegetative cover, the establishment of vegetation on denuded areas, the protection of forests and grasslands from fire, reduction of grazing, adoption of logging and forest management practices that maintain good ground cover, the proper use of close-growing and cover crops on tilled lands, changes in use of land and kinds of plant cover that will result in reduction of run-off and erosion, all of which help increase infiltration of water into the soil and its retention in the soil and help prevent erosion. Also included are installations of mechanical measures and conservation practices such as terraces, diversion ditches, stabilization of roadside ditches, check dams, small detention dams, debris basins, contour cultivation, and strip cropping to help retard run-off and reduce erosion and movement of sediment. Although it is not possible at this time to assign any over-all monetary or other unit to indicate the benefits which will result from the diverse measures and structures which make up a watershed treatment program, it is obvious that they will produce large returns on a Nation-wide basis by conserving land and improving existing farm and land production. They will complement flood control works on major streams by reducing the number of small floods, and the damages of large floods, and by preventing the flow of sediment into major streams.

33. There are a number of other features of comprehensive plans for conservation of water resources and improvement of river basins. These include:

(a) Pollution control and abatement: In 1939 the Water Resources Committee of the National Resources Committee indicated that there was no quick and easy solution of the problem of river pollution; and estimated that an expenditure of about two billion dollars would be required to abate the more objectionable pollution. Since that time a large amount of work has been accomplished by local and State agencies, under agreements between various States in a river basin, and in accordance with plans and programs supervised by the Public Health Service. In addition legislation is in process of final consideration by the present Congress which will provide for continuation of Federal assistance in pollution control under the general supervision of the Public Health Service. The comprehensive plans for the various river basins, which are summarized in this study, give consideration to this problem; and in many cases reservoirs for flood control and other purposes will have substantial values in controlling pollution by increasing low-water flows. Complete or essentially complete solution of the problem, however, will require treatment plants for municipal sewage and industrial waste. Since such works are largely a responsibility of local governments and private industry; and since proposed plans and their cost were not available it was not practicable to include all of these works in this summary.

(b) Preservation of fish and wildlife: The plans for river-basin improvement include features and costs for preservation of fish and wildlife. In carrying out such plans every effort is made to avoid disturbing the natural habitat of fish and game. This is not always possible as development of the potentialities of the rivers usually results in change in natural regimen and conditions; but in such cases an effort is made to restore favorable conditions as nearly as possible. In other cases it is possible to conserve natural areas and improve their suitability for propagation of fish and game. This aspect of conservation is considered by the Corps of Engineers in all of its plans for river-basin development.

(c) Recreation: With the growth of population in the country there has arisen a growing need for recreational facilities, particularly near centers of population. The navigation channels afforded by the inland waterways in the over-all plan of improvement will serve one phase of this need by offering facilities for recreational boating. Reservoirs built for various purposes are often suitable for recreational use. At this time the Corps of Engineers prepares a master recreational plan for each of the reservoirs placed under construction, and this plan is followed in the development of recreational facilities in conjunction with State and local agencies. The National Park Service of the Department of the Interior cooperates with the Corps of Engineers in the analysis and planning of recreational facilities. The plans of river-basin development summarized in this study will, when accomplished, produce substantial recreational values.

(d) Water supply: The upstream reservoir storage contemplated as a large part of plans of development will greatly improve the streams as a source of water for municipal and industrial use by the regulation of flow and particularly by increasing low-water flow. In addition, in many instances it is possible to reserve storage in the reservoirs themselves for water supply, and the plan contemplates such reservations. This aspect of water conservation will become more important with the development of population and urban areas.

(e) Salinity control: In some coastal areas the encroachment of salt water into the tidal portions of rivers and canals, and into underground water tables, has created a problem which is becoming increasingly serious as these areas are settled and developed. This problem is considered in affected areas and improvement of this condition will be obtained by means of barrier structures, increased low water flows, and by fresh water storage areas.

VI. CONCLUSION

34. This review of plans for conservation and use of the water resources of the United States presents the full scope and magnitude of this national problem. The summarization of the diverse elements of this problem has been made possible by the availability of the "308" river-basin surveys which were authorized by Congress; by the ability of field organizations of the Corps of Engineers in 10 divisions and 41 districts covering the entire United States to keep the plans up to date and coordinated with the plans and activities of other Federal and local agencies.

35. This summary shows in brief that the plans for development of the water resources of the United States will be abcut 16 percent complete with the completion of work now under way. Definite plans for development which are now ready in the form of authorized projects, reports to Congress, or plans in course of preparation, will include projects with a total cost of about $18,981,000,000. These projects and plans represent a measure in monetary terms of most of the work that would be justified at present or in the prospective future—say in the next 20 to 25 years; and they form a part of longer-range plans that point the way to ultimate river-basin development.

36. It is recognized that this summary presents in brief a tremendous problem, and it is believed that it is factual and correct within the limitations involved in estimating future improvements of great size. The problem is not insurmountable because very substantial progress is shown by the magnitude of work completed and under way. It should be borne in mind that most of this work has been accomplished in the last 20 years, during which the Nation has also participated in a world war when all civil-works activities were practically at a standstill. While the total cost of complete development of our national water resources will be large, it will be only a fraction of the expenditure which this Nation was forced to make to preserve itself during the recent world war. The benefits and advantages which will accrue from a long-range program of water-resource development will far exceed the cost. In fact prosecution of a sound program of river-basin development may be essential to our survival as a Nation. Ancient civilizations, such as that of the Incas of the Andes found it necessary to build great public works, such as terraces and aqueducts to conserve meager resources

of mountain water and soil, in order to maintain themselves. The cost of those ancient works would be enormous by present-day standards but they were essential to the needs of their time. This Nation, with its abundance of resources of soil and water, can insure its future by continuing with a far-sighted program for the conservation and use of these resources.

TABLE 1.—*Status and estimated cost of plans for conservation and use of the water resources of the United States*

	Projects completed	Projects under construction	Projects definitely planned	Future plans for ultimate use	Total
Atlantic Northeast	$907,200,000	$175,700,000	$1,447,300,000	$1,422,300,000	$3,312,500,000
Atlantic Southeast	163,100,000	143,400,000	2,058,700,000	1,443,200,000	3,808,400,000
Alluvial valley of the Mississippi	677,500,000	142,700,000	744,200,000	485,800,000	2,050,200,000
Ohio River Basin	1,192,700,000	433,300,000	3,062,100,000	2,130,600,000	6,758,700,000
Great Lakes Basin	28,700,000	42,400,000	47,800,000	403,700,000	522,600,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin	410,600,000	127,300,000	764,400,000	847,800,000	2,150,100,000
Red River of the North Basin	3,500,000	8,300,000	14,000,000	12,400,000	38,200,000
Missouri River Basin	149,600,000	1,635,700,000	2,681,700,000	1,650,000,000	6,123,000,000
Southwestern tributaries of the Mississippi River	270,000,000	352,500,000	1,631,100,000	2,611,200,000	4,864,800,000
Gulf Southwest	201,700,000	208,800,000	912,500,000	1,921,500,000	3,304,500,000
Pacific Southwest	804,100,000	332,100,000	2,203,200,000	5,880,700,000	9,220,100,000
Pacific Northwest	551,000,000	990,800,000	3,467,900,000	10,337,400,000	15,347,100,000
Total	4,779,700,000	4,393,000,000	18,980,900,000	29,152,600,000	57,306,200,000

STATES INCLUDED WITHIN DELINEATIONS OF GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS

Region	States wholly within region	States partially within region
Atlantic Northeast	Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland	New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, West Virginia.
Atlantic Southeast	South Carolina, Florida	North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi.
Alluvial valley of the Mississippi	None	Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee, Missouri, Illinois, Kentucky.
Ohio River Basin	do	New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois.
Great Lakes Basin	Michigan	New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota.
Upper Mississippi River Basin	None	Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Indiana.
Red River of the North Basin	do	North Dakota, Minnesota, South Dakota.
Missouri River Basin	Nebraska	Minnesota, Missouri, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Kansas.
Southwestern tributaries of Mississippi River.	Oklahoma	Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Kansas Colorado, New Mexico, Texas.
Gulf Southwest	None	Texas, New Mexico, Colorado.
Pacific Southwest	California, Arizona, Utah	Nevada, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Oregon.
Pacific Northwest	Washington	Montana, Idaho, Oregon, Wyoming, Nevada.

TABLE 2.—*Accomplishments of the plans for conservation and use of the water resources of the United States*

	Flood control average annual flood damage			Inland navigation transportation savings [1]	Hydroelectric power (in kilowatts)			Irrigation (in acres of land)			Drainage (in acres of land)	
	Prevented by existing projects	Remaining under present conditions	To be prevented by planned works		Present installed capacity	Remaining undeveloped potential	To be developed planned projects	Now under irrigation	Irrigable land not yet developed	To be irrigated under plan	Potential farm land not drained	To be improved under plan [2]
Atlantic Northeast	$10,934,000	$42,088,000	$26,648,000	$100,000,000	1,810,000	6,826,000	5,674,000	0	0	0	164,000	23,000
Atlantic Southeast	13,062,000	19,162,000	13,503,000	25,000,000	1,873,000	5,565,000	5,457,000	0	0	0	5,815,000	3,787,000
Alluvial valley of Mississippi River	212,847,000	34,899,000	31,019,000	60,000,000	0	4,000	4,000	[3] 1,039,000	[4] 1,275,000	[5] 1,000,000	3,505,000	2,632,000
Ohio River Basin	36,786,000	60,535,000	[4] 47,844,000	150,000,000	2,934,000	4,980,000	4,760,000	0	0	0	902,000	752,000
Great Lakes Basin	310,000	6,103,000	3,993,000	500,000	2,089,000	3,525,000	584,000	0	0	0	163,000	49,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin	10,140,000	52,756,000	[4] 41,684,000	50,000,000	573,000	1,053,000	217,000	0	0	0	553,000	286,000
Red River of the North Basin	45,000	2,391,000	1,851,000	0	10,000	0	0	0	1,166,000	1,166,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Missouri River Basin	4,550,000	50,100,000	[4] 43,000,000	15,000,000	800,000	4,200,000	[6] 2,023,000	5,027,000	4,995,000	4,995,000	0	0
Southwestern tributaries of Mississippi River	12,099,000	47,612,000	[4] 27,406,000	20,000,000	168,000	3,006,000	3,006,000	907,000	1,648,000	895,000	2,579,000	423,000
Gulf Southwest	7,014,000	52,985,000	33,630,000	25,000,000	199,000	1,096,000	795,000	[3] 4,457,000	[4] 2,888,000	[5] 990,000	7,707,000	5,420,000
Pacific Southwest	31,550,000	70,197,000	62,850,000	5,000,000	3,840,000	10,195,000	7,487,000	9,309,000	7,378,000	5,334,000	331,000	184,000
Pacific Northwest	4,194,000	27,331,000	23,103,000	25,000,000	2,831,000	39,212,000	29,503,000	4,093,000	5,523,000	3,311,000	1,268,000	799,000
Total	343,531,000	466,109,000	356,531,000	475,500,000	17,127,000	79,965,000	59,540,000	[3] 24,922,000	[4] 24,873,000	[5] 17,691,000	23,987,000	15,350,000

[1] Based on detailed estimates for completed works and preliminary data for planned works.
[2] Includes lands that will be improved by a combination of drainage, flood protection, and water control.
[3] Includes furnishing water for rice lands.
[4] Exclusive of damages prevented in alluvial valley of the Mississippi River.
[5] Present plans for Missouri Basin contemplate 2,023,000 kilowatts in prospective future; and larger ultimate development as required.

TABLE 3.—*Division of cost of plans for conservation and use of the water resources of the United States*

[In thousands of dollars]

	Flood control	Navigation	Hydro power	Irrigation	Drainage	Watershed treatment	Pollution abatement	Fish and wildlife and recreation	Total
Atlantic Northeast	763,300	475,100	1,809,200	----------	3,000	168,000	93,900	----------	3,312,500
Atlantic Southeast	445,900	565,800	2,648,800	----------	55,100	91,800	----------	----------	3,808,400
Alluvial valley of Mississippi River	1,294,900	579,200	----------	18,000	----------	155,400	----------	2,700	2,050,200
Ohio River Basin	1,951,300	1,756,700	1,832,600	----------	23,000	550,000	645,100	----------	6,758,700
Great Lakes Basin	105,800	7,400	348,700	----------	3,300	3,000	53,300	1,100	522,600
Upper Mississippi River Basin	794,600	920,000	171,300	----------	13,000	142,700	68,900	39,600	2,150,100
Red River of the North Basin	26,400	----------	2,000	----------	300	1,000	5,700	2,800	38,200
Missouri River Basin	1,530,800	306,100	918,400	1,530,800	----------	1,530,800	30,600	275,500	6,123,000
Southwestern tributaries of Mississippi River	1,982,600	653,400	1,198,200	206,600	28,700	766,000	24,500	3,500	4,864,800
Gulf Southwest	875,500	490,000	342,700	706,400	99,000	477,900	282,100	27,500	3,304,500
Pacific Southwest	1,631,700	51,500	3,235,400	4,148,800	400	11,400	125,000	21,900	9,226,100
Pacific Northwest	988,000	427,900	11,579,600	1,971,100	148,600	114,000	35,700	82,200	15,347,100
Total	12,295,200	6,233,100	24,086,900	8,681,600	375,400	4,012,000	1,365,800	456,200	57,506,200

STATUS OF IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the United States Reclamation Act was passed by the Congress of the United States in 1902, 46 years ago. Hon. Francis G. Newlands, then United States Senator from the State of Nevada, was the father of the act. The act was passed under a great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, and has been responsible for the conservation and development of approximately 20,000,000 acres of land and 2,500,000 kilowatts of electric energy.

Mr. President, as chairman of the National Resources Economic Committee, a special committee created by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I ask unanimous consent there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement and report by that committee.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATUS OF IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—17 WESTERN STATES, JUNE 30, 1948

The people of the 17 far western States which make up the vast arid and semiarid areas are deeply concerned with the Federal reclamation program for complete conservation of water resources for the development of irrigated lands, with the development of hydroelectric power, to assist in repayment of costs and to assure maximum use of the water and land resources. The country at large was likewise concerned with this great reclamation conservation program which was initiated under President Theodore Roosevelt when the Congress adopted the reclamation law of 1902; and it has continued its interest and concern for furthering the reclamation program during the 46 years since the national irrigation policy was written into the Federal Statutes.

Along with the Federal reclamation program, of course, is the companion program of the Army Corps of Engineers, particularly in relation to flood control and navigation concern on the major streams of the West, as well as the country at large. The Corps of Engineers' program obviously looks also to hydroelectric power development as an incident to flood control and navigation projects just as power production is incidental to reclamation irrigation water conservation.

The Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, Dams and Electric Power Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of the United States Senate, of which I have the honor of being chairman, is thoroughly alive to the importance and vital necessity for coordination, in a real sense, of the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers' plans for river-basin developments in the West. The predecessor of this committee, the Interstate Commerce Committee, took an important forward step in this direction in 1944 when it recommended and Congress adopted the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (ch. 665, 50 Stat. 887). That act made a number of progressive moves for the development of western water resources. Among these were the following:

1. The declared power of Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders, and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control, to preserve and protect to the fullest possible extent, and establish potential uses for all purposes of the waters of the Nation's rivers.

2. The requirement that plans, proposals, or reports of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and the Secretary of the Interior relating to works of improvement for navigation or flood control by the Army or for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto by the Bureau of Reclamation, shall be submitted to the States affected for their comment and recommendations. The reports are also to be reviewed and commented upon by the Federal agencies concerned—that is—the Corps of Engineers reviews the Bureau's plans in the West and the Bureau does likewise with the Army plans in that area.

3. The requirement that navigation projects operated in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian, shall not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, of the waters of these States for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes. This provision was intended not only to protect the rights of the States but to give priority to irrigation and other purposes mentioned where navigation requirements might conflict with the irrigation requirements of the States.

4. Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to supervise the disposal of hydroelectric power produced at Army-constructed dams. Section 5 of the Flood Control Act requires that the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit and dispose of such power in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers, consistent with sound business principles. Preference in wholesale quantities of this power is given to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, States, cooperatives, and private-owned companies, presumably in the order named. The same authority for transmission of power developed in this manner is given the Bureau as in respect to Reclamation dams.

5. Approve the comprehensive plans of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for the full development of the Missouri River Basin, for flood control and navigation by the Corps of Engineers and for irrigation by the Bureau of Reclamation. Both agencies were authorized to produce power as a byproduct in connection with their respective developments. Initial appropriations were authorized to begin construction under the respective plans.

Under the comprehensive plan for the Missouri Basin, the Corps of Engineers is devoting its energies primarily toward the construction of dams, on the main stem of the Missouri for flood control and navigation purposes with power facilities to be installed where economically feasible.

The Bureau of Reclamation is directing its energies toward the construction of storage dams on the western tributaries of the Missouri, which are primarily for irrigation and flood-control purposes with power facilities where feasible. The Bureau is also planning and constructing transmission facilities to carry power, not only from its own dams but from the power plants of the Army dams to the points where it can be sold for distribution. The Bureau of Reclamation is also planning and constructing irrigation-distribution facilities for irrigation of four or five million acres of land in the Missouri Basin that over the years have been subject to serious drought hazards.

The comprehensive plan for the Missouri Basin sets the stage for what the Congress undoubtedly believed to be the proper procedure for coordinating the highly vital work of the Corps of Engineers having to do with flood control and navigation, and the work of the Bureau of Reclamation, which is concerned primarily with irrigation and incidental flood control. As in the new Missouri Basin project, where dams constructed by the Army can conserve water for irrigation, provision is or should be made in connection with other areas for this important conservation measure, for it is important that waters should be conserved for irrigation where operating plans can be developed which give adequate flood-control protection, and, at the same time, conserve water for irrigation.

Such coordination is sometimes difficult but is not impossible of achievement. Recently in the Public Works flood-control bill H. R. 6419, enacted in the closing days of the Eightieth Congress, the approval was given to the comprehensive plans of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for the middle Rio Grande development in New Mexico. This is another step toward the coordinated development of western rivers by these two outstanding agencies of the Federal Government.

There is yet much to be done in this direction by these two agencies in presenting coordinated comprehensive plans for the development of other river basins in the West. Among these where both agencies have been working, I hope in a cooperative way, are the Central Valley of California, the Columbia River Basin affecting western Montana, Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Wyoming, and the Colorado River Basin which affects the States of Nevada, Arizona, and California in the lower basin, and Utah, Wyoming and New Mexico in the upper basin. These are the major river basins remaining where coordinated programs should be forthcoming, and there are also a number of subbasins which would be subject to the same process.

For the information of the Congress and the people of the West and the country generally, I am herewith submitting a few facts on the long-range possibilities of irrigation and power development by the Bureau of Reclamation.

These figures are, in the main, taken from a booklet on Reclamation—A National Development prepared by the National Reclamation Association from data in the Reclamation files and printed beginning on page 2193 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on the Interior appropriation bill for fiscal year 1949. The first tabulation given below is an inventory of irrigable acreage in the 17 Western States.

As is well known, the limiting factor on irrigation in the West is the availability of water that can be economically delivered to land that can be made productive through the artificial application of irrigation water. Generally speaking, the limit of irrigation in the West has been placed at approximately 40,000,000 acres out of a total of areas in the 17 Western States of 1,162,000,000 acres.

Approximately 20,000,000 acres are now under irrigation principally through private enterprise, but including about 3,000,000 acres which have been brought under irrigation by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Office of Indian Affairs.

In addition to providing a full supply of water to approximately 2,500,000 acres, the Bureau of Reclamation now provides supplemental water for an additional 2,390,000 acres that faced water shortages due to inadequate supplies provided by the enterprises that originally developed these areas. I mention the supplemental water problem because it is of continuing importance to the West that established communities built on irrigation developments shall not pass out of existence due to diminishing irrigation water supplies.

In this connection it will bear repeating that the economy of the 11 States of the Mountain and Pacific regions is almost wholly dependent on the irrigation develop-

ments that have led to the tremendous growth in population since the turn of the century. It will be irrigation expansion as well as the hydroelectric power developments in multiple-purpose reclamation projects that will enable the West to continue to grow and to continue to be a major factor in the future development and security of the entire country.

The first tabulation below also shows by States the areas that will be served by irrigation under the Federal reclamation projects now under construction or authorized for construction. These projects when completed will irrigate a little more than 7,000,000 acres of new land and provide supplemental water for slightly more than 3,600,000 acres of land now inadequately irrigated.

Under investigation or proposed for investigation by the Bureau are projects or developments which indicate the possibility of serving a total of 10,250,000 additional acres. Of this 10,250,000, 6,112,000 would be newly irrigated lands and 4,143,000 acres would be provided supplemental water. Thus the Federal reclamation program, as shown by this tabulation contemplates full irrigation supply to 13,200,000 acres of additional new land and supplemental water for 7,750,000 acres now inadequately irrigated. This would leave about 7,000,000 additional acres which might be irrigated in the future.

The table which is a tentative inventory of irrigable acreage in the 17 Western States with details by States on the reclamation program is as follows:

Inventory of irrigable acreage in 17 Western States

State	Area of State	Area works were capable of supplying with water, 1940	Irrigated in 1939 other than Federal	Area irrigated in 1946 on Indian reservations	Federal reclamation projects						Total project acreage
					Irrigable, 1947[1]		Under construction or authorized		Under investigation or proposed [1]		
					Full supply	Supplemental	New lands	Supplemental	New lands	Supplemental	
Arizona	72,691,200	844,212	245,537	69,935	93,195	92,612	109,285	0	145,250	607,060	1,257,402
California	100,353,920	7,398,576	5,127,254	8,465	60,281	560,431	800,500	1,220,000	963,000	890,000	4,494,212
Colorado	66,538,880	3,913,542	3,117,599	8,656	132,661	51,125	3,300	1,100,700	718,745	781,615	2,788,146
Idaho	52,997,120	2,593,534	1,051,631	31,643	445,800	933,280	62,570	742,320	730,120	236,110	3,149,600
Kansas	52,552,320	142,409	99,980	0	0	0	237,020	830	0	0	237,850
Montana	93,642,240	2,344,590	1,585,040	148,822	358,701	0	903,500	265,600	133,300	77,300	1,718,701
Nebraska	49,057,920	992,957	252,978	0	195,958	92,798	1,137,840	20,960	0	0	1,447,556
Nevada	70,273,280	841,304	745,301	26,359	68,402	68,265	0	0	97,800	99,780	334,247
New Mexico	77,767,040	731,990	428,597	17,488	119,668	0	38,387	0	171,900	146,250	476,205
North Dakota	44,834,560	36,522	7,337	7	26,607	0	1,222,810	0	0	0	1,249,417
Oklahoma	44,341,120	8,624	3,826	0	451	0	50,792	0	180,800	600	232,643
Oregon	61,664,000	1,261,081	827,463	3,863	178,545	93,549	47,005	0	1,018,575	211,700	1,549,674
South Dakota	48,983,040	121,847	25,161	298	72,431	0	1,013,110	23,300	0	0	1,108,841
Texas	168,732,160	1,773,812	566,280	0	67,000	18,645	2,080	7,520	578,120	616,780	1,500,345
Utah	52,701,440	1,357,714	917,567	60,864	41,912	272,137	0	53,792	168,647	247,933	744,421
Washington	42,895,280	731,527	367,516	124,101	250,289	191,700	1,054,500	0	492,300	106,170	2,094,959
Wyoming	62,403,840	1,913,527	1,308,766	23,890	187,136	16,739	415,340	177,800	422,760	154,910	1,374,685
Total	1,162,399,360	27,007,568	16,777,833	544,391	2,489,067	2,389,681	7,098,099	3,612,822	6,112,317	4,143,808	25,851,094

[1] Data from Bureau of Reclamation files. Subject to change on issuance of Federal long-range program.

NOTE.—For details as to projects, see State tables 3 to 19 in the appendix.
Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Sixteenth Census Reports. Office of Indian Affairs, and Bureau of Reclamation.

Hydroelectric power is a vital factor in repayment of costs and for pumping in the irrigation development of the Federal reclamation program. Presently installed on Bureau of Reclamation projects are a total of 2,138,137 kilowatts. Authorized for construction are about 4,800,000 additional kilowatts, including the installations of about 1,260,000 kilowatts at Army dams in the Missouri Basin, where the power production will be distributed over transmission lines to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. A tabulation which shows a schedule as of January 1948 for installations through 1953 is as follows:

Summary of estimated schedule of installations in power plants on reclamation projects, existing, under construction, or authorized (through fiscal year 1953)

[Figures shown in kilowatts nameplate capacity]

Region and State	Projects and plants	Ultimate capacity, kilowatts	Existing capacity,[1] June 30, 1947	Estimated capacity (kilowatts) to be added during fiscal year						
				1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	After 1953
Region 1:										
Idaho	Boise:									
	Black Canyon	8,000	8,000							
	Boise River	1,500	1,500							
	Anderson Ranch	40,500	0	0	0	27,000	0	0	0	13,500
Idaho	Minidoka: Minidoka	13,400	13,400							
	Palisades: Palisades	60,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	30,000	30,000
Montana	Hungry Horse: Hungry Horse	300,000	0	0	0	0	0	75,000	225,000	
Oregon	Deschutes: Cove	1,500	1,500							
Washington	Columbia Basin: Grand Coulee	1,964,000	668,000	324,000	108,000	324,000	432,000	108,000		
	Yakima:									
	Prosser	2,400	2,400							
	Rocky Ford	187	187							
	Yakima Ridge	10,000	0	0	0	0	10,000			
	Total region 1	2,401,487	694,987	324,000	108,000	351,000	442,000	183,000	255,000	43,500
Region 2: California	Central Valley:									
	Shasta	379,000	154,000	150,000	75,000					
	Keswick	75,000	0	25,000	50,000					
	Delta Steam	240,000	0	0	0	0	80,000	80,000	80,000	
	Total region 2	694,000	154,000	175,000	125,000	0	80,000	80,000	80,000	
Region 3:										
Arizonia-California	Parker: Parker	150,000	120,000							
Arizona-Nevada	Boulder Canyon:									
	Hoover	1,322,300	1,034,800	0	0	0	82,500	82,500	0	122,500
	Davis	225,000	0	0	0	90,000	135,000			
California	Yuma: Siphon drop	1,600	1,600							
	Total, region 3	1,698,900	1,156,400	0	0	90,000	217,500	82,500	0	122,500

Footnote at end of table.

Summary of estimated schedule of installations in power plants on reclamation projects, existing, under construction, or authorized (through fiscal year 1953)—Continued

[Figures shown in kilowatts nameplate capacity]

Region and State	Projects and plants	Ultimate capacity, kilowatts	Existing capacity,[1] June 30, 1947	Estimated capacity (kilowatts) to be added during fiscal year						
				1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	After 1953
Region 4:										
Colorado	Grand Valley: Grand Valley (Palisade)	3,000	3,000							
Nevada	Newlands: Lahontan	1,500	1,500							
Utah	Strawberry Valley:									
	Spanish Fork (Upper)	900	900							
	Spanish Fork (Lower)	250	250							
	Payson	400	400							
	Total, region 4	6,050	6,050							
Region 5: New Mexico	Elephant Butte: Elephant Butte	24,300	24,300							
Region 6:										
Montana	Plants operated by Bureau of Reclamation									
	Missouri Basin:									
	Lower Marias	1,600	0	0	0	0	0	1,600		
	Yellowtail	120,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	60,000	60,000
	Canyon Ferry	36,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,000	24,000
	Missouri Basin:	60,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60,000
North Dakota	Mission									
	Missouri Basin:									
	Crosby	70,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70,000
South Dakota	Des Lacs	70,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70,000
Wyoming	Missouri Basin: Miller Drop	180,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180,000
	Missouri Basin:									
	Boysen	15,000	0	0	0	0	0	15,000		
	Tongue River	25,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25,000
	Riverton: Pilot Butte	1,600	1,600							
	Shoshone:									
	Shoshone	5,600	5,600							
	Heart Mountain	5,000	0	0	5,000					
	Plants constructed and operated by Corps of Engineers (power marketed by Bureau of Reclamation):									
Montana	Fort Peck: Fort Peck	85,000	35,000	15,000				35,000		
North Dakota	Garrison: Garrison	320,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320,000
South Dakota	Gavins Point: Gavins Point	24,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,000
	Ft. Randall: Ft. Randall	320,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320,000
	Big Bend: Big Bend	120,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120,000
	Oahe: Oahe	400,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400,000
	Total, region 6	1,848,800	42,200	15,000	5,000	0	0	51,600	72,000	1,663,000
Region 7:										
Colorado	Colorado-Big Thompson:									
	Green Mountain	21,600	21,600							
	Marys Lake	8,100	0	0	0	8,100				
	Estes	45,000	0	0	0	15,000				
	Quillian	28,500	0	0	0	0	0	28,500		
	Cottonwood	11,500	0	0	0	0	0	11,500		
	Rattlesnake	13,500	0	0	0	0	0	13,500		
	Flatiron Mountain	41,000	0	0	0	0	0	41,000		
	Big Thompson	6,700	0	0	0	0	0	6,700		
Wyoming	North Platte:									
	Lingle	1,400	1,400							
	Guernsey	4,800	4,800							
	Kendrick: Seminoe	32,400	32,400							
	Missouri Basin:									
	Kortes	36,000	0	0	2,000	24,600				
	Glendo	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	
Nebraska	Missouri Basin: Harlan County (Army Corps of Engineers)	1,200	0	0	0	0	0	-1,200		
	Total, region 7	271,700	60,300	0	12,000	77,100	0	102,400	20,000	
	Total, all regions	6,915,237	2,138,137	514,000	250,000	518,100	739,500	499,500	427,000	1,829,000

[1] Salt River Valley Water User Association hydroelectric plants (capacity 70,020 kw.) and Imperial Valley Irrigation District plants (capacity 14,400 kw.) on All-American Canal not included.

Source: Bureau of Reclamation.

Existing capacity June 30, 1947	2,138,137
Total scheduled through 1953	2,948,100
Total programed after 1953	1,829,000
Grand total authorized projects	6,915,237

The importance of hydroelectric power in connection with the reclamation program is highlighted from the financial side, for returns from the production and distribution of power will not only repay the cost of power facilities with interest but will materially assist in the repayment of the construction costs of irrigation facilities in many instances.

For instance, on a project like the presently authorized Central Valley in California, the irrigation facilities will represent something like two-thirds of the entire construction costs of the project. While power facilities will cost only about one third of the entire investment, the revenues from power will repay approximately two-thirds of the over-all costs. A similar ratio of the assistance by power to irrigation will prevail, I understand, in the Columbia Basin project and to some extent in the Missouri Basin project where nonreimbursable flood-control and navigation benefits are an essential part of the over-all financial picture.

Reclamation appropriations for irrigation are traditionally repayable without interest by the immediate beneficiaries who are the water users on the various projects. The Flood Control Act of 1944 to which I have referred in connection with the authorization for the Missouri Basin project sets a new standard on repayment. The investment in power facilities bears interest, of course, but the power facilities that are a part of the irrigation development are interest-free. Flood-control allocations in reclamation projects are nonreimbursable under the national flood-control policy just as the Army dams constructed for flood control represent nonreimbursable funds of the Federal Government.

From statistics on the total investments, or construction costs already incurred or presently contemplated by the Bureau of Reclamation in carrying out the program, the following tabulation is a summary:

Total expenditures by Bureau of Reclamation on irrigation and multiple-purpose projects to June 30, 1947	$1,083,606,000
Estimated cost to complete irrigation and multiple-purpose projects under or authorized for construction, including transmission facilities (but not power plants of Army dams)	3,556,927,000
Total estimated cost of completed and authorized projects	4,640,000,000
Total estimated cost of irrigation on multiple-purpose projects under investigation or proposed for investigation by 1955, including transmission facilities	3,500,000,000

Thus the reclamation program, including projects constructed, those under construction, or those authorized for construction and potential projects under investigation or proposed for investigation will represent an investment by the Federal Government of more than $6,100,000,000. Of this amount the table shows more than 57 percent has been completed, or for which Congress has given the go-ahead signal through authorizations.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, under long-established precedents through a succession of acts by the Congress of the United States three types of projects can be undertaken by the Government under certain conditions:

First. Flood control and the development of rivers and harbors where the benefits exceed the cost, without repayment to the Treasury of the United States.

Second. Irrigation and reclamation, where the actual cost is returned to the Treasury of the United States, without interest, through assessments of such costs to the lands benefited.

Third. Power or other commercial developments in connection with such projects to assist in repayment of costs—bearing interest on the money advanced by the Government, not less than that paid by the Government.

TEMPORARY REGULATION OF CONSUMER INSTALLMENT CREDIT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 157, for the consideration of the Senate.

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in order to protect the Nation's monetary, banking, and credit structure, and interstate and foreign commerce, against increased inflationary pressures, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are authorized, notwithstanding the act of August 8, 1947 (Public Law 386, 80th Cong.), to exercise, up to and including March 15, 1949, consumer-credit controls in accordance with and to carry out the purposes of Executive Order No. 8843 (August 9, 1941) insofar as it relates to installment credit.

All the present provisions of sections 21 and 27 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (relating to investigations, injunctions, jurisdictions, and other matters), shall be as fully applicable with respect to the exercise by the Board of Governors of consumer installment credit controls as they are now applicable with respect to the exercise by the Securities and Exchange Commission of its functions under that act, and the Board shall have the same powers in the exercise of such consumer installment credit controls as the Commission now has under the said sections.

SEC. 2. (a) The third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by changing the first sentence of such paragraph to read as follows:

"Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 35 percent against its deposits and reserves in gold certificates of not less than 40 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation: *Provided, however*, That when the Federal Reserve agent holds gold certificates as collateral for Federal Reserve notes issued to the bank such gold certificates shall be counted as part of the reserve which such bank is required to maintain against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation."

(b) The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "25 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "40 percent."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To suspend for a period of not exceeding 30 days and from time to time to review such suspension for periods not exceeding 15 days, any reserve requirements specified in this act: *Provided*, That it shall establish a graduated tax upon the amounts by which the reserve requirements of this act may be permitted to fall below the level hereinafter specified: *And provided further*, That when the reserve held against Federal Reserve notes falls below 40 percent, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall establish a graduated tax of not more than 1 percent per annum upon such deficiency until the reserves fall to 32½ percent, and when said reserve falls below 32½ percent, a tax at the rate increasingly of not less than 1½ percent per annum upon each 2½ percent or fraction thereof that such reserve falls below 32½ percent. The tax shall be paid by the Reserve bank, but the Reserve bank shall add an amount equal to said tax to the rates of interest and discount fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

SEC. 3. Section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the sixth paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion, may by regulation change the requirement as to reserves to be maintained pursuant to this section against demand or time deposits or both (1) by member banks in central Reserve cities, or (2) by member banks in Reserve cities, or (3) by member banks not in Reserve or central Reserve cities, or (4) by all member banks; but no such change shall have the effect of requiring any such member bank to maintain a reserve balance against its time deposits in an amount equal to more than 7 percent thereof, or a reserve balance against its demand deposits in an amount equal to more than 29 percent thereof if such bank is in a central Reserve city, 23 percent thereof if in a Reserve city, or 17 percent thereof if not in a Reserve or central Reserve city. No change in reserve requirements made under authority of this paragraph shall continue in effect after March 31, 1949."

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, merely to explain the procedure, on the question of credit the House has taken the measure which we passed nearly a year ago, providing for the extension of regulation W, regulating consumer credit. To that measure it has added two amendments, one dealing with the reserves of the Federal Reserve banks, and another dealing with the reserves of commercial banks.

Rather than refer the amendment of the House to committee, in order to hasten the procedure we have simply allowed it to lie on the table, and we now call it up. However, in effect the committee has considered it. The committee has met and discussed it. It has held hearings on the general question and on the whole question of inflation control, and it now has a report to make on this particular measure, which I think we should consider exactly as though the joint resolution had been referred to the committee and the committee had reported the bill back with amendments. I believe that the committee amendments should be considered first, and thereafter the amendment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Ohio with reference to the procedure to which he has called attention? I have no objection to the consideration of the House amendment without the necessity of referring it formally to committee. However, I do not wish that any Member of the Senate should be thereby denied the right to offer an amendment to the House amendment or to the joint resolution as it will come before the Senate, whether such an amendment be included in the House amendment, or any amendment thereto, or in a report of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, would not the Senator add, "in whole or in part"?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. If we are to take up the joint resolution and consider it, the entire subject should be considered, and any amendment which any Senator desires to offer should be eligible.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that is entirely my purpose. If any suspension of the rules is required to bring that about, I should be glad to see it done. I should like to have the Chair state exactly what the parliamentary situation is in the case of amendments which may be offered to the House amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The parliamentary situation at the moment is that the House version of the joint resolution is pending before the Senate, and is open to amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair whether the House substituted entirely new language for the Senate joint resolution, or whether it amended the language of the Senate joint resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It adopted a complete substitute. Whether or not it includes similar language, the Chair cannot say.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the entire House version is subject to amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to state for the RECORD that that was my understanding when I made the request that the amendment of the House be laid before the Senate. The procedure adopted saves the time which would be consumed in sending the bill to the committee. As the House amendment comes before us now, it is open to amendment. Any Senator may offer any amendment he wishes to offer, just as though the measure had been considered by the committee. It is under that procedure that I made the request. I feel that it will expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. President, Senators have asked me whether or not there will be an attempt to reach a vote this afternoon, and whether or not there will be night sessions. We are pressing just as strenuously as we can to debate all these very important issues. I cannot guarantee that there will not be a vote this afternoon. It is our intention to continue in session until at least 6 o'clock, or perhaps 7 o'clock, if we get into a debate which should continue for another hour. But there is no intention to have a long-drawn-out night session at this time.

I understand that certain Senators feel that we should proceed, even with night sessions, to expedite consideration of the pending business; but the present intention of the acting majority leader is that we proceed in an orderly way to the consideration of the business before the Senate. I cannot guarantee a vote on any amendment which may be offered. I think the Senate ought to have plenty of time to consider the joint resolution a amended by the House, and Senators should have an opportunity to offer amendments to it.

We want to be absolutely fair. All we want to do is to try to expedite the work of the Senate. I will say that unless there is greater demand for night sessions than there is at present, there will be no night sessions. It will be our purpose to conclude at approximately 6 o'clock, or not later than 7.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator, in the first place, for the information. I am not seeking to delay a vote on final enactment of what the Senate does; but in view of the complicated subject with which we are dealing, and the possibility that vital amendments may be offered, I express the hope that no effort will be made to foreclose the offering of such amendments by any attempt to dispose of the legislation this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. I can assure the distinguished majority leader that there will be no effort to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. The nature of amendments which may be offered may not yet be definitely determined.

Mr. WHERRY. The cooperation has been wonderful. We shall get along. The purpose is to proceed to debate the joint resolution, and any amendments which may be offered.

Various Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, can the Senator from Nebraska, the acting majority leader, give us any idea when he believes Congress may be able to adjourn sine die?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the proposed legislation that is now before us for consideration is the only legislation that I know of that has been reported from committee. What the committees will do between now and the time when we dispose of this proposed legislation, I cannot tell. All I can say is that, of course, we are attempting to conclude the session as quickly as possible, but with due consideration to giving ample time for the Senate to consider any other proposed legislation which may come before the Senate from committee.

I assure the Senator that no attempt will be made to cut off any debate or consideration of proposed legislation until the Senate is ready to proceed with a vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that I am not one who is undertaking to keep the Senate in session, but I should like to ask whether it is anticipated that there will be a session tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; let me announce, as perhaps I should have previously, that there will be a session tomorrow; and if the present session does not conclude tomorrow, we shall go right on next week with daily sessions until the session is concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to see the session concluded tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I am very hopeful that that may be done, but, of course, I cannot tell now.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. This may be of interest to the Senator from Georgia, as well as other Senators: So far as the Banking and Currency Committee is concerned, our desks are cleared with the reporting of a measure by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. We have nothing now pending.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should also like to have the attention of the able chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. Do I correctly understand that no action has been taken or is intended to be taken by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the President's anti-inflation program introduced by the distinguished minority leader?

Mr. TOBEY. Let me answer the Senator by saying that we had a meeting this morning at which various component parts of the President's program were taken up in the form of motions. Some were voted up and some were voted down; and the matter is now about to be placed before the Senate in the form of a measure reported by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] from the committee.

Mr. PEPPER. It is about to be reported; is it?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Is any measure to be reported on the displaced-persons bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the answer to that inquiry is the same as the reply previously given; in other words, there is no proposed legislation about to be before us except the measure about to be reported by the Banking and Currency Committee. If other measures are reported by a committee, they will be presented.

Mr. PEPPER. But the situation is that we might adjourn tomorrow, I understand.

Mr. WHERRY. On that point, the acting majority leader has made it plain that no time for adjournment has been set. I wish the Senator would again remember my remarks made at the opening of the session, and also in reply to inquiry made recently, namely, that this session will not be concluded until all legislation reported from committees is handled on the floor of the Senate. No definite statement is made now as to whether the session will end tomorrow or at any other time.

Mr. PEPPER. Can the Senator state what proposed legislation will be reported concerning minimum wages?

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot tell the Senator, except that we shall consider any proposed legislation that is favorably reported from committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me inquire whether it is in order at this time to offer an amendment to the measure under discussion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the ordinary procedure, the amendments which are recommended and submitted from the committee are considered first. The Chair is waiting to recognize the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who no doubt will offer the amendments from the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have been standing on my feet ever since notice was given by the Senator from Ohio of this rather unusual procedure of undertaking the consideration of a measure without its reference to a committee—in this case, the Committee on Banking and Currency. The only information I had with respect to the contents of the House measure—it has not been printed—is what I have obtained by reading the articles in the press.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair inquires whether the Senator is propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; this is a parliamentary inquiry.

I desire to know therefore, whether any consent has been given—certainly that was not done in my hearing—to proceed without referring the measure to the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is a privileged matter, under the rules, and is not required to go to the committee. It comes in order when laid down by the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I should like to address an inquiry to the Senator from Washington, who has been recognized by the Chair. I should like to ask whether the committee has held any hearings upon the proposal, which I understand was included in the measure which passed the House, to increase the gold reserves for the Federal Reserve banks.

Mr. CAIN. The answer to the Senator's inquiry is "Yes," in a limited fashion. During the last 10 days, testimony has been taken from competent witnesses representing the administration, in part on the subject to which the Senator from Wyoming has just addressed himself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator gives a rather qualified answer; he refers to the hearing as being conducted "in a limited fashion," and he refers to testimony "in part." Will the Senator be kind enough to name the witnesses who testified about the proposed increase of the gold reserves?

Mr. CAIN. My memory indicates that Mr. Marriner Eccles, of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, was one of the witnesses, and also Mr. Sproul, president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, and Mr. McCabe, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. All three of them spoke on this subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator be kind enough to let the Senate know what action the Senate committee has taken on the provision made by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CAIN. I shall be glad to satisfy the Senator's inquiry at this time, and also to inform the Senate as a whole, by stating that the Senate committee has been in opposition to the recommendation presented by the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I take it that the Senate committee has deleted that provision of the House measure.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is precisely correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to hear that.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency to amend the House amendments to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157 in the following manner:

On page 1 of the House engrossed amendments, line 6, strike out "March 15, 1949" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

On page 2 of the House engrossed amendments, beginning with line 5, strike out all down to and including line 15 on page 3.

On page 3 of the House engrossed amendments, line 16, strike out "SEC. 3" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 2."

On page 4 of the House engrossed amendments, line 4, strike out "7" and insert in lieu thereof "8."

On page 4 of the House engrossed amendments, line 6, strike out "29" and insert in lieu thereof "31."

On page 4 of the House engrossed amendments, line 7, strike out "23" and insert in lieu thereof "25."

On page 4 of the House engrossed amendments, line 8, strike out "17" and insert in lieu thereof "19."

On page 4 of the House engrossed amendments, line 11, strike out "March 31, 1949" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

The effect of the amendments may be briefly stated as follows——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator asking for their consideration en bloc?

Mr. CAIN. I should like to have them considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, they will be considered en bloc.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Chair. The effect of the amendments may be briefly stated as follows:

From the effective date of this act they extend to June 30, 1949, the authority of the Federal Reserve Board to reinstate consumer installment credit controls. The bill as amended in the House would have extended this power only until March 15, 1949. This and a similar change in the provisions regarding bank credit will afford the incoming Congress a better opportunity to reappraise the situation in the light of conditions then existing. Secondly, the committee amendment deletes the provision of the bill as amended in the House which would have increased from 25 to 35 percent against Federal Reserve bank deposits and 40 percent against Federal Reserve notes, the gold certificate reserve required to be maintained by Federal Reserve banks. The sponsors of these increases admit it will only have a psychological effect at best. Some concern has been expressed that the increase might make it more difficult for the Federal Reserve system to aid in supporting the Government bond market. Third, the committee amendments allow the Federal Reserve Board to increase the lawful reserve requirements of member banks of the Federal Reserve System by 2 percentage points beyond the existing limit of 6 percent in the case of time deposits, and by 5 percentage points beyond the existing limits in central Reserve cities, 20 percent in Reserve cities, and 14 percent in country-bank cities, the reserve against demand deposits. It was felt that the alternative increases of 1 percent against time deposits and 3 percent against demand deposits suggested by the House amendments are too small to have the desired beneficial effect. The committee amendments further extended this authority of the Federal Reserve Board to June 30, 1949, instead of March 31, 1949, as proposed in the House amendments.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments are pending en bloc. The question is on the adoption of the amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think they should be adopted one by one, in the usual manner, in order that the questions may arise seriatim.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as I understand, the only purpose of the amendments is to lay before the Senate the action which was agreed to by the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning, when it took action on the House amendments to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157), which is now pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has ordered consideration en bloc. Is it the desire of the Senator from Ohio that that order be rescinded?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I ask for a separation of the amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order for consideration of the amendments en bloc will be rescinded, and the amendments will be submitted one by one.

Mr. CAIN. That is certainly agreeable to the committee.

Mr. TAFT. I take it if they were adopted en bloc it would not be in order to reject any one of them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The amendments involve entirely different subjects, and I think the Senate will desire to consider them separately.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment, which the clerk will read.

The first amendment was on page 1 of the House engrossed amendments, line 6, to strike out "March 15, 1949," and insert "June 30, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, beginning with line 5, to strike out all down to and including line 15 on page 3.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not particularly insist on an objection, but I think the committee action striking it out is unwise.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the Members of the Senate realize that in this procedure, votes are being taken. I do not want to delay the matter. We have already obtained a unanimous-consent agreement that there may be votes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, would the Senator reserve the suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment in order that I may ask a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. It was my information, I should like to suggest to the Chair, that we were simply laying before the Senate for action the amendments of the committee. May I inquire of the Chair whether I am misinformed on that subject?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is submitting the amendments one by one to a vote of the Senate for action.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ecton	Kilgore
Baldwin	Ellender	Knowland
Ball	Feazel	Langer
Barkley	Ferguson	Lodge
Brewster	Flanders	Lucas
Bricker	Fulbright	McCarthy
Bridges	Green	McClellan
Brooks	Gurney	McFarland
Buck	Hatch	McGrath
Butler	Hawkes	McKellar
Byrd	Hayden	McMahon
Cain	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Capehart	Hill	Malone
Capper	Hoey	Martin
Connally	Holland	Millikin
Cooper	Ives	Moore
Cordon	Jenner	Morse
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Eastland	Kem	O'Conor

O'Mahoney	Sparkman	Umstead
Pepper	Stennis	Vandenberg
Reed	Taft	Watkins
Revercomb	Taylor	Wherry
Robertson, Va.	Thomas, Okla.	Wiley
Robertson, Wyo.	Thomas, Utah	Williams
Russell	Thye	Wilson
Saltonstall	Tobey	Young
Smith	Tydings	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the Chair). Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BREWSTER obtained the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. I take it the Senator from Washington has the floor, and that it was agreed between him and the Senator from Maine that I was to yield to the Senator from Maine in order that he might immediately debate the subject of inflation. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the agreement, was it not? That was my understanding.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

POTATOES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to discuss a matter which was discussed at some length in the Senate yesterday in connection with the farm program, which is vitally concerned with the question of inflation and prices, and particularly because reference was made to potatoes, which are of vital interest to the State from which I come.

I am in general sympathy with the strictures upon the administration of the farm program, particularly in connection with potatoes. Throughout the last 2 years, while there was a surplus of potatoes, which were being removed from the market under the provisions of the Steagall amendment, I urged very strongly and repeatedly upon those in authority that we should adopt the solution suggested by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] yesterday in the matter of feeding Europe.

I was told repeatedly by the authorities in Washington that it was impracticable to ship potatoes to Europe. That flew in the face of the experience of half a century, as I had heard my own father tell me of observing the shipments of potatoes arriving in the United States from both Ireland and Germany at the time of a potato famine in this country. I had been familiar myself, as Governor of Maine 20 years ago, with the shipment of potatoes to Ireland at the time of the potato famine there, and there was a rather curious arrangement by which the shipment of American potatoes was prevented by the allegation that they were infected with the Colorado beetle, which I later discovered meant the ordinary potato bug. As Governor of Maine I carried to the then President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge, the most vigorous protest I could make against the obvious invasion of our trade relations, since at that time the British were allowing freely the importation into Ireland of potatoes from New Brunswick, which is just across an entirely imaginary line from Maine, and I was quite confident, as I think everyone in that area knows, that the potato bugs were entirely unable to distinguish between Maine and New Brunswick, so far as potatoes were concerned. Yet the British allowed the potatoes from New Brunswick to go across to Ireland, while they denied us.

Coming down to more recent times, the demand in Europe for potatoes has exceeded all bounds. I have observed it growing. It is a fact familiar to all interested in the potato industry that Germany was more dependent upon potatoes than any other country in the world. Believe it or not, curiously enough, under their economy they produced and consumed 10 times as many potatoes per capita as were consumed in the United States. They produced approximately 2,000,000,000 bushels a year for 65,000,000 people, while we were producing 400,000,000 bushels a year, or somewhat less, for 130,000,000 people. In other words, they had developed the potato into a significance in their agricultural economy that was beyond that of any other country in the world. They used it not only for human food, but for cattle feed, for industrial alcohol, for potato flour, and a variety of other purposes.

I had observed this situation during the war when we were faced with the problem of feeding German prisoners. Under the obligations of our international agreements they are permitted to receive the same ration given to the enlisted men in our Army. They were being fed on them in the Maine woods while they were cutting pulp, and I was very much interested when I went there to find that these German prisoners had requested that they should have more potatoes in their diet and less of some other items, because they were so familiar with the potato as a food commodity, and their bodies were apparently so adapted to it, that it was potatoes they most desired.

It therefore always puzzled me as to why we were called upon to ship so many hundreds of millions of bushels of grain of various kinds to Europe; and at the same time entirely ignore the contribution which potatoes could make to the problem of feeding Germany, and much of northern Europe as well, where the potato is a familiar article of diet.

For the past 3 or 4 years I had followed this matter very closely, and I discussed it with General Clay when he was here. He told me of the difficulties they were having in connection with securing adequate supplies of potatoes both for food and for seed. I discussed it with Mr. Hoover when he was asked by the President of the United States to go abroad and survey the food situation in Europe. He was the first one who returned and by the emphasis of his report to the Secretary of War, finally compelled an extremely reluctant department to recognize the contribution which potatoes could make. Meanwhile the authorities had been disposing of them, as the Senator from Delaware has indicated in a variety of other ways which were not contributing to the primary problem of human food, which was the most challenging issue before the American people and the people of the world as well. So that I think there was good cause for the criticism which the Senator from Delaware made.

I wish to speak a word in behalf of the humble potato and its right to recognition in connection with our farm program. I have followed this subject ever since I came to Washington, some 15 years ago. While potatoes are produced in practically every State of the Union, they have always seemed, in circles here in Washington, to have considerable claim to being the forgotten crop. It was only after a most vigorous fight that potatoes were recognized in 1935 as a crop that was entitled to consideration, under the leadership of Lindsay Warren, then a Representative from North Carolina, in the Warren potato bill, as it was called. Subsequently the Supreme Court decided the entire program of agricultural legislation was invalid, so that we were never permitted to put into practice what we believed at the time was a sound solution of this problem.

Coming down to more recent times, potatoes finally became recognized, and under the stimulation of the parity theory, production increased from the normal three hundred and fifty to three hundred and seventy-five million bushels, to 450,000,000 bushels, and it was necessary for this great removal program to be carried out, without, as I believe, sufficient regard for the practical solutions which might have been made of the problem.

What I wish to make clear, certainly to all the Members of the Senate and of the Congress, and I trust to the country, is the fact that it was the potato growers of Maine, and I think I speak also for the potato growers of America, who themselves, of their own free will and accord—and whether this is unique in connection with agricultural support prices I do not know—urged very earnestly that the 90 percent parity provision be eliminated, because it was stimulating production beyond the bounds of what we could consume easily, and they urged that it should be reduced to 60 percent. From my study of agricultural legislation I am convinced the potato growers of America who urged that reduction are entitled to most cordial commendation from a Congress which has been inundated with requests for benefactions of various kinds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In my discussion of yesterday I pointed out very clearly that my criticism was not levied against the farmers, nor did I question the right of the potato growers to participate in a farm program. In fact I would join with the Senator from Maine or any other Senator in support of such a program. I also pointed out—and I know the Senator from Maine is correct in his statement about it—that the potato growers of Maine are as critical of the program as it is being carried out by the Department of Agriculture as is the Congress. They do not want the subsidies to the extent they are receiving them. They do not like to see food destroyed after it is grown.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate what the Senator from Delaware says. I know that the farmers of America have no better friend than the Senator from Delaware, out of the wealth of his experience in agriculture throughout his life.

I point out that in the State of Maine—and I think it is true in other States—we have to pile up some 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes in an enormous heap and pour gasoline or oil on them in order to destroy them so as to be sure that they will rot in the field, without any use of any character being made of them. That has revolted the farmers of Maine to the point where I believe it would have been utterly impossible to carry out such a program for another year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Maine, I am sure, will also agree with me that the potatoes which were destroyed in Maine were suitable for export to Europe?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, every potato grown in Maine is very well adapted for that purpose. We have ample shipping facilities to seaports, and have admirable docking facilities, so our potatoes can be properly shipped abroad.

The story which was told by the Department of Agriculture—and the Department should have known better, it seems to me—with respect to potatoes spoiling in transit overseas, I found to be based entirely upon some shipments of southern potatoes from Charleston, S. C., which had fermented during transit, and caused great difficulty, for reasons which I think a child could understand. For them to condemn the shipment of potatoes overseas on the basis of that situation indicated an ignorance which it is difficult to conceive could properly exist in the Government. We finally persuaded them to try the shipment of northern potatoes, as the Senator from Delaware indicated yesterday, and there was no difficulty with them whatsoever. Those potatoes arrived in beautiful condition, as General Clay told me in Germany. He said that many of them were used as seed potatoes and planted, and others were used for food.

We have shipped, as I believe the Senator from Delaware pointed out, several hundred thousand, if not several million, bushels of potatoes to the Argentine, across the Equator. While the Senator criticized such shipments, and the criticism was was apparently based on a minor reason, it is true that those potatoes arrived in Buenos Aires in most excellent condition, demonstrating what it was possible to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My criticism of the shipment of potatoes to South America was that they were shipped to a country which was not necessarily in need of food at that time, while in Europe there was a terrible shortage of food, and the United States had underwritten that food-supply situation. I felt that the potatoes which were shipped to the Argentine could have been shipped to Europe. I used that as an example. I also criticized the Administration because it sold those potatoes for export, the potatoes to be resold to the Argentine consumers at a lower price than the price at which potatoes were allowed to be sold to the American housewives, and I did not think it was quite consistent with the Administration's policy of pitying the American housewives to be subsidizing another country by shipping to them potatoes at a cheaper price than that at which we permit them to be sold to our own people.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think there was very much basis for that comment on the part of the Senator. However, I would not wish it to appear that the people of Argentina did not need potatoes in their economy. It was true that the Argentine potato crop had entirely failed. I would not want the people of that country to get out of the habit of eating potatoes, so I was glad to see some potatoes go there. But I think we do still have ample supplies to take care of European needs if we should cultivate that situation properly.

Mr. President, I have noted that there have been outbursts of potato stories in the last few days in the press, and the discussion by the Senator from Delaware, of course, further focused attention on the potato problem. I think it would be extremely unfortunate if the people of the United States did not understand that it was the potato growers themselves who had urged the reduction of parity from 90 percent to 60 percent, which is provided for in the legislation sponsored by the Senator from Vermont which he discussed here on the floor yesterday or the day before, and it is the belief of all those familiar with the situation that this reduction in the parity will make it certain that there will not be the incentive to production which has caused very large surpluses of potatoes in recent years, and thrown such a burden upon the Treasury. This proposal is designed to discourage the so-called marginal production of potatoes, and is also designed to put a floor under the price so that we shall not see a recurrence of the situation which we saw 15 years ago, when I first came to Congress, when potatoes were selling for 10 cents a bushel. The farmers were compelled then to dump the potatoes, because it literally was not worth their while to pick them up. But a floor placed under the price of potatoes of 60 percent of parity will be a guaranty that the people of the United States can be adequately provided with potatoes without the impetus of a 90-percent parity which it has been demonstrated in that field certainly serves as a stimulus to overproduction.

I now want to move from potatoes to grain. I hold in my hand a clipping from the New York Times of this week, the heading of which is as follows:

Grain prices rise on export news—foreign shipments expected to be 75,000,000 bushels over early figures.

I read the first paragraph:

Grain markets were on the upgrade on the board of trade today, liberal short covering developing in wheat following announcement that exports this season might be 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 bushels in excess of preliminary figures, despite marked improvement in the European food grain crops.

Wheat was up 3 cents and corn 2½ cents at one time.

* * * * *

Government buying of cash wheat is extremely heavy, purchases in all positions Monday being estimated at 6,650,000 bushels, including 250,000 bushels in Minneapolis, the first grain taken in the latter market in recent weeks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAIN PRICES RISE ON EXPORT NEWS—FOREIGN SHIPMENTS EXPECTED TO BE 75,000,000 BUSHELS OVER EARLY FIGURES

CHICAGO, August 3.—Grain markets were on the upgrade on the board of trade today, liberal short covering developing in wheat following announcement that exports this season might be 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 bushels in excess of preliminary figures, despite marked improvement in the European food grain crops.

Wheat was up 3 cents and corn 2½ cents at one time, but the market reacted late on profit taking. Wheat closed ¾ cent to 2¼ cents higher. Corn rose ¼ to ¾ cent, and oats ½ to ¾ cent. Rye gained 2¼ to 3 cents and soybeans 3 to 6 cents. Lard advanced 12 to 30 cents.

There was a lack of pressure in wheat at the start and general local short covering developed, with some mill buying, the latter reflecting a betterment in the domestic and export demand for flour. Cash wheat premiums in Kansas City advanced 4 to 5 cents early, but lost part of the extreme upturn in the late trading when ordinary No. 1 Hard sold at 4 cents under September, compared with 2½ cents under at one time. Yesterday sales were made as low as 9 cents under September.

Government buying of cash wheat is extremely heavy, purchases in all positions Monday being estimated at 6,650,000 bushels, including 250,000 bushels in Minneapolis, the first grain taken in the latter market in recent weeks. Harvesting of spring wheat is making good progress, except where delayed by showers, but threshing returns are not available as yet. Harvesting of winter wheat is about completed, with some damage to late grain by rain.

Professional operations featured the corn market, one large trader buying September and another aggressive on the selling side. At the top September showed 4 cents above the low of yesterday. Cash corn was in good demand and No. 1 Yellow sold at 39 to 42 cents over the future, compared with 35 to 40½ cents over Monday. Country offerings increased slightly on the upturn, purchases of 56,000 bushels being made for deferred shipment. The best bid sent to the country tonight for 10-day shipment was $1.99, or about 34 cents over September. Crop comments remain favorable. A private estimate on the crop will be received by the trade about 10 a. m. tomorrow and is expected to show a good advance over the figures of a month ago.

Oats followed other grains, with hedging in evidence on the advance. However, it was not as heavy as on Monday due to smaller receipts. Cash oats premiums showed little change. Chicago interests were reported as having contracted for storage room for 750,000 bushels of oats in Buffalo and are buying the grain in the spot market to fill the room.

Prices for the principal grains were as follows:

Chicago

WHEAT

	Open	High	Low	Close	Previous close	Last year
September	2.22½	2.25	2.22¼	2.23½	2.22	2.32
December	2.25¼	2.27½	2.25¼	2.26¾	2.25	2.29¼
May	2.20½	2.23¼	2.20⅜	2.21⅞	2.19¼	2.28½
July	2.07	2.09½	2.06⅞	2.08½	2.07½	2.25¼

CORN

September	1.65½	1.67	1.64½	1.64½	1.64¼	2.19¼
December	1.48	1.49	1.47¼	1.47¼	1.47	2.03
May	1.51¾	1.52	1.50⅝	1.50⅝	1.50	1.98½
July	1.50¾	1.51⅝	1.50¼	1.50⅜	1.49½	1.94⅝

OATS

September	0.72	0.73¼	0.71¾	0.72¾	0.71¾	0.98
December	.73⅛	.75⅞	.73	.73⅛	.74½	.96
May	.75⅛	.76⅝	.75⅛	.76⅛	.75½	.95½
July	.72⅝	.74⅝	.72⅜	.72⅝	.71½	.92½

RYE

December	1.65	1.67½	1.65	1.67½	1.64½	1.45
May	1.68	1.68½	1.67½	1.68½	1.66¾	------

SOYBEANS

November	2.61¾	2.68	2.61¾	2.67	2.61	2.88
December	2.62½	2.68	2.62½	2.67	2.64	2.80
March	2.63	2.71	2.63	2.70	2.66	------

LARD

	Open	High	Low	Close	Previous close	Last year
September	20.30	20.47	20.10	20.20	20.00	16.75
October	20.40	20.52	20.20	20.32	20.10	17.00
November	20.35	20.00	20.35	20.40	20.10	17.15
December	21.40	21.72	21.33	21.37	21.25	17.35
January	21.45	21.65	21.37	21.37	21.20	18.02

Minneapolis

WHEAT

September	2.16	2.19½	2.16	2.18⅝	2.16¾	2.34½

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I believe the Senator will agree that all the grain prices have dropped 25 percent to as much as 50 percent since last February.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. And that the prices of wheat, oats, barley, and in fact practically all the grains, are below the support prices, or below cost of production.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am familiar with that, and deeply gratified over it, when this country is under the impression that all prices are going up, particularly of food; but what interested and intrigued me in this statement was the very clear revelation that the price of these products corresponded in some measure to the export policy of the administration. That is a point I want to drive home, because it has seemed to me abundantly clear that the President, holding absolute control of exports under existing law, has complete power in his own hands at any time to turn on or off this spigot and by that action determine whether or not the prices shall go up or down.

The wheat crop of Europe is 450,000,000 bushels more than it was 1 year ago. That happens to be the precise amount that we exported last year. We were planning this year to export 350,000,000 bushels; and this week when prices were sagging somewhat more, the administration announced that it was going to export 100,000,000 bushels additional, and prices promptly rose. I do not think it requires anyone above the primary grade to realize that that action was beautifully calculated—whether or not it was so designed—to bolster the prices which were sagging. I think it warrants an inference that the administration was perhaps considerably more concerned lest prices should go down, rather than that they should go up.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Maine for yielding to me. First I wish to corroborate what he has said with regard to the support price on potatoes. I wish every consumer in the country knew that this support price was put on potatoes in order to bring about the production of enough potatoes to go around. We were becoming short of potatoes. The Government told the potato growers that if they would obtain the new equipment which was necessary, if they would get the higher-grade fertilizers which were necessary, and if they would go to the other necessary expenses to produce an increased crop of potatoes they would be guaranteed 90 percent of parity for their potatoes for the duration of the war and 2 years thereafter. Even this offer, which proved to be liberal, was probably not anywhere near so liberal as the offers which were made to industry when new buildings were constructed for industry, and contracts were let on a basis which would permit paying for the facilities over a 5-year period.

Mr. BREWSTER. Or even less.

Mr. AIKEN. Some were paid for in a 3-year period. So no special privilege was given to the farmers. The potato growers themselves came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this year and asked to have the support price lowered at the end of this period, which ends December 31, and that was done. As the Senator from Maine says, the support level on potatoes will doubtless drop to 60 percent, or not much above, beginning January 1.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Vermont will recall the problem of the northern growers, who do not market their 1948 crop until January, February, or March 1949.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. The committee and the Congress very wisely provided that the 90-percent support for the 1948 crop should continue through the marketing period of that crop.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct in making that statement; and it is perfectly proper that the 90-percent level should be sustained until the 1948 crop is marketed.

Mr. BREWSTER. If we had not done that, the only consequence would have been that the entire 1948 crop would necessarily have been dumped on the Government on December 31, 1948, as the growers would not have dared to take the hazard involved in continuing.

Mr. AIKEN. And the Government does not have adequate storage to handle them.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. So what the Senator says is 100 percent correct.

In regard to grain, the Senate reluctantly agreed to continue the 90-percent support for the basic commodities for 1 year after December 31. As everyone knows, the Senate believed that the reduced price-support program should go into effect at the end of this year, January 1, 1949. I was interested in finding out just what the difference would be between the support levels at the long-range support-program prices, and the 90-percent support with which it appears we shall have to get along for another year, although I feel that it is going to be disadvantageous to agriculture. I feel that the consumer and the taxpayer will become annoyed at us if we go through, as we have already agreed to do, with this high support level for another year.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator will agree that there is much less likelihood of any criticism next year so far as potatoes are concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. There will probably be no criticism of potato support prices next year, because it is doubtful if the potato support-price program will cost the Government anything for next year.

I asked the statisticians of the Department of Agriculture to use their best judgment, taking the Government estimates of this year's production of the grain crops, in estimating, to the best of their ability, the probable total supply on January 1, and in figuring out what the support prices would be under the 90-percent-of-parity program, and what they would be provided the long-range farm program took effect January 1. I have those figures. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a brief statement and all the figures which I have obtained.

There being no objection, the statement and figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The attached table illustrates the changes in support prices which would result if title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948 were made effective on January 1, 1949, rather than January 1, 1950.

The estimated supply percentages are rough estimates that need to be further checked. They are also subject to the influence of a number of factors about which no information is available at present. The most important of these is, of course, the weather.

The support prices are based on parity prices as of July 15, 1948. This is not a forecast that parity prices will necessarily be the same a year from now. The important factor here is the different support-price provision in the two titles of the act rather than the level of parity prices. For wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts the transitional parity price (95 percent of the parity price according to the present formula) is the price on which the support price is based. For these commodities the maximum support price under title II of the act would be less than the mandatory support level under title I. The maximum support level for rice would be slightly higher than the level under title I.

If conditions were such that marketing quotas or acreage allotment were in effect, the minimum support levels would be as follows: Wheat, $1.73; corn, $1.32; cotton, 25.13 cents per pound; and peanuts, 9.5 cents per pound. These support prices would still be below the mandatory support prices under title I.

The following table illustrates the support prices for the basic commodities:

Estimated support prices of basic commodities, assuming title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948 in effect in 1949

Commodity	Unit	Estimated supply percentage, 1949 crop [1]	Parity price		Support price					
					Title II [2]				Title I [3]	
					Minimum		Maximum			
			Present	New	Percentage of parity	Price	Percentage of parity	Price	Percentage of parity	Price
		Percent			Percent		Percent		Percent	
Wheat	Bushel	116	$2.22	[4]$2.11	68	$1.43	90	$1.90	90	$2.00
Corn	do	108	1.61	[4]1.53	72	1.10	90	1.38	90	1.45
Cotton	Pound	110	.3112	[4].2956	71	.2090	90	.2650	90	.2801
Rice	Bushel	102	2.04	2.15	75	1.61	90	1.94	90	1.84
Peanuts	Pound	113	.120	[4].114	60	.0787	90	.103	90	.108
Tobacco:										
Flue-cured	do		.488	.502			[5]90	.452	90	.470
Burley	do		.473	.507			[5]90	.456	90	.426

[1] Does not take into account the influence of marketing quotas or acreage allotments.
[2] Based on prices in new parity column.
[3] Based on prices in present parity column.
[4] Transitional parity price.
[5] The minimum support price for tobacco is 90 percent of the parity price when marketing quotas are in effect.

Other provisions for all practical purposes mean that marketing quotas will be in effect every year unless disapproved by more than one-third of the producers.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the present program, which guarantees 90 percent of parity to the wheat grower for next year, it is estimated that the support level of wheat will be $2 a bushel. It is also estimated that on January 1 there will be 116 percent of a normal supply of wheat in this country. Two dollars a bushel will unquestionably prove to be an incentive price for the raising of wheat next year. According to the best estimates, by January 1 wheat will be in surplus. It means that with fairly good weather next year there will be enough wheat produced under the $2 guaranty so that there is a strong probability that quotas may have to be imposed on the production of wheat for the year 1950. That would be most unfortunate. I do not believe that the growers want it at all.

Nevertheless, if we go through with a high support price level for another year, that will be the result. If the long-range farm program were in effect, the growers would be guaranteed a minimum price—and here again I want to make it plain that this is according to the best estimates obtainable—of $1.43 a bushel. That would be subject to an increase in the event of poor weather or short crop, or other conditions.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator means between now and December.

Mr. AIKEN. If there were a short supply next year, or conditions were bad, the price of $1.43 could be increased; but with normal conditions the guaranty to the wheat grower next year would be $1.43, or a little more.

The guaranteed support price to the corn grower under the 90-percent-of-parity level is estimated to be $1.45 a bushel. Under the long-range farm program it would be $1.10. It would be subject to the same slight increases. That would be the minimum which the Secretary would announce at the beginning of the year.

For cotton the 90-percent-parity support level would be 28.01 cents a pound. Under the long-range farm-support program it would be 20.99, or approximately 21 cents a pound. However, it is estimated that this year's yield of cotton will be so heavy that there will be 110 percent of a normal supply on hand January 1, which will make cotton subject to quotas, and under the formula there would be a 20-percent premium paid on the support level, which would bring it up to about 25 cents a pound under the long-range farm program.

Under the 90-percent guaranty, rice will be supported at $1.84. If the long-range program were in effect it would be supported at a minimum of $1.61 a bushel. Under the 90-percent guaranty peanuts will be supported at 10.8 cents a pound. Under the new long-range program they would be supported at 7.87 cents a pound. Peanuts, however, are another crop which is under quota. So the growers of peanuts also would receive the benefit of a 20-cent premium, and therefore would have a support price of about 9 cents a pound, as compared with 11 cents a pound at the present time.

Because of an amendment adopted here on the floor, tobacco would show an increase of 2 or 3 cents a pound in the support level, if the long-range program were adopted as of January 1, 1949, instead of going over for another whole year.

But I regard it as most unfortunate that we have to go through another year guaranteeing $2 a bushel for wheat, because it is almost certain to result in a tremendous overproduction unless we have very bad weather conditions, and it will have a very unfortunate effect upon the whole farm support-price program. If the support prices on grains were lowered somewhat there would be greater encouragement to feed grains and to market them in the form of meat, dairy products, and poultry products; and in the long run that undoubtedly would prove to be of benefit to the farmers and the consumers alike.

I feel that if we only could have this long-range price-support program take effect January 1, 1949, instead of January 1, 1950, it would have a greater effect on controlling inflation than all the measures which we are likely to approve at this special session of the Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I certainly thank the Senator from Vermont very much for that contribution, as his comments on agriculture always are of value, and particularly in the explanation and application of this program. I am not prepared to express an opinion regarding his formula, but I have been ready to accept it because of the great study he has given to it; and I think the figures he presents today certainly show the wisdom of developing a program of that character, rather than the program heretofore prevailing. The figures he submits certainly indicate how greatly it might contribute to the solution of the problem of inflation.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed at this point in my remarks a clipping from the Wall Street Journal, containing a summary of the anti-inflation program presented by Mr. Eccles, former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, to the House Banking and Currency Committee, dealing with housing, public works, farm prices, and other matters.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECCLES PRESENTS HIS ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM; BALANCING BUDGET IS MOST IMPORTANT POINT—CREDIT CONTROLS LISTED SECOND; TRUMAN PLAN HAS INFLATIONARY ITEMS, HE CLAIMS

WASHINGTON.—Former Federal Reserve Board Chairman Marriner S. Eccles yesterday gave Congress his personal anti-inflation program.

It differed markedly from the President's program, which Mr. Eccles termed "more of a political program than an economic one." This was true, he told the House Banking and Currency Committee, because Mr. Truman's program includes many points which are inflationary, rather than deflationary. Among these inflationary items he placed support of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing bill, broadening social security and increasing minimum wages.

Warning that from all present indications the Government will operate in the red next year. Mr. Eccles said the most important

item in his anti-inflation program was maintaining a balanced budget.

"There isn't much use talking about controlling inflation unless fiscal policy calls for a balanced budget," he said. "It would be impossible if the country should run into a budgetary deficit to put into effect a restrictive monetary and credit policy."

Next most important anti-inflation weapon, the former Federal Reserve Board Chairman said, are controls over consumer and bank credit. He termed these the "easiest, simplest, and most effective" controls, but warned that they are "only supplemental to a sound budget policy." The power to raise reserve requirements, he said, might not have to be used at all—the psychological effect of the existence of the Board's power to increase reserves further might suffice.

ECCLES' PROGRAM

Other points in the Eccles program were:

Housing: "The Federal Government should not, by what seems to me political reasons, encourage a housing program in excess of the amount of labor and materials available and encourage further inflationary trends."

Public works: "The Federal Government should do everything in its power to encourage States to postpone every expenditure that can be postponed, and set an example to the States by doing likewise."

Farm prices: "The Federal Government should do everything in its power to bring down food prices by encouraging more and not less production."

Mr. Eccles made it plain—as he did before the Senate Banking Committee last week—that his program could not prevent a deflationary adjustment but merely cushion the shock of that deflation.

LONGER INFLATION, WORSE DEPRESSION

The longer inflation continued, he told the House group, the rougher time we would have when the inevitable depression comes.

Mr. Eccles did not confine his criticism to the administration, but said Congress and the public generally were equally to blame for the present inflationary condition, which he laid to premature removal in 1945 and early 1946 of the "whole harness of war controls, including the excess-profits tax." It was apparent then, he said, with a record purchasing power available and with a war-accumulated backlog of demand, that to remove these controls made the "inflationary spiral inevitable."

He does not now favor reimposing the excess-profits tax, however, Mr. Eccles said, because it is too complicated for consideration at a special session and because the whole tax structure should be overhauled rather than changed by piecemeal revision.

Mr. Eccles presented his program in an impressive 50-minute extemporaneous speech, "off the cuff and from my heart." He asked both parties to "adjourn political considerations and consider honestly and openly the economic facts of life."

SEES LITTLE HOPE OF SURPLUS

Prospects for a budgetary deficit next year, Mr. Eccles said, "will be increasingly serious if we still have the inflationary situation." He added that he saw little hope of securing a budgetary surplus so long as we have increasing military expenditures with no terminal point or a world-aid program with no terminal point in such amounts as this Government is now spending, and so long as the cost of the veterans' program, interest on the public debt, and other Government expenditures that seem impossible to reduce continue."

Mr. Eccles repeatedly hit at minority pressure groups, each wanting the benefits of inflation for themselves but wanting others to pay for it.

"The farmer wants a floor under farm prices but no ceiling. The real estate and building materials people want easy credit so they can readily dispose at inflated prices of the homes and materials they sell, but they certainly resist any excess-profits tax so that the Government could recapture some of the profits thus made. Labor always wants price controls but vigorously resists wage controls. Bankers want higher interest rates but don't want Federal banking agencies to have increased power over the expansion of credit.

"There has been little or no willingness to face up to it realistically, either by the public, the Congress, or the administration. This situation now has gone so far that to stop the inflationary developments could well bring about a deflationary development."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have offered this article because it seems to me that it lends further support to a recognition of the appropriate approach in this matter.

I have already inserted in the RECORD the figures on wheat, showing the barometer that wheat prices are or the way in which wheat prices promptly responded to the announcement of the export program. I think all those in this country who are concerned with the high cost of living may well address themselves to the simple lesson taught by this matter. I was somewhat disturbed and somewhat surprised to discover last week, in connection with an exploration of the transportation problems on the Atlantic coast—I was told this by representatives of the Army—that in the next 3 months, the critical 3-month period between now and November which spans the period to the election, the Army contemplates the exportation of 2,000,000 tons of various foodstuffs and material from the United States to Europe. That is 4,000,000,000 pounds of a variety of foodstuffs and other materials, many of which certainly are in critically short supply. I am not challenging the use to which they are to be put, but I call attention to the fact that the European wheat crops are increased by 450,000,000 bushels, the precise amount of our exportation last year. So the Europeans are that much better off.

However, I call attention to the plain provisions of the European relief legislation Congress enacted, which in repeated sections, which I read into the RECORD a week ago when this matter was previously being discussed, provided that the President should at all times take into account the needs of the domestic economy. I think anyone with the slightest familiarity with the law of supply and demand knows very well that if we export 4,000,000,000 pounds of foodstuffs and other materials, and if we put into our economy $4,000,000,000 of money of some kind or other, whether it be paper money or banking loans, or regardless of what other inflationary methods are used, and substitute that money in place of the goods, it will mean that in the American pocket there will be money burning a hole, demanding goods which are necessarily in somewhat more limited supply.

Although I do not believe that the export program is the entire reason for our difficulties in this country in recent years in the matter of inflation, nevertheless I do believe that the possibilities of controlling the price structure by the control of our export program have not been used at all to the extent that would be warranted and wise in the interests of the American people, who are suffering under this program at the present time. I believe that if the President were to exercise his plain powers and plain responsibility under existing legislation for the European relief program, there could be little doubt that the prices of these essential foodstuffs would promptly decline to parity, or even, as indicated here by the Senator from North Dakota, go somewhat below that.

Mr. President, I shall not labor this matter further. I think the item which I inserted, which was a small item, or was to me, and I believe would be to the average man in the street unfamiliar with the gyrations of the market, offers rather conclusive evidence that the action of the administration in connection with the export foodstuffs and other essential and critical materials which are entirely under the control of the administration under existing law, and the responsibility for the control of which in the interests of our domestic economy is made exceedingly plain by the legislation we have enacted under the European relief program, indicates that present powers can well be used to deal with much of the problem of food prices for the solution of which we were called back into special session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber yesterday when the Senator from Delaware had a colloquy with the Senator from Illinois regarding an amendment which had been adopted by the Senate last year. Although it is certainly true that we have had a number of major inflationary factors at work in this country, nevertheless, I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Delaware the fact that that has not been true in the case of all the products of the American farmer.

California happens to be one of the major agricultural States of the Union. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator from Delaware to some figures on the average price, in terms of dollars per ton, received by the farmers of my State. The figures are contained in a table, which I shall now read:

	Average price, dollars per ton			
	1944	1945	1946	1947
Raisins	$200.00	$203.00	$312.00	$120.00
Table grapes	110.00	78.00	98.70	45.60
Wine grapes	111.00	62.30	104.30	36.40
Apricots for canning	92.60	110.00	97.60	70.00
Dried apricots	610.00	632.00	600.00	480.00
Cling peaches	61.80	63.00	69.70	45.90
Freestone peaches	70.40	70.40	74.80	46.70
Dried peaches	70.50	73.20	51.40	30.00
Pears	87.10	79.30	96.20	70.60
Prunes	218.00	210.60	256.60	148.00

I want to say to the able Senator from Delaware that in some of the crops in California the farmers found it necessary last year, and the outlook is that they will again find it necessary this year, to tear up the producing orchards because of their inability to get enough out of

the crops to pay for the cost of the labor it would take to harvest the crops. I merely want the RECORD to be complete and to show that while there are many inflationary factors at work in the country, there are also some deflationary factors at work in certain parts of our economy, which if allowed to continue indefinitely without some constructive program might lead to a general collapse of at least a segment of our agricultural economy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield, I may say to the Senator from California that in my speech yesterday I did not say that the prices of the various commodities had declined. In fact, I thought that was why we were here, to bring about a lowering of prices. I merely pointed out the fact that the Government was buying certain commodities. For example, they bought 140,000,000 pounds of dried prunes, raisins, honey, and grapefruit juice. They bought 1,500,000 gallons of grapefruit juice, which was resold at 40 cents a gallon.

I merely wanted to point out that all these commodities were bought for the sole purpose of holding up prices in America. They were resold by the Department of Agriculture on a contract carrying a proviso that under no circumstances—that is what the substance of it meant—should any of the goods so sold be allowed to be resold to the American housewife. I said it was in direct contradiction to the statement by the President that he wanted prices to decline. To show how the program works, the articles alone which I put in the RECORD represented a loss to the Treasury of around $60,000,000, all of which has taken place within recent weeks. The city of Washington, or the District of Columbia, which comprises the city, principally, pays 1¼ percent of all the revenue of the Government. Therefore, to quote it in simple language, the city of Washington has been called upon—that is, citizens of the city of Washington in recent weeks—to pay $750,000 into the Federal Treasury in order to hold the price of food products up. I said at that time we should ask the housewives whether we are really sincere in wanting to put prices down.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want to say to the able Senator from Delaware, I think we must all agree that there is a rule of reason that must be used on this type of situation. I think the very able Senator from Vermont has recognized that situation in wanting and in trying to arrange some kind of formula that would not encourage a constantly inflationary cycle and at the same time would protect the American farmer from a distressed market, because I think we all realize that if there is a collapse of the agricultural economy the time is not too far distant when there will be a collapse in the urban centers of the Nation. The fact of the matter remains that the historical markets for a great many of the agricultural products, particularly in my section of the country, have been in central Europe, and in the period of the past few years, particularly after the Nazis came into power and tended to block off foreign trade, particularly during the war period when the Nazis had taken over most of Europe, the historical markets were closed to the normal agricultural producers in my State and in other States of the Union.

It certainly seemed to a great many of us that in this day and age, when there has been so much hunger in Europe, it did not make sense for agricultural crops to be destroyed on the ground while there was tremendous need overseas for helping to rehabilitate the war-torn world.

Moreover, if the Senator will remember, it was at the time that the inflationary factors affecting wheat were being brought into play and the price of wheat was constantly mounting. It was the contention of a great many of us that for the caloric value, if they would take certain of these items that were soon to become distress items and substitute them for wheat in the feeding program, it would tend to stabilize or reduce the price of wheat to a more normal basis, and that, in turn, would have an advantageous effect upon the meat production in the United States as well. In other words, we felt that we did not want to see food crops in this country destroyed at a time when there was a great need of food throughout the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield further, I should like to say that when the Senator from California presented his first amendment to take care of that situation, I expressed my approval of the amendment and said that the Government should be required to use the surplus products we had for shipment to Europe and hold back some of the scarce commodities. However, the criticism I made yesterday was that they are not carrying out the instructions which were given at that time.

The commodities which are being sold are not among those required under the appropriation for the European recovery program. It is a separate section entirely, and they are being used for a separate program. I said there was no excuse in the world for subsidizing—which is what it was—the agricultural interests here, in order to hold prices up, while at the same time we are trying to hold prices down for the housewife. We simply cannot mathematically work out prices so that will happen.

I notice that the average 10-year price of corn for the past 10 years, according to a report published by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate was 95.3 cents. The parity price under the formula was 1.42. If we support corn at 90 percent of parity, we are supporting it at a point about 35 percent higher than the average prices the farmer has been receiving for the past 10 years. I said that was not economically sound to support a price that high.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to reply briefly to the remarks of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that under the long-range farm program, if it were in effect now, by January 1 next year the support price would probably be $1.10 a bushel, which is not unreasonable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that had his proposal of a long-range farm program been adopted, it would have been a much better program than that existing now. I think the bill reported by the committee was a much better bill than the one we are working on, and would have gone much further toward correcting some of the things we are criticizing. I do not think it went far enough. That is my criticism. It would have been a step in the right direction. But the facts we have before us now show that we are confronted with a situation in which we have another 1½-year extension of this same wasteful program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Delaware was not on the floor a few minutes ago when I stated that if we could put into effect on January 1, 1949, a long-range program, instead of on January 1, 1950, we would probably go further in the direction of controlling any additional inflation than by any measures we are likely to pass at this special session.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. It seems to me that nearly everyone, in talking about the prices which the consumer pays, always thinks in terms of what the farmer receives. Wheat has dropped in price 33 percent since last February. The price of bread has not dropped more than 1 cent a loaf, and in many cities not any. High prices of food involves high taxes, high wages, high transportation costs, and many other factors. While wheat has dropped 33 percent in price, bread has dropped in price 1 cent or less.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, that is a very interesting comment. I wish to call attention to the fact that a great deal of the difficulty in connection with potatoes grew out of the unparalleled productivity of California acres. California farmers discovered that they could go into some of those broad and fertile lands largely with mechanical means and raise potatoes to the extent that they were running out of their eyes and ears, and they have increased the production of potatoes in California four or five times what it had been previously. That has accentuated the difficulty. We have seen pictures of potatoes on the runways of the airport, and the best advice to dispose of them was to dump them on the air fields, run tractors over them, dehydrate them, and use them for cattle feed.

The former Secretary of Agriculture, who is now a candidate for Senator from New Mexico, was very greatly distressed regarding the constituents of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who were doing only what they were encouraged to do by legislation and by high prices. But it was California, with its optimism, which accounted for a good deal of the problem. I do not know what the current situation is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Maine that the particular situation in regard to potatoes and the encouragement which may have been given to over-production—and I think that is something which should be guarded against, and we are not encouraging over production—did not grow out of the amendment which the junior Senator from California offered from the floor last year, but from legislation which was passed long before the Senator from California came to the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. It was under the application of the Steagall amendment and its formula.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MURRAY BY THE AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, recently our distinguished colleague the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was deservedly complimented by the American Dental Association. Because American dentistry's evaluation of the Senator's work in the field of health legislation is of import to all of us, I have prepared a few remarks concerning it. I ask unanimous consent that they be set forth in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION PRAISES THE WORK OF SENATOR MURRAY, OF MONTANA

A very few weeks ago, Senator MAGNUSON addressed a plea to the doctors of America for their sincere cooperation with us in the framing of health legislation. In the course of that address he laid stress on the success achieved by Senator MURRAY and his colleagues in drafting such bills as the National Heart Act recently passed by the Congress. That act is both of tremendous importance to the millions of heart disease sufferers throughout the Nation and thoroughly acceptable to the doctors of America. It was acceptable to the doctors, to the people, and to the Congress because the physicians working in the field of heart disease left the propagandists of organized medicine outside and themselves sat down in a spirit of sincere cooperation and helped draft the legislation which Senator MURRAY, in the interest of millions of our people, was concerned with.

Now we have added proof of the success which can be achieved when professional men forget suspicion and distrust of their legislators and cooperate with public officials in honest efforts to secure proper and constructive laws. The dentists of America have done this. They sent dentists rather than public relations men to sit down with Senator MURRAY and to aid in the drafting of dental health legislation. The result was a dental research bill thoroughly acceptable to the dental profession and holding great promise for the children of this country. The following quotes from the American Dental Association News Letter of July 1, 1948, show how well the dentists think of Senator MURRAY. They reflect the thinking of dentists who have actually worked with our distinguished colleague from Montana—of professional men who really know Senator MURRAY.

The comments are:

"ADA SPOKESMAN PRAISES WORK OF REPRESENTATIVE BEEHM AND SENATOR MURRAY

"Dr. Flagstad issued a statement commending the action of Congress in writing a successful conclusion to the 8-year-long campaign of the ADA to secure Federal legislation in support of dental research. He named Representative BEEHM and Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, as deserving special credit for supporting the dental research bill."

Dr. Flagstad, chairman of the American Dental Association's Committee on Legislation, said in part:

"There are two Members of Congress who deserve special credit for their exceptional service. Representative WALTER BEEHM, of Ohio, a dentist by profession, merits the appreciation of the dental profession. * * * Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, from Montana, also merits the association's appreciation because he introduced the original dental research bill 8 years ago and has reintroduced it in every succeeding session of Congress. Senator MURRAY has consistently and energetically fostered our dental research bill and secured its passage through the Senate in two different sessions of Congress."

In recognition of this tribute from American dentistry to Senator MURRAY, I want to add my voice to Senator MAGNUSON'S in urging organized medicine to follow the lead of the heart specialists, the cancer specialists, the mental hygiene people, and the dental profession of the country. If they will but sincerely cooperate with Senator MURRAY in the interests of America's health, they too will find him as interested in protecting their rights as in advancing the health of our people. They too will learn, as Senator MAGNUSON so well put it, that Senator MURRAY is for health insurance because he is against socialized, state medicine.

PALESTINE AND THE NEW NATION OF ISRAEL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to another matter which is also concerned with the current situation, and that is dealing with a problem which has been of recurring consequence to us in the problems presented in the Middle East, particularly in relation to Palestine and the new nation of Israel.

The political platforms of both political parties have some very clear declarations on the issue. I shall later ask to have the planks printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, we were all profoundly gratified when the United Nations took the action they did last November, under American leadership, and recognized the creation of this new state. We were all profoundly disturbed when the administration apparently withdrew the action. We were gratified, and our hopes rose again later on, when finally a truce was arrived at in the lamentable controversy which prevailed there and when the creation of the new state of Israel became a fact and was recognized de facto immediately by the United States with a promptness which certainly did us credit.

We have been called here to consider the implementation of some of the programs provided for in our platform, and there has been considerable somewhat invidious criticism as to what has and has not been done. I call attention to one sentence in the Democratic platform, which says:

We favor full recognition of the state of Israel.

Action on that pledge is in the complete control of the President of the United States today, and I think he could do no more worthy act to demonstrate his desire to carry out the obligations imposed by the platform of his party, which was adopted at Philadelphia, than to transfer the recognition from de facto to de jure. It is a matter absolutely within his control and would qualify Israel for application for admission to the United Nations at the oncoming meeting in September.

Mr. President, I have a memorandum dealing with de facto and de jure recognition, citing several instances in the past few decades in which the United States has recognized a provisional government without waiting upon application or upon the establishment of a permanent government. I want to cite three of the cases, the first of which is Russia. Interesting enough, after the Revolution, when we recognized the provisional government established by Kerensky, full recognition was granted, despite the fact that the government itself was de facto in character, was weak, and later was overthrown by the Soviet authorities.

The citation for this is to be found in Mr. Hackworth's treatment of this matter, volume 1, pages 135 and 136:

(b) Poland after the recent war: The Potsdam Declaration specifically indicates that recognition was granted by Great Britain, the U. S. S. R., and the United States to the "Polish Provisional Government of National Unity." The interesting thing here is that recognition was unqualified at a time when future elections were contemplated and Poland's borders remained to be delimited.

(c) France after liberation: We unqualifiedly recognized the "Provisional Government of the French Republic," although it was understood that elections remained to be held and a new constitution framed and adopted.

Mr. President, I ask that this legal memorandum dealing with the question of the de facto and de jure recognition be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGAL MEMORANDUM ON DE FACTO AND DE JURE RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL

1. There are several instances in the last few decades in which the United States has recognized a provisional government without waiting upon elections or upon the establishment of a permanent government:

(a) Russia after the revolution when we recognized the "provisional government" established by Kerensky. Full recognition was granted—despite the fact that the government itself was de facto in character, weak and later overthrown by the Soviet authorities. See I Hackworth 135–136.

(b) Poland after the recent war: The Potsdam Declaration specifically indicates that recognition was granted by Great Britain, the U. S. S. R. and the United States to the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity. The interesting thing here is that recognition was unqualified at a time when future elections were contemplated and Poland's borders remained to be delimited.

(c) France after liberation: We unqualifiedly recognized the "Provisional Government of the French Republic", although it was understood that elections remained to be held and a new constitution framed and adopted.

2. There would seem to be no reason or warrant for making the nature of our recognition—de facto or de jure—turn on whether the particular government is provisional or final. What a new sovereignty chooses to call its government—whether it decides to regard it as provisional or otherwise—is irrelevant from the viewpoint of another country which must determine whether or not to recognize that government. The Provisional Government of Israel is the legal, de jure government of that country, and what procedure the Israelis choose to follow before drafting a constitution, establishing a permanent government, etc., has no bearing whatever on the issues before the United States.

3. The United States is properly concerned with matters such as these: Whether in fact the Israeli government is in possession of the machinery of the state; whether it governs with the assent of the people; whether it can fulfill its international obligations. But assuming these tests are met—and so far as I am aware no one has denied that Israel can meet these tests—to withhold full or so-called de jure recognition because the Israelis happen to have described their own government as provisional is an act of political expediency, not law.

4. American history offers illustrations where appropriate use has been made of limited recognition. For example, in the case of various South American republics established by revolution; where power has been transferred from one to another group and where the authority of the government in power is under obvious challenge—de facto recognition may be appropriate. But certainly no one in the State Department has yet suggested that the Provisional Government of Israel does not fairly meet the historical tests of recognition. What appears to have happened is that these who were loath to recognize Israel seized on the word "Provisional" in the title of the government and then developed a legalistic thesis that since the government was provisional, American recognition would only be "de-facto." From the viewpoint of reason and precedent this is an absurd non sequitur.

Mr. BREWSTER. It proceeds:

American history offers illustration where appropriate use has been made of recognition.

I further ask that there be incorporated in connection with my remarks an editorial from the New York Post of Tuesday, July 20, denominated "Unhappy Truce," by T. O. Thackrey, dealing with the propriety and the urgency of a recognition of Israel de jure at this time.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNHAPPY TRUCE

(By T. O. Thackrey)

There is a dangerous air of optimism over the truce which has momentarily halted fighting on several, though not all, fronts in Palestine, hardly justified by a sober review of the conditions:

1. Arab acceptance of the cease-fire order—an acceptance not observed yesterday by Syrian and Iraqi forces—is conditioned on embargo of immigration to Israel and loss of Israel's status as a nation.

2. The effect of the Security Council resolution, which was authored by the United States in behalf of American-British joint policy, is to substitute Count Folke Bernadotte as a one-man mandate in Palestine for the indefinite period of the truce. Under a strict interpretation Israel's full sovereignty could be withheld indefinitely, and immigration throttled.

3. Israel's acceptance of the cease-fire order is also conditioned—and properly—upon her right to exercise sovereignty over immigration and recognition as a lawful nation.

4. The mediator, Count Bernadotte, continues to press for all-Arab rule over Jerusalem and has thus become an advocate of British and Arabian partisan claims which run directly contrary to the United Nations proposal outlined in the November 29 General Assembly resolution for establishment of Jerusalem as a free city under UN control. Israel, which might well have claimed Jerusalem as a capital, in view of the preponderance of Jews in the population, agreed to the UN proposal—but Count Bernadotte is pressing to make it an Arab capital, clearly disqualifying himself as an administrator or mediator.

It now appears most likely that whatever the fate of the cease-fire order, the United Nations mediator, relying on United States and British support in taking a pro-Arab position, will propose again to make Jerusalem an all-Arab city, restrict Israel immigration, reduce Israel's borders, and suggest joint Transjordan-Israel sovereignty in Palestine on a pro rata basis; meaning, of course, establishment of Jewish minority villages under Transjordan rule and the dismemberment of Israel's national sovereignty.

President Truman's administration is wholly responsible for the fact that such a state of affairs has been brought about despite the clear pledges of his party to all-out support for Israel.

The deputy representative of his State Department wrote and fought for adoption of the UN Security Council resolution now in effect.

Although his party pledged lifting the arms embargo, the President's representative at Lake Success instead brought about a world-wide arms embargo, more effective on Israel than her enemies since her borders are more readily patrolled.

Although his party pledged full sovereign recognition of Israel, and even pledged that the United States sponsor Israel's membership in the United Nations, President Truman's representative at Lake Success sponsored the resolution that restricts Israel's sovereignty both in the matter of immigration and self-defense.

The resolution does not, happily, impose even by implication any restriction on the right of the United States to grant full lawful (de jure) recognition to Israel and conclude treaties of commerce, trade, and other diplomatic exchanges: But yet, President Truman has not acted to do so.

Until he does, he must be held guilty of flouting the pledges of his party, ignoring principle, and abandoning Middle East policy to the pro-Arab section of his State Department.

He has also succeeded in demonstrating thus far that the pledges of the United States, when made by his administration, are worth less than the paper they are written on: that the pledges work, rather, in reverse.

In today's world, this can hardly be said to be a constructive or sensible demonstration.

Unless his party's pledges are implemented by the time the special session of Congress, called by the President, opens next week, there will be an opportunity for the Republican Party to demonstrate, if it will, that its pledges on Israel are more meaningful.

The Congress, dominated by Republican members, easily has the power to memorialize the President to keep his pledges, recognize and support Israel, and return to the support of the partition policy of the United Nations.

Recognition of Israel at this time by the President would at least be a demonstration that he had read his party's platform.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask that the Republican and Democratic planks regarding Israel be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the planks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Plank in Republican national platform of 1948 dealing with Israel:)

We welcome Israel into the family of nations and take pride in the fact that the Republican Party was the first to call for the establishment of a free and independent Jewish commonwealth. The vacillation of the Democrat administration on this question has undermined the prestige of the United Nations. Subject to the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter, we pledge to Israel full recognition, with its boundaries as sanctioned by the United Nations, and aid in developing its economy.

(The full text in the Democratic national platform of 1948:)

President Truman, by granting immediate recognition to Israel, led the world in extending friendship and welcome to a people who have long sought and justly deserved freedom and independence. We favor full recognition of the state of Israel.

We affirm our pride, too, that the United States, under the leadership of President Truman, played a leading role in the adoption of the resolution of November 29, 1947, by the United Nations General Assembly for the creation of a Jewish State.

We approve the claims of the state of Israel to the boundaries set forth in the United Nations resolution of November 29 and consider that modification thereof should be made only if fully acceptable to the state of Israel.

We look forward to the admission of the state of Israel to the United Nations and its full participation in the international community of nations.

We pledge appropriate aid to the state of Israel in developing its economy and resources.

We favor the revision of the arms embargo to accord to the state of Israel the right of self-defense. We pledge ourselves to work for the modification of any resolution of the United Nations to the extent that it may prevent any such revision.

We continue to support within the framework of the United Nations the internationalization of Jerusalem and the protection of the holy places of Palestine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a further point is the assistance which may be appropriately considered for this new Government which has been born under such difficult conditions, although it is the first country in the history of the world which came into being as the result of considered determination of the overwhelming majority of the nations of the world, who had considered this matter, and had recommended that Israel should come into being as a new nation among the peoples of the world.

The President of the United States, at the time of the recognition de facto, indicated his complete sympathy and his desire that America should extend the same character of aid that was being extended to other nations in the reestablishment of their shattered economy. Certainly if there was any country that needed this, in view of the stormy history of recent years, the details of which I shall not here discuss, as they have been fully labored here before, certainly Israel was in that category.

There is now an application before the Export-Import Bank for a loan of $100,000,000 in order to assist in the development of Israel. This, again, comes

within the category of those things which the President had indicated might be seriously considered, and are matters entirely within the control of the administration without further action by the Congress of any character.

The further issue of the admission of Israel to the United Nations will, I presume, be presented at the meeting of the General Assembly in September of this year. I ask that a memorandum dealing with the considerations governing this, and with its practical consequences so far as Israel and the world are concerned, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL TO THE UNITED NATIONS

The resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted on November 29, 1947, provided:

"When the independence of either the Arab or the Jewish state as envisaged in this plan has become effective and the declaration and undertaking, as envisaged in this plan, have been signed by either of them, sympathetic consideration should be given to its application for admission to membership in the United Nations in accordance with article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations" (par. 1-F).

The question now arises whether the state of Israel should be admitted to the United Nations at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly in Paris.

I. ISRAEL'S QUALIFICATIONS

1. The origin of the state: Israel is the first state in history to be created as a result of the investigations, deliberations, and decisions of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Its credential for admission is thus a unique international birth certificate inscribed with a distinguished and honorable parentage. Thirty-three nations voted for the General Assembly's resolution, and would therefore seem to have a moral commitment to favor Israel's early admission.

2. The existence of the state: Israel's existence is now a fact of international life of which the whole world is aware.

(a) External recognition: Although admission to the United Nations and recognition are not synonymous—and many states which have sought admission have not had as many recognitions as the state of Israel—it is significant that the state of Israel was accorded recognition by 15 powers in less than 10 weeks' time. These include: United States, Guatemala, U. S. S. R., Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Nicaragua, Uruguay, South Africa, Hungary, Finland, Rumania, Costa Rica, Panama, Venezuela.

(b) Internal recognition: Fundamental in the establishment of a state is the writ of authority it derives from its own people and its capacity to control its area and carry on the functions of Government. The record of performance since May 15 has demonstrated the representative character of the organs of government established in Israel, their acceptance of the people, and their competence to create a smoothly operating apparatus of government serving all the needs of the people.

The United Nations mediator attested to this achievement in paragraph 34 of his report to the Security Council:

"The de facto situation in Palestine today is that a Jewish Provisional Government, recognized by an increasing number of states, exists in an area of Palestine, and is exercising, without restrictions of any kind on its authority or power, all the attributes of full sovereignty, including the waging of war." (In par. 17, the mediator described the war as a defensive one.)

Moreover, although Israel was attacked by six Arab states within a few hours of the proclamation of its independence, its people rose loyally to its defense and not only repelled all attacks but succeeded in carrying the war to the enemy's territory.

II. FIDELITY TO THE UNITED NATIONS

1. Israel's orientation to the United Nations: Israel has given ample evidence of its independence and its freedom from the domination of foreign powers. The very fact that its birth was attended by a union of great powers which have been divided on other issues has developed in Israel an international attitude oriented to the United Nations and to that body alone.

2. Israel's relations with the United Nations: Since its establishment, the state of Israel has fully and faithfully responded to every decision and appeal of the United Nations and its organs. More than half a dozen times the state of Israel willingly complied with calls made upon it by the Security Council, despite the fact that those calls equated aggressor and victim and imposed onerous obligations and conditions which should have been reserved for the aggressors against Israel. This scrupulous and undeviating fidelity to the commands of the United Nations has confirmed the promise that the United Nations would be the keystone of Israel's foreign policy.

3. The experience and attitude of Israel's people: The people of Israel, long before the state was formed, fought for the cause and in the armies of the United Nations. It was against the Jewish people that Hitler first declared war, and 6,000,000 Jews perished in the cause for which the United Nations arose. Their contribution to victory in World War II, both in Palestine and on every front, was far more impressive than that of a number of countries which gave little or nothing to that cause but which nevertheless have been admitted to the United Nations.

III. THE PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES OF ISRAEL'S ADMISSION

1. Its significance to the United Nations: The admission of Israel to the United Nations would be an announcement to the world that the United Nations is prepared to honor its commitments. Delay would be an act of vacillation by the General Assembly which would undermine confidence in that body's disposition and capacity to give effect to its own recommendations. Recommendations of the General Assembly would have little force or meaning to the nations of the world if the Assembly itself were to set an example of indifference to or noncompliance with its own recommendations.

2. As a contribution to peace: The most compelling reason for Israel's admission is that it will, more than any other act at this time, stabilize the situation in the Middle East. Arab aggression against Israel was encouraged by a delusion that Israel could be liquidated. When the Arab states are persuaded to realize that this is an objective impossible of achievement by arms or by diplomatic maneuver, there will be a powerful incentive to reach a peaceful settlement with Israel. But if Israel is denied admission at the forthcoming session, uncertainty will continue for another year, Arab intransigence will be emboldened, and the prospects of negotiations leading to a final peace will be gravely prejudiced.

It should be noted that the language of the General Assembly's resolution, quoted above, deliberately made the admission of the Jewish state independent of the establishment and admission of its neighbor.

It may be argued that Israel's admission should be deferred until an agreement is reached with the Arab states and until Israel has compromised its differences with the Arabs.

Clearly, the situation dictates the opposite course. Agreement with the Arab states is far more likely to be consummated if the international community removes all lingering doubts of Israel's status.

Experience in the Palestine controversy has shown that firm action by the United Nations and its organs facilitated progress toward a solution, and that equivocation and delay retarded a final and lasting settlement.

With the existence of Israel an immutable fact, the establishment of peaceful relations between Israel and its neighbors and the stabilization of the entire Middle East can best be achieved by formal and international confirmation of reality—Israel's acceptance into the family of nations.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have covered the considerations which it seems to me may be appropriately brought to the attention of the administration at the time of this special session, called to deal with various matters of moment and concern, and to emphasize that, so far as this recommendation is concerned, so far as movement to have Israel admitted to the United Nations is concerned, and so far as the consideration of its application to the Export-Import Bank for aid is concerned, they are all entirely within the full control of this administration and of the President of the United States. I can only hope that early and sympathetic consideration will be given to this matter without further delay.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it will be recalled that the Democratic platform at Philadelphia respecting Israel and Palestine provided as follows:

President Truman, by granting immediate recognition to Israel, led the world in extending friendship and welcome to a people who have long sought and justly deserved freedom and independence. We favor full recognition of the state of Israel.

We affirm our pride, too, that the United States, under the leadership of President Truman, played a leading role in the adoption of the resolution of November 29, 1947, by the United Nations General Assembly for the creation of a Jewish state.

We approve the claims of the state of Israel to the boundaries set forth in the United Nations resolution of November 29 and consider that modification thereof should be made only if fully acceptable to the state of Israel.

We look forward to the admission of the state of Israel to the United Nations and its full participation in the international community of nations.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, does the Senator realize that I have just inserted this plank in the RECORD?

Mr. PEPPER. Let me conclude. I did not know the Senator included both planks.

Mr. BREWSTER. I included both the Democratic and Republican planks.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the Senator did. I wish to conclude reading this, however. It continues:

We pledge appropriate aid to the state of Israel in developing its economy and resources.

We favor the revision of the arms embargo to accord to the state of Israel the right of self-defense. We pledge ourselves to work for the modification of any resolution of the United Nations to the extent that it may prevent any such revision.

We continue to support within the framework of the United Nations the internationalization of Jerusalem and the protection of the holy places of Palestine.

Mr. President, that is a forthright declaration of the Democratic Party on the subject of Israel. The Republican platform is also a very favorable statement upon the same subject.

In our respective parties we have our own acts of aid to Israel to which we naturally turn back with pride. We, as Democrats, as well as Americans, are pleased that it was a Democratic President who had the distinction, and, I may say, the heartfelt satisfaction, of extending recognition to the old state of Israel created anew in our own time. I am sure that we share one another's confidence that it is the right thing to extend that de facto recognition into de jure recognition, that we all favor the expeditious transition of the status of recognition from de facto to de jure, and we believe that surely it will be done in the very near future.

I myself certainly entertain the confident hope that the President who extended de facto recognition to Israel reborn, will not lag behind in making his de facto recognition the de jure recognition which will consummate the purpose which he first implied with the de facto recognition.

I also feel that it is only a matter of time, and I hope a short time, until Israel will be granted the economic aid it so sorely needs in its extremity. After we have been so generous, as well as just, with other needy peoples of the world, letting them have billions of dollars, I cannot see why we hesitate longer over a few hundred million dollars to a great people reborn, after the travail of their birth.

I certainly hope that the Congress and the Government will approach both the matter of de jure recognition and the extension of economic aid on a commendable bipartisan basis, and that the Congress, speaking for one part of the Government and, the executive for another, will join hands in seeing to it that these two high purposes are consummated in the immediate future.

One other matter: It seems to me that more progress than at one time appeared probable has been made in the stability of the military situation in Palestine. There does seem to be a truce. We hope that the order of the Security Council that there be a cease fire by both parties will not only be adhered to, but will be implemented as well. I am sure it is the sentiment of all parties in Congress and Government that the United States shall use its full moral and material power to see to it that the Security Council does attend to the cease-fire order, and that we are prepared to implement that order should the occasion arise. By doing so we not only would preserve Israel against attack and aggression, but at the same time we would strengthen the arm of the United Nations as the agency of law, order, and peace in the world.

Mr. President, we should also make it clear that the truce is not to be conditioned upon any contingency which is not consistent with the full sovereignty and independence of the state and the people of Israel, that is to say, it must not be conditioned by anybody or any agency upon the new Jewish state being denied the emphasis of proper sovereignty to determine the conditions of immigration and in other respects to act as any sovereign state is expected to act to determine its own policy and its own destiny with respect to such internal matters as that.

I think it should be made clear at the earliest possible time that the United Nations has prescribed the boundaries of the state of Israel, and that if changes are to be made they will have to be made with the concurrence not only of the United Nations, but also of Israel. I think no real peace can prevail unless the boundaries are changed in the way that the boundaries of any sovereign people might be changed, and in no other way.

Lastly, Mr. President, the Assembly of the United Nations meets in Paris in the fall. What more fit time and place could there be than for the doors of this world organizations to be opened to the embrace of this new State, this new people of Israel? Surely, it seems to me that we as bipartisans, as Americans, can agree also that our Government should take the lead in sponsoring the admission of Israel into the full sisterhood of nations in the United Nations Organization, and that we should do it at the meeting of the Assembly in September, so that before this old year, with so much heartache and travail and tragedy, comes to an end, we may at least offer to mankind one bright hope that we are making steady progress in the long war for democracy, for humanity, and for decency in the world.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, supplementing what the Senator from Florida has so well said in connection with the application for a loan of $100,000,000 from the Export-Import Bank, I might point out that those of us who have had the good fortune to study this situation at first hand in recent years have seen the enormous equity which has been created in Palestine as the result of a contribution of more than one-quarter of a billion dollars, largely from American sources, as the free-will offerings of those who were interested in the welfare of their fellows overseas, and who have poured that money out voluntarily and gladly into the rehabilitation of the economy of the new state of Israel, which is the best guaranty that it is a state to which we might prudently consider an advance of this character, when we have been advancing so freely, I believe since the end of the war, $18,000,000,000, for the rehabilitation of various other economies.

Mr. President, this is of concern not only because it will provide for the unfortunate people in Europe who are looking to this country as a haven, who find here the only hope for reestablishing themselves as the result of the dislocation incident to the war, but because, in my opinion, it is one of the greatest contributions that can be made to the rehabilitation of the entire economy of the Middle East. It will furnish an example of what it is possible to do in these formerly desert areas, because the entire area, particularly in the region a few hundred miles beyond Palestine, in the Valley of the Tigris and the Euphrates, is capable today of being restored as the Garden of Eden, which it once was. One need but to see in that region the drainage canals which existed there 3,000 years ago to realize the rich resources of that soil. If that soil, and the soil of the adjoining Arab regions of Iran, Iraq, and Arabia, were devoted to one-tenth or one-quarter of its possibilities, to the rehabilitation of agricultural economy, the level of living of that entire area would be raised considerably, which would quiet the seething unrest which affects that region today and threatens the stability of the world, because if another World War comes upon the earth, it is altogether likely to emerge as the result of the collisions which are occurring among the starving, deprived people of the Middle East, who are not privileged to have the benefits of the soil and the riches of the soil which is really within their domain.

So, it has always impressed me that the problem of Palestine and Israel was of consequence to us, not merely from the standpoint of relief, not merely from the standpoint of an ancient nation now seeking recognition, but from the standpoint of a contribution to the stability of that entire region of the earth which by its progress will remove itself as one of the greatest problems of this time.

I think the President could make a very great contribution if he should extend de jure to Israel recognition at this time, and give serious consideration to the remaining problems with which we are faced.

THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Washington News entitled "Not Funny, Mr. President." Adjoining the editorial is a cartoon which depicts a whale with the President standing in the bottom of its open mouth. On the whale appear the words "Commies in Government hearings." The President is shown as saying "It is just a red herring."

Mr. President, I consider the Communist problem in the United States a very serious one. The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and many other patriotic organizations have opposed this menace to a free government since World War I. I believe the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, headed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], which is investigating the problem, is doing an excellent work and should be supported and commended.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT FUNNY, MR. PRESIDENT

President Truman charged congressional hearings on Soviet spy activities are a "red herring" to hide the Republican Congress' failure on other matters. In doing so, he

very foolishly accepted a measure of responsibility for an ugly and dangerous situation which previously could not have been charged against him.

Not many people who have followed the testimony in the current hearings will agree with Mr. Truman that the Communist problem in Washington can be laughed off as "Republican politics," in our opinion.

Moreover, the President has further placed himself on the defensive on this issue by denying to the investigating committees information which is pertinent to their inquiries.

The failure of Congress to act upon the President's anti-inflationary program will not in any sense excuse him for his own refusal to cooperate in removing a very real threat to our national security. The issues are not in any way related. Today we are concerned with another problem.

Under Mr. Truman's own loyalty program, laid down by Executive order, it is the announced policy of the Government to bar from positions of trust in "sensitive" agencies any employee whose loyalty may be subject to question.

That policy broke down when William W. Remington was appointed chairman of the Commerce Department's export license committee although it was known he was under investigation for association with a confessed member of a Russian spy ring. That is not something existing only in the mind of Representative KARL E. MUNDT, as Mr. Truman would have us believe. It is an undisputed, unexplained fact. And if the President's loyalty test was not applied in Mr. Remington's case, what reason have we to believe that it has been applied in any other case?

The two congressional investigations, particularly the one being conducted by Senator FERGUSON, have been extremely useful. But neither has more than scratched the surface, in our judgment.

We need a careful, searching inquiry, that will give free access to all pertinent information, conducted by an agency with the ability and the power to purge the Government of all disloyal and unreliable elements. An unofficial civilian commission should be created for this purpose, as a safeguard against the subversion of the Government by enemy agents or dupes.

Such a commission, to command respect and confidence of the public and Congress, should be composed of persons of the caliber of Herbert Hoover, Bernard M. Baruch, Henry L. Stimson, Charles Evans Hughes, Owen D. Roberts, Robert M. La Follette, and James F. Byrnes—men who know government, who respect civil liberties, but who would resolve all doubts in favor of national security.

Let's forget politics when the issue is security.

DISPOSAL OF THE RENO ARMY AIR BASE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program on August 25, 1947, held a hearing on the Reno Army Air Base disposal pursuant to a general demand spearheaded by the American Legion, Department of Nevada.

The hearing was held to permit the city of Reno and the State of Nevada to carry out any plans they might have for a National Guard, veterans or other housing, schools and religious institutions, without interference from any extraneous source whatever.

The work of the committee brought out certain secret and unrecorded agreements, including possible plans to remove the buildings and equipment for private gain with the consent of the then Administrator of the War Assets Administration.

Subsequent developments have proven the value of the work, since the National Guard has now made application to the War Assets Administration for a long list of material, equipment, housing, runways, and land with which to operate at the base—a copy of which is attached to the committee report.

The superintendent of public instruction, Miss Mildred Bray, has just inspected the buildings and equipment at the base, together with the representatives of the University of Nevada, and the administrators of the high schools in the northern and western parts of the State, including Reno, Sparks, Carson City, Fernley, Tahoe, Yerington, and Humboldt and Pershing Counties, and all agree that at least a partial answer to their need for additional classrooms will be found at the base.

The remaining property not required by the National Guard can be cleared almost immediately, and the housing and equipment selected for use by the schools offered for bids; then, since the schools will receive a 95 percent discount from their bid price, they can obtain possession of the property within a very short time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the subcommittee, the list of materials, and so forth, and several communications printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENO ARMY AIR BASE DISPOSAL

(JOINT REPORT of the Subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program pursuant to S. Res. —— and the Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments pursuant to S. Res. 75, November 1947)

(Letter of Transmittal)

Washington, D. C., ——, 1947

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman, Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: There is transmitted herewith to the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments a report of the Joint Committee of the Subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and the Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments concerning the hearing held at Reno, Nevada, on August 25, 1947, the subject of which was the pending disposal of the Reno Army Air Base. This report incorporates the findings and recommendations by the Joint Committee as the result of the hearing.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER FERGUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and Subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program

Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program: Owen Brewster, Maine, chairman; Homer Ferguson, Michigan; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; John J. Williams, Delaware; George W. Malone, Nevada; Harry P. Cain, Washington; Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico; Claude Pepper, Florida; J. Howard McGrath, Rhode Island; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: George D. Aiken, Vermont, chairman; Homer Ferguson, Michigan; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Iowa; John W. Bricker, Ohio; Edward J. Thye, Minnesota; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; Irving M. Ives, New York; John L. McClellan, Arkansas; James O. Eastland, Mississippi; Clyde R. Hoey, North Carolina; Glen H. Taylor, Idaho; A. Willis Robertson, Virginia; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland.

Subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program: Homer Ferguson, Michigan, chairman; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; George W. Malone, Nevada; Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland; George Meader, counsel.

Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Homer Ferguson, Michigan, chairman; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Iowa; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; John L. McClellan, Arkansas; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland; Miles N. Culehan, counsel.

The Department of Nevada, American Legion, assembled in convention in Reno, Nev., passed a resolution requesting the joint committee of members of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program and the Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to investigate into and hold a hearing upon the proposed disposal of the Reno Army Air Base. The Legion indicated that certain facts existed which necessitated such a course. Since the joint committee of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program and the Surplus Property Subcommittee was holding hearings in Las Vegas, Nev., on the pending disposal of the basic magnesium plant, the Nevada American Legion suggested that the joint committee hold a hearing in Reno following the hearings in Las Vegas.

Accordingly, on August 25, 1947, a hearing was held in Reno, Nev. Senator MCCARTHY, acting as chairman, and Senator MALONE were present as members of the committee. Numerous witnesses were heard, and the subject of the proposed disposal of the Reno Army Air Base was exhaustively covered.

Based upon a résumé of the facts and findings of the committee attached hereto and made a part hereof, the committee makes the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the acquisition of the airport by the city of Reno, Nev., would be desirable both for the city and the Federal Government in that such a sale could insure the preservation of such airport and its reversion in the event of an emergency.

2. That the city of Reno, Nev., be permitted under Public Law 289, passed by the Eightieth Congress, to make application through Civil Aeronautics Administration to acquire possession of the airport, including such other facilities and properties, to wit, land, buildings, warehouses, railroad sidings, roads, and utilities, all a part of the Reno Air Base, as could be utilized to pay for the maintenance and operation of the airport, if such operation proves feasible, and if not safe for operation as a civilian airport then classified in such manner even if a special act is necessary to not require operation of such facilities by the city, but to preserve it for emergency military purposes.

3. That War Assets Administration forthwith take the proper steps to have such air base reclassified under Public Law 289 and to furnish such aid and assistance that may be necessary to enable the city of Reno, Nev., to accomplish the purposes set forth in recommendation No. 2, and to preserve the airport without necessary operation for the armed services in the event of emergency or for military training.

4. It is recommended that War Assets Administration reclassify two or three buildings as may be necessary to be sold for removal from the site in order to try to meet the requirements of the Legion for a clubhouse. The selected buildings should of course not seriously interfere with or destroy the disposal value of the area.

5. The committee approves the proposed disposal of the chapels to recognized religious organizations pursuant to the directions of the United States Army Chief of Chaplains.

6. The committee desires to remain in close touch with this problem and in order that this end may be obtained requests that War Assets Administration and any or all interested parties keep the committee fully advised of all important developments and negotiations.

The committee finds that the facts are substantially as follows:

FACTS

The Army Air Forces declared the Reno Army Air Base surplus to War Assets Administration pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act. Under the regulations promulgated by the Administrator of War Assets Administration, it is necessary for real property to be classified before it can be disposed of. When a portion of this property consists of an airport, it is necessary for Civil Aeronautics Administration to determine how much of the entire property shall be classified and disposed of as an airport, and subsequently War Assets Administration must classify that portion which remains. The Reno Army Air Base consists of two areas; one which has been classified as the airport property by Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the other has been classified by War Assets Administration.

War Assets Administration has determined, pursuant to its regulations, that the remaining portion, known as the cantonment area, should be disposed of in place as distinguished from a sale of the facilities to be removed. War Assets Administration officials testified that a sale of the buildings and improvements in the cantonment area for removal from the site would result in a serious loss to the Government, inasmuch as several million dollars have been invested in the utilities, and their only substantial value is, of course, use in place.

Under the Surplus Property Act and the regulations, municipalities are entitled to a priority and a discount in the disposal of airports.

The practice has been to dispose of airports to a municipality in the locality at a 100 percent discount, provided that the municipality agrees to maintain and operate the airport pursuant to the requirements of Civil Aeronautics Administration, and provided further that the city cannot transfer or dispose of any portion of the airport without the consent of Civil Aeronautics Administration, and in the event of a national emergency the property reverts to the Federal Government for such use as may be necessary.

The city of Reno proposes to exercise its priority to acquire the airport property. However, the facts indicate that under the present circumstances the airport operates at a substantial loss, and the city of Reno is not in a position to finance this loss. Official reports also indicate that the airport is not feasible or safe for operation as a civilian airport—therefore the city should not be required to operate it as such, but it should be preserved for emergency military purposes or as a training field even if special legislation is necessary. The city also has a priority under the act to purchase the cantonment area, but must pay fair value for this area and does not receive any discount on such a purchase. The city proposed to exercise its priority to acquire the cantonment area, and then lease both the airport and the cantonment area to a private corporation, referred to as the Merrick Corp., recently organized for this purpose, to operate them and thereby permit the city to acquire the airport and at the same time avoid the annual loss which now accrues.

The private corporation planned to support the operation of the airport by the profit which could be derived from the cantonment area and also by attempting to interest commercial air lines in the use of the airport, and by leasing part of the facilities for use by the National Guard. The airport has since been pronounced not feasible for civilian use, but would be valuable for military training purposes.

The existence of a proposed contract to this effect between the city and the private corporation was testified to by the facts produced at the hearing indicated that the city and the Merrick Corp. had abandoned or dropped the contract. It was suggested by the committee that a formal cancellation of this contract be executed, in order to clarify this situation and make certain that it did not interfere with any other possible bidding. The committee has since been advised that such an instrument of cancellation has been executed. However, the representatives of the corporation stated at the hearing that in the event that they can acquire the cantonment area either through the city's priority or through purchase for their own account, they will still be willing to enter into some arrangement for the operation of the airport so that the city will not be in a position to sustain a loss.

The Nevada American Legion expressed a desire to have the cantonment area sold to veterans exclusively, and classified so that the structures and improvements could be removed from the site. Under the Surplus Property Act, veterans have no priority in regard to real property of this nature. It was also shown that the experience of War Assets Administration in the sale of real property reveals a much larger return in the sale of improvements with the land as compared to the sale of improvements for removal from the land.

The American Legion representatives testified that they were interested in acquiring two or three buildings in the cantonment area for subsequent removal and use as a Legion clubhouse. It was indicated that it was possible legally to reclassify a few of the buildings to permit removal from the site, provided that such removal would not substantially diminish the value of the entire area.

The proposed disposal of two chapels in the cantonment area was the subject of some discussion, but it was determined that the recipients of such chapels are determined by the United States Army Chief of Chaplains, and the recipients are chosen from the applicants for the chapels who are recognized religious organizations.

It was pointed out that since the classification of the airport property by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Public Law 289 was passed in the last session of Congress. Under this act, Civil Aeronautics Administration can include in its classification as an airport sufficient adjacent property to support the operation of the airport. Such an application and classification could still be made.

In the event that the city does not exercise its priority to acquire the cantonment area when it is advertised for sale, then it will be sold at public auction to the highest bidder. This, in all probability, would be the private corporation, and although the representatives of the corporation indicate that they would still be willing to enter into a contract to support the operation of the airport out of the income from the cantonment area, they would, of course, not be bound to do so and could make whatever use of their acquisition as they saw fit.

DEMAND FOR HEARING

The general demand for a congressional hearing spearheaded by the American Legion, Department of Nevada, was aggravated by the lack of available information and rumors of a semisecret and unrecorded agreement between the city of Reno and a private corporation to get possession of the several million dollars' worth of Government property to dispose of as they saw fit under the guise of industrial development and operation of the airport.

It developed that a $6,000 deposit had been made with the city of Reno by the private corporation which was withdrawn when the information was made public through the hearing.

CORPORATION NOT BOUND TO OPERATE AIRPORT

It also developed that while the contract with the city mentioned operation of the airport as a commercial venture that the corporation was not bound to operate it and that by consent of the War Assets Administration the buildings and equipment could be removed for any purpose.

The hearings cleared up what could have developed into an unhappy situation for all concerned and provided the city of Reno a clear field to decide the course best for the city, State, and the National interest.

LIST OF MATERIAL, HOUSING, EQUIPMENT AT THE RENO ARMY AIR BASE REQUIRED BY THE NATIONAL GUARD

RENO ARMY AIR BASE, NEV.,
August 3, 1948.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF REAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Mr. Smith.)

GENTLEMEN: Reference is made to letter from this office dated March 11, 1948, requesting that disposal action be held in abeyance in regard to certain portions of Reno Army Air Base, Nev., which were required for future use by the National Guard.

The requirements of the National Guard have been amended and it is requested that disposal action be held in abeyance in regard to the following lands and facilities, rather than those set forth in the aforesaid letter dated March 11, 1948:

1. The following-described lands in township 21 north, range 19 east.
(a) The west half of section 17.
(b) Section 18.
(c) Section 19.
(d) Section 20.
(e) The southwest quarter of section 21.
(f) The west half of section 28.
(g) Section 29.
(h) Section 30.

2. (a) Building T–5004, crash shed.
(b) Building T–5006, night lighting vault.
(c) Building T–6001, traffic-control tower.
(d) Building T–6101, parachute building.
(e) Building T–6102, administration and operations building.
(f) Building T–7000, oxygen storage.
(g) Building T–7001, personnel equipment and squadron supplies.
(h) Building T–7002, personnel equipment and squadron supplies.
(i) Building T–7003, hangar.
(j) Building T–7004, armament storage.
(k) Building T–7102, link trainer building.
(l) Building T–8001, personnel equipment storage and locker space.

(m) Building T-8002, personnel equipment storage and locker space.
(n) Building T-8003, hangar.
(o) Building T-8101, photo lab.
(p) Building T-8201, classroom.
(q) Building T-8202, supply room.
(r) Building T-8203, classroom.
(s) Building T-8204, classroom.
(t) Building T-8205, communications repair.
(u) Building T-8206, classroom.
(v) Building T-8207, classroom.
(w) Building T-8208, classroom.
(x) Building T-8209, administration.
(y) Building T-T-99, rotating beacon.
(z) Building T-101, ammunition storage.
(aa) Building T-130, filtration plant.
(bb) Building T-204, filtration plant.
(cc) Building T-131, reservoir.
(dd) Building T-132, storage tank.
(ee) Building T-135, well.
(ff) Building T-201, well.
(gg) Building T-110, paint, oil, and dope storage.
(hh) Building T-2404, quartermaster fuel storage pump station.
(ii) Building T-2504, oil and grease storage.
(jj) Building T-1201, warehouse.

3. The equipment described below, installed in buildings which are not to be withdrawn:

(a) Twenty-five horsepower cast-iron sectional boiler, oil-fired, including fuel tank and smokestack complete with hardware, electrical equipment, and plumbing attached thereto. (Now installed in Building T-1204, bakery.)
(b) Blackboards and status boards (now located in Building T-1001).
(c) Supplies and shelving (now installed in Building T-1202).
(d) Issue counters and bins, three large tables, four large storage bins (now installed in Building T-1402).
(e) Clothing bins, partitions (now located in Building T-1501).
(f) Bins, exhaust-disposal unit, stepladders, block and tackle, wash and grease racks (now installed in Building T-2503).
(g) Guard rail (now installed in Building T-3305).
(h) Bar unit and mirror (now located in Building T-4214).
(i) Orderly room counter unit (now installed in Building T-5209).
(j) Supply-counter unit (now installed in Building T-5216).
(k) Desk unit (now installed in Building T-5301).
(l) Counter unit (now installed in Building T-5312).
(m) Five blackboards, two cabinets, guard rail (now installed in Building T-6201).
(n) Counter unit (now installed in Building T-6303).
(o) Bulletin board and book shelves (now installed in Building T-7205).
(p) Two Westinghouse air units, drawer unit, ventilating fan (now installed in Building T-7401).
(q) Six clothing bins (now installed in Building T-7415).
(r) Six heater fans (now installed in Building T-9014).
(s) Two outside grease racks (located in the vicinity of Building T-2503).

4. The perimeter fence surrounding Reno Air Base.

5. All railroad trackage now installed in the land area requested above, together with the railroad trackage between the Western Pacific Railroad right-of-way and the land area requested above, together with rights of ingress and egress thereto.

6. Water bearing land right-of-way and easements pertinent to the provision of a water supply be made available to the National Guard together with all equipment pertinent thereto, including the following facilities:

(a) Well No. 2 as indicated on United States Engineer drawing No. 121-13-123, sheet 15, unit lay-out map "Utilities" dated April 1943.
(b) Reservoir and water-treatment system and equipment located as indicated on United States Engineer, South Pacific Division drawing "Exhibit A," Real Estate, Reno Army Airfield—including pipe line and power line.
(c) The installed pipe and equipment indicated in red on United States Engineer drawing No. 121-13-118, sheet 9, water distribution system, Reno Airfield.

7. Gasoline distribution system: The following items as shown on United States Engineer drawing 121-13-73, aircraft gasoline fueling system, dated July 1942.
(a) Transfer station.
(b) Transfer line running along Avenue A to four underground tanks located at east end of Avenue A.
(c) Four 25,000-gallon tanks and truck-fill stands located at east end of Avenue A.

8. Electrical system: All pole lines, transformers, switch gear, and other equipment specifically a part of the following systems:
(a) The primary and secondary power and lighting system indicated in red on U. S. Engineer Drawing No. 121-13-118, sheet 2, primary and secondary electrical system, dated April 1943.
(b) Obstruction light system indicated in red on U. S. Engineer Drawing No. 121-13-118, sheet 4, obstruction light system, dated April 1943.

9. That portion of the sanitary sewer system indicated in red on U. S. Engineer Drawing 141-18-118, sheet 6, dated April 1943. 1943.

10. Obstruction lights in outlying areas:
(a) Flashing beacon on Peavine Mountain.
(b) Obstruction light, Station No. 50 located on Flat Mountain.
(c) Obstruction light, Station No. 51 located on West Approach Mountain.
(d) Obstruction light, Station No. 52 located on Clam Mountain.
(e) Obstruction light, Station No. 53 located on Horse Mountain.
(f) Obstruction light, Station No. 54 located on North Mountain.
(g) Obstruction light, Station No. 55 located on Ordnance Mountain.
(h) Obstruction light, Station No. 56 located on Belt Mountain.
(i) Obstruction light, Station No. 57 located on Round Top Mountain.
(j) Radio beacon site located on Bald Mountain.

11. All flying facilities such as pavements, markers, aircraft parking areas, etc., on the flying fields.

It is to be noted that Buildings 6501, 6502, 6503 and 6504 and 8 acres of land in section 29, and Building T-100 and 1.32 acres of land in section 21 were withdrawn from surplus by WD 1145-B and WD 1145-F, respectively.

Sincerely yours,

H. O'NEILL,
Assistant, Management and Disposal Division, Real Estate
(For the Chief, Engineers).

Excerpts from letter from Superintendent of Public Instruction Mildred Bray, dated August 2, 1948; received August 5, 1948:

"Last week, in company with John P. Gifford, representative of the United States Office of Education in San Francisco for War Assets Administration, Mr. J. R. Warren, office deputy, and I went to the Reno Army Air Base to inspect the property and see if it would be suitable for school purposes. The following day Mr. Gifford and Mr. Warren invited the school administrators in this area to go to the air base with them and decide whether they would like to make application for specific property. We all agreed that probably the wings of the hospital could easily be converted into excellent classrooms and would meet our problem. They were so long that approximately three school classrooms could be made out of each ward. The administrators from Reno, Sparks, Carson City, Fernley, and Tahoe selected units which would make about 50 classrooms; and the University of Nevada also is seeking several buildings and the heating plant. Today the superintendents of the Yerington schools, the Pershing County High School, and the Humboldt County High School will inspect the property, and file their applications for some of the buildings."

Telegram sent Miss Mildred Bray, superintendent of public instruction, on this date:

AUGUST 5, 1948.

MISS MILDRED BRAY,
Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Carson City, Nev.:

Have your letter re building and equipment desired at the Reno air base for use of University of Nevada and schools in northwestern Nevada, including Reno, Sparks, Carson City, Fernley, Tahoe, Yerington and Pershing and Humboldt County High Schools. Army has made their selections of buildings and equipment to be retained for National Guard and other purposes, complete list of which is going forward to you today by air mail. Presumably remaining buildings and equipment can be released almost immediately.

Advise you make selections of housing and equipment desired by the University and school system of State immediately and forward list to Robert Bradford, Regional Director, War Assets Administration, 1182 Market Street, room 306, San Francisco, Calif.

War Assets Administration advises that almost immediately they can advertise the equipment on your list for sale and that on whatever you bid for such equipment there is a 95-percent reduction—in other words, you will pay 5 percent of the amount of your bid for the housing and equipment on your list which may then be removed or utilized in any way in accordance with your plans.

I realize the school year is starting very soon and if you will keep me advised I will follow it through and there should be no hitch whatever in the proceedings to make all such equipment in addition to that retained for the National Guard available to the schools of the State.

Regards.

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I intend to follow through in this matter, and keep the Senate and the State of Nevada advised of the use and final disposition of Reno Army Air Base.

TEMPORARY REGULATION OF CONSUMER INSTALLMENT CREDIT

The Senate resumed consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to offer an amendment to the pending measure, to be printed and lie upon the table; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, ordered to be printed and lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REVERCOMB to the House amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer credit for a temporary period:

At the end of the House amendment insert the following:

"There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

"SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation of the present high prices of consumer goods and (2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than January 2, 1949, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

"SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

"SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

"(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 157 contains three provisions. First, it contains a provision which was passed by the Senate nearly a year ago, permitting the reinstallation of consumer-credit controls as they were authorized by Presidential order issued under the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917. That authority is extended until March 15 of next year. The committee has recommended its extension until June 30.

The second provision, which has been eliminated by the committee, would increase the gold reserve requirements against Federal Reserve notes from 25 percent to 40 percent, and the gold-reserve requirements against deposits in Federal Reserve banks from 25 to 35 percent. Those are the percentages which have always been in force until we reduced them approximately 3 years ago, in 1945, when the war was still in progress, to 25 percent. The House amendment proposes to restore them. The Senate committee—I do not know by what vote—proposes to eliminate that increase.

The third provision increases the power of the Federal Reserve bank to require reserves in commercial banks against time deposits and against demand deposits. The House amendment would authorize the Federal Reserve Board to increase those reserves by three percentage points; In the case of central Reserve cities, from 26 to 29 percent; our committee goes on to 31 percent; in the case of Reserve cities, from 20 percent to 23 percent; our committee increases it further to 25 percent; and in the case of country banks generally, from 14 to 17 percent; our committee proposes to increase it two points more, to 19 percent.

Mr. President, this measure deals with the general question of credit and the control of credit by the Government on the theory that the increase in credit which has occurred and which is likely still to occur is one of the causes of inflation. I have discussed at other times the general causes of inflation, but there can be no question that an increase in bank loans and an increase in consumer credit creates additional currency and additional dollars which may be spent, and which go into the market against a supply which is not necessarily increased by that operation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the Senator mention the provision in the House amendment with respect to time deposits? I think he referred to demand deposits in the various percentages.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I did not give the percentages on time deposits. The present requirement as to time deposits is 6 percent. The House increased it to 7 percent, and the Senate committee proposes to increase it to 8 percent.

As to the actual increase in consumer credit, in 1945 the total consumer credit outstanding in the United States was $6,638,000,000. I am reading from pages 96 and 97 of the President's Midyear Economic Report, received last week. By June of 1947, a year ago, it had reached $11,230,000,000; and in June of this year $14,100,000,000, or more than double since 1945, an increase in 1 year of nearly $3,000,000,000.

This measure applies only to installment credit. Installment credit, however, has provided the greater part of the increase. In 1945 installment credit was $2,365,000,000. By June of 1947 it had doubled, increasing to $4,919,000,000; and by June of this year, it had increased to approximately $7,200,000,000, or a total increase of about two and one-fourth billion in 12 months.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator is now discussing the consumer credit provision, which has to do principally with the curtailment or discouragement of installment buying, does it not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. I was about to ask the able Senator if he thought the curtailment of installment buying would materially affect the prices of food, my own thought being that food is not the sort of thing which is generally the subject of installment buying. Installment buying involves to a greater extent things like automobiles, radios, and so forth. Would the consumer credit measure, even if it discourages what might be called consumption or purchase of durable or semidurable consumer goods, materially affect the price of food?

Mr. TAFT. The whole installment credit business affects general prices only as I have suggested; but the fact that there is an increase of $2,250,000,000 in purchasing power has some effect on the entire economy. It is not one of the largest elements in increasing purchasing power, but it does increase it by $2,250,000,000. It is not as important as bank credit, to which I am coming next.

Mr. PEPPER. In my opinion, the observation which I have made is equally applicable to clothing, and other things which are not ordinarily the subject of installment buying.

Mr. TAFT. To some extent the question of prices is a question of particular things; but also there is no question that the steady rise in prices of all kinds in the past 3 years is due to the fact that we have more money than we have supply of goods. We have more demand than there is supply of goods; and to the extent credit is created, we simply add that much more purchasing power out of thin air. Ordinarily we create purchasing power by producing goods and paying money to those who produce them. That is a perfectly normal process, and we get no more purchasing power than we get goods. But when we increase credit, we increase the number of dollars available for purchasing power. Of course, if the Government is running a deficit, that represents an increase. It was the big increase in Government credit—$50,000,000,000 a year increase in debt—which created this problem in the first instance. Now we no longer have that factor, but we do have an increase in consumer credit which, as I have pointed out, is about $2,250,000,000 a year. We have an increase in bank credit, and we have an increase in housing credit. Those things create general purchasing power in excess of the goods produced, and have a general effect in keeping the spiral going up a little all the time—perhaps one-half of 1 percent a month.

Mr. PEPPER. I believe that the national income is now in excess of $200,000,000,000. What I wanted to ask the able Senator was this: Assuming that all the measures embodied in the House amendment should be enacted—if we should increase the gold-reserve requirements, if we should raise the requirements with respect to deposits of various sorts, and if we should impose burdens on installment buying, how much does the able Senator believe that would diminish the national income?

Mr. TAFT. I doubt if it would particularly affect the national income.

Mr. PEPPER. How much would it curtail the purchasing power of the people of the country?

Mr. TAFT. I think it would curtail the purchasing power of the people of the country. There are a good many other causes besides an increase in credit, but that is one cause, and one which it is proposed to restrain.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to have the Senator's opinion as to what would be the relative diminution in the purchasing power of the people if all those measures were enacted.

Mr. TAFT. I have no means whatever of telling the Senator. We have a great many different causes of the general inflation. We have the steady increase in wages, and the Government encouragement of it just after the war. We have the high Government spending. We have the factor for which I criticized the Congress the other day. The Government is competing with the entire construction industry by building Government works. We have high Federal taxes, and we have a stimulation of exports. We are exporting about $8,000,000,000 more goods this year than we import, which obviously also creates an inflationary pressure. I believe that the only way to do is to deal with the various factors one at a time and try to reduce them all. However, each of those programs has great merit, in the opinion of its proponents, and each of them has tremendous popular support. The efforts to restrain them have not been generally successful.

Mr. PEPPER. Was it not inevitable, and is it not now inevitable, that unless by violence we force down the price structure and the wage structure and the entire economy of the country from where it was in wartimes, with the demands which the Marshall plan and our other international obligations impose, with the demands of our defense program and all that is incident to it, we shall have more purchasing power than we have goods; and therefore is it not inevitable that we shall have excessively high prices unless there is some sort of governmental control and restraint upon prices, and upon the other essential factors?

Mr. TAFT. My answer is "No." It is not inevitable, because, as a matter of fact, up to date the Army program and the shipments abroad have been paid for by money taken from the people through taxation. So, while they have an inflationary effect to some extent, I do not think it is a very vital inflationary effect. I think that when credits are created out of thin air, if that is continued in great volume, it probably will bring about a continued rise in prices.

I see no reason why the economy should not be stabilized. We were close to it last year. I think there is some hope that the economy may be stabilized; but I think there is no question that the Federal Reserve Board has power today to restrain the inflationary spiral. I have no objection to giving the Board some additional powers—which is what we propose to do by this measure—at the particular point where today the expansion of total credit creates purchasing power out of thin air.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me ask whether it is a fact that prices rose more or substantially as much after the time when price controls were removed than they did during the war, when controls were in existence.

Mr. TAFT. I think so; I think that is a fact; yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Then, is not the conclusion inescapable that we have in our economy factors which inevitably will force high prices unless there are arbitrary restraints on prices; and can the Senator give us any hope that the price of meat and the price of bread will be substantially reduced by these measures?

Mr. TAFT. I think that by the general situation of which this is part, such prices will be reduced. Already the price of grain is reduced. The price of wheat is reduced a dollar a bushel, as of today; and that is bound to be reflected in the price of bread.

The price of corn is down 75 cents, or about, I think, to the support price. The new crop will come in at the lower price. With that change, I think everyone agrees the price of meat will come down. The price of meat will not reflect that change at once; it is doubtful whether it will reflect it before next year, but I think the price will come down.

Mr. PEPPER. All of us know that the countries that have kept their controls have been the ones that have maintained the most stable price structure.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I absolutely deny that we know anything of the kind. In France, where controls were maintained, they became a joke. Everything was sold on the black market, at 3 or 4 times the price that was fixed. There was no stable economy in France. Not only that, but the attempt to maintain the controls reduced production to the point where the French were obliged to ask us to feed the French people out of our surplus.

Mr. PEPPER. I have particularly in mind Canada, in which the situation is analagous to the situation in this country.

To go back to the experience we ourselves have had, it seems to me that so long as the expenditures we are making today must be made, and so long as the Government is not going to reverse its foreign policy and its domestic defense policy, the only way we are going to bring prices down is by forcing them down; and the only way we shall keep them down is by holding them down. If the Senator is not willing to face that necessity, painful as it may be, experience will prove his hopes as erroneous as were his hopes that production would increase and prices would decrease if controls were removed.

Mr. TAFT. I did not make any such statement. I thought that if controls were removed, prices would go up, although I did not think they would go up as much as they have, as the constantly increasing spiral has gone on.

However, there is no question that if we permit controls to continue, there will be no way by which we can escape permanent inflation. Inevitably, as soon as the war came to an end, inflation in the form of black markets, proceeded to break through all the price levels. For instance, 80 percent of the meat was sold on the black market, at the time when controls were removed by President Truman in 1946. I say that inevitably there was an effect, but I think the effect has fairly well worn off. We still have, I think the Board estimates, about $2,000,000,000 worth of our goods to be purchased abroad, and of course that is a cause of inflation, because the result is dollars which come back to the United States to compete for the purchase of our goods. I suppose unquestionably there is still a certain amount of inflation hanging over from the war, in the case of individuals who are able to spend money now which they would not otherwise spend. But inasmuch as net savings are steadily decreasing, the spending of savings cannot be in the amount of a very large sum.

So I feel that we are fairly near a stable condition; and if we curtail some of the governmental programs—we do not have to eliminate them, but if we reduce them to some extent—and if we restrain the use of credit, I think unquestionably there is a very fair hope that we may reach a stability of prices.

The moment we propose to cut any of these programs, immediately some very plausible arguments are presented to show that if we do so, we shall have a depression. No sooner do we say that we should restrain credit in order to prevent inflation, than some one says, "If you do that, you will have deflation." Certainly if there is to be a balance, some steps must be taken.

It is claimed that if Government bonds are permitted to reach their normal price on the market, the moment that is permitted to happen, depression will be started.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have been following the Senator's presentation with much interest, and I should like to ask him a question, purely for information, because it relates to a matter which I did not clearly understand as the Senator presented it.

In his discussion of the portion of this measure which relates to the control of bank credits, I did not clearly understand whether that portion of the measure will apply to or is designed to apply solely to member banks of the Federal Reserve System, or, instead, to apply to all banks. Will the Senator enlighten me on that point?

Mr. TAFT. I was just coming to the question of bank reserves or, rather, the increase of bank loans. The increase of bank loans has been as follows, according to the table appearing in the President's economic report.

In December 1945 bank loans were $26,100,000,000.

A year later, in December 1946, they were $31,100,000,000, or an increase of $5,000,000,000.

In December 1947 they were $38,100,000,000, or an increase of $7,000,000,000 during that year.

At the same time there was an increase of about $1,000,000,000 in other securities, which in some ways, from an inflation standpoint, other than Government bonds, may be looked upon as a further inflation of credit.

In June 1948, bank loans had only increased to $39,700,000,000, or $1,600,000,000 in the last 6 months. There are signs, however, that they are increasing again. The seasonal effect was somewhat less at that time, and I think also the general payment of the Government debt in such large amounts had some effect on that increase.

The proposal in the bill is to give the Federal Reserve Board power to increase reserves on member banks only. The Federal Reserve Board, I think, recommended an increase of 10 points in the case of all bank reserves, of all demand deposits, which was in fact an increase of 50 percent, and, in the ordinary city, from 20 percent to 30 percent. There was very wide protest from the banks. Such an increase, if applied overnight, would unquestionably require the calling of loans, and the stopping of all new loans. I think no member of the Board was willing to say how much the Board would increase reserves. The best opinion is that during the next 6 months they may possibly increase the reserves not more than 2 percent, or two points.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I would rather finish, if I may. The House fixed it at three points, which they felt would give the Federal Reserve Board power to increase the reserves as much as anybody has even suggested they should be increased, until 6 months from this time, when Congress will be back in session, if they want further power. The moment bank reserves are increased, under present conditions, the banks simply turn around and sell Government bonds to the Federal Reserve bank and replenish their reserves. It is not a very effective weapon at best, but I think it can be used with the other powers.

The best opinion today certainly is that if the Federal Reserve Board really wants to restrain bank credit, it can raise the interest rate on short-term Government bonds, and in effect let short-term Government bonds go below par. It does not make much difference, of course, because they are paid within a year anyway, and we cannot go very far wrong, by increasing the interest rate on Government bonds. I understand that many members of the Federal Reserve Board itself think that the rate could be increased from 1½ percent. It has been increased from seven-eighths percent to 1⅛, to 1½. It fact the most the Federal Reserve could do would be to help the Treasury of the United States keep the interest rate down, to avoid what is clearly an inflationary element.

I think there is some feeling about the matter. All last year there was a difference between them as to whether they really wanted to restrain the inflation in bank credit or whether they did not. They have now more or less agreed, the Treasury going along at least with this particular increase in reserves. Whether they are yet willing to permit the increase of interest on short-term Governments, I do not know. If that is accompanied by an increase in the rediscount rate, it will have a substantial effect.

They say "We also want the power to increase reserves." If they want that power also, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to give them as much as there is any possibility or likelihood of their being able to use during the next 6 months; and that is what this bill does.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I recall hearing the able Senator from Ohio a few days ago making some comment about the President not having exercised, not "legal" but some sort of persuasive authority he has over the Federal Reserve Board, to cause them to take action to restrict the economy, so as to tend toward lower prices. Here, when the matter is one of giving effective and decisive power perhaps to the Federal Reserve Board, our sister party leaves out a great part of the banking structure of the country, and does not include it at all, so that the Government through the Federal Reserve Board would have no power to affect them. In the second place, when they ask the 10-point authority, the Congress presumes to say, "No, you could exercise only 3 points, and therefore we are not going to give you authority to exercise restraint beyond 3 points." If Senators really want the Federal Reserve Board to restrict the economy so as to tend toward lower prices, why do they not give them power to act?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have already some days ago suggested that the President had some persuasive power with the Federal Reserve Board. I have extended that statement today to say that not only has he persuasive power, and not only has he failed to exercise it, but he has exercised his power through the Secretary of the Treasury, whom he controls, to prevent the Reserve Board from exercising the power of increasing the interest rate on short-term Governments, to the point at which it will really act as a restraint on the increase of bank credit.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Ohio will yield, does he propose legislation to curb that, if it is a wrong?

Mr. TAFT. That is a matter that must be left to discretion. It is impossible for us to say, "the interest rate on short-term Governments shall be 1¼ or 1⅜ or 1½." We cannot do that here. We must entrust somebody with power to do it.

So far as the increase in reserves is concerned, I think, used in connection with other powers, it can be useful to the Federal Reserve System. It certainly shows our desire to indicate to the banks that we think credit should be restrained. We are granting more power in order to restrain it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I should like to say one thing further.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well; I shall wait. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to answer some more of the Senator's questions. He asks so many at one time it is a little difficult to handle them.

The Senator has asked why we leave out the nonmember banks. Of course, in the first instance, when the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury came in with this bill, and when the distinguished Senator from Kentucky introduced his bill, they left out the nonmember banks. That was their policy. Subsequently, I understand, by a very close vote the Federal Reserve Board overturned that policy, and came down with a new recommendation that nonmember banks be included. I fully agree that if we took the Federal Reserve Board's recommendation of making an increase of 10 points, we could not do it without including nonmember banks. The discrimination would be so great that actually many banks would be driven out of the Federal Reserve System.

One reason why I think the committee has made a mistake in increasing it five points instead of three, which was in the House bill, is that it tends to discriminate more against the member banks. If it is confined to three points, and if it is temporary, as it is, I do not think any member bank is going to leave the Federal Reserve System, simply because of the temporary enactment of a three-point increase in reserves. But even with the five, I think it is doubtful.

On the question of whether the nonmember banks should be included, there is first the constitutional problem of whether that can be done. In the second place, there would be an intense feeling on the part of member banks and of many State banks that every bank in the country should not be forced into the Federal Reserve System and under Federal control. There is a very strong feeling along that line. We have debated that subject in the Senate. It would produce very bitter and determined controversy if we tried to do it. It seemed to me the House was right in saying, "We will not try to do it at this time. This is only a temporary measure. We ought not to consider a substantial change in the whole banking structure of the country, in a temporary measure. If we are finally to undertake to increase reserves, then we can consider it at that time. We do not think we had better require more than three points of the member banks because we do not want to drive member banks out of the Federal Reserve System."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not want to be captious in this criticism, but I believe experience will prove the justification of the criticism which I am about to make of the program of the majority. All these things are in the right direction. Every one of the suggestions is a good one, but, so far as results are concerned, I predict that it will be another example of too little and too late. If we are to face this problem at all—and the Senator says we do not want to exert controls again, which I myself think we shall have to do if we are to accomplish anything effective—certainly we should let some agency, such as the Federal Reserve Board, have great power

to regulate our economy in such a way that gradually prices can be forced down. When we get to that question, what do we do? We deal with half of the banks, on the ground that the others are State banks, and then when the Federal Reserve Board requests 10 points authority to use to psychological advantage, we cut them to 3.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Florida says "half the banks"——

Mr. PEPPER. Nearly half.

Mr. TAFT. However, the loans of a nonmember bank are only 15 percent of the total. Not only that, but they are scattered in places where they do not much affect the general tone, so to speak. Therefore it is not a very material factor. We can leave out that 15 percent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have received several communications from banks in Boston which raise two questions regarding which I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have been asked whether votes will be had on these amendments tonight, and how long the session will last tonight. So long as we are debating this measure we should continue in session and have all the debate we can have today. I have consulted with the minority leader and those interested in the legislation, and I am wondering if the Senate would now be ready to consider a proposal to vote on the measure now before the Senate and all amendments to it at the hour of 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. If it meets with the approval of the distinguished minority leader, there might be an equal division of the time tomorrow from 2 o'clock until 4 o'clock, divided equally between the proponents and opponents, with the idea that the Senate will convene at 11 o'clock in the morning, rather than at noon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before that request is made, in view of the fact that a considerable number of Senators are not on the floor, I think we should have a quorum call. I have no personal objection to the fixing of the time. I would want to discuss further the question of a division of the time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of a quorum call?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brooks	Connally
Baldwin	Buck	Cooper
Ball	Butler	Cordon
Barkley	Byrd	Donnell
Brewster	Cain	Dworshak
Bricker	Capehart	Eastland
Bridges	Capper	Ecton
Ellender	Lodge	Robertson, Wyo.
Fengel	Lucas	Russell
Ferguson	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Flanders	McClellan	Smith
Fulbright	McFarland	Sparkman
Green	McGrath	Stennis
Gurney	McKellar	Taft
Hatch	McMahon	Taylor
Hawkes	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Hickenlooper	Martin	Thye
Hill	Millikin	Tobey
Hoey	Moore	Tydings
Holland	Morse	Umstead
Ives	Murray	Vandenberg
Jenner	Myers	Watkins
Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor	Wherry
Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Kem	Pepper	Williams
Kilgore	Reed	Wilson
Knowland	Revercomb	Young
Langer	Robertson, Va.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, now that the quorum has been developed, I propose a unanimous-consent agreement to the Senate, as follows:

Ordered, that on the calendar day of Saturday, August 7, 1948, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon any amendment that may be pending and upon any amendment that may be proposed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 157; that no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of said joint resolution shall be received. Ordered further, that on the said day of August 7, the time between 1 o'clock—

And I am inserting this at the suggestion of the minority leader—

and 4 o'clock be equally divided between the proponents of the committee amendments and the opponents thereof, and controlled respectively by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] for the proponents and the distinguished minority leader the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] for the opponents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, would the Senator mind inserting a proviso to this effect, *"Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent a vote on the committee amendments prior to 1 o'clock?" I think it possible if we can vote on matters which are not controversial before 1 o'clock it might be desirable to get them out of the way.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to disposing of them. They would be automatically considered first, anyway.

Mr. TAFT. If we do not reach a vote on them by 1 o'clock, they will be acted on under the agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; I add that to the proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be authorized the printing of Senate Joint Resolution 157 with the House amendments, showing the amendments of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk, to the joint resolution, to be inserted at the proper place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it desired to have the amendment read?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I want it printed, and to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment which I offer is the bill which I introduced a few days ago minus titles 1 and 2. Titles 1 and 2 deal with the Federal Reserve question and consumer controls, which are embodied in the report of the committee.

Title 3 of the bill deals with prices and wages. I have introduced that as it is in the joint resolution, with the exception that I have changed the date for the level of prices from November 1947 to August 1, 1948, which eliminates the so-called roll-back, and provides a standard and level of wages which will be applicable as of August 1948.

Title 4 of the bill deals with priorities and allocations in the same manner as contained in the bill.

Title 5 is the title dealing with rent control.

Title 6 deals with the regulation of commodity exchanges, which has been before the Senate heretofore.

Title 7 is a miscellaneous title defining the President's duty in regard to the proposed legislation.

I do not care to discuss the amendment further, I desired only to call attention to these titles.

I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order has heretofore been made.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Ohio, if he will be so kind, tell us what the distinction will be in the method of treatment of the member banks and the nonmember banks.

Mr. TAFT. Under the House measure there is an increase of 3 points in the reserve requirement, or the power of the Federal Reserve to impose requirements on commercial banks which are member banks, and there is no power over nonmember banks. Our committee increased that from 3 points to 5 points, but put in no provision about nonmember banks. So that as the measure is today, it deals with member banks and not with nonmember banks.

The Federal Government has never prescribed or claimed the power to prescribe, up to this time, at least, the reserves of nonmember banks.

Mr. LANGER. How would the rediscount rates be affected?

Mr. TAFT. The rediscount rates would not be affected. They are within the discretion of the Federal Reserve Board to an unlimited degree.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator two questions which are based on information I have received from bankers in Boston concerning the possibilities of administrative action helping to solve the problem of inflation which faces us without the enactment of legislation.

My first question is, Is not the present rediscount rate one of the lowest in the history of the Federal Reserve System, and could not that properly be raised, and thus help to take out of circulation a certain amount of currency, which is a desirable thing to do?

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is correct; I believe the rediscount rate is probably lower than it has ever been, and it has not been increased. If it were raised, it would have the effect of restraining the increase of banking credit.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is now about one-half of 1 percent, is it not?

Mr. TAFT. That is what I understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And that is lower than it was at any time during the war period, is it not?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. I do not know about it being lower, but it is as low.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My other question is this: At the present time the Federal Reserve supports the Government bond market. That was perfectly proper during the war period. We all agree that that is a very difficult matter to regulate, and to regulate correctly.

I understand that at the present time the Federal Reserve holds $22,000,000,000 of short-term Government bonds. Would it not be helpful if the interest rate were very gradually changed in order to have a somewhat freer market in Government bonds, thus helping, we may say, the insurance-policy holder, thus helping institutions and businesses to sell their bonds on the market, thus encouraging business, encouraging production, and bringing about a freer exchange of Government securities between banks and the Federal Reserve System, rather than forcing them always to sell their bonds to the Federal Reserve, because there is no other market at the price?

Mr. TAFT. Broadly speaking, I should say that I agree with the Senator. The interest rate on short-term Governments was seven-eighths of 1 percent at the end of the war. That rate has been advanced by the Federal Reserve Board to 1⅛ percent. It is the general opinion, I think, that it should be raised to 1½ percent on short-term Governments without affecting the 2½ percent rate on long-term Governments.

Ordinarily when the officials speak of holding Government bonds at par, they mean holding the long-term 2½'s at par. That interest rate of course affects other interest rates. There have been times in the past when the short-term rate was higher than the long-term rate. Today I believe we could raise the short-term rate to 1½ percent without endangering the holding of the 2½-percent rate. That would be an important factor in restraining bank credit. That and the raising of the rediscount rate and the increase in the reserves could all be used together to do that if the Government wanted to do it.

As I have pointed out, however, it is perfectly apparent that although the Federal Reserve Board wants to do something in that direction, the Secretary of the Treasury has insisted on holding down the interest rate on short-term paper.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. These are all steps, are they not, that can be taken by administrative or Executive action without legislation being required?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. The legislation is only supplemental. I think practically everything can be done without it that can be done with it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I received an inquiry from a company in Connecticut which manufactures building material. Its inquiry is whether or not there is anything in the measure which interferes by imposing credit controls upon the purchases of building materials for repair and maintenance. As I have read the measure I cannot see that it does. I think it is entirely up to those who administer the law and the Federal Housing Administration. Am I correct in that supposition?

Mr. TAFT. The limitations contained in the measure mean that the controls under section 1 can only be exercised on what is called consumer credit. So the sale must be in the first instance to the ultimate consumer.

In the second place it is only a limitation on installment credit. I do not know what the terms of Executive Order 843 are; whether it is limited or not; but I do not think it applies to building materials, if that is what the Senator wants to know.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in connection, therefore, with the banking reserves, and because I do not think it is wise to start to try to impose controls at the present moment on nonmember banks and becoming involved in a long dispute on that subject, I think it would be better to accept the House rate rather than to increase it. I would be willing to put down a large wager that the full amount of the House rate will not be used by the Federal Reserve bank before the 31st of next March or the 30th of next June, and I think it is a mistake to give more power than is actually required.

The other amendment which the committee has presented deals with striking out the proposal to increase the reserves of Federal Reserve banks. I think that is an interesting question which should at least be discussed by the Senate. I might start the discussion by reading an editorial published in this morning's Wall Street Journal, as follows:

INFLATION'S CAUSE

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder repeats his opposition to the proposed legislation to restore to 40 percent the gold reserve behind Federal Reserve notes. The present requirement is 25 percent.

Mr. Snyder is quoted as saying this is not the proper time to make such an adjustment because "we need the extra margin in our debt management program."

If there were 40 cents in gold behind each dollar of Federal Reserve currency, it would be possible, at the present level of reserve gold holdings, to issue about $14,500,000,000 in additional currency.

But the Secretary of the Treasury says that this may not be enough margin. We think this is a fair question: Does he contemplate a situation where the present inflated currency supply may be further inflated to an extent greater than $14,500,000,000?

Representative PATMAN, of Texas, is more specific. He thinks that the President should veto a bill with the 40-percent-gold-coverage provision, because it would "cripple, if not end, the efforts of the open-market committee to support the Government bond market and will increase interest rates."

So quite obviously Representative PATMAN contemplates a situation where Government evidences of debt may be monetized through the central bank to an extent much greater than $14,500,000,000.

Stripped of all technical financial verbiage, the objections to raising the gold reserve behind the currency boil down to this:

There cannot be even a remote check on the power of the Government to engage in an operation which is equivalent to printing money.

So long as that attitude prevails, there will be no effectual check on the growth in the money supply and so long as that is not checked, the pressure created will force prices and wages upward.

The rates to which we are proposing to return were in effect ever since the beginning of the Federal Reserve System up until 3 years ago, and we, including myself, were persuaded by Mr. Eccles that they should be reduced to 25 percent. Mr. Eccles took the position very frankly that in his opinion we do not need any gold reserve at all. He does not believe in gold reserves. He thinks paper currency is sufficient. But he said that as a concession to prejudice he was willing to have a 25-percent reserve. During the war a situation was brought about due to the fact that we had been losing our gold. We had lost about $2,000,000,000. We were in the middle of the war. We were confronted with the necessity of being able to do more financing at any moment in the interest of national defense. The gold reserve had slipped away until we had come to the point where if the loss had continued at the same rate there would have been no possibility of continuing to issue Government bonds to pay the war deficit. We would not have been able to do so if for 6 or 12 months more the gold had continued to slip away. So we reduced the rate. Moreover, after the end of the European war, before the Japanese war had ended, there was a general fear of a depression after the war. That was the objection by the Government economists with which we were faced. That was an inflationary move. I think it is a deflationary move to take the opposite step. Many people feel that we would be better off if we returned to a gold standard, if we were to pay out gold coin on Federal Reserve notes when they are presented. I think that is a perfectly possible system to consider. I myself have never been quite willing to say I would go that far, but certainly that is something which ought to be settled.

As I see it, a larger gold reserve does not have any immediate effect. The

Federal Reserve banks today have 51 percent in gold against their notes and Federal Reserve deposits. But it certainly sets up a red light a little closer than it is today against a further expansion of the Federal Reserve System and the issue of more and more Federal Reserve notes, which might be brought about if they had to buy very large quantities of Government bonds. So we could change the system back if it appeared at any time that we ought to do so.

On the whole I believe it is wise to return to a gold standard. I think it would indicate our desire very clearly that we want to stand as far as we can on a gold basis, on the kind of a gold basis at least that we have today, and I should be inclined to vote for the House provision and to oppose the committee proposal. However, I think that is up to the Senate to decide. Whatever the Senate does, the effect will be more psychological than it will be actual during the next few months. Whether the action is taken or not, I believe its effect would be more psychological than otherwise. Yet inflation is usually a psychological matter. Therefore, I believe it is desirable to retain the House provision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio know that the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Mr. Sproul, testified before the committee against the 40-percent reserve?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and so did Mr. Eccles, and so did Mr. McCabe. The Federal Reserve banks are like everyone else; they want to restrain everyone else's power but they do not want any restraint placed upon their own powers. The only witnesses before the committee who were against the proposal were members of the Federal Reserve Board or of the Federal Reserve System.

What I should like to suggest is that the Senate study the matter, think it over this evening, and discuss the question somewhat further tomorrow, and perhaps take a vote on it. I do not think it absolutely vital; yet I think it is, on the whole, a very wise step to take in an inflationary situation such as we have today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to read a bit of testimony offered by Mr. Sproul, because he quoted from the statement of the Senator from Ohio when the reserve was reduced to 25 percent. I do this merely because I think the Senator's suggestion that the question be given consideration is a wise one.

Mr. TAFT. I may say to the Senator that I have all my remarks before me. I supported the 25-percent reduction at the time. Under the same conditions which existed then I would support it today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I felt sure that would be the attitude of the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. In a deflationary situation I would probably support it again; but I believe that under the conditions today the action proposed is justified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to read a portion of Mr. Sproul's testimony:

> I can do no better than to quote from a speech made by Senator TAFT at the time the present reduced requirement for Federal Reserve banks was adopted by the Congress in 1945. He said when the bill was before the Senate in April of that year:
>
> "I cannot understand why a 25-percent gold-reserve requirement is not a sufficient one for the currency of our country. I think 25 percent as a gold reserve is adequate. I cannot conceive that gold would be demanded in anything like the amount of 25 percent. If there were any such tremendous rush it would swamp 40 percent just as much as it would swamp 25 percent. I do not see the necessity for a 40-percent reserve, but I do see great danger involved in constantly agitating as to what the reserve should be."

Then Mr. Sproul continued:

> I think that was good advice when Senator TAFT gave it, and I think it is good advice now. Our people are not afraid of the dollar. They are gravely concerned about rising prices, but they are not rushing to get out of currency and into things, as people do when there is a run-away inflation. Those who risk creating such fears about our currency, no matter how devious the approach, are performing a real disservice.
>
> I might add that my own view about this matter is influenced largely by the effect which increasing the gold reserve would have upon the open-market operations. I feel that the Senate should not risk hampering in any way the power of the Government to support Government bonds. I think if we risk that power we shall be playing with fire.
>
> I merely wish to content myself with expressing the hope that the committee amendment will be sustained. I think it was a very sound and wise act on the part of the committee to recommend the elimination of the House provision.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what I was anxious to bring home at that time and today is that the reduction in the reserve did not in any way invalidate the notes. A 25-percent gold reserve is sufficient so far as credit to support the Government notes which are outstanding is concerned. I thought the action we were taking then should not be taken as in any way indicating that the currency was weaker. I do not think it is. I do not think we are making it any stronger in this way. It is rather the effect on the Federal Reserve banks of saying to them, "There is a limit beyond which you cannot buy Government bonds and monetize the debt." Today, with a reserve of 25 percent, $30,000,000,000 or so can be bought. If the rate is increased to 40 percent the buying would be limited to about $14,000,000,000. After they have bought about $8,000,000,000 more and are getting anywhere near that limit, we ought to reexamine the question.

So in a way we are merely setting up a red light of danger. If we get somewhere near the point where the Federal Reserve bank open-market committee is limited in its power to buy Government bonds, we ought to take a look at the situation. It is a long way off. I do not know how much more they could buy under present conditions—perhaps $30,000,000,000 or so. I think it is just as well to have the red light a little closer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will pardon me, I think he is not taking a look at the situation. On the contrary, he is acting without looking.

The point of the matter is that the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department are now studying this very point. I agree with the Senator. I doubt very much whether there will be any demand for Government bond purchases involving anything like $14,000,000,000, but that is precisely the reason why I feel that we should not undertake at this moment to jump from 25 percent to 40 percent, because that would be doing precisely what the Senator from Ohio warned against in April 1945. It would be tampering with the base and arousing fears that something was wrong with the currency.

THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish briefly to complete the record in respect to another matter which was submitted to the Congress by the President in connection with this special session. I refer to the International Wheat Agreement, in which many Senators have expressed a very earnest and intimate interest, and in which I know there is a very widespread public concern.

The subject came to the attention of the special session in a paragraph in the President's message, from which I read:

> The international wheat agreement is another vital measure on which the Congress should act. This agreement is designed to insure stability in the world wheat market in the years ahead when wheat will be more plentiful. It would guarantee American farmers an export market of 185,000,000 bushels of wheat at a fair price during each of the next 5 years. Since the agreement is in the form of a treaty it requires only ratification by the Senate. Although this agreement should have been ratified by July 1 of this year, we have good reason to believe that it can still be made effective if it is now ratified promptly.

The day after the Chief Executive had delivered his message to the Congress the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations resumed its labors in consideration of the International Wheat Agreement and the new concepts upon which it is based. As a result of continuous study the committee has come to a unanimous conclusion. I am happy to submit another in the long line of committee reports by the score of 13 to 0. The committee has come to a unanimous conclusion which undertakes to do two things: First, to recognize the great importance of fully exploring this new concept, the principle of surplus agricultural marketing by international agreement. Second, to assure time for its careful and prudent study.

Our problem has been to find a meeting of minds to resolve these two objectives. I am happy to say that we have unanimously done so, and I wish to read the very brief, three-paragraph report which the committee instructs me to

submit to the Senate in returning Executive F of the Eightieth Congress, Executive Session, to the Senate for the Executive Calendar. The official statement of the committee is as follows:

[Ex. Rept. No. 12]

REPORT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations reports the international wheat agreement to the Senate Executive Calendar because of the committee's earnest belief that the principle of surplus marketing by international agreement is sound and because it wishes to encourage this objective. It will not ask for Senate consideration until early in the next Congress because of contingent factors which make it impossible, as it is also unnecessary, to apply the agreement to this year's wheat crop, and because these factors can more wisely and safely be resolved at that time.

One of these factors involves resignature to the agreement by other countries which have withdrawn since July 1 and which are necessary in order to make the agreement effective. Another involves the necessity for implementing the treaty with general legislation to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to finance these export deficits when they occur. There are other factors which the committee believes can be helpfully explored in the interim to create a better domestic understanding of the issue and the widest possible degree of agreement upon the treaty.

The committee regrets that it was physically impossible to complete work on the treaty at the recent regular session in the relatively few weeks available for this purpose. In view of its novelty and its complications and its controversies, there was no chance to reach a responsible finality. These complications increased in the brief recess preceding the present special session. But so also did the conviction that a useful principle is involved. So also did the committee's desire to revive the treaty and keep it open for ratification or renegotiation.

Mr. President, that completes the official statement of the committee; and I ask unanimous consent to file it as a report with the treaty, requesting that the treaty go to the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the matter a little further, so that Senators can be fully informed upon the problems involved, because I know of the very deep interest which exists in the country in connection with this subject.

On the one hand, we have the great farm organizations earnestly, unitedly, enthusiastically, and insistently asking for ratification of the treaty because of the belief that through a new concept of international surplus contracts it may be possible to anticipate the disposition of future agricultural surpluses. On the other hand, there is an equally insistent viewpoint in the country which disbelieves in the treaty, challenges the concept, and earnestly opposes ratification of the treaty. There are somewhat similar differences of opinion regarding details in the committee itself. Somewhere between those two schools of thought, lies the correct answer.

The committee itself, differing among its members, I repeat, in respect to some phases of the problem, has concluded that the wise and sensible and constructive thing to do is to bring the treaty back to the Senate for the Executive Calendar, so that it remains alive, so that it is available for future consideration, subject at that time, of course, to amendment or reservation, as the situation may ultimately recommend, but, while bringing it to the Executive Calendar, to take it definitely out of current consideration, and put it into the next session of Congress.

Mr. President, I wish Senators to know precisely why this postponement seems to be advisable; and certainly it is most earnestly supported by the chairman of the committee and, I am happy to say, unanimously agreed to by the committee itself. We confronted a peculiar situation in connection with this International Wheat Treaty. It did not reach Congress until April 30, 1948. In other words, we had only 4 or 5 totally inadequate weeks in the regular session in which to deal with it. It was immediately sent to a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. The subcommittee held extensive hearings on May 14, 15, and 17, and made every effort to complete at least a preliminary record, to see if it were possible to conclude action before the adjournment of the last session of Congress. It became entirely impossible to give this new export subsidy device adequate study and analysis within the time available; and when the subcommittee reported to the full committee that it was felt that it was impossible to proceed to ratification in the regular session, it was the agreement of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, without dissent, that that was the case. In my view, there could have been no other responsible verdict at that time.

Unfortunately, however, under the terms of the treaty the time of primary signature lapsed on July 1, 1948. Therefore, the net result of the situation in which we found ourselves was that when the special session met, we were technically beyond the deadline for signature.

Since July 1, 1948, when the signatures closed for the time being, five countries withdrew from the International Wheat Council, which is the administrative body under the International Wheat Agreement. Those five countries are the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, and Denmark. They withdrew undoubtedly because of the fact that the United States had not adhered; and obviously the utility of an International Wheat Agreement without the presence of the United States was next to nothing.

I may say parenthetically that one of the original complaints against the agreement—a complaint which still is good—was the fact that it did not—and does not—include the Argentine and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, two of the great wheat producers of the world. But when these other signatories withdrew after July 1, that left as the only signatories the following six countries: Austria, Canada, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, India, and Sweden. Of course, it would be completely futile to discuss an international wheat agreement which could not have any effectiveness whatever if it included only those six countries.

That is the technical form in which the treaty came to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during this special session, for consideration and ratification. Obviously, with only two of the world's great wheat producers—to wit, Canada and the United States—in the international compact, there would be no possible hope for an effective and a conclusive operation. Yet those who so deeply believe in this new concept felt that if there was some way to keep the interest, some way to register the fact that there was still some substantial life in the official interest of the Government of the United States in this new concept of handling export market surpluses by anticipation, it would be well worth while; and it was felt that if the United States indicated the continuation of its interest beyond the deadline, even though the deadline had been passed, that would become an effective inspiration to the countries which had withdrawn to renew their interest.

The official, textual possibility of reactivating the treaty, despite the deadline, was indicated by a resolution of the International Wheat Council on July 6, which suggested that despite the mortality on July 1, the agreement should be kept alive, looking toward the renegotiation of a new agreement effective August 1, 1949.

Therefore, in connection with the international wheat agreement, the committee confronted a situation which really defies conclusive action at the present time, but not primarily because of any hasty adjournment of this session of the Congress, in fact, substantially unrelated to that subject, because the reasons why effective action on the international wheat agreement is impossible at the present moment are of an entirely different character; and I have indicated one, namely, the fact that at the present time the prospective membership of this international wheat agreement is in flux and in doubt and has to be resolved so that we may know who our associates are, before we undertake to conclude with finality any such agreement.

Then there was a second problem involved, and there still is, which could not be resolved at the immediate moment. Those who are familiar with the international wheat agreement will realize that it involves a prospective 5-year contract for the export, sale, and distribution of 185,000,000 bushels of American wheat per annum between fixed floors and ceilings of prices. Without going into the highly technical and often controversial features of the method in which the formula works, because that is one of the things which still needs effective exploration, I suggest to the Senate that the thing of basic importance that I now bring to its attention is that in the event the Government of the United States were required to furnish wheat abroad under the agreement at a time when the international contractual price is lower than the support price of wheat in the United States, it would be necessary for

the Treasury of the United States by way of subsidy to American farmers to equalize the difference between the minimum contract price in the wheat agreement and the support price at home.

These subsidies in prospect have been variously estimated between $50,000,000 a year and $150,000,000 a year. In any event it was and is the purpose to pay them from the Commodity Credit Corporation, in line with the general activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation in that field of action. But this is a totally new subsidy. I do not mean that the Commodity Credit Corporation has not frequently been used to pay export subsidies; I mean that there never has been a contractual international export subsidy of the character here involved. It is because it is a new device, a very great novelty, that the committee, among other reasons, has felt that the agreement ought to have even greater and more careful consideration before there is any ultimate and final conclusion in respect to the congressional decision.

In order to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the new type of subsidy, the State Department and the Agricultural Department sent down draft legislation for an implementing statute to be passed by both Houses of Congress as a supplement to the ratification of the international agreement. Obviously that was the correct course to follow, because obviously the House of Representatives is entitled to voice in connection with any decision in respect to new uses of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The only alternative method of reaching the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation under the international wheat agreement, if subsidies be required, the only alternative method in the absence of this new implementing legislation, the only method would be to stretch the existing general powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation, powers that were defined and written long before this new international concept had ever arisen. It would be necessary to stretch those general powers to cover the payment of the new subsidies, if, as and when they should accrue.

It was the opinion of the committee, and I must say it was the very deep conviction of the chairman of the committee, that it would be highly improper to arrange a new subsidy project of this kind and to provide this entirely new concept of international surplus disposal, involving deficit liabilities chargeable to the Commodity Credit Corporation, that it would be entirely improper to launch this new obligation against the American taxpayers without definite and explicit statutory authority from the Congress of the United States. Everybody agrees that this would be impossible at the present time. The reason is unrelated to the current expiration of the present special session. It is the second reason—among others including serious question about some of the escape clauses which might neutralize the values to our wheat exports—why the committee has concluded that it is infinitely better from the standpoint of sound legislative process as well as from the viewpoint of the best interests of an ultimate wheat agreement itself, it is best to postpone the final decision until the next session of the Congress, when the International Wheat Agreement, under the plan submitted in the committee's report, will become one of the first orders of business. It will then be open to amendment and reservation, as the developments in the interim may dictate, if such be the case.

The nub of it all then is that we feel in this fashion we have been fully fair to the freest, unbiased chance for the evolution of this great concept in which organized agriculture is so desperately and so rightly interested, and yet fair with the responsibilities of the Senate in respect to fundamental legislation of this character particularly in respect to the fiscal obligations that may be involved.

For myself, I want to say I think this is the happiest possible conclusion that could have been found with respect to a desperately complicated matter, which has held the attention of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee continuously for the past 10 days, in quest of a meeting of minds which could accomplish the greatest good to the greatest number, and I am very glad to have been able to file the committee report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have listened to most of what the Senator from Michigan has said. I came in while he was speaking. I, personally, and I am sure a good many other members of the committee, regret very much that the committee and the Senate were not able to complete ratification of the treaty at this time. As a matter of fact I feel we could have ratified it, if the committee and the Senate had more time in which to act. All the large farm organizations are strongly supporting the measure—the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Farmers Union, and, I assume, some of the smaller organizations.

The treaty was designed to assure the American farmer an export outlet for wheat in periods of surplus, at a guaranteed price; that is, at a price guaranteed within certain limits. It, of course, involves obligations on our part as well as obligations on the part of foreign countries that are recipients or importers of wheat.

The Senator from Michigan spoke about the necessity of implementing legislation. That, of course, is necessary, but before there can be implementing legislation there must be a treaty. We must first ratify the treaty. As a matter of fact it was made clear in the hearings by representatives of the Department of Agriculture that by the general law under which the Commodity Credit Corporation now operates they could get along for a limited period without implementing legislation.

On the whole, the committee decided it was impractical to take up the treaty and undertake to ratify it at the present session of the Senate. The committee has filed a report. I have not read it, but I am sure it conforms to what has been said. It is our hope that at the next session of the Congress the first item on the calendar of the Committee on Foreign Relations will be the International Wheat Agreement, and that we shall be able to work it out in such a fashion as to meet the objectives which we have had in mind for several years, and which have been discussed at one or two international conferences.

I think it is a fine conception. Of course, no plan is exactly perfect. All of the joints are not greased at the proper time and all of the gadgets are not adjusted, but we think, on the whole, it is a splendid plan for the disposition of American surplus wheat in time of overproduction at home. It would afford foreign countries some assurance that they could get wheat when they are in dire need of it.

The committee has worked diligently on the matter. The report was not delivered to the Senate until toward the last of April. The committee has given very careful attention to the subject. It has had a very able subcommittee working on it for a long period, holding rather full hearings. So the committee has not been in the slightest degree neglecting its duties with respect to the matter. If we had more time at the present session we could probably dispose of the question to the satisfaction of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BUTLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield? If so, to whom?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not want to lose the opportunity to say a word, in addition to what has been said by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in regard to this treaty. I wish, first, to express my profound regret that it has been impossible to ratify the treaty and make it effective in connection with the wheat crop of 1948. Whether it could have been ratified within such time is now a moot question and is water over the dam.

The subject is one which has been under discussion and negotiation between our Government and other governments for a long period of time. The treaty was brought to Washington and signatures were begun on it, I think, on the 6th day of March 1948. By the first of April the signatures had been obtained to the document, it was submitted to the Senate by the President on, I think, the 3d of April, and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. A subcommittee of that committee held hearings for 3 days on the matter, around the middle of May. There were some serious problems facing the subcommittee which no doubt caused it to delay reporting to the full committee. The result was that the regular session went by without any action on the part of the committee. I suppose it is not unfair to say that if the President had not included it in his message to the special session, the Senate would not now have the committee's report. The committee probably would not have taken the matter up for consideration at all during this special session. So the President's recommendation that the Senate consider the treaty and ratify it has at least accomplished the report of the treaty to the Senate, with the explanation made by the chairman of the committee, the

Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. President, I was one of those who were ready to vote for the treaty to be reported without reservation for immediate ratification. It is unfortunate that the time limit—it is not really a time limit except in the technical sense, so far as the 1948 wheat crop is concerned—which was set as July 1, elapsed without our ratification. Due to that fact other countries withdrew because it was obvious that without any ratification during this year the treaty could not become effective for the wheat crop of 1948 and that whatever happened in regard to it hereafter could only apply to future crops, thus making it a 4-year agreement instead of a 5-year agreement, eliminating the 1948 crop.

I think it is an advantageous agreement to the wheat growers of the United States. I realize the anxiety of the chairman of the committee to bring in a unanimous report. Regardless of its contents, in a sense, even though admittedly postponing consideration of the treaty to the next session of the Congress, it does hold out the hope to the nations which have withdrawn and which withdrew because of our failure to ratify, that they may still re-adhere and come back into the fold, and if the treaty is ratified it can take effect for the 1949 crop and subsequent crops.

Although I agree that it is always desirable for the Committee on Foreign Relations to have unanimity, this treaty stands on a little different basis from that of the ordinary treaty involving foreign relations. It is not a foreign-relations matter; it does not necessarily involve our foreign policy. It is an agreement with respect to a market for wheat, a domestic problem, affording a market for American-grown wheat at a price fixed for a period of 5 years. It is not an absolute, irrevocable price, but there is an effort over that period of time to guarantee a market for our wheat growers at a price which they at least think is reasonable and would be beneficial to them.

I hope the report which has been made in putting the treaty on the calendar of the Senate will offer encouragement, hope, and assurance to those nations which have withdrawn to come back, because without them we all feel, naturally, that the treaty would be of little value because of the small number of nations involved.

So, Mr. President, I join in the report, because it was obvious that without regard to anyone's fault, if anyone be at fault, we could not ratify the treaty at this time, in view of the time limit which Congress has placed upon itself for adjournment. It is unfortunate that the time limit of July 1 was effective, so far as the treaty was concerned. In my judgment, it is unfortunate that the stopwatch time limit set for this Congress interferes with the proper ratification of the treaty. I hope that when Congress returns the nations which have withdrawn will reenter the compact and that the treaty will be promptly ratified so as to take effect for the wheat crop of 1949 and subsequent years.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as Senators know, I am from a wheat-producing State of considerable importance. I have been greatly interested in the proposed treaty, and have made a statement thereon which, I hope, does not give the impression that I am against the consideration of an International Wheat Agreement if, as, and when it can be taken up with a prospect of receiving the consideration which it deserves at the hands of the Senate.

I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the members of the committee who have spoken for the unanimous action they have taken and for the report which they have filed. I think it is a very wise decision at this time. In order to complete the record, however, I should like to read a release made by the Department of Agriculture regarding the wheat situation. This release is dated August 3, only a few days ago, and indicates that United States approval of the proposed wheat agreement would be an empty act, of no effect at this time, and that the Wheat Council itself does not believe that the agreement requires immediate United States approval.

The release which was made by the Department of Agriculture reads as follows, under date of August 3:

> The International Wheat Council at a meeting in Washington July 7 decided to abandon further efforts to apply the international wheat agreemen to the 1948 production.

This matter was referred to by the distinguished Senator from Michigan in his remarks a few moments ago.

> The agreement had not been ratified by the Government of the United States and by the governments of some of those countries which had already ratified the agreement withdrew because the guarantied quantities of the countries which had formally accepted the agreement were insufficient to insure its successful operation. The meeting on July 7 agreed that later consideration should be given to the possibility of considering an international wheat agreement on the lines of the document signed in March 1948, to be brought into operation on August 1, 1949. A preparatory committee was appointed to keep under review the prospects of concluding such a new agreement. This committee consisted of the representatives of Australia, Benelux countries, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, France, India, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Concluding, Mr. President, I for one am very pleased at the report which has been made by the committee and will join with them in earnest consideration of the proposal at the beginning of the next regular session.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to add just a few words in this burial ceremony of the international wheat agreement. I am keenly disappointed that the agreement was not ratified at this session of the Congress. I think that its defeat will prove a disastrous blow to agriculture in the United States, not only to wheat farmers, as stated on the floor of the Senate, but to others, because the price of wheat is always reflected in the prices of all other grains and generally in the prosperity of all agriculture.

Agriculture has been most prosperous in the United States when we had a large part of the European market. Following the last war, as soon as we lost that market, prices of farm products were depressed in the United States, and shortly after that we had a Nation-wide depression.

Farm organizations have worked desperately in an endeavor to preserve the European market we now have for farm products, and I believe the failure to act on this agreement will be a disastrous blow to American agriculture.

TAX ADVANTAGES TO COOPERATIVE CORPORATIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should prefer not to yield further until after my remarks have been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware declines to yield further during the course of his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am sending to the desk an amendment to the general tax revision bill, H. R. 6712, relating to income-tax treatment of cooperatives, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Since Congress is preparing to adjourn soon, it is generally understood that H. R. 6712 will not be considered by the Senate at this session; however, I am offering this amendment and asking that it be referred to the Finance Committee in order that this important question might be studied during the recess.

Next year when the general tax revision bill is considered in the House, it is hoped that they will see fit to include this provision as a part of that bill; however, should the bill come to the Senate without this provision being included, I shall reoffer this amendment with the hope of having it adopted by the Senate.

I do not claim that the amendment is the perfect solution to this problem, nor does it attempt to deal with the other inequitable tax exemptions allowed under our existing laws; but it will, in my opinion, go far toward correcting the situation and at least form a basis upon which we can start to work.

It is the purpose of the proposed amendment:

First. To tax what are at present exempt cooperatives on their income except patronage dividends paid in cash, and to require, as a condition for eligibility for deducting cash patronage dividends, that the association restricts its operations to selling or buying for its members only;

Second. To tax presently nonexempt cooperatives—and those cooperatives which do not restrict operations to selling or buying for their own members—on all income, including all income paid out or allocated as patronage dividends;

Third. To make all cooperatives taxable on accumulated profits in the same manner as corporations are taxed under the present law; and

Fourth. To require cooperatives to file information returns concerning accumulated profits, patronage dividends, and the interest of the members in the association similar to the information returns at present required of corporations

concerning dividends paid or declared, accumulated profits, and so forth (sec. 148 of the code).

To accomplish these objectives, it was thought that the best approach would be to repeal outright the present tax exemption of cooperatives, and to provide in lieu thereof a recognition for tax purposes of cash patronage dividends paid by those cooperatives to which, as a matter of policy, it is believed this should be done. In carrying out this approach to the objective, it was also necessary (1) to redefine gross income so as to include income though paid out, credited, or allocated as patronage dividends and (2) to stipulate that such dividends are not to be deducted or excluded from gross income, except where paid in cash by certain cooperatives.

In this manner of approach to the problem, it was thought unnecessary to give special treatment to the problem of accumulated reserves of cooperatives—patronage dividends not paid out to members or patrons but retained by the association. The present provision permitting exempt cooperatives to accumulate reserves for any purpose would be eliminated by the repeal of sections 101 (12) and 101 (13). All patronage dividends not paid in cash would be taxable to any cooperative. Therefore, section 102 of the code, which taxes profits of corporations accumulated above reasonable needs, would be applicable to all cooperatives.

Under this amendment we are not attempting to deal with the tax-exemption extended to those corporations rendering public-utility services, such as the REA cooperative, mutual associations, foundations, or other presently tax-exempt organizations, each of which are important enough in themselves to deserve an independent study by the committee.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the proper place in title I of the bill, insert:

"SEC. —. Cooperative corporations.

"(a) Repeal of exemption of farm cooperatives: Section 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Code are repealed.

"(b) Imposition of tax and computation of income:

"(1) Technical amendment: Section 4 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting at the end of a new subsection reading as follows:

"'(m) Cooperative corporations—Supplement V.'

"(2) Taxation of cooperatives: Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 421 a new supplement reading as follows:

"'SUPPLEMENT V—COOPERATIVE CORPORATIONS

"'SEC. 431. Tax of cooperative corporations:

"'(a) In general:

"'(1) Cooperative corporation: For the purposes of this chapter the term "cooperative corporation" means a corporation (A) that calls itself a "cooperative" or "co-op," or (B) that represents to any persons or classes of persons which deal with it that their patronage will or may entitle them (i) to the payment, either actually or constructively, of patronage dividends, or (ii) to an equity interest in any of the corporation's assets, or (C) that is otherwise operated for the mutual benefit of persons or classes of persons that deal with it; but such term does not include a mutual insurance company or any corporation exempt under section 101.

"'(2) Net income: In computing the net income of a cooperative corporation there shall be excluded patronage dividends paid or payable to patrons, but only if—

"'(A) The activities of such corporation during the whole of the taxable year did not extend beyond (i) marketing commodities acquired solely from members, and transactions ordinarily and necessarily incident to such marketing, or (ii) selling goods or commodities to, or performing services for, members, and transactions ordinarily and necessarily incident to such sales or services;

"'(B) The patronage dividends are paid in money exclusively not later than 60 days after the close of the taxable year; and

"'(C) Such patronage dividends are derived exclusively from marketing commodities acquired from members, or the sale of goods or commodities to, or performance of services for, members, or from transactions ordinarily and necessarily incident to such marketing, sales, or services.

"'(3) Gross receipts: The gross receipts from the sales of goods or services used in computing the gross income of a cooperative corporation shall be determined without the exclusion or subtraction of any patronage dividends, paid or payable to patrons.

"'(4) Cost of products bought from producers: In determining the cost to a cooperative corporation of products sold to it by a producer for resale (whether or not in their original form), only amounts, other than patronage dividends, paid or payable to such producer on account of such sales shall be used in computing such cost unless under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the corporation establishes that the application of this paragraph would more clearly reflect income, in which case the prevailing market price on sales of such products by producers, or the amounts, including patronage dividends, paid or payable in money on account of such sales, whichever is the lesser, shall be used in determining the cost to the corporation of such products so sold to it for resale.

"'(5) Patronage dividend: For the purposes of this chapter the term "patronage dividend" means an allocation or a distribution paid or payable (whether or not in money and whether described as a refund, rebate, price adjustment, or payment of a balance due under a marketing agreement) to member patrons or to member and nonmember patrons on some basis related to their sales to or purchases from the corporation during the taxable year, if (A) the allocation or distribution is conditional (i) upon profits or margins being earned by the corporation from all its operations or a class of its operations during its fiscal year, or (ii) upon income attributable to the resale of the producer's product along with products or a class or classes of products of some other producers less any deductions, determination of which is within the discretion of the corporation, or (B) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined only with reference to the amount of the profits, margins, or income earned, or (C) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined only after declaration or payment of dividends on any class of stock of the corporation or only after the fixing of sums to be transferred to capital, reserves, or surplus.

"'(6) Member of cooperative corporation: For the purposes of this chapter, a person shall be considered a member of a cooperative corporation only if such person has paid in to such corporation not less than $10.00 for capital stock of, or membership or equity in, such corporation, is entitled to exercise voting rights, such capital stock or evidence of membership or equity has actually been issued by the corporation to such person, and such person has otherwise qualified for membership under the corporation's charter, rules, or by-laws.'

"(c) Information returns required of cooperatives: The Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting between sections 148 and 149 a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 149A. Information by Cooperatives:

"'(a) Payments of patronage dividends, refunds, or rebates: Every association organized and operated as a cooperative shall, when required by the Commissioner, render a correct return, duly verified under oath, of its payments of patronage dividends, rebates, or refunds, stating the name and address of each member in the association, and the amount of payments paid to each member and patron.

"'(b) Accumulated earnings and profits: When requested by the Commissioner, every association organized and operated as a cooperative shall forward to him a correct statement of accumulated earnings and profits, including patronage dividends, rebates, or refunds allocated to, but not paid in cash to, members and patrons, and the names and addresses of members and patrons who would be entitled to the same if divided or distributed, and the amounts that would be payable to each.'

"(d) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments and repeals made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this amendment does not have the effect of repealing the present tax exemption of bona fide cooperatives, nor does it prohibit a group of farmers from joining together, pooling their purchases or sales and dividing the proceeds received therefrom. It does remove their tax exemption, however, if and when this same group decide to set themselves up as a competitive business organization, buying and selling in competition with private enterprise. It is then under the amendment that they become subject to the same tax laws as applied to other corporations.

A study of the original law as enacted by Congress in 1916 reveals that at that time it was clearly the intention of Congress to extend tax exemption only to those cooperatives doing business with their members at actual cost plus necessary expenses, and had their business been conducted on this basis as described in the law, it is true that there would be no profits to tax. However, during recent years corporation tax rates have reached a peacetime level of 38 percent, and during the war period when the excess profits taxes were applicable, the rate reached 95 percent, at the same time cooperatives were being exempted either under the law or by Treasury Department regulations. As a result, the competitive advantage which the cooperatives today enjoy over private industry has reached such dangerous proportions that Congress is going to be compelled to take action.

At the outset let me make this clear. This whole subject is more than a mere principle of taxation, and the answer we give to the question will, in my opinion, determine the future of our system of free competitive enterprise; will determine whether that system, which has given us the highest standard of living

in the world, is to continue as the bulwark of American democracy; or whether by virtue of cooperative tax advantages, all business will be transformed to a cooperative basis.

The extraordinary rise in Federal corporation taxes during the war years has brought this question into bold relief.

The problem before the United States Senate is not whether we are to destroy the cooperative movement, as its defenders assert, but whether they should, as competitive business enterprises, pay taxes on an equal basis with all other business.

The power to tax is recognized as the power to destroy. The Socialist and Communist Party leaders know this very well. Through this power competitive free enterprise is being challenged, and those who want cooperatives to continue to escape the payment of taxes would by their votes limit individual initiative and ultimately concentrate economic power in an all-powerful state.

I make bold to assert, therefore, that if this issue is not resolved, the American way of life as we have known it for a century and a half will ultimately be destroyed.

It should be emphasized that those here who believe they can limit competitive business, but leave other freedom intact, are fooling themselves. Economic and political independence for the individual can never be separated. To my way of thinking, when the final vote is taken upon this issue, it will constitute the most important test of our domestic economic policy ever to face the United States Senate.

Let us state some of the facts involved in this issue. They are:

First. Private enterprise pays 38 percent Federal income taxes on profits. Cooperatives pay little or nothing, depending on their policies, practices, and organizational form.

Second. Cooperatives, as a direct result of this tax favoritism, are expanding at a terrific rate, violating, as I see it, the intent of the original law which exempted from Federal income taxes only farmers, fruit growers, and like organizations doing business at cost.

Third. In 1939, before corporation taxes were drastically increased, cooperatives in the United States did a business of only some $4,000,000,000. In 1947 this had grown to more than $14,000,000,000. It is conservatively estimated that by 1950, under the present tax structure, the tax-exempt business volume of cooperatives will reach the sum of $20,000,000,000.

I think that at this time it might be profitable to review the legislative history of this subject.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Income-tax exemption of farmers' cooperatives was first provided in the Revenue Act enacted by Congress in 1916. This provision as thereafter amended—contained in section 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Code—begins by exempting from tax on corporations "farmers', fruit growers', or like associations" organized and operated on a cooperative basis—

(a) For the purpose of marketing the products of members or other producers, and turning back to them the proceeds of sales, less the necessary marketing expenses, on the basis of either the quantity or the value of the products furnished by them, or

(b) For the purpose of purchasing supplies and equipment for the use of members or other persons and turning over such supplies and equipment to them at actual costs, plus necessary expenses.

And section 13—

Corporations organized by an association exempt under the provision of paragraph (12), or members thereof, for the purpose of financing the ordinary crop operations of such members or producers, and operated in conjunction with such corporations.

The law enacted in 1916 exempting farmers' cooperatives was very simple and direct, limiting the scope of its effectiveness to "farmers', fruit growers', and like associations," acting as mere selling agents for their members. In 1921 the legal exemption of farmers' cooperatives was expanded to include purchasing as well as marketing activities.

Between the years 1921 and 1926, cooperative corporations were given more preferences and advantages, largely by rulings issued by the Treasury Department, which advantages and liberalities the Congress legalized in the Revenue Act of 1926, under which cooperatives were enabled to become corporations paying up to 8 percent on capital stock and were permitted to establish reserves. This act also permitted farmers' cooperatives to do 50 percent of their marketing and purchasing business with nonmembers.

The 1926 act also eliminated the phrase "sales agent" and "purchasing agent." This elimination authorized cooperatives to take title to property and otherwise to engage fully in competitive business enterprise.

Congress has likewise extended many other privileges to cooperatives since the original enactment of the 1916 exemption. Among these are:

(a) The Capper-Volstead Act of 1922 which recognized the cooperative system of business and in effect exempted farmer cooperatives from prosecution under the antitrust laws.

(b) The Farm Credit Act of 1933 creating the Farm Credit Administration which was authorized to lend money to cooperatives on favored terms.

(c) The Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, under which cooperatives are permitted to give rebates and discounts of a type illegal if done by other businesses.

(d) The Securities Act of 1933 under which farmers' cooperatives were permitted to issue securities without the security and approval of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

These are the principal examples of important preferences which cooperative businesses enjoy over private enterprise.

PATRONAGE DIVIDENDS

The question of patronage dividends forms the basis of the chief controversy on the question of the taxation of cooperatives.

The heart of this question is whether the Government should tax patronage dividends in the hands of the corporation and again in the hands of the recipient member. Ordinary business corporations, large or small, are taxed that way. Cooperatives, however, through rulings of the Internal Revenue Bureau of the Treasury Department, permit patronage dividends to be deductible from taxable income of the cooperative. If the ruling was upon the same basis as applied to ordinary business corporations, the income in the hands of the cooperative doing business with nonmembers in competition with private industry would be subject to Federal income tax before the distribution of the patronage dividend to the members.

Insofar as competitive advantage enjoyed by cooperatives is concerned, this could theoretically be eliminated by the elimination of the double taxation of corporate earnings. The problem, as I understand it, is now being intensively studied by the Treasury Department and by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. However, so long as this double tax is applied under the present law, it certainly should be applied equally to corporations of every character, including cooperatives.

RAPID BUSINESS GROWTH OF COOPERATIVES UNDER TAX EXEMPTION

Under the low corporation tax rates cooperatives grew at a moderate rate prior to World War II. While an advantage existed, it was one which private enterprise could meet because the corporate tax rate was never higher than 16½ percent and normally much lower.

However, with the advent of World War II income taxes have become a major cost of doing business. Rates were increased to 40 percent on normal income and up to 90 percent on excess profits. This differential almost overnight gave the tax exempt and tax-avoiding cooperatives an advantage that approximated 65 percent on the average.

Recognition of this fact by the cooperatives is evidenced in a speech to the American Institute of Cooperatives in 1942 delivered by Mr. A. G. Black, at that time Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. He said:

Farmer cooperatives, as such, have been given by the people, through their Congress, some very important advantages—advantages not accorded to privately or corporately owned business. If no changes are made in laws relating to these advantages, they are going to bulk larger and larger. For example, tax exemption under certain conditions, if there is no change, will result in a tremendous advantage to the cooperative form of organization. As taxes on private and corporate business increase that advantage to cooperatives becomes greater. Under conditions of low taxes, of course, it is of some advantage, but when taxes are absorbing a large part of the earnings of private business, the cooperative form of business really provides an enormous advantage.

A study of this subject shows that the cooperatives themselves are not just a small group of farmers, operating for their own account, but that today the cooperative movement has reached such staggering proportions that numerous cooperatives are in reality monopolies.

A Treasury Department bulletin recently released discloses that out of the total volume of business as reported by 4,397 cooperative organizations doing a business of $2,233,904,000 during the year 1944, over 60 percent of this volume of business was done by 322 cooperatives,

each of which showed gross income and receipts in excess of $1,000,000. In other words, 7 percent of the cooperatives reporting were doing over 60 percent of the business.

Another Treasury Department bulletin disclosed that 2,909 cooperative corporations examined showed assets of $489,044,000. Of this total, 16 corporations, each with assets ranging from $5,000,000 to $50,000,000 represented 33⅓ percent of the total. In this instance one-half of 1 percent of the cooperatives reporting controlled over 33 percent of the assets.

This clearly proves beyond any doubt that when we deal with this subject we are not speaking of small farmers; we are truly speaking of big business.

At this time I shall insert some specific examples of how these institutions have grown under this tax exemption. The major portion of this information has been taken from the hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee. It is understood that these figures are subject to revision up or down according to progress made by the cooperatives since that time.

UNION EQUITY COOPERATIVE EXCHANGE, ENID, OKLA.

This cooperative was organized in 1926, at which time it purchased a small elevator for a reported price of $5,000. Twenty years later, in 1946, this same cooperative claimed total assets of $2,270,000.

During the fiscal year ending April 30, 1947, this exchange reported a business volume of over $50,000,000 upon which it had net earnings of approximately $1,200,000. A regular corporation with similar earnings would have been called upon to pay an estimated Federal income tax of over $450,000.

It now owns a 12,000,000-bushel terminal elevator which, according to its own statements, is the largest in the world.

CALIFORNIA FRUIT GROWERS EXCHANGE, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

This cooperative has an annual estimated business volume in excess of $300,000,000. It operates three subsidiaries, the Exchange Orange Products Co., the Exchange Lemon Products Co., and the Fruit Growers Supply Co., through which they market more than 85 percent of all the lemons and over 33 percent of all the oranges in the United States.

In addition to practically controlling the citrus-fruit markets of the United States, this same cooperative owns 100,000 acres of timberland. They operate three lumber mills and they own the entire town of Westwood, Calif., including the telephone, water, electric, and sewerage systems of that town which they purchased from the Red River Lumber Co. in 1944 at an estimated price of $11,000,000. Also included in the purchase of the town was a railroad.

This same Red River Lumber Co. had paid in the year prior to their purchase by this cooperative nearly $1,000,000 in Federal income taxes, revenue which henceforth will be lost to the Federal Treasury. It should be reemphasized here that every time a taxpaying private enterprise is absorbed by a cooperative those who will remain in private industry must make up the deficit.

NATIONAL FARM MACHINERY COOPERATIVE, BELLEVUE, OHIO

This cooperative was organized in April 1940, largely through the efforts of the Indiana Farm Bureau Corp. They reported a business volume for the year ending June 1946 of more than $3,000,000. At the same time they announced that they expected to reach a volume of business in 1947–48 of approximately $19,000,000.

Shortly after its organization this cooperative purchased the Ohio Cultivator Co., which is now operated as one of their divisions. In the year prior to their absorption by this cooperative the Ohio Cultivator Co., operating as a private company, paid income tax of $197,000. As previously mentioned in similar cases, this revenue is now lost to the Treasury Department for as long a period as cooperatives enjoy the present tax exemption.

LAND O' LAKES CREAMERIES, INC., MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Beginning originally as a butter marketing agency in 1921, this cooperative has now expanded to an annual business volume of more than $100,000,000. As of December 31, 1946, it had assets totaling nearly $24,000,000. Total assets of this cooperative increased at the rate of $4,500,000 during 1944, $4,600,000 during 1945, and $3,250,000 during 1946. The earnings for the year 1946 were estimated at approximately $1,940,000, upon which amount of earnings an ordinary corporation would have been required to pay a tax of approximately $737,000. The manner in which these substantial tax-exempt earnings have been used to build up this supercorporation can best be explained by quoting from one of their own bulletins issued in March 1945 in which they said: "The capital structure of our association, now amounting to $6,411,319.42, is made up entirely of members' and patrons' equities. * * * The members' and patrons' equities have been built up during the past years almost entirely from earnings and savings which accrue only to the patrons on the basis of patronage."

This cooperative operates, among other facilities, 3 butter-making plants, 3 cheese plants, 21 dry-milk plants, 7 poultry and egg processing plants, and 1 evaporated-milk plant.

COOPERATIVE GRANGE LEAGUE FEDERATION EXCHANGE, INC., ITHACA, N. Y.

This cooperative owns 3 feed mills, 10 fertilizer and chemical plants, 3 canning plants, and controls 223 service stores, owns 44 bulk petroleum plants, and sells through 46 other local cooperative associations.

Its sales for 1945 exceeded $170,000,000 on which earnings totaled over $4,300,000. An ordinary corporation with equal earning power would have paid on corresponding earnings for the same period over one and one-half million dollars Federal income taxes.

In 1945 the net worth and reserves of this corporation equaled $17,234,751.31. The records disclose that their net worth had increased during the past 10-year period approximately 330 percent.

EASTERN STATES FARMERS EXCHANGE, WEST SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

This cooperative operates principally in Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the New England States.

It owns a feed mill at Buffalo, N. Y., valued at $5,780,000. The volume of business in 1946 was estimated at over $56,000,000 and earnings were listed as $1,452,000 which was divided as follows: $953,207 was retained for capital expenditures, while the remainder of $499,296 was declared savings. At the end of 1945 this cooperative had assets totaling $9,331,179.

CONSUMERS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC., NORTH KANSAS CITY, MO.

The Consumers Cooperative Association was incorporated in 1929 with seven members and a capitalization of $3,000. In 1946, 17 years later, the invested capital was listed at $9,614,557.15, an increase of more than 3,000 percent.

It owns a soybean mill, a cannery, a cola bottling plant, an oil compounding plant, a printing plant, a feed mill, an alfalfa dehydrating plant, and 11 warehouses.

In 1939 it organized a subsidiary cooperative, Cooperative Refinery Association, Phillipsburg, Kans., to build and operate an oil refinery with a rated capacity of 3,400 barrels daily. In 1942 they purchased a 1,500-barrel refinery of the Terry Carpenter, Inc., at a cost of $700,000. One year later the 13,500-barrel refinery at Coffeyville, Kans., was purchased from the National Refinery Co. for $4,000,000. In 1943 this cooperative joined with the Central Cooperative Wholesale of Superior, Wis., the Midland Cooperative Wholesale of Minneapolis, Minn., the Farmers Union Central Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., and the Farmers Union State Exchange of Omaha, Nebr., and organized the National Cooperative Refinery Association with an authorized capital of $2,010,000. This newly organized cooperative then purchased the 17,500-barrel refinery of the Globe Oil & Refining Co. at an estimated cost of $5,000,000. Prior to 1943 the Globe Oil & Refining Co., which they purchased, had been paying Federal income taxes for the previous 11 years. Included in this purchase was a 229-mile pipe line from McPherson, Kans., to Council Bluffs, Iowa.

In 1946 the Consumers Cooperative Association sales volume equaled $26,243,652.71; earnings for this same year were reported at $1,665,293.82.

The manager of this giant cooperative has been given the credit for coining the phrase "Factories are free to cooperatives."

The operations of this giant cooperative had reached such staggering proportions and had drifted so far from the original concept of a farmer cooperative that last year Hon. Edward F. Arn, the attorney general for the State of Kansas, thought it necessary to instigate a suit asking for the dissolution of this giant cooperative, which, using his own terms, was characterized as an "industrial empire." The suit asked for the dissolution and charged them with violating State marketing act and the sale of $7,000,000 unregistered securities in violation of the laws of Kansas.

The attorney general also pointed out that this giant cooperative which was operating under the immunity which Congress had originally intended for the benefit of small farmers only, had extended their operations in international trade and that such sales included 3,000,000 gallons of motor oil exported to 10 foreign countries during the year 1946.

The net result of the gradual accumulation by this giant cooperative of these various once privately owned enterprises meant the gradual reduction of the number of taxpayers who were carrying the load of our Government expenditures.

In the bulletin published by the Farm Credit Administration entitled "Handbook on Major Regional Farm Supply Purchasing Cooperatives, 1944 and 1945," the following statement was contained in reference to this same corporation:

Of the net worth as of August 31, 1945, 19 percent was accumulated through sale of stock and 81 percent represented retained savings.

FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

This cooperative was incorporated in 193[illegible] with a capitalization of $30,000 and by 1946 their net worth had increased to $10,680,000.

This cooperative owns six terminal elevators. One of these elevators is located at Superior, Wis., with a capacity of 4,500,000 bushels.

This cooperative through its subsidiary, Farmers Lumber & Supply Co., now operates 75 lumber yards and 54 coal yards located throughout 6 States.

It now handles more than 100,000,000 bushels of grain a year.

Through another affiliate, Farmers Union Grain & Supply Co., it manufactures feed, processes poultry, operate a locker plant, and handles farm supplies for distribution.

In 1946 they showed net earnings of $3,650,000 upon which an ordinary corporation would have paid Federal income taxes of nearly $1,400,000.

This cooperative does not distribute patronage dividends in cash but in stocks and certificates of equity. Through this method this cooperative has been able to capitalize its rapid expansion almost entirely out of tax-exempt earnings.

The ninth annual report of this cooperative, 1946, shows that—

If the net savings for the year ending on May 31, 1946, had been paid out in cash refunds, this is what your GTA could not have done:

GTA could not have increased its liquid capital, $864,399.54.

GTA could not have paid off the mortgage debt, $1,249,650.

GTA could not have purchased additional properties, $817,700.

THE SOUTHERN STATES COOPERATIVE, INC., RICHMOND, VA.

This cooperative was originally organized in 1923 as the Virginia Seed Service. It was reorganized in 1933 under its present name, with total assets of only $191,692.01.

Up to 1946 it is reported as servicing 200,000 patrons in Virginia, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, and West Virginia. It is composed of 7 subsidiary corporations, 80 cooperative retail service stores, 3 cooperative freezer-locker plants, 17 petroleum cooperatives, and 3 marketing cooperatives. It also operates three fertilizer plants—one in Norfolk and two in Baltimore—and it is understood others are soon to be constructed in Nashville, Tenn; Winchester, Ky.; and Bowling Green, Ky.

In addition to distributing farm supplies through its own retail outlets, the Southern States Cooperative also sells through 59 independent local cooperative associations and some 484 private dealer agencies. The supplies consist of feed, fertilizer, seed, petroleum, and farm supplies.

The following table shows the dollar volume, net earnings, total assets, and net worth of Southern States Cooperative for the 10-year period 1938 to 1947, inclusive:

Year	Dollar value	Net earnings	Total assets	Net worth
1938	$7,949,829.91	$477,183.53	$2,419,636.76	$1,026,278.88
1939	7,868,899.75	433,487.27	2,771,207.90	1,303,955.32
1940	10,168,855.76	590,097.64	3,165,858.48	1,461,633.77
1941	11,513,995.19	681,201.22	4,199,589.55	2,098,083.91
1942	17,727,606.23	1,095,795.45	6,491,025.78	3,275,699.31
1943	27,500,932.87	1,596,989.88	7,343,114.92	4,682,868.74
1944	40,130,581.02	2,712,067.66	8,911,887.20	6,915,244.38
1945	40,170,448.01	1,312,241.63	9,703,300.14	8,687,127.83
1946	41,939,103.02	1,702,910.44	12,685,968.62	11,490,945.38
1947	63,102,125.85	1,512,161.66	19,449,279.40	13,988,002.21

As this table shows, during this 10-year period, Southern States' assets increased from $2,419,636.76 to $19,449,279.40, or more than eight times in this brief period of time. Its net worth grew from $1,026,278.88 to $13,988,002.21, or more than 13 times. The reason Southern States made this extraordinary record is by virtue of its tax exemption. It today enjoys a 38-percent tax advantage over private enterprise.

The loss in income to the Federal Government resulting from this tax exemption has conservatively been estimated at $300,000,000 annually; and assuming that there is no action by Congress to correct this exemption, and that the current rate of expansion is continued by the cooperatives, in less than 5 years this tax exemption is expected to equal the staggering sum of $1,000,000,000.

While the loss in Federal taxes is important, the impact on our private-enterprise system in America of such inequities of taxation is even more important. It is bound to wreck our free-enterprise system.

A study of the history of numerous countries in Europe disclosed that their adoption of a socialistic and communistic state was preceded in many instances by special tax exemptions and privileges granted to favorite groups.

We must support and defend the American system of free, competitive enterprise, otherwise we shall find ourselves confronted with socialism here. There is no middle road.

This amendment which I have offered here today may not be the perfect solution to this problem; however, it is a step in the right direction, and I sincerely trust that Members of the Congress during the recess will give this matter their most earnest consideration, and that at the next session we shall be able to submit an answer to this serious problem.

I know of no better way to emphasize the seriousness of this problem to our American system than by quoting a portion of the platform of the Socialist Party in 1944, which said:

In conformance with the Socialist ideals, consumer cooperatives are specifically designed for social ownership and democratic management. They have already demonstrated that they are instruments which can be molded to handle wide areas of economic life on a nonprofit basis. They are not merely a means to the Socialist end, but are a part of that end. Socialists will therefore use every effort to build cooperatives both as an immediate need of today and a major part of the world of tomorrow.

CLAIMS OF AMERICAN NATIONALS AGAINST GERMANY AND JAPAN

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement concerning the status of H. R. 4044, which was passed on June 19, the last day of the regular session of this Congress.

The bill establishes a War Claims Commission to hear and determine claims of American nationals against Germany and Japan and makes provision for immediate payments to American soldiers who were prisoners of war, to civilian internees, to workers who were captured while working on military installations, and to churches and religious organizations situated in our posessions who gave relief to our soldiers and civilians when no other help was available.

When the bill came to a subcommittee of the Judiciary, composed of myself as chairman and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it was found that provision was made for immediate benefits to civilian internees only, that benefits to workers were specifically excluded, that benefits for veterans were postponed, and that religious organizations were omitted.

After hearing testimony of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and AMVETS, and from Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Congressman from Pennsylvania, and former commander of the VFW, and from numerous veterans of Bataan, with respect to veterans' benefits, and from Mr. Walter Mason, legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor, and from others in the interest of the civilian workers, we wrote into the bill provisions to fairly compensate American soldiers and workers who suffered, as well as civilian internees.

Due to the fact that the bill was passed on the last day of the Congress, no appropriation was made. I have written Mr. JOHN TABER, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the House, asking

that an appropriation be made, so that the operation of the bill will not be postponed until the next session of Congress. The letter is as follows:

AUGUST 6, 1948.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TABER: I am writing this letter to request that action be taken to provide necessary appropriations for H. R. 4044, Public Law 896, which was passed by the Congress on June 19, and approved July 3.

In a statement made at the time of approval, the President criticized Congress for failing to make appropriations to carry out its purposes. In my opinion his statement was very unfair, in view of the fact that he knew that it had been passed on the last day of the session and that it was impossible to make appropriations after its passage. Further, the administration at no time manifested any interest in the bill, or assisted in any way in its passage.

The bill establishes a War Claims Commission of three persons to hear and determine immediately four types of claims of American citizens arising from injury caused by Germany or Japan during the war, and to make recommendations to the Congress concerning the determination and payment of other claims.

The four types of claims for which immediate provision is made are as follows:

1. American soldiers who, as prisoners of war, were deprived of the standard of food required by the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1927, at the rate of 81 per day.

2. American citizens who were interned by the Japanese Government in territories and possessions of the United States attacked or invaded by the Japanese Government.

3. A small group of some 1,300 workers who were employed in the Pacific area in the construction of military installations and were captured and interned by the Japanese Government.

4. Churches and religious institutions located in American possessions, who rendered aid to American prisoners of war and internees.

I desire to emphasize that an appropriation of funds necessary to carry out the purpose of the bill until the next session of the Congress will not call for any increase in expenditures of the Government. The act provides that all costs and benefits shall be paid from a war claims fund, which is created on the books of the Treasury, and which will consist of sums paid into the fund from German and Japanese assets held by the Alien Property Custodian.

It is indicated that $470,000 will be needed to initiate the operation of the act.

In view of the fact that it benefits American soldiers, civilian internees, workers, and religious organizations, who contributed in great measure to the successful prosecution of the war, and who suffered greatly, and in view of the fact that no expenditure is imposed on the people of the United States, and that all benefits will be payable from German and Japanese assets, I earnestly urge that your committee make the necessary appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. COOPER.

Mr. President, I should like now to speak on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it has been my opinion since the call of this session that the place of announcement of the call and the time at which it was made created an atmosphere in which no extensive program of legislation could be properly considered or enacted.

Nevertheless, neither these circumstances, nor the motives of the President, nor the evident unsoundness of many of the proposals made by him, free us of responsibility for action upon sound legislation which is of an emergency nature.

Without excluding other legislation in which I am interested, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate a measure which is of an emergency nature, and which could be enacted by the Congress at this session.

I refer to Senate bill 472, entitled "The Educational Finance Act of 1948," and more popularly known as the Federal Aid to Education Act, which was passed by the Senate on April 1, 1948, by a vote of 58 to 22, and which is now before the House.

It is unnecessary to detail at length the compelling arguments made by teachers, educators, and many Senators, which led the Senate to pass S. 472.

I assert again, as I did in a speech on the Senate floor on March 31, 1948, that there is no greater responsibility resting upon the Congress than to take the initial step toward assuring to all the children of the Nation equality of educational opportunity, an equality which in my opinion cannot be obtained except through Federal aid.

I assert again that low salaries received by teachers in many States of the Nation, including my own State, Kentucky, are deterring young men and women from entering the teaching profession and are driving qualified and faithful older teachers into other occupations and professions.

Many States have found it necessary, and will find it necessary in this school year, to use emergency teachers. As an example of this situation, I pointed out in my speech on March 31 that in my own State in the school year of 1946–47, 5,229 of the 18,164 public-school teachers were not regularly qualified but taught under emergency certificates.

A similar situation prevails in many other States.

Those who suffer most because of this situation are the children of these States. The ultimate sufferer is the Nation, whose strength and progress will be determined in great measure upon the degree to which educational opportunity enlarges the capacity of our citizens to render the informed judgments upon which our governmental system must rest.

I have written the Speaker of the House urging him to take immediate steps to see that the House is given the opportunity to vote upon the bill at this special session.

I earnestly hope that the vote will be taken, and that S. 472 will become law at this session.

TEMPORARY REGULATION OF CONSUMER INSTALLMENT CREDIT

The Senate resumed consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I had hoped to make some remarks on the pending legislation; but the hour is growing late.

In view of that fact, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain telegrams, news releases, and statements pertaining to the anti-inflation legislation.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *August 5, 1948.*

Senator J. J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building:

Railway labor regards the passage of adequate housing and inflation measures before adjournment of this special session as imperative. We must have good laws on both to avoid increasing difficulties in our economy in the immediate future. We urge you and your associates to press for action on these two paramount problems. Our people desire to be heard on any new measures dealing with these subjects, which the special session may consider.

FRED N. ATEN,
President, Railway Employees' Department, American Federation of Labor.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 5, 1948.*

The Honorable J. J. SPARKMAN,
The Senate:

According to the public press and radio, Congress has already planned to adjourn its special session without enacting adequate anti-inflation and housing measures. The continually rising cost of living and the wholly inadequate housing program are a dire threat to our economy and are therefore a very vital concern to the plain citizens of our country.

The International Association of Machinists, representing 600,000 wage earners who, with their families, aggregate approximately 2,000,000 plain citizens, urge you and your associates to remain in session until the two aforementioned basic issues are adequately dealt with in a manner that will bring immediate tangible relief to the plain citizens of this country. The International Association of Machinists further requests that we be given an opportunity to be heard in connection with any anti-inflation or housing measure which the present special session of Congress may consider.

H. W. BROWN,
International President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 5, 1948*

Hon. J. J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building:

The Sheet Metal Workers International Association representing 75,000 workers regards as imperative the passage of adequate and suitable anti-inflation and housing legislation at this special session and urges that Congress remain in session until this is accomplished.

ROBERT BYRON,
President.
L. M. WICKLEIN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *August 5, 1948*

The Honorable JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Banking and Currency Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks representing over 300,000 men and women in transportation industry regards it as imperative that suitable and adequate inflation controls be enacted at this Congress and urges that Congress remain in session until such legislation is passed.

GEO. M. HARRISON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. J. J. SPARKMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D C.:

The train dispatchers of the United States insist upon immediate action by this Congress to enact measures to curb inflation and provide adequate housing. Regardless of politics this action is absolutely necessary to protect our economy and we feel that further delay will be disastrous.

O. H. BRAESE,
President, American Train Dispatchers Association.

DETROIT, MICH., *August 5, 1948.*

JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of 300,000 maintenance of way employees on the various railroads throughout the United States, I strongly urge your active support of adequate housing and anti-inflation measures before the present special session of Congress adjourns. Prompt enactment of adequate and sound legislation on these two basic problems is of the utmost importance to the welfare of our Nation and failure to act promptly and effectively may well bring about serious difficulties in our national economy in the coming months. We earnestly hope that these important issues will receive your favorable consideration and action. We also urge that authorized representatives of railway labor be given an opportunity to be heard on any new anti-inflation or housing measures which may be considered by the present special session. Please address reply to 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich.

T. C. CAROLL,
President, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. J. J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Order of Railroad Telegraphers represents more than 50,000 men and women engaged primarily in the handling of train movements throughout the United States. Many of them are returned veterans and are located in practically every county, city, and hamlet in our country. The increase in the cost of living has affected all of them to such a degree that their meager standard of living has already been reduced and, in many instances, their living quarters are deplorable. Such conditions should not be permitted to exist in a country like ours. They demand that Congress pass adequate measures to combat inflation and adopt a realistic housing program before it adjourns. They insist that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill should be passed to provide housing relief and that the Wolcott bill be defeated. The anti-inflation measures adopted must be effective. The needs of our people are imperative. Action is necessary before adjournment.

G. E. LEIGHTY,
President, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers.

CHICAGO, ILL., *August 6, 1948.*

Hon. J. J. SPARKMAN,
United States Senate:

Railway labor believes it to be absolutely necessary that the passage of adequate housing measures and anti-inflation measures be accomplished at this special session of Congress. Accordingly, I urge you and your associates to do everything possible to bring about proper action in connection with these two very important matters.

M. G. SCHOCH,
President, Railroad Yardmasters of America.

KANSAS CITY, KANS., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America regard as imperative the passage of adequate housing and anti-inflation measures before the special session adjourns. On behalf of the thousands of members of our organization who I represent I urge that you and your associates take action on these two basic problems. We must have good laws on both if our economy is to avoid increasing difficulties in the months immediately ahead.

CHARLES J. MACGOWN,
International President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge you defeat McCarthy amendment and support housing bill reported by Senate Banking Committee, Thursday, August 5.

A. F. WHITNEY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

JULY 30, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee:

The American Veterans' Committee supports the President's anti-inflation program. We feel that control of inflation is one of the most important problems facing our Government today. We do not feel that it is necessary for your committee to hold long drawn-out hearings in order to establish the fact that a dangerous inflation does exist. Therefore, we urge that you report favorably on the President's program immediately. What the American people need at this time is a comprehensive, intelligent, and strong program such as offered by the President, designed to control run-away prices which threaten to wreck our economy. However, if you plan to continue your hearings, the American Veterans' Committee requests an opportunity to testify in favor of the President's program.

JOSEPH A. CLORETY,
Acting Chairman.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 5, 1948.*

DAVID D. LLOYD,
Director, Research and Legislation, Americans for Democratic Action:

Have sent the following telegram to Senators TAFT, WHERRY, BARKLEY, LUCAS, TOBEY, SPARKMAN; and Congressmen WOLCOTT, SPENCE, MARTIN, HALLECK, RAYBURN, and McCORMACK.

"According to the public press and radio, Congress has already planned to adjourn its special session without enacting adequate anti-inflation and housing measures. The continually rising cost of living and the wholly inadequate housing program are a dire threat to our economy and are therefore a very vital concern to the plain citizens of our country. The International Association of Machinists, representing 600,000 wage earners who, with their families, aggregate approximately 2,000,000 plain citizens, urge you and your associates to remain in session until the two afore-mentioned basic issues are adequately dealt with in a manner that will bring immediate tangible relief to the plain citizens of this country. The International Association of Machinists further requests that we be given an opportunity to be heard in connection with any anti-inflation or housing measures which the present special session of Congress may consider."

H. W. BROWN,
International President.

[Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.]

CIO DEMANDS TIME TO TESTIFY ON INFLATION, HOUSING, PROFITS TAX BILLS

The CIO today protested against "abrupt cloture" of congressional committee hearings, and demanded of Republican leaders that four CIO national officers be allowed to present labor's views on bills affecting inflation, housing, civil rights, and excess-profits taxes.

It voiced bitter criticism of the Republican Policy Committee's decision that "rain or shine, inflation or no inflation, the Congress must adjourn next Saturday night."

CIO Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey made public the texts of telegrams sent last night (Wednesday) to Senator ROBERT TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, Speaker of the House JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts, and Senator CHARLES TOBEY, Republican, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. Carey said the CIO had been informed that the Banking and Currency Committee would limit its witnesses to Government representatives and representatives of the banking fraternity on the all-important question of inflation. He said that although there is no need for long hearings to establish the need for anti-inflation legislation, the meaningless bill now being considered makes it mandatory for organizations representing the public interest to be heard.

In the telegram to Senator TAFT and Representative MARTIN, Mr. Carey asked that the GOP hold the Congress in session in order to hear the views of President Philip Murray on inflation, Secretary-Treasurer Carey on the civil rights program, Vice President Emil Rieve (head of the textile union) on the excess-profits tax bill introduced by Representative DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, and Vice President Walter Reuther (head of the auto union) on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

Senator TOBEY was told that the CIO was shocked by the "abrupt cloture" applied to the Banking and Currency Committee hearings, and by the "unprecedented classification of private bankers, whose banks happen to be members of the Federal Reserve System, as Government witnesses.

"The discrimination in favor of the bankers on the one hand and against other citizens and their organizations on the other hand is an unfortunate precedent which, we prefer to believe, you personally would not seriously defend."

Text of the two wires are attached.

TELEGRAM TO SENATOR TAFT AND REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN

"When the Congress adjourned in June it left behind an unprecedented record of unfinished business. Bills to meet the needs of the American people were ignored, pigeonholed, or amended beyond recognition. The special session of Congress called by President Truman gave Congress an opportunity to rewrite its record. Food that cost $1 in June 1946, now cost $1.47. Other necessities like clothing, which cost $1 in June, 1946, now cost $1.25. The doubling up of many American families, due to the housing shortage, is a crime. With both political parties

committed to the passage of civil rights legislation, the effect of Senator VANDENBERG'S ruling prevents this issue from coming to a vote.

"The Congress of Industrial Organizations was informed this morning that, due to a decision of the Republican Policy Committee, the Congress will adjourn Saturday having heard, outside of Government witnesses, only the representatives of the banking fraternity on the all-important question of inflation.

"The phony filibuster successfully conducted by the Southern Democrats is a decided contrast to the prompt squelching by the Republican leadership of the recent filibuster led by Senator LANGER to include a civil rights program in the recently enacted Selective Service Act. Senator VANDENBERG'S ruling, which allowed the filibuster to continue, makes a mockery of the deliberative process and, in view of the arbitrary adjournment date, made it easy for the Republican Party to do nothing effective to control inflation, to do nothing to provide decent homes for the returned veterans, to do nothing to protect and extend the civil rights of all the people.

"Although it would appear that there is no need for long hearings to establish the need for anti-inflation legislation, the meaningless bill now being considered makes it mandatory for organizations representing the public interest to be heard. Senator CAPEHART has publicly stated that the people were not interested in the cost of living. He claimed that there were no requests to testify on the need for legislation to halt the upward inflationary spiral, despite the fact that the CIO and many other groups representing the average American have requested time to be heard on this subject.

"In the interest of the general public, we urge that you as leaders of the Republican Party exercise your influence to hold Congress in session in order to hear the views of President Murray on inflation, Secretary-Treasurer Carey on the civil rights program, Vice President Rieve on the excess profits tax bill introduced by Congressman DINGELL, and the need for enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill by Vice President Reuther. This special session of Congress cannot afford to adjourn without establishing this record on which the American people will vote November 2.

"I would appreciate an early reply so that if Congress is to stay at work and do its job we can inform our membership and arrange for the appearance of our witnesses."

TELEGRAM TO SENATOR TOBEY

"We were shocked to be informed today that the CIO has been denied an opportunity to testify during the hearings being conducted by your committee on proposed anti-inflation legislation.

"The 6,000,000 members of the CIO and their families are suffering daily what may properly be described in the language of the Republican Party's Presidential candidate as 'rightful impositions' caused by the high and rising cost of living resulting from uncontrolled inflation that, if continued, is bound to result in bust and depression. We believe our testimony would be of interest and value to your committee. In any event, we feel that we should have an opportunity to present it on its merits and under circumstances that will make it possible for the members of your committee to test its validity by questioning.

"More shocking than the abrupt cloture invoked before opportunity had been given to us or to other organizations to present facts, opinions, problems, and criticisms of pending legislation is the reason stated for breaking off hearings, namely, a decision by the Republican Policy Committee that, rain or shine, inflation or no inflation, the Congress must adjourn next Saturday night.

"Most shocking is the statement that only Government witnesses would be heard and the unprecedented classification of private bankers whose banks happen to be members of the Federal Reserve System as Government witnesses. As we understand it, they are members of the Federal Reserve System purely for regulatory purposes.

"The discrimination in favor of the bankers on the one hand and against other citizens and their organizations on the other hand is an unfortunate precedent which, we prefer to believe, you personally would not seriously defend.

"We urge you to reconsider and to support our request to Senator TAFT and Speaker MARTIN that Congress be kept in session until effective action has been taken on the emergency items of inflation, housing, and civil rights.

"We will appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience."

[Americans for Democratic Action,
Washington, D. C.]

The following is the text of a statement issued by Leon Henderson, national chairman for Americans for Democratic Action, on the announced intention to close congressional hearings on the anti-inflation proposals now pending before the Congress:

"The House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees have announced that their hearings on the President's anti-inflation program have terminated.

"Statements by majority leaders indicate that the only portions of the President's program which will receive serious consideration in the executive sessions of these committees will be those proposals having to do with the control of bank and consumer credit.

"ADA has requested both committees for an opportunity to testify and to present the case for a complete inflation control program, in the event that the committees feel that the evidence and information which they have already acquired does not sufficiently justify prompt and favorable action on the President's program.

"High prices of consumer goods are imposing increasing hardships on every American family. Banking and credit controls, while important, are only one feature of the President's program and will not in themselves provide relief in the near future for American consumers. The chairman of the Senate Banking Committee has already stated that such controls will affect high prices only indirectly and in the distant future.

"The American people have a right to ask that Congress take immediate steps to aid them. The cost of living has reached an all-time high. We ask the National Legislature not to turn a deaf ear to pleas of millions of Americans.

"If Congress, as the majority leaders have stated, can pass banking controls in the next 3 days, it should certainly be possible to remain in session for another week and to enact other measures which will have a more direct effect and which will give more direct relief to the American family."

PEOPLE WANT ACTION ON INFLATION—RESULTS OF AN ADA POLL IN BALTIMORE

The Baltimore chapter of Americans for Democratic Action recently conducted a public-opinion poll on a scientific basis to determine public attitudes on the special session and on inflation controls. The poll was conducted with the accepted techniques of market research experts on a sampling basis. The questions were asked between July 28 and August 2, 1948.

The public response showed 54 percent of the people as approving the President's action in calling a special session of Congress and 85 percent as in favor of action by Congress in the special session on the subject of rising prices. Eighty-two percent of those questioned also believed that Congress should act on the high cost of housing at this session and 65 percent believed that Federal aid to education should be passed at this time.

The results of this poll, while it represents the sentiment of only one city, probably could be duplicated throughout the country. The majority of the people are clearly in favor of effective action by Congress at this time to curb the cost of living.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks some excerpts from the testimony of Mr. Marriner S. Eccles before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives on August 3 of this year, relating to the same legislation.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF MARRINER S. ECCLES BEFORE THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 3, 1948

Mr. ECCLES. There has been some talk about a compromise then on this bill, and only making it 5 percent. Well, I would say that the 10 percent is still not a very restrictive requirement in itself. * * * There is nothing in this proposal that would bring about or force a credit contraction. It may be too mild. It may be altogether too mild to have very much effect, because if the banks own $65,000,000,000 of Governments, and they could sell $10,000,000,000 to meet the requirement, they still have a huge potential for credit expansion. * * * I am not saying that they would do that. I think if you raised the short-term rate, and you had the power to put this 10 percent additional on, that the desire of the banks, under these conditions, would be to try to keep liquid, based on the experience of the thirties, and that might well restrain credit expansion. It certainly would make them extremely selective and very cautious and would put much more restraint on than any voluntary program can or would put upon the banks. I just hope that if anything is going to be given to the board it would not be an amount that would be completely inadequate, because the whole question of the use of this is, as I said, supplementary to other things, but at this time I believe it is desirable and possibly the most helpful thing that could be done in a hurry to help hold the line.

* * * * *

Mr. TALLE. But the change was made from 40 percent and 35 percent to an even 25 percent for both, in June of 1945. Would it not be desirable to move back to the larger percentages, under present conditions?

Mr. ECCLES. I do not think that (a return to the gold-reserve requirements of Federal Reserve notes and Federal Reserve bank deposits to 40 and 35 percent, respectively) would be desirable. I think it would do no immediate good and may well give the public a feeling that it was an anti-inflation action whereas it would not be effective and it would not do any good for the present.

At the present time the reserve requirements, if they were increased—the gold reserve requirements—if they were increased to 35 and 40, respectively, on currency and bank deposits with the Federal Reserve banks, it would require $16,069,000,000. The excess of gold now held by all of the banks of the Federal Reserve System is $5,717,000,000. But, as a practical matter, the excess amount is $4,642,000,000, because in practice we have found that you cannot get closer to 3 percent of the limit, within the limit. There is an operating ratio. So that I would say that if we increased the reserve requirements to 35 percent and 40 percent, you would have $4,600,000,000 of excess reserves. Therefore, there would be no pressure whatsoever upon the ability of the Reserve banks to expand currency to meet

the public demand for currency, or to purchase Government securities in the market, or to make loans to member banks in order to provide reserves.

If the excess amount that I have mentioned disappeared, as it was used up, through an expansion of currency, or if inflation continued, or through an expansion of the purchase of Governments by the Federal Reserve System in the support of the market, then you would be up against this problem: The Federal Reserve System would be entirely unable to help the Government in its refunding operations, would be entirely unable to support the Government market, and we would likewise be unable to meet the increased demand for currency from the member banks whose customers required currency, and we would have to come back to the Congress, as we did before, and say to the Congress: "You must reduce the reserve requirement because if you do not reduce the reserve requirement, the responsibility for a collapse in the Government bond market that should eventuate, or our inability to supply the banks with currency, and, in turn, their inability to be able to furnish it to their customers would seriously impair the whole banking system," and I am sure that the Congress would merely reduce the requirement again. But it does not make very much sense, it seems to me, to try to control the expansion and the contraction through the medium of an indirect gold standard. That is really what we are trying to do, and when we say we want to impose that reserve requirement, there is a much more honest and a much more direct way of dealing with the problem. It would amount to this: As the excess reserve got close to the limits, the smart people, the people that understood the restrictions, would immediately say: "Well, the Federal Reserve System Open Market Committee now is limited in its purchase of Goverments. They will not be able to buy more than another billion dollars or another $5,000,000,000. Their limit is there. Or perhaps $2,000,000,000." So the big boys, the insurance companies, and others, might say, "I think we had better sell our securities to the Federal Reserve System while we know that they are able to support the market," and you may well have enough sale of Governments that they would use the excess reserve they held rapidly, whereas others would not use it at all, but the very fact that it had a limitation, the very limitation itself, could induce a lot of selling of Government bonds, which certainly would be undesirable and unnecessary, and I see no value whatever in changing to that, except if the Congress indirectly wanted to say to the Reserve System, "You shall not support the bond market." Of if they wanted to say, "We are going to put you in a position where you cannot support the public credit."

I say the much more honest way to do that is to say, "Do not support the 2½ percent rate," and the other way is to not vote for appropriations or for tax reductions that create budgetary deficits, but support budgetary surpluses, so that the question of the Government being able to take care of its refunding can be accomplished without any help from the Reserve System. That is really the direct way of getting at it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on Wednesday of this week Mr. Leon Keyserling, Vice Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. Although I am not a member of that committee, I attended those hearings and listened to Mr. Keyserling's testimony. He discussed the dangers and maladjustments which have been and still are generated in the inflationary processes. He discussed the outlook if they are left unchecked, and he presented an economic analysis of some of the problems and programs being currently discussed in connection with inflation. He discussed the recommendations made by the President.

I believe Mr. Keyserling's presentation was one of the finest and clearest on this subject that I have ever heard. Since there has not been time to have his statement printed by the Banking and Currency Committee, I now ask unanimous consent that his testimony may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Keyserling?

I am sorry to keep you waiting, sir. We did the best we could.

STATEMENT OF LEON H. KEYSERLING, VICE CHAIRMAN, COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. KEYSERLING. My name is Leon Keyserling. I am Vice Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Keyserling, you are one of the board of three—what do you call the organization?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Council of Economic Advisers.

The CHAIRMAN. To the President?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You report directly to him?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been in that position?

Mr. KEYSERLING. About 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Your associates are who?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, and Dr. John D. Clark.

The CHAIRMAN. How often do you meet?

Mr. KEYSERLING. We meet constantly.

The CHAIRMAN. Continuously?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you came to this position, what was your work?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Immediately before that I was General Counsel of the National Housing Agency.

The CHAIRMAN. Prior to that time, you were a lawyer by profession?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I had done teaching and study in economics, as well as legal work and study. I had done a variety of writing on general economic and legal subjects, particularly relating to the problems of employment.

The CHAIRMAN. You understand that what this committee is charged with here is consideration of the President's program. We would like any contribution you can make. We will give you half an hour, sir.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I am particularly appreciative of the opportunity to discuss with this committee some current facts about our economy and some of the economic analyses which may be applied to these facts, because this committee had initial legislative responsibility for the Employment Act of 1946 under which I served as vice chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. The high purpose of this act was that, while no men are infallible and economics is not an exact science, men of good will could be aided by the known and tested tools of economics in evaluating and deciding upon national policies in the national interest.

I am deeply conscious that my only function here is to lay before you some of the facts and some of the methods of economic analysis which may help you in evaluating proposed public policies. This task of ultimate evaluation is yours, not mine, and if I should overstep this boundary it will not be intentional.

For almost 2 years, the members and staff of the Council of Economic Advisers have been devoting constant study to the task and trials of our complex and tremendous economy during a period of postwar transition characterized for the most part by the central problem of inflation.

In the course of our studies, we have received additional evidence that no economist will ever have a perfect answer to practical problems. But because we have assumed a public responsibility, these imperfections have not turned us from seeking clearer understandings, more workable answers, and a wider range of common agreement.

Considering the difficulty of our work, and the imponderables involved, we have arrived at a surprising degree of agreement as to what the facts say, what they mean, and what should be done about them. That appears clearly from various publications issued by the council as a whole, such as its recent report on the economic situation at midyear 1948. However, I ought to say that my statement here today is my own in the sense that no two individuals in a field such as economics ever use exactly the same process of reasoning or stress exactly the same points in reaching results.

In the current economic situation, as I see it, there are compelling reasons why inaction is fraught with danger, and why men must act even if they cannot be absolutely certain of every step they take.

The material that I should like to bring before you classifies easily into four main parts:

First, as an aid in the interpretation of specific data and problems, I shall attempt to state a few general principles and uncover a few current fallacies. Without this as a foundation, we all seem to be confronted with a hopelessly baffling welter of facts, contentions, and conflicting viewpoints.

Second, upon this foundation, I shall attempt to build a fair portrayal of some of the most serious maladjustments and disparities which our economy is generating in the process of inflation, and to indicate how these maladjustments and disparities are now imposing genuine hardships upon millions of our people and how they threaten all of our people if they are not corrected.

Third, I shall endeavor to show why the prospects for continuing inflation are so substantial as not to justify the belief that relief will come quickly, or come at all without involving even more serious dangers, if this inflation is left to follow what might be called its normal course.

Fourth, I shall try to apply some economic analysis toward an evaluation of various proposals now before the committee for consideration, in terms of their relevance to the current and immediately prospective economic situation.

BASIC PRINCIPLES AND CURRENT FALLACIES

Generally speaking, we are now and for some time have been in an era of rising prices, wages, and other incomes, accompanied by rising costs. In popular terms, this situation and the processes by which it is unfolding are called inflation. It is frequently stated that this inflation is taking place because demand for goods is being exerted in the market in excess of the supply of goods flowing into the market. This demand for goods is made manifest by money exerted as spending power; and consequently, it is said that inflation is taking place because the money supply is unusually high in relation to the volume of available goods.

The total money supply, which was 26.5 billion dollars in 1929, rose to $37,000,000,000 in 1939, and to 115.1 billion in 1947. In June 1948, it stood at 110.4 billion dollars. (See chart 1.) Manifestly, the money supply has increased much more than the volume of available goods.

The proposition that the relationship between the money supply and the available supply of goods has a basic influence upon the level of prices and incomes of all kinds is obviously correct as a statement of fact.

But it does not in itself tell us much about causes and effects. More important, it does not in itself tell us why the current inflation is dangerous, or where the particular dangers lie, or why we need to worry if nothing is done about these dangers, or what ought to be done about them. Until this is firmly recognized, we are likely to be misled by oversimplified or distorted solutions focusing attention upon the money supply alone. This is true because it is not demonstrable that a generally rising price level interacting with a generally rising money supply is bad per se. We had a falling price level after 1929, and the country was certainly not on the way to prosperity. We had a rising price level after 1932, and yet the country was on the way to increasing employment and production. We had a fairly stable price level in the later twenties, and yet obviously something must have been wrong with the economy in view of what ensued although everyone will not agree as to just what was wrong. In short, there is no arbitrarily sound or even preferable price level or course of price movements—such as those of 1926 or 1939 or 1946—as distinguished from some other price level or course of price movements; and, therefore, there is no arbitrarily sound or ideal relationship between the size of the money supply and the available supply of goods.

To detect whether our economy is in a state of danger or safety, we must concentrate foremost attention upon other things besides the over-all levels or movements of prices and the money supply. In a period such as the present, when prices, wages, and other incomes are far above prewar levels, and when employment and production and other indexes of useful business activity are also far above prewar levels, the most important thing to be considered is the relationship among these various factors in the economy rather than the absolute magnitude or course of each factor viewed separately. This is particularly true when the relationships among these separate factors, as well as the absolute magnitudes of each of them, have been changing substantially for some time and are changing rapidly now.

Since 1939 (see chart 2) these relationships have changed enormously, and they have been changing greatly during the accelerated inflationary process since the middle of 1946. To select a few items, employment since 1939 to the middle of 1948 has increased about 28 percent; consumers' prices about 70 percent; wholesale prices about 112 percent; weekly earnings in manufacturing about 118 percent; gross national product in current dollars about 173 percent; manufacturing sales about 231 percent; and corporate profits after taxes about 272 percent. The base year that I have chosen, 1939, is used only to illustrate the point generally that relationships have changed greatly. The use of this base year should not be taken as an assertion that it is the best base year for all purposes of comparison or analysis.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is your cost of living there?

Mr. KEYSERLING. The cost of living is represented by the consumer price index; that has gone up 70 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt you? I am puzzled. Hold that a second.

Kindly show me the relative difference between the cost of living and the wage income.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I will show that in much greater detail, Mr. Chairman, in the further charts.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. KEYSERLING. In probing the significance of these changes in relationships, there are two current fallacies to be avoided. First, it is fallacious to assume that dangers or maladjustments have been created in our economy simply because the indexes of various items have moved upward, or that the cure lies simply in moving them downward. For example, it is certainly desirable that employment and production are much higher now than in 1939. Likewise, it is to be expected that both wages and profits should be higher now than in 1939. The second fallacy to be avoided is the idea that there is any danger or maladjustment in the current situation simply because some of these items have moved upward faster than others. In a changing and growing economy, some items must move upward faster than others. For example, wages should be expected to move upward faster than consumer prices during a period when there have been real increases in production for civilian use. Profits should be expected to move upward faster than prices during a period which has carried us from large-scale unemployment to full employment. Thus, persons who attempt to prove that dangers or maladjustments exist solely because some items have moved upward faster or more slowly than others are simply misjudging the nature of our economy in action.

The real problem we face now, in order to detect dangers and maladjustments, is to examine carefully and objectively whether the relationships among various factors in economy have changed and are changing soundly or unsoundly by reasonably derived objective tests; whether these changes are bringing us into a state of better balance or worse balance throughout the economy; whether they are curing discernible maladjustments or causing further discernible maladjustments; in short, whether they are moving us nearer to a zone of safety or further and further into a zone of danger.

On the basis of these principles, we may turn to a more specific examination of the relationships that are developing in our current economy during the continuing process of inflation. The evidence, as I shall try fairly to present it, is that the changes that have occurred and are still occurring in the process of inflation are progressively creating dangerous maladjustments which now inflict hardship upon millions of individuals; and also maladjustments among price relationships, wage relationships, and price-wage relationships which are now interfering with essential national objectives, and which are also distorting the pattern of production, consumption, and national income in ways that will eventuate in a general economic decline of employment and production if they are not corrected promptly.

CURRENT MALADJUSTMENTS AND THE DANGERS THEY PRESENT

The first serious maladjustment to which attention should be turned involves the effect of the continuing rise in consumers' prices upon family standards of living.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is the most important.

Mr. KEYSERLING. It is extremely important, perhaps the most important.

Since June 1939 (see chart 3), the consumers' price index for all items has risen 74 percent; for food it has risen 129 percent. By far the most rapid increases took place immediately after June 1946; since then, the increase has been 29 percent for all items and 47 percent for food. The increases since June 1947 have been 9 percent for all items and 12 percent for food. While the net increases during the past year have not been as rapid as in the preceding year, they have, of course, come on top of earlier increases. Furthermore (see chart 4), the net increases during 1948 have been reduced by the downswing which followed the commodity break near the beginning of the year; but since the middle of March the index for all cost-of-living items, and particularly for food, has been rising very sharply. In the second quarter of 1948, the food index rose at the rate of about 2 percent per month. In recent months, the cost-of-living index has been reaching new peaks.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you take that away, the lower strata there gives some evidence, that rent control, although it is much maligned and created some injustice, has been effective in keeping costs down?

Mr. KEYSERLING. There is no doubt about that. You will notice in this connection, Mr. Chairman, the beginning of the rise in rent after the mid-1947 period.

The impact of the rising cost of living, in terms of hardship, is necessarily associated with the distribution of family income. According to the most recent comprehensive studies covering 1947 (see chart 5), about 50 percent of all families had incomes below the $3,200 a year estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to be necessary to maintain an urban family of four at a reasonably satisfactory standard of living. Between a quarter and a third of all families had incomes of less than $2,000 a year, and more than 10 percent had incomes of less than $1,000 a year. Even allowing for the fact that many of the families included in these statistics were of smaller size than four, and that many of them were rural families where the cost of living is somewhat less, it is nonetheless a palpable fact that a large proportion of our population is being literally submerged by the high cost of living.

It may be said, of course, that "the poor are always with us"; that millions of families were submerged even before the war and before inflation; and that, relatively speaking, low-income families are better off now than they were during prewar periods. If we take the whole span of years since 1939 into account, these assertions are undoubtedly true, because our total national output has gone up so much since 1939 that practically everyone has benefited to a degree. But this would not be true since 1946, when postwar inflation got started in earnest; since then, families of low income and moderately low income have undoubtedly lost ground in the race with living costs. And 1946 is a fairer base of comparison than 1939 for this purpose, because our national output now is quite similar to 1946 but far and away above 1939.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of that situation shown by the crossed lines under $3,200, in view of the price level and cost of living, it might not be an overstatement to say that within the scope of those crossed lines is a very definite, concentrated section of human beings in misery.

Mr. KEYSERLING. There is no question about it.

Moreover, as a study of developments in 1946 and 1947 indicates (chart 6), while a majority of the families in the middle-income and upper-income brackets have received increases in incomes as the cost of living has advanced, a majority of those in the lowest-income brackets have either received no increases in income or have actually suffered decreases in income. Among families with incomes under $2,000, a full quarter suffered actual decreases of income during this period, and an additional 40 percent of these families received no increases in income. Thus, the families who have been the worst victims of the advancing cost of living because their incomes are low are also the families who have been least able even to hold their ground during the process of inflation.

The sheer physical problem of being unable to maintain a satisfactory standard of living has been compounded by the psychological problem of going deeper into debt. In 1947 (see chart 7) about 57 percent of the families with incomes below $1,000 and about 41 percent of the families with incomes between $1,000 and $2,000 either spent more than they earned or barely broke even. By early 1948 (see chart 8), about 27 percent of all spending units had no liquid assets, while another 15 percent had liquid assets of less than $200, and still another 13 percent had liquid assets between $200 and $500. Cumulative, about 55 percent of all spending units had liquid assets of less than $500.

These hard facts illustrate one of the clearest and most undebatable evils of spiraling inflation. There can be no disputing the truth that inflation is imposing an intolerable and ever-increasing burden upon millions of families. While it is hard to draw the line between matters of social and economic significance, it is obvious that a social maladjustment so extensive in its range must have great economic significance in a nation of people who believe rightly that the ultimate objective of their economic system is to promote the welfare and security of its citizens as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. We will recess at this point. I do not think we will be gone more than 10 or 15 minutes, and we will extend your time.

(Brief recess.)

The CHAIRMAN. Come to order, please.

You may proceed, Mr. Keyserling.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Mr. Chairman, the main concern I have is that these factual matters which I am presenting to you are the basis for a brief discussion of how the various measures now before your committee tie into this analysis.

I don't want——

The CHAIRMAN. That brings us nearer and nearer to the $64 question of what we are going to do with it.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I don't want to burden you with the facts to the extent of not getting to the very point and purpose of how I think I can be helpful in the evaluation of measures, but I do think that the facts are important.

Having covered the question of the effect of the price structure upon people as individuals and families, I now turn to the wholesale price situation, and will use this as a basis for what might be called the economic as distinguished from the predominantly social question.

A second area in which the inflationary and uneven march of prices is aggravating present maladjustments and storing up dangers for the future is revealed by an analysis of wholesale price trends and relationships.

Since June 1939 (see chart 9), the wholesale price index for all commodities has increased 120 percent; for farm products, the increase has been 214 percent; for foods, 168 percent; and for products other than farm and foods, 86 percent. As in the case of retail prices, the sharpest increases have come since the middle of 1946. The significance of these trends in wholesale prices may be appraised by examining (a) the relative trends of agricultural and industrial prices, (b) the trends of a few specific industrial prices with particular stress upon events of this year, and (c) the more general trends of prices as they affect the relationship between funds available for business investment and funds available for consumer use.

The relative trends of agricultural and industrial prices may be evaluated by the test of equity, and also by the test of their implications for the maintenance of economic stability at maximum levels of employment and production. By the test of equity, I do not share the viewpoint of those who have belabored the proposition that agricultural prices have increased more than industrial prices since 1939 or since some other base period. In the main, I think it can be demonstrated that the relatively greater gains in agricultural prices and incomes have tended to redress the unfairly disparate position in which farmers and farm families found themselves before the war in a predominantly industrial economy.

While farm prices may well have climbed a bit too high at their postwar peaks, in broader perspective the changes that have taken place since 1939 for the most part not only represent an equitable gain, but also represent a relationship between farm income and other incomes that will maintain our whole economy in better balance if it can be substantially retained. Moreover, by this vital test of effect upon general economic stability, the quick adaptability of farm prices to changes in the supply and demand situation gives reasonable assurance that a substantial break in general levels of employment and production will not be engendered by inflexibility or stickiness on the part of farm prices. In fact, experience thus far in 1948 (see chart 10) illustrates quite clearly the almost unique sensitivity and responsiveness of agricultural prices to the market situation and outlook, compared with the fairly sustained pulse of rising industrial prices. Thus the most recent experience tends to corroborate the comments that I have just made with respect to the problems of agricultural prices and industrial prices over the longer period since 1939. I venture the prediction, and it is one of the very few that I shall make, that in the ensuing months and years the problem of preventing agricultural prices and incomes from getting too high will be less pertinent and less difficult than the problem of preventing agricultural prices and incomes from falling so low in relation to other prices and incomes as to jeopardize balanced national growth. This balanced growth, as we have learned from experience, depends in large measure upon such parity between agriculture and industry as assures a high demand on the part of our farm population for the products of our factories and city workers.

On the other hand, the fairly steady upward march of industrial prices since 1939, which has been maintained thus far in this year 1948 (see again chart 10), is a cause of genuine concern. The reason for this is that these prices are in large part administered or at least partially administered prices, which we know from repeated experience do not respond so rapidly or so sensitively as farm prices to changes in the composition of demand. If industrial prices go beyond levels at which they can be permanently maintained, and this they would seem already to have done, the necessary reductions in such prices particularly if they are allowed to advance still further along lines indicated by current trends will not be accomplished quickly enough without being preceded by wide-scale unemployment and large cutbacks in production. It follows that, although farm prices happen now to have reached higher levels in relation to a prewar base, there is a large margin of error in the oft-repeated proposition that the problem of restraining industrial prices is less serious than the problem of restraining farm prices. There will be something further to say about the trends in industrial prices, in connection with further analysis of current dangers and maladjustments from the more general perspective of price-income relationships throughout the economy.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that line, may I ask? Farm products? That sharp digression downward back in July 1948. What are those products that went down like that?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I would have to furnish you with a break-down of that.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is interesting.

Mr. KEYSERLING. It is partly grains, but I would have to give you a break-down.

The dangers in advancing industrial prices are further revealed by examining some specific price trends in the industrial field (see chart 11). During 1948, sustained and substantial industrial price advances in highly significant areas have been occurring for metals and metal products, and for building materials, as well as for fuels and lighting products. This continued upswing is taking place in fields where the postwar demand thus far is extraordinarily high, in view of the business reconversion and equipment boom, the cumulative shortage of housing, and the special demands of the preparedness program and the foreign-aid program. True, if our economy is maintained at full employment, it may continue to need an output of metals and building materials as large or even larger than the present output. But it is extremely doubtful whether a demand sufficient to absorb an output of this size can be maintained at current price levels when the special temporary factors in demand just cited have spent their main force.

For example, the country needs, for at least 10 years, an annual volume of housing output as large, or even considerably larger, than the current high level of house construction. But when the relatively thin market of those who can buy high-priced or luxury housing is saturated, and when the residential construction industry is faced with the task of supplying the mass market of those who need far more moderately priced housing, there is certain to be a collapse in the postwar building boom, analogous to that which took place after 1925, unless prices are drastically lowered. My personal belief is that the postwar building boom at current prices cannot be sustained for as many years as it was after the First World War. This forces upon us the unpalatable conclusion that the rigidity and stickiness of industrial prices in crucial fields will lead to serious unemployment and cut-backs in production if the price level is permitted to move further and further above levels that can be permanently maintained.

The continued upward surge of these industrial prices is also of great significance in its effect upon the foreign aid and preparedness programs. This upsurge of prices confronts us with the unhappy choice either of carrying these programs forward at a slower pace than our national interests require, or of serving these interests fully at the cost of greater damage to the civilian distribution of the commodities involved than would result if a more restrained price policy were pursued.

In connection with this phase of the industrial price situation, there is to be considered the price-wage spiral. The movement for higher wages through collective bargaining is not responsive solely to changes in the cost of living, although most of the attention has focused upon this aspect since the war. The demand for higher wages rests also in large degree upon the price-profit picture in the industries that pay the wages. Even if the cost of living should be leveled off or reduced, no one familiar with the realities would predict that the price-wage spiral can be stopped so long as industrial prices are moving upward and resulting in such large net returns as now seem both present and prospective.

This brings us to an examination of price trends in terms of their effect upon the flow and use of national income. Particular emphasis should be placed upon the key problem of maintaining a workable balance between productive capacity and consumer buying power. There is a general tendency to overlook this venerable problem in the midst of inflation, although one of the main dangers of inflation is that it stealthily creates conditions which will ultimately throw this problem at us with stunning impact.

The CHAIRMAN. Which is coincident with deflation.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Which is coincident with deflation, and this is the real central danger of inflation, from the economic point of view. The paradoxical thing about it is that inflation masks this danger to the point that it is hard to see it while the inflationary period lasts, but it is there nonetheless.

The growing maladjustments taking place during the process of inflation in the relationship between income available to stimulate and finance production and income available for consumer use may best be revealed by examining trends in the gross national product and in its composition.

Since 1929 there have been enormous changes in the gross national product measured by current dollars, and very great changes in real output are evidenced when the current dollar figures are deflated to take account of price changes (see chart 12). Our real national output is about 72 percent higher now than in 1929, reflecting a profound and presumably permanent change in the national economy. The gross national product in real terms was only very slightly lower in 1947 than it was in 1946 when it still reflected conditions carried over from the war. During the first half of 1948, the product has been running at about the same annual rate as during 1947 as a whole. The slight variations since 1946 are not very significant, because of changes in the composition of the product which make available measurements inexact. It is significant, however, that total output since 1946 has not increased as might have been expected in view of the volume of employment and the improved quality of plant and equipment.

The gross national product may be translated into receipts and expenditures by consumers, government, business, and in the form of net foreign investment (see chart 13). For the purpose of appraising trends in the composition of demand, the expenditures figures are relevant. The expenditures of consumers, which may be taken to represent the pull of consumers upon the total supply of goods and services, dropped from 71.1 percent of the total gross national product figure in 1939 to 65.2 percent in the first half of 1948. Contrasting the same two periods, the expenditures of government rose from 18.5 percent of the total to 19.4 percent; net foreign investment rose from 1 percent to 1.5 percent; and business investment rose from 9.5 percent to 13.9 percent. Thus, the most significant changes in the composition of demand since the last prewar year have been the sharp downturn in the relative size of consumer expenditures, compensated for mainly by the sharp upturn in the relative size of business investment. This reflects industry's postwar reconversion boom, and does not in itself reveal anything undesirable.

However, the present composition of expenditures or demand cannot be expected to maintain as we move to a more characteristically peacetime economy. To preserve a workable balance between productive capacity and ultimate consumption, consumer expenditures or demand will need to assume a relatively larger role, not only because business will be through the reconversion and reequipment period but also because the relative role exerted by Government expenditures and net foreign investment must be expected to decline with the advent of a more normal international situation. Yet, when we examine the income relationships being developed in the current inflationary process, and remember that income is the foundation for expenditures or demand, we find that these developing income relationships threaten to militate against rather than to facilitate the necessary adjustments.

This conclusion rests on national income analysis. The total of national income, like the total gross national product, has increased in real terms by more than 70 percent since 1929, and has not changed significantly since 1946 (see chart 14). Upon examining the composition of national income (see chart 15), it appears that the following developments have taken place: Compensation of employees has dropped from 65.9 of the national income total in 1929 to 63 percent in 1947, and to 62 percent in the first half of 1948. During the same three respective periods, business and professional income has increased from 9.4 percent to 11.5 percent to 11.8 percent. Farm income has increased from 6.5 percent to 7.8 percent to 8.4 percent. Corporate profits and inventory valuation adjustments have increased from 8 percent to 13.2 percent to 12.3 percent. Interest and rents dropped from 10.6 percent in 1939 to 5.6 percent in 1947, and remained at the latter level during the first half of 1948. The most important changes have been the increase in the farmers' share, the significance of which I have already discussed; the decrease in the share represented by compensation of employees; and the very substantial increase in the share represented by corporate profits and inventory valuation adjustments, accompanied by a lesser increase in the share represented by business and professional income.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it correct, sir, do I interpret that chart right, that compensation to employees has been practically at parity from '47 to '48?

Mr. KEYSERLING. That is substantially correct, as a percentage of the total national income, contrasting 1947 as a whole with the annual rate during the first half of 1948. There has been a slight downward movement of compensation to employees, from 63 to 62 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. How about corporate profits?

Mr. KEYSERLING. There was a slight change upward, hardly discernible on the chart, from 12.2 percent to 12.3 percent, between 1947 and the first half of 1948. The great change in the corporate profits percentage of total national income was from 8 percent in 1939 to more than 12 percent in 1947 and in the first half of 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. That cannot be right, compensation to employees in 1939 is 72 billion.

Mr. KEYSERLING. No; that is the total figure for the whole bar, representing total national income.

Senator SPARKMAN. You seem to have one element in the 1939 column that is not in the column to the right. I guess it is. Is that business and professional income?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes, they are all in.

Senator SPARKMAN. It seems a little lighter on this side.

Mr. KEYSERLING. It is the same. The width of the bars, rather than the height of the bars, indicates the change in the total size of the national income (deflated), which was 72.5 billion in 1939, raising to 126.4 in 1947, and to an annual rate of 127.1 for the first half of 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. For the sake of ordinary minds like ours, you could elucidate that a little better in your chart to make that distinction.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I would like to try to do that.

Senator SPARKMAN. Let me see if I understand. You have a percentage bar running up and down on both sides.

Mr. KEYSERLING. The percentage bar indicates the percent of the total that is taken by these various factors.

Senator SPARKMAN. The percentage of the total which the compensation of employees bears in 1939 is not greatly out of line with '47 and '48, the percentage, not the quantity.

Mr. KEYSERLING. It depends on what you mean by "greatly." The change has been from 65.9 percent, Senator, to 62 percent. When you are dealing with large compounds, that is quite a substantial change.

Senator SPARKMAN. It looks slight there.

Mr. KEYSERLING. It is a substantial change.

These relative trends in the main types of income would not seem to correlate at all well with the composition of expenditure or demand that will be needed in a balanced economy at maximum employment and production as we move toward workable peacetime relationships. But before embracing this conclusion, it is necessary to examine the trends in corporate profits and in consumer incomes a bit more specifically. Looking first at the corporate profits picture (see chart 16), these profits when measured as a percentage of sales were 5.4 percent in 1929; 3.9 percent in 1939; 4.6 percent in 1946; 5.2 percent in 1947; and 5.2 percent in the first quarter of 1948 according to the best available estimates. Measured as a percentage of investment, these corporate profits were 5.1 percent in 1929; 3.5 percent in 1939; 7.4 percent in 1946; and 9.6 percent in 1947. Estimates for 1948 are not yet available. Together with these figures, it is noteworthy that during the first half of 1948, retained net earnings and depreciation reserves continued to supply the major part of corporate financial requirements (see chart 17). It appears from the available data that business income is on the high side in relation to the amounts required to sustain the volume of business investment compatible with peacetime economic balance. At the same time, consumer incomes, of which the compensation of employees forms the major part, have been reflecting a decreasing share of national income. Furthermore, total real per capita personal income after taxes is now lower than during 1946, although it has been fairly constant since the second half of 1947 (see chart 18).

The foregoing analyses strongly presege the emergence of an inadequacy of consumer income when production mounts, when reservoirs of wartime savings have been further depleted, when those expenditures of Government which reflect the tense international situation decrease, and when business investment comes to assume a relationship to total economic activity more nearly in line with peacetime experience. It may be said, in dissent from this conclusion, that total consumer income is now adequate, or more than adequate, to take the supply of goods now available for consumer use, as evidenced by the fact that prices are still being pushed upward. This would be a comforting conclusion if we could but ignore the lesson of experience. For experience during past periods of adjustment leaves little room for belief that wages would be increased voluntarily or prices decreased systematically at the very time when the business outlook might be dampened by a decline in Government-created demand for foreign aid and preparedness. Experience indicates, rather, that the delay of adjustment until that time would result in curtailment of employment and production, followed by disorderly price breaks and a general economic decline—the spiral of depression.

It would be far safer if real consumer incomes were now kept more nearly abreast of increases in domestic output. If compelling reasons of national policy require for a time that an extraordinary part of this output be diverted away from domestic consumers, the worst way to deal with the situation is by price increases that ration goods unfairly and enormously magnify the coming problem of peacetime adjustment. A more prudent approach, for the time being, would be to keep income relationships in sounder balance by a restrained price policy, and to cut consumer spending rather than consumer incomes by voluntary savings and high taxes. We should then have a better chance to maintain a full economy by not cumulating maladjustments against the day of reckoning.

The CHAIRMAN. Are all those charts in this?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

Senator SPARKMAN. What number will be the one that you are about to put up?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Chart 19 is coming up. This chart shows the final type of maladjustment which I shall discuss, now appearing in the process of inflation, which is a consequence of unequal trends in the real earnings of individuals. For all wage earners (see chart 19), the index of real earnings has declined about 10 percent since June 1946, and this is to be regarded as an unfavorable development for reasons already stated. But more significant than this, in some ways, is the much greater decline in real earnings suffered by such groups as clerical and professional workers. This group has been thrown for a loss of about 15 percent during the same period. Meanwhile, a few groups have fared much better than the average.

The CHAIRMAN. I confess I am surprised at that, sir. I had supposed that the wage scale was fully as high today as it was then.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Not in relation to the price level.

Senator SPARKMAN. This is the real wage?

Mr. KEYSERLING. The real wage, in relation to the price level. This is made more realistic by adjusting it to the price level.

Quite aside from the inequities involved, these widely disparate changes in the wage and salary structure are not a basis either for social contentment or for uniformly calm industrial relations. Moreover, in the extremely tight labor market of full employment, these disparities do not result in the distribution of marginal manpower along lines consistent with the best national interest by any reasonable test. An outstanding example of this, of course, is the situation of the teaching profession, where the shortage of teachers is growing while the number of school-age children is increasing rapidly.

Due to historic and other reasons, disparities in wages and salaries among groups where most people would not say that the differentials in training or skill justified the differentials in pay, is to a degree normal even if not entirely fortunate in a complex economy. But disparities as great as those that have been developing in the process of inflation are neither normal nor desirable. They constitute some of the worst manifestations of the inflationary process. These disparities also indicate the superficiality of the argument that an effective anti-inflationary program must "hurt everybody a little bit," when in fact the essence of an effective anti-inflationary program is that it be selective enough to help those who have already been hurt too much, while it restrains those who have been going too far.

We may now summarize briefly the dangers and maladjustments which have been and still are being generated in the inflationary process.

First, the inflationary process is working untold hardships upon millions of families. Not only have these families failed to participate in the rising standards of living that have been made available to others as the end of the war has released more goods for civilian use. More than that, these millions of families are now losing ground in absolute as well as relative terms. Their money incomes are going down; their real incomes are going down; their accumulated savings are disappearing or have already disappeared; they are spending more than they earn; their debts are increasing. Whether one calls this a social or an economic problem—and it is certainly a mixture of both—it is a problem that no great nation can discount or ignore without facing the prospect of mounting discontent, friction, envy, and suspicion, at a time when there is desperate need for unity of endeavor. Under such circumstances, wily or misguided agents can more easily sow the seeds of trouble in the field of discontent.

The CHAIRMAN. It has some religious aspects, too.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think it is fundamentally a moral question.

The CHAIRMAN. I think so.

Mr. KEYSERLING. As most economic questions are ultimately.

Second, the inflationary process is creating price and income and production maladjustments of increasing size throughout the economy. It is threatening, though few as yet perceive it, to revive the post-World War I problem of disparity between agricultural income and industrial income and thus to complicate the problem of price supports. It is pushing specific industrial prices, such as those in metals and building materials, to the point where output cannot be permanently disposed of at these price levels, while if the threatened further rise of these prices occurs it will make readjustment of these prices to maintainable levels almost impossible without being preceded by large cutbacks in employment and production. The inflation is creating enormous disparities in the wage structure which are indefensible on equitable grounds, and which are inconsistent with the availability of an adequate supply of workers for some of our most vital national needs such as primary and secondary education. The inflation is so distorting the composition of national income that the old danger of inadequate consumer buying power to provide a market for the maximum output of industry and agriculture at full employment is threatening to reappear; and this danger should not be overlooked because inflation by its very nature tends to conceal the danger until it suddenly descends upon the economy in full force. There is stewing in the boiler of inflation the main ingredients for an economic explosion, and we cannot afford to wait until these ingredients fuse themselves into the combination that will touch off that explosion.

Third, even if in the process of inflation many of the changes in the price-income-production structure were not changed in the direction of further maladjustment, which in fact they are, we could still be certain that the speed with which these changes are taking place prevents any responsible factor in the economy from getting its true bearings. By keeping everyone off balance, inflation is profoundly unsettling everyone. This is best illustrated by the price-wage spiral (see chart 20). Quite independently of whether prices are outrunning wages or wages are outrunning prices, quite independently of who is blameworthy or blameless in this process, the very fact that prices and wages are chasing each other at such a mad speed around so many dark corners means that serious collisions are bound to take place unless both management and labor can slow down for a while and get their bearings.

The CHAIRMAN. When Mr. Ben Fairless came before the Joint Economic Committee last spring, I happened to be present, and in the course of his prepared statement he made this statement, I think verbatim:

"Under no circumstances should demands for increased wages follow increased profits."

I wrote it down. When he got through I asked him the question and he said he did say that.

My question was: Suppose he wasn't Ben Fairless, president of the Steel Corporation, but Ben Fairless, one of the open-hearth operators in Pittsburgh, and he is intelligent as most men are who are in labor today, and he thought the steel corporation was making large earnings of $11.70 on a share after taxes and reserves and $120,000,000 net profit, when would Ben Fairless, now John Smith, hearth worker, feel that he was entitled to increased wages when the concern he represented was making the largest earnings in the history of the country?

He didn't like the question. I was thinking in terms of when the reverse happens. Then they close the plants and John Smith goes out on his ear, and his income is lost, and his family is in distress.

I am asking you on this theory about labor and the demand for wages and all, when would they expect to get increased wages if it wasn't at a time when profits were being paid and made from profits which they produced.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think what you say, broadly speaking, is correct, Mr. Chairman. I would say that I have tried to approach this subject objectively, and as I said near the beginning of my statement, it doesn't always follow that wages and profits should increase at the same rate.

There are periods when profits should increase faster than wages, because the profit structure is more volatile. When the economy is going downhill, when it is running into a period of large-scale unemployment, profits sometimes fall below the zero point, and manifestly we couldn't allow wages to fall below the zero point. And likewise, profits have to increase faster than wages at times to make up for the times when they have decreased faster.

At other times, wages should increase faster than profits. I think the second formula is closer to the correct formula for a well balanced, healthy maximum employment and maximum production economy.

What has been happening at the present time is partly illustrated by this chart (20) showing the relative movements in prices and wages from June 1946 to June 1948. The line moving upward is the price line. The line moving sideward is the wage line. The dates on the lines indicate the points at which particular spurts occurred, and they are important for the purpose of showing you how you have had a sequence of a price jump and a wage jump and a price jump and a wage jump. That is the spiral. The line, of course, does show that the prices have moved upward more rapidly than the wages.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it possible in your judgment as an economist for the mind of man to devise some scheme whereby the dollar may be tied into the values and factors that make up the cost of living something along the line of a commodity dollar, whereby that dollar would reflect in the exchanges which a man receives for his wages and go along in juxtaposition with changing conditions?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Irving Fisher had an idea something like that and worked for many years on it. It wasn't very widely accepted for a variety of reasons. It may have some merit, but it still would leave you with the real problem, Senator TOBEY, which is the fundamental problem of the distribution of the product, because you cannot simply say that the wage at all periods should change simply comparable to the cost of living. If it did that, you would have a constant standard of living, although production might be increasing. If you are in a period when production is increasing, you should have an increase in the real wage. This is a generally accepted proposition. The real question is how much of an increase. The real question is how much of that increased production should take the form of further capital expansion financed or stimulated in part by profits, and how much should go immediately to increased consumption. This is the problem at its core.

As an economist, I would say that in one form or another we are always going to have this problem with us in the free society we want to maintain. But we can, I believe, reduce this problem by developing some economic judgments to promote a better balance in the economy than is generated by the unrestrained price-wage spiral during inflation.

Senator SPARKMAN. Before you get away from that, may I ask you this question?

I think the whole country has been interested in the recent price and wage increase in steel. I am just wondering if you and your group of analysts have analyzed that situation. I don't vouch for the accuracy of these figures, but I have heard something like this:

The increase in the wage amounted to somewhere—nearly $5 a ton—$4.70 or something like that; but United States Steel almost immediately announced an increase in its product of nearly $10 a ton—$9.94, I believe.

I also saw somewhere that the profit they were already making after taxes was something over $12 a ton. As I said, I don't vouch for the accuracy of those figures; I wonder if you have analyzed that situation so as to be able to say whether or not there was

any justification of this in such a price increase, on steel, following that wage increase, and particularly in view of the already existing high corporate earnings?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Senator SPARKMAN, I don't have the detailed figures before me now, and a generalization in a matter of this kind is always difficult. I am prepared to say, however, directly in answer to your question, that it has seemed that the price advances which have taken place in certain key industries, steel being one, have been more than were justified or necessary in view of the whole economic situation. In other words, in such cases the level of profits after taxes has afforded a higher rate of return than has been necessary amply to stimulate and support the level of investment and production required to keep a fully employed labor force and plant at work and to use the resources that should at this time or shortly be turned to production purposes. This conclusion is generally implicit in my analysis of the production picture, and it was developed a little more specifically in the charts and figures which I have submitted on the profit picture in general.

Senator SPARKMAN. Are they in the report?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

Senator SPARKMAN. I do not recall whether or not in this midyear economic report to the President, which the President in turn transmitted to Congress, you and your associated economists called attention to the effectiveness of an excess-profits tax in drying up those high-level corporate earnings.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I shall touch on that question as I come to an evaluation of specific proposals.

Mr. Chairman, I have cited three of the dangers and maladjustments occurring in the current inflation. I should now like to cite two others.

Fourth, the pace of the inflationary process is breeding a psychological uneasiness throughout the economy. This psychology is based upon the observation that booms in the past have ended up in busts; and the question of whether history must repeat itself becomes irrelevant in view of the fact that history will repeat itself if enough people think that it is going to.

Fifth, the inflationary process is jeopardizing our whole program of aid to the free countries of western Europe, along with all of our objectives for the restoration of better international economic relations as a foundation for permanent world peace. The inflation is confusing many of our own people into the mistaken belief that the foreign-aid program is primarily responsible for the hardships they are suffering under inflation, and thus is tempting them toward the relinquishment or abatement of an imperative undertaking of policy. The inflation is reducing the value of the financial aid that we are extending to other countries, planting in their minds legitimate concern that America may be heading for another depression, and therefore militating against their cooperation with us on the full and trustful basis which the world situation demands. The inflation is affording a talking point for such enemies of our foreign policy within our own gates as look elsewhere than to America's best interests for their guidance or command.

THE OUTLOOK FOR INFLATION IF LEFT UNCHECKED

If these be the dangers of inflation, what are the prospects that these dangers will disappear of their own accord, except through a process of deflation and depression which would mean infinitely larger dangers?

There is little need at this point to enter into an extended demonstration of the fact that inflation is still on the march. Prices are still going up, and reaching new peaks. The price-wage spiral is augmenting. The suffering of the primary victims of inflation is increasing. While a year ago, or 6 months ago, there was a division of opinion as to whether the forces of inflation were nearly spent, there is no such division now. Business journals and business economists join with others in appraising the current situation as highly inflationary. The proponents and opponents of the anti-inflationary program now before the Congress are not divided in this appraisal. The overwhelming majority of them seem to agree that inflation is still very much with us; their division of opinion is limited to what are the main causes of inflation and what are the main remedies to be applied. Some favor the proposals that have been advanced on the ground that they will help remedy the inflation, while others oppose the very same proposals on the ground that they would aggravate the inflation; but almost all agree that the inflationary problem has become more acute. Under such circumstances, to bring before this informed committee the accumulated evidence that the danger of inflation is still here, beyond the evidence contained in the various charts and figures already referred to, would be carrying coals to Newcastle. The question is no longer what the factual situation is, but rather what to do about it.

The only prospect now being held out for relief from the dangers of inflation in our strained economy, without benefit of an affirmative program, is that there will be a general softening of demand which will reduce prices. This is nothing more than a sugar-coating of the bitter pill that inflation of course will be over when unemployment mounts and when the economy passes from a sellers' to a buyers' market. There is nothing new about that kind of relief for inflation, and by the same token there is nothing desirable about it. There is no assurance that an adjustment along such lines would afford succor to the millions of families who are the primary victims of inflation; on the contrary, we know full well that rising unemployment and a slackening of industrial activity would put these families in an even worse position than they are now. Nor is there any assurance that such an adjustment, even if tolerable, would stop at some nice and convenient point between what is called inflation and what is called deflation. The prospect is all too real to be overlooked that our highly sensitive economy cannot start rolling down this kind of hill without rolling into the valley.

In essence, the bad thing about inflation is not the high price level in itself, but rather that the maladjustments and disparities which are occurring in the process of inflation victimize countless individuals and threaten the maintenance of maximum employment and the achievement of maximum production. The main reason for wanting to combat inflation is that it jeopardizes prosperity. We cannot wait for or solicit the kind of cure that kills the patient.

The CHAIRMAN. You are pretty nearly through; are you?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask you a question? Here is a committee, sitting here. We are charged with the responsibility of doing something. You, I assume, can testify you were consulted in drawing up the administration bill; is that correct?

Mr. KEYSERLING. In drawing up the administration bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Not as a technician on the details.

The CHAIRMAN. You are familiar with the bill?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You know how important price control is to most of us?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Here we are in a tropical sea in here, and this inflation is going on. We have Mr. Eccles' thesis that we are going to have a bust. When, as, and if is the question.

Forgetting the political side of this entirely, what do you think we ought to do?

Mr. KEYSERLING. That is what I want to come to now. My statement thus far has attempted to provide the factual and analytic foundation for evaluating proposed measures. I want to take these few remaining minutes that you may give me—and I am terribly sorry if I am delaying the Secretary of Commerce, but I got started about an hour after I was scheduled.

The CHAIRMAN. He is getting an education, too.

Mr. KEYSERLING. On this foundation, we may make a general appraisal of the relative weight and significance of some of the explanations advanced as to the causes of inflation and some of the economic proposals made to combat the dangers and maladjustments of inflation.

THE ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSED REMEDIES FOR INFLATION

Inflation and foreign aid

The very first point to be made involves firm, unalterable recognition that we must conquer inflation while meeting our essential obligations as a nation, and not by avoiding these obligations. Sufficient examples of this are the foreign-aid and preparedness programs. Even if these programs were complicating the inflation problem far more than they in fact are, we would have to carry these programs forward nonetheless. To be sure, if we abandoned foreign aid, and preparedness, and agricultural price supports, and the good living standards that come with good wages, and the goal of maintaining maximum employment and production, and many other things that make our Nation what it is, we would then have no problem of inflation. But we would lose infinitely more than we would gain.

It is true that if we decide to divert more of our resources to a particular purpose, such as foreign aid or preparedness, we will for the time being not have those same resources available for other purposes. But there is no good reason why a decision on grounds of national policy to divert manpower and other productive resources to one purpose rather than to another should prevent us from dealing more equitably with our people at home or from checking the economic maladjustments which are now under way. During the war, we diverted about half of our output to noncivilian use, and yet through affirmative economic policies we actually raised civilian standards of living and ended the war on a fairly promising footing for lasting economic prosperity. Growing maladjustments have developed since then, not because we have undertaken certain essential programs such as foreign aid and preparedness, but because we have done so little to deal with the disruptive forces which have been released by the actions of men and can likewise be contained by the actions of men.

Inflation and increasing production

The second point in evaluating measures to combat inflation is that increased production alone is not a feasible solution. In the first place, with full employment (see chart 21), shortages of materials, and almost full utilization of our resources, we cannot increase production very much in the short run and must live with that fact. Certainly, price inflation is not driving production upward (see chart 22). In the second place, mere increase in production will not by itself correct the maladjustments already indicated in the price-income structure; taken alone, it might even accentuate some of these maladjustments, particularly the general balance between production and consumption. If this were not true, no one would be able to understand how a business upswing ever turns into a business downswing. The truth is that our immediately soluble problem is less one of total production than of the composition of production and the distribution of the product. Prices under unrestrained inflation are operating to induce the production of too much of some things and not enough of others at a rather fixed level of total production. Some lines are expanding relatively too fast, and others relatively not fast enough, to serve national needs or to avoid eventual disruption of production generally. In short, while the problem is partly to relieve inflation by more production as fast as we can, the bigger problem is that inflation is impairing production in detail and in the long-run will impair it in general. If we can deal vigorously with inflation, production for the most part will take care of itself.

INFLATION AND DECREASING DEMAND

The third point in evaluating anti-inflation measures is that reducing total demand is by no means a full solution, although it is frequently hailed as such. Demand means spending power in the market. If all demand throughout the economy were reduced pro tanto, we would indeed have a lower price level, but price-income relationships and the distribution of goods and services would remain approximately the same as they are now. The submerged families who are not now getting enough goods would still not be getting enough goods; and some others who are getting relatively too much would still be getting relatively too much. On the demand side, as on the supply side, the immediate problem is mainly one of relationships rather than of totals. Some types of demand need to be curbed, while other types need to be made more effective. Effective demand in the market determines the kind of work that people do, the kinds of goods that are produced, and how these goods are distributed. When we are faced with trouble on the demand side in a full-employment economy, the real task is not to reduce all demand but rather to readjust relative demands either for reasons of equity or national policy or in the interests of general economic stability. We need to do this now for all three reasons.

INFLATION AND HOUSING

A good example of the demand problem is in the field of housing. The point has been made that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill is inconsistent with an anti-inflation program because it would add to demand.

This point is not well-founded. If there is a shortage of housing, and if this is contributing to excessive housing costs in the same way that a shortage of food would contribute to excessive food costs, then the production of more housing is anti-inflationary in the same sense that the production of more food would be anti-inflationary. It may well be that, for a time, we cannot divert much more labor and materials to the total production of housing in view of other competing national needs. But let us make sure that they are competing national needs and not competing nonessentials. And even then there would still remain the question of the composition of the housing that is being produced. It would still be sound and desirable to produce relatively more low-rent housing for veterans and others of modest means, and relatively less high-priced housing for families who can get along very nicely for a while with what they already have. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is designed basically for this purpose, although this is not true of the title VI provisions contained in the bill. Thus, under present circumstances, talk about damping down the demand for housing is indiscriminating and mistaken until one breaks the demand down into various types. Some types of housing should be expanded, other types should be contracted.

INFLATION AND GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

What is true of housing is equally true of other expenditures, including expenditures under Government programs. Some types of expenditures, of course, should be held low or reduced. Those types of expenditures which represent essential national purposes, or serve essential individual needs, cannot be reduced below the point of safety or basic welfare. Some of them, for example, educational outlays, need to be increased. The problem is to translate the more necessary expenditures into effective goods and services, and this can be done only by reducing, on a selective basis, other types of expenditures which are drawing goods and services away for less essential purposes. The problem here again is one of the composition of expenditures and their relationships one to another.

INFLATION AND PRICE-WAGE-PROFIT POLICIES

The price-wage-profit problem in the current stage of inflation cannot be met by deciding arbitrarily that all prices should be held where they are now, or that all wages should be held where they are now, or that all profits should be held where they are now. Some items are relatively too high, and others are relatively too low, both on grounds of equity and on grounds of economic stability. A program which sought to hold everything just as it is now, even if it could be successful, would merely freeze current maladjustments where these exist, and if current maladjustments did not exist there would be no crying need for the program at all. The fact is that some items need to be raised, and others need to be lowered, in relation to the general structure of prices, wages, and profits.

INFLATION AND PRICE OR WAGE SUPPORTS

As a further example of this point, there is nothing intrinsically inconsistent between proposals on the one hand to maintain agricultural price supports, and proposals on the other hand to check such prices as are found to be rising too fast. Preventing some prices from falling to levels that are relatively too low is just as much a part of a sound economic program as preventing other prices from reaching levels that are relatively too high. Likewise, there is no inconsistency between raising minimum wages, or seeking to improve the real earnings of those who are discriminated against in the current price-income structure, while at the same time seeking to restrain such wage increases as would break through necessary price ceilings.

TREATMENT OF INFLATION SHOULD BE SELECTIVE AND NOT INDISCRIMINATE

For these reasons, there is little merit in the high-sounding notion that a genuine anti-inflationary program should get equally tough on everybody, and that a program which gets tough at some points and not at others is unsound or disingenuous. For example, inflation cannot be remedied by getting tough on those who are already its chief victims. The very essence of a corrective program is that it increases pressure at some points and relieves pressure at other points so as to get things into better balance. The only kind of economic development that gets tough on everybody is a depression.

An effective anti-inflationary program must be both comprehensive and selective. It must embrace a variety of measures because the problem is complex, and it must treat each of these problems carefully and not with a meat ax. Maladjustments can be cured only by treating everybody fairly, not by treating everybody the same.

In the light of these standards, it becomes easier to evaluate the main proposals now before the committee, relating to credit controls, materials allocations, and selective price control.

CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROL

The control of consumer credit has an appropriate place in a rounded anti-inflation program, because it can be used to curb the effective demand for goods on the part of those who are now securing too many goods in relation to what the economy at current levels of production can make available. But manifestly, consumer credit controls cannot and should not be used to decrease the amount of goods made available to those who are already receiving relatively too little. In short, consumer credit controls by themself cannot do much for the primary victims of inflation, and for this reason as well as others they need to be combined with other measures.

Let me illustrate that a bit more specifically, Mr. Chairman. If consumer credit controls were to be directed primarily against those whom I call the primary victims of inflation, in other words, those at the bottom of the structure, isn't the manifest truth that it would operate to lower their living standards much more rapidly than it would operate to lower the whole price-wage structure to the point where they might be among the beneficiaries of that general lowering?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, because they haven't the fat.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Certainly. In other words, consumer credit control is a selective device that can be used effectively in connection with other measures; taken alone, it would be a puny device indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. You understand what the committee is charged with in the next few minutes, is to put you on the spot in view of your background. Tell us what you, Leon Keyserling, would do if you were charged with full authority—carte blanche—to go ahead and remove the danger of inflation.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I am certainly relieved not to have that responsibility. It is my responsibility to put before you, as the makers of policy, as objectively as I can, the facts and some of the results of analysis. It is up to you to decide basic policy.

I think I have sufficiently discussed consumer credit controls. The next proposal relates to bank credit.

RESTRAINT ON INFLATIONARY BANK CREDIT

This proposal has great merit as a part of a rounded program, but I don't think that it should be ridden to the point where anyone would regard it as a sufficient remedy by itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you also agree with me in a remark made last night in the committee that by no circumstances would the common people be justified in feeling that relief from this burden of high prices would accrue to them from regulation of bank credit?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Taken alone, it is not nearly enough, in my judgment.

The control of inflationary bank credit, by whatever devices may be used, has fruitful usages and is subject to obvious limitations in the kind of inflation we now have. If such controls are used selectively to abate the types of business enterprises which should not be undertaken at this time, they can be useful. But if they were to be used in a blunderbuss fashion to contract the total volume of business activity, they would be utterly inconsistent with the sound idea of striving to increase total production, and would be consistent only with the fallacious and dangerous notion that inflation can be cured by bringing on a mild recession in the general level of employment and business activity. Such controls, moreover, have other inherent shortcomings which prevent them from being the whole answer or even enough of an answer to the current inflationary problem. Some of the lines of enterprise and expansion which ought to be relatively reduced under present circumstances are not dependent upon outside credit to an extent

that they would be affected perceptibly by these controls. Conversely, some of the types of production that should be relatively stimulated under present conditions would not be helped by such controls and might be impaired by them. And, manifestly, there controls would not reach into the crucial problem of the price-wage spiral generally, unless they were applied so extremely and so unwisely that they brought about a serious contraction in Nation-wide levels of business activity—which is just the reverse of what we should want to do. Therefore, neither by the test of relieving the primary victims of inflation, nor by the test of curing the maladjustments in the economic structure, which are the central danger of inflation, do credit controls afford more than a part, albeit a necessary and essential part, of a workable program for checking inflation.

So, without laboring the point too much, and I will carry it further if you have any additional questions, it seems clear that consumer credit controls and bank reserve controls taken together are highly selective measures to be judicially employed for limited purpose, but they hardly touch some of the most strategic elements of danger in the current inflationary situation.

The CHAIRMAN. What are they?

Mr. KEYSERLING. First, the hardship inflicted on the primary victims of inflation; second, the question of the allocation of materials and productive effort to necessary uses in the short run, and to uses that will build up the most favorable conditions for sustained maximum employment and production.

The CHAIRMAN. And the lever there would be to have some power of allocation over these things.

Mr. KEYSERLING. That is right. This brings me to the subject of allocations.

ALLOCATIONS

Because it is neither desirable to contract the total level of economic activity nor feasible in the short run to expand it very much, the real problem is to weigh the composition of this activity in favor of our most urgent national needs. This means that a vigorous and fully implemented program of allocation of basic commodities in relatively short supply ranks high on the list of effective measures from the viewpoint of general economic analysis. So long as there is not enough steel for everyone to get as much as he wants or has the money to try to buy, it is imperative that a program such as the preparedness program not be jeopardized because too much steel is being drained off in other directions. It is likewise important, even to the extent that effective measures exist for getting steel for the preparedness program, that the amount of steel which this program leaves available for general civilian use is wisely directed and sanely used. The same principle applies to other basic commodities in relatively short supply, whether because of domestic conditions or because of a combination of domestic conditions and the foreign aid and preparedness program. We should not want to reduce the total production or the total use of these basic commodities through general contracting measures which would both impoverish the country and create unemployment; the problem is rather to channel them to the most effective use. And in appraising what is the most effective use, we need to take into account not only short-run urgency but also the longer range problem of the balanced development of interrelated facilities. The worst danger of relative shortages is the distortions which they create.

Senator SPARKMAN. I suppose every Member of the Senate received just a few days ago from Mr. R. R. Young, President of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, a letter and an article that had been published in some railway publication dealing with the unavailability of steel with which to build needed railroad cars, whereas trucks and automobiles apparently were getting all they needed.

I don't recall the figure, definitely. I believe he said they were having a shortage this year of 28,000 railroad cars.

He pointed to the fact that when the time comes for transporting the great fruit crops of this year, the grain crops, we were going to feel that. Is that what you mean by taking care of the more essential needs?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Very definitely.

Senator SPARKMAN. At the expense of the less essential.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Very definitely. There are illustrations of this problem at numerous key points in the economy. Some of the specialized agencies working in the various commodity fields would be able to illustrate this better than I.

This brings us to what the Chairman calls the $64 question—price control.

SELECTIVE PRICE CONTROL

I very genuinely feel, as I know every member of the committee does, that there is involved here a question of balance. On the one hand, there is to be weighed the inconveniences, the black market possibilities, and the administrative difficulties, of imposing this kind of restraint. On the other hand, there is the fact that unrestrained prices have become immensely dangerous.

In weighing this issue, we cannot say that price control is basically inconsistent with our form of government or our basic freedoms, because we have used it before without endangering these precious values. Nor can we set the proposal for price control aside on the ground that it won't work at all, because we know that despite the black markets and inconveniences and aberrations it did work to hold a fairly stable level of prices and that it did bring us out of the war on a much sounder economic footing for postwar prosperity than we now have, because of the maladjustments which have crept up particularly since mid-1946.

If price control is going to be excluded from the tools made available to fight inflation, this can reasonably be done only on the ground that its inconveniences outweigh the need for meeting the great dangers and hardships in the existing economic situation, or on the ground that other proposals than price control are in themselves sufficient without price control.

I have indicated my reasons for believing—and I most reluctantly reach this conclusion—that the other proposals taken alone would be insufficient; that the other proposals taken alone would seem even to be inequitable; that the other proposals taken alone would seem to have an even greater shortcoming—they would seem to impose upon our people the belief that their Government had taken adequate steps to cure the situation when in fact it had not, which I think, as an economist, should be a cause for great concern.

Senator HAWKES. Might I ask a question there? I am not on your committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to wait until he gets through? We will question him when he gets through.

Mr. KEYSERLING. You are the chairman. It is up to you.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought there was nobody else asking. We will wait until you get through.

Go ahead.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Then we come to another question which has been raised, and this is whether selective controls can be effective. The argument has been made that selective controls must necessarily move to all-pervasive controls.

Purely as an economist, I think that this argument proves too much. It proves too much because it seems to run to the conclusion that a nation cannot take moderate measures to deal with—I won't say a moderate situation, but a developing situation—but must wait until you have a total situation and then take all-out measures.

It seems to me that such an approach is inconsistent with prudence, and inconsistent certainly with the "stitch in time saves nine" idea that this Committee and the Congress approved by a great majority in the Employment Act of 1946 under which I serve.

The reason that we moved from selective controls to all-pervasive controls earlier in this decade was not by any inexorable law of logic that if you do something, you have to do everything. It was rather because of the fact that we moved from a defense period which presented a relatively lesser strain to a war period which had a terrific impact on our economy.

During the war, we were devoting about 50 percent of our total resources to nonciviliian use, and at the same time, because we were financing the war mainly through borrowing rather than by taxation—and I am not criticizing that policy—the volume of purchasing power in the economy went up as fast or faster than production went up, but the production was not going to civilians although civilians were getting the income. Thus there was a perfectly terrific spread between purchasing power and goods. In that situation, of course, we needed all-out measures. We needed all-out rationing, we needed all-out price control, we needed all-out compulsory savings, and other extraordinary things besides.

We haven't that kind of all-out situation now. A comparable emergency in peacetime would be a large-scale depression, which would be as great a danger to our economy as a war, or nearly as great. If we now waited until we arrived at such a critical situation, we would need all-out measures, though different from wartime measures. But there is no reason, as I have said, why the application of certain limited measures to the limited dangers of today should lead to all-pervasive measures unless we neglect the situation until a crisis is at hand. I don't want to burden the committee with detail, but I think the Canadian experience with selective controls has worked fairly well, if you measure it by the test of holding down the cost of living. I think it can be done.

The point I want to stress again is that this is not the kind of situation where it would be safe to compound a series of remedies which fairly clearly cannot do the job. Anyone would be pretentious who said—and I am not prepared to say—that any series of remedies offer sure-fire 100-percent proof, in advance, of their perfection. The real test before us is to select those proposals which, looking at the situation as a whole, we think are most likely to do the job with reasonable safety and dispatch.

If this covers the questions raised sufficiently, I can turn to the excess-profits-tax matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

THE EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

Mr. KEYSERLING. You asked me to discuss the excess-profits-tax proposal. That is not before this committee. Nonetheless, this committee has to consider that the whole range of anti-inflation proposals are interrelated.

I think that, in the present economic situation, there is merit in the proposal for the excess-profits tax.

First, by definition, the tax does not apply to restrain either normal or legitimate levels of profits. I am not using the word "legitimate" in the legal sense. I am using it in the popular sense.

Second, in the current economy, as was indicated by my general analysis and further brought out by one of Senator SPARKMAN's questions, there clearly are important instances where the level of profits after taxes is higher than needed to provide adequate incentives and funds for the highest rate of present and prospective investment that our resources can sustain.

Third, I think that the excess-profits tax would help to moderate the price-wage spiral for this reason: Although wage negotiations recently have concentrated largely upon the question of the cost of living, it is only realistic to recognize that the cost of living is not the only question or rationale underlying collective bargaining. Even if the cost of living should be held at its present levels, there is a general philosophy which we cannot set aside that there should be some relationship between the earnings of a business and what those who work therein receive. There is a philosophy which we cannot set aside that, at a stable cost of living or a stable price index, wages should go up as productivity increases to reflect increasing standards of living. Because these issues enter into collective bargaining, I think that a restraint upon excess profits would relieve tension and help to moderate the rate of wage increases. This does not mean that it would be a panacea, but it would help.

The fourth point I would make relates to the argument that an excess-profits tax would operate actually to raise prices because, since the return after taxes would be lower with the excess-profits tax than without it, even higher prices would be charged in order to keep the return stable. Putting aside entirely the fact that this argument is directly contrary to accepted principles of economics, there still remains the fact that the repeal of the excess-profits tax when it was repealed had no restraining effect upon prices. The price-wage spiral continued.

In the present inflationary situation, in those administered price areas where businessmen make conscious judgments as to prices, the price does not necessarily represent the highest price that can be charged at any given moment. I think that there has been some restraint in this respect. But it does represent what some businessmen regard as the highest price that it is wise to charge, and their judgment may sometimes be wrong, although the principle of seeking the optimum price is right and proper in the profit system which we all want to retain and support. I think that, where there are excess profits, the judgment is wrong from the point of view of the interests of the whole economy. For these reasons, in an inflationary economy operating at full employment and very high demand, I do not believe that an excess-profits tax would operate to drive administered prices higher, because in any event they tend during inflation to come near to the highest level that those who administer prices think they can safely charge. I think that the spiral of inflation will take prices still higher, if firm measures are not applied.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not contend that you can increase production by price-control measures?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I would make two points. I would say, first, that it has been clearly demonstrated from a chart (22) which I have already discussed that spiraling prices do not increase production. Second, while I would admit that price control in itself does not directly and immediately increase production, we have learned from experience that production can be increased greatly while price control is in effect, if the manpower and resources are available to increase it. Moreover, by helping to check inflation, price control would help to remove one of the main dangers to both employment and production. The maladjustments that are developing in the course of inflation will turn us downhill if they are neglected. If we can stop inflation, without a recession or depression, production will be quite satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. If wage controls are necessary, in your judgment, is not the pending legislation deficient in that respect?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that the formula in the pending legislation relating to the relationship between price control and wage control is a sound formula. I think that if we look at the situation in the main, Senator TOBEY, on the factual side, economic analysis will not support the proposition that the total level of wages has risen relatively too fast in relation to the whole complex of the national economy. Wages, since inflation got started in earnest, have been trying—and not with complete success—to keep up with the cost of living. Nor has the total of compensation to employees been too high in relation to other distributive shares of national income, as my earlier remarks have indicated in more detail. The outrunning has been mostly in parts of the price structure and in certain levels of profits. For these reasons, I do not think that there would be an acute problem on the wage side if the cost of living could be held measurably in line, and if the exacerbating factor of some excessive profits could be dealt with.

The formula in the bill, however, does not sidestep the wage problem. It says simply and directly that in those cases where it is necessary to impose a price ceiling because of the price structure, the Government should have authority to prevent those types of wage increases which would break through the price ceiling, except where necessary to relieve hardship or maintain living standards or correct inequities or maladjustments. Wage increases based on productivity or payable out of margins without breaking through a price ceiling should not be interfered with.

The CHAIRMAN. There are those who do not think that strong enough.

Mr. KEYSERLING. There are those who don't think it strong enough, and there are those who think it too strong. I disagree with both. It is a middle approach.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to give my colleagues the privilege of asking questions. Senator BUCK?

Senator BUCK. I have no questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator CAIN?

Senator CAIN. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator FULBRIGHT?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Mr. Keyserling, would you say the imposition of credit controls alone would be worth while if the whole program is not undertaken?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I find it hard to answer that question, Senator, although I do not want to duck it.

Mr. Chairman, the question asked me was whether I would say that the imposition of credit controls alone would be undesirable if the whole program were not undertaken. I did not intend to say that, and I do not think that I said it.

Senator FULBRIGHT. You didn't put it that way.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I said that I did not think that credit controls alone would be nearly adequate to deal with the current inflation.

Senator FULBRIGHT. I was trying to clarify what you meant. I realize you did not use the words I used, but I was trying to get at your meaning, because all of your remarks were in the background of an over-all program, including several things. I don't think as a practical matter the whole program is going to be given serious consideration. It is generally thought in the Senate that this credit control, particularly bank credit and consumer credit, is the only feature of this program that may be given consideration. As a Member of the Senate, I am intensely interested in whether or not that alone is worth while.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Senator FULBRIGHT, I think we are talking in an area where it is important for me to distinguish between the functions of the economist and the functions of the legislator. I don't want to step over the line. I understand your question, and it is reasonable, but it is a very hard question for me to answer. About as far as I can go is to say that it seems clear to me that a rounded and sufficient program to deal with the inflationary situation requires the range of measures that I have discussed, and that anything short of this range of measures would be insufficient. That much I can say as an economist. When you go beyond that and ask me to advise whether or not, if I were a member of the Senate, I would vote for a partial program, being unable to get a whole program, I think that this is a practical question of legislation beyond my appropriate province. Frankly, I don't know what I would do if I were in your place, but I don't have to make that decision.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Do you think the repeal of the excess-profits tax in 1945 was a proper measured move to take at that time?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think it was well-intentioned at the time, but in view of subsequent events I think it would have been better not to have taken such action.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Do you think the decrease in income tax this spring was a proper measure from the inflationary point of view?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that from the inflationary point of view it was a mistake to do this at that particular time.

Senator FULBRIGHT. We will assume for purposes of this question that we do impose some credit controls, the ones proposed. Do you think at the same time that we increase the availability of money for the housing program that that would not have the effect of offsetting——

Mr. KEYSERLING. I am glad you asked that question, Senator FULBRIGHT. It raises the whole point which I have labored throughout my statement to develop, namely, that in a situation like the present it is impossible to get a formula which says: "We are going to fight inflation by clamping down on everything." Every expenditure is in a sense inflationary. Expenditures for production are in that sense inflationary. Raising the wage of the fellow who is getting $14 a week and who can't live under inflation is inflationary in a sense.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a question of objectives, is it not, and of human needs?

Mr. KEYSERLING. It is a question of balance. On the housing program I would say this: If you look at it solely from the demand side, obviously when you create more demand for housing it is inflationary. If you look at it on the production side, then a proposal to increase the volume of housing because the inflationary situation in that area is caused partly by a shortage is no more illogical than if we were proposing to increase the production of steel or to increase the production of food because there were shortages in such areas. As I understand it, the proposed housing program is primarily designed to increase the production of housing. It is quite different from something like consumer credit, which does not increase the production of anything.

Further, even if we have reached the point where for a while we cannot increase the total volume of housing because of shortages of manpower or resources or materials, we still have to be concerned tremendously about the composition of the housing product. We should have a combined program, which on the one hand cuts down the amount of certain types of housing which are being built, like luxury housing, high-priced housing, twelve- to fifteen-thousand-dollar-a-unit housing, while at the same time filling in the gap with a relatively greater diversion of the product into low-rent housing which now represents a much greater need on the part of veterans' families and others with low

and moderate incomes. I think that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which has been before this committee, is sound at this time because its main immediate purpose is to deal with the composition of the housing product. We are in a situation where at any given level of housing production we should have relatively more low-rent housing available at moderate charges for the kinds of families who now are suffering most from the housing shortage.

Senator FULBRIGHT. As I understand it, as a practical matter, title VI is about the only feature that is receiving serious consideration.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that would be a most serious mistake, to act on that feature alone.

Senator FULBRIGHT. That is really what I meant by housing. I am not sure about that because the agenda of the Congress is still uncertain, but has nothing definite to say.

It seemed to me that that alone would do the very thing which you say should not be done.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Exactly, Senator Fulbright. Housing is the best example of the point that what is needed is a well-rounded, selective, anti-inflation program. We can't just take an oversimplified solution and say that we want to cut down on everything, because that would cut down on employment and production. We can't say we want an over-all solution that will cut everybody's income, because that would cut the income of the people at the bottom faster than the income of anybody else. We can't say we want a program that is just going to contract credit, for that would reduce necessary production as well as unnecessary production. We need a selective program in this kind of situation, and that is why I think a balanced program of credit controls, allocations, selective price controls with its attendant features, and fiscal measures, is the kind of program adjusted to the kind of situation we are in.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Just one other question. Why is it that the control of bank credit by the increase of reserves is more appropriate now than it was last January, when it was first proposed and apparently was not supported?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that this would have been a desirable measure last January, and I recall that it was proposed.

Senator FULBRIGHT. What?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that this would have been a desirable measure last January, and I recall that it was proposed.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I understand the administration didn't approve of it last January. I understood that; I thought there was some change in the economic situation that might very well have justified that difference of view.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I have tried throughout my statement here to give you my objective views as I hold them, and not to defend——

Senator FULBRIGHT. I understand that.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Not to defend or disclaim.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Unfortunately, we have to make that decision.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I have answered your question in the one way that I can. You asked me about the control of bank credit last January, and my answer is that I think it would have been a good thing if it had been done then.

Senator FULBRIGHT. That was a mistake, then, not to have done it then——

Mr. KEYSERLING. I do not know who made the mistake.

Senator FULBRIGHT. If it is proper to do it now.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Whoever may have been responsible for the mistake, I think it was a mistake. As to who was responsible, that is not within my province.

The CHAIRMAN. Carrying that out further, we are 8 months farther down the river, nearer the breakers.

Senator MYERS. I surmise that just the restriction of bank credit last January would have been just as inadequate as the restriction of bank credit alone today might be?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that is correct, Senator MYERS.

Senator MYERS. And you needed a balanced program last January in 1947 just as much as you need a balanced program today.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that is correct, except possibly that it is even more clearly needed today.

Senator HAWKES. I was going to ask the gentleman, at the time he said he didn't think we ought to hold out a plan that you know will not work, did he say that? Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I said that I, as an economist, had concern about that.

Senator HAWKES. I thought you said that you didn't think we should hold out a plan that we know will not work. I want to ask you whether you know that this plan you are suggesting will work?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Well, no; I cannot be certain of the future. I have said that very frankly. I said that——

The CHAIRMAN. You made a qualifying statment.

Senator HAWKES. I was not here at the beginning.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I said that in the kind of world we live in, we cannot get universal agreements, or absolute surety, even among technicians.

Senator HAWKES. That is correct; or legislators.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Also, we cannot be absoluteiy certain of every step we take. However, that is generally true in dealing with practical problems. But this does not mean that, where a situation is sufficiently critical and the pressure sufficiently acute, no steps should be taken until they are as certain as a mathematical demonstration. It is necessary to make the best possible judgment as to whether, on the basis of experience and analysis, the steps proposed seem like wise or foolish steps.

I have tried to indicate, in response to questioning, what seemed to me to be wise or foolish steps by the test of economic analysis. I didn't intend in any way, Senator HAWKES, to have that carry over into an expression of what I felt members of the committee or of the Congress ought to do as they weigh from a somewhat different perspective the whole range of competing considerations.

Senator HAWKES. The point I had in mind was to ask you this question, if you can tell us a single nation that has gone to and stayed with controls, price controls and allocations, the things that are being asked, that has been successful in doing the thing we want to do in the United States.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I don't think, Senator HAWKES, that I suggested in any way that we should stay with price controls permanently. They should be employed temporarily, and selectively, and such is the proposal before you.

Senator HAWKES. That is all right. We don't need to have so much conversation. What I wanted to do is to get right down to the point that if you get them on, these other countries, their leaders, promised that they would not stay on, but they did stay on, and habit is very strong, and when you get it going, it is very hard to get it off.

We who got OPA off the backs of the American people happen to know how hard it was to get it off. It was a very difficult thing. The countries who have adopted the plan that the President is recommending to us now and that you are talking about, are all socialistic today, and they are all in the junk pile, and we are sending millions of tons of foodstuffs and things of that kind over to keep them from starving to death.

I am not saying I am right, and you are wrong. I am saying that this is a very debatable thing, and I think every serious-minded man in the Congress and in the Senate realizes it is a debatable thing, and we are trying to find out if there isn't some way to do this thing without fastening controls again upon the American people and destroying voluntary cooperation and incentive.

Mr. KEYSERLING. In conclusion, I want to say just a word about timing.

THE PROBLEM OF TIMING

Nobody can foretell just when the dangers and maladjustments of inflation will culminate in a crash. But is it not a strange paradox that those who believe that this ultimate calamity is some time off should on that ground be skeptical of prompt remedial action? Is it not more prudent to take remedial action while the common judgment is that there is still time for it to be effective? I think that these questions pose one of the supreme issues of our generation, which is a moral issue as well as an economic issue. Will our democracy make manifest its innate sense of justice which rebels against hardship for so many people even in the presence of prosperity? Will our democracy make manifest the strength and the unity to act before the ultimate crisis appears, just as we have made manifest the strength and the unity to act upon the event of crises—especially when we know that some of these crises would never have appeared if we had acted in time?

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to say, now that you have come to the conclusion of your talk, and I sat all through it, that you have in a more comprehensive way than any witness that has come before us in my memory met this situation that you came to talk to us about.

Speaking from this chair and for myself only, I do not doubt very much, reflecting the minds of some others here, you have shown a grasp of the situation, you have shown a manifest fairness, you had a lucidness of utterance of expression, and you have not been dogmatic, and you have impressed me with the fact that you realize how delicate the situation is; and all of these things after all, are experimentations, but you have a reason for the faith that is within you.

I want to pay you a compliment, if I can, and say that as far as this fellow is concerned, I invite the committee to join me, I envy the mental equipment that God has given you and that you use so well, and thank you for being present.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Thank you very much.

Senator BUCK. Because I have to leave, may I at this point ask consent of the committee to only introduce at the conclusion of the hearings a statement which was sent to me by Mr. Dodge of the American Bankers Association?

The CHAIRMAN. We will be very glad to have it in the record.

Senator BUCK. He comments upon the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. I now ask the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, to come to the stand.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES SAWYER, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sawyer, we regret very much that due to the exigencies of a tense schedule today, we had to keep you waiting, but I do now, to put it very frankly to you, it was with some degree of being edified by what you have heard and you will now contribute to our edification, I am sure.

Secretary SAWYER. May I say this with reference to Mr. Keyserling: He has left me less confused than any economist I ever listened to.

The CHAIRMAN. I feel the same way, now.

You are going to speak as I assume, because the subject is one that is in the purview of our consideration here in pending legislation, more pertinently on the subject of allocations; is that right?

Secretary SAWYER. I learned at noon that I was expected to come and I have here a statement which my staff has prepared for me, which I shall either go through or not, as you wish.

The CHAIRMAN. How long is it? How many pages?

Secretary SAWYER. Twenty.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder if you will not put the statement in the record and talk to us in your own way; just around the country store at night, conversing about what you think about the situation?

Secretary SAWYER. I am perfectly willing to omit the statement—in fact, I would be very glad to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty pages would take very nearly 50 minutes, and it is now 6 o'clock, and these gentlemen have some plans made for evening engagements and so I thought we could just put in a quarter of an hour here and you talk intimately and we will read your statement, at least, the chairman will, some of us will, at least, I think. That would be very helpful.

Secretary SAWYER. I shall be very glad to. I think perhaps I could accomplish the same purpose if I referred briefly to certain parts.

The CHAIRMAN. Do it in your own way, please.

Secretary SAWYER. One or two things which have been handled in the Department of Commerce, which is the only department with which I am familiar—at the present time the Department of Commerce is making use of several statutory provisions to assist in meeting problems which I have described, including principally the voluntary agreement provision of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, export controls, and the priority and allocations powers under the Second Decontrol Act. While these statutes are necessary in the areas where they are applicable, there are many situations where they do not assist us.

I have spent most of the day with another Senate committee, considering one of the so-called voluntary agreements, dealing with the allocations of 50,000 tons of steel for prefabricated steel houses.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that the Lustron Co.?

Secretary SAWYER. Yes. The allocations to go to five companies, but it is that the major part of it, theoretically, at least, and probably actually, if the agreement goes through, will go to the Lustron Co.

That hearing was an excellent example of the situation of shortages which face us now not only in the country at large, but of course particularly in the Commerce Department, where we are trying to operate this voluntary program.

I might say to you, Senator, that with reference to specific suggestions which I understand you would like to have, I would suggest, further, that the Congress extend this voluntary control program that is in Public Law 395. I think I wrote to you and one or two others previously on that, because the date at the moment is March 1, 1949, and by reason of the steps that need to be taken and the time that must elapse we can't operate up to that date. At least, that is the opinion of those in the office who are carrying on the program.

I assume that the reason for things like fixing that date was that the next Congress would be able to decide in the light of what happened what it wanted to do. My suggestion is that date be extended to June 30, at least, 1949, perhaps even longer.

If I may, I would like to make another suggestion in connection with that voluntary-agreement program, and that is that you give us the same power which was given to the ECA, for instance, to employ experts and consultants without subjecting them to the possibility of prosecution under the statutes against the conflict of interests, bribery, and so forth, with which you are more familiar than I.

Perhaps I can just let my statement go altogether and just discuss this thing if that is what you would really prefer.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that would be helpful.

Secretary SAWYER. It seems that the problem which has arisen in connection with the voluntary-agreements program is typical of the entire problem. It is one of shortages. And while originally the shortages were not so acute, they are daily growing more acute.

It is quite clear to me, and I am sure to everyone in contact with the situation, that every time you make a voluntary agreement and by that much cut down the steel which is available, the balance becomes more desirable, and the influx of applicants for voluntary agreements is growing, and will continue to grow.

I might also say that if any addition should be made to the job that was given the Department of Commerce, I hope we will have an additional appropriation, because we can't do this without personnel.

We have, as you doubtless know, made some voluntary agreements, and if it would be of interest at all, I will list what these are.

The allocations of steel are, first, to the Atomic Energy Commission, 20,000 tons a month. Freight cars, I heard those mentioned a while ago, during Mr. Keyserling's testimony, 240,000 tons a month.

Senator BRICKER. What number of cars will that provide?

Secretary SAWYER. They are operating under the theory that it is ten thousand. Of course, as you know, Senator, only during 1 month, I think, has that goal been met.

Senator BRICKER. Actually been reached?

Secretary SAWYER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How is that apportioned between the different car building companies, as to proportions of output—how is the allocation made?

Secretary SAWYER. The allocation is made by voluntary agreement. I myself don't know at the moment just how much each company gets, but it is divided between the companies that make cars.

Senator TAYLOR. Is anything being done or can be done to increase steel production?

Secretary SAWYER. I am told that there are things being done, but, of course, in order to increase steel production they themselves must get steel and other things to build their mills. I am quite sure there are things being done.

The CHAIRMAN. Isn't there also the inhibition automatically with the steel companies as with any sound business, they hesitate about going ahead with high prices and extending plants extensively when the recession some day coming will change the whole picture?

Secretary SAWYER. I have understood that was their argument against very large enlargement of their plant facilities.

I would not be qualified to speak on that. I do know that at the moment the problem of allocating what steel is available is a very critical one, and as someone mentioned a few moments ago, we not only have our own domestic requirements, but we are asked at all times to ship steel abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. Steel is the bête noire, the chief situation, is it not?

Secretary SAWYER. Steel is the heart of the whole problem. There is no doubt of that, although lead and copper and zinc and tin are others. Both steel and nonferrous metals are beginning to be more critical. Even aluminum, which has been in fair supply, is getting short.

The CHAIRMAN. What, if anything, are we doing to build up critical materials in the event of any world-wide catastrophe?

Secretary SAWYER. We have the stock-piling program, and one of the things which has made the allocation of various materials more difficult is the fact that we have now begun to put more effort in that, and actually have stock-piled more, that is, the Munitions Board has; the Commerce Department and others have assisted in that, by putting more in the stock pile than has been done before.

That, of course, just adds to the urgency of the situation, and is one more element in addition to the requirements of the defense program which has been handled by voluntary agreement.

That will call for about 106,000 tons per month.

All of those elements tend to make the situation more critical and of course, I am sure it is apparent to you, tend to make it more difficult to operate a voluntary program.

Senator BRICKER. Are the limitations in the other fields of the metals that you mentioned a moment ago due to the same factors, limitation of production facilities, that you have in steel, or is it a variety of reasons?

Secretary SAWYER. I am not sure what the causes are. I don't feel I could testify as to that today. I think it is partly due to domestic demands and partly due to the demand from other countries.

For instance, a large delegation from Venezuela came in to see me the other day, one of the few countries in the world that has plenty of dollars. They furnish, as you doubtless know, a large portion of oil, in fact most of the oil, I believe, that we import from other countries comes from Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it be true today as against the Arabian oil?

Secretary SAWYER. I think it is still true; that we get more from Venezuela than any other place.

Senator BRICKER. What did they want?

Secretary SAWYER. They want steel, and they want steel not only for their oil fields, but they want steel for other purposes, and they argued, and I must say it is rather persuasive, that being one of the few countries in the world that is sending us products which we badly need, they are entitled to it.

Senator BRICKER. And have dollars to pay for what they get.

Secretary SAWYER. And they have that; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How about the export of steel pipe to Arabia?

Secretary SAWYER. As you know, I am sure, we have held that export up for that pipe across Arabia, the Saudi-Arabian line. We did agree on, I think it was 12,000 tons, not a very large amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Are domestic oil interests in the West able to get what pipe they need now for drilling, and also in the South?

Secretary SAWYER. They claim not; and I think their claim is good.

The CHAIRMAN. Is second-hand pipe selling for phenominal prices?

Secretary SAWYER. That I don't know. There is a black or gray market in steel.

The CHAIRMAN. How about nails?

Secretary SAWYER. Well, there is a shortage of nails, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Has it improved much in the last few years?

Secretary SAWYER. I think not. The situation is worse, I think.

The picture gets darker, and the situation gets more critical day by day, and steel which we are now dealing with, and in other commodities, as you know, control now over tin and antimony, and other commodities, in my opinion, should be put in that category.

I suggest some other departments be given the job of handling it, but I still think that something of that sort should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. In the pending bill which is before us, the bill introduced by Senator BARKLEY, S. 2910, you know, you have read the bill, you are familiar with the allocation features of it—what have you to say as to your views about that?

Secretary SAWYER. I think it would be well to give compulsory powers to the President, but as I say, I would just as soon they be

given to some other department, eventually, of the nature which we now have with reference to tin. I think it is probably desirable to give some inventory control power.

I think that the voluntary agreements program—this is my own personal opinion, should be retained, and supplemental controls of a compulsory nature should aid in that.

We have had an example of what we can do by voluntary control and agreement.

Perhaps it would be better, Mr. Chairman, if I were to let you ask me the questions.

The CHAIRMAN. That is why I put that question as I did there, and you said you would like to see these things continued, and you gave your reason for it.

Have you any questions?

Senator CAIN. No; I am just listening, thank you.

Senator BRICKER. What committee was hearing the Lustron matter this afternoon?

Secretary SNYDER. The Wherry Small Business Committee.

Senator CAIN. They were hearing it perhaps from a point that a contract presumably had been agreed to some time ago, and yet no houses were resulting from it.

Secretary SAWYER. No; they were hearing it from the standpoint of the effect of the allocation of this 59,000 tons of steel upon many other types of steel fabricators who can't get enough steel as it is.

It was an effort to bring out all sides of the question.

Senator CAIN. Trying to determine that you would build houses that use less steel; that is, the usual houses?

Secretary SAWYER. That was one of the angles. Of course, as I have learned, and as the Senator suggested a while ago, you come back to steel, no matter where you start, or where you go. And one of the things which we are trying to do under the voluntary agreements program is to get some steel scrap out of Germany.

I am seeing tomorrow morning a man who has been in Germany and has just come back here, who has been over there for the sole purpose of seeing how much of that 10,000,000 tons of German scrap we can get back here.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you suppose the cost will be over prevailing scrap here, transportation and all, handling?

Secretary SAWYER. There is a fixed price. They have fixed a price of $26 a ton. I don't know what the transportation cost is. The experts are of the opinion that the matter of cost isn't a critical factor. They just can't get scrap.

Senator BRICKER. Is the same thing true in the Pacific?

Secretary SAWYER. The Navy has done very well. We are getting quite a bit of scrap from the Pacific.

Senator BRICKER. Have you the production figures on steel for this year; that is, anticipated?

Secretary SAWYER. Sixty-five million tons.

Senator BRICKER. What was the figure last year?

Secretary SAWYER. It was less than that. I don't know how much it is up.

Senator BRICKER. And they will increase it in spite of the loss due to the coal strike?

Secretary SAWYER. No; that is the estimate—65,000,000 tons.

Senator BRICKER. That will be an increase over last year; is that right?

Secretary SAWYER. That is right.

Senator BRICKER. They lost about 1,200,000 tons because of shortage of coal.

Secretary SAWYER. There was quite a loss, but there is no doubt about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other questions around the room?

Senator TAYLOR. No.

Senator CAIN. Just one question, Mr. Secretary:

Do you approve in detail of the provisions covering your operations included within the so-called Barkley bill that is before us?

Secretary SAWYER. I approve of the suggestion that we have some compulsory powers with reference to this matter of allocations and the matter of inventory control. I feel that the situation is getting more critical and that as it gets critical, as I said a moment ago, it will be more difficult to work out voluntary agreement proposals, although I want to say that the steel people have been very cooperative and in the programs which I have mentioned a moment ago have indicated a desire to do all they could to carry out that instruction of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, again I feel I owe you an apology. It is regrettable that after the painstaking statement you prepared we had to treat you rather impersonally this afternoon, due to these exigencies.

It has been a tough day for us here. I hope you understand it. You have met your part splendidly and I thank you for it.

Secretary SAWYER. Let me add that I am just as pleased as you are not to have to read my statement.

So, if I may leave it with the committee, and the two or three suggestions I have made, I assume that my part of this performance is over.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir; thank you for it.

We will meet tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in executive session.

(Whereupon, at 6:25 p. m., the committee recessed until 10 a. m. of the following day.)

DIVISION OF THE POWER OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Eightieth Congress generally, and this special session in particular, has been harshly attacked by many of the citizens and by the press of this country. As a Member of this body I feel that it is my duty to say a few words, at least, in explanation of the underlying circumstances with which we have been confronted, and to state briefly my views about this session and the issues before us.

I quite agree that the Eightieth Congress, and this special session, has to a very great extent been an ineffective, do-nothing Congress. The reason for this, however, is not primarily because it is composed of men who are less intelligent or less high-minded than were the Congresses which preceded it. The fundamental reason for our futility is that our Government, with its coordinate branches, can never function positively and effectively for the welfare of this Nation when the executive power is under the control of a party different from that which controls the legislative power. Our history demonstrates clearly that when the power of government is thus divided between the two parties, a stalemate, a period of quarreling futility, is the result.

In January of 1947, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 29, providing for an amendment to the Constitution designed to prevent in the future the recurrence of this paralyzing division of power. The negative reception that it received in the press and in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary showed that the seriousness of this defect in our governmental machinery was not then and is not now recognized. Even today the critics, both those in the press and outside the press, persist in castigating the individual Members rather than seeking to understand the real cause of our trouble. I suppose that this is because it is so easy and natural to find fault with one's public servants, whereas it requires hard thinking to understand, and there is no reader interest in explaining, the principles which underlie our complex governmental machinery.

The fact is that even when a single party is in control of both the executive and the legislative branches of the Government, it still is very difficult to formulate and carry through a positive, coordinated program. The character of our country, its great diversity in economic interests, in cultural and social customs, and in its racial and human resources, while a source of strength, in one sense, at the same time presents a formidable obstacle to easy agreement in any streamlined action by the National Congress. Under our system there is little interdependence, or at least it seems so to many Members of the Congress and to many Presidents, between the legislators and the Executive. In fact, under our constitutional division of power, there tends to arise a certain amount of competition, if not antagonism, between the legislative and the executive, even when they belong to the same party.

If, in addition to the constitutional division of power, there is superimposed the further division based upon party allegiance, we have a condition in which, as a practical matter, we have merely a caretaker government, without power to generate and carry through a positive program. This weakness in our system, which has often afflicted us, was tolerable so long as we were an isolated nation with a relatively simple economy. However, since the First World War we have paid an extremely heavy price for it. During the last 2 years of Woodrow Wilson's administration, under a divided Government, we failed to throw in our lot with the nations desiring to build a peace, and we had a second war. During the last 2 years of Herbert Hoover's administration, under similar conditions which prevented our doing anything, we permitted the most disastrous depression in history to develop, without turning a hand.

During the past year and a half, we again have been unable to do anything to prevent the development of an inflation, which may very well wreck not only our domestic economy but also all our plans for creating a peaceful world.

I submit, Mr. President, that those members of the press who are so violent in their criticism of the Congress or of the Executive, should consider carefully and thoroughly these circumstances, before venting their spleen upon the individuals who compose this Government. It is not a question of individual patriotism or intelligence or morals. It is a question of having a governmental structure through which the power of the Nation can be focused upon the achievement of an objective. When our objectives were limited to the protection of the individual's liberty within our own borders, and when our economy was relatively simple, our power was adequate. But now that our freedom is primarily threatened from abroad, and our industrial economy is complicated and sensitive, there has arisen a need for the continuing ability to focus our power effectively upon the problems which confront us abroad, as well as those at home. In other words, we have come of age as a world power, and it is time that we devise the political methods to utilize our power at all times, for our own and the world's protection. I believe that the people and the Congress should give immediate and serious consideration to the problem of reforming our system so that at all times we may have a Government that can function positively and affirmatively.

Mr. President, in order to keep the record straight, I wish to state that in November of 1946 I pointed out the danger of a divided government and the probability of a stalemate. I wish to read several paragraphs from a statement which I made at that time, in order to show that this is not merely hindsight as to the occurrences which have been taking place in the past few months. I quote now from the statement I made at that time, in 1946:

> As for the welfare of the Nation, I am quite unable to see why it is not highly desirable to have at all times, but especially in a time of tense international relations and confusion at home, a government capable of functioning in a definite, positive manner. Practically every responsible commentator on national affairs has agreed that, as a result of the divided responsibility in our Government we are faced with a stalemate for the next 2 years. Typical of these views is that of the Washington Post:
>
> "If the next 2 years are passed in mutual evasion of responsibility, with the only activity the playing for advantage at the next Presidential election, then the outlook is dark indeed. No government is a luxury this Nation can no longer afford. Nor could the world survive it. Surely there is enough common sense left in the parties to avoid this catastrophe."
>
> But history and our common sense plainly show us that under these conditions of divided responsibility there is no reasonable expectancy of that high degree of common sense or statesmanship which could overcome the very natural impulses that will arise in contemplation of the Presidential election of 1948. The rising fervor of bitter recrimination and faultfinding as the next election approaches is too familiar to us to require argument. It simply is not human nature to be nonpartisan in ones views and actions as the election approaches.
>
> An extremely important benefit accruing from giving the Republicans this responsibility would be the clarification of the minds of the people as to just what the Republican Party stands for and how efficient they can be in the practical application of their campaign promises. It is exceedingly important that the people be given some basis for an intelligent evaluation of the two parties in the Presidential election of 1948. Without full responsibility the Republicans can and undoubtedly will insist in 1948 that if they had had control of the Executive during these 2 years things would have been better; and of course no one can prove the contrary.

I submit that the experiences of the last year and a half fully justify the opinions expressed in November of 1946.

INFLATION CONTROL

Mr. President, with regard to the so-called anti-inflation bill that is now before the Congress, I intend to support it; but I want to make it clear that I think it will have very slight effect upon the rising spiral of inflation.

It is my belief that the forces of inflation have already been permitted to grow too strong, and that it would require drastic measures to mitigate the ill effects which we are likely to experience from these forces. This bill certainly is not a drastic measure. I understand, however, that the leadership of the majority of the Congress has definitely decided that it is this bill or nothing—therefore, I shall support it, ineffective as it is.

In order to keep my own record straight on the question of inflation, I wish to read a few excerpts from a speech that I made in October 1945, in opposition to the repeal of the excess profits tax. The full speech may be found on page 10033 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 26, 1945.

I desire to quote from that speech again, because I do not wish to be accused of using hindsight rather than foresight. I think it may possibly contribute to a better understanding of why inflation has become such a serious threat to us today. At that time, October 1945, long before the major postwar strikes got under way, and long before the really serious dislocation between prices and costs arose, I had this to say:

> Mr. President, the main reasons for high wartime taxes, including the excess-profits tax, were, first, to hold down the deficit and the need for borrowing, particularly from the banking system; second, to reduce inflationary pressures at a time of greatly excessive demands for goods and services relative to supply; and, third, to curb profiteering out of the war.
>
> These underlying reasons for maintaining high taxes apply with equal or even greater force during the critical period of reconversion, because, first, we still face a heavily unbalanced budget; every dollar of Government expenditures not raised by taxes will have to be borrowed, and to the extent that banks furnish these funds new supplies of money will be added to the already enormous accumulations of liquid funds in the hands of the public as a result of war financing; second, demands, both domestic and foreign, upon our economy are and will continue for an indefinite period to be greatly in excess of supply; and, third, the profits to be made in the next year, at least, will be a direct result of war expenditures and thus just as much war profits as if they were derived while hostilities were still in progress.
>
> Taxation is the last real bulwark against inflationary forces because of the weakening of other controls, such as the War Labor Board exercised over wages and hence prices, and such as the WPB exercised in the construction field. The most prudent course at this juncture would be to defer tax reductions until such time as supply is more nearly in balance with demand and we have begun to approach a balanced budget. At this stage we would be wise to err on the side of too much rather than too little revenue—taxes can always be reduced.
>
> I wish to remind the Senate that the real period of inflation in connection with the last war was not so much during the war as it was soon after the war. In fact it began about 6 months after the war with the removal of what controls there were during that war, and we are facing exactly the same situation.

A little later in the same speech I said:

> It is significant that expectations of outright repeal of the excess-profits tax are having four adverse effects: First, it is doing much to boom the stock market, drawing into this vortex of speculation funds that the Government ought to be getting. Second, whetting the appetite of labor for bigger demands, reinforced by strikes.

I think that statement certainly was borne out by the experience during months that followed.

> Third, inducing corporations in the excess-profits group to avoid any further sales in the last quarter of this year, because, obviously, profits after January 1 would go untaxed so far as the excess-profits tax is concerned if Congress repeals it as of that date. Fourth, inviting inventory speculation in anticipation of profits resulting from rising prices together with lower taxes.

In summing up I said:

> To sum up, if any reductions are to be made at this stage, they should benefit primarily those at the bottom of the income scale, not those individuals and corporations best able to pay taxes. Repeal of the excess-profits tax, in particular, not only favors the few and the financially strongest corporations, but it would grant them these benefits, including refunds, at the Government's expense when revenue is of critical importance; it sets an example in pocketing what are, in fact, war profits that makes it difficult to argue that labor should be denied correspondingly large wage increases; and the effect is to invite the familiar wage-price upward spiral.

I again read those portions of my speech of October 26, 1945, on June 26, 1946, in discussing the conference report on the OPA bill. On the latter date I also said:

> I am very doubtful about the efficacy of this OPA bill or for that matter any other OPA measure standing alone. I think it is very doubtful, even if we should extend the present OPA without any change, that such an act would effectively control prices after we have removed the deterrent of the excess-profits tax, the benefits of which we had all during the war, and after we have already created a dislocation between costs arising from increased wages and the prices which have been established and the OPA is attempting to maintain.
>
> During the war there had been worked out, by the combination of these three methods of control, a fairly satisfactory relationship between costs and profits; and while we all had complaints from the business people within our districts or States, on the whole I believe that the system worked quite well. I believe that if we could have maintained that relationship and those three controls, the system might well have worked for one more year, during which we could have attained production sufficient to have relieved much of the pressure which now exists against the prices which we are attempting to maintain.
>
> Under the present circumstances I believe it is misleading to encourage the people to feel that we have discharged our duty in the control of prices. I doubt that it can be done by any single legislative act dealing with price control. It will require a tremendous upsurge of understanding and cooperation on the part of the people themselves—the consumers as well as the producers—to exercise self-restraint during the next few months or the next year, if there is to be any effective control of prices. I think it is perhaps beyond the ability of any single legislative act such as this, or the one under which we are now operating, to control prices. The only thing I could suggest, in a legislative way, would be the reinstitution of something similar to the excess-profits tax, and some agreement with labor, or the reinstitution of some agency such as

the War Labor Board, which could to some extent control wages. But there has been no serious move to do either of those things. As I have just stated, the excess-profits tax was repealed, against my vote and against my best opinion at that time. And without the excess-profits tax, I doubt the effectiveness of the proposed new OPA Act. If I recall correctly only three or four Senators opposed its repeal at that time. Many of those who now complain of the ineffectiveness of OPA supported the repeal of excess-profits tax then.

I believe we are in for some very serious inflation, regardless of what we do with this report, except with respect to the suggestions which I have made, but which I have no hope of having adopted, because apparently there is no support for the reinstitution of the excess-profits tax or anything like the War Labor Board. The destruction of price control began with the repeal of excess-profits tax, the abolition of WLB, and the theory that wages could be raised without raising prices

On July 11, 1947, I again made reference to this question, when the tax-reduction bill was being considered, and at that time, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 93, Part 7, on page 8660, I made this statement:

Mr. President, it seems to me the problem now facing the country is not so much one of increasing production and inducing further investment in productive capacity, but the real problem is to attain some stability in our economy; that is, that every measure affecting our economy should be designed to prevent anything which will contribute to an undue deflation; in other words, to try to smooth out the great variations in our level of production and employment.

I think the proposed tax reduction is premature. If the effect of the tax reduction at this time will be what the sponsors say it will be, I do not believe that effect would be a proper one. The sponsors say we now need inducement for further investment of capital to build greater productive capacity. I think that is the wrong result to seek at this time. I think the time will come when the present productive machinery begins to become more obsolete, when production begins to fall, when the much-discussed recession takes place, when an incentive to greater profits will be very important, and I think then will be the time to reduce taxes, along with other measures designed to increase employment and production.

I think the Members of the Senate will find the debate on the tax bill which took place on July 11, 1947, very interesting in connection with a discussion of inflation. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance based his argument partly upon the theory that we were likely to have recession. I shall read one or two excerpts from that debate, found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 93, Part 7, on page 8661:

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Basic in the Senator's—

This relates to the Senator from Colorado—

Basic in the Senator's argument is his prophecy that a depression will be upon us next year.

This was, as I said, in July 1947.

I submit that he cannot, with any greater justification than other experts in the Government, prophesy what is going to be the case. At the present time I cannot see a single tangible sign, either in prices or in any other factor of our economic system, which indicates that the depression is beginning. In fact, the signs are all to the contrary. Within the past 2 weeks there has been a new lease on the inflationary spiral.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am inclined to agree that those who do not predict an early recession have the better of the argument, but in the management of our fiscal policy I suggest that it is only prudent to base calculations on some recession. In the budgetary set-up we are figuring on a recession from the present rate of national income payments of $178,000,000,000 to an average of $170,000,000,000. Obviously, if it were to average out that way, it would take us seven or eight points below $170,000,000,000. That would increase present unemployment of probably 2,000,000 people to 4,000,000 or 4,500,000. An unemployment figure of 4,000,000 or 4,500,000 does not denote a cataclysmic state of unemployment. It is not what the technicians call a drastic recession. I suggest, however, that it is a prudent estimate of recession, and if we do not meet it we are all to the good. If it should develop, we have made provision for it.

I merely mentioned that to show how far wrong the estimate of the committee was, which I believe lends support to the argument that the timing of the tax bill was entirely erroneous. There is one further excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 93, Part 7, on page 8663. I should like to quote two paragraphs from my remarks:

I am only asking that we try to be a little more farsighted and make some sacrifice now in order to prevent that extreme variation in the level of industry and the standard of living in this country. That is really what it comes down to—a matter of timing.

I understand from the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on Finance that the bill is based on the assumption that there will be a depression next year. He said I could not anticipate there would be inflation, and I do not think he is any more justified in making his assumption than I am in arriving at mine. The signs today, especially in the home town of the Senator from Illinois, Chicago, all indicate the opposite of his prediction.

On the same page the following appears:

I cannot say when is the right time—

These are my remarks, Mr. President—

and I do not think the chairman of the Committee on Finance or anyone else can say just when the conditions will come about which will justify tax reduction. My idea is that tax reduction should be responsive to the economic conditions in the country.

There are several other remarks along the same line. I only wish to refresh the memory of the Senate in order to bring to the minds of Senators the fact that the bill with which we are dealing is such a puny bill that it cannot possibly have any substantial influence on inflation. The time for real measures against inflation was when we were discussing the tax bill and when we repealed the excess-profits tax in 1945. I think the wrong action of the Senate has now created the basis for an inflation which I do not think can be avoided. In my opinion, the pending bill is not calculated to any great extent to mitigate the bad effects of inflation.

I think the sentiments I expressed in July 1947 are certainly valid, as judged in the light of events since that time. The fundamental mistakes of this Congress were made when we repealed excess-profits taxes, reduced income taxes, and permitted regulation W to lapse. The abolition of allocation and wage stabilization prematurely in 1945 is a part of the sorry picture. I believe that the forces of inflation are now so strong that the puny, mealy-mouthed bill we are now considering is of insignificant value. The circumstances require drastic measures, but the leadership of this body is not disposed to consider such measures.

Mr. President, in order that the bill may have more strength to it and that some little help be given to the everyday citizen of the country, I send to the desk an amendment which I have been intending to propose to the bill, and I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The amendment which I am offering is a bill which is well known to the Senate. It passed the House of Representatives by greater than a 2-to-1 vote in April and has been approved by the Committee on Finance, with a very slight amendment. I am offering the bill which passed the House and I am sure there will be no difficulty in the House accepting it, because the House has so clearly expressed its views. I think the amendment would give to the pending bill some significance, some slight relief to the ordinary citizen of this country from the gradually increasing effects of the high cost of living. I am sure it would be a much greater relief than anything that could happen to them as the result of the passage of the bill in its present form. So I am sure that the Senate will be glad to consider the amendment at the proper time. I know the people of the country will be gratified by the adoption of my amendment, for not only will it make a contribution to the living standards of the people, and to the reduction of the high cost of living for the average citizen, but it will also correct an ancient wrong which has already persisted too long on our statute books.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which would strike out section 2 of the House substitute, beginning on page 2, line 5.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for the information of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, let me say that the unanimous-consent agreement included a provision relative to amendments. No doubt the Senator is well aware that in the event he wants to offer an amendment at the proper time tomorrow, the provision of the agreement applies only to amendments which are germane to the subject matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am aware of that, and I think it is quite clear that my amendment is germane, and will contribute more effectively to the objective desired than will some of the other amendments to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That will be a matter which will be contested if a point of order is raised as to the germaneness of the amendment. I simply raise that question for the information of the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Do I correctly understand that there will be no voting this afternoon?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on August 3 the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] made a very able address on the comprehensive health program which the President and his leadership in Congress insisted that we enact at this special session. The speech of the Senator from Missouri coincides so fully with my own views that I am anxious that the people of my State have an opportunity to read it, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

The Republicans in the Congress, including myself, have strongly opposed the type of legislation proposed by the President, particularly Senate bill 1320, known as the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill. I point out that if the Democratic Party should regain control of the Senate and the House, and their leaders should again control the committees which have charge of this legislation, a strong effort will be made to enact the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill into law.

During the last regular session of the Congress the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, gave the Nation a comprehensive report on the progressive action which the Eightieth Congress has taken in the field of health, without imposing Federal control. I hope it will be widely read.

Again, Mr. President, I commend my colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] for his able speech.

There being no objection, Mr. KEM's speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, President Truman in his recent message to the joint session of the Congress on July 27, 1948, recommended a comprehensive health program based on health insurance.

There is nothing new in this proposal, or in Mr. Truman's espousal of it. On November 14, 1945, Mr. Truman, in a message to Congress, advocated a compulsory health-insurance system which, he solemnly assured the Congress, is not socialized medicine. Later the President let the cat out of the bag. In his message on the state of the Union on February 7, 1948, Mr. Truman stated: "Our ultimate aim must be a comprehensive insurance system to protect all our people equally against insecurity and ill health." In order to protect all our people, the scheme must be compulsory. So there is no question where Mr. Truman stands on socialized medicine. Apparently he finds this term distasteful. Nonetheless, he has decided to go all out.

We also know, by way of contrast, where Mr. Dewey stands. In some extemporaneous remarks before the house of delegates of the Oregon State Medical Society in Portland, Oreg., on May 1, 1948, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey stated his position very clearly and in language anyone may understand:

"Compulsory socialized medicine is no good. It cannot be done. Accordingly, I have spent the last 2 years of my life knocking down every proposal that anybody has made to regiment the medical profession and the people of America through any program of socialized medicine. * * * I don't want to run the risk of happening to the health of our people what has happened to the health of every group of people which has tried to drag the medical profession down to the Socialists' level. You won't drag anything up. You will enlarge the volume of medical care but utterly destroy the quality of medical care the minute you try that process."

Again Governor Dewey said:

"This idea which has been shared by the last two occupants of the White House that you can improve medical care by passing a law must be stopped. We must get vast broad educational ideas to the people as to the quality of care that now exists and, as to a greater program that is going forward by men of medicine, we must have a program all can take a share in. Let's get some good public-relations men and get the businessman to do his share and get the lawyers and the labor leaders and everybody else. They are the ones who will lose most of all, if freedom in medicine is ever lost."

The issue between the two major candidates for President of the United States is clear and clean cut. Mr. Truman believes as an ultimate aim there must be a compulsory comprehensive insurance system to apply to all our people. Governor Dewey believes that compulsory socialized medicine is no good. For my part, I believe that the position of the Republican candidate, Governor Dewey, is sound, backed up by theory and experience. I believe the ideas of the Democratic candidate, President Truman, are a distinct threat to the medical and allied professions as we now know them and to our American way of life.

The advances in public health in the United States already made show that our basic institutions are sound. Existing shortcomings—and some are admitted—can be corrected within the framework of our time-tried, time-tested system of nonpolitical medicine. Relying in the future, as in the past, mainly upon individual initiative and personal cooperation, we may reasonably expect the health of the people of the United States to continue to improve.

There are two ways of life competing for supremacy in the world today. One is the Russian system, based on the Marxian principles of the abolition of private enterprise as the means of production. The other, the American system, is based on the principles of free enterprise and personal initiative. Our English friends are trying to combine the two with conspicuous lack of success. Under the Marshall plan England is receiving from us more than one-third of our total gifts to western Europe. These goods and commodities produced under our free-enterprise system, are going forward to England as free-will gifts from the American people because the English tell us that under their present regimented economy, which now includes socialized medicine, England is not producing enough to maintain a fair standard of living for her own people.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to yield until I finish my prepared address. I shall then be glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Socialized medicine is not new. Nations throughout the world have for decades been experimenting with one form or another of government-sponsored programs. Germany, for example, adopted a socialized-medicine plan in 1883 when Bismarck was forging his "golden chain" around the necks of the German people. Australia followed with a similar program in 1888. Britain took the first step in 1911, and completed the socialization of medicine when the Socialist majority in Parliament passed the National Health Service Act, which went into effect on July 5 of the present year. This legislation is designed to unify medical and auxiliary services in an insurance scheme directed by the state and supported by compulsory contributions by all citizens. In other words, Britain has achieved that point which Mr. Truman now described as his ultimate aim.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate, invited the Brookings Institution, the outstanding research organization famous for its impartiality, to prepare a report on the issue of compulsory health insurance. The conclusions and recommendations furnished the Senate committee came as a bombshell into the camp of the advocates for socialized medicine, who have been extolling the virtues of various foreign systems.

These are some of the conclusions reached in the report published in April 1948:

1. Probably no great nation in the world has among its white population better health than now prevails in the United States.

2. The United States, under its voluntary system of medical care, has made greater progress in the application of medical and sanitary science than any other country.

3. The nonwhites in the United States have materially poorer health than the whites, but the evidence does not indicate that this condition is primarily or even mainly due to unavailability or inadequacy of medical care.

4. The advances in health among both the whites and nonwhites that have been made in the United States in the past four decades do not suggest basic defects in the American system.

The learned professions of the United States have always enjoyed a distinction not found in any other field of human endeavor. The clergyman, the lawyer, the physician, and the dentist have always dealt directly with humanity. A personal relationship is the touchstone of their service to mankind. To the present day in the United States no man has intervened between them and those who sought their aid, counsel, service, and assistance. Contrary to the claims of the advocates, schemes for socialized medicine place a middleman between the doctor and the patient. For my part, I hope the learned and respected profession of medicine, as well as its allied professions, will be able to withstand this onslaught on its cherished heritage. If they are unable to do so, what does the future hold for the other professions?

The Republican Eightieth Congress has been unusually alert in matters connected with the health of the American people. It established a National Heart Institute within the United States Public Health Service to fight America's No. 1 killer, diseases of the heart and circulation. It provided $500,000 to the Research Institute to combat these diseases which affect 1 person in every 16 and cause 1 out of every 3 deaths.

It authorized a National Institute of Dental Research, the functions of which in the dental field are similar to the Heart Institute.

In addition, it provided $28,400,000 for the National Cancer Institute to study the disease of cancer and to disseminate knowledge on how to reduce its terrible toll of lives.

Furthermore, it passed a bill establishing a National Science Foundation to develop and encourage a national policy for scientific

research and scientific education, and to initiate and support scientific research in medical and other sciences. The National Science Foundation bill passed by the Congress was vetoed by President Truman for reasons best known to himself. These measures are directed to the improvement of the health of all our people, without resort to socialism.

After all, the American way of life has given us the American standard of living—the envy of the rest of the world.

I am proud to say, the Republican Congress in all of these acts has been alert to protect the American way, to cherish and preserve it for our children and our children's children.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, apparently the work of the Senate has been concluded for today, and I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, August 7, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 6 (legislative day of August 5), 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DIVISION OF CUSTOMS

David N. Edelstein, of New York, to be Assistant Attorney General in charge of customs, vice Hon. Paul P. Rao, resigned.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation in accordance with section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Vice Adm. George D. Murray, USN.
Vice Adm. Gerald F. Bogan, USN.
Vice Adm. Russell S. Berkey, USN.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grades hereinafter stated.

LIEUTENANTS

Bloomer, Francis W.
Gillis, Arthur W.
Standish, John C.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Chamberlain, Lewis C.
Johnson, Carl M.
Noga, Edward L. S.
Vasey, Charles A.

ENSIGNS

Applegate, Craig
Case, George O.
Gibson, John C.
Havener, Millard F.
Knight, Richard H.
Morgan, Bobby Gene
O'Neil, Gerald P.
Sorge, Monroe B.
Stewart, Donald R.
Winslow, John Arthur

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the grades hereinafter stated.

LIEUTENANT

Chesnut, Luther T., III

ENSIGNS

Cassidy, Earle M.
Collier, James R.
Coyer, Charles B.
Geddis, Paul O.
Mascenik, John (n)
McGuire, Larry C.
Nicholson, Leroy F.
Otto, Carl W.
Walton, Albion W., Jr.

The following-named officer of the Supply Corps of the Navy for permanent appointment in the line of the Navy in the grade hereinafter stated.

ENSIGN

Ryan, Joseph C., Jr.

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

OFFICERS OF THE LINE

Theodore C. Lonnquest
Louis Dreller
David H. Clark
John E. Gingrich
Austin K. Doyle
Thomas H. Robbins, Jr.
William G. Tomlinson
Richard F. Whitehead
Charles Wellborn, Jr.
Daniel V. Gallery, Jr.
Walter F. Boone
Joseph F. Bolger
Oswald S. Colclough

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the line and staff corps of the Navy:

OFFICERS OF THE LINE

Oliver W. Gaines
William L. Pryor, Jr.
Mario G. Vangeli
Willard M. Sweetser
Clarence Broussard
Karl F. Poehlmann
James F. Byrne
William G. Cooper
William L. Anderson
Etheridge Grant
Clarence W. McClusky, Jr.
Wendell F. Kline
Donald L. Mills
Samuel M. Tucker
Clifford H. Duerfeldt
Paul W. Watson
Louis E. French
Clarence O. Taft
Jesse L. Hull
Upton S. Brady, Jr.
Charles N. Day
John F. Greenslade
John A. Winfrey
Theodore R. Frederick
William A. Dolan, Jr.
Theodore C. Aylward
Eugene F. May
William T. Jones
William Miller
William R. Smedberg III
Francis L. Busey

OFFICERS OF THE MEDICAL CORPS

Omar J. Brown
John R. Weisser
Kenneth H. Vinnedge
Milton R. Wirthlin
Thenton D. Bonz

OFFICER OF THE SUPPLY CORPS

Fred L. Haerlin, Jr.

OFFICER OF THE DENTAL CORPS

Clifford E. Allen

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

Franklin A. Hart

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

John T. Walker

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Lawson H. M. Sanderson

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Walter W. Wensinger

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Nate L. Adams II, a citizen of Virginia.
Edwin W. Hakala, a citizen of Michigan.
Lawrence W. Hetrick, a citizen of Ohio.
Donald V. McCloskey, a citizen of California.

The following-named enlisted men to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Rodger I. Eddy
John J. Gates
Edward W. Snelling

The following-named midshipman to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Thomas H. Johnston

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 1, 1948

Maj. Walter Francis Dix, AO50892, United States Air Force.
Lt. Col. Lothar Charles Maurer, AO41332, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Reginald Carl Harmon, AO28736, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Kirk Hamilton Scott, AO50896, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
×Lt. Col. Llewellyn Goode Duggar, AO28799, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Maj. Ralph Wright Totman, AO50899, United States Air Force.
Maj. Wayne Milton Roberts, AO50900, United States Air Force.
Lt. Col. Willard Gardner Barker, AO41387, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. George Merritt Smith, AO28807, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. William Reineman Forbes, AO28808, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
×Col. Rogers Alan Gardner, AO16066, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Walter Grant Bryte, Jr., AO16076, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Edgar Turner Noyes, AO16271, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Walter Llewellyn Wheeler, AO16304, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Norme D. Frost, AO16305, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Linus Dodge Frederick, AO16306, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Milton Miles Murphy, AO16309, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Emory Lee Bruns, AO41391, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Maj. Francis Wilson van der Veer, AO50906, United States Air Force.
Maj. Robert Ernest Osborne, AO50907, United States Air Force.
Maj. Cecil Lloyd Stratten, AO50909, United States Air Force.
Col. Carroll Shaw Miller, AO41395, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Fletcher Pollard Jaquess, AO28817, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Ellis Harold Wilson, AO28821, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Samuel Norman Van Meter, AO41402, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. William McKinley Miles, AO28828, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Harry William Generous, AO28829, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Robert Alstein Rollison, AO50914, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Ronald Francis Wilson, AO39530, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
×Lt. Col. Edward Lee Hurlburt, AO28832, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Edwin Parker Archibald, AO28833, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Edgar Winfrey Gardner, AO38603, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Maj. Francis David Glasheen, AO50915, United States Air Force.
Lt. Col. Robert Jackson Knight, Jr., AO39531, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Raymond Fisher, AO50916, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Kenneth Edwin Turner, AO41407, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Louis Denard Cooper, AO28841, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Samuel Gershon, AO28843, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Francis Colville Myers, AO28846, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Frank Harley Holmes, AO28849, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Raymond Frederick Wiseheart, AO41410, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Lawrence Burnett Rhodes, AO41412, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Donald Plympton Mayhew, AO41413, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Lebbeus Bigelow Woods, AO28853, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. John Fitzpatrick Payne, AO41415, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Siebenaler, AO41417, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Albert Russell Weaver, AO41419, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Julius Wagner Marshall, AO28863, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Albert George Foote, AO39535, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. George Anthony Westphal, AO50920, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Harry Gordon Spillinger, AO28869, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Samuel Wallace Van Meter, AO16383, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Henry Raymond Baxter, AO16461, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Charles Winslow O'Connor, AO16560, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Narcisse Lionel Cote, AO16569, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. George Hall Sparhawk, AO16686, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. John Felix Guillett, AO16570, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Frederick August Bacher, Jr., AO16646, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. F. Edgar Cheatle, AO16663, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Clinton William Davies, AO16690, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Maj. John Dozier, AO50924, United States Air Force.
Lt. Col. Frank James Shannon, Sr., AO41434, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Merle Eugene Parks, AO50925, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Maj. Lewis Welling Jones, AO50926, United States Air Force.
Maj. Jean Paul Harrison, AO28878, United States Air Force.
Lt. Col. Frank Edward Hoffman, AO28881, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Maj. John Franklin Carter, AO39543, United States Air Force.
Lt. Col. Franklin Hornor Colby, AO41445, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Erwin Franklin Gardner, AO41373, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. John James Wilson, AO41446, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Bernard Brice Smith, AO50931, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Maj. Charles Francis Reed, AO39546, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Paul Adkins, AO28891, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Walter Louis Weinaug, AO41450, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Charles Oscar Moody, AO28893, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Gerald Charles Ward, AO50937, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. James Burton Gordon, AO28896, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Maj. Milton Blair Samuel, AO50939, United States Air Force.
Col. Earl Clinton Robbins, AO16714, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Russell Keillor, AO16716, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Richard Andrew Morehouse, AO28898, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Maj. George Edward Percefull, AO50943, United States Air Force.
Maj. Joe Luther Dukes, AO50945, United States Air Force.
Lt. Col. Joseph Wells Jones, AO50946, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Maj. Leroy Gordon Cooper, AO41460, United States Air Force.
Maj. Lowell Emmett Peaster, AO28914, United States Air Force.
Col. Charles Henry Voeller, AO50951, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Bennett Moseley Venable, AO41464, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Gus Benning Hoffman, AO28917, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. William Baily, AO41466, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Bertrand Ellwood Johnson, AO28920, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Lee Bird Washbourne, AO16746, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Kenneth Earl Thiebaud, AO16785, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Robert Lewis Easton, AO16933, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Walter William Gross, AO16983, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. John N Jones, AO16987, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Charles Philip Marstin, AO41468, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Robert Lucas Mason, AO41470, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Nicholas Kane, AO28925, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Maj. George Oren Hanford, AO41471, United States Air Force.
Col. George Richard Geer, AO17014, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Herbert Melvin Newstrom, AO17026, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Ivan Maurice Palmer, AO17030, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Joseph Atticus Morris, AO38611, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Ralph Wendell Crane, AO28931, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Neal James O'Brien, AO41476, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. William Orron Moore, AO39361, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Hampton Ray Kenaston, AO39562, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Paul Ivon Doty, AO28948, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Harley Sanford Jones, AO28952, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Robert Beverley Habersham Rockwell, AO50980, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Clare Wesley Bunch, AO41513, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. John Nicholas Dick, AO39583, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Leroy Gray Heston, AO29002, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Bradford Allen Shaw, AO29007, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Frederick Jensen Dau, AO17077, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. George Raymond Bienfang, AO17162, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Elmer Wentworth Gude, AO17272, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. John Francis Wadman, AO17277, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Marshall Ambler Glasebrook, AO41542, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Solomon Jack Zoller, AO29028, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Paul Anderson Zartman, AO38620, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Frederick Funston, Jr., AO51007, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Melvin Spedden Hollidge, AO38624, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Karl Edward Baumeister, AO29058, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Monroe Thompson Smartt, AO41572, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. George Oscar Bond, AO29066, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Harold Oscar Allison, AO28997, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Bernard Cecil Rose, AO29075, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Donald Menzies Hamilton, AO41580, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Warren Herbert Higgins, AO17387, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Willard Reno Shephard, AO17389, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
×Col. Roland Ogden Strand Akre, AO17403, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Guy Frost Hix, AO17418, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Terrell Edward Phillips, AO29083, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Ira David Snyder, AO29087, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Charles Edward Jost, AO29090, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Sam Williamson Cheyney, AO17438, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Ralph Rhudy, AO17444, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Paul Mueller Jacobs, AO17470, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Robert Wilson Stewart, AO17482, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Richard Irvine Dugan, AO17486, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Edgar Morris Scattergood, Jr., AO29115, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Ward Terry Abbott, AO17515, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Clayton Earl Hughes, AO17536, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Richard Lee Scott, AO17545, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. William Lewis McCulla, AO17580, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. William Gilmer Bowyer, AO17663, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Melle John Coutlee, AO17699, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Luke Bruce Graham, AO17755, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Thomas Richard Lynch, AO17768, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Llewellyn Charles Howell, AO29121, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. William Lewis, Jr., AO33632, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Jerome Brooks McCauley, AO29336, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Philo Orson Rasmusen, AO29354, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Joe A. Bennett, AO29359, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Howard Alton Moody, AO39631, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. David Barlow Lancaster, AO41638, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Glenn Phil Nell, AO39635, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. William Curtis Warren, AO41641, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph Kennedy, AO51078, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Donald Harvey Baxter, AO17925, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Roy Thomas Wright, AO17929, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. John Waldron Egan, AO17948, Air Force of the United States (major U. S. Air Force).
Col. Joseph Wiley Baylor, AO17968, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Albert Meldrum Kuhfeld, AO38663, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Algene Earl Key, AO29397, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Charles Dahl Parr, AO38666, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Lester William Light, AO41682, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. James Edward Reilly, AO39679, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Lawrence Edward Brooks, AO41691, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Gerald Hoyle, AO17994, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Archibald Johnston Hanna, AO18017, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. George Cechmanek, AO38671, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Robert Van Gorder Dunn, AO29428, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Marshall Gordon Lassek, AO38672, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. LeRoy Bartlett, Jr., AO18032, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Charles William Haas, AO18056, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Phillips Waller Smith, AO18112, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Neal Edwin Ausman, AO18137, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. John Brazelton Fillmore Dice, AO18162, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Othel Rochelle Deering, AO18164, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Buford Russell Nyquist, AO18173, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Richards Montgomery Bristol, AO18184, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Gerry Leonard Mason, AO18221, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. H. Paul Dellinger, AO18222, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. William Duncan Stenhouse, AO29444, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Elvin Freestone Maughan, AO18259, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. George Walton Peterson, AO29453, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. James Elmer Mayberry, AO41800, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. John David Howe, AO29459, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Robert James Goewey, AO41801, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. William Stanley Dolan, AO41803, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Marvin Sledge, AO38675, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Stewart Sherman Maxey, AO23620 Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Ethelred Lundy Sykes, AO29494, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Michael Norman Wright McCoy, AO39698, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. William Hardin Lyle, AO41825, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. William Daniel Campbell, AO29498, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Frederick Worgum Eley, AO38679, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. William Edward Rentz, AO41841, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Walter Urbach, AO29527, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. John Mel Schweizer, Jr., AO29554, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. William Hamilton Monay, AO29559, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Tracy Kemp Dorsett, AO41874, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
×Lt. Col. William Charles Kingsbury, AO38694, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Elwin Herklas Eddy, AO18364, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force)
Lt. Col. Roger Willard Moore, AO18370, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Alfred Christian Gay, AO18377, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Joseph Francis Carroll, AO18390, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. A. J. McVea, AO18401, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Frank Pickering Corbin, Jr., AO18402, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. William John Bell, AO18441, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. John Edwin Barr, AO18459, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Louis Augustine Guenther, AO18462, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Jermain Ferdinand Rodenhauser, AO18470, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Millard Chester Young, AO18472, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Force).
Col. Robert Freeman Fulton, AO18484, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. George Frederick Hartman, AO18501, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Carl Wilbert Carlmark, AO18504, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Charles North Howze, AO18506, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Richard Hungerford Wise, AO18507, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Charles Francis Densford, AO18508, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. William Travis Clayton, AO51239, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Irwin Barnard Anderson, AO41900, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Allen Wood Rigsby, AO24289, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Philip Blanchard Foote, AO29596, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Charles Gilbert Kirk, AO29603, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Rex James Elmore, AO51251, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Valentine A. Rutherford, AO51253, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Kenneth William Mosher, AO29617, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Charles Wesley Schott, AO23632, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Aram Sanekerim Tootelain, AO41924, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Norman Louis Callish, AO29636, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Marshall Allen Elkins, AO29639, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Dross Ellis, AO29643, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Curtis Morgan Anderson, AO29648, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Leonard Prine Kleinoeder, AO29655, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Ralph . red Gallogly, AO51280, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. James Harvey Rothrock, AO29663, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Chester Grant Martz, AO41993, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
×Col. John Riley Kane, AO29680, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Robert Bradford Richard, AO29682, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. William Douglas Hopson, AO29686, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Orville Laird, AO29699, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. William Walter Holmes, AO29716, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Jerome Lester Loewenberg, AO42035, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
×Col. Frank Junior MacNees, AO29942, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Lester Maxwell Taylor, AO29722, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Earl Harold Jacobsen, AO29723, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. John Francis Babcock, AO38717, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Troy William Crawford, AO39778, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. William Gaston Davis, AO29752, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Arthur Hanson, AO42063, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Francis Ray Hoehl, AO18665, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Stanley Ronald Stewart, AO18675, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
×Col. Torgils Grimkel Wold, AO18705, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Benjamin Jepson Webster, AO18714, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. James Forsyth Thompson, Jr., AO18717, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Harry Cecil Porter, AO18746, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Merle Robbins Williams, AO18320, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Nicholas Earnest Powel, AO18823, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Albert Edward Stoltz, AO18839, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Walden Bernald Coffey, AO18858, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. James Richard Nuzum, Jr., AO29764, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Charles Arthur Miller, AO29768, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Einar Axel Malmstrom, AO29775, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S Air Force).
Lt. Col. Jerome Davis Giddens, AO42083, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Fred Clemons Slagle, AO29779, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Howard Lee Halsey, AO29785, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Frank John Seiler, AO29791, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Alexander Stuart Young, AO42097, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Donald Casper Sloan, AO42106, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Theron Herman Whitneybell, AO38729, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Fred Oscar Easley, Jr., AO29832, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. James Fred McClendon, AO29834, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Aaron Lowell Johnson, AO42129, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. George Stewart Cassady, AO29861, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Richard William Henderson, AO29879, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Roscoe Townley Nichols, Jr., AO29883, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Carl Allen Addington, AO29884, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Joseph Francis Delaney, AO29913, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Carlos John Cochrane, AO29932, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Otto Gerhard Quanrud, AO29940, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Cecil Parker Lessig, AO29947, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. William Hogan Clark, AO29732, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Herbert Nathan Cowles, AO29960, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Platt Linn Welker, AO29935, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Bernard Card, AO18980, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Thomas Allen Glass, AO18997, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. William Livingston Travis, AO19009, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Edward Joseph Hale, AO19018, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. John Glenn Armstrong, AO19029, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Vernon Cleveland Smith, AO19051, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Harry Stephen Bishop, AO19055, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Frederic Henry Fairchild, AO19062, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
×Col. Edward Deane Marshall, AO19092, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Harry Nelson Burkhalter, Jr., AO19106, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Douglas Moore Cairns, AO19129, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. John Martin Breit, AO19171, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Leo Harold Heintz, AO19177, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Victor Haller King, AO19184, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Corwin Paul Vansant, AO19199, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Alton Alexander Denton, AO19219, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Richard Thomas King, Jr., AO19232, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Roland Arthur Elliott, Jr., AO19234, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Karl Truesdell, Jr., AO19258, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Millard Loren Haskin, AO19274, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Richard Mattern Montgomery, AO19289, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Herbert Aubertin Bott, AO29995, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Earl Johnson Nesbitt, AO30002, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Clyde Daniel Gasser, AO30005, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Col. Philip Senter Robbins, AO30007, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).
Lt. Col. Francis Harold Monahan, AO51442, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Woodward Berkeley Mann, AO30012, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Charles Chambers, AO30013, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Anthony Helm, AO29597, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Taylor Thurman, AO26374, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Eaton Rankin, AO30052, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Durham Smith, Jr., AO30057, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Elmer Jung, AO42298, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Roger Taube, AO30132, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Gilmore Vincent Minnis, AO30139, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Theodore Albert Fuller, AO30141, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Millard Archibald Libby, AO30153, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Clifford Jensen, AO30155, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lewis Olinger, AO30182, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wilfred James Smith, AO42370, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Maxwell Williams, AO30199, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Haskell Erva Neal, AO30202, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph D. Croft Caldara, AO30226, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Vernon Jones, Jr., AO30229, Air Force of the United States (captain U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harris Benjamin Hull, AO30230, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orville Ernest Mohler, AO51530, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Orlin Butler, Jr., AO39915, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Neil Gray, AO42415, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Jones Schofield, AO42416, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Burroughs Cary, AO19352, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Carter Ashworth, AO19362, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Walter Moore, AO19376, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Curtis Delano Sluman, AO19378, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Sebastian Stone, AO19384, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Loveland Rogers, AO19388, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Bernard Dany, AO19389, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawson S. Moseley, Jr., AO19393, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jean Paul Craig, AO19395, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Leslie Crystal, Jr., AO19400, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frederic Wood Barnes, AO19401, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Jack Holzapfel, Jr., AO19409, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gene Huggins Tibbets, AO19431, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Tompkins Hanley, AO19435, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Edward Shuck, AO19436, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John dePeyster Townsend Hills, AO19443, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. William Monte Canterbury, AO19451, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Edward Blair 2d, AO19454, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles John Bondley, Jr., AO19462, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dale Orville Smith, AO19465, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Perry Bruce Griffith, AO19478, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wilson Hawkes Neal, AO19496, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elvin Seth Ligon, Jr., AO19497, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Burton Winkle, AO19501, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Monroe Hutchison, AO19508, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arno Herman Luehman, AO19513, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Lawrence Barton, AO19514, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Judson Reeves, AO19523, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Harvey Wise, AO19527, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Andrew Legg, AO19528, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harvey Thompson Ainess, AO19531, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Theodore Wilson, Jr., AO19543, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John William White, AO19550, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Lafayette Inman, AO19559, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stanley Joseph Donovan, AO19560, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Edward Barzynski, Jr., AO19595, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bruce Harley Perry, AO42435, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Claude Bryant Thompson, AO30276, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Channing Ernest Beasley, AO42476, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Thomas Quirk, AO42483, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Emmett Buckner Cassady, AO42493, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Christian Dale Kauffman, AO42497, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Luther Moran Bivins, AO51588, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Arthur McKerley, AO51593, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Berthold Eugene Nowotny, AO30388, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Stolle, AO42542, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ned Baker Chase, AO30395, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benjamin Grad Holzman, AO30412, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marion Daniel Unruh, AO42573, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James William Smith, AO42594, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lee William Fulton, AO30465, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Van Henry Albertson, AO42600, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Ovid Newell, AO51631, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Francis DeVos, AO30502, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Joseph Shower, AO19714, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Wallis Hickman, AO19718, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leighton Ira Davis, AO19721, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Van Gorder Wilson, AO19744, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Kimball Brown, Jr., AO19758, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Morris Stillman, AO19760, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Elmer Ellsworth, AO19767, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Gordon Russell, AO19795, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Paul Bergquist, AO19802, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Allison Fickel, AO19809, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Downs Eugene Ingram, AO19813, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Howard Walsh, AO19824, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willis Fred Chapman, AO19832, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Henderson Baynes, AO19835, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Aaron Warner Tyer, AO19847, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. German Pierce Culver, AO19855, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Morris, AO19869, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Carlton Boys, AO19876, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lamont Saxton, AO19896, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Orin Houston Moore, AO19909, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Cebern Musgrave, Jr., AO19916, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Thomas Joseph Gent, Jr., AO19927, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Pelham Davis Glassford, Jr., AO19937, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Hollis Strauss, AO19940, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Maurice Monroe Simons, AO19941, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Roberts, AO19963, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Curtis Thompson, AO19978, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel Barcus Knowles, Jr., AO19979, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Baird Buck, AO19981, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Dale Franklin Pocock, AO30508, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ray Willard Clifton, AO19987, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Randolph Lowry Wood, AO19988, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arnold Theodore Johnson, AO19989, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Frederick Stalder, AO19991, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Noel Francis Parrish, AO19992, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dolf Edward Muehleisen, AO19993, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Swyter, AO19994, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Cole Weller, AO19995, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Morris Gavin, AO19996, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Edward Jarmon, AO19997, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Neff Moyers, AO20000, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Bynum Stanley, AO20003, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clarence Morice Sartain, AO20005, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Hughes Price, AO20006, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Caruthers Moore, AO20007, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Scott Fulwider, AO20008, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lester Stanford Harris, AO20009, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Newman Wackwitz, AO20011, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clair Lawrence Wood, AO20014, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Bennett Harvin, AO20015, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bob Arnold, AO20017, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Burton Wilmot Armstrong, Jr., AO20018, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Lee Neely, AO20020, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Erickson Snowden Nichols, AO20021, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jasper Newton Bell, AO20022, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Russell Lee Waldron, AO20023, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Foster Day, Jr., AO20024, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Daniel Edwin Hocks, AO20027, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Patten Todd, AO20028, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Glenn Workman, AO20499, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Owen Brown, AO20042, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clayton Baxter Claassen, AO20045, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Thomas Hudnell, AO20046, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Lawrence Kreider, AO20047, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Oman Neal, AO20048, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Agnew Sebastian, AO19561, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Vincent Thomas Cannon, AO42660, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walden Alexius Sundell, AO30562, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ralph Irwin Williams, AO51679, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Holmes Congdon, AO39695, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Herbert McCann, AO30574, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edward J. Hopkins, AO30587, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Harmon Lewis, AO30589, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Albert Milton, AO30620, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Rollo McNitt, AO30625, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Collins, Jr., AO30630, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. C. Pratt Brown, AO30638, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Russell Vaughn Ritchey, AO30369, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jack Eugene Thomas AO30644, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Xavier Krebs, AO30645, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Donald Neely, AO42720, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert Abe Shumsky, AO42732, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Durson Forman, AO30672, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Thomas Black, AO30573, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Allen Adams, AO42761, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alban Boardman Ogden, Jr., AO40024, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ellery David Preston, Jr., AO30706, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. David Spinx Blackwell, AO38636, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Elmer Van Ness Schuyler, AO30770, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Louis Clark, AO30781, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joe Kennith McNay, AO30786, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Winzer Davis, AO51802, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Gifford Norman, AO30800, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Oliver Garfield Haywood, Jr., AO20113, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cecil Edward Combs, AO20121, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Barnard Stewart, AO20126, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benjamin Oliver Davis, Jr., AO20146, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gordon Harrison Austin, AO20161, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jay Dean Rutledge, Jr., AO20164, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Frederick Frost, AO20166, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Dean Gapen, AO20175, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howell Marion Estes, Jr., AO20183, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Knox Arnold, Jr., AO20188, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton Dermott Vincent, AO20189, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Henry Carmichael, AO20203, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Walter Gillespie, AO20206, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Rutland Gunn, Jr., AO20207, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nicholas Tate Perkins, AO20210, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col Albert Patton Clark, Jr., AO20218, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Richard Kelly, AO20225, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norman Calvert Spencer, Jr., AO20228, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick Reynolds Terrell, AO20230, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Bernard Tyler, Jr., AO20232, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fredrick Bell, AO20233, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Milton McCorkle, AO20239, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Denton Cairnes, AO20247, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wilfred Henry Tetley, AO20252, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Walter Twaddell, Jr., AO20254, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col William Russell Grohs, AO20255, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Swinton Steele, AO20260, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Milton Bartella, AO20261, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton Utterback True, AO20271, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Turner Clifton Rogers, AO20272, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Paul Champion, AO20279, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Garnett Lee, Jr., AO20308, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Warren Newcomb Wildrick, AO20323, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Von Roy Shores, Jr., AO20335, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Ellerbe Covington, AO20336, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Rigden Van Dickson, AO20350, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clark Lewis Hosmer, AO20356, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Wesley Jones, AO20358, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph James Nazzaro, AO20364, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edmund Whritner Miles, AO20371, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Levere Kimball, AO20372, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Samuel Holmes, Jr., AO20379, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wallace Conrad Barrett, AO20381, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Conrad Francis Necrason, AO20384, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Victor Hermann Wagner, AO20385, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Philip Holden Best, AO30817, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Martin Menter, AO30826, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William James Cummings, Jr., AO31325, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles James Lester, AO40058, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Grady MacDaniel, AO31359, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bernard M. Wootton, AO42916, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Henry Curtis, AO31383, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Lt. Col. Marvin Maxwell Harvey, AO31390, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Lt. Col. Roland Ellsworth Sliker, AO31393, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Godfrey T. McHugh, AO31403, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Berton Root, AO20459, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Melville Brown, AO20462, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herman Alfred Schmid, AO20464, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Paushi Hopwood, AO20449, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Arthur DeMarco, AO20451, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Day Lee, Jr., AO20434, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leslie Raybold, AO20457, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wilbur Walter Aring, AO20458, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Oscar Guthrie, AO20425, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Phillip Hollstein, AO20426, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Lindley Randolph, AO20424, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Homer Astley Boushey, AO20438, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Orville Darrow, AO20429, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Austin Gunn, AO20443, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Leslie Rivard, AO20422, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Henry Miller, Jr., AO20416, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Allen Hilger, AO20437, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Clinton Coddington, AO20452, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Richardson Cook, AO20420, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Engberg Todd, AO20453, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis William Proper, AO20460, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Charles Rockwood, AO20435, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Tom Jefferson Cunningham, AO20432, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Henry Gist, Jr., AO20430, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Ross Robertson, Jr., AO20463, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Stanley Holtoner, AO20423, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Clyde Selser, Jr., AO20427, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Douglas Ellsworth Williams, AO20455, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lewis Leo Mundell, AO20417, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brooke Empie Allen, AO20465, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Beaumont Cornett, AO20446, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Hal Jeffus, AO20419, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Boyd Hubbard, Jr., AO20431, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norman Lewis Peterson, AO20450, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Victor Raymond Haugen, AO20433, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hilmer Cannon Nelson, AO20439, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Parker Fisher, AO20461, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Windeck Hall, AO20454, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Howard Dane, AO20466, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Graves Hubbard Snyder, AO20418, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chester Witten Cecil, Jr., AO20440, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Markward Reynolds, AO20448, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Wester Luker, AO31417, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Augustus Maine Minton, AO42941, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Iddings Fletcher, AO31429, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Henry Mackey Smith, AO42956, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Virgil Floyd Fairfax, AO38906, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Allen Gardner, AO31452, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Bernard Hohman, AO42977, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Bohn, AO42992, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Oliver Tillman Simpson, Jr., AO38912, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Cobb Mallary, AO43017, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walter George William Clatanoff, AO40159, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Lt. Col. Miles Howlett Thompson, AO20555, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Emmett Murchison Tally, Jr., AO31545, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson Curbo, Jr., AO43065, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Samuel LeNoir Moise, AO51899, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Bruin Ocamb, AO31605, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Orrin Beckwith, Jr., AO31611, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Leofric Temple, AO31613, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Alexander Gunn 3d, AO31616, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Norman Donohew, AO20574, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Dudley Stevenson, AO20583, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nils Olof Ohman, AO20586, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Lawrence Holcomb, AO20587, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Ray Clingerman, Jr., AO20591, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Asher Burtis Robbins, Jr., AO20596, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Eckman, AO20602, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Noel Snouffer, AO20607, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Phillip Klocko, AO20608, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Francis Batjer, AO20627, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Sayre Wade, AO20631, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Gordon Eriksen, AO20635, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert William Griffin, AO20641, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Risley Barden, AO20644, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Allen Russell, Jr., AO20645, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard William Fellows, AO20655, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Whiteford Carlisle Mauldin, AO20659, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bruce Keener Holloway, AO20664, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Arthur Preston, AO20673, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ivan Wilson McElroy, AO20677, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Kienle Horrigan, AO20678, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alan Doane Clark, AO20683, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Hensey Herman, AO20686, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Linscott Aldin Hall, AO20691, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Richard Ostrander, AO20697, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Caldwell McDowell, AO20709, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Young Parker, AO20712, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sam Wilkerson Agee, AO20714, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Taylor, 3d, AO20715, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Thomas Shields, AO20722, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Curtis Raymond Low, AO20732, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Borden Broadhurst, AO20744, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Bainbridge Westover, AO20746, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel Charles Gurney, Jr., AO20753, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harvey Charles Dorney, AO20755, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Paul William Scheidecker, AO20764, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Junious Harrison, AO20776, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Emmett McDonald, AO20778, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Russell Ulricson, AO20783, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Lt. Col. Lawrence Augustus Spilman, AO20785, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Grover Hipps, AO20787, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph George Focht, AO20791, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marshall Randolph Gray, AO20792, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Augustin Mitchell Prentiss, Jr., AO20796, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Woodrow William Dunlop, AO20814, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Oliver Sanborn, AO20819, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Joseph Cain, Jr., AO20833, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Malcolm Green, Jr., AO20836, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles William Stark, AO20839, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Morton David Magoffin, AO20847, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Ragland Maxwell, AO20849, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Theo Posey, AO20850, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wesley Skilton Calverley, AO20854, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leo Belton Smith, AO40189, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur Howland Baker, Jr., AO20873, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George William Croker, AO20910, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willard Wright Smith, AO20911, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hart Hanson, AO20912, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Jenkins Huddleston, AO31657, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Neywood Hutchings Roberdeau, AO31658, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Earle Teal, AO40197, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel McClure Smith, AO31667, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Lafayette Musgrave, AO43358, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Nelson Ewbank, Jr., AO31702, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James William Thomson, AO43376, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Audley Thorpe, AO43379, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Alban Gibbs, AO20932, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leon Howard McCurdy, AO31733, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Morgan Thomas, AO31750, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Daniel Martin Harvey, AO31759, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Herman Blase, AO31770, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Robert Orr, AO43427, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Daniel Graham Hawes, AO31782, Air Force of the United States (captain U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carlton Julian Martin, AO43460, Air Force of the United States (captain, United States Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Lester Hamrick, AO31838, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Louis Gordon Thorup, AO31847, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Chaney Segrist, AO43478, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Barton Morrow Russell, AO31850, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Johnnie Radford Dyer, AO40253, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Joseph Friedman, AO31870, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Carl Woodrow Andrews, AO31671, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Douglas Howder, AO40256, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frederick Mauger O'Neill, AO31873, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John William Oberdorf, AO52168, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clinton Douglass Bannister Smith, AO43545, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Pierce Hall, AO31927, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Hall Waller, Jr., AO31947, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Edward Herrelko, AO31960, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Allen Breitweiser, AO21055, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Theodore Preuss, AO21060, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harold Killian Kelley, AO21068, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Brett Kieffer, AO21075, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leo Vernon Harman, AO21077, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Marshall Batterson, Jr., AO21082, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Kenneth Skaer, AO21091, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Prescott Miner Spicer, AO21093, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Leland Crouch, Jr., AO21100, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Craddock Coleman, AO21104, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roy Cleveland Heflebower, Jr., AO21112, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sherwood Ernest Buckland, AO21115, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Dale Ryan, AO31177, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert Peterson Sights, Jr., AO21123, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Omar Ellsworth Knox, AO21125, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Pleasants Sturdivant, AO21140, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Earl Johnson, Jr., AO21146, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Doan Kenzie, AO21149, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph York, AO21151, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bertram Cowgill Harrison, AO21152, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Keith Kincaid, AO21157, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clifford Field Macomber, AO21158, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Douglas Clinton Polhamus, AO21164, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Edward Coira, AO21166, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Robert Lee Snider, AO21168, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ashley Burdett Packard, AO21169, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Ward Saunders, AO21172, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Peek Brett, AO21174, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Herbert Spangler, AO21183, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Horace Chavasse, AO21187, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Charles Huglin, AO21183, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Cornelius Morrison, AO21191, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Franklin Bromiley, AO21199, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Raymond Lemon, AO21201, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Virgil Lee Zoller, AO21205, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Carleton McBride, AO21206, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Neil David Van Sickle, AO21209, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Cozart Pitchford, AO21210, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Robert Hawes, AO21220, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hugh Blanchard, AO21223, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Castex Paul Conner, AO21224, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hugh Douglas Wallace, AO21232, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Rhea Luper, AO21240, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carter Eugene Duncan, AO21242, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Murray Dean, AO21245, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Henry Frederick, Jr., AO21262, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Vincent Morgan Miles, Jr., AO21264, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Breece Wells, AO21266, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harris Edward Rogner, AO21269, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roy Ray Brischetto, AO21278, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gibson Emerson Sisco, Jr., AO21281, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Elam Sims, AO21282, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Mathes Young, AC21292, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Merrick Bayer, AO21294, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Littleton James Pardue, AO21300, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wallace Stafford Ford, AO21312, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Joseph Claude Reddoch, Jr., AO21315, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Horace Isbell, AO21350, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Beddie Coleman, AO21352, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Felix Moses Hardison, AO21354, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Monroe Means, AO21358, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Danville Brown, AO21384, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Philip Leber, Jr., AO21388, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Michael Joseph Coffield, AO21394, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Waymond Austin Davis, AO21397, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Henry Dalton, Jr., AO21400, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Ray Kilgore, AO21402, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henley Vedder Bastin, Jr., AO21403, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Shepard Chickering, AO21405, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Guy Leonard Hudson, Jr., AO21407, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Robert Carl Orth, AO21412, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George William Prentice, AO32000, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walter Erath Arnold, AO32458, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Mark Everett Hubbard, AO32026, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walter Moore Bridgers, AO38960, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hugh Harcourt Master, AO43646, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. James Joseph Stone, Jr., AO32052, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Lewis Jones, AO21484, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Madison West, Jr., AO21486, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Dodge Shoemaker, AO21487, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Alvin Roubal Luedecke, AO21488, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Russell Spicer, AO21489, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willard Van Deman Brown, AO21490, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Haldane Councill, AO21492, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Ray Kreps, AO21493, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Peter Havens Remington, AO21494, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Blaine Ballit Campbell, AO21497, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Morris Henry Shedd, AO21498, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Mayhue Delbert Blaine, AO21500, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Fish Nichols, AO21501, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Beeton Klein, AO21502, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marion Malcolm, AO21503, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick Lawrence Moore, AO21504, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Emlen Marion, AO21505, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ben Ivan Funk, AO21506, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard William Simons, AO21508, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Spencer Hardy, AO21510, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Louis Donicht, AO21512, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ladson Green Eskridge, Jr., AO21514, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Harry Matthews, AO21515, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ryder Waldo Finn, AO21516, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Franklin Hardy, AO21517, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Wietzel Zehrung, AO21519, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Jenkins Pierce, AO21520, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Francis Worden, AO21521, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Bradford Baker, AO21523, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Reed Volin, AO21525, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. T. Alan Bennett, AO21526, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Garfield Thorne, Jr., AO21527, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Baskin Reid Lawrence, Jr., AO21529, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sam Philippe Triffy, AO21530, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Earl Bernard Young, AO21531, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Mason Reid, AO21533, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bernard Adolf Schriever, AO21536, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Ernest Watson, AO21537, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cy Wilson, AO21538, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Craven Clark Rogers, AO21539, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Lewis Curry, AO21540, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Audrin Rotha Walker, AO21541, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Calvin Ely Peeler, AO21542, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold S. Ecklund, AO21544, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Kay Martin, AO21545, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. John Beverly Montgomery, AO21546, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Allen Way, AO21548, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Ferguson, AO21549, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Brewer Keese, AO21550, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Frederick Hunker, AO21551, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Bell David, AO21554, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Francis Burnham, AO21555, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clyde Box, AO21556, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chris Henry William Rueter, AO21558, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Horace Armor Shepard, AO21559, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Louis Wilhelm, Junior, AO21560, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Franklin Kendall Paul, AO21562, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ben Allen Mason, Junior, AO21563, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raleigh Hunter Macklin, AO21564, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Graeme Stewart Bond, AO21565, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marcus Fleming Cooper, AO21566, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Victor Schwanbeck, AO21567, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Melville Caldwell, AO21568, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Joseph Abbott Thomas, AO21569, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elbert David Reynolds, AO21570, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Sheldon Garman, AO21571, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Ernest Frederick Wackwitz, Jr., AO21572, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Christian Demler, AO21573, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cecil Hampton Childre, AO21574, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jacob Jerval Brogger, AO21575, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Irvine Alfred Rendle, AO21576, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Junius Waldo Dennison, Jr., AO21577, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Wilbur Keating, AO21580, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Sutton Brewer, AO21581, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Irving Lewis Branch, AO21582, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Charles Carlson, Jr., AO21586, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Eades, AO21587, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald William Eisenhart, AO21588, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sam Maddux, Jr., AO21589, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Lewis Polifka, AO21590, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Reed Stewart, AO21591, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Klahr McNown, AO21592, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert William Ryder, AO21595, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Avelin Paul Tacon, Jr., AO21598, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Conrad Joe Herlick, AO21599, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Evart Wilbur Hedlund, AO21600, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Franklin Helmick, AO21601, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Loughery Johnston, AO21603, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James John Roberts, Jr., AO21604, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Atwood Walker, Jr., AO21605, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur William Schmitt, Jr., AO21606, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Ray Martin, AO21608, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Edward Glaser, AO21609, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Franklin Strickland, AO21613, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Ovide Bordelon, AO21618, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clyde Charles Harris, Jr., AO21620, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jean Rogers Byerly, AO21621, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward George Kiehle, AO21624, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Eugene Bates, Jr., AO21625, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. David Wade, AO21627, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. J. Francis Taylor, Jr., AO21628, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Wilford Maschmeyer, AO21629, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ray Hamilton Martin, AO21632, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick John Sutterlin, AO21633, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Murray Alston Bywater, AO21634, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Delmar Edmond Wilson, AO21635, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joshua Thomas Winstead, Jr., AO21636, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Duncan Jones, AO21637, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Haywood Beverly, AO21638, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Edward Schaetzel, AO21640, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Grenville Huish, AO21641, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Claude Edwin Putnam, Jr., AO21642, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Carl Woltz, AO21645, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Edwin Rouse, AO21648, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vernon Lake Stintzi, AO21650, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clarence Theodore Edwinson, AO21651, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Carroll Cochran, AO21653, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Whitmell, Tompkins Rison, AO21656, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leslie Ethridge Martin, AO21658, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gwen Grover Atkinson, AO21660, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harold Michael Keeffe, AO21661, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Wesseler Bicking, AO21662, Air Force of United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Fred Edward Hild, AO32063, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Mark Curtis Bane, Jr., AO32078, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Vincent William Howard, AO46320, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Holliday Chick, AO32567, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Byron Manning Sansom, Jr., AO32095, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Hewitt Terrell Wheless, AO32096, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Glynn Poff, AO32100, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leslie Wallace Holman, AO32102, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Screven Bond, Jr., AO40330, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Patrick Gerrity, AO32147, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Rader Powell, AO32151, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leonard Thomason Nicholson, AO32157, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Eugene Kofahl, AO32162, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kyle Loyd Riddle, AO32161, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Wendell Moore, AO32165, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Thornal Compton, AO32174, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert George Ruegg, AO32183, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Morris Brown, Jr., AO32186, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ola Paul Thorne, AO32207, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glen Robbins Birchard, AO32217, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Leonard Johnson, AO32221, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Howell Starbuck, AO32228, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sydney Thomas Smith, AO43803, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Oscar Reynold Schaaf, AO32262, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Arnold Delahay, AO32266, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Johnson Pugh, AO32269, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Elmer George Prohaska, AO43833, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Edgar Goldsworthy, AO32283, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Loren George McCollom, AO32298, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Narce Whitaker, AO38985, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ralph Buchert, AO32336, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hugh O'Neill McTague, AO32340, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. William Staats Rader, AO32342, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Delmer Joseph Rogers, AO21740, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Spoor Samuel, AO21742, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roscoe Campbell Crawford, Jr., AO21752, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Yount Jumper, AO21763, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Crandall Newcomer, AO21770, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph George Perry, AO21771, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Harriman Curtin, AO21773, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Norman James McGowan, AO21778, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Josephus Alan Bowman, AO21785, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Benjamin Miller, AO21787, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Wilson Carpenter 3d, AO21790, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wayne Laverne O'Hern, AO21793, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Edmund Howard, Jr., AO21806, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adam Kirk Breckenridge, AO21815, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roland Wallace Boughton, Jr., AO21816, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Arthur McDavid, AO21817, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Crenshaw Pulliam, AO21824, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Rufus Hardy Holloway, AO21826, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Allen Forrest Herzberg, AO21827, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Riggs Sullivan, Jr., AO21830, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Lawrence Dickman, AO21833, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Paul Joseph Long, AO21834, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Hillhouse, AO21838, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roger Edwards Phelan, AO21842, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Merwyn Wray, AO21843, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Andrew John Kinney, AO21845, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Allen Romig, AO21856, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orin Henry Rigley, Jr., AO21861, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Elbert Owen Meals, AO21872, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin John Latoszewski, AO21875, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Daniel Curtin, AO21888, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Wallace Iseman, Jr., AO21889, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Barclay Knapp, AO21890, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil Cerel McFarland, AO21894, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benoid Earl Glawe, AO21902, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Carver Sears, AO21906, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Evans Greer, AO21910, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Shepler Ward Fitzgerald, Jr., AO21912, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Roy Little, AO21917, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Leslie Evans, Jr., AO21925, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Steele Morrison, AO21951, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Bernard Whitehouse, AO21958, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Daniel Farrington Tatum, AO21959, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Gordon Lycan, AO21968, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Wallace Roger Zethren, AO21970, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Strother Banks Hardwick, Jr., AO21973, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Charlwood Richardson, 3d, AO21975, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Brereton Bestic, AO21976, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Ursan Brombach, AO21978, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elliott Vandevanter, Jr., AO21989, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Winston Bailey, AO21991, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Mercer Higginson, AO22003, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jack Gordon Merrell, AO22004, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Stein Boyd, AO22012, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Thomas Smith, AO22014, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alfred Virgil Walton, AO22020, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Lee McDowell, Jr., AO22029, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ray Joseph Will, AO22030, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert John Rogers, AO22032, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Perry Milo Hoisington 2d, AO22044, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Salvatore Edward Nanzo, AO22053, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leonard Neil Palmer, AO22055, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Kemp Martin, AO22061, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Royce Gideon, Jr., AO22064, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Prentiss Davis Wynne, Jr., AO22084, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ellsworth Reily Jacoby, AO22089, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Vincent Reardon, AO22111, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Theodore Kingsley, Jr., AO22112, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Lt. Col. John Christian Habecker, AO22117, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Carlos Edwards, AO22131, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Louis McCoy, AO22141, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Willard Barber Atwell, Jr., AO22142, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Manly Walton, Jr., AO22145, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Peter Schmid, AO22156, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lewis Wilson Stocking, AO22160, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Matthew James McKeever, Jr., AO22161, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Walter Wilson, AO22174, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Milton Bernard Adams, AO22178, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ronald Fredric Fallows, AO32382, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Sterling Leland, AO43930, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Henry Berkenkamp, AO43932, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Byron Benjiman Webb, AO22197, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Bruce Miller, Jr., AO22220, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dale Donald Brannon, AO22226, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Thomas Crimmins, Jr., AO22242, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Batchelder Fletcher, AO22243, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Leonard McNickle, AO22249, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Weeks Ingenhutt, AO32424, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brooks Albert Lawhon, AO32446, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Bayzand Selm, Jr., AO32448, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oswald Weeks Lunde, AO32454, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Franklin Bronson, Jr., AO22324, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elbert Helton, AO22325, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Viccellio, AO22326, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Colbert Gray, Jr., AO22327, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Lowell Wassell, AO22329, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Osmond Jay Ritland, AO22332, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Victor Lenvik Anderson, AO22339, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joe Gordon Schneider, AO22340, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bourne Adkison, AO22342, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harold Douglas Courtney, AO22343, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Benjamin Greene, Jr., AO22344, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Kenneth Crain, AO22345, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Loring Franklin Stetson, Jr., AO22346, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glendon Philip Overing, AO22347, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oscar Allen Heinlein, AO22348, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Emanuel Eubank, Jr., AO22349, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edward Greer, AO22352, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hubert Zemke, AO22353, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Thomas Kight, AO22356, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William John Bohnaker, AO22357, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Crawford McGehee, AO22358, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jo Kyle Warner, AO22359, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Stephen Chennault, AO22360, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Leroy Robinson, AO22362, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Herbert Snavely, AO22364, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Edward Northcutt, AO22365, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clarence Arthur Neely, AO22366, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Alton Cheney, AO22370, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Allison Pechuls, AO22372, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Lynn Sullivan, AO22375, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hiette Sinclair Williams, Jr., AO22378, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Delaway Stevers, AO22379, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Carlyle Nye, AO22380, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Columbus Agan, Jr., AO22381, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Gordon Ford, AO22382, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lee Bannerman Coats, AO22383, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Air Force).

Col. Murray William Crowder, Jr., AO22385, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edwin Basye, AO22386, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wayne Earl Thurman, AO22390, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Miles Ramage, AO22391, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Coupland, AO22392, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Quentin Timson Quick, AO22393, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Beverly Howard Warren, AO22394, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Van Hatton Slayden, AO22395, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Wilbur Anderson, Jr., AO22398, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Daniel Aynesworth, AO22399, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Erwin Elder, AO22402, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hervey Haydon Whitfield, AO22405, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edgar Davis, Jr., AO22406, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Hodder Gibson, AO22410, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Jay Barrett, AO22411, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Walter Ohlke, AO22415, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Vernon DeShazo, AO22417, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Bream Diehl, AO22418, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chester Lee Sluder, AO22419, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald James French, AO22422, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Julian Marian Bleyer, AO22423, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Frederick Setchell, AO22428, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Theodore Barthelmess, AO22429, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Donald Stuart Dunlap, AO22432, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bruce Burns Price, AO22434, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Duane Louis Kime, AO22435, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Arnold Tate, AO22437, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Allman Tenney Culbertson, AO22440, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Wesley Hughes, AO22442, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Roes Greening, AO22443, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Walter Gray, AO22447, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Norman Luellen Ballard, AO22448, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Clyde Bagby, AO22449, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leonard Boston Storm, AO22451, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Bosworth Darling, Jr., AO22453, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Austin Ames, AO22454, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Julian Mason, AO22456, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Paul Fulcher, AO22457, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hugh Boyd Manson, Jr., AO22460, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Stanley Emrick, AO22461, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. A. J. Bird, Jr., AO22463, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Stoll Zipp, AO22465, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Estes Moore, AO22466, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edgar Wade Hampton, AO22468, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Richard Rowland, AO22470, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Albert Rouse, AO22472, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Allen Kurtz, AO22473, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Rector Hughes, Jr., AO22480, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James William Chapman, Jr., AO22481, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. David Mudgett Jones, AO22482, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Warren Philbrick, AO22483, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clair Arthur Peterson, AO22484, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Stanley Anthony Zidiales, AO22485, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bingham Trigg Kleine, AO22486, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hubbert Cleveland, AO22487, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Benjamin Reed, AO22488, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Dean Berry, AO22490, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theron Coulter, AO22491, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton Curtis Wasem, AO22493, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Phillip Henry Greasley, AO22497, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cyrus William Kitchens, Jr., AO22499, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Troy Keith, AO22504, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Henry Schwartz, Jr., AO22506, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Bennett Putnam, AO22508, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brian O'Neill, AO22509, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Colonel John Timothy Fitzwater, AO22510, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gladwyn Earl Pinkston, AO22511, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oliver George Cillini, AO22517, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Henry MacDonald, AO22518, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Kelly, AO22519, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur William Kellond, AO22520, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Broadus Beene Taylor, AO22522, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Monty Duran Wilson, AO22523, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Ray DeBolt, AO22525, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Joseph Harold Moore, AO22527, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank B. James, AO22529, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Theodore Wightman Tucker, AO22530, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Frank Rudell, AO22532, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph William Rodieck, AO22533, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Norton Harding Van Sickien 3d, AO22534, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Gardner Chandler, Jr., AO22537, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Vandenburgh Endress, AO22538, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Air Force).

Col. William Sydnor Barksdale, Jr., AO22539, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Danforth Van Auken, AO22540, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Edwin Roberts, AO22541, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leland Stanford McGowan, AO22542, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Carpenter Averill, AO22543, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Keith Karl Compton, AO22545, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack William Saunders, AO22546, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Christopher Otho Moffett, AO22548, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Eugene Dougherty, AO22550, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Paul Christian Droz, AO22552, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Baird Tipton, AO22554, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Affleck Dunning, AO22556, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Lee Strickland, AO22557, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dalene Edward Bailey, AO22558, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clemens Kieffer Wurzbach, AO22562, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Pinkham Smith, AO22563, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William David Gilchrist, AO22566, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Deilinger Dick, AO22569, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. J. C. Bailey, AO22571, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Valentine Edmundson, AO22573, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adam Joseph Heintz, AO22575, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vincent George Huston, AO22576, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Joseph Holt, AO22577, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ansel James Wheeler, AO22580, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Guy Hamilton Rockey, AO22581, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leo Francois Dusard, Jr., AO22585, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col, John Kenton Hester, AO22586, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Blake Young, AO22589, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Milton Wade, AO22592, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Renwick Nevitt, AO22595, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Giannatti, AO22599, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Richard Anderson, AO22600, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Milton Herbert Ashkins, AO22604, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry J. Bullis, AO22605, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Simmons Jenkins, AO22606, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Henry Mears, AO22608, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Adolph Edward Tokaz, AO22900, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Dickson Terry, Jr., AO22611, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Hule de Russy, AO22612, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Rufus Yancey, AO22613, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Robert Feeney, AO22614, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clifford John Heflin, AO22617, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Kenneth Andrew Cavenah, AO22618, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Theodore Chadwell, AO22620, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Allison Johnson, AO22621, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Jacob Rau, AO22623, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sam Wilkins Westbrock, AO22624, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Melvin Francis McNickle, AO22628, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theodore Romaine Aylesworth, AO22629, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William James Wrigglesworth, AO22630, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Addison Blakey, AO32460, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Isadore Wood, AO22657, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Paul Howard Long, AO32489, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Randall Holzapple, AO32490, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Allen Dose, AO32504, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Dumont Greenfield, AO32503, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Elroy Watkins, AO32535, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lewis Plank Ensign, AO32554, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Watterston Veal, AO32568, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Salvador Phillip LaBarbera, AO32570, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Clayton Robertson, AO44101, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Benson Downer, AO32579, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Charles McPherson, AO32586, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Norman Gayle Morris, AO32597, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Oren James Poage, AO32601, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Ira Cornett, AO32617, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Tarleton Harvin Watkins, AO32623, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Osborn Hall, AO32624, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Gorden Cook, AO32639, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lee Delashaw, AO32646, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Charles Tates, AO32653, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harley Camden Vaughn, AO32654, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Hatle Callahan, AO32672, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Walter Elliott, AO32675, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Frederick Anderson, AO32433, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Robert Large, Jr., AO32707, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Barnard LeBailly, AO32720, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harvard Wendell Powell, AO44223, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Dittman, AO32752, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Andrew Loberg, AO32757, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Warfield Tibbets, Jr., AO32761, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Todd Crowell, AO32769, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Owen Patteson, AO32779, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ronald Dean Hubbard, AO32785, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert William Fletcher, AO32794, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wallace Packard Mace, AO32800, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John George Glover, AO32806, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hallock Peter Kindle Walmsley, AO32814, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert William Witty, AO32818, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil Herbert Scott, Jr., AO32821, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joe Lennard Mason, AO32831, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roswell Freedman, AO32839, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Arthur Burchinal, AO32840, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charlie Rankin Bond, Jr., AO32850, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Dalton Jones, AO52511, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Churchill Hutchinson, AO22802, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Peter Bostrom, AO22804, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Otto Wangeman, AO22805, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richmond Archibald Livingstone, AO22806, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sylvan Davis Hand, AO22807, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Copeland Paul, AO22809, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Franklin Whisenand, AO22812, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roland John Barnick, AO22820, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Harber Holbrook, AO22823, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Bernard Hammerle, Jr., AO22824, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John William Weitman, AO22825, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert John Koster, AO22828, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Daniel Mayden, AO22831, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Anthony Vincent Grossetta, AO22832, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Henry Carter, AO22833, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Brunow William Felling, AO22838, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glen Webster Martin, AO22839, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Gregory, AO22841, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Marion Eisenhart, AO22843, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gilbert Louis Meyers, AO22848, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Keith Wesley Dech, AO22849, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Lowry Dunn, AO22856, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Jerome Hughey, AO22857, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Everett Wilson Stewart, AO22859, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Robbins Pancake, AO22861, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Wallace Momyer, AO22862, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Nelson Boaz, Jr., AO22867, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph James Preston, AO22868, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Randolph Maney, AO22871, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Tarter, AO22872, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Dewey Slocomb, Jr., AO22873, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adriel Newton Williams, AO22877, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Constantine Schauer, AO22879, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Echelbary Cranston, AO22882, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Loran John Anderson, AO44355, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Lawrence Pritchard, AO32873, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Victor Edwin Warford, AO32914, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin McConnell 2d, AO32920, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Elroy Kimmel, AO32926, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt Col. Winston Cureton Fowler, AO22893, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Cutright Sheetz, AO22895, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Austin James Russell, AO22906, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Albright French, AO22908, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Nathan Louis Krisberg, AO22931, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Applegate, AO22933, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Carey Law O'Bryan, Jr., AO22936, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jack Stewart DeWitt, AO22956, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Webster Bagstad, AO22986, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Hamilton Warren, AO22989, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Manford Jay Wetzel, AO22990, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Josiah Kent, AO23005, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Willis Franklin Lewis, AO23013, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Wilbur Wilcox, AO23020, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Sargent Abbey, AO23022, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Clare Gideon, AO23034, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Philip Courtney Loofbourrow, AO23050, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Davison Dalziel, AO23071, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edward Buck, Jr., AO23072, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Joseph LaBreche, AO23075, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Raymond Starrat Sleeper, AO23088, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Robert Wilbraham, AO23091, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Beverly Campbell, AO23101, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Fant Berry, AO23125, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Dill Baynard Ellis, AO23133, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Everett Houston Ware, AO23134, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Reginald James Clizbe, AO23155, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ernest Bryant Jones, AO23163, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Maurice Earle Parker, AO23166, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Andre Ringgold Brousseau, AO23209, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Ross East, Jr., AO23212, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lester Cecil Hess, AO23214, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert William Strong, Jr., AO23215, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Hudson Norman, Jr., AO23216, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John William Norvell, AO23223, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Allan Ashley Crockett, AO23227, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Warren Curtis Stirling, AO23230, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Raymond John Downey, AO23233, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roy Willard Nelson, Jr., AO23238, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur Theodore Frontczak, AO23246, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Stanton Thomas Smith, Jr., AO23266, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Julius Boswell Summers, Jr., AO23271, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Karl Tweeten Rauk, AO23272, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Francis Coleman, AO23280, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Burton Elmo McKenzie, AO23289, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Mason Smelley, AO23291, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Air Force).

×Lt. Col. William Powell Litton, AO23300, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alvan Cullom Gillem 2d, AO23302, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theodore Ross Milton, AO23307, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kermit Robert Dyke, AO23318, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Frederick Stewart, AO23332, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Wendell Rogers, AO32929, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ollen Turner, AO44433, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Robert Royal, AO32933, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hubert Stonewall Judy, Jr., AO32937, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Weldon Marion James, AO23353, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Norton Reynolds, AO23354, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Elza McEntire, AO23355, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bryan Brand Harper, AO23356, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alvin Edward Hebert, AO23360, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Miles McNeese, AO23361, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Condie Sanders, AO23366, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ernest Roderic Manierre, AO23367, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Fleming Harris, AO23368, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Baseler, AO23371, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gerhard John Schriever, AO23373, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adolf Milton Wright, AO23374, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil James Looke, Jr., AO23375, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Edward Glober, AO23377, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Afton Gayle, AO23379, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orville Herman Rehmann, AO23383, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orie Olin Schurter, AO23384, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Ellsworth Boyd, AO23389, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alexander George Evanoff, AO23391, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jerry Dentler Page, AO23392, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Rollen Henry Anthis, AO23393, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Austin Cunningham, AO23394, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dorr Ellsworth Newton, Jr., AO23396, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Leonard Clark, AO23397, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Stanley Jeffrey, Jr., AO23400, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Stephen Davenport McElroy, AO23467, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roger McKee Crow, AO23476, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Horace Albert Hanes, AO23480, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stuart Moss Porter, AO23481, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alvan Neavitt Moore, AO23484, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Lee Wood, Jr., AO23485, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Norton Graves, AO23506, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Robert Ford, AO23508, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Carl Paul Walter, AO23521, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ariel Wayne Nielsen, AO23537, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Barkeley McPherson, AO23538, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Edward Nitsche, AO23557, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

NOTE.—All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be first lieutenants

*First Lt. Raimon William Lehman, O56586, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 2, 1948.

*First Lt. John Paul Vann, O38485, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 2, 1948.

*First Lt. Robert Anthony Ryan, O56587, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 3, 1948.

*First Lt. Melvin Jordan Sowards, O39473, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

*First Lt. Walter Parks Blanton, O39474, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

*First Lt. John Neal Kennedy, O50425, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

*First Lt. Robert Herman Siegrist, O39475, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

*First Lt. Louis George Selig, Jr., O50427, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 6, 1948.

*Second Lt. Winfred Bullard, Sr., AO56588, United States Army, with rank from July 6, 1948.

*First Lt. John Hilary McAuliffe, O56594, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 7, 1948.

*First Lt. Otto Paul Scharth, O41337, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 14, 1948.

*First Lt. Gordon Sumner, Jr., O38489, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 23, 1948.

Second Lt. Charles Liston Gambill, O50435, United States Army, with rank from July 26, 1948.

Capt. Charles Raymond Sniffin, O50437, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 29, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Louis Pomerene, O50438, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 30, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Lee Moriarty, O50440, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 4, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Bruce Elliott, O50442, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 5, 1948.

First Lt. Loren Ralph Keefer, O38492, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 7, 1948.

Second Lt. Victor David Green, O50445, United States Army, with rank from August 11, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Bertram Ledford, O38496, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 13, 1948.

First Lt. William Joseph Farrell, O38488, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 14, 1948.

First Lt. Jefferson DeRosenroll Capps, O50447, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 15, 1948.

First Lt. Ernest Mahlon Monroe, Jr., O38407, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 15, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Francis Gioe, O56619, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 16, 1948.

First Lt. Raymond Godfrey Lehman, Jr., O56621, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 17, 1948.

Capt. Donald Cary Schaffer, O38231, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 28, 1948.

Capt. Charles Lenton Stark, O50451, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 29, 1948.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

*First Lt. Thomas Ross Ostrom, O50576, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 7, 1948, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. James Rock Walpole, O38579, Medical Service Corps, United States Army, with rank from August 3, 1948.

First Lt. George Raymond Krough, O38580, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 22, 1948.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

First Lt. Catherine Nelda Cotsones, N1506, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from April 26, 1948.

*First Lt. Amalia Rita Lazaro, N1519, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Patricia Anne Donaldson, N1779, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army, with rank from July 1, 1948.

*First Lt. Rosemary Witt, N1520, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 1, 1948.

*First Lt. Joan Martha Wissing, N1710, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 3, 1948.

*First Lt. Ellen Marie McDonald, N1187, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 6, 1948.

*First Lt. Marie Josephine Schmahl, N1521, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 13, 1948.

*First Lt. Nancy Bolt Power, N1626, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 14, 1948.

*First Lt. Gladys Irene Breault, N1522, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 16, 1948.

First Lt. Margaret Marla Kish, N1523, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 1, 1948.

To be majors, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, with rank from July 19, 1948

*Capt. Elsie Kuraner, M10033, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Edna Lura, M10034, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Harriet Shannon Lee, M10001, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Felie Woodrow Clark, M10002, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Brunetta Avis Kuehithau, M10019, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Eleanor Lois Mitchell, R10035, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Hilda Muse Lovett, R10061, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Nell Wickliffe, R10036, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Grace Smith, R10001, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Helen Alice Dautrich, R10002, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Ethel May Theilmann, M10055, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Myrtle Aldrich, R10003, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Agnes Patterson Snyder, M10003, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Helen Morris Davis, R10004, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

*Second Lt. Harriet Louise Wood, M10066, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army, with rank from July 2, 1948.

*First Lt. Betty Ann Harlan, M10016, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 10, 1948.

*First Lt. Angela Barreras, M10047, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 10, 1948.

*First Lt. Frances Jane Johnson, M10031, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 10, 1948.

First Lt. Margaret Eileen Mahoney, M10017, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 9, 1948.

Second Lt. Barbara E. Bangs, J20, Occupational Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army, with rank from August 27, 1948.

NOTE.—Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

IN THE NAVY

Admiral Raymond A. Spruance for appointment in the permanent grade of admiral in the Navy as authorized by Public Law 791, Eightieth Congress.

The following-named midshipmen (Aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Archie E. Benton, June 4, 1948.
William J. Brantley, June 4, 1948.
Hermann J. C. Burchardi, June 4, 1948.
Frank L. Cheek, June 4, 1948.
Walter R. Delaney, June 4, 1948.
Frank J Drechsler, June 4, 1948.
Francis G. Gergen, June 4, 1948.
George C. Hafner, June 4, 1948.
William J. Hepburn, June 4, 1948.
Stanley J. Kakol, June 4, 1948.
Ralph C. Knight, June 4, 1948.
Ted R. McGinnis, June 4, 1948.
Donald P. McKay, June 4, 1948.
Donald B. Obiad, June 4, 1948.
Lyle R. Olson, June 4, 1948.
Jack W. Perry, June 4, 1948.
John J. Smith, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Roy Z. Taylor III, June 4, 1948.
Robert H. Wade, June 4, 1948.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Lester N. Hill, June 4, 1948.
Robert F. Valentine, June 4, 1948.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy:

David "P" Barker	Ralph I. McFarland
Raymond J. Borntraeger	Max R. McGlamry
Charles O. Brown	William "E" McLuckie, Jr.
Woolson S. Brown	John C. Mape
James D. Bryan, Jr.	LeRoy O. Mosher
Eugene R. Christie	James F. Murphy
William R. Crawford, Jr.	Raymond P. Notson
Donald L. Egger	Leon M. Orcutt, Jr.
Oliver N. Evans	William B. Otto
Ernest D. Fife	Frank J. Roehrenbeck, Jr.
Fred A. W. Franke, Jr.	Richard D. Schwartz
Donald A. Gillham	Emory R. Sourbeer, Jr.
Roy V. Gunther	Raymond W. Spangrud
Russell L. Handy, Jr.	Max W. Stults
Arthur R. Hasler, Jr.	Joseph L. Sunderlin
John G. Herndon	James J. Thompson
Alvin S. Hibbs	Robert N. Wallis
Rowland P. Hill	Howard W. Westervelt, Jr.
John L. Hotes	Frank M. Wilson, Jr.
John G. "W" Jackson	Richard E. Young
Richard E. Lewis	
James A. McCaig	
Richard K. McCorkle	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

James A. Brimson
Karl R. Whitney

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Morton J. Aronson	Edmundo V. Castillo Amy
Jack S. Biesenkamp	Frederick A. Clark, Jr.
John W. Bisenius	Walter T. Colbert
Winton R. Boyd	Keith S. Ditman
Leland C. Brannon	Donald W. Edwards
Carl A. Broaddus, Jr.	Stanley J. Geller
Jack E. Byrd	William L. Hall
Robert L. Hill	Ira B. Patton
Clarence H. Johnston	Robert O. Peckinpaugh
Paul W. Johnston	Maurie D. Pressman
Hoyt Kirkpatrick, Jr.	James S. Reed
Kenneth L. Krabbenhoft	David R. Rogers
Joseph L. Mays	Neal D. Sanborn
John A. Meier	Ray T. Smith, Jr.
Robert E. Mitchel	Ernest A. Sneddon
Robert S. Mutch	James E. Stark

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

George I. Chegin	Milton E. Kreyenhagen
Jack Dillard	Robert S. Leventhal
Harry C. Dolbeck	David F. Morrow
Glendale M. Eaton	Lawrence C. Murdoch, Jr.
Herschel B. Hamric, Jr.	Kay K. Thurman
William H. Jeffery	
William M. Kirkpatrick, Jr.	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Paul W. Chalfant	Charles A. Szczesny
Joseph F. Ciconan	John A. Widman, Jr.
Henry T. Lavin	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Raymond B. Oskin
Martin J. Roddy, Jr.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

William C. Brandon, Jr.
William E. Crollius, Jr.
Clarence E. Saunders

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Melvin L. Calton	William B. Kovacs
William H. Cock, Jr.	Frank A. Marmarose
John J. Fritz	Ward E. Quilter, Jr.
John W. Hardwick	Paul H. Satterlund
Robert E. Hill	John P. Scullin
Harold R. Hudson	William T. Strahan

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Jane E. Alexander	Laura C. Haring
Sara J. Barton	Ima G. Harrell
Ann A. Bergen	Annie P. Martin
Lucille M. Bernson	Cristina Hernandez
Mildred J. Bishop	Enid Y. Horning
Arkie A. Bothwell	Joan L. Huber
Opal E. Bridges	Billie J. Johnston
Shirley L. Brooks	Lenora M. Judy
Irene R. Broski	Mary J. Kaelin
Jean D. Cairns	Mary L. Kaiser
Oleta M. Cameron	Florene Kelly
Viola "C" Carboy	Arline L. Kennedy
Betty V. Carden	Julia Kidda
Ann E. Carlson	Margaret E. Kissinger
Margaret E. Chapman	Geraldine M. Koiha
Barbara A. Chappell	Aldona Krushinski
Nell M. Chumley	Cornelia F. Long
Kathleen Claffy	Anna McConnon
Virginia M. Cleary	Eleanor C. Mahoney
Pauline T. Cote	Ann Manley
Mary L. Crouch	Dorothy L. Martin
Betty M. Davis	Fannie I. Martin
Nettie A. DeLisa	Eileen LaV. Mehrmann
Florence J. Delynko	Lois C. Merritt
Alice "M" DeReyes	Betty M. Millsap
Mary V. Dewey	Jean E. Moury
Louise H. Dewing	Margaret M. Murphy
Patricia L. Dowell	Maribelle Page
Rose C. Fidale	Audrie M. Peplinski
Dorothy J. Garber	Shirley A. Raymond
Roma E. Garner	Nathalie A. Roark
Allene H. Gherardini	Ruth C. Robinson
Mary M. Gilmore	Eva K. Roth
Dorothy J. Goodell	Betty L. Sharp
Alice T. Griffin	Katherine G. Shea
Shirley A. Hakius	Mary C. Sheridan
Shirley A. Harbaum	Dorothea M. Short
Dorothy B. Slaven	Georgia Vassilakos
Mary R. Staehling	Mary M. Wein
Anna M. Stary	Dolores Weisman
Diane M. Steiner	Florence J. Welty
Ada M. Strickland	Marjory H. Werne
Alfreda Szkodna	Lola E. Wilkinson
Barbara J. Taylor	Loree Young
Elizabeth Taylor	Marvis E. Young
Kathryn A. Terhune	Kathryn E. Zabel
Mary F. Trocchi	Joan B. Zdeblick
Dolores Troskoski	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDERS

Vernal G. Backman	Thomas P. Rogers
Vernon E. Martens	Henry J. Wiser

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Warner D. Bundens, Jr.

LIEUTENANTS

John R. Bierley
Walter H. Jarvis, Jr.
Leo S. Madlem, Jr.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

William F. Bennett Jr.	Martin O. Greaney, Jr.
William E. Carter	Walter F. Hansen
Nathaniel M. Cohen, Jr.	Raleigh M. Hood
David C. Dixon	Donald H. McCowan
John S. Graettinger	George T. Van Petten
	Frederick L. Whitlark
	Burton Willard

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Joseph R. Grysbeck
Joseph W. McAleer
Willard R. McClellan

LIEUTENANTS

George I. Gilchrist, Jr.
Arthur L. Loring

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Richard "C" D'Vincent	Enrique Valentin, Jr.
Neale H. Morrow	Walter F. Woodward

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

John J. Beretta
William J. Perry

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Andrew D. Singleton

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Regina M. L. Harty	Marion F. Wardell
Esther V. Walenga	Helen L. Young

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Catherine M. Cirillo	Ruth L. Price
Martha L. Gabuzda	Mildred K. Teass
Mary T. Gilfedder	Martha A. Van Wye

ENSIGNS

Marie C. Bringgold	Martha G. McKelley
Eleanor M. Lux	Mary C. Seaton

ADDITIONAL NOMINATIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be Lieutenant Colonels with rank from July 1, 1948

Lt. Col. Francis Nicholas Miller, O41791, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erwin Orlo Gibson, O29899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

To be Majors with rank from July 1, 1948

Maj. Roy Hesten Steele, O41847, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hiram Brown White, O41849, United States Army.

×Maj. Theodore Douglas Kern, O51209, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Peter Thomson, O51211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Richard Reagon, O29533, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Carl Kalt, O29532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Adolph Kretlow, O39708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Brasted, O41854, United States Army.

Capt. Robert Nicholas Smith, O39709, United States Army.

×Capt. Harold Sinclair Hayward, O51213, United States Army.

Maj. David Wainewright Bowman, O39711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lehman Jerome Lewis, O29537, United States Army.

Lt. Col. William Ray Robinette, O29539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Laverne Clarke, O41856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wallace Harvey Dawson, Jr., O39712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerard Beekman Crook, O39713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karl Robinson, O41857, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Sawyer Willard, O29541, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wallace Higgins, Jr., O29542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Fisk Rogers, O29544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Clarence T. Foust, O41860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Eugene Thomas Adler, O29549, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Earl Gambrill, O39716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Clair Knapp, O38624, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Ralph Wallace White, O39717, United States Army.

Capt. Carlton Vermont Bingham, O39718, United States Army.

Maj. James O. Younts, Jr., O29552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Wilson Reed, O29553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harley Arnold Lanning, O39720, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Gordon McTavish Johnson, O29406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Allen Kallis, O38687, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Francis Victory, O41869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harwood Sterling Nichols, Jr., O51219, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Lawrence Nolan, O38689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Erwell Mackintosh, O51221, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Wood, Jr., O29563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Kenneth Eakin, O51222, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Alexander Eugene Lancaster, O41875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lowe Herman Herndon, O51223, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Clyde Aylmer Houltry, O51224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Mervin Emil Mansager, O41876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Taylor Goodley, O29566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reed Muriel Titus, O41879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Norman Michael Wagner, O51225, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Lloyd Whitman, O29569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Arthur Hagerty, O41883, United States Army.

Maj. Walter Harold Murray, O38693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ray Joseph Cox, O29571, United States Army.

Maj. George Joseph Schill, O51229, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Joseph Brophy, O39723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Hupman Drake, O41887, United States Army.

Maj. Wyatt Garner Batton, O38696, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dana Turner Merrick, O51231, United States Army.

Maj. Arthur Paul Carter, O29580, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vernon Milton Blum, O39728, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Gaspare Frank Blunda, O18405, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Deane Gough, O18413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Maurice Brown, O18453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Bryant Cooper, Jr., O18469, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Harris Isbell, Jr., O18474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Roger Urban, O18490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Rosser Patterson, O18491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edwin Dietz, O18500, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Maynard Norwood Levenick, O18514, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John William Mackay Read, O18527, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Hamilton Hogan, O18551, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Francis Reidy, O18557, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Winston Candler, O18562, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Ambrose Herman, O18563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Terrence Robert Joseph Hickey, O18567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Knox Armstrong, O18578, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harry George Roller, O18597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ernest Clyde Peters, O18603, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Daniel Turner Workizer, O18608, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Maloney, Jr., O18610, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Moorman Cheal, O18613, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William James Mahoney, O18616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dexter Lowry, O17628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Harry Richard Davis, O41894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Willard Harper Kilpatrick, O41895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. William Alfred Watkins, O51237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Leonard Wilton Winget, O41896, United States Army.
Maj. Frank Forest Wilkins, O39731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Theodore Burton Tufte, O39732, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Fred William Ludecke, O41898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Earl Walter Hall, O38698, United States Army.
×Maj. Herbert Frederick Lindal, O51243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Walter Edwin Jordan, O41910, United States Army.
Maj. William Taylor McAninch, O29601, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Francis Alexander, O41912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Franklin Lewis, O41915, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. George Daland Webb, O41916, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Donald Winthrop McRell, O29606, United States Army.
Maj. Ernest Corwin Seaman, O29607, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. John William Mac Leod, O41919, United States Army.
Maj. Henry Lemle Phillips, O51249, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wayne Lorrain Wood, O51250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Edward Duvall, O41921, United States Army.
Maj. Leon Deane Marsh, O39739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Carroll Henry Harrison, O51252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj Ben Milton Young, O51255, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Eugene Paul Fahringer, O41930, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Francis John Goatley, O51256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Gerald Allison Sams, O41931, United States Army.
Maj. Francis Eugene Houghton, O39742, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Kenneth Otto Schellberg, O39743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Charles Edward Case, O51260, United States Army.
Maj. Laurence Wheeler Lougee, O41933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Adam Mount, O41934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Elmer Andrew Keil, Jr., O38699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Lee Taylor, O41939, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Todd Yule, O29627, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Arthur Meek, O51261, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Edward McHugh, O39745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Harold Edwin Sprague, O41940, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eugene Ernest Moyers, O41938, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lawrence McAllistor Knapp, O41942, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Michael Keane, O38702, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Eugene Joseph Field, O29630, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. George Denver Paxson, O29633, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Norman Cogswell, O41945, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. James Mitchell DeBardeleben, O51266, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Cornelius Michael Reing, O29637, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Sherlock Garner, O29640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Kenneth Marion Hurst, O41947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Thomas A. Weadock, O39748, United States Army.
×Maj. Frederick Beasley Alexander, Jr., O41949, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas Joseph Brascher, O39749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Lynn Smith Waters, O41950, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Eli Edward White, O41951, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Milton Owen Picknell, O41952, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Lloyd Atwood, O39750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Richard Owen Brown, O39751, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Willie Nussum Thomas, O29644, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Oscar Theodore Hammerness, O39752, United States Army.
Maj. Robert Gwynne Humphrey, O29646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Edward Frank Thelen, O29649, United States Army.
Maj. Lawson Edmond Hahn, O29650, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Marvin Antrim Saxton, O51275, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Lee Johnson Rutz, 51276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Paul Eugene Chappell, O41968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Ernest Chisolm Watson, O29652, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas Venson Dixon, O51277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Fred Lafayette Bryson, O41969, United States Army.
Maj. Svend Wright Nielsen, O39753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Carter Todd, O41972, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Delphine Delmas Rasco, O41973, United States Army.
Maj. John Earl Norman, O51279, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Vasco Laub, O41975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Pyueng Son Pyuen, O41976, United States Army.
Capt. Charles William Nussbaum, O51281, United States Army.
Maj. George William Dorn, O41979, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. William Brown Derrickson, Jr., O51282, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Harold Tuft Perkins, O51284 Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ralph Henry Hatfield, O39755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Sidney Lowenstern, O51285, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Kurt Norman Heyne, O39756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas Charles Davis, O41981, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Kenneth Llewellyn Leiby, O51286, United States Army.
Maj. Max Oboler, O51287, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Raymond Fields, O51288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Anderson Norton, O41984, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Lobdell Percy Brown, O39757, United States Army.
Capt. Jeff Clay 3d, O29667, United States Army.
Lt. Col. King David Colson, Jr., O29668, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Kenneth Lovell Sipes, O41989, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Francis Duke Crinkley, O29669, United States Army.
×Maj. Aldean Aaron Eakin, O41994, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Benjamin James Handwerker, O29671, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Ralph Thomas Mulvanity, O29674, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Elmer Lee Koup, O41999, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Percy Harold Laming, O42000, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Array).
Capt. Stewart Henry Legendre, O42004, United States Army.
Maj. Robert Beasley Moore, O51294, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Array).
Lt. Col. Elvyn Ambrose Robb, O42006, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Fred Carlton Taylor, O39761, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Alfred Conway Knight, O29684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Burton Albin, O51296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Herbert Nelson Reed O51297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Wendell Mark Broadus, O29690, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Gordon Lanier Barclay, O29691, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lewis Voiers, O39763, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edwin William Baron, O42012, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Harold Lee Taylor, O29694, United States Army.
Capt. C. A. Holmes Eubanks, O42014, United States Army.
Maj. John Ascalon Eiterich, O29696, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Edward Ceasar White, O39766, United States Army.
Maj. James Sevier Killough, O29697, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Forney Hurst Ingram, O29698, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arthur Julius Peterson, O29681, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Kenneth Clair Haycraft, O29704, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. William Alvin Stephens, O39768, United States Army.
×Capt. Donald Oran Markham, O29705, United States Army.
Maj. Vernon Morgan Budge, O42017, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Richard Nicholas Borgfeldt, O42019, United States Army.
×Capt. Joseph Sharove, O42021, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Charles Willis Wilmore, O29706, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lee Llewellyn Dymock, O29708, United States Army.
×Maj. Horace Napoleon Elkins, Jr., O39770, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Prescott Pike, O42023, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. John Rudolph Fox, O42024, United States Army.
Capt. Robert Ewing Johnson, O51309, United States Army.
Maj. Lule William Mayfield, O42025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Herbert Walter Cooley, O39773, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Arthur Joseph Pollard, O42029, United States Army.
Maj. Julian Earle Weisler, O42028, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Mandel Nathaniel Goldstein, O29711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Frederick Joseph LePenske, Jr., O39774, United States Army.
Maj. Joseph Anthony Petrolino, O29712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Kenneth Anthony Carson, O42030, United States Army.
Capt. Charles William Hutchins, O29714, United States Army.
Maj. Henry Smith Newhall, O29717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Clarence George Hubbart, O29718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Horace Spicer, O29719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Johnathon Thomas Kaigler, O29721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Peter Ulys Maxey, O51314, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Carey Alexander Clark, O51315, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Miles Coeyman, O51316, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Anthony Nebel, O42040, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Francis Lancer, O51317, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Marquis House, Jr., O29729, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Arthur Albert Fiedler, O38719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Madison Brooks, O29736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Charles Shircliffe Hoult, O42047, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. James Harry Ritts, O38720, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. George Wilfred Hutchinson, O29744, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Carl Henry Larson, O42048, United States Army.
×Maj. Edward Lane Gibson, O42049, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Raymond Herrmann, O39779, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Patterson Kline, O39780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. William Calvin Huber, O42052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Abbott Edward Dodge, O51326, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Howard Cunningham, O51325, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Arthur Evans, O42060, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Marcus Edward Cooper, O51327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Wesley Campbell, O29755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Edward James Murphy, Jr., O42061, United States Army.
Maj. Eugene Goliday Hite, O29756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Max Webster Hazlehurst, O38723, United States Army.
Maj. Walter Herbert Parsons, Jr., O39782, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Ruthven Smith, Jr., O18661, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thore Fritjof Bengtson, O18670, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Menoher, O18690, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Philip Vibert Doyle, O18712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Allen Rude, O18732, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Parks Goodwin, O18733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Abner Meeks, O18735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Aaron Meyer Lazar, O18738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Folkes Moore, O18781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Bernard Thielen, O18782, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Karl Laurance Scherer, O18784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Russell Huber, O18797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Gerard Charles Cowan, O18807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Kenneth Edward Tiffany, O18822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Franklin Vines Johnston, Jr., O18836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Sewell Marion Brumby, O18846, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis Deisher, O18852, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William George Davidson, Jr., O18862, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Celistine Quartier, O18879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lawrence Bartlett Babcock, O18837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Elwood Means, O18901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Randall Everman, O18910, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Clyde Wesley McKnight, O29760, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Edward Doe, O42066, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Veon Maurice McConnell, O51333, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Barclay Thurston Hesler, O42068, United States Army.
Maj. Irving Wilson Brooks, O39783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Lawrence Benton, O39784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Maurice Myrlen Radcliffe, O39787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wayne Otto Jefferson, O29766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Andrew William Hamilton 3d, O29767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Michael Theodore Metz, O42071, United States Army.
Maj. Andrew Donald Kane, O42073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Danhouse Martz, Jr., O29769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Francis McAneny, O42075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harold Rennie Sanderson, O42076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Nathan Sanborn Mathewson, O29771, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Herbert Herman Rasche, O51339, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Eugene Munson Elliott, Jr., O51340, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Alva Lawrence Ritchie, O39788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Glenn Amos Hawes, O42077, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Adams Edwin Rackes, O42073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Yenne Earl Snider, O51341, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Donald Francis Gibbons, O38724, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Herbert Rolfe Archibald, O29776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Stanley Knapp Franks, O51343, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. David Armitage, O42079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Wellford Taylor, O38725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles John Timmes, O29777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Franklin Gaffney, O51345, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Martin Michael Mendell, O42082, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. James Richard Crank, O51346, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Herber Carlton Leney, O39789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Orval James Baldwin, O39790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Arthur Bell Butler, O29783, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Ray King Bannister, O29784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John George Wagner, O51348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Alan Beresford Todd, O42088, United States Army.
Maj. Loveaire Ackley Hedges, O29786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Cameron Forrest Woods, O42089, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Weldon Lester Slisher, O29787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Alford Laforge, O51349, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ernest Alton Hough, O42090, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Grant Waite, O30358, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arnold Vinson Wyss, O29788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Tom Bryson Hembree, O29789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Preston Tuggle, Jr., O42093, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Franklin Willis Clarke, O29792, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Herbert Myron Fish, Jr., O29793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Hans Wilhelm Helm, O29794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Alfred Maria Koster, O29796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Roland Dale Graves, O29795, United States Army.

Lt. Col. William Albert Warner, O39791, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Grant Bent, Jr., O29797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Russell Whitehead, O42095, United States Army.

×Maj. Winslow Randall Willis, O51352, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Thomas Hazlett, O39792, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert H. Cole, O29798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Herrward Mauz, O29799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Irvine Sanders, O42096, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Grant Learnard, Jr., O29801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Virgil Guisleman, O39793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Greenlief Smith, Jr., O29804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Richard Boyles, O29803, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Robert Raymond Judson, O39794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clifford Lyman Sawyer, O51355, United States Army.

Maj. Kenan McLendon Rand, O39795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion Monroe Brown, O29806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Lindley Pickett, O42099, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Martin Sassé, O29807, United States Army.

×Capt. William Ralph Thomas, O51356, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Robert Raymond Robertson, O51357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Lauren Elmer Hannah, O51358, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Louis Buttner, O42100, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Maxwell, O39796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Richard Hill, O42101, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ira Winfield Hart, O29808, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Ray Joseph Laux, O42102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alwyn Vincent Larkin, O29809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Orville Rupp, O42103, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Oliver Irvin, O42104, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irvin Louis Allen, O29810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Truman Snowden, O29811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lewis Bivens, O42105, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Leo Sievers, O29814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Charles Parsons, O29816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Timothy Howard McKenzie, O39797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lester W. Kale, O29815, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Loren Elmer Gaither, O42109, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Arthur Klinetop, O39798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Ernest Newcomb, O38727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Forrest Vinyard Diehl, O51361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Emery Baya, O29817, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pierre Augustine Kieff, O39799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Ruebush Andrews, O51362, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elmer Robinson Higgins, O38755, United States Army.

Maj. Paul Andrew Conlin, O42111, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter William Gerken, O42113, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Ellsworth Stoever, O42114, United States Army.

Maj. Edgar Lee Grider, O42112, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ludwig Schulz, O42115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard John Conran, O29820, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.)

Capt. Wiley Burton Davis, O29822, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Elmer Louis Littell, O29823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Voorhies Nicholas, O51363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Kim Atkinson, O29826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Theodore Edson, O29827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hays Holmes, Jr., O29828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank William Herberth, Jr., O29829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Murray, O29833, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Charles Jones, O42119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Miguel Joseph Pomar, O42120, United States Army.

Capt. Lowell Hugh Powers, O42123, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Seymour Walter Wurfel, O29835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Joseph Ingeman, O42124, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Clifton Creighton, Jr., O29836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erquiet Taylor, O29838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clinton William Janes, O38730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floy William McGinn, O42127, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Francis La Piana, O51365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Sumner Standley, Jr., O29840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Wortendycke Beggs, O39802, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilfred Felix Menegus, O42128, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilburn Lesca Strickland, O29839, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Thomas Simpson, O29841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Linwood Bush, O29843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Arnold Gerhard Eger, O29842, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Andrew Ralph Lolli, O29844, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Vernon Hart, O38732, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Lee Williams, O30082, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Malcolm Townsend Powell, O51368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Patrick Gibbons, O39804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Mackentyre Thames, Jr., O29846, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Amos Byron Churchill, O29847, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hill Greene, O42130, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Arny, Jr., O51369, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Eugene Pickett, O42131, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur LeRoy Baker, O39805, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Lydon Briggs Cole, O29848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Howard Frank Bogner, O51370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Smith, Jr., O29850, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Herman Meinert, O29851, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Howard Bates, O39806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Askins, Jr., O29852, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick James Cooke, O29853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harry Fredrick Kirkpatrick, Jr., O39807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Holmes Hoffman Bevington, O42133, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Temple Johnson, O29856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Burns, O38733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lorraine Lynnhaven Manly, O51373, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gardner Baker Gross, O29859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Lee Andrick, O42134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Harry Davidson, Jr., O39808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Timothy Chapman, O29860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Humphrey Tomlinson, Jr., O38734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Evander Francis Kelly, Jr., O51377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Parmelee Babcock, O39809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edgar Wilson, O29863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kirk Buchak, O29864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Silas Roswell Langlois, O29865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Melvin Lundberg, O42136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Silas Benjamin Dishman, O29052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Alexander Dasche, O39810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Fred Joe Gosiger, O29867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Edward Conn, O29868, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Richard Dwyer, O42138, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Neal Anderson, O51379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry C. Brindle, O51380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Robinson Heard, O39811, United States Army.

Maj. Homer Littlefield Davis, Jr., O29869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward Daniel Fitzgerald, O29870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.)

Lt. Col. William Maxwell Rodgers, O39812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Blair Eliot Henderson, O39813, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Samuel Winsper, O39814, United States Army.

Capt. Charles Lacy Ringgold, O30115, United States Army.

Capt. Darrell Leonard Reed, O39815, United States Army.

Maj. Franz Heiberger Ross, O29871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Newell Skaggs, O39816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Benjamin Besbeck, O42142, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Marshall Sprake, O29672, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. James Willard Pumpelly, O51384, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Glenn Rees, O39817, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Gustin Hall Smith, O29877, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Russell Decatur Fagin, O42145, United States Army.

Maj Edwin Hart Druley, O29876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Strother Ison, O39819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Anthony Sivigny, O51385, United States Army.

Maj. William Francis LaFarge, Jr., O42147, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Weir-Mitchell Weir, O42150, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Hadrick Ebbert, O29885, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Royal Leonard Leidy, O29886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kermit James Silverwood, O42153, United States Army.

Lt. Col. John Henry Lattin, O29887, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Melville Bisant, Jr., O51387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Sidney Levie, O38735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Howard Loomis, O29889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Braxton Eugene Small, O42156, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Harold Meek, O29890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Heltzel, O29891, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Jackson Magee, O42158, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lyndon William Merry, O51391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dwight Thornton Hamersley, O42159, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Quentin Samuel Quigley, O29894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Teddy Hollis Sanford, O29893, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Joseph Rupel Walton, O39821, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Thomas Richardson Palmerlee, O29895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Victor B. Fox, O29896, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Wenzel David Roth, O51392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Stephen Bodner, O51393, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Gibson Davis, O51394, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Robert Roland Creighton, O42161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Schaeffer Mansfield, O29898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Richard Siemers, O42162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harllee Royall O'Neal, O42163, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Otto Fischer, O29901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Conrad Hildebrant, O29902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd Milton Reiser, O39823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jean Paul LaCour, O39822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Stewart Bessmer, O30824, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col Charles Raymond Keasey, O38736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beverly Taylor, O29903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Otto Peterson, O29904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jackson Knight Judy, O39825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col James Abner Richardson 3d, O29906, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Marion Claude Miller, O51396, United States Army.

×Capt. Harry Bauer Sames, O42167, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Dane Oatman Sprankle, O42169, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gordon O'Brien, O42171, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eldon Alfred Koerner, O42172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Wilbur Greene, O38737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Humphrey Johnson, Jr., O29908, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Major Ayars, O42173, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byron Martin Shipley, O39827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mattison Albert Darragh, O42174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Conk, O29909, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander George Eagle, O29910, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harley Derrell Brown, O29911, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Joseph Hannon, O42175, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Knox Bell, O29912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Dilg Frampton, O42176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Patrick McKenna, O42179, United States Army.

Capt. Wesley Earl Farmer, O51398, United States Army.

×Maj. Paul Anthony Shaw, O42181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rudolph George Winckler, O51399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Elvin Johnson, O39828, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Cecil Malcolm MacGregor, O42182, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Earl Stevens, O29916, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Osborne Toft, O42183, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Haddaway del Mar, O29917, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Eugene Londahl, O39829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Victor Johnson, O39831, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Wright Roberts, O39830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Roy Edward Goode, O29921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Havens Jackman, O51402, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Lee Coleman, O38738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Hamilton Gibson, O29923, United States Army.

Maj. Charles Allen Leavitt, O51403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Wilfred Gustafson, O51404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Farnell Hudson, O42184, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orlando Adam Scott, O42187, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Reid Dorman, Jr., O51406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Arthur Luther, O38740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Weston Locke Blanchard, O29925, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt.. Col. Slaftcho Katsarsky, O39832, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robinson Baird Rider, O51408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Mark Smith 2d, O29927, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lee Henry Morrison, O51409, United States Army.

Maj. Sherburne Jackson Helliker, O29928, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Levern Bates, O29929, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Glen Black, O39833, United States Army.

Capt. George Samuel Haviland, O42189, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Frazer Woodruff Rodman, O38741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Leonard Kerr, O42191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Heron McNary, O38742, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Jackson Grant, O38743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Harwood Taylor, O29931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Perl Dunn, O51413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maxwell Birge Fogarty, O42193, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Benjamin Chesson, Jr., O51414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Edwin Bisbort, O29934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Lewis Peyton, O29935, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Leroy Icke, O42195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Lewis Plahte, O29936, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Arthur McAleer, O42196, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Seymour Austin Potter, Jr., O29937, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Albert Fanning, O29939, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Ashworth Robbiee, O42198, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Ralph Bonner Garretson, O39835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lowrey Robert Moore, O29941, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Beecher Reed, O30193, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Albertson Bradley, O39836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William James Whitehead, O39837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Gordon Gealta, O38744, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Gustav Kiel, O42199, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tom Watson Sills, O29949, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Thomas Evans, O29950, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James Sutton, O29951, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Albert Martin, O51419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orman Goodyear Charles, O29954, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dudley Peterman, O29955, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James Watson, O29730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Courtney Shewbridge, Jr., O38745, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Harold Andrew Cassell, O29956, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Alden Norell, O39838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Anthony Devine, O42202, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Howard Raftery, O39839, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest LeeRoy Ritchie, O29957, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Harvey Sibbald, O29958, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Johnson Henderson, O42203, United States Army.

Capt. Harry Jarvis Engel, O39840, United States Army.

Capt. John Joseph Sullivan, Jr., O39961, United States Army.

Maj. John Joseph Agoa, O42205, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clayton Wallace Wells, O39962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Frank Henry Preston, Jr., O42206, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Lawrence Norfray, O51423, United States Army.

Maj. Harold Ralph Yeager, O29567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Peter West, O29964, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Angelo Michael Ricciardelli, O42208, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edwin Rust, O29965, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Scott Cain, O42210, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Prentiss Bishop Reed, Jr., O39841, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Malcolm Wesley Courser, O42211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hans Godfrey Jepson, O29966, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Gregory Lux, O42212, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Kenneth Johnson, O42213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Paul Burns, O51426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Francis Adams, O29968, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Delmer Pearl Anderson, O29969, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Argyle Phillips Jones, O39842, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Guy Vinton Miller, O42215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Franklin Riley Patterson, O38746, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Frederick Miller Sperry, O51427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilmer Arthur Edge, Jr., O38747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marcus William Heskett, O42218, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Reed Turman, O42217, United States Army

Capt. John Joseph Dalton, O42219, United States Army.

Lt. Col. James Noel Brewer, O42220, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Philip Thomson, O29974, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Herman Bittner, O42221, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Zinn Traeger, O51429, United States Army.

Maj. Claude Elbert Ray, O51430, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Fay Kenyon Green, O29976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Raphael Dunlap, O29975, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

×Maj. Arnold Boogher, O39843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward Stannah, O29977, United States Army.

Maj. Fred LeRoy Baker, O42223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Charles Baker, O29979, United States Army.

Capt. Paul Patrick Byrne, O51429, United States Army.

Capt Jack Reeves Murphy, O51431, United States Army.

Maj. Frank Kellers, O51432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Phil Dinka, O29982, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Valentine Motte Barnes, Jr., O51434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Hensley Fulton, O29984, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Leroy Lewis, O42224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Dulaney Lee O'Roark, O29986, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Earle Nelson, O51435, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. John Francis Reed, O51436, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Armand Fulton, O42225, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Anthony Cain, O29988, United States Army.

Capt. Rafael Montilla, O51437, United States Army.

Maj. Ernest Warner Posse, O29989, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter August Kneyse, O42227, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Harold Bach, O42228, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Wesley Doverspike, O42229, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Curtis Theodore Ricketts, O51438, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Frederick Linthwaite, O29990, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Kenneth E. Fields, O18957, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wood Beeler, O18958, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duncan Hallock, O18960, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alfred Dodd Starbird, O18961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Douglas Matheson, O18962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Davis Meyer, O18963, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alden Kingsland Sibley, O18964, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, O18968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Campbell Tripp, O18972, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward George Herb, O18973, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Jonas Ely, O18974, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Honeycutt, O18975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Allen Harris, O18976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Gardner Shinkle, O18979, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hoy D. Davis, Jr., O18982, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alvin Charles Welling, O18983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Charles Davis, O18985, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellsworth Barricklow Downing, O18986, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Amrine Turner, O18987, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Warren Gray, O18988, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Sherman Henry, O18989, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Orin Blandford, O18990, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Adonis Downing, Jr., O18991, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy Cecil Lothrop, O18992, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Crain Leslie, O18993, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col John Edward Watters, O18994, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Francis Joseph McMorrow, O18995, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Golding Dunn, O18996, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dabney Ray Corum, O19001, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lauren Whitford Merriam, O19002, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert George Sparrow, O19003, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wolcott Meals, O19005, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter August Jensen, O19006, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Bodeau, O19008, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Marion Humphries, O19012, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Denton Armitage, O19014, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore John Conway, O19015, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Elton LaDue, O19017, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Daniel, O19019, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Arthur Dahlen, O19020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Lane, O19021, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ira Whitehead Cory, O19025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William York Prentzel, O19026, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Edward Otto, O19030, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lamar Cecil Ratcliffe, O19034, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Chapman, O19035, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Lawlor, O19036, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Alfred McCrary, O19037, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Parker, Jr., O19038, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Haskell Kibler, Jr., O19039, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris Oswald Edwards, O19041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Zeller, O19043, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beall Franklin, O19046, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Gordon Bartlett, O19047, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Paul Nelson Gillon, O19048, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Rudolf Walters, O19050, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Thorndike Ashworth, O19052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bruce Logan, O19053, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lafar Lipscomb, Jr., O19054, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Sheldon Tubbs, O19056, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Henry Kaesser, Jr., O19057, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Charles Plapp, O19059, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Joseph Henry O'Malley, O19061, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Hobart Chapman, Jr., O19064, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick William Guiney, Jr., O19066, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Thorlin, O19067, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Harris Shepardson, O19068, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William George Fritz, O19069, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Worman Hain, O19072, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Goyer Patterson, O19073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Lucken Jones, O19074, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Edward Maston, O19075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ethan Allen Chapman, O19076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oren Eugene Hurlbut, O19077, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Warren White, O19079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Park, Jr., O19080, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Beverly DeWitt Jones, O19081, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Hadley Richardson, Jr., O19082, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Roosevelt Brindley, O19087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marcus Tague, O19090, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Leon Van Way, O19093, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Chase, O19095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. David Virgil Adamson, O19096, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Ferris, O19097, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Penn Thompson, O19098, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Roland Kinderman, O19099, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neil Merton Wallace, O19101, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Paul Whelihan, O19102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marshall Woodruff Frame, O19103, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robin George Speiser, O19104, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James Given, O19105, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Avery John Cooper, Jr., O19107, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Ogden Fuqua, O19109, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hardin Leonard Olson, O19110, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cam Longley, Jr., O19113, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Benton Neely, O19114, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Henshaw Pope, O19115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Warren Stilwell, Jr., O19117, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Robert Cyr, O19119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Wilson Tyson, O19120, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Menzie Pittman, O19121, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Allen Carver, O19122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph O'Connor, O19125, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Rushmore Gretser, O19126, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sherburne Whipple, Jr., O19130, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edgar Collins Doleman, O19131, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyril Joseph Letzelter, O19132, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Light Hine, O19134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Wallace Rudolph, O19135, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Abell Cleveland, Jr., O19136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Powers, 3d, O19137, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joshua Robert Messersmith, O19139, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Tripp Evans, Jr., O19140, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Martin Cahill, O19141, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Francis Ryan, O19142, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Skinner, O19144, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Anthony Frank Kleitz, Jr., O19145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Thomas Carroll, O19146, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard John Meyer, O19147, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Randolph Whiting Fletter, O19148, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Harlow Miles, Jr., O19151, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Humbert Joseph Versace, O19152, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Guest Smith, O19154, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Baumer, O19155, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Pugh Pearson, Jr., O19157, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl Jacob Macherey, O19158, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Alapaugh, O19159, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Lorenzo Roberson, O19161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Edward Bastion, Jr., O19162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.

Lt. Col. Thomas Herbert Beck, O19164, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Evans Kaiser, O19165, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Thomas Harris, O19166, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gardner Wellington Porter, O19167, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry William Sweeting, Jr., O19168, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyrus Abda Dolph 3d, O19170, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Lindsay Richey, O19172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Bowes Evans, O19174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Andrew Fleckenstein, O19175, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Franklin Gibney Rothwell, O19176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Fant Damon, Jr., O19179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Clay Bridgewater, O19182, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ernest Mikell Clarke, O19183, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Orr Boswell O19188, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Parker Gibbs, O19189, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maddrey Allen Solomon, O19194, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lyle William Bernard, O19195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Shelby Francis Williams, O19196, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jean Evans Engler, O19198, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Abner Huntsberry, O19200, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Donald Stephenson, O19201, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Graver Gilbert, O19202, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Laurence Elder, O19203, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Cameron Cubbison, Jr., O19204, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Amaury Manuel Gandia, O19205, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Harrold Bayne, O19207, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gwinn Ulm Porter, O19210, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Robert Zierath, O19211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hulburt Douglas, O19212, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Darnell, Jr., O19213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Brice Crawford, O19215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Coleman 3d, O19216, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Wiltse Sellers, O19217, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Gibb, O19222, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Kemp Markle, Jr., O19223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Talbot 3d, O19226, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Ellsworth Leydecker, O19227, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Austin Andrew Miller, O19228, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris King Henderson, O19230, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel O'Reilly, O19233, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Ralston Fredendall, Jr., O19235, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edson Schull, O19236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royal Reynolds, Jr., O19238, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Graydon Casper Essman, O19242, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Franklin Akers, Jr., O19243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col Claude Leslie Bowen, Jr., O19244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duff Walker Sudduth, O19245, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Wagstaff, Jr., O19246, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Rhoden Pritchard, O19248, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmett Gallagher, O19250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Edward Gee, O19251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alston Grimes, O19252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Otto Hartel, O19254, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Walter Parr, Jr., O19255, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Roberts Calhoun, O19256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edson Duncan Raff, O19261, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Braddock Degavre, O19262, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Agin Bailey, O19264, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Newman Scoville, O19267, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Field Due, O19268, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Demosthenes Clainos, O19269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Schmeltzer, O19270, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Thomas Jellett, O19273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Remus, O19275, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Harrell, O19276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Allen Risden, O19278, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Nelson Lonning, O19281, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Moore Blanchard, Jr., O19282, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Wilson Quinn, O19283, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charner Weaver Powell, O19284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Pearce Bellican, O19285, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Spalding Ehlen, O19286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Tallant Kilday, O19288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Roberts Kimmell, Jr., O19291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Vernard Thompson, O19292, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wilkinson Rayburn, O19295, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emmanuel Salvador Cepeda, O19297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kimball Clay Smith, O29882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Harper Rogers, O29992, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj William James Marquette, O42231, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gus Hugh Montgomery, 29993, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Colella Evans, O42233, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Melvin Delos Losey, O42235, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alanson Tyler Leland, O42236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Albert Sidney Britt, Jr., O42237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ernest Harrison, O29991, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duff Green, Jr., O42239, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Harper Pryor, O29996, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Lewis Seeger, O29997, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Franklin Decker, O29999, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Luther Wilkin, Jr., O39847, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melville Hulbert Griffith, O39845, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wilbur Barker 2d, O30001, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hughe Doyle Coleman, O39848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marvin Arrington Middlebrooks, O51440, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Wallace Jay Nichols, O30003, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Francis Curren, Jr., O38749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Mary Woestenburg, O30004, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Taylor Miller, O30006, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Anthony McGuire, O51443, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Bohrer Thrift, O39849, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kurt Ladislaus Walitschek, O42241, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Michael Peter Georges, O42242, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Edwin Le Page Beauchamp, O51444, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Seney Ballagh, O30009, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Porter Snooks, Jr., O30011, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Michael Noonan, O42243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Cornelius Kelleher, O38750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harland Stuart, O42244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel David Mack, Jr., O30015, United States Army.

Maj. Elbridge Leroy Brubaker, O51445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Francis Penaat, O29598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Eugene Jackson Carson, O51446, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Reginald Conklin Miller, O26375, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Marshall Pitzer, O26378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Alexandre Guimond, O26379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Wesley Booth, O26382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Charles Buser, O42246, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adrian Leonard Hoebeke, O19334, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry von Kolnitz, O30018, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Truden, O42248, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Cantey, O30019, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Soares, O30020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry John Stark, O51448, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Snelson Neill, O51447, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. George Glover Lewis, O42250, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Angelo Domenic Bollero, O39853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Jacob Berkowitz, O39854, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Maguire, O42251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Taft Stump, O30023, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William James Evans, O30025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ambelten Mangles Ahrens, O30026, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Louis Rehmann, O30027, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Ripley Lodge, O42252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hamilton Davin, O42253, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luigi Francis Claps, O39855, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Wesley Darrah, O30029, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Victor Smith, O30030, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harry Van Dine, O30032, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Calvin Lambert, O30033, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Augustus Wingo, O51451, United States Army.

Maj. Anthony Gaul Merritt, O42255, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ralph Yancey O42256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Conners, O30034, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Kabrich, O39856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Reeves Maddox, O30036, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Andrew Williams, O42257, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Irving Haumerson Eales, O38751, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Jennings Pritchard, O42258, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Alton Dresser, O30037, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Presley Horton, O42259, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Weldon William Cox, O51453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Edward Spitzer, O30039, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Harry W. Cooper, O42261, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Norton, Jr., O42262, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eual Wister Culbertson, O42263, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charlie Lemon Young, O51455, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Frederick Clark, O30040, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Conrad Mullen, O51456, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Rambo Dale, O39857, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Earle Echols, O42265, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rhoman Edward Clem, O51457, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Cesario Granzin, O30041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Holley Johnson, O30042, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Julius Theodore Dargusch, O51459, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harold Dicks, O30043, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Edwards, O42267, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Moore Markley, O38752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Augustus Weaver, O30044, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmore Patrick Moore, O51460, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Marshall Richardson, O42269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gail Addison Eaton, O42268, United States Army.

Lt. Col. David Arnold Mathewson, Jr., O38753, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

Capt. Brookman Renninger Painter, O38754, United States Army.

Maj. Terrance Marshall Longacre, O30047, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Troth, O42270, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Oliver Rishol, O51462, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jay Theodore Glen, O29953, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Robert Glen, O30049, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Garland Guthrie, O30050, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Forrest Hall Forcum, O51464, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt Eugene Louis Lash, O42272, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Albert Morse Johnson, O39858, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Regis Whitlo Luke, O39859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dave John Cook, O30051, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Shaw Sabine, O39860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Donald DeMarr, O42273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Chapman Coleman, Jr., O30053, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Stanley Llewellyn Stewart, O42274, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin George Tieman, Jr., O30303, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neil Frederick Hein, O51467, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Gilbert Spinney, O30054, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Heck, O51469, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Frank Laron Street, O30055, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Werlen Franklin Cheney, O42276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ray William Whitson, O30056, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Aubrey Ranney, O39863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey James Yost, O42277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Boynton Lininger, O30059, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Orsen Branch, O42279, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Fuller Allen, O30060, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Otto Frederick Sonneman, Jr., O42280, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Asbury Haines Jackson, O29629, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifton Frank Nooncaster, O30061, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burdwell Hoyt Shipe, O30065, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Mitchell Franklin, O39864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Milton LaFayette Johnson, O42284, United States Army.

×Maj. Halbert Jennings Slagle, O39865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Edward Painter, O56813, United States Army.

Maj. Albert Tyra Stafford, O39866, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ivan Orville Walt, O42286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Aries Henry Miller, O42287, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Franklin Metcalf, O42288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Roger Elsbree Higgins, O39867, United States Army.
Lt. Colonel Edwin William Grenelle, O38757, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Griffith Johnson, O38756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. James Jenkins Butler, O30068, United States Army.
Capt. Theodore Leslie Chenault, O30069, United States Army.
Maj. Clifford Cecil Hines, O42289, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harold Hatch Haines, O39868, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Frederick Mathias Schellhammer, O42291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Winston Lewis Field, O39869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wayne Hardman, O30072, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Curtiss Welt Oakes, O51471, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Cecil Hamilton Bolton, O39870, United States Army.
Lt. Col. George Wayne Coffman, Jr., O42293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry John Hampton, O30073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Arthur Hamilton, O42294, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Leonard Amoroso, O30076, United States Army.
Lt. Col. William Anderson Smith, O30079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Lee Dake Chilson, O39871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Gilbert Proctor Dubia, O39872, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Auspitz, Jr., O30081, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Samuel Hardy Duerson, O30084, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Clifton Howell, Jr., O30085, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Patterson Streetman, O30086, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eric Robert Osborne, O42299, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Adam Whitz Meetze, O30087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Gaston Graham Fornes, O30088, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Clayton Hanson, O39873, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Alvin Bergmann, O42300, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.
×Capt. Donald Peter Rinque, O39874, United States Army.
Capt. James Roy Miller, O51472, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Marvin Leroy Tjostem, O30089, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Watson Sylvester, O51473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Monas Nathan Squires, O38758, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Edward Frick, O42303, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Clarence Philip Hendricks, O42302, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arvine Walter McElroy, O30093, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Clarence Edwin Routh, O39875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Martin McGrail, O39876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leon David Gladding, O30095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond Edward Daehler, O42304, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Chester Harley Anderson, O30096, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ervin Daniel Karl Hoehne, O39878, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Merwin Bishop Forbes, O30097, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Raymond Leo Orton, O42306, United States Army.
Lt. Col. William Henry Billings, O30098, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Richard Stacus Tennant, O51474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Truman Harry Kern, O42309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Robert Earl Dorsey, O30100, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Paul Powhida, O51475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Charles Elwood Voorhees, O30101, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Edmund Hawley Jones, O30102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Henry Pochyla, O30103, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Theodore August Rathje, O42311, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Nelson Isaac Decker, O30105, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Marvin Henry Snyder, O30106, United States Army.
×Capt. Victor Morgan Ryan, O42312, United States Army.
×Maj. Robert Edwin Hisle, O51476, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Evert Spencer Thomas, Jr., O30107, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Howard Willoughby, O30108, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Glenn Leonard Clinebell, O30109, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Millard Shaw, O42313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clark Webber, O30111, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arthur Terry Hill, O30112, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Arnold David Blair, O51477, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Samuel Hastings Wrightson, O39879, United States Army.
Maj. Lewis Gabriel Villere, O42520, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Arthur Briggs, O42315, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Jackson Woolley, O51478, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Pasquale Pietro Maiorano, O42316, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dana Emerson Smith, O38759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Stanley Archer Young, O51479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Donald Kenneth Hughes, O38708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Llewellyn Corey, O56814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Merle Leroy Mennie, O39880, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Frank John Culley, O30117, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Abner Stanley, O30118, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Russell Reifsnyder, O39881, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Martin Bradley, Jr., O42318, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Lester Lewis, O30119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph James Griffin, O39882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Vincent Usera, O39883, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ramon Antonio Sandin, O39884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Mervin C. Bowers, O42319, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Don Snowden Mathews, O30121, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John David George, O30122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Arthur Augustus Weinland, O30123, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gustaf Adolph Engstrom, O30124, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Russell Hawkins Horton, O30125, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gines Perez, O30126, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Perry Henderson, O51483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Cornelius James Rinker, O30129, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Harry Donald Kamy, O42321, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Merle John Senn, O42322, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John James Shoemaker, O30133, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Byron Edward Williams, O30134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Edward Langley White, O39885, United States Army.
×Capt. Vernon Hammonds, O51486, United States Army.
Lt. Col. William Harold McCreary, O42324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Alexander Thomas McElroy, O30135, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Hartley Fuller Dame, O51487, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lee Huse Pray, O30886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Andrew Seitz, O30137, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).
Capt. John Kershaw Lee, Jr., O30136, United States Army.
Lt. Col. James Ansel Gaston, O30138, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Larry James O'Neil, O38761, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Glenn E. Nida, O30140, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Donald Angus Sanders, O51489, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Curtis Moultry Banks, O30143, United States Army.

Maj. George Quincy Bass, O39888, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fitzhugh Horton Chandler, O42328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Joe Le Roy Fincher, O30145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Leonard Marshall Johnson, O42329, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).
Lt. Col. Francis Richard Blankenship, O42330, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lewis Andrew Hunt, O39889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. George William James, O30146, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Emil Albert Lucke, O42331, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Charles Frank Mallalieu, O42333, United States Army.
Maj. John Rodgers Clifton, O30148, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Ralph Saenz, O38762, U. S. Army.
Maj. John Jay Jewett, O39890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Arthur Minot, O42335, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Hubert Paul Coleman, O42336, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William M. Campbell, O42337, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Emanuel Martin Robertson, O30149, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lloyd Graham Hanley, O30150, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald MacGlashan MacWillie, O30152, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Hugh Painter Osborne, O30151, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Bradley Smith, O51491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Courtland Forrest Brittain, O42341, United States Army.
Capt. Eugene Edward Miller, O30156, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Shelly Prusher Myers, Jr., O30157, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Stewart Hood Knowlton, O30159, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Arthur Shaw, O42343, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. James Terry DeJarnette, O42344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. William Russell Spillman, O42345, United States Army.
Maj. Jack Oliver Cromwell, O42346, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Stanley Woodard Smiley, O30160, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. William Alexander Mowery, O51492, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Stephens Neel, O51493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Mason French Goodloe, O30161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Lund Foster Hood, O39892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas William Bender, O30162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Chester Bucher, O51494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Hugo George Goetz, Jr., O39894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. James Ernest Akans, O39893, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Merwin Howard Smith, O42349, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Elmer Harvey Harrelson, O42350, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leonard Edward Wellendorf, O29538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Bradley Roelofs, O38764, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Doyle Nutt, O30164, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Richards Hubbard, Jr., O30165, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Stuart Meredith Cox, O39896, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Raymond Coward, O51495, United States Army.
Lt. Col. John Thomas O'Neill, O30166, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Glenn Joseph McGowan, O42353, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. William Theodore Grenier, O30167, United States Army.
Capt. Lewis Henry Keyes, O38765, United States Army.
Maj. Guy Anthony Orsino, O30168, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William John McDonald, O30169, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Hawley Hayden, O42356, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Dudley Clark Breckenridge, O39897, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Forrest Phillips, O30170, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. James Richard Nagel, O30171, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Luther Harper, O51497, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Gus Spiece Zinnecker, O42357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Joseph Stanley Bochnowski, O51498, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Frederick Thomas Kent, Jr., O30172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Erman Milford Newman, O30173, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Thomas Massingale, O51499, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Thomas Wadsworth Eddington, O30174, United States Army.
Maj. Lawrence Carrithers Threlkeld, O51501, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ernest August Benser, O42360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Stuart Sheets Hoff, O38766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Frank Day, Jr., O51503, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Homer Edwin Long, O30176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Walter Ray Ewing, O42362, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Eugene Victor Blaser, O42364, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Byron Feindel, Jr., O30177, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Bertram Howard Johnson, O51503, United States Army.
×Maj. Robert Louis Roper, O42365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Co. Roy Alexander Murray, Jr., O42366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Ralph Turner, O39899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl Edward Williamson, O30178, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Rubert Daniel Chapman, O42367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Wilton George Gaefe, O30179, United States Army.
Capt. Robert McFarland Mouk, O42368, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Lawrence Lewis Boyd, O30180, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Alfred Ludman Stevens, O51506, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Elmer Brown, Jr., O39900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arthur Ernst Messner, O30181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Charles Alexander, Jr., O39901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Elverson Earl Baker, O30183, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harry Christ Petros, O30184, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Roy Ridlehuber, O39902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Nelson Swartz, O39903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Jack Martin Ernst, O42371, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Embree Ensign Reynolds, O51507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lewis Tabor Martin, O30188, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Vernon William Rice, O30189, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Merrill LeRoy Tribe, O42374, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Martin Hurst, O30191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Donald Dominic Limoncelli, O42375, United States Army.
Maj. James Bernard McNally, O30192, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Major George Edward Crane, O42377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Ervin Huneycutt, O29945, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Major Townsend Canfield Anderson, O30195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Thomas Brogan, O30194, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Captain Bule Hess, O42379, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Robert Luther Ford, O38767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edward Murthas Jones, O30197, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Albert Leonard Reed, O42380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Henry Marx Stiebel, O30198, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Manfred Jacques Hess, O30200, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. David Gustive Schepp, O42382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Blanchard Jeffery, O30201, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Lewis LeVerl Flamm, O42384, United States Army.
Maj. Oscar Glenn Goodhand, Jr., O51511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Willard Winfield Mize, O30204, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas Gordon Harton, O42385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Cooper Bush, O30205, United States Army.

Maj. Harlan William Hendrick, O30206, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Webb, O30207, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Edmund Trail, O40206, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Fredrick Ryan, O40213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Ray Taylor, O42187, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Johnston Preston, Jr., O[illegible] Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Albert McEachern, O30207, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Willard Caughron, O31519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clayton Parry, O29908, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald George Dow, O42389, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clewis Clayton Moffett, O39909, United States Army.

Lt. Col. George Francis Moynahan, Jr., O30210, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lennart Yngve Ohlsson, O30211, United States Army.

Capt. John Patrick McGovern, O42391, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Blaire Aloysius Froehle, O42392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clair M. Worthy, O39911, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Troy Alton Barker, O42394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harper Brown Cowles, O51515, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Levin, O39912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Edward Baker, O42395, United States Army.

Lt. Col. John Raymond Riley, O38768, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thornton Eugene Jones, O30214, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert B. Evans, O30215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John McBride, O30216, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Osmyn Arsene Vining, O42398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seaborn Hawes Mosely, O42399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dallas Buford Pack, O51517, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Boyce, O42402, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Lee Johnson, O30219, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Warren Karl Pratt, O51519, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Paul Ernest Bellamy, O30220, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Cad Luna, O42403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Aubrey Locke, O29967, United States Army.

Capt. Danna Lee Lane, O51520, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. James Edward Harper, Jr., O42404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. William John Murphy, O30222, United States Army.

Capt. Kenneth Grant Harrison, O51522, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Thomas Marvin Larner, O30223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sam James Rasor, O38760, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Stock Himes, O30224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maskell Edward Brown, O30014, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Walden Phillips, O42407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Anthony Sabatelli, O51525, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Kelly Blair, O51526, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lewis Willey, O42408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vancel Ritson Beck, O30233, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Lincoln Nelson, O30232, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Paul Curtin, O30231, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Noble DeVaney, O38770, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Louis Ryan, Jr., O30234, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph McNamara, O51528, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland Veeder Miller, O30235, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Augustus Deagle, O30237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Freebairn Jackson, O51529, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Constantine Vardas, O30236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Dale Malen, O42410, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Ernest Courtland Parks, Jr., O30238, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon Oscar Pond, O42412, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willard Renwick Seymour, O38772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Douglas Cornell, O51531, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George William Barry, O39916, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Hudson Vail, O51533, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Garfield Wobbeking, O42417, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Franklin True, O38773, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charlie Emmett Ashburn Morgan, O51535, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Beverly Matthews Leigh, Jr., O39917, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold John Pearson, O42418, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Louis Hart, O30241, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Frederick Kuster, O42419, United States Army.

Maj. Frederick George Ward, O39918, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Vincent Holly, O42420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Michael Clisson, O30243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Tank, O19350, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas DeForth Rogers, O19351, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Erlenkotter, O19354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Staunton Lindsley Brown, O19355, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Moser Sieg, O19357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Julian Tate, O19358, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Burton Blodgett Bruce, O19360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert George MacDonnell, O19361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Leon Andrews, O19361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Jackson Renfroe, Jr., O19364, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joslin Himes, O19365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beauchamp Miller, O19366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Fell, O19368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Rea Revie, O19369, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ochsenschlager Killian, O19370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Heber Lipscomb, O19371, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Walsh, O19372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Austin Wortham Betts, O19373, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Page Buehler, O19374, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seymour Irving Gilman, O19377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Butler Warren, O19380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilford Edward Harry Voehl, O19382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jonathan Owen Seaman, O19385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kermit LeVelle Davis, O19386, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellis Oakes Davis, O19387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harvey Julius Jablonsky, O19390, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Urquhart Pullen Williams, O19391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Samuel Peca, O19392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Ringo Moorman, O19394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Oscar Baker, O19396, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hicks Anderson, O19398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Severin Richard Beyma, O19399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Frelinghuysen Hoffman, O19403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Miles Birkett Chatfield, O19404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry White, Jr., O19407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mathew Valois Pothier, O19410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Sylvester Piram, O19411, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Adams, O19412, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Almon White Manlove, O19413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John DuVal Stevens, O19414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Yale Harold Wolfe, O19415, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Farnsworth Smolier, O19416, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Craig Smyser, O19417, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Kemble, Jr., O19418, Army, of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Richardson Hester, O19419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gersen Leo Kushner, O19420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Edward Weber, Jr., O19421, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Charles Davall, O19425, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Delbert Womack, O19426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Gardner Baker, O19427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ronald LeVerne Martin, O19428, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wadsworth Hill, O19430, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Oliver Vars, O19432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry William Ebel, O19434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Belmont Routh, O19437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lee Carl Miller, O19438, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Travis Ludwell Petty, O19439, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Peter James Kopcsak, O19440, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Griffith Fingenour, O19441, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Scott Penn, Jr., O19442, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Willoughby Moorman, O19444, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Lake Sanders, O19445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merlin Louis DeGuire, O19446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander James Stuart, Jr., O19447, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Percy Thomas Hennigar, O19450, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Riffel Kenerick, O19452, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Lee McKee, O19453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Howard Garrett Fuller, O19190, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stacy William Gooch, O19455, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clark Lynn, Jr., O19456, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo William Henry Shaughnessey, O19458, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Jenkins Hubbard, O19459, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Knox Yarbrough, Jr., O19460, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Free Surratt, O19461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Morris Howard, O19464, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gordon Graham Warner, O19466, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Patterson Mossman, O19469, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carl Bahr, O19470, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Carter Norvell, O19471, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Walker Darrah, Jr., O19473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hawkins Adams, O19474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Glover McLennan, O19475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Franklin, Jr., O19476, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Gilmore Bilbo, Jr., O19477, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stilson Hilton Smith, Jr., O19480, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Alonzo Cunin, O19481, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Eugene Wood, O19483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frederic Carson Cook, O19484, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Elmer Fellenz, O19485, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Percival Stanley Brown, O19487, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Clary Foote, O19488, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bernadou Elliott, Jr., O19490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Winn, O19491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Henry Heyne, O19493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Evans Lardin, O19494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Herbert Wood, O19498, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dana Watterson Johnston, Jr., O19506, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Murray Cheston 3d, O19507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Edward Still, O19510, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Guldlin Simenson, O19511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Caufield, O19515, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Snee, O19516, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dudley Wilmeth, O19519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Lester Hillyard, O19524, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hutcheson Craig, O19526, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Doak McKinney, O19529, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Johnson, O19534, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carson Kyser, O19535, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dixon Lawlor, O19536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Russell William Volckmann, O19537, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Linscott Durfee, O19538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hallett Daniel Edson, O19541, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Rusteberg, O19542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl Trueheart Gould, O19544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harold Webb Browning, O19545, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Hadley Andrae, O19546, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Frederick Northam, O19547, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lowe Eatman, O19548, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Berchman Stanley, O19549, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Brown, O19552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nathaniel Plummer Ward, 3d, O19553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Buchanan Wells, O19554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Adams McPheron, O19555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Hogan Hayes, O19556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Conly Brookhart, O19562, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Messmore O'Connell, O19563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Walker Jenna, O19564, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerhard Leroy Bolland, O19565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Bentley Kern, O19566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Alfred Walsh, Jr., O19567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Horner Gerhart, O19569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Andrew McCrary, O19570, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John George Benner, O19571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Travis Tabor Brown, O19574, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Gantt Hickman, O19575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Alexander Cunningham, 3d, O19579, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Meade Julian Dugas, O19582, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Almon O'Neil, O19583, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Emory Alexander Lewis, O19584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Joseph Mullen, Jr., O19586, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Hammond Waugh, Jr., O19587, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Neilson, O19588, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Hector McKinnon, O19590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dennis John McMahon, O19592, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James O'Hara, O19593, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Nabors Tyson, O19594, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Buchanan Richardson, Jr., O19596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Marion George Stewart, Jr., O30244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Shirley Guy Blencoe, O30245, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Harry Reynolds, O39919, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Clark Wilson, O30248, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Herbert Henry Naughton, O51536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John O'Connell, O42422, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Clark Graham Campbell, O38774, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. William Ferdinand Schmidt, O42423, United States Army.
Capt. William Henry Ward, Jr., O51537, United States Army.
Lt. Col. John Valleau Rathbone, Jr., O42424, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Page Harrison Slaughter, O30250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Frederick Stein, O51538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Edgar Yanka, O30252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Howard Gregory Ford, O38775, United States Army.
Lt. Col. James Grady Hattox, O30253, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Henry Fillmore, O30254, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Hal Peter Andersen, O39920, United States Army.
Maj. Robert Hamilton Scott, O30255, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. James Eugene Foster, O30256, United States Army.
Maj. Marzelle Freeman Boyd, O39921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gerald King Gifford, O51539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Barney McGary, O51540, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Walter Finn, O30257, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Claude Patrick Joyce, Jr., O42426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Roy Falke, O51542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arthur Paul Ireland, O51543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ernest Thomas Trial, O30259, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ford Elliott Allcorn, O51544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edward Bishop Crossman, O42428, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Franklin Morris Flinlau, O30263, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Neal Woodrow Harper, O30262, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harlow Engle Allen, O39922, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).
Maj. Harold Robert Richmond, O30265, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robley Dunglison Evens, O39924, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Oliver Clark Harvey, O38776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Francis Escude, O30519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Bascomb Miller, O30266, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Howard Henry Burd, O42434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas Norby, O51548, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Stuart Myron Alley, O30268, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Owen Thomas McClosky, O30269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard Kilbourne Eggleston, Jr., O30271, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Kenneth William Gillespie, O30273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Earle Fillmore Mitchell, O30272, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Walter Edwards, O30274, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Richard John Grondona, O42439, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Franklin Roscoe Brickles, O30278, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. George Jay Banigan, O42443, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Jesse Devon Jackson, O51555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wentworth Hamilton Taylor, Jr., O30280, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Christopher Jesse, O42446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Godbey, O30281, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Miller Davis, O30282, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Hugh Montgomery Arnold, O30283, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Lewis De Haas, O30284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robin Brem Gardner, O38777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederic Donald Ray, O51558, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Dill Raney, O30285, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Jacob Richard Hershey, O30286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Stuart Wilkes, O30288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Joseph Ferdinand Vering, O30289, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harry Goddard Foster, O30291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Charles Bass, O30292, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Thaddeus William Drobek, O42453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Louis Martin Nawrocky, O30293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Oscar Rooney, O42454, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Henry Watson, O42458, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Kreigh Moody, O38778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Farles Pindar, O42463, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Archibald Douglass, O30296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wilfred Knobeloch, O42464, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Claudius Albert Beall, Jr., O39931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Sanford Joseph Butler, O30297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles William Henry, O30299, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Henry Robert Sievers, O30298, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Philo Milton Baumgartner, O38780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Pongonis, O30301, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard Arthur Miner, O39933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Anthony Stahl, O39934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wayne Pinkerton Litz, O30304, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Holman Don Hoover, O30305, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Philip Buckley Melody, O38782, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Emmett Rochford, O30307, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Perry Edwards, O30309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Walter Andrew Taylor, O51566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Lee Ferguson, O30046, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Foley, O42474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. George Patrick Miller, O42475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Donald Peterson, O30311, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Louis Davids, O38783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur John Cornelson, O51567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jack Edgar Willis, O30313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Max James Roadruck, O42479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward McMaken, O30318, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Norman Parker Barnett, O38784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Major Harry William Berry, O42480, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin William Saurel, O42482, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Frank Blackmon, O51569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Edgar Allen Noel, O51570, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Louis M. Etherton, O39940, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Samuel Tilden McDowell, O30321, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Devitt Edmunds, O30323, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Delio Perez, O30324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Eugene Stevenson, O38785, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Emery Douglas Middleton, O30329, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Douglas Hand, O30328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Lee Rhea, O30327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Joseph William Jogl, O30330, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Willice Edgar Groves, O30075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Francis Maguire, O30332, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Bennett Laugerman, O30333, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Earl Floyd Pegran, O42487, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ernest Edward Steck, O42490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Erwin Edward Sullo, O42491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wilbur Wilson, O42494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Lynn Hubert Webb, O39946, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gordon Charles Gill, O42495, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wilton Briggs Moats, O30336, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Dasher Shearouse, O30337, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Wiltrakis, O51575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Emery Erwin Hyde, O51576, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leo George Woerner, O30341, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Theodore Gustav Thomas, O30344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Donald Hoisington, O30348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Manlius Rupert Stewart, O42503, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Paul William Albert, O42507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Paul Taplin Scott, O30351, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lewis Drexel Morgan, O42508, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Chester Emil Lange, O30353, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis William Anderson, O30354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Curtis Chedister, O30355, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Jesse Deaderick Willoughby, O38787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Maurice E. Webb, O30357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Walter Bidwell, O29508, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Julian Alexander Wilson, O30359, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Russell Sage Hahn, O56815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John D'Alessandro, O42510, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Helmer Haliden, O30360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harrell Glenn Hall, O51580, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dale D. Dixon, O38788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Honald Noel Maidt, O42513, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Robbins, O42512, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ward Conrad Howard, O42515, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Nyles Wesley Baltzer, O51581, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wilber Alexander Stevens, O30365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Kenneth Bowen Potter, O30366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Ralph Homer Stephens, O30367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Henry Wagner, O42518, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lewis Matthew Flint, O42519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Samuel Lindsay Hall, O51584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert William Lockridge, O42524, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Frederick Zinser, O30370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Preston Miller Motes, O30372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Calvin Neely, O30374, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis Peter Carberry, O38789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl Verner Burke, O38790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Carl Feil, O30379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Alexander Cawfield, O30378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Edgar Mickel, O38793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Helmer August Holmstrom, O30382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wilton Louis Sanders, O38794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Hert, O39952, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Clair Edwin Towne, O30385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arthur Barney Oldfield, O42532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Thomas McKee, O30383, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Scott Hays, O42534, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Ralph Wesley Gontrum, O51596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ted James Madden, O42537, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Glenn Neely, O42538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Hugh Gordon Brown, O42539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Murray Adams Little, O39956, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Glenn Lang, O51600, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lynn Wilson Pine, O30392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Samuel Edward Burns, O30394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Peter Peters, O39961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Carl Garrison, O30144, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Morton Albert Rubin, O39962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Earl Milton Hamilton, O30398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas John Trainor, O51604, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl McClellan Poston, O30400, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Frith Bienvenu, O30401, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Eugene Byrns, O51606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Robert Barricklow, O56816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Garnett Steffey, O30404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clinton Adolph Waggoner, O42552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Alexander Persell, O51608, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Peter Hermann Dahmlow, O30406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Chandler Dodenhoff, O30407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Mario De Maio, O30399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leniel Edward McDonald, O30408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Mudgett, O30409, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Edwin Jennings, O39964, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Clifford Peterson, O42555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Ivor Jones, O30410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leslie Duncan Goodall, O30411, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Levis Chalmers Wiggins, O42556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Elmer Russell Powell, O30414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Herbert Mahoney, O51613, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward William Quinlan, O51617, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond George Trampe, O42561, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Vernon Walter Brugger, O39966, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Joseph Bolling Seay, O30420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Jefferson Hornaday, O30423, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Balthasar Steiner, O51622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Edwin Johnston, O30424, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arent Orvil Wiken, O30426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Archie Cheatham, O30427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Shelley, O42571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Cornelius Culbreth, O30429, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Chester Malcolm Stratton, O30431, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nathan McQuade Quinn, O42574, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kennard Smith Vandergrift, O42575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Edward McClish, O30432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Coates, O30433, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wilkens Burnett, O42578, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Floyd Eason, O30435, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Henry Overby, O30437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Hudson Newton, O42579, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Colvin, O30434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Albert Hauck, O30436, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Prokop, Jr., O98797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dick Andrew King, O30438, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Morgan Barnes Heasley, O30175, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Tracy Gerard, O30445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Roy George DeVecchio, O42584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Richard Bech, O42585, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur von Molt DeLoach, O30449, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Joe Dyekman, O30455, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Emmanuel Fernandez, O30454, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alex Earl McKenzie, O39967, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wilkes May, O39968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jefferson Rueben Cronk, O30461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Wilson Johnston, O30462, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Rossing, O42593, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Leland Motz, O42596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward McClam Foxworth, O42598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Andres Troy, O42597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Grant W. Mason, O30738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Allen Darden Jr., O42599, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Condon, O39972, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Hugh Moore, O42602, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Charles Nauman, O30467, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry McCann, Jr., O30468, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Lucien Fortin, O42605, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Edwin Skelly, O30473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Kimball, O42607, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jacob Fargo Wagner, O30475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Brocks, Jr., O38801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Blaine Frastus Anderson, O39976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Graham, O39977, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Alexander Shadrick Turner, O51632, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Wendell Caron, O30479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Barton Emmons, O39979, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Samuel Mathes, O30481, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Justin William Stoll, O30483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Jerome Newman, O51635, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph T. Mozley, O42611, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Lyle Barnett, O30469, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bert Kirkman Whaley, O42612, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James George Basbas, O42354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Stevens Hardiman, O30492, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver O. Dixon, O30494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Roberts, O30493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herrick Franklin Bearce, O30498, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Francis Lovell, O42616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Jenkins Badger, O39981, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Ballentine, O39983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Frederick Hansen, O42618, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Lawrence Weinerth, O42620, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Byron Baker, O30239, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Slaughter Carpenter, O42622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Garlen Randolph Bryant, O30507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Holbrook, O51646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Vernon Lester Lewis, O42628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Rudolph Brannan, O42629, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Drake Bristor, O19710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Abeel Phelan, O19711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Aaron Evan Harris, O19712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Hamilton Gregg, O19713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Campbell Wallace, O19715, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Houston Frye, Jr., O19716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Caran Gee, O19717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Allen Elliget, O19719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Calhoun Zeigler, O19720, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Joseph Pickard, O19723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otto Jacob Rohde, O19725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Somers Buist Dick, O19726, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Winston Lapsley, O19727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James DeVore Lang, O19728, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Jephthiah Jeffus, O19730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Lewis Hille, Jr., O19731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Lathrop Throckmorton, O19732, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Ruhlen, O19733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelius DeWitt Willcox Lang, O19734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Richards Parker, O19735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Carl Haug, O19736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Sutton Growdon, O19737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Duffy, O19738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Sylvester Everett, O19739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Watkins Miller, O19740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Salvatore Andrew Armogida, O19741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Paulding Grieves, O19742, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Tage Birger Johnson, O19743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Alexander Osmanski, O19745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Sanders Waterman, O19746, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Benjamin Hall, Jr., O19747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Langfitt Bowditch Wilby, O19748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dudley Cole, Jr., O19749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Raymond Wilkins, O19750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry James Lewis, O19751, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Albert Symroski, O19753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Chaffee Thayer, O19754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Yeates Adams, O19755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Jacob Lemley, Jr., O19756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duncan Sinclair, O19757, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Geoffrey Dixon Ellerson, O19759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray Allen Pillivant, O19761, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellery Willis Niles, O19763, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Rigby Glass, O19765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Stafford Eckhardt, O19766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvin Dolliver Robbins, O19769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sidney George Spring, O19770, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Stephen Bechtold, O19771, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seth Lathrop Weld, Jr., O19772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Clare Rumsey, O19774, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel John Murphy, O19776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Bidgood, O19777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Albert Simpson, O19778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh McClellan Exton, O19780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Durward Ellsworth Breakefield, O19781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sanford Welsh Horstman, O19783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col Kelso Gordon Clow, O19784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harry Herndon Critz, O19786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Porter van Ormer, O19787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Kraus, O19789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Irwin Curtis, O19790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Charles Moore, O19791, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Alexis Gloriod, O19793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Nathaniel Macon Martin, O19794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Salathiel Fred Cummings, Jr., O19796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col James Martin Worthington, O19797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Michael Donohue, O19798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clarence McDonald, Jr., O19799, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Waters Keating, O19800, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Halford Robert Greenlee, Jr., O19801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Robert St. John, O19805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Frederick Brown, O19806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard George Root, O19807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles McLean Peeke, O19810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Boyd Firehock, O19812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Milton Lawrence Rosen, O19814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Mobley Kimbrough, Jr., O19816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ralph Wright, Jr., O19817, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Barnwell Harden, Jr., O19818, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Moseley Harris, O19819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Luke Frink, Jr., O19821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer John Gibson, O19822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julius Desmond Stanton, O19823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Bryde, O19825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Washington Woodyard, Jr., O19826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Gilbert Fries, O19827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Rich Hale, O19828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Leonard, Jr., O19829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Frank Skells, O19830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seneca Wilbur Foote, O19833, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Willoughby Totten, O19834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Henry Walter, O19836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Curtis Wells, Jr., O19838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Melroy Miner, O19839, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Nevin Howell, O19840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hamilton Austin Twitchell, O19843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alfred Ashman, O19846, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dyce Alger, O19848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., O19849, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ewing Chase Johnson, O19851, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Johnstone Murdoch, Jr., O19853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pennock Hoyt Wollaston, O19854, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Theodore Isham, O19856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Mark McGoldrick, O19857, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Alfrey, O19859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Rieber Russ, O19860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Dilley, O19861, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Charles Orth, Jr., O19863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Duncan Gillis, O19864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Autrey Joseph Maroun, O19865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Clay Taylor, O19867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Cobb Stancook, O19870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Brown Morgan, O19871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Henry Wiechmann, O19874, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Foster Rhoades, O19875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Robert Oglesby, O19877, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Calvin Stapleton, O19878, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col, William Vincent Martz, O19879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Arvid Skinrood, O19882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Noel Maurice Cox, O19883, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Crook Anderson, O19884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hart Caughey, O19885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Edward Schlanser, O19886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Thomas Cherry, Jr., O19888, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Joseph Treacy, Jr., O19892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reuben Henry Tucker 3d, O19894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Genier Proctor, O19895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Hardic Walker, O19898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clair Beverly Mitchell, O19899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Williamson, O19900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Duzzette Farnsworth, Jr., O19904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Price Mock, O19906, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Allen Beall, Jr., O19907, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Wythe Gleaves Rich, O19910, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald William Bernier, O19911, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harvey Bower, O19912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Allen Harvey Foreman, O19913, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Floyd Garfield Pratt, O19915, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Glenn Cole, O19917, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward William Sawyer, O19918, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Bradford Means, O19920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Gibson Sherrard, Jr., O19922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson Boyle, O19924, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Stephen Disbrow Cocheu, O19925, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin White Heckemeyer, O19930, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Nassieb George Bassitt, O19931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Oscar Rawles Bowyer, O19934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John James Davis, O19935, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Norman Basil Edwards, O19936, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Eugene Tucker, O19938, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alfred Kirk duMoulin, O19943, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Edward Bare, Jr., O19944, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul James Bryer, O19947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Burnis Mayo Kelly, O19950, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lester Lewes Wheeler, O19951, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carmon Ambrose Rogers, O19952, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Russell Batch Smith, O19953, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Marcus Samuel Griffin, O19954, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Hayden Agnew, O19956, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Leroy Thomas, O19958, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Russell Lynn Hawkins, O19960, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eric Per Ramee, O19961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Hood Ferris, O19962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Madison Jones, O19965, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Louis McGehee, O19969, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Graham Barnwell, Jr., O19980, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Albert Riemenschneider, O19970, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Pierce O'Neal, Jr., O19971, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Place Hill, Jr., O19972, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Melville Brown Coburn, O19973, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Bonesteel Stone, O19976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Osborn Lashley, O19982, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Robert Clarkin, O19983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Pope Blackshear, O19984, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George August Meidling, O42634, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edward Lucas Austin, O38805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl Henry Elges, Jr., O30511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Orth Beckner, O30512, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roland James Halada, O42635, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Philip MacGregor Judson, O30516, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Olin Hoffman, O30517, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leon Flores Punsalan, O42639, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Hamilton Colwell, O42640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Milton Humphrey Price, O30518, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Clinton Whicher, O39936, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Richard William Bowden, O42642, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Maurice Loring Driscoll, O30525, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard Elbert Von Kaenel, O30527, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Herbert Joseph O'Connor, O51654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Nason Walker, Jr., O51655, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Chesley Harris, O30529, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Allen Gross, O30528, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Russell Porter Grant, O42646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond Wilhelm Reisner, O51656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Frederick Ellis, O51657, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Knight Britton, O30532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul James Ritchie, O38808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Luther Elman Johnson, O30535, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Millard G. Bowen, Jr., O30536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Orval Calvin Thompson, O30539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roland Hull Mapes, O30538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Neal Wallace Lovsnes, O30540, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Edward Wilson, O30542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harrison Schermerhorn Markham, O20073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Floyd Edward Gidinsky, O30543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas Vernon Munson, O42654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Merle Garretson, O38809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jack Nicholas Nahas, O39990, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Sackton, O30553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Alvin Pace, O30552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Sture Alexander Ansell, O30554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Heinrich Gary Schumann, O39991, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lowell Traxler Bondshu, O51670, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Theodore Fox Astrella, O42356, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Pat M. Stevens, 3d, O30557, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Hewitt, O30558, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Ivy Davis, O42658, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ernest Wyttenbach Ewbank, Jr., O30474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Eugene Smith, O30559, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Merlin Oscar Tryon, O38810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alexander Hamilton Miller, O39992, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert French Evans, O42662, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Rellie Weldon Adams, O42663, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Vernon Merriweather Smith, O39993, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Leslie Calhoun, O42664, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Byrd Gall, O30563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Benson Alexander, O30565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ramon Carl Dougan, O30566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Erdie Otis Lansford, O30569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Lucian Ward, O38811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Horace Fenton McFeely, O38812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Harry Schnee Messec, O51682, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Colle A. Quinn, O30571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bennett Goodwin, O30573, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Whitwell Bowman, O38813, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles MacKinnon Ackley, O39997, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wilbur Morgan Johnson, O30577, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Armel Dyer, O42674, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Horace Entricen Townsend, O30578, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Lewis Schaefer, O39999, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fay Edward Joseph Carey, O38814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Everett Holman, O38815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arland Eugene Bigelow, O51687, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Carroll Barton McMath, Jr., O42678, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Douglas Stevens, O38816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Irwin Thomas Shaw, O42379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Russell Gilbert, O51689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Guinn Burch Goodrich, O42680, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Leon Bieri, O42682, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gus Edward Lehmann, O40001, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Gerson Haskell, O30588, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Wells Vance, O51693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Lamoreaux Warfield, O30590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Maurice Neal Clark, O42690, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Herman Bosbyshell, O30596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Maxwell McClain, O42693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Brown Richardson, O30597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. LeRoy Beatty Woodbury, Jr., O30598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Winston Butscher, O30599, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harrison Hines Finlayson, O42697, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Franklin Ashenfelder, O40008, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Lawrence MacKusick, O42695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Albert Deason, O30601, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lawrence Spencer Simcox, O30602, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Paul Mulrooney, O42699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Raymond Walter Burkett, O30603, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Clyde Elhannon White, O42700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Gilbert Turner, O31414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roberts Homer Billingsley, O30608, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Theodore Law Poole, Jr., O30606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Eugene Michael Lill, O40011, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Andrew Paul Flanagan, O30609, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Giles Henry Gere, O51707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Murphy Murray, O30610, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Adrian Johansson, O51710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Milburn Neil Huston, O30612, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Lassetter, Jr., O51714, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Donald McPhail, O30613, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph Raber, O30614, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Theodore Larned Eastmond, O40013, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Armington Baldry, O30615, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Cornelius Taylor, O30616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Philip Eugene Pons, O30621, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lennard Charles Sorensen, O42710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Myron Lawrence Williams, O30622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Miles Albert Kinley, O51718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Massie Throckmorton, O42711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Bruce Edward Kendall, O30623, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ernest Wesley Philpot, O30627, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Warren Horton, O30626, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl Yates Farrell, O30628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond Richard Guehring, O51723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Edgar Baker, O42714, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Herman William Dammer, O30634, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Douglas Edgar, O30635, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Warren Schroder, O30637, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lester Keith Olson, O30640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Charles Brinsmead, O42715, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph Matkovcik, O30641, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Howard Cogswell Higley, O38821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Irving William Finberg, O42716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William John Scott, O42718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edward Warwick King, O30646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Earl Sheen, O40015, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Halsell Reynolds, O42721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Henry William Meinecke, O42722, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Bill Bassett Hunkapiller, O40016, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Roger Allen Rawley, O30648, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ambrose Thomas McGuckian, O42725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Orvie Palmer Anderson, O42727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fredolin William Kuhn, O51734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Radam, O51736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Byron Gregory, O51737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard Winston Langley, O30649, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Dillard Land, O30650, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Albert Raymond Cupello, O38822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Stafford Ashley Cooper, O42730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Russell Oliver Fudge, O30652, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Franklin Wells, O30654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harold Lee Freshwater, O51739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. John Harrison Dixon, O42733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Graham Roy Evans, O30656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Isadore Benjamin Burdick, O42735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Allen Miller, O40018, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Blair O'Connor, O51740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard Frederick Kuenning, O42739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Steven Malevich, O30660, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas William Donnell, O30663, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Norman Donald Carnes, O30666, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ernest Cliff Hudgins, Jr., O38824, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Carrol Settle, O30665, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Keith Thomas O'Keefe, O30669, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Aloysius Muth, O30670, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond LaVerne Blust, O30671, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Farnum, O42743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. William Otis Wyatt, O40020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Walter Donald Rogers, O30676, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lawrence Bernard Markey, O38826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Clifton Pennington, O42749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. LeRoy Ernest Frazier, O30678, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Bert de Melker, O30679, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Bob Haynes Glover, O30680, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Fred Deakyne Bendler, Jr., O30681, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Philip Joseph Galanti, O30684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Edward Hagerty, O30685, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Bailey Tibbs, O30688, Army of the United State: (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Lindley Ogden, O30689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Willard Britten, O38828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William John Fabritius, O40021, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Rensselaer Sanford, O38827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Douglas Chesley Barton, O38829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Crawford Farmer, O30691, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col William Fredrick Durbin, O51748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Donovan McCormick, O42765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Berkeley Bush, O30692, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Josephi Helms, O30694, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Hora McLauchlin, Jr., O51752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Glenn Carroll Hess, O51753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ritchie Garrison, O30696, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harry William Bues, Jr., O42772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Edward Lobit, O30699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Hamilton Reger, O30700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Frank Edwin Lee, O42775, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Allen Thomas Stanwix-Hay, O51759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Sidney Redfield, O30704, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Marcus Webb Adams, O40025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Carl Louis Ziegler, O30707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Rolla Darby Pollock, O38832, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Ewell Grant, O42778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George MacElwain Barker, O30708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. B. J. Leon Hirshorn, O51762, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Laurence Terry King, O30713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. George Emil Myers, O51765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Marter Denton Middleton, O51767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Preston Vincent Phelps, O40026, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Arthur Tolve, O40027, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Weston Arthur McCormac, O30716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond Frederick Field, O42784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Percy Davidson, O42785, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Robert Hector, O30717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Adrianus Johannus Van Oosten, O40028, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Marsh Patrick Stockton, O51769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Harold Moore, O30721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Fella Hill, O38835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harry Vincent Douglas, O42786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Thomas Laughlin, O30723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Earl Henry Hauschultz, O42789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Edward Robb, O42790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Shelby Linwood Gillette, O30727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Bruce Layton, O30729, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Josef Albert Prall, O51772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Henry Connerat, Jr., O30730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edmund Robert O'Brien, O40032, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Wulfe Kuehler, O30731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Kermit Harry Glenn McCoy, O51776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Edward Hughes, O30733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Oliver Olson, O30734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Gottfried Gramzow, O30735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Eugene Cooke, O30736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Luther Russell Miller, O30737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Abraham Walk, O42796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Ernest Kehke, O42797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leo Vasserot Merle, Jr., O51778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Thomas Bankus, O42799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Lathrop Paddock, Jr., O30740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jack Lloyd Williams, O42800, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Alph Hamberg, O30741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.)
Lt. Col. Ralph Harvey Elliott, O30744, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Donald Garton Buck, O30745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Fred Arfman, O42802, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Adolph Traeger, O30746, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald McBurney Curtis, O38837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Merton Barnum, O51780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clifford Earl Dykes, O51781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Otto Max Boerner, O30747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Kaighin Watts, O30752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Marshall Slayden, O30754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Clifton Conine, O30203, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Webster Wilder, Jr., O51784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Georg Wilhelm Finke, O40037, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wheeler Godfrey Merriam, O30759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert James O'Donnell, O51786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jack Cassels Jeffrey, O30763, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul LeGrand Jolley, O30764, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Truman Alford, O30765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richmond F. Thweatt, O30766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Wilson Harold Birch, O42816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army)
Lt. Col. Robert Richard Lutz, O30767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Melvin Adolf Hoherz, O42819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Pickett Smith, O30772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Mayo Ogilvie, Jr., O30773, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harry Waldemar Johnson, O42821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Brown Franks, O40041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Marvin Brown, O30777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Herbert Bernard Heyer, O40042, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Franklin Sutherland, O30779, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Melvin Hunt, O30782, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Maurice Benjamin Gullion, O42826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edward William Fitzgerald, O30495, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eugene S. Tarr, O42327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Oscar William Fulton, O30784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Charles Hunter, O40045, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Elbert Dupree, O40044, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Benjamin Franklin Keist, O38843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Wythe Munford Peyton, Jr., O42830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Jesse Mellette Johnson, O51797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Royden Arnold Konopaska, O30787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gordon Benjamin Page, O40046, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Wendell Swanson, O30788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Jennings Seigler, Jr., O30789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ernest Church Clark, Jr., O42834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Clapper, Jr., O42835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eugene Albert Salet, O30790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Raymond Van Fleet, O51801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Norman Welbec Parsons, O30793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Poats Littlejohn, O42837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Lawrence Leidenheimer, O30795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clifford LeRoy Woodliff, O30796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Myron Abraham Funk, O30798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Wilbur Otto, O30799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Clifton Davie, O40050, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Burton Keeney Philips, O40048, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Russell Summers, O42841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Henry Waters, O20114, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Ralph Dickson King, O20115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond John Harvey, O20116, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Bruce Palmer, Jr., O20117, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Reeves Shuler, O20118, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Dean McCarty, O20119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Herbert Kerkering, O20120, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Pierre Victor Kieffer, Jr., O20122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Karl Theodore Klock, Jr., O20123, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Arthur Milton Jacoby, O20125, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Alexander Falks, O20129, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Ervan White, Jr., O20130, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gilbert Meding Dorland, O20132, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Jay Hayes, 3d, O30134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gordon Henry Holterman, O20135, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Alexander Finley, O20136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Mellard Connor, Jr., O20137, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Jacob Katz, O20138, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wright Hiatt, O20139, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Kramer, O20140, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard Allen Morris, O20141, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Stephen Elliott Smith, O20142, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edgar Hall Thompson, Jr., O20143, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William David Milne, O20144, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Benjamin Lampert, O20147, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Reginald Joseph Beauregard Page, O20149, Army of the United States (captain; U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lawrence Edward Laurion, O20150, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Bernard Bess, O20151, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Albert Cozart, O20152, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Andrew Davis Chaffin, Jr., O20153, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Nott Beard, O20154, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Edward Kelly, O20156, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Stephen Walsh Holderness, O20157, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Emmett Goodwin, O20158, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Paul Francis Oswald, O20160, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Cecil Eldon Spann, Jr., O20162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Foster LeRoy Furphy, O20163, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard Pinkney Persons, Jr., O20167, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Adam Stephen Buynoski, O20169, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Daniel McElheny, O20170, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Kenneth Einar Madsen, O20171, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Van Valkenburg Sutherland, O20173, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thea Lewis Lipscomb, O20174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Oren Swain, O20176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David McCoach, 3d, O20177, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Henry Kessler, O20178, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Edgar Mikkelsen, O20179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Kinard, Jr., O20180, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eugene Everett Lockhart, O20181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Maxwell Morrison Kallman, O20182, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Richard Ganns, O20184, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Everett George Habney, O20185, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clifford Frederick Cordes, Jr., O20186, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Matthew Burnett, O20187, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Woodrow Hiester, O20191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Dudley Hartman, Jr., O20192, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Selwyn Dyson Smith, Jr., O20194, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond Lemuel Cato, O20195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Walter Romlein, O20197, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Aldrich Davis, O20198, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Alexander Grove, O20200, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Barry Yost, O30201, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Bruce Partridge, O20204, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Worthington Williams, O20205, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wilmer Charles Landry, O20206, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eldred George Robbins, Jr., O20211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard McCrum Snyder, Jr., O20213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Orville Newton Stokes, O20215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Edward Landrum, Jr., O20216, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Davis Torrey, Jr., O20217, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Raymond Prince, O20219, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Gilbert Grothaus, O20221, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ned Taylor Norris, O20222, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Childs Westmoreland, O20223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Earl Barlow, O20224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Kenneth Francis Dawalt, O20226, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Merritt Warfield, O20229, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leonard Copeland Shea, O20231, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

×Lt. Col. Harold Roy Low, O20234, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Beverley Evans Powell, O20237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Read Bodine, O20238, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Earl Franklin Holton, O20241, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Ridgeway Pancoast Smith, Jr., O20243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Hall Safford, O20244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Clare Dunn, O20245, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Chester Victor Clifton, Jr., O20246, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wilbur Maben Griffith, O20250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Langdon Andrew Jackson, Jr., O20251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joshua Asher Finkel, O20253, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry David Lind, O20256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Paul Christensen, O20257, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Edward Gooding, O20258, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Carl LaVerne Rickenbaugh, O20259, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Charles Haneke, A20263, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Tillman Willis, O20264, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Karl William Schwering, O20265, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Claude Lee Crawford, O20266, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert George Fergusson, O20267, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Edward McCabe, O20269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Joseph Jakle, O20270, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Walker Breaks, O20273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Harold Gaston, Jr., O20276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Wheaton Cole, Jr., O20277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Rainier Weaver, O20278, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Arnold Heintges, O20281, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Harold Daly, O20284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Daniel Mohlere, O20286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Francis Meany, O20287, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Peter Woods Garland, Jr., O20288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ned Butler Broyles, O20289, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Randolph Charles Dickens, O20290, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Elmer Williford Grubbs, O20291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fred Livingood Walker, Jr., O20293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Weldon Childs, O20294, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Henry Chiles, O20295, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Creighton Williams Abrams, Jr., O20296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Gregory Beggs, O20297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Thomas Ryder, O20298, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Edward Sievers, O20299, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Latham Crandell, Jr., O20306, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Worthington Cooke, O20307, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. McPherson LeMoyne, O20309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Lawrence John Ellert, O20311, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Wilkins Ripple, O20312, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Emmett O'Brien, Jr., O20313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Philip Sheffield Greene, O20314, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thurman Wesley Morris, O20315, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Clyde Lafayette Layne, O20317, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jesse Cyrus Drain, Jr., O20318, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Marvin Williams, O20319, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Austin Glenwood Fisher, O20324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Lee Simpson, O20325, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Allen Leeds Peck, O20327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Hersey Michaelis, O20328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Franklin Rogers Sibert, O20329, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Michael Illig, O20330, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Henry Kreitzer Benson, Jr., O20-331, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Francis Curran, O20338, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Burnham Milliken, O20340, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Allen Clinton Miller 2d, O20342, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Renwick Hughes, O20343, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard Franklin McManus, O20346, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert John Trout, O20347, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond Horace Tiffany, O20348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Glenn Austin Sikes, O20353, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Wallace Noake, O20357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Lincoln Edwards, O20359, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Otto Turnage, Jr., O20360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas James Lawlor, O20361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Pelham Yarborough, O20362, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Aloysius Elliott McCormick, Jr., O20363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Billingslea, O20367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin Evans, Jr., O20368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Billy Leer, O20370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Matthew Lynch, O20377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Manly Pack, O20378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Theodore Janof, O20382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Henry Nicolson, O30804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Stanton Palmer, O30806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Price Jones, Jr., O30807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edwin Lawrence Atkins, O30809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James McCauslin Moynahan, O42848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Arthur Claffee, O30810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Carroll James Williams, O30811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Davidson Alexander 3d, O40052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Burkitt Ameral Rey..olds, O30814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Philip Waters Regar, O40053, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Patrick Howard Devine, O31975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Gerald Alexander Paterick, O42853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Rudolph Morgan, O30251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Leslie Adam Arnold, Jr., O30815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Eugene Deering Billings, O30816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Michael Scott, O30822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Otto Gerot, O30818, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Albert Barkin, O51809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Ernest Doran, O38892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Richard Alderson Blair, O42858, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Vernon Porter, O31328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col Sylvester Alvin Hal', O40057, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Norman Argyle Campbell, O42861, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Sam Frederick Fleming, O42863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Elmer Lawrence Slob, O42867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Asa Calvin Black, O58694, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Bolick Albert Saholsky, O31331, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Breckenridge Coffin, O38895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Arthur James McBride, O42870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Emett Robert White, O31334, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Mostyn Williams, O31337, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Allan Benedict Rochford, O42876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Ridley Spark, O51812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Donald Lewis Adams, O31339, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Arno Lorenz, O30534, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Ernest Schoenfeld, O31342, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Louis Siegel, O42879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Leonard Frank Walker, O31344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Isaac Francis Bonifay, O40061, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Walter Warren McCarthy, Jr., O40062, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Leonard Joseph Julian, O51814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Welch Hill, Jr., O31348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Burton Edward Miles, O42886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. James Vincent Shea, O40063, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Bruce Tomlinson, O31354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Albert Emil Lofstrand, O42889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Waldo Wilburn Montgomery, O42890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John James Moore, O31355, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Kenneth Roy Dyer, O40065, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Horace Bruce Frederick, O42891, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Alfred Wyburd Furrell, O42894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Wyatt Rawlings, Jr., O42895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Harry A. Hall, Jr., O51819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Gordon Belser, Jr., O42897, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Danahy Albro, O31360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Finis Garrett Johnson, O40067, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Robert Platt Boyd, Jr., O40068, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jacob William Bealke, Jr., O31365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Ray Mason Bagley, O42902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roger Hargreaves Williams, O40069, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Rollin Harvey Smith, O31367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Thornton Walker, O31368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Aaron Jenkins, O31369, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Cecil Williams, O31372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Maurice Kilburn Schiffman, O31375, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clyde Vernon Pickell, O31376, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Bland West, O31378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Nathaniel Ramsey Hoskot, O31379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas Bernard Jones, O42919, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Webster Marcy, O31380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Reuben Star, O42920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Lee Witt, O31382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Joseph Stover, O31381, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin James Withers, O42921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Cyril Albert Millson, O42922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Joseph Dunn, O31385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Draper Easton, Jr., O51822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Melvin William Kernkamp, O42923, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Julian Powers Fox, Jr., O51823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Furman Walbridge Marshall, O42925, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roger Hunt Hemion, O40075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Joseph Frank Whitton, Jr., O51825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas William Akins, O40076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Omer Siegmond Dews, O40079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Paul Sampson, O42926, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Holmes Harrison, O31396, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clay Orville Collier, O42928, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Ezra Cuttino, O31397, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis Albert Dunphy, O31398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Paul Adam Anson, O31400, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lawrence Edwin Sommers, O31405, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Daniel Melvin Carter, O31406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Daniel Hines, O38900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Curry Ned Vaughan, O31407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Carroll Martin Covington, O40083, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Yates Allen, O31412, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Ernest Lyman, O38903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Albert Kuhn, O31419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lloyd Mitchell Marr, O31420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Andrew Woodbury, O42943, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Downing Temple, O51834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Weisberg, O40085, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Bradford Butler, Jr., O31425, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lyman Peter Marden, Jr., O40086, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Allen Ashley Futral, O42948, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ara Guy Lindley, O31427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Michael Jesse Reichel, O40087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dured Ellsworth Townsend, O31430, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Robert Magnusson, O31432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Seymour Blair Satterwhite, O31431, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ford Edwin Pratt, O31433, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Carl Leonard Whitney, O31435, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Livermore Whitten, O42954, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Vernon Allen Shurm, O31436, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Levin Bruce Cottingham, O42955, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Gordon Fort, O31437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Serle Blodgett, Jr., O31438, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Russell Springer, O30624, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Homer Cornelius Blake, O42959, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Earl Sutton, O42961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Norbert Charles Miller, O38905, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Gratian Michael Yatsevitch, O31442, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lewis Albert Hall, O40089, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lester Barney Johnson, O42963, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Hayden Arp, O31445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Louis Crownover, O42968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Eugene Milton Orton, O51844, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leonard George Robinson, Jr., O31448, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Joseph Martineau, O42971, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Clair Hall Thurston, O31453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Frances Quinn, O31454, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Frank Hill, O42973, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Major Aldon Mellroy Hoffman, O42975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Roland Philip Carlson, O31456, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Walton, O31459, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Francis Nowe, O31460, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dyson Crawford Sweger, O31461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard William Keyes, O31467, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Richard Smoak, O31463, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Henry Milford Freidinger, O42983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Arthur Goshorn, O31465, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Darien Duncan, O31466, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Harold Shell, O31472, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Loren Emerson Bishop, O40091, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Austin Stricklen, Jr., O31473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eugene Mimms Lee, O31474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Ambrus Thornton, O31818, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Duval Smith Adams, O42997, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Silas Gassett, O31481, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Herbert Hiram Champlin, O30661, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Carter Quinlin, O51860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Norman Merod Schroeder, O43002, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Brennan Egan, O43003, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Norman Arnold Anderson, O31483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Daniel Comm, O31484, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Wiley King, O51864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edmund Herman Lang, O43006, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Mabry Griffin Miller, O31486, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Clifford Gilbert O40095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Claude Harvey Matchette, O31490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Major Joseph Ron Lamar, O43014, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph LeRoy Dickie, O31493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Robert Swarm, O43018, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Herbert August Jordan, O38795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jack Allen Clark, O31496, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Waldemar Alexander Solf, O40145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Wesley Roberts, Jr., O40154, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wilmot Thomas Baughn, O40155, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joe Arthur Clema, O43020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ellis Dillon Blake, O43023, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Samuel Angus Bethune, O31502, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Glover Steiner Johns, Jr., O31501, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Edward McArdle, O30695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Robert Clark, O31506, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Clarence Lee, O43030, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Clifton Dalrymple, O31509, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Lincoln McMackin, O31511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Corydon Blake, O51875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gerald Edmond Feidt, O31513, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Albert Geddes, O31512, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Vincent Camden Frisby, O20543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edmonde Bernard Kelly, O20544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Perry Jones, Jr., O20546, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt Col. Willard Paul McCrone, O20548, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Aldo Hector Bagnulo, O20550, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis James Loomis, O20551, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Henry Dillon, O20552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jackson Graham, O20553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Christian Hanburger, O20554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Walter Sloat, O20556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Karl Fred Eklund, O20557, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard James Lowe, O20558, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Edward Leonhard, O20559, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Nels Redling, O31516, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Joseph Lagasse, O31517, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Franklin Knapper Eberhard, O40161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Hess Burba, O31518, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Joseph McLeod, O43036, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Benjamin Mangold, O31522, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robin Gloor Montgomery, O31525, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Austin Thetford, O38913, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Armond Ulrich, O31527, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jeff F. Hollis, O31528, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Royal Earle McShea, O51881, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edward Duda, O43041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Frederick Jeffers, O40165, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Harry Scordas, O38914, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Allyn Ord, O31532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Emerson Francis Hurley, O31533, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph John Peot, O31536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Rudisill Bush, O40166, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Edward McShane, O51884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Wilson Grant, O31539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Denzil Laval Baker, O43052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Donald Elster, O38915, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl Robert Yost, O31542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Fredric Rader, O31543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Marion Alexander Cromartie, O43057, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Daniel Fitzhugh Shepherd, O43060, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Waldemar Martin Mueller, O31553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Payne, O31554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Lawrence Prahl, O31555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lawrence Pierce Jacobs, O31556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin William Weissman, O31559, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Francis Lambert, O38919, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Udell Clay, O43072, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Linwood Griffin, Jr., O4 074, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Cecil Harold Davidson, O31560, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Frederick Nelson, O43073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Perry Benjamin Priest, O31562, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Henry Considine, O40172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Raciene Mason, O31563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick William Richards, O31565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leonidas George Gavalas, O31569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Arnold Clifford Gilliam, O31570, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Barry Foster Phillips, O51893, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Sydney Emil Sacerdote, O38920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald D. Shepherd, O31571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Leverett Sanford, Jr., O31572, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Haviland Arthur Neil Connolly, O31575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Louis Gershenau, O31577, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Melville Gold, O40179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Frederick Julian Owens, O43087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harvey Earl Sheppard, O43086, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Frankel, O40178, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Milton Robert Blum, O31695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ernest Lee Janes, O31587, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Franklin Earl Scott, O51898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl Edward Bledsoe, O31592, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Carl Willis Bartling, O43091, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Thomas Adair, O51901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Donald Vincent Smart, O31597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Dent Leroy Lay, O40181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Nicholas William Willis, O43099, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Seaton Franswell McDaniel, O43098, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Henry Ashton Crosby, O43102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Barney Driggs White, O31606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Phillips Brown, Jr., O38922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Earle Bennett Butler, O43106, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Leonard Humphrey, O31609, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Nesen Brownson, O43108, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ralph Hunter Smith, Jr., O31614, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lewis Frederick Shull, O43277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lauren Arden Arn, O43290, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jean Paul Sams, O43293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Rafael Cleveland, O31618, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl Anton Cuphaver, O43296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Christopher Dalia, O43297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Olin Page Holt, O43298, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Alton Sturm, O40185, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Solon Moncrief, Jr., O31623, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur William Oberbeck, O20569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Bennett Parker, O20571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick James Clarke, O20572, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eugene Joseph Stann, O20573, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fred Earl Ressegieu, O20575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Francis Mitchim, O20577, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Bayer Strandberg, O20579, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Moses McAfee, Jr., O20580, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Stanley Kuna, O20581, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Julian Vincent Soliohub, O20584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Boes Hines, O20585, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Chandler Spaulding, O20588, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Peter Clarke Hyzer, O20589, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Stephen Barko, O20590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Hamilton William Fish, O20592, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ellis Edmund Wilhoyt, Jr., O20593, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Lewis Register, O20594, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leigh Cole Fairbank, Jr., O20595, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Manning Cromelin, O20597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Horace Lewis, O20598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Otto Diercks, O20599, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Tice Griffin, O20600, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Giles Lincoln Evans, Jr., O20603, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jay Alan Abercrombie, O20604, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Douglass Phillip Quandt, O20605, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Brockenbrough Randolph Hines, O20606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Francis Seedlock, O20609, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Gamble Schermerhorn, O20610, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Stanley Palmer, O20611, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Houghton Ross Hallock, O20612, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Noel Houk Ellis, O20614, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jack West Chapman, O20616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Henry Walker, O20617, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Joseph Murray, Jr., O20619, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Carlin Hamlin Whitesell, Jr., O20620, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alexander Day Surles, Jr., O20622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Carl Miller, O20625, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Walter Cinn DeBill, O20626, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Wilt Shive, O20628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Perry Huston Eubank, O20630, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Graham Zierdt, O20632, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond William Rumph, O20634, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Mershon Spengler, O20636, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Elwyn Norman Kirsten, O20637, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Milton Harvey Clark, O20638, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edgar John Ingmire, O20639, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Horace Greeley Davisson, O20650, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Armitt Scott, Jr., O20652, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William George Easton, O20656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col George Franklin Leist, O20657, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Martin Cone, O20658, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Morris Lee, O20661, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Haynes Reeves, Jr., O20665, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Emmette Young Burton, Jr., O20672 Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Vernon Underwood, Jr., O20679, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Chester Lee Johnson, O20681, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Stuart O'Malley, Jr., O20682 Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Nixon Peale, Jr., O20684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Wise Bailey, O20687, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edgar Major Teeter, O20688, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Daniel Allen Richards, O20689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Chrysostom David Scherrer, O20690, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Harrison Wilson, Jr., O20693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Bearse Nye, O20695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas McGarey Metz, O20696, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Denman Neier, O20698, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley John Cherubin, O20700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Meyer Arendt Edwards, Jr., O20702, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Clyde Gildart, O20703, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Fred Pierce Campbell, O20704, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Early Norvell, O20706, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Stumpf, O20707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Brady Mitchell, O20713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lukas Ernest Hoska, Jr., O20717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Marion Postlethwait, O20718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Battle Malone Barksdale, O20719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Levering Green, O20720, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ludger Chabot, O20721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Luis Fernando Mercado, O20724, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Maurice Stegmaier, O20725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Woodrow Wilson Stromberg, O20728, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Everett Marr, Jr., O20729, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Cashemere Russell, O20730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Cecil Himes, O20731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Harper Hodges, Jr., O20733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Thomas Unger, O20734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Clem Conway, O20735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Laurence Powers, O20736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Coy Lyman Curtis, O20737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Shields George, O20740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Lawrence Lindquist, O20748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Peter Major, O20750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hincks Montgomery, Jr., O20754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Johnson, O20756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. LeRoy Lutes, Jr., O20757, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Heber Van Volkenburgh, Jr., O20758, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Maryan Maliszewski, O20759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Samuel Brierley, O20760, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Robert Meyer, O20762, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Oscar Gordon Kreiser, O20765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Walter Elkins, O20766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Whitelaw Browning, O20767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James John Cosgrove, O20768, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Besson, O20771, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Ferris Pearsall, Jr., O20774, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Stanley Warren Connelly, O20775, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kelsie Loomis Reaves, O20777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin Taylor, O20779, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Hertel Laflamme, O20781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Kelton Seymour Davis, O20786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Parker Calvert, O20794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maxwell Awyn Tincher, O20798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thomas Clagett, O20799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll David Wood, O20803, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Delano Brant, O20804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delk McCorkle Oden, O20805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Alexander McGee, Jr., O20806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Dawes McKinley, O20807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Ralls Lawson, O20808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Winfield Lee Martin, O20809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Allen Dodds, O20815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Kelley Benjamin Lemmon, Jr., O20816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elery Martin Zehner, O20820, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Bidwell Sloan, O20821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Kirkham Amos, O20822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Olen John Seaman, Jr., O20825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Jarvis Tolson 3d, O20826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Huff Van Vliet, Jr., O20828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Walter Richardson, O20830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Howard Skeldon, O20831, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold McDonald Brown, O20832, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Wilson Duncan, O20834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Noel Ambrose Manard, O20835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ephraim Foster Graham, Jr., O20838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Barrett Travis, O20840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Millard Simmons, O20841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Talmage Kimbrell, O20851, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Norrington Smalley, O20853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eads Graham Hardaway, O20855, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Brackett McClellan Chase, O20855, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Ray Harrison, O20858, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Fleming Polk, O20859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Powers Connor, O20860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Blauvelt, O20861, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ted Franklin Douthitt, O31626, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Loose Miller, O43302, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Vincent Johnston, O43313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Popowski, Jr., O31633, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Joseph O'Rourke, O32923, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Montague Blight, O40191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Howard Saylors, O31638, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Clarke Ashby, Jr., O43320, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Vincent McLaughlin, O31639, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor A. Ishoy, O31640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas William McGrath, O43322, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Thompson Newton, O20865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Clinton Clayman, O20866, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Warren Sisson, Jr., O20867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Greene Hammond, O20868, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Russel Groves, O20869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Whitsett van de Velde, O20870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur George Christensen, O20871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Laurence Clifford Brown, O20876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Andrew Enemark, O20879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merten Kenneth Helmstead, O20880, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon John de Penne Rouge, O20882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Sherbourne McCrea, O20884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Frederick Thompson, O20885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gordon Nelson, O20886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Unsworth Allen, O20889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Byron William Ladd, O20890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Washington, O20894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Robert Etzler, O20895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Steve Archie Chappuis, O20899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Bolton Kennedy, O20900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Brownbridge Simpson, O20902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Thomas Boleyn, O20903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fredrick William Nagle, O20904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jabus Willie Rawls, Jr., O20906, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Leslie Coan, O20908, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward Francis Kent, O20909, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col John Willis Paddock, O20913, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Horace Edward Alphin, O43324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Frederick Haberman, O40153, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Keith Orton Dicken, O43327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Peters, O31646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herold Frederick Dyer, O43328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Earl Lester Edwards, O31647, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Ralph Pierce, O43332, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer K. Curtis, O51918, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Edward Grant, O31653, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Patton Brooks, Jr., O31654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norvell Riley Stark, O31335, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Aubrey Knox, O51921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Matile Griswold, O31660, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Randolph Hinson, O51922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Van Dyke Murphy, Jr., O31663, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Blabing, O31665, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Edward Minor, O31668, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Gallagher, O31669, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris Edgar Galusha, O43345, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Dutee Wilcox, Jr., O43347, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elias Carter Townsend, O31680, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Kenneth Gaynor, O43354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Robert Short, O31685, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl Conner, O31686, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin J. Briggs, O43363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert John Check, O51936, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Forbes Jenks, O31691, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Yancey Talbott, Sr., O31664, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl George Lutz, O43366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Parrish McWhorter, O31692, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Benjamin Blank, O43363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James McDonnell, Jr., O31699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Walter Franklin Diesem, O43372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. McClure Hudelson, O43371, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Homer Hewins Bowman, O31700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jules Emmable Gonseth, Jr., O40211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Ferguson Schneider, O31708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Mann Haycock, O31712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Hennigan Tyler, O31711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wallace Grote, O31717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Austin James Montgomery, O51942, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlton Wallace Nelson, O43381, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Brooksie Kemp, O43382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Jay Redding, Jr., O43385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis Edward Shelton, O51944, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Hurst Prather, O31722, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Alfred Manning, O43386, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William George Van Allen, O20931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Cortland Adams, O20933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lavonne Edwin Cox, O20934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles V. Ruzek, Jr., O20937, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Holmes Fielding Troutman, O20938, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ward Hamilton Van Atta, O20939, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Cottrell Rowland, Jr., O20940, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Smedile, O20942, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Allan Morrison, O20945, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Andrew Allgair, O20947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Samuel Pierce, Jr., O38928, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Edward Roth, O43387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Dean Holm, O20948, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Forrest Wilson Duff, O43391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alphonse Joseph Sockoloskie, O51945, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Rowan, O31727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dudley Randolph Berwick, O51946, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Forest Locke, O31728, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Henry Lanphier, O20949, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Carlysle Speedie, O31730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Elmo Peddicord, Jr., O43397, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wiles Pervier, O31736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Riley Alexander Graham, O43404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Charles McNamara, O31738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Stephen Saunders, O31737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William Durham, O31739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Busby Hudiburg, O31741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Ogle McGillin, O31743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Churchill Dunbar, O43408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Eric Hall, O31747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Frederick Plank, O43410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Carl Henry Bronn, O31748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Calvin Francis Finn, O43413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Cullin Sandlin, O31752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Selmer John Espelund, O43416, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Cecil Dinsmore, Jr., O40225, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry George Thomas, O31756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lance Ernest Booth, Jr., O31755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Martin, O42947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army)

Maj. John Stanley Taylor, Jr., O31765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Jack Hoadley Dempsey, O31766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. William John Parsons, O40228, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col Francis McCay Clark, O38931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Stanley Edwin Whitmore, O52122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Henry Lappe Walton, O31777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Cyril Parker, O31778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John William Koletty, O40230, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Augustus Theodore Terry, Jr., O31781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Greg J. Brown, O31783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Randall Haywood Bryant, O31785, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Nicholas Christ Angel, O31789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Willis George Ethel, O31786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Bednarek, O38932, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Howard Gordon Smigelow, O31791, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Oliver William Schantz, O31795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Hughes Lanier Ash, O31799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Melvin Morley Kernan, O40236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Roland Virgin Tiede, O31801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Marshall Kenderdine, O43446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Alexander Gresham Fraser, Jr., O31805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Albert Lawrence Thornton, O31806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald MacGrain, O38933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Dowling Tanner, O52132, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Herbert Francis Gagne, O43452, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Clarence Edwin Reid, O31809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James O'Biern Millott, O40240, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Cameron Knox, O31815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Will Dan Joslin, O31816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Herman Lorenzo Purkhiser, O31819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Wiley Sellers, O31821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Nash Ody Thompson, O31822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Herbert Wishart, O38935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis Gergely Gregory, Jr., O31828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Donald Warren Holmberg, O38937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ernest William Fischer, O31829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Edward Bannon, Jr., O31830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Rudolph Barlow, O31835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edward Charles Holland, O31840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Matthew John Bartosik, O52145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Wallace Page, O40247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Kenneth Campbell Robertson, O31845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wesley Brooks Edwards, O31848, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. George Clayton Williams, O52146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Carleton Edward Fisher, O31852, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward McWilliams 3d, O31853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Stephen Anthony Ucherek, O31854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. John George Hoffman, Jr., O31856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Lafayette Burchell, O40251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Daniel Hickey, O52152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ivan Willard Elliott, O31863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Elmer Loudenslager, O52155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Jeff George Ray, O31865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Arthur McKee, O31867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. LeRoy Clancy Hill, O31874, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Javier Buldain, O43495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Nelson Beck, O40258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Kenneth Eagle Jurgens, O43496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Elmore Grenville Lawton, O38941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dan Edward Craig, O31879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Chalmers Hilliard Armstrong, Jr., O31877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Lee May, O40260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Alvin Lee Newbury, O38942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Atwell O'Reilly, Jr., O31881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Russell R. Reed, O52162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fred James Reese, O31884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Elisha Orrin Peckham, O31885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Alexander Craig, O43505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Curtis Prentice, O31888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Linton Mushen, O43508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Willard Edmund Harrison, O31892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Albert Joseph McWade, O43512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Cornelius Cuthbert Albaugh, Jr., O40268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. David Donald Klous, O31899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edgar LeRoy Arnold, O31902, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Steven Zimmerman, O38946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl C. Turner, O31909, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Thomas Ryan Rodgers, O43529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Paul Baerman, O40273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Mervin Sterling Waters, O43533, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Maurice Alexander Bellsle, O52175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Allan Stanley Hirsch, O38947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Louis Coates, O31912, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Mitchell Abraham Mabardy, O31913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur James Downey, O31914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Herbert Nolan Turner, O31921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Matthew Conroy Stewart, O43541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Cargill Erickson, O52177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Frederick Fenn Quist, O52178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Thompson Hancock, O31923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Niles Denniston, O43552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Martin Minion, Jr., O31601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Doane Willets, O40281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Ransom Roderick, O31941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Morgan Prosser, Jr., O31945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roland John Meeker, O52185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Patrick Burk, O43569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Julian Hannibal Martin, O31958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John William Carlson, O43577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Robert Jannarone, O21053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Matthew John Altenhofen, O21054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Willard Bixby, O21056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Desloge Brown, O21057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Burney Chubbuck, O21058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alexander John Frolich, O21059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Eugene Kelsey, O21061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Worrell Love, O21062, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Allen Orr, O21064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Giles Stilwell, O21065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John William Thompson, O21067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Linn Lewis, O21069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Donald Glazier Williams, O21071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Howard Anderson, O21072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Kenneth Gregory Wickham, O21073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Stoddard Crocker, Jr., O21074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Clinton Harvey, Jr., O21076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Ward Smith, Jr., O21078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Alan Langford, O21079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Alfred Bailey, O21083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Joseph Kasper, O21084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Milton Paul Barschdorf, O21085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Vincent Martin Elmore, Jr., O21086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis Woodworth Jenkins, O12087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Gray O'Connor, O21088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Edward Lotz, Jr., O21090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Claire Elwood Hutchin, Jr., O21092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Samuel Mason Hogan, O21094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Nelson Moorman, O21095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Melvin Rhodes Russell, O21097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Trevor Nevitt Dupuy, O21098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dallas Fernald Haynes, O21103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Iver Arthur Peterson, O21105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, O21106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Welby Beverley, O21107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Roland Bennett Anderson, O21108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alfred John D'Arezzo, O21109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Wade Norris, O21110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.
Lt. Col. John Fouché Brownlow, Jr., O21111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Burton Robert Brown, O21113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Charles Lough, O21118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Braden Latta, O21119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William McGregor Lynn, Jr., O21120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col Joseph Conigliaro Conell, O21121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Blake, Jr., O21122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alvar Bertil Sundin, O21128, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard Edward Michelet, O21131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Samuel Knox Eaton, O21132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ted Irving Sawyer, O21133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jesse Fuller Thomas, O21135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Maj. John Robert Bailey, Jr., O21136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Tracy Bovard Harrington, O21137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Martin Lockwood Webb, O21138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Albert Joseph Weinnig, O21139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Canning Davis, O21141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Philip Yeager Browning, O21142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Harland Swenson, O21143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Norman Lester Tittle, O21144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Hollis Vail, Jr., O21145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis Burnett Harrison, O21147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alvin Lee Burke, O21148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Henry Corbett, O21150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Anthony Sussmann, O21165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arpad Arthur Kopcsak, O21167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Charles Nickerson, Jr., O21170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Simon Rudel Sinnreich, O21173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Joseph Long, O21175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, O21177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gallon Myers McHaney, O21179 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jack Lee Grubb, O21180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edgar Stanton McKee, O21181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Taylor, Jr., C21184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Emmett Ekman, O21160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jaroslav Folda, Jr., O21193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Nevin Howell, O21194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Charles Fremont Tillson 3d, O21196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Albert Bassett, O21202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lorenzo Dow Adams, O21203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Loyd Jackson, O21207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Charles Damon, O21208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harlan Keith Holman, O21211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Elmer Ellsworth Hallinger, O21212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Wallace Hayes, O21214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Merton Singer, O21215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Lee Clarke, O21216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jefferson Johnson Irvin, O21217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George William Rhyne, O21219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Chilton Works, O21221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Francis Gillivan, O21225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Little Haley 3d, O21226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Gray Duncan 3d, O21227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Albert Johnson, Jr., O21228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carl Erlenbusch, O21230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hubert Emmet Strange, O21231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Davis Offer, O21233, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Henry Patrick, O21235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Adolph Sundlof, O21236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Lynch, O21237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Douglas Hulse, O21238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Earle Beck, O21239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Patrick Wansboro, O21241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Laskowsky, O21243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rollin Benedict Durbin, O21244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Benedict Missal, Jr., O21247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Warren Rand Williams, Jr., O21250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Milton Finn, O21252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Joseph Sweeney, O21254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Charles Brown, O21256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roberts Sherwood Demitz, O21259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Sylvester Collins, Jr., O21260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Milton Izenour, O21263, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Walker Thackeray, O21265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Watson, O21267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Mrazek, O21269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Dickson Miller, O21270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Augustine Broberg, O21272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Owen Byars, Jr., O21273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Stephen Kujawski, O21276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Nelson Sibley, O21277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mark Francis Brennan, O21279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Arthur Machen, Jr., O21284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Sternberg, O21286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Allen Jones, Jr., O21287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederic Charles Teich, Jr., O21288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Carl Thomas, O21289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas English, O21296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Alexander Norris, Jr., O21299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Henrie Hartline, O21301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Maxwell Murray, O21303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Eliason Boyt, O21304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Wallace Siren, O21306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Leaning Ashworth, O21308, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Thomas Hannum, Jr., O21316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hodson Rhine, O21317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Henry Lahti, O21322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Birdsey Lee Learman, O21324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Corley, O21325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Ewing, O21326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Eugene Henderson, O21327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clark Jackson, Jr., O21329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Conyers Fite 2d, O21331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andy Archer Lipscomb, O21333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Kent Schmidt, O21335, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Cornell Abert, O21337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ward Sanford Ryan, O21339, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Artman, O21342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Rapp Zohrlaut, O21344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Gibson Sherrard, O21345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Edward Hartman, O21346, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Chalgren, Jr., O21349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frost Staples, O31967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Elliott Fonger, O31969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Stinnie Huff, O43583, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elliott Burwell Cheston, O31976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Henry Oliver, O43586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Lafayette Nash, O43587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Perkins Pope, O31981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Kenneth McCormick, O31982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Hilary Gomes, O21353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Vincent Roddy, O21356, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Perry Elmer Conant, O21357, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Bruce Bissell, O21360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Amos George Johnson, O21363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carolus Adams Brown, O21364, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Raymond Peers, O21366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Ernest Walker, O21368, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Morgan Summers, O21369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifton Ferdinand von Kann, O21371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Laverne Arthur Parks, O21372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Peter Hagen, O21373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Murray Elroy Sparks, O21374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Albert Armstrong, O21375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Peter Stone, O21376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank George White, O21378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Theodore Sauser, O21379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elwin Thomas Knight, O21380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Gill Springer, O21382, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gregory Leo Higgins, O21385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aaron Alexander Abston, O21391, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Winfred Alban Ross, O21395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Bernard Burket, O21398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Harold Stangle, O21406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Meredith Ernest Allen, O21408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Emerson Babcock, O21413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Burhyte Wilmot Corey, Jr., O21415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rollie Neel Blancett, O21416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Benjamin Schweizer, O21418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alfred Matthew Eschbach, O21419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Kenneth Howell, O21421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Brennan Stelzenmuller, O21422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilmer Kersey Benson, Jr., O21423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Ellsworth Skinner, O21425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Myron Ellsworth Page, Jr., O21426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Judson Woodring Wark, O21428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edmund Mortimer Fry, Jr., O21431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry George Woodbury, Jr., O21432, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Chipman Holley, O21433, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Wright Bennett, O21434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Herbert Evans Brown, O21437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Claude Potter, Jr., O21439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Ellison, Jr., O21440, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Milner, O21441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Russell Rorabaugh, O21445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henderson Beddow, O21446, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Carpenter Paules, O21447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Andrew Valden Inge, O21449, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

To be captains with rank from July 1, 1948

Capt. Andrew Adolphe Aines, O43463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Hayward Sevier, O43454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Simon Albert Strickler, O52136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Martin Ruemmele, O31824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Anderson Hudson, O52137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Raymond Kemm, O52139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Homer Jerome Victory, O31826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertram Junior Ellis, O40244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matt William Werve, O31832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Turner Wright Gilman, O31831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Clirehugh, O31833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Estill Stanley Thurston, O43469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Johnson Meade, O31834, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Ira Arterburn Pair., O40245, United States Army.

Maj. Christopher Berry Cushing, Jr., O31836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Edward Septfonds, Jr., O31837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Henry Joseph Phillips, O31839, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Melford Palmer Fritsvold, O43473, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Leffers, Jr., O31843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Covert Troutman, O31841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie M. Gross, O38938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wesley Gough, O43474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Joseph Stephens, O31844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Arthur Gray, O38939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis James Pallister, O43476, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Coy Wilson Baldwin, O31924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Victor Wendell White, O43479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Clinton Gadeken Merrill, O31849, United States Army.

Maj. Bernard Joseph Scherer, O52147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Harrison Rousseau, Jr., O52148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Bissell Whaley, O52150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Ernest Michael Bozak, O43486, United States Army.

Capt. Francis Donald Linse, O31858, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Myron Douglas Smith, O31860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Pachomski, O40252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert William Bsrendt, O31861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj Raymond Thomas Caraballo, O31862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Asa Miller, O52154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Davitt, O43490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harris Joaquin North, O52158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Elmer Rownd, O31868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Clifford Gustav Folen, O40255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

Capt. Benjamin Ives LaFlare, O52159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice Glynn Powell, O40259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Gerald Allen, O31878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Floyd Hermann Buch, O43500, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward Raynesford Warner McCabe, Jr., O40262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Hall, O31882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph O'Connor, O52160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Henry Bauer, O43502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony Jackson Race, O52163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Browne Leggette, O43503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Paul Mathew Koerner, O40263, United States Army.

Maj. Taylor Elliott Carney, Jr., O40264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carmen Aldo Rossi, O52165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dovre Christian Jensen, O52166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Leo Drennen, Jr., O31890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Orval Quincy Matteson, O43509, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Whitman Young, O31891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Joseph King, O40265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Graves Salisbury, O43510, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Maxe Huston, O38943, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Reynold Atlas, O31894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis duRest van de Velde, O31895, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Louis Salonick, O40266, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Bernard Richmond, O43519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Reginald Campbell, Jr., O40267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Marion Brown, Jr., O31897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lee DuBose, O38945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Hupalo, O40269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Rolfe Hill, O31898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Thaddus Leland Black, O31900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Lehman Bartholomew, O43524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Homer Alton Stuverud, O43523, United States Army.

Maj. William Harry Pople, O43525, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Beverly Wilder, O40271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Boyd Emory, O31903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Maj. Eugene Sites, O43526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Sherman Stacy, O31905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Wallace Humphreys, O31910, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Richard Lewis Bettien, O43528, United States Army.

Maj. Richard Clarke St. John, O43530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Roy Underwood, O31911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Leslie Firm Palmer, O43531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jackson Ralph Burns, O40274, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Lord Harrison, O40275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Ferdinand Knoll, O43535, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Ridge Emery, O40276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Helge Nelson, O31916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Jereslaw Owen, O43536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Lincoln Spaulding, O31915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Logan Harrigan, O43538, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Joseph Aerni, O31920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lowell Gideon Moore, O43539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Taylor Coker Tyler Hayes, O43542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Albert Robbins, O43543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Norman Maurice Walker, O31925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Robert Morris Wygant, O31926, United States Army.

Capt. John Scott Robinson, O38948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Thomas Dennis, O43547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Loui Peter Mueller, O52181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew William Ritchey, O31934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Clayton Young, O31935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Joe Elbert Childers, O31936, United States Army.

Capt. Stockbridge Howland Barker, O38949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John DeWitt Phillips, Jr., O31937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Francis VanGundy, O31938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Martin Joseph Waters, Jr., O31939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Hope Kederich, Jr., O43556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Marshall William Baker, O43558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Alexander, O40280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Gideon Johnson, Jr., O43557, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen Olaf Tonstad, O43560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Danby Northrop, O40282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Cullis, O31942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Melvin Oscar Miller, O40283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Compton Ball, O52184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Jacob Frederick Polifka O31943, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Charles Becker, O31944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Stanley Kenneth Carlson, O52534, United States Army.

Capt. Howard Fulton Goldsmith, Jr., O31946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Arthur Hicks, O31948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Coughlin, O40284, Army of the United States, (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Franklin Yuill, O43571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edward Gardner, O38951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Albert Emanuel Holtz, O40285, United States Army.

Maj. Marshall Woodrow Myers, O52188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Nicoblus Brandt, O31955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Andrew Barry Crook Nicholls, O31957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Louis Springer, O31961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas MacConnell 3d, O40286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy West Lonsinger, O52192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Inglis, O31964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Wilson Van Doorn Ledley, O43579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Tapp, Strawbridge O40287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Frederick Isaacson, O31965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Milton, Vinson, Jr., O31990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Glade, O21181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Terry Craig, O21248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Carusone, O21295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Nicholas Guletsky, O21309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Thomas Riordan, O21318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Winthrop White, O21319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harlan Chambers, O21323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Starr Wright, Jr., O21328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Salvatore Campanella, O21348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Paul Stanley Lindberg, O52194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertil Vernon Jones, O31968, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Orven Donald Moore, O43581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nicholas Joseph Sloane, O43582, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Maurice Majors, O31971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Crome Shuler, Jr., O31970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Maynard Doerflinger, O31972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Luther Gragg Strange, O40288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Joseph Edward Noble, Jr., O31973, United States Army.

Maj. John William Fueg, O40289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ray Marion Lee, O31974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morris Elmer Sorenson, O31977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. William Edward Watts, O40291, United States Army.

Maj. Russell Leroy Norgordt, O43589, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Zacharia Houston, Jr., O31979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. David Brownell Jodrey, O43590, United States Army.

Capt. Robert Joseph McDonough, O43591, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Frederick Jost, O40292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Ellis Deshon, O21362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Samuel McGraw Swearingen, O21381, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Jefferson Hodges, Jr., O21401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Stanley Byrne, O21404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ernest Veale, O21435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Nendel Anderson, O21436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry Bradbury Hackett, O21443, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Zitzer, O21444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Carpenter Fields, Jr., O43592, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Commerford, Jr., O40293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Earl Crump, Jr., O31983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).

Capt. Felder Lavett Fair, O31984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Elza Waller, O40294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Herbert Steele Long, Jr., O31985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Harold William Wheeler, O31986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Adams Alley, Jr., O52203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Leckie, O40296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Wesley Roe, O52205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Haig Jackson, O52204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis William Pflanz, Jr., O43600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Howard Nelson, Jr., O31992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Gordon Gorski, O31993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Melville Bowman, Jr., O43601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Burns Noland, O43603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Stanley Tyler, O43602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Allen Bucha, O31996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Stephen Gerety, O43605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Henry Koreman, O38953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Edwin Daniel, Jr., O38954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. John Edward MacDonough, O52208, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Milton Irving Wallace, O21467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Luther Blue, O31997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Carter, O38955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Francis Schiltz, O38956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Arnold Bierl, O40298, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Foreman Wood, O32001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Bryant Slimp, O43608, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jackson Stuart Lawrence, Jr., O32003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Stacy Capers, Jr., O32004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas William Ackert, O32005, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lee Trout, O43610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Tinsley Dodge, O21468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Samuel Casto, O32007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ted Joseph Palik, O43611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Kendal Whitehead, O43612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Luther Regan, Jr., O32008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Scott McMillin, O32010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Herbert Nelson Ostrom, O43614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Eugene Woodrow, O32011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Owen Waite Owens, O38958, United States Army.

Capt. John Justice Beeson 3d, O32013, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Charles Spencer Campbell, O43615, United States Army.

Maj. Oscar Stegall, Jr., O32014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick West Hawksworth, O43619, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earle McDaniel Clarke, O32015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Louis Haberstroh, O52210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Mortimer Robert Staley, O43620, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Joseph Francis Ryneska, O32017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wesley Herbert Burr, O32019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Bruce Benjamin Caulder, O43626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gardner Alston Williams, O40301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Irvin Casterline, O43628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rudolph Charlemagne Koerner, Jr., O52211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dalton Walker Lain, O40302, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Herbert Bearss, O32020, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Moses Cookson, O32021, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Edward Gerber, O32023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Joseph McCool, O32024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Jordan Brown, O38959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Wallace Creel Wardner, O52212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Willard Jones, Jr., O43631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Joseph Macken, O40304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. James Hugh Keefe, O43634, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Paul Shirley Hicks, O32028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Andrew Rice, O43635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Cloake Small, O52214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Augustus Perry, O32030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Henry Slover, O43638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Hill Campbell, O32031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Leon J. Fishkin, O52215, United States Army.

Maj. Leland Earle Anderson, O52216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karl Josef Wicker, O32033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilford Lloyd Willey, O38961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wellington Snoad, O32034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. John Wilbur Baumgartner, O43642, United States Army.

Capt. Henry Howard Marsden, Jr., O43643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kay Kipling Cowan, O52217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Herbert Gregg, O32037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Clarence Paul Ehrhardt, O43644, United States Army.

Maj. James Damian Donlon, Jr., O32039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Runyan Linvill, O40305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Peter Ketcham, Jr. O38963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas St. John Arnold, O32040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Sigman White, O32041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Dobley Fleming O32042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Cornelius Spiedel, Jr., O32044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Clayton Bane Lyle, Jr., O40306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Burk, O32043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dan Christie Kingman, O32045, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lionel Edward Scott, O32046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward G. Edwards, O32048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Emery Yeatch, O32047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack David Wolfson, O40307, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Neil Marshall, O52221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jewett Agusta Dix, O32049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Harvey Houser, O32050, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Edward Dueker, O32051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Daugherty, O52222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Victor Lesneski, O32053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Preston Donald, O52223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Weldon Winston Wilson, O32054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Freeman Francis Gage, Jr., O32055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Merritt William Briggs, O38964, United States Army.

Capt. John Campbell, Jr., O43649, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Leonard Pridgen, Jr., O38965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert LeRoy Staver, O43650, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. William Leon Adams, Jr., O43651, United States Army.

Capt. Philip Charles Hess, O32059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ayres William Stoddard, O43652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick Brown, O43653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ford Murray Beardsley, O40311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Earl Wills, O32060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Sion Cook, Jr., O43655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jack Priestley Napier, O43657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Walter Flint, O43656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Peter VanCourt, O38966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Frederick Benjamin, O32062, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Willis Everett Kooken, O43658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Ellsworth Keough, O43659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Harvey Williams, O38967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Saffold, O43660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Noble Allwine, O43661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Gustavus Stotlar, O43662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Orr Graham, Jr., O32064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Garrett Sutton, Jr., O43663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Charles Carroll Roder, O43664, United States Army.

Maj. Lawrence Alfred Martin, O43665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lee Wallace, O32065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Philip Murphy, O52226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Robideaux, O32066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Gordon Kinney, O32067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Joseph Kiely, Jr., O32069, Army of the Untied States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Cecil Ball, O32070, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Morehead Hargrave, O32071, Army of the United States (first leutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Abram Jameson, Jr., O32072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Keith Herbert Houlson, O52229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Otto Rudolph Koch, Jr., O32074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edgar Wales, 3d, O40315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Eugene John Hollerbach, O32076, United States Army.

Maj. Ralph Lawrence Norling, O32112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Wright Williams, O32077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Milliff, O40316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Gerlach Sory, O43670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Grant Lavell, O32080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Edward Rose, O32079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hughes Alfred Carnes, O43674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Donald Mitchell, O31625, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Aaron Underwood Trimble, O43675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chase Rawson Teaboldt, O32082, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Henry Morrison Owen, Jr., O32083, United States Army.

Maj. Don Osvold Currier, O40318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Palmer Johnson, O43677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ollie James Allen, O32085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hobert Wayne Sharp, O43678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Beeman Mullinix, O32086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Randolph Archer, O38968, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Herring Sharpe, O43682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Harry Anthony Slad, O32088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Bert Outlaw, O32089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry Arthur Munro, O32090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harry Atkinson Greer, O43685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Fletcher Rolph, O32091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Joseph Attaway, O40321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wood Calvert, O52232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Sam Francis, O52233, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Elman Leighton, Jr., O43688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nicholas Dunlap, O32094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Frank Albert, O32097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carlton Stack, O32098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Gradon Reynolds, O32099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Curtis Payne, O32101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Boyd Claypool, O43693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Elmer Allen, O32103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Barrell, O32104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Audemard Beplat, O43694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Thomas Kellett, O40323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Benjamin Murphy Goetz, O43696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Laverne Woods Graff, O52239, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Warren Raymond Johnson, O43697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Howard Clarence Parker, O32108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John David Sapp, O32109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Daniel Haskins, O32110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Dean Harris, O32111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Jarrold, 043699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Carlisle, O40324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frank Adrian Bogart, O40325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Ignatius Klein, O32113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Snead Blocker, O32118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maynard Byron Weaver, O32120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Everette Johnson, O43704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Joseph Convery, Jr., O52244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Wilson Corder, O43706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Angster, O32124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Albert Brinkerhoff, O43708, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Gordon Drouillard, O32125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Orert Dean Chapman, O40328, United States Army.

Maj. Lawrence Arver Twomey, O32126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon Frederick Lavoie, O32127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Shannon Delos Brown, O32247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Freeland Allyn Daubin, Jr., O43709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Wilbur Smith, O32128, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Anthony Eckstein, O40331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Francis Wilson, O36971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Luke Hustead, Jr., O43711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Lauriston Harding, O32134, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Sheldon Scott, O43712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Millard Glen Gray, O32137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royal Ector Phillips, O32136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Ramon Francis D'Elosua, O43713, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Allen Rankin, O32140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Shepherd Fromer, O32141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Lewis Whipple, O43714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Thomason Ayres, Jr., O43715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Evans, O32142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Jackson Gillespie, O32143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Calhoun Hooker, O43717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Durwin White, O40332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Wesley Boyer, O32145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Charley Walker Haynes, O43719, United States Army.

Maj. Arnold Peter Murr, O43720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irwin Allen Edwards, O32149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Bennett Wild, O40333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertil Bernhard Sandell, O32153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charles Edward Michaels, O38972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Lloyd Osborne, O32154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank von Phul Williams, O40334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Palsrok, O43722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Moseley Bachelor, O43723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward August Seifert, O52253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Evers Jacobs, O52256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Nathan Hanks Hixson, O52254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ellis Harry Mist, O52255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Henry Levine, O32155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Murray Brannon, O32156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Aaron Hoard, Jr., O43729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Daniel Drake, O32158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Philip Lyke, O43731, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Dooley, O32159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William May Myers, O32160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Sailor Bowers, O38973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Duncan Conley, O52260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Alexander Johnston Rankin, O32166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charles Ellis Lawrence, O52261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harle Grady Bailey, Jr., O32167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Law, O32169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Julian Boyles, O32168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Edward Fives, O32170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Michael Witter, O32172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Duncan Aboosh, O32171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Drazen, O40336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Mathew Cromwell, O32176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrell H. Burnett, O32177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Jorge Jose Lluy, O56698, United States Army.

Capt. Fountain Fox Beattie, Jr., O52265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Alexander Galt, O43743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hendric Byrd, Jr., O52267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmett Sullivan, O43745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Emerson Perry, O38974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph George Belon, O43746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Julian Louis Hogan, O32178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Ronan, O43750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thomas Campbell, O32180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carroll Broadus Hodges, O43751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edward Feliz, O43752, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Cella, O52269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Simon Kostanski, O43755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Patrick James Brennan, O43756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Gabriel Katin, O43758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Francis Register, Jr., O43757, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamine Marvin Brothers, O32185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Barney Golden, O40337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emmett Gilliam Scott, O43760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cornell Dent Booth, O52271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lucian Capers Croft, O32189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Austin, O32191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Wilbur Wendt, O32190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Warren Black, O32192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Harvey Lane, O40338, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Warner Reagan, O38975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Howard Gibbs, O43764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Victor Bruni, O32195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Francis Flynn, O43765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lee Stahler, O32197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis William O'Brien, O32196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Fred Ax, O32198, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. John Charles Kulp, Jr., O43768, U. S. Army.

Lt. Col. Charles Bless Boswell, O38976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Preston Lerner, O32199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederic Morris Cramer, O52273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Clement Hatchell, O32200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arlo Willis Mitchell, O43772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Miller Heiser, Jr., O43773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Middleton Rutledge, O32201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Arthur Dalton von Rohr, O43774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifton Allen Peters, O32202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Stone Livermore, O32203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Crouch, Jr., O43777, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Theodore Guenther, O32206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Kenneth Long, O43778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Werner Holtz, O32209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Monroe Johnson, O52276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Bernard Tenhagen, O43785, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Donaldson, Jr., O32721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Kenneth Hutson, O32212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Capt. Maxim James Dowd, O32210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George McCutchen, O40341, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Mervyn Wilson, O38978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bennett Scott, O32213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Tyrus Raymond Ambron, O32215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Haberer, Jr., O52278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Keith Saxe, O43790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. James Paul Clark, O40343, United States Army.

Capt. Park Trammell Jenkins, O32218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howard Miller, O32220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Atticus Thrasher, O32733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice James Reynolds, O43793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Eugene BeLieu, O32223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Kenneth Walker, O32225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Ephriam Downard, O32224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Middleton Thompson, O43794, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellis Vandenberg, O38979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Holder Crawford, Jr., O32229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Aloysius Graham, Jr., O32231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellwood Frederick Hanson, O52281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leslie Maurice Payne, O43797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glen Ercil Daugherty, O38980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerome Sydney Jefferds, O52283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herman Heinrick Von Benge, O32237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Elias Frederic Liakos, O32238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. McLean Hampton, O32239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William David Mouchet, O43802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Myron McClure, O32241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynn Dillon Fargo, O32242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dan Earl Riggs, O52285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Logsdon Albert, O40344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thurston Tyler Paul, Jr., O32243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Alfred Stanford, O43808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Everett Moore, O32244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Webster Holmes, O32247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Griswold Grandin, O32248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Walker Tomlin, Jr., O32249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Ray Wilcox, O32251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Raymond Huston, O43812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Dean George, O43815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Homer Clair Hinckley, O52289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Alonzo Chamblin, O32255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Charles Pertl, O40349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Watkin Reese, O43818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Cleland Osborne, O43819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Boice O'Hara, O31887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kenneth McWilliams, O32257, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Henry Pierre, Jr., O32258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reuben Nathan Salada, O32261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Ben McKenzie, O32264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris John Naudts, O32265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Carroll Case, Jr., O43824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Williams, O40352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bill Woodrow Paden, O52291, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Edward Berri Armstrong, O32267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Robert Pershall, O43825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis James Smith, Jr., O43826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil Lawrence Mosheim, O32272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Egbert Bruehl, O32270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Gnau, O43828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Leon Kelly, Jr., O52292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thorvald Jorgen Guerdrum, O43829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Curtis Everett Healton, O32275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Young Canon, O43830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Thomas Hennessey, O32274, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Harry Huppert, Jr., O32277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Gray Patterson, O32278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. George Edward Albert, O32279, United States Army.

Maj. Charles Henderson Hollis, O38981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Martin Holmes Colley, O38982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Patrick Scholl, Jr., O32281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Cordrey Pardue, O40354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Anthony Emil Papa, O52294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Ellis Nestlerode, Jr., O32282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Frederick Balkman, O32285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Samuel Heywood Oakley, O43841, United States Army.

Maj. Robert Ellis Butts, O32286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Thomas Pullen, Jr., O52296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Burnett Price, O43842, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eric Armand Rundquist, O43843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Claude Bartholet, O43845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Cummings Motter, O32288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Douglas Hoskins, Jr., O43846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Melvin Arthur, O32290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Conrad Olia Mannes, Jr., O32293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stockton Donald Bruns, O32292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert David Hand, O32294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eric Ray Edgerton, O43850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burton Staley Andrews, O43849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Sharp Bary, O32296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Emil Davidson, Jr., O32295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pierre Donald Boy, O32297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allan Louis Bogardus, O43853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hugh Wikoff, O32301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Samuel Ryan, O32300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl George Witte, O32303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Justus Crawford Kennedy, O43856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Franklin Schoonover, O32304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Secord Smith, O32305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Roy Cheek, O32306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roman Irodian Ulans, O52302, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Byron Saul Smith, O43860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Ralph Robert Kenigson, O52303, United States Army.

Lt. Col. John Joseph Hayes, O32309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Lunsford Wyatt, O32310, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Joseph Eldon Hanks, O43866, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Paul Richard Jeffrey, O40358, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Innes, O43867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hotenel James Huff, O43868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lee Redman, Jr., O32311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertram Isaac Nash, O40361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Loyd Cone, O40362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl George Peacock, O43873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Thomas Seaburn, O32314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Leland Pence, O43875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Jack Lawrence Weigand, O32315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Stanton Niccolls, O32317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Michael Paul Gierlak, O40363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Ian Frederick Turner, O32318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thomas Specht, Jr., O32321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Cowley Jones, O32320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Daniel Nestor Black, O52309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William McCaw Hughes, O32322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Claire Kreighbaum, O43883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Prindle Bartow, O52310, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard William Martens, O32324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Frederick Pille, O52311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Emil Holt, O32326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Hamor Hamlin, O52312, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gordon Ulysses Tapper, Jr., O52314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Darce Ronald Knight, O43887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Henry Sweet, O38984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Van Nostrand Grace, O40365, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Vivian Kling, O40366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Hugh Rowe O'Farrell, O43888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stuart Frederick Brady, O32329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland Rodman Drake, O43894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert James Jackson, Jr., O38986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Talbert Iredell Martin, O43893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Richard Kinnicutt Brown, O32333, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Kenneth Elmer Eckland, O32334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Hugh Francis Queenin, O40367, United States Army.

Maj. Paul Hugh Mize, O32335, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burrell Curry Hassett, Jr., O38987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Thomas Hillis, O40369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Michael Mullen, O43896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Ray Ware, O52317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth William Wallace, O32338, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Laverne Etka, O43898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Wellington Fox, Jr., O52318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Hustler Blair, 3d, O44388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Willits Crowell, O52319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Woodrow Way, O32341, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Joseph Bird, O32343, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Lee Tate, O38988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles John Kronke, Jr., O40371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald August Lake, O43901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Francis Zeoli, O32345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Clarence Frederickson, O32347, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bradfoot Lyle, O32348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Thomas Fry, O43904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Watson Carter, Jr., O32349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Leon Wilson, O32350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Morris Solomon, O32351, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Albert Schmidt, O52322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Spencer Skillman, O38989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mahlon D. Hickman, O32355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wilbur Casey, O32356, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sherman Dell Cosgrove, O38990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Orlando Lee Greening, O43906, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred William Kellner, O32358, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harmon Henry Seale, O32360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John White Yow, O32361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Irving Seekins, O32362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chesley Folsom Durgin, O32363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Sylvanus La Mee, 3d, O32364, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salvador Francis Taranto, O40372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Raymond Steckla, O32366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale Martin Garvey, O43910, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Stanley Nelson, O52325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Challen Clowes, O32367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Francis Dudley, O40374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lachlan Maclean Sinclair, O32369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Glen Wilson, O32370, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Vinyard Christianson, O43913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Juskalian, O32371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Isaac Hoppenstein, O32373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Sterling Champ Bush, O43914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Craig Dameron, O32376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Walter Dziuban, O21738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, Jr., O21739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Albert Funzig, Jr., O21741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Duncan Wolfe, O21743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Wilmot Ruet McCutchen, O21744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Kirby-Smith, O21745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Elting Coates, Jr., O21746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harvey Reed Fraser, O21747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Edgar McCollam, O21748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jay Phelps Dawley, O21750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Montgomery Lee Webster, O21751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Marsden Duke, O21753, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Woodrow William Wilson, O21755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Medusky, O21756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Mason Matheson, O21757, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lewis Cantrell, O21758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Farrell, O21759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Riis Ploger, O21760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Donald Richardson, O21761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Lloyd Winegar, O21764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Paraska, O21765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Johnson Wells, O21766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Riel Stanton Crandall, O21767, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Thomas Bradley, O21768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Sidney Taylor Martin, O21772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward John Gallagher, O21775, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Evans Brinker, O21776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Pavick, O21780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence LeRoy Beckedorff, O21781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis Cassidy, O21783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert William Studer, O21786, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lawton Collins, Jr., O21788, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ladislaus Casimir Maslowski, O21789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Eugene Showalter, O21794, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hyde Camp, O21798, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Joseph Minahan, Jr., O21799, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Mabry Williams, O21801, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Irvin Muir, Jr., O21802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Wald, O21804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Harry Kurth, O21807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Penn Haffa, O21809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Walter Allen, Jr., O21810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Belmont Stuart Evans, Jr., O21811, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter MacRae Vann, O21812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Charles Dolle, O21813, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Martin Royce, O21814, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert Schrader, Jr., O21818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Peterson Winton, Jr., O21819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Richardson Reeves, O21820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ray, O21821, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward McCleave Dannemiller, O21822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Fenton Rollins, O21823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Godfrey Urban, O21825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas James Bartley Shanley, O21828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jasper Jackson Wilson, O21829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry McNeil Myers, O21835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Carroll William Dietz, O21836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dalton Byrne, O21837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Mortimer Crawford, O21840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Albert Hinternhoff, O21844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles McNeal Mount, Jr., O21849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Gustavus Gilbert, O21850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John William Dobson, O21851, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Livingston Nelson Taylor, Jr., O21853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hasket Lynch Conner, Jr., O21855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard deForest Cleverly, O21862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Putnam Scroggs, O21863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Leon Yarnall, O21864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Kummer Norris, O21865, Army of the United States (first leutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Young Nanney, O21866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joel Furman Thomason, O21867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James McMenamin Shepherd, O21868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Anthony Janowski, O21869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Howard Keller, O21871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sterling Russell Johnson, O21873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ulrich Georg Gibbons, O21874, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Barton George Lane, Jr., O21876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Wright Caldwell, O21877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Wayne Reed, O21878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Christopher Charles Coyne, O21879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael John Krisman, O21880, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin George Megica, O21881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles David Thomas Lennhoff, O21882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Norman Hunsbedt, O21883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Keith Maughan Hull, O21885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles David Keppie, O21886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Millar Geary, O21887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic William Boye, Jr., O21891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Leroy Robinette, O21892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Chessman Beere, O21893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph John Hanchin, O21895, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Vernon Tuttle, Jr., O21896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Campbell Bane, O21897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Kosler Newcomer, Jr., O21898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Bradner Marlin, O21899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Watt, O21901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Herbert Price, Jr., O21903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Irving Coffey, O21904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Ray Brownfield, Jr., O21905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Herbert Wohlfeil, O21907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Thomas Holt, O21908, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Jordan, O21911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clark George, O21913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Badger Goodwin, O21914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Randall Seaver, O21916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hulen Dee Wendorf, O21919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Frederick Roberts, O21920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Turner Bowie, O21921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Whitehead West 3d, O21922, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Davis McFerren, O21923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roger Merrill Lilly, O21924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Jay Henry, O21928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gordon Johnson, O21929, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Lee Shepard, Jr., O21931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Sykes Billups, Jr., O21932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Hill, Jr., O21933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benton Raymond Duckworth 2d, O21934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Pickett, O21938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Chester Chapman, O21939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Boiler Maxwell 2d, O21942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Max Cochran, O21945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seth Foster Hudgins, O21947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Boyle, O21953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles James Hackett, O21954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Heinz Welsemann, O21956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lincoln A. Simon, O21961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., O21963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Gifford, O21964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Alexander McChristian, O21966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Albert Trahan, O21967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Buford Davidson, Jr., O21969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vester Melvin Shults, O21974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marshall Wallach, O21977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Casper Clough, Jr., O21979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, O21980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Mull Crawford, O21983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wiley Burge Wisdom, Jr., O21985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt Col. Donald Max Simpson, O21986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Martin Higgins, Jr., O21987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Andrew Nolan, Jr., O21988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, Jr., O21990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Thomas Mildren, O21992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Lentz, 2d, O21993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Traywick McConnell, O21996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Ellsworth Wood, O21998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Dean Pointer, O21999, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Thomas Smith, O22001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Schellman, O22002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salvatore Joseph Mancuso, O22006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joel Terry Walker, O22007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Moorhouse Coleman, O22008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Joseph Belardi, O22009, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Willis Walker, O22011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick David Mulcahy, O22015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Mulford Van Harlingen, Jr., O22016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Howard Bertolet St. Clair, O22017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Busby Miller, O22018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry de Metropolis, O22021, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Stephen Charles Farris, O22022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Langley Patrick Medinnis, O22023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Keith Boles, Jr., O22025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Matt Combes Cavendish Bristol, Jr., O22027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lyle Everett Peterson, O22033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Wright Allen, Jr., O22034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Howard Vincent Cooperider, O22035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew Comerford Smith, O22038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Charles Wickboldt, O22047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Manning Kirby, O22048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Geoffrey Lavell, O22049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Shannon Davison, O22051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James McConnell, O22052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fidelis David Newcomb, O22056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Walker Davis 3d, O22059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Riley Bess, O22060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Paul Smith, O22063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Franklin Hull, O22067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Olav Herstad, O22068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Neary Davis, O22070, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Osburn Dickerson, O22071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Goodhue Kail, O22072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Patricio Lasché, O22073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Carter Stone, Jr., O22075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James LeRoy Rogers, O22076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Malcolm Frank Gilchrist, Jr., O22077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John William Jaycox, O22078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beirne Spragins, O22080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard George Teeters, O22081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. DeWitt Nalley Hall, O22083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Raymond Odom, O22086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward MacDonald Serrem, O22090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Chapman Williams, Jr., O22091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles George Fredericks, O22092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Herbert Grant, O22093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Robert Larsen, O22094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Barclay Carvey, O22095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Joseph Kelley, Jr., O22097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. William Calvin Banning, O22098, U S. Army.

Lt. Col. William Montgomery Preston, O22099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Leland Lampert, Jr., O22100, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frank Goodwin Forrest, O22101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).

Lt. Col. Shields Warren, Jr., O22103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Holloman Barnett, O22104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

Lt. Col. James Thomas Lowe Schwenk, O22106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ned Woods Glenn, O22107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

Maj. Richard Mousheglan, O22109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henderson Patterson, Jr., O22110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bradford Smith, O22113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Kopf Rippert, O22115, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Elliot Rager, O22116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wesley Florance, Jr., O22119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert William Page, Jr., O22120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Lansing Scott, O22121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Eric Olson, O22125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Terry Sutton, Jr., O22128, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wilmarth Kouns, O22129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Griswold Barber, O22130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Allen Matter, O22132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

Lt. Col. Earle Livingstone Lerette, O22133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Tucker Clifford, O22135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmet McMahon, O22137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Anderson Roosa, O22138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Fennell, O22139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Lawrason Murray, Jr., O22140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Jackson Fling, O22144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Frederick Brockman, O22147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Lore Miller, 2d, O22149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Everett Reynolds, O22151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Richard Harrison, Jr., O22152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick Aiden Kelly, O22154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl August Buechner, Jr., O22155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Peter Mial, O22157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Law McCrorey, Jr., O22158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Laurence Boylan, O22162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robison Reilly, O22163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Reeson Looney, O22164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edgar William Schroeder, O22166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Wilson Collins, O22169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Charles Chapla, O22170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Josiah Scott Kurtz, O22171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Levin Lane Lee, O22172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Watson McClellan, O22173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. David Samuel Dillard, O22175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Meyer, O22179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Constant August Troiano, O22180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lindsay Coates Herkness, Jr., O22181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Deimel Green, O22182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles John Parsons, Jr., O22183, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Herbert Hale, O22184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Kelly, O22185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Earl Mitchell, Jr., O32326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lem Morris Kelly, O32378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John James Petro, Jr., O32380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glendale Draper Gallaher, O43925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hugh Bedford, Jr., O43926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Crawford Dean Lyons, O43924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Batlin, O43927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bill James Tutin, O32381, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Sexton Simmerman, O40376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Terrell Shaver, O43928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Adams Laing, O43929, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hallie Augustus Matlock, O40377, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Oscar Witherspoon, Jr., O40378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis John Aebischer, O32384, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Allard Helfert, O32385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Josiah Borden Miller, O32386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clifford Rountree, O32387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey Seymour Browne, 3d, O38992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee S. Kaufman, O32388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Bell Erb, O40379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Robert Tam, O43933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Rufus Shepherd, O40380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Becker, O32392, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Joseph Scannon, O32393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Mario John Zecca, O32396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oliver Jacob Helmuth, O32395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Beryl Leon Boyce, O32400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Eli Delnore, O32398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delbert Leonard Bjork, O32399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sterling Henry Abernathy, O32401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland Swarts Devore, Jr., O32404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thornton Edgar Pfaff, O32405, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Wilson Jacks, Jr., O32407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. C. W. McConnell, O40381, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Jack Alloyse Requarth, O22189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walden Francis Woodward, O22190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Carpenter Dewey, O22191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert William Frink, O22192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Merril Hoover, O22193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Joseph Genetti, O22194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Edward Hassenfelt, O22195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Richard Luczak, O22196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Robert Donaldson, O22198, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Harley Lumry, O22199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Gorn, O22200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Dowe Vieman, O22201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Francis Slaughter, O22202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kurt Gustav Radtke, O22203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Pettingell Samson, O22204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Alphonse Hussey, O22205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Murphy Williams, O22206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Gool Pavey, O22207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mylo LeRoy Heen, O22208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Myers, O22209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Enos Wood, Jr., O22210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Richard Christofk, O22212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Irving Pray, O22214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Ahee, O22215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Hamilton Ragsdale, O22217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Balish, O22218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Kenneth Marshall, O22219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Murray Dean Dougan, O22221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Newton Shigley, O22222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Reeves, O22223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Earl Lay, O22224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Thomas Schooley, O22225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Martin Bachman, O22226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Edward Miller, O22227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Allen Sharrer, O22229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Franklin Bishop, O22231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Hector Cross, O22232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Farris Ludeman, O22233, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Taylor Beelman, O22235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard George Jewett, O22236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Albert Swatta, O22237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glen S. Waterman, O22239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Calvin Oliver Smith, O22240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Jones Merrill, O22241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jesse Price Moorefield, O22244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Gunnard Carlson, O22246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Fleetwood Crocker, O32410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harlan Moore Freeman, O32409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Landon Greaud Cox, O32413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edmund Victor Harnstrom, O32414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Chester Emmett Canine, O43949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Kendall Harrold, O32417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon August Miller, O1C386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Gray, O40387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Louis Lossen, O32420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil Delbert Sasse, O32421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lee Kinson, O43955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Carl August Peterson, O52344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ripley Bruce, Jr., O32423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. James Dee Gallagher, O43958, United States Army.

×Capt. George Leslie Morelock, Jr., O43960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Abraham, O32427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Urban Edward Rohr, O38996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Calvin Siddell Hannum, O32428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles George Micheau, O32429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

1st Lt. Crawford Henry Lydle, Jr., O52349, U. S. Army.

Capt. David Carl Turner, O43965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Don Leigh Husman, O32431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Joseph Petrilli, O32433, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William John Penly, O22300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Leonard Erickson, O32434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Barnes Marshall, O52350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Norman Hale, O43938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lloyd Jorgenson, O32436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Edwin Fisher, O32435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Baum, O38997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Wendell Reynolds, O43963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Amel Lavaine Cox, C43971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilbur Ainsworth Hamilton, O52352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Washington Johnson, O52351, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas McKnight, O32439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Richard Koshko, Jr., O43974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Preston Dawson, Jr., O38998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

1st Lt. Robert William Wildey, O52353, U. S. Army.

Lt. Col. Ralph Eugene Hood, O32443, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ross Young, O39001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Luther Wenbert Murphy, O43979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Andrew Reid Duvall, Jr., O32444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Bernard Sellers, O43981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Newman Smith, O32449, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Theodore Hays Wineman, O52354, United States Army.

Maj. Max McCord, O52355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Walter McWhinney, O32450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Simms, O32451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Evans Ackner, O32452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Melvin Layman, Jr., O32455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morris Dantzker, O43992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Pierce Reeves, Jr., O43996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Ashton Ross, O39003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lon Devere Marlowe, Jr., O32459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Kenneth Doyle, O44000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Herman Dickey 3d, O44001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arden Isaiah Lewis, O43360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lee Richardson, O44002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Parker Warner, O32462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Walter Taylor, O32465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Myron Gray, O44007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Franklin Giles, O56899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Harold Kyckelhahn, O32467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Charles Wilkins, O44009, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Arnold Rodgers, O44010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edwin Arthur, O32468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bevelle Tallaferro Brown, O32469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elwyn James Fonk, O44015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Dallas Burns, O32472, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Jackson Rushing, O40391, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Edward Babcock, O44016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lionel Friedman, O32474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edgar Seth Sanders, O52359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Vinning Clark, O40393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Glazier Piland, O52360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Edward Eitt, O32477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Raymond Russell, O32478, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederick Louis Schumm, O32479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Keith, Jr., O32482, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Merle Fondren, O32481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Nelson Jean, O22632, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hubert Denwood Thomte, O22633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Sewanee Baskin, O22634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Otto Johnson, O22635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Gordon Ratliff, O22637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Sylvan Preston Lay, O22638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ira Bertram Richards, Jr., O22639, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Allen Dees, O22641, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald William Coons, O22642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Charles McCrum, O22643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Reeve Bruyere, 3d, O22644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Dunlap Hill, O22645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lemuel Edwin Pope, O22646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vladimir Bohdan Kovac, O22647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Wheeler Downey, Jr., O22649, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Parrish McQuail, O22651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Lee Copley, O22652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Johnson Grant Lemmon, O22653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Ehlert Rex Rawle, O22654, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Sterling Charles Holmes, O22655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Hastings, O22658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Snow, O22659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willys Hicks Pearson, O22660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Ezra Shoemaker, O22661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Robert Moore, Jr., O22662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Latta Mann, O22663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col William Overton Gall, O22664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Heasty, Jr., O22665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Avery W. Masters, O22666, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Louis Thorkelson, O22667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Longwell Foster, O22669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Frederick Beaty, O22672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Hasselback, Jr., O22673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Burns Barry, Jr., O22674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Buck White, O22675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Franklin Kent, O22676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Logan Irby, O22678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Clay Holloway, Jr., O22679, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morgan Garrott Roseborough, O22681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Cantrell, O22682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dorsey Elwood McCrory, O22683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Dayle Balliett, O22684, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aleck Francis MacDonald, O22685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Grady Ford Rials, O44022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Christy, O44023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Norman Ewing Cole, O32484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Gerald Lucey, O44025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Francis Kaiser, O52323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Frederick MacLeod, O44026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Cross Gee, O44027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Whittick, O32487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude William White, O44029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Elmer Rousek, Jr., O44030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Schaeffer Bare, O32486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Norman Ward, Jr., O32491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harrison John Merritt, O32492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. William John Besser, O44039, United States Army.

Capt. Earl Willard Ralf, O44037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Christopher Worth Chaney, O32496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Brubaker, Jr., O32497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Edward Hall, Jr., O32330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John MacLean, O44042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Royce Lester Eaves, O32499, United States Army.

Maj. John Temple Heston, O52371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Denton Callaway, O32502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford John Van Sickle, O32505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Page Hudson Brownfield, O40395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Lewis Norwood, O44046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Halland William Hankel, O44049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Thomas Behnken, Jr., O44052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Getty Fairchild, O40396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linden Kinder Cannon, Jr., O32509, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Allison Shaw, O32511, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Arthur Williams, O32513, Army of the United States, (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Winston Landes, O40397, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lewis Brooks, Jr., O44054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Greene Risley, O32516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Getchell Maynard, O32515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harauld Dean Langham, O32518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Cannon Bradford, O32519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Winford Leonard, O44055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Victor Scott Kendall, Jr., O32521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Virgil Glenn Brown, O40398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis James Wadle, O44059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Herbert Rankin, O32522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Erik William Jordahn, O44060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wesleigh Molloy, O32526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edwin Carruth, O44064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles E. Surber, O32528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brian Odell Montgomery, O32529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Hodges, O44065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Newhall Page, O32530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Dean Dickson, O32531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Earle Tardy, O32532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Stuart Werngren, O39006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gordon Bennett, O40400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Aloise Luszki, O44073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Paul Killman, O32538, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Whitfield, O32537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Girard Di Meo, O44074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Reid Raber, O44076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Calvin Featherston, O44075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Warren Moon, O32540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ross Putnam Frasher, O40401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glenn Arthur Welde, O40402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Aloysius Sullivan, O44080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Francis Byron Mills, O32544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Keagle Buck, O32545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rodney Douglas Brown, O32547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Michael Miletich, O32546, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Frank Lester Lear, O39007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Benjamin McGrath, O32548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Conn, O32550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Wayne Engelland, O32551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thad Sam Oliver, Jr., O32553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tony Francis Perpich, O32552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lilbourne Wayne Sherrod, O40403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Theron Strickland, O44085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cleo Vernon Hadley, O44086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Raymond Brice, O32557, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jack Victor Doriot, O52386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Albert Laliberte, O32558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Philip Heller, O52389, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harold Wayne Gaines, O32559, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hudson Christie Hill, O32560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Kenneth Charles Johnson, O44090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernst Fredrich Liebmann, O44091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Oswald Miller, O40404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Raymond Bernard Graeves, Jr., O32563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Baker Hallums, O32564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. C. Craig Cannon, O39008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Albert Walsworth, O32565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Francis Smith, O40406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Laurence Edmund Chloupek, O44094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Martin Trauger, O44095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Terrell Dunn, O32612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Seely Hutchinson, Jr., O32611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Melvin Thompson, O44098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Collyer Smith, O32572, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Byron Gordon, O32573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Pickering Nichols, O40407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Leonard Lerner, O44103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Shelton E. Lollis, O32575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clyde Morton, O39010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roger Whiting, O32577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel David Wilder, O44104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Judson Hyde, O44109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×First Lt. James Gordon Russell, O32580, United States Army.

Capt. Paul Kinnison, O32581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Stuart Crossman, O32583, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Craig Beechley, O44115, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Franklin Melvin, O32585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clem Garrison Hailey, O40409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. LaMar Arthur DeSpain, O32587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. James Franklin Carney, O52396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Gilbert Raff, O32588, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Frank McPherson Bullard, O44121, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bill Buerkle, O52399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Harry Daubert, O32593, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Bartley Axum, O52400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Broderick Huntley, O22714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elbert Mack Sleeker, O22716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Emil Barker, O22717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elbert Emerson Stickels, O22718, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Alan MacGregor, O22719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dean Edgar Painter, O22720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Lee Pitney, O22721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Walter Stephenson, Jr., O22722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Shacter, O22724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Hubbard Strong, O22725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Wilhoit Stulting, O22726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick Boisseau Watson, O22727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel McCord Hollis, O22728, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew Charles Mautz, O22729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Nelson Eddy, O22730, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Arnold Kreidberg, O22733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lucius Walton, O22734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Belton O'Connell, O22735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wright Williams, O22736, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilson Maxwell Hawkins, O22737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Armistead Robison Harper, O22738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene John White, O22739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Xavier Bradley, O22740, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ellison Hart, O22742, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thornton Jones, O32595, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paull Alonzo Bane, Jr., O32596, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Sylvester Jones, O52403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ogene Pitts, O44126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lyndon Peter Kramer, O40413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Asher Stone, O40414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank John Wasson, Jr., O39011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Winston Anson Jones, O32602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gerald Woodrow Gray, O44130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herald Heyman Smith, O32603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Elliott Renaud, O44131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mildridge Frazier Vaughn, O40415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Franklin Edward Duda, O52407, United States Army.

Maj. John Thomas Lorenz, O52408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Anton Barten, O32605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Monroe Marlow, O32606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Francis Hamele, O32610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alfred Knute Clark, O32608, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Martin Davis, O52410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Osborn Cooper, O44135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Foxx, O40418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Cecil Fralish, O32668, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Grover Chester Richards, Jr., O44139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wallace McKee Kendrick, O32615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Guy Luckett Campbell, O32616, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Michael Phillip Elcano, O44142, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Selby McKay Frank, O32620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Jenkins Halsey, Jr., O32619, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Davis Sydnor, Jr., O32618, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Harold Duckworth, O32621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Arthur Allen, Jr., O32622, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frank Taylor, O44143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Edwin Thomas Rhatigan, O52412, United States Army.

Capt. Robert Mitchell Dill, O32626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Christian Neumann, Jr., O44145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence William Drye, O52413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Silas Rice, O32628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Halsted Graham, O40420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Gaines Stark, O40421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byron Escar Cowart, O52415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Lee Harllee, O44146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Blake Stark, O32633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Myron Laithwaite Brewer, O32495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Allen Marshall, O52416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jim Alva Campbell, O52417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lorenzo Albino Mella, Jr., O52418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elba Walter Bowen, O32634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Victor Emile Morissette, O44149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roderick Dermott Eason, O52420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Tommins Adler, O32635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Howard Dunning, O52421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Southward Robbins, O32636, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hiram Madison Merritt, O32638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Timothy Augustus Moran, O32640, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel William Rachal, O44159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Merrill Farmer, O44158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilbur Samuel Hilton, O32643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×First Lt. Nat Giambelluca, O44161, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Morris Bailey Montgomery, O44162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Elmer Bates, O32644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Barclay Wolff, O32645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Tom Walker Barnett, O44164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Eugene Long, O40422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Mark, O32647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Franklin Marshall, O32648, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Rutledge Greer, Jr., O32651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Frederick Ottinger, O39012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Clancy Cassaday, O32653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Simpson Keisler, O32657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Fairfax Bayard, O44169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Minot Boyd Dodson, O32660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Giles Houghton Kidd, O32659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Lovell Hooper, O32662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Joseph McIntyre, Jr., O44171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Ramey Keller, O33248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hayden John Price, O39013, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. LaRue Henry Ritter, O40424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Buckley, O52429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Robert Duffy, O52428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Miller Hartman, Jr., O44177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Farren, O32670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Martin Gettys, O44181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Milton Dillender, Jr., O32671, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carmon Lavon Clay, O32673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Frank Goodwin Hubbard, O52430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. John William Hughes, Jr., O32676, United States Army.

Capt. Emile Joseph Bussolati, O32677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Wayne Sunderlin, O32678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Thomas Heinrich, O39014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Matthew Richard Joseph Giuffre, O40425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Daniel Wise, Jr., O32682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Edwin Kirk, O32681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Harold McCord, O32683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis Legare Jenkins, Jr., O32684, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Weaver Henderson Gaines, O32686, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).
×Capt. Nathan Guelzow Schmidt, O44188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S Army).
Capt. Marshell Garrett McBee, O39015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).
Capt. Edwin Bruce Jeffress, O44190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Edwin Gilbert Moran, O52434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. David Herber, O32689, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Adolph Joseph Gondek, O44196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Edward Richard Radzwich, O32691, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. John Henry Murphy, O44201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Garcia Lundy, O32692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Merle Lee Goodrich, O32693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. George Willett Wood, O44203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Thomas Henry Birch, O32696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Baker Clark, O32695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Raleigh Osborn Worrell, O32697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas William Alvey, O32698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Robert Lyle, O32700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Douglas Patterson, O32702, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Storey McMillan, O32703, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Edward Welsh, O32706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Perry John Roberts, O44206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Raymond Lawrence Steinbacher, O32709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Hugh Alden Hurt, O44210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Felix Edward Tharpe, O32204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charis Roger Sparra, O32712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Otis Ross, O52442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Hays Hammond, Jr., O44213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. George Clifford Freeman, O44214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Robert Elmer Godfrey, O52444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Edwin Charles Kingsley, O32717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Jack Hill Carter, O52445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harry Lawrence Yerby, O32719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Richard German Murdock, O44221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Barton Ormsbee Baker, O44222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
First Lt. Gerard James Grogan, O40429, United States Army.
Maj. Clifford Hayes Ruffner, Jr., O39017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Milford Walter Wood, O32723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Lewis Lucas, O40249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Maj. George Edward Carter, O40430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Thomas Benjamin Ross, Jr., O32724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur William Ries, O44226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Glenn Byron Owen, O32725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Paul Eric Blumensaadt, O32727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Leon Herbert Rainville, O32726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Murray Parker, O39018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Major Jonas Alvin Vilhauer, O32732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Cyrus Reyon Shockey, O44234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Major Kenneth Edison Pell, O40432, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Talton Woodrow Long, O32735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Willis Elmo Smitherman, O52455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Wendell Wright Gaffney, O44235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Orville Emil Bloch, O32736, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Lyles Snyder, O52456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edgar Charles Wall, O32738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Alfred Joseph Montrone, O32737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).
Capt. Raymond Ford Hoffman, O44240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ronald Watson, O52459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Hal Hardenbergh, O32740, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Major Harry Verner Helm, O32743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).
Maj. Clarence Flagg Murray, Jr., O32744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. John Richard Riddle, O32745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Benjamin Beckham, O32747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Dexheimer, O32749, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).
Maj. Lee George Kays, O32750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Oakley McCurdy Lamb, O32751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Chase Gleason, O44245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Graham Buhmann, O32748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Irvin Norris, O44246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Paul Bernhardt Schuppener, O52465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. John Judson Spencer, O44248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Carl Slifer Leidy, O32755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Walcott Watson, O32756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Julius Willie Levy, O52466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. James Hantzes, O52467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Raymond Willhite Hannah, O32760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Edgar Stuart, O52468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ralph Wright, O32765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Henry Thomson Guth, O32768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Robert Wells Johnson, O44258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Oliver Glen Stutzman, O32771, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Herbert William Hartung, O44261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Charles Aubrey Wolfe, O44262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Francis Ariel Swope, O32774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Francis Leonard Dunn, O40437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Henry Clayburn Tipton, O32777, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence August Mette, Jr., O32776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. David Ewing Foster, O52471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Frederic N. Oettinger, Jr., O32782, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Warren Preston Stockwell, O40438, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Laurence Alvin Johnson, O33361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Robert Edward Harper, O32783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
First Lt. Andre Harry Nelson, O44271, United States Army.
Maj. Chester Herman Johnson, O44273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Jay Hunt, O32789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Marshall Bigelow Allen, O44275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Craig, O52479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. John William Engl, O44278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Robert Harold Ward, O44280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Guy Clifford Emery, Jr., O52481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Eugene Nelson Axtell, O44281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Alvis Morrow Howell, O32797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. John Curtis Allan, O32798, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Benjamin Frederick Cook, Jr., O32801, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Donald Edward Twyon, O32805, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Wilbur Samuel Dillon, O32807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Carlyle Hegsted Shurtleff, O44288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Gordon Elwood McQuain, O40441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Taft Benson, O52484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Norman Davis, O32808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Patrick Francis Cassidy, O32809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harry Ernest Meisell, O32812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Chester Herman Hancock, O44292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Earl Thomas Wiley, Jr., O40442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Asa Glass, Jr., O44293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Clifford Henry Dawson, O39023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Bristow Sanford Hopper, O32815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert William Sanders, O44296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Clark Vincent Telquist, O40443, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Kermit Herbert Rosenberg, O52487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Russell O'Grady, O40444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Henry Wilson, O52820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ernest Albert Henry Woodman, O32822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Witus Thybony, O39024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. David Prior, O44304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Smith McElhenny, O39025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Richard Eddison Wade, O32824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Joseph Garland May, O32825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)
Maj. Henry Harrison Hewitt, O32827, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harold Elmore Dalness, O44310, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Capt. William Newton Lingenfelter, O32829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Henry Stack Hastings, O32830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Fred Martin Ruck, O33049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lee Samuel Stoneback, O44316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Charles Leo Davis, O44317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Beverly Risque, O40446, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
1st Lt. William Donald Canfield, O44318, United States Army.
Maj. Fred Louis Elstrup, O44319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Claude Wilson White, O40448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Elwood Dale McSherry, O44322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
1st Lt. Larry Gene McPherson, O52498, United States Army.
Maj. Eben Randolph Jones, O32836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Allen Law Morrison, O32837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Everett Wellman Duvall, O32842, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Leon Ryno Yourtee, Jr., O44329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Frank Alexander Penn, O32843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Walter John Hewitt, O44332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Anthony Henry Ortenzi, O33383, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Donald Goldsmith Thompson, O32844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Lyle Eugene Hershey, O52502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Rains White, O32847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Curtis Yarnell Kimball, O32663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).
Maj. Lloyd Dayton Colvin, O32853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Duane David Davis, O39026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Joe McAdoo Willis, O32854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Kenneth Frederick Langland, O52505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Einar Watten, O44342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. William Kenneth Bunney, O52507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
First Lt. David Hugh Darlington, O33440, United States Army.
×Lt. Col. Otho Tindall Winstead, O44345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Aubrey Sanford, O32857, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harlan Veatch Logsdon, O44347, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arthur Lawrence Dean, Jr., O32860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
First Lt. William George Barry, O40452, United States Army.
Maj. Harold Gross Stover, O32845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Frank Lewis Lillyman, O32861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Henry Everett Osthues, O52512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Tyler Gilbert, O44348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Edwin Jackson Chatham, O52513, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Alexander Anthony Zaresky, O44353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Victor Allen Davis, O40453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
First Lt. Charles Elwood Conway, O44354, United States Army.
Maj. Leroy French Clark, Jr., O32863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Maj. Beverly Thomas Richardson, O32864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Lewis Charles Spinney, O44357, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
First Lt. Walker Felton Nolan, O52516, United States Army.
Capt. Russell Carl Krueger, O32865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Emmett McKay Lewis, O32866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Thomas Avery, Jr., O32867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).
Capt. Paul Reed Behnke, O32869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Gordon Evans, O52521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Paul Blakely, O32870, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allan Lee Swaim, O32871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Preston Wintrode Wyand, O44263, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward Cook, Jr., O32876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ray Frederick Coyle, Jr., O52523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leopold Frederick Hofinger, O44368, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Hoover, O44370, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Armour Stewart Armstrong, O44372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Denton Hickman, O44374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Carl Edwin Strauss, O44375, United States Army.

Maj. Joe Melvin Dietzel, O32881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Christopher Raymond Keegan, O44383, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Tuttle Barnaby, Jr., O44385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lee Baker, O40456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Trevor Eifer Williams, O32883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Willie Lee Tate, O32885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Kruse Kolster, O32886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Archie James Griggs, O44389, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Evert Cecil Way, O32888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Emil Schulten, Jr., O40457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floyd Harrison Long, Jr., O32889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reino Oscar Lehtonen, O52532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aaron Ellsworth Blewett, O32893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Julius Rozamus, O32892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Boothe, Jr., O52533, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Rigel, O32894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Leroy Hicks, O52535, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allan Langdon Leonard, Jr., O32898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ward Truett Blacklock, O32899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wallace Aux, O44399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arley Leroy Outland, O44400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harlos V. Hatter, O32901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Harrington Griffith, O44403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Henry Franklin Prysi, O32904, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Ernest Von Pawel, O52541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Max Zaumeyer, O32906, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edward Hudson, O44410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roosevelt Thomas Plummer, O44412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Lee Huffaker, O32911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Frederick Hooper, O39028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Ernest Beda, O32916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Martin Scott, Jr., O52544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Evans McHenry, O52545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Edward Murray, O44421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Joseph Flanigan, O44422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Lawrence Cormier, O32923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Clayton McLaughlin, O44423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Kenneth Nelson, O44426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Stewart, O32925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Maj. Thomas Charles Prunty, O32924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Clifton Brown, O22888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

×Lt. Col. Alan Edward Gee, O22889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Lt. Col. John William Burfening, O22891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Lt. Col. John Anthony Graf, Jr., O22892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bellows Hazeltine, Jr., O22896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Erway Dunham, Jr., O22897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Francis Dixon, Jr., O22899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ashod Michael Ahmajan, O22900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Joseph Fuller, O22901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Francis O'Neil, O22902, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Gordon Forbes, O22903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Richard Peterson, O22904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Stuart Parker, O22907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Harold Goodrich, O22911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Aiken Flanders, O22912, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Thomas Podufaly, O22913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Leroy Jacobs, O22915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clayton Allen Rust, O22916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Wilson Penney, O22917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Duvall Quaid, O22919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Maurice Clock, O22920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carter Pfeil, O22921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Richard Sullivan, O22923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Landon Haseman, O22925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Henry Free, O22926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Gaylord Cook, O22927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Eugene Gunster, Jr., O22928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Hobart Krauss, O22932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thaddeus Michael Nosek, O22934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Joseph Legere, Jr., O22937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oval Hale Robinson, O22938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul David Phillips, O22939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Harvey Banks, O22940, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Harvey Roedy, O22941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Carmin Noble, O22942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Morris Rogers, O22943, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Bunyan Corbly, Jr., O22944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Lovell Elliott, O22945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Dixon Arnold, O22946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cuyler Llewellyn Clark, Jr., O22947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerhard Evans Brown, O22948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Minahan, O22949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Regis Shanahan, O22950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Pershing Strauss, O22951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Irving Dice, O22952, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edmund Harrison, Jr., O22953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Urey Woodson Alexander, O22954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Payne Francisco, O22955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow Maurice Smith, O22960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Roger Guy, O22961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ray Williams, O22962, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Montgomery Moore, O22963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wendell John Coats, O22964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Ferrell Winton, Jr., O22966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Bernard Ambrose Ferry, O22967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Jacob Yeager, O22969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Mayo, Jr., O22970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Renola, O22971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence William Clapsaddle, Jr., O22972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morris Loeb Shoss, O22973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Moore Brewer, O22975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth McRae Lemley, O22976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Harvey Spengler, O22977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Leroy Shoemaker, Jr., O22978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Nils Martin Bengtson, O22979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Hamilton Kyle, O22981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Barron Chandler, Jr., O22982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Titus Vanderhoef, O22984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Silvasy, O22985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Haldeman Baumer, O22987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Marti Benson, O22991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Augustine Miley, Jr., O22993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Wendt, Jr., O22995, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Talmage Marsh, Jr., O22996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rolland Woodrow Hamelin, O22997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Edward Gushurst, O22998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Raymond Weir Millican, O23000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Vivian Bennett, O23001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Allen Cunningham, Jr., O23003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Woodrow Wilson Vaughan, O23004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Willard Walters, Jr., O23006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Daniel Carnahan, O23007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Merrick Patten, O23008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Fate, O23010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Kirkbride Taylor, O23011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Fahey Black, O23012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robinson Riley Norris, O23014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Harrison Mullin, O23015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burdett Eugene Haessly, O23016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Huntington Monroe, Jr., O23017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hobart Burnside Pillsbury, O23019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Louis Hoffmann, O23023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Manley Calbraith Perry, O23024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Jacob Beiser, O23025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Boyle Stewart, O23028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Simonton Brice, Jr., O23029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Henderson Scott, Jr., O23030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Joseph Crown, O23031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett DeWitt Light, O23033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Alexander Shaunesey, Jr., O23036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Andrew O'Brien, O23037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Woodfin Hobson, Jr., O23038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerry Spears Addington, O23041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Milton Orman, O23046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otis Maxwell Ulm, O23047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Henry Hendrickson, O23048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dennis Ladislaus Barton, O23049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Griffith Baker, O23051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Levin Belt, O23053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Thompson Simpson, Jr., O23054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Fellenz, O23055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John MacNair Wright, Jr., O23057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Campbell Cassibry, O23058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Loring Clay, O23059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Paulick, O23060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Jerome Delaney, O23067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Roscoe Kintner, O23068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wendell Burley Sell, O23069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Frank Armand de Latour, Jr., O23073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Bowman Hargis, Jr., O23076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Langworthy Beaudry, O23077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Kieser Britt, O23078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Elroy Tyler, O23079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Hobbs Fraser, O23080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Carroll Haggard, O23081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Herbert Rosen, O23082, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donovan Paul Yeuell, Jr., O23083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stewart Lawrence McKenney, O23084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edison Albert Lynn, Jr., O23085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertil Andrew Johnson, O23086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alan Phillip Thayer, O23087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Pidgeon, O23089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic Watson Oseth, O23090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jordan Joseph Wilderman, O23092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Harold Nelson, O23093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Stevens Harnett, O23094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Frederick Kreitzer, O23096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Aber, O23097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Martin Strock, O23099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Hume Woodward, O23102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Thorne Tuck, O23104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Osmund Alfred Leahy, O23105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Butler Bonham, O23107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Anthony Lotozo, O23109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Alexander Aubrey, O23110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul S. Cullen, O23111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Frederick Gordon, O23112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Kenney, O23114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edmund Collins, O23116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Francis Bavaro, O23117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Frederick Horton, O23118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Olin Lee Bell, O23119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Mead Bowlby, Jr., O23120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Scott Montgomery Case, O23121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Edward Kramer, O23122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rowland Herman Renwanz, O23123, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Wilbourne Milner, O23124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Schuyler Hardin, O23126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jules David Yates, O23127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sanford Patrick England, O23129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Goodnow Stoddard, Jr., O23130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Maedler, O23132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip John Moore, 3d, O23135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ronald Maurice Kolda, O23136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Scott Greene, Jr., O23137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Jefferson Turner, Jr., O23138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salvo Rizza, O23139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert McLean, O23140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Deber Townsend, O23141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Herold Wohner, O23142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wing Fook Jung, O23144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Corwin Chamberlain, O23145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelius Arthur Murphy, O23146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Michael Rooney, O23147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Thomas Hennessy, O23148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Zahrobsky, O23149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Anthony O'Brien, Jr., O23152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Christie Emery, O23153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delbert Earle Munson, O23156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roderick Wetherill, O23158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Arthur Robert Barry, O23160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bryce Frederic Denno, O23161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Russell Dodderidge, O23164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Leo Clement, O23167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dan Porter Briggs, O23169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Ford Prioleau Fuller, Jr., O23170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Lionel Bierman, O23175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas O'Keefe, O23176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel McClure Goodwin, O23177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carroll Cameron, O23178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace James Hackett, O23179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Barbour Byrne, O23181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lester Frank Schockner, O23182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Lt. Col. John Dibble, Jr., O23183, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Henry Bates, O23184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Ami Stella, O23185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Bert Lane, O23187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Eugene Farthing, Jr., O23188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Bell Chandler, O23189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George John Bayerle, Jr., O23192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Park Richards, O23194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kerr Roberts, Jr., O23195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Hans Mueller, O23196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Balthis, Jr., O23199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland George Cagwin, O23200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Henry Muller, O23201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Silvio Emil Gasperini, Jr., O23203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harmon Porter Rimmer, O23204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James David Loewus, O23205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Fielding Lewis, O23206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Rockwell Crocker, O23207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Myers Kasper, O23210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Meszar, O23211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Thomas Cassidy, O23213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lee Watson Fritter, O23217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Orville McDonald, O23218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sanford Harvey Webster, O23222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Frederick Williams, Jr., O23224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Deming Lucas, Jr., O23225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Washington England, Jr., O23226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis O'Donnell, O23228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Anthony Schmaltz, O23229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gilford Dalton Green, O23231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Chittenden Mandell, O23234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emory Sherwood Adams, Jr., O23235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Gordon Malone, O23237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Ware Mabee, O23241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Florian John Erspamer, O23242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Eugene Oglesby, O23244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Theodore Biswanger, Jr., O23245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bidwell Moore, O23248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thaddeus Philip Floryan, O23249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Dale Epley, O23250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Webster Hough, O23251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony Lewis Paul Wermuth, O23252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Donald Budz, Jr., O23253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Talman Watrous, Jr., O23254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Durward Henry Galbreath, O23255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jodie Gibson Stewart, Jr., O23256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Eben French Swift, O23258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Weisman Davis, O23259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Neville Mackin, 3d, O23260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Alexander Shagrin, O23261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Gonzaga Mendez, Jr., O23262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Joseph Gildart, O23264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sidney Vincent Bingham, Jr., O23269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Bernard Morrissey, O23270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mark Clair Baugher Klunk, O23273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Victor George Conley, O23276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Merrill Gleszer, O23278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Lee Mastran, O23279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Drummond Swank, O23281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Norman Holm, O23282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Sorg Reinecke, Jr., O23284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Edward Miner, O23285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Raleigh, O23287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Dunphy Fitzpatrick, O23288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Julian Aaron Cook, O23290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Thomas Larkin, O23293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Page Egerton Smith, O23294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Force Daniels, O23295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William White Saunders, O23296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Henry Harley Arnold, Jr., O23299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Hatfield Merchant, O23301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Moffet Freudendorf, O23303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Joseph Manzolillo, O23304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Franklin Delamater 3d, O23305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Jack Borden, O23306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Robert Cibotti, Jr., O23309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Thomas Devlin, O23314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Newlin Ross, O23315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Landon Albert Witt, O23317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bertram Coontz, O23319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton David Lederman, O23320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Grinnell White, O23326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Jennings Floyd, O23328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Kuziv, Jr., O23330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Bennett, O23331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Cicero Fogle, O44426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Douglas Gorrie Alexander, O32927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Burrell Hewette, O44430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Rasmus Anderson, O40461, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Beals Scudder, O36179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Francis Morand, O32930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Joseph Bee, O44437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Acton Kirk, Jr., O44442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Meade Parker, Jr., O32936, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burkhardt Marshall Senn, O32950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ivan George Phillips, O32941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Winston Lewis Olson, O32940, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Reeves Garton, O32945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Paul D'Arezzo, O23383, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Freund, O23384, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Deneley, O32946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Helmuth Simmons, O39029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Camden Page Fortney, Jr., O32949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce Braid, O32950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard James, O40463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Charles Rohen, O32954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Courtney Heald, O44454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Neil Potter Whitney, O32955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Neil Sands, O32957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick William Baum, O23385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Herbert Batte, O23401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Walter Wright Lange, O23402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Stanley Griffith, Jr., O23403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Washburn Bruneau, O23404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Cook Tredennick, O23405, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Conrad Miller, O23406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Hall Livingston, O23408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hunter LeGear Stockton, O23409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jene Earl Mills, O23410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow Bryan Sigley, O23411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Pratt Alexander Warren, O23412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Randall King, O23413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Gray Platt, O23414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Harness, O23415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Denisevich, O23416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Archie Hatten, O23417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Gilbert Warren Curl, O23418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Lincoln Brassel, O23420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Lester Ramme, O23421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Cobb Benjamin, O23422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Blair Green, O23423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harlan Bull, O23424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Burbank Webster, Jr., O23425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emerson Wallace Grant, O23427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Blatchford Robinson, O23428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clifford Ellwood Lippincott, O23429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Dana Young, O23430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Francis Carter, O23431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Kethley Gillmore, O23432, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyril Dean Sterner, O23434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Walton Walker, O23435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Alvin Kersting, O23436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Walker Sample, O23437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Benjamin Grant Taylor, Jr., O23438, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Richard Irvine Manning, O23439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Addis Emmet Moseley, Jr., O23441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Sheridan Eldridge, O23442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Misha Nicholas Kadick, O23444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Storey Sandiland, O23445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Houghton Collart, O23447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Scandrett, O23448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrel Gee Costello, O23449, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bergen Brokaw Hovell, O23450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Henry Symbol, O23452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Samuel Daley, Jr., O23453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Howard Ressijac, O23454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jack Finney Lane, O23456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Mix Gilbert, O23457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas O'Connor Blakeney, O23458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Jackson Natzel, O23459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Hammond Walker, Jr., O23460, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otto Bismarck Cloudt, Jr., O23462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Diedrich Hansen, O23468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emil Paul Eschenburg, O23469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Arn, O23470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Cone Mahoney, Jr., O23486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Chester Goers, O23487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. David William Iunghuhn, O23488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Darrel Cavness, O23489, Army og the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Bennett Johnson, O23490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Parker Ewan Connor, Jr., O23491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Pancratius Fagan, O23496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Unverferth, O23499, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Paul Edward Alban, O23500, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Metcalf, O23501, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl William Edwards, O23502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bert Perrin, O23503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Thomas Shelby, O23504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Henry Lorenz, Jr., O23505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Christopher Wilkinson, Jr., O23512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arden Charles Brill, O23514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Washington Shivers, Jr., O23515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Clyde Stump, O23516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Cecil Evans, Jr., O23517, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Ernest Rice, O23518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Fogg Twombly 3d, O23519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tom Spencer Phair, O23520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Toxell Olin Mason, O23522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Franklin Mynderse, O23523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merle Reed Preble, O23524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Hall, O23525, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Alexander Schendel, Jr., O23526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Charles Durgan, O23527, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Albert Hansen, O23528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thompson Horner, Jr., O23530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Milton Hightower 3d, O23531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hal Dale McCown, O23532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh William McClary, O23533, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Marion Brümfiel, O23534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Henry John Richter, O23536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin O'Connor, Jr., O23539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Harold Lahlum, O23541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Condit Ingalls, O23542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vallard Cassius Smith, O23543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Pershing Brown, O23544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Clark Manson, O23545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Claire Tillson, O23546, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nye Maguet Scofield, O23547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Greenwood, Jr., O23548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Law Bryan, O23549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Melvin Desmond Clark, O23550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Howard Bayer, O23551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Marvin Kinzer, O23552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Brinkley Ramsey, O23553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Donham Higgins, O23554, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Zim E. Lawhon, O23555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bradford Rosson, O23556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elgin Gilbert Radcliff, O23558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Somer Shepland, O23560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Harry Pell, O23561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Alexander Edens, O23563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Vincent Wilson, O23564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irvin Albert Johnson, O40464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Newell Barber, O52568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Charles Smith, O44457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Kenneth Smith, O32959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Farrar Bristol, O44459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Wayne Mather, O44458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Raymond Budge, O52569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Clifford Melius, O44464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Pearson, O44466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bernhard Randle, O52570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Riley, O40465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Osborne Romeo Rumph, O40466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ledford Lain, O32967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Davis Preston, Jr., O32969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl J. Brown, O39031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Allen Poe McCarthy, Jr., O32970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Gleason Cornett, O32972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Robert Hansen, O52571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Alexander Higgins, O40468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lashlie Utley, O32977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Delbert Lewis Jellum, O44478, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman I. Zimmerman, O52576, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Warren Sisco, O52579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max Hobart Gerard, O32982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Albert Newlin, O32983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Colmer Whitting, O44487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Adrain Michaelis, O44486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Neal Tudor, O39032, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harrison Crowe, O32986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Clark Bingham, Jr., O40471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Vincent Schalbuch, O32990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Morris Scott, Jr., O44504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. LaVere Henry Strom, O32995, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Hawley Matthews, O32997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leland Henry Langbein, O40473, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Alexander Finlay Berol, O33000, United States Army.

Capt. Jack Schwartzman, O40475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alva Thomas McDaniel, O44521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Andrew Young, Jr., O44524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Robert Guice Kimball, O52599, United States Army.

Maj. William Gamble McIlhiney, O33005, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Clarence Aylesworth, O23614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Dickerson, O23615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Earl Treadway, O23617, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Entwistle Burton, O44526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ben Warner Legare, O39034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tracy James Hardman, O33007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Andrew Roberts, O33008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Lester Alphonso Kearney, O33010, United States Army.

Capt. Robert Hyatt Malone, O33014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ray Goodman Lawrence, O52606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Neil Mackay Matzger, O44539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Carlisle Griffin, O33016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gilbert Martin, O39035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rieder William Schell, O33021, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Roger Harris, O44564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Ballard Porter, O40477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Clifford Pittman, O33022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Reinoldi, O52610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Kenneth Addison, O44547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Robert David Branagan, O33024, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Robert Branson Cobb, O33025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Mayer Wilson, Jr., O33026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clements Blackwell, O40478, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Elmer Pederson, O40479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Marion Conover, Jr., O33029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Patrick Mullarkey, O33030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Eugene Scherer, O33032, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Charles John Larsen, O44558, United States Army.

Maj. Walter Henry Clifford, O33033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bernard Benjamin Beck, O40481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Brice Pace, O33035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Walter Lang, O33004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Howard Hanson, O52615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Herberts Bykerk, O33038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vincent Edward Osborne, O33039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene C. Oates, Jr., O44576, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Edwin Cooper Gibson, O44578, United States Army.

Capt. Marcello Worthington Bordley, Jr., O44580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Armand Leo Bellavance, O40484, United States Army.

First Lt. James Dickson Polley 3d, O39036, United States Army.

Capt. Norman Elwood Petty, O33041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Burrows, O23621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hector Carrie, Jr., O33043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Pratt Mason, O44587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold William Athan, O52624, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph James Delaney, O33048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Throckmorton Ghent, O52626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Francis Leon Leva, O52627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anders Olof Wiklund, O44597, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Thomas Ryan, O52629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Donald Allen, O52630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Arthur Wooten, Jr., O44599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Capt. Roger Orrsin King, O44600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Vincent Fahey, O33054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Stern Quick, O44602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Calone Bieri, O33055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Alfred Collins, O40486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Fred Brown Mitchell, O52633, United States Army.

Maj. Richard Roberts Prewitt, O44603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward John Cullinan, O44604, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Tillman Hunt, Jr., O33057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Adams Hall, O44605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wah Geung Chin, O33058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Blackburn Stephens, O33060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Driver, O52637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ernest Ward Smith, O33064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Garland Rawlings, O33065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Clifford Wood, Jr., O52640, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Francis Roberts, Jr., O44612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Webster, O33071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Peter Parker, O40487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Golden Bogle, O52642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Goulding Marriott, O33072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Carl Frederick Byers, O52643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Thornton Boyle, O33074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karlton Warmbrod, O33077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Gerald Irwin, O40490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lieutenant John Sumstad, O52646, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Robert James Rosa, O33078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thro Haslam, O33079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter John Todd, O40491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Russell Morris, O44626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Louis D'Amello, O44627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Blades, O33082, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Davis Skipper, O33083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Edwin Niffenegger, O33084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Foster Ball, O39039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank John Kent, O33087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ira Waugaman, Jr., O33086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Holt Green, O33085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alton Randolph Taylor, O33092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Edward Billingsley, O44631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arlin John Kehe, O33094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Strother Branch, O40494, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Henry Merriam, O33095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Percy Leahy, O33097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Thomas Reitz, O33096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dwight Bennett Dickson, O33099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Franklin Clymer, Jr., O40495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Clair Ritze, O44634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Mucha, O44636, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Leon Daman, O40496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fletcher Smith, O44638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred F. White, O33776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion Parks Bowden, O33104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Wilson Brotherton, O52658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Gerard Downey, O33106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. William Joseph Flahaven, O40497, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Lewis Robert Adams, O39042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John MacKellar Ansley, O39041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Palmer Hill, O33108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Fletcher, O33111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Harold Schwab, O44646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Alley Thompson, Jr., O33113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Wilbur Manning, O33114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynell William Green, O52665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edwin Dressler, O44653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Emmet Kennington, O23623, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Trabue, O23625, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Love Latta, Jr., O23627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bangs Corbett, O23628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Martin, O23629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Kenneth Warren, Jr., O23630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Barwick Strahan, O23631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Greenwood Thomas, O23632, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Michael Delaney, O23633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Marion Smith, O23634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Samuel Wanner, O33116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Babington Macaulay, O32549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lewis Oliver, O33118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nicholas Edward Sloan, O33117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Robert Smith, Jr., O33119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Gilkey Gunning, O52669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold George Creyts, O44662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harris Toney Mitchell, O52670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

Capt. Wilbur Oscar Miller, Jr., O33126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Alfred Rasmussen, O40502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Napier Butchart, O44664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Randlett Irving, O33127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Aloysius Murphy, O44667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Merithew Freeman, O40503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Roger McLean, O33136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Hopkins, Jr., O40504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Harold Hughett, O44674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Patterson Dailey, O52682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Nicholas Zarpas, O40505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frank Lobdell Brown, O40506 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Herbert Austin Johnson, Jr., O33140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joseph Higgins, Jr., O33141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Henry Scanlon, O33142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edwin Englehardt, O33143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Dan Adams, O33147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Chandler Fairbanks, 3d, O33145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Boulton Bainbridge Miller, O33148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Eugene Moore, O33149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Frederick Dietrich, O39043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Russell Blair, O33150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant), U. S. Army).

First Lt. Curtis Clarence Batson, O33152, United States Army.

Capt. Herbert Ulieao Sieben, O33153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Woolfolk, 3d, O52687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Kinney Welch, O33155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Benjamin Gray Moore, O33158, United States Army.

Maj. Robert Jacques DeMers, O33159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Denmark C. Jensen, O44694, Army of the United States (first lieutepant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Norman Edward Meyer, O40511, United States Army.

Capt. Raymond James Wardrop, O44698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur William Delaney, O44697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Edward Bobo, Jr., O33184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herman Carlyle Park, O33163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donal Irvin Medley, O33165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Milton Adolph Pullman, O33166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Carl Johnstone, O44702, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karl Amos Zipf, O39044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Judson Locke, O40512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Edward Tistadt, O44706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Lundberg, Jr., O33170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Francis Smith, O33169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Smalley Greene, O40514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jefferson Melvin Fairley, O52699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Hoover Calahan, O40515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. John Heard Carter, O33174, United States Army.

Maj. Wyatte Gristie Trainer, O40516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jesse Foss Wheeler, Jr., O44719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Walston Scarburgh, O44723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frank August Sandholm, O33178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Pearson Buckley Yeager, O33176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Schafer, O39045, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Truman Frederick Cook, O44727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Keith Lincoln Ware, O33181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wesley McAlhany, O40517, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Eugene Goldoni, O33182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Ware Youngman, O33183, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Levene John Weigel, O33187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Jordan Strait, Jr., O44735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Thomas White, O52708, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Howard Walton, O44746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Van Lear Hawes, O52711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Argyle Williams, O44750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Allen Hutchinson, O33200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Everett Porteous, O33203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Kenji Hino, O44753, United States Army.

Maj. Edwin Joseph Gravel, O33206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byrd Sergent, O52717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Nicholas Schoming, O44755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edmond Reichmuth, Jr., O33209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×First Lt. John Florea Austin, O33208, United States Army.

Maj. John Edwin Bowman, O33211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Richard Duddy, O33214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Charles Robert Obermeyer, O44759, United States Army.

Capt. Andrew Harold Prudhomme, O33213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Eugene David Manary, O33216, United States Army.

Capt. Joseph Moorman Gardner, O40522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Boyd Lightfoot Brown, O33215, United States Army.

First Lt. Bobby Boyd Larsen, O52722, United States Army.

Maj. David Warren Wright, Jr., O33217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Uel Wilford French, O33218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Guy, O33219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred William Scott, O44765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Craig Anderson, O44768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivey Oscar Drewry, Jr., O33224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Arthur White, O40524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Howard Norvi Zeigler, Jr., O44773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. John Turner Merrill, O23225, United States Army.

Maj. Edwin Murel Sayre, O33220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Willard Andrew Muir, O44774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Duncan Shi, Jr., O33230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Clare Sherrets, O44781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eber Hilliard Thomas, Jr., O44780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Leroy Clancy, O52733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Flake, O40526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Neelian Omar Nelson, O33234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce McRae, O33236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lemuel Chafin Downs, O40527, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Noel Dahlstrom, O33238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Edward DeKemper, O33240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Robert Creel, Jr., O33241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Hamilton Hilliard, O33246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Clarke Archer, O44792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur William Ritchings, O52739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Murray Edward Manley, O52740, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Warren Pruden Davis, O33245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Powell Venable, O33247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Eugene Brewer, O52741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Respess Arnold, O32664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cesides Victor Barberis, O33249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Hiser, O44795, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Anthony Ingerski, O40531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Herbert Sablitz, O40532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Thomas Masao Kobayashi, O52745, United States Army.

Maj. Lanier Dunn Buford, O39046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Spartan Ferrari, O44810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Donald Crow, O52746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edison Eugene Yates, O39047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Dodge Servis, O52747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gillis Metcalfe, O52749, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Charles Costabile, O44814, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony Joseph Wilkowski, Jr., O52748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Harris Wiltamuth, O44817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gerard Cosery Adams, O44819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Chester Allen Richardson, O33259, United States Army.

Capt. John Gregory Sisak, O52751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack David Smith, O33260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Owen Davidson, O33262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David McVicker Kyle, O33263, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Frank Freeman, O44823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gilbert Charles Ruasl, O33264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Page Jones, Jr., O44826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major John Loyd Wilson, Jr., O33268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lehman Holson Johnson, Jr., O44831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlyle Fredrick McDannel, O33271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Harbert, O44833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Edward Nelson, O52756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arlo Albert Miller, O44835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Waldo Jones, O40530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Thomas Hanna, O52758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion Gibson Williams, O44841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Charles Ulrich, O44842, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hartsell Hamilton Northington, O33275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Chandler Conroy, O33276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Vail Converse, O39050, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Pryse Alcorn, O44844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Dale Nielson, O33280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Conway Lyman Ellers, O39051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Francis Bradshaw, O44846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn David Walker, O33282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Perry Ewing, O33284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Clinton Tarkenton, Jr., O33283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Stanley Joseph Paciorek, O33285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Sylvester Donnell, O33295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Charles McGuire, O33293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Washington Simon Kuhn, Jr., O44862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Carroll Kelly, O44863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel Wayne Lawson, O33298, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rufus James Cleghorn, O52767, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glenn Marvin Vinquist, O44867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Tracy, O44869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alford Clifford Shellum, O33299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Duda, O52768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Webster Prewitt, O33301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Bickley Stevens, O44872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Bernard Zohn, O52769, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Robert Julian Meeker, O33304, United States Army.

Maj. John Wakeley Patchin, O40537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

Capt. Robert William McCartney, O39052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Maltbie Alexander, O33305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sterling Evans Purnell, O44875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Raymond Cay Nelson, O52775, United States Army.

Maj. Paul Albert Troup, Jr., O33306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lewis Duckwall, O39053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Rodney Dean, O44877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benedict Andrew Karnosky, O44878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert David Harback, O44880, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Franklin Andrew Werner, O33307, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Donald O'Connor Vaught, O33308, United States Army.

Capt. Howard Gustave Schade, O33311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Julius Holmes, O33317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Davis Pryor, Jr., O33316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Postford Arthur Loiselle, O33321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McCoy Goodman, O33323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Bernie Francis Morgan, O44899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Thomas Neumann, O39054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Luther Gates, O40539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Beauchamp, O44907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Alexander Riegle, O33325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Charles Troescher, O39055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Hubert Jerome Arsenault, O44917, United States Army.

Capt. Jonathan Monroe Kight, O44919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Allan Preston Nesbitt, O52782, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Walter Ryan, O33328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph King, Jr., O33329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Collin Bushway, O33330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gail Bruce Lee, O33332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×First Lt. Joe Slaughter Webb, O52787, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Thomas Jackson Bowen, O33333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Robert Gooding, O33334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Andrew Cumbie, O40542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Harrison Costigan, O33336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Wade Hampton Arrington, O40543, United States Army.

First Lt. Philip Henry Bramble, O33341, United States Army.

Capt. Charles Lowell Sims, O33345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Marion Elmer McDaniel, O33346, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jim Hillery McCoy, O52796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Alexander Vitarius, O40544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Paul Flynn, O33350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Stuart Joseph Palos, O52797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd Albert Ramsey, O33352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Delmar Leavengood, O44936, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Waugh Keyser, O33355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Webb Foster, O52802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Joseph Corley, O33360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Edward William Quinlan, Jr., O33359, United States Army.

×First Lt. Merle Edison Hamner, O52805, United States Army.

Capt. Edward Benjamin Krainik, O33367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Carl Girtman, Jr., O44951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Patrick William Harrington, O33372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wesley Duke, O33373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Kyle Terry, O33375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dominick Charles Dennis, O44953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Roger Longacre, Jr., O33378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. J. Elmore Swenson, O33380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Henry Heldreth, O33382, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Frank Garbacz, O40548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kemuel Kenyon Blacker, O44956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vern Eskil Johnson, O44959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wallace Murdock Hanes, O33384, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Felix Claborne Sharp, Jr., O39057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howell Barrett Thompson, O33385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Elwin Coulter, O33386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Holton Eugene Blomgren, O44964, United States Army.

Maj. James William Johnson, O33387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Raymond Cole, O33392, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Flint, O44970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Alvin Gottlieb, O44972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Gage Cogswell, O33393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wesley Oliver Moberg, O44973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claire Stillwell Curtis, O33394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Phillip John Linn, O33395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Bernard Bennett, O44977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arlo Reed Gill, O44983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl C. Edmondson, O44982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harvey Robinson, O44984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Joseph Corbin, O33399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Angelo Enrico Pilla, O44989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hamilton Smoot Rebentisch, O44991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William McKinney Mantz, O33403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Henry Blohm, O44994, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ottis Audrey Davis, Sr., O40553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Milton Denny, O33406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Nathan Martasin, O44997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Charles Felton, O39058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Franklin Coffey, Jr., O44998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Ferris Lieblich, O33409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Walter Raleigh Evans Coleman, O52823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dale Howard Shick, O33412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Ford, Jr., O33411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Sidney Dodds Hilton, O33413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Hamilton Schuler, O33414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren George Duemmel, O45004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gerald Bethune Little, O40554, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin Hancock, O45013, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Sayle Smith, O33424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice Albert Rogers, O40555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Wilbur Collins, O33425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Frank Massoglia, O52831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan William Johnson, O33426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray Ralph Liedike, O39060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Robert Harlan Palmatary, O45026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Capt. Anthony Joseph Vinci, O45029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gibson Cooper, O33430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Burner, O33434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Burton Seeley, O33436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edgar Sleadd Waugh, O33439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Richard Edward Eggleton, Jr., O52844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Trevett Williams, O52845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Cecil Floyd Hunnicutt, O33442, United States Army.

Capt. Claude Hathaway Stewart, O33441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peyton Royston Lucas, O33445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Robert Murphy, O52847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Joseph Hejna, O45033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Grant Freeman, O33450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frank Butler Greer, O33447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ferris Adam Kercher, O33456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Albert Reynolds, O52252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Eugene Davidoff, O33460, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Joseph Cooke, O45043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Alvin Curtis, O33462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Hubert Tirey, O33464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Max Richard Machnicke, O33465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Atwood Herod, O52859, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Morris Allen Lent, O33469, United States Army.

Capt. Jack Rawson Melton, O33470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Zais, O33471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Johnnie Derrick Duffie, O33474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Newell Jenkins, O40561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. James Daniel Anders, O33475, United States Army

Capt. Paul Bernard Schaefer, O40562, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Richard Aguglia, O33477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elon Lee Hiller, O45059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Douglas Davis Peairs, O33479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Savilla, O40563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Martin Kamp, Jr., O33482, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Farnsworth Goodsell, O33483, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Max Verlyn Kirkbride, O33485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Nelson Simmons, Jr., O30063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Ralph Edward Konkol, O52868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mills Brown, O33487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert William Jones, O33488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Heinz Peter Rand, O33490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Whitson Kane, O33492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duane Wright Ackerson, O45068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Otis Doane, O33493, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry George Mathos, O45077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Monsey Thomas Gresham, Jr., O45078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Boyd Shemwell, O44995, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Henry Landers, Jr., O30064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Chilton Holbrook, O33501, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Killian, O33502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Theodore Frederick Schweitzer, O52875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Smith Riddick, Jr., O40570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Hain Mengel, 2d, O33504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Jacob Howard, O33508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Homer Humphrey Hammond, O33507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clair Gillespie Henline, O45087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×First Lt. Merton Smith Coe, O52876, United States Army.

Capt. Arnold William Alexander, O45039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Oscar Franson, Jr., O30065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rocco Francis Meconi, O33516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Edwards Mecredy, Jr., O45091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Norman Lunsford, Jr., O33518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Clark Standish, O39066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Luther Denlinger, O33519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Z. Helber, O45094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Jefferson Hatch, O45096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Hugh Agnew, O45102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Conrad Rudolph Underdahl, O33523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilbert Denning Meeks, O45109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alex Noble Nelson, O33528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Llewellyn Sobke, O33529, United States Army.

Capt. Edward Brian Detchemendy, O45117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Harold George Lee, O52885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Raymond Ebbs, O45116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Walrath Burns, O52887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Judson Force Moody, O23685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Parker Yates, O23686, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Clifford Hodges Lee, Jr., O23688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Lloyd Powell, Jr., O23689, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Roy Oswalt, Jr., O23690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Jensen, O23692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Ira Schnittke, O23693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Paul Carlson, O23694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Charles Gribble, Jr., O23695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Wheaton Chapman, Jr., O23696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sears Yates Coker, O23697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Warren Clark, O23698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Austin Gerig, Jr., O23701, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Skiles Kelley, O23703, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Wyman Ramee, O23704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jess Paul Unger, O23706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Schilling, O23707, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Schremp, O23709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Field Michel, O23710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Delaney, O23711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy Harold Goddard, O23714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Mack Tarbox, O23715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Kenneth Wade Kennedy, O23716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lynn Cyrus Lee, O23717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Strain, O23719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Graham Waitt, O23720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Campbell Clendening, O23721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Henry Carroll, O23722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Van Horn Ellis, Jr., O23724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Charles Besancon, O23725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Meriwether Ramey, O23726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Miles Linton, O23728, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Sealey Kramer, O23729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harrington Willson Cochran, Jr., O23731, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick John Baker, O23732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Ingram Gurfein, O23734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Stanley Grygiel, O23737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Philip Seneff, Jr., O23738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Webb VanHoy, Jr., O23739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mills Carson Hatfield, O23741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Leon Rowny, O23744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Herbert Richardson, Jr., O23748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Edward Mather, O23749, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Walter Samz, O23750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Leo Smith, O23751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Dorsey Maynard, O23754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Holmes Camp, O23758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burnside Elijah Huffman, Jr., O23759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Denis Blundell Grace, O23760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James William Roy, O23762, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Burtchaell, O23764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Edward Kuzell, O23766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James William Stigers, O23767, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Thomas Murray, O23768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Allan George Woodrow Johnson, O23769, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard John Rastetter, O23770 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Thaddeus Kosiorek, O23772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Lawrence Slocum, O23773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Roy J. Clinton, O23774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Bradley Lodford, Jr., O23775, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Millikin, Jr., O23781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Vaughan Elsberry, O23783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Andrew McCulloch, Jr., O23786, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Pressly Scott, O23787, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Hyman Bodzin, O23788, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Gabriel Gauvreau, O23789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Harleston deSaussure, Jr., O23790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Leroy McMillan, O23791, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Alfred Lee, O23792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Jeunet Whitaker, O23793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Malcolm Corwin Johnson, O23794, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter James Woolwine, Jr., O23795, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Robert Salisbury, O23797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frank Pleasants Stainback, Jr., O23801, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Gabriel Redmon, O23802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Geldermann, O23803, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Bissland Moore, O23804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. George Roopen Adjemian, O23806, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Mortimer Buell Birdseye, Jr., O23807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max Campbell Tyler, O23809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wallace Michael Lauterbach, O23810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gregg LaRoix McKee, O23811, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Clinton Stanford, O23812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Stanley Reilly, O23813, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Stevens Neumeister, O23815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gerard Healy, O23816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul George Skowronek, O23822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Russell Reed, O23824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duward Lowery Crow, O23825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Panke, O23831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Duncan Brown, Jr., O23832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jonathan Edwards Adams, Jr., O23833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Arthur Cannon, Jr., O23835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Franklin Foster, Jr., O23837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Fletcher, O23839, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William McIntyre, O23841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Frank Star, O23843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lawrence Theisen, O23846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Benjamin Manley, Jr., O23847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Knighton Harris, O23848, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Oscar Green 3d, O23850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Longstreet Lawson, O23852, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Eugene Clifford, O23853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Waggener Couch, O23855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Moore Christensen, Jr., O23856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

Maj. Walter Francis Molesky, O23857, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Norton, O23858, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Cooper, O23860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Potter Campbell, Jr., O23861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Malcolm Graham Troup, O23862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Charles Tonetti, O23864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Joseph Canella, O23865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tom Depher Collison, O23868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Lippincott Knowlton, O23869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lyman Saunders Faulkner, O23870, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lloyd Meyer, O23871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Vivans Greene, O23872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Bertron Magruder, O23874, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matthew Clarence Harrison, O23875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul von Santen Liles, O23876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Miroslav Frank Moucha, O23877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morton McDonald Jones, Jr., O23879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Patrick Ahern, O23881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jacob Heffner Towers, O23883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Henry King, O23884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Charles Henzl, O23885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Horace Maynard Brown, Jr., O23886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Joseph Lenihan Greene, O23887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Windsor Temple Anderson, O23891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Putnam Detwiler, O23892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Fuller McKinley, Jr., O23893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Morris Hoge, Jr., O23894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Frank Aliotta, O23895, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Lanigan, O23896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Leighton Atteberry, Jr., O23899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Hunter Woodward, O23900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harley Truman Marsh, Jr., O23901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Winston Curley, O23904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William Cooper, O23905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Auburon Paul Hauser, O23908, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Evarts Clark, O23911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin McCaffery, Jr., O23912, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Boswell, Jr., O23913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Guthrie Miller, O23914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Patrick Henry Tansey, Jr., O23915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward McElroy, O23917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harold Alexander Tidmarsh, O23918, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Coakley, O23919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Huff Edger, O23921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Channing Borman, O23922, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Paul Johnson, O23926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Cornelius Fitzpatrick, O23927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matthew Gordon Harper, Jr., O23928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Leonard Robinson, O23929, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Jacob Hoebeke, O23930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Abbott Hume, O23931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Bibb Pickett, Jr., O23932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Berry Kercheval, O23933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merritt Lambert Hewitt, O23934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Gray, Jr., O23935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gibson Niles, O23936, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Moody Elmo Layfield, Jr., O23939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reynolds Robert Keleher, O23941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Raine Laney, Jr., O23942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Maj. Dick Stanley Von Schrilitz, O23944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Ray Thomas, O23947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Manly Busbee, Jr., O23950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wendell Pollitt Knowles, O23953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Felix John Gerace, O23954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Peter Kirkbride Dilts, O23955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Thomas Gleason, O23956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Irving Stern, O23957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Howard Ellis, O23958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Benton Howze, O23960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Faye Roton, O23961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Coles Barney, Jr., O23963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Boynton Buttery, O23966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Leon Arthur Briggs, O23967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linton Sinclair Boatwright, O23968, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Tuck Brown, O23969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Willoughby Garrett, O23971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Augustus Purdy, O23973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harold Gurnee, Jr., O23974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Victor Woodrow Campana, O23975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Carl McIntyre, O23976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Dooley Vaughan, O23978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Crawford Root, Jr., O23979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Mar Levy, Jr., O23980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Wilson Sharkey, O23981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Charles Kisiel, O23984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Walter Raleigh Mullane, O23987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Ward Maxwell, O23988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edgar Pigue, O23990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maynard George Moyer, O23991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richardson, O23993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Courtenay O'Connell, O23994, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nelson Paul Monson, O23996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Freemont Danforth, O23997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas James Cleary, Jr., O23998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peer de Silva, O24000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Niles Rising, Jr., O24002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Daniel Fowler, O24003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Llewellyn Flanders, Jr., O24006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Frank Muzyk, O24010, Army of the United States (first lieutanant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ellis Rossell, Jr., O24011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Daniel Salinas, O24012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Lyons Driscoll, O24018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Richard Kemp, O24019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Franklin Poff, O24020, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Alvord Spiller, O24023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Mercer Presley Longino, O24024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph McGrane, Jr., O24027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harwell Leon Adams, O24028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leroy Pierce Collins, Jr., O24031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Angelo Augustine Laudani, O24033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Toombs Dixon, O24035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Albert Samuel Dalby, O24036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Truman Eugene Deyo, O24037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Paul Forsyth, O24038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Breed Deane, O24040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Lawrence Felchlin, O24041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanton Claude Hutson, O24042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Martin Andrew Shadday, O24043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Vincent Brown, O24044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Wilmer Bailey, O24045, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Rayford Sykes, O24046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Henry Zott, Jr., O24048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bradish Johnson Smith, O24049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Kellogg Plume, Jr., O24054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Hardy Barrow, O24055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Reed Upton, O24063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wetherby Graham, O24064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Bernarr Celmer, O24066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Schuyler Tanous, O24067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bernard Keagy, O24072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Joseph Myers, Jr., O24073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clinton Earl Male, O24078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Doyle Pratt, O24079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl K. Buchanan, O24080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wilson Callaway, O24081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lawrence Kaiser, O24085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Hollenback Welles, O24086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thomas McDaniel, O24088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Holroyd Linnell, O24089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Capt. Roy George Hendrickson, O24093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Benedict Zarembo, O24094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Vincent D'Esposito, O24095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clare Hibbs Armstrong, Jr., O24098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard James O'Neill, O33536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Knox White, O24102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Gerard McBride, O33539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sydney Fletcher Frazier, O33540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Alfred Coulter, O33541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Miller, O33542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred F. Lash, O40574, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Wilson Williams, O45122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Eugene McArthur, O52892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Raymond Donald Pearsall, O33548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Berry Galbreaith, O33549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Charles Wood Audet, O52899, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Walter Garrison Hopkins, Jr., O33551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Matthew Rankin Collins, Jr., O33550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Luther Griffin Jones, Jr., O40575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Carlton Brown, O32556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roger Willard Spigelmoyer, O52903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ambrose Claibourn Arthur, O52904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Noel Ritter, O33558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Victor Thieme, O33561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Wallace Peyton, Jr., O45136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic Francis Ahlgren, O33566, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Copeland O'Byrne, O52910, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lewis Gillette Wetherell, O45147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harry Kendall Bagshaw, O24088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Alexander Lell, O33577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Archie Stanley Walker, O52915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Glenn Smith Finley, Jr., O24117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Wendell Constance, O24118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Erwin Drewes, O24122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Collins Bagg, O24132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Willard Guest, O24133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Broudy, O24134, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Lowery Amell, Jr., O24136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allan Gardner Pixton, O24137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Ruane McGuire, O24138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles McDonald Parkin, Jr., O24150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Keith Philip Fabianich, O24151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alexis Michael Gagarine, O24153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harland Glen Wood, O24154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Carl Sparrow, O24155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur McMurrough Murphy, O24156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Heck, O24157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albin Felix Irzyk, O24158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard James Darnell, O24159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lewis Warner Fogg 3d, O24160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Lowell Chambers Scott, O24161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Leon Urban, O24163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Eldon Phelps, O24165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Morris Cowan Stout, O24166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glen Carl Long, O24170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Ethelbert Cowan, O24171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Allan Pierce, Jr., O24172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jeff William Boucher, O24173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Elbert Gowell, O24174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Miller Hustead 2d, O24175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Zebulon LaFayette Strickland, Jr., O24176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilburt James Irwin, O24179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Arnold Martin, O24180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas John Sharpe, O24181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Vandiver Langston, O24182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reuben Eugene Wheelis, O24184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Herbert Savage, O24186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rawlins Murrell Colquitt, Jr., O24189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Tennesson, Jr., O24190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd LeRoy Hanes, O24191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jules Maurice DuParc, O24192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Bernard Pohlman, Jr., O24193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Francis Kosmacki, O24194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Alexander Clayton, O24196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Boyd Bullock, O24198, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John William Paxton, O24199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Earl Walters, O24200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Kermit Brunsvold, O24201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Sutherland, Jr., O24202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Arthur Benner, O24203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin LaHatte, O24206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Kelly Thomson, O24207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Donald Ward, O24208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Ira Taylor, O24209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Vaughn Beck, O24210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Henry Bigger, O24212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Victor Sanden, O24213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Lester Ballard, Jr., O24215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Henry Janz, O24217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Selden Holcombe, O24218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burt Lunney Mitchell, Jr., O24219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Frederick Cathrae, O24220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Van Middleworth, O24226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Penquite Mulcahy, O24227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Hugo Almquist, Jr., O24228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Logan Schutz, O24229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen Beall Knight, O24231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Price Tucker, O24232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Freeman, O24234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Neville Sloan, Jr., O24235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Peach Rollins, Jr., O24237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gordon B. Cauble, O24239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Wendell Gunn, O24241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Elwood Kennedy, O24242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William E. Feeman, O24243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Haley, C24244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Robert Charles Barthle, O24246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Theodore McQuaide, O24247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burton Bryant Chandler, O24250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward Bernard Jennings, O24251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otho Eugene Holmes, O24252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Loring Douglass, O24254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Bond Jones, O24255, Army of the of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maxwell Bryant Thurmond, O24256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byron Mark Kirkpatrick, O24257, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albro Lellis Parsons, Jr., O24259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Samusson, Jr., O24260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj William Barker Wootton, Jr., O24261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robertson Desobry, O24262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hubert Walter Gillespie, Jr., O24264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Louis DuBois, O24265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Albert Becker, O24267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Frederick Ostner, O24271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Toma David Harris, Jr., O24273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Blaine Wells, O24275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lindsay Disharoon, Jr., O24277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Michener Wilson, O24280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Taylor Newman, O24281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Eugene Watson, Jr., O24283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Dean Dunlop, O24284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Gorrell Kearfott Miller, Jr., O24285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Douglas Mitchell, O24286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Warren Adcock, O24287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Madison Atkins, O52916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Paul Berger, O33579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Dean Hoile, O33580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Cowles West, Jr., O45153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Rhodes Hall, O40578, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Franklin Wright, Jr., O40580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Francis Vogel, O33585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Wesley Strunk, O40581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Michael Holland, O45157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Everett Wandel, O45160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Vivian Harris, O33595, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph William Bergman, O45174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Douglas Gardiner, O45175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lee Erickson, O33597, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Brice Smith, O45178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norval Milner Locke, O33601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rolf Erling Mickelson, O45184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Gordon John Hartzler, O33603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Bennett Mechling, O24333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willard Roper, O33605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Allen Webb, Jr., O40585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin George Schuck, O33606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Oscar Manasco, O33608, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Horton, O33609, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Frederick Olliver, O40586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Tate Poffenberger, O45197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Pauly Field, O45196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Bright Jaccard, O45195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jurgen George Pohly, O52934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Arthur Minton, O45199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Morgan Alexander Brakonecke, O33616, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brice James Martin, O33620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Donnell Van de Voort, O39071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Robert Patrick, O45212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Jacob Halper, O39072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Champlain Shaw, O33626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Thomas Krampitz, O33630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eldon Woerner Schmid, O33627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Layton Carlos Tyner, O33640, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Lewis Wells, O33641, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Blount, O45217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Dominick Klunder, O52947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Robertson Ward, O33646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marion Karl Bandley, O45222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winant Sidle, O33651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Robert Redden, O33657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Julius Lind, O45230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Darrell Barton, O33663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Jack Wayne Duke, O33662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Harris Gardner, O33665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Joseph Lacey, Jr., O33668, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Francis Austin, O45239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Neil Geiger Stewart, O33670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. French Greig Lewis, O33676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Albert Scott Madding, O33680, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Gaspard Wall, O33023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Maxwell Conover, O33685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Henderson Andrews, O33688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Marlyn Edward Mohr, O45256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Presbury Patterson, O33687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Worthy Millard Cunningham, O45258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thompson McCrea Colkitt, O33690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederick Walter Coykendall, O33694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Leon Todd, O33696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Dare Gray, O40596, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alden Peverley Shipley, O33699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ancher Emil Christensen, Jr., O45271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Cleveland Hicks, Jr., O40598, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Julius Albert Sakas, O33709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Eugene Walters, O33710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Truman Holt Setliffe, O24350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Dowling Hiers, O33715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Shannon Tabb, O33721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Elmer Booth Lagerman, O52980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Reese Bierer, O33722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Wise Riley, Jr., O33658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Mayse Nash, O33727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic Emile Hansard, O45303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Troy Edwin Whiting, O33729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. J. T. Smyrl, O33732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Dunwody Blackburn, O33734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Menon Walker Whitsitt, O31384, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Edwin Taylor, O45316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Carlton Weyand, O33736, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Farr, O33737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Jerome Anderson, O33741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Robert Lewitz, O45325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Thomas Prendergast, O45327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Donald Prendergast O40590, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Theodore Schrader, O33747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Leo Rush, O39076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John James Carroll, O52996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Kent Harris, O40600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Hubert Cox, O33751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Arthur Warren, O45337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Eli Bozeman, O45339, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Shirley Norman Black, O39078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Muir, Jr., O33754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Thomas Joseph, O33756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Merton Wendle, O33764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Hallowell Holcombe, O45349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Worth Marlow Curtiss, O53005, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Paul Balkman, O33766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Temple Quick, O53006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Alexander Bailey, Jr., O40602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Petersen, O33771, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nelson Whitney Tobey, O33778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Wesley Dalton Harris, O45371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. LeRoy Charles Brown, O33782, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Penson, O33787, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John George Montgomery, O33788, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Forbes Antrim, O33793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Donald Richardson, O45380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Pearce Yeuens, O40505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elliott Taylor Katherman, O53023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Denton Carl Rountree, O33797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Donald Iseman, O33798, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Dyson, O33799, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Lerch Ditamore, O33800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Kazmir Wojcik, O33802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. LeRoy David Brummitt, O44087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Joseph Gavin, O33807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Thomas Caprino, O32808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Edward Muggelberg, O33812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Grover Marks, Jr., O45395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Hollister Scott-Smith, Jr., O33817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Allen Wilson, O33818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Caldwell Knox, O45402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Merwin Hinman, O33822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Manford Ray Murphy, O45403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Franklin Roberts, O33825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chris McCullough, O40611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Joseph Parziale, O33829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Edward Dougherty, O53037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl William Kappel, O33833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Alexander Kane, Jr., O34140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ragsdale Howton, O40613, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joshua LeRoy Holley, Jr., O40612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Norval Isom Sommers, Jr., O40614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellis LeRoy, O33835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Parkhurst Cloud Hough, O33836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Edward Davis, Jr., O33841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Alois Neibert, O45411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Henry Stein, O33837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Balis Dexter, O33838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent White Rasper, O40615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Otto Fischer, O45412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Brakebill, Jr., O33840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William George Skinner, Jr., O53044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Louis Garay, O45416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow Wilson Morse, O53048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bob Eugene Edwards, O33844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Wellington Campbell, O33151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Herbert Karstedt, O33849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arnold Mandigo Bloss, O45424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Arthur Mackenzie, O40616, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Kirk Hamilton, O45425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Madison Tolliver, O33856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thomas Webster, O33858, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charles Copenhaver Webb, O40620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Matthias Frassrand, O40621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Byrne, O45436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Arsene Peter Bonifas, O45437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Francis Philp, O53061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Herbert Lundy Garris, O33872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roderick Joseph MacEachen, O53064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wythe Parks Brookes, O45447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Cohee Blossom, Jr., O45451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Alexander Todd, O33878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clark Richard McCauley, O40623, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gregg Newhall Jennings, O45454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Wayne Davis, O33886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Davis, O33886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hoyt Edward White, O33889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Maxey Silvey, O33887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Theodore Kramers, O33890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Bogner, O33892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Kennedy Smith, Jr., O45463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald George McNamara, O39065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Martin Lawson, O45475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dan Ralph Davis, O40629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Franklin Moffitt, Jr., O40530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilbur John Lage, O33911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lamar Asbury Welch, O24391, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ernest Conine, O24393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Jones Williams, O24394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edmund Hand, O24395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Verle Douglas Miller, O24396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Henry Stone, O24397, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Meyer Lipton, O24398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col Lucien Fairfax Keller, O24399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James DeLuca, O24400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Carlton Reddington, O24401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Julian Maline, O24402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Farwell Mitchell, O24405, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Norman Cameron, O24408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gene Richard Welch, O24409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Charles Liggett, O24410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Dorsey Hulsey, O24411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Clifford Healy, O24412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hunter Marion Brumfield, O24413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irvin Marshall Rice, O24414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Mace Gonseth, O24417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Marcel Cummins, O24418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude Esmond Bailey, Jr., O24420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Parsons Clark, Jr., O24423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Waldorf Barnes, O24425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Xavier Leary, O24427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Almon Louis Hugins, Jr., O24428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tom Billie Strother, O24429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Numsen Lucke, O24430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Calvin Aldrich Heath, O24431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Clark Storey, O24433, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Webster Hodges, O24437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Corson Landrum Hilton, Jr., O24438, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Vincent Maixner, O24439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Oliver Gordon, O24440, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emery Ellis Bellonby, O24441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Phillip Haines Baker, O24442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robert Tuck, O24444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Abbott Lucey, O24446, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Carl Maldonado, O24447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Byron Mowbray, O24450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Leslie Bereuter, O24451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Carl William Plitt, O24452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Arthur Martin, O24453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter John Rankin, O24455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Leo Dooley, O24456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Elliott Arthur, Jr., O24457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Thomas Mehalko, O24458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wiley Freeman Shaver, Jr., O24459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Craig Boyce, Jr., O24460, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Frank Sills, O24463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Glen Ferguson, O24464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Niels Marius Dahl, O24466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Francis Munster, O24467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wayne Harold Lee, O24469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joshua Logan, O24470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fredrick Kenneth Hughes, O24471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Leonard James Goodsell, O24472, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Owen Becker, O24473, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Walter Erickson, O24474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Michael Williamson, O24476, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Albert Gile, O24477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Szabo, O24480, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harrison Zimmerman, O24481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Francis Dunn, O24482, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Olcott Foster, Jr., O24483, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Nicholas Wellems, O24484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert McDonald Shannon, Jr., O24486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Easton Nelson, O24487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vitaly Kovalevsky, O24488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Buford Patton, O24489, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Beal Kelly, O24490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Milton Davis, Jr., O24491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Eugene Burrell, O24492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Sweeney, Jr., O24494, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Leroy Miller, Jr., O24495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Arthur Ford, O24497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Maurice Johnson, O24498, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Alva Ogle, O24500, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clinton Fort Matthews, O24503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Fairfield Carr, O24504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Howard Schofield, O24505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Thomas Larson, O24506, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Peden Croninger, O24507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry John Muller, Jr., O24508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George I. Forsythe, O24510, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Forbes, O24511, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Francis Driscoll, O24512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Leonard Peavy, O24514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Charles McInnis, Jr., O24516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maynard Clayton Raney, O24517, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Arthur Hebbeler, O24518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Elmer Simmons, O24521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Jennings, Jr., O24522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Louis Ruwet, O24524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Myron Thorne Johnston, O24525, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Louie Coleman, O24527, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Millman Morrill, O24528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Frederick Lawson, O24529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Hugh Porter Stubbs, Jr., O24530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Schmierer, O24531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Ovid Hamilton, O24532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Maurice Clavelle Holden, O24534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Thielens Peeples, O24537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul V. Hannah, O24539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Friedman, O24540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Melvin Charlton, Jr., O24543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Morrison Allen, Jr., O24550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Woodrow Cozad, O24552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Herbert De Chow, O24553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McAdams, O24555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William Carter, O24556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Furman Spencer, O24559, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Walter Sedr, O24561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Palmer Boyer, Jr., O24563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dayton Willis Eddy, O24565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gilliland Renfro, O24567, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Viron Edward Bird, O24568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Martin Kane, O24569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kearns Muller, O24570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Grover Holland, Jr., O24573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jose Antonio Andino, O24575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Koepcke, Jr., O24581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jack Helm Remele, O24585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Elwood Kimball, O24586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward McBride, O24587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arden Wirth Dow, O24591, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Martin Volheim, O24593, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Walter Harvey, Jr., O24598, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Hammer, O24599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Lee Cary, O24600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clare Norton Lyke, O24601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allen William Rodeheffer, O24602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas James Camp, Jr., O24603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Raymond Graham, O24605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Campbell Williams, O24609, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Raymond Cross, O24610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Rorbach Fisk, O24614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ben Lamar Anderson, O24616, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Orwin Clark Talbott, O24617, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Woodburn Matheny, Jr., O24619, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Mayer Hamilton, O24621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elbridge Lee Snapp, O24622, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Charles Miller, O24623, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Killilae, O25017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richard Burkhart, O25018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Joseph Richardson, O25019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Curtis Jeffries, Jr., O25020, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale Taylor Elliott, O25022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Preese Kernan, O25023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Herbert Brown, O25024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Clement Moran, O25027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Elmer Pershing Curtis, O25028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrel Leon Syron, O25034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Johnson, Jr., O25035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Max Snyder, O25036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Brittain Kreutzer, O25037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Joseph Stillman, O25038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Hull Verheul, O25039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irving Heymont, O25040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orville Kenneth Knight, O25043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Harold Vernon Mackey, O25046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Rhodes Thompson, O25047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Arthur Bird, O25048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerry Marion Wimberley, O25049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Blakely Todd, O25051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harry Mobley, O25053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Dulaney Schutz, O25054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Parker Osborne Stuart, O25055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Pershing Traylor, O25060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joseph Daly, O25061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Overton Golladay, O25062, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reuben Wallis Mundy, O25063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Will Gillespie Atwood, Jr., O25067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Weamer Elder, O25068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Harry Bowen, O25069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Marshall Woods, O25071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Leroy Ramsey, O25072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Wilbur Best, Jr., O25074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Apthorp Gould Fuller, 2d, O25075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Edgar Noesaman, O25079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Roger Jerald Culhane, O25083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leroy Cosby Land, O25084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bradford Lee Smith, O25086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl William Schaad, O25087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Karl Heinrich Zornig, O25089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Fred Poppenburg, O25090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jesse Charles Crumbley, Jr., O25091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Ralph Bayard Sessoms, Jr., O25092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert James Welsh, O25096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil William Delu, O25097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Durrenberger, O25099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Latimer Whittle MacMillan, Jr., O25100, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Hall Woods, O25101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Francis Tyrrell, Jr., O25102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Neil Grove, O25104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Ellis Cox, O25105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leroy Buckman Wilson, O25106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. George Franklin Charlton, O25107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Reid, O25108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William McKinley Shepard, O25110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Murchison Grusky Locksley, O25111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Alfred Higgins, O25112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Edgar Rayle, Jr., O25113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Charles Hughes, O25114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Stephen Rice, O25119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Stuart Cumings, O25120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bernard Via, O25121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Flynn, Jr., O25122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Reginald Eklund, O25123, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gaynor William Hathaway, O25124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Wilson Starkey, O25126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Moyer Delos Harris, O25129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Philip Leber, O25130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Philip Geise, O25131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Lindsay Koob, Jr., O25132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Earl Simons, O25136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Thomas Harvie, O25138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Raymond Laverne Hoff, O25140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edwin Pinard, O25172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Elmer Gould, O25174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Leo Kolb, O25184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cleveland Charles MacLane, Jr., O25185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Henry Dale Weston, O25186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Frederick Crecelius, O25187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donal Royce Pepke, O25188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Yates McCachern, O25190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edwin Allison Nichols, O25192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Benedict Cullison, O25193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Paul Burns, O25194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Casper Wittmann, O25195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Athel Bangert, O25202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Hume Lucas, Jr., O25204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lewis William Leeney, O25206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edward Doherty, O25212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Ames Moon 2d, O25214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walton Orville Threadgill, O25215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Joseph Ptak, O25216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Clendenen Davis, O25218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Condy, O25220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Carr, O25222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Leonard Anderson, O25223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edmondston Coffin, O25234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gerald Michael Dailey, O25249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Allen Carroll, O25230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Cline Irby, O25231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Edgar Thompson, O25232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Simeon Moore, O25233, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Boyd Lee Branson, O25234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William McCaffrey, O25256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Charles Craig, O25262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Armand Goers, O25265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Bansley Falks, O25266, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Samuel Beatty, Jr., O25268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Lorenzo West, Jr., O25269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clinton Taber, O25270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Brent Vivian, O25272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ray Spurrier, O25273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Paul Arthur Nilsson, O25274, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Wyman Healy, O25275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Albert Whitehorne 3d, O25277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Potvin Barry, O25283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Berry, O25284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Hancock Hay, Jr., O25290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Scott Pollard, Jr., O25291, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andy Walter Pribnow, O25292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Hilton Cantrell, O25295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willard Webster Morris, O25297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Jay Holliman, O25298, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Lawrence Sullivan, Jr., O25299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Wright MacFeeters, O25300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. ..dellon Franck Hanson, O25301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert H. Schulz, O25303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Wightman Sanders, Jr., O25305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Barton Lamond, O25309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Thornton George, Jr., O25319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Pierce Gillespie, O25320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William FitzGerald Brand, Jr., O25323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Paul Hamill, O25324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerome Bailey York, O25327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Dalrymple, O25329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Bayless Mitman, Jr., O25330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Douglas Yelverton Ostrom, Jr., O25331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Fannon Sullivan, O25332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Michael Smolensky, O25333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duane Seaman Cason, O25334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Floyd Lester Johnson, O25336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Emerson Vandervort, Jr., O25337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Bernard Ellis, O25338, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Haakon Lindjord, O25340, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edmund Dwan 2d, O25354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Joseph Gibbons, Jr., O25355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Norton Hathaway, O25366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Alexander Simpson, O25368, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Jack St. Clair, O25369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Nathaniel Acuff, Jr., O40637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy O'Neil De Young, Jr., O33925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Jean Palizza, O33924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jacob Lewis Riley, Jr., O53161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Sidney Benson, O33954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carleton Preer, Jr., O45567, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Marcus Sanders, O33923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Willis Grady, O33940, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cornelius Wesley Coghill, Jr., O33928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merrill Grover Hatch, O33918, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Roscoe Smith, Jr., O33922, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Frederick Kreager, O33919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Blakefield, O33927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Paul Alfred Feyereisen, O39089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Lavin, O45613, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald White Glenn, O33931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Howard Neill, O33930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Connor, Jr., O33933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lewis Culp, O45508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Joseph Miller, O45642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Aloysius Boulger, O33935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Beverly Norton Skardon, O33939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Ainsworth Clark, Jr., O33937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Garrett Leroy Hill, O33941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Herbert Birdsong, Jr., O33945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Elihue Ball, O33944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ritchie Herbert Clarke, O35173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dwight David Bonham, O33949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Terrill Barco, Jr., O33938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Dale Leon Vincent, O33948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Lamar Sallee, O33951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilfred Francis Farrell, O33950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leonard Carlton Turner, O33952, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Alfred Edwin Coffey, O53220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Francis Stephen Kelly, O45513, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Wayne Townsley, O33953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Elwood Glassen, O33932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Francis Hughes, Jr., O33956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilson Sifford, O33920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Kent Shaffer, O40639, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Snedecor Maxwell, O53163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Edward Rice, O45730, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Connor, O33960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Coxe Covington, Jr., O53151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Allison Morgan, Jr., O45520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred DeMasse Clarke, Jr., O45673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Thorwald Netterblad, Jr., O33971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William B. Askren, O45507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U. S Army).

Maj. Elmer Pearce Fleming, Jr., O33975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jackson Evert Shirley, O33977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jess Edward Newland, O45793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Leland Hankins, O35190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Evans Hoffmeister, O33942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Victor Manson Wallace, O53124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ross Franklin Powell, O33980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Joe Seitz, O33979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Van Scoten Lanterman, O33983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralph Dozier Crosby, O33981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Burg Dyer, O53095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick James Bailey, Jr., O33982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James William Cocke, O35168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Milton Joel Mastalir, O33992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John George Georgelas, O33978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Glenn Pierce Elliott, O40656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Louis Brown O33987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Jones Pierce, O33990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Faust, O40641, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Cropper Williams, O33974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Spencer Penrose Edwards, Jr., O33990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Joseph Gendron, O45776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kary Cadmus Emerson, O33991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Stanley Lancey, O33997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Otto Reed, O53102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Rudolph Corey, O34006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Clark Taynton, O34007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Judson Bestor, O33972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Herbert William Bennett, O45675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Warren Love, O34026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emitt Cleveland Witt, Jr., O34027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sterling Kenwood Eisminger, O40651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Leo Schreiber, O34043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Brown Sewell, O45491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Snow Griffin, O53096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lawrence Woodard, O34031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Henry Hislop, O34034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Gerald Sullivan, O39097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Olinto Mark Barsanti, O34037 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Kenneth Chenault, O45678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ashley Anthony Blinn, O35322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George James Heil, Jr., O39109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Marvin Smith, O34041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Triplett, Jr., O34030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Joseph Nawn, O53200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Patrick Downing, O33917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Riley Chapman, O40711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Hamman Smith, Jr., O34044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Willard Elder, Jr., O34033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin William Flora, O34083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Christopher Mataxis, O34035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Rhinehart Washington, O34042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Pitts, Jr., O34036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Grant Ellsworth Jones, O40649, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Willis Davis, O34046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William John Yamber, O40656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Preston Baldwin Cannady, O34101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ovid Morgan, O34049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Owen Jones, O34059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Joseph Kron, O45822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Joseph Lang, O40705, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harold Harper, O40735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edgar Charles Wood, O34051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Sam Efnor, Jr., O34054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lafayette Mabry, Jr., O34047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Pershing Muir, O39105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Beverly Boyle, Jr., O34090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Charles Guerin, O34052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Hamlet Cooper, O45975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Francis Unger, O34056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rex Russel Sage, O34061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Lee Farrar, O34053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Archey Dean, O46007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Asa Parker Gray, Jr., O34096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Joseph Raffaeli, O53170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Victor Bottomly, Jr., O34071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Charles Ohl, O34078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Elwood Murphy, O34080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Anderson Smith, Jr., O34081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward Lowndes Davis, Jr., O34079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Gale Peabody, O39098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hayward Hubbard, O34111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale Douglas Hogoboom, Jr., O34085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Danield Thornton Chapman, O34086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Levant Strong, O34088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edwin Webb, O34092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellis Earl Pickering, O53113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Allen Loop, O45735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Emmett McGraw, O39107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Marine Carpenter, O34098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Cole Jeffries, O34093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Johnny Mac Rice, O34094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Joseph Munch, O45546, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harley Lester Moore, Jr., O40729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linus Patrick Ward, O53191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Lester Inman, O34102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Harold Ray Kent, O34103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Cary Allen, O34104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norvel Harold Barnhart, O34105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Jacob Weber, Jr., O53319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lynnwood Murat Johnson, Jr., O35199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Coleman Parker, O34123, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Worth Williams, O34107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Hill Stewart 3d, O35205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Madison Farnell, O34108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Wilbur Chapman, O40704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Hugh Emert Howard, O45529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Jack Girard, O34110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ira Cornelius Redfern, Jr., O34109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Don Davis, O45687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Augustus Edwards, Jr., O34116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rafael Negron, O34115, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ronald William Van Orne, O40725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Walter James Davies, O53328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay William Herrington, O34121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reinhold Carl Riede, O45810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Charles Glover, O34122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dantes Alto York, O45549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Thomson Pillsbury, O34125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Julian Caldwell Propst, O45943, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Lawson Ransone, O34142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Crosby Park Miller, O34151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Whitaker Alexander, O34143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brilsford Pease Flint, Jr., O34146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard George Ciccolella, O34117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Charles Bryan, O34150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Harold Felter, O53216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Blanding Jones, O34152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Louis Rail, O40632, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Jones Davis, Jr., O34154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Francis Hollingsworth, O34155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John William Irving, O53276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nathan Anderson Roane, Jr., O34156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Neal Charles Galloway, O34158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Verde Weaver Bennett, O34157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Long, O34180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee L. Stewart, O34184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Nagel Stanford, O35182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Henry Wallace Witcover, O45522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Barton Pratt, O34186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Phillip Howe, O45555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Speaks, O34196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Leverne Jenkins, O45935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Lee Treadwell, O53121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl McQuillis Cooper, O34191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Coke Whitworth, Jr., O35231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Hilary Eugene DuVal, O53137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis Jones Adams, O34197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Wilson McGregor, O39096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Walburn Zarger, O45568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Owen Murphy, O34193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Scott Saunders, O34205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard LaVerne Cornutt, O45992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Randolph Dudley, O45497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Paul West, O34208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Robert Bush, O53342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellis Snetzer, O35458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Miller Boggs, O34087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Paul Ludwikosky, O34228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Elliott Lang, O45628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Sidney Andrew, Jr., O34235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil Victor Benard Edmond, O34234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ottis Mazel Plant, O40714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Hermanson Courtney, O35196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joy Kaufman Vallery, O34241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Louis Schaf, Jr., O45860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Freeman Harris, Jr., O34242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Harland Walker, Jr., O34243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Raymond Dunn, O34084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Robert Borns, O34245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dan Kistler Dukes, Jr., O34283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Marvin Callahan, O34055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Oxley Quirey, O39102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aubrey Parkerson Nathan, O34270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Bowden Street, O34272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Dewitt Gattis, O34269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Earl Whetstone, O53212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ray Lynch, Jr., O34268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Scarborough Hughes, O34271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Gordon Morris, O45665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sammie Newell Homan, O34279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce DesBrisay Jones, O34238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Marvin Browning, O35220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Stuart Terrell, Jr., O53118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Royal Dickson, O34091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Smith Lawrence, O34286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Louis Mueller, O34292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Weldon Emanual Laiche, O34295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Walter Heatwole, O35215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herron Nichols Maples, O45920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Lewis Smith, O33515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Thomas Smith, O34320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emro Joseph Quashnock, O34321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Hezekia Jacob Ross, Jr., O34112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edwin McDowell, O40674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Scott Housman, O53308, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Barton Jones, O34239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Howard Davis, O34325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Elmer Kjeldsen, O34326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Austin Grinnell, O53260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morrell Ray Sexton, O34057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Frazier, Jr., O39094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack LeRoy Marinelli, O34331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Walter Green, O34332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Allen Eicher, O40665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Clinton Lindley, O45614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Henry Schweiter, O34334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Grant Chesley, O53265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Alexander McWatters, O34336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Delbert Leroy Bristol, O34340, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerry French Dunn, O34342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Leonard, O34124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mont Sandels Johnston, O53169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carl Roth, O39095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Larson, O45964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Norvell McVeigh Walker, O34375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Christian Hansen, O34333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Gifford Carson, O53255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Graham Edward Schmidt, O34348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Earl McBride, Jr., O34347, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Chester Biggs, O45688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Donald Kight, O56904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gloyd Shettle, O40706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Edward Denby, O34192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Donnelly, Jr., O34359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Ernest Creek, O39099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tobias Raphael Philbin, Jr., O24406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carroll Wayne Andresen, O34388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marvin Leo Lindmark, O34393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Hiram Darwin, O33779, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow John Steichen, O34392, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Emmett Vollendorff, O34398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Wilbert White, O32250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clifton Henry Chamberlain, Jr., O56907) Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Paul DeCamara, O34399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph John Prusaitis, O34402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thurmond Gordon, O34397, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Luther Seale Crawford, O34297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Calvin Cross, O39092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Terrance Charles Fitzgerald, O45700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Woodrow Wild, O39142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Thomas Mixon, O34281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris James Lucree, O33401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Ralph Gates, O53457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wesley Charles Franklin, O45565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Moser Winder, O34420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Delmar Lewis Oaks, Jr., O34419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Regnault Fausset, O34421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Woods Bengel, O34423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Ira Fernandes, O53129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Clement Burn, O34426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Perlier Hinkley, O42675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Lawrence Haven, O53180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Eugene Porter, O34430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Paul Alexander, Jr., O34481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward LeRoy Nicely, O53251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Edward Roberts, O35232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellis Warner Williamson, O34484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Melvin Cock, O34294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest LeRoy Perry, O53324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Patrick Sweeney, O34485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Maj. Peter Louis DalPonte, O34486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Henry Gerfen, O53165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Delaney McDowell, O35204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralph Lynton Dalton, O34488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Jackson Hawkins, Jr., C45759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gust Edwin Olson, O46079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Edwin Garrett, O35307, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joachin Joseph Speciale, O45946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Edward McKinney, O39090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Edwin Divine, O45523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic Calvin Thompson, O35255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cader Cothren Terrell, O34555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vern Louis Joseph, O53375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lysle Iver Abbott, O34559, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hodo Boykin, O45838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Hubert Lester Nolan, O39111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winfred Clayton Naseiroad, C35259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Guysbert Bogart Vroom, Jr., O46019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William David Brodbeck, O31565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Woodrow Wilson Marriott, O33486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Britton Moyo, C46024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Hunter McCorkle, C45857, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Albert Harris, O53117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Adelbert Dale Boggs, O34569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Clark Rubottom, O35286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Langendorf, O45551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Marcus Lindley Parsons, O45699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jay Dee Vanderpool, O34570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Alan Rogers, O24572, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Lloyd Herper, O35272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Tobias Burke, O34575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Rocky Ross, O34278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Frederick Via, O34635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Chesley, Jr., O53264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Harvey Featherston, O34339, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Willard Adelbert Smith, O34637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dean Warren Barnes, O40745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Leonard DeNoya, O53352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Dee Pickard, O34639, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack G. Hines, O46117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major George Bernie Jordan, O34644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Leo Clifford Cooksley, O34571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Deason, O35323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Irving Resseguie, O53240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William Dickerson, O34189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Miller Duncan, O34647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Archie Tom Madsen, O45806, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Kenneth Robert Lindner, O34650, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd David Williams, O39139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Levens Metcalf, Jr., O53170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Worth Linn, O34653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Reeves Howell, Jr., O46248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Teir, O40701, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Roy Little, O53090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Billy Harland Kerr, O34655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Johnnie Clites Brink, O34658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Newton, O40742, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Rhodes Kugler, O34663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donn Warrington Yoder, O34664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jean Lindley Wood, O34660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harley Neivell Miller, O53155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Louis Cornelius DeGooyer, O45562, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earle Warren Aldrich, O34667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Malone Hall, O40692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Austin Joseph McDermott, Jr., O40754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Joseph Carney, O34672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Martin Piper, O34674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter John Angers, Jr., O34677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Leon Geer, O34675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robertson Kent, O34678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jim Dan Kelrsey, O34681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Cecil Caryl Helena, O53271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Esko Davis, O39136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Lawrence Keeth, O34687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald William Bunte, O39122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Calvert Snoddy, Jr., O34690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Art Harvey Davis, O34693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Martin Flynn, O39133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Franklin Harrison, O46168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Joseph Waszak, O35415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Arthur Hicks, Jr., O53246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Burns Crayton, O34682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ralph Richmond, O46217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Nelson, O34692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clovis Dee Heard, O34680, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Fred Dennis Chesnut, O45795, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Nelson Harris, O46059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Houck Spencer, O34719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Donald McLanachan, O46037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Spann, O34695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Hawthorne Armor, Jr., O45590, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

×Capt. James John Cortez, O53277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Lynn Balthis, O34709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Holt Hitchcock, O34709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Cooper, Swearingen, O34711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Jordan Fee, O34705, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Joseph Hoffman, O34709 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

Lt. Col. Arndt Lewis Mueller, O34700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Eugene DePuy, O34710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Paul Arntz, O39126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Newton Stewart, O34712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Clayton Norvin Gompf, O34716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Gilchrist, O45818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edgar Hiatt, O34717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Mair Muller, O34715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Harold Gold, O34862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Randolph Thomas, Jr., O45667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles LaForrester Cudlipp, O35265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Beverly Matthews, O34721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Chambers Bird, O35264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Felton Hatcher Moore, O34724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Walter Urban, O34722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Joseph Morgan, O35260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Michael Kessler, O34723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Anthony Richeson, O34725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Philip Zeigler, O34726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Quentin Roosevelt Hardage, O35276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Boswell Ayres, O34732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Leroy Gunn, O34734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Howell Moore, O34735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Alexander Murray, Jr., O34739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Keith Merrill Schmedemann, O34742, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Clark Maling, O34745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Foster Franklin Flegeal, O39118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Key Walker, Jr., O34744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Keith Angwin, O34741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Joseph Vidlak, O46142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Glenn Morris Harvey, O46210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Welch Stone, Jr., O40712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Franklin Herrington, O34756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Brad Wilson, O35162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Manly Seaton, O34760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Glenn Appel, O40700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harold Francis Buerschinger, O46015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Alexander Noseck, O45645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Louis Packman, O34761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ray Clinton Lewis, O53181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Hayes, O53437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Russell Mesecham, O53374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winston Earl Wallace, O34770, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Francis Hart, Jr., O45792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Blodgett Avery, O45766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harold Bingham, O34828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert John Ryan, O40631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erling Jerome Foss, O39127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Ray Harry Hurst, O45720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Cassin Langley, O40691, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Abb Chrietzberg, O34838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gibson Reynolds Finley, O34837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John William Oswalt, O46071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilfred Christian Becker, O34839, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederic Harold Palmblad, O34845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Mahan Brooks, O53449, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Rex Golston, Jr., O40657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Edward Maness, O39135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Webster Downer, O34854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Elliott Moran, O39103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howard Elder, Jr., O53453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Bowlby, O45718, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Robert Bauch, O34401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Edward Nolan, O53275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Leroy Victor Pearson, O34860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Frierson Burgess, Jr., O35280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack George Condon, O45542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles John Rahaeuser, O34873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Eggleston Eastlake, Jr., O34879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gerald Hugh Shea, O34882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Serlo Isenson, O34884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Johnson Grimsley, O39119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Rex Harry White, Jr., O45595, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marcus Lundy Powell, Jr., O34558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Powell Alexander Fraser, O34689, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Mahlon Brown, O39120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Beverly Money Read, O46180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Burr Johnstone Randall, Jr., O35611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Stanley Barrett, O34939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mark Joseph Gill, O45784, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Monroe Kemp, O39146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Rodney Middleton Covert, O45998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Franz, O53425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Earl Holmes, O46227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin I. Donley, O34887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Captain Louis Alfred Shuford, O45876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Harold Craze, O53279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Warren Cobb, O45851, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Sheldon Harley Wheeler, O34949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Edward Parker, O34951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Elmer Westervelt, O45723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Anderson McIntosh, Jr., O45816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Hamilton Franklin, O35175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Marion Burney, O34956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl William Gustafson, O45560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Stewart Stafford, O34556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James William Lane, O53091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Edward Griest, O34573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Lynn Nungesser, O53150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Joseph Neary, O34964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irvin Francis Carpenter, O39112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Sylvester Conaty, Jr., O34965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Leroy Morgan, O45796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas Carter France, Jr., O34967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Irvine Furman Belser, Jr., O53122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hudson Rupert Hurst, O53242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winston George Whall, O34970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Leonard Sexton, O45773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Gordon Fowler, O53218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Eberhart Griscti, O34666, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Magnus Leo Smith, O40698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

×Maj. John Harold Harden, O34977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Douglas Haig Patterson, O34979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Taylor Agee, O45709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Henri Frederik Frank, O46187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Vinson Milano, O46052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Andrew Fisher, O53311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward John Kloos, O53291, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Hanitch Johnson, O46097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nicholas Samuel Strider, O45589, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. D. L. Benton, Jr., O35022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irving Darris Warden, O53379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Richard Couch, O53462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Richard Couch, O53462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Randall Harris Wise, O53315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Mitchell Smith, Jr., O40724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George James Holly, Jr., O46075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aley Leonard Smith, O35044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Franklyn Jenkins, O53168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Lee Burke, O35047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Thomas Bernard, O45997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Peter Hidalgo, O35049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Roger Carpenter, O53450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Arch Van Sandt, O40762, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Mann, Jr., O40652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Francis Pope, O40672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Benjamin Sliman, O35048 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Howard Mehaffie, O40761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Elden Sharp, O35046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bryant Pridgen, O53197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Phipps, Jr., O39037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Norman Fairbanks, O40747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Castle, O35299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Lee Hall, O46268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claudius Miller Easley, Jr., O35056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Kebbe Anderson, O35057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Leo Henry Eberhardt, O53435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Michael Puetz, O34654, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Montgomery Graham, Jr., O53182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William McKinley Copley, Jr., O39114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph DeWight Kooken, O34743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Lee Smith, O34746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Herman Henderson, Jr., O45534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Perry Michael, O40669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Allen Ward, O34415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Kent Millar, Jr., O53428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Helmuth Otto Froeschle, O35070, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lee Waters, O34720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Walter Markey, O35143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Harold Greeley, O35144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Guy Humphrey Drewry, Jr., O35274, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Edwin Howell, O39149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Lee Newell, O35145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul LaVern McCrillis, O45768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Stuart King, O35147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Merritt, O46220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Edward Marfing, O34713, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Robert Franks, O52431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugo Wagner Heffelfinger, O46143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Hazen Purkitt, O35152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Yancey Henry Knowles, O35153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lawrence Roy Ligon, O35154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Sampson Wiley, Jr., O45927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Crane, O46186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip George Walker, O46287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond LaVerne Latimer, O34833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Granville Attaway Sharpe, O34966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Henry Homburg, Jr., O35159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Adams Smoak, O46267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel LaFayette Reid, O35160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Beatty Meanor, Jr., O34981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Cameron Johnson, O34950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Gundlach, O35163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Dixon Tummons, O46124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Emery Branigin, O53419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bill Gene Smith, O53387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bruce Smith, O46241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Olaf Gunnir Miller, O53184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Gildee, Jr., O35303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellsworth Cundiff, O34847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Bautz, Jr., O34750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vernon Wilbur Morgan, O45837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Antonio Villarreal Reyes, O35292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Isaac Williams, O34960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Arthur Dwight, O35305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Charles Beaumont, O35059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claire Benjamin Penzkofer, O46282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lloyd Osgard, O35315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Howard Chadwick Blazzard, O35453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Matthew Hart, O34665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Seigfried Henry Spillner, O35300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Ray Dingeman, O53463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerry M. Sage, O35326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Nelson Crawford, O35353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Washington Coss Carter, O35390, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Pemberton Frazier, O46344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Edward Williams, O35386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Brown Thompson, O36635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Donovan Ziler, O35412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harley Williard Ladd, O53512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Wilson Dean, Jr., O35420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Thomas Knowles, O35418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Harwell Barfield, O35425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Walton Greer, O35426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Russell Solomon Bieber, O35424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Haskell Lee, O35428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Sims, O35435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Randall Smith, O35445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Daniel Kennedy, Jr., O35444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Ben Wilson Perry, O35447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence William Jones, O45646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Albert Shaw, O35451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Wilbur Cook, O35454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Edward Quigley, O46420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Ike Looney, O40776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Leigh Fallwell, O35463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alan A. Sawyer, O35464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Sabolyk, O35475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Newton Jack Heuberger, O35476, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Lee Meggs, O35474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Randolph Lacy Jones, O35477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Percy Franklin Lisk, Jr., O53540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cary Andrew Kennedy, Jr., O40779, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McEachron Gaustad, O39164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Herschel Henry Hutsinpiller, O35487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hollis Dakin, O40780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Gage Kline, O46466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joyce Bailey James, O53547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Feller Parr, O35524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Fred Clarke, Jr., O46484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ottis Quimby, Jr., O35534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hoyt Leslie Fulmer, Jr., O35535, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Robert Rotz, O46505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Reed Van Dusen, Jr., O35538, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joffre Haig Boston, O35537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Staten Browning, Jr., O35536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Pickering Waters, Jr., O35543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Joseph Cronin, O35545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lester Earl Barlow, O35544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph McCabe, Jr., O39167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel McLaughlin, O46520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard McGowan Lee, O35551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Londy Bailey, O35552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Herbert Roberts, O35553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Malcolm Kullmar, O35555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Winfield Scott Williams, O40789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Solomon Lowe, O35561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Leverne Doupe, O35562, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James Thomas, O35564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Robert Ulrich, O35566, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Richard Kennedy, O46534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Arthur Godding, O40790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Paul Keleher, O35568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William McEvoy, O35570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Woodson Barnett, Jr., O46540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Paul Robinson Sheffield, O35569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Bartley Kitchens, Jr., O40791, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edgar Ray Jackson, Jr., O46542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen Edward Woodruff, Jr., O36172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Carroll Kendrick, O46545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hutchinson O'Connell, O35575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Edward Leeper, O46552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Geyer Jones, O24576, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Knut Harold Raudstein, O53611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Madison Ramsey, O53610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Jennings Wagstaff, O35585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Vincient Roberts, O35584, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Peter Mahon, O40792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert James MacDonald, O39172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Dreiss, O35589, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hal LeRoy Schroeder, O25297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Junior Newton Cox, O46561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Henry Hoye, O46570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oren Clifford Wingfield, O39173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fariss Hardin, O35600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Billie McKemie, O46573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arnold Alvord Berglund, O35599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Russell Cornwell Geist, Jr., O46585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Joseph Gettings, Jr., O46600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Lloyd Raines, O35621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Foster Barto Watson, O35665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Sammet, Jr., O35624, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John DeHart Foulk, O35629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marshall Milford Motes, O16627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Benjamin McDivitt, O53661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Ulin Overall 3d, O46630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Walter Vail, O35647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Alden Burke, O46646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Binkley Williams, O35669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Eyre Redheffer, O35672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Elmer Holmgrain, O46656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Charles Aycock, O46664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Darrell Bowen, O46668, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charles Edwin Harris, O46675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert John Daniels, O53632, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Franklin Bradley Simmons, Jr., O53683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Basil Wilcox Henderson, O46671, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Don Carlos Faith, Jr., O46673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter William Mirras, O53684, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Kennedy Bennett, O35691, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Marvin Minter Parr, O53681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Sam Floyd Warren, O34289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ed Vardo Hendren, Jr., O46682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Gussie, O35697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frederick Gay, O40804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Wilford Dennis Gower, O35699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Swaim, O46685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Chester McAdams, O39177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Smith Coleman, O35710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Earl Durham, O35709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wesley Jarrell Simmons, O35713, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Chason Walker, O35719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Febrey Arnold, O46714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Harry Cowles, O35735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lockhart Horn, Jr., O53717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Roger Barclay, O46727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harris Whitton Hollis, O53724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Emerson Ford, O35741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wayland Jones, Jr., O35763, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Fredric Dean, O35768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Delard Goudreau, O46744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Wallace Moore, O53733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Morris Zimmerman, O53738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Anthony Robbins, O35780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Charles Crawford, O35784, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marion Steele Bell, O35787, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brooks Ogden Norman, O35793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Daniel McNally, O35796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Curtis Bone, O35792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Clark DeReus, O35790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Gordon Owens, O39181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilburn Elihue Grant, O35789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elden Cornelius Campbell, O40817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

Maj. Charles Lenier Anderson, O35797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Carl Schrader, O40830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Adolph Herman Phillips, O35888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Killip, O40823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick McEvoy, O46774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Walter Emil Stielau, O35815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Lee Waddell, Jr., O25371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Dougherty, O35817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Bayard Hansen, O35819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Augustine Dever, O40827, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Minor Stewart, O46789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elvin Vernon Vestal, O40828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome William Schrader, O35821, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Freeman Beaver, O46800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cud Thomas Baird 3d, O46804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Bigart, O35831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Waldron John Winter, O35832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Stephan Lekson, O35837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmond Ragland Urquhart, O40831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harold Cook White, O46808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Manford Milton Canary, O35841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wylie Ben Walters, O35840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Forrest Boomer, O35846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl William Kruger, O35845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lloyd George Smith, O38024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Rathbone Mumma, O46819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Zakel, Jr., O35849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Francis Andrew Seitzer, O46818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Wilson Hemingway, O35854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joel Phillip Holcomb, O46829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence William Patten, O35859, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert James Bennett, O46832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred George Steiner, O35860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Durning Harlan, O35861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Arthur Gleason, Jr., O35882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Woodrow Reed, O35884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward John Chrysler, O53809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Donald Denchfield, O35886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Raymond Elliott, O40837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Earl Holzbach, Jr., O46861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard LaVerne Nispel, O53810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vincent Henry Ellis, O53814, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Theodore Macek, O46866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Jessie Ellison, O40846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Oliver Herman Bruce, O46926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Lewis Long, O46931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Morrison Click, O39183, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Dale Reid, O35712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jeremiah Bryant Monk, Jr., O46946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Herman Parthum, Jr., O35939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ardery Campbell, O25400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kermit Reginald Mason, O46951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louie Neil Rodgers, O35941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Tyron Earl Tisdale, O46953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Jackson Allen, O46952, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Oeland Denham, O35948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Radford Donald Hyde, O35949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Earl Roberts, O46969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Brandon Brantwood Trussell, Jr., O39190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Isaac Edward Whisnant, O46963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Henry Hill, Jr., O39191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Robert Poole, O35959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Alvah McKean, O35958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Paul Tallon, Jr., O35965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Norfleet Chavis, O39193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Stanley Staiger, O53879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Walton Fickessen, O35973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Truett Cooper, O35983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard John Titley, O35982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bryan Cowan, O40850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vocqsal Doss Wood, Jr., O47003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Walter MacIndoe, O25407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Dods Beard, O47010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin Johnston, O35987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Edward Milotta, O35989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Davis Morgan, Jr., O47012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Locke Lyons, O35997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Don Rue Hickman, O35998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward Purcell Ludington, O47015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Esler Whitmore, O35993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hugh Wear, O47014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marlin Watson Camp, O35999, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Truman Alexander Hopkins, O36057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Laurence Sylvester Browne, O47086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Braddock Babbs, O39203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Eugene Adams, O39202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Tomlinson Eichnor, O53927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Davis Bush, O47101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

Maj. Carl Peter Keiser, Jr., O36066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William James Harris, O47105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Ellsworth Dunlap, O40862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Martin Wright, O53931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Albert Broadus Dillard, Jr., O53930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Morton Young, Jr., O47107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Cecil Vogelsang, O36078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lester DeWayne Royalty, O36081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Washington Putnam, Jr., O39206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Trampe Loesing, O36090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Hart Hottenroth, O24645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Henry Hayes, O24646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Preston Halsell, O24647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Ellsworth Cumpston, O24650, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Edward Hesselbacher, Jr., O24651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Paul Young, O24652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bryan Newman 3d, O24654, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Reiley Finney, O24655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irving Rock Obenchain, Jr., O24658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Willard Vogel, O24661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Winthrop Barnes, O24663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ward Watkin, Jr., O24664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Joseph Hamerly, O24665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Ambrose Martell, O24666, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Paul Koisch, O24669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Arthur Raymond, O24670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerrold Duster Snow, O24671, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph John Schmidt, Jr., O24672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eric Castlereigh Orme, O24673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Robert Cerar, O24674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Dumond Wilder, Jr., O24676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip George Krueger, O24677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Tuttle Hamilton, Jr., O24678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Miles Lowell Wachendorf, O24679, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Peyton Tabb, Jr., O24680, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Charles Roecker, Jr., O24681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Edgar Rosell, Jr., O24682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Clement Mattina, O24683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mahlon Eugene Gates, O24685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Louis Hennessy, O24690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Alley Barnes, O24694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Army).

Maj. Seymour Rubenstein, O24695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmond Harrison Leavey, Jr., O24698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Francis Eugene Voegel, O24699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Leland Weeks, O24700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Preston Sheffey 3d, O24701, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Baker, O24704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Raymond Eisenschmidt, Jr., O24706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Wayne Leonard Bart, O24707, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rosario Pietro Bonasso, O24714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Matthew Rienzi, O24715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Fred Shutrump 2d, O24718, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rollin Thomas Steinmetz, Jr., O24720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Russell Kraft, Jr., O24726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Patrick Murphy, O24729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lawrence Lambert, O24731, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Garrard Foster, O24732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Garth Stevens, O24735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Davis Terry, O24739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Walter Fritz, O24744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Corley, Jr., O24746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army)

Maj. John Randle Watson, O24748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Alfred Vivian, O24751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Henry Riedel, Jr., O24756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Eldon Buchanan, O24759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George R. Allin, Jr., O24760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Lahm, O24761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard John Pasciak, O24765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Raybourn O'Neal, O24772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Matthew John Redlinger, Jr., O24775, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Hilary Connolly, Jr., O24783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Dean Short, O24789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel John Dilworth, O24790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Rogers Selp, O24792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Allan Rickman, O24796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Hubbard Hays, O24797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Windsor Rice, O24800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Horatio Clagett, Jr., O24803, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Lee Lewis, O24809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Severino Martinez, Jr., O24811, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Short, O24812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Carpenter, Jr., O24816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Kenneth Charbonneau, Jr., O24817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Dennis Sitterson, Jr., O24818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Joseph Roberts, O24820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Nicholas Thompson, O24823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mark Howard Terrel, O24826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Russell Deane, Jr., O24835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Boone Bartholomees, O24839, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Harmeling, Jr., O24843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Stanley Geiger, Jr., O24845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Peter Iuliucci, O24848, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Henry Ivey, O24849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Harvey Tarver, O24851, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Alfred Wyman, O24854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Hilton Offley, Jr., O24871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj Charles Marmaduke Grimshaw, O24872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel William Koster, Jr., O24873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linwood Fogg Jordan, O24879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Crosson, Jr., O24880, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ulysses Grant Jones, Jr., O24882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Houston Townsend, O24890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis Dale Crittenberger, Jr., O24893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Haley Caruthers, Jr., C24696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Dean Hennessee, O24897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Edward Hunter, O24898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas Cunningham Murray, O24899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richard Pendergrast, O24905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel Beck Stephens, O24913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Griffin Clapp, Jr., O24914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert MacDougall Bringham, O24925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Hall Marks, Jr., O24935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Butner Clay, O24937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Alfred Divers, O24945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Talbot Russell, O24947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Fuller Davis, Jr., O24948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wolcott Ryder, Jr., O24951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Burnett Spilman, O24955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Edward Halpin, O24957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry William Urrutia, O24966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Ray Rogers, O24967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edgar Shedd 3d, O24971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Virgil Morey, O24975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lawrence Eckert, O24976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Richard Miles, Jr., O24979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donnelly Paul Bolton, O24982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charlie Calhoun Coleman, O24987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Simmons Timothy, O24992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Edward Seifert, O24993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Boyd Freeze Walker, O24998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Alleo, O25000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Doan Rehkopf, O25004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert George Brugh, Jr., O25009, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Denis Crowley, Jr., O25016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Walter Anderson, O25363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Earl Parsons, Jr., O36095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Neil Hickok, O36096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Pedro Roxas Flor Cruz, C47122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Vincent Silvis, O36098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Christian Beachler, O36099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Schudt, O53939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Andrew Meads, Jr., O36100, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Andrew Wiley, O47130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Rowland Bethea, O47132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude Arther Hays, O47134, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Augustine Kerley, C47139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald William Homann, O23382, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Orville Theodore Lowe, O36111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Marshall Whitenton, O36114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Albert Guenthner, O47146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ignatius Ciraldo, O36117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Thomas Falls, O47145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Barr Nixdorff, O40367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald King Stevens, O36118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hughes Hard, O36120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Pershing Bane, O36121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nathaniel Andrew Gage, Jr., O47155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Blount Harding, Jr., O53938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Adams Wilson, O36129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Leslie Crawley, Jr., O53963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Bartley Cagle, Jr., O36131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Thomas Paul, O36142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Felix Wilhm, O47170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Lane Gude, O36138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Simuel Henderson, O25412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Reece Sedberry, Jr., O25415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Alexander Duke, O40873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Artha Darby Williams, Jr., O40871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Harding Stutler, O36148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Heacock McBride, O47172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Richard Miller, O53967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Jean Dennis, O36151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ivan King, O36153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wilbur Gilman, O25394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Raisey Stevens 3d, O39215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Bailey Jones, O36168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Wayne Lyon, O36169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Leo Farrell, Jr., O36160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Eschman Curran, Jr., O36163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max Adams Morris, O25379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Verne Church, O36171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Clifton Honea, Jr., O36175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Clayton Butsch, O47199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Woodrow Kogstad, O36176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Andrew Guntharp, O36178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Griffith Hays, Jr., O25390, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Leroy Harrison, O25373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Andrew Spencer, O36076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Lorenzo Leech, Jr., O25386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Benjamin Thomas, O25411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Carter Fuson, O36184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Evans-Smith, O53988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Mitchell Hill, O36185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Francis Ahern, O36187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Henry Hamilton McKee, O36190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles John Anderson, O25376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Berrisford Harlan Walker, O36195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Forrest Richardson, O36193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carroll Fordyce, O53996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Paul Testa, O40877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dow Seigel Grones, O47225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Marion Seignious, O47226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Theodore Lunger, O25388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Wendel, Jr., O36220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Eugene Williams, Jr., O36227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. James Dewey Ramsey, O36228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Derwood Cann, Jr., O36230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eric Roland Mills, Jr., O47272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Virgil Parker Foster, Jr., O36229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Patrick Barry Ward, O36239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harold Kenneth Reynolds, O39218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Earle Pinckney, O47275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kimball Russ Richmond, O47281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hall Breaden McElree, O36252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salve Hugo Matheson, O36253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dallas Andrew Pilliod, O36257, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Linwood Arthur Carleton, O36260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Newton Levick, O47292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Leslie Field, Jr., O40890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Lawson Johnson, O36285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Vitold Weiss, O36287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Clifford Neve, O40893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Norman Whitley, O47359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edwin Mead, O36314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Cyril Dorn, O36316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant), U. S. Army).

Maj. William Treloar Russell, O25410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Campbell, O47367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Maj. Harold Paul Baker, O40895, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Gregory Gust, O36330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Louis Klingenhagen, O39223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Franklin Young, O36327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clyde Hudgins Baden, Jr., O36333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Joseph Nemethy, O36332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Edmund Neidner, O47381, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard George Foelsch, O36337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Niram LeRoy Sauls, O47366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Elton David Vaughan, O47395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Charles Golladay, O40897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Elwood Shiflet, O47394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James William Gunn, O40896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Basile, O40900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Stanley Kimmitt, O36343, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Dowell Capshaw, Jr., O36345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Jermiah O'Leary, O36344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Bee McFadden, Jr., O54083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Gelling, O36353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sumner Freedland, O47401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Young, O36350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Marshall Bragg Garth, O36357, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Cunningham, O36361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Charles Young, O36362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Attison Luttrell, O36363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Petruzel, O36364, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Cleveland Armentrout, O47412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Harry Patterson, O54094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Edward Condon, O36373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Anthony McCloskey, O36372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Molloy Clark Vaughn, Jr., O25393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morgan Agustus Whitfield, O36389, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Daniel Webber, Jr., O36393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Calvin Pinson, O36408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Edwin Temple, O47459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Murphy, O36776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert L. Duncan, O39230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Eugene Napper, O36416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Urban Schmidt, O36425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Gayle Whitsitt McFadden, O54125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Dan Anthony Mobley, O54145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rufus Eugene Hallmark, O47516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herald Bud Gallinger, O36481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Pershing Brubaker, O36484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Edward Cavanaugh, Jr., O36485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Curtis Franklin, O47521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Briggs Lathrop, O36492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oats A. Pynes, Jr., O36491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Leary Peterson, O36496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Irvan Olsen, O47541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Albert McMahon, O54182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Pickford Clarke, Jr., O36505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wayne Elbert Ligon, O36510, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kroner Eney, O36514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carl Crisson, O36520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Hillsman Underwood, O36541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Prescott Kean, Jr., O40927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Merrill Brizzard, O54027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Darrell George Wood, O54196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Orr Jackson, O47577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cornelius John Shaffer, O47584, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Boehmer, O36550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Leslie Davis Smith, O33042, United States Army.

Maj. Jerome Belsky, O40932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Francis Rey, O47633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jesse Lee Morrow, Jr., O36564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Edwards, O54229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Whitson Marr, O36567, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Restani, O36568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore William Paterson, O47644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Howard Chapin, O47651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Carlton Bender, O47706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Oscar Ernest Schlamersdorf, O39248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eldridge Clair Dudley, O54260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Alexander Pashley, Jr., O40942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward O'Neal Logan, O36610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Henry Herndon, O36636, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Regner, O25395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Saunders Parkins, Jr., O47716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ross Bond, O36618, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Elza Renfleng, O36620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Spencer Webster, O36621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Charles Finneran, O36643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jasper Stuart Moore, O47770, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Ransom Olcott, O54292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Beall Harvey, O47778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Joseph DeAngelis, O39252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John David Hill, O25401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh King Boyd, O36658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Fredrick Robens, O36665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Ernest Lester Knoll, O54304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Scott Torgeson, O25421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Laney Gordon, O36662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Carroll McFalls, Jr., O47800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Michael Hudak, O47803, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howell Mathias, O47844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Frederick Monsarrat, O36698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Eugene Gibb, O47853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Council Braxton, O36703, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Howard Irvine, O36705, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawson William Magruder, Jr., O36711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Richard Burdick, O36760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eldon Robert Davis, O36771, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Anthony Abrignani, O40966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Warren Johnson, O36315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Randolph Mathews, Jr., O47934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Adrain Raichlen, O54419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Scanlan, O47971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Louis Corrado, O54417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alvin Clendenning Metcalfe, O36809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James Sutton, O36816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Paul Biggio, Jr., O36821, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Potts, O54461, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Hugh McGovern, O36851, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herman Lamar West, O48031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Donald McQuinn, O48053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Franklin Parkins, O36855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byrne Allen Evans, O36859, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Paul Bernard McCain, O48072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Tetley Omenhiser, Jr., O54435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Leon Baldwin, O36864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Forrest Ithamar Rettgers, O36414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice Waldo Dunn, O40985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Garcia Uglade, O36354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Ernest Milloy, O35239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oswald C. Smith, O54531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward Pieklik, O36942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Reiley Guthrie, O36240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edward Maertens, O48227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laddie L. Stahl, O36988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Crawford Sheldon, O48236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Grady Francis Lilly, O36990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward O'Leary, O37002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Kirk Singlaub, O37040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Allen Knowlton, O25436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. DeWitt Clinton Armstrong 3d, O25441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Anthony Rebh, O25444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Ambler Camm, O25448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas King Blue, O25453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Roscoe Ellis, O25455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McClure, Jr., O25456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Creel Marshall, O25467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Johnson Talbott, O25468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrie Hewitt Richards, O25458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Emmanuel Saari, O25470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cecil George Young, Jr., O25472, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Love Starnes, Jr., O25475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Msj. Robert Guthrie Hillman, O25477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emmett Robinson Reynolds, O25489, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Stuart MacVeigh, O25496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter William Hogrefe, O25518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Foster Stephens, O25539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Nickel, O25553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stewart Canfield Meyer, O25530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Paul Edward Andrepont, O25570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lawrence Philip Bischoff, Jr., O25571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Gray Wheelock 3d, O25572, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Lyndon Wilkes, Jr., O25575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. McGlachlin Hatch, O25578, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vasco John Fenili, O25579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merle Landry Carey, O25586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Lukacs Toth, O25587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Jacob Luther, Jr., O25597, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Eugene Wilbourn, O25606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Robert M'chael, O25609, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edward Kelleher, O25611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Mease, Jr., O25614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Alden Hine, Jr., O25617, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Benjamin Hollis, Jr., O25651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Maude Davenport, Jr., O25656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman David Greenberg, O25695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Kamell Maertens, O25698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Michael Flanagan, Jr., O25710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Alvin Wirt, O25725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hamlin Schofield, Jr., O25754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Daniel Moore, O25760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Wilson Brown, O25769, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hiram Pietsch, Jr., O25773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elvy Benton Roberts, O25781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Boone Seegers, O25789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Everett Edward Lowry, Jr., O25799, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Henderson Farnsworth, O25800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Arthur Mesereau, O25822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carlton Clyde Thornblom, O33750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

NOTE.—All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, AUGUST 6, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. H. Lambdin, pastor of St. Luke's Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father, which art in Heaven, we bow in quiet reverence before Thee today as we turn our minds to thoughts of highest levels. We desire to draw closer to Thee that we might hear Thy voice giving us encouragement and wise counsel as we begin our activities in this day's session.

Our minds get disturbed and confused with many problems, hard-to-solve problems, and with many responsibilities, difficult and trying ones to our way of thinking; yet, O God, we know we can come to Thee for that extra strength which we feel we need in the turmoil of these confusing times.

We know that if we will but trust Thee, Thou wilt see us through successfully, even through the hard places which seem to grow more numerous from day to day.

We ask Thy blessing on us all; and on all the peoples of our Nation whom we seek to serve, honestly and with appreciation of their confidence in us. May we strive to do our part to bring about a real peace on earth, with good will toward men of all nations, and may we help to establish good feeling and brotherly kindness in the earth. We pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one on the OPA and related matters and in the other on the subject of money for school buildings.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

COMPARATIVE INDEXES—COST OF LIVING AND WAGES, 1945–48

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have heard much stress laid upon the consumer price index of 170.5. That is only part of the story. From the figures furnished me this morning by the Department of Labor, we find that while costs have risen, the average weekly earning index of manufacturing workers, based on the same period 1935–39, has risen even more, to 230.9. That is 60 points more than the cost-of-living index.

There follows a table setting out by quarters beginning January 1, 1945, the cost-of-living index and the increase in earnings:

	Consumers' price index for moderate-income families in large cities, 1945–48	Gross average weekly earnings of manufacturing production workers, 1945–48
1935–39	100.0	100.0
1945:		
First quarter	126.9	211.5
Second quarter	128.1	207.4
Third quarter	129.3	190.4
Fourth quarter	129.3	182.8
1946:		
First quarter	129.6	184.2
Second quarter	131.7	191.3
Third quarter	144.1	198.9
Fourth quarter	152.2	205.9
1947:		
First quarter	153.2	211.2
Second quarter	156.0	216.0
July	158.4	218.5
August	160.3	219.3
September	163.8	225.1
October	163.8	227.7
November	164.9	228.8
December	167.0	235.0
1948:		
January	168.8	232.2
February	167.5	230.8
March	166.9	232.2
April	169.3	230.6
May	170.5	230.9

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, using middle month of each quarter for consumers' price index figures.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; living costs have risen, but so have earnings. Both sides of the story should be told so the public may be fully advised.

DISMANTLING OF INDUSTRIAL PLANTS IN GERMANY

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on December 5 last, I called the attention of the House, and I might say in particular our Committee on Foreign Affairs, to the fact that plants were being sold and dismantled in Germany, and at the same time we were shipping material to Europe to replace like plants.

Such action is not only downright foolish and a terrific waste of our tax moneys, but is so unrealistic that it appears to be part of a gigantic plan to keep our production down and prices high.

For over 2 years now almost weekly the Department of Commerce Office of International Trade circulars, described as Reparations News, have listed well over 2,000 German plants already dismantled or to be dismantled and offered for sale in the United States for reparations. I would like to call attention to the fact that there are at this time held by the War Assets Administration in their New York office four turbogenerators. Inquiries from American business regarding the purchase of these generators for use by American industry here in America are met with the bald statement that they will not be sold to American industry but are going to be turned over to ECA for shipment to Germany.

Why? Is it because there are no turbogenerators available in Germany? Just so the facts may be shown, I want to give you just a few plants which are listed by the Allied Reparations Commission as including turbogenerators:

Paraxol plant, Lippoldsberg, Germany.

Hastedt steam power plant, serial No. A/S/183, Bremen, Germany.

Grosskraftwerk Mannheim, A. G., serial No. A/S/177, Mannheim-Neckarau, Germany.

H. Soehne Lavis, serial No. A/S/130, Offenbach, Germany.

G. m. b. H. Anorgana, serial No. A/S/86, Gendorf, Germany.

Toeging, serial No. A/S/87, Muhldorf, Germany.

These are just a few of the plants which actually have power-generating equipment available. Any one of you by checking Reparations News I mentioned earlier can verify the foregoing facts for yourself.

Is it not time that this kind of foolishness be brought to an end? There certainly is no sense in ripping out this equipment over there and then having ECA give them new equipment with our dollars to replace it. Certainly, here is a specific case for the watchdog committee to get to work on.

MELROSE, MASS., A DEBT-FREE CITY

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, with city tax rates going higher and in some instances by appalling increases and with so many people complaining of the high cost of living when they ought to be concerned with the high cost of government, I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that it is refreshing to be reminded of an instance where hard-headed, common sense, businesslike fiscal management pays off to the great satisfaction of the citizens affected.

Last Monday morning it was my pleasure and pride to join the other former mayors of my home city of Melrose in accepting the invitation of Mayor Thomas L. Thistle to meet him in the city hall to commemorate the paying off of the last remaining item of city indebtedness.

Thus this city of 28,000 becomes the only debt-free city in Massachusetts and perhaps the only one in the eastern part of the United States.

The following story of this noteworthy event is from the Christian Science Monitor of August 2, 1948:

INDEBTEDNESS DISPOSED OF BY MELROSE

(By Bertram B. Johansson)

MELROSE, MASS.—A traditional Yankee pay-as-you-go policy paid off rich dividends in this city today as the municipal government achieved a completely debt-free status.

Down at the Merchants National Bank in Boston, $12,000 in bonds was paid off today by city officials, thus wiping all bonded indebtedness off the city books—and at a time when debts in most other communities are rising sharply.

MAYOR GIVES CREDIT

Mayor Thomas L. Thistle said that Melrose was the only debt-free city in Massachusetts today and very likely in all of New England and much of the eastern coast.

He said that some western cities where oil has been discovered—practically under the city hall—are debt free.

Credit for the unusual balanced-book status of the municipal government goes not to one man alone, Mayor Thistle emphasized. He attributed the accomplishment to a lot of shrewd mayors, several of them from down Maine, most of them with successful private businesses, who came in here to serve in the mayor's office as a public service.

FORMER MAYORS GATHER

The festive occasion—and even paying off municipal debts can be festive—was observed in the mayor's office as several of the former mayors gathered to talk over old times.

First of the mayors to arrive this morning for the get-together was Charles H. Adams, who served in the mayor's office from 1915–20. Representative ANGIER L. GOODWIN (Republican), of Massachusetts, who was up from Washington for a short week end, also came in for a few minutes' chat with the several mayors. He served as the city's executive here in 1921 and 1922. The Representative left for Washington by plane for the special session of Congress after greeting his colleagues here.

WARTIME OFFICIAL ON HAND

Another of the distinguished Melrose mayors at the meeting today was Carl A. Raymond, a former State budget commissioner, who served as mayor from 1942–47, during the war period when a considerable amount of debt was paid off.

Also present was former Mayor Robert A. Perkins, who served the longest of any of the mayors present—a 10-year period from 1931–41.

Albert M. Tibbetts, who was mayor from 1925–30, was not able to be present.

Achieving the debt-free status has not left Melrose's municipal coffers entirely bare, it was made clear. While retiring debt at a fast rate, the city also accumulated during the war a $350,000 rehabilitation fund which is now being used for construction of sewers and street and building repairs.

MONEY FOR SCHOOL

"In addition, we also have $300,000 accumulated for the building of a new primary school," Mayor Thistle said. "It's all set aside and we will begin construction as soon as we get the appropriate plans."

Mayor Thistle, who described the pay-as-you-go policy as paying for current operating expenses out of current income, said that "a lot of cities camouflage such policies, but we don't. It's the real thing in Melrose."

"Good government and good shrewd Yankee common sense over a period of 50 years are really responsible for the debt-free position of our city today," the mayor said.

COMMUNITY OF 28,000

He added that no bond issues of any consequence were anticipated in the next year or so, although some capital construction may be necessary in another year or so, for which borrowing might be necessary.

Melrose is a 28,000-person community, almost strictly residential, with only a few small factories, has very little tax-free property, and is compactly fitted into a 4.9-mile-square area. It has fewer than 300 city employees and has a strong mayor-type city charter.

DECLARATION OF RECESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time during the day for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (S. J. Res. 239) to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 403 of title IV of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by striking out the words "January 2, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "March 1, 1949."

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICINE CREEK DAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like first to bring to the Congress several thousands of "thank you's," then I want to invite the Members to a party—Nebraska style.

Almost 10 years ago I made a speech on the floor of this House, telling the Congress of the flood problems in the Republican River Valley in Nebraska. I described to the Members the disastrous flood which took the lives of more than 100 people and destroyed millions of dollars of property.

Nearly every year which followed, the sturdy people of that valley suffered from floods. Ironically enough, they also suffered from drought. They needed protection from floods; they had to have water for agriculture.

Only last year in the thriving little city of Cambridge, Nebr., 13 people lost their lives in the frightening floods of one of the Republican River tributaries. At that time we made an appeal to the Congress to move up the schedule of the Bureau of Reclamation for the erection of a dam on Medicine Creek just out of Cambridge. This Congress responded to that request and granted funds to start this flood control work.

On Tuesday, August 10, that dam will be dedicated. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Republican Valley are grateful to the Government of the United States, and particularly to the Eightieth Congress for the consideration shown and action taken in this very urgent problem.

In behalf of the people of the Republican Valley, the Republican Valley Conservation Association, the committee in charge and my colleagues from Nebraska, I wish to extend to every Member of this Congress an invitation to come out to Cambridge, Nebr., next week to meet the fine people of my district and to see this Federal project. When Nebraskans have something to celebrate, they do it generously, and the Medicine Creek Dam dedication is one of the most celebration-worthy events in the history of our State.

In the months that lie ahead the Congress will be hearing more about the Republican Valley. On July 22 of this year the Medicine Creek was again at flood stage and almost reached a point where great disaster would have occurred. More work and more money are yet needed to finish the job now undertaken.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MATHEWS and Mr. ELLIS asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the testimony given by Mr. Paul Porter before the Committee on Banking and Currency on the subject of the President's inflation program.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address given by H. Stewart Potter at the opening of Soldier Memorial Field at Halifax, Pa.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GOFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Boise Statesman.

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, the first on the sale of the State Department art project, and to include figures received from the War Assets Administration as to the actual cash received, and in the second to include a portion of his testimony given yesterday morning before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, August 9, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSMEN ARE CITIZENS FIRST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, we are all citizens first and Congressmen second. We shall be going home in a few days. Whether or not the Congress is right or wrong in adjourning, history and the electorate will decide. But let us not fool ourselves as citizens. With food and apparel prices double what they were in 1939, very little will have been done to deal with the high cost of living by legislation. The Congress is taking a very serious, and I think unnecessary, chance on the automatic operation of economic forces to bring prices down, by not adopting legislation for selective controls and allocations; but that is apparently the decision.

Mr. Speaker, there is always the possibility that this special session will be succeeded by yet another one. When we go home, let us at least remember the fundamentals and review with our constituents—workers, management, and farmers—where the real trouble lies. Everybody is getting his—that is understandable but true. Corporate profits are fabulous, farm income is fabulous; we have had three rounds of wage increases and it looks as though we may be up for a fourth round. The greatest corrective of inflation would be to stop the wage-price spiral by agreements among management, workers, and farmers—founded on industrial statesmanship. If that is too much to hope for it will take legislative action—and far more drastic than the palliatives proposed—to save the country from a depression so much worse than that of the thirties as to threaten to shatter our whole society.

If we are to go home, let us at least think it over.

THE HIGH COST OF BREAD AND MEAT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the two most important items in the average person's diet are bread and meat. They are both sold on a free market and the price of wheat and the cost of animals on the hoof determine to a large extent the ultimate cost to the consumer. With a greater supply of wheat and of beef cattle the price of bread and meat would

go down. But what do we find the administration doing?

On July 24 the United States Department of Agriculture put out a release or bulletin recommending that our wheat acreage for next year be decreased by 8 percent, and beef cattle breeding herds be reduced by 517,000 breeders. This means a drastic reduction in our food supply for next year, if the farmers follow such a program. In other words, our administration is officially trying to decrease production of both wheat and meat at the very moment when it is yelling about high food prices.

Mr. Speaker, the cattle population of the Nation has decreased from 82,000,000 to 75,000,000 during the last 5 years, a decrease of 7,000,000, in the face of an expanding population. Today we have something like 15,000,000 more mouths to feed than we had 10 years ago, not to say anything about the European millions that we are feeding. Yet in the face of these figures the Department of Agriculture recommends a further reduction of one-half million breeding cattle.

Why does the Department of Agriculture try to create scarcities, thereby increasing prices, when the President is urging Congress to control inflation and to roll back prices to the 1937 level? This is only one sample of the conflicting and chaotic actions of the present administration.

CONTRAST THE COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WITH NEW YORK STATE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the charge has frequently been made here on this floor, that there are more Communists in the State of New York than anywhere else. No doubt that is correct. Figures tend to bear out such an assertion. The latest figures available from the Legislative Reference Service disclose that 44 percent, almost half, of the Communist vote in the United States was cast in the State of New York.

Despite this fact, the contrast between Communist infiltration in the Federal Government and in the New York State government is noteworthy. Apparently, the Communists find the air of Washington more to their liking than Albany.

The President complained yesterday that the shocking disclosures now being made are undermining public confidence in the Government. You are mistaken, Mr. President. The American people have not lost confidence in our great Government, but rather in those who are running it.

Governor Dewey and the Republican administration of New York State do not subscribe to the policy of publicly condemning communism, but privately courting the support of those who follow the Communist line.

In November, the voters will have the opportunity to decide which course they prefer. The issue is clear. There is no doubt what the verdict will be.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by the president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include editorials.

THE THREAT OF COMMUNISM

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, throughout our land, millions of conscientious Americans are worried, deeply worried, about the infiltration of Communists into American institutions and Government. I now speak to you about communism and those who spread its propaganda and carry out its subversive program in the United States.

On the occasion of another great crisis in our history, Patrick Henry said:

> This is no time for ceremony. The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country.

The question of communism is today a matter of awful moment to the American people. We can no longer afford the luxury of ignorance or complacency.

There is a lesson for the American people in Biblical history. You recall that the people described by the Bible in Sodom and Gomorrah were eating and drinking and making merriment when sudden destruction came upon them. The people of the United States today stand in danger of that very fate.

I have been attending hearings now being conducted by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and, as a result, I am convinced that America today faces the threat of destruction by communism, from within as well as from without. Fortunately, events during recent weeks have served to dramatize the clear and immediate menace of Communist infiltration in the United States.

During this past week, the Communist Party of the United States held its fourteenth annual national convention in New York City. This was the second Communist convention within a month. The previous convention was held in Philadelphia under the name of the Progressive Party.

The Communist Party's convention in New York was merely an echo of the Wallace convention in Philadelphia. Henry Wallace deserved and he received the endorsement of the Communists and the blessings of "good old Joe" Stalin.

Let us reflect a moment. During the progress of each of these conventions 12 top leaders of the Communist Party of the United States were under indictment in New York on charges of conspiring to overthrow the Government of the United States by force. And in the Nation's capital, coincident with that political circus called a special session, former Soviet espionage agents revealed to the Congress a sordid record of treachery by Communist agents and sympathizers in our own Federal Government.

Thus we see an almost unbelievable spectacle—avowed enemies of our Nation abusing the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and action. These Communists who screamed so loud in Philadelphia and New York are accepting the protection of the very constitutional guaranties that they aim to abolish. Let us ask ourselves this question, and answer it fairly: Can anyone, Communist or otherwise, accept protection of constitutional guaranties and claim, or be permitted, the right to advocate the overthrow of our Government by force, the right to destroy our system and our liberties? The Southern States, during the War Between the States, did not attempt this; they seceded and adopted another constitution. They refused to become traitors. The American Colonies also declared their independence of England before embarking upon the American Revolution.

No one can endeavor to destroy his government and continue to accept its protection without becoming a traitor. Any American who subscribes to the Communist theory of overthrow by force and violence becomes a traitor to his Nation. And any American who gives the Communist Party his support and sympathy in word or in deed is in effect giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States. No person can hold a membership card in the Communist Party and remain a loyal American. Listen to the words of the head of the Communist Party in America, now under indictment for subversive activity. William Z. Foster said:

> The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag. That is the Red flag. * * * The Red flag is the flag of the revolutionary class, and we are part of the revolutionary class, and all capitalist flags are flags of the capitalist class, and we owe no allegiance to them.

This is the same man who today seeks sanctuary behind the Constitution of the United States in order to indulge in treasonable utterances and actions against the Government of the United States.

The indictments in New York serve as a warning to the American people that communism is a real peril to the democracy of this Nation. Hundreds of foreign agents, most of them Reds, are operating in this country and have infiltrated into important positions in our Federal Government. The Communist Party announced in 1945 that it had severed its connections with Moscow, but the recent indictments may be expected to reveal that the party is just as obedient as ever to Soviet Russia and that its political activities in the United States are only a false front.

As necessary as it is to expose these 12 leaders as the heart of the Communist conspiracy, it is equally essential that we expose all those members who operate secretly in labor, government, and other agencies. With the ever-present danger of war, we are fostering a great national tragedy—another Pearl Harbor—when we permit Communists, in and out of our Government, to formulate plans for sabotage. We must also determine to what extent the United Nations has been used as a gateway into this country by Communist espionage agents from Russia and other foreign nations.

The American people owe a profound debt of gratitude to our Department of Justice for bringing indictment against the leaders of the most dangerous gang in America today. Also deserving a word of commendation is the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which has gone courageously ahead with its task of smoking the Red rats out of their holes. Any organization that is primarily loyal to a foreign power which is constantly professing hostility toward America deserves exposure. It is now a matter of positive proof that the Communist Party has been and is now engaged in secret and conspiratorial activities within our borders. It is the height of folly for a free government to tolerate movements which are directed toward the violent destruction of democracy.

If such a movement were weak and ineffectual, it might be safely ignored. But the Communist Party is neither weak nor ineffectual. The fact that the Communist Party in the United States claims only 100,000 members should not lull us into a sense of complacency. J. Edgar Hoover has stated:

> I would not be concerned if we were dealing with only 100,000 Communists. The Communists themselves boast that for every party member there are 10 others ready to do the party's work. These include their satellites, their fellow travelers, and their so-called progressive and phony liberal allies. They have maneuvered themselves into positions where a few Communists control the destinies of hundreds.

This fact is apparent from the recent convention of the so-called Progressive Party. The Communists and fellow travelers who dominated the Progressive Party Convention at Philadelphia succeeded in writing a complete Soviet platform, with its undisguised appeasement policy toward Soviet Russia. The foreign policy of the new party might easily have been written in Moscow by Stalin himself. It commits us to get out of Berlin with our troops, out of Europe with our dollars, and let the Soviet Union take over the Old World.

In its domestic program, the Progressive Party platform promises all things to all men, but its chief emphasis is on regimenting the American people and socializing American industry. It is significant that the secretary of the platform committee at the Wallace convention was former CIO General Counsel Lee Pressman, who has been named as one of the leaders of the Communist espionage ring in Washington. Mr. Pressman remained in the CIO until it became evident that the rank and file of the workers were ready to throw off the Communist shackles. Pressman jumped right into the third party movement and took with him hundreds of Communists and fellow travelers. When the Communists set out to gain control of an organization, they do not worry about numerical strength. In fact, they boast publicly that an organization with only 5 percent Communist membership is effectively in their control.

The important point to remember is that the Communists do not need to have a majority in order to rule. Communism achieves and maintains its power through greed, bribery, intimidation, and terror; through hatred, envy, jealousy, and through lying, misleading propaganda, based on the theory that the end justifies the means. Thus, under communism, the mass of the people become completely subservient to the dictatorship of the power-drunk few, as we have seen so clearly around this grief-stricken world.

We must concede, of course, that there are many members of the new party who are not Communists, who are indeed opponents to Communists. With them, the Progressive Party is intended as a means of obtaining new legislation, along the lines provided for in the Constitution. But that is not the purpose of the Communists who control the Progressive Party. Their purpose is to use that party as an instrument of revolution. This fact should be borne in mind by Americans interested in the Wallace movement. They should not permit themselves to be deceived by the Communists. By associating themselves with this movement they become mere tools of the Kremlin.

Communism is opposed to every ideal that America stands for. It is opposed to family life as it exists among religious people. It is opposed to religion in any form. It openly advocates the destruction of religion. It is opposed to freedom of speech and the press. It is opposed to the right of trial by jury. It stands for the confiscation of property. It is opposed to personal liberty in every form. It is pledged to foment class and racial antagonism. Here in the South it is the object of the Communist Party to create racial violence under the hypocritical guise of civil rights.

The time has come to deal forcefully with foreign agents and home-grown traitors. If America is to remain strong and free, we must protect ourselves from the enemy within our gates. America stands today as the sole sentinel of freedom of the individual, the sole champion of freedom of speech and press, the sole land of individual opportunity. America stands alone in a world that is being engulfed by Godless and tyrannical communism that enslaves the body and the soul of men. It is our solemn responsibility to resist the Soviet Union's insatiable lust for world domination. We are a tolerant people, but we can no longer tolerate treachery in the land of the free.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including, in addition to my own remarks, a letter I received from a woman in my district, pleading with me and all of the Members of Congress to do something to make it possible for her to get food and clothing for herself, her three children, and her 80-year-old grandparent, whom she has to support.

This woman works in a mill 40 hours a week at 60 cents an hour. On this $24 a week, she has to support her three children and her grandparent. In order to try to make ends meet, she has to do family washings at night, and has to do the cooking for her family. But let her letter speak for her—for her family—and for the millions of people similarly situated all over America. It is a touching and dramatic appeal to all of us. As this woman says, an increase of 5 or 10 cents an hour would help. How can we afford to adjourn without acting upon the bill which proposes to increase the minimum wage to 75 cents per hour? And how can we fail to do something effective to control prices?

> MARIETTA, GA., *August 3, 1948.*
>
> Mr. HENDERSON LANHAM.
>
> DEAR SIR: Will you please, Mr. LANHAM, see what you can do not only for my benefit, but thousands in the same predicament?
>
> I am a widow with three children, ages 6, 8½ and 11 years, and my 80-year-old grandparent to support.
>
> I work in a mill 40 hours a week at 60 cents an hour, which gives me but $24, and have to do family washes nights to make ends meet.
>
> The children are not fed enough of what they should have. I cannot afford meat, milk, and few vegetables. We use canned goods. Oh, if you can be of help in getting a higher wage it would help us and others so much. People who are even getting $30 and $75 a week I hear complain; but, sir, 5 or 10 cents an hour more would be a godsend in my case.
>
> With clothes, food, rent $30 a month and other expenses, it takes more than I can earn. I have even gone without rather than hear the children say, "I'm hungry mama," before I tuck them in bed.
>
> Please, kind sir, do all you gentlemen can to help me and others. God will reward you for it, I know.
>
> With winter so near and coal to buy, and school clothes for the children, it must come off our table or appeal to welfare.
>
> Thank you all so much.
>
> A worried mother,
>
> MRS. CLARA STEWART.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by him last night.

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Americans for Democratic Action, Baltimore branch.

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUILDINGS FOR MILITARY RESERVES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a measure to provide national defense buildings for the use of the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States.

The armory construction program, by which States and communities have provided facilities for the National Guard is well known to the public. Of less general public knowledge is the Naval Reserve armory program under which the Federal Government provides training facilities for naval units.

These are insufficient to meet the needs for the expanded Reserve of the present day. It is not possible for the local communities to pay the cost of additional armory construction needed for guard and Army Reserve activities. There is an added weakness of costly inefficiency in the present program, in that it encourages the construction of armories for the different services side by side in the same town.

The National Guard has long since outgrown its historic function as a State force. Other Reserve units are entirely Federal in scope. In consequence my bill proposes to relieve State and local communities of the expense of armory construction.

It is my belief that a common armory can be shared by all Reserve components in a community and by the recruiting officers of the various services. Generally but 1 night's training is required of a Reserve unit each week. This will permit common use of the drill floor. Separate offices and supply rooms should be provided for the separate Reserve components. Use as a community center during other periods will increase its value and popularize Reserve activities.

The Reserve, under the American system, is the most practical and inexpensive way of providing a backlog of trained men for defense in the event of a national emergency. One of the greatest remaining draw-backs to a strong Reserve is the lack of armories for training and study. The cost of a program of armory constructoin as outlined here would total at least half a billion dollars, but armories are long lived, and their construction would be extended over a period of years.

I realize that there is no likelihood of action on my proposal in this session; but I feel that it is sufficiently important to call it to the attention of the Congress and the public. I plan to reintroduce it at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances; in one, to include a statement from the Illinois Bankers Association giving their viewpoints against the bill passed yesterday; in another, to include a statement by the Midwest Manufacturers' Association pleading in behalf of small-business men.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] may be granted leave of absence for today and tomorrow on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may proceed for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today, after the expiration of any other special orders that may have been entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ON JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, before the Taft-Hartley Act, A. F. of L. unions were free to fight each other or fight with the CIO or vice versa. So far as the Wagner Act was concerned, the public was apparently expected to wait until one union licked the other. If at the end of that time the employer was still in business, production was to be resumed.

A particularly violent and drawn-out jurisdictional dispute waged in the Hollywood studios for approximately 2 years. This dispute concerned two A. F. of L. unions, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners and the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Motion Picture Machine Operators. The fight—and it was that—was over the question of who should do the carpenter work in the Hollywood studios. A member of the carpenters' union involved in this dispute testified before Congress when the Taft-Hartley Act was being considered, as follows:

Gentlemen, it has been proven that Congress is the only place that we can go now to get relief, because there is an absolute stalemate. The executive council of the American Federation of Labor is unable to this day and has been unable to this day to enforce its own decision.

What the Taft-Hartley Act does: Section 10 (k) provides that in jurisdictional disputes between locals of an international union or between different unions, the NLRB shall hear and determine the dispute, unless within 10 days the parties to such dispute submit satisfactory evidence that they have voluntarily adjusted the dispute. The decision of the Board is enforceable by the Federal courts.

The practical result is that in many cases the parties themselves are amicably settling these disputes.

For example, the building and construction industry for many years was plagued with these disputes and stoppages arising out of them. However, on May 1, 1948, as a direct result of the Taft-Hartley Act, and under the guidance of the general counsel of the Labor Board, an agreement was signed by the building trades department of the American Federation of Labor and various contractors' associations throughout the country setting up a board called the National Joint Board for the Settlement of Jurisdictional Disputes in the Building and Construction Industry. This board, as its name implies, was established for the settlement of jurisdictional disputes in that industry.

To date the Board has had approximately 45 disputes referred to it for decision. All its decisions have been honored and in no case have work stoppages continued while a dispute was pending before the Board or after settlement of the dispute. In a few cases work stoppages had taken place before the disputes were referred to the Board, but these stoppages ended as scon as the Board took jurisdiction.

A case that took place in Minnesota late last fall, a few months after the act became effective, further illustrates the effectiveness of section 10 (k). The Northern States Power Co., which supplies St. Paul with gas, was converting to natural gas. The company had a contract with IBEW, but the conversion required the hiring of additional, temporary employees. The pipefitters and plumbers demanded the work and IBEW insisted on its contract for all employees. It was submitted to William Green, president of the A. F. of L., who ruled in favor of IBEW, but the two craft unions would not recognize his decision. Minnesota has a jurisdictional strike law and the Governor appointed an arbitrator who after a long investigation decided in favor of IBEW. The crafts did not think any more of his decision than they did of Mr. Green's. The work could not be started—winter was approaching and the artificial gas would be supplied only for a short time. The Governor appointed a fact-finding commission, which again came to the same decision. The State went to court to enforce the arbitrator's award and was met with an injunction obtained by the union. Finally, the company filed a charge with NLRB. Attorneys for the Labor Board were sent to Minnesota with authority to obtain a Federal court injunction and in 3 days the case was settled with the company free to hire whom it chose and the unions free to attempt to secure their membership.

Figures compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that jurisdictional strikes have declined since the act took effect.

Work stoppages caused by jurisdictional disputes in all industry

	Number of stoppages	Number of workers involved	Man-days idle
First half of 1947	25	16,320	566,000
Second half of 1947	27	2,840	72,000

Thus, during the first 6 months after the pasage of the Taft-Hartley Act, the number of man-days lost because of jurisdictional disputes was approximately one-eighth of the number lost during the last 6 months before the passage of the act. Of the 15,000 workers reported by BLS to be on strike in the building and construction industry in June of 1948, none were reported to be out because of jurisdictional controversies.

In short, the Taft-Hartley law has teeth in it to stop these jurisdictional strikes. But the teeth have not been used often; instead, their very presence has led parties to adjust these disputes themselves, peacefully and with a minimum loss of production. The building trades are to be congratulated for their cooperation in stopping jurisdictional disputes.

THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS AND THE FARMER

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the constructive agricultural program enacted by the Eightieth Congress should be widely acclaimed and strongly supported by the farmers of America. Following is a list of major accomplishments taken by this Congress in each of several fields that are of concern to the farmers of the Nation and to the consumers who depend upon them for food and produce.

SOIL CONSERVATION

The Eightieth Congress has been thoroughly aware of the necessity for real soil conservation in the United States. Early in the first session, hearings on a long-range agricultural policy were started by both the House and Senate, and one of the first conclusions reached by those committees was that soil conservation must be the keystone and No. 1 objective of any sound, long-range agricultural policy.

Before the war, erosion was making heavy inroads on our soil and during the war we further seriously depleted our agricultural lands in attempting to feed the people of the world. The need to repair the damage is obvious, and the Eightieth Congress has met this need by appropriating more than half a billion dollars for soil-conservation activities for American farms.

I am happy to report to my constituents that I was successful in obtaining authorization and funds for many deserving flood-control projects in the Seventh Indiana Congressional District during the Eightieth Congress, which will materially aid in combating soil erosion in the affected areas.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

The Eightieth Congress has provided more generously for rural electrification than any other Congress in history. I should like to point out that this commendable program of furnishing electricity to our farmers is carried on without any burden upon the American taxpayer. The Government actually borrows the money that is loaned to the Rural Electrification Administration and pays interest thereon. That money, in turn, is loaned by REA to the various cooperatives who pay the Government an interest rate slightly above the rate the Government pays. Therefore, any contention that the program is subsidized by the taxpayer is incorrect.

During this Congress, $800,000,000 in loan authorizations has been provided for the extension of REA electric lines, and as the result of these generous appropriations, electricity was extended to 400,000 farm homes during the past fiscal year. This is more than double the record in any prewar year, and an even greater number of farm homes are scheduled to receive electricity during the 1949 fiscal year.

We Congressmen representing agriculture sections of the country believe that the program of the REA is one of the most important features incorporated in the Department of Agriculture. Electric service has brought comfort and pleasure to our farmers besides providing a more efficient method for them to perform their duties. This fine program must go on without interruption until electricity is made available to every farm in America.

LONG-RANGE PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Of vital concern to both farmers and consumers was the enactment by the Eightieth Congress of farm price-support legislation geared not only to the present emergency demand for food exports but to the long-range welfare of both consumers and producers.

The price-support bill passed by Congress combines the temporary incentives necessary to secure all-out farm production through the 1949 crop year with a long-range price support program for future years designed to provide an abundance of agricultural products for American consumers and to protect both producers and consumers against unstabilized agricultural prices. The program for supporting the price of leading agricultural products on a 90 percent of parity basis has been extended for 2 years. Beginning January 1, 1950, the provisions of the long-range price-support program will go into effect. These include a general revision of the parity formula to take into consideration the shifting costs of agricultural production, changes in the pattern of consumption, and other factors.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

One of the outstanding long-range contributions to agricultural stability was adoption by the Eightieth Congress of a permanent charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Because of its permanent status, the Corporation will provide a continuity of action in support of the farm economy that has not been possible under programs operating merely on a year-to-year basis.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

One of the most dreaded of all animal diseases—foot-and-mouth disease—has been reported raging in Mexico since late in 1946, and has threatened to spread to the United States. Its spread to this country would have caused billions of dollars of loss to livestock farmers, the halting of interstate shipments of livestock, packing plants would be forced to suspend operations, and, perhaps most important of all, breeding stock probably would become infected with the disease resulting in a shortage of meat for years to come.

The Eightieth Congress took prompt action to combat the disease by granting permission for the Department of Agriculture to work with the Mexican Government in an all-out effort to stop its spread, and the Congress appropriated adequate funds to carry out the work in Mexico. Funds have also been provided to strengthen the patrol on the Mexico-United States border, and the establishment of a laboratory to engage in research on foot-and-mouth disease has been authorized.

PROTECTION AGAINST PESTS AND DISEASES

Diseases of plants and animals, that are a threat to both farmers and consumers, have been promptly attacked by this Congress. Authority and ample appropriations were provided for fighting—in addition to the foot-and-mouth disease—for the eradication of cattle grubs, the new threat of the golden nematode disease in potatoes and tomatoes, for added safeguards against the importation of pests and diseases of shrubs and small plants, and for concerted action against pests and diseases in our forests.

RURAL ROADS

Realizing the necessity of good farm-to-market roads for modern motorized farming, the greatest rural road-building program ever undertaken cooperatively by the Federal and State Governments is scheduled for the next 3 years under legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress.

SUGAR

When the Eightieth Congress convened, sugar was still rationed in the United States. One of the first acts of the House Committee on Agriculture was to appoint a special subcommittee to survey the sugar situation. That committee found that there was an adequate supply of sugar to meet domestic needs. It recommended the immediate liberalization of both household and industrialist rations and their removal if supplies turned out to be as adequate as they appeared from the committee's survey.

The committee also recommended that the Secretary of Agriculture take every step possible to secure more abundant sugar production in the United States and its Territories during 1947 and 1948. Specifically, it suggested that acreage quotas should continue to be suspended and that no restriction whatever should be placed upon domestic production during those years.

Following the recommendation of the committee, sugar rationing to household

users was discontinued, and allocations to industrial users were dropped a few months later.

A Sugar Act was passed by the Eightieth Congress to assure consumers an adequate supply of sugar at reasonable prices, and to assure American farmers producing sugar that they will have an equitable share of the American market.

SHORTAGES

The postwar period has revealed a great and serious shortage of farm equipment and other items that are essential to the farmer in his work. Congressional committees through investigations have brought some measure of relief to farmers in their demand for farm machinery, fertilizer, and so forth. For instance, investigations have disclosed that shipments of farm machinery to Europe under the relief program were not based on practical surveys of the quantity of machinery which was actually needed. As a result, farm machinery scheduled for export was reduced about 25 percent.

I have taken a personal stand of consistently opposing exports of fertilizer, farm machinery, trucks, and all supplies in short demand, badly needed by the farmer.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

The Eightieth Congress increased funds above those requested by the President for the school-lunch program. Thereby, the program which provides balanced meals for our hungry and undernourished school children, and an outlet for surplus farm supplies, may be extended.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments I have listed above are by no means a complete record of the Eightieth Congress with relation to agriculture. There are many, many more outstanding phases of the program that will add to the welfare of farm families and the improvement of farm living conditions. For example, the Eightieth Congress has revised and set up the crop-insurance program on a sound long-range basis; improvements have been made in the administration and operation of marketing agreements and in laws relating to farm labor, the national forests, the tenant-purchase program, and other fields of agriculture. Of particular importance to the farmer should be the fact that both Agriculture Committees in Congress have had extended and comprehensive hearings on a long-range program which have given individual farmers in every part of the country an opportunity to personally testify and present his views as to the kind of a program that should be adopted for agriculture. No Congress in history has been better informed of the farmers' wants in a long-range program and the information advanced by the farmers themselves will continue to guide the Congress in future consideration of farm legislation and policy.

Since my congressional district is largely an agricultural district, I am personally very much interested in agriculture. As a member of the Republican Food Study Committee, I have taken great interest and followed very closely the work of our Agriculture Committees. Needless to say, I have aggressively supported the sound program these committees in Congress have offered the American farmer.

Mr. Speaker, it has always been my conviction that prosperity begins on the farm. Unless the farmers are prosperous, industry cannot be prosperous, labor cannot be prosperous, nobody can be prosperous. This Nation and the entire world are looking to the American farmer for necessities of life—food, raw materials for clothing, shelter, fuel, and so forth—which will ultimately assure health, happiness, and everlasting world peace. I shall continue to actively and earnestly work for all proposals that would benefit the American farmer and do my very best to serve him in Congress.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Truman said in his speech of acceptance that the Eightieth Congress had taken social-security benefits away from 750,000 persons. Other New Dealers have made similar statements.

This is just not true.

The facts are these: The social-security law intended that employees and employers should each pay 1 percent of the employees' pay into a fund for the benefit of the employees, to be collected by the Treasury and administered by the Social Security Board.

The Board had of its own volition paid benefits to a number of persons who had not been considered as employees by their employers and who had not paid anything into the fund. In 1947 the Supreme Court decided that in order for a person to be entitled to social-security protection he must be an employee. Following this decision, the Treasury and the Social Security Board, now known as the Federal Security Agency, proceeded to issue a new regulation by which the Agency could exercise wide discretion as to who was to be considered an employee.

In order to prevent the enforcement of this regulation, the Eightieth Congress passed House Joint Resolution 296 which the President vetoed and which was promptly passed over his veto.

House Joint Resolution 296 states in specific language who shall be entitled to draw social-security benefits and prevents the Federal Security Agency from allowing benefits to persons who have not contributed to the fund. This resolution does not take social-security benefits from a single person. It even provides that those who had been illegally on the rolls should be permitted to stay on since many of them were aged persons.

The Eightieth Congress went further. This House passed a bill which would have given social-security protection to an additional 3,500,000 persons. This bill is pending in the Senate. The Eightieth Congress also passed a social-security bill increasing pensions of the aged, the blind, and dependent children to the extent of $184,000,000 per year.

So I repeat that the Eightieth Congress did not take social-security benefits from 750,000 persons. It only prevented the Federal Security Agency from usurping the functions of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD covering social-security protection.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances.

OUTLOOK FOR FUEL OIL

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been continuing its study of the condition of this country's fuel oil supply. Hearings have been held throughout the regular session and during the 2 weeks following the adjournment in June. The committee has received evidence from competent witnesses, from within the petroleum industry and from the departments of the Federal Government concerned with the problem. In view of the experiences of last winter the committee and its staff have made a determined effort to obtain the latest authentic information as to the possibility of any fuel shortage in the months ahead and particularly during the fall and winter heating season. The committee's schedule calls for a continuous study of this matter during the recess and it will make every effort to do everything within its power to prevent a recurrence of the conditions which prevailed in this country last winter.

Therefore, I think you will understand how concerned the members of this committee would be in connection with any prediction from an official source that another crisis is probable in terms of this country's fuel-oil supply. Yet, it was reported yesterday afternoon that during his press conference, the President stated that the Secretary of the Interior was preparing to submit a program dealing with the proper distribution of coal and heating oils and other fuels. The report of this conference also stated that a reporter then asked the President if he thought, in the absence of controls on fuel, that it would be possible to avert another crisis in the East this winter, and the President flatly said he did not.

I can assure you that every witness before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has testified that conditions as to the petroleum supply for the fall and winter are better than was the case last year. It is true that most of the witnesses expressed caution that the supply situation was still tight but certainly none of them predicted any anticipated crisis.

I think the record should be made clear and I want to report for your information and use certain excerpts from testimony before the committee the latter part of last June. Mr. Howard W. Page, executive assistant to the president of the Standard Oil Co., New Jersey, said:

Our estimates indicate that there will not be any over-all oil shortage during the coming year, barring war, disaster, or serious strikes. We do not think, however, that all instances of localized spot shortages can be avoided. Elimination of spot shortages can be achieved only when supply capacity and working stocks are appreciably higher in relation to demand than can be reasonably expected during the coming year.

Our definition of a spot shortage is a shortage which can be corrected promptly when it occurs. Spot shortages are annoying, they cause some inconvenience, but they are not symptoms of any over-all crisis. * * * However, if average supplies merely equal demand over the coming 9 months, local spot shortages should be infrequent and quickly corrected. Recent experience indicates that such balance can be achieved. There is even a possibility that average supplies will exceed the demand.

Mr. Max Ball, Director of the Oil and Gas Division, Department of the Interior, testified:

Assuming that the winter is no worse than the last winter was as to weather, that we have continued consumer conservation, at least as complete as we had last winter, and that we have no strikes in the oil business and no coal or railroad strikes, that we have no unexpected increases in military demand beyond those which the military has already foreshadowed, that the system of State coordinators is continued in operation through the winter and that, particularly, the voluntary plan under Public Law 395 on which we are now working is put into effect, then there will be little individual consumer hardship for want of oil.

There will still be some consumer hardship and considerable amount of industrial hardship for want of gas, particularly in the Middle West.

If too many of these things fail or go wrong, then there will be consumer hardship for want of oil, and even more hardship than I have indicated for want of gas.

You will recall that last winter one of the greatest sources of difficulty arose from the shortage of transportation. A committee of the National Petroleum Council recently reported that due to new construction the United States will have sufficient oil tankers to meet the demands for at least this coming year. Land transportation has also improved. There is one major pipe line in the Midwest now in operation and another is scheduled for completion in the near future. In this connection, I would like to submit a question by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] and the reply of Mr. Ball.

Mr. O'HARA. What is your general over-all prognosis for the coming winter, assuming that we have as severe a winter as we had last winter in the Middle West?

Mr. BALL. If we have as severe a winter as last year and if we can continue to have consumer conservation, I think that in the Middle West the situation will not be quite as tight, as far as supply is concerned, as it was last year. * * * There are two new big pipe lines into the Middle West from the Southwest. That is going to help materially not only in furnishing additional crude to the refineries in the Middle West, but of course that translated into production means that the available supply is going to be greater in the Middle West; and that is going to cut down on the need for tank cars.

There does appear to be a greater concern as to the availability of kerosene than as to other types of heating oil, but Mr. Ball testified that the country was far better prepared to meet the problem of local shortages because of the activities of all concerned. Mr. Ball further recommended the reactivation of the State fuel coordinators system which was so effective in many of our States last winter.

May I quote another brief excerpt from Mr. Ball's testimony in which he, too, emphasized the necessity of immediate approval of the voluntary agreement plan by the Attorney General.

Mr. HESELTON. Then we have no change, relatively speaking, in our situation; although we have more oil, we have more demand?

Mr. BALL. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. And consequently we are no better off than we were last June?

Mr. BALL. I think we are better off, chiefly in this respect: of course, we are better off with respect to gasoline, but as to fuel oil, next winter I think our chief betterment is in better preparation, that is assuming this voluntary plan is to go into effect and be implemented.

In that connection, it is a source of concern to many of us that final approval of this plan has not yet been given at the top level of the executive department.

Therefore, so far as our prospects as to fuel oil are concerned, it is difficult in the extreme to understand why the President should make such an alarming statement as he did yesterday afternoon. Certainly the people living in the East expect the most careful and conscientious kind of efforts on the part of representatives in their Government to prevent a recurrence of last winter's conditions. But I submit that the prospect of solving this problem is not advanced by what appears to have been a petulant political comment.

Let me deal briefly with this comment so far as coal is concerned. This morning's newspaper carried a dispatch headlining the decision of the Department of Commerce to abolish the coal export quota system on September first.

The newspaper account is as follows:

Because of improved world coal supplies, Secretary of Commerce Sawyer yesterday announced the dropping of the coal export quota system as of September 1.

Prospects are favorable, Sawyer said, that United States mines will be able to produce in coming months enough coal of all types for both domestic and foreign customers, particularly since overseas demand for American coal has greatly declined.

Although the tonnage allocations to foreign countries will be suspended at the end of this month, export licenses will be required for foreign shipment for the time being, the Secretary said.

However, he promised that as soon as the supply prospects for fall and winter heating are better established, the Department will study the possibility of eliminating coal export controls entirely.

I cannot reconcile the statement of the President with the statement of Secretary of Commerce Sawyer. I do not know what the President meant. I strongly suspect that he does not know. But certainly, instead of making an extemporaneous and alarming prophecy, it is his solemn duty to state fully any facts upon which he bases any such conclusion and to make immediately any further recommendations, if there are such, other than those which have been already submitted by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce.

Finally, in the interest of both accuracy and the full record, I wish to quote a portion of the full statement made by the Secretary of Commerce on August 4 before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency as to coal and petroleum. It is as follows:

COAL

Coal is the major source of energy for the world. The devastation accompanying the war greatly reduced the output of coal in Europe, and the United States Government has committed itself to supply the maximum amount of coal that it can afford to ship. Thus, rather than restricting the shipment of coal from this country, export controls on coal have operated to increase exports and direct them to areas of most urgent need.

The first quarter of 1948 witnessed an easing in the pressure of European demand on United States coal supplies. This development was due primarily to three factors: a relatively mild winter resulting in an improved stock position in Europe; increased coal production in Europe, and the reduced buying power of European countries. Output in the United Kingdom, Poland, and western Germany—which accounts for four-fifths of the combined production in Poland and western Europe—increased markedly during 1947, reaching 109,000,000 metric tons in the fourth quarter, compared with 95,000,000 in the corresponding period of 1946. Supplies in the importing countries of western Europe likewise increased substantially, approaching prewar levels for the group as a whole in the latter half of 1947.

Despite the rising trend of European coal production, exports from the United States are expected to play a vital role in the European recovery for some time. To meet the easing of demand, however, export controls were relaxed in recent months, and all ports were released from the country-by-country allocation system. Limitations have been retained on the total number of cargoes which can be cleared through the various ports, in order to prevent concentration of demand which would burden certain ports or coal supply areas.

PETROLEUM

The general petroleum situation has eased considerably since the severe shortages encountered last winter. Gasoline supply has been adequate to meet the sharply increased demands of summer driving, and no shortages of gasoline are anticipated, with the possible exception of spot shortages.

The improved petroleum situation has resulted from sharply increased output. Crude oil production reached an estimated 5,500,000 barrels a day in the second quarter of 1948, a 10-percent increase over the same period in 1947. Since gasoline, kerosene, and the light fuel oils are produced at about the same point in the refining process, the percentage of gasoline produced from a given amount of crude oil may be increased or decreased, with decrease or increase in the amount of light heating oils produced. Despite the decrease in the relative proportion of gasoline derived from crude during the past winter, total crude runs were so great that gasoline stocks rose sharply during the winter. Stocks of gasoline at the end of June of this year were about 15 percent above last year. Since consumption has increased by about 10 percent, however, the stock increase in relation to consumption has been slight.

Heating oil inventories have also risen, though at a less rapid rate than gasoline. Since demand for heating oils is largely a

function of the weather, only tentative forecasts can be made at the present time concerning the situation this coming winter, but the outlook for heating oils appears somewhat better than last year. Installation of oil burners has fallen off sharply because of heating oil price rises; the rate of installation during the first 4 months of 1948 was about 50 percent of the rate during the corresponding period of last year. If the weather is as severe as last year, the supply-requirements balance will be approximately the same, but the Nation is much better organized to handle the situation. If the winter is relatively mild, it is not expected that there will be any shortage of heating oils.

The operation of export controls has followed closely the changes in the supply situation. Since there were severe local shortages of heating oils during the winter, export quotas were sharply reduced during the first quarter of 1948. Exports of crude petroleum during this period represented less than 2 percent of total supply, compared with almost 6 percent prewar, and exports of the major refined products were reduced even more sharply. Despite the urgent requirements of other nations, exports of kerosene and gas oil and distillate were severely curtailed.

With the easing of demand for heating oils in the spring months, export quotas were increased for all products in the second quarter. Since demand for petroleum is continuing to rise, the Department of Commerce has adopted a very cautious policy in setting quotas. As a result, exports during the second quarter, while above the extremely low level of the first quarter, were substantially below exports during the second quarter of 1947.

As the United States is producing almost two-thirds of the world's petroleum output with less than one-third of the known reserves—and probably considerably less than one-third of the reserves still to be discovered—it is clear that the United States will become increasingly dependent upon foreign sources of crude oil. It is even more essential that the dependence of Europe and other areas upon the Western Hemisphere for petroleum supplies be reduced. At the present time, the Western Hemisphere is supplying roughly 75 to 80 percent of western Europe's import requirements, and the Middle East 20 to 25 percent. With the expansion of projects now under way in the Middle East, it is expected that these proportions will be reversed. Until this happens, it is of the utmost importance to maintain control of petroleum exports.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, this Congress provided for those export controls. I cannot in good faith say that the controls have been exercised soundly or effectively. But I can say that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is doing everything possible to insist on administration of the export control powers to carry out the congressional mandate of protection of our domestic economy against serious injury by reason of the Government's program of exports. Some improvement has resulted. It is imperative that more effective action should be taken immediately. I hope that the President will interest himself in that problem when he reexamines the advice given to him as to the condition of our fuel supply.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today following the special order heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next following the business on the Speaker's table and any special orders already entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and to include extraneous matter.

UN BUILDING IN NEW YORK

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to be certain that it is made clear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that an attempt was made yesterday, by the opponents of the bill providing for the so-called loan to construct a building for the UN in New York City, to obtain a roll-call vote on the measure and that this met with failure.

It was generally known among the Members that a deliberate effort was put forth to prevent a record vote. The fact should be known to the public because the action taken would seem to reveal considerable sentiment not altogether favorable to the proposition. It would appear that if the Congress were as heartily in favor of the project as the announced vote would seem to indicate, there should not have been any hesitancy on the part of its supporters to definitely put themselves on record.

It should also be recorded that extraordinary pressure was put upon the Members to vote for the bill. Except for this, the matter in all probability would not have been considered at this session, or if it had been, the result might have been different.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House that it is my understanding that discharge petition No. 6 on the Speaker's desk, which would bring to the floor of the House the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, needs very few more signatures to complete the required number.

I take this opportunity to note that fact to the membership.

I should also like at this time to bring out something the people across our Nation are talking about and asking questions: Why does not Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, the Republican nominee for President and leader of the Republican Party, speak up on the vital issues before this Congress? Governor Dewey is reported in the press to have said that one of the major issues of the 1948 political campaign was to be inflation. Why has not Governor Dewey spoken on this issue? Why has he not offered the people of the country—the people who are being most cruelly hurt by inflation—the benefit of his views? If the Republican Presidential candidate is so concerned with inflation why has not he assumed the powers of his leadership to direct his party in Congress to take immediate and positive steps to halt this inflationary trend?

Is the answer, I ask, that Governor Dewey has abdicated leadership of the Republican Party in favor of the MARTINS, the WOLCOTTS, the TABERS, and the HALLECKS?

President Truman said quite correctly that high prices will not recess for the elections. Contrast that statement with Governor Dewey's weak lament that it was "cruel and inhuman treatment to call Congress back into session."

I say it will be "cruel and inhuman" treatment of the American people if we, the Congress, adjourn before enacting a strong anti-inflation law and a law to give our homeless veterans decent homes.

URANIUM MATERIAL FURNISHED TO RUSSIA

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the morning session of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I expressed concern and disgust over the manner in which our Government in the past had coddled the Soviet Union and had permitted that country's agents to infiltrate our Government. I brought out for the first time that as early as 1943, the Russians were able to obtain from us vital uranium compounds which were essential to atomic research. I said they obtained this as a result of pressure of the highest kind. I reiterate this statement, but to illustrate how hard and difficult it is to get the facts before the people of America, let me now cite a prime example of the type of double talk and cover-up which we encounter every time we attempt to expose the sinister activities of the Russian agents in this country. In the New York Times this morning there is an article which states as follows:

In the meantime a former associate of General Groves asserted yesterday that anyone at all familiar with the nature of the atomic project must seriously question the accuracy of Mr. McDOWELL's information.

In the first place, he said a distinction must be made between uranium compound and purified uranium metal. Uranium compounds cannot be used for atomic-energy work. Furthermore, such compounds are available everywhere, including Russia, and sold before the war for as little as $3 a pound. It is, therefore, absurd to believe that Russia had to bring tremendous pressure to obtain two shipments of 300 and 1,000 pounds of uranium compound, he added.

As for uranium metal, at the beginning of 1941, the total amount of the world's supply at the time was a few grams. The fact that this country succeeded in developing a process for purifying it was one of the war's most closely guarded secrets, as secret as the atomic-bomb project itself. We needed every bit of it, and more, for the atomic bomb, he said, and we could not have parted with any of it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to be premature regarding this important investigation which the Committee on Un-American Activities has been conducting and the incredible story which it will unravel to the Congress and the people in the near future, but I defy whoever this anonymous associate of General Groves is to identify himself and state publicly that the shipment on March 23, 1943, of 200 pounds of uranium oxide and 220 pounds of uranium nitrate which was furnished by the S. W. Shattuck Chemical Co., of Denver, Colo., and which was shipped directly to Col. A. N. Kotikov, of the Soviet Government Purchasing Commission, did not go. It was then transported by air from Great Falls, Mont., to Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, even though this vital atomic-research material got out of the country before even the Manhattan project knew about it, what is really pathetic is that we learn that 500 pounds of black uranium oxide and 500 pounds of uranium nitrate were shipped directly from Port Hope, Ontario, Canada, by the Canadian Radium & Uranium Corp., to Great Falls, Mont., United States of America, and then to the afore-mentioned Colonel Kotikov, and that our intelligence authorities, so far as we have been able to determine, did not even know that it had been flown out of the country. I say that it is time that all the facts are given to the public, and that is just what our committee proposes to do.

As further evidence of the appeasement policy and coddling of the Soviet Union by the United States of America, I call upon this anonymous associate of General Grove to deny the fact that uranium metal, of prime importance in the making of the bomb, was in fact sent to the Soviet Union in 1945 to appease them. I have the records and I have heard the testimony of over 30 people in connection with this, and I defy any of them to disprove this information.

After they got this last 1,000 pounds they came back and wanted 15 tons, but by that time somebody woke up, and so far as I know this order was not permitted to be filled.

AMERICA'S HOUR OF DESTINY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Sumner Welles has said:

This is the hour when the fate of western civilization is at stake. This is the American hour of destiny.

I agree with this statement. We have fought a great war and won the contest of arms but for 3 years we have been laboring unsuccessfully to win the peace and bring about stability and peace among the nations of the world. World War II left more than 400,000 dead and 670,000 wounded of our American boys who engaged in the great contest to bring about world peace. Over $330,000,000,000 were expended in the conflict. This was more than the combined expenditures of Britain and Russia. We now have a public debt which with contingent liabilities aggregates $430,000,000,000. With an interest charge on direct obligations of over $5,000,000,000, with some six billions for veterans and upward of thirteen billions for national defense, the Nation is facing a critical situation in its economic and fiscal affairs. The Congress, therefore, has been viewing with utmost care and scrutiny any long-range programs, regardless of their merits, which involve the expenditure of other billions of tax dollars. It is far more desirable to forego for the time being much needed reforms than to strain the financial structure of our Nation to the breaking point. Otherwise all that we have been fighting for in the preservation of the American way of life and free enterprise and democratic processes will have been lost.

We in the Congress realize the seriousness of the problems now facing the Nation with respect to inflation, the high cost of living and the lack of adequate housing for low-income groups, including many thousands of veterans. We also realize the responsibility resting upon the United States as a world nation to do its share in aid to foreign countries in an endeavor to bring stability and peace to the world and prevent the spreading of communism throughout Europe and eventually to the Western Hemisphere.

When the extraordinary session of the Congress was called by the President, informed observers were almost unanimous in the conclusion that it was a political move. However, I took the position when the Congress convened that regardless of the motives of the President when calling it, since the Congress was in session it should ignore any partisan political considerations and devote itself to the sincere consideration of every constructive measure upon which action could be taken which would help to prevent the further spread of inflation, curb the high cost of living, provide adequate housing for our low-income citizens, and give some measure of relief to the elderly citizens of the Nation. Furthermore, I took the position that we should remain in session if necessary, until Christmas to achieve these objectives.

We are facing a most serious and critical problem in our international relations and the President and our diplomatic representatives thus far have been unable to reach an accord with respect to unity of action in Germany. As Sumner Welles said, the shadows are lengthening. None of us can fail any longer to understand what the impending crisis signifies. The new world order that took shape only 3 years ago at San Francisco, in which millions had placed their faith and their hopes, seems to be dissolving like mist before the sun. The civilization of the west that has slowly and painfully struggled past milestones of Magna Carta, habeas corpus, the American Constitution, "liberty, equality, fraternity," and the Bill of Rights, is threatened with eclipse. The peoples who have so often proved that they valued freedom more than life itself face the grim prospect that the same ideology which they believed had been forever crushed by their victory over the Axis, and which proclaims that the sole destiny of many is to serve a ruthless oligarchy, may yet, under a new guise, succeed in obliterating man's hard-won liberties from the face of the earth.

The Eightieth Congress has faced more and greater problems than any other Congress in the history of the American Republic. While it has not enacted all legislation which is considered by many to be necessary for the best interests of the Nation, yet it has been a hard-working Congress and has enacted many laws in the interests of the Nation as a whole and its people and in the opinion of most informed and unprejudiced observers has done a good job.

In the foreign field it has, with utter disregard of partisan politics, joined with the Administration in carrying forward the program of the Administration and has been more than generous in providing funds to enable the nations of the Old World to rehabilitate themselves, restore their economy and become self-sustaining. I have been glad to participate in this program and to do whatever lay within my power to help bring the world back into balance and restore normal peaceful relationships throughout the world. I was happy, therefore, my colleagues, to receive recently from our beloved Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, a personal letter in which he said:

May I extend to you my warmest felicitations on your renomination for Congress. It was a tribute to the splendid service you have rendered your district and the country.

The Eightieth Congress has reduced extravagance in government; it has made material savings in the cost of government; it has reduced taxes and it has restored powers to the people taken away in previous Congresses. It has built for a strong America and an America which has discharged its obligations to the world. You have aided materially in this program and that your district appreciates your service is indicated in your renomination. * * * Working together in harmony we will build for a better America and a better world.

Mr. Speaker, with all the problems facing us and the unsettled state in the international fields and the inflationary spirals that are plaguing our Nation and the high cost of the necessities of life

which so many of our low-income citizens are unable to meet, nevertheless we do have much for which to be thankful. No nation, even with all the adversity facing us, enjoys greater prosperity than we do here in this great Republic. With 6 percent of the world's area and 7 percent of the world's population, we have 46 percent of its electric power, 48 percent of its radios, 54 percent of its telephones, 59 percent of its steel capacity, 60 percent of its life insurance policies, 85 percent of its automobiles, and 92 percent of modern bathtubs. We have the highest standard of living of any nation of the world. We still have freedom of action, and freedom of speech and religion and free enterprise.

Free enterprise has been defined to be distinctly the product of the Constitution of the United States. The right of representative government to determine the laws which protect the rights of freemen is the foundation upon which free enterprise is built. In conjunction with this right of representative government, we have an economic framework which gives the citizens of the United States the right to own and hold property against seizure either by government or by individuals. It gives the citizen the right to develop and own the resources of the Nation and to benefit from the production of new wealth. Free enterprise means the right to produce and to enjoy the full benefits and fruits of toil. Therein lies the incentive for the individual to forge ahead. Basically then, our economy rests on a foundation made up of individuals. As individuals prosper from the production of goods and services, in that ratio the Nation prospers. A good income to the individual automatically means a prosperous community, a prosperous State, and a prosperous Nation. Free enterprise is worth fighting for.

A fundamental concept of our free America is the right of every individual to own property. As Abraham Lincoln said:

> Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; it is a positive good in the world; that some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my party in asserting that one of today's major issues is between radicalism, regimentation, all-powerful bureaucracy, class exploitation, deficit spending, and machine politics, as against our belief in American freedom for the individual under just laws fairly administered for all, preservation of local home rule, efficiency and pay-as-you-go economy in government, and the protection of the American way of life against either Fascist or Communist trends.

We believe that genuine social and economic progress can be achieved only on those American constitutional principles and it is our purpose to give our citizens this clean-cut choice.

I have been glad during my service in the Congress to have given full support to the program of my party to strike from the Nation's pay rolls all those individuals who are activated by foreign ideologies and principles subversive to the best interests of our own Nation. I have therefore joined with my colleagues in ridding from the Government service Communists and fellow travelers who would overthrow our Nation by force and destroy free enterprise as we know it under the American system and substitute in its place a totalitarian or police state where the individual would be subject to the control of a dictator. The committees of the Congress have unearthed and brought out in the open a spy ring which has permeated through many of the major departments of our Government, including the executive offices, Department of State, Department of Commerce, and the Treasury Department. Congress made available a large sum at the disposal of the President to inaugurate a loyalty program for the purpose of relieving from public office all subversive and communistic individuals. Unfortunately, as disclosed by the hearings of the congressional committees, the administration has not followed out the mandate of the Congress but has permitted such individuals to remain on the pay rolls and work their nefarious practices in securing secret records from Government offices and turning them over to Soviet Russian agents to be used against this country. The President has refused to cooperate with the Congress in ridding the Government of these disloyal employees and has even refused to make available to the committees the FBI's reports on their records. And worst of all there has been a continued, stubborn resistance by administration officials from the top down to a purge of Communist, "pinko," and other subversives from the Government household. This has been repeatedly demonstrated by hearings held by the committees of the Congress. There should be no place in our Government for such individuals. When the examinations and investigations now going forward have been completed every Government employee who is disloyal to our country or who espouses the doctrines of a foreign ideology and seeks to overthrow our Government by force should be summarily dismissed and brought to the bar of justice and punished.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the people of my district for their loyal support during my long tenure of office in the Congress of the United States. By reason of my length of service I am now the dean of the Oregon delegation and hold the record for length of service for the Third Oregon District. I have been happy to serve as a member of the Public Works Committee and as chairman of the Subcommittee of Rivers and Harbors, which is so important to the welfare of the great Northwest and to my own State of Oregon. I have been glad to take a part in the fight to reduce the high taxes which have burdened our people for so long, and to reduce the bloated cost of government, and to keep America solvent with full employment in private enterprise, with fair treatment for both labor and capital. I was glad to join with my colleagues in removing the wartime limitations, restrictions, and controls, believing that as soon as a right or liberty taken over by our Government can be restored to the people it should be done. There can be no justification for fastening regimentation or a police state upon the American people. Following out this objective, we forced the elimination of 76,000 Government rules, regulations, and orders that were blocking our transition from a wartime economy to peace.

Almost a third of the average income dollar is now taken to support the Government, both national and local, which is a heavy burden upon our people. The present high cost of Government means that the person working on the average of 40 hours a week is working 10 hours to support the Government and 30 hours to support his family. This administration and its predecessor have consistently followed a plan of wasteful spending which is characterized by the phrase "tax and tax, spend and spend." This is clearly brought to view by consideration of the costs of the Government in preceding years as compared with those of this spending era. In 1927 the total costs of Government were $2,761,000,000. In 1937 they were $8,177,000,000, and in 1947, a peacetime year, they reached $42,505,000,000. No nation can continue to make such profligate expenditures and hope to remain solvent. I have consistently fought to reduce the tax burden and prevent the waste of tax dollars, to reduce the public debt, and to balance the national budget, and to keep the expenditures of the Government within tax income.

I supported the Republican bill for tax relief which was vetoed by the President three times and was passed over his veto in the House by a vote of 311 to 88. Under this bill 71 percent of the $4,800,000,000 in tax relief provided, goes to persons with incomes of less than $5,000 a year. About 7,400,000 taxpayers in the lowest brackets no longer have to pay any income tax. Percentage tax reductions range from 12.6 in the lower brackets down to 5 percent in the top brackets. Husbands and wives are permitted to split their income for tax purposes, thereby lightening the family tax burden and eliminating discrimination against citizens of many States. An additional $600 tax exemption is granted to taxpayers who are over 65 years of age and for the blind there is also an additional $600 exemption. This is practical and real social security relief which I was glad to support.

The Republican Congress also passed over the President's veto a bill increasing payments by $5 per month for the needy aged and the blind, and increasing payments by $3 per month for each dependent child, thereby adding $184,000,000 annually to social security payments received by 3,500,000 dependent children, the aged and the blind.

For the first time in 14 years the Federal budget has now been balanced and it is significant that it was balanced for the first time when the Republicans took over the Congress. I believe that all profligate spending should be eliminated and that foreign aid should provide only a springboard for self-help and not a wheel chair for permanent doles.

I have been glad to have had a part in the Eightieth Congress in passing the many laws for the benefit and welfare of the veterans and their dependents. A grateful Nation demands that those who fought in its defense, their widows, and orphans must never be forgotten. The best medical care and rehabilitation, education, and training for all desiring it, and efficient assistance in securing homes, farms, businesses, and real jobs must be provided for the veteran. I have joined with my party in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses in fulfilling the foregoing objectives. The Eightieth Congress enacted 188 laws directly benefiting war veterans and meeting a wide range of needs.

We passed a measure authorizing financial assistance to disabled veterans in the construction of specially designed homes for veterans paralyzed from the waist down, with 50 percent of the construction costs to be borne by the Government. We also provided special-type automobiles for amputees and a bill to cash immediately the terminal-leave bonds of enlisted men, which was done over the protest of the President, and the Secretary of the Treasury. This was in keeping with a similar provision for officers which had not been extended by the administration to GI's. We also increased the allowances for veterans and their dependents and for schooling and training to compensate them for the loss of educational opportunities while fighting for their country. We also enacted a number of laws providing for long-term, low-interest-bearing loans and other rights to veterans, to enable them to secure housing for themselves and families, giving them preference over all others; and we in this extraordinary session have passed in the House additional legislation for the strengthening of the laws for the benefit of veterans' home building. As a result of the building program inaugurated by the Republican Congress, over a million housing units will have been constructed in 1948, which is a record construction program exceeding the high period of 1925. In 1946 under New Deal confusion and inefficiency 437,800 dwelling units were completed. In 1947 under Republican free enterprise 835,100 units were completed. Even with this record, I am strongly of the opinion that we should enact any additional laws which will enable not only veterans but other low-income groups to acquire homes within the reach of their incomes, either by purchase or rental, and I have consistently supported legislation to that end.

I have been happy to have taken a leading part in the fight waged in the Congress for the amendment of our social-security laws whereby our aged citizens would receive adequate annuities to take care of their needs in their old age, particularly in these days of high living costs. I have been happy to support the program of my party for the ending of appeasement and double talk in national affairs and for a 100-percent national defense for the protection of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, coming from the great Northwest as I do, I have been deeply interested during my service in Congress in the development of the natural resources of the Nation, and particularly the Columbia River basin. As a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and later the Public Works Committee, I have been glad to work early and late for the development of these great natural resources, including navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, reclamation, and irrigation. The welfare of the West is dependent upon the full utilization of these resources, and I am glad to state that the Eightieth Congress has been most generous in providing necessary funds for these great projects. President Truman, by an order issued in August 1946, froze much of the funds for this great internal improvement program that the Congress had appropriated, which effectively stymied the construction program. This Republican-controlled Congress, however, has appropriated more money for reclamation than any previous Congress—$389,804,000. Likewise it has made record appropriations for river and harbor improvements of $285,500,000 and for flood control $712,063,000, all of which are vitally essential to the development of these great resources and the expansion of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, during the primary campaign in my congressional district I made a pledge to my people to continue to fight for the principles I have enunciated herein. I want publicly here to renew that pledge. I will fight for the aged, blind, handicapped, and veterans and the development of Oregon's great natural resources—Columbia River, reclamation, hydropower, agriculture, industry, and for free enterprise and against bureaucratic controls, deficit spending, inflation, and high living costs. I will continue to fight to oust the spendthrifts and Communists from Government, reduce war taxes and exorbitant Government costs which are bleeding taxpayers white, stifling production, and dragging America into bankruptcy. I will oppose all profligate spending at home and abroad, believing that foreign aid should provide only a springboard for self-help and not a wheel chair for permanent doles. Let us end appeasement and double talk and maintain 100 percent national defense.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, in these days of great stress and strain, when the welfare of our Nation hangs in the balance and when many subversive interests are boring from within and endeavoring to destroy the cherished liberties of America, it is an appropriate time for all of us to renew again our vows of loyalty to our country and to remind ourselves that spiritual understanding is as important as political wisdom and that we must eschew intolerance, racial and political prejudices, and work together in unison for the preservation of our Nation. We cannot too often make known our allegiance by redcdicating ourselves to the principles set forth in the American's Creed:

> I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrified their lives and fortunes.
>
> I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, may I ask the majority leader if he can tell us the program for the remainder of this week and next week?

Mr. HALLECK. I am not in position to say definitely what the program will be at this time. There are some special orders on the desk, which will be disposed of; then it is possible, under the unanimous-consent request obtained a few moments ago, for a recess to be declared by the Chair with a view to determining what further may be done today.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is for today?

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. RAYBURN. Not for tomorrow or next week?

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. I cannot say what will be brought up for consideration tomorrow. That will be subject to determination.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I notice in this morning's Washington Post that Governor Dewey, the standard bearer of the Republican Party, has pressed a committee of the other body to bring out an amended DP bill. I want to commend Governor Dewey for this effort on his part to get out a fair displaced-persons bill in place of the iniquitous measure that was passed in the last session of the Congress.

Now that he has come out into the open and taken a stand on the Displaced Persons Act I hope he will also take a stand on the housing and inflation programs which face the Eightieth Congress and I hope that he will intercede with his friends on the Republican side of the House and indicate his wishes as to their action on housing and inflation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

GOVERNOR THURMOND MAY BE THE NEXT PRESIDENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely probable that Governor Thurmond, of South Carolina, may be the next President of the United States.

It looks now as if no candidate will get a majority of the electoral votes. In that event the election will be thrown into the House of Representatives; then under the Constitution each State will have one vote and the contest will be limited to the three candidates receiving the highest number of electoral votes.

If Governor Thurmond, Governor Dewey, and President Truman are the three leading candidates, and nobody gets a majority in the House on the first ballot, the chances are that Governor Thurmond will be elected, for the very simple reason that every Republican would rather have Governor Thurmond than President Truman, and every real Democrat would rather have Governor Thurmond than Mr. Dewey.

Governor Thurmond is running on a real American platform. He is running for President of the United States of America, and not for President of Israel, or Akhoond of Africa.

The gentleman from California a moment ago undertook to defend Governor Dewey for asking us to throw wide open the gates of immigration to alleged displaced persons.

That would mean the flooding of this country with more aliens, many of whom would bring with them communism, atheism, anarchy, and infidelity. We have too many of that kind in this country now. I should like for us to ship them out of the country.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] undertook to tell the House a while ago that if Governor Dewey were elected President he would clean the Communists out of Washington. He overlooks the fact that Governor Dewey through the FEPC law in New York has dug a veritable storm cellar for every Communist in America who wants to go there and seek employment.

Under that New York law, which Governor Dewey signed with 22 pens, and the regulations under it, one cannot ask a man in New York "what his name was before it was changed, by court order or otherwise," when he applies for employment.

You cannot tell him that the organization with which he is seeking employment observes the Fourth of July.

You cannot ask him where he was during the First World War, from 1917 to 1919.

You cannot ask him what his wife's name was, although he may have married a Russian spy.

You cannot ask him what organizations he belongs to in New York, although he may be a member of the Communist Party.

Governor Dewey's chief adviser at the other end of the Capitol has introduced this FEPC bill, and it is now before the Senate. If it should become a law, and the same regulations put into effect under it that are now in effect in the FEPC law in the State of New York, then Russia or any other foreign country could pack their spies into every defense plant and put one at the elbow of every businessman in America.

I am not so sure that Mr. Dewey would not bring those Communists with him who are now enjoying the storm cellar of the FEPC law in New York, instead of cleaning out the ones that are already here.

We will have no such crazy laws enacted if Governor Thurmond becomes President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's primary in Tennessee, a progressive and liberal Democratic candidate for governor, an ex-Member of this House and a former Governor of that State, Mr. Gordon Browning, received a tremendous majority, and our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. ESTES KEFAUVER, also a real progressive and liberal Democrat, received a great majority for the United States Senate. The size of their majority and the number of Democratic votes cast assures their election in November and indicates that the action of the people in Tennessee in voting for progressive Democratic candidates will be followed by the people in other States. Consequently, it appears to me that the viewpoint of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] with regard to his Presidential nominee is erroneous. I think the American people appreciate the great efforts made by President Truman, and I feel that all fair-minded and honest people, when realizing that he has done everything possible to relieve them of the existing intolerable conditions brought about by the unholy coalition and the Republican majority in Congress, will reelect him. The Dixiecrats will not have the opportunity to throw the election in the House as the gentleman from Mississippi predicts.

President Truman may not be perfect, and I do not claim that he is perfect. Everyone makes mistakes. I regret that I have not agreed with him on some matters where he has erroneously followed the suggestions or recommendations of some clever Republican leaders, including John Foster Dulles and Mr. Herbert Hoover, in which matters I feel he was unfortunately misled by them. But he has been sincere in this effort to bring about a reduction in the high cost of living and the construction of low-cost homes that veterans and people in the low-income brackets can afford to buy, and he has demonstrated that he has the interests of the American people at heart as compared to the legislative record of the Republicans in the Eightieth Congress who have placed the interest of wealth above human needs.

STICK TO THE FACTS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I respect the opinion of every Member of this House who has any objection to FEPC on either a local or national basis, provided only that he sticks to the facts. If you look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 11 and March 15 you will find that I placed in the RECORD at that time statistics which clearly show that under FEPC in New York State employment is up, business has increased, more business has come in and more new business enterprises undertaken. Only last week our labor department in the State of New York stated, "We have sufficient places in industry and on the farms of New York State to absorb another 50,000 people if they are admitted under the recently enacted displaced persons bill."

If that is punishment, it is the kind of punishment the country needs.

Get emotional about this problem, if you must, but stick to the facts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REPUBLICAN POLICY IN ASIA

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker—

If American policy had attained its manifest objectives in China * * * China would be Communist today. * * *

The executors of our war policy have been carrying on a public love affair with China's rebellious and autonomous Communists.

This is the judgment of the Roosevelt-Truman policy in Asia expressed by one of our foremost military heroes, Gen. Claire L. Chennault. The general knows the problem well. He has been in China since 1932 when he organized the legendary Flying Tigers to fight Japanese aggression. After the United States entered the war against Japan, General Chennault became this country's top aviation chief in Asia as commander of the Fourteenth United States Air Force. As the general himself put it:

I am a witness to the disastrous results of that policy today.

Because of the blunders made by the Democrat administration both during and after the war, all of Asia is today slipping behind the iron curtain of Soviet imperialism. Our supplies have armed Communist rebel armies in China and other countries. Our policymakers have lent their prestige to the Communists and have exerted pressure on the legitimate governments to give greater and greater privileges to the Moscow-trained agents of the Comintern.

The situation has become disastrously critical in China where the national government under the able leadership of President Chiang Kai-shek is forced to surrender one military position after another, because of the lack of the most elementary military equipment. On the other side, the Soviet Union has poured into Red China untold tons of equipment, much of it seized from the million-strong crack Kwantung army of the Japanese, as well as valuable technical and strategic assistance.

As long as China can maintain itself free of communism, the western democracies will have a 4,000-mile long border facing the Asiatic holdings of Russia from which to attack the Red Army by air in the event of conflict. Knowing the dangers of a two-front war, the masters of the Kremlin will not be inclined to attack Europe or the United States, if there is a powerful and independent China at their back door. Stalin is concentrating much of his effort in Asia while the Truman administration is trying to snare him in Europe by pouring billions of dollars into the support of Socialist nations.

While the nomination-hungry Truman administration is shadow-boxing with the Soviet Union in Europe—

Writes the authoritative Far Eastern News Letter—

the deadly agents of communism are snatching Asia from under our noses. Despite the warnings of some of our foremost national leaders—including General MacArthur, General Wedemeyer, Ambassador Bullitt, and Governor Dewey—the Government of the United States is permitting Asia to slip into Soviet hands by default.

Communist seizure of China would represent a distinct and imminent danger to the defenses of the United States. It would make possible the extension of Soviet control over all of the western Pacific area, thus completely outflanking our toehold in Korea and our military position in Japan. Without a free China, the United States must surrender its occupation of Japan at the whim of the Red army.

The American taxpayer—

Ambassador William Bullitt told the House Foreign Affairs Committee earlier this year—

could for a time pay enough to keep the Japanese alive and to support a large army in Japan to keep down the Communists—but not for long. Domination of China by the Communists would, therefore, lead to eventual Communist domination of Japan. China is the key to the entire Far East.

If our Government should permit the Communists to take over China it would have failed to bar the way to attack on our country by overwhelming masses of Stalin-driven slaves.

On the other side of the international ledger stands the firm and determined record of the Republican-led Eightieth Congress and of every major Republican leader, including Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Senator Robert A. Taft, and Senator Styles Bridges.

The Republican Party has advocated and enacted into law a new approach to the problems in Asia in line with its traditional policy of keeping the other side of the Pacific Ocean free of any potential aggressor who is a threat to the west coast of the United States.

For half a century American policy in the Far East has been a seesaw struggle between Republican firmness and Democratic appeasement of both Japan and Russia.

Just before the turn of the century, the great powers of Europe and Asia were beginning to make inroads on Chinese territory, taking for themselves strategic military and economic positions. France, Germany, Russia, and Japan were all set to parcel out China among themselves as a colonial empire. Realizing the danger of a potentially hostile coalition in Asia, Republican Secretary of State, John Hay, engaged in an exchange of notes with the powers for the purpose of preventing the partitioning of China and to protect American strategic and economic interests. Secretary Hay took the sound position that—

Whoever understands that mighty Empire socially, politically, economically, religiously, has a key to world politics for the next five centuries.

The result of his efforts was the crystallization in 1899, during the Administration of President McKinley, of the so-called open-door policy under which no nation was permitted to establish itself exclusively on Chinese territory. In its strategic sense, this position is the logical parallel to the Monroe Doctrine and to efforts to keep friendly nations in control of the Atlantic Coast of Europe.

The open door was the keystone of American policy under the succeeding Republican administrations and was instrumental in maintaining China, although weakened by internal disunity and century-long stagnation, as an independent political entity. During the early 1900's Japan and Russia were particularly interested in violating Chinese sovereignty. Their conflict over Asiatic territory finally erupted into the Russo-Japanese War. The Czar's navy was annihilated in the Straits of Shimonoseki and the Czar's army was decisively beaten on the battlefields of Manchuria.

Flushed by its victory over the supposedly formidable Russian military power, the Japanese tried to seize important territories on the Asiatic mainland. Again a Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, interceded and brought the two warring factions together at Portsmouth, N. H. His astute diplomacy and his unflinching adherence to the open-door policy finally forced the Japanese to give up much of the land that they had earmarked for conquest, thus preserving a safe balance of power in Asia.

Japan was not, however, willing to abandon its imperialist designs and kept pressing the United States for recognition of the fact that, because of her geographic position, she had special interests and special rights in the Chinese province of Manchuria. Secretary of State Knox, during the Taft administration, remarked dryly:

Why the Japanese need Manchuria any more than does China, who owns it now, or why it is any more vital to them than to China is not apparent.

The first abandonment of the open door came during the Democratic administration of President Wilson. After the beginning of World War I, the Japanese took advantage of American preoccupation with European problems to seize the strategic Shantung Peninsula of China and to force military and economic concessions from the Chinese Government. These inroads on China's sovereignty gave the Japanese a considerable advantage in east Asia over the United States and other nations.

After the surrender of the Central Powers, Chinese representatives at the Paris Peace Conference demanded the restoration of the lands seized from them at bayonet point. Despite the clear-cut violation of the open door President Wilson ignored these pleas. Encouraged by the attitude of the administration, the Japanese sent Viscount Ishii, as special emissary, to Washington to secure formal recognition of the "rape of Shantung" and agreement by the United States that Nippon had special rights in China beyond those of the other powers. It must be emphasized here that such demands had been consistently and firmly rejected by the United States Government for more than 20 years.

Yet, to the amazement of the entire civilized world, President Wilson's Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, not only recognized the Japanese conquests in violation of American policy, but, in an exchange of notes with Ishii, stated that—

The Government of the United States recognizes that Japan has special interests in China, particularly in the part to which her possessions are contiguous.

The sell-out of the open-door policy drew quick resentment from the Republican-controlled Congress, and, on August 11, 1919, Secretary Lansing was asked by Senator William Borah, of Idaho, and others, to explain how the Democratic administration could have permitted itself to be outwitted by the Japanese diplomat.

It is of particular significance that the 1919 agreement with Japan has all the earmarks of the 1945 Yalta agreement with Russia, both giving to a hostile power a blank check for imperialist adventures. World War II and the attack on Pearl Harbor were the logical results of permitting the Japanese to occupy strategic positions facing our west coast. If world war III should break out, it will be the result of the same kind of appeasement policy followed by the Roosevelt-Truman administrations.

In 1920, the Democratic administration was turned out by the biggest Republican landslide in history. The new Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes, worked

desperately to remedy the blunders of his predecessor. Although the Japanese could no longer be dislodged from their positions without military action, the American policy makers worked out a program of containing Japanese imperialism within its existing limits. At the Washington Peace Conference of 1922, Secretary Hughes—who later became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court—expressed strong disapproval over the continued presence of Nipponese troops in the vital port of Vladivostok. Sensing a new determination in Washington, the Japanese agreed to observe the open-door rule, and shortly thereafter withdrew their forces.

The next serious conflict in China erupted over Soviet invasion of Manchuria to seize the vital Chinese Eastern Railway in 1929. The Russian move was not only a violation of the open-door policy but was a flagrant breach of the Kellogg-Briand peace pact, which had been the great achievement of Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg, during President Coolidge's second term in office. Secretary of State Henry Stimson, who served under President Hoover, was greatly alarmed at the Soviet military activity and called for a conference of the powers in order to effect a peaceful solution. The Communist rulers of the Kremlin snubbed all attempts to secure their attendance although they were a party to the Kellogg-Briand peace treaty and went ahead with their imperialist designs. Despite the efforts of the United States, no action to halt the Soviet was taken.

INVASION OF MANCHURIA

Seeing the refusal of the powers to back the United States in any action to halt the Soviets, the Japanese Army brazenly moved into Manchuria in 1931, setting up the satellite state of Manchukuo under the deposed boy Emperor Pu-yi. Secretary Stimson immediately laid down a firm policy of nonrecognition of the puppet regime and set out to find a peaceful road for the return of the seized territory in conformance with the open-door policy. Unfortunately Stimson's work was interrupted by the elections of 1932 in which the Republican Party was defeated. To assure continuity of American foreign policy, regardless of internal political differences, both President Hoover and Secretary Stimson invited President-elect Franklin D. Roosevelt to participate in a bipartisan formulation of foreign affairs. It was soon found, however, that it was impossible to work in harmony with Franklin D. Roosevelt. His personality made any cooperative effort impossible and Mr. Hoover regretfully dropped his attempts at joint action.

With the Democratic administration in power, the United States embarked upon a 16-year period of appeasement of both Japan and Soviet Russia. The firm policy of Henry L. Stimson was dropped and valuable war materials, including oil and scrap iron, were shipped to Japan with the blessing of Washington. In the case of the Soviet Union, President Roosevelt abandoned the Republican nonrecognition policy of the outlaw Soviet Government and welcomed red Russia into the family of nations over the sharp protest of many loyal Americans.

These two steps: Strengthening of Japan and recognition of Soviet Russia, are the two basic reasons for World War II. They have created the principal difficulties now being encountered by the United States and the world in resisting Soviet imperialism and aggression. Both of these acts followed the footsteps of the Wilson administration 14 years earlier by bowing to the warlike designs of two major aggressor nations.

In the spring of 1933, the new Roosevelt policy became evident when the invasion of North China by the Japanese went by without protest from Washington. On September 29, Foreign Minister Koki Hirota announced that Japan would "establish an Asiatic Union comprising China, Japan, Manchukuo." Although this was a direct violation of the "open door," the Democratic-controlled State Department made no reply, uttered no opposition. Underlining its complete surrender to the Japanese pressure, the Administration recalled the Pacific battle fleet in November and ordered it to the Atlantic where there was no need for American battle wagons.

Then, in 1934, the Japanese Army was again on the move on Chinese soil. Instead of trying to stop this new aggression, the State Department engaged in an amiable exchange of notes with Tokyo, assuring the Japanese that "the American Government will be prepared to examine the position of Japan in a spirit of amity and of desire for peaceful and just settlement."

END OF OPEN DOOR

Spurred on by the friendship in Washington, the Japanese Foreign Ministry announced that Japan had the sole right to maintain peace and order in eastern Asia and that she would look with disfavor on any joint operations undertaken by foreign powers, even in the name of technical and financial assistance and would especially oppose supplying China with war planes, building airdromes in China, and detailing military advisers to China, or contracting a loan to provide funds for political use.

The open door which the Republican Party had guarded since 1899 was slammed shut a year after the Democratic administration took over.

During the next 3 years, while fighting continued on a small scale in China, the Japanese one by one denounced international peace agreements, including the Washington naval treaty. The policymakers in Washington looked on in bewilderment unable to cope with the problem.

On July 7, 1937, the Japanese launched a full-scale war in China, an operation which eventually carried them to Pearl Harbor. In a few weeks they had seized all of North China. In Washington, the administration delivered itself of a few feeble protests while continuing to supply the Japanese war machine with essential products. More than 50 percent of the war goods imported into Japan came from the United States.

On October 5, 1937, President Roosevelt, bowing to persistent public opinion, called for a quarantine on aggressor nations but still American supplies kept pouring across the Pacific. It was not until 8 months later that the State Department declared a moral embargo on war material for Japan. During these 8 months, American interests were trampled in Asia; the United States gunboat *Panay* and three tankers were sunk and their survivors machine-gunned.

Even the embargo of 1938 was a sham. Japan still received more than 90 percent of her copper imports here, 90 percent of her imported scrap iron and steel, 77 percent of her aircraft and plane parts, and many other products. While Washington was trying to negotiate a peaceful settlement with the Mikado, Japan kept using the United States as a base for supplies. Even in 1939, the year in which World War II began, they were able to import from here petroleum products worth more than $45,000,000, iron and scrap steel valued at $33,000,000, copper at $28,000,000, power-driven metal-working machines at $25,000,000.

By 1940 Japanese intentions must have been clear even to the Democratic policymakers. Nonetheless, it was not until July 2, that Washington took action to limit the export of war goods to Japan. The National Defense Act of 1940 provided for the licensing of war-material exports and this device was to be used to cut off the flow to Japan. The administration made a public show of its righteousness, but Japan was still permitted to purchase vast amounts of power-driven machinery and other products in this country. Total exports of petroleum products alone amounted to more than $53,000,000, the major part during the last quarter of the year.

PEARL HARBOR

Even in 1941, the year of Pearl Harbor, Japan was able to get here 227,000,000 pounds of iron and steel bars and nearly 7,000,000 pounds of iron and steel plates, a tremendous increase over the previous year; all this with the consent of the administration.

The people of the United States were presented with the bill on December 7, 1941.

Had the open-door policy been followed by the only two Democrat Presidents of the present century, the Japanese empire would never have been in a position to challenge the power of the United States of America. By consenting to their continuous expansion into strategic areas, the Democrat Party made it possible for Japan to gain sufficient strength for a test of arms which, but for the valor of American men, might have cost us our liberties.

The greatest advantage that the United States had in the war with Japan was the fact that China had been able to hold out against the Japanese Army since 1937 and, despite severe losses, had tied up a vast number of the Mikado's troops. China had reason to expect substantial aid from the United States but the expected military assistance did not arrive; it was poured into Soviet Russia, the country which had made Hitler's war possible by agreeing to a division of the spoils in 1939.

The first American commander of our Asiatic theater was Gen. John Magruder,

who permitted diversion of planes intended for the Chinese armies to the British who were fighting a losing battle in southeastern Asia. He was replaced by Gen. "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell, who immediately came into conflict with the Chinese Government, particularly President Chiang Kai-shek because of his burning desire to be the big boss without advice from anyone else. General Stilwell's action brought sharp criticism from General Chennault who wrote, not long ago, that had it not been for the removal of "Vinegar Joe" in 1944 "it would almost certainly have meant the final ruin of the joint Chinese-American effort."

In the fall of 1944 the China theater command went to one of our most capable military officers, Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer. Although this brought about a change in the attitude of our military high command, the civilian missions in China, directly responsible to the State Department, intensified their public love affair with the Chinese Communists. It is not surprising to learn that some of President Roosevelt's emissaries and representatives in China—including Lauchlin Currie—have been mentioned recently in connection with the espionage activities on behalf of the Soviet Union.

During the war the Reds in China, as well as the Communist Parties in the other allied countries were under orders from Moscow to give lip-service loyalty to the legal governments and to cooperate in the war effort, not on behalf of their own country, but to assure the final emergence of a victorious and dominant Soviet Union.

In this effort, the Roosevelt administration was the greatest helpmate of the Communists, both in Asia and in Europe. American field representatives in China kept recommending that special aid be extended to the Chinese Communists, precisely as such aid had already been given secretly to Russian-trained leaders of Europe. In Chungking, the temporary capital of China, United States diplomats were openly criticizing President Chiang Kai-shek for his refusal to take the Communists into the government and were threatening to cut off aid to China unless the Reds were given greater power with which they could eventually take over the government itself.

SUPPORT OF REDS

As early as 1942, Gen. Patrick Hurley was sent to China with ambassadorial rank to bring about a coalition between the Communists and the Government. In 1944, President Roosevelt sent Henry Wallace as his personal envoy to China in order to further pressure the Chungking government into adopting the Communists. Accompanying Wallace were two men whose long-standing sympathies with the Communists are a matter of record, Owen Lattimore and John Carter Vincent, chief of the Far Eastern Division of the State Department. Wallace left the task of surveying the situation to his two accompanists, hardly unprejudiced or competent observers. The ex-Vice President himself spent much of his time inspecting United States Army Air bases, conferring with leading leftists and Communists, and holding himself up to public ridicule by trotting around in his shorts for exercise. He spent all of 4 days in Chungking, much of the time talking to such noted Communist fronters and sympathizers as Chang Lan and leaders of the pro-Communist Democratic League.

The report that was finally submitted by Wallace—written, of course by his left-wing ghost writers—recommended the strongly pro-Communist program which has been the basic policy in China of the Democratic administration.

Wallace himself told the President that China could not last more than 3 months. That was 4 years ago and China is still fighting communism. The Wallace mission gave the Communist leaders full confidence that the United States would use its power to force the Chinese government to capitulate. Mao Tze-tung, Moscow-trained head of the Chinese Communist Party, stated:

We will wait. American pressure on the Kuomintang cannot come until after the elections in the United States.

In Washington, the administration was doing its utmost to bring about Communist control over China. Officials of the State Department were urging the arming of the Communists with American equipment and the establishment of a branch of the United States Embassy in Communist territory. On orders from higher up, Under Secretary of State Joseph Grew cabled Ambassador Hurley in China to take as his guide the recommendations contained in the Wallace report.

YALTA SELL-OUT

By the beginning of 1945, it was certain that the valiant fight of the American armies would bring about the defeat of both Germany and Japan in short order. The Soviet Union, therefore, took immediate steps to consolidate its position and to reinforce its international fifth column. The Comintern which was buried in a mock funeral in 1943 as a sop to the Allies, suddenly redoubled its activities. Soviet diplomats worked feverishly to obtain widespread concessions from the other warring powers. Again President Roosevelt was their most generous ally. At the Yalta Conference he signed away to Soviet control 10 countries in eastern Europe and large slices of Chinese territory without so much as consulting the Chinese Government.

President Chiang Kai-shek was not informed of the secret Roosevelt-Stalin deal and he continued to place his faith in administration promises that Manchuria would be returned intact to China after the Japanese were driven out. In June 1945, the Soviet Government asked China to send an emissary to negotiate a treaty with the Kremlin. President Chiang sent Prime Minister T. V. Soong who was the first Chinese official to be informed of the secret clauses of the Yalta sell-out. Shocked by the humiliating agreement between Roosevelt and Stalin, Soong refused to sign the treaty and returned to China. The Chinese Government protested to Washington but was told bluntly by the White House to accept the Soviet demands or face the full fury of the administration. A new Chinese envoy was thereupon sent to Moscow and he signed on the dotted line to the profound sorrow of the entire Chinese nation.

Reduced to its simplest terms, the Yalta agreement meant that the United States was using its superior military and economic position to strip China—the one country that had been fighting Japan from the very beginning of the conflict with the Axis—of its most vital military and economic lands to reward the Soviet Union—the country which had made the war possible by concluding the infamous Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939. The same thing was true in Europe, where countries like Poland and Yugoslavia, which had valiantly resisted Nazi aggression while the Soviet Union was still swilling up the loot at the same trough with Hitler, were being turned over to Russia by President Roosevelt.

Reassured by the American surrender at Yalta and convinced that the subsequent defeat of Germany meant an early termination of hostilities, the Soviets dropped their mask of cooperation with the western democracies and moved to consolidate their imperialist aims and to reinforce their world-wide fifth column. The Comintern, which was supposely laid to rest in 1943 as a token of good will, suddenly reappeared and its leaders everywhere took an active part in promoting chaos and rebellion.

NEW SOVIET POLICY

On June 11, 1945, the official Soviet organ Izvestia published the Russian plan for the domination of China and laid down a new policy to be followed by the Communist Party and its fellow travelers. Among the demands made by Izvestia was that the legally constituted Chinese Government be purged of its principal leaders and that their places be filled by Communists. Izvestia was particularly vehement in its denunciation of President Chiang Kai-shek and his party, the Kuomintang.

The way to bring national unity in China—

Thundered the Moscow propaganda organ—

is to create a coalition government. * * * The Chinese should also improve their relations with the Soviet Union. * * * The first step should be the calling of an assembly of all parties. * * * The second the removal of all reactionaries now at the head of the Kuomintang.

Like puppets whose strings are controlled in Moscow, the left-wing clique which surrounded the President and dominated the far eastern section of the State Department—aptly dubbed the State Department's "red cell"—suddenly hopped aboard the Moscow propaganda line. They repeated as their own the policies laid down a few days earlier by Izvestia. The pressure on the Chinese Government was intensified and the demands for surrender to the Communists were now made the central theme of all American-Chinese negotiations.

All arms shipments to the embattled Chinese armies were cut off. Although we had promised to equip eight and one-half Chinese air groups, this commitment was ignored by the Truman administration.

Administration spokesmen repeated the Communist Party line with increasing frequency and increasing conviction. They were bent upon justifying the sell-out at Yalta regardless of its eventual effect on American interests.

Six days before the final surrender of Japan—August 14, 1945—the Soviet Union sent its troops into Manchuria. The Japanese, beaten to defeat by the troops under Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the fleet of Admiral "Bull" Halsey, and the bombers of Gen. Curtiss LeMay, offered only token resistance. Within a week the so-called Kwantung Army in Manchuria, the last Japanese army still intact, surrendered to Marshal Rodion Malinovsky.

It appeared to many observers that American men had died on Guadalcanal, on Iwo Jima, and on Okinawa so that, at the moment of victory, the Soviet Union could walk in and pluck the richest prize in Asia.

The propagandists had done their job well and protests against the surrender of Manchuria to Russia were lost in the pro-Communist howl raised by the White House palace guard.

The ghost of Manchuria could, however, not be laid to rest that easily. Republican leaders, who had kept silent during the war in order to present a united front, began to take a less charitable view of Democrat blunders in Asia. The demand for an explanation of the Manchurian fiasco became increasingly insistent.

In Manchuria itself, the Russians had clamped down an iron curtain. But soon disturbing rumors trickled out that the Soviets were engaged in a wholesale looting of the province. A few American correspondents were able to break through the steel cordon of the Red Army and the story and pictures they brought out showed wholesale devastation of what had been the most industrialized area of continental Asia. These first glimpses of Soviet plunder presented only a partial picture of what the world was to face.

During this period the Chinese Government engaged in negotiations with the U. S. S. R. in an attempt to obtain the restoration of Manchuria. On August 14, 1945, the Treaty of Moscow as dictated by Stalin to Roosevelt at Yalta was signed, providing for the return of Manchuria to Chinese sovereignty, although Russia was granted many privileges for a period of 30 years. When the treaty period expired the Red Army refused to move and final evacuation did not take place until 6 months after the original deadline fixed by Stalin.

They left the province more devastated than a plague of locusts. Everything movable had been stolen. Factories were completely stripped and many buildings were wantonly destroyed by explosives. In many cases, concrete foundations holding machinery were blasted away. Installations that could not be moved were destroyed.

LOSS OF MANCHURIA

Even this plundered Manchuria was not destined to be returned to the Chinese people. Instead, the Soviet Army surrendered control of the area to the Chinese Communist guerrillas, who were under strict control of Moscow. To make certain that the Government troops should not be able to take over Manchuria, the Soviets turned over to the Communists the vast military stores of the Kwantung Army.

Still, the administration in Washington was preaching coalition with the Communists. As a result, Ambassador Hurley threw in the sponge and resigned. Upon his return to Washington he charged that aides assigned to him by the State Department, as well as officials of the Far Eastern Division, were purposely sabotaging his work and were out to destroy the Government of China. He cited the fact that threats had been made to cut off lend-lease supplies unless President Chiang knuckled under to the Communists. Among the culprits named by General Hurley were John Carter Vincent and John S. Service. Instead of bringing about the much-needed house cleaning of the State Department, Hurley's charges merely drew from the Secretary of State a prompt prefabricated whitewash. General Hurley is now Republican candidate for the Senate in his home State of New Mexico and is the likely victor in the contest.

MARSHALL MISSION

To cover up the damage done to the administration by the Hurley resignation, the President sent to China as his representative, Gen. George Marshall, who had no political experience in or knowledge of the Far East. His mission, like that of all his predecessors, was to persuade President Chiang to widen the basis of government by including the Communists and other left-wing elements. For more than a year in China, General Marshall held innumerable conferences with both government representatives and Chou En-lai, the No. 2 Communist of China.

The presence of General Marshall in China for the sole purpose of getting them admitted into the government gave great hope and assurance to the Communists. Their mask of conciliation was dropped and their attitude toward the government became increasingly truculent. By June of 1946, the Red troops were on the march again. Despite this open rebellion Marshall was still trying to talk the government into the coalition. The situation would be comparable to a Chinese representative asking President Lincoln to take into his Cabinet Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee after the battle of Bull Run.

To support General Marshall's persuasive powers, the administraton in Washington threw its full measure of economic sanctions against China. Nearly all commercial intercourse and all assistance were cut off.

On July 29, 1946, at the request of General Marshall, the State Department ordered a ban on all shipments of arms and munitions to the Chinese Republic, despite the fact that Soviet Russia was providing the Communists with generous supplies of armaments for their rebellion. At the same time, it should be pointed out the administration was still shipping great quantities of supplies to Russia.

In October 1946, for example, China tried to buy surplus American ships from this country. In a letter to Admiral Smith of the Maritime Commission, Under Secretary of State Will Clayton, stated that the sale would have to be conditioned upon acceptance by the Chinese of American demands for a coalition government.

By December 1946, the civil war in China had flared into large-scale operations by the Communists and Marshall's demands for Communist recognition were rejected by President Chiang. In December 1946, the White House was forced to admit failure and General Marshall returned home. Another blunder had been added to the long list of the Democratic administration.

On December 18, 1946, President Truman announced that all lend-lease shipments to China "had been suspended," although we were obligated to make deliveries by previous agreement. In the light of the attitude of the administration toward the anti-Communist government of China it is of particular interest to recall that 2 months later representatives of the State Department appeared before a House committee to demand money for lend-lease shipments for the Soviet Union. The reason given to the astonished Representatives was that the United States was committed to make deliveries under prior agreements. The administration was quick to honor its commitments to the Soviets but not those to any anti-Communist government.

REPUBLICAN ATTACK

In January 1947, the new Republican Congress met in Washington and laid down the first challenge to the blundering foreign policy of the Roosevelt-Truman period. During the war, in full compliance with the bipartisan foreign policy, Republican leaders had refrained from justified criticism of the administration in order to present our enemies on the battlefield with a united American front. Undoubtedly, this expression of deep patriotism cost the Republican Party the election of 1944. Had they turned the full measure of objective analysis on the Roosevelt mistakes in the field of international relations, there is little question that Governor Dewey would have carried the Presidential contest.

In 1947, the Eightieth Congress was faced with the problem of rescuing the country from the disaster of the Democratic administration. It was necessary to reestablish American prestige in the world and to work for reconstruction of the foreign policy of the United States. Being in favor of genuine international cooperation, Republican leaders opposed any continuation of the Soviet appeasement which the Government had indulged in during 14 years of Democrat misrule.

This was no rubber-stamp Congress willing to give pro forma consent to any measure emanating from the White House. The Eightieth Congress demanded an immediate revision of this fatal policy in Asia. In a desperate last-hope effort, the administration tried to silence Republican criticism by trying

to secure one more whitewash of its activities.

WEDEMEYER MISSION

The man selected to do the job was Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, a soldier whose personal integrity and ability rank him with the great military heroes of our proud history. The general, unlike his predecessor, was thoroughly familiar with the situation in China. As the commander of Allied military forces in the China-Burma-India theater, he was in the best position to study China and her problems. Upon his shoulders fell the delicate job of restoring Chinese-American relations which had been badly battered by the State Department and General Stilwell. He performed both his diplomatic and his military mission well.

General Wedemeyer was sent on a fact-finding mission to China early in the summer of 1947 and he was back with a full-dress report in August. The report threw a bombshell into the White House. The expected whitewash did not materialize: General Wedemeyer called the shots as he saw them. Although pointing out that the Chinese Government had many faults, he made it abundantly clear that the difficulties of China were the result of Communist aggression. He left no question that the Communists were the tools of Moscow and recommended abandonment of the pro-Communist policy of the administration plus military assistance to China. There is considerable evidence that the left-wingers in control of the State Department rewrote the Wedemeyer report so as to support their pro-Communist stand and then tried to force the General to sign the fake document for public consumption. This General Wedemeyer refused to do.

Stunned, the administration classified the Wedemeyer report "top secret" and buried it in the inner recesses of the State Department. All congressional attempts to see the document have been rebuffed by the White House in line with the policy of the President to keep out of the public eye any material that might reflect on the Democratic Party in the coming election.

It was, however, too late to retrieve the damage done by the constant Republican hammering and in December the White House was forced to make a public disavowal of its demand that the Government of China surrender to the Communists. Even this act was typical of the present administration. In a public statement, Mr. Truman denied that this Government had ever suggested that Communists be taken into the Government. To give this statement the lie is a long chain of public utterances by many major Government officials as well as Democratic spokesmen in Congress. In fact, when General Marshall was in China, much of his time was spent in talks with the Communist envoy, and the Communist Party is the only organization outside the Government with which he had any serious dealings.

The 1948 session of the Eightieth Congress continued to expose the Truman policy in China. Congress included China in the foreign-aid bill and wrote in a proviso for military assistance. Administration officials were urged to make available to the Chinese Government surplus war material rotting on our Pacific islands to assist the Chinese Government in defending itself against the Soviet-engineered revolution, at no cost to the taxpayers.

While giving lip service to an anti-Communist program, the State Department has done everything in its power to sabotage the China-aid law. Instead of sending the arms authorized, the administration has been shipping tobacco to China. Impatient at the stalling in Washington, Chairman STYLES BRIDGES of the Senate Appropriations Committee called the State Department to task for general laxity, contrary to the interests of the American people, pointing out that, although emergency military aid had been on the law books for 3 months nothing had been done in Washington to comply with the mandate of Congress.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITY IN ASIA

The abandonment of China to the Communists, has had serious repercussions elsewhere in Asia. Other countries are slowly falling into the Kremlin trap, thus presenting the United States with an increasingly solidified Asia under Communist rule. In Korea, the Communists control the industrialized northern part of the country and are threatening to seize the United States-occupied area by force. In Indonesia, the self-styled republican government has strengthened its relations with Soviet Russia and has given additional power and governmental posts to leftists. In Indochina the Communists have maintained a full-scale war for nearly 3 years under the leadership of the notorious Soviet agent, Ho Chi-minh. This has immobilized some of the best elements of the French Army which would otherwise be stationed in Europe, ready for action in the event of Russian military aggression. Similarly, the Communists in Burma are in open rebellion and the Burmese Army is now preparing action against them. In Malaya, the British are fighting a Communist-led rebellion and troops have been sent there from Europe. Even in India, which has been relatively free of Communist agitation, there is increasing subversive activity and the Moscow propaganda machine is giving considerable attention to that area of the world.

It is not difficult to imagine the danger to the United States should Russia be able to mobilize the billion inhabitants of Asia against us.

REPUBLICAN POLICY

It is now certain that American policy in Asia will change with the election of a Republican President next November. Governor Dewey and the other leaders of the Republican Party have definitely committed themselves to a reexamination of our Asiatic policy and a complete housecleaning of the State Department.

Last fall, when the bankruptcy of the administration's pro-Communist policy became a matter of public record, Mr. Dewey told the Nation that—

I believe the administration has been niggardly and faltering and inconsistent and blundering to the point of tragedy in the failure to adopt a realistic program to save China from the Communists. I am firmly convinced that we must adop a realistic program that the leaders of the Chinese Government need, and increase our confidence in those willing to fight with us shoulder to shoulder.

His stand was seconded by Senator TAFT, majority leader in the Senate and chairman of the Republican policy committee, who declared:

He—

General Marshall—

said that China was completely wrecked by civil war, but he opposed the policy of extending vigorous military aid, which alone could bring an end to civil war.

Approval also came from the United States Pacific commander and a leading Republican, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. In a letter to Chairman EATON, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he said:

I can say without the slightest hesitation that a free, independent, peaceful, and friendly China is of profound importance to the peace of the world, and to the position of the United States. It is the fundamental keystone to the Pacific arch.

That the Republican position is sound and strategically vital is evident from the fact that it has the support of many officials and ex-officials who have served the Democrat administration for many years. Among them are William Bullitt, former Ambassador to Russia and France, as well as President Roosevelt's special wartime representative; ex-Governor George Earle, of Pennsylvania, who was minister to Bulgaria and Presidential envoy to the Near East; Gen. Lowell Rooks, former head of the ill-fated UNRRA; Generals Chennault, Wedemeyer, and MacArthur.

The Truman palace guard has tried desperately to counter this formidable array of experts by ordering Cabinet officers to publicly espouse the official policy of the administration. Even these pressure tactics have, however, failed. During the closing days of the last session of Congress, the White House ordered Army Secretary Royall to appear before congressional leaders in secret session and state that China could not hold out against the Communists—something that the White House has now been telling the country for years. In obedience to orders, Secretary Royall repeated the statements that were put in his mouth but he made it clear that they did not represent his opinion. He told congressional chieftains that he was not testifying as Army Secretary nor as a private citizen but only as a member of the administration.

In order to recover its lost position in Asia, the United States must immediately and irrevocably return to the traditional Republican policy of maintaining the open door in Asia. As Senator BRIDGES pointed out:

The expenditure of billions of dollars to halt the spread of Communist forces in Europe makes little sense if at the same time this Government allows China to go to the Communists by default.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects: one, old-age assistance payments, and the other, the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in honor of a great Alabamian who by his work in preventive medicine made possible the building of the Panama Canal. The name of this outstanding American is Gen. William Crawford Gorgas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

HOUSING FOR VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for a great many days I have repeatedly asked the House and the Congress to pass the bill H. R. 4488, the only bill that is ready for action that would provide houses for veterans. This is a housing bill for veterans, and veterans alone, and they are the ones who have suffered the most because of the lack of housing.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Senate will consider placing in the housing bill now under consideration as an amendment a bill introduced in the Senate by Senator MARTIN, and which is the same as the bill H. R. 4488. This bill was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Many Members of the House support this bill, but 29 Members besides me introduced this bill for the American Legion. We amended the bill. We think it is an excellent bill, a workable bill. The veterans can secure low-cost housing and low-cost rentals. They have 40 years in which to pay the loan back. The houses will be built for them, so that there will be no initial cost for the veterans. I am sure that if the amendment is placed in the bill in the Senate the House will approve it unanimously. Then the Veterans' Administration and the veterans can go to work, and the houses for veterans will soon be on their way.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentlewoman from Massachusetts tell the House whether it is possible to pass legislation that will bring about the building of any more houses for veterans than are being constructed at the present time?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I feel very sure it will. I think there will be a great deal of interest in seeing that supplies are given to the associations that are building houses for the veterans. I think that when the people who have the supplies for housing realize that they are for veterans, the materials will be forthcoming.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The situation regarding materials and labor that go into the building of homes is at the present time exceedingly tight. What could you do by legislation such as is being considered here now to change the situation?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think public opinion will do a great deal along that line. There are certain buildings that are not Government buildings whose construction is being planned. I think the Government could hold back on its building for a while, both as to those that are not under construction and some of those that are under construction. I think they could wait.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentlewoman refers particularly, I suppose, to the $65,000,000 voted yesterday for the United Nations building?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That could wait for a while. My recollection is that that was only an authorization bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I understand that is not only an authorization, but provides for the use of funds immediately.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am not sure about that; I believe the money comes out of the contingent fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAHAM). The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is recognized for 10 minutes

INFLATION OF CREDIT AND CURRENCY

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, high on the list of purposes for which this special session of the Congress was called by the President was the current high cost of living to the American people.

Admittedly, the plight of millions of people in paying for their daily bills is a matter of serious moment and, quite properly, it is the responsibility of Government to find some adequate and sufficient means of relief.

It was the President's recommendation that authority be given to him to control prices, regulate wages and ration and allocate scarce commodities and goods. The remedy recommended by the President has been rejected by the Congress as being unsound, both in principle and practice. The principal evidence of the ineffectiveness of price control and rationing as a medium to curb inflation is the fact that it was so recently tried by the Government during wartime and was found to be both ineffective and highly unpopular.

Fundamentally, the President's recommendation fails to strike at the real causes of inflation and seeks to deal with its effects. High prices are analogous to sores appearing upon the human body, striking evidence that something is wrong with the human anatomy. In such a case, the remedy is not to scrape off the scabs or to pour antiseptics upon the sores but rather to diagnose the ailment by a study of the internal system and organisms of the body. This the President and the whole executive department of the Government has tragically failed to do.

The administration, in all of its bombastic talk about inflation and the high cost of living, and the program which the President has proposed, has assumed that high prices are the disease to be cured. As we all know, high prices are merely the symptoms, the outward evidences that something is wrong with the internal mechanism of our economic anatomy. The real disease which is the cause of these external evidences of an ailment is an overexpansion of credit and, to some extent, of currency. It is this colossal balloon of credit that puts an undue amount of purchasing power in the hands of both Government and the public and results in the reckless bidding up of prices for available goods and commodities.

There is only one way to get at the roots of this matter—only one real, effective, and permanent remedy, and that is by contracting credit and currency with a marked curtailment of governmental spending as the initial step. Yet, the administration, while proposing to tie down the safety valve, which represents prices, has continued to stoke the boiler by a deliberate policy of cheap money, easy credit, excessive public expenditures, and the creation of an almost unmanageable debt.

Actually, quite far-reaching powers already reside in certain executive departments and agencies to deal with the causes of inflation. I believe the spotlight should be turned upon these agencies and that the administration should be called to account for its actions, past and future, under these powers.

For example: Why has the Federal Reserve System been so slow to increase the required reserves of member banks and why has it not already put the ratio in central reserve cities up to the legal limit of 26 percent? What use does it propose to make of the rediscount rate, which, while presumably is not as effective as formerly, is nevertheless a weapon to be accounted for and used? What attempts had it made or can it make by means of open market operations, through the sale of securities, to cut down the excess reserves which are an actual or potential encouragement to credit expansion? What influence can it exert under its general selective powers, to curb credit extension in the fields of installment buying or other aggravated areas?

When is the Treasury going to change its policy of artificially holding down interest rates on its paper, to the definite stimulation of easy money conditions and credit expansion throughout the whole economy? What is the current scope of the gold-buying policy and what should be done to lessen its inflationary effects, whatever they may amount to? What are the innumerable Government corporations and agencies which operate in the field of building or utilization of scarce goods and labor doing to lessen the impact of such operations in the present market? The latter question would, of course, cover the RFC, the REA, Commodity Credit, and the like.

This is not the first time our country has been faced with serious problems of inflation. High prices such as we now have occur periodically as an aftermath of a war period. For the purpose of stemming previous inflationary spirals

and in anticipation of future similar conditions, the Congress has granted to various of the executive agencies, through the exercise of their normal business, a latitude of operation which, if exercised, could operate to stem inflationary tendencies.

By calling the Congress into special session, the President has indicated to the country that the responsibility for both the cause of the present condition and the cure of it rests upon the Congress. Actually, the cause exists within the operation of the executive department itself and various steps for its cure presently exist within the agencies of Government.

Accordingly, I have today introduced a resolution calling upon the executive agencies of the Government to inform the House of Representatives and the people what steps they have taken or propose to take in order to curb the existing inflation of credit and currency.

There are good precedents for a resolution such as I am suggesting. Like action was taken following the Civil War and World War I, when inflationary conditions in both cases were strikingly like those of the present.

Near the end of 1865, the House almost unanimously passed a resolution for the resumption of specie payments and the contraction of the greenbacks.

In May 1920, the Senate passed a resolution calling upon the Federal Reserve Board to "Advise the Senate what steps it proposed to take or recommend to the member banks of the Federal Reserve system to meet the existing inflation of the currency, credit, and the consequent high prices."

Following each of these resolutions credit and currency actually were contracted and commodity prices began to fall within a matter of weeks. If Congress has any real purpose to force deflationary action under powers already existing, here is a step which might accomplish some results.

I believe that the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency have contributed to public understanding of the responsibility of the executive agencies in this situation, and that the testimony before this committee strongly supports the sense of my resolution.

Considering the timing and effects of like action by the House and Senate in the past, there is reason to think that this resolution would induce action by the various executive agencies such as might change the whole trend of credit expansion and commodity prices. I might call attention especially to the similarity in both political and economic situations in 1920 and the present. The Senate was Republican then and the administration was Democratic. It was a Presidential election year. The high cost of living, particularly of meat, was a prime issue before the people. The Senate resolution in 1920 played a considerable part in inducing the Federal Reserve Board to tighten controls over credit and change the trend from expansion to contraction, with an almost immediate downward movement in commodity prices.

If such a resolution as this is adopted, which I strongly urge, it will serve the dual purpose of focusing upon the executive department of Government the attention of the public that powers already exist with the Government which, when exercised, will cause a downward trend and will stimulate action by the executive department in the exercise of those powers.

A responsibility does rest upon Government to cure this dangerous condition. The President has said this responsibility is ours. The remedy he has advocated is unsound. It is our obligation to tell the people the truth and show them that this situation was caused by Government practices and can be cured in a large way by a change in Government policies and practices under existing authority of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WHERE IS GOVERNOR DEWEY?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, according to a story in today's New York Times, Governor Dewey is planning to make the high cost of living a major issue in his Presidential campaign. His press secretary, however, when asked whether Mr. Dewey planned to submit an anti-inflation program to the current session of Congress, answered, "I do not believe so."

The country is now presented with a very sorry spectacle. Governor Dewey as the defeated candidate for President in 1944 of the Republican Party, and as the party's nominee for 1948, has the position of leadership of the GOP. Yet the ranking leaders of his party in Congress are confused and divided as to what should be done in this special session of Congress on the critical issues of high prices and the housing shortage. Some Republican Members of the other body have openly assailed the Republican opposition in the Congress to effective and immediate action to cope with these problems. These Members seem to realize what most Republican Members of Congress and apparently Governor Dewey do not. They seem to know as President Truman told the Congress that "high prices are not taking time off for the election," that "high prices will not wait until the next session of Congress," that high prices will not wait while Governor Dewey takes the stump to campaign for the Presidency. Something must be done now during this special session of Congress to give the people the relief they so sorely need. If the Republican leadership is unwilling to enact the program of President Truman for curbing high prices and for providing housing for people with low incomes, then let them submit an alternative program. Apparently, the Republican leadership in Congress does not have any constructive comprehensive program to offer.

But Governor Dewey must have such a program, for he has announced his intention of making the high cost of living a major campaign issue. Now, Mr. Speaker, would it not be more befitting the dignity of a candidate for the office of President of the United States to suggest measures with which to solve these problems than to play politics with them in his campaign?

Governor Dewey has not hesitated through his varied assortment of campaign managers, to make known his views on other less-important items of legislation which President Truman called to the attention of the special session of Congress, but he has carefully refrained from any active participation in the fight against inflation and the fight to put a roof over the homeless people of this country. Where is Governor Dewey today?

Why is he not down here assisting and guiding the Republican leaders in Congress? Of course, there is always the possibility that he fears he cannot persuade the Republican leaders of Congress to accept his views and to enact legislation which the emergency requires, but, Mr. Speaker, if this be true now, it is all the more important that the country know this fact. If Governor Dewey has already abdicated the leadership of the Republican Party to the reactionary leadership of the Republican Eightieth Congress, then the only alternative is to remove these obstacles and to give President Truman a Congress that will cooperate with him, starting next January. Governor Dewey recently said that it would be cruel and inhuman punishment for the President to call the Congress back into special session. Apparently he, through his inactivity and the Republican leadership in Congress, through their inactivity, are intent upon inflicting the cruel and inhuman punishment of continued rising prices and continued housing shortages upon the American people.

It is no answer and no excuse for Governor Dewey to say that he will make everything clear during his campaign. The big question is, "Where is Governor Dewey now, and has he or has he not surrendered his leadership of the Republican Party?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on price control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. GRAHAM]. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF EIGHTIETH CONGRESS IN THE FIELD OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, before this special session of the Eightieth Congress draws to its inexorable close, it is appropriate, I think, to review briefly its accomplishments in the field of foreign affairs and point a finger in the direction in which we should move if we are to keep pace with the rapid crescendo of international events.

This Congress, which the Chief Executive has assailed as the worst in our history, will some day be recognized as one of the greatest Congresses.

This Congress created the legal basis for the establishment of the United Nations on these shores when it enacted the UN Headquarters Agreement Act. On yesterday it underwrote the United Nations headquarters with a $65,000,000 loan.

Fourteen months ago this Congress provided relief assistance to war-devastated areas in Public Law 84, sometimes known as post-UNRRA relief. It continued and strengthened the undertaking of promoting world peace through economic assistance in the Foreign Aid Act of 1947, which was passed after Congress was summoned back into session last November to deal with the economic crisis in Europe. This was an interim measure to bolster western Europe until the European Recovery Program could go into effect. Finally, after protracted hearings, careful study, and much devoted thought, the Congress worked out a formula for long-term European reconstruction in the Economic Cooperation Act, which was passed last April. This may be described as a strategical measure with relief characteristics. It constitutes an effort of gigantic and unprecedented proportions in the international arena.

This Congress legislated assistance to Greece and Turkey to buttress them against the Communist tyranny. It originated the principle of assistance to China, similarly threatened.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, has reported and the House of Representatives has acted upon a total of 31 public laws dealing with foreign affairs. I have mentioned the significant ones relating to economic policy and to the United Nations. In addition positive forward steps were taken in the general sphere of international organization and cooperation. This Congress passed legislation authorizing American participation in the World Health Organization, the International Refugee Organization, the Caribbean Commission, and the South Pacific Commission. This Congress authorized acceptance of the trusteeship for the territory of the Pacific islands. It reincorporated the Institute of Inter-American Affairs to carry on our mutual programs with various Latin American republics.

This Congress legislated the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948—better known as the Voice of America Act.

This Congress developed the policy of the 70-group air force, passed the Armed Forces Unification Act, and renewed selective service. These were concrete measures to show the world that we intended to back our word with our strength; that in our opinion peace is a product of strength, war a derivative of weakness.

A lesser measure of the same sort was the legislation extending authority to arm merchant ships in time of emergency.

This is a record of which any Congress, indeed any President, could be proud.

It would be fortunate if one were able to say that the slate is clean. The current accelerated tension is ominous and abundant notice to us that such is not the case. Since last February our ship of state has been moving gingerly through very dangerous and turbulent seas. Somewhat paradoxically this danger arises in great part from the success attending our economic legislation. The Soviet tyranny, finding itself unable to capture the governments of western Europe by outward pressure and by infiltration is, it is feared, considering more forceful means of encompassing its objectives. The fact that we are in the process of translating some of our war potential into actuality might, it is apprehended, induce the Soviet Union to force the issue.

This is a matter largely for delicate diplomatic handling. Surely we can glean some satisfaction from this evidence of the effectiveness of our legislation. There is, however, one great piece of unfinished business—concrete military assistance to western Europe in its undertakings of mutual self-defense. It is on this subject that I wish to speak.

More than a half century ago Lord Bryce wrote that the United States could not indulge its easy optimism "had Canada or Mexico grown to be a great power, had France not sold Louisiana, or had England, rooted on the American Continent, become a military despotism."

America lives in a world of peace—

He said—

Safe from attack, safe even from menace, she hears from afar the warring cries of European races and faiths. For the present, at least—it may not always be so—America sails upon a summer sea.

Lord Bryce's warning came true when the balance of power system was wiped out in World War II. No longer could America afford to rely upon the great nations of the other continents to neutralize each other's power. Only two great areas of military might were left. The strategic objective of the United States—borne of the necessities of the new situation—became that of insuring that the whole of the Eurasian land mass, with its vast resource in manpower and economic strength, should not fall into the possession of the one power which might threaten our security. For should the great Eurasian continent become united against us, we would find ourselves under siege in this hemisphere.

The nation was slow in recognizing the dangers and the requirements of the new situation. Before we came to face reality, diplomatic mistakes of huge consequence had been made. Our present dilemma is due in large part to the failure of our diplomats to understand and accurately to appraise the postwar conflict.

Finally, however, there emerged a doctrine by which America hoped to secure the position of the west while waiting for the United Nations to mature as an agency capable of realizing its mission of peace. This doctrine was worked out by the Executive in closest collaboration with Congressional leaders.

It may be described as the policy to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure.

This is the cornerstone of our strategic foreign policy. The ERP is the economics expression of that policy. We must develop a military policy to match it. Otherwise our great effort may well result in frustration, failure, and insolvency.

The new doctrine is not confined by geographic limits. It is an invitation to free peoples everywhere to stand up against the aggressor. We and the world must never forget that this nation alone cannot supply the military sinews to guarantee security in every continent. We can do it only with the help of allies.

Now the requirement for winning allies is the willingness to be an ally.

To be an ally means to engage in the common defense. It requires more than a mere promise to liberate allies after they have been victims of conquest. The peoples of western Europe fear that liberation may mean annihilation by the atom bomb and other terrible new weapons of destruction. It means the willingness to take protective measures.

The United Nations Charter provides for regional and other undertakings of mutual self-defense.

We have used the formula of Article 51 of the Charter as the basis of the Pact of Rio de Janeiro tying together the republics of this hemisphere in a common front against all potential foes.

Five of the governments of western Europe have been drawn together in a similar undertaking of mutual defense. Evidence of this nation's support of the Western European Alliance is found in the fact that this government has participated in staff conversations to implement the Brussels Pact. This support is manifested also in various Executive pronouncements, the Vandenberg resolution passed by the Senate, and H. R. 6802, which was reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and for which the leadership of the House has promised early consideration in the Eighty-first Congress.

Pronouncements and staff conversations are, however, not enough. We must affirm our support in concrete, measurable steps.

Let us rid ourselves of the illusion that support of the Western Alliance is a question for debate. The fact of the situation is that we are in Europe. We are involved whether we like it or not. The question is whether we shall be involved for the protection of our national security and of free peoples the world over.

Our forces occupy parts of Germany, Austria, and Trieste. A punative enemy could attack the western powers only by attacking us first. We could not be more inextricably involved if we had signed and ratified the Brussels Pact.

The only remaining question is: What steps should we in prudence take to support the undertaking?

We must develop a military counterpart to the European Recovery Program. Had the military staff committee of the United Nations Security Council been permitted to function, it would not be necessary for us to consider political guaranties and military lend-lease as strategical sequels to the European Recovery Program.

Until this comes to pass the responsibility of freedom rests largely upon us. We have taken steps to protect western Europe from internal aggression. We must now face the portentous problem of protecting western Europe against external aggression.

In approaching this problem we must recognize that the organization and disposition of the military forces of western Europe should be based on European rather than on national considerations. Such a step would have many beneficial results:

First. The military establishments of the western European countries are a great burden on their national economies. To organize them on the lines I have suggested will eliminate much duplication and waste and thereby help the European Recovery Program and relieve the burden on the American taxpayer.

Second. Such a step will also help to achieve the goal of a European economic federation as the foundation for a United States of Europe.

Third. It will quite obviously result in far greater strategical strength.

Fourth. It will diminish the possibility that we may blunder into war because of any misunderstanding with respect to our intentions.

In order to encourage the western Europeans to undertake such an overall coordinated integrated military plan, we must be prepared to sell or lend-lease to them certain items of military equipment. We can also help them to manufacture such equipment for themselves. The details of such a move should be worked out with great care in order to insure maximum effectiveness at minimum cost.

I need hardly point out the gravity and the delicacy of the Berlin crisis. I believe that an indication of our determination to implement our policy in western Europe as we have implemented it in Greece, Turkey, and China will act as a powerful deterrent of war.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of regret that the President, in defining the mission of the reassembled Congress, did not see fit to include concrete proposals in support of the Western Alliance.

That project remains one of the items in the first order of business for the next Congress and the next Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington News.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Portland Oregonian.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include three editorials.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6959. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS AT ANY TIME

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, will the majority leader take us into his confidence as to whether or not there will be a session tomorrow?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, there will be a session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to consider conference reports at any time they are submitted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as the message from the Senate has just disclosed, the housing bill, which was acted upon by the House some time ago and has been pending in the Senate, has been acted upon by the Senate, with certain amendments in which the concurrence to the House is requested. We might have called it up today, but it has been determined that in the interest of better understanding of the measure it should go over until tomorrow. That measure will be called up in the House tomorrow.

May I add that the bill dealing with inflation, which was acted upon by the House, is now under consideration in the other body. I would not undertake to predict what may transpire over there, but it now appears as a possibility, at least, that that measure may be acted on in the other body tomorrow and come back here for such further action as may be necessary to bring about its final enactment. As far as I am concerned, I express the hope that the measure will be here for action tomorrow, and that it can be promptly disposed of.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution relative to negotiations with the Canadian Government concerning the construction of railroads in Alaska and the establishment of reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 28, 1948.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, August 7, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 7131. A bill to exempt posts or organizations of war veterans from the tax imposed on billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 7132. A bill to amend section 203 (a) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 7133. A bill to assist local communities in financing the construction of low-cost houses; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 7134. A bill to provide national defense buildings for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOLGER:

H. R. 7135. A bill to repeal section 5a of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to certain agreements between carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. R. 7136. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence; to provide for the notification thereof to foreign governments; to provide for the assumption by the government of Puerto Rico of obligations under the treaty with Spain on December 10, 1898; to define trade and other relations between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the calling of a convention to frame a constitution for the government of the island of Puerto Rico; to provide for certain mandatory provisions of the proposed constitution; to provide for the submission of the constitution to the people of Puerto Rico and its submission to the President of the United States for his approval; to provide for the adjustment of property rights

between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the maintenance of military, coaling, and naval stations by the United States on the island of Puerto Rico until the termination of the war between the United States and Germany and Japan; to continue in force certain statutes until independence has been acknowledged; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7137. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 7138. A bill making appropriations for the War Claims Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7139. A bill to authorize public improvements in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 7140. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the use and occupancy of national-forest lands, and for other purposes," approved March 30, 1948 (Public Law 465, 80th Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the American Legion in April 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Res. 708. Resolution providing for a report by the President of the United States and other executive and administrative departments and agencies on the use or proposed use of existing powers to curb inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 7141. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathleen Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 7142. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marek Halpern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7143. A bill for the relief of Henry E. Weil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 7144. A bill for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLGER:

H. R. 7145. A bill for the relief of Numa A. Winstead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 7146. A bill for the relief of Sergio and Mara Lamberti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 7147. A bill for the relief of Kostas Kallinikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 7148. A bill for the relief of the aliens Nicholas Parthenades, Catherine Parthenades, and their son Constantine Parthenades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2142. Mr. COTTON presented a petition of the Council of the City of Franklin, N. H., relative to the high cost of living, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

SATURDAY, AUGUST 7, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, August 5, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy presence is our shield in the stillness of the night and our strength in the struggles of each new day. May this moment of prayer be a veritable mount of vision where we shall receive insight and inspiration for all our tasks and responsibilities.

Make us sensitive and responsive to the persuasions and leading of Thy Spirit. May we daily grow in nobler ways of living. May our characters be transformed from what they are to what they ought to be.

Grant that we may never be afraid of that which is high or hard. Keep us in the vanguard of those who are seeking to build a finer civilization. Give us the courage to believe that the Kingdom of God is emerging and that the day is coming when our quest will be a conquest and our hopes a blessed reality.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 6, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT—VIEWS OF FARM ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in order that Members of Congress might be fully informed as to various angles of the international wheat agreement, which has been pending for some time, I invite their attention to a letter and report submitted by three great organizations of our country, the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Farmers' Union.

The various angles of this question deserve our consideration and study, and I therefore request unanimous consent that this letter be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 4, 1948.*

Hon. HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'CONOR: We, the heads of the three general farm organizations of the United States, appeal for your support in getting the international wheat agreement considered and ratified at this special session of Congress. The principal reasons in support of our appeal are:

(a) That the agreement assures to our wheat farmers the maintenance after World War II of the export markets lost to them after World War I;

(b) That the agreement stabilizes on the international level the world's most important commodity and thus stoutly reinforces our domestic agricultural price-stabilization and support programs;

(c) That the agreement precludes our being compelled by the weight of the stocks of wheat and other grains held by our Government under the commodity-loan programs to return to the extremely costly headaches of acreage reduction, marketing quotas, and all their concomitant and distasteful regulations;

(d) That the agreement guarantees to the United States, over and above our exports to the occupied areas of Germany and Japan and to any nonsignatory importing countries, an annual export market of 185,000,000 bushels compared with annual average exports of wheat, including wheat flour, during the 10-year period 1931–32 to 1940–41 (excluding 1935–36 and 1936–37 when the United States was a net importer) of about 60,000,000 bushels;

(e) That the agreement precludes cutthroat competition between three of the four principal wheat-exporting countries, thus greatly reducing the cost to the United States Treasury of the export subsidies required to maintain exports of wheat and wheat flour when the international price is below the market or support prices in the United States;

(f) That the agreement, in exchange for our guaranty to provide 185,000,000 bushels per year at a uniform ceiling price of $2 per bushel, guarantees an international price for our annual export quota of 185,000,000 bushels of not less than $1.50 per bushel in the first year, $1.40 in the second, $1.30 in the third, $1.20 in the fourth, and $1.10 in the fifth;

(g) That the agreement records, in the case of wheat, the success of the United States fight against bilateral discriminatory agreements; failure to ratify the agreement at the present special session of Congress would be a critical set-back;

(h) That the agreement is an integral part of the economic aspects of our bipartisan foreign policy;

(i) That the agreement contains the first fruits of the leadership the United States has given in international councils in the development of a world-wide program of cooperation between nations to expand production and consumption and thereby avoid a repetition of the economic waste which followed in the wake of the First World War;

(j) That the agreement makes a substantial contribution to the general economic welfare which is so potent an influence in strengthening peaceful and democratic processes;

(k) That the agreement assures, if ratified by the present special session of Congress, much more favorable terms to our wheat farmers than any agreement which could be renegotiated in the foreseeable future (with the sole exception of the United Kingdom, all the countries which participated in the negotiations at the International Wheat Conference held in London in the spring of 1947 were then prepared to sign an agreement which provided a ceiling of $1.80 per bushel; the present agreement provides a ceiling for 5 years of $2 per bushel; clearly the bargaining position of the exporting countries is now, and in all probability will continue to be, much weaker than it was when the agreement was negotiated in February of this year);

(l) That the agreement assures an adequate supply of wheat to the European nations which tried to become self-sufficient after World War I and should thereby prevent a repetition of uneconomic wheat production behind prohibitive tariff walls and would thus permit our wheat to flow in natural channels;

(m) That the agreement will cost the United States Government little or nothing because under the Economic Cooperation Act we are already committed to supply hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat at whatever the cost may be; such deliveries can be applied in most cases against our commitments under the wheat agreement; and

(n) That the agreement can be ratified subject to the condition that Australia and the United Kingdom (both of which declared to the International Wheat Council on July 6 that their withdrawal was solely attributable to the failure of the United States to ratify and that in the absence of any prediction that the United States Senate would ratify the agreement in time to bring it into force in the 1948–49 crop-year they felt they had no legal alternative to withdrawal) accede under article XXI to the agreement on its present terms and that the majority of the other importing countries which have not so far ratified, or which have withdrawn, also accede by a date to be fixed by the International Wheat Council.

In concluding this appeal to you, Mr. Senator, we should like to emphasize the importance we attach to keeping the wheat agreement within the framework of our nonpartisan foreign economic policy just as we are so keeping all other international economic questions such as those being dealt with by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (the FAO).

In the councils of the FAO and the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (the IFAP—a nongovernmental body consisting of the independent farm organizations of 20 countries) the farm organizations of the United States have played a prominent part. Our leadership has been recognized and accepted as objective, fair and democratic. We cannot overemphasize the importance we attach to the retention of the international good will we have so far succeeded in establishing.

Through the annual conferences of the FAO, and in other international agricultural forums, our Government, strongly supported by the farm organizations of the United States, has advocated the solution of international economic problems, such as the threatened wheat surplus problem, by multilateral commodity agreements. The world has accepted this approach. The wheat agreement is the first attempt to apply it. We cannot afford as the architects of that agreement to let it fail.

In the hope that it will be helpful to you in considering the arguments for and against the ratification at this time by the United States Senate of the international wheat agreement, we enclose a synopsis of the questions which have been raised regarding it and our answers thereto.

Sincerely yours,

A. S. GOSS,
Master, the National Grange.
ALLAN B. KLINE,
President,
American Farm Bureau Federation.
JAMES PATTON,
President, National Farmers' Union.

STATE SOIL-CONSERVATION WEEK—PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY GOVERNOR CARLSON, OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of the State Soil-Conservation Week proclamation issued by Hon. Frank Carlson, Governor of my State of Kansas. I send the proclamation to the desk and request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE SOIL CONSERVATION WEEK
PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF KANSAS,
Topeka, Kans.

To the People of Kansas, Greetings:

The preservation of the rich soil of Kansas is of prime importance if we are to continue our great productive capacity. To bring this essential fact more forcibly to the attention of the people it is appropriate that 1 week each year be set aside to emphasize the importance of soil conservation.

When the first settlers turned the soil they could not know nor realize that the fertility, the residue of nature's bounty throughout the years, was expendable unless proper methods of conservation were employed. Only when the constant toll of depletion and erosion had become a menace did there come a full realization of the imperative need for conserving the priceless vitality of our soil.

Kansas has been blessed with a rich and responsive soil. To protect and preserve its bounty is a duty we owe to ourselves and to future generations.

Now, therefore, I, Frank Carlson, Governor of the State of Kansas, do hereby declare the week of August 1 to 7, 1948, as State Soil Conservation Week and urge the people of Kansas to take this opportunity to emphasize the importance of soil conservation, to the end that the State may continue its proud position as the bread basket of the Nation.

Done at the capitol in Topeka under the great seal of the State this 21st day of July A. D. 1948.

By the Governor:

FRANK CARLSON.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2938. A bill for the relief of Eugene Cahan;

S. 2939. A bill for the relief of Gizella Cahan; and

S. 2940. A bill for the relief of Marianna Maria Racz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REVERCOMB (for Mr. McCARRAN):

S. 2941. A bill for the relief of Jacobus Lubbertus Muller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 2942. A bill for the relief of Nicholae Malaxa; and

S. 2943 (by request). A bill to establish the United States of America Patriotic and Charter Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2944. A bill to establish Admiralty Island National Park in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 2945. A bill for the relief of Ruston (Russi) Benjonji Bana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. J. Res. 240. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a commission to be called the National Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the proposed United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Denver, Colo., as the Edward W. Combs Veterans Facility Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRINTING OF RECODIFICATION OF FEDERAL CORRUPT PRACTICES AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES ACTS (S. DOC. NO. 201)

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a report prepared by the Sub-Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration entitled "Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities—Federal Corrupt Practices Act—Hatch Political Activities Act." I will explain to the Senate that the document brings down to date a recodification of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and all political activities acts including the Hatch Political Activities Act and all amendments down to and including June 25, 1948. This being a campaign year numerous requests for these documents have come from all parts of the country. Not only have we brought all the measures down to date, but there are included the decisions and annotations thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMENTS BY SENATOR SMITH ON PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MESSAGE AND ON THE INFLATION PROBLEM

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the record statements by him on President Truman's message to the Congress and on the inflation problem, which appear in the Appendix.]

WHY AMERICA NEEDS THOMAS E. DEWEY AS NEXT PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement prepared by him entitled "Tom Dewey—Why America Needs Him as Next President of the United States," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FRIENDSHIP FLEET—LETTER FROM SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter addressed by him to Gen. George C. Marshall regarding the Centennial Friendship Fleet, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECORD OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by him for delivery before the National Education Association, at Cleveland, Ohio, July 8, 1948, together with a

transcript of remarks which he delivered on the same occasion, which appear in the Appendix.]

CHINA TODAY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "China Today," written by him, and published in the newspaper PM, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY TO THE WEST—ADDRESS BY GOV. HERBERT B. MAW

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Contributions of the Democratic Party to the West, delivered by Gov. Herbert B. Maw, of Utah, at the concluding session of the Democratic National Convention, Philadelphia, July 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a recent press release by him expressing his views upon the minimum means which should be taken by Congress to curb inflation, which appears in the Appendix.]

VIEWS ON CURRENT CONDITIONS

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release by him expressing his views upon conditions prevailing during the special session of Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN ECONOMICS AND WORLD PEACE—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, American Economics and World Peace, delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, before the World Affairs Institute, Estes Park, Colo, August 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY DR. CLINTON N. HOWARD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Eightieth Congress," by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, to be published in Progress Magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. WALSH, PRESIDENT OF THE MARYLAND STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address by the Honorable William C. Walsh on the occasion of his election to the presidency of the Maryland State Bar Association, which appear in the Appendix.]

SUPPLY OF ANHYDROUS AMMONIA—LETTER FROM THE BAUGH & SONS CO.

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Baugh & Sons Co., relating to the supply of anhydrous ammonia, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE MARYLAND TAX DIGEST

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Aid to Education," from the Maryland Tax Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

INCREASE OF AUTOMOBILE PRICES

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the rise of automobile prices since 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

GROWTH OF IDEA OF A FEDERATED EUROPE

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by DeWitt Mackenzie, entitled "Idea of Federated Europe Continues to Gain Support," published in the August 5, 1948, issue of the Arkansas Democrat, and an editorial entitled "ERP and European Unity," published in the August 7, 1948, issue of the New York Times, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROGRESSIVE PARTY KEYNOTE, ACCEPTANCE SPEECHES, AND ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAYLOR

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the platform of the Progressive Party, the acceptance speeches by Henry Wallace and himself, the keynote speech of Charles P. Howard, and a radio address delivered by Senator TAYLOR on July 31, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN NOMINATING GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY AT THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD his address nominating Gov. Thomas E. Dewey as candidate for President of the United States at the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia, which appears in the Appendix.]

VETERANS' LEGISLATION IN THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding veterans' legislation in the Eightieth Congress, together with a memorandum regarding veterans' legislation prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by himself on the subject of universal military training, broadcast on June 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by himself on the privileges enjoyed by Americans, broadcast June 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICANS DO NOT WANT PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him on the subject Americans Do Not Want Peacetime Conscription, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ON HOUSING BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on housing, prepared by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUNDRY STATEMENTS, NEWS ARTICLES, EDITORIAL, ETC.

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on National Freedom Day, a review prepared by him on flood-control problems in Pennsylvania, a statement on the need for stronger rent controls, and various news articles and editorials and other material, which appear in the Appendix.]

HENRY WALLACE: A DIVIDED MIND—ARTICLE BY GARDNER JACKSON

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Henry Wallace: A Divided Mind," by Gardner Jackson, from the Atlantic for August 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR RECORD OF LT. MERRILL H. TILGHMAN III

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the war record of Lt. Merrill H. Tilghman III, of Wayne, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR COOPER TO THE KENTUCKY SOCIETY OF NEW YORK

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the annual meeting of the Kentucky Society of New York in New York City, May 19, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR COOPER

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Kentucky Farm Bureau in Louisville, Ky., January 9, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR COOPER

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a meeting of the Kentucky Cooperatives of the Rural Electrification Administration at Louisville, Ky., April 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR COOPER TO THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUBS

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the national convention of the National Federation of Women's Republican Clubs, at Louisville, Ky., March 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the address by Senator HILL on the anti-poll-tax bill, from the Birmingham Age Herald of August 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY LABOR SHOULD BE INTERESTED IN THE 1948 ELECTION—LETTER FROM CATHERINE MICHO

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Catherine Micho, of Stockton, Pa., on the subject Why Labor Should Be Interested in the 1948 Election, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WHEAT SITUATION IN PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the wheat situation in Pennsylvania, which appears in the Appendix.]

MY DAY—ARTICLE BY ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column entitled "My Day," by Eleanor Roosevelt, from the Pittsburgh Press of August 2, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECORD OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the record of the Democratic Party, prepared by him and published in the Philadelphia Bulletin of July 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS BY THE SECOND SESSION, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements relating to the appropriations of the Eightieth Congress, which appear in the Appendix.]

RURAL ELECTRIC SERVICE TO COOPERATIVES

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from P. K. Mastel, Coordinator of the Kem Electric Cooperative, Inc., relative to the furnishing of electric service to rural applicants, together with his reply, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE SECOND SESSION, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the activities of the session of Congress which convened on July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM E. WARNE BEFORE MISSOURI BASIN INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE MEETING

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the remarks made by Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, and chairman of the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee, before the Missouri Basin Committee meeting in Riverton, Wyo., on July 29, 1948; which appear in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER URGING "FREEDOM OF OPPORTUNITY" PLANK IN THE 1948 DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by George J. Burger, representing the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., before the resolutions committee of the Democratic National Committee, urging the adoption of a "freedom of opportunity" plank in the 1948 Democratic platform; which appears in the Appendix.]

INFLATION—PRICE CONTROL

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of inflation-price control, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COST OF LIVING AND INFLATION

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement, prepared by him, on the cost of living and inflation, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL—FILIBUSTERS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress Suffers," from the Miami Daily News, and an editorial entitled "G. O. P. Strategy Points To Only Seven States," from the Tampa Times, which appear in the Appendix.]

GREETINGS TO AMERICAN LABOR BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the final edition of the RECORD a statement of greetings to American labor on Labor Day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

HIGH PRICES: THE ANSWER—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the final edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I am preparing on the subject High Prices: The Answer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the order is made.

TEMPORARY REGULATION OF CONSUMER INSTALLMENT CREDIT

The Senate resumed consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate today is acting under a unanimous-consent agreement which provides for a vote at 4 o'clock p. m., and for control of the time after 1 o'clock. The immediate question before the Senate is the amendment of the House to the text of Senate Joint Resolution 157, to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed to the House amendment by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, striking out all after line 4 on page 2 of the engrossed amendment, down to and including line 15 on page 3, the same being section 2. The corresponding page and line numbers in the Senate committee print are page 3, beginning in line 11 and extending down to and including line 22 on page 4.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Tobey
Ecton	McKellar	Tydings
Ellender	McMahon	Umstead
Feazel	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	Young
Hawkes	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed to the House amendment by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, striking out all after line 4, on page 2, of the engrossed amendment down to and including line 15, on page 3, being section 2.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the second committee amendment would delete from the bill the provisions for an increase in the gold-reserve requirements for Federal Reserve banks. In the opinion of the committee, such an increase would have at best only a psychological effect upon the control of inflation. As stated by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] yesterday when he spoke in opposition to the committee's recommendation, the gold reserves in the aggregate presently amount to about 51 percent of deposits in Federal Reserve banks and Federal Reserve notes. Hence, from the point of view of the committee no practical or immediate effect would be gained at present by raising from 25 percent to 35 and 40 percent respectively the gold reserve behind deposits in Federal Reserve bank deposits and Federal Reserve notes.

The disadvantages of the increase were so eloquently expressed by Mr. Allan Sproul, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, in his appearance on August 6, 1948, before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that I think it would be advantageous to quote briefly from Mr. Sproul's testimony appearing in volume 4 of the hearings, page 537, as follows:

Such a proposal might, of course, have arisen out of the fundamentalist thinking of those who believe that any strengthening of the gold basis is a desirable check on inflationary developments. I am not going to enter into that area of religious belief and religious disputation. In the area of economics and public policy I can discern rather dimly three arguments which might be made for this proposal, none of which, however, has anything to do with the inflationary problem.

First, there is the argument that the reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks were lowered during the war to meet an emergency situation and should be returned to their former level through the same process, now that the war is over.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Was evidence introduced before the committee to show

what was the lowest percentage of Federal reserves at any time after the reserve requirements were reduced to 25 percent?

Mr. CAIN. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not catch the first part of his question.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator just stated that at the present time there are 51 percent of reserves. What is the lowest reserve which has existed since the requirement was reduced from 40 percent to 25 percent?

Mr. CAIN. One of the reasons why the committee opposed the House proposal was that at the time of our hearing this subject was incidental to the main question of inflation and we benefited very little from testimony on the subject. I am therefore entering for the RECORD and for the information of Senators only pertinent parts of the opposition testimony as given by Mr. Sproul and several others. I therefore cannot answer accurately the Senator's question.

A member of the Committee on Banking and Currency has just laid before me what I think to be an answer to the Senator's question. The reserves fell to 47.8 in 1947.

I continue to read from Mr. Sproul:

Second, there is the argument that should you increase the reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks it would sterilize the current gold inflow.

Third, there is the sort of catch-all argument that an increase in the reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks would put desirable restraints on the central bankers, give earlier public warning of critical conditions in our banking system, and bring the whole subject before the Congress for review.

On the first argument—aside from the pointing out the futility of a different reserve requirement for notes and deposits in a country with a highly developed deposit banking system, in which notes and deposits are completely interchangeable—I can do no better than to quote from a speech made by Senator TAFT at the time the present reduced requirement for Federal Reserve banks was adopted by the Congress in 1945.

Yesterday I think the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] made reference to those quotations credited to the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from Ohio at that time gave his own answer.

At this point, Mr. Sproul set forth the argument that a 25-percent gold reserve is adequate, that a rush to demand gold of proportions sufficient to cause reserves to fall below 40 percent would not be likely to stop before also carrying the reserves below 25 percent.

I shall quote further from Mr. Sproul at some length, because he happens to be the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and therefore in our opinion a very competent witness:

I think that was good advice—

Referring to the speech of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]—

when Senator TAFT gave it, and I think it is good advice now. Our people are not afraid of the dollar. They are gravely concerned about rising prices, but they are not rushing to get out of currency and into things, as people do when there is a runaway inflation. Those who risk creating such fears about our currency, no matter how devious the approach, are performing a real disservice.

I might add this general argument about the more specific proposal. The reduction in reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks was made late in the war as a necessary adjustment to fundamental changes which had taken place and still were taking place in our banking system.

I think it is a fact that one of the reasons given for reducing those reserves was that we were likely to experience an immediate period of deflation.

The reserve requirement was lowered in order to provide the monetary authorities with sufficient excess reserves to meet any emergency which might develop. I can see no institutional or conventional reason for restoring the reserve requirement to what it was before the war so long as we cannot happily make the same adjustment in the public debt and the assets and liabilities of our banking system.

The action taken in 1946 was not solely an emergency action, but, if it had been, the emergency it was designed to meet is still with us.

I think little time need be spent on the second argument that increasing the reserve requirements of the Reserve banks would sterilize the current gold inflow. That is really just another way of saying that the Federal Reserve banks now have too much excess reserves, and it follows by definition that any increase in the reserve requirement would reduce the amount of those excess reserves. That is not sterilization, however, since it does nothing about member bank reserves, and it is at that level that the problem currently arises.

So long as we had a substantial Treasury surplus which could be used to retire Federal Reserve-held debt, we were able to offset the effect of gold imports in considerable part. That was the way in which we were sterilizing gold imports to the extent that we did sterilize them.

Finally, on this general argument about tightening up the brakes in our monetary machine, it has a reassuring sound but it may be a dangerous adjustment. Historically the chief reason for the suspension of the Bank of England Act, for instance, was the high fixed gold reserve requirement of the British currency system and in our own country we established a Federal Reserve System because we found that when we attempted to jam on tight brakes as a result of declining reserves, we usually had a money panic.

Theoretically, reserve requirements of Federal Reserve banks are unnecessary, in my opinion, but I am not arguing it and will not argue that point, because I think they are required by public opinion.

So granting that the Reserve banks should be subject to reserve requirements, I think they always should be permitted to have a wide margin of excess reserves. To be of real service in time of need the Reserve banks must be prepared to face the situation as they find it, to maintain broad contacts with the commercial banking system, and to extend accommodation on any sound asset.

That definition of "soundness" is thoroughly understood by all of us, and goes back into the management side of the Federal Reserve System. If we have sound management we must provide them with the tools to meet any emergency which may arise in our banking system.

Quoting further from Mr. Sproul:

It is essential that the public have confidence in its ability to obtain money when needed. While the Reserve banks should be in a position to impose restrictions and restraints on monetary and credit expansion, they should not be compelled to refuse demands by an automatic and inflexible mechanical brake on their powers.

The proposal to increase gold-reserve requirements may be based on the idea that the country's supply of gold should automatically govern the supply of credit. However, the flow of gold to or from a country is not geared automatically to the internal credit needs of the country. The change suggested by the House might at some future date require the Federal Reserve banks to reduce their credit at a time when the domestic economy makes such a course undesirable. At such a time the Federal Reserve banks might well be unable to act as a market to purchase Government securities, resulting in a serious decline or possibly a collapse in the prices of Government securities.

When questioned about this proposal for an increase in gold reserve requirements, the Chairman of the body charged with the duty of acting as a stabilizing influence in monetary and credit matters—Mr. McCabe, of the Federal Reserve Board—who was confirmed several months ago, I believe, in his position as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board—replied that he was not then prepared to make a recommendation on the subject, that the Federal Reserve Board is having a comprehensive study made of the proposal and that he would be very pleased to give the committee his views on the subject at some future time.

Speaking on behalf of the Banking and Currency Committee on this subject, I believe we should await the views of the Federal Reserve System on this matter before changing existing law in a manner which promises no early aid in the fight to control inflation. It would have no possible effect at this time in lowering the price structure. It obviously would have a great deal to do, for good or ill, with our over-all banking credit structure. Weighed in the scale of appreciable results the disadvantages of the House proposal outweigh its advantages. I urge adoption of the committee amendment to delete from the pending resolution any provision for an increase in gold-reserve requirements at this time.

For technical reasons, the adoption of the committee amendment will require the renumbering of section 3 of the pending measure as section 2, which is the subject of the third committee amendment. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the second and third committee amendments be voted upon as a unit.

Mr. President, the Banking and Currency Committee rests its case in support of the amendment it offers for action at this time.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. What witnesses did the committee hear among the bankers—and I have been in touch with a number of them—who are very much in favor of the amendment of the House? The Senator quoted Mr. Marriner Eccles and the Federal Reserve group. I realize that he is presenting the Eccles point of view on this question. There are those who do not agree with Mr. Eccles; and bankers with whom I am acquainted feel that we shall make a great mistake if we fail

to impose this curb at this time as one of the steps toward controlling inflation. I am asking for information.

Mr. CAIN. The question of the Senator is quite proper, and I can give him a concrete answer. The subject of increasing the gold reserve of the Federal Reserve System was not a part of the President's recommendation when he came before the Congress several weeks ago. We therefore went into committee session to concern ourselves primarily with his recommendations. During the course of the hearings almost casual reference and inquiry was made into this subject. I was but one of several Senators who, whenever Government witnesses came before us who knew anything about monetary or credit or fiscal affairs, asked them what their opinion was concerning the desirability of increasing the reserves at this time. That accounts for the fact that we heard only from Government witnesses.

However, I can say that so far as I know, the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate has received no requests from any private bankers to be heard on the subject. Most of us on the committee feel that the subject is exceedingly delicate and difficult, and we are prepared to stand by the recommendation of the Federal Reserve System that we consider taking no action until they have had an adequate opportunity to lay before us the results of their considered study of the problem, a study which is being undertaken at this time. But will the Senator permit me to suggest that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has a considerable interest in the problem, and I wish he would volunteer an answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from New Jersey that when section 2 relative to the gold reserve of the Federal Reserve banks was first suggested, the first intimation to me came in an informal conference with the House of Representatives this week. I was surprised, and I wondered what it was all about. I could see, on quick consideration, no particular reason to be concerned about it, and I offered no objections.

The more I have thought about it, the more it seems to me that the committee's decision to delete it from this bill was wise. It came out of the blue. It is a foundling on the doorstep of the Senate, without known parentage. It is a cowbird's egg in the legislative nest. It is a matter of such importance that it is absolutely beyond reason that we should pass on it here today without adequate hearings and opinions from all groups interested in the matter. It is an imposition on the legislative processes to ask us of the committee to support anything of this sort without adequate hearings; and adequate hearings could not be held, and can be held only after a proper introduction of the subject at the next session of the Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield on that point, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont to settle a question that is bothering me in this connection. I understand that the House committee held hearings on this matter, and that at the hearings there were witnesses on both sides of the controversy, and those hearings are reflected in the amendment.

I also understand that a 40-percent reserve—which would represent a breaking away from the 25-percent reserve which is apparently the present percentage—is now recommended.

I admit there is a difference of opinion, and I agree that the matter is difficult to deal with in a brief session. However, I am more in favor of the normal 40-percent reserve than I am of continuing the 25-percent reserve, which we provided for under emergency or unusual conditions.

Mr. CAIN. Is the Senator aware that we have more than a 40-percent reserve now.

We are very serious in our answers, because of the seriousness of the task of dealing with our monetary and credit and fiscal system. We approach it with great wariness, because those who have dealt with it in a hurry in the past, often have done great harm to the country.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am aware of that.

Mr. CAIN. Let me ask the Senator from Vermont a question. As one who has had great experience with the Federal Reserve and with banking operations, does the Senator from Vermont see any possible likelihood that any demands for additional credit will be made by the national banking system on the Federal Reserve System between now and the middle of next year, for example, in any sum approximating the billion dollars involved in this recommendation of increasing the 25-percent reserve to a 35-percent or a 40-percent reserve?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I would say to the junior Senator from Washington that there is no reason that I can see or imagine for making this provision a part of emergency legislation. The principal effect the passage of this measure could have at this time is a psychological effect along the lines suggested by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. However, I think the psychological effect will be entirely different from that which he envisaged. We have an enormous public debt. There is, as was indicated in Mr. Sproul's testimony, and as I think all of us realize, no fear that in any foreseeable future time there will be a flight from the dollar to things or goods, such as has occurred in European countries; but there is a question very much under discussion, very much in the minds of business and banking people, and I think it is beginning to get into the minds of the public. It is the question whether the Government is going to continue its support of Government bonds at par.

If this measure has any psychological effect whatsoever, Mr. President, it will be to accentuate the doubt as to whether the Government is going to support the price of Government bonds, because to the extent that the gold reserve is raised at this time, in the face of our enormous public debt, which is an element in the whole problem, and which was not in existence to the same extent at the time when the gold reserve was reduced, to that extent the increase of the gold reserve is going to reduce the ability of the Federal Reserve System to support the price of Government bonds.

So the psychological effect is going to be to increase the doubt of the people of the country as to whether the Government bond market will be supported, and that is a psychological effect which I think is important.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. That is exactly the psychological effect it should have, because if the Government is going to say, we are prepared to spend any number of billions of dollars—thirty or forty billion dollars—to monetize the debt, rather than to let the Government bonds go down, that is an inflationary position which we should not establish.

If we put the reserve back to 40 percent, we say, in effect, you have $14,000,000,000 with which you can buy bonds. If you spend as much as $10,000,000,000, it is very doubtful whether you should go on; and we shall reconsider at that time whether we shall further reduce the reserve so that you can buy billions of dollars more of Government bonds and monetize them.

I think there should be a stopping point at which the Federal Reserve Board can buy Government bonds and issue currency in place of them. Today that stopping point is practically nothing; with a 25-percent reserve, that stopping point is perhaps $30,000,000,000, or some figure of that sort.

If we reduce it to $14,000,000,000, by putting the reserve up to 40 percent, if that is to be the point where we must stop and look around before we let them go on in what is clearly an inflationary process, it seems to me that will be a very good thing to do at the present moment, for the psychological effect.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Ohio for having supported the contention I have just made. Evidently he feels that that is the purpose of section 2, which has been introduced from the House. If that is the purpose, I submit it is no part of emergency legislation, and should not be considered at this time, but should have the earnest consideration of the Banking and Currency Committee, with full public hearings.

So I sincerely hope that this body will not simply follow the lead of the House of Representatives, which seems to be the fashion at the present moment, and to which I regret to see that my esteemed friend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] apparently was acceding.

I trust that we shall arrive at our own conclusions on this matter, after adequate public hearings, and then shall present proposed legislation which the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will uphold.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think, so far as I remember, that in the meetings to try to find out what could be done in the matter of restraining inflation from a credit

standpoint I was the one who suggested that this provision be inserted. So I do not think it can be said that we are in any way following the leadership of the House. I agree it is not an absolutely vital matter whether we do it or do not do it, but it seems to me a perfectly sound provision.

I went through all the hearings 3 years ago when it was thoroughly examined by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and perhaps I have had more opportunity to hear testimony than the other members of the committee; so I am not criticizing the committee's action. But it does seem to me that something can well be done, something which can in no way handicap anyone in doing anything he desires to do, so far as I can see, but which will indicate that the Senate and the Congress feel in the first place that the currency should be backed by as solid a metal as can be found, so far as we can safely go; in the second place, that we should say to the Federal Reserve Board, "You do not have unlimited power to go out and issue all the currency you want to issue in behalf of a policy of supporting Government bonds, or any other policy; if you get to a point where you want to do something which is clearly inflationary, come around and see us again."

I notice that speeches I made 3 years ago at the time this was passed have been quoted, and I shall read from what I said at the end, explaining in part the reason why we did it:

> Just before the expiration of the 2 years, there would be a tendency among foreign nations and others to rush in and try to get the gold while it was still available; and because of the increased requirements of our own system, there might be great difficulty in meeting the demands of foreign nations for the export of gold.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me we should do what we are doing. We should leave for 2 or 3 years from now the final settlement regarding what the reserve should be in time of peace, if then we think it should be changed from the 25-percent rate. In other words, we did something which was a war measure at that time, and what I at least am proposing now is that we return to the peacetime basis for setting our gold reserves.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I asked during the time of the hearings if it was not recognized, when this reduction was made, that it was inflationary, but that it was best, solely because it was necessary in order to help finance the war, or was thought to be.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I should like to read later more of Mr. Burgess' statement before the committee at the time we did this. But in answering the Senator's question, he says:

> The bill before the Senate removes, in reducing this reserve, certain automatic checks on credit inflation.

I meant to say that the very reason I agreed at that time to the reduction in the reserve was that we eliminated the so-called Thomas amendment which authorized the indefinite issue of $3,000,000,000 of greenbacks. I think that was the bill in which we also eliminated the provision authorizing the issue of so-called Federal Reserve notes without any collateral at all. That was in effect a part of the arrangement made at that time to nullify the inflationary effect of the reduction of the gold reserve.

Mr. CAIN. As the Senator from Ohio does not criticize the committee for its recommendations, certainly the committee does not take violent exception to the position of the Senator from Ohio. The committee is not disposed to argue his main point, that the percentage of reserves behind notes and deposits of the Federal Reserve System should be higher. We are inclined, as a committee, to think the percentage should be higher. We do not know how much higher it should be. We certainly would not approve of that portion of the recommendation which makes a distinction between deposits, on the one hand, and notes, on the other. The only reason that is contained in the provision apparently is that it was there, I recall, before the prevailing 35- and 40-percentage points were cut back to 25, in 1945 or 1946. The committee feels that no practical purpose is to be served at this time by acceding to the recommendation of the House. We have a Federal Reserve System, the principal purpose of which, as I understand, is to care for the credit needs of the banks of the country in times of emergency particularly. Those whom we charge with responsibility for managing the Federal Reserve System acknowledge that there is a problem for consideration in connection with gold reserves, and that they are presently undertaking a serious step, which takes time, and they think it would not be proper to take any action until such time as their recommendations have been laid before the Senate for consideration and action. The committee thinks that position is substantial and sound.

Personally, I agree with the Senator from Ohio that there is a psychological advantage in adopting the recommendation of the House, but that advantage is based purely upon the fact that the average American has not the slightest idea of monetary and fiscal policies. We can take this action—and perhaps we should do so—and in effect say to people who otherwise will not know, that we are raising the reserve requirements, we are stiffening our credit policies, and we are therefore materially assisting in curtailing inflation. However, it is simply not going to work that way, and every Member of the Senate knows it. Because of the importance of the whole subject of money, the committee should not, without having a much firmer conviction on its part, recommend a change in the prevailing gold requirements presently imposed upon the Federal Reserve System.

I take it we are all in agreement that since the beginning of man there has been universal concern about the mysteries involved in the management of money. I hold to that view. There have been no concrete answers given, in decades and centuries gone by, which would enable us to obviate the difficulties we are experiencing at this time. We have given a major portion of our time to the consideration of those items which we thought would be of some substantial assistance in dealing with the problem now facing the country. It was because of that, and further because we thought this recommendation would not amount to anything at the moment or until such time as Congress returned for the next session, that we have recommended that it not be adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not care to repeat what I said yesterday, but I do want to ask for a correction of the RECORD on page 10131 of yesterday's daily RECORD. It reads:

> As I see it, a larger gold reserve does not have any meaning or effect.

What I said was:

> As I see it, a larger gold reserve does not have any immediate effect.

I ask that the correction be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The correction will be made.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I have found difficulty in understanding two statements on page 10132 in yesterday's daily RECORD, and I am wondering whether either one of them is in error or whether it is my inability to understand it. It is in the second column, about halfway down. The Senator from Ohio is there quoted as saying, after referring to the Federal Reserve banks:

> Today they can still buy fourteen and one-half billion more Government bonds.

In the next paragraph it states:

> I do not know how much more they could buy under present conditions—perhaps $30,000,000,000 or so.

Is there an inconsistency in those two statements, or do I not understand the distinction which was in the mind of the Senator?

Mr. TAFT. I have sent for the figures to try to make it more accurate. My suggestion was that under the existing reserve of 25 percent, $30,000,000,000 or so can be bought. If it is increased to 40 percent, it would be limited to something like $14,000,000,000.

Mr. DONNELL. That is what I deemed the Senator meant, although in that first paragraph to which I directed his attention the language is:

> Today they can still buy fourteen and one-half billion more Government bonds.

That sounds as if it has reference to the present conditions under which the 25-percent reserve is all that is required.

Mr. TAFT. That should be corrected. However, I hope to have the correct figures here in a moment.

Mr. President, I desire to add one further thing because it shows so clearly what the issue was at the time we reduced the reserve in 1945. I wish to read from the testimony of Mr. Burgess, president of the American Bankers' Association at that time. He said:

> Mr. BURGESS. There are two reasons for the restraints on Federal Reserve action which are contained in the legislation you are discussing; that is, restraint on the pledging of Government securities on Federal Reserve notes and the percentage of reserve required against deposits and not liabilities.

That was a different question.

> First, to place some limitations on the very great power which the Federal Reserve Act puts in the hands of a few people.
>
> Second, to serve as red lights when a huge expansion or credit takes place, for such credit expansion is dangerous.
>
> We are in the process of going through red lights. In addition to the bill before this committee, a bill raising the debt limit is before Congress, and that also means passing a red light.

Remember, we were still at war at that time.

> Inflation usually shows itself in rising interest rates, and we have suppressed by Government control, not the inflationary forces themselves but their danger signals.
>
> The danger signals are being passed but the inflation is going forward. The money held by the people, both in currency and bank deposits, is piling up in unprecedented amounts. We now have the same forces at work, but in exaggerated degree, that gave us the inflation of 1919 and 1920 and the crash of 1921. It took years for the farmer to recover from that boom and crash that carried wheat prices up to $3.50 and down to $1; that doubled the price of farm land and then dropped it back again.
>
> The same forces later caused the real estate and security inflation of 1927–29 and the later depression of the thirties. It took the war to pull business and labor out of that slump.
>
> There are many signs that these inflationary forces are vigorously at work today.

This was the spring of 1945.

> We see them in city and farm real estate and in all uncontrolled prices, in black markets and lower quality of goods. The amount and quality of food, clothing, shelter, and service that the citizen can buy for his dollar is steadily declining.
>
> We bankers are working with the Treasury in selling Government bonds to the people. We have put on a lot of pressure and incurred, I believe, a moral obligation to those people to keep their dollars sound. After World War I the prices of Liberty bonds dropped 15 percent, but their buying power in goods dropped more than that. Today, the savings bond fortunately can't drop in price, but its buying power can fall and, in fact, is now falling.
>
> This bill before the Senate removes certain automatic checks on credit expansion.

That is what we were necessarily doing. We were removing automatic checks on credit expansion; and I am suggesting that at the present time we put them back.

Then the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] asked a question. He said:

> And ergo, it follows—

The Senator from New Hampshire was using the Latin term "ergo."

> And ergo, it follows from your first statement to the effect that we are going through red lights, that it is a necessity to go through red lights.
>
> Mr. BURGESS. We have to; yes, sir. To do so is a wartime necessity, but it means we must be increasingly alert. We ought to review where we stand on the inflation problem and take what steps we can to put the brakes in working order.
>
> We, therefore, make the following definite suggestions:
>
> 1. That the bill be amended so that at the same time that the use of Government securities for Federal Reserve notes is made permanent, the 1933 emergency power to issue Federal Reserve bank notes and the power to issue greenbacks under the Thomas amendment of 1933 shall be repealed.

That advice was followed; those provisions were repealed.

> 2. That the committee consider whether it may not be better at this time to lower reserve requirements to 30 rather than to 25 percent. Thirty percent is likely to take care of the needs for many months—

At that time gold was going out of the country and we were getting fairly close to the point where many more Government bonds could not be bought. We were much closer to that point than we are today—

> and if it then proves inadequate, it will be because credit expansion has gone to a point where congressional review may be desirable.
>
> 3. That every proposal for Government postwar spending be scrutinized with great care. Government spending is the chief cause of inflation. We agree wholly with Chairman Eccles' statement that "Nothing would be more helpful to prevent inflation developing than to have a balanced Budget shortly after the war." I am quoting from the text of the statement I saw. It was not a corrected text, and whether it has been corrected or not, or changed, I do not know. No campaign among the people and no price controls will be adequate to curb inflation unless the Government itself sets an example and puts its own house in order.
>
> 4. That the committee request the Federal Reserve Board to make a comprehensive report to Congress on the dangers of inflation and proposed methods for its avoidance.

That was the program submitted in 1945. The reduction in reserves was accepted with the greatest reluctance. So far as the American Bankers' Association was concerned, they thought it ought not to be in excess of 30 percent, and they feel today that it should be returned to the figure which obtained before the war. So I think it is clearly a question whether restoration of the reserve will be a deterrent to inflation. It may be a psychological deterrent, and it is something which I believe Congress ought to do at the present time. Should it be defeated, I think I shall offer it again at the next session of Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. In connection with what the Senator from Ohio said in reading from the testimony of Mr. Burgess, I may say that Mr. Burgess was the man to whom I talked on this subject this very morning, and he is urging a restoration of the 40 percent. I am confused by the situation, because it seems to me that there is a very wide difference of opinion. While I agree with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] that we do not want to rush into it hurriedly, I feel that we should want to restore normal conditions.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I happens that I know Mr. Burgess personally and in his official capacity, and I hold him in exceedingly high regard. He did not come before our committee, nor did he ask for permission so to do. That is true with respect to a number of other equally distinguished private bankers. It is clear, as the Senator from New Jersey has stated, that it is a controversial subject. The committee is recommending, in the absence of sufficient testimony on this important subject, and because the Federal Reserve System does not wish the rate limit to go higher, that a study be made with a view to making a recommendation as to what height it should go and whether it would be proper for the Banking and Currency Committee seriously to recommend the adoption of a measure which the committee itself thinks is deserving of a more thorough study. The very distinguished Senator from Ohio has just indicated that if the wish of the committee prevails he will introduce a bill in the next session of the Congress. The committee only urges the Senate to support the committee, and then the committee will, and I, in its name, do so now, encourage the Senator from Ohio to introduce for early consideration in the next session the subject of increasing gold reserves.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I certainly will.

Mr. DONNELL. In the existing law it is provided that—

> Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves of gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its deposits and reserves of gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against Federal Reserve notes in national circulation.

I should like to make two inquiries, one is a question of fact, the other a question of reason. The question of fact is, Can the Senator enlighten us as to the approximate amount of the aggregate deposits today in the Federal Reserve banks and the approximate amount of Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation at this time?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington cannot provide an accurate answer to the question without reference to the figures, which would take some time, but we can readily provide an answer to the question in a few minutes.

Mr. TAFT. I have some figures here, and after answering the Senator's question, I think they should be made a part of the RECORD. What is the question?

Mr. DONNELL. My question is, What is the present aggregate amount of deposits in the Federal Reserve banks?

Mr. TAFT. The total deposits are $20,316,000,000.

Mr. DONNELL. The second subdivision of my question was, What is the present aggregate amount of Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation?

Mr. TAFT. The answer is $23,806,000,000.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Ohio referred to billions in each instance, did he not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; $23,806,000,000.

Mr. CAIN. And the Senator's other reference was to $20,000,000,000, not millions?

Mr. TAFT. $20,316,000,000.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Ohio. Will the Senator from Washington yield that I may ask another question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. DONNELL. Can the Senator tell us the reason, if he knows, why the House amendment differentiated in the percentages which it made applicable with respect to deposits and to notes in actual circulation, so that 35 percent in the one case is provided in the House amendment, and 40 percent in the other case, namely, 35 percent against deposits, and 40 percent against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation? Has the Senator already given us that information?

Mr. CAIN. I have given it in brief fashion. I should like to restate for the information of the Senator from Missouri what Mr. Sproul of the Federal Reserve Bank in New York had to say on the subject. He thought it was rather futile——

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator means the differentiation was futile?

Mr. CAIN. He says it is futile to have a different reserve requirement for notes and deposits in a country with a highly developed deposit banking system, in which notes and deposits are completely interchangeable.

We have tried to ascertain as best we could—because it is an interesting question—wherein lies the logic for making this differentiation, and no man has yet given us any approximation of what appears to be a reasonable answer.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It was a part of the original Federal Reserve law, passed in the Wilson administration, in 1915, I think. I suppose the issue of notes was regarded as more inflationary than the acceptance of deposits on time. There is no real reason today for such a differentiation.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me say, with the Senator's consent, in order that the record may be complete regarding what the Senator from Ohio has just stated, that I hold in my hand the statute enacted December 23, 1913, the opening portion of which reads:

> Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates or lawful money of not less than 35 percent against its deposits and reserves in gold certificates of not less than 40 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation.

Of course that is the precise statement in substance the Senator from Ohio just made. I should like to inquire if the Senator from Washington knows the reason for the differentiation in the original statute, and knows whether or not the House gave consideration to the point Mr. Sproul makes as to the alleged invalidity of the differentiation.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. Sproul and the Senator from Ohio have both said they know of no logical reason at all for making any differentiation. I was not either in the Congress or interested in money matters at the time the Federal Reserve statutes were drawn. I do not know what was in the minds of those who urged that legislation at that time. All I know is that in the highly complex and delicate banking system from which all of us benefit in this country today, there is no continuing need for such a differentiation. Yet our primary reason for asking that the Senate consider this matter at a later date is rather firmly supported, I think, by virtue of the amendment which the House has sent to the Senate in which they include a requirement which one of the supporters of that amendment himself has just said is, in his considered opinion, totally unnecessary.

I wish I could give the Senator a more constructive answer, but I am inclined to think that in terms of the need for a distinction, there simply is not any, and that we should not be a party to continuing a mistake of the past.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood from the Senator from Ohio that the present amount of deposits in the Federal Reserve banks is $20,316,000,000. The amount involved, therefore, in changing the existing reserve requirement of 25 percent as regards deposits to 35 percent is approximately $2,031,600,000; one-tenth, in other words, of the amount of the deposits. Is not that correct?

Mr. CAIN. If I understood the Senator's question correctly, I think the Senator from Ohio yesterday introduced into the RECORD an editorial from a New York paper which answers the Senator's question in the following fashion:

> If there were 40 cents in gold behind each dollar of Federal Reserve currency, it would be possible, at the present level of reserve gold holdings, to issue about $14,500,000,000 in additional currency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator referred to a statement I made yesterday, and he has said what I intended to say, that is, that if we accept the House measure, the Federal Reserve banks will still be able to buy over $14,000,000,000 more of Government bonds. Under the pending bill, I find from these figures, the Federal Reserve banks will be able to buy $45,000,000,000 of Government bonds with the 25-percent reserve.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask again, How many billion dollars of bonds would they be able to buy under the 35-40 percent reserve plan proposed by the House amendment?

Mr. TAFT. About $14,000,000,000 of bonds.

Mr. DONNELL. So that there would be a net decrease in the amount of bonds they could buy of approximately thirty or thirty-one billion dollars?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. There is practically no limit today on what they can buy. If they had to buy $10,000,000,000 more of bonds and issue Federal Reserve notes, and increase the currency from about $26,000,000,000, counting other things, to $36,000,000,000, I think we should take a look at it and decide whether or not we were going to let them indefinitely go on with such increases in the currency.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington permit me to ask the Senator from Ohio another question?

Mr. CAIN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I understand that if the 35- and 40-percent provision proposed by the House shall be put into effect, there will be an ability to buy only approximately $14,000,000,000 of bonds.

Mr. TAFT. Fourteen and a half billion dollars of bonds. They now have $21,000,000,000 of bonds which have been accumulated at the rate of more than three or four billion a year. It would mean a tremendous speeding up for them to buy $15,000,000,000 of bonds in 6 months.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood also that under the present law which requires 25-percent reserves in the case of deposits and notes in actual circulation there is an ability to buy approximately $45,000,000,000 of bonds.

Mr. TAFT. That is a very rough calculation, made in a hurry.

Mr. DONNELL. I have made only a hasty calculation myself, but the tentative calculation I have made does not enable me to follow the figures the Senator from Ohio has given. As I see it, under the present law regarding deposits, there would be a requirement to maintain a reserve of 25 percent, whereas under the proposed House measure the requirement would be to maintain a reserve of 35 percent. There are only $20,316,000,000 of deposits, so that the addition to the reserve which would be required under the House measure, as regards deposits alone, would be $2,000,000,000 and a fraction over, namely, 10 percent of the $20,000,000,000 of deposits. There would be a difference of $2,000,000,000 between the amount of reserves required under the proposed House bill and the amount required under existing law.

Mr. TAFT. The 35–40-percent proposal introduces a complication which makes it difficult to calculate the figures, but if we treat deposits and notes as practically the same, and assuming that a 40-percent reserve is required, as the Federal Reserve banks own $22,404,000,000 in gold or gold certificates, 40 percent reserves will support $89,000,000,000 of notes and deposits. We actually have today some $44,000,000,000 of notes and deposits. The difference between $89,000,000,000 and $44,000,000,000 is $45,000,000,000 for notes and deposits. That would be the figure if we required a 40-percent reserve. It is not proposed to require quite that much reserve; the requirement is only 35 percent. Therefore, the figure would be somewhat higher than $45,000,000,000.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington again yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not want to go too much into details on the mechanics of the

question, but I think it is of some importance to appreciate just how much in dollars, at least approximately, is involved in this proposed change by the House. I have not yet been able to make my computations come anywhere near the computations of the Senator from Ohio. As I see it there will be as much decrease in the ability to buy bonds as is equal to the increase in requirements of reserves if such increase is brought about by the pending measure.

Mr. TAFT. No; that is not so.

Mr. DONNELL. Why is it not so?

Mr. TAFT. Because what happens is this: If a Federal Reserve bank buys $10,000,000,000 of bonds it issues $10,000,000,000 of notes before it increases its deposits $10,000,000,000. Consequently it is necessary to take the existing liabilities, which are approximately $23,000,000,000 of notes and $20,000,000,000 of deposits, or a total of $43,000,000,000, and it is necessary to increase that to about $54,000,000,000 without increasing the gold reserves. In other words, the amount is added to both the reserves and the balance sheet. The limiting factor is the $22,400,000,000 of gold. So long as there is that gold reserve, and none of it is lost by buying Government bonds—and gold is not paid out for Government bonds; notes are given for them—so long as that $22,000,000,000 of gold is in the reserve it will support a total liability of the Federal Reserve banks of $89,000,000,000.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a further question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Just a moment. Take the figure $44,000,000,000. The Federal Reserve balance sheet is now made up of $22,000,000,000 of certificates and $21,000,000,000 of Government bonds. They would then have an increase of $45,000,000,000 of Government bonds, while having $22,000,000,000 of gold just the same. On the other side of the balance sheet they would have deposits and notes of about $85,000,000,000, and it would still be legal. They would have bought, therefore, $45,000,000,000 of Government bonds and they would still be within this reserve requirement. Such an operation, I think, would cripple the currency in the hands of the public and would bring about a condition which would be most unfortunate.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Ohio may well be correct, and I am very much interested in the figures he has given us. I should like, however, to have the RECORD show, so that at least this angle may be in the RECORD, that with the present requirement of 25 percent immediate reserves applicable to deposits in Federal Reserve banks, an increase in that requirement to 35 percent would mean an increase, as I see it, of 10 percent in the amount of the $20,316,000,000 of deposits, or $2,031,600,000. In like manner the present law applicable to Federal Reserve notes in circulation requires a 25-percent reserve, whereas the proposed House measure requires 40 percent, or not less than 40 percent, I should say. That is a difference of 15 percent with respect to these notes. Now 15 percent of $23,806,000,000 is, as I figure it, $3,570,000,000. And the aggregate of $3,570,000,000 and $2,031,000,000, in round figures, is $5,601,000,000. I should like to have those figures in the RECORD for the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator's method of calculation, I am sorry to say, is wrong; that is, in calculating how many more bonds the Federal Reserve banks could buy, the figures are wrong. The Senator, I think, can accept the statement from the editorial I read into the RECORD yesterday, that if the House amendment is adopted, the Federal Reserve banks can still buy $14,500,000,000 of bonds, and that under the present law there the limit is much higher, being in the neighborhood of forty-five billion or forty-six billion dollars of bonds.

Mr. TOBEY and Mr. HAWKES addressed the chair.

Mr. CAIN. If Senators will permit me, I should like to make one observation with respect to what the Senator from Missouri has said. I think one important fact to bear in mind is that, the Senator from Ohio, who encourages very strongly the adoption of the House amendment, is the first to agree that Federal Reserve deposits and notes are entirely interchangeable. To carry that one step further, he is criticizing the amendment which has come to us from the House, because it would require 35-percent reserves behind deposits, and 40 percent behind notes. The only justification for the recommendation is purely an historical one, which goes back many years.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator accept an amendment of a flat 35 percent? I, myself, would even accept 30 percent flat. In fact, if the amendment of the House is retained I would be glad to offer an amendment to change the 40 or 45 percent figure to 35 percent flat, or, even, if it were acceptable to the Senate, to 30 percent.

Mr. CAIN. If the House amendment should prevail I would agree with the Senator that the first thing we would have to do would be to make it a good amendment. But the lack of competent testimony on the subject, not in this body, sir, but coming to us as a committee, does not justify our taking action at this time, and we should like to take the Senate's position to conference.

I shall now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I propose to speak in my own right before the vote is taken on the effort to change the gold reserves. But I do want to bring to my friend, the Senator from Washington, and my friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and my friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] an incident which may serve as an illustration relating to what has just taken place. I refer to it in view of the colloquy that has been going on in the elucidation of figures in the *n*th degree here, which I confess have me mystified, because this matter of figures is a very difficult thing to prove by other figures.

What we need is a lightning calculator like the one of whom I am about to tell the Senate. He was on a New England train going up into Vermont and New Hampshire. As he sat in his seat looking out of the window, he kept moving his shoulders this way and that way in apparently a very nervous manner. The conductor noticed his actions, and inquired, "Have you a nervous disease?" "No," answered the man, "I am a lightning calculator. While sitting here and looking out of the window I am just practicing my vocation. I count the cows in the fields as we pass by them." "So you can count the cows in the field?" said the conductor. "Well, I will give you something to do. Five miles from here is a farm on which there are a great number of cows. It belongs to my brother. You will identify it by a large red barn, with a cupola on it. There is a white house and a large green lawn in front of it, and you will see a great many cattle in the pasture, running alongside our tracks. When you come to that place count the cows, and when I return I will check the number with you and see if you are correct. I know the actual number there. If you make a correct count I will agree that you are indeed a lightning calculator." And I say, Mr. President, that what we need for the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and for the other Senators who have taken part in the discussion of figures, is a lightning calculator.

After a while the conductor returned and asked the man, "Did you count the cattle in the field I told you about?" The man said, "I did." "How many were there?" The man said, "Eighty-four." The conductor said, "That is exactly the number. It is marvelous. How did you do it?" "Why," the lightning calculator said, "that was easy. I just counted the teats and divided by four.' [Laughter.]

Mr. President, what we need in the Senate Chamber now is such a calculator to get the figures being dealt with correct.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency is hopeful that the Senate will support the committee's point of view, which is to reject the recommendation made by the House, so that the least opportunity we shall have is to take the matter to conference, to benefit from further views.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] on behalf of the committee.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, while I happen to be chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, which is a great privilege and honor, and affords opportunities for fine fellowship, I must confess that I have many limitations to a complete understanding of finance, foreign exchange, and monetary matters. There is often a diversity of opinion around the committee table, as there should be in the democratic process.

However, I think I am safe in saying that I am not alone in limitations. I do not believe that there are many Members of this body who can be called real authorities on this subject.

The question before us now is that of restoring the gold reserves as they were 2 or 3 years ago. I am against it. The committee is against it. The committee voted 8 to 1 against it. Every witness who came before us was against

it. To whom are we to look for understanding of these problems if we do not look to the present Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. McCabe, the man who deposed Marriner Eccles as Governor; the head of the greatest bank in the Nation, Mr. Allen Sproul, head of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York—and I do not go down the scale when I mention the man in the light coat who sits behind me, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] who at one time was president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. He understands finance and Federal Reserve matters as well as does any other man under this Capitol dome.

They all say, "Let the thing alone." The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the proponents of the change, including the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, present the amendment to us and say, "This will not affect things today. This is only a matter of psychology." How long have we been worried about psychology? Did we apply psychology in the action which we took yesterday, in taking away public housing and rent control? What sad psychology is involved in that action?

How is psychology applied to the teeming millions in this country who are burdened with high prices and who are wondering whether Congress cares anything about them? They ask for bread, and we give them a stone. As I contemplate the work of the Congress in this special session I am of the opinion that the mountain labors and brings forth a mouse. Opposition to increasing the gold reserves as proposed in the House bill is the sentiment of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the sentiment of Mr. Sproul, Mr. McCabe, Mr. Eccles, and all the banking authorities who came before us.

The proposal to increase the gold certificate reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks would make no contribution whatever to the fight against inflation. That is why we are here. We are here to make a fight against inflation but we have done nothing whatever against it. We have not lifted a finger against inflation in this session. We certainly cannot do it by putting something more or nothing in the basket. It is only psychology, we are told.

The proposal before us might well demoralize the Government bond market or precipitate the kind of money panic the Federal Reserve System was created to prevent.

The proposal is apparently based on the idea that the country's gold supply can, and should, automatically govern the supply of credit. Unfortunately, that simple theory does not fit the hard facts of how the economic system operates.

It has long since become evident that the flows of gold to or from a country have little or no relation to its internal credit needs. Tying the supply of credit rigidly to those flows of gold would be like tying it to a wheel of chance.

No one would seriously suggest that the Federal Reserve System should always increase Reserve bank credit to the full extent permitted by the gold certificate holdings of the Federal Reserve banks. If the System did that, it would have to increase Reserve bank credit by almost $12,000,000,000 above present levels even if the proposed 35 percent and 40 percent requirements were in effect. The disastrous folly of requiring the System to take such inflationary action at the present time is obvious.

But it would be equally unrealistic and unreasonable to place the requirements at a level that might arbitrarily require the System to reduce Reserve bank credit at a time when such action might be equally disastrous. The 35 percent and 40 percent requirements would have no effect for the present or foreseeable future—except to cause needless operating difficulties for some of the Reserve banks. But at some future time they might suddenly—and by the pure accident of gold movements—force the System, willy-nilly, to curtail credit. Such action might conform to the real credit needs of the country at the time, or it might not. It would be merely a lucky accident if it did.

The present requirement is thoroughly acceptable to the public and is ample to serve the only real purpose of such a requirement on a Reserve bank—that of helping to sustain public confidence in Federal Reserve credit and currency.

The proposal would appear to be a clumsy effort to force the Federal Reserve System to abandon support of the Government securities market and thus bring about sharp increases in interest rates. It is inconceivable that Congress or the public desire to create a run on the currency or collapse of the bond market. If that were the intention it should be done openly and frankly and not by indirection and in disguise.

The committee can see no reason for tinkering with a provision which is working well and has no relation to the present inflationary situation. Only harm could come from passing the present proposal which could not help solve the present inflationary problem and might well rise to plague the country in the future.

Psychology? Apply the test to housing, and the cost of living to the masses of the people. Will an interest in psychology lead us to change the fundamental banking laws of the Nation at a time of great crisis? If we do not follow the testimony of Sproul, McCabe, Eccles, and Ralph Flanders, whom are we to follow?

I leave the decision with the Senate. There is no question in my mind what it ought to do. Let us stand by the present situation. This is nothing but ephemeral talk having a subtle intent to withdraw Government support from the Federal bond market, which in my judgment should be supported consistently for some time to come.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 239) to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 7, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 239) to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report.

TEMPORARY REGULATION OF CONSUMER INSTALLMENT CREDIT

The Senate resumed consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] on behalf of the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I think this is a rather important question which we are discussing. I realize that it is full of technicalities, and rather difficult to understand. I should like to invite the attention of Senators to an excerpt from the testimony of Mr. Eccles before the House Banking and Currency Committee, which I placed in the RECORD yesterday. It appears at pages 9984 and 9985. He gives just about as plain an explanation, I believe, as can be given. I think it would be helpful to all of us in understanding this problem to read those two brief excerpts from the testimony of Mr. Eccles.

I have had assistance in preparing a memorandum which I think couches this problem in rather plain language which anyone can understand. I should like to present this brief memorandum to the Senate:

> Whether it is the purpose of the sponsors or not, the effect of the proposal to increase the gold reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks will be to destroy the policy of supporting long-term Government bonds at par.
>
> There are many important figures in the financial world who are opposed to the bond-support policy, but the President, upon the advice of the Treasury Department, of the Federal Reserve Board, and of the Council of Economic Advisers, has taken a very strong stand in favor of that policy. He has used the most emphatic language in assuring the people that the Government will not permit the recurrence of the disaster of 1920 when the price of Liberty bonds fell to 82. He has also endeavored to reassure the thousands of bankers who read the repeated intimations in the eastern financial journals that the bond-support program will not really be carried out literally, and that after a little while, the price of Government bonds will be permitted to fall a little below par.
>
> This gold-reserve proposal would so clearly destroy our ability to maintain the Government bond price at par, or even near par, that the small bankers of the country would no longer have any confidence that whatever happens they can sell their bonds without loss if it is necessary for them to do so. If they lose this feeling of security they will immediately begin to sell off a part of their very large bond holdings. That process will begin to grow, and will, in turn, affect the millions of holders of savings bonds. The demands upon the Federal Reserve banks, and upon the Treasury to buy and redeem bonds will grow in volume unless it becomes perfectly clear that the Government has the ability to buy all bonds offered. If, on the contrary, the people discover that the Government does not have that ability, the liquidation will become a panic. The Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks will be overwhelmed and will have to suspend purchases. The price of bonds will drop disastrously, and the credit of the Government will be shaken.
>
> This is not overdrawing the picture. This $250,000,000,000 national debt has been handled so skillfully that even those people who shuddered when Roosevelt suggested 15 years ago that the country could survive even if the debt grew to $50,000,000,000 are now altogether too complaisant about a debt five times as large. As a matter of fact, our big public debt is not a domestic animal but is a wild beast if aroused, and we shall quickly learn that that is true if we once permit the people to doubt the ability of the Government to stabilize bond prices.
>
> The relation of the gold-reserve requirement to the bond-management policy is this: Now that the Treasury has no surplus to use in buying bonds, the only way to support the bond market is by having the Reserve banks make loans to the Treasury for that purpose, or by having the Reserve banks themselves buy the bonds as an investment. The latter process is the normal method but the economic implications are the same, whichever plan is used. When the Federal Reserve bank buys the bonds, it pays for them by giving a deposit credit to the member bank which has acted as intermediary in the transaction, or perhaps has been the actual bond seller itself. The only limit upon the ability of the Reserve bank to carry on this process is the limitation which is placed upon commercial banks in making loans, namely, the reserve requirements.
>
> If the gold requirements are lifted to 35 percent on account of deposits and 40 percent on account of currency, the Reserve bank will have to set aside an additional reserve of $350,000 for every million dollars of bond buying. Even a moderate financial and business disturbance would cause holders of Government bonds to liquidate enough of them to exhaust the reserve potential of the Federal Reserve banks very rapidly. If the proposed change in gold reserve requirements were made at this time the Federal Reserve banks as a whole would hold gold in the amount of $5,700,000,000 above its immediate reserve requirements. This excess reserve would be exhausted when the banks had purchased $16,000,000,000 of Government bonds. The banks could then neither buy more Government bonds nor could it make loans to the Treasury for that purpose because such loans also would be blocked by the reserve requirements.
>
> Sixteen billion dollars of bonds is a very small part of the marketable securities now outstanding and it would be only a small financial storm which would bring forth that amount of liquidation if there were any doubt about the permanent ability of the Government to support the bond market. It would be terribly reckless to do anything to create such a doubt. What is needed of Congress now is not such action as increasing gold reserve requirements—which it is admitted will have no effect upon the current inflation but which will seriously limit the ability of the Government to stabilize bond prices. On the contrary, the best service Congress can render is to stop this constant stream of intimations from financial centers that the bond-support program will be modified, and this it can do by joining the President in a vigorous reaffirmation of our debt-management policies.

THE SPECIAL SESSION—PROPER ATTITUDES FOR SOLUTION OF NATIONAL PROBLEMS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a great American by the name of Henry William Grady, of Atlanta—one of the great journalists and thinkers of his time—wrote in the Atlanta Constitution in 1879, on the occasion of General Sherman's visit to Atlanta:

> We welcome General Sherman to Atlanta, on behalf of a people brave enough to bury their hatreds in the ruins his hands have made and kind enough to turn their passion toward recuperation rather than revenge.

With those words he welcomed General Sherman to Atlanta.

In these days when at home and abroad there is much to upset our sane thinking, that little incident impressed me with its vital qualities. It was such thoughts expressed through a great newspaper that brought about the reunion in spirit of this great people after a disastrous civil war.

Mr. President, in a few hours we shall leave this Chamber to go to our homes. Our purpose and intention in this session will be misrepresented by the evil and misunderstood by the indifferent. However, we will carry on, and will not permit those negative forces to interfere with our bringing our honest convictions to the attention of our constituents. As we do that, it is well to remember the words of Henry William Grady. This very session, of which so much has been written and said, will be a blessing in disguise if it will result in turning our people from the thought that, through legislative action, economic evils can be solved, and will turn our people from politics to work and production, from fear to courage, from selfishness to selflessness, from listening to fearists and doubters to listening to the voices of hope, charity, and love. Mr. President, in the period in which Henry William Grady lived, there was a gentleman from the South by the name of Lamar. Lamar was a Senator. In addressing himself to the problem of meeting the impact of the postwar situation which then existed, he said:

> To know one another, you will love one another.

Mr. President, indeed we need fewer stump speeches, and more stump pullers who will pull up the stumps of partisanship, lassitude, and un-American thinking. We need in our people a conviction of the blessings and advantages of America, with the result that some of our people who have been seeing green pastures over in Europe and Asia will, instead, begin to look at our own green pastures here at home. Yes; we need less talk and more work—more work of the right kind, work of the productive kind. We need not only the proper sort of physical work but also the proper sort of work of ideas, the yeast that dissolves wrong thinking, unproductive thinking. We need a realization by all of us that our problems will be solved, not by delegating the job to "George," and letting a legislative "George" do it, but by taking hold of the plow ourselves. That conviction must be widespread not only among legislators but also among merchants, bankers, lawyers, labor, and farmers. That is where our problems will be solved, if we get rid of some of our selfishness and in its place put selflessness and service.

There are those who assume that they are omniscient, that they know everything, and that the Congress knows nothing. However, the overwhelming proportion of the American people have enough reason and judgment to know that if the Congress refused to take action on certain arbitrary requests, its decision was a considered one, a conscientious one, and one based upon what the Congress faithfully believes is in the best interests of the American people. There are times when inaction on a wrong request is better than action on such a request. The fact that the Congress turned down certain items is an indication not of the fact that it is a do-nothing Congress, but on the contrary, that the Congress was indeed intent on not doing evil—which should be one of its foremost aims; just as another aim should be to do good; which is what it did.

TEMPORARY REGULATION OF CONSUMER INSTALLMENT CREDIT

The Senate resumed consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in view of an amendment which may be offered to the pending joint resolution, I want to make the objection, if it is necessary in order to raise the question, that it is not germane and that it is a revenue measure.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think it would be desirable, if we can vote before 1 o'clock, to get the committee amendments out of the way, in order to have a vote on the amendment which I am proposing. The amendment of the committee keeps the present reserve of 25 percent and refuses to increase it. It was said by the Senator from New Hampshire that gentlemen from the Federal Reserve Board testified it should not be increased. The difficulty with the Eccles philosophy of government is that he does not believe in any gold reserve at all. He made that perfectly clear when he testified in 1945. He says we are practically the only country that is on any such basis

of a gold backing for its money. The English and the Canadians do not have any gold reserve. They have no such requirement of a gold backing of their currency. We are the only country left that still has the idea of maintaining a gold reserve back of its currency. That is the philosophy that has reduced the gold reserve requirement, and it is the philosophy which I oppose in trying to restore the gold reserve to a figure where it will mean something in restraining inflation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest that we take a vote on the amendment. I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, a combined statement of the condition of the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement of condition of the 12 Federal Reserve banks combined

[In thousands of dollars]

	Aug. 4, 1948	Increase or decrease since—	
		July 28, 1948	Aug. 6, 1947
ASSETS			
Gold certificates	21,791,671	+7,001	+2,105,492
Redemption fund for Federal Reserve notes	612,505	+372	−60,108
Total gold certificate reserves	22,404,176	+7,373	+2,045,384
Other cash	272,058	−7,477	+4,850
Discounts and advances	282,590	−44,201	+159,483
Industrial loans	598	−191	−1,084
U. S. Government securities:			
Bills	7,388,012	−346,669	−6,702,674
Certificates	5,121,707	+164,500	−1,564,259
Notes	1,902,300	−51,000	+1,533,000
Bonds	6,966,185	+102,294	+6,243,495
Total U. S. Government securities	21,378,204	+168,895	−490,438
Total loans and securities	21,661,332	+124,503	−332,039
Due from foreign banks	49		−53
Federal Reserve notes of other banks	120,495	−11,980	+1,470
Uncollected items	2,389,022	−21,505	+214,432
Bank premises	32,433	−30	+557
Other assets	147,578	+7,821	+93,770
Total assets	47,027,143	+98,685	+2,028,377
LIABILITIES			
Federal Reserve notes	23,806,903	+81,555	−320,178
Deposits:			
Member bank, reserve account	17,605,901	+72,306	+1,196,999
U. S. Treasurer, general account	1,851,532	+29,748	+1,123,683
Foreign	387,941	+10,770	−161,909
Other	471,624	−26,056	−49,284
Total deposits	20,316,998	+86,768	+2,109,489
Deferred availability items	2,153,526	−71,038	+196,490
Other liabilities including accrued dividends	12,261	−2,357	−447
Total liabilities	46,289,688	+94,928	+1,985,345
CAPITAL ACCOUNTS			
Capital paid in	199,117	+72	+6,014
Surplus (sec. 7)	448,189		+8,366
Surplus (sec. 13b)	27,543		+88
Other capital accounts	62,606	+3,685	+28,364
Total liabilities and capital accounts	47,027,143	+98,785	+2,028,377
Ratio of gold certificate reserves to deposit and Federal Reserve note liabilities combined (percent)	50.8	−0.2	+2.7
Contingent liability on bills purchased for foreign correspondents	1,772	+196	−2,562
Commitments to make industrial loans	6,788	+364	−122

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment to the House amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 157.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not want this matter to be voted on without another word with respect to the dangerous character of the suggestion carried in the House provision, increasing the gold reserve. I should like to point out that the majority of the Banking and Currency Committee, a very overwhelming majority as I understand, only two members of the committee, I am told, having voted against the committee amendment, have come to the conclusion that this is no time to make the very substantial change in the gold reserve policy. The evidence before the committee was clear that the governors of the Federal Reserve System are now giving study to this precise question. No hearings have been held for this precise purpose, at any length. The implications of the increase are so great, they have been so clearly set forth in the remarks by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], that I feel all Members of the Senate should realize that if they vote now to change the present policy, they are seriously impairing the power of the Government of the United States to sustain its bonds.

We reduced the gold reserve from 40 percent to 25 percent during the war, but when we made that reduction the national debt was only a fraction of what it is now. The national debt was increased successively after that reduction had been made. To manage the national debt is the most difficult fiscal problem faced by any country. If the United States of America is not able to manage its debt, if Congress does anything whereby it impairs the power of the Government to carry on open-market operations, the result can easily be a collapse of the bond market.

There is no doubt in my mind that there are several persons of great importance who believe bonds should be permitted to go below par, who believe this change should be made; but it is absolutely too great a risk to take. The banks of the country, Members of Congress, members of the executive department, and leaders in business, all during the war have been selling the bonds of the United States upon the argument that those bonds will be maintained. Now, if without hearings, the Congress should undertake to deprive the Government of the only power by which it supports the bond market, we would be inviting disaster.

I sincerely hope the committee amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the next committee amendment.

The next committee amendment was, on page 4, line 4, to strike out the numeral "7" and insert the numeral "8."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I understand that amendment relates to the increase in reserves against time deposits?

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that the House increased the reserves which may be required in commercial banks against demand deposits by 3 percentage points. Our committee proposes to increase it by 5 percentage points. I think we should adopt the 3 percentage points, but, assuming that the Senate adopts the 5 percentage points and the bill goes to conference, it can be reasonably expected that it will come back with 4 percentage points as a compromise between the 3 and the 5. I have consulted with the House leaders and they assure me that if we adopt the 4 percentage points now, with the other two committee amendments which have already been adopted extending the date, striking out section 2, they will accept the Senate bill without conference. I suggest that the business-like way to do it is to make that change, to amend the committee amendment so as to provide for 4 percent. I can give the Senate assurance it will not then be necessary to send the bill to conference. The difficulty of sending the bill to conference is that we shall not pass the bill until after 4 o'clock. It then has to go to the House; they will have to go through the procedure of agreeing to a conference and appointing conferees, and it may make 2 or 3 hours' difference in the time at which we adjourn this evening. I have talked to the chairman of the committee about it and I suggest that if he will suggest an amendment to change the percentage so as to strike an even compromise with the House, I can give the Senate assurance that that figure will be accepted by the House and that the bill will be accepted by the House without a conference.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask, what about the time deposit percentage?

Mr. TAFT. I think the best thing to do in that instance, perhaps, though I have not discussed it with Members of the House, is to make a 1½ percent increase. The House increased it 1 point; the Senate committee proposes to increase it 2 points. I suggest that it be 1½ points, halfway between, which is what the conference committee inevitably would do when figures of that kind are involved.

Mr. CAIN. I should say to the Senator from Ohio that as representing the Banking and Currency Committee, I am not qualified to speak officially for all the members of the committee. In my opinion there is much to be said for the position and recommendation just made by the Senator from Ohio. I have been informed within the last few minutes that the Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the committee, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], a member of the committee, will subscribe to the recommendation. Do I infer correctly from the statement by the Senator from Ohio that the House would be agreeable to making the increase on demand deposits 4 percent, rather than 3 percent?

Mr. TAFT. Four percent.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is taking as an assumption 1½ percent on time deposits. If I were to speak on that subject, I should speak in support of it.

Mr. TAFT. If that is agreeable, I move then that the committee amendment be amended by striking out the figure "8" and inserting the figure "7½."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Just a moment. Without objection, the announcement of the vote agreeing to the Senate amendment is rescinded. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] whether he consulted any other members of the committee besides the chairman, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. CAIN. Those were the only Senators from whom I have had a concurrence in the proposal made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I would speak strongly in favor of the suggestion, as an individual, but I cannot, as I endeavored to suggest, speak officially for each member of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the committee's suggestion was not so strong as the recommendation made by the President.

Mr. CAIN. The President recommended 10 and 4. The compromise finally turned out to be 5 and 2.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? As I understand, the Banking and Currency Committee was evenly divided on the 5, so they almost accepted the 3 percent figure. Is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. We voted, first, and got no decision, on 10 and 5, 6 and 4, and 3 and 1, and finally arrived at a compromise on 5 and 2.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington or the Senator from Ohio whether we are being asked again to make a serious mistake in order to accommodate another body. Do we have a stop-watch on the session? Does the Senate have to adjourn at a certain minute, and, in order to avoid a conference, do something which the committee did not recommend? I do not see any objection to letting the matter go to conference. If it can be agreed to promptly, it will be agreed to. It seems to me that the idea that the Senate is now compelled to make another mistake in order to avoid a conflict with the House——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a question of principle is not involved, but a question of degree. A matter of 3 points will authorize the Federal Reserve Board to increase the required reserves on demand deposits by approximately $2,700,000,000. Another point would make the figure approximately $3,000,000,000. If we get into conference with the House it is a question of whether we should take the halfway figure, which we usually do. The next question is extending the date from March to June and striking out section 2, on one of which our conferees might give way. So that on the whole the deal, if the Senator wants to call it that, is perhaps better than we would get if we should go to conference.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, whether it is a matter of principle or policy is not very important. It seems to me, in view of this discussion and this second effort to compromise in advance matters which ought to be thrashed out between the two Houses, it might be well to suggest that we consider providing that all senatorial committees shall find out in advance what the House will do, and then bring in bills according to the wishes of the House.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I remember when the distinguished minority leader was in charge of this body, and he had a great deal of trouble with the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I had trouble with the House.

Mr. TAFT. In a short session, such as this one, time is limited. The ordinary legislative process, as the Senator knows, involves passage here and passage in the other House about 3 days later, if every rule is followed. Then a conference committee is appointed, which takes another 2 or 3 days. I am only trying to assist the convenience of the Senate in an effort to bypass that process to some extent.

Mr. BARKLEY. The convenience of the Senate is not a vital matter. It is not the matter for which we were called back by the President. The welfare of the American people, as well as the convenience of the Senate, it seems to me, is involved. I appreciate the Senator's reference to the days when I was majority leader. I did have trouble with the House. I have had trouble with this House sometimes. But I do not recall that I have ever hot-footed it over to the House day after day, hour by hour, and even minute by minute, to find out what they would allow us to do.

Mr. TAFT. This is my proposal to try to avoid a possible long spreading-out this afternoon while the conference committee tries to work it out.

Mr. BARKLEY. We do not have to spread out today. We might spread out on Monday.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection. But I have found it to be the sense of the Senators that if we have to do certain things anyway, we can do them today rather than on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I still object to the argument that we should do something hastily and maybe erroneously, because the House has been canvassed by someone, and that someone has told the Senator from Ohio that the House will not agree to what we do here. That is no way to legislate.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see why not. It is perfectly reasonable to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the motion made by the Senator from Ohio is altogether in harmony with the policy which has been adopted on the majority side, namely, to do as little as possible with the tremendously important problem of controlling inflation. Everyone agrees that inflation should be controlled. Everyone agrees that we are in the midst of very serious inflation. The Republican convention, in its platform referred to the cruelly high prices which the people are being compelled to pay for the cost of living. But the members of the majority are not disposed to do anything. It was reported at the very beginning of the session, upon very excellent authority, that the Republican leaders had advised the majority members just to stick around for a couple of weeks and then recess. Of course, the mere fact that we are doing anything at all is a confession upon the part of the majority that there is a serious problem. The mere fact that we are passing a housing bill, and the mere fact that the majority is willing to consider consumer credit, which was held up in the House for almost a year, are absolute confessions on the part of the majority that there is a problem. But the policy of the majority is to do as little as possible.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to say for the record that that is not the policy of the majority. I want to state for the record that if we cannot compromise this question we should take it to conference, and when the conference report comes back, if it take a day, a week, a month, or a year, I am willing to stay here and thrash it out. That is the policy of the majority.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to point out to the acting majority leader and to the Senator from Wyoming that the policy of the majority today was the policy which was enunciated by the Senator from Ohio in a speech on this floor on July 24, 1946, and it has not changed one iota.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator will quote it.

Mr. McMAHON. This is what he said:

> If the consumers think that the price is too high today, they will wait until prices are lower. I feel that in time the law of supply and demand would bring prices into line.

They should not try to fool the American people into thinking they have any different philosophy today from what they had before. Everything they are doing is in conformance with the philosophy enunciated by the Senator from Ohio in July 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All Senators will suspend. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time is in the control of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator indicate how much time he yields?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not believe it will take me more than 3 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield the Senator 3 minutes, or 5, if necessary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am prompted to take my seat now because of the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. The policy of the majority is to be determined not by what any member of the majority may say here, but by what the majority proposes to do. The majority is clearly intending to adjourn Congress by tonight, if it is humanly possible to do so. It is clearly the intention of the majority not to pass any other legislation dealing with inflation than that which is contained in the measure before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator in favor of title III and title IV of the President's bill, which cover price control, allocations and control of wages? Is the Senator for them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That will be presented——

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator vote for them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That will be presented here in a few moments. I am pointing out that the policy of the majority party is to pass two bills, the housing bill and this inflation control bill, and then a little appropriation bill, although there are before us——

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not care to answer the question, because that issue is not here.

Mr. WHERRY. The issue is here. That is the only issue we are going to decide here this afternoon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The issue is——

Mr. WHERRY. The last time I asked the Senator the question he said he had not studied it. The Senator has had 2 weeks, and I ask him now, is he in favor of title III and title IV of the President's bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WHERRY. I said the President's bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky. I want to get some results to control inflation. I do not believe that the proposals offered by the majority party will do that.

Oh, it is a blessing, in my opinion, that now that the Congress has been called back into special session by the action of the President of the United States we are going to have consumer credit control. That will hold down the supply of money. It is a great blessing, of course.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. The last statement of the Senator was a very interesting one. Are we or are we not going to have consumer credit control? That is proposed here today, and the Senator just referred to it as coming from the President and being consumer control. It is consumer installment credit control.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Installment credit control.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield the Senator from Wyoming two more minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for two more minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not care to infringe upon the Senator's time at any great length. My friends on the other side are introducing all sorts of divergence to get away from the fact that a too-little program is being offered. I only hope and pray it will not be too late also.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss the pending amendment.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] could agreeably speak now, I am sure, if it suits the wish of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much time would the Senator like?

Mr. CAIN. About 20 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That will not in any way affect my right to offer the amendments, will it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will not.

Mr. CAIN. I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I realize that under the order of procedure obtaining in the Senate now any remarks to be made upon any phase of the joint resolution or any proposed amendment must be made at this time, because at 4 o'clock we will begin to vote, and we cannot make our comments after that hour.

Mr. President, the high inflationary prices confronting the people today constitute a problem that cannot be lightly examined and speedily cured with the passage of one, two, or three acts by the Congress. There are so many different sides contributing to this economic question, so many complexities, that it is utterly unreasonable to assume the dilemma can be solved with one slashing blow.

Of course, I am concerned, as the people of my State of West Virginia and the whole Union are concerned, when the prices of meat, and bread, and milk, clothing, and all the necessities of life, soar upward in cost to such a tremendously high level that the drain on family incomes is dangerously heavy.

As I have always strived upon every occasion during my service in the United States Senate, I want to help seek out and support affirmative, constructive legislation which will relieve the people of our Nation from this intolerable burden of inflation. But no man can declare wisely that this serious problem can be worked out in a short space of days or weeks. Nor can it be truthfully stated, in my opinion, that the many facets of inflation can easily be reconciled by Congress in the midst of a political campaign.

Conditions, events and circumstances, some the doing of individual men, some the inevitable out-growth of the war, and some bearing the unmistakable stamp of origin among those who desire things for themselves, have lapped and overlapped into a vast, diversified picture which reflects the unhappy situation confronting us today.

To say flatly and with unqualified assertion that there is one basic cause or one basic remedy is to argue with no logic or reasoning at all. There is no escaping the fact that high expenditures by this Government's administration is a contributing cause. The public debt attests the dollars poured from the Treasury. Is this the cause?

We are embarked on a huge program of spending in the name of economic recovery for the war-devastated countries of the world, and at the same time committed to energetic spending for the purpose of strengthening our armed forces. Loans by our banks are thrusting unlimited sums into the pool of purchasing power of the people. Wages are at high peaks, and I hope they can justifiably be kept there.

High taxes, maintaining the flow of dollars from the taxpayer into the Treasury for more Government spending return to haunt that same taxpayer in the form of hidden costs in the higher prices.

At this time the Government has embarked upon a great spending program of purchasing commodities on the open market, such as wheat, knowing that by such action it is sending up the price of wheat, or maintaining the price, or promising a higher price for the future.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Do I understand correctly that the Senator complains that the Government's program for the purchase of agricultural commodities is inflationary?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I complain where it goes beyond the point and is administered beyond the point, I may say to the Senator, of making a shortage for the American people of grains, or of any other commodity.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator realize that the program of purchasing by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Agricultural Department is in exact conformity with the law as laid down by the Congress, and as laid down with the help of the Senator's vote?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am entirely in favor of the support of proper prices, but not to the point of buying that causes inflation.

Mr. President, I must proceed with my remarks, because I am limited in time.

The causes to which I have referred and countless others have inflated prices to their present high levels.

Let no one argue that overnight the inflationary spiral can be battered down by law or edict. It is impossible to do that, and it is foolish to think it can be done.

There can be no following of the course of police-state methods, as the present occupant of the White House so aptly described price controls and rationing as we knew them at the war's end.

Perhaps the quickest way to control prices is to give the power to control them into the hands of the Executive, but I doubt the wisdom of doing that in view of the experience we have had under the present administration in the handling of price controls. I doubt the wisdom of giving that power back into the hands of the Executive until every other method has been used to curtail inflation. Yet, Mr. President, the Chief Executive has asked for a return of that power. I am reluctant to place it in the hands of those who had it before. I recall that formerly this power was used to an extent and administered—I should say misadministered—in such a way that even foodstuffs were not on store shelves and could not be obtained.

Mr. President, I remember well that in my own State it was estimated there were 600,000 head of cattle at a time when the people could not obtain sufficient meat. West Virginia is not a large cattle-producing State, but the number of cattle in the State at that time would have been of value if some of them could have been used to supply meat for the people of my State. However, the cattle were in the fields and the people could not get sufficient meat. Why? Because under the orders of the administration slaughterers' permits were not allowed to be issued. People went hungry while at the same time there was an available meat supply right at their front doors.

Consider the plight of Great Britain under peacetime regimentation of prices and business and labor in general. We see there scarcities in food and clothing, and almost universal misery and want. No, price controls and a return to wartime rationing are not the answer we seek against inflation at this time.

Power rests in the administration at this moment to control completely the shipments of products abroad. Much as I favor foreign trade and the exportation of articles to those abroad who are in need, I want the people of this country to have a sufficient part of the benefit of America's full production so that we will not be in want here or subjected to the inflationary prices which exist today.

I repeat, Mr. President, it is impossible for Congress after a fortnight's study, to enact a bill or law that will strike a shattering blow against the evil of inflation. We can make the best headway possible now. We can take steps proposed to be taken at this time; but I do not think the whole evil can be cured by the administration of one or two doses of medicine. I do not believe any right-thinking man or woman expects Congress to perform an overnight miracle.

High prices did not spring upon us suddenly. They have grown slowly and steadily to ominous maturity on an intricate economic framework. If we thoughtlessly and impulsively begin tinkering with this complicated economic picture, it will without warning fall into the jig-sawed separate pieces which it actually is.

I am convinced that the entire complex problem of inflation deserves careful, deliberate attention by both Houses of Congress. Let us proceed here as far as we can in the present short session; let us do what we can and do it earnestly. But more must be done to meet the problem. I believe that the Congress should undertake to tackle the difficult and serious situation in a correct way.

The proposal I make today is not a new method. Ever since the time when the first representatives of the American people assembled in the Congress the problems of the Nation have received initial consideration by committees of the Congress. It is such a committee which I believe the Nation needs today, and it is such a committee, with a serious task before it, that I urge be formed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to the pending measure directing the creation of a joint congressional committee composed of five Members of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives to investigate the present high prices of consumer goods, and report its recommendations to Congress not later than January 9, 1949.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I recommend the appointment of such a committee, although I know that other committees have studied the question. I know that it is unusual to ask for the appointment of a special committee, and if there is any real objection to the appointment of a special committee I am perfectly willing that such a direction be contained in the amendment so that any committee that may properly deal with the subject may continue the study of the problem.

I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am not sure whether the Senator from West Virginia is aware of the fact that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, a committee composed of Members of both Houses, chairmaned by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], has been studying this problem for 2 years, and that hearings have been held by that committee in various parts of the country. That committee was broken up into three subcommittees, and the subcommittee of which I was a member held hearings from New Hampshire to Florida. Hearings were held by other subcommittees in the Midwest and in the Far West. Sufficient studies of the subject have been made. I think the joint committee, which is well staffed, has ably and completely studied the problem and can continue whatever study of the problem is necessary to be made. Recommendations have been made by that committee, at least by the minority members, to curb inflation. But no action has been taken, I will say to the Senator from West Virginia. What we need now is some action. We have studied the subject. We are aware of the problems. We do not need anyone to tell us that prices are high. We have looked into the situation completely. Now is the time for action. The difficulty is that we are not obtaining action during the special session of Congress. The little bits of action we are receiving may result in more inflation. We need a general, rounded program to stabilize the cost of living or to roll it back. Although I think the Senator's proposal is a splendid one, the studies have been made, the facts are before us, and the time has now arrived for action.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I agree with the Senator that a rounded, full program must be worked out, and I agree that action, so far as it is wise to be taken at this time, should be taken. However, I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he desires to place controls in the President at this time in respect to the fixing of wages and the fixing of prices for goods?

Mr. MYERS. I believe the situation is now so serious that we should meet it as we met the serious situation brought about as the result of the war. Yes; I will say to the Senator from West Virginia I will vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to give the President more power to impose selective controls in order that we may prevent the cost of living from spiraling further upward. The cost of living will spiral upward.

Mr. President, we are being told each week and each month by Members of Congress that the situation will work itself out; that the law of supply and demand will take care of the problem. But prices continue to rise.

I will support the President's program; yes. No one else has submitted an adequate program in this Congress. No program has been submitted by the majority party. The majority have accepted two of the President's proposals, but those two alone cannot do the job. I will vote for those two measures, but I know they will not do the job. We must have more. We must have a rounded program.

Of course, I do not like controls. No one likes controls. But I say to the Senator from West Virginia that the situation is becoming so serious that we had better fight this inflation as we fought the war. We had better fight to win. Unless we are willing to do something, and something drastic, we will not win the battle, we will go over the precipice so fast that then we will be worrying about deflation rather than inflation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say to the able Senator that it is perfectly possible that we will have to come to controls, even severe controls, in the United States. Where the Senator and I differ is that I do not want to place such controls in the same hands that administered them before, because I have not forgotten what happened heretofore as a result of the administration of controls. I am perfectly willing to approach this to any end, but I am very wary and very apprehensive at this time of putting the power of controls back into the hands of those who administered the controls before. I want to take every other course, every other step possible before that is done. The step that is proposed to be taken by the majority today is to approach the subject as gradually as we can, and if controls have to come, the Senator from West Virginia will be ready to vote for them. But I am reluctant to do it at this time under the present situation.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator from West Virginia mean that he is willing to allow inflation to continue, for the cost of living to rise, the cost of foodstuffs to rise, the cost of everything the housewife buys to rise, until some future date when he may determine in his own mind that the situation has gotten out of hand, and it is time to impose controls? Or does he mean, since he states that he did not have any confidence in those who formerly managed the program, that he wants to wait until after the election, and allow prices to rise until election day, or until next year?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is not a question of waiting until after election. Nor can the Senator from West Virginia say that he is going to wait until any certain day. The Senator from West Virginia says that in the desperate situation which confronts us today every step should be taken before we place so-called police-state controls in the hands of the present administration.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator knows that that was said last year. It was said in June 1946; it was said in the fall of 1947; it was said in January 1948. "Let us wait." We have waited. The American people have waited, and the cost of living is getting entirely out of hand. How long should we wait? What is the "target day"?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let us take the steps proposed today and see what the results may be. Let us not take the severe steps proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Kentucky and place control back in the hands of the administration. That is the position of the Senator from West Virginia. I hope I have made it clear. I urge that this amendment for the formation of a joint congressional committee be made a part of the bill. I am perfectly willing that the existing committee take over the work and carry it on, to meet the problems of today under the facts which exist today, and to continue such studies as may eventually result in methods of meeting this problem, which does not arise from any one cause but from many.

It may be that controls are necessary. Let us not adopt them until it is necessary to do so. I, for one, am not willing to place controls upon the American worker and the American buyer today. That is my own position.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator realizes, does he not, that under price control prices rose about 6½ percent? That meant that the wage earner had to earn $1.065 in 1945 and 1946 to buy what he could have bought for a dollar in 1939. Since that time the index has risen to $1.265. Is it the Senator's position that he wants to tell the American people and the people of West Virginia that they can enjoy dollar hamburger and 88-cent eggs while he has a commission appointed to study prices? Is that the Senator's position?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, no, Mr. President. I am working just as hard as any other Member of this body, and I am just as hopeful as any other Senator that the steps taken here will relieve the situation so that we shall not have such prices for hamburger and eggs. But I can never forget the wrongs which were done under the former administration of price controls by those in power today.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator in answer to his observation that I shall never forget the swarm of lobbyists which the National Association of Manufacturers turned loose on the Congress to destroy price control, and their assurances that if only price control were removed, everything would be all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield me 1 minute?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Connecticut cannot forget the assurances which were contained in advertisements which were carried in every newspaper in the country, that if only price controls were removed production would increase, and prices would rise for a time and then come down. That was 2 years ago. Since that time it has been absolutely demonstrated that although prices have risen, production has not increased in proportion.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The able Senator from Connecticut never heard any statement of that kind from the Senator from West Virginia. The Senator from West Virginia wanted price controls lifted after the abuses which arose under them, and at a time when there was no food upon the shelves of the stores of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I should like to continue the argument so ably presented, but unfortunately interrupted, which related to the promises of the National Association of Manufacturers, a branch of the Republican Party, that if we would only remove OPA control, production would rise and prices would fall——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN. I have not been able to finish my first sentence yet. I think it is a little early. I shall be glad to yield later.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will yield, I assure him that I shall not interrupt him again. On the point which the Senator is discussing, I think the Senator has made an inadvertent error. I understood the Senator from Rhode Island to say that the National Association of Manufacturers had made certain allegations or statements to the Republican Congress. Of course, the Senator recalls that the controls were taken off by the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was a Democratic Congress, and were also taken off by the President of the United States.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator from California misunderstood me. I said nothing about a Republican Congress. I did not use the words. I referred to the fact that the National Association of Manufacturers was in a sense a representative of the Republican Party, and that it had made its appeal not to the Congress of the United States, but to the people of the United States.

As an illustration of that fact, I have in my hand two full-page advertisements from the Washington Post, one of April 18, 1946, and the other a little later. The earlier one was headed "Paging Mr. Bowles," and discussed the question of the lack of meat, underwear, household appliances, men's suits, butter, and radios. It then gave the recipe of the National Association of Manufacturers for a cure for the high prices of those materials. The advertisement stated that the high prices were due to lack of production, and that lack of production was due to controls. The advertisement concluded with this question:

Isn't this the answer? NAM has said: Remove price controls on manufactured goods and production will step up fast. In a survey of a representative cross-section of NAM membership, 97 percent find price controls are hampering production. Remove these controls and goods will pour into the market. Within a reasonable time, prices will adjust themselves naturally—as they always do when production goes up—in line with the real worth of things. This is the way you can get the goods you want at prices you can afford to pay.

That was two and a quarter years ago. Are the people getting the goods they want at the prices they can afford to pay?

About a month later there was another full-page advertisement, which was headed: "Would you like some butter or a roast of beef? Well, here's why OPA ceilings make them hard to get." Similar reasons are given, and the advertisement concludes with a similar question:

Isn't this the answer? Remove price controls on manufactured goods and production will step up fast. Goods will then pour into the market, and, within a reasonable time, prices will adjust themselves naturally and competitively, as they always have, in line with the real worth of things. This is the way you can get the goods you want at prices you can afford to pay. Write your Congressman your views—today.

That was two and a quarter years ago. I suggest that if we are to follow the advice of the National Association of Manufacturers, the people might write to their representatives in Congress their views today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the two advertisements to which I have referred printed in full at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the advertisements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Washington Post of April 18, 1946]

PAGING MR. BOWLES

On March 24, Chester Bowles, Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, said, in The New York Times:

"The heads of the National Association of Manufacturers • • • tell us that under price ceilings goods will not be made. • • • If any person reading this article knows of any instance where price controls are actually holding up production I hope he will • • • give me the facts."

Here, Mr. Bowles, are some of the facts you asked for, as reported by leaders of American industries, in the Roll Call on Production broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System last Tuesday:

MEAT

"As a direct result of OPA regulations, legitimate meat packers are producing substantially less meat of all kinds than normally. Industrial surveys in representative cities from coast to coast show most consumers in those areas are paying black market penalties of about 20 cents on each dollar's worth of meat they buy. The whole trouble is that OPA regulations are unworkable. What is needed is for Congress to do away entirely with all OPA meat and livestock regulations so that cousumers again may get the kind of meat they want, when they want it, at a fair competitive price." (Wesley Hardenbergh, president, American Meat Institute, Chicago, Ill.)

UNDERWEAR

"An estimate from figures compiled all over the entire country shows the manufacturers of summer and winter underwear are only producing about 60 percent of their normal output of essentially needed underwear items. OPA has forced manufacturers, generally, to discontinue low-priced items. • • • OPA policies make it impossible for manufacturers to intelligently plan the operation of their plants and this can only mean continued low production." (Edward J. Ashe, executive vice president, Standard Knitting Mills, Knoxville, Tenn.)

HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCES

"We have had confusion where we should have had production. This chaotic price situation still forces many manufacturers in this field to produce at a loss or not to produce at all. The prompt elimination of price control would rapidly increase the production of household appliances." (Howard E. Blood, president, Norge Division, Borg-Warner Corp., Detroit, Mich.)

MEN'S SUITS

"Production has been retarded on account of the determination of OPA to enforce the absorption of very considerable wage increases, without adequate relief in selling prices.

"Government efforts to stimulate production of low-priced suits by granting priorities have largely failed.

"Our greatest need is more production and less control, and unless the maximum average price regulation is eliminated, the present scarcity of suits will continue." (Bertram J. Cahn, president, B. Kuppenheimer, Inc., Chicago, Ill.)

BUTTER

"Butter production is now at the lowest level in 25 years because OPA keeps butter prices 20 percent below other dairy products. Consumers are being robbed by the black market. OPA price controls are restricting production, that is why you can't find butter." (L. S. Hurtz, president, the Fairmont Creamery Co., Omaha, Nebr.)

RADIOS

"Home radio receivers • • • have been in low supply for lack of those parts that go to make up a radio receiver, manufactured mainly by specialty companies. And this shortage is due to low price ceilings • • • the OPA does not permit to be included in the selling prices the actual cost increases realized by the manufacturers. • • • Here we are, 8 months after VJ-day and in those 8 months, my own company has made only as many radio sets as we should have made in each of those 8 months • • • the industry had a very easy reconversion job to do and by this time the market should have been flooded with radio receivers." (R. C. Cosgrove, vice president and general manager, Crosley Corp., Cincinnati, Ohio; president, Radio Manufacturers' Association.)

Isn't this the answer? NAM has said: Remove price controls on manufactured goods and production will step up fast. In a survey of a representative cross section of NAM membership, 97 percent find price controls are hampering production. Remove these controls and goods will pour into the market. Within a reasonable time, prices will adjust themselves naturally—as they always do when production goes up—in line with the real worth of things. • • • This is the way you can get the goods you want at prices you can afford to pay.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS.

[From the Washington Post of May 4, 1946]

WOULD YOU LIKE SOME BUTTER OR A ROAST OF BEEF?

Well, here's why OPA ceilings make them hard to get—

Because OPA "controls" discourage the production of butter. And much of the little produced is being sold in the black market.

"Fifty percent of all butter production today is going into the black market and selling for 80 cents or more a pound." (D. K. Howe, president, American Butter Institute, Chicago, Ill.)

Because OPA "controls" drive meat away from legitimate packers into the black market.

"The plain fact is that OPA meat regulations are driving the honest operators out of business and are turning the business over to crooks and cheats and chiselers." (Wesley Hardenbergh, president, American Meat Institute, Chicago, Ill.)

It's the same with other things you want: men's suits, underwear, socks, work gloves, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, electric irons, toasters, women's low-priced dresses, moderate and low-priced textiles, lumber and other building materials, furniture.

Production of too many of the things you have been waiting for is held back by OPA.

Instead of the things you want, you are too often forced to buy high-priced merchandise you don't want. And you know what the black market is in your home town.

OPA—with an army of 31,784 employees and $150,171,000 to spend this year—has failed completely to stop the modern bootleggers and racketeers who prey upon us all.

OPA MEANS LOW PRODUCTION—LOW PRODUCTION MEANS BLACK MARKETS—BLACK MARKETS MEAN NEEDLESSLY HIGH PRICES

Isn't this the answer? Remove price controls on manufactured goods, and production will step up fast. Goods will then pour into the market and, within a reasonable time, prices will adjust themselves naturally and competitively, as they always have, in line with the real worth of things. This is the way you can get the goods you want at prices you can afford to pay. Write your Congressman your views—today!

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield approximately 5 minutes to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, an effort has frequently been made to represent the farmers of the United States as the villains in this inflation tragedy now threatening our economy with collapse. Hardly a day passes but we can hear in congressional debates or read in the press of the big industrial centers attacks on the farmers, charging them with responsibility for the high cost of living. On the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] recently indicted the farmers of America as the real culprits in the present inflation, insinuating that the high price of farm products was the real cause of the high cost of living. He charged that the prices of steel had gone up only 45 percent, while the prices of agricultural products had risen 150 percent. That statement is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 30, at page 9565.

The people of Montana can easily see the utter unfairness of that argument. Prior to the war, the prices of farm products had sunk to the lowest point in our history. In 1933, when the Roosevelt administration came into power, wheat was selling at 25 cents a bushel in Montana and the farmers were losing their shirts. On the other hand, steel, which is a monopoly, had curtailed its production, raised its prices, and was making huge profits, paying the steel corporation directors huge bonuses and the stockholders fat dividends, even during the depression. When the war came on, steel did not have to raise its prices; its prices were already so high that in 1938 the steel corporations were making more profits than they had made in 1929, which was the highest period of American industrial activity. With the stupendous war contracts, through the war they made fabulous profits, while small business was suffering severely.

However, throughout the period of the depression, the farmers faced bankruptcy. Naturally, when the war came on, with the great demand for farm production, their prices rose with all prices. But the prices of everything that the

farmers had to use on their farms—labor, machinery, trucks, farm implements, fertilizer, seed, everything a farmer uses—went up, and the net profits of the farmers were curtailed. They could not lay away great reserves as the steel industry could.

Mr. President, I do not want to be understood as attacking the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for his stout defense of big business and his effort to relieve big business from the charge of responsibility for our runaway prices. He speaks for the industrial East; he speaks for the conservative party, which is dominated by the big corporations and industries of the Nation. I think, however, it is only fair that his efforts to fasten upon the farmers of America the blame for the inflation we are now experiencing should be analyzed and refuted.

It must be clear to anyone who has studied this subject of inflation that the farmers of America are not responsible, either directly or indirectly, for the present inflationary conditions. Farmers do not fix prices in our economy. Farm prices are fixed in the national and international markets; and when the basic prices of the Nation go up, farm prices must necessarily follow.

Recently, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, said that the wheat now being harvested is the most expensive wheat crop in history. This is due, of course, to the increased labor costs, machinery and seed costs, and to the price of everything used in producing a crop. The same plea can be stated regarding the production of other farm crops and of meat.

All economists of the country recognize the fact that in an industrial Nation like ours, the prices of the basic products, such as steel, copper, aluminum, cement, and other such items, are the ones that influence inflation and high costs of living. It is well recognized that all the big monopolistic organizations in the country controlling basic industries raised their prices at the beginning of the war and made excessive profits. These prices have been constantly rising; and when labor demands increased wages to meet the increased cost of living, the big basic industries grant the wage raises, but immediately increase their commodity prices far more than the increased wages justify. It is that vicious circle which is causing inflation; and the attempt on the part of the Republican Senators in the East to fasten on the farmers of America the blame for the high costs of living, is utterly unjustified.

Some of the large newspapers of the country and some of the Republican columnists seem to think that Congress should pass laws designed to prohibit the American farmer from earning a living. The big industries of the Nation want low farm prices and high profits for themselves. If living costs go up, they have to pay higher wages. Consequently, they seek to depress farm prices and avoid the payment of better wages. In many of the big newspapers and magazines, the farmer is being pictured as a fat profiteer, burdening the taxpayers by his subsidies, and generally to blame for the high costs of living. That propaganda does not fool the people in Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the statement which I have prepared may appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farm income in Montana, of course, has reached an all-time high; but the farmer, like everyone else, is putting out more money for what he has to buy. While farm products have increased in price 11 percent during the last year, the prices for what the farmer buys have soared 16 percent. Furthermore, many Montana farmers buy a large percentage of their food from merchants; and when those farmers shop, they have to pay for the cost of production and the costs of selling, wholesaling, distribution, and speculation. When they buy clothing, trucks, tractors, farm machinery, a family auto, gasoline, tires, or anything else, they have to pay the highly inflated prices that exist. They have to maintain their houses, farm buildings, machinery, and fences, and are obliged to pay the wage scale which has mounted during this period of inflation.

The farmers, the workers, and the small-business men of the Nation are being threatened with bankruptcy by this inflation we are passing through. They are demanding that something be done about it. The President has called Congress into special session and has presented to the Congress a program to control the inflation. But what is the present Republican-controlled Congress doing about it? At first it threatened to do absolutely nothing, and to adjourn sine die, without the slightest action. Lately, however, it decided to present some measures for action. So we are having a few of the proposals recommended by the President acted upon. However, this is an incomplete and ineffective program. The major program for inflation control is being completely ignored.

The able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the leader of the minority party, has offered an amendment to the pending measure, Senate Joint Resolution 157. This amendment seeks to provide measures which will protect the people of this country from a further rise in inflationary prices which is certain to result in a final economic collapse if something is not done about it. The Barkley amendment has been fully discussed; and I shall not take up the time of the Senate to review its provisions, except to say that I think the Congress of the United States will make one of the greatest mistakes in its history if it fails to take action on this matter and give the people of this country legislation along the lines of the Barkley amendment, to protect the country from the dangers which today threaten it. It is my intention to support the Barkley amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does either the Senator from Washington or the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to speak to the remaining amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. CAIN. The first two amendments have already been adopted by the Senate. The fourth committee amendment would increase to 8 percent the lawful reserve which member banks of the Federal Reserve System could be required to maintain behind time deposits. The law presently fixes an upper limit of 6 percent for this purpose. The House amendment would increase that amount only to 7 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the purpose of keeping the RECORD clear, does the Senator from Washington desire to yield to himself, at this time, a certain number of minutes?

Mr. CAIN. I desire to yield to myself an unlimited number of minutes, in order to inform the Senate as to the remaining committee amendments to be considered.

I hope the Senate will understand that I am referring only to time deposits, as opposed to demand deposits.

As I said a moment ago, the law presently fixed an upper limit of 6 percent for this purpose. The House amendment would increase that only to 7 percent, or an increase of 1 percentage point.

If we are to arm the Federal Reserve System to combat inflation, we should arm it reasonably. The committee is of the opinion the House amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 157 in respect to this matter would not do so as well as would the recommendation submitted now by the Senate committee. The ease of expanding currency by the present ratio of approximately 6 to 1 represents a potent source of inflationary credit. This problem would be remedied in proportion to the extent the "lawful reserve" requirements of member banks of the Federal Reserve System are raised.

In speaking of the bank credit control proposals in Senate bill 2910, Mr. Sproul, President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York said:

It will reduce somewhat the ratio of expansion on reserves.

He explained it as follows:

With a modern central banking system operating in a highly developed deposit banking system, and with a decreasing reliance upon gold, much of the need for low reserve requirements and consequent economizing in the provision of money by commercial banks has disappeared. In these circumstances there may well be a balance of advantage in higher reserve requirements, as a means of reducing the dangerous expansibility and, at times, destructive contractability of a money supply based on low reserve ratios of commercial banks.

The proposal expressed in the committee amendment in this respect, is therefore, more effective than the House provision on this particular point. At the same time it represents a fair compromise, we think, between the higher figure of 4 percent requested by the administration and the lower figure of 1 percent requested by the House.

As stated by Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, presently a Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, before our committee—

The very fact that the Federal Reserve Board had that power would have a very wholesome influence upon the banking system, even without putting the increased reserve requirement into effect, for this reason: Every bank would want to keep themselves in a position where they would have either excess reserves or have securities readily available that they could dispose so as to meet the increased reserve requirement if it were put into effect. * * * The very fact that we get increased reserve requirements is going to cause the banks to hesitate at least to increase their loans as freely when they have to sell Government bonds to do so, because as they sell Government bonds in the market and they increase their loans, they become less liquid and they become less able to meet the increased reserve requirement. Therefore, the expectation of having to do that in itself would be a deterring factor.

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has assured us the power requested in order to control bank credit would be used with extraordinary care. Mr. Sproul corroborated that the present Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is fully aware of the delicacy of applying credit restraints. As a matter of practicality, the committee proposal represents a fair compromise between the higher figure of 4 percent requested by the administration and the lower figure of 1 percent requested by the House.

The Banking and Currency Committee, by unanimous action, as I recall, recommends adoption of the amendment by the Senate.

The next three committee amendments are numbered 5, 6, and 7. I should like to explain them briefly.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS 5, 6, AND 7

The fifth committee amendment would increase to 31 percent of demand deposits the lawful reserves which the Federal Reserve Board could require of member banks in central reserve cities. The present legal limit is 26 percent. The House version of Senate Joint Resolution 157 would increase that limit only to 29 percent.

In the case before us, the House has recommended that the additional requested reserves against demand deposits be 3 points, whereas the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency recommends an increase of 5 points.

The sixth and seventh committee amendments provide for comparable increases of 5 percentage points above existing legal limits in reserve cities and country bank cities, respectively, instead of the increases of 3 percentage points approved in the House version of the joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 157.

Every argument I have advanced to sustain the fourth committee amendment relating to time deposit reserve requirements applies with even greater vigor to the fifth, sixth, and seventh committee amendments. Without repeating those arguments in detail, I would remind my colleagues that increases in reserve requirements beneficially decrease the ratio of expansion of currency on reserves, that the benefits are proportionally greater the higher the reserve requirement is placed, that mere possession of the power by the Federal Reserve Board has a deflationary effect, that it may be expected that such Board would, on the basis of past practice, apply such increases in requirements judiciously, and that the committee amendments relating to member-bank demand deposit reserve requirements represent a practical compromise between the 10 percentage point increase requested by the administration and the 3 percentage point increase voted by the House.

By unanimous action, the Committee on Banking and Currency fully supports the committee amendments numbered 5, 6, and 7. The question obviously will be raised, as it should be, as to why the committee thought it proper not to accept the administration's recommendation that reserve requirements behind the time deposits be increased 4 points, and the requirements behind demand deposits, 10 points. The committee thinks serious consideration should be given by the Congress to the granting of additional stand-by powers to the Federal Reserve Board. The committee feels, however, in the present instance that the Congress was not called back into emergency session in order to consider any long-range changes within our national banking system which may be determined to be necessary. The committee is completely satisfied that to grant the additional authority to the Federal Reserve System at this time as recommended by the committee in its amendment will provide sufficient stand-by authority and increased reserves adequately to protect our banking system against whatever we may conceive may possibly arise in the period between now and when we shall have had a more adequate opportunity to examine into the administration's recommendation, at some latter period during the first year of the next regular session.

Many people throughout the country do not understand money or its management. The committee makes no pretense of being individually or collectively a complete authority on the subject. What the committee knows is that it would not be humanly possible for the Federal Reserve System, without serious injury to the economy of the country, to utilize the total authority which we are recommending they be given. It will be used for the most part as stand-by authority. Certainly it will be used judiciously, wisely, cautiously, and without haste. There is nothing we could give them in this field of endeavor by way of further power, which they could possibly use in the national interest within the next year or two.

The last committee amendment is No. 8, and it is simply a clarifying amendment. It would authorize the Federal Reserve Board to require the increases in reserves behind time and demand deposits until June 30, 1949. The House voted to terminate such authority on March 31, 1949.

The committee is of opinion that the June 30, 1949 date should be fixed in order that the next Congress may be afforded an adequate opportunity to reappraise the situation and the need of further legislation in the light of conditions then existing. The June 30, 1949 date would also be consistent with that placed in the consumer installment credit provisions of the pending measure through an earlier acceptance by this body of the first committee amendment.

We merely think that to adopt the House recommendation calling for an expiration date of March 31, 1949, would not permit the Congress to give the proper amount and kind of consideration to the problem which it will deserve before the legislation expires.

That, Mr. President, is a brief explanation of the remaining committee amendments now before the Senate. I trust that later on, during the course of the afternoon, questions will be raised by Members on both sides of the aisle concerning the nature and wisdom of each of the amendments. If it suits the convenience of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, I should like to conclude my remarks at this time, and have him take the floor if he is prepared to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remarks which the Senator from Washington has just completed consumed 13 minutes of his time. To whom does the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think we should dispose of the pending amendment, because I desire to offer an amendment, which I cannot do until this amendment is disposed of.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington has been advised that the period between 1 and 4 o'clock is to be devoted to discussion, and that no action is to be taken on any of the pending amendments until the hour of 4 o'clock arrives. I hope I have been misinformed.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not my understanding. We have been voting on pending amendments all morning but, while the debate is to be controlled, I did not understand we could not vote on committee amendments and get them out of the way.

Mr. CAIN. I hope the Senator's understanding of the situation is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Otherwise, I should have no opportunity of explaining the amendment I offer. May I ask the Chair if that is a correct understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling of the Chair is that it is entirely possible under the unanimous-consent agreement for a yielding to occur for the purpose of voting upon an amendment. The unanimous-consent agreement provides only that at the hour of 4 o'clock the Senate shall proceed to vote upon any pending amendment. That does not preclude the disposal of amendments, as the Chair rules, earlier in the afternoon, by agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not include the offering of other amendments at 4 o'clock, does it? At any rate, we can vote on this one.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if the decision of the Chair is that it is now proper to take action on the committee amendments, I should like to call up the next amendment, which I think is No. 4, and ask for its immediate consideration and adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state for the information of the Senate that the question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], to strike from line 13, page 5, of the committee amendment the figure "8," which figure is by the committee amendment proposed to be substituted for the figure "7," in line 4, page 4, of the House engrossed amendment, and further to substitute for said figure "8" the figure "7½."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to speak very briefly on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. What it means is that the Senator from Ohio has recommended that instead of adopting the committee's recommendations of 5 points for demand deposits and 2 points for time deposits, we should approve a figure of 4 percentage points against demand deposits and of 1½ points against time deposits. As everyone knows, the President urged Congress to provide the Federal Reserve System with additional authority to increase reserves against member banks, 10 points against demand deposits, and 4 points against time deposits. The committee, after giving the matter thorough consideration, and for reasons which the record contains all through it, thought at this time that there was not sufficient reason to justify the President's recommendation. Therefore we looked for a figure which, in our opinion, could be construed to be more practical and more nearly emergency in character.

The House included within its proposal a recommendation that the reserve requirements be increased to 3 points against demand deposits and 1 point against time deposits. The Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate has recommended reserve increases of 5 points and 2 points. The distinguished Senator from Ohio is of the opinion, and I agree, that the House of Representatives would accept a compromise figure of 4 points against demand deposits and 1½ points against time deposits, for the reason that, in my opinion—and I think I now speak for the entire committee—it would not be possible for the Federal Reserve System to invoke either 4 points against demand deposits or 2 points against time deposits between now and, let us say, June of next year. I think it is perfectly reasonable for the Senate to compromise the position which has been taken by the Banking and Currency Committee. I speak not alone for myself but, I understand, for the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who understands the Senator's compromise amendment, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who is, I think, generally agreed to be the best authority among all of us on subjects pertaining to Federal Reserve requirements and needs, and the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. TOBEY], who are all willing, together with myself, to compromise the committee's position in support of the recommendation as presented by the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to strike from line 13, page 5, of the committee amendment the figure "8," which figure is by the committee amendment proposed to be substituted for the figure "7" in line 4, page 4, of the House engrossed amendment, and to substitute for said figure "8" the figure "7½."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, what we have just done was to take action on the committee amendment No. 4, which concerns itself with time deposits?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. Therefore the action to be taken is on the demand deposit amendments which are numbered, I think, 5, 6, and 7. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as amended by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in respect to demand deposits?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Washington that it is in respect to time deposits. The effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is to substitute, in line 13, at page 5 of the committee amendment, the figure "7½" in place of the figure "8." [Putting the question.]

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I call up the next amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the time taken for the discussion of these amendments and the adoption of them charged to the time of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it would be the opinion of the Senator from Washington that the time would be——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state its ruling. In the absence of an agreement concerning the division of time, the time will be taken from the side by whom the proposal to vote is presented. Therefore, up to this time, the time has been taken from the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington is entirely satisfied with the decision of the Chair. Mr. President, may I call up the next amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 6, of the House engrossed amendment, it is proposed to strike out "29" and to insert in lieu thereof "31."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment just stated to the House amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment by inserting the figure "30" in lieu of the figure "31."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, to the committee amendment, to substitute "30" for "31."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment as so amended is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

Is that the desire of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CAIN. It is, Mr. President.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the "23" and insert in lieu thereof "25."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment by striking out "25" and inserting "24."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment, as so amended, is agreed to.

Does the Senator from Washington desire to take up the next amendment?

Mr. CAIN. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "17" and insert in lieu thereof "19."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to strike out "19" and insert in lieu thereof "18."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment, as so amended, is agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I now call up the last committee amendment, No. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "March 31" and insert "June 30."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, to be found on line 20, page 5, of the printed copy before the Senate, substituting "June 30" for "March 31."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington would like to determine the wishes of the Senator from Kentucky, who I think is about to speak to and offer his amendment to the measure presently before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky desire to yield at this time to any other Member of the Senate?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. On the desk and printed there is an amendment which I propose to offer to the pending joint resolution. It is possible I may want to substitute another amendment in place of the one that is on the desk at this time. Is it necessary in order to make that substitution that I offer the substitute prior to 4 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be necessary for either the Senator from Washington or the Senator from Kentucky to yield time to the Senator from West Virginia for that purpose.

Mr. REVERCOMB. At the proper time I shall seek such permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand, all committee amendments have now been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I therefore offer an amendment which I send to the desk. Inasmuch as the amendment has been printed and has been on the desks of Senators, first in the form of a bill and later in the form of an amendment to the pending joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the reading of the amendment will be dispensed with, and it will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. BARKLEY is as follows:

At the proper place, insert the following:

"SEC. 4. That this joint resolution may be cited as the 'Anti-Inflation Act of 1948.'

"FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 5. (a) Existing inflationary conditions, caused primarily by World War II and continuing as an aftermath of that war, threaten further increases in the cost of living in the United States.

"(b) Certain materials and facilities continue in short supply at home and abroad as a result of the war and the need for strengthening the national security. There is a danger that these scarce materials and facilities will not be available for essential purposes, at home and abroad, and that the demand for these scarce materials and facilities will result in further inflationary rises in prices.

"(c) Such inflationary conditions and maldistributions of scarce materials, unless corrected, will impair the standard of living in the United States, disrupt commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, produce subsequent deflation and widespread unemployment, undermine national security, and obstruct the foreign policy of the United States.

"(d) In view of the foregoing, the Congress hereby declares that it is necessary, in order to promote the flow of commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, provide for the national security, provide for the general welfare, and implement the foreign policy of the United States, that the Federal Government pursue a comprehensive and coordinated anti-inflation program, including the fixing of maximum prices for commodities which substantially affect the cost of living or the cost of industrial or agricultural production and the further regulation of rents and credit, protection of the domestic economy from the injury which would result from maldistribution of scarce materials and facilities which basically affect industrial and agricultural production or the cost of living, and promotion of the production at home or abroad of such materials critically needed in the United States.

"TITLE I—PRICES AND WAGES

"TIME LIMIT; APPLICABILITY

"SEC. 101. (a) The provisions of this title, and all regulations, orders, price schedules, and requirements thereunder, shall terminate on June 30, 1950, or upon the date specified in a proclamation by the President, or a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this title is not necessary, whichever date is the earlier; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred prior to such termination date, the provisions of this title and such regulations, orders, price schedules, and requirements shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense.

"(b) The provisions of this title shall be applicable to the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

"ORGANIZATION

"SEC. 102. The President shall designate the departments, agencies, or officials of the Government that shall exercise the power, authority, and discretion conferred by this title. For the purposes of this title, the departments, agencies, or officials of the Government so designated are referred to as the Department.

"CONDITIONS FOR ESTABLISHING MAXIMUM PRICES

"SEC. 103. The Department may establish a maximum price for a commodity in conformance with section 104 whenever in its judgment the following conditions are satisfied:

"(a) The price of such commodity substantially affects the cost of living or the cost of industrial or agricultural production;

"(b) The price of such commodity has risen or threatens to rise at least 20 percent above the price therefor prevailing in June 1946 (or, if the Department determines that the prices prevailing in June 1946 were not generally representative because of abnormal or subnormal market conditions or other cause, then above the prices prevailing during the month or consecutive months of the calendar year 1946 in which, in the judgment of the Department, the prices for such commodity were generally representative);

"(c) The regulation of the price of such commodity is practicable and enforceable; and

"(d) The public interest will be served by such regulation.

"REGULATIONS AND PRICE STANDARDS

"SEC. 104. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Department the conditions set forth in section 103 for the establishment of a maximum price have been satisfied, it may by regulation or order establish such maximum price or maximum prices as, in its judgment, will be generally fair and equitable and will aid in controlling inflation. So far as practicable and reasonable, any maximum price for the commodity or commodities included in such regulation or order shall be established at the level of the prices prevailing on August 1, 1948 (or if, in the case of any commodity, the prevailing prices on such date are not generally representative because of abnormal or seasonal market conditions or other cause, then to the prices prevailing during the nearest 1-month period in which, in the judgment of the Department, the prices for such commodity are generally representative): *Provided*, That, in establishing any maximum price, the Department (1) shall make adjustments in the prices prevailing on August 1, 1948 (or in the nearest generally representative 1-month period), for such relevant factors as it may determine and deem to be of general applicability; and (2) may consider, among other factors which it deems relevant, speculative fluctuations, general increases or decreases in costs of production, distribution, and transportation, and general increases or decreases since June 30, 1946, in profits earned by sellers of the commodity or commodities: *Provided further*, That no such regulation or order shall contain any provisions requiring the determination of costs otherwise than in accordance with established accounting methods.

"(b) Before issuing any regulation or order under the foregoing provisions of this section, the Department shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with persons who, in the judgment of the Board, are representative of the industry which will be affected by such regulation or order, and shall give consideration to their recommendations. In the case of any commodity for which a maximum price has been established, the Department shall, at the request of any substantial portion of the industry subject to such maximum price, regulation, or order of the Department, appoint an industry advisory committee, or committees, either national or regional or both, consisting of such number of representatives of the industry as in the judgment of the Department may be necessary in order to constitute a committee truly representative of the industry, or of the industry in such region, as the case may be. The Department shall from time to time advise and consult with the committee with respect to the regulation or order, and with respect to the form thereof, and classifications, differentiations, and adjustments therein. The committee may make such recommendations to the Department as it deems advisable, and such recommendations shall be considered by the Department.

"(c) After the issuance of any regulation or order establishing a maximum price under subsection (a), the Department may on its own initiative and shall at the request of the industry advisory committee, established under subsection (b), review and, when necessary, revise the maximum price established by such regulation or order. In making such review the Department shall consider, among other factors which it deems relevant, general increases or decreases in costs of production, distribution, and transportation, and general increases or decreases since June 30, 1946, in profits earned by sellers of the commodity or commodities.

"(d) Every regulation or order issued under the foregoing provisions of this section shall be accompanied by a statement of the considerations involved in the issuance of such regulation or order.

"(e) Whenever in the judgment of the Department such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this joint resolution, it may, without regard to the foregoing provisions of this section, issue temporary regulations or orders establishing as a maximum price or maximum prices the price or prices prevailing with respect to any commodity or commodities during such 5-day period subsequent to June 1, 1948, as the Department shall specify; but any such temporary regulation or order shall be effective for not more than 90 days, and may be replaced by a regulation or order issued under the foregoing provisions of this section.

"(f) Whenever in the judgment of the Department such action would be necessary or proper in order to assist it in determining whether to establish a maximum price under subsection (a) or subsection (e) of this section, it may, without regard to the foregoing provisions of this section, issue regulations or orders providing that sellers of a commodity may not increase the price of such commodity except after such notice to the Department, not exceeding 30 days, as the Department may specify. During such period, the Department may require any seller who has filed such a notice to appear at a public hearing to be held by the Department with respect to the need for and the effect of such price increase. Failure of the Department to establish a maximum price before the end of any such period shall not preclude it in any way from establishing at a later date a maximum price lower than the price specified in such notice of increase.

"(g) The Department shall make an adjustment for hardship to a seller caused by a maximum price established under this section, if in the judgment of the Department such adjustment is necessary to prevent gross inequities and can be made without impairing compliance with the provision of this title.

"(h) Any regulation or order under this or any other section may be established in such form and manner, may contain such classifications and differentiations, and may provide for such exceptions and adjustments, as in the judgment of the Department are necessary or proper in the public interest and in order to effectuate the purposes of this title, and may be modified or rescinded by the Department at any time.

"(i) Whenever in the judgment of the Department such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this title, it may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit manipulative practices (including practices relating to changes in form or quality) or hoarding, in connection with any commodity which in its judgment are equivalent to, or are likely to result in, price increases inconsistent with the purposes of this title.

"(j) Regulations, orders, and requirements under this title may contain such provisions as the Department deems necessary, to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof.

"AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"SEC. 105. (a) The maximum price established for any agricultural commodity shall be a price which will reflect to producers of such commodity not less than the parity price, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, or, in case a comparable price has been determined for such commodity under subsection (b), such comparable price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials); and no maximum price shall be established or maintained hereunder for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price therefor equal to the parity price or comparable price, as so determined.

"(b) For purposes of this title, in the case of any agricultural commodity other than the basic crops corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, the Secretary shall determine and publish a comparable price whenever he finds, after investigation and public hearing, that the production and consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for basic commodities: *Provided*, That comparable prices heretofore determined by the Secretary may be used for the purposes of this title.

"(c) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or affect the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, or to invalidate any marketing agreement, license, or order, or any provision thereof or amendment thereto, heretofore or hereafter made or issued under the provisions of such act.

"(d) Wherever a maximum price has been established, under this title or otherwise, with respect to any fresh fruit or any fresh vegetable, the Department from time to time shall adjust such maximum price in order to make appropriate allowances for substantial reductions in merchantable crop yields, unusual increases in costs of production, and other factors which result from hazards occurring in connection with the production and marketing of such commodity.

"WAGES

"SEC. 106. (a) The adjustment of wages, salaries, or other benefits (hereafter referred to as wages) through collective bargaining to reflect increases in productivity, to protect and improve standards of living, and to afford an equitable distribution between wages and profits, is in accord with the policy of the United States. This title is not intended to modify this policy, but rather to further the objective of preventing price increases which tend to destroy economic stability and correspondingly to destroy the value of the wage earner's dollar.

"(b) There is hereby established a Temporary Wage Board, hereinafter referred to as the 'Board.' The Board shall be composed of six members, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two of whom, including the Chairman and the Vice Chairman, shall be representative of the public, two representative of employees, and two representative of employers. For each member of the Board the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an alternate member who shall serve as a member of the Board in the absence of his principal. The Board shall be within the Department of Labor, but shall be independent of the Department of Labor with respect to its policies and decisions.

"(c) An increase in wages may be granted by an employer who produces or processes a commodity for which a maximum price is in effect under this title. To the extent that such wage increase is found by the Board to be necessary for the purposes specified in subsection (d), it shall be taken into account for the purpose of adjustments in the maximum price of such commodity. Otherwise, such wage increase shall not be taken into account for the purpose of such adjustments until 6 months have elapsed after the wage increase has become effective. A wage increase may be referred to the Board by an employer at any time for a determination under subsection (d).

"(d) When an increase in wages has been referred to the Board, it shall be the duty of the Board to determine whether the wage increase or any portion thereof is necessary for one or more of the following purposes: (1) To compensate for increases in the cost of living or prevent lowering of living standards, or (2) to correct inequities in the wage structure, or (3) to correct substandards of living, or (4) to maintain essential production at levels certified by the Department. The decision of the Board shall be rendered within 30 days after receipt of the application unless the time is extended by the Board with the approval of the Anti-Inflation Coordinator provided for in section 502. Decisions shall be by the majority vote of the Board.

"(e) Members of the Board shall receive necessary traveling expenses and a per diem of $25 on such days as they are actually engaged in performance of duties in pursuance of this joint resolution in lieu of actual expenses. The public members of the Board shall also be compensated on a when-actually-employed basis at $25 per day.

"(f) Service of an individual as a member of such Board shall not be considered as service bringing such individual within the provisions of section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 198 and 203), or of section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (41 U. S. C. 119), or of title 18, United States Code, section 281, 283, or 284 (Public Law 772, 80th Cong.), or of section 190 of Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"(g) In the exercise of the authority conferred upon the Board by this joint resolution it may issue rules, regulations, and orders, and include therein such provisions as it finds are reasonably necessary to exercise its functions hereunder.

"PROHIBITIONS

"SEC. 107. (a) It shall be unlawful, regardless of any contract, agreement, lease, or other obligation heretofore or hereafter entered into, for any person to sell or deliver any commodity, or in the course of trade or business to buy or receive any commodity, or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of any regulation or order under this title (including the portions of the Emergency Price Control Act, as amended, which are incorporated in this title), or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to do any of the foregoing.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States, or for any adviser or consultant to the Department in his official capacity, to disclose, otherwise than in the course of official duty, any information obtained under this title, or to use any such information for personal benefit.

"(c) Nothing in this title shall be construed to require any person to sell any commodity.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 108. (a) The Department may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as are necessary in order to carry out the functions and duties under this title, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Department may utilize the services of Federal, State, and local agencies and may utilize and establish such regional, local, and other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Department in any case in any court.

"(b) The Department or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all the powers under this title in any place.

"INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 109. (a) The Department acting under this title shall have the authority which was vested in, and be subject to the limitations which were imposed upon, the Price Administrator by the following sections and subsections of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, namely:

"(1) Section 201 (c) (relating to authority for expenditures).

"(2) Section 201 (d) (relating to authority to issue regulations).

"(3) Section 202 (relating to investigations; records, and reports).

"(4) Section 203 (relating to procedure on protests): *Provided, however*, That such protests may be filed only within a period of 60 days after the issuance of the protested regulation or order; or, if such protest is based solely on grounds arising after the issuance of such regulation or order, within a period of 60 days after such grounds arise.

"(5) Section 204 (relating to review in the Emergency Court of Appeals); and the Emergency Court of Appeals already created shall continue in existence.

"(6) Section 205 (relating to enforcement); except that subsection (b) of section 205 (relating to criminal penalties) shall not be in effect and section 310 of the present act is provided in lieu thereof, and except further that subsection (f) of section 205 (relating to licensing and revocation or suspension of licenses) shall not continue in effect.

"(b) The sections and subsections listed in subsection (a) of this section are hereby incorporated herein by reference, the same as though set forth in full, and shall be applied to this title with such changes in designation of provisions as may be appropriate and with any exceptions specified in said subsection (a). Specifically, but not exclusively, any references in said incorporated sections or subsections to a regulation or order issued under section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be construed to mean a regulation or order issued under section 304 of this title and references in said incorporated sections or subsections to a violation of section 4 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be construed to mean a violation of section 307 of this title.

"ENFORCEMENT

"SEC. 110. Any person who willfully violates any provision of section 107 of this act, and any person who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed under section 304 of this title or section 202 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever the Department has reason to believe that any person is liable to punishment under this section, it shall refer the matter to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, after such investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as he may deem necessary, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

"QUARTERLY REPORT

"SEC. 111. The Department from time to time, but not less frequently than once every 90 days, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this title. If the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session, such reports shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate, or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 112. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'sale' includes sales, dispositions, exchanges, leases, and other transfers, and contracts and offers to do any of the foregoing. The terms 'sell,' 'selling,' 'seller,' 'buy,' and 'buyer' shall be construed accordingly.

"(b) The term 'price' means the consideration demanded or received in connection with the sale of a commodity.

"(c) The term 'commodity' means commodities, articles, products, and materials (except materials furnished for publication by any press association or feature service, books, magazines, motion pictures, periodicals and newspapers, other than as waste or scrap), and it also includes services rendered otherwise than as an employee in connection with the processing, distribution, storage, installation, repair, or negotiation of purchases or sales of a commodity, or in connection with the operation of any service establishment for the servicing of a commodity: *Provided*, That nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize the regulation of (1) compensation paid by an employer to any of his employees, except as provided in section 107 or (2) rates charged by any common carrier or other public utility, or (3) rates charged by any person engaged in the business of selling or underwriting insurance, or (4) rates charged by any person engaged in the business of operating or publishing a newspaper, periodical, or magazine, or operating a radio-broadcasting station, a motion-picture or other theater enterprise, or outdoor advertising facilities, or (5) rates charged for any professional services.

"(d) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing, and includes the United States or any agency thereof, or any other government, or any of its political subdivisions, or any agency of any of the foregoing.

"(e) The term 'maximum price,' as applied to prices of commodities, means the maximum lawful price for such commodities. Maximum prices may be formulated in terms of prices, margins, commissions, fees and other charges, and allowances.

"(f) The term 'documents' includes records, books, accounts, correspondence, memoranda, and other documents, and drafts and copies of any of the foregoing.

"(g) The term 'district court' means any district court of the United States, and the United States Court for any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and the term 'circuit courts of appeals' includes the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

"TITLE II—PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS

"SEC. 201. In order to effectuate the policies set forth in section 5 of this joint resolution, section 2 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended, is reenacted and paragraphs (1) and (2) thereof are amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. (a) (1) (A) In order to carry out the policies set forth in section 2 of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948, the President may, in his discretion, assign priority to deliveries under any contract or order over deliveries under any other contract or order, and he may require acceptance of and performance under such contracts or orders in preference to other contracts or orders for the purpose of assuring such priority, whenever the President finds that any of the following circumstances exists:

"'(i) The prompt filling of the contract or order is needed to bring about an early increase, or prevent a substantial reduction or break-down, in the production of a material or facility, at home or abroad, which is critically needed in the domestic economy and which basically affects industrial or agricultural production or the cost of living;

"'(ii) The prompt filling of the contract or order is essential to the national security; or

"'(iii) The head of the agency designated by the President for this purpose certifies that the prompt filling of the order is of high public importance and essential to carrying out the foreign policy of the United States; and the head of the appropriate agency designated by the President to act under subparagraph (B) certifies that proposed action will not have an unduly adverse effect upon the domestic economy of the United States.

"'(B) Whenever the President in his discretion determines that a shortage in the supply of any material or facility which basically affects industrial or agricultural production or the cost of living is interfering or may interfere with the fulfillment of the over-all requirements for the defense of the United States or for carrying out the foreign policy of the United States or is resulting in an adverse distribution of such material or facility which is causing or threatens to cause a failure to fulfill requirements essential to the domestic economy or which will contribute to inflationary price increases, the President may allocate such material or facility, in such manner, upon such conditions, and to such extent as he may deem necessary or appropriate in the public interest and to carry out the policies set forth in section 2 of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948, and he may assign priority to deliveries of such material or facility under any contract or order over deliveries under any other contract or order, and may require acceptance of and performance under such contract or order for the purpose of assuring such priority, in order to carry out such policies.

"'(C) The allocation authority granted in paragraph (B) shall not be initially exercised with respect to any material or facility except after a public hearing held upon reasonable notice, including publishing a notice in the Federal Register, and after such investigation as the President may deem appropriate: *Provided*, (i) That such hearing or notice is not required where the President finds that a hearing or notice would defeat the purpose of the proposed allocation by tending to promote hoarding, excessive consumption, excessive speculation, or other action contrary to the public interest in anticipation of the exercise of allocation authority; and (ii) that the authority to allocate authorized under this section at the time of the enactment of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948, may, without prior hearing, continue to be exercised subject to the terms and conditions then provided.

"'(D) Whenever the President deems it necessary, in order to carry out the policies set forth in section 2 of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948, he may restrict and control inventories of any scarce material which basically affects industrial or agricultural production or the cost of living, so as to carry out such policies, without regard to the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C) above, and in so doing he may establish specific inventory limits for different classes of persons and different materials.

"'(E) Discrimination against orders or contracts to which priority is assigned or for which materials or facilities are allocated under this act or under any regulation or order issued under this act, either by charging higher prices for such orders than for other generally comparable orders, or by imposing different terms and conditions for such orders than for other generally comparable orders, is prohibited.

"'(F) The President may issue such rules, regulations, and orders as he may deem necessary to carry out this subsection 2 (a) (1), and any such rules, regulations, and orders may contain such classifications and differentiations and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions as in the President's discretion are necessary or proper to carry out the policies set forth in section 2 of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948.

"'(2) This section 2 (a), as amended (including the amendments made by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and section 401 of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948), shall be in force until June 30, 1950, except that the Congress, by concurrent resolution, or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any power, authority, or discretion hereunder. The amendments to subsection 2 (a) (1) made by section 401 of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948 shall not be construed to amend the Rubber Act of 1948.'

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 202. (a) The President may exercise any part or all of the power, authority, and discretion conferred on him by this title through such department, agency, corporation, or official of the Government, as he may direct.

"(b) Each officer or agency to which the President delegates any of the powers, discretion, and authority conferred by this title shall make a quarterly report, within 30 days after each quarter, to the President and to Congress of its operations under this title. Each such report shall contain (1) a statement of the controls which it exercised under this title during the quarter (2) detailed information as to the manner in which the controls were exercised and the effects of the controls, and (3) a statement of the facts and reasons for the continuance of each of the controls exercised during the quarter.

"MISCELLANEOUS

"SEC. 203. (a) Title XV, section 1501, of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 1501. Titles I, II, IV, V, VII, and XIV of this act and the amendments to existing laws made by such titles shall remain in force only until March 31, 1947. After the amendments made by any such title cease to be in force, any provisions of law amended thereby shall be in full force and effect as though this act had not been enacted.'

"(b) The repeal of the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, as amended, which is effected by paragraph (a) of this section, is not intended to restrict the powers and authority conferred on the President by said act, it being the intent of the Congress that the

powers and authority conferred on the President by this title include the powers and authority conferred by said act.

"EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROLS

"SEC. 204. Section 6 (d) of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, is amended by striking out 'February 28, 1949' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1950.'

"TITLE III—RENT CONTROL

"REESTABLISHMENT OF MAXIMUM RENTS

"SEC. 301. Section 303 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 is amended to read as follows:

"'Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, he may, by regulation or order, establish such maximum rent or maximum rents for any housing accommodations in a designated defense-rental area or establish or reestablish the regulation of rents in any defense-rental area or portion thereof, as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable. So far as practicable, in establishing any maximum rent for any defense-area housing accommodations, the Housing Expediter shall ascertain and give due consideration to the rents prevailing for such accommodations, or comparable accommodations, on or about April 1, 1941 (or, if prior or subsequent to April 1, 1941, defense activities shall have resulted or threatened to result in increases in rents for housing accommodations in such area inconsistent with the purposes of this act, then on or about a date (not earlier than April 1, 1940), which in the judgment of the Housing Expediter does not reflect such increases), and he shall make adjustments for such relevant facts as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability in respect of such accommodations, including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs within such defense-rental area.'

"RECONTROL OF PERMANENT HOTEL RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 302. Section 202 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended in the following respects:

"(a) Clause (1) of paragraph (c) is amended by striking out the first word 'those' and inserting after the word 'accommodations' the following: '(other than dwelling units occupied by nontransient tenants)':

"(b) By striking out clause (3) of paragraph (c) in its entirety and renumbering clause (4) as clause (3).

"RECONTROL OF DECONTROLLED UNITS

"SEC. 303. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(h) For housing accommodations not included within the definition of "controlled housing accommodations" as this definition read prior to amendment by the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948 the maximum rent shall be the higher of (1) the rent generally prevailing in the defense-rental area for comparable accommodations on the maximum rent date for such area, plus due allowance, where new construction is involved, for general increases in the cost of construction in the area from 1939 until date the construction is or was completed; (2) the maximum rent last in effect for such housing accommodations under Federal rent control.'

"TREBLE DAMAGES

"SEC. 304. Section 205 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out from the heading of such section the words 'By Tenants'; and by changing the period at the end of the sentence 'Suit to recover such amount may be brought in any Federal, State, or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction within 1 year after the date of such violation' to a colon and inserting: 'Provided, That if the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received, either fails to institute an action under this subsection within 30 days from the date of the occurrence of the violation or is not entitled for any reason to bring the action, the Housing Expediter may institute such action on behalf of the United States within such 1-year period. If such action is instituted by the Housing Expediter, the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received shall thereafter be barred from bringing an action for the same violation or violations.'

"CRIMINAL SANCTIONS

"SEC. 305. Section 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 206. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204, or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of this act, or of any regulation or order or requirement under this act, or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to do any of the foregoing.

"'(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, he may make application to the appropriate court for an order enjoining such act or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a showing by the Housing Expediter that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

"'(c) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, and any person who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed under this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever the Housing Expediter has reason to believe that any person is liable for punishment under this subsection, he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

"'(d) The district courts shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violations of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, and concurrently with State and Territorial courts, of all other proceedings under section 205 and subsection (b) of this section. Such criminal proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Such other proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred, or may also be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found. Any such court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of any criminal or other proceedings brought before it under this section. No costs shall be assessed against the Housing Expediter or the United States Government in any proceeding under this act.

"'(e) No person shall be liable for damages or penalties in any Federal, State, or Territorial court, on any grounds for or in respect of anything done or omitted to be done in good faith pursuant to any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder notwithstanding that subsequently such provision, regulation, order, or requirement may be modified, rescinded, or determined to be invalid. In any suit or action wherein a party relies for ground of relief or defense upon this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, the court having jurisdiction of such suit or action shall certify such fact to the Housing Expediter. The Housing Expediter may intervene in any such suit or action.

"'(f) The principal office of the Housing Expediter shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place, and attorneys appointed by the Housing Expediter may appear for and represent the Housing Expediter in any case in any court.

"'(g) The Housing Expediter is authorized to make such studies and investigations, to conduct such hearings, and to obtain such information as he deems necessary or proper to assist him in prescribing any regulation or order under this act, or in the administration and enforcement of this act and regulations thereunder.'

"EVICTIONS

"SEC. 306. Section 209 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 209. Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit speculative or manipulative practices or renting or leasing practices (including practices relating to recovery of the possession) in connection with any defense-area housing accommodations, which in his judgment are equivalent to or likely to result in rent increases inconsistent with the purposes of this act.'

"TITLE IV—REGULATION OF COMMODITY EXCHANGES

"SEC. 401. The Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (42 Stat. 998; 49 Stat. 1491; 52 Stat. 205; 54 Stat. 1059), is further amended by inserting at the end of section 4a the following:

"'(5) (A) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the nature or extent of speculative trading on boards of trade causes or threatens to cause sudden or unreasonable fluctuations or unwarranted changes in the price of any commodity, he may prescribe rules and regulations governing the margin to be required with respect to the purchase or sale of any such commodity for future delivery, or the maintenance of a position resulting from such purchase or sale, on or subject to the rules of any board of trade, whether or not designated as a contract market under section 5 of this act.

"'(B) It shall be unlawful for any person to buy or sell, or accept orders for the purchase or sale of any such commodity for future delivery, subject to the rules of any board of trade, or maintain or carry a position resulting from such purchase or sale, unless margin funds or securities are deposited and maintained in compliance with the rules and regulations promulgated under this paragraph (5). No floor broker shall be deemed to have violated this paragraph (5) with respect to any transaction in connection with which he has acted solely in the capacity of floor broker.

"'(C) All money, securities, or property deposited as margin shall be handled by the person receiving such margin in compliance with the requirements of section 4d (2), regardless of whether such person is a futures commission merchant as defined in this act and, for the purpose of this provision, the term "contract market," as used in section 4d (2), shall be deemed to mean board of trade.

"'(D) It shall be unlawful for any person to engage in soliciting or accepting orders for the purchase or sale of any commodity for future delivery on any board of trade, whether or not such board of trade is designated as a contract market, unless such person shall keep a record in writing showing the date, the parties to such contracts and their addresses, the commodity covered and its price, the terms of delivery, and the amount and kind of margin deposited. Such record shall be kept for a period of 3 years from the date of the transaction and shall at all times be open to the inspection of any representative of the United States Department of Agriculture or the United States Department of Justice.

"'(E) For the purposes of this paragraph (5), the term "commodity" when used in this act includes any agricultural commodity or product or byproduct thereof.

"'(F) For the efficient execution of the provisions of this paragraph (5), the provisions of section 21 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 899), as amended, are made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Agriculture in administering and enforcing the provisions of this paragraph (5) and to any person subject thereto.'

"TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

"PRESIDENTIAL DUTIES

"SEC. 501. (a) The President shall issue such orders and regulations to such departments, independent establishments, and other agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government, including any corporation which is an instrumentality of the United States, as he may deem necessary to provide for the exercise of their powers in a manner to assist in accomplishing the objectives of this joint resolution.

"(b) From time to time but not less frequently than once every 90 days the President shall transmit to the Congress a report on the progress that has been made in controlling inflation and on such legislative action as he may deem necessary or desirable. If the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session, such reports shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate, or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"ANTI-INFLATION COORDINATOR

"SEC. 502. (a) There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President an Anti-Inflation Coordinator (hereinafter called the 'Coordinator'), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

"(b) The Coordinator shall assist the President in the coordination of the anti-inflation activities of the executive agencies exercising powers conferred by this joint resolution and perform such other functions pursuant to this joint resolution as the President may designate. For this purpose the Coordinator shall make or cause to be made such studies, require such reports and information from executive agencies, and consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, State and local governments, and other groups, as he deems necessary.

"(c) To the fullest extent practicable, the Coordinator shall utilize the facilities and personnel of other executive agencies. Within the limits of funds which may be made available, he may employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out his functions. The Coordinator may appoint not to exceed six deputies, specialists, or other experts without regard to the civil-service laws and may fix their compensation without regard to the classification laws, except that one such person shall be compensated at a rate of $14,000 per annum and five such persons shall be compensated at a rate of $12,000 per annum. All other officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"ANTI-INFLATION ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 503. There is hereby created an Anti-Inflation Advisory Board, the members of which shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. All of the members of the Board shall represent the public interest, but in order that the Board may have the benefit of experience in the matters with which it will deal under this joint resolution, the Board shall include members who have had experience in business management, in agriculture, in matters relating to labor, and in consumer problems.

"(b) The Board shall advise with the Coordinator with respect to the anti-inflation program and make to him such recommendations relating to policies, procedures, and legislation as it may deem necessary.

"(c) Members of the Board shall receive necessary traveling expenses and, in lieu of other necessary expenses, a per diem allowance of $25 for each day spent in actual meetings of the Board or at conferences held upon the call of the Coordinator.

"(d) The provisions of section 106 (f) of this act shall be applicable to members of the Anti-Inflation Advisory Board.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 504. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application of such provision to any person or circumstantes shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the joint resolution and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 505. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT INAPPLICABLE

"SEC. 506. Section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting after 'Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947,' the following: 'the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948.'

"Amend the title so as to read: 'Joint resolution to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes.'"

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish briefly to explain the purpose of the amendment which I have offered, and I hope I may do so without any interruption while I am going through the amendment for that purpose, in order to save time, because under the limitation of time it is possible to become engaged in a colloquy over one point which may consume all the time I have. Therefore I should appreciate very much if I may be able to follow the course I have suggested.

May I inquire how the time stands now between the two sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has approximately 72 minutes, and the Senator from Washington has approximately 45 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall take such time as may be necessary briefly to explain the purposes of the amendment and the circumstances surrounding its offering and, of course, I shall be charged with such time as I occupy.

The amendment which I have offered is practically the same as the bill which I introduced on July 29 seeking to carry out the President's recommendations in his message to the special session dealing with the subject of inflation. The bill which I introduced contains seven titles. Title I dealt with the control of consumer credit, and title II with bank reserves. Those two titles being the subject matter of the joint resolution now before the Senate, I have eliminated them from the amendment which I have offered. Otherwise the amendment contains the provisions of the bill which I introduced on the 29th of July, and which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, with one or two changes in date and the numbering of sections, which are merely technical changes to conform with the fact that the amendment contains only the remaining titles instead of all the titles originally contained in the bill.

Mr. President, I do not think any of us can deny that there has been and is now a dangerous inflation besetting our country. I do not wish to go into any political argument about who was responsible or who was not responsible for the termination of price controls in 1946. We all know what the record is so far as the Senate was concerned, and how difficult it was to secure, at any time since the end of the war, any extension of price controls. Efforts were made not only to repeal and terminate them, but efforts were made to throw restrictions around the enforcement such as to make it impossible to effect genuine price control. Be that as it may, price controls did effectively terminate in 1946 over a period of weeks, some of them earlier and some of them later.

It is pertinent to inquire—and I think to make a matter of record—what has happened in the matter of prices since 1939 and since 1946. Since June 1939 the consumers' price index for all items has risen 74 percent. On food alone it has risen 129 percent. By far the most rapid increase took place immediately after June 1946 when price controls were relaxed and later terminated.

It is pertinent to inquire what the increase in prices has been, then, since 1946 with no controls of any sort in operation. The increase has been 29 percent for all items entering into the cost of living, but 47 percent for food. So that in 2 years the cost of food to the American family has increased, to be exact, 47 percent, which is not far from a 50-percent increase. The increase since June 1947 a year ago, has been 9 percent for all items entering into the cost of living, and 12 percent for food. Those are official figures which cannot be denied, and they prove conclusively that we have not reached the leveling off process in prices. They are still on their way up. They have increased at a very rapid rate since 1939, and at a relatively more rapid rate since 1946, and they are still increasing.

I realize that there is a difference of opinion among honest men, particularly here in the Senate, in regard to the method by which this continuing spiral of increased prices can be brought to a halt. Surely we cannot allow it to continue during the next 12 months at the rate of increase of the last 12 months.

In my judgment it would be dangerous to our economy if it were allowed to increase at such a rate for as much as 6 months from now, until January, February, or March of next year.

I favor the provisions of the joint resolution before the Senate dealing with consumer credit and bank reserves. They are a part of the program recommended by the President, but only a very small part. While they may be helpful by themselves to a small degree, I think those provisions would be more helpful if tied in with a more effective price-control measure so that the entire picture might be before the administration of any law that Congress enacts, and so that they might be related one to the other in such a way as to make a well-rounded program. It is for that purpose that I have offered the amendment setting up real price control, not through a reestablishment of an OPA, not by establishing any independent agency, but by authorizing the President to designate any department which he may desire, for the purposes of administering the law and enforcing its provisions.

I shall now read the conditions under which price control might be instituted:

SEC. 103. The Department—

Whichever department is designated by the President—

may establish a maximum price for a commodity in conformance with section 304 whenever in its judgment the following conditions are satisfied—

These are the conditions without which no price control can be instituted:

(a) The price of such commodity substantially affects the cost of living or the cost of industrial or agricultural production;

(b) The price of such commodity has risen or threatens to rise at least 20 percent above the price therefor prevailing in June 1946 (or, if the Department determines that the prices prevailing in June 1946, were not generally representative because of abnormal or subnormal market conditions or other cause, then above the prices prevailing during the month or consecutive months of the calendar year 1946 in which, in the judgment of the Department, the prices for such commodity were generally representative);

(c) The regulation of the price of such commodity is practicable and enforceable; and

(d) The public interest will be served by such regulation.

All these conditions, Mr. President, must be satisfied before a department designated by the President may institute price controls. As introduced in the form of a bill the price-control section provided that prices might be set at a level approximating the prices which existed in November 1947. But having in mind from our experience during the 60-day hiatus between the lapse of all price controls and the reenactment of controls 2 months later the difficulty of reestablishing, or rolling back, as we say, prices which have already increased, I have changed that from November 1947 to August 1, 1948, as the date on which approximately the level of prices may be determined in the event the conditions which I have mentioned are satisfied and price control is instituted. So that under the amendment there would be no roll-back in prices beyond the 1st of August 1948.

Of course, the amendment provides for industry committees, as heretofore in the administration of price control, and for public hearings by the department on the request of interested industries before a permanent price control may be instituted. So far as the details of administration are concerned, the department designated by the President would follow somewhat the pattern of the administration processes by which the price control law was administered heretofore. So I shall not go into the details of that matter.

The price-control section deals also with agricultural commodities. It provides that no price can be set for an agricultural commodity at less than parity, which may be determined and is determined under the law from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture. It is a flexible quantity, because it depends upon the cost of purchases by farmers in the conduct of their agricultural enterprises. So that the higher the cost of things they buy, the higher parity is for the articles which they produce.

It also provides that no processed article made in whole or in substantial part from an agricultural product shall be fixed at a price which will not at least reflect parity, and where there is no parity existing, as it is in the basic commodities of cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, a comparable price may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. The price cannot be fixed below the comparable price for articles in the basic law which we enacted some years ago.

The amendment provides also for the fixing of wages. It sets up a temporary wage board which may determine all the elements, including the increase in the cost of living and other elements which may appropriately go into the fixing of wages. It does not interfere with collective bargaining, and it does not deal with the question of the ability or the right to strike. It has no reference whatever to that subject. But it does provide that where an increase in wages has been given without the consent of the temporary wage board, no increase in prices based upon such an increase can be made for 6 months following the effective date of the increase.

The amendment also contains a provision in regard to rents. There are certain administrative provisions which go through the amendment which I shall not undertake now to explain, because it would take more time than I have available, and I could occupy all the time at my disposal if I saw fit to do so, but other Senators desire to speak upon the subject, and I shall take as little time as I can.

The amendment provides for the reimposition of rent controls with respect to permanent quarters in hotels, but not to temporary or transient quarters. It does not apply to motor stations or motor accommodations, such as trailer yards or things of that sort. It applies particularly to the reimposition of controls over permanent quarters in hotels. It provides for recontrol within defense rental areas of houses individually occupied, and it provides also for control over rents brought about by new construction, giving allowance for all increase in the cost of construction since 1939.

It contains the usual enforcement provision.

It provides for priorities and allocations by the department designated by the President in regard to materials in short supply. A priority may be issued in behalf of the fulfillment of a contract over other contracts where the public interest requires it or there is such a shortage in materials subject to contract as to make it desirable that one contract be fulfilled in advance of another, in harmony with the best interests of the country and the economy of the country in regard to the use of materials which are short for any purpose in the manufacture of commodities or in construction.

The power to issue priorities and allocations is circumscribed by what seems to me to be adequate protection and consideration in regard to the use of that authority in giving preference to the use of certain materials. So long as materials are substantially short, so that there is no way by which there can be an equitable allocation for desirable purposes of the material necessary in any given enterprise, or in the entire economy of the country, it seems wise to clothe the President, through the department designated by him, with authority to issue priorities of that sort under certian conditions.

The amendment would also authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to impose margin requirements on the commodity markets of the United States. We know from our experience a year or so ago, growing out of speculation on the commodity market, which affects the cost of living and the price of agricultural commodities, that there was an insistent demand here and outside this Chamber for some better regulation of the requirements for marginal dealings in the commodity markets of the United States. At the present time the board of trade is the arbiter of what the margins may be. It may fix them at any point within its discretion. The amendment would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to impose marginal requirements, even up to 100 percent margin deposits, if it is necessary in his judgment to stabilize the markets in agricultural products or to prevent undue fluctuation in the markets for such commodities.

The amendment would authorize the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint an Anti-inflation Coordinator, who would cooperate with the department designated by the President as the agent through which price control would be enforced.

A little while ago I mentioned the temporary wage board, which would be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The board would be composed of six individuals, two of whom would represent the public. One of the public representatives would be chairman and the other would be vice chairman. Two of the members would represent employers, and two would represent employees. So the temporary wage board of six would be divided equally among the public, the employers, and the employees, so that all interests would be adequately represented.

The provisions of the amendment would automatically terminate on June 30, 1950, unless sooner terminated by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution adopted by both Houses of Congress, whichever may be the earlier. So there would be three ways by which this law might terminate—first, automatically by its own terms; second, by proclamation of the President; and third, by concurrent resolution adopted by the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, I do not wish at this juncture to take more of the time allotted to me. I have offered this amendment in good faith. I have offered it because I do not believe, meritorious as are the two provisions now before the Senate in regard to consumer credit and bank reserves, that we can deal with the problem which now faces the American people and our economy, and faces every household in America, without imposing some form of authority similar to that asked for by the President, and similar to that provided for in the amendment which I have offered.

Of course, we do not know whether the President would be required to exercise that authority. I assume we would all naturally hope that the spiral of increases, the inflationary marathon which is now in operation in all parts of our country, without regard for all the elements which have entered into the cause of it, would abate. However, in my judgment we cannot sit idly by and see that marathon continue without endangering the safety of our economy, without endangering even our own national defense to some extent, and without having an impact upon our foreign policy in dealing with the recovery of the world under all the legislation which we have enacted.

I would naturally hope that the price situation would level off and stabilize itself, if possible; but it has not done so. It gives no hope now of doing so, without some artificial method of control. We must all admit that this is an effort to deal with the problem by the imposition of artificial elements, such as price controls of one kind and another. But the President is not required in any given case, or with respect to any given commodity or industry, to exercise the power and authority granted to him in this amendment. He will not be expected to exercise it, and will not, of course, exercise it, unless it is necessary. The very fact that he has the authority, which has been termed a stand-by authority—the very fact that he has this "big stick behind the door," if we may so designate it, might have a salutary and stabilizing influence upon the continuous rise in the prices of commodities and in the cost of living.

It is amazing when we consider the proportion of American families which receive an income of less than $2,000 a year. Approximately half of all the families in America receive less than $2,000 a year. The impact of high prices and inflation—this creeping thing that they cannot themselves individually fight—is affecting more disastrously families with an income of less than $2,000 a year than any others. In that connection I think it ought to be stated that approximately 25 percent of the families of the United States receive less than $1,000 annual income.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have indicated that I prefer not to yield. I am almost through.

The figures which I have given are round numbers. I am not attempting to be exact as to the number of families, but I have given the approximate figures. I shall place the exact figures in the RECORD, because I think they are important. However, I shall not take the time now to refer to my memorandum to obtain them.

We all understand the great difficulty, under normal conditions, no matter what profession or occupation a man may follow, in supporting a family of four. The difficulty is increased in proportion to the increase in the size of the family. It is difficult for us in the Senate to appreciate the position occupied by the head of any family of four who makes even $5,000 a year, or even $10,000 a year, in coping with this creeping thing which we call the increase in the cost of living. But if it is difficult for a $5,000-a-year income to provide the normal necessities—not merely the bare necessities of cheap clothing and scant food, but the ordinary necessities which we think should go into a normal American household—if it is hard for a family with an income of $5,000 a year to get by, how much more difficult and how much more tragic it is for a family of four or five persons to try to live on an income of $2,000 a year or an income of $1,000 a year.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have declined to yield at the moment. I shall be through in a minute or two; and then, when I have concluded, I shall be glad to respond to questions.

Mr. President, although the bank-credit provision and the consumer-credit provision may help a little, I doubt if they will ever reach down to the $1,000 or $2,000 a year families in any effective way that such families can recognize by any process of sight with which I am familiar.

I think the amendment I have offered—and it is offered in good faith, in the hope that it may be adopted—not only will be able to stabilize the cost of living for all these families, but it may stop the increase in the cost of living. Certainly, the cost of living has gone high enough up to now. We do not want the process of reducing the cost of living and stopping the upward spiral of the cost of living to be followed by an economic collapse or debacle, such as we have witnessed in years gone by, as a result of the pyramiding of prices and the inability of the American people and our economy to withstand the impact of such pyramiding and such dangerous conditions.

Mr. President, let me ask how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has approximately 42 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then I shall reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used approximately 30 minutes in the course of his speech.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida wish me to yield to him?

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to speak at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much time would the Senator from Florida like to have?

Mr. PEPPER. Can the Senator spare me 15 minutes?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think so; I have only 42 minutes remaining altogether. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator, and we shall see whether that will suffice.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the face of the national crisis which faces the country concerning high prices and inflation, and in the face of the call of the President, the program of the Republican Party is a response which obviously is too little and too late.

Let it be remembered that the distinguished acting majority leader, the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], in speaking to the Mid-Atlantic Lumbermen's Association on February 5, 1948, said:

I do not need to remind the membership of this association that it was the Republican leadership in the Senate and in the House that was responsible for ending OPA.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 12, 1946. At that time I offered an amendment for the continuation of OPA, as it had existed in the past, until June 30, 1947.

In offering that amendment, I received the support of one Republican Member of the Senate—the distinguished and able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—and I was also supported by 21 Democratic Senators. I was opposed by 31 Republican Senators. So it is very clear that the record confirms the claim of the Republican Party that it killed OPA.

In June of 1946, when that casualty occurred, the price index was 133.3. In June 1948 that index has reached 171.7, or an increase of 38 points, or a percentage increase of 29. In other words, the increase in the cost of living index has been four times as much since OPA was killed in June 1946 as it was from May 1943, when effective price controls took effect, to June 1946, when the Republican leadership, as it claims, killed OPA.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator please repeat those figures?

Mr. PEPPER. I have only a limited time; but I say that the increase in the price index was from 133.3 in June 1946 to 171.7 in June 1948, an increase of 38 points, or about 29 percent.

Mr. President, corporate profits after taxes, a matter close to the Republican heart, in June 1946 were $12,800,000,000 a year. By 1947, with no OPA, they had reached $18,100,000,000; and for the year ending March 31, 1948, they have reached $19,200,000,000. In other words, since the OPA was killed, an event about which

the Republican leadership boasts, corporate profits have increased 50 percent.

Food prices have increased during the same period 47 percent. Let it be remembered that over 50 percent of the poor families' budgets goes for food for the family.

What has happened to wages and salaries in private industry, the means by which the masses of the people of the United States live? What have they done? In 1946 they were $91,000,000,000. In 1947 they were $104,700,000,000. In 1948, they were $111,100,000,000—an increase of 23 percent from 1946 to 1948 or less than half of the rate of increase of corporate profits since the killing of OPA by the Republican leadership. And remember 40 percent of the increase of the poor man's income went to buy the food he had to have, at a dearer price.

Naturally, higher prices and relatively falling wages and salaries of the people affected the people's savings. In 1946, for example, the people's savings were $14,800,000,000. By the end of 1947 they had declined to $10,900,000,000.

Let me state some of the effects of higher prices upon the people, given by the head of the public welfare board of my State, Mr. Leland Hiatt. On January 18, 1948, Mr. Hiatt said—I quote from the Tampa Sunday Tribune, January 18, 1948:

> In reporting the heavy increase in the number of applications, Hiatt said 49,215 persons were receiving old-age assistance at the end of 1946, but there were 55,890 recipients at the end of 1947.

He also said the increase in the number of children on relief almost doubled in 1947 over 1946; and he said the number of blind on relief also increased sharply in 1947 over 1946. Then Mr. Hiatt concluded—I quote from the article mentioned:

> The increase in applications was explained by Hiatt, who said many persons who were able to get by on their limited incomes in previous years, now need supplemental financial aid, due to the high cost of living.

Naturally, Mr. President, the people who had, in effect, lowered incomes, due to higher prices, first had to exhaust their savings, and then had to borrow. So the borrowings of the people increased from $10,200,000,000 in 1946 to $13,300,000,000 in 1947.

The next obvious step the people had to take was to cash in their bonds; and so we find that, as to the $100 War Savings bonds, which were bought by the little man or the little woman, the ratio of bonds turned in to sales increased from 23 percent in 1945 to 87 percent in 1946 and 136 percent in the first 6 months of 1947, and for smaller denominations of savings bonds the increase in these ratios was even greater.

But, Mr. President, nothing could better tell the story of where the Republican interest is, and, according to the Biblical references, therefore, where its heart is, than in the tax structure of the country. In 1939 individuals paid 25 percent of Federal income taxes. In the same year, corporations paid 23 percent. Mind you, Mr. President, 25 percent was paid by individuals, 23 percent by corporations. But in 1948, with the Republican tax bill in force, the figures changed. Individuals paid, not 25 percent, but 50 percent of all the income taxes paid to the American Government, while the corporate contribution shrank from 23 percent to 21 percent.

As between individuals, Mr. President, it is the same old story. In 1939 individuals making less than $5,000 a year contributed 9.8 percent of all Federal income taxes. In 1948, after the Republican tax bill was in effect, they contributed, not 9.8 percent, but 51 percent of all the Federal income taxes, while those over $5,000 in income in 1939 paid 90 percent of the Federal income taxes contributed by individuals, but in 1948 after the Republican tax bill was in effect, their share—that is, those receiving over $5,000 in income—had shrunk to 49 percent.

So you see, Mr. President, that what we face today is the Republican Party wedded to the privileged few and serving their interests, and beating down and down and down in ratio to corporate profits the wages and the salaries, the standard of living in the American home.

Mr. President, we come here to the particular legislation before the Senate. It has three parts to it: Consumer-credit control and increases in Federal Reserve ratios and member bank Reserve ratios. That was called for by the President in 1947. Legislation covering consumer-credit control was passed by the Senate in December 1947, after it had expired on November 1, 1947, and lingered in the House of Representatives until this special session, with no action taken. The other portion of the Republican bill will mean little if anything in lowering high prices. So, Mr. President, the story is the same as in the past. The special interests are served, and the public interest is disserved by the Republican leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the benefit of the occupants of the galleries, the Chair makes the announcement that any demonstrations whatever in the galleries are strictly contrary to the rules of the United States Senate. The rules will be enforced. Therefore no further demonstrations will be permitted by the occupants of the galleries.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news dispatch headed "Taft advances new price-cut plan—eat less," by Robert C. Albright, which was published in the Washington Post on September 13, 1947.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Washington Post, September 13, 1947]

TAFT ADVANCES NEW PRICE-CUT PLAN—"EAT LESS"—OPENS WESTERN TOUR WITH PLEA FOR VOLUNTARY BELT-TIGHTENING

(By Robert C. Albright)

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF., September 12.—Senator ROBERT A. TAFT today opened his tour of the west coast with a suggestion that people "eat less and eat less extravagantly."

Asserting the price rise may well top all other questions, including the labor act, as a 1948 campaign issue, he said return of price controls isn't the answer.

Instead, he suggested "voluntary" reductions in domestic food consumption as a partial solution.

TAFT briefly discussed prices, foreign policy, and a wide range of other issues at a press conference here.

Then he plunged into a vigorous defense of the Taft-Hartley Act and States' rights in two separate panel discussions before the California State Bar Association.

TAFT IS BOOED

TAFT was booed by some 200 A. F. of L. and CIO union pickets as he entered the Civil Auditorium tonight.

The pickets wore signs reading, Repeal the Slave Labor Act and Taft for President Ha Ha.

They made an opening for Senator JAMES MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, speaking against TAFT. TAFT arrived and moved unmolested through the break MURRAY had made. TAFT grinned at the boos and catcalls.

Welcomed to California last night by Governor Warren, and other State GOP leaders, a jovial, laughing TAFT, contrasting with the often stern "boss" of the Senate, teamed twice in 1 day with Indiana's CHARLES A. HALLECK, House majority leader.

HALLECK, often rumored a Thomas E. Dewey ally, paired with TAFT against Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, and Representative RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana, both administration Democrats, in the panel discussions.

In the bar association debate, TAFT cited last Tuesday's special election in Pennsylvania's Eighth Congressional District as evidence of his contention that the labor law cannot be made a successful issue.

Backing up TAFT, HALLECK also termed the law "fair and moderate." He said it had already belied "villifying" charges of labor leaders that it would enslave labor, destroy unions and undermine collective bargaining.

MURRAY and MADDEN bitterly replied that the act was punitive, discriminatory, and has already "turned back the clock."

But it was TAFT's earlier free-for-all press conference, with no topics barred, that topped the day's news in the postseason quiet of this beach resort town.

"I would be very loath to return to price controls," TAFT told newsmen. "It would mean a return of the black market that existed when OPA was in operation. I question whether it would be an effective means of dealing with the price problem."

Saying the price rise is partly attributable to the big domestic demand, influenced by tremendous domestic consumption, he recalled Herbert Hoover once proposed people "save food and eat less." TAFT said he agreed. "People are buying it, and have money to buy," he said. "True, a lot of people can only get just enough, but many others can save food by eating less. They should eat less meat and eat less extravagantly."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask to have printed a telegram received by me from the president and secretary of the chamber of commerce, and the president and secretary of the merchants association, both of Dunedin, Fla.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUNEDIN, FLA., *July 28, 1948.*

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The executive boards of Dunedin Chamber of Commerce and the Dunedin Merchants Association met in joint session July 27, 1948, for the express purpose of discussing present inflationary trends in all commodities. We are cognizant of the political significance of President Truman's call for special session of Congress. We are also cognizant of the political significance, the threat by the Republican-controlled Congress to recess immediately. We believe that taxpayers resent being a political football. That present food prices are of no benefit to the retailer, and a hardship on the consumer. Therefore, the following resolution was unanimously approved.

Resolved, That the present special session of Congress, as duly elected Representatives of the people, cease playing politics and remain in session until corrective legislation is passed pegging all food prices and if necessary reviving OPA.

Yours truly,

THOMAS R. HOOD,
President, Chamber of Commerce.
Mrs. VERA L. WILLIAMSON,
Secretary, Chamber of Commerce.
JAMES W. NOLAN,
President, Merchants Association.
R. A. BERKIHISER,
Secretary, Merchants Association.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment to the pending measure, which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Connecticut that there is an amendment now pending, namely, the one offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut consequently will be received and will lie upon the table for the present.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, it is hardly necessary to point out that the American people are most worried and concerned about high prices. Our own experiences, and public opinion polls, have provided that information. It is our obligation, as representatives of the people, to do everything in our power to relieve them of the dangers inherent in inflationary living costs.

Because it is the one item that we cannot postpone or do without, food is the most important element in the high cost of living. About 30 percent of the national food budget is accounted for by meat and we know that the present prices of meat preclude thousands of families from having an adequate supply, and require most Americans to pay more than they can afford for the meat they use.

Whether the high cost of meat is due to the Government price program and subsidies or whether it is due to the fact that the President pointed out the other day when he said the farmers should be grateful to the Democratic Party for providing an increase in income from two and one-half billion in 1933 to about eighteen billion in 1947, or whether it is due to exorbitant profits on the part of distributors, or whether it is due to the cost of other materials and commodities, is open to argument. But the American people are not so much concerned about the cause as they are about effecting a cure.

Between August 15, 1939, and June 15, 1948, the price of meat to the consumer has risen 167.5 percent.

I should like here to point out, Mr. President, that a part of that increase occurred under OPA. We are often apt to shut our eyes to that fact in this political atmosphere, but, in spite of the fact that during the war OPA had put a very heavy lid upon all food prices, nevertheless OPA was compelled to increase them in order to attempt to get an adequate, or what proved then to be an inadequate, supply. Even since a year ago, it has risen 18 percent. Last week, between July 23 and July 30, the price of hogs and steers per 100 pounds jumped about $1. The production of meat has dropped since 1943 from 24,500,000,000 pounds in 1943 to an estimated 21,000,000,000 pounds in 1948.

I may point out here, Mr. President, that the recent order issued by the Department of Agriculture, which is calculated to bring more meat from the ranges into the market, in my humble judgment in the long run may add something to our supply now, but may dangerously interefere with the breeding animals we shall need for the next year and the year thereafter. Having in mind also from my own experience on the farm as a small boy that a meat animal is not produced in 60 days.

During the same period, the civilian per capita consumption has increased an estimated 4 pounds. Obviously, there is a tremendous pressure on the meat supply, but it is interesting to note that presumably because of increasing prices, the civilian per capita consumption which reached its peak in 1947, will probably be reduced about 12 pounds per capita during 1948. That is not because people choose to buy less meat, but because they cannot afford to buy as much as they did in 1944 or 1945 or 1946 or 1947.

Mr. President, I appreciate that it is highly improbable that this Congress will want to adopt any measures imposing price controls or price ceilings. It is my own humble judgment that a vast number, if not a vast majority, of the American people have demonstrated that they were so thoroughly dissatisfied with price controls and the OPA in 1946 they would not want to see them reimposed. On the other hand, Mr. President, I do not believe that this Congress can afford to adjourn without taking some measure looking to the future as it concerns the price of meat.

We have two standing committees in the House and Senate, the Banking and Currency Committees of the respective Houses, concerned with matters of this kind. My amendment, Mr. President, would ask the chairmen of these committees, or direct the chairmen of these committees to set up a permanent committee with a staff to watch meat prices.

In my opinion, several things would be accomplished by such a survey. In the first place, I may say very frankly that in the confusion of the information and material we have now available to us, I myself would be reluctant to say that the President should have, or that anybody else should have, the opportunity to impose price controls. I do not think we know enough about it. I think that is unfortunate, because in the anti-inflation bill which was passed by the Congress in December 1947, and signed by the President, there was a complete and adequate program provided, whereby the President and the administration, with its many agencies, could have provided us with this information. They could have provided us with this information last January or February, or at any other time we were in regular session.

But the President and the administration have seen fit completely to ignore the procedure outlined in the bill. So we do not have and have not had, pursuant to the provisions of the bill, specific recommendations as to how to deal with this one specific item. That, Mr. President, is what the President asked for in his special message to the Congress in special session last fall.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I will say to the able Senator that I am very much interested in his amendment. As a matter of fact I have on the desk, to be called up, an amendment dealing not only with meat, but with all consumer commodities. I should be very glad to have the Senator read and consider my amendment. As a matter of fact, I expect to offer a substitute for my amendment. The substitute is similar to a measure which is pending in the House today and which deals with the same subject of creating a committee to consider the matter.

Mr. BALDWIN. I think meat is a special case, and I think there should be a special committee which would gather the facts so that, if necessary, we could return after the election, when we would not be completely surrounded by a 100 percent political atmosphere, and deal with the subject in a factual way.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington wish to yield time?

Mr. CAIN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I send to the desk, to lie upon the table, an amendment which I have designated "Amendment No. 2." Its contents will appear on the desk of each Senator. It is entitled as a House joint resolution. I have changed the title and the heading of the joint resolution to make it an amendment. I make this explanation so that the Senators may know the contents of the amendment which I now send to the desk and, at the proper time, will call up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, with regard to the amendment which I have at the desk regarding the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine, to be offered to the pending bill, I find it is not in conformity with the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on yesterday.

In view of this fact, Mr. President, I shall not offer it to the Senate for action. I wish to say, however, that I think the Senate has been highly inconsiderate of the wishes of the American people and the will of the House of Representatives in not acting on the subject of the repeal of the unjust taxes imposed on oleomargarine. I hope the Senate and the House will take up this matter at the beginning of the next session and that satisfactory legislation will be passed by the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD some remarks on the subject of oleomargarine and the repeal of the taxes on that commodity, which I had prepared for delivery, but, because of the limitation of time, under the unanimous-consent agreement, I shall not be able to make at this time.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is evident that Congress will go home without final action on H. R. 2245, the measure proposing repeal of Federal antimargarine legislation. That bill is now pending on the Senate Calendar. It passed the House by an overwhelming vote, was reported unanimously by the Senate Finance Committee and undoubtedly would be approved by the Senate if it came to a vote here.

I feel that the leadership of the Senate erred in not bringing the bill up in the closing days of the regular session or at the special session which is drawing to a close. I think everyone will agree that there is extraordinary interest in this measure. The mail on the subject is evidence of that fact. I made a speech on this issue last December and have made several subsequent speeches. As a result, I have received more than 1,000 letters about margarine from every State in the Union. Very few of these letters criticized my stand. I also would like to state that the contents of the letters were such that almost all of them clearly were written by housewives and others genuinely interested in this question.

At the next session of Congress—if there is no other special session—the attempt to repeal the Federal anti-margarine legislation must start all over again. Bills will have to be introduced in both the House and Senate and, since in theory, the tax on margarine is a revenue measure, the House will act first. In the past, the House Agriculture Committee, to which House margarine bills are referred, has refused to report any bill proposing repeal or modification of the Federal antimargarine laws. As you know, the House committee voted last spring to table all margarine legislation for the remainder of the Eightieth Congress. H. R. 2245 came before the House through a discharge petition, an unusual procedure. Ordinarily, the House abides by the decision of its major committees. It is only when the House feels that a committee is thwarting the will of the Members that a measure is taken away from the committee and acted upon by the House itself. Such an action obviously is a rebuke to the committee involved.

I am hopeful that the House Agriculture Committee will take into account the will of the House and will promptly report a bill to repeal the antimargarine laws when the next session begins. For this issue is not dead. I predict that there will be the same intense interest in the question during the next Congress that there was during the Eightieth Congress. Furthermore, I predict passage during the Eighty-first Congress of a bill to repeal the Federal antimargarine laws. I intend to do all that I can toward passage.

In so doing, I have in mind, of course, the fact that margarine is made primarily from cottonseed oil and soybean oil. Both cottonseed and soybeans are major products of my State. Yet, I have another and more impelling motive in trying to repeal the Federal antimargarine laws. I think these laws are wrong. I believe their presence on the statute books violate fundamental principles of our economic system and of democracy itself.

For 160 years this country has been justly proud of its principles of political equality and free markets economically. It constitutes the largest free trade area in the world. No Fourth of July oration is complete without mention of free enterprise and free markets.

We have not always been equal to all the fine words we have said, but by and large we have lived up to them. For nearly a hundred years, until 1886, the national Government had never undertaken to erect an internal tariff against one industry and one group of American producers in favor of another industry and another group of American producers.

And yet, in that year when the first Federal antimargarine law was enacted, we broke that precedent. And for 62 years that unwise legislation has been on the statute books.

It was a new species of legislation so far as this Government was concerned. It was a departure from our concepts of free markets, free enterprise, and fair play. It placed a penalty on one domestic industry for the benefit of another. It taxed an essential table food of the low-income groups and left untaxed a rival food which, even then, many of the poor could not afford to buy. It was rightly called a tax on the poor man's spread. It deprived one domestic industry of an opportunity to compete freely in the market place in an effort to give an advantage to another and rival industry. It took income from the American farmers—and their families—who produced the ingredients of margarine and attempted to channel that income into the pockets of other American farmers who produced the ingredients of butter. I have said it did these things when it was passed. It has been doing them for 62 years. It is still doing them. And it will continue to do them until Congress remedies this long-standing wrong.

If our boasted tradition of free enterprise means anything at all it means that every industry should have the right to compete on equal terms with domestic competitors; it means that initiative and enterprise and inventive skill in one industry shall not be penalized and restricted and hampered for the benefit of a competing industry.

It is said that margarine is an imitative product, made to look like butter and to taste like butter. But even if this were so—if we are going to levy a tax on all products which imitate the original, in color and other characteristics, we will wreck our entire economy. The very essence of competition is to develop new products which are like the old but which are cheaper and better. Until the butter lobby achieved its unique claim to legislative protection from the Federal Government, this development of new products was generally considered as indication of progress. It is still so considered, I believe, except in the case of margarine.

I do not intend here today to discuss at length the merits of this matter. They have been thoroughly aired in both the House and Senate and will be discussed again. I do not believe the claims made by the butter lobby are taken too seriously any more. The trend is toward repeal of both the Federal and State antimargarine laws. Since we began discussion of this legislation last December, five States have done away with laws prohibiting the sale or manufacture of colored margarine. These States are Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Maryland, and New Jersey. Nineteen States still retain laws which prohibit the sale or manufacture of colored margarine. I predict repeal in many of these States during 1949.

An effort and a consistent one has been made to persuade the dairy industry that it would suffer if the antimargarine laws were repealed. This is not the fact. I have pointed out time and time again that the sale of milk for butter is the least profitable use of milk. I have emphasized the tremendous increase in the use of fluid milk and byproducts of milk other than butter and the decline in butter production. Less butter is being produced for a very simple reason. The dairyman can get more for his product by selling it for other uses. This decline in butter production has increased during 1948 and now it appears that butter output this year will be 1,110,000,000 pounds as compared to approximately 1,650,000,000 pounds in 1947.

As a matter of fact, the use of high-priced butter is competitive with the more profitable uses of milk. As all of you know, the sharp increase in the cost of living has put a great strain upon the food budgets of many families. In this connection, let me point out that the housewife who buys 1 pound of table spread a week for her family would pay—at July 1947–June 1948 national average prices—$21.06 for margarine or $45.84 for butter.

The saving by using margarine—$24.78, or 54 percent—would purchase (on the same price basis) 131.8 quarts of milk.

I would like to remind the dairymen that any saving in the family food budget, such as would result from the purchase of margarine rather than butter, means more money available for the purchase of fluid milk and other uses for milk that are more profitable than butter.

I am indeed sorry that Congress is going home without final action on H. R. 2245. It is my feeling, however, that the fight has not been in vain. I have already mentioned the accelerated trend toward repeal of antimargarine legislation in the States. There is another byproduct of the effort to repeal the Federal antimargine laws which is not generally realized. That is the increase in the use of margarine and the corresponding increase in the use of cottonseed oil and soybean oil.

The production of margarine for the first 6 months of 1948 is not known exactly but it will be in the neighborhood of 472,000,000 pounds. This is an increase of 42 percent over the same period last year. The current year's production of margarine, on the basis of existing conditions, will be close to 922,000,000 pounds as compared to 745,000,000 pounds in 1947. Back in 1941, margarine production totaled 362,800,000 pounds. Approximately 150,000,000 pounds of cottonseed oil were used in the manufacture of margarine in 1941. This oil was valued at approximately $15,500,000. The value of the cottonseed oil used in margarine manufacture in 1947 approximates $89,400,000 and for the January-May period, 1948, the value of the cottonseed oil used in making margarine is valued at about $72,000,000.

The value of soybean oil used in the manufacture of margarine in 1941 approximated $10,000,000; in 1947, $66,500,000, and for the January-May period, 1948, more than $30,000,000.

With the exception of shortening, margarine provides the greatest outlet for both cottonseed oil and soybean oil. If the present trend continues, the use of cottonseed and soybean oil in margarine probably will exceed the use in shortening.

The consumption of margarine has been increasing steadily over the years. Numerous factors have contributed to this. However, the substantial increase in 1948 over 1947 undoubtedly goes back in large part to the public attention given margarine as the result of the attempt to repeal the antimargarine laws. Many people learned from the debate and publicity attending the repeal effort that margarine is fully as nutritious as butter and that in some ways it is a more dependable product.

I am certain that the cotton and soybean farmers already have benefited greatly as the result of the drive for repeal. I feel that they will benefit more as time goes on. A profitable price for cottonseed and soybeans depends in large part upon the oil from these crops which goes into margarine. With repeal of the State and Federal antimargarine laws I look for greatly expanded uses for margarine which will assure a fair and remunerative price for cottonseed and for soybeans during the years ahead.

MARGARINE PRODUCTION AND USE OF AMERICAN MATERIALS

Production: In 1941, margarine production reached 362,811,900 pounds, or about 2.7 pounds per capita, for domestic use, compared with about 15.9 pounds per capita of butter (creamery and farm combined). Since then, margarine production has considerably increased its rate of production. Most striking, however, is the still accelerated increase of 1948 over 1947, and of the continued gains margarine is making this year. Interest in Federal legislation abolishing the antimargarine law undoubtedly has been a factor, as well as margarine's appeal to family budgets as a nutritious table fat at economical price.

Production in 1946 totaled 572,537,990 pounds. In 1947 this rose to 745,644,815 pounds. The increase between 1941 and 1946 was 58 percent; between 1946 and 1947, 32 percent; and the rate of increase for 1948 over 1947 will be over 20 percent.

Production for the first 6 months of 1948 is not yet exactly known, but may be estimated fairly closely at 472,000,000 pounds. This is an increase of 42 percent over the same period last year. If 1948 margarine production maintains the same increase over 1947 for the period June–September as it did during January–May, and then is the same for the period October–December as it was in 1947, the current year's production total will be about 922,000,000 pounds. This is a fairly conservative estimate on the basis of conditions as they existed through July.

Ingredients: As a result, American growers of oilseed crops have enjoyed a far larger margarine market than ever before, as illustrated by the following table:

Item	1941	1946	1947	1948 (January to May)
Cottonseed oil:				
Amount (million pounds)	149.9	222.8	322.6	204.6
Estimated value (million dollars)	15.7	39.7	89.4	71.8
Soybean oil:				
Amount (million pounds)	75.6	206.7	227.7	103.7
Estimated value (million dollars)	9.8	39.3	66.3	30.3
Peanut oil:				
Amount (million pounds)	2.2	13.8	17.5	4.5
Estimated value (million dollars)[1]	.2	2.1	4.6	.15
Corn oil:				
Amount (million pounds)	.6	.7	.7	.3
Estimated value (million dollars)	.1	.1	.2	.1

[1] Crude.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Adopting the conservative estimate of 900,000,000 pounds margarine production for 1948, and extending the proportions used so far of the major oils, their total use would be: Cottonseed, about 457,000,000 pounds; soybean, about 231,000,000 pounds; peanut, about 11,000,000 pounds; corn, about 700,000 pounds.

In 1947, margarine used approximately 29 percent of cottonseed oil consumed in this country, and 16 percent of soybean oil. This year, consumption of cottonseed oil by margarine has increased absolutely and relatively.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 33 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, how much time has the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has 32 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. It is my understanding that the Senator from Kentucky is detained from the floor at the moment because he is, quite properly, having his lunch. Together with a number of other Senators, I had the pleasure a few moments ago of listening to the Senator from Kentucky as he discussed his proposed amendment to the measure which is before us, and I should like a little later to have an opportunity to ask the Senator some questions.

The position of the Banking and Currency Committee, by which the bill of the Senator from Kentucky was considered, is that the committee is not enthusiastic about it. We did not share the indifference of the Senator from Kentucky with respect to the proposal. We looked at it, thought about it, worried over it, but turned it down conclusively because we did not then think and we do not think at this time that the proposals which the Senator is presently asking the Senate to act upon will work. We do not think we should be doing the American people any good service at all by returning, as most certainly we would return, to a system of price controls and rationing if the recommendations of the senior Senator from Kentucky should be adopted.

One of our reasons, Mr. President, for taking in the committee and, I hope, on the floor of the Senate, a strong position in opposition to the recommendations and proposals presently placed before us by the Senator from Kentucky is that we became more and more convinced that the administration had not given very much thought to the recommendations which we were asked to consider. The record shows that leading proponents within the administration had different and contradictory ideas as to what would result from the passage of the requested legislation. The Senator from Kentucky a few minutes ago said, if I correctly understood him, that the powers requested by the President were stand-by powers and, in his opinion, they probably would not be invoked, but that for psychological reasons they would be of assistance to the President and the administration.

The President's coordinating administrator, Mr. Paul Porter, appeared before the committee, and in answer to a question as to when he proposed that the powers would probably be put into effect by the President, he said, "immediately." I, in concert with many other people, want to know precisely from the Senator from Kentucky whether his opinion is valid that the requested powers are to be stand-by authorizations, or whether they are, as Mr. Porter testified, to be invoked immediately.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator want me to give my opinion now?

Mr. CAIN. I should appreciate it very much if the Senator would do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it has been my understanding all along that the powers requested were to be stand-by powers, to be used if and when, and according to the need as it developed. The very conditions under which the powers can be exercised are set forth in the amendment itself. They are, in a sense, stand-by powers to be exercised if all the conditions prescribed should take place.

Mr. CAIN. Apparently Mr. Porter is of the opinion that all the requirements have already been met which would necessitate a return to price controls immediately and it appears to be the opinion of the Senator from Kentucky that he has not given any thought to that particular problem.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill provides that the President or the department must make a finding that these conditions do exist. We cannot assume that they exist merely by the enactment of the legislation. A definite finding must be brought about based upon the conditions set forth in the amendment. Certainly until that finding has been made and those conditions have been set out and specified it would have to be a stand-by power, because it could not be exercised until the conditions had been met.

Mr. CAIN. Yet I think it very important for the Senate to know, and for the Americans present in the gallery and those throughout the country to understand, that in the opinion of the man who has been selected to speak officially for the Administration, the price controls and rationing authorization requested would immediately be invoked. It happened to be the opinion of the Committee on Banking and Currency that further and more substantial study should be given to such recommendations before a determination of their need was made in final sense.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for an insertion in the RECORD, and for the Senator from California to address one or two questions to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune, entitled "Truman's Blaming Republicans for Inflation is Termed Unjust."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the same article has hitherto been offered today. If it should develop that it has already been presented, would it be agreeable to the Senator from California that it might be omitted as requested by him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It has been offered for printing in the RECORD, but I think it is appropriate to the pending discussion, and I think it should be placed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN'S BLAMING REPUBLICANS FOR INFLATION IS TERMED UNJUST—MARK SULLIVAN CALLS INCREASED DEFENSE COSTS AND ERP, BOTH URGED BY PRESIDENT, PRINCIPAL CAUSES OF HIGH PRICES; SEES UNITY IMPERILED

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, August 5.—For understandable reasons, including a reticence which the most responsible leaders in Congress and of the Republican Party enforce upon themselves, the impression made by this special session of Congress and its intended early ending, is superficial and incorrect. It is not that congressional and Republican leaders are so much angry at President Truman as in despair about him.

The surface picture which portrays Congress as angry at President Truman because he called them back to Washington in hot weather, and because he denounced the body and as further angry because he called the special session in a spirit of and for the purpose of partisan politics—all that is true enough so far as it goes. But Congress and the Republicans would regard that sort of thing as the give-and-take of politics.

What deeply concerns the Republican leaders, what they regard as their highest obligation, is the need for national unity in the face of the foreign situation. The Republican position on this, formulated on the highest level of party leadership, is in a statement given out July 24 by Governor Dewey in consultation with Republican Senator VANDENBERG and Governor Dewey's adviser on foreign affairs, John Foster Dulles. They were soberly aware of what they were doing; they devoted their painstaking hours to composing the statement. What they renounced was as important as what they pledged:

"The Berlin situation is critical. • • • The present duty of Americans is not to be divided by past lapses but to unite to surmount present dangers. We shall not allow domestic partisan irritations to divert us from this indispensable unity."

REASON FOR DESPAIR

What puts the Republican leaders in despair about President Truman is the course followed by him which shows either a lack of adequate concern about unity or lack of comprehension of the effects of his actions. It is the sober conviction of men in Washington who are at once the best informed and the most poised in temperament that the danger of war with Russia is at least 50–50. It is this condition that determines the course of the Republican leaders.

In this condition President Truman, by his call for a special session and the manner of it, creates division between himself and Congress and between himself and the Republicans. Adding to his provocativeness, he blames Congress and the Republicans for inflation. As put by the Democratic platform and often repeated in equivalent words by Mr. Truman; "The Republican Eightieth Congress is directly responsible • • • for high cost of living," that is for inflation.

Now every Republican in Congress is conscious that they enacted two measures which make for inflation because they involve immense Government expenditures and divert industry from production of goods for domestic consumption—the vastly increased appropriations for national defense and the likewise vast appropriations for the European recovery program.

TWO DANGERS BALANCED

The Republican Congress passed these measures knowing that they increased the danger of inflation. They balanced this danger with the foreign danger, decided that the latter was the greater and were thereby forced to increase the former.

The Republican Congress did this at the request of President Truman, in willing and complete support of the foreign program laid down by the Truman administration, and in the spirit of unity in face of the foreign threat. Now, President Truman puts blame on the Republican Congress for inflation without a single mention of the inflationary acts and that they were his own program. If the Republicans, and Congress, were to defend themselves from Mr. Truman's charge of responsibility for inflation, they must defend the inflationary measures, increased military appropriations and the European recovery program. To defend these would bring up foreign relations in Congress during the Presidential campaign. A "who-done-it" debate on inflation might become a "who-done it" debate on responsibility for our foreign crisis, and that would go angrily into actions and policies of the Truman administration and even more the Roosevelt one. Hardly anything could be more disruptive. Avoidance of disruption would be helped by an early ending of the special session, and this the Republican leaders decided upon.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the able Senator from Kentucky, for whom I have very high regard, whether he has made any estimates of the number of employees who would be required to administer the OPA proposal he has offered to the Senate. I may say as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, that I have checked with that committee to ascertain the number of OPA employees when the OPA was functioning, and also we have double checked with the Byrd committee, and we tried to get the Bureau of the Budget on the telephone today, but they apparently are closed down, this being Saturday afternoon. From the best figures we can obtain, the two authorities agree that they had 64,818 employees.

The staff of the Committee on Appropriations made a very rough estimate as to what that number of employees would require in the way of funds, and they roughly estimate that it would run from $120,000,000 to $170,000,000.

I was wondering if any estimate had ben made by the experts of the administration as to the number of employees who could be required under the Senator's OPA reimposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from California will understand that the OPA, which was an independent agency operating by itself, was different from what the amendment proposes. We do not propose to set up an independent agency, but that the President shall designate an existing department, perhaps a Cabinet member, perhaps the Department of Agriculture, or the Department of Commerce, whatever department he feels would best administer the act. Obviously that whole department, insofar as it would be available, would be utilized. The amendment also provides that any other Government agencies may be utilized by direction of the President.

It would be difficult for me—I have not done it, I may say to the Senator—to estimate the number of additional employees who might be required over and above those already in the department which might be designated by the President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, the minority leader, that under the plan he is proposing to the Senate, which I am sure if put into effect would require a considerable amount of policing, unless existing agencies or departments of the Government are tremendously overstaffed so that the employees are in fact twiddling their thumbs, I do not see how they could take on this great obligation without adding employees. The mere fact that an independent agency is not being created, if there is a job to be done, would not change the situation so far as concerns the number of employees required to do the job, regardless of under whose supervision the job was to be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think any employees in any of the department are twiddling their thumbs in idleness.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did not charge that they were. I said that unless they were doing so, I did not see how they could assume this great extra burden.

Mr. BARKLEY. Someone might draw an unjustifiable implication from the Senator's use of the words "twiddling their thumbs."

The Committee on Appropriations, the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, all of us, have been combing the departments with respect to reduction in the number of employees. Undoubtedly it would require some additional employees, but it would not require as many, in my judgment, as would be required if we were creating an independent agency similar to that to which the Senator referred, the OPA. Undoubtedly designating a department with ability to deal with the subject would require fewer additional employees, admitting there would be some, than would be necessary if we were establishing an entirely different agency.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The last question I should like to propound to the Senator is this: Under the proposal of the President in 1946, when he made his talk in October, he indicated that it might be necessary, at least it had been given consideration by the Cabinet, to seize the cattle on the ranges because they had not been brought in to augment the meat supply. As I read the Senator's amendment, it provides a control of inventories. Very extensive powers are vested under the amendment. Is it the Senator's judgment that, under his amendment, if a person did not want to dispose of a commodity, the Government could seize the cattle on the ranges, or the grain in the fields, or whatever the commodity might be?

Mr. BARKLEY. My answer to that is emphatically "No," because there is a provision in the amendment which prohibits the Government, through any agency, compelling anyone to sell what he has, and that would apply of course to farm products, as well as others.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield so

that I may ask the Senator from California a question?

Mr. CAIN. I should like to yield, but time is very precious, and if the Senator will ask for time from the Senator from Kentucky, it would be appreciated by me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a tremendous contradiction faces the Senate as it gives serious consideration to the proposals made by the senior Senator from Kentucky. Congress was called into special session, coming from every corner of a very great land, and after we had gotten here there was laid before us a proposal—a price and wage control and rationing bill. It was offered to the Senate and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency under the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky. We had every right in the world to conclude that it was a considered, a thoughtful, and a carefully designed bill. We further had reason to understand that it was the administration's last word on the subject.

In that bill there were a number of recommendations, but time will not permit me to discuss them all. One was the suggestion, as I read it, and as every other member of the committee, both Democrat and Republican, read it, to roll back prices. To where? To 1947. Every member of the committee, as I recall, said it could not be done, that it would not work, that we would not even give any further consideration to the subject. Mr. Paul Porter, the President's administrative coordinator, came before us and testified that it would not work.

Now, when we are presumably within 50 minutes of taking action, we have another so-called considered proposal before us, a proposal to freeze prices, as of August 1948 which would not work as proposed. I have a very high regard, affection and respect for the senior Senator from Kentucky, but I wish to say to the Members of the Senate that it simply is not possible to give his proposal any substantial thought, particularly when the administration on one day says that we can roll back prices, and less than 2 weeks later makes a recommendation which, in itself, has nothing to do with rolling back prices.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I should like very much to continue for a minute or more until I conclude, if the Senator will permit me. We are dealing with the fate of the Nation. Every man had better say what he most seriously thinks. In regard to rolling back prices, I do not think it can be done in any approximation of a free economy. As to freezing wages or freezing the price structure, which is the last recommendation, I am satisfied that that is not practicable, and I inquire, Is there not a better answer to this problem than that?

The Senator from Kentucky a few minutes ago in discussing his amendment spent quite a little time in talking to us about the need for relief for the low-income families of the country, the 25 percent of the families referred to by the President in his speech. Every human individual has a sympathy for the plight of people who do not have as much as it takes to get along, and the President said that 25 percent of the people of the country last year spent more than they took in. What would the proposal to freeze prices as of August 1948, do to the people for whom the Senator so feelingly pleaded and for whom so many of the rest of us would like to find a reasonable, legitimate way in which to be of service? I merely point that out because I feel so strongly that the Administration is presenting for consideration to the Congress a series of contradictions which thoughtful men cannot tolerate and cannot put into the form of law.

I am among those who do not know exactly what it is that we can do to meet the problems of the inflationary day in which we live, but I do know what we should not do. Whatever chance we have to stabilize the national economy, it will not be done by adopting, without far greater thought than has been given to the subject, proposals which have been requested of us by the administration of this country. I refer any thoughtful man or woman, any citizen in or out of Congress, to the record which was written by the Committee on Banking and Currency as the greatest justification for that committee coming before the Senate and saying, "Whatever you do, do not pass affirmatively on administrative recommendations which are not even understood by those who present them."

Mr. President, I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. BARKLEY. Am I to assume that the Senator does not have any time to yield to me, as I requested?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to take the Senator's time in this limited debate. I merely desire to call attention to the fact that my amendment does not automatically freeze anything. It provides that the administration of the act cannot go back of August 1. Now it is up to the administration to determine whether any price ceiling shall be fixed, or any price regulation made, but that is not a freezing, because the law itself does not take effect except through the human agencies set up in the measure.

Mr. CAIN. How right the Senator is. But that is the purpose and expressed hope of the measure before us, and the contradiction I have pointed out is that the Senator is now, quite properly from his point of view, asking us to enact legislation which in his opinion would freeze prices, and I should like to think that they could be frozen. But I should say to the Senator from Kentucky in all humility, that 2 weeks ago, his proposition was that we attempt to roll prices back to November 1947.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is criticizing me for offering an amendment different from the one which he and all the members of his committee said could not be administered, so far as roll-backs are concerned.

Mr. CAIN. Exactly, sir.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are we, as Senators, not supposed to be benefited by the enlightenment given us by the great Banking and Currency Committee?

Mr. CAIN. In one instance you were—and I used the word "you" not in a personal sense. The Senator from Kentucky listened to the views expressed by the comparatively small group of men composing the membership of the Committee on Banking and Currency considering the Senator's proposal, which is that of the administration, and the Senator said the Committee on Banking and Currency was correct, and the Senator said he would make the change. I will say to the Senator that our most serious criticism is that action was requested of Congress on measures which deserve the most careful and painstaking study, and which could not be acted upon in the time Congress has at its disposal in the session to which it was called back by the President.

Mr. BARKLEY. For the Committee on Banking and Currency I have the greatest respect, because I served as a member of it for 20 years. But I believe it has acted wrongly in not reporting anything to the Senate which in my opinion would be effective in curbing the constantly increasing cost of living. The committee would not report anything of that sort. So, when I have offered a modified amendment, modified only with regard to the date at which it should take effect, the Senator indulges in criticism of such action.

Mr. CAIN. It may very well be, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, that the committee—and I am desirous of sharing fully in the responsibility—has done wrong in not recommending more positive action than we have done, but we have come forward in all seriousness with a recommendation as to what should not be done. For the good of the country, we should not adopt either one of the price-control measures that have been laid before us by the senior Senator from Kentucky for the administration.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is much talk about stand-by controls, and that the powers sought to be granted would not ordinarily be exercised. I think the first thing that ought to be known is that the amendment gives complete, arbitrary, and unlimited authority to the President of the United States to reestablish OPA in all its details. It actually removes many of the restrictions which were contained in the OPA Act, because Mr. Porter wrote the new measure, and he removed things on which we had formerly relied, and he criticized some of the things we did. This is not a stand-by proposition. This is a request to give the President unlimited power to fix prices of every commodity, of every service that is rendered in the country. We cannot escape our responsibility. We cannot say, "Well, here is a stand-by power. Use it now and then. This is only going to be a selective control." We are giving the President arbitrary power over the operations of every business in the United States. We are giving him power to say how businessmen shall conduct their businesses, what kind of prices they shall charge. The amendment is not confined to prices only. It gives power to say how they shall distribute their goods.

Our experience is that once we embark on price control we cannot stop. We cannot fix the price of meat unless we are prepared to fix the price of grain, corn, wheat, and oats. We cannot fix the price of meat unless we are prepared to fix the price of chickens, because the moment we restrict the price of meat and hold it down, it immediately affects the price of chickens, and it reduces the production of chickens so that the prices of chickens rise at once far beyond what they would normally be. We cannot have a stand-by control; we cannot have a partial control. That is what the President himself said when he decontrolled all prices under the OPA law in 1946. He then said to the people:

I am convinced that the time has come—

This was after the election of 1946, when the President in his proclamation said:

I am convinced that the time has come when these controls can serve no useful purpose. I am, indeed, convinced that their further continuance would do the Nation's economy more harm than good. Accordingly, I have directed the immediate abandonment of all control over wages and salaries and all control over prices.

The President continued:

The Price Administrator has advised me that, with so much of the economy freed from price controls, clinging to the rest would, in his judgment, lead to distortions in production and diversion of goods to an extent far outweighing any benefit that could be achieved.

The President went on to say:

Some shortages remain—

And so forth—

but I believe the law of supply and demand operating in the market place will, from now on, serve the people better than would continued regulation of prices by the Government.

That was President Truman speaking at the end of 1946. There is not any way to do this on a partial basis. What we are asked to do is to give the President a power which, if he begins to use it, will gradually include all the features of OPA, the War Production Board, and rationing. We cannot effectively enforce a good many prices without rationing the goods which are distributed. This is a complete power which is asked. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky said that the President cannot go out on the farms and seize the cattle. We placed a special provision in the bill to prevent that, because the President suggested that very serious consideration had been given to it. He so stated in the summer of 1946.

As a matter of fact this amendment really does give that power, because it permits allocations. The administration may not say, "You must sell to the Government," although I rather believe that the powers even go to that extent. They did during the war. Certainly it could say, "You cannot sell it to anyone else. You cannot sell to the packers." So the farmer would be placed up against the proposition of either selling to the Government or not selling to anyone, and selling at a price fixed by the Price Administrator under the terms of the proposed law.

So far as placing the administration in another department is concerned, what difference does it make? Give it to the Department of Commerce, and tomorrow it would establish an OPA as a bureau of the Department of Commerce, under Paul Porter. We can see exactly what the President had in mind when he called Paul Porter back here to do this job. He was the man who went all-out for OPA at the end. He was the man whose arbitrary action injured practically everyone under OPA.

The roll-back provision is eliminated, but the President is not prevented from rolling prices back. He is not compelled to roll them back, but the amendment very clearly provides that the administration shall make adjustments "in the prices prevailing in November 1947 for such relevant factors as it may determine and deem to be of general applicability."

There is full power to find that none of the circumstances are of general applicability; full power to set up the 1947 price, just as it was before. The Senator removed that as a primary consideration, but he left it in his amendment for the purpose of giving general permission, to make it perfectly clear that the administration can go back to that date, base everything on that date, and give attention only to such considerations as it chooses to regard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I decline to yield. I am sorry, but the time is extremely limited.

The difficulty with this proposal is just what we have said all along. This is an attempt to leave the causes of inflation in operation and try to hold against the results. It cannot be done. It never has been done. During the war, through a certain amount of general determination and interest in the war, combined with patriotism, we got enough people to conform, so that we got a certain amount of conformity. There were some violations, but they were not very important. But just the moment the war ended we saw everything go into the black markets, which is a natural condition under such control.

The American people do not believe that the Government has any right to limit their power to act as they see fit to act. We saw corn go into the black market, the moment the price of corn was fixed. If the general free price is higher than the price fixed, trucks go to every farm and the farmer is paid a higher price. An illegitimate trade is developed. That is what happened in connection with meat. At the end of OPA, 80 percent of the meat was sold in the black market. The President himself refers to it in the proclamation decontrolling meat. There were not enough cattle in the regularly established packing plants, in the legitimate channels of industry, to produce enough leather for shoes and enough insulin for the treatment of diabetes. The situation reached the point where practically no meat was handled in the regular channels. There is no reason to believe that conditions would be any different today if we had such controls again. Price control will not work in America in time of peace.

It seems to me that we must get at the causes. Those causes are many. The Government must go about the problem with complete sincerity, and in every possible line in which it can operate.

There is the general problem of the restraint of credit. It is said that people generally are very much worse off. Of course they are not worse off as a whole. On the average the people are much better off than they were before the war. The general cost of living has gone up from 100 to 170, at the same time that the average weekly earnings of factory workers—approximately 14,000,000 of them—have gone up from $23.86 to $52.81, or about 120 percent. The difficulty is that we have such a tremendous purchasing power, and such high wages that the purchasing power has constantly increased the demand as against the supply, so that we cannot keep up, even though production has been constantly increasing.

We can reduce inflation somewhat by holding down Government expenditures. I have stated that we were to blame for not doing more than we did. However, the President can still reduce many of the expenditures of the Government. He still has power to enforce economies in the military service. He has power to enforce economies in our treatment of foreign countries.

As a general cause, we have the tremendous excess of exports from this country, some of them necessary for European relief.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield me two more minutes?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The President has power to cut the exports to some extent—not necessarily those to Europe. About half of this surplus goes to other parts of the world.

That is the only way we are going to stop this inflation. There is no magic means by which we can do it. The bill before us provides certain credit-control powers. However, the administration already has powers which it has never exercised. I refer to the raising of the interest rate on short-term Government issues, and the raising of the rediscount rate. The administration has not even used the power which it has. The administration can raise the rediscount rate for the New York and Chicago banks 2 percent without any legislation. The Federal Reserve Board can generally cut down the expansion of bank credit. Last year it provided $7,000,000,000 of additional purchasing power over what is normally produced by production.

I think we have given all the powers we can. There is every reasonable hope that we may accomplish what we wish to accomplish.

At this point I wish to refer to an American Federation of Labor bulletin for January 1948, in which it is stated that the root cause of the upward price spiral was "the inflated money supply resulting from wartime fiscal policies." I believe that Mr. Boris Shishkin, the man who wrote it, is one of the best economists in the country:

The upward pressure of the huge money supply has been so great that prices were breaking through ceilings and black markets were appearing long before OPA expired. This was to be expected. Price control cannot dam an ever-growing flood of money inflation. This has been proved again and again, in country after country. We must attack the root cause of inflation, the excess money supply.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of answering, in a word, the Senator from Ohio.

He says that notwithstanding the date of August 1, 1948, back of which the President cannot go in fixing prices, we could go back to November 1947, anyway. There is nothing in the amendment that even implies that such a thing can be done, any more than it can be implied that we could go back to November 1920, 1930, 1940, or any other year. Such authority simply is not there.

So far as compelling anyone to sell anything is concerned, the Senator from Ohio stated that the amendment would authorize the President to compel anyone to sell anything to the Government. Let us read only the sentence which prohibits it.

Nothing in this title—

That is, the price-fixing title—

shall be construed to require any person to sell any commodity.

That means sell it to anyone. The Senator from Ohio is a good lawyer. I am defending his reputation as a lawyer in what I am saying, notwithstanding the more or less pettifogging argument to which he resorted.

Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it may be that price control is not the answer for the inflationary period in which we are living. But up to this time the majority has presented nothing that will do anything serious about the fires of inflation which are now burning around the national home of America.

We can discuss from now until doomsday the disadvantages of price control, and all the irritations and annoyances which we were compelled to put up with during the war; but I make this prophecy: Unless the Congress of the United States does something with respect to high prices, if we continue one inflationary spiral after another, sooner or later the so-called boom period in which we are living will be followed by a bust; and the higher the prices the deeper the depression, bringing with it misery, bankruptcy, and all the other horrible consequences that go along with a major depression.

With respect to price control, Mr. President, let me say that when I think of what happened here 2 years ago and what was said then by those who were attempting to destroy price control, and when I think of the promises and the prophecies that were made, I am constrained to repeat just a few of those statements made by various prominent businessmen and prominent Members of the Senate who predicted what would happen once price control was destroyed. Some of them said that for a short while there would be chaos and confusion and higher prices, but that in a short time everything would level off and prices would be reasonable and stable and in line with what they were before the war.

Let me point out here that John E. Jaeger, president of the National Association of Retail Grocers, in speaking to the American Wholesale Grocers Association on February 3, 1946, said that—

We (retail grocers) feel that the time has arrived when * * * action must be taken * * * to prevent renewal of the Price Control Act * * *. Competition will * * * benefit the consumer by making available ample food at reasonable prices.

I wonder whether Mr. Jaeger would say the same thing today? Does steak at a dollar a pound, butter at a dollar a pound, eggs at 90 cents a dozen, and milk at 25 cents a quart represent reasonable prices? How long do the experts who testified 2 years ago expect these high prices to continue until prices level off? They say economy is necessary; they say the people should eat macaroni. For instance, the Senator from Nebraska said recently they should eat chicken. Or perhaps others would say the people should eat fish or eat crow; or if they cannot get bread give them cake, but obviously they do not wish to have anyone disturb the high prices and the profits that grow out of them. That is what they are telling the American people at this time. They tell the millions of people who cannot afford to buy houses because prices are so far out of reach, "Wait until there is more production." But today every factory is busy and every acre of land capable of producing food is producing it. Nevertheless the so-called experts ask the people to wait for more production. They said, "Just wait." We have been waiting, waiting, Mr. President, for the time to come when these prices will be stabilized; but today they are going still higher.

On yesterday, hogs and cattle on the Chicago market sold for the highest price in the history of the Nation; and they constitute a part of the food which should go to the lower-income families of this country, in order to provide a healthy, and stable diet.

I remember that in 1930, when the bread lines were getting longer and longer, the Republicans had the same sort of slogan: "Just wait. Prosperity," they said, "is just around the corner. Everything will be all right." But nothing was done; and then we went into the greatest depression in American history.

Mr. President, as certain as it is that my name is LUCAS, unless we do something to halt these high prices and the inflation that is gripping this country, that situation will take us into a depression that not only will ruin the economy of the United States but could well lose the peace of the world, because at this particular time the economy of the United States and world peace are tied hand in glove. If America goes to the bottom of the abyss, economically speaking, the democracies of the world depending upon the United States for help to lift them out of their present difficulties, will be lost. Mr. President, this is the most difficult domestic situation the Nation has faced since I have been a Member of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] says we are dealing with the fate of the Nation. I am glad someone on the other side of the aisle finally treats this matter as an emergency. They have been treating it as no emergency at all.

Here is what Mr. Jay T. Taylor, of Amarillo, Tex., said in 1946, in speaking in behalf of the Joint Livestock Committee:

We are convinced that, if you should discontinue the present livestock and meat program, the actual price of meat would be lowered. Our abundant supply would see to that.

That is what Mr. Taylor assured us in December of 1946, and, of course, it was in February 1946, that Mr. Jaeger said that the prevention of the renewal of the Price Control Act would benefit the consumer by making available ample food at reasonable prices.

Mr. President, are prices reasonable today? In 1946 porterhouse steak sold for 43 cents a pound, but today it sells for 98 cents a pound. In 1946, sirloin steak sold for 39 cents a pound; today it is 98 cents a pound. In 1946 rib roast was 29 cents a pound; today it is 79 cents a pound.

Millions of our citizens, I contend, have paid for the folly of Congress.

I wish I had more time to speak on this matter. I should like to name many of the persons who advocated or spoke in favor of the repeal of OPA. I should like to state what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] said on the floor of the Senate, and I should like to inform the Senate what was said by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] in regard to what would happen after OPA was destroyed and in regard to the leveling off of prices.

I should like to tell the Senate what was said by Mr. Bruce, of the lumbermen's organization, who told how they would build homes, once the OPA was out of the way.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield a few more minutes to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 2 minutes more to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] went along with Mr. Bruce in a speech he made to the Middle Atlantic Lumbermen's Association on February 5 of this year. He told them:

I do not need to remind the membership of this association that it was the Republican leadership in the Senate and the House that was responsible for ending OPA.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have time.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the Senator how many houses were built under Public Law 388? The answer is 500,000. How many houses were built in 1947? Eight hundred and eighty thousand.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am surprised that my friend would interrupt me in that way.

Mr. WHERRY. I should have a chance to answer the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not yield. The Senator from Nebraska is the acting majority leader, and he knows the rules better than anyone else does.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator please not to do that to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] said on July 8, 1946:

> I should like to say that I was never more convinced of anything in my life than that if the economic and business interests of the United States could be free from price controls production would increase, prices would level off.

When are prices going to level off? I ask the Senator from Oklahoma.

The figures I have obtained from the Department of Labor show that in the 2 years since this Congress killed price control prices have given no indication of leveling off. According to the predictions that were made by various persons in 1946, the reduction of prices is long overdue. For instance, an economist for the Cotton Textile Institute told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on April 30, 1946:

> On the other hand, there isn't any doubt in my mind and in the mind of anybody in the market that if Congress were to abandon the OPA tomorrow, cotton textile prices would decline immediately.

But, Mr. President, the prophecies made by those gentlemen at that particular time are so far from the mark that I sometimes wonder whether their conscience does not bother them a little. That is especially true when they see the housewife going to the corner grocery store and paying such tremendous prices for meat and milk, and paying such exorbitant prices at the clothing stores and at the shoe stores for the clothing and shoes the children of the family must have.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it is not my intention to go back to 1946 and attempt to lay the blame or endeavor to determine who may have destroyed or killed OPA. I have my own thoughts and ideas on that subject.

However, I shall go back only 24 hours. Yesterday, in one of the newspapers, appeared an article headed:

> Ford Raises Car Prices for Third Time in a Year.

Today in one of the Philadelphia newspapers we see an article headed—

> Meat, Food Prices Expected To Rise.

And, Mr. President, the price of milk has just been increased a cent and a half a quart in my own city of Philadelphia.

What is the Congress going to do about this situation? Congress is here for the purpose of dealing with this situation. Does any Member of the Senate think that any restraint on consumer credits or bank credits will lower the price of a Ford automobile? The price of steel has increased $10 a ton. What are Senators going to do about that? Are they simply going to give us this little bit of legislation that is now proposed—necessary legislation, but not adequate? It will be adequate only if it is a part of a general, rounded-out program That is what we are here for. Let us forget for a moment responsibility back in 1946 and 1947. Let us take care of that in the campaign. Let us now rise to the occasion. Let us do something. Let us remain here Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday, or all next week. Do not attempt to fool the American people. Do not have a headline in the newspaper, "Inflation control put into effect by the Congress," if there is no action to back it up. The people cannot be fooled in that way except possibly for a short period of time.

Now we have been hearing here about the black market. I have more confidence in the American people and American business than some appear to have, even in this Chamber. I believe during OPA the great rank and file of the American people used their coupons and did not go into the black market. But let me remind the Senator from Ohio of a study made by his own committee, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. They obtained their data from the American Meat Institute. They had figures on the average overcharges, or black-market charges, while OPA was in existence. They said there was an average overcharge in the black market during OPA of 12 or 13 cents a pound for round steak, and certainly not everyone was in the black market paying that overcharge. Since OPA round steak increased, by April 1948, 43 cents a pound, or more than 100 percent. Black-market prices were mild in comparison. Let us take another item, that of rib roast. The Senator's own committee—and I refer to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]—in a study of the subject indicated that the average black-market overcharge for rib roast was 9 or 10 cents. Since the repeal of OPA it has gone up 32 cents. And so on down the line on every item.

The overcharge in the black market on chuck roast averaged 9 cents a pound. By last April, however, chuck roast had gone up 28 cents, or more than 100 percent over OPA prices.

Black-market overcharges on hamburger averaged 7 cents. By last April, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics, hamburger was up 22 cents over OPA.

Veal cutlets cost an extra 13 cents in the black market. Now they cost an extra 49 cents, again double the OPA price.

Leg of lamb, sold at a premium of 3 cents in the black market, now costs at least 29 cents more a pound than during OPA.

Pork chops sold for 37½ cents during OPA and black markets charged an average of 4 cents more. Yet, in April, pork chops sold for an average of 73½ cents, or just about double.

Yes; the black-market prices—which most Americans refused to pay—were modest and mild compared to present outrageous legal prices.

I think the American people are honest. They obey the law, they do not cheat and they do not endeavor to get into black markets. The argument that is used here is, "Oh, there is going to be a black market." Well, I think it is time we fought inflation as we fought the war and as we fought the depression. The Congress and the administration had the courage in those dark, dreary days, to fight the depression. When the war came along, we all joined together and fought that war, and we won the war. We are now faced with a serious situation, a crisis which confronts the American people. I think we should have the same courage. We should fight with the same determination. We should win the battle of inflation as we won the war, by not retreating from reality. But it takes courage to do it, Mr. President. I think the Congress should have that courage. They should remain here and meet this problem. If they do, then I am convinced they will earn the thanks of the American people. Let us forget November for a week or two. Let us forget the election for a short time, and let us think about the children of today and the people of tomorrow; let us think of the future of this Nation and of the world. That future rests on a solvent, stable American economy; wishing will not make it so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, when the President presented his message to Congress over a year ago, he connected up the idea of price control with European relief and European recovery. He made a very logical argument for it. We had an opportunity then to do something about prices. We did nothing. In January of last year, a bill to control prices was introduced by myself, and was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The bill contained the provisions which are now being considered by that committee. Therefore we have wasted a whole year because the bill was not considered at that time. We now confront a similar situation but with conditions very much worse and very much more grievous. The President delivered his message to the Congress. We paid little attention to it.

Three times the request has been made to the Congress of the United States, and only a partial answer has been given. It has been said that it is impossible to effectuate controls, that nothing can be done about inflation, that it must merely be allowed to take its course. That was the argument made during the worst period of deflation we have ever had, that

nothing could be done, and therefore it was said, "Let us do nothing about it." But, Mr. President, the facts are otherwise. Statistics prove that control can be effective. I should like therefore to refer briefly to some statistics. We have just listened to the Senator from Ohio saying "How imposible. How impossible. How impossible." Everything is impossible, but listen to these figures.

In 1935–39, all the items of rent, food, and clothing, which came under control, may be taken at 100 percent. By 1943, the figure on all items had increased to 125 percent. Food was 143 percent, clothing was 127.9 percent, and rent, 108 percent. By the time controls were removed, all items were up to 133.3 percent; food, 145.6 percent; clothing, 157.2 percent; and rent, 108.5 percent. Rent, of course, remained under control.

By June 1948 controls were removed in the face of the argument which was advanced that nothing could be done about it. Here are the facts. On all items, the cost had risen to 171.7 percent, a rise of over 40 percent above June 1946. Food was up to 214.1 percent, a rise over 1946 of about 70 percent. Clothing was up to 196.9 percent, a rise of about 40 percent. Rent, still partially controlled, had risen to 117 percent.

Mr. President, the question is whether we are going to do anything or not. The determination, judging from what has been said by Members of the Senate in support of the measure which is before us and against the proposal submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], is to do nothing. If Senators desire to do nothing, nothing will be done. But, Mr. President, I would remind the Senate that in years of "bust and boom," the going up is quite as perilous as the coming down, in spite of the fact that the drop is almost instantaneous.

Mr. President, in order that we may be able better to appreciate the points I have tried to make during this discussion, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this place in my remarks a table on the cost of living, based on figures obtained from the Department of Labor and from the Department of Commerce, the table showing consumer prices for moderate-income families in large cities.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cost of living—Consumer prices for moderate-income families in large cities

A. 10-YEAR PERIOD: 1935–39=100

Date	All items	Food	Clothing	Rent
1935–39	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
May 1943	125.1	143.0	127.9	108.0
June 1946	133.3	145.6	157.2	108.5
June 1948	171.7	214.1	196.9	117.0

B. MAY 1943 TO JUNE 1948: MAY 1943=100

Date	All items	Food	Clothing	Rent
May 1943	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
June 1946	106.6	101.8	122.9	100.5
June 1948	137.3	149.7	153.9	108.3

NOTE.—During the 3 years of effective price control, the cost of living rose only 6.6 percent and the cost of food only 1.8 percent.

Cost of living—Consumer prices for moderate-income families in large cities—Con.

C. WHAT HAS HAPPENED SINCE THE END OF PRICE CONTROL: JUNE 1946=100

Date	All items	Food	Clothing	Rent
June 1946	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
June 1948	128.8	147.0	125.3	107.8

NOTE.—During the 2 years since the end of price control, the cost of living has increased more than 4 times as much as during the 3 years of effective price control.

Source: Department of Labor.

Average weekly earnings in manufacturing

A. 10-YEAR PERIOD

(1939 monthly average=100)

Date:	Earnings
1939 monthly average	100.0
May 1943	180.6
June 1946	181.5
June 1948	221.3

B. MAY 1943–JUNE 1948

(May 1943=100)

Date:	
May 1943	100.0
June 1946	100.5
June 1948	122.6

C. WHAT HAS HAPPENED SINCE THE END OF PRICE CONTROL

(June 1946=100)

Date:	
June 1946	100.0
June 1948	121.9

NOTE.—Real wages of the American worker have increased faster than cost of living over the 10-year period since 1939; but since the end of effective price control in June 1946 the trend has been reversed. Cost of living has increased faster than average weekly earnings.

Source: Department of Labor.

Corporate profits after taxes

A. 10-YEAR PERIOD

(1939=100)

Date:	Profits
1939	100
Second quarter, 1943	212
Second quarter, 1946	240
Second quarter, 1948	360

B. SECOND QUARTER 1943–SECOND QUARTER 1948

(Second quarter, 1943=100)

Date:	
Second quarter, 1943	100
Second quarter, 1946	113
Second quarter, 1948	170

C. WHAT HAS HAPPENED SINCE THE END OF PRICE CONTROL

(Second quarter, 1946=100)

Date:	
Second quarter, 1946	100
Second quarter, 1948	150

NOTE.—Over the 10-year period, corporate profits have increased 260 percent, while the cost of living increased 71.7 percent and average weekly earnings 121.3 percent. Since the end of effective price control, corporate profits have increased 50 percent, while average weekly earnings have increased 21.9 percent and the cost of living 28.8 percent.

Source: Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. How much more time have I?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Nine minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had intended to cover some more facts and figures on the present high cost of living than have been covered here today, but, inasmuch as time is short, I shall now ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the portion of my remarks which I shall have to omit because of the time element.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the senior Senator from Washington as to whether the remarks he holds in his hands constitute a speech he was to have given on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MAGNUSON. These are certain figures to which I intended to refer.

Mr. CAIN. On the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. May I inquire why the Senator has not found it convenient to give those figures on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because of the limitation of time. I have only 2 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. All I meant to suggest was that the Senator had not found it convenient to ask for time heretofore to make the figures known to the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some of them were filed only this afternoon.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON Mr. President, when this Congress adjourns there will be statements placed in the RECORD, as usual, with respect to the cost of the Congress, namely, how much money has been appropriated, and there will be some comparisons made as to whether the Eightieth Congress was the costliest Congress in history, or how it compared with other Congresses.

I contend that this has been the costliest Congress in history, for the American people. The present majority party assumed control of this Congress on January 1, 1947, and even then the President of the United States warned against the inflationary spiral——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if I may have half a minute additional time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield a half minute to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On November 17, 1947, the President called our attention to the same subject, and only a few days ago the President again called our attention to it. This Congress, in its do-nothing attitude, has been not only the costliest Congress in connection with its appropriations, but has cost the American people, since the first time the President called attention to the inflationary spiral, approximately $30,000 000 000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place this statement in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY'S COSTLIEST CONGRESS

(By Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON)

The Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress is history's costliest Congress in peacetime. The present majority party assumed

control on January 1, 1947. In his first message sent to this Congress, President Truman warned: "An important present source of danger to our economy is the possibility that prices might be raised to such an extent the consuming public could not purchase the tremendous supply of goods and services."

On November 17, 1947, the President called the Congress into special session. He urged the Congress to enact a 10-point program, designed to break the inflation spiral. The Eightieth Congress was challenged, but it refused to fight for the welfare of the American people.

A preview of the economic philosophy of Republican leaders took place on the floor of the Senate and in committee hearings during the June 1946 fight to extend OPA. Here's what the president of the National Manufacturers Association said at that time: "If OPA is finally dead, women will now use the canned meats and other goods they have on their shelves to see them through any temporary period of price rises. If OPA is eliminated entirely, prices of automobiles may be expected to reach a normal within 6 months, while rents might take at least a year."

Similar sentiments were echoed by Senators on the other side of the aisle, present here today. That was a philosophy of let nature take its course, let the economic forces run rampant, this is a free-enterprise economy, let supply and demand regulate prices, even if it means a boom and bust. It is a philosophy of "do-nothingism." It represents a course consistently pursued by the majority leadership.

The majority party here in the Congress has gambled with the welfare of the American people. They have wagered that supply would catch up with demand, even though they had been warned over and over again that our productive plant is operating at full capacity. They have known that our farms, our factories, and our labor force are being fully utilized and they should have been able to deduce from this fact that headway on the supply side of the equation would be a slow process. They were warned over and over again that we could not discharge our full obligation to a world yearning for peace and prosperity without creating demand for goods and services. They knew when we voted on a bipartisan basis to assist the Marshall-plan countries that additional claims would be made on goods and materials. They knew when we voted on a bipartisan basis for a bigger Military Establishment that new demands would be created. Yet in the face of all this, the Republican leaders still gambled that prices would level off, that somehow or other we can avoid run-away inflation—at least until after the election.

The majority party wagered and lost. The stakes were high and who is now paying off the bet? The American people. Do you know how much this reckless gamble and "do-nothingism" is costing the American people? Let me give you a few figures. In January 1947, Republicans took control of both Houses of Congress. Since Congress convened on January 3, 1947, consumer prices have risen over 18½ percent. In the first quarter of 1948, consumers were spending at an annual rate of over $170,000,000,000. Republican "do-nothingism" has added over $30,000,000,000 to their annual bills. Since June 1946, food prices have risen 47 percent. Consumers in the United States spend in the neighborhood of $40,000,000,000 a year for food alone. The Republican wager to let supply and demand halt rising food prices will cost the American consumer over $18,000,000,000 this year.

I am sure the majority party knows that Senate Joint Resolution 157 is not an anti-inflation program. It represents merely an attack on one facet of the problem. Debate here on the floor has demonstrated that the leadership on the other side of the aisle recognizes they are giving the administration only one blunt tool with which to work. There are numerous fronts from which the inflation problem can be attacked. The Eightieth Congress proposes to go home without granting the administration the power it needs to launch a real counteroffensive. It prefers to get out of the Washington, D. C., heat with the job still undone. The do-nothing, let-nature-take-it-course philosophy of the majority has made this history's costliest Congress. It is the American people who will dig out of their pockets the $30,000,000,000, in the form of higher prices, to pay off the bet the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress has already lost.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, with regard to the construction of houses under OPA control and under the administration of that agency by Mr. Wyatt, there were built less than 100,000 units. The President himself admitted the program was a failure and removed controls. Last year, without controls, 880,000 houses were constructed. This year, at the rate at which we are now going, I wish to state to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] that we shall have more than 1,000,000 units constructed without price control.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, while America benefits today from high wages and full employment, it suffers, at the same time, from high prices. In too many instances we are all fully aware of that. The job of this Congress, on both sides of the aisle, is to endeavor to do almost the impossible, which is to maintain full employment and high wages while controlling or leveling off prices.

It is the opinion of the Banking and Currency Committee that the proposal of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] will by no means accomplish that objective; that it will do more harm than it will do good.

I should like to say to all America that because of the debt structure which this country has we shall have inflation for a long time. If we want to protect the financial integrity of the United States our task is to eradicate the causes of inflation. I wish it were possible for me to stand up, recommend, and sponsor on this side for the committee, legislation which would result in artificially reducing prices, but I cannot do it. I think we are compelled for a period of time to suffer because of the difficulties which confront us, which are greater than we have ever previously faced in all our history. I think it is incumbent upon us all to cooperate with self-sacrifice in the hope that in the early part of the next session we may cure, for the first time, some of the causes of the ills which we suffer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All of the Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 6 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON].

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, some propaganda has been issued by the Republican Party saying that it is time for a change. I agree that it is time for a change from Republican control of the Congress. The American people will have complete and final proof of their callous disregard of their welfare by their denial of additional housing and of relief from the high prices which are robbing them of the caloric diet necessary to sustain them at work. This special session of Congress is going to add to the previous record of the Republican Congress a record which includes no attention to education, no attention to health, no attention to the minimum wage, and a total disregard of the Republican platform pledges on social security.

Yes, Mr. President; it is high time for a change, and the Congress today will give final and complete evidence of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the four remaining minutes I can only reiterate what I have heretofore said on this subject.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] referred to the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency heard several distinguished members of the administration, Cabinet members, and others. That is true. It did hear them. The Banking and Currency Committee declined and I think, ruthlessly, to hear representatives of millions of American people who were anxious to be heard before Congress ended. I went before the committee a few days ago with a telegram from Mr. A. F. Whitney, head of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, asking and pleading that he be allowed to testify. He was denied the opportunity to do so. I placed in the RECORD telegrams from——

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry, but I cannot yield. I have but 3 minutes left.

I placed in the RECORD telegrams from the heads of the railway brotherhoods, the American Federation of Labor, the CIO, and I have on my desk copies of telegrams which have been sent here by representatives of millions of American citizens who have a right to be heard but who cannot be heard because they have been denied the opportunity. In this connection, Mr. President, I should say that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], was sympathetic in the matter.

I was asked a while ago by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] how much it would cost to administer this amendment if it should be adopted. I was unable to give the Senator the figures, and I cannot do so now, but I am willing to make the prediction that if nothing more is done regarding inflation and the high cost of living than has been proposed by the majority of the Senate, within 12 months it will cost the American people $10,000,000,000 in further increases in the cost of living.

The Republicans have done nothing on housing, nothing on inflation, nothing on

minimum wages, nothing on education, nothing on social security. I suggest that the theme song of the Republican Party between now and next November should be "I've Got Plenty of Nothing."

Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be adopted, that it will be sent to the House of Representatives, to give that branch an opportunity to act, and, before we adjourn, whether it be tonight or next week, to express their opinion and their attitude with respect to this great problem which confronts the American people. I hope the Congress of the United States will not take the attitude of flouting the desire and the will of the American people to have Congress undertake to do something which would affect the household welfare of every man, woman, and child in this Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time for debate has expired under the agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Tobey
Ecton	McKellar	Tydings
Ellender	McMahon	Umstead
Feazel	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	Young
Hawkes	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—33

Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Ellender	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Feazel	Langer	Pepper
Fulbright	Lucas	Russell
Green	McFarland	Sparkman
Hatch	McGrath	Taylor
Hayden	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	Magnuson	Tydings
Holland	Murray	Umstead

NAYS—53

Aiken	Ferguson	Revercomb
Baldwin	Flanders	Robertson, Va.
Brewster	Gurney	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Stennis
Buck	Jenner	Stewart
Butler	Kem	Taft
Byrd	Knowland	Thye
Cain	Lodge	Tobey
Capehart	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Capper	McClellan	Watkins
Cooper	Malone	Wherry
Cordon	Martin	Wiley
Donnell	Millikin	Williams
Dworshak	Moore	Wilson
Eastland	Morse	Young
Ecton	Reed	

NOT VOTING—10

Ball	George	Wagner
Bushfield	McCarran	White
Chavez	Maybank	
Downey	O'Daniel	

So Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with my amendment which was just acted upon, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD copies of telegrams I have received from four organizations asking for the adoption of certain legislation in the present session of the Congress.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANHEAD, MD., *August 7, 1948.*

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the 5,250,000 members of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers I implore you to use your influence in keeping Congress in session until the Federal aid-to-education bill is brought to the floor of the House. Equal educational opportunities for all children should not wait for next session of Congress.

MRS. STANLEY G. COOK,
Chairman of Legislation.

CHEVY CHASE, MD., *August 7, 1948.*

Senator BARKLEY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

American Association of Social Workers deplore passage McCarthy housing bill. Demand open hearings on this bill. Hope you can keep Congress in special session till housing needs under bill are met.

PHILIP SCHIFF,
The American Association of Social Workers.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 6, 1948.*

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Inflation in the United States has reached tremendous and frightening proportions. America's inflationary economy can no longer be controlled solely by the isolated measures for restricting credits and increasing bank reserves passed by the House in its anti-inflation bill. The control of inflation requires a coordinated program which takes into consideration all aspects of the economy.

Today the cost of essentials—of food, clothing, and housing—places a serious strain on the budget of the majority of Americans. Savings are rapidly being used up in a desperate effort just to live. Small luxuries have become possible only for a very few.

It is clear that America's economy cannot withstand this strain of inflation for long. An effective remedy must be applied at once.

The members of the National Council of Jewish Women feel strongly that the battle against inflation requires the immediate enactment by Congress of price control, the rationing of foods in short supply, and strengthened rent control. Only by these measures will the rise in prices be halted and the fruits of American production once more be made available to all Americans. We urge you, Senator BARKLEY, to exert every effort in your position of Democratic leadership to bring about the immediate enactment by this special session of Congress of a strong anti-inflation program that will include price control, more effective rent control, and rationing.

MRS. JOSEPH M. WELT,
National President,
National Council of Jewish Women.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

According to public press and radio, Congress has already planned to adjourn its special session without enacting adequate anti-inflation and housing measures. The continually rising cost of living and the wholly inadequate housing program are a dire threat to our economy and are therefore a very vital concern to the plain citizens of our country.

The International Association of Machinists, representing 600,000 wage earners who, with their families, aggregate approximately 2,000,000 plain citizens, urge you and your associates to remain in session until the two afore-mentioned basic issues are adequately dealt with in a manner that will bring immediate tangible relief to the plain citizens of this country. The International Association of Machinists further requests that we be given an opportunity to be heard in connection with any anti-inflation or housing measures which the present special session of Congress may consider.

H. W. BROWN,
International President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be proposed to the House amendment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I call up my amendment No. 2, and ask for its adoption

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the amendment is a long one.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if it is in order to do so, I shall ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, because it is printed and on the desks of Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TAFT. I object. I think the amendment should be read. Senators do not know what it is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the House amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

There is hereby created as an agency of the Congress a select committee to be known as the Congressional Economic Study Committee composed of 15 members to be named as follows:

Five members from the Senate of the United States to be named by the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Five members from the House of Representatives to be named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Five members from civilian life eminently qualified to assist in solving problems in the fields of finance, labor, industry, or agriculture and familiar with the problems of the consuming public to be named jointly by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall designate one member of the committee as chairman and another member as vice chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to make a study of (1) economic maladjustments which it believes are contributing to undesirable levels of prices, wages, and supplies of commodities in the United States or places where the United States has a special responsibility for economic conditions, (2) measures which in the committee's judgment might contribute to an improvement or solution of such economic problems, (3) and to consider and evaluate any reports on economic conditions submitted to the Congress by the executive branch of the Government during the life of the committee. The committee may well study, but is not limited to, any economic situations arising out of money supply and monetary relationships in this and other countries.

The committee shall report to the Senate and the House (or to the respective clerks thereof if the Congress is not in session) from time to time as it shall deem appropriate, but finally not later than March 1, 1949.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress and until the date of its final report at such times and places as it deems advisable, whether or not the Congress is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel and such special assistants, to hold such hearings, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Reports of its activities may be made public from time to time, but its conclusions and recommendations shall be reserved for its reports to Congress as above provided.

Members of the committee who are Members of Congress shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the committee. Members of the committee who are not members of Congress and whose other relationships to the Federal Government do not prevent shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the committee, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

There is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $50,000 or as much thereof as may be necessary to meet the expenditures authorized by this resolution, which expenditures shall be payable upon vouchers signed by the chairman and vice chairman.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is this the first time the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has been presented to the Senate of the United States?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not advised. The Chair is advised by the clerk that the amendment has been lying on the table. The amendment is in order and is not debatable.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to the House amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia to the House amendment. [Putting the question.] The "nays" appear to have it——

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask for a division.

On a division, Mr. Revercomb's amendment to the House amendment was rejected.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, there is an amendment on the desk which the junior Senator from Connecticut has submitted. I now offer the amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the House amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC —. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the membership thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the present high prices of meat.

SEC. —. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than February 1, 1949.

SEC. —. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] to the House amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN. On this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the House amendment. [Putting the question.] The "nays" appear to have it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be offered to the House amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the House amendment, as amended, to the text of Senate Joint Resolution 157.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment of the House of Representatives amending the title to read "Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures" will be agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND EXCESS-PROFITS TAXES

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the last issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some remarks by the junior Senator from Colorado on the subject of social security and excess-profits taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, with amendments, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 445.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, following the first paragraph, under the title "Displaced Persons Commission," to insert the following:

The appropriation of $2,000,000 for the Displaced Persons Commission in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 785, Eightieth Congress, second session, may be apportioned for obligation and expenditure during the first three quarters of the fiscal year 1949.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there is so much disorder in the Senate that many of us cannot understand what question is being put.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to have the question restated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to have the question restated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will again state the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, following the first paragraph, under the title "Displaced Persons Commission" it is proposed to insert:

The appropriation of $2,000,000 for the Displaced Persons Commission in the Second Deficiency Act, 1948, Public Law 785, Eightieth Congress, second session, may be apportioned for obligation and expenditure during the first three quarters of the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I address a question to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], chairman of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I understand, this is the proposal which was adopted in the committee today, in lieu of passing the $2,000,000 appropriation for which a budget estimate was submitted by the President.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. It is for the purpose of giving greater latitude in spending the money already appropriated, so that it may be spent without fear of violation of the antideficiency section of the law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senate should know that the Congress, in the regular session, provided an appropriation of $2,000,000 to administer the Displaced Persons Act. It was the report of the executive branch of the Government that this was not sufficient. The original request for this purpose was $4,000,000. A new budget of $2,000,000 was submitted to bring the appropriation up to that which was originally requested by the President, upon the ground that the $2,000,000 fund would seriously reduce the number of displaced persons who could come into the United States under the law. This substitute for an appropriation is merely a legislative provision to eliminate the effect of the Antideficiency Act, so that the $2,000,000 which was appropriated may be more rapidly expended than would have been the case otherwise.

The committee has had no hearing. It is impossible to determine whether that will be a sufficient relaxation to enable the displaced persons law to be administered as it was intended to be administered by the Congress only last June, when it was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if the figure he is using is based upon the so-called present law, or whether there was any discussion as to what the figure would be if the law were changed as suggested by the President—and I understand from press reports, also suggested by the Republican nominee. It was suggested that the date be changed. Was there any discussion of that question?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Washington knows that the only thing the Appropriations Committee can do is to base its action on the existing law. It is not within our province to go into any amendments to the basic law. We merely act on the basis of existing law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate that, but I thought that perhaps the Congress might change it, and then we would be without funds to take care of the added burden if the law were changed as suggested.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator that the amendment will adequately take care of everything, and the Congress will be in session again in January. I think the Senator has no cause for worry. I believe there is sufficient latitude so that every consideration may be met.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to know whether this will include the Japanese nationals; or is it limited exclusively to displaced persons in Europe?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is limited to the basic law. I have not the basic law before me, but this is the entire appropriation covering displaced persons. The Senator, being a member of the committee which reported that measure, may know more about it than I. We are dealing with the entire displaced-persons problem.

Mr. LANGER. I am desirous of ascertaining, if I can, whether it also includes the Japanese nationals who were included in a subsequent bill. Does the Senator know about that?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is not my understanding that it does. It refers to the basic original law affecting displaced persons, the act of 1948.

Mr. LANGER. Does this include purely administration?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Does it include the cost of ships to transport persons to this country?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is not my understanding. It has to do only with the administration of the act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the paragraph under the title "Treasury Department," it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, under the title "Motor Carriers Claim Commission," as follows:

Section 6 of Public Law 880, Eightieth Congress, second session, an act to create a Commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers, is hereby amended by striking out the words "six months" in said section and inserting in lieu thereof the words "nine months."

Section 13 of said act is amended by striking out the words "six months' period" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "nine months' period."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to provide additional time after January 3 for the filing of motor vehicle carrier claims which would otherwise expire on January 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to add a comment or two about this item.

The Congress enacted the Motor Carriers Claims Commission Act in July of this year. It was provided that the claims of motor carriers who were alleged to have suffered loss by reason of the fact that the Government of the United States, for purposes of the war, took over certain lines—about 120 in number—in 10 or 11 States of the West during the war, should be filed by January 3. The intention of the law was that such claims should be expeditiously handled.

However, the bill naturally carried no appropriation. The President set up a budget estimate calling for an appropriation of $100,000 to enable the Claims Commission to handle these claims expeditiously—in fact, to enter upon the work immediately.

The appropriation was suggested in the committee, but it was rejected, the purpose of the committee being, as I understood it, not to provide any appropriation other than those which have already been presented by the committee.

This legislative rider changes the law which was enacted in July by extending for 6 months the period during which the claims may be filed. The hope was entertained by those who were supporting the measure when it was under consideration in the Senate that funds might be made available immediately and the work undertaken at once.

Personally, I greatly regret that the appropriation of $100,000 has not been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I now offer, and send to the desk, individual clarifying amendments, and I ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses

The amount made available under this head in the Government Corporations Appropriations Act, 1949, for administrative expenses for the Office of the Administrator, is increased from $750,000 to $1,050,000.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 10, it is proposed to strike out "Constituent units of the Housing and Home Finance Agency" and insert "Federal Housing Administration."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 12, after the words "administrative expenses" it is proposed to insert "of the Federal Housing Administration."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 15, it is proposed to strike out "$2,400,000" and insert "$2,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to some omissions in this measure which seem to me to be of real gravity. I intend to make a motion with respect to some of these items.

When the Interior Department appropriation bill was under consideration during the regular session, the Congress had before it the recommendations of the President, through the Budget Bureau, with respect to the construction of power facilities and transmission lines in the West. However, the Senate saw fit to curtail many of those appropriations. In other words the amounts recommended by the President were reduced by the Congress.

One of the appropriations reduced by the Congress was that for the Kortez Dam, in the State of Wyoming. That appropriation was reduced by $715,000.

Some $560,000 was cut from the appropriation for transmission lines in the Missouri Basin, for the completion of a distribution system in the States of Nebraska, Colorado, and Wyoming.

The President has submitted a budget estimate of $1,825,000, that being the exact amount of the reductions which were made in the regular appropriation bill with respect to these matters.

Throughout the West, as indeed, throughout the entire country, there is a shortage of power. The development of the mineral resources of the West, the development of the ordinary business in the West, is being curtailed by lack of power; and one of the purposes of the public power program and the construction of power facilities and particularly the construction of the transmission lines was to hasten the development of this power and make it available.

During the debate upon inflation we have been told over and over again that the best and easiest way to fight inflation is to increase production. It was the desire to increase production which prompted the President of the United States to submit these budget estimates. Therefore, when the Congress curtailed these appropriations, it was acting to curtail production, and thereby it was acting to prevent one of the most effective antidotes for inflation, about which we have heard so much, namely, increased production.

Not only was it true that these reductions were made on a Wyoming project and on Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado transmission lines, but I should also like to call attention to the fact that the appropriation for the Colorado-Big Thompson project has likewise been cut in the amount of $2,775,000. I read from the President's estimate, as submitted by the Budget:

> These additional funds are necessary so that the construction of the power-producing and transmission features will not be delayed. It is essential that these funds be made available early in the current fiscal year in order to avoid serious disruption of construction schedules with material delays in the production and transmission of electric energy.

Here is another item in Montana—the Hungry Horse project, in Montana, for which the appropriation requested has been cut $2,183,350. With respect to this project, the President's budget estimate says:

> The amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1949 for the Hungry Horse project is $2,183,350 less than the estimate of appropriation submitted. Failure to restore this amount will retard realization of the power benefits of the project for a full year, by delaying increased power production at downstream plants, including Grand Coulee and Bonneville, which will be dependent on the seasonal release of water stored at Hungry Horse.

The appropriation for the Columbia Basin project, in Washington, was cut in the amount of $1,473,000. With respect to that item the budget estimate says:

> Estimates affecting power production on this project for the fiscal year 1949 were reduced by $1,473,000. It is essential that this reduction be restored in order to avoid delay in the construction and installation of additional generators at Grand Coulee Dam. Such a delay would accentuate the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest.

An estimate was submitted with respect to the Fort Peck project, in Montana, for an additional amount of $1,500,000—

> to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations under this head shall be available for the construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and related substations.

The elimination of this appropriation from the bill was another instance of the kind of curtailment, which took place over and over again, of appropriations which would make electrical-transmission lines available. The policy seemed to be to cut away, so far as possible, any appropriation of the construction of public transmission lines which would take the public power from the generators to the consumers who need the power, and who, indeed, are crying for it.

The budget estimate says:

> Additional funds are required to initiate construction of facilities to deliver low-cost electric energy from the Fort Peck project to rural areas in the vicinity of Havre and Shelby, Mont., in accordance with the present power program of the area and to avoid a serious delay in accomplishment of this program.

The same was true with respect to the Central Valley in California. I shall not stop to read the proposed amendment which was sent up, but I merely call attention to the fact that the budget estimate makes this comment:

> Additional funds are necessary so that the power-construction program of the Central Valley will not be delayed. Also, modification of restrictive language in the 1949 appropriation act is requested.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all these items. I ask unanimous consent that the Budget estimates may be printed at length in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the estimates were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY, THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

(Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations in the total amount of $56,428,450 proposed for the fiscal year 1949, for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Army)

July 29, 1948.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 28, 1948.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: On July 27, 1948, I presented a message to the Congress in which I urged restoration of reductions made in certain estimates of appropriations for fiscal year 1949 relating to the generation and transmission of electric power and, in the case of the Department of the Interior, removal of certain restrictive limitations on expenditures. I now have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress supplemental estimates of appropriation in the total amount of $56,428,450 proposed for the fiscal year 1949 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Army, as well as certain proposed changes in restrictive limitations contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949.

The details of these estimates and the related revisions of existing law are set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitted herewith, in whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington 25, D. C., July 28, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: Consonant with your message to the Congress dated July 27, 1948, in which you urge that congressional reductions in certain estimates of appropriation for fiscal year 1949 be restored and certain restrictive limitations on expenditures be removed in order to carry forward the Federal power program consistent with national needs and obviate delays of at least 1 year in the generation and transmission of electric energy, I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration, supplemental estimates of appropriation for fiscal year 1949 in the total amount of $56,428,450 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Army.

In every case where appropriations are requested, the amounts represent restoration in whole or in part of reductions made in your recommendations to the Congress. In addition, certain revisions of existing law are requested. The estimates of appropriation follow:

"TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

"Tennessee Valley Authority: For an additional amount for 'Tennessee Valley Authority,' for construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., $4,000,000, to remain available until expended; and the limitation under this head in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, on the amount available for capital expenditures is increased from '$21,689,000' to '$25,689,000.' "

The purpose of this estimate is to permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to begin construction of a steam generating plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., at once and not allow it to be delayed a year. The total cost of this plant is estimated at $54,000,000. The capacity will be 375,000 kilowatts. The plant is necessary to firm up the power supplied by hydro units in dams on the Tennessee Valley Authority system and is urgently needed to meet the growing demands of the area.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"Office of the Secretary

"Expenses, power transmission facilities: For an additional amount for 'Expenses, power transmission facilities,' $97,000: *Provided*, That appropriations under this head for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available for operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities."

These additional funds are requested to adequately maintain and operate existing public-power facilities in a shortage area in the southwestern part of the country.

"Construction, power transmission facilities: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, including the construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities; purchase (not to exceed nine, of which five shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and printing and binding; $2,462,000, to remain available until expended."

The funds requested will provide (1) switching stations to interconnect with existing facilities which will materially relieve the critical power situation in the area; (2) a tie-in to the Fort Gibson project now under construction, thus making this power, when ready, available to the whole region; and (3) additional facilities, general plant, and equipment, all of which are needed to make the Norfork-Denison line more flexible in meeting the growing power needs of the region. Provision of these essential power facilities will be delayed 1 year unless the additional funds are made available in the current fiscal year.

"Continuing fund, power-transmission facilities: All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased in the southwestern power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of $300,000, including the sum of $100,000 in the continuing fund established under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944 (57 Stat. 621), which shall be transferred to the fund hereby established; and said fund of $300,000 shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary and shall be subject to check by him or his duly authorized representative to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuous operation of the facilities, and to cover all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and rentals for the use of transmission lines and appurtenant facilities of public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies."

The continuing fund in this additional amount of $200,000 will provide (1) for emergency expenses, and will thus insure continuous operation of the facilities owned and operated by the Federal Government; (2) for the purchase of electric power and energy; and (3) for the rentals and other costs in connection with the use of transmission lines and appurtenant facilities owned by other public agencies and private interests.

"BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

"Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system: The proviso under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which reads, *'Provided further*, That not exceeding 8 percent of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis:', is hereby repealed."

The Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, included a proviso that not to exceed 8 percent of any construction appropriation for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account. This proviso interferes with the economical and expeditious performance of the authorized work of this Administration and its repeal is therefore recommended.

"BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"General offices

"Salaries and expenses (other than project offices): In addition to the amount appropriated under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, there shall be available for expenditure under said head any sums transferred thereto for work performed or to be performed for the benefit of specific projects or undertakings for which other funds or appropriations of the Bureau of Reclamation are available; and the first and fourth provisos under said head are hereby repealed."

The Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, continued in the first proviso under this head a limitation of $7,800,000 on the amount transferable to this appropriation for work to be performed for the benefit of specific projects. This limitation restricts the funds to be expended by the Branch of Design and Construction and its facilitating services in Denver, Colo., where all major power-design work is performed by a specialized staff of engineers. The Bureau's total design load for the fiscal year 1949 is 50 percent greater than for 1948. An increase in the transferable amount is required to provide an adequate engineering staff for the preparation of designs and specifications for power equipment and construction now authorized.

The act also included in the fourth proviso under this head a limitation of $48,000,000 for administrative and other personal services. The power program authorized for 1949, together with the additions recommended herewith, will require additional personal services for proper performance of the work on schedule.

Repeal of these restrictive provisos is recommended.

The language recommended above would repeal both of the provisos referred to, and would continue without limitation as to amount the authority to use funds transferred to this appropriation on account of work performed for the benefit of specific projects or undertakings.

"CONSTRUCTION

"Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch Dam: Funds heretofore appropriated under this head shall be available for construction of a transmission line and related facilities from Anderson Ranch power plant to Mountain Home, Idaho."

No additional funds are required for the construction of the authorized transmission line from Anderson Ranch to Mountain Home, Idaho, but the statement in the report of the House Appropriations Committee that funds for the construction of this transmission line are specifically disallowed will in effect leave a completed power plant with no means of disposal of this power to any existing system. Under present schedules, power will be available at Anderson Ranch by July 1950. Unless authority is immediately given to the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with the construction of this line, the capacity of the plant upon completion could not be utilized for its intended purpose since, under present conditions, at least 2 years are required to secure materials and construct such facilities.

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

"Central Valley project, California: For an additional amount for 'Central Valley project, California,' from power revenues, $45,600.

"Columbia Basin project, Washington: For an additional amount for 'Columbia Basin project, Washington,' from power revenues, $135,000.

"Shoshone project, Wyoming: For an additional amount for 'Shoshone project, Wyoming,' from power revenues, $28,500."

These funds from power revenues are required to provide adequately for the operation and maintenance during fiscal year 1949 of additional generating capacity which was placed in operation during fiscal year 1948, and not previously provided for, and of additional capacity which will be placed in operation during fiscal year 1949.

Without these additional funds the proper operation and maintenance of urgently needed generating units cannot be adequately provided to assure a continuous source of reliable power.

"GENERAL FUND, CONSTRUCTION

"General fund, construction: For additional amounts for continuation of construction, to remain available until expended, as follows:

"Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada, $3,302,000."

These funds are required for the continuation of construction on schedule of all the features of Davis Dam project. An additional power supply is urgently needed in the Southwest, particularly in the State of Arizona, where deficiencies in existing power supply have been extremely serious in respect to irrigation pumping. These funds are necessary for initial generation at Davis power plant early in 1950, on schedule, to meet the requirements for irrigation pumping at the beginning of the irrigation season in the spring of that year. The construction of the project's major backbone transmission system is geared to the schedule for the installation of generating equipment, so that transmission facilities will be available for operation at the time new generation is brought in at the Davis power plant. Supplemental funds in the amount of this estimate are required to avoid serious delays in supplying power to an area which has one of the most serious deficiencies in our Nation.

"Central Valley project, California: $3,990,000 to be available as follows: transmission lines, Shasta to Delta (Tracy) via Oroville and Sacramento, Shasta-Tracy No. 1 and No. 2 (west side line), Shasta-Roseville, Tracy-Contra Costa-Clayton-Ignacio, and Keswick-Tracy via Elverta, communication equipment and Roseville substation, $2,264,000, to be consolidated with the limitation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, on the amount available for 'transmission lines, Shasta to Delta (Tracy) via Oroville and Sacramento,' which is increased from '$500,000' to '$2,764,000'; switchyards at Elverta and switchyard facilities at Tracy, whether or not required for operation of the project pumps, to be consolidated with the limitation under said head on 'switchyards, Shasta, Keswick, and Tracy pumping plant,' which is increased from '$3,250,000' to '$4,776,000'; and Delta steam plant, $200,000: *Provided*, That in carrying out the terms of the proviso under said head, unobligated balances may be classified and combined with and expanded for any of the foregoing amounts in the same manner as prescribed for amounts previously appropriated for under said head."

Additional funds are necessary so that the power construction program of the Central Valley will not be delayed. Also, modification of restrictive language in the 1949 Appropriation Act is requested.

"Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $2,775,000."

These additional funds are necessary so that the construction of the power producing and transmission features will not be delayed. It is essential that these funds be made available early in the current fiscal year in order to avoid serious disruption of construction schedules with material delays in the production and transmission of electric energy.

"Hungry Horse project, Montana, $2,183,350."

The amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1949 for the Hungry Horse project is $2,183,350 less than the estimate of appropriation submitted. Failure to restore this amount will retard realization of the power benefits of the project for a full year, by delaying increased power production at downstream plants, including Grand Coulee and Bonneville, which will be dependent on the seasonal release of water stored at Hungry Horse.

"Columbia Basin project, Washington, $1,473,000."

Estimates affecting power production on this project for the fiscal year 1949 were reduced by $1,473,000. It is essential that this reduction be restored in order to avoid a delay in the construction and installation of additional generators at Grand Coulee Dam. Such a delay would accentuate the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest.

"FORT PECK PROJECT

"Fort Peck project, Montana: For an additional amount for 'Fort Peck project, Montana,' $1,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations under this head shall be available for construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and related substations."

Additional funds are required to initiate construction of facilities to deliver low cost electric energy from the Fort Peck project to rural areas in the vicinity of Havre and Shelby, Mont., in accordance with the present power program of the area and to avoid a serious delay in accomplishment of this program.

"MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

"Missouri River Basin (reimbursable to the extent and as provided in the act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 534)): For an additional amount for 'Missouri River Basin,' $1,825,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the second proviso under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, funds appropriated under said head shall be available for and in connection with the acquisition or installation of power facilities or transmission facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana."

Additional funds in the amount of $550,000, together with elimination of the legislative restrictions relating to the construction of the Canyon Ferry Dam and power plant, are required to avoid delay in the orderly construction of this project including the development of power in line with the original authorization.

Additional funds in the amount of $715,000 are necessary to continue the construction of Kortes Dam and power plant on schedule.

Additional funds in the amount of $560,000 are required for the Missouri Basin Transmission Lines Unit for the early completion of the power system in the tri-State area of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado. All of these lines are under contract or will be placed under contract at an early date.

"FORCE ACCOUNT WORK

"That part of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which reads 'not exceeding 8 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis, except for projects or items the estimated construction cost of which does not exceed $200,000, and only then in cases where the Bureau of Reclamation finds the lowest bids to be excessive' is hereby repealed."

The Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, included a proviso that not exceeding 8 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in the act shall be available for construction work by force account. From long experience, the Bureau of Reclamation has found that the installation of certain electrical equipment and other work may best be performed economically and expeditiously by force account.

The experienced volume of such force account operations is small in relation to the total power program but the ratio varies in respect to individual project appropriations. Repeal of the restrictive proviso is recommended.

"NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

"CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CORPS OF ENGINEERS

"Rivers and harbors and flood control

"Rivers and harbors

"Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: For an additional amount for 'Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works,' $10,583,000, to remain available until expended."

These additional funds include $2,000,000 for Jim Woodruff Dam in the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers system and $8,000,000 for McNary Dam in the Columbia River Basin and are required to maintain normal and economical construction progress on these projects. The remaining $583,000 will be used to continue planning activities on Chief Joseph (Foster Creek) Dam in the Columbia River Basin in order that construction on this project may be initiated in fiscal year 1950.

"Flood control

"Flood control, general: For an additional amount for 'Flood control, general,' $21,829,000, to remain available until expended."

These additional funds include $3,000,000 for Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark., $800,000 for Blakely Mountain Reservoir, Ark., $800,000 for Narrows Reservoir, Ark., $2,000,000 for Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla., $1,172,000 for Whitney Reservoir, Tex., $7,287,000 for Wolf Creek Reservoir, Ky., $4,400,000 for Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak., and $2,370,000 for Folsom Dam, Calif.

With respect to the request for Folsom Dam, it is contemplated that the Congress will expand the present authorization for this project, in accordance with the recommendations contained in your message dated January 12, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 496, 80th Cong., 2d sess.), to provide for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of a power plant and transmission lines, as well as irrigation works, and for transfer of the dam and reservoir, upon its completion, to the same agency for operation.

It is essential that these additional funds for rivers and harbors and flood control be made available early in the current fiscal year in order to forestall serious and costly disruptions in construction schedules with resulting delays of at least 1 year in the generation of much-needed electric energy as well as adverse effects on the industrial economy of the respective areas and unwarranted drains on the petroleum resources of the Nation.

The need for these appropriations was fully explained in your message of July 27, 1948. I recommend that the estimates be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK PACE, JR.,
Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In order that we may have a determination by the Senate as to whether or not the Congress should endeavor to supply this public power by the early completion of the project and by the construction of the necessary transmission lines, I shall offer the amendment dealing with the Missouri River Basin. The amendment reads as follows:

I move that there be added to the appropriation bill, in the appropriate place, the following language:

Missouri River Basin: Missouri River Basin (reimbursable to the extent and as provided in the act of December 22, 1944, Public Law 534): For additional amount for "Missouri River Basin," $1,825,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the second proviso under this head in the Interior Department appropriation Act, 1949, funds appropriated under said head shall be available for and in connection with the acquisition or installation of power facilities or transmission facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana.

Let me add, Mr. President, this comment from the budget estimate:

Additional funds in the amount of $550,000, together with elimination of the legislative restrictions relating to the construction of the Canyon Ferry Dam and power plant, are required to avoid delay in the orderly construction of this project including the development of power in line with the original authorization.

Additional funds in the amount of $715,000 are necessary to continue the construction of Kortes Dam and power plant on schedule.

Additional funds in the amount of $560,000 are required for the Missouri Basin transmission lines unit for the early completion of the power system in the tri-State area of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado. All of these lines are under contract or will be placed under contract at an early date.

I might add that the proposed dam under the plans as they were submitted and approved, and for which the budget estimate was prepared, would have been completed by the end of December 1949. Because this amount was eliminated, it will not be possible to complete the dam before the middle of 1950 at the earliest.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit the amendment and earnestly hope it may have the support of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to offer, as an amendment to the amendment just proposed by the Senator from Wyoming, the addition of the following language:

Hungry Horse project, Montana, $2,183,350.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a point of order? Is this an amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it an amendment beyond the second degree?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. It is an original amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming is an original amendment. The Senator from Montana, as the Chair understands, is offering an amendment to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct. The amendment which I have just proposed is intended to make it possible to complete the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana 1 year earlier than it will be completed under the existing appropriations. The appropriations that were requested for that project were cut down to a sum which was $2,183,350 less than the estimates submitted for the construction of the dam; which, as I say, will delay the construction of that dam for a whole year, and will be a great injury to the country in view of the fact that there is tremendous shortage of power.

I also wish to add as another item, the following:

FORT PECK PROJECT

Fort Peck project, Montana: For an additional amount for "Fort Peck project, Montana," $1,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations under this head shall be available for construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and related substations.

This item is essential for the purpose of carrying out the construction of this transmission line in Montana, which will enable the farmers in my State to get the advantage of low-cost power produced at Fort Peck Dam. It provides for a transmission line that will carry that power from Havre, Mont., to Shelby, Mont.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I correctly understand that the Fort Peck amendment which the Senator offers is for $1,500,000?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest to the Senator from Montana that the amendment he now offers with respect to Fort Peck is within the budget estimate.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment which he offers with respect to the Hungry Horse project is not within the budget estimate. In order that the issue may not be confused, may I suggest to the Senator that he withhold his Hungry Horse amendment, because if he goes above the budget the whole amendment will be jeopardized.

Mr. MURRAY. The able Senator from Wyoming suggests that I withdraw that item relating to the Hungry Horse project.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Perhaps I did not correctly understand the Senator. Was his Hungry Horse project amendment for the sum of $2,183,350?

Mr. MURRAY. The original amount was very much larger. I have forgotten the exact figure, but it was something like $16,000,000. It was curtailed to the extent of $2,183,350. It was less than the amount the budget estimate called for, for the construction of the dam, in order to complete it within the time specified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My understanding now is that the Senator's amendment with respect to the Hungry Horse project is to carry out the budget estimate.

Mr. MURRAY. It is within the budget estimate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the question now before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is offering an amendment to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming to the appropriation bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming, and what is the amendment to the amendment, submitted by the Senator from Montana?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming will again state his amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to appropriate $1,825,000 for the Missouri River Basin under the reclamation laws. This would include $550,000 for the Canyon Ferry Dam in Montana, $715,000 for the Kortes Dam in Wyoming, and $560,000 for electrical transmission lines in the tri-State area of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado.

The Senator from Montana has offered two amendments to my amendment; one of them being to appropriate the budget estimate of $2,183,350 for the Hungry Horse project in Montana; the other, to appropriate $1,500,000, as submitted in the budget estimate, for the Fort Peck project in Montana. All these were items which were denied in the last appropriation bill, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I merely wish to discuss briefly the need of these appropriations to carry out the construction work in Montana. Everyone knows there is a serious shortage of power in the country. It is having a very serious effect upon economic conditions.

A shortage of production in many lines has been created. There is a serious shortage of production of aluminum in this country. Many small business concerns are being forced into bankruptcy as the result of their failure to get the aluminum necessary to keep them in operation. So it seems to me that the Senate would be acting wisely if it accepted these amendments and made it possible for us to go forward with the construction of the projects in the West, which will contribute very materially to the stabilization of economic conditions and to increasing production.

Mr. President, for many years I have been associated with our distinguished colleague from Wyoming in problems concerning the West. I have always found, as I am sure we all have, that Senator O'MAHONEY is a profound and penetrating student of economic factors which affect the well-being of our Western States and of the entire Nation.

I want to join with the able Senator from Wyoming in the proposal he has made and I want particularly to lend emphasis to his point, that essential to the fight against inflation is the increased power developed in the West which would result if this Congress were to adequately finance these projects.

Only last week I addressed the President of the United States on this subject as follows:

JULY 31, 1948.

It occurs to me that while congressional committees are holding hearings on other matters, there is no reason why the Congress should not act immediately to provide funds for justified hydroelectric, reclamation, and rural electrification projects in the West. Such developments by increasing production can provide a key to the price situation and help retard the inflationary trend now threatening the country.

In my own State of Montana there are several such projects which I have on earlier occasions discussed with you. Full appropriations for the Fort Peck construction program including the Havre-Shelby line and three substations, and a $3,500,000 appropriation for work on the Yellowtail Dam project are, I believe, two essential items in such a program.

I know you will realize that this is in no sense a special plea for special favors for my State. I have just returned from Montana and I know that the people out there are keenly aware of the importance of these measures. I am positive that they are reflecting the opinions of the people in all our Western States. They feel that this Congress has given them too much legislative lip service and not enough action. I am sure that the people of Montana and of the entire West will support your demand that the Congress take action on these subjects which have been mentioned approvingly in the campaign platforms of both political parties.

Mr. President, in the message of the President of the United States to the Congress, a legislative program was laid down in which the urgent needs of the people of this country were stressed. The President pointed out that we are in the midst of a dangerous inflation which may ultimately result in economic collapse, widespread economic chaos, and bankruptcy.

These needs of the people cannot be ignored or evaded without serious danger to our economic system. The people are demanding that Congress take prompt action to check the rising costs of living and the rapidly mounting inflation threatening the country. These demands are coming from citizens in all walks of life and from all over the Nation.

Unless something is done to curb these mounting living costs, we will be plunged into a deadly depression, with widespread unemployment and bankruptcy for thousands of small-business men. It will be a repetition of the depression which we experienced in the thirties, with even more serious consequences.

The President, in his message calling attention to the needs of the country, pointed to the acute shortage of electric power, which has created serious problems in the field of industrial production. Anything that holds back production is bound to increase costs of living; anything that increases production tends to lower the costs of living.

Mr. President, these two problems—high costs of living and the shortage of electric power for industrial development—are closely related. The shortage of electric power is causing serious distress and financial loss to many business concerns deprived of adequate supplies of aluminum, newsprint, fertilizer, and other industrial products which require a heavy use of electric power.

From many sections of the country last winter we heard demands for relief from the shortage of oil and coal, so essential in our homes and in industrial production. Notwithstanding these facts, we have been neglecting to harness our river systems for the production of low-cost electric power to relieve these pressures. A program along the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority, applied to other sections of the Nation, would have a revolutionary effect on our whole economic situation.

Publicly constructed low-cost hydroelectric power projects is one of the great issues of our times. Nothing could be more effective in bringing widespread prosperity to our Western States. It is demanded by the people but vigorously opposed by the power monopoly. A proper program for the harnessing of our river systems and the development of hydroelectric power would not only solve the problem of our short supply of oil and coal; but it would also bring about vastly increased industrial production, overcoming many of the shortages now causing high living costs and inflation.

The President in his message has now appealed to the Congress to reconsider its record, which has struck sharply at our national electric power policy. He is requesting Congress, in this special session, to consider appropriations needed for power projects in the West which, if constructed, will do more to overcome these dangerous economic problems than any single thing that could be considered. This is a program in which the sparsely settled Western States are vitally interested. In Montana, for example, we have been witnessing a dwindling population and an ever-increasing tax burden on the people. Montana's small population and low tax income are insufficient to support the operations and services of a government in the vast State we live in. There is only one solution for this problem, and that is the development in Montana of processing plants and industries that can be related to our natural resources. This would mean increased population, increased taxable values, and a stronger and more efficient government.

Mr. President, the establishment of a fertilizer industry in our State, for example, would have an immediate and permanent effect on our future growth and prosperity. Montana has large deposits of phosphate rock, which is the basis of cheap chemical fertilizers necessary to replenish and maintain the croplands of the Nation. The Federal Government has gone beyond the planning stage in developing the western fertilizer industry, private businessmen are ready to make their investments in it—all that is holding things up is the completion of power-generating dams and transmission lines to provide cheap hydroelectric power near the vast deposits of phosphate rock.

Yet Montana may not get it share of these fertilizer plants unless the people of our State, realizing the importance of this great new industry, become fully aroused to insist that no delays be allowed to interfere with the Government's program of increasing hydroelectric development. This is the key to the industrial development of Montana. It is why I supported the construction of Hungry Horse Dam long before it was a popular cause; why I urged the construction of Fort Peck power-generating installations, and why now I am doing my utmost in Washington to secure other electric power dams to be put to use powering the machinery to make cheap chemical fertilizers abundant.

Mr. President, a single large-scale superphosphate chemical plant located in Montana would mean a direct investment of $4,000,000. It would require 300 workers employed in such a plant and in the mines, with a pay roll of approximately $1,000,000 a year being spent in Montana. Several such plants could be located in our State.

In the counties where such a phosphate industry might be located, not only will the local residents find steady work at high pay, but there will be a gain of 10 percent or more in additional population. Demands for all kinds of things will increase, too—for food, clothing, housing, amusements, professional services, schools, and community activities. But there would be substantially greater increases in taxable wealth to pay for the added costs to the counties and cities where this phosphate plant is located. Experts have estimated that such a plant would add approximately one-fourth to the taxes collected in the counties where it operated, giving great opportunity for community improvements, while at the same time reducing proportionately the taxes now being paid in such counties.

The production of triple superphosphate in Montana will give the stockmen and farmers vast quantities of this much-needed fertilizer right at their very dooryards at a great reduction in price over what they now are forced to pay for fertilizer, much of which is freighted across the continent.

This is no small matter to our State, where so much of our wealth and so many of our people are dependent on agriculture for their living.

Let me repeat, there is only one major obstacle standing in the way of building a great fertilizer industry in Montana in the near future—and that is the lack of an adequate supply of low-cost hydroelectric power. Just consider this one fact: Tennessee, which has 2 percent of the Nation's phosphate rock, now produces and markets over a fourth of all this chemical fertilizer in the United States. She does so for one principal reason, that she has the TVA with its tremendous amount of low-cost power. And the making of chemical fertilizers requires a great amount of cheap electric power.

Montana is doubly blessed by a provident Nature. She has great quantities of phosphate rock ready to be mined, and she has more and better places to put dams, and larger amounts of unused water flowing down her stream beds than almost any other area of the country.

And yet, because of the powerful opposition of the Electric Power Trust, we continue to neglect to provide programs for the control and development of our great river systems and the development of low-cost hydroelectric power. We continue to permit soil erosion and floods to carry down our streams the rich topsoil of our agricultural lands, to be dumped in the ocean and lost forever. On July 8, 1948, General Eisenhower, touching on this subject at a conference in New York, made the statement:

> You can stand at the dock in New Orleans, where the Mississippi enters the Gulf of Mexico, and witness a 40-acre farm go past your feet on its way to the ocean every 30 seconds. We in this country must do our part on all of these fronts.

Will we in Montana accept this advice and do our part in conserving our great resources of water and soil, and in the development of our great electric power potentialities? Or must we go on exhausting our resources, losing population, while other sections around us are enjoying ever-increasing prosperity? Or must we continue to be a backward State, saddling upon the taxpayers one of the largest and most costly highway systems in the Nation on a population of only 500,000 people?

My answer, and I am sure it is the answer of the people of Montana, is that we must work continuously to support the program for the development of low-cost electric power in our State as the basis of our industrial growth. We must work for the development of a chemical fertilizer industry in Montana, and for other industries and businesses that will be stimulated as a result of such a program.

This is the answer to Montana's problem of lack of adequate population to support a sound and efficient State government, and lack of adequate taxable values which make it necessary for the people of our State to assume excessive tax burdens. By such a program we will increase our population, spread the burdens of taxation, increase opportunities for our young folks to secure jobs, and bring genuine prosperity to our State.

This will not only help Montana but it will help the Nation solve the problem of production and advance the living standards of all our people.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would it be in order for me to offer an amendment similar to the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in connection with these western projects? My amendment would add other projects.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is an amendment to an amendment already pending. As soon as that amendment is disposed of, the Senator's amendment would be in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then, Mr. President, at this time I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the remarks made by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Wyoming on the matter of western power projects.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like very much to make a very brief observation regarding the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and the amendment offered to that amendment by the distinguished Senator from Montana. One has to do with the Missouri River Basin appropriations in the amount of $1,825,000. The other has to do with the Hungry Horse project in the amount of $2,183,350, and also the Fort Peck project, involving $1,500,000.

I should like to state to the Members of the Senate that these are some of the projects which were given full consideration in the hearings in the House, which lasted from early in January until May, and those hearings were made the basis of the findings of the Senate committee. The Senate committee also held continuous sessions on each one of the projects, going into the justifications of all of them. Let me give the Senate some idea of the amount of money involved in the regular appropriation bill. The regular budget estimate which came to the House was in the amount of $235,059,000. That is the over-all estimate. The House, after giving each one of the projects full study, allowed $187,924,175. Then the Senate reviewed the House findings. All the new testimony and other testimony was considered. The Senate subcommittee and the full committee recommended the amount of $207,994,000. It was reported to the Senate and passed the Senate. Then the bill went to conference, and the total amount of new appropriations which the conferees brought back and which both Houses adopted was $202,541,037.

The President asked to have reinstated for reclamation, rivers and harbors, and civil functions the amount of $56,428,450, which is the difference between what the budget estimate was and what Congress allowed in the regular session. For reclamation it amounts to $20,016,450.

I want to be fair about this, Mr. President, as I know does the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. Much can be said about the merits of these projects. I do not want to dispute with him as to that matter. It is a question of how fast the program should proceed. It was with a great deal of pride that I listened to the complimentary remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming wherein he said that the committee had done a good job. There was no quarrel with the amounts brought to the Senate floor. Even though we might have had some personal differences, the subcommittee and the full committee endorsed the items which are now sought to be amended in order to get additional funds.

As I recall, the only difference we had was over the minority report that was filed by the Senator from Wyoming, I believe it was, and I think the Senator from Arizona, relative to the restrictive language which had to do with the employment of the reclamation officials. I believe that is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to repeat now what I said at the time the original appropriation bill was brought in. I think the Senator from Nebraska did a very excellent piece of work in bringing about several substantial increases in the appropriation.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Nevertheless, as he has said, there were in many cases sums appropriated below the budget estimates. In the case of the Kortes Dam in particular the fact remains that this reduction of $715,000 prevents the completion of the dam within the year. If that appropriation were added it would mean the finishing of that plant, it would not mean a continuing appropriation. Therefore, the President has sent these budget estimates to the Congress, pointing out that he has not added any new money, but some of the items had been cut down, causing a delaying effect on the construction of the power facilities and the transmission of public power.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his restatement relative to the work of the committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield to the Senator before I conclude.

When the Senate assembled, it was my opinion that the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations on the Interior Department of both the House and Senate had considered all the items, but there was no new evidence, and we felt that we should not reopen the items unless there could be new evidence submitted, or a new need submitted for justification.

I took this matter up with the chairman of the House committee, and he said he agreed with me. We looked all the items over, and I have here an analysis of the additional appropriations asked by the President, and I should like to insert it at this point in the RECORD, because I think very definitely it should be in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1949, AS SUBMITTED IN HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 735, DATED JULY 29, 1948

In House Document 735, July 29, 1948, there was submitted to the Congress supplemental estimates for the fiscal year 1949 totaling $56,428,450 for the following:

(1) Tennessee Valley Authority	$4,000,000
(2) Interior Department	20,016,450
(3) Corps of Engineers—civil functions	32,412,000
Total	56,428,450

The items and projects for which the supplemental amounts are requested appear in tables attached to this memorandum.

In addition to a request of $20,016,450 for the Interior Department, various language changes are requested in the 1949 Interior Department Appropriation Act, which are discussed in the pages in this memorandum relating to the Interior Department.

The Acting Director of the Budget Bureau in transmitting the supplemental estimates to the President stated the purpose of the supplemental estimates to be as follows:

"Consonant with your message to the Congress dated July 27, 1948, in which you urge that congressional reductions in certain estimates of appropriation for fiscal year 1949 be restored and certain restrictive limitations on expenditures be removed in order to carry forward the Federal power program consistent with national needs and obviate delays of at least 1 year in the generation and transmission of electric energy, I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration, supplemental estimates of appropriation for fiscal year 1949 in the total amount of $56,428,450."

The Acting Director of the Budget Bureau further states in his letter to the President as follows:

"In every case where appropriations are requested, the amounts represent restoration in whole or in part of reductions made in your recommendations to the Congress."

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ITEM IN SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET ESTIMATE, HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 735, JULY 29, 1948

The supplemental estimate proposes an appropriation of $4,000,000 as an additional appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority, fiscal year 1949, this amount to be used toward construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., the estimated cost of which is $54,000,000.

This is the item for which an estimate of $4,000,000 was submitted to Congress in the regular 1949 budget. The item was included in the Government corporations appropriations bill, 1949, as passed by the Senate.

Following conferences between the Senate and House conferees, and failure to reach an agreement, the chairman of the Senate conferees on June 19, 1948, moved that the Senate recede from the amendments involving the New Johnsonville steam plant. The motion that the Senate recede lost on a roll-call vote, 37–47.

The amendments (Nos. 1, 2, and 3) involving the steam plant were subsequently reported in disagreement by the conferees of the Senate and House. Following adoption of the conference report by the House, a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments lost on a roll-call vote, 186–201. The House then insisted on its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

Following adoption of the conference report by the Senate, a motion was made that the Senate recede from the amendments relating to the steam plant, and this motion was agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT ITEMS IN SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET ESTIMATE, HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 735, JULY 29, 1948

A. Supplemental items involving requests for additional funds.

1. These items are listed on the attached table.

B. Supplemental items involving requested changes in language.

1. Bonneville Power Administration:

The supplemental estimate proposes to repeal the following proviso appearing in the 1949 act: "*Provided further*, That not exceeding 8 percent of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis."

As passed by the House the limitation on force account work was fixed at 6 percent.

As passed by the Senate, the House proviso was deleted, and the following proviso was inserted in lieu thereof: "*Provided further*, That no part of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except for management and operation, maintenance and repairs, installation of machinery or equipment, engineering and supervision, routine minor construction work, or in case of emergencies, local in character, or in those instances when no bids have been received in response to a public invitation therefor."

The proviso as finally agreed to by the House and Senate appears above, and House Document 735, page 3, proposes the repeal of this proviso.

2. Bureau of Reclamation:

(a) General offices, salaries and expenses (other than project offices):

The supplemental estimate proposes to delete from the 1949 act the following proviso: "*Provided*, That in addition to the foregoing amount there may be transferred to this appropriation from other appropriations made to the Bureau of Reclamation not to exceed $7,800,000 for work to be performed for the benefit of specific projects and to insert in lieu of the foregoing limitation the following provision, which in effect is the same language as was contained in the 1949 budget estimates:

"Salaries and expenses (other than project offices): In addition to the amount appropriated under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, there shall be available for expenditure under said head any sums transferred thereto for work performed or to be performed for the benefit of specific projects or undertakings for which other funds or appropriations of the Bureau of Reclamation are available."

The Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, as it became law appropriated $3,500,000 for "Salaries and expenses (other than project offices)," and in addition it made available to this appropriation "not to exceed $7,800,000 for work to be performed for the benefit of specific projects." The $7,800,000 is a limitation on the Denver office, and the effect of repealing this proviso and inserting the proposed language would be to remove the ceiling on the amounts for transfer to this office for work performed or to be performed for the benefit of specific projects.

The bill as passed by the House provided for a limitation of $6,000,000, the bill as passed by the Senate provided for a limitation of $8,500,000, and the conferees agreed on $7,800,000.

The supplemental estimate also proposes to repeal the following proviso appearing under the appropriation "General offices, salaries and expenses (other than project offices): *Provided further*, That not exceeding $48,000,000 of appropriations available for expenditure by the Bureau of Reclamation during the fiscal year 1949 shall be used for administrative personal service and other personal services."

This proviso as passed by the House provided for a limitation of $45,341,615. The Senate deleted this proviso from the bill. In conference a compromise was reached, fixing the limitation at $48,000,000.

(b) Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch Dam: The supplemental estimate proposes the enactment of the following provision:

"Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch Dam: Funds heretofore appropriated under this head shall be available for construction of a transmission line and related facilities from Anderson Ranch power plant to Mountain Home, Idaho."

The House allowed $5,100,000 for the Anderson Ranch Dam project, and the Senate agreed to this amount. The House in its report, however, stated that $139,444 for construction of a transmission line from Anderson Ranch power plant to Mountain Home, Idaho, was specifically disallowed.

The provision proposed in the supplemental estimate, therefore, would make funds appropriated to this project available for construction of the transmission line referred to.

(c) Central Valley project, California:

In proposing an additional appropriation of $3,990,000 for this project, the language submitted sets forth certain transmission lines, substations, and switchyards.

The 1949 act contains the following proviso in connection with this project: "*Provided*, That the unobligated balance on June 30, 1948, of funds heretofore appropriated for this project shall be classified under and combined with these amounts and shall be expendable only for the specific purposes set forth in this paragraph, subject to determination by the Comptroller General."

The supplemental estimate proposes the following provision with respect to the foregoing proviso: "*Provided*, That in carrying out the terms of the proviso under said head, unobligated balances may be classified and combined with and expended for any of the foregoing amounts in the same manner as prescribed for amounts previously appropriated for under said head."

(d) Fort Peck project, Montana:

In addition to proposing an appropriation of $1,500,000 for this project as an additional amount for the fiscal year 1949, the supplemental estimate proposes to insert the following proviso in the 1949 act: "*Provided*, That appropriations under this head shall be available for construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and related substations."

The House in allowing $590,000 for this project stated in its report that funds were specifically disallowed for the Havre-Shelby transmission line and related substations. A provision was also placed in the bill by the House rescinding carry-over funds totaling $560,197, which would otherwise have been available during the fiscal year 1949 in connection with the Havre-Shelby transmission line and related facilities.

As the bill passed the Senate, the appropriation for the Fort Peck project was increased from $990,000, as proposed by the House, to $1,980,000, and the rescission provision was deleted.

In conference, the appropriation was fixed at $990,000, the House figure, and the Senate receded from its amendment deleting from the bill the rescission provision.

(e) Missouri River Basin:

The supplemental estimate, in addition to proposing an additional appropriation of $1,825,000, recommends the following language: "*Provided*, That notwithstanding the second proviso under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, funds appropriated under said head shall be available for and in connection with the acquisition or installation of power facilities or transmission facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana."

As the bill passed the House, it carried the following proviso respecting the Canyon Ferry Reservoir: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate Canyon Ferry Reservoir at a higher maximum normal pool elevation than 3,766 feet, unless and until such time as the waters above the Hebgen Dam have been completely utilized for irrigation purposes; or for or in connection with the construction of the power plant, power facilities, or transmission facilities in connection with the Canyon Ferry project, Montana, other than excavating costs in connection with the construction of the dam and foundation for a powerhouse."

The Senate struck this proviso from the bill.

In conference, the proviso was restored to the bill in the following form: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate Canyon Ferry Reservoir at a higher maximum normal pool elevation than 3,766 feet, unless and until new land in Broadwater County, Mont., equal to acreage of the irrigated land to be inundated in Canyon Ferry Reservoir above elevation 3,766 feet is provided with facilities for irrigation; or for or in connection with the acquisition or installation of the power facilities or transmisson facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana."

(f) Force account work:

The supplemental estimate proposes repeal of the force account provision in the 1949 act by enactment of the following:

"That part of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which reads 'not exceeding 8 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis, except for projects or items the estimated construction cost of which does not exceed $200,000, and only then in cases where the Bureau of Reclamation finds the lowest bids to be excessive' is hereby repealed."

The force account provision in the 1949 bill as passed by the House reads as follows:

"Not exceeding 6 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis."

The Senate deleted from the bill the House provision on force account work and inserted the following force account provision in lieu thereof:

"No part of any construction appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except for management and operation, maintenance and repairs, installation of machinery or equipment, engineering and supervision, routine minor construction work, or in case of emergencies, local in character, or in those instances when no bids have been received in response to a public invitation therefor."

The Senate and House conferees agreed on the following force account provision, which the supplemental estimate proposes be repealed:

"Not exceeding 8 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis, except for projects or items the estimated construction cost of which does not exceed $200,000, and only then in cases where the Bureau of Reclamation finds the lowest bids to be excessive."

Comparative figures on Bureau of Reclamation items for which supplemental estimates were submitted in H. Doc. No. 735, July 29, 1948

Item	Regular estimate	Allowed by House	Allowed by Senate	Amount in 1949 act	Amount of supplemental
Expenses, power transmission facilities	$180,000	[1] $280,000	[1] $280,000	[1] $280,000	$97,000
Construction, power transmission	3,000,000				2,462,000
Continuing fund, power transmission facilities	[1] 200,000				[2] 200,000
Operation and maintenance:					
Central Valley, Calif	1,169,000	979,675	1,110,000	1,044,837	45,600
Columbia Basin, Wash	1,780,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,645,000	135,000
Shoshone, Wyo	231,000	165,000	190,000	182,000	28,500
General fund, construction:					
Davis Dam, Ariz.-Nev	25,427,000	18,000,000	22,884,300	22,125,000	3,302,000
Central Valley, Calif	47,186,000	40,000,000	42,467,400	41,358,900	3,990,000
Colorado-Big Thompson, Colo	23,000,000	19,750,000	20,700,000	20,225,000	2,775,000
Hungry Horse, Mont	[3] 16,795,000	8,100,000	15,115,500	14,611,650	2,183,350
Columbia Basin, Wash	50,000,000	45,312,000	45,312,000	45,312,000	1,473,000
Fort Peck, Mont	2,990,000	990,000	1,980,000	990,000	1,500,000
Missouri River Basin	63,000,000	52,767,500	56,275,800	54,786,650	1,825,000
Total	235,089,000	187,924,175	207,994,000	202,541,037	20,016,450

[1] Consolidation of appropriation items under "Expenses, power transmission facilities."
[2] Increase in continuing fund from $100,000 to $300,000 requested.
[3] Includes $6,945,000 not before House but submitted in S. Doc. 166.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL FUNCTIONS—ITEMS IN SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET ESTIMATE, HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 735, JULY 29, 1948

House Document 735 proposes additional 1949 appropriations for the Corps of Engineers for rivers and harbors and flood control, general, totaling $32,412,000.

The $32,412,000 requested in the supplemental estimate is divided as follows:

(1) Rivers and harbors (3 projects)	$10,583,000
(2) Flood control, general (8 projects)	21,829,000
Total	32,412,000

Comparative figures on the three rivers and harbors and the eight flood control, general, projects appear on the attached table. In each instance the amount of the supplemental request is the amount of reduction made by Congress in the regular 1949 budget estimate.

Comparative figures on Corps of Engineers, civil functions, items for which supplemental estimates were submitted in H. Doc. No. 735, July 29, 1948

Item	Regular estimate	Allowed by House	Allowed by Senate	Amount in 1949 act	Amount of supplemental
Rivers and harbors:					
Jim Woodruff Dam, Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers system	$5,000,000	$2,000,000	$5,000,000	$3,000,000	$2,000,000
McNary Dam, Columbia River Basin	30,000,000	20,000,000	27,000,000	22,000,000	8,000,000
Chief Joseph (Foster Creek) Dam, Columbia River Basin	[1] 625,000	[1] 42,000	[1] 625,000	[2]	[1] 583,000
Total, Rivers and Harbors	35,625,000	22,042,000	32,625,000	25,000,000	10,583,000
Flood control, general:					
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark	17,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	3,000,000
Blakely Mountain Reservoir, Ark	4,000,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	800,000
Narrows Reservoir, Ark	3,000,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	800,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla	9,000,000	6,500,000	9,000,000	7,000,000	2,000,000
Whitney Reservoir, Tex	5,172,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	1,172,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir, Ky	19,687,000	12,400,000	17,600,000	12,400,000	7,287,000
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak	30,400,000	25,000,000	28,900,000	26,000,000	4,400,000
Folsom Dam, Calif	3,370,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	[3] 2,370,000
Total, flood control, general	92,229,000	68,900,000	80,500,000	70,400,000	21,829,000
Grand total	127,854,000	90,942,000	113,125,000	95,400,000	32,412,000

[1] Planning funds.
[2] Of planning funds appropriated for rivers and harbors, $534,000 was not earmarked. Funds from this amount are available for the Foster Creek project in such amount as may be allocated by the Corps of Engineers.
[3] The following statement appears in the supplemental estimate with respect to the Folsom Dam: "With respect to the request for Folsom Dam, it is contemplated that the Congress will expand the present authorization for this project, in accordance with the recommendations contained in your message dated Jan. 12, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 496, 80th Cong., 2d sess.), to provide for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of a power plant and transmission lines, as well as irrigation works, and for transfer of the dam and reservoir, upon its completion, to the same agency for operation."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, after I had seen these requests I learned that there was no new evidence, that it was merely a question of asking for the amounts. The matter under discussion comes home close to me, because this very transmission line about which the Senator is speaking is needed in the State of Nebraska. But I have to be fair with the committee, and I have to be fair with all its members. If we upset this appropriation bill by allowing the money requested we may throw out of balance all the projects to which we agreed to apply a formula. We simply cannot possibly do this without opening up the whole bill and giving every Senator a chance to do the same thing with projects in his own State.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Let me finish, and then I shall yield.

Secondly, if we do what the Senator from Wyoming asks, even though we would like to do it, it is my opinion that it would disturb the language relative to the Canyon Ferry project, and if it does, and if this is legislation on an appropriation bill, as I think it must be, I believe it could be stricken out on a point of order. I am not going to make the point of order, but I do point that matter out to the chairman of the committee, because I think the point should be raised.

My State needs this project as badly as does that of the Senator from Wyoming, and when we talk about the merits of one of these projects or the merits of another, let me say that in the face of all the demands made upon the Congress, I think the Eightieth Congress was the most reclamation-minded and did more for such projects than any other Congress in the history of reclamation, in 46 years.

Let me state the appropriations for reclamation:

1939	$44,544,600
1940	76,934,600
1941	73,194,600
1942	101,361,631

We have to be fair, and say that during the war the appropriations were not made on as large a scale, because war was on, and we had to conserve wherever we could.

I continue reading the appropriations:

1943	$89,727,270
1944	38,275,500
1945	24,155,200
1946	117,365,050
1947	116,346,843
1948	136,644,738

In the Interior Department Appropriation Bill, 1949, Congress appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation $245,566,139, plus contract authorizations of $3,600,000, which together with an estimated carryover at the time of the Senate hearing of

approximately $26,000,000 will provide a total of $275,166,139 for the Reclamation Bureau in the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. President, that is two and a half times as much money as has ever been spent on reclamation in any one year in the history of reclamation.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. First I shall yield to the Senator from Montana, then to the Senator from Tennessee. As a matter of fact, I do not have the floor, but if the Senator from New Hampshire will allow me, I will yield to the Senator from Montana first.

I should like to put this table into the record. It is found on page 3 of the Senate hearing on the Interior Department Appropriation Bill, 1949, the paragraph that has to do with the appropriations for the last 10 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Regular annual and deficiency appropriations made to the Bureau of Reclamation, fiscal years 1939 to 1948, inclusive, and amount allowed by House for 1949

Fiscal year—	Amount
1939	$44,544,600
1940	76,984,600
1941	73,194,600
1942	101,361,631
1943	89,727,270
1944	38,275,500
1945	24,155,200
1946	117,365,050
1947	116,346,843
1948	136,644,738
1949 (House allowed)	226,794,897

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was with the distinguished Senator from Montana at the very place where the proposed dam is to be built. He came to me and I said, "Senator, we are going to do our level best to get the money to be spent there this year." He told me personally that he thought we had done a good job. I know he can stand here and make a good case for building the Hungry Horse Dam faster than has been contemplated in the program. I know the transmission lines should be built. The farmers want them; they want them in my State, and in every other State. The only question is how fast we should proceed.

This matter has been worked out in fairness to every State in connection with all the projects, and if we increase the appropriation for the project of the Senator from Wyoming, who is most persuasive, and if we do the same for the Senator from Montana, then each Senator who was denied has just as much right to come forward and say to the committee, "We want our appropriations restated, too," because there are other cases just as meritorious as these.

Mr. President, I wanted to make this statement, and to reiterate that I wish to be fair. The Senator from Wyoming was most cooperative, and I agree with him in his appeal. The situation is very difficult for me, because the very appropriation for which he is asking is for a project which comes into western Nebraska, and I should like very much to have it completed. I worked for it, and we got what the committee felt should be allotted to that particular project. We did our level best. When we have done that, I think the matter should not be disturbed, but we should proceed to do the best we can next year.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to what happened in the committee this morning. As everyone knows, I am very greatly interested in power projects in Tennessee under what is known as the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have been interested in that nearly all my official life, which has been a long time.

The committee has been most generous to the Tennessee Valley Authority all along the line. The present committee feels about it as others have. I offered an amendment, a very necessary amendment, in the interest of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the erection of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

Mr. President, I was told by the chairman of the committee that under an arrangement which had been made it would be impossible, owing to a situation which existed, to get the appropriation through at this session of the Congress, and after hearing it discussed in the committee it seemed to me that what the chairman of the committee had said was very reasonable, and I withdrew the amendment. If the Senate were to adopt an amendment making appropriation for the Missouri Valley, naturally the people in my section would want to know why appropriation was not made for the Tennessee Valley. I feel that such action would place me in a very bad situation. I believe the committee has been very generous, and that both branches of Congress have been very generous to the power projects of the country. We have built them just as rapidly as we could. The Senator from New Hampshire said that in January these matters would all be straightened out, and I am going along with him. I think it is probably best to consider them when Congress meets next year.

I again say that I thank the Senate and the House for the generous attitude they have shown toward power development in my State, and I want to go along as best I can and in a manner which will be fair and just to everyone. I am extremely interested in the projects in the West. I think they should be built, and as rapidly as we can build them. I want to vote for measures along that line.

I felt that I should let the Senate and the country know just what has happened, and just what we in the Appropriations Committee of the Senate think about the subject.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Supplementing what the Senator from Tennessee has said, I wish to say that the full Appropriations Committee this morning, with a very large attendance, considered, discussed, debated, and voted upon whether or not we would undertake to restrict the appropriations to those matters which were the subject of legislation in the present extra session. The Senator from Tennessee has stated correctly the vote, which as I recall was about 16 to 2, to restrict the appropriations to such amounts as are necessary for the legislation considered in the present session. We all agreed that if we opened up the situation every Senator interested in a project here or there would be entitled to present an amendment respecting the matter in which he was interested. We felt that if the Missouri Valley were to be provided for, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and the Tennessee Valley, would be entitled to make a request of a similar nature. With the exception of the two Members who voted in the negative, the committee felt that the only reasonable thing to do was to restrict the appropriations to those matters connected with legislation considered in the present session.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that I was amazed to hear him say that this Congress had been more lavish and liberal toward reclamation than has any other Congress. I hope he will keep that statement uppermost in his mind. I hope he will remember it during the campaign, when speeches are made this fall charging the high cost of living to the failure of the Federal Government to reduce expenditures.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope the President of the United States will also keep it in mind, because after all he does not have to spend this money if he does not want to.

Mr. MYERS. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will keep both those political statements in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us be fair to the American people, and let us both keep them in mind.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I appreciate the desire of the able Senator from Nebraska to be absolutely fair in this matter. He has visited the projects in question. He knows what they are. He knows how important they are to the country. He is willing to see the full appropriations made. It is not his fault that the appropriations have not been provided for. I am not in any manner criticizing him. But I want to point out that there is absolutely no justification whatever for the reduction that was made. The reduction makes the construction of the project inefficient. It makes it more costly in the end, and it delays its completion one whole year. Who is going to receive any benefit from that? The money in question is not going to be taken out of the Treasury and given to the people of Montana. Every dollar spent on this project is going to be paid back. It is 100-percent reimbursable. So where is there any justification for the talk of generosity on the part of committees to the people of the country who are asking for these projects? The only reason we are not getting them is that the power interests do not want them. That is the truth of the matter, and everyone who knows the situation will understand that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator yielded to me to make reply to what had previously been said, and I think I ought to have the privilege of answering.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire declines to yield further.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, when anyone makes such a statement as that which the Senator from Montana has made, that the only reason the appropriations are not provided is because of the power interests, it is not true. The Senator knows it is not true.

Mr. MURRAY. I know it is true.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator knows it is not.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from New Hampshire must be a mind reader if he can inquire into the secret workings of my mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire declines to yield.

The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senator from New Hampshire concluded?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned I had hoped that we were going to get through with the appropriation bill. We have come to a very definite agreement on it. If the bill is opened up there will not be merely one or two projects with which a few individuals will want to play politics, but there are dozens of projects which have some merit and to which some consideration should be given if we open this matter up wide. All the reclamation projects the Senator has discussed have received consideration. All of them are coming along. All of them will receive fair consideration from the next Congress. It is not as if they had not been treated with fairness. There is nothing new about them. If this situation is opened up at all it will mean that it will be opened up wide. I sincerely hope that nothing like that will happen, and that the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be defeated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield the floor?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. As I have said, Mr. President, I have no criticism to make of the chairman of the subcommittee who conducted the hearings which gave consideration to the appropriations for these projects in Montana. I know that he visited them, as I have said, and that he is in full accord with them. I cannot understand how any justification can be offered for the proposition of cutting $2,183,000 from the estimated cost of that project merely for the purpose of delaying its construction, rendering its construction inefficient. How is anyone going to be benefited by that?

Mr. President, the real reason for the objections can be found in the remarks I made a few moments ago. There is a project which I mentioned, that is involved in the Fort Peck Dam item; that is the construction of a transmission line from Havre, Mont., to Shelby, Mont., which will transmit the power generated at the Fort Peck Dam to the farmers in that section of the State. The farmers have formed a cooperative. They have gone to great expense in laying out their project there. If this project is denied to them they will lose many thousands of dollars. It will deprive them from getting the power to their farms which they have planned. Besides, the entire project which they are asking for is repayable to the United States Government; every dollar of it. Where can anyone find any objection to such a project? I know the real objection. The power interests do not want that transmission line built because they are seeking now to tie these farmers up with contracts to make them pay twice or three times as much as the power would cost them if they had this transmission line built.

We in Montana all understand that. We know that is the only opposition to the projects—the opposition being that of the power interests, and no one can escape from that. Anyone who says that is not true is playing politics himself, but he is playing politics on the other side of the line, for the power interests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I appreciate what my distinguished colleague has been trying to do. I wish to thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the members thereof for their very generous treatment of us in Montana. There are some of these projects for which we would like to have had a little more money if it had been available, but we feel that we have been pretty generously treated all the way around.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. Just a minute. Let me finish.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to ask one question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield at the moment.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the inference has been made here that the power interests in my State are responsible for higher rates, and this, that, and the other. I wish to say that in the State of Montana we have a public-service commission of three members elected by direct vote of the people of the State, and they are the ones who set the rates for the State of Montana, including the farmers and all the other people. So there is no monopoly in Montana so far as power is concerned. So long as we have a board elected by direct vote of the people of the State, which sets these rates, there can be no monopoly of power.

I appreciate the fact that we could use more money. I think all of us could. If it were another time, I would go along with my distinguished colleague; but at this late hour when we are trying to wind up this special session, I wish to say to Members of the Senate that, in my opinion, the majority of my people and my colleague's people in our State are willing to accept the verdict of the regular session. It is not necessary to open the appropriation bill now before the Senate to this item.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. As I understand, my distinguished colleague feels that he cannot support the amendment which I have proposed.

Mr. ECTON. Under the present circumstances, as explained by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I regret very much that I shall have to vote against it.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator said something about there not being a monopoly of power in Montana. Will the Senator tell us what other power utilities are delivering power to the people of Montana besides the Montana Power Co.?

Mr. ECTON. There is another company at Kalispell which has been delivering power.

Mr. MURRAY. That is a little steam plant.

Mr. ECTON. We get power from Fort Peck.

Mr. MURRAY. Fort Peck is a Federal project, not a utility.

Mr. ECTON. The South Dakota Utilities Co. operates in the State of Montana. The Senator knows that there is no monopoly. My position is that so long as we have rates fixed by a public service commission which is directly responsible to the people, it cannot be said that there is a monopoly of power. They are supposed to protect the people. I think the Senator recognizes that that is true in our case.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, that argument would justify monopoly in every State in the Union. It seems to me that my colleague's argument is that you may have a monopoly provided you have a utilities commission to regulate the rates, and that no Government power project should provide power in the State when there is a utility company being regulated by the utilities commission. I do not think that answers the question which is before the Senate today.

I am not talking about the regulation of the Montana Power Co. or the regulation of rates of any monopoly. I am talking about the need for these particular projects at Fort Peck and at Hungry Horse. The one at Fort Peck involves a transmission line which will be of tremendous value to the farmers of that area, and I am sure that my colleague will not stand on the floor of the Senate and say that that project should not be approved. I am sure that he will consider that it is a valuable project, and that it is essential for the

farmers to have it in order to get low-cost power on their farms. They cannot afford to pay the rates which the Montana Power Co. charges. We have low-cost power there. The law especially favors the distribution of that power to the farmers and to the municipalities where they can have access to it. I cannot understand why there should be any objection to this project, and I cannot see what could justify my colleague in making any remarks opposing this particular project.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to add my voice to those advocating the reinstatement of appropriations for western power developments. I have watched such developments for a great many years. Appropriations are made, but the funds are insufficient. The work has to be stopped right in the middle of a project. The machinery is taken away, and the labor force scattered far and wide. Then they get another appropriation, start again, and collect the machinery and the workers. In that way the projects cost a great deal more than they would if the work could be carried on continuously until the projects were completed. I think it would be good business, as well as good sense and service to the people, to make the money available so that these projects could be completed.

I should like to comment on what the Senator from Montana had to say about power monopolies. I know what they are. In Idaho we have the Idaho Power Co. in southern Idaho, and in northern Idaho it is the Washington Water Power Co. We have been having quite a fight out there over a Columbia Valley Authority. The power companies pour money into the battle without stint. They call anyone a Communist who favors a Columbia Valley Authority development similar to the TVA. They have called me a Communist out there for years, simply because I favored a Columbia Valley Authority development.

At campaign time the power company hires a great many young men, gives them a briefing, and sends them out as service employees, to service electric irons, toasters, and other appliances of customers, even out in the rural areas. While they are tinkering with the electric iron they always manage to bring up politics. They say to the farmers that if they vote for that Communist TAYLOR, the water will be taken off the land and run through generators to make power, and it will be no good for anything else after that. Of course, when they tell the farmers that they are going to lose their water, they do not have to prove it at all. Merely intimating it scares them to death.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Montana to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I have a statement which I should like to make regarding the acomplishments, shall we say, of the special session. I think I might as well get rid of that speech, and then I shall be through. I have not participated in the farce which has gone on here for the past several days. I have kept silent.

I

President Truman called the session, in his acceptance speech of July 15, 1948, to needle the Republicans about high prices, housing, civil rights, and a number of other pressing issues. Having had his say, however, the leader of the Democratic Party retired into semi-inactivity. His party chieftains in the Senate and the House called no caucuses of the embattled minority to fight for the President's program and give the country leadership in solving these pressing economic and human problems. A member of the President's party told a union delegation this week "We never get called together, we do not know what the program is, or where the party is trying to go." Representative RAYBURN, Democratic leader in the House, admitted to a delegation that a majority of House Democrats would not support public housing, which was demonstrated by the vote in the other Chamber today. The Democratic leaders in both Houses declared it would be futile to call a Democratic caucus; it "would only create a row." That was demonstrated by the filibuster on the anti-poll-tax bill. The Democratic administration sent its Secretary of the Treasury to fight for price control before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, where he made the statement that he liked price control about as much as he liked castor oil.

President Roosevelt used to have his problems with Congress too—even with a Democratic Congress. But President Roosevelt took the issues to the people—on the radio. Last night, as this special session prepared to fold up its tents and silently slink away, having accomplished just one of the President's 11 points, and played bipartisan politics with 2 others, did we hear the President appealing to the American people to demand that this Congress stay in session and pass his program? No. Where was the man who on July 15, 1948, proclaimed boldly:

> They are going to try to dodge their responsibility * * *. but I'm here to say to you that Senator BARKLEY and I are not going to let them get away with it.

On the day when some of us fought to postpone the overriding of President Truman's veto of the Taft-Hartley bill, President Truman went to the ball game. Last night, as Congress scuttled his program for the special session, President Truman was cruising on the Potomac.

II

If the Democratic Party in the special session has demonstrated impotence and hypocrisy about its campaign pledges, the Republican Party has demonstrated consummate arrogance. The Republican Party stands proudly on its record of inflation, chaos in labor relations, and Quonset huts for veterans.

The Republican Party was advised by Tom Dewey to stay down here just long enough to throw the blame for the failures of the special session onto the Democrats. So they took the needle which President Truman was attempting to stick in them, turned it around, and jabbed the Democrats. They called up the anti-poll-tax bill. As the Washington Post of July 29, 1948, commented—

> The object, of course, is plain—to let the special session peter out with the Democrats quarreling among themselves.

The Scripps-Howard press Washington staff called the move "a transparent political phony," and pointed out that—

> instead of trying to break the filibuster, Senate Republicans are cozily cooperating by adjourning early. They even suggested how one southerner might regain the floor after overnight rest.

When I fought for time to let the people make their voices heard on the Taft-Hartley bill and the draft bill, Mr. President, I was accorded no such courtesy.

III

The score for the special session, for both parties, is virtually a goose egg. Of President Truman's 11 points, just one—the appropriation for the United Nations home—was enacted. On two others—prices and housing—both parties played politics for a while, and then settled down to do just what the NAM and the real-estate lobby would have done if they were sitting in Congress.

On housing, the Senate "recanted," as the New York Times puts it today, on its own bill which it had passed three times before. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] took the lead in renouncing his own bill. The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who reputedly stands high in the counsels of Mr. Dewey, supported the Senator from Ohio.

As to price control, the bill to restrict consumer credit and to raise bank reserve requirements is not a price-control bill. It is a credit-control bill. It does not check the soaring cost of living. It checks only the amount of money which consumers and small businessmen will have to meet the soaring cost of living and the rising cost of doing business. The big corporations which are mainly responsible for high prices, will not be squeezed; they can live off their undistributed profits, depreciation reserves, and other internal assets which now total around $62,000,000,000 of working capital.

Mr. President, the only honest way to meet inflation is to freeze and roll back prices, or to increase the purchasing power necessary to pay the high prices. This Congress has chosen to do neither. Instead, it has taken steps in the direction of reducing purchasing power while doing nothing to freeze and roll back prices. In effect, the Congress—and the administration—would cure deficiencies of diet by withholding the means to buy more food. It does not make economic sense.

Do not tell me it is impossible to control prices, that nothing can be done about them, Mr. President. I was looking at a chart the other day as to the situation in England, a country we are helping handsomely. I am glad to help them if they need it, but I believe that charity begins at home in this respect. I find that in England one can buy a rib roast, for example, for 47 cents a pound, and can buy butter for 30 cents a pound. The people of England pay 15 cents a pound for oleomargarine. There is some difference between those prices and what the taxpayers of the United States are having to pay.

I say that if that can be done in England, with its limited resources, and largely dependent upon our generosity to keep going, we should be able to do it for our own people in America.

IV

Both parties have attempted to divert attention from their failures here this month by holding a three-ring circus. In ring No. 1, Representative THOMAS has exhibited those neurotic exhibitionists, Miss Bentley, Mr. Chambers, and Mr. Budenz, in a proceeding which has shocked the civilized world for its callous disregard of due process of law and the rights of innocent people to be protected against irresponsible smears.

Mr. President, I have on my desk some editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post which I should like to have printed at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks. The editorials state how improper and un-American the proceedings that have been going on are, in that they smear people without due process of law; they are guilty without a trial, instead of being innocent until proven guilty. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials may be embodied at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 2, 1948]

EXHIBIT ON THE HILL

Committees of both Senate and House are vying with each other in hoisting Elizabeth Bentley into a notoriety that in the light of her revealed character may not be entirely unwelcome. It is curious procedure. For what she has done the average reader will wonder why she is not before a grand jury answering one of a variety of possible charges—from the violation of security regulations to failure to register as the agent of a foreign principal. It is in a court of law that she should be given a chance to turn state's evidence.

The fact is, of course, that she has had her day in court. Evidently she appeared before the grand jury in New York which went over the ramifications of her sordid tale of espionage. Evidently she was granted immunity if she turned state's evidence. Evidently no indictable offense was discovered against the men she pilloried. Evidently the records of the grand-jury hearings, which are supposed to be secret, were turned over to congressional investigators in quest of sensations useful for smearing and vote-getting. It is reprehensible, let alone curious, procedure. Publicity is not enough of a penalty for some of the persons touched by the Bentley disclosures. But there are others who are now being caricatured in a circus of publicity by a muddleheaded and foolish woman who admits that a lack of truth was one of the "principles" that she embraced when she became involved with the dead man Golos.

The revelations are certainly sensational, though the only shortcoming in this respect, as compared with the Canadian spy trial, is that no Russian is forthcoming. He may, of course, be waiting in the wings. But whether he is there or not, the story has some of the elements of melodrama, after the dirt has been scraped off it. Elizabeth Bentley and her friends and fellow Communists seem to have trapped or seduced officials in responsible wartime positions into disgorging data for relay to the Russians. In her favor were the circumstances of the times. The artfully contrived atmosphere of treason is artificial. A war was on, and Soviet Russia was our ally, for whose feats of arms, moreover, most Americans were full of admiration. In those days even Representative RANKIN had a good word to say about Stalin. This does not condone leaks, but it explains some of them. In wartime the Capital was a free-and-easy place where even the itinerant imbibed "classified" information with free cocktails. There was no need to stand at street corners for it.

How much of the dope thus collected was valuable to the Russians is not explained. It might ruin a good story. After all, this country was officially in cahoots with the Russians, and surely the bulk of the data that the Bentley crowd got with such ostentatious surreptitiousness must have been made available to Moscow. Those were the days when officials were trying to encourage confidence in Russia by example. Moreover, the Russians, according to such authorities as General Deane in his "Strange Alliance," are so full of suspicions that they look askance at gifts, let alone information. There was the case of the factory that was sent to Russia with an offer of American engineers to set it up. The offer was not accepted, and the plant remained in pieces, rusting away as if it were tainted. Much the same distrust doubtless went into the evaluation of the mountains of odds and ends of news that this spy ring purloined and relayed.

Except for Remington, the dramatis personae of this fantastically told plot still have to be heard. Remington, whatever his political beliefs, does not inspire confidence in his sense of responsibility. Nor is he an example of good hiring practice in Government service. But too much can be made of his position as chairman of the Department of Commerce Committee on Export Licenses. From the figures this committee seems to be made up of inverted Micawbers waiting for applications from countries east of the iron curtain to turn down. And the chairman is a cipher compared with the military member, for this latter has a veto power. However, Remington seems to have been put in responsible jobs before he had arrived at the age of discretion, and this is the mildest thing one can say about him.

Except for him and another person on the list, the fact remains that not one of the men whose names Elizabeth Bentley is now broadcasting with toothsome enjoyment is now on the Federal pay roll. What is clear is that by grace of Congress she is doing a better service for Moscow by her revelations than she did by her gumshoeing and sleuthing. Without a doubt eternal vigilance is the price of American security. And to this end, in view of the presence in our midst of an international conspiracy aimed at undermining it, the security laws should be invoked where they apply, and strengthened where they are weak. An equal price of our security, however, is wisdom and sobriety in the conduct of the Nation's affairs. Both qualities are lacking in dealing with Elizabeth Bentley. We can imagine the feeling against any east-west trade Elizabeth Bentley is being allowed to generate, the undermining of the integrity of Government service, the inculcation of that reciprocal fear between Government and the citizenry that Ferrero spoke of as an evil beyond computation.

[From the Washington Post of August 3, 1948]

EXPOSING SPIES

(Commenting on our editorial of yesterday, Senator FERGUSON, chairman of the Senate investigating committee, informs us that though a request for a court order asking for release of the grand jury testimony into the Bentley case was considered, no such request was, in fact, made, and further, the committee has not had access to or information about such testimony. Every witness at the current hearing is instructed not to divulge what was said during the New York proceedings.)

The sensational story of twin Soviet spy rings in Washington, narrated by Miss Elizabeth T. Bentley under the auspices of two congressional committees, has been widely likened to the disclosure of Soviet espionage activities in Canada by a royal commission just a little more than 2 years ago. Perhaps, therefore, it would be useful to compare the procedures followed in the two cases. Some of the differences between them are enlightening.

The Canadian disclosures, like those currently emanating from Capitol Hill, were based in the first instance on the testimony of an apostate Soviet agent—a Russian citizen named Igor Gouzenko employed by the Soviet Embassy in the one case, a disillusioned American citizen working for the American Communist Party in the other. Gouzenko's testimony, however, was supported by voluminous documents which he took with him from the Soviet Embassy's files, the authenticity of which was carefully ascertained. Miss Bentley's testimony, on the other hand, has thus far had no documentary corroboration whatsoever.

In Canada, before the names of any persons involved in the spy ring were made public, there was established, through an Order in Council, a royal commission to make a complete inquiry and to report on all the circumstances of the case. The commission heard 116 witnesses and studied about 1,000 exhibits, developing in connection with each person it denounced as implicated in espionage a detailed interlocking network of evidence. At the same time it took great pains to avoid divulging the names of persons mentioned in the course of testimony but innocent of any wrongdoing. After listing those actively involved in one way or another with the spy ring, the commission report declared:

"The names of certain other persons were mentioned in such a context that it was considered advisable to examine them and to investigate their activities. In each case we were satisfied that their conduct has been entirely proper and that while the Russians designed to draw some of them into the net in future, having, in anticipation of doing so, actually given them cover names, such hopes were in our opinion completely without foundation and the objects of those hopes were unaware that they were being considered * * *. The names of a number of persons, in Government service and otherwise, who were members of Secret Communist cells have been disclosed by this inquiry.

These names appear in the volume of evidence. As there is no evidence that these persons were implicated in, or aware of, the espionage networks, we do not consider it necessary to mention these names in this report."

The procedure on Capitol Hill, by contrast, has been first to publish the names of those alleged by Miss Bentley's unsupported testimony to be involved in espionage and later on, presumably, to inquire into the validity of her allegations. This seems the more remarkable since there is a firmly fixed American tradition to the contrary. It must be supposed that no congressional committee would carelessly make public an unsupported allegation that Government officials, or former Government officials, of high repute had embezzled funds or committed arson. Yet there appears to be no hesitation at all in letting such public servants be denounced as traitors to their country—on the mere affirmation of a turncoat Commie. Perhaps the Canadians benefited somewhat from the fact that their royal commission was thoroughly nonpartisan—and was not obliged to conduct its inquiry in the course of an election year.

[From the New York Times of August 4, 1948]

DUE PROCESS IN WASHINGTON

If there is one thing above all others in our American way of life in which most thoughtful citizens take pride and in which they firmly believe, it is in the principles of civil rights enunciated in the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. They were attached to the Constitution on the demand of the people of the Thirteen Colonies before they would accept the Constitution itself. They make up what is popularly called our Bill of Rights. Among these are a guaranty against being called to answer for an infamous crime except upon grand jury indictment, a promise of open trial by a jury of one's peers, the right to confront one's accusers in open court after having been previously informed of the nature and the cause of the accusations. We do not believe these fundamental rights are being observed today in Washington by the congressional committees investigating communism in the United States. Let us look at the record.

Two former high officials of the Government, and others, have been accused by Miss Elizabeth T. Bentley, herself a confessed former spy for the Communists, with having engaged in espionage during the war, with having violated their oaths of office, with having acted as unregistered agents of a foreign government. Did they learn of these charges of commission of infamous crimes through official channels, or on being called to answer an indictment? They did not. At least one first learned of Miss Bentley's testimony through a call from a newspaper reporter. They already had been broadcast to the world. How substantial are these charges?

Before appearing before the House Committee on Un-American Activities Miss Bentley testified before a Federal grand jury in New York City that was investigating wartime espionage activities. Presumably she gave the same testimony there that she did in Washington. Did the grand jury indict the men against whom she made the charges? It did not. Before appearing before the House committee Miss Bentley also gave the same testimony before an executive session of the Senate subcommittee headed by Senator FERGUSON that is conducting a parallel inquiry. Did they make public her testimony or allow her to give it in open hearing? They did not. Yet a day later Chairman THOMAS of the House committee calls her to the witness stand and lets her make the charges openly.

To grant Mr. Remington, Mr. Currie, Mr. White, and others named by Miss Bentley an opportunity later to confront her in the committee room and answer her charges does not rectify the basic wrong that has been done. Many will read, and perhaps believe, the charges but not the rebuttal. There is even no guaranty that these accused will ever have their day in court. Dr. Edward U. Condon was accused a year ago by the Thomas committee of being "the weakest link in our atomic energy set-up" and he has yet to be given an opportunity to answer before the committee.

There undoubtedly were, and still are, agents of the Soviet Government, and of other governments, in this country seeking information on military matters that is not available to them through official channels. They should be sought out, brought to trial, and punished, if they are found guilty. There are legal ways of doing that, such as the Royal Commission used in Canada in investigating the leakage of information on atomic research. It conducted its hearings in private, weighed the evidence, and only then made public the charges.

We have a precious heritage in this country of protection of the innocent against false accusation, of a fair trial even for the guilty. What price a few headlines if those rights are compromised or violated? A dubious security purchased by those means would be bought far too high.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am glad Mr. Truman has denounced this proceeding, but I would remind him that it was his own Attorney General who started this thing, worked for 3 years, and spent half a million dollars trying to "get something" on a group of outstanding public servants who had long ago been judged "guilty" in the eyes of the Chicago Tribune, the New York Daily News, the New York Sun, and the Washington Times-Herald, of the high crime of being New Dealers. Also, I cannot understand how the Republican-controlled House committee on un-American propaganda activities got hold of the records it is now using to smear these people, unless those records were turned over by Mr. Truman's Democratic Attorney General. For that reason I regard this whole proceeding as a thoroughly bipartisan affair, aimed at discrediting Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal and the new Progressive Party, while at the same time serving as an excellent cover-up for the bipartisan failure to do anything about high prices, housing, and civil-rights legislation.

In ring No. 2 we have had the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Expenditures, its star witness the confused Mr. Remington, who says Miss Bentley is wrong about him, but right about everybody else she accuses. I am not a psychiatrist, Mr. President, so I cannot say which committee would have a more difficult problem on its hands if it wanted to get to the bottom of this nonsense.

In ring No. 3 we have had the House Labor Subcommittee investigating whether the Taft-Hartley Act is tough enough and whether perhaps it is too soft on labor. I believe that committee has not been able to compete for the headlines won by the other two, but I am sure that in the long run it intends to do just as much harm—singling out progressive trade-unions for its smear attack.

v

It seems to me the reaction of the average, decent, honest American citizen to these shenanigans in Congress, this farce of circuses without bread, must inevitably be, "A plague on both your houses." That is the reason a new party, the Progressive Party, has come into being and has met with interest, enthusiasm and support from millions of Americans who formerly found in Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal a government sincerely interested in bettering their lot.

At the close of our founding convention, the Progressive Party delegation to Congress announced to the press what we thought this special session should do. It was a minimum program on the most urgent issues—price and rent control, housing, civil rights, minimum wage, old-age pensions, repeal of the draft, and the Taft-Hartley laws, and an end to the "cold war" policies which underlie inflation.

When we compare even this minimum list with the accomplishments of this session, it should be obvious that it is not President Truman who has put the Republicans on the spot, nor the Republicans who have put the Democrats on the spot, but both old parties which have put themselves on the spot with the American people. And this time the people have an alternative to turn to—the new Progressive Party.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Was there more than one amendment submitted by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MURRAY. I submitted two projects, but only one amendment. The amendment included the Hungry Horse project and also the Fort Peck project.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming, which is open to amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to submit an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, which would include the amount cut by the Appropriations Committee for the Columbia Basin project in Washington, the sum of $1,473,000.

This is one of the items referred to by the President of the United States in his message to Congress on July 28 of this year, at the special session, asking the Congress to approve it. It is not a new item, but was included in the budget. I shall in a moment read from the supplemental estimates. What the amendment does is to restore the amount, in order to avoid delay in construction and installation of additional generators at Grand Coulee Dam.

The President in his message said all such delay would accentuate the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest. Like the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Montana, I have no criticism of the treatment given the western power projects by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the chairman and members of the Appropriations Committee. I think I had as many projects provided for in my State as were provided for in any other State of the Union. I felt we should have had the full budget amount. It was not at any time a matter of playing politics. Here is a great project in the State of Washington, the greatest project ever built by man, the greatest hydroelectric project in all the world. On it the Government has expended well over $200,000,000. The original project provided for a certain number of generators. The dam was built. Obviously, as the Senator from Nebraska has pointed out, the generators could not all be installed at once. Neither could the entire project be built all at once. The project was undertaken in order to cope with a very serious power shortage in the Pacific Northwest. The dam is already built, there being now an investment in the project of hundreds of millions of dollars. The money is to be paid back. As the Senator from Montana pointed out, it is not necessarily a matter of generosity on the part of Congress in making the appropriations. The money will be repaid. In fact, the project has already, under the contract with the Federal Government and the Treasury, repaid the money invested to an amount far exceeding expectations. Grand Coulee has already repaid from the money coming from the sale of power more than $8,000,000 above what it was expected to repay. Generators are of course necessary, and power cannot be developed until they are installed.

Reference was made today to a certain project which was expected to begin repayment within a year. In the case of Grand Coulee, the minute the generators are installed and the minute water goes through them, that minute the money invested in the project begins to flow back to the United States Treasury. Time is required for the building of generators. Contracts have to be made. As Senators know, they are of immense size. A great deal of engineering work is involved.

When the regular session ended without action upon the project, I did not complain, but we have been called back into special session. The President in his message to Congress stated this was one of the items which should be considered by the Congress at the special session. It is well within the purview of what was intended to be done. It is not a new item. I talked with the President of the United States about the items. He stated to me at that time that he did not expect Congress to make the appropriation, or to discuss anything new, but he stated that he hoped the Congress would restore the budget estimates, particularly on the power projects, in view of the serious power shortage.

I hope the $1,000,000 will be restored. I do not ask to have it restored at the expense of other projects throughout the country, but this relates to a project which can immediately begin repayment of moneys invested. The money is needed for generators in a dam already built. The Hungry Horse project in Wyoming, when constructed, will speed it up.

I hope the amendment will be adopted. In agreeing to it, I do not think the Senate would be doing anything out of line.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I share my senior colleague's enthusiasm for the Columbia Valley. It is, has been, and will be a fantastically great project. Its results will be of immeasurable benefit not only to the western slope of the country but to the remainder of the country as well. However, with reference to the problem before us, and speaking as one coming from the area in question, I feel that if equal consideration cannot be given to every request which has been laid before the Appropriations Committee, special consideration should be given to none. I shall, therefore, oppose the amendment submitted by my colleague.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington requests a division. Those in favor of the amendment will rise and remain standing until counted. Those opposed. The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who would vote "yea" if present, is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—32

Barkley	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Connally	Langer	Pepper
Ellender	Lucas	Sparkman
Feazel	McClellan	Stennis
Fulbright	McFarland	Stewart
Green	McGrath	Taylor
Hatch	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Murray	Tydings
Holland	Myers	Umstead
Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor	

NAYS—49

Aiken	Gurney	Revercomb
Baldwin	Hawkes	Robertson, Va.
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Smith
Brooks	Jenner	Taft
Butler	Kem	Thye
Byrd	Knowland	Tobey
Cain	Lodge	Vandenberg
Capehart	McCarthy	Watkins
Capper	McKellar	Wherry
Cooper	Malone	Wiley
Cordon	Martin	Williams
Donnell	Millikin	Wilson
Dworshak	Moore	Young
Ecton	Morse	
Ferguson	Reed	

NOT VOTING—15

Ball	Eastland	Maybank
Buck	Flanders	O'Daniel
Bushfield	George	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Wagner
Downey	McCarran	White

So Mr. MAGNUSON's amendment to Mr. O'MAHONEY's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on that amendment, to save time, I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the point of order is justified, and is sustained.

Are there further amendments?

Mr. BRIDGES. There is one minor amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 2, before the period, it is proposed to insert a semicolon and the words "and the sources of the funds for such administrative expenses shall include the housing investment insurance fund created by the Housing Act of 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington offers an amendment, which will be stated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is the amendment relating to the appropriation for disaster relief.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the proper place the following:

BUREAU OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Disaster relief, public facilities: For expenses necessary to alleviate damage or hardship caused by flood, tornado, fire, or other

catastrophe respecting which the President has heretofore made a determination under the Act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 233), by grants, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Federal Works Administrator, to local public agencies to assist them in defraying the cost of (1) the repair, restoration, replacement, or reconstruction of local public facilities damaged or destroyed by such catastrophe and (2) the construction, maintenance, and operation of schools necessary for children of families from Vanport City, Oreg., including personal services in the District of Columbia, $35,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1950: *Provided*, That no grant shall be made to any local public agency unless the Administrator determines that other Federal funds are not available for such facilities and that such agency needs the grant and cannot otherwise defray such cost without creating an excessive tax or debt burden: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 4 percent of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses required in connection with such grants.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is an amendment which was offered to a bill which passed the Senate at the end of the last session. It involves the question of disaster relief. The conference saw fit to eliminate the amount. Together with the senior and junior Senators from Oregon, and I presume my colleague, I thought that the amount should have been restored.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate. I appreciate that these things probably might well have been brought up, if we had had the chance, in the committee. At the beginning of the special session I wrote the chairmen of both the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Appropriations asking for the right to appear with other witnesses on this specific item which the House cut out. In the wisdom, or whatever the reason was, of both committees, they decided not to have any hearings on any of these matters.

Mr. President, this is an emergency matter. The damage from the flood will amount to well over $250,000,000. Most of the damage was to small towns, counties, and cities which have no taxing power to take care of broken streets, damaged water systems and sewage systems. The Senate has once approved this amendment. It provides that the Federal Works Administration may make grants-in-aid to enable the cities, counties, towns, and municipalities, where it is proven they have no taxing power, to repair the damaged facilities. I merely bring this up because I hope we can do something about it.

The urgency of the matter is apparent to anyone. It may be that the committee of the Senate may wish to reiterate the stand which it took once before, and have the matter sent to the House, in the hope that they will agree to this amount, which is so vitally needed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as the Senator from Washington well knows, in the previous session the Senate Committee on Appropriations reported this item favorably, the Senate took favorable action on it, and it was lost in conference. The issue was thrashed out at the time. The amendment has merit. The Senator knows how the Senator from New Hampshire stands on it. But we cannot open the bill up, and therefore I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have one further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am somewhat troubled by the point of order and the ruling of the Chair, both as to this and the previous amendment. I understand this is an amendment providing for an appropriation to carry out an existing law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The provisos in the amendment carry it beyond that basis.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is upon the basis of the provisos in the amendment that the ruling is made?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator from Washington whether he has this amendment before him, and whether in the amendment there are any provisos which change the law?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The proviso, if it can be called that, was a direction that the money should be spent only in a disaster area; we set out where it should be spent. That may be a proviso, but it is an appropriation. The language is no different from the language that has been in hundreds of appropriation bills passed by the Senate and the House. That is the only proviso I know of in the amendment I have submitted, and it was passed and approved by the Senate once, and no point of order was made against it then.

I appreciate what the Senator from New Hampshire has said regarding this matter. I appreciate that the Republican policy is not to open up the bill. But that should not mean I am denied the right to submit the amendment, and I should not get all the glum looks from the Republican side because we are keeping them after 6 o'clock, and it should not prevent me, or at least foreclose me, from standing up and talking about the power projects in my State, and money we need to repair the damage caused by the Columbia River flood. I still think this action should be taken. I do not quite like all those glum looks I am getting on the other side. There is no hurry. It is not necessary to adjourn the Congress because it is 6 o'clock Saturday night. These are matters the President brought up, and they are within the scope of the call of the special session. It seems to me that they are entitled to consideration. This happens to be an emergency matter.

I say to the Senator from Wyoming that the only proviso is that the money shall be spent only for the relief of disaster victims in one particular area.

Mr. TAFT. Was there a Presidential estimate at this special session, or any mention of this by the President?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; this is not a Presidential estimate, because this is a matter that has never been before the budget, and the Senator from Ohio well knows that obviously it could not be. I do not think the budget was clairvoyant enough to anticipate a flood on the Columbia River when they were making up their estimates. I wish it had been in the estimates.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to disabuse the mind of the Senator from Washington as to the reason and the cause of the so-called glum looks he sees around the Chamber. He has misinterpreted the facial expressions on this side. The real reason is this: We know that this is the closing hour, almost the closing minute, of the last session, we hope, of the Eightieth Congress. We have in mind that there are many faces that will not be with us at the next session, and I call the Senator's attention to that classic phrase, "Parting is such sweet sorrow." [Laughter.] That is the real reason.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the Senator from Ohio asked whether this was sent in by the President. It was included in a special message after the flood.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, does the Senator from Washington know of any good reason why the Congress has to adjourn this evening?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know of any reason.

Mr. HATCH. We might remain in Washington and attend to a little important business of the people of America.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. President, I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the second amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON.]

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out, in the third line of subsection (c) of section 2, the phrase "December 22, 1945," and in lieu thereof inserting "April 21, 1947."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. BRIDGES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is recognized.

Mr. BRIDGES. On that amendment I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to reserve the point of order until I may explain the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Obviously the point of order is not only sustainable, but unavoidably sustainable. The Chair is very happy to recognize the Senator from Washington for any statement he wishes to make.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Again I wish to say, in order that the record may be clear with respect to all these matters, that the amendment deals with legislation concerning displaced persons, one of the pieces of legislation for which the President called the Congress into session.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a news dispatch from the New York Daily News of today, from which I read, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 6.—Governor Dewey personally intervened with the special session of Congress to liberalize the displaced persons law, but a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee gave him a deaf ear. It decided today against any changes at this time.

The President of the United States has also made a similar recommendation. I was hoping Congress would back up the two recommendations.

Mr. President, this is a serious matter. All my amendment does is to change the date from December 22, 1945, to April 21, 1947, because investigation has shown that a great number of the Jewish people in Europe, and other people, but mainly Jewish people, were not in so-called DP camps prior to the first date, and therefore cannot be admitted.

I was going to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary if he proposed to call the committee into session on this matter, because as I understand the vote on this subject in a subcommittee of that committee was a tie. I thought possibly the full committee might want to do something about the matter. I assume, however, it is the intention not to hold such a meeting, in view of the fact that it is desired to adjourn quickly.

I think the RECORD should show, however, that nothing was done respecting the subject of displaced persons, despite the fact that the President of the United States asked for action on the matter, and despite the fact that the Republican nominee had seen fit personally to intervene in the matter, according to newspaper reports—and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] confirmed it whereas he did not see fit to intervene on other matters involving housing and the high cost of living. The reason the Republican nominee intervened is to my mind perfectly obvious. There are many people of the Jewish race in the State of New York. There are people of that race in other parts of the country, but they are particularly in New York, and New York is vitally interested in this matter. Therefore I had hoped that the date would be extended.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if it has not often been publicized that the able Governor of New York, the Republican nominee, believes in team play between the Executive and his legislative or congressional counterpart, and if that be true, then is it not already evident that in this case, when the captain of the team called upon the team to perform, the team did not perform very well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They did not make a first down on this matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact that the Senator who raised the point of order against his amendment, the very able and affable chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, himself only an hour or two earlier offered a legislative rider upon this appropriation with respect to the Motor Carriers' Claims Commission Act. The legislative rider which the Senator from New Hampshire offered changed the law by extending for 6 months the period within which claims may be filed. So the record is clear now that the Senator from New Hampshire, who was willing to submit an amendment, against the rules of the Senate, to extend for 6 months the period within which motor carriers may file their claims, is unwilling to waive the point of order when the Senator from Washington asks that a change may be made in the law with respect to displaced persons—a change requested by the Governor of New York, the Republican candidate for the Presidency.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that what prompted me to offer the amendment was the very fact that the Senator from New Hampshire had offered the amendment to which reference has been made. I went to the Parliamentarian and asked him if that was legislation on an appropriation bill. He said it was. In view of the fact that the genial Senator from New Hampshire offered such an amendment himself in the last hours of the session, I thought we were sort of liberalizing our viewpoint on the strict rules respecting the offering of amendments. I thought the amendment should be offered also in view of the fact that, with the exception of perhaps a few Senators on this side of the aisle, all were in favor of such legislation, although the Members on the Republican side of the aisle are not. I realize that it is desired to adjourn quickly, but I thought we could accomplish the purposes sought to be accomplished by my amendment at this time because it deals with one of the subjects which formed the reason for the calling of the special session.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Wyoming knows perfectly well, and no Senator knows it any better than he does, why I offered the motor-carrier amendment. I did it because of a vote taken in the Appropriations Committee. I so stated to the Senator from Wyoming and the other Senators who were interested in the matter. The amendment was unanimously agreed to in the committee. The Senator knows that. I appreciate the fact that he has called attention to that situation, but the Senator knows in his heart perfectly well the reason why it was done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that it did not satisfy me. The legislative rider which the Senator offered was merely a device to prevent the appropriation of $100,000 to carry out a law which was enacted last July by Congress.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission established by the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 880), including personal services in the District of Columbia; traveling expenses; printing and binding; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $100,000:

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, the amendment seeks to provide money in the sum of $100,000 so that the act passed at the regular session may be administered. The purpose of the act was to give relief to 131 motor carriers in the western part of the country, whose properties were taken over by the Government during the war. During the regular session we declared it to be our intention adequately to compensate them, by setting up the proper machinery, and declaring that they were entitled to compensation, but we provided no money with which to administer the law. The amendment merely shows our good faith in this matter by providing $100,000 for the administration of the law.

On this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the matter was considered in the Appropriations Committee. An amendment has already been adopted by the Senate today which takes care of this situation, by extending the time 90 days for the filing of claims. Again I object to opening up the bill further, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. Is it the Senator's intention that this law shall not be allowed to operate for 90 more days?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. My intention is, and it is the purpose of the amendment previously adopted, to extend for 90 days beyond January 3 the period for filing claims, which will give adequate time for the filing of claims.

Mr. McGRATH. And until an appropriation is made the motor carriers will have to go without compensation? Is that the Senator's intention?

Mr. BRIDGES. These claims have been pending for some time now. A matter of 4 months will not make any difference.

Mr. McGRATH. The claims have not been pending at all. There has been no forum before which the claimants could be heard. At the last session of the Congress we provided a forum where they could be heard. Now by my amendment I propose to provide the money for the payment of the claims.

On my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the bill which was passed in June, I believe, which allowed 6 months for the trucking

companies to file their claims. I followed it through from the start, about 2 years ago. I know that there was an oversight, due to the rush in closing the session in June, because the bill was passed so late that it was impossible to get an appropriation bill through in time to have the Commissioners appointed. The President has not yet appointed the Commissioners authorized under the bill to pass on the claims.

I feel that the 131 trucking companies interested in this bill in the Western States surrounding my State of South Dakota would be perfectly happy with the 90-day extension. I would, of course, like to vote for the amendment. I do not see how it would operate any better, however, because the Commissioners are not appointed. The 90-day extension will take care of the problem in very good shape.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—31

Barkley	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Connally	Lucas	Pepper
Ellender	McClellan	Sparkman
Fulbright	McFarland	Stennis
Green	McGrath	Stewart
Hatch	McKellar	Taylor
Hayden	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Holland	Murray	Tydings
Johnson, Colo.	Myers	
Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor	

NAYS—50

Aiken	Ferguson	Revercomb
Baldwin	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Brewster	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hoey	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Taft
Butler	Jenner	Thye
Byrd	Kem	Tobey
Cain	Knowland	Umstead
Capehart	Langer	Vandenberg
Capper	Lodge	Watkins
Cooper	McCarthy	Wherry
Cordon	Malone	Wiley
Donnell	Martin	Williams
Dworshak	Millikin	Wilson
Ecton	Moore	Young
Feazel	Morse	

NOT VOTING—15

Ball	Eastland	O'Daniel
Buck	Flanders	Reed
Bushfield	George	Russell
Chavez	McCarran	Wagner
Downey	Maybank	White

So Mr. McGRATH's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to comment briefly on what has happened here in the Senate with respect to the failure to include the appropriation provided for by the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH]. It seems to me that it is a very unhealthy sign in the Congress of the United States when we pass laws and take credit for the passage of such laws, and fail to appropriate the money to carry them out.

The only reason I mention this point is that the other day the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], in making a speech on the question of national health insurance, took particular pride in stating what the Republican-controlled Congress had done in the passage of the national heart bill. However, he failed to say that in the face of a minimum budget of $6,000,000 necessary to carry out the purposes of that act, the Congress appropriated the small sum of $500,000. In the same address the distinguished Senator from Missouri took particular credit on behalf of the Republican-controlled Congress for the national dental bill, which was passed; and I presume they will go to the country and will tell the people what they have done in connection with the passage of these bills. Yet not a single dime was appropriated to carry out the provisions of the national dental bill.

So I mention these two bills, along with the one we have just acted upon, to show what is going on here in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois realize that in the regular appropriation bill, more than $2,000,000 was appropriated, in addition to the $500,000, for the Heart Institute?

Mr. LUCAS. I have just been telling the Senator what I understand to be the facts of the case.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was indicating to the Senator that he is wrong in his facts, and I am sure he wants the RECORD to be correct.

Mr. LUCAS. If I am wrong, I always want to be corrected. I should like to have the Senator explain that to me again.

Mr. BRIDGES. The National Heart Institute bill was one which I, together with various other Senators, including the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], sponsored.

Prior to the time when that basic legislation was passed, the Federal Security Administration appropriation which was made, included funds for the Public Health Service, of course. There has been appropriated something more than $2,000,000—I do not have the exact figures here—for heart work.

That is in addition to the $500,000 which was appropriated after the Heart Institute bill was passed. So there is substantially more than what the Senator has spoken of—sufficient for a good beginning.

I am hopeful that the next Congress will carry on adequately the fine work this Congress has begun.

Mr. LUCAS. My informant may be wrong in regard to this matter. It intrigued me, the other day, when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] spoke about what had been done. I made an investigation of the situation. Either my figures are wrong or the figures supplied by my informants are wrong, or what the Senator from New Hampshire has said is wrong.

It is my understanding that there was a request for $6,000,000 as the minimum necessary to carry out the purpose of the act, but the Congress appropriated the token sum of $500,000. I do not know anything about any other money the Senator from New Hampshire mentions. If I am wrong I wish to be corrected.

The Senator from Florida is on his feet, and I yield to him.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, both Senators are generally correct in what they have said about this matter, if I may say so.

Beginning last year, the first substantial appropriation was provided, in the appropriation bill, for heart research in the Public Health Service. That was approximately $500,000, and that originated in the Senate.

In the succeeding appropriation bill the House added to it approximately $1,000,000. I believe the total amount was somewhat in excess of $2,000,000, in the regular appropriation bill.

Then there came along the Heart Institute legislation, to which reference has been made, which was bipartisan-sponsored legislation. Then a request for appropriations was made by the Public Health Service. Witnesses appeared and advocated that additional sums of money be appropriated. As a matter of fact, it was stated that it was necessary to have at least $12,000,000 or $15,000,000 with which to get that program appropriately under way, including the program of the making of grants-in-aid to the States, and the like. It was in the late stages of the regular session, and the appropriation which was allowed was for only half a million dollars.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Insofar as the appropriation under the Heart Research Act itself is concerned, the Senator from Illinois is correct in stating that the amount for that purpose—and the Senator from New Hampshire stated nothing to the contrary—in furtherance of the National Heart Institute Act was only, I believe, a net appropriation of $500,000—which was a disappointment to all of us who wanted to see a more adequate program authorized and appropriated for.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that the original money appropriated for heart research work—the first money provided for heart research work in this country—was put in by the Senate Appropriations Committee last year. We started it. Before the Heart Institute bill providing authorization legislation was passed, there was provided in the regular Public Health Service appropriation bill more than $2,000,000 for heart research work. When the Heart Institute bill was passed, additional help was provided.

It is natural now that we have the basic legislation, that all work of this sort should be coordinated under that head. I know that the Senator from Illinois wishes to be fair, and so I know he wishes to state the total amount.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to be fair with the Senator from New Hampshire, as I always wish to be.

What I am complaining about is that the Republican majority in the Congress is attempting to take the credit for the passage of that act; but when those who are interested in the Heart Institute request an appropriation of $6,000,000, only $500,000 is provided. It may be that the $2,000,000 the Senator is talking about is another part of this fund.

Mr. PEPPER. No; it is additional.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Florida says it is not a part of the fund. Of course, under the law they cannot mingle different funds.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to call attention to the fact that a part of this legislation comes under the Public Health Service, and a part of it comes elsewhere. The Public Health Service got over $200,000,000 this year, so the Senator can see that this work is not neglected.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Heart Institute program get the benefit of any of that money?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; under the research provision it can, I believe.

Mr. LUCAS. I seriously doubt that it can, unless the money is earmarked for that purpose. I am talking about a specific appropriation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is worried about the transfer of funds. I have had a little experience, in the last 24 hours, with Mr. Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, as to the transfer of funds. He has taken a Negro cook from St. Elizabeths Hospital and has had him do his private chef work in his office—transferring funds—and now he is defying Congress about it.

So if the Federal Security Administrator can transfer the No. 1 cook from St. Elizabeths Hospital, where they need cooks very badly and where they want additional help, and can use him to cook meals for the big-shot guests he brings into his office, certainly they can transfer other funds.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am surprised that the Senator from New Hampshire is more interested in the question of a Negro cook than he is in this heart work. Certainly he will not put me off the trail by talking about Oscar Ewing. The Senator from New Hampshire can talk about Oscar Ewing and the Negro cook from now until midnight, but let us stick to the subject.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am sticking to the subject. What the Senator from Illinois has been talking about comes under the Federal Security Act; and Mr. Ewing is the head of the Federal Security Administration. If he can go to the length of transferring the outstanding cook from the kitchen of St. Elizabeths Hospital, where more than 2,000 patients are provided meals and where more than 200 diets are maintained, and can bring him to his office, to bake and cook and serve meals for himself and his "big-shot" guests, why, of course he would not be troubled at all by transferring funds between different projects.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President my friend the Senator from New Hampshire is making a wonderful speech about a $2,000 cook who is being transferred from one place to another. I do not pretend to know much about that matter; I am not on that committee. But I know the Senator from New Hampshire is doing that in the interests of economy, certainly.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say he is a $3,200 cook. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. I know the Senator from New Hampshre is speaking in the interest of economy about the $3,200 cook, who occasionally is used in Ewing's office to cook some meals for what the Senator from New Hampshire calls "big shots." I myself never have had any of those meals. I am sorry I have not been down there. The Senator from New Hampshire gives what amounts to an open invitation to go there. Perhaps the Senator has eaten some of those meals.

But I know the only reason why the Senator from New Hampshire brings this matter before the Senate at this late hour is to tell the people of the country that he is interested in having that $3,200 spent efficiently.

When he is talking about efficiency, he can look on the Republican side of the aisle and can look at some of the chairmen of committees where, since the Republicans have been in control of Congress, funds have been spent for the employment of committee investigators and committee staffs from time to time, and the Senator might find that some of those investigators or other committee employees have been doing work other than the work they are paid to do. A great number of these investigators who are, strictly speaking, being paid out of funds appropriated by the Senate for special committee work, may be found doing a lot of private work for Senators and other work that is not special committee work. If the Senator wants to do some investigating along that line, he might start investigating some of the special committees that have been established in the past 2 years, on which hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent for that very purpose.

Now, let me get back to this heart case. [Laughter.] I know Senators on the other side of the aisle do not like to hear this. They would like to get away and go home. We are not going to let them go home for a little while, because we are going to do just a little talking on this side of the aisle. Senators on the other side of the aisle have held the floor for 2 weeks. They have farmed out the time on that side of the aisle, times without number. They have prepared and have had others prepare for them political speeches which they have delivered. At least 12 or 15 vicious political speeches against the administration have been made on the other side of the aisle. Senators on this side of the aisle who were doing the filibustering were perfectly content to let them make those speeches. It was helping them filibuster on the poll-tax issue. The majority party never had any intention of passing the anti-poll-tax bill. Senators know that to be so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No, I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question. I do not want any long speeches. The Senator wants to get home; I know that. He wants to get back to Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that he wants to get home, or that I want to get home?

Mr. LUCAS. I mean the Senator from Nebraska wants to return to his home.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator want to get me to remain here another week?

Mr. LUCAS. I want to stay here another week, if the Senate will do something, but if the majority party is not going to do anything more than it has done so far, they had better go home tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean, if we are not going to do anything more than we have done, or does he mean, more than the Senators on the other side of the aisle are doing?

Mr. LUCAS. I mean, more than the majority party has done until now.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator means, more than what he is doing now?

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no. I mean what the majority party has done until now. This is really the first chance I have had to obtain the floor. I had to wait until all the legislation was passed before I could get the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. But we have not yet passed the pending bill. If the Senator would allow us to proceed we would get a vote on the pending bill and then he could speak as long as he liked.

Mr. LUCAS. This is the first opportunity I have had to speak.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No. I should like to talk to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BRIDGES] for a minute.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand the Senator's statement. It is simply and completely untrue. If he wants to make an argument I think he ought to confine himself to the truth. He could have spoken any time he wanted to speak. No one has at any time been shut off. Nobody has at any time shut off any motion that I know of. Every Senator has been perfectly free to say anything he wanted to say.

Mr. LUCAS. That is, providing he could obtain recognition from the Chair and could get the time. I am surprised that my friend from Ohio would become a little disturbed at what I am saying, because he is usually very calm, cool, and collected. He now almost charges me with being untruthful. I think that is what he said. That is perfectly all right with me. I shall not take offense at this late hour. But the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and I do not know how many other Republican Senators, have made one political speech after another in the past week or 10 days. I charge it was deliberately done for the sole purpose of trying to keep Senators on this side of the aisle from talking a little politics. I make that charge. It was difficult to obtain the floor. Senators on the other side of the aisle would not yield. At any rate, they very seldom yielded. They said, "Oh, no, wait. We have a limited time in which to speak, and we do not want to yield until we finish." Well, of course, by the time they finish, everybody has gone out of the Chamber, and nobody wants to ask them anything.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield, if the Senator is going to talk about the heart program.

Mr. HATCH. No; I want to talk about something else.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for an observation or a question.

Mr. HATCH. My observation simply is that I have been standing on the floor here for about 30 minutes, myself, trying to obtain recognition. I wanted to serve notice that at the conclusion of the remarks by the Senator from Illinois, I intend to seek recognition.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope the Senator gets it. I seriously doubt whether the Chair will recognize him, especially if some Senator rises on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that is exactly the reason I made the statement.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the other day, in making his able address on socialized medicine, during which he got caught between two fires, when he found out for the first time that the Governor of California was strongly endorsing the compulsory insurance features of the health measure, continued his address on the national dental bill. "Oh," he said, "what a great thing it is. What a great thing the Republicans have done, in passing the national dental bill." But not one dime was appropriated for the dental bill. Members of the majority party in the House of Representatives used the economy hatchet on everything, including the dental bill and the heart bill. They almost used it on the European recovery program. They used it on the United Nations organization, in the establishment of its headquarters, until they came back to this special session. When a measure gets to the House, it goes by the wayside. But why do Senators on the other side of the aisle make the kind of speeches they do? It is for the sole purpose of enabling them to go to the country and say, "This is what we did. This is what we did." And yet there is no appropriation of money with which to carry out the measures they passed. It is a sham, that is all. I resent the playing of politics of that kind.

Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I have the floor, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question, but I submit to him that there will be plenty of time.

I should like very much if the Senate would allow us to have a vote on the pending bill. After the vote has been had, we can agree on an hour of adjournment, if possible. We shall then have all night in which to debate, and all the time we want.

Mr. HATCH. I do not seek recognition through the courtesy of the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I said I was not yielding. I asked the Senator to withhold his request to be recognized until we could get a vote on the bill.

Mr. HATCH. I am seeking recognition in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico will be recognized in his own right at the first opportunity.

Mr. WHERRY. I am simply asking the Senate if we may not proceed to a vote on the bill. It has been read the third time. It is ready for the vote. After the vote has been had, we shall be perfectly willing to remain here, and we will not adjourn until Senators have had an opportunity to say everything they want to say. I simply make the request.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois yielded to me for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized. Does he yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HATCH. Do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has been recognized in his own right.

Mr. MURRAY. But, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] yielded to me, to permit me to ask a question, before the Senator from New Mexico sought the floor. Is that not right?

Mr. LUCAS. I endeavored to.

Mr. HATCH. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Montana, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to apologize for not having known of what appears to have been an arrangement between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Montana. The oversight was unintentional. The Chair has recognized in his own right the Senator from New Mexico, who has most graciously agreed to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. Before the Senator from Montana begins, I want to disabuse the mind of the Presiding Officer with reference to any arrangement that I had with the Senator from Montana. The Senator from Montana merely asked me to yield, and I thought I had yielded. The Presiding Officer recognized the Senator from Nebraska before the Senator from Montana could begin.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. In the course of his remarks a few minutes ago he referred to the fact that, among other bills, the Senate has passed a bill setting up a dental research bureau. My understanding is that no funds have been appropriated for the purpose of carrying the act into effect.

Mr. LUCAS. That is my understanding.

Mr. MURRAY. So that nothing can be done with reference to that important program, which is so valuable to our country. The bill was advocated by the American Dental Association.

That bill was proposed by the American Dental Society. It has been before the Senate for many years. I introduced it at least 3 or 4 years ago. It was passed by the Senate at the last session, but when it reached the House it was held up there. It now comes up again at this session. Nothing has been done toward effecting that very important program which means so much to the health of the American people. Nothing can be more important than a program for the study of the causes of dental decay. It is one of the most important things in the province of medicine. It seems to me that some appropriation should have been made for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. I wanted the RECORD to show that there was no appropriation made, and yet the Republicans are claiming credit for the passage of the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New Mexico will yield in order that I may correct the RECORD in connection with the statement made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I think the Senate would be interested to know just what was done.

Mr. HATCH. I yield, if I may do so, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be understood.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, since the question has been raised, I think both the Senate and the country will be interested in the factual information as to what was done by the Eightieth Congress at the last session in regard to appropriations for public health.

The RECORD shows that in connection with venereal diseases Congress appropriated $17,230,000; for tuberculosis, $9,291,000; for assistance to States, general, $13,865,000; for communicable diseases, $7,490,000; for hospital construction—grants—$40,000,000; for administrative expenses, hospital construction, $1,300,000; for hospitals and medical care, $21,443,000; for foreign quarantine service, $3,000,000; for employee health service programs, $592,500; for National Institute of Health, operating expenses, $13,670,000; National Cancer Institute, $14,000,000; construction of research facilities, $5,000,000; commissioned officers, pay, and so forth, $1,886,300; for training for nurses, $350,000; for salaries and expenses, $4,047,700; for Office of International Health Relations, $285,000.

That makes a total of $153,230,500.

In addition to that, Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact that in Public Law 639, of the Eightieth Congress, it is provided, on page 9, as follows:

> For construction of a combined hospital and research building, together with a power plant and distribution facilities, garage, storage facilities, and roads and walks, for the National Institute of Mental Health and for general medical research, including research in cancer and cardiovascular diseases, and for the alteration and repair of existing research facilities and the construction of temporary structures for radioactive research, including acquisition of site or sites and preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the appropriation of $2,650,000 under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1948, and the appropriation of $850,000 to the Public Buildings Administration under the head "National Institute of Mental Health" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948.

In addition, there were contract authorizations in the sum of $25,630,000 for the building of facilities, including the facilities that will be available for heart work.

I also call to the attention of the Senate the fact that in the field of heart diseases alone, in connection with a question raised by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] on page 413 of the hearings before the House Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security, it is shown that the total amount for heart work, in addition to the facilities available, was $1,519,580.

Furthermore, Mr. President, over and above what was provided by the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security, there is also, for cancer research, provided in the funds allotted to the Atomic Energy Commission an additional $5,000,000 in that field.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to say something about a question which seems to me to be of great importance. I am told that the pending bill should be acted upon and should go to the House, and I am perfectly willing to cooperate with the acting majority leader and let the bill be disposed of, if I may be recognized after that has been done.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from New Mexico for his courtesy, and I ask unanimous consent that after the vote on the bill has been taken, the Chair will recognize the Senator from New Mexico without prejudice to the right he now has with regard to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution having been read three times the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) was passed.

PROCEDURE OF THE SENATE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the principal reason I rose and sought recognition was to protest against the procedure of the Senate in meeting, as we have done, under a special call of the President of the United States, to meet a great emergency, and then to be confronted with having to remain in session until 7 o'clock, or perhaps all night long, as we did at the close of the last regular session——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I only want to say that there is no reason to stay here all night long, because, so far as I know, there is no more legislation to be passed by this session of Congress. I understand there is a resolution to be considered, but there is nothing to keep us here unless Senators desire to talk. Of course we are glad to stay and listen to them, but certainly not all night.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Ohio.

I have heretofore expressed my regard for the Senator from Ohio, the high esteem in which I hold him as a man of integrity and honor. If I were to speak at length tonight I think I would choose for a text, if that were proper to be done on the floor of the United States Senate, words from the Republican platform adopted at Philadelphia, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present." Those words appear in the Republican platform of this year, the platform adopted at Philadelphia. Let me repeat them, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present."

Those words were spoken by the Great Emancipator, by the founder, I may say, of the Republican Party, in his annual address to the Congress on December 1, 1862.

I wondered, when I read those words from the Republican platform, if the honorable gentlemen at Philadelphia who adopted those words of the leader of their party understood what they meant, if they knew where they came from, if they knew the occasion upon which they were uttered.

Mr. President, from the actions in this special session of Congress I am utterly convinced that the men who wrote the platform at Philadelphia had no conception and had no idea or understanding of the words of the great founder of their party, who said, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present." Those words were uttered on the occasion of the delivery of his second annual message to the Congress of the United States on December 1, 1862, when he proposed to the Congress a complete solution for the great question of slavery and civil strife which then tore this Nation.

Abraham Lincoln in this message, as great a message of statesmanship as was ever sent to the Congress, talked to his own divided party, and proposed in the message the articles by which he expressed the sincere and fervent hope that civil strife might be ended.

Mr. President, he did not quit there; he continued and said, "The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion." When I read those words, and remembered the circumstances under which they were uttered, and realized that in his day and time—and I hope the Republican Members of this body will listen to me—he said "The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion," I knew that the Republican Congress controlled by his party, had failed to rise high, failed to meet the occasion, and as a consequence of failure to follow the advice of Abraham Lincoln civil strife in this Nation continued for long years, followed by the reign of the carpetbagger in the South.

True it was that in that message Abraham Lincoln proposed a compromise. He said it was a compromise, but he said, "If adopted it will shorten the war, it will end civil strife." Had his advice been heeded, all the terrors and horrors of continued civil strife and of the carpetbag era which followed in the South would not have been experienced.

I ask the Republican Members of the Congress to go back and read the words of Abraham Lincoln which they so glibly quote in their platform, but to which they did not then and they do not now adhere. The Republican Congress then failed to rise to the occasion, it did not meet the occasion, and as a consequence this country suffered further long years of civil strife. They have not risen to meet the occasion today, they have failed to meet it. On every point the majority party of the Congress of the United States has failed as utterly and as miserably as they failed in 1862.

How have they failed? Will anyone on the other side of the Chamber say that they met the housing situation? I listen; I am waiting, and I shall be glad to yield for any Senator on the other side of the the aisle to say, "We have honestly and conscientiously met the housing situation."

Mr. President, there is no response. There is no response because there can be no response, because the failure is here.

Oh, they may smirk, and they may smile, and they may say that the President of the United States was moved by political considerations, and political considerations alone. Very well. Suppose he was. What have they done that was better? Nothing.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] today said he was reminded of the theme I Got Plenty o' Nothing. I was reminded, too, of something else. The Senator from Kentucky is older than I am, but I recall quite well some 25 or 30 years or so ago there was a song, a popular ditty of those days that ran like this:

> You look like nothing.
> You talk like nothing.
> You act like nothing.
> Nothing from nothing leaves you.

Mr. President, the record of this special session of the majority party is that nothing from nothing leaves nothing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to my good friend from California, of whom I am very fond.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the able Senator from New Mexico, who I regret is not going to be with us at the next session, who has retired of his own volition, I believe, that I take it this speech is somewhat in the nature of his swan song to the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, no, not at all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say that I am sure that in the time I have been in Washington the Senator has tried to be eminently fair on the floor of this body. During the time I have been in the Senate I have tried not to be a narrow partisan. But when the Senator, in the eloquence of debate, permits his enthusiasm to run away from him and says that the record of this Congress is—I believe he said "nothing from nothing adds up to nothing"——

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the Senator on reflection realizes that that is not a fact. This Congress cooperated, I believe, more than any other Congress has ever done with a President of the opposition party in the field of foreign affairs, because we recognized there was a great crisis facing the world which transcended narrow partisan lines. We have tried to the best of our ability to let partisan politics stop at the water's edge.

The record of the Eightieth Congress from the day it met up to the present time is replete with instances in which we have cooperated in the field of foreign affairs so that we might present a united American front to the world, and that no group overseas might drive a wedge between us and disrupt this Nation. I do not believe that even in his enthusiasm here tonight the Senator from New Mexico will deny that fact.

Mr. HATCH. Has the Senator from California concluded?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have concluded for the moment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am very happy the Senator from California interrupted me and propounded the question which he did. I am glad indeed that he did so. I am glad of it, Mr. President, because I do not suppose there has been a stronger advocate in the United States Senate, or in the country, of a unified bipartisan program than I have been. I have spoken all over the country in behalf of a united program by which America, your country and my country, sir, would stand with just one front to all the rest of the world.

Mr. President, of course, I have served on the Committee on Foreign Relations and I have cast a favorable vote in that committee every time the committee voted to report out a matter. We have reported out every bill, every measure, every treaty, every agreement by a vote of 13 to 0.

Mr. President, I am happy to say that under the leadership of the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]—and I am sorry the Senator from Michigan as well as the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] are not both present in the Chamber at the moment—we have stood forthrightly and squarely together, not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but as Americans. And I pray God that that may always be.

I trust I have answered the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely want to say that I think at least the Senator will admit then that in the field of foreign policy the Congress has had a record of substantial achievement, one that not even the Senator now himself feels that he is able to criticize so far as foreign policy is concerned.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not criticize; I brag of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that at the proper time—and I do not now want to interrupt the Senator—we can demonstrate that in the field of other legislation the present Congress has had a substantial record.

I am quite willing to agree with the able Senator from New Mexico that there have been some bills passed by the Senate which the other House in its judgment did not feel it could pass. There have been some such bills which I have personally voted for and spoken for on the floor of the Senate of the United States. But under our constitutional system, in order to pass a law it must have the approval of both Houses of the Congress, and the approval of the President, or if he vetoes it, Congress can pass it over his veto. I would far rather have some legislation fail in the Eightieth Congress, or the Eighty-first Congress or the Eighty-second Congress, and have the Congress of the United States carry out its constitutional duty, than to have a Congress which would blindly follow as a rubber stamp and pass everything the Executive might send to the Congress under a "must" program, saying, "You have to pass it," because that is how countries have lost their liberties, and their peoples have found themselves no longer able to maintain themselves as freemen in a free world. That is the path they have followed. Our legislative process may take time. Some of us may become impatient, as I have often become impatient, but in the long run I believe that our constitutional system, with its separation of powers, with its representative system of government, is far better than any other.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I must again completely agree with my friend from California. There is no difference between us at all respecting what he has said. I agree perfectly with what he has just said. But, Mr. President, that is one of the reasons why I have sat here in shocked amazement and listened to Republicans on the other side of the Chamber, such as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], who made a statement upon which I should now like to comment. Is the Senator from Connecticut present in the Chamber? I wish the officers of the Senate would call the Senator from Connecticut to the Chamber. I want to comment just a little bit upon his assertions here that the Congress of the United States did not have information upon which to act; that the Congress had passed a bill with respect to which the President was obliged to make recommendations to us.

Mr. President, may I ask the Secretary to call to the Chamber the Senator from Connecticut?

I have been extremely shocked, Mr. President, when Senators on the other side of the aisle have risen on the floor, as they have done repeatedly, and tried to place blame on the President of the United States in such a manner. Where is the integrity, where is the independence, where is the ability of Senators, that they cannot act, that they cannot draft legislation until the President recommends it to the Congress?

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] the other day made a statement of the kind I have just mentioned. He made such a statement again today. He spoke of some insignificant, some futile bill the Congress passed at the last session, with which I am quite familiar. And then, with regard to another measure, he said the President had not made recommendations with respect to it, and therefore the Congress of the United States was helpless, and the Congress could not possibly act.

I see that the Senator from Connecticut has now entered the Chamber. I was just saying that the Senator had said, with respect to a certain measure, that the President of the United States had not recommended what the Congress should do. So it would seem that all the pitifully weak, insignificant, Republican majority can do is to say, "We cannot act; we do not know how to act. We do not have enough information on which to act."

Why, Mr. President, there is not a housewife in America who does not have information respecting the high cost of living. There is not a man who pays a grocery bill who does not know about the high cost of living. Yet the distinguished Senator from Connecticut says that we must have a special investigation; we must authorize a special committee to go forth and study and bring back a report sometime next February or next March or some other time next year.

I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut wish to have the Senator from New Mexico yield to him?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to be fair. Let me say that I have been criticizing the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am grateful to my distinguished friend for giving me this opportunity. I remember very well that at the adjournment of the regular session in 1947 I had pending in the Senate a resolution calling for an investigation of the price situation and inflation in the United States. I do not recall that any Senator on the Democratic side of the aisle had introduced any such resolution. I do not recall that in the regular session of 1947 there was any action whatsoever from the other side of the aisle looking toward dealing with the subject of high prices. I remember the extreme difficulty I had in getting that resolution through.

It was finally adopted. The best, the broadest, and the most effective grassroots study possible was made on the subject of inflation by the committee appointed under that resolution. We went at it in a completely bipartisan way.

At the end of the hearings which we held all over the country there were many recommendations as to how to deal with the subject of inflation, and in the special session of 1947 the President, in his message, adopted as his own 10 of the recommendations of that committee; and as I recall, seven, and part of the eighth of those recommendations, were put into effect in anti-inflation legislation.

I recall that we enacted a bill which outlined the procedure by virtue of which the administration could lay before the Congress the specific facts and demand action within 15 days. That was the law of the land. Perhaps my friend did not like it; but I do not understand that it is the privilege of the Executive or of any official of the Government to observe only those laws, and operate only under those laws, which he or his party may like. I understand that when legislation is enacted by Congress it becomes the law of the land, and until it is changed everyone from the President down is supposed to observe it, under his constitutional duty.

The other day I stated in my speech, and I reiterate, that the act which was passed in 1947 was a good act. It had some very helpful features. I say again that the President has failed to observe the provisions of that act. Perhaps he has his own good reasons for so doing. I said in my speech, and I reiterate, that had he done so it would have been most helpful to this Congress. Nevertheless, he did not see fit to act upon it. But he comes to us with a message with very general suggestions as to how to deal with inflation.

I believe that if my good friend will examine the Appendix of the RECORD he will find an editorial from the New York Times which I think deals very effectively and very conclusively and ably with the President's program to combat inflation. I refer the Senator to that excellent editorial. The whole effect of the editorial is one of disapproval of the President's recommendations.

Certainly the New York Times is not a Republican newspaper. It is recognized throughout the world as one of the leading newspapers in the world, and its editorial comment has often been quoted by my distinguished friend from New Mexico.

I have no desire at this time to get into an argument with the Senator from New Mexico, much as I would really enjoy it; but since he has raised this point I merely wish to make this comment. I greatly appreciate the opportunity which he has afforded me. He was very desirous of obtaining the floor and keeping it. It is an extremely generous act on his part to yield to me to make this brief comment, and I thank him from my heart.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am most happy to have the remarks of the distinguished and able Senator from Connecticut. I hope he will understand that there was nothing personal in what I said. I have a high respect for the Senator, and I have a very great respect for the New York Times. I presume that I have placed in the RECORD several of its editorials. I do not now recall what editorials I have placed in the RECORD, but I am sure I have placed in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times. I am familiar with the editorial to which the Senator refers, in which the President's program was criticized.

I want Senators on the other side of the aisle to understand that perhaps the President's program was all wrong. What better do they have to offer? Have they offered anything better? The silence is painful, Mr. President. The only thing they have offered is this weak, ineffective, insignificant bill which was passed today.

This is not a challenge from me. It is a challenge from the American Republic, from the people of America. Perhaps the President was wrong on his program when he first proposed it at the call of the special session last year. For the sake of argument, let me agree with the Senators on the other side of the aisle. Perhaps he was wrong in January this year, when he again urged the program. Have they offered anything better? Again the silence is painful, Mr. President.

There was one thing, Mr. President, about which the President was not wrong, and that was that the continued inflationary spiral could bring disaster to all the country. What have Republican Senators done about that? Are they going to adjourn this special session as they adjourned the regular session, without any effective action? Will they go home to the American people and say, "We will let nature take its course?" That is what they are doing. They may offer all the resolutions they wish to provide for a further study. They may beg the question on the platform by saying that Harry Truman killed OPA. Who killed Cock Robin? They will not deceive the American public.

Mr. President, on the 9th day of January of this year, in an effort to get away from partisanship and from party politics, I stood here on the floor of the United States Senate and literally begged Senators on both sides of the aisle to forget party politics. I told them that this was a campaign year; but I said that the American people were more interested in the cost of living than they were in the success of the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. I pleaded with Congress to get together through the policy committees—that was the only thing I could think of—and devise a nonpartisan program.

Then as now, then as on December 1, 1862, when Abraham Lincoln addressed the Congress, the words fell upon deaf ears. Mr. President, Lincoln in that immortal address uttered the words which I have already quoted. I wish Senators would read it, because Abraham Lincoln was one of the greatest Americans this country has ever produced. The wisdom, the philosophy, the sincerity, and the honesty of those words which he addressed to the Congress, had they been heeded, would have meant so much to this country. But he went on, and said:

> As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew.

In 1862 the Congress did not think anew and it did not act anew. As a result, the long years of civil strife continued, and this country was plunged into an era from which it has only in more recent years emerged.

Mr. President, do Republican Senators know what else Abraham Lincoln said at that time? They will be terribly surprised if they will read the words of their own leader, for after he had pointed out all those things, and after he had said:

> The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew.

He added another sentence, the concluding sentence of that paragraph, although it does not appear in the Republican platform of this year. I wonder how many of the Senators on the Republican side of the aisle know what that sentence was. I wonder whether their platform makers knew what it was. I wonder whether they really understood what Abraham Lincoln was talking about, or whether what they said was just glib political baloney—for Abraham Lincoln said in the next sentence, which they did not quote:

> We must first disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country.

The Republican platform committee in Philadelphia did not see fit to add those final words of Lincoln's. They did not see fit to say, "We must first disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country." The Republicans did not disenthrall themselves in 1862, and the Republican Party has not disenthralled itself in 1948. They still cling to "the dogmas of the quiet past," which are "inadequate to the stormy present."

Mr. President, a very good friend of mine came to me just now and said that I should not make these remarks. All I have to say on that point is that I have a deep conviction of the truth of what I am saying. I believe that we must rise to meet the occasion, and I believe the Republican majority has failed to do so. So long as I have breath to speak, regardless of what may occur in the future, I shall stand here on the floor of the Senate of the United States and shall condemn the action of a political party which fails to rise to meet the occasion. I say it regretfully, because the Republican Party does have a great past and it has much to rise to. I say to the Senators on the other side of the aisle that they should stay in session here—I protest against an adjournment—and should give these men an opportunity to come before the Banking and Currency Committee; they should give that opportunity to the labor groups about whom the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] spoke. Who is more interested in the cost of living than the laboring men of America? Yet the committee slams the door in their faces, and says, "We will not hear a word you have to say."

So, Mr. President, I ask the Senators on the other side of the aisle, "Are you rising to meet the occasion?"

Mr. President, I shall not speak longer.

Mr. MURRAY and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

Mr. HATCH. I yield first to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have been listening with great interest to the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico. I agree with him fully that this Congress has failed to do many things that should have been done to meet the situation which confronts our country at this time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield right there, let me say in conclusion—and then I shall yield to any Senator who wishes to be yielded to—that inasmuch as the Senator from Montana has said that this Congress has failed to do some things it should have done, I am reminded in this connection of the Episcopalian Prayer Book, I believe, which says:

> We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done; and there is no health in us.

I yield now to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHERRY, Mr. FERGUSON, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has yielded to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in connection with the saying that many things which should have been done have been left undone, I am reminded that in 1947 there was introduced in the Senate a bill identified as Senate bill 1652, known as the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act. That bill purported to set up a corporation which was to aid the veterans of the country to get into business, and to provide opportunities for them in this country, after their return from the war.

Mr. HATCH. Let me interrupt the Senator from Montana for a moment. I know what he is talking about. I yield now to myself.

Mr. CAPEHART and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, no, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would point out that the Senator from New Mexico has the floor. He yielded at the request of the Senator from Montana, but the floor remains in the right of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MURRAY. But I have not concluded the remarks which I had to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair point out that as between the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Montana, the Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana; but I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. President, if there is any question about that——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no question. The Senator from New Mexico yielded to the Senator from Montana. Later, the Senator from New Mexico said to the Senator from Montana, "I yield now to myself."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, just in case any question is raised, I yield to the Senator from Montana for any observation he may care to make, provided that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not like to interrupt, but as I understand the rules, the Senator from New Mexico may only yield to the Senator from Montana for a question. Is that not correct?

Mr. HATCH. Oh, certainly, if the Senator from Ohio wants to insist on the rule. That is the reason I was inquiring.

Mr. TAFT. I was only interested in not having the Senator from Montana make an entire speech in the time of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I am interested only in straightening out the situation. If I can yield to the Senator without being taken off the floor, I shall do so; if not, I shall reclaim the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from New Mexico making a unanimous-consent request that he be permitted to yield to the Senator from Montana without losing the floor?

Mr. HATCH. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I feel we probably should not observe a very strict interpretation of the rules. I do not object to the distinguished Senator asking the Senator from Montana a question, and he may answer it. The Senator from Montana is my good friend.

Mr. HATCH. No; the Senator from Montana is asking me a question.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no intention here to farm out the time. If there were, I should have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MURRAY. I could have finished long ago.

Mr. HATCH. I reclaim the floor in my own right. I decline to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to conclude the statement I started to make.

Mr. HATCH. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may state that he has no authority to permit the Senator from Montana to conclude a statement, a portion of which the Senator from New Mexico permitted to be made. The Senator from New Mexico having reclaimed the floor, he now holds the floor in his own right and can yield only for a question; which he declines to do.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield for any purpose.

Mr. MURRAY. For any purpose?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I happen to know what is in the mind of the Senator from Montana, so I think I can explain to the Senate exactly what the Senator from Montana is thinking about. Where is the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]? I do not want him to leave. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] will return. I trust someone will see that he is notified.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] placed in the RECORD several months ago a short letter from a distinguished and able resident of my State, Gen. Patrick J. Hurley. General Hurley is a candidate for the United States Senate. I would cast no reflections whatever upon the good general. But the Senator from New Hampshire placed in the RECORD a very interesting letter he had received from General Hurley, in which the general espoused, endorsed, and agreed to support until the end of time, as I recall, a bill which had been introduced in the Senate by the Senator from New Hampshire and several other Senators, including the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. There was no partisanship; it was sponsored by both Republicans and Democrats. It is a good bill. It is a bill, as stated in the letter, to set up for the veterans of America a small RFC by which the veterans could go to an organization financed by the Federal Government, without taxation, to obtain loans. I am not clear about how that could be done without taxation, but it is so asserted. It is a very worth-while measure. When it was called to my attention that the Senator from New Hampshire had inserted in the RECORD the letter from General Hurley, it was stated that he had also included a lengthy dissertation on industrial rehabilitation, farm improvement, parks, highways, and every form of internal improvement in management, including in New Mexico river and harbor development and boat transportation. That was a little amazing to me. Nevertheless, I should like to ride by boat from my town of Clovis to the city of Albuquerque and possibly disembark at a pier in the harbor on the Rio Grande.

I was a little amazed when I read that, and I checked up on the record. I found that previously, quite some time before, Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, who has recently been nominated by his State for the United States Senate, had inserted in the RECORD the same identical matter. He called it the Tennessee plan. I am glad the Senator from New Hampshire is now present. I must say for Representative KEFAUVER that he very frankly disclaimed any credit for originating the plan himself. He stated where it originated. It was set forth in detail in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page after page, as a description of the Tennessee plan. It was the same identical plan which the Senator from New Hampshire had received from my friend, General Hurley, of New Mexico, and which he had placed in the RECORD as the New Mexico plan. That was interesting.

Mr. MURRAY. Also the Montana plan.

Mr. HATCH. I repeat, the bill sponsoring this plan is a good bill. The bill which the Senator from New Hampshire introduced, along with the Senator from Kentucky and other Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, is a very good bill. It was introduced early last year. It went to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have inquired about hearings. None have been held by the committee, none have been asked for. Not a single witness has appeared in behalf of the proposed bill for the veterans of America, the Tennessee plan, and the New Mexico plan.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I am not through. I am a long way from it.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield. In the House of Representatives, not only did Representative KEFAUVER introduce the bill, but I may say at least eight or ten other Representatives introduced the same identical bill. The bills all went to the committee. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there is the letter, which Senators may read if they look it up, inserted by the Senator from New Hampshire, which contains the most enthusiastic praise for that bill by Representative WOLCOTT, chairman of the committee which considered it. I have ever read in my life. According to the chairman of that committee, this particular bill will solve all the problems of the veterans. Yet, the committee, with eight or ten bills pending before it, has not heard a single witness.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. I decline to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a point of order. I want to call the Senator's attention——

Mr. HATCH. I decline to yield for a point of order or for any other purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico continues to decline to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MURRAY. Would it be correct for me to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the bill was sent to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, not to the committee to which he has just referred, and that a few days ago——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must point out that the Senator's observations on that point are not in order. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor, unless he wishes to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. So, Mr. President, it is not possible to call attention to a mistake being made, in order to correct the RECORD.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing for the Senator from Montana to correct my misstatements. I may be wrong regarding some of the details. I shall proceed quickly.

After the Tennessee plan had been introduced, and after the New Mexico plan had been introduced, Senators introduced the Wyoming plan, in the same identical words; they introduced the Delaware plan, in the same identical words, and with the same enthusiastic phrases; and only recently the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] introduced the Montana plan. That is what has aroused the interest of my friend from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in regard to a man who is running for the Senate against the Senator from Montana and who says, with enthusiasm, that the plan is a solution of all the problems of the veterans in the United States.

I am not being facetious, because the Senator from New Hampshire recently introduced the New Hampshire plan, in almost the identical language.

I have never heard so much talk and seen so little accomplishment as there has been in connection with the subject. I had not intended to raise the question——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is speaking about all of these plans——

Mr. HATCH. I do not think I have named all of them. I think there were some others.

Mr. LUCAS. He has talked about a number of plans introduced by various Senators. Did the Senators claim that the plans were their own original plans?

Mr. HATCH. I may say to the Senator that, as a matter of fact, I understood that each Senator who proposed the plan indicated, as will be shown in the RECORD, that it was a magnificent conception which he had dreamed up alone, without any help from anyone else. It is strange, Mr. President, that the idea that the Montana plan, the New Hampshire plan, the New Mexico plan, and all the other plans were couched in identically the same language.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS (S. CON. RES. 63)

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask that it be read and that it receive immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63), as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, August 7, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.
>
> SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the concurrent resolution debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Murray
Barkley	Hill	O'Conor
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Russell
Brooks	Jenner	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Ecton	McGrath	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Umstead
Ferguson	McMahon	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Magnuson	Watkins
Green	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hatch	Millikin	Williams
Hawkes	Moore	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is detained on official business and has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Kansas

[Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] has a general pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

I announce also that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—54

Aiken	Gurney	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hawkes	Revercomb
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bricker	Hill	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hoey	Smith
Brooks	Holland	Sparkman
Butler	Ives	Stennis
Cain	Jenner	Stewart
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Capper	Knowland	Thye
Cooper	Lodge	Tydings
Cordon	McCarthy	Umstead
Donnell	McClellan	Vandenberg
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Ecton	Martin	Wherry
Ellender	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	Williams
Fulbright	Morse	Young

NAYS—18

Barkley	Langer	Magnuson
Connally	Lucas	Murray
Green	McFarland	Pepper
Hatch	McGrath	Taylor
Hayden	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Kilgore	McMahon	Thomas, Utah

NOT VOTING—24

Ball	Flanders	O'Mahoney
Buck	George	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Downey	Maybank	Wagner
Eastland	Myers	White
Feazel	O'Daniel	Wilson

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 222. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the two Houses of Congress until December 31, 1948; and

H. Con. Res. 223. Concurrent resolution authorizing the signing of enrolled bills and joint resolutions following adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask the Chair to lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 222.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 222, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, August 7, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators I will say that this concurrent resolution is identical to the Senate concurrent resolution just adopted by the Senate. It has just come over from the House, and in order to expedite matters I ask now that the Senate concur in it, and after it has been approved I will ask to have reconsidered the vote by which the Senate concurrent resolution was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 222) was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which Senate Concurrent Resolution 63 was just agreed to. That is the concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the two Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move to lay Senate Concurrent Resolution 63 on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask that the Presiding Officer lay down House Concurrent Resolution 223.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 223, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses until December 31, 1948, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS OR COMMITTEES AND TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

On motion of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress until December 31, 1948, the President pro tempore be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

Ordered further, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives subsequent to such adjournment.

ADDITIONAL MILEAGE FOR SENATORS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I ask unanimous consent to report favorably an original resolution and request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 272) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1949, to Senators their additional mileage for the second session of the Eightieth Congress convened in pursuance of the proclamation of the President of the United States of July 15, 1948.

INSERTIONS IN THE APPENDIX OF THE RECORD

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators have asked me whether opportunity will be afforded to make insertions in the final copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will be printed some time after the Congress adjourns.

I now ask unanimous consent that memorial addresses respecting the late Senator Bankhead, of Alabama, may be submitted for insertion in the final copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and also that other memorial addresses may be printed in the final copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is made.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in light of the discussion this afternoon concerning the appropriations for health activities by the Eightieth Congress I have had a statement prepared by the clerk of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which I have also had carefully checked by the clerk of the Appropriations Committee; which gives the over-all figures of the activities covered. The statement is as follows:

Appropriations in the amount of $262,000,000 were granted to the Public Health Service by the Eightieth Congress. In addition, the Public Health Service was granted in excess of $187,000,000 in contract authorizations. These sums cover the wide range of health programs administered by the Public Health Service, including grants for assistance to the States in the control of venereal diseases, tuberculosis, communicable diseases, mental health activities, cancer, and other health-control activities.

The funds also cover grants for the construction of hospital facilities, and provide funds for the construction of research facilities and the conduct of research in heart disease, cancer, mental health, dental health, communicable diseases, and other diseases by the Public Health Service. The funds also cover training of nurses and the salaries and expenses of Public Health Service personnel throughout the United States.

The figures cited above do not, of course, include the appropriations, well in excess of $1,000,000,000, made by the Eightieth Congress to provide proper health facilities and medical care for our American veterans and for the members of our armed services.

NOMINATION OF MAURICE J. TOBIN TO BE SECRETARY OF LABOR

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri on the condition that I do not lose the floor thereby.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield to me without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent to the Senate the nomination of former Gov. Maurice J. Tobin, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor, a position which has been vacant since the death of former Senator and former Secretary Schwellenbach. Of course, we all recognize the fact that unless there are extraordinary circumstances which militate against it, any President has the right to choose the members of his own Cabinet. In that spirit I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination of Governor Tobin to be Secretary of Labor, without the nomination having been referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to which it would ordinarily go.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, while it is usual, of course, to confirm the members of the Cabinet of the President, it is not always done. There is no rule that members of the Cabinet shall be confirmed without their nominations being referred to the committee. Therefore I feel constrained to object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not invoking any rule. I do ask unanimous consent, because the rule provides that a nomination must be sent to a committee, but now that we are about to adjourn until January it seems to me not improper nor out of the ordinary to ask unanimous consent that this nomination to the President's Cabinet, to fill a vacancy which will remain vacant unless the President makes a recess appointment, should be confirmed without referring the nomination to the committee.

Mr. TAFT. I may point out that the President can make a recess appointment. If Congress had not now been in session, he could have made a recess appointment. He can make a recess appointment on Monday. I see no reason to set aside the rule of the Senate in the manner the Senator from Kentucky has suggested.

Subsequently,

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Maurice J. Tobin, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

WARNING BY DR. WILLIAM A. WIRT, OF GARY, IND., OF COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IN 1934

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield, without losing the floor, for an insertion in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the time has come to vindicate a great Indiana educator who gave his life in an effort to warn the people of this Nation of the infiltration of communism into this Government.

His effort was made futile and his life miserable by a faulty and unfair attempt to refute his evidence.

I speak of the late Dr. William A. Wirt, of Gary, Ind.

In 1934 Dr. Wirt warned the Nation of the presence of communism in our Government and his warning was investigated by a special committee of the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks the minority report of the committee.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We cannot join in the majority report. The committee has not met its responsibility as directed by the House in House Resolution 317, enacted by the House of Representatives on March 29, 1934. On the contrary, we report that the committee has by a studied effort deliberately refrained from obtaining the information which it was directed to obtain by such resolution. We further report that the committee has not only deliberately refrained from obtaining such information but has deliberately suppressed the obtaining of such information.

The information which the committee was required to obtain by House Resolution 317 is set forth in section 2 of said resolution. By this section, the committee was required by the House to ascertain two things: First, who told Dr. William A. Wirt that there is a deliberately planned revolution and that certain employees of the Government are attempting to thwart the program of national recovery in the United States; and second, who is connected in any way with said activities, to wit, carrying on a deliberately planned revolution and attempting to thwart the program of national recovery.

The committee, by the vote of the three majority members, deliberately ignored and refused to consider this second requirement. In support of our statement that there were these two requirements upon the committee, we here set forth section 2 of the resolution In doing so, we shall divide this section into subsections A and B. The section is as follows:

"SEC. 2 (subsec. A). The committee is authorized and directed to summon Dr. William A. Wirt, of Gary, Ind., before it, and to require him to reveal the source of statements he has made to the effect that the United States is in process "of a deliberately planned revolution," and to the effect that certain officials or employees of the Government are attempting to thwart the program of national recovery in the United States; and the committee is authorized and directed to bring before it all officials or other persons alleged by Dr. Wirt to have given him said information; or

"Subsec. B. To be connected in any way with said activities, and to examine them as to the truth or falsity of the statements made by Dr. Wirt; and to summon and examine such other witnesses and make such further investigation in connection with such statements and the reasons and persons actuating the same as the committee in its discretion may deem advisable."

The majority members of this committee, by their votes and conduct in the holding of the hearings and by their majority report, deliberately ignored and refused to consider subsection B of section 2 of the resolution. There can be no question but that the committee was required to subpena and call in witnesses to ascertain what, if any, public officials were connected with said activities, to wit, "carrying out a deliberately planned revolution or attempting to thwart the program of a national recovery." Whether or not such people had talked with Dr. Wirt was entirely immaterial.

As proof that our construction of the resolution passed by the House as to the responsibility of the committee to call not only witnesses who talked with Dr. Wirt, but to call any and all others in order to ascertain the true information as to whether or not there is anyone in the Government connected with such said subversive activities, we cite the proceedings in the House of Representatives on pages 5815 to 5817 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 29, 1934.

When this resolution was before the House, Mr. McGugin, of Kansas, took the position that the resolution was ambiguous, and that the committee would use it for the purpose of suppressing truth rather than for the purpose of ascertaining truth. Mr. McGugin said:

"This resolution is a 'cover-up.' It is a cowardly effort to smother the issues presented by the Dr. Wirt letter. This letter of Dr. Wirt does not present a mere personality. It presents the broad issue of whether or not there are those connected with the administration who are committed to philosophies of government wholly contrary to the Republic under the Constitution."

In answer to this statement of Mr. McGugin on the floor of the House, Mr. Byrns, Democratic leader in the House, scorned the statement by Mr. McGugin that the resolution restricted the inquiry to the mere statements of Dr. Wirt. Mr. Byrns, in speaking of the resolution, said:

"It undertakes to direct the committee to bring before it all officials or other persons alleged by Dr. Wirt to have given him this information: 'or to be connected in any way with said activity.'" In addition to that it provides:

"'And to summon and examine such other witnesses and make such further investigation in connection with such statements and the reasons and persons actuating the same as the committee in its discretion may deem advisable.'"

"How much broader could this resolution be made? Talk about its being cowardly. A Democratic Congress, a Democratic committee, I say to the gentlemen, has proposed this investigation to find those persons, if they exist in this administration, who are acting treasonably toward our Government.

"There is no disposition to cover up anything. On the contrary we want brought to the attention of the public and the country those persons who are guilty of that sort of conduct. We want to bring them into the open so that they can be dealt with as the law provides, and also dealt with by the administration as seems necessary and proper under the circumstances.

"Mr. MAPES. Just as a matter of interpretation of the language which was discussed somewhat in the Committee on Rules, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee if it is his interpretation of the last clause of section 2 that this committee will be empowered under that clause to call anyone it sees fit to call, who may have information as to whether or not there are men answering the description of the charges made by Dr. Wirt, in the Government services?

"Mr. BYRNS. I do not think there is any question about it, because it distinctly says, 'such other witnesses and make such further investigation in connection with such statements and the reasons and persons actuating the same as the committee in its discretion may deem advisable.' I do not see how the resolution could possibly have been made broader in its scope."

After the Democratic leader in the House placed this interpretation upon a resolution, introduced by a Democratic Member and presented to the House by a Democratic Rules Committee, the House of Representatives had a right to and did accept and pass the resolution believing in the sincerity of this interpretation by Mr. Byrns.

As soon as the resolution was passed and the committee was appointed by the Speaker, the first act of the committee by the vote of three Democratic members, over the protest and votes of the two minority members, was to pass a resolution limiting the first day's hearing to the testimony of Dr. Wirt with Dr. Wirt's testimony limiting to the specific question of naming the people with whom he talked and setting forth their specific conversation. Thereafter the majority members of the committee, over the protest and vote of the minority members, limited the second day's hearing to the bringing before the committee the six specific witnesses with whom Dr. Wirt talked at a particular party and refused to call any other witnesses that were named by Dr. Wirt in his testimony.

Following the Byrns interpretation of the resolution, to wit, "it undertakes to direct the committee to bring before it all officials or other persons by Dr. Wirt to have given him this information," the committee respected this part of the Byrns' interpretation of the resolution and then at all times completely ignored and disregarded the following part of the Byrns' interpretation which is verbatim a part of the resolution "or to be connected in any way with said activity."

As further evidence that the majority members of the committee used this hearing for the avowed purpose of discrediting the witness, Dr. Wirt, and suppressing the truth with no reasonable desire or effort to obtain the truth, we point out the following:

First. Dr. Wirt was denied the opportunity in his own way to make his opening statement. When the majority members denied to Dr. Wirt this opportunity they denied to him a right and a privilege which has been enjoyed by all of the hundreds and thousands of witnesses who have ever appeared before congressional committees, House and Senate.

Second. It denied to the minority members the right to call a single witness whom they designated or chose to call before the committee. In doing this the committee again repudiated all the precedents of congressional investigations. In doing so the majority members made it inevitable that the proceedings would be a suppression of the truth rather than an uncovering of the truth. As an illustration, what would the Teapot Dome investigation have amounted to if the majority members of the committee investigating those transactions had denied to Senator Walsh, a minority member, the right to call before the committee to examine under oath any and all witnesses whom he chose to call?

The proceedings of a congressional hearing which limit the calling of witnesses to the majority members of the committee exclusively will inevitably suppress justice and truth just as a proceeding in court which would permit only one litigant to call witnesses would produce a perversion of truth.

Not only did the majority members refuse to permit the minority members to call witnesses to determine whether or not there were those in the Government service who were connected in any way with such subversive activities, but they refused to permit the minority members to call witnesses specifically named by Dr. Wirt, which witnesses could give the true testimony as to whether or not Frederick Howe, a high official in the Government, was doing everything within his power to retard the recovery program.

Dr. Wirt specifically said that General Westervelt, a former official in the Agriculture Department had told him (Wirt) that Frederick Howe had made the following statement to him (Westervelt):

"Is there any way by which we can stop feeding them? We are going too slowly. If we could stop feeding them, we would make greater headway toward what we are trying to accomplish."

Of course, this statement standing before the committee upon the testimony of Dr. Wirt that he was told this by General Westervelt is mere hearsay. However, the testimony on this subject directly from General Westervelt and Frederick Howe would be direct testimony and would not be hearsay. The majority in its determined effort to suppress truth chose to leave it as hearsay testimony and refused to call or permit the minority members to call General Westervelt and Mr. Howe before the committee.

There is only one interpretation which can be placed upon this statement of Mr. Howe by General Westervelt and that is "so long as the Government feeds the hungry it will be impossible to accomplish a violent overthrow of Government." It is an axiom of the revolutionist that the people must be made hungry in order to goad them into a violent overthrow of established order.

The refusal of the majority members to permit the minority members to call either Frederick Howe or General Westervelt before the committee to prove or disprove that this statement was made by Mr. Howe leaves but one logical conclusion as to the motive of the majority members of the committee. That conclusion is that they were fearful or believed that the complete truth of this statement would be established, and having been established, every citizen of the land would know that it was the designed purpose of Frederick Howe, consumers' counsel of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, to retard recovery for the purpose of bringing about a revolution. Such proof would have completely substantiated the original statement made by Dr. Wirt.

The minority members made their appeal to the majority members to have Arthur Morgan, H. A. Morgan, and David Lilienthal, Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority; Harold Ickes, Public Works Administrator; and Harry Hopkins, Federal Emergency Relief Administrator, subpenaed to appear before the committee. By their votes the three majority members refused to permit these five public officials to be brought before the committee. The minority members informed the majority members that if they were permitted to bring these witnesses before the committee that they would show the following:

First, that the three Tennessee Valley Authority directors had organized subsidiary corporations with the stock in said corporations to be owned by the Government of the United States and the corporations chartered to engage in the business of producing, processing, and selling farm crops and livestock; manufacturing and selling goods, wares, and merchandise of every description; lending money to any person, firm, or corporation with or without security; borrowing money without limit as to amount and speculating and dealing in the stocks and bonds of any other corporation. The minority members further informed the majority members that it would be disclosed that these three directors in organizing these corporations are proceeding without any authority of law.

The minority members further informed the majority members that if Harold Ickes were subpenaed before the committee that it would be shown that he had taken money from Public Works funds and used it to purchase the stock in such a corporation, and that Harry Hopkins had taken money from the Federal Emergency Relief Fund and used it to purchase stock in another such corporation.

That it would be further disclosed that Harold Ickes and Harry Hopkins with the purchasing of stock with such funds were acting without authority of law. That when it was disclosed that these five Government officials were doing these acts without authority of law that it would then be established that here were five high officials in the executive branch of the Government who were overthrowing the Republic under the Constitution so far as these acts are concerned, because they were deliberately proceeding without any regard for laws enacted by the Congress in accordance with the Constitution of the United States.

Dr. Wirt in his direct testimony brought to the attention of the committee various public statements of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Prof. Rexford G. Tugwell. Among such statements were the following:

"We have a century and more of developments to undo.

"It is, in other words, a logical impossibility to have a planned economy and to have business operating its industries just as it is also impossible to have one with our present constitutional and statutory structure. Modifications in both, so serious as to mean destruction and rebeginning, are required."

He also brought to the attention of the committee that it was the publicly expressed theory of Professor Tugwell that a planned economy required three great changes: first, breaking down the present statutes and constitutions of the Government; second, destroying private business; and, third, destroying the sovereignty of the States, and that Professor Tugwell after setting forth these three requirements in one of his public speeches boldly stated:

"All three of these wholesale changes are required by even a limited acceptance of the planning idea."

These expressed theories of Professor Tugwell were brought to the attention of the committee by Dr. Wirt when he cited to the committee the professor's speech before the American Economic Association on December 28, 1931.

The minority members requested that Professor Tugwell be subpenaed before the committee. Their request was voted down by the three majority members. It is our belief that all will concede that the AAA and the NRA are at least a "limited acceptance of the planning idea." We wanted to ascertain from Professor Tugwell under oath the information as to whether or not as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, he is administering his duties in keeping with his previous expressed ideas, as to the requirements for a limited acceptance of planning. If so, we wanted to know if in the administering of his duties, he is, in fact, doing what he can to break down the present statutes and constitutions of government, to destroy private business as it has heretofore existed, and to destroy the sovereignty of the States. We wanted to know from him if in the administering of his present duties he is attempting to modify business and our present Constitution and statutory structure so as to mean destruction and rebeginning of both business and Government.

The minority Members insisted that they had the right and that it was the duty of the committee to call such officials before the committee under the mandate of the House set forth in subsection B of section 2 of the resolution and as the resolution was interpreted by Mr. Byrnes, the majority leader of the House.

Before the hearings of the committee, Dr. Wirt first appeared and named six people who were with him at a dinner party in Virginia. He related the conversation which was had with these other six people. Thereafter, these six people were called before the committee. They denied that any of them had made the statements which Dr. Wirt had quoted them as having made. These six witnesses told the committee under oath that in a conversation which lasted from 4 to 5 hours Dr. Wirt did all the talking and that the only statement made by any of the remaining 6 was that 1 of the 6, Miss Kneeland, uttered the one sentence which was in substance that she did not believe in restoring the 1926 price level. It must be remembered that it was relatively easy for these six people to tell the same story when that story was confined to the repeating of one sentence offered by one person. Likewise, it must be remembered that it would have been exceedingly difficult for each member of the party to have told exactly what was said by various members present unless their testimony was confined exclusively to the truth.

The majority Members in their report find that the statements made by Dr. Wirt were untrue. For two reasons, we cannot join in this finding of the majority report:

First, we do not believe that there was a 5-hour conversation among seven people in which one person did all the talking with the exception of one of the remaining six uttering one sentence. We believe, that the remaining six in testifying that nothing more was said than one sentence by one of them forces the logical conclusion that they must have said that which Dr. Wirt quoted them as having said. Otherwise, they would have told what they actually did say at this party instead of giving the preposterous and unreasonable testimony that of the entire six all that was said by any of them was one sentence by one person.

Second, that the one sentence which was in substance that Miss Kneeland said that she opposed returning to the 1926 level is in and of itself proof of a determined effort on the part of some connected with the executive department of the Government to thwart the recovery program of the administration. It will be remembered that times without number the President and others high in the administration have offered as the goal of recovery the 1926 price level.

The majority members of the committee in accepting the testimony of these six witnesses and denouncing the testimony of Dr. Wirt disclose their determination in this proceeding to protect and exonerate those who were not in sympathy with traditional American Government under the Constitution.

Be it remembered that from the testimony of these witnesses, it was disclosed by a part of them that they had been members of and contributors to the American Civil Liberties Union. Further it was brought out at this hearing that this was an organization about which the New York State Legislature in 1928 made the following report:

"The American Civil Liberties Union, in the last analysis, is a contributor of all subversive movements. Its propaganda is detrimental to the interests of the State. It attempts not only to protect crime but encourages attacks upon our institutions in every form."

In 1931 a special committee of the House of Representatives made a report which was signed by two Republicans and two Democrats. In this report this House committee quoted this finding of the New York State Legislature and reported the following:

Your committee concurs in the above finding.

It was further disclosed from said witnesses that one of them, Robert Bruere, who now holds an important Government position in the NRA, in connection with the cotton-textile industry, was in 1918 and 1922 an avowed defender of the IWW and a severe critic of the Department of Justice under the Wilson administration for its conduct toward the IWW during the war.

It was further disclosed that another one of these witnesses, David Cushman Coyle, an important official in the Public Works Administration, frequently in public addresses refers to Al Smith and other similar personalities as mere "intellectual casualties of the depression."

Be it further remembered that another one of these witnesses has for years been a news correspondent with Communist newspapers in the United States among the users of his writings; that he is now in the employ of the Soviet Government as a Washington correspondent for the Tass News Agency; and that this agency is owned, controlled, and operated by the Soviet Government.

Yet these are the people—whose preposterous story that in a 5-hour conversation their sole statements consisted of one sentence uttered by one of them—who are protected by the majority report. Not only does the majority report protect them and their statements by placing upon them the stamp of truth, but upon that statement the majority report places the stamp of falsehood upon the testimony of Dr. Wirt.

As further evidence of the determined effort of the majority members of this committee to disregard Dr. Wirt and his testimony even at the cost of defending communism, I refer to this statement in the majority report.

Lawrence Todd is a correspondent for the Tass Agency in Washington, which is the "Associated Press" of the Soviet Union.

This statement in the majority report shows that the majority members are not only determined to protect this writer, who for many years wrote for Communist newspapers in the United States and who is now employed as correspondent for the Soviet Government, but are willing to do so by boldly taking respectability from the Associated Press of the United States and lending it to the subversive communistic propaganda agency of the Tass Service.

The evidence disclosed that the Tass Agency is owned and financed by the Soviet Government. Such was the testimony before the committee by Mr. Todd, yet the majority members in their report would undertake to draw a similarity between the Tass Agency and the Associated Press. Here is the difference. The Associated Press is privately owned and operated by various newspapers of the United States. It is a news agency entirely independent of the Government of the United States and operates under no governmental censorship. It operates under the freedom of the press guaranty of the Constitution of the United States, while the Tass Agency, owned and controlled by the Soviet Government, is in no sense an honest news agency but is a mere communistic propaganda agency of the Soviet Government.

The majority report of this committee is in perfect keeping with what apparently was a determined effort throughout the entire proceedings to discredit Dr. Wirt and to suppress the truth.

In support of this statement, we offer the following:

First, the Speaker of the House was reported in the press as having said that if Dr. Wirt would not testify that he would be put in jail. That statement was made before Dr. Wirt appeared before the committee and when he had made no statement that he would not testify. We submit that such a statement could serve no purpose other than either to intimidate or discredit the witness previous to his appearance before the committee.

Second, the statement was made on the floor of the House by the chairman of the committee that Dr. Wirt had been in jail for disloyalty during the war. This statement was not true and was not retracted until 5 days after the statement was made.

Third, a day or two after Dr. Wirt testified, the Secretary of the Interior was reported in the press as having stated that Dr. Wirt had endeavored wrongfully to obtain Public Works money for his own selfish benefit. The statement was refuted by Dr. Wirt. It was refuted by those who made application for the loan with the statement that Dr. Wirt has no interest whatever in the making of the application or obtaining favorable consideration of it.

An effort has been made to discredit this hearing and the testimony of Dr. Wirt by inferring that the people with whom he conversed were minor personalities and of no consequence in the administration. This is not true. Five of them hold important key positions in various Departments of the Government and are the oracles of those who are controlling Government. The sixth one is an important and direct employee of the Soviet Government. It is significant that these five people holding key positions in our Government should be in such close social relationship with Lawrence Todd, one of the foremost propaganda agents of the Soviet Government in America. Let us call the roll of these five who hold key positions in the Government.

First, Miss Barrows is an educational expert in the Department of the Interior. It is through the schools that frequently insidious propaganda is disseminated.

Second, Miss Kneeland is head of the Bureau of Home Economics in the Agriculture Department. Her department puts out scores of bulletins which furnish the ideal means of disseminating propaganda. From her own testimony she is bitterly opposed to returning to the 1926 level. Supposedly the Agriculture Department is to work for the welfare of the American farmers. There is not a farmer in a thousand but who would be immeasurably pleased to trade present conditions for 1926 conditions. Wheat was then $1.40 a bushel. It is now worth 75 cents a bushel. While it is supposedly her duty to work for the interest of the farmers, yet Bulletin 296, published by her department, advocates a reduction in the consumption of wheat. This bulletin has been given wide publicity. Everyone who reads it is being propagandized to consume less wheat which is produced by the American farmers. From her testimony, it is obviously her primary interest to socialize America rather than to increase the prosperity of the farmers.

Miss Taylor, from her testimony, is editor in chief of a publication which is put out by the office of the Consumers' Counsel of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. From her testimony, she admitted that this magazine contained propaganda advocating planned agriculture. It is significant that

while this publication advocates planned agriculture nothing is said in the publication about the fact that Dr. Tugwell has expressed the views that we cannot have even a "limited acceptance of planning" without changing constitutions and laws once and for all, destroying business as we have known it, and destroying the sovereignty of the Government. On the contrary, these requirements for a planned agriculture are insidiously kept away from the farmers in this publication while the farmers are being propagandized with the thought that they will receive profits from a planned agriculture.

It is perfectly obvious that Miss Kneeland and Miss Taylor, in charge of these propaganda agencies, are merely reflecting the true views of Secretary Wallace, Assistant Secretary Tugwell, Jerome Frank, counsel for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. These men whose thoughts they reflect are in complete control of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Another witness was Robert Bruere. From his testimony, it was disclosed that he was a defender of the IWW and a critic of the Department of Justice under the Wilson administration for its attitude toward the IWW and their war conduct. He is now in a key position in the NRA. In his position he has much control over the cotton-textile industry.

The fifth witness, David Cushman Coyle, holds an important key position in the office of the Public Works Administration. He is obviously an oracle of the Public Works Administrator, Secretary Ickes. He is constantly making public speeches propagandizing for the New Deal. His views are reflected in his recent speech in Washington before the Nurses' Association. In that speech, among other things, the press reports him as having said:

"Everything which we were taught in school is actually wrong. Thrift is no longer a virtue. Saving for a rainy day makes it rain all the harder."

Considering the positions which these five witnesses hold, it is obviously clear that they typify and reflect the views of superiors who are in direct control of the Government. This is a fact which would have been completely substantiated by direct testimony except that the majority members of the committee voted down the request of the minority members to call before the committee their immediate superiors, to wit, Secretary Wallace; Assistant Secretary Tugwell; Jerome Frank, counsel for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration; Frederick Howe, consumers' counsel of the AAA; Secretary of the Interior Ickes; and Donald Richberg, counsel for the NRA.

The charges of Dr. William A. Wirt, which formed the basis of this inquiry, may be summarized as follows:

Certain persons in positions of influence and authority in the administration hold these beliefs:

The depression demonstrates that the political, economical, and social organization of our country, heretofore accepted as the embodiment of American traditions and ideals, is inadequate to insure the temporal well-being and security of the people. The concept that American men and women constitute a free people must be scrapped.

In its stead must be erected a planned economy wherein the everyday activities of American citizens in agriculture, industry, transportation, merchandising, and other pursuits, including labor, are controlled and regimented by the Government, functioning through numerous bureaus. It necessarily follows that remuneration for such activities and the wealth invested therein likewise are in the control of the Government, even if the naked title to such properties is left in the present owners.

Inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States is the keystone of the arch supporting the concept of a free people, its provisions must be disregarded and allowed to fall into desuetude.

Dr. Wirt further charges that these persons holding the opinions above set forth are using their positions in the administration to draft measures, ostensibly temporary in character and purported to accelerate present recovery, which in effect operate to further the regimented economy plan. Such measures necessarily retard immediate economic improvement, which is all right with the economic planners, because the more serious the plight of the people the more readily will they submit to the proposed new order.

No suggestion was advanced that any such persons contemplate physical violence or that the established agencies of the Government be forcibly overthrown.

This, in substance, is the contention of Dr. Wirt, the truth of which this committee was created to probe. The committee limited its activities to an attempt to ascertain the sources of information upon which Dr. Wirt based his statement.

This was an utterly futile proceeding. Every well-informed person knows from the speeches, published writings, and radio addresses of Government officials constituting what is commonly known as the "brain trust" that their political, economic, and social philosophy is substantially as set forth by Dr. Wirt.

This committee is not authorized to sit in judgment upon the relative merits of the old order of a free people or a Government-regulated mode of American life. Under a broad, common-sense construction of the resolution creating the committee, we were commissioned to investigate whether Government officials, believing in a socialized American order, were so functioning as to facilitate its establishment. In short, what are the purposes of the "brain trust" and what are they doing about it?

This the American people are entitled to know. This it was not only the privilege but the duty of the committee to ascertain.

Unfortunately, the committee booted away its opportunity.

We therefore take the position that the committee has not performed its duties under the resolution and that the committee should be directed by the House to proceed to complete its duties under the resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have concluded the reading of the minority report and I should like to suggest to the able Senator from Michigan that upon the resumption of public hearings by his committee on the matter of the loyalty program in our Government that he summon those named in this report as witnesses.

Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. MALONE, Mr. GURNEY, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to Senators who are now on their feet, for insertions in the RECORD, without losing the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I object.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I decline to yield. There has been an objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Michigan may yield to me, without losing the floor, in order that I may present certain routine Army nominations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

THE IRON CURTAIN AT HOME

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak this evening on The Iron Curtain at Home.

The case of William W. Remington and the recent hearings of the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, has brought into bold relief certain fundamental issues which I believe deserve the attention of the Senate at this time.

The subcommittee, as Members of the Senate know, is charged with the responsibility of examining into the efficiency of governmental operations in the executive departments. In the course of one such examination undertaken some months ago into the Government's export-control program, it was brought to our attention that one William W. Remington, a high official in the Office of International Trade, which administers the strategically vital export-control program, had been under surveillance by the FBI, and in fact had been called before a Federal grand jury which was investigating subversive elements in this country.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Am I to understand, Mr. President, that the Senator desires to make this speech without yielding at any point?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I decline to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. That information, and the development of other information including the fact that Remington had held other governmental positions of trust while under surveillance, and the fact that dismissal proceedings ultimately were brought against him under the loyalty program, suggested to our committee a question as to how the program of loyalty checks, designed to weed out of Government service persons suspected of subversive activity or associations, was working out in practice.

It seemed inconceivable that in an efficiently operating loyalty program an individual whose loyalty was apparently suspected could have held three important governmental positions, and been elevated to one which involved the regular handling of secret and vital information and data.

The committee was unanimous in the belief that the circumstances under which such a thing could occur should be brought to light and examined fully to determine, first, the efficiency with which the loyalty-check program for which $11,000,000 had been appropriated was being carried out; and second, whether existing law and present rules, policies, and procedures of administrative departments are adequate and sufficient to protect the public interests in enabling administrative officials to prevent the infiltration into the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal to it.

I should observe that the committee approached its inquiry into the loyalty program, Mr. Remington being a case in point, with certain fixed conceptions regarding that program. The theory upon which the committee assumes the loyalty program to be based does not contemplate as necessary to its operation the indictment or conviction of an individual under law for a disloyal act. A special category of responsibility is set up under the loyalty program, and any individual failing to meet its tests is declared ineligible to hold Federal governmental office of trust.

An analogy with the operation of grand juries is apt. A grand jury may return an indictment if it believes a person should be tried for a specific crime. It may also issue presentments which do not call for prosecution, but advise the public of any facts developed in its investigation which may show the public interest to have been threatened. Dismissals from public service under the loyalty program amount to a presentment, since they do not require the evidence of criminality upon which an indictment is based.

Incidentally, the fact that dismissal proceedings eventually were brought against Remington suggests the possibility that the grand jury before which he appeared would have been justified in making a presentment on its own behalf concerning him.

I wish to emphasize that our committee did not feel a responsibility to determine for itself the loyalty or disloyalty of Mr. Remington. The facts in that respect were incidental to the fact that his loyalty was admittedly suspect while being retained and advanced in governmental office, and to the question of how such retention and advancement was possible under an efficiently operating loyalty program.

It was necessary to place in the record the nature of the charges which had been made against Mr. Remington and presumably were known or should have been known to the department in which he was employed. In fairness to Mr. Remington, the committee provided him with a forum in which to reply to the charges. Beyond the facts which were incident to his case the committee conscientiously sought to avoid the incrimination of any individual for alleged subversive activities. Revelations of that nature are the proper province of other authorities.

In pursuit of its inquiry into the operation of the loyalty program as it affected Mr. Remington, the committee requested from various executive departments certain information relating to him. It was seeking to determine whether, and when, information bearing upon his loyalty had been received by any of those departments, had been communicated to other departments for their guidance, or had been acted upon. Among the departments requested to provide that information were the Navy Department, which had requested Mr. Remington to relinquish his Reserve commission on grounds incompletely stated but now presumed to concern his loyalty; the Commerce Department, in which he was employed; and the Justice Department, which had been investigating his alleged espionage activities in the same period that he was moving about and advancing in governmental service.

Each of these departments has refused to comply with the committee's request on the ground that it would violate a directive from the President.

The committee was not unaware of the directive in question at the time it made its requests for information, nor of the directive's purpose "to preserve the confidential character and sources of information." The committee specifically requested that it not be furnished with information which might compromise confidential sources of information or investigative techniques. It was concerned only with the question of how and when checks made upon Remington under the loyalty program had been acted upon.

Notwithstanding those facts, the position of the departments has been affirmed in a remarkable public statement by the President, which involved the unusual permission for direct quotation.

That refusal of cooperation has brought the committee to a point at which it can no longer proceed with public hearings in this case.

This does not mean that the committee has closed the case. The existence of a ruling which permits any departmental subordinate to withhold from a duly authorized committee of Congress necessary information in the cloak of loyalty restrictions will not prevent our committee from proceeding further.

It is our unanimous determination to attempt, by every legal means, to obtain the true facts regarding the administration of the loyalty program, which is the vital concern of every American citizen.

The significance of the case does not rest at that point, either. It is a significant case because the elements which have presently brought public hearings by the committee to a standstill are by no means a new or unique development in the recent history of governmental operations.

What I have just related is not an isolated instance. It is only the most recent and immediate of a long series of deliberate blockages. I may say here that the immigration subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee in the last day has been denied papers and proceedings and records of the State Department. So when I say the case I have been discussing is the most recent one, actually there is another of equally recent date. Throughout the entire executive branch there is, and long has been, an increasing tendency on the part of officials to conduct their affairs in secret, and to regard information as something to be withheld from the public, the press, and the Congress of the United States, including both Houses. Only those who work in Washington and whose daily task requires a free access to information, can grasp the lengths to which this obsession for executive secrecy has gone.

I want, here and now, to analyze this development and show something of the spread of this day-to-day practice of strangling information. And I say also, here and now, that if the Congress does not meet this situation head on, and press the issue until it is resolved, then the future of free, representative government is dark indeed. People must be able to trust their Government. In some way the facts must be available to the public. Somehow the truth must be told. And the truth is not being told now.

How is it possible that suppression of information on such a wide scale can be accomplished? The reason is the enormous accretion of power in the executive branch. Let me show briefly how this came about.

More than a generation ago, Congress began delegating powers to independent agencies. The reason for this was the growing complexity of our economic and social life. There was simply too much for any Congress to keep up with. The delegation of this power was not made without apprehension; and, in many instances, as in the case of the Tariff Commission, various housing and financial agencies, and many others, Congress sought to perpetuate the system of checks and balances by making direct report by the agencies to Congress a statutory obligation.

Then came the crash of 1929 and the depression. The emergency was so acute, the pressure was so intense, that grants of power and great sums of money were voted to the Executive simply because somebody had to act, and act quickly. Large sums of money were appropriated directly to the President, so that he might use them without any record whatever.

Now began the era when multitudes were living on doles, where subsidies became the instrument of experiment and manipulation of Federal policy extending to the most distant village and farm. To administer this policy, executive agencies multiplied and the number of executive employees mounted into the millions. That had to be. Today, 14,200,000 persons are receiving regular checks from the Federal Government. Every time you impose a regulation of Nation-wide scope, you must see to its enforcement, and enforcement always means more money, more technicians and administrators, and more clerks by the thousands. I do not say that all of these regulations were evil. I do say that there was doubly a necessity for Congress to know what was going on.

Now comes the first obstruction to information. A sizable contingent of the New Dealers were committed from the start to the idea of a planned economy. There was no such unanimity of mind in Congress, however uncertain individual Senators and Representatives might be about the problems of the hour. So, very early, there came a difference between the Executive and the Legislature of a very different nature than that of traditional rivalry. The New Dealers were going to accomplish a peaceful revolution, and they did not want to answer any more questions than they had to—either to Congress or anybody else. Coincidental with this development came the installation of public relations and publicity men on an enormous scale, for the agencies had made the obvious discovery that secretaries for information were just as useful for twisting information and keeping it back as they were for giving it out. Eventually more than 45,000 of these publicity people went on the executive pay roll at a cost of $74,000,000, as of 1947. Since then we have

not been able to obtain the figures. Gone were the days when a cub reporter could buttonhole anybody in sight. All sorts of mazes and catch-alls for news and information were set up, and it took an experienced and industrious reporter to master the bypaths in this labyrinth.

In the wake of the first New Dealers came people with every sort of panacea and program, the Communists included. From the information available, I deduce that the Communists got their first foothold in the Department of Agriculture, and spread from there to other agencies. Power was accumulating fast, and the Communists were eager to get their hands on some of it, not overlooking the advantages of a Federal meal ticket, also. I do not want to imply that the Communists are the only problem. They are a real problem, all right; but they are only a part of a bigger one. Somehow or other we shall find a way to get the Communists and the fellow travelers out of the Government, but a much greater problem is that of the concentration of power in the Executive.

Gradually, here a little, there a little, now a big chunk, now a small piece, this great power was built up. As the power grows, the question becomes more pressing on the Executive: How much shall Congress and the people be told?

At this stage, after the middle 1930's, the picture in Washington began to be colored by the situation abroad—the aggressions of Hitler, the invasion of Ethiopia, the Spanish civil war, and the military expansion of Japan. I do not propose to go back to the old debate over intervention. I simply want to recall a fact which all will concede: That the division of opinion in the country over this issue was very broad and deep. Because opposition to Mr. Roosevelt was so intense, he adopted a devious course in carrying out his objectives in his foreign policy. Many of his supporters freely admit this now but maintain that he had no other choice. That is the defense. They say that he saw what the country must do where others could not see it, and that, because of their obtuseness, he had to work his will by strategem and maneuver. So the practice of withholding vital information grew. This policy of concealment was maintained consistently up to Pearl Harbor. Then, with our entry into the war, secrecy in many things became military necessity.

Now observe for a moment: The President had already acquired many new powers during the depression years. The addition of the special war powers and the constitutional power of the Commander in Chief sufficed to turn the White House into the GHQ of the world. The enormous economic resources of the United States and the President's power to control them made his decisions practically final in a great part of the Allied world.

The war and the necessary drive for victory provided the centrifugal force that kept the power firmly centered, however widespread the delegation of the power had to be.

The result was that a sort of political-military hierachy was built up, an entirely new bureaucracy that tended to bypass many of the executive agencies and center itself in the White House, the State Department and Military Establishment. The Bureau of the Budget was taken from the Treasury in 1939 and attached to the White House. It became a master planner of new types of executive machinery. The State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee served to bind foreign policy and the military ever more closely to the President and an ever-increasing number of confidential agents and functionaries, of whom Mr. Harry Hopkins was the chief, made their headquarters and did their daily work in the White House. What these people said and did was secret, to be revealed to Congress, the press, and the people only if it seemed expedient.

If an increase in the power of the Executive was inescapable, if administrative law was to crowd the courts to an increasing degree, it stood to reason that the only check to maintain the balance of power lay in Congress and that Congress would have to have a day-by-day access to information about what was being done. Such access was not provided. The executive branch grew and the tendency to suppress information grew with it.

Suddenly, in April 1945, President Roosevelt died and Mr. Truman succeeded him. Four months later the fighting stopped. Some people supposed that the era of secrecy would end with the fighting. But it just did not. Undertaken in peace and consolidated in war, the concentration of power and the secrecy to protect it remained. Mr. Truman, while a Senator, had been intensely critical of this secrecy. I have some personal knowledge of that, having served on the War Investigating Committee. I knew how he felt about it. But when he became President he became the willing prisoner and mouthpiece of this power clique. The hierarchy which had carried out the decisions made in the White House were still in their jobs and they did not propose that either their actions or those of the President should be looked at or scrutinized.

The perfect illustration of this was the congressional investigation of Pearl Harbor which began in the autumn of 1945 after the fighting was over. I was a member of that investigating committee and I shall never forget the experience nor the roadblocks that were put in our way. Hearings were held for 70 days and a record of 10,000,000 words was accumulated, but from beginning to end vital documents were withheld, crucial witnesses declined to appear and, under pressure, other witnesses altered their testimony—everywhere secrecy and suppression.

Presently, when the soft policy toward Russia was abandoned and the get-tough policy adopted, the arguments for secrecy were reenforced. A strange picture. There stood this political-military hierarchy, centered in the White House, there was the labyrinth of agencies with all the functionaries, Communists, and fellow travelers included, using information for their own purposes, keeping it from others.

Mr. President, let me show you a piece of this labyrinth. I have spoken of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee. Back in November 1944, Secretary of War Stimson complained to Secretary Hull that State Department officials were going directly to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on questions with military implications. Mr. Stimson thought such matters should be handled through the War and Navy Department offices. Mr. Hull suggested that the three secretaries get up a committee and a staff to handle these matters. This was the genesis of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee and, with the addition of Air Force representation it exists today. It has been a powerful policy arm. One of its creations was the Security Advisory Board, an office now housed in the State Department. A little over a year ago this Security Advisory Board became involved in an attempt to impose the most elaborate rules of secrecy this Government has ever known.

Early in 1947 a young man named Hamilton Robinson was appointed Chairman of this Security Advisory Board. Who was Robinson? He was a young Wall Street lawyer with a most socially correct background of education at Princeton and the Yale Law School. During the war he rose to the rank of colonel as a management engineer under General Somervell. After the war was over, Robinson looked around, as he said, for something constructive to do. He found this constructive work in the State Department and was promptly made Chairman of the Security Advisory Board and put to work in the administration of the loyalty order. Now, I want to show you how constructive Mr. Robinson could be in systematizing the suppression of information.

President Truman issued the loyalty order on March 21, 1947. Buried down in the order is a section labeled "Miscellaneous." Let me read it to you:

The Security Advisory Board of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee shall draft rules applicable to the handling and transmission of confidential documents and other documents which should not be publicly disclosed and upon approval by the President such rules shall constitute the minimum standards for the handling and transmission of such documents and information and shall be applicable to all—

Observe the phrase, to all—

departments and agencies of the executive branch.

The statute on which the President based the loyalty order is the Civil Service Act which permits him to draw up rules for determining the fitness of candidates for civil-service jobs. You will search the statute and the Constitution in vain for any clause or phrase which permits the President to initiate a censorship, yet that is exactly what he did.

Robinson was assisted in his task of drawing up consorship regulations by two men from the Military Establishment. Col. Charles Blakeney of Army Intelligence, and Commander Lichliter, of Navy Intelligence. In making a draft of rules for secrecy the collaborators draw heavily on already existent service regulations for the handling of confidential matter. In other words, the instructions which are supposed to guide a military commander in keeping military secrets were turned to civilian use.

Eventually an elaborate code was drawn up and distributed to the heads of the more than 50 executive departments and agencies. Let me read the heading. It is very explicit:

Preliminary draft: Minimum standards for the handling and transmission of classified information in executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government. (Issued pursuant to Executive Order 9835.) Purpose: These rules constitute minimum standards for the handling and transmission of confidential documents and other documents and information which should not be publicly disclosed and are applicable to all departments and agencies of the executive branch.

Permit me to read one more section, the most remarkable of all:

The term "confidential" as used herein applies to information the unauthorized disclosure of which, although not endangering the national security—

I want to stress those words—

would be prejudicial to the interests or prestige of the Nation or any governmental activity thereof—

Mark you, Mr. President, I am reading these words from that order—

or would cause unwarranted injury to an individual or would cause serious administrative embarrassment or difficulty, or would be of advantage to a foreign nation.

Administrative embarrassment. What a prospect for a bureaucrat. Every executive employee, from the humblest clerk to the most powerful administrator, would be free thereafter from any fear of prying or discovery. At long last the executive branch would be impregnably buttressed against Congress and the people.

I have found no record of any department or agency entering a protest at this "constructive work" of Mr. Robinson's. I can find no record anywhere of any official suggestion that, if certain documents had to be kept confidential, the problem be taken to Congress and there thrashed out. No intimation of any kind was made public, save for the original publication of the President's order in the Federal Register. No one knew anything about it until early in October last year, 1947. Then a reporter named Nat Finney, of the Washington bureau of the Minneapolis Tribune, overheard some employees of the Veterans' Administration discussing a censorship order which had just been imposed in their agency. Finney followed up the lead, discovered Robinson, and asked for a copy of the censorship rules. Robinson refused to give it. Finney got hold of a copy elsewhere, wrote a series of stories and published them.

This exploded the works. Under Secretary of State Robert Lovett authorized the publication of a memorandum saying that "these standards merely represent a codification of existing practices." This could only mean that by a sort of unofficial understanding a censorship was already in force. The State Department's "Directory of Committees," which listed Robinson and his board, a manual seemingly as innocuous as a phone book was labeled "Restricted."

Right at this point Representative KEATING wrote to President Truman about the press exposure and asked for details. The President made a strange reply. "I have seen the article to which you refer," he wrote, "but have never heard of the program to which the article refers." In other words, the President all but denied that he had ever read the Executive order which he had signed. It also revealed a strange lapse of memory in the White House offices, if Mr. Finney's testimony at the investigation by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is to be taken seriously.

My first feeling—

Said Mr. Finney—

about what I uncovered was that it was the result of the misguided zeal of relatively subordinate members of the administration. With that in mind, I took the information I had, documents and all, to Mr. Charles G. Ross, the President's press secretary, and Mr. Ross agreed to call the matter to Mr. Truman's attention. Mr. Ross told me that, so far as he knew, the President had no close knowledge of the matter. I sent Mr. Ross a one-page memorandum, presumably for the President's attention, stating the objections to the proposal. Frankly I expected that Mr. Truman would put a stop to the thing and that would be the end of it.

But it was not the end of it. When the question was put to the President at a press conference last November, he was enraged. What did reporters mean, he asked, by taking fragmentary bits of information to build straw men and then knocking them down?

Last Thursday the President denounced the congressional investigation into loyalty as a "red herring," and he allowed himself to be quoted, to distract people's attention, and said that "The public hearings now under way serve no useful purpose." But he will not surrender the records that would give the answer "Yes" or "No." Nine months ago he pushed aside all questions of his censorship scheme. That was a straw man. Now, another instance is a "red herring." Who thought up the idea of this streamlined gag rule? We do not know. What is the true reason for withholding the records in the loyalty investigation? We do not know.

Mr. Robinson was summoned to testify before the House committee. His testimony was far from clear. Mr. Finney, the reporter who testified later on March 10, 1948, observed this fact.

I note—

Said Mr. Finney—

that he says he did not say that public officials should have the power to decide what the public was to be told and what it was not to be told. He did not tell the truth about this on your record. He plainly said to me that he believed public officials should have such power to give or withhold information, deciding what the public should be told, and what it should not be told, and that the formal establishment of such power for public officials was the purpose of the so-called minimum standards by the Security Advisory Board.

The Board maintained that the draft had been distributed for inspection and suggestion only. It was said that the phrase about administrative embarrassment had been struck out and that, anyhow, the censorship could not be in force until the President approved the final draft. Why then did Mr. Lovett say that the draft merely codified existing practice?

Under these rules of secrecy who, outside, could tell what was secret and what was not? No one, no Senator, no Member of Congress, nor any reporter could know all the types and kinds of information the agency might have. By a stroke of magnificent irony, Mr. Robinson found it expedient to resign from the State Department, so great was the storm of disapproval, while Mr. Finney was awarded the Pulitzer prize for his fine scoop, but these devclopments do not solve the mystery nor the threat of this censorship. The Secretary of the Security Advisory Board assured the House Committee that action on the regulations would be suspended until the investigation was complete. The Eightieth Congress is about to adjourn; the House investigation is over. Are those rules now in force? Has the President approved the draft? We do not know, nor will we know until some problem arises in Congress and needed information is withheld or until some reporter comes up against a blank wall in his search for facts.

What is at the bottom of all this? Within the space of 30 days Dr. Studebaker, the recently resigned Commissioner of Education, has declared—and it is now in the official record of the Senate and the Congress—that pressure was put on him to tone down a speech on communism. Almost simultaneously Luther Evans, Head of the Library of Congress, wrathfully told the National Association of State Librarians that the Government was trying to dragoon him into restricting library material heretofore free to all.

Dr. Evans said:

There seems to be a tendency among bureaucrats, particularly buresucrats who are concerned with the armed services, to keep away from the public, and even scholars, information which might in any way be misconstrued if published, or which might by any chance make it more difficult to have their way free of the annoyances of public opinion or the constituted repreesentatives of the people in Congress.

Secrecy, suppression, restriction on every hand. The Executive withholds from Congress FBI reports on Communists in government while the Library of Congress is urged not to let the Russians have access to what everybody else can see.

The attempt to impose a censorship on a wholesale basis has been underscored again and again by secrecy and censorship in individual instances. This was the case with the renewal of the President's authority to make reciprocal trade agreements.

Before an agreement with any country is made the President must give public notice of what he is about to do so that any interested American businessman, manufacturer, or exporter whose interests are affected shall have a chance to present his figures and plead his case.

A committee appointed by the President analyzes the testimony given by

these businessmen and then makes recommendations to the President. This committee keeps a record of its discussions in a secret minute book.

Now in the past the authority to make tariff revisions has been limited to terms of 3 years. At the end of such a term the President must come back to Congress for a renewal of the power. The 3-year term expired this year and a few weeks ago, in May 1948, a bill for renewal came before the Finance Committee of the Senate.

While deliberating on the case the chairman of the Finance Committee asked Mr. Clayton, the special adviser to the Secretary of State, to produce the minute book—that is the minute book of this committee. He refused. Why? Because, said Mr. Clayton, these minutes "have considerable confidential material in them, which business interests furnished on the understanding that the material would be kept confidential because it is private information which they do not wish their competitors to see."

Well, could the clerk of the Senate Finance Committee see the minute book? "I don't think so," said Mr. Clayton. Could the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee see the minute book? "I am not authorized to make it available," said Mr. Clayton.

Well, why not? Mr. Clayton wrote a letter on May 5 saying why not. "The President," said Mr. Clayton, "is the one responsible for decisions on tariffs under the act and is entitled to the opinions of his advisors expressed fully and freely without the constraint which would inevitably come from the knowledge that they might be made public."

The President's committee may hear in confidence something which the President refuses to let the Senate committee know in confidence, yet this same Senate committee must pass upon the question as to whether the President shall have the authority to make any tariff concessions at all.

Mr. President, just a few days ago a lawyer for a department came into a committee and refused to answer a question as to his conversation with a Cabinet officer. What did he give as his excuse? He said, "I am a lawyer. I am a lawyer for that branch. The Cabinet officer is my client. Under the law I should not communicate to anyone my confidential communication with my client." Can any Senator imagine such feeling upon the part of lawyers who are employed and paid by American taxpayers? The committee was so shocked that instead of citing him for contempt they took a recess, giving him sufficient time to call up the Cabinet officer. He returned and apologized to the committee, saying he was wrong; and he did answer the question.

Congress came up against the same stone wall when it attempted to deal with the security problem in respect to atomic energy. It was of vital importance that members and employees of the Commission met security standards.

The Senate had a responsibility in this matter because it had to confirm the President's appointments. In attempting to fulfill this responsibility the Senate formally requested the President to supply them with the information gathered by the FBI on persons nominated to the Commission. This information the President refused to give on the ground that Congress was not entitled to the information. On June 3, 1948, Congress passed an act, S. 1004, providing that the FBI make a report to Congress on any future nominations to the Atomic Energy Commission. Twelve days later, on June 15, the President vetoed the bill. No matter how acute the problem, no matter how grave the responsibility of Congress, Congress was not to be given essential information.

Another example of the President's flagrant disregard of his duty to execute the laws and to inform Congress concerns the procedures dealing with inflation. Last November we provided a means for the President to cooperate with Congress in this respect. If he found any commodities in such short supply that the economic stability of the country was endangered, he was to have presented the relevant facts and figures to Congress together with his recommendations.

The President totally ignored his duty to present this information to Congress. Instead he simply demanded from Congress more executive power to fix prices, fix wages, and impose controls wherever and whenever he saw fit. This is just another instance of executive disregard of law and of executive intent to accumulate powers and exercise them without responsibility to Congress.

Where, then, are we heading?

If every Communist and fellow traveler were discovered and expelled from the Government today, we would still have this problem of executive secrecy on our hands tomorrow. Where the power is, there will secrecy be also.

There has been an attempt to impose a censorship on every single department and agency in the executive branch. The Military Establishment has attempted to get the press, the radio and the movies to deliberately censor themselves. American newspaper men in foreign countries have been dragooned at the behest of their own Government. The Library of Congress has been tampered with. Congress has been thwarted in its effort to get information on Pearl Harbor, on appointees to the Atomic Energy Commission, on reciprocal-trade operations and now on the loyalty program affecting the vital security of the Nation.

A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary investigating the immigration problem has been also denied access to the records. How can the Senate and the Congress legislate upon the great problems before them if they cannot obtain vital information?

I ask, Mr. President, how far must this trend go before Congress and the people must use drastic means to put a stop to it?

In all these instances the President has taken the position that the specified information sought by congressional committees are matters confidential to the President in his conduct of the executive department and that the executive officials cannot divulge them without his approval.

He relies upon the prerogatives of his high office, the constitutional powers vested in him, the principle of separation of powers, and upon historical precedents supporting his position on one or more of these grounds. I say that is his defense. The general ground of the President's refusal to give papers and information to congressional committees is that it would not serve the public interest. In specific instances he has maintained that to divulge such information would either violate the confidence in which he acquired the information or hinder his agents in the future acquisition of confidential information necessary to the proper exercise of the public business. What Presidents have claimed as sacred and secret in their own persons as the Chief Executive they have also sought to extend to all subordinate officers in the executive department.

Mr. President, the power is delegated to a counsel, to a lawyer in the Bureau, to a Cabinet officer, to anyone who might be asked to bring the information before a Senate or a House committee. In sum, the President claims the right to don the cloak of absolute executive immunity whenever in his sole discretion he desires to do so, and to extend it as he pleases to cover all other officers and operations of the executive branch. Those who defend this extreme position maintain that he is accountable only to his country in his political character and to his own conscience.

I am well aware of the constitutional powers and prerogatives of the President. I have reviewed with great care the historical precedents in official conduct and in law through which many Chief Executives of our country have pressed for absolute independence in office. I have respect for the principle of separation of powers through which our country has been protected from too great concentration of powers in our governing process. I do not intend in this late hour to review this long and complicated background.

I merely wish to point out that the number of occasions in which Congress has met with Executive rebuff has greatly increased in recent years. Not only are these examples increasing but the range of subject matter over which the executive department claims immunity from congressional investigation is also increasing.

There has always been a blur in the line between the claims of congressional jurisdiction and the President's claim to executive independence. But I should like to point out that under the pattern of executive domination now developing, Congress is rapidly being pushed into the intolerable position of having either to legislate through a blind spot or compel the President to answer for his conduct in an impeachment proceeding. Those are the only two remedies. We do not want representative government reduced to such a ridiculous position.

It does not seem reasonable to me that American government should be forced to function in this dilemma. What is more, I am sure that there is nothing in the Presidential office, his powers or the historical precedents which by any latitude of free construction justifies the placing of Congress in such an extreme position.

On the contrary, I think the scheme of our government, the Constitution, our statute law and practices, and the nature of the times—all combine to reject emphatically the President's attempts to override Congress and to impede Congress in the performance of its constitutional powers and responsibilities.

In the distribution of powers of government the Constitution recognizes Congress as of first concern. It vests Congress with specific powers covering the entire range of government.

It vests the President only with the general power of the executive office and pledges him to execute faithfully the laws of the land. In a test of supremacy between the executive and the legislative, the Constitution clothes Congress with the final word. It can make laws notwithstanding the President's vetoes. And if he carries the powers of his office to unconscionable extreme, the Congress can dispose of him by impeachment proceedings. The President, on the other hand has no powers vested in him that would permit him to dispose of Congress.

The attempt of the President to have the executive department refuse to give Congress information necessary to its duties also flies in the face of the fact that all the executive departments are themselves creatures of Congress. They were set up by Congress, vested with powers and duties prescribed by Congress, can be altered at will by Congress, and by hundreds of statutes they are compelled to report to Congress.

It is all the more important that they respond to Congress because in modern times administrative government has been extended so widely. The recent Congressional Reorganization Act recognized fully this new development by expressly affirming the congressional power to oversee and to investigate the executive agencies of the Government.

By modern conditions, the Federal Government now extends its concern to every detail of national life and to almost every crossroad of the world. It would be strange indeed, if at this juncture of affairs, Congress was blocked in its legislative function by the iron curtain of Executive refusal to supply Congress with the facts on which it must legislate.

Moreover, the nature of one of the dangers to our security forces Congress as a representative of the people to be far more alert to conditions in the executive department than was necessary in the days of narrowly limited Federal Government. The Communist menace today is not that governments will be seized by forcible means. It is that they will be undermined and taken over by the insidious infiltration of Communists into high government offices.

Congress, no less than the President, is charged with the security of our Government and our national life. Congress, no less than the President, must meet the new methods of subversion in our governmental household. Congress is charged with the responsibility of protecting the security of our people through legislation. But if, when it tries to do so, the President can deny to Congress the information it needs to legislate intelligently, then the President has gone beyond the prerogatives of his office and threatens the very foundations of representative government.

Mr. President, I do not intend to try my case against Presidential arrogance now. Some day we shall have to meet the issue head-on because the trend to Presidential arrogance is becoming intolerable. I point these things out so that we may give serious thought to them. I invite the study and suggestions of all who hold free government sacred. I myself hope to study the problem intensively in the months to come. I devoutly hope we shall find a solution fair to the President and to his high office, and to Congress and the people. Unless we find a way to reinvigorate Congress' power to secure all the information it needs to legislate properly and intelligently—unless we keep the President within bounds in his attempt to put an iron curtain between Congress and the public business and the people—unless we succeed in that endeavor, constitutional and representative government will be transformed before our very eyes into centralized, executive dictatorship.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TYDINGS. Can the Senator from Nebraska yield for any other purpose than for a question, without losing the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. To satisfy the acting minority leader, I will ask unanimous consent to yield only for the purpose of an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sorry, but the Senator has no more right on the floor than has any other Senator. If there is to be a special rule made for the Senator from Nebraska, much as I should like to accommodate him, there must be the same rule for all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken.

PERMISSION TO INSERT MATTER IN THE RECORD

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

On behalf of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], I ask unanimous consent that three letters may be printed in the final edition of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION BY APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE IN MEXICO

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a subcommittee has been appointed by the Committee on Appropriations to investigate the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. This investigation was approved by the full committee. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was asked to call together the members of the subcommittee this afternoon to determine which Senators would go on the investigation. I was asked to take charge of the subcommittee. It is contemplated that the last week in September the subcommittee will proceed to Mexico, in accordance with the action taken by the Senate Appropriations Committee. Any Senator who is a member of the Appropriations Committee and who would like to go should give his name to the Senator from North Dakota or myself, and we shall see that arrangements are made for him to accompany the group.

Mr. President, I am glad to yield to my colleague [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I object. The Senator cannot yield to any other Senator. He must obtain recognition from the Chair.

ARMY NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have been asked by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. GURNEY] to see whether or not it would be possible to confirm certain routine promotions in the Army. I understand that if those promotions are not confirmed there is some question about pay. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from South Dakota has asked me to request unanimous consent for that purpose only, in order that the nominations may be confirmed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask who will have the floor afterward. Are we Democrats to have an opportunity to get the floor before the motion to adjourn?

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator like to have me yield to him for any purpose?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. I wish to obtain recognition in my own right. I should like to obtain recognition now, if there is a unanimous-consent proposal pending. Reserving the right to object, am I recognized?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for the purpose of stating his position on the unanimous consent request.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think I have to confine it to that at all. If I am recognized, I can speak on any subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The opinion of the Chair is that a request for unanimous consent is not debatable.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I shall have to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland objects.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska moves that the Senate adjourn. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. HATCH, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. McMAHON, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McMAHON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators need not be disturbed. The Chair will protect all their rights, and there is no need of a riot. The yeas and nays are requested on the motion to adjourn. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

Mr. McMAHON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the request as soon as this order is completed. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

Mr. McMAHON. I am glad that the chair recognizes some rights. No one else seems to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McMAHON. I most certainly do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can do so very peacefully and get results. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. McMAHON. I propose to suggest it in my own way, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Murray
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Holland	Saltonstall
Butler	Ives	Smith
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Capehart	Kilgore	Stennis
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Lucas	Thye
Donnell	McCarthy	Tobey
Dworshak	McClellan	Tydings
Ecton	McFarland	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Young
Hatch	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to adjourn. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is detained on official business and has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator for Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] has a general pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, if all who wish to vote have voted, in view of the exigencies of the hour, before the vote is announced, may I have 30 seconds in which to make a statement about one of our colleagues?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That would be against the rule.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask unanimous consent that the rule be suspended, to allow me to speak for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. TOBEY. I think not. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears none.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, all I wish to say is that this is the closing minute of the session. The portcullis will fall in a moment. One of the finest things about this body is the fellowships among the men who make up the Senate. We differ about issues and we have our party designations; but underlying it all is the common denominator of fellowship.

There is one man in this body, who sits on my left, who has had 30 years of honorable service in the Senate of the United States. He has just cast his last vote in this body, after 30 years of honorable service in the Senate. I would be derelict in my duty and privilege in this closing minute of this last session of the Eightieth Congress if I did not ask for a rising vote in tribute to ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas. May God's rich blessings follow him all the rest of his days.

[Great applause, Senators rising.]

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 39, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—39

Aiken	Ecton	Morse
Baldwin	Ferguson	Revercomb
Brewster	Gurney	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hawkes	Smith
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Taft
Butler	Ives	Thye
Cain	Knowland	Tobey
Capehart	Lodge	Vandenberg
Capper	McCarthy	Watkins
Cooper	Malone	Wherry
Cordon	Martin	Wiley
Donnell	Millikin	Williams
Dworshak	Moore	Young

NAYS—29

Barkley	Holland	O'Conor
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Ellender	Kilgore	Russell
Feazel	Langer	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lucas	Stennis
Green	McClellan	Stewart
Hatch	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McMahon	Tydings
Hill	Magnuson	Umstead
Hoey	Murray	

NOT VOTING—28

Ball	Jenner	Reed
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	McCarran	Taylor
Byrd	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Downey	Maybank	White
Eastland	Myers	Wilson
Flanders	O'Daniel	
George	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote the yeas are 39, the nays are 29, and the motion is agreed to.

In accordance with the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 222) previously adopted, the Senate now stands adjourned until December 31, 1948.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 222, to December 31, 1948.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 7 (legislative day of August 5), 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Elmer H. Wene, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Maurice J. Tobin, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor.

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named pedsons to be judges of the Tax Court of the United States for terms of 12 years from June 4, 1948, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate (reappointments):

Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio.

Miss Marion J. Harron, of California.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

John H. Alsmiller, of Louisville, Ky., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky., in place of Harry M. Brennan, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, AUGUST 7, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. C. H. Lambdin, pastor of St. Luke's Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

We bow before Thee, O God, in quietness and reverence, and with our inner thoughts upon those things which are right and good. As we meditate with Thee for this brief moment, we hear Thee say to us: "Fight the good fight with all thy might," and so we ask Thy help that we might attain the victory in our fight for right.

May we have the best good of our Nation at heart as we ponder the grave situations which face us; may we realize that we are the servants of many peoples who are counting on us to try to make life less confusing for them; may we feel keenly our personal responsibility in the performance of our work and bravely take our stand on the side of right.

The great world looks to us for leadership; here we are, individual leaders, knowing the interests of our Nation and of the world are at stake, in this the beginning of our day's session, ready to conscientiously consider our problems, but we feel a need; a need for strength; a strength which will hold us steady through this day; strength which comes from Thee, O God; strength of wisdom and courage of spirit; this we pray for, knowing that Thou wilt not fail us.

We ask Thy richest blessing to rest on us all, not only today, but through all the days of our lives. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, Facts About Inflation and The Republican Congress Makes Good.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUCK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a paper.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some extraneous material.

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROSS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a bill which he introduced today.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials of different date from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include supporting data.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Res. 709) which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby, agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important proposition, and I think the Members ought to be here to hear the discussion. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 130]

Allen, Ill.	Gallagher	Nixon
Andrews, N. Y.	Gore	Norrell
Bakewell	Gregory	Norton
Barden	Gross	O'Konski
Bates, Ky.	Harless, Ariz.	Peden
Bell	Hébert	Pfeifer
Bloom	Hendricks	Phillips, Tenn.
Boggs, La.	Hess	Powell
Bolton	Jackson, Calif.	Priest
Canfield	Jenkins, Pa.	Regan
Carroll	Jennings	Richards
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Riley
Clark	Kefauver	Sarbacher
Clason	Kennedy	Scoblick
Clippinger	Kerr	Spence
Cooley	Lesinski	Stigler
Coudert	Lucas	Stockman
Courtney	Ludlow	Teague
Cox	Mathews	Thomas, N. J.
Cravens	McCormack	Trimble
Cunningham	McMahon	Vail
Davis, Tenn.	McDowell	West
Dawson, Ill.	Meade, Ky.	Whitaker
Domengeaux	Meade, Md.	Whittington
Dorn	Mitchell	Wood
Elliott	Morton	
Evins	Murray, Tenn.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 347 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Justice Jackson.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one, to include a revised compilation of Virginia laws affecting veterans' benefits and in the other, to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include an editorial.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ISACSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. FORAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARDY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address which he will make at Waverly, Va., on August 26.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REEVES asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include excerpts in each.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. HUGH SCOTT, Republican national chairman, delivered in Hartford, Conn., Wednesday, August 4.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on pending legislation.

Mr. KEEFE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Mr. George Reedy.

Mr. KEATING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in several instances, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. SHORT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two or three newspaper articles.

Mr. POULSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the last issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SABATH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SIKES asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorial material.

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I do not want this Congress to close without my saying a word or two about the remarkable record which has been achieved in the past year and a half by our colleague, Congressman JAMES T. PATTERSON, of Connecticut. It is seldom that a young man in so short a time can accomplish so much for his district—and for that matter, for the country. He was not here 4 months before the Congress had passed and the President had signed the Patterson bill, now Public Law No. 42, of the Eightieth Congress. Let me review a few of the facts in connection with this measure, which was referred to our Committee on Ways and Means, upon which I have the honor to serve.

Congressman JIM PATTERSON comes from the Naugatuck Valley in the Fifth Congressional District in Connecticut. Copper is probably the most essential of the raw materials going into the brass products manufactured in Waterbury and neighboring cities. I suppose it was but natural that he early became acquainted with the acute copper shortage which confronted the country when the Metals Reserve Company, a subsidiary of RFC, ceased commitments for the importation of copper in November 1946. All during the war, since our domestic production was so short, we had to import copper from abroad to meet our wartime needs. It was brought in without the payment of the excise tax of 4 cents a pound by the Government itself. In January 1946 we had a stock pile of more than 500,000 tons of copper but continued high postwar demand reduced this stock pile at a steady rate.

Congressman PATTERSON introduced a bill which would have the effect of repealing the 4-cent import tax. He went right to the heart of the problem, for he realized perfectly well that American industry could not pay $80 per ton duty without bringing about an enormous increase in price, not only for foreign copper, but for domestic copper as well. Such a result would have greatly increased the price of copper for brass, for wire, for refrigerators, for automobile radiators, for thousands of manufactured items in everyday use. The Patterson bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee where hearings were held. The very leading industries in the United States submitted evidence to the committee.

After consideration of the problem, our committee reported the Patterson bill with an amendment which had the effect of suspending the import excise tax of 4 cents per pound until March 31, 1949, the form in which it finally passed the House, and later the Senate.

The Members of this Congress also may take special pride in the promptness with which they met the emergency which confronted the country.

During 1947 after the Patterson Act became law American copper users imported copper at the rate of approximately 40,000 tons per month. The price of copper has been stabilized throughout the entire period at a price of approximately 21½ cents a pound which means a saving to the American people of at least $100,000,000 in the past year.

Throughout 1948 the domestic consumption of copper has continued at the rate of about 118,000 tons per month. The mine production in the United States over the same period has been running at the rate of about 73,000 tons a month. Obviously the difference represents a deficit which simply had to be made up by imports from foreign producing countries. Copper is being sought for stock-piling purposes for our national defense. It is in strong demand by the participating nations under the European recovery program. The extent of the stock-piling demands and of the European requirements cannot yet be known and has not been reflected in the figures I have mentioned.

It becomes apparent that our Nation will continue in short supply so far as the production of copper is concerned for many years to come. In the meantime, there are thousands of articles in daily use which have been produced because of the initiative of Congressman JIM PATTERSON. There are tens of thousands of employees who have not missed a day's work because of a copper shortage due to Congressman JIM PATTERSON'S foresight. Yes; he had the help of many of us who became aware of the critical nature of the problem because of representations made to us from our own districts. No man can do these things all alone, and the entire Congress cooperated and got back of Congressman PATTERSON'S bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in giving credit where credit is due, and I want the record to show my own personal appreciation and thanks to Congressman PATTERSON.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House today for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may be permitted to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the alleged purpose of calling this session of Congress was to pass legislation to check inflation. Yesterday we passed the gift loan bill for constructing a palace for the UN in New York City, which is inflationary.

Now we are considering a so-called housing bill which would greatly intensify inflation. Not one additional house will be built because of the passage of this act. It will not add a nail or a piece of building material or increase the available amount of labor for the erection of dwellings.

It will only create more credit to bid up prices on a definitely tight and limited supply of building materials and labor, thus not only forcing the prices of houses higher, but living costs in general as well.

The yield-insurance provision in this bill involves the basic principle of totalitarianism—fascism, nazism, communism—that is, political expropriation and disposition of private property.

This compromise measure may help to reelect some of us to Congress, but we should remind ourselves of what Euripides said: "The gods visit the sins of the fathers upon their children."

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I expect to support the motion of the gentleman from Michigan. This bill, H. R. 6959, as amended by the Senate, will be helpful in the home-building field though it is not altogether satisfactory to many of us. It is either this or nothing because, under the rules of the House, it cannot be amended. Especially unsatisfactory is that section of the bill with reference to a secondary market for GI loans. As I understand, under the Senate amendment, the amount of GI loans to be purchased is increased from 25 percent to 50 percent. While this is an improvement, it is certainly not adequate in this and many other respects.

Upon extension of the life of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on July 1, 1947, the Congress eliminated the authority theretofore existing in the corporation to purchase loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Immediately GI home loans took a downspiral, to such an extent that in June 1948, such loans had fallen off 43 percent. In the last hours of the last session of the Eightieth Congress, Public Law 864 was passed, reestablishing this authority in the Federal National Mortgage Association, but on an extremely limited basis. This law amounts to a mere drop in the bucket. Under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, without an adequate secondary market in the Federal Government, the home loan guaranty provision amounts to a mere hunting license.

Under the present authority of FNMA to purchase GI loans, the Association interprets the law to provide that no GI loan may be purchased if guaranteed before April 30, 1948. Under H. R. 7120, a bill I introduced a day or two ago, any GI loan may be purchased, even if guaranteed before April 30, 1948. This is necessary in order to give the small lending institutions, particularly in the small communities, the necessary liquidity to continue to make 4 percent GI loans. This is similar to the amendment I had placed in the act of 1946 extending the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Under the present authority, in addition to the limitation that the loans must be guaranteed after April 30, 1948, it is provided that only 25 percent—now 50 percent under Senate amendment to H. R. 6959—of such loans may be purchased by FNMA. Under my bill, 66⅔ percent may be purchased, regardless of the date on which they are guaranteed. It is necessary that the volume of allowable purchases be substantially increased in order that the GI home-loan program may be fluid.

Under the present authority, FNMA can purchase loans not exceeding $10,000. Under my bill, it is provided that loans guaranteed before September 1, 1948, not exceeding $12,000, can be purchased; and loans guaranteed after that date, not exceeding $7,500, can be purchased. We must not be unreasonable in limiting the purchase of loans made in the past because those loans cover homes which have already been constructed and which are now owned by the veteran; moreover, the lending institution needs a market for such loans in order to make new loans at the low-priced level.

Under the present authority, all loans must meet the requirements of FHA construction standards. Under my bill, it is provided that only those loans hereafter made must meet such standards. It is not possible to go back and reconstruct the homes already guaranteed, and now occupied by veterans, and therefore there is no purpose in ruling out loans guaranteed in the past because of any such requirement.

Under the present authority, there is no specific provision as to the rate which may be allowed the seller of the mortgage for servicing the loan. However, under recently issued regulations of the FNMA this service fee has been set at not more than one-half of 1 percent. Under my bill, it is proposed to set the maximum service, within the discretion of the Association, at not more than 1 percent. This is the going rate for such servicing charges, and is necessary for the small lending institutions to come out even in servicing these loans.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM].

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, in passing H. R. 6959, this Congress can be proud of the action it has taken on housing at this special session.

The bill relies on private enterprise and initiative to get the housing job done. It involves some major steps forward in housing finance and production—steps which I believe will mean not only a larger volume of housing for rent and sale, but also housing at lower costs that people of average means can afford.

Thus, there are several programs in this bill which will produce more rental housing, with special emphasis on programs to get lower rentals. There are several programs in this bill which will keep up our high production of houses built for sale, again with special financing incentives for lower-cost housing.

These programs have received considerable attention in the discussions of this bill so I will not dwell upon them. My main purpose in rising to speak is to call attention to those programs in this bill that are directed toward a reduction in the cost of housing by applying modern industrial methods, with all the economies resulting from such techniques. Housing is still the only major field in which we have not fully utilized the mass production and machine methods that have made American industry the greatest example of production efficiency in the world.

This bill contains the tools for the industrial production of housing at the lower costs which have typified all other machine methods, as contrasted with handicraft methods. It also contains aids for those large-scale site operations that will produce at lower costs. Besides the loan assistance to companies and builders and the mortgage financing for home purchasers, the bill contains a most significant provision to promote economy through the standardization and improvement of building codes and methods.

The effectiveness of all these provisions depends on sympathetic and vigorous administration to carry out the purpose and intent of the law. The Congress has met in special session to pass this housing law. It is now up to the Government agencies to have some special sessions to get these laws into operation quickly and effectively.

As a sponsor of the provisions relating to financing of factory producers of lower-cost housing, I would like to make a few comments for the RECORD as to the intent of some of the provisions in the law.

The bill contains provisions to aid housing manufacturers, both by FHA insurance of working capital loans and by loans directly by the RFC. The purpose behind these provisions is not merely to have two separate sources of financing. It is also to assure that there is no gap in meeting the needs of the housing manufacturers. Thus, the RFC loan can cover plant and machinery, which cannot be covered by a 609 loan. It is contemplated that the RFC loans would be made or modified in such a manner that a housing manufacturer would not be precluded from utilizing the insurance of loans under section 609. Therefore, it is expected that security and contract arrangements will take a form which will enable a housing manufacturer to assign his purchase contracts and borrow against them under the provisions of section 609. Moreover, it is my understanding that the bill is drawn in a way which will not preclude the loan from being made by the RFC if it should develop that private banks are unwilling to make the loans at the established interest rates or under the terms of the insurance contract which is offered.

So far as section 609 is concerned, it is my understanding that it now incorporates all the amendments that the FHA desired in order to make this provision fully and completely workable. As presently drawn, it is intended to eliminate the unworkable requirements that a purchase contract could qualify only after the purchaser had acquired land and arranged all of his financing. In view of the fact that the suggestions of the Government agencies have been accepted, and in view of the shortness of time that this law has to run, it is imperative that it be made immediately operative through a set of simple regulations and contracts that can be expeditiously administered.

This legislation necessarily requires a coordinated approach within the Government so that one agency does not defeat the purposes of the law which another agency is seeking to carry out. For example, the policy of the War Assets

Administration on its war plants must necessarily take into account the objective of the Government to encourage more housing at lower costs. Likewise, the FHA must encourage the use of the modern materials and methods that promise cost reductions. There cannot be discrimination against these new approaches or we will not be able to make progress. We must give the people a chance to buy and accept the houses produced by new methods and materials, and not assume that they will reject something just because it is made from different materials or methods.

In addition to moving toward standardization of building codes, we must make sure that there are no restrictions and variations imposed by the FHA through its local offices, which defeat our efforts toward mass production and standardizing dimensions and methods. Any variations for which there are not climatic or other comparable justifications should be eliminated.

Congress has done its job in giving the Government agencies the tools they require to help private enterprise meet the housing needs. It is up to the Government agencies now to do their job of carrying out the purposes of these laws effectively and expeditiously.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, what is in this bill has been dismembered from the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and we have for separate treatment a number of its component parts.

The incentives to private enterprise are here in very much liberalized form.

First. The FHA is permitted to insure loans up to 95 percent on homes costing $3,000 or less. The present limit is 90 percent.

Second. On homes costing $4,500 that are eligible for loans under title I of the National Housing Act the present limit is $3,000. The amount of money available for title I loans is increased by $35,000,000.

Third. An additional $800,000,000 is made available for rental housing loans under title VI of the National Housing Act. Loans are limited to $8,100 per apartment or per family unit. The present limitation is on rooms instead of units.

Fourth. Construction loans up to 80 percent are authorized on loans costing $7,500 or less in projects of at least 25 family units.

Fifth. Loans to prefabricated home manufacturers are liberalized.

Sixth. The Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized to provide a secondary market for 50 percent of all loans to veterans. Under FHA insured loans the present limitation is 25 percent. This provision applies to loans made since April 30, 1948.

Seventh. A new division is created in the Housing and Home Finance Agency to seek standardization of building codes and measurements.

Eighth. The bill guarantees a rate of 2.75 percent interest on equity investments in rental property.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is the tax amortization provision in this bill which would give a tax subsidy?

Mr. BUCHANAN. This bill does not include the tax amortization plan to which the gentleman refers. It does have a plan on yield insurance, but not the fast tax amortization plan the gentleman has in mind.

Eighth. The bill guarantees a rate of 2.75 percent interest on equity in rental property.

Mr. SADOWSKI. What does that mean?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is under the yield insurance phase. There is a rather lengthy dissertation there. It is covered from page 76 on throughout the section. It would take me much longer than I have the time to explain fully but there is where it will be found in the particular bill.

What it does in brief is guarantee a return of 2.75 percent interest on equity in rental property.

It is a very liberal provision and it is not restrictive in any sense, the gentleman may be assured.

There is not anything in this bill that you could object to. It is what is not in the bill that you can object to for not including those provisions.

Ninth. There is a provision requiring all apartment-house builders, who apply for FHA insurance on loans, to swear that they will not discriminate against families with children in renting their apartments. This is a pious hope.

Tenth. On page 67 of the bill there is a provision which allows a return up to 5 percent, as the Administrator finds necessary to meet the mortgage market.

Eleventh. On page 70, lines 16 to 20, is the provision that the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located. This is the so-called present cost formula.

Twelfth. On page 100, section 503, is the so-called Lodge amendment relative to any low-rent or veterans' housing project. This section is meaningless in view of the absence of any such sections in this bill.

What the bill does not contain are those provisions in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which provide for rural housing, farm housing. It has no urban redevelopment or slum-clearance section, no public housing or no Government research section. It does contain a section that deals with the standardization of building codes and materials. But, the real criticism of this measure lies in the things that are omitted—incentives to cities and low-cost housing and slum clearance.

Certainly it is a liberal bill; a very liberalized form of title VI financing and title II financing aids. It really is a great spur and offers increased incentives to private large-scale home builders and real-estate developers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership in the House has made a grave mistake—a serious political mistake in its failure to give the Members of the House their democratic right and opportunity for full consideration of the T-E-W bill on the floor of the House.

Think of this. Our cities and people unable to buy their own homes are forgotten. Our large metropolitan areas are not only congested but are decaying near the core from blight. Although blighted areas make up about 20 percent of metropolitan residential areas in the United States today, they account for 33 percent of the towns' population, 35 percent of the fires, 45 percent of the major crimes, 55 percent of the juvenile delinquency, and 60 percent of the tuberculosis victims.

Consequently, the average city must spend 45 percent of all its funds available for police, fire, health, and other city services on these blighted areas, while receiving back from the areas only 6 percent of the revenue provided by the property tax. Blight is not only an eyesore, but a terrible drain on a city. And in hundreds of towns the area of blight is spreading unchecked every year.

Until these blighted areas and slums are wiped out we will continue to be faced with major problems in city government.

Members of the Congress, this bill is a splintered version of a really adequate housing bill and a long-range housing program. It is a sop. The cities and the people of this Nation who need decent, adequate housing, are forgotten. This bill is a complete surrender to political expediency and a gift to the real-estate lobby and the very powerful interests that have denied you the right to express yourselves fully upon the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. In spite of its inadequacies and its shortcomings, I ask that you support this bill, regardless, because there will be some accrued benefits. Some of these benefits may trickle down and benefit those who are without any housing whatsoever. Volume production will be sustained at high-price levels and in the resulting inevitable shrinkage bound to take place in the real-estate market, additional housing will be made available.

This bill on housing certainly points up the difference between Republican and Democratic Party policy on housing. It is—private interests triumphant over the public interest.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, my remarks apply to many ventures which the Federal Government may make into new fields or additions it may make to its present activities in old fields.

Mr. Speaker, the per capita Federal debt is estimated at about $1,784. The average per capita State debt is $16.31. It ranges all the way from 31 cents per capita in Idaho to $67.18 in Louisiana. Hence, the States are in far better con-

dition to finance various undertakings than is the Federal Government. There is a direct affiliation between the United States debt and the value of our money; there is not any direct affiliation between the State debt and the value of our money. This is a fundamental economic question. Only the United States Government has the power to coin money and regulate its value. The States and localities have no such power. So there can be no effect upon the value of money from the creation of debt by the local and State governments. State and local governments in issuing debt create purchasing power for themselves, but in the sale of these obligations to investors they absorb purchasing power from the purchasers of their securities. There is no over-all addition to purchasing power and there is no creation of additional money or credit.

On the other hand, the issuance of Government bonds pumps money and credit into the monetary stream of the country. This is obvious in the case of deficit spending. Secretary Snyder has stated that we are again approaching an era of deficit spending unless Government expenses are curtailed. Our Federal Reserve System as it now operates on a fractional reserve system permits a credit expansion of five to six times the amount of reserves acquired by the System. These reserves in part are in the form of Government obligations. The ratio of Government obligations to total reserves is directly affected by the Federal Government's borrowing operations. The dollar bill in your pocket today is backed, to a large degree, not by a tangible asset but by another promise of the Government to pay—this promise being in the form of a Government bond. Since increases in the Federal debt increase the volume of money in circulation, and since the fiscal and monetary policies of the Government can turn the Government debt into money and credit, the net result is an over-supply of money in relation to the availability of goods. Therefore, there is a decrease in the value of money and an increase in the value of goods which expresses itself in an inflationary increase in prices.

It is true you can turn private debt into money. But there can be no objection to that as long as the debt created is increasing production and employment. But when you monetize debt created by Government borrowing which does not create goods, then you add to the supply of money without any corresponding increase in the supply of goods. Therein lies the danger.

We are indeed fortunate in this country to have State and local governmental units which can conduct financing operations without any direct effect on the value of money. Unless the purpose for which funds are borrowed is a direct function of the National Government, the borrowing power of the States should be utilized, and the danger of further monetary depreciation lessened.

If we go into a long term of Federal obligation to build houses and subsidize rents, we are not only taking a step which will increase directly the cost of housing through competition for scarce materials and manpower, but we are also starting a program which will indirectly increase the cost of every item of goods and commodities sold in this country. As shown above, the indirect effect of the Federal expenditures is to lessen the value of money, thereby increasing the cost or value of goods. We have seen this illustrated steadily during the past 16 years.

This is a fundamental fact. It should be kept in mind in every decision as to whether the States and localities or the Federal Government should undertake certain functions. Federal housing subsidies will not only make the prices of houses higher than they otherwise would be; they will also keep higher the price of automobiles, refrigerators, grains, and other items.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the motion to suspend the rules and pass this bill. However, I could not let this opportunity go by without again protesting the gag system used in bringing this bill and other housing bills into this House, to prevent the Members from having an opportunity to vote on slum clearance, public housing, and farm housing.

This bill will do some good. It will help continue the present private housing boom that is going on in this country and giving us about 900,000 new units each year. The only difficulty about these new units is that they are not reaching down to the level where the greatest urgency in the housing shortage is occurring.

The continuing increase in the cost of building materials and the accelerated increases in labor costs have raised the prices of new housing largely beyond the reach of the average veteran.

In passing this bill, which I admit will give us more housing, we fail to give help to the people we need to help, namely, the veterans who must have low-priced housing, or low-rent housing.

There is plenty of subsidy in this bill. You Members who have been railing against public housing as being subsidized, ought to know that the Government is subsidizing private building and larger and more expensive houses under this bill.

Yet you are refusing at the same time to give any help or attention to the most pitiful, the most hopeless group in this country, the hundreds of thousands of people in our slums who must look forward to a life condemned by unsanitary, uncomfortable, and unhealthful conditions in the slums.

You thus pass up another year's effort to try to cure this cancerous slum growth on the body politic.

I resent also the fact that the Congress after passing this bill will have appropriated or authorized $10,000,000,000 for Government-insured housing loans for city dwellers without making one thin dime available for farm housing.

You Members who come from the farm districts had better start looking at your instructions from your people, because sooner or later the farmers are going to find out that they are being discriminated against and denied this wonderful opportunity to get Government-insured loans on farm housing.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Is not the gentleman mistaken when he says that we have given not a dime for farm housing?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not know of a single dime that has been spent under any legislation brought out by the Committee on Banking and Currency in the past 5 years which would be available for farm housing.

The gentleman will remember the testimony before our committee to that effect.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. The gentleman will recall that they are included in this particular bill and if the people in the farming areas do not take advantage of it, it is their responsibility.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman well knows that the neighborhood restrictions and requirements concerning subdivisions and plumbing, and so forth, of the FHA make it absolutely impossible for the farmer to get one thin dime for housing out of this legislation, and the record is filled with testimony to that effect.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. They can do it very easily under title I.

Mr. MONRONEY. You cannot build a house under title I. You can improve only your home under title I, if you already have a home. I would like to see the gentleman try to improve a one- or two-room shack in that way.

I want to take this opportunity to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he will announce on the floor that the $3,450,000 required to put this bill into operation will be provided either under a deficiency appropriation bill now, or whether he will arrange through a resolution or in some other way for the FHA to accelerate the spending of its current appropriation. Without this money this bill does not mean anything, and the FHA cannot carry on this new and larger program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, this measure provides hundreds of millions of dollars of Government credit for speculative building. By so doing, the bill effectively prevents low-cost housing. It makes it impossible for genuine private enterprise to compete in the housing field. The foregoing consequences result automatically when the Government makes the taxpayers assume the risk of loss for building operations.

Under this measure speculative builders can bid top prices for labor and material, knowing that if price levels go down the loss is transferred to the taxpayers. If prices go up it is the speculators' gain. To call this kind of operation "private enterprise" amounts to

labeling socialism with the title of free enterprise.

Congress has been told again and again that the unrestricted supply of Government credit in the building industry is highly inflationary. As far back as last December the Federal Reserve Bulletin declared:

> One of the most inflationary factors—perhaps the most inflationary single factor—in the present situation is excessively easy mortgage credit for housing.

In the face of this warning this legislation is reckless and irresponsible. When the Congress apes the executive branch by voting inflation while talking anti-inflation the dollar is on the skids. Those who are investing in dollar obligations are, in the language of the street, "being sold down the river."

Mr. Speaker, those who are relying on the value of Government obligations are being betrayed. No other language accurately describes this legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us proves conclusively what I stated the other night on the radio; that this special session of Congress would give the people no housing legislation. Here, we have the living proof. With the need for low-cost housing, public housing, veterans' housing, and slum clearance so urgent, what do we have in this bill? No public housing, no low-cost housing, no veterans' housing, and no slum clearance. We are here again given the same old Republican-Democrat merry-go-round of free enterprise. More money for houses for those who can afford to pay rentals of $100 a month or more. Money to the real-estate and mortgage interests. Not one cent for houses and homes that the plain people of this country can afford.

Let us see what the story is about housing. The Republicans have repeatedly killed housing legislation. This Congress has refused to pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill which would provide housing and give some measure of relief to the suffering millions who find themselves without homes. This bill before us is worse than a poor substitute for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The Republican leader, Senator TAFT, the other day, disowned his own bill, and stated that it would not be passed at this session. The Democratic record on this score is no better. In the Seventy-ninth Congress it was a combination of Republicans and Democrats that killed the housing bill in committee. In the Eightieth Congress, with a few exceptions, the Democrats with the Republicans in the House have given aid and comfort to the real-estate trust in sabotaging the public housing program. I shall oppose adjournment of this special session until this Congress enacts a genuine housing bill providing housing for all, for low- and middle-income groups, for public and low-cost housing, for veterans' housing, and slum clearance.

As for housing for veterans it is to be recalled that it was President Truman himself who scuttled the Patman law by lifting controls and yielding completely to the free enterprise boys of the real-estate trust. So, here again, we have the same old merry-go-round; the Republican-Democrat merry-go-round.

I wish that this special session of Congress could have been on television. The American people would have witnessed a most revealing spectacle. It would have convinced Americans that there is no real difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties. For instance, if the Senate proceedings of the last few days had been on television, they would have seen an Alphonse-Gaston act performed by the Republican and the Dixie Democrats on the issue of civil rights. Americans would have seen the politest filibuster that has ever been put on in Congress. Newspapers tried to give the impression that there was a real fight going on here between the Dixie Democrats and the Republicans. However, television would have shown that they were both shadow-boxing and hitting each other with powder puffs.

The Republicans were pretending to get passed legislation abolishing the poll tax. The Dixie Democrats were putting on a filibuster. The Republicans did nothing to break the filibuster. After a few days of this sham battle the anti-poll-tax bill was buried. Yes, the people would have witnessed a phony fight if the special session had been televised.

Where were the Truman Democrats who, with Truman, have been going around proclaiming their friendship for civil rights? They were where they have always been; far, far away from the fight. Television would show you that they were not even near this fixed fight. They have never fought for civil rights; no more than Harry Truman has ever fought for them. President Truman talked big at the Democratic Convention about civil rights and his last two Executive orders proved exactly what we Progressives have always said about his big talk; that is, that when it comes to action the Negro people get nothing. His last two Executive orders proposed some more commissions and investigations. The Negro people are tired of being commissioned and investigated. General Bradley has since announced that segregation will continue to be the policy of the armed forces. This announcement exposes the emptiness of President Truman's Executive orders. Yet the Truman Democrats, relying on this last gesture of the President, played their usual role in the Senate. They did not lift a single finger to break the filibuster of their Dixie colleagues. Yes, television would have shown the Nation the amiable and friendly cooperation of the Republicans with the Dixie Democrats, and with the Truman Democrats nowhere in the scene. The tragic result is that we have no civil-rights legislation out of this Republican-Dixie Democrats, and Truman Democrat Congress. It is the same old merry-go-round; the Republican-Democrat merry-go-round.

How about the high cost of living? The American housewife is now paying $1.30 a pound for meat, $1 a pound for butter, and 24 cents a quart for milk. I charge that this special session of Congress has done nothing about it. Why? First of all, we must remember that both parties are controlled by the same big monopolies that destroyed price controls 2 years ago and who do not want price control now.

President Truman has asked for standby price controls. Anyone who knows anything about the subject knows that this will not do the job, for what is needed is roll-back of prices to January 1947 levels and real price control with teeth in it, with power given to the Government to seize any industry that refuses to produce at Government-fixed prices. Further, President Truman's record is a bad one on this score. In 1946, he removed controls on meat, and in early 1947, he removed all price controls. The Republicans demanded the removal of controls, the National Association of Manufacturers beat the drums against price controls and Truman surrendered. He has asked Congress to undo the damage that he himself helped cause. Prices have been going up and up since price controls were removed. Remember who did it. The Republicans and Democrats in Congress and President Truman in the White House. How could anyone have expected this same combination in this special session to have done anything to bring down prices? They have blamed each other, but done nothing. The so-called Republican anti-inflation bill does not even scratch the surface of the problem of inflation. It provides for no price controls in any manner, shape, or form. It is a fake and a delusion. The result is that prices will continue to rise. American housewives demand cheap groceries. This Republican-Democratic Congress gives them red herrings. It is the same old merry-go-round, the Republican-Democrat merry-go-round.

Mr. Speaker, there is a much more fundamental reason why this Congress or any other Republican-Democratic Congress has not been able to give the people of our Nation housing and relief from inflation. No country can make any progress as long as it exists on an imperialist war economy basis. War economy means high prices; war economy means Taft-Hartleyized labor; war economy means no civil rights; war economy means no housing; war economy means no social progress. You cannot have housing, you cannot have effective price controls as long as the economy of a nation is geared to war. There will be no housing program and there will be no control of inflation as long as the Republican-Democratic policy of cold war continues. President Truman himself stated on March 17 when he asked for the draft and universal military training that we must prepare to pay the price. Yes, the price that the people are now paying is the high cost of living, ever-spiraling inflation, no housing, enslaved labor, and no civil rights.

We are now spending for the present cold war almost twenty-one billions; six hundred and forty-two millions for Army civilian programs abroad; five hundred and fifty-five millions for so-called foreign aid and tax refunds; nine hundred and forty-nine millions for supplemental national defense, cash; two billion two hundred and seventy-five millions for supplemental national defense, contract authorization; six million seven hundred and forty-nine millions for national military, 1949; three billion seven hundred and forty-nine millions for Navy, 1949; and six billion thirty-one millions for the Marshall plan, 1949—Daily Digest of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 20, 1948.

It is impossible to say what the future costs will be for the next 2 years. Some estimates go as high as thirty billions a year from 1950 on. You can easily see that the country is being daily placed into a war strait-jacket.

On this cold-war program the Republicans and Democrats do not even make a pretense at disagreement. The record shows that they are in unanimous accord in placing our Nation in a war-economy strait-jacket. It is the program of the big trusts of Wall Street. It is Truman's program. It is Dewey's program. It is a program of Wall Street's Forrestal and Snyder, the two dominating figures of Truman's Cabinet. It is the program of Wall Street's John Foster Dulles and Chase National Bank, the masters of Dewey's Republican Party.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that this Republican-Democratic Congress has not given the American people housing and has not even attempted to control inflation? And all for what? Not for defense. We are in no danger of attack. Yes, in no danger of aggression from the Soviet Union, despite the tons of newsprint and the billions of radio words to the contrary. All this suffering and deprivation is for the Wall Street trusts who seek to control the world for profit and more profit, and at the American people's expense.

We, of the Progressive Party in the Nation and of the American Labor Party in New York, are united behind Henry Wallace on a platform of peace based on aid to the needy people of the world through the United Nations, and on peace with the Soviet Union. We propose to fight the big trusts who control both old parties, and defeat their plan to embroil this world into another war. The Republican and Democratic Parties stand for an imperialist war economy. I repeat this means no housing, no relief from high prices, and no civil rights. The record of this Congress is clear proof. We, of the Progressive Party, stand for peace. We recognize that only a peace economy will bring housing, low prices, freedom, and abundance. That is the big, big difference between us and the Republicans and Democrats.

Americans today have been put on the merry-go-round; on the Wall Street Republican-Democrat merry-go-round of boom, bust, and war. We, of the Progressive Party, fight to take them off this old merry-go-round, and no amount of smear, hysteria, and Red-baiting will deter us.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, day before yesterday Senate Joint Resolution 157 was before this body for consideration. At that time I strongly criticized the manner in which that resolution was brought before this body. We were limited to 40 minutes in our debate. We were denied the opportunity to amend or submit a motion to recommit. We, as members of the minority party, were denied our fundamental rights in properly opposing that important measure. At the time I warned that section II of that resolution was dangerous legislation, and could bring great harm to our people. Notwithstanding repeated warnings from the Members of the minority party, the resolution was passed. Today, however, I am happy to report that the Senate of the United States has had the wisdom and the judgment to strike out section II of that resolution.

I call this to your attention for the purpose of emphasizing the necessity of granting sufficient time within which to debate these important issues. Moreover, it should be crystal clear to every Member here that it is extremely unwise to attempt to gag the Members of the minority party from either debating, amending, or moving to recommit important legislation. So today, we again are called upon to act intelligently on legislation of national import, but again our efforts are limited under this gag rule.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the present housing bill is a great improvement and will provide greater benefits to veterans and others seeking homes than the bill which we passed in the last few days of the preceding session. However, it is also quite clear to me under the provisions of this bill the very forces who have been lobbying against the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill will be the principal beneficiaries under this legislation. That is to say, there is ample protection provided for them in the financing of homes for construction. Under the circumstances, recognizing the growing need for additional housing and dwelling units, almost any bill which aids materially in reducing the need for housing must be approved. There is no excuse, there can be no justification, however, for the refusal of the leadership of this body to meet the problems confronting low-income groups and I refer specifically to the slum clearance, public- and rural-housing features of the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Again, under the gag provisions of the suspension of rules theory, we are being denied the right to amend this legislation or to move to recommit in order that the people know where each and every Member of this body stands on this important issue.

I shall vote for this bill for, as I have said before, it indicates we are winning ground in the battle for an adequate housing program. This does not mean, however, that we shall abandon or diminish our efforts in any respect for the total fulfillment of the other features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill when the Congress reconvenes next January.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

PRICES AND HOUSING SHORTAGE—WHO IS TO BLAME?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, when the President recalled the Eightieth Congress the opponents of progress and social justice branded his action political.

When the President addressed the special session, asking for legislation to curb the cruelly high cost of living and provide homes for millions, the GOP cried "cheap politics."

Every man who holds public office or who aspires to win an election engages in politics. But, to my way of thinking, there is nothing political about steak at $1.30 or butter at 90 cents a pound.

There is not anything political about a week's wages that will not stretch from pay day to pay day. Nor is there any politics in cramped and improper housing or writs of eviction.

It is my opinion that the GOP has done worse than play cheap politics in this special session. It has willingly gambled the security of the country and the welfare of its citizens in order to indulge in its fondest pastime—waging war with the Democratic Administration.

Acknowledging only its loyalty to the special interests it has served throughout its history, the GOP has refused to do anything to check the wild inflationary boom which grows more perilous with every passing day.

There was another period in our history when everything seemed to be sailing along on the crest of an endless boom. Millions were being made in the stock market. Wealth was being piled up by the privileged few. The needs of the average family were ignored and powerful interests screamed that the boom should not be interfered with—that eventually prices would find their own level. All would eventually be right with our economy if only Government kept its hands off.

The sequel to the story of that wild era was the tragic depression of the thirties.

People can still recall that few voices were raised then to halt the mad march of wild money. Those voices went unheeded—and all America suffered as a consequence.

There are a few voices raised today at the peak of another boom, pleading that something be done before it is too late. Mingled in the voices which can be heard are the frantic pleas of the American housewife—at her wit's end—struggling to put on her table a diet that is adequate for her growing children; worrying over her inability to pay all her household bills as they come due; seeing her husband's wages shrink more and more as his dollars become less valuable.

The GOP—in Congress and out—has for many years heaped abuse on the New Deal and the Democratic Party. It has bleated for years about the improvements in our economy it would produce if it but could have the opportunity to dictate the policies of Government—if it could enact legislation to its own liking.

We all recall—all too sadly—the great promises which were made when the GOP moved for the wiping out of all controls—at the close of the war.

We are still familiar with the full-page ads—published all over the country at the cost of millions; of the lobbyists for NAM, NRDGA, and other manufacturers' agents—who spent money lavishly and poured out their canned arguments before Congressional committees.

Production would zoom, plenty would be placed on the market, prices would fall, prosperity would bless everyone and happy days would be here again—all this and heaven too—if price controls, material allocations, credit regulations, and taxes on excess profits would be thrown into the discard.

All this was done—and more. Special arrangements were made for manufacturers who no longer had fat war contracts; special tax-payment provisions were set up; lush refunds were handed out to industry; special guaranties were made to the farmers—millions provided to support a high price for his products.

In addition to all this for the benefit of industry and producers, the reins of the Federal Legislature were handed over by the sovereign American people to the Republican Party.

What has all this produced?

Confusion and chaos—worry which fast approaches despair.

Today, prices are higher than ever in history.

The general cost of living has increased over 40 percent.

The price of food in some instances is over 100 percent above that of 2 years ago, and in all foodstuffs the price increase ranges between 60 and 100 percent.

Is that an honorable redemption of the GOP promises of just two short years ago? Or is it a callous disregard of promises that were made solely to entice votes?

As the last war drew to a close it was apparent to everyone that there was insufficient housing accommodation for veterans who would soon return from battlefields around the world.

Families had been living doubled up. Boys and girls had sacrificed fruitful years and looked forward to early marriages. Families which had grown larger were in need of additional housing facilities—to rent and to buy.

During both regular sessions of the Eightieth Congress, the GOP, in complete control of legislation, refused to acknowledge there was need for any intervention in this crucial field by the Federal Government—even going so far as to repudiate the measure offered by the Senator who had been the principal GOP advocate during the entire life of the Eightieth Congress.

At the end of June Congressmen and Senators returned home. They must have been brought face to face with the crying need for housing. Families are still being evicted—with no place to turn to. Families—young and old—are still living in cramped and improper quarters. American family life is being threatened because of the impossible conditions under which many are forced to eke out survival. With the calling of the special session, the President appealed for prompt action on housing. The President appealed for the passage of the measure introduced by Senator TAFT, pushed through the Senate by Senator TAFT, and praised as good legislation by Senator TAFT.

The GOP leadership in the House has steadfastly refused to have anything to do with this bill and has instead brought forth a bill which completely misses the point—ignores the demand for slum clearance and public housing which is of vital concern to those in low income groups who are now so tightly strapped.

MINIMUM WAGE

On the fringe of our industrial economy there are hundreds of thousands of people still working for starvation wages. The present minimum hourly wage is 40 cents. Consider for just a moment the plight of any individual working 40 hours at 40 cents per hour. What in the name of everything just and proper can he hope to do to maintain any kind of a standard of living?

The GOP Congress was asked to raise this minimum to somewhere near decent levels. It bluntly refused—and thus again gave evidence of its complete lack of regard for the less fortunate of our citizens.

During the days of the New Deal, which the GOP condemns with such vigor and enthusiasm, a beginning was made on the task of freeing from fear and poverty our aged and the survivors of wage earners.

These unfortunate people, who have given years of their lives to the development of the country's present position are left with a mere pittance in the face of rising prices which they cannot hope to meet.

The Eightieth Congress refused to become interested in their welfare; ignored legislation which would have increased their benefits and brought millions now unprovided for under the coverage of our social-security system. Instead, serving selfish interests, the Eightieth Congress enacted legislation which effectively expelled hundreds of thousands from the protection afforded by social security.

Let me repeat—there were some voices raised in protest of the GOP record of performance in the roaring twenties. Those voices went unheeded and the GOP depression with all its attendant misery and suffering followed.

Voices are raised today protesting the GOP record and appealing for action—it is later than we think. There are many causes for fear. Now is the time when something should be done.

There were great promises of prosperity and plenty for all at fair prices if industry could have its head. Those promises and predictions have been proven so much hot air—as industry continues to pile up tremendous profits and grinds the consuming public between the millstones of rising prices and shrinking dollars.

The GOP predicted great things if it could but control the legislative branch of our Government. It has occupied that position for 2 years and it has failed miserably to redeem a single promise made to the American people.

The GOP met in a great convention just a few weeks ago and nominated its choice for President of the United States. Its platform promised still more rosy things for all Americans.

In this special session the GOP had an opportunity to redeem at least some of those promises. Through its leaders it refused to consider the party platform as an issue. Its candidate for President has refused to speak out on any pressing problem. It has demonstrated clearly that it has no concern whatever for the distressful plight of the American housewife.

It is my opinion that the GOP Congress has failed completely in discharging its obligations to the American people.

In promises the GOP resembles a cloudburst; in performance—a drought.

Soon its speakers will be addressing the American public in a great political campaign. No doubt still more grandiloquent promises will be trotted out for public consumption.

I sincerely hope these spellbinders will find some small place in their addresses for an explanation of the GOP record in the Eightieth Congress. I feel confident the bulk of the American people will place the GOP record of promises alongside its record of performance. That is the final and best test. Action speaks louder than words.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] 1 minute.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that this bill fails utterly to provide any aid to farmers in the construction of homes, despite the fact that it fails to provide any secondary market that is useable so that the GI loans for house building can be availed of, I am going to support the bill on the theory that it will provide a little crumb of help to meet the critical housing shortage.

Owing to the gag rule voted last Wednesday by the Republican majority, it is impossible for me or any other Member to offer any amendment. And 40 minutes, 20 minutes to the side, is allowed for debate. Consequently it is impossible properly to consider or even to debate this important measure. I just want to point out that FHA loans under the provisions of title 6 of the Housing Act will be available only for housing built in cities and towns which meet the many requirements for sewerage, fire protection, and so forth. The farm people will get not a dime of aid in building homes under this bill. And by failing to provide an assured secondary market for GI mortgage loans through RFC, all aid to farmer ex-servicemen in building farm homes is denied. Yes; it will extend some housing aid to people in the cities who badly need it and because of that I shall support it. There is no hope for anything better from this session of the Congress. But I want to register my protest against the failure of this bill to provide aid for farm home building and for loans under the GI bill. I want to protest its failure to do anything for the low-income people, now housed in miserable slums. And, above all, I want to protest against a procedure that denies the membership the opportunity to offer amendments extending aid to them or

even to plead their case in this House. Such arbitrary action can hardly strengthen the faith of Americans in their Congress as an instrument of Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." I hope the next Congress will be more conscious of public need, and more willing to face issues forthrightly and solve them in the public interest.

CANADIAN PRICE CONTROL LAW HOLDS PRICES DOWN—PRICES OF FOODSTUFFS, MEAT, AND MEAT PRODUCTS, AND BUILDING MATERIALS ARE FROM 25 TO 50 PERCENT LOWER THAN IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely sorry that I am again obliged to criticize the Republican action in refusing to give the people of this country a decent housing bill. It is to be regretted that the gag rule, which you forced through the House, under which this bill is being considered, prevents Members to exercise their prerogative and right to offer and vote upon amendments to broaden the bill to provide cheaper homes and cheaper rents for the most needy and deserving veterans and people of our country.

AVARICIOUS REAL-ESTATE LOBBY HAS ITS WAY

The avaricious real-estate, contractors, and builders lobby will have its way because this bill is purely in their interest and not in the interest of the nearly three million veterans and people of low income who have appealed, pleaded, and prayed for relief from the intolerable conditions under which they have been obliged to live because of their inability to purchase or rent homes at prices they can afford to pay.

The bill does not, in any way, provide for public housing or for slum clearance. It is to be regretted that the other body was obliged to yield to the reactionary big four leadership of this House—I may say the big five leadership—to include the leader who is responsible for the failure to give the country a decent and honest housing bill. It would seem that they are devoid of any feeling or regard for the millions of homeless people. But the bill will aid the bankers in the Government guarantee of their loans and the builders of apartment houses and homes, but will, in no way, help the people who wish to obtain low-cost homes. There are, however, a few minor provisions in the bill that have been agreed upon by both sides of the House, but the $800,000,000 that is provided will serve to bail out the bankers and big contractors and not one penny is appropriated or authorized for the construction of low-cost homes or reasonable rental homes. The bill in effect subsidizes the higher but not the lower cost homes. I am surprised and amazed that the other body that has given real, serious consideration for 4 years to the housing shortage has yielded as they have, for political expediency, to the reactionary big five leadership of this House. The action and position they have taken with respect to this needed housing legislation indicates, unfortunately, that they have been subservient for the last three years to the real-estate combinations who, through their vicious lobby, have expended $2,000,000 to defeat a real and honest program to provide homes at prices that the people or ex-servicemen with low earnings and income are able to pay.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ADJOURN

I still maintain that we should not adjourn until we—

First. Pass a decent housing bill.

Second. Pass a real anti-inflation bill.

Third. Pass a bill to reduce the high cost of living.

Fourth. Pass a bill increasing the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour.

Fifth. Amend the discriminatory Displaced Persons Act the Republicans enacted 6 weeks ago to permit the entry of 400,000 instead of 200,000 suffering displaced persons, and to allow the entry of 30,000 ex-Polish soldiers now stranded in Great Britain.

Sixth. Pass the fair-employment bill.

Seventh. Enact the corporation excess-profits tax bill and to amend the income tax act to reduce the taxes of the taxpayers in the lower-income brackets who are now carrying the greater share of the tax burden.

Eighth. Enact the oleomargarine bill to repeal the 10 cents a pound tax paid by the poorer class because they cannot afford to pay 90 cents for a pound of butter.

Ninth. Pass a bill to broaden the Social Security Act, and to increase the monthly compensation of the aged persons now on the rolls who do not have enough to live decently.

Tenth. Pass a bill to place price controls on foodstuffs, necessaries of life, and scarce building materials that would reduce the outrageously high prices.

Eleventh. Pass the anti-poll-tax bill.

HIGHER PRICES—HIGHER PROFITS

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to point out that in Canada, where they have a price-control law, the prices of foodstuffs, shoes, wearing apparel, other necessities of life, and building materials are from 25 percent to 40 percent cheaper than in the United States. The Republicans forced the repeal of our price-control law and despite the demands of the consumers and the recommendations of President Truman that it be reenacted, they have failed to act, and are responsible for the American consumer paying these higher prices than the Canadian consumer. Compared with the Canadian prices, the prices charged by the Oil Trust, the Steel Trust, the Lumber Trust, and all other American trusts have enabled them to increase their profits during the first 6 months of this year to a greater extent than the huge profits they enjoyed in 1946 and 1947. The promise of the National Association of Manufacturers and the Republicans that, if price controls were removed and industry were allowed to voluntarily adjust and fix prices, the increase in prices would be arrested, and even lowered, did not come to pass, and the people will call you to account by defeating you in November.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this makeshift housing bill before us as it may leave to some small degree—and I say small degree—a few crumbs to the homeless veterans and people. This on the theory that it is better to have a little than nothing at all.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this House know, I have been supporting the Veterans Homestead Act since December 19, 1947, when I introduced this measure at the request of the American Legion's legislative representative. I have felt during all this period that the Veterans Homestead Act would go further toward providing immediate relief, and toward remedying the housing shortage than any other proposed legislation. It is my opinion now that the Veterans Homestead Act would go further toward providing relief than House bill H. R. 6959, upon which we are about to vote.

However, this bill contains many features which will relieve the present critical housing shortage.

It does provide for veterans cooperative housing projects. On page 70 of this bill an amendment to section 207 (c) of title II, provides for the formation of nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporations, whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II, and provides that mortgages on houses built by such nonprofit cooperative organizations may be insured in an amount up to 95 percent of the replacement cost of houses erected for members of such organization. This provides for insurance either in a maximum amount of $8,100 per unit or maximum amount of $1,800 per room.

Provisions of this bill contained on page 62 in section 611 (a), page 73, paragraph 2, facilitate the construction and financing of low-cost homes, ranging in price from $4,500 to $6,500 each. These provisions will afford relief to a segment of our population who are most urgently in need of relief in the housing situation at the present time. This bill also provides for both an immediate and long-range rental housing program. It provides for the production of low-cost multifamily rental housing, provisions being contained on pages 69 and 70 for a rental-housing program to be provided for by continuance of section 608, on pages 55 and 56, and on page 76, wherein a new title, title VII, is added to the National Housing Act, the purpose of which is to supplement the existing systems of mortgage insurance for rental housing by a special system of insurance designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing at rents within the capacity of families of moderate incomes.

This bill also broadens the Government's secondary mortgage market in the case of GI mortgages, and Lanham Act permanents, and also rental projects. It raises the maximum amount of mortgages which may be sold by lenders and

banking institutions from 25 percent to 50 percent.

While this bill is not all that I would like to see enacted in the way of housing legislation, nevertheless it will be a considerable contribution on the part of the Government toward relieving the housing shortage, providing immediate relief, as well as a long-range rental-housing program. One of the features of this bill, with which I am in hearty accord, is the fact that it contains a provision that owners of section 608 rental housing projects, in selecting their tenants, will not discriminate against families with children. This bill provides a $500 penalty for any violation of that section. I am especially glad that this provision is in this bill.

I shall, therefore, for the above reasons, support and vote for this measure.

LET US STAY ON THE JOB

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, if we were to listen to the dictates of our consciences, we would not go home today. We would stay right here on the job until we did something about stopping the inflationary spiral, and something to give to the country, public housing or housing for the low-income groups, and something for slum clearance. You may go home today and tell your constituents that you passed a housing bill and that you did something for the veterans in connection with housing. It will be a half truth. The words "veterans" and "housing" are in this bill, but you are really doing very little for them.

There is no public housing in this bill. There is no slum clearance provided for in this bill. There is no farm housing provided for in this bill. There is no veteran's help of any consequence in this bill.

It is tragic that you are allowing yourselves only 40 minutes to talk about the needs of this country and what to do about the housing situation that confronts us.

This Congress spent $100,000 for a joint housing committee investigation. Since 1944 bills have been before the Congress to help cure this situation. They were debated in the Senate for days. You now find time to spare all of 40 minutes to talk about it, and you preclude yourselves from offering a single amendment that might be adopted or might be voted upon, regardless of the outcome. There are 47 pages of printed matter making up the text of this bill. The prints were not available until late yesterday. Very few Members of this House have had an opportunity to read the bill. I dare say that there is not a Member of this House who has read the bill who could explain its terms in 40 minutes, no less to argue its merits and demerits.

After all the time and effort that has been put into the public hearings conducted by a joint housing committee and by the standing committees of the two Houses of this Congress, it is nothing short of an insult to the citizens of this country to attempt to pass this bill under a suspension of the rules, with such limited debate and without an opportunity to offer amendments.

Mr. Speaker, this bill can very aptly be termed "a rich man's housing bill." It does nothing for the fellow who needs any help. You provide insurance for the man who wants to make a mortgage investment, you provide a guaranteed income to the man who wants to build. You provide for the real-estate big-business man who wants to build so that he can get the money and make practically no investment of his own. All of that benefits the fellow in the upper brackets.

If you want to know how badly the veterans need help and how little help they are getting, I suggest that you carefully read the statement of Teel Williams, president of the Basic Builders Corp., of 140 Nassau Street, New York City, which was circulated yesterday by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], and which I understand he has included in the Appendix of the RECORD. He tells about a project designed solely and primarily to provide for 600 families of veterans which cannot be built for lack of financing. The project has been approved and acclaimed as a good economic and provident venture, yet it has been abandoned because private capital will not finance it. It cannot be financed under the terms of this bill because the cost of construction must necessarily far exceed the $8,100 per unit limitation contained within this bill.

Do you know the meaning of the limitation in this bill of $8,100 a unit? It means that you can erect a building with four-room apartments provided the cost does not exceed $2,000 a room. There is not a metropolitan area in the country where, in today's market, multiple-dwelling units can be built unless the cost per room far exceeds that. When you put up a multiple dwelling at a cost of even $2,000 per room or $8,000 per unit for a four-room apartment, the rents must be so high that anyone who needs help in this critical housing situation cannot get the help.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I wish to thank my colleague from New York for yielding to me at this point. If it were not for his generosity, it would be impossible for me to express my views.

The question of housing is one of the principal thoughts in the minds of the American people. Over 5,000,000 of our people are either without housing or are improperly housed. Experts have testified before the committees of this House and through the media of the public press that lack of housing and faulty housing are the principal causes for the clogging of the divorce calendars of the courts of our country, the increased juvenile delinquency and a general break-down in the moral fiber of our people.

For the Republican majority which controls this House to bring this bill out under a gag rule that precludes all amendments and limits debate of the proponents of improved housing to 20 minutes is a travesty on the parliamentary system of government. The Republican leadership well knows that this is not a true housing bill and will not give a bit of relief in housing conditions in a single large city of our country. The bill is the dream of the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, and dishonest and corrupt builders. It does not provide the large-scale housing so essential to hundreds of thousands of our low-wage earners in the great cities. It absolutely prohibits the erection of one- and two-family units in those same communities, because of its limitations upon costs. It guarantees not only the continuation of high cost, low grade housing, but will create an ever-mounting spiral of increasing prices in the realty field.

The bill is born of deceit and conceived by political conniving. It is a deliberate attempt on the part of the Republican leadership to hoodwink the people of our country.

Gentlemen of the Republican Party, you are perpetrating a fraud upon the American people. You are pretending that you are endeavoring to create more housing and homes in this country, whereas you know you are doing nothing more than rigging the present high prices and guaranteeing further increases at the expense and discomfort of millions of our people. The responsibility is yours and you must face the consequences.

Later today you intend to call up another fraud. A bill that is supposed to attack the question of the high cost of living. Again the Republican leadership allows the opponents of the high cost of living but 20 minutes of debate. No Member of this House can go back to his district, to his people, without the question of the high cost of living being brought up within 2 or 3 minutes—$1.30 a pound steaks, 97-cent bacon, 96-cent eggs, 93-cent butter, 24-cent milk, $60 men's suits, $5.95 infants' shoes—everything at a level so high that the working man and woman is hard pressed to buy even the necessities of life.

You told the people of this country when you removed controls that prices would go down. Well, prices for food, clothing, and the other necessities of life have gone up 60 to 110 percent in the 2 years since you have lifted controls and in the 2 years that you have controlled this Congress of the United States. You charge that high costs are due to Government spending. Well, my friends on the other side of the aisle, I will take you at your word. During the past 2 years since you have controlled the House every single dollar that has been appropriated and spent by this Government of ours has been appropriated and expended through and by your party. It is time for sham, pretense, and lies to be swept aside. It is time that the American people be informed and made to realize that it is the Republican Party that has controlled the purse strings of this Nation for the past 2 years. It is time that the people be made aware of the fact that never in the history of this country has there been so much lobbying in

Washington and never in the history of this country has there been a party so responsive to this lobbying.

For some unknown reason you seem to doubt the intelligence of our people. You seem to feel that through sham and pretense you can hide the truth. Gentlemen, you are dealing with a literate, free public who have access to the radio, to the press and to other media of information. You have not fooled them, you are not fooling them. They know that they are paying the bill for your perfidy and they know that they can hold you to a strict accounting on November 2.

If you are sincere in your efforts to assist the people of this country, I ask you to join with me and the other 40 Members of this House who have banded ourselves together to oppose adjournment until such time as this Congress will honestly and sincerely attack the problems of housing and the high cost of living I ask you to forget party policy and party loyalty. I remind you that your first obligation is to the Nation and to its people. I ask you to stay here in the Capitol until we can work out legislation that will make it possible for our people to live within their incomes and to have decent and proper housing. The request is a simple one. Have you the courage and the intellectual honesty to bear with me?

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Mr. Speaker, the people will not long be fooled by what we do not do here.

Residential construction may well reach an all-time high in 1948, but the number of those who can afford to buy these new homes is becoming smaller and smaller, and the demand of those most urgently in need of new housing—the low-income families—is not being and will not be met by private construction.

What is happening in Philadelphia, Pa., is typical of what is happening all over the United States.

Of 3,972 new one-family row-houses, 1.2 percent sold for $7,000–$8,000, 48.5 percent sold for $8,000–$9,000, 27 percent for $9,000–$10,000, and 23.3 percent for $10,000 and more. The average sales price was $9,625.

At the same time, 23 percent of all families had annual incomes of less than $2,000, 43 percent had incomes from $2,000 to $4,000, 13 percent had incomes from $4,000 to $5,000, and 21 percent had incomes of over $5,000.

Under accepted standards, no family should pay for a house more than twice its annual income. Sixty-six percent of all families cannot afford to pay more than $8,000 for a new house, yet 1.2 percent of all new houses built in Philadelphia are available for sale at less than $8,000.

These people are asking this Congress: Where shall we live? Where shall we provide the homes for our children, the citizens of tomorrow, in which to implant in them the traditions of a good America?

Mr. Speaker, we are doing the country an injustice, an immeasurable injustice, if we do not stay right here on the job and give the people a housing bill that is a housing bill, one that will help clean up this desperate situation that confronts us.

Those who say there will be time enough to take care of this problem in the Eighty-first Congress may find that their shirking of their duty today may well be the cause of keeping them out of the Eighty-first Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, this bill in substance excludes from consideration with respect to new housing 36 percent of the population of the United States, who have annual incomes of less than $2,000 per year; hence I shall stick by the principles which induced me to introduce the Taft-Ellender-Wagner comprehensive housing bill in March 1947, and vote "present" on this resolution as I voted on the Wolcott bill when it was before us in June.

The last-ditch opponents of public housing have won this round, but the people want public housing and the people will get it in the next Congress.

The real record on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, Mr. Speaker, is engrossed on the discharge petition, completed to a very substantial extent, and signed by Members on both sides of the aisle; those Members can best account to their constituents in that way.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6959, as amended by the Senate, is an honest attempt to furnish aids to provide more and lower-cost housing—both for rent and for sale.

What will H. R. 6959 do?

First. Facilitates the construction and financing of homes in the $5,000 to $6,500 price range.

Second. Provides for both an immediate and long-range rental housing program.

Third. Provides for the production of low-cost multifamily rental housing.

Fourth. Facilitates the purchase by veterans of low-cost Government-owned rental housing, the lowest possible priced housing in today's market.

Fifth. Provides for liberalized financing in localities and metropolitan areas where there is a need for new dwellings for families of lower income.

Sixth. Aids the production of mass-produced prefabricated houses, and the economies of on-site mass production of conventional houses.

Seventh. Provides for veterans' cooperative housing projects with 95 percent mortgage financing, as well as other cooperatives and nonprofit corporations with 90 percent.

Eighth. Provides for the development of standardized codes and measurements of building materials.

Ninth. Broadens Government secondary mortgage market in the case of GI mortgages and Lanham permanents—which have veteran preference—and rental projects.

Tenth. Rental housing program provided for by continuance of section 608, yield insurance, veterans, and other cooperative ownership housing corporations as well as other section 207 type programs.

Eleventh. Provides that the owners of section 608 rental housing projects in selecting tenants will not discriminate against families with children, and provides $500 penalty for any violation thereof.

Mr. Speaker, I believe H. R. 6959 is a fine, comprehensive housing bill, and I intend to vote for it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the many years I have been in the House I have never seen a bill which was perfectly satisfactory to every Member. That undoubtedly is the case in respect to this bill. Some Members are keenly disappointed that the provisions in which they were most interested perhaps are not included in the bill; but this bill generally will be of material benefit to those who want to build and those who want to buy low-cost housing, statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

The bill is designed to encourage the construction of low-cost housing and advantages are given in that field. It is designed to accelerate the production of apartment houses in the big cities and if the bill is administered as we hope it will be administered, it will result in building thousands and thousands of rental units in cities where this housing is most needed. It will not necessarily build any more houses than would otherwise be built this year because if we build over a million units we are going to have to use almost all of the available material and labor in that effort; but it will adjust the demand in such a manner—and it will follow if this bill is passed—that building material and labor will be channeled into the low-cost housing field and into the construction of apartment units in cities where they are needed the most.

The Housing Act of 1948 is designed to attack the existing housing emergency as well as to provide a broadened long-range program of low-cost housing in the home ownership and rental fields. It will encourage now, an accelerated production of low-cost homes. It will encourage now, an expanded production of rental housing units. It will immediately liberalize home financing for veterans. From a long-range point of view, the bill modernizes and broadens FHA housing insurance programs. The bill seeks the economies in construction costs attendant upon improved and standardized building codes and standardized dimensions for building materials. The bill encourages cost reductions through mass production of prefabricated houses as well as homes of conventional construction.

LOW-COST HOUSING

The bill will facilitate the financing of homes in the $5,000 to $6,500 price range. The FHA title I mortgage insurance maximum is increased from $3,000 to $4,500. According to a survey of construction costs by the Bureau of Labor

Statistics last year 20 percent of the new housing construction in the country fell within a price range that would be covered by the new mortgage limitation in title I. A new provision is added to mortgage insurance under FHA title II under which 90 to 95 percent loans are permitted up to a mortgage maximum of $6,000. According to the survey abovementioned 43 percent of new housing construction fell within the authorized mortgage limitation of this provision. Mass production of prefabricated houses will be encouraged by the financial assistance afforded by certain provisions of FHA title VI. Another provision of title VI is designed to encourage on-site mass production of homes of conventional construction.

RENTAL HOUSING

One of the acute problems in the housing emergency is the shortage of rental housing. To stimulate the immediate production of rental-housing accommodations $800,000,000 of title VI FHA mortgage insurance is authorized for such housing construction. A longer term approach to this problem is provided under a $1,000,000,000 yield-insurance program. Rentals charged under the yield-insurance program would be FHA approved and so set that they will meet the needs for dwellings of families of moderate income. Each of these insurance programs are supported by premiums charged so that the amounts involved reflect only contingent liabilities of the Government. Provision is made for the production of rental housing units for families of lower income in localities or metropolitan areas where there is a need for new dwellings at such rental. Projects of nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporations and nonprofit corporations can likewise be financed in this field under a mortgage which may be insured up to 90 percent, and in case the cooperative is a veterans' cooperative up to 95 percent—section 207 amendments.

VETERANS' HOUSING

The bill makes eligible for purchase by the Government secondary market in the Federal National Mortgage Association, insured mortgages covering Government war housing. By regulations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency veterans are given first preference in the purchase of this housing. This housing constitutes probably the lowest cost housing available for veteran ownership, and the provisions of this bill should stimulate the acquisition of this housing by veterans. The Government secondary market is also broadened with respect to GI home loans in that 50 percent of the lender's portfolio of such loans insured after April 30, 1948, are made eligible for sale to the Federal National Mortgage Association. As noted in the preceding section veterans' cooperative housing projects are accorded a preferential 95 percent insured mortgage. While not involved in this legislation, attention may be called to the fact that the housing and rent act of 1948 gives veterans a priority for the purchase of all newly constructed housing and priority for occupancy in all newly constructed rental housing.

CONCLUSION

This country is experiencing a housing boom which promises to reach over a million units this year, a building record never before equaled in this or any other country. The provisions of this bill are designed to keep this momentum going. While a full use is being made of existing supplies of labor and materials it is believed that the financial incentives offered in this bill will attract labor and materials into an even greater production of housing units through emphasis on lower cost construction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point the Senate amendment to the bill H. R. 6959 may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

That this act may be cited as the "Housing Act of 1948."

TITLE I—FHA TITLE VI AND TRANSITIONAL PERIOD AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

TITLE VI AMENDMENTS

(a) Section 603 (a) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$5,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,750,000,000 except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased to not to exceed $6,150,000,000";

(2) By striking out the second proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That no mortgage shall be insured under section 603 of this title after April 30, 1948, except (A) pursuant to a commitment to insure issued on or before April 30, 1948, or (B) a mortgage given to refinance an existing mortgage insured under section 603 of this title and which does not exceed the original principal amount and unexpired term of such existing mortgage, and no mortgage shall be insured under section 608 of this title after March 31, 1949, except (i) pursuant to a commitment to insure issued on or before March 31, 1949, or (ii) a mortgage given to refinance an existing mortgage insured under section 608 of this title and which does not exceed the original principal amount and unexpired term of such existing mortgage: *Provided further*, That no mortgage shall be insured under section 608 of this title unless the mortgagor certifies under oath that in selecting tenants for the property covered by the mortgage he will not discriminate against any family by reason of the fact that there are children in the family, and that he will not sell the property while the insurance is in effect unless the purchaser so certifies, such certifications to be filed with the Administrator; and violation of any such certification shall be a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not to exceed $500:";

(b) Section 608 (b) (3) (B) is amended by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That the principal obligation of the mortgage shall not, in any event, exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located; and".

(c) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$1,500 per room" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,100 per family unit"; and

(2) By striking out the colon and the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(d) Section 609 is amended—

(1) By striking out all of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding purchase contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator providing for the purchase and delivery of the houses to be manufactured, which contracts shall provide for the payment of the purchase price at such time as may be agreed to by the parties thereto, but, in no event, shall the purchase price be payable on a date in excess of 30 days after the date of delivery of such houses, unless not less than 20 percent of such purchase price is paid on or before the date of delivery and the lender has accepted and discounted or has agreed to accept and discount, pursuant to subsection (i) of this section a promissory note or notes, executed by the purchaser, representing the unpaid portion of such purchase price, in which event such unpaid portion of the purchase price may be payable on a date not in excess of 180 days from the date of delivery of such houses.".

(2) By striking out the first and second sentences of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost, exclusive of profit, of manufacturing the houses, which are the subject of such purchase contracts assigned to secure the loan, less any sums paid by the purchaser under said purchase contracts prior to the assignment thereof. The loan shall be secured by an assignment of the aforesaid purchase contracts and of all sums payable thereunder on or after the date of such assignment, with the right in the assignee to proceed against such security in case of default as provided in the assignment, which assignment shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Administrator; and the Administrator may require such other agreements and undertakings to further secure the loan as he may determine, including the right, in case of default or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses then owned and in the possession of the borrower."

(3) By adding at the end of subsection (f) the following new sentence: "The provisions of section 603 (d) shall also be applicable to loans insured under this section and the reference in said section 603 (d) to a mortgage shall be construed to include a loan or loans with respect to which a contract of insurance is issued pursuant to this section."

(4) By adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) (1) In addition to the insurance of the principal loan to finance the manufacture of housing, as provided in this section, and in order to provide short-term financing in the sale of houses to be delivered pursuant to the purchase contract or contracts assigned as security for such principal loan, the Administrator is authorized, under such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe, to insure the lender against any losses it may sustain resulting from the acceptance and discount of a promissory note or notes executed by a purchaser of any such houses representing an unpaid portion of the purchase price of any such houses. No such promissory note or notes accepted and discounted by the lender pursuant to this subsection shall involve a principal obligation in excess of 80 percent of the purchase price of the manufactured house or houses; have a maturity in excess of 180 days from the date of the note or bear interest in excess of 4 percent per annum; nor may the principal amount of such promissory notes, with respect to any individual principal loan, outstanding and unpaid at any one time, exceed in the aggregate an amount prescribed by the Administrator.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to include in any contract of insurance executed by him with respect to the insurance of a loan to finance the manufacture of houses, provisions to effectuate the insurance against any such losses under this subsection.

"(3) The failure of the purchaser to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of any note or notes executed by the purchaser and accepted and discounted by the lender under the provisions of this subsection, shall be considered as a default under this subsection, and if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the lender shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance, as provided in subsection (d) of this section except that debentures issued pursuant to this subsection shall have a face value equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan plus interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of default to the date the application is filed for the insurance benefits.

"(4) Debentures issued with respect to the insurance granted under this subsection shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date application is filed for the insurance benefits and shall bear interest from such date.

"(5) The Administrator is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this subsection, in addition to the premium charge authorized under subsection (h) of this section. Such premium charge shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the original principal of such promissory note or notes and shall be paid at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator."

(e) Section 610 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Administrator is further authorized to insure or to make commitments to insure in accordance with the provisions of this section any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any of the so-called Greenbelt towns, or parts thereof, including projects, or parts thereof, known as Greenhills, Ohio; Greenbelt, Md.; and Greendale, Wis., developed under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, or of any of the village properties under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and any mortgage executed in connection with the first resale, within 2 years from the date of its acquisition from the Government, of any portion of a project or property which is the security for a mortgage insured pursuant to the provisions of this section."

(f) Title VI is amended by adding after section 610 the following new section:

"SEC. 611. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under other sections of this title, and in order to assist and encourage the application of cost-reduction techniques through large-scale modernized site construction of housing and the erection of houses produced by modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Administrator as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"(2) cover property, held by a mortgagor approved by the Administrator, upon which there is to be constructed or erected dwelling units for not less than 25 families consisting of a group of single-family dwellings approved by the Administrator for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That during the course of construction there may be located upon the mortgaged property a plant for the fabrication or storage of such dwellings or sections or parts thereof, and the Administrator may consent to the removal or release of such plant from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may approve;

"(3) involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(A) not to exceed 80 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the completed property or project, exclusive of any plant of the character described in paragraph (2) of this subsection located thereon, and

"(B) not to exceed a sum computed on the individual dwellings comprising the total project as follows: $6,000 or 80 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each single-family dwelling.

"With respect to the insurance of advances during construction, the Administrator is authorized to approve advances by the mortgagee to cover the cost of materials delivered upon the mortgaged property and labor performed in the fabrication or erection thereof;

"(4) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time: *Provided*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest, not exceeding 4½ percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, if he finds that the mortgage market demands it. The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"(c) Preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for veterans of World War II and their immediate families and for hardship cases as defined by the Administrator shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(d) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 608 shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

TITLE II AMENDMENTS

(g) Section 203 (b) (2) (B) is amended by striking out "$5,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,300."

(h) Section 203 (b) (2) (C) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$6,600" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,500";

(2) By striking out "$6,000" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,000";

(3) By striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,000."

(i) Section 203 (b) is amended by striking out in paragraph numbered (3) the following: "of the character described in paragraph (2) (B) of this subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "on property approved for insurance prior to the beginning of construction."

(j) Section 203 (b) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) (C), inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or," and adding the following new paragraph:

"(D) not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 90 percent of the appraised value, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance (or 95 percent if, in the determination of the Administrator, insurance of mortgages involving a principal obligation in such amount under this paragraph would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities for families of moderate income), of a property, urban, suburban, or rural, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That the Administrator may by regulation provide that the principal obligation of any mortgage eligible for insurance under this paragraph shall be fixed at a lesser amount than $6,000 where he finds that for any section of the country or at any time a lower-cost dwelling for families of lower income is feasible without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability: *And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages insured under this paragraph the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 10 percent (or 5 percent, in the case of a 95-percent mortgage insured pursuant to this paragraph (D)) of the appraised value in cash or its equivalent, or shall be the builder constructing the dwelling in which case the principal obligation shall not exceed 85 percent of the appraised value of the property."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph numbered (3), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 30 years in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(3) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph numbered (5), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 4 percent per annum in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(k) (1) Section 203 (c) is amended (1) by striking out in the last sentence the words "section or section 210" and inerting in lieu thereof the word "title"; and (2) by striking out in said sentence the words "under this section."

(2) Sections 203 (c) and 603 (c) of such act are amended by striking out in the last sentence and in the next to the last sentence, respectively, the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

(l) Section 204 (a) is amended—

(1) By striking out, in the last sentence, the following: "prior to July 1, 1944,";

(2) By inserting between the first and second provisos in the last sentence the following: "*And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages which are accepted for insurance under section 203 (b) (2) (D) or under the second proviso of section 207 (c) (2) of this act, there may be included in the debentures issued by the Administrator on account of the cost of foreclosure (or of acquiring the property by other means) actually paid by the mortgagee and approved by the Administrator in amount, not in excess of two-thirds of such cost or $75, whichever is the greater:".

(m) Section 207 (b) is amended by amending paragraph numbered (1) to read as follows:

"(1) Federal or State instrumentalities, municipal corporate instrumentalities of one or more States, or limited dividend or redevelopment or housing corporations restricted by Federal or State laws or regulations of State banking or insurance departments as to rents, charges, capital structure, rate of return, or methods of operation; or."

(n) Section 207 (c) is amended—

(1) By amending the first sentence to read as follows:

"(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage on any property or project shall involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(1) not to exceed $5,000,000, or, if executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, not to exceed $50,000,000;

"(2) not to exceed 80 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the property or project

when the proposed improvements are completed, including the land; the proposed physical improvements; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Administrator: *Provided*, That, except with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, such mortgage shall not exceed the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project, exclusive of public utilities and streets and organization and legal expenses: *And provided further*, That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph No. (2), a mortgage with respect to a project to be constructed in a locality or metropolitan area where, as determined by the Administrator, there is a need for new dwellings for families of lower income at rentals comparable to the rentals proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project (or, in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporations, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members) may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed, except that in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II, the principal obligations may be in an amount not exceeding 95 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed; and

"(3) not to exceed $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, except that in the case of projects of the character described in the second proviso of section 207 (c) (2), if the Administrator finds that the needs of the members of any such corporation could more adequately be met by per room cost limitations, the mortgage may involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed $1,800 per room for such part of such project as may be attributable to dwelling use."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of the second sentence, inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and adding the following: "except that with respect to mortgages insured under the provisions of the second proviso of paragraph No. (2) of this subsection, which mortgages are hereby authorized to have a maturity of not exceeding 40 years from the date of the insurance of the mortgage, such interest rate shall not exceed 4 percent per annum."

(3) By adding the following additional sentence at the end thereof: "Such property or project may include such commercial and community facilities as the Administrator deems adequate to serve the occupants."

(o) Section 207 (g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the number "2" appearing in clause (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "1."

(p) Section 207 (h) is amended by striking out, in paragraph No. (1), the words "paid to the mortgagor of such property," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund."

(q) Section 204 (f) is amended by inserting in clause No. (1), immediately preceding the semicolon, the following: "if the mortgage was insured under section 203 and shall be retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund if the mortgage was insured under section 207."

(r) Section 207 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(q) In order to assure an adequate market for mortgages on cooperative-ownership projects and rental-housing projects for families of lower income and veterans of the character described in the second proviso of paragraph No. (2) of subsection (c) of this section, the powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association and of any other Federal corporation or other Federal agency hereafter established, to make real-estate loans, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, or partial interests therein, may be utilized in connection with projects of the character described in said proviso."

TITLE I AMENDMENTS

(s) Section 2 is amended:

(1) By striking out "$166,000,000 in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000,000";

(2) By striking out "$3,000" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,500";

(3) By striking out the first proviso in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $10,000 and having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure used or to be used as an apartment house or a dwelling for two or more families;";

(4) By striking out the last sentence of subsection (b).

SEC. 102. In order to aid housing production, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans to and purchase the obligations of any business enterprise for the purpose of providing financial assistance for the production of prefabricated houses or prefabricated housing components, or for large-scale modernized site construction. Such loans or purchases shall be made under such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Corporation may determine: *Provided*, That to the extent that the proceeds of such loans or purchases are used for the purchase of equipment, plant, or machinery the principal obligation shall not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of such equipment, plant, or machinery: *And provided further*, That the total amount of commitments for loans made and obligations purchased under this section shall not exceed $50,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and no financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless it is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

SEC. 103. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of section 500 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*And provided further*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest than otherwise prescribed in this section for loans guaranteed under this title, but not exceeding 4½ percent per annum, if he finds that the loan market demands it."

TITLE II—SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI HOME LOANS AND FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION INSURED MORTGAGES

SEC. 201. Section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "which are insured after April 30, 1948, under section 203 or section 603 of this act, or guaranteed under section 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "which are insured after April 30, 1948, under title II, or title VI of this act, or guaranteed after April 30, 1948, under section 501, or section 502, or section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended."

SEC. 202. Paragraph (E) of the proviso of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause numbered (2) the figure "25" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "50."

TITLE III—STANDARDIZED BUILDING CODES AND MATERIALS

SEC. 301. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall undertake and conduct technical research and studies to develop and promote the acceptance and application of improved and standardized building codes and regulations and methods for the more uniform administration thereof, and standardized dimensions and methods for the assembly of home-building materials and equipment.

SEC. 302. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator shall utilize, to the fullest extent feasible, the available facilities of other departments, independent establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government, and, notwithstanding any other law, shall appoint a Director to administer under his general supervision the provisions of this title.

SEC. 303. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE IV—EQUITY INVESTMENT AIDS

SEC. 401. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new title:

"TITLE VII—INSURANCE FOR INVESTMENTS IN RENTAL HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME

"AUTHORITY TO INSURE

"SEC. 701. The purpose of this title is to supplement the existing systems of mortgage insurance for rental housing under this act by a special system of insurance designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing at rents within the capacity of families of moderate income. To effectuate this purpose, the Administrator is authorized, upon application by the investor, to insure as hereinafter provided, and, prior to the execution of insuance contracts and upon such terms as the Administrator shall prescribe, to make commitments to insure, the minimum annual amortization charge and an annual return on the outstanding investment of such investor in any project which is eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided in an amount (herein called the "insured annual return') equal to such rate of return, not exceeding 2¾ per centum per annum, on such outstanding investment as shall, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, be fixed in the insurance contract or in the commitment to insure: *Provided*, That any insurance contract made pursuant to this title shall expire as of the first day of the operating year for which the outstanding investment amounts to not more than 10 percent of the established investment: *And provided further*, That the aggregate amount of contingent liabilities outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure made pursuant to this title shall not exceed $1,000,000,000.

"ELIGIBILITY

"SEC. 702. (a) To be eligible for insurance under this title, a project shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The Administrator shall be satisfied that there is, in the locality or metropolitan area of such project, a need for new rental dwellings at rents comparable to the rents proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project.

"(2) Such project shall be economically sound, and the dwellings in such project shall be acceptable to the Administrator as to quality, design, size, and type.

"(b) Any insurance contract executed by the Administrator under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the project and the investor for such insurance, and the validity of any insurance contract so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an investor from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such investor.

"PREMIUMS AND FEES

"SEC. 703. (a) For insurance granted pursuant to this title the Administrator shall fix and collect a premium charge in an amount not exceeding one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year for which such premium charge is payable without taking into account the excess earnings, if any, applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment. Such premium charge shall be payable annually in advance by the investor, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Administrator under this title at par plus accrued interest: *Provided*, That, if in any operating year the gross income shall be less than the operating expenses, the premium charge payable during such operating year shall be waived, but only to the extent of the amount of the difference between such expenses and such income and subject to subsequent payment out of any excess earnings as hereinafter provided.

"(b) With respect to any project offered for insurance under this title, the Administrator is authorized to charge and collect reasonable fees for examination, and for inspection during the construction of the project: *Provided*, That such fees shall not aggregate more than one-half of 1 percent of the estimated investment.

"RENTS

"SEC. 704. The Administrator shall require that the rents for the dwellings in any project insured under this title shall be established in accordance with a rent schedule approved by the Administrator, and that the investor shall not charge or collect rents for any dwellings in the project in excess of the appropriate rents therefor as shown in the latest rent schedule approved pursuant to this section. Prior to approving the initial or any subsequent rent schedule pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall find that such schedule affords reasonable assurance that the rents to be established thereunder are (1) not lower than necessary, together with all other income to be derived from or in connection with the project, to produce reasonably stable revenues sufficient to provide for the payment of the operating expenses, the minimum annual amortization charge, and the minimum annual return; and (2) not higher than necessary to meet the need for dwellings for families of moderate income.

"EXCESS EARNINGS

"SEC. 705. For all of the purposes of any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, 50 percent of the excess earnings, if any, for any operating year may be applied, in addition to the minimum annual return, to return on the outstanding investment but only to the extent that such application thereof does not result in an annual return of more than 5 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year, and the balance of any such excess earnings shall be applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment: *Provided*, That if in any preceding operating years the gross income shall have been less than the operating expenses, such excess earnings shall be applied to the extent necessary in whole or in part, first, to the reimbursement of the amount of the difference between such expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and such income, and, second, to the payment of any permium charges previously waived hereunder.

"FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

"SEC. 706. With respect to each project insured under this title, the Administrator shall provide that, after the close of each operating year, the investor shall submit to him for approval a financial and operating statement covering such operating year. If any such financial and operating statement shall not have been submitted or, for proper cause, shall not have been approved by the Administrator, payment of any claim submitted by the investor may, at the option of the Administrator, be withheld, in whole or in part, until such statement shall have been submitted and approved.

"PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

"SEC. 707. If in any operating year the net income of a project insured under this title is less than the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return, the Administrator, upon submission by the investor of a claim for the payment of the amount of the difference between such net income and the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return and after proof of the validity of such claim, shall pay to the investor, in cash from the housing investment insurance fund, the amount of such difference, as determined by the Administrator, but not exceeding, in any event, an amount equal to the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return.

"DEBENTURES

"SEC. 708. (a) If the aggregate of the amounts paid to the investor pursuant to section 707 hereof with respect to a project insured under this title shall at any time equal or exceed 15 percent of the established investment, the Administrator thereafter shall have the right, after written notice to the investor of his intentions so to do, to acquire, as of the first day of any operating year, such project in consideration of the issuance and delivery to the investor of debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year. In any such case the investor shall be obligated to convey to said Administrator title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and, in the event that the investor fails so to do, said Administrator may, at his option, terminate the insurance contract.

"(b) If in any operating year the aggregate of the differences between the operating expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and the gross income for the preceding operating years, less the aggregate of any deficits in such operating expenses reimbursed from excess earnings as hereinbefore provided, shall at any time equal or exceed 5 percent of the established investment, the investor shall thereafter have the right, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, to convey to the Administrator, as of the first day of any operating year, title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and to receive from the Administrator debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(c) Any difference, not exceeding $50, between 90 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year in which a project is acquired by the Administrator pursuant to this section and the total face value of the debentures to be issued and delivered to the investor pursuant to this section shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Administrator to the investor from the housing investment insurance fund.

"(d) Upon the acquisition of a project by the Administrator pursuant to this section, the insurance contract shall terminate.

"(e) Debentures issued under this title to any investor shall be executed in the name of the housing investment insurance fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Administrator, by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. Such debentures shall be dated as of the first day of the operating year in which the project for which such debentures were issued was acquired by the Administrator, shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the insurance contract was executed, but not to exceed 2¾ percent per annum, payable semi-annually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, and shall mature on the 1st day of July in such calendar year or years, not later than the fortieth following the date of the issuance thereof, as shall be determined by the Administrator and stated on the face of such debentures.

"(f) Such debentures shall be in such form and in such denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and may include such provisions for redemption as shall be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be issued in either coupon or registered form.

"(g) Such debentures shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, shall be payable out of the housing investment insurance fund, which shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed, as to both the principal thereof and the interest thereon, by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the housing investment insurance fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or the interest on any debentures so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon, to the extent of the amount so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such debentures.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real and other property by the United States, the Administrator shall have power, for the protection of the housing investment insurance fund, to pay out of said fund all expenses or charges in connection with, and to deal with, complete, reconstruct, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, make contracts for the management of, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash or credit or lease in his discretion, in whole or in part, any project acquired pursuant to this title; and, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator shall also have power to pursue to final collection by way of compromise or otherwise all claims acquired

by, or assigned or transferred to, him in connection with the acquisition or disposal of any project pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract for hazard insurance, or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of any project acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such purchase or contract does not exceed $1,000.

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 709. The investor, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, may terminate, as of the close of any operating year, any insurance contract made pursuant to this title. The Administrator shall prescribe the events and conditions under which said Administrator shall have the option to terminate any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, and the events and conditions under which said Administrator may reinstate any insurance contract terminated pursuant to this section or section 708 (a). If any insurance contract is terminated pursuant to this section, the Administrator may require the investor to pay an adjusted premium charge in such amount as the Administrator determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges which such investor otherwise would have been required to pay if such insurance contract had not been so terminated.

"INSURANCE FUND

"SEC. 710. There is hereby created a housing investment insurance fund which shall be used by the Administrator as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. For this purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Administrator such funds as the Administrator shall deem necessary, but not to exceed $10,000,000, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, inspection and other fees, service charges, and any other income received by the Administrator under this title, together with all earnings on the assets of such housing investment insurance fund, shall be credited to said fund. All payments made pursuant to claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, cash adjustments, the principal of and interest on debentures issued under this title, expenses incurred in connection with or as a consequence of the acquisition and disposal of projects acquired under this title, and all administrative expenses in connection with this title, shall be paid from said fund. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all approved claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, and, in the event said fund fails to make any such payment when due, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the investor the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Moneys in the housing investment insurance fund not needed for current operations under this title shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of said fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed by, the United States. The Administrator may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under this title. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 711. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Administrator under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 712. The Administrator may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title, including, without limiting the foregoing, rules and regulations relating to the maintenance by the investor of books, records, and accounts with respect to the project and the examination of such books, records, and accounts by representatives of the Administrator; the submission of financial and operating statements and the approval thereof; the submission of claims for payments under insurance contracts, the proof of the validity of such claims, and the payment or disallowance thereof; the increase of the established investment if the investor shall make capital improvements or additions to the project; the decrease of the established investment if the investor shall sell part of the project; and the reduction of the outstanding investment for the appropriate operating year or operating years pending the restoration of dwelling or nondwelling facilities damaged by fire or other casualty. With respect to any investor which is subject to supervision or regulation by a State banking, insurance, or other State department or agency, the Administrator may, in carrying out any of his supervisory and regulatory functions with respect to projects insured under this title, utilize, contract with, and act through, such department or agency and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 713. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

"(a) 'Investor' shall mean (1) any natural person; (2) any group of not more than 10 natural persons; (3) any corporation, company, association, trust, or other legal entity; or (4) any combination of two or more corporations, companies, associations, trusts, or other legal entities, having all the powers necessary to comply with the requirements of this title, which the Administrator (i) shall find to be qualified by business experience and facilities, to afford assurance of the necessary continuity of long-term investment, and to have available the necessary capital required for long-term investment in the project, and (ii) shall approve as eligible for insurance under this title.

"(b) 'Project' shall mean a project (including all property, real and personal, contracts, rights, and choses in action acquired, owned, or held by the investor in connection therewith) of an investor designed and used primarily for the purpose of providing dwellings the occupancy of which is permitted by the investor in consideration of agreed charges: *Provided*, That nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting the inclusion in a project of such stores, offices, or other commercial facilities, recreational or community facilities, or other nondwelling facilities as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or desirable appurtenances to such project.

"(c) 'Estimated investment' shall mean the estimated cost of the development of the project, as stated in the application submitted to the Administrator for insurance under this title.

"(d) 'Established investment' shall mean the amount of the reasonable costs, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, carrying out all works and undertakings for the development of a project and shall include the premium charge for the first operating year and the cost of all necessary surveys, plans and specifications, architectural, engineering, or other special services, land acquisition, site preparation, construction, and equipment; a reasonable return on the funds of the investor paid out in the course of the development of the project, up to and including the initial occupancy date; necessary expenses in connection with the initial occupancy of the project; and the cost of such other items as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the development of the project, (1) less the amount by which the rents and revenues derived from the project up to and including the initial occupancy date exceeded the reasonable and proper expenses, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, operating and maintaining said project up to and including the initial occupancy date, or (2) plus the amount by which such expenses exceeded such rents and revenues, as the case may be.

"(e) 'Physical completion date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which the Administrator determines that the construction of the project is substantially completed and substantially all of the dwellings therein are available for occupancy.

"(f) 'Initial occupancy date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which 90 percent in number of the dwellings in the project on the physical completion date shall have been occupied, but shall in no event be later than the last day of the sixth calendar month next following the physical completion date.

"(g) 'Operating year' shall mean the period of 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date and each succeeding period of 12 consecutive calendar months, and the period of the first 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date shall be the first operating year.

"(h) 'Gross income' for any operating year shall mean the total rents and revenues and other income derived from, or in connection with, the project during such operating year.

"(i) 'Operating expenses' for any operating year shall mean the amounts, as approved by the Administrator, necessary to meet the reasonable and proper costs of, and to provide for, operating and maintaining the project, and to establish and maintain reasonable and proper reserves for repairs, maintenance, and replacements, and other necessary reserves during such operating year, and shall include necessary expenses for real-estate taxes, special assessments, premium charges made pursuant to this title, administrative expenses, the annual rental under any lease pursuant to which the real property comprising the site of the project is held by the investor, and insurance charges, together with such other expenses as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of the project, but shall not include income taxes.

"(j) 'Net income' for any operating year shall mean gross income remaining after the payment of the operating expenses.

"(k) 'Minimum annual amortization charge' shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment, except that, in the case of a project where the real property comprising the site thereof is held by the investor under a lease, if (notwithstanding the proviso of section 703 (a) hereof) the gross income for any operating year shall be less than the amount required to pay the operating expenses (including the annual rental under such lease), the minimum annual amortization charge for such operating year shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment plus the amount of the annual rental under such lease to the extent that the same is not paid from the gross income.

"(l) 'Annual return' for any operating year shall mean the net income remaining after the payment of the minimum annual amortization charge.

"(m) 'Insured annual return' shall have the meaning ascribed to it in section 701 hereof.

"(n) 'Minimum annual return' for any operating year shall mean an amount equal to 3½ percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(o) 'Excess earnings' for any operating year shall mean the net income derived from a project in excess of the minimum annual amortization charge and the minimum annual return.

"(p) 'Outstanding investment' for any operating year shall mean the established investment, less an amount equal to (1) the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge for each preceding operating year, plus (2) the aggregate of the excess earnings, if any, during each preceding operating year applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization in accordance with the provisions of section 705 hereof."

SEC. 402. Sections 1 and 5 of the National Housing Act, as amended, are hereby amended by striking out "titles II, III, and VI" wherever they appear in said sections and inserting in lieu thereof "titles II, III, VI, and VII."

TITLE V—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. (a) Effective upon the date of enactment of this act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $16,500 per annum, and the members of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner shall each receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

(b) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "Federal Housing Administration;" immediately after the semicolon which follows "United States Housing Corporation": *Provided*, That, as to the Federal Housing Administration, the audit required by section 105 of said act shall begin with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, and the exception contained in section 301 (d) of said act shall be construed to refer to the cost of audits contracted for prior to July 1, 1948.

SEC. 502. In carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties—

(a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Administrator may make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out such functions, powers, and duties and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. The Administrator may delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees as he may designate, and may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. The Administrator shall cause to be prepared for the Housing and Home Finance Agency an official seal of such device as he shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal. The Secretary of Commerce or his designee shall hereafter be included in the membership of the National Housing Council.

(b) The Public Housing Administration shall sue and be sued only with respect to its functions under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, as amended. The Public Housing Commissioner may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall hereafter be made hereunder, and shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees of the Public Housing Administration as he may designate; and make such rules and regulations as he may find necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. Funds made available for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Administration (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administration. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law except provisions of law hereafter enacted expressly in limitation hereof, the Public Housing Administration, or any State or local public agency administering a low-rent housing project assisted pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937 or title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it where such action is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such housing accommodations are administered, and, in determining net income for the purposes of tenant eligibility with respect to low-rent housing projects assisted pursuant to said acts, the Public Housing Administration is authorized, where it finds such action equitable and in the public interest, to exclude amounts or portions thereof paid by the United States Government for disability or death occurring in connection with military service.

(c) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board (which term as used in this section shall also include and refer to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board), the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, may in addition to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities conferred elsewhere in this act—

(1) with the consent of the agency or organization concerned accept and utilize equipment, facilities, or the services of employees of any State or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization and, in connection with the utilization of such services, may make payments for transportation while away from their homes or regular places of business and per diem in lieu of subsistence en route and at place of such service, in accordance with the provisions of 5 U. S. C. 73b–2;

(2) utilize, contract with, and act through, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, any Federal, State, or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, and any funds available to said officers for carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties shall be available to reimburse any such agency or organization; and, whenever in the judgment of any such officer necessary, he may make advance, progress, or other payments with respect to such contracts without repard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes;

(3) make expenditures for all necessary expenses, including preparation, mounting, shipping, and installation of exhibits; purchase and exchange of technical apparatus; and such other expenses as may, from time to time, be found necessary in carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase or contract by said officers (or their agencies), respectively, for services or supplies if the amount thereof does not exceed $300: *And provided further*, That funds made available for administrative expenses in carrying out the functions, powers, and duties imposed upon the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, by or pursuant to law may at their option be consolidated into single administrative expense fund accounts of said officers or agencies for expenditure by them, respectively, in accordance with the provisions hereof.

ACT CONTROLLING

SEC. 503. Insofar as the provisions of any other law are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall be controlling.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 504. Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this act, all powers and authorities conferred by this act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. Notwithstanding any other evidences of the intention of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the controlling intent of Congress that if any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act or its applications to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provisions of this act, or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the question as to what should be done to provide adequate housing is one that has created distinct differences of opinion. However, there is no difference of opinion as to the need of more housing.

The difference of opinion that does exist centers largely around the question of whether the housing bill should contain a provision for public housing or low-rent and slum-clearance projects. It is difficult for me to understand why there should be any difference of opinion on a subject of this character. The need for this type of housing is so great that in my opinion any comprehensive housing program must make provision for it.

The bill now before the House is exceedingly worth while as far as it goes. I intend to vote for it, but, like many others who will do so, I regret that it does not go further, and include a public-housing program for the low-income group.

Opponents of this type of housing claim that it is contrary to the free-enterprise system for either the Federal, State, or local government to engage in public housing. It is my studied opinion that this objection is not well founded.

The free-enterprise system is based upon the profit theory. It does not engage in activities where there is little or no possibility of profit. We would not

expect nor suggest that it should be otherwise. Therefore, where the public interest requires that the Government step in and do what private enterprise, for lack of assured profits, is unwilling to do, it cannot rightfully be said that Government is invading the field of private enterprise.

Private enterprise during the years 1947 and 1948 has done a fine job in its efforts to build homes and dwelling apartments. It is estimated that upward of 1,000,000 additional housing units will be constructed during the present year. The building industry should be commended for what it has been able to accomplish under adverse conditions. The shortage of material and labor has prevented even a greater record from being made. But no matter how commendable the record of private industry has been in this respect we must acknowledge that practically all of the dwelling units provided by it during the past 2 years have been of a kind and character that only those with substantial incomes could buy or rent. It has been beyond the reach of the low-income group. It does not represent types of construction of which they can take advantage. They have neither the financial ability to purchase nor sufficient income to pay the high rents necessary for the homes and dwelling units now being constructed. The price is far beyond their ability to pay.

Therefore, if private industry is not justified from a profit standpoint in constructing dwellings for the low-income group, or to engage in slum-clearance projects, and I do not see how they can be expected to do so, then the only alternative is for some agency of government to step in and do the job. And, in this connection, it is my judgment that the State or local government is best equipped to construct and operate such projects.

As previously stated, I think the bill should have made provision for a program of public housing to bring homes within reach of the low-income group. However, I shall vote for the bill because it is good, very good, as far as it goes. Furthermore, I am encouraged to believe that a more comprehensive bill will be enacted at the next session of Congress convening in January next.

THE SPECIAL SESSION AND 1949

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the present bill because I am convinced that it will prove to be helpful in relieving the housing shortage. After all, in essence this bill does take substantial parts of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and enact them into law. It does exclude—and I think unfortunately—the provisions of that bill for the public construction of low cost rental housing and for slum clearance.

I wish to go on record once more, as I have repeatedly done in the past, that I favor properly guarded legislation providing aid for the municipal construction of low cost rental units, with an accompanying slum-clearance program. I am not impressed with the argument that this is a socialistic measure. I have observed the actual operation of low cost housing projects in my district, particularly in Atlantic City. The administration of those projects is good. The overwhelming percentage of the people living in them are paying all the rents they possibly can afford, and paying them promptly. The net results of these operations have cost the Government very, very little. The social benefits derived from slum clearance and decent housing units in Atlantic City have been inestimable. Mayor Joseph Altman of that city, who has made a continuing and careful study of this problem, is firmly convinced that the housing units have been directly responsible for a marked decrease in juvenile delinquency, and a general reduction of fire hazards and police problems.

In our economic system there will always be many people who despite their best efforts, and despite hard work will be unable to afford houses of minimum decency. These people cannot afford to purchase houses at their present inflated values, and they cannot afford to pay rents that private capital would be obliged to charge them. This is a problem which in my judgment must be solved, and I intend to continue my efforts to solve it.

At this special session, we were not afforded the opportunity to consider and vote upon public housing. I hope and believe that the issue will come up and be disposed of early in 1949.

HIGH COSTS

Mr. Speaker, present high costs have many causes. Among them is a high level of wages, and a very particular villain is extravagant government spending. Mr. Truman's $40,000,000 budget, and his general inflation program will be curtailed by a strong Republican President with a united Republican Congress.

Even without these causes, the huge and necessary expenditures on rearmament, and the billions of dollars worth of commodities that are being poured into Europe will still create high prices. It is, therefore, even more necessary that Government extravagance, and every other unnecessary cause leading to inflation should be controlled. It will not be done under the direction of a spending Executive, and it cannot be done at a special session, conceived as a political maneuver, and not for the benefit of the people.

I greatly regret that the Senate would not modify the displaced persons bill, and remove features that are discriminatory. I repeat that the bill passed by the House was a sound approach to the problem. This too, I think we will have the time and opportunity to correct at the regular session.

And to conclude by repeating what I said yesterday, and on many previous occasions: A Republican President and a Republican Congress will amend the Senate rules to prevent filibustering, and pass an adequate and an American civil rights program.

The special session was, of course, unable to function. The Government was divided against itself, and the Congress has no confidence in the executive department. One thing alone, the exposure of the infiltration of communism into high Government offices has been sufficient to destroy that confidence. I look forward to the early months of 1949 when a reunited government, purged of subversive and incompetent influences, will be able to do the job required of us.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the people are demanding congressional action to encourage the availability of reasonably priced homes and low-cost rental units, because they are desperately in need of them.

I am glad that we are being allowed today to take a step, however feeble and inadequate it may be, in recognition of the critical need.

I appreciate that on many of the measures proposed for consideration at this special session, the Members can find reason for doing nothing by a plea there is simply not time enough for the study and investigation that would be required. One subject, however, is an outstanding exception; that is housing.

This problem, however, has been already exhaustively investigated by both Houses of Congress. At least three congressional committees have conducted full-scale hearings on housing relief, and one committee traveled all over the country gathering evidence. There could be no excuse for adjourning this session without enacting remedial measures in correction of the admitted housing shortage crisis.

We have been genuinely concerned with the difficulties of peoples all over the world, and have passed substantial relief measures to help them overcome their difficulties, but we have done little or nothing for the relief of our people here at home.

Too many persons in this country are acutely suffering because of the housing shortage and the high prices of available houses and apartments to have this problem dismissed with a shrug of the shoulders. One of the greatest travesties of justice and duty, in modern times, has been visited upon the American people in this matter of providing housing relief. The results are visible on all sides, in the continuing scarcity of homes, particularly in the low-cost field. Veterans who returned to the accompaniment of promises that homes would be found for them are still living doubled up in the houses of their parents and relatives. Rental dwellings are practically impossible to locate in almost all sections and home seekers are too frequently compelled to buy houses priced above their means, simply because they have no other choice.

You will recall that during the first session of this Congress, a joint committee on housing, consisting of Members from both the Senate and this House, was created. May I read an extract summary of the findings and recommendations which that committee made after holding hearings over a period of many weeks in various parts of the United States:

This committee was set up as a joint committee of both the Senate and the House at the end of the first session of the Eightieth Congress in July 1947 to make a thorough study and investigation of all phases of the housing problem. This committee, beginning with September 10, 1947, and continuing through January 28, 1948, held 51 days of hearings in 33 cities and heard 1,286 witnesses. The testimony alone takes up 6,100 printed pages. In addition, various members as subcommittees of the committee conducted special investigations on basic housing problems, and made detailed reports on such topics as the high cost of housing, slum clearance, building materials, and the effects of taxation upon housing. The final report of the committee filed March 15, 1948, essentially represented an endorsement of the basic programs contained in S. 866. More specifically, the report recommended the prompt enactment of comprehensive housing legislation, including a program providing a direct attack upon the basic problem of high housing cost through a program of housing research, and special FHA and RFC insurance and loan aids for modernized methods of construction both on site and through the prefabrication process; a secondary market for FHA and GI loans; revision and improvement of FHA's insurance programs to meet the needs of lower-income families and veterans; a yield insurance program; a program of Federal loan and subsidy assistance to urban redevelopment; a program to extend public low-rent housing; and a program of Federal loans and subsidy aids for farm housing.

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to go into prolonged details on a subject that has been so extensively debated on this floor, but I submit it is not superfluous to discuss the housing situation in the terms in which it is regarded by our people—terms of their need for homes in which to live as Americans should, in which children can get a fair start in life, and which will provide the inspiration which all of us must have to make life worth living.

I call your attention to the needs of nearly 3,000,000 families who do not have any homes at all, but are living with their in-laws and other families and of the 500,000 living in trailers, rooming houses, temporary housing, and other makeshift accommodations. I call your attention to the needs of more than 5,000,000 families in cities and surrounding areas, whose homes fall below decent living standards. May I direct emphasis also toward the families on the farm whose homes are shacks which should be replaced, or, at minimum, need major repairs in order to make them livable. I am not going to recount the vast number of farm homes which do not have the sanitary facilities which have become so essential for safe living in our cities.

These are the reasons why a comprehensive housing bill should be of paramount consideration in this House today; these are the reasons why I deeply regret we are not being permitted to enact an adequate housing relief measure; these are the reasons why I earnestly hope that the early days of the next Congress will see proper action taken to encourage the all-out production of homes and rental units for the people of the United States, at prices they can afford.

In the meantime, I shall support this present measure, and urge my colleagues to do so, because it contains a few provisions of moderate assistance toward the eventual cure of our housing crisis.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for H. R. 6959, an amendment to the National Housing Act of 1948, as proposed by the substitute amendment offered by Senator MCCARTHY and which passed the Senate yesterday, as it gives incentive and protection to private industry in the construction of apartment houses, small homes, and to invest funds in big rental projects. The principal provisions of the McCarthy bill, as I see it, are as follows:

First. Low- and middle-income families would be allowed 95 percent insured mortgages on houses costing $6,000 or less.

Second. Construction loans would be provided for builders of low-cost homes, with an 80-percent insured mortgage for builders of 25 or more units priced under $7,500 each.

Third. Owner-occupied homes would be eligible for more liberal loans, such as a 90-percent insured mortgage for single-family units costing up to $6,300 instead of the present $5,400.

Fourth. Large-scale rental projects would be allowed 90-percent insured mortgages. The $1,350 cost limitation per room would be removed and a family unit maximum of $8,100 substituted.

Fifth. A minimum return of 2¾ percent a year on investment, plus 2 percent for amortization, would be guaranteed by the Government to those making investments in construction of rental property for lower- and middle-income groups.

Sixth. Prefabricated-housing manufacturers would be allowed more liberal loans.

Seventh. An additional $35,000,000 would be provided for insuring loans for home modernization and improvement.

Eighth. A new division in the housing and home-finance agency would be set up to work toward the standardization of building codes and measurements.

Ninth. To discourage apartment-house signs reading "no children" by requiring the apartment-house beneficiaries of Government financial help to take an oath that they will not discriminate against youngsters.

I regret very much that the proposed housing bill does not include any provision for public housing, slum clearance, and rural housing. I reiterate my stand on this matter as appears in my remarks made on the floor of the House on June 18, 1948, at the time H. R. 6959 was under consideration. I have not changed my mind nor my position on this matter.

In Connecticut we have a severe housing problem primarily because of our greatly increased population, particularly in the defense industrial areas, and this is particularly true in New Haven in my congressional district. The need today in Connecticut is estimated at some 40,000 housing units. In New Haven alone there are some 1,500 families seeking shelter in low-rent housing units. While private industry has done a remarkable job, it has not been able to produce houses in sufficient number and at a price which the ordinary individual could afford to purchase or rent.

Under the bill providing for public housing it is permitted only when it definitely appears that private industry has been unable to cope with the situation and the particular community votes in favor of it, and specifically provides that there shall be no interference or competition with any private construction, and certain guaranties are made to local housing authorities set up under the laws of the States involved.

I am of the opinion that provision should be made now for assistance to local communities for the provision over a period of years of a maximum of at least 500,000 units of low-rent public housing for families of low income with additional safeguards written into the act to increase local responsibility and avoid any competition with private housing. If subsequent events demonstrate that this program is no longer required, I am sure that the Congress would take the necessary action to repeal such legislation as no one wishes the Government to inject itself into any situation where private enterprise can operate.

Provision should be made now for Federal aid to local communities to enable them to undertake the clearance of their slums and blighted areas so as to make such areas available for redevelopment with the active participation of private enterprise.

Such legislation would be extremely helpful to the people of the State of Connecticut in their effort to relieve the intolerable housing conditions which now prevail.

I do not find any fault with what is contained in the bill as presented, but am concerned with what is left out of the bill. I am satisfied the legislation as written, however, will have a very beneficial effect for it liberalizes loans for low-cost housing and veteran cooperatives and increases the so-called secondary market, and the whole spirit of the bill tends toward encouraging private industry in its endeavor to solve this troublesome problem.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL] is unable to be present today due to the fact he is convalescing from an operation. He had asked me to have him paired in favor of this housing bill, H. R. 6959. Inasmuch as I am unable to pair him for the bill, due to the fact there is no one desiring to be paired against it, I use this means of recording in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL] desired to be paired for the bill.

THIS SOMEWHAT HOUSING BILL

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am not voting for this bill because I like it, or because it will even start to do the job we need to do in housing, or because I condone the absolute and tragic failure of this Congress to come to any constructive housing legislation—or to come to any constructive legislation, period.

This is a time when the real-estate lobby takes the cake, and the people take the crumbs, and I am forced to the unwelcome position of voting for the crumbs because I find myself in a minority so small we cannot even make our voices heard.

But, Mr. Speaker, I warn the majority, and now I am speaking not alone of the Republican majority, but the majority of the Members of this House who have been deaf to the cries of the people for housing, that this one issue alone is likely to be enough to change the constituency of this House next January.

My enthusiasm for decent American housing for decent American citizens is not an aimless and casual enthusiasm.

This is a problem which lives with me and the people I represent 24 hours a day. I believe, and my people believe, that houses, yes, and butter and chops and clothes for our back, should come before guns and cantonments. We do not believe that the problem of shelter is solved by merely calling names. We do not believe that the two-ring circus of character assassination staged here in Washington the last 2 weeks is going to make up for the loss of action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill.

BREAD AND CIRCUSES

Some forgotten Roman politician invented the age-long slogan, "Give the people bread and circuses."

The Republican Party learned that lesson imperfectly; your party has forgotten the bread, and circuses alone are not diverting enough to make the people forget their deep anger at the failure of this Congress to do something positive about critical problems like housing, not to mention high prices.

I am speaking now, Mr. Speaker, about the housing problem which faces the American people; and yet I call your attention to the fact that it is difficult to confine myself to construction problems alone. The ruinous inflation about which you also have done nothing effective is so deeply intertwined with the shortage of housing in which people of small means can live without bankruptcy that it cannot be separated.

This was a time for bold and drastic measures.

This Republican majority has responded to the crisis with timid exclamations.

You have tried to solve the vital problems pressing down on our people by declaring rapidly that no problem exists.

You are wrong; and I foresee that an aroused electorate will give its verdict at the polls next November.

THESE MADE THE FIGHT

One of the things which we want to have clear and sharply defined is this: This abject surrender to special privilege and vested interest is the direct responsibility of the Republican leadership in the House.

When discharge motion No. 6, to bring the T-E-W bill to the floor was initiated more than a year ago, the list of names at first grew slowly. My own name is there early in the list.

Names were added more rapidly after the second session began. Republican Members who dared risk the displeasure of the leadership boldly signed the petition.

When, in this brief unhappy session, our own leader added the prestige of his honorable service, seniority, and leadership by signing the petition, the Republican leadership "turned on the heat." No more Republicans signed; and I understand that some who had signed, under the lash of party pressure, withdrew their names.

Do they believe that their constituents will admire this display of pusillanimity? Will the people who can neither pay fortunes for palaces nor exorbitant rentals for hovels place party conformity above their own needs?

I doubt it, Mr. Speaker, I doubt it.

No. The only Members of this Congress who can or will get any credit for making the hopeless fight are those who put their names on that discharge petition and kept them there.

Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, a well-known builder and reputable businessman whose office is in my district, an easy walk from my own New York office, enlisted my aid 4 months ago in trying to solve his financial problems. The interest strike of the banks, the limitations written into the authority of the RFC by this Congress, and the quadrupled cost of metropolitan construction had him just about licked.

I gave him every possible cooperation; but our combined efforts could not overcome the failure of this Congress to enact new, long-range, comprehensive housing legislation.

He finally decided to come to Washington to plead for himself and for the veterans who had pledged their corporate cooperation in the erection of a 152-unit veterans' cooperative housing project in New York.

That gentleman is Mr. Teel Williams, president of the Basic Builders Corp., a former housing official and a former newspaperman. With him in his door-to-door legislative canvass of the majority leaders was Mr. John Rega, president of the Cooperative Engineers Co. of Cleveland, a firm which proposed to construct similar cooperative projects in four Ohio cities.

Teel Williams, himself a veteran of World War I, and the father of a veteran of World War II, speaks eloquently in his own right. Out of the rage and frustration he felt after 5 days of fruitless work here on the hill, he sat up all Thursday night, writing a statement which, with my help, reached the Members last night. Mr. Williams is addressing himself to only a small, specific sector of the core of the housing problem; but his reputation and his project give his words weight.

I am inserting his statement at this point because I think it is a proper part of the record of this mousy legislation:

Disillusioned, discouraged and disgusted with the attitude of the present Congress, Teel Williams, president of Basic Builders Corp., today announced the abandonment of a 600-family New York City $11,000,000 veteran cooperative housing project with the prediction that over 1,000,000 veteran families in our larger cities will be deprived of housing over the next year to 2 years by failure to pass legislation at this session to enable fully organized and veteran approved cooperative projects to proceed.

Concerned by petty, partisan considerations, veterans' cooperative housing (developed at many thousands of dollars' cost in full cooperation with and the approval of the Veterans' Administration, supported by exhaustive review and certified loan commitment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation) is being allowed to wither on the vine in the present unsightly scramble for political advantage, declared Mr. Williams.

Apparently Veterans' Administration cooperative housing projects are considered outcasts, "unclean, untouchables" by either our largest insurance companies or private banking institutions and also by the Congress in the present arguments over the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

After 2 years of painstaking development with the Veterans' Administration, our Great Oaks project in Riverdale, New York City has received full approval and a $1,800,000 commitment from Reconstruction Finance Corporation only to find that no private lending institution in New York will touch it "because it is a veterans' cooperative project."

Confidently expecting relief from the present special session of Congress, "we naively came to Washington thinking the Banking and Currency Committee would welcome full documentation of this first large veterans project of its kind to emerge with full approvals ready to break ground. Instead we have encountered indifference and worse in the cat-and-dog fight over the question of public housing."

Two years ago we started the planning of Great Oaks with the Veterans' Administration as one part of a program to meet the housing needs of veterans of New York City, as disclosed by a careful survey. Great Oaks was only one project so planned. Another totaled over $60,000,000. We were to be the pattern for hundreds of thousands of veterans' apartments in all of our major cities.

Great care was exercised by the Veterans' Administration to avoid any possible criticism and to set up a practical, workable program. It is estimated that $15,000 was spent by the Veterans' Administration alone and many times that by ourselves as builder sponsors in the months of tedious technical and legal studies and revisions of the Great Oaks plan. Every contract and lease form was especially drafted. The Veterans' Owning Corporation was formally organized, the charter and bylaws written and rewritten, and veteran officers elected. On April 14, 1947, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, then Administrator, affixed his official signature to a voluminous Veterans' Administration approval. This in turn set up such extraordinary conditions for the protection of the veteran as the almost unheard of requirement of a 100-percent bond to completion. The Treasury Department only requires 50-percent bonds for post-office buildings and National Housing Administration requires none at all. The builder's profit on his firm and bonded contract figure to the Veterans' Corporation also was limited to specific construction items amounting to less than 8 percent or to an estimated 3.8 percent after taxes. Topping off the approval was the requirement that the itemized and audited estimates of the builder's contract figures should be submitted to an independent committee of appraisal experts to be appointed by the Veterans' Administration but at the expense of the builders.

Without even the privilege of meeting with the panel of distinguished appraisers, chairmanned by S. Edwin Kazdin, of New York City, twice president of the American Appraisal Association, we were required to place $5,000 in escrow to guarantee payment to the panel, win, lose, or draw. Fortunately, the independent studies of these appraisers arrived at figures within 2.2 percent of our own, or at a fair selling price to the veteran of $2,700,000 for each of four 12-story modern fireproof apartment buildings of some 3,030 rooms of 3-, 4½-, 5½-, and 6½-room apartments. Great Oaks thus emerged as the first big city veterans' cooperative project so fully approved and expected to be the model for a vast national program for veteran residents of all our major cities.

But there developed at this point an unexpected and to date an insurmountable financial road block. The approval of the Veterans' Administration was intended to carry a guaranty of $4,000 for each veteran purchaser of an apartment under the home loan provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Act, or the so-called GI bill of rights. But the drafters of this act had never conceived anything beyond small homes for which a deed and individual mortgage would be delivered. How could individual deeds and mortgage be given for apartments one above the other and over the same plot of ground? Obviously only one deed and one master mortgage is practical for an entire apartment building. Therefore, ruled the Solicitor's Office of the Veterans' Administration, 100 percent of the apartments in an entire building must be sold and a single deed and mortgage executed before the guaranty of $4,000 for each apartment can be effective.

In other words, at this late date it was necessary to sell all of the apartments, not 50, or 100, or 149, but all 150 in each building from blueprints, pictures, and pretty words, before even beginning construction and before any assurance could be given to a veteran of when he might move in. It cost $23,000 in advertising and sales effort to prove this to be an utter impossibility although 14,000 veterans responded and 1,400 filed written applications for apartments as soon as we could start actual construction.

Answer to this problem finally was sought with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Thomas H. Hickey, Chief of Home Loans Division of the Veterans' Administration, personally presenting an appeal before a hearing presided over by Harvey J. Gunderson, chairman of the Board of Directors, for a loan to start Great Oaks.

Unfortunately for us, Reconstruction Finance Corporation had been taken out of mortgage financing by Congress a year before, but Great Oaks was adjudged eligible for a temporary business loan. After 14 weeks of intensive and exhaustive review and investigation of the entire project, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation finally on July 9 issued a certified commitment of $1,800,000, which with $412,000 additional cash equity from the builders plus the investment to date would complete the first of the four buildings. Of course Reconstruction Finance Corporation retained the Veterans' Administration condition also of a 100-percent bond, and just guarantee that their loan could not become a permanent mortgage loan and thus involve them with possible explanations, they insisted that a permanent financing commitment first be obtained from an acceptable lending institution to bail out their loan on completion of the building.

Quite confident that at last we would quickly be cleared to begin construction, we called in one of the most eminent mortgage brokerage houses in New York to handle the loan application. With beautifully collated portfolio on the project in hand, and the expressed confidence that within 2 weeks the required permanent financing commitment would be obtained, these brokers proceeded to make application with one of the most prominent insurance firms in America. To their and our astonishment and dismay, the application was refused not only by this but by approximately 20 of the largest insurance and banking houses of America. Without saying so in so many words, we were quietly given to understand that it had become the adopted and firm policy of all such institutions to have nothing whatsoever to do with the financing of veteran cooperative projects.

Reporting back to the Veterans' Administration, T. B. King, Director of Home Loans, told us "that this attitude had become universal; that the insurance companies and large savings banks visualize picket lines around their counting rooms in the event that buildings might have to be foreclosed. There is even a squeeze on," he told us, "by these institutions to obtain higher interest rates on veteran small-house loans, and that such lending also has almost come to a standstill." No other alternative is now left but Government underwriting.

We knew that while our negotiations were under way with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, measures had been introduced before the Eightieth Congress to give relief in this veteran housing financing emergency. The 95-percent 40-year guaranty passed in the last few minutes before adjournment as an amendment to the National Housing Act of 1941 seemed to be the answer. But an innocent section of this act limited its benefits to housing costing $1,350 per room. This limitation made the act, though signed by the President, wholly inoperative even for lowest-cost housing, as was quickly recognized. When the special session was called we were given assurances by Members of both Houses of Congress that elimination of this inadvertent ceiling would be a certain and first matter of business.

To our consternation, however, the first move toward correction of this act was reported in the press last Monday as a bill of Senator IVES, providing not for elimination of the $1,350 ceiling, but for its increase to $1,800 per room. For big city fireproof construction such a ceiling would be just as futile as $1,350. This ceiling is now part of Senator MCCARTHY'S proposed bill.

It was amazing to us that there could be so much misconception of the housing problem after all of the fumbling of Wilson Wyatt and almost continuous agitation and investigation since. Apparently housing is still just a matter of "pigs is pigs" even to the members of the housing committees of the Senate and the House. If $1,800 per room is comfortably sufficient to finance all housing needs in Fond du Lac, Wis., it seems blandly accepted as sufficient for New York City. Although there is as much difference between semi-fireproof, 2 to 6 story minimum housing and masonry and steel multi-story fireproof construction on high-priced land under restrictive zoning and rigid city building codes, as there is between a Kiddie-Kar and a Cadillac, this fact has never seemed to occur to our legislators.

Naively thinking that the facts would be welcomed and adequate action, free from partisan considerations, might be taken to relieve this emergency for our veterans, we rushed off explanations and figures by telegram and special-delivery mail to all members of the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees. Then we followed up in person loaded with fully documented records to expose ourselves to any questions. We can hardly say that anybody rolled out the plush carpet for us. In most cases it was a brusk if not totally indifferent brush-off. Where we persisted, astonishment and outright disbelief were expressed at facts we presented such as the average cost of $14,634 per apartment, or over $3,700 per room for the Alfred E. Smith fireproof, slum replacement, tax-exempt project in downtown Manhattan. Fortunately, these were not our figures but the published report Thursday, July 29, 1948, of New York State Commissioner of Housing Herman T. Stichman, and we had been foresighted enough to bring photostated copies.

We suggested that no rigid ceilings should be attempted for our large cities but that these should be left to expert and certified appraisals under the Veterans' Administration. We suggested that low-cost financing of rental as well as cooperative is the real solution to our veterans' housing problem and presented figures to demonstrate that 2½ to 3½ percent, 40- to 50-year 90-percent direct Government loans, approved by the Veterans' Administration and disbursed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, would make apartments costing $18,000 self-liquidating at rentals as low as $16.75 per room per month. We thought our legislators would be delighted at such a simple solution for the public-housing problem. Why subsidized slum-replacement housing of minimum standards when good housing can be provided for the lowest-income GI Joe if financed as we suggest?

One legislator asked, "Why should we be interested in doing anything for New York City or for your firm's selfish interests?" We answered that there were other projects totaling many millions also approved and ready to go and the need for 1,000,000 such apartments or more in all of our big cities. We admitted to being guilty of selfish interest after 2 years of effort and an investment of thousands of dollars for which we offered to show audited statements.

Another, after challenging Stichman's record of New York City's public-housing cost, declared before a number of his associates "that perhaps it is the wrong time to build any big-city housing and we should drop anything but Federal Housing Administration title 6 insurance."

No interest was expressed in the idea of good housing for veterans through direct low-cost Government financing. No interest was shown in the Veterans' Administration cooperative or rental-housing program in general, or our project in particular. No concern was evinced over the abandonment of this and other projects in New York City totaling over $70,000,000 and ready to go, intended to provide the pattern for more than 1,000,000 veteran apartment homes in our large cities. You can say that we are sick, discouraged, and disgusted. The real answer is direct Government financing for veteran cooperatives such as Great Oaks. We doubt that the larger lending institutions will even be interested in 95-percent guaranties at 4½-percent interest. But we don't even have hope for such a guaranty for big-city fireproof housing. And we are left no alternative than to abandon the project, "If Congress now runs away and refuses to face this problem of homeless city veterans."

TEEL WILLIAMS,
President, Basic Builders Corp., New York City.

LAST APPEAL

Mr. Speaker, to complete the record, I include also a last-minute telegraphic appeal made by Mr. Rega, supplementing Mr. Williams' public statement; and I call upon the people of this Nation, and especially upon the veterans, to take note that nothing happened:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 7, 1948.*
Senator ROBERT A. TAFT,
Senator JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Representative RALPH A. GAMBLE:

Isn't it possible to save Veterans' Administration cooperative housing?

The Veterans' Homestead Act would do this with ceiling adjustable to certified appraisals of experts for major city fireproof projects.

Two hundred thousand veteran residents of Ohio badly need apartment homes and veteran administration projects similar to Great Oaks and Forest Gate in New York City have been planned for Cleveland, Cincinnati, Dayton, and Youngstown; but they are impossible to build under limitations of McCarthy bill.

Everybody will applaud your action in saving this worthy emergency veterans' cause.

JOHN REGA,
President, the Cooperative Engineers Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the present bill, while it marks a definite improvement over the previous measure adopted by the House, does not, I conceive, constitute a complete or adequate answer to the critical housing problem now confronting the Nation.

Many American communities are seriously suffering from shortages of housing

accommodations. Construction is proceeding at a remarkably high rate in many places, but it is still lagging behind the cumulative needs of the war and postwar years. Many veterans are still without proper accommodations and are forced to live with their relatives under crowded, and frequently, unwholesome and unpleasant conditions.

Other veterans who are unable or unwilling at this time to undertake the building of a home of their own, which of course is the ideal objective of every citizen, are unable to find reasonably priced, suitable apartments or homes for rent. Indeed, the principal pressing need in the current housing situation would appear to be small houses or apartments that could be rented at reasonable monthly rates. In fact, low-cost rental units are the most urgent need of the veteran and his family at the present time.

To be sure, there is real danger in projecting elaborate housing programs which would be additionally inflationary in their effects, or which would augment existing shortages: high prices and skilled labor and mechanical deficiencies. But the Congress must nevertheless provide an over-all plan—and now—for coordinating the various programs and implementing further construction in necessary categories.

This bill will provide some substantial relief in the present contingency. It broadens credit, insurance, and financing opportunities. It lays a base for easing the position especially of our veterans and low-income groups so that they may be assisted with their housing problems and needs. The bill has many shortcomings which I will not enumerate now. But it is a step in the right direction. It will provide ad interim, temporary, stopgap relief until another session of Congress may be able to tackle the housing problem more comprehensively.

For these reasons, I will support this measure with the hope that it will prove beneficial to those who are in urgent need of low-rental housing accommodations, particularly our veterans who must never be forgotten or overlooked by the representatives of the people.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to add more oil to the inflationary flame by still another overissue of Government currency to build houses deepens the debacles ahead of us.

WATERY MONEY HAS CAUSED OUR HIGH PRICES

There was a time when the American dollar was a dollar. Its value was stable and dependable as a means of exchange for any transaction in the free market, as a medium of exchange for a bushel of wheat, a suit of clothes, or a house. Today, however, so many dollars have been printed and floated around that it takes more than $2 to buy almost any commodity one would buy before. Commodities do not double in value. But dollars are cut in two by increasing the amount of money in circulation without increasing the values behind them. In earlier days it was the monetary policy of our Government to issue money only equivalent to the value of gold and the products of agriculture, commerce and industry. The money value would not exceed the amount of the gold and the products of agriculture, commerce, and industry. It could never be issued in excess of such values.

However, beginning with 1933 the United States Government began to print money for spending by Government itself without regard to the amount of physical production and services. It continued that policy of printing money without limiting it as exchange for goods. Thus we now have behind our Government-increased currency Government bonds which do not represent real goods but merely promises to pay out of taxes to be collected sometime in the future, whereas our production needs justify the issuance of only about one-half the money now in circulation. That leaves about twice as much money in circulation as there are goods behind it. The balance is pure water. The effect of having $2 floating about for every dollar's worth of production and services leads to the disastrous rise in prices we are now experiencing.

Let us illustrate by a church supper. Food and places have been provided for 200 persons and no more. Then the church committee prints and sells 400 tickets. When the 400 tickets are presented there is naturally confusion, scrambling, and a lot of scolding. What can be done? The church has no money to redeem the excess tickets. It cannot double the food—there is no more. The only way to treat all ticket holders alike is to divide the food into half portions. That means the expected value of each ticket has been cut in two.

It is such a situation that we are facing today. In 1933 when the dilution of the dollar started we had real gold or goods behind every dollar in circulation, a real meal for each ticket. By 1940 the Federal Reserve banks held $2,000,000,000 of Government bonds as reserves against deposits or dollars outstanding. These dollars or deposits were used to pay for Government projects and Government deficits in all of which there was little or no productive value.

Then came World War II when money was continuously printed against a production of war commodities that were blown to bits. The money was printed to meet a national emergency. Instead of taxing we borrowed left and right throughout the war. That is our wartime inflation. By 1945 the Federal Reserve banks had issued billions of dollars. That is why it now takes more dollars to buy a 1939 dollar's worth of production or services.

Prices have about doubled. Since 1939 general wholesale prices have more than doubled, and the cost of food has more than doubled. Thus in 9 years the value of the dollar has dropped to less than half its 1939 value. Yet, inasmuch as our monetary supply against Government bonds is 12 times greater than in 1933 the prices have, as of today, gone only part way up the spiral which will continue until present policies are changed or a bust develops. At first we had a steady, creeping adjustment process of prices rising. Now the creeping has changed to a walk. Soon it may be a run. All of our citizens are in a scramble to get real value for their commodity, production, or services. To get that real value they must get about twice as many dollars today as would have given the same value in 1939. That means that it is the money inflation which is the cause of our trouble. The changing prices only reveal how utterly cheap our dollar has been made by the Government itself.

The President wrongly accuses the terrible people who ought to be regulated and controlled and have their prices fixed, because they are the inflationists. The Government is the culprit, because it alone can over-issue currency or checking accounts. According to Webster, that is inflation. Nothing else.

It is impossible for the people—however terrible—in a free economy of competition to create inflation. The so-called spiral of higher prices is not caused by people or business in the first place but by the Government permitting its printed promises to be used as money before the spiral of higher prices ever started.

Higher prices are the effect, not the cause. Prices for production cannot be too high until the money no longer exists with which to buy them. As long as the goods produced find markets they are not overpriced.

There is therefore no way by which we can bring down prices or stabilize the prices of commodities such as food and clothes as long as potential customers have the watery money and desire to buy more of them than are currently available. It is therefore utterly deceptive and untrue to say that rising prices are the cause of our debacle and to suggest that there can be any change in this critical situation by Government controls of the price of food or rents or houses, unless the watery money itself is first eliminated. This can be done by bringing the money supply down to the real level of national production. We cannot save our economy simply by manipulating the price of goods and services. If we try it they will dry up. We must deal with the money itself. To issue more Government credits for housing proposed must add more oil to the inflationary fires already running. More money forces prices still higher. We ought to force prices lower.

After the special session of the Congress convened, Mr. Marriner S. Eccles came before the House Banking and Currency Committee giving a presentation of the picture such as he saw it. The former Chairman of the Board of the Federal Reserve System warned the Nation that we are in the midst of an inflationary money flood completely unprecedented in our national history. The situation was regarded as so fantastic and dramatic that Mr. Eccles at one point in his testimony exclaimed, "I don't know where we are."

Facing a total national debt of over $250,000,000,000, $47,000,000,000 of which obligation will fall due over the next year, and with the Government spending at the rate of $40,000,000,000 annually, Mr. Eccles observed that if people could only appreciate the true state of facts they might be frantic about their Government bonds. There would be no chance on earth that our Government could honor

in 1939 values its obligations to its own citizens. In the words of Mr. Eccles, "The Federal Reserve System is our greatest engine of inflation." That is to say, the farmer, the laborer, the manufacturer, and the distributor are not the cause of inflation since the real culprit is the Government itself. Our citizens are in fact but the victims of this "engine of inflation"; namely, the Government itself.

The President, however, not only ignored all this but asked the Republican Congress to join with him in a bipartisan deception of the people by giving him additional billions of printed money and asking the Congress for other inflationary measures. On top of that, he proposed a further deception of the citizens by their Government by suggesting that it is possible to arrest the rising prices of goods and services by Government decree without reducing currency. Instead, he asked to continue in fact further inflating of the currency by spending more Government money for public housing, Federal aid to education, Government medicine, insurance, ERP, and the like. It is almost like asking that someone, please, to watch the horse in the barn and at the same time asking the robber to ride it away.

We must not forget, as Governor Eccles repeated, and has so often been pointed out, that wherever and whenever inflation crushes a nation's economy it inevitably wipes out the middle class and leads to widespread bankruptcy. In this connection, we should also remind ourselves of how the German inflation after World War I not only wiped out the middle class of the Weimar Republic but brought on nazism just as night follows day.

No less an expert than Lenin—in fact, all of the disciples of Marx—have taught that the easy and sure way to undermine a free society is to debauch its currency. When that time comes the confidence not only in the monetary system but in the whole order of self-government is destroyed. The people helplessly follow the promises of the demagogs of state socialism.

Can this wicked deception of the people by blaming one group as against another for high prices be stopped? Are not the American people ready courageously to face the fact that they must begin now to pay for the war and the New Deal printing of money. They must pay by accepting now the purchasing power of a depreciated dollar in exactly the same way they might have faced the cost of the war by taxing a greater proportion of the dollars they earned at the time.

Governments finance wars by a deception of the people which tempts them to believe that wars bring about prosperity, inasmuch as easy money flows through their fingers. We face today the same issue that we faced after the Civil War, when candidates ran for election on the basis of utter repudiation of the money issued by the Government to fight the Civil War.

Fortunately a President was elected who dared to tell the people the truth and face the facts. They took the water out of the greenbacks which had no goods behind them in their time. They endured terrific high prices resulting from their currency inflation, just as we are today. Knowing the facts they could not be fooled by such nostrums as price controls to cure a condition that could not be met except by rising prices. That is the challenge we face now and it is time the people understand that truth. If they know what it is they must face they will meet the challenge. If they do not know the facts they will put the blame in the wrong place and the situation will grow worse. They will insist on the wrong solutions. They will blame some political party for their suffering.

The watered currency can be reduced only by the most rigid reduction in the size, operation and expense of this utterly colossal and unmanageable government and by redeeming the currency. The more painful and inequitable course is the one which we are now following, namely suffering price rises which repudiate the value of the dollar by reducing still further its purchasing power. That process cannot come to rest until all the water in the present inflated currency is eliminated.

We can and we must now put our economic house in order, to pay on the home front for the war which our soldiers so magnificently won on the fields of battle. This is exactly what we should have done during the war and many of our fighting forces criticized severely the home front while they were in the battle, that we at home did not have the courage then to be equal to their valor.

If we can maintain our freedom, the inventive, creative, cooperative, and productive capacity of the American people, free from the compulsions, manipulations, and controls of the Socialist state, will once more surprise ourselves and the world. And we will have won the greatest economic victory of our national history. The dollar will, once again, be worth a dollar. Then only can we say that we have won the war.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the measure we are now considering, H. R. 6959, is a vastly improved measure over any housing proposals that we have had before us for a vote, heretofore, in this Eightieth Congress. May I, however, also point out for the RECORD that I signed the discharge petition on the Clerk's desk in a sincere desire and effort to bring out the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to the floor. I wanted to vote on the provisions of that legislation. The procedures did not bring about such an opportunity, but a study of the pending bill, as amended, upon which we shall shortly come to a vote indicates to me great encouragement for low-cost housing, the need for which is so great in my State of Connecticut. And, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this housing act, if properly administered, will provide many thousands of necessary housing units. A further attestation of this belief, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, will be made by the overwhelming affirmative vote that the Members of this House will give H. R. 6959 when the vote is recorded later today.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the rules be suspended and the resolution be passed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 351, nays 9, answered "present" 4, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—351

Abbitt	Durham	Kearns
Abernethy	Eaton	Keating
Albert	Eberharter	Kee
Allen, Calif.	Ellis	Keefe
Allen, La.	Elsworth	Kelley
Andersen, H. Carl	Elsaesser	Keogh
Anderson, Calif.	Elston	Kersten, Wis.
Andresen, August H.	Engel, Mich.	Kilburn
Andrews, Ala.	Engle, Calif.	Kilday
Angell	Fallon	King
Arends	Feighan	Kirwan
Arnold	Fellows	Klein
Auchincloss	Fenton	Knutson
Bakewell	Fernandez	Kunkel
Barrett	Fisher	Lancis
Bates, Mass.	Flannagan	Lane
Battle	Fletcher	Lanham
Beall	Fogarty	Larcade
Beckworth	Folger	Latham
Bell	Foote	Lea
Bender	Forand	LeCompte
Bennett, Mich.	Fuller	LeFevre
Bennett, Mo.	Fulton	Lemke
Bishop	Gamble	Lewis, Ky.
Blackney	Garmatz	Lewis, Ohio
Bland	Gary	Liebenwalter
Blatnik	Gathings	Lodge
Bloom	Gavin	Love
Boggs, Del.	Gearhart	Lusk
Boggs, La.	Gillette	Lyle
Bonner	Gillie	Lynch
Boykin	Goff	McConnell
Bradley	Goodwin	McCowen
Bramblett	Gordon	McCulloch
Brehm	Gorski	McDonough
Brooks	Gossett	McGarvey
Brophy	Graham	McGregor
Brown, Ga.	Granger	McMillan, S. C.
Brown, Ohio	Grant, Ala.	McMillen, Ill.
Bryson	Grant, Ind.	Mack
Buchanan	Griffiths	MacKinnon
Buck	Gwynne, Iowa	Macy
Buckley	Hagen	Madden
Bulwinkle	Hale	Mahon
Burke	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Maloney
Burleson	Hall, Leonard W.	Manasco
Busbey	Halleck	Mansfield
Butler	Hand	Martin, Iowa
Byrne, N. Y.	Hardy	Merrow
Byrnes, Wis.	Harless, Ariz.	Meyer
Camp	Harness, Ind.	Michener
Cannon	Harris	Miller, Calif.
Carroll	Harrison	Miller, Conn.
Carson	Hart	Miller, Md.
Case, N. J.	Hartley	Miller, Nebr.
Case, N. Dak.	Harvey	Mills
Celler	Havenner	Monroney
Chadwick	Hays	Morgan
Chelf	Hedrick	Morris
Chenoweth	Heffernan	Morrison
Chiperfield	Herter	Muhlenberg
Church	Heselton	Multer
Clason	Hill	Mundt
Coffin	Hinshaw	Murdock
Cole, Kans.	Hobbs	Murray, Wis.
Cole, Mo.	Hoeven	Nicholson
Cole, N. Y.	Hoffman	Nodar
Colmer	Holifield	Norblad
Combs	Holmes	O'Brien
Cooper	Hope	O'Hara
Corbett	Horan	O'Toole
Cotton	Huber	Pace
Crosser	Hull	Passman
Crow	Jackson, Calif.	Patman
Cunningham	Jackson, Wash.	Patterson
Curtis	Jarman	Peden
Dague	Jenison	Peterson
Davis, Ga.	Jenkins, Ohio	Pfeifer
Davis, Wis.	Jensen	Philbin
Dawson, Ill.	Johnson, Calif.	Phillips, Calif.
Dawson, Utah	Johnson, Ill.	Pickett
Deane	Johnson, Okla.	Ploeser
Delaney	Jones, Ala.	Plumley
Devitt	Jones, N. C.	Poage
D'Ewart	Jones, Wash.	Potter
Dingell	Jonkman	Potts
Dolliver	Judd	Poulson
Dondero	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Donohue	Kean	Price, Fla.
Doughton	Kearney	Price, Ill.
		Rains
		Ramey

Rankin	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Thompson
Rayburn	Scrivener	Tibbott
Redden	Seely-Brown	Tollefson
Reed, Ill.	Shafer	Towe
Reed, N. Y.	Short	Twyman
Rees	Sikes	Van Zandt
Reeves	Simpson, Ill.	Vinson
Rich	Simpson, Pa.	Vorys
Richlman	Smathers	Vursell
Rivers	Smith, Kans.	Wadsworth
Rizley	Smith, Maine	Walter
Robertson	Smith, Va.	Welchel
Rockwell	Smith, Wis.	Welch
Rogers, Fla.	Snyder	Wheeler
Rogers, Mass.	Somers	Whitten
Rohrbough	Stanley	Whittington
Rooney	Stefan	Wigglesworth
Ross	Stevenson	Williams
Russell	Stockman	Wilson, Ind.
Sabath	Stratton	Wilson, Tex.
Sadlak	Sundstrom	Winstead
Sadowski	Taber	Wolcott
St. George	Talle	Wolverton
Sarbacher	Taylor	Woodruff
Sasscer	Teague	Worley
Schwabe, Okla.	Thomas, Tex.	Youngblood
Scott, Hardie		

NAYS—9

Banta	Crawford	Sanborn
Buffett	Gwinn, N Y.	Schwabe, Mo.
Clevenger	Mason	Smith, Ohio

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Douglas	Javits	Marcantonio
Isacson		

NOT VOTING—65

Allen, Ill.	Gregory	Murray, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gross	Nixon
Barden	Hébert	Norrell
Bates, Ky.	Hendricks	Norton
Bolton	Hess	O'Konski
Canfield	Jenkins, Pa.	Phillips, Tenn.
Chapman	Jennings	Powell
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Priest
Clippinger	Kefauver	Regan
Cooley	Kennedy	Richards
Coudert	Kerr	Riley
Courtney	Lesinski	Scoblick
Cox	Lucas	Sheppard
Cravens	Ludlow	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	McCormack	Stigler
Dirksen	McDowell	Thomas, N. J.
Domengeaux	McMahon	Trimble
Dorn	Mathews	Vail
Elliott	Meade, Ky.	West
Evins	Meade, Md.	Whitaker
Gallagher	Mitchell	Wood
Gore	Morton	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Canfield with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Priest.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Hess with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Whitaker.
Mr. Mathews with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Vail with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Nixon with Mr. Cravens.
Mr. Morton with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Domengeaux.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Gregory.
Mr. Phillips of Tennessee with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. McMahon with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. O'TOOLE changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

Mr. MARCANTONIO changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a report from the Committee on Public Lands and that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. BATES of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Passaic Herald-News.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CROSSER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Akron Beacon-Journal.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include articles and speeches.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY AND THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, namely:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Funds made available by the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, for administrative expenses of the constituent units of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the fiscal year 1949, shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with the Housing Act of 1948 in such amounts as may be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (but not exceeding in the aggregate $2,400,000) and the amounts so approved by the Director of the Budget may be transferred from funds available within such limitations as may be affected hereby for the last quarter of the fiscal year 1949 and obligated during the first three quarters of such fiscal year.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Housing investment insurance fund

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to make available to the Federal Housing Administration for credit to the housing investment insurance fund as provided in the Housing Act of 1948, $10,000,000 to remain available until expended.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

AUTOMOBILES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

For an additional amount for "automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans," $5,000,000.

SEC. 2. The appropriations and funds herein made available shall be subject to section 402 of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948.

SEC. 3. This act may be cited as the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for $10,000,000 to be turned over to the Treasury Department to take care of the provision which is found just below the top of page 87 of the Housing Act which has just been passed. It also provides $2,400,000 to take care of administrative expenses for the operation of those functions of the Housing Administration which have been supplemented by that act. Authority is given to use this fund by the 31st day of March so that we can again consider the matter when the new Congress comes in in January.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to call to the attention of my distinguished chairman from New York that in section 502 of H. R. 6959, which was just passed by this House, there is a provision which permits the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or the Administrator, to lump the already made appropriation, and therefore permits promiscuously the transferability of funds.

I do not think there is any need of that, and I doubt very much whether the Committee on Banking and Currency had any such intention. I heard no such expression on the part of the committee in any of the discussion on the floor of the House.

Your Subcommittee on Government Corporations, which handles all of these appropriations, has very carefully worked out certain limitations on these various constituent agencies. The Budget as developed by that committee was unanimously developed and unanimously approved by the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and unanimously approved by the House. I think it is in harmony with the sincere objectives of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator. I think it should be made clear, therefore, in the necessary expedition given to this appropriation, that it is still the intent of this House that they conform to those administrative limitations, except where the exception must come because of the emergency of the new legislation as it applies in the main to the Federal Housing Administration. Under this they could lump it for public housing. In this new bill there is no need for any additional funds. We are trying to clean up the despicable mess there has been in that administration, and we are getting cooperation from the new Administrator. To dump new funds in there now unnecessarily in any amount would defeat the purpose of this Congress.

Mr. TABER. We have tried by limiting the amount that might be available to bring that about. I know I personally feel that the restrictions the subcommittee placed in the Government corporations bill should be lived up to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I join the chairman of my committee and of the subcommittee of which I am a member in stating that I think it is the intention of the committee to carry out as far as can be done the limitations in the appropriation bill. In addition, I would personally like to see the funds that are provided in this bill handled in such a way that they will be traceable when this committee convenes next spring. I state that because over the past several years, not only when the Democrats were in control, but since the Republicans have been in control, we have given a world of time to trying to straighten out some rather unwholesome aspects of some parts of this program. We think we have done that fairly well. I appreciate the fact that the chairman of the committee has indicated it is their intention to go along and see that the Housing Authority goes along with those limitations.

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say that I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his statement, and I should like to add that this subcommittee will watch this thing closely and will meet again in January if we think they are not living up to that sort of instruction.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Do I correctly understand that the pending resolution calls for an appropriation of $10,000,000?

Mr. TABER. It calls for $10,000,000 to carry out the provision on page 87 of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is to administer H. R. 6959?

Mr. TABER. Not to administer it, but to provide for the operations of title VII of the insurance fund.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And that is H. R. 6959, the bill we just passed?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish to express my approval of what my chairman the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] and the gentleman from Mississippi have just said. As a member of the subcommittee on Government corporations, I agree perfectly with the position they take.

Mr. TABER. There is not any question but what the Housing Authority should be on its mettle and be very careful about the way they spend the money that is involved.

I want to call attention to one other thing. We have included $5,000,000 to provide automobiles for disabled veterans in accordance with the provisions of an act which was passed in the closing days of the session. This is the full budget estimate.

The other estimates that were before the committee were either estimates or items which had been considered by the subcommittees and in the conferences between the House and the other body and agreed to by the Congress, with the exception of a few items.

There is an item for motor-carrier claims. That can be taken care of by the President designating somebody with whom claims can be filed. It could not be done in any other way, unless he acted to appoint members to that Commission.

The other situation involved these war-damage claims which were authorized under a certain act passed in the last session of the Congress.

There is no limitation on the time within which claims can be filed. That can be taken care of when the Congress again convenes. There is really no other emergency legislation that should be considered at this time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the chairman also make a statement with reference to the operation of the Displaced Persons Act?

Mr. TABER. Two million dollars has been provided. That is more money than can honestly be spent by the Commission until the time that Congress meets again in January. There is no occasion for going into that any further at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. What did the Displaced Persons Commission ask for?

Mr. TABER. They asked for $4,000,000, and were given $2,000,000. That is plenty of money for them to get along with.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Would the gentleman at this time, if he is ready, and if not, will he please in an extension of his remarks, bring us up to date on the total budgetary situation?

Since the regular session ended, we have had a great deal of controversy about the matter. I have studied the gentleman's figures. I hope that he can bring us up to date on that.

Mr. TABER. I will put that in the RECORD in the extension of my remarks and I am sure that that will cover everything in connection with that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Has the gentleman discussed the proposed appropriations to implement the War Claims Act of 1948?

Mr. TABER. I have discussed that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman be kind enough to explain to the House his views on the need for transfer of funds to implement that act.

Mr. TABER. Substantial funds will not be needed until after claims are filed and adjudicated. Little more than filing can be accomplished before January 1, and that can be accomplished by the President by the designation of someone with whom the claims can be filed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is a motion to suspend the rules and pass an appropriation bill. It is a very unusual procedure, seldom resorted to in the consideration of major appropriation measures.

Of course, any motion to suspend the rules is a departure from normal procedure. That was the statement made by Speaker Longworth in passing on a point of order in the Seventy-first Congress. He prefaced his decision on that occasion with the statement that any motion to suspend the rules was not a normal procedure. Then, he went on to say that it was not only an abnormal procedure but it was not a fair procedure, because it gave no opportunity for adequate debate; it denied the right to amend; and was an arbitrary process, as he said, justified only in extreme emergencies.

Now, we have no emergency here. There is nothing to warrant a departure from the usual routine in the consideration of appropriation bills under the rules of the House. There is ample time. It is months before election. We have approximately 3 months in which to stay here and transact business that should be transacted in a leisurely and orderly manner. There is no occasion for us to omit the usual safeguards in keeping with the customary procedure of the House; no reason why full debate should be denied; and certainly no justification for denying the right to perfect the measure by amendment. There is no reason why we should not give ample and exhaustive consideration to this and the numerous other urgent problems awaiting disposition by Congress at this session.

There are various requisitions for appropriations as well as numerous legislative needs which the country expects Congress to take up at this time and which should be disposed of before adjournment.

For example, we have estimates of an urgent nature which have been transmitted from the Bureau of the Budget and on which hearings should be held with a view to submitting them to the House as a part of the pending bill or some more carefully considered bill of this character.

Most of them provide for needs which it is claimed have developed since the annual supply bills were passed and are therefore entitled to study.

For example, here is a request for an appropriation for the Department of the

Interior, for the expenses of power transmission facilities, which they say is urgently needed at this time.

Here is an estimate for construction, operation, and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Now, certainly these matters of operation and maintenance, not to mention matters of construction, should have at least cursory attention.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will permit me to complete my statement I shall be glad to yield.

Then, there is also a request here in the budget estimates for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Reclamation, which ought to be taken up in connection with any deficiency appropriation bill considered at this time.

There is likewise an estimate for an appropriation for construction of a project in Idaho. The Congress has authorized the construction of a dam there, and funds should be provided in this bill if shown to be needed. It is claimed that construction should be pushed as rapidly as possible in order to meet the seasonal condition which obtain there.

Then, here is an item, for operation and maintenance—not construction—but operation and maintenance of a project in California. Also, for the Columbia Basin project in Washington. And the estimates include provisions for the Shoshone project in Wyoming.

There is also said to be need in the general construction fund for construction of the Davis Dam project. The Congress passed legislation declaring it should be constructed and the committee should go into the matter of whether the entire amount is needed.

Likewise, the Central Valley Project in California is said to be in immediate need of $3,999,000 for transmission lines and for various other purposes on which I do not have time to go into in detail.

Also the Colorado-Big Thompson project in Colorado, the Hungry Horse project in Montana, the Columbia Basin project in Washington, and the Fort Peck project in Montana, all have been authorized by Congress after extensive hearings and due consideration but are said to lack sufficient funds.

Although gentlemen may insist that these needs are not warranted, or that they have been taken care of, the fact remains that these estimates here enumerated have been submitted to the Department and the Department after careful screening has submitted them to the Bureau of the Budget, and the Bureau of the Budget, after further estimate and consideration, has presented them to Congress for urgent and emergency action at this session. The House has referred them to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered them to be printed and they are available at the Document Room as House Document No. 735 and House Document No. 736. But the Committee on Appropriations refuses even to hold hearings on them, and although they are submitted as emergency matters which should be provided for during the vacation which we are shortly scheduled to take and which we are told will extend to December 31, the committee refuses to give them any study whatever.

Now, for the Missouri River Basin.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will permit me to complete my statement I shall be glad to yield.

This amount for the Missouri River Basin is reimbursable, and is estimated to be among the needed projects. The estimate is accompanied by a recommendation for funds for the Mississippi River Basin and the Canyon Valley project in Montana.

Then there is included here recommendations for appropriations for the Construction Division of the Bureau of Reclamation without which that work must necessarily be curtailed.

And estimates under the National Military Establishment are before the committee; certainly Congress should investigate needs for flood control. The annual losses due to inundation in this area reach into the millions of dollars and has materially interfered with the production of food products of strategic importance at this critical time. The over-all project for area control includes Bull Shoals project in Arkansas, Lakely Mountain Reservoir in Arkansas, Narrow Reservoir in Arkansas, Fort Gibson Reservoir in Oklahoma, the Quigley Reservoir in Texas, the Wolf Creek Reservoir in Kentucky, the Garrison Reservoir in North Dakota, and the Folsom Dam in California—and I may add, at the suggestion of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], although no specific estimates appear in this particular document, provision for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway.

Also included in House Document No. 736 are estimates for funds to be appropriated for the Displaced Persons Commission. A task half accomplished is sometimes worse than none at all. They have asked here for $4,000,000. We propose to give them in this bill only $2,000,000. We should inquire whether this amount is inadequate.

Then under the Civil Service Commission funds are required for Panama construction annuity funds. This item should have attention and investigation before Congress adjourns.

Under the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act it is insisted there is an imperative need for funds to establish the new agency. Our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York, calls attention to the fact that the President may appoint other officials who are already in the Government employ to initiate this activity. I believe you will concede that all such officials have enough business of their own to require their entire time and attention. If they have not, they ought not to have the jobs. Their time is fully taken up with duties which have been entrusted to their care, yet it is suggested that they divide their interest and attention and slight their present work by assuming the further burden of the administration of the Motor Carrier Commission, the work of which will be particularly exacting at this time because they are establishing new activities and must start from the ground up. Either they must neglect their own duties or they must neglect the work of the new commission.

Now, we come to the War Claims Commission, and I have introduced a separate appropriation bill to take care of this agency, which, incidentally, has not received consideration by the committee.

The War Claims Commission has been authorized by act of Congress and provides for a variety of beneficiaries.

For instance, there are claims of prisoners of war who certainly have rights which should be taken care of and taken care of immediately. The longer we defer consideration, the longer we deny them justice. Who will say that those who went through the rigors of foreign incarceration under a ruthless enemy regime, who suffered grievously thereby, should go without prompt redress simply because the committee refuses to appropriate money for a commission which has been authorized by an act of Congress?

This item also provides for settlement of claims of internees, of employees of contractors and of religious organizations which sustained damages and injuries as a result of enemy action during World War II. Why should they be required to wait when it must be paid eventually, and we could as easily as not include the amount here? Why should funds not be included in this bill in order to compensate for these injuries where it is shown to be needed?

There is also the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, which has an estimate here for administrative expenses necessary for the proper discharge of the functions of the Bureau.

Then there is the provision for the mining experiment stations, particularly timely when we are trying to stock pile material for eventualities which may be precipitated unexpectedly.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether these appropriations are needed or not. But hearings should have been held and an opportunity given to justify them. No one can tell what should have been appropriated or whether anything should have been appropriated, but they should at least have had consideration.

Mr. Speaker, to pass a law recommending these appropriations and authorizing these activities, and then fail to provide the money is merely a gesture. Some might be unkind enough to say that it is a misleading and deceptive gesture to give the impression we are going to take care of these urgent needs, while denying the funds to implement the law.

The bill, as presented, may be inadequate. We had a Budget estimate for the Housing and Home Finance Agency of $3,800,000. The bill now before the House, under a motion to suspend, has had no hearings, no study, no real consideration. It only provides $2,400,000. That may be enough but nobody knows. No attempt has been made to give a reason why we should not appropriate $3,800,000 for housing.

After we have eliminated some of the most essential provisions of the bill—after we have reduced the program materially—we may now be further reducing its chances of successful operation by reducing the amount of money to make it effective. That uncertainty is not surprising in view of the lack of study which has attended the submission of the bill. No hearings have been held on any of these estimates. No meeting of the Committee on Appropriations has been called. No authorization has been asked or given by the Committee on Appropriations for the submission of the bill in this form or any other form. And without hearings or study or authorization—and contrary to the accustomed practice in the consideration and disposition of appropriation measures—the pending joint resolution is thrust into the House on the last day and in the last hours of the session.

No explanation is given for this arbitrary and precipitate action. There is no need or necessity for adjournment, either today or any other day within the next 2 months. This is a very important measure. It is a matter of universal interest throughout the country. It is one of the principal objectives for which the session was called. Opportunity should be given for proponents of housing legislation, and any who are opposed to it, to be heard and it should be studied with some deliberation.

It is evident on the face of it that this meager appropriation is not intended to really solve the problem of houseless and homeless veterans awaiting action by the Congress. It is merely a token appropriation, and purely a makeshift to obviate as adroitly as possible the embarrassment of failing to carry out a party platform pledge.

I shall support the bill because it is this or nothing. But I want to again call attention to the fact that there is no reason why the subject of housing and homes for veterans should not have had more than the 40 minutes' attention this House has given it. There is no reason for Congress adjourning at this time. In fact, there is every reason for Congress not adjourning at this time or any other time until this and other pressing problems of the country have had reasonable consideration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by many Members of this House to make some report to them about my recent survey of conditions in Europe. On this day I have officially reported to the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. By leave granted me, I include this report as part of my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 6, 1948.

Memorandum for the chairman.
Re: Comments on activities and conditions in Europe.

In response to a request by the Secretary of State that his Department's operations in Europe be examined, the full Committee on Appropriations, on June 1, 1948, requested me to study activities arising from the passage of European recovery-program legislation and the increased activities of the Foreign Service. The committee further indicated it desired that I comply with the request of the Secretary of the Army that a survey of feeding in occupied areas by GARIOA (Government and Relief in Occupied Areas) be made. The Secretary of State requested that I look into the possible overlap or duplication by the ECA (European Cooperation Administration) and diplomatic missions, inquire into the effectiveness of the Voice of America program, and report on developments in Czechoslovakia.

Five weeks were consumed in the inspection of the Office of International Exchange in New York and in making studies in France, Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Switzerland. I left Washington on June 21, 1948, and returned on July 29, 1948.

To present a picture of what I was able to cover in the course of my trip, I have broken down my account into subjects which I feel would be of most interest to the committee. For convenience they are outlined below:

	Page No.
1. The Marshall plan	2
2. Crops in Europe	2
3. International Children's Feeding Fund	3
4. American activity in Austria	3
5. Providing food for persons in occupied areas	4
6. American activity in Berlin	4
7. Gen. Lucius Clay and Ambassador Robert Murphy	4
8. Displaced-persons camps	5
9. Expellee and refugee camps	6
10. Stabilization of the German mark	6
11. Dismantling of industry in the Ruhr	6
12. Reports on Czechoslovakia based upon reliable escapee informants	7

THE MARSHALL PLAN

I found the ECA, or Marshall plan, just beginning to operate in some of the countries I visited. The operation, however, was in such an infant stage that I cannot give to the committee any real report on preliminary results. I found Mr. Harriman, the roving Ambassador, very busy setting up his groups in the valous countries. Mr. Harriman has secured space on two floors of a hotel in Paris where he is setting up his "overall headquarters." He has now selected the chiefs for the various countries and they are fairly well on the way to filling most of the positions. It was my privilege to attend the conference of 16 governments in Paris on Sunday, July 25, where Mr. Paul Hoffman, the ECA Administrator told the Prime Ministers and the representatives of the various countries what the ECA plan stood for—and what this country expected the various members of the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation) to do. It is my firm conviction that Mr. Hoffman made a deep impression on the representatives of these various governments. Both his prepared and extemporaneous speech contained straightforward statements to the effect that the United States Government was not in the relief business, and that the ECA was a 4-year recovery or rehabilitation program. He explained that the people of the United States wanted to help the people of these countries to help themselves. The replies to these statements by the representatives of the various governments invariably were to the effect that these representatives would endeavor to sell the idea to their people. They promised to cut down their statistics and give to the American people some actual results. This indicated to me that the entire program was still in the embryo stage and that it will be many, many weeks before real activity and results can be achieved.

After careful consideration and study, it is my sincere belief that amendments to the ECA Act will be necessary sometime in the future. Duplication, overlapping, and interference with orderly diplomatic and foreign-service activity cannot be avoided. As the program proceeds, I seriously recommend that studies be made as to what amendments should be made in order to safeguard the Marshall plan from failure due to possible bypassing of our regular diplomatic and political missions in foreign countries.

CROPS IN EUROPE

Farm crops throughout Germany, France, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Switzerland, will be record-breaking, in my opinion. Rains have been heavy everywhere, and for a time it was feared that too much moisture would cut the large crop prospect. However, there was more than a week of sun, and the drying days have resulted in saving the crop.

While there is a shortage of livestock in some of these countries, the stock that is on hand is in excellent shape and there will be a large amount of feed for fattening. I feel the committee was right in endeavoring to stretch out the ECA funds to 15 months instead of 12 months because it rightly based its judgment on newer crop figures than those submitted by the departments. I visited several hundred farms and talked with farmers who indicated that their yield this year cannot be compared with 1947 figures. In Normandy, some fields of wheat will average 90 to 100 bushels per acre. This statement has been questioned in various American agricultural circles, and also by some Government agencies. In order to substantiate this information, I submit for the information of the committee a letter written by Mr. Ben H. Thibodeaux, chief of the food and agriculture branch in the office of the United States special representative in Europe (ECA). Of course, the secret in this heavy yield of grain is the fact that there was an abundance of moisture and that it cost the French farmer approximately $60 per acre for fertilizer. Incidentally, there will be sufficient fertilizer in France, but that is not true in Germany and Austria.

I visited for some time with Chancelor Figel and Prime Minister Gruber in Austria. Chancelor Figel is a farmer and owns land adjoining the American airport 14 miles inland in the Russian zone. Chancelor Figel is a practical farmer, and he expressed great appreciation to the American people for the assistance given to Austria. He confirmed what many farmers in Austria, Germany, and France told me regarding their requirements. Chancelor Figel stated that the Austrian farmers needed most of all machinery and machinery parts drawn by oxen and horses. He indicated he was not interested in mechanization of small farms though perhaps mechanization would be very good for larger farms. He insisted that the No. 1 priority on Austrian farms was machinery and parts for machinery drawn by animals. He said that the No. 2 need for the Austrian farmers, which is true in Germany, was for fertilizer, and the third priority was for work clothing and work shoes. In talking to farmers in other countries, I find that these requirements are almost staple.

I visited two large farms outside of Paris with Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Harriman where the operator indicated he would like to have more tractors, but I noticed that the animal-drawn farm machinery was a must even in this locality. However, on these large farms ranging from 200 to 1,000 acres, mechanized farming is a necessity. Of course, there is a shortage of this kind of machinery throughout Europe. But emphasis must be centered on horse- or ox-drawn machinery for obvious reasons—return of fertilizer to the land, the high cost of gasoline, and the small acreage of the average farm in Europe

Bread in most parts of Europe (except in Switzerland, etc., where there is no rationing and where everyone seems to be rich) is rationed, and is of such quality that it is unpalatable. All over France, Germany, Austria people were hopeful that the wheat crop would be heavy enough to eliminate the rationing of bread. People in Europe want better bread. Agricultural experts tell me that they will require considerable bread grains from the Marshall plan, and every effort will be made to bring a better bread to

the people of Europe. Europeans will request a large amount of American corn for animal feeding.

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S FEEDING FUND

The committee appropriated $35,000,000 for this fund, and an effort was made to reduce this amount because of certain complaints made to the committee. After some investigation in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere, I find some of these complaints had a sound basis, and a reconsideration of the entire fund should be made when justifications are made for the next fiscal year's appropriations. I was able to witness the activities of this organization, and I feel that with conditions improved in Europe a resurvey will be necessary. I had a conference with Mr. Morris Pate, director of the organization, in Prague, Czechoslovakia. He indicated that some of the benefits of the fund will be spread to the children in occupied areas, such as Germany, where there is considerable malnutrition among children. This is especially true of those found in refugee camps.

AMERICAN ACTIVITY IN AUSTRIA

I cannot say too much in commendation for General Clay and his administration in the occupied areas of Germany, and General Keyes in Austria. In Austria, which has a central government, the task of rehabilitation is considerably less difficult. Minister Eberhardt and General Keyes' staff are an ideal team. They work exceptionally harmoniously with the Austrian Government, in spite of the fact that there is an unusual amount of military activity in Austria on the part of the Russians. I have been informed that the Russians have been holding maneuvers during which live ammunition is used by their ground forces and live bombs are used by their air forces, much to the discomfort of Austrian civilians.

AMERICAN ACTIVITY IN BERLIN

General Clay made it possible for me to fly from Frankfurt to Berlin in a plane participating in the air-food delivery by our air forces. I observed the loading and unloading of these planes. Throughout the time I was there, the weather was practically zero and I witnessed and participated in what I believe was one of the greatest air feats in modern aviation history. General Wedemeyer, whom I met in Germany, told me this air lift was comparable to flying over the hump during the war. This task brought American aviators from all parts of the United States, Hawaii, etc., to Germany. After only a few hours briefing, these aviators were flying to and from Frankfurt and Berlin through the most dangerous flying weather I have ever seen. I was told by Russians, Germans, French, Austrians, and Britishers, who witnessed this aviation feat, that they believed the American aviators were the greatest flyers in the world. This operation could not be as successful as it is without the unusual efficiency of the ground force, radio, and communication experts of the American Air Forces. Knowing something about the problems of aviation and being experienced in radio and telegraphy, I took particular interest in listening in and participating in some of the activities. In my opinion, this operation, although entailing a gigantic amount of expense, may be of great value because it provides unusual experience for our great aviation organization. However, I am hopeful that our diplomacy will be able to solve this Berlin problem in a more economical manner before winter and impossible flying weather sets in. In my opinion, it will be impossible to continue this feeding operation indefinitely.

PROVIDING FOOD FOR PERSONS IN OCCUPIED AREAS

The feeding in occupied areas and the general program of the American occupation, in my opinion, is conducted in a manner complimentary to those in charge of these problems. However, it is a tremendously expensive program and with better crop conditions in Europe and the plan of General Clay to civilianize the program future appropriations should be reduced drastically. Everything points to the conclusion that original estimates of grain needs for all Europe were greatly in excess of what, it now has been established, will be necessary. Our committee chairman and others sufficiently well informed to foresee that estimates of grain needs were exaggerated have again been proven correct. The number of civilian Americans and their dependents in occupied Germany should be reduced.

GEN. LUCIUS CLAY AND AMBASSADOR ROBERT MURPHY

I cannot speak too highly of the work performed by Gen. Lucius Clay, who is supreme chief of our occupation forces in Germany, and his political adviser, Ambassador Robert Murphy. I had the unusual opportunity to see these great Americans working together in a gigantic task in Germany. I also had the opportunity (because of my knowledge of German language) to listen to the unbiased statements made by Germans and other foreigners located in Germany. These statements indicated an unusual respect for both General Clay and Ambassador Murphy. No high commissioner of an occupied country could be called popular. No army of occupation can be really considered popular among the people over which it rules under occupation conditions. I have known both General Clay and Ambassador Murphy over a period of 14 years and my respect for both has not changed. I feel that the people of the United States are efficiently represented by these two Americans. The gigantic tasks they have already accomplished and the new crises which they face are no bigger than the men whom the American Government has selected to solve them.

General Clay's firmness without belligerency, coupled with Ambassador Murphy's finesse in handling difficult situations has made possible our remaining in Berlin under circumstances that under less skillful handling might easily have resulted in war.

DISPLACED-PERSONS CAMPS

(Maintained by the International Refugee Organization (IRO))

I visited a number of displaced-persons camps known as DP camps. The occupants of these camps should be differentiated from what is known as the ordinary expellees, persecutees, escapees, refugees.

The number of persons in DP camps is not known from day to day. I was given all kinds of figures in Europe, and the best I can figure is that they total approximately 650,000 people. The committee will recall that it is anxious that these camps be liquidated as soon as possible. My observations in Europe indicate it will be a long time before liquidation can be achieved because of the rather preferential status of these displaced persons. I went through the invoices of some of these camps and found the feeding in terms of calories varied from camp to camp. The maximum depends upon the management and the genius, you might say, of some of the camp traders. The cleanliness of these camps range from A No. 1 to a most degrading status of sanitation. Everything possible should be done to liquidate these camps and fit the people occupying them into the economy of the country in which they are located, or send them to countries which will take them. The IRO funds are supplemented by the funds, material, and food shipped into these DP camps by various relief organizations. This, together with the fact that some of the occupants are living off of the local economy, gives them a decidedly preferential status, and causes considerable complaint from other refugees, local and American officials, and naturally, from the natives at large.

Many of these DP's are there as the result of the war and many underwent great suffering. However, many of them told me of their appreciation for the anticipation of their possibly coming to the United States under the new DP legislation. Many are anxious to come to other countries of the Western Hemisphere. I feel a majority of these DP's are not satisfied with their lot and do not wish to remain in these camps. However, a large number of them are becoming institutionalized and will remain a great burden upon the American taxpayer unless some additional pressure is started to liquidate the camps.

EXPELLEE AND REFUGEE CAMPS

(These camps are separate and distinct from what are known as DP camps)

I visited a large number of what are known as refugee camps. These people are the expellees from Sudetenland, Yugoslavia, Latvia, Poland, Russia, and many other countries. There are millions of these expellees. They have now been enlarged by the escapees from Czechoslovakia of which there are 8,000 or more. Their plight is most pitiful. Many of them were the finest craftsmen of glass and textiles in the Sudetenland; many of them belonged to the various professions, some were merchants, tailors, bricklayers, carpenters, electricians, plumbers, painters, and farmers. Some of them are politicians. Bavaria gets the largest share. Up to this very moment, more than 600 come into Bavaria each day. They are a drain upon the local economy. There is no international organization to feed them. They talk many different languages. When they arrive, they are doled out to whatever housing is available. Local people must take them in and share whatever room there is in the towns, cities, and on the farms. They are in Germany in such large numbers that there is no longer room in the farm houses or in the city homes for them. As a result the overflow is cared for by local authorities in rough barracks. As many as 40 persons live in 1 barrack room. I have visited many of these barrack rooms in which men, women, both young and old, boys, girls, and children live in a common room. Two-deck beds, with corn husk mattresses and pitiful sanitation is the rule. Expellee doctors tell me that tuberculosis is the No. 1 disease. It is not uncommon for one TB case to come into one of these rooms and spread the disease through the entire group. The caloric ration for this pitiful humanity is less than 1,200 per day. I have retained a copy of the meager daily ration for these people.

As a result of the growth of these refugee or expellee camps, Bavaria is overpopulated by 4,000,000. The Secretary of Interior in Bavaria told me that if Bavaria could be relieved of its refugee and expellee population it could very well take care of its own economy. Bavarian local officials, guided by the American army of occupation are encouraging new industries on the part of these refugees. However, export orders far exceed production due to the lack of raw working material available for many of the experts included in the ranks of these refugees.

What the winter will bring in the way of suffering and death to these people is far beyond comprehension unless some additional aid is given to these expellees through the generosity of the American Government and American charitable organizations.

I have talked to hundreds of these expellees and asked them where they wished to go. Invariably the answer is, "We want to go home." Home to them is many countries, Sudetenland, Yugoslavia, Poland, Russia, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Latvia, Lithuania, and so forth. Most of these people have never known any other place as home. If they cannot go back "home" most of them would like to come to the United States of America.

STABILIZATION OF GERMAN MARK

German rehabilitation and recovery is being helped by the stabilization of the mark more than any other one thing. Everywhere in Germany I found the farmers coming into towns with their produce. Everywhere the shopkeepers were bringing out merchandise for sale which had, by tradition, been the black-market merchandise. Germans told me they were surprised at the quantity and source of this merchandise. Everywhere German housewives told me that never in many months had there been the vegetables, farm produce, and merchandise on legitimate sale. I was informed that in various communities I had visited, everyone knew the identity of the black marketeers. These individuals were now forced to go to work because consumers were able to buy in the open market merchandise and farm produce. It was no longer necessary for town people to go out into the country and barter with the farmer for his goods. In spite of this, there is a black market on the dollar. The rate is 3.30 for the dollar on the legitimate market, and runs as high as 10 marks per dollar in the black market. Some bank officials expressed concern over the possibility that there may be some trade in the counterfeit of the new mark. The rank and file of Germans told me that while there was plenty of merchandise on the legitimate market, the difficulty now is to get sufficient marks. There is a labor shortage in some sections but in parts of the country, especially in Bavaria where DP's and refugees are located in tremendous numbers, there is some noticeable unemployment. Bavaria is encouraging Sudetenlanders to manufacture glass, and so forth, for export.

DISMANTLING OF INDUSTRY IN RUHR

I found in the Ruhr of Germany much activity. Coal production is on the increase and the stabilization of the mark and the increase in daily rations (now over 1,800 calories) is real incentive for work on the part of the laboring man. However, there was much evidence of communistic growth in the laboring sections of the Ruhr, especially in and around Essen.

German officials in the Ruhr told me the greatest obstacle to recovery is the dismantling program under the reparations agreements. Our committee had been informed that most or perhaps all of the dismantling of industry had ceased at least temporarily. I discovered that this is not the fact. I presented 100 CARE packages to the city of Kamen in the Ruhr. The mayor of the city in accepting this gift which came from a humble farmer (Mr. Claude Canaday) of Nebraska—declared that it did not make "common sense" for Americans to "feed us" and at the same time dismantle industries which could not be regarded as "possible war plants." This mayor called my attention to the fact that in the city of Kamen a plant which had been in existence for many, many years was being dismantled. He stated that this plant manufactured parts for wheels on railroad cars. It manufactured other material needed badly for coal and steel production. The plant had provided jobs for hundreds of people for many years. He declared this plant was being dismantled or ordered to be dismantled. He believed Americans who are spending billions to help rehabilitate Europe perhaps do not realize what is being done. In order to get better information on this dismantling program I visited the Krupp residence near Essen. The Bipartite Control Office—United Kingdom-United States coal-control group is located there. I came in time to meet Mr. Estelle, our chief, following one of the group's morning meetings. Mr. Estelle indicated his discouragement in reaching any real results due to the dismantling program. He submitted to me for the information of this committee a list of 30 plants which are doomed to be dismantled. So inconsistent are the recommendations on some of these industries that I submit the entire 30 for your information. I suggest careful reading of some of these recommendations. No. 1 especially will enlighten you on the inconsistency. This recommendation is that because of the specialized products of the firm they should be continued in operation after dismantling. It is no wonder that Mr. Estelle threw up his hands and indicated to me that he was through and about ready to quit.

I visited a number of places in the Ruhr and everywhere I heard protests from the natives. My inquiry of officials in Europe as to who will pay for the operation after dismantling brought the explanation that perhaps "after dismantling" the machinery of these plants would be distributed around to various countries and that this machinery could be brought back again. By whom? Scanning the recommendations one is struck by the senselessness of the whole procedure. How can a sane and sober man devise a diabolical scheme whereby a plant is dismantled at the time it is trying to figure how to procure equipment to produce extremely essential goods. At the time when Europe must have coal the factories that have produced mining equipment are being destroyed. Only a blind, irreverent, unreasoning, ghastly spirit of revenge could be responsible for what must ultimately do much to defeat our attempt to cure Europe's economic ills.

I reported my findings to Mr. Paul Hoffman, the ECA Administrator, in Paris. He indicated that these plants and this entire matter had not been referred to him but did state that he felt these dismantling operations should be frozen in the name of "common sense" and for the best interests of European recovery.

Immediately upon my arrival in Washington I referred the list of 30 plants handed me by Mr. Estelle to the Department of the Army. I learned that some action is being taken toward the freezing of dismantling operations for some of these plants. A memorandum regarding this program is being furnished me by Colonel Cheseldine and will be furnished to the committee.

REPORTS ON CZECHOSLOVAKIA BASED UPON RELIABLE ESCAPEE INFORMANTS

Fortunately, because of my wide acquaintanceship in Czechoslovakia and my familiarity with the language, I was able to be in contact with exceptionally well-informed individuals who furnished me with intensely interesting information. These men were escapees from Czechoslovakia who had occupied high posts, were well informed, and felt I could be trusted.

One was able to recount in detail the procedure the Communists followed in taking over Czechoslovakia. It was a grim story, replete with instances of deception, treachery, and disloyalty. He recalled how loyal Czechoslovakians resisted nazism and sought to liberate their country from the beginning in 1939. He pointed out that Klement, Gottwald, and other Communists had, until 1941 when the U. S. S. R. was attacked by Hitler, collaborated with the Germans. He believed the Communist putsch took place in February 1948, because a public opinion poll estimated that in the 1948 spring elections, the Communists would get less than 30 percent of the votes. The Czechoslovak Institute for the measurement of public opinion (Gallup poll) had estimated the results of the 1946 election correctly within two-tenths of 1 percent. The Communists had officially declared many times their aim to achieve 51 percent of all votes, and could not afford a free election which would end the growth of their party and defeat their plan to take over Czechoslovakia.

I was informed that on July 6, 100,000 members of the Sokol Gymnastic Club who were in Prague for their traditional games, gave a stirring pro-Benes and pro-American demonstration. They demonstrated real courage by carrying tiny American flags for 6 hours under the eyes of policemen and security agents. As nearly as possible the account one observer furnished is set out in full:

"It may interest you that during the parade the President—i. e., Mr. Gottwald—and his Government staff tribune were completely ignored, in fact, in many cases insulted by the carrying of the standards on the shoulders of the bearers instead of in front or lowered. Immediately after all sections passed the tribune, and there were some 280,000 in the parade, every single section without exception started to cheer for Benes. You could hear all over the old town square the chants, 'We want Benes,' or just 'Benes' or 'We want President Benes,' for which thousands of people were later arrested. It was a spontaneous revolt if I ever saw one. Literally thousands of the people in the parade showed Masaryk and Benes pictures, and thousands and thousands of them waved only American flags.

"One particular group was led by a large American flag with only banners following. Even the absence of the Czech flag was very apparent. This particular group was called the Masaryk County (as you know, all the so-called organizations are divided into different counties either by the name of a leader or by the name of a city from where they come), and this group followed immediately upon the heels of the labor section of the athletic organization DTJ, which is definitely communistic. It was a very small group of several hundred comprising this labor athletic organization. All of the members cheered in order to obtain response from the onlookers, but only the grandstand with the Government officials stood up and clapped. Everybody else was just stone still and without emotion. Immediately following this group came the Masaryk group with the American flag in front, and the entire Staromeska Namesti, the old town square with the Jan Hus monument, went into a terrific ovation which could definitely be heard on the grandstand. It was unbelievable what courage the people really showed. Unfortunately, there was not the expected overthrow of the Government. Before my eyes I saw dozens of secret policemen making constant arrests of people, and it was very deplorable. The final day in the stadium, youths between the ages of 14 and 19, and there were 17,000 of them, right in the middle of their exercises, pulled out thousands of American flags and waved them in protest against the local regime. A terrific number of people were arrested for this protest."

A few hours after the parade many Czechs turned their radio dials to the Voice of America to hear a report of the pro-American aspect of the demonstrations. The first program to be heard did not carry the news, much to their disappointment. It was disheartening to many who felt that America did not care for the risks they were taking. Reportedly, accounts of the incident were broadcast on July 7 and 8. Voice of America officials explained the story was not carried on July 6, when the Czech listeners were eager to hear it, because the wire service available did not carry the story in time to include it in the July 6 broadcast.

CZECH URANIUM CITY

One very well-informed escapee told me a grim story about the famous uranium mines in Jackymov in Bohemia. Last February before the Communist putsch in Czechoslovakia, a Prague newspaper reported that the mines had received 22 trucks from the Ministry of Transport in spite of the scarcity of such vehicles. The journalist was charged

by the Communist-controlled Ministry of the Interior with a crime against the defense of the Republic for having revealed a very important military secret. Since May 1945, when the Soviet troops took over the mines, the name of Jackymov had become tabu in Czechoslovakia. The Soviet officers and officials who occupy and administer Jackymov do so as if it were a Soviet colony. All post cards and all propaganda literature describing the healing powers of Jackymov Spa which had a world-wide reputation were confiscated. Subservient Czech authorities had declared that to sell a post card of the famous resort hotel there constituted a crime against the security of the state. Practically all civil rights of the citizens of the town were abolished. Spa guests have been limited in their movements. When Jan Masaryk was minister he was, upon one occasion, expelled from the restricted area by Russian soldiers. The Russians went so far as to suggest to the Czechoslovakian Government that in geography lessons in Czech schools not a word be said about the existence of the town of Jackymov.

Its mines rival the uranium deposits of the Belgian Congo and yield other valuable ores. Prior to the Russian seizure of the mines, the yield of uranium amounted to approximately 60 tons per year. Now the Russians are producing approximately 200 tons per year. This increase, instead of being attributable to efficiency, is testimony of the absolute ruthlessness with which the mines are being plundered, and the way human beings are being treated.

Work in uranium mines, unless carefully managed, gradually kills the miner. For this reason all work in prior years was carried out with great care for the health of the workers. The Russians have made the mines forced-labor establishments using German prisoners of war. The slaves are worked till exhausted, or they die of exposure. The number of miners has been increased from approximately 500 to approximately 650.

For over 30 years cartographic researches have been going on in Jackymov, thus giving precise knowledge of the uranium beds and their capacity to the depth of 800 meters. The Russians, using this knowledge, have opened up a shaft in the 600–800-meter depth where no mining had taken place in view of the fact that work there was dangerous and very unhealthy because of the extreme radioactivity. The Russians, in spite of all warnings, started work there and endanger not only hundreds of lives, but also the whole mine and the whole region if the strong geyser of mineral water breaks loose.

The Soviet commander of Jackymov, Major Michajlov, and the Russian geologist, Mlcjunko, are deaf to warnings. They are certain that if and when the gigantic strength of the mineral waters will break the dam and flood the mines, nobody will ever hear of it.

The Russians care little about the cost of the mining operation as there is more than money at stake. The Soviet is trying to catch up with the United States on atomic bomb production.

At Freiburg in Saxony, a Soviet center for uranium research has been set up in the building of the Saxon Mining Academy. It is not the only one, because even in Prague in the borough of Zisker, the Czech Government has established a uranium research laboratory for the Soviets. Five to fifteen tons of uranium are brought there every month. It is difficult to estimate the value of the uranium ore that is being stolen from Czechoslovakia by the Russians, according to my informant. As he pointed out, Belgium sells uranium to the Americans whereas the Russians steal it from the Czechoslovakians.

Respectfully submitted.

KARL STEFAN,
Member of Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks in regard to the pending appropriation bill. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has pointed out some of its shortcomings.

On June 19 Congress gave final approval to a bill which was originally known as H. R. 4044 but which was materially modified before it was finally passed. The bill has become Public Law 896 of the Eightieth Congress and is known as the War Claims Act of 1948.

Among other things, this law provided certain benefits for men who were prisoners of war in World War II. Payment is to be made from enemy assets which are under our control. The act provides for the setting up of a War Claims Commission.

Congress in its unwise haste to adjourn on June 20 failed to provide funds for the setting up of the Commission. The present bill makes no provision for the Commission. This session will, therefore, twice adjourn without providing necessary funds for making effective the War Claims Act of 1948. This is inexcusable. In the subcommittee meeting this morning I voted to include the funds.

Mr. Speaker, this is only one of many pieces of legislation which could and should be acted upon at this session.

I take this means of urging immediate action. Veterans and veterans' organizations are much concerned about this matter.

I quote the following from the President's budget message of July 31:

"ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the War Claims Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses; printing and binding; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $470,000, to be derived from the war claims fund created by section 14 (a) of the War Claims Act: *Provided*, That transfers may be made from this appropriation to other Government agencies for use of their facilities and services in carrying out the functions of the Commission."

The language for payment of claims is required to authorize such payments from the war claims fund by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896) and solely on the basis of certifications by the War Claims Commission or Federal Security Administrator.

The estimate for administrative expenses of the War Claims Commission will provide funds for the organization of the Commission and its operations during fiscal year 1949. This Commission is created by the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, 80th Cong.) for the purposes of paying claims to internees, prisoners of war, and certain religious organizations which sustained damages or injuries as a result of enemy action during World War II. In addition to the payment of these claims, the Commission is charged with the responsibility of inquiring into and preparing a report to the President for submission to the Congress on or before March 31, 1949, with respect to war claims arising out of World War II other than those claims which will be immediately adjudicated under the War Claims Act of 1940.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] called attention to the fact that appropriations had not been made to begin the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway.

I call attention to the fact that the Ohio Valley Improvement Association has come out openly and positively in support of that great project.

I am assured that funds to begin its construction will be included in the appropriation bill in the next session of Congress.

I regret it could not have been done at this time.

From Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans, down the Mississippi River, then across to Mobile along the intercoastal waterway, and then up to the Tennessee River along the Tombigbee, and then downstream 262 miles back to Cairo—the round trip is 1,768 miles.

Of that 1,768 miles 1,131 of it will be downstream and the rest of it will be in slack water.

It will benefit everybody on all the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Tennessee, the Warrior, the Tombigbee, and every other stream in what is known as the great Mississippi Valley—extending from the Allegheny to the Rocky Mountains. Let me show you what it will do.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I suppose the gentleman knows that the President said last fall, "No new starts for flood control or reclamation in the 1949 appropriation bill."

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that the President has assured me that if the funds are available they will be allocated to this project, for the simple reason that it gives a direct connection from Oak Ridge, our great defense plant on the Tennessee River, to the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile.

It cuts the water distance from Oak Ridge to Mobile by 870 miles, and gives an additional outlet from Oak Ridge to the sea.

Let me show you what it will mean from the standpoint of traffic costs back up that waterway from the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile to Oak Ridge, Tenn. A 14,000-ton barge would save $30,000 on its fuel bill alone, going from the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile to Oak Ridge on the Tennessee River.

I will place the rest of this information in the RECORD, and let me say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] that it will greatly benefit his State, because you ship your grain down on these barges, and when those barges return, you will get the benefit of this low-cost transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a speech that I made in the House on July 1, 1947, on this same subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The statement referred to follows:)

THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY—BYPASSING THE SWIFT CURRENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI FOR UPSTREAM TRAFFIC

(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, July 1, 1947)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to talk to you about the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway.

I shall offer an amendment at the proper time for funds to start the work on this, the most important inland waterway project that has ever been presented to the Congress of the United States.

As I pointed out to you a few days ago, for 200 years the American people have been virtually denied the use of the Mississippi River, because of their inability to stem the swift tide of that stream for up-bound traffic. Only recently the businessmen along the Ohio River were looking for an outlet to the Atlantic Ocean so they might escape the penalties of this devastating current.

For more than 100 years engineers have tried to develop a slack water route connecting the Tennessee River and the Gulf of Mexico by way of the Tombigbee River.

If you remember, the Tennessee River flows in a southwesterly direction to about Guntersville, thence westward to the Mississippi State line, then turns northward and flows 215 miles to where it empties into the Ohio River at Paducah. From Paducah the Ohio flows west, or southwest, 47 miles and empties into the Mississippi at Cairo.

Until recently the engineers were unable to find a way to connect the Tombigbee with the Tennessee without locks going up from the Tennessee and also locks going up from the Tombigbee. The two streams were separated by a sand ridge about 25 miles wide, and there was no water supply at the summit. You cannot operate locks to lift water traffic to a higher level unless you have a water supply at the summit. Those of you who have seen the Panama Canal remember that we changed the course of the Chagres River and turned it into Gatun Lake in order to provide a water supply at the summit of the Panama Canal project, 85 feet above sea level.

In 1933 the Tennessee Valley Authority built the Pickwick Dam on the Tennessee River, just below the mouth of Yellow Creek, where this proposed project joins the Tennessee. That raised the water level at the mouth of Yellow Creek about 55 feet. The Army engineers were called upon to make a new survey, and they came back the most enthusiastic group I have ever seen. They said, "We find now that we can cut through the sand ridge separating the Tennessee River from the Tombigbee 25 miles away, and put the summit of this project in the Tennessee River." That project was recommended by the Chief of Engineers, authorized by a vote of both Houses of Congress, and signed by the President.

The Tennessee River at one time probably flowed down the Tombigbee Valley. Hernando De Soto, who discovered the Tennessee River up near its source, followed it down to the present site of Guntersville, where he left it and went south. When he later discovered the Mississippi he thought it was the same stream. He published a map showing the Tennessee curving southward and flowing down the present course of the Mississippi. It never occurred to him that the Tennessee would turn north and flow in that direction for hundreds of miles.

Some upheaval in prehistoric times seems to have lifted that ground up and turned the Tennessee north, to where it flows into the Ohio River at Paducah.

The Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek is 100 feet above the Tombigbee, where it is formed by the confluence of Brown and Mackeys Creek less than 25 miles away. So by cutting through this sand ridge and building locks and dams from the mouth of the Warrior River up to the Tennessee, they can put the summit of this project in the Tennessee River and provide a slack-water route up the Tombigbee 481 miles from Mobile into the Tennessee and then a downstream route 215 miles on the Tennessee River to Paducah and then down the Ohio 47 miles to Cairo, Ill.

If you will turn to page 7911 of yesterday's RECORD, you will find a table showing what this means. My time is limited, so I am going to talk to you in terms we can all understand.

From Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans down the Mississippi River 869 miles, then 156 miles across to Mobile, along the intercoastal waterway, which is slack water, then 481 miles up this proposed Tombigbee inland waterway, through slack water, to the Tennessee River, then 262 miles downstream to Cairo, Ill., a vessel or a barge from Cairo, or Paducah, making the round trip would travel 1,768 miles. Of that 1,768 miles, with this new development, 1,131 miles of it, or approximately two-thirds of the way, would be downstream, and the rest of it would be in slack water.

General Robins said to the Senate committee that if he were to promise to provide a slack-water route all the way up the Mississippi to Cairo, just as if it were across the Gulf of Mexico, all the way up and back, they would throw up their hats and shout.

"But," he said, "this is infinitely better, because," he said, "we give you a slack-water route up to the Tennessee, and then a downstream route to Cairo, 262 miles, and save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic."

As it is today, your vessels cannot go back up the Mississippi River, except at tremendous expense.

I have here some photographs which were supplied me by the Army engineers. You will notice one of these barges is coming down from Pittsburgh, Pa., down the Ohio River. It is loaded with 14,000 tons of freight. When that barge gets to the mouth of the Mississippi River, or to New Orleans, with that stream raging as it is today, it is practically paralyzed so far as returning up the Mississippi River is concerned. The same thing is true of this 14,000-ton barge coming down from Chicago. Here is one from Detroit, loaded with automobiles and automobile parts.

Here is one probably coming down the Missouri River, probably from Omaha or Kansas City or down the Mississippi from St. Paul, Minneapolis, or St. Louis loaded with 14,000 tons of freight.

If they desire to take back the raw materials, cotton, cottonseed, or cottonseed meal and hulls, oil, lumber, bauxite, sea foods, tropical fruits, or other raw materials, if they are so loaded and undertake to go back, here is the difference they would pay:

Let us take a 14,000-ton barge. We will say it is returning from New Orleans to Cairo. To go across along the slack-water route from New Orleans to Mobile, up this slack-water route to the Tennessee River, and then downstream to Cairo, Ill., the saving would amount to $9,800; and if it were just going to Paducah, or any point on the upper Ohio, it would save $11,760.

Such a barge load going from Mobile up the Tombigbee to the Tennessee and then downstream to Cairo would save $20,000 on its fuel bill alone.

If that barge were going from Mobile to Paducah, Ky., Pittsburgh, Pa., Wheeling, W. Va., Cincinnati, Ohio, or to any other point on the Ohio River, it would save $22,120 on its fuel bill alone.

There is not another project—and I am quoting the words of the Army engineers—there is not another project on the face of the earth, or a place where one can be constructed, where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so little cost, so much ease, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances. The nearest we have found is the connection between the Don and the Volga Rivers in Russia, and even that does not have the benefit of a downstream route for approximately two-thirds of the round trip.

In addition, we have right here on the Tennessee River the greatest defense project the world has ever known, Oak Ridge, covering 70 square miles, where our atomic bombs are made. That is the project on which we are going to have to rely for our national defense in case of attack probably for generations to come. Not a man in this House knows the number of thousands, or millions, of tons of raw materials that have to be brought in for that purpose. This short-water route will cut the water distance from Oak Ridge to Mobile by more than 800 miles.

Suppose you are going from Mobile with a load of materials for Oak Ridge; let us see how you would go. You would go along the intercoastal slack water route 156 miles to New Orleans, then you would have to fight the swift current on the Mississippi River all the way to Cairo, Ill., 869 miles, go up the Ohio River 47 miles to Paducah, and then up the Tennessee 215 miles to the mouth of the Yellow Creek, where this project intersects the Tennessee River which point you could have reached by moving 481 miles in slack water from Mobile up the Tombigbee along this new route.

I repeat, there is not another project like it on earth.

What we want is funds with which to begin this construction. With the devastating floods that periodically occur on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, with the need for their control and for the development of these waterways, I have no patience with this policy of pouring billions of dollars into the coffers of Europe, and denying funds with which to develop our own resources or protect our own people.

All we are asking is that you give us a reasonable amount to begin this construction in order that you may put us 1 or 2 years ahead of what we would be if we waited until the next Congress for this appropriation.

This project has already been approved. It was approved by the House in 1946. It went over to the Senate and it was approved by the Senate by more than 9 to 1—44 to 91 and signed by the President.

This project is just as sure to be constructed as night follows day. All the forces of the opposition could not take this project off the statute book and thereby deny this relief to the shippers in the great Mississippi Valley extending from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Sioux City, Iowa, from Chicago, Ill., to El Paso, Tex., and from Minneapolis and St. Louis to New Orleans, La., and Mobile, Ala.

The sooner this project is constructed the sooner your people will reap the benefits, and I am speaking of the people of Michigan and Illinois who shipped these boat loads of automobiles and other materials down the Mississippi River; I am speaking of the people of Pennsylvania whose vessels come down the Ohio River; I am speaking of the people of Minnesota whose material comes down from St. Paul and Minneapolis; I am speaking of the people of Iowa and Nebraska whose wheat we buy and with whom we exchange oil, lumber, and other products; I am speaking of the people of those great Middle Western States between the Allegheny and the Rocky Mountains, or the Cascades, and between the Great Lakes and the Gulf.

I urge you to join me when the time comes to adopt an amendment that will give us a start in building the greatest transportation project ever proposed on any river system throughout the entire world.

Mr. McDOWELL. How much money is involved?

Mr. RANKIN. The cost of the entire project is estimated to be $116,000,000, to be spent over a period of 5 or 6 years.

The Army engineers testified before the Rivers and Harbors Committee that they ought to have $9,000,000 to begin with. But we have decided that to carry on this work until the next Congress, they can get along with $3,000,000. Therefore, I shall offer an amendment for that amount.

I am not for burdening the Treasury, I am not after piling upon a national debt, but I am tremendously interested in developing our national resources to take care of the American people now and for all time to time.

I am taking the same attitude I took on the construction of the Cape Cod Canal; I am taking the same attitude I took on the development of the Columbia River, and the Central Valley project in California. I am taking the same attitude I took on the developing of the TVA and the Arkansas and Missouri Rivers projects.

This is one project the construction of which we cannot afford to postpone; because the longer we delay the longer the American people will be denied its benefits.

Every year this construction is delayed will cost our people untold millions of dollars, to say nothing of the effect on our national defense. Let us start work on it now.

Here is the table showing what the saving of this great project would amount to for up-bound traffic.

From—	To—	Via Mississippi, per ton	Via Mississippi, per tow of 3,500 tons	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per ton	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per ton	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
Houston, Tex.	Cairo	$2.34	$8,190	$1.94	$6,790	$0.40	$1,400	$5,600
	Paducah	2.42	8,470	1.88	6,580	.54	1,890	7,560
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.74	9,590	1.00	5,000	1.14	3,990	15,960
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	2.02	7,070	1.32	4,620	.70	2,450	9,800
	Paducah	2.10	7,350	1.26	4,410	.84	2,940	11,760
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.42	8,470	.99	3,465	1.43	5,005	20,020
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	2.39	8,365	.95	3,325	1.44	5,040	20,160
	Paducah	2.47	8,645	.89	3,115	1.58	5,530	22,160
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.79	9,765	.62	2,170	2.17	7,595	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	2.96	10,300	.95	3,325	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	3.04	10,040	.89	3,115	2.15	7,525	30,100
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.36	11,700	.62	2,170	2.74	9,590	38,360
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	2.68	9,380	.67	2,345	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	2.76	9,660	.64	2,135	2.15	7,525	30,090
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.08	10,780	.34	1,160	2.74	9,590	38,360
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	2.83	9,905	.51	1,783	2.32	8,120	32,480
	Paducah	2.91	10,185	.45	1,575	2.46	8,610	34,440
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.23	11,305	.17	595	3.06	10,710	42,840
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	2.88	10,080	.46	1,610	2.42	8,470	33,880
	Paducah	2.96	10,300	.40	1,400	2.56	8,960	35,840
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.28	11,480	.13	455	3.15	11,025	44,100
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	2.93	10,255	.41	1,435	2.32	8,820	35,280
	Paducah	3.01	10,535	.35	1,225	2.66	9,310	37,240
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.33	11,655	.08	280	3.25	11,375	45,500

As I said, it is the greatest project of its kind ever proposed, and the sooner it is constructed the better it will be for the people of the entire Nation.

I hope you will all support my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts from both party platforms.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in criticism of certain language in the platform of my own party. I do this not for the purpose of giving aid and comfort to the opposition, nor to add to the arguments advanced by certain political leaders of my section who believe that the Democratic Party which we have known as a vehicle of human service should be abandoned. I am proud of my party's history, and I believe that we have a mission, whether in victory or defeat.

The particular section of the platform which I want to discuss is that relating to foreign policy. I offer these comments in an effort to discharge a personal obligation which I assumed in the early part of my service in this House to contribute to the development of a foreign policy that might be characterized not as a partisan policy but as a continuing, predictable, American policy, making for the Nation's security and the world's peace.

My actions in 1943 when the official bipartisan policy began to unfold were not casual, but represented a strong conviction. In the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses I saw the Republican Party adopt an admirable role as the minority partner in the policy-making procedure. This was made possible because they were invited by a Democratic administration to share in decisions and to contribute to those intellectual and spiritual resources which the Nation required in the ordeal of war. The implications were clear. If the minority were to share in decisions they were also to share the credit for achievements and a proportionate measure of the blame for our failures. But one thing is clear, and both parties must stand by this standard: We cannot accept the minority contribution and then withhold from them their measure of credit. Neither party, in other words, can honorably make foreign policy an issue in this election. I do not assume that by the unfortunate language inserted in the Democratic platform in Philadelphia the party intends to do that. I would hope that enough Democrats feel as I do to make it clear that no advantage will be taken of the fact that the party was honored with control of the Government in the perilous days of the war and in the early period of the great transition through which we still move.

I am not condemning the entire foreign-policy section. It is no breach of the bipartisan commitments to speak glowingly of our party's determination to support the United Nations and, in other specific ways, to work toward peace. Our Republican opposition offered its own assertions and they were equally forthright. What I do deplore is that in moments of party exuberance we gave the impression in two paragraphs of the platform that the achievements in foreign policy were distinctly Democratic and that the official Republican policy is contrary to our program. This is not only unfortunate, it is untrue. This sentence, for instance:

> We advocate the grant of a loan to the United Nations recommended by the President but denied by the Republican Congress for construction of United Nations headquarters in this country.

The action of the House in approving the loan by a vote of 164 to 27 is indicative of the fact that this Republican Congress is not opposing a loan.

Actually the delay in authorizing the loan was caused by the House Foreign Affairs Committee's consideration of the bipartisan resolutions to strengthen the United Nations. The chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], was undertaking wisely, I think, to secure consideration of these resolutions as a part of a general measure covering all United Nations legislation. It should have been acted upon during the regular session, it is true, but the loan could have gone over until the Eighty-first Congress without the imputations in the Democratic platform statement. The bipartisan resolutions put those of us who collaborated on the Democratic side under the necessity of putting the record straight in this regard.

Another reference in the Democratic platform statement which might be subject to misunderstanding is that which refers to the United Nations. The language is as follows:

"Before the end of the war the Democratic administration turned to the task of establishing measures for peace and the prevention of aggression and the threat of another war. Under the leadership of a Democratic President and his Secretary of State, the United Nations was organized at San Francisco. The Charter was ratified by an overwhelming vote of the Senate."

Standing by itself, this statement does not affect the bipartisan policy, though the words "Democratic" might well have been omitted since the President, in leading the United Nations movement, acted in his capacity as Chief of State, not as chief of his party. I wish the platform makers might have included this simple addendum: "The United Nations Charter would not have been approved without substantial aid from the Republican minority and we pledge the party to continue the bipartisan handling of foreign policy." This is undoubtedly what the party intends to do. It should have said so.

Neither were Republican Convention proceedings entirely free from loose language on foreign policy. If we avoid damaging the bipartisan program there should be some healthy deletions from some speeches in both conventions. Fortunately, these errors were not adopted in the Republican platform.

At the same time, I recognize that the bipartisan policy has certain limitations, that it does not require withholding of criticism of administrative actions. As I interpret, the informal arrangement known as the bipartisan program means simply this: An honest effort is made by both sides to reach general agreement in directing American diplomacy. Decisions having been reached, the opposition party stands by them. At all times there must be consultation. It involves an honest effort by the opposition to perfect the policy and to accept whatever political handicaps are involved. Likewise, the administration is committed to respect the opposition's right to condemn administrative mistakes but, in any event, the administration must accept final responsibility under the Constitution for the policy.

Moreover, the bipartisan policy has always had certain specific exceptions. One of the notable participants in the policy, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has probably stated the Republican position on China much better than the official policy has stated it. This, in other words, represents an exception—a divergence.

It must also be recognized that each individual candidate stands upon his own record. Democratic candidates opposed by Republican candidates who have refused to accept the joint decisions are justified in making foreign policy matters an issue. This is an issue between individual candidates; it is not a party issue.

This whole experiment in party cooperation for the common good has elements of boldness. It is not the conventional way, politically speaking, but such experience as we have had confirms the impression that it is the best way.

We are still living in a dangerous world. We could not follow the usual political patterns without jeopardizing the Nation's safety. To forego advantages was the patriotic course. For the Democrats it meant renunciation. It precluded boasting of achievements which were the products of a common effort. For the Republicans it meant foregoing criticism and condemnation, even where they had not shared responsibility, though at times the temptation was great. Mr. Dewey was tempted in 1944 to make capital of the fact that the Japanese code was broken before Pearl Harbor. He was patriotic enough to pass up his advantage when General Marshall told him the consequences. Again, at some stages when the United Nations seemed to be unpopular, the Republicans might have capitalized its unpopularity. They did not. If politics rather than statesmanship dictated some Republican decisions, we Democrats must nevertheless stand by the early commitments.

Neither can we discharge our obligations by patting Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. EATON on the back. Neither of these good party men could have done their work without the support of Republican adherents. They had to convince their colleagues that they were right. In a sense, they have acted as Republicans as well as statesmen.

I wish to make it clear that I do not regard the unfortunate language of the Democratic platform as a serious breach. It is only because there are certain potential dangers to foreign policy in the political campaign of 1948 that I make allusion to it. It is to avert damage rather than to repair it that I make these remarks

The difficulties are aggravated by the creation of the Henry Wallace party. Ordinarily, dissent of this kind would logically fit into our democratic procedure. It would give those who share in the dissent an opportunity to register their opposition. That is true in theory only, because it is obvious that Communist influences were present in the Wallace convention. The convention's refusal to adopt the motion of the Vermont delegate that criticism of United States policy does not imply blanket endorsement of Soviet policy confirms suspicions that most Americans had that the Wallace movement is strongly permeated with Communist influences. For this reason, the choice afforded is not between two American policies, but rather between a policy dictated by attachment to our own national interests and on the other hand those emanating from abroad.

I wish to echo the sentiment recently expressed in this Chamber by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who asserted that we cannot laugh off the Wallace threat. No one has any fears as to 1948, but, in my judgment, the Wallace party is planning its strategy for 1952. The next 4 years are therefore crucial ones. Much more than foreign policy is involved. The implied threat to our system of government and the stability of our democratic institutions is substantial enough to cause all of us, as Americans and as party men, to weigh our actions and to avoid all appearances of disunity. The world might misunderstand and misinterpret our disagreements, particularly if we magnify them for political advantage. The Wallace party creates the imperative necessity of continuing the bipartisan foreign policy of this Nation. The nominees themselves and the shrewd strategists who stand behind them are launching plans that could bring tragic consequences unless the older parties utilize to the fullest extent the resources at their command. Nothing less than our best will meet the challenge of the next 4 years.

I believe in the two-party system. For this reason, I shall also oppose the fourth party, the States' Rights Party organized at Birmingham. While agreeing with many of the declarations of the Birmingham group, I am convinced that withdrawal from the Democratic Party will work against the interests of the South and of the Nation. The experience of other nations with the multiple party system has been tragic. Let us avoid that misfortune here. One effective way to do it is to state clearly our differences on domestic issues and to pursue them vigorously in the American tradition. In the field of foreign policy, for the reasons stated, we must persist in efforts to occupy common ground and to maintain the bipartisan approach to peace.

WHY NOT A MARSHALL PLAN FOR THE AGED OF AMERICA?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extent my remarks at this point in the RECORD on four subjects and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, immediately on the convening of this extraordinary session of the Eightieth Congress, I wrote a personal letter to every one of the sponsors of the old-age legislation, H. R. 16, which I introduced on the opening day of the Eightieth Congress, urging that they exert every effort possible to secure the additional names required on the discharge petition to bring this bill on the floor for passage before this session adjourned. I have also written to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee urging that the committee report the bill out for action at this session in behalf of the urgent need of the old people of the Nation for some relief in these days of inflation and high cost of living. I include this letter as part of these remarks:

AUGUST 5, 1948.

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KNUTSON: As author of H. R. 16, the so-called Townsend bill, providing for annuities for the elderly citizens of our country, I sincerely urge that the Ways and Means Committee, of which you have the honor to be chairman, report the bill out on the floor for action before this extraordinary session of the Congress adjourns. This extraordinary session was convened for the purpose of

considering emergency legislation, particularly on inflation and the high cost of living. The bill for the relief of the old folks qualifies on every one of these specifications.

There are 182 signatures on the petition to bring the bill on the floor, which evidences a great interest of the membership in this humane legislation. It is patent that the old people of America are not getting sufficient monthly incomes under the old-age Social Security Act to keep body and soul together with the high cost of foods and their low monthly incomes, which I understand, average $36.91 a month. It would seem not only fair but in the interests of good legislation to pass this bill or some bill giving sufficient annuities to the old folks that they may continue to exist in these days of high cost of food and the other necessities of life.

Your committee held long hearings on this legislation in the Seventy-ninth Congress so that there is a full record available for use when the bill comes on the floor. With the billions we have spent and are spending for the aid and relief of the peoples around the world under the Marshall program and other programs, there seems to be no justification now why we should not act during this session and pass this legislation. The old people of America are looking to the Ways and Means Committee and to the Members of this Congress to enact old-age legislation which is simple justice to our own old people who have, by their loyalty, perseverance and farsightedness built America and made it what it is.

I most sincerely urge that your committee heed this request and bring the bill up for immediate action.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my personal thanks to all sponsors and supporters of this much needed legislation for their loyalty and sincere support of the bill. My only regret is that the bill was not brought to the floor either by the Ways and Means Committee or by petition to discharge. As I have said since this session convened, I, for one, am willing that the Congress stay in session even if we have to remain here until Christmas to pass legislation not only for the old people of America but all necessary legislation for the control of inflation to curb the high cost of living and to provide adequate housing for the low-income groups of the Nation.

I want to repeat the arguments I made in behalf of this legislation in the House on February 2, 1948. I pose the question, Why not a Marshall plan for the aged of America? While we are considering tax measures and the Marshall plan for Europe, is it not time to adopt a Marshall plan for the old folks of this Nation? The proposal of the administration is to spend some $17,000,000,000 in aid to European countries under the Marshall plan in the next 4 or 5 years, with an allocation of $6,800,000,000 for the ensuing 15 months. This is in addition to the twenty-four billions that have already been expended for European aid since the war ended. I call attention to the fact that much of this huge expenditure will be made available for the needy of the European countries, including the aged. I maintain it is a decent thing to do, while we are expending such huge sums for foreign aid, to have a Marshall plan for our own old folks in America and give them some help in their distress.

The Congress for years has been considering legislation for security for its elderly citizens. Throughout my legislative service here, covering some 9 years, I have urged that the Congress adopt a Federal old-age program which will do justice to the old folks of America.

On the opening day of the Eightieth Congress, I introduced H. R. 16, which is a bill providing benefits to the aged and the totally disabled. This bill does not provide any fixed monthly annuity for the recipients, but it does provide for a tax and the total amount raised thereby will be prorated monthly among those entitled to take part under the bill. The experts of the Congress on fiscal affairs and tax legislation should determine the tax formula necessary so that the bill, when enacted, shall provide an adequate annuity to maintain these old folks in decency and health. It would lie within the province of the Congress to change the tax from time to time as conditions warranted. This bill has been gathering dust in the pigeonholes of the Ways and Means Committee. Before we adjourned at the special session, I urged that every Member of the House interested in the welfare of our old folks, sign a discharge petition which I placed on the Clerk's desk. The Christmas season was then approaching and it seemed appropriate as an evidence of good will and sincere interest in the welfare of these old folks that we sign this petition and bring this bill on the floor for consideration. One hundred and forty Members have signed the petition. When 218 Members sign, the bill will come to the floor under an open rule and will be subject to any germane amendment, and the House will be able to work its will and to adopt any amendments it desires in order to make the bill acceptable to the majority of our Members. The exact terminology and provisions of this bill are not the important consideration, but it is important to enact some legislation making adequate provision for our old folks, with an assurance that they will have an ample monthly income during their old age to permit them to secure the necessary medical care, food, clothing, and shelter to protect them from want, hunger, and cold.

The existing social-security law for the aged is an ineffective gesture. Under it, as shown by the reports from the Social Security Agency, the payments the aged are receiving for old-age assistance through the States of the Union, average from $16.92 a month in the lowest State to $64.95 in the highest, as shown for the month of November 1947, with a national average of $36.91. Truly, such allowances to cover food, clothing, medical care, and shelter, represent a starvation program. As was recently pointed out by the Administrator, in some areas contributions by the State and Federal Governments are not enough to enable people to maintain an adequate diet and they are literally suffering slow starvation.

The United States Public Health Service recently reported the results of a long-range survey which shows that about 35 persons per 1,000 have some chronic illness or major physical disability. A gradual increase takes place to a rate of about 100 cases per 1,000 at 45. From this point on the curve goes up very rapidly. There are nearly 250 chronically ill per 1,000 at 60. In the next 10 years the rate goes up to 400 per 1,000. At 80 more than half of the group needs the regular care of a physician, and at 90 the rate is more than 900 per 1,000.

The critical problem facing our old folks in their endeavor to maintain a bare existence is tragically intensified by the high cost of food and other necessities of life in this inflationary period in which we find ourselves. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has recently announced that the cost of food bought by the average American family increased 25 percent in 1947 over 1946. Dorothy Bovee, Red Cross nutritionist, reports that the cost of a minimum adequate diet for a family of two in the Washington area at this time, is at least $11.60 weekly, and she lists the items which make up this minimum diet for two adult persons for 1 week, as follows:

Food and amount:	Cost
Whole milk, 7 quarts	$1.47
White potatoes, 10 pounds	.46
Peanut butter, 4 ounces	.09
Baked beans, 14-ounce can	.15
Oranges, 6 medium-sized	.12
Tomatoes, 1 No. 2 can	.16
Tomato juice, 1 No. 2 can	.10
Cabbage, 1-pound head	.06
Spinach or kale, 1 pound	.25
Corn, 1 No. 1 can	.17
Green pepper, 1	.08
Carrots, 2 bunches	.17
Lettuce, 1 head	.13
Celery, 1 stalk	.19
Onions, 1 pound	.12
Banana, 1	.07
Apples, 2 pounds	.19
Pears, 2 pounds	.20
Applesauce, 1 can	.14
Raisins, ½ pound	.10
Prunes, 1 pound	.19
Eggs, 1½ dozen	.98
Cottage cheese, 1 pound	.23
American cream cheese, ¼ pound	.15
Hamburger, 1 pound	.43
Beef liver, ½ pound	.30
Fresh lean pork, ½ pound	.26
Pork butts, ¼ pound	.17
Scrapple	.24
Dried beef, ¼ pound	.33
Fish, 1 pound	.29
Beef stew meat, ½ pound	.22
Bread, 7 loaves	.98
Rice, 1 pound	.22
Rolled oats, ½ pound	.07
Farina, ½ pound	.10
Flour, ¼ pound	.03
Macaroni, 4 ounces	.06
Margarine, 1 pound	.45
Lard, ½ pound	.15
Salad dressing, 1 jar	.23
Sugar, 2 pounds	.18
Cookies, 1 box	.18
Jelly or apple butter, ¾ pound	.25
Coffee, 1 pound	.49
Total	11.60

We all know old-age annuitants with their meager income would not be able to buy this diet, but would be limited to the essential staples only, eliminating the fresh fruits, canned goods, and fancy items. For them it would be a luxury diet.

In contrast to the foregoing minimum fare which old-age annuitants are unable to buy with their limited allotments, is the menu of a dinner recently given in the Statler Hotel here in Washington to 100 guests by Mr. Charles Luckman, who headed the President's meatless-eggless-

days program. Here is the menu: Shrimp cocktail, fried oysters, crabs, shrimp and lobster gumbo, curried chicken, roast turkey, baked ham, roast beef, string beans au gratin, fried apple rings, pickled walnuts, celery, olives, rye rolls, assorted finger rolls, ice cream, and coffee. Mr. Luckman's job was to conserve food for hungry Americans.

Mr. Speaker, how can an old person who must maintain himself on old-age assistance, according to the plan provided in the present social-security setup, meet his expenses, not only for food but for all other necessities, on an average monthly payment of $36.91? Is there any valid reason why this Eightieth Congress should not give the right-of-way and green light to legislation for old-age assistance while we are opening the Treasury doors wide for European relief?

We have been concerned in the Congress about the rising cost of living, the inflation spiral, and the added burden placed upon the millions of our workers and the low-income groups who must pay these increased prices for food, clothing, and shelter. Cognizant of these difficulties, the Congress has increased substantially the income of some groups of our citizens, but it has given the old people no consideration. Their meager monthly average of $36.91 remains the same, while the simple fare they must provide to keep body and soul together has risen in price by leaps and bounds. Many annuitants receive much less than the average $36.91. The miserable pittance they were receiving was wholly insufficient to care for their modest needs before the advent of high living costs.

According to statistics I received some time before the war with respect to the annuitants under the insurance provision of the Social Security Act, 252,000 past 65 years of age received an average of $23 a month; 74,000 wives of these pensioners 65 or over received an average of $12.25 a month; widows over 65, totaling 25,000, received only $20.16 a month; 28,000 parents received $13 a month; widows under 65, of whom there were 55,000, received $19.50 a month; and 159,000 children under 18 received $12.21. Of all persons 60 years of age or over, four-fifths received less than a minimum for decency and health. Before our entry into the war, it was estimated that of the persons 60 years of age and over in the United States, 54.9 percent were supported wholly or partially by public or private social agencies or were dependent on children, relatives, or friends for their subsistence and care. A considerable proportion of the remainder received part or all of their support from various pension systems—Federal, State, and municipal, industrial, or private.

At the beginning of the year 1946, nearly half of all civilian jobs were excluded from coverage under the Social Security program, and nearly 2 in 5 of all persons employed were neither fully nor currently insured. At best the social-security law we now have is a haphazard program which, in effect, is largely financed by the public generally, but the benefits of which are shared in by only a few selected groups. It encourages inflation by collecting a huge fund currently used for deficit spending. These difficulties would be overcome by the adoption of H. R. 16, which would cover all citizens falling within its provisions, and the obligations and benefits of the program would likewise be shared by all. It would be all-inclusive in its provisions and therefore would obviate the necessity of continuing many social-security laws now in existence and would, for the first time, set up in our country a Federal old-age-security program which would insure all of our elderly citizens 60 years of age or over against the hazards of old age. It would build up no reservoir for deficit spending, but the moneys collected would go back into the channels of trade each month, providing local markets for American production and buying power for aged citizens.

On December 31, 1947, there had been paid into the social-security fund approximately $10,524,681,961.55; and only $1,772,431,249.69 paid out to beneficiaries; the balance was spent by the Government for general governmental purposes.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress are engaged in a great adventure in human welfare. We are charged with the responsibility of planning and building for 140,000,000 Americans a social, economic, and cultural structure which will assure their welfare. If we omit from our plans the care and protection of the millions of aged citizens who are in want, we will build in vain. We will build a tower of Babel. We must not reject the guiding hand of Providence in our plans; we need spiritual understanding as well as political wisdom. As Benjamin Franklin said to the Constitutional Convention when the great charter of our liberties was drafted:

> We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writings, that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel; we shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests, our project will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down to future ages. And, what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing government by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, conquest.

Daniel Webster, one of our eminent predecessors, said:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

We should not be unmindful of the fact that these senior citizens were the workers of yesterday. They helped build our cities, our roads, our industries and helped to clear our lands. They were the trail blazers, the pioneers. They built for us. Now that they are old, we cannot pass them by. They do not seek our charity. They only ask simple justice—a modest share in the fruits of American industry, to the production of which their labors in the past have contributed.

Let us prove to the whole world that these aged American citizens are entitled to and shall have vouchsafed to them by their country "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Let us prove that humanity is still on the march here in America by enacting an old-age-annuity plan that will provide for our old people an annuity sufficient to maintain them in decency and health.

I want to commend the local representatives of the Townsend organization for their earnest, sincere, and cooperative efforts in pressing for passage of H. R. 16. Those of us who are sponsoring the legislation in the Congress have found them ready at all times to assist us in our program for early enactment of much-needed old-age legislation.

I most sincerely hope and urge that if legislation for the aged is not enacted at this session that it be made the first order of business when the Eighty-first Congress convenes and that it be pressed to early and successful conclusion. We owe this to the old people of the Nation and no legislation will confront the new Congress which has greater merit.

SURPLUS SPUDS FOR THE POOR OR FOR THE DUMP PILE, WHICH?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it was recently brought to my attention that it is rumored that the Government will again embark on a program of destroying the surplus potatoes which it has acquired in order to support the potato market. I immediately wrote to President Truman urging that if there was any foundation to the rumor that instead of destroying the potatoes, they, as well as other Government surplus foods in the same category, should be turned over to the aged and needy of our country. The President promptly replied that he is investigating the matter.

My appeal has been given some publicity throughout the Nation and clippings have come to me with letters all the way from New York to Klamath Falls supporting my appeal. We recall that last year the Government did destroy thousands of tons of edible potatoes by dousing them in kerosene and destroying them in other ways rather than making them available to the needy of our country. I have just been advised, but have not had the opportunity to verify the correctness of the statement, that the Government dumped between 2,700 and 3,000 carloads of potatoes in Kern County, Calif., between May 30 and July 1 of 1948. I hope this rumor is unfounded. In these days of high food costs and with many of the aged and other needy groups without means with which to acquire food with which to keep body and soul together, it is indefensible that our Government should destroy edible foods and I urge that all Government officials heed the appeals from across the Nation that any surplus foods be made available for the needy.

I include as a part of these remarks an editorial which appeared in the Sunday News of New York on August 1, 1948:

POLITICAL POTATOES STILL HOT

Uncle Sam's big multi-billion-dollar program to feed the world hasn't quite got into high gear yet. But one of Uncle's grocery bills—for potatoes—has been added up tentatively, and the figures to date don't make pleasant reading for the long-suffering United States taxpayer.

The reason our potato bill came in first seems to be partly agricultural, but mostly political.

Last year, as President Harry ("Let's all eat potatoburgers") Truman and some 40,000,000 American housewives recall, there was all hell to pay about our New Deal subsidized potatoes.

The girls didn't like paying 6 cents a pound for grade B spuds. And when they saw pictures of Mr. Truman's economic geniuses piling high-grade potatoes to rot in fields, mashing 'em on airport runways, and blithely kerosening the rest, the ladies promptly and understandably blew their pretty tops.

COSTLY FLOUR

So, this year, Mr. T's global advisers decided to be brighter, or anyway more discreet, about their excess spuds. No cutting down payments to voting-age farmers or anything like that, of course. But, in this election year of 1948, the boys decided to eliminate crude, housewife-infuriating stuff like kerosening and dumping. Millions of tons of excess tubers will still be grown. But, this year, they'll be turned into potato flour and then shipped quietly overseas.

So what's wrong with our giving the Army approximately 200,000 tons of potato flour with instructions to hand it out to our overseas wards?

Well, some conscience-stricken farmers have been figuring that one out. Their indignant report is that this latest New Deal effort to get rid of its 1948 hot potatoes will cost the United States taxpayer the juicy sum of 110 to 130 million dollars.

About 1,500,000 embarrassing tons of Government potatoes will be gotten rid of by turning them into flour. But the farmer will collect about $1.55 per bushel for his useless spuds; Uncle Sam will spend another 45 cents to ship them to the flour mill; and then Uncle will sell them to the miller for a token 15 cents per bushel.

The cost of making potato flour—or hiding Mr. T's new excess potato crop—will add up to 24 or 30 cents per pound, all paid for out of taxes. If we would just forget about this potato comedy and ship wheat flour to Europe, Japan, or wherever, we could do the job for one-fifth the potato expense.

So why, a very innocent, politically naive citizen might ask, don't our Democrats just ship wheat flour to our international free-lunch counters and save our beat-up taxpayers that 110 or 130 million bucks? Why, even, doesn't Mr. T forget about election year, starch up his courage, and just tell our potato farmers there's no more use growing them by the excess ton, because Uncle Sap ain't gonna pay no more?

To our mind, these would be pretty sound, sensible questions. But we're warning you, if you start asking logical questions like those of any of our surviving New Dealers, in this desperate election year of 1948, you'll very probably be told to go eat worms or even drop dead, you nasty, whining little taxpayer, you.

DISASTER HOUSING FOR VANPORT

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, of the estimated 5,300 families residing in Vanport at the time of the great flood disaster on May 30, many of them are without proper housing. I regret that the Congress failed to take action on the several bills I and other members of the northwest delegation of Oregon and Washington have introduced, which would have made possible permanent housing for the flood victims who were housed in Government houses at Vanport when the flood took place. I realize in this extraordinary session the time was short but this problem was an emergency one and, in my judgment, should have received attention before we adjourned.

I include herewith as part of these remarks an article from the Oregonian of August 4, 1948, discussing this problem:

TWO THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINE APPLY FOR HOUSES AFTER FLOOD—LOCATION OF OTHERS PUZZLES AUTHORITY, MANY DOUBLING UP

Of the estimated 5,300 families residing in Vanport at the time of the May 30 flood, only 2,239 have applied for emergency housing, Portland housing authority officials said Tuesday.

Of this number, 1,106 have been placed in temporary housing, 698 applications are still on file, and 435 have been withdrawn or rejected, the officials reported.

Heads of the housing authority said they were at a loss to explain the whereabouts of the remaining flooded-out families, but believed many are doubling up with other families.

A total of 240 families have been placed in the controversial trailer camps, while 85 families are at Columbia Villa, and 781 in other Portland housing projects.

FALL RUSH VIEWED

Commenting on the statistical break-down of flood housing, which raises the question of how many of the trailer units will actually be needed, Harry Freeman, authority chairman, said, "Only time will tell."

Officials said the approach of the school year usually brought a rush to public housing, and for that reason they hope to have a picture of the actual demand by mid-September.

Both Freeman and Mrs. Katherine Walker, tenant section supervisor at Vancouver, say it is too early to prophesy that any large number of the 1,211 trailer units brought into the area will go begging for tenants.

An annual summer slump in demand for public housing may also be partly to blame for the present situation, officials said.

UNITS OCCUPIED RAPIDLY

About 720 trailers are scheduled for location in Portland, and at the present time families are occupying these units as fast as they are prepared. However, Vancouver has 488 new trailers, many of them in the $3,500 class, and these are going begging for tenants, as are apartments at Vancouver's Fruit Valley homes project.

Freeman said the rush to the Portland trailers is being made although the Guild's Lake project, where most are located, is a commercial site lacking stores, schools, and other advantages. The trailers there are used war trailers, but are being refurnished before occupancy.

The 217 new trailers allotted Portland are being installed in a 302-unit project on North Burgard Street across from Parkside homes and near the new Vanport College building at Oregon shipyard. These are expected to accommodate students if there are not enough flood applicants.

Vancouver housing spokesmen have indicated unofficially that Portland will be offered upward of one-half of the 488 new trailers allocated Vancouver if it is shown they will not be needed across the river.

BUS TRIP CITED

Authorities explained the opposition to the Vancouver location by stating that most of the prospective tenants work in Portland and the 45-minute bus trip to Vancouver appeared to discourage them.

"But," says Mrs. Walker, "while transportation seems to stop people from coming from Portland to Vancouver for housing, it hasn't stopped Vancouver people from getting jobs in Portland. A large percentage of McLoughlin Heights residents work in Portland."

Mrs. Walker added that there had been increasing numbers of withdrawals from McLoughlin Heights by people who said they were moving in with other families to cut expenses.

OUST REDS FROM GOVERNMENT BUREAUS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the President of the United States has not only failed to cooperate with the Congress in its determined action to drive Communists and other subversive individuals from our Government but in his public statement he apparently takes the position that he is opposed to the program itself. I include as part of these remarks a number of editorials which clearly disclose the sentiments of the country are in support of the Republican program to rid our Government of Communists and fellow travelers.

[From the Washington Post of August 7, 1948]

GOP FORBEARANCE

(By Mark Sullivan)

FOREIGN POLICY REMAINS UNIFIED

For understandable reasons, including a reticence which the most responsible leaders in Congress and of the Republican Party enforce upon themselves, the impression made by this special session of Congress and its intended early ending, is superficial and incorrect. It is not that congressional and Republican leaders are so much angry at President Truman as in despair about him.

The surface picture which portrays Congress as angry at President Truman because he called them back to Washington in hot weather, and because he denounced the body, and as further angy because he called the special session in a spirit of and for the purpose of partisan politics—all that is true enough so far as it goes. But Congress and the Republicans would regard that sort of thing as the give-and-take of politics.

What deeply concerns the Republican leaders, what they regard as their highest obligation, is the need for national unity in the face of the foreign situation. The Republican position on this, formulated on the highest level of party leadership, is in a statement given out July 24 by Governor Dewey in consultation with Republican Senator VANDENBERG and Governor Dewey's adviser on foreign affairs, Mr. John Foster Dulles. They were soberly awafe of what they were doing; they devoted three painstaking hours to composing the statement. What they renounced was as important as what they pledged:

"The Berlin situation is critical. • • • The present duty of Americans is not to be divided by past lapses, but to unite to surmount present dangers. We shall not allow domestic partisan irritations to divert us from this indispensable unity."

What puts the Republican leaders in despair about President Truman is the course followed by him which shows either a lack of adequate concern about unity or lack of comprehension of the effects of his actions. It is the sober conviction of men in Washington who are at once the best informed and the most poised in temperament that the danger of war with Russia is at least 50–50. It is this condition that determines the course of Republican leaders.

In this condition President Truman, by his call for a special session and the manner of it, creates division between himself and Congress and between himself and the Republicans. Adding to his provocativeness he blames Congress and the Republicans for inflation. As put by the Democratic platform, often repeated in equivalent words by Mr. Truman: "The Republican Eightieth Congress is directly responsible • • • for high cost of living," that is, for inflation.

Now every Republican in Congress is conscious that they enacted two measures which make for inflation because they involve immense Government expenditures and divert industry from production of goods for domestic consumption—the vastly increased appropriations for national defense and the likewise vast appropriations for the European recovery program.

The Republican Congress passed these measures knowing that they increased the danger of inflation. They balanced this danger with the foreign danger, decided that the latter was the greater and were thereby forced to increase the former.

The Republican Congress did this at the request of President Truman, in willing and complete support of the foreign program laid down by the Truman administration, and in the spirit of unity in face of the foreign threat. Now, President Truman puts blame on the Republican Congress for inflation without a single mention of the inflationary acts and that they were his own program.

If the Republicans, and Congress, were to defend themselves from Mr. Truman's charge of responsibility for inflation, they must defend the inflationary measures, increased military appropriations and the European recovery program. To defend these would bring up foreign relations in Congress during the Presidential campaign. A "who-done-it" debate on inflation might become a "who-done-it" debate on responsibility for our foreign crisis, and that would go angrily into actions and policies of the Truman administration and even more the Roosevelt one. Hardly anything could be more disruptive. Avoidance of disruption would be helped by an early ending of the special session, and this the Republican leaders decided upon.

[From the Washington Daily News of August 6, 1948]

NOT FUNNY, MR. PRESIDENT

President Truman charged congressional hearings on Soviet spy activities are a "red herring" to hide the Republican Congress' failure on other matters. In doing so, he very foolishly accepted a measure of responsibility for an ugly and dangerous situation which previously could not have been charged against him.

Not many people who have followed the testimony in the current hearings will agree with Mr. Truman that the Communist problem in Washington can be laughed off as "Republican politics," in our opinion.

Moreover, the President has further placed himself on the defensive on this issue by denying to the investigating committees information which is pertinent to their inquiries.

The failure of Congress to act upon the President's anti-inflationary program will not in any sense excuse him for his own refusal to cooperate in removing a very real threat to our national security. The issues are not in any way related. Today we are concerned with another problem.

Under Mr. Truman's own loyalty program, laid down by Executive order, it is the announced policy of the Government to bar from positions of trust in "sensitive" agencies any employee whose loyalty may be subject to question.

That policy broke down when William W. Remington was appointed Chairman of the Commerce Department's export license committee although it was known he was under investigation for association with a confessed member of a Russian spy ring. That is not something existing only in the mind of Representative KARL E. MUNDT, as Mr. Truman would have us believe. It is an undisputed, unexplained fact. And if the President's loyalty test was not applied in Mr. Remington's case, what reason have we to believe that it has been applied in any other case?

The two congressional investigations, particularly the one being conducted by Senator FERGUSON, have been extremely useful. But neither has more than scratched the surface, in our judgment.

We need a careful, searching inquiry that will give free access to all pertinent information, conducted by an agency with the ability and the power to purge the Government of all disloyal and unreliable elements. An unofficial civilian commission should be created for this purpose, as a safeguard against the subversion of the Government by enemy agents or dupes.

Such a commission, to command respect and confidence of the public and Congress, should be composed of persons of the caliber of Herbert Hoover, Bernard M. Baruch, Henry L. Stimson, Charles Evans Hughes, Owen D. Roberts, Robert M. La Follette, and James F. Byrnes—men who know government, who respect civil liberties, but who would resolve all doubts in favor of national security.

Let's forget politics when the issue is security.

[From the Washington Post of August 7, 1948]

FAULTY HIRING

The three-ring Communist circus on Capitol Hill has scored at least one important point—that Federal administrators were occasionally very naive or very reckless in their hiring of personnel. It is difficult to understand how a man with the record of Nathan Gregory Silvermaster could have obtained a job, let alone a succession of jobs which he held onto for more than a decade, anywhere in the United States Government. The account of his background made public on Wednesday when he appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities was certainly no revelation. It had been publicized long before by the old Dies committee. It was well known, as the records show, to the Civil Service Commission and to the Office of Naval Intelligence. The FBI must have been equally familiar with it.

Yet Mr. Silvermaster was able to secure the indorsement of usually careful and conscientious public officials, even of so indisputably patriotic and exacting an administrator as former Secretary of War Patterson, and to remain on the Federal roster until 1946, despite the fact that examiners and review officials of the Civil Service Commission—not the Commission, mind you—had declared him ineligible for any Government job as early as 1942 and the Dies committee had started denouncing him in 1938. Why were their warnings ignored? Perhaps it was because the investigators themselves desired to keep Mr. Silvermaster where his actions and associations could be observed. Perhaps it was in some measure because they had so debased the currency in which they were dealing as to make their warnings seem valueless.

The Government's investigating agencies cried "wolf" too frequently. They cried it about many Government employees and job applicants who were in no sense subversive, who had no affiliation whatever with communism and who were guilty of nothing save independence of mind and liberalism. They cried it about many men who nevertheless served their Government valuably and faithfully—men whose services would have been lost to the war effort if certain administrators had not manifested the courage and toughness to override the protests of those who confused conformity with patriotism. Sometimes the investigating agencies employed incredibly naive and absurd criteria in evaluating the suitability of persons for Federal employment—disqualifying them on shadowy grounds such as membership in innocent liberal organizations or because they advocated and practiced racial equality or because they read books and magazines supposed to be dangerously radical. Federal administrators who had jobs to get done had to hire workers in the teeth of such silly objections. And it is not altogether surprising that some of them came to disregard all objections, even valid ones, from these sources.

Today, the investigators have the upper hand. They completely control Federal personnel policy. Anyone at whom they point is likely to be blacklisted so far as the Government is concerned. Great care in hiring Government employees is indubitably necessary in these times when Communists willingly serve as a fifth column for the Soviet Union. But great care is no less necessary to avoid the stigmatization of loyal Americans and the exclusion from the Government of honest men urgently needed to carry on its vital work. Zeal in keeping the Communists out should not be permitted to result in letting in only the ordinary, the sterile, the second rate.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D. C.]

MORE THAN A "RED HERRING"

It is unfortunate that President Truman should have seen fit to add his voice to the swelling, intemperate chorus of generalized denunciation of the so-called spy scare in Washington. He dismissed the whole business as a "red herring" to divert attention from congressional inaction on his legislative program. The Communist Party convention in Philadelphia has made substantially the same charge, in different words. So have several of those accused.

But the average citizen is not likely to be satisfied with Mr. Truman's evaluation of the current hearings at the Capitol. Nor will his anxiety over the disclosure regarding an apparent break-down in the loyalty safeguards—implicit in the Remington case, for example—be relieved by the President's peculiar reaction.

Mr. Truman told reporters he could see no useful purpose whatsoever in the inquiries being conducted by the Senate and House committees—that the same information had been known for a long time to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a Federal grand jury in New York. Is it not serving a useful purpose, however, to let the public know that, despite the availability of such information as that given by a self-confessed Communist spy against William Remington, this civil servant was able to obtain transfers to positions of high security at top pay? Mr. Remington himself told the committee he could not understand how this was possible.

The President would have been justified in criticizing the publicity-surrounded, name-revealing procedure of the House Un-American Activities Committee—a procedure fraught with dangers of injustice to innocent persons. A distinction should be drawn, however, between the methods of that committee and the more judicial processes of the Ferguson committee. The Senate group, while foregoing an indiscriminate publication of names of those accused by former Communists, is doing a thorough and necessary job of finding out why the loyalty program did not work for so long in the Remington and perhaps other cases.

Few persons, after reading the testimony received by the committees to date, will share Mr. Truman's opinion that the only Communist spy ring in Washington exists in the imagination of the congressional probers. It is apparently true that testimony similar to that at the hearings was given to the grand jury in New York and that no spy indictments have been returned. But it should be remembered that the insufficiency of legal evidence to convict under the narrowly drawn Espionage Act does not necessarily mean that with all the smoke there is no fire. It is hard to believe that Mr. Truman is so naive as to think that

Communist agents have overlooked Washington, of all places.

Mr. Truman is within his rights, however, in refusing to turn over to the Ferguson committee the confidential loyalty file in the Remington case. The FBI would be seriously hampered in its work if its private sources of information were to be exposed. The President has authorized his subordinates to give the committee nonclassified data in the Remington personnel file. He should not stop there. He should make it plain to Congress and to the public generally that he is willing to cooperate without stint in all reasonable efforts by Congress to rid the Government of subversive influences. For the President brusquely to brand such efforts with a "red herring" label is wholly unfair and suggestive of the same sort of apathy as marked the handling of the Remington case by departmental executives.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of August 6, 1948]

TRUMAN SEEN ADVISED BADLY IN STATEMENT ON "RED HERRING"—CALLED FORM OF APOLOGY FOR COMMUNIST ACTIVITY WITHIN GOVERNMENT

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman seems to be getting the worst kind of political advice—or else he is ignoring good advice and going off on his own.

The statement that the White House considers the congressional inquiry into Communist activity to be a "red herring" is a form of apology for Communist activity that will not sit well with the voters.

The statement, moreover, that the President will continue to refuse to divulge the records in his Executive agencies pertaining to the loyalty of persons publicly accused of disloyalty will not sit well with the voters either.

RESENTED BY PEOPLE

There is one thing that the people as a whole resent—and that's any effort at suppression of evidence of what is going on inside their own Government.

The possibility that someone who is innocent might be accused is small potatoes compared with the larger public interest, which is whether the President and his Cabinet officers and their subordinates are sufficiently vigilant in protecting the security of the United States.

Anyone who is innocent and wrongly accused can be given his chance to refute charges. But if the President, with all his power, hides the evidence, then suspicion is compounded with suspicion and the people are led to believe that high crimes and misdemeanors are being committed behind the scenes with official protection.

There comes a time when a President who is running for office must forget politics and do what the people of all parties want done in an investigation on loyalty and security—namely, have all the facts produced.

PULLED A "BONER"

Mr. Truman certainly pulled a "boner" when after several days of headlines from self-confessed spies he brushed it all off as just an attempt by Republicans to divert attention from legislation for price control.

Mr. Truman takes unto himself full responsibility for ignoring what the Communists and alleged Communists have done as revealed by the two congressional committees. He says in a public statement:

"No information has been disclosed in the past few days by congressional committees that has not long been known to the FBI."

But will the President say frankly that the FBI knows only what has been testified before the committees and nothing else? Will he permit the FBI to open its files confidentially to members of the congressional committees? Will he rescind his gag order which prevents the FBI from doing anything about the evidence it has collected and keeps the FBI even from discussing it with any Members of Congress?

GRAND JURY BROUGHT IN

These are the pertinent questions that need answering along with another vital point. Mr. Truman now has brought the Federal grand jury into the matter. He says:

"The Federal grand jury found this information insufficient to justify indictment of the Federal employees involved."

Will the President reveal what recommendations, if any, were made by attorneys of the Government as they appeared before the grand jury and what facts or evidence was submitted? It is well known that, as a rule, grand juries take their cue from prosecuting attorneys of the Justice Department. One press dispatch says, for instance, that the Department's representative felt that, because it couldn't be proved that the information actually got to Russia, there was no real proof that could be used to secure a conviction. No such solicitude was shown before indicting several leading businessmen of America in recent years on criminal charges under the antitrust laws.

GOES STEP FURTHER

The congressional committees, it might be thought, could investigate what did happen in the Justice Department but the President can forbid the Department to answer a congressional committee's questions. Mr. Truman has just reiterated his decree that no information from the loyalty records of Government departments may be furnished to Congress. He goes a step further. He adds:

"The public hearings now under way are serving no useful purpose. On the contrary, they are doing irreparable harm to certain persons, seriously impairing the morale of Federal employees, and undermining public confidence in the Government."

The American people will have to judge whether any useful purpose is served by ferreting out disloyalty in the Government and whether the vast number of Federal employees can possibly be disturbed by the revelation that a few among them have been questioned as to loyalty. What is being undermined is not "public confidence in the Government" but public confidence in the efficiency and competence of the Truman administration.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 7, 1948]

LOOK WHO'S TALKING

Speaking off the cuff at a press conference yesterday, High Tax Harry Truman opined that the current congressional investigation of alleged red and pink spy dupes, now or formerly on the New Deal's pay roll, is a red herring.

It's all a political plot, Harry insisted, to divert public attention from other woes like inflation, which he is trying to pin on Congress, though not on its Democratic Members.

Many of our sweltering Congressmen, of course, have been moaning for some days that Harry was doing a bit of political plotting himself, in dragging them back to Washington. To many a legislator's twitching nose Harry's maneuver to get free campaign publicity out of Congress smelled very much of herring itself.

BAD STEER

However that may be, we think one of Mr. T's brain boys gave him a sad steer on that "red herring" crack. We don't know how guilty some of those pinkish exhibits will turn out to be, but we think the American public is benefiting by this airing of their antics. And they're being allowed, as they should, to defend themselves and their reputations.

About that "red herring" phrase, though, Mr. President, the funny thing is: That's what the Communists have been screaming about those hearings ever since they started.

PAY OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have on two different occasions within the past 30 days called the attention of the Members of the House and the leadership of the majority to the fact that commencing next January every single enlisted man in the armed services of the country, that is, the Navy, the Army, the Marine Corps, and the Air Corps, will suffer what is in effect a reduction of wages.

Mr. Speaker, it is not too late today. We are going to recess for probably 3 or 4 hours this afternoon. We can still on this last day pass a resolution by unanimous consent which would continue the present pay scale of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Corps.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility for this reduction in pay of the armed services is squarely on the shoulders of the leadership of the majority party of the House of Representatives. I hope they will consider this matter and permit the passage today of a proper House joint resolution.

EXPORTS IN RELATION TO GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCTION

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that in the RECORD today I shall insert some facts and figures on exports in relation to our gross national production. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I think it is important for the entire membership to have the facts on exports. Our total exports, including foreign aid, are but a small percentage of the gross national production; they are not the cause of present high prices.

I shall also include in the RECORD some facts on the support price program.

The support price program is not the cause of present high prices, although these two reasons will be given in the coming months for the high price of meat, vegetables, bread, milk, and everything else people need to live. This special session of Congress is long on excuses and short on action.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROBLEM

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD some very pertinents remarks made by His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York. These remarks were made before the annual convention of the New York State Federation of Labor on August 2, 1948.

I am sure that a thorough reading of this distinguished address by all segments of our population will bring forth a clearer understanding, on all sides, of labor-management problems.

ADDRESS OF HIS EMINENCE FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN, ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK, AT THE OPENING OF THE EIGHTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NEW YORK STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR, HOTEL COMMODORE, AUGUST 2, 1948

"IF FREEDOM FAIL"

I come before you today a minister of God and a son of the soil of America, begot from the loins of sons of toil that have helped make our country great. I come to call not alone upon you, citizens of our own New York State, but upon every loyal citizen of every State within our Nation to unite in solving a most vital problem, a cause which in its consequences affects us all: the relationships between capital and labor, the cause of liberty and justice, the cause of America itself. Fortified by my feeling that you believe in my love of God and of my country, I come to ask that with friendly hearts and open minds you ponder my reflections founded on the sacred principles of my priesthood and my patriotism, and then to do what the soul of each man counsels him to do. For if each man to his own self be true, "it must follow as the night the day, he cannot then be false to any man." Thus will he live faithful to God and true to his neighbor, publicly avowing by his words and his works an eternal enmity to godless tyranny and evil and an everlasting loyalty to justice and democracy.

The burden and solution of the problem of unity and equity between labor and capital belong jointly to us all. It matters not where we live, or what position in life we hold, whether we be rich or poor, Negro or white, Protestant, Jew, or Catholic, employer or employee, by our works we must prove our faith in God, our country, and our fellow man. And I am confident that the majority of Americans have the determination, jealously to guard their country, their neighbors, and themselves against the wily power of foreign influence which history and experience prove is the most fearsome foe of republican government. I am confident that they have the determination to go forward together, to live and work together for the welfare and peace of themselves and their countrymen—a determination which I believe to be all important to the survival of each and every American and to the unity and survival of democratic America itself.

Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, we have in war and in peace fought together in common causes against common dangers, shared common sorrows and sufferings, triumphed in common successes, and the independence of liberty which we now possess are the works of combined councils and united efforts, resulting in benefits to all. This unity is the source of our strength, the core of our liberty, the foundation of our peaceful living. It is therefore a great and grave mistake to assume that any one class of Americans is naturally and inevitably hostile to any other class, that the wealthy and the workingman, employer and employee are destined to live in mutual conflict.

This morning I pray Almighty God, as every morning of my priestly life I have prayed, that every man living upon American soil, sharing American freedom, will forever be loyal to our democratic government founded upon the principles of faith in God and reason and justice. And what is this American democracy for which, over the youthful span of our Nation's life, millions of our sons have fought and died to preserve and protect? On the political side we all know the answer—by instinct perhaps, rather than by definition. We have learned and lived the magnificent phrases that symbolize and enshrine democracy's prime principles: The Bill of Rights; a government of laws, not of men; life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Yes, of political democracy, we have full and familiar concept. But what about economic democracy? Totalitarians have their plan and their own purpose in economic matters, and a very great segment of the human race is ruled in accordance with their theory and practice that economic security and social welfare can be had only at the sacrifical price of freedom. America denies this heresy. "For what avail the plow or sail, or land, or life, if freedom fail!"

Down through the years America has lived to give lie to all who would deny that in unity and justice for all, reside the strength, wealth, and peace of our United States and all its varied peoples, who, living and working as one, have made and kept our country one. And upon our continued productive activity and efficiency depend the maintenance and the improvement of our standards of living. But there can be no mutually profitable productive activity without cooperation between employer and employee—cooperation motivated by the social and spiritual incentive of justice, based on the great commandment of the divine law: "To do unto others as you would have others do unto you." As capital and labor recognize and organize in accordance with this God-inspired principle, all Americans will benefit hundredfold in a rapid march of material progress in providing food and shelter for every citizen to maintain him in health and give him opportunities for the education of his children, and finally give to him the assurance that the blessing of children will not bring with it the hardships of poverty. These are each citizen's rights—all these, and freedom too.

But think you man can attain these rights without fulfilling his corresponding duties to the will of God and to society? I tell you "No." Show me a man who reveres and follows God's ways and I will show you the man who respects his fellow men and strives to do them service. And I beg of all men to seek guidance of God for the good of themselves and their fellow workers. The man who listens to God is inflamed of heart and enlightened of mind, for the Lord teaches knowledge without confusion and he who listens quickly becomes wise. Man is ensnared with many passions, held fast by many fears, worn with many burdens, tormented with want. He yearns to be freed from the bondage of these cares and trials, secure in liberty and peace. But if he is to enjoy freedom's gifts, first he must learn to obey God's laws and strive to help his neighbor—because it is in God himself that our rights and duties and our peace and our freedom are founded, for "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

Is it not a satisfying feeling for man to look upon the mighty, many-threaded works of labor and industry—lofty cathedrals and churches; unsurpassed skyscrapers, schools, homes, shops, and offices, all with equipment designed for efficiency and comfort; sturdy ships, trains, and automobiles; airplanes built to race the sun and carry man from clime to clime—is it not good to look upon all these and to know that employer and employee—engineers, architects, tradesmen, men of every profession, laborers all—shared their united efforts, and, insofar as is humanly possible, have kept apace with God's own handiwork to make man's life livable, peaceful, and prosperous. God alone can do anything, but men to build a peaceful prosperous world must enlist God's help and unite their efforts with one another's.

America's prosperity and happiness can be attained only through the full cooperation between labor and capital with full employment and fair wages. Yet millions of people are being taught—and tricked into believing—that the benefits of security fall like manna from heaven. I beg those people who are being deceived that they cease to be terrified, stunned, or confused by Communists or Communist-inspired agitators who, with sharp sickle-strokes seek to murder democracy, stifle free enterprise, and destroy world peace. I beg of them that with firm resolve and the might of free democratic citizens they unite in the common cause of the safety and survival of our country and the welfare of one another. I am confident that all true Americans believe with me and stand ready to live by the pure democratic credo: That property should be the servant and not the master of the Nation, and that every man born of woman should have a fair chance to make of himself all that in him lies to reach the highest point to which his capacities can carry him, and to receive for himself and his family substantially what he has earned. A nation that gives to each of its citizens equal chances to earn his own and his family's keep has its right to receive from each of its citizens the highest service of which he is capable. And any man or group of men who does not give full service for full pay contributes to the spiral of inflation, increases prices for his neighbor, and himself, jeopardizes economic stability, and invites corrupt communistic disruption.

The right to regulate the use of wealth in the public interest is universally admitted. But in the essential interest of the common good for the common man we must also admit the right to regulate the terms and conditions of labor, and in the interests of the workingman himself we need set our faces like flint against mob violence just as against corporate greed; against the lawlessness of workers, just as much as against the lawlessness of employers, remembering always that each must render justice to the other.

Democratic governments are established not for the aggrandizement of particular individuals or special groups, but for the general good of all citizens, and I contend that it is the duty of every loyal American to obey the Nation's Constitution and its laws, until through just democratic processes, they are amended or repealed. Obedience should be each citizen's principle and practice, since disobedience to a law because a man thinks the law is bad might be used to justify another man in the disobedience of a good law. This principle should hold true in all organizations set up within the framework of our democratic Nation. But I believe with the mighty poet Milton who inspired the deathless dream of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, that a dispesition to controversy in a nation is no proof of sedition or degeneracy if in controversies which affect countless people, leaders exert every lawful means and pursue every reasonable avenue to effect peaceful decisions and just settlements.

Down through the years, as labor has struggled for its rights, an effective economic weapon has been evolved—the strike weapon—recognized in this and many other nations of freemen, as lawful. However, this powerful, legal, economic weapon should be

used less frequently as capital and labor continue to work out their problems and differences in mutual respect and enlightened understanding, following the principles of collective bargaining which jointly they have adopted for the well-being of all parties. In fair collective bargaining rests America's greatest hope for future peaceful labor relations, but in its processes men must guard themselves against selfish, domineering minority groups opposed to our democratic form of government, groups that refuse to solve their problems through this just device and use strikes as smokescreens to wage political war against America. In no business nor profession nor craft nor institution in America is there room for any man with a divided allegiance. Nor can we Americans afford to blind ourselves to the actual conflict which faces us today. The issue is obvious, and we must solve it or disintegrate. The hope of all mankind rests with us, and if it should be proven that our example of equitably settling problems between capital and labor through fair collective bargaining has become an argument against the experiment, and if we strike ourselves out of prosperity and peace, the knell of liberty and civilization would be sounded throughout the earth.

As I bring to a close these reflections for which I have begged your thoughtful and prayerful attention, may I express my personal and my official gratitude to the leaders and members of the Building Trades Union of New York City and of Westchester County with whom I have had continuous close and cordial contacts. When employment was slow and builders were hesitant in May of 1947, I promised to try to swim against the tide and to expend $25,000,000 for new construction in the Archdiocese of New York. In April of 1948, I was pleased to announce publicly that this promise had been fulfilled. At the time I made this commitment the Building Trades Councils of New York City and of Westchester County pledged "not to interrupt the work by stoppages due to disputes between unions or between union and employe . to give a day's work for a day's pay, and to supply sufficient mechanics to carry forward the work."

Fortified with these pledges I authorized work to commence on a number of projects, chief of which was a high school for boys in White Plains, N. Y., dedicated to Archbishop Stepinac, the persecuted victim of godless tyrants in Communist-conquered Yugoslavia. And I am happy and proud today to testify to labor's complete fulfillment of its pledges, and that on the 12th of next month, in record-breaking construction time, the Archbishop Stepinac High School, built at a cost of $4,200,000, will open its doors for 1,360 boys. I thank also the architects and builders of this school whose work has won first prize in a Nation-wide competition for America's best designed high school.

In New York City we are building an addition to St. Vincent's Hospital, dedicated to the memory of the late beloved Gov. Alfred E. Smith. As part of the work, we are completely renovating the older portions of the hospital, while the full routine of the care of the sick is maintained. This involves many difficulties for the workmen, the hospital staff, and the patients. The successful solving of all such difficulties is attested by the statement of the hospital administrators testifying to the courtesy and efficiency of the workmen and their care for the comfort of the patients. To these men also I express my heart's gratitude.

Yet, in contradiction to this proven program achieved only because all of us have worked in complete harmonious agreement, I quote William Z. Foster, who said:

"A program based on class peace would be a first-class disaster to the workers and the people generally, as well as to our party. * * * The aims of the trade-unions cannot be achieved by a harmonious agreement between labor and capital."

That is the Communist credo. It is not mine. And I know it is not yours, nor can it ever be the credo of any patriotic American. But I do here repeat the creed for capital and labor which is mine, and I believe and pray will be your creed and the creed of every loyal citizen for the security, survival, and peace of our America.

I believe in a system of government which encourages labor and capital to function freely under God, giving full measure of deed and devotion for the common good of the common man, in loyal, concerted service to our common country. Thus, I believe, taking God as my inspiration and God's laws as my guide.

Six days God labored for man, dividing the light and the darkness, studding the skies with sun and stars, stocking the forests with birds and beasts, sowing the plains with fertile seed, storing ore and oil in the earth. Then did God create man to His own image and likeness, and blessed him.

But in disobedience and defiance man failed God. Yet did a forgiving, merciful God bestow upon man his greatest blessing, investing His only Son in humanity, making the world livable and life lovable for man's own and his children's sake. In His great goodness God quickened the earth with riches for man's use, not for his abuse; for his rise, not for his ruin, and labor and capital can reap the rewards of God's goodness only if labor unstintingly produces with the skills with which God has so abundantly endowed it, and capital unsparingly distributes the produce of labor for all men's welfare.

Labor has the right and duty to expand its service and usefulness to the social body and to progress through orderly processes. Capital, too, has its right and duty to increase its usefulness to society through free enterprise, fair competition and reasonable profits. Thus may labor and capital together glorify God in this fair land bequeathed to man, fulfilling their debt to God and their duty to relieve man's needy estate.

God has gifted man with brawn and brain, with the good rich earth and the fruits thereof, opening before him widening avenues for service to all humankind. Possessed of these gifts, it is the sacred duty of labor and capital, faithfully to remain the repository and stronghold of God's trust, rendering unselfish service to society—service which can prosper and endure only by steady production and fulsome distribution.

By God's decree man labors for bread by the sweat of his brow, tilling fields and tending folds, working mines and sinking wells, manning machines and building homes. Thus by simple obedience to God and honest work with his neighbor, man himself is saved, enriched and ennobled.

Christ, who is God, sanctified labor by toiling as a carpenter and it is labor's duty to keep toil blessed, giving unbounded service for the happiness and prosperity of man as an avowal of his faith and trust in God. So too did Christ sanctify capital, by calling laborers to work in His vineyard, paying to them their just hire. Shareholder with labor, it is capital's duty also to preserve itself blessed by fostering human happiness and prosperity, for no man should be slave nor master to another, but each should be servant to God and helpmate to his neighbor.

If labor and capital are to thrive and survive, they must serve as members of one social body, with singleness of purpose and diversity of functions, united in the strong bond of service for the good of mankind, spirited by reverence and love of God, working together to do God's will on earth as it is done in heaven. For labor and capital are destined under God's plan to achieve and maintain standards of living harmonious with God's will, and only thus shall posterity glean its legacy of God's glory.

God in His infinite wisdom, mercy, and justice implements His plans for man's welfare through human efforts, and labor and capital are his especial instruments impelled by God's guiding hand to lead and to help man on the road to peace.

All this I believe, taking God as my model, for the law of His life is the law of love.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, each to include extraneous matter.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the action of a subcommittee in the other body seems to end any hope that the date in the Displaced Persons Act will be changed from December 22, 1945 to April 21, 1947, at this special session. For it was after the December date that tens of thousands from eastern Europe, most of whose kin had already been exterminated by the Nazis, escaped to the DP camps from violent political and religious persecution. These thousands still in the camps are barred by this law.

The failure to make this change will be considered as outright discrimination by thousands of American families who have friends and relatives in the DP camps, for it sets a wholly arbitrary standard and admits as immigrants DPs not according to the proportions of their elements actually in the DP camps, but according to the arbitrary standard set in a law which gives a preference to one element over others at least equally deserving. Those of us who have seen the DP camps and talked personally with hundreds of DP's and with their relatives in the United States, will realize vividly the personal tragedies involved.

Members may as well assure their constituents that the change will be made early in the next session for the protest will be so loud and clear, and so well justified that I believe the next Congress will have to make it one of its first acts. I only wish that this Congress could have had the privilege of righting this injustice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE PRESS AND HON. CARTER MANASCO

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise, as spokesman for the Alabama delegation, to offer our profound thanks and expressions of gratitude to the fourth estate, our friends of the press, for the very gracious, and cordial testimonial they have just given to one of our distinguished Members, the Honorable CARTER MANASCO. The feeling back of that party and testimonial is shared by every Member of this House. Our distinguished Speaker honored us with his presence, as did our latest former Speaker, and so many of the ladies and gentlemen on both sides of the aisle. We of the Alabama delegation simply wish to express our appreciation of the signal and unique honor that they have chosen to bestow upon our beloved friend. We all know and love CARTER MANASCO. We honor him for the services that he rendered as secretary to our beloved Bill Bankhead. He served as his press secretary during the time he was Speaker. So, as a testimonial of the affection he won from the press, for his fairness and the fullness of his service in that regard, which meant much to them at that time, and which has been continued since, we of Alabama wish to express our lasting gratitude.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

INCOME-TAX EXEMPTION FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] remarked on loss of pay which all members of the armed services will incur on the first of next year. I assume the gentleman referred to the fact that the services will lose the $1,500 exemption in income tax on that date.

I may say that the picture is not quite as dark as it might seem because some little time ago we did pass a measure to continue this exemption. It failed of passage in the other body, but I sincerely hope and believe that the next Congress will consider the matter again and will take care of it either by continuing the tax exemption or by increase of pay before members of the armed services involved are compelled to pay the income tax which will be due on this $1,500.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman, I think, will understand it will be impossible to get any action in time to prevent the withholding of these taxes from the privates in the Army or the seamen in the Navy, every single one of them without regard to any commissioned personnel exemption.

A master sergeant in the army will have $20 less pay for the month of January than he has during this year, and it affects other men in the service.

The leadership could very easily pass a simple resolution today, because every paymaster in the armed services will necessarily have to make up a new pay roll for every man in the service commencing with the 1st of January. That calls for mountains of work and will cost thousands and thousands of dollars.

Mr. BRADLEY. The gentleman is undoubtedly correct. I merely would indicate that I do not believe there will be any ultimate loss to the personnel involved.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It will definitely be a loss when the paymaster has to make up a new pay roll taking withholding taxes from every man in the service from the lowest private in the lowest rank in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps.

I submit that if the membership had an opportunity to vote on that bill it could be passed in 5 minutes. Really, it is an unjust thing to let this bill fail.

Mr. BRADLEY. I appreciate that there will be a lot of additional work involved and that there will be some inconvenience and distress due to the withholding of these taxes from the families of enlisted personnel, in particular.

The purpose of these remarks is merely to let armed service personnel know that the House of Representatives has not abandoned its efforts to continue present income-tax exemptions for the armed services, or to provide an equivalent increase in pay. We shall try again early in the Eighty-first Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

AU REVOIR, NOT FAREWELL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, unless the entirely unexpected happens, today will conclude for me 10 years of service in the House of Representatives, and so, in conformity with an ancient and established tradition in congressional circles, I take this opportunity simply to bid you what I hope will not be farewell but an au revoir.

As most of you know, I am about to embark on an attempted journey on what I presume is the shortest, the most expensive, and the most hazardous journey of all America's travel routes, the 500 feet which lead from the House of Representatives over to the Senate of the United States.

As an established Member of the House I hope you notice I said "over to the Senate," and not "up to the Senate," because I feel I am simply endeavoring to shift from one body to another.

Certainly I could not leave this great body of distinguished men without saying how much I have appreciated working with you and sharing with you the tremendous problems which have come before us in the past 10 years. I can assure you that, speaking as a country boy from South Dakota, this has been a great experience to me, a great series of contacts and associations. It has been one long succession of pleasant experiences, and I can truthfully say that while I have differed violently with some Members of the House, representatives of the third party especially, who are now pressing their Presidential campaign, I cannot say I personally dislike anyone in this great historic body.

Everybody is pursuing his objective with diligence and sincerity. I know of no institution in all the world, including the one in which I now seek membership, which is greater, or more important, or more able or patriotic than the House of Representatives.

So I say "salute and farewell." And if I am fortunate I hope to see you in January, thus making this just an au revoir instead of a firm farewell.

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, KARL MUNDT represents the eastern half of the State of South Dakota. My district borders his to the east. I, for one, deeply regret seeing this gentleman leave the House of Representatives, but I do know that there is a broader field available for his talents in the Senate of the United States, and with all due respect to that body I do think they need a gentleman of KARL MUNDT's fighting ability over there to lead the crusade against communism.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE WEST

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we listened a few minutes ago to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] express some very strange opinions, most of which were mistatements, regarding appropriations made by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress for western reclamation. The facts are that the Eightieth Congress appropriated more than twice as much money for the development of the West for irrigation, reclamation, and hydroelectric power than had any other Congress in the history of this Nation.

It is rather singular to see the administration under Mr. Truman and Mr. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, now send a budget up to this special session asking that additional funds be made available for a number of projects. This request comes about 30 days after the regular session and after the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations of which I have the honor of being chairman had had 11 solid weeks of hearings and 424 witnesses. If the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior cannot estimate their requirements any closer than they indicate they have by such a request, I would suggest they throw in the sponge now.

Of course, the truth of the matter is that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] knows exactly less than nothing about which he spoke, as the facts and figures prove; but like the President,

Mr. Krug, Mr. Straus, and company, all know they are on a bad spot and are all using the truth shamefully and recklessly for purely political reasons, hoping to keep the people fooled as usual, but that day is past forever, I hope.

It was Mr. Truman himself who placed a stop order against over half the 1947 money Congress appropriated for flood control and reclamation on August 2, 1946, the very day Congress adjourned. It was the same Mr. Truman who directed that there should be no new starts in the fiscal year 1949 for flood control and reclamation. No wonder they have red faces now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

THE HONORABLE KARL MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say to my friend, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], that if I am privileged to be a Member of this body in the Eighty-first Congress I shall miss his presence very much indeed. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs it has been my pleasure and privilege to work with the gentleman from South Dakota on a subcommittee of which he was chairman, on a select committee of which he was co-chairman and on the full committee. He was always tireless in his energies, he was patient and equitable in his approach to the problems which came before us, and his comments were illuminating and helpful.

Mr. Speaker, the other body will be fortunate in obtaining the participation of the gentleman from South Dakota in the important legislation which will face it next year. We in the House have lost a genial friend and a mighty contributor to the work of this great deliberative body.

I wish him good luck and Godspeed and I hope that our paths will cross often.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to add to the gentleman's remarks by expressing my view as majority leader. In my opinion the gentleman from South Dakota, KARL MUNDT, is one of the most able Members of the House and I join with the others in regretting the fact he has seen fit to move over to the other side of the Capitol; but since he has made that election, what is our loss will be their gain. I know he will perform both ably and admirably in his assignment to the other body.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, although I represent a district in California, a district of which I am very proud, it so happens that the portion of his State so ably represented by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], is the district in which I was born. So, I have more than a fraternal bond in my association with the gentleman from South Dakota in the House of Representatives. When a new Member comes to Congress, as you so well know, he is confronted with a very complex, a very confusing and a very difficult situation. KARL MUNDT has been in the past, during my association with him, a source of strength, and a source of constant help; always cooperative, and always willing to be of service. During the period of time I have had the honor to serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs with KARL MUNDT I have come to admire his fine qualities and to respect his judgment, and I should like to say with the others that the great loss of the House will almost certainly be the great gain of the Senate of the United States.

ROBERT BRUCE MATHIAS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD this week I included a letter from Gael Sullivan of New York calling attention to the fact that the month of September is Youth Month. Every American today, yes, every citizen of the world, marvels at the great feat performed by an American youth on yesterday in London, England, at the Olympic games, where a boy 17 years of age won the decathlon. We pause and wonder at the great achievement that he performed, the most outstanding in the history of the athletic world. As long as American youth can display such determined spirit and competitive challenge to the rest of the world like that young fellow did, America will always be the greatest Nation on earth.

Mr. Speaker, when this 17-year-old California school boy, Robert Bruce Mathias, won the decathlon he showed the world the stuff American youngsters are made of. It took long hours of training and application and stout courage to achieve this victory. It proved that American youth is not soft but that in competition—in both war and peace—it ranks with the best.

Bob Mathias is not only an honor and a credit to his school and his State, but he is also the epitome of American youth. All-American, yes, but primarily in the sense that he typifies the greatness of a country and the courage of its people. The Congress salutes him.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) entitled "joint resolution to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period," with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. Henry A. Wallace. I understand it may exceed the limit. Notwithstanding that, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The regular order, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman is not going to make a speech on my request.

Mr. RANKIN. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker. How does it exceed the limit?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In size. It may require a page or two beyond the limit.

Mr. RANKIN. I just wondered how it exceeds the limit.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. For the information of the gentleman, may I say to the Speaker that it is exactly 10 mimeographed sheets.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes the gentleman will not object.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HILL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SOMERS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables, editorials, and extracts, notwithstanding the fact that it may exceed the allowable amount that may be included in the RECORD.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article from a Minneapolis paper.

Mr. POULSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include three editorials.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. How many days do we have in which to make any extensions following this session?

The SPEAKER. It is an indefinite period, but generally it is about 10 days.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping and four short letters and copies of replies thereto.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. GWINN of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PROTECTING THE NATION'S ECONOMY AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass a resolution, House Resolution 711, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 157, to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures, with Senate amendments to the House amendments, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendments to the House amendments be, and the same are hereby, agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, there is but one speaker on this side. I wonder if the minority wish to use their time.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question: Are State banks included in the Senate amendment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; they are not. State and nonmember banks are not included.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I expect to support the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this bill that any Member of the House need worry about supporting. There is so little in the bill that it is hardly worth having a vote on.

The dangerous section that we made a hard fight on and which we feared would destroy the Government support operation of Government bonds has wisely been stricken out by the Senate. This, I believe, proves the point the minority tried to prove here the other day.

This bill will have no more effect on stopping inflation than the placing of a very small pin in the path of a rushing Pennsylvania streamlined train. The bill contains two tiny items, one to restrict installment credit, which restriction continues until July 1 of next year; and the other raises the reserve requirements of member banks in the Federal Reserve by 4 percent.

This tiny bit of effect against inflation is what the Republican mountain has labored and brought forth by its labor.

When people complain to you about dollar or dollar and a half a pound meat, of record-breaking prices for clothing, and of an all-time high cost of living, you can point to this bill and say that this is Congress's feeble answer to your plea for something to stop inflation.

If it stops it, it will certainly surprise every Member of the Democratic side of the Committee on Banking and Currency, because it is absolutely insufficient and ineffective in meeting the dangerous spiral of inflation that is going on today.

The Congress, I feel, in passing this insignificant bill, has completely admitted its failure to deal with inflation. If the people in control of this Congress did not like the President's program, and since they could not deny that inflation was here, they should have submitted a program that they themselves could have supported.

Under the gag-rule provisions which the Republican majority has imposed in this special session, the Democratic minority was denied the right to amend this bill to make it effective, or to even offer a motion to recommit.

Even in the Banking and Currency Committee, the committee by majority action refused to even hear the testimony of the Cabinet members most actively affected by this inflation spiral. Ready and asking to testify were the Secretaries of Agriculture, on food prices; the Secretary of Commerce on priorities and allocations on scarce industrial commodities; and the Secretary of Interior on fuel prices. They, too, were denied a right to appear in person before the Banking and Currency Committee to testify.

Then, when this mouselike bill to halt inflation was brought to the floor, the most severe form of gag rule was imposed, so that no Member of the House could seek to strengthen or make effective the meager provisions of the committee bill.

All told, the House itself, under this gag-rule procedure, permitted only 40 minutes of debate and consideration to the Nation's No. 1 problem of inflation. The product of its deliberations hardly indicate that that much time was spent. Surely, when the people look at new high record prices each month, then they can only logically conclude that this Republican-controlled Congress either was unwilling to recognize the danger, or was incapable of recommending any effective remedy for their plight.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I wish the gentleman to explain, if he will, the restrictions that are placed in this bill on installment credit, as we have not had a chance to hear the bill read. What restrictions are placed upon installment credit?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Section 1 of this bill deals with the matter of consumer-installment credit and extends it until June 30, 1949, only on selected items. It will probably not be as inclusive as regulation W was in all its forms. In that measure they covered automobiles, furniture, and 10 household-appliance items. This, of course, will have to be set up by regulations of the Federal Reserve Board so far as to what is actually covered.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They are permissive?

Mr. BUCHANAN. As far as consumer-installment credit is controlled they will be mandatory.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They are mandatory. In other words, we have done nothing whatever to stop the inflationary spiral, but now we put restrictive installment-credit controls on the poor people who have to spend their meager salaries over a long period of time in order to obtain any consumer goods.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is section 1 of the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the Federal Reserve Bank have to indicate the items on which there are installment controls?

Mr. BUCHANAN. They will prescribe the administrative regulations. Of course, I am merely forecasting, but I think those regulations will probably not be as all-inclusive as regulation W.

Mr. Speaker, what is in this bill? Of course, insofar as what we passed the other day, section 1 deals with consumer installment credit and as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], has stated, the very controversial gold reserve section has been stricken out by the other body.

In the section on bank reserves they have raised the percentage points to 4 across the board on demand deposits and 1½ on time deposits. The previous resolution that we sent over was 3 percentage points across the board on time deposits and one on time deposits.

The American economy has since the end of hostilities displayed remarkable strength and elasticity.

Now, the present inflationary pressures continue. Our economy, of course, having gone through a period of war and a period of postwar adjustment, is still in the throes of a continual rising period of an inflationary spiral. The pressures are constantly increasing.

The President in his various messages to the Congress on four respective occasions has asked for control measures and stand-by measures to meet and deal with the present situation providing that if conditions were to become aggravated, he would have authority to deal with it. He asked for an eight-point anti-inflation program to cover price control, wage control, rationing, allocations, inventory control, and tighter rent control. There is nothing in this so-called Republican anti-inflation control bill that meets any of those problems.

I want to say to the Members of the House and I want to say to the people of this country that they should not be under any illusions so far as what this bill will do. While it does contain two of the recommended provisions that on consumer credit and that on bank reserves, there is nothing so far as controls or stand-by authority that will give to the President the over-all authority to check the continuing spiral of inflation.

We are witnessing the spectacle of rapidly soaring prices. On the very eve of an economic collapse, many people are apt to grow more confident that all is well even in the face of new mounting figures. When you appraise the figures on industrial production, gross national product, distribution of income, prices, wages and profits, it gives one the illusion that we are enjoying a great period of prosperity. Nothing can be farther from the truth because the gap is ever getting wider between wages and prices, prices rising and wages falling behind. The gap between the middle and lower income groups is spreading. Savings are being spent. Consumer credit continues to expand. One-fourth of the family units spent more than they earned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, all of the expert opinion and testimony that was offered before the House Banking Committee, of course, was to the effect that we are in an artificial period of prosperity. We should recognize the fact that we were called to action by the President to do something constructive and affirmative now, to put the brakes on, to put the checks on, and to apply these brakes and apply these checks; but the story so far as this legislation is concerned is too little, too late. So, Mr. Speaker, when the story is written on housing in the Eightieth Congress, when the story is written on price control, when the story is written on Federal aid to education, when the story is written on excess profits, you may recall the theme song in 1946 of the Republican Party which was, "Have you had enough?"

I believe that the American people in 1948 are going to offer their version of the theme song by saying that they have had enough of nothing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I voted against this proposal several days ago because I felt that the Federal Reserve requirements being increased was possibly a dangerous move. I shall support this legislation not with the idea that it will accomplish its goal or its purpose, but that something, as small as it is, is better than nothing.

I think it is tragic that we have handled the gravest domestic issue facing the American people today as a partisan political matter. The truth of the matter is—and all of us must admit it if we will be honest with ourselves—that we are living in a war economy. We have a $40,000,000,000 national budget; we have a national debt of something over $250,000,000,000. The inflationary pressures today are every bit as great as they were during World War II. As long as the international situation remains as it is, as long as Russia challenges our freedom and our liberty, the pressures are going to remain upon the economy of America, and we are going home, Democrats and Republicans alike, with this Nation facing its most dangerous economic situation in all of its history and telling the people of this country that we have done something about it.

Now, that is just perfectly ridiculous and incomprehensible. We have done nothing about it. I am not pleading for the President's program. I have no way in the world of knowing whether or not it would have worked, but I say this, that with prices spiraling as they are spiraling now, to have conducted hearings for only a matter of days and hours, to have permitted only four witnesses to come before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, to have failed to go to the finest brains in America and the best economists in America and ask them to come forward with a program that might possibly offer a solution to this problem, is a dereliction of duty that lies squarely upon the leadership of this body. The record is written. The gag rule was used in committee and on the floor. The country will know this too.

Inflation is not a partisan matter. Inflation affects Republicans and Democrats, Wallaceites, and Dixiecrats. It affects all Americans, and if we will reflect for a moment and think about the welfare of our country rather than partisan politics, and face this grave problem honestly and squarely, we would attempt to do something constructive about it. We would not go home and abandon our people and invite depression, disaster, unemployment, and insecurity. Remember that is what Russia is counting on in the cold war.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is no more than a gesture toward curbing inflation. When it was before the House for consideration on Thursday it not only was subject to the criticism that it presents no remedy for inflation. It then contained a section which actually made it a dangerous bill.

As the bill was then written, section 2 would have increased the gold-certificate reserve requirement to 40 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in circulation, and to 35 percent against Federal Reserve bank deposits.

The present reserve requirement is 25 percent. Under the original provisions of this bill the supporting Federal Reserve funds for supporting Government bonds, and maintaining them at par, would have been reduced from the figure of $40,500,000,000 to approximately $10,000,000,000, or a reduction of 450 percent, according to financial experts.

This would have created the possibility of one of the greatest panics this country has ever seen. It created the possibility of large holders of 2½-percent Government bonds cashing them in, with the veiw of buying new issues at a higher interest rate, and breaking the Government bond market.

It is important that the Federal Government maintain Government bonds at par. The people who have bought and paid for these bonds have the right to expect and look to the Government to be able to buy them in at 100 cents on the dollar, plus accrued interest at all times.

Section 2 would reduce the amount of gold reserve available to support the price of Government bonds, and would weaken the cushion that has been available to support the bond market.

This section 2 was a menace to the stability of the Government bond market. As reluctant as I am to vote against any measure offered as a weapon against inflation, I could not vote to subject the people of the United States to such a provision as this section 2, and I voted against it.

The Senate realized the danger of this provision, and has wisely and properly amended the bill to remove section 2. The bill is now back before us with this provision taken out.

It is a weak and ineffective measure. In my opinion it will have little effect on inflation. Yet, it is the only anti-inflationary bill that is going to be permitted to come before Congress this session. And, under the circumstances, since the threat to the Government bond market is now out of the bill, I shall support it.

I am sorry the bill carries a provision to place Regulation W back into effect. I feel that it is wrong in principle to pass a law that in effect will keep a poor man from buying his wife a washing machine and paying for it on the installment plan, or a refrigerator, or similar articles. I doubt that this feature of the bill will reduce inflation to any noticeable extent. Still, it is a gesture, and under the circumstances, it may be worth trying. At any rate, it will only remain in force under this bill less than 11 months, until June 30, 1949.

We only have the choice of voting for the bill as is, or voting against it as is.

Therefore, with section 2 and its threat to the bond market now out of the bill, I shall vote for it. The Atlanta Journal on July 31, 1948, carried an editorial pointing out some of the difficulties incident to curbing inflation at this late date. I attach this editorial herewith, as a part of my remarks:

THE CONGRESS AND INFLATION

At least one paragraph in President Truman's Mid-Year Economic Report, which was transmitted Friday to the Congress, is understandable by any person who can read, and will be disputed by no one. It is this:

"Thus far we have shown a blind disregard of the dangers that beset our path. Despite my repeated warnings and recommendations, we have not adopted adequate legislation for controlling inflation."

All, too, will join fervently in his expressed hope that "it is not too late for preventive measures." The tragic consequences of economic collapse into depression are a grim reality to those who experienced the bitter 1930's, and we want no more of that.

As to the efficacy of the prescription offered by Mr. Truman to treat the economic fever which now racks our people, there is ample room for doubt. Nonetheless, the duty of Congress to deal with the situation honestly, emphatically, and without political finagling is exigent. If the Congress can devise and enact a better legislative program than that offered by the President it should do so.

It is too bad that the administration and/or Congress not only failed 2 years ago to take reasonable steps against inflation recommended by the Committee for Economic Development, but actually went counter to some of the most important of those recommendations.

This committee, a group of able and experienced executives and economists, stated seven essential requirements. They were:

1. Efforts of management, labor, and Government to increase production.

2. Restraint by individuals, acting singly or collectively, in raising prices, wages, and salaries in recognition of the common interest in avoiding a wage-cost-price spiral.

3. Restraint by individuals and businesses in making deferrable expenditures.

4. Restraint by State and local governments in making expenditures not urgently needed.

5. A monetary policy to help prevent further expansion of expendable funds in the hands of the public.

6. A vigorous campaign to sell, and keep sold, Series E and F bonds of small denominations.

7. A vigorous policy to reduce Federal expenditures and maintain sufficient revenues to yield a large excess of receipts over expenditures.

The vital items were: (1) control of wages and prices, (2) a monetary policy to prevent further expansion of expendable funds, (3) maintenance of taxation to reduce the Federal debt.

President Truman wanted a continuance of OPA but did not want to curb wages or the price of farm products. It is less easy to make flat general statements about monetary policy, but it is significant that Marriner S. Eccles, who favored an anti-inflationary curbing of credit, was dismissed from a position of power over the Federal Reserve system. The President pleaded against tax reduction but Congress overrode him.

In short, nothing was done, and a bad situation has become worse. In September 1946, when President Truman transmitted that report to Congress, it would have been painful to put its recommendations into effect. Now it is many times more unpleasant, if indeed it has not become what is cynically termed politically impossible.

NONE WILL BE FOOLED

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to voice my assent to all that has been said in the little time allotted to them by my distinguished colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, which has been charged with handling this piece of legislation.

I hope that if nothing else comes from this special session it will teach the Eighty-first Congress the necessity of stopping the practice of bringing in and attempting to pass legislation under suspension of the rules.

The two most important problems confronting this Congress will have been disposed of by this special session after 80 minutes of discussion, without an opportunity to offer a single amendment, without an opportunity to hear from anyone as to how we could solve these two very important problems.

I will support this measure, but I want everybody to know that none of us think for one moment that this will stop the inflationary spiral or that it may even tend to cut back prices.

It will do nothing of any real consequence to help stop the rise in the cost of living. It will do nothing to help the man, who cannot buy meat for his family today, to buy it.

It may help restrict some in the commercial field from getting credit. It may stop some people from getting luxury items they have no right to buy.

But it will help no one to buy the necessities of life, whether food or clothing, and it will certainly give no housing to the low-income groups.

None will be fooled by this bill. We have not begun to deal with the problems, the solution of which is the duty of this Congress.

STRENGTHEN THE ANTITRUST LAWS TO FIGHT INFLATION

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the administration has demonstrated its incompetency to deal with the subject of inflation in two important respects. First, it has adopted a policy of favoring high farm prices and even cutting farm production to maintain those high prices. The President has failed to use those measures presently enacted into law to control the excess amount of money on the market. The President has advocated to the special session of Congress various other inflationary measures.

Secondly, the administration has advocated price control in such a way that if it were enacted it would ruin the economy.

The administration has not struck at the causes of inflation. Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn this Congress we can strike one telling blow at a basic cause of inflation by passing H. R. 7024, a bill which I introduced on June 19, 1948, to strengthen the antitrust and antimonopoly laws.

Alice-in-Wonderland economics and Government tinkering will not combat high prices. To go back to Government controlled economy at this time without the powerful motives of war for high production would result in America turning into one huge black market, because Americans will not readily submit to dictatorship controls except in war times. Price fixing, which also means wage fixing, can work only with people subdued under a dictatorship. And even a dictator fixing low prices and wages cannot legislate production. There is no use fixing prices when there is little on the shelves to buy except on the black market. If we want Leningrad type of production, we can enact the Government controls advocated by Socialists masquerading as Democrats and thus put the American economy in a Marxian strait-jacket.

But before we adjourn this special session we can hit at a basic cause of our high prices. The issue is production and competition in a market where freedom is maintained versus scarcity and monopoly in a Government-controlled market. The latter method built the pyramids with the whip of tyranny across the backs of slaves. The former method built the United States.

But I have said, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to production we must have competition. We can produce a mountain of products but if the disposal of these products is in the hands of only a few, then the few can control the price and withhold the products from the market place. Recently we have had examples of huge industrial combinations raising the price of consumer goods because there has been no effective competition to bring the price down. There has been such a merger of economic power within the past decade that many of the large enterprises in our cities have, during that period, been merged so as to be controlled from other metropolitan centers. We must return more competition to the American market place. H. R. 7024 is designed to strengthen our antitrust laws and to increase competition. Clever lawyers have gotten around the purpose of the present laws intended to maintain competition. The present laws prevent the buying of the corporate shares of a corporation by a competing corporation, but they do not

prevent a corporation from buying the assets of a competing corporation. And thus the lawyers have found a loophole and the merging of industries in this country during the past few decades has produced such economic giants as United States Steel, that can dictate the price of steel for the United States. The antitrust laws should be strengthened to prevent the merger of such competing corporations. They should also be strengthened to prevent the directors of competing corporations from sitting together on the board of a third corporation. Vertical monopolies should also be given close scrutiny. No private enterprise should be permitted to monopolize a substantial part of our natural resources from the raw material to the finished product.

Our American system needs a market place where freedom is maintained. But that freedom must be maintained with eternal vigilance. Freedom does not mean the freedom to destroy freedom. Freedom of speech does not give a person the liberty to shout "fire" in a theater. Free enterprise does not give a particular industry the liberty to swallow up all competition so as to monopolize the market. That kind of freedom is mere license and is the law of the jungle.

The price of modern technology has been the concentration of economic power in the hands of few men. The Socialist solution is to turn the concentrated power over to the state so that the majority of the workers will get their wages and prices fixed by the all-knowing employer state. The American solution is to prevent the concentration of economic power either in private or state hands. The American system demands hundreds of thousands of free enterprises operating with due regard for the freedom of one another. Thus, Mr. Speaker, we can strike one American blow at the basic cause of high prices by encouraging competition in the market place. If we do not take this step and economic mergers continue, small business will be a thing of the past.

Even as we debate in this House, we have a very wonderful Olympic team representing the United States in London. That team will win the Olympics. I watched the selection of the American Olympic team in Chicago a month ago. It was selected on the basis of keen but fair competition. Keen and fair competition brought out the very best in American athletic effort. That is the American way. We need more of that some competition in American industry.

I beseech the Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, to take favorable action on H. R. 7024 before this special session adjourns.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it necessarily follows that this is a very short bill and does not cover very many subjects.

The contention has been made, and it is not subject to successful contradiction, that the Administration and the Federal Reserve System today have sufficient powers to stabilize the value of the American dollar and the American economy. It would be foolish of us to reenact the powers which they already have to do that job.

They have asked for an increase in reserve requirements. In this bill we have given them an increase in reserve requirements. We have increased the reserve requirements on demand deposits by four percentage points. We have increased the reserve requirements on time deposits by one and one-half percentage points.

It will be recalled that when the bill passed the House Thursday we had increased the reserve requirements three percentage points on demand deposits. The Senate increased that to four percentage points, and if this resolution is adopted we will accept the Senate version. The same thing applies to the action taken on time deposits, which we increased by one percentage point. The Senate increased them by one and one-half percentage points.

As was said the other day, if these powers are judiciously used, then, with the powers which the Federal Reserve and the administration have at the present time, we can stabilize the value of the American dollar, stabilize our economy, and bring prices down.

In respect to consumer-credit controls, the President asked only for the authority to control installment buying. The bills which were introduced by the banking minority member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], and the minority floor leader of the other body, Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, provided only for the continuance of the power to control installment buying.

If there is any criticism that we have not extended the controls more broadly in the consumer-credit field, it lies in the fact that the President has not asked for any broader powers than we are giving him in this bill, and those in charge of his legislative program in the Congress have not asked for any broader powers than we are giving him in this bill.

We do not know, of course, how these powers to control consumer installment buying are going to be administered. The field is rather wide open. But the reason given for the control of consumer credit is that we should decrease the volume of velocity of consumer credit because of the influence which consumer credit has upon prices. If that is the case, the only way that these controls can be effectively used is to control all consumer installment buying—not the consumer installment buying which attends the purchase of a refrigerator or the purchase of a rug or the purchase of an automobile, or the purchase of any other 1 or 2 of 12 commodities, such as were under control when we rescinded the authority last year. So long as anyone can go down to a jewelry store and buy a $300 diamond ring for 50 cents down and 50 cents a month for the rest of their lives, then we are not slowing down the velocity of credit, and we are not reducing the volume of credit.

In order that these controls may be effectively used and they can be effectively used, the whole field of consumer credit should be controlled. Unless the whole field of consumer credit is controlled, under this bill, that is, in the installment field, then we may be assured it is not administration policy to use these controls for the purpose of reducing the volume and the velocity of credit, but instead it is to manage that particular segment of our economy which they bring under such controls.

Therein lies the only danger that I see in that particular phase of the bill.

In this bill the other body has taken out—and by the adoption of this resolution we accept their action—the provision with respect to the increase of the gold reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks.

I think it was a mistake on the part of the Senate to do so, but as was said on this floor, the action to increase the gold reserves is more psychological than anything else, because the reserves at the present time are actually 51 percent and we would have reinstated them at 40 percent.

But I presume because of the discussion had on the floor of the House and because of the debate on this joint resolution, it would and should indicate that it is the policy of government to start now—immediately—with the powers which we are legislating here together with the powers which the President and the Federal Reserve already have to reverse the processes by which money has been made cheap—by which the dollar has been depreciated in value and by which prices have been caused to rise and rise and rise. What America needs today is a reversal of these processes which have made money and credit cheap. We should tighten credit. We should revalue the American dollar. We should stabilize. I think we have a right to call upon the President and the Federal Reserve, when this legislation is passed, to do the job that they should have been doing for the last 2 years. We demand of them today, and I think we have the right to demand of them today, that the President and the Federal Reserve stabilize the value of the American dollar, stabilize our economy, and bring prices down.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

(Senate Joint Resolution 157, as amended, is as follows:)

Resolved, etc., That in order to protect the Nation's monetary, banking, and credit structure, and interstate and foreign commerce, against increased inflationary pressures, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are authorized, notwithstanding the act of August 8, 1947 (Public Law 386, 80th Cong.), to exercise, up to and including June 30, 1949, consumer-credit controls in accordance with and to carry out the purposes of Executive Order No. 8843 (August 9, 1941) insofar as it relates to installment credit.

All the present provisions of section 21 and 27 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (relating to investigations, injunctions, jurisdictions, and other matters), shall be as fully applicable with respect to the exercise by the Board of Governors of consumer installment credit controls as they are now applicable with respect to the exercise by the Securities and Exchange Commission of its functions under that act, and the Board shall have the same powers in the exercise of such consumer installment credit controls as the Commission now has under the said sections.

SEC. 2. Section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the sixth paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion, may by regulation change the requirements as to reserves to be maintained pursuant to this section against demand or time deposits or both (1) by member banks in central reserve cities, or (2) by member banks in reserve cities, or (3) by member banks not in reserve or central reserve cities, or (4) by all member banks; but no such change shall have the effect of requiring any such member bank to maintain a reserve balance against its time deposits in an amount equal to more than 7½ percent thereof, or a reserve balance against its demand deposits in an amount equal to more than 30 percent thereof if such bank is in a central reserve city, 24 percent thereof if in a reserve city, or 18 percent thereof if not in a reserve or central reserve city. No change in reserve requirements made under authority of this paragraph shall continue in effect after June 30, 1949."

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the resolution be passed?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on that.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 337, nays 11, answered "present" 2, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—337

Abbitt	Byrnes, Wis.	Feighan
Abernethy	Camp	Fellows
Albert	Cannon	Fenton
Allen, Calif.	Carroll	Fernandez
Allen, La.	Carson	Fisher
Andersen, H. Carl	Case, N. J.	Flannagan
	Case, S. Dak.	Fletcher
Anderson, Calif.	Celler	Fogarty
Andresen, August H.	Chadwick	Folger
	Chelf	Poole
Andrews, Ala.	Chenoweth	Forand
Angell	Chiperfield	Fuller
Arends	Church	Fulton
Arnold	Clason	Gamble
Auchincloss	Clevenger	Garmatz
Bakewell	Coffin	Gary
Banta	Cole, Kans.	Gathings
Barrett	Cole, Mo.	Gavin
Bates, Mass.	Cole, N. Y.	Gearhart
Battle	Colmer	Gillie
Beckworth	Combs	Goff
Bell	Cooper	Goodwin
Bender	Corbett	Gordon
Bennett, Mich.	Cotton	Gorski
Bennett, Mo.	Crawford	Gossett
Bishop	Crosser	Graham
Blackney	Crow	Granger
Bland	Cunningham	Grant, Ala.
Blatnik	Curtis	Grant, Ind.
Bloom	Dague	Griffiths
Boggs, Del.	Davis, Ga.	Gwinn, N. Y.
Boggs, La.	Davis, Wis.	Hale
Bonner	Dawson, Utah	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Boykin	Deane	Hall, Leonard W.
Bradley	Delaney	Halleck
Bramblett	Devitt	Hand
Brehm	D'Ewart	Hardy
Brooks	Dingell	Harness, Ind.
Brophy	Dondero	Harrison
Brown, Ga.	Donohue	Hart
Brown, Ohio	Doughton	Harvey
Bryson	Durham	Havenner
Buchanan	Eaton	Hays
Buck	Eberharter	Hedrick
Buckley	Ellis	Heffernan
Bulwinkle	Ellsworth	Herter
Burke	Elsaesser	Heselton
Burleson	Elston	Hill
Busbey	Engel, Mich.	Hinshaw
Butler	Engle, Calif.	Hobbs
Byrne, N. Y.	Fallon	Hoeven
Hoffman	McMillan, S. C.	Robertson
Holmes	McMillen, Ill.	Rockwell
Hope	Mack	Rogers, Fla.
Horan	MacKinnon	Rogers, Mass.
Huber	Madden	Rohrbough
Hull	Mahon	Rooney
Jackson, Calif.	Maloney	Ross
Jackson, Wash.	Manasco	Russell
Jarman	Mansfield	Sabath
Javits	Martin, Iowa	Sadlak
Jenison	Merrow	St. George
Jenkins, Ohio	Meyer	Sanborn
Jensen	Michener	Sarbacher
Johnson, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Sasscer
Johnson, Ill.	Miller, Conn.	Schwabe, Okla.
Johnson, Okla.	Miller, Md.	Scott, Hardie
Jones, Ala.	Miller, Nebr.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Jones, N. C.	Mills	Scrivner
Jones, Wash.	Mitchell	Seely-Brown
Jonkman	Monroney	Short
Judd	Morgan	Sikes
Karsten, Mo.	Morris	Simpson, Ill.
Kean	Morrison	Simpson, Pa.
Kearney	Morton	Smathers
Kearns	Muhlenberg	Smith, Maine
Keating	Multer	Smith, Wis.
Kee	Mundt	Snyder
Keefe	Murray, Wis.	Somers
Kelley	Nicholson	Stanley
Kerr	Nixon	Stefan
Kersten, Wis.	Nodar	Stevenson
Kilburn	Norblad	Stratton
Kilday	O'Brien	Taber
King	O'Hara	Talle
Kirwan	O'Toole	Taylor
Knutson	Pace	Teague
Kunkel	Passman	Thomas, Tex.
Landis	Patterson	Thompson
Lane	Peden	Tibbott
Lanham	Peterson	Tollefson
Larcade	Philbin	Towe
Latham	Phillips, Calif.	Twyman
Lea	Pickett	Van Zandt
LeCompte	Ploeser	Vinson
LeFevre	Plumley	Vorys
Lemke	Posge	Vursell
Lewis, Ky.	Potter	Wadsworth
Lewis, Ohio	Potts	Walter
Lichtenwalter	Poulson	Welchel
Lodge	Preston	Welch
Love	Price, Fla.	West
Lusk	Price, Ill.	Wheeler
Lyle	Rains	Whitten
Lynch	Ramey	Whittington
McConnell	Rayburn	Wigglesworth
McCowen	Reed, Ill.	Williams
McCulloch	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Ind.
McDonough	Rees	Winstead
McDowell	Reeves	Wolcott
McGarvey	Rich	Wolverton
McGregor	Riehlman	Woodruff
	Rivers	Youngblood
	Ribley	

NAYS—11

Buffett	Patman	Smith, Ohio
Douglas	Rankin	Wilson, Tex.
Hagen	Sadowski	Worley
Holifield	Schwabe, Mo.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Isacson Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—79

Allen, Ill.	Gross	Norrell
Andrews, N. Y.	Gwynne, Iowa	Norton
Barden	Harless, Ariz.	O'Konski
Bates, Ky.	Harris	Pfeifer
Beall	Hartley	Phillips, Tenn.
Bolton	Hébert	Powell
Canfield	Hendricks	Priest
Chapman	Hess	Redden
Clark	Jenkins, Pa.	Regan
Clippinger	Jennings	Richards
Cooley	Johnson, Tex.	Riley
Coudert	Kefauver	Scoblick
Courtney	Kennedy	Shafer
Cox	Keogh	Sheppard
Cravens	Klein	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Smith, Va.
Dawson, Ill.	Lucas	Spence
Dirksen	Ludlow	Stigler
Dolliver	McCormack	Stockman
Domengeaux	McMahon	Sundstrom
Dorn	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	Mason	Trimble
Evins	Mathews	Vail
Gallagher	Meade, Ky.	Whitaker
Gillette	Meade, Md.	Wood
Gore	Murdock	
Gregory	Murray, Tenn.	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Cox.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Redden.
Mr. Canfield with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Norrell.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Gillette with Mr. Domengeaux.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Jennings with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Vail with Mr. Whitaker.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. Cravens.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Priest.
Mr. Mathews with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Beall with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Kline.
Mr. Hess with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. McMahon with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Gregory.
Mr. Shafer with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Sundstrom with Mr. Harless of Arizona.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Murdock.
Mr. Mason with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Stockman with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Smith of Kansas with Mr. Gore.
Mr. Gwynne of Iowa with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Phillips of Tennessee with Mr. Powell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and communications.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will there be an opportunity later on for Members to make extended remarks on the floor of the House?

The SPEAKER. That would not be in order, until after the disposition of the business of the House at the end of the legislative day. It was not the purpose of the leadership to have extended debate after that.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask unanimous consent, then, although I do not want to upset the program of the leadership, to address the House for 15 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper articles.

REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGH PRICES

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include some editorial comment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the following potent excerpts, all from the editorial page of the Detroit News of Thursday, July 29, with timely and pertinent comments by W. K. Kelsey, have a bearing upon the editorial, "Prices Then and Now."

The editorial of this same issue is factual, not political, and as such cannot be challenged. The comments anent the many unsolved problems, the neglect of which is chargeable directly and solely to the Republicans now in control of both Houses of Congress and to no one else, cannot be denied or laughed off any more.

Indeed, only a few months ago—on February 5, 1948, a ranking Republican Member of the other body proudly told the Middle Atlantic Lumbermen's Association:

I do not need to remind the membership of this association that it was the Republican leadership in the Senate and the House that was responsible for ending OPA.

Nor can the Republican Party escape this responsibility by senseless shibboleths of Republican leaders that all that is wrong today is due to "a fundamental difference in Government philosophy" between the Congress and the President. On June 6, 1946, when he was actively working to kill OPA, Senator WHERRY said over the radio:

We are perfectly willing to rest our case with the housewife, the farmer, and the laborer of America. I ask of each of these groups, Can we, who have been raised to expect meat and bread upon our table—who have accepted as our free heritage a living standard second to none—live on statistics and propaganda?

The answer of the American people next November will be, "No, Senator, give us the bread and meat you promised—not statistics and propaganda. We must give President Truman the cooperation of a Democratic Congress."

The victims of inflation and of the superhigh prices suffer want and privation because of the accelerated rise of prices which will continue their devastating upward spiral until stopped by courageous and drastic congressional action. There is no other prospect for relief. The pensioner, the poor, and the fixed-income group will be ground deeper into the dust of desperation unless we act before we adjourn. The Republicans must accept President Truman's recommendations, since they submit none of their own.

There is one thing the people know and remember. It is an undeniable fact that under OPA even during wartime, under conditions not comparable by a great margin with the nearer normal conditions of today, prices were lower—infinitely lower. The price controls held the line and even though goods were scarcer, the rise in price was remarkably small. Even in the black market, which constituted a fraction of the available volume, prices were lower by far than legitimate prices being paid today. Yet the Republicans 2 years ago promised plenitude in 60 days after repeal of OPA and that prices would find their normal lower level in the same length of time. They were elected by this deceitful promise, spiked with their slogan: "Had enough?" Well it seems to me, inasmuch as the price dam has broken and we are now being engulfed by record prices 100 to 200 percent higher than under OPA, which have rationed Mr. Average Citizen not only out of the line in which he stood under OPA but completely out of the market, that now is the time to revive and reverse the slogan the Republicans would like to forget: Have you had enough? Then vote in your own self-defense to bring prices down, build more and cheaper homes, provide relief for social-security beneficiaries, widows, dependent children, old-age pensioners, and others equally deserving—something which can be done without inflation. We can give aid to education, raise the minimum wage level from 40 cents per hour to 75 cents, raise the health standard of the Nation by giving the people a sound and permanent health insurance plan—not "socialized medicine" as the reactionaries and enemies who want to make permanent the pauper system would have you believe.

The clippings, quotations, and the editorial speak in support of my philosophy of government and of its responsibility toward the people more eloquently and without flavor of partisanship or politics than I could, try as hard as I might.

They are worthy of preservation in the RECORD. They are food for thought, and I commend them to you for your perusal:

PRICES THEN AND NOW

Republican leaders in Congress should remember that, faults of OPA's former controls admitted, it did hold prices in check. Compare present Detroit prices of key necessities with those when, in 1946, controls came off.

Steaks: From 55 cents a pound for the best, 45 cents for rounds—up to $1.50 and $1.

Pork: From 34 cents for chops and 42 cents for bacon—up to from 85 to 95 cents for either.

Coal: Average soft, from $11 in 1946 to $17.25 a ton now. (Same cost $8 in 1944.)

Gasoline (regular): From 19 cents in July 1946 to 25.6 cents a gallon now.

Bread: Average loaves through the war and until controls came off, 11 and 12 cents—up to 18 and 21 cents.

The story of manufactured things, automobiles particularly, corresponds.

The intricate argument about who really killed this Cock Robin is simply wearisome evasion. That a chief role in killing OPA was played by the GOP Congress cannot be denied.

For desperate situations, desperate remedies.

THEY LEAVE IT TO THE VOTERS

Assuming the cost of living will be the chief campaign issue, insofar as President Truman can contrive it, the point of main interest in the reply of Republican congressional leaders to his message is their decision in this regard to stand on the record.

They not merely have again rejected Mr. Truman's demand for revived rationing and price control, but have pitched their rejection on the note of political and economic principle. The principle, they announce, they are quite willing to submit to the judgment of voters in the approaching election.

It is a bold course they have chosen. It leaves no convenient avenues of retreat in the event that circumstances, as the campaign progresses, should counsel some less stiff-necked attitude on the price problem.

The Congressmen have left Governor Dewey, whose own attitude on the question remains undisclosed, small room for maneuver should he desire it.

Yet the position taken, whether wisely or unwisely, must evoke admiration for its frank honesty.

Congressional leaders trace the President's quarrel with the Eightieth Congress, on this and other matters, to "a fundamental difference in government philosophy."

"The President," they wrote, "would fix wages, fix prices, expand Government spending, increase Federal taxes, socialize and nationalize medicine and generally regiment the life of every family, as well as agriculture, labor, and industry. • • •

"The Congress believes that progress must be made and all our problems solved within the principles of liberty, equality and justice to all men, which guided this country for 150 years. • • •

"The only way this fundamental difference can be resolved is by vote of the people at the November election."

Further on, the congressional leaders applied their credo specifically to the price problem, with the assertion that Government controls "would only make the situation worse." They would "create black markets and check the increase in production which is the only ultimate solution."

The ultimate truth of that last observation is no more to be challenged than the courage-inspiring insistence that Government's role in the recovery of price stability must be the traditionally passive one. Politically, however, the choice of this proposition, thus stated, as the one to take to the people, may be less widely admired.

It may be questioned, if living costs continue to mount from now to November 2, that ultimate solutions will satisfy an impatient and possibly angry electorate. Governor Dewey, one suspects, would have welcomed being left a little more latitude to adapt his campaign to circumstances as they arise.

MORE TO BE DONE

The cooperation promised by the Lake Carriers Association to reduce the contribution to Detroit's smoke nuisance by vessels passing through the river is very welcome.

The spirit displayed by the vessel owners is no less to be appreciated because cooperation could be forced, if necessary.

Now, if something could be done to dissuade vessel crews from discharging ash and oily wastes into the river and St. Clair Channel, contrary to law, Detroit would be still more grateful. In swimming is the last place where a citizen expects to get a cinder in his eye; but, as matters stand—or float, it can happen here, and frequently does.

THE COMMENTATOR

OVERCONFIDENCE PLAGUES THE GOP

(By W. K. Kelsey)

The Republican leaders are afflicted with an after-convention hang-over. At Philadelphia they assured one another that the November election was in the bag; that President Truman, who would certainly be renominated, was a dead pigeon; that the Dewey-Warren ticket was a 100-to-1 shot to succeed, and that little need be done but raise a huge campaign fund to distribute

among the loyal shirkers, and then wait for the day of the inevitable victory.

This mood persists. It has not been jolted by the President's call of a special session of Congress, nor by the long program of work required to be done which he has outlined. Therefore the Republicans in control plan to do approximately nothing, believing that the great majority of the voters will sanction this decision.

That remains to be seen. In the commentator's opinion, a quick adjournment without even an attempt to answer the President's challenge, is a gamble that is unjustified by present conditions, and is likely to become still less justified before November 2. If the Republican Congress now refuses even to try to enact what it has promised in its platform, the obvious conclusion to which people are entitled to jump is that it has little intention of carrying out its pledges if the party is installed in complete power next year.

The President is accused of playing politics. Certainly he is playing politics. Who, in his position, would not? He is playing the smartest kind of politics. He is putting the Republican Party in the wrong, and the Republican policy is to let him get away with it. If that is smart politics on the Republican side the commentator has spent half a century of political study in vain.

LEAVING THE JOB UNCOMPLETED

President Truman might have pointed out in his message that the job of a Member of Congress has come, in recent years, to be almost full time, and therefore there is no justification for an adjournment when important measures have been enacted by one House and sent to the other for action.

This is especially true when a new Congress must start all over on these bills. They then become new legislation, subject to the regular procedure of committee hearings, reports, getting them to the floor, debating them, passing them, sending them from one House to the other, going through the same process in the second House, sending them to a conference committee in case of disagreement, and final passage. A great deal of this work is time-wasting duplication on bills that have already been studied and passed by one House.

The Seventy-sixth Congress sat 625 days; the Seventy-seventh, 711 days; the Seventy-eighth, 695 days; the preceding Congress, 554 days. The present Congress sat 351 days last year, then quit in June to attend the conventions, leaving a large amount of work nearing completion and a still larger amount ready for action but for the time limit imposed by the adjournment agreement. To shirk this work is to fail to protect the national interests. The President has given Congress an opportunity to make good. Apparently it intends to offer not even a gesture. It will do its best to provide a filibuster, and then adjourn.

The President has asked for various price-control measures. Why not enact all of them, since the Republicans are so sure they won't work? That would throw the responsibility on Mr. Truman. He has asked for a Federal housing measure. Why not enact it, if the Republicans believe it would send building costs sky high? The onus would be on the President. Moreover, to leave the situation as it is does not provide homes for GI men, except those who take over houses abandoned by the more fortunate who can afford new, high-priced dwellings.

Besides, if the Republicans know the answers, they could develop them in the special session, instead of waiting until next year.

WHAT THE PEOPLE CAN INFER

It is no excuse at all to say that the President has heaved at Congress a program so huge that it cannot possibly undertake it in the special session.

What Mr. Truman has done is to demand immediate legislation on several matters, pointing out at the same time other things that need to be done. He has emphasized his previous accusation that this is a do-nothing Congress, that has quit an unfinished job to take a rest and then campaign for reelection. The charge is true. The inference, which the people should be quick to discover, is that this Republican-controlled Congress does not want the job of doing the things needed, and therefore another Republican-controlled Congress will be equally unwilling to do them.

So what fools we shall be if, desiring lower prices, slum clearance, homes for the not-so-well-off, a better break for pensioners, more and cheaper electric power, better schools, and the rest of the multitude of things enumerated by the President, we vote the Republican ticket.

Logically, the least Republicans can do is clear out the riffraff in the House of Representatives, and replace them with persons who really believe in the platform promises of their party.

CONGRESSIONAL ECONOMIC STUDY COMMITTEE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Resolution 714, to create a Congressional Economic Study Committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas problems of economic and social character left unsolved by the break-down of the London Economic Conference in 1933 continue to plague the world; and

Whereas those problems were accentuated by the destruction of property, the dislocation of peoples and the loss of production incident to World War II; and

Whereas there exists in the United States, as in other countries, grave problems of supply and demand in relation to commodities, prices and wages requiring basic adjustments which can be obtained only by a program or programs based upon careful and impartial studies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Congressional Economic Study Committee composed of 10 members with 5 special consultants to be named as follows:

Ten members from the House of Representatives to be named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Five persons from civilian life eminently qualified to assist in solving problems in the fields of finance, labor, industry, or agriculture and familiar with the problems of the consuming public to be named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be invited to work with the committee as special consultants and to be compensated as hereinafter provided.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall designate one member of the committee as chairman and another member as vice chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to make a study of (1) economic maladjustments which it believes are contributing to undesirable levels of prices, wages, and supplies of commodities in the United States or places where the United States has a special responsibility for economic conditions; (2) measures which in the committee's judgment might contribute to an improvement or solution of such economic problems; (3) and to consider and evaluate any reports on economic conditions submitted to the Congress by the executive branch of the Government during the life of the committee. The committee may well study, but is not limited to, any economic situations arising out of money supply and monetary relationships in this and other countries.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk thereof if the Congress is not in session) from time to time as it shall deem appropriate, but finally not later than January 3, 1949.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress and until the date of its final report at such times and places as it deems advisable, whether or not the Congress is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel and such special assistants, to hold such hearings, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Reports of its activities may be made public from time to time but its conclusions and recommendations shall be reserved for its reports to Congress as above provided.

Members of the committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the committee. The five special consultants to the committee and whose other relationships to the Federal Government do not prevent shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the committee plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I knew nothing about any such resolution as this coming up. Nobody has even hinted anything about it to me. I do not know what is in this resolution. I do not know whether it overlaps any other investigating committees. I do not know whether it is something that would be helpful to the country or whether it is another -around-the-world- junket or something like that. I would like to have this resolution laid aside for a little while until I can find out what it is.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am willing to accede to the gentleman's request, if that be helpful. However, I thought that perhaps if the author of the resolution, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is given an opportunity to explain it, in the time which I expect to yield to him, that we might expedite matters.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman might withdraw his motion and have a discussion with the minority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, under a unanimous-consent request, anybody can call up anything that the Speaker will recognize him for. But I think somebody

ought to be told when important matters like this are coming up.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to move that further consideration of this resolution be laid aside until 6:30?

The SPEAKER. It may be reserved until 6:30, and at that time the gentleman can renew his request.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution be deferred until such time as a renewal of the motion may be made, in order to permit an opportunity for discussion.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think that is much better than a specific time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Why not allow the Members who desire to make speeches make them now?

The SPEAKER. No. The Chair has ruled during the day that such matters will have to go over until after the legislative business of the day is completed. If the gentleman is going to make any speeches he is going to do it after the calendar business has been disposed of.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the Speaker.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 7 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m. by the Speaker.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution making appropriation for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

APPROPRIATION FOR HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY AND THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 445, making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration, with amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

"The appropriation of $2,000,000 for the Displaced Persons Commission in the 'Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948,' (Public Law 785, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) may be apportioned for obligation and expenditure during the first three quarters of the fiscal year 1949."

Page 1, after line 7, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"The amount made available under this head in The Government Corporations Appropriations Act, 1949, for administrative expenses for the Office of the Administrator, is increased from $750,000 to $1,050,000."

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Page 1, strike out line 10 and insert "Federal Housing Administration."

Page 1, line 12, after "expenses" insert "of the Federal Housing Administration."

Page 1, line 15, strike out "($2,400,000)" and insert "$2,100,000."

Page 2, line 4 after "year" insert "; and the sources of funds for such administrative expenses shall include the Housing Investment Insurance Fund created by the Housing Act of 1948."

Page 2 after line 12 insert:

"MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

"Section 6 of Public Law 880 Eightieth Congress second session 'An act to create a Commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers' is hereby amended by striking out the words 'six months' in said section and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'nine months.'

"Section 13 of said act is amended by striking out the words 'six months' period' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'nine months' period.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. TABER)?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take for granted it is the purpose of the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, to move that the House concur in full in the Senate amendments.

Mr. TABER. That is it exactly.

Mr. CANNON. I trust the gentleman will explain the Senate amendments, in which we are asked to concur, and their effect upon the resolution as it passed the House.

Mr. TABER. The amendments are these in effect. I will not go into the technical amendments, but just in substance.

The first one, providing $2,000,000 for the Displaced Persons Commission, having to do with the admission of persons under the so-called Displaced Persons Act, was provided for that purpose by the House. This language provides that instead of being obligated in 12 months, it may be obligated in the first 9 months of the fiscal year.

The second amendment relates to the housing situation.

We provided $2,400,000 for administrative expenses generally.

The Senate, in effect, segregates $300,000 of that for the administrative expenses in the Administrator's office and $2,100,000 in the field, the over-all amount being the same.

The third item—there are more amendments, but the rest are all technical—the third item provides that the bill providing for the presentation of claims for losses by motor carriers whose property was seized during the war may be presented in 9 months from July 3, 1948, instead of 6 months as the act authorized when passed.

These are the three.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is any of this amount appropriated for these motor carriers' claims?

Mr. TABER. No; but they can be filed, and about all that could be done with them anyway would be for them to be filed during the period between now and January 1. Then a commission would be appointed and the consideration of the claims begun and the claims disposed of promptly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I cannot understand and I do not believe the Membership of the House can understand why an appropriation bill should carry a proposition of substantive law which allows these motor carrier claims to be brought before the Congress when the courts have already decided this question. The courts have decided the question, yet now in an appropriation bill you are enacting substantive law to give an advantage to motor carriers whose claims have already been decided by the courts of the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may be under a little misapprehension. The basic law created a commission which could receive these claims. The commission would have to investigate them and make a recommendation to the Congress before any appropriation whatsoever could be made.

There is no appropriation in the bill.

The only occasion for this extension of time for the filing of the claims is that the original act was signed on the 2d of July. That act provided that the claims had to be filed within 6 months after that time. In view of the fact that that bill was passed in the closing hours of the second session no appropriation was made for the operation of the commission. Since no appropriation has been made the commission might not be created and might not be functioning by the 2d of January; and the language in the Senate amendment merely provides that claims may be filed up until the 3d of April, the 9-month anniversary, rather than the 6-month anniversary of July 2. That would give the Congress an opportunity to consider an appropriation for the administrative expenses of the Commission when it meets in January.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether or not responsibility can be placed for this special legislation for motor carriers, classing it as emergency legislation which this Congress has been called into special session to enact. Now, this is special legislation for a particular class of claims. The leadership has allowed, Mr. Speaker, this special class of claims to be classified under emergency legislation which the Congress is called upon to enact at 15 minutes to 8, daylight saving time, Saturday, August 7, 1948, which is within a few minutes of adjournment. If we are going to legislate, Mr. Speaker, on emergency legislation in this session, I do not think it is proper to bring in this special plea from special pleaders for these motor carriers. The courts have already defined the laws of the United States in this matter. Yet here we are passing special legislation in their behalf. If that is what we are here for in this session, it is all right, but I would like the RECORD to show it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it is apparent from a reading of the Senate amendments and from the explanation made by the gentleman from New York that there is no additional appropriation over the amount provided by the House. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON. In other words, these amendments are largely innocuous. Summing up the whole matter there is no advantage and no disadvantage in them. It is largely a matter of allocation.

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in withdrawing my reservation of objection, may I say it is to be regretted that the Senate did not add some amendments which would have provided for additional items which should have been included in this bill. It is especially to be regretted that it does not provide funds to effectuate the War Claims Commission Act and other matters similarly urgent. But under the circumstances, at this late hour, I withdraw my reservation and shall support the bill as inadequate as it is.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL MILEAGE OF MEMBERS

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Resolution 715.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to pay to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives not to exceed $171,000 out of funds appropriated under the head "Contingent expenses of the House," fiscal year 1949, for additional mileage of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, at the rate authorized by law.

SEC. 2. That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to pay to Walter K. Granger, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of Wilson versus Granger, as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $2,000, to be disbursed out of funds appropriated under the head "Contingent expenses of the House," fiscal year 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this special session of the Congress has produced a few—but very few—useful results. The majority leadership in this body has refused to face up to its full responsibilities in combatting inflation and lack of housing. Too much time has been spent talking; too much time has been spent acting; and not enough time has been spent legislating in behalf of the people.

We have enacted some legislation to control credit; some legislation in behalf of housing; and legislation to lend the United Nations $65,000,000 to build its permanent home in New York City.

We have failed utterly to consider the problem of high food prices. We have thus failed to come to grips with the single most disturbing element in the present situation. We have failed to consider the O'Mahoney-Mansfield bill, H. R. 7076, which would force a cooling-off period for great corporations for 30 days in which to justify price raises before the Federal Trade Commission. Rather than face up to these serious questions we are going to adjourn and go home. The consequences of this lack of action on a full-scale attack against the high cost of living may be tragic for the American people.

This Congress should know that if inflation is not controlled, deflation will follow and a depression will set in. If this happens—and the chances are very much in favor of it—we will face a condition in this country far more serious than the depression of the 1930's. With a domestic depression will come a breakdown in our foreign policy. The U. S. S. R. has been looking forward to an American depression to further the ideology of communism here, to break up the Marshall plan, and to take over western Europe. It is their contention that a depression here will revive isolationism in this country to such an extent that we will refuse help to rehabilitate Europe and will pull up stakes and withdraw entirely from there and Asia as well. If a depression comes, how many Americans will care whether we stay in Berlin, in Germany, in Korea, and in Japan?

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not fear the atomic bomb because it believes a depression here will mark the beginning of the end of our system. It is the duty of this Congress to see to it that a depression does not occur and to do this certain steps are necessary.

We should stay in continuous session to consider and devise means to strengthen the American economy, to lower prices, and to give hope to our people. What we have done so far in this special session is little indeed. We should recognize that a depression here will affect the free peoples of the world and create a situation which will be disastrous for all of us. The people of the world, as well as our own people, are watching us to see what we will do because, in a sense, democracy is on trial. The question they are asking is this: Is a free society capable of the self-control and unselfishness necessary for its own survival? The answer lies in our own hands and will be of the majority's choosing. It is my prayer that even now we will rise above party considerations, get down to business, and stay in session and do the kind of a job we must do to stabilize the American economy and give hope to our people and the people of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I shall demand the yeas and nays to record my opposition to this Congress going home without really tackling the high cost of living and I will oppose the adjournment of this Congress because we have failed in our full duty to the American people.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk House Concurrent Resolution 222 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, August 7, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAYBURN) there were—yeas, 236, noes 56.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 223) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses

until December 31, 1948, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING THE NATION'S ECONOMY AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the language of the House amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures, as amended by the Senate, may be printed in the RECORD immediately preceding the roll call on the adoption of the resolution with reference thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENTS OF COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress until December 31, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of clarification, may I ask whether or not a Member can today insert a speech in the body of the RECORD, under the terms of the request?

The SPEAKER. Not under the terms of the request, but if the gentleman wishes to make such a request the Chair will be glad to recognize him for that purpose immediately after this request is granted.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HAS GOVERNOR DEWEY SURRENDERED THE LEADERSHIP OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WITHOUT A FIGHT?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the floor of the House I raised the question that remains the enigma of this special session of the Eightieth Congress. I refer, of course, to the inexplicable absence of the influence of Governor Dewey upon the Republican leaders in the Congress. President Truman on July 27 suggested a legislative program of the highest priority to stop the rising cost of living and to build homes for the people who need them. He also suggested a number of other problems—some of them related to the anti-inflation program—and still others upon which he requested consideration to the extent possible without interference with the legislation on housing and high prices.

It is significant that the Republican platform, which Governor Dewey has described as "a magnificent statement of principles, I proudly support it," referred to a number of the subjects upon which President Truman implored the Congress to take action in this special session.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

On this subject of the Republican platform pledges:

An attack upon the basic causes of inflation, including the following measures: Progressive reduction of the cost of Government through elimination of waste; stimulation of production as the surest way to lower prices; fiscal policies to provide increased incentive for production and thrift; sound currency; reduction of the public debt.

Mr. Speaker, what has been the record of the Republican Eightieth Congress both in the regular and in the special session on such "measures"? According to the most reliable statistics available, the net reductions by the second session of the Eightieth Congress through June 20, 1948, in all specific requests submitted by the President was $1,008,031,936. It has been estimated that the passage of the tax reduction bill over the President's veto will require increased expenditures for tax refunds in fiscal year 1949, in the amount of $687,000,000. For all practical purposes, therefore, despite pledges of hard-headed economy in Government, the Republicans have been unable to cut down more than a trifle the Budget that President Truman and his Cabinet had already slashed to the bone. So, the Republicans, despite their platform, have made no "progressive reduction on the cost of Government."

The majority would also stimulate production "as the surest way to lower prices." Mr. Speaker, this sounds like the advertisements of the National Association of Manufacturers in 1946 in their hate-campaign against OPA. I am sure we will not soon forget the Republican NAM promise "If OPA is discontinued, the production of goods will rise rapidly and, through free competition, prices will quickly adjust themselves to levels that consumers are willing to pay." The other Republican platform promises for "an attack on the basic causes of inflation" include sound fiscal policies, sound currency, and debt reduction—all of which have been made infinitely more difficult, if not impossible, by the Republican tax-reduction bill which has wiped out the surplus for the current fiscal year at a time when our national income is the history in history. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has rejected not only the anti-inflation program of President Truman, but also the vague and innocuous Republican platform pledges which Governor Dewey found so magnificent. If he has supported these magnificent principles during the special session of Congress, his support has been well-nigh invisible.

HOUSING

On this subject the Republican platform is a bit more honest. It suggests that "Government can and should encourage the building of better homes at less cost," but recommends Federal aid "for local slum clearance and low-rental housing programs only where there is a need that cannot be met either by private enterprise or by the States and localities." On the other hand, President Truman has called for the enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill as the only direct and adequate solution of the housing shortage. But here Candidate Dewey, the Republican platform, and even the distinguished Republican coauthor of the T-E-W housing bill have bowed to the Old Guard in control of the Eightieth Congress.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

President Truman warned the Congress: "Children in our schools, and the men and women who teach there, have been the victims of inflation," and he called upon the Congress to provide Federal assistance to the States in meeting the present crisis in education. The fate of this proposal at the Republican National Convention was remarkably prophetic of the disposition by the Eightieth Congress of this urgent appeal. The tentative text of the Republican platform, prepared by a drafting subcommittee, did contain the following proposal: "We favor Federal aid to the States on a just basis to increase educational opportunities without Federal control." This tentative plank proved too strong for the full resolutions committee, and was deleted from the platform. This deletion, of course, is strictly in line with the reported attitude of Governor Dewey toward the teachers of the country.

MINIMUM WAGES

The closest the Republican platform came to a discussion of minimum wage legislation was the bold assertion that "there must be decent legislation and decent wages." President Truman has stressed repeatedly how pitifully inadequate is the present minimum-wage law in the face of today's high prices. Yet we find the very moderate proposal to raise minimum wages to 75 cents an hour too unpalatable for the Republican leaders in Congress. And Governor Dewey has refused to urge action at this special session.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Other victims of inflation for whom the President urged Congress to take action are the 2,000,000 people who depend upon social-security benefits. Even the Republican platform called for "an increase of the benefits to a more realistic level," but the only action of the Republican Eightieth Congress, despite all of its promises and despite all the talk to the contrary, has been to do not one thing about raising the moderate level of benefits set back in 1939, and to deprive of even these benefits nearly a million workers and their families whom the Supreme Court held were given coverage by a Democratic Congress back in 1935.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Displaced Persons Act, passed in the closing days of the regular session, was signed reluctantly by President Truman because of its discrimination against some displaced persons on the ground of religion, land of origin, or occupation. The President reminded the Congress on July 27:

These provisions are contrary to all American ideals. This act should be promptly amended to wipe out this discrimination.

According to the press of yesterday and today, Governor Dewey shares President Truman's views regarding the Republican Displaced Persons Act. A Republican Member of the other body announced that Governor Dewey had asked revision of the law, but stated that no action would be forthcoming during the present session of Congress.

Now it may be, Mr. Speaker, that Governor Dewey's experience on displaced-persons legislation suggested the wisdom to him of remaining silent on all these other great issues. If he cannot lead his party on the question of displaced-persons legislation, then how could he hope to be an influence on the critical problems of housing and inflation? If Governor Dewey is so impotent in the formulation of Republican policy, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fortunate that this fact has been revealed to the American people before next November, rather than afterward.

PUBLIC POWER

One of the most significant changes made by the Republican platform committee in the draft prepared by its subcommittee at Philadelphia was the deletion of a pledge of "adequate appropriations" for the progressive development of the Nation's water power resources. The people of the great Northwest, and of the entire country, should know that this action at the Republican national convention, which received the blessings of Governor Dewey, is strictly in accord with the failure of the Republican Eightieth Congress to provide adequate appropriations for the implementation of our national electric power policy. Governor Dewey has not asked Congress to do anything to restore the appropriations for the TVA steam plant and for other projects, the lack of which may delay the production of power for more than a year. As in all these other important areas of Federal activity, a page of legislation is worth a million times all the promises that could ever be assembled for a Republican platform.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. Speaker, there is very little difference between the Republican and Democratic platform on this question, but it is crystal clear that the Republican leadership in the Congress abandoned principle to use the anti-poll-tax legislation as a cloak for their inactivity on the pressing problems of prices and housing.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to cover briefly the subjects upon which President Truman called for action at the special session of this Republican Eightieth Congress. I have tried to point out that the Republican platform pledged the party to a position on most of these issues. I have also pointed out that Governor Dewey, as the defeated Republican candidate in 1944 and as the party nominee for President in 1948, has specifically bound himself to the pledges in the Republican platform. Yet, Mr. Speaker, except for the displaced persons discrimination, Governor Dewey has done nothing to try to obtain action at this current session on these Republican promises. It is clear that either Governor Dewey has abdicated his leadership of the Republican Party or he has rejected, by his very inaction, the principles to which he committed himself in his acceptance speech at Philadelphia. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, where is Governor Dewey? Where does he stand? Is he going to try to lead the Republican Party? Why hasn't he spoken out on behalf of his views at this special session? The American people are entitled to know.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF HEROIC SERVICE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in this final hour of the Eightieth Congress, may I be privileged to relate to the House an inspiring chapter of heroism taken from recent history of the Detroit police department. This is not the first example of courage and of devotion to service, nor is it the last. The annals of the department are replete with examples of selflessness and of sacrifice for the people of Detroit.

The story surrounding the heroism of Casimer W. Kaliszewski, Jr., however, is different. A probationary officer, a "rookie" of scarcely 22 years of age, he displayed the stuff of which heroes are made. He has the heart of a lion and the spirit which is natural in his family and which is the motivating impulse of the Detroit police force.

Casimer, Jr., a worthy son of a noble sire, was endowed with forthrightness and courage by his equally brave and honest father who, 23 years ago, set the pattern in exemplary service for his posthumous son when he gave his all for the people of Detroit and for the uniform which he respected.

"Giving your all" is not an outcropping of individual bravery—it is traditional with the entire Detroit police force. It is a priceless heritage passed on as in this instance from a heroic father to an equally brave and worthy son. It permeates to a marked degree the entire body of the men in blue.

Once before, Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to extoll the virtues of a brave lad who perished in the continuous war against the depraved thug and bandit.

Somewhere along the line of demarcation between life and death the young police officer battles bravely for survival bolstered by the love and the devotion of two spartanlike women. One, the young wife who but a few months ago was his smiling happy bride; the other, his mother for whom this vigil is a second journey which it is hoped might terminate short of Golgotha.

The prayers of these faithful women joined in a chorus of the citizens of all Detroit pour forth before the throne of the Almighty God to stay the heavenly call so that Casimer W. Kaliszewski, Jr., might live to serve as an inspiration to the rookies of tomorrow and to put fear into the criminal hearts of all evildoers who by the words of Commissioner Harry S. Toy face retribution for a certainty.

In his orders to the police force, the commissioner stated, "This is a case that must be cleaned up—and fast," and again he added, "This boy's father was killed while he was on duty and we can't let the son down." The entire force is on its toes; the scoundrel will not evade the dragnet; he will be caught and with his henchmen, if there be any, brought to justice.

Thus closes my brief and totally inadequate narrative covering the other side of another story on the police blotter—a story of heroism, service, and devotion, written in the blood of the men in police uniforms—these men of courage, who risk the happiness of their own families and their lives for the sake of the community.

While man for man the Detroit police force is the equal of any in the world, no force is stronger or more effective than the public sentiment by which it is sustained. Public support of the police, both moral and financial, in all the good work of the department is essential to the well-being and morale of the entire force. Such wholehearted support will redound to the credit and the safety of the entire community. These foul and cowardly attacks upon the police will be eliminated or at least curbed by the moral force of an aroused and united citizenry.

Casimer W. Kaliszewski, Jr., like his heroic father who paid the price before him, is a symbol of faithfulness and courage which must be sustained by a grateful people lest such sacrifice be made in vain.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on official business when the roll call was ordered on H. R. 6959, the Housing Act of 1948. I am and have been in favor of this legislation and would have voted for it had I been present.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the adjournment of the House until Friday, December 31, 1948, by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations, may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the Eightieth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 716) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to Congress, pursuant to section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945 (56 Stat. 6), and the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597), after the adjournment of the 80th Congress, shall be printed as House documents of the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

AUGUST 7, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the standing Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Respectfully,

CARL ALBERT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

AUGUST 7, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture to take effect today.

Sincerely yours,

PRESTON E. PEDEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 717) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee on Agriculture.

The resolution was agreed to.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 222. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the two Houses of Congress until December 31, 1948; and

H. Con. Res. 223. Concurrent resolution authorizing the signing of enrolled bills following adjournment.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6959. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 239. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6959. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The House stands adjourned pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 222.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 222, the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1718. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $100,000 and an authorization in the amount of $3,450,000 for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $10,000,000 for the Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1949 (H. Doc. No. 740); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1719. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $5,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 741); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1720. A letter from A. Tarchiani, Ambassador of Italy, to the Speaker, transmitting an invitation from the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Genoa, Italy, to the Congress of the United States to be represented in the International Parliamentary Convention in Genoa, September 14 through September 17, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. Report pursuant to House Resolution 93, Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Eighteenth intermediate report on investigation of General Accounting Office audit of wartime freight vouchers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Nineteenth intermediate report on investigation of Bureau of Reclamation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4713. A bill to authorize the Secretary of National Defense to acquire additional recreational facilities at Eglin Field, Fla.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 7149. A bill to provide for cooperation of the Federal and State Governments in the assessment of inheritance taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7150. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 7151. A bill to amend the copyright laws so as to make unlawful the pirating of phonograph records; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 7152. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 7153. A bill to provide for a program of aeronautical training for the youth of America to insure a better understanding of the international, social, and political implications of air power and its vital place in the future of world developments and to provide a trained backlog of pilots and technically qualified young manpower to meet the requirements of a national emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7154. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 7155. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to collective-bargaining contracts which have been in existence for a continuous period of 20 years or more; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 7156. A bill for the relief of the city of Chicopee, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCOWEN:

H. R. 7157. A bill to provide Federal funds to assist the States in the acquisition and construction of plant facilities for public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. J. Res. 446. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Denver, Colo., as "Edward W. Combs Veterans Facility Hospital"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. J. Res. 447. Joint resolution to create a Congressional Economic Study Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 710. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should direct the Export-Import Bank of Washington to lend $150,000,000 to Israel; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. Res. 712. Resolution to authorize the House Judiciary Committee to investigate the Rosa Lee Ingram case; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 713. Resolution to authorize the House Judiciary Committee to investigate the Rosa Lee Ingram case; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. Res. 714. Resolution to create a Congressional Economic Study Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7158. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 7159. A bill for the relief of Irene Maria Schneidmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 7160. A bill for the relief of Nicolae Malaxa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 7161. A bill for the relief of Lazar Gartenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2143. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to stop present inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2144. Also, petition of the city of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Taft-Wagner-Ellender- housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1948

The Senate reassembled this day in its Chamber at the Capitol in the city of Washington, in pursuance of the provisions of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 222) agreed to August 7, 1948.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore of the Senate, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, may the year that is past teach us and not torment. Help us to be realistic about ourselves. May we not steal credit for success, nor deny blame for failure. Give us the grace to take things as they are, and to resolve, by Thy help, to make them what they ought to be, in the strong name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, August 7, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield to the acting minority leader, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], for a quorum call, for which he has asked.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hoey	Pepper
Ball	Holland	Reed
Brewster	Ives	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Stennis
Cooper	Lucas	Stewart
Cordon	McCarran	Taft
Donnell	McCarthy	Taylor
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McGrath	Thye
Ferguson	McKellar	Tydings
Flanders	McMahon	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Martin	Watkins
George	Maybank	Wherry
Green	Millikin	White
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hatch	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	
Hickenlooper	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. FEAZEL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair would like to state the order of business which will be pursued this morning.

There are a number of privileged matters to which attention first will be given. At the conclusion of the privileged matters the regular morning hour will offer all Senators ample opportunity for any activities they may have in mind.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on August 7, 1948, the President pro tempore, under the authority of House Concurrent Resolution 223, signed the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on August 7, 1948, the Secretary of the Senate reported that on August 9, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures.

APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on August 7, 1948, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved the following joint resolutions:

On August 10, 1948:

S. J. Res. 239. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report.

On August 11, 1948:

S. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948.

On August 16, 1948:

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures.

DEATH OF SENATOR BUSHFIELD, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, at this time it is my sad responsibility to remind the Senate, that since our last meeting in August, one of our number has been called to his final reward.

I refer to my esteemed colleague HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, who passed away September 27, 1948, at his home in Miller, S. Dak. His passing represents a distinct and irreplaceable loss to his family, to the United States Senate, to the Nation generally, and particularly to the citizens of South Dakota in whose interests he labored unceasingly for many, many years. And, with his passing, I have felt the heavy personal sadness which engulfs one who has lost a friend.

Senator BUSHFIELD was born in Atlantic, Iowa, August 6, 1882, but moved with his parents to Dakota Territory in 1883. He attended the public schools of Miller, S. Dak., and was graduated from the University of Minnesota Law School in 1904. He made his mark in the professional field of law early in his career, and, as the years wore on, he devoted an increasing amount of time and energy to the affairs of his community, State, and Nation.

In 1938 he was elected Governor of South Dakota, and during the two terms he served, he fashioned a State administration which will be a model for his successors for many years to come. Entering the United States Senate in 1943, he quickly won the respect and admiration of the Members of this body by his sincerity and his determination to press those legislative measures which he believed would promote the general welfare of this country.

I knew and admired HARLAN BUSHFIELD for more than a score of years, and from the beginning of our friendship, I knew that his conspicuous ability and tenacity of purpose made it inevitable that the area of his public service and influence would continually expand.

My affection for HARLAN BUSHFIELD was not founded on personal intimacy, nor even on parallel thinking, because on many issues our opinions differed. It was anchored on something more basic and fundamental—a healthy respect for his honesty, sincerity, and dogged determination to uphold those principles in which he believed.

The thought has often crossed my mind that HARLAN BUSHFIELD typified South Dakotans. He was honest, forthright to the point of bluntness, independent in thought, and large and rugged physically. He ascribed those qualities to others, too, and he was impatient with the sly, the devious, and the cunning wherever encountered. That is typical, I think, of South Dakotans.

And now HARLAN BUSHFIELD has answered the final quorum call. I find myself quite lacking in the eloquence necessary to word an appropriate and meaningful tribute. I must merely observe that he served his State and Nation eminently well; that he was a constructive force for good; and that he leaves us all a rich and inspirational legacy of memories of a public servant whose devotion to principle was unswerving.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be immediately considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the tribute paid by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD. I became acquainted with the late Senator BUSHFIELD when we came to the Senate at the same time. We were personal friends, and I know him to have been a man of high standing, many friendships, and great qualities. I join with his colleague in the tribute which has been paid, and the many additional tributes which may be paid to HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to add my testimonial to the remarks which have been made about our late colleague, HARLAN BUSHFIELD, by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

I knew Senator BUSHFIELD first some years ago when we were both Governors of our respective States and learned to like and appreciate him at that time.

Later on, when he came to the Senate, it was my privilege to be associated with him for 6 years while he was a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

HARLAN BUSHFIELD was a man of high principle, courage, and steadfastness of purpose. He had a firm belief in the ideals for which he stood and could not be wavered from those beliefs. I always admired this quality in the man as well as his kindliness and courage.

His primary interest seemed to be in the welfare of the American farmer and we all remember the very potent and powerful speech which he made in support of the tillers of the soil about a year ago. Even when his health began to fail him, he made it a point to attend meetings of the Committee on Agriculture and the Senate whenever matters of agricultural importance were being considered, often at the expense of his own health.

He served the farmers of South Dakota and of the Nation well and in his passing they have lost a real friend and we Members of the Senate have lost a loyal and devoted colleague.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that several other Senators wish to speak respecting our departing colleagues. The Chair suggests that Senators defer their addresses until the Senate can conclude the privileged business of the morning.

Without objection, the resolution just presented will be considered.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 273) was considered by unanimous consent and unanimously agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 448) to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 224, providing that the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, December 31, 1948, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The message informed the Senate that a committee of two Members had been appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

SENATOR FROM SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I present the certificate of appointment of Mrs. VERA C. BUSHFIELD to fill the unexpired term of Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of appointment will be received and placed on file.

The certificate of appointment is as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of South Dakota, I, George T. Mickelson, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint VERA C. BUSHFIELD, of Miller, Hand County, S. Dak., a Senator from said State to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Harlan J. Bushfield, until a successor is elected and qualified as provided by law.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, George T. Mickelson, and our seal hereto affixed at Pierre, this 6th day of October A. D. 1948.

By the Governor:
GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor.

Attest:
[SEAL] ANNAMAE RIIFF,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the resignation of Mrs. VERA C. BUSHFIELD as Senator from South Dakota.

The resignation was read, as follows:

UPPER MONTCLAIR, N. J.,
December 22, 1948.

The Honorable GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor of South Dakota,
Pierre, S. Dak.

DEAR GOVERNOR MICKELSON: Herewith I tender my resignation from the office of United States Senator from South Dakota, to become effective at 12:01 a. m., December 27, 1948.

Your appointment of me to this high office was a personal honor. It was even more an honor to the memory of my late husband, Harlan J. Bushfield, and for this I am more grateful than I can tell you.

Faithfully yours,
VERA C. BUSHFIELD,
United States Senator.

Signed in the presence of Mary Janith Bushfield Work, John L. Work.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I present the certificate of appointment of Hon. KARL E. MUNDT to fill the unexpired term of Senator from South Dakota due to the resignation of Mrs. Bushfield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of appointment will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of South Dakota, I, George T. Mickelson, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint KARL E. MUNDT, of Madison, Lake County, S. Dak., a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States, effective as of 12:01 a. m. December 27, 1948, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Vera C. Bushfield, until said KARL E. MUNDT shall have qualified for the term to which he was elected.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, George T. Mickelson, and our seal hereto affixed at Pierre, this 24th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] ANNAMAE RIIFF,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of appointment will be placed on file.

SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the certificate of election of Hon. J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON to fill the term of Senator expiring on January 3, 1949.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of election will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

To J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, *Greeting:*

We do by these presents commission you a Member of the United States Senate, Congress of the United States of America from the State of North Carolina for the short term ending January 3, 1949, your election thereto at the general election of November 2, 1948, having been duly certified to us; and do hereby confer upon you all the rights, privileges, and powers useful and necessary to the just discharge of the duties of said office.

In witness whereof, His Excellency, R. Gregg Cherry, our governor, and commander in chief, hath signed with his hand these presents and caused our great seal to be affixed thereto.

Done at our city of Raleigh, on the 24th day of November A. D. 1948, and in the one hundred and seventy-third year of our American independence.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] R. GREGG CHERRY.
THAD EURE,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of election will be placed on file.

SENATOR FROM LOUISIANA

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennesssee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. I send to the desk the credentials of the Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG, the Senator-elect from the State of Louisiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be read by the clerk.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 RUSSELL B. LONG was duly chosen, by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term ending at noon on January 3, 1951.

Witness His Excellency our Gov. Earl K. Long, and our seal hereto affixed, at Baton Rouge, this 26th day of November A. D. 1948.

[SEAL] EARL K. LONG,
Governor.

By the Governor:
WADE O. MARTIN, JR.,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be placed on file.

If the three Senators whose credentials have just been presented will proceed to the desk the oath of office will be administered to them.

Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BROUGHTON, and Mr. LONG, escorted by Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HOEY, and Mr. McKELLAR, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

CREDENTIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the credentials of the 32 Senators elected for the 6-year terms beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

These credentials, with four exceptions, in which State forms are probably followed, are in the form suggested by the Senate in its resolution of January 4, 1934, and, if there be no objection, they will be printed in the RECORD without reading and ordered to be placed on file.

There being no objection, the credentials of the respective Senators-elect were received, ordered to be placed on file, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, CLINTON P. ANDERSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Thomas J. Mabry, and our seal hereto affixed at Santa Fe, this 18th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1948.

THOMAS J. MABRY,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] ALICIA ROMERO,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 STYLES BRIDGES was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Hampshire a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Charles M. Dale, and our seal hereto affixed this 22d day of November 1948.

CHARLES M. DALE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ENOCH D. FULLER,
Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

To J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, *Greeting:*

We do by these presents commission you a Member of the United States Senate, Congress of the United States of America, from the State of North Carolina for the regular term beginning January 3, 1949, your election thereto at the general election of November 2, 1948, having been duly certified to us; and do hereby confer upon you all the rights, privileges, and powers useful and necessary to the just discharge of the duties of said office.

In witness whereof, His Excellency R. Gregg Cherry, our Governor and commander in chief, hath signed with his hand these presents and caused our great seal to be affixed thereto.

Done at our city of Raleigh, on the 24th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948, and in the one hundred and seventy-third year of our American Independence.

R. GREGG CHERRY.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] THAD EURE,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
STATE BOARD OF ELECTION COMMISSIONERS,
Frankfort, Ky., November 22, 1948:

The undersigned, a board for examining the returns of an election held on Tuesday, the 2d day of November 1948, for United States Senator of the State of Kentucky, do certify that Hon. VIRGIL CHAPMAN, of Paris, Ky., received the highest number of votes given for that office, as certified to the secretary of state, and is, therefore, duly and regularly elected for the term prescribed by the Constitution.

CHARLES K. O'CONNELL, *Chairman,*
T. C. MCMURRAY, *Member,*
DANIEL W. DAVIES, *Member,*
State Board of Election Commissioners for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Attest:
CATTIE LOU MILLER,
Secretary, State Board of Election Commissioners.

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

Know ye, that it appearing from the official canvass of the votes cast at the regular general election held within and for the State of Oregon on Tuesday, the 2d day of November A. D. 1948, that GUY CORDON, of Douglas County, State of Oregon, received the highest number of votes cast for the office of United States Senator in Congress at said election:

Now, therefore, I, John H. Hall, Governor of the State of Oregon, by virtue and in pursuance of the authority vested in me under the laws of the State of Oregon, do hereby grant this certificate of election and declare said GUY CORDON, of Douglas County, State of Oregon, to be duly elected to the office of United States Senator in Congress for the State of Oregon for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Oregon to be hereto affixed. Done at the

capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 2d day of December A. D. 1948.

JOHN H. HALL,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] EARL T. NEWBRY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ILLINOIS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 PAUL H. DOUGLAS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Illinois a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Acting, Hugh W. Cross, and our seal hereto affixed at Springfield this 22d day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

HUGH W. CROSS,
Lieutenant Governor and Acting Governor.

By the Governor and Acting Governor:
[SEAL] EDWARD J. BARRETT,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Sr., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning at noon on January 3, 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Earl K. Long, and our seal hereto affixed, at Baton Rouge this 26th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

EARL K. LONG,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WADE O. MARTIN, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

JACKSON, MISS.,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 JAMES O. EASTLAND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Fielding L. Wright, and our seal hereto affixed at Jackson this the 18th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

F. L. WRIGHT,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HEBER LADNER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF DELAWARE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Delaware a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Walter W. Bacon, and our seal hereto affixed at Dover, this 22d day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

WALTER W. BACON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WILLIAM J. STOREY,
Secretary of State.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, December 6, 1948.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 HOMER FERGUSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Michigan, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the third day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Kim Sigler, and our seal hereto affixed at Lansing, Mich., this 6th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

KIM SIGLER,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] F. W. ALGER,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF IOWA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To GUY M. GILLETTE, *Greeting:*

It is hereby certified, that an election holden on the 2d day of November A. D. 1948 you were elected to the office of United States Senator of said State, for the term of 6 years, beginning at noon on the 3d day of January A. D. 1949.

Given at the seat of government Des Moines, Iowa, this 22d day of November A. D. 1948.

ROBERT D. BLUE,
Governor.

Attest:
[SEAL] HOLLO H. SEARBROOK,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND
PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, PROVIDENCE.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November A. D. 1948, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Rhode Island a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January A. D. 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, John C. Pastore, and our seal hereto affixed at Providence, R. I., this 8th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948

JOHN O. PASTORE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ARMAND H. COTE,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF NEW JERSEY.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify, that on November 2, 1948, ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Jersey, a Senator from the said State, to represent the said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

In testimony whereof the great seal of the State is hereunto affixed.

Witness the hand of His Excellency our Governor, Alfred E. Driscoll, at Trenton, this 30th day of November A. D. 1948.

ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] LLOYD B. MARSH,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Minnesota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Minnesota to be affixed at the State capitol in St. Paul this 29th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948 and of the State, the ninety-first.

LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
Governor.

[SEAL] MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, LESTER C. HUNT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wyoming a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, LESTER C. HUNT, and our seal hereto affixed at Cheyenne, Wyo., this 27th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

LESTER C. HUNT,
Governor of Wyoming.

Attest:
[SEAL] A. G. CRANE,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, EDWIN C. JOHNSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Colorado a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Lee Knous, and our seal hereto affixed at Denver, this 23d day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

LEE KNOUS,
Governor

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WALTER F. MORRISON,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, LYNDON B. JOHNSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Texas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, and our seal hereto affixed at Austin, this 20th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

BEAUFORD H. JESTER,
Governor of Texas.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] PAUL H. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, ESTES KEFAUVER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Tennessee a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Jim McCord, and our seal hereto affixed at Nashville, Tenn., this 20th day of November 1948.

JIM MCCORD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JOE C. CARR,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Oklahoma City, November 15, 1948.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, ROBERT S. KERR was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor of the State of Oklahoma, and our seal hereto affixed at Oklahoma City, Okla., this 16th day of November A. D. 1948.

ROY J. TURNER,
Governor of Oklahoma.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, BURNET R. MAYBANK was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Carolina, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, J. Strom Thurmond, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, this 20th day of November A. D. 1948.

J. STROM THURMOND,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] W. P. BLAKEWELL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Little Rock,

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arkansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Ben Laney, and our seal hereto affixed at Little Rock, this the 17th day of November A. D. 1948.

BEN LANEY,
Governor.

By the Governor:
C. G. HALL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

CERTIFICATE

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, BERT H. MILLER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Idaho a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, C. A. Robins, and our seal hereto affixed at Boise, this 24th day of November A. D. 1948.

C. A. ROBINS.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] J. D. CY PRICE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d of November 1948, KARL E. MUNDT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Dakota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, George T. Mickelson and our seal hereto affixed at Pierre, the capital, this 2d day of December A. D. 1948.

GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ANNAMAE RIFF,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MONTANA,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 JAMES E. MURRAY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Montana a Senator from this State to represent the State of Montana in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Sam C. Ford, and our seal hereto affixed at Helena, this 6th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

SAM C. FORD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] SAM W. MITCHELL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Charleston, December 7, 1948.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 MATTHEW M. NEELY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Clarence W. Meadows, and our seal hereto affixed at Charleston, this 7th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

CLARENCE W. MEADOWS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] D. PITT O'BRIEN,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 A. WILLIS ROBERTSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Virginia a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent Virginia in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

In testimony whereof the Governor of Virginia hath hereunto signed his name and affixed the lesser seal of the Commonwealth at Richmond this 23d day of November in the year of our Lord 1948 and in the one hundred and seventy-third year of the Commonwealth.

WM. M. TUCK,
Governor.

[SEAL] THELMA Y. GORDON,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

STATE OF GEORGIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Atlanta.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Georgia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Herman E. Talmadge, and our seal hereto affixed at Atlanta, Ga., this 16th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] BEN W. FORTSON, JR.,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 13th day of September 1948 MARGARET CHASE SMITH was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Maine a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Horace Hildreth, and our seal hereto affixed at Augusta, this 16th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

HORACE HILDRETH,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HAROLD I. GOSS,
Secretary of State.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 LEVERETT SALTONSTALL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Gov. Robert F. Bradford, and our seal hereto affixed at Boston this 24th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1948.

ROBERT F. BRADFORD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF KANSAS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Kansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Gov. Frank Carlson, and our seal hereto affixed at Topeka, Kans., this 2d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1948.

FRANK CARLSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] FRANK J. RYAN,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 JOHN SPARKMAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Alabama a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the third day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, and our seal hereto affixed at Montgomery this 15th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1948.

JAMES E. FOLSOM,
Governor.

Attest:
[SEAL] SIBYL POOL,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 KENNETH S. WHERRY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nebraska a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Gov. Val Peterson, and our seal hereto affixed at Lincoln, Nebr., this 22d day of November, in the year of our Lord 1948.

VAL PETERSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL]

FRANK MARSH,
Secretary of State.

ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certified copies of the final ascertainment of the electors for President and Vice President of the United States from the States of Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts (photostat), Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska (amended), Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BALL, chairman of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee on the subject of labor-management relations, which was ordered to be printed as part 3 of Report No. 986.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BALL, chairman of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee on the subject of Labor-Management Relations—Welfare Funds, which was ordered to be printed as part 4 of Report No. 986.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BALL, chairman of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee on the subject of Labor-Management Relations—West Coast Maritime Industry, which was ordered to be printed as part 5 of Report No. 986.

Mr. MURRAY subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that there has been submitted a majority report of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations. I merely wish to reserve the right to file minority views after having opportunity to study the majority report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's reservation will be noted.

REPORT ON CONTROL OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE (S. DOC. NO. 211)

Mr. WHERRY, from the Special Subcommittee on the Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease of the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a report on the study of pernicious effect of foot-and-mouth disease as it exists in Mexico and elsewhere, progress of program to prevent entry of the disease into the United States, the most effective methods of combating and controlling the disease, and the proper location for the authorized research facilities, which was ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

REPORT ON POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE (REPT. NO. 1777)

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolution 81, Eightieth Congress, first session, a report relating to postmaster appointments under civil service, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON PARKING LOTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 209)

Mr. CAIN presented a report of the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitted to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, pursuant to Public Law 826, Eightieth Congress, relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

PAY OF SENATE PAGES

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 274), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms hereby is authorized to employ 21 pages for duty in the Senate Chamber to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from December 28 to December 31, 1948, at the basic rate of $1,800 per annum.

LEORA STANLEY

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution to pay a gratuity to Mrs. Leora Stanley, and ask for its immediate consideration. I have consulted with the ranking majority and minority members of the Rules Committee, and they have no objection. I am informed the funds are available in the contingent fund.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 275) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Mrs. Leora Stanley, widow of Sherwood B. Stanley, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

Mr. GURNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 276), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Harlan J. Bushfield, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FRED J. CRENSHAW

Mr. MAYBANK. I submit a resolution in the case of Fred J. Crenshaw, who was badly shot and was unable to return to work. He was a member of the Capitol Police force. The man who shot him is serving a prison term of from 5 to 15 years.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 278) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Fred J. Crenshaw an amount equal to 2 years' compensation at the rate last received by him as a private of Capitol Police, the said sum to be considered as reimbursement in full for all expenses and allowances on account of injuries suffered by him in the discharge of his official duties.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. LUCAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 279), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner with which he has presided over its deliberations during the present Congress.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

CONTINUATION OF SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 280) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1947 (creating a Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises), and continued by Senate Resolution 153, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, and Senate Resolution 191, Eightieth Congress, agreed to March 15, 1948, is hereby continued until January 31, 1949.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the unanimous-consent request, may I inquire from the able Senator from Nebraska just what is expected to be done between now and the 31st of January next?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to answer the inquiry.

The resolution providing for the extension for 30 days is primarily for the purpose of enabling the committee to complete its work. About all that remains to be done is to write the reports and wind up the affairs of the committee as it is now constituted.

I do not know what Members on the other side may say about the work of the committee. However, so far as we are concerned, all the investigations have been concluded. The purpose of the resolution is merely to afford time for winding up the affairs of the committee. Ninety percent of such work consists of writing reports and findings of investigations.

I may say further for the benefit of the distinguished acting minority leader that I am not sure that there is sufficient money on hand to complete the work; but I felt that if it should prove that there were not sufficient funds to take care of terminal-leave pay, and so forth, the proper way to handle the situation would be to come before the Senate with a resolution which would be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration and reported back to the Senate. Otherwise I would not submit the resolution today.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that I shall not object to the resolution which has been submitted for continuation of the committee for a period of 30 days, in order that the committee may make its report during that time. However, Members of the Senate well know the position of the great majority of Democratic Members with respect to special committees under the Reorganization Act. No Senator is more interested in the continued success of small business than is the Senator from Illinois. However, a vital principle dealing with special committees is involved under the Reorganization Act, and it seems to me that at the proper time either the Banking and Currency Committee or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should take over the duties of the Small Business Committee. One of the regular standing committees should continue to operate in behalf of the small business of this Nation. As everyone knows, I feel very keenly about the matter, as was apparent from the spirited debates we had on this subject 2 years ago when the matter was before us at that time. I shall reserve further remarks upon the question until some more appropriate time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as a member of the minority of the committee, I wish to say that I am fully in accord with the expression of opinion by the acting leader of the majority. I think the committee has served a very valuable purpose during the years it has been in operation, and I am very anxious that it be given this additional time in which to write reports.

Of course, I am in favor of an extension of the committee. It should be extended because of the great service it has rendered the businessmen of the United States. I think they would be bitterly disappointed if there were a failure on the part of the Senate to continue the work of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 448) to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes, which was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act of July 7, 1947, entitled "An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," is amended as follows:

(1) Section 10 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Report: Not later than 70 days after the Eighty-first Congress is convened and organized, the Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress."

(2) Section 3 is amended, as of December 31, 1948, by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(d) Continuation of membership upon change of status: Despite the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a Member of Congress or in the status of a person in the executive branch of the Government, who thereafter ceases to have such status, shall nevertheless continue as a member of the Commission, and from and after his change of status shall, if he has returned to private life (except for his membership on the Commission), receive the same compensation as a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a person from private life."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this resolution extends for 60 days the length of time during which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make its report to the Senate. A tremendous amount of work has been involved in this matter. That work is not quite finished, although it is nearly completed. We hope to have it ready by the 13th of January, but it will not be so good a report as it would be if a little more time were given.

The other provision of the resolution would permit Representative MANASCO to remain as a member of the Commission until the report is made and the work is completed. Under the present law, Representative MANASCO will cease to be a member of the Commission as soon as his successor in the House of Representatives takes office on January 3. This resolution would permit the continuation of the Commission as it now is. It would simply be out of question for a new Member of the House of Representatives to take over that work at this stage of the proceeding, when the report is almost, but not quite, ready to be submitted.

So I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution from the House of Representatives acted upon and approved at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NOTIFICATION OF THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution (H. Res. 718), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore to join a similar committee appointed by the House, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This resolution corresponds to the one received from the House of Representatives.

Without objection, the resolution (S. Res. 277) is considered and agreed to; and the Chair appoints the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] as the committee on the part of the Senate.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 224), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, December 31, 1948, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

CARL A. LOEFFLER

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes to compliment the Senate by calling its attention to an event which is of far more than casual or passing interest and importance.

Mr. Carl A. Loeffler, Secretary of the United States Senate, will be relieved of his official duties and retired from his official relationship with the Senate on Monday, January 3. In this brief announcement of fact there lies a career and record as distinguished and noteworthy as one can find in the entire annals of American political history.

Mr. Loeffler was born here in Washington on January 12, 1873, in the shadow of the White House and during U. S. Grant's first term in Washington.

Mr. Loeffler was born on a Sunday on Church Street during church hours. He was conceived, lived, and will die, as a Christian.

Carl Loeffler has served the Senate of the United States in almost every capacity for 59 years. His first association

with the Senate came when he was selected to be a page boy by Matthew Stanley Quay, of Pennsylvania, in December of 1889. He was 16 years of age when he first took his place in the service of the Senate.

Carl Loeffler's father was the late Maj. Charles D. A. Loeffler, United States Army, who, as usher to the President, was the friend and confidant of eight Presidents, beginning with U. S. Grant and continuing through the terms of Teddy Roosevelt. Major Loeffler in his own right was as unusual as his son has become. When General Grant first entered the White House, he called Major Loeffler to serve as his personal aide and secretary. During Grant's second term, Major Loeffler resigned his commission, and continued to serve in a civilian capacity. During President McKinley's occupancy of the White House, the President established the post of military storekeeper in the Army, in order that Major Loeffler might return to a post of importance in the military service of his country. When the post was sanctioned by the Senate, and Major Loeffler was confirmed by the Senate to fill the position, he remained for the rest of his life in the Army, while continuing to serve in the White House for many years.

From such a background did Carl Loeffler enter this world. The young man's formal education came from the public schools of the District of Columbia and from Columbian University. His much broader education and background came from his parents and from what he lived among and saw during his early childhood, which was spent in and about the White House.

This Senator knows of his utter inability to describe adequately what has taken place within the Senate and Nation since Carl Loeffler began his duties in 1889. Carl Loeffler is one of the few men alive who could do justice to that task. I am but one of many who deeply trust that the future will provide both time and energy through which Carl Loeffler may leave for students everywhere a written record of what has taken place before his very eyes. This would be a tremendous contribution. It would constitute a textbook to satisfy the curiosity of youngsters who will dream of some day serving in the United States Senate.

A word of recapitulation is all I can or should attempt.

During Carl Loeffler's early service in the Senate, he witnessed the bitter debate on the Force bill of 1890 relating to more stringent enforcement of Federal election laws; the stormy period of the Spanish-American War, culminating in Cuban independence, and the dissolution of the last vestige of European control in the Western Hemisphere.

Carl Loeffler was here when Hawaii was annexed and the Philippines became a possession of the United States.

Carl Loeffler was here when William McKinley was assassinated and Theodore Roosevelt became President.

Those were times of great movements which marked the end of our pioneer era and the beginning of our period of great industrial growth.

All that and a great deal more took place while Carl Loeffler was growing up with his country and serving one of the great institutions which exist on the face of the earth.

In 1913, Carl Loeffler was elected acting assistant doorkeeper of the Senate, and in 1919 he became the assistant doorkeeper.

That was the period of the First World War; and the vastly increased legislative activity in the Senate was carefully surveyed, briefed, and indexed in the agile and painstaking mind of the one who retires to private life on Monday next.

In his 59 years of service, Carl Loeffler has seen and known intimately more than one-half of all the Senators who have ever served in the United States Senate. No American has ever enjoyed and been permitted to appreciate an experience comparable to his.

In the career of Carl Loeffler there have been legislative high spots which ought to be mentioned. Every one of them would mark an epoch in the life of any individual who was permitted to be a participant in the forming of the legislation. How many of us had any part to play in any considerable number of this abbreviated list:

First. Uniform Bankruptcy Act.

Second. Elkins Interstate Commerce Act.

Third. Aldrich-Vreeland Currency Association Act.

Fourth. Postal Savings Bank Act.

Fifth. Department of Commerce establishment.

Sixth. Interstate Commerce Act.

Seventh. Food and Drug Act.

Eighth. Panama Canal Act.

Ninth. Bureau of Mines establishment.

Tenth. Federal Reserve Bank Act.

Eleventh. Sixteenth through twenty-first amendments to the Constitution.

Twelfth. Federal Corrupt Practices Acts.

Thirteenth. Railroad Arbitration Act.

Fourteenth. Eight Hour Acts.

Fifteenth. Department of Labor establishment.

Sixteenth. General Accounting Office establishment.

Seventeenth. Budget created.

Eighteenth. Debates on (a) Colombian treaty, including Panama Canal rights; (b) Canadian reciprocity bill; (c) ship-purchase bill, World War I; (d) arming of merchant vessels, World War I; (e) League of Nations; (f) limitation of naval armament; (g) World Court protocol; (h) extension of NRA; (i) neutrality acts of World War II.

Nobody can ever challenge Carl Loeffler's official association with the past and the present. Any student or curious citizen will always be able to determine the long period of time during which Carl Loeffler was a distinguished public servant. Official records probably will be far too dry and terse to give credit to Carl Loeffler as a very human man. As those of us who know him well chuckle over the fun we know he enjoyed as a youngster, history ought to permit others to derive the same joy and satisfaction.

We see Carl Loeffler sitting before us today as a courtly and dignified elder statesmen. May I suggest that it was not, as it should not have been, always thus. Carl Loeffler was once a page, and a good one, too. He was as high-spirited and bubbling over with youthful enthusiasm as are any of those who sit this morning at his feet. Once upon a time, Carl and other pages brought bows and arrows to this very Chamber. They affixed gum to one end of the arrows and long paper streamers to the other. They took for their target, with Carl as their leader, the glass panels in the ceiling above us. There the arrows remained fixed and the paper streamers hanging until tall ladders could be brought by workmen and the offending decorations removed.

On another occasion, while playing and running in the Chamber before the day's session, as succeeding corps of pages have done through the years, Carl Loeffler was so eager to catch and tag one of the other pages that he crashed through one of the glass doors in the cloakroom and shattered beyond repair the etched glass panel. Undaunted and honest, as always, he immediately went to the head page and admitted the accident. I have not yet discovered why he was not fired, and neither has he.

Carl Loeffler in years is not a young man, but he remains in energetic health and stamina. There is a most excellent reason for his present excellent condition. Carl was a bicyclist of note in the days of the long ago when that sport overshadowed all the many games we play today. He was a winner of medals in competition, and he once set a record for cycling between Washington and Lock Haven, Pa., a distance of 225 miles, in 2 days' time. Do you know of any among us who could have gone so far so fast?

Carl Loeffler is a man of many parts. At Columbian University he prepared himself to become an engineer. The fact is that he almost became one, and the Senate almost lost his services before his career was more than just begun. He once went to New York City to seek an engineering opening. When told that his services upon graduation from his engineering school would command the sum of $4 a week, he decided to remain in politics, which was a wise decision for him and for us.

Carl Loeffler has the virtue of stubbornness and on occasion it has kept him from doing what he most enjoyed. Some years ago Mr. Loeffler was a member of the Columbia Country Club. Like all of us who play golf, he became one day so disgusted with his golf game that he publicly declared that unless there was some immediate improvement he would resign his membership and sell his clubs for any figure which anybody might offer. Unlike most of us, he meant what he said. His game got worse, he resigned and sold his clubs, and did not play golf again for more than 10 years.

Carl Loeffler may give to many the impression that he is stern of mien, and leaves to others the laughing over the fun of living. Nothing could be further from the truth. Just about a year ago a friend of Carl Loeffler's was entertaining friends of his from England. After dinner it was decided to visit the amusement park at Glen Echo. Carl Loeffler did there what he wanted to do. His conduct amazed, delighted, and amused

the party, for he rode on everything, including the high slides. When the visitors returned to England, they wrote Mr. Loeffler's friend of their tremendous enjoyment of that particular evening, and they added that they felt it to be a wonderful thing that a man so highly placed in the United States Senate could so thoroughly enjoy himself and still maintain his dignity.

Mr. Loeffler has followed many worthwhile interests other than that of politics. He is a talented portrait artist in pen and ink, and has drawn portraits of many of the prominent men with whom he has been associated. Carl Loeffler has more than a reasonable ability as a poet, having written hundreds of poems extremely varied in subject, many of them written for his own children. He is likewise a skillful creator of miniature furniture. His grandchildren can testify to his ability in this field and to his originality of furniture design and treatment.

Carl Loeffler has been a life-long Republican, but two of his greatest friends and advisers have been strong members of the Democratic Party. Not only was he a friend of Col. Jacob Ruppert, but at one time while performing his duties in the Senate, he helped Colonel Ruppert operate his office, while Ruppert was a Member of the House of Representatives. Another of his great friends among the Democrats was the late Senator Hill, of New York, with whom Mr. Loeffler toured Europe in 1908.

Carl Loeffler was married in April 1901, to Minnie Schneider of Washington, D. C. To this union were born two charming and talented daughters. This family of four is as happy today as it has always been. Mrs. Loeffler and the daughters are proud of the head of their household. He has never failed to count them as being his most priceless assets.

The junior Senator from Washington would have preferred to listen to a far more able presentation of the worthwhileness of a distinguished American. It is his privileged opportunity, however, to speak good and happy thoughts about a fine friend. When this Senator first came to Washington, Carl Loeffler went out of his way to open the mysterious doors which surround the uninitiated. What Carl did for me, he had been doing for others through decades gone by. I shall be sorry to see Carl Loeffler leave the Senate; but I shall be glad that when he has gone he will have a long period, of which no man is more deserving, during which he can justifiably think of himself rather than of others, which he has done so completely during his lifetime up to this minute. [Applause on the floor.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am glad to join in the deserved tribute paid by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to our friend, Carl Loeffler.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to say a word, joining with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], relative to the retirement of Carl Loeffler.

It is with sincere regret that I note the retirement of Mr. Loeffler from the official family of the United States Senate, for he has been more than a member of the official family; he has been a real friend of Senators, and no employee of this legislative body has ever served more faithfully. No employee has been more devoted to the best interests of the Senate and to the fulfillment of its high place in the Government and life of our people. We shall miss Carl very much, and yet we are aware of how completely he has earned the retirement which we hope will be most pleasant for him and his family.

He entered the service of the United States Senate a hundred years and some months after the first convening of this body under the Constitution. That was in December 1889, the first session of the Fifty-first Congress. In December of this year he passed his fifty-ninth year of faithful service to the Senate. He entered this Chamber as a page, and leaves it as Secretary of the United States Senate. That fact alone is a high tribute to Carl Loeffler's industry, ability, and loyalty.

In closing I want to extend to him and to Mrs. Loeffler my best wishes that in retirement they may find those pleasures which a very busy life to date may have prevented them from enjoying, and that complete fulfillment may be theirs in the years ahead.

I am sure all the Members of this body entertain the same feelings as those I have attempted briefly to express toward this loyal, faithful, and intelligent public servant on his retirement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to join in the sentiments expressed not only by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], but also by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in their tributes to the Secretary of the Senate, Carl Loeffler, who will retire next Monday. I know I represent all Senators when I say we join in the observations made about this man who has served 59 years in connection with the work of the Senate of the United States.

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPORTS FROM A SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as presently constituted, may file reports until January 17, 1949. In making this request I have no desire that it include any work to be done other than the making up of such reports and their filing. The work of the committee will be under the leadership of the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. There is sufficient money to carry on the program. There would be included, however, a joint report on "The Voice of America," and the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations having to do with that subject will be headed by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I join in the request just made by the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none; and the order is made.

ELECTION FRAUDS IN KENTUCKY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement prepared by the Citizens' Committee of Bourbon County, Ky., concerning the attempted vote frauds in that county at the recent November election. The committee of which I speak is made up of outstanding citizens of Bourbon County, of both parties. It is headed by Cassius M. Clay, as chairman. It was formed on November 10 for the purpose of assisting in the investigation of the attempted frauds, and, as stated by the Committee, "the bringing to justice of the guilty persons, regardless of person or party."

There can be no question that a very flagrant fraud was attempted in the general elections at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, a United States Senator, and a Member of the House of Representatives were to be elected. It is at present being investigated by the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is being rumored in Kentucky, as reported to me by substantial citizens, that an effort has been made, or will be made, to minimize to Federal law enforcement officials the magnitude of the crime. I have no knowledge that this is true. I hope it is not true, or that if it be true that such an attempt has or will be made, it will be resented and denied by Federal officials. I call upon my colleague in the Senate, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator who will succeed me, and upon the newly elected Member of the House of Representatives from the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky, vigorously to present the importance of this matter to the Department of Justice. I speak of the matter because of the pride in my State and in the citizens of Bourbon County itself, who are representatives of the very best of our people.

There are a few counties in Kentucky in which such frauds have been practiced in the past. In 1942 a Federal grand jury in the eastern district of Kentucky indicted 99 defendants and convicted 71 persons. That action has deterred this illegal practice in Kentucky. As a circuit judge I presided at trials in 1946 which resulted in sending several defendants to the State penitentiary for vote frauds.

I know from my experience as a judge that it is not difficult to receive the evidence and convict in these cases if there is a genuine desire to stop the practice. If the case is not vigorously prosecuted, new offenders will find courage to continue such frauds. I can think of no more reprehensible practice and nothing that represents a more cynical attitude toward free government than does vote stealing.

I hope that the Department of Justice will vigorously investigate this matter and will prosecute the offenders.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the November 2, 1948, general election, 11 of the 31 ballot boxes in Bourbon County, Ky., were stuffed with forged and fraudulent ballots before the polls were open

for voting. Since all but 1 of the 254 ballots, which during the tally were identified as forged, were straight Democratic votes, the ostensible purpose (as stated in the Federal district attorney's petition to the Federal court) was to increase the Democratic vote in the county and to diminish the number of Republican ballots in relation to the total vote.

Soon after forgery and fraud were discovered, County Judge George Batterton and various other officers, civic organizations, and individuals appealed to the Honorable Tom Clark, Attorney General of the United States, to have the FBI assist in the investigation and determination of those guilty of the fraud. Circuit Judge William B. Ardery, of the State court, also specially charged the grand jury to "investigate to the limit of the ability of each of you jurors and to the limit of the resources of all of you." The grand jury investigation was halted when the Federal attorney for the district, Hon. Claude Stephens, obtained an order from the Federal court impounding the evidence in the case. In a report to the circuit court, the grand jury found that, "The evidence proved conclusively that in 11 precincts fraud and forgery had been committed," constituting "a crime against the United States and the Commonwealth of Kentucky." The grand jury advised the court that its investigation had been "temporarily halted by the action of the Federal court," and requested that the court "instruct the next grand jury to pursue the investigation."

The FBI field representatives arrived on the scene while the matter was still before the grand jury. The FBI has not yet completed its work on the case; and it is understood that there will be no release from the Department of Justice on the matter until after the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress.

Our citizens committee, which was formed in response to a mass meeting of citizens held in the county courthouse on November 10, 1948, is composed of the following representative citizens of the county: Hume Payne, Dodge L. Whipple, Cassius M. Clay, Stanley S. Dickson, Thomas M. Mitchell, Frazier R. Insko, and Samuel Clay, Jr.

It includes both Democrats and Republicans. At the mass meeting, it was charged with the responsibility of furthering the investigation and the bringing to justice of the guilty persons, "regardless of person or party."

In a report, copies of which have been placed in the hands of the Attorney General of the United States and of the Federal district attorney, the committee has stated:

"The committee is strongly of the opinion that no one thing will be more conducive to honest elections in the county in the future than the bringing to justice of the individual or individuals responsible for the stuffing of the ballot boxes with fraudulent ballots in the November general election. The unanimity of opinion among right-thinking citizens on this point was evidenced in the mass meeting, in response to which the citizens' committee was formed, and in the action taken by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, Rotary Club, Lions Club, and other civic organizations, as well as by the telegrams sent to the Attorney General of the United States by Judge George Batterton and other individuals, concerning the fraud and urging action by the responsible authorities. It was shown by general public approval of Circuit Judge William B. Ardery's charge to the grand jury. Attention also should be called to the interim report of the grand jury to the court after the evidence had been impounded by order of the Federal court.

"The contemptuous disregard of the Federal and State election laws in the stuffing of the ballot boxes and the forging of the signatures of election officers was crudely conceived and executed. It should not be difficult for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with its experience in much more difficult cases and with the expert facilities at its command, to discover those guilty of the fraud, as so far as we are advised, it may have done already. We urge the Department of Justice to assign to the case one of its special attorneys to assist the Federal district attorney, as was done when similar election frauds were uncovered and prosecuted in Harlan County, Ky., some years ago. We are informed that the Department frequently assigns a special attorney in cases where the public interest is less clear than in the instant case.

"While regrettable from the standpoint of the guilty person or persons in this case that they must be made to suffer the penalty whereas in the past others have violated the law without punishment, failure to bring to trial the person or persons guilty of this gross fraud will be unfair to the many innocent officials of the county and others in the party organizations who have now been brought under suspicion by the act of said person or persons.

"The view that, because persons with political influence in Washington may be able to exert pressure on the Department of Justice, the matter will not be prosecuted with vigor, we reject because it is subversive of our faith in the fundamental soundness of our American institutions of government."

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
(S. DOC. NO. 210)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent in his State today. He has asked me to request of the Senate unanimous consent for the printing as a Senate document of an important document on the United States Constitution. The material had been prepared primarily for the use of the Senate Judiciary Committee as a vital reference to its work in connection with the Constitution. But it was felt preferable that it be prepared as a Senate document.

The material includes a chronology of important dates in the history of the Constitution and of leading quotations with reference to it.

I am happy to comply with the request of my colleague to ask at this time unanimous consent for its printing as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly today of a former Member of the Congress who died in February of this year. I speak of John Marshall Robsion, who represented the Ninth Congressional District of Kentucky, in which I reside, formerly the Eleventh Congressional District, continuously during the 30 years from 1918 to 1948, with the exception of 1931 and 1932, when he was in voluntary retirement, and the year 1930, when he was a Member of the United States Senate.

Even before his election to Congress he had demonstrated the qualities of leadership which were to mark his service here, and had attained outstanding success as an educator in the public schools and colleges of Kentucky, as a banker, and as one of the great lawyers of our State.

It is unnecessary for me to retell in detail the story of his work and accomplishments as a Member of the Congress. He never stopped working, and as a ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary he had practically completed, at the time of his death, the task of revising and codifying the United States Code, and helping to enact it into positive law.

Others collaborated, but I am sure that all would agree that it was solely the industry and the broad legal knowledge of Mr. Robsion that made possible this monumental achievement.

His career in the Congress was marked by conscientious work in committee, by vigorous debate on the floor, and by a broad interest and knowledge of all fields of legislation.

Perhaps, however, his people will remember him for his work in those fields which touched their daily needs, his labors in behalf of roads and schools, and for his sympathetic interest in those who labor on the farm, in the mines, and in the factories. Himself the son of a wounded Union soldier, and the father of a soldier, his namesake, he was the friend of the soldier. Thousands of veterans and their dependents will attest to his affection for those who had known the heat of battle, their widows and orphans.

The regard in which he was held by his people, and by his colleagues in Congress did not arise from superficial qualities. It arose from his strong and independent mind and from the enduring qualities of his character, his unquestioned integrity, his tolerance and sympathy, and his great humility.

Above all other characteristics, perhaps, which we knew he possessed, was that fierce and patriotic love of country and its institutions which is the proud mark of the people he represented.

In appearance, in action, and in thought, he was a leader, and bore well the title given to him by his people, "The Tall Sycamore of the Mountains."

It has been difficult for me to speak of him because of the respect and affection I held for him, but in this inadequate way I have wanted to remember a firm friend and a great leader.

I now ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks an editorial by the distinguished editor of the Louisville Times, Mr. Tom Wallace, regarding Mr. Robsion, and an article by Mr. Harry Snyder of the Owensboro (Ky.) Messenger paying tribute to him.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Times of February 21, 1948]

ROBSION'S FRANKNESS UNFAILING—CANDOR IN COMMITTING HIMSELF IN WRITING REFRESHING CONTRAST TO EVASIONS OF MANY

(By Tom Wallace)

One characteristic of the late Representative John Robsion, who knew a great deal about personal politics; about how to earn friendships by performing services for his constituents, be it getting for them garden seed or pensions or something else, was his willingness to commit himself on issues when queried.

His congressional district was not anywhere near Mammoth Cave National Park, and Kentucky's sectionalism is well known. But, when I wrote to him in opposition to the proposed Mining City Dam in Green River which would affect the underground streams in Mammoth Cave and in other ways injure the park, he promptly replied that he would oppose it.

"I am very much opposed to any action which will lessen the value of our wonderful Mammoth Cave," he said, "not only as a great asset to Kentucky but to the Nation as a whole, and I am sure this is the view of an overwhelming majority of Kentuckians and the people of the Nation."

He was among the earliest Kentuckians in public office who opposed the projected power dam in Cumberland River which would have destroyed Cumberland Falls. The dam was advocated by Flem D. Sampson, a Republican Governor from Mr. Robsion's section.

It falls to the lot of persons interested in legislation affecting natural resources to write occasionally to Members of their State's delegation in Washington, asking them to oppose or to support this or that pending bill.

ARTFUL DODGERS

Anyone who writes to his State's delegation a few times learns what to expect in the way of replies. He soon learns that there are Members of Congress who will never so reply that they are committed to anything, no matter how well they know the effect of proposed legislation; no matter how determined they are to vote for it or against it. Their letters are models of courtesy and calculated evasiveness. They reply promptly and the man who has written to them knows nothing about their intentions beyond knowing that they do not intend being frank.

A poll of members of a State delegation gets candid responses from some of them and the usual dodge-the-issue responses from others. Mr. Robsion was among the candid repliers. I always knew what to expect from him. I did not know what his position would be, but I knew he would say forthrightly what it was.

No matter how one may differ with a lawmaker, the lawmaker earns his respect if he is willing to be frank when it would be wholly unreasonable to believe the measure under discussion one as to which he could be without opinion because of lack of information.

I always attributed Mr. Robsion's straightforward replies to superior intelligence as well as to courage. In my opinion, a politician who thinks it wise, or smart, to be habitually evasive is a good deal less smart than he thinks he is, because anyone who deals with him and learns that he is always bent upon being sleek or slippery loses respect for his character no matter how he bellows and bawls on the stump about his righteousness.

SENSE OF HUMOR

Mr. Robsion had a sense of humor, about others and about himself, and a keen sense of humor is a reflection of keen mentality. The pompous man is the dull and undiscerning man. As a figure in politics he is no novelty.

Not being among those who instinctively dislike, distrust, and disparage a politician because he is of one political party and instinctively think well of a man who belongs to another political party, I was never much moved by the party label under which Mr. Robsion won his honors and kept them to the end of his long life.

I liked him, enjoyed his company when—rarely—we were thrown together. But I especially liked dealing with him as to measures pending in Congress. When a lawmaker writes, in response to a legitimate question, an answer which suggests the possibility that it is a form letter which he does not actually dictate; a letter which his secretary knows how to write and does write, for his signature, knowing that he will sign it and a sheaf of like letters without reading them, the recipient of the form letter develops an opinion as to the character of the signer. That opinion is so uncomplimentary that any man of high intelligence would wish to avoid incurring it.

Mr. Robsion was highly intelligent. He was in manner and in speech almost as rural as the late Joe Cannon, who after 30 years in Congress was, perhaps painstakingly, a man from Vermilion County, Ill. The quaintness of Long John Robsion, along with his faculty for humor, made him a most agreeable companion. His formula for political success was based on recognition of the high value of personal contacts, and he was singularly successful.

[From the Owensboro (Ky.) Messenger of February 22, 1948]

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT SAYS MONUMENTS TO REPRESENTATIVE ROBSION NOT NECESSARY—HE HAS THEM

(By Harry Snyder)

WASHINGTON.—The last roll call has been answered by Representative Robsion, Republican, of Kentucky, but it will be a long time before he passes from the memories of his associates on Capitol Hill.

"Did you know him well?" ask his colleagues. "He was a real character."

His friends say they won't have to build any monuments to him. He has them already. They are real, live people.

Here is what they mean:

Back in 1919, after the one-time rough-and-tumble school teacher turned lawyer and was elected to Congress, he decided to help young fellows improve themselves.

So he began the practice of hiring young men to work in his office or elsewhere in the Federal Government. But they had to agree to go to school while they worked.

There was Charlie Parrigin, of Clinton County. The Congressman brought him to the Capital, watched him go through National University, get his law degree. Today he is chief of a division in the Department of Internal Revenue.

Then there was Sam Bass, from the home district. Sam became an accountant. Now he's with the Federal Reserve Board.

After Sam came Walter Ray Smith, of Williamsburg. That was in 1922.

Ray came to the Capital in response to a telegram from the Congressman. "I've got a job for you, Ray," said Robsion; "you start today. But I want you to start to school right away—tonight. I'll be watching you."

Smith did. He studied shorthand and typing, and one day he was directed to take over the Congressman's secretarial duties.

For 26 years he has served in that capacity, picking up a law degree and a master's degree on the side. Now it is his job to wind up his mentor's affairs.

Ben Sharp, of Jamestown, was another young man to whom Robsion lent a helping hand. Ben, too, got a law degree and now is practicing in his home town.

Next came John Cannon, a Washington youth, who responded to an advertisement which offered "office work at poor pay but with an opportunity to get an education." Cannon now is chief attorney of the Chicago district of the Bureau of Aeronautics.

From London came Rufe Bird, who was guided through a business-college course as he worked in the Kentuckian's office. He now is a successful businessman in his home town.

It was then time for the Representative's son, John M., Jr., to take his turn at the office routine. Young John did, getting his law degree at Georgetown University at the same time. He now practices law in Louisville.

Then there was Joe Muncey, of Leslie County, who worked his way through a business college and departed to make his home in Ohio.

Since the war "J. M." had brought on Roy Woolum, of Knox County, an Army veteran, and Harvey Cromer, of Whitney County, a Navy veteran.

Close associates of the Congressman credit him with helping Herbert Hoover gain acceptance by many Republican Members of the House.

"Robsion began inviting Hoover to dinner with his colleagues," it is told. "He had Hoover meet his friends in small groups from time to time. Finally, Hoover made friends with a majority of them, and his nomination followed."

Robsion turned down the Secretary of the Interior post under Hoover.

"I want to do something for you," the former President is quoted as having told Robsion. "How about that boy of yours?"

The Congressman's son was then working in the Pension Bureau.

"I'll make him Chief of the Law Division in the Pension Bureau," said Hoover.

Young Robsion was one of the youngest division chiefs in the Department. He was 24.

A colleague recalls another incident to demonstrate Robsion's independence. He was then a Senator, having been appointed to fill a vacancy.

Hoover had nominated Judge John Parker, of North Carolina, for the Supreme Court. Parker had earned the opposition of organized labor, and Robsion shared the feeling.

He is reported to have gone to the President and urged him to withdraw the appointment. Hoover was adamant. Robsion is reported to have told him:

"Mr. President, I am sorry you are taking this stand. The vote in the Senate will be close. I will vote against confirmation."

Parker was rejected by the Senate by one vote. It was Robsion's.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. WHERRY advanced in the center aisle and Mr. LUCAS said: Mr. President, the committee appointed to inquire of the President of the United States whether he had any further communications to make to the Congress before adjournment has performed its duty, and reports back that the President has no further communication to make.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives subsequent to the final adjournment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that subsequent to the sine die adjournment today the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the enrolled joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 448.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, late a Representative from the State of Texas, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 448) to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes, and it was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE WEST

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I present a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 281) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE DELANEY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I send to the desk a resolution, and ask that it be read and immediately considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 282) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

TRIBUTES TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, apparently the Senate has about concluded its work for the day, and, incidentally, this day marks the end of the Eightieth Congress. I had been informed that possibly the minority leader would have some remarks to make about some of the members of the Senate who are leaving today to return to active private life. Unfortunately, the minority leader is not with us.

Today when we part with some of our associates in the Senate I should like to say, especially to the new Members of the Senate, that during my 6 years one thing that has impressed me is that, regardless of the party with which one might be affiliated, or whatever its ideology, we develop friendships and fellowships here that mean much to us as the years come and go.

The end of the Eightieth Congress witnesses a turn-over in the United States Senate, and while I am not absolutely positive of the correctness of this statement, I think we will possibly lose more Members from the Senate who have served here for a long period than has happened at the conclusion of any other Congress.

It would be impossible for me to mention the names of all those who leave us today, but I wish to say to each and every one that, as the acting majority leader, whether they are on this side of the aisle or the other, I deeply feel their passing, and extend to them my very sincere wish for every good thing in their new careers in private life.

Now I wish to speak of three of these men who have rendered long periods of service. As I have already intimated, regardless of our party affiliations, we all believe in the two-party system in this country, because it is the foundation upon which our form of government actually rests. But there develops over the years the fellowship and friendship and comradeship to which I have referred.

Naturally we all have affection for the minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and we all desire to pay him our tribute today, and assure him of our respect, as he takes over in a short time the office of Vice President of the United States, and leaves his post where he has so fully and actively participated in the proceedings of the United States Senate, where we have come to know him so intimately. I do not know how long the Senator from Kentucky has served in the Congress of the United States, both the House of Representatives and the Senate, but I remember that one day a very interesting colloquy took place in which the Senator from Kentucky engaged the Senator from Tennessee in a debate as to who had rendered the longest service in this body and in the House of Representatives. Possibly all Senators now present remember the colloquy which ensued, and one of the statements made, namely, that one had been here longer than the other, and that one was still in short pants when the other one came to the House of Representatives. I am not sure which Senator won that debate, but I am sure that both of them have worn long pants as they have done their work in this great body.

Another Member of the Senate who concludes his term today is the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. One of the most fitting tributes ever accorded a Senator was paid Senator CAPPER by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who honored him with the inspiring observations he made at the conclusion of the special session last August. For me or anyone else to attempt to expand his remarks it seems to me would be an anticlimax to the very impressive and inspiring experience we all enjoyed at that time.

There are just a few facts I should like to present for the RECORD today about Senator CAPPER, who leaves the Senate after long experience here. He has been a Member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during his entire tenure of office in the Senate. To me, that seems unusual. For the past 2 years he has been the chairman of that committee. During the Coolidge and Hoover administrations he was chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and on that committee he is today the ranking Republican member. He has served on it for 30 years, and so well that in Washington circles he has been regarded as a Senator for the District of Columbia, as well as a Senator from the State of Kansas. He also is ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Before coming to the Senate, in 1919, Senator CAPPER had served 4 years as Governor of his native State of Kansas, from 1915 to 1919.

Four major pieces of legislation bear his name: The Capper-Volstead Act, legal basis for every farmer cooperative in the Nation today; the Capper-Tincher Act, regulating trading in futures on the grain exchanges, since amended by the Capper-Jones Act so as to take in commodity exchanges; and the Capper-Ketcham Act, authorizing permanent appropriations for 4-H Club work. There also was a Capper Act which placed a representative of the Secretary of Agriculture on the Federal Reserve Board. The original act reducing interest rates on Federal land-bank mortgages was sponsored by him.

Mr. President, I shall not go further into his record in the Senate. It is well known to all of us. I wish to say, however, that the thing about him which to my mind stands out above everything else is that during all the time I have had the privilege of associating with him and being a friend of his I have never known him to utter nor ever heard of him saying an unkind word respecting any person, or of doing an unkind deed. I think that when such a tribute can truthfully be paid to a man it is really a remarkable tribute, and it is something from which we should all profit.

Another of our colleagues who will leave the Senate today is the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. I suppose that during the past 2 years I have been more closely associated with him than any other Member of the Senate. During that time there has been developed between us not only a friendship but a comradeship of which I am justly proud. Having had such a close relationship with the Senator from Maine I am inspired by it to pay a tribute to this public servant who has performed such a masterful job as a Senator, as chairman of the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and as the majority floor leader of the Republican Party.

Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., was born in Lewiston, Maine, August 6, 1877. His first service in Washington was as secretary to his grandfather, Senator William P. Frye.

Elected to the House of Representatives in 1916, he took his seat April 6, 1917, at the special session of Congress called by President Wilson to declare war. He served in the House until 1930 when he was elected to the Senate, in which body he has served ever since.

From 1928 to 1930 he was chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House. He served as

minority leader of the Senate from 1944 to 1946, when he was elected majority leader. During the past 2 years he has also served as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Senator WHITE'S service is in the great tradition of our Nation. With the exception of a 6-year period from 1911 to 1917—please bear this in mind, for I think it establishes a record—with the exception of a 6-year period from 1911 to 1917, Senator WHITE and his grandfather, Senator William P. Frye, have served the people of Maine and of America in Congress continuously since 1871, a period of more than three-quarters of a century.

Those of us who have been honored with WALLACE WHITE'S friendship, know that among his outstanding characteristics are his integrity, which is above reproach; his loyalty, which is unquestioned; and his faith, which is abiding. He is beloved by each and every Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, and it is with deep regret that we see such a distinguished American pass from the ranks of Senate membership into private life.

Mr. President, I can think of no more fitting tribute that can be paid the honorable Senator from Maine than that of having him make the final motion to adjourn. This is the last motion he will make as a Senator, as floor leader, and it will conclude the work of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as colleague of the senior Senator from Maine, I ask the indulgence of the Senate to express what I know to be the unanimous sentiment of the Members of this body, the deep regard and affection with which my colleague has come to be held through the period of his rather extraordinary service. I shall not undertake to amplify what the acting majority leader has said regarding his public service except to point out that from that record it will be found the American merchant marine perhaps owes as much to him as to any other single American to the end that the American flag still flies upon the high seas.

On the subject of communications Senator WHITE has been recognized as the authority, for, regardless of party ties, President Roosevelt selected him as the chairman of the American delegation to repeated international communication conferences in spite of the fact that he was a member of the minority at the time. That was a distinct recognition of knowledge, ability, and patriotic devotion.

As a colleague in recent years of the senior Senator from Maine I can only add my deep personal regard and esteem, and to express profound satisfaction that in spite of his decision now to leave the active public service we shall still have available his rich experience and his wise counsel to assist us in the many problems with which America will continue to be faced.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not want this session to end without adding my tribute to the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who are voluntarily retiring, in addition to those who retire as political casualties by reason of what happened in November.

Senator CAPPER has served Kansas longer than any other citizen has served it in its existence. His 30 years in the Senate, following 4 years as governor, is a record which will stand for the next hundred years. No man in Kansas has enjoyed greater respect and admiration and confidence on the part of the people of Kansas than has Senator CAPPER as governor and as Senator.

Mr. President, when I came to the Senate 10 years ago I became a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, and was associated on that committee with the Senator from Maine, WALLACE WHITE. For the last 2 years he has been chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I have been called to serve under his chairmanship.

There are no two men in the Senate who have won to a greater extent the respect and confidence of the Senate than have the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Maine.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would be remiss to the emotions of my being did I not say one word. The Senate of the United States, the Nation, can ill afford to lose the intellectual honesty, the courage, the conviction that WALLACE WHITE brought to the public service, and which has marked his every thought and act through a long and useful career. By instinct and inheritance he has been a Senator in the great tradition. I have known many men in the years that I have been privileged to serve in public capacity, but I have never known one who had more courage and who was farther from ever stooping to do the purely expedient thing. I know of no man for whom I have a more profound affection or more respect than I do for the distinguished Senator from Maine, and I shall miss his presence in this body. His life and character have been a constant source of inspiration to me, and I am blessed to be able to call him friend.

I repeat the words that I uttered once before on this floor, paraphrasing the Bard of Avon:

His life is gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world "This was a man!"

Hail and farewell to a great American citizen. I pray that he may be vouchsafed many years of peace and happiness.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is most unfortunate that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the minority leader of the Senate, is unable, because of a temporary indisposition, to be present today. In view of his long and distinguished service in the United States Senate he is much more capable of paying just tribute to those to whom tribute is due than is the Senator from Illinois.

In my brief service in the United States Senate it has been my privilege to be associated rather closely with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], who by retiring as a United States Senator severs his connection with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which he served so long. During all the time he was chairman of that committee, I want to bear witness to the Senate and the country that he was fair, just, and courteous. At all times he had the welfare of the basic industry of America, which is agriculture, at heart. No more lovable character has served in the Senate during my period of service than the Senator from Kansas.

My experience with the majority leader, Mr. WHITE, has been a most unusual one. He is a man to whom a younger Senator could go for advice and counsel. In him one could place trust and confidence, because when WALLACE WHITE said anything he was speaking from a heart of truth. His long experience in the United States Senate has been of great assistance to me at various times during my short career in this great legislative body. He is a mild-mannered man, courteous, and easy to get along with. Yet from the lips of WALLACE WHITE I have heard some of the most profound statements upon controversial issues that I have heard from any man who has served in this body during my period of service.

Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senators who have spoken so highly of the retiring Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Carl Loeffler. What is true of WALLACE WHITE with respect to courtesy, fairness, and decency, counsel, and advice, is also true of Carl Loeffler. He is a gentleman of the old school, who understands good fellowship, who has intuitive judgment about human beings and problems. He is a great and good citizen who passes out of the political arena today along with other distinguished men. I am glad to rise and pay this brief but sincere tribute to honorable and good men.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it has been said that peace has its victories no less renowned than those of war, and that the forum has its gallant leaders as well as do the more famous battlefields. In the past few moments in this chamber encomiums have been paid to such distinguished leaders.

It was my great privilege to serve for many years on the Commerce Committee with the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]; and for the past 2 years on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. In those committee relationships, as well as in the Senate and in the happiest personal associations, I came to treasure their friendships and to admire and revere their ability, their sterling characters, and their innate capacities.

There are many whose going saddens all of us. As has been so well said by the acting majority leader [Mr. WHERRY] our personal relations have always clung more tenaciously in our memories than have the differences we may have had upon matters of public policy. I know of nobody in which personal relationships reach deeper into sentiment and into the wells of tender affection than in the Senate of the United States.

When these gentlemen go forth from these walls, may they have the satisfaction of knowing that, in the opinion of their colleagues, to as great an extent as any men who live they have reached the Biblical standard, so that one is able to say that they have constantly grown in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and man. May the blessings

of Providence, like the affection of their colleagues, follow them through many very happy and useful years.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now yield to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] with the request that he formally make the motion to adjourn.

RESPONSE OF SENATOR WHITE—ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I cannot resist saying a brief word in appreciation of all the kindly expressions which have come to me during this day from Members on both sides of the Chamber, as well as the many kindnesses which have been shown me throughout my long service in this body. I am deeply grateful, but I am robbed of the words adequately to express how I feel. I am eternally grateful.

NOW, Mr. President, it is my understanding that the business appropriate to today has been concluded. Because of that fact, in pursuance of action taken concurrently by House and Senate, I now move that the Senate adjourn sine die, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator and Representatives.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned sine die.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1948

Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 222, the House met and was called to order at 12 o'clock noon by the Speaker, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Father of mankind, we would be still and know that Thou art God, holy and blessed forevermore. In the afterglow of this holy season, O let the Star of Bethlehem radiate until it lightens the darkened corners of the earth, bringing peace to men of good will.

As we stand at the threshold of a new year, lay Thy hand upon the homes of our land; O pour the blended spirit of city, village, and country into the chalice of our national life that it may ever bear the fruitage of unselfish devotion to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. We ask in the name of Jesus our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, August 7, 1948, was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT MADE AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 18, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of August 7, 1948, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did, on August 14, 1948, appoint as a member of the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] to fill the existing vacancy thereon caused by the resignation of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 223, Eightieth Congress, he did, on August 7, 1948, sign a joint resolution of the Senate, as follows:

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures.

And on August 8, 1948, a joint resolution of the House as follows:

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on August 9, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION AFTER ADJOURNMENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States received by the Clerk of the House reported that on the following dates the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On August 10, 1948:

H. R. 6959. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

On August 13, 1948:

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Progress report on fuel investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

HON. PAUL C. JONES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the secretary of state of the State of Missouri, I have received, as of November 26, the certificate of election of the Honorable PAUL C. JONES as Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Tenth Congressional District of that State, to fill the unexpired term of the Honorable Orville Zimmerman, now deceased.

This special election was held on November 2, 1948.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

HON. CLARENCE G. BURTON

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the secretary of the State Board of Elections of the Commonwealth of Virginia, I have received, as of December 8, the certificate of election of the Honorable CLARENCE G. BURTON as a Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of that Commonwealth, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond.

This special election was held on November 2, 1948.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the secretary of state of the State of Texas, I have received, as of December 30, the certificate of election of the Honorable LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR., as a Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Fifteenth Congressional District of that State, to fill the vacancy for the unexpired term of the Honorable Milton H. West, deceased.

This special election was held on December 4, 1948.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. BURTON, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. PAUL C. JONES appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 30, 1948.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I take this means of informing you that I have transmitted to the Governor of South Dakota my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the First District of South Dakota with the stipulation that this resignation become effective as of 12:01 a. m. of December 31, 1948.

With best wishes, I am
Cordially yours,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Member of Congress.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO MAKE REPORT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following joint resolution (H. J. Res. 448) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act of July 7, 1947, entitled "An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," is amended as follows:

(1) Section 10 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Report: Not later than 70 days after the Eighty-first Congress is convened and organized, the Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress."

(2) Section 3 is amended, as of December 31, 1948, by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(d) Continuation of membership upon change of status: Despite the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a Member of Congress or in the status of a person in the executive branch of the Government, who thereafter ceases to have such status, shall nevertheless continue as a member of the Commission, and from and after his change of status shall, if he has returned to private life (except for his membership on the Commission), receive the same compensation as a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a person from private life."

The resolution was engrossed, read the third time, and passed.

CERTAIN STUDIES OF CAPITOL POWER PLANT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 719) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the House Office Building Commission, is authorized and directed to enter into a contract with competent engineers to conduct an investigation and study of the steam distribution systems and the refrigeration supply and distribution systems of the Capitol power plant, with particular view to future load increases, at a cost not to exceed $8,000, which shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such Commission, signed by the chairman of such Commission, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROVISION FOR SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 224) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, December 31, 1948, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 718) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 718, the Chair appoints as the House members of the committee to notify the President of the United States the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS OR JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CLERK AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I transmit herewith the third report to Congress on the United States foreign-aid program made pursuant to Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress. This report was received in the office of the Clerk from the President of the United States on November 8, 1948.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THIRD QUARTERLY REPORT OF EXPENDITURES AND ACTIVITIES UNDER THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the third quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-aid program authorized by Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress, approved December 17, 1947.

This report covers the period from April 1 through June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 8, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The attached sealed envelope indicating on its face that it contains a message from the President of the United States, and addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, was received in the office of the Clerk on December 6, 1948.

Respectfully,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the fifth quarterly report (covering the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949) on United States military assistance to Greece and Turkey. Military aid to Greece and Turkey was inaugurated under the authority of Public Law 75, Eightieth Congress, and was continued under the authority of title III of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, known as the Greek-Turkish Assistance Act of 1948. Responsibility for United States assistance in the economic rehabilitation of Greece begun under Public Law 75 was, pursuant to Public Law 472, title I, transferred effective July 1, 1948, to the Economic Cooperation Administration, and results are reported to the Congress under that title.

The encouraging prospect for substantial elimination of the Greek guerrilla forces which existed at the time of the victory of the Greek National Army in the Grammos Mountains and which was referred to in the report for the period ending June 30, 1948, has unfortunately not materialized. A military stalemate has ensued which has prolonged the struggle. The United States is, of course, through the American Mission for Aid to Greece, continuing to deliver to the Greeks necessary military supplies and equipment and to advise and assist the Greek armed forces, in accordance with the Assistance Act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The accompanying fourth report to Congress on assistance to Greece and Turkey

was received from the President of the United States in the office of the Clerk on October 5, 1948.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 75 (80th Cong., 1st sess., 61 Stat. 103) is the fourth quarterly report of expenditures and activities in conjunction with the program for aid to Greece and Turkey.

This legislation was enacted at a critical juncture in the history of the struggle for peace, involving the right of small nations to self-determination of their future. The conspicuous success of this program in enabling the people of Greece to meet the military and economic crisis which confronted them, and in supporting the Turkish determination to remain independent in the face of external pressure, has contributed significantly toward stabilizing this strategic area of the world in the interest of world peace.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 4, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: On September 15, 1948, the Clerk received the accompanying twenty-sixth report to Congress on lend-lease operations from the President of the United States.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the twenty-sixth report of operations under the Lend-Lease Act.

The attached report on lend-lease fiscal operations was prepared by the Treasury Department and submitted to the Secretary of State in accordance with Executive Order No. 9726. The period covered is from March 11, 1941, through September 30, 1947.

Activities to complete fulfillment of the various pipe-line agreements have continued since the issuance of the twenty-fifth report.

A final settlement agreement was signed with Norway on February 24, 1948. In March, Haiti paid the balance due on its account. An arrangement was concluded with Brazil on April 15, 1948, fixing the terms of payment of the amount due under the original master agreement with Brazil.

As stated in chapter 4 of the twenty-third lend-lease report, one of the important remaining lend-lease functions is the collection of payments due under various international agreements. Some of these agreements involve matters other than lend-lease, such as surplus property and claims. Recent payments arising out of agreements covering lend-lease, and in some cases other matters as well, are shown in the following list:

Brazil: $5,000,000 principal paid on July 15, 1948; installment on its remaining lend-lease obligations.

France: $13,000,000 interest paid in francs on July 1, 1948, under settlement agreement dated May 28, 1946.

Iran: $711,753.40 paid on April 29 and $711,753.40 on July 15, 1948, principal under settlement agreement dated December 21, 1945.

Netherlands: $960,000 interest paid in dollars on June 30, 1948, under settlement agreement dated May 28, 1947.

United Kingdom: $76,617.50 paid on March 31, $262,112.50 on April 30, $403,250 on May 28, and $403,250 on June 15, 1948 (paid in pounds), principal under settlement agreement dated December 6, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 15, 1948.*

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth quarterly reports of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration joint resolution received in the Clerk's office from the President of the United States on August 13, 1948.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the thirteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration joint resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from July 1, 1947, through September 30, 1947.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of UNRRA's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited primarily to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of September 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the fourteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration joint resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from October 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of December 31, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the fifteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration joint resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from January 1, 1948, through March 31, 1948.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of March 31, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The accompanying third quarterly report to Congress on the United States' foreign-relief program was received in the office of the Clerk from the President of the United States on September 1, 1948.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THIRD QUARTERLY REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN RELIEF PROGRAM — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the third quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-relief program authorized by Public Law 84 of the Eightieth Congress, approved May 31, 1947, to provide "relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war." This report covers the quarter ending March 31, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 1, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The attached sealed envelope indicating on its face that it contains a message from the President of the United States, and addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, was received in the office of the Clerk on November 4, 1948.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

FOURTH REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN RELIEF PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the fourth quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-relief program, authorized by Public Law 84 of the Eightieth Congress, approved May 31, 1947.

This report covers the period from April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 4, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the President of the United States the Clerk received on October 4, 1948, the accompanying first report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration made pursuant to Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

FIRST REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the first report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

This report is for the period April 3 to June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 4, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The attached sealed envelope indicating on its face that it contains a message from the President of the United States, and addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, was received in the office of the Clerk on October 21, 1948.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SUPPLEMENT TO THE FIRST REPORT TO CONGRESS OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the supplement to the first report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 21, 1948.*

CONGRESSIONAL INAUGURATION COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

NOVEMBER 29, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Congressional Inauguration Committee, such resignation to take effect as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,
L. C. ARENDS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of August 7, 1948, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did on November 29, 1948, appoint as a member of the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that in view of the long-standing custom of the House of Representatives there will be no speeches made today except in eulogy of our deceased members.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three articles.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report of the Subcommittee on Questionable Trade Practices, although it may exceed the allowance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio talk made by him.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of nearly nine happy and informative years for me in the House of Representatives—for today the Eightieth Congress ends. This means that it is my last day in the House, for as you know, I am relinquishing my seat in the House to move over to the Senate.

I shall miss my friends in the House, friends who have generously given of their time and talents to "teach me the ropes" in Congress to make a better legislator of me. I shall never forget my friends in the House who have taught me patience, forbearance, parliamentary procedure, clean progressive politics—who have given me constructive lessons in statesmanship. Without these friends I would never have been able to equip

myself with the necessary qualifications for the United States Senate in the degree as approved by the people of Maine in granting me that office on September 13. Yes, much of my good fortune will be directly attributable to my friends in the House.

I shall be homesick for the House. One of the good things about being elected to the Senate is that I will be in Washington with my good friends in Congress—to be able to walk over from the other side of the Capitol and to return to the floor of the House and renew and continue friendships which have meant and mean so much to me. I say to the membership of the House, and to its truly great leader, the Speaker, thank you from the bottom of my heart.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three statements by Paul O. Peters of the Select Committee on Small Business.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Champaign News-Gazette about the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by George J. Burger, a member of the board of directors of the National Federation of Small Business, made before the Committee on Monopolistic Practices of the Small Business Committee on November 17, 1948.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Public Printer that the estimated cost of printing is $177.50. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include copy of a bill which he introduced today.

Mr. HOBBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities together with some documents released to the press.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: First, in connection with the death of George F. Rogers; and, secondly, in connection with the death of Edgar A. Sharp, and also to include an editorial.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert a speech made by Gen. Omar N. Bradley.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. I believe it to be the unanimous sentiment of this House that we go on record to express our hearty appreciation of the excellent service rendered by the retiring Speaker, the Honorable JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

Although he was reelected as a Member of Congress by the flattering majority of 33,000, his party—Nation-wide—did not do as well. And so, due to circumstances beyond the claims of his own meritorious record, JOE MARTIN is stepping down from the Speakership to his old and able role as minority floor leader.

Even we, of the Democratic Party, regret this transition, for there is no more democratic Member of this body—and I use the word in its nonpartisan meaning—than the genial and fair-minded Representative from the Fourteenth Massachusetts District.

His own party is indebted to him for his steadfast devotion to those principles which he believes in. Under his Speakership, we of the opposition have learned to respect him highly. In an office whose power and responsibility is second only to that of the Presidency, he has worked hard, honestly, and well.

It is such character that nourishes our national unity in spite of partisan divisions, and to this, we of the opposite party wish to pay tribute.

We tender to you our thanks for your distinguished and invaluable leadership. But, what is more, we want you to know that we think you are a swell guy.

This comes from your legion of friends on both sides of the aisle who hope that you will be with the Congress for many, many years to come.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include therewith excerpts.

Mr. LYLE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Mr. Dale Miller.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] to kindly take the chair.

Mr. MCCORMACK assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I come to perform a pleasurable duty in one sense, and one that is not so, in another. I come to speak of the man who will in all probability on next Monday vacate the Speaker's chair.

Before I offer a resolution of thanks to him for his uniform kindness and fairness, I desire to say that as minority leader when I was Speaker, and as Speaker when I was minority leader, our relationships personally, and in the conduct of the business of the House, have been uniformly pleasant. He has worked with me as I have sought to work with him.

I say this without fear of contradiction, that he will go down in the history of the House of Representatives as one of the fairest, one of the ablest men who ever graced the chair of Speaker. I look forward in the days to come to a continuation of that fine association, because I will need his counsel, I will need his help, and I will need and desire the benefit of his great parliamentary skill.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I offer a highly privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 720) offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the House are presented to the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the able, impartial, and dignified manner in which he has presided over the deliberations and performed the arduous duties of the Chair during the present term of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the vote on the resolution may be had by a rising vote of the House.

The question was taken; and on a rising vote the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to express his sincere thanks to the distinguished gentleman from Texas for his generous and laudatory remarks and also the splendid comradeship to every Member of the House. It has been a pleasure for me to have served 2 years as your Speaker. I have endeavored to the best of my ability to be fair to all. At all times I have been conscious of the great prestige the House enjoys among the people of this country, a prestige that makes the heart of every Member of this body swell with pride. This great House of Representatives is a symbol, a symbol of democracy; it is a symbol of a people's government. I have tried to maintain that high tradition. Let me say any success I may have enjoyed would not have been possible without the generous support of the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the always fair and uniform cooperation of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Each of us have our own opinions, sometimes they are in conflict; but I have always been proud to say that few people ever came to the Congress who were not trying each in his own way to build a better and finer country. I have been proud of membership in this Congress not only in these last two critical years, but in the 24 years I have served in this body.

Next Monday, in another role, I hope to have a greater opportunity to express my personal tribute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], when I present him to the House as your Speaker. I know we will all be in safe hands when he is Speaker. I thank the Members of the House for their generous resolution which I shall always cherish.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes.

THE LATE FRANK W. COLLIER

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 721).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Frank W. Collier, Postmaster of the House of Representatives from the Sixty-sixth Congress to the Seventy-second Congress, and for the Eighth Congress.

Resolved, That the Clerk transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

FLORENCE M. COLLIER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 722) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Florence M. Collier, widow of Frank W. Collier, late Postmaster of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 1 year's salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Frank W. Collier.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE MILTON H. WEST

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, since last we convened here the State of Texas, the Congress, and the Nation have sustained a great loss in the passing of our former colleague from Texas, a Member of the Eightieth Congress, Hon. MILTON WEST, who passed away in the city of Washington on the 28th day of October 1948.

This year I have served as chairman of the Texas congressional delegation, and on behalf of the members of the delegation I speak at this time. We, of course, were shocked and grieved over the passing of our colleague. He was our friend.

Earlier in the year when Mr. WEST announced that he would not seek reelection to Congress I had occasion in the House of Representatives to speak of this stalwart friend and his distinguished service in the Congress.

He came to the House of Representatives during the Seventy-third Congress when the Honorable John Nance Garner from southwest Texas was made Vice President. At the time this seat became vacated MILTON WEST took over and served here for many years with great distinction.

MILTON WEST was much beloved by his colleagues from Texas and he was much beloved by the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. He performed a great service to his own district and State, to the Congress, and the Nation. We all mourn his passing and we extend our sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve with MILTON WEST in the Texas Legislature nearly 20 years ago. We knew him there as here, as a man who would speak his mind without hesitation and without reservation. We knew him as one on whom we could rely and one whose word was always good. We came to have a real affection for MILTON WEST as did the Members of this House.

MILTON WEST has served his State and his Nation over a long period of time with credit to himself and with great benefit to his own community. His passing was a great loss to the Nation, and although he had voluntarily retired from the Congress and was not a candidate for reelection, his passing will be felt in Texas and throughout the United States. All of us will find ourselves the poorer by losing this great friend of ours.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, this is our first meeting since the untimely death of our late lamented friend and former colleague, the Honorable MILTON WEST, of Brownsville, Tex. I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to him. He served his district, the State of Texas, and the Nation here in the Congress for many years with rare distinction. He was a rugged individualist of whom we have too few. He commanded the respect of all who knew him. There was never any doubt of his position on any issue. He always fought for what he thought to be right with honesty, courage, and ability. Our country is a better place because of his life and service, and suffered a great loss in his passing.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to pay my tribute to MILTON WEST. He was one of the finest men I have ever associated with in all my life. He was a man who had his own individual ideas and at heart he was one of the finest characters I have ever known. Always sincere in the things he wanted to do, he did those things which he believed would be in the best interest of his country.

The people of Texas have lost a great representative, the people of the United States have lost a man who was always interested in doing those things that would make our country a better place in which to live. Personally, I have lost one of the finest friends I have ever had.

Mr. Speaker, MILTON WEST's name will go down in history as one of the greatest Congressmen. He was a friend at all times, a man for whom we had great respect and confidence. His loss is mourned by all.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for giving me this opportunity to say a word of tribute to our late colleague and my very dear friend, MILTON WEST. While I had the honor to be chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. WEST served for a number of years as a member of that committee. Up to the time his health failed he was always attentive and diligent in his work, and his outstanding ability was equaled only by his courage. He always acted in a way that he conceived to be his duty, not only for the best interest of his own district, but in advancement of the welfare of the entire country. He enjoyed the respect and confidence and, I might say, the love of each member of our committee.

MILTON WEST succeeded a great man in this House. He represented the district formerly represented by the great John Nance Garner, who was for many years, as we all know, one of the most able and outstanding Members of this House. Mr. Garner served two terms as Vice President of the United States.

MILTON WEST succeeded a great man; he represented a great district; and he discharged his duties in a most commendable manner. I am proud and glad to have the privilege of saying a word of tribute to the splendid work he did in this Congress.

In closing I express my deepest and most profound sympathy for each member of his family in their great sorrow and bereavement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this Nation lost a wise legislator, an able, fearless, public servant in the passing of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, of Texas. Those who have served with Representative WEST know that he was firm in his convictions and moreover that he had the courage to stand by them at all times and under all circumstances. Here was the type of Representative who never deviated from what he considered the fundamental principles of sound government.

Although a quiet man, when he did express himself either in committee or on the floor of the House his words carried weight with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

During the Seventy-third Congress to the Eightieth Congress, inclusive, the service of Representative WEST in the

House of Representatives was of the highest order in the field of statesmanship. I knew him well. I not only had a profound respect for him but a deep affection as well. We were personal friends to the very last.

I consider that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has lost one of its ablest and most valuable members in the passing of our distinguished colleague from Texas.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. West and to the relatives and friends of Representative WEST.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to add my word of tribute to this distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST]. He was a a man of noble impulse; a man of the highest character; a rugged man of the soil. It was a pleasure to serve with him on the Ways and Means Committee when we were considering matters of great importance, which we did frequently on that important committee; it was a test of one's intelligence, and more important yet, it was a test of one's courage and fortitude. With the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] it apparently was easy for him to make his decision and it was easy for us to know his position and to know that when he once took a position he could be depended upon. I shall miss MILTON WEST, for I had great confidence in him and great respect for his opinion.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it was with very deep regret that I heard of the unfortunate passing of our distinguished colleague, MILTON WEST, of Texas. It was my privilege to serve with him throughout his service here and to be rather closely associated with him as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. He was a man who possessed the highest attributes of character and all of the sterling qualities of manhood; a man of recognized ability and demonstrative devotion to public service.

I am sure we all extend our deepest sympathies to the members of his bereaved family.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay a modest tribute to my good friend, MILTON WEST, who has been to me a paragon of rugged honesty and helpful in all the things that are good and decent. May God rest his soul.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, strong, stalwart, statesmanlike, fearless, without ever asking any quarter from anybody anywhere, MILTON WEST, from the State of Texas, which is not a State but an empire, stood on the floor of this House and voiced his opinion and spoke his convictions often at times against his own colleagues.

There is not much remuneration that we get from being in this body except the camaraderie and the good friendship, but always until my dying day shall I cherish the memory of MILTON WEST.

He was no softie or cream puff. He was not a sissy. No one ever accused him of being such. He was a Texas Ranger. He had red blood in his veins, he had clear thinking in his mind, and he had brotherly love in his heart.

I loved MILTON WEST more than I ever dared tell him. CLARENCE LEA, you who have served for a third of a century in this House, knew him well. We are sorry to see you leave, but having lived and associated with him all these years, I know that you like myself will cherish his blessed memory.

Words are weak and impotent, they are so hollow, and we cannot really give expression to the feeling that is deep down in our hearts, but you who lived with him and knew him much better than most any of us know that we can say "Here is a man." God bless him and his loved ones through all the years to come.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it was with real sorrow and regret that I learned of the death of our colleague and member of our committee, Hon. MILTON WEST, of Texas.

During my terms of service in the House of Representatives, and more particularly since I became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I learned to know him and to admire him for his outstanding ability, for his courage, and his loyalty. I know that we are all sorry to hear of his death.

I extend to his family and relatives my sincerest condolences.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, during my entire service on the Committee on Ways and Means I enjoyed very much the friendship and comradeship of MILTON WEST. He served on that committee with distinction to himself, to his district, and to the Congress of the United States and to the United States as a nation.

It was with great regret and sorrow that I learned of his death. I knew that he had been ill for several months. I join with the other Members who have expressed their sorrow at his passing.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, an honor for me to speak of my distinguished and honored predecessor, MILTON H. WEST.

God in his wisdom has seen fit to take from our midst one of the House of Representatives' most courageous and capable men. I knew MILTON WEST and members of his family intimately, although I did not have the privilege, as you men had, of serving with him. But I did have the honor of being one of his constituents.

He was of the pioneer stock that took Texas as a frontier country and made it the progressive State it is today. His life story is almost a legendary one of service to the people of this Nation as a Texas Ranger, district attorney, State legislator, and United States Representative.

The things that MILTON stood for were pronounced by his every deed and his every action. He was known throughout his district as a man of courage and ability, a man who voted his convictions in serving both his district and his country.

Now that MILTON WEST has gone west, we of his district want the Members of the House to know that the thoughts and love of the people of his district go with him. He was a sincere, honest, and generous citizen of our State—a man we like to think of as a real Texan.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the words of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], or at least some of them, in describing the man, MILTON WEST, were accurate and deeply touching. Always when I thought of MILTON WEST, I thought of two things. I thought of the Rock of Ages and I thought of the giant oak. He was sturdy; he was strong. He was a Texas Ranger in the days when it was dangerous to be an officer of the law in some sections of the far West. He was a sheriff. He was a lawyer. He was a prosecuting attorney. He was a Congressman. He was true to the ancient faith every day of his good life.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in Texas, MILTON WEST needs no eulogy, for it is written in the hearts and minds of the people who knew and admired him. He typified the spirit of the West, of those who believed in good, old-fashioned Americanism. He had but little patience with those who want something for nothing, who sneer at the fundamentals of our democratic institutions.

MILTON WEST was reared in southwest Texas, along the silvery waters of the Rio Grande, where he developed a code of honor and justice which followed him throughout his useful life. In Congress he devoted himself to the welfare of his own constituents with a frequency unequaled. Among men of honor he commanded the highest respect, and with his logic and soundness of judgment he wielded a tremendous influence.

Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our friend, the State of Texas and his district have lost an eminent representative and an outstanding citizen, the Nation has lost an exponent of those principles of sound government which must be preserved if our democracy is to survive, and I have lost a treasured friend.

By the memory of MILTON WEST, let us resolve to cultivate, preserve, and emulate those fine qualities which characterized his career; let us determine to meet the call of duty with that firmness of character and devotion to principle which typified his life.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House who desire to do so may have unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point in regard to the passing of our late beloved colleague, MILTON WEST.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our beloved colleague, MILTON WEST, the membership of the House and the people of his great district have lost an able and patriotic public servant. No man has ever served in the House who was more highly regarded by his colleagues than he. His common honesty, good level head and straightforward manner in dealing with men and problems endeared him to all of us. We will miss his wise counsel and his personal friendship.

I enjoin with you in expressing to his lovely family our deep and sincere sympathy. We share with them their great sorrow and irreparable loss.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 723) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN J. DELANEY

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, since the House recessed at the special session, we in New York have lost a very distinguished Member of our congressional delegation in the death of the Honorable JOHN J. DELANEY.

Mr. DELANEY represented his district in Brooklyn in this House for many years. He first came to Washington in the Sixty-fifth Congress, and later in the Seventy-second Congress, and remained here until his death, shortly after he had been elected to the Eighty-first Congress which will shortly convene.

JOHN DELANEY was one of the most beloved citizens of Brooklyn. For years he had been active in the fraternal and civic affairs of his native borough and had served the city of New York as one of its deputy commissioners in one of its very important departments.

He came here as a young man and devoted himself to the service of his country and to the legislation in this House. He was made a member of the Rules Committee of the House, where he served with distinction for many years.

I am sure we are all regretful of his passing, which came shortly after he had been reelected. Although during the last campaign he had been unable to go out and speak for himself, because of his illness, nevertheless his friends were legion, and they returned him to this House.

To his wife and son and daughter I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member who may desire to do so may extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of our late colleague and dear friend, JOHN DELANEY, is a personal loss to me, and a great loss to the House of Representatives. During our years of service, while I have become very close to many Members, and I think enjoy the friendship of most Members with whom I have served, there is none who occupied a closer or more friendly relationship than the late beloved JOHN DELANEY. He had a long and honorable service, not only in this body but in other public offices in the great State of New York.

JOHN DELANEY was not only a lovable personality, but a man of understanding nature; a man with whom anyone could live, without regard to differences of opinion or race or color or creed, because he was possessed of that one spirit, which I think is more important to enable people to live together than anything else—the spirit of understanding, of respect of one for the other, with an understanding state of mind.

JOHN DELANEY was a man of intense faith, a man of equally intense loyalties; and when in the journey of life you and I find a person of intense faith and intense loyalty we find one of God's noblemen.

My career in this body has been a rather interesting and checkered one. I served for 10 years on the Committee on Ways and Means and for 6½ years as majority leader. In the last 2 years I was a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That was the first time in my 20 years' service in this body with JOHN DELANEY that he and I were on the same committee. He was a tireless worker, not one who spoke excessively, but one who wielded a powerful influence in this body and in its committees, because of the respect we all had for him, and the last 2 years in committee work with JOHN DELANEY were most pleasant to me.

The House has lost one of its most humble Members, a man of great simplicity, but one of its most influential Members because of the persuasion he wielded in his quiet way, because of the noble things of which he was symbolic, and because of our response to his great endowments.

To his widow I extend my deepest sympathy, and I know that all of my colleagues join me in expressing to her their deepest sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, when JOHN DELANEY was a member of the Rules Committee I leaned on him with confidence for many years. He was able, conscientious, loyal, patriotic, well schooled in the principles of sound government and their application. He endeavored at all times to beneficially serve not only his great State and district but all the people of the United States. He was in no sense or degree provincial. He showed extraordinary interest in the cause of labor and legislation in the interest of the masses. Frequently, he was the only man on whom I could consistently rely to help me in my endeavors in the Rules Committee to effect the mandates of the people and our party program. He could always be found on the side of the common people and trying to reflect in legislation the wishes of those who elected him.

I knew this lovable dead for many years. I saw him grow in stature as a statesman from the time he served first as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. He patiently and assiduously served an adequate novitiate before he became an influential member of the great Committee on Rules. I admired his unflinching courage to stand, after thorough and thoughtful consideration, for what he believed was right and for the best interest of the whole country.

I know his splendid family, consisting of wife, daughter, and son, to whom he has left an enviable record as good citizen, wise legislator, and humanitarian. May they in this sore and dark hour be comforted by the Giver of all good. His passing has left a void that will be hard to fill, because few men have the opportunity that was his, and which he embraced with enthusiasm, to acquire so much useful and practical information to help make this a better world for men and women of good will.

Although a lawyer by profession, our friend concentrated all efforts on his congressional duties. He was seldom absent when a roll call came on important measures and never unnecessarily absent. Indeed he represented his district with honor and distinction many years; and he has left a real imprint upon the major activities of National Government in the difficult era in which he served with perfect fidelity and selflessness.

His services will be gratefully remembered by many who are his beneficiaries; and I hope members of his family will extract from this useful life a sustaining love and remembrance that may soften this severe blow that must at this time seem irreparable. The gratitude of myriads will live long in connection with our deceased colleague. His earthly work is finished; but his influence for good is imperishable.

In thinking of our departed friend let us remember our obligation to make safe and secure the government of the people which has been committed to our keeping. Let us remember that it can thrive and grow only in a spirit of popular attachment and unselfish devotion; and, above all, let us remember the lessons and admonitions that flow from the useful life which we today memorialize.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, when I listen to these eulogies year after year, I like to think in what respect a certain individual was particularly outstanding. I knew JACK DELANEY well, although he came from a great metropolitan district and I come from a rural district, and although he was a Democrat and I a Republican we were very warm friends.

We lived at the same hotel and I knew him well. His character was above reproach. But he was distinctive in that he was preeminent in his unfailing courtesy. He was always a gentleman. He was warm and cordial and always courteous. I shall miss him and I extend to his widow my most profound sympathy.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress I met JOHN DELANEY and I found him to be most interesting, affable, and very helpful, even though he was a Member on the other side of the House. We were very good friends. We often dined together and talked things over. He was particularly interested in legislation that would take care of Members of Congress in their old age or on their retirement.

I looked upon Mr. DELANEY as a great citizen, a man who rendered a splendid public service to his Nation, to his city, and to his State. I regret his passing. I consider it a personal loss, and I extend to Mrs. Delaney and his family my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, JOHN DELANEY was a fine, Christian gentleman. He was a member of the opposite party, but as a neighbor in the House Office Building and having served on the same committee with me, and living in the same hotel, I knew Mr. DELANEY as a fine Christian gentleman and mourn his loss.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to pay my respects to JOHN DELANEY. He was progressive, far-sighted, and generous. Mr. DELANEY was one of the first Members to welcome me to this great body, because we both came from Brooklyn.

It was with regret that I noted his passing, which is a great loss, not only to this body but to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I could not fail to embrace this opportunity to raise my voice in very brief but sincere tribute to the life, character, and public service of our friend and colleague, JOHN J. DELANEY, of New York. It was my privilege to cherish a very warm and close friendship with him throughout the period of our services.

He was a man of unusual ability and great devotion to the public service. His heart beat in tune with the interest and welfare of the masses of our people. He was always extremely courteous and considerate of all of those with whom he came in contact. I am sure that we all feel a great loss now that he has passed away. We realize that his district, his city, and the Nation have lost an outstanding public servant.

We extend our deepest sympathies to his bereaved family.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of JOHN DELANEY I have lost one of my best personal friends. Since first I came to Congress, Mr. DELANEY was very kind and very generous to me. We spent many happy hours together. Our association was very close, and I join with the other Members in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family. His passing is not only a very definite loss to his own district but to the country. He was a humanitarian, a man of great understanding, and I sincerely sympathize with his family at this time.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my heartfelt tribute to my good friend, JOHN J. DELANEY, of New York, and to say, in his memory, that he has rendered a great service, not only to his people but to the entire Nation. I can ask but one thing of the Lord, and that is that He rest his worthy soul.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, JOHN DELANEY was one of the most kindly men it has been my privilege to know. He was honest, courageous, and able. He had in him those fine qualities out of which good and true men are made. God bless his family.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 724).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of the Eightieth Congress the State of South Dakota also lost a member of its congressional delegation, a Member of the other body, our very distinguished Senator HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD. Senator BUSHFIELD had been twice elected Governor of our State and was completing the sixth year of his term as Senator from South Dakota. He was one of the sturdiest and stanchest sons of the Northwest and it was a great loss to the State and the Nation when he passed away.

Senator BUSHFIELD had been in poor health for some months prior to his death. Last spring, that condition led to a decision to withdraw from a primary contest for nomination for reelection. Although he and his friends were confident of winning that contest, he calmly and deliberately decided that he did not have the physical strength to carry on a campaign in person at home and be faithful to his duties here in the Senate at the same time.

I shall never, never forget when he called me over to his office to tell me of his decision some days before he made a public announcement.

He was a man of great stature, a man accustomed to carrying out his convictions and his decisions with an iron will. He had led South Dakota out of the depression when he had to win support for a policy of economy and thrift and taxes in the days when drought had made our people poor. He led us with courage and confidence and the people responded to the inspiration of his call for sacrifice and hard work, though some called him cold and unfeeling.

That day, Mr. Speaker, I saw that his so-called coolness was but the calm courage of a true leader to follow the right as God gave him to see the right, cost what it might. When the time came for him to apply a difficult decision to himself, he was as true as steel to his sense of duty.

He had gone through whatever Gethsemane there is when a proud man peers into the shadows and sees the end of his hopes. The marks of the struggle were on his face that morning, but he did not flinch from carrying out the mandate of his conscience.

Some days later, when he announced his decision, I made some remarks in this Chamber on the outstanding service of Senator BUSHFIELD to South Dakota and the Nation and I shall not review them here. In passing I shall only say that in the days ahead, yes, in these very days, the world sorely needs men of the Bushfield courage, men of the Bushfield conviction, men of the Bushfield will, men who place public responsibility above personal ambition.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution for the consideration of the House and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 725).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, a Senator of the United States from the State of South Dakota.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 224. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the Congress on December 31, 1948.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution No. 273

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

Senate Resolution No. 281

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution No. 282

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as a further remark of respect to the deceased Members, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution No. 224 the Chair declares the second session of the Eightieth Congress adjourned sine die.

Whereupon (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned sine die.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes.

APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

A message from the President of the United States, received by the Clerk of the House, reported that on this day the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members elected to fill unexpired terms in the Eightieth Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the Eightieth Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

PAUL C. JONES, Tenth District of Missouri.

LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR., Fifteenth District of Texas.

CLARENCE G. BURTON, Sixth District of Virginia.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

[*Submitted September 24, 1948*]

1721. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of Defense Homes Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (pursuant to House Resolution 716, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 746); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1722. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on audit of the Inter-American Affairs Corporations for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and including in this report the audit of the Inter-American Navigation Corporation for the period July 1, 1946, to February 25, 1947 (pursuant to H. Res. 716, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 747); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

[*Submitted October 28, 1948*]

1723. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1946 and 1947 (pursuant to H. Res. 716, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 748); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1724. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 22, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, East Chester Creek (Hutchinson River), N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 27, 1945, and also authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 749); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1725. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 21, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Kenosha Harbor, Wis., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 750); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1726. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 11, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Grand Marais Harbor, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 19, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 751); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1727. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 6, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on San Joaquin River and Stockton Channel, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 6, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 752); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

[*Submitted December 16, 1948*]

1728. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (volume 6—deals exclusively with the activities of the subsidiary, Metals Reserve Company) (pursuant to H. R. 716, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

[*Submitted December 22, 1948*]

1836. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 9, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion study of Anna Maria and Longboat Keys, Fla. Made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 760); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with seven illustrations.

1837. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 5, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative study for beach erosion control at Santa Barbara, Calif., made under authority of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 761); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 13 illustrations.

1838. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 4, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Fire Island Inlet, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 762); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1839. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 5, 1947, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion study of certain portions of the shore line of North Carolina, made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 763); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 13 illustrations.

1840. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 10, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations,

on a cooperative study for beach erosion control of Winthrop Beach, Mass., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 764); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with eight illustrations.

1841. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 20, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion study of Jupiter Island, Fla., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 765); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with six illustrations.

[*Submitted December 29, 1948*]

1842. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 23, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Chocolate and Bastrop Bayous, Tex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 28, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 768); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

1843. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 16, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the shore in the vicinity of Punta Las Marias, San Juan, P. R., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 769); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 10 illustrations.

1844. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 12, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Far Creek, N. C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 27, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 770); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1845. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 21, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Christiansted Harbor, St. Croix, V. I., with a view to improvement for navigation, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 772); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1846. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 7, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion study of Palm Beach, Fla., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, and Public Law 166, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 31, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 772); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 12 illustrations.

1847. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 15, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Alabama-Coosa Branch of the Mobile River System, with a view to locating as nearly as can be determined the salinity line in the Mobile River and its tributaries, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 16, 1944 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 773); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with seven illustrations.

[*Submitted December 31, 1948*]

1729. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration, covering its operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1730. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of June 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1731. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of July 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1732. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of September 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1733. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of settlements of debts due Farmers Home Administration in excess of $1,000; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1734. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of August 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1735. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of that law for the month of October 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1736. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a request by the Junior Midshipman of America, Inc., for the transfer of a steel pontoon barge to be used at New London, Conn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1737. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, showing the amount of moneys credited to the helium-production fund and the amount of disbursements made therefrom during the preceding fiscal year, and the unexpended and unobligated balances on hand in such fund as of the end of such fiscal year (pursuant to sec. 3 (c) of the amendatory Helium Act approved September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 885; 50 U. S. C., sec. 164)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1738. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting an interim report covering the contracts negotiated by the NACA pursuant to the authority of sections 2 (c) (11) and (16) of that act during the period May 19 through June 30, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 413, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1739. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report for the period ending June 30, 1948, of real and personal property leased by the Department of the Navy under the authority of Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1740. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the sixth annual report, under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 560, Eightieth Congress, for the period July 1, 1947, through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1741. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report to Congress on transportation to and from places of employment for personnel attached to or employed by naval establishments and Navy contractors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1742. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting proceedings of the Forty-ninth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in St. Louis, Mo., August 29 to September 3, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1743. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the Fiftieth National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Washington, D. C., August 22 to 26, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Cong.), approved September 18, 1941); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1744. A letter from the adjutant and quartermaster general, Grand Army of the Republic, transmitting journal of proceedings of the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, held at Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1745. A letter from the Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the sixth semiannual report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, covering the period from January 1 through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1746. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the eighty-fifth annual report, covering the activities of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1747. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of petroleum products (pursuant to Public Law 395, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1748. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for factory-made steel houses, and copies of the requests for compliance therewith which the Secretary of Commerce has issued to various steel producers and steel consumers (pursuant to Public Law 395, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1749. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for the construction, conversion, and repair of domestic freight-carrying barges and towing vessels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1750. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for requirements of the armed forces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1751. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products to the anthracite industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1752. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for tank and oil-field production equipment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1753. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for oil tankers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1754. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for requirements of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1755. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for construction, reconversion, and repair of merchant vessels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1756. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, covering the housing activities of the Federal Government for the calendar year 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1757. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting its annual report, dated September 28, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 592, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1758. A letter from the President, Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, transmitting its report showing the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1759. A letter from the Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, for the year ended December 31, 1947, covering the regulation and operation, also financial and statistical data of the public utilities in the District of Columbia coming under the jurisdiction of said Commission (pursuant to pars. 14 and 20 of sec. 8 of an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1760. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the quarterly progress report by the War Assets Administration for the period July to September 1948 (pursuant to sec. 24 of the Surplus Property Act); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1761. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the eleventh report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1762. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report listing the contracts for research and development and industrial mobilization awarded by the Departments of the National Military Establishment from May 10 through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1763. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1764. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Production and Marketing Administration report of losses on the disposition of price-support commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the provisions of section 11 (e) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the limitations established in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1765. A letter from the Chairman, Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting the Third Semiannual Report of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission, for the period ending December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1766. A letter from Vassili Dendramis, Ambassador of Greece, transmitting a message voted and drafted by the Greek Parliament protesting barbarism, and an appeal to the United Nations Organization to come to the aid of the Greek people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1767. A letter from V. K. Wellington Koo, Ambassador of China, transmitting a message from the President and Vice President of the Legislative Yuan of China, dealing with the critical status of affairs in China and asking and appealing for increased and speedy aid, military and economic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1768. A letter from Dr. Francis Gordon, ex-Hungarian Minister in Switzerland, transmitting notes and copies of letters addressed to the Secretary of State and Members of the Senate of the United States and a report on the real events in Hungary from the beginning of 1945 to the end of 1947; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1769. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Power Commission to the Eighty-first Congress, first session, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (D) of the Federal Power Act, furnishing required information on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1770. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the seventeenth quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period July 1 through September 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1771. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Department of Commerce during the fiscal year 1948 under part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (title 4 of Public Law 601, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1772. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 35 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1773. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Panama Railroad Company in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) for the period July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1774. A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report to the Congress of tort claims paid by the Veterans' Administration pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (title IV, Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1775. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the fourth quarterly report required under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, entitled "Export Control and Allocation Powers"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1776. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the fifth quarterly report required under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1777. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a report of all tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1778. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting new and additional evidence in the case of Costos Kolitses which warrant the reopening of the entire proceedings and requesting that the case be withdrawn from those now before Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1779. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting quarterly report of claimant to whom relief has been granted under Public Law 657, together with the amount of such relief and a brief statement of the facts and the administration decision; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1780. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1781. A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from July 1 through September 30, 1948; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1782. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the fourth quarterly report outlining the activities of the Maritime Commission relating to ocean transportation to, from, and within Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1783. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly, the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1784. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1785. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of the budget for the municipality of St. Croix, V. I., for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1786. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certified copies of acts of the seventh special session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, July 12 to 25, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1787. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of the budget for the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., for the fiscal year July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1788. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the fourth quarterly (final) report covering conditions in underground bituminous coal and lignite mines inspected by the Federal coal-mine inspectors during the year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1789. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting his report and findings of a plan for the development of the Chino Valley project, Arizona, together with related data and letters of comment on the report; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1790. A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1791. A letter from the director, American Legion National Legislative Commission, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including October 31, 1948; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1792. A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to make clear the authority of the Administrator to negotiate rates of compensation for training in certain

institutions"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1793. A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, with the request that it be introduced and considered for enactment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1794. A letter from the director, the American Legion National Legislative Commission, transmitting proceedings of the thirtieth national convention of the American Legion, held at Miami, Fla., October 18 to 21, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1795. A letter from the Acting Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed pursuant to section 607 of the act for the quarter ending September 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1796. A letter from the Acting Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed pursuant to section 607 of the act as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.) for the quarter ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1797. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 (Public Law 106), a consolidated report and supporting data covering additional within-grade salary advancements as rewards for superior accomplishment made by the several Government departments and agencies during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1798. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting reports of funds received during the fiscal year 1948 for the rental of buildings and lands acquired as sites for the future construction of public buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

1799. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report from the Chief of Army Engineers on the compilation of preliminary examination, survey, and review reports on rivers and harbors, flood control, and beach erosion control prepared pursuant to House Resolution 716, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Public Works.

1800. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 6, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Taskmers Creek, Northumberland County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1801. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of harbor at public landing, Worcester County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1802. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Hudson River Channel, N. Y., and Hudson River, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 8, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1803. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Deep Creek and Fresh Water Pond, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1804. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 23, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of waterway, approximately 8 feet deep and 50 feet bottom width, from Crescent Lake, Fla., by way of Haw Creek to Bunnell, thence by way of a land cut to the sea at Flagler Beach, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

1805. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 10, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Pine River (Saginaw Bay), Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1806. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 25, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Bayamon and Hondo Rivers and their tributaries, municipality of Bayamon, P. R., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1807. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 14, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Peconic River, Long Island, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1808. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 9, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on waterway from Deleon Spring to St. Johns River, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 13, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

1809. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 5, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Wolf River (Memphis Harbor), Loosahatchie River, Tenn., from its mouth to the O. K. Robertson Road and including the area west of the Illinois Central Railroad and north of Wolf River, with a view to extending the navigation facilities of Memphis Harbor, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 18, 1945, and authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1810. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 4, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Sandy Hook Bay, N. J., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1811. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 7, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Hutchinson River and tributaries, New York, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1812. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 9, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of the Hague (Smith Creek), Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1813. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 6, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Tofte Harbor, Minn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1814. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 3, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Eau Gallie Inlet, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 17, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1815. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on St. Croix River, Minn. and Wis., with a view to providing a small-boat harbor at Stillwater, Minn., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 18, 1945, and Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on October 18, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1816. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 13, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, White and Bad Rivers, S. Dak. and Nebr., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on August 18, 1937, and also authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

1817. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of San Rafael Creek and its tributaries, California, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1818. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 3, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Hocking River in Hocking County, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1819. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 14, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Chester River Channel, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1820. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 28, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Nelscott, Oreg., with a view to the protection of the beach, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1821. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of St. Croix River Basin, Minn. and Wis., including consideration of the construction of dam below the mouth of Kettle River, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1822. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of channel from Charlestown, Northeast River, Md., to Havre de Grace, and from Havre de Grace, Md., to Red Point via Stump Point and Carpenter Point, authorized by River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1823. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 11, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Port Jefferson Harbor, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, adopted on October 19, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1824. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 14, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Centerport Harbor, Long Island, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1825. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 17, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Marumsco Creek, lower Somerset County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1826. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 4, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Camden Harbor, Maine, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 15, 1943; to the Committee on Public Works.

1827. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 9, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Tanners Creek, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1828. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 7, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Farnham Creek, Richmond County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1829. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 31, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Cimarron River, Okla. and Kans., including Kenton Reservoir, Cimarron River, Okla., and Dry Cimarron River, Union County, N. Mex., authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved on June 22, 1936, and August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

1830. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 5, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Estero River and tributaries, Puerto Rico, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1831. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Hoskins Creek, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 5, 1943; to the Committee on Public Works.

1832. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 30, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Clinton River, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1833. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Ross Cove (Magothy River), Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1834. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 17, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Jackson Creek, Westmoreland County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1835. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Mamaroneck and Sheldrake Rivers and their tributaries, New York, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1848. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list showing the number of officers in the Navy and Marine Corps above the rank of major in the Army or lieutenant commander in the Navy with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, filed on or before January 1, annually (pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1849. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to adjust salaries of officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1850. A letter from V. K. Wellington Koo, Chinese Ambassador to the United States, transmitting a message signed by the members of the National Assembly of the Republic of China asking for assistance from the United States to help combat communism in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1851. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting the reports of the American National Red Cross for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1947, and June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1852. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter referring to a letter dated April 15, 1948, showing 107 cases involving suspension of deportation, and requesting as of December 21, 1948, that the case of Victor Gama-Bermudez be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1853. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a message from the Congress of Guam, signed by B. J. Bordallo, President of House of Council, and A. Won Pat, Speaker, House of Assembly, Ninth Guam Congress, extending from the people of Guam the season's greetings and best wishes for a successful and prosperous New Year; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1854. A letter from the Governor of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1855. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on a plan for the development of the Snowflake project, Arizona, together with related data and letters of comment on the report; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1856. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting certificates of the final ascertainment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States chosen in the respective States on November 2, 1948; to the Committee on House Administration.

1857. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty-inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1947, the number of pieces procured, the estimated mailings, and the estimated cost by departments and agencies for the period July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1858. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the Fifteenth Annual Report of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

1859. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting 10 copies of the Annual Report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1860. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report to the Congress of the United States on the audit of the Virgin Islands Company for the year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 774); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1861. A letter from the secretary-treasurer, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1862. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the Bureau of Mines, Anthracite Research Laboratory being constructed at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1863. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting copies of petitions from the county chief and county council of Mauputasi County, American Samoa, and from the district governor and district council of Manua District, American Samoa; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and a resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 7162. A bill to authorize the United States during an emergency period to assist

in rehabilitating and stabilizing Italy's economy by permitting the admission into the United States for permanent residence of an increased number of Italian nationals who are relatives of United States citizens, and agricultural, skilled, professional and other workers needed in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7163. A bill to provide veterans of World War II the opportunity to obtain rental housing by providing temporary financial aid to such veterans in meeting the high rentals of newly constructed rental housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. Con. Res. 225. Concurrent resolution to refer the cases of Bishop Lajos Ordass and Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Submitted December 20, 1948]

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report on investigation on Army Talks; without amendment (Rept. No. 2463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report on investigation of strikes in the meat-packing industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted December 29, 1948]

Mr. PLOESER: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on problems of small business resulting from monopolistic and unfair trade practices; without amendment (Rept. No. 2465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PLOESER: Select Committee on Small Business. Annual report of the Select Committee on Small Business; without amendment (Rept. No. 2466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Progress report on national transportation inquiry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Progress report on fuel investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted December 31, 1948]

Mr. RIZLEY. Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures. A report of the Campaign Expenditures Committee; with amendment (Rept. No. 2469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and foreign Commerce. Report on fuel investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Select Committee on Newsprint and Paper Supply. Final report; without amendment (Rept. No. 2471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Select Committee to Investigate Commodity Transactions. Final report; without amendment (Rept. No. 2472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report of Subcommittee on Procurement and Buildings; without amendment (Rept. No. 2473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Final report of Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda; without amendment (Rept. No. 2474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARTLEY: Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations. Report on labor-management relations, west coast maritime industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARTLEY: Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations. Report on labor-management relations, welfare funds; without amendment (Rept. No. 2476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARTLEY: Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations. Report on labor-management relations; without amendment (Rept. No. 2477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2145. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Bayerischer Handwerkstag, Munchen, Germany, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to Bavarian handicraft, freedom of trade, and an order of the military government dated December 2, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2146. Also, petition of F. A. MacDonald, clerk, city of Cincinnati Council, Cincinnati, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the United States Housing Administrator to withold evictions from public housing projects until additional housing can be provided to meet the existing critical shortage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2147. Also, petition of clerk, City of Rome, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the tax-exempt property in the city of Rome, N. Y., and in reference to adequate physical plants for carrying on the educational work in that city; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2148. Also, petition of president, United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the admission of the state of Israel to the United Nations and to render it financial assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2149. Also, petition of secretary, Greek-American Progressive Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Greece's claim to the territory of North Epirus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2150. Also, petition of the Student Council, Juilliard School of Music, New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the rededication of Members of Congress to the struggle for peace and security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2151. Also, petition of president, St. Elizabeths Holy Name Society of St. Elizabeths Roman Catholic Church, Wilmington, Del., petitioning consideration of their resolution against communism and for the preservation of God-given rights and the guaranty of blessings of liberty and freedom to peace-loving people throughout the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2152. Also, petition of Jessie W. Jenkins, executive secretary, the National Patrick Henry Organization, Inc., Columbus, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the impeachment of President Harry S. Truman, the voiding of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and for the apprehension and incarceration of the warmongers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2153. Also, petition of Capt. Ejner Henrichsen, Valparaiso, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to asking for payment for damages caused to his ship the *Viking*, and further consideration of their plight with the Immigration Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2154. Also, petition of John Sabol, secretary, the First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States of America petitioning consideration of their resolution that the Congress of the United States of America be heartily commended in its action in enacting legislation to provide an asylum for displaced persons, that again may be reborn the freedoms with which God's blessing bestowed upon the peoples of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2155. Also, petition of H. Maandi, secretary general, the Estonian National Council, Stockholm, petitioning consideration of their resolution that in the interests of equity and justice, the Displaced Persons Act be amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2156. Also, petition of John Jacob Janzen, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his second amendment to his claim of April 6, 1946, for compensation for a lost claim against Russia and the Russian people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2157. Also, petition of Nicholas J. Curtis, Trenton, N. J., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his case against Philip Forman, United States Department of Justice, district of New Jersey, and Guy L. Fake, United States Department of Justice, district of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2158. Also, petition of secretary and treasurer, International Association for Identification, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to enable Hawaii to be admitted into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2159. Also petition of the Rotary Club of Tacloban, Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to establishment of an international shrine in the immediate vicinity of a national park at Red Beach, Palo, on Leyte; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2160. Also, petition of Adriano V. Negar, municipal secretary, Municipal Council of Palo, Leyte, Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the construction of four veterans' hospitals in the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2161. Also, petition of Pedro Ambatali, Nueva Vizcaya, Philippine Islands, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to Resolution No. 1, of the Philippine Constabulary Veterans, asking that veterans who serve from 1901 to 1914, be included in legislation now pending in the Eightieth Congress (H. R. 451), and scheduled to be introduced in the Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2162. Also, petition of President Francisco Colon Gordiany, Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to Resolution No. 8, asking for an appropriation for the construction of a hospital at San Juan, P. R.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2163. Also petition of Hon. William M. Tuck, chairman, Governor's Office, Richmond, Va., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to transmitting a copy of a resolution adopted by the Southern Governors' Conference at Savannah, Ga., December 14, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the third calendar quarter of 1948.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act, three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____
Business address _____

INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM PERSONS REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:
(1) _____
(2) In whose interest he appears or works:
(2) _____
(3) The duration of such employment:
(3) _____
(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:
(4) _____
(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:
(5) _____
(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:
(6) _____
(7) What expenses are to be included:
(7) _____

See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____
Business address _____
Employed by _____
Address _____

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:
(1) _____
(2) To whom paid:
(2) _____
(3) For what purposes:
(3) _____
(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:
(4) _____
(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:
(5) _____

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the third calendar quarter 1948, and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Association of American Ship Owners, The, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) The registrant is composed of 14 owners of vessels documented under the laws of the United States. (2) See attached.[1] (3) The duration of the registrant is not limited. (4) The amount which registrant is paid and is to receive is indefinite but is fixed from time to time at rates based upon the gross registered tonnage of vessels owned and operated by registrant's members as the members determine to be necessary to provide funds to defray expenditures in accordance with the articles of association authorized in registrant's budget. (5) The registrant is paid or is to be paid by registrant's members. (6) Registrant is to be paid nothing for expenses other than expenses authorized by the members in the registrant's budgets. (7) The expenses provided in the budgets of the registrant are as follows: Salaries, withholding tax, general expense of officers, rent and electricity, furniture and fixtures, office supplies, telephone, teletype, and telegraph, postage and express, subscriptions and publications, transcripts, printing, publicity, employers pay-roll taxes, other and miscellaneous expenses, legal and other fees.

Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Sixty-eight member companies (see attached list of member companies).[1] (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (5) Sixty-eight member companies. (6) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (7) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1]

Berger, Robert I., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite. (4) $650. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) None. (7) None.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Brown, Russell B., 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. Amended form. Since filing Registration Form B under the Lobbying Act, my annual salary has been increased as of October 1, 1948, in the amount of $3,000.

Carson, T. J., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Special session beginning July 26, 1948. (4) $25 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day (7) Personal expenses, transportation

Case, Ralph H., National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Tribal Council, Cheyenne River Reservation, Cheyenne Agency, S. Dak. (2) The Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. Dak. (3) Five years. (4) $2,000 per annum. (5) By the tribal council, with the approval of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. (6) Travel and subsistence while on tribal business, telegrams, stenographic services, printing, etc., with the approval of tribal council and Commissioner of Indian Affairs. (7) Same as included in (6) above.

Coulter, John Lee, 611 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Renderers Association, 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of American agriculture and American consumers. (3) Irregular. (4) $50 per diem when actually employed. (5) National Renderers Association. (6) None. (7) None.

Drake, John, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite, no fixed term. (4) $5,000 per annum to cover all services for the federation including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

Federline, Andrew Paul, 723 Fifteenth Street NW. Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen. Bona Allen Building, Atlanta, Ga. (2) For the commission salesmen who sell women's and children's apparel (members of the association named above). (3) Continuing, indefinite (registrant is Washington counsel for the association named). (4) $10 per hour for the time actually spent on legislative matters (same as for services on legal and administrative matters). (5) National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen. (6) None other than reimbursement for cash outlay. (7) Telephone, telegraph, meals, and travel.

Fifer, Russell, executive secretary, American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill. Amend Form B on file, item 4, to read as follows: "$14,000 per annum—such payments are received for services as executive secretary of the American Butter Institute."

Gall, John C. (firm of Gall & Lane), Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Electric Companies, Washington, D. C. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) No fixed amount; fees for work done from time to time. (5) Same as (1). (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (7) Telephone, telegraph, taxi, miscellaneous office.

Gardner, Fraser S.,[2] national legislative chairman. ANU., 5410 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Appointed (to serve without pay) by National Commander James

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

M. Callahan, Army and Navy Union, U. S. A. Victor, Iowa (national headquarters, Atlantic City, N. J.), on August 19, 1948. Representing Army and Navy Union, U. S. A. (2) The Army and Navy Union, U. S. A., in the welfare of veterans and members of the armed forces via legislative activities. (3) Usually for a period of 1 year, the duration of the national commander's term of office (August 1948 to August 1949). (4) No wages or salary is given for the work. (5) No wages or salary is given for the work. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses are reimbursed, such as lunch, cab fare, phone calls, wires, postage, etc., by the National Adjutant Henry W. Gerber, of Atlantic City, N. J., on approval of the national commander. (7) Normal every day business activity expenses as recited in (6) above. (This, the oldest active veterans' organization, has very limited funds.)

Gilbert, Ray, Hotel English, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Same. (3) Approximately special session. (4) Approximately $20 per day (salary). (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation.

Goodman, Leo, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Membership of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 per annum. (5) Congress of Industrial Organizations. (6) Indeterminate; will be submitted at later date. (7) Travel and actual personal expenses.

Haynes, Kit H. (1) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (3) October 1, 1948, until terminated. (4) Salary of $6,000 per year, which includes services of all kinds rendered by me to my employer; my complete legislative activities, much of which consists of appearing before committees of Congress, will consume less than 10 percent of my time. (5) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (6) Limited to actual expenses. (7) Travel expenses only.

Henderson, Elmer W. (1) American Council on Human Rights, 1130 Sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Edna Over Gray, president. (2) American Council on Human Rights. (3) Permanent. (4) $4,300 per year. (5) American Council on Human Rights. (6) $500 per year (estimate). (7) Local travel and miscellaneous above normal office expenses.

Hickman, R. L., Bayou Rapides Road, Alexandria, La. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Possible special session. (4) $20. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80. (7) Room, meals, telegram, telephone, taxi fare.

Jones, L. Dan, Esq., 1110 Ieing Building, Washington, D. C. Amended form. This is to advise you that since filing Registration Form B under the Lobbying Act and my letter to you dated July 10, 1947, my annual salary has been increased as of October 1, 1948, in the amount of $1,600.

King, Thomas H., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Reserve Officers Association of the United States. (3) Indefinite, elected National judge advocate of the Reserve Officers Association for 1 year in June 1948. (4) Nothing. (5) No one. (6) Nothing. (7) Nothing.

Lipman,[1] Leonard H., Tunison Lane, New Brunswick, N. J. (1) New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc. (2) New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (5) New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc. (6) Whatever they actually amount to, except that automobile travel expense is to be reimbursed at the rate of 6 cents per mile. (7) Travel, meals, lodging, postage, stationery, printing, telephone calls, telegrams, etc.

Lunn, Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) Townsend Plan, Inc. (2) Townsend national insurance plan. (3) Temporary. (4) No salary, no specified amount. A small commission on dues of club members locally, not enough to cover stationery and mailing. A humanitarian movement; I donate time and money. (5) Townsend Plan, Inc., and self-donation. (6) No set amount, not enough to cover local expenses, such as postage, etc. (7) Mimeograph occasional bulletins, post-card notices of local club meetings, etc.

Lusk, Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW.; National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue. (2) In the interest of the public and of the members of the respective associations. (3) The Washington Taxpayers Association has been in existence for 15 years. Registrant no longer represents either of the other associations. (4) The amount from Washington Taxpayers Association is not fixed. It varies with the needs of the association and is shown on the required quarterly reports. Registrant no longer represents: (a) the Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, nor does he now receive any compensation from that association for legislative activities. The compensation he does receive from the association since February 1, 1948, is in the nature of severance pay and for that reason is not shown in the quarterly reports subsequent to that date; (b) the National Association of Home Builders employed registrant to make a public housing survey and paid him a flat fee for his work and expenses in connection therewith. Registrant has set forth all amounts received subsequent to the passage of Public Law 601 in the proper quarterly reports. (5) By the respective associations at the times and in the amounts shown in the quarterly reports. (6) Nothing in addition to the amount described in paragraph 4 above. (7) Salaries, office supplies, and maintenance; travel and miscellaneous expenses.

McBreen, Thomas J. (1) The National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors' Washington Committee, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors' Washington Committee. (3) Indefinitely. (4) At present, part-time employee at $4,000 per year. Salary will be increased later with full-time employment. Sixty percent of salary is paid by National Association of Real Estate Boards and 40 percent by Realtors' Washington Committee. Sixty percent of time is spent on legislation. (5) The National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors' Washington Committee. (6) No specified amount; to be reimbursed for legitimate out-of-pocket expense. (7) Travel, telephone, meals, and similar expenses in connection with my duties.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

McCloskey,[2] Bryson deHaas. (1) Youth of America (a nonprofit association), 316 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Youth of America (a nonprofit association). (3) Since 1939 as founder and president—from the date of this registration as lobbyist (for youth). (4) No compensation has been made to date since the establishment of the association in 1939. All salaries are fixed at a maximum of $12,000 yearly. (5) Youth of America (a nonprofit association). (6) No specific compensation as lobbyist; not over $12,000 yearly salary if and when any compensation is paid. (7) Travel and all other expenses incident to the work of the youth organizations; no budget has as yet been drawn for any expenses but it is likely that it will cover office, telephone, printing, etc.

McIsaac,[2] John R., 96 Brooks Street, Brighton, Mass. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Special session commencing July 26, 1948. (4) $25 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Personal expenses, transportation.

Marchbanks, Modane, 901 Lincoln Tower, 75 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. (1) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (3) September 1, 1941. (4) $6,500 per year. (5) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (6) Unspecified expense account, of which none, so far, has been expended regarding Federal legislation. (7) All expenses incident to Federal margarine legislation.

Mathews, P. H., Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Association of American Railroads. (3) Regular employment. (4) As registrant's duties are of a various nature, it is not possible at this time to apportion any percentage of time to Federal legislation, but such time spent on legislation will be reported on quarterly reports. Registrant's annual salary is $16,000. (5) Association of American Railroads. (6) Actual expenses for travel and business expenses incurred at headquarters. (7) As shown in item (6).

Morrow, Giles, room 225, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. Amended form. Effective as of September 1, 1948, my rate of compensation was increased from $10,000 per year to $12,000 per year. There is no other change in the information as reported by me on January 24, 1947.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., (chiropractor), 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Chiropractic Association, Inc., Webster City, Iowa. (2) Chiropractors. (3) Have worked for the chiropractors for 10 years; was employed by the National Chiropractic Insurance Co. for approximately 2 years; have been employed by the National Chiropractic Association since July 1, 1948. (4) Salary covers public-relations work; no salary is paid for lobbying, which is incidental to public-relations work. (5) National Chiropractic Association, Inc. (6) Expenses cover public-relations work; no expenses allowed for lobbying. (7) [Blank.]

Pierce, James L., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Special session, beginning July 26, 1948. (4) $25 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Personal expenses, transportation.

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

Schaeffer, Alexander L., Lasher House, Ancram, N. Y. (1) Alexander L. Schaeffer, (self-employed). (2) Own account. (3) Indefinite and optional with the person registering. (4) Not exceeding $7,500 annually, and may be nothing. (5) From contributions and loans. (6) Such expenses as are necessary for the successful accomplishments of the purposes and objectives, depending upon the scope of the endeavor. (7) Maintenance of office or offices, assistances, employees, printing, advertising in all mediums, publications, releases, postage, traveling and subsistence expenditures, legal and/or other necessary expenses.

Stewart,[2] John H., (1) Air Freight Forwarder Association, care of Air Dispatch, Inc., 1015 Union Central Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (2) As above. (3) Indefinite, for such term as may be decided by the officers of the association from time to time. (4) No compensation. (5) [Blank.] (6) See (7) below. (7) Actual expenses subject to approval in each case by officers of the association.

Sullivan, Charles H., 75 State Street, Albany, N. Y. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Special. (4) Approximately $20 per day (salary). (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation.

Sullivan,[2] Gael, (1) Theatre Owners of America, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Theatre Owners of America. (3) July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949. (4) No compensation in addition to salary as executive director. (5) Theatre Owners of America, Inc. (6) Reimbursement of traveling and hotel (or its equivalent) expenses. (7) See (6) above.

Teel, Donald, (1) Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (2) Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Nothing. I am secretary-treasurer of the Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., serving without pay. (5) Expenses paid by Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc. (6) To be reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) Transportation costs, telephone calls, and other incidental expenses necessary in the performance of duties.

Todd,[2] John H., 1037 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Partner in the law firm of Calloway & Reed, of Dallas, Tex. (Mercantile Bank Building), and Washington, D. C. (Woodward Building). (2) National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association. (3) Indefinite; year-to-year basis. (4) Law firm, as general counsel, receives an annual retainer, less than $1,500 (if any) of which could be considered compensation for activities, the purpose of which is to influence the passage or defeat of Federal legislation. (5) The law firm is paid an annual retainer by the (treasurer of) National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association. My compensation consists of a division of the annual profits of the law firm. (6) Actual expenses are reimbursed. (7) All actual expenses incurred on behalf of the National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association.

Vine, Ronald H., room 701, Realty Building, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) PER, Inc., 8406 Milton Street, Dallas, Tex. (2) In the interest of clients of PER who are manufacturers in the six States of Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas. (3) By yearly contract. Present contract for the period May 17, 1948, to May 16, 1949. (4) $5,000 per year. Note: This salary, plus expense account, is for the primary purpose of representing PER in Washington relative to obtaining business from the Government, foreign purchasing agencies, and commercial people for the clients of PER. It is not expected that lobbying, as such, will require more than 10 percent of the applicant's time. (5) PER, Inc. (6) As required; i. e., office rent, automobile allowance, office supplies, etc.; averages about $130 per month. (7) As above. It is not expected that the applicant will be required to expend moneys for entertainment, literature, etc.

Walker, Jimmie, Post Office Box 1329, 305-06 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc. (2) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc. (3) An elected secretary-treasurer for 1 year from March 1948 and work on a voluntary basis. (4) Retained by Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., and reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in behalf of the association. (5) Voluntary and reimbursement on expense basis. (6) Actual, as incurred and approved. (7) Travel, telephone, postage, meals, and lodging; and when considerable time is devoted to work of association, it is expected in the future that some salary will be paid.

Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) This is a nonprofit organization made up largely of Washington property owners, 1830 Jefferson Place NW. Payment of taxes to the District government qualifies for membership. (2) In the interest of the public and of the members of the association. (3) This organization has been in existence for 15 years. (4) The amount is not fixed; it varies with the needs of the organization and its members. The amount actually received appears on the required quarterly reports. (5) By contributions of members. (6) Nothing in addition to the amount described in (4) above. (7) Salaries, office supplies, printing, and maintenance of office.

Wenchel, Tannenbaum & Nunan, Esqs., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) David Rosenthal, Scarsdale, N. Y., and Henry Kalman, New Rochelle, N. Y., through their counsel, Brozan & Holman, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Same as above. (3) Employment has no specified period of duration but will probably continue during the current and succeeding sessions of Congress. (4) A fee of $1,000 has been paid and additional undetermined fees may be paid at the termination of the employment commensurate with the services rendered and results obtained. (5) The $1,000 fee already paid was received from Messrs. Brozan and Holman, counsel to David Rosenthal and Henry Kalman. Any additional fees will also be paid by Brozan & Holman out of fees paid to them by David Rosenthal and Henry Kalman. (6) It is not contemplated that any expenses are to be paid or incurred in connection with this employment. (7) See above.

Whitney, Byrl A. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 1028 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) For the special session of Congress beginning July 26, 1948. (4) $25 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day, plus transportation costs, telephone, postage, stationery, and such secretarial incidentals. (7) Personal living expenses, transportation, telephone and telegraph, postage, and secretarial incidentals.

Wilken, Carl H., 1818 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Self. (2) In behalf of national economy, especially agriculture. (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary. (5) Self or some client if occasion should arise. (6) Unknown and indefinite. (7) Those occurred incidental to service.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, Fort Duchesne, Utah; Ignacio, Colo.; Towaoc, Colo. (2) Same as (1). Deponent does not believe that he is required to register or report, because his legislative activities are not only incidental to his employment to prosecute claims against the United States but files this registration so that no question may be raised with respect to his activities. (3) Employed under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior to prosecute claims of Ute Indians against United States in the Court of Claims. (4) Receives no fees unless or until a judgment is entered by the United States Court of Claims, and it is then set by the court. (5) In the event of a judgment, would be paid by United States Treasury from funds recovered for the Confederated Bands of Utes. (6) Necessary expenses for prosecution of claims, approved by Secretary of the Interior. (7) See (6).

Young, Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (2) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (3) Permanent. (4) $11,000 per annum, although not more than one-half is paid for the "principal purpose" of influencing legislation as defined in section 307. (5) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (6) No definite amount. (7) Ordinary taxi and telephone expenses.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the third calendar quarter, 1948, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 10279) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Adkerson, J. Carson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; self. (1) Disbursements, $5.58. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Interested in any legislation having to do with manganese or strategic minerals.

Alifas, Nels Peter, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,999.98; reimbursed to the extent of $10 for legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying; i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 20 percent of time spent on this work. (4) The Federal Machinist, a monthly periodical, of which he is editor. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allen, William, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Mississippi Valley Association, 911 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Allman, Roy G., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; self. (1) No money received, however expended approximately $100

per month. (2) Transportation, taxis, telephone, cables, postage, entertainment. (3) To promote bills to pay Americans for damages received as result of war in the Far East. (4) None. (5) To pay Americans for war damages.

American Association of University Women,[1] 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None except salary of registered associate, $7,000. (2) To legislative program associate, who is registered under the act. (3) As part of yearly salary of $4,000. (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women (quarterly); General Director's letter (for branch officers and chairmen) (three times a year). (5) See attached sheet [2] (legislative notes from summer, 1948, Journal).

American Booksellers Association, Inc., Gilbert E. Goodkind, executive secretary, American Booksellers Association, Inc., 31 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $115.12 expended in June and paid after filing of last quarterly report. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Telegrams to members of this association and to Senators and Congressmen on June 15, 16, 17, 1948. (4) None. (5) Legislation to increase the book parcel-post rate.

The American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Contributed by 312 member lines during third quarter 1948, $21,656.48, only a small portion of which is for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) J. M. Hood, $74.07; A. C. Mellichampe, $14.85; Wilson Epes, $126; proportion of president's time and supporting secretary and clerks, telegraph, telephone, postage, rent, office supplies, taxes, etc., estimated at $302.10. (3) For salaries, office expenses, printing, and reimbursement of personal expenses in furtherance of the legislative program of the 312 member lines of the association. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting short-line railroads. (See first-quarter report for complete text of legislative program.)

Aring, Hector M., 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See original registration form for complete explanation. No other contributions received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposed to appropriation for cotton subsidy under section 32 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act, 1947—Tax legislation.

Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Income, $2,059.33; expenses, $2,764.71. (2) Lobbying activities, none; nonlobbying activities, Edward M. Kriz, John H. Smith, Jr., Patricia Mortell, Jeanette Carey, Sylvia Karr, Kathleen Anderson, Mary Malone, Mrs. John Schaffer, plus miscellaneous operating expenses. (3) The general purpose of the association is to foster more efficient use of third-class mail by those enterprises employing the use of it. (4) None. (5) All legislation relating to postal laws and regulations.

Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. The registrant is composed of 14 owners of vessels documented under the laws of the United States. (1) No money has been received by the registrant for activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601. The registrant did, however, in the regular course of business receive payments of dues from certain of its members. No expenditure has been made by or on behalf of the registrant to any person for any amount or value in furtherance of any such object, except that registrant has paid salaries to and expenses of George W. Morgan, its president, and Lynn E. Mote, manager of its Washington office. For the extent, if any, to which such expenditures have been applied to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration, reference is hereby made to the reports being concurrently filed by such officer and employee of the registrant and such reports are hereby made a part hereof. (2) See item (1). (3) See item (1). (4) See item (1). (5) The registrant is not employed to support or oppose any proposed legislation. Reference is hereby made to paragraph 2 of the registrant's registration statement on Form B, which paragraph is hereby made a part hereof.

Association of Casualty and Surety Companies,[2] 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (2) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (3) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (4) The association publishes the Casualty and Surety Journal, as stated in exhibit A attached to Form A. Also issues releases to insurance trade press and to papers and periodicals of general circulation, such releases being mainly concerned with accident-prevention problems. (5) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

Association of Casualty and Surety Companies,[1] 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (2) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (3) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (4) The association publishes the Casualty and Surety Journal. Also issues releases to insurance trade press and to papers and periodicals of general circulation, such releases being mainly concerned with accident-prevention problems. (5) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

Austern, H. Thomas, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. (1) No money received or expended during third quarter of 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Canadian fisheries.

Ayer, N. W., & Son, Inc., a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.; National Association of Electric Companies. (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (Ayer) received from National Association of Electric Companies $14,488.40, of which $11,327.44 represented compensation to Ayer and $3,161.05 was for out-of-pocket expenses. (See item (2) below.) The only money received or spent by registrants, J. Vance Babb, and Raymond C. Baker, was for out-of-pocket expenses noted in item (2) below. (2) J. Vance Babb, R. C. Baker, B. J. Kelly, and O. Leiding, employees of Ayer, for traveling and miscellaneous expenses, $2,303.94; materials, postage, messengers, clippings, telephone and telegrams, mimeographing, prints, etc., $857.11. (3) The amounts described in items (1) and (2) above were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the electric industry as described in registration dated April 15, 1948. Neither the services nor the expenditures involved lobbying within the meaning of the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) None, except that Ayer services included publicity regarding the proposed appropriation to the Tennessee Valley Authority for construction of a steam power plant. This quarterly report is filed subject to the reservations contained in the amended registration dated April 15, 1948.

Babcock, Charles E., Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va.; National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Have an expense account of $50 per month for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Various; see below. (3) Services at gasoline stations, postage, telegrams, meals, and hotel rooms, transportation to and from Washington, all for myself. (4) The Junior American, the official organ of the Junior Order (as above). (5) Immigration, deportation, and naturalization; free public schools; occasionally other legislation the order believes for the general good of the country, and in which its members are interested.

Bailey, C. Lloyd, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Friends Committee on National Legislation. (1) Gross salary, July, August, September, $1,000; travel expense, $211.71. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send out a news letter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Bailey, Frazer A., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant believes that $750 represents the amount of his salary received from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., during the third quarter of 1948, which is allocable to legislative activities; $42 paid to Carlton Hotel for expenses of luncheon meeting with industry and labor representatives in connection with overtime-on-overtime legislation. (2) No expenditures other than as indicated in item (1) except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See items (1) and (2). (4) Lykes Fleet Flashes. (5) As president of the federation, am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. However, during past quarter supported overtime-on-overtime legislation and certain amendments to Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Baker, Gibbs L., 1011 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Charles Niedner's Sons Co., Inc., Malden, Mass.; the United States Rubber Co., New York City; the Firehose Manufacturing Co., Inc., New York City; the Approved Equipment Manufacturing Co., Inc., New Milford, N. J.; and the Federal Firehose Manufacturing Co., Inglewood, Calif. (1) $750. (2) Self. (3) On account for services rendered and out-of-pocket disbursements. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5608.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Expenses, July 1 through September 1, 1948, $55.89; salary, same dates, $165.58. (2) Expenditures made for transportation, office work and supplies, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting civil liberties.

[1] Filed with the Secretary only.
[2] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.
[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[1] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

Baldrige, H. M., United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C., and 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 per month or $6,000 for the quarter; no money expended on any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) During the year I opposed H. R. 5051, H. R. 6502, and House Resolution 425.

Baldwin & Mermey, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; Hershey Corp., Hershey, Pa. (1) Retainer from Hershey Corp., $2,250; reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, $7.22. (2) New York Telephone Co., Baldwin & Mermey, post office. (3) Telephone, postage, and public-relations counsel. (4) [Blank.] (5) Sugar legislation.

Barber, Hartman, room 301, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, seventh floor, Brotherhood Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. Total salary for quarter, $1,320; total expenses for quarter, $338.18. (2) See explanatory statement.[1] (3) See explanatory statement.[1] (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; The Haloid Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barlow, Joel, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (1) Received, $1,149.48; expended, $127.28. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $21.38; Western Union, $78.80; cab fares, miscellaneous expense, $27.10. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, teletype messages, transportation within the District of Columbia, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer for the purpose of rendering general legal advice and assistance. Considerable time is being currently spent and may continue to be spent in the preparation of materials for presentation to Congress in support of proposed legislation to improve marketing conditions in the fruit industry during the postwar interruption in normal export marketing.

Barnard, Robert C., Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Disbursements by Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox during last quarter $4.94. Receipts from Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., $333.63. In accordance with arrangements between registrant and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, this money paid to Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox. (2) Disbursements, $4.74 tolls; 20 cents postage. Receipts to Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox. See answer (1) above. (3) Disbursements, see answer (2) above; receipts, $300 fee for professional services, $33.63 reimbursement for previous expenditures. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6253 and S. 2539, both bills entitled "For the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co."

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Bauer, Charles J., Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) BOMA Letter (bimonthly newsletter). (5) I was not employed to support or oppose any proposed legislation. I was employed as permanent secretary of Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington with duties including appearance at public hearings on legislative and regulatory matters of direct concern to the association.

Benson, Ernest H., national legislative representative, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary at rate of $8,600 per annum; no expense account. (2) Ernest H. Benson. (3) Activities in connection with legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes.

Beirne,[1] Joseph A., 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $1,065.34; salary, $3,300; total, $4,365.34. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my positions with the Communications Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Berckes, Herbert C., secretary, Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans, La. (1) For services as secretary: April $250, May $250, June $250, total $750. Expended for travel expense: April $454.78, May $589.06, June $563.94, total $1,607.80. (2) Includes transportation and per diem. (3) Legislation. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the southern pine lumber industry.

Berger, Robert I., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation the sum of $650 as compensation for all services. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Bergin, Preston B., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 salary; $17.97 expenses. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Bernard,[1] William S., 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6369, Emergency Displaced Persons Act.

Berns, Karl H., Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,840, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service $366; expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Berry,[2] Raymond H., 1000 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.; Automobile Club of Michigan, 139 Bagley Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Reimbursement on account of transportation, hotel expense, meals, taxis, tips, telephone calls, and telegrams from February 2 to March 15, 1948, $207; also allocated portion of fee for various legal services rendered the Automobile Club of Michigan covering period January 17, 1944, to March 1, 1948, the amount believed apportionable for this report, $290, covering period from February 1 to April 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) No specific legislation; conferences merely had to do with possibility that Internal Revenue Code may be amended to include specifically such clients as the above.

Berry,[2] Raymond H., 1000 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich. (Automobile Club of Michigan). (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) No specific legislation; conferences merely had to do with possibility that Internal Revenue Code may be amended to include specifically such clients as the Automobile Club of Michigan.

Biorn, Norman E., Minnesota Associated Businessmen, 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn. (1) Salary from Minnesota Associated Businessmen, none; received for actual expenses, $180.28; spent for legislative activities, none. (2) Mary Lou Kusteiski, $150; United States Government, $12; Northwest Bell Telephone Co., $18.28. (3) Stenographic services, postage, phone, and telegrams. (4) None. (5) Elimination of inequalities in tax legislation.

Bison, Henry, Jr., Tyre Taylor, suite 1112, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,581.27, expenditures for living purposes only. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of the free-enterprise system.

Blair, Newell, 421 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Cardin Mining & Milling Corp., Picher, Okla. (1) Have received from Cardin Mining & Milling Corp. between April 1 and June 30, 1948, $718.98; expended between April 1 and June 30, 1948, $793.46; difference reimbursed in July, $84.48. (2) Blair & Blair, of which firm registrant is a member, 421 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (3) Reimburse advances for travel, $424.72; telephone, $146.56; telegraph, $2.66; printing, $44.42; taxis, $9.35; entertainment, $170.76; total, $798.46. (4) None. (5) Subsidy on nonferrous metal mining.

Bledsoe,[2] Samuel B., 1730 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Selvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $85.75. (2) Carfares, taxicabs, $52.50; meals, etc., $18; phone calls, $15.25. (3) Transportation; luncheons; phone calls, local and long distance. (4) I worked to assure the publication and dissemination of news and radio comment favorable to margarine legislation desired by our client but I cannot say categorically that I caused any articles to be published or any radio comment. (5) Margarine legislation.

Bledsoe,[1] Samuel B., 1730 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Selvage & Lee 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $8.90. (2) Carfares, taxicabs, $2.90; luncheon, $6. (3) Transportation, luncheon. (4) I worked to assure the dissemination

[1] Filed with the Secretary only.
[2] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[1] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[2] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

and publication of news favorable to margarine legislation desired by our client but I cannot say that I caused any articles to be published. (5) Margarine legislation.

Bloch, Charles J., Macon, Ga.; Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. (1) Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, under which I have registered, requires that reports shall be filed by registrant so long as his activity continues. Inasmuch as my activity did not continue during the preceding quarter, I am filing no formal report. The only money which I have received from the Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. during the past quarter is as stated in paragraph 1 of my report for the quarter ending March 31, 1948. There have been no expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Bodary, D. A., (national legislative and general representative Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America) 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 107 West Linwood Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo. (1) Annual compensation of $6,000 and $12 per diem for expenses, hotel, meals, etc. (2) D. A. Bodary. (3) As national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, my duties include handling of legislative matters and handling and progressing of grievances and other activities of my organization. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America.

Bodfish, Morton, United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See attached statement.[1] (2) See attached statement.[1] (3) For travel, hotel, and maintenance in Washington, D. C. (4) Only the customary materials found in our trade papers, in our trade association periodicals, and in our trade association bulletins. National Defense and Our Business, by Morton Bodfish, July 1948 Directors Digest. (5) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home-financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

Boehne, John W., Jr., 1058 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association Employees—Collectors of internal revenue, $600; printing and postage, $110.24; total, $710.24. (2) John W. Boehne, Jr. (3) Counsel for above association. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employees of Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Bohannon, John N., Asheville, N. C. (1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.); Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) Personal remuneration, including expenses, during the preceding calendar quarter, $2,000; money expended, see (3) below. (2) See (3) below. (3) Personal subsistence, transportation, routine and other customary expenses only; also see (6) Form B heretofore filed. (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect producing, gathering, transportation, distribution, or sale of natural gas.

Bonamarte, Robert F., Sr.,[c] Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Regular Navy, Marine Corps, Fleet Reserve, and retired and veterans' legislation.

Bonamarte, Robert F., Sr.,[1] Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Veterans' legislation and legislation affecting the armed forces of the United States.

Borkin, Joseph, 1017 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.; Federation for Railway Progress, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $459.84. (2) Mimeographing service, Western union, telephone company, office-supplies company. (3) Office supplies and services. (4) [Blank.] (5) The above amount represents expenses in connection with the Washington office of the Federation for Railway Progress and was not paid to me for the support of our opposition to any legislation.

Bourg, Clarence J., 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Sugar Cane League, main office, New Orleans, La.; Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, main office, Saginaw, Mich. (1) $192.60 has been received and expended in connection with legislation and other contacts with Government, of which not more than one-fourth has been expended in connection with legislation, such as taxicab fares about Washington and an occasional lunch when Congress is in session. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) Sugar Bulletin of New Orleans, La.; Sugar Beet Journal of Saginaw, Mich. (5) Any legislation affecting the domestic sugar producer.

Bowden, Benjamin Edward, 267 Robbins Drive, Newark (Licking County), Ohio; American Train Dispatchers Association, 10 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $220.22; expense, $147.76; no money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, various restaurants, pullman fare, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph and postage, laundry, and cleaning. (3) Necessary living, transportation, communication (lodging and meals), laundry, and cleaning. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railroad labor, particularly to oppose legislation detrimental to existing railroad retirement insurance system.

Bowden, Ray B., National Grain Trade Council, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,968, all used for personal purposes, none for lobbying activities; travel expense, $722.12, all used in routine travel: estimate, $2.40 used for taxi fares in Washington, D. C., in connection with lobbying activity. (2) Taxi service, Washington, D. C. (3) Transportation. (4) None, so far as known, having any connection with lobbying activity. (5) Legislation affecting the grain or feed trade. Opposed enactment of international wheat agreement; sought modifying language in CCC charter.

Boyd, H. B., United States Beet Sugar Association as secretary-treasurer, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Boyd, William R., Jr., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N.Y. (1) See attached schedule[1] for answers to items (1) to (3). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Bradley, Otis T., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Guaranty Trust Co. of New York as trustee of the several trusts described as the Frances G. Phipps trust, Herbert Sanford Ward trust, Sarita E. Barclay trust, and Colville Herbert Sanford Barclay trust, under indenture dated December 24, 1913, and various indentures supplemental thereto made by Charles H. Sanford, 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The employment is for the purpose of attempting to secure an amendment to the Federal gift tax acts involving gifts in trust and the effect for gift tax purposes of the surrender by the grantor of a retained power to alter the disposition of the property but not in any way beneficial to himself, and the employment is expected to continue until such amendment is either secured or rejected.

Brady, Joseph E., Brewery Workers International Union, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) None in the preceding quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) None in the preceding quarter. (4) None in the preceding quarter. (5) None in the preceding quarter.

Brewbaker, James M., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125; expenses reimbursed by employers, $457.58. Expenditures: $457.58. (2) Expenses paid to various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, railroads, and planes. (3) Traveling, attending meetings to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents, and trade-marks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC acts.

Bright, O. O., 1302 Eighteenth NW., Washington, D. C.; Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $52.41. (2) To various hotels, cab drivers, etc. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the lumber manufacturing industry.

Brightman, Melvin H., 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C., Dairy Industry Committee. (1) $3,000 salary as executive secretary of Dairy Industry Committee. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To observe legislation possibly affecting dairy industry.

Bromsen,[c] Archibald, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $71, May 1948. (2) Registrant. (3) Pay for legal services and expenses. (4) None. (5) Support improved railroad workers' pensions, congressional bills S. 2055; H. R. 4695.

Bromsen, Archibald, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y.; the Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Support improved railroad workers' pensions.

Brooks, A. E., 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.; American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Cook Building, Mexico, D. F. (1) Received $1,250 (partial retainer fee); paid $500 (retainer fee). (2) Fritz G. Lanham. (3) Retainer fee. (4) None. (5) To exempt from income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

Brooks, William F., National Grain Trade Council, 607 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expense received during period amounted to $2,786.45, of which less than $4 was spent for any purpose covered by the act. (2) Taxicab fares, no one of which was in excess of 70 cents. (3) Transportation. (4) None other than weekly news letter published by employer. (5) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

Brown,[c] Edgar G., National Negro Council, 1717 Euclid Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $700 membership contributions. (2) National Republic Printers, 511 Eleventh Street NW., $301; telephone and telegrams, $50; postage, $35; traveling expenses, Mr. E. G. Brown, $200. (3) Printing, publicity, advertising, and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Antidiscrimination legislation.

Brown, Russell B., Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act: $15. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) My normal duties include periodic reporting to members of the association on pending legislation. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Bryson, Jack, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received, $6,280.79; expended, $6,280.79. (2) To self. (3) For personal and family needs. No sums received or expended in connection with activities covered by act. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

Buck, Mrs. J. L. Blair, not employed for pay, elected to office of president of the general federation, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For July, August, and September 1948, $1,178.13 travel and expense of entertaining in connection with work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. (2) See question (1). (3) See question (1). (4) General Federation Clubwomen and State federation magazines. (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the general federation supports or opposes legislation, and asks the organization membership to do likewise, when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention.

Buckman, Henry Holland, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.; Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla. (1) Received from Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla., for professional services, $750, pro rata. Pro rata expenditures account long-distance telephone calls, July and August 1948, $8.78. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C. (3) Long-distance telephone service. (4) None. (5 No specific bill as yet. Interested in any legislation providing for or related to improvement of the intracoastal canal between Jacksonville and Miami, Fla.

Buckman, Henry Holland, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.; the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (1) Received from the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J., for professional services, $250, pro rata. Pro rata expenditures account long-distance telephone calls (1) May and June 1948, $120.53; July and August 1948, $4.47; total, $125. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C. (3) Long-distance telephone service. (4) None. (5) No specific bill since close of second quarter. Interested in any legislation related to tin and the detinning industry.

Bugbee, George, American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $4,749.96; reimbursement of travel expenses, $785.90. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Building Products Institute, room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Contributions, $17,500; expended, $7,296.36. (2) See attached sheet.[1] (3) As indicated by items on attached sheet.[1] (4) Construction Trends, press releases, and certain economic studies. (5) Proposals which may affect the producers of building materials.

Bulow, William J., Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, $2,343.75; money expended, $14.70. (2) Various transportation, telephone, and telegraph companies and United States post office. (3) Customary business expense for transportation, telephone calls, telegrams, and postage. (4) None. (5) Postage rate legislation.

Burger,[b] George J., Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.; self. (1) Received $5,068.05 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent, and acting as director in charge, Washington office, National Federation of Small Business. Expenditures, $4,770.56 for general operating expenses. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publications, weekly bulletin, travel expenses, etc. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Antitrust law enforcement (monopoly); rubber-tires bill; all legislation affecting small business.

Burke, Harold, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for 3 months at $708.33⅓ per month equals $2,125. No expenses received or expended on any legislative activity. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Burnett, Leo, Co., Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (1) For National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $65,222.17. (2) See addendum A.[1] A portion of this sum, not definitely ascertainable, was for purposes referred to in section 307, Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. The reason for our not being able to specify the exact amount used for so-called lobbying purposes is that we handled advertising generally for the Margarine Association. Not only is some of our advertising not directed at the affective legislation at all, but individual advertisements may be partially what may be termed "general advertising" and partially an appeal to support the Margarine Association's position in the legislative matters referred to. (3) See addendum (A).[1] (4) None. (5) Generally, legislation favorable to margarine manufacturers, specifically, the Rivers bill (H. R. 2245).

Burrows, Orrin A., International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,725; expenses, $1,513.60 minus withholding and railroad retirement deductions. The expenses are reimbursable items, such as transportation, hotels, meals, and incidental items. None for lobbying purposes. (2) Railroads, bus companies, taxis for transportation, hotels, motels, and restaurants for meals and lodging, telephone and telegraph companies for messages. (3) Transportation, meals, lodging, telephone calls, telegraph messages, and incidental items, such as tips. (4) The Electrical Workers Journal. (5) All legislation affecting the electrical worker in particular and labor in general.

Butler, Eugene J., Esq., National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $1,758.96; expense account, $150. (2) Eugene J. Butler. (3) Salary, expense account. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

Butts, Joseph G., Jr. (law firm of Gall & Lane), 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Nonsubsidized Insulation Manufacturers Committee, Riverton, Va. (1) Received, $1,000; expended, none. (2) Retainer paid to Gall & Lane. (3) Legal opinions, research, and consultation. (4) None. (5) To support limitation on subsidies.

Caffrey, Charles G., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Manufacturers Association, 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C. (1) One-fourth of per annum salary of $9,000. (2) No payments were made to anyone by Charles G. Caffrey for any purpose whatsoever during the quarter in question; normal expenses excepted. (3) None. (4) None. However, I might state for the record that I spent about $25 during the quarter for taxicab fare, lunches, telephone, and carfare to and from the Capitol to keep informed on legislation. (5) [Blank.]

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Rehabilitation Association, 1025 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) $450 received from the National Rehabilitation Association by the firm of Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for the association. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) No particular legislation. The association is interested in any legislation affecting the vocational rehabilitation program.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $2,100 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for National Tax Equality Association. Allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Firm retained as Washington counsel on all legal matters affecting NTEA, including legal aspects of various legislative proposals relating to taxation of cooperatives and other corporations enjoying tax exemptions or special privileges.

Carpenter, Austin W., Main Street, Sherburne, N. Y.; New York Associated Businessmen, Inc., Sherburne, N. Y. (1) Received from New York Associated Businessmen, $1,276.28. (2) To self, salary, $750; to railroads and hotels for travel expenses, $526.28; total, $1,276.28. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation which discriminates in any way against the constitutional right of small-business people to quality of competitive opportunity.

Carson, T. J., 1522 East Tenth Street, The Dalles, Oreg.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Amount received including per diem, salary, and travel expenses paid to me by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and expended by me for transportation, living expenses, and incidentals, $699.63. (2) To hotel, restaurants, railroads, taxis, etc. (3) For transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, amendments to minimum-wage law, housing, and anti-inflation. Note: This is final report as above employment was only temporary.

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $3,000 as compensation; reimbursed $975.65 for expenses advanced; expended $641.55 which will be reimbursed. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Munsey Real Estate Co.; incidentals. (3) Telephone service, rent, incidentals. (4) None. (5) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislation affecting company's interest.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[b] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[c] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[c] Filed with the Secretary only.
[b] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[c] Filed with the Clerk only.
[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[c] Filed with the Clerk only.

Carter, Asa L., 335 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; petitioners and their due successors and joining associates at and after War Department file No. 7040, April 1933 (287 U. S. 627); (supra) extended to all abutters on B lines duly and precisely mapped herein. (1) I received and expended only $106.54, costs and disbursements herein, divided: petty cash, clerical work, researching records, and addressing mail, $60.25; and for postage, printing, telephoning, carfare, etc., $26.29. (2) It was paid to postmasters, printers, public-service companies, and standard clerical help at Pittsburgh, Pa. (3) For the purpose of furthering sentiment for a Rainbill Prize for the best B line electric pipe train locomotive for major heavy freight, maximum ton miles on wheels, one-half pound per square inch absolute. Keep to wheels or be inflated into Dark Ages on barbarian pack animal airplanes. Do not forget communistic preaching of equal distribution of unequal earnings always gives civilization barbarians on cheapest transportation of men and deliberate omission of heavy wheel freight or logistics. Financed racket or robber barons come in for maximum bribery only a misdemeanor. (4) I publish nowhere except by first-class mail to abutters and contributors, and their due and immediate representatives. (5) Everything for or against B line.

Carter, Jack, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1036 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $375 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $8 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Carver, Leslie O., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Carver,[4] Leslie O., associate general counsel, National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at the rate reported in last quarterly report for performance of regular and usual duties incident to my employment. Expenses for travel, hotel, subsistence, and incidentals totaled $331.94. I engaged in no activity contemplated by the act, and none of the money received and expended was for the purpose of work under the act. (2) Paid nothing. (3) Performed no activity under the act. (4) None. (5) None.

Carver,[5] Leslie O., associate general counsel, National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at the rate reported in last quarterly report for performance of regular and usual duties incident to my employment. Expenses for travel, hotel, subsistence, and incidentals totaled $331.94. I engaged in no activity contemplated by the act and none of the money received and expended was for the purpose of work under the act. (2) Paid nothing. (3) Performed no activity under the act. (4) None. (5) None.

Case, Ralph H., National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Allied Aviation Corp., Cockeysville, Md. (1) Compensation for services rendered and expenses, $9,050. (2) Sundry small items for long-distance telephone calls, taxi fares, stenographic work; total, $50. No item over $10. (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) H. R. 631, Eightieth Congress. Work completed; this is my final report.

Case, Ralph H., National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, Elbowoods, N. Dak. (1) Receipts: Compensation for services rendered under contract, $1,000. (2) Disbursements: Sundry small items, less than $10 each; stenographic service, postage, and telegraph, total $45. (3) Official business transactions and correspondence with Tribal Council, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak. (4) None. (5) House Joint Resolution 426.

Cates, Larry, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, $2,975.96; expended, $200.-96. (2) Various companies and business firms for transportation, communications, gasoline, oil, airplane operation, miscellaneous entertainment, meals, hotels, tips, and incidental expenses. (3) Travel and all expenses in connection herewith, taxi, telegraph, telephone, and for the prosecution of a pilot strike on National Airlines where scab pilots are currently employed in a strikebreaking attempt. (4) Air Line Pilot. (5) All legislation concerning aviation safety and hours, wages, and working conditions of pilots on our commercial air lines.

Chace, W. E., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $20 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, H. R. 4417, and S. 1251.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Salary, $6,250; expenses in Washington reimbursed by employer, $889.98; expenditures in Washington, $889.98; out-of-town expenses, $529.16. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills affecting national labor policy, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, Federal subsidization of research, patents, and trade-marks, control powers, revision of SEC, foreign aid, Federal housing, Government competition with business and such other matters as may affect industry.

Chandler, E. Lawrence, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Nothing. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislative bills regarding which it is considered that the engineering viewpoint can be constructive.

Christman, Miss Elisabeth, National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $935 salary as secretary-treasurer of the National Women's Trade Union League. Legislative work is only one phase of the program of the league. My work is predominantly administrative, but a small percentage of my time is spent in activities in furtherance of our legislative program. (2) No money expended except for an occasional taxi fare. (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin, the league's monthly publication. (5) [Blank.]

Clarke, David R., 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Clorety, Joseph A., Jr., American Veterans Committee, 1200 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary of $5,600 per annum for position as national secretary of the American Veterans Committee plus not more than $10 per month for expenses incurred in connection with activities under the Lobbying Act. (2) Joseph A. Clorety, Jr. (3) To execute duties as national secretary of the organization of which not more than 25 percent involve activities under the Lobbying Act. (4) AVC Bulletin. (5) Legislation relating to international, domestic, and veterans' affairs in accordance with national platform of the American Veterans Committee.

Cohn, Marcus, American Jewish Committee, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During a typical month, the registrant devotes a maximum of 5 percent of his time to matters which may possibly be regarded as embraced in section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The figures set forth here for the months of July, August, and September 1948 are based upon that percentage: Salary, $93.75; travel, $6.37; telephone, $9.63; office and miscellaneous expenses, $66.50. (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) See (1). (4) I have supplied information to the general press on immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) Legislation dealing with immigration and S. 2764 and H. R. 6917. See original registration statement and (1).

Colborn, Miss Vera M., Board of Christian Education Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., Division of Social Education and Action, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No expenses incurred during this period. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress Magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as (3).

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Compton, R. T., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, salary, $3,750; expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,129.10; expenditures, $1,129.10. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social-security research, patents, and investments.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,228.36, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $244.67; expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Condon, Arthur D., attorney, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Morton Salt Co., 310 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) July, August, September 1948, received, $2,103. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717.

Cone, D. C., Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, room 307, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Annual compensation for 1947, $5,250. (2) D. C. Cone. (3) As vice president and part-time national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America covering all service rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act and particularly the interests of the employees represented by the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.

Cone, John C., Pan American Airways, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During the quarter ended September 30, 1948, I have not participated in any way or received or spent any funds in connection with legislation. (2) None received or spent in connection with legislation. (3) Same as above. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose legislation but may be concerned with any legislation relating to aviation which may be pending.

Conroy, Eugene J., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None; no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass.; Veterans Association of Federal Employees, New York Naval Ship Yard, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) None this quarter. (2) Self. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Support or oppose legislation affecting veterans' preference in Federal employment.

Corbett, John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $2,791.70 as wages, $880 for 8 months' back pay (retroactive to January 1, 1948); $200.01 for office rental; $1,295 expense allowance from January 1 through September 30, 1948. (2) $200.01 to Labor for office rental. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and legislative matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interest of labor.

Cortright, Frank W., National Association of Home Builders, suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $4,375.02; per diem, $644; expenses, general, $1,267.07; expenses, travel, meetings and conference, $1,390.83. The payments reported above as my salary and per diem are for general services as executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders, and are not dependent upon rendition of services which might be considered "lobbying" within the meaning of the act. Similarly, expenses reported include substantial amounts for routine association business which could not be regarded as lobbying within the meaning of the act. Expenses reported do not include items of association expense such as travel, secretary's salary, telephone, and rent, which are part of the general administrative budget of the association and do not represent moneys received by me from the association. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, International News Service, United Press, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. I also write an article each month for the American Builder, a monthly publication devoted to the interests of the housing industry. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter, and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but I am the executive vice president of the trade association of the home-building industry. In that capacity it is incumbent upon me to supervise, among other things, the work of the association's legislative department. The function of that department of the association is to follow all legislation affecting the home-building industry; to advise the membership of the association of all such legislation; and to make known to the public and to the Congress the opinion of the membership on all such legislation.

Costello, John M., 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.; the American League for an Undivided Ireland, 165–167 William Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received as fees for services $760; reimbursement for expenditures, $60.76. (2) (a) Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, $13.36; (b) travel expenses, $47.40. (3) (a) Hotel room rental; (b) gas, oil, meals, etc. (4) CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. (5) Any legislation which may tend to effectuate the unification of all Ireland into a united nation.

Coulter, John Lee, 611 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Renderers Association, 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received during quarter April–June 1948; compensation for the calendar year paid in December. (2) [Blank.] (3) To appear before Senate Finance Committee to recommend amendments to pending legislation. (4) None. (5) Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934, as amended and extended.

Courtney, Paul L., National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses only. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Laws affecting business.

Covington, J. Harry, III, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Smelting & Refining Co. et al. (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $115.92. (2) Telephone and telegraph expense, $79.15; travel expense including hotel accommodations, $36.77. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Cowan,[6] Nathan E., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $1,875; expenses, $910. (2) Hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, railroads, etc. (3) [Blank.] (4) Union News Service and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Cowan,[7] Nathan E., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, CIO, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, July, August, and September, 1948, $1,875; expenses, $920. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cabs, etc. (3) [Blank.] (4) Union News Service and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Crampton, Charles J., attorney, 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex.; State Rights Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex. (1) No money received during the preceding calendar quarter. Third quarter, 1948, expense account filed for reimbursement, $678.75. (2) Third quarter, 1948, expense account filed for reimbursement. Receipts for all expenditures of $10 or more have been filed with the association. All other expenses are the cumulative totals of small expenditures at numerous cafes, for taxicabs, and other sources. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) To bring about constructive cooperation between community-property and common-law States for the development of a plan of tax equalization which will afford an equitable basis for income, estate, and gift taxation in the Federal tax structure. To support complete retroactive repeal of the 1942 estate and gift tax amendments as they apply to community-property States in an unfair, discriminatory, inequitable manner. We have supported and will continue our support of the American Bar Association's recommendation for tax equalization.

Crawford, William A., Railroad Association of Georgia, 536 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) No money received or expended for any lobbying activities. (2) No one. (See reply to question (1) above.) (3) None. (See reply to question (1) above.) (4) None. (5) None.

Crowley, Leo J., 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) No money received or expended during the preceding calendar quarter in connection with influencing the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads operating in and having trackage in the State of Colorado.

Cullum, Robert M., Committee for Equality in Naturalization, 302 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary totaling $750 for services which terminated August 1, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation to provide that the right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race.

Cuneo, John C., Post Office Box 1054, 922 Jay Street, Modesto, Calif.; the Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Receipts: Townsend Plan, Inc., gross for operations in California, $1,872.53; less deductions at source, $268.55; net amount for operations in California, $1,603.98; amount paid to John C. Cuneo for his personal use, $780; balance to be used for operations in California, $823.98. Total disbursements for California operations, $2,074.90. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) The Townsend plan.

Curran, Roland, Central Valley Project Association, Box 15, Bakersfield, Calif. (1) Received from Central Valley Project Association for all activities connected with the association July 1 to September 30, 1948,

[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

$874.70. (2) Maintenance of Bakersfield office and activities, travel expense Washington, D. C., to California, and miscellaneous. (3) Same as above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Central Valley project and flood-control projects in same area.

Curry, James E., 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; N. C. A. I., various Apache and Paulte Tribes, Southeast Alaskan natives, Oglala Sioux and Omaha Tribes; N. B. Johnson, president, National Congress of American Indians, Claremore, Okla. (1) $3. (2) Frances Lopinsky. (3) Cab fares. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation dealing with economic and political status of Indians and particularly legislation concerning the tribes above-mentioned.

Curtiss, Ralph E., 111 Kellogg Building, 1422 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.; retained by Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc., 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis. (1) Received, $312.56; expended, $62.56. (2) Hotel, railroad company, and telephone company. (3) Travel expenses and telephone. (4) ATOA News (monthly publication of the association). (5) Any legislation affecting the tavern industry.

Daley, William L., 817 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Receipts and expenditures on behalf of National Editorial Association, $997.78. (2) Telegraph, telephone, taxicabs, office supply companies, $92.78. (3) Reimbursement for expenses, transportation and communications. (4) Interpretative articles in official bulletins of national and State publishers associations; also in trade publications of publishing industry. (5) Measures affecting the press.

Dameron,[4] William V., Grand Lodge representative, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Dameron,[1] William V., Grand Lodge representative, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Damon, Eugene J., St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., chairman, Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) No money was received or expended for Federal legislative matters during the last quarter. July 1, 1948, promoted from position of attorney to assistant general attorney of the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co. and total salary was increased from $703 to $800 per month, otherwise the statements contained in Form B heretofore filed remain the same. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Darby, Frederick R., 3270 Westerville Road, Columbus, Ohio; self. (1) None. (2) Negate. (3) Negate. (4) United Press Radio, July 14, 1948, Columbus, Ohio; the Columbus Citizen, August 8, 1948, Columbus, Ohio. (5) In re S. 2213.

Daugherty, Paul J., 830 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

Davies,[4] Aled P., 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary from American Meat Institute of $2,076.96. Travel expenses when out of Chicago, including lodging, meals, taxicabs, entertainment, transportation, telephone, and telegraph, $470.67. (2) Various railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and telephone and telegraph companies. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry.

Davis,[5] John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $3,000. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed news letter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Davis,[1] John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, 1948, $3,000. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed news letter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Davies,[4] William D., 27 Water Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Since filing my first and only report at the end of the first quarter no activity has been taken by me which necessitates a report; in the event that such activity is taken by me I shall, of course, resume reports. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Dawes, Bourbon, Hotel Association of Washington, 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,624.98; expenses, $54.32. (2) (a) Taxis and transportation, $26.27; (b) miscellaneous lunches and dinners, $19.55; (c) miscellaneous expenses, $8.50. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting hotels in the District of Columbia.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

DeGroot, E. H., Jr., 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.; Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Harwill Building, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See statement attached.[1] (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) None. My duties are those of treasurer.

Denning, William I., 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,875 was received as retainer for services rendered plus $31.39 reimbursements for personal expenses in connection with work for the association. (2) William I. Denning. (3) For general legal representation in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Not called upon during quarter in connection with any legislation.

De Quevedo, Rafael G., Building Products Institute, room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $37.20. (2) Taxi, $22; restaurant, $12.20; publication, $3. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Dickerman, John M., National Association of Home Builders, suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,500; expenses, $52.95. The salary and expenses listed under (1) are charged against that portion of the association's budget allocated to the legislative department, of which I am in charge, which allocation is $20,000 for 1948. Only some of the functions of this department might be deemed as coming within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, hotel rooms, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, International News Service, United Press, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) All legislation affecting the home-building industry.

Disbrow, Walter L., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September, 1948, $1,110. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of the Retirement Federation on legislation affecting their welfare. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any and all legislation affecting the civil-service retirement laws.

Disney, Wesley E., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. See (1). (1) Income: Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., $1,500; Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., $1,250; expenses: Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., $23.52; Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., $472.28 (reimbursed). (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, telephone calls, etc. (4) None. (5) Natural Gas Act amendments; attention to legislative matters affecting oil and gas industry.

Dixon, Loy Thomas, Continental Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Panama Railroad Employees Association, Balboa, C. Z. (1) Received second quarter $128.50 for expenses; expended $295.43 for second quarter for expenses. (2) Hotel, taxicabs, meals, and incidental expenses at Washington. (3) Same as No. 2. (4) None. (5) Support of H. R. 3749, S. 1416. All citizens of the United States employed by the Government in the Panama Canal Zone.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $600 salary and $225 expenses. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., the Postmaster, the Superintendent of Documents, and others. (3) Telephone service, postage, Government publications, rent, and minor office expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dorsett, J. Dewey, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the third quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Article entitled "Loss Prevention Is Big Business" made available for

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[1] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[1] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

publication in house organs of member companies. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

Dougherty, John E., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending September 30, 1948, consequently no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act, and, likewise, no expenses were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Douglas, Proctor, MacIntyre & Gates, a law partnership composed of James H. Douglas, Jr., Robert Proctor, Malcolm A. MacIntyre, and Samuel E. Gates, with whom are associated Carl McGowan, John F. Meck, Maurice Winger, and Roy B. Kelly, 730 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; self-employed (Western Cemetery Alliance). (1) Received from Western Cemetery Alliance $500 as balance of compensation due for legal services rendered in 1947, plus $48.71 as reimbursement for expenses incurred during calendar year 1947; spent, nothing. (2) No payments. (3) No payments. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to the establishment of or extension of national cemeteries.

Dow, Fayette B., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Pipe Line Companies, care of L. F. Kahle, treasurer, Box 1349, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Deponent has rendered no services in the past for the Committee for Pipe Line Companies that come within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. This registration under the act is made in order to comply with its provisions with respect to any such services that he may render in the future. Of total compensation received by deponent, the sum of $500 is believed to be a fair apportionment for such services as might come within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. Also received $301.54 covering postage, telephone, and miscellaneous items to reimburse for corresponding expenses incurred, none of which relate to activities within the scope of the Lobbying Act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) No legislation is proposed by Committee for Pipe Line Companies, deponent's employer, and there is no pending legislation which deponent has been called upon to support or oppose.

Dowd, M. J., Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) For third quarter of year 1948: Salary, $960 per month; incidental traveling expenses, $370.22. (2) Th salary is regular compensation for my full-time employment as consulting engineer for Imperial irrigation district on irrigation, power, drainage, and related matters. Expenses represent reimbursement to me for personal travel, hotel, and subsistence expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the Colorado River and affecting Imperial irrigation district.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers (now known as Associated Fur Manufacturers, Inc.). (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting the fur industry.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Drake, John, The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1732 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $26.95. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Dresie,[5] Grey, Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) $340.96 from Kansas Independent Business Men's Association for traveling expense to Topeka, Leavenworth, Kansas City, Oklahoma City. (2) Various filling stations, hotels, etc., from Wichita, Kans., to above destinations. (3) Travel. (4) The Friendly Dollar. (5) Tax equality.

Drysdale, Robert M., Jr., Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $2,124.99 as executive vice president of the federation; travel expense, $246.41. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) Travel expense. (4) None. (5) None.

DuBois, Ben, secretary, Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn. (1) I haven't been in Washington this last quarter so there is no expense for lobbying. Our receipts have been solely from new members secured, some by personal solicitation, others through the medium of a circular letter and the circular letters were sent out by directors in different States to the bankers of their State. My salary as secretary remains the same throughout the year—namely, $6,500—and the lobbying I do, if it can be called lobbying, is part of my duties as secretary of the association. We have put out one circular letter this quarter to our members, about 2,350 in number, and a copy of the circular is herewith attached. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) . [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

DuBuque, Jean H., National Aviation Trades Association, 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as outlined in Registration Form B. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Letters to membership of National Aviation Trades Association, Inc., for which I am public-relations counsel. (5) Support constructive legislation in connection with Public Law 346, as amended, particularly regarding veterans flight training courses.

DuBrul, Stephen M., General Motors Corp., General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file this report. (4) None. (5) None.

Dudley,[5] Harold and Ruth, American Council of Commercial Laboratories, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 a month for April, May, and June; total of $510 for traveling expenses. (2) Harold Dudley. (3) For representing the interests of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories before Government agencies and serving as the council's executive secretary. (4) [Blank.] (5) Revision of Internal Revenue Form 990.

Dudley,[7] Harold and Ruth, American Council of Commercial Laboratories, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 a month for July, August, and September; total of $322.68 for traveling expenses. (2) Harold Dudley. (3) For representing the interests of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories before Government agencies and serving as the council's executive secretary. (4) [Blank.] (5) Revision of Internal Revenue Form 990.

[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

Dunn,[8] William M., 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $1,204.98; salary, $1,999.98; total, $3,204.96. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxi cabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my positions with the Communication Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Dwyer, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary previously reported. Expenses reimbursed by employer, $901.26. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, retail stores, taxicabs, telephone companies, Government Printing Office, Hickey Bros. (3) Administrative, traveling, and incidental expenses; newspapers, periodicals; cigars, cigarettes, etc.; meals and entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting petroleum and its products, or natural gas.

Earle, C. E., secretary-treasurer of Independent Business Council of America, Inc., 448 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) Though not in an employed status, Mr. C. E. Earle will be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred. (3) For out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation that in the opinion of the members of this association affects the welfare of small and independent business men and women.

Echols, Oliver P., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Nothing received except salary no part of which was paid for activity covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress; no expenditures. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a National Air Policy.

Edelman, John W., 1031 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,730.70; $464.50 to reimburse actual expenses incurred, $100 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Eichelberger, Frank, suite 1225, No. 1 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co., same address; United Zinc Smelting Corp., 50 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Since I registered only for this Eightieth Congress, have done no work, nor have I received or made any contributions or other expenditures since June 30, 1948, I desire that my registration be withdrawn. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Eliason, Courtleigh W., General Motors Corp., 11-243 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file this report. (4) None. (5) None.

Elliott, John Doyle, 812 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Income: (a) Salary of $60 per week, plus (b) allowance of $30 per week reimbursement for cost of mileage, fares, meals, and hotel costs while away from residence location. (2) Referring to (1) (b) above, $76.75 spent on fares, meals, etc., while away from residence location during this last

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

quarter of 1948 (July, August, and September). (3) Contacting Townsend clubs and other organizations and citizens on behalf of furthering the Townsend plan. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, Eightieth Congress, first session, generally known as the Townsend plan.

Ellis,[1] Clyde T., executive manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (3 months ending September 30, 1948), $3,300; expense accounts, $460.52; total, $3,760.52. (2) Self for salary and reimbursement for meals, hotel, tips, and transportation, $3,760.52. (3) Travel incident to members' meetings. Board of directors' meetings, etc. (4) Rural electrification. (5) (Although not employed primarily for this purpose and same requires but a relatively small percentage of his time.) Legislation affecting the growth and welfare of rural electric cooperative corporations, public power, and public utility districts, including legislation affecting public power developments where they would in turn affect the rural electric cooperative corporations, public power, and public utility districts.

Ellsworth; Charles K., Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,250; expenses, $15. (2) Expense money paid out only to hotel, restaurants, and cab drivers. (3) Covered above. (4) Have no records of any such publication. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Have been assigned by Hill & Knowlton, Inc., to prepare educational information and material showing consequences of measures proposing to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; general counsel, American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Services to date have not involved the supporting or opposing legislation. At the request of the association legal analyses and opinions are rendered from time to time on legislation affecting public power.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) $2,191.21 as legal fees and expenses for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, etc. Of this figure $91.21 represents reimbursement of expenses. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during the quarter covered by this report; work done related to litigation and departmental conferences.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif. (1) $1,500, the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during the quarter covered by this report; work done related to conferences with Government departments.

Ely,[4] Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel for Colorado River Board of California and Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $3,886.65 representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with matters affecting California's interest in the Colorado River. Of this amount $586.65 represents reimbursement of expenses, $2,000 of the total figure was paid by the Colorado River Board and $1,886.65 by the Six Agency Committee. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph, and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during the quarter covered by this report. Work related to conferences with Federal Government departments, and agencies of the State government.

Ely,[4] Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; employed as special counsel, Department of Water and Power, city of Los Angeles. (1) $2,100 representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, and litigation. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph, and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during the quarter covered by this report; work done related to litigation and departmental conferences.

Euler, W. A. F., 50 Union Square, New York, N. Y.; United Zinc Smelting Corp., same address. (1) Further to my registration filed with your office on April 12, 1948, and my subsequent quarterly report of receipts and expenditures for the period ended June 30, 1948, filed with your office pursuant to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Please consider this registration withdrawn since I have neither receipts nor expenditures during the third quarter, my activities having terminated before June 30, 1948.

Evans, Mrs. Ruth M., Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $125; expenses. (2) Self (salary), expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Fahy,[6] Kathleen (Mrs. Jack B.), 132 Third Street SE.; American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $101.67 for miscellaneous expenses, expended $101.67. (2) Various. (3) Entertainment, miscellaneous expenses, travel. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriations for United States Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education bill.

Fahy,[7] Kathleen M. (Mrs. Jack B.) 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $85.35; expended $85.35. (2) Various. (3) Entertainment and miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriation for United States children's bill; Federal aid for education bill.

Fain, David, care of Black & Kendall, 1200 Cascade Building, Portland, Oreg.; Anacortes Shipways, Inc., 904 Lewis Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) The undersigned has heretofore filed in your office, pursuant to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, the requisite forms in connection with his activities in support of S. 2476 and H. R. 6057.

Would you be good enough to withdraw this registration since all the work performed in connection with the above described proposed legislation was performed prior to June 30, 1948, and neither the writer nor this office has received any contribution nor has made any contribution or other expenditure in connection therewith, subsequent to June 30, 1948.

Fakler, Herman, 847 National Press Building; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) I received $5,166.67 salary as an officer of the Millers' National Federation. I am employed specifically to engage in activities described in section 307 of title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. During the preceding quarter I devoted approximately 1 day to such activities. During that period, I made no expenditures for these activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. On August 1, 1948, I participated in a radio forum conducted by the National Grange on the question "Should the Senate Ratify the International Wheat Agreement?" I took the negative side of this question.

Farrington, Charles J., National Coal Association, 803 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,949.85 salary and expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Taxi, phone, meals, and transportation. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the coal industry.

Farshing, Donald D., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,300 gross salary received; $344.65 expenses. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Ferguson, Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Building and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Telephone calls and telegrams, $21.20; general retainer as Washington counsel, United States Building and Loan League, less than one-half of work is in connection with legislation, $1,750; total, $1,771.20. (2) American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Charges for services rendered. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting building and loan associations and general mortgage lending.

Ferguson,[4] H. T., Langdon Street, Madison, Wis. (1) No money received or expended during the calendar quarter ending September 30, 1948. My employment as legislative agent for all persons represented previously was terminated as of June 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Ferguson, John A., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,125 (allocated). (2) No legislation pending, no

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) No legislation pending.

Ferris, Muriel, League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $185.42 salary every 2 weeks; received and expended, carfare to and from the Capitol and travel, $21.60. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) Carfare and travel only. (4) Trends in Government, Member Magazine, publications of the League of Women Voters. (5) I am employed principally to inform league members on legislative matters, secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation, see league program adopted by national convention, 1948, attached.[1]

Fifer, Russell, American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Expenses, $376.02. (2) To hotels, air lines, etc., for services rendered. (3) Normal business and traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) General farm legislation affecting the butter and dairy industry.

Filer, Harry L., New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $5,300, and no expenses. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Finucane, James, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Compensation at the rate of $3,600 a year; expenses, $68.75. (2) Usual suppliers of miscellaneous services, such as railroad companies, newsstands, book stores, etc. (3) Transportation, papers, etc. (4) Peace Action; newspapers around the country which would use our regular releases, usually distributed by United Press, Associated Press, or International News Service. (5) Any bills affecting the peaceful prospects of international amity, such as conscription bills, restrictive immigration bills, or excessive military appropriations.

Fisher, Lewis H., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Canal Construction Service Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z.; Dr. Alexander Renner, temporarily at San Marino, Calif. (1) National Association of Retired Civil Employees, $300; Canal Construction Service Committee, $3,833; Dr. Alexander Renner, temporarily at San Marino, Calif., $100. (2) Various individuals and corporations. (3) Telephone and telegrams, $38; taxicabs and streetcars, $7.20; stationery, $9.50; postage, $15; 1 meal, $4.40; office help, $125. (4) Annuitant. (5) Assisting displaced persons under Public Law 774.

Fistere, Charles M., American Butter Institute, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $397.18, of which $22.18 was received in reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) District of Columbia cab drivers, $4.80; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $17.18. (3) Transportation and communication. (4) None. (5) Legislation proposing to amend or repeal internal-revenue regulations of oleomargarine.

Fitzpatrick, F. Stuart, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, salary, $3,625; expenses, luncheon, $7.50. (2) Statler Hotel. (3) Necessary normal expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the general fields of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

Fleming, Charles Henry, Coast Guard League, 1011 Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) Nothing. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting veterans of service in the United States Coast Guard, or any legislation affecting the United States Coast Guard in which the league has a definite interest.

Fleming, Roger W., 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $2.40 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed May 1948.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: International wheat agreement; authorization with respect to the construction of headquarters for the United Nations; monetary and fiscal policies.

Flinn,[1] W. G., grand lodge representative, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (International Association of Machinists). (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Flinn,[1] W. G., grand lodge representative, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (International Association of Machinists). (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Forbes, E. F., Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., room 304, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary, $5,000.04; expenses, $2,530.02. (2) For ordinary traveling expenses, such as railroad fares, taxi fares, pullman fares, hotel accommodations, meals, telephone and telegraph, etc. (3) Ordinary expenses in connection with routine work as president and general manager of the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc. (4) None. (5) Not employed to propose or oppose legislation. This work is only incidental to the regular work of the president and general manager of the association.

Ford, Mrs. J. A., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Average approximately $30 per week expenses. (2) Hotel and meals when away from own home, and traveling expenses. (3) Above. (4) The Townsend National Weekly. (5) A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Ford, John B., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A fair proportion of my salary chargeable to lobbying purposes is $50 per month—$150 for the quarter. I have not expended or received any other money for lobbying purposes. (2) To me. (3) Compensation for personal services. (4) I caused no articles or editorials to be published, relating to legislation. (5) Legislation affecting the American merchant marine, specifically legislation amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (H. J. Res. 377, 398, 412, 413, and companion bills), overtime-on-overtime legislation, and other legislation affecting shipping.

Ford, Tirey L., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Fort, J. Carter, Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For all services rendered to the Association of American Railroads, described in Registration Form B, filed December 1946, registrant received salary during the third quarter of 1948 at the rate shown in such registration, as amended by the supplement thereto, filed January 10, 1948, and received in addition $230.63 as reimbursement for all traveling expenses while away from Washington and all reimbursable business expenses in Washington, such as cab fares, business meals, etc. Of the salary received, $1,891.67 is estimated to be allocable to legislative activities. Of the expenses for which registrant was reimbursed, $64.10 is estimated to be allocable to legislative activities. The legislative activities above referred to include activities with respect to possible legislation which registrant was called upon to consider, analyze, etc., but which was neither supported nor opposed by him. (2) The expenses above shown were paid to various restaurants, taxicabs, dining cars, etc., and to the Chicago Club, Chicago, Ill. (3) Traveling expenses while away from Washington and such expenses in Washington as business meals, taxis, etc. (4) None. (5) Generally, to support all legislation in the interests of the railroads and of a sound national transportation policy and to oppose all legislation contrary to the interests of the railroads and to a sound national transportation policy. No such legislation was under consideration by Congress during the third quarter of 1948. For bills supported or opposed during the second quarter, see registrant's return on Form C for that quarter.

Foster, Charles E., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: July, August, September, 1948 (after taxes and social security), $1,037.93; bonus: 10 percent of annual salary (after taxes and social security), $220.57; incidental expenses and travel, July, August, September, 1948, $112.71; total, $1,371.21. (2) Charles E. Foster, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (3) See No. (1) above. (4) DAV semi-monthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the survivors of deceased service men and women.

Francis, Joseph H., Morgan, Utah; National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Post Office Box 338, Morgan, Utah. (1) $5,892.89 received from the National Board of Fur Farm Organizations. (2) $3,000 represents salary for acting as executive secretary of organization, April, May, June, 1948; $2,892.89 represents personal expenses April, May, June, 1948. (3) Personal expenses as shown under item 2 include transportation, hotel and meals, telephone, telegraph, and minor personal miscellaneous expenses. (4) American Fur Breeder, National Fur News, Fur Journal, and Black Fox Magazine. (5) Any and all legislation affecting the fur farming industry of the United States.

Franklin, L. S., director, The National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 94, Route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (1) Received $600 for July, August, September, 1948; paid out, $1,309. (2) Operation, upkeep, auto, 500 miles per week, $30, for 13 weeks, $390; lodging, meals, $8.65 per day for 13 weeks, $519; salary for 13 weeks, $375; mimeographing bulletins, $25; total, $1,309. (3) Tax reform. (4) None. (5) Tax reform.

Fredrickson, Fred J., Valley City, N. Dak.; North Dakota Resources Board, 311 North Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak., and State water conservation commission, Bismarck, N. Dak. (1) Quarterly salary for July, August, and September, 1948, before deductions for withholding and social-security taxes, $1,350; and reimbursed expenses for same period, $602.83, none of which was for lobbying purposes. (2) Hotels, eating establishments, railroad and bus companies, car expense,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[1] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[1] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

telephone and telegraph companies, mimeographers, and United States post office. (3) Lodging, meals, transportation, communications, mimeographing, office supplies, and postage. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting irrigation, reclamation, water conservation, flood control, land and mineral development and utilization in North Dakota, and allied legislation.

Freeman, Milton V., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Silver Rod Sales Co., Inc., 660 Newark Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.; Ace Mail Order Co., East Orange, N. J.; Black Cigar Store, Newark, N. J., Globe Mail Order Co., Jersey City, N. J. (1) $2,500 received on account of legal fees (for funds expended see attached letter to Clerk of the House of Representatives.[1] (2) [Blank.] (3) Telephone, telegraph, railroad, taxi fares, and other actual expenses of registrant have been paid by the firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter in the total amount of $694.04, for which amount the firm has been reimbursed (see attached letter to the Clerk of the House).[1] (4) None. (5) Oppose H. R. 5645.

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) July, $248.96; August, none; September, none. (2) Miscellaneous. (3) Entertainment and transportation. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

Fyffe & Clarke (David R. Clarke, John Harrington, Albert J. Smith), Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Gaither, H. Rowan, Jr., 333 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., Mills Building, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None during quarter from July 1 to September 30, 1948. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6253.

Galvin, M. J., 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.; Minnesota railroads, St. Paul, Minn. (1) None. All of the undersigned's clients as listed on this registration have paid the expenses reported herein, and the undersigned's salary, on the ratio of the mileage which they have within the State of Minnesota. Amount paid is the same as that expended. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Gammons, Earl H., Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., Warner Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $390. (2) Restaurants, hotels, and incidental expenses. (3) Entertainment and out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Garstang, Marion R., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $1.55. See attached schedule. (2) Travel. (3) Taxicab. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Gavitt, Frank, Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., registered in accordance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, and retained as public relations counsel for Schenley Distillers Corporation, did not, during the third calendar quarter of 1948 (the period covered by this report), conduct any lobbying activities. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Geary, Paul M., National Electrical Contractors Association, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expenses incurred and no money received other than salary originally reported on form B, filed May 22, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) No special legislation under consideration.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Geaslin, Bon, 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. (1) No expenditures made during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp., we are interested in all legislation affecting the merchant marine and civil aeronautics.

Gebhard, Mrs. Paul, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No expenses incurred during this period. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian general assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as No. 3.

George, Leo E., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September 1948, $2,499.99; travel and general organization expenses, $1,157.27. (2) Travel and general organization expenses including hotels, meals, and minor incidental expenses due to attendance at local, State, and National meetings and conventions, plus transportation as follows: Pennsylvania Railroad, $65.62; Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, $86.15; Southern Railroad, $58.88; and American Airlines, $26.62; total, $1,157.27. (3) Expenditures for hotels, meals, and incidental expenses are an actual reimbursement for cash expended in connection with attendance at meetings and conventions. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the Civil Service Retirement System; improve the wages, hours, and conditions of post-office clerks and to improve the postal service.

Gerrity, Harry J., 1001 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.; Oregon-Washington Bridge Co., Olympia, Wash. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 569 and S. 570.

Giddings, Ernest, assistant director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,381.68, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities estimated for legislative service, $276.34; expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Gilbert, C. C., Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) $1,725 salary as secretary Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation as affects industry generally.

Gilbert, R. C., 159 Hotel English, Indianapolis, Ind., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $82.60, hotel and meals; $13.12, transportation. (2) Undersigned. (3) Expenses at Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act; amendments to minimum-wage law; housing and anti-inflation.

Goddard, Livingston, 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $833.31 as secretary-treasurer of the Federation; traveling expenses, $124.12. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) Travel expense. (4) None. (5) None.

Goodman,[2] Leo, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,000 salary; $442.50 expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) CIO News, Autoworker. (5) Rent control, housing, and community development and planning.

[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

Goodwin, William J., the Loch, Roslyn, New York & Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Resources Commission of China, 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, $10,000 on September 24, 1948 (in addition to $30,000 received earlier this year, making a total of $40,000), representing additional retainer under my contract with the National Resources Commission of China, which contract was previously reported; total expended, $5,364.02. (See schedule attached.[1] (2) See schedule attached.[1] The attached schedule of expenses during the last 3 months includes some expenses perhaps not pertinent to the purposes of this retainer. Other expenses, not included, definitely do not pertain to this account, as I have other income and other accounts which do not come under this act. (3) See schedule attached.[1] (4) None, although I have introduced representatives of the Chinese Government to newspaper editors, legislators, businessmen, and others, in order that they would learn the truth about China. (5) Reference is made to my letter of July 1, 1948, which accompanied my registration statement.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received from the American Institute of Accountants, July 30, 1948, $12,050.42, representing fees of $10,520 from March 1947 to date, reimbursement of $1,250 paid to Gordon Rule, associate counsel, as shown in prior quarterly reports, and $300.42 for reimbursement of telegraph and telephone charges, printing, mimeographing, etc., during a period of approximately a year and a half. This was the first payment received, and paid the account to date. (2) Small amounts to telegraph and telephone companies. (3) Telegrams and long-distance telephone calls. (4) The Journal of Accountancy and the Certified Public Accountant. (5) Advancing the interests of the accounting profession in reference to bills relating to practice before Government agencies and practice before the Tax Court.

Goss,[2] Albert S., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I received $1,875 in salary for the quarter, which is my total compensation for all my services as master of the National Grange, of which legislative activities form only a part. I paid out none of it. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The National Grange Monthly. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. As master of the National Grange, however, it is my duty to support or oppose legislation in conformity with the policies of the National Grange.

Goss, Bert C., 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received no money other than salary as vice president of Hill & Knowlton, plus essential travel and entertainment expenses. I estimate that of my travel and entertainment expenses for the 3 months ended September 30, 1948, less than $100 was expended for purposes that might be interpreted as subject to being reported under this law. (2) Paid to taxicabs and restaurants. (3) For travel to and from the Capitol, for luncheons and dinners for committee personnel and Congressmen, etc. (4) Maintain no such records. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose legislation. Interested in legislation affecting aviation, in proposals to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine, and in other legislation affecting interests of clients of Hill & Knowlton.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

Courley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $3,000 retainer. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Bills affecting the public health.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building; Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, P. O. box 2450, Honolulu, Hawaii. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Griffiths, Dr. H. M., National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $1,900; expenses, one trip to Washington, $64.23. (2) Expense money paid to railroad, hotel, taxis, restaurants for meals. (3) Normal expense of trip. (4) Mimeographed brief: The President's Anti-Inflation Proposals: They Are Unrealistic, Unsound, and Contradictory; a Brief Economic Analysis of the Fallacies of President Truman's Bill and the Inadequacies of the Republican Measure. Addressed to Senate and House committees and to Members of the Congress, August 6, 1948. By National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York. (5) Opposed to any legislation for public housing, price controls, Federal aid to education, FEPC legislation, increased Government expenditures. In favor of sound monetary policies for control of inflation, reduced Government expenditures.

Grimes, Weston B., 436 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Received: (includes office and general expenses totaling $1,136.71) $18,761.39; expended: (for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act) $8.50. (2) Taxicabs, $3.50; restaurants, $5. (3) Taxicabs to and from the Capitol; restaurants, meals, entertainment for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) Legislation concerning commodity exchanges, international commodity agreements, exports and imports, taxes and regulation of business generally.

Grinberg,[3] P. Irving, Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Jeweler, Jewelers' Circular-Keystone, Jewelry, Jewelers' Outlook, Jewelers' Newsletter, Executive Jeweler, ANRJA Bulletin, NAGJ Bulletin, Mid-Continent Jeweler, Northwestern Jeweler, Southern Jeweler, Pacific Goldsmith, Trader & Canadian Jeweler, Manufacturing Jeweler. (5) Interested in securing relief from excise taxes as applied to jewelry.

Haas, Frank E., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the third quarter of 1948 this registrant was not assigned to and did not engage in activity in connection with Federal legislation or covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act and thus received no compensation and incurred no expense subject to report thereunder. (2) Not any (see No. (1)). (3) Not any (see No. (1)). (4) Not any (see No. (1)). (5) Not any (see No. (1)).

Haas, Herbert A., Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $75 from the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits for expenses incurred July, August, and September, 1948. (2) Money received spent for carfare, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses. (3) Necessary expenses while engaged in further corrective legislation to H. R. 1362, passed into law July 31, 1946. (4) None. (5) Crosser Act (H. R. 1362) passed into law July 31, 1946.

Haddock, Hoyt C., CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE. (1) $1,560 in salary; $130 expenses. No legislative activities engaged in due to adjournment of Congress. (2) Taxi companies, telephone company, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxi, telephone calls, papers and periodicals. (4) NMU Pilot, Mebs Marine Engineer. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen; oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Haddon, George A., treasurer, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 419 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Received and paid out $550 for fares and expenses while commuting to and from Washington, D. C., during the last quarter from July 1 to October 1, 1948. Also, for the National Conference on Public Employee Retirement Systems. (2) George A. Haddon, treasurer, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, room 419, City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (3) For train and taxi fares commuting and for meals, refreshments, etc. (4) None. (5) Trying to have Federal and municipal employee pensions exempt up to $1,440 from income tax as are railroad pensions. Also, trying to keep members of existing pension funds out of social security.

Hadley, Harlan V., 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None, other than one-quarter of the annual compensation of $2,500 as set forth in supplemental registration (form B) filed April 9, 1948, and miscellaneous expenses not to exceed $15. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Federal tax (excise) legislation, materials control legislation, and such other legislation as the association may hereafter from time to time indicate.

Haines, Samuel P., 4407 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, 171 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, $5,500; expended, $5,287.18. (2) See exhibit B attached.[1] (3) See exhibit B attached.[1] (4) None. (5) Reduction or repeal of the 20 percent excise tax applying to dine and dance rooms of hotels.

Hale, William C., Tennessee Eastman Corp., Kingsport, Tenn. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Revisions in the Tariff Act—draw-back regulations.

Hallbeck, E. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September 1948, $1,999.98; legislative expenses, July, August, and September 1948, $357.70; travel and general organization expenses, $1,914.78. (2) Legislative expenses include meals, streetcar, taxi, and minor incidental expenses, $357.70; travel and general organization expenses include attendance at State and National conventions and necessary expenses for hotels, meals, and incidentals plus transportation to Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, $74.47 and $234.63, and Seaboard Railroad, $53.19, $1,914.78. (3) All expenses are an actual reimbursement for cash expended on account of travel and attendance at meetings and conventions. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve and strengthen the Civil Service; improve the Civil Service Retirement System; improve the wages, hours, and conditions of post-office clerks, and to improve the postal service.

Hamlet, Harry G., Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $600. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended, nothing. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Hanscom,[4] William A., 1700 I Street, room 406, Washington, D. C.; Oil Workers International Union-CIO, 301 East Fifth Street, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Received salary, $1,125; expenses, $345. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and the International Oil Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Hanscom,[1] William A., 1700 I Street NW., room 406, Washington, D. C.; Oil Workers International Union-CIO, Ledger Building, 301 East Fifth Street, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Received salary, $1,300; expenses $245. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and the International Oil Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Harmanson,[4] L. James, Jr., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $1,625. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Agricultural legislation. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Harmanson,[1] L. James, Jr., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, 1948, $1,625. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $425; expenses, $280. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress (a) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below of the convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations held triennially and (b) the opinion of the national board of the Young Women's Christian Associations in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) None. (5) Legislation related to international security, social and economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties.

Harris, Ronald B., Irrigation Districts Association of California, T. W. Patterson Building, Fresno, Calif. (1) I have engaged in no activities in Washington for the Irrigation Districts Association of California for the quarter ending June 30, 1948, or at all. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Harris, Winder R., Room 203, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received: Office expense, $124.18; personal expense, $36.85; total, $211.03. Expended: Office, $126.06; personal, $86.85; total, $212.91; refunded, $1.88; total, $211.03. (2) Various. (3) Office and personal expenses. (4) None. (5) None for quarter for which report is made.

Hart, Merwin K., National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,640.86. (2) [Blank.] (3) Much of the period covered by the 3 months July 1 to September 30, 1948, was spent by me in Europe. I think a fair allocation, if any, to lobbying expenses would be the sum of $421, which was one-fourth of the expenses of my trip. I include this only for the reason that some of the

[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[1] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

knowledge obtained by me on this trip was later used in the writing of certain council letters. (4) Economic Council letters. (5) I have opposed legislation believed by me to be against private enterprise, and supported legislation believed to favor it. I have made no specific appearances on any legislation during this period.

Hart, Stephen H., 350 Equitable Building; National Livestock Tax Committee, Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) During the quarter the National Livestock Tax Committee paid to me a per diem of $50 for office work and $100 out of town for actual time spent in study, advice, conferences and correspondence concerning general livestock tax questions including the analysis of the present provision of the Internal Revenue Code and current rulings and decisions concerning Federal taxation of livestock operators. (2) Such activities also included work in connection with proposal of the National Livestock Tax Committee to amend the Internal Revenue Code, recognizing capital gains in sale of breeding livestock and permitting deduction of ordinary recurring ranching expenditures. It is impossible to determine what part of my services related to this problem, but it is my opinion that only a portion of my activity, if any, during the preceding quarter could be interpreted as lobbying. (3) During the quarter a total of $675 for legal services was paid to me for all my activities and services. I was also reimbursed $41.01 for out-of-pocket expenses. (4) During the quarter I wrote an article on the general tax problems arising from the sale of cattle because of drouth. This article was published by the California Cattleman, the Producer, Cow Country, and perhaps other livestock periodicals. (5) [Blank.]

Harter, Dow W., 412-14 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (1) Received annual retainer from the B. F. Goodrich Co. for all services as its Washington counsel. Allocation of amount paid for my services between legal and legislative activities is not feasible. Amount received during third quarter of 1948, $1,875. In addition, received reimbursement for long-distance telephone, travel, taxicab fares, and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The B. F. Goodrich Co. is interested in legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of synthetic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes. It is interested in various proposals now under study by Congress for a long-range rubber program for this country. It is also interested in the repeal of the present excise taxes on tires and tubes, and in other legislative proposals which come before Congress from time to time.

Hawes, Robert N., 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.; Grays Harbor Industries, Aberdeen, Wash.; Forks Chamber of Commerce, Forks, Wash.; Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce, Port Townsend, Wash.; Sequim Chamber of Commerce, Sequim, Wash.; and Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Port Angeles, Wash. (1) From Grays Harbor Industries; $3,333.32, compensation; $423.51, expenses. (2) Out-of-pocket expenses. (3) Telephone, telegraph, travel, entertainment, postage, etc. (4) None. (5) Reference Olympic National Park.

Hawkins, Paul M., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,800 salary, only a small fraction of which was for lobbying activities; $197.72 expenses, only a small fraction of which was expended for lobbying activities. (2) Taxicabs, railroads, restaurants, hotels, air lines. (3) Transportation, meals, rooms. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the hotel industry.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1603 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $250 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social security taxes, $12.75 incidental expenses for months of July, August, and September 1948. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) $12.75 incidental expenses for months of July, August, and September 1948 (taxi, car fare, phone calls, meals). (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, re-education, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalizaton laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the National Convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Hays, Joseph H., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the third quarter of 1948 this registrant was not assigned to and did not engage in activity in connection with Federal legislation or covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act and thus received no compensation and incurred no expense subject to report thereunder. (2) Not any (see No. (1)). (3) Not any (see No. (1)). (4) Not any (see No. (1)). (5) Not any (see No. (1)).

Hazen, John C., 1008 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Meals, $107.65; hotel, $46.56; taxes, $49.25; transportation, railplane, $40; miscellaneous, $4.90. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Special Bulletin of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, published weekly. (5) [Blank.]

Hebert, Felix, 702 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (1) Hotel rooms, $32.50; meals, $28.25; railroad fares, cabs, $42.50. (2) Hotel rooms, Mayflower, Washington, D. C.; meals, Mayflower, Pennsylvania Railroad, Senate Restaurant; transportation, New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; Pennsylvania Railroad; cabs. (3) Travel expenses. (4) None. (5) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code.

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary of $800 per month, which is paid for all services rendered, only a part of which concerns legislation. Out-of-pocket travel and incidental expenses, $97.50. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and luncheons. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.; American Parents Committee (without salary), 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $29.50 for traveling expense, entertainment, etc.; expended, $29.50. (2) Various. (3) Railroad fare, miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriations for U. S. Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education.

Heiney, Robert B., National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,625 as one-quarter year's salary as assistant to secretary of association for all work performed; $27.10 has been received as reimbursement for expenses incurred. (2) Taxi fares and miscellaneous expenses, $27.10. (3) See above. (4) National Canners Information Letter. (5) Opposing marketing orders on commodities for canning; supporting S. 2386, H. R. 6050 and S. 2409.

Hensel, Robert E., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended the sum of 10 cents in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Additional charge for a telegram. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Hebert, Felix, 702 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Companies.) (1) Hotel rooms, $8.50; meals, $28.50; railroad fares, cabs, $53.83; total, $90.83. (2) Hotel room, the Mayflower, Washington, D. C.; meals, the Mayflower Hotel, Pennsylvania Railroad, Washington Station Restaurant; transportation, New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, Pennsylvania Railroad, cabs. (3) Travel expenses. (4) None. (5) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code.

Herndon, Maurice G., 1001-2 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Herrmann, Louis F., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) August 10, 1948, taxi, 80 cents. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Hess,[2] Amiel Edgerton, 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.; Oil-Heat Institute of America, Inc., 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Nothing at present.

Hester, Ewart A., law offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September, $2,500; no expenses for this quarter. (2) No expenses reported. (3) None. (4) None. (5) See supplementary statement paragraph 2 attached to Form E filed by me January 9, 1948, H. R. 7036.

Hewes and Awalt, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, and Maxwell M. Merritt, 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn.; 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) (a) This registrant received no money or other compensation from the Life Insurance Association of America during the calendar quarter ended September 30, 1948. (b) This registrant made certain out-of-pocket expenditures during the calendar quarter ended September 30, 1948, in connection with its employment by the above-named association for which registrant has not received reimbursement, these being listed in detail, as follows: to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for long distance calls, $9.90; to taxicab drivers, 70 cents; total, $10.60. (2) See (1). (3) Expenses for transportation and communication, as listed in the attached statement. (4) None. (5) Any revision of Internal Revenue Code affecting life insurance and annuities.

[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

Hickman, R. L., Bayou Rapides Road, Alexandria, La.; Brotherhood Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, 1370 Ontario Street, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $573.30, and expended by me for transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (2) To hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxis, etc. (3) Transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Anti-inflation and housing, amendments to minimum-wage law, repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, and public education. This is final report as above employment was only temporary.

Hill and Knowlton, Inc., room 300, Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached.[3] (2) See attached.[3] (3) See attached.[3] (4) Have no records of such publication. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Are retained to prepare educational information and material.

Hinders, Justin, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended, $29.96. (2) Various. (3) Expenses. (4) Attached list shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Hines, Lewis G., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, $2,200; expenses for July, August, and September, $108.75. (2) Taxi drivers and phone company when away from office. (3) As stated in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Hinman, Ray C., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary, this represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act, $1,250; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $157.66. Money expended in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act, $1,407.66. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Hoffmann,[3] Frank N., 718 Jackson Place NW., United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,530.01, salary, $1,901, expenses. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel in and away from Washington. (4) None. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the National CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Hoffmann,[3] Frank N., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,999.99, salary; $2,884, expenses. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel in and away from Washington. (4) None. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the National CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Hollister,[4] R. F., Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Money received: Salary, $1,800; money expended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Holloway, William J., 2816 First National Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) (a) Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La., $5,000; (b) Public Service Co., Tulsa, Okla., $2,500; (c) Carroll B. Huntress, New York, N. Y., $500. (2) William J. Holloway, as above set forth. (3) Attorney's fees. (4) None. (5) (a) Oppose certain appropriations for Southwestern Power Administration; (b) oppose certain appropriations for Southwestern Power Administration; (c) oppose House legislation for St. Lawrence waterway.

Holman, Charles W., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $10.90. (2) Various. (3) Taxicabs. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Holmes, George T., Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky. (1) No money was received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Holste, Oscar W., room 301, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW. Washington, D. C., Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. Court and Vine Streets, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,296; expenses, $711.17; no other expenses than personal maintenance. (2) Hotel Annapolis, taxicabs, telephone, postage, laundry, pullman fare, and various eating places. (3) All living, transportation, and telephone expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation pertaining to railroad labor, particularly opposing all bills pertaining to the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts, which legislation would be detrimental to the acts.

Hood, J. M., president, the American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received from the American Short Line Railroad Association, $4,125; expenses incurred for account of the American Short Line Railroad Association for which reimbursement has been or will be made, $720.75; impossible to accurately allocate either salary or expenses, but carefully calculated estimate is that 5 percent of salary, $206.25, and 10 percent of expenses, $72.08; total, $278.33, expended for purpose of influencing legislation. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, clubs, transportation and communication companies. (3) For travel and entertainment in connection with the furtherance of the legislative program of the 312 common carriers by rail members of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting member lines of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (See text of legislative program attached to return for first quarter by that association.)

Hooks, Homer E., Canners League of Florida, P. O. Box 1252, Lakeland, Fla. (1) No activity during quarter; temporary work on specific legislation terminated with adjournment of last session, Eightieth Congress. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Horsky, Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash.; Libby, McNeill & Libby, food products, Chicago, Ill.; New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Kadiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (1) Received, none; expended, none. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon-canning companies and the Department of the Interior, relating to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered.

Hosking, Floyd J., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.03 as miscellaneous expenses (see below). (2) Notary public, $2; postage, 3 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report, postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Howard,[4] S. H., 1328 Evergreen, Millvale, Pa.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $1,162.50 for the second quarter of 1948 and had expenses of $617.60 for this quarter. (2) Hamilton Hotel, various restaurants, taxicab, streetcar, and Pullman fares. (3) Lodging, meals, and transportation. (4) None. (5) All legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular. Working in behalf of proposed laws to amend the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Acts.

Howard,[3] S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received for third quarter, $1,162.50; working as grand lodge representative; not assigned to legislative activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Howard, Paul, 1709 M Street NW.; American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Attached.[3] (2) See attached.[3] (3) Operation of office. (4) ALA Bulletin, Library Journal, San Antonio Express, New York Times, and any other who use our releases; since we do not subscribe to a clipping service, we do not know who they are. (5) Any legislation affecting American Library Association members and/or the library profession.

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (1) Received $1,500 as salary and $313.99 as reimbursement for general expenses. (2) Various. See answer to question (3). (3) Miscellaneous and incidental, including local transportation, lunches, gratuities, committee meeting expenses, and other incidental expenses of Washington office, American Institute of Laundering. (4) Not applicable under section 308 (a). (5) I am interested in all legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof. My primary function as to legislation is to report status, prospects, etc., to my employer—the American Institute of Laundering. See also letter attached to Registration Form B, which is made a part hereof.

Howe, Robert E., Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United Mine Workers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,999.99, salary; $2,884, expenses. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel in and away from Washington. (4) None. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the National CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[3] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[3] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

(1) Since April 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,125 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $546, a total of $2,671. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Howrey, Edward F., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 914 Eleventh Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Peanut and Nut Salters Association. Fee: None this quarter; expenses, $14.62. (2) Telephone, $10.57; notary fees, $1; restaurant expenses in Washington, $3.05; total, $14.62. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) Proposals affecting peanuts and tree nuts, particularly those placing limitations and restrictions on importation of nuts.

Huff, George B., secretary, the Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received for reimbursement of actual travel expenses (Philadelphia conventions and Chicago), $668.12. (2) American Airlines, TWA, Scott & Schuler, taxicab operators, various filling stations, and restaurants. (3) Procurement of travel, housing, and subsistence. (4) None. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Huntress, Carroll B., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.; National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y., acting as chairman for the National St. Lawrence Project Conference without compensation and for reimbursement of expenses. (2) Railroads, hotels, $439.50; New York Telephone Co., Western Union, $32.19; United States Post Office, $7. (3) To carry on duties as chairman. (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate Joint Resolution 111; House Joint Resolution 192.

Hushing, W. C., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, $2,200. Expenses for July, August and September, $105.90. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (when away from office), and messengers. (3) As stated in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Hutson, John B., suite 719, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., Tobacco Associates, Inc., Raleigh, N. C. (1) Salary at the rate previously reported on form B, which registrant filed as a matter of information to the Congress, although of the opinion that he does not come within the purview of the act (Pub. No. 601, 79th Cong.) (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See schedule A[1] for all money received during preceding calendar quarter and attachment for allocated expenditures. (2) See attachment.[1] (3) See ttachment.[1] (4) Regular Association publications. (5) No legislation pending.

Ingles, William, 1624 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. et al.) (1) See schedule 1 (a) and 1 (B) attached.[1] (2) See Schedule 1 (B).[1] (3) Normal office operating expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting industry.

Jackson, Charles E., general manager, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 229 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Jackson,[2] Robert C., National Cotton Council of America, post-office box 18, Memphis, Tenn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None: (5) None.

Jhung, Walter, post-office box 1706, Washington, D. C.; Korean-American Trading Co., 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (1) July salary of $333.33 as an employee of the Korean-American Trading Co., 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. Expended, $53.50. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) S. 152 and H. R. 860 to place Korea upon immigration quota and to seek naturalization privileges for Korean nationals in the USA.

Jobe, William T., National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Employed on a full-time annual basis as general counsel for the National Association of Ice Industries at a salary of $10,800 per annum. I have received my regular monthly salary for the past calendar quarter of 1948 and nothing more. Pursuant to the requirements of Public Law 601, I have expended no money. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Johnson, Elmer, president, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The sum of $747.90 was received during the third quarter of 1948. (2) None. (3) Fee of $225 per month; $72.90 to cover transportation, meals, etc. (4) The Annuitant. (5) In support of any measure designed to improve the Federal Retirement system.

Johnson, Gilbert R., Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Pro rata of annual retainer as legal counsel (including 8-percent increase effective September 1, 1948) as set forth in my letter of April 9, 1948, amending initial registration dated January 10, 1947. No expenses were incurred during this period. (2) Retainer to self. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) During this quarter I have given attention to legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping as part of my work as legal counsel for Lake Carriers' Association. I do not consider that I am engaged for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation and this report is made without prejudice to that position.

Johnson, James G., Jr., 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Graves, Kizer & Graves, Old National Bank Building, Spokane, Wash. (1) Receipts, $2,852.54; expenditures, publications, 85 cents. (2) Congressional Intelligence, Washington, D. C. (publications). (3) For normal legal services, consisting primarily of advice and assistance in the drafting of proposed legislation, the collection of information in relation thereto and discussions thereof with members of Congress and representatives of interested executive departments. (4) [Blank.] (5) S. 2105 and H. R. 6536.

Johnson, Lee F., National Public Housing Conference, Inc., 1015 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500 salary, less withholding tax. No funds expended under Public Law 601, except as perhaps 20 percent of my time was devoted to national legislative work. No expense account received. (2) Nothing paid out except for living expenses and transportation. (3) [Blank.] (4) Public Housing—editor of that journal. (5) Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill, S. 866.

Johnson, Vernon A., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW. Washington, D. C.; Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. (1) Received a total of $4,008.45, all from the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., $2,750 of this was for salary. The balance of $1,258.45 was for expenses, itemized as follows: $17.17 for automobile travel, $44.50 for taxicab fares, $679.77 for entertainment, $334.06 for travel tickets, $73.50 for hotel room rent, and $109.45 for meals. (2) Various taxicab companies, hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, etc. (3) For normal business activities and relationships. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Johnson, W. D., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) January 1948, annual compensation of $3,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor, generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Johnson, Walter R., National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $444 for July, $222.50 for August. (2) Registrant. (3) Transportation, $300; meals for self and guests, $220; miscellaneous, $46.50. (4) None. (5) To confirm and establish titles in States to land beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

Jones, Bascom F., Tennessee Railroad Association, 990 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Jones, J. M., National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Salary, $2,100. (2) [Blank.] (3) No lobbying expense for third quarter 1948. (4) The National Wool Grower, coeditor, J. M. Jones. (5) [Blank.]

Jones, L. Dan, Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered to be within the scope of the act, $12.55. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Jones, Lyle W., 1737 De Sales Street NW.; National Small Business Men's Association, Akron, Ohio. (1) $600 monthly salary less withholding tax and social security tax. $100 personal expenses for July, August, and September. (2) Lyle W. Jones, 1737 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Luncheons, taxicabs, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) Pulling Together—monthly bulletin, National Small Business Men's Association. (5) [Blank.]

Jones, Walter J., care of W. C. Hushing, Room 607, A. F. of L. Building, Washington, D. C.; Canal Zone Central Labor Union, Box 1494, Balboa, C. Z. (1) $1,500 at $500 per month for April, May, and June 1948. (2) Tuition at Harvard, railroads for fare, landlord for rent, various groceries for food, service stations for gasoline and oil, cab fare, tips, and miscellaneous items incidental to living in Washington. (3) Studies at Harvard, fares, rent, food, operation of automobile, etc. (4) None. (5) Retirement for Canal Zone employees, pay legislation, increased injury compensation, any other affecting Federal employees.

Kane, John E., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported in Form B heretofore filed pursuant to act; expenses reimbursed by employer, $279.15. (2) Various taxicab companies, restaurants, hotels, other service establishments. (3) Administrative expenses, transportation, meals, gratuities. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.

[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

Kane, John E., District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $498.31 as treasurer of District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee. The sum of $498.31 expended on behalf of committee during quarter. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the sale and distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

Keehn,[3] Thomas B., legislative secretary, the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches of the United States of America, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During recent months the activities which I have carried on which could conceivably be designated as lobbying have been so negligible that it does not appear to us to be necessary to file a quarterly report under the regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Keesling, Francis V., Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; city and county of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif. (1) $2,806.45 retainer; $1,146.55 reimbursement for travel, subsistence, secretarial, stenographic, telephone, telegraph, and postage expenses. (This also covers services concerning matters before the various executive departments, in addition to legislative matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, and includes expenses at Washington, D. C.; San Francisco; and elsewhere.) (2) No payments made except as set forth in (1) above. (3) In connection with various legislative matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco. (4) None. (5) Various bills of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including Army civil functions, housing, surplus property, in lieu taxes.

Kennedy, Gilbert F., Esq., partner of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Washington, D. C.; and 1, Garden Court, Middle Temple, London, England; Mr. Louis Dreyfus, of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York, N. Y., and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50, New Bond Street, London, England. (1) Nothing received during the quarter; $2 expended during the quarter. (2) H. W. H. Smith Howard, commissioner for oaths, $2. (3) Commissioner's fees. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, being a bill to enable wife (Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus) to regain her United States citizenship.

Kennedy, Harold L., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.; Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa 3, Okla. (1) Received 3 months' retainer in the amount of $3,000; expended, $27. (2) See No. (3) below. (3) Expended $12 for 30 taxi fares (40 cents each) to and from the Capitol; 10 meals at $1.50 each, comprising a total of $15. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation that might affect the oil and gas industry.

Kent, Arthur H., 1720 Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif.; American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Payment of $1,148.22 received from American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., July 15, 1948. (2) United Airlines—transportation San Francisco to Washington and return and excess baggage charges, $361.53; American Airlines—transportation Washington, D. C. to New York and return, $28.06; Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., charges room, etc., $259.46; C. K. Leith, Washington, D. C., rent of apartment, $150; telephone and telegraph tolls, $38.63; meals, taxis, etc., Washington, D. C. and New York, $319.54. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses incurred to July 1, 1948, and reimbursed by above payment. (4) None. (5) Support of amendment to section 116 (a), Internal Revenue Code, relating to taxation of earned income of United States citizens from foreign sources.

[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

Kern, George A., Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Ketchum, Inc., 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Education Association: April 20, 1948, $4,717.54; May 29, 1948, $4,108.89; June 21, 1948, $1,600; total, $10,426.43. (2) Ketchum, Inc., $10,426.43. (3) Services, $8,800; expenses living, travel, and incidental expenses), $1,626.43; total, $10,426.43. (4) News releases sent to Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (Information also distributed to Members of Congress.) (5) Current educational problems in furtherance of the passage of H. R. 2953 and S. 472.

Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Received from Main & Co., April 7, 1948, $473; May-June 8, 1948, $264; total, $737. (2) (a) Romeike Press Clipping Bureau, $21; (b) Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $716; total, $737. (3) (a) Clipping service, (b) services. (4) News releases sent to Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Wall Street Journal, Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, and general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (5) The incentive income tax plan, a program of income-tax revision prepared by Frank Wilbur Main and other partners in Main & Co., certified public accountants, with headquarters office in Pittsburgh.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $833 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $76.35 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) V. F. W. Foreign Service, V. F. W. legislative newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security; immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration.

King, Joseph T., National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, suite 302, the Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,800 salary and $69.35 expenses. (2) Restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Meals, taxi fares, and tips while traveling on official business; business luncheons; entertainment. (4) National Affairs Report and bulletins. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building supply dealers, such as Fair Labor Standards Act, wage-and-hour legislation, housing legislation, and tax legislation.

King, Joseph T. (Robert N. Hawes), Suite 1028, Barr Building, 912 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to Olympic National Park.

King, Thomas H., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

King, Williford I., Room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During this past quarter, I received an overall of $2,791.69, including salary and expenses. (2) I am not a disbursing officer and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Kitchen, C. W., United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Various articles have been prepared and published in trade periodicals and association yearbooks on marketing subjects, none dealing specifically with legislative matters. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Kline, Allan B., American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $256.14 expended (see item (6) of Form B filed January 1948). (2) Taxi fares, train fares, hotel, and restaurants. (3) Transportation, lodging, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: International wheat agreement, authorization with respect to the construction of headquarters for the United Nations, monetary and fiscal policies.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Washington counsel for Kirlin, Campbell, Hickox & Keating, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Kneipp, Leon F., 3700 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Organization of Professional Employees of United States Department of Agriculture, South Building, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. (1) Only money received was compensation for services during months of July and August at rate of $100 per month. Total $200. (2) No money paid to any person, company, corporation, or otherwise. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Measures relating to interests of Federal professional employees, viz: Pay rates, retirement, disability compensation, per diem allowances, etc.

Koch, Robert M., National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) It is estimated that, as secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., $500 of my salary represents that part of my time covered by Public Law 601 during the third quarter of 1948. This was all disbursed for personal living expenses. In addition, I received $25 for reimbursement for taxis and carfare in connection with legislation of interest to members of the association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation directly or indirectly affecting the agricultural limestone industry.

Krebs, Alfred U., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant believes that $166.66 per month represents a fair allocation of his salary for the third quarter of 1948, to the activities referred to in Form B. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See item (2). (4) None (5) Registrant is not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Kreutz, Oscar R., executive manager, National Savings and Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $4,500 salary and $1,698.01 special expense. Approximately 10 percent of my time was devoted to legislative matters so that $450 of my salary would be allocable. Of the special expense item, none of it could be construed as applicable. (2) No one (none expended by me). (3) None expended by me. (4) National Letter and National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry.

Krueger, A. H., 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the quarter July-September 1948 I was paid a total of $2,049.98 as an employee of Millers' National Federation for various services which have no relation to the activities described in section 307, title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Section 307 activities, if any, would be incidental to my regular employment, and no specific amount of my salary is allocated for activities covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. I made no expenditures for the quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) New York Times, July 7, 1948. (5) Prepared short statistical article on International Wheat Agreement, incidental to my regular employment.

Kruse, Herman C., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No activity during quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

La France, Francis X., Esq., Swan, Keeney & Smith, 911 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.; Narragansett Brewing Co., New Depot Avenue, Cranston, R. I. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2759 and any correlative bill.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) From the National Patent Council, Inc., as retainer, $1,500; from the American Fair Trade Council, Inc., as retainer, $1,000; from the Trinity Improvement Association for rental and other expenses, $750. Other than as herein recited, I have made no expenditures except for postage, stationery, taxi fares, etc. (2) $408 to Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (3) Rental and garage. (4) None. (5) My employers are nonprofit organizations, and I am employed in an advisory capacity and not for the purposes of supporting or opposing legislation in Congress. Their purposes are principally educational with reference to the objectives of their organizations.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C.; A. E. Brooks, 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) $500 in further payment of retainer. No expenditures except for postage and stationery. (2) No expenditures except as recited above. (3) Postage and stationery. (4) None. (5) Legislation with reference to taxation of citizens of the United States engaged in business abroad.

Larkin, Frederick, Jr., Independent Business Council of America, Inc., 448 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $435. (2) Frederick Larkin, Jr. (3) Living expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation that in the opinion of the members of this organization affects the welfare of independent and the small-business men and women.

Laugherty, R. R., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., Room 1309, 604 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,500. Expenses, $750. No money expended only for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxi fare, postage, telephone and telegraph, cleaning, and food. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting and detrimental to railroad employees.

Lawrence, John V., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $36.70. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., American Medical Association, Suite 301, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $400.12; expenses, $181.28. (2) Capital Airlines, Eastern Airlines, Palmer House. (3) Travel, hotels, meals, local transportation, conferences, incidental expenses. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the section of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has received no contributions for the purposes designated in subparagraph (a) or (b) of section 307, Public Law 601. Expenditures: Salary, carfare, telephone, telegraph, postage, publications, $1,448.10. (2) Muriel Ferris, salary and carfare. Balance as indicated in (1). (3) As indicated in (1). (4) Trends in Government and Member magazine, both published by registrant. (5) See attached program[1] of the League of Women Voters of the United States.

Lee, Ivy, and Ross, T. J., United States Cuban Sugar Council, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) See appended statement I.[1] (2) See appended statement I.[2] (3) See appended statement I.[1] (4) See appended statement II.[1] (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public relations matters pertaining to sugar legislation relating the Sugar Act of 1948.

Leith,[4] W. Gordon, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $1,500 (before withholding taxes were deducted). Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Leith,[7] W. Gordon, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September 1948, $1,500. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Letts, David S., attorney, 901 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; American Transit Association, 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,950 salary as attorney for the American Transit Association. Received $136.61 for actual business expenses. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, etc.; hotels and restaurants; merchants and others. (3) Traveling and living expenses away from Washington. Expenses in Washington for transportation, fees, dues, entertainment and miscellaneous. (4) None. (5) In connection with proposed legislation affecting the transit industry, registrant may present the views of members of the American Transit Association.

Levine, Seth, CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,365 in salary; $130 expenses. Very little time spent in legislative activities. Major portion of quarter attributed economic research. (2) Taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxies, telephone calls, periodicals, and newspapers. (4) CIO News, NMU Pilot, IFAWA Fisherman, The American Marine Engineer.. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen, longshoremen, fishermen, and allied maritime workers. Oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Levy,[4] Herman M., 152 Temple Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) No contributions or compensations other than that received as an annual retainer for duties as general counsel of Theatre Owners of America, Inc., plus hotel (or its equivalent) and traveling expenses. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Affecting motion picture theater owners and operators.

Lewis, George J., Union Station, Lexington, Ky.; Kentucky Railroad Association, Louisville, Ky. (for fuller details see Form B, filed by me on June 3, 1947). (1) No moneys received. None expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Employed to support legislation favorable to the railroad industry and to oppose legislation detrimental to that industry.

Libby, Frederick J., executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,149.99; expenses, $87.75; total, $1,237.74. (2) Expenses for railroad tickets, hotels, taxies, porters, telephone and telegraph services, postage, and miscellaneous expenses when away from Washington. (3) Speaking trips, attending conferences, meetings, etc. (4) Peace Action, monthly news bulletin of the National Council for Prevention of War. (5) Supports, in pursuance to the purposes of the organization, legislation which promotes peace and opposes legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Liljenquist,[4] L. Blaine, room 300, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; E. F. Forbes, president, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary during April-June 1948 quarter, $2,000; expenses incurred with respect to legislation, $76.98. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, postage stamps, notary fees, printing and mimeographing. (4) None. (5) Supported legislation dealing with Federal meat inspection. Also supported legislation designed to correct the overtime-on-overtime problems.

Liljenquist,[7] L. B., 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Linton, Donald H., Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates; 250 Stuart Street, Boston, Mass. (1) None during period. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Lipman,[8] Leonard H., New Jersey Businessmen Association, Inc.; Tunison Lane, New Brunswick, N. J. (1) Received from New Jersey Businessmen Association, Inc., $38.65. (2) Expenses in connection with traveling, telephone, and telegraph, $39.95. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Tax equality, reduction of Federal expenses.

Littell, Norman M., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Navajo Tribe of Indians, residing in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado, address of superintendent of the Navajo Service, Window Rock, Ariz. (1, Received $1,785.36, which entire sum was paid to expert witnesses, O. A. Larrazolo and Martin Van Couvering, for preparation of claim on behalf of the Navajo Tribe of Indians. (2) To employees of registrant's law office, including stenographers, and to expert witnesses in connection with the proving of the claims. (3) For legal services in connection with the Navajo business. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the Navajos as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting the Navajos is being considered.

Little, Charles R., Kenwood Road, Box 153–M, Rural Route 508, Cincinnati, Ohio; executive secretary, Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress, Dr. Charles E. Holzer, Sr., president, Holzer Hospital, Gallipolis, Ohio. (1) Total received for salary, $900; total received for expenses, $600; total expenses, $412.60 (actual amounts directly chargeable to lobbying are less than totals shown above). (2) Various hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Transportation $191.45, lodging $46.07, meals $51.39, tips $11.82, office (periodicals, communication, postage, stationery, supplies, etc.) $111.87. (4) None. (5) Not solely employed for this purpose, but concerned with any legislation dealing with conservation and flood control in the Ohio Valley, including appropriations.

Little,[4] Charles R., executive secretary, Kenwood Road, Box 153–M, Rural Route 508, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Total received for salary, $900; total received for expenses, $600; total expenses, $412.60 (actual amounts directly chargeable to "lobbying" are less than totals shown above). (2) Various hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Transportation, $191.45; lodging, $46.07; meals, $51.39; tips, $11.82; office (periodicals, communication, postage, stationery, supplies, etc.) $111.87. (4) None. (5) Not solely employed for this purpose, but concerned with any legislation dealing with conservation and flood control in the Ohio Valley, including appropriations.

Little, Walter J., Southern Pacific Co., et al., 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Lodge, F. S., the National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $150 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News, Fertilizer Review, Agronomic Notes, and Pasture Progress, all published by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., Washington, D. C. I issued and distributed, in the customary manner, a press release relative to the election of Dr. Russell Coleman as president of the association, and one relative to a conference on mineral nutrition, but do not know what publications may have published them in whole or in part. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Lofgren,[4] Charles E., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,500. (2) Charles E. Lofgren. (3) Salary. (4) Naval Affairs Magazine, official publication of the Fleet Reserve Association. Various monthly publications of chartered branches of the Fleet Reserve Association. (5) Personnel and veterans legislation pertaining particularly to Navy and Marine Corps, and generally to armed services.

Lofgren,[7] Charles E., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,500 (salary). (2) No expenditures other than personal living expenses. (3) Receipts, $1,500 salary; expenditures, none, other than personal living expenses. (4) Naval Affairs Magazine, official publication of Fleet Reserve Association. (5) Armed services personnel legislation and veteran legislation.

Lopinsky, Frances, Curry, Cohen & Bingham, 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) About $3. (2) Cab drivers. (3) Cabs to and from Capitol. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation concerning Indian affairs, particularly concerning members of National Congress of American Indians, Alaskan natives, Apaches, Piautes.

Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York; 1316 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $31,544.80. (2) No disbursements made during third quarter of 1948. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

Lorence,[6] Walter E., The Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 730 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Regular salary for April, May, and June 1948, as reported on Form B; reimbursements of $178.03 for personal out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses (various). (3) Personal out-of-pocket expenses for lodgings, food, travel, telephone calls while in Washington, D. C. (4) Progress News, a publication of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc. (5) In the interest of navigation and flood-control projects in the Ohio Valley.

Lorence,[9] Walter E., The Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 730 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Regular salary for July, August, and September 1948 as reported on Form B. (2) Self. (3) [Blank.] (4) Progress News, a publication of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association Inc. (5) In the interest of navigation and flood-control projects in the Ohio Valley. No lobbying activities performed during this quarter.

Lovelady, Rufus M., care of American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Canal Zone District of the American Federation of Government Employees, Box 1708, Balboa, C. Z. (1) During special session of Congress from July 26 to August 7, 1948, expenses, as follows: Plane fare from Canal Zone to Washington, $172.20; board and lodging while in Washington, $63; steamship fare on return to Canal Zone, $62.26; total, $297.46. (2) Pan American Airways, hotels and restaurants in Washington; Panama Railroad Company, (3) Transportation, board, and lodging. (4) None. (5) Retirement legislation applicable to employees of the Panama Canal; preservation of competitive civil-service positions on the Canal Zone for citizens of the United States.

Lucas, James C., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $200, salary; $14.45, expenses. (2) Taxi drivers and publishers. (3) Transportation and publications. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable-fabric legislation.

Lusk,[10] Rufus S., Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $31.04; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $424.11. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown below. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, therefore the sum of $15 is allocated to those purposes. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, nd the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation whether national or local in scope that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[11] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW.; National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $46.57; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $709.24; from National Association of Home Builders, $795.01. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses, and supervisory fees as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, therefore the sum of $22.50 is allocated to those purposes. Registrant was employed by National Association of Home Builders to conduct and supervise a public housing survey in connection with legislation pending before the Congress. Therefore, he sets forth the entire amount of compensation so received. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation whether national or local in scope that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[12] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW.; National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $40; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $2,602.65; from National Association of Home Builders, $108.40. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses, and supervisory fees as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now

[1] Not printed. Filed in Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[3] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.
[9] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[10] Filed for third quarter, 1946.
[11] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[12] Filed for first quarter, 1947.

on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, therefore the sum of $37.50 is allocated to those purposes. Registrant was employed by National Association of Home Builders to conduct and supervise a public housing survey in connection with legislation pending before the Congress. Therefore, he sets forth the entire amount of compensation so received. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation, whether national or local in scope, that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[14] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $40; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $3,270.69. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington. Therefore, the sum of $37.50 is allocated to those purposes. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation, whether national or local in scope, that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[14] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $40; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $3,023.51. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown below: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington. Therefore, the sum of $37.50 is allocated to those purposes. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any

[14] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[15] Filed for third quarter, 1947.

legislation, whether national or local in scope, that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[15] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $40; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $3,068.86. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington. Therefore, the sum of $37.50 is allocated to those purposes. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning the District of Columbia taxation, appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation, whether national or local in scope, that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[16] Rufus S., Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $32.99. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above association. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. (3) See paragraph 2. (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation, whether national or local in scope that affects the real estate industry.

Lyon, A. E., executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[15] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[16] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250. Total expenses for quarter, $682.58. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

Lyon, R. B. H., 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C; Kinsman Optical Co., 1320 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $400 final fee. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 5241, Eightieth Congress, second session.

McAvoy,[4] Harold, 705 Manhattan Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.; National Association Post Office and Railway Mail Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen and Messengers, 1113 Arch Street, North Side, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,500, which must take care of all expenses for the quarter. (2) Harold McAvoy, our legislative representative. (3) Legislation for the benefit of all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department. (4) Mail Handlers Journal. (5) He must support all legislation that will benefit all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department.

McAvoy,[7] Harold, 705 Manhattan Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y. National Association of Post Office and Railway Mail Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen and Messengers, 1113 Arch Street, North Side, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,400, which must take care of all expenses for the quarter. (2) Harold McAvoy, our legislative representative. (3) Legislation for the benefit of all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department. (4) Mail Handlers Journal. (5) He must support all legislation that will benefit all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department.

McBreen, Thomas J., National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors Washington Committee, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $346.71 (60 percent of time devoted to legislative activities). (2) No expenses. (3) No expenses. (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 918 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary of Jonas A. McBride, $2,500; salary of Glenn C. Russell, stenographer, $1,303.95; salary of Jo Ann Jones, stenographer, $100; printing and supplies, $49.39; rent, $180; personal expenses, Jonas A. McBride, $863.92; telephone and telegrams, $68.95; postage, $30. (2) Salaries to Jonas A. McBride, Glenn C. Russell, and Jo Ann Jones as indicated; printing and supplies to various printers and stationery supply companies; rent to Labor, 10 Independence Avenue SW. (3) For maintenance of office of national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending September 30, 1948, consequently no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act, and, likewise, no expenses

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

McCaskill, J. L., associate secretary, Department of Higher Education, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,631.68, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. Estimated for legislative services, $100. Expense: None. (2) Self—salary. Expenses: None. (3) No expense incurred. (4) College and University Bulletin. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

McClure, Warren C., box 207, Camden, Ark.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

McDonald, Angus, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers' Union), 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., the Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) Salary, $750; expenses, $250; total, $1,000. (2) Salary to self. Expenses for travel. (3) Answered above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) Support a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

McGough, Richard, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.; Northern Pacific Railway Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Great Northern Railway Co., the Milwaukee Road, Seattle, Wash. (1) Salary as stated in original registration. Expenditures in connection with Federal legislation, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Washington.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, general delivery, Washington, D. C. (1) Approximately $165. (2) Thomas Edward McGrath. (3) To use as I see fit. (4) For a fee—none. (5) [Blank.]

McIsaac, John R., 96 Brooks Street, Brighton, Mass.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, July 26 to August 7, inclusive, $269.22; per diem, $154. (2) Hotel, restaurants, taxis, etc. (3) Living expenses, transportation, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley law, amendments to minimum-wage law, housing, and anti-inflation. This is a final report.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; the Lincoln Electric Co., 12818 Colt Road, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Pension trust statutes; Internal Revenue Code, section 23 (a).

McKercher, M. C., the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Received salary, $362.50 and expenses, $294.46. No money expended in connection with legislative work. (2) Hotel Hamilton, various restaurants, telephone, telegraph, postage, railroad and Pullman fares, streetcar and taxi fares. (3) Necessary living and transportation. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

McLaughlin, Robert E., AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 410 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended except petty cash for taxi fares and actual expenses in connection with attendance at the national convention. I am national legislative director and general counsel of AMVETS at a modest per diem rate for time actually consumed. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) National AMVET and AMVET letter. (5) To support legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II and their dependents.

McLaughlin, Robert E., National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received quarterly retainer of $250. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) To support legislation beneficial to this client and civil-service employees in general.

McMains, W. H., Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary same as previous report. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the industry represented is reported to members.

McMillan, Robert W., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,100, with less than one-twentieth of the time and services for which such compensation was paid being for activities which might conceivably be construed as coming within the purview of any of the provisions of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; $76.65, reimbursement of expenses allocable to foregoing activities. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Transportation and other normal out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

McQuatters, Geneva F., 1017 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $202.90. (2) Railroads and air lines, post office, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Travel, postage, office supplies, telephone, and telegraph. (4) The Independent Woman, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (5) Equal-rights amendment, opposition to discriminations against women, Federal aid to education, displaced persons, amendments to the Pure Food and Drug Act, equal pay for equal work, universal military training, Women's Bureau appropriations, jury service for women, United Nations participation.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., 1182 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; American Optometric Association, care of Dr. Samuel L. Brown, O. D., 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio. (1) From the American Optometric Association development fund, the total sum of $2,713.86, $2,500 of which was for professional services from February 1 to August 1, 1948; $81.61 for traveling expenses during said period, and $132.25 for long-distance telephone and telegraph tolls during said period. From Remington Rand, Inc., the sum of $2,500 for professional services from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, in connection with the appropriation bill limiting the price which the Government can pay for typewriters. (2) During this quarter, I expended $34.83 for traveling expenses; $26.01 for telephone tolls; $1.16 for telegram tolls; and $34.15 for miscellaneous expenses. Total disbursements during this quarter were $96.15. All for American Optometric Association development fund. (3) See (1) and (2) above. (4) None. (5) On behalf of the American Optometric Association, I supported in a special session of Congress the action of the District of Columbia Optometric Association in requesting an amendment to the District of Columbia optometry law for the purpose of raising the standards of the profession in providing better visual care for residents of the District of Columbia.

Macleay, Lachlan, Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with general work done for the Mississippi Valley Association, all reimbursed by association, $587.11. (2) Railroads, etc., $264.85; hotels and miscellaneous, $322.26. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) A portion of Mr. Macleay's time was used in regard to legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

MacMillen, William C., Jr., 165 West Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress (until September 21, 1948), 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $96.14, as president of the federation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Macnamee, W. Bruce, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A fair proportion of my salary chargeable to lobbying purposes is $300 per month, $900 for the quarter. In addition I have received $19.35 reimbursement for expense of luncheon. (2) To me. (3) $900 compensation for personal services; $19.35 reimbursement of luncheon expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the American merchant marine, specifically legislation amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (H. J. Res. 377, 378, 412, and 413, and companion bills); overtime-on-overtime legislation; and other legislation affecting shipping.

Madaris, James B., 220 South Alfred Street, Alexandria, Va.; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Magee, Miss Elizabeth S., National Consumers League, 348 Engineers' Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary; part time, $83.33. (2) [Blank.] (3) Part-time salary. (4) National Consumers League Bulletin. (5) Supporting minimum wage legislation; extension of social security.

Margolin, Mrs. Olya, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (1) $1,125 gross (before income-tax deduction) in salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y., none of which was spent in connection with work; $20.15 received from above, spent for carfare, postage, etc. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preperation of educational and other material.

Markham, Baird H., American Petroleum Institution, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached schedule[1] for answers to Items 1-5. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marks, Herbert S., room 305, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the Detroit Edison Co.; 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) In connection with all legal services to this client, including some services relating to legislation, registrant received $2,555 total fee during this quarter and reimbursement for disbursements of $269.68; total disbursements in connection with all matters for this client during quarter $276.82. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $26.20; transportation and other expenses of trips to Detroit, $238.27; miscellaneous, $12.35. (3) Telephone, traveling expenses, and miscellaneous, including taxies, postage, etc. (4) None. (5) General legal services to this client include services in connection with proposed amendment to exempt limited interstate and international electric connections under the Federal Power Act.

Marks, Raymond E., Southern Pacific Co., 139 North Virginia Street, Reno, Nev. (1) Nothing to report for the third quarter of 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marran,[6] Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, did not receive or expend any sums during the quarter ended June 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax legislation proposing to amend section 116 (a) and section 1621 of the Internal Revenue Code, pertaining to United States citizens earning income from sources outside the United States and withholding required on such income.

Marran,[3] Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, did not receive or expend any sums during the quarter ended September 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax legislation proposing to amend section 116 (a) and section 1621 of the Internal Revenue Code, pertaining to United States citizens earning income from sources outside the United States and withholding required on such income.

Marran,[4] Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended the sum of 10 cents in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Additional charge for a telegram. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Marsh, Benjamin C., Peoples Lobby, Inc., room 31, 810 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts, $1,603.57; salaries and wages, $891.30; bulletin and printing, $1,013.50; postage, $262.54; rent, $165.00; A. J. Walker, $51.30; Addressograph Corp., $38.07; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone, $23.28; B. C. Marsh, trip to convention, $19.30; incidentals, $19.46. (2) Benjamin C. Marsh, Arlene Ryan, Graphic Arts Press, postage, J. B. Stein, Andrew Walker, Addressograph Corp., Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., cleaning, etc. (3) Salaries and wages for publicity and clerical work, other for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) We have not caused any article to be published, but have sent material and releases to hundreds of papers. (5) Support attached program and oppose that against it.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; William J. Goodwin, the Loch, Roslyn, N. Y. (1) $7,500 received from William J. Goodwin; $4.20 expended. (2) Leet Bros., Inc. (3) Photostatic copies of letter. (4) None. (5) See letter attached to registration statement of William J. Goodwin, dated July 1, 1948.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Magothy River Association, 908 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md. (1) $1,000 received from Magothy River Association, $1 expended. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (3) Long distance calls to Annapolis and Baltimore, Md. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3314, H. R. 6341, S. 1675, S. 230.

Marston, R. B., director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,069.18, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $413.83; expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Martin,[5] Robert F., Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Masaoka, Mike M., national legislative director, Japanese-American Citizens' League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Post Office box 1628, Washington, D. C.; Japanese-American Citizens' League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in form B, filed January 22, 1947; see attached supplementary sheet.[1] (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list.[1] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Maslow, Will, American Jewish Congress, 1834 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $112.50 for services under Public Law 601; expended $30; in addition, I received for services not under Public Law 601, $2,500. (2) Rail and hotel expenses for one trip to Washington, D. C., to testify before Senate Subcommittee on Immigration. (3) Same as (2). (4) Law and Social Action, May–June 1948, July–August 1948; book reviews in Iowa Law Review; Yale Law Journal; Saturday Review of Literature; and one article in magazine Jewish Community. (5) Legislation designed to implement the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights; to keep separate church and state; to liberalize immigration laws; to liberalize Senate rules.

Mason, Walter J., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, $2,200; expenses for months of July, August, and September, $93. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (when out of office). (3) As stated in (2). (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Mathews, John Clifford, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America for the Christian Amendment Movement, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary received from J. S. Tibby for July, August, September, $750; preaching fees to be applied on expense account, $100. (2) Salary used for personal and family expenses only. Preaching fees applied to expense account and used for paying railway fare, cost of hotel rooms, meals, etc., in necessary travel for the Christian Amendment Movement. (3) See above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) In support of an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States to acknowledge Jesus Christ as Saviour and King of nations.

Mathews, P. H., 170 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.; New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 61 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Total expenses, $1,247.86; salary (net), $2,268.96; total, $3,516.82. It is to be noted that registrant's principal employment is legislative and public-relations work within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Only a portion of 1 month of this quarter was spent in connection with Federal legislation. However, all moneys received for salary and expenses are reported herewith. This is to advise you that on October 1, 1948, I resigned my position with the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., under whose employment I registered pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, such registration being filed with your office under date of May 2, 1947. Accordingly, I respectfully ask that your files containing any and all matters in connection with this registration be closed. (2) Various sources—for traveling expenses, transportation, and other necessary expenses when traveling and living away from home. (3) See item 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to the railroad industry.

Maudlin, C. V., 716 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.; Georgia Power Co. and its associate company, Savannah River Electric Co., Electric Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) All money received and expended during quarter ended September 30, 1948, was for nonlegislative activities. (2) None for legislative activities during quarter ended September 30, 1948. (3) None for legislative activities during quarter ended September 30, 1948. (4) None during quarter ended September 30, 1948. (5) None during quarter ended September 30, 1948.

Mechem, Frank L., P. E. Harris & Co., Libby, McNeill & Libby Food Products et al., 603 Central Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) As stated in answer to question (4) on form B, the only money received by registrant is (a) legal fee on per diem basis for services performed, and (b) reimbursement for traveling expenses. No money was received during the preceding calendar quarter by way of legal fees, and no money was received as reimbursement for traveling expenses. (2) See (3). (3) The only expenditures during the preceding calendar quarter consisted of traveling expenses covering air and railroad transportation, hotel, meals, telephone, and telegraph tolls. (4) None. The formulation and presentation of proposed legislative program designed to stabilize certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry.

Meeks,[2] E. A., National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary only, $1,500 for quarter ending June 30, 1948. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Any legislation affecting postmasters.

Meeks,[3] E. A., National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary only, $1,500 for quarter ending September 30, 1948. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Any legislation affecting postmasters.

Meixell, Harry, National Aviation Trades Association, 1344 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as outlined in registration form B. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Letters to membership of National Aviation Trades Association, Inc., for which I am executive director. (5) Support constructive legislation in connection with Public Law 346, as amended, particularly regarding veterans' flight training courses.

Messer, James, Jr., Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla. (1) Total amount received and expended, $13.77. (2) Southeastern Telephone Co., Tallahassee, Fla. (3) Telephone and telegraph expense in connection with S. 110 (Reed-Bulwinkle bill), which was theretofore pending in the Congress. (4) None. (5) Any legislation in which I might be directed to support or oppose by Florida Railroad Association, generally legislation affecting railroads.

Messer, Ross A., National Association of Post Office Maintenance Employees, formerly

[1] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[2] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

National Association of Post Office Mechanics and Custodial Employees, name changed at national convention, Cincinnati, Ohio, August 23, 24, 25, 26, 1948, Post Office box 1611 (room 527 Victor Building), Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,333.32; expenses, $632.55; expenses include postage, office supplies, box rent, taxi, postage for mailing monthly publication and bulletins and other necessary expenses for handling legislation and grievances; $161.77 of the above expenses were for expenses to, from, and while attending our recent national convention at Cincinnati, Ohio. (2) [Blank.] (3) In support of all beneficial legislation for postal employees, and in handling grievances between the membership and the Post Office Department. (4) The Post Office Custodial News and Special News Bulletin advising the membership of legislation activities or other beneficial information for the membership. (5) All beneficial legislation for postal employees and custodial employees in particular.

Middleton, P. Harvey, Railway Business Association, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) The only money received by me during the period from July 1 to September 30, 1948, was $5,666.66 in salary gross. No part of this salary was spent in legislative activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Miles, Clarence R., Chamber of Commerce of the USA, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: Salary, $4,125. Expenses, $34.32. Expended: Transportation, $11.25; telephone, $23.07. (2) Taxi companies, railroad, and telephone company. (3) Transportation to and communication with the Capitol; other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Miles, Harold M., Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None for Federal legislation. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Miller, Charles C., 715 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) I have received from my employers, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., for the quarter ended September 30, 1948, prorated on the basis of total expenditures at 10 percent to cover time spent on legislative work in the period, a total of $497.08. (2) $14.96 to hotels for guest meals; $6.07 for taxis; $5.95 for tips and miscellaneous expenses; $30 for telephone and telegraph; $1.59 for postage; $10.05 for office supplies and equipment; $64.50 for rent; $314.80 for salaries of registrant and secretary; $29.33 air travel; $19.38 for hotel, meals, and travel expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) Press coverage consisted of general news reports on tire and tube production and rubber consumption. (5) Revision of excise tax on tires; measures pertaining to regulation of transportation of coated fabrics; investigation of the effects of recent basing point decisions on industry.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.; Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana & Texas, Houston, Tex.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Company, Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y. (1) Received: $1,500 plus $750 expenses, from Dallas Chamber of Commerce; $1,500 plus $296.27 expenses, from Intracoastal Canal Association; $1,500 plus $1,069.53 expenses, from Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. Expended: $2,115.80. This sum includes all business expenses in Washington, only a small portion of which would apply to activities within the purview of the act. (2) Carlyn Apartments, Mayflower Hotel, United States Post Office, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation facilities, stationers, food and beverage establishments. (3) Apartment rent, $481.50; office rent, $780; taxi fares, etc., $108; telephone and telegraph companies, $158.30; stamps, stationery, other usual office expenses, $150; entertainment and miscellaneous, $438. (4) Monthly article in Dallas magazine, official publication of Dallas Chamber of Commerce. (5) Legislation affecting flood control, water transportation, river and harbor improvement, appropriations, and taxes.

Milton, Charles J., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J.; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3237 and S. 249.

Mollin, F. E., American National Live Stock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Have had no special contributions for lobbying purposes. The association finances handled in normal fashion. My compensation as executive secretary of the American National Live Stock Association is $1,000 a month. In addition I received in January of this year a bonus of $1,000 for last year. (2) No payments to anyone in connection with lobbying activities. Only part of the expense of myself as executive secretary of the association on trip to Washington in past quarter could be chargeable to such. Total expense for this purpose was: $305.28; telephone and telegraph, $10.51; Washington stenographer, $14.35. (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own official magazine, the American Cattle Producer. (5) Attended congressional hearings on price control and inflation.

Montgomery, Donald E., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks at $100, $1,300; subsistence, 13 weeks, $819; expenses, 13 weeks, $650.32; total, $2,769.32. This amount covers nonlegislative work as described under (4) in Form B, as well as legislative work. Legislative work accounts for less than half of total duties. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Worker, Washington Report, and Ammunition (UAW-CIO publications), Economic Outlook (CIO publication), Antioch Review, Labor and Nation. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Mooney, William W., 406 Bernice Building, Tacoma, Wash.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Total amount received after deductions of $152.10 for withholding tax, hospital, etc., was $1,146.64. From that amount $423.93 was paid out for travel expenses for travel in auto, bus, train, and hotel and incidental expenses, leaving $722.66 for personal use. (2) William W. Mooney, traveling field representative. (3) Traveling over the State of Washington promoting Townsend Plan activities and creating interest and organizing new clubs or helping to build stronger clubs with side trips to other States to give talks, by arrangement. (4) Send notices and articles to the Townsend National Weekly, printed in Cleveland, Ohio, also mail to clubs over the State, bulletins and letters of a promotional nature, and give talks to clubs and groups by arrangement. (5) Supporting the Townsend plan bills in United States Congress for a national security plan for the aged and permanently disabled.

Moore, Chester B., Western Growers Association, 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Regular salary as managing director of Western Growers Association, plus traveling expenses. (2) To all regular accounts of my personal and business life. (3) [Blank.] (4) Western Grower and Shipper. (5) Am paid regular salary. Not directly employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. I do oppose or support any legislation of interest to our members.

Moore, Clayton, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Fourth and Main Streets, Winston-Salem, N. C. (1) Actual expenses incurred, $215.69. (Salary for full-time services as associate counsel same as amount in last quarterly report and for the purposes more fully set out in registration form.) (2) Airline fares, $69.69; hotel, meals, phones, and taxicabs, $146. (3) Travel, hotel, meals, phones, and taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation affecting R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Moran, Raymond H., 46 Burnside Avenue, Cranford, N. J.; International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, none; expenses, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Morgan, George W., Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made, no money has been received or expended by the registrant for activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601. (2) Inapplicable. (3) Inapplicable. (4) Copies of the only two issues of any publication in which the registrant caused any article or editorial to be published during the quarter for which this report is filed are annexed hereto[1] and made a part hereof. (5) The registrant is employed as president of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During the quarter for which this report is filed the registrant did not support or oppose any proposed legislation.

Morgan, Gerald D., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Alaska Transportation Co., Pier 57, Seattle, Wash. (1) Engaged in legislative activity on behalf of Alaska Transportation Co. for approximately 10½ days, for which firm of Morgan & Calhoun received $1,050. Expended during this period $132.69 for telephone and teletype messages, for which the firm received reimbursement from Alaska Transportation Co. Thus sum includes expenses in connection with nonlegislative matters, but an allocation is impossible. (2) $132.69 paid to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., for telephone and teletype service. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Legislative activity consisted of conferences with various persons in the Maritime Commission and the Department of the Interior, as well as various Members of Congress respecting legislation to take the place of Public Law 12, Eightieth Congress, relating to Alaska shipping, when that law expired on June 30, 1948.

Morris Plan Corp. of America, the, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received, none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) The corporation in its interests and in the interests of its stockholders opposes the adoption of bank holding company legislation in the form represented by S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Morrow,[6] Giles, Freight Forwarders Institute, 225 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary at the rate reported on Form B filed on January 24, 1947, as amended January 14, 1948, and in addition received $105.90 as reimbursement for expenses incurred. Reimbursement covered expenses incurred in Washington in connection with business of the institute, including taxicab fares, meals, and tips. (2) Washington taxicabs and restaurants. (3) Local transportation on office business, and business luncheons. (4) I. C. C. Practitioners' Journal (editor in chief). (5) Any legislation directly affecting the freight forwarding industry. Testified on national transportation inquiry before House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Morrow,[7] Giles, the Freight Forwarders Institute, 225 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary at the rate reported on Form B filed on January 24, 1947,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

and as subsequently amended, and in addition received $183.37 as reimbursement for expenses incurred in conducting institute business in Washington and New York City. (2) Taxicabs and restaurants in Washington, D. C.; the American Airlines; the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Pullman Co.; texicabs and restaurants and the Commodore and McAlpin Hotels in New York City. (3) Local and interstate transportation, meals, and other traveling expenses, all incurred in connection with meetings and other business of the Freight Forwarders Institute. (4) I. C. C. Practitioners Journal (editor and contributor of legal and technical articles). (5) Any legislation directly affecting the freight forwarding industry.

Morse, Henry Hoyt, 99 Pearl Street, Gardner, Mass.: Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid. (3) No work undertaken. (4) Stove builder. (5) None.

Mosier, Harold G., Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.; the Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (1) In addition to the regular annual salary previously reported on form B, the registrant has been or will be reimbursed for certain expenditures for travel, subsistence, communications, etc. Payment of these amounts so expended has been made directly to the hotels, railroads, restaurants, etc., which rendered the services to which reference is made. Expended $311.29. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Mose, Lynn E., Association of American Ship Owners, suite 301, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made registrant received only his salary and expenses. The total salary received by the registrant during the quarter was $2,000, and the total expenses received by the registrant amounted to $341.06. Only a small portion of such salary and expenses is applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration. (2) No expenditures except taxicabs, meals, railroads, and similar out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See item (2) (4) None. (5) The registrant is employed as manager of the Washington office of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During the quarter for which this report is filed the registrant did support bills to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Mougey, William J., 200 Hill Building, Washington, D. C; General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file report. (4) None. (5) None.

Murph, Daniel S., the National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $25 may be allocable to attempt to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Chiropractic Association, Inc., Webster City, Iowa. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) None specified.

Murphy, Ray, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the third quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

National Association of Real Estate Boards, its realtors Washington committee, and its public relations department, Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) Schedule attached.[1] (2) Schedule attached.[1] (3) Schedule attached.[1] (4) Attached list [1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Stevedores, 140 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $800 received, $704.24 expended; see statement A [1] attached. (2) See statement A [1] attached. (3) See statement A [1] attached. (4) None. (5) H. R. 4387, S. 2386.

National Postal Committee for Books, room 305, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (see registration for statement of membership of committee). (1) No receipts during said period; expenditures, $9,186.42. (2) $64.84 to American Book Publishers Council; $8,905.55 to Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens; $210.42 to Grosset and Dunlap, Inc.; $5.61 to Paul Printing Co. (3) For telegrams; professional services and disbursements; other telegrams and letterheads, respectively. (4) Publishers Weekly, New York, N. Y. (5) The committee opposes unfair increases in postal rates and discrimination in postal rates, such as contained in H. R. 2408 and H. R. 3519.

National Reclamation Association,[2] Don McBride, secretary-manager, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts for period April 1 to October 1, 1948, $24,467 (see schedule VI [3]); total expenditures for period April 1 to October 1, 1948, $24,467 (see schedule VI [3]); total attached schedules V and VI.[3] (4) National Reclamation Association Bulletin (see enclosed).[3] (5) Amendment to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and any other legislation affecting resources of the 17 Western States (see sec. 3, Purposes, first page, our Constitution enclosed in first quarterly report.[3])

Nau, Carlton L., American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW. (1) No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) None.

Neal, William S., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,685.10 during period engaged in activities probably covered by act, which is for July and 10 days of August 1948; $1,504 represents salary and $181.10 expenses. (2) Expenses paid for lunches, taxi fares, telephone, miscellaneous. (3) Advocating NAM program including opposition to regimentation, such as price control, rationing, and allocations, for lowered Government expenditures. (4) Regular contributions NAM News. (5) Opposition to regimentation, such as price control, rationing, and allocations, for lowered governmental expenditures.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the Secretary only.
[3] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

Neel, Samuel E., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) money received (July 1–September 30, 1948): (a) Retainer, $2,750.06; (b) traveling expenses, $370.60; (c) office expenses, $1,168.19. (2) The travel expenses were paid to various railroads, hotels, etc., and the office expenses were paid for postage, office supplies, etc. (3) See (2). (4) Washington News Letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; Letter to Members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; the Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage banking industry.

Nelson, G. W., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $390.70, salary and expenses; $24.48, pullman and taxies; total, $415.18. (2) Hotels, restaurants, and Pullman Co. (3) Pullman berth, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley law, amendments to minimum-wage law, housing and anti-inflation.

Nelson,[1] George R., grand lodge representative, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Nelson,[1] George R., grand lodge representative, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Nelson, Herbert U., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Reimbursement by employer for travel expenses and per diem, $600; salary, 20 percent of time devoted to legislative activities, $1,250.01; total, $1,850.01. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached list [1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Newton, R. Wayne, National Association of Cooperatives, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) July 14, $31.19 expense account; July 15, $367.67 salary; July 30, $367.87, salary. (2) R. Wayne Newton, August 13, $367.86, salary; August 31, $367.87, salary. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Employed to counteract the anti-farmer co-op lobbying activities of (1) the National Tax Equality Association; (2) Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, whether lobbying individually, as officers and employees of the National Tax Equality Association or as a firm of organization and industry counsellors claiming the National Tax Equality Association as a client; (3) all State and local tax-equality associations and all national, State, and local small business or other associations however known which are subsidized from or contributors to the lobbying funds of the National Tax Equality Association.

Nixon, Russ, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $45; expenses, $97.69. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel; these expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative activity. (4) UE News. (5) Support

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[3] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare, oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Noble, William R., National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $54.67. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, luncheons, and hotel. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing, Hardware Retailer. (5) Have taken position on wage and hour legislation, taxation matters, and several minor bills.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Council of Business Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Council of Technical Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Federation of Private School Associations, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Home Study Council, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Nortman, Walter, Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

O'Brien, John, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Riegel Textile Corp., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received; long-distance telephone calls, $10.06. (2) New York Telephone Co., $10.06. (3) Same as (1). (4) None. (5) Proposals for relief of work glove manufacturers on account of payments made in settlement of controversy with Office of Price Administration.

O'Connell, Jerry J., National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $125 per week (on loan from Progressive Party of Washington); expenses, $374.27. (2) Hotels, railroads, air-line companies, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Living expenses while away from home, travel, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Defeat of the Mundt bill.

O'Connor,[1] Edward H., Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received during quarter, $2,499.96; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $420.20. (2) Paid out $420.20 in traveling expenses to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous items of personal expense. (3) For personal traveling expenses of the undersigned incurred in carrying out my work for the Insurance Economics Society of America. No moneys expended during this quarter for lobbying activities. (4) None. (5) The Howell bill, H. R. 3150, and its companion Senate bill 670, by Hawkes; S. 1320 and its companion H. R. 3546; H. R. 6355, Senate Resolution 249.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 396 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

O'Gara, Herrick J., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $23.20 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing, welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

O'Hara, Bart W., secretary-treasurer, Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 450 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation that may be designed to bring about tax equality concerning corporations.

Oliver, Fred N., 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; senior partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Estimated $262.50 from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks and an indeterminate part of $1,800 from Railroad Security Owners' Association, Inc. (see appendix).[1] (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation but is to appear before congressional committees on legislation in which the mutual savings banks and railroad security owners have a legitimate interest.

Oliver, John P., Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) July 1948, $583.33 plus $46.70; August 1948, $583.33 plus $7.30; September 1948, $583.33 plus $3.75. (2) The grocer, the baker, the landlord, the taxi driver, etc. (3) Living expenses for self and family, transportation, taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

Ottinger,[2] Mrs. Julia M., Tennessee Women's Christian Temperance Union, 1939 Cowden Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. (1) Balance forwarded from last quarter, $12.98. (2) The Letter Shop, 215 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. (3) Mimeographing letters (June 1), $4.75; mimeographing petitions (June 8), $2.75. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation bearing on the manufacturing, sale, and advertising of intoxicating liquors.

Owens,[3] Thomas R., United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $960; expenses, $943.64. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, and other travel expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) United Rubber Workers. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

Owens,[1] Thomas R., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Rubber Workers, Akron, Ohio. (1) Salary, $960; expenses, $892. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, and other incidental expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) United Rubber Workers. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Oxholm, Mrs. Theodor, volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Membership contributions, $37. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Federal legislation specifically affecting children and child welfare.

Parel, James Donald, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $3.25 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: International wheat agreement, authorization with respect to the construction of headquarters for the United Nations, monetary and fiscal policies.

Patton,[2] James G., National Farmers Union, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Paul,[3] Randolph (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Wharton & Garrison), 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) Receipts, none; expenditures, $21.75 for miscellaneous disbursements. (2) Taxies, $4.05; telephone company, $15; Leet Bros. (photostats), $2.70. (3) Taxi fare, telephone toll on two long-distance calls, and photostats. (4) None relating to the subject below. (5) An amendment to eliminate section 131 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended, $74.57. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Perry,[4] Leslie S., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $43.21. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) NAACP Bulletin. (5) FEPC, antipoll tax, antilynch, minimum wage, Wagner-Ellender-Taft Housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security and similar social welfare legislation.

Perry,[5] Leslie S., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $23.03. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) NAACP Bulletin. (5) FEPC, antipoll tax, antilynch, minimum wage, Wagner-Ellender-Taft Housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security and similar social welfare legislation.

Petersen, William J., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 704 Insurance Building, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my regular salary as executive secretary for the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, for which I performed my regular duties as chief administrative officer of the chamber, which said duties were related only incidentally to Federal legislation. Aside from my regular salary nothing was received nor spent for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such

[1] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[2] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

legislation affecting business and industry generally, as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary of $1,222. Received $178.90 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $90.24 of this amount was for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder of amount for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, air lines. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) CIO News and The Advance. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Petty, Don, National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 received for services as attorney for the National Association of Broadcasters for quarter ending September 30, 1948; $2,843.55 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, communications companies, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) The amount set forth in (1) above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as general counsel handling all of the legal affairs of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involved Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None. (5) None. I am interested in any legislation—Federal or State—which may affect the radio-broadcasting industry.

Pierce,[a] James L., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) For special session of Congress, July 26 to August 7, 1948, for salary and expense, or per diem, salary, $350; per diem, $177. (2) To myself. (3) For services as deputy president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (4) None. (5) Repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, national housing legislation, Wages and Hours Act, Social Security Act, extension of coverage and benefits, national health legislation, Federal aid to education, steam plant, T. V. A., United Nations loan.

Pierson, A. T., the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $1,815, and no expenses. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Pirnie,[a] Col. Warren Bruce, president, Pirnie, Lee & Co., Federal, Inc., U. S. A., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; R. Allman, provincial governments of Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Hopeh, and Hunan, China. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank]. (4) Before Appropriations Committee of the Senate, China-aid program, June 10, 1948, and Appropriations Committee of the House, May 18, 1948. (5) China-aid program.

Pirnie,[a] W. Bruce, president, Pirnie, Lee & Co., Federal, Inc.; U. S. A., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., and Pedder Building, Hongkong; Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Hunan Province, as negotiating agents for reconstruction of China. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) China Monthly for October. (5) China aid.

Place, Henry C., care of Townsend, Elliott & Munson, National Association of Electric Companies, 1100 Provident Trust Building, Seventeenth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) The firm received from the National Association of Electric Companies $6,225 for legal services for the quarter and reimbursement of $641.96 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all legal services to the association, only a part of which fee and expenses was for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $289.97; subsistence expenses away from Philadelphia, $308.49; telephone and telegraph, $40.50; miscellaneous, $3. (4) [Blank.] (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which our firm is counsel, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members, directly or indirectly, as going business concerns.

Plumley, Fletcher D. P., Rialto Building, State Street, Montpelier, Vt.; National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $975 gross salary received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Pogue, L. Welch, Committee for World Travel, 905 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,250 fee received during quarter plus disbursements as follows: Taxicabs, $1; postage, $1.75. Total received during quarter, $2,252.75. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B on file in your office.

Pollitzer,[a] Anita, national chairman, National Woman's Party, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Woman's Party: Quarter ended September 30, 1948, $330; 6 months ended June 30, 1948, $100; total, $430. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support equal rights amendment. Chief sponsor in Senate, Senator Arthur Capper; chief sponsor in House, Hon. Katharine St. George.

Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $8,366.32; disbursements, $148.10. (2) See attached statement.[1] (3) See attached statement.[1] (4) None. (5) S. 2173; H. R. 5583; S. 2202; H. R. 6556; H. R. 6248; S. 2318.

Posner, Stanley I., the Linen Supply Association of America, Institute of Industrial Launderers, National Council of Technical Schools, National Council of Business Schools, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Poulton, J. E., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Powell, E. Henry, partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,800 is the entire amount received by registrant from Oliver & Donnally for all his legal services rendered during the quarter. A small proportion of this amount (not more than 5 percent) was for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

Powell, W. Royce, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Committee of Americans, Inc., 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City, and Magothy River Association, Annapolis, Md. (1) $1,200, Committee of Americans; $1,000, Magothy River Association. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Washington Post, Washington Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington News, Baltimore Sun. (5) Opposed legislation to authorize and appropriate for Sandy Point Naval Academy Airport at Annapolis.

Pratt, Foster J., International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, A. F. L., room 908, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As acting president he receives a monthly salary of $600 minus withholding tax and social-security tax, expended for personal living expenses. (2) Foster J. Pratt. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as administrative and executive head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen's Union. (Lobbying is minor and incidental.) (4) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, A. F. L. weekly Federal news letters and monthly outlook for the dissemination of organization news including legislation. (5) Beneficial to the employees in the engineering and architectural professions.

Pray, Kenneth L., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $5,000; expenses, allowance, $1,260. (2) University Club, National Press Club, Statler Hotel, taxicabs, Pennsylvania Railroad, etc. (3) Dues, meals, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) My services insofar as legislative matters are concerned consist primarily of factually reporting the status and content of proposals affecting Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies.

Prentice, Howard A., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.03 as miscellaneous expenses (see below). (2) Notary public, $2; postage, 3 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report; postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Press, William H., Washington Board of Trade, 204 Star Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,000; expenses, $73.20. (2) Miscellaneous taxi and transportation, $28.75; miscellaneous luncheons and dinners, $44.45. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) Releases sent to Washington newspapers—Washington Post, Times-Herald, Evening Star, and Washington Daily News. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia.

Pritchard, E. Anthony, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and traveling expenses in connection with his usual duties as assistant to the manager of the National Lead Co., Washington office, and no part of it whatsoever was expended during this quarter in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Proctor, Harry E., attorney at law, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 paid the registrant as salary by Oliver & Donnally; no expenditures. (2) No expenditures. 3) None. (4) The registrant contributed articles for the July and September issues of Mutual Savings Banking, a trade publication of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) The registrant studied and analyzed a number of bills pertaining to banks, savings and loan associations, taxes, railroads, veterans, and housing.

Purves, Edmund R., director of public and professional relations, the American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None, except salary for this period, which amounted to $3,125. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.

Putt, C. J., the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) None preceding calendar quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None preceding calendar quarter.

Pyke, John S., 1759 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None for second quarter of 1948. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) S. 265, S. 2352, S. 2365, H. R. 6556.

Pyle,[a] Schuyler Shelby, Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. Am registered, but have not engaged in any legislative activity whatever since registering. (4) None. (5) None.

Pyle,[b] Schuyler Shelby, Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Quigley, Frank, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,071.19. (2) Transportation: Pennsylvania Railroad, Washington, D. C., to Absecon, N. J., and return, $18.36; Washington, D. C., to Charleston, W. Va., Indianapolis, Ind., Milwaukee, Wis., Minneapolis, Minn., Cleveland, Ohio, and intermediate points and return; automobile mileage, 3,091 miles, at 6 cents per mile, $185.46; car ferry, one way, Detroit to Cleveland, one car and person, $14.56; Washington, D. C., to Jamestown, N. Y., Buffalo, N. Y., Detroit, Mich., and intermediate points and return, automobile mileage, 1,134 miles, at 6 cents per mile, $68.04; car ferry, Detroit to Buffalo, one way, car and person, $18.64; Hotel Statler, Detroit, $18.50; all other items individually amounting to less than $10 cover meals, board, lodging, garage, and incidental traveling expense. (3) Conferring with associated and connecting Bell Telephone companies at various points hereinbefore mentioned and other intermediate points in connection with general matters of information and public relations. Also general conference on public relations matters at points above referred to, to wit, Absecon, N. J. (4) None. (5) None.

Radner & Zito (the firm members and associates are William Radner, Frank J. Zito, J. Franklin Fort, Odell Kominers, and Mary L. Schleifer), Room 528, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (see letter of September 1, 1948, to clerk, amending Form B), 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting maritime industry, particularly in relation to wage-and-hour law.

Raebeck, Helen, National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $425. On leave until September 1. Pro rata salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Spotlight, a house organ of the National Council of Jewish Women, a small part of which is devoted to asking membership support of certain legislative measures. (5) None. My job is to keep the membership informed on legislative developments and indicate action they can take in support of certain bills.

Raesly, Leon, Thornton & Taylor, 1218 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) None.

Ragland, Edward F., Associated Tobacco Manufacturers, 109–110 Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None, but am interested in any legislation affecting tobacco industry.

Railroad Pension Conference,[c][10] Post Office box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) $1,203. This was $1 contributions for membership into the Railroad Pension Conference. Expended, $302.67. (2) Railroad Pension Conference. (3) Membership fees. (4) Railroad Pension Conference Bulletin. (5) H. R. 4695 and S. 2055.

Railroad Pension Conference,[c][c] Post Office box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) $1,307. This was contributions of $1 each for membership into the Railroad Pension Conference. Expended, $567.69. (2) Railroad Pension Conference. (3) Membership fees. (4) Railroad Pension Conference Bulletin. (5) Passage of H. R. 4695 and S. 2055.

Ramsey, Donald J., Silver Users Association, 1730 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (before tax withholdings), $3,000; reimbursement for expenses, $1,960.76; total, $4,960.76. (2) Various. (3) Transportation, hotels, etc. (4) Silver News Letter. (5) Legislation affecting the silver using industry.

Ramspeck, Robert, Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Eighty cents. (2) Taxi fare. (3) Taxi fare. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the proper advancement of the air-line industry in the public interest. For specific legislation supported during this quarter.

Rankin, J. Lee (Beghtol & Rankin, a partnership), Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

Ray, L. S., 2015 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $450 salary. (2) Myself. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting disabled emergency officers.

Reck, Jacob, 1023 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association Legislative Bulletin, which is issued by registrant in his capacity as Washington representative. (5) H. R. 3825; registrant is paid an annual retainer as counsel of the National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association; no determinable amount of compensation is paid or received on account of legislative activities of registrant; normally the total time used by registrant in activities covered by this law is infinitesimal.

Reckord, M. A., executive vice president, National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Rector, Stanley, 506 Washington Hotel, Fifteenth and Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.; Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. (1) Received $5,000 as salary for second quarter for duties as legislative director of Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. (2) No money paid except for expenses, for which I am reimbursed; expenses reported by employing corporation. (3) [Blank.] (4) The Advisor. (5) Social security and related legislation.

Reinhold, James P., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.; 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary for calendar quarter as reported in January 10, 1948, quarterly report Form C; also reimbursed in the amount of $335.80 expended during calendar quarter, none of which was expended for purposes covered in the act. (2) Paid for meals in hotels and various restaurants, expended for taxicabs and automobile, telephone calls, postage, and telegrams. (3) In furtherance of duties described in Registration Form B, of which personal legislative activity is not my principal purpose but is occasional and incidental. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Rhodes, Hubert M., 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1342 East Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Registrant is a regular employee of the Credit Union National Association, Inc., and receives no additional compensation for service on legislative work. The amount received and expended by him was $1. (2) Notary public, $1. (3) Notarizing reports required to be filed under the Lobbying Act for the quarter ended June 30, 1948. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

Rice, Richard M., Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to effect tax equality as between similar businesses.

Richards,[a] D. D., 1238 National Press Building; Mail Order Association of America, 1061 West Thirty-fifth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specifically.

Riggle,[a] John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $2,000; less than 10 percent of this amount would be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Legislative Digest, a mimeographed résumé of legislation introduced which is of interest to agriculture; distributed to members of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Riggle,[f] John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September 1948, $2,000; less than 10 percent of this amount would be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Legislative Digest, a mimeographed résumé of legislation introduced which is of interest to agriculture; Foreign Trade Memo, a mimeographed résumé of developments in foreign trade in agricultural products and supplies; both are distributed to members of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Riggs, Frank E., Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 419 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Received and paid out for expenses, $550 for commuting to and from Washington, D. C., and expenses while there lobbying for Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association from July 1 to October 1, 1948, and for National Conference on Public Employee Retirement Systems. (2) Frank E. Riggs, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 419 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (3) For train fares commuting to and from Washington, D. C., for meals on trains and in Washington and for taxis, lunches, refreshments, entertainment, etc., in Washington. (4) None. (5) Trying to have Federal and municipal employee pensions exempt up to $1,440 from income tax as are railroad pensions. Also, trying to keep members of existing pension funds out of social security.

[a] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[b] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[c] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

[a] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[b] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[a] Filed with the Secretary only.
[b] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[10] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[a] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[b] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[c] Filed with the Clerk only.

Rising, E. W., Western Beet Growers' Association, National Water Conservation Conference, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A. Western Beet Growers' Association, Great Falls, Mont., $250. B. National Water Conservation Conference, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., $464.97. (2) A. To E. W. Rising for office expenses, postage, stationery in connection with information service furnished members of Western Beet Growers' Association. B. To E. W. Rising for office expenses as follows: Postage, $10.53; Western Union, $1.35; stenographer, $345; miscellaneous stationery, $10.09; telephone, $15.50; flowers, $7.50. (3) [Blank.] (4) None during third quarter, 1948. (5) A. Legislation of interest to sugar-beet growers. B. Legislation in connection with development and conservation of land and water resources and in preservation of States' rights and control of natural resources; tidelands legislation; regional and valley authority legislation.

Roark,[4] L. E., National Founders Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000; expenses, nominal travel, hotel, and meals. (2) Common carriers for travel; hotels for room and meals. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Labor legislation, tax legislation, and legislation affecting the foundry industry.

Roark,[7] L. E., National Founders Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000; expenses, nominal travel, hotel and meals, but none this quarter. (2) No expenses this quarter. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Labor legislation, tax legislation, and legislation affecting the foundry industry.

Robb, George Mackay, 121 Warner Avenue, Syracuse, N. Y.; Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) There was no activity during July, August, and September; No money received; no money expended. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Senate Joint Resolution 150 and House Joint Resolution 239.

Robbins, Paul H., National Society of Professional Engineers, 1359 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $500, and expenses, $50, for July, August, September, 1948 for attention to legislative matters. (2) Regular office and travel expenses. (3) As executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers. (4) American Engineer, Legislative Bulletin, National Society of Professional Engineers. (5) All legislation affecting the welfare of professional engineers.

Rogers, Watson, National Food Brokers Association, 537 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Rowe, Roland H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money was received or expended by the undersigned for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation except: $27 (9 hours estimated, at $3.00 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,780 received by the undersigned as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocres' Association, Inc., allocable to the preparation of the following documents in which Federal legislation was advocated, opposed or mentioned: News releases, answer to questionnaire of the House Small Business Committee, letters to wholesale grocers seeking witnesses from among them to appear at hearings held by that committee in various parts of the country and report of the undersigned on legislation submitted at the fall meeting of said association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Washington News Letter of United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. He was later specifically authorized by the executive committee of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., to support or oppose general labor legislation and fair-employment-practice legislation.

Rudy, John Forney, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $100 received as salary from National Federation of American Shipping during the third quarter of 1948, and approximately $50 for lunches and entertainment, allocable to legislative activities. (2) The $50 was paid to restaurants and dining rooms. (3) For lunches and entertainment. (4) None. (5) As Director of Public Relations am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. During the closing days of the Eightieth Congress issued several news releases and assisted in preparation of statements to our membership outlining legislation before Congress.

Rule, Gordon W., Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,875 fee received during quarter plus disbursements as follows: taxicabs, $13.90; telephone calls, $41; travel, $53; mimeographing, mailing, etc., $36.16; for a total received during quarter of $2,019.06. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B on file in your office.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, room 427, Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) None received; approximately $50 expended for taxicabs, long distance phone calls, etc., during quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with a proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code relating to the foreign tax credit.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, room 427, Washington, D. C.; Harbor Boat Building Co. and Wilmington Welding & Boiler Works, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) None expended; $1,739 fee and $36.68 disbursements received during quarter; no more moneys will be received and this case is now closed; no further reports will be filed. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 4379, a private bill for the relief of the companies listed above, which bill was signed by the President on June 3, 1948, and became Private Law No. 329.

Rumely, Edward A., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I receive my salary, commissions, and expenses, as reported on earlier Form B; the corporation has reported its disbursements separately on Form A. (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed but issue news releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation. Sometimes the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then I distribute educational material on the question.

Rush, Charles J., Washington Real Estate Board, 1417 K Street NW. (1) Received $666.66 per month as executive secretary. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate.

Russell, Francis M., National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $245 expended for matters relating to legislation. (2) See (3) below. (3) Telephone and telegraph, taxi fares, entertainment. (4) [Blank.] (5) As an incidental part of registrant's duties as vice president in charge of Washington office of National Broadcasting Co. Inc., including operation of the company's radio stations in Washington, registrant may engage in activities relating to legislation affecting radio communications companies.

Russell, Horace, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received retainer at rate of $11,000 per annum a nominal fraction of which is for legislative work and incurred no lobbying expense. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) Contents of the Legal Bulletin of the United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill. (5) Legislation affecting the savings and loan business.

Russo, Paul M., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks, $1,170; subsistence, 13 weeks, $952; expenses, 13 weeks, $713.74, total, $2,835.74. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Rutherford, F. S., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative work did not exceed $1,250. Amount expended, $99; this covers hearings and securing miscellaneous information pertaining to industry in general and the steel industry in particular. (2) See item (3) below. (3) Approximately 30 trips to Capitol by taxicab at 80 cents a trip; approximately $75 for phone calls, both local and long distance; the above for the purpose of securing legislative information on matters pertaining to industry; and transmittal to principals. (4) None. (5) See original registration.

Ryan, M. O., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for quarter, $3,300; July 1, 1948, to September 30, 1948, inclusive, total personal expenses for taxes, lunches, and dinners, phones, etc., in Washington, D. C., were $498.02, of which an insignificant amount was for activities related to lobbying (2) Taxies, restaurants, and hotels for lunches and other meals. (3) For transportation, lunches, and dinners. (4) Any legislation affecting the hotel industry. (5) [Blank.]

St. Clair, Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $1,250; no expenditures. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of general interest to retail automobile dealers.

St. Clair, Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Stran Steel Division, Great Lakes Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich. (1) Received, $1,500; no expenditures. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of general interest to client.

Sanders,[9] J. T., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I received $1,500 as salary for the quarter as legislative counsel of the National Grange; in addition I received $50.44 for expenses, as follows: Transportation, $24.70; meals and incidentals, $25.74. (2) Transportation agencies and restaurants. (3) Transportation, food, etc. (4) The National Grange Monthly. (5) Hawaiian Statehood; Commodity Credit Corporation, H. R. 6214; Selective service; Federal Standard Time, S. 2041 and S. 2246; meat inspection bills, H. R. 5675, H. R. 6259, and S. 2256; cattle-grub eradication; agricultural appropriations bill; soil conservation, H. R. 6054; International wheat agreement; mortgage insurance, H. R. 6114; Interior appropriations; Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; ECA appropriations.

[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

Sands, Chas. E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, AFL, 528 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Just salary at rate of $7,200 per year. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Social and labor legislation.

Sasuly, Elizabeth, 158 North Twentieth Street, Philadelphia, Pa., former address, 930 F Street NW., Washington D. C.; Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers of America, CIO. (1) $1,125, salary; $475.79, expenses. (2) Funds received to cover expenses paid to railroad, taxicabs, air lines, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) To cover expenses incurred. (4) FTA News. (5) Support legislation in the interest of the working people of the United States and oppose legislation directed against the interests of the people.

Saylor, Richard D., National Lead Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and expenses in connection with his usual duties as manager of the National Lead Co., Washington office, and no part of it whatsoever was expended in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) Office lessor, telephone company, stationers, etc. (3) Rent, telephone service, supplies needed in carrying out duties as manager of the Washington office. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Schaeffer, Alexander L., Ancram, N. Y. (1) $167.63 advanced by myself. (2) postage, books, and miscellaneous stationery, etc., to post office and local merchants, newspapers, etc. (3) General distribution of letters and gathering information. (4) None. (5) No royalty taxes on any commodity or service; the right to work and the right to strike legislation, and total abolition of the closed shop.

Schell, S. D., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Approximately $300 of regular salary is allocable to services performed on matters relating to legislation. Activities consisted mainly of answering questions of various persons, Government department officials, and consultations regarding general legislation pending in Congress, with no particular activity on any pending bills. (2) No expenditures. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) No particular activities or appearances before Congress or committees, nor conferences with Members or employees of Congress during this period on any legislation. Discussions as referred to in (1) above related to general matters in connection with maritime activities.

Schmidt, Henry P., care of Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, etc., 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Salary, $635.52; expenses, $502.67. (2) Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C., cabs, streetcars, and train fares, telephone, laundry, cleaning, postage, and various eating places. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor, particularly to oppose all bills detrimentally affecting the existing railroad retirement and unemployment system.

Schoen,[9] Paul W., Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office box 692, Valdosta, Ga. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Schoene, Freehill & Kramer, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, and Milton Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All written materials are delivered to the client and dissemination is entirely in the client's control. (5) Railroad retirement, unemployment insurance, and employers' liability matters.

Schoenhals,[9] E. L., Tax Equity League of Utah, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Received from Tax Equality League of Utah for use of my law office, stenographic services, traveling, $100. (2) To my secretary, Jean Powers, for office rent. (3) To maintain my office, receive phone calls from members, and carry on correspondence with members of the organization. (4) Deseret News, Salt Lake Tribune, and Salt Lake Telegram have carried news items only, but no paid advertising. (5) To obtain tax equality.

Scott, Jack Garrett, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Motor Operators. (1) No receipts except annual retainer for general legal services as shown in registration statement; no expenditures for legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Generally all legislation affecting the intercity motorbus industry. During the second session I made presentations before congressional committees on S. 110, H. R. 221, excise-tax legislation, H. R. 584 and S. 1126, House investigation of Fair Labor Standards Act, S. 1812, national transportation inquiry, standard and daylight time, S. 2062, S. 2386, and H. R. 6136.

Scott, John W., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Harvey B. Jacobson, Randolph & Beavers. (1) None other than salary received at the total monthly rate of $400 from Harvey B. Jacobson, John N. Randolph, and Patrick D. Beavers; no expenditures made. (2) Does not apply. (3) Does not apply. (4) None. (5) As previously stated in my registration statement. (Note: The firms of McMorrow, Berman & Davidson and Victor J. Evans & Co. are attempting to cancel contracts of employment with me, and they are not currently paying me any sum of money.)

Scott, Vernon, and Schuler, Loring A., constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, organizers and counselors, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; see attached statement;[1] see attached statement.[1] (1) No money was received or expended for purposes within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress; see attached statement.[1] (2) No one; see answer to paragraph (1). (3) See answer to paragraph (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to have various types of business corporations taxed on the same basis.

Scott, William C., report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received during said period; receipts of the firm of which I am a member are reported in the quarterly report of Mr. Ethelbert Warfield; no expenditures during said period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Sears,[4] W. J., vice president, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No time devoted to legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills pertaining to long-term legislation on national rubber policy, on the transportation of flammable materials, and on proposed revisions of the excise taxes.

Shandros,[4] Geraldine, American Communications Association, CIO, 5 Beekman Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $280 (this constitutes one-half of salary received and is so reported since time spent in activities covered by the act constitute about one-half of working time); travel expense, $11.50; miscellaneous, $25. (2) Travel, Pennsylvania Railroad, miscellaneous taxies, telephone calls, newspapers, etc. (3) Explained above. (4) ACA News. (5) Legislation affecting workers in the communication industry and American working men and women generally.

Shandros,[7] Geraldine, American Communications Association, CIO, 5 Beekman Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Salary, $140 (this constitutes one-fourth of salary received and is so reported since time spent in activities covered by the act constitutes about one-fourth of working time); travel expense, $15; miscellaneous, $15. (2) Travel: Pennsylvania Railroad; miscellaneous taxies, telephone calls, newspapers, etc. (3) Explained above. (4) ACA News. (5) Legislation affecting workers in the communication industry and American working men and women generally.

Shaw, Mark R., 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.; National Council for Prevention of War, New England secretary, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; traveling expenses, $26.55; total, $226.55. (2) Gas stations, restaurants, etc. (3) Traveling to speaking dates, conferences, meetings. (4) Bulletins of the NCPW. (5) Universal military training, oppose; repeal of peacetime selective service, favor; admission of displaced persons, favor; other measures related to issues of war and peace.

Shields, Robert H., United States Beet Sugar Association as president and general counsel, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Sifton, Paul, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW-CIO, 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks at $100, $1,300; subsistence, 13 weeks, $819; expenses, 13 weeks, $432.30. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Worker, Washington Report, and Ammunition (UAW-CIO publications). (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Skinner, W. E., 325 Park Drive, Pueblo, Colo.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) I received $670.76; this includes salary, per diem, travel expenses, living expenses, transportation, and incidentals. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxies, etc. (3) For transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, amendments to minimum wage laws, housing, and anti-inflation. Note: This is final report as employment was only temporary.

Smart, Elizabeth A., 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; National WCTU, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill. (1) Received $665.07 salary; received and paid out $73.40. (2) Washington Times-Herald, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., post office, Western Union Telegraph Co., New York Alcoholic Beverage Control Commission, A. C. Gilbert Co., A. B. Dick Co. (3) Subscription, telephone, postage, telegrams, copy New York liquor-control law, electric fan, covers for mimeograph and addressograph machines;

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

stencil sheets, mimeo ink, and correction fluid. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relations.

Smith, Allen L., Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., P. O. box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support any legislation to amended the Internal Revenue Code so as to improve basic taxation principles providing for removal of tax disparities between business competitors.

Smith, Anthony W., Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative employment, $75; this is computed as stated in registration statement A $300 a year; no expenditures. (2) None. (3) Compensation as above received for legislative work. (4) CIO-News, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Forestry legislation, River Valley developments, resource conservation.

Smith, Donald W. (report as attorney for American Nurses' Association), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; American Nurses's Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: $12,706.23 for legal fees and disbursements, paid to Satterlee Warfield & Stephens for services by firm as counsel in all capacities; expenditures: No expenditures during said period. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None during the period covered by this report. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing or health, on which the American Nurses' Association has taken a stand, including the extension of social security coverage and Federal aid to nursing education.

Smith, Dudley, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,250 monthly from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for the principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for the purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Harold O., Jr., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) During the past quarter I did not have occasion to engage in any activities which I believe would be construed as lobbying; serving full time as executive vice president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., my activities are those of a trade association executive and any contacts with members of Congress are purely incidental to my many other activities in connection with trade association work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) In our bulletins and weekly news letter to members, we occasionally report on legislative matters affecting the trade. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers; in behalf of our members we opposed the rulings of the Department of Internal Revenue which exempted cooperatives from taxation; also the Department's rulings which placed an unreasonable burden on wholesale grocers in reporting sales of oleo margarine.

Smith, Howard J., Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) July, salary, $1,603.15; August, salary, $750; September, salary (unpaid), travel expense, $160.99. (2) Howard J. Smith, executive secretary, Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Salary, travel expense, board and room when engaged in travel, in interest of work of the association. (4) The Case for Water in Central Arizona, Work for Water, California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River, What the Central Arizona Project Means to You. (5) Employed to support Senate bill 1175.

Smith, Lloyd W., room 425, Shoreham Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW, Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received regular salary for the period July 1 to September 30, 1948, for services as special representative of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. in the same amount as for the quarter ending June 30 and reported previously; no money was received or expended by me during this last quarter in connection with any lobbying activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Other duties for said company comprise the major part of this work.

Smith, Purcell L., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $16,250 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $523.65 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, clubs, railroads, airlines, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $70.45; hotels, clubs, restaurants, $376.54; gratuities and miscellaneous, $41.26; telephone and telegraph, $35.40. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am president, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters; the association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Smith, Robert E., Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York. (1) Received $300; expenditures, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) To support legislation which directly or indirectly is believed to be beneficial to holders of life insurance and their beneficiaries; and to oppose such legislation as is believed to be unfavorable to same.

Smith, Russell, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Snyder, Calvin K., Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $313.24. (2) Various. (3) Travel expenses, taxicabs, telephone calls, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Snyder, James D., Illinois Legislative Committee, room 1236, LaSalle Street Station, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Illinois railroads.

Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500 received for services covering the period commencing in 1947 and continuing to June 1, 1948; $67.99 for disbursements for expenses on two trips; $2,567.99, total. (2) Transcontinental & Western Airlines, $42.09; Pennsylvania Railroad, $13; taxies, busses, etc., $12.90; total, $67.99. (3) To cover expenses of trips. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Spencer, Lyndon, Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Stack, Thomas George, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill. (1) None, as I have not been in Washington since June 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., Newspaper Rail Pension News, cost $900 for quarterly edition, June, July, and August 1948; circulation, 90,000 rail employees. (5) Supported H. R. 6766 last session of Congress, and to get before the House and Senate bills to give railroad employees more adequate benefit under the Railroad Retirement Act.

Starling, Howard M., 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York City. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act; registrant has estimated, however, that $150 received by registrant during the third quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock, casualty and surety insurance companies.

Steele, Raymond E., general counsel, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Stein, Margaret I., 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $1,000.02; received expenses, $157.99; total, $1,158.01. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

Stengle, Charles I., American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW. (1) $13.20. (2) Taxicab drivers. (3) Trips to and from Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Government employees.

Stewart, Annalee (Mrs. Alexander Stewart), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No report for the third quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary (50 percent of time devoted to legislative activities), $3,000; reimbursement by employer for travel expenses, incidental expenses and per diem, $229.14; total, $3,229.14. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., 1737 K Street NW, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Money received July 1, 1948–September 30, 1948—$1,800 salary (only 50 percent of time, however, is devoted to legislative activities). Expenses incurred by Edwin L. Stoll in connection with legislative activities for which reimbursement was received for the period from July 1 to September 30, 1948, were $24.43. (2) Various. (3) Dues, lunches, taxicabs, etc. (4) Attached list shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stone, Mrs. Margaret F., National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $80.78 salary; no money expended for legislative activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own National Women's Trade Union League publications, monthly, Life and Labor Bulletin. (5) See regular legislative program of league already on file with your office.

Stoudenmire, Sterling F., Jr., 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries, Mobile, Ala. (1) Salary, $2,100; expense reimbursements, $106.24. (2) Various. (3) Taxicab transportation, meals, entertainment, etc. (4) None. (5) I am not engaged specifically "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by Congress"; my employment is as attorney in the general counsel's office of the Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries, who are interested in any legislation affecting the merchant marine, the operation of aircraft, and transportation generally. Such employment of necessity requires presentation of information and facts to members of committees handling such legislation. This work is not the principal part of my employment, but is one of the incidental duties in connection therewith. During quarter for which this report is filed, supported House Joint Resolution 412, House Joint Resolution 413, and S. 2647, S. 2696 relating to the merchant marine.

Strachan, Paul A., American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1376 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Sponsoring legislation on behalf of our 28,000,000 physically handicapped citizens. Supporting S. 2896; S. 2319; H. R. 6525; H. R. 6653.

Strackbein, O. R., America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 601 Carpenters' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, July-September, $3,990; expenses, July-September, $3,024.31 (consisting of $2,600 in salary and $424.31 expenses). (2) No payments were made to individuals. Expense money was paid out for the purposes listed below. (3) Rent, telephone, taxicab fares, clerical work, traveling expense, a few lunches, and office supplies. (4) Editorial in the Photo-Engraver, a monthly publication of the International Photo-Engravers' Union. Article in the Glass Cutter, published by the Window Glass Cutters' League. (5) Tariff legislation and related matters, such as ratification or nonratification of the charter of the International Trade Organization.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $200 salary, $4.30 expenses. (2) Taxi drivers and streetcar drivers. (3) Transportation. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Sturrock, J. E., Texas Water Conservation Association, 605–609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (1) Salary for July, August, and September 1948, $1,500, less income tax. Traveling expenses for July, August, and September 1948, $212.85. (2) $212.85 traveling expenses paid to various railroad, air-line, and taxi companies, hotels and restaurants. (3) Covering transportation, meals, lodging, and entertainment. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association Bulletins and pamphlets and various analyses of bills pending in Congress. (5) Employed to support legislation, both State and National, concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation which seeks to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan, Charles H., 75 State Street, Albany, N. Y.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $125 salary, $93.32 expense. (2) Charles H. Sullivan. (3) Hotel bills, meals, railroad and pullman fare. (4) None. (5) All legislation at the special session of interest to the brotherhood, particularly housing, price controls, wage controls.

Sullivan, Francis M., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, September, 1948 (after taxes and social security), $1,746.60; bonus, 10 percent of annual salary (after taxes and social security), $634.11; expenses to Philadelphia, Pa., June 1948, $118.81; incidental expenses, June 1948, $27.60; total, $2,527.32. (2) Francis M Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) See No. (1) above. (4) DAV Semimonthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the survivors of deceased service men and women.

Sutlive, Carey R., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125; expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,013.87. Expenditures: $1,013.87. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations, and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Swanson, Walter S. J., National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 938 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. During the quarterly period just ended, he has expended no money and has made no payments to anyone in connection with any activities coming within the Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Prepared articles for Highway Highlights and certain bulletins released by the National Highway Users Conference (5) Within the general responsibility of my office, I have carried out the work outlined above. During the past quarter, this has been solely confined to reportorial coverage of congressional activities dealing with Federal highway aid and highway taxation, the only legislation in which I am interested. I have conducted no activity during the quarterly period coming within the purview of the Lobbying Act.

Swomley,[1] John M., Jr., 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Travel expenses between Washington and New York plus out-of-pocket expenses in Washington, $22.68. (2) John M. Swomley, Jr., for personal expenses indicated above. (3) Indicated above. (4) Conscription News Weekly. (5) I serve as acting director of the National Council Against Conscription on a volunteer basis to promote the achieving of the international abolition of conscription, worldwide disarmament, and the defeat of conscription.

Swope,[1] Harold W., 1006A La Salle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Fees, $2,940; expenses, $2,104.60. (2) La Salle Apartment Hotel, Inc. (3) Office rental, $400; hotel rent, $315; transportation, $187.65; balance, $1,201.95. Other expenses, none of which totaled more than $10.

[1] Filed with the Secretary only.

(4) None. (5) Incentive payment plan for strategic and critical minerals.

Taylor,[2] Hugh W., 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky. (1) Amount received from Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association: For salary, less social security and tax, $2,250; for expenses incurred, $120.45. (2) Various. (3) Hotels, meals, taxicabs, etc. (4) Tobacco and the Marshall Plan, July 1948 issue of the Kentucky Marketing Bulletin, published by Division of Markets, Department of Agriculture, Frankfort, Ky. (5) Legislation which affects tobacco production and foreign trade in leaf tobacco.

Taylor, John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $500 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $504.48 reimbursement for traveling expenses during July, August, and September 1948; $1.60 incidental expenses for July, August, and September 1948 (taxies) (2) John Thomas Taylor. (3) $504.48 reimbursement for traveling expenses: Round trip to Aberdeen, S. Dak., two round trips to Philadelphia, Pa., one trip and return, Minneapolis, Minn., and Indianapolis, Ind; $1.60 incidental expenses for July, August, and September 1948 (taxies). (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, re-education, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which are opposition to all subversive activities, and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Taylor, Margaret K., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $13.30; (2) Various. (3) Taxicabs and telephones. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Taylor, Russell J., United Shoe Workers of America, CIO, room 608, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $80 per week; expenses, $21 per week; hotel, $12 per week. (2) Russell J. Taylor. (3) Legislative representative, United Shoe Workers of America, CIO. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Taylor, Tyre, suite 1112, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $2,500 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by National Association of Retail Grocers. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expense amounting to $838.03; (b)

[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

traveling expenses, $76.30. (2) (a) Landlord, secretary, postage, telephone, etc.; (b) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above. (4) National Grocers' Bulletin (published monthly). (5) Repeal of margarine license taxes and other legislation of interest to independent retail food distributors.

Taylor, Tyre, suite 1112, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.; Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) Received $4,237.50 and one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by Southern States Industrial Council. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expense amounting to $488.03; (b) Research and technical assistance, $1,581.27; (c) travel expense, $76.30. (2) (a) Landlord, postage, telephone, etc.; (b) Henry Bison, Jr.; (c) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above for purposes. (4) Semimonthly News Bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council. (5) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

Teel, Donald, Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., formerly Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Temple, Marjorie L., American Association of University Women, 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received only salary which is $4,100 per year, approximately one-half of which is for legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women (quarterly) General Director's Letter (3 or 4 times a year as program guide to State and branch officers and chairmen. (5) See attached sheet (legislative notes from summer journal, 1948). Printed sheet (original copy only).

Terrell,[1] John U., Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Colorado River Association, $2,750. (2) Ordinary business expenses, including transportation, hotel, meals, taxies, telephone, etc. (3) Ordinary business expenses, including transportation, hotel, meals, taxies, telephone, etc. (4) Newspapers, wire services, especially southern California newspapers, including Los Angeles Daily News, Los Angeles Times, Hearst papers, Copley papers, and general distribution. (5) S. J. Res. 145 and H. R. 226.

Thompson, Chester C., the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary from the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., $5,000, covering July, August, September, 1948. (2) Miscellaneous expenses, $11.25. (3) Local transportation and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) Concerned about all legislation affecting domestic water carrier and operator industry of the United States. During third calendar quarter (July, August, September) of 1948; less than 2 percent of registrant's time occupied in legislative matters.

Thomson, Mrs. Dorothy W., American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act; National Science Foundation bill; appropriations for United States Children's Bureau; Federal aid for education bill.

Thompson, Louis E., president, Small Business Association of New Jersey, Inc., Box 188, Glen Ridge, N. J. (1) Dues received by the Small Business Association of New Jersey, Inc., in the third quarter of 1948, $340; of that amount, $13.35 was spent for, see (3).

[1] Filed with the Secretary only.

(2) Conference of American Small Busines Organizations. (3) Promote legislation to return to the gold standard. (4) None. (5) See (3).

Tinney, William H., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending September 30, 1948; consequently, no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act and, likewise, no expenses were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Tobin, Fred A., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) My salary is $1,250 per month, or $3,750 for quarter year. I do not incur any expenses in performance of legislative work. (2) Fred A. Tobin. (3) I am an attorney representing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers Union and its affiliated locals before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Labor Relations Board. Am the liaison representative between various Government agencies and international union and the affiliated locals. The above includes general services of a non-legislative nature pertaining to business and operation of International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals; also for part-time services in connection with legislation, both Federal and State, for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals. (4) I do not have any connection with any newspaper. (5) Legislation, Federal and State, which may affect the interests of the International Brotherhood or Teamsters and its affiliated locals, particularly in the field of labor law.

Tobler, H. Willis, 261 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $5.36 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: International wheat agreement, authorization with respect to the construction of headquarters for the United Nations, monetary and fiscal policies

Todd,[2] John H., 1037 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) None for the purposes covered by the act. This filing is made in the conviction that it is not required by Public Low 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. It is made solely to avoid even any unwarranted suggestion of a question of good faith or of compliance with the law. (2) None for purposes covered by the act. (3) None for purposes covered by the act. (4) None relating to the purposes covered by the act. (5) No specific legislation.

Tone, Joseph M., legislative representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,875; expenses, $5 per day, excluding Sundays and holidays. (2) Personal. (3) Personal. (4) None. (5) None.

Tool Owners Union, Inc., 1802 Massachusetts Avenue, Lexington, Mass. (1) Received $5,983.08; expended, $4,070.24. (2) See attached schedule.[1] (3) See attached schedule.[1] (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Truitt, Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $41.25. (2) Various persons. (3) Miscellaneous expenses such as taxies, carfare, luncheons, notaries' fees, etc. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., partner of law firm of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Louis Dreyfus, president of Chappell & Co., Inc., R. K. O. Building, New York City, and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, a bill to facilitate naturalization of Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; John Frecerick Firth-Hand, 1744 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 1742, Eightieth Congress, first session, a bill for the relief of John Frederick Firth-Hand.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia; the Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania, 308 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the just payment of French spoliation claims.

Turner, Harold J., 325 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., et al. (1) None on Federal legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular proposed Federal legislation. See statement A to my registration, Form B.

Vance, C. W., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) None. No services performed in third quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Van Osdol,[2] Paul, Jr., Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. (NOTE.—I am secretary-treasurer of the Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association. As secretary of this association I may, in the future, write letters to businessmen, civic organizations, and to the public, which may encourage them to write letters to members of Congress with regard to pending or proposed Federal legislation, including legislation relating to taxes. Although I am of the opinion that my activity does not come within the requirements of the Federal regulations of Lobbying Act, since a part of my activities may include the writing of letters to Members of Congress, or to encourage the members of our association to do so, I will keep the records required by the act and submit the required reports.)

Van Osdol,[1] Paul, Jr., Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. (NOTE.—I am secretary-treasurer of the Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association. As secretary of this association I may, in the future, write letters to businessmen, civic organizations, and to the public, which may encourage them to write letters to Members of Congress with regard to pending or proposed Federal legislation, including legislation relating to taxes. Although I am of the opinion that my activity does not come within the requirements of the Federal regulations of Lobbying Act, since a part of my activities may include the writing of letters to Members of Congress, or to encourage the members of our association to do so, I will keep the records required by the act and submit the required reports.)

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Filed for second quarter, 1945.
[1] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

(1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the city of New York.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Versen,[3] Albert F., Missouri Valley Chapter, Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Received, $156.25; expended, $900.28. (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) None.

Versen,[3] Albert F., St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) See statement attached.[1] (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) None.

Viles,[4] A. L., president, the Rubbe Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No time devoted to legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills pertaining to long-term legislation on national rubber policy, on the transportation of flammable materials, and on proposed revisions of the excise taxes.

Virkus,[5] Frederick A., Conference of American Small Business Organizations, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Compensation, $3,000; expense, $181.03. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Mayflower Hotel, taxi drivers, telephone company, telegraph company. (3) Expenses: Primarily travel, some miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business.

Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Walker,[6] Jimmie, (voluntary) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., P. O. box 1329, 305–306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax equality among all business.

Walker,[7] Jimmie, (voluntary) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., post office box 1329, 305–306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) None. (1) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax equality among all business.

Waller, Theodore, United World Federalists of Washington, D. C., 1710 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United World Federalists, Inc., 7 East Twelfth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary received from United World Federalists, Inc., $375. Received from United World Federalists, Inc., for traveling expenses, $217.39. Received from William Cochran as a gift for the purpose of carrying out the work and program of United World Federalists, $1,500. (2) Salary paid to my secretary, Mrs. Anita Kiefer, April 23, 1948, $25; May 21, 1948, $25; June 25, 1948, $25; $75 total salary paid by me to my secretary during the quarter April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948. (3) Salary for secretarial services. (4) World Government News. (5) Any legislation designed to strengthen the United Nations.

Walter, Stephen M., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $6,625.02 as an employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursement of $675 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, book stores and stationers. (3) Transportation $196.65; meals and incidental expenses on account of association members in Washington, $375.35; telephones and telegraph, $25.55; newspapers and publications, $32.75; miscellaneous, $44.70. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies of which I am an employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Warfield, Ethelbert, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; report as attorney for American General Corporation, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) No receipts or expenditures during said period. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) To oppose S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Warfield, Ethelbert, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: $8,905.55 received by Satterlees, Warfield & Stephens for services by firm as counsel in all capacities. Expenditures: Professional services and disbursements, $2,343.75; transportation, $19.67; carfare, 20 cents; telephone calls, $65.74; telegrams, $2.39; stenography, $39.47; hotel rooms, $13.28; meals, $3.40; postage, $1.90. (2) William J. Bulow, Jr., Washington, D. C.; Pennsylvania Railroad and American Airlines, Inc.; various surface transportation companies; various telephone companies; Western Union; various stenographers; Hotel Carlton, Washington, D. C., various restaurants; and United States Post Office, respectively. (3) For the respective purposes above specified. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Warner, Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) Received from the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J., for professional services; conferences with various Members of Congress in regard to legislation for the period April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, $3,250. Expenses for transportation and traveling to and from Washington, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, entertainment, and expenses in Washington, $532.19. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Services were rendered in connection with housing, credit, labor, railroad reorganization, and general welfare legislation and protective of the interests of the policy holders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[10] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $543. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $310.48; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $300, proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $77.47; total, $687.95. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $31.04 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[11] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $1,396. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $400.02, reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $166.23; total, $1,016.25. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts so devoted, not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities; therefore the sum of $40 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[12] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $1,359.50. Moneys expended: management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $400.02; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $143.87; total, $993.89. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted, not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities; therefore the sum of $40 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk, in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[10] Filed for third quarter, 1946.

[11] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[12] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[13] Filed for second quarter, 1947.

association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[15] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $418. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $400.02; reimbursement of Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $106.66; total, $956.68. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities; therefore the sum of $40 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[15] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received, contributions fror members of the association (none over $500), $987.47. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $400.02; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $135.42; total, $985.44. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted, not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities; therefore the sum of $40 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[15] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $741.83. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $329.94; reimbursement Rufus S. Luck for the following: clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $78.11; total, $858.05. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted, not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $32.99 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

[15] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[16] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[17] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[2] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $837. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $329.95; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $100.50; total, $880.45. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $32.99 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[7] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $1,193. Moneys expended, none. (2) Registrant has received no moneys for management fees or reimbursement for expenses incurred during this quarter. Any such moneys will be subsequently shown in the proper quarterly statement. (3) See (1). (4) The following are names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Watson, J. R., Mississippi Railroad Association, room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss. (1) No reportable receipts and expenditures. (No segregation of salary as between principal employment and possible incidental concern with matters of Federal legislation. The registrant is of the opinion that his activities for the period covered by this report do not fall within the scope of the Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Annual employment, primarily for services not related to Federal legislation. Matters of Federal legislation are other and different from and only incidental to principal employment and purpose, but as an incident thereto, legislation pertaining to railroads in Mississippi None within the period covered by this report.

Waybur, Bruce, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,060; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative activity. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,000; $10 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying; i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general, Not more than 6 percent of time spent on this work. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and occasionally organized labor in general.

Webb, William H., National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,298.45. Reimbursement for expenses, $416.50; expended, $536.15. (2) Various individuals, corporations, and organizations. (3) For miscellaneous office, personal and traveling expenses. (4) Collier's Yearbook, 1948; Waterways magazine; and the Workboat. (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Weingarten, J. W., 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me during the quarter ending September 30, 1948, on account of lobbying activities. I received my regular monthly compensation described in last report for the duties of my office but neither received nor expended any money in connection with any lobbying activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroad business.

Weitzer,[6] Bernard, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Money expended: Railroad fares, $41.38; plane fares, $81.31; hotel bills (including room and meals), $82.75; taxi fares, $80.60; miscellaneous office expenses, $3.70; postage, $7.78; telephone calls from booths, $9.24; salaries $2,000 received by Bernard Weitzer. (2) American Airlines, Pennsylvania Railroad, Netherland Plaza Hotel, Cincinnati; Biltmore Hotel, New York; Park Central Hotel, New York; Hildebrecht Hotel, Philadelphia; various restaurants, various taxi drivers, various telephone booths, office expenses. (3) (As indicated by the nature of expenses in (1).) (4) None. (5) He is to support such legislation as will carry out the purposes of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution which follows and to oppose any legislation which would tend to frustrate the purposes therein expressed: "To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America; to foster and perpetuate true Americanism; to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions; to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed; to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men; to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster ths education of ex-servicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

Weitzer, Bernard, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money expended: Railroad fares, $52.84; hotel bills (including room and meals), $41.50; taxi fares, $63; miscellaneous office expenses, $7.95; postage, $13.75; telephone calls from booths, $9.50; salaries, $999.99 received by Bernard Weitzer. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Park Central Hotel, New York, Concord Hotel, Kiamesha Lake, N. Y., various restaurants, various taxi drivers, various telephone booths, office expenses. (3) As indicated by the nature in (1). (4) The Jewish War Veterans. (5) He is to support such legislation as will carry out the purposes of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution which follows and to oppose any legislation which would tend to frustrate the purposes therein expressed: "To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America, to foster and perpetuate true Americanism, to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions, to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed, to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men, to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster the education of ex-servicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

Welliver, Edward M., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $18.60. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Wenchel, Tannenbaum & Nunan, 1625 K Street, Washington, D. C.; David Rosenthal, Scarsdale, N. Y., and Henry Kalman, New Rochelle, N. Y., through their counsel, Brozan & Holman, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,000. (2) No funds expended. (3) See answer to (2). (4) None. (5) To support changes in the Internal Revenue Code with respect to family partnerships.

West, Oscar H., 1001-1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original Form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (4) American Agency Bulletin, monthly publication of National Association of Insurance Agents. (Tear sheets attached.) (On original only.) (5) [Blank.]

White,[6] John C., care of Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Shippers Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) $65.10. (2) Ever Ready Stenographic Service, 1745 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Mimeographing statements of witnesses before Senate Agriculture Committee on minimum-margin legislation. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support S. 2202, European Recovery Act; S. 2376, revolving fund for occupied areas; reciprocal trade agreements extension. Oppose: Minimum margin legislation on futures exchanges; tax exemption of cooperatives.

White, John C., care of Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Shippers Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) No expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support S. 2202, European Recovery Act; S. 2376, revolving fund for occupied areas; reciprocal trade agreements extension. Oppose: Minimum margin legislation on future exchanges; tax exemption of cooperatives.

White, Richard P., American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 636 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts of salary, $2,500; expenses reimbursed by employers, $514.49; (2) expenses paid to various air lines, railroads, hotels, clubs, restaurants, taxis, associations, etc. (3) Attending meetings of association committees, local associations, and payment for miscellaneous publications. (4) Blank. (5) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry.

Whitehall, Albert V., 1834 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $2,187.48; reimbursement of travel expenses, $82.02. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitlock, Douglas, partner of law firm Sanders, Gravelle, Whitlock & Howrey, Room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Building Products Institute. (1) From the Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C., total fee, $4,500, allocated $1,500 to legislative and $3,000 to legal and administrative. Total expenses, $402.06, allocated $24.06 to legislative and $378 to legal and administrative. (2) Various. (3) Taxicabs, etc., and legal and administrative. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Whitney, Byrl A., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 1528 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $871.51 paid to me by Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and expended by me for transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (2) To hotel, restaurants, railroads, taxies, etc. (3) For transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, amendments to minimum-wage law, housing, and anti-inflation. NOTE.—This is final report, as above employment was only temporary.

Whyte, Louis E., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, allocated, $725. (2) No legislation pending; no expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) No legislation pending.

Wickenden, Elizabeth, 522 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Public Welfare Association, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None (on leave of absence entire period). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

Wieting,[8] C. Maurice, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June, 1948, $1,650. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Wieting,[9] C. Maurice, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary from July 1 to July 23, 1948, $421.59. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. Left employ of above organization as of July 23, 1948. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Wilken,[11] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) October 1, to December 31, 1946, none received. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilken,[12] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) January 1 to March 31, 1947, none received. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilken,[14] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) April 1 to June 30, 1947, none received. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilken,[14] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,000 from Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill., and $750 from Earl W. Shinn, attorney, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., quarter July 1 to September 30, 1947, as a donation to publish research material under the title "Prosperity Unlimited—The American Way." (2) Kistler Stationery Co., Denver, Colo. (3) Costs of printing book. (4) Prosperity Unlimited—The American Way. (5) None.

Wilken,[13] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) None received quarter October 1 to December 31, 1947. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilken,[16] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) None received January 1 to March 30, 1948. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received no money for activities in any way connected with influencing legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Supporting S. 2743.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., and Wilkinson, Glen A., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Radio Service Corp. of Utah, 10 South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) No money received; expenses totaled $2.20: $1.70 for taxicabs and 50 cents for notary fees. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Opposing S. 2231, Senate Resolution 240 and Senate Resolution 246

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Goodwin, Francis M., and Wilkinson, Glen A., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Klamath Tribe of Indians of Oregon, Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) Received no payments; expended $651.75 as follows: Taxicabs, $7.50; telephone, $44.41; telegraph, $15.25; postage, $3.86; notary fees, $1; United Air Lines, $451.33; other travel, $128.40. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2502 and H. R. 2775; opposing S. 1222, S. 1210, H. R. 1113, and H. R. 4725.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Goodwin, Francis M., and Wilkinson, Glen A., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, Keshena, Wis. (1) Received $650 for legal services; only a portion of that amount is properly allocable to legislative work; expended $24.52 for taxicabs,

[8] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[11] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[12] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[13] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[14] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[15] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[16] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

postage, telegrams, and notary fees. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 5300; opposing H. R. 1113, H. R. 4725, and S. 1210.

Willard, A. D., Jr., National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $6,249.09 received for services as executive vice president of the National Association of Broadcasters for the quarter ending September 30, 1948; $1,070.61 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, communication companies, hotels and restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as executive vice president, acting as administrative officer at the headquarters of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involve Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None; miscelloneous information is furnished to members through weekly bulletin. (5) None; I am interested in any legislation, Federal or State, which may affect the radio-broadcastnig industry.

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,500; no part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended nothing. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Williams, Myers & Quiggle, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Paul F. Myers, James Craig Peacock, Martin W. Meyer, John E. Skilling, and Robert H. Myers, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Food Brokers Association, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Washington Food Brokers Association, care of R. J. Dannemiller, president, 2653 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $47.03 from the National Food Brokers Association as reimbursement to us for taxi fares, telephone calls, telegrams, and transcript; and received $1,100 from the Washington Food Brokers Association as partial payment of our fee for legal services rendered in this matter; no expenditures. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) S. 2409 which became Public Law 509 on May 3, 1948.

Wilson, E. Raymond, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, July, August, September, $1,500; travel expense, $977.71. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Wilson, Eugene E., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a National Air Policy.

Wilson, Everett B., Jr., 728 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $750 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) None.

Wilson, J. B., Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo. (1) No money received for legislative work; Wyoming Wool Growers Association paid my salary amounting to $1,500 for the third quarter and paid me $217.15 for traveling expenses, none of which was expended in Washington or on legislative work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) J. B. Wilson is editor of the Wyoming Wool Grower, a semimonthly publication sent to members of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association. (5) J. B. Wilson is not employed to support or oppose legislation, but as secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association, is interested in all legislation concerning wool, lamb, mutton, public lands, and taxes.

Wingert, E. L., 1 West Main Street, Madison, Wis.; Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my share of retainer fee paid my firm for general services as legal counsel for Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, involving mainly services unrelated to Federal legislation. Aside from that, received nothing for use in influencing Federal legislation; and expended nothing for that purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Winter, Everett T., 705 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Woodrum, Clifton A., president, American Plant Food Council, Inc., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The registrant, Clifton A. Woodrum, nor his employer, the American Plant Food Council, Inc., neither received nor expended during last quarter any funds for the purpose of influencing directly or indirectly any legislation. (2) Please see letter filed with original registration. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Woodson, George W., 424 North Washington Avenue, Lansing, Mich.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) I have received as a commission $992.06, and I have also received $572.40 to be used for a petition drive in the State of Michigan to initiate legislation and all have been spent as follows: Attorney fee, supplies, printing, postage, and other expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Spent for supplies, postage, hotel, meals, transportation, clerical work, telephone, and telegraph. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16 (Townsend plan).

Woodul, Walter F., Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.; Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex.; Burlington-Rock Island Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Forth Worth, Tex.; Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Galveston, Tex.; the Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; International-Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex.; Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex.; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co., Houston, Tex.; Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway Co., Amarillo, Tex.; Paris & Mount Pleasant Railroad Co., Paris, Tex.; Quanah, Acme & Pacific Railway Co., Quanah, Tex.; St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; St. Louis, Southwestern Railway Co., of Texas, St. Louis, Mo.; Southern Pacific Co.; San Francisco, Calif.; Texas Electric Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Texas South-Eastern Railroad Co., Diboll, Tex.; the Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; the Texas Mexican Railway Co., Laredo, Tex.; the Union Terminal Co., Dallas, Tex.; Wichita Falls & Southern Railroad Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.; the Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Compensation as previously reported, and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses for months of June, July, and August 1948, in the sum of $630. (2) Braniff Airways, $21.98; Indian Lodge, $124.50; Hotel, Austin, $12.13; Hotel Baker, $17.25; and to various hotels, eating places, and others, in amounts less than $10. (3) Transportation, $16.02; hotels, $181.21; meals, $74.15; entertaining, $6.40; taxis, telephone, tips, and incidentals, $54.50. (4) None. (5) All legislation effecting Texas railroads.

Wootton, Edward W., Wine Institute, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 quarterly salary as manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute, principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco. (2) Received by the undersigned for all personal services rendered as manager of this office, some of which services involve legislative activity. (3) See (1) and (2) above; no expenditures were made by undersigned to any other person for legislative purposes. (4) None. (5) No legislative activity this quarter.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) $2,000 fees for services; $525.32 reimbursement for traveling, telephone and telegraph (including that paid to firm of Case & Wozencraft). (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved, Western Union and telephone company. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Bank holding company legislation.

Wright, Mrs. Leslie B., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For July, August, and September 1948, postage and miscellaneous, $18.23. (2) See answer No. 1. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for pay; a volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs; the General Federation supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Yonkers, Andrew J., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary, $875. This represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $99.51. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Young, Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,333.34; expended, $6.90; meals, $2.10; transportation, $4.80; phone calls, none. (2) Restaurants and taxi companies. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Young, Robert R., 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Railway Progress, volume II, No. 5, July 1948; volume II, No. 6, August 1948; volume II, No. 7, September 1948. (5) None.

Zook, John D., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80*th* CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 94—PART 9

JANUARY 6, 1948, TO MARCH 5, 1948

(PAGES A1 TO A1436)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1948

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with much satisfaction the almost unanimity with which the editorial writers of the country are approving H. R. 4790, introduced in the House by Representative KNUTSON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Under the circumstances that exist, it seems to me the committee could not report to the House a more satisfactory tax-reduction bill.

The bill very properly gives greatest consideration to those in the lower bracket and, as a matter of fact, removes from the tax rolls entirely 7,400,000 of the present taxpayers in that bracket. I hope, and I believe, that both the House and the Senate will pass the bill by substantially more than a two-thirds vote of the membership and that the bill will become the law, a veto by the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The following editorials from the Tampa (Fla.) Daily Times and the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune are typical of many others appearing from day to day:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Daily Times of December 19, 1947]

KNUTSON FIRES FIRST SHOT IN A NEW TAX CUT FIGHT

The public will welcome Representative KNUTSON'S announced intention to make another attempt at income-tax reduction when Congress reconvenes in January.

His latest proposals indicate he is cognizant of the pitfalls that trapped the two previous tax-reduction measures vetoed by President Truman earlier this year. If his prediction that this time his measure is veto-proof comes true, no one will be happier than income taxpayers, large and small.

Income-tax reduction legislation, like most other legislation, regrettably places most emphasis on political expediency, with the public interest taking second place. Likewise, the economic soundness of any particular measure proposed is subordinate to its political effect.

The President's chief objections to the tax reduction plans sent him before were that they failed in his opinion to give adequate consideration to the low-income groups and also be criticized reduction moves as coming at the wrong time, but never pointed out when he thought would be the right time.

The new bill outlined by Mr. KNUTSON quite evidently would give relief to the low-income group. It would equalize the present unfair advantage community-property States have over the remainder of the States. It would free an estimated 7,400,000 low-income and elderly persons from any tax obligation and would give proportionately greater relief to moderate income groups on a percentage basis than it would to the high-bracket taxpayers. In short, it is an acceptable proposal from an economic point of view and one which would not cripple the Federal budget.

Which way the wind will blow on this latest proposal may not develop clearly until discussion on the floor of the House gets underway in January. No doubt plenty of straws will be tossed into the wind while Congress takes its Christmas holiday and public opinion may well be fanned to good heat before that time.

It is conceded in advance that tax cutting will be a major political issue in the coming Presidential campaign. Both parties want the credit for any cuts enacted. For this reason, if for none other, the taxpayers will do well to keep their hopes for income-tax relief in check.

The opening gun has been fired, now let the battle rage, and it is to be hoped that this time the public will come out the victor.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Morning Tribune of December 20, 1947]

CONTEMPLATED SUICIDE

Mr. KNUTSON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, trying again to be a Santa Claus to the suffering taxpayer, has introduced a new tax-reduction bill, which he proposes to make the first major business before Congress when it reconvenes in January.

This new bill removes the major objection urged to the former one by President Truman when he vetoed it, after its passage by large majorities in both Houses. The veto was narrowly sustained. The President attempted to support his veto by asserting that the bill discriminated in the tax cutting in favor of the big fellows and against the little fellows. That wasn't altogether true, but, at lease, it afforded some pretense for the objection.

The new bill, KNUTSON says, is "veto proof," because it would give the benefit of its reductions mostly and decidedly to the smaller taxpayers, with only nominal reductions to the big taxpayers. While it would give cuts to all the Nation's 54,500,000 payers of income tax, the cuts would range from only 10 percent in the highest brackets to as much as 100 percent in the lower brackets. It would remove entirely from the taxpaying rolls 7,400,000 low income and elderly persons. For example, a man with a wife and two children, and an income of $2,400 a year, who now pays $76 income tax, would pay nothing. The bill gives special exemption to persons over 65. All of the lower bracket taxpayers would benefit on graduated scale, from 32 to 100 percent—77 percent of the total reduction would be on incomes less than $4,000. The appeal of this relief to millions of low-income citizens must be irresistibly attractive. Furthermore, the Knutson bill includes the community-property feature, giving an additional saving to taxpayers in the other 36 States now enjoyed by those of 12 States, under State law.

As to the effect on the Federal Treasury, the total of the reductions, estimated at $5,600,000,000, would be well within the estimated Treasury surplus of $7,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year.

It would be extremely difficult to find a reasonable objection to this tax measure. But what did the President say? At a press conference he spoke out against any immediate tax cut. He gave the impression that he would veto it, as he did its predecessor. If he does, he will be denying needed and just tax relief to 54,000,000 people, most of them of small income, to whom the payment of the present income tax is a serious burden; he will also be refusing to remove the rank discrimination under which the people of 12 States are enjoying community property tax saving, which the people of the other 36 States are not permited to use.

In our candid opinion, if Mr. Truman vetoes this bill or any bill carrying similar relief to the taxpayers, he will make himself both a political suicide and a political murderer—killing himself and his party.

Freedom Train Could Run on a Sound Track

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a well-written, admirable, and impressive editorial on the subject of the Freedom Train recently appearing in the Saturday Evening Post by the distinguished author and commentator, my friend, Richard Attridge, of Clinton, Mass.

His proposal is the product of an alert, active mind and appears to be one ready

solution to what has been the rather vexing problem of trying to arrange a suitable itinerary for the Freedom Train and also accommodate the thousands of people who desire to inspect its contents in various local communities throughout the country.

The editorial follows:

FREEDOM TRAIN COULD RUN ON A SOUND TRACK

(By Richard Attridge)

Why wouldn't it be a good idea to put the Freedom Train on a sound track, and make a documentary movie of it? Wherever the Freedom Train has gone in its travels, it has turned out to be a smasheroo attraction. In fact, the toughest problem for the people planning its itinerary was how to take care of the multitudes who flocked to see the train and its precious cargo.

It hasn't been possible to solve this problem completely. Although thousands of people lined up patiently, in rain or shine, sometimes the lines have been too long, especially for older folks and small children. Physical train dimensions arbitrarily impose limits on the number of people who can view the Freedom Train exhibits in any specified length of time, and also curtail thoroughness of examination by those who manage to get aboard.

A documentary film would bring the Freedom Train to every whistle stop as well as to our larger communities; it would give a break to old and young; it would permit close-up and unhurried study of the great signposts in the history of our heritage of freedom. In brief, it would do almost everything the Freedom Train itself does, more easily for millions more people. The film could, of course, be shown as long as people wanted to see it, could be revived through the years or possibly made available for schools and community groups. If Hollywood should decide to contribute this documentary movie to the Nation, its rentals could be used to support some good cause—perhaps to provide extra little luxuries for the disabled veterans who have already paid extra fares so that the rest of us could ride on the Freedom Train.

Without trespassing on the highly technical field of movie production, it is obvious that Hollywood is equipped to dramatize supplementary historical material that could not be contained in the actual Freedom Train. Of one thing we're certain: Hollywood wouldn't have to glamorize the Freedom Train; it will highball along without any love interest. Hollywood's favorite boy-meets-girl theme might be happily underscored simply by showing an American youngster taking off his hat to the Goddess of Liberty.

Is Washington Becoming Like Berlin and Nazi Propaganda Machine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following article by Louis Bromfield appearing in the Omaha (Nebr.) Sunday World-Herald of December 21, 1947:

A VOICE FROM THE COUNTRY—"NEVER SO MANY BEING BAMBOOZLED BY SO FEW"

(By Louis Bromfield)

I wish it were possible for every thoughtful American citizen to spend a week each year in Washington watching what goes on. He would learn and understand many things which, save in the case of the most objective news reporters, are seldom revealed to him.

Most reporters and columnists living on the spot are so subject to pressures, local prejudices, personalities and ideologies that frequently they cannot see the forest for the trees.

The fundamental trouble is, of course, that our Government has become so big and so bureaucratically involved that issues are no longer determined along the lines of the policies of two political parties. Issues are threshed out by the policies of countless departments, bureaus and lobbies working inside government for their own individual and selfish convictions and interests.

The fact is that in some instances we have come near to attaining a kind of government by direction and bureaucratic propaganda which, resembles the Goebbels technique in totalitarianism.

INSIDE LOBBIES WORST

There have always been outcries against the lobbying of private interests. But the dangers of these lobbies are mild as compared to the lobbying and pressures of bureaucratic interests inside government itself.

The danger is even more devastating when one or more of these groups inside government teams up with outside special interests.

It is not uncommon nowadays to find open editorial reference to the State Department lobby, the Army and Navy lobbies, and so forth. All of these as well as other bureaucratic lobbies are powerful and dangerous, and often as selfish in their aims as any public utility, labor, or farm lobby.

They are particularly powerful and dangerous when they operate inside government and are able to exert pressures, invisible to the people, directly upon the President and upon some Members of Congress.

Perhaps the most flagrant example was the intense bureaucratic lobbying about a year ago against any attempt by members of either political party—Republican or Democrat—to bring about economies in government. Every pressure known to old-fashioned and comparatively harmless lobbying, together with some new and shameless wrinkles, was exerted by Government bureau groups.

Scruples or conscientious public service had little to do with the motives. They were essentially the motives of ambition, power, and self-preservation.

LATEST BALLYHOO

Lately the people of the Nation have been treated to a high-pressure propaganda campaign in behalf of an all-out Marshall plan. Certain elements in the State Department, the Army, and the Navy have exerted every possible concealed and inside pressure upon Congress and upon the President. The latter is not too sure of himself or his information. All too rarely he is given to making judgments of his own.

The propaganda concentrates itself upon three aspects of the international situation:

1. That the collapse of Europe is inevitable unless we pour out our wealth in unlimited quantities.

2. That unless we do so communism will swallow up Europe.

3. That war with Russia is inevitable and may happen at any moment.

Plenty of sound and informed observers do not believe any of these premises. Their voices have been obscured by the skillfully managed propaganda hullabaloo.

The State Department has, as far as possible, taken the attitude that the American people are unable to judge because they do not know many of the facts which that Department and the Army and Navy are keeping hidden. This is, of course, nothing more or less than the old bureaucratic totalitarian technique.

The answer to it is simple enough. The people have every right to this absurdly mysterious information and can thus judge for themselves.

PROFITEERS JOIN IN

Some of the State Department motives are obscure, and some apparent.

One can also discover the trail of many private interests, both industrial and banking, which are all out for the Marshall plan because they stand to benefit greatly by profiting in foreign markets and the benefits of scarcities, exchange, and high prices.

In other words, American taxpayers will pour out money which, after being filtered through Europe, will return in concentration to the pockets of the individuals and special interests involved.

This is one aspect of the European aid program which has by no means been sufficiently explored. But they are in there pitching, supporting every move of the State Department, the Army and the Navy, and in turn being supported by these bureaus.

The self-interest of the Army and Navy cliques is much more transparent.

Like all military groups at any time in any country, they want money and prestige and power. They are unwilling to return to democratic government the powers delivered to them in time of war.

They fight law, tax reduction, and economies because the appropriations which give them power and prestige may be cut.

Of course, the best technique for maintaining both power and big appropriations is to scare the living daylights out of the American people.

Consequently they keep circulating rumors of the mysterious powers and menace of Russia, many of which are unfounded in fact. They keep dangling bogeymen constantly in front of Congress and the people.

BUREAUCRACY'S PATTERN

By design or by accident, these three groups—State Department, Army, and Navy—have become dangerous and powerful lobbies inside the Government, seeking to dominate the Nation itself.

This is an age-old pattern of bureaucracy.

The Washington Government has developed since 1933 steadily increasing evidences of a vicious bureaucracy. It is becoming like the old days of Berlin when in Germany government and its bureaus became one gigantic propaganda machine.

Editors and other citizens with a sense of public spirit should take a little more notice of bureaucratic lobbies and pressures. They are infinitely more dangerous to this Nation than any outside special interest lobbies have ever been. As one suspicious Senator put it the other day, "Never are so many being so bamboozled by so few."

One thing is certain that never in all our history have we had a Government so dominated by military men.

They are everywhere, going in and out of the White House, the State Department, the Capitol, not singly but in troupes, muttering about the horrible mysteries which cannot be told to the American people whom they are paid not to dominate but to serve.

This is the first of two articles dealing with the dangerous bureaucratic lobbies which have grown up unnoticed, inside our Government.

More Education for Everybody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Republic, Mitchell, S. Dak., by W. R. Ronald, chairman of the planning committee, board of directors, Dakota Wesleyan University, and owner and editor of the Daily Republic:

MORE EDUCATION FOR EVERYBODY PROPOSED

Interesting and progressive is the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. What it proposes is a great deal more of so-called higher education, not only for those of college student age, but of adults as well.

Correlatively a book has appeared, written by Mrs. Viola Lurch Cox, of New York, a life-long educator, entitled "Wealth Through Education." Its premise is that all wealth is derived from education, a point that need not be labored. Therefore, it is proposed to finance universal higher education by means of promissory notes given by the students, the Government to use them as the basis of a special issue of currency.

This method of financing some such program as that proposed by the President's Commission is novel. But it would have this tremendous advantage over any other kind of currency, namely, that it would finance an investment in education that, after all, is more of an asset than any material possession.

Dakota Wesleyan University's commitment to an education based on recognition of spiritual law as the only law, in which many educators, one foundation and two national organizations already are interested, would add the inestimable value of moral quality to the higher education proposed for the great mass of the people of this country.

Union college has demonstrated that very few young men and women are incapable of benefiting from a college education. That is supporting evidence for these attempts to realize upon a sacred assurance that all men shall know the truth and that it shall make them free.

Well-Known Publisher Surveys Conditions in Europe and the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, while congressional committees were touring Europe and the Near East last summer and fall, Mr. Eugene Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star, was making a careful survey of the same regions on his own hook, accompanied by Mrs. Pulliam, who paid particular attention to conditions affecting women in the countries they visited. Mr. Pulliam has prepared a summary of his conclusions and I have obtained permission of the House to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on account of the light it sheds on vital problems. Mr. Pulliam's conclusions are the findings of an excellent reporter and a fearless and independent investigator. His summary is as follows:

The blessings and privileges of free America are never so sweet as when you are forced to get along without them. Coming back to the United States after two months in the regimented atmosphere of Europe and the Near East, you are overwhelmed by the sheer joy of being free again. Free to go where you please, free to take a plane or a train without filling in a dozen forms, free to pick up your traveling bags without detailed examination by unfriendly officials, free to go from one city to the next without consent of suspicious police, free to buy food or clothing or what-have-you without governmental coupons or restrictive red tape, free to express your opinions, free to voice your protest, free to say yes and free to say no, free to be a free American once again. It is an amazing experience. You wonder how on earth you ever could have taken freedom for granted like the air you breathe.

The contrast between living conditions in America and almost every country of Europe and all those of the Near East is sharp and stark. The average industrial worker or the average farmer of America lives in Utopia as compared to the lot of the workers and farmers of Europe and the Near East. Industrial workers of America have automobiles, electric lights, radios, refrigerators, a variety of good food and warm clothing. On the continent the workers struggle to remain alive. They know nothing whatever of modern conveniences or simple luxuries. For the most part they live in one- or two-room hovels or in crowded flats.

Not one in 50,000 owns an automobile; very few have radios. There are electric lights in some of the flats, but no electric refrigerators. Their one absorbing interest is to get enough food and clothing to keep alive and warm.

The living conditions of the farm class are even worse, except they do have more food than the city workers. But electric lights, automobiles, and modern farm equipment are practically nonexistent in the farming sections. They live and work and struggle as the peasants of Europe did 200 years ago.

Existence for the middle classes is not much better than that of the industrial workers and farmers. In prewar days the middle classes did enjoy many of the so-called better things of life, but their standard of living at its best was very meager compared to American standards. But all of that is changed now and the middle classes, too, are fighting to stay alive. In the black-market countries prices are soaring and inflation is rampant. In the countries where there is a rigidly controlled economy wages are low and regimentation is a stone around every person's neck.

There is no personal freedom as we know it anywhere in Europe, except in a modified form in the Scandinavian countries. Even free England is no longer free. Under national socialism Englishmen are regimented as never before. They cannot leave the country without the government's consent and even then can take only £20 with them. Elsewhere on the continent everybody is under constant police surveillance. There are restrictions of almost every possible nature, restrictions meekly accepted by the people there, which if attempted here would cause a social revolution.

"If they don't like all these restrictions why don't they rise up and rebel?" a friend asked me yesterday when we were discussing conditions in Europe. It is a natural question and the answer is just as simple: "You don't rebel in the face of machine guns." In generations gone by men could rise up against tyrants and win with clubs and forks. But not any more. Two trained soldiers armed with machine guns can keep a thousand men cowed. In addition, the people of Europe are so tired and exhausted by war they have no heart for rebellion. Complicating their economic troubles is the ever-growing fear of a Soviet war of aggression. Against the Soviets they have no adequate defense. They can only look to America and pray that we will save them.

Socialization, regimentation, class privilege and war have brought Europe to its present unhappy state. By contrast consider conditions in free America. Nowhere on the face of the earth has any country even remotely approached the American standard of living and personal liberty that we enjoy under free enterprise. Nowhere else is there so much production and plenty. This is in fact the workers' republic because almost everybody in America works and works hard in an atmosphere of unrestricted opportunity. That is true of no other country in the world. It explains why so many, many millions of Europeans would give anything they possess just for the chance to come to America to live. They would give everything for what all Americans have for free.

The Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I submit to the House for the consideration of its Members a letter written by F. C. Sammons and published in the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Advertiser of December 21, 1947.

Mr. Sammons is a successful construction contractor and a student of history and world affairs. You no doubt will find his letter interesting.

The letter follows:

THE CONSTITUTION

EDITOR, THE HERALD-ADVERTISER:

Prominent educators have worked to undermine our Constitution, but I nominate Prof. Charles A. Beard as the pioneer in this field. He was born in Indiana in 1874, he studied at Oxford and received his Ph. D. at Columbia University in 1904. He later wrote textbooks and taught government at Columbia.

In 1913, he wrote The Economic Interpretation of the Constitution—a textbook which devotes much space to enumerate the amounts of money loaned by each of the founding fathers for the financial support of our revolution. The professor insinuates that the patriot fathers may have written the Constitution in order to insure the repayment of their personal loans. He apologizes for raising the dangerous Constitutional question which finally led up to the Supreme Court packing controversy in 1937. Professor Beard had no fine scruples against slandering the motives of our patriot fathers, therefore, it is fair to question his economic motives.

Since reading this book (years ago) we have learned much about the power of the purse, of Marxist Labor International, and the London School of Economics in subsidizing Socialist textbooks and other subversive propaganda.

Please remember that this is a high school or college library textbook—cleverly designed to cast doubt over immature minds regarding the value of our Constitution—a Constitution which was written to protect private enterprise, private property, and a personal money system—and to protect us against all forms of Government ownership, state capitalism, and flat money system. The whole tenor of the book suggests that fascism—or flat money, or what have you—might be a better type of government than the one we inherited.

Since Mussolini, Stalin, and Hitler came to power as a natural result of such doubtful educational theories, which were taught in European schools; why don't we reestablish in our school system the teaching of the main object of our Constitution, and do it before it becomes too late?

F. C. SAMMONS.

Truman's Doctrine Has Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a timely editorial written by Mr. John S. Knight, editor of the Chicago Daily News, under date of Saturday, January 3, 1948. Mr. Knight calls attention to the fact that last March, when the gift to Greece and Turkey was being considered, he predicted that it would end in a dismal failure. He now reaffirms that statement. He further points out that the failure of Mr. Truman's efforts in Greece and Turkey will mean that the Marshall plan is in jeopardy. I include the editorial referred to:

TRUMAN DOCTRINE'S FAILURE BODES ILL FOR MARSHALL PLAN

When the Truman doctrine (remember?) was first proposed last March, I predicted that it would end in a dismal failure.

It seemed quite obvious then, and even more so now, that merely lending Greece and Turkey $400,000,000 would neither "doctor up" the Greek economy nor drive the guerrillas from northern frontiers.

After Congress voted for the Truman loan, I said on August 31 that "the United States is now reduced to a painful choice between pulling out when the loan is exhausted or sticking with the Truman doctrine, regardless of cost and American lives."

My views came in for a great deal of criticism at that time because it is part of the American credo that you can fix anything with money.

EVEN PUNDITS SEE THE LIGHT

Now, even the heavy thinkers of American journalism are beginning to see the Greek situation in its true light. A revealing dispatch by Walter Lippmann brings out these facts:

1. We have given the regular Greek Army 74,000 tons of military equipment and provided all of the food for the entire Greek Army of 100,000 men. Lippmann estimates that the guerrilla forces number not more than 20,000 and says they cannot have received anything like the same amount of help from the Yugoslavs and the Bulgarians.

2. The present Government in Greece, although nominally a freely elected government, quite plainly does not have popular support.

3. Some supporters of the Government have begun to do business underground with the rebels. American food and medical supplies are distributed exclusively by Greek politicians.

4. The same people in the United States Government who said last year that $300,000,000 and 73 military advisers would do the job are now saying that two American divisions can stiffen the Greek Government and seal the border.

In that connection, Mr. Lippmann quite correctly observes that if two divisions are put ashore in Greece, the whole military power of the United States will have to be committed to support them. If two divisions do not suffice, it will be necessary to send as many more divisions as are needed to accomplish the purpose for which the two divisions were sent.

That is precisely what I said last March when Dean Acheson, then Under Secretary of State, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "the present plans do not include sending troops to Greece and Turkey."

Mr. Acheson's diplomatic double talk was quite transparent. State Department officials now concede privately that the present Greek Government can never restore order without the help of American troops.

According to James Reston, of the New York Times, our loan has neither helped the Greeks to carry on alone nor will it permit us to end the investment and pull out of Greece with honor.

HOUR IS LATE FOR DIPLOMACY

Mr. Lippmann calls for diplomacy to extricate the United States from a position where its prestige is so dangerously involved with the fate of the Greek Government. He suggests that the middle powers such as Canada, Brazil, and Sweden be invited to submit proposals for settlement of the Greek problem.

The suggestion is a good one, but tragically late. I protested at the time of the Greek loan that the question could be resolved by further discussions between the nations involved.

President Truman's answer was to ignore the report of the international commission then investigating conditions in the Balkans, and to bypass the United Nations with a flimsy, unrealistic, political formula which came to be known as the Truman doctrine.

At the time, I called it an open invitation to war and subsequent developments have not caused me to alter that view.

The two important issues of 1948 will be the Presidential election and the Marshall plan.

Of the two, the Marshall plan is more momentous. If passed by Congress along the lines of President Truman's recommendations, it will involve any future President in a long-range policy having utterly unpredictable results.

The weaknesses of the Marshall plan are precisely the same as those which handicapped the Truman doctrine.

The money flows from the United States to unstable governments which are unlikely to survive even a portion of the 4-year program.

Assurances from present governments that efforts will be made to stabilize currencies, balance budgets, and stimulate production are flimsy props which may collapse at any time under political pressure.

Unless there is a resolute determination on the part of European peoples to recapture something of the national heritages which once made them strong and virile no amount of American dollars can bring about their salvation.

However, our national pulse beats in sympathy with European distress, and it is a foregone conclusion that Uncle Sam will spring to the rescue.

CONSIDER ITS EFFECT ON UNITED STATES

It is important, therefore, to consider what repercussions the 4-year, $17,000,000,000 Marshall plan will have upon our own domestic economy.

President Truman blithely observes that we have already given approximately $15,000,000,000 to world recovery and that the additional proposed expenditure of less than 3 percent of the expected national income is well within our national resources.

The fallacy of the President's argument is that it is exceedingly dangerous to speculate in futures, and I am not thinking of the grain market.

He is assuming a continuance of our boomtime income of nearly $200,000,000,000 a year. What he fails to mention is how we would meet our commitments under the Marshall plan if the national income declined to $150,000,000,000 a year, still a high mark in comparison with free spending 1929 figures.

Wouldn't it be far more prudent for us to vote a 1-year appropriation and take another look at the world situation at the end of that period?

We might discover that the European recovery program was inflating prices in the United States to such an extent that our own economy was being placed in jeopardy.

We might learn that despite all of our efforts to help Europe the plan was failing because of political inepititude, maladministration, or internal conditions in the Marshall bloc of nations over which we had no control.

In the event of a severe recession in the United States during the 4-year period we might find that we no longer could afford to play the role of Uncle Sugar.

Americans are traditionally the most generous people in the world. But how many of us are willing to make firm pledges to the community fund or the Red Cross for a 4-year period?

Our personal charities are based upon what we feel we can afford to give this year but everyone reserves the right to revise the amount of next year's contribution to fit his bank account.

If this is a prudent course for individuals to adopt, should our Government, of which we are collectively the owners, pursue a less sound policy?

PLEA FOR CHINA ALSO MISLEADS

Let us not be misled, either, by the current clamor for additional help to China. More than $5,000,000,000 has already been poured down the Chinese rat hole in a vain effort to support the corrupt and hopelessly inefficient regime of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

A neutral survey by Associated Press correspondents in China reveals that her deteriorating military-economic situation is reaching a point where neither American money nor arms will have much bearing on the struggle with the Communists.

Correspondent Joseph Burke reports from North China that "Peiping opinion questions whether there is enough money in the world to pull Chiang Kai-shek's government out of the hole far enough to save it for any length of time."

As we go into 1948, a year fraught with fateful consequences, our heads rather than our emotions should govern the United States foreign policy.

We must develop the moral leadership which will enable us to find the truth and fend off propaganda; to approach every problem without prejudice, expediency or fear; to perceive the difference between right and wrong and be fired with the courage to uphold the right, regardless of personal consequences.

We can then bring some inspiration and hope to a weary and confused world suffering from the ravages of war and an overdose of political patent medicine.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

The Attack on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the Portland Oregonian published in my congressional district there appeared on December 30, 1947, an editorial under the above caption which is worthy of careful consideration while we are studying the problems facing the second session of the Eightieth Congress having to do with inflation and the high cost of living. The editorial follows:

THE ATTACK ON INFLATION

When President Truman submitted his 10-point inflation control plan—which may be the basis of his campaign for election in 1948—Congress had three choices. It could have accepted his program of "selective" controls on prices and wages, and selective rationing; it could have gone whole hog, with rationing and price and wage ceilings in all lines; or it could, and did, devise a program based essentially on the hope of voluntary agreements in business and agriculture.

The public recognizes that Democrats and Republicans, though sincere in their hopes of stopping inflation before it culminates in a national bust, are angling to lay the blame on the opposition if prices continue to go up, and to take credit to themselves if the rise is halted.

In deciding to sign the Republican measure, President Truman termed it "inadequate" and stated flatly: "This bill will not reduce the high cost of living and it will not keep prices from going even higher." Yet he agreed to sign it, and promised that his administration would utilize the authority given "to the fullest extent." Obviously, he considers it better than no legislation.

The President's criticism of the Republican program would have carried more weight had there been more meat and less of political sail-trimming in his own proposals. Some Republicans who believed that Mr. Truman's plan for selective controls could not possibly have succeeded, and would have created great discord and inequities in industry and labor, were tempted to let him have the program and the responsibility. But greater consideration had to be given to the national peril, and to this Nation's assumption of world assistance.

Yet neither Republicans nor Democrats were willing to thrust upon the Nation a system of all-out rationing and price and wage controls unpopular in wartime and unexampled in peacetime. Would the people have accepted such a program as a necessity in a period of high wages, high employment, high prices, and high profits? Congress and the President thought not. Criticism by each of the other's program may not then be taken too seriously.

Obviously, the steps taken by Congress will not be effective unless Mr. Truman's government firmly and vigorously implements them with positive action. Perhaps, as the President predicts, the program still will fail, but if it does the need will be shown positively for emergency powers over the lives of the citizens such as most Americans abhor.

There may have been significance in Mr. Truman's omission, in his recapitulation of the powers he had demanded, of the item of selective wage controls in vital industries. If he intended to give Government encouragement to another round of wage increases, the public will be justified in assuming that he will not make much effort to achieve the price-lowering aims of the GOP program.

By encouraging higher wages, on the one hand, and pointing to a failure of the congressional anti-inflation plan, on the other, the President could put himself into a strong vote-gathering position. Yet there is not yet reason to doubt Mr. Truman's sincerity in pointing to the Nation's danger. A strong nonpartisan administration of the Republican program would prove him a better President than politician.

The fundamental hope of stopping the price climb and getting more production lies, however, with business, agriculture, and labor. The unanswered question is: Are the leaders in the private-enterprise system willing to work together to stabilize the economy and prevent a world-shaking collapse? The President and Congress can only point the way, short of an economic dictatorship distasteful to a great majority of the citizens.

Plug This Rat Hole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release of Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, a former Member of the House:

PLUG THIS RAT HOLE

The high cost of living and the high cost of giving are in competition. Whatever we give under the Marshall plan, the colossal waste between giver and givee must be stopped.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, after a look at Europe, reports "miles" of American goods which have been rotting on wharves for a year or more. He believes much of this is due to the hostility of European merchants and businessmen who don't want American relief goods to compete in their markets. How do we stuff up this rat hole?

Obviously, this is no job for left-wing social welfare workers. Some mighty tough talkers must be put in charge. The greater the need of the destitute for relief the greater the need for hard-boiled handling of international charity. Somebody must crack the whip and get the food into the homes of the hungry. Otherwise, local interests and black-market politicians will gum up the works to prevent the group in charge of distributing the food to the hungry from getting the political credit for our charity.

There must remain one impregnable Gibraltar in the world, if the world is to be saved. Uncle Sam is the only visiting fireman now able or willing to respond to any alarm. If the fireman gets sick, who will take care of him?

It is a new thing in American history to hear huge crowds in Paris and Rome and Cairo shouting: "Down with Americans." Are American troops going to be sent into the Near East when British troops pull out?

We used to say, "Don't set your plow too deep." But that was when America was growing up to the mightiest stature any nation has ever achieved. It was before the waste of public funds was a social virtue, and careful Government bookkeeping had ceased to be honored.

Everyone here was under some pressure to buy war bonds. Patriotism was a pressure—an honorable one. But no one was actually compelled by law to buy a bond. Yet, when our Government makes a loan to a foreign government on its promise to repay, the President and Congress compel every citizen, indirectly, to purchase a share in a foreign government's promise.

The loan to Britain a year and a half ago, of $3,750,000,000, amounted to $27 per capita from American pockets. The total aid already extended to Europe since VE-day, plus the new Marshall plan, will amount to about $250 per capita, or $1,000 for an American family of four.

It is interesting to compare these figures with the taxes that brought on the American Revolution in 1776. At that time England was forcing Americans, per capita, to pay her about $3 a year, mostly in customs duties. The tax on the tea dumped in Boston Harbor was threepence per pound. How would you like to pay taxes of $3 a year, or 25 cents a month, to support our Federal Government today?

This comparison is made from figures in a book published in 1766, when Patrick Henry and other patriots were protesting taxation without representation. The book's title is "Considerations on the Propriety of Impesing Taxes on the British Colonies." Interesting reading 181 years later.

Did the atom bomb, the Frankenstein which we created, repeal the Declaration of Independence? If so, sad news to old Sam Adams in his grave: "If I have a wish dearer than that my ashes may be mingled with Warren (who died at Bunker Hill) it is that these American States may be forever free and independent."

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast of my colleague from Massachusetts, Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, in the next few months the Congress of the United States is going to have to decide whether or not it, on behalf of the American people, will authorize a program of foreign aid. The day after tomorrow the Senate will open up hearings on the question and early next week the House Committee on Foreign Affairs will continue its hearings which it conducted for 1 day at the end of our special session. Congress's action is being watched not alone by the 16 nations of Europe which participated in the Paris Conference to draw up a plan of mutual self-help, but likewise by the Far East, South America, and our neighbors on this continent both to the north and the south. Each of these nations, in varying degree, is hopeful that the United States in making available for reconstruction purposes some of its dollars and its commodities, can put the world, or at least that part of the world which is not within the orbit of the Soviet Government, on the path toward greater productivity, a higher standard of living, and greater political stability. Russia and her satellites alone are opposing any program of aid to any European or Asiatic country with all the power of their influence and their great propaganda machine.

Generally speaking, I think it's fair to say that the majority of the Members of the Congress feel that the United States in its own self-interest should give aid within the limits of its financial and economic capacity. However, there is a wide divergence of opinion; first, as to the amount of aid that can safely be given; second, as to the way in which aid should be administered; and third, the extent to which the United States should look forward to any repayment, whether directly through the products which we need and which foreign nations can supply, or indirectly, through the restoration of the world's strength and freedom. To attempt to discuss all these divergences would be impossible in this brief period, but I do wish to concentrate on the second area, namely,

differences of opinion with respect to administration, because in my opinion the finding of the correct answer to this problem very directly affects the others. Unless the United States can provide the strongest and most efficient administration possible for the carrying out of any program, then dollars spent or commodities given away, are likely to be lost and any hope of repayment either in terms of goods or in terms of a stronger and freer world may well be futile.

At the moment the divergence of opinion as to how any program of aid should be administered can be found most clearly in comparing the draft of a bill which the State Department has submitted for the carrying out of its ideas and the bill which was filed by myself and which carries out the unanimous ideas of an 18-member special committee of the Congress of which I had the honor to be acting chairman. This latter committee was directed by the Congress to make a particular study of this subject and devoted a greater part of the summer and early fall to its work both by visiting the principal countries of Europe affected and by working here in Washington.

The major differences in the two approaches are as follows: The State Department bill, in effect, places the entire administration of the program directly under the Secretary of State both in its domestic administration and in its administration overseas. Although a special agency is created and a special administrator named, nevertheless, the latter is actually under the direction of the Secretary of State in all matters affecting foreign policy, and abroad all of his agents would become in effect a part of our foreign service and could report only through State Department Ambassadors and State Department channels.

My bill would create a special agency organized in corporate form. This agency would have a group of eight directors equally divided between the two political parties, all to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate and one of the directors would be the Chairman of the Board of Directors, and would be the operating head of the authority. The latter would coordinate his work with the policies of the State Department through a foreign aid counsel of which the Secretary of State would be the chairman and which would embrace the principal governmental authorities having a direct interest in the program of foreign aid. He would likewise be required to get the counter-signature of the President on directives which he issued to other Government departments, thereby in effect coordinating his policies completely with those of the President. However, on the technical side he would have considerable autonomy, would be free to select his own personnel both in this country and abroad and would be free, subject to the over-all policies of the President and the Secretary of State, in negotiating special arrangements with each foreign country to which we are extending a helping hand. I am convinced that only through some such special agency as my bill provides can two extremely desirable ends be accomplished. First, the sharing of responsibility by the two major political parties through the creation of a bi-partisan board thereby making a bipartisan foreign policy a reality; second, attracting the ablest brains that we have in this country through giving them sufficient leeway in the carrying out of their administrative duties without having complete direction in all detail by the Department of State. These officials would be free from civil-service regulations and would be acting on a temporary basis. They could be paid such salaries as their services should command. Under my bill the services by contract or otherwise of engineering experts and other technical experts would be possible. Only in some such way could a really competent staff be assembled to administer what in effect would be a highly technical and very difficult operation.

There are other differences in the two bills. The State Department bill would appropriate a given sum of money for the over-all operation and would then leave it to the administrator working under the State Department to determine how much of it should be spent for grants in aid and how much should be loaned to foreign countries. With respect to loans, the administrator would consult with the National Advisory Committee which again consists of administration officials, but does not include the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank and in the making of any loan, the terms and conditions and amounts would be decided by the administrator, and would then be administered by the Export-Import Bank. In my bill it is specifically set out that only food, fuel, and fertilizer can be considered in the grant in aid category; the one exception being that a limited amount can be spent for so-called incentive goods such as tobacco and again a limited amount to take care of urgent requirements such as agricultural or mining machinery for which loans are not immediately available. In my bill the Export-Import Bank capital would be increased and that bank, which in my opinion is one of the most efficiently and ably operated agencies in Washington, would make the final determination as it does today as to the loans which it would make for the financing of raw materials and certain types of light machinery. Both of our bills would presumably leave the financing of capital goods or heavy machinery to the World Bank although in the case of the State Department bill, the Administrator whom they propose could go into this field if he chose to do so.

Again, I am strongly prejudiced in favor of the provisions of my own bill because I feel that we should make full use of an agency which is operating well and which by law can make loans only if such have, and I quote "a reasonable chance of repayment." I do not believe that the United States should make any loans except on such a basis.

The third big difference between our approaches deals with the handling of export controls. The State Department bill would leave export controls where they are now in the Department of Commerce. My bill would transfer them to the new agency. This is an important difference. Any program of foreign aid, whether or not it is limited to certain European countries or whether it includes countries in the Far East, must be directly related to what we in the United States can afford to give or sell not alone to those countries but to all the other countries of the world. It is little realized that during the last year we shipped to the 16 nations of Europe which made up the Paris Peace Conference, only one-third of our total exports. The other two-thirds went to Canada, Mexico, South America, Cuba, India, Australia, etc. Obviously, if an intelligent planning of any program is to be made so as not to weaken our own domestic economy it must be made in relation to the rest of our trade with the rest of the world. The export control is the only control which we have which can effectively channel such goods as we can spare to the right countries. Obviously, that control should rest in the hands of the individual or organizations responsible for our foreign-aid program. In a similar way, the State Department leaves the allocation of foodstuffs in the Department of Agriculture. All allocations in my opinion should be left to the one new agency which would certainly have the best facilities available for determining relative needs. The administrator I propose would have to consult with the Secretary of State and with the President but by and large unless responsibility is fixed efficient administration is impossible. Furthermore, that responsibility ought not to be fixed in the Secretary of State because the State Department has to receive all formal protests from foreign governments and should be free to act as a claimant agency for those foreign governments and also be free from the petty annoyances and difficulties of administrative detail.

There are other differences between the State Department bill and my own, particularly with respect to the use of local currencies taken in payment for goods delivered to foreign governments and with respect to receiving in return certain metals for stock-piling purposes which are either nonexistent or have been exhausted in this country.

I have not touched on the question of the amount necessary to carry out an effective foreign-aid program. That matter is still being carefully studied, but I am very doubtful whether in the first 15 months as large a sum is required as the State Department has indicated. I further feel very strongly that the Congress should not commit itself to any specific sum over a four and a quarter year period. I say this for two reasons, first, because to make a commitment at this time for a very hazardous and unknown future would be foolish on our part and might well lead foreign nations to believe that we have promised just so much help regardless of whether or not they did their own share to help themselves. I firmly believe that we should do what we can to help, but I equally firmly believe that we should review what we are doing at least once every year and that we should continue only so long as real progress is being made and a willingness on the part of recipient nations is being shown to carry out to the best of their ability their own share in the program.

Again let me repeat that I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for a strong organization and one which can attract the ablest brains we have. It is the primary essential in granting help to those who are in trouble.

Thank you for letting me express in this brief way my views on a very controversial matter. Good night.

Meredith Nicholson's Advice to Youths Who Are Unable To Obtain a College Education

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, when Meredith Nicholson, the distinguished author, died, a poor man, at Indianapolis, on December 21, he left a formula which he had used for obtaining a liberal education outside the walls of an educational institution. This formula is a legacy of value to every poor boy and girl in America who cannot find means to obtain a college education. Mr. Nicholson began to earn his own living at the age of 15 as a printer's devil and never went to college. By his own statement he made the city of Indianapolis and its outstanding men his school.

In an autobiographical sketch titled, "Without Benefit of College," Mr. Nicholson detailed his experiences in acquiring an education outside of formal schools:

I shouldn't be writing it at all if it were not for the hope that some boy or girl, denied an opportunity to go to college, or some parent, puzzled and distressed because a child seems slow or stupid, may find comfort and encouragement in my confession.

He related that he was "undoubtedly below the average child in my ability to learn" and recounted a battle with high school algebra which induced him to end his formal schooling.

My parents were poor, but it was not poverty that drove me from the schoolhouse so much as panic over the algebraic signs—

The Hoosier author wrote.

Upon his withdrawal from high school, he plunged into a different kind of learning—educating himself by talking with outstanding men of all kinds and doing many types of work.

I was making the town itself my school, appointing its most brilliant and stimulating men my teachers and helpers—

He says.

In his sketch he recalls many meetings with Myron W. Reed, then pastor of the First Presbyterian Church; Oscar M. McCulloch, pastor of the Plymouth Congregational Church; with Attorneys John T. Dye and William P. Fishback, for whom he worked for a time, and with many other leaders of the community.

I was probably learning more by observing and listening than from the books I borrowed from the library, which ran the whole range of human knowledge—

He said.

Expressing disdain for the restrictive routine of colleges, Mr. Nicholson said:

I can see now that I would never have been a successful student if I had gone to college; the routine of a fixed curriculum would have crippled my initiative. I gathered such fruit as pleased me from the tree of knowledge and did not worry about the rest.

I have the greatest reverence for exact scholarship, but I was born with what, I believe, is called a journalistic mind and took the shortest cut to any information I wanted.

Who Gets the American Market?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial appearing in the Green Bay Press-Gazette should give us cause to stop and think. The subject matter is particularly pertinent in view of action taken in the recent trade agreements entered into by the President and in view of the fact that the Trade Agreements Act will expire in June. The big question we must resolve soon is: Who gets the American market?

The editorial follows:

WISCONSIN FOX FARMS

This is not a good time to judge future economic policies because we are still feeling the effects of that great upheaval called war.

But we are naturally interested in the fur-farm problem because we have had many worthy citizens develop the business hereabouts, and they are entitled to our consideration.

The fox-fur industry is laboring hard to keep on its feet. We find that about 65 percent of American imports from Russia last year consisted of furs. These imports didn't do our fur farmers any good although they benefited the Soviets by providing dollar exchange and they also benefited tool makers with whom the Soviets spent their dollars.

It just doesn't seem right. It isn't right. During the past 20 years we were cheering the fellows who dug in their fingernails at a new business venture—that of raising furs instead of depending upon foreign fields or the wilds for them. It takes courage to enter a new venture and use up one's savings or mortgage one's property upon an uncertain future. But it has been ventures of this kind all sewed together that have made America. Our fur farmers burned the midnight oil. They studied markets. They studied animals. They studied food and care. They studied breeds and crossbreeds. They experimented. And they must have balanced in their minds certain perils, for there are always dangers in every business. Yet we doubt that they ever figured their own Government would take their market away from them and give it to someone else.

It is not a matter of the share of this market that goes to the Soviets. It is the deep-seated principle of how much of such market should go to anyone in preference to our own people.

Republican Leaders Review Accomplishments of Eightieth Congress and Assure Country the Republican Majority Will Continue To Keep Their Party's Pledges for Sound, Forward-Looking Legislation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, remarks on the brilliant accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress were made by five distinguished Republican leaders in a radio program on the night of January 5, 1948.

The program was presented by the Republican National Committee over the Mutual Broadcasting System from Station WOL in Washington, D. C.

These leaders of the Republican Party included the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, and the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, leader of the majority in the House of Representatives.

Accomplishments in reversing the ruinous trend of New Deal Democrat administrations were detailed in the broadcast, and outlined was the Republican Party's program to maintain the American way of life so that America may continue to be strong and a bulwark for the republican form of government in a troubled world.

Herewith is the full text of the Republican radio program presented over the Mutual Broadcasting System last night:

ANNOUNCER. Republicans are on the air.

On the eve of the second session of the Eightieth Congress, the Mutual network presents from Washington a discussion featuring five leaders of the Republican Party. To be heard are Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee; Senators Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, and Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado; Speaker of the House Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, and House Majority Leader Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana. And now here is the chairman of the discussion, Mr. Carroll Reece.

Chairman REECE. Good evening. The Republican Party is confronted this year with a great opportunity and with the gravest responsibility ever faced by any political group in history.

This is the appropriate time to appraise the situation, to make plans to take advantage of the opportunity and to discharge the responsibility.

The most important single factor in the determination of Republican success or failure this year will be the record of the Republican Congress.

That Congress made a brilliant record during its first session, despite opposition of Mr. Truman and his executive departments.

It kept every promise its Members had made to the people during the campaign with the sole exception of a reduction in withholding and other income taxes.

It was prevented from keeping that promise of tax relief only by an unprecedented misuse of the Presidential veto power.

During the special session just ended—and despite handicaps imposed when the Truman administration injected domestic politics into the European relief emergency—the Republican Congress made a record equally satisfactory to the American people.

During the second session, which begins tomorrow, the Republican leadership will make additional progress toward maintaining our representative Republic and preserving our American way of life.

Tonight it is my privilege to present four distinguished Republican congressional leaders who will discuss with you some of the high lights of the legislative task confronting the Congress.

Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, the majority leader of the House of Representatives, is first on our panel. Mr. HALLECK, would you like to tell the audience what, in your opinion, the people had in mind when they voted a year ago last November to give the Republicans control of the Congress?

Representative HALLECK. Yes, Mr. Reece, I would like to do that, but I don't think I need to go into detail to refresh the memory of the American people regarding the chaotic, insufferable conditions that prevailed in this country when the people by their votes in November 1946 said they had had enough.

Our country was on the brink of disaster. The years of New Deal Democrat misrule; their rubber-stamp Congresses, huge blank-check appropriations; pollution of every phase of our national economy by all sorts of alien philosophies—all of these and more, had conspired to strangle industry, farming, and mining.

The American people's memory is vivid on those hectic postwar days when the Truman administration was fumbling and bungling and steering the ship of state toward rocks of destruction.

The war had ended but controls, directives, Executive orders, rules and regulations were still going strong and hamstringing the country.

It was plain to almost everybody that bad government was stifling the production of the peacetime goods so urgently needed.

That's why the American people voted for good government—Republican government—and they are not going back to bad government. They are not going back to OPA.

We all remember the meat situation that existed in 1946. Housewives could buy a little meat, but to get it they had to stand in line for hours, or be lawbreakers and go into the black market and pay outrageously high prices. And there were shortages in

nearly every other line—washing machines, clothes, refrigerators, shoes, radios. In short, about all we got was old bull meat and short shirt tails.

Sure, some prices are too high today, chiefly because of the tremendous drain of foreign exports on our limited domestic resources. But the solid fact is that many things that were not obtainable before the people elected the Republican Congress are now on the market shelves.

That is because the Republican Congress got production under full speed ahead. But for that prices would be much higher and we could not begin to meet our necessities, either at home or abroad.

The truth is the Truman administration has no sound solution for any of our national problems.

All it wants is power and more power to regiment the people. That is the road to collapse and ruin.

The administration asks for these police-state powers on its record. But the way the administration has abused these powers in the past is the best warning sign for the future.

The American people remember that a few days after they had repudiated the Truman administration in the 1946 elections the President publicly issued a statement acknowledging the people's verdict and pledged cooperation with the Republican Congress.

He has not kept that pledge.

Instead he has called the signals for opposition to every major measure proposed by the Republican majority in the Congress.

He has opposed reduction in Government expenditures. Twice we passed bills to give the people relief from the heavy wartime tax burden only to meet Presidential vetoes. We Republicans have a majority in the Congress, but we do not have the two-thirds required to override all the President's vetoes. Incidentally, with a Republican President, we won't need two-thirds.

Again I ask you to cast your thoughts back to those chaotic days of 1945 and 1946. Labor-management disputes raged all over the country. The year 1946 was the blackest year for work stoppages and loss of production in the entire history of our country. Not once but many times widespread strikes paralyzed large segments of industry.

The people demanding action, we passed the fair and just Taft-Hartley Act.

It is not, and never was, intended to be a punitive law.

Workers now know from experience under its terms that it is a good law and their bill of rights. They know it completely protects their rights—the right to organize, the right of full control over their unions, fair and honorable collective bargaining, and the right to strike. Under it contracts are being made, and, what should be of interest to workingmen everywhere, those contracts are good ones.

The country knows it is a good law because it makes the public interest paramount.

President Truman vetoed the bill. The House of Representatives overrode the President's veto, 331 to 83, only one vote short of 4 to 1. The Senate vote was 68 to 25, or six more than a two-thirds of the 93 Senators who voted. More Democrats in the Congress voted for the bill than against it.

Fellow Americans, I have given you some of the reasons why the people have determined there will be no fifth term for the New Deal. America is going forward!

And now, Chairman Reece, will you take over?

Chairman REECE. Thank you, Mr. HALLECK. Now we go from the House to the Senate. Next is Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate. Senator TAFT, suppose you give us a few facts about why we have high prices and what has been done and what could be done to keep them from going higher if the Administration was really interested in that idea.

Senator TAFT. I shall be glad to do that, Mr. Chairman.

The people today are restless and uneasy. In spite of full employment and high wages, they have no sense of safety or security. Abroad, the policies of Yalta have brought us to a condition where no one is confident of peace. At home prices are so high as to shock every housewife and impose hardship on millions of families of the white collar and fixed income groups, the aged and the pensioners. Everyone feels the present artificial conditions will end in a depression if it is not promptly corrected.

Why are prices rising? The New Dealers have been in power for the last 15 years. They have always tried to bring on inflation. They devaluated the dollar. They encouraged Government spending and huge deficits, both before and during the war. They tripled bank deposits and quadrupled the cash money in circulation.

They adopted the extraordinary theory that you could increase the whole wage level by 20 percent without increasing prices, a theory disproved almost before the new wage pattern for factory workers became effective.

They have been promising the farmer higher prices, the consumer lower prices and the workmen higher wages all at the same time. They don't know anything but inflation. How can they be expected to stop it?

Prices go up when there is more money to buy things than there are things to buy. We are producing more today than ever before, but the Government has created still more paper dollars. In spite of these policies, prices were almost stable when Congress was in session in 1947. But more New Deal policies have started them up again.

First, the Government itself is spending four times what it spent before the war and the Government doesn't produce any goods on the selling side.

Second, we have supplied foreign nations with dollars in huge sums to come here and buy our goods. Our exports of goods and services in 1947 amounted to $18,000,000,000, against only $8,000,000,000 of imports. Ten billion dollars came in here to compete with our citizens for goods and services produced here, without adding one bushel of wheat to our production. And most of these dollars were supplied by our taxpayers on credit or as a gift. Of course, the price of wheat rose on the open market to $3. Wheat went up even faster because of reckless Government buying methods. Of course, the members of the Government who bought wheat futures knew the price was going up.

Third, the administration let bank loans increase in a year by $5,000,000,000, creating that many more dollars. It failed to use the powers it has always had to restrict bank credit.

Now the administration demands a return to OPA, to WPB, to the War Labor Board. The President hysterically demands unlimited power to ration the housewife, fix prices, fix wages, and direct every detail of business—the very powers which he denounced 2 weeks earlier as police-state methods. He tries to blame the Republicans because controls were removed. Why, he removed controls himself, 8 months before his price-control powers expired.

In any event, police-state methods won't work in the United States in peacetime as we saw under OPA. They can't be enforced. Black markets spring up overnight. If controls could be enforced, they would stifle production as they have in Europe and did here. And more production is the ultimate solution. Freedom and free competition have made America the greatest producer in the world, and have made it possible for us to help Europe.

Let the administration get at the causes. Increase production and, in the meantime, cut down the demand by less spending for a while.

The New Deal method has always been to set up a bureau, issue orders and regulations, and call out the police to enforce them. They do not know any other method. Let the President try some American methods to cure high prices. Let the Government stop spending itself, and then it can get the cooperation of the people to save more and spend less. Let him tell his bureaus to stop spending $40,000,000,000 a year. Last year he fought every Republican effort to save. Let him cut down on exports, he has had the power right along and has refused to use it.

As long as we have lavish Marshall plans, we will have Marshall-plan prices.

Let the administration make it clear that banks must curtail lending. Most bankers will tell you prices can be turned down over night if the orthodox methods are used which the administration has had full power to use. The power is so great it has to be carefully handled not to bring prices down too rapidly.

The Republican Congress has consistently given the President all the powers needed to stop inflation by American methods. We have given him everything except the OPA and wage fixing and allocation, police state methods. All the important powers he has had ever since the war. But he has not used them. So, even if you get more paper dollars in your pay envelope, the administration policies have reduced the value of your dollars.

Is the President afraid to use American methods? Or is it possible he doesn't really want lower prices? Whenever any food price starts going down, or even threatens to go down, as in the case of sugar, some Government department steps in and starts buying to keep up the price. Does the President think that Democratic chances are better if he keeps the boom going, even at the cost of a serious depression and hardship to millions of consumers?

And now, Chairman Reece, will you take over?

Chairman REECE. Yes, Senator TAFT. And now back to the House again. Next on the panel is the Speaker of the House, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts.

The Republican Party keeps its promises. During the last campaign it made promises to reduce Government expenditures and wartime taxes. To tell you how the party lived up to those promises, I now call upon the Speaker.

Speaker MARTIN. All right, Mr. Chairman, I'll talk about Federal Government expenditures and taxes.

"Spendthrift" is a term that applies definitely to New Deal Democrat administrations, past and present. Spend and spend and tax and tax has been their guiding philosophy in utter disregard of the road they were traveling—the road to ruin, bankruptcy, and the police state.

For any whim of these New Dealers, any experiment in collectivism they could think of, they spent and spent and they taxed and taxed.

They tell us that if the Government takes the people's money and spends it the result is not inflationary, but if the people use their money as they decide the result is inflationary. That is nonsense.

The American people know that the cost of government has gone up all out of reason. They want those costs cut and we shall do so. The Republican Congress during its first session made a start in eliminating unnecessary expenditures and in relieving the Federal pay roll of persons not needed.

We lopped off several billion dollars from President Truman's padded budget. The number of persons on the Federal pay roll has been reduced by approximately 1,000,000 persons since the beginning of the Republican drive for the elimination of useless bureaucrats.

These accomplishments for the most part were made despite vigorous opposition of President Truman and his followers on Capitol Hill. The administration fought economy every step of the way, and they turned loose their propaganda machine to misrepresent the facts. All across the country one could hear the wails of busybody bureaucrats, when they were deprived of some of their sugarplums.

The American people are deeply concerned over the high cost of government.

Federal, State, and local governments now cost about $50,000,000,000 a year. That is one-fourth of our entire national income of roughly $200,000,000,000. Think of it. The Nation's food bill was less than $40,000,000,000 in 1946. It costs our people more to be governed or misgoverned than their food costs them. It is estimated that the cost of food has increased about 92 percent since 1939, while the cost of the Federal Government has gone up 331 percent, and we are in our third year after the war.

Yes, we are going right ahead with our reduction of unnecessary governmental expenditures during the session of the Congress beginning tomorrow. Of course, we will not be able to finish the job on it as well as on other matters until the people next November elect a Republican President who will cooperate with a Republican Congress.

Now on taxes: We shall pass a tax-reduction bill during the forthcoming session. I am hopeful we can pass it in the House this month. Continuation of wartime taxes in peacetime is intolerable and indefensible.

The American people know that the Republican Party is the party of economy in Government expenditures and in tax reduction. Twice during the first session of the Eightieth Congress we passed tax-reducing bills only to meet indefensible vetoes by the President. I say indefensible, because the Constitution definitely lodges in the Congress the power to say what the tax policy shall be.

Our Federal Treasury today would be operating in the red if the Republican Congress had approved all of the spend-and-spend proposals of the Truman administration.

Largely due to the freedom of competitive enterprise that the advent of a Republican Congress generated throughout the land—and the constructive record of this Congress—Federal revenue now exceeds outgo for the first time in 17 years.

We got the Government out of the red, and we are getting the Reds out of the Government.

We shall continue to see that adequate funds are provided for effective national defense and for the needs of our war veterans.

We shall do whatever is necessary to maintain the upsurge in home building that began when the Congress took charge of the housing shortage from ignorant New Deal planners.

We appropriated the largest amount in history for flood control. The Republican Party originated the vast reclamation program that today is meeting the needs of our Western States, and the present Republican Congress is expanding and developing that program in a sensible businesslike way.

All of these expenditures are necessary. They will be made and with continuation of the economy record of the present Congress there will be ample margin of Treasury surplus to give the people the tax relief which they demand and which they are entitled to have.

Lower taxes mean more take-home pay. Lower taxes mean more money to invest in business enterprises for production of goods and to provide jobs.

Lower taxes will help cut the cost of living. Taxes enter into the cost of everything we buy, from an automobile to a haircut. Every time you housewives go to the store and spend $10, $2.50 of it goes for taxes.

Lower taxes mean more money to save and for our aged citizens, lower taxes might mean they can obtain the necessities of life. We must cut the cost of government and cut taxes to help keep America strong.

The American people want to do all they can to help friendly foreign countries recover from the war and to stop communism, but our people want the Congress to be prudent about it and not bankrupt America. Only a strong America can be an inspiration and bulwark for the republican form of government. Now, Mr. Chairman, will you carry the ball from here?

Chairman REECE. Thank you, Speaker MARTIN.

Much of the legislation which will be needed to end the chaos bequeathed to this Nation by the dying New Deal will be considered by the powerful Senate Committee on Finance. Its chairman, who is here tonight, is Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado, and he is also chairman of the Senate Republican conference, which includes all majority Members of the Senate. Senator, we would like to have your views on the Marshall plan.

Senator MILLIKIN. All right, Mr. Reece.

In 1944 the voters were assured and a majority of them believed that another 4 years of New Deal executive leadership was necessary if we were to win the kind of peace that would justify the appalling human and material costs of the war then in progress.

And so we were promised and a majority of the voters, including our voting servicemen believed, that there would be no territorial aggrandizement by the victorious powers; that liberated governments were to be rooted in the approval of their citizens as determined by secret and uncoerced ballots in free and unrigged elections; that the human race was to walk upright and unafraid in the sun of freedom.

Later on, these and other inspiring principles were formally expressed and pledged by us in the Atlantic Charter and in the Charter of the United Nations Organization.

What happened? At Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, the leaders of the executive department of our Government turned their backs on their pledged adherence to the peacemaking principles which I have mentioned and which had comforted and inspired our wartime sscrifices, and joined in deals for their violation. Many of these deals were secret and there is no sound assurance that we have heard the last of them.

It seems that the opposition leaders were operating under a variation of the childhood theory that you can catch a bird by putting salt on its tail. They apparently thought you can tame a bear by feeding him all of the honey he can eat. But there isn't that much honey.

Those deals which were made without the approval of the Congress and without the cooperation and with the abhorrence of the Republican Party, brought down the "iron curtain" with the tragic consequences which confront us today.

It will serve us well to remember these things for it will not be long until we are again told that only the present occupant of the White House has the infallible master touch to insure the victory and keep us out of further war.

Well, what is the Republican position?

We do not say to our opponents—you have made the mess, go and clean it up. Not at all.

Our country has to be protected from the perils which surround it and peace with honor has yet to be salvaged. These facts set our duty.

We have cooperated patriotically on a bipartisan basis and shall continue to cooperate on that basis with every sound measure proposed by the opposition to further those purposes.

I respectfully affirm that the Republican leadership of Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG inspired the reversal of the appeasement policies of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

The Republican Party wants our foreign policy to move in partisan unity throughout the world.

The sincerity of our purpose has been attested by the conduct of Republicans who represent this Nation in the United Nations Organization. It is attested by the most effective support and leadership which Republicans have given to all our accomplishments in furthering peace and friendly relations throughout the Western Hemisphere.

This should evidence that we shall not allow our disillusionments and frustrations either to move us into isolationism or into measureless, and self-destructive world-wide commitments. We are not insensitive to the troubles of other nations, but this does not require that we shall rush to diaper every squalling problem all over the face of the earth, or shoulder burdens which belong rightfully to others and which they are able to bear.

We shall follow policies of sanity and common sense and these, by their nature, exclude adherence to morbid extremes.

We shall confront the dangers of the hour with courage and self-respect.

We accept the rightful responsibilities of a great Nation. We are not unmindful of the fact that the performance of these responsibilities must necessarily be limited to our means.

We recognize that our broader best interests are served by an economically sound, free, and peaceful world.

It is my personal opinion that this session of Congress will pass foreign-aid legislation.

I believe it is realized that the operation of a foreign-aid program will add to our shortages at home and that this will keep us from buying many things we would like to have, and will exert pressures against the lowering of high prices.

Nevertheless, out of a spirit of helpfulness, unparalleled in world history, I believe that a majority of our people want the Congress to enact foreign-aid legislation.

A decent regard for what is in the hearts of the American people requires that the aid shall not imperil our own economy and shall be of a nature that will help our friends abroad to help themselves.

Decent regard for these duties of high trust will require, among other things, that the Congress shall come up with a plan stripped clean of hysteria, waste, extravagance, overswollen aims, and scatteration. A plan sharply focused on the accomplishment of vital objectives, a plan limited in time so as to assure performance of whatever our promise may be, a plan that will avoid raising false and extravagant hopes, a plan so constructed that the performance can be watched and our aid be abandoned if the intended purposes are not accomplished.

Now, Chairman Reece, will you take over at this point?

Chairman REECE. Thank you, Senator MILLIKIN. May I say in closing that I am confident the United States is on the road to recovery. We cannot hope for a complete cure overnight.

This Nation has been on the greatest spending spree in history—one which has lasted more than 15 years. The inevitable headache must be endured. But the cure for the headache is not more of the stimulant which produced it.

A year ago the people called in a new physician and under the ministrations of the new doctor substantial progress has been made toward recovery. The American people are not going to adopt a policy of reaction which would take them back to the conditions so vividly described earlier on this program.

The American people are going forward—forward with the Republican Party, the party of progress and liberalism. The Nation's only hope—and it may turn out to be the only hope of the world as well—is the Republican Party, which stands unequivocally for the American governmental and economic system.

The Republican Party had a noble origin. It came into being to prevent slavery and to

promote freedom for the individual. The onslaught on individual liberty by the alien-minded radicals—the Typhoid Marys of communism—who have insinuated themselves into positions of influence in and out of the Government, signifies the importance of maintaining freedom in America at this time.

The Republican Party from its beginning, has been consistent in principle, loyal to its beliefs and faithful to its commitments. Its long record is an assurance of its sincerity and fidelity. The character of the Republican Party gives assurances of good government.

ANNOUNCER. Tomorrow the second session of the Eightieth Congress will convene on Capitol Hill. This evening you have heard a discussion by Republican leaders of what legislative developments may be expected in the months ahead. Heard on the program were Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee, Senators Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, and Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado, Speaker of the House Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, and House Majority Leader Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana. The preceding half hour was made available by the Mutual network to the Republican Party in the public interest. The program originated in our Washington studios. This is the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Federal Grants-in-Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we will soon begin consideration of the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1949. We will be looking for ways and means to reduce this budget to an absolute minimum.

One place where great savings can be made is in the field of grants-in-aid. In this connection, I call attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Green Bay Press-Gazette on December 19, 1947:

WANT $2,000,000?

Three years ago the United States Congress increased Federal aid appropriations for highways. One section of the Federal aid law set up the first specific Federal subsidy program for urban streets which are part of the Federal highway system.

Municipal representatives from all over the country, including Wisconsin, represented such a program as seriously needed. Congressmen listened, and gave them the money. The Wisconsin apportionment amounted to more than $8,000,000 divided through 3 years.

But today, with the delayed expiration date nearing for the expenditure of the first year's apportionment, the State highway commission is worried about what to do with the money that has been credited to this State.

Only about $700,000 of nearly $3,000,000 has thus far been claimed by Wisconsin cities, some 50 of which are eligible for the subsidies, our Madison bureau informs us in an interesting dispatch. The cities are apparently indifferent about the disposition of the remainder of the money. Most of them have filed no plans, made no claims.

Here may be a prime example of the confusing lengths to which the grants-in-aids system has been carried by the national Government in recent years.

The Congress has taxed the American people to supply millions of dollars of highway funds which local authorities, by their inertia and indifference, have indicated will not be used. In spite of repeated admonitions from the State highway commission—which evidently is a little embarrassed by this turn of affairs—the money is going begging.

There are other Federal aid programs with which the State and local governments of Wisconsin can easily dispense. We are not so poverty-stricken that we cannot raise the funds needed for the public services which we actually can use and want. The ignored Federal aids may awaken the people to the wild lengths to which our free-spending Washington Government has gone in recent years to willfully dissipate the resources of the people.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Foote, from the Bay City (Mich.) Times:

CIVIL RIGHTS
(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—The President's committee on civil rights has made an exhaustive report, eloquent and at times persuasive. It would set up a Federal bureaucracy to enforce a greatly expanded list of civil rights, including a Federal antilynching law, antipoll-tax law, and fair-employment law.

It goes far beyond President Truman's Executive order which proposes a study of better ways and means of "preserving of civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution." It also recommends passage of State laws.

There is much to commend in the report. It enunciates a lofty principle of human conduct, a great ideal of morality if not of law. Some of the results of segregation on account of race, color, creed are a shock to the conscience of all good citizens.

It errs in placing more reliance on compulsion by law than the character, vision, and high principle of the people. It errs also in seeking to extend Federal authority into the jurisdiction of the States.

The Constitution-makers were setting up a limited form of political government. They confined themselves to guaranteeing security of person, citizenship, and freedom of expression. They knew that a government which deals with social questions inevitably gets into the realm of sumptuary legislation.

And as the Constitution-makers realized, 140 years before the prohibition amendment, sumptuary legislation does not work in a free society. No legislation works in a free society unless it has the backing of a large majority of the people.

The report lacks balance because it fails to take into account the great progress made in the past. Only six States now have poll-tax laws. The Negro race in this country has only been out of involuntary servitude since 1863. In the period since it has made more progress than any race in the history of civilization.

Some of the promise for the future is contained in the past. Progress in wiping out injustice and inequality is always slow, but it usually goes along with the burial of old antagonisms. The danger of compulsion by law is not only its ineffectiveness, but in the creation of new antagonisms. The committee puts little emphasis on education and evolution as a solvent.

The committee turned the spotlight on the National Capital as the plague spot of discrimination. It holds that Washington should set the example for the country. In this it ignores the practicalities of the situation—a Congress in which southern Democrats bitterly opposed to breaking down segregation—hold a veto through use of the filibuster in the Senate.

The report stated: "The Capital Transit Co. (Washington street railway system) advertised for workers hundreds of miles away and even recruited Government employees on a part-time basis. In spite of this, the company would not employ Negroes as operators."

This is in error. The company was always willing to employ Negroes. But the union of company employees vetoed it. The company knew if it hired even one Negro operator, the National Capital would have a transit strike on its hands in wartime.

Herewith is presented a viewpoint opposed to that of the President's committee of Donald Richberg, who switched from labor lawyer to bitter critic of monopoly and coercive features of labor law as developed by the New Deal. Richberg filed a brief with the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare opposing a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. He said:

"The essential liberty to choose one's associates because of personal liking and confidence, or individual judgment, whether rational or irrational in the opinion of others, is one of the most essential freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. Denial of that freedom is not admirable but detestable.

"All unreasonable prejudice may be assumed to be evil. But bad thinking cannot be legislated out of the human mind. And how can a Government official be endowed with the celestial wisdom necessary to determine whether that which is called prejudice and intolerance is really evil, or is righteous dislike or hatred?"

Is it wrong or right for a deeply religious person to prefer not to associate with those who would like to destroy his religion? Is it wrong or right for a free individualist to object to enforced association with a fanatic Communist, who works to enslave him?

Richberg says if the FEPC law were passed, the management of a religious publication (for profit) would be forbidden to discriminate against atheists or hostile religionists, who might be qualified but certainly not cooperative employees.

If an employer is to be regarded as a mere instrument of state policy who can be required to employ anyone whom a Government bureaucrat finds to be qualified for a particular job, why should not all employment be made through a Government agency?

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on December 27, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, in response to a number of telegrams received from home, informing me of a critical fuel oil shortage in the Triple Cities, I immediately appealed to the authorities in Washington.

The Department of the Interior, which is handling this problem, is not very optimistic over our northeastern supply of fuel oil for the balance of the winter. The director told me that we can expect at least a 20-percent shortage in view of increased demands for this vital utility.

Personally, I feel both Government and industry should take care of fuel-oil users who have homes and families to keep warm before they allocate their supplies to any other applicants.

As you know, Congress passed the anti-inflation bill just before we recessed, along with a moral persuasion proviso. This calls upon industry to cooperate with Government to make voluntary agreements concerning prices and allocations of materials.

I am advised that fuel oil will figure importantly in this whole allocation picture. To my mind the powers that be had better think clearly and precisely through the dilemma in order to keep the people who need fuel oil well supplied.

There will be meetings held soon here in Washington, consisting of men from all petroleum concerns to work out with the Interior Department details of this new legislation which is now on the books.

Compulsory methods in connection with the program of distributing our material resources will not work out. You cannot make some individuals do entirely as they should, even for the public welfare.

Programs like this ought to be voluntary. The will to cooperate must be there, else there will be no cooperation. But to make it a success everybody must cooperate.

The solution then is to convince these people that their chance to save our form of government is now. If they get their heads together and carry out a plan whereby all the United States can be supplied sufficiently with the necessary things for living, all will be well.

If they fail to rise to the occasion, then our citizens will begin to go without. The agitators will come out of their holes and begin to stir up resentment against a society which is rich and powerful, yet cannot supply the needs of the people.

Where there is want, where there is suffering, as there will be if petroleum and other fuel are short, there will be grumbling and dissatisfaction. Those in business certainly will realize this and do everything in their power to see even the reduced supplies of fuel oil distributed fairly around the country. No family must be cold this winter.

Some challenged me when I said compulsory measures will not work. They say industry will never be patriotic enough to volunteer.

I maintain the whole business is past the stage of compulsion. It is either volunteer or lose our form of government. There can be no room for selfishness if we are to save America.

Behind the iron curtain compulsory methods have snuffed out all distribution of fuel of any kind. The majority huddle together in their below-zero dwellings and pray for liberation. Brute forces keep them from getting a look at any fuel, to say nothing of burning it in their homes.

It is the same story over there with food, clothing, and other commodities the people must have.

So I say it has reached a point beyond the stage of compelling private enterprise to do anything. They are aware of the seriousness of our plight. They know only too well that if our people become desperate as the result of want and privation, anything can happen.

As I have said so many times, the best way to lick communism is to make the American system work.

It cannot work if profiteers are tossing monkey wrenches into production. It cannot work if exploiters are jockeying prices far above the reach of the average buyer. It cannot work if those who control the high finances of this Nation throw overboard the legal ballasts that hold down our economic balloon and send it skyrocketing into the stratosphere of inflation.

Saving our American system will take more than idle wishing for the moon. Our leaders will have to see that the standard of living, not the cost of living, goes up. They will have to bring about a state of permanent, full employment. They will have to guarantee a greater production of life's necessities than ever before.

Such conditions will do more to keep foreign "isms" away from our shores than all the armies, all the airplanes, all the atomic bombs we can bring to bear against the enemy.

So you see the fuel-oil shortage is an important part of the whole problem. The remedy of this important part is the same right down the line. Let industry and Government realize that equitable distribution of what is available must be the paramount goal. Their patriotism and willingness to preserve America will be the cornerstone upon which the moral persuasion question, the voluntary compliance with regulations made for the good of us all, will be laid.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harvey S. Firestone, president of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.:

THE AMERICAN WAY

As we enter into the new year of 1948, one fact becomes crystal clear. Divine providence certainly smiled kindly on us when we became Americans. Mathematically, our chances of being born in the United States were only 1 in 16. And all of us know that today, except in a few rare cases, the plight of the other fifteen-sixteenths is downright tragic.

Hunger, poverty, and desperation stalk the earth. From all points of the compass, pleading eyes are turned to the United States in prayerful hope that out of our compassion and our generosity will come relief for those in dire need.

Certainly we cannot ignore these appeals to our humanitarian instincts. Therefore, through the principles of the Marshall plan, we are considering ways to make up the deficit between what these people can produce themselves and their actual needs for the next few years. There can be no doubt that we have a definite responsibility to do everything within our power to help alleviate starvation wherever it occurs. But there are those among us who feel that some of the nations that are asking for help will come back again and again for more and more unless we insist that they rebuild on the sound foundation that to produce is to progress. Our contribution to world recovery should be essentially in the form of equipment and know-how and not in dollars and cents alone.

Some of the countries now asking for help were great powers long before the United States became an independent nation, yet in the relatively short span of 171 years we have overcome their head start of centuries and have become the most prosperous, the most powerful, and the most successful nation on earth.

How did this happen? How was it possible for a poor, struggling former colony, made up of people of many nationalities, of many races, and of many creeds, to surpass in so short a time the long-established power and prestige of older nations?

OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

The answer is fourfold: First, Mother Nature endowed us with tremendous resources; second, we had no powerful neighbors to threaten our security; third, we adopted at the start and developed down through the years a better system of government; and, fourth, we created an economic system which brought to us a better way of life.

We established a republican form of government, and we laid down the rules for its operation in a living document called the Constitution. We laid the cornerstone of a new economic system, based upon competitive free enterprise. The rules for its operation were recorded in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, which we call the Bill of Rights. In effect, we made it possible for every person to go as far as his will and his skill permit, provided that he does not deprive his fellow men of this same right.

Yes; this is the land of opportunity, where such qualities of character as diligence, foresight, and ability are much more vital to success than noble birth, tradition, and force. Over here America has sought to better the lot of all her people by fostering individual initiative through a system designed to produce a higher standard of living.

And so, it is no wonder that despairing people in other lands cast longing eyes at us and wish with all their hearts that they, too, had the material possessions, the political liberties, and the sociological advantages which we Americans enjoy. But, apparently, it does not occur to some of them that the blueprints and formulas for their own salvation and prosperity are all clearly recorded in the pages of American history. Instead of adopting eagerly a system which has been proved successful, some of them waste their time and our money in futile experiments with doctrines which have failed miserably in the past and which, at best, promise only in the far-distant future a standard of living which we Americans already enjoy.

DOCTRINES OF DESPAIR

Today, Americans look at conditions in many other countries, where starvation, poverty, and tyranny rule supreme, and they see nothing to be gained and much to be lost by changing to any other social doctrine. There are countries which call themselves democracies where a citizen may not own land or select his own job. He may not be tried by a jury of his peers. He may not stay away from work without good and sufficient reasons. He may not employ anyone to work for him. He does not have freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, or freedom of religion and his press and radio are censored by his government.

The weekly wage of this same man will purchase 11 pounds of meat or 40 quarts of milk. An American worker, with his weekly income can buy 94 pounds of meat or 263 quarts of milk. Over there, it takes 104 hours of work to buy a pair of shoes. Over here, it takes only 7 hours. Over there, it takes 250 hours of work to buy a wool dress. Over here, it takes only 13 hours. Over here, one miner produces as much coal as four miners over there. With about the same

number of acres under cultivation, the average American farmer turns out four and a half times as much as a farmer over there. Certainly these contrasts speak for themselves.

The complaints against the American system of competitive free enterprise frequently come from those who want to gain fame and fortune by sponsoring some new cause. They come from failures who do not have what it takes to succeed under our system and therefore want to change the system. They come from paid propagandists whose employers resent the fact that we have a successful system and want to wreck it so they can say "I told you so." And they come from visionaries who either ignore or hope to change the laws of human nature.

I do not mean to imply that we should be completely satisfied with things as they are. I sincerely hope that we never shall stop seeking improvements, for progress ends where smug satisfaction begins. None of us should delude himself that our way of life is perfect. But, fortunately, only a few starry-eyed fanatics and professional rabble-rousers want to destroy the edifice we have built and start all over again. Instead, most of us wisely advocate refinement, renovation, and repair of the present structure.

WHO PROFITS FROM AMERICAN BUSINESS?

Many of the objections to our present system are based on fallacies. Let us examine a few of them. For half a century, soap-box orators, wily subversives, and well-meaning but misled reformers have spread the completely erroneous idea that workers get the smallest share of the income which manufacturing produces and that the owners receive fabulous amounts. Actually, out of every dollar of sales made by a manufacturer, 47 cents go for materials and supplies, of which 35 to 45 cents go to the workers who produce those materials. Nine cents go for taxes of which 4 cents are paid to Government employees. Six cents go for depreciation, maintenance, repairs, and interest; 2 cents for advertising, and 1 cent for research. That leaves 35 cents from the sales dollar of which the employees get 29 cents. The remaining 6 cents are profit of which 3 cents are set aside for tomorrow's jobs by reserves to buy new machines and to expand plants. The remaining 3 cents are paid to stockholders, who are the owners of the machines, the tools, and the factory buildings.

All told, approximately 85 cents out of every dollar of sales by manufacturers go for salaries and wages.

Stymied in that argument, the critics then turn their guns on the 3 cents that go to the owners. They give the impression that American business is owned by a mere handful of individuals. Here again they must face the facts. Actually, some 14,000,000 people own shares in American industry: Workmen, teachers, grocers, bus drivers, and many others who have saved and invested their money. These securities are much like promissory notes; receipts, if you will, for the money which the firms borrowed from these individuals and on which they attempt to pay interest in the form of dividends.

In addition to these direct owners of American business, there are 54,000,000 who have life-insurance policies and 50,000,000 who have savings accounts. All of these people are vitally interested in the successful operations and profits of American business, because the insurance companies and banks in which they have deposited their money have, in turn, reinvested most of these funds in the securities of American business.

Thus, it is apparent that the vast majority of our population receive direct or indirect benefits from American business.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

The young men and women of today have before them opportunities greater than have existed since the beginning of time. Strangely enough, the word "opportunity" has no equivalent in some languages. To people who live under totalitarianism, however, this omission is not serious. They have little need for such a word. But it is a priceless word in the vocabutary of an American, and it will become increasingly meaningful as time goes on.

Looking back along the road that Americans have traveled in the past, it may seem that so much has been accomplished that there may be a shortage of opportunities in the future. But when we glance along the road ahead, we realize that there are many more opportunities before us than there were in the years gone by.

Think of the many new inventions and discoveries of the last few years on which whole new industries are being built. Radar, atomic energy, electronics, synthetic chemistry, antibiotics, plastics, and hundreds of other new and revolutionary developments are still in their infancy. The United Nations and the problems which that organization faces may well create wholly new and different fields of endeavor in finance, in sociology, and in law.

A century ago, thousands of families left their homes east of the Alleghenies and braved the unknown wilderness in search of fortune. They knew before they started that thirst, hunger, exposure, and savage enemies were obstacles which they would have to overcome before they could span the continent and reach their goals. Did these hardships stop them? Not for a minute. They knew that anything worth while can be gained only by taking risks, by hard work, and by determination. Most Americans still believe in that creed. America is not getting soft. Like the hardy pioneers who defied the hazards of the trail, Americans know that you have to give in order to get.

Under our system of competitive free enterprise, to all who are willing to work, to think, and to dare, the American way brings rich rewards.

HARVEY S. FIRESTONE, Jr.,
President, the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.

Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas Hardie, from the Washington Post of December 21, 1947:

WAR WAS A DAMPER—ONCE ARDENT CRUSADE AGAINST CHAIR SHOWS NO SIGNS OF REVIVAL

(By Thomas Hardie)

The once stormy issue of capital punishment is dying a natural death in America.

As late as 1780 the common law recognized more than 200 capital crimes. A man could be executed for felling a tree, robbing a rabbit warren, stealing a half dollar, or association with gypsies.

Public sentiment gradually whittled this list down until today capital punishment is invoked only for murder, rape, and treason in most States, and, although legal in 42 States, it is mandatory for a first-degree murder conviction in only 5.

However, while there were many fiery movements arguing for complete abolition of the death penalty before the war, there is nothing but ghostly silence today.

The American League to Abolish Capital Punishment, Inc., for example, seems moribund. Only a few gasps have been heard in several years, and these were localized in California.

A lone voice in the House, that of WALTER B. HUBER (Democrat, Ohio), has spoken out since the war for abolition of the death penalty. In August 1946 he proposed a resolution to amend the Constitution, and he said last week he intends to make a similar move next session. But he was pessimistic as to its success.

PEACETIME SUSPENSION

Other countries have been more active in this field. On May 26 the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. abolished the death penalty in peacetime and decreed that crimes formerly punishable by death would bring "confinement in corrective labor camps for 25 years."

This move was prompted, the Presidium said, "by the exceptional devotion of the entire population" and because "peace can be considered as secured for a long time."

England has witnessed a growing postwar sentiment against capital punishment. London's Law Journal attributes it to a "natural revulsion" after 6 years of killing.

British Socialists in Parliament have revived a 20-year-old proposal by humanitarians to suspend the death penalty for a 5-year trial period. Many think it has a good chance of adoption.

Even George Bernard Shaw, who advocates "state-contrived euthanasia for all idiots and intolerable nuisances," has excoriated the present British method of execution by hanging.

TREND REVERSED

Although there was a latter nineteenth century trend in the United States to abolish capital punishment, Washington State restored it in 1919 and Oregon a year later. In 1931 there was a restoration movement even in Michigan, the State which had been the first to abolish it.

At present, only in Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin is life imprisonment the maximum penalty.

The few surviving abolitionists are consoled by modern and supposedly more humane methods of execution, such as electrocution and lethal gas. The District of Columbia uses the electric chair but there has been some agitation for substitution of the gas chamber.

The late Lewis E. Lawes, warden of Sing Sing and crusader for abolition, argued that to a great extent the old eye for an eye doctrine was a product of the sadism inherent in almost everyone. That is why, he said, that as many as 50,000 spectators have attended public hangings in this country.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt opposed capital punishment in principle but believed the question was one for criminal experts to decide.

HEMISPHERE PROPOSAL

Before the war, there was a short-lived movement among the Americas to abolish the penalty. A meeting of Latin-American criminologists at Santiago, Chile, in 1941, urged the step for the entire western hemisphere. But the war finished that.

The declaration of human rights recently presented by Mrs. Roosevelt to the United Nations Human Rights Commission at Geneva, does not mention capital punishment. Drawn up by a committee of State, Labor, Justice, and Interior Department officials, it is intended for adoption by the General Assembly next September. It is described as a statement of the aspiration of the peoples of the world.

As to its silence on the abolition of capital punishment, a high-ranking official explained last week: "The world is not ready for it yet."

Italy Faces 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sumner Welles from the Washington Post of January 6, 1948:

ITALY FACES 1948

(By Sumner Welles)

COMMUNIST THREAT IN BACKGROUND

Internal developments in Italy justify continued optimism.

A republican constitution has finally been adopted. The government has been greatly strengthened by the inclusion of the right-wing Socialists and the Republicans. The democratic coalition which Prime Minister de Gasperi now heads has an absolute majority in the National Assembly. The cabinet is politically far stronger than the Schuman cabinet in France, since it need not depend for support upon the extreme right. It has public opinion behind it. There is no doubt that the democratic parties could secure an overwhelming victory in fair national elections.

It was because of the government's popular strength that the revolutionary strikes called by the Communist Party failed so abjectly. The government acted with vigor and dispatch. The police and the army, which had not previously been tested, obeyed enthusiastically their instructions to maintain order. And most of the Italian workers, members though they are of Communist-dominated trade unions, were so desperately tired of Communist agitation and so anxious to work, that they refused to strike.

The chief cause for public confidence is that the de Gasperi cabinet is getting things done. Minister Einaudi's financial and economic program is succeeding. Inflation is being controlled. The prices of basic necessities have actually gone down. The devaluation of the lira has stimulated Italy's export trade. Employment is slowly increasing.

Italy is receiving about 75,000 tons of coal a month from the United States, 200,000 from the Ruhr and some 60,000 from Poland. Industry can consequently operate at a satisfactory level. American stopgap relief will prevent acute distress until the end of March. If Italy can obtain the 400,000 tons of wheat from Argentina due under the recent credit, there need be no food crisis before next June.

Yet with all of this encouraging progress the situation of Italy is becoming increasingly precarious.

The creation of a Moscow-dominated Balkan federation is under way. The establishment of the Communist Greek guerilla government is the long-expected sign that the Soviet Union will stop at nothing short of actual hostilities in order to dominate the Mediterranean. If Greece is brought under Russian control Italy would inevitably become the next scene in the struggle.

There have as yet been only minor clashes along the new frontier between Italy and Yugoslavia. But Yugoslav provocation in the Adriatic have now commenced. The Yugoslavs lately seized 25 Italian fishing boats within sight of the Italian coast on the pretext that they had invaded Yugoslav waters. Feeling is beginning to run high. The unsettled status of Trieste invites a major incident.

The next crisis will probably come during the Italian national elections. The tactics of the Communists are already foreshadowed. The Communist Party, which, notwithstanding Togliatti's self-incriminating denials, is largely financed from Soviet-controlled sources outside Italy, and which has by far the largest campaign chest of any Italian party, will use its funds lavishly to cut down the showing of the democratic parties.

On election day the Communists will provoke local riots in order to prevent their opponents, and particularly the Italian women, from going to the polls. If the Communist leaders see that there is a democratic sweep which neither corruption, fraud, nor subversive activities can arrest, they will immediately claim that communism has been cheated. That will be the moment for revolution, provided Moscow believes the time to be then ripe for violence.

Yet the tide against communism is today so strong that, unless the Soviet Government is prepared to support an armed rebellion by force, a coup d'état would undoubtedly fail. Even were the Communist leaders to follow the example now set on Greece's borders, and establish a rebel government in some frontier city like Gorizia, such a government could not maintain itself save with Russian or Yugoslav military assistance.

The Italian people, in their great majority, will resist any attempt to impose a Communist dictatorship upon them.

Because of the help given them by the United States, the Italians are able to stage a magnificent comeback. If they were freed from the growing threat of Soviet intervention they could recover more rapidly than any other major nation of western Europe.

Winston Churchill has rendered democracy no greater service than his salutary warning last year that the Soviet ruler: respect only force. In a world in which force is rampant, Soviet power can only be restrained by the Kremlin's knowledge that there exists a superior power, prepared and able to restrain it.

Where so many of our own political leaders are making their fundamental mistake is in their comforting, but wholly unrealistic assumption that loans and relief alone can keep Europe free.

It is true that the only hope for European economic reconstruction lies in that form of cooperative undertaking which the European recovery program can bring into being. But of what value to the American people would such a start toward recovery prove to be if the Soviet Union is able, like Hitler, to crush democracy in one western European country after the other?

If Europe is to be saved, the European recovery program is indispensable. But what is equally urgent is that the Congress of the United States—whose voice is the only American voice that the Kremlin will heed in this Presidential election year—declare that American force will, if necessary, be made available to enforce the provisions of the United Nations Charter, and to guarantee the independence of those European democracies like Italy, whose freedom has today become essential to American security.

Citizens and Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a healthy sign for the Nation when our editors begin to appreciate that there are such things as "intelligent and public-spirited politicians."

I know that I have never been associated with a finer lot of gentlemen than it has been my pleasure to encounter on both sides of the aisle in this House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, and so it was distressing indeed to see that the recent Gallup poll indicated so few Americans are desirous of having their sons follow political careers.

I think that editorials such as the one which follows from the Hynes-Clearwater Journal of Paramount, Calif., are most beneficial in bringing the people of the Nation to a fuller realization of the encouragement needed for young men who wish to make politics their life's work:

CITIZENS AND POLITICIANS

A recent Gallup poll indicated that few American parents want their sons to go into politics, expressing the belief that "a political career leads to graft and crookedness."

This is a dangerous sign for a democracy which depends for its efficient operation upon the willingness of men to offer their services to a governmental capacity for the benefit of society as a whole.

It should be perfectly obvious that parents with such a complex are attempting to blame the politicians for some of the shortcomings of the citizens of this country. Neither the Government nor the people who serve as governmental officials can be more than the people expect and support. Moreover, a democratic government, in its attempt to reconcile antagonistic interests, can only function through intelligent and public-spirited politicians.

The Cost of Food and the Cost of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN C. SNYDER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I was startled a few days ago when I saw an article in the United States News on the cost of food and cost of government. The food bill for the Nation, high as it is, is not as high as the bill being paid for government in the United States. Food still costs less per person than taxes to run the Government.

In 1947, food cost the American people $47,520,000,000. Government—Federal, State, and local—cost an estimated $54,300,000,000. The food bill was $330 per person; taxes per capita were $371 in the year 1947. The bill for government on a per capita basis was $41 more per individual than the food bill.

Checking back, we find that in 1929 the per capita cost of food was $161. Government that same year cost $85 per person. Food in that year was only about half as expensive as in 1947. Government then was only about one-quarter as expensive as now. In 18 years the per capita cost of Government has gone up about 4 times; food cost has about doubled.

Today we hear a great deal from the administration about high prices and the high cost of living. Prices are high and every effort possible must be made to bring relief without imposing on the American people a "police state." The exportation of food, steel, and other items in short supply is a material factor in the high cost of living.

The cost of Government receives very little, if any, consideration from the present administration. We still have over two million Federal employees, duplicating and overlapping functions of Government—the cost of which amounts to $371 per person.

The Congress again will make a vigorous and determined effort to cut down the budgets of the various Government agencies and again, no doubt, will be opposed by every Government bureau. Again a determined effort will be made to reduce taxes and increase the take-home pay of millions of workers. I believe all thoughtful people will agree that the per capita cost of Government should not exceed the per capita cost of food in the United States.

Who Will Carry the ERP?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing on December 16, 1947, in the New York Journal of Commerce, of which Stanley Ferguson, a consistent friend of the American merchant marine, is the author.

Representatives of the industry inform me that the shipping industry withheld efforts to amend the interim relief bill to sustain American cargo ratios in order that the legislation designed to take care of a desperate situation might go through both Houses quickly, but that when the main Marshall plan comes before Congress, it will be of vital importance that at least 50 percent of the supplies will be carried in American ships for the life of the plan which will run until 1951.

The article follows:

WHO WILL CARRY THE ERP?

(By Stanley Ferguson)

If there is anything in common between European and American views as to what ships shall carry exports shipped abroad under the European recovery program, it is the earnest and persuasive quality of the arguments on both sides.

The European argument, as set forth by Percy Rogers, a variety of influential maritime publications abroad and by our own State Department, is that since the dollar shortage in Europe is the crux of the whole crisis now enveloping the western part of that continent, things are only made worse when Europe is forced to make dollar shipping outlays from its meager supply of this hard currency.

The 16 nations at Paris—or at least the 10 of them most concerned with shipping—argued with some effect that shipping is one service they are able to provide, up to a point; it is one field in which they are able to earn their way. Therefore why waste their dollars by paying them out to Americans for a service they do not actually require when the dollars are so urgently needed by them for other purposes—the purchase of steel, foodstuffs, machinery, and the like? If the United States means business when it urges the European states to help themselves in every way possible before turning to us to meet the deficit, shall it turn around and deny these same countries the right to help themselves in one valid way they are able to do so—by carrying as much of their imports as possible?

The American position is hardly less solid. The United States today has the ships to do the job. It also has a merchant marine which it believes, as a matter of policy, should be maintained in a strong position, not only to support our important maritime industry, but to develop the Nation's commerce and for the very important factor of national defense.

Shipping lines in this country will concede freely that the European recovery program will, if adopted, mean more cargoes for them than they could otherwise expect. Failure of such a plan to materialize would probably cut our exports by 25 percent next year. But the difference to shipping is not as great as commonly supposed for reasons set forth here on previous occasions. Some traffic would continue to move in any case. Moreover, ERP will doubtless punish some American line in the non-European trades by making it progressively more difficult for Latin America, Africa, and Asia to buy scarce materials here.

The American section of the industry, which has been carrying half or more of our foreign trade, is not taking a narrowly nationalistic position when it insists that the mere fact that it flies the flag of the country which is being asked to put up $19,000,000,000 or so for ERP is not an adequate reason for excluding it from the export movement. Shipping lines here have demonstrated that actual dollar savings would be very small, all things considered, even if foreign ships did carry the whole program. And there is the additional consideration that the Government of the United States has to consider the welfare of its own merchant marine. No other government is going to.

A MODERATE COURSE IS THE RIGHT ONE

If one takes either the American or European arguments by themselves, it is quite possible to understand an extreme view on either side. The dollar squeeze tells the Europeans they should carry all they can possibly get and scrape ships together to move, even if it means denuding other trades of tonnage. Americans may feel that since they are putting up the money, their merchant marine comes first and should decidedly get the business.

In view of the tendency toward extremes on both sides, the American shipping industry, as represented by the National Federation of American Shipping, is to be commended for adopting what is on all counts a moderate and common-sense course.

Operators here might well have asked that Congress implement Public Resolution 17—which directs that American shipping shall carry goods purchased here by foreign interests with the proceeds of United States Government loans or credits. They might well have, but they have not. Instead, they are asking merely that Congress direct that American ships shall carry the same proportion of export cargoes under ERP that they have carried during the past 6 months under the various European relief programs. This would amount to somewhere between 50 and 60 percent.

This request simply means that the present ratio of American to foreign tonnage in the United States-European trades should be left undisturbed by adoption of ERP. It means that neither American nor European shipowners will get all of the business they might like to have, but neither group will find itself arbitrarily frozen out.

All in all, this seems to be about the least that Congress could do to offer needed protection to American shipping without throwing too heavy an additional burden upon Europe. It is a restatement of the old doctrine of live and let live, which is still about the best that has been devised in the world of shipping and foreign trade.

THE CAPTAIN ON THE DECK

The time was not so long ago, and the scene was the deck of an American passenger ship just prior to its departure from New York. There were two chief characters, the master and a minor union official. What action there was was brisk but over quickly. During the argument the union official swung and then turned and left the ship as the captain hit the deck.

That was all there was to it. No officials were called. No inquiry was begun. There was no publicity. The captain, seemingly humiliated, indicated he preferred to "forget" the incident. Possibly, by now, he has, but there were others present who have not.

American Legionnaires at Cleveland last week who heard the Coast Guard's Commodore H. C. Shepheard describe conditions affecting discipline and personnel in the American merchant marine today may well have been shocked—as they appear to have been—but among those who have been circulating in maritime circles continuously enough to taste these matters first hand there was nothing whatever that the commodore said that was new—except, perhaps, his statistical compilation of shipboard offenses which have gone unpunished. There have been about 500 since June.

All may not agree with Commodore Shepheard that discipline in the American merchant marine is now at its lowest ebb. All may not agree with him that it is the product of "foreign ideologies." That would be difficult to prove and probably confuses the issues, although there is no doubt that the Communists are doing and will continue to do everything in their power to disrupt conditions in the merchant marine. But discipline certainly is low, and corrective measures are urgently needed.

One should not have to argue that there should be at sea, as well as ashore, not only authority, but the power to enforce it. Such authority did exist, within limits, until the recent overhaul of our shipping legislation when Congress ill-advisedly decided to deprive the Coast Guard of disciplinary powers formerly vested in the Bureau of Marine Inspection. While doubtless spurred by the best of intentions, this was a most unfortunate move, as the steady deterioration of shipboard labor conditions has so convincingly demonstrated.

There is now before the House legislation which would correct this situation by vesting with the Bureau of Marine Inspection the corrective powers which is now lacks. This amendment has already been passed by the Senate. Prompt action by the House will aid greatly in restoring a semblance of order and discipline out of a situation which neither the Nation nor the shipping industry can afford to tolerate any longer.

Forcing Socialized Medicine on America by the Use of Federal Employees and Government Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the National Physicians Committee's national conference of the professions, Sheraton Hotel, Chicago, Ill., September 29, 1947:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am particularly happy to be with you this evening, because I am acquainted with the great fight this organization has waged in behalf of free medicine, as distinguished from that type of socialized medicine which we now find in every country in which dictatorship prevails.

The brand of dictatorship makes no difference—communism, fascism, nazism, socialism—all are alike, in that they enforce a system of state medicine, or political medicine, as I prefer to call it.

Whatever the name of the dictatorship, or whatever the pattern of the particular brand of collectivism in a given country, the system of socialized medicine is always pretty much the same. It is based on compulsion and is generally administered by a nationwide system of ward and precinct politics.

But socialized medicine is not for free America, and I am happy to congratulate you gentlemen on the great fight you have made during the last 10 years to head off this unwholesome campaign in Washington.

If the medical profession and all our hospitals can be taken over by the Federal Government and forged into a new and gigantic health bureaucracy, then it would only be a question of time until Washington likewise moved into the field of education, religion, the press, the radio.

Freedom soon would be in total eclipse.

That must not come to pass in mighty America, the last great citadel of freedom and liberty on the face of the globe today.

HEARTENED BY PHYSICIAN SUPPORT

Ours is a great responsibility to hold aloft the bright torch of freedom and honest representative government. And it has been most encouraging to know that we have the great body of the American medical profession standing behind us in this effort in Congress, as this meeting tonight so clearly indicates is the case.

Approximately 5 months have passed since our special subcommittee was established to investigate publicity and propaganda in the executive agencies. We are a subcommittee, as you know, of the standing legislative Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Our special interest has been the techniques of Government propaganda by which our Federal bureaucrats perpetuate themselves in office, generate pressures on Congress for more and bigger appropriations, and sponsor socialistic enterprises in the name of national emergency or an artificially stimulated public demand.

More than 6 solid weeks of our investigation has been devoted exclusively to the so-called health work shops set up throughout the country under the aegis of the United States Public Health Service, the Social Security Board, the Children's Bureau and several other agencies having an oar in the administration of health and welfare programs.

The amazing ramifications of the Federal propaganda in behalf of socialized medicine have astonished me. How much of our total appropriations for health and welfare are being diverted to this sort of high-pressure propaganda, we do not yet know. But we do know that the amount is considerable. And before our inquiries are concluded, we shall hope to present for public consideration an itemized account, of the total diversion of Federal funds for this propaganda campaign. In that accounting we shall include a considerable item for foreign travel to New Zealand, England, South America, and Japan. For we now know that our health bureaucrats are interested in socialized medicine not only in the United States but in every other land in which they can find an opening.

Before enlarging on the details of the health work shops inquiry, I should like to give you an over-all picture of the Federal publicity operations, as we have measured them to date.

SEVENTY-FIVE MILLION

We began with a special report from the Budget Bureau which showed that the various Federal agencies spent $74,829,467 for publicity and propaganda work of every kind and description.

An earlier study, covering the fiscal year 1941, showed total publicity expenditures of the Federal establishment at only $28,000,000.

Now, everybody in Washington recognizes that certain information services are an essential part of any institutional operation. But Congress insists that there is a clear line of distinction between legitimate information services and those additional operations which tend to build up public opinion in favor of more projects, broader programs, or Federal invasion of new spheres of public service. It is primarily the latter operations which our subcommittee seeks to itemize as to cost and scope. It is my contention that, at least, the people are entitled to know how much they are spending to educate themselves to more spending.

HUGE PUBLIC RELATIONS STAFF

In the Department of Agriculture, committee investigators found 525 persons engaged in public relations work. Salaries ranged from $10,000 down to $1,888 a year. But only 204 members of this robust information staff were in Washington. The rest were found in Department of Agriculture branch offices in Boston, San Francisco, Milwaukee, Raleigh, Dallas, Denver, Albuquerque, Philadelphia, Ogden, Chicago, Atlanta; Juneau, Alaska; San Juan, P. R., and eight lesser cities throughout the States and Territories.

Total budget estimates for Agriculture's Office of Information for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, were $2,307,000, an increase of $335,350 over the previous year. But this does not include printing or mailing expenses.

Every known media of intelligence is utilized by Agriculture. The Office of Information prepared 1,998 press releases in the 9 months ended April 1—an average of 11 every working day. During the same months the office prepared 837 radio scrips, including several network programs. The radio time contributed for these programs normally has a commercial value of more than $500,000 a year. The same 9 months saw 17 new motion-picture films released through the Department's film stations.

For the 1947 fiscal year, Agriculture's combined printing bill—all bureaus, divisions, and offices—will be $2,260,784, exclusive of mimeographing processed within the Department.

SPENDERS FOR PUBLICITY

These activities begin to explain why the Government Printing Office, which occupies 33 acres of floor space in Washington and employs 7,000 full-time workers, still can't keep up with Government printing demands.

Some of the principal spenders for publicity in fiscal 1946 were:

Department of State	$30,377,000
Treasury	11,104,800
Department of Agriculture	9,295,700
Office for Emergency Management	8,154,021
War Department	5,715,690
Office of War Information	3,772,095
Office of Price Administration	2,572,000
Office of Petroleum Administration	2,572,000
Federal Security Agency	2,043,983
Department of Commerce	2,003,212
Department of Labor	1,440,641
Navy Department	704,000
Veterans' Administration	660.571
Tennessee Valley Authority	245,000
Post Office Department	11,960

My distinguished colleague, Representative RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, long has been a crusader on the Appropriations Committee against excessive public relations expenditures within the Federal establishment. He expressed astonishment at the 1946 tabulations I have just quoted.

"In my opinion," he said, "the enormous governmental propaganda set-up is not only a gross waste of the people's money, but, over and beyond that, makes for the destruction of the proper exercise of the legislative functions of the Government."

With that, of course, we are all in full agreement.

SOCIAL SECURITY SPENDING

You will note that the Social Security Board has been spending about $2,000,000 a year in public relations activities—regardless of whether we call it publicity or propaganda. We do not yet know the full scope of this work. But we do know that they have been setting up these so-called health work shops; that they were launched on a Nationwide scale; that they are financed entirely by Federal funds diverted from the regular appropriations; and that it was never at any time the intention of Congress or its appropriations committees to authorize the expenditure of public funds for such activities.

To our committee it seemed reasonable to ask why these agencies should be permitted to spend public money to generate an entirely artificial public demand for a system of socialized medicine in the United States, when all our experience through public-opinion polls, and all our contacts with the medical profession, indicate beyond question that the American people and the American medical profession insist upon maintenance of our traditional system of free medicine, under which we have attained the highest standards of service and scientific skill and proficiency ever recorded in the history of the world.

It seems to our committee to be a proper function of the Congress to determine whether the diversion of public funds from legitimate purposes to purely propaganda purposes for socialized medicine, does not, in fact, constitute a criminal violation of the law.

And on this point, I may say that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is giving that question some serious study at the moment. As you know, we advised the Attorney General, Mr. Clark, what we discovered about the health work shops, and we have since been informed that some of the vouchers are in the hands of the FBI for investigation.

WORLD-WIDE PROPAGANDA

All this federally financed activity for socialized medicine heads up in the Bureau of Research and Statistics in the Social Security Board.

Our committee investigators have found in that bureau a veritable nerve center of socialized-medicine propaganda for the entire world.

Mr. Isadore S. Falk is the Director of Research and Statistics in the Social Security Board. He has been in the Government service for some 12 years. He has always been noted for his militant and aggressive advocacy of socialized medicine.

Our committee, of course, does not challenge the right of any citizen to hold whatever views he may wish on any subject of political or economic policy.

But we are interested that funds appropriated by Congress for public administration shall not be diverted to a world-wide system of propaganda calculated to advance socialized medicine the world around.

Such operations, until specifically approved by the Congress, are positively illegal. And our committee will not rest until they are uprooted and stamped out of the Federal picture.

ILLEGAL USE OF FUNDS

Any group of citizens has a right to agitate for socialized medicine, if it puts up its own money and pays its own bills. But I, for one, do not intend to see this gigantic propaganda machine for socialized medicine financed entirely by funds secretly diverted from moneys appropriated by Congress for the legitimate functions of government.

In our hearings to date we have examined officers of the United States Public Health Service, the Children's Bureau (which is another section of the Federal Security Administration), the Social Security Board, and the Farmers Home Administration, a section of the Department of Agriculture. As a part of this investigation, we also have called upon the General Accounting Office for certain travel vouchers in connection with the Health Work Shops.

On page 8 of the interim report, which most of you have before you, there appears a tabulation of the various Federal officers who have taken part in this propaganda effort. In each case, the agency or governmental unit paying the salary and travel expenses is indicated.

We found that the first meeting on the Health Work Shops was held in Washington on November 2, 1945. It was attended by only 12 persons—10 of whom were full-time employees of the Public Health Service, the Social Security Board, and the Department of Agriculture.

WORK SHOP BORN

This is where the Health Work Shops were born. The chairman of that meeting was Dr. George Perrott, of the United States Public Health Service.

The detailed operations of the Health Work Shops are set forth in House Report No. 786 of the Eightieth Congress, as published by our subcommittee on July 2, 1947.

Suffice it to say here, that the project was financed almost entirely by Federal funds, through the contributions of the participating Government agencies—through the assignment of the so-called forum experts from the Government bureaus, through the payment of travel expenses, and the providing of literature and mimeographed material for the meetings.

The real purpose of these meetings was to generate pressure upon Congress for passage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

HILLEBOE'S STATEMENT

At one point in our hearing, our committee counsel, Mr. Frank T. Bow, asked the witness, Dr. Herman Hilleboe, of the Public Health Service, if the literature presented by the Government agencies presented all sides of the medical discussion, or merely the side supporting socialized medicine, as embodied in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. To this question, Dr. Hilleboe answered:

"We would naturally give emphasis to that, because that is why we are in government. Otherwise we should get out of government."

Here, indeed, is a strange concept of Federal service in public health—the concept that any physician who is not a vigorous advocate of socialized medicine should remove himself from the Government service.

And that conception of the public service appears the more distorted when we realize that at no time has Congress approved any declaration of policy favoring the expansion and development of socialized medicine at Federal expense; nor has Congress authorized the expenditure of public funds for any sort of propaganda work calculated to generate public opinion in behalf of socialized medicine as a national policy. Yet here is a responsible official of the Public Health Service testifying before our investigating committee to the effect that the presentation of material supporting socialized medicine is a clear and direct moral obligation of the Public Health staff.

Gentlemen, I am here to say that such a distorted conception of the public service in Washington must be uprooted by Congress.

BECKER ON STAND

On another occasion, we had as a witness before the committee Mr. Harry J. Becker, health consultant in the Children's Bureau. When asked if his public speeches throughout the country presented both sides of the discussion touching compulsory national health insurance this witness answered: "I don't know what you mean by both sides."

Those two bits of testimony, to my mind, offer a pretty complete picture of the present set-up in Washington as it relates to Government propaganda supporting socialized medicine. From the Public Health Service came the suggestion that doctors who do not believe in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills simply have no place in government; and from the Children's Bureau came the response that the witness was either unaware of the opposing viewpoint, or had so firmly closed his mind against opposition argument that they could merit no time or attention in his public speeches.

From these incidents it seems reasonable to conclude that some of our bureaus in Washington regard themselves as the protectors and defenders of the whole concept of compulsory national health insurance and socialized medicine.

But, again, I want to repeat—that is not what Congress appropriated the money for.

MISSION TO TOKYO

Plowing deep into these matters, our investigators soon came upon the much discussed health mission to Tokyo. You have seen reports on this in the newspapers. It, too, is revealing for the light it throws on the operations of the Washington inner circle which is forever pulling the wires for socialized medicine.

In our examination of the Bureau of Research and Statistics in the Social Security Board we discovered that practically every argument, every pamphlet, every radio broadcast, and every statistical table advocating socialized medicine originated primarily in the Social Security Board. Here is the world-wide nerve center of the movement for socialized medicine.

Our committee found, and has so reported to Congress, that pamphlets prepared as to basic material in the Social Security Board were distributed to the general public by the CIO and A. F. of L., the Farmers' Union, the Physicians' Forum, and the Committee for the Nation's Health.

All these pamphlets vigorously supported socialized medicine as embodied in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

In several of the pamphlets, no matter by whom distributed, the language and the figures were the same.

"CENTRAL GENERATING PLANT"

The Social Security Board is the central generating plant, so to speak. And the material is then distributed for popular consumption by whatever organization will lend its official imprint to arguments and briefs of Messrs. Isadore Falk and Wilbur Cohen.

That's the fundamental set-up discovered by our committee, and that's the beginning of the health mission to Tokyo.

Just about a year ago a Federal civilian employee in Washington (one Stanchfield) was detached temporarily from his job to go to Tokyo to make a preliminary survey of social security and health needs. Upon his return to Washington early this year Mr. Stanchfield proposed a general health mission to Tokyo. His proposal was presented directly to Mr. Arthur J. Altmeyer, Commissioner of Social Security.

Next, on March 5, 1947, Mr. Altmeyer proposed the mission in a formal communication to the War Department. In that letter Mr. Altmeyer designated the particular individuals who should make up the mission, and then went further to suggest that William H. Wandel, Chief of the Program Division, Bureau of Unemployment Security, be appointed chief of the Social Insurance Division of the Public Health and Welfare Section of the Supreme Command for the Allied Powers in Tokyo. It is perfectly apparent from the letters we have taken from the War Department files that the personnel of this mission and the planning of its program originated in and was dictated from the Social Security Board in Washington.

Up to this point there had been no hint that the proposed health mission had been requested or urged either by General MacArthur or any responsible Japanese source. The suggestion came first from Mr. Stanchfield, who had been sent to Tokyo from Washington for that particular purpose.

LETTER TO ISADORE FALK

Next, we found a letter, under date of June 14, 1947, from Mr. Wandel in Tokyo reporting directly to Mr. Falk in Washington on the progress of the work in Tokyo. In one revealing passage of this letter, Mr. Wandel said:

"We think that our need is for someone who is primarily not so much an economic analyst as one versed in health insurance. Health insurance is the major field of social security in Japan. * * * Permanent revision requires amalgamating national health insurance with health insurance on a compulsory basis."

When the Tokyo health mission finally was named it comprised two men from the Public Health Service, one from Mr. Falk's bureau, and one from the Federal Housing Authority. This mission departed for Japan on August 28, this year, with the understanding that Mr. Altmeyer and possibly Mr. Falk would follow when the work had been sufficiently organized in Tokyo.

BUREAUCRATIC INTRIGUE

Because this instance offers a shocking demonstration of bureaucratic intrigue in violation of the purposes and intent of Congress, I have brought the matter to the attention of the House Appropriations Committee, with the suggestion that when the next budget comes up from the Social Security Board and the Public Health Service all those engaged in spreading socialized medicine around the world be stricken from the public pay roll—unless, of course, Congress shall determine to support such world propaganda with funds specifically allocated for that purpose.

In my letter to Chairman TABER, of the Appropriations Committee, I made eight specific charges against the Tokyo health mission. I wish to summarize them here, because they are the nub of our case against the Social Security Board and the United States Public Health Service in relation to all this propaganda supporting socialized medicine.

CHARGES AGAINST TOKYO MISSION

My charges against the Tokyo health mission are as follows:

1. That the health mission to Japan is composed entirely and exclusively of men long identified in the public record as advocates and proponents of socialized medicine not only in the United States but throughout the world.

2. That the real purpose of this mission is to lay the groundwork for a system of socialized medicine in Japan.

3. That the scheme for such a mission originated in the Division of Research and Statistics in the Social Security Board in Washington, and nowhere else.

4. That the nominal request for the mission was engineered through the General Headquarters of the Supreme Commander in Tokyo by Federal employees sent from Washington for that particular purpose.

5. That Gen. Douglas MacArthur does not favor—and does not approve—any plan to establish compulsory socialized medicine in Japan.

6. That the dispatch of this mission to Tokyo for the purpose indicated in Mr. Wandel's letter to Mr. Falk under date of June 14, 1947, is a gross misuse of public funds.

7. That the real purpose of the mission is not to assist Japan in working out her basic problems in health and welfare, but to force upon that country a compulsory system of socialized medicine.

8. That although the questions here involved are of a health and medical nature, the Surgeon General of the United States Army was not consulted in reference to the problems involved.

TAXPAYER FOOTS THE BILL

I deem it inappropriate for Federal employees, at the expense of the American taxpayer, to travel throughout the world preparing or assisting in the preparation of legislation to be adopted by foreign countries when similar legislation, long pending, has not been approved by the Congress of the United States.

It is hardly necessary for me to tell you that we shall watch developments in this case with lively interest. General MacArthur certainly does not intend to lend himself to any such intrigue by our Washington health bureaucracy.

And I am equally certain that my distinguished colleague and good friend, JOHN TABER, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, does not intend to see Federal funds misapplied in this fashion. We shall hear more of this mission to Tokyo as our investigation goes forward.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM

One other point about these operations in the Social Security Board merits brief attention at this juncture, although our inquiry in this direction has not been concluded. The fact is that this entire movement for world-wide socialized medicine is tinged and infiltrated with international communism.

World communism has adopted compulsory health insurance as one of its major tenets; and our committee investigators have found the agitation for socialized medicine in the United States closely linked with Communist and fellow-traveler publications and meetings.

JACOB FISHER'S RECORD

Under date of May 14, 1947, Mr. Isadore Falk, Director of the Bureau of Research and Statistics, sent a memorandum to the Acting Commissioner for Social Security, urging that one Jacob Fisher, a member of Mr. Falk's staff, be sent to New Zealand at Government expense, to study compulsory health-insurance programs and activities in that nation.

We find that this same Jacob Fisher has been documented by the House Committee on Un-American Activities for almost uninterrupted association since 1939, with various Communist-front and fellow-traveler organizations in the United States. At various times, according to his record, Jacob Fisher has been identified with seven different groups or organizations avowedly sponsoring the Moscow party line in the United States. He has published at least one report on health insurance in New Zealand, in the Social Security Bulletin—a report which has been criticized by some reputable medical authorities as extremely biased.

In a later interim report on propaganda activities within the Social Security Board, we shall present to the Congress the detailed record of Jacob Fisher's activities, as certified to us by the Committee on Un-American Activities, together with additional material bearing upon organized Communist agitation for socialized medicine, through such agencies as the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

THE MOSCOW PARTY LINE

Suffice it at this time to report our firm conclusion, on the basis of the evidence at hand, that American communism holds this program as a cardinal point in its objectives; and that, in some instances, known Communists and fellow-travelers within the Federal agencies are at work diligently with Federal funds in furtherance of the Moscow party line in this regard.

I must emphasize that I have not given you a complete and comprehensive report on our committee's work. But within the limits of the time allotted, I have summarized the main points of our inquiry as it touches this vital problem of Government propaganda in support of compulsory health insurance.

From the letters which have come to us in Washington, I know that the medical profession is well aware of what's going on in the Public Health Service and the Social Security Board. And the medical profession welcomes and supports our investigation.

ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES

We know, too, that much of the activity we have cited is positively illegal under section 201, title 18 of the United States Code.

That section offers a blanket prohibition against the use of any part of any Federal appropriation for the purpose of influencing legislation before Congress. That's the legal point which is now under vigorous investigation by the FBI.

But the issue is even broader than the question of socialized medicine. It is also challenging in that it reveals for public examination the manner in which all Government lobbyists operate on the Government pay roll, how they are always at work to expand their fields of interest, to perpetuate themselves in office, and to impose their ideas and systems upon the American people by organized propaganda paid for entirely by the diversion of public funds from their true purposes to the shielded purposes of the top bureaucrats and planners.

THE BASIC ISSUE

This is the fundamental issue from the legislative standpoint—the question whether the Congress of the United States has lost its power to establish and maintain the sort of government the people want; or whether the bureaucrats are supreme and can give the sort of government they want, regardless of Congress, regardless of elections, regardless of public opinion.

That's a question that goes to the very roots of popular government. If the bureaucrats are above Congress, and may defy Congress in the way they spend their appropriations, then representative government has become a fiction.

PLANNERS DEFIANT

I am certain that the United States has not yet reached the point where it must be submissive to the dictates of a rampant bureaucracy in Washington.

But my work with the propaganda subcommittee during the last 6 months has convinced me that there are danger signals in the air.

The spirit of defiance encountered by our committee investigators within the Social Security Board and the Public Health Service is a most unwholesome sign.

The circular letter sent out by the Surgeon General, Dr. Parran, in 1945, wherein he directed that all public statements should be in line with the President's national health message, regardless of the individual views of the officer himself—that is a very dangerous sign in a nation devoted to representative government.

We must not fall into the attitude that all our opinions are made in Washington and handed down to us full-fashioned. That is the way of dictatorship.

HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

Public opinion must be maintained in its free and virile state—in full harmony with the great American tradition of liberty.

If we do that by stamping out government propaganda at its roots, then we shall have rendered a great service, not only to medicine, but to the whole cause of liberty and freedom the world around.

We all know that freedom is not free.

We all know that bureaucratic power feeds upon itself—and upon the rights and privileges and liberties of the people.

If we are to support and defend liberty and constitutional government in America, we must begin by keeping clean and undefiled the wellsprings of public information from Washington.

Government propaganda poisons the wells of public information.

Government propaganda is illegal.

Government propaganda is a method of dictators.

Our purpose will be to uproot and destroy Government propaganda wherever we may find it.

The Panama Canal: Operations or Engineering?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the Panama Canal, the width of the project, other improvements needed and its defenses are peculiarly live subjects at this time. There appeared in the United States Naval Institute Proceedings of December 1947, a very comprehensive article by Commander Arthur Stanley Riggs, United States Naval Reserve, retired, entitled "The Panama Canal: Operations or Engineering?"

It is said that the statements of fact and the views expressed in the article are exclusively those of the author, and must not be taken to reflect the opinions of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or of the Panama Canal.

Attached to the article appears a memorandum which says:

Commander Riggs' first naval service was with the fleet in 1898 as an enlisted man. Anticipating a possible war, he joined the Naval Reserve in 1935, was called to active duty in 1941, and detailed to the office of Censorship. Here he was assigned the task of planning and then supervising the reference libraries of all cable censorship stations throughout the world, with additional duty as information officer. He has long been especially interested in the Panama Canal.

The article is informative and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include in my extension of remarks the article referred to. I make the request notwithstanding that I am advised it makes three and one-third pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $260.34.

THE PANAMA CANAL: OPERATIONS OR ENGINEERING?

(By Commander Arthur Stanley Riggs, United States Naval Reserve, retired)

The success of any military plan depends upon the relation of its practicality to its purpose. No sane commander would send battleships to hunt submarine packs.

The Panama Canal is first of all for military purposes, then for international marine commerce. Its purpose is to pass traffic of all types from one ocean to the other quickly—and safely. Necessarily that makes the solution of most of the problems it presents, operational solutions. The men most competent to handle such matters are obviously the men who operate the ships traversing the Canal, whether they are naval craft or of the merchant marine of this or any other nation. But the history of this tremendous ditch, from the days of the ill-starred Comte Ferdinand de Lesseps to the present decade, shows that navigators, masters, and pilots had little if anything to say about the original design. The Canal was conceived as an engineering problem from first to last, its design was elaborated by engineers, other engineers and construction men executed it, and as a consequence it does not fulfill its purpose as well as it could have done had operation been the basic principle of its planning. As a task force, a weapon, and a public utility it has such serious defects that at best its functioning is slow and dangerous.

At last we have begun to be aware of this. What shall we do about it, if anything? If we do undertake the problem, how long a time will its solution require, what will the ultimate cost be, and who will do the planning? Shall we again put our trust in the engineers, who neither know nor care anything about ship handling; or shall we turn for counsel and guidance to the men directly concerned, the men who risk valuable lives, property, and their professional reputations every time a ship goes through from sea to sea? The answer should be rather evident, but as yet so much of the thinking about the Canal has been either tainted by influence (of which this writer knows nothing) or by muddy reasoning, or by both, that it is not amiss to apply a little logic in the endeavor first of all to find out exactly what it is we wish to remedy, and after that the most promising means of effecting the desired result. Moreover, in considering the problem of the Panama Canal we must remember that it is unique in both magnitude and problems. For that reason experience in developing and operating other waterways is largely useless because they are all secondary in importance and so not comparable. The Panama Canal is the only truly interoceanic canal in the world.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Right at the beginning we may disregard completely all the more or less violent propaganda of various types which for more than a year past has circulated in the press of both halves of this hemisphere and in more than one language. Our concern is with fundamentals only. One of these, and by no means the least important, is the question whether or not what we do today is to be final or of only temporary value. Whether we see the Canal from the naval-military or the business standpoint is not especially significant in the beginning. We must see it with eyes wide open and clear for the future. The great banker, Morgan, once said that "the man who sells America short is a fool." Unless we are utterly crushed by a world cataclysm, which no one today really anticipates, we cannot fail to recognize the normal growth in population, expanding foreign relations, and commercial interests of the United States as one of the main blocks for building our foundation. Other great powers will grow and progress side by side with us, and the demands upon the capacity of any canal will steadily increase. No one today can plot the curve of that growth accurately. It seems more than likely, therefore, that the sensible thing—after we know completely what is wrong and in general what we wish to do about it—is not to try now to make the Canal the final word. Common sense tells us that nothing is final, nothing so adequate in a restless age of achievement that it cannot be improved. The obvious answer to this first question, therefore, seems clearly to be a canal capable of accommodating the increased traffic, both as to numbers and as to the dimensions of individual vessels, in the foreseeable future. Before the saturation point is reached world conditions may have so changed that the national interests will be better served by an entirely different outlook.

A second point that has been repeatedly and senselessly raised during the past 2 or 3 years is vulnerability. So far as that is concerned, no canal conceivable by human intelligence could be constructed that would not be vulnerable. The present Canal could be completely wrecked without ever touching it; the breaching of its protecting dams would put it out of action for an indeterminate period. A single burst in a cut might easily start a chain of geological reactions in the distinctly unstable rock formations on either hand whose end no man can foresee. The only protection of any canal across the Isthmus is adequate air cover able to dispose of attacking elements long before they can reach it. For that reason the ultimate design is something that must be considered wholly apart from defense. To attempt to solve this duplex problem at a single stroke is to try to fire a .45 slug from a 10-gauge shotgun and expect accuracy of fire.

Any detailed study of the problems to navigation imposed by the Canal reveals immediately only the obvious reasons for the hazards of its transit. Beyond the manifest there lies a natural cause of anxiety so profound it cannot be rightly calculated by any engineering methods. This is the soft stratification of part of the subsoil rock whose shifting was the cause of the slides that continually gave trouble by rolling down into the present Canal and having to be laboriously dredged out. Any disturbance of the slightly hardened surface material which exposes new areas of the softer rock beneath disturbs the equilibrium, and almost anything in the nature of a slide or a bottom bulge can easily occur. Geologists who have made careful, detailed studies and examined core-borings of the rock at the slides of the Canal agree almost unanimously that the nature of the terrain is so doubtful that any large-scale operations tending to widen or deepen the channel, or both, would have unpredictable results but might easily result in such further slides as to close the Canal to navigation, for how long a time no one could say. The mere dredging up of the slides might in itself have a tendency to provoke additional displacements of material.

REASONS FOR DISABILITIES

Beyond the geophysical conditions are the even more unpredictable results of temporary meteorological unbalances. No weather chart or calculations on earth could have predicted with certainty when and to what extent the Mississippi River system would rise as a result of exceptional rainfall, burst through restraining levees over a tangled series of courses for a thousand miles, inundate millions of acres, destroy hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property, and drive the inhabitants of entire large as well as small towns from their homes as occurred in 1947. Similarly, any sudden increment of the normally heavy rainfall in the Panama sector—or its antipode, an unforeseen heavy drought—can operate to the serious disadvantage of the Canal, and cannot be omitted from any calculations for the future. This matter of water, and the further factor of the heavy fogs in Gaillard Cut at night, have a direct and very important bearing on two of the three proposed plans for improvment of the Canal, as will appear.

For the present, with the natural and the not easily recognized factors out of the way, accidents which have made the Panama Canal the most hazardous short waterway in the world, and the reasons for them, complete the picture of what is wrong, and automatically suggest the remedies. To understand the accident record it is necessary to go back and review the history of the design of the Canal from the days of Ferdinand de Lesseps and the first calculations of the French engineers who planned, partially constructed, and so thoroughly estimated the possibilities that when we took over on the collapse of the French company we made full use of the glorious failure.

When De Lesseps arrived at Colón on December 30, 1879, he began work immediately and was reported by the Panamá Star and Herald on January 1, 1880, as saying he recognized only two great difficulties to be overcome. These were the slashing through the summit of the Continental Divide at Culebra and the equally formidable nature of the Chagres River. He had not realized, as did the late John F. Stevens, that the Isthmus was then (and still remains) "one of the most forbidding spots on earth" for construction work of any sort, and with even more obstacles than appear to the unaided eye. The Panama Railroad having been already built, De Lesseps projected the Canal to follow its general route at sea level with a trench 72 feet wide at bottom and 27 feet 6 inches deep. The initial plans included a mighty dam at Gamboa to hold back the waters of the Chagres, which otherwise would have cascaded disastrously into the Canal, and on the Atlantic slope north of the Divide two outlet channels to carry flood waters to the ocean, one to the eastward of the main waterway, the other to the west. South of the Divide two other flood channels were scheduled, one on the east side of the main Canal, one on the west. This made a total of five, the main artery for navigational purposes and four diversionals for surplus water. To compensate for the different ocean levels a tidal lock at the Pacific end was considered sufficient, and a long mole or breakwater at Colón to provide shelter for shipping from the frequent heavy northers. The total excavation was roughly figured at 75,000,000 cubic meters, the total cost at $168,600,000.

Long before the French collapse the engineers knew a sea-level plan was unfeasible because of slides too formidable for their limited equipment to handle, and because of the enormous amount of excavation required on even the scale then governing operations. So difficult and slow was the work at Culebra that it would have required practically a century to complete the Canal. The slides and the Culebra obstacles were the final cause of the abandonment of the sea-level plan in favor of a lock canal on high level. The change, however, came too late to save the financially exhausted French, though their excavations had extended throughout the entire length of the canal, even including Culebra cut. By May 15, 1889, all work on the Isthmus had been suspended, the great French effort had failed, and misfortune after misfortune followed in rapid succession until the United States undertook the project and assumed formal responsibility on May 4, 1904, a date celebrated annually in the Canal Zone since then as Acquisition Day.

Entirely aside from the financial maneuvering and political influences working against success, France failed not only because of the sickness and corruption which were so freely discussed while the Canal was building, but because all efforts were bent toward a sea-level canal without adequate vision of the terrific size of the undertaking, and the failure of the heads of the project to adopt the logical plan for the high-level lock canal advocated by Adolphe Godin de Lépinay, the only French engineer who knew the region, the geological and hydrostatic conditions, had supervised construction work there, and could see the solution from the navigational viewpoint. Curiously enough, though we eventually built the Canal largely along the lines Godin de Lépinay laid down, we omitted one vital feature of them. It is the adoption of that feature, dating back to 1879, with the essential changes it imposes at the Pacific end of the Canal, that offers a solution of the problem attended by less cost, fewer difficulties, and requiring less time for its completion than any of the other plans thus far suggested.

THE UNITED STATES ASSUMES CONTROL

As soon as we assumed control, new surveys and tests were made, careful estimates figured of the amount of excavation to be done and the best means of disposing of the mountains of excavated material, and plans developed for machinery, tools, labor, supplies, and all the rest of the necessities for making the task not only a success from an engineering standpoint, but the Canal larger and of far greater capacity than anything the French originators had considered. At this point the matter of sickness had to be reestimated, and the vision of Gorgas, with the heroism of the volunteers whose submission to yellow fever and malaria provided our biologists and physicians with the information necessary to mitigate these twin accurges, immediately comes to mind. In other words, the world had progressed mightily, and the new undertaking was carried forward in that spirit of advancement, plus the practically unlimited financial backing the United States alone could give.

From the standpoints of engineering and sanitation, success was certain from the beginning. But unfortunately the conception was still entirely one of engineering. In all the calculations no one thought of consulting the men who must take their ships through the Canal once it became a fact. The technical details of design and construction, and their relation to the traffic, are all a matter of public record in print, so they have no place here. But the flaw in the plan was a serious double one; it took no account of the human factor (not all masters or pilots being equally skilled and instant in their responses to emergency), and no sufficiently generous allowance was made for the behavior of the Canal itself under differing conditions of width, depth, side-slope angle, wind force, currents, surges, and the actions of vessels moving upon its surface but materially affected by many more than surface conditions.

THE OPERATIONAL PROBLEMS AND HAZARDS

Briefly, the operational problems the Canal presents may be summarized as the traffic bottleneck at the Pedro Miguel locks; the double lockage of vessels at the Pacific end, with consequent accidents, loss of transit time for ships involved directly, and hindrance of capacity operation otherwise; delay to traffic caused by nocturnal fogs in Gaillard Cut; heavy surges in the Cut caused by operation of the Pedro Miguel locks; distinctly limited operating range of the 82–87-foot level of Gatun Lake; the navigational risks imposed by the restricted channels, especially in the Cut; and the narrow dimensions of the present locks.

In addition to this formidable indictment, there is the further matter of the difference in maneuverability between different types of vessels, with especial emphasis on the single screw, amidships rudder and the multiple screw, double rudder type on the one hand, and the unwieldy tanker and ore-carrier type on the other. Any examination of the accident record discloses the fact that mishaps fall into two main classes, lock and channel. Those most feared are the ones occurring in Gaillard Cut, where the jagged rock sides have brought grief to many a stout ship so unfortunate as to strike the bank. Damage to vessels in the locks, while not usually so serious as the groundings and sinkings in Gaillard Cut, is nevertheless very expensive and holds up traffic wastefully while blocking the passage.

THE CARDEROCK MODEL BASIN SCALE TESTS

When the French projected the Canal, and a quarter of a century later when we undertook the job of completing it, neither they nor we had the apparatus adequate to such a colossal task. Neither did we have any institutional means of experimentation to scale such as exist today. But, as has invariably transpired when necessity pressed us hard enough, we mixed our labor with intelligence. The practical results, though slow at first in manifesting themselves, eventually gave ample proof that we could accomplish our purpose. That effort did not cease when the Canal was opened, for awakened intelligence struck out boldly into many fields, one of which is right now contributing its revolutionary findings to our knowledge of the peculiarities and hidden forces of great waterways.

With characteristic thoroughness and determination to secure and evaluate every scrap of evidence of whatever nature bearing on the subject, the United States Navy has been unostentatiously holding an elaborate and searching series of tests accurately scaled for the purpose of producing scientific data covering all the problems of restricted channel design, which are steadily continuing. These tests are being held not on the Isthmus but at the David Taylor Model Basin at Carderock, Md. In that great test laboratory the naval architects and engineers conducting the experiments produce conditions minutely scaled to the dimensions and conditions obtaining in the Canal, and by means of delicate recording instruments are achieving results of astonishing detail and accuracy which give mathematical proof and the fullest confirmation of conclusions reached by practical operating experience.

Before a single experiment was conducted, the engineers who were to make the tests were flown down to the Canal for several weeks of first-hand observation of the topography, the plan of the Canal, and the problems of ships in transit. The accident records and their causes came under the closest scrutiny. Always the visitors had the cooperation of the pilots and engineers attached to the canal to clarify their personal observations. Eventually they returned to Carderock knowing precisely by experience what the problems were that they had to solve and how best to go at the task to secure results.

As detailed, highly technical memoranda of progress are available for those qualified by knowledge and by official authority to use them, no attempt is made here to give more than general principles governing the experiments, and brief mention of one or two of the results of outstanding interest to navigators. In the model basin the channel was so arranged as to afford bases for traffic studies in both still and moving waters, in varying depths and widths, both straightaway and with channel bends. Three ship models were used in many of the experiments—one of a large naval vessel, one of a Liberty-type ship, and the third of a huge twin-screw, single rudder oiler. The Navy model, with four screws revolving outwardly, though its general steering qualities were rated as excellent, was hard to handle because of its size. The tanker was a natural selection because so many canal accidents have involved craft of this type and made the canal pilots feel they are exceedingly difficult to maneuver in restricted waters. Summed up, repeated tests under all conditions established the principle beyond controversy that the angle of rudder required to hold the vessel parallel with the axial line of the canal while under way ahead may be accepted in general as the index of controllability. This, of course, varies markedly with the depth and width of the channel, the distance of the vessel from the center line, and her speed.

At every test the Panama Canal pilots, who assisted, said the models behaved very well and that where differences were to be noticed the model was on the whole more difficult to control than a full-scale vessel. The pilots, incidentally, have taken part in the experiments by rotation, so that the full navigating skill and experience that keeps traffic flowing through the canal is being utilized to reinforce the ability of the technicians at Carderock. At the time this is written the tests are continuing steadily to exhaust the subject if possible. In summary, when they are completed and the data they provide are collated and analyzed, they will make available not only the information requisite to make traffic through the Isthmus safer, faster, and easier, but they will quite possibly effect waterway modification and construction all over the world.

LOCK ARRANGEMENT

When the Canal was designed the reason given for placing the single-step lock at Pedro Miguel and the double-shift lower locks at Miraflores a mile away was that the engineers believed suitable foundations could not be had in a single location along the surveyed Pacific end of the Canal route for all three. As each lock is 1,000 feet long inside the chamber, placing three such structures in continuous series would have meant substantial foundations for a goo three-quarters of a mile. So the Pedro Miguel one-step lock was placed squarely across the southern end of the Gaillard Cut. This was an error of the first magnitude, since it directly caused operational dangers the designers had not even imagined. They had not realized they were literally cresting a choke-bore. Every time 103,000 tons of water are drawn into the Pedro Miguel Lock to fill a chamber measuring 1,000 feet in length by 110 in width and 30 in depth the draft causes a seiche or surge like a tidal wave in Gaillard Cut. The amplitude of this surge at its maximum is approximately 3 feet, its speed almost 25 miles an hour. Hours elapse before this oscillation is dissipated, provided no other ships lock through. If there are other lockages each one creates a new surge, resulting in continuous disturbance of the most dangerous water in the Canal, that of the Cut. Not only does the surge create

powerful local shifts of the water, but it actually decreases the depth of the Canal channel and makes steering and control more difficult. As a result, more than one stout ship has suddenly yawed into one bank or the other and sunk. On February 17, 1942, the 36,000-ton ore carrier *Steelore* sank near La Pita in the Gaillard Cut after sheering into the west bank and breaching several forward plates as a result of these currents caused by the surge. But her sinking is only half the story. After she was securely moored by wire nawsers to the bank and had come to rest on the bottom she suddenly rose, moved forward several feet, snapping the hawsers, and again took the bottom. To lift 36,000 tons and shift it about in that fashion testifies to the irresistible force of the surges and the danger they are to navigation every time the Pedro Miguel Lock is used.

About a mile southeast of Pedro Miguel, the two-lift Miraflores Locks take traffic first when north-bound, last when south-bound. Between the two Pacific locks Miraflores Lake is little more than a huge marsh with a channel across it. The standard speed for vessels in transit is six knots, which for large units gives little more than steerage way under normal conditions. But on approaching Pedro Miguel, craft of any size necessarily have to exercise the greatest caution. As a writer in a popular magazine put it, getting a really large craft into the lock without accident is much like ramming a bass-drum into a telephone booth while on the run. There is opportunity for a mistake. Either she goes in smoothly, or she doesn't go in at all. Naturally this slow approach and extra caution slows traffic down perceptibly. The figures for complete locking at each end of the Canal show that the passage of both sets at the Pacific end takes an hour longer on the average than at the Atlantic. For very large craft, such as those of our aircraft-carriers which can go through, still more time is required, and the maneuvering has to be delicate in the extreme because of projecting sponsons and superstructures. Direct passage from one lock chamber to another, as at Gatun, is relatively safe and simple because the ship is kept continuously under the control of the towing locomotives.

Besides the spacing on the Pacific side, the size of all the locks as compared with the beam of vessels entering them reveals strikingly how far the demands of ocean commerce and the national defense have sent us since the completion of the Canal. With a maximum width inside the chamber walls of 110 feet, none of the present locks can take in our largest carriers or battleships. Such giant passenger liners as the two great Cunarders are automatically barred. An *Essex* class carrier fits the locks almost like a cork in a bottle, with nine inches to spare on either hand. The bigger and beamier *Midway* carriers have to round the Horn to go from sea to sea. With such progress in the past 30 years, is it safe today to attempt to say what we shall need 30 years hence? Is any man today wise enough to determine the ratio of ship dimensions to Canal facilities beyond the nearer future?

GAILLARD CUT DANGERS

Assuming a vessel to have entered, northbound, from the Pacific, and to have progressed safely from the entrance as far as Pedro Miguel Lock, if the weather is clear she proceeds and enters the Gaillard Cut, the most hazardous stretch in the entire Canal. For approximately 7 miles the Continental Divide, a range of hills rising to some 600 feet, is slashed through by a winding channel 300 feet wide at the prism line, with slopes only a tenth off the vertical. In this narrow gorge, its waters troubled by the surges from the lock, vessels have to be handled with infinite skill and care. None is safe anywhere but in the middle of the channel. Let a ship deviate from the center line, and the laws of hydrodynamics come into play at once. The vessel's displacement of water by her forward motion creates pressure greater between herself and the near bank than vice versa, and results in bank suction which has a strong tendency to draw her stern in toward the rocky side of the nearer bank, with a corresponding outward sheer of her bow toward the farther one. Given a strong surge at the same moment the bank suction takes effect, the ship may become uncontrollable, especially if she is of deep draft and heavily loaded. We have already seen in the sinking of the *Steelore* what happens in such a case. And that is not the only instance by a good deal.

Besides the dangers of the Gaillard Cut in itself, there is the further serious impediment of impenetrable fog at night during about 110 days a year. In other words, almost 1 night out of every 3 is foggy, and thus completely stops all transit for a period whose extremes range from 1 to 11 hours. During the rainy season, when fogs are naturally most frequent, they are often so dense that the Canal banks cannot be seen from the deck of a vessel in transit. In such circumstances it is obvious that movement in the area smothered by this impenetrable blanket is utterly impossible. The astonishing feature of the fog is that it generally affects only the Cut. Since the locks at both ends of the Canal are free from this smother, it is clear that the Cut is the cork in the bottle. Vessels can come in from the Pacific and proceed as far as Pedro Miguel, where they must stop until the fog is dissipated. Pacific-bound traffic, since it cannot traverse the fog-filled Cut must wait at Gatun Lake anchorage. Right there is the keystone of the Canal problem.

Berthing capacity for vessels along the Pedro Miguel Lock walls is so limited that only a very few vessels can wait there. Others desiring to make the transit must wait at Balboa, some distance away. Exactly the opposite is true of the Caribbean end of the Canal. These vessels entering or leaving may anchor at the pilot's discretion on both sides of the locks without the assistance of tugs or any special supervision either in Limón Bay outside, or in Gatun Lake, inside the Gatun Locks. The misunderstanding by the designing engineers of the operational problems caused this unsymmetrical arrangement with consequent added dangers to shipping and the risk of blocking the Canal through accident at any time. The experience of 30 years in operating the Canal proves the wisdom of the French canal engineer, Godin de Lépinay, who in 1879 foresaw exactly this condition and struggled to secure terminal anchorage facilities at the Pacific end so as to balance traffic and thus permit use of the locks at their full working capacity.

With adequate water supply, the ability of the locks to pass ships through is the index of the Canal's capacity. The figures given by the Canal authorities show that, including closure of one side of the Pedro Miguel Lock for the biennial overhaul, the "lockage interval for single culvert operations is 53½ minutes, or a daily capacity of 27 lockages in each 24 hours. This figure has been accepted as the minimum capacity of the Panama Canal." These figures, however, are not entirely conclusive, for they ignore the fogs in Gaillard Cut, which may settle down after 9 p. m., and lift under normal conditions before 8:30 a. m. next day. They also did not take into account the necessary traffic restrictions governing the use of the Cut by explosives ships, oilers, ore-carriers, large naval craft, and unwieldy or extra large passenger vessels. For them the Cut must be clear of traffic so as to avoid the risk of possible collision. It follows naturally that with such vessels in transit, approaching traffic must be held, and the delay pulls down the general average. In other words, with so many and such diverse factors entering the equation, any capacity figure must be regarded as approximate, and subject to wide variation in special circumstances.

PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENT

With the principal defects in the Canal briefly indicated, the three main propositions for improvement may be considered. The first of these is the so-called Third Locks project, undertaken in 1939 to increase the Canal's capacity, to permit the transit of the largest naval craft, to achieve a greater theoretical security from bombing, and eventually to make conversion from the high-level, lock-type canal to a sea-level design easier and more expeditious. It may be asked, however, why, if the Third Locks solved the traffic problem, there should be any necessity for conversion of the entire Canal to sea level. No adequate reasons for that conversion have ever been presented. Moreover, no study was made of what the effects of conversion would be.

Only 2½ years of uneasy peace and increasing fear intervened between the authorization of the plan in August of 1939 and the entry of the United States into the war in December of 1941. Excavation was pushed as rapidly as possible for a new set of large locks at some distance from the present Gatun locks, and bypasses connected with the main channels. The first bypass was planned to leave the existing channel near Cucaracha at an angle of 28°59'. Between it and the proposed lock at Pedro Miguel a bend of 46°17' was planned. A ship that succeeded in negotiating these two hazards would then pass through the new and larger Pedro Miguel locks, enter Miraflores Lake, and make a turn there of 37°30' to enter the new Miraflores locks. Shipping men who have studied the question are emphatically opposed to any such plan as adding to the present hazards for all types of vessels by creating new focal points for serious accidents and generally increasing instead of solving operational problems. Fortunately for the welfare of both shipping and the Canal, the war emergencies forced the suspension of the plan in 1942, before it was too late.

The second, and most widely hailed and controversial plan calls for a sea-level canal, thus reverting to the original idea of Comte de Lesseps. It is hardly necessary to go into detail regarding such a fantastically impossible suggestion along the lines proposed by its advocates, none of whom ever handled a ship in any waters. The plan thus far published calls for a titanic excavation job, some of it so demanding as to require special dredges never before designed, to work to a depth of 135 feet beneath the water's surface. With a bottom width of a mere 500 feet, and banks sloping 1 on 1 to give a surface width of about 80 feet, nobody connected with the plan seems to have thought of what would happen to even a very moderate-sized vessel obliged to anchor suddenly in emergency. The chance that she would be squarely on the axial line of the Canal may be granted as a possibility. But even then, with only 45 feet of water under her, and the banks only 400 feet away on either hand, with no tidal lock, a current flowing at all times, and her normal swing to be considered, any such ship would inevitably ground and be damaged, perhaps sinking, and besides blocking at least half the available waterway, creating dangerous eddies.

Besides this perfectly obvious operational hazard, the sea-level plan calls for control of the Chagres River and its floodwaters by the construction of approximately 30 miles of tremendous dams and, to compensate for the difference in tidal levels of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, a tidal lock at Miraflores. The flaws in the plan are so numerous and glaring that only a few of the major ones need be indicated for their effects on operating. Such a waterway would, if it followed the same general route and had in the main the same form as the present Canal, increase the danger zone from the length of the present Gaillard Cut of 7.69 miles to approximately 31 miles, probably extend the fog area considerably, and not only add to the number of curves or bends, but make the aggregate of curvature in the danger zone considerably higher. It appears, accordingly, that the sole benefit to be gained by adoption of the sea-level plan is that of doing away with the present type locks and the consequent diminution of lock-type accidents. The cost of conversion has been estimated at as much as $20,000,000,000, the time required at from 12 to 20 years. Because of the geological formations it is impossible to state definitely whether the excavations would at any time result in closing the present Canal to traffic for indeterminate periods.

It is anticipated on the basis of present conditions and their bearing on the future, that the Canal will have reached its ultimate capacity by about 1970, less than a quarter of a century hence. Whatever plan is adopted for the improvement of conditions must, therefore, be such that it can be in successful operation at or before that time. Furthermore, the cost must not be so exorbitant that ship tolls will have to be heavily increased to amortize the expense incurred. That is a much more important item that appears at first. The ship operators, of course, pay the tolls in each instance, but any accounting shows immediately that the cost is inevitably passed on to the public in various forms. Passengers would have to pay more for their tickets, shippers higher rates per ton for the goods carried, and, of course, the retail customer more for each item on a proportionate basis. So when it comes to discussing calmly the theory that money is no longer a factor in public service, and that only human energy counts, the fact is inescapable that every one of us in some form or other will help to pay for whatever is done, whether we realize it or not. Besides the main debt for the job there is also the matter of terrific amounts to be paid for annual interest.

THE TERMINAL LAKE PLAN

A plan, therefore, which is at once practical and relatively inexpensive, and whose execution would interfere with the daily operation of the Canal less than any other, is not to be considered lightly. The Terminal Lake Plan, which has aroused such opposition from sea-level advocates, is thus far apparently at once the most practical, the most historically based, operationally sound, economical, and capable of being most expeditously constructed. Briefly, it utilizes the present Canal but takes out the Pedro Miguel locks bodily, concentrating all the Pacific locks near Miraflores in a single set, and creates an ample anchorage basin by extending the area of Miraflores Lake. This automatically solves most of the operating problems, increases the safety of the Canal, adds notably to its capacity, and as far as human skill and foresight can go at present, makes an end of the question. By recognizing its own limitations—as the other plans do not—and working not to provide for an ever expanding future but for what can be legitimately estimated as within the probabilities, it provides at a reasonable cost which will not add too greatly to Canal tolls, the capacity for both ordinary and exceptional traffic. By exceptional is meant the occasional transit of some huge liner or other super-size vessel. A noted naval authority recently said to me that in his judgment there will not be much difference in size between the ships of today and those of tomorrow. "The average vessel will be a smart ship of say up to 30,000 tons maximum and good speed. But we must not overlook the possibility of the big freaks that are practically sure to come along jammed with passengers looking for sensation."

Whatever the value of this guess, any survey of the land contours in the Miraflores area shows that by throwing a dam across the present Miraflores locks the lake can be extended well into the impounding hills, thus increasing the summit level water supply and giving a total navigable area of 1.03 square miles. This affords space for nine 300-yard berths and thirty 200-yard berths. The operational advantage of this is evident at a single glance. It enables full use of the Pacific locks without regard to nocturnal fogs, puts an end to surges in Gaillard Cut, removes the dangerous bottleneck at its southern end where the Pedro Miguel locks now stand, provides ample anchorage facilities between Gaillard Cut and the Pacific locks, and thus greatly speeds up the operation of the Canal as a whole, does away with the double handling of vessels in transit at the Pacific end by elimination of the one-step Pedro Miguel locks, lessens lock-operating costs, and enables a much better handling of traffic in transit during slides. It has other marine advantages also, but these are enough to show the utility of the plan as a whole.

The United States Navy's foremost expert on the Canal, after years of study and with more than 3 years of close observation and responsibility as captain of the port at Balboa during the war, feels that besides its manifest advantages, the terminal-lake plan can easily develop into the plan for the ultimate passage across the Isthmus, whatever the future may determine that to be. There are engineering difficulties to be met and problems to be worked out; and beyond doubt, as the surveys and tests are made and the work undertaken, defects will appear, since no human plan is perfect. But considering the needs of the Nation in both naval and commercial spheres, the terminal-lake plan is so simple, so obvious, so operationally sound from the practical standpoint of the men who have to take the ships through, that it seems to meet all our foreseeable requirements at a moderate cost within a predictable time. Behind it stand that most alert and progressive marine interests, the Canal pilots to a man, those engineers who have had experience with great waterways, and every naval expert who has with his own eyes seen what operation of the Canal means at present.

What plan the Congress in its wisdom will finally adopt no one can say. But it is no more than fair to the legislators in Washington to believe that they will declare in favor of the utmost that operating experience can suggest, technical expertness can plan, and the initiative of the American people demand for their service. All the political and selfish interests in this and other countries can be disregarded, all the nonsensical whimsicalities like ship-tunnels, elevated railroads, and whatnot forgotten along with the defense problems, which latter must be solved as an entirely separate affair. The more we know of this Big Ditch—the only truly interoceanic canal in the world—the more certain are two things: the improvements made must insure a faster, safer, greater flow of traffic; and the more reasonable the solution we work out, the less the public eventually will have to pay out in cash as the ultimate consumer.

Defense of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID M. POTTS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with unanimous consent given to me, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following radio talk which I made over Station WMCA in New York City on Saturday, December 27, 1947:

As the year 1939 and the war in Europe approached our Army and Navy became profoundly apprehensive about the Panama Canal, not only as to its defense but also as to its capacity to accommodate the extra large battlewagons then being built for our Navy. We know this now. It could not be disclosed then. You see, when the Canal was built the locks were made 110 feet wide. At that time that width was considered more than ample to cover the needs of our Navy in the foreseeable future. But naval building changed very greatly in the interval between the two world wars so that by 1939 we had naval vessels with beams greater than 110 feet. These ships could not fit into the locks. Incredible as it may seem, these ships had to go around Cape Horn at the tip of South America to get to the Pacific from the Atlantic, or vice versa. They were thus subjected to greater danger from enemy submarines as well as delay in getting into action in the Pacific theater of the war. So far as these ships were concerned, the purpose of the Canal, which was to expedite the transit of ships between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, was defeated.

The importance of the Canal in war is graphically demonstrated by the report of the Governor of the Canal Zone, General Mehaffey, that over 6,400 transits by combat vessels and about 10,300 by other military craft were made during the war period.

The experiences of World War II indicated the need of reconsidering our interoceanic needs in peace and in war. As a result, the Governor of the Canal Zone was charged by an act of Congress with making a comprehensive review and study, with approximate estimate of costs, of the means for increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal to meet future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense. He was also to make a study to determine whether a canal or canals at other locations might be more useful to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce or national defense than can the present canal with improvements.

The Governor, Gen. Joseph C. Mehaffey, recently completed his report and the President has transmitted it to Congress with a recommendation for a sea-level canal at the present canal site. The cost of such a project is estimated at $2,500,000,000. Over 1,000,000,000 cubic yards of earth and stone would have to be removed. It would take 10 years to complete. That is as long as it took to build the present canal.

Why is the Congress and the people of the United States being asked to provide funds at this time for the Canal?

It has been estimated that the Canal will not be taxed to capacity by commercial ships desiring transit for many years. Consequently, present consideration of canal improvements is impelled principally by reasons of national defense especially since the advent of the atomic bomb.

The report of Governor Mehaffey reflects a profound anxiety as to the vulnerability of the Canal in event of war. We hope and pray that a new war will not be inflicted upon us. But we are not children and so we must face reality, brutal as it may be, in this atomic age.

Of course, the Canal, as it exists today, could be wiped from the face of the Isthmus of Panama by bombardment from atomic missiles. We all know this. The question before us then is what can we do to establish effective measures of defense? This is the problem which is posed by the Governor's report and this is the issue upon which we must bring to bear our most expert knowledge and judicious consideration.

It has already been concluded by the engineers examining the problem that either a lock canal or a sea-level canal would satisfy the needs of interoceanic commerce and the

needs of naval vessels. But it has also been agreed that a lock canal cannot be designed and constructed to give absolute security against loss of the waterway or to provide as great a degree of security against traffic interruption as the comparatively invulnerable sea-level canal. However, the sea-level project will be substantially more costly to develop. Accordingly, Congress will be required to balance security factors against comparative costs in determining what expansion plans will be approved.

Even before the report of the Governor of the Canal Zone was submitted, as required by law, the House Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, of which I have the honor of being chairman, gave intensive and extensive attention and study to the problem in its many complex and important phases. The members of the subcommittee in April of this year went to the Canal and after a period of the most exhaustive and detailed examination drew up a report. This report was filed with the House of Representatives on July 2, 1947, and in it is contained the thoughts and conclusions of the members of the subcommittee. This report makes no recommendations as to what particular form the reconstruction of the Canal should take nor does it make any recommendations regarding alternative sites for the Canal. However, it is largely upon the basis of the facts contained in this report that the legislation, which will make possible the reduction of vulnerability to attack upon the Canal, will be drawn up for submission to the Congress.

The term "sea level" canal means to the layman that a ship comes from one ocean, sails into the Canal at one end, and out the other into the second ocean. That, however, is a misconception. The Pacific Ocean has a 20-foot tide; the Atlantic Ocean, a 2-foot tide. It is only when there is a meshing of tides during the day that the Canal would be truly sea level. That would only be about 30 percent of each day. At other times a tidal lock would have to be used to control the difference of 18 feet in tide levels.

Many naval experts, in turn, prefer the present-type canal—a lock canal—as the best from a navigational standpoint and safety to ships in transit.

Contrary to popular belief, navigational hazards do exist in the Canal of today, which has experienced many accidents and some sinkings. It is said that the sea-level canal will aggravate these perils and would also involve a tremendous expenditure of funds. On the other hand, it would make the Canal less susceptible to complete uselessness in the event of attack.

Governor Mehaffey in his report said:

"Weapons of attack are of primary importance in the determination of Canal security. The atomic bomb introduced a new era of destructiveness in war. Even conventional weapons have increased so much in power, range, and accuracy that practically all existing defenses have been outmoded. New types of airplanes, guided missiles, and rockets are increasing manyfold the difficulties of interception. New devices for directing these weapons are taking the attack out of the hit-or-miss category. The nature of these weapons is such that dependence cannot be placed entirely upon the military defense to prevent a successful attack."

One thing is certain. If the Canal is to be properly defended, we shall need to prepare it to withstand the destructiveness of the atomic bomb and modern conventional weapons.

Possibly the atomic bomb will not be used in the next war, if there should be one. In World War I, poison gas was used. But not in World War II because its use had been outlawed. Perhaps the use of atomic bombs will be outlawed. But whether that be so or not, we cannot omit consideration of the atomic bomb in our determination of adequate Canal defense needs.

Even with a very strong military defense of the Canal, no assurance would exist that an enemy could not penetrate to the Canal with aircraft of great speed carrying conventional or atomic weapons, or with aerial rockets and torpedoes. Nor is there any assurance that a suicide attack of the Japanese "Kamikaze" type or one employing guided missles, launched from land, airplanes, surface vessels, or from submarines, could be averted. It can be expected that new modern weapons will have sufficient power, range, speed, and accuracy to make their complete interception impossible. Unless a canal is safe against these highly destructive weapons, active defense cannot prevent its extended closure or loss for the duration of a war.

It has been said by high authority that the largest conventional weapons would not be a significant threat to the security of the sea-level canal and that were an atomic bomb to be dropped directly into the Canal, traffic could be restored within a period of a few weeks, with full allowance for the difficulties involved in removing radioactive debris.

Let us consider together for a moment some other matters which will also have to be considered in determining the nature of the improvement.

Navy men say that if the Canal is made sea-level, tidal currents will be introduced. Navigation thus will be made more difficult and therefore some naval officers say it can be expected that accidents will be multiplied.

You will recall that the bed of the Canal proper is 85 feet above sea level. It is the function of the locks to raise and lower ships in transit between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. If the locks were blown to bits, the waters of the Canal would promptly cataract into the oceans, leaving behind a muddy mountain pass.

To make the Canal sea level, it will have to be dug down an additional 85 feet the entire distance of the Canal and through the Continental Divide, that range of mountains running down through Central America.

Severe and many slides were experienced in Gaillard, formerly Culebra cut, which runs through the Continental Divide, caused by the excavation when the Canal was built. If it is dug down an additional 85 feet, and the mountains on both sides made that much higher with a consequent greater weight and pressure on the sides of the cut, it is likely that the slides will be more numerous and intensive and a hazard to navigation.

Occasionally islands are pushed up from the floor of the Canal, creating a continuous dredging operation. These are brought about by the great weight of the mountains on the sides of the Canal pressing in on it, the tendency of which in the settling process is to push these islands up in the Canal. If it is dug down an additional 85 feet, it is also likely that many more of these islands will be created.

If it is to remain a lock canal, the question of lock width will have to be given serious consideration. This in turn will depend on what the best minds in naval engineering can foretell will be the nature of naval architecture and construction over a long period of time.

The committee has also reported on suggestions concerning the advisability of building a canal or canals at other sites in Central or South America or both. In all cases it must be kept in mind that the defense of the Canal is not a problem which can affect the United States alone, but, on the contrary, it is quite apparent that every nation in this hemisphere has the most vital concern in seeing established a canal system which not only will be able to transit ships plying the seas in times of peace, but also one which will offer the maximum possible security in times of war. And one, moreover, which will in itself be a mighty bastion against sudden and violent aggression. For their own protection, therefore, it is quite reasonable to suppose that every nation in this hemisphere, and especially those contiguous to the Canal, will cooperate in their own interests as well as for the interests of all the Americas.

Of course, the best defense against war is peace. Two days ago we celebrated the birth of the Prince of Peace. God grant to those in authority—in and out of government—that they shall be so plenteously endowed with a desire for peace, that never again shall humanity be subjected to the utter devastation and demoralization which war brings about.

Poland Should Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a radio address I delivered Sunday, January 4, 1948, over radio station WORC, in Worcester, Mass. This address was made in support of the Justice for Poland program sponsored by the Polish American Congress, Inc.

The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, as United States Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts, I consider it to be not only a pleasure, but a duty to take part in your program.

The pleasure arises from the opportunity presented to express sincere tribute to the millions of my fellow citizens of Polish extraction, in whose hearts burns the same love of freedom that drove Thaddeus Kosciusko to fight on the side of a few weak colonies against one of the great powers of Europe. We have in America no finer citizens than those Poland has given us; none more devoted to the fundamental concepts of a free society; none more willing to suffer privation and hardship, and to die, if need be, to preserve for themselves, for all of us, and our children, the precious heritage of freedom that has been bequeathed to us. We, in America, can well be grateful to Poland and to the Americans of Polish descent for their marked contribution to the progress, from its inception, of our country.

The duty evolves from the obligation resting upon me, and every officer of our National Government, to tell our people the truth about American domestic-world affairs, and specifically to raise our voices on behalf of those peaceful, freedom-loving peoples who today are being cruelly dominated by the ruthless forces of imperialistic suppression.

In our confused postwar efforts to promote a just peace on earth, based upon the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations, there is no sorrier blot on the annals of history than the disgraceful betrayal of the smaller nations, particularly Poland, by the major world powers, including, I am unhappy to say, the United States.

The treatment of Poland is a problem which most Americans here, and millions abroad, regard as the test case of American resolve toward questions of international justice and that fair play among nations which alone can provide an enduring basis for peace.

It is unnecessary, I know, to recite to you in any detail the part played by Poland as our loyal and gallant ally in the recent war. Her military effort on practically all European fronts, the courage of her indomitable people, their fighting spirit and readiness to sacrifice their lives for their independence and the principles at stake in the common cause, surpassed the expectations of everyone in the world. In fact, Poland's record, as a fighting nation, as a devoted and faithful ally, as the only nation which did not produce a quisling, stands unequaled.

You will recall that on the 3d of September 1939, 3 days after Germany's attack on Poland, Great Britain declared war on Germany in accordance with her treaty to defend Poland's independence and territorial integrity.

You will recall further that on July 30, 1941, the day that the Polish-Soviet treaty was signed by General Sikorski and Ambassador Majeski in London, Mr. Anthony Eden, then British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, handed to General Sikorski a statement which ended with these words:

"I also desire to assure you that His Majesty's Government does not recognize any territorial changes which have been effected in Poland since August 1939."

You also know that the Atlantic Charter, which was incorporated in the United Nations Pact of January 1, 1942, declared:

"Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Free public opinion in all the countries which were signatories of this pact interpreted these phrases to be a guaranty by the United Nations, jointly and severally, of the independence and territorial integrity of Poland and the other small nations.

The basic pledge given during World War II to the fighting Polish Nation was that the common victory would bring full restoration of Poland's independence and its territorial integrity.

Neither the United States nor Great Britain have lived up to this pledge. In the three successive agreements reached at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam we scrapped the Atlantic Charter and all provisions of international law to become a party to the extinguishment of Poland's independence. The Polish people were forced, in a series of acts inspired by Soviet Russia, to accept a territorial settlement without being given any opportunity to express their views; the administration of Poland was given over to a group of Soviet officials sponsored by the Russian Government.

Shortly after the Polish elections were held, last January 19, 1947, the President of the United States himself declared that the so-called free and unfettered elections promised to the Polish people at Yalta and Potsdam, were carried out, under a rule of fraud, coercion, and intimidation.

The Honorable Arthur B. Lane, former United States Ambassador to Poland, declared publicly on April 3, 1947, that "he could no longer stay in Warshaw because his presence there might have been construed as an acquiescence to the rule of terrorism and oppression exercised by a Communist-dominated administration over the Polish Nation.

The Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President of the United States Senate, stated on January 29, 1947, that "a world war, which started on behalf of Polish liberty, could scarcely be considered adequately won until Polish liberty is something more than a rigged and terrorized election which defies and defeats every elementary concept of autonomy, self-determination, and democracy and which nullifies the most solemn pledge of which Britain, the United States, and Soviet Russia are capable."

All the leading United States authorities agree that Poland, the first nation to fight against the common enemy, has been deprived of its independence, sovereignty, and territory by one of the victorious allies with the consent of the other United Nations.

It is my considered opinion that the whole European dilemma cannot be brought to a satisfactory solution until the Polish question has been solved. If we fail to correct this original injustice, all our actions, based as they must be on that mistake, will be fraught with portentous implications for the future.

I believe that most Americans are daily becoming more concerned about the present fate of Poland, which stands in accusing testimony to our failure to live and act according to the principles for which our people have fought and died in two world wars.

It is increasingly apparent that we have not only sacrificed moral principle but also needlessly weakened our strategic and economic position in a confused effort to preserve by appeasement something of what was gained for all of us by force of arms. The American public realizes now that, particularly, with respect to Poland, the United States is suffering serious strategic set-backs and losses in prestige all over the world.

In simple moral justice our Government must insist that the Polish people be allowed a free and unfettered election to express their inalienable right to order their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

The great wrong that has been done to Poland must be righted, if the United States of America, and the United Nations are to maintain their own self-respect. The appressed people of Poland are not asking special favors from any nation; they are only requesting their God-given right to be relieved from cruel subservience and be permitted to live as free citizens of a nation ordained and developed under the same principles of individual, personal dignity upon which our own beloved nation is based.

The cause of Poland is, and will be, the one great test to determine if this Nation and the United Nations possesses the moral conscience and courage to carry out the great basic principles for which we fought the war, of establishing freedom and liberty for all peoples.

In personal recognition of the magnificent devotion and sacrifice of Poland and the Polish people, as an American ally, I am honored to pay my humble tribute and to extend my pledge of continued efforts to the sacred cause of Poland and human freedom.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I listened to a news commentary this morning on my way to the Capitol and was so amazed by the subject matter discussed that I have asked the gentleman who made the statements to supply me with a copy of his comments.

I submit herewith the statement made by veteran news commentator George E. Reedy over Station WOL, Mutual network, this morning at 8 o'clock.

I undoubtedly was not the only Member of this body who listened with the same degree of amazement to Mr. Reedy's broadcast this morning. However, I feel that his remarks should be of interest to every man in the country, as well as the membership of this House. I need not elaborate on his statement. However, I do feel that both sides of the aisle should be forewarned of an incredible development in the President's anticipated message tomorrow.

Mr. Reedy's statement follows:

Taking the credit for another man's idea is always a good stunt if you can get away with it. It's even better when you can prevent the other man from doing it himself and still grab the glory at the right psychological moment.

There are strong indications that that is the Democratic strategy at the session of Congress opening today. No one will be positive until the President reads his State of the Union message. Nevertheless, it's in the wind.

The informed guesses are that the President will rock Congress with a request for tax reduction. If he does, the resulting furor will be worth any price of admission. It will be one of the best shows staged on Capitol Hill in years.

The President, of course, is the man who blocked two attempts at tax reduction during the last session. To be sure, they were Republican attempts, and that may have made the difference. With a Democratic name on such a bill he might feel happier.

Naturally, no one expects the President to offer the same proposals advanced by the GOP during the last session. There will be differences, and they may be important differences. Undoubtedly, the approach will not be the same.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that President Truman twice vetoed tax-cutting bills during the last session. In both instances the Democratic minorities were able to muster enough strength to make the vetoes stick.

The principal reason given for the vetoes was that the bills would contribute to inflation. In other words, taxes were being used as a method of cutting down on people's income, so they couldn't buy as much and run up prices.

If the President should change his mind this year and come out for a tax cut, he will have to answer some embarrassing questions. To justify his position he will have to prove that inflation has passed and is no longer a danger.

The Republicans are in no such embarrassing dilemma. They have maintained all along that reducing taxes will not contribute to inflation. On the contrary, they argue that it will help the situation by increasing purchasing power.

Their principal argument at the moment is that the country must either have a tax reduction or a new round of wage increases. They contend that the former is better, because it will be spread out over a large group of people.

The Republicans have their own tax-slicing bill and have made it the No. 1 priority legislation of this session. They are expected to hammer it through in short order. This year they hope they can pass it over a veto.

They may be right. It is hard for any politician—Republican or Democratic—to vote against a tax cut in an election year. That is one operation that is popular with almost everybody. A man who opposes it takes his political life in his hands.

Of course, it may be true, as many Democrats claim, that the voters are not interested in lower taxes. Should that be true, however, it would be passing strange for the President to recommend such action.

At the moment the signs point to his doing just that. Should that be his recommendation, the battle will not be over the legislation but over the credit for it. It's going to be quite a scramble, and at this distance no one knows who will win.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the organized drive and propaganda for universal military training has been going on for some time. I have noted a thoughtful editorial entitled "Volunteers Are Better," in the St. Peter Herald, St. Peter, Minn., of December 12, and a letter recently published in the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., which illustrate another question properly raised, as to the conflict between the proponents of universal military training and those who advocate the Marshall plan.

While the letter points out this conflict between universal military training and the Marshall plan, it does not comment upon the fact that some of the most violent advocates of both universal military training and the Marshall plan are one and the same persons and organizations.

It is also timely to call attention to the fourth Intermediate Report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House Report No. 1073, Eightieth Congress, first session, Investigation of Participation of Federal Officials of the War Department in Publicity and Propaganda, as it Relates to Universal Military Training.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and letter:

[From the St. Peter (Minn.) Herald of December 12, 1947]

VOLUNTEERS ARE BETTER

In a recent column written by Past Commander B. D. Livingston in his column called Legion News a forceful and convincing article favoring universal military training appeared. We hold no brief with the writer for demanding military preparedness, for keeping in step with the world, militarily speaking, and for always being aware of the precious freedoms we possess but too often forget about.

But there is absolutely no foundation for believing that just because we will have UMT that there won't be another Pearl Harbor. The ways of the Lord are manyfold.

Of course we should be strong enough to resist attack. But wouldn't a strong concerted voluntary program that would take in the National Guard, the Reserve training program of the Army, Navy, Marines, and the Air Force, the Regulars for all branches and an expanded ROTC program for both high schools and colleges do the trick. No country that has used the compulsion method of military preparedness has ever had good luck with it. At least until a strong voluntary program of military preparedness has been tried, compulsion should be considered a secondary measure.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post]

UMT AND THE MARSHALL PLAN

America must choose either to help reconstruct Europe or to pass compulsory military training. It cannot do both without injuring the American economy. During the next 4 years the Marshall plan for reconstruction of Europe will cost the United States about $20,000,000,000. Peacetime conscription for the same period would cost in all close to twenty billion.

The yearly cost of conscription would be between three and five billion dollars a year, according to an article in the July 1947 Reader's Digest by the Nation's leading military writer, Hanson Baldwin.

Aid to Europe will, of course, provide markets for American products as well as prevent the growth of communism. Communism is unlikely to spread among people whose needs are being met.

Universal military training, which is far less frightening than the atom bomb, would neither scare Russia nor prevent the growth of communism in Europe, if all our other vast military preparations have not produced these results. Instead, it would withdraw much-needed labor from the production of consumer goods in this country. A shortage of consumer goods and a surplus of money in the hands of the consumers is a major factor in causing inflation.

Marriner Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, was quoted in the press of September 26 as warning that the country faces danger of economic collapse if inflation continues unchecked, and that "military expenditures comprising the largest single item in the budget * * * are one of the most important factors that contribute to inflation." He suggested that it would be better to reduce expenditures on the Nation's military forces. He said, "It may be we could spend less on military forces if we spent more to maintain conditions on which democracy and peace depend."

If we cannot add three to five billion dollars each year to our military expenditures without the possibility of economic collapse, it would be folly to pass conscription. Nothing would do more to encourage the growth of communism at home and abroad than the economic collapse of America.

Not only must a choice be made between reconstruction and conscription, but if the Marshall plan is going to cost about twenty billion dollars there ought to be a reasonable assurance that it will succeed. Insistence on the passage of compulsory military training now would certainly imply lack of confidence in the ability of the Marshall plan to accomplish its purpose. It would obviously be difficult to make a case for compulsory training if the reconstruction of Europe does accomplish its purpose.

Moreover, a provocative move like the adoption of conscription would seem to imply that the reconstruction of Europe was just another aspect of the power struggle between Russia and America and not really intended to help achieve peace. This in itself would injure America. Marquis Childs, writing from Paris, was quoted in the press of October 8 as saying:

"If in coming into being the Marshall plan takes on the appearance of another and grander move in the struggle for supremacy, the chances of final success will be small. The ordinary man who has endured so much wants to believe that it represents the hope of a better world."

To give the Marshall plan of reconstruction the best possible chance to succeed the proposal for compulsory military training should be dropped.

Rev. Allan P. Farrell, S. J., Associate Editor, America; Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Pastor Emeritus, Riverside Church, New York; Rabbi Robert Gordis, Professor, Jewish Theological Seminary; Dr. Mordecai Johnson, President, Howard University; Dr. Alonzo F. Myer, Professor, New York University; Dr. Ralph McDonald, Secretary, Department of Higher Education, National Education Association.

WASHINGTON.

Marshall Plan—International Gamble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John S. Knight, editor of the Chicago Daily News, correctly points out that the so-called Marshall plan will involve risks and sacrifices. The American people should know and fully understand what is involved in this gigantic program. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on Monday, December 22, 1947:

INTERNATIONAL GAMBLE—MARSHALL PLAN TO INVOLVE BOTH RISKS AND SACRIFICES

President Truman's message on the Marshall plan presents to Congress and to the American people the biggest, most daring—and most expensive—peacetime program this Nation has ever been asked to consider.

In effect, the Marshall plan makes the United States underwriter of a new 17-member United Nations.

If the plan is adopted the American frontier is no longer the Rhine; it is the stratosphere.

The plan proposes that we gamble $17,000,000,000 on the proposition that 16 other nations can and will cooperate with us to restore economic and political order in Europe and thus lay the foundation for peace and prosperity throughout the world.

It is a colossal gamble. So many unknowns and variants and intangibles are involved that no sane mathematician would attempt to work out the odds.

In its simplest terms the Marshall plan proposes that the United States contribute during the next 4 years approximately $17,000,000,000 in grants and loans to 16 non-Communist nations of western Europe. The money is to be converted into food, raw materials, and machinery to speed economic recovery.

Also, in President Truman's own words, it is designed to make sure that the 270,000,000 people of those countries do not turn, in their distress, to communism.

"Such a turn of events," said Mr. Truman, "would constitute a shattering blow to peace and stability of the world. It might well compel us to modify our own economic system and to forego, for the sake of our own security, the enjoyment of many of our own freedoms and privileges."

Aid to China is to be considered separately. Also, by inference, the President left the door open to other European nations which might at a later date want to participate on the same terms as the original 16.

To receive our aid, each country must agree to carry out a seven-point program:

1. Increase its own agricultural and industrial production.
2. Stabilize its currency and maintain a proper rate of exchange.
3. Cooperate in eliminating tariffs and other barriers that interfere with trade.
4. Cooperate with other nations for the welfare of Europe as a whole.
5. Stimulate production of certain raw materials and facilitate procurement by the United States for stock piling of raw materials we need.
6. Deposit in a special account the equivalent in their own currency of the grants they receive from us, such funds to be used only in a manner mutually agreeable to them and to us.
7. Furnish their people and the United States appropriate information concerning the use made of our aid and the progress under agreements with us and other countries.

These agreements were entered into in substance by the 16 nations last summer. To date they have done little toward putting them into effect. If the interval had been used effectively to put their own houses in order the plan would have more support in the United States.

Meanwhile, the situation has deteriorated in some European countries—notably France and Italy—and in the United States. Our inflation has increased the cost of the commodities Europe needs by approximately 7½ percent since the Paris Conference was held. This suggests that if the plan is to go through, we, too, will have to put our house in order.

Certainly we will have to increase our production in agriculture and industry. We will have to stabilize our currency. We will have to carry out at home some of the governmental reforms we demand of the beneficiaries of our bounty. High on the list of such reforms are governmental economy and efficiency.

Mr. Truman skirted the subject of our domestic responsibilities warily.

He devoted a few words to stating that the undertaking would be costly, would require self-sacrifice, and carried no guaranty of success. He suggested that rationing and controls might be necessary. He warned that efforts would be made to incite strikes in Europe to hamper working of the plan.

He made no mention of the necessity of avoiding strikes at home, if we are to attain the production goals necessary to make the program succeed here and abroad.

He made one concession to widespread demand: The program, if adopted, will be administered by a new governmental agency, separate from the State Department, but guided by it.

The Economic Cooperation Administration would be headed by an administrator, drawing $20,000 a year. His first deputy would receive $17,500. A director, maintaining liaison with the cooperating countries, would have ambassadorial rank and allowances, and would receive $25,000 annually. The total ECA administration pay roll would be about $712,500 a year.

President Truman said he presented his message now rather than after the new Congress convened in January because it is essential that the plan be in operation by April 1, 1948.

That does not give Congress and the people much time in which to consider one of the most important and revolutionary pieces of legislation the Nation has ever had to face.

The battle in Congress promises to be heated and prolonged.

If we adopt the Marshall plan it means more than acting as banker, commissary, and wet nurse for western Europe. The plan is intended to give western Europe and ourselves military security. If it is to work, we must make ourselves stronger industrially and economically. We must meanwhile make ourselves stronger in arms, lest potential enemies threaten to thwart the plan's objectives by force.

Particularly, we must have the world's biggest and best air force, and bases throughout the world from which it can operate.

Many such bases are available in the countries we propose to aid or in their colonial possessions. The cooperating countries should grant us basing rights, wherever necessary, as part of the Marshall plan agreement. Such bases are as essential to defense of western Europe as they are to us. They are essential to the world peace and prosperity that the Marshall plan seeks to achieve.

We must realize that if we adopt the Marshall plan, it will mean more than adopting a new foreign policy. It may also turn out to be a major factor in our domestic affairs for years to come.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is about to take up the so-called Marshall plan for discussion in committees and on the floor. This will be an interesting and a historic discussion. It is important in that debate as in all discussions which affect the future of the American people, we should have facts, accuracy, honesty, and a minimum of propaganda.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial comments on this subject which appear in the current issue of American World Intelligence, a bimonthly letter, written by Dr. C. S. Norborg in Washington, which has an increasing and well-deserved circulation, both in the country and abroad. The article follows:

EUROPEAN HONESTY VERSUS AMERICAN PROPAGANDA

Once again, the American public (and the U. S. Congress) will be flooded with the half-truths and sentimental double-talk to which the present administration always repair, when it wants to sell the people a financial foreign-aid plan.

If the recent propaganda efforts of the Foreign Policy Association and the Washington Post are samples of what we are in for, the European recovery plan will be sold to an uninformed American public opinion as (1) a device with which to stop communism; (2) an attempt to build a bulwark in western Europe against Soviet expansion; (3) a plan by which the free governments of Europe will be helped to recover from the war; and (4) a "calculated risk" which—given a chance—will pay good dividends for all, including the United States.

But, is this the real story?

Surrounded by this irresponsible American propaganda, it is morally refreshing to be able to quote exactly what leading European statesmen have told us both publicly and privately. They are very forthright about their interpretation of the so-called Marshall plan, which incidentally, was outlined on the front pages of European newspapers 6 days before Mr. Marshall spoke at Harvard on June 6, 1947.

Here is what the Europeans say:

1. Western Europe looks upon the Marshall plan as a financial aid, pure and simple, without any strategic or anti-Soviet angles.

2. The Marshall plan is but the American part of an over-all plan of inter-European recovery, the success of which will rest also upon a tremendous trade with the Soviet Union and the Soviet-controlled nations of eastern Europe.

3. With the indispensable assistance of the United States during the next 4 years, western Europe hopes and plans to raise its production to a level of from 140 to 170 percent of the prewar level.

4. This tremendously expanded production western Europe plans to sell by exporting it to the four corners of the world. The precise export picture for 1951 is, for example, as follows:

[Millions of United States dollars]

Exports to—	1938	1951
United States	443	1,484
Rest of American continent	867	2,461
Other nonparticipating countries	2,365	6,816

In other words, the Europeans expect in 1951 to export both to the United States and to the rest of this continent three times more (in dollars) than they exported in 1938.

The total figures for exports from the participating countries stand at $10,761,000,000 (1951) as compared with $3,615,000,000 in 1938.

5. The Europeans bluntly warn that the world trade recovery will fail if American dollars are not available in South America, Canada, the Far East, Southeast Asia, and other mutual trade areas.

6. Finally, the Europeans still maintain that the European currencies involved cannot be stabilized except by having sufficient gold being made available: $3,000,000,000 is the minimum needed, and those $3,000,000,000 of gold must come from the United States Treasury.

How trivial, how misleading the American propaganda talk must appear to any informed person: Why should the American people always be cheated?

American World Intelligence firmly believes in the necessity of pooling the economic, political, and productive strength of the free nations. However, we have had first-hand opportunity to watch the inefficiency and secrecy of our representatives in international affairs and believe that no good can come to America or to free men elsewhere by the continuation of cheap, superficial, and nonfactual propaganda.

Henry Wallace Waves Magic Wand, Bringing "Peace, Prosperity"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following article on Henry Wallace by John Griffin which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., recently:

HENRY WALLACE WAVES MAGIC WAND, BRINGING "PEACE, PROSPERITY"—TRIES TO TELL AMERICAN PEOPLE HE, ALONE, HAS ALL THE ANSWERS—REMEMBER HIS SCARCITY PROGRAM?

(By John Griffin)

One of the greatest searches in all history is close to ending. It is the search for peace. Down through the ages, men have looked in vain for some way of assuring peace, but the secret has always eluded them. It seems to have been the eternal quest, the goal of men great and small.

Sometimes the road seemed open, but always something formed a block and caused a detour. Men have kept trying, however. They have formed a league of nations, an organization called the United Nations. They have striven mightily, but have never reached the goal.

SEARCH IS ENDED

But the search is all over now. It ended last Monday night at approximately 10:45 o'clock, a date and hour that will surely live in history. At that time, the great secret was revealed. All that is necessary is to vote for Henry A. Wallace for President of the United States.

In addition to that, Mr. Wallace is going to throw in prosperity, too, all for the price of one vote. Certainly this is a wonderful bargain to set before the American people and, of course, they will jump at it.

Here's how it happened, according to Mr. Wallace's own version:

He went to the leaders of the Democratic Party and laid down certain terms as the price for his support of that party's candidates in the coming election. They said to him, "Henry Wallace, we welcome your support, but we will not change our policies."

And that, Mr. Wallace says, was "the answer to millions of Americans who demand the right to vote for peace and prosperity." Well, that took care of the Democratic Party all right. That leaves the Republican Party to be handled.

As for the Republicans, there is no hope at all, Mr. Wallace states, for you can't expect them to be interested in peace and prosperity. So draw your own conclusions; Mr. Wallace is the only choice left. And he's willing.

SHOW THE WORLD

So he goes a step further, and says that "the bigger the peace vote (meaning, of course, the vote for Wallace) the more definitely the world will know that the United States is not behind the bipartisan reactionary war policy that is dividing the world."

He doesn't see any difference between the Republicans and President Truman. Both, in his opinion, are opening the door for war and are making certain that if war doesn't come in our lifetime, it will surely be ready for the next generation.

Well, nobody wants that, so the answer is clear. All you need to do is cast your vote for Wallace and say right out loud, "We are voting peace and security for ourselves and our children's children."

Simple enough, isn't it? How can Wallace lose? He has a perfect set-up. Here he is, the guarantor of peace and prosperity and security for generations to come. And who's opposing him?

A Truman, a Marshall, a Vandenberg, Dewey, Taft, Stassen, Saltonstall, and all the Democratic and Republican leaders and prospective candidates, all knowing nothing about peace and prosperity, all wanting war and depression.

ALL THE WARMONGERS

Look at all those men who have conferred with the Russian representatives, Stettinius, Byrnes, Marshall, and the rest. All of them giving their time and effort in exhausting efforts to bring about another war.

Think of the courage of Mr. Wallace to come right out flatly for peace and prosperity. There's a man for you. He doesn't want war, with all its misery. He doesn't favor depression and want. No, sir; he's for peace and prosperity.

He is not like the rich monopolists who have always been more ready to sacrifice their sons than their money and now have reached the point where they are willing to sacrifice both for the sake of world control.

Oh, yes. There is one other thing I forgot: Mr. Wallace is also for abundance and against scarcity. Someone might be unkind enough to point to Mr. Wallace and say, "Look who's talking?" Those unregenerate souls might be those who recall who was the apostle of scarcity a few years ago. But they won't embarrass Mr. Wallace; he doesn't embarrass easily.

If he did, he certainly couldn't be talking about the need for a United Nations disarmament conference "to rid humanity for all time of the threat of the atomic bomb and all other methods of mass destruction." Because that is just what the United States has repeatedly tried to do, only to find the Russians in opposition.

But let's not get into difficult things like that; it only makes the situation more complex, when actually, according to Mr. Wallace, it is very simple. All we have to do is have a peaceful settlement of our differences with Russia.

HAS MAGIC WAND

That ought to be easy, even though several leading American statesmen appeared to have failed at the task. Turn it over to Henry Wallace. He will wave his magic wand and all will be well. The Russians will immediately become cooperative and wholesome in all their dealings, they will look upon all our differences objectively.

They won't try to communize Europe or to split up Germany, or to interfere in Balkan affairs. They won't call all Americans who support the American foreign policy "warmongers and hatemongers and imperialists." All will be sweetness and light and the Russians will be gentle of spirit and wholehearted in looking at things objectively.

So if you want to, you can join the forces of peace, progress, and prosperity and support Henry Wallace. It's as simple as that, according to Mr. Wallace. And if you don't join, you are probably a dirty Fascist and reactionary and a monopolist and an imperialist. So there!

There was one line in the Wallace speech which seems to stick out. "It just doesn't make sense," he said. He was referring to the monopolists who want to sacrifice their sons and their money. He was not referring to his own speech.

But it applies pretty well at that.

United States Air Supremacy the Only Hope for a Permanent Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following radio address entitled "United States Air Supremacy the Only Hope for a Permanent Peace," delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co. network, December 26, 1947:

Ladies and gentlemen, the most important and by far the most vital of all principles in a realistic platform on foreign policy for the United States is the rapid achievement and the continued maintenance of full and adequate preparedness for defense on the sea, on the land, and more especially in the air. All the funds required to keep us the strongest military nation on the planet should be unhesitatingly appropriated by the Congress, and then, having done this, the Congress should insist that the armed services efficiently and effectively move to an early and full realization of this proposed goal. A strong and powerful United States is the surest guaranty for the perpetuation of a society of free nations. Only by adopting and acting upon the principle of sufficient preparedness will we be able to win the long-protracted struggle in which we are engaged for the achievement of an enduring peace.

On several occasions I have stated that air supremacy by the United States must for our own national interests become an actuality at the earliest possible moment, regardless of cost, the effort, or the sacrifice involved. Air power is peace power. United States air supremacy is the only hope for a permanent peace. In a telegram to President Truman and the Republican leadership of the Congress on August 21 of this year I strongly urged the calling of a special session to adopt the Marshall European Recovery Program and to strengthen the armed forces of the United States, particularly the Air Force.

There is an imposing array of impelling reasons why the United States must have air supremacy. Overwhelming air power is required to protect our world-wide interests. In view of the Russian program of expansion and aggression, air strength is necessary if we are to make our voice heard in world affairs and if encroachment on strategic points is to be resisted. Complete control of the air is the only defense against the atomic bomb. The vast oil supplies of the Middle East which will soon furnish the life blood of our economic system must not go unprotected. The money which we propose to spend on the Marshall plan to bring recovery to western Europe will be thrown away if we do not achieve air superiority to make our security and the respect for our will certain. Failing to strengthen our armed forces the position of the United States in world affairs will be jeopardized and the decline of the leadership of this Republic will be a favorite subject for dissertations by the historians of the future.

Our position in world affairs must be made perfectly clear. We should have it thoroughly understood that we will use our strength in the future to stop and defeat aggression just as we have done on two occasions within the last 30 years. We should emphatically state that an attack directed at certain strategic positions, the integrity of which we deem essential to the security of the United States, will be considered an unfriendly and inimical act. The world should be informed that when there is any encroachment upon strategic areas, such as the approaches to the Atlantic, Gibraltar, Greece, the Dardanelles, Turkey, Iran, the Near East, the islands of the Pacific, and so on, the aggressor making the encroachment will be met at once with our concerted, sustained, and unrelenting resistance. Any movement on the points I have mentioned would constitute an attack on our country and a threat to our national life. To take such a position as I have outlined requires air power—swift, overwhelming, devastating air power.

Any nation contemplating an atomic attack on the United States will hesitate only if she knows that within a period of hours from the time the attack is made there will be delivered in reprisal a knock-out, devastating, retaliatory blow from the air. The United States can be immunized against assault from the air by building a completely unassailable and invincible air force. With air supremacy and atomic supremacy any aggressor would not entertain the idea of an attack upon us because it would be perfectly clear that the cities of the country making the attack, the industrial centers, the lines of communication, and great segments of the population would be wiped from the face of the earth by a practically instantaneous single paralyzing blow from the air. Only by being fully prepared to deliver such a blow within a matter of hours after the first indication of an impending assault upon us will we be able to consider ourselves in possession of any measure of security. We have the ability, the resources, the strength, and the will which we must begin to exercise to create an air force fully capable of accomplishing the objectives I have set forth.

The rapid pace of our ill-timed and unwise demobilization left us scarcely anything from the wreckage of the most powerful fighting force in all history. One could weep at the asininity of our performance. Within a few months after the demobilization order, the Air Forces were unable to put one single squadron in the air at war-time standards of efficiency. We liquidated 320 groups and 80,000 airplanes, terminated contracts involving more than $10,000,000,000, closed more than 600 zones of interior stations and about 1,000 overseas stations. We disposed of surplus property in a total amount of $25,000,000,000 and lost most of our experienced personnel, both military and civilian.

The peak strength of the United States Air Force during World War II was as follows: Military personnel, 2,411,294. There were 243 groups with 104 separate squadrons, the approximate number of planes, 80,000.

When hostilities ceased, the Air Force Staff reached the conclusion that the minimum level at which the United States Air Force could be reduced in peacetime and still fulfill its responsibilities would be 70 tactical groups and 22 separate squadrons with necessary supporting services. The attainment and maintenance of an Air Force of this size has been the basis for the Air Force's recommended budgets to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress. The funds to support this 70-group program have not been forthcoming and the current appropriations for the fiscal year provide for only 55 tactical groups and supporting services.

General Spaatz in a statement at a public hearing before the President's Air Policy Commission on November 17, 1947, said "we need 6,869 aircraft for the 70 groups, including training; 3,212 for the Air National Guard; and 2,360 for the Air Reserve; the total amounts to 12,441 airplanes. To keep this force modern and up-to-date we require an annual procurement of about 5,200 planes. Also a reserve of 8,100 airplanes is essential.

The money we allotted to the Air Force for the current fiscal year is $3,388,000,000. To establish the minimum 70-group program as recommended by the United States Air Force, we should have appropriated approximately $5,235,000,000 for the fiscal year. To achieve the absolute minimum air force for safety and to have a reserve of approximately 8,100 planes as determined by General Spaatz, we must allocate a much larger sum of money to the Air Force.

If the Air Force has a 70-group peacetime organization backed up by a reserve and an Air National Guard, it would demand a procurement program for airplanes, a training establishment and other activities which would require an expenditure for Air Force purposes alone amounting to approximately $6,000,000,000 annually, beginning at once. This means for the next fiscal year. Such a program would call for a force of 401,000 military and 150,000 civilian personnel, making a total of 551,000.

On December 15, I introduced a bill providing for a supplemental appropriation of $500,000,000 to be expended on the Air Force between now and June 30, 1948. This sum could be obligated and used economically during the remainder of the current fiscal year for the purpose of implementing the proposed 70-group program. Beginning with the fiscal year 1948 we should appropriate to achieve the irreducible minimum air protection for the United States, $6,000,000,000 annually. It should be emphasized and reemphasized, iterated and reiterated, that the suggested supplemental appropriation of $500,000,000 and the annual appropriation of $6,000,000,000 beginning with the next fiscal year will provide for this country only the barest minimum peacetime Air Force to maintain our national security.

Even with the allotment of funds I have advocated it would be 1952 before the United States could realize the 70-group program were we to start at once. When this 70-group program is a reality we will have only the basis on which air supremacy could be achieved. Should we be attacked, this minimum Air Force would be just sufficient to blunt the enemy's first offensive. We would not have air supremacy and before we could attain it a period of 18 months would be required. To win a war we must have an Air Force of approximately 175 to 200 groups.

In view of these startling facts and in view of the feverish manner in which the Soviet Union is increasing her armed strength, we must act with haste to acquire air security for the United States. It is utterly ridiculous to continue to talk tough if we have no intention of moving to secure adequate preparedness. The United States cannot make its will felt with a $3,000,000,000 Air Force. I hope that we will exercise the foresight, the courage, and the statesmanship to grant at least the appropriations necessary to realize the 70-group program. Personally, I would make available much larger funds in order that we might reach the goal of complete air supremacy in the immediate future.

The Present Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two editorials by Mr. A. R. Wilder, the able editor and publisher of the Amboy Herald, Amboy, Minn., which will be of special interest to my colleagues because of their common sense and practical approach:

AS EXPECTED

Sure, just as we expected, the Republicans are now being accused by the Democrats of failing to do in one session of Congress, and against a Democratic President, what the Democrats have failed to do in nearly 15 years. And we think we are more lenient in our attitude than the supporters of present administration in that we make no attempt to deny that they have accomplished some good in that time. But when it is expected that just because the Republicans have had a congressional majority in only one session of Congress, and are thereby expected to right all the wrongs accumulated in over 15 years of the present controlling powers, we think that is just a little bit too much. A lot of detail could be added to back up that statement, but that is the gist of the situation at the present. Also we find the present administration adopting policies and strategy which they hope will entangle the Republicans in case they should be given the entire reins of government at our next election, and which in itself is a tacit admission that they do not expect to win. For nearly 15 years the present administration has played a superpolitical game, and it would not be in the least bit surprising if the people of this Nation would follow the present trend at the next election and make a change.

PRICES

The Minnesota poll reveals that more than three-fourths of the people in the State want Congress to do something about prices. But when it comes to settling on any definite price program the poll reveals that they fly off onto to so many angles that not any one of them gets more than a very small minority. Those that wanted lower prices polled the largest minority vote of 24 percent, and all of the rest of the angles on the price situation had a much smaller minority vote, even down to only 1 percent. And we wonder how Congress can pass any legislation that will fit that kind of a mess. To sum it all up, we might just as well say that we all want lower prices for what we buy and higher prices for what we sell, and who don't? But on the basis of the above it looks as if it might be dangerous to tamper too much with price controls, and let the present situation work itself out in due course. However if some restrictive legislation were passed on black markets and similar abuses of prices, there might be one angle that could receive some just attention, and which is long past due.

Community-Wide Demonstration Commemorating Palestine Partition, Revere, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following speech delivered by me before the community-wide demonstration commemorating the Palestine partition, Sunday, December 21, 1947 at 8 p. m., in Revere, Mass.:

Fellow Americans, the United Nations has made its first major decision.

This infant organization, upon whose development the security of mankind depends, devoted more time, study, and anxious effort to find a solution to the problem of Palestine than to any other issue to come before it.

It is significant that the first constructive step of the United Nations was to right an ancient wrong which has troubled the conscience of the world for many, many years. The United Nations, faced with the conflicting claims of Jews and Arabs, has struggled with this serious problem during months of intensive investigation and debate.

Then came the last week of November 1947.

In Palestine—that tiny area of land which is the hub of communications between Europe and Asia—a land crossed by the great artery of a pipe line which carries the liquid wealth of oil from Arabia to the Mediterranean ports, a land tense with the intrigues of great powers, the climax of an age-old drama had arrived. Crowds stood for hours in front of radio loud-speakers on the streets of Tel-Aviv. Newspapers worked night and day, rushing special editions off the presses as they tried to give a blow-by-blow account of the great debate which was taking place in the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York. The verdict hung in the balance. Earlier the committee had voted for the partition plan by a margin of 25 to 13. But 2 nations were absent and 17 had abstained from voting. There lay the crux of the whole situation. Why were so many nations on the fence? Which way would they lean? The outcome would alter the foreign policy of great nations, and, as such, was a matter of world interest. To the 1,800,000 Jewish and Arab people of the Holy Land it was more than this. All the hopes and fears and cross-purposes of centuries were coming to a head.

This might be a life-or-death decision for the people of Palestine.

Thirty years ago Great Britain was delegated to rule Palestine under a League of Nations mandate that promised eventual establishment of a Jewish national home in the Holy Land. This mandate specified that "nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of non-Jewish communities."

Britain failed in the job of trying to satisfy both the Jews and the Arabs. It has cost her much in treasure to garrison this key country. Because she has tried to keep to the middle of the road in her administration of Palestine, she has reaped the harvest of world indignation.

The partition plan, written chiefly by the United States and Soviet Russia, calls for the termination of the mandate by next August 1. By October 1, two independent states and a United Nations trusteeship will come into existence. They are:

The Arab state, comprising 4,500 square miles, with a population of 604,000 Arabs and 10,000 Jews.

The Jewish state, embracing 5,500 square miles, with a population of 397,000 Arabs and 538,000 Jews.

The United Nations supervised area of Jerusalem, with 289 square miles and a population of 105,000 Arabs and 100,000 Jews.

This does not take into account the 75,000 Jews who are expected to emigrate to Palestine in the first half of 1948, with a larger influx toward the end of the year.

Britain said that irrespective of what the United Nations might decide, she was going to give up her mandate and get out of Palestine. She refused to participate in any United Nations plan unless it was accepted by both Arab and Jew. The responsibility which has proved so costly to Britain in men, money, and prestige at last became too much for her. After repeated attempts to get both groups together, the British Government, under the additional pressure of those who wanted her to get out of Palestine for good, threw the whole problem into the forum of the United Nations.

What would the 17 nations who had abstained from voting in the committee—what would they do when the roll call of the Assembly was read? We have no proof that the United States Government persuaded those who were undecided, to vote for partition—but we strongly suspect that Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and other public-spirited Americans had something to do with it. For when the final vote was tallied, partition had won.

And there was great rejoicing among the Jews of Palestine—among the refugee Jews in Europe who look to the Holy Land as their only salvation—and among the Jewish community in the United States. I am happy to add that many of your fellow Americans who are not Jews, shared your rejoicing. We have always inclined toward those people who have the belief, the courage, and the persistence to follow through in their quest for freedom. For free peoples need the support of one another in this world where tired nations are in danger of giving up their birthright for the illusion of security. The struggle for liberty is a long and difficult one, as the Jews know, better than any other people. The winning of it is only the beginning—a notable beginning which should inspire us to defend it with vigilance, and to care for it as a living quality which we must nourish for its greater development.

Since the UN made its momentous decision, Britain has quickened her plans to get out of Palestine. Furthermore, she says that British troops will not be available to enforce order between Jews and Arabs. She intends to terminate her mandate as early as May 15 of next year. This, apart from the earlier date set for withdrawal of her troops, was what she had already said before the UN General Assembly. To this, however, she has added a new provision, stating that she does not want the United Nations to send a commission to Palestine to prepare the way for partition until May.

Clearly, this raises the possibility of a serious situation. The UN's administrative machinery to carry out the partition is made up of representatives from Bolivia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Panama, and the Philippines. It will be aided by a secretariat drawn from the UN staff.

It will follow these steps.

1. It is now making a preliminary study of its task. Early in January it will go to Palestine.

2. The partition plan has already outlined the general boundaries. The Commission will fix the exact ones.

3. The Commission will work with Jewish and Arab groups to set up the government structure of the new states.

4. On the date that Britain yields up her mandate, the Commission will become the transitional government of the Holy Land.

5. On October 1, at the latest, the Commission will formally transfer sovereignty to the two new states. Partition will then be completely in effect.

The British decision to pull out earlier, without allowing the Commission to start its interim work before that time, might create a vacuum which would lead to widespread violence and bloodshed. The British must be prevailed upon to reconsider, and give the Commission sufficient time to establish a provisional government before she withdraws.

But, apart from this emergency angle, how is partition to be enforced? The UN is hopeful that its prestige will have a moderating effect. If this fails, the problem becomes one for the 11-nation UN Security Council.

It can proceed in two ways. First, it can order members of the UN to invoke economic and diplomatic sanctions against an aggressor state. Second, it can call on member nations to provide troops to deal with the situation.

In view of the tense international situation, and the distance of transport separating the United States from Palestine, our Nation is presently reluctant to supply troops. We have vital oil interests in the Middle East. There is anxiety and tension among the 11,000 Americans directing an investment of hundreds of millions of dollars in these countries. Many of them live in isolated communities where they would be completely cut off in the event of a holy war. It is felt that if we send troops, the Arabs, spurred on by Russia, might provoke a major crisis which would lead to war. On the other hand, if we abstain, Russia might propose that she provide the Security Council's troops—a move that might give her a complete grip on this strategic region. Britain will not lend her troops to enforce partition.

The brief picture I have just drawn, looks at the worst possibilities in the situation, so that we may anticipate and avoid, the worst.

What is the immediate picture? In the 3 weeks which have passed since the United Nations made its decision, hundreds have been killed and wounded, and many thousands of dollars in property damage has been suffered, as Arabs attacked, and Jews defended themselves.

Part of this may be due to the release of overwrought emotions. Part of this stems from the Arab campaign of creating a major nuisance in the hope of obtaining concessions. Perhaps part of it is calculated to save the Arab "face."

And how do Jewish leaders regard these attacks?

They are realistic. They know that the Arabs deeply resent the decision to establish a separate Jewish state. What the Arabs are prepared to do about it—is the factor which must be carefully appraised.

The Jews believe, and rightly, that the United Nations, and particularly the United States as a main sponsor of partition, cannot leave them out on a limb.

Zionists claim that if the British troops are drawn back too quickly toward ports of embarkation, it will put the Jews at a disadvantage against Arab fighters who are expected to follow in the wake of the departing British. English soldiers will be withdrawing through an area which is intended to become a Jewish state and Jews may be handicapped in getting their defense forces organized with British troops in the way. The Arabs, on the other hand, have only to close in as the British pull back.

It is not believed, however, that full-scale warfare of Arabs against Jews will break out. Officials in Palestine anticipate that guerrilla warfare will be carried on by the Arabs against their Jewish neighbors.

The Arabs will boycott goods from Palestine, placing a strain on the economy of the new Jewish state, while guerrillas make raids upon railroads, industrial installations, and upon agricultural projects. Under such an attack, Palestine may have to fight hard for survival for some years after partition. Those of us who believe in her cause are so confident that she has the resourcefulness and the courage to do so.

The Jews have the Hsganah.

The Haganah's strength is a secret but it is believed that they have a total of about 70,000 members, of whom some 10,000 are well-trained, first-line fighters. Among them are several thousand men seasoned in World War II, as British troops and officers. A reservoir of raw material is the additional 30,000 or 40,000 young people between the ages of 17 and 25, now being registered for national service.

No, the Jews are not asking for men. They have their own. But, to guard against any eventuality, they need arms, which they wish to buy from the United States. We have given arms to Greece and Turkey. Can we do less for the young Jewish state, whose cause we have supported with so many words? I say that we cannot and will not abandon them now. The United States must send military supplies to Palestine at once.

But Palestine also needs help in the financial field, in order to survive economic warfare. For this she looks to friends in the United States, as well as in other parts of the world. With characteristic belief in the justice of their cause, the Jewish people are working with a will to help themselves before they ask help from others. Palestine is an old land but its settlements are new, built up from the wasteland by work and sweat and the inspiration of a dream that is on the verge of becoming reality, because the Jews are making it come true.

Aware of the economic needs of the young state as it faces the problems of self-government while harassed by neighboring Arab states, American Jewry is responding to the challenge. During the past week, plans were mapped to raise $250,000,000 in 1948, for aid to the Jewish nation that is coming into being. This is the largest quota ever set by any private relief organization in the history of the United States.

It will require back-breaking effort and sacrifice to raise this huge total which is needed to defend Palestine and put it squarely on its feet as a self-governing and self-sustaining nation.

Your zeal and the cooperation of your fellow-Americans will put this drive across.

The Jews of Palestine will, if need be, fight for their freedom. With your help, and my help, and that of all believers in the future of freemen—they will, most certainly—build for it.

Your people have wandered 20 centuries in search of a haven for your brethren who are oppressed. Now it is at hand. Within sight of the goal, the Jewish people will not be stopped by those who would challenge their birthright.

For Palestine is born. And it will survive and prosper.

Address of Gov. Earl Warren, of California, to Hollywood Republican Committee

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the recently organized Hollywood Republican Committee which has for its declared purpose to support and defend the American way of life held its first dinner meeting at the Beverly Hills Hotel. The principal speaker was the Governor of California, Earl Warren.

The president of the Hollywood Republican Committee is motion picture actor George Murphy and the vice president is Robert Montgomery. Other officers include Walt Disney, Leo McCarey, Adolph Menjou, Ginger Rogers, and many others prominent in the motion-picture industry.

The Hollywood Republican Committee representing, as it does, many prominent executives and actors in the motion-picture industry will be an effective element in the 1948 campaign, and by its organization and its effective work up to the present time has added prestige and influence to the Republican Party in the State of California.

Following is the address delivered by Gov. Earl Warren:

This gathering is a good sign of the times. To me it represents what is going on in the minds of Americans everywhere. People are reaching out now for an opportunity to be helpful to our country in the solution of our many problems, domestic and foreign. They recognize in these problems both the seeds of progress and of disaster. Single-handedly, however, they often cannot tell which is which. It is only when they are viewed from every angle and from every source of light that one can be clearly distinguished from the other.

It is to accomplish this purpose that people are increasingly recognizing the necessity of associating themselves together for the purpose of political thought and action. It is not only a phenomenon of our day; it has long been a characteristic of the American people. It was this instinct that brought our party system into being a century and a half ago.

Strangely enough, the founding fathers did not perceive the necessity of political parties. Some were violently opposed to the mere suggestion of them, but their development was inevitable. As problems of government appeared on the surface people debated them, made patterns for their solutions, developed philosophies, and gave names to their groups, as a result of which political parties came into being.

Through the years these parties have risen and fallen according to their usefulness. Fortunately for the American system our people have always been satisfied to solve their problems through the medium of two parties. On occasions when they were not measuring up to the standards set for them by the electorate, or when dissension had torn their ranks asunder, new parties were launched. Always, however, within a short time the American people would settle down again to the two major parties which they could use most effectively in the solution of the current problems.

The Republican Party itself came into being through the dissolution of one of the major parties of the day. Many groups were vying for leadership. The present Republican Party supplied that leadership. It started as a party of principle, a party of the people. For almost a hundred years it has been a dynamic force in the life of our Nation.

The Republican Party has had its "ups and downs" as have all other human institutions. It has been in power and out of power. It has at times performed great things for the Nation. At other times when it became self-satisfied and lethargic, it invariably paid the price for its omissions.

But the core of the Republican Party has always remained sound. It has never wavered from true American principles. Invariably, therefore, we have been able to rebuild around it until it could again assume a dominant place in the political life of the Nation.

We now stand on the threshold of the greatest opportunity the Republican Party has had in a generation to serve the needs of the American people. Last year the people turned to the Republican Party by making it the majority party in both Houses of the Congress. They gave it the opportunity to develop the programs which will solve the many and great problems of our day. They gave it a training ground on which to prepare for complete leadership next year.

No majority in Congress has ever been assigned a more difficult task. It took over at a time when the world was in a state of flux and seething with long-established hatreds which were accentuated by the poverty and destruction of war—at a time when our own domestic life had been disrupted by years of this same war.

The Republican Congress has worked hard at its task and is now at grips with the challenging problems of the day. It needs our help. It needs groups that are active in the formulation of public opinion. It needs it in the way you are giving it tonight, by associating yourselves together to advance Republican causes rather than merely to campaign for Republican candidates.

Political parties are not designed merely to elect candidates to office. Any party that so limits its activities is doomed to ultimate failure. Their main purpose is to create sound public opinion by developing issues and pointing up the answers for those who hold public office.

No man or small group of men know all the answers to the many problems of the day. They are too numerous to fall within the experience of any man. They are too complex for one human mind to encompass. The answers to them are to be found in the hearts and minds and collective experience of the American people. They can only be refined through exchange of opinions, debate, publicity, and resulting action. In recent years there has been too little of this in the Republican Party. Groups like your own can supply this deficiency. They can give to Republicans who have the urge to do so, and there are millions of them, the opportunity to help in the solution of the problems of their day. That is the reason I believe this meeting is a good sign of the times.

We cannot afford to have this process going on actively only among the extremists in our society. The Communists work at creating public opinion 24 hours of every day. Because they do this and are so vocal, there appears to be many more of them than there actually are. Their influence is out of proportion to their numbers. I know that to be true in this country, and I believe it to be true in other parts of the world. I am sure you find that this same situation exists in the motion-picture industry.

With all well-wishers of the motion-picture industry, I have been interested in discussions, pro and con, concerning the persons and activities of asserted Communists in the industry.

It is a good thing, now and then, to look into possible communistic infiltration wherever it may occur, and especially in such an important agency of influence as motion pictures. But it is not sufficient merely to identify Communists. We must nullify their effectiveness.

The inspiration and conviction which bring men and women into an organization such as this one will do more to discourage a Communist and defeat him than any other form of effort. I would venture a guess that for every Communist or fellow traveler in your industry there are literally thousands of men and women who abhor communism and who would fight to prevent its spread. The trouble too often has been that while the Communist furthers his cause, we who are unalterably opposed to it sit by and do little to advance ours.

You have taken a step in the right direction by joining together in this organization which not only condemns communistic doctrines, but proposes to put up a fight for the security and survival of principles which communism menaces.

All that is necessary for us to do to make communism impotent in America is to stick to our democratic principles as the Communist sticks to his objectives, and through the application of our principles solve the basic problems of American life so effectively that there will be no hunger for either food or human rights upon which communism can construct its system. Human misery is the only foundation on which communism can build.

But until the world is much healthier than it is at the present time, communism will be a problem for every country on earth. It is not sufficient for us to reduce it to an irreducible minimum in our own country. We must also lend encouragement—both moral and material—to those countries that are endeavoring to maintain their independence in spite of its aggressions. Our relations with Russia have become serious, not because we care what kind of government Russia has for Russians, but because Russian communism is a form of aggression that is bludgeoning its way across state borders and into the lives of nations who want nothing more than the opportunity to work out their own problems without outside domination. This aggression is contrary to the America spirit of fair play and to the commitments that the nations of the world, including Russia, have recently made to one another.

The world is in turmoil at the present time, and there are many people who believe war with Russia is just around the corner. I do not share this belief. Such a war would be a world war. It would involve all the civilized nations on earth. It is my belief that the people of these civilized nations have the intelligence, and the enlightened self-interest, which will compel them eventually to try in every possible way to avoid World War III. They must know that such a war would amount to self-destruction of the winner as well as the loser.

It is possible, of course, that our country cannot guarantee peace as much as we desire it. There are too many factors over which we have no control. But we can delay conflict and perhaps avoid it ultimately by frankness, forbearance, and good will.

I do not believe that vacillation, expediency or appeasement on our part will avoid

trouble with Russia. Nothing but firm adherence to those principles to which we have subscribed in the United Nations and the Atlantic Charter—principles designed to establish peace through united effort and justice, will mobilize the sufficient world intelligence and cooperative action that is necessary to prevent war. To be able to do this we must keep our country spiritually and militarily strong enough to assure not only ourselves but the world that we are able to and will keep our commitments in furtherance of permanent peace.

We must help those nations that are endeavoring to retain their national integrity through the processes of free government, while striving at the same time to rehabilitate their war-torn economies. We must do this both on the grounds of common humanity, and also as a matter of enlightened self-interest. Unless these nations are successful in reestablishing themselves on a free and self-sustaining basis, the world will continue in its unhealthy condition as it is today. Even America cannot prosper ultimately in an unhealthy world.

It seems to me that there are two phases to this problem—one, to relieve destitution; the other, to make the stricken countries self-sustaining. To undertake the former without a sound plan for the latter would eventually weaken our own economy without strengthening theirs. Mere subsistence is not rehabilitation. Neither will it prevent the spread of communism. Any plan adopted must both strengthen the aided countries and, at the same time, not weaken ours. In transfusing economic blood into the anemic bodies of Europe and Asia, we must not bleed this country white. It would serve no world purpose to pour dollars or commodities into Europe at the expense of weakening the economic structure of this country. It is the fond hope of the Communists that we will make just such a mistake in order that they may be able to build upon the misery resulting from our failure.

We want to help our neighbors of the world. We can do it very substantially where they are also willing to help themselves. But they must help themselves. The amount given in each instance should in my opinion be not only in relation to need, but also in relation to the sincerity of purpose of the aided country to maintain free government, to live at peace and in cooperation with its neighbors, and to make a real effort to rehabilitate itself through hard work. Just how and to what extent we are to help depends largely upon them, but i.. the last analysis, of course, upon all the people of this country. The more political groups such as yours study the problem, the more enlightened our ultimate decisions will be.

In our concern with international affairs we must not lose sight of the necessity of keeping America an inspiration for the freedom-loving peoples of the world. The way we solve our own domestic problems will have much to do with their opinions. The eyes of the world are upon us, and there is no longer a clear line of demarcation between our foreign and our domestic affairs. They are interrelated to a degree which makes consideration of one without the other impossible. The examples of working democracy will mean even more than the principles we espouse. The best example we can give is to maintain the standards of living, cultural attainments, and security for all our people that characterizes a free and healthy state.

We must solve the housing problem, expand our educational and health facilities, and attack the high cost of living and other inflationary tendencies. The solution of such problems not only strengthens our own faith in democracy, but discourages and renders impotent all extremist organizations of either the right or the left.

Here in California we must work at our local problems that are mainly incidental to our rapid growth. We have 3,000,000 more people now than we had before the war. It is as though the entire population of the great State of Virginia had been picked up en masse and set down within the boundaries of our State in the last 7 years. Every facility of government and of community life has been strained to the limit. Resources that formerly appeared to be inexhaustible now call for conservation measures. Our economy has changed. We are now one of the great industrial States of the Union. Life here is changing also. It is our duty to see that it does not change for the worse, because those of us who live upon the resources of our country and State today as well as those who are entrusted with the affairs of government are but trustees for the future. If we are to serve a useful purpose we must try to prepare our country to serve the needs of our children and their children even better than it has served ours.

If we measure our devotion and our civic activities in proportion to the way America has treated us, our opportunities for service are unlimited.

I repeat it is most fortunate for the well-being of our Nation that new committees like yours here tonight are being organized.

From the manner in which you are proceeding, it is evident that you mean business and that you will make a genuine contribution to the integrity and effectiveness of our party efforts. Your personal and active interest in Republican Party affairs and in the formation and promulgation of party principles is a fine and encouraging thing—both for Republicans and for the people generally.

Your participation in the councils of the party will be welcome, not only because many of you are known and admired by millions of our countrymen to whom your names and personalities are so familiar, but because you bring to the party new leadership, new viewpoints, and new perspectives.

The usefulness and vitality of a political party are determined by its capacity for growth, by its ability to attract and hold the confidence both of the mature citizen and of the young men and women who are just entering upon the stage of life.

I believe our party, the Republican Party, is the one great political organization in the United States today to which the people can turn for competent leadership, and I believe the people themselves realize this.

It is up to us as Republicans to make sure that such trust and confidence are justified. We can't let them down, and I don't think we will.

Cost of ERP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Cost of ERP," which appeared in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, issue of January 1, 1948.

One of our greatest dangers in approaching the problem of continued aid to Europe is that we think of American aid in dollar figures rather than as actual, tangible wealth and resources. A dollar sign followed by a long string of figures has very little meaning for most of us, for the average person simply cannot comprehend the immensity of the astronomical sums involved. The figures begin to make sense only when they are translated in concrete, understandable terms such as used in this editorial. I sincerely hope that we in Congress, and all other Americans, will measure the cost of ERP by such simple, everyday yardsticks.

COST OF ERP

How many people understand how much is $1,000,000,000? Americans read of huge appropriations voted in Congress. The New Deal accustomed them to the billion-dollar lingo but it didn't teach them how to visualize the immensity of the astronomical sums it so casually and recklessly spent.

Never was it more vital for Americans to understand the size of the $6,000,000,000 bill they'll have to foot for the first year or so of the $17,000,000,000 Marshall plan if it's approved in the form the administration would like.

We are indebted to a reader for suggesting that if the United States plans to give away six billions, then it would be handing out the equivalent of total assets of the following companies:

General Electric, Ford Motor Co., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chrysler Co., Armour & Co., F. W. Woolworth, Eastman Kodak Co., Atlantic Refining Co., Aluminum Co. of America, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Republic Steel, International Harvester Co., Reynolds Tobacco Co.

To get a broader idea of the scope of these properties, one has only to observe what the Ford Motor Co. alone would embrace. It would mean principal plants at Dearborn and River Rouge, assembly plants in several cities, mines, timber holdings, inventories, and all other properties. To this add the broad expanse of physical assets owned by the other companies.

We wonder how many Americans realize that the Marshall plan would require American resources on such a gigantic scale. Our informant says "this is $6,000,000,000 in a form I can understand."

Americans have a high standard of living because as a people they have produced it. Giving away their substance and reducing that living standard won't raise the standards of any of the 16 nations involved unless we can, at the same time, give them the American spirit of enterprise and determination to produce.

Time for Reasoning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach an editorial from the Parkersburg News, published in Parkersburg, W. Va. The statement is timely and supports the indisputable fact that we can best serve the cause of freedom abroad by demonstrating the fact that democracy, as we know it, is superior to any form of superstate.

The editorial follows:

TIME FOR REASONING

There has been an ominous increase in the fear of Russia on the part of the American people during the past few months. This is not said out of a desire to minimize the seriousness of the international situation. However, it must be remembered that it is possible to fan the flames of fear and suspicion until a nation comes to believe that war is inevitable. And once that stage is reached, war always comes sooner or later.

David Lawrence put this well when he said, "The danger in a battle of words is that it can conceivably develop into a battle of arms." It is unfortunate that American statesmen have been goaded into using language that is not often employed between countries not at war. The Russians, of course, provoked them into it. Even so, difficult as it may be to keep our tempers, we cannot gain anything by warlike talk simply because Russia employs warlike talk. To quote Mr. Lawrence again, "It is a time for restrained phrases and for persuasive argument. It is a time not for feeling but for reasoning."

We can best serve the cause of freedom abroad, in our relations with the Russians and all others, by backing up our material aid with a demonstration of the fact that democracy, as we know it, is superior to any form of superstate. We can, in other words, help combat the spread of communism by example. We must keep our people and our industries free of the governmental controls which plague Europe. And, at the same time, we must continue to work to the limit of our abilities with all nations, regardless of ideology, to maintain the peace of the world. Fear hysteria will never achieve that vital end.

Let's Not Repeat Mistake Following World War I in Our Peace Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial of the Kingsport Times, Kingsport, Tenn., of December 12, 1947. Mr. W. J. McAuliffe, the editor of the Kingsport Times, is not only a very capable editor but is an eminent historian and political scientist. His editorials on the subjects of meeting the threat of communism by making democracy work and on not repeating the mistakes we made after World War I in our present quest for peace are great contributions to the thinking of our day. Typical of these editorials is the one included here, as follows:

THOSE SADDEST WORDS

The recent death of Nicholas Murray Butler, former president of Columbia University, recalls the fact that Dr. Butler received the Nobel peace prize, along with Jane Addams, in 1931. That honor was not undeserved and came as a reward for many years' work in behalf of world peace. Dr. Butler was a leader in a group of great Americans who gave time and energy to creating a better understanding among the nations, in the hope that some day a means would be found to find a substitute for war in the settlement of international problems.

But recalling that award brings to mind another story. In 1931 Woodrow Wilson had been in his grave about 6 years, a grave in which the League of Nations was also buried. That League was given its mortal blow by the failure of the United States to join it. The cause of that failure lies partly at the door of Nicholas Murray Butler; whether one calls it blame or credit depends on whether one thinks that it was a good or a bad thing.

Dr. Butler, as we said, had been a worker in the field of world peace for many years. He was a worker in that field before Woodrow Wilson and Jan Smuts conceived the idea of the League of Nations. So had Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft and Elihu Root and Herbert Hoover and a great many other eminent Republicans, in public office and out.

But the group of Republicans led by Henry Cabot Lodge were not workers for world peace. They were in fact cynical of the idea that war could be abolished, and they were, as far as the United States was concerned, isolationists in their approach. This group set out to kill the idea of the United States joining the League. Where was Nicholas Murray Butler and his group in this critical time?

These men were caught on the horns of a dilemma. Recognized as proponents of cooperation, committed by all their past action and words to the principle of an international organization to prevent war, they found themselves obliged to choose between supporting the program of Woodrow Wilson, thus opposing the active heads of the Republican Party, and supporting the senatorial group, thereby letting slip the chance of organizing a real league.

These great men chose the latter course, and thereby the course of history was changed. Because they did the world was committed to travel the same road, and not permitted to try the great experiment. This is true because the League without the United States had as little chance of living as the United Nations would have without our participation today.

An attempt at compromise was made. They professed to believe that amendment to the League constitution was necessary; and that it was Woodrow Wilson who prevented our joining by refusal to accept the legitimate amendments or reservations of the Lodge group. Later they went a step further and supported the campaign of Warren Harding, telling the American people, in a sort of manifesto, that they favored the United States joining the League of Nations, but the best way to get participation was by electing a Republican President.

We do not know how much this word influenced the voters. Likely, Mr. Harding would have been elected in any case. Nor do we know whether the statement was made in all sincerity or not. What we do know is that a Republican President was elected and the idea of bringing up the subject of joining the League was not revived. And it is not of record that any of these great men made an effort to have it revived.

The blame for failure of the United States to join the League is often placed on Woodrow Wilson, particularly since later thinking decided that it was unfortunate that we did not join. Many people who think we should have joined at that time ask what made Woodrow Wilson so stiff-necked in his pride of authorship? But it was not just pride.

Nobody knows what would have happened if we had joined the League. But we can say definitely that we would not have joined if Wilson had accepted any amendments or reservations. Because, if we had acted on the principle that we had the right to amend the League constitution or make reservations in any particular at all, then every other national legislative body would have the same right, and each would have to pass on the reservations made by all the rest. What sort of constitution would come of that? No agreement would ever be reached. Woodrow Wilson knew that we had to take the League as it was just as the Senate knew it had to take the United Nations Charter as it was. Amendment would have to come by action within the League.

But of course the unhappy truth is that the League was only a pretext, not an issue. It was just opportunity for the Republican Senate leaders to destroy Wilson. The group of eminent Republicans, of which Nicholas Murray Butler was one, bowed to those leaders. We will never know what might have been if they had chosen the other path. It might have made so much difference. It might have been—those saddest words.

Accomplishments of the Committee on Public Lands During 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, during the year 1947 the Committee on Public Lands, of which I am chairman, carefully considered and favorably reported to the House of Representatives 124 bills and resolutions at a minimum cost to the Federal Government and at an amount far below that which is authorized by the Congressional Reorganization Act. The House passed 109 of these bills, 68 of which have become law. This is a record of which the members of the committee can be justly proud.

The name of the committee is a misnomer, because it is no longer limited to public lands legislation, but under the Congressional Reorganization Act is a consolidation of six former legislative committees of the House, viz, Territories, Indian Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, Public Lands, Insular Affairs, and Mines and Mining. Thus, it will be seen that the Committee on Public Lands has legislative jurisdiction involving nearly all of the Nation's natural resources, and it includes a wider range of legislation than almost any other committee in the House.

In the interest of expediency I appointed five subcommittees as follows: Public Lands—chairman, Congressman BARRETT, of Wyoming; Irrigation and Reclamation—chairman, Congressman ROCKWELL, of Colorado; Territorial and Insular Possessions—chairman, Congressman CRAWFORD, of Michigan; Mines and Mining—chairman, Congressman LEMKE, of North Dakota; and Indian Affairs—chairman, Congressman D'EWART, of Montana.

The Congressional Reorganization Act authorized the appointment of four professional staff members in addition to six clerical staff members. The basic salary of each professional staff member could have been $8,000 annually. Such professional staff members would be of no possible use to the committee unless they made field investigations which would have cost an amount equivalent to their salary. In the interest of economy the committee has not made these appointments nor has it filled the full quota of clerks, with a resultant saving of a minimum of $60,000 during 1947.

It was decided that instead of employing a full staff, members of the committee would go into the field and make personal studies of the most important problems under the committee's jurisdiction. To carry out this program I requested, and the House authorized, $25,000 to be expended by the committee for field studies.

There were 20 hearings held by the full committee and the subcommittees in California, Washington, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Nevada, and Alaska. While the committee was allowed $25,000, it expended only $12,548.50, approximately half the amount authorized and appropriated, for the payment of all costs, including members' traveling expenses and transcripts of hearings.

The Plan Should Be Ignominiously Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I submit for your consideration an editorial from the West Union Record, published in West Union, W. Va., and edited by Walter Stuart. This is a Democratic paper, circulating in a great farming section of our State, and no doubt reflects the thinking of these fine people. They are fed up on foreign relief and are not being fooled by the administration's boom for the Marshall plan.

The editorial follows:

Congress has voted to give three European countries and China twice as much of the American taxpayers' money as it cost the United States to build the Panama Canal. And Congress did it with about as little debate and with about as little interest or solicitude as if it had been considering a bill appropriating money for the erection of a post office or a dam here in the United States. Only six votes were cast against it in the Senate, and, before the bill was sent to conference, it went through the House without a roll call, only a few feeble voices being heard against it. The bill as slightly amended by the conference committee went through the Senate without a roll call and was opposed by 82 votes in the House.

Upon the reassembling of Congress a determined effort will be made to secure the enactment of the Marshall plan, a plan by which, if adopted, the United States Government will obligate itself to give Europe four or five billion dollars a year for the next 4 or 5 years.

That plan should be ignominiously defeated, but as the so-called interim or emergency bill went through Congress so easily it is very likely that the Marshall plan will be favorably acted upon although it will meet with much more opposition than did the emergency bill.

Congress and the President seem to be more interested in the people of Europe than they are in the people of their own country. There are millions of people here in the United States today who are having a hard time to live and who should be as much the concern of the Nation's lawmakers as any of Europe's millions.

We should give to the needy people of Europe as much food and clothing as we can spare without lowering the standard of living in our own country or without weakening the Nation's economy, but we should certainly not obligate ourselves to give any definite amount each year for a period of years. Let us give what we can on a year-by-year basis and no more.

What sense would there be in our pledging to give Europe a definite sum 1 year from now, a like sum 2 years from now, 3 years from now, and 4 years from now? Who knows what the conditions will be in Europe 1 year from now or 2 years from now? Why, of course, nobody knows, certainly not anybody in Washington. Why then obligate ourselves to give Europe four or five billion dollars every year for 4 or 5 years? Could anything be more foolish, more unbusinesslike, more unstatesmanlike? Would it not be far more sensible to hand out supplies as Europe needs them and as we can stand to hand them out and then quit as soon as Europe becomes self-supporting or is no longer in need of relief?

It appears that the President and Congress are not giving money and supplies to Europe so much for the purpose of helping the people of Europe who are in distressed circumstances as they are doing it for the purpose of preventing the spread of communism or of preventing Europe from falling prey to communism.

Who knows that Europe is about to go Communist or would go Communist if she should not be aided by money and supplies from the United States? Certainly not President Truman nor any member of his official family nor anybody in Congress. It is simply nothing but a guess that Europe will adopt communism if she is not helped by the United States to get back on her economic feet. The threat of communism is being used solely for the purpose of gaining support for the Marshall plan. If it were not for the threat of communism, the Marshall plan would stand little chance of enactment.

The average European, no doubt, has just about as much sense as the average American, and human nature over there is just about the same as it is over here. If the people of Europe want communism and believe that it will better their condition, they will have communism in spite of all the money and supplies that the United States might be able to pour into their country. If they do not believe in communism, they will not accept communism, regardless of any pressure or influence that might be brought to bear upon them by Communist countries.

If the people of Europe want communism, it is none of our business. They have a right to any kind of government they want. The American people have never tried to deny Russia the right to any kind of government she has chosen to have. Then why should we deny the same right to the countries of Western Europe? They have the same right to their choice of government as Russia has to hers.

Survival in Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Philip H. Parrish, editor of the Oregonian editorial page, published in my congressional district, recently returned from a second tour through Europe and is writing his views and observations on the problems of these war-devastated countries. Mr. Parrish is a keen student and experienced writer and his observations are worthy of careful consideration by all of us who have the responsibility of deciding upon the issues involving these war-torn countries. The first of the series of articles is as follows:

SURVIVAL IN CHAOS—WRITER'S RETURN FINDS PEOPLE OF EUROPE MORE IN STRIDE FOR SNATCHING LIVELIHOOD FROM AMIDST DEBRIS OF WAR

(This is the first of a series of articles detailing observations made recently in Europe by Philip H. Parrish, editor of the Oregonian editorial page. Mr. Parrish spent 7 weeks in Germany, Austria, France, and England as a sequel to similar 1946 visit.)

(By Philip H. Parrish, editor, the Oregonian editorial page)

This first article is by way of being a misplaced conclusion. I am writing the conclusion first for the convenience of Secretary of the Army Kenneth C. Royall, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Gen. Lucius D. Clay, to whom a prompt report is due, and also for the benefit of such readers of the Oregonian as may not have the desire or the opportunity to follow through a series of articles.

When invited by the War Department to resurvey the European theater something over a year after my first visit, and report on progress or retrogression, I assumed that it was to be as one of a group of repeaters.

It was somewhat alarming to find, when we reported in Secretary Royall's office in the Pentagon on the morning of November 13, that only Barry Bingham, president and editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal; Charles Gratke, foreign editor of the Christian Science Monitor, and I were in that category. We are the only ones who so far have retraced a War Department tour. Mr. Bingham was along with me in 1946. Mr. Gratke—who, incidentally, is an Oregonian and an alumnus of the university, and an old friend—was a member of a still earlier party.

ARMY PRESSURE LACKING

It can be imagined that the burden of responsibility suddenly assigned to the three of us was no whit lessened when General Eisenhower, as his only statement to the gathering, asserted that he and the Department of the Army were going to be particularly concerned with what the repeaters had to say—good or bad.

(It needs to be stated here, and insisted upon, that no one indicated directly or indirectly that the high command was looking for a good report. There were no restrictions on what we saw or learned. Nothing was off the record unless we ourselves felt it should be. And though it will be difficult to convince the skeptical of this, we were not led around by the nose. All of us have had rather more experience than most persons in not being led by the nose.)

GERMAN PEOPLE CHANGE

Anyhow, what follows is a summary of the changes in the European scene—particularly in Germany and Austria—between the autumn of 1946 and the early winter of 1947-48, as it appears to one observer. There may be modifications later, and especially additions, but in general this is how affairs seem to me to stand:

First. There has been a startling alteration in the attitude of the conquered peoples—specifically the Germans. The Austrians have always been considered liberated rather than conquered and did not have a hang-dog demeanor even in the beginning.

In the case of the Germans, the alteration has been so gradual as to be almost unnoticed by those on the scene but to the visitor it is unmistakable. In the fall of 1946, they avoided the American in the street. They walked on the other side if possible, with head down and eyes on the ground or

averted. They still did not know what the Americans were going to do to them, what burst of anger and punishment they might encounter. Also, there was a frantic air about them. Each was on the prowl for a cigarette butt, a lump of coal, a piece of paper, or string. They poured along the streets carrying their brief cases and bags in which they secreted their black-market goods and whatever they might pick up. Their frantic air resulted from a combination of fear and confusion—confusion as to just how to supplement their diet—along with supplementing clothing and fuel—in a world of fallen buildings and no lights.

FEAR OF UNITED STATES FADES

The change results from two facts: In the first place, the United States has restored nearly all powers to the German governments and acts for the most part in an advisory capacity. The Germans are surprised at this but they take it at face value. They feel they have little or nothing left to fear from us. They say in effect: "We are your Germans now. What are you going to do about us?" They no longer look aside in the streets and sometimes are even impudent, though not often.

In the second place—and perhaps most important—they have learned the technique of survival in chaos. It is not that they have more to eat and wear. They grow hungrier and shabbier. But they are no longer frantic, because they know the exact procedure necessary. If one is a farmer, he knows just how to secrete the maximum of crops and sell on the black market. If one lives in the bigger towns and cities, he has counted his possessions over and over. He knows just how each possession is to be slipped to the butcher or baker, or carried out to the farms. He understands their value, and how long a man and his family can expect to live on what remains.

ROPES OF MISERY LEARNED

If one resides in Berlin, he appreciates the exact dangers of running the Russian blockade into the countryside around. He appreciates the chances of his being hauled off a train by a Russian wielding a specially devised hook, and of having his bag of potatoes—bought for the winter—taken away from him.

He has learned the ropes of misery. He still picks up butts but he does not leap for them. That takes too much energy.

Second. The German is flagrantly not working, and generally speaking he has no intention of working so long as present conditions exist. And before denouncing him, we should face the simple realities of existence as the German faces them.

Suppose he is a laborer receiving 200 marks a month. He can get all the rationed goods allotted to him with 100 marks. That is, he can get his rationed food, soap, fuel, clothing and so forth, as well as pay his rent and electricity bill. He has half his wages left over—100 marks—which looks pretty good. But with this second 100 marks he can only deal on the black market, and on that market 100 marks amounts to only, for example, a fourth of a pound of coffee—little more than a package of American cigarettes.

CIGARET HIGH PAY

In other words, with the official rate standing at 10 marks to the dollar and the black market rate as bad as 175 marks to the dollar, it does not pay the German to work any harder than is necessary for him to keep on the official ration list. After that the important thing is that he conserve his strength so that he will be able to scour the countryside for leavings, make excursions among the farms, pick up wood in the forests and cart it into the cities, beg for cigarets around the Army camps. (A German who acquires one cigaret a day makes as much as one who labors 8 or 10 long hours in the rubble.)

Perhaps I should revise my statement. The German actually is working, but on the black market after hours, not on the job. It profits him more to beg or steal a bar of soap somewhere than to become foreman of his plant and be paid off in valueless marks.

The tragedy of all Europe is the lack of a firm currency, and in Germany, where we are most heavily involved, the situation is most critical.

RUSSIAN PATTERN CLEARS

Third. The past year has witnessed a remarkable clarification of our contest with Russia for the soul of Europe, and particularly it has witnessed clarification of the pattern of Russian procedure.

I do not think there is one of our party of editors but would agree that without the Marshall plan, or its equivalent, communism would flood to the Atlantic, either forcing our withdrawal or precipitating war. Nor do I think there is one who disagrees with the policy of giving back frank talk for frank talk, as adopted this sumer—though some feel our policy should have been adopted without fanfare rather than announced.

However, the details of the conflict will be discussed later. At the moment the vital thing is to make plain what I mean by the "clarification of the pattern of Russian procedure." Here in America we tend to think of the Russians as assaulting western Europe with great blasts of verbal propaganda. They do that all right. But far more important is the fact that they are materialists, who believe economic control means ultimate ideological control and who are operating on that basis. In every area behind the iron curtain they are gaining majority stocks of the leading industries. In the Russian zone of Germany this is done by means of a single gigantic holding company; in Hungary it is by four companies. And so forth. The details vary from country to country but not the over-all purpose. Russia intends to run these countries after it pulls out its military forces, and it does not intend to pull out its military until the financial control is established.

OFFICER PROVIDES DATA

Along with a special article on the subject, I have a remarkable document to release in regard to the economic penetration of Hungary, done by an American officer who was denounced by the Communist press a few weeks ago as "the spy in uniform." He gives the dates, places, and names. There will be a remade and largely Sovietized eastern Europe when and if the Kremlin orders the troops out. It is too late to do anything about it now, but the knowledge may help us in the future.

While Russia was accusing us of economic imperialism in the west, it has achieved such imperialism for itself in the east. It has perfected the methods which the Nazis used in their expansion.

Fourth. In regard to our actual administration in Germany and Austria, reactions must be mixed. The troops are better than a year ago—older soldiers serving longer periods of enlistment. There is every reason to feel pride in them. So also with the high command under General Clay at Berlin and Lt. Gen. Geoffrey Keyes at Vienna. These are professional soldiers picked for their ability, and now in the occupied areas only because it is their assignment.

MILITARY GOVERNMENT RULE GOOD, BAD

However, among the temporary officers and the run-of-the-mill civilian officials of military government there is an incredible admixture of decent people, carpetbaggers, earnest idealists, and plain adventurers. One could understand how that would be. After the fighting stopped, most of those trained for military government headed home. Their places were taken by some who actually felt they had a duty to perform and by others who were "on the make" or feared the competition at home. Their ranks could stand a lot of improvement.

As to the over-all policies of military government, as worked out in cooperation with the State Department, yes and no. A year ago the Germans were trying to accustom themselves to the idea that government was being turned back to them, with American officials only advising and using the veto. The feature of the year has been the German response to this responsibility, and it is not too good. They are using their political independence to defeat the social, juridical, religious, and educational reforms without which political democracy cannot survive. For instance, Bavaria has openly defied military government in regard to reform of the aristocratic school system, and Wuerttemberg-Baden and Hesse have given no more than meaningless lip service. Also, the dreadful German party system continues to exist. And the free press we have established could not survive 6 months if left to the mercy of the parties and the governments. Personally, I think there needs to be a return, in some degree, to orders in place of advice. There are basic procedures without which no democracy can function.

On the other hand, though the economy of western Germany has been disrupted by the severity of the past winter and the drought of the past summer, I am convinced that military government has done a fairly creative job with industry and that it deserves the principal credit for getting the scene set for a political and economic union of the American, British, and French zones. Such a union is a minimum need, now that the Russians have proved adamant in regard to a general solution. And General Clay has operated well in preparation.

RED MARCH REVERSED

Summary: During the year Russia moved with absolute ruthlessness to strip the areas behind the iron curtain of movables and secure permanent financial control over the immovables, so that its effective control will continue after its troops are gone. It has been helped psychologically and materially by the fact that east of the curtain, in a farming region, there were extra good crops, while west of the curtain, in industrialized Europe, there was one of the poorest crops on record.

So, in the spring and summer communism was on the march. But the march was slowed down by our fairly prompt and generous response with food, and in the past few weeks the implementation of the Marshall plan—giving our policy some permanency—has turned the march into a definite retreat.

Two weeks ago today—from the time when this is being written—most of my party flew into Paris to discover that the French general strike had collapsed the night before, and that a million and a half union members were prepared to leave the Communist-dominated organizations which had sacrificed them on behalf of the Kremlin's war against the Marshall program.

At that same hour, I landed in London, where the conference of foreign ministers was in its final stage, but this time with Bidault and Bevin unswerving in their support of Marshall, and Molotov retiring in the worst disarray of his career.

History was breaking around our ears, and with a friendlier sound than we had been accustomed to during recent months.

MOLOTOV TYPIFIES FEAR

However, during those days in London, when Molotov's isolation was becoming complete and communism was in confusion in France, there was a disturbing picture which kept returning to mind. At the time when we landed at Northolt Field, west of the city, amused British customs officials had pointed out to us Mr. Molotov's special plane, under heavy guard of Russian soldiers, off in one corner. They had informed us that even the

gas was flown in by special and guarded plane from Russia.

So, on the morning of Saturday, December 13, when I took off for Paris—the same morning that the meeting of foreign ministers finally collapsed—I looked out the window of my British Viking toward Molotov's corner and had a slight case of the willies.

There can be no assurance of peace on earth so long as the representative of so great a power as Russia lives in a primitive atmosphere of fear and ambition. It is worth our prayer, anyhow, that somehow they may learn to move among us as just pilgrims like ourselves.

The Third Step Necessary for Permanent Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, most of us felt that in our effort for peace it was necessary to take a stand against expansive communism by coming to the aid of Greece and Turkey. Most of us were convinced that it was required to provide emergency aid to the people of western Europe to hold the line until conditions could be stabilized by the European recovery program. Even after the successful application of the Marshall program, a third step is going to be definitely necessary if world order is to be given any real degree of permanence. It is time for us Members of Congress to be thinking seriously of this third step. It is succinctly but clearly described in a feature article by one of the South's most capable editors, Mr. Edward J. Meeman, in the Memphis Press-Scimitar of December 26, 1947. The article is as follows:

THIS UNITED STATES CAN NEITHER STAND ALONE NOR SAVE THE WORLD

(By Edward J. Meeman, editor, Memphis Press-Scimitar)

President Truman has asked Congress to authorize $17,000,000,000 for the European recovery (Marshall) plan and to appropriate $6,800,000,000 for the first 15 months.

This will be opposed by those who, tired of the rest of the world, imagine that we can crawl back into our thin shell and find safety.

Yet the Marshall plan is only the irreducible minimum required for our safety. It is only the second step, of which the Truman doctrine was the first. There is a third and greater step we must take beyond the Marshall plan.

In the Truman doctrine we said to communism: Thus far shalt thou go and no further. We went to Greece and Turkey, which we once regarded as far-away lands, and said: This is the frontier of our liberties—the frontier of our national safety. President Truman's announcement was an act of great political courage. Its daring has not been fully appreciated because of the fact that its necessity was so quickly accepted by public opinion. The Truman doctrine has recently been given even wider scope when we served notice that we will not stand for aggression against Italy.

ONLY EMERGENCY MEASURE

The Truman doctrine should be regarded only as an emergency measure. It is a limb we had better not stay out on too long. We do not have the strength to defend the safety and liberty of the free world alone. Magnificent as was her courage, Britain could not have defeated Nazi aggression with her own power alone. If we had not joined her, she would have gone down. We had better not count on having the same luck—better not count on the chance that we will pick up some allies after we get into a war. We had better get those allies now, by firm, unbreakable bonds.

Let us get those allies not through power politics, but by the natural next step in world organization. We have done some bold things which are really a sharp break with our traditions. We have joined a United Nations; we have served notice on the world that we will not stand for aggression in Europe. But we have overlooked the most natural thing for us to do—we have not joined hands, hearts, and forces with the peoples whose traditions are like ours and whose objectives in the world are like ours—peace, freedom, and democracy. Perhaps we have overlooked it because it is so obvious.

LET'S DO IT NOW

Let us do now what we should have done in the first place—form a federal union of the free, composed of the nations of the British Commonwealth and the democracies of western Europe. We could not possibly win a war without them; let's federate with them now, so that we know they will be with us in time of crisis. (Maybe that crisis is already here.)

The United Nations is a good thing; let's keep it. It is a valuable international forum. It is a valuable agency through which to work out many international agreements and to improve world conditions by joint action of the nations. But it cannot prevent aggression from striking or defend us from aggression if aggression strikes. The belief that it could do so was based on the illusion that Russia intended to cooperate with the western world.

Within the outer circle of the United Nations let's form the inner circle of the union of the free. Let the federal union of the democracies have a common international policy, common defense forces, common currency, mutual free trade. The creation of such a union would assure such wide markets for free enterprise that the collapse for which communism is hoping could not occur. Some of the democracies which would be included in such a trans-Atlantic union have large dominions and colonies, assuring us of such a storehouse of natural resources that democracy would be impregnable.

TWO MISTAKEN EXTREMES

The isolationist who thinks that this Nation is strong enough to stand alone is mistaken. The interventionist who thinks we can save the world alone is equally mistaken.

The defense of freedom is the job of all free peoples equally. The benefits of freedom, economic and spiritual, belong to all free peoples alike. They can assume this joint responsibility and enjoy these benefits in but one way: through the federal union of the free. It must come eventually if freedom is to survive in a world which is so largely unfree; it had better come now. For the hour that necessity forces it upon us may be too late.

Mr. Speaker, it will be observed that Mr. Meeman in this article, as he has in other writings on the subject, proposed to go far in merging the economies and national interest of the nations which would make up the Federal Union of the Free. I am not now prepared to go this far and from a practical viewpoint we know, and Mr. Meeman knows, that the aims he seeks will have to be attained gradually and by degrees. It is stimulating, however, that he and other thoughtful men are shooting at the ultimate objective. A beginning should be made now. We, in Congress, should lose no time in trying to work out arrangements for close cooperation in every feasible way between our country and the other democracies of the world. Plans for a common international policy, coordination of defense forces, and mutual trade with free or low tariffs would be a good beginning. The future of our world depends upon what we do with this third step.

Hon. Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of Mr. RAYBURN'S birth, it is not possible to overlook the great contribution he has made to the stability, strength, and honor of our Government. There can be no finer birthday wish than that we may have his wise counsel at the policy table of our Government for many, many years, and that the men who take their seats in this body may approach the stature of SAM RAYBURN.

On behalf of the people of my district, I offer him congratulations and best wishes.

Address of Mr. Justice William O. Douglas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an address by Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, of the Supreme Court of the United States, principal speaker at the dinner in Chicago on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of John Peter Altgeld, which was held at the Hotel Stevens on December 30, 1947:

John Peter Altgeld is probably unknown to most Americans. He seldom figures in our history textbooks. Few adults or school children identify him with the great human causes which have shaped the American character. His name has not yet become, as it should, a symbol of the clean, powerful force which we call American idealism.

He has, indeed, been an "eagle forgotten." But as Vachel Lindsay nobly said of him, "To live in mankind is far more than to live in a name." Altgeld does, I believe, "live in mankind." It was the cause of mankind which he pleaded. Though his name may no longer be identified with the issues which he espoused, their vitality in the years which followed him reflect the courage and faith with which he embraced them. Moreover, those who would not have seen eye to eye with him on many of the contentious issues

of his era nevertheless gain inspiration from the character of his advocacy.

He feared no man. As a lawyer, his clients did not cause him to stand mute when his conscience urged him to speak out. As a politician, he did not follow the safe course of indecision or of ambiguous pronouncement when his instinct for justice told him to meet an evil head-on. As a private individual, he did not turn his back and withdraw to the ease and comfort of his wealth when the victims of an industrial system cried out against its inhumanities.

The powerful social forces of his age moved him to action. He was blunt, outspoken, and at times indiscreet. Edgar Lee Masters once said that perhaps "his weakness was that he hated the bad so much that it obscured his love of the good." He certainly made up in daring what he may have lacked in discretion. His was the frontal attack—he stormed the walls of the enemy at high noon; he did not delay in order to infiltrate their fortress at midnight. He was, indeed, an expendable. The heat of his zeal, the tremendous demands of his nervous energy consumed him in a brief and hectic 55 years.

He lost almost every major cause he pleaded. But those were the skirmishes and the battles which were mere episodes in a larger and more far-flung campaign. His failures caused new recruitments. A full generation later men who never knew his name were summoned by the ideas which he had generated or espoused. They marched to great victories of which he perhaps had never even dreamed.

His activities were, in the main, restricted to Illinois. But the ideas which he represented spread throughout the land as seed travels on the great airways of the world. His platform power was potent, though his spoken word was carried by the tongues of men, not by the magic of radio. The issues of which he spoke later became national issues. Millions became advocates of his lost causes. A generation unborn at his death witnessed victory in the war of which his lost battles were a part.

One who follows a trail through the wilderness may not know who first laid it out, who blazed the trees that mark its course. The pioneer who went ahead and marked the trail may, like Altgeld, be unsung. Those who later come to know its rigors—the crags which it mounts and the treacherous lowlands which it skirts—will want to pay tribute to him who first dared walk it. As Irving Dilliard said, the State of Illinois paid such a tribute in a literally inspired way in 1941 when it chose Altgeld Hall as the name of the building to house its distinguished college of law. Such monuments to his name do more than honor him. They help insure that his ideas continue as potent forces in our national life.

Altgeld came to maturity during the days of our robber barons. The great industrial and financial strength of the East had won a war and had grown stronger in the process. A large productive capacity, a huge reservoir of capital awaited new ventures. Men of vision saw untold opportunities in the exploitation of the western two-thirds of the continent. Parrington has described the beginning of this gilded age in pungent terms:

"A passionate will to power was issuing from unexpected sources, undisciplined, confused in ethical values, but endowed with immense vitality. Individualism was being simplified to the acquisitive instinct. These new Americans were primitive souls, ruthless, predatory, capable; single-minded men; rogues and rascals often, but never feeble, never hindered by petty scruple, never given to puling or whining—the raw materials of a race of capitalistic buccaneers. • • • The romantic age of Captain Kidd was come again, and the black flag and the gospel banner were both in lockers to be flown as the needs of the cruise determined. With all coercive restrictions put away the democratic genius of America was setting out on the road of manifest destiny. • • • It was an anarchistic world of strong, capable men, selfish, unenlightened, amoral—an excellent example of what human nature will do with undisciplined freedom. In the gilded age freedom was the freedom of buccaneers preying on the argosies of Spain."

Banker, industrialist, builder, and speculator were the driving forces in that tremendous undertaking. Some maintain that, at least in days of peace, the job never could have been done so fast any other way. However that may be, it is clear that it was extravagant in its cost, inhuman in its methods, corrupt in its influence.

The agrarian groups were exploited by the mercantile and industrial interests. A scourge of poverty and want—10-percent interest and 10-percent corn—swept the farms. Out of such stuff grew the Granger movement and later the Populists and other groups bent on reform.

Jungle warfare was the technique that fashioned the trusts. Big business rose out of the ruins which it had made of little business.

The newly acquired wealth became, in part, a slush fund to corrupt legislatures, to purchase favors from public officers. The credit mobilier scandal and the whisky-tax frauds were typical.

The Nation had just rid itself of chattel slavery, renouncing for all time the idea that men could be bought and sold and exploited like cattle. But it seemed to many that the Nation was on the verge of embracing a form of industrial slavery, which in its consequences was almost as vicious as the slavery which had just been abolished.

The great industrial projects of that age required men as well as capital for their execution. But in the eyes of the promoters, men were as fungible as the ties of the railroad tracks which spanned the continent. There was at least some effort to protect the capital placed in the ventures and to give it rights against the day of loss and failure. But there was little or no effort made to compensate for the arms and legs and eyes and lives of human beings that went into these great industrial undertakings. Workmen's compensation laws, employer's liability laws were still in the future. There were only a few who talked of social justice.

Many workers, living in company towns, were beholden as in feudal days to a master; and this time their master was a corporation.

Child labor was widespread. Long hours of work obtained for men and women alike. Unhealthy and unsanitary conditions of work were found on every hand. The 8-hour day was a radical idea. Trade-unions were sabotaged. Collective bargaining was still largely a dream.

The claims of stockholders and bondholders against enterprises had long been recognized. But there was no similar recognition of the claims of labor. Workers had no right to work; they had no claim to a fair wage.

Men struck for more wages so that they might live decent lives, so that they might raise sturdy sons. Strikebreakers were brought in, and the poorly organized strikers were usually defeated. A great industrialist handled his strike with these words: "There is nothing to arbitrate. The workers have nothing to do with the amount of wages they shall receive."

The reaction was severe. There were probably some men of violence on the scene who would destroy the system that gave birth to the new industrial oligarchy. But men of good will—zealots and reformers—were also pilloried as anarchists. So were those who only protested against the chains of their new slavery.

There were riots and bombs. Violence begat violence. Troops—Federal troops—were called out to enforce injunctions issued by Federal courts. These were injunctions not only to protect property but to keep plants open and to outlaw strikes. He who defied the injunction went to jail. He was in contempt of court.

A great restlessness swept the country. There was a depression in the early nineties and millions were unemployed. They swept over the Cascades and the Rockies on the move to Washington for currency reforms, for a public-works program. Some stole trains and were jailed. So were the hitchhikers who rode the boxcars. Strikers, too, were jailed. Contempt of court became a weapon in industrial warfare. It was a powerful weapon. It allied the forces of government—the courts, the marshals, the troops—on the side of industry and against the workers. Government was there not to adjudicate the justness of the claims, not to mediate nor to arbitrate the disputes, but to crush and suppress those who protested against the injustices of the new industrial era.

These issues were injected into local and national politics. A distinguished line of muckraking journalists, starting with Henry Demarest Lloyd, emerged and wrote in words that all could understand an indictment against the age of plunder and exploitation.

Antimonopolists pressed their reforms. Those who protested against the great and uncontrolled power of industry often advanced as their cure-all the socialization of business. Many good people were alarmed. Mr. Justice Brewer, who severely criticized Altgeld, was of the view that "the cry for socialism comes largely from the dissipated, the lazy, the dishonest." Men stood condemned as un-American whose programs of reform were not more radical than the vision of our own Tennessee Valley Authority and Grand Coulee. The specter of socialism did indeed stalk the land. Mr. Justice Holmes, writing in 1897, observed that "when socialism first began to be talked about, the comfortable classes of the community were a good deal frightened"; in fact, the fear of socialism "influenced judicial action both here and in England." Many in high places believed that this society of ours was headed for a pitched battle along class lines.

It is easy in retrospect to draw a false picture of an age merely by emphasizing the extremes which history has recorded. The sketch of the gilded age which I present may suffer that defect. But whether it does or not, I think it fair to say that this is the view Altgeld had of the era. The enormous injustices which he saw violated his sense of social justice. He first wrote and spoke his protests; then he moved to action, giving and expecting no quarter.

As Governor of Illinois he put through a law aimed at sweatshops, at the employment of children who were under 14, and at the employment of women over 8 hours daily or more than 48 hours a week. The latter provision was held unconstitutional on grounds which reflected the dominant political philosophy of the age—that it violated both the employer's and the worker's freedom of contract. He put through a law in aid of collective bargaining, which made it a crime to dismiss an employee because of membership in a labor union, and thus sowed one of the first seeds out of which the National Labor Relations Act grew a generation or more later. He inaugurated a system of mediation and arbitration of labor disputes. He put through a law that outlawed limitation of production, price fixing, pooling agreements, and other restraints of trade. He got an inheritance-tax law passed. He was offered $500,000 if he would sign a bill which would tighten the hold of the traction and other utility interests on the State. He vetoed the bill, stating it was a "flagrant attempt to increase the riches of some men at the expense of others by legislation." Thereafter he campaigned for public ownership of utilities.

He protested vigorously against the use of Federal troops to break strikes. He resisted

the use of the injunction in industrial disputes. As Harry Barnard graphically shows, it was Altgeld who coined the phrase "government by injunction" and drove home at every opportunity the oppression which that practice fostered. The Norris-La Guardia Act, passed in 1932, thus can trace its ancestry to him.

As Governor he put his influence behind the development of a strong, progressive university. He feared that monopoly capital might spawn its own seats of learning and dominate the minds of men as well as their bodies. He also knew that the character of a university is a "force that creeps silently over the land and by day and by night molds the sentiment of men." He therefore wanted a university which would represent the great common people of this country, which would be the friend and the helper of the toiling masses, of those people who do the work of the world.

He well knew the workings of the judiciary because he had been a judge. So when he saw rulings of courts which seemed to him prejudiced and partisan, which tipped the scales against the common man and in favor of the vested interests of that day, he cried out in protest. In 1893 he said, "The men who administer the laws are human, with all the failings of humanity. They take their biases, their prejudices, with them on to the bench. Upon the whole, they try to do the best they can; but the wrongs done in the courts of justice themselves are so great that they cry to heaven." He saw the corrupt use of wealth extending its influence so far as to create judges "who do its bidding."

Altgeld knew what we are apt to overlook or forget, that the procedural safeguards of the Bill of Rights were designed to protect the citizen against the tyranny, not only of legislatures and of executives but of judges, too. He knew that power could be abused, whether it was industrial power or judicial power. He knew his history and had read those chapters which reveal that even courts sometimes show a callous disregard for human rights. Their robes do not always conceal their tyranny. The framers of the Constitution, knowing that, designed the constitutional requirement of a fair trial to protect the accused, not only against the police and the prosecutors but against the judges as well. All these things Altgeld knew, and that is perhaps why, as Charles A. Madison says, "he was harshest on judges who abused the spirit of our laws to the hurt of the people."

When Altgeld became Governor four of the men found guilty in the Haymarket riots had been hanged. Three were still in prison. Altgeld reviewed their cases and granted them pardons. The pardon was for him a simple, uncomplicated act. For as he told Brand Whitlock, he knew he was "merely doing right." He felt that way because in his judgment "those fellows did not have a fair trial." Unfair attitudes of both judge and jury had, in his view, infected the trial.

The reaction was violent as Altgeld knew it would be. He at once experienced what many both before and after him experienced—that he who calls for the application of the Bill of Rights to unpopular minorities, as well as to the other groups of the community, often becomes himself suspect. Thus when Altgeld insisted that even anarchists were entitled to due process of law, he was dubbed an anarchist. But a man whose devotion to our system of government was so great that he did not want it to become the tool of a capitalist oligarchy was not even remotely related to the anarchists. He was merely seeking to apply the philosophy of Jefferson to the workaday world of the 90's—due process of law for every man, whatever his race or creed or political faith; social justice for those at the bottom, as well as those at the top, of the economic pyramid.

But the label stuck. Then came the bitter years. He lost both his wealth and his health under the pressures of his enemies. The man who had the courage to adhere to the spirit of our Bill of Rights and extend its benefits to a despised and hated minority was hounded to his death by powerful influences bent on his destruction. Yet I am confident it will be recognized as true 100 years from now, as it is increasingly recognized today, that of those on the public stage in that era it was Altgeld who brought the brightest honor to the democratic ideal.

Some issues survive all ages. But most of them have a habit of being redefined in the special context of the next generation. Hence this review of the issues which drew Altgeld's fire has relevancy here only as a reflection of his philosophy. It is that philosophy which remains a vital factor in American life, although the issues which gave it content have been resolved or forgotten. Altgeld's philosophy has relevance to current American problems in at least two respects.

First. Altgeld placed human beings higher than the dollar in the national scale of values. A nation's industrial plant represents not only the daring of capital and the imagination of executives, but the blood and sweat of men. The men and women who compose a nation are its greatest natural resource—greater than its mines or forests or rivers. The nation is healthy only if its people are strong. The state must concern itself with their economic disasters. For the greater share of their troubles are due not to laziness but to economic forces beyond their control. There is in most men a lively sense of decency, of good will, of fraternity. The poor have those instincts, as well as those blessed with more worldly goods. The powers of government should be directed to protect them in their struggle to survive and in their efforts to live in dignity and to share the fruits of freedom.

Altgeld felt with Cardinal Manning that even a starving man had the right to eat. And he thought it was an insult for those who started in life with good brains, good training, and excellent advantages, and who are now well-housed, well-clothed, and well-fed, who know nothing about the actual conditions or wants of the poor, to lecture them on laziness or shiftlessness.

We will be wise if we carry that philosophy into the world problems which confront us today. There are active bidders for the good will and support of the common people of the world. There are emissaries of totalitarian regimes in the capitals of the world, bargaining with bags of wheat for the souls of men. They are our competitors, but we need not emulate their example.

The victims of war in Europe and Asia need and ask our aid. But these people must not be treated as if they can be purchased with the dollar. We must not manage this great crisis of democracy as if it were an auction; as if the peoples of the world were on the block and going to the highest bidder. The sensitiveness of people increases with their suffering. The peoples of the world have suffered beyond our comprehension. If we so manage this crisis as to leave the impression that our standards are mercenary, we will have generated a revulsion to our system which may well be irreparable.

As a result of their struggles all peoples of the world are closer together. Their common interests have made them parts of something which is bigger than their own country. That is true of us, too. We have wider horizons, greater obligations. So when we come to the aid of the distressed people of the world, we act not out of charity alone but in answer to a responsibility to support in peace the ideal for which we were willing to wage a war.

Someway, somehow, we must let the peoples of the world know that. We must reach behind the facade of ministers and cabinets and commissions and let the common people feel our warm handclasp. We must let them know that we understand their suffering. We must make sure they know that our desire is not to make them our satellites but to meet them as equals in a world where standards of decency and justice prevail.

My remarks are not directed to agencies of government. I refer more particularly to the role which all groups—civic, cultural, and religious—can play in keeping close ties with the peoples of the world. Behind even the iron curtain of eastern Europe are human beings whose thirst for freedom is as great as our own. We must manage to let them feel the warmth of our understanding and friendship. We must not let them become the forgotten people of the world. They must know that their problems are our concern, too, that we respect their worth as human beings, that they also are part of the brotherhood which we have come to symbolize in the world. Governments may be imposed on these people. But the people themselves are the ultimate source of political power in every state. The pattern of an enduring peace will be found only in their hopes and aspirations.

Altgeld once said that "All great reforms, great movements, come from the bottom and not the top." That is true in the international as well as the national field. Thus, it is doubly important that we do not lose the link which we have with all peoples whose dream is political, intellectual, and religious freedom.

Second. There is another current problem to which Altgeld's philosophy is relevant. On the domestic scene his courage and steadfastness of purpose are needed for protection of the civil liberties of our people.

We are apt to leave that task to the far away court in the State or National Capital. Those courts, by their examples, exert a great influence. But the great percentage of the grist is found in the lower courts. A more accurate measure of the vitality of our Bill of Rights is not in the sporadic rulings of our highest tribunals but in the day-to-day attitudes of the lower courts. Moreover, it is not in the courts alone that the strength of our civil liberties is to be ascertained. The executive and legislative branches of government also have responsibilities for enforcement of the Bill of Rights. The administration of the voting booths, the habits of the police in law enforcement, the nature of the city's ordinances—these all are indices of the vitality of the Bill of Rights in the life of the community. So is the attitude of the community. For an indifferent community, like a misguided one, will surely breed disrespect for the standards embodied in the Bill of Rights.

We may never reach perfection in our practice of the ideals of the Bill of Rights. But there is no earthly reason why with education and organization it cannot become an increasingly potent force in the everyday lives of our people. The extent of a community's respect of the human rights of all of its citizens is in fact the measure of its progress in civilization. Altgeld broke the trail—making it easier for every man of conscience who followed.

The creation of a healthy community attitude is not the exclusive task of any one group. The task starts in the homes, in the schools, and in the churches. But city and State officials, editors, lawyers, and other groups of citizens have an important share of the responsibility. I remember recent instances where tyrannical judges sitting in local courts rode roughshod over the civil liberties of defendants charged with crime. In one case it was a doctor, in another an editor who thundered personal disapproval and started campaigns to rid their cities of those oppressive practices. They were, indeed, the ones that alerted the local bar associations and caused civil liberties committees to be formed to patrol the local scene.

These are not always easy steps to take. When Altgeld insisted that even anarchists were entitled to due process of law he himself was labeled a subversive influence. That will often be said today when one insists that the safeguards of the Bill of Rights be extended to all groups, including any minority group in our midst that may be at the whipping post or the subject of temporary hysteria.

Yes; it takes courage to stand between an unpopular minority and the community, insisting that our Bill of Rights was designed for the protection of all people whatever their race, creed, or political faith. The lawyer may feel uneasy when it seems that important clients may slip away because of his attitude. The editor may be tempted to stand mute by reason of the views of important advertisers. Even the clergyman may be under pressure to hold his tongue because of the influence of some of his parishioners.

But those who are devoted to the democratic ideal expressed in our Bill of Rights will take the direct and daring course. Once they are sure of their facts and know they are doing right they will, like Altgeld, espouse the cause of the victims of ignorance, prejudice, or passion. They, too, may be pilloried or cursed. But institutions become great by the greatness of the men who champion them, by the greatness of the advocacy that defends them. A people indifferent to their civil liberties do not deserve to keep them, and in this revolutionary age may not be expected to keep them long. A people who proclaim their civil liberties but extend them only to preferred groups start down the path to totalitarianism. They emulate either the dictatorship of the right or the dictatorship of the left. In doing this they erase a basic distinction between our system of government and totalitarianism.

To allow that to happen is to lose by default. Far better to lose pleading the cause of decency and of justice. Then we win greatness even in defeat, and leave behind a rich heritage for those who later rebuild on the ashes of our lost hopes. But there will be no failure if we adhere steadfastly to our faith. For the goal of people of all races is toward a system which respects their dignity, frees their minds, and allows them to worship their God in their own way. None has yet designed an article of political faith more suited to those ends than our own Bill of Rights.

Problems of a Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the York (Pa.) Dispatch:

MANY ODD INQUIRIES REACH CONGRESSMEN—ONE CALLER ASKED GROSS HOW TO SELL CIGARS TO LEGISLATORS—ELUSIVE WORD FOUND

YORK, PA., January 6.—Responding to a last minute year-end inquiry, Congressman CHESTER H. GROSS, of the Twenty-first Congressional District, comprising York, Adams, and Franklin Counties, today made public a compilation of activities handled in his district office in York. The Congressman revealed that more than 1,000 persons visited his office during 1947 with their problems.

More than one-half of these constituents were from York County, but Adams and Franklin Counties were also well represented. Furthermore, many personal contacts were made during bimonthly visits by the Congressman and his district secretary, Lee K. Smith, to the county seats in Adams and Franklin Counties.

In making this, which is probably the first annual report ever made by a Congressman representing this congressional district, a great diversity of problems and interests are revealed.

A break-down by groups and interests shows:

Veterans: A total of 512 visited the office. Principal interest centered around pensions for veterans and dependents, hospitalization, relief, claims involving back pay, subsistence, lost articles as a result of service, errors in discharges, release from prisons, bringing back soldier dead, etc.

Businessmen: A total of 155 sought information as to the next move in Government, taxes, etc., so as to enable them to get a sense of direction in the conduct of their business. Many wanted copies of bills and laws or appointments in the various departments of Government, while others sought information as to proper contacts to sell their merchandise to Government agencies.

Immigration problems: Total, 42. Most of these involved cases of American citizens endeavoring to bring their kin or relatives to this country, principally from Greece and Italy.

Individuals: Total of 81, all Republicans, whose principal interest centered around "active party leadership."

INQUIRIES FROM LABOR

Labor: Total of 59 raising a wide range of questions, such as whether their check-offs were legal; others wanting to feel certain that the Taft-Hartley Act would not injure the cause of labor. A few wanted to know how to sever union connections and still hold their jobs.

Professional men and women: Total, 25. Interest was directed to taxes, the Taft-Hartley Act, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, better known as the socialized medicine bill, and the bill for Federal aid to education, etc.

Federal employees: Total of 44 cases raising questions of retirement and disability compensation, aggregating more than $20,000.

Farmers: Total, 180; whose problems and inquiries concerned subsidies, soil-conservation payments, the agricultural outlook, need for farm labor and equipment, requests for information as well as agricultural bulletins dealing with general farm problems obtainable from the Congressman and of which the office carries a generous supply.

Rent cases: Total of 20 involving complaints on the part of landlords that rents are too low, while tenants were inquiring for living quarters at rentals they could afford to pay.

Clergymen: Total of 26, interested mostly in the question of universal military training, the problem of getting food and livestock to needy people in Europe, as well as expressing concern over the Stratton bill now before Congress which would permit the admission to this country of 400,000 displaced persons.

Relief and public assistance: Total 17, individuals seeking relief through Federal and State agencies.

Claims against Government: Total 18, ranging from $50 to $250,000, filed by individuals and corporations for reimbursement for traveling expenses, transporting personal effects, loss of personal property, damages, and contract violations.

Passports: Total 13, chiefly industry representatives and others leaving the country on business or pleasure.

Postal employees: Total 12, interested in their jobs, advancements, and legislation affecting their civil-service status.

Service academies: Twelve boys seeking appointment to West Point and Annapolis.

Mail-delivery cases: Nine concerning extension of postal service, with a few complaints about postal service.

Miscellaneous cases: Total 58, men and women who wanted to discuss trends, express themselves generally, or, in other words, "wanted to tell it to their Congressman."

"MISSING WORD" FOUND

Listed in still other categories were inquiries concerning a word to complete a crossword puzzle (the word was located in an office dictionary); selection of an "honest" lawyer; how to sell cigars to Congressmen in Washington; hotel and tourist reservations; whereabouts of straying husbands; tickets to football games, passes to horse races, radio broadcasts, courtesy cards for admission to visitors' galleries of Congress, etc.

All this made a busy and interesting year for the Congressman and his staff, Congressman GROSS said. He explained that the compilation covered only activities with respect to his York or congressional district office. Not covered was the business handled in his Washington office which was similar in many respects. The work there included giving guidance and entertainment to various groups visiting Washington from time to time. Such groups numbered from 25 to 200 persons. Also, the Congressman said, is the task of handling the regular daily chores, such as answering the mail, attending committee meetings and the sessions of the House.

Statement on the President's Message, January 7, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, at the opening of the special session last fall President Truman asked for a return of his wartime police powers to ration goods and to control prices. The Congress refused to grant those powers knowing how they had been used and abused. In his message on the state of the Nation President Truman demands those powers and controls knowing full well that the Congress will again refuse to grant them.

During 1947 the administration entered the wheat market and bought up hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat for export. This Government buying of huge quantities of wheat for export forced the price of wheat up from $2 plus per bushel to $3 plus per bushel in 9 months' time.

Every farmer knows that the price of corn, of meat, of dairy products, of poultry and eggs are all tied to the price of wheat and fluctuate with the price of wheat.

After causing present high prices by its own market manipulations, or wheat buying spree, the administration now demands of Congress through President Truman wartime police powers to ration goods and to control prices, which Congress is in no mood to grant.

High prices are only symptoms of the disease that is afflicting this Nation today. We should treat the disease itself by removing the cause. Controlling the symptoms will not remove the trouble.

President Truman also wants to reimpose the excess-profits tax that was

repealed in the Democratic tax-reduction bill of 1945, which he signed in the face of a $20,000,000,000 Treasury deficit for that year. The repeal of the excess profits tax in 1945 was a great stimulus to American business enterprise; it brought about a tremendous increase in production, and also in the number of jobs available. In fact it achieved the goal of 60,000,000 jobs 2 years ahead of the time F. D. R. predicted. Now President Truman wants to reverse the trend of expanding business, increasing job opportunities, and badly needed production, and go back to a period of contracting business, decreasing production, and fewer jobs. As one member of the Ways and Means Committee I am not for his tax program. It is unsound and contrary to all past experience. It would have the opposite effect to what he hopes for it. If 10,000,000 low-income taxpayers are exempted from paying Federal taxes as he proposes, and there would be a decrease in the number of jobs available from 60,000,000 jobs to 50,000,000 jobs—which would be the probable result of his tax program—would the country be better off?

An Unbiased View of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum I have mailed to the entire membership of the two Houses which was prepared by a very able and distinguished Swiss citizen who stands high in the business life of that country, analyzing the situation in Europe:

JANUARY 5, 1948.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: A prominent Minneapolis flour miller, whose product formerly went to all parts of the globe, has sent me a report on the European situation, prepared by a gentleman highly connected with Swiss banking and industry, who acts as adviser to clients in the United States. I feel that this report should be made available to every Member of Congress as it presents an angle on the European situation that should be helpful to us in determining our future policy in Europe.

Yours very truly,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
Member of Congress.

MEMORANDUM TO CLIENTS

OCTOBER 29, 1947.

In our memorandum of August 4 we called clients' attention to the fact that the real question about the Marshall plan was whether it could be made to work. The writer left for a trip to Europe in order to obtain, if possible, an answer to that question. The best place to seek such an answer was Switzerland. The Swiss think the way we do; they understand the European problems far better than we; they are internationally minded; they have no axe to grind as far as the United States is concerned and, before all, they are hard-headed realists.

At no time during my stay in Switzerland did I seek to reach conclusions of my own. Rather, I attempted to conduct a sort of qualified Gallup poll. Thus, the views presented in this letter are based completely on the consensus of opinion of Swiss people whom I consider properly qualified.

I was very fortunate at the outset to meet in Basle Mr. ———, a prominent attorney, who has visited the United States several times in a semiofficial capacity and who is closely connected with the leading Swiss banks as well as the Swiss Government. Dr. ——— is a specialist on the problems of international clearings, a man of high intelligence, and with a remarkable understanding of the American viewpoint. He arranged an interview for me with Mr. ———, of the Vorort of Swiss Commerce and Industry. The Vorort is virtually the economic and financial dictator of Switzerland, and regulates all clearing and import and export transactions. Mr. ——— warned me right away that he had no right to speak for the Vorort, but was merely expressing his personal views. Besides Dr. ——— and Mr. ——— spent considerable time with Mr. ———, of the Swiss Bank in Zurich, and Mr. ———, of Basle, who is the Swiss representative of very important French steel and coal interests. I also talked with any number of other people, but the four I mention above were so representative of Swiss opinion and their views, so strikingly similar, that the conclusions I came to and the suggestions I have to offer are based principally on my interviews with them.

(NOTE.—Actual names are omitted for obvious reasons.)

ANALYSIS OF THE PRESENT SITUATION

There is no practical way of implementing the Marshall plan. As the situation stands now, the European mess is so bad that it has to get worse before it can get better. A crisis is inevitable and American help at this stage will merely defer and aggravate it. This applies, of course, to the rehabilitation and rebuilding of Europe and not to the relief of hunger and want which should be placed strictly on a humanitarian basis and separated entirely from the reconstruction program.

England: The English need another Dunkerque. They are one of the greatest stumbling blocks to European recovery. Their stupidity is simply beyond belief. Unfortunately they are in command of the Ruhr and it is impossible to penetrate the barrier of ineptitude, incapacity, and red tape which they have set up. They won't do any work themselves and will not let anyone else work. The conditions in the Ruhr are appalling and are their direct responsibility. Here are a few stories to illustrate.

Mr. ——— took me out to the port of Basle to show me his coal yards (heavy shipping to Switzerland comes over the Rhine from the Atlantic seaboard and the North Sea via barge). A barge was unloading coal and he took me to it. "See this coal," he asked, "where do you think it comes from?" Of course I had no idea and said so. He spat on the ground in disgust and said, "Pennsylvania, via rail to Baltimore, via steamer to Antwerp, and via barge to Basle; and dammit all, the Ruhr is 100 miles away and we own two coal mines there. But do you think I can get any coal from the British? Not a chance. We have been unable even to see what shape our mines are in. So the Americans, instead of the British, get our Swiss francs, the Ruhr is starving, and not producing the coal and steel for which all Europe is clamoring."

Before the war the Germans used to make an excellent automobile known as the DKV, the plant being located in the Ruhr. A group of Swiss industrialists conceived the idea of reopening the plant, reequipping it, and putting it into production. Swiss capital was going to take care of everything. As no one knew exactly in what shape the plant was, a delegation was sent to the British zone to ascertain the facts. The delegation came back without any facts. The British would not even let them get a set of the old blueprints of the factory. No reasons were given. The Swiss are still wondering why good, hard Swiss francs and brains were not permitted to go to work. As one of the men put it, "The British have a bunch of school teachers sitting in the Ruhr who haven't the slightest knowledge of the problems involved. They don't even have the intelligence necessary to realize their own shortcomings."

The hard-working Dutch managed to raise a substantial crop of vegetables this summer and requested permission from the British to ship the surplus to the Ruhr (3 hours by truck); the matter of payment to be arranged in some mutually satisfactory fashion, no question of actual money being involved. Permission was refused as, according to the story I heard, the British were fearful that the Dutch, their allies during the war, would possibly have some claim somehow on the Ruhr. The produce had to be dumped in the Dutch canals.

The Swiss do not care whether the British Government is socialistic or not. What they care about is the ineptitude of those at the helm and the unwillingness to work prevailing in England. As one Swiss paper put it sarcastically, "For the first time since its inauguration, the Labor Cabinet, in view of the crises, met on a Saturday afternoon."

According to Mr. X our gravest mistake was to grant the British a loan a year and a half ago. The show-down would have occurred sooner and Mr. X still hopes that after a real shock Britain will pull out somehow.

France: France is beyond a shock. It needs a dictatorship, as the French people have lost the virtue necessary for democratic government. A show-down is inevitable and the sooner the better. We have to gamble that the Communists will get licked. The average Frenchman is not so much pro-Communist as against everything. And the Communists will sabotage every effort of rehabilitation under present conditions.

It is estimated that gold and dollars hoarded by individuals exceeds $3,000,000,000. The official rate of the French franc (approximately 120 francs to the dollar) is out of line with reality. I bought French francs in Switzerland at the rate of 380 to the dollar, but try and export goods from France based on the true rate. Nothing doing. It has to be at the official rate. One of the comical results is that you can buy French wine in Switzerland cheaper than in France. The Swiss are doing a lot of business with France through the Vorort, which sees to it that the phony exchange does not hamper the Swiss and also that when credits are extended to France, the Swiss get merchandise in return at the proper price no matter what the official rate is for the French franc.

Right now the French have a phenomenal wine year, both in quality and quantity but no place to store it and not enough bottles for it. There is a natural market for this wine in the United States, and export of wine would give France some of the dollars they are clamoring for, but naturally the growers' price is based on the true value of the franc and not on the artificial rate maintained by law—and thus we do not get the wine here, the French Government gets no dollars, and the grower still has his wine. This applies naturally also to the French peasants who will not sell the products of their farms and incidentally have no incentive to increase production. The French workman, as usual, doesn't give a damn anyway. Any help to France outside of relief will be an incentive to do less rather than to do more. As Mr. ——— put it, "The only reason I have for believing that France will pull out is because I believe in miracles."

Italy: Italy is a hopeful spot, especially the north. Italians are hard at work, communistic sabotage and shortages of raw materials permitting. The lira is the only currency to have gone up in the black market in the last 6 months (from 850 lira to the dollar to 650 to the dollar). There are practically no currency restrictions. All the Italians want is for people with hard money to buy their goods, live there, and leave their francs or dollars behind. Italy is in bad need of coal and steel, which, of course, should come from the Ruhr and not from the United States.

Sweden which was in a very strong position, is going down hill due to the hash made of the economic situation by the socialistic government there. The great mistake was the revaluation of its currency which resulted in a loss of some $500,000,000 in gold (about half of the Swedish reserve), and the imposition of import restrictions which were a hard blow to the European economy.

Denmark was doing remarkably well but now has an economic crisis based, of all things, on the surplus of foodstuffs—England under its new austerity program having stopped its purchases.

Holland would love to buy food from Denmark, but while the official rate for the guilder is 38 cents you can get all the guilders you want in Switzerland for 13 cents; so, of course, Denmark does not want to sell to Holland at a fictitious rate. The same, of course, holds true for England. The Danes would take pound sterling in payment for their produce at the true market rate, which is $2.20, as against the official rate of $4.04, especially so if pounds were convertible into hard money. But nothing can be done because British pride or stupidity or what not refuses to recognize the true value of the pound sterling.

According to Dr. ———, the currency problem is one of the sore spots of Europe and will have to be cured before any of our efforts are effective. The Swiss have set up a highly competent organization to deal with it, and as a result everything is obtainable in Switzerland and the Swiss manage to do business with everybody, even the Russians.

The Marshall plan is based on the idea that Europeans should help themselves. I am sorry to report that most Europeans either cannot (France) or will not (England) do it. Under these circumstances, outside of the purely humanitarian help which Europe needs because of general crop failures, any attempt to implement the Marshall plan is futile from a European standpoint and harmful from our domestic standpoint. Congress is meeting to consider rising prices and the danger of inflation. Won't we ever learn that one does not cure a sickness by discussing symptoms? Prices will come down fast enough if we stop our senseless exports to Europe and concentrate on domestic production.

Please bear in mind in considering the above that the Swiss have everything to gain from the Marshall plan. Economically it will permit them to increase their trade with France, Italy, England, etc. Politically the Swiss are in far greater danger of communism than we are. They are right next door to it, and, notwithstanding all of this, they just about said to me, "Good Lord, you Americans are not going to be suckers enough to fall for it."

A SWISS SUGGESTION

At the end of my interview with Mr. X he said to me, "Look, I hope you will not take offense at what I am about to say, but why do you Americans always want to save the whole world, and at the same time solve the problems of 57 nations? It just cannot be done! Why don't you work with us? We think alike, our money is at a premium, we understand what is going on in Europe and we are all set up to handle practical problems—one by one. Europe is now a festering swamp. You cannot drain and heal the whole of it. You will just sink yourself in the mire. Why don't you try to heal one spot at a time? Show the rest of Europe what can be done instead of talking about it. You must get one starting point somewhere and give Europeans a practical example. Do so and they will all be coming to you crying 'me too'."

In conclusion, I would like to offer the following suggestions of my own.

Segregate relief of Europe from rehabilitation; the latter to be on a cold-blooded business basis.

Whatever form our assistance to Europe takes, we should work very closely with the Swiss and take advantage of their know-how of European affairs.

Don't try to bite off more than we can chew.

The rebuilding of the Ruhr will do more for Europe at a smaller cost than anything else we can possibly do. What is the sense of shipping coal and steel to Europe which we need so badly ourselves, when most of Europe's requirements can be produced in the Ruhr at a fraction of our cost. If the Ruhr problem is properly handled, it could be put into full production within a year. Europe would be supplied with coal and steel and the drain on our economy will be stopped, partially at least.

By following a realistic program, we will show Europe and the Russians that we mean business and are not a bunch of suckers.

Benefits of Tennessee Valley Authority Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I just received from Mr. E. R. Deaver, of the Deaver Dry Goods Co., of Knoxville, Tenn., describing the advantages which have come to the people of the Tennessee Valley as a result of the program carried out by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAVER DRY GOODS CO., INC.,
Knoxville, Tenn., December 23, 1947.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Committee on Public Lands,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 18 and in reply to same I am pleased to give you any information I can pertaining to benefits received from TVA.

There is no doubt that the flood control brought about by building dams has done a great deal to stop soil erosion and to furnish rural and urban communities with cheap electrical power.

I can readily understand how you would receive some adverse criticism, but in my opinion this comes from a very small minority who felt that they were being personally inconvenienced by being forced to give up some productive land. Now that these families from the flooded areas are relocated they seem very happy in their surroundings and are more alert to the opportunities they have to improve their farms, homes, churches, schools, and living conditions generally.

There has been a movement in progress for some time sponsored by the civic organizations of Knoxville and working in conjunction with the Extension Division of the University of Tennessee, bringing to the attention of the entire section that has been affected by the building of these power and control dams, to awaken the people of the section to the possibilities they have.

As a result of this movement more scientific farming is being carried on and in this year there has been 186 communities competing in a friendly manner for prizes offered to the ones showing the greatest progress in their respective communities. This movement is also closely connected with the university and through the county agents throughout east Tennessee they are given information that has a lot to do with their progress.

Summing up all the results that I have seen I am convinced personally that the project as a whole is very beneficial.

Without meaning to burden you with extra mail reaching your desk I am enclosing a pamphlet prepared by the committee referred to above, which will give you a condensed i a of the fine work being done from the standpoint of agriculture and home improvements.

Then too, there is no way to estimate the value of the recreational facilities afforded by the fine lakes well stocked with game fish where hundreds of boats are in use daily.

Without burdening you with figures which are usually rather monotonous, we can safely say that thousands of tourists are visiting our section and they marvel at the improvements being made.

Please be assured that I very much appreciate the report sent me and in closing may I say that I remember very pleasantly meeting you personally at one of the meetings held in Washington concerning hosiery.

With apologies for the lengthy letter and assuring you that if there is any further or more detailed information you would like I shall be very glad to cooperate in any way possible.

Yours very truly,
E. R. DEAVER.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the people of America will give support to a sane and properly considered program for aid to the devastated countries of Europe, just as soon as the fullest information is imparted to the people. I think it most desirable that the fullest discussion be had of the Marshall plan in all its implications. From a desire to assist in the dissemination of all pertinent information, I issued recently a statement upon this general subject matter. I request unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the hungry millions of Europe's war-devastated areas, it must seem symbolic that at this Christmas season, when the age-old promise of "peace on earth to men of good will" resounds throughout the world, America proposes a program of help and rehabilitation which would open a way to the peace and progress which these unhappy people crave so desperately.

The Marshall plan for assistance to 16 countries, proposing the outlay of an estimated 17 billions of dollars, is the most gigantic humanitarian program ever conceived upon this earth. While there will be doubt in many minds as to whether that amount actually will be needed, and whether also our own economy can withstand the impact of such a tremendous additional load, nevertheless I believe that all men of good will everywhere will approve America's willingness to assist these nations to regain their economic balance, and to become again respected, self-supporting members of the family of nations.

"Before one could reject the Marshall plan in its entirety, it would be necessary to consider the alternate possibility of a helpless Europe, deprived of American aid and wallowing in the misery of the chaos that must inevitably ensue. The end of that chaos, we can be certain, would be absorption into the Communist orbit. The ruin of these tottering countries, if America withholds her aid, can only result in a Europe gone completely communistic which means antagonism to every American concept of living and of government.

When the treacherous Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor on that fateful Sunday in 1941, and in the dark war years that followed, no one could reasonably question the tremendous expenditures for defense which piled one upon another. Those expenditures, we rightly believed, were for the defense of democracy and decency, for the saving of civilization itself. Not less threatening to the future of free peoples everywhere is the tide of misery and despair which now threatens so many countries of Europe, and will surely overwhelm some or all of them unless, with the assistance of American food and machinery and finances, they can be rescued from their present helplessness, and put once again upon the solid path of self-sufficiency.

The whole conception of this gigantic program is so far reaching in its ramifications that it is difficult for the average citizen, secure in our own American economy here at home, fully to visualize. As a prerequisite we must have faith in the leaders who have the information available upon which to base such momentuous decisions. I have such confidence in those of our leaders who have carried forward our bi-partisan foreign policy so successfully in recent times. Likewise, I have confidence in Secretary Marshall's understanding of the forces at work in Europe which threaten to pull down the whole fabric of civilization.

I am heartily in favor of the European recovery program in principle. I believe that every American of good will likewise will subscribe to it. Whether $6,800,000,000 is the proper amount for the first 15 months of the program will be debated thoroughly in the Congress and in hearings before the responsible committees of that body. Likewise, whether a grand total of $17,000,000,000 will be necessary, or whether, with the nations in question striving to help themselves once they are assured of our helping hand, they can regain their status as self-supporting sovereignties on a lesser amount must also await future determination.

It is vital, however, that assurance be given the leaders of those countries promptly that a continuing program of assistance will be available. I believe there is need for, and I am convinced that there will be forthcoming, adequate checks and balances on the expenditures in this first 15-month period to June 30, 1949, and as a prerequisite for further allotments of funds. Consequently, the American public and, of course, the Congress will have the benefit of this experience in deciding if the recipient countries are doing their part in order to secure continuing benefits.

It is a gigantic task to which America is asked to set its shoulder. After more than 2 years of futile attempts to erect a peace, it seems more evident with each passing day that lasting peace can never be achieved except with self-supporting, self-respecting nations. This result, I believe, can be achieved by, and only by, some type of continuing American aid.

The only adequate program offered thus far, based on certain knowledge of present conditions and of future needs of the individual countries, is the Marshall plan. Fundamentally it is sound and entitled to our support, under conditions and stipulations that will insure the realization of its objectives for the mutual advantage of America and of the friendly peoples of Europe.

Future Desperate Gamble for Residents of War-Torn Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the third in the series written by Philip H. Parrish, editor of the Portland Oregonian editorial page, on European problems:

FUTURE DESPERATE GAMBLE FOR RESIDENTS OF WAR-TORN BERLIN—CAPITAL STATUS STILL IN DOUBT—QUARRELS OF VICTORS BRING HEAVY CLOUD

(This is the third of a series of articles detailing observations recently made in Europe by Philip H. Parrish, editor of The Oregonian editorial page. The writer spent 7 weeks in Germany, Austria, France, and England.)

(By Philip H. Parrish, editor, the Oregonian editorial page)

Berlin differs from other German cities only in that it is much bigger; that it is farther north than most, and so in the winter colder and darker; that it is more a governmental creation than the natural creation of economic forces; that it stands far out in the Russian zone of occupation. Thus the differences merely serve to intensify the struggle for life among the millions who pack its outlying houses, damaged apartments, and cellars among the rubble.

Standing downtown, one could hardly tell but what he was in Munich or Essen or Frankfurt. But the climate is harsher; there is constant trouble in the air through the quarrels of quadripartite management; the countryside with its food is farther away, and the trip there is more dangerous because of the Russian guards who surround the city. Nor does Berlin know who will be its ultimate master, or whether it will ever be a capital city again. It has no assured resilience, such as that of the Rhine cities. Any study, just now, of mass-man in calamity should begin and end in Berlin.

It began with me on this second visit—and ignoring for the moment the official meetings with General Clay and his staff—with a drive through the evening streets with Lt. Col. and Mrs. Glen W. Campbell.

That, in itself, had its drama, for Mrs. Campbell is a daughter of Edward L. Wells, so long our Portland weatherman, and her brother Ed is chief engineer for Boeing. The vast havoc around us as we drove through the desolation of the Tiergarten, past the Chancellory, and on through the dim streets, was in large part Ed's technical achievement.

"I want Ed to come over and visit us," she said. Mrs. Campbell gives much of her own efforts to charity.

GIRL LEADS TOUR

Just then an old woman came out of the shadows to stop us and beg cigarettes in exchange for pictures of Berlin as it had been.

It was through the good offices of the Campbells that I set out the following afternoon with Ilse Borzym, 23-year-old German girl who works at their house, to see what the depths of the city were like. They had asked what I wanted to do, and it had seemed a good idea to get into the streetcars and subways. There are no automobiles for the Germans—only for the conquerors; so movement must be by mass transportation or by bicycle or by foot. (Queer description of us, isn't it?) I had been fascinated by the jamming of the surface cars. Ilse spoke English and we could get by.

Once, however, will be enough.

We got on at Zehlendorf station in the southwest (our zone) and turned east past Templehof airport and up northward on the Ringbahn through some of the most congested of the Russian-held working-class areas. We circled northwestward on the Ringbahn, and on the northern side of the city transferred to the newly reopened Nord-Sued Bahn—the subway that roars beneath the city, north and south, and which brought us out at Schoeneberg, near our starting place, where Colonel Campbell was waiting and was welcome. (The subway had been closed until recently because in the final days of the Berlin siege the crazed SS troops released the river waters into it, drowning uncounted numbers of their own people who had taken refuge there.)

Our trip required nearly 2½ hours, and took us through the most crowded sections at quitting time. On occasion we had to fight and squirm and struggle to keep from being trampled underfoot or smothered.

LIGHTS TURNED OUT

Then the lights would be turned out, in order to conserve power, and the cars, jammed beyond conception with swaying humanity, would roll along in darkness—everybody reeking because of the lack of soap, and especially because of potatoes. I had visions of being wrenched away from my interpreter, and of having to battle my way out, and home, among these grim beings who looked neither to the right nor left, and never smiled.

Once Ilse whispered to me:

"Sometimes there is trouble in the cars. The people are so tired after work and it is so difficult to get home."

One should only shudder at the thought of what would happen in one of those blacked-out holes if even one man gave way to the "furor Teutonicus"—shudder and struggle for breath.

Once when Ilse had explained something or other to me, a German at her elbow interrupted with a stern guttural phrase. Afterward she told me that what he said was: "Tell him the truth."

I think she did. Certainly there were many details I must have missed without her aid. She pointed out how many persons were wearing shoes made of cloth tops sewed to wooden soles. At first the people had been fairly well supplied with shoes but now these were giving way, and among those who received no contributions from abroad the wooden soles were almost the only answer. Also, note the garments made from blankets. These were multiplying. The tailor was bribed, with something, to make over a piece of blanket into coat or pants. One could sleep in the garment at night as well as wear it in the day.

LITTLE LEFT UNGUARDED

"These were very fine cars on the Ringbahn," Ilse said, as though a little surprised herself at their present condition. She rides her bicycle to and from work and avoids the mass transportation. "They had good upholstery."

"Where is it now?"

She shrugged. "The people needed for a little something at home. They are wearing it."

Anyhow, the cars are now just hard boards. And such lights as there are in the cars are heavily covered, with bars. Bulbs are scarce and cannot be left within reach. Indeed, nothing in Berlin except bricks and stones is left unguarded if one hopes to preserve it. Even automobiles are stripped within a few moments, down to the body proper. Thrill crimes—the crimes of violence—are rare. The people have no time or strength for them. But pilfering and theft have become a part of the life of the great majority of persons. (General Clay told us that he himself might steal under similar circumstances, with his children hungry.)

BIG BURDENS CARRIED

But the feature of our trip, if I were to name one, would not be the packed misery, or the greatly increased shabbiness. It would be the burdens that men carry—that is, both men and women.

Naturally there is no such thing as delivery of purchases in Berlin, or in any other German city. So delivery would explain much lugging in itself. But also it serves to distract attention from what is lugged illegitimately. Down in the subway stations one sees men staggering under great boxes, attached to poles, which they can barely get up the stairs. An old woman drags along under a bag of potatoes which bends her almost double. Children with immobile eyes go by carrying this or that. There is a dizzy and unending movement of people in all directions, and of people who want to be overlooked. They just want to get home, without speaking and without being noticed or stopped, with their burdens.

It was a relief to emerge into the cold of the city. And that night it was cozy to sit late in the close little apartment where Ilse lives with her parents, Herr Paul Borzym and his frau, Frieda. Ilse's fiance, Richard Tischler, was present also. He is an auto mechanic employed at the European Exchange Garage, and his ability with English helped in getting answers to my questions. I went with great detail into the economy of the family—and the situation of similar families—and believe I was answered honestly.

This family group was fortunate because Ilse and Richard both work for the occupation forces and can bring home extras. Also, the father and mother receive their little apartment by acting as caretakers for the apartment house. There are no children to worry about. But presumably there will be if Richard and Ilse get up nerve to marry. They are afraid now of the single room somewhere in the ruins to which they will be assigned by the municipality in case of marriage. Also, it costs 35 marks and up on the black market to buy even one pot to cook in. The Campbells, though, have promised pots, and the young folks are going to try it presently.

Herr Borzym has a job in the records office in the city hall. Prior to 1937 he worked on a lathe in a factory but suffered a spine injury. In the final months of the war, along with others who were incapacitated, he was taken into the Army and thrown in front of the Russians on the eastern front after only a few days of training. The Russians didn't think it worth while even to hold him for the work camps.

FORTY-EIGHT MARKS DEDUCTED

He gets 188 marks a month at the city hall, amounting to 140 marks of take-home pay after deductions.

His way of supplementing the family diet is by fishing. He gets a license each year for Wannsee Lake, northwest of the city, and goes there once or twice a week during the season. The fishermen line up 10 or 12 feet apart along the bank, and their take is a few tiny roach.

"Father," said Ilse, making a face, "grinds them up heads and all in the kitchen grinder. Says they are best that way. Mother and I do not like it so well."

Herr Borzym nodded at me laughingly from his chair, having caught the turn of the conversation.

Ilse receives 160 marks a month as a domestic, of which 110 marks are take-home pay. (Richard receives 320 as a mechanic, taking home 220.)

Out of Herr Borzym's take-home pay of 140 marks, about 50 will cover all the general food which can be had on the ration list; the rent would be 36½ marks—that, at least, being the ceiling; 3½ for cooking gas; 5 for electricity; 1.75 for the ration of coal when it can be had; 2 for use of the radio on restricted hours; 5 for vegetables when any can be found—a total of 104 marks. Thus 36 marks a month are left over theoretically.

And what could be done with 36 marks?

They reported the following black-market prices:

One pound sugar, 80 to 90 marks; 1 pound butter, 250 to 300; 1 pound coffee, 350 to 400; shoddy cloth for a suit, but unsewn and no thread, 800 to 1,000; 1 pair lady's hose, 150; 1 bar American soap, 30 to 50; a candle, 5; a light globe, 16. Put the 36 marks where you wish on this list.

They have had no milk since 1943. Breakfast, on the average, will consist of dark flour soup with water and salt, or bread, and an ersatz coffee. Herr Borzym takes his lunch with him on his bicycle, perhaps bread with a smear of fat on it, and a touch of vegetable. Supper is usually soup again. Sunday may be better. The family, under the ration, should have a total of 4 pounds of meat a month.

BLADE USED 3 WEEKS

Herr Borzym has a ration of one razor blade every 3 weeks. (A photograph of Frau Borzym's allotment of laundry soap for 6 weeks accompanies this article.) No thread, no needles. The little things bother a woman around the house.

I took my leave without asking questions as to whether or not this particular family traded in the country or otherwise resorted to the black market, and how. They would have answered frankly, I am certain, but in recounting their story I wanted to use names, and it is best not to use the names of those running the Russian blockade. Disappearance has become common in Berlin. An American-licensed German newspaper recently charged that about 6,000 persons who had displeased the Russians have vanished from the western-held sectors of the city.

Besides, I already had the information on that blockade. By prearrangement I had been met by a young German professional man and his wife, and spent hours with them on the details. The very clothes they wore had come from the cousin in Oregon who got in touch with me, and they were eager to be helpful.

This young German would be judged in the street as educated and successful. And he is. At least, he receives basic pay of 600 marks and makes a legitimate salary sufficient to live on, particularly where there are two small children. So he has become a blockade-runner and black-market trafficker on the side. At carefully chosen times of the year, depending on what has been harvested, he disguises himself in his seediest clothes, takes what may be a last look at the children, kisses his wife, and makes off in the darkness before dawn for one of the roads leading out of the city. There he creeps through the line of German police operating under Russian direction, or, more often, bribes a German truckdriver for 20 marks—the average price—and gets far out into the country in a box or curled under a pile of rags. There he alights and starts out to make the best deal possible with whatever it is he has brought along to trade.

He explained: "Last week—and that is the last time until spring, because the harvest is over—I had a bicycle tire. I got 30 pounds of flour.

"You ask what is it the farmer wants most? The farmer wish to have no money, but all other things. No people wish to have money. The farmer wish clothes most. Or glass for his windows. It is the joke that he wish to have a carpet for his cowhouse. I go to him and say, 'I have a shirt; you give me potatoes.' Or I say, 'Take my shoes; give me potatoes.'"

GOODS RUNNING LOW

My friend is getting down to the bottom of his bag of possessions now. He won't return to the country until spring, and he figures that by then he will have to sell his camera, perhaps for 6,000 or 7,000 marks.

"And after that is gone?"

He shrugged. "There is nothing left."

Possibly then it will have to be thievery.

I asked to whom he would sell his camera for 6,000 or 7,000 marks. "Not to Germans," he replied. "The richest are the Polish farmers. They come in with pork. They have pockets stuffed full of thousand-mark notes."

Of course, getting out of the country is only the first and easier part of his adventure. Then he must reenter Berlin with his potatoes or flour. Perhaps he has gone south, in the Dresden direction, from which there are many trains nightly. He is fortunate indeed if he gets inside, in the jam, where he can pass undetected. Ordinarily he will be hanging to the outside somewhere, and when the train draws onto a siding to let other trains pass he will have to dart off and hide behind a tree or bank to avoid the police with their hooks. These are special hooks to drag the blockade-runners from the trains.

If they catch him the children will cry for food through the winter. And perhaps he will not return to tell them why.

All of which illustrates how it is—as I observed in the opening article of this series—that the Germans are no longer frantic. This man and all his neighbors have learned the ropes of misery. It has become a calculated routine with them. They face the chances with cold eyes. Only those can hope to live who are not afraid to die, and make no missteps.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, realizing the imperative necessity of keeping America well prepared to cope with any emergency, I am of the belief that the American people have a right to expect a forthright statement from its elected representatives upon the important question of universal military training.

Accordingly, I prepared such a statement, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

(By HERBERT R. O'CONOR, United States Senator from Maryland)

Among all the many problems facing America today, that of preserving our national security is paramount. That there is a real

threat to that security in the defiant attitude of Russia and its satellites, no reasonable person can well deny.

At the moment America may hold a trump card through possession of the atomic bomb. Russian propagandists have indicated that their country now is able to manufacture the bomb. Whether that is true, or whether America actually is the sole possessor of the bomb today, it is generally agreed by leading scientists that our potential enemies will be able to develop atomic bombs themselves within the matter of a relatively few years.

Furthermore, every well-informed person is aware of the rising tide of communism. The clash of ideologies underlying the democratic and totalitarian systems naturally leads to misunderstanding, distrust, and possibly could lead to the breach of friendly relationships. While we pray God that neither we nor our children may experience another war, we cannot take anything for granted.

We must be prepared to cope with any emergency which may arise. Especially in view of the unsettled condition of world affairs must we remain so strong that no nation will dare to attack us.

Of course, there will be many who will reject the possibility of another unprovoked, undeclared attack. However, representatives of the Soviet Union have made it amply clear in the discussions before the United Nations, and in their animosity to European aid through the Marshall plan, that they hold America to be the No. 1 enemy of communism.

In their vision of speedy world-wide conquest, these opponents of freedom rightly regard America as the spokesman for and the leading advocate of individual freedoms throughout the world.

As the greatest industrial country in the world, the country which armed and financed the Allied nations in World War II, America would have to be silenced. Soviet officials know, before they could proceed to realize their dream of world domination. And make no mistake about it, they will do their best to insure that America is silenced completely, if they think the time is ripe to launch their world attack on democratic nations.

To meet such a threat, America must have an air force prepared in size and in equipment to launch immediately an overwhelming counter attack, and she must possess likewise a highly trained military force in every section of the country. Not only must these forces be skilled in procedures to meet any air- or sea-borne invasion that likely would follow an all-out bomb attack but they must also be versed in methods to cope with the peculiar problems that would be occasioned by widespread economic disruption or by radioactivity in the bombed areas.

One method of meeting such an eventuality, namely, a huge standing army, the American people would reject without much ado. Experience over the past months has shown, likewise, that voluntary enlistments cannot be depended upon to meet such an emergency. The only other avenue, therefore, to guarantee the establishment of the needed armed forces would be Universal Military Training.

Obviously, and naturally, any program of military training will meet with definite objection in a country where the idea of permanent military conscription has always been abhorrent. As parents we dislike the idea of having our sons taken from home during the formative period of their youth. While admitting the force of the arguments that can properly be advanced against Universal Military Training there still remains the alternate possibility. America could be destroyed in atomic warfare unless, sometime in the near future, the most comprehensive preparation for all-out defenses are developed.

In perfecting a plan for Universal Military Training it is imperative that we keep uppermost in mind the need for specialized training of a "key" force to concentrate upon the atomic bomb. Because of scientific advances it is incumbent upon us to have this special group devote itself exclusively to the peculiar problems incident to the use of this devastating implement of warfare.

Add up all the arguments that can be advanced against military training, and compute, if you will, the danger to the youth of our country, their loss of interest in their interrupted education, conjure up all the losses such a system would occasion, and they still are small as compared to the loss of our freedoms which could quickly follow an atomic bomb assault upon an unprepared America.

America's security, the whole future of world civilization, is under constant threat as long as world conditions remain as they are. Until permanent peace is assured we must remain powerful enough to discourage any potential enemy. Universal Military Training offers the only sound program of preparation that has been advanced for the safeguarding of America's security.

Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and concise editorial appearing in the Trainman News, official publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, December 20, 1947.

This editorial points out the fallacies of the Taft-Hartley Act, the serious damage it is causing in promoting industrial unrest, and the need for its early repeal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFW: "REPEAL THAT LAW"

After reading Gerhard P. Van Arkel's factual article, The Taft-Hartley Act Really Hurts Labor, in the December Railroad Trainman, we are more convinced than ever that a lot of labor trouble can be avoided by prompt repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The strike now disturbing the Chicago newspapers and the restive situation developing in the Remington-Rand plants are evidence that the law not only may be what the doctor ordered for employers who want to make unions powerless, but is also a direct cause of labor trouble.

As Mr. Van Arkel says (and as former general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board he is competent to speak authoritatively on the subject), "The unexpressed purpose of the Taft-Hartley Act is to break up unions and defeat collective bargaining."

We contend that to deny any union access to the procedure of government simply because its officers have not accepted the insult and certified that they are not Communists is an utterly new philosophy in this country and a provision of the act which we believe is clearly unconstitutional. It is made to order for the employer who is looking for a reason not to bargain with the strong, militant union equipped to represent the rank and file of the workers.

In the Remington-Rand case, the NLRB refused to recognize the United Electrical Workers' Union, CIO, notwithstanding the fact that a majority of employees selected that union to bargain for them. Can you think of a better way to promote labor trouble and provoke a strike? In this instance the Taft-Hartley Act is the cause of the trouble and the Federal Mediation Service, the arm of the Government charged with the responsibility of promoting and preserving industrial peace, is powerless to act. As you watch developments in the Remington-Rand dispute, mark this one down as directly traceable to the NAM's brain child.

Consider the unwise feature of the law which prohibits the closed shop under any circumstance, regardless of the desire of the employees and employer. Here again is a new philosophy and another provision which probably is not constitutional. It is the cause of the strife between the International Typographical Union and the Chicago papers. And here again the Mediation Service is powerless. As you watch developments in this case and observe the trouble spreading to other cities, bear in mind that it is a result of the antilabor law.

Under another equally obnoxious provision, a union is prohibited from expending or contributing money to promote or discourage election of candidates for Federal office. The union, according to Senator TAFT, Republican, Ohio, may not even make a candidate's voting record available to its members. This feature destroys political freedom and restricts rights of all citizens. We can't believe that any court would hold this constitutional.

Certainly there was no mandate from the people for any such law. And if TAFT does not know it, he will be enlightened in 1948.

To allow the Chicago Tribune to go all out for TAFT or BALL or HARTLEY, while not permitting a union-owned newspaper freedom of the press, just doesn't make sense and is wholly un-American. Yet this would seem to be TAFT's understanding of the law which bears his name.

No wonder Mr. Van Arkel resigned from the NLRB the week the act went into effect. We commend him for having the courage of his convictions and the character so much needed today in public officials.

What we need now is men of equal character and conviction in Congress to work effectively for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act before it creates more avoidable labor trouble.

A. F. WHITNEY.

Rehearsal for History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. WALLACE CHADWICK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Malvina Lindsay:

REHEARSAL FOR HISTORY
(By Malvina Lindsay)
CONGRESS ON TRIAL

They look like most other men and women, these members of the Eightieth Congress who are beginning their historic session of 1948. Yet we who are audience at their new drama see something special about them. Familiar as they are, we regard them with fresh curiosity. They are suddenly set a little apart.

Perhaps it is because they are about to try out for their roles in history. How will posterity finally judge a VANDENBERG for his performance? Or a TAFT? A MARTIN? A TABER? Or the seven Congresswomen, minute symbol of the feminine millions who are praying for freedom from fear of war? Or a freshman legislator who has one of the 531 votes that may sway the destiny of the world?

We think of all that is expected of them—to curb inflation, prevent depression, get enough houses built, settle the factious universal training issue, make the Nation's moral decision about Europe's tragic displaced, decide which turn a critically sick world is to take—toward recovery or relapse.

We see them standing out with a few other little groups in the procession of Congresses since 1789. Another reconstruction Congress is at the job of building peace, which is always so much harder than waging war. Will it do any better than did the stubborn, myopic, politics-ridden one of 1919? Or the passionate, vengeful one of 1867? Will the seeds of peace or of war be sown in the reconstruction it ordains? Will another Thaddeus Stevens achieve legislation of fear and hate? Will provincialism and political ambition bring about timid, negative subterfuges when bold, far-visioned action is needed?

We shudder momentarily at thought of the endless debate ahead—the demagogic archaisms that will provide a field day for cliché experts, the chauvinistic and petty utterances that will advertise our worst side to the world. Yet that is part of our freedom—and there will be noble expressions, too, which school children may some day learn.

We think sadly of the world cry for leaders. "There is paralysis in leadership from the Elbe to Washington," laments the London Economist. Our fellow Americans sigh, "If only we had some great figures as in the early days of the Republic."

Yet we know that the leaders of those days appeared to their contemporaries much as ours do to us. They were ridiculed, berated, even physically attacked. The first Congress was widely criticized for logrolling and for catering to money interests. A later Congress passed the notorious Alien and Sedition Acts which ruthlessly invaded civil liberties. Yet these Congresses at times acted with audacity and vision to strengthen the foundations of the Republic. Is there not a chance this one will take the steps that will strengthen foundations of freedom throughout the world?

After all, we tell ourselves our legislators have the advantage of hindsight. They know of hate's bitter reconstruction fruits of the sixties and seventies. They know of the whirlwind of boom, bust, and war that was reaped in part from congressional plantings of selfishness after the First World War. Nor is this Congress dominated by the vengeance and passion that prevailed in 1867. It is not ruled by the provincialism of 1919. One-third of its Members were abroad last summer. Most of them know that our oceans have become creeks.

We see these men and women, weighted with their loads of decision, sitting in Senate and House, watched by the world. Modern communications have brought them an audience of hundreds of millions—the hungry, the homeless, the suffering, the eager, the cynical, and the scornful abroad; the anxious, the searching, the hopeful at home. Never has a Congress played to such an unseen "house." Surely it will be inspired to a great and self-forgetful performance.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock from the New York Times of January 6, 1948:

IN THE NATION—ISSUE ON ERP ADMINISTRATION IS NOW PLAIN
(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 5.—The pretense has been dropped that the agency to administer the European recovery program would, in the form recommended to Congress by the President, be independent of, or even separate from, other executive agencies. Senator CONNALLY and Representative EATON, of New Jersey have conceded that, if Congress adopts the President's blueprint, the administrator of the ERP will be a subordinate of the State Department, with his every act as well as policy under its detailed direction.

Two fantastic arguments were employed by the Senator and the Representative in their attempt to further the State Department's ambitious plan to take minute charge of a vast economic and business operation. Mr. CONNALLY said that, if this ambition is not gratified by Congress, "Moscow would placard it to the world as an evidence of Russian victory over President Truman"—the logical conclusion being that Congress must agree with Mr. Truman 100 percent on every detail for the same reason. Mr. EATON said he has serious doubts that a truly independent agency to administer the ERP would be legal, because the Constitution reserves to the President the conduct of foreign affairs. The logical ultimate of this argument is that it would be unconstitutional for Congress to decline to appropriate in the field of foreign affairs any sum requested by the President for any purpose.

The importance of these observations does not derive from their substance, which is flimsy indeed, but from the concession of fact involved. This is that, despite the evasive words used in the President's message and the State Department's accompanying break-down of the administrative plan, the Chief Administrator of the ERP, like his principal assistants abroad, is designed to be just another employee of the Secretary of State.

That makes the issue plain, and gives to Representative HERTER, Speaker MARTIN, probably Senator VANDENBERG, and others in Congress who oppose this arrangement, a clear field to devise an administrative plan which will not be subject to the same objections as that sold to the President by a State Department increasingly bent on becoming an operating instead of a policy-making branch. These objections are:

1. The proposal follows a model that became the symbol of inefficiency and waste during World War II, being based on the principle of responsibility without commensurate authority.

2. The administrator would be the captive of the State Department because (a) he "must be subject to the direction of the Secretary of State on all matters affecting our foreign policy," and every "matter" he deals with necessarily does that; (b) Congress could not reach him for an accounting without breaking through two executive barriers, the Department and the National Advisory Council; (c) he would be obliged to recruit his assistants abroad from the Foreign Service of the Department, and these are given the titles of "Ambassador" and "Minister" to clinch the control; (d) all reports from these assistants to him, and instructions from him to them, must be channeled through the Department and cannot be handled by him d'rectly.

A series of endless frustrations and disputes would be the consequence of this arrangement, as our experience in World War II amply demonstrated when an administrator was assigned a large task without direct authority to accomplish it. The administrative plan recommended to Congress by the President even excludes all decisive phases of allocation and procurement from the official in charge. All this foreshadows a running battle among the executive departments; and between the executive and the legislative branches of Government whether or not the same party controls them both after the 1948 elections.

With such a set-up it should have been obvious that congressional analysis would soon cut away the screen of words which represented the new agency as independent and separate. But Mr. Connally and Mr. Eaton have made unnecessary a painstaking effort to do that by conceding the misrepresentation.

When it is remembered that calls have been uttered by the Executive for the ablest men in the country, with appropriate experience, to man the program, the attempt becomes the more remarkable. Obviously few men who meet that description would undertake the task if the State Department is really to run it and it is to be manned by its foreign service employees, trained in a specially limited field. One probable exception, of course, is Ambassador Douglas, who, being already a member of the State Department, might conclude he would be permitted to run his own show.

Alternative plans, like Representative HERTER'S envisage a truly independent and separate agency, subject to proper coordination with economic and foreign policy, but with complete operating authority for its director, the right to recruit and dismiss his own staff and to deal with its members and their reports at first hand.

The Mufti of Jerusalem Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly the crimes of Haj Amin el-Hussein, Mufti of Jerusalem, have been presented to the world, from this floor and from every forum of public opinion. His history is a matter of record running back to the First World War. In World War II he was openly allied with Hitler.

No adequate explanation has been forthcoming of his escape from France and his return to power in Araby. No one has been able to explain the failure to put the Mufti on trial with the other war criminals. Hitler, Mussolini, and their cutthroats are dead; only the Mufti has survived his vicious crimes and gained new infamy, surrounded by others of his ilk in defiance of the United Nations.

I commend to you, Mr. Speaker, and to everyone else who esteems justice and despises treachery, a vigorous editorial from the Washington Post of Tuesday, January 6, 1948, which I am inserting in the RECORD under leave:

MIDDLE EAST

No means are available to us to check British charges that Jewish refugees seeking to enter Palestine from the Balkans are handpicked Communists or left-wing sympathizers with links to the Stern gang. But the kind of Arab who is leading the resistance to the UN plan to partition Palestine needs no check. His record is plainly written in the pages of the war's history. At the head and front is the Mufti of Jerusalem, the notorious Haj Amin el-Husseini, the man whom Mr. Churchill called Britain's worst enemy.

The Mufti, slipping through British fingers, spent the war in Berlin, plotting with the Germans against Britain's interests. He has around him the same breed of troublemakers as himself.

This was brought out in a recent dispatch from Jerusalem. The most active man in the field at the moment, according to Emile Ghory, a leading Arab nationalist in Palestine, is Sheik Hassen Salameh. Sheik Salameh during the war was a German major, and he was dropped by parachute in Palestine to undermine the British. Unlike the Mufti, whom the French picked up in Germany, only to let him escape from Paris, he was never caught. This is the character who is in charge of the Arab forces in the whole Lydda-Jaffa district, and, according to the New York Times correspondent in Jerusalem, "probably was responsible for the numerous recent train robberies." The other field commanders have the same common denominator of anti-British and pro-Nazi activity. They are merely identified as leaders in the 1941 revolt in Iraq headed by the Mufti and Rashid Ali which sought to turn Iraq over to the Nazis. It is curious that these Arab gentry get no mention in recent comment of British spokesmen in Britain.

Since the General Assembly's Palestine recommendation the comments from London have been as irregular as some of the acts in Palestine of the British-officered Arab Legion of Transjordania. The concern in London seems to be with the attribution of pro-Soviet motives to the Jews in Palestine. To be sure, there are Communists in Palestine, as in every other country. In Palestine they appear to make up the notorious Stern gang, which arose as the result of the delay in attending to the Palestine problem. It is a small group of terrorists. In all likelihood they were back of the dynamiters of the offices of the Arab Higher Committee in Jaffa last week end. But we take leave to doubt whether the 10,000 or so Balkan refugees trying to get into Palestine are, as to the bulk of them, Communists. All we know about them is that they include 5,000 children fleeing from anti-Semitic lands where they have been freshly persecuted. It is time that the British spokesmen tuned their comment to a regard for their responsibilities as the mandatory power and for their membership of the United Nations.

The Christmas Message of Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, from the watch tower of the Vatican came a Christmas message on December 24 that applies to all people who believe in the fatherhood of God without which there can be no brotherhood of man.

It is significant that Palmiro Togliatti, a potent foreign agent of Moscow, who seeks to add Italy to the Communist chain, should have attacked the Vatican again only a few days ago at the Sixth Congress of the Italian Communists in Milan.

Togliatti knows that Christianity ideologically defeats communism. The Communists seek to make a god of the state and a materialistic animal of man. They seek to make a mockery of the family and to destroy religion, which is the relationship between man and his God. The Communists know their enemies. They know that the Vatican is a spiritual bulwark of defense, not only to western civilization but to men everywhere in the world against the hard-driving world ambition of Marxists who seek to enslave all men to communism.

VATICAN CITY, December 24.—The English text of the Christmas Eve message to the world, delivered by His Holiness Pope Pius XII is as follows:

ENGLISH TEXT OF PONTIFF'S 1947 CHRISTMAS EVE MESSAGE TO ALL MEN OF HONESTY

"The feast of Christmas and the new year close at hand bring with them certain signs which point a warning finger toward the days to come.

"The customary greetings exchanged at this season, which ascend to heaven in a cloud of incense and of prayer, cannot and will not, for all the deep and sincere affection prompting them, allow us to lose sight of the condition which confronts us at the present hour, when Europe and the wide world have reached a turning point of their destiny. The gravity of the crisis is unquestionable, its possibilities for good or evil immeasurable, its issue unpredictable.

"When last year on this same occasion we addressed our Christmas message to the Catholic world, and to all men of good judgment and good will besides, who could have had it in his heart to predict for humanity, tired of war and hungry for peace, what has today become a cruel, undeniable reality?

"Christmas bells will still ring in the feast, as from the days of old. But for many closed, embittered, and tormented hearts they ring out in the desert, where they wake no living echo any longer.

"Now that another postwar year has passed, with its burden of distress and suffering, of disillusionment and privation, those who have eyes to see and ears to hear cannot but be pained and humiliated by this: Europe and the world—even to distant and tormented China—today are farther from real peace, farther from complete and definite safety, farther from a new order based firmly on agreement and justice, than ever they were before.

"The champions of negation and disagreement, with the long line of profiteers in their train, are jubilant at the thought—or the illusion—that their hour is near.

"Contrariwise, the friends of peace, the promoters of a lasting reconciliation between the people of the world, feel the twinge of anguish in their hearts when they compare the moral and social wealth of Bethlehem's good tidings with the misery of a world that has wandered far away from Christ.

"But genuine Christians, for whom the whole of life, the source of all its lights and worth, consists in 'thinking with the Church,' perceive and realize better than anyone else the meaning and value of times like ours; times of dense darkness, but of blinding light as well; where the enemy of Christ reaps a vast, tragic harvest of souls, but many also of the good are leading better lives; where generous hearts can scale victoriously the peak of heroism, while numbers of the tepid and the faint of heart, slaves of human respect and afraid of sacrifice, slip into mediocrity or sink into the vile depths of degradation, like these who 'neither rebels proved, nor yet were true to God but for themselves were only.' (Dante, Inferno.)

"In the titanic struggle between the two forces now competing for the mastery of the world, if hatred is all that is needed to marshal under the leadership of the evil one men who would seemingly have every ground to disagree, what could love not accomplish toward uniting in a world-wide league those whose high purpose, noble instincts, and community in suffering have drawn them together by ties stronger and more intimate than any difference or divergency which could keep them apart? To the millions who are disposed to become members of this world alliance, the charter of which is the message of Bethlehem and its unseen head the king and peacemaker who lies before us in the manger, we direct at this juncture our heartfelt appeal.

"The brand on the brow of one generation, and the source of its disruption and decadence, is the tendency, every day more obvious, to insincerity, a lack of honesty, and this not merely as an occasional expedient, or of obstacles unforeseen. No. Today it amounts practically to a system. It has been raised to the distinction of a strategy, in which the lie, the garbled word or fact, and trickery have come to be an accepted weapon of offense, which some people wield with the skill of professionals, boasting even of their competence.

"So clearly, as they view it, has the suppression of all sense of right and wrong come to be part and parcel of modern technique in the art of forming public opinion, of controlling it and making it serve their political ends. For they are bent on winning at any cost the battle of class interest and theories, of ideologies and power politics.

"We do not propose to describe here in detail the havoc wrought by this tournament of insincerity in public life. But we are in duty bound to open the eyes of Catholics all over the world—and of all others besides who share our faith in Christ and a transcendent God—to the dangers which this prevalence of falsehood presents for the church and Christian civilization, for the entire religious and even merely human heritage which has supplied the peoples of the world with the substance of their spiritual life and of their real greatness for the past 2,000 years.

"When Herod of old was plotting anxiously to slay the Babe of Bethlehem he hid his plan under a pious mask, and tried his best to make the honest men into unwitting spies. Likewise today, his modern imitators move heaven and earth to conceal their real purpose from the masses, and make them the unconscious instruments of their designs.

"But once they have won power and feel the reins securely in their hands, little by little they let fall the veil, and pass by successive stages from oppression of the dignity and liberty of man to abolition of all authentic and independent religious life.

"Here, then, is the question we put to all honest men: How is humanity to recover, how can any new order worthy of the name emerge from the mistakes and agitation of this present hour of confusion, if the lines which mark off friend from foe, yes from no, and faith from lack of faith are to be erased and moved about?

"The church, though her heart is ever full of love and sympathy for these erring souls, cannot fail to denounce error, in loyalty to her divine founder's declaration: 'He who is not with me, is against me.' (Matt. 12, 30.) She cannot but tear the mask from the 'forgers of lies' (Job 13, 4) who come forward as wolves in sheep's clothing (compare Matt. 7, 15), as founders and pioneers of a new golden age. She cannot but warn the faithful not to let themselves be lured from the path of rectitude, or be deluded by fallacious promises.

"Our position between the two opposing camps is exempt from every prejudice, from any preference for this or that people, for this or that bloc of nations, as it is foreign to any sort of temporal consideration. To be with Christ or against Christ—that is the whole question.

"Each of the opposing sides believes itself constrained to this mistrust, as by a duty of elementary precaution. Obviously, this very fact leads to the building of an immense wall which renders hopeless every attempt to bring to the bewildered human family the blessings of true peace.

"Have we not had occasion, even during the past few weeks, to experience the tangible results of this mistrust? Have we not seen a most important conference of the great powers adjourn without having taken those essential and decisive steps along the road to peace for which the world in its anguish was waiting?

"There can be but one way out of the straits to which the cult of insincerity has brought the world—the return to the spirit and practice of straightforward honesty.

"No one today—to whatever social or political movement or party he may belong—who wants to bring the weight of his convictions and his public acts to bear upon the present or the future destiny of nations, has any right to wear a mask, to appear to be what he is not, to avail himself of the strategy of the lie, of tension and of threats, in order to restrict the honest citizens of every land in the exercise of their just liberty and civil rights.

"You will readily understand, then, how pained we are to see hostile propaganda distorting what we think and say, embittering men's hearts, hindering the peaceful exchange of ideas, and deepening the chasm which separates from us so many souls redeemed by the blood of the same divine and loving Savior. At the bottom of it lies, unfailingly, the same identical duplicity, deliberately adopted and ruthlessly employed as the most incisive weapon with which to combat justice and truth, and hinder mutual understanding, reconciliation and peace.

"The inevitable outcome of such a situation is the splitting of humanity into powerful and rival groups, whose highest law of life and conduct is a basic and invincible mistrust. Here is at once the tragic paradox and the curse of our time.

"That is why we would remind you, dear sons and daughters, that we celebrate tomorrow the birth of Him from whose lips one day escaped the cry: 'Veritas liberabit vos' (John 8, 32); the truth (which is His teaching) shall make you free. Never, perhaps, has this cry reechoed so loudly as it does today in a world hungry for peace but forced to groan beneath the oppressive yoke of falsehood.

"Let all Christendom, too, make answer—to Him who was made flesh that He might be for all "way, truth, and life"—in a prayerful plea that the truth may find its way back to the hearts of the rulers of nations, whose yes or no may determine the fate of the world. And with the truth may there shine out upon the earth no deceptive mirage, but Bethlehem's bright star of peace divine."

II

"Those who were absolutely determined to win the war were ready for any sacrifice, even unto death. Those who sincerely wish to win the peace must be ready for sacrifices just as generous, since nothing is more difficult for convulsed and embittered human nature than to forego reprisals and lay aside its unforgiving rancor.

"The injustice and cruelty committed by those who unleashed the Second World War aroused waves of righteous indignation, but served, alas, at the same time, to develop the seeds of a natural inclination for revenge.

"The saner portion of mankind—even among nations chiefly involved in the conflict—unanimously denounced the excesses and atrocities which a political system, falling into moral nihilism, not only practiced during the war which it provoked, but even dared to justify in theory. Facts and documents recently come to light have only served to confirm that those who sponsored and worked out this system are mainly responsible for the world's misery today.

"Men of the postwar period could have easily confronted this degeneracy with their own moral superiority; unfortunately, in not a few instances they have let slip a golden opportunity. It must be admitted that the history of the world during the days and weeks and months immediately following the war was very far from being one of unmixed glory.

"The punishment justly meted out to the chief culprits could have inspired Dante's pen with scenes for the Inferno, but the great poet would have shrunk from depicting the reprisals wrought upon the innocent.

"Forced migrations and compulsory hard labor followed later, defying the most elementary laws of humanity as well as the letter and the spirit of the rights of nations. Who, then, could be surprised that the sense of justice which had been rightly shocked at the sight of such deeds perpetrated by one side should also react similarly when it sees others commit them?

"Who can measure what futher moral domestic and social distress, what harm to the cultural and economic stability of Europe—and not alone of Europe—will be caused by the compulsory and indiscriminate displacement of peoples, what sorrow at present, what anguish for the future? Only a broader vision, a wiser and more judicious policy on the part of those who hold the fate of the world in their hands, can provide a tolerable solution for an otherwise insoluble problem.

"All honor, then, to those of every nation who shirk no privation or shun no labor to hasten the fulfillment of such a noble enterprise. Let them not be troubled at the contradictions and opposition they will have to meet and which precisely in these days seem to have grown more intense, in stimulating another war of nerves, provoking discord, reducing to naught the efforts of the champions of unity and peace. Let them be confident that the hour is at hand—as we trust and ask in our prayers—when the King of Peace will grant victory to those who do battle for His cause with a right intention and with the weapons of peace."

III

"The human race, then, will be powerless to emerge from the present crisis and desolation and to go forward to a more harmonious future unless it restrain and control the forces of division and discord by means of a sincere spirit of brotherhood uniting all classes, all races, and all nations with the one bond of love.

"We launch such an appeal to the entire world today, the eve of Christmas, because we see this spirit of brotherhood in danger of being stifled and crushed; because we see selfish appetites getting the better of sound reason, and the cruel tactics of oppression and violence prevailing over loyal understanding and mutual respect, and the utter disregard for any consequent evils to the detriment of the zealous maintenance of public welfare.

"The church, whose maternal heart embraces all nations with equal affection, is following with great anxiety this new development in national and international conflicts.

"When faith in God, the Father of all men, begins to grow dim, the spirit of brotherly union also loses its moral foundation and cohesive force; and when the consciousness of a society embracing all men, as wished by God, and which includes reciprocal rights and duties, determined by fixed norms, begins to die out, there arise in its place a morbid hypersensitiveness to what divides, a ready propensity to overstate one's rights, true or imagined, and a neglect—at times thoughtless, but not for that reason less ruinous—for the essential needs of others.

"At this point, the way is open for the struggle of all against all; a battle which knows no other right except that of the strongest.

"Our age, alas, has provided some sad examples of fratricidal war, resulting with relentless logic from the weakening of the spirit of brotherhood.

"Even the land which heard the hymn of the angels announcing peace to men, which saw the Star of the Saviour shine forth, and where the Divine Redeemer died crucified for our salvation—even that Holy Land, with all its memories and shrines most dear to every Christian heart, is now divided and has become the scene of blood and strife. And Europe herself, the center of the whole great Catholic family—is she not perchance today, a warning and an example of the plight to which the loss of the spirit of brotherhood can reduce a part of the world once so beautiful and flourishing? The wounds she suffered during the late war are still unhealed, and already the sinister light of a new conflict flashes on the horizon.

"Oh, if all honest men were to unite together, how quickly would the victory of the brotherhood of men be realized and along with it the rehabilitation of the world. Such people already constitute a substantial element of public opinion, and show that they possess really human instincts, with political wisdom as well.

"But there are others just as numerous, whose mere word has considerable weight in hastening or impeding the peace of Europe—the necessary initial step toward world peace—and who follow a course directly opposite. Are they afraid, perhaps, that if Europe were to recover, regain her strength, and become conscious once more of her Christian mission, she would wish to rid herself of the deadly germ of atheism and revolution and live a life of her own, free from unhealthy foreign influence?

"It is obvious that a Europe shivering and feverish from economic difficulties and social chaos yields more readily to the seductions and illusions of a fatuous ideal state than a healthy Europe with her vision clear.

"Meanwhile, the propagators of such deceptive schemes spare no effort to make converts to their cause among the fanatics and the simple, whose aim, in turn, it will be to drag their people along the path of ruin that others have traveled before them, not from choice but because their civil and religious liberty had been systematically repressed.

"Have we not had occasion to see here, on the sacred soil of the city where God has established the Chair of Peter, the emissaries of a concept of life and human society based on atheism and violence sowing cockles in the good earth of Rome, and doing their utmost to convince her sons that they have discovered and set up a new culture more worthy of man than the ancient and eternally youthful Christian civilization?

"Since things have reached such a pass, the time has surely come for everyone who cherishes the human and spiritual heritage of his forefathers to rouse himself from sleep, take up the arms of faith and courage, and preserve the city, civilization's mother, from religious, moral, and social deterioration, such as might render very difficult, to our keen regret, that solemn celebration of the coming holy year desired by Catholics the world over.

"If, however, the frank words we utter during today's celebration know no boundaries, they refer only to doctrines denying faith in God and Christ, and certainly not to the nations or groups of nations who are the victims of these doctrines. For these latter the Church ever cherishes the same constant love. Nay, the more they suffer the greater is her love for them. It is in the days of trial, rather than in untroubled hours, that men of all nations should realize that they are brothers. The real meaning, the lofty mission, and the power to reconcile of this brotherhood has never been, nor shall ever be, extolled with such force

as it was by 'the first-born among many brethren' (Romans 8: 29), who from Bethlehem to Golgotha preached by His example more than by His words that great and universal brotherhood of men.

"Over this Christmas a dark cloud is gathering. As the people's anxious yearning for peace grows ever ever more intense, the inability of their leaders to satisfy it by merely human means is just as apparent. Do not the honest efforts of some to arrive at an equitable peace and the systematic planning of others to prevent its fulfillment bring perchance to mind the picture of a dangerous game of chance of which the stakes are forture or ruin?

"Into the meeting places of men the spirit of evil creeps unnoticed, 'the angel of the abyss' (Apo. 9, 11); the enemy of truth, the fomentor of hatred, the denier and destroyer of all sense of brotherhood, believing that his hour is nigh, uses everything at hand to hasten it. Nevertheless, we desire to end our Christmas message with an irrepressible appeal for hope and confidence.

"Although faith in the Divine Redeemer prompts Christians to ponder everything in the light of the truth—ever ancient, ever new—of aged Simeon's declaration concerning the Child Jesus at the presentation in the temple: 'Behold this child is destined for the fall and for the rise of many . . . and for a sign that shall be contradicted' (Luke 2, 34), still we know that the number of those who do not separate themselves from Christ by unbelief, who cling to Him, who are ready to give their lives for Him and who place in Him and in the resurrection their unwavering hope—we know that the number of these is great, that it is increasing and growing strong. We see them radiating energy and influence for good in every sphere of life. We see that other men of good will are joining them.

"To you all, therefore, beloved sons and daughters, we say: Your hour is come.

"At the assemblies of statesmen another unseen spirit presided as Sovereign Lord, the Omnipotent God to whom nothing is secret and who holds in His hands the thoughts and hearts of men, to bend them as He wills and when He chooses; God, all of whose inscrutable designs are governed by His paternal love. But to fulfill these designs He wishes to make use of your cooperation. In the day of battle your place is in the vanguard, fighting at the front. The timid and those afraid to come out in the open are very close to becoming deserters and traitors. He is a deserter and a traitor who would give his material support, his services, his talents, aid, or vote to parties and to forces which deny God, which put might in place of right, and threats and terror in place of liberty, which make of lying, opposition, and incitement of the masses to revolt so many weapons of their policy, thus rendering national and international peace impossible.

"Let us bring ourselves back 300 years, to a Europe torn by the horrors of the Thirty Years' War. The year 1648 brought at last the message of peace, the dawn of restoration.

"Pray and work to obtain from God the grace that the year 1948 may be for wounded Europe and for the nations torn by discord a year of rebirth and of peace. So pray and work that after the rout of the spirit of darkness, the angel of the bottomless pit, the sun of justice may rise over the world: Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom the honor and glory in time and in eternity.

"And now let our Apostolic blessing, a pledge of divine grace and aid, go out to all our beloved sons and daughters, those of this episcopal city of ours as of the whole word. But let it extend especially to those groaning under a heavier weight of distress and pain; the sick, the poor, the unemployed; the homeless and all who are hungry and cold; for those bereft of freedom, family, country through the tragic happenings of a dreadful war, through other men's injustices, or through their own past mistakes and faults, and who feel the pang of discouragement and anguish all the more keenly at this holy season; to the prisoners of war not yet restored to their dear ones; to the refugees and the displaced; in a special way to those, particularly priests, suffering persecution, prison, exile, threats of torture and of death simply because of their fidelity to God, to Christ, to the Church, and to their duty."

Our Changing Land Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith an address delivered by Mr. E. H. Taylor, associate editor of the Country Gentleman, at the second annual meeting of the Soil Conservation Society of America, at Omaha, Nebr., on December 4, 1947.

This address is a most constructive and challenging criticism of the land policies followed by this Nation since its beginning. It is the ablest discussion I have seen of the importance of land conservation in the future social and economic development of our country. It should be read by every Member of Congress and all others who have a duty and responsibility in determining public policies in the field of conservation.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Soil Conservation Society of America, after long and troubled reflection I have concluded that your program committee contains some practical jokesters. They gave me a subject entitled "Our Changing Land Policy." It was kindly suggested that if I traced some of the significant historical changes in our land policy it might help us all to understand better why we are where we are now—and where we might be going.

I have earnestly tried to carry out this assignment. In my efforts to find that land policy, which the committee asked me to describe to you, I have read a dozen or so books dealing with the administration of this Nation's land and have delved into a number of congressional debates and enactments. And now a firm respect for truth and honesty compels me to say that I cannot live up to the promise made on your program. To trace and interpret our changing land policy just can't be done, for reasons that should become apparent to you before long.

It has been said, "If we know the past, we can better understand the present." How true that statement is I never quite realized until I began this intensive study of our land history. In greater part it is a history of what happened to a public domain, vaster and richer than ever possessed by any other nation. In its entirety this public domain embraced 1,300,000,000 acres, acquired by conquest, cession, purchase, and outright occupation. Within less than a century and a half it had all been disposed of—settled and farmed, devoted to grazing use, logged over, and mined, or set aside into national reserves.

By what manner of means was all this turn-over of land accomplished? What were the acts of farsighted statesmanship and the wise principles which shaped the distribution and treatment of this mighty store of natural resources? Here surely we should find signs of that land policy, which my subject assumes. But the historian-economist, Benjamin Wallace Hibbard, author of perhaps the best work on our land history, has only this to say:

"While there were many individuals with interesting, even excellent, ideas as to how the public domain should be administered, it cannot be said that a conscious policy worthy of the name existed. • • • It was rather a series of expedient actions."

The curtain lifts on the first of these actions involving the land soon after independence was achieved. The young Republic was in debt and it had few sources of revenue. But it owned an unsettled territory, stretching from Ohio to the Mississippi, more than 265,000,000 acres, acquired by defeat of England and by cession from the original colonies. The statesmen of the time saw in it one of the means of solving their financial problem. Both the land ordinance of 1785, in which Thomas Jefferson had a hand, and Alexander Hamilton's Report to Congress on the Public Lands held that the public domain should constitute a source of national revenue through the gradual sale of land.

For more than a third of a century this emphasis on the revenue function of the land was to prevail. But there was little agreement otherwise.

At the very start there was a sharp difference of opinion whether the land should be sold in large blocks to land-settlement companies—and speculators—or in small acreages suited to the financial ability of the settler, at auction, or to the individual buyer. The result was a compromise—one of so many that were to develop. The auction method was adopted. Land was sold in large blocks—to the Ohio Co., the Scioto Co., and others, in one of which, I am sorry to say, Congressmen were the promoters. It was also sold in settler-sized blocks.

The land history of the next quarter of a century is a long series of controversies—over the price of land, the terms of credit, and extensions of payment. Prices started off at a minimum of $1 an acre, were raised to $2 an acre, but with concessions to land companies that were sometimes as low as 16 cents an acre. Credit terms began at one-half down and the rest in 2 years. This time limit for final payments was lengthened to 3, then to 5 years. When settlers became hard-pressed Congress frequently voted extensions, depending on whether the eastern or western viewpoint prevailed.

For land was ensnarled in one of the many conflicts of interests, which have marked our history. The West, seeking new settlers and development, wanted low-land prices and easy terms. But the East feared the loss of its population and the increasing political power of the West. Its growing industrialism wanted a plentiful and cheap labor supply, which every easing of land settlement made harder to hold.

So the historian, writing of that period, merely comments: "No policy developed for making the best or most logical use of the public domain."

But one marked change took place in 1824. As a result of unprofitable experience, the credit system was abolished. Almost as an incidental afterthought Congress attached a reduction in the price of land to $1.25 an acre. It was the beginning of a trend, away from the emphasis on the public lands as a source of revenue and toward an emphasis on the human values they might serve.

Lending a powerful voice to this trend was the appearance in the Senate of one of the great figures in our land history—Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri. He was pontifical, egotistical, and no doubt often irritating to his fellow Senators. But he deserved the title of "Statesman of the West," and he looms as one of our few statesmen of the land.

In a series of speeches in the 1820's he advocated graduated land prices and even the free settlement of land. "The freeholder," he declared, "is the natural supporter of a free government, and it should be the policy of republics to multiply their freeholders. Pass the public lands easily and cheaply into the hands of the people; sell, for a reasonable price, to those who are able to pay; and give, without price, to those who are not. I say, give without price to those who are not able to pay, and that which is so given I consider as sold for the best of prices."

Settlement and cultivation, he maintained, were the true means of increasing wealth and the national income. Revenue could be derived from the sale of land but once, he asserted, while the land, settled and under cultivation, would be a source of endless future production.

Senator Benton did not achieve any of his objectives at the time. But he planted seed that was to bear abundant fruit later on. And he invested land with a social purpose that was to carry on down to our day in the stress on the family-owned and operated type of farm.

The historian comments: "Benton did not originate a policy so much as a philosophy of the land. Great changes, it is true, were to follow along the lines of his thinking. But they were not the products of any orderly program but rather of circumstances that rendered them advantageous for other reasons."

His ideas failed at the time because land became involved in another of those struggles between conflicting interests. From Hamilton's time the Federal Government had two main sources of revenue—duties on imports and income from the sale of public lands. In the first 45 years sales of these lands totaled 87,538,347 acres, yielding a considerable outlay of money to a Government that then cost little. But by Jackson's second administration the Government could see itself soon out of debt. There was, in consequence, less need for revenue. The South was hostile to the tariff and wanted lower duties or none at all. The West wanted cheaper land prices or, better free land.

The industrial East was alarmed over both possibilities. Here the adroit Henry Clay began a series of strategems. He entered into an agreement with John C. Calhoun for the retention but gradual lowering of the tariff. And he proposed that the proceeds of the land sales be distributed among the States. The guise was to promote internal improvements, but the intent was to keep up the price of land by arousing the covetousness of the States. This proposal was brought up at one session of Congress after another until it was finally passed in the form of a deposit of the Government's surplus funds with the States. But the deposits continued less than a year, for then the panic of 1837 was on and the Federal Treasury was broke.

It was not the first—or the last—time that politics was to sacrifice the welfare of the land.

But another influence, more powerful than politics, was soon to enter upon the scene. From the outset grants of land for various public purposes had become an accepted practice. They had been awarded as military bounties and for the protection of the frontier. Section 16 in each township had been set aside to promote education. In all, through this original act, a further grant in 1841, and the Morrill Act in 1862, for the establishment of agricultural colleges, the Government gave more than 100,000,000 acres for educational purposes.

Then, as the newly settled areas began to demand outlets, grants were made for wagon roads, canals, and river improvements.

These gifts tended to shape a phase of the popular and official attitude toward the land—it was something that could be exchanged for improvements that the people wanted. This paved the way for a development that was to hasten land settlement and to shift the historical balance of interests in this country. It was the coming of the railroads and the grants of land to promote their construction.

The first of these land grants to subsidize the building of railroads was made in 1850, with the Illinois Central the recipient. Alternate sections of land for 6 miles on either side of the railroad—or their equivalent if the land was already settled—were given to the States, through which the Illinois Central was to pass. The land was to be sold and the proceeds turned over to the railroad's builders. The price of the public land intervening between these railroad-grant sections was raised to $2.50, on the theory that the benefit conferred by the railroad increased its value to that extent.

Before the period of railroad building, financed in part by land gifts, ended, the Government was to make total grants for that purpose of 129,028,558 acres and the States 37,789,169 acres. The wisdom and justice of these land grants, the means by which some of them were obtained, the subsequent use of these railroad lands all have been subjects of question and controversy. I shall not enter into their merits. But I do venture the opinion that no other factor had so revolutionizing an effect on the course of our land history.

With the advent of the railroads, the industrial East began to realize the possibilities of the western markets and to become more favorable to rapid land settlement. Easy and comparatively fast transportation opened up distribution outlets for industrial goods. In return the abundance of cheap food from the West relieved the pressure on wages. The great mineral and lumber resources of the West were made accessible, with eastern capital the chief beneficiary. The northern and western alliance began. It was to have historical repercussions.

The first of these was a more friendly attitude toward homestead—or free land—proposals. Such spokesmen as Horace Greeley and Amos Lawrence reversed their former positions and became champions of a homestead law. A Pennsylvania Congressman—Galusha Grow—became the chief advocate of homesteads. A pre-emption or "squatters' rights" act, termed by one historian "the first democratization of the public land," had been passed in 1841. Homesteading had been officially approved for the Oregon Territory. The spirit of manifest destiny was pushing the Nation to the shores of the Pacific, and giving the settlement of the intervening territory an urgent importance. From 1840 on some form of homesteading act was introduced at nearly every session of Congress.

It seemed Benton's dream was about to be fulfilled. But land again became involved in a political issue—the struggle between the slave and the Free States. Southern leaders saw that the small landholder, who would be multiplied by a homestead act, would prove a barrier to the extension of the plantation, slave-farming system. Antislavery interests were equally quick to see the same fact. So, for 15 years, homesteading was delayed by this deeping conflict between political and economic interests. A hybrid homestead act was vetoed by Buchanan in 1859 in deference to his southern supporters.

The victory of the new Republican Party in 1860 insured the passage of the Homestead Act. It was delayed by the needs of the Treasury, but only until 1862.

With the Homestead Act a period in our land history ended and another began. The public lands ceased to be regarded as a source of revenue. Their use for the subsidization of railroads was to attain still larger proportions, but it is significant that the year 1871 saw the last railway grant. The rapid settlement and cultivation of the public lands by an independent, home-owning population had become recognized as their best use.

Like all Government actions in respect to the land, it was late. Two-thirds of the land suited to homesteading had already been occupied. There were other failures of foresight in connection with it. Yet this comment by one land historian seems fair: "With all its shortcomings the Homestead Act has more to its credit than any other one act passed by the Federal Government. A million and a third homesteads were taken up and carried to completion under it." Some of us here were to grow up on homesteaded farms.

It did not constitute a policy, only the culmination of a long tendency to make land easier of settlement. Nor did it bring order into our land affairs. The Homestead Act was based on experience in the settlement of the middle country. It broke down when it attempted to cross the Plains and enter an area of different climatic conditions.

Here, as in all of the Government's land activities, one grave deficiency was to have costly effects. This was the failure to classify the public lands—the very essence of a rational land policy. Thus for the first half century all land, good and bad, sold for virtually the same price; and under the Homestead Act, all public land was considered equally adapted to entry in 160-acre tracts, regardless of the character of the land or its geography.

Under this blind and improvident system, enormously valuable mineral and timberlands were to pass into private hands for a pittance in comparison to their real values. The results were an incalculable loss to the Federal Treasury, the promotion of fraud and corruption, and the exploitation and waste of natural resources. There were other byproducts, still all too familiar. The lands west of the one-hundredth meridian became the scene of ill-fated attempts at homesteading settlement, of wars between the "nesters" and the rangemen, and of tragic failures and disappointments to thousands of homesteaders.

The wise advice of Maj. J. W. Powell who, I believe, spent his last years in Omaha, was disregarded. After a survey of the West he recommended that what is now mostly range country should be settled in large tracts, suited to pasturage. Instead Congress attempted to repair the flaws in the Homestead Act by numerous pieces of patchwork legislation: The Kinkaid Act, the Enlarged Homestead Act, the Stock-Raising Homestead Act, the Timber Culture Act, the Desert Land Act, the Carey Act and still others. But no act of Congress could enable a homstead-farmer to succeed on land that nature intended to be grazed by animals. The limitations of geography, and not the wisdom of Government, have had to work out the solution to this problem of land use.

Not until 1891, when most of the public domain had passed into private hands and much of the most valuable parts had been possessed by the railroads and the mining and lumber interests, did Congress act to protect the little remaining against exploitation. It then passed a General Revision Act of all land legislation. And not until 1907, in Theodore Roosevelt's Administration, did the first real movement for the conservation of our natural resources take shape. But it was mainly concerned with waterpower, timber, and minerals. The first official move toward conservation of our greatest natural resource—the land—was to wait another quarter of a century.

I believe the review of our land history might properly end here. All of you are familiar with the subsequent actions of the Government—the Reclamation Act, the legislation establishing the Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Adjustment Act. In their merits, and in their shortcomings, they are in keeping with the rest of our land record. None of them attains the rank of a land policy, although they might contain the seed of such a policy.

Somehow, after such a fashion as I have outlined, the land of this country has been settled and turned to use. Of all our mighty store of land resources, less than 100,000,000 acres remain to be reclaimed by the costly processes of drainage or irrigation. It is a sadly mixed history—this occupation of the world's greatest land empire. If we consider only the courage, the hardihood, the sacrifices, and the resolution of the pioneer settlers we can well feel a glow of pride. In all too many histories and official documents these pioneer settlers have been held up as "soil robbers" and blamed for the wastage and destruction of our natural resources. There were, among them, some who were guilty of such abuses—through ignorance, greed, or shiftlessness.

But here and now I intend to put the blame for the dissipation of our land resources exactly where it belongs—on the Government of the United States and on the men who constituted that Government from time to time. By their improvident and short-sighted actions they set the example for a wasteful attitude toward the land. By their failure to enact policies that would safeguard the disposal of the public lands they encouraged speculation, fraud, and exploitation. By making land the football of politics they set back the type of development that would have best served the interests of the Nation. The miracle is that the development of our land resources turned out as well as it has. For that fact we can thank the intelligence, the spirit, and the enterprise of a majority of the people who have settled and cultivated the land. As to the record of the Government in that respect, I shall quote the remarks of perhaps the best-qualified historian on that subject:

"Thus far there has been no genuine land policy in and for the United States. True enough, there have been temporizing plans, some of them good for a time, and for certain sections. But a plan involving and comprehending the welfare of the whole Nation, we have not had."

Now you understand why I am unable to carry out the assignment given me by the program committee. We have had no past land policy to change. We have no present land policy to which we are changing.

What we have had have been trends in the prevailing attitude toward the land. What we have now is a changing trend, one toward the maintenance of our land resources. Like the trend toward the use of the land to encourage an independent, home-owning citizenry, this also has had its seer and spokesman. He is Hugh H. Bennett. One of the few things of which I am proud is that I first met him, and helped a little, when he was still a lone voice crying in the wilderness. He it was who first really awakened the country to the irreparable loss it was suffering from soil erosion—from all the ravages of water, wind, and neglect that were depleminishing our land resources. He not only saw the need; he had the constructive ability to bring together in a practical program the practices that would insure a good stewardship of the land. If history is just, it will list Hugh H. Bennett as one of the half dozen most useful Americans of our time.

But again, as with Benton, the trend he initiated is slow of achievement. Our land history is being repeated—the needed action always late. And again, as in our past, it is the people who are ahead of the Government. The farmers themselves, and not Washington, are now the chief motive force in the trend toward conservation of our land resources. They are realizing more and more that the soil is their primary capital asset, and that its proper use and care is the first commandment of good farming. I have been impressed by the number of them who have appeared before the congressional committees and put soil conservation first, asking that benefit payments be made only for those practices that will be of permanent value in maintaining the productivity of the soil. The huge crowds that have attended the demonstrations of complete conservationizing of farms signify the wide farm interest. In a recent poll in Wallace's Farmer as to who is the most successful farmer, by far the largest vote was cast for the one who follows the best soil-conservation practices.

Sportsmen now see that wildlife conservation is inseparably linked with soil and water conservation. Wildlife must have food and cover and clean streams if it is to exist. Only the conservation of our soil and water resources will provide these essentials.

Again, as with the homestead idea, the trend is gradually gaining the support of business interests. Bankers are learning that an eroding farm means a declining security for a loan or a dwindling deposit in the bank. The implement companies and other suppliers of farm equipment are enlisting behind conservation because only productive land will afford them an enduring market. The local businessmen in the thousands of small towns, who depend upon farm trade, are beginning to understand that the soil is the sole basis of purchasing power in their areas. The meaning of conservation is also taking hold in a larger sense. I quote from an editorial in the Kansas City Star, entitled "The Land That Feeds Us":

"The soil losses in the Middle West this year concern every American housewife who has to pay the price at the butcher's counter. They concern the poorly fed Europeans who wait for American shipments. But here in the Missouri Basin the issue is far greater. The future of Kansas City, Topeka, Omaha, and all the other cities in the Missouri Valley depends on stopping the wasting away of the land that supports them. There is no alternative. * * * Soil conservation is a national must. It is an absolute essential to the whole flood-control program. It goes far beyond the reservoirs and levees to keeping the soil on the land and water on the soil. Flood control and soil conservation roll together into one vast program—keep the soil on the land, keep all the water on the land that the soil will hold, harness the water resources of the basin for the use of man. We had better wake up to the fact that soil and water are the sources of life."

All of these are valuable contributions to a changing trend in the general attitude toward the land. But they do not constitute a policy. A policy would be an enactment by Congress, establishing the conservation of the Nation's soil and water resources as a declared purpose of Government and adjusting other programs and policies to it. This we do not have, and it isn't going to be easy to get. The land has again become involved in another issue—the world struggle now going on between different social systems. For the time being the short-term needs of our foreign policy seem likely to take priority over all else—even the interests of the land. Actually a sound land policy is the strongest arm of any long-time foreign policy, as will shortly become evident. But there is another reason why such a policy is not in sight. It is the simple fact that a majority of those who presently make up our Government do not realize any better than those of the past the paramount importance of our food-producing resources to the progress, stability, and destiny of this country.

Let us, for the sake of record, make clear their full meaning to the life of the Nation. It is my considered opinion that the abundance of our food-producing resources has been the greatest single factor in the social and economic development of this country. There are conclusive reasons for that opinion and I shall state them now.

1. The bounteousness and variety of our food supply, coming from a comparatively new soil, have given us a vigorous and energetic population throughout our history. Only a people, well-nourished and strong, could have accomplished so much in so short a time. For corroboration and for its significance to our future, I shall quote a statement by Dr. George R. Minot, of the Harvard School of Medicine, who said recently, "Initiative, progress, success, and the happiness of a people tend to go hand in hand with an abundance of food and a good diet."

2. An adequate supply of food has been one of the strongest supports of our free political institutions. We are having demonstrated to us, on the present world stage, how precarious is the life of governments where the food supply is inadequate. Hunger is the greatest threat to the stability of any form of government. We have never had to face it here. There have been times when some of our people did not have enough to eat. But those occasions were due to the failure of political and social leadership, never to a shortage of food.

3. Our vast industrial development would have been impossible without an abundance of food. The processing and marketing of food is in itself our biggest single industry, drawing upon innumerable others for materials and equipment. But in another and still more significant way our food resources have facilitated the growth of our complex industrial system. With the single exceptions of the periods following the two world wars, food has not only been plentiful but cheap. This insured a labor force physically capable of doing the work. More important, it left a large margin of earnings to be spent on the products of industry. Over the long record kept by the Department of Agriculture the food basket has accounted for little more than 20 percent of the average spendable income. Nowhere else in the world has it been possible to satisfy the food needs of a people and have so much of a balance left to be used in raising the common standard of living. Suppose this margin above the food requirement slips down, as it inevitably will if the deterioration of our soil resources continues, to 70, to 60, to 50 percent—what will happen to industry?

4. The three essentials in war are: Manpower, weapons, and food. A nation without adequate food resources and with its supply lines destroyed is a defeated nation. Never, in all our wars, have we had to worry about an ample supply of food. We have been able to take full care of ourselves and to provision our allies as well. God grant that we may never suffer another war, but if we do we can be sure that a sufficient food supply will be as vital as in the past. A reserve of productivity, stored in the soil, will be as necessary as a stock pile of bombs or other weapons.

5. The products of our soil have been and are now one of the strongest forces for success in our foreign relations. All but forgotten is the fact that for three-quarters of a century they accounted for our favorable balance of trade, enabling us to pay off the capital investments foreigners made here when we were a creditor nation. We know well what they mean now. They are the most powerful arm of our foreign policy. Without them the Marshall plan or any other effort to stay the march of communism in Europe would be impotent. Our food producing resources will be no less indispensable to an effective foreign policy in the future. Upon their maintenance depends our strength at home and the ability to produce the surplus supplies needed to back up our foreign policy. A sound land policy does not run counter to our foreign policy; it is its strongest support.

6. The maintenance of our food-producing resources is the very foundation of our national security. Our rival for world leadership is master of the greatest storehouse of natural resources left on earth. But we have ruined one-fifth of our original grant of tillable land and we are using up the remainder faster than it is being restored. All history holds for us the lesson of nations that ignored the waning of their food resources. Their epitaph is written in the Book of Isaiah: "Thy speech shall whisper out of the dust."

And yet, in the face of all of these facts so vital to the destiny of the Nation, this is what an eminent land historian has to report: "During the century and a third, over which our legislation has extended, there has been little attempt to couple land policies with the ultimate need for food."

Isn't it time that we had such a policy, one that comprehends this ultimate need for food and the basic importance of our soil resources to the economy and security of the Nation?

You and I know the answer well enough but too many other people do not. The necessary job ahead is to make the facts known, to bring home to these others the element of their own self-interest that is at stake. And, as the facts plainly show, the interests of all—city as well as country—are involved. The present condition of scarcity and high prices of certain primary foods is but a preview of what will be normal 15 or 20 years from now if the present deterioration of our soil goes on unchecked. I am not an alarmist, but I saw what the floods of last spring did to the richest of our farm lands.

There are obstacles to be overcome—the still persistent myth of land plenty; the historic tendency of Congress to adopt temporizing measures instead of the needed reality; the subordination of the land to other interests and issues; the uncalled-for fight over who shall administer the conservation program; and the "parlor conservationists," who would go to extremes as in their present war on the range cattlemen.

But these obstacles can be overcome. I have faith that they will be. The changing attitude toward the land, evident over the country, can become an irresistible movement. An increasing number of men in Washington, CLIFFORD R. HOPE, BEN JENSEN, Senator ED THYE, Secretary Clinton Anderson, to name but a few—understand the importance of our soil resources to the welfare of the Nation. Perhaps from among them will arise a new statesman of the land to write his name above even that of Benton.

Yet we might as well be honest about this job of conserving our soil and water resources. It's something of which everybody speaks highly and lets it go at that. So far as real effort is concerned, we've just been using a boy to do a man's job, or rather dividing it up among two boys. It isn't going to be done right until we're committed to it in a national land policy that allows no further evasion. Some of us have worked out this outline by which such a policy might be stated: "That it is hereby recognized that the conservation and maintenance of our basic food-producing resources are essential to the national security and to the physical and economic well-being of the American people; that the wastage of our soil and water resources, resulting from soil erosion, loss of soil fertility, flood damage, and the silting of our streams, lakes, and reservoirs, has become of critical national concern; that the enactment of a permanent national land policy, for the purpose of conserving these basic resources, is necessary to prevent their further exhaustion and the consequent endangering of the national security and the physical and economic well-being of the American people; and that this national land policy shall be established and used as a foundation for other agricultural policies and programs."

Such an enactment, stated in those terms, really commits us to do the job and should give us the tools with which to do it. All of us can see the useful results it would have. I shall cite some of them. It would command public support because it represents a manifest public interest; it would provide a practical and defensible basis for the payment of benefits in any future farm program; it would act as an effectual check upon any near-time crop surpluses while insuring our ability to produce more when it is needed to feed our growing population or to meet emergencies; it would expedite flood control and reduce the public expense caused by the silting of streams and reservoirs; it would make possible an upgrading of the American diet and give the people more of the kind of foods they have shown they want—the foods rich in minerals, vitamins and the first-class proteins (for a good land policy is a necessary preliminary to a good food policy); and it would eventually stop this insidious loss of irreplaceable national resources.

I am not a believer in conservation just for conservation's sake. I believe in it because I recognize in it a co-worker with the laws of nature, and of nature's God, as revealed to us in the processes by which the earth was made productive. And there is still another reason. We are engaged on this continent in an experiment with a form of society in which men and women may live and think and work and worship in freedom. That experiment can succeed only if the natural resources to sustain it are kept adequate. I want it to have that chance.

Review of Senator Wiley's Book Laughing With Congress in American Bar Association Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I know my colleagues will be interested in a review carried in the December 1947 issue of the distinguished magazine, The American Bar Association Journal, on the subject of the book Laughing With Congress, written by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. The review draws attention to many of the high lights and interesting characteristics of the volume.

Taking themselves too seriously has been the chief defect of the dictators. A sense of humor assures a sense of perspective. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the review, together with the introduction to it, in order that we, at least, may not fall into the difficulty which has afflicted so many other nations.

There being no objection, the review and introduction were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAUGHING WITH CONGRESS—SENATOR WILEY TELLS MANY HUMOROUS INCIDENTS

(By Walter P. Armstrong, of the Tennessee bar (Memphis))

("An anthology of American political laughs," to use Paul F. Douglass' apt phrase, has been assembled by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, member of our association since 1923, and stanch coworker for many of its objectives. The grand art of laughing is, of course, an important part of the process by which, under a free government, proposed legislation is tested by men's wits, pretense and impromptu ideas are deflated, and the cross-roads scrutiny finally points the way to national policy. We doubt if rubber-stamp legislators under a dictatorship or a planned economy ever poke fun at each other and at other branches of government as do the Members of both Houses of the American Congress. Senator WILEY has strung together an amusing batch of stories and anecdotes, and it may be that some of our readers in these tense days will relish good, clean fun. But something more emerges—a philosophy of legislative government, a sanity of the lumbering democratic process, a realization that the over-all picture is on the good side.)

No doubt it was Senator WILEY's customary courtesy toward his fellow Members that led him, in selecting a title for this little volume,[1] to emphasize the mirth-provoking sallies that originate on the Hill rather than the shafts of wit that are flung at the body of which this Wisconsin lawyer is a distinguished Member. It was a permissible choice, for the brew is 'arf an' 'arf of the sayings of those who have laughed with and of those who have laughed at Congress.

Criticism of Congress is one of the few things in which the American people have shown a continuing consistency. Representative EVERETT DIRKSEN in 1942 compiled a long list of historic criticisms of Congress, the earliest of which dates back to the beginning of the nineteenth century; three[2] of the most popular of the current Broadway plays have scenes ridiculing Members of the House or Senate. There are no lacunae in the years between.

The general idea seems to be that a Congressman will attain the proper humility only when, like Kipling's Tommy Atkins, he has "stood beside and watched himself be'avin' like a bloomin' fool." I have always thought that the thing was overdone, for Congress in the main is an intelligent, conscientious, hard-working body, fairly representative of the American people. It is because he shares this view that Senator WILEY good-naturedly quotes freely the most extreme jibes of the Congress baiters. I may add that the Senator has no need to shrink from the "hair shirts" he exhibits, for he has no penance to do; he has always been a capable and energetic Member whose work has reached its flower in his chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS CONTRIBUTE MUCH HUMOR TO THEIR SESSIONS

More entertaining than the invectives—nearly always exaggerated and frequently dull—that have been hurled at Congress is the humor for which the Representatives and Senators are themselves responsible. Of this there's an excellent cross section. As the entire period of congressional history is covered, necessarily some of the stories are not new. There's the one about those mortal enemies, John Randolph, of Roanoke, and Henry Clay, meeting face to face on a sidewalk too narrow for them to pass. Randolph: "I never turn out for scoundrels." Clay (gingerly stepping out into the mud): "I always do." And the one concerning the colored barber and the new Senator. Barber: "By de way, Senator, you remind me of Dan'l

[1] Laughing With Congress, by ALEXANDER WILEY. Illustrations by Leo Manso. New York, Crown Publishers, September 1947; $3. pp. ix, 228.

[2] Finian's Rainbow, Call Me Mister, and Command Decision.

Webster." Senator: "Is it my brow or my speeches?" Barber: "No, boss, it's your breath."

More in the modern manner. Member: "Have you heard my last speech?" Another Member: "I hope so." Reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD "are printed without profit and read the same way." Congressman: "I don't pretend to have had the advantage of education; I am a self-made man, sir." Fellow Congressman: "I am glad to learn this; it certainly relieves the Lord of a great responsibility."

These retorts are perhaps not typical, for most Congressmen who essay humor are in their anecdotage and usually seek to make their point by a pertinent story. The anecdotes which are included are the most original and amusing I have come across in the last few months outside of Bennett Cerf's column[3] in the Saturday Review of Literature.

OASES FOUND IN THE ARID WASTES OF CONGRESSIONAL DEBATES

It is not easy to transfer oral humor to the printed page—so much depends upon unexpectedness, appropriateness, facial expressions, intonation. Senator WILEY has performed this difficult task well and has guided us to any oases in the arid waste of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Some of the humor is unconscious. Perhaps some day a Congressman who has involuntarily retired will tell us what he really thinks of those constituents who at times tried men's souls. Senator WILEY does give one or two instances where his colleagues' constituents have proved pestiferous, including the one who wrote for a copy of the Declaration of Independence "with all the recent changes"; but to the Wisconsin voters—half apologetically—he explains that "laugh-time" represents not "more than a tiny fraction of 1 percent of Congress' proceedings," and that "on no occasion was any official business sacrificed in order to complete this volume."

SHREWD AND PITHY COMMENTS ON THE WORK OF THE CONGRESS

One of the excellencies of Senator WILEY's method is that he does not confine himself strictly to his subject. He includes Jerry Kluttz's[4] glossary of "bureaucratese, or the language of the red tapist," which is the wittiest and most penetrating challenge to bureaucracy that I have seen. From time to time Senator WILEY interjects shrewd and pithy comments on the work of Congress. Not even all the quotations from his colleagues are humorous. Senator HILL's defense of Gen. George C. Marshall is an admirable example of modern congressional eloquence:

"I recall what General Joffre said. Someone asked him, 'Who won the battle of the Marne?' General Joffre replied, 'I don't know who won the battle, but if it had been lost, it would have been Joffre who lost the battle.' If we were to lose the war, if we were to have any unusual catastrophe, any terrible situation of any kind, I imagine that George C. Marshall, as Chief of Staff, would have to bear the prime responsibility."

We are being deluged with a spate of serious studies of Congress. Senator WILEY's book, dealing with the lighter human side, not only provides an excellent supplement to these, but it reveals the atmosphere and gives the flavor of Capitol Hill as no one of them does.

[3] Trade Winds. Senator WILEY's congressional stories are racy of the soil, while Mr. Cerf's smack of the supersophistication of the New York literary set.

[4] Columnist of the Federal Diary in the Washington Post.

Memorial to the Late Senator James J. Davis, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorial to the late Senator James J. Davis, of Pennsylvania, printed in the Moose Magazine, volume 33, No. 11.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMES J. DAVIS DIES; NATION, FRATERNAL WORLD MOURN DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE

The Honorable James J. Davis, 74, of Pittsburgh and Washington, humanitarian and statesman, died early Saturday morning, November 22, 1947, in Washington Sanitarium, Takoma Park, Md. His death was attributed to uremia.

Mr. Davis, director-general of the Loyal Order of Moose, founder of Mooseheart and Moosehaven, former United States Secretary of Labor under three Presidents, and former United States Senator from Pennsylvania, was without doubt the world's outstanding fraternalist and one of the most distinguished statesmen in American history.

His life story outshone the pattern of success made famous by Horatio Alger. James Davis was born into a family of humble means in Tredegar, Wales, October 27, 1873, and was brought to this country by his parents when he was 8 years old. While still a boy, he was doing a man's work at hard, grueling labor as he helped to support his family. By his own labors and determination, plus a natural gift of leadership augmented by idealistic vision, he lifted himself to international prominence. He became the main driving force to build the Loyal Order of Moose from a faltering membership of 246 to the dynamic humanitarian organization it is today with more than 800,000 members and a program of loving care for orphaned children and impoverished old folks. The child city of Mooseheart, Ill., and the city of contentment for the aged, Moosehaven, Fla., are world-famed. His was the vision that built them.

Although such a marvelous accomplishment would be more than enough to crown the lifetime career of the most exceptional among men, it was only half of the success story of James J. Davis. The other half of his brilliant career was in American Government where he attained the highest honors that can be held by a naturalized American citizen—membership in the Presidential cabinet and a seat in the United States Senate. It has been said many a time that if James J. Davis had been born in this country instead of Wales, he might have become President of the United States.

James J. Davis was one of six children who, with their parents, immigrated to this country from Wales in 1881. The family settled in Pittsburgh, Pa., then moved to Sharon, Pa. Davis, Sr., was by trade an ironworker, as were his father and grandfather before him. Jim followed his forebears into the mills, and at 11 began working in the iron and steel works at Sharon. In 1892, when he was 19 years old, he went to Pittsburgh to work as an iron puddler. (In later years, he wrote the biography of his life under the title of "The Iron Puddler." The laboring men of America and the political and fraternal leaders of this country knew Davis affectionately as "Puddler Jim.")

In 1893, Jim Davis moved to Elwood, Ind., to work in the steel and tin-plate mills. By this time, despite his youth, he had acquired considerable knowledge of the relationship between industry and labor, a knowledge that was going to serve him well as he surged upward to governmental heights in later years. He was popular with his fellow workers and his leadership talents were becoming apparent.

He was elected president of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers and held the office for many years, greatly furthering the interest of employees. Mr. Davis became city clerk of Elwood in 1898 and 4 years later was elected recorder of Madison County. He had prepared himself for such advancement by a business course and the study of law and accountancy.

Jim Davis joined the Loyal Order of Moose at Crawfordsville, Ind., on October 27, 1906—his thirty-third birthday. He was the two hundred and forty-seventh member of the fraternity which had been organized in 1888 for social purposes and was virtually dormant.

Jim Davis had found his vehicle for humanitarian service.

From that moment forward, the Loyal Order of Moose became almost the pulsebeat of Mr. Davis' life. His qualities of leadership and magnetic personality had come to full flower. With his driving energy and enthusiasm pushing him to the forefront, he quickly became director-general of the Moose, a position that he held until his death more than 41 years later.

Among his gifts was the knack of organization and the ability to rally to his cause conscientious men of high ideals. He had the vision that the handful of members would some day be a multitude and the determination and courage to plot a course and hold steadfast to his goal. He traveled from border to border and coast to coast, painting with thrilling words his dream of a better world, founded on brotherhood, and with service to the helpless. He preached the principle of men banding together, "one for all and all for one," sharing their substance that orphaned children might have a home and an education; and that the aged might pass their last days in happiness and security.

He was inspiring in his vision and good men by thousands rallied to his call. He had only a beautiful dream to offer but he radiated assurance that the dream eventually would be a reality. Lodges sprang up all over the country. The strength of the Moose grew.

In 1913, the first part of Jim Davis' dream came true. On the rolling prairie of Illinois, 35 miles west of Chicago, Mooseheart, Ill., the child city, was founded to provide care and education for children of deceased members of the fraternity. Jim Davis and the men who had rallied to the Moose banner were putting into practice their belief that every child is entitled to at least a high-school education and a trade. Mooseheart was the fruit of Mr. Davis' age observation that "no man stands so straight and tall as when he stoops to lift up a child."

Mooseheart that day in 1913 was not the beautiful community of 150 charming buildings set deep amid green lawns that one sees today. Mooseheart was a circuit tent pitched in a field. Thomas R. Marshall, Vice President of the United States, dedicated the community with the words: "Thank God that here, on this most sacred day, humanity has again proved its right to be called the children of the Most High, has reached out its hand in love and loyalty to the needy brother and has disclosed not only the right but the duty of this great order to exist."

Nine years later, when Mooseheart had flowered forth from the prairie into a beautiful and ever-growing community, the Loyal Order of Moose founded its home for the aged, the city of contentment, Moosehaven, in sun-kissed Florida, on the banks of the sparkling St. Johns River, at Orange Park, 14 miles south of Jacksonville. Both Mooseheart and Moosehaven—the dreams of Jim Davis and his pioneer Moose—stand today as models for the world.

Mr. Davis' work with the Moose made him friends and boosters in every section of the country and raised him to national prominence. A laboring man himself, he was trying to bring security through the Moose to all workingmen, providing a means for protection of themselves and their families. In 1921, Mr. Davis was appointed United States Secretary of Labor by President Harding and retained that office in the Cabinets of Presidents Coolidge and Hoover. He resigned from the Cabinet in 1930 when he was elected United States Senator from Pennsylvania for an unexpired term of 2 years. His popularity was attested by the margin of his victory, almost a million-vote plurality. In 1932, he was elected for the full-term of 6 years by a majority that was far ahead of the rest of the Republican ticket, another testimonial to his popularity. He was re-elected for the third time in 1938.

In addition to his leadership of the Moose, which included chairmanship of the Mooseheart Board of Governors and the position of pilgrim governor, head of the highest honorary degree of the order, Senator Davis held membership in other fraternities, including the Masons and Odd Fellows. He was a member of the Pittsburgh Athletic Club, the Chevy Chase Club, the American Republic, the Press Club, and the Congressional Club of Washington. He had received honorary degrees from Bucknell and Drake Universities, St. Bonaventure College, the University of Pittsburgh, and Pennsylvania Military College, of Chester, Pa.

He is survived by five children—all of whose names begin with "J" like his own—James, Jr., Jane, Jean, Joan, and Jewel. Mrs. James J. Davis, Sr., died some years ago.

Senator Davis held top rank as a statesman, but time probably will record his most enduring monuments as Mooseheart and Moosehaven.

The Grain Situation and the Distilling Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following summary on the grain situation and the distilling industry. Upon this subject much has been written and said and undoubtedly much more will follow. The summary has been prepared on behalf of the Distilled Spirits Institute, Inc., and the Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc. A full discusion of any subject should present both or all sides of the question. Especially for this reason, as well as in the interests of the dispassionate, unemotional consideration of a pressing problem of today, I am pleased to insert the summary.

THE GRAIN SITUATION AND THE DISTILLING INDUSTRY

A SUMMARY

Beverage distilling industry's use of all grain is comparatively small in terms of total available supplies.

Since repeal in 1933 the beverage distilling industry has used on the average less than 1 bushel out of every 100 bushels of total available supply[1] of types of grain used for distilling in this country.

The averages used throughout this summary are for 13 years, rather than 14, as it must be noted that no beverage spirits production took place during 1944.

The statistics are all fiscal-year figures.

Average annual amount of all grain used in production of distilled spirits since 1933

[56-pound bushels]

Average amount used by beverage distilling industry----------bushels--	35, 828, 000
Average annual total available United States supply[1] ----------bushels--	4, 613, 867, 000
Beverage distilling use of total supply----------percent--	0. 78

[1] Includes current crops, carry-over, and imports of types of grain used for distilling.

Total grains used in the production of distilled spirits (including miscellaneous grains)

[56-pound bushels]

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Used by beverage-distilling industry	Total United States supply [1]	Beverage-distilling use of total supply
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Percent*
1934	14, 462, 051	(2)	
1935	33, 006, 619	2, 881, 361, 000	1. 15
1936	48, 155, 776	3, 592, 618, 000	1. 34
1937	50, 702, 260	2, 904, 235, 000	1. 75
1938	25, 660, 121	4, 005, 405, 000	.64
1939	23, 698, 452	4, 377, 770, 000	.54
1940	25, 472, 315	4, 577, 274, 000	.55
1941	30, 599, 182	4, 698, 210, 000	.65
1942 [3]	46, 807, 221	5, 296, 640, 000	.88
1943 [3]	18, 772, 595	5, 993, 152, 000	.31
1944	(4)	(4)	(4)
1945 [3]	19, 414, 445	5, 518, 043, 000	.35
1946	54, 937, 396	6, 291, 527, 000	.87
1947	53, 108, 069	5, 230, 163, 000	1. 02

[1] Includes carry-over from the previous crop year, production and imports during the current crop year.
[2] Not available.
[3] From Oct. 8, 1942, through June 1945, American beverage distillers produced war alcohol for the Government almost exclusively. Grain use data of the U. S. Government is not segregated as to use for war alcohol or beverage spirits; accordingly, grain "used by the beverage distilling industry" from the fiscal year 1943 have been estimated by the research and statistical bureau of Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., in an attempt to approximate beverage distilling industry uses.
[4] War period—no beverage-spirits production.

Source: Prepared by Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., from data of the Alcohol Tax Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

Normally the beverage distilling industry's use of wheat is very small in terms of the total available wheat supply.[1]

Since repeal in 1933, eliminating war years and their aftermath (1942–46), the beverage distilling industry has used about 1 bushel of wheat out of every 25,000 bushels of the available supply of wheat.

[1] Includes current crops, carry-over, and imports.

Average annual amount of wheat used in the production of distilled spirits since 1933 excluding the war years, 1942–46 [1]

Average amount used by beverage distilling industry----------bushels--	49, 179
Average annual total available United States supply [2] ----------bushels--	1, 039, 655, 000
Beverage distilling use of total supply----------percent--	0. 005

[1] From time to time during the war years, distillers were required by the Government to use wheat because of the bumper crops of that grain and the shortages of corn then existing.
[2] Includes current crops, carry-over, and imports.

Wheat used in the production of distilled spirits

[56-pound bushels]

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Used by beverage-distilling industry	Total United States supply [1]	Beverage-distilling use of total supply
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Percent*
1934	47, 398	995, 536, 000	0. 005
1935	54, 705	872, 678, 100	.006
1936	58, 765	866, 464, 000	.007
1937	54, 311	862, 280, 000	.006
1938	41, 268	1, 029, 107, 000	.004
1939	58, 452	1, 149, 864, 000	.005
1940	31, 857	1, 062, 321, 000	.003
1941	44, 840	1, 174, 821, 000	.004
1942 [2]	1, 109, 105	1, 462, 821, 000	.078
1943 [2]	2, 576, 631	1, 722, 107, 000	.150
1944	(3)	(3)	(?)
1945 [2]	6, 723, 655	1, 533, 107, 000	.439
1946	10, 524, 003	1, 596, 321, 000	.659
1947	51, 014	1, 345, 714, 000	.004

[1] Includes carry-over from the previous crop year, production and imports during the current crop year.
[2] From Oct. 8, 1942, through June 1945, American beverage distillers produced war alcohol for the Government almost exclusively. Grain use data of the U. S. Government is not segregated as to use for war alcohol or beverage spirits; accordingly, grain "used by the beverage distilling industry" from the fiscal year 1943 have been estimated by the research and statistical bureau of Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., in an attempt to approximate beverage distilling industry uses.
[3] War period—no beverage-spirits production.

Source: Prepared by Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., from data of the Alcohol Tax Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

The principal grains used by the distilling industry are corn, rye, and malted barley. Since repeal, the industry has used on the average of less than 1 bushel out of every 100 bushels of the available corn supply; [1] its use of malted barley has averaged less than 2 bushels of every 100 bushels of the available supply; [1] while use of rye has averaged less than 12 bushels out of every 100 bushels of the available supply.[1]

In examining the figures that follow, the similarity between the years 1936–37 and 1946–47 should be noted. In 1936–37 the industry was building up whisky inventories after prohibition. Now it is building up toward normalcy after war stoppage of production.

Average annual amount of corn, rye, and malted barley used in the production of distilled spirits since 1933

[56-pound bushels]

	Average amount used by beverage-distilling industry	Average annual total available United States supply [1]	Beverage distilling use of total supply
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Percent*
Corn	20, 664, 000	2, 913, 443, 000	0. 71
Rye	6, 815, 600	57, 705, 600	11. 81
Malted barley	4, 535, 600	282, 359, 600	1. 61

[1] Includes carry-over from the previous crop year, production and imports during the current crop year.

[1] Includes current crops, carry-over, and imports.

It was noted on the previous page that the beverage distilling industry in the years since repeal has used an average of 11.81 percent of the total available United States supply [1] of rye. Some explanation of this percentage figure is in order.

Rye has always been a relatively insignificant crop in terms of total available grain supplies or for use as a food. By and large, rye is a "marginal" crop—that is, it is grown as a "filler-in" crop in between the harvesting and planting of other major crops.

The alcoholic beverage industries have always been one of the principal users of rye grain and, in fact, a large part of the rye crop sown each year in certain parts of the country is specifically grown for use by the alcoholic beverage industries.

Aside from alcoholic beverage industries' use, domestic use of rye is limited; a small part of each year's total crop is ground to rye flour, and the balance is used on the farm. The largest rye supply total on record since repeal—88,000,000 bushels in 1943—was only one-fortieth the size of that year's corn supplies and one-nineteenth the size of that year's wheat supplies.

Rye used in the production of distilled spirits

[56-pound bushels]

(Farmers regard rye as a marginal crop. Its domestic uses are limited and it is exported only on rare occasions and then in extremely small quantities)

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Used by beverage-distilling industry	Total United States supply [1]	Beverage-distilling use of total supply
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Percent*
1934	4,471,631	(2)	
1935	10,170,985	41,595,000	24.49
1936	12,502,597	71,204,000	17.64
1937	11,849,000	66,102,000	23.01
1938	5,966,763	54,802,000	10.86
1939	5,457,504	66,085,000	8.26
1940	5,804,109	60,862,000	9.14
1941	6,468,553	62,575,000	10.36
1942 [3]	6,666,867	74,573,000	9.20
1943 [3]	1,247,914	88,788,000	1.41
1944	(4)	(4)	(4)
1945 [3]	3,870,216	60,585,000	6.39
1946	6,608,790	61,180,000	10.54
1947	4,290,114	22,500,000	18.82

[1] Includes carry-over from the previous crop year, production and imports during the current crop year.
[2] Not available.
[3] From Oct. 8, 1942, through June 1945, American beverage distillers produced war alcohol for the Government almost exclusively. Grain use data of the U. S. Government are not segregated as to use for war alcohol or beverage spirits; accordingly, grain "used by the beverage distilling industry" from the fiscal year 1943 have been estimated by the research and statistical bureau of Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., in an attempt to approximate beverage distilling industry uses.
[4] War period—no beverage-spirits production.

Source: Prepared by Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., from data of the Alcohol Tax Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

Corn used in the production of distilled spirits

[56-pound bushels]

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Used by beverage-distilling industry	Total United States supply [1]	Beverage-distilling use of total supply
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Percent*
1934	7,853,666	2,785,087,000	0.28
1935	18,232,866	1,823,609,000	1.00
1936	29,308,602	2,385,247,000	1.23
1937	32,608,074	1,788,245,000	1.83
1938	16,468,165	2,710,482,000	.61
1939	15,289,599	2,910,653,000	.53
1940	16,467,918	3,165,762,000	.52
1941	20,279,224	3,151,212,000	.64
1942 [2]	33,534,884	3,321,323,000	1.01
1943 [2]	12,949,663	3,624,543,000	.36
1944	(3)	(3)	(3)
1945 [2]	4,869,163	3,424,607,000	.14

Footnotes at end of table.

[1] Includes current crops, carry-over, and imports.

Corn used in the production of distilled spirits—Continued

[56-pound bushels]

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Used by beverage-distillin industry	Total United States supply [1]	Beverage-distilling use of total supply
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Percent*
1946	21,374,740	3,326,841,000	.64
1947	39,392,748	3,461,000,000	1.14

[1] Includes carry-over from the previous crop year, production and imports during the current crop year.
[2] From Oct. 8, 1942, through June 1945, American beverage distillers produced war alcohol for the Government almost exclusively. Grain use data of the U. S. Government is not segregated as to use for war alcohol or beverage spirits; accordingly, grain "used by the beverage-distilling industry" from the fiscal year 1943 have been estimated by the research and statistical bureau of Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., in an attempt to approximate beverage-distilling industry uses.
[3] War period—no beverage-spirits production.

Source: Prepared by Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., from data of the Alcohol Tax Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

Malted barley used in the production of distilled spirits

[56-pound bushels]

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Used by beverage-distilling industry	Total United States supply [1]	Beverage-distilling use of total supply
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Percent*
1934	2,127,374	(2)	
1935	4,557,021	148,599,000	3.18
1936	6,229,021	209,703,000	2.21
1937	6,369,139	204,823,000	3.10
1938	2,211,145	213,987,000	1.50
1939	2,867,841	261,188,000	1.15
1940	3,033,437	284,699,000	1.05
1941	3,811,405	302,601,000	1.25
1942 [3]	5,279,842	363,888,000	1.45
1943 [3]	1,976,743	451,107,000	.44
1944	(4)	(4)	(4)
1945 [3]	2,264,340	318,807,000	.72
1946	7,370,914	296,750,000	2.54
1947	7,314,749	296,166,000	2.61

[1] Includes carry-over from the previous crop year, production and imports during the current crop year.
[2] Not available.
[3] From Oct. 8, 1942, through June 1945 American beverage distillers produced war alcohol for the Government almost exclusively. Grain use data of the U. S. Government is not segregated as to use for war alcohol or beverage spirits; accordingly, grain "used by the beverage distilling industry" from the fiscal year 1943 have been estimated by the research and statistical bureau of Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., in an attempt to approximate beverage distilling industry uses.
[4] War period—no beverage-spirits production.

Source: Prepared by Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., from data of the Alcohol Tax Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

During the distillation process, starch only is removed from the grain, whereas yeast is added. All the proteins and all the vitamins remain plus the extra vitamin and nutritive value of the yeast used in fermentation. Thus, processing grain by beverage distillers leaves 100 percent of the feeding value for beef, dairy cattle, swine and poultry, if these distillery residues are used properly to supplement grain feeding on the farms of the Nation. Practically every distiller in the country utilizes his grain mash for animal feed purposes either as dried grains and dried solubles or as spent grain mash in liquid form.

The full value of distillery-processed feed can be more clearly understood by this example: Any farmer can take 20 percent of his grain to a distillery, have it distilled, take back the residue and feed it to his livestock with the remaining 80 percent of his grain and not lose, in the entire procedure, one single ounce of feed value.

The Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan, declared in a radio address on November 11, 1946, "These special protein elements help make prime beef prime; help make hens lay more eggs; help broiler chickens to develop more rapidly, and improve the litters of sows."

Continuous research into the further development of distillers' feed recovery is being spearheaded by the Distillers Feed Research Council which has its headquarters at 1232 Enquirer Building, Cincinnati 2, Ohio.

One bushel of corn equals $49.65 in excise taxes

It has been explained that the beverage-distilling industry's use of grain is comparatively small; it has been explained that 100 percent of the feeding value of the grain used by distillers is retained and may be returned to the farm in the form of high-protein livestock and poultry feeds. But it should be emphasized that a single bushel of corn processed by the distillers brings into the United States and State Treasuries a total of $49.65 in excise taxes alone. This is an amount 20 times the market value of the original grain. Here is how this figures out:

From a 56-pound bushel of corn costing approximately $2.50 at current prices beverage distillers can produce 4¾ gallons of 100-proof whisky. At the wartime excise-tax rate of $9 per gallon, which is currently still in effect, the Federal Government collects $42.75 in excise taxes alone from these 4¾ gallons. The average State government, moreover, collects approximately $6.90 additional in excise taxes alone (at the average rate of $1.45 per gallon) on the whisky produced from that same bushel of corn. These two figures added together total $49.65 in excise taxes alone—they give no consideration to the other revenues received directly and indirectly by Federal, State, and local governments through other taxes—licenses and permit fees, etc.—levied on distilled spirits.

In the 1946 calendar year, Federal, State, and local governments received a total of approximately $2,446,000,000 from taxes, fees, etc., levied on whisky and other distilled spirits, making this commodity the largest single tax producer of all products manufactured by American industry.

Thus, the small amount of grain which the beverage-distilling industry uses each year in the production of beverage spirits yields billions of dollars in revenue for Federal, State, and local governments.

The facts on whisky supplies

Because of the stoppage of whisky production during the war years when distillers used their facilities to make war alcohol, an unbalanced whisky inventory situation resulted, and the industry has been striving to get back to a more normal position.

Because of this, there is today and there will be for several years to come a shortage of aged and bonded whiskies.

Of the whisky currently sold approximately 90 percent is what is known as blended whisky. This is a combination of neutral spirits and aged whisky, the relationship between the two being variable, depending on the brand in question.

There is on hand at the present time (as of August 31, 1947) sufficient neutral spirits to produce approximately an 8 months' supply of blended whisky.

De facto prohibition

If it can in any way contribute to saving grain for the hungry peoples of the world, the liquor industry wants to do so. The liquor industry, as we know it today, was brought into existence by an affirmative vote of the American people in 1933. Its leaders are doing everything within their power to see that the industry discharges its social responsibilities to the American people. The distilling industry wants nothing except the right to continue to function in its proper place in a free-enterprise system of business.

However, there are some aspects that must inevitably be considered in this connection.

Because of the curtailment of production during the war and the consequent unbalanced whisky inventory situation, any total prohibition of production, coupled with the high wartime tax rates, is an incentive to illicit distilling and moonshining. This has already started on a large scale in the Eastern States and has been further encouraged by the recent release of sugar from rationing. Illicit distilling will inevitably lead to the antisocial evils of the prohibition era—mobsters, gangsters, gang wars, and crime waves. Any total shut-down of the production facilities of this industry has other consequences; it means loss of employment in the production departments of distilleries which will be closed down, as well as other disruptions.

The answer to all of these problems is not complete prohibition of production of distilled spirits. This industry wants to do everything within its power to effect a real saving of grain. It is ready, willing, and anxious to contribute its experience toward achieving this end and asks nothing more than to be allowed to participate in the planning to accomplish this in a sane and realistic manner that will be productive of the most good and the least evil.

Isn't It Obvious That Stalin Is Supporting the Marshall Plan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose the following excerpt from a letter:

DEAR MR. BUFFETT: Congressmen who are hysterical on communism in Europe and Asia have been made so by the Communists. Can none of them be shown that every Comintern move, from the Kremlin to the fellow travelers' stooges in our press and radio, is designed to support the Marshall plan?

Can't they see that every Soviet move is timed? And for a motive?

Why does Molotov rage? And Pravda attack the United States of America?

Why was the Comintern formed—and publicized—when it was?

Why does it pull off abortive uprisings in France and Italy just at the moment when Congress in special session is debating stopgap aid?

Are any of these moves calculated to lull Congress and Americans to sleep? Or are they calculated to make Congressmen hysterical on communism?

As originally proposed, the Soviet Union and all its "liberated" eastern European countries could have come into the Marshall plan. If they had, this country would have gone on handing them money and goods. So why didn't they? Is it assumed that, suddenly proud and self-respecting, the Kremlin wants no more American hand-outs?

The reason they didn't come into the Marshall plan is that, if they had, anti-Communist sentiment in this country would have opposed the Marshall plan, perhaps strongly enough to have stopped it.

The reason that the Kremlin officially has been screaming, raging, foaming at the mouth against the Marshall plan, the reason for the Molotov and Pravda attacks, the reason for the Comintern and for the Communist outbreaks in Europe, is that every one of them weakens the opposition to the Marshall plan in this country. In heaven's name, isn't it obvious that Stalin is supporting the Marshall plan?

The Kremlin is like a sleight-of-hand magician. Any fool knows enough not to watch whatever it directs attention to. The way to see the trick is to look in the other direction, at the other hand. But Congressmen gawk like school children and believe what the trickster intend. them to believe. Can't you teach them how to play "odd or even"? Don't they ever play poker?

Western Europe is going to collapse; in fact, it has collapsed already. The Republican Party is not going to escape being made the goat for pouring this country into the sewer. Americans, in general, drive cars; when they see a wreck piled up on the highway, they know enough to try, at least, not to pile their own cars into it. They know enough not to support the Marshall plan.

Suppose your party leaders say "Yes" (as they are doing) to the hand-out, and the Communist collapse comes in the areas to which the hand-out is going. Do they think that then they won't be made the goat?

Can't they get it into their heads that no bank robber ever decided not to rob a bank because there was too much money in it? The Comintern is an organized band of gangsters; it will take any country that it can, when it can, if taking that country fits Kremlin world strategy. It makes no difference whatever whether the people are eating or not eating in that country at that time; the people have nothing to do with the matter.

The Marshall plan is a fairly important move in Comintern world strategy, because it weakens this country (the only one left on earth with strength enough to resist the Comintern at present); it increases inflation and economic chaos here, and that is all to the good as preparation for resumption of world war, because in modern warfare the strong economy wins.

Meanwhile, the military advance is through the Balkans to the Dardanelles, and the United States of America helps that along by demanding the partition of Palestine and turning that whole area anti-American.

You will see, too, that the tactic that works so well in re the Truman-Marshall plan will be used in regard to compulsory military training here; that is, the open Communists will openly rage and roar against it, while all the concealed Communists (the liberals, New Dealers, fellow-traveler writers, commentators) will support it, chanting, "America must be strong." Because universal military training weakens the country that adopts it, and especially weakens the economy, which is this country's strength. You will see, too, that at precisely the right moment, when universal military training is before Congress, the Kremlin will make some threatening gestures, to scare our scared Republican leaders still more—if possible.

Sincerely yours.

Mr. Speaker, here is a chronological record of acts of the present administration favoring communism in the past 5 years:

First. Unconditional surrender.

Second. The Tehran Conference.

Third. The Morgenthau vengeance plan.

Fourth. The Yalta Conference.

Fifth. The Potsdam Conference.

Consider this list. The effects of the first two plans and the actions taken at the three conferences showed each episode to be a sucker play for Communist gains.

After this unbroken series, Is it not only possible, but highly probable, that the Marshall plan will turn out to be another sucker play for Stalin, a prospect my correspondent points out so convincingly?

Mr. Speaker, many Members concede that the Marshall plan is a gamble. Would not they serve America best now by refusing to gamble any longer on the plans of an executive branch with an unanimous record of failure in Russian relations?

Where's Your Meat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this House would deny that the meat shortage in the fall of 1946 played an overwhelming part in the Republican victory at the polls. Once again we find the question of meat uppermost in the minds of the people in this country. This issue could well determine the outcome of the general election next November.

This morning a prominent radio commentator, George E. Reedy, of Station WOL, called attention to this issue. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including his statement in full:

A compelling issue is likely to take the spotlight at this session of Congress and displace the Marshall plan in public interest. It is the frightening specter of a meat shortage, which experts believe will hit us in early spring.

Neither political party will be happy to see such a thing bob up in an election year. No one can gain from it, and nobody can be sure of just who will be hurt. But everyone remembers the violent public reaction the last time it happened.

The meat shortage in the fall of 1946 unquestionably played a large part in the overwhelming Republican victory. The public laid the blame at the door of the Democrats and voted accordingly. When the smoke cleared away Congress was in new hands.

The coming shortage is something that cannot very well be prevented by either political party. It is due to a number of factors that are out of control. They all add up to very little meat to put on the table at any price.

The question that will have to be faced is just what can be done about it? The answer would be worth a fortune to any up and coming politician. So far, however, no one has offered to produce even the suggestion of a politically wise answer.

Undoubtedly there will be strong proposals to reimpose rationing and price controls. But it is unlikely that the American public will stand for it. Every indication is that the voters still have unhappy memories of the OPA.

The last shortage was ended when controls were lifted. Today, of course, there are none to lift. Even if there were it could not do much good. The coming situation will be a real shortage of meat and not just a reluctance to sell at low prices.

The President has already asked for standby authority to impose rationing in the event of a shortage in critical goods. Even his own party members in Congress, however, refuse to back him in this move.

They rightly consider it political suicide. No politician is going to commit political suicide. That is something that happens

only once in a matter of decades. As a rule, an officeholder prefers to go right on holding his office.

Nevertheless, something will have to be done. The leaders of both parties are well aware of the dangers inherent in the situation. The estimates of the coming meat shortage have been too well substantiated to be doubted.

The Democrats, acting through the administration, are debating a program of voluntary rationing. They hope to conserve enough meat now to tide the country through the critical days ahead when the shortage really hits.

Should such a program be successful the leaders of both political parties would be greatly relieved. They would far rather see the issue out of the picture altogether than spend the next few months trying to pin the blame on their opponents.

The failure of a voluntary rationing program would put the next move up to the Republicans. As they are in control of Congress they are the ones who have to do the legislating. Theirs is not an enviable position.

The American people have always considered meat a basic part of their diet. They have reacted violently to any proposal and any situation in which it is cut down. It may well be that meat—and not the high cost of living—is the real key to the 1948 elections.

Col. Julius Klein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a well-written article with respect to Col. Julius Klein, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. I have known Colonel Klein for almost 20 years and have a tremendous admiration for his ability. He is a veteran of both World Wars and won distinction in each, as well as the admiration and friendship of Gen. Douglas MacArthur for his bravery. He has now assumed a post in which he will be in position to carry on the great work which he has done for our country, and I am pleased to join Mr. Herczog in his remarks, and also Senator BREWSTER in the comments which he previously made concerning Colonel Klein on June 5, 1947, at which time there was printed in the RECORD a report of Colonel Klein with respect to occupation troops in Germany.

[Translation of an article published in the November issue of AZ Ember]

COL. JULIUS KLEIN

(By Geza Herczog [1])

We have a dear friend who lives in Chicago, but is nevertheless nearer to us than if his residence were here on Fifth Avenue. He is a born American—a native product in every sense—but he understands not only the language but the slightest sigh of every American of foreign extraction. He was as well known at the Imperial Hotel in Vienna as at the Romanischer Cafe in Berlin; he was present at the Paris Peace Conference, as he was on the boundless battlefields of the South Pacific. He worked in the palm-bordered university city of Hollywood at their studios as he did in the sooty city. A man out of the ordinary, whose talent is great, but whose goodness and kindness are greater still. His brain is superb, but his most important physical organ is his heart, and because within it there is a special treasure chamber for everything that is Hungarian we, in return, love him and respect him.

This extraordinary man is Col. Julius Klein, 46-year-old Chicago newspaperman.

He is a bred-in-the-bone newspaperman, excitingly typical of Chicago; the characters in Ben Hecht's and Charles MacArthur's Front Page might have been modeled from him. Since everything he does is filled with the electricity of complete conviction and the atomic energy generated by his heart, he has attained high distinction in newspaper work, as well as in other fields. At one time he was one of the most famous foreign correspondents of those in the Chicago contingent. Because it is not his passport that makes him American, but his flaming belief in freedom and human dignity in this, the last stronghold of these things, General Pershing gave Colonel Klein his confidence, as did Franklin Delano Roosevelt; Herbert Hoover respects him, as does Dwight Green, Governor of Illinois. There is no notability in American public life who has not asked his advice at one time or another, or who would not gladly open the door of his house if Colonel Klein were knocking on it.

He fought through the First World War, an adolescent lad, a soldier in the United States Army. He had reached the rank of captain shortly after the war to save democracy ended. He was proud of his rank in peacetime, too, and during the truce between the two wars, however anachronistic it may have appeared to be, and sometimes contradictory to his surrounding—in a Hollywood studio or a Chicago editorial office or a Hungarian restaurant in New York, or in the Bismarck Hotel in Chicago—he was always "Captain Klein," always on a war footing, always mobilized, always ready for the call to the colors. He did not await the outbreak of the Second World War. He was the first to enlist, back in 1940, a year before America's entry into the war, for he foresaw what was coming more clearly than the then Members of Congress, a majority of whom passed the Selective Service Act. In the Second World War he became a colonel, not an office colonel, but a combatant, and that of the best. He shared with his fellow soldiers from Chicago every danger of jungle warfare. He became an office colonel on the day the war ended; after VJ-day, Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, asked him to become one of his special assistants.

Who is this outstanding man, this soldier here, this brilliant journalist—first in everything he attempts?

A Jew. An American of the Jewish faith, to state it with precision.

He is not a Jew because he was born one, and therefore accepts, with head held high, the particular hardships of that destiny. He is not a Jew in the sense that he keeps his hat on in the house of worship, or does not smoke on the Sabbath. He is a Jew not merely by birth and fate, but a Jew by conviction. He believes that the Jewish philosophy was the cradle for the teachings of Christianity, the origin of the New Testament and the Koran, and that the Ten Commandments are the only constitution by which life can be governed. He is a proud—more, a haughty—Jew, an active, indefatigably fighting Jew, one who, in a single lifetime, has performed tasks sufficient for a hundred people, tasks of fighting for the rights of Jews, not only here, but all over the world. Julius Klein is the national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. Those who wish to find out what a powerful organization that is should read I. Kaufman's book, American Jews in World War II. There they will learn that 550,000 American Jews served on every front in the world.

A touching coincidence: The writer of these lines interrupted his work on Sunday morning to attend ceremonies at the Riverside Memorial Chapel in memory of Lt. Murray J. Ritter, heroic son of Lajos Ritter. Beside the flag-draped coffin, the Jewish veterans stood with their arms—Julius Klein's soldiers saluting a beloved comrade. One of the 550,000.

The Jewish War Veterans' National Convention, held in St. Paul, immediately following the first ballot in which Colonel Klein led Jackson J. Holtz, a Boston lawyer, by 2,500 votes, unanimously elected Colonel Klein their national commander. Of the 800,000 Jewish soldiers who took part in the two world wars, the organization now has an active membership of 104,000, in 612 branches.

After his election, Colonel and National Commander Julius Klein gave a brief address. "A hundred percent Americanism" without wavering in the direction of any other "ism" whatsoever was his topic. He expressed the wish to work in perfect harmony with all other veterans' organizations—this spokesman for the Jewish veterans of both world wars.

A scene to which readers of AZ Ember were witness in the Yorkville Casino was an unforgettable one. It was in 1942, at the beginning of the war, at the loyalty celebration conducted by AZ Ember. Julius Klein, then a lieutenant colonel on his way to the front, heard that his friend, AZ Ember, was organizing a celebration to express the loyalty of Hungarian-America in America's war. Julius Klein stepped onto the stage, sought out Ferenc Gondor's box, and saluted toward it—saluted precisely, in a soldierly way, in a manner prescribed for the forces of the United States.

AZ Ember now returns the salute to the national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

[1] Geza Herczog is one of America's most outstanding playwrights and is the author of such famous plays as The Life of Emile Zola, The Wonder Bar, etc.

What Should We Do in China Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio address given on the Town Meeting of the Air January 6, 1948:

WHAT SHOULD WE DO IN CHINA NOW?

(By Hon. WALTER H. JUDD, Town Meeting of the Air, January 6, 1948)

The preceding speaker, Mr. Lauterbach, has followed the usual technique of calling the Chinese so many names that some are apt to be diverted from the really important consideration, namely, what events in China mean from the standpoint of our own compelling stakes there. I believe those stakes require that we give open and effective assistance to the government and people of China in their efforts to keep from being subjugated by the well-organized and armed Communist rebellion. Without vigorous American aid the Chinese Government will almost certainly collapse, just as will the Governments of Greece, France, Italy, and several other countries without American aid. Such a collapse in China would have the gravest consequences—for Asia—for Europe—and for the United States.

1. It would bring the vast resources and manpower of China under the control of a ruthlessly efficient Communist government, subservient to the Soviet Union.

2. Asia could then be taken under the Soviet wing almost at will. If Chiang Kai-shek's 20-year struggle against Communist imperialism in Asia is lost, who else or what else in the Far East can possibly stop its spread?

3. We would be forced for years ahead to send American dollars to subsidize Japan and Korea, and America soldiers to defend them, or else walk out on our promises to those peoples and abandon the whole western Pacific.

4. Let no one be so naive as to imagine the Philippines can ever become self-sufficient or long remain free, if the continent of Asia comes under Communist—which means Russian—control. It is 50 years of splendid investment of American lives, effort, and money in the Philippines that will go down the sewer if we are so short-sighted as to pay attention to purple adjectives instead of to the interests of the United States.

5. With China and other parts of Asia behind the iron curtain, England, France, and Holland would be unable to rebuild their trade with the Orient. Without it how can they recover so they can get along without American subsidies in endless billions of dollars.

6. Most important of all, if Chinese resistance should be broken, Russia would have satellites and security all along her Asiatic frontiers. She would then be able aggressively to concentrate all her attention and efforts on Europe in her announced purpose of defeating recovery there. How much chance of success would the Marshall plan have then? Or, put it this way—How many additional billions in American dollars and resources would then be necessary to keep Western Europe free?

One cannot imagine the hard-headed men in the Kremlin being as stupid as Hitler and getting themselves into a two-front war. In my opinion our best chance of preventing World War III is to make sure, if we can, that Russia does not get control over the Chinese, thereby eliminating her Asiatic front and becoming free to concentrate all her efforts and strength on her other front—Europe.

But is not the Chinese Government so undemocratic it does not deserve our support? So inefficient and so corrupt that any aid given will inevitably be wasted? The answers are, no, not if the aid is well handled. Eight years of war, invasion, and occupation have inevitably weakened the Chinese Government seriously. It has suffered even worse from the Communist threefold strategy—in full operation since early 1944. First, to destroy the Chinese Government at home by wrecking the nation's economy and communications and bringing its people to despair. Second, to discredit the Chinese Government abroad by magnifying its weaknesses, and ignoring its very great strengths. And third, by portraying the Communists as merely patriotic Chinese peasants not connected with Russia.

It is instructive to note that Moscow's organ in the United States, the Communist Daily Worker, recently scoffed at what it called those good-hearted but misguided people who believe that the way to defend the Yenan government is to pretend that Chinese Communists are really Jeffersonian Democrats. The Daily Worker thinks Communist victory in China is now so near that it no longer needs to maintain the hokum about agrarian reformers. It has served its purpose—the pretense bought time and produced confusion. Now the mask can be taken off.

The Chinese Government despite its weakened condition as a result of 8 years of war and occupation and the opposition of the Communists demonstrated its determination to move toward more democracy by calling right after VJ-day a national assembly to work out a constitution. The Communists refused to participate but the assembly went ahead and produced a year ago a constitution which was inaugurated on Christmas day. Of it General Marshall stated, "in all respects it is in accordance with the principles laid down by the all-party political assembly last January (1946). It is unfortunate that the Communists did not see fit to participate in the assembly since the constitution that has been adopted seems to include every major point that they wanted." General Marshall at that time apparently still thought that what Communists say in their propaganda is what they really want. He has had some expensive lessons since then, both from Chinese Communists, and from Messrs. Molotov and Vishinsky.

There are bad elements in the Chinese Government. Recent history indicates all is not well in our own. But no realistic person can expect the Generalissimo to throw out the support he has until he is sure of receiving other support in its place—any more than American Presidents repudiate the support of machines here which are as corrupt as any in China.

Right after Pearl Harbor, Congress, without a negative vote, appropriated $500,000,000 to help China under the same government it has now, the same one it is said we must not now support. Why did we help it then? Because it was a good government, democratic, efficient, without corruption? No. Because we saw it was imperative for our own security that China be kept independent and on our side, holding the line until we could rebuild our sunk navy, capture the islands one by one, and ultimately—3 years later—bring our superior power against Japan.

Well, is it less important, less vital to our security now? Indeed not.

The crux of the matter is this: If China is free, she can and will move rapidly toward greater democracy and better government, as was proved during the period of peace from 1932–37. If China is taken over by the Communists, there will be no more opportunity for her to move in those directions than there is today in Poland or Yugoslavia. The more we want improvement in the admittedly bad conditions in China, the more we must support the government which is trying to keep China free—and on our side.

We recognize that France and Italy cannot recover until we help them. But we won't help China until she recovers. It is precisely like saying to a desperately ill patient, "You get well first, and then we'll give you the penicillin."

No aid will be given to China, or to any other country for that matter, on a blank-check basis. Aid will be given only on the basis of carefully drawn agreements. They will specify a joint or cooperative administration, including the use of Americans to observe, advise, and report. Congress has by law directed our President to stop at once all aid to any country if that country is not using the aid properly and in accordance with the joint agreements.

On such a basis it is possible to carry out a program of assistance to China with no greater corruption and waste than in other countries. It has been done repeatedly in the various famines and floods in China during the last few decades.

If we try either to order the Chinese around or condescendingly and patronizingly look down upon them, then we should not start a recovery program there or anywhere else because it will fail. But if Americans are willing to work with the Chinese, they will find them as reasonable and cooperative as any people on earth.

The Communists cannot be checked without American moral, military and economic assistance for the Chinese Government. But that government cannot adequately improve living conditions for the people so as to regain their full confidence and support unless some basic reforms are carried out even while the war is in progress. The Generalissimo realized this fully when I talked to him about it in 1944, and he is fully aware of it now—as I know from a long conversation with him only 2 months ago. But how can anyone actually expect him to make drastic changes just on the hope of support from us—especially when we have let him down tragically several times in the past.

The less we help the Chinese Government, the worse it gets; and the worse it gets, the less we help. That vicious circle must be broken, or the results for ourselves will be disastrous. Only we can break it—by forthright assistance now.

The obstacles to success in China, except for the lateness of the hour due to our own indecision, are no greater than in Europe and in some respects, less. It is sounder and involves less risk to the United States to build on the existing government in China than to have it collapse and come under the Communists—which means under the Kremlin. Our choice is not between the present government in China and something better. I wish it were. It is between the present government in China and the Communists—which is infinitely worse.

If China is not to be free, then it would have been far better for her to be under Japan rather than under Russia. Not to aid her now may well mean that all the sacrifices in men and money in the Pacific during the war were useless; or even worse than useless, because if we wind up with one imperialistic power, Russia, dominant in both Europe and Asia, then we will have less security than when we started.

If there are risks in supporting the Government of China—and there are—the risks in not supporting it are infinitely greater. Let us not make the same tragic mistake twice in one decade.

Development of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by my colleague from North Carolina, Hon. CARL T. DURHAM, at Guilford College, N. C., on Monday, January 5, 1948:

The whole world seems greatly concerned these days with the future. Our newspapers are filled with conjecture about what is in store for us. I can't help but wonder, whenever I see the word "future," just when the men who use it expect it to arrive. Of course, we have a future, and we are rightly much concerned about it. But what we do today determines to a large extent what we will be doing tomorrow and next month and next year. Out of the crude materials of our daily political, social, and economic life we are building the future about which we read and hear so much.

If each of you could visit the laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission, as I did in September, the day-by-day construction of the future would be immeasurably more

impressed upon you. Inspecting those laboratories and the plants which they serve is part of my job in Congress. Your jobs are here, far removed from the dozens of workrooms of our atomic scientists. Yet, what they are doing will have an immense effect on your future. For that reason it is very important that each of you attempt to keep informed about what is going on in those laboratories. Only in that way can you intelligently aid and guide the methods of application of those developments.

War and peace lie side by side in our laboratories. Atomic bombs made a memorable debut at Hiroshima and Nagasaki more than 2 years ago. Since that time, an increasing amount of our scientific effort has been devoted to adding to our basic knowledge of atomic energy. The progress that has been made in these nonmilitary areas will affect our lives just as surely and perhaps even more completely than did the atomic bombs.

We must know what is happening in those laboratories—we must understand and examine the projects under way in the workshops of our atomic scientists—we must prepare for what lies ahead. For the science of atomic energy will one day enter into every phase of our lives. We can know more today about what lies ahead than most of us realize. No writer of fantastic fiction or soothsayer is needed to depict what is in store for us and for our children. Knowledge of what is going on in the laboratories plus sound common sense will tell each of us what tomorrow will bring, if we but look, listen, and make an effort to understand. Let me tell you a little about how atomic energy may affect your lives tomorrow—how it is already affecting you today.

The first area is that of atomic power—industrial atomic power—the kind that will light your homes and run the trains and steel plants. An atomic power plant is now under construction in upper New York State at the Knolls Laboratory near Schenectady. There, General Electric, working under Government contract, is busily engaged in constructing a new type of power-generating plant. This test model is intended to produce enough electricity to light a city of several thousand people. Out of this experiment, it is hoped that enough will be learned to permit eventual construction of commercial plants.

At present, such a plant is expected to produce electricity at a considerably higher cost than coal-powered generators. Costs may come down, but the main use for such atomic power plants will be in areas where other types of power plants are not feasible. Thus, metallic ores which are now prohibitively expensive to operate because the whole mass of rock must be transported to refineries, might become cheap to operate. Atomic-powered refineries at the mine sites would eliminate the need to transport anything other than the metal itself.

Predictions as to when we may expect a critical segment of industry to be atomic-powered vary, but a conservative average of the more informed predictions leaves us with an estimate of about 1970. Atomic power is on its way, and that is the all-important fact to be placed in the balance.

The power plants of which I have been speaking will resemble conventional power plants using coal or oil and requiring transfer of heat from a sort of boiler to a generator. In the deeper and more basic laboratories scientists are working feverishly on the problem of direct energy utilization. No one, even they, can say when they will emerge with an answer, but until they do the possibility of direct energy production from atomic fission remains. That is the unknown and distant future about which the most brilliant of men can scarcely hazard a guess. The power bill to run your car is in that realm—not the foreseeable future. Atomic power already on the horizon is great enough so that there is no need to fool ourselves. Learn to distinguish between fantasy and fact, and you will be better prepared for life in the atomic-powered future of 1970. There is plenty of time after that to speculate about life in the year 2000.

To the individual in his own home the benefits of an atomic power plant such as I have described may seem remote. What of other benefits? Well, a whole host of scientists are busy applying known atomic information to the field of agriculture. These men hold out hope of realizing one of the oldest dreams of mankind—the ability to grow better and more crops with less effort. Agricultural experiment stations all over the country are seeking the answers to the nature of plant nutrition and growth. Out of their work are already coming ways of getting higher crop yields per acre, better crops, and improved disease resistance. These findings will show up on your dinner table. Atomic energy, like the international situation, is about to take a place at your dinner table. The results are not going to become evident all at once, but gradually atomic science can help to lower the cost of the food on your table and to place more food on the tables of all the families of the world. Those are worthy and desirable goals—those are the attainable goals of scientists studying atomic energy today.

More people will be able to enjoy the higher standards of living tomorrow because of what our atomic scientists are doing in the medical laboratories today. The history of medicine has been a constant struggle to overcome the biological enemies of mankind—the disease which afflicts and destroys millions of potential productive citizens of free nations. Today, in hundreds of hospitals and laboratories, scientists and doctors are using the powerful new tool of the atomic age—the radioactive isotopes of almost every element known familiarly as tracers. These tiny bits of matter produced in atomic furnaces can be added to almost any known substance and traced as they move about. Thus, radioisotopes are assisting biologists in the study of hundreds of human ailments from glandular excesses to cancer. In some cases the radioisotopes are more than tools—they are medicine in themselves. So it is with leukemia—a disease of the blood—which is greatly reduced in its action through the use of radioactive gold.

Atomic energy has brought problems to the medical profession as well as assistance. New diseases and new biological weapons are now possible and must be studied and understood in order that the dangers of this great scientific discovery may not overbalance the benefits. The hazards of radiation are still relatively unknown. In time we may expect not only preventive methods but also basic medical benefits to result from scientific investigation of the horrible new dangers. Remember the terrible scars suffered by the survivors of the Japanese bombings? Study of those scars is yielding information about cancer. Have you seen the pictures of hemorrhaging caused in animals exposed to the Bikini tests? Already, knowledge of heart disease and the ailments of old age is coming from study of those animals. Every aspect of atomic medical science offers new hopes for life for more people. Think of it. One day you may owe your very life to the knowledge scientists have gained through the study of atomic energy. That's not a very far-removed benefit, is it? Your life and mine might be saved some day because we encouraged doctors and scientists to study atomic energy. Our lives might be lost because we failed to appreciate that simple fact and so worked to forbid scientists to investigate the atomic horizon. That is not a pleasant prospect and alone should stimulate us to encourage our atomic scientists.

The greatest hopes for the future in the atomic age lies in the field of pure science, however. Out in the area of the scientific unknown there are facts which may one day revolutionize life itself. Only through constant research can our scientists forge ahead into that area. The secrets of photosynthesis which makes plant life possible, of cellular reproduction which makes all life possible, and of atomic structure makes matter itself possible—those secrets still lie beyond our grasp.

The huge Government-built laboratories, the atomic piles and cyclotrons—these are the sort of tools the scientists of today must have. These things cost more money than any private group can afford. Yet, the further advancement of science depends on having these tools. That is the reason underlying the Government program of sponsoring research and development in the field of atomic energy. We will benefit from those developments as a collective whole—we must finance them as an equal entity.

I have refrained from the overoptimism of popular science and business writers in telling you what lies ahead. Atomic energy is a part of our lives, but not a fantastic part. Clean sanity is ever at a premium, and especially in a field such as this in which so few are expert. I have held out no hope to you of atomic-powered cars and washing machines in a few years because those things are unrealistic. Those who write and speak of them, however cleverly, are not being honest with you.

Interplanetary rocket travel and fuel pills are as much a conjecture as they were several years ago. Speculate if you wish, but don't fool yourselves into thinking that they are practically here. When they will be depends on far more factors than I can resolve.

Finally, it is only fair to ask, "What are our chances of gaining even these practical benefits of atomic energy in a world torn by political and economic conflict?" The future holds these tangible things, but if they arrive in a world chilled and made powerless as a result of atomic warfare they would be of little use. That is the sober and mature counterbalancing fact to this picture of a roseate future.

This is our balanced picture. On one hand, we have the daily arrival of new atomic science benefits which make life better for all of us. On the other hand is the daily threat of atomic conflict which threatens to make our world of tomorrow an uninhabitable horror. The statesman, the businessman, the teacher, the housewife—each of them has the citizen task of understanding this balance and taking part whenever our democratic process requires in deciding how best we as a people can advance into the future without upsetting this balance in our own disfavor. This is a great challenge—it requires each of us to draw upon all our training, knowledge, understanding, and common sense. With each other's help—in our living rooms, classrooms, and legislative halls, and with the help of God—I believe we can meet the challenges which lie ahead in this atomic age.

The Free-Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Phelps Adams, from the New York Sun of January 5, 1948:

THE FREE-ENTERPRISE SYSTEM—WHAT IT IS; HOW IT WORKS; WHAT IT HAS DONE

(By Phelps Adams)

When the stork picked you up, slung you comfortably from his bill, and began winging his way earthward with you, the chances were fifteen to one against you. But you were lucky. You hit the jackpot. You live in the United States of America!

This means that you live better than the people of any other nation on earth. Nowhere else in the world could you acquire so many of life's material riches in return for so small an expenditure of effort. In no other country will an hour's labor buy so many of the necessities, comforts, and luxuries of life. Never in history has any people known a standard of living as high as that which Americans enjoy today.

America harbors only one-sixteenth of the earth's population, but she produces nearly seven-sixteenths of the world's goods. Her people own 46 percent of the world's electric power, 48 percent of its radios, 54 percent of its telephones, 59 percent of its steel capacity, 60 percent of its life-insurance policies, 85 percent of its automobiles, and 92 percent of its modern bathtubs.

Yes, it is statistically true that in the 150 years of her dynamic, adventurous life, America has made more progress than all the other nations have made in 6,000 years. Why? What has she got that the rest of the world has not?

She has only 6 percent of the world's area. Other nations have more land and more people. Some are more richly endowed with natural resources. Several enjoy a general level of health, education, political freedom, and native ingenuity approximately comparable to our own. Carry the comparison on down the line, and you will be forced to the conclusion that the one thing which America has that the other nations lack is the American system of free enterprise.

That you live in America is circumstance; but that America lives as she does, is not. For a century and a half Americans have planned it that way.

WHAT IS FREE ENTERPRISE?

The American system of free enterprise, on its record, indisputably is the most progressive and completely democratic form of capitalism yet devised by man. It is the only economic system extant which provides investor, producer, and consumer with freedom of choice and opportunity.

It is a system under which all the productive facilities of the Nation are owned directly by the people themselves. The people alone—not their Government nor their politicians—determine what wages shall be paid for what services, and—without governmental coercion they decide how much capital shall be invested, in what competing enterprises, at what prospective profit.

The 9,000,000 individual enterprises in America know only one boss: the customer. Every time the customer buys a car, an ice box, a radio, or a bucket of paint, he casts a vote that determines which business shall be big and which shall be small—which shall grow and give increasing employment and which shall fail and produce unemployment. The only way a business can grow big and stay big in America is by winning the larger share of the votes that are cast daily by the American consumer.

American enterprise today provides gainful employment for more than 60,000,000 persons, who work only at the pleasure of their customers. But these 60,000,000 workers are the customers. As workers, they constantly exact higher wages; as customers they insistently demand lower prices. Caught squarely in the middle, management is forced, under this tremendous competitive pressure, to operate more and more efficiently and to produce better goods at lower cost. When it ceases to do this it ceases to exist.

Thus the American system of free enterprise may truthfully and accurately be defined as the economic system under which the worker exploits management.

CONTRAST WITH OTHER SYSTEMS

Capitalism and communism stand at opposite economic poles. Their essential difference is this:

The Communist, seeing the rich man and his fine home, says, "No man should have so much." The capitalist, seeing the same thing, says, "All men should have as much."

That difference lies in the point of view. Communism—born of poverty and hunger—seeks to perfect a system for the equal distribution of a scarcity of goods, so that ultimately no man has enough of anything. Capitalism—born of hardship and toil—seeks to provide such a plentitude of goods that, ultimately, all men may have enough of everything. Communism is content that no man should be rich; capitalism strives that no man shall be poor.

A third system, socialism, represents a kind of economic purgatory wherein nations hang suspended between the riches of capitalism and the poverty of communism. Here the government owns and operates part or all of the nation's enterprises. By taxation or otherwise, it raises the necessary capital, and then decides what this capital shall be used to produce. Since the government alone determines what shall be produced, it also decides what its people may buy, what they shall pay, what wages they shall receive, and at what jobs they shall work.

They have no choice in the matter. There is no customer control of production. There is no competition. There is only monopoly, and since monopoly inevitably becomes lazy and inefficient, the people must pay too much for what they buy. Production and purchasing power decline and the system tends finally to give up the struggle and drown in the ever-spreading waters of communism.

These are the three basic economic systems at work in the world today. How have they operated? Which has succeeded? Which truly provides the greatest good for the greatest number?

THE RECORD

Economically speaking, the system which provides the greatest good for the greatest number is the system which provides the greatest supply of goods for the greatest number. By any standard of comparison that system is free American capitalism. It has enabled every American worker to produce and to possess more than six times as much goods as the average worker outside the United States. No other system has equaled—or closely approached—that record.

During the war, one nation, singlehanded, outproduced the combined powers of the Axis. That nation was America.

One nation was able to arm and equip all of its own fighting forces and still give vast quantities of supplies and munitions to its allies. That nation was America.

Many military analysts concede that while the Allied troops outfought the enemy all over the world, the decisive victory was won on the American assembly line which literally buried fascism under a never-ending deluge of production.

Behind the battle lines, throughout the war, both sides engaged in a grim race to produce a weapon of total destruction. The scientific geniuses of many nations contributed to the final discovery and design of that weapon, but only one nation possessed the industrial capacity to produce it in time. That nation was America.

And now that the war is over—now that the nations of Europe have turned to socialism or have been engulfed in communism—they seek the help of the only nation on earth that can produce enough and give them enough to keep them from actual starvation. That nation is America.

Is it mere coincidence that the United States also is the only nation left which enjoys free enterprise as we have known it?

The record speaks for itself.

THE SECRET OF PRODUCTION

The secret weapon which has enabled American free enterprise to triumph in the competitive battle of production is the machine. American capital has provided the American worker with better tools than the workers of any other nation possess. The story can be told in a few simple statistics:

One hundred years ago it took only $557 worth of capital to provide the tools, machines, and plant facilities used by a single American factory worker. He labored 70 hours a week for a bare existence.

Today it takes 11 times as much capital to provide tools for this worker. He puts in 40 hours a week. His hourly earnings, in terms of dollars, are about 16 times as high as they were 100 years ago. In terms of purchasing power they are about five and one-half times as great. Over the century, the gross value of this worker's product has increased in almost exact proportion to the amount of capital invested in his job. His purchasing power would have increased, it will be noted, in almost the same proportion had he not chosen to forego nearly half of his earnings in exchange for additional leisure.

But this is only half the story.

One hundred years ago the worker was economically muscle-bound. The volume of his output was limited by his muscular strength. The precision of his work was similarly limited by the individual dexterity and skill which he possessed. Since he produced little, he earned little. There was little to buy, and little that he could afford to buy. Even so, the price charged for the things he produced was fabulous in relation to the cost at which things of the same quality could be produced today. But most things of that quality could not be sold at any price today.

By way of illustration, take one staggering example:

In 1908, before the automobile industry was the highly mechanized, mass-production institution that it now is, it took one man 8 hours to shape the top half of a gasoline tank. Today one man—and one machine—does the same job in 1 minute. If a whole automobile were produced by the hand methods of 40 years ago, and at today's basic wage of $1.49 per hour, that automobile would cost $50,000.

Because one machine can do the work of a hundred men, because it can work with a precision that the most skilled and dexterous of men could never achieve, and because it can operate with incredible speed, Americans today can buy $50,000 worth of automobile for about 3 percent of that price.

And that is the story of the machine and the secret of American production. One hundred years ago machines did only 6 percent of man's work. Today they do 85 percent of it, and do it better, cheaper, and faster, while man gets more pay in an hour for running a machine than he did in a day for exhausting his muscles.

To this story, however, must be added one brief postscript. For a century men—both here and abroad—have looked upon the machine with deep suspicion, foreseeing the day when it would enslave and destroy them. Because it would do the work of a hundred men they insisted that it would throw a hundred men out of work. Their fears caught the popular imagination and were echoed in literature and on the stage. Frankenstein and the stage play "RUR" were fascinating drama, but they were very bad economics, because they helped to perpetuate one of the most expensive fallacies in all history.

What are the facts? Well, in 1890, when only a few machines were at work in the

United States, 18,000,000 persons were gainfully employed—29 percent of the total population. Today 60,000,000 are gainfully employed, or 43 percent of the total population. Machines have created jobs, as well as wealth and leisure for the workers in the Nation that has used them most extensively.

YOU ARE A CAPITALIST

Before any man can go to work in the average American industry today, someone must put up $6,500 in cash to provide the machines, tools and plant facilities that man will use. To supply this cash is the job of the capitalist.

To millions of Americans, unhappily, a capitalist is a silk-hatted, pot-bellied, cigar-smoking caricature with dollar signs on his vest. The concept is as ridiculous as it is tragic.

The truth is that under American free enterprise the capitalist is every man and woman who has a savings account, a life insurance policy, or a share of stock. Capitalists, in America, are the families that are seeking to set aside something for their old age. They are people who are looking beyond the mere desire for a shorter workweek, to the hope of providing a shorter working life for themselves, or a better future for their children.

They, in a word, are the millions of little people who deny themselves the luxuries of today in order to provide the necessities of tomorrow. And theirs, economically speaking, is the kingdom of heaven, for without them there would be few jobs and little to buy.

Many of the biggest corporations today have more stockholders than workers. The most reliable statistics available in Washington indicate that 90 percent of all the stockholders in the country have incomes of less than $5,000 per year. The latest available tax returns show that in 1944, more than half of all the corporate dividends paid out went to "little people" in the brackets below $5,000. In that year alone, $150,000,000 in dividends and interest was reported by taxpayers whose adjusted gross income was less than $1,000.

These, however, are only the direct investors. In addition, there are 50,000,000 savings bank depositors and the owners of 147,000,000 life insurance policies, who—all together—have created a reservoir of capital totaling $200,000,000,000. These people are capitalists, too, for much of this money is reinvested by the banks and insurance companies. And since there are only 2,500,000 persons in the country whose income is more than $5,000 a year, and only 138,000 who get more than $25,000 a year, it is obvious that the rich bulk small.

But even these little people, who by self-denial, supply the funds that buy the machines that provide the jobs and produce the goods, expect a return on their investment. Whether it is in the form of interest on their savings, reduced premiums on their life insurance policies, or dividends on their stock, they demand a profit. For their services to industry they ask payment just as insistently and just as reasonably as the worker does for his labor. They want a fair wage for the work their savings do, and without that incentive they are no more willing to invest than a worker is willing to labor without pay.

This is not greed, nor a desire to exploit their fellowmen. It is a simple matter of security. If they can earn a profit of 6 percent on their savings and put aside 10 percent of their pay every week, they find perhaps that at the end of 40 years of their normal working life, they can provide for their old age. But if the profit is only 2 percent, 40 years won't do it.

And when inflation comes—as it has after every war—they find that the sum which they had thought would give them security will no longer suffice. To live, they must have a larger profit, just as the workingman must have a higher wage. Thus, as prices mount, wages rise and profits tend to do the same.

So it all boils down to one simple fact which the critics of free enterprise prefer to ignore: The selfsame workers who are the customers, are also the principal owners of American industry. And when the soap boxer denounces profiteers, whom is he talking about?

Why, bless my soul, it's you.

FACTS ABOUT PROFITS

For more than a year, now, you have been told that today's skyrocketing prices are due to the exorbitant profits of industry. But is that really true? What would the cost of living be were there no profits?

Official Government records show that corporate profits last year amounted to about 6.2 percent on sales. That means that when you spent a dollar for a manufactured article 6 cents of that dollar was profit. But that 6 cents bought you more probably than all the rest of your dollar.

That 6 cents provided all the machines that produced the article—and machines, remember, did 85 percent of the work on it. Animal power did 10 percent. Human energy did only 5 percent of the work; yet for that human energy you paid ten times as much as you did for the machines.

It is that 6 cents, moreover, which has made it possible for you today to buy a $50,000 automobile for 3 cents on the dollar. Without it there would be no machines, and machines work much cheaper than men. Year in and year out, the average American industry pays ten times as much in wages and salaries as it pays in profits for the machines it uses.

But Philip Murray of the CIO will tell you that the 6 cents was an "unconscionable profit"—much more than you should have paid. He will tell you that industry made $12,000,000,000 more in profits last year than it did in 1939. He will not, of course, tell you that labor made $62,000,000,000 more in wages than it did in 1939. Both figures are correct. Neither means a thing, except in relation to the total national income.

So, let's see what really happened to that 6 cents profit you paid.

The significant fact is that less than half of it went to the investors who paid for the machines. Government reports show that only 3.1 percent of the total national income went to stockholders last year. Yet, in only three of the past 18 years did these investors receive a smaller share of the total national income. They did not do nearly as well as usual.

What happened to the rest of the profit? It had to be placed back into the business to meet rising costs. The inventories—the raw materials and the supplies out of which the finished product is manufactured—rose tremendously in price. It took more money to buy them, so more money had to be tied up in them.

Then, too, factories and machines wear out. Out of its earnings industry must always establish a fund to replace them. But replacement costs have gone up enormously, and the funds originally set aside for the purpose are no longer adequate. For example, it costs twice as much to provide the plant and machinery necessary to produce a ton of steel today as it did before the war.

A Department of Commerce study shows that in the first 6 months of last year, industry needed $11,000,000,000 to meet the higher costs of inventories and the replacement of tools. But all the funds it had set aside for that purpose, plus all the profits it was able to retain, amounted to only $7,500,000,000. It had to borrow the other three and one-half billions.

So the bald truth is that the 6-cent profit which you paid was not enough to meet even the current needs of industry—let alone to provide for the normal expansion of plant and facilities which must take place if America is to have the new jobs and the additional goods that her ever-increasing population demands.

Clearly, you didn't get gypped.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH IT?

The greatest paradox of this bright New Year is the fact that free enterprise, with its unparalleled record of achievement, is under attack and on the defensive all over the globe. Millions of men and scores of governments are turning their backs on it, and today there are not half a dozen nations in the world which still embrace it completely.

Its enemies bombard it with catchy phrases which are glibly parroted by thousands and believed by millions, while its champions can defend it only with facts which many refuse to believe and decline to verify for themselves. So the facts are engulfed in a torrent of fallacies. Let's look at a few of them:

Opinion polls show that an overwhelming majority of the American people believe that stockholders get the largest share of the income produced by the manufacturing industry. The majority is wrong. Government records show that of all such income produced in the past 18 years the workers got 86 percent.

Opinion polls show that 40 percent of the American people believe that corporate profits exceed 25 percent. Government records show that over the last quarter century manufacturing corporations have had an average profit of about 4 percent, and that their highest profit in any of these years was less than 7 percent.

Soap boxers charge that free enterprise has resulted in a maldistribution of income, and that 2 percent of the American people own 80 percent of America's wealth. Not only is that not true; it is silly. Studies just completed by Notre Dame University show that over a 30-year period 88 percent of the total national income was paid to persons receiving less than $5,000 per year; 8 percent was paid to those in the $5,000 to $25,000 bracket; and only 4 percent went to those receiving more than $25,000 annually.

They also tell you that big business smothers little business; yet the truth is that big business is the best customer that little business has. About half of the parts for the products manufactured by big business are purchased from smaller enterprises.

They cry monopoly, but there are 500,000 corporations and 3,000,000 unincorporated businesses competing against each other in this country today. Five hundred thousand new ones have been born in the past 12 months and 200,000 old ones have closed their doors. Thirty percent of all corporations failed to show any profit in 1944—the latest year for which tax statistics are available.

They charge that the financially overstuffed executives of the big corporations get the lion's share of the pay roll. That isn't so either. If the salary of the three top executives in General Motors Corporation was divided among all the workmen, it would take each man 6 days to buy one pack of cigarettes out of this money.

And so it goes. Check the facts and you will find that there is only one well-founded and significant charge that can legitimately be leveled at the American system of free enterprise, namely, that over the years its progress has been interrupted regularly by recurrent circles of boom and bust. That evil persists. It stands as a challenge to the Americans who have built the greatest—and the only successful—economic system in the world.

But here again two highly pertinent facts should be borne in mind, first, American business has relatively little control over the present boom cycle upon which we appear to be embarking. Most economists agree that its causes lie chiefly in the war and in the inflationary policies pursued by the Federal Government. Second, no other economic system has solved the problem that plagues free enterprise. Thus far the others have prevented booms only by creating permanent busts.

The American system of free enterprise is your business. Its success is a matter of life or death to you. It will survive only so long as men strive sincerely and understandingly to improve and perfect it. But the next time some long-haired orator tells you that it is an evil and oppressive thing which should be scrapped and urges you to follow in the despairing footsteps of Great Britain or of Russia, check the facts and ask yourself the question:

What nation will then be left on earth to bail us out when our folly, too, has run its course?

German Men, Women Lose Weight in Fight for Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the fourth in the series written by Philip H. Parrish, editor of the Portland Oregonian editorial page, on European problems:

GERMAN MEN, WOMEN LOSE WEIGHT IN FIGHT FOR LIFE—NATIVES NEED FOOD, SHOES—FEAR LESS COMMON IN AMERICAN ZONE

(By Philip H. Parrish)

I had thought to wrap up in a single article my picture of the great cities of industrialized Germany trying to survive in catastrophe. But yesterday I didn't even manage to get out of Berlin.

The other cities, however, follow, in general, the pattern.

We approached them from the south, the party having flown to Vienna and then to Trieste, returning to Germany for Thanksgiving Day at Berchtesgaden in the Bavarian Alps overlooking Austria, where the first fall of the year deposited a foot and a half of snow on the passes and covered the town itself with several inches. From there on down through the American zone of Germany, our trip was by motor caravan. We drove northward from the Alps across the stormy plateau of the upper Danube to have a couple of days in the Bavarian capital, Munich, then westward across the frigid landscape and over the Danube-Rhine divide to Stuttgart, capital of Wuerttemberg-Baden; and on, after a couple of more days, down the Rhine valley to Frankfurt-am-Main.

Then there were several days on the lower Rhine in the British zone, specializing in the Ruhr and including the cities of Essen, Duesseldorf, Duisberg, and Cologne. There we lived, out of politeness, on our private train, since the British do not have too much hotel space or food.

STORES LACK LIGHT

Anyhow, it was always the same with the cities. The same overcrowding and devious life in the ruins; the same routine of contact with the countryside; the same deterioration of clothes and shoes; the same slowdown of work in order to conserve strength for barter and the black market. And everywhere, so far as the open market is concerned, the stores are dark little shops reconstructed in the injured buildings and offering postage-stamp collections, picture frames, or hand-made knickknacks. Christmas was coming on, and hungry-eyed crowds formed around the tawdry windows, searching for something to buy. I suppose many of the people were well supplied with their almost worthless marks from the black market.

There was one contrast with Berlin, however. Here the people had lost most of their fear of the invaders. They still salute the British officials punctiliously, though not the Americans, who do not require it. But in the ordinary run of things they feel they are not going to get hurt.

A man can go out of Frankfurt or Cologne with his pane of glass to trade to the farmer, or his fountain pen or collection of cigarets, and not skulk in dread that he will be dragged off the returning train, with his loot, by a Russian hook.

"It isn't the law," a German at Stuttgart told me, "but the American soldier is more likely to help me than take my potatoes."

That means that bartering between city and country is "regularized" if not legally accepted. And the situation has its complications. As matters stand, the farmers of the American and British zones surrender the least possible of their crops to the collectors who must keep up the stocks of the official ration stores. They hide away the maximum for barter with their secret callers from the city.

Even so, the weights of the town and city people, including Berlin, show a fairly firm tendency, and downward.

So-called street weighings have been taken since the beginning of the occupation, and those of September 1947 show that men aged 20 to 39 are 10.7 pounds under the weights fixed as normal for those ages; men 40 to 59 are 17 pounds under; men over 60 are 22.5 pounds under. Women of 20 to 39 show a weight deficit of 3.7 pounds; women 40 to 59, a deficit of 14.4 pounds; women over 60, a deficit of 20.6. The fall had been steady up to this summer when it appeared to slacken.

Actual starvation, however, is rare, to say the least, and military government is touchy on that subject.

"Personally," we were told by an Army officer who heads the health service in Land Wuerttemberg-Baden, "I have yet to see my first authentic case of starvation edema, except for the prisoners of war and expellees from the Russian zone."

RUINS STILL APPALL

The explanation obviously is that the food, though inadequate, has been spread fairly evenly, so that one person could not starve without many starving. The weights are eloquent as to the universality of hunger; the mortality tables are clear enough evidence that the masses are still above starvation, if barely so.

But what are these cities doing in the way of cleaning up? What are they doing in the way of rebuilding? Surely, they have bricks and stones enough? What are they doing for themselves? These are questions everyone at home asks me.

The answer is that the cities are but little improved in appearance over a year ago, though in fairness it must be agreed that a great deal of effort would show but little result against so great a task. The streets are more open, with the rubble carried off. Every city has its crews loading miniature trains—sometimes the crews consisting of women, especially the old, who want the extra food allotment which goes with this heaviest work. And nature itself is effecting some unidentifiable alchemy of mellowness. But it will be a long time before the cities are sightly, and a certain percentage of the wives and mothers of American personnel, joining their husbands and sons, continue to have the heebie-jeebies over discovery of the reality. Some have not been able to take it.

Nor can it be claimed that anything spectacular is being accomplished in the way of construction itself. At Munich, which is typical, I found the American officials most critical of the Bavarian Government's building program. Under it 60 percent of available materials—and remember that building requires more than brick and stones—is for the Government itself, with 40 percent for private construction. The 60 percent goes to bridges, roads, Government buildings, and a remarkable part to the restoration of monuments. The 40 percent, so far as I could determine, largely trickles out on the black market. There is shamefully little for industry and for housing to meet the overcrowding.

In this discussion—as in nearly every discussion of Germany—one always comes back to the black market.

With regard to construction, the case becomes obvious once it is mentioned. The butcher or the baker or the grocer or the farmer is the one who can get a shop repaired or a barn built. He has something more than marks to offer the officials who assign the priorities, the dealers who distribute the materials and the workmen who handle the hammers and trowels. One can't just start out on a job, unless he himself is the artisan. One has to wangle his materials and workers by gifts under the counter.

The government, of course, practices what amounts to forced labor. The workers must take jobs assigned to them or suffer loss of ration cards.

MANY YIELD CARDS

But even loss of the ration card has not coerced many of the Germans into conformity. Besides the black market operators themselves, there appear to be hundreds of thousands of ordinarily honest workmen who have given up their cards, or never asked for them, in order to hire out where they wish. A good mason, for example, can make far more by doing a job for a grocer who pays him with a pound of butter (350 or 400 marks), and requiring a week, than he could by laboring a month for 350 marks on repair of the autobahn.

And of course the magic of goods as distinct from marks is not confined to the building trades. It extends into all of the efforts at survival.

At Berlin, Ilse Borzym mentioned to me: "Our family is fortunate about shoes. Father gives the cobbler a roach or two he has caught in Wannsee. The cobbler is fond of fish."

MINERS DRAW BOON

So with the tailor. He has been asked to make a coat from an old blanket and his attitude is entirely changed by an electric light bulb to replace the burned-out one above his table. Or the plumber. He perhaps has a sweet tooth. And more than likely he has children at home.

Or take what I would judge to be the supreme example, since it involves left-handed acceptance of the black market situation by the occupation forces. The Americans and British, desperate to reverse the falling coal production in the Ruhr, not only offered greatly increased food rations, CARE packages as prizes and the right on the part of miners to purchase a certain percentage of consumer goods received as a result of coal exports. They also allotted each miner 5 tons of coal a year. Since this is far more than the miner needs, it sets him up as a little businessman on the black market. He is a man of wealth among the shopkeepers, craftsmen, and farmers.

There has been much celebration in recent weeks over Ruhr coal production climbing to a postwar peak of 285,000 tons a day, compared to a dispirited 200,000 this past spring. And such production, and better, is necessary for the recovery of German and European industry. But the miners are now by far the

most favored workers in the country, and if they won't settle to their sawing under present incentives, the case would be hopeless indeed.

Something I did not get around to mentioning is in connection with my experiment in the jammed surface stations and cavernous subways to Berlin.

Germany is much more dominated by its mass transportation than the American ordinarily stops to realize. Such transportation, particularly in the form of railroads, coincided in development with Germany's industrialization, unification and bid for world position in the past century. And since the state owned and planned the roads, there was no limit. Every city seems to be built around its vast downtown station, such as those of Stuttgart and Frankfurt—some like immense medieval castles, with walls after the Prussian fashion. Once Germany dreamed of a widespread chain of continental transportation, as witness the idea of the "Berlin-to-Bagdad railroad," so prominent in conversation before World War I. And even now the proud word "Mitropa" is embroidered on nearly every piece of linen remaining in the German trains.

The point, however, is that with virtually no automobile traffic as of today, these stations are crowded as never before, and their size and complexity and dim depths have conspired to make them "the" black-market centers. Considerable has appeared about this in the past three or four months in American books of travel, magazines, and newspapers. And it would be hard to overdo the truth.

REDS HOLD WORKERS

At Frankfurt, for example, where the station spreads for blocks, one can walk through at night and see enough suffering, desperate, criminal humanity to do for a lifetime. One finds himself, in the darkness, in a crowd of war prisoners getting off a Russian train. Their clothes hang raggedly. Their faces are expressionless and they move obediently like automatons. (Russia is not yet returning those well enough to work.) One moves on into the crowd beyond—people trying to get to and from work, weary with their loads; girls of the underworld; beggars; thieves. The black-market centers are usually definite but apparently shift as the law becomes mildly interested. Blocks and blocks of it.

The jam in these centers, as on the surface cars, has been complicated by the removal of so many people from the bombed downtown and working-class sections into the less bombed suburbs. On the average, the distance has become much extended from residence to work.

Maybe it was a latecomer from that midnight turmoil who wakened me early one morning, before daylight, when we were at the Hotel of the Four Seasons at Munich. At first I was drowsily conscious of a voice a block or two away, and thought that I was safely at home and it was a newsboy. Then it became louder, finally under the window, so that I got up and looked out.

Snow had been falling—was still falling—and in all the long length of the street there was only this one figure. I presumed that he must have been drinking, since he leaned against a corner of a building and then crossed slowly and unsteadily to rest against a street vendor's closed stand. But it was not until he had trudged on into the snow that I realized that his voice had a clarity and range which belied the idea of very much to drink. Rather, his voice would have done credit to a Wagnerian character. And there was Wagnerian tragedy in the fact that he could have passed, so very solitary, through the middle of a great city. I saw only one light go on in one window in answer to his imprecations.

But it wasn't until morning that I realized that possibly I should have gone down into the snow in my bare feet. Ralph McGill came in from his side of the bathroom and asked what that commotion had been along toward morning. He said he hadn't awakened but that he had heard the words, cried out in German, "mother" and "bread."

The incident is beyond me.

If the lonely passer was not intoxicated, and if he talked through the deserted street of mother and bread, then the bootlessness of the people along the way becomes a social problem. Many of the American personnel told me they were shocked at the callousness of the Germans to one another under the conditions of disaster.

Anyhow, I don't know, I should have learned German in school.

The Economics of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this week hearings are being held in California to determine how much of our oil lands shall be set aside to enlarge the present naval reserves. This has been brought about by the fact that our oil resources are dwindling to such an extent that the Navy has become alarmed. In southern California there is only one substitute for oil and that is electric power. The source of supply of electric power does not become depleted, as does the source of oil supply. Therefore it becomes a necessity to immediately develop the unlimited power resources of the Colorado River.

The accompanying editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News clearly sets forth this problem, and I subscribe to it 100 percent:

THE ECONOMICS OF POWER

The Los Angeles metropolitan area development of the Colorado River system holds chiefly the promise of power.

While current interest in the Arizona-California squabble over water rights focusses attention on the Colorado as a source of reclamation, the power potential of the river is of even greater importance insofar as Los Angeles is concerned.

Los Angeles' power appetite is enormous. With the growth locally of both industry and population, available kilowatts are being devoured greedily. Still more kilowatts are needed. And they can be obtained only from natural energy resources—coal, oil, or water power.

As a means of satisfying this increasing power appetite, the local city-owned bureau of water and power, as well as private utilities, are carrying out expansion programs—new generating plants, new transmission lines.

Because no additional hydroelectric power has yet been harnessed, these expansion programs have had to be geared to the use of fuels such as oil and gas.

Some idea as to the extent to which fuels are being consumed, or may have to be consumed, in order to produce the kilowatts Los Angeles needs can be gained from the estimates of power officials.

Translated in terms of what two proposed projects on the Colorado might be made to produce is a significant reality. This reality is that oil, figuratively speaking, is flowing down the river and into the ocean at the rate of 15,000,000 barrels a year.

This is because power experts figure it take a barrel of oil to produce 500 kilowatts of electrical energy. Also, based on a current delivery price of approximately $2 per barrel, this means dollars, too, are flowing down the Colorado—about $30,000,000 each year.

Hence, what's being wasted through failure to develop fully the Colorado River system are not only millions of acre-feet of precious water—water that can reclaim arid desert lands and produce a flourishing agriculture. What is also being wasted in even greater quantity is real wealth—the wealth of the Nation's oil reserves, the wealth of dollars.

The two Colorado projects which would save 15,000,000 barrels of oil and $30,000,000 annually are the Bridge and Glen Canyon projects. Each has been blueprinted by Bureau of Reclamation engineers.

Bridge Canyon, at the headwaters of Lake Mead, would have an installed hydro electric capacity of 650,000 kilowatts. Glen Canyon, farther upstream, would produce 400,000 kilowatts.

Considering the requirements for electrical energy by the metropolitan areas of southern California, and by other similar, though smaller areas in southern Nevada and central Arizona, early construction of these projects is indicated.

Naturally, they're going to cost money—lots of money—which will have to be provided by the Federal Government. But as the oil and dollar similes have shown, not having these projects is costing much more money and is depleting the oil and gas resources of the Nation as a whole.

All estimates of future total power requirements in the southern California area point to enormously increased consumption. In residential, farm, commercial, mining, manufacturing, and transportation uses consumption of electrical energy is multiplying steadily.

Development of the Colorado resources clearly is the prime requisite for a future, prosperous Los Angeles.

That's why citizens should take an interest in the Colorado projects and spread the word, as the Bureau of Reclamation has said, that "this mighty river is a life giver, a power producer, a great constructive force."—R. E. G. H.

A Threat to the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an editorial by Mr. Felix Morley, which appeared in the January 14, 1948, issue of Pathfinder magazine. I recommend this for reading of all Members of Congress:

A THREAT TO THE REPUBLIC
(By Felix Morley)

Opposition to the $17,000,000,000 European recovery program is not due to any lack of generosity among our people nor any failure to appreciate the gravity of Europe's economic picture.

The underlying and justified fear of those who criticize ERP is that it may result in undermining our republican system of government. Such a result is possible for two reasons. One is obvious. The second is coming out now.

The obvious reason for anxiety about this tremendous relief program is its inflationary effect. It is simply impossible to make the contemplated shipments of goods to Europe, getting little or nothing in return, without creating domestic shortages. Shortages mean higher prices for food and manufactured articles in short supply. Higher prices mean agitation for higher wages. Higher wages mean still higher prices, and so on.

Strikes, even if apparently successful, only make the situation worse. Any strike means a loss of production. That means further shortages. As matters stand now, a strike may put more dollars in some pay envelopes. But this is offset by the fact that everybody's dollar is losing value.

The inflationary effect of ERP has been recognized by all of the many agencies which have studied the program. The general conclusion is that because of tremendous productive capacity we can afford the risk.

Even so, President Truman thought it advisable to ask Congress for authority to impose rationing, price controls, wage controls, and other forms of regimentation characteristic of what Mr. Truman himself called a police state. Congress has refused to grant this authority. It does not see how we can defeat communism by imposing on the American people the same sort of controls the Communists apply.

This issue was fought out during the debate on the stopgap relief appropriation approved by Congress just before it adjourned for the Christmas recess. None of the drastic economic controls requested by the President was approved and the stopgap assistance asked for the period until April 1 was cut by nearly 13 percent.

This may prove to be a precedent for cutting the $6,800,000,000 appropriation requested for the first 15 months of ERP. But a cut in that proportion will not diminish inflationary effects, stimulating demands for un-American governmental controls.

The effect of ERP on American institutions is not confined to the amount of money involved. There is an even more dangerous threat in the character of the administrative set-up.

The President proposes a new political agency, to be called the Economic Cooperation Administration. It would be responsible to the White House. The Administrator, said President Truman in his message of December 18, "must be subject to the direction of the Secretary of State on decisions and actions affecting our foreign policy."

It is an unfortunate fact, which the public is beginning to realize, that during and since the war the administration has not taken the public into its confidence on matters of foreign policy. For that reason Congress will resolutely oppose giving the Department of State absolute control over the expenditure of billions of relief dollars. This would mean secret diplomacy on a scale heretofore never even imagined here. And secret diplomacy could spell the end of our Republic.

Congress already has before it, in the Herter bill, a far more desirable measure for the control of ERP. This would set up a temporary Government corporation, with a bipartisan board of directors responsible to Congress. The whole operation would be out in the open, not hidden away in the corridors of the Department of State.

For the future of the Republic, the issue of how ERP is run is more important than the amount it spends.

Stanislaw Mikolajczyk Reports on Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Sentinel is printing a series of most significant articles by Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party. As you know, Mikolajczyk recently escaped from Poland where it is believed he would have been put to death if he had remained. The evidence of communistic terror emanating from all countries into which the Soviet Government has placed its despotic hand becomes overwhelming. Humanity cries out at the barbarism of the Soviet Government. Mikolajczyk's voice is only one in the chorus. The situation in Poland is all the more tragic because of the Christian tradition in that land. The Polish people are highly spiritual and have a strong attachment to Christian culture. That is why the heel of Russia presses hard upon the Polish heart.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Milwaukee Sentinel:

MIKOLAJCZYK TELLS HOW REDS TORTURE PEOPLE OF POLAND—"MY NATION IN FRONT LINES OF NEW WAR," HE ASSERTS

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and President of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment I)

Poland, conquered by Adolf Hitler first and later forsaken by its own allies, may seem to be a remote land to the reader.

The names of its people, including my own, may be difficult to pronounce, and its tragedy may be dismissed by some as the normal plight of Europeans and particularly Poles.

But Poland today is you. When a Pole today is deprived of his God-given rights or is tortured vilely and put to death for simply believing steadfastly in what millions of democratic peoples elsewhere take for granted, you, too, are being attacked. And so is the sanctity of your home.

A fantastic World War began on Polish soil, after being conceived in the twisted minds of Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, and Tojo.

And now an even more horrible war has erupted in Poland. It is a war against the dignity and freedom of all democratic peoples, and the Poles once again are in the front lines.

REDS IMPOSE YOKE ON WORLD

Just as World War II spread its tentacles out of Poland, this war could reach the homes of peace-loving people elsewhere in the world—and more quickly and with a thousand times the venom of the opening of the Battle of Britain and the attack on Pearl Harbor.

I know, because I am a survivor of the opening movements of that war of which I speak.

I know the determination, the pitilessness and the vigor of the new common enemy of mankind, communism directed from the U. S. S. R.

I know Stalin personally. I know the men behind him, and the workings of their minds and the yoke which they are now imposing on the world.

Forget for a moment my very name and the positions that I held in the Polish Government not only during the occupation by the Nazis but by the even more sinister invader of today—the Reds.

Simply assume you are a Pole, like myself, and that you are still possessed of your love of personal liberty, your feelings on the rights of man, and your beliefs that you have the right to speak, act, and vote as your conscience dictates.

MIXTURE OF MOCKERY, MURDER

One night, without warning, a group of armed security police, trained, directed, and controlled by a foreign power, enters your home and arrests you.

You ask to see their warrant and they laugh at you, for their warrant is the machine gun that is pointed at your stomach. In their pockets is your sentence, already made out, and your "trial" in the military court—if you are given one—will be only a fiction.

One of them casually pulls out a revolver, opens a drawer in your desk, puts the revolver in the drawer, lifts it out again, and accuses you of concealing weapons in violation of a "law" that is suddenly a mixture of mockery and murder.

Your wife and children and relatives and even associates are taken from you, and you may never see them again and—if you live—you will always be tormented by the terrors inflicted upon them.

You yourself are subjected to what could be 10,000 types of torture, for there is no limit to the infamy concocted by the Communist torturer. And if you survive and are released, you must sign a document in which you promise not to reveal what has been done to you or your family. If you break that promise, there are other tortures and no difficulty in arresting you again.

You are cursed in the controlled newspapers as a "bandit" or "Fascist" or "traitor" though you are none of these things and have proved it throughout your life.

Your crime? You liked a certain candidate for office and had announced your intention to vote for him. Or, perhaps, you had decided to run for office yourself—constitutionally your right—on a ticket that does not happen to please Moscow.

You would protest, of course. You might even die—as thousands of Poles similar to you have done—rather than yield to such an incredible tyranny.

But this is certain: You would say to yourself, "This cannot happen in the twentieth century. This cannot be the work of men by whose side we fought the Germans. The Americans and British will do something about this," you would say, knowing the heart-warming humanity of those powers.

There lies the ultimate tragedy.

What Russia and its agents are doing in Poland today is nothing but a bold perversion of solemn pacts and promises signed by Stalin, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill, first at Tehran and then at Yalta.

Roosevelt and Churchill must have sincerely believed that they could do business with Russia. Those men, men of good faith, believed in the solemnity of the pacts which they signed with Stalin.

They simply underestimated Stalin. Nobody can do business with Stalin. Take this as the testimony of a man who tried for 2½ years, and then failed under the brutal force of Stalin's Communist agents in Poland.

Those historic pacts have been spat upon by Moscow and the stooges Stalin has placed in office in Poland by means of arrogant pressure, careful programs of vilification against Polish democrats, and an "election"

which criminally frustrated the honest votes of a brave people which still believed that pacts and promises made by the three big powers were more than paper and hot air.

There have been vigorous protests from Washington and London, but they have been callously ignored by Russia and by the Reds who pose as Poles and dominate the police state.

They laugh at such protests, and when they do not laugh they carry out reprisals which cause additional bloodshed in my land—such as the destruction of the Warsaw headquarters of my Polish Peasant Party by Communists immediately after Mr. James F. Byrnes' speech at Stuttgart.

The only vestige of democracy left in Poland today—in a country, mind you, which Mr. Roosevelt earnestly hailed as "the inspiration of nations"—is in the pulpits of the church.

Only here can the so-called liberated Pole be told he should be free. Only here can he be openly told to love instead of hate, to tell truths instead of lies, to believe in his destiny.

But the Red offense against this last barricade of democracy in Poland has now been brought into the open. At the opening session of the Sejm, our Parliament, on October 20, 1947, Josef Cyrankiewicz, Prime Minister of the Communist-dominated Polish Government, accused the church of attempting to thwart the "people's democracy."

Two weeks later, in a brutal burlesque of a military trial, Cardinals Hlond and Sapieha were denounced by a specially instructed witness as collaborators with the anti-Government underground.

Do not be surprised at the news, in the near future, that there have been other trumped-up charges against clergymen as "collaborators," "saboteurs," and "traitors." All this inevitably in the maniacal tradition of dictatorships.

Poland is but one country in Russia's overall plan for conquest of the world. But it is a key nation, for it symbolizes the essential treachery of the Red plan and its ruthless lack of conscience. Though occupied throughout World War II, Poland produced no quisling government. It was an Ally. Today it is invaded again and is actually paying reparations to Russia.

Russia will strike former friend or former foe without discrimination. France and Italy have but recently barely evaded Communist-inspired civil wars which would have been the signal for the Red army to plunge to the Atlantic with legions of troops and the most modern armor, to "defend the rights of the suppressed peoples."

Russia has lost these two recent battles, but they were only battles. Russia has not lost the war it is waging on the dignity and freedom of all democratic peoples any more than the loss of some of its western cities to Hitler in 1941–43 meant that it had lost World War II.

It will try again, soon and on many fronts.

It will do its utmost to defeat the Marshall plan, whose aim is to stabilize and raise the European standard of living—a condition which is an antidote against the Reds' program, based on misery and chaos.

Russia is content that nothing can stop the march toward domination—political, economic, and military—of the entire world. Stalin can die, but his successors, Zhdanov, Molotov, and others, will carry on.

There are countless trained men in many echelons behind these leaders, waiting to step forward and pursue the Red program. Tomorrow I shall tell you about that program.

Report on Un-American Activities in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following radio speech I made over the Columbia Broadcasting System network, January 7, 1948:

What to do about communism at home and abroad is one of the foremost questions facing the American people today. The Congress was recently called into special session in an effort to dike the floodtide of communism which threatens to sweep a great part of the world, a floodtide which we all know would destroy the very freedom of mankind. The surrender of a number of eastern European countries to Stalinism and the tottering of France and Italy provides stark realism of what is upon us.

We, in the United States, are not immune from the Communist cancer, for we have within our boundaries a small but highly organized, well disciplined, Moscow-directed conspiracy which operates under the misnomer of the "Communist Party of the United States." It is a conspiracy seeking to overthrow our Government, our American system of business, and, indeed, everything which we Americans hold dear and sacred. The question is, therefore, What are we going to do about this conspiracy? This is a most important question, and as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I would like to report to you for a few minutes this evening on what the Committee on Un-American Activities has done on this subject during the past year, and what it intends to do in the future.

First, I would like for you to know a little about the committee, how it is constituted and how it functions. It is one of the 19 standing committees of the House of Representatives. It is composed of nine members and it is our function to determine what legislation is needed to cope with subversive influences in the United States. In order to legislate, it is necessary that the Congress have the full facts on a subject. Thus we, like all committees of Congress, serve basically as a fact-finding body. Facts can only be determined by a thorough and diligent investigation and inquiry. Congressional committees, equipped with the historic and unchallenged prerogative of investigation, perform for the American people one of the most necessary and effective functions of our democratic form of government, for it is through these investigations that the spotlight is focused upon the corrupters, the subversives, the war frauders, and others who cannot stand its beam.

When I became chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities last January, we adopted an eight-point program. This program had as its objective the determination of the extent and character of subversive influences in the United States. We have worked diligently to carry out that program in order that we might avail ourselves of sufficient facts and information to determine what legislative action, if any, was necessary to protect the welfare of the United States against the un-American forces active here. In pursuing this program, we conducted many public hearings. We began by exposing Gerhart Eisler and revealed him as the No. 1 commintern agent directing the activities of the Communist Party here. He was thoroughly unmasked, his many aliases, his fraudulent passports, his tax evasions, and his perjured statements are no longer secrets. As a result of our exposure, Gerhart Eisler has been tried and convicted of passport fraud and for contempt of Congress, and is now facing a possible 6 years imprisonment and a $6,000 fine.

We likewise turned the spotlight on the activities of his brother, Hanns Eisler, who, like Gerhart, is an important cog in the world revolutionary program of Moscow. We showed how many high personages in and out of the Government had interceded in his behalf in an effort to secure for him a visa to legally reenter and remain in the United States, even though at the time he was illegally a resident here. Following our hearings, the Immigration and Naturalization Service issued a warrant for his arrest on deportation proceedings.

Communist Leon Josephson was exposed as a procurer of false passports for important Communists in the United States, and his refusal to be sworn and answer questions before our committee resulted in his conviction for contempt of Congress. He has been sentenced to serve 1 year in jail and pay $1,000 fine.

Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, was likewise convicted for contempt of Congress and sentenced to 1 year and $1,000 fine. During the course of the hearing on Dennis he, like, Gerhart Eisler, was shown to have traveled under false passports, used many aliases, and, in addition, had falsified his draft registration, and was a fugitive from justice of the State of California.

We held extensive hearings on the subject of Communist penetration into the labor movement. We had before us the best authorities on the subject of communism, including such experts as J. Edgar Hoover, William C. Bullitt, and many others, during a public hearing on two bills to outlaw the Communist Party. We also heard in public hearings a former Government official of the Soviet Union, who described to us the inner workings of the Soviet espionage system in the United States. We revealed to the public various "legal espionage" techniques being used by the Soviet Government here in America, such as their raid upon our Patent Office, in which they obtained hundreds of thousands of our military and industrial patents without giving us a single patent in return.

The committee has issued special reports on the American Youth for Democracy, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, and the Civil Rights Congress, in which we unanimously found these organizations to be Communist fronts. We likewise issued a special report entitled "The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power."

The voluminous files of our committee on "subversives" in the United States have been open to the Congress and to the intelligence agents of the Federal Government. To give you some idea as to the extent to which these files are used, during the past year 1,567 Federal agents came to our offices for information on un-American individuals and organizations.

In an effort to determine the extent of Communist influences in the important motion picture industry, we conducted hearings both in Los Angeles and in Washington. Over 40 witnesses were heard. By now, I think that most of you are familiar with the 10 Hollywood figures who refused to answer the question: "Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?" for which they were cited for contempt by the House of Representatives, and have been indicted by a Federal grand jury and are now awaiting trial.

You may also remember that the committee placed into evidence the date and number of the Communist registration cards of each of these 10 persons. This was supplemented by a detailed report of the Communist and Communist front affiliations over a period of years of most of these individuals. All of them occupied important high salaried positions as writers and directors in Hollywood. As a result of our hearings, the motion picture industry has fired these 10 persons, and has apparently set about to put its house in order, somewhat belatedly, however, I must say, but I wish to serve notice upon the motion picture industry and to advise the public that our investigation of Hollywood is far from over, and in the very near future the records of many more top salaried Hollywood figures will be spotlighted, and well they should, for it is sheer folly to permit the Communists and their fellow travelers to remain in strategic positions in such a powerful medium of propaganda, education and entertainment as the movies which draw over 85,000,000 spectators in the United States each week.

If any of you who listen tonight entertain any doubt as to the strength and influence of the Communists in the United States, you have only to reflect upon the elaborate campaign that was launched against our committee during the Hollywood hearings in an effort to destroy the investigation by any means. I am sorry to say that they were aided and abetted in this ill-fated but powerfully organized venture by certain prominent dupes and innocents in the motion picture industry. They did not succeed, however, and the recent action of the industry and certain recanting individuals in it, speaks louder than words as to the effectiveness of our hearings.

Now I would like to deal with our program for this year. As we all realize, we are rapidly approaching a shown-down with world communism, or the "totalitarian left" as I choose to call it, which is just as great a threat today as was the "totalitarian right" yesterday, exemplified by Nazism and Fascism.

What we do here on the home front to stop the spread of this cancerous growth will have an important effect in other parts of the world. With this in mind, as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I shall recommend the following program for the coming year:

1. Submit to the House as soon as practicable a series of bills designed to break up the Communist conspiracy in America. To expedite this, I have appointed a subcommittee, headed by my colleague Congressman RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, and I expect that they will begin hearings this month. They will wish to hear from the Attorney General and other Government officials and qualified experts, and, above all, from the people, as to the best means to legislate against the threatening forces of communism. Therefore the thoughts and opinions of the American citizen will be most welcome. We must bear in mind, however, that it is easy to say "Let's outlaw the Communist Party," but to effectively do it is another matter and we must be very cautious that in our actions we do not destroy or impair any of the rights and liberties which we hold so fundamental here in America.

2. Full public hearings on the activities of those in the United States who have organized themselves to spread antiracial and antireligious propaganda. These hearings, I propose, will be conducted by subcommittee which I have appointed, headed by my colleague Congressman JOHN MCDOWELL, of Pennsylvania, and should begin sometime this month.

3. Intensify the committee's present investigation of Communist influences in our educational institutions.

4. Public hearings by the full committee, beginning on March 1, on a number of Communist aliens who are illegally in the United States. Our committee has a complete record on these individuals and will demand their deportation.

5. That early in February hearings before the full committee on the extent of subversive influences seeking to exploit the Negro population of the United States be held. Early last year the committee appointed a Negro investigator to direct this inquiry. His report is now ready to be submitted to the committee and 30 witnesses have been scheduled to appear.

6. That public hearings should also be held on the Communist domination of strategic labor unions which are vital to the national defense of the United States.

7. I shall recommend that a conference be held, composed of delegates from each of the legislative branches of all of the governments of this hemisphere with the idea of working out a hemispheric unity of purpose in legislating against the further spread of communism in this hemisphere, and a mutual exchange of information on this subject between all countries of this hemisphere.

8. That the committee recommend legislation aimed at strengthening the authority of the Government in dealing with espionage activities, the need for which has been demonstrated by the activities of certain foreign agents exposed by the committee during the past year.

9. Resumption of the Hollywood disclosures.

10. That the committee staff prepare for public consumption reports on all Communist-front organizations operating in the United States.

11. That we continue to expose and ferret out those employees in the Federal Government who are identified with communism in the United States.

12. For 6 months the committee investigators have been exploring Communist influences in the field of atomic energy. This investigation is almost complete, and I shall recommend that the full facts be submitted to the Congress as soon as possible.

Let me assure you in closing that we will continue in the future as we have in the past to expose the subversives in America wherever they may be, for never before in the history of our Government has it been so essential that the Congress and the people be informed of the activities of those who seek to destroy our Government, whether they be on the totalitarian right or the totalitarian left.

Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the December 8, 1947, issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer on statehood for the Territory of Alaska entitled "The Fiftieth State":

THE FIFTIETH STATE

The Territory of Hawaii, as we have already emphatically asserted, should be admitted to the Union by act of Congress soon after it convenes in its next regular session in January.

Without any protracted delay, after that action is taken, Congress should make Alaska the fiftieth State.

Alaska needs to be a State of the Federal Union in order to realize its vast potentiality for development. But, more than that, this Nation needs Alaska as an integral part of its economy, its political constitution and its defensive strength.

There is no longer any valid reason for maintaining Alaska in the condition of a distant relative from whom it is convenient and profitable to take, but to whom we are too selfish to give. And there is real danger in further delay in admitting Alaska to the Union, for not until the people of Ohio and Michigan and New Mexico regard the people of Alaska as one with the people of the present 48 States will this Nation have the same zealous concern for Alaska's protection as it does for the States that happen to be in a geographic entity.

We most urgently suggest that the Members of Congress, and we want to address especially Ohio's Representatives in the Senate and the House, make it plain that they will give early and sympathetic consideration to the bill for Alaskan statehood. That bill is before the House Committee on Territories. The case for Alaskan statehood, and a powerful case it is, is on the record for every Member of Congress to see.

The bill that would make Alaska a State of the Union ought to be reported out of committee soon after the convention of the regular session of Congress, voted up by the House and passed along to the Senate for action before the session ends.

Alaska, as anyone who knows its people, is well aware, meets the decisive test for statehood, the test of devotion to democratic government. Alaska knows well how to conduct government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It has earned the right to carry on such government in the dignity of and with the prerequisites of statehood.

Only two arguments against statehood for Alaska have been advanced which, we believe, are at all stumbling blocks to the admission of that Territory to the Union.

One is that Alaska hasn't sufficient population (only 90,000) to be a State. As a matter of historic fact, Alaska now has more inhabitants than did 13 States when they were admitted. Moreover, inadequate, obsolete, discriminatory territorial laws, which would be supplanted under a modern State constitution, stand as the greatest obstacle to large, healthy, and steady increase in Alaska's population. Laws of property acquisition and title transfer like those in the present 48 States would alone be enough to result in rapid growth of Alaska's population.

The other major argument used by opponents of Alaskan statehood is that "Alaska is not yet developed enough." It is the set of conditions imposed on Alaska as a territory, a territory in which the people pay all Federal taxes but get little in return except the leavings from the congressional pork barrel that has prevented the development of Alaskan industry, the carefully regulated but not strait-jacketed development of its immense and varied natural resources and the development of its trade with a United States that now appears to Alaskans as an under-sized funnel with a pinched tube ending at Seattle.

Alaska's potentiality for development in the field of agriculture has been criminally neglected, while across the Bering Straits from this Territory vast sums are being poured by a Soviet Government into experimentation that is making Russian land, under climatic conditions similar to those in Alaska, productive land. This state of affairs can be ended only by giving Alaska statehood and devoting to its agriculture the same means and technics that are employed in the agriculturally productive States of the Union as now constituted.

There is no reason, save the unreasoning selfishness of a very few, why two stars should not soon be added to the flag of the United States.

The Real Truth About Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a newspaper clipping entitled "Bible News Flashes," which contains an advertisement on the liquor question that appeared in the Boise Democrat, of Boise, Idaho, more than 60 years ago.

I wish every American could read it in the light of what is going on in this country today.

The matter referred to follows:

THE REAL TRUTH ABOUT LIQUOR
(Transcript by Charles Chester, Topeka, Kans.)

In 1886 James Lawrence conducted a saloon in Boise, Idaho, which he named the "Naked Truth Saloon."

In the issue of February 24, 1886, of the Boise Democrat he ran an advertisement of which the following is a transcript:

"Friends and neighbors, having just opened a commodious shop for the sale of liquid fire, I embrace this opportunity of informing you that I have commenced the business of making drunkards, paupers, and beggars for the sober, industrious, and respectable portion of the community to support.

"I shall deal in family spirits which will incite men to deeds of riot, robbery, and bloodshed, and by so doing, diminish the comfort, augment the expenses and endanger the welfare of the community.

"I will, on short notice, for a small sum, and with great expectations, undertake to prepare victims for the asylums, poor farms, prisons and gallows.

"I will furnish an article that will increase accidents, multiply the number of distressing diseases, and render those who are harmless incurable.

"I will deal in drugs which will deprive some of life, many of reason, most of their property, and all of their peace; which will cause fathers to become fiends, and wives, widows, children to become orphans, and all mendicants.

"I will cause many of the rising generation to grow up in ignorance and prove a burden and a nuisance to the Nation. I will cause mothers to forget their offsprings, and cruelty to take the place of love.

"I will sometimes corrupt the ministers of religion; defile the purity of the church and cause temporal, spiritual, and eternal death; and if any be so impertinent as to ask me why I have the audacity to bring such accumulated misery upon the people, my honest reply is, 'money.' The spirit trade is lucrative and some professing Christians give their cheerful countenance.

"From the United States Government I have purchased the right to demolish the character, destroy the health, and shorten the lives and ruin the souls of those who choose to honor me with their custom.

"I pledge myself to do all that I have promised. Those who wish any of the evils above specified brought upon themselves or their dear friends, are requested to meet me at my bar where I will, for a few cents, furnish them with the certain means of doing so.

"THE NAKED TRUTH SALOON,
"JAMES LAWRENCE, *Proprietor*,
"BOISE, IDAHO."

On Deflating Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Dr. Norman Sweet, which appeared in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel on January 4, 1948:

ON DEFLATING PRICES

To the EDITOR:

Our cost of living has now reached its peak—66.1 percent above 1939 prewar standard-of-living cost. Now, my suggestive hints for deflation are to have CIO, A. F. of L., UMW heads get together with the United States Chamber of Commerce and AMA heads and all work together unselfishly for America to increase production of commodities on a deflated basis until we have an economic balance established.

This will do away with partisan politics upon our great economic stronghold in 1948 Presidential election.

Let us all become one people, united together—labor and capital, Democrats and Republicans—all 100 percent Americans for democracy. This will do more to show Russia that its scheme to break America's economic back is futile. I dare not hope we are scientifically intelligent, unselfish enough to do this great thing.

However, anyone reading these deflation hints knows we could effect this absolute victory without threat of a third world war and the stabilizing of the UN organization.

However, production must be colossal. No strikes; let wages remain at present levels until deflation standards are effected and be used to continue our high tax rate and additional tax for European economic assistance, which, with great production, can be met without endangering our own domestic economic situation. Stalin then will be given a second economic thrust from all the American people.

This can be done and should be done and at once. Will our boastful labor-union chiefs, business leaders, and political aspirants be big enough to do this? If not, they are too little to hold the top positions of power in America. No exceptions.

NORMAN SWEET.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARTER MANASCO
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by George E. Reedy:

The confused welter of comments and interpretations on the President's message to Congress has boiled down to just one point, Mr. Truman has put the Republican Party on a spot, and it's going to be a tough one to get out of.

The message is being studied from every angle by GOP experts in all fields of legislation. But basically they know that most of it can be disregarded. The thing that counts—and the only thing that counts—is his proposal to cut taxes.

Leading Republicans have already assailed it as a demagogic proposal, meant only to draw votes from the left. Whether they are right, however, is beside the point. It is definitely a program that will appeal to large masses of voters.

The philosophy of soaking the rich and giving to the poor has always been popular in America. The New Deal rode to power on such a program and managed to stay in office for practically 15 years. There's no getting away from it. It is liked.

Republicans have already produced figures to show that the President's proposal would give less tax relief than their own proposal. Furthermore, they are on record as twice trying to cut taxes during the last regular session of Congress.

The President is now in a strong strategic position. There is no doubt that the Republicans will pass their own tax bill. But Mr. Truman, on the basis of his message to Congress, can snap back with a strong veto.

He can point to his own proposal which would have cut taxes in the low brackets and plastered them on corporations. From a political standpoint this is an appeal that will be hard to resist or explain.

Of course, there are obvious inconsistencies in this whole approach. Mr. Truman asks that business be taxed even more heavily than it is now. At the same time he recommends that businessmen be encouraged to expand their production.

The two ideas cannot very well be said to go together. But the one sticks out of his message like an automobile headlight on a dark night. The other is lost in the shuffle and is not very apt to strike home in the minds of the average American.

Whatever else may be said, there can be no doubt that the President is getting very astute political advice these days. The tax proposal was worthy of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt in the days when he kept Congress in continual jitters.

To pass it is out of the question in a Republican-controlled Congress. Not to pass it is to give the President an opening for a bitter attack on his opponents. It should not be forgotten that in 1948 the President is also a candidate for office.

The Republicans have no choice except to hurl every conceivable argument at the proposal and hope they can convince the country that they are right. It is not a very pleasant prospect, but there is simply nothing else to do.

The effects of the President's message will not be immediately apparent. He has merely laid the groundwork for the battles that are to come later in the year. From the standpoint of political strategy it is a solid groundwork.

Of course, much can happen in the next few months. The changing tides of election-year controversy may alter the situation overnight. But no one can dodge the fact that the President has scored heavily in the opening round.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on January 3, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, it is my sincere wish that all of you in our most patriotic section of America enjoy a happier, more fortunate new year than you did in 1947.

For my part, I am glad we are turning over a new leaf. We can start fresh and forget about some of the mistakes during the months just ended.

Regardless of the doldrums we went through the recent past, the future must always look bright and promising. We must not have it any other way. To my way of thinking, 1948 will be a year of great issues and conquests on the domestic front, which, if won, will mean a grand, exotic life for the people of the United States.

Of course, to win these conquests, we must be prepared to exercise patience, fortitude, and charity instead of selfishness and greed.

The powerful and the prosperous must be satisfied to take less profit, if we are to be successful.

The rich and the consequential must be willing to divide up their material wealth among the hungry and the needy.

They must follow the direction of the Lord when he said to the rich young man, who wanted to follow him:

"Give up thy worldly treasures and render them to the poor."

The ambitious and the smart will reach their goals more speedily in 1948 if they consent to think of their fellow men before they take from the downtrodden.

We could arrive at the millennium within one short year if men were disposed to look upon their brothers with love and tolerance.

We could attain a paradise on earth if everyone, not just the few who now do, would carry out the principles of the Golden Rule.

Yes, our families, our friends, our neighbors, yes, even our enemies and ourselves would profit by putting into practice the simple exhortation, "Do unto others, as you would like to have them do unto you."

You and I cannot command the rest of the world to do these things, but we can appeal to them to follow the examples we might set. If we do our part, I believe the rest will come around.

There is no choice in today's world, but to do the best we know how. Nations are in distress, they are once again at each others' throats. We must try to keep the peace if it is humanly possible.

As for America, I believe we must work the hardest on her. I hate to see events at hand which promise to undermine and weaken the greatest Nation under the sun. I dread a continuance of the ruthlessness and selfish decorum I have seen all around me since the struggle for permanent peace began.

During the war, it seemed that nearly everybody thrust aside thought of self and rushed to preserve their country. I wish we could work half as hard today to preserve this land as we did then.

So I say that 1948 will see a battleground upon which the forces of greed will be challenged by those patriots who really want to save America.

If these patriots succeed in beating back our enemies, this form of government will prevail. We will continue to enjoy the highest standard of living on earth. We will keep on living safely with our neighbors and will honor them as they will honor us without thought of what race or religious group any of us belongs to.

If patriotism is triumphant over subversive elements, our citizens will not be torn by strife or civil conflict. They will be protected by the Bill of Rights and the Constitution which guarantee life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all.

We have the choice now to take the road to ruin or the path to glory. We cannot keep going, however, in the direction we have lately unless we meet with disaster.

In view of the seriousness of our present plight, the hunger and want which inflation will bring about, the dangers now evident to our domestic front because of high prices, I want to appeal here and now for united action to remedy the economic ills now besetting us.

Yes, 1948 will be a crucial year, but we can make it the best yet for this Nation. We can resolve to eliminate the dangers by stamping out all evil practices which a few are pursuing at the expense of the great majority.

As your representative, as one in whom you have had faith and confidence for many years, I feel it my duty to disclose to you my intentions for the new year. The following is a set of resolutions for 1948 which I expect to try to carry out to the best of my ability. I realize I will have plenty of opposition from a selfish and powerful few just as I always have had, but I promise you I will fight on, no matter how great the odds, to keep these resolutions.

Therefore, I do hereby resolve:

1. To continue my agitation in Congress for an immediate end to the terrific prices you are now being forced to pay for the necessities of life.

2. To use whatever influence and power are at my command to battle the greatest curse the American people are facing, namely, inflation.

3. To wage war against the hypocrites and the scoundrels who have flaunted and are still sabotaging my efforts in behalf of our veterans and their loved ones.

4. To keep on fighting for the older folks, now dependent upon somebody else, or upon public charity, so they can enjoy reasonable pensions and annuities in their declining years.

5. To continue the struggle for a national bonus for veterans of World War II in line with the loan guaranty in the GI bill of rights for which I voted.

6. To introduce at the earliest possible moment a bill providing for payment of pensions to veterans of World War I, who have for the past few years been shoved aside and not considered as they deserve to be.

7. To fight to protect the workers of the Triple Cities and America against exploitation whether it comes from employer or labor agitator.

8. To help the farmer preserve his family-size farm which has made America agriculture great and is feeding not only America but the whole world.

9. To do my utmost to save our Constitution, our country, and the people of the United States from the viciousness, deception, and odious designs of our enemies who would overthrow and demolish the Government of our great land.

What Are War Industries?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from the Honorable James Forrestal:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 6, 1948.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter of December 17, 1947.

War industries include those which produce small arms and ammunition, specific war chemicals and gases, magnesium, primary aluminum and alumina for the purpose of producing aluminum, radioactive materials, hydrogen peroxide above 50 percent in strength, and beryllium.

Those peaceful German industries which will be allowed to develop freely within the limits of resources available include furniture and woodwork; ceramics; bicycles; flat glass, bottle and domestic glass; and potash.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Cooperative Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, congressional committees are giving considerable attention to changes believed to be needed in Federal laws governing operations of cooperative associations. I have received many letters from people expressing opinions both pro and con on this matter which reflect serious thought and consideration.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following report by Mr. W. Bassett Orr, president, Bryan Feed & Seed Co., Inc., Bryan, Tex.:

SOME SIGNIFICANT CHANGES NEEDED IN FEDERAL LAWS GOVERNING OPERATIONS OF COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS

(By W. Bassett Orr, president, Bryan Feed & Seed Co., Inc., Bryan, Tex.)

As a preliminary statement I want it clearly understood that I am unalterably in favor of our democratic way of life, and I believe that free trade and free enterprise are necessary

basic factors in our social and economic life in the United States, if we are to continue as a democracy. I would not for one minute agree to the conditions of any measure that would preclude any group of citizens of this Nation, whether they be farmers or others, from associating themselves together voluntarily in an effort to improve their mutual social and economic conditions so long as the action of such an organized group is not assisted or accelerated by law or subsidy in achieving the desired goal at the expense of some other citizen or group of citizens.

It is my belief that any organized group of citizens engaged in carrying on any legitimate business should be chartered by the State or Federal Government, thereby entitling them to receive all the benefits provided by law and generally accorded to any other similar group or organization engaged in carrying on a like activity. I believe further that any organization receiving protection or benefits through a charter issued by the State or Federal Government should be required to assume the corresponding responsibilities and liabilities that are necessary and justifiably in keeping with the benefits and protections granted in the charter by the Government. Inasmuch as existing laws afford various kinds of protection and immunity to stockholders in business corporations, so should the Government provide the same protection to stockholders or members of any organized and chartered cooperative group. In return for these federally granted favors, cooperatives, as well as their individual members, should be required to bear certain responsibilities that are in keeping with the favors granted them. I am opposed, generally, to any measure or practice that results in the granting of special privileges by the Federal Government to any person or group of persons, if the same privileges cannot be granted to any or all other citizens.

Most States and the Government of the United States now have laws that provide for granting of charters to organized groups of farmers engaged in business activities pertinent to the production of new agricultural wealth in the form of the products they raise. Generally these laws were adequate and reasonable when they were passed, and in actual practice usually they imposed no inequities on other persons or organizations. The beneficiaries of these laws were real farmers who made their livelihood from the land and associated themselves together for the purposes of shipping, transporting, handling, and marketing their agricultural products, or for the purchasing of supplies necessary in the production of these agricultural products. Such cooperative associations transacted most of their business with members and all savings or profits earned through the efforts of the association itself were passed back to the individual members as dividends. These associations were properly known as nonprofit associations because actually they did not retain the profits in the association as such. Even after Federal income taxes became such a large cost factor in business generally, these farmer-owned nonprofit associations were granted Federal income-tax exemptions, because it was assumed that the individual members of such an association would show on their individual income-tax returns the savings or profits received from the association income and thus the profits from such organized business activities would make their proportionate contribution to Federal income taxes through the tax return of the individual farmers.

Along with the many changes and complications which have arisen in recent years in the business life of individuals and corporations, so have many changes arisen with respect to the objectives of cooperative associations and in their operating practices, as well as in the make-up of the membership itself. It is with respect to these changed conditions that the revision of the present laws governing cooperatives is desirable. An example of some of these changed conditions is seen in an effort to understand the complex definition that must be given to the term "farmer." A few years ago any sixth-grade school child could explain the meaning of the word "farmer," but now the term "farmer" in its broadest meaning has become so complicated and the occupation of farming has been so invaded by people from the professional fields that the term "farmer" now is almost undefinable. One generally accepted definition of a farmer would include a millionaire New York businessman who owns a farm in the heart of a Texas oil field, and who carries on his farming operations merely as a hobby. Under existing laws governing the operations of cooperatives this farmer is entitled to the benefits originally intended for persons who actually produce agricultural products through their own efforts and who depend on this production for their economic livelihood. Pioneers in the development of the cooperative movement and the laws that subsequently were passed to further the movement carefully provided that all cooperatives receiving benefits under State and Federal statutes should be owned and controlled by the farmers themselves. Under the present conditions it is not uncommon to find the directorate of a chartered cooperative association comprised of such professional people as doctors, merchants, bankers, and even employees of State or Federal Governments. Oftentimes such professional people own farms on which they "lose" a considerable portion of their incomes in the form of operating expenses. They thus avoid the payment of income taxes justly due the Government. These professional people are not the only owners of rural property who have taken advantage of privileges granted under cooperative laws to avoid the just payment of income taxes. The theory that the payment of income taxes on profits realized through a cooperative is double taxation, when such income items are reflected again in the farmer member's personal income tax returns, loses much of its persuasiveness when one realizes that in recent years actual farmers have become expert at keeping their farm accounts in such a manner as to show as repairs or operating expenses many items of cost that in fact represent capital investments in permanent improvements. These conditions arise because of loopholes in existing laws, and represent losses in tax revenue to the Government and in turn result in increasing unfairly the tax burden on other citizens who may not be in a position to take advantage of such evasions. Such inequities should be corrected through revision of those laws governing the operations of farmer cooperative associations.

Many of the great leaders in the development of the cooperative movement in America saw in it the vehicle to be used in successfully combating the development of great monopolistic organizations. It was not expected that farmer cooperatives themselves might combine and themselves be guilty of becoming monopolistic in their operations. Yet, today, some of our largest monopolies operate under the powers granted by the Federal Government to cooperative associations. Oftentimes in such cases the operations of these giant organizations are so far removed from the individual farmer member that he has little or no real or personal interest in them.

These large cooperatives usually are run by a paid manager who, theoretically at least, takes orders on matters of policy from a board of directors. In practice, the professional manager often becomes a dictator in his own right and exercises the utmost control over the directors and ultimately the members. Usually these managers are well educated and well trained in business methods and are clever, capable, ambitious men who covet a successful name for themselves, and naturally desire to increase the reward from their efforts. It is to their best interests to enlarge the associations' operations and to expand its physical properties. Our present cooperative laws provide a splendid opportunity for this sort of growth and development by permitting a cooperative to issue, for all practical purposes, an unlimited amount of preferred stock as dividends to its members in lieu of cash dividends. This practice enables the cooperative association to retain in the business its earnings to be used for capital expenditures or other purposes and at the same time receive exemption from the payment of Federal income taxes on these earnings. This practice might not be so inequitable except for the fact that individual members of the association who receive these preferred stock dividends are not required to list such dividends on their personal income-tax returns. This is due to the fact that preferred stock of cooperative associations is merely a promise to pay at some unspecified time a certain amount of money, if and when the association is financially able to do so and provided further that the board of directors in their discretion decide that such payment shall be made. It is not difficult to understand that preferred stock of a cooperative that issues an unlimited amount of stock certificates without any regard to the true value of the stock and with no examination by the Securities Exchange Commission or even the stockholders themselves, usually is worthless paper, and should not be considered as income in the personal income-tax return of the holder of such stock. By the same reasoning, however, it is difficult to see the justice in permitting a cooperative association to retain in its treasury its earnings, income tax free, under the guise that it has been paid back to its members in the form of preferred stock.

In summary, let me emphasize that there is a need for the revision of our State and Federal laws governing cooperative association to the end that:

The language and phraseology of laws governing cooperative associations be changed so as to no longer require that members and directors of cooperatives be farmers but that any person meeting the full requirements for citizenship in the United States be eligible to membership in a cooperative and permitted to serve as a director when duly elected by the members.

The Congress of the United States should take the initiative in designating a term such as "profits," "savings," or some other suitable one, that for the purpose of fixing income-tax assessments under Federal laws shall represent the difference between income and expenses of a cooperative association.

The Congress of the United States should enact laws that require cooperative associations operating under a charter granted by the Government to pay the same taxes as are exacted from any other person, firm, or corporation engaged in a like or similar business activity.

Cooperative associations operating under a charter granted by State or Federal Government and issuing preferred stock as dividends in lieu of monetary returns should be limited in the amount of preferred stock issued to an amount in keeping with a fixed ratio of such stock to the net worth of the cooperative, and the practice of such cooperative associations with respect to issuance of preferred stock should be subject to review by the Securities and Exchange Commission, or the directors of the cooperative association should be required by law to make a report to the United States Treasury annually setting forth the names of the recipients of preferred stock and the respective amounts of stock issued. The Federal Government should amend the present income tax laws so that it becomes mandatory that anyone receiving preferred stock dividends from a cooperative association whose operations provide for its issuing an unlimited amount of stock and not subject to review by the Securities and Exchange Commission shall list for income tax purposes such preferred stock certificates as income on their personal income tax returns.

Federal laws should be enacted that will provide for the Attorney General or some other proper Federal agency to investigate charges of monopolistic tendencies and practices on the part of cooperative associations and to provide suitable penalties for violation of antitrust laws, in case such penalties are not already provided for in existing statutes to the end that monopolies among cooperatives shall be dealt with and assessed penalties on the same basis as any other monopolistic organization that violates the laws of the land.

These statements outline the most significant changes that are needed at this time in the laws governing cooperative associations in order to correct the inequities now receiving so much attention from cooperative groups and those opposed to cooperatives and the public in general.

The Work of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, as the New Year begins and the second session of the Eightieth Congress convenes Members of Congress would do well to scrutinize with care the work of the first session and appraise its accomplishments. Reading editorials in newspapers and magazines gives us a very fair picture of the view taken of our work by the country as a whole; and in this connection, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a fine editorial entitled "The Work of Congress" that appeared in the January 2, 1948, issue of the Ottumwa (Iowa) Daily Courier:

THE WORK OF CONGRESS

Political party policy is established in two ways—by the platform adopted by the quadriennial national convention and during the intervals between conventions by the records of the party's elected public officials.

Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee, points this out in a letter today to 17,500 party officials and leaders throughout the country.

Probably the most important single factor in the determination of Republican success or failure this year will be the record of the Republican Congress.

That Congress made a brilliant record during its first session which convened a year ago. It kept every promise its Members made to the people during the 1946 campaign with the exception of a reduction in withholding and other income taxes. It was prevented from keeping its promise of tax relief by an unprecedented use of the Presidential veto power.

During the special session recently ended, despite handicaps imposed when domestic politics was injected into the European relief emergency, the Republican Congress made a record equally satisfactory to the American people.

There is no reason to doubt that the record of this Congress during its second regular session, which convenes January 6, will be in harmony with that established during the first regular and special sessions.

Members of the Republican majorities in the Senate and House have proved that they are fully aware of the responsibilities imposed on them by the fact that they control the most powerful legislative body in the world.

California Antisegregation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Congress, it gives me pleasure to present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by Mr. Eugene Nogueras, publisher, El Sol, a Spanish-language weekly printed in San Bernardino, Calif. This editorial received national recognition and award by the Common Council for American Unity. It follows:

With the signing of the antisegregation bill, Gov. Earl Warren has let the rest of the Nation know—especially those States where an FEPC is not operating—that public schools are truly public schools and not centers for the exclusive use of this or that group of citizens.

The act of the government as symbolized by Governor Warren brings to light the fact that something had to be done to correct constitutional abuses to citizens and residents that in the past, and up to this very moment, were and are segregated by reason of their nationality or their country of birth. The fact is that in our so-called civilized State the Mexican-American children are sent to special schools in their own neighborhoods commonly designated as "Mexican schools." How stupid to refer to a public school in California as a "Mexican school" when it should be of common knowledge that Mexican schools are functioning in Mexico.

The acceptance by Governor Warren of legislation concerning this vital problem indicates that the so-called dominant group have at last come to understand that the correct way of learning to live in a truly democratic society is by demonstrating to our children—our youth—that the act of being born is a mere incident, not punishable by the degradation of one citizen as against another. It is in the schools where customs and social habits are formed. It is in such places in civilized nations where one should start learning to respect the dignity of man. Perhaps when the future society accepts the desired ways in a nonsegregated school it shall understand that, also, in the social and the economic aspects men shall be appreciated by their moral, social, and intellectual contributions to that society and not as of today by appearances, that is the bark, the epidermis.

If my brother is unworthy and sins against society, my brother should be punished according to his acts, but if my brother is a decent individual, a respected and respectable citizen, it is criminal to abuse him because he is my brother and not a member of the privileged class that believes itself endowed with the power to direct and dominate our lives. He who punishes another man only because he believes that he has been differently conceived is a fool that has not learned that man is born not of his own choosing.

Governor Warren has only commenced to draw the first lines of the beautiful picture of true democracy with the signing of the bill that will eliminate segregated schools in California. May his example be emulated by other States of the Union where still is being practiced the archaic system of castes in our public schools.

Why Not European Bonds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there are always those who are willing to help others but not with their own resources. This is especially true of those who would give away America. However, one's test of charity is giving of his own resources which could be accomplished by the private purchase of bonds. The matter is most timely, and I want to include the following very fine editorial of Spencer Canary, editor, Sentinel-Tribune, Bowling Green, Ohio:

WHY NOT EUROPEAN BONDS?

If Congress finds it economically unwise for the United States to adopt President Truman's plea of financing the Marshall plan for aiding Europe to recover, it might consider letting these countries issue long-time bonds, whose ultimate payment would be guaranteed by the United States.

The President suggests a 4-year program involving an expenditure of $17,000,000,000. The details are so many that it is estimated it would take 2 hours to deliver it at an ordinary speaking rate; and, of course, it will take many more hours for Congress to study and digest it. Congress is likely to refuse to commit America to 4 years of definite appropriations, for its first duty is to our people who elect members as our representatives. What they decide after the first of the year will bind all Americans who live during the period adopted; and their decision will affect future generations.

There are three reasons for our helping to rehabilitate war-torn Europe. These are peace, humanity, and future commercial trade. The first will have the most influence on judgments. If fair prosperity may be restored in Europe, war is less likely to occur; and those countries are certain to be moral forces in denouncing it; and, if it should be forced by Russia, they would be our allies instead of the Soviet's.

The call of humanity is always strong in the American breast and will be a factor.

To restore these countries to self-sufficiency would stimulate world trade. For Americans who export and their employees this prospect will be a stimulating influence for the present; but the specter of competition from these nations, when they shall have recovered, will dampen enthusiasm.

But for our people as a whole it is probable they would consider an investment of seventeen billion as a guarantee against war a reasonable premium to pay for insurance. However, Marshall himself and other leaders do not think his plan would be such insurance. They only think it would likely so to be. But it still would be a gamble.

One of the biggest needs of these countries is American dollars. If they were allowed to float low-interest rate bonds in America partly guaranteed by our Government, in order to get dollars, many Americans would buy them. Any sale of such should be limited

as to the amount to be bought by any single individual so as to spread their purchase over the country, and they should be nonnegotiable for a few years except in case of death so that they might not become a target for speculation and tie up funds needed for our own expansion of industry. It is probable that Americans, swayed by various considerations, would be ready to take their chances on ultimately getting all their money back, if the Government guaranteed half of it.

If you thought you could buy world peace and at the same time help humanity, you would chance losing half of $50 or $100 or much larger amounts, wouldn't you? To raise 17 billions by our 142,000,000 people would take an average of about $120 each or $600 per family.

The issue of such bonds should be limited for each country on the basis of a reasonable expectation that they would be paid by each country issuing them. This reasonable expectation should be a little more liberal than the directors of the International Bank fund are now willing to act upon, for taking a chance of repayment is an essence of the proposal.

However, a country would be less likely to repudiate its bonds of many issues than to try to twist out of paying Uncle Sam a big lump sum.

The bonds should be issued from year to year for the 4 years and a promise to pay through a series of years be made, just as municipal bonds are. They should not all fall due on the same date, as such payments in a lump might cripple a government in the future.

Of course, the United States would have to guard against counterfeiting or issues in excess of the amounts authorized by Congress. This probably would necessitate our Government endorsing and affixing its seal on each bond.

Flotation of the bonds could be through all banks with a small charge for doing so and without compulsion to handle them.

To Promote the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, friend and foe alike of the European recovery program, as well as the still open-minded, though for differing reasons, have hailed the decision of the administration not to insist that this Congress take the obviously improper step of attempting, futile gesture though it might be, to bind future Congresses to expend a specific amount in dollars over a 4-year period. Such a course would lead almost inevitably to misunderstanding at home and abroad, accompanied by charges of misrepresentation from both quarters. That there is now unanimity in this respect is confirmation of the statements of those who counsel careful study and thoughtful consideration of the devious ramifications of this many-sided problem.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, in an article which, under leave to extend my remarks, is set forth below, has called attention to another decision which should be made before we proceed further. Upon the identity of the top personnel selected to administer foreign aid may depend the decision of some Members whether to support or reject the measure. It is more than a mere detail. It is basic and fundamental. A wise decision on this issue may spell victory or defeat for the entire program. It is altogether fitting, therefore, that we know in advance as much as possible on this important phase of the problem before we are called upon to make a final decision.

Since the program was first proposed I have urged the impropriety, indeed probable illegality, of any attempt to usurp the functions of the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses. I have also favored the general principles of the Herter bill, and share emphatically the views of its author, my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, that a separate bipartisan agency should not only administer any future programs of overseas assistance, but also should take over at an early date the implementation of our already extensive commitments.

Also, I shall continue to press for the enactment of legislation to require the disclosure by our Government of the identity of each national of recipient countries known to have property or assets in the United States, together with the character, location, and value, if determinable, of such property or assets, to the end that satisfactory arrangements may be made to guarantee that such assets be held by the United States as security against any loans or credits made by this country to the nations to which these foreign nationals owe allegiance.

Upon the outcome of these and like controversial features will, in considerable measure, depend the extent of support accorded to the program itself.

Mr. Lippmann's valuable contribution to our deliberations follows:

TO PROMOTE THE MARSHALL PLAN
(By Walter Lippmann)

The agreement between Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. Lovett to delete the total figure of 17 billions is the first of several practical steps that need to be taken before the Marshall plan will be ready for general debate in Congress. It was a necessary first step. For there was no point in asking Congress to accept a figure which is at best only an educated guess as to what may be needed for a period of more than 4 years.

The naming of the figure in the authorization bill would not have meant that Congress was committed to appropriate that sum, and no European government would have been justified in regarding the figure as an American commitment which it could count upon and take for granted in its calculations. But the American public and the European public would have been misled; they would not have understood easily why Congress named the definite figure 17 billions in a law if that huge sum of money was not in fact promised and made available.

A second step which might now be taken is the negotiation of an agreement on the agency which is to administer the European recovery program. In fact, there is much to be said for separating the bill which creates the agency from the bill which contains the authorization of money and defines the standards which are to govern the use of it. If this were done, the bill for the agency could be reported to Congress and passed before the debates on the program itself began.

There are many practical advantages in this procedure. The greatest perhaps is that Congress and the people would know quickly who was actually going to handle the money and the whole complicated operation. If they have confidence in the men who are to operate the program, they will have much greater confidence in the figures.

For these men, selected by agreement among the leaders of Congress and the administration, will have to be men of eminence and experience. The fact that these men, who will be bearing the responsibility, vouch for the figures will be a better test of the soundness of the figures than any amount of prolonged, abstruse, and abstract statistical calculation. Most of the Congressmen who have to vote will be in the position of a man who wishes to invest his savings prudently and profitably. In deciding where to invest he cannot really make up his mind by studying the financial prospectuses. He makes up his mind by looking at the names and records of the directors and managers of the corporation.

Moreover, in this way an agreement on the agency should be easier to reach. There are some abstract differences in principle between the State Department plan, the Herter plan, the Bureau of the Budget plan, and one or two other plans that will be proposed. But there is no point in debating these differences in the abstract, no point in getting into a wrangle about the blueprints of the organization. Once there is the basic agreement on the men who are to administer the business, the heat will go out of the argument about principles. The men will obviously have to be men who are trusted by the President, by Secretary Marshall, and by Congress. It will be these men, not the blueprints of organization, who will see to it that the program is consistent with our foreign policy and with the intent of Congress.

By giving priority to the agency the congressional committees will be doing what Congress, in its vote for the interim-aid bill, has already suggested. Section 14 of that law says that "the functions, applicable records, and funds provided for the purpose of carrying out this act shall be transferred to the administration of any organization for general foreign aid which Congress may provide."

The interim-aid bill provided funds which were to be used up by March 31. No one thought when that bill was passed, and few think now, that the general foreign-aid program will have been adopted and the funds appropriated by March 31.

Therefore, it is a fair conclusion that Congress contemplated the creation of a new administrative organization for foreign aid early in this session.

There are other advantages to be gained by creating that agency first, and as soon as agreement can be reached on the form of organization and the men who are to be appointed. One is that Congress can then demonstrate concretely its general approval of the idea, and yet not commit itself to the substance of the program until it has had a full opportunity to debate it. This will have a salutary effect in Europe at a time when the strain of the winter and the tensions created by the debates here will be serious.

The enactment of a short bill and the naming of the men will prove at once not only in London, Paris, and Rome, but in Moscow, Prague, and Warsaw that Congress, while it means to deliberate and is no rubber stamp for the administration, does in fact mean business.

Stalin will understand it. For Stalin, we may recall, refused to believe that the British and Americans really meant to invade the continent until Roosevelt and Churchill had appointed a supreme commander.' If in a few weeks' time Congress creates the agency for the Marshall plan, everyone will understand that there is going to be a Marshall plan, however much delay there may be over the details of the program.

Another great advantage to be gained is that the European countries will have no further reason for delay in creating a European organization to police the commitments they made at Paris. The Marshall plan requires European cooperation, and no more time should be lost in organizing that cooperation. The European countries by acting together while Congress is discussing the program will be showing that the program is in fact what it professes to be.

Our people will be much more disposed to contribute the large sums which the plan calls for if they are convinced that they are contributing to the unification of Europe. They will not take kindly to this whole project if they are left with the impression that all there is to the plan is 16 separate shopping lists put together in one envelope.

Therefore, it is imperative that the European countries, led by Britain and France, act as soon as possible to prove that they are in fact cooperating. They will have no excuse for not acting promptly if Congress adopts quickly a law to create the American agency.

Bill Introduced To Give Reserve Components of the Armed Forces the Same Privileges as Regular Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which if passed by the Congress will, I think, do much to help preserve our country and its democratic institutions. Twelve million young men were actively engaged in the last war. Each one of them was trained to do one or more jobs as a part of a fighting unit. The Government of the United States expended much time and tremendous sums of money in training them. Many of those 12,000,000 men were in combat with the enemy. Those who survived gained an experience that is an invaluable one—one which cannot be bought nor taught.

Now that the ambitions and true intentions of the leaders of the Soviet Union and the Communist governments have been unmasked for all the world to see, we know that they constitute a threat to the United States and the peace of the world. Prudence demands we prepare to defend ourselves militarily as well as politically. In view of that fact is it not logical that we should avail ourselves of the experience and training of those 12,000,000 veterans who comprised our defense in the recent world war? An attempt to utilize them has been made through the various Reserve programs. However, none of those Reserve programs has thus far been successful, and the principal obstacle has been this: Veterans in the Reserve who went on training for less than 30 days were not granted the protection in event of injury that has been given to enlisted and officer personnel of the Regular Army, Navy, Air Forces, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. Airplanes, machine guns, grenades, and all weapons of warfare are dangerous instrumentalities. They maim and kill just as easily whether Congress has declared war or not. Consequently most of the veterans have been reluctant to join Reserve organizations and subject themselves to the hazards of training without adequate protection for either themselves or their families.

To overcome this obstacle I have introduced this bill which provides in substance that all officer and enlisted personnel of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Forces, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the National Guard, who might suffer death or disability in line of duty from an injury received while performing active-duty training, with or without pay, shall be entitled to receive the same benefits, compensations, retirement pay, and commissary and post-exchange privileges as are now provided for Regular officers and enlisted men of the armed services.

There is much talk in the Congress about the universal military-training bill. It has been estimated that if it becomes law it will cost the Government over $2,000,000,000 annually and take 14 months to organize and get under way. Thereafter, it will take considerable time to train the new men in the ways of warfare. Universal military training is therefore still a long way away.

In my opinion, it is the height of folly to waste the great reservoir of experience and training which we now have at hand in the form of veterans of World Wars I and II. It is a case of "not seeing the forest because of the trees." Undoubtedly, in the event of conflict it would be these veterans who would be the instructors and leaders of the young men proposed to be trained under the universal military-training program. Should not then all veterans be given every encouragement to immediately join up in the various Reserve organizations of the branches of our armed forces? This bill, I think, will go a long way in providing that inducement for them and thereby immediately strengthen our national defense at minimum expense. It is my hope that the Members of Congress who talk so much about national defense will join in pushing this bill through the Congress.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. McGARVEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, if President Truman can fulfill all the campaign promises made in his state of the Union address and still balance the budget—and it is incredible that he would propose a program without believing that it could be made effective—Congress should adjourn immediately after passing a resolution vesting the President with all legislative and administrative powers and go home to campaign for the 1948 elections. A great deal of time and hard work will be needed to defeat the man who can accomplish the things which Mr. Truman evidently thinks can be done without plunging the Nation into bankruptcy.

The Role of Government in Management-Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the opening address which I delivered at the round-table discussion on the subject The Role of Government in Management-Labor Relations, at the session of the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., December 29, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN MANAGEMENT-LABOR RELATIONS

(The opening address delivered by Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, Democrat, of Utah, at the round-table discussion on the subject The Role of Government in Management-Labor Relations at the session of the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., December 29, 1947 at 2 p. m. Those participating in the round table with Senator THOMAS were Miss Frances Perkins, member of the United States Civil Service Commission; Senator JOSEPH H. BALL, Republican, of Minnesota; Mr. Cyrus Ching, Director of Conciliation of the United States Conciliation Service; Dr. Paul F. Douglas, professor of political science of the University of Chicago; and Dr. Dexter Keezer. Dr. William M. Leiserson, former member of the National Labor Relations Board, acted as chairman.)

I have no desire to continue the months of debate that we passed through in the last few years, at this Round Table. My aim is merely to present the fundamentals behind the stand I have taken in those debates.

A guaranty of labor technique or management technique in law will not make for industrial peace. The acme of decent industry-labor relations in the United States, and the one on which all industry-labor relations should rest, came out of the pledge agreed upon unanimously by both labor and management at the Industry-Labor Conference held in Washington in 1941. Those representatives pledged:

1. There shall be no strikes or lock-outs.
2. All disputes shall be settled by peaceful means.
3. The President shall set up a proper board to handle disputes.

We fell from this high plane of achievement through congressional action, by (1) the Smith-Connally Act; (2) the Portal-to-Portal-Pay Act; and (3) the Taft-Hartley Act. Also, it should never be forgotten that even before the above-mentioned agreement was reached, the industry-labor conference was attacked on the floor of the Senate. While the attack was partisan, it was, nevertheless, encouraged by those elements in our country who do not want to see industry-labor

peace. The President was charged with having no authority for calling the conference. Then too, no sooner was the War Labor Board set up and started functioning than its decisions, following the good American habit, became precedents for other decisions and argument on the basis of standing on decisions turned the War Labor Board into an institution of law.

My conception of the meaning of liberty in our industry-labor relations may seem very trite. But to me there can be no liberty without respect for others. There can be no freedom without respect for the public welfare. There are no rights unless those rights are linked with duties and responsibilities. No better definition can be given for liberty and for freedom, in a political sense or in a labor-management sense, than the one expressed so often by Jefferson—that one can be free to do only so long as that which he does does not interfere with another. There are no absolutes in freedom.

We have had about 50 years in the development of the freeman in industry under Supreme Court definition and the expansion of legal rights in the growth and development of those definitions. Before that time man's right to seek freedom through organization was interpreted in law as conspiracy. It was in a Utah case where man's freedom in the modern industrial sense had its start. There had been a great disaster in one of our coal mines and scores of men lost their lives. This made our people thoughtful about conditions under which those men worked. The whole country had passed through troubles of the depression of the nineties, the labor troubles incident to that depression, and the political reactions to both. At that time there dawned in the minds of certain men that tired miners, overworked miners, were a menace to their fellows, and, therefore, to society. The 8-hour law in the mines was the result.

However, there was the sordid aspect to this great reform. The workingman was charged with advantage taking and the industry was charged with attempting to exploit and overwork laborers. But the idealist accepted the thesis I have advanced, and when the law was challenged in the courts the opposers to the law also took the idealistic approach. Suit was brought in the name of one of the miners who said he had a right to work as long as he wanted to work, that depriving him of working 12 hours a day was a destruction of his liberty and an infringement of freedom of contract. Strange as it may seem, but nevertheless it was true, and it occurred a few months before Mr. Dooley made his profound pronouncement that he did not know whether the Constitution followed the flag or not, but he was sure the Supreme Court followed the election returns. The Court denied that there was any freedom for the employee because it said the "proprietors lay down the rules and the laborers are practically constrained to obey them." (*Holden* v. *Hardy* (169 U. S. 366, 397).)

This case is important in at least three ways. First, the State stepped in showing a public interest. Second, the court denied that there was any freedom for the worker under the condition he had to work because the employer prescribed the condition and he had to submit. Therefore, there was no freedom of contract because the employer had the absolute right to hire and fire. And third, it showed definitely that if the individual employee was to enjoy any freedom he must gain it alining himself with other employees in the seeking, by united action, of a right for all to work at the pleasure of all as expressed by the majority of the group.

Note how a later interpreter of our law in the Supreme Court followed this reasoning. In sustaining the constitutionality of the National Labor Relations Act, the Supreme Court said, "a single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer; * * * that union was essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on an equality with their employer." (*National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones and Laughlin Steel Corporation* (301 U. S. 1, 33).) Thus, as a new freedom was born through the act of the Utah Legislature and the decision of the Supreme Court just before the turn of the century, so it was confirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States in the middle of the last decade and the theory of liberty in industry-labor relations, as then defined, had its birth. The Supreme Court sustained the new theory of collective bargaining and for 10 years it became the recognized practice of our land.

Another development had taken place. Federal rights in the field of labor had become recognized and the old dictum that manufacturing, mining, and agriculture were of purely local concern ceased to hold. A definition of the public's welfare today in our industry-labor relations is as broad as our Constitution itself. Industry and labor as they affect commerce in the United States must seek their rights under the theory that those rights are of common or national concern.

The theory accepted in the Utah case, that, for the good of the State, the hours of miners' work per day could be limited, has expanded into the theory of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Upon three decisions of the Supreme Court, the one dealing with the Utah case, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Wages and Hours Act, the law of the last 10 years has rested.

The constant agitation on the part of those who have fought labor on the score that labor organizations denied men their freedom of action are using freedom only as a cloak to cover their attempts to destroy freedom and liberty for the working men and women of America. There were attempts to extend the Selective Service Act to force labor to work against its will. There were attempts to use service in the Army for punitive purposes. There were attempts to force the laborer to stay on the job, work where he was told to work. And there were attempts to draft certain fields of labor. But all of these failed, failed primarily because the American people in their judgment and in their thinking saw that, while the State had the inherent right to call men to service in the defense of their country, a right which was developed in law from a mathematical theory that the whole is greater than any of its parts, the State must maintain proper limitations on that right. Therefore, this theory should not be made to apply and the State restrained itself from becoming completely totalitarian and refused to move into the fields of industry and labor.

In the development of freedom and liberty for the laborer, the state built its theory upon the political concept that the majority shall rule. It turned its back upon the notion that liberty and freedom are absolute. The rights of the minority are maintained by a concept of common consent and a recognition of the notion that the minority must be protected. Thus, politically speaking, the genius of the American Government rests not so much upon the fact that the majority rule, as it does upon the fact that the minority shall be respected. The minority maintains its respect, its right, and its freedom by recognizing the right of the majority rather than eternally contesting it. Thus industry and labor both have liberty and freedom only so far as they are willing to submit to the will of the majority in the protection of and the working out of that liberty and freedom.

To assume that there is such a thing as an absolute right to strike would likely destroy all decent relationships between employees and industry, and probably would result in the destruction of the basic elements which hold society itself together. No law can provide any right at all unless it is linked up with certain duties and responsibilities.

American democracy, American freedom, and American liberty all center in a single concept—individualism with a social conscience and a sense of responsibility. When American democracy works and reaches its conclusions, it is understood by all that that which is done is done by common consent for the public good.

My concern is that by the whittling away of certain broad rights gained and principles laid down labor will lose its fundamental freedom and liberty. That, to me, is the evil behind one of the last Supreme Court decisions (*James F. Morris* v. *Wm. R. McComb*, No. 7, October 1947), the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, and the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, the passage of the portal-to-portal amendments. Labor's losses cannot be estimated at this time because a whittling of any foundation stone is not apparent at first, but let that which has been started in the last 2 years continue, and the great gains made for labor in the last 10 years will be nullified. I do not want to be accused of striking at the motives of anyone. Excesses and abuses generally follow in the wake of any new governmental habit. But those excesses and abuses should be corrected in such a way that the correction shall not retard or break down the liberties and freedoms gained.

Altgeld Centenary Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on December 30, 1947, there was held in the city of Chicago a memorial meeting of representative citizens honoring the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Peter Altgeld, one of the most forward-looking and progressive Governor Illinois or any other State of the Union has produced. A very memorable and extraordinarily illuminating address was delivered on that occasion by His Eminence Samuel Cardinal Stritch, of Chicago. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Archbishop Spalding, at the Altgeld memorial meeting, held on April 20, 1902, said: "In assembling to honor the memory of Governor Altgeld, to profess our faith in his personal worth, and to value what he has said and done, we honor ourselves, for there is no better proof of noble nature than appreciativeness of noble men." This evening we are gathered publicly to pay tribute to the name of Altgeld, because we are convinced that the struggle for what is right and good, even though success is not apparent, is the way of genuine progress. We honor those who labor and suffer for justice's sake, who are strong enough unselfishly to strive to make our democracy more and more real, because there is in us the conviction that man is capable of achieving what is noble and good and is not hopelessly enchained by passion and pride and the weakness of shameful compromise. The defeatist who has no faith in the best that is in man, the trafficker in human weaknesses, the exploiter who plunders his fellowmen for ugly greed—such men would not be comfortable at this gathering. We are idealists, who dare to dream dreams of a better day, and we are sturdy realists who are willing to try to make these dreams come true. If we admire the noble in Altgeld, it is because we love the noble and are brave enough to seek it. Altgeld is not a museum piece from the pages of our history; his spirit calls to us and lives in us.

The man that we honor tonight was in everything, above all else, a true American. Born in Europe, he came here as a boy and from boyhood loved with an almost romantic love our sublime political ideals. He had very little formal education. The university in which he learned and grew was American life, with its hopes and its constant pioneering to expand western culture. A farmer boy, a soldier, a lawyer, a successful businessman, and a public servant, he was never a scholar, but his keen direct mind did cull from his opportunities and experience wisdom, the wisdom which creates personal greatness. Our country was growing and expanding in his times. The pioneer was not engaged so much in taming the wilderness as in trying to make democracy work as it grew. Altgeld did not have the paralyzing illusion that with the ratification of the Constitution, American ideals suddenly became a full reality. He understood that genuine democracy is a living thing, which constantly must struggle in changing environments and grow and expand. As changes come in our society, there come problems, which must be faced and solved in the light of our fundamental democratic principles. At such times there always will be some who will try in narrowness of mind to lead us away from our fundamental principles and some who will try to interpret them for selfish or group advantages and not for the common good. The hardest thing in our democracy is to plumb its depths and discover how to fit into it a right solution of problems which come with changes in society. It may be said that Altgeld's memory is cherished and honored because he was able to see in the sound principles of genuine democracy a real solution for the problems of his generation.

It was his lot to live at a time when our industry was still in the pioneering stage. Strong men were building our great factories, our businesses, and our system of transportation. Cities were growing. Our population was increasing, particularly by the addition of waves of immigrants, who had come to our shores to find happiness in our free institutions. New problems of human relations in our democracy had appeared. Everybody wanted to solve these problems in an American way. Unfortunately, there was the danger of an industrial feudalism. Some insisted so strongly on the inviolability of the individual, imbedded in our fundamental law, that public good in their minds was identified with an economic condition in which there would be barons and serfs. This was not a deliberate thought in them, but something which grew out of the confusion which had come in trying to Americanize large industry. Others there were who in sheer ignorance of our tradition saw a solution of the problem in the importation of Marxian and revolutionary doctrines. There were contradictions in the minds of many, which endangered the very preservation of our political ideals. The great masses of people longed only to be American freemen. They needed a voice, a voice which would tell them at once the danger of feudalism and the sorry aberrations of un-American revolutionaries. This voice had to point out that safe within our Constitution there was a right way of solving the problems and enriching our political inheritance. Altgeld was that voice. Despite the bitter accusations heaped on him by some of his contemporaries, he had no sympathy with the revolutionaries. He was distinctly a figure in the American culture. He envisioned harmony in our economic life, in which all would remember the high social function of production and work and would unselfishly seek the common good. If at times he was the defender of the weak and the victims of injustice, he never forgot the high social function of the economically strong. He was not a perfect man. In his choice of means to power, he was at times very weak. He was not always right, but particularly when he reached the maturity of his powers, his honesty and sincerity made him really a great man. When he championed seemingly lost causes, he was at his best, and then he revealed a humility and unselfishness and high disinterestedness which we cherish in the memory of him. In his speeches and addresses there is a charming fervidness and a logic which, were it not for his personal appearance and defects in education, might have made him a great orator. The fact in his life which stands out is that he always sought an American solution of American problems. We must not measure his worth by the success which crowned his efforts. In many things he saw clearer and further than his generation. We honor him because in public life he was a noble man, a great American.

In our own day, we face great changes. Something like the beginning of a new era, with the disappearance of an old one, is taking place about us. Problems and problems challenge us. Our great work is to find a solution of these problems without the surrender of our democratic inheritance, and in our day to widen the reaches of our free institutions and enrich the political inheritance of future generations. There are those who will not recognize the changes, or, recognizing them, think that the solution of them is to be found in turning back the pages of history. And there are those who insult us by daring to offer us a new political philosophy. Deep down in our American tradition it is written that government is for the prosperity of all in the common weal. We recognize that there are rights which are above and beyond the rights given in our human law, rights with which the Creator endowed man. These rights are imbedded in a law which the Creator gave, a law which speaks of justice and charity. We cannot be great defenders of our American tradition unless we recognize that immutable law of the Creator—the moral law. Religion must inspire us and help us to understand that the greatness of our country must not be found in mere material things, but in the greatness of its citizens. We need great men, men in whom the noble is refulgent, men who are strong enough to prize virtue above goods, men who are clear-minded enough to think out the solution of our problems in the enrichment of our own American tradition, men who do not forget our past and yet courageously face the changes of the present, men who unselfishly, even at the cost of failure, work for the common good, for a better and greater American democracy. We are honoring the name and the memory of Altgeld, because we want our country to be great in the virtue and fortitude and clear-headedness of its leaders and citizens.

Why Do We Stay in New England?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Boston Herald there were printed excerpts from an address by Mr. Edward Weeks, the editor of the Atlantic Monthly. He set forth in a specific and interesting fashion the many advantages of life in New England, and mentioned by name a number of prominent citizens of New England who had achieved great success in life. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DO WE STAY IN NEW ENGLAND?—EDWARD WEEKS GIVES HIS ANSWER

(Excerpts from the talk by Edward Weeks, editor of the Atlantic Monthly, at the Advertising Club of Boston luncheon yesterday)

This fall I did some traveling in October. During the 29 days I was on the jump, I delivered 22 lectures and handled many a question period. But when you return home, no one seems to attach quite as much importance to your words, no one seems to listen to you with the same rapt attention, not even your wife. This results in deflation, and in this low period a man is apt to ask himself—why am I here in New England anyway? And why do I stay?

REDISCOVERS CHARM

The dismay—it is simply a puncture of vanity—lasts about 48 hours. Then you begin to rediscover Boston. You begin with fundamentals. You find that Boston appeals to you because this is where your wife lives. Well, you go down to your office, like Admiral Byrd to the Antarctic, through a frozen landscape. But inside your office nothing is frozen; it is warm, loyal, with an unpretentious air of integrity. There are none of the nervous jitters of New York, nor the annual turnover of personnel; we haven't the tension nor the iron smile of Detroit; what we work with here is neither the burly suspicion of the Middle West nor the glad hand of California. Of course, we don't earn the salaries of Hollywood. We live by something else.

When I go to a Boston restaurant, Malatesta's, Joseph's, or Locke Ober's, I go to enjoy the company and the meal. I know I shall be treated as a friend of the house. I shall not be expected to gape at those who are already there at tables near the entrance. If they are sitting at better tables than I get, my reasoning will be that I should have got there earlier, had I some deep interest in the location of my table. I am not going there hoping to see the Prince of Monaco in disguise or the fifth and newest wife of some well-to-do and famous souse. Neither am I likely to be mistaken by my fellow diners for the public relations man who is getting himself on page one in the latest congressional whoop-te-do.

I walk to work of a morning through the prettiest public park in North America; even if I were riding the Cambridge subway I should not need shin guards and a crash helmet. Within 30 miles of Boston are the

sea, the deep woods, and the open country; wild deer, the otter, the striper, trout, and ducks unlimited; the Gloucester wharves, the Marblehead fleet, Chestnut Street in Salem, Walden Pond, and Hugo's lobsters, Ipswich clams—and plenty of Bisodol. Within 10 miles of the statehouse is the best orchestra in the world; the best hospitals for young or old; the great trees planted by Charles Sargent; the hospitality of Beacon Hill; the eagerness of our great public schools, and the leadership of our great universities.

Men from all over the country prefer to make their bid here—Luckman and Robert Frost, Pinanski and Mullins and Marquand, Tom Pappas and Conant and Compton; Bradley Dewey and Charles Francis Adams, and Mike Kelleher, Lloyd Brace, Rabbi Liebman and you and myself.

Why in New England? Because here, accessible to Europe, with an open hand to Canada, here we stand, as a lighthouse to an anxious continent. "Let your light so shine before men," so runs the ancient saying, "that they may see your good works. * * *"
In the light of tomorrow we of New England have to balance our thinking against the motors, the ore, the oil of the wealthier States.

FUTURE IS GREAT

New England has been in the business for going on 400 years, and in that time it has learned to live by the long view. It has populated the West with its younger sons, its capital, and now its industries. But I submit that it has retained a very vigorous heart-beat here at home.

Consider for a moment that $6,000,000,000 question which will be decided in Washington in the immediate future. Shall there be civilian or military control of atomic energy? That is part of the question, and behind it is a greater decision; can we develop atomic energy for peacetime use by private industry with the people as the ultimate beneficiary?

The Nation goes slow on an undertaking as big as that, and during the period of transition, while the research goes forward—I mean the research at MIT and the Harvard labs; while the first benefits find their way into medicine—I mean at the MGH, at the Children's, at the Faulkner, at the Peter Bent Brigham Hospital; while the financial readjustments which may affect every phase of our national life are worked out by our great banks—the First National and the Shawmut—and our insurance companies—the John Hancock and the New England Mutual—keep in mind the words of our most conservative Yankee philosopher, the man who wouldn't leave the White House until he had found that other rubber. "Have faith in Massachusetts."

The National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The National Science Foundation, which I delivered before Pi Gamma Mu, national social-science fraternity, at one of the sessions of the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., December 30, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few years ago, in the extremity of war, there was created on a bare stretch of land in Utah County of my home State, a steel plant more modern than any in Pennsylvania or Alabama, and affectionately known by those who have spent their lives in the industry as the steel maker's dream.

Inside, it was obvious that the steel maker, when he dreams pleasantly, envisages the reduction of fabulous-sized ingots to thin, smooth plates as a consequence of methodic, button pressing. It was a technological marvel to watch the man in his great, roving, overhead cage and to witness his industrial exploits without benefit of tools. Relatively there were few men at work. One could speculate on the number of labor gangs it would have required to pound the hot, dense, converted iron blocks into industrial submission. These men who were there, and who did participate, were past masters of a rather complicated process. Their catlike manipulations were abundant testimony to the product of the engineer's unconfused thinking.

It was wartime; the fact that such a plant would cost millions and millions of dollars was of no consequence. The only question was whether we could produce—and we did. Man had found a way to let machinery do his work abundantly.

Such a fine plant was erected dozens of years before it might have been, and I use the borrowed phrase advisedly, in the course of human events.

In other areas men and women of science meanwhile produced other monsters of engineering, some Frankenstein in their potentialities, some not, in a necessary struggle for national life or death.

Everything done was dictated by science and directed by scientific formulae.

Edison, Morse, Bell, Fulton, Franklin, the Wrights, Baldwin—their words were joined with hard studies of those who understood them. Certainly Tennessee Valley Authorities, and Boulder Dam, and Geneva Steel plants may be erected if a nation has science and money.

During the war, while admitting it could throw flame so many feet for so many seconds with its most modern announced device, the Service actually had a flamethrower with a range several times as long, and with longer burning power. It had the incomparable Norden bomb sight. It had a fantastic floating harbor, and it created the "big inch" pipe line and the "red ball" highway. We heard scattered comments about the Bailey bridge long after it had been in use. Portable ground-strips created air fields on partly imaginary land. "Ducks," "water buffalces" and other inorganic amphibians took to land or water with like relish. Stories of the *Seraph* and other underwater craft replace the standard sagas of the surface sea.

Science was on the loose. The inventor who could not therefore get someone to back him found that if he could get past the National Inventors Council he could have spent on his gadget more money than he could ever see in a pile.

Our enemies were not idle either. Japan was being unscientific when she failed to recognize her secret telegraph code as probably broken, its details within our knowledge so that we could cover her next chessman before it was played, and, too, in many ways her people were more imitative than inventive, yet Japan did well because of her background of dozen of years of consistent technological advance. As for Germany, except for a costly 2-year's withdrawal of public support for research, and except for throwing out of her borders outstanding Jewish scientists, Germany was scientifically superb during most of the war and, had she been able to produce her V-bombs and other articles which military men invariably call "new stuff," might have turned its conclusion in her favor.

And, of course, everyone stimulates his imagination each to its utmost when we consider the atom bomb.

Science—why even the earth tenements of the Pueblo Indians were applied science. Irrigation as practiced on the Nile was the most beautiful scientific application in agricultural history, or at least many of my own neighbors so believe. The seven wonders of the world include the scientific with the natural. Fire, wool, the use of cow's milk—all were scientific discoveries of a marvelous hour. Science has no known alpha. We are not a hundredth of the way to the omega.

Nor shall we, as a nation, come close to real scientific development unless we now take unusual and abundant steps to encourage the development of science and scientists. If we turn men and women back into the darkness and groping of their own initiative we are lost.

In an unorganized community all men are adversaries at the drop of an insult or the birth of a whim. The last frontier now remaining is, curiously enough, the whole world itself, whose simple frontier assets are the United Nations organization, scattered treaties, and some precepts in international law. Roughly speaking, except for these fragments of world unity, we as a Nation are on our own resources and have no more idea how we are going to fare next decade than had some little country of an earlier era, in stark wonderment of Napoleon's next move.

In this state of affairs we have no choice but to be scientifically as nearly perfect as American ingenuity can provide and money can buy such perfection. That we have active competition on a grand scale is a statement almost too obvious to make.

Moreover, looking at the subject from the standpoint of uniformity of education, it must be recalled that the dean of an outstanding college declared recently that in comparison with the student of agriculture, the student engineer had felt frustrated for 35 years because of the numerous and substantial benefits in favor of the former.

Scholarships for scientists provide, of course, the greater essence of the so-called science bill, or bills, rather. The encouragement of the schoolroom and laboratory, without the growing fear of paying the landlord and meeting the grocer for the common necessaries of life, may spell the difference between the United States as a great and proud nation and a second-rate, groveling and perhaps occupied land area. The dean's complaint today registers as the wishful expression of a quiet thinker. Unanswered, the deficiency will gather tongues to sound into Washington as a great sullen roar. Your scientist does not work 30 hours without food in cheap and bare lodgings as in the success stories of a different age. The houses of magic, such as we have and such as they are, have replaced the garret and the starvation diet. To the extent that they are supposed to serve, they are effective. Indeed, the industrial laboratory of a corporation frequently meets the highest expectation of its owners; new and profitable discoveries; inventions and refinements, for the good of the stockholders—with no objection, of course, to a contribution to public welfare, comfort, and progress, as an incident, if it is a source of convenience and profit to the corporation. It is a mistake to regard worthwhile commercial adaptations as general public assets. It is wrong to consider factory technology as a guaranty of national security.

Knowing these premises, and especially interested during the repeated worry over battle outcomes, many Members of Congress and many dozens of scientists, besides the President of the United States, have been organizing their wits and endeavoring to prove their opinions in order to create a National Science Foundation. Great strides were made during the Seventy-ninth Congress, when divergent interests, divergent ideas, and even diverse and divergent committees were got together and held together through the American process of give and take. At that time I was chairman of the then Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. As such I sponsored the final hearings, in which were merged the interests of all Senate committees having shares of interest in the subject matter. The coup was successful to the point of the Senate's agreeing upon a bill.

We were on the march.

In 1947, in spite of the renascence of the committees under the Reorganization Act and in spite of the further reorganization of both Houses owing to the political change, Congress went a step further. When I say that I introduced S. 525, I do so in all modesty, for S. 525 was about as original as the Ten Commandments would be if I were to publish them in the form of a bill. S. 525 was an accumulation of knowledge upon the subject.

In the same way a variation of S. 525 appeared as S. 526 under the sponsorship of Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, and associates. Senator SMITH's bill was another and certainly not opposite reflection of the accumulated knowledge upon the subject. This time the subject matter was—and is—before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and as I had been chairman of this committee under its old name, and now am its ranking minority member, I feel at home having this legislation where it now is and should be under the groupings offered by the Reorganization Act.

Our committee agreed on features of the Smith bill and the Thomas bill. We reported the compromise onto the calendar as S. 526, the number of Senator SMITH's bill; and both Senator SMITH and I, and no one else, personally reported the bill and personally signed the report.

Out of this—for want of a better word I shall call nucleus—was molded a bill on which both the House and Senate could and did agree, a bill which went to the President for signature which was not forthcoming for reasons given in a veto message which I shall not attempt to analyze except at some official time and place such as in committee, on the floor of the Senate, or in conference. Suffice it to say that there are those who believe his objections could be overcome by the simple expedient—if Congress is willing—to make the foundation's chief officer more nearly responsible to the President. There are likewise those who believed his message was even more—they call it ominous—far reaching. The President went to the White House from the Senate. In this there should be hope and faith for an understanding of what can be done, practically, toward further overhauling, and wherein the limits of possibility may lie. At any rate to enact a bill which can pass the Senate and House and still be attractive to the Executive is our problem. We shall have undertaken its solution manfully after January 1, 1948.

Very little of the bill would appear to be moot. There seems to be no question but that the final product will provide for medical, mathematical, physical, and engineering research and development, the furtherance of the biological sciences, provision for consideration of scientific personnel and education, and the very strong and very greatly emphasized consideration of national defense. These subjects are appropriately arranged into five working divisions, concerning the constitution of which, so far as they go at least, there should be no further controversy.

We may, so far as I can determine, confidently expect that the act as finally passed will authorize the Foundation to: "(1) formulate, develop, and establish a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences; (2) initiate and support basic research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements—including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance—for the conduct of such basic scientific research; (3) initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defenses by making contracts or other arrangements—including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance—for the conduct of such scientific research; (4) grant scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences; (5) foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries; (6) correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups; and (7) establish (a) a special commission on cancer research, (b) a special commission on heart and intravascular diseases, (c) a special commission on poliomyelitis and other degenerative diseases, and (d) such other special commissions as the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this act."

In carrying out the foregoing an objective of the Foundation is to "strengthen fundamental research and education in the sciences, including the independent research by individuals throughout the United States, including its Territories and possessions, and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education."

It would seem that any residue would and will contain the scholarship and fellowship provision, most likely in the language of the most recently current bill, as follows:

"SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS; REGISTER OF SCIENTIFIC PERSONNEL

"SEC. 10. (a) The Foundation is authorized to award, within the limits of funds made available pursuant to section 14, scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient of such aid, for such periods as the Foundation may determine. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships from among citizens of the United States, and such selections shall be made solely on the basis of ability; but in any case in which two or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Foundation to be possessed of equal ability and there are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to grant one to each of such applicants, the Foundation shall award the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships to the applicants in such manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

"(b) The Foundation shall maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways provide a central clearing house for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States and its Territories and possessions. No individual shall be listed in such register without his consent."

Without detailing the patent provisions, let me say that they were submitted to the most microscopic scrutiny, and if and when a bill is passed and signed we may be assured that the patent features in such an act will include substantial encouragement to private discovery and invention, the complete protection of inventor's rights and property interests, enrichment of the Government's own store of science, and, in the public welfare, a greater abundance of public patents and rights, and security of information for our Nation's safety.

It should be stated, or, rather, restated for emphasis, that in the discussion about the veto nothing is intended to imply a negative, reluctant, or captious attitude on the part of the executive branch toward science legislation. It is, of course, a matter of record that the President exercised a considerable degree of leadership in his message to Congress on the subject.

If I have stressed the legislative background perhaps it is because it has been as a legislator that I have lived with the subject and with its aims and ideals through a number of years and have been most active in bringing the Foundation so near to fruition.

I would not willfully withhold full appreciation of the work of others. The efforts of Senators KILGORE, MAGNUSON, and FULBRIGHT certainly might be said at least by these gentlemen to have eclipsed my poor efforts. The House has been active. Scientists themselves have in a creditible manner explored our common problem, and generously they have offered us their solutions. I dare not begin a roster of credit. It would be a long roll; a single omission of a worth-while name would be a mistake of the utmost gravity.

Our abiding hope is in the capacity of men of good will for compromise and the achievement of a unity of purpose.

Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1948

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on December 31, 1947, and January 2, 3, and 5, 1948, there appeared in the Washington Daily News and various other newspapers throughout the country articles by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt pertaining to the candidacy of Hon. Henry A. Wallace for President of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the articles may be printed in the Appendix in the order in which they appeared in the newspapers, that each article be captioned as it is captioned in the newspaper, and that the date of each article be shown.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of December 31, 1947]

HENRY WALLACE HAS ALWAYS BEEN POLITICALLY INEPT

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, Tuesday.—So Henry Wallace is really going to head a third party and run for President in 1948. What strange things the desire to be President makes men do.

He has probably forgotten, but I remember his coming to see me in the summer of 1945 in Washington. At that time, I felt very strongly that it would be good for the country if Henry Wallace, whom we all believed in and admired, would leave active politics

and become the leader of the independents of the country. Their vote had increased greatly in the years between 1929 and 1945, but they needed leadership and organization.

They were neither Republicans nor Democrats. They were primarily interested in getting the kind of leadership which would keep them free of economic depressions. And they wanted to continue what had been a peaceful but steady revolutionary movement which had given us, over the years, a greater number of people in the middle-income brackets and fewer people in the millionaire group or in the substandard-income groups.

This had been accomplished in smaller countries like Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, but it was a little more complicated in a country the size of ours and had to come more gradually.

I felt that out of politics Henry Wallace could do a tremendously valuable piece of work to keep both of our political parties on their toes; to make both of them less prone to act for purely political reasons; to make both of them realize that to win any election this independent, liberal vote was essential and must be courted by deeds, not words.

At that time, Henry Wallace told me he believed it was his duty to stay and work in the Democratic Party. I knew then, as I know now, that he was doing what he thought was right. But he never has been a good politician, he never has been able to gauge public opinion, and he never has picked his advisers wisely.

All of these things might have been less important if he had been a disinterested, nonpolitical leader of liberal thought, but as a leader of a third party he will accomplish nothing. He will merely destroy the very things he wishes to achieve. I am sorry that he has listened to people as inept politically as he is himself.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 2, 1948]

WALLACE'S APPROACH LIKE CHAMBERLAIN'S WITH HERR HITLER

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, Thursday.—I read with great care Henry A. Wallace's speech in Chicago Monday. Affirmatively, he stands for "a positive peace program of abundance and security, not scarcity and war. We can prevent depression and war if we only organize for peace in the same comprehensive way we organize for war."

There is no country in the world where the people would not agree they wished to organize for peace and abundance and security. But in this speech Mr. Wallace oversimplified the problems that face us today. If he were in office today and responsible for our policies, he would understand how much more complicated it is actually to carry the responsibility, to try to get at what is the truth of any situation and then convince people of many diverse backgrounds and political beliefs that certain methods will achieve the results which you succeed in making them believe are desirable to achieve.

To begin with, let us take the political situation which a third party faces. No one in this country wants a third party as much as the Communists do. All over the world they are working for confusion because that is the way to create economic chaos and political weakness, and this is their one hope of defeating democracy in the world and proving that communism is the only thing people can turn to.

The American Communists will be the nucleus of Mr. Wallace's third party. I know all the old arguments in favor of working with people who want the same objectives as you do. But I have worked rather more steadily and closely with the representatives of the U. S. S. R. than has Mr. Wallace. I like all these I know and I hope that we can get on with them in a peaceful world, but I know that our only approach is an economic approach.

They do not understand many of the things which we consider essential and they will not until their economy reaches a much higher standard than it has yet reached or will reach for some time. They understand strength, not weakness, and they say many things they know are not true because they think they can make others believe they are true.

We did not oblige the Soviets by any action of ours to take over Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, or to attack Finland. Therefore, when Mr. Wallace assumes that by changing certain of our policies until we resemble Mr. Chamberlain, hat in hand, approaching Hitler, we will have the results which he calls "peace and abundance." I am afraid he is doing more wishful thinking than realistic facing of facts.

A totalitarian government, whether it is Fascist or Communist, has certain earmarks. Secret police rule is one of them. Another is benefits to the people, but no freedom. We live, in fact, in a much more complicated world than Mr. Wallace seems to understand, and the issues are so important that tomorrow I will continue my discussion further.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 3, 1948]

WALLACE WOULDN'T BE SO COCKSURE IF HE WERE PRESIDENT

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, Friday.—Henry Wallace says he is in favor of helping Greece and he believes in the humanitarian side of the Marshall plan, but that he would turn the aid program over to the United Nations and that aid should be given without consideration of political beliefs, on a basis of need, with the only strings attached being that nothing be used for preparation for war.

Let's look at that program. Most of the aid for Europe has to come from us or through arrangements which we make with other nations. We have no means for inspection. How would we know that none of the aid we sent was used for war preparation?

We have offered a perfectly fair system for control of atomic energy by the UN and for inspection of all the nations under that plan. The people who have stymied it right along are the Russians. Mr. Wallace would say that is because they know we have the bombs. They also know quite well that we have offered to give them to the UN under the control plan. I do not think we have always been wise or tactful in our approach to the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, but basically we have been the ones to make the constructive offers and they have been the ones to refuse.

Mr. Wallace's objection, of course, to the present support we are giving Greece is that Great Britain returned the King to Greece with the kind of government Great Britain wanted. Possibly the people were not anxious for that type of government, but the people have had plenty of time and opportunity to express themselves since then, and have done so. Neither Great Britain nor the United States has such great military power in Greece that the Greeks are under any compulsion to have a government of which they do not approve.

The "government" established recently by the guerillas is led by a known Communist. Certainly the Greeks have a right to ask for help in remaining a democratic state, and certainly the steady progress of the U. S. S. R.'s political influence over every state which they have taken over shows that they have every intention of spreading communism wherever they can. Are we to be so naive as to believe that, with such a program well under way, a few gentle words from us will change the U. S. S. R.'s policy?

Foreign Minister Molotov's statement that we had refused at the London conference to allow Germany to rehabilitate itself industrially because we were afraid of Germany becoming a competitor may seem laughable to us, but it is proof of the type of thing that Russian representatives say, knowing full well they are not telling the truth. We feel that Germany should be helped to rebuild along peaceful lines, but we do not want to risk having the military group again take over control.

The U. S. S. R. knows that as well as we do, but she thinks it sounds well to the people of Germany and of Europe to announce that we are retarding Germany recovery out of fear of economic competition.

Oh, Mr. Wallace, if you were President, you would not have such pat sentences to offer us. You would find it far harder to act constructively than you suggest in your speeches.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 5, 1948]

CONCLUSION—WALLACE HAS DONE COUNTRY AND WORLD A DISSERVICE

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, Sunday.—One of the main things that Henry Wallace attacks, namely, universal military training, will come up in the new session of Congress.

Purely military universal service has never been much to my liking, but at the present time I think it is probably one of the most important gestures we can make to convince the U. S. S. R. that we mean to remain strong in a military way until some settlement is made within the United Nations which will make it possible for the U. N. to be strong enough to hold even a big nation in check.

Then I would agree that disarmament was justified and much to be desired. Yet I am not sure that even then I would not approve of 1 year of universal service for boys and girls alike. The military part of it I would cut, but I would keep the discipline. I would make it a point to stress physical development and health, and then make the service consist of work of value to the community and the country. And I would tie it in, where possible, with the individual's preparation for his life work.

For years people have searched for a way in which to give the same sense of responsibility and selfless devotion to their country which is called out in time of war. This year of service might well be the substitute that has been looked for. We need to start our lives as citizens with a sense of responsibility to the community.

Later we will be called upon within our communities to do many services and perhaps we will enter fields of public service, but a first year of work for the Nation may well be the first intimation to many youngsters that they have obligations as well as privileges because of their citizenship in a democracy.

I think there is plenty of room in this country for us to fight to improve our democracy. I am frank to say that I was deeply troubled when I read of the machinery to be used by the Loyalty Review Board. We are far from having achieved the rights, and I can understand why Mr. Wallace wants to fight for some changes which are long overdue and without which we cannot feel that if we have a true democracy.

If, in organizing a third party, Mr. Wallace has in mind simply forcing the Democrats to make better nominations and then throwing his third-party strength to those candidates, he may, of course, have a few successes. In addition, if he hopes to force the Democratic candidate for President to come out for more liberal policies, after which he, Mr. Wallace, would bow himself out of the picture, he may have some success there too. But there is no assurance that this is what he intends to do, nor that he will succeed in doing it.

In the last analysis, he may simply make it possible for the Republicans to nominate a complete reactionary and still win. He may find his party repudiated by all liberal Congressmen who will feel that they are being tagged with communism. If he thinks that a complete reactionary 4 years will bring us a saner 4 years afterward, I am afraid he will find that is not the way the pendulum usually swings. Great reaction brings chaos and confusion afterward.

I do not think we have the time to go through reaction to the right and then to the left. It would take too long to reach a normal middle-of-the-road period. We might survive, but the rest of the world would not—and so my conclusion is that Mr. Wallace has done both his own country and the world a great disservice.

Get Together on the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Get Together on the Budget," published in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 31, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET TOGETHER ON THE BUDGET

The open season on the Federal budget will soon be here again. It is obvious, even to those uninitiated in the intricacies of Federal finance, that income-tax reductions can only be in direct ratio to the amount actually pruned off the list of Government expenses. To bring about a veto-proof tax-reduction program, it must be the Republican responsibility to cut down Government expenses wherever they can be saved without impairing the national safety. In January the budget trimmers must again go to work. Tax cuts may remain a mirage unless Government expenses are reduced much more than they have been so far.

Senator MILLIKIN, Colorado Republican, apparently seeking Republican agreement on budget slashes, has suggested that the Comptroller General be given power to frame a budget for Congress. The Comptroller General is the traditional watchdog over the Treasury. Under the 1946 Congressional Reorganization Act, Congress is given the responsibility of working out a budget of its own for the Government. The experience of Congress showed, however, the need for effective congressional agreement on what should, or should not, be cut. Such agreement can come about, of course, only by having more information available to Congress.

When Congress convened in January 1947 the Republicans were in control for the first time since 1932. They had made campaign promises to cut expenses and to reduce taxes. They tried to do both. The Republican-controlled Joint Committee on the Budget voted almost at once to chop off $6,000,000,000 from Mr. Truman's $37,500,000,000 budget requests. No sooner was this goal announced than cries of anguish—some justified and some not justified—began to be heard from this department and that department. Some Republican Congressmen joined with the Democrats in resisting cuts for pet departments or services. For instance, the Department of Agriculture was cut some 28 percent, but under protests—many of them from western Senators and Congressmen—several million dollars were restored to its allowance. Representatives from the service establishments all fought, of course, against budget cuts in their departments. Even so, substantial savings were achieved.

A job remains to be done, however. The Truman expenses are still running about four times those of the Roosevelt administration in its peacetime years. With an election year, there may be an unfortunate tendency to play politics with the budget, and to defer savings. In mid-December, for instance, a group of House Republicans who cut funds for western reclamation projects early in 1947 now not only want those cuts restored, but want increased appropriations. It was last May that Governor Warren, of California, said the reclamation cuts might hurt the Republican Party in the West. Both parties will feel the political pressures from now until next November. They may soft-pedal efforts to make any sizeable cut in the Federal pay roll, now running about 2,000,000 persons, as compared to Roosevelt's 887,000 in 1939.

The people want a reduced budget—and reduced taxes. A year ago the Republicans made a beginning to prune those expenses. Considering the fact they had been out of office so long, they did a good job. They should continue that job, however, without falling prey to bloc pressures.

Be a Leader: They're Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able editorial written by Hon. W. D. Jamieson, who was a Member of the Congress from the Eighth District of Iowa 23 years ago.

Mr. Jamieson now lives in Washington, and publishes an interesting weekly paper called the Window Seat, which contains in its January 7, 1948, issue this timely editorial comment on the need of leadership.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BE A LEADER: THEY'RE NEEDED

I write this mainly with the young people in mind—the oldsters are too set to "Do something about it, and do it now!"

Religious workers say they can get 10 or more child converts with the same work and care it takes to get one adult.

But I do want every reader to ponder this statement I am about to make, think of it time after time, and if you pray, then pray over it—and then act. Here it is:

The world desperately needs leaders! you can be one, no matter who or where you are.

I beg of you to think of this, make up your mind you are going to help, and then be a leader. I mean, be a leader in your own community, be a small leader. Don't try to be an Edison, or a Ford, or a Washington, or a Lincoln, or a Wilson, or a Horace Mann, or a Phillips Brooks, or a Bryan, or a Frances Willard, a founder of the WCTU. No; be a little leader.

However, the little leaders often do wondrous things. I think of Jessie Field, a country school teacher in my home country who got the idea of better home making and better farming. The result was she taught it, and from this came the wonderful 4-H clubs which are helping to remake the United States.

The best way to start is to learn this great Bible verse, John 10:10; then live it:

"I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."

Having made up your mind you are going to help other folks and help the world, then pick out one or more of the things you know need to be set right, get somebody else to join you, go at it. Bang! You are a leader. And you can't tell what the end may be.

Ten million such leaders will set the United States and the world going right. Form study and other clubs to find the facts, then move to correct: the world's tens of millions hungry and ill, the fuss between Russia and the United States, our own millions of children out of school, too high prices, not enough production, too much party greed in Congress, 10,000,000 children without religious teaching, the church's main weakness of laymen not working at it, the terrible demon of booze, broken homes, Sunday breaking, monopolies, industry-labor troubles, and on and on.

Be a leader. Yes, you. The world is crying to you. Providence will help you.

Side Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1948

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Side Show," written by Charles Francis Coe, editor and publisher of the Palm Beach Post-Times, Palm Beach, Fla. This editorial appeared on December 28, 1947.

I wish it were possible to have printed the cartoon which accompanies the editorial, by Enright, likewise entitled "Side Show." This cartoon shows Uncle Sam standing at the crossroads of Constitution Avenue holding the hand of the newborn babe, "1948." Off to the side, with all kinds of noises and sounds to attract the attention of the little fellow, "1948," are such things as Crackpot Alley—buzzards sitting on a sign, No Work—All Play; another sign, Everything for Nothing; another sign, The Great Side Show—Freaks Galore. Mushroom growths of new plans and the 5-year plan with an alarm clock ringing.

The question is, Will Uncle Sam allow the little fellow to be attracted by these crackpot plans, which can never bring anything but sorrow and regret to the American people, or will Uncle Sam properly induce the newborn babe, "1948," to walk straight down Constitution Avenue, which has at the end of it a sign in the words of the great pronouncement, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth"?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIDESHOW

A babe enters the world. With all the eager, unfounded hope of the traditional

infant, that which appears before its eyes will attract. 1948. Swaddling clothes. Uncle Sam.

It is a combination upon which the eyes of the world center. It is cynosure. Will the eyes of infancy be capitivated by the sideshow? Or will the indulgent old Uncle see his true course and follow that course? History will tell.

Pandemonium circus is vociferous, as it is always vociferous. The barkers of communism assault the ear. The tinsel of exaggerated promises furnish allure to the uninitiate eye. The teachings of democracy are mingled in the din, even as the gold in the alloy.

The alchemists of the ages are concocting a new brew. Nineteen hundred and forty-eight will know but a brief infancy. That will be turbulent. Its youth will be a series of maladjustments in frenzied efforts to avert calamity. Its middle age will be laden with travail. Its deathbed will glow with the lights of triumph, or be obliterated in the depths of night.

Every man who thinks, agrees that these things are so. We have found none unaware of the seemingly insoluble problems ahead. Economically, we balance on the wire stretched taut between prices and wages. Here and abroad. That is not an emotional element. We balance under the umbrella of inflation. A change in the wind of so much as 10 degrees, can imperil the whole structure.

If 1948 takes the wrong road, pandemonium circus will embrace us with all its fraudulent tumult. If we take the right road, it will be because the consciousness of these United States will have roused itself in time.

If the babe drags Uncle Sam onto the by-way of illusion, then chaos will engulf civilization. If Uncle Sam guides the babe into the sanctuary of the Constitution, the consecration of devoted citizenship, the proven ground of our way of life, then chaos will be averted.

We have no hesitancy in saying that the twelve-month existence of this babe aborning will write the history of mankind for at least a century. In the accompanying cartoon Mr. Enright depicts Uncle Sam gazing at the babe. It would be less cartoon but more wisdom were he gazing along Constitution Avenue. Too many babes have been leading us. We have led too few babes.

The hour has come when the fibers of our philosophy must meet the tests of time and opposition. That, we admit, is easily said. It is another matter to state how these may be met. We suggest, as we have suggested before, a basic plan for Europe. That plan should be patterned on the building loan.

Building loans are not too highly regarded by many financiers. That alone is concession enough on the score of generosity and good faith. If we do that, we have served amiably and nobly the actual needs. As Europe is rebuilt, we should advance funds to carry on the building. The moment the building stops, the advance of funds should cease.

More: That which has thus far been rebuilt should find a lien impressed, payable to Uncle Sam. Only so can control be maintained. Only so can the fingers of lechery be kept from the dollars advanced.

A survey of assets must support the funds advanced. Those assets must be cultured in the sweat of a working Europe, the fires of a purposeful human hearth, determined to rebuild. By act of Congress on the deathbed of 1947, 1948 is mortgaged. If the covenants of that mortgage are loosely drawn, then we are downright subversive.

We are unresponsive to the call of duty and the dictum of civilization. Into the arms of this babe we have placed burdens beyond the computation of the finite mind. If we fail to stand strong, to plan well, to enforce equitably, then well may we name the babe "malfeasance."

The main tent is our objective. The sideshow is the allure for suckers and saps. And for unknowing infants. Uncle Sam, we urge that you keep such strength at home as will dissipate any ambition to assail you. We urge that you assert this strength abroad, by the dictation of terms upon which your largess will be disbursed for the needs of others.

We deny your right to waste time at the sideshow, that the infantile ear and eye may gaze in wonder at perishable tinsel, raucous and rancid promises. We pray that your feet will guide this infant into the realms of permanent democracy. We pray that you will not be actuated to supine surrender to the plaintive cry of puerility, the temporary satiety of irresponsibility, the devastating denial of your mission in the world.

Harry Truman, you have greatest influence on Uncle Sam. This babe will, on its deathbed, write your obituary for history. See that it writes in luminous letters of patriotic import, not in the blood of warfare induced by a combination of "I don't know" and "I don't dare."

Your forebears dared. Your compatriots dare. Do not misconstrue the meaning of "a little child shall lead them." That is inapplicable to the new year dawning. For this dawning year will test the sinews of our Republic. will spell out the future of the modern world; will establish you as great, or as frustrated, futile, and inadequate.

There are great and determined Americans. Gather this about you. Forget the sideshow.

CHARLES FRANCIS COE.

One Way America Can Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I prepared, entitled "One Way America Can Help," published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah, December 17, 1947.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE WAY AMERICA CAN HELP

America must always stand in the minds of the people of the world as a country which, above all other things, guarantees "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The Senate of the United States has now voted nearly $600,000,000 interim relief aid to Italy, France, and Austria. This is a prelude to the Marshall plan. All but six Senators present voted this aid, some for one reason, some for another.

I, myself, did not succeed in having inserted in the bill what in my opinion should be its most essential feature. The bill as it stands today is purely a relief bill, carrying food, fuel, fertilizer, and pesticides to a stricken humanity. The way to help any people is to help them to help themselves. This, the bill fails to do.

I have never favored make-work projects for the sake of merely making work. There is so much that needs to be done in this world to make it a better place to live in without making work an end in itself. Economic ills cannot be corrected by breaking all of the rules of economy. Wealth is produced from the earth through the application of labor. It is wealth that is lacking in Europe today. We should plan conditions today which will make a better world tomorrow. That is the essence of true relief. That is the basis of the full employment declaration uttered at Philadelphia in 1944, when the nations assembled there voted for recommending to the governments of the world that each nation should make full employment a national objective.

Our own country responded to that suggestion by passing the National Employment Act of 1946. This act does a new thing for our Government. It provides for the President's submitting to Congress an economic budget as well as a fiscal one. Private employment, private property, free enterprise, individual initiative, all of those things which make America what she is, are the considerations which enter into the economic budget. One of the hardest-headed economists of the United States asserts that the Full Employment Act of 1946 represents the spirit of 1776 at its best. The hope is that distress, inactivity, loss of wealth, financial panic, and depression can be avoided. The spirit of the Full Employment Act is as much the spirit of 1776 as are the words quoted above, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The thoughtless realists of the world will reply to this by saying you cannot eat "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." My reply to such realism is always the same: You cannot eat religion. You cannot eat morals. You cannot eat a decent philosophy of life. You cannot eat loyalty. I may go on indefinitely. But without these, man remains an earthworm.

For us to ever hold out aid to the rest of the world without always showing the rest of the world what we really stand for is one of America's mistakes. What has made America great can make the rest of the world great. You cannot eat free education. But free education ultimately makes it possible for men to eat. You cannot eat freedom of thought. But freedom of thought leads to invention which, in turn, creates abundance.

Someone long ago said that man cannot live by bread alone. I am wondering if, while man is only free to the extent of his physical limitations, America, like the Church which is founded on the teachings of Jesus, will ever offer to the world anything finer than the two basic idealistic systems represented by the teachings of Jesus and the basic theories of our founding fathers. On second thought, they are not two systems. They are divergent activities springing from the same source.

John C. Cooper Defines the Fundamentals of Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the consent granted by the House, I insert in the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by John C. Cooper, a member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University. This address was delivered at the Coolidge Auditorium in the Library of Congress on the 7th of January 1948, under the auspices of the Library and the National Air Council. It helps in clearly defining the fundamentals of the aviation problems now confronting this Congress.

Mr. Cooper is recognized as being qualified to discuss these problems in a way well worthy of our consideration. In the course of his remarks Mr. Cooper said:

THE FUNDAMENTALS OF AIR POWER

Today the world is in the midst of one of the great revolutionary periods of history. Institutions, standards, values—the basic foundations of national and international life a generation ago—are changing before our eyes. New forces have emerged gravely affecting our whole political, economic, and social structure. Of these forces, none is more potent than air power.

Our historic political territorial system has been based on the existence of surface boundaries, some natural, some artificial. Man has lived in communities connected or separated one from another by surface conditions. Until air power emerged as a world force, man moved about only on the surface of the earth. Nations traded by land and by sea, built surface armies and navies for their protection, fortified themselves behind rivers and oceans and mountains in fancied isolation and security. But those fine days have passed. Today nations are flying over those same rivers and oceans and mountains. The airspace has become boundless highways for war or for peace, for destruction or for commerce. Which shall it be? That is our problem today.

What do we mean by air power? What are the factors and conditions which govern its existence, its growth, or its decline in this or any other nation? To what extent are these elements of air power within our control? It is vitally important that air power be understood if we are to guard the Nation's future and have any real opportunity to restore lasting peace to this very troubled world.

Air power is the total ability of a nation to fly, to act through the airspace, to use controlled flight, such for instance as the flight of aircraft. Gen. H. H. Arnold, in his last report as commanding general of the United States Army Air Forces, pointed out that air power "is the total aviation activity, civilian and military, commercial and private, potential as well as existing."

This is the first fundamental of air power. From it springs a second fundamental—that the air power is indivisible. Military air force and civil aviation are supported by the same elements of national power. So long as a nation continues to possess these basic elements its potential air power is not impaired, though some uses of its air power may be temporarily limited.

The third fundamental of air power is this: The air power of a nation will continue to exist so long as that nation has first, the political right to fly and to control its own air space, and second, the physical capacity to fly.

The extent of a nation's political right to fly is not a matter of abstract theory, but a very real international question. Since 1919 the nations of the world have recognized that each nation has complete and exclusive sovereignty of the air space over its lands and territorial waters. Also long before 1919 it was recognized that no nation has or could have sovereignty over the high seas, and that the navigation of the high seas was free to all. The doctrine of air-space sovereignty carries with it the right and the power of every nation to control the air space over those parts of the earth's surface under its sovereignty and to admit or exclude any foreign aircraft from that air space. The same doctrine however says in substance that as there can be no national sovereignty of the high seas, every nation has the equal right to fly in the air space over the high seas of the world. That this principle of air space control is of basic importance in any consideration of air power is well illustrated by the fact that the Soviet Union, for example, includes within its sovereign territory about one-sixth of the land surface of the world. It therefore has the complete and exclusive control of an enormous amount of the world's navigable air space. In that air space it has the sole political right to fly while at the same time it enjoys with every other nation equal right to fly in the air space over the oceans that lie between the Soviet territory and such other nations.

AIR PROVISIONS OF VERSAILLES TREATY

Historically the importance of the political elements of air power are best illustrated by the collapse of the air clauses of the Versailles Treaty ending World War I. By that treaty, it was provided in most positive terms that "The Armed Forces of Germany must not include any military or naval air forces." This prohibition was to continue so long as the treaty existed. The intent to disarm Germany in the air was plain, but the method employed was destined for certain failure. The treaty left with Germany, after January 1, 1923, control of German airspace. Civil aviation and aircraft manufacturing were little impeded. The German government used as a bargaining weapon this right to control its airspace and to admit or exclude foreign aircraft. In the end it admitted the aircraft of its former victorious enemies only under an arrangement which resulted in the complete collapse of the controls which were intended to enforce the permanent disappearance of German military air force.

The fundamentals of air power must not be misunderstood again. If we have reached a fixed determination that Germany and Japan must be prevented from rebuilding the air forces which came so close to providing an Axis victory in World War II, then the potential air power of Germany and Japan must be destroyed. To do this, we must provide complete international control of German and Japanese airspace and the right to fly in that airspace. We must also control so far as possible German and Japanese capacity to fly.

CAPACITY TO FLY

The elements of a nation's capacity to fly are of two kinds: first, assuming that it has a right to fly, those which determine its present usable national air power, and, second, those additional elements which measure the potential air power of a nation over a long period. In the first class I would include aeronautical industry, aeronautical facilities, the civil air establishment and the military air establishment. Aeronautical industry (including the aircraft manufacturing industry, engineering and research) furnishes the air fleet and its necessary replacements. Aeronautical facilities (including airports, maintenance, and air navigation aids) provide the physical operating requirements without which the civil and military air establishments would be useless. These elements of a nation's capacity to fly and therefore of its air power have several things in common. They are visible and acquired national assets. Together they will provide the national air transport in its widest sense, whether in peace or in war. If any one of them is deficient, national air power suffers.

The civil air establishment must be sufficient to provide the needs of a nation's air commerce in time of peace and a reserve of aircraft and airmen in time of emergency. The military air establishment must be adequate to maintain the peace and defend the Nation from any possible aggression. Both aeronautical industry and aeronautical facilities must be adequate to serve the needs of peace and capable of such immediate and practical expansion as any foreseeable emergency may require.

LONG-RANGE AIR POWER

Vital as are these elements of present national air power, there are certain conditions which together with these elements determine the long-range potential air power of a nation. So much has been said and written about the visible elements of air power, the military and civil air establishments, aeronautical industry, and aeronautical facilities, that we have lost sight of those underlying factors which make possible the continued existence of air power over a long period of time. Included in those conditions which affect the potential air power of any nation, I would suggest: (1) Geographic conditions, including among other things location, size, physical conformation, climate, and weather of national territory; (2) Resources, both economic and material; (3) Population, including size, educational level, and adaptability for aeronautics; (4) Industrial development; and (5) Political conditions, including national incentives and government policies.

Consider, for example, the status of France at the date of its liberation. It had neither air fleet, nor aircraft industry, and its air navigation facilities were largely destroyed, but France had regained political control of its own airspace and still had national characteristics which gave it great potential capacity to fly. Its air power still existed. Neither Germany nor Japan has today any of the visible elements of air power, but each of them has still many of the national assets on which were built the air forces of World War II. If the final treaties of peace leave to either of them the control of its own airspace, potential air power will certainly exist.

SIZE AND LOCATION OF A NATION'S TERRITORY

No national asset is more important to air power than the size of a nation's territory. This is particularly true if national territory is included in a single land mass. The larger the national land mass, the more the internal air traffic of the nation is developed, thus building a reserve supply of aircraft usable elsewhere in an emergency, as well as the aircraft maintenance and manufacturing industries needed to support its internal aviation, together with the trained airmen and ground crews, navigation facilities, and airports.

The location of national territory also directly affects its capacity to fly and its air power. Of any two nations otherwise equal, that nation will have the greater air power which is so located that it can normally reach the larger number of its foreign air objectives with less flying and by more direct routes, particularly if such routes need not cross intermediate foreign territory.

The length and location of a nation's ocean boundaries are therefore of the greatest importance. Over a boundary separating national territory from that of another nation aircraft may fly only when political permission has been obtained. But over boundaries facing the sea a nation has complete freedom or air action and may fly when and where it wishes.

The Territory of the Soviet Union occupies approximately one-sixth of the land surface of the world. In area it is approximately equal to all of North America. The Soviet Union has the longest shorelines in the world. While the thousands of miles of its Arctic shores may be useless as an asset of sea power, they are not useless as an asset of air power. Its aircraft may fly northward across the Arctic toward Greenland and Canada and eastward across the Pacific toward Alaska and continental United States as and when they wish. The geographic air-power potential of the Soviet Union is quite beyond that of any other nation. Aircraft with a range of 5,000 miles, flying from bases within this single great Soviet land mass could reach any point in Europe, any point in Asia, including Japan and the Netherlands East Indies, any point in Alaska, Canada, continental United States, most of Mexico, and any point in Africa as far south as Johannesburg in the Union of South Africa.

The geographic air-power position of Germany was and is excellent. While its comparatively small size necessarily limited its internal flying, its central position at the crossroads of Europe gave it tremendous advantages. These were fully realized in the development of its international civil aviation prior to World War II and in the use against its neighbors of military striking force during World War II.

The geographic air-power position of the United States is unique. Its continental land mass as well as its industrial resources have fostered the development of the greatest existing civil aviation. Its boundaries on the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, the Pacific Ocean, and the Arctic Ocean and Bering Sea (through Alaska) give it great freedom of action. It is handicapped however by the fact that Alaska and Hawaii (two of its most important geographic air-power factors) are physically disconnected from its mainland mass. Aircraft are quite useless for military or civil purposes unless they can be kept adequately supplied with the necessary fuel and replacement parts. Aircraft located in Alaska or in Hawaii or in any other outlying bases which the United States may maintain suffer from this handicap.

ECONOMIC AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Although geographic conditions are important, they alone do not determine potential air power. Other national factors are directly involved. Not the least of these are the economic and natural resources available for the construction, operation, and maintenance of air fleets, military and civil, together with the necessary airports and other ground facilities. I cannot impress on you too strongly that any nation which must import its completed aircraft or necessary parts and accessories, is almost fatally deficient in potential air power. In time of emergency such importations might be prevented and replacements would cease, with fatal results to the military and civil air establishments.

Almost as important is the status of the raw materials needed to construct aircraft, aircraft engines and parts, as well as the fuel required for their operation. This is one of Great Britain's real air-power handicaps. Practically any kind of material that goes into the construction of its aircraft and all the petroleum products needed for fuel and lubrication in its aircraft engines must be imported from far overseas. In this respect both the Soviet Union and the United States have certain advantages. The petroleum industry of the Soviet Union has certainly expanded, and I am personally inclined to think that it can now rely on its internal sources of supply for aircraft fuel and lubrication without importation. The Soviet Union is, of course, handicapped by very difficult inland transportation conditions in northern and northeastern Siberia. It must be recalled, however, that the great Siberian rivers which flow from south to north are open during part of each year and that the trans-Siberian railway crosses each of these rivers in southern Siberia, thus providing combined rail and water transportation for supplies to the Siberian Arctic coast. Also, with the use of efficient ice breakers the Soviet Union has developed summer seaborne traffic as another source of supply for its Arctic territory.

The metallurgical resources of the Soviet Union are very little known. Within the last few years they have certainly been tremendously developed and the Soviet Union is probably approaching self-sufficiency in the matter of materials needed for the construction as well as the operation of its aircraft.

RAW-MATERIAL POSITION OF UNITED STATES

The raw-material position of the United States has been a matter of serious debate. It is quite impossible to review it at this time. Suffice it to say that in the construction of modern aircraft certain light metals are necessary and also certain scarce metals for the required alloy steels. Last year I made a study of this problem with the result that I found that the plans for the construction of one type of modern high-speed transport aircraft indicated that the materials to be used would be approximately 58 percent aluminum and 34 percent alloy steel. It is my information that the United States is deficient in and must import certain of the metals needed for these alloys. As to our supply of aluminum, without which I do not believe we could maintain an adequate air fleet, I call your attention to the language of a report as to the wartime use of strategic raw materials made by a special Senate committee in 1946. Aluminum is a refined product of what is known as bauxite. The Senate committee said that "the United States never had large resources of bauxite, except in the State of Arkansas. These fields were large enough only for a year or two of production at our maximum rate. We are, therefore, dependent for our supply of bauxite on South America in particular, and to some extent on the Pacific areas. Unless we can develop new industrial methods * * *, the United States will always be dependent in this very basic industry on its ability to import from abroad."

Petroleum products are needed for aircraft fuel and lubrication. Raw rubber is needed for aircraft tires. If the air power of the United States is to be maintained, adequate supplies of these basic materials are absolutely necessary. The United States has been in the past the greatest producer of petroleum. Whether we have already arrived at the time or whether we are approaching the time when we must depend on importation of petroleum products is a subject of wide debate. As to rubber, we certainly must rely on the imported raw product unless we maintain our capacity for synthetic production developed during the war.

Maintenance of air power for the future requires the most careful consideration as to the sources from which the United States will obtain the needed raw materials, metals, fuel, rubber, and all of the other products required for the construction and operation of aircraft. To the extent that stock piling may be necessary, it must not be neglected. To the extent that the manufacture of synthetic products will be required, we will forget them at our peril.

Manpower

But the construction, operation, and maintenance of aircraft involves more than material. It also requires manpower. The population characteristics of any nation will affect its present and, even more so, its future air power. Aviation calls for young men and women. Particularly in the operation of aircraft youth is a major factor, and to some extent this is also true in the manufacturing and maintenance processes. The educational level of the population is also a matter of importance in considering air-power problems, for no other industry requires higher over-all technical skill than does aviation, whether it be manufacturing, operation, or maintenance.

On the other hand, a nation which has a very large number of youth from which to pick may have real advantages even though the educational level and technical skill of its inhabitants might be below that of another nation of fewer inhabitants. If we would compare the future air power potential of the great nations of the world, I would call your attention to these provocative figures. In the last prewar census there were approximately 170,000,000 people in the Soviet Union. Of these it was estimated that 36 percent or approximately 61,000,000 were then of 15 years of age or under. At approximately the same time there were about 190,000,000 people in the English-speaking nations, comprising the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and Australia. But of this 190,000,000, a little less than 25 percent or about 46,500,000 were 15 years of age and under. The Soviet Union lost heavily during World War II. Since 1939, however, additional territory has been added to the union and it has been estimated that its present population may be about 200,000,000 with a normal increase of about 2,800,000 per year. From these figures it appears that the Soviet Union has a very large percentage of young men and women, and that either now or in the very near future the number of Soviet youth may be twice that, age for age, of the youth of the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and Australia combined. May I suggest that these questions of population cannot be overlooked in assessing world air power problems.

Aeronautical industry

Air power, of course, requires more than materials and men. The whole complicated economic structure of a nation, and its technological ability, is also involved. Aeronautical industry in being at any particular time is one of the vital factors of usable air power. Even more important as an element of potential air power is the national ability to maintain that industry and to continue its technical advance, and to be able in an emergency to increase many times its output capacity.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE GOVERNMENT

Of the long-range factors which may control the growth or decline of national air power, none however is more important than the attitude of the government which has the responsibility of directing a nation's activity. Perhaps little can be done about the territorial status of a nation or the numbers of its population or the natural resources within its borders. These factors are more or less fixed and out of our control. But otherwise the attitude of a government may be decisive. A nation may have every other element of air power but still lag behind if its government has no real urge to insure its future development. The attitude and actions of government will fully determine the size of our military air establishment, and greatly affect the efficiency of our civil air establishment, our aeronautical industry and facilities—hence our air power in being. The same attitude may also determine our ability to take advantage of those national conditions which aid our long-range potential air power as well as to improve those conditions, such as the waste of natural resources, which threaten our future.

But government alone cannot be responsible. We ended World War II with the greatest military and civil air establishments then in existence, the finest aeronautical industry and world-wide aeronautical facilities. Our air power in being, military and civil, was then unassailable. Our potential capacity to fly is, in my judgment, unequaled even today. To maintain this leadership and realize these potentials is the problem of our people, our industry, and our Government. Planning for the future is a most complex matter, and in no field is it more complex than it is when dealing with air power.

Air power is today the most dynamic force in the life of nations. Properly used it can be the means to better understanding among the people of the world. Improperly used it can be a threat to the general security even in time of peace. If war comes again air power can transport the armed forces and missiles fated to destroy our civilization. I submit to you that we cannot afford to ignore the lessons of history. We must realize that air power is the ability of a nation to fly; that air power is indivisible, used at times for civil air transport and at times for military striking force; and that air power will continue to exist as long as a nation has the political right to fly and to control its own airspace, and as long as it vigorously and consciously maintains its capacity to fly. These are the fundamentals of air power.

Jesse Jones and RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston Post of December 28, 1947:

JESSE JONES AND RFC

In the happy hunting days which went on for congressional investigating committees, from the beginning of the Roosevelt administration in 1933 to the end of the war in 1945, the boys on Capitol Hill gave the RFC a wide berth.

Its activities were too well known; its unique record of making money, instead of throwing it away, too well established; and the popular understanding of how well it had done its job was too apparent for it to offer any juicy bits for those who were seeking to get their names on the front pages of the Nation's newspapers.

But since that time, with the great bulk of the RFC's splendid work for the country accomplished, some of the committeemen, who have had lean lickings in public attention, have made furtive forays after the agency.

The General Accounting Office led off with a vague, and patently ridiculous charge that billions were unaccounted for. There has never been an iota of material on which to base such a charge. The most the average reader can make out of the accusations is that the RFC and the GAO did not keep their books in exactly the same manner.

Last summer, the House Banking Committee took a little flyer at the RFC, but it didn't last many days. Now, another House committee has scheduled hearings for January.

One of the best tests of any organization, of course, is in men it turns out.

The record of the "graduates" of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been a notable one. One of these "graduates" is now the Secretary of the Treasury; another is president of the New York Stock Exchange.

Still another former staff member of the RFC is now an associate justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Many of the country's biggest banks are headed by former employees of the RFC. Synthetic rubber companies and other great industries, manufacturing a wide variety of products, have called on the RFC to furnish their executives. Other RFC men have gone ahead in the law and in various types of finance.

Only recently, at a dinner in New York, hundreds of alumni of the RFC met to pay honor to their long-time chief, Jesse Jones, of Houston.

At that meeting, there was offered a world of testimony about the RFC. Among those who were heard from were three men, who are in best position of any to know what the agency was set up for, what it accomplished, and how well it did its work.

Those witnesses were:

Former Vice President John N. Garner, who was Speaker of the House in 1932 and piloted the RFC bill, sought by the Republicans, through a House which was controlled by the Democrats.

Former President Herbert C. Hoover, who sought the legislation creating the RFC; who signed the bill, and who appointed the first board, including Jesse Jones.

President Harry S. Truman, who headed for many years the Senate War Investigating Committee which had before it all the "dirt" which could accumulate in Washington, and who, since he became President in April of 1945, has been the Chief Executive of the Nation, and, as such, sees the operations of such boards as the RFC.

All paid unstinted praise to the organization and to Mr. Jones who headed it for so long.

Hear what Mr. Garner had to say in a telegram:

"I understand his former associates are honoring Jesse Jones tonight. He richly deserves any honor, and the entire RFC organization is entitled to the thanks of the country for a fine job in a dark hour of our national history.

"It was my opportunity to serve in Washington for 38 years, or one-fourth of the history of the Republic from its founding until the time I left Washington. I had an opportunity to observe the work of many administrative officers in that time and I place Jesse Jones at the top of all of them."

From Herbert Hoover, delivered in person:

"It was toward the end of my administration that we undertook to meet the financial disasters of the depression by a new method in government. We created the RFC so that business could be helped to recovery. It was a sound business program and the results proved to be very sound.

"If the RFC did not actually save the economy of the country, it came awfully close to doing so.

"In making appointments to the board, it was my pleasure to name Jesse Jones as one of the original members. It was Jesse Jones and the men around him who built the RFC into such a great institution and made it a fabulous success.

"I take great pride in my 15 years of friendship with this man of an opposite political party.

"But Jesse Jones never let politics enter into his service to his country or his personal friendships.

"His concept of public service constitutes the mark of a great American."

And the President of the United States, in a special message:

"I understand that the alumni of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are giving a testimonial dinner to the Honorable Jesse H. Jones this evening.

"I wish you would express to Mr. Jones and those gathered at the dinner my compliments on the inspiring part that the RFC played in the rescue and stimulation of business during the depression years, and on its magnificent role in the development of production and the accumulation of critical and strategic supplies for the defense and war programs.

"It is fitting that those associated with Mr. Jones during those significant periods now do honor to their great leader, a tribute in which I heartily join."

These men were in a position to know what went on in Washington. They have stated their views on the work of the RFC.

Any congressional committee really wanting to get at the actual facts, and not simply to throw a harpoon, might begin its investigation by calling them.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein a petition received from my friends at Holland, Lucas County, Ohio, asking the Eightieth Congress to establish a system of military training as recommended by the President's advisory commission.

I know Mrs. Doris Woggon, the lady who has circulated this petition and know her to be a very alert lady, a good citizen, and always active in worth-while enterprises not only for her community but interested in the Nation's welfare as well.

The petition follows:

PETITION

TO HOMER A. RAMEY:

Peace is worth striving for. Therefore we, citizens of the United States and voters, urge you, our Representative in the Eightieth Congress of the United States, to support and vote for legislation establishing a system of universal military training for American young men, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training.

Mrs. Doris Woggon, Mrs. Otto Dose, Mrs. Milo Downs, Mrs. George Cunningham, Mrs. Emma E. Thorp, Mrs. William Kurtz, Mrs. Ernest Blauvelt, Mrs. Orlando Rowell, Mrs. John Groh, Mrs. Richard Witte, Mrs. Gale Buerk, Mrs. C. W. Fisher, Mrs. Allan B. Linn, Mrs. R. E. Gandlander, Mrs. Dorothy Hess, all of Waterville, Ohio; and Mrs. Albert Kiefer, of Perrysburg, Ohio.

Problems Facing the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the radio remarks of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] on Friday evening, January 2, 1948, at which time several distinguished leaders of the Democratic Party participated in a Nation-wide broadcast, discussing the critical problems which face the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We Alabama Democrats look with confidence to the re-election of President Truman in November and we know that Alabama will once again lead the victory parade.

Chairman MCGRATH, Senator BARKLEY, Senator GREEN, Senator MAGNUSON, and Congresswoman NORTON have reminded us of how President Truman and the Democratic

Party have fought for a strong and expanding economy at home and a workable peace for all mankind.

They have reminded us of the Republican attacks on the farm program—soil conservation, reclamation, and farmers' cooperatives—on the school-lunch program, the REA, TVA, on the Fair Labor Standards Act with its protection and benefits for millions of unorganized and white-collar workers, on rent control and the housing program, on the program for the encouragement and protection of small business and independent and locally owned business.

The Republicans have had no program except to block the Democrats. Their only bill has been a tax bill to salve the rich and soak the poor. For years the Republicans have been bankrupt in ideas and in default in leadership.

When President Truman called Congress into special session on November 17, he told the truth as to the grave danger of inflation and ever-increasing prices, and urged a program of 10 specific points. The Republicans refused to accept the program and brought in a bill that does practically nothing to meet the situation but that cripples the antitrust laws and extends the grip of big business on our economic system.

Prices continue to go higher, unit sales of goods and merchandise steadily decline, the pinch of living cost is felt more and more and millions of American families are forced into the red to get bread and sustenance.

The American people know that today's mounting prices imperil our entire economic system and that inflation carries the threat of a chaotic bust which would plunge the United States into a depression vastly deeper and more lasting than the Hoover depression. They know that such a depression would drag down the rest of the world with America and would end our hopes for world peace. The people know how the Republican leaders—TAFT, WHERRY, MARTIN, WOLCOTT—struck down the Democratic safeguards against inflation and its danger. They know how the Republicans carp and criticize but refuse to act to curb inflation and put an end to its threat. The Republicans have been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

The American people will make answer in November by reelecting President Truman and giving him a Democratic Congress that will support and sustain him in keeping America strong and building the peace of the world.

Democratic Nation-Wide Radio Rally, January 2, 1948—Comments by Democratic Leaders and Typical Citizens Discussing Critical Issues Facing the Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on Friday evening, January 2, five distinguished leaders of the Democratic Party participated in a Nation-wide broadcast over the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System in a discussion of the critical problems which face the Congress during this session. In this radio rally, typical citizens in various parts of the country joined with those leaders in telling how they were affected by the problems which face the Congress.

The leaders of the Democratic Party who took part in this broadcast were the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Congresswoman from New Jersey, Hon. MARY T. NORTON.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Democratic radio rally be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC RADIO RALLY, MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, FRIDAY, JANUARY 2, 1948, WASHINGTON, D. C.

THOSE PARTICIPATING

From Paris, France: Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, minority leader, United States Senate.

From Washington, D. C.: Hon. THEODORE F. GREEN, United States Senator from Rhode Island; Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, United States Senator from Washington; Hon. MARY T. NORTON, Congresswoman from New Jersey.

From Los Angeles, Calif.: Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Typical citizens in Cleveland, Chicago, and Omaha will broadcast their views on the issues discussed in Washington.

In the final 3 minutes of the program local Democratic leaders spoke over the Mutual stations carrying the program.

ANNOUNCER. The Democratic Party is on the air.

The following half hour has been made available by the Mutual Broadcasting System to the Democratic National Committee as a public service. Issues which will be decided in the session of Congress which convenes on Monday will be discussed by party leaders and plain citizens broadcasting from various parts of the country and from Europe. Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, will be the first speaker. From Los Angeles, Senator MCGRATH.

Senator MCGRATH. Good evening, fellow citizens, as we start this critical year, we in America along with men of good will the world over seek one thing more than anything else—a lasting and just peace. Peace is in every heart, in every prayer, and it is a subject of great anxiety in the souls of all of us, for we know that lasting peace is not yet within our grasp—in fact, there is grave danger that it may not be possible in our time.

We in the United States—members of both political parties—have kindled a new flame of hope in the freedom-loving nations overseas through our proposal for what has been called the Marshall plan, a program of European economic recovery.

It will come before the Congress this month. Is it vital? What do the people of Europe think about it? What can it accomplish? Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Senate Democratic leader, is in Paris, France, tonight, and he will give you the on-the-spot answers to these questions.

(Program switches to Paris.)

Senator BARKLEY. I am happy to join in this program though compelled to do so from Paris on account of my absence from home.

In the few moments at my disposal I shall try to emphasize the importance of the economic recovery and political stability of Europe.

No one who has not seen the vast devastation which the war wrought throughout Europe can fully understand the magnitude of the recovery task. This devastation was not only physical. It was economic, political, moral, and social. As a result there has been a great uprooting of humanity, and the failure to agree on peace treaties, to restore actual peace, has complicated the task of anchoring the people and their institutions to a solid pier of hope and reconstruction.

This hope is indispensable. It requires faith in the justice and stability of government. It requires the financial aid necessary for a long-term program designed to enable the nations accepting it to get on their own feet and go forward on their own steam.

That is what the Marshall plan is designed to accomplish. Without it the prospects of European recovery are dim to the vanishing point, and the hope of political and social stability will vanish with the failure of European economic recovery.

America's vital interests are deeply concerned with this whole project. We cannot afford merely to nibble at the bit. We must sink our teeth into it, however unpleasant the taste. The Marshall plan contemplates a 4-year program of aid and recovery. It makes it possible to work out arrangements in advance with a view to the formation of a well-considered and well-rounded approach to the problem. A shorter commitment would make this impossible and would involve the risk of making what we do totally futile and ineffective.

If we are to undertake it, let us do it well. Our own welfare and the peace of the world require it. It will be an investment in world security which will return large and comforting dividends, and will be infinitely cheaper in dollars to the American people than another war which might see the destruction of civilization itself.

Congress is to tackle this problem immediately upon reassembly. It will undertake to gather all the facts, because both it and the American people are entitled to the facts. I feel confident that when the American people know the facts and recognize the opportunity and the duty, to themselves and to the world, our country will not fail in this hour of crisis and of leadership.

ANNOUNCER. And now we turn to domestic problems—problems which members of both parties agree are closely tied in with foreign relations. Congresswoman [MARY NORTON] talks from Washington, D. C., on high prices. Mrs. NORTON.

Mrs. NORTON. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, I am not only a Member of Congress, I am also a housewife, and have personal knowledge of the problem of every housewife in America. I know something must be done to bring food prices down or a great number of America's children will suffer from malnutrition. This is an individual problem for each and everyone of us and the question in your mind and mine is what we are going to do about it. Well, the President tried to do something about the high cost of living in his message to Congress on November 17, but the Republican Congress was not interested in reducing inflation.

I charge the Republicans choked price controls to death before supply had a chance to catch up with demand. Their slogan was "end price controls and prices will find their level." Time has proved how wrong they were.

Prices have literally soared since the Republicans and the National Association of Manufacturers succeeded in killing price controls. And, they are still soaring.

For example, just in the 6 weeks during which Republican Congressmen stalled over the President's anti-inflation controls before they finally voted, too little and too late to attack soaring prices, the cost of living took a substantial jump.

Butter in Washington went up from 88 cents to $1.05 a pound. In Pittsburgh men's shoes went up just in 6 weeks from an average of $8.72 a pair to $9.38 a pair.

These are typical. But worse yet, wholesale prices which give us an indication of future retail prices, show even more trouble ahead.

During the week ending December 20 wholesale prices averaged seven-tenths of 1 percent higher than the week before. This rise was just in 1 week and it was a new postwar record.

And on that date, wholesale prices were at their highest peak since May 1920 just before the sharp recession which followed the last war—the recession we are trying to avoid after this war. These facts do not seem to alarm the Republicans.

They know that swollen profits and high prices will bring a depression but they are not willing, nor will the National Association of Manufacturers permit them, to do anything to stop it. The session of Congress starting Tuesday will determine whether greed or stupidity caused the Republicans to kill price controls. As I have said, there are now before Congress proposals submitted by President Truman which will curb our inflationary spiral. The Republicans refused to enact these proposals into law at the special session. Instead of cooperating with the President in this great crisis they deliberately passed a half-way bill which will not curb inflation. I regret to say that the Republican controlled Congress stands convicted of deliberately voting for inflation in sponsoring a weak bill in their effort to blame the President who must administer their unworkable program. This definitely is playing politics with human misery.

The Democrats will support the President and would if in control of Congress do whatever is necessary to bring down the cost of living but unfortunately for the working people of America the great tragedy is that the Democrats are not now in control of Congress.

In Cleveland, Ohio, a typical housewife is waiting to tell her story:

Mrs. WILLIAM AULT. I am Mrs. William Ault, of 698 Eddy Road, Cleveland. My husband makes about $50 a week. We have three children, 6, 9 and 11 years old. During the war, with rationing and price control, we got our fair share of food at prices we could afford. Now that there is no rationing and price control, we cannot afford to eat as well as we did during the war. You can get all you want if you have the money, but we can't afford much at today's high prices—butter at 93 cents a pound for example. I don't want luxuries, but I do want decent food and clothing for my children. I want to know why the Republican Congress doesn't take the steps necessary to give me relief from high prices. If the Republicans don't act, I'm afraid we'll have another depression and folks like me will be even worse off than we are now.

ANNOUNCER. Back in Washington Senator MAGNUSON speaks to you on problems of the West.

Senator MAGNUSON. Thank you.

We are faced here in America with the necessity of giving freely of our resources so as to preserve the peace of the world.

Yet certain Republican leaders in Congress have taken the unrealistic view that we can give of our food and resources as we are asked and at the same time cut down on the reclamation of the lands of the West that are now arid and nonproductive.

Some Eastern Republicans who seek to keep the West as a sort of colonial empire for their own exploitation forget that power for industry is vital in the West to create even greater industrial capacity.

Where would the country be in the race for atomic power if we did not today have the great public power projects that have given us the industrial head start that is necessary for atomic production?

They forget, too, that the entire economy of the Nation is based on a 6-inch layer of top soil extending across the country. They forget this and slice the funds vital to soil conservation.

They forget that the American farmer does not yet know all the answers for controlling of our rivers, for the conservation of the rich croplands that are menaced by erosion. They slash the funds for the scientific study of methods to meet these problems.

They attack the farm cooperatives that have helped make our farm owners economically self-sufficient and to improve their production and methods of distribution.

They refuse to accept the tenet that farmers need to partake of the benefits of electric power—that rural electrification is vital to increased productivity. Great steps were taken toward expanding the REA in America during the last 15 years, yet in great areas of the West and Midwest there are thousands of farms that have no electricity.

In my State of Washington, for instance, there were on last July 1 some 4,500 farms without electric power; in Minnesota, 71,000; in Iowa, nearly 57,000; and in Wyoming over 5,000. This is typical.

The Federal Power Commission said recently, "The national situation with respect to the supply of electric power is serious." Yet in the face of this, the Eightieth Congress in the first session lopped $25,000,000 off the President's request for funds.

This is the sort of penny-wise and pound-foolish philosophy these Republicans have taken in their approach to the problems that involve our national resources—not in the West and Midwest alone—but all over the country.

Soil conservation is a subject close to every farmer's economic life. It is a fact that conservation, according to figures released by the Soil Conservation Service, means about $4.90 per acre more for the average farmer in increased production.

Think what that means in increased food for a distressed world.

Since 1933 we have spent $480,000,000 to conserve soil. Yet during the same period we have lost $14,000,000,000 by erosion. During the war and even yet we used and are using our soil resources faster than we are replenishing them.

It seems obvious we need more expenditures for soil conservation since they are more than self-supporting; not the senseless cuts the Republicans give us.

Yet the Republicans have trimmed requests for soil conservation by more than 10 percent. Our national resources are vital to all of us, but especially to farmers. Let me introduce a typical farmer, who will speak to you from Omaha, Nebr.

Mr. PETER PARKERT. I am Peter Parkert, dirt farmer from Hooper, Nebr. Thanks to aids given us by Democratic administrations, Nebraska farmers have increased average production of wheat from 50,000,000 bushels in the Hoover era to 90,000,000 in 1947, and midwestern farmers increased corn yields from two and a half to more than three billion bushels. In the same period our cattle herds increased greatly. Prices have advanced from 25-cent wheat and 2-cent hogs to their present heights. Now the GOP would destroy our gains. If the cheap Republican philosophy prevails, you can look for return of the Dust Bowl. Development of our great rivers will be abandoned. Farmers' cooperatives will be scuttled. For these reasons farmers will vote Democratic in November.

ANNOUNCER. And now Senator GREEN in Washington.

Senator GREEN. Why should we fear talk about communism here in America. It promises material gains in return for surrender of civil liberties, but our American system of free enterprise has made us the strongest and richest country in the world.

Communism has spread the fastest where there has been a class split. For example, where the owner of a factory has had too much profit and the worker too little wages. In our country the owner of the factory has lived well, but so has the worker. In America the man who helps to build a car can also own one.

Yet today this system of ours is dangerously out of balance. Soaring prices are robbing many people of a fair share of our national production. If this continues, we must face a crippling depression. That would be a failure of our capitalistic system to which the Communists might well point.

Only recently has the Republican Party shown any appreciation of this danger, and then only in applying superficial treatments.

America has reached its highest level of production and, what is more important, the fairest sharing of it under a Democratic administration. Why? Because Democrats realize that our human resources are the bedrock basis of our national wealth, and that to continue to grow stronger as a nation we must continue to grow stronger as individuals.

This basic truth seems to escape the Republican Party, but it does not escape the Democratic Party.

On the one hand American people are better housed than any other; but on the other hand millions of Americans are not decently housed.

American people are in general healthier than those in the rest of the world; but the war revealed that millions of American youth were unfit to serve their country.

America has a high standard of public education, but it is still out of reach of many.

The average citizen has more security than he had, yet millions are without any form of old-age security.

The Republican Party does not think these problems are important.

The Democratic Party says they are very important. We say that our free enterprise system depends upon our solving them and that the Government must act to solve them.

Consider the Nation's health. The Democratic Party believes that we must make sure that all people get adequate medical care so that all can contribute to the Nation's production. That is why the Democratic Party supports national health insurance, while the Republican Party wants only a medical dole for the poor.

Bad housing breeds insecurity and unrest, disease and crime. All these are expensive and hamper our production. The Democratic Party proposes that the Government solve our housing problem but the Republican Party gives only lip service. It is true that individual Republicans indorse housing measures but the party itself does nothing.

With education it is the same. Lip service and inaction.

Similarly with expanded social security and a higher minimum wage. Some lip service, but nothing is done.

It all adds up to a record of Republican blindness to the fact that human values are the keystone of American strength and wealth.

The free enterprise system cannot succeed fettered by the Republican philosophy that the men who operate small businesses or who work in a factory or on the farm or in the mine need only be kept alive to go on producing indefinitely.

President Truman has proposed positive, workable programs to meet the problems I have cited. They will be before the Republican controlled Congress in this session.

But the Republican leadership is not likely to think them important enough to carry through to success.

My fellow Americans—what do you think?

In Chicago three typical citizens are ready to give you their answer to that question.

Mr. ERNEST SIPPLE. I am Ernest Sipple, 4745 North Rockwell Street, Service Office, Marine Corps League.

Senator GREEN said that the Republican Party gives only lip service to the housing

problem, but I think that possibly a better name for it would be slip service. They certainly slipped up on their chance to do something for veterans, who are generally harder hit by the housing shortage than any other category of our citizens. They could have passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, but intentionally or not, they slipped on that one. They had a chance to give veterans preference in buying materials, but they slipped there, too.

Under present prices—Republican prices—very few veterans can afford to build homes. Let's hope, for the sake not only of veterans but of all the unhoused, that something is done to solve this problem in the new Congress.

Mr. ALBERT TOWERS. I am Albert Towers, 7514 Rhodes Avenue, a member of the United Steelworkers, CIO.

Ever since the last elections I've been thinking of that Republican slogan, "Haven't you had enough?" That was so full of the promise of better times for all of us. What we've experienced is just another example of how different actual performance can be from promises. By now I'm sure every workingman has had enough of the Taft-Hartley law, to say nothing of the Republican prices. To my way of thinking there's only one remedy—it's up to organized workers to register and vote against those who have demonstrated they would throw labor for new losses if given new power in 1948.

A CHICAGO SCHOOL TEACHER. As a school teacher, a Chicago school teacher, I know that the members of my profession all over the Nation will be watching the new session of Congress with unprecedented interest. Most teachers, I feel, are convinced that the Republican-controlled Congress overlooked the opportunity of a lifetime in the last session when they did nothing about President Truman's proposals for expanded educational program. One result has been that teachers, to whom we have traditionally entrusted the training of our citizens of tomorrow, are leaving their poorly paid profession and I think it is safe to say that many of them will not go back until something is done at the Federal level to improve our educational system.

ANNOUNCER. Again from Los Angeles, Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

Senator MCGRATH. The protection of the human resources of the American people is vital.

The development and conservation of our great natural resources is equally important.

The Republican Congress, as you have heard, has not seen fit to protect these vital assets.

But what about our political resources?

The Republican Congress cannot be blamed for the failure of the American people to use and protect the most priceless assets of all—the ballot.

Part-time citizenship and rocking-chair voters are not the answer to the problems of our present-day world. The American citizen—the free voter—cannot close his eyes to the world of reality. He is a part of that world and his well-being is affected by political action whether he wills it or not.

Thinking men and women will recognize the truth of this premise.

Yet, thinking men and women have failed in the United States to use their franchise. They have failed to vote.

There are, according to the Bureau of the Census, some 91,000,000 persons who are qualified to vote in this country. In 1946 little more than one-third of these qualified voters went to the polls.

The Republicans, with a tightly organized core of voting party members, cast some 20,000,000 votes. With two-ninths of the qualified voters of the Nation they were able to take control of the Congress.

A tightly organized minority thus has given the Republicans the majority control of the Eightieth Congress. This majority of the minority has failed to act on vital problems in the first session of the Eightieth Congress. They failed to act adequately again in the recent session. If they can, they will defer action on vital matters in the coming session.

How serious such deferment can be has been illustrated by plain-speaking citizens on this broadcast. You have heard workingmen and farmers, housewives, and professional women tell how they are affected by the problems which Republicans in Congress have refused to face.

All of us must understand that the only compelling voice left is the voice of the American citizen manifested through the ballot box. We must realize that the ultimate master is the voting citizens.

This ability to take part in the affairs of the Nation depends on the use of the ballot. It is imperative that all of us understand that.

Nonvoting citizens who think nothing can happen here should be reminded that atomic bombs, when they drop, fall on voters and nonvoters alike. They don't just pick out a favored few.

The problems of our time are the problems of all our citizens.

Secretary Marshall said recently that foreign policy has entered every home and taken its place at every dinner table.

Never were more prophetic words spoken. Every citizen must realize his responsibility. He must register and vote. He must see that his neighbor registers and votes.

The good health of our citizens is important.

The good health of our economy is important.

But our political good health is just as important as either.

Regardless of which party wins elections, we do not enjoy political good health unless those of us who are entitled to vote actually go to the polls and do so.

That way, and that way only, can we have a truly representative government.

And I am confident that the people want to go forward through the progressive legislative steps we have discussed tonight and that we will do so only through government that represents the will of all eligible voters.

These problems tie in closely with each of you as individuals and with the activities of the Democratic Party in your city, county, and State.

It is the party workers in the wards and precincts who see to it that their neighbors understand the issues and that they register so that they can record their opinions in the polling booths.

You local Democratic leaders are the ones who will join with you in these activities.

And now, a local Democratic leader from your own town or county will talk to you over the station to which you are listening.

(At this point the program was switched to local stations for participation by local leaders.)

Trading in Grain Futures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH H. BALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Grain Trading Cuts Your Bread Bill," by Harry A. Bullis, from the Washington Post of Sunday, January 11. Mr. Bullis is chairman of the board of General Mills, Inc. The article deals with the function of the futures market on the grain and milling trade in the United States.

Along with this article I ask that there be printed an editorial entitled "Trading in Futures," which appeared in the same paper.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of January 11, 1948]

HEDGING REDUCES PROCESSOR'S RISKS—GRAIN TRADING CUTS YOUR BREAD BILL

(By Harry A. Bullis)

(Mr. Bullis is chairman of the board of General Mills, Inc. The importance of General Mills as a grain trader is indicated by the fact that in its last fiscal year, ended May 31, 1947, the corporation paid $311,953,057 to farmers and other suppliers. That is 84 cents out of every sales dollar, on sales totaling $370,932,427.)

The grain futures markets are like any other markets—a place where people go to sell their products and where others go to buy them. The only difference is that in one market the goods are actually displayed and the purchaser buys them and takes them away. The futures market operates by contracts between the seller and purchaser to deliver the product at some agreed future date. It is a meeting place where the transactions record the forces of supply and the prices that prevail therein.

To these markets go producers, processors, exporters, importers, elevator operators, commission houses, grain merchandisers, consumers, and actual handlers of the commodities, and equally—as in any other market—those who attempt to wager their judgment against the future prices for purposes of gain. These are commonly known as speculators.

The vast proportion of commodities passing through these futures markets go directly or indirectly into the hands of processors, or those who perform services in connection therewith. These for the most part rely upon a charge for the service they perform, rather than on any changes in the value of the products. To this end they attempt to minimize the risks involved in any possible price changes by what is known as the process of "hedging."

Briefly stated, hedging is merely the method of protecting a purchase by the immediate sale of the product either in its original or processed form.

For example, a processor buys a volume of wheat for delivery to him on a certain date, and immediately sells an equivalent amount of flour to be delivered by some future date. Or, if he wants to insure a supply of wheat for the future, he may purchase wheat and store it in his elevator, at the same time selling an equivalent amount for delivery at some future date, relying upon the differences in price to pay for the cost of carrying, insurance, and servicing.

In considering these futures markets, one must fully understand that production of agricultural products is seasonal, but consumption is continuous. At harvest time there is a great flood of the commodity coming into the market, far more than the consumption at that time. By hedging, one may buy freely without risk and without price interest, and thus absorb the flow of the commodity which would otherwise be accumulated without buyers, unduly depressing the price.

A SENSITIVE REGISTER

The grain futures markets perform their very important economic function in three ways:

1. They provide a highly sensitive price-recording mechanism wherein the forces of supply and demand can be promptly registered. With the futures markets in existence, no individual or group of individuals, even including the United States Government, can artificially control the price level. They may affect it temporarily, or they may hasten a trend; but prices cannot be kept high or low with the futures market in existence solely as a result of futures trading. Supply and demand ultimately set the level. Any individual who feels that the price level is either too high or too low at that particular moment may buy or sell, depending upon his opinion.

With the grain futures markets in existence, any changes in the supply or demand picture can be reflected in change of price level. In a free economy it is highly desirable that such changes in the supply and demand picture be recorded promptly, as an increased price level tends to increase production and curtail consumption, and a lower price level tends to do just the reverse. The earlier the price-level changes are established and recorded, the quicker our economy sets to work to counteract these changes.

The present situation is a good case in point. Last year's total grain production in the United States was approximately 800,000,000 bushels less than was consumed and exported during the previous crop year. In order to make our reduced supplies go around, it was necessary to sharply curtail the use of grain in some category. The way it could best be reduced was in the animal feeding category. With our highly sensitive futures systems, prices rapidly rose to a level wherein grain feeding to animals was sharply curtailed.

It was very important to the national economy that this scarcity of grain be immediately recognized, and that the counteracting grain saving commence at the earliest possible date. Had we not had such price-recording machinery, which quickly and accurately reflected supply and demand, it is almost certain that we would have wasted grain through excessive animal feeding and the Nation would have discovered the shortage of grain for human food after it was too late for corrective measures to be effective.

INVALUABLE PRICE TAGS

2. The second important economic function of the grain futures markets is to establish grain values and publicize those values for all to see. With this system it is possible for both the producer and consumer to observe not only the value of the different kinds of grain, but also the value of grain for immediate delivery versus grain for deferred delivery or the same grain for delivery in the following crop year. Likewise, these futures markets record the differential in value of one grain versus another, or the differential in value of grains in various locations. The important thing is that every segment of our population can know exactly what the price of grain is at any given moment and can observe the results of changes in the supply and demand picture.

To the producer this is very valuable information. The extreme importance of grain futures quotations to the farmers of the Nation is dramatically evidenced by the fact that every radio station in the Farm Belt must carry grain quotations regularly as a part of its farm service.

In the marketing of his grain the farmer is able to observe the market reports in the public press, to select his own time for marketing, and to establish price before date of shipment. If he elects to market his grain in his local market he can, by again observing the futures markets, establish exactly the cost of using one or more middleman's services in the marketing of his grain. Neither of these features is available to the producer of commodities not traded in on futures exchanges.

PRICE RISK MINIMIZED

3. Probably the most important function performed by the futures market is that these markets provide a means and a system whereby risk of ownership may be largely eliminated by those who wish to avoid such risk, and these risks passed on to those who are willing to assume them.

As the greater part of each year's wheat production is marketed during the first 3 months after harvest, and the demand is dependent upon the buyer's attitude, wheat must be accumulated by processors, exporters, and others in anticipation of a later demand. The buying and accumulation of wheat in excess of immediate sale exposes the owners to changes in market prices. To avoid such hazard, the same processors, exporters, and merchants turn to hedging in the futures markets.

The sole and vital use which my company makes of the grain futures market is for this purpose of hedging to minimize the price risk. This is of real value, not only in contributing to the stability of our company's operations, but in making it possible to sell our products at a lower cost to the consumer than we could if we had to make provisions for potential losses due to price fluctuations, thereby narrowing the spread between the producer and the consumer to a very small conversion cost.

It is a well-publicized fact that in order to protect our national economy we must have a carry-over of grain from one year to the next. In the case of wheat this carry-over, for safety's sake, should always be at least 200,000,000 to 250,000,000 bushels, and at times a carry-over of 500,000,000 bushels may be faced. Here again someone must assume the risk of ownership of this vast quantity of wheat carry-over from one year to the next.

If we did not have the mechanism by which the risk of ownership could be readily transferred from producer, processor, and consumer to those willing to assume this risk, the value of wheat would be subject to extremely wide fluctuations. Prices would be very depressed whenever producer selling exceeded consumptive buying, and the prices would rise very sharply whenever consumptive buying exceeded producer marketing.

SPECULATOR'S FUNCTION

The public, and particularly the producer, should know that the minute grain has been produced and harvested, a risk of ownership exists, and that it is to the advantage of all that a means is provided for transferring this risk to the shoulders of those who are willing to assume it. The speculator, therefore, does perform a true economic function. He absorbs this risk of ownership, which must be borne by someone. Whenever producer selling and consumptive buying are out of balance, he is the balance wheel which prevents violently fluctuating markets.

Under our present system the producer may, if he wishes, retain the risk of ownership by withholding his produce from the market at harvest time, and marketing it gradually throughout the season or late in the crop year. However, with the futures market in existence, he may elect to market his entire crop at harvest time and avoid completely any risk of ownership from that date forward and without unduly depressing the market in so doing. The speculator assumes the risk and will suffer any loss if values decline as the crop year progresses. Likewise he does and should benefit from any enhancement of price following the date of his assumption of this risk.

The flour miller, grain merchant, or cereal processor may, if he wishes, buy an entire year's supply of grain at harvest time, thereby assuming the market risk of such ownership. In most instances, however, he considers himself simply a processor or merchandiser and plans to earn his profit as processor or merchant. It is of great benefit to him and to the consumers who purchase his product that he can pass this risk of ownership on to others. This is known as "hedging" against market fluctuations.

FORM OF INSURANCE

When attacks are made on the futures exchanges, the reader or listener should bear in mind that this risk of ownership becomes a fact the minute the commodity is produced, and that this risk remains in existence until the date of consumption. The risk is real, and someone must carry it.

In this important function the futures market can be compared favorably with the fire-insurance company. The owner of the property must assume great risk of loss by fire. Through our fire-insurance companies he is able to avoid such risk, placing it in turn on those who are willing to assume it.

As we can all recall, whenever grain prices are high as the result of heavy demand versus supply, attention is focused on the futures markets as the cause of high prices. Likewise, when grain prices are low as the result of heavy supply and poor demand, the futures markets are given as the reason for depressing the prices. Actually, the futures markets act for a more stable price and a more realistic price based upon the law of supply and demand than would be possible if the futures markets did not exist.

The public, in my opinion, should regard the grain-futures markets as machinery which records grain values at various points and in future months, and in so doing eliminates an element of risk which otherwise would add to the cost, and consequently to the price, of the grain products offered for sale to the consumer throughout the Nation.

TRADING IN FUTURES

The drive against speculation in the grain futures markets has undoubtedly caused many people to believe that the organized commodity markets are the haunts of gamblers whose operations ought to be suppressed in the public interest. As previously stated, we think that, for reasons of policy, Federal employees should not engage in speculative operations of this sort. And, of course, Government officials in a position to obtain inside information regarding Government grain-buying plans are guilty of a betrayal of trust if they take advantage of their knowledge to feather their own nests. But, so far as private citizens are concerned, speculative transactions in the futures markets are legitimate operations serving a highly useful purpose, as pointed out by Harry A. Bullis, president of General Mills, in an article published today on page 1 of this section.

Mr. Bullis explains in nontechnical language the important services performed by grain futures markets as sensitive recorders of changing conditions of supply and demand. His own company makes use of the futures market for hedging purposes, thereby minimizing risks of loss from changes in grain prices. As a result the company is able to sell its products at prices below those that would be charged if it were not protected from price fluctuations. In brief, hedging—made possible by the existence of organized grain futures markets—cuts your bread bill, as Mr. Bullis says, instead of increasing it.

Speculators on the organized grain exchanges, as distinguished from hedgers, are an essential part of the country's distributive mechanism. For their buying and selling give the futures markets the necessary balance and liquidity without which they could not offer merchants or processors of grain the necessary facilities for insuring themselves against price risks. Of course, there are times when speculative activity becomes excessive and tends to aggravate short-term fluctuations in prices. But, generally speaking, prices in the futures markets register changing factors affecting supply and

demand; they are not long-run determinants of prices. The speculator who assumes the risks of ownership of commodities, the prices of which are constantly fluctuating, is, as Mr. Bullis states, performing a "true economic function" in absorbing this "risk of ownership, which must be borne by someone." Why that is so will be apparent to the readers of Mr. Bullis' instructive article.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein a petition received from my friends at Holland, Lucas County, Ohio, asking the Eightieth Congress to establish a system of military training as recommended by the President's advisory commission.

I know Mr. Simmons, the gentleman who circulated the petition, very well and am most pleased to state that he is one of our most outstanding citizens, as well as one of my closest personal friends.

The petition follows:

PETITION

HOMER RAMEY,
United States Congressman:

Peace is worth striving for. Therefore we, citizens of the United States and voters, urge you, our Representative in the Eightieth Congress of the United States, to support and vote for legislation establishing a system of universal military training for American young men, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training.

A. E. Simmons, Irene Knighton, Ira V. Knighton, Edwin E. Holman, Vileda Holman, George Holman, Jr., Mrs. M. W. Reid, John C. McFellin, James Delaney, William H. Y. Slaymaker, Holland, Ohio; Raymond Babich, Toledo, Ohio; Roy C. Wood, Holland, Ohio; Charles Crim, Maumee, Ohio; Albert E. Lormer, Dallas N. Barnes, Charles A. Hartman, Donald E. Brown, Alvin Hamberry, Mrs. W. H. Slaymaker, Mrs. A. E. Lormer, Holland, Ohio; Mrs. Charles Crim, Maumee, Ohio; Mrs. Alice Barnes, Mrs. Charles Hartman, Holland Ohio; Mrs. Carl M. Barnes, Carl M. Barnes, Toledo, Ohio; Mrs. Roy Wood, Scott Wood, Mrs. Lucille McFellin, Mrs. Latis Knighton, Rex W. Vesey, Mrs. W. N. Heeter, Mrs. Rex Vesey, Edward Berendt, Mrs. Edward Berendt, Mrs. C. R. Vesey, Donald Williams, C. R. Vesey, Holland, Ohio.

Mr. Truman's Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman's Platform," from the Omaha World-Herald of January 8, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TRUMAN'S PLATFORM

The President's message to Congress yesterday was only incidentally a report on the state of the Union. It was primarily a report on Harry Truman's candidacy and a bland, undisguised, plea for votes next November.

In this, his platform for 1948, Mr. Truman gives notice that his celebrated "swing to the right" is now a closed chapter. That was all very well for the early, callow days of his administration, but now an election is impending and he returns to the time-tested techniques, the vote-buying techniques, of the New Deal.

Spend and spend. Elect and elect.

As had been forecast, the President places his greatest emphasis on more social services, wider social security.

Unemployment compensation, he says, should be increased. Likewise old-age benefits. Likewise survivors' benefits. Then there is the matter of health. "Our ultimate aim must be a comprehensive insurance system to protect all our people equally against insecurity and ill-health." As for education, "the Federal Government has a responsibility for providing financial aid to meet this [school] crisis."

Security, health, and education, from the cradle to the grave, provided by benevolent old Uncle Sam.

At a cost of how many billions? The President does not at this time face that question. Sufficient to the campaign the promises thereof.

Spend and spend.

But let it not be implied that President Truman ignores economic issues. He discusses them in extenso and in terms of magnificent self-contradiction.

For example:

"We are today far short of the industrial capacity we need for a growing future. At least $50,000,000,000 should be invested by industry to improve and expand our productive facilities over the next few years."

And how does he propose to help industry to set aside this huge sum for expansion? By slapping a whopping tax increase on corporations. An increase of three and two-tenths billions a year.

Corporate profits last year, he says, reached an all-time high of $17,000,000,000. Probably he is right about that. Wages also reached an all-time high. So did the cost of living. All were inflated out of reason because everybody was using a 50-cent dollar.

And now, at a time when fifty billions are needed for reinvestment in industry in order to increase productivity, the President proposes an added tax on industry of three and two-tenths billions. This would be given back to the taxpayers at the rate of $40 per head—thus increasing spending power, increasing the demand for goods which underfinanced industry cannot produce.

On one point the President is adamant. There must be no over-all tax reduction. No decrease in the cost of Government. Not "until inflation has been stopped."

As a matter of cold fact, as every economist knows, high taxes are a major cause of the high cost of living. The American people last year paid out more money for taxes than for food. High taxes are a part of the exorbitant price of beefsteak and potatoes, overshoes and underpants, magazines and prayer books. If the Government in Washington, by economy, could bring about a substantial reduction in its total tax levy, the dollar would gain in value and the cost of living would decline.

If that were to come about, every American would be more secure, better able to take care of his own health and provide for the education of his children.

But any such sensible attack on the basic problems of inflation and security has no appeal for Candidate Truman. To his mind, apparently, no cure for the ills of the people and the Republic can be adequate unless it is made in Washington, managed by the bureaucracy and paid for by New Deal taxes.

Space limitations forbid a detailed examination of all sections of President Truman's platform in these columns.

But the careful reader will find that the President's feet are back on the path of the New Deal. The path that leads to more and more Government do-goodism, higher and higher Government costs, stronger and stronger Government authority—always at the expense of the individual citizen and his liberties.

The Hendersons and the Bowleses and the Wallaces are gone from Washington but their philosophy—economic and political—lingers on, given voice now by the man from Missouri.

Thus one side of the campaign of 1948 has been staked out and occupied. Whether the other side—the side of the self-sufficient American who loves freedom—will be taken and resolutely advocated by the Republican Party and its candidate, that remains to be seen.

Economic Problems of the Netherlands in the Postwar Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Some Economic Problems of the Netherlands in the Postwar Period, delivered recently by the commercial counselor of the Netherlands Embassy before the Women's National Democratic Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The title I have given to this address seems deceptive, since it is hardly possible nowadays to speak of the economic ills of one particular country, or even of a particular group of countries. We can see the proof of it right here in Washington. Secretary of State Marshall's now famous Harvard address has developed far beyond its original goal—aid to Europe. Within Europe it has stirred up the question of relations between eastern and western Europe; of the future of Germany, especially the level to which its industry is to be allowed to develop without impairing the security of its neighbors; and here on this side of the Atlantic it has been felt that aid to Europe could affect the economy of this country. Aid to Europe has opened discussions on the whole field of United States economy; it has made this Nation aware of the potentialities and also of the limits of its resources; it has stirred up anew the question of prices and of price controls. But also other areas besides the United States and western Europe were to enter the picture. Latin America and Canada, with their large surplus of foodstuffs, are prospective suppliers under a general recovery plan. Furthermore, those vast raw-material-producing areas in southeastern Asia which contributed to such a large extent to the welfare of Europe should be mentioned. When I finally remind you of the large reconstruction needs of China, you will realize how at this moment the economy of the whole world is at stake, and how the economic problems of most of the world are now focused on Washington.

Nevertheless, tempting as it may be to discuss all of these subjects, I must somehow come to my subject and tell you something of the economic problems now facing my country. When Holland was liberated in the spring of 1945, 8 months after Belgium and France, it was stripped of practically everything which makes human life possible. I am not exaggerating when I tell you that the food packages dropped from Allied airplanes were literally lifesavers for the population of the large cities. Had the occupation lasted only a few more weeks, mass starvation would have taken place. Factories were stripped of their machinery, bridges were destroyed, railway tracks had been removed, and transportation equipment was carried away.

As a result of 2½ years of extremely hard work, coupled with generous help from wartime Allies, Holland was able to heal some of the worst scars left by the war. Once more food supplies are adequate if not plentiful. Transportation is improving rapidly; numerous bridges, so many of which were destroyed, have been replaced; most of the railway tracks have been laid anew; trains are on schedule although many of them necessarily are using obsolete equipment. However, it would be grossly incorrect to conclude from these apparent improvements that Holland is on its feet again and could, without further outside help, gradually regain its prewar prosperity. The most one can say is that Holland is now beyond the first postwar relief stage. And even in saying this I must strike a cautious note. The economic level which has now been reached, owing to the strenuous efforts of the whole population, is very precarious; reserves are so thin that each set-back—for instance, a drop in world food supplies—would immediately affect the consumer. The drought which struck western Europe this summer has resulted in a more or less serious reduction in a number of basic food rations in the Netherlands. The same thing happened in other western European countries, which illustrates the permanent danger of the food situation in western Europe.

If I say that even what I would like to call the relief stage in the Netherlands is hardly overcome, how much more serious is the long-term economic outlook of the courty. Let me be very clear about this. With modern technical means, with the great reservoir of good will which always exists at the end of a great catastrophe, it is not too difficult to repair the worst damages caused by such a catastrophe and to restore the first essentials of life. But it is quite another problem to put a country back on its feet again, especially a country which suffered what the Netherlands had to endure. Besides that, exactly what do we mean by putting a country back on its feet? Do we mean thereby restoring the same conditions under which it used to live in prewar days? Such action, even if it were possible, would prove to be rather unrealistic because it would simply ignore the quite substantial changes in the economic relationships among the various countries which were brought about by the war. When you read the report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation, the committee of 16 European countries which worked all through last summer in Paris to state their economic difficulties, you will see that the main part of their report is a vast production drive aiming at targets which are well above the prewar level. This is a realistic approach. When one has lost out, the way to overcome this loss is to work harder. But in order to work harder, one needs food, clothing, tools, raw materials, and a roof over one's head. This is really the gist of the Paris report.

I can make clear to you what this really implies by indicating the way the Netherlands has to adapt itself to changed world conditions. The Netherlands is one of the most densely populated countries in the world. If in prewar days it had managed to attain a degree of welfare for its population, which was not far below American standards, this was due to its extensive trade relations with the rest of the world. The Netherlands could feed, house, and provide a living for its dense population—in a country poor in raw materials—only by building up an extensive source of income, apart from its exports which never were sufficient to pay for its imports. This was done by rendering services to other countries, such as foreign investments, shipping, and insurance. Investments in the Netherlands East Indies before the war amounted to $1,600,000,000. These investments made it possible for the Netherlands Indies to become an important supplier of foodstuffs and raw materials for the whole world. It was through this category of services that the Netherlands was able to finance its large trading deficit with the United States.

In speaking about trading deficits, let us first have a look into the problem of the dollar shortage which is so widely discussed nowadays. There are some economists in this country who deny the existence of a dollar shortage. Their reasoning is rather simple. They have calculated that there are now far more dollars held by noncitizens of the United States than there were before the war. So they say that there are sufficient dollars in the world to buy American goods and that there is no need for this country to extend any foreign help. I would like for these economists to spend a winter in any of the countries which are involved in the European recovery program. I am sure that on their return to the United States next spring they would have become aware of the reality of the dollar shortage. They would have observed it in the daily meals, in the cold homes they would have visited, in the clothes people are wearing, and in hundreds of other items of the people's daily lives. If they had, during their stay in the Netherlands, wished to exchange a hotel room for a house or an apartment they would have discovered—even if they were lucky enough to have found a place—that they would have had to share it with others; the blessing of a private home is a luxury. The dollar shortage prevents the building of sufficient homes to make up for the large-scale destruction of houses during the war.

These, however, are only the outward signs. But let me make a point of it right away that the people in these countries do not expect and do not wish other more fortunate nations to feed and clothe them. What they do expect is that within a reasonable time they will be able once more to be self-sufficient; that is to say, to be able to pay for what they need with their exports and their services. Now they are not able to do so, and their last resources are being used to keep life going, at the expense of their future. If the help they have been receiving since the end of the war were to be withheld from them, the standard of living they have been trying to rebuild would all at once be pitched to low levels and hunger and misery would once more enter every home.

There is in reality a very serious shortage of dollars because of the simple fact that the dollar is the ticket, so to say, with which most of the goods Europe needs for its recovery are to be procured. Many of these goods in prewar days could be procured nearer by in Europe—in Germany, in France, in eastern Europe, in the United Kingdom.

Take coal for example: before the war Europe produced sufficient coal for its own needs. Now, in order to have a minimum return of its vitally needed industries, not to speak of coal for domestic heating purposes, Europe yearly has to import half a billion dollars' worth of American coal. I can assure you that this is sheer necessity because nobody in his right senses would think of using his scanty financial reserves for the haul over the ocean of American coal and pay freight, which amounts to 150 percent of the price of the coal. One only does such a thing when there is no other means of obtaining sufficient coal.

A few figures on the Netherlands balance of trade will also show you the implications of the dollar shortage. Before the war one-fifth of our imports had to be paid for in dollars; for the year 1947 this proportion is twice as high, 40 percent. The total value of our imports this year is three times as high as it was in 1938. This means that we are spending on our current trading account six times as many dollars as we did before the war. On the contrary, our dollar receipts still are far below our prewar dollar inflow. Besides that, for the time being there is not the cushioning effect of very substantial exports of foodstuffs and raw materials from the Netherlands East Indies to the dollar area. These figures apply to the Netherlands. When we make the same calculation for other European countries, we shall, with a few exceptions, arrive at similar results. The dollar shortage at the moment remains a very serious and real problem for European nations.

Another factor which weighs heavily on the problems of recovery of the European nations is the situation in Germany and the allied policy in that country. The German problem has been complicated in many ways, and it is a fallacy to say that restoring Germany economically is synonymous with restoring her war potential. No European, and especially no European who has experienced the horrors of the Nazi occupation of his country, will wish to see the revival of a Germany capable of waging wars of aggression. But no European will wish for a continuation of the present chaos in Germany. Apart from the very real dangers of the economic prostration of from 60 to 70 million Germans in the heart of Europe, the crippling of Germany's industrial production greatly affects the economic recovery of its neighbors and aggravates their plight.

Let us study a few figures. A moment ago I mentioned coal. In 1938 western Germany (the Bizone) produced 206,000,000 tons of coal, a large share of which was exported and which was of vital importance to the steel industry in France, Belgium, and Luxemburg. In 1947 production is estimated to amount to 133,000,000 tons, a difference of 73,000,000 tons, which is almost double the present yearly exports of coal from this country to Europe. This clearly shows that even taking into account the substantial coal shipments from the United States, the coal situation in Europe remains extremely critical.

Steel production gives an even more marked contrast. Production of crude steel in the Bizone in 1938 amounted to 17.6 million tons. This year it will be not more than 2.8 million tons. You will remember that under the Potsdam declaration Germany was allowed a steel capacity of 5.8 million tons. Recently this figure, under the revised level of industry plan, was increased to 10,000,000 tons which was equal to German steel production in 1936 before the great Nazi rearmament boom set in. When you look at present production, however, you will see that it is still far below the Potsdam figure and that German steel exports, which would, accelerate European recovery is at present out of the question.

To the Netherlands the economic fate of Germany is of the greatest importance. Twenty-five percent of the Netherlands prewar imports came from Germany. These consisted mainly of manufactured articles, machines, and machine tools. Most of these goods, which on account of wartime destruction and the necessary expansion of the

Netherlands industry must be imported in greatly increased quantities, are no longer to be purchased in Germany and we are compelled to come to this market thereby increasing our dollar deficit.

On the export side, the picture is equally dismal. Germany before the war bought 16 percent of our exports. This market is almost completely lost because the military authorities have to cut down on imports. The reason for this policy is obvious. On the other hand, it seems anomalous in these days of food shortage to leave the Netherlands with unsalable surplus of vegetables which would help to make up for the deficiency in the German diet. But the real importance of Germany to our economy was our geographical position on the mouth of the Rhine River, that great artery of water traffic which leads right into central Europe. The ports of Rotterdam and Amsterdam are natural inlets and outlets, and are important commercial links between central Europe and the world overseas. When one considers these great ports, the cruel bombardment to which the Germans subjected Rotterdam in the May days of 1940 and the almost scientific method in which they wrecked port installations in Rotterdam and Amsterdam in 1944 and 1945, they gain special significance. The Netherlands ports before the war gained their ascendancy only in heavy competition with the German ports of Hamburg and Bremen. This competition from the German side had to take into its stride artificial devices such as special railway rates between Hamburg and Bremen and numerous places in central Europe. We had hoped that the military defeat of Germany would have ended the preferential position of Hamburg and Bremen, and that it would have restored Rotterdam and Amsterdam to the place to which their geographical positions and their past records would have entitled them. It is quite a disillusionment, however, to see the bizonal administration in Germany channel all overseas traffic to Germany through the ports of Hamburg and Bremen. Financial reasons are again called upon to motivate this policy. This may be so, but on the other hand, the use of the ports of Rotterdam and Amsterdam for this purpose would have been of enormous benefit in the strenuous struggle for recovery the Netherlands are waging. Restoration of Rotterdam's and Amsterdam's earning capacity would greatly diminish the dependency of the Netherlands on American aid.

The Netherlands Government is following with a keen eye the proceedings which are taking place in the drafting of a peace treaty with Germany. In January of this year the Netherlands Government submitted a memorandum to the Big Four giving its views on Allied policy with regard to Germany. In this memorandum the Netherlands Government states as its principal aim, relative to the German problem, "the creation of adequate guarantee to ensure peace and security, and the creation of the prerequisites for the recovery of the national economy and the recovery of the prosperity of Germany insofar as this is essential to European and world prosperity." It is felt throughout the Netherlands that its economic relations with Germany, as a result of its geographical position, have always been so close; that the Netherlands has such a long-standing experience in dealing with Germans; that they, as well as other countries neighboring Germany, feel they are entitled to a large degree in helping to draft the future status of Germany. Germany's importance for European recovery was recognized in the report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation in these words: "For the purpose of drawing up a European balance sheet of resources and requirements, it is indispensable to take account of Germany since that economy has been, in the past, and by the nature of things will remain, closely tied up with the economic system of other European countries."

But let us now leave the German scene and turn to a more general aspect of European aid. I believe the core of the whole problem of aid to Europe to be the question whether the proposed aid will serve its purpose, and whether the countries now applying for such aid will thereby, after a number of years, really succeed in becoming self-sufficient.

The answer to this question, to a great extent, lies in Europe itself. There is no use denying that the line which runs from Stettin in the north to Trieste in the south, separating the west of Europe from the rest of the continent, is in itself an economic monstrosity. Take only the fact that Europe's bread basket in the east is no longer available to the densely populated western Europe. It is the American taxpayer who has to make up for a part of this loss by having to pay almost $1,000,000,000 a year for feeding the population of the Bizone. Furthermore, the collieries in Silesia now wholly in Polish territory, used to supply many a European country with coal. This flow to the west has now become a thin trickle.

The Paris Committee of European Economic Cooperation, in various places of its report, makes full allowance of this fact and stresses the importance of the reopening of the source of supplies from eastern to western Europe.

A second problem in connection with the efficacy of American aid to Europe is the question of economic cooperation among the European countries. The recovery program of the Paris Committee is based inter alia on the development of economic cooperation between the participating countries. Now I know that Americans feel very strongly about this point and that they are apt to belittle the obstacles which exist in welding together the economies of a number of national units, each with their own language, their historical traditions, their ways of living, and last but not least with their own bureaucracies. It is clear that all of these very real obstacles cannot be overcome within a few months, even with the best possible intentions.

In the Netherlands the need for such action is keenly felt. During the war in 1944 the Netherlands Government, then in exile in London, concluded a treaty with the Belgian Government-in-exile whereby both Governments pledged themselves to submit a bill to their Parliaments after the liberation of their respective countries establishing a customs union between the Netherlands and the Belgo-Luxemburg Economic Union. This bold plan inaugurated in wartime London found a warm reception in both countries. The work involved in bringing this idea into effect, however, proved to be an enormous task. A new common tariff had to be elaborated which would apply to the three countries. This task has now been accomplished, and as from January 1, 1948, the new tariff will be in force. As from the same date, the customs barrier between the Netherlands and Belgium will be eliminated. But this is only the first step in the audacious program of the Benelux. The program when completed envisages a complete economic union eliminating all trade barriers between its partners, such as excise duties, quota regulations, and foreign-exchange restrictions. This means a complete merger of the economies of the Benelux countries. It is needless to point out that this ultimate aim cannot be accomplished overnight. A number of mixed committees with representatives from the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxemburg are continually working on the various aspects of the program. Very close contacts among the business interests have to take place. The countries of the Benelux are aware that they are giving up a part of their sovereignty in their proposed merger. For instance, under a cooperation of this kind it is no longer possible to work out plans for the establishment of a new industry in one of the countries without consulting the other Benelux countries and without estimating the economic effect of such a new industry on the economy of the whole Benelux territory.

At the recent Paris conference I believe that the Benelux had a favorable press. A study group was set up which was required to examine the question of further customs unions on the Benelux model. European countries would greatly benefit from further steps in coordinating their economies and thereby rationalize their oversees requirements and enhance their chances for speedy self-sufficiency. But such steps, even when vital, must take their time. Customs, habits, methods of work, even prejudices have to be overcome while a great amount of work of a difficult technical nature is to be done. It took the Benelux countries exactly 3 years to reach the first stage of their program. How much longer will it take to do the same thing for a large number of very diverse European countries?

Secretary Marshall in his Harvard address clearly indicated that the responsibility for the restoration of Europe could lie only with the Europeans. This view is shared in my country.

The Netherlands was badly struck in this war, not only in the European mainland but also in the territories in southeast Asia. The Netherlands history shows many a dark hour, but every period of darkness in our country has been followed by a revival of the strength of the Netherlands people. The war had terrific effects on the economic life but there is one thing that no enemy has been able to take away from our people and that is their capacity and their will to work. Holland is buzzing with work, as I have been able to witness during my two visits there in the course of this year. Every time you see Holland, improvements have been made. Each time more war scars have disappeared. Life is simple, but sufficient. No one will object to simpler ways of life, which, simple as they may be, are a great contrast to the horrible experiences of the Nazi occupation.

However, as I told you before, this level is extremely precarious and far from what it should be, and the resources of foreign exchange are dwindling away rapidly. Without further help all of the efforts which have been exerted would be jeopardized. The whole purpose of the Marshall plan is to prevent this from happening in Europe.

Repeating what I pointed out in the beginning, it is hardly possible today to speak of the economic ills of one particular country. People in many countries in the world are becoming aware of these things. Daily the facts are appealing to the consciousness of mankind and inciting them to use their best efforts in overcoming the present economic disease. I believe this growing awareness to be an advantage.

The task and the responsibility of the Congress of the United States is an enormous one. The importance of its decision on the European-recovery program is far greater than the billions it may appropriate for European aid. Its views may set the course of a freely organized economy in Europe for the next decade. But the responsibility of European statesmen, businessmen, and workers is just as great, maybe greater. It is up to them and to their mutual cooperation that American aid can be made effective. It is up to them to create that feeling which will make Americans say—to paraphrase an expression recently used by a distinguished American—"Europe is a good risk."

God Bless America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by the former Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, which appeared in yesterday's Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—GOD BLESS AMERICA—SOME OF THE THINGS ABOUT THIS COUNTRY THAT ITS CRITICS FORGET WHEN THEY EMPHASIZE OUR FAILINGS

(By the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D.)

Our majestic Capitol, with the Eightieth Congress in momentous session under its white dome, is in full view and hearing of a fear-haunted world. What American does not find in his heart the sound of a great amen to the prayer of a distinguished citizen, who said, "Every time I gaze on the illumined dome I offer the prayer: 'God make me worthy of America at its best' "?

It is easy to see America at its worst. In these days of the whirlwind and the earthquake, there are small groups of misguided and misinformed people who owe everything to this dear land of the free, but who seem to have nothing but jeers for the gold of America and cheers for the dross of alien systems. They condemn almost everything under the Stars and Stripes and condone, and even approve almost everything drenched in the blood and tears of cruel regimentation abroad. In one hand every such person holds pink glasses and in the other a magnifying lens. Whenever they gaze abroad they put on the rose spectacles of praise; whenever they look at their own land they use for their appraisal the magnifying glass of disdain. Just as it is possible to miss the face of Cromwell because of the wart, so these critics scarcely can see the benign face of Uncle Sam because of defects.

To be sure the most ominous loss, to a person or a nation, is the faculty of self-criticism. As Americans we keenly must be conscious of our national failure in practicing the democracy which is our proud creed. We never must be oblivious to our racial prejudice, our glamorous paganism, our blatant irreligion. Always, with searching of heart must we repeat the prayer, "America, America, God mend thine every flaw." But there is more to America than flaws.

God bless America, for the free speech which allows even ungrateful citizens of this privileged land to utter bitter anathemas, for which they immediately would be liquidated in the lands they speak of with such fervent approbation. While some are blaming America for dividing Europe into two warring camps, when that decision was made by another power which vetoed the grand design that America desired, we say: God bless America for the most unselfish and humanitarian gesture recorded in history. And, while this pink-glasses group charges America with imperialism in threatening the sovereignty of other nations and, in the next breath, extolls the system which has crushed more national sovereignties by sheer power than have ever before been turned into puppets, we say again: God bless America!

With the greatest physical might in her hands that any single nation ever has controlled, yet manifesting such scrupulous regard for the national rights of even the smallest and weakest nation on her borders (even when her own national security may be involved), she promptly gives up her bases in a tiny country which asks her to vacate. When America, with the fearful power of the atomic bomb in her hands, offers, in a spirit of internationalism no other nation ever has manifested, to share the dread secret even with those plotting against her own life, some of our own citizens blindly charge her with threatening the power that stubbornly refuses her generous overtures. But, God bless America, for this supreme witness of her belief in the United Nations.

There are those who cry to high heaven over one life in America taken by a lawless mob defying our national laws and our national sentiment, but who are silent about millions kept from their homelands, dying like flies, or toiling under a taskmaster's whip. God bless America, whose leaders in both political parties plainly see that there is a vast difference between cooperation and capitulation—abject appeasement of a system whose theories of the universe, of man, and of ethics are the exact opposite of those principles which are the foundation of America, is the way to the final loss of our own liberties.

God bless America, as in the fear of God and in the name of all humanity she stands before the whole world for the dignity of the individual and the invincible creed that the state is made for man, and not man for the state.

God bless America, because her spires are symbols of a church which is the conscience of the state, and not the slave of the state.

God bless America, because, as Lincoln declared, she is "the last best hope of earth."

Mikolajczyk Tells of Russian Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the fate of the message given us by Mikolajczyk shall not be that of the warnings of Cassandra.

The Milwaukee Sentinel is printing his story on conditions in Poland, installments of which I herewith submit:

MIKOLAJCZYK BARES RUSS PLANS TO SEIZE EUROPE IN HOURS—BRITAIN TO BE NEUTRAL, UNITED STATES UNPREPARED, REDS REASON

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment II)

Communism, linked with Russian military might, is a fantastic machinery which, having been set in motion in Poland and elsewhere in eastern Europe, now must roll on with the relentlessness of a Juggernaut.

Let me tell you of the fervor of one Russian colonel who outlined Russia's master plan to me several months ago in Warsaw.

"You must believe this," he said. "Nothing can stop us. We have profited from the mistakes of previous would-be conquerors and we cannot conceivably make the same blunders.

"France and Italy may be a bit difficult for a time, but we have good men working there and, in time, they will achieve our purpose in those countries.

"But even if they do not," he shrugged, "we have the military might to advance across Europe to the water at a speed which is unknown to students of modern warfare. I do not speak of days, I speak of hours."

I asked him what the Red Army thought England would be doing during this conquest of the Continent. He laughed, without mirth.

"England will be neutral in the war," he said. "They know we have made tremendous development in the rockets we recovered in Germany. They know, too, what suffering they underwent when hit by the undeveloped rockets the Germans used against them. They know they cannot survive if they protest."

"And the United States?" I pressed him.

"Oh, we'll offer them a negotiated peace and probably they'll turn it down and declare war. But what does that matter? We will hold the beaches of the entire Continent. America is unprepared, so the declaration of war will be useless for a long time—while they build back their forces and devise means of transporting men and armor all the way to the Continent without the aid of an offshore base, such as England and Ireland were in World War II.

"In the meantime, we can consolidate our gains."

But that is in the future—how distant I cannot predict. If you want to know what Russia is doing today, in pursuit of its master plan, you need look no further than Poland.

For here is the test case. Here is the sampling of democracy's boiling point—just as the Japanese bombing of the American gunboat *Panay* was the sampling for Pearl Harbor.

All of these depredations I will deal with at length in subsequent articles. My point now is simply to touch certain high spots, sound a warning to all lovers of freedom in the world, reveal the galling tragedy of a people who sacrificed 5,265,800 dead in World War II and yet would have considered that almost a bargain if we had been granted even the most elemental of postwar promises.

In the name of humanity I will certainly make no appeal in these articles for a military war on Russia. We need no further proof that war is the worst and least effective means of settling disputes.

A World War III would not only be a most terrible calamity to my people and my country but a blow from which civilization itself could hardly recover.

IT CAN BE AVERTED

I believe World War III's military phase can be averted, despite the fact that the prime aggressor, first with the acceptance of the British and American Governments, and since that time with a ringing scorn for both those powers, has made enormous gains.

It would have been comparatively simple for me to die in Poland. Had I remained a few more days, I would have been stripped of my immunity as a member of the Polish Parliament, tried by a military court for preaching and practicing the only kind of democracy which peace-loving people know, and shot.

This would have been the culmination of 2½ years of ever-tightening pressure on me which began the day I returned to Warsaw in 1945.

It would have been the final act of a series of intimidations of me and the party I head which began with my arrival at the airport outside Warsaw, when Boleslaw Beirut, the old-line Communist who has been imposed on Poland as its so-called President, ordered me to address the hopeful thousands on hand with a salutation that was even less humane than comrades, and I turned my

back on him and said instead, "My sisters and brothers."

GLAD HE'S ALIVE

It would have climaxed the murders of 104 Peasant Party leaders and the cynical confiscation and destruction of the party's various headquarters. It would have been the apparent coup de grace administered to the last articulate democratic political body, bearing the undisputed support of a majority of the people, left in Poland.

The latest news I have had from Poland is that the people are saying they are glad that I am still alive. They say I would have become a symbol, but a very dead one.

They say they prefer me as a living Pole, a living hope.

So I escaped by methods which I will deal with later. I reached the haven of Britain, and now the United States—to tell the whole world my story.

MIKOLAJCZYK TELLS HOW RUSS HAMPERED FLIGHT FROM NAZIS

(Installment III)

It may perhaps help the reader understand what is happening in Poland today if he first understands what happened to me during those tragic days of disorder leading up to and following the declaration of World War II.

Europe is a land of intense nationalistic feeling, and I readily shared that trait. My father, one of 16 children born on a small farm in western Poland, had given up the soil to work in the coal mines of western Germany. We remained Poles at heart.

I was born in western Germany, returned to the farm with my mother when I was 7 and at 16 took a job as a laborer in a sugar factory.

In 1918 I joined the Falcon organization, a group of independence-minded Poles, in their uprising against the Kaiser. In 1920 I fought as a private in the Polish forces that turned back the advancing Bolsheviks. I was wounded.

So, before my 20th birthday, I had been a private in what amount to two wars for the freedom of my country. And when the second war was done and Poland's sovereignty established beyond doubt, I returned to our family farm near Poznan and worked there, increasing our holdings to 12 acres.

And I went back to school, got interested in various agricultural, cooperative, and political clubs in my area and joined the Polish Peasant Party. I was attracted to it because of its liberal, democratic platform and because it represented the hopes and ideals of a majority of the Polish people.

Today, under Communist domination, for a Pole to espouse those same hopes and ideals is tantamount to inviting the Russian-trained security police to crack down with penalties that range from confiscation of one's property to death.

By 1924 I was secretary of the district headquarters of the Peasant Party, editor of a farmer's weekly, a contributor to newspapers and magazines which are now banned, organizer and first president of the Association of Polish Youth of Western Poland, founder and instructor in the Peasant University at Nielazkow, and active in self-government, agriculture, and cooperative organization.

I ran for Parliament in 1930 on the Peasant Party ticket and was elected from the Gniezno area.

Pilsudski and Beck had seized control of the Polish Government, changed the constitution which he had patterned after that of the United States. Pilsudski exiled the leader of my party, Wincenty Witos, and the pressure on me stepped up when I became acting chairman. I vigorously opposed Pilsudski because of his appeasement of Nazi Germany.

HITLER PLAN OBVIOUS

From the moment he took office it was obvious Hitler planned to attack Poland. He had said as much in Mein Kampf and one had only to speak to average German youths to know their receptivity toward the approaching war.

"You're fooling yourself," I told one German with whom I had grown up. "Hitler's a Socialist, or says he is. You were always a conservative. How can you support him?"

"Political parties mean nothing anymore," he replied, as if surprised I did not know such an obvious fact. "Germany has had three great leaders who transcended party politics, Frederick the Great, the Kaiser Wilhelm, and now the greatest of them all, Der Fuehrer. Providence ordained him to make us the herrenvolk. Under his leadership we will rule the world."

FULL OF ECSTASY

Another young German, full of ecstasy for Hitler, told me of the wonderful economic gains Germany had made under him.

"We have no more unemployment," he said, "Hitler has put the nation to work, building guns, tanks, planes * * *"

"For what?" I asked him.

"To relieve unemployment, of course."

"But how will these things be used?" I inquired, and, in his bewildered way, he said what countless other Germans must have been saying.

"When we have a sufficiency, Der Fuehrer will know what to do."

MUST STAND BY ARMY

He did. He attacked us. Shortly before the blow fell, I spoke, as chairman of the Western Poland Farmer's Association, to a group of 15,000 farmers and agricultural authorities and told them that in the perilous days to come we must stand by our army.

As a result, the government offered me a post as coordinator of food during the war to to come. But I had made my speech and meant it. I joined the army on August 27, 1939, once again as a private.

Poland was felled as if struck by lightning, as, indeed, it was. The disorder was beyond belief. I had urged that the people permit the panzers to roll through, and thus remain behind the advancing Nazi lines in ever-increasing numbers, and continue the fight.

JAMMED ALL ROADS

Instead, millions of Poles were ordered to flee in the face of the approaching Germans. They jammed all roads and were slaughtered by strafing German planes. The Army could not possibly maneuver.

It was a bitter shambles. It is a sickening feeling to see one's country plunged into utter defeat through blind unpreparedness.

One dim hope remained as the German tanks forged on against us—our defending forces sometimes made up of youths bravely but pathetically throwing bottles of benzine at the steel monsters.

That hope centered around Russia. Poland had a solemn-sounding nonaggression pact with Moscow. Perhaps we could flee into the U. S. S. R. Perhaps, even, Russia might come to our aid.

Then on September 17, as our map unit—now depleted by casualties—retreated toward the southeast, our commander turned from his radio with a look I shall never forget.

"This is the worst," he cried. "Russia has put the knife in our back. The Red Army is now entering eastern Poland to help the Germans."

With 4,000 other remnants of the Polish Army, I walked into Hungary, then still neutral, and was interned. I had never been able to reach my family.

The defeat of Poland lay on me like a fever, and a part of that malady was the anger at the callous, pitiless manner in which Russia, our friend by pact, had kicked us while we were prostrate.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, New York, N. Y.:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF 53 MEMBERS ON HOW TO COMBAT INFLATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy pointed out at its inception in 1933, and at various times since, that the stage was being set by a variety of governmental monetary and spending policies for what is commonly called inflation—more specifically, a relatively rapid depreciation in the purchasing power of our dollar in terms of goods and services.

Now that these policies, combined with those related to the expansion in note and deposit currency and other economic distortions that occurred during the war, are revealing some of their logical consequences, there is considerable concern, in Government circles as well as outside, as to what should be done to arrest or to minimize what is now being widely recognized as an unhealthy trend of events in our economy. Once so many seeds of inflation have been sown and cultivated with such persistency, in peacetime as well as in war, the problems of arresting or counteracting the consequences sometimes become exceedingly difficult and complicated. Sometimes the consequent forces become so strong that they tend to run their natural course to their unfortunate end despite efforts to counteract them.

It was because of the world's experiences with results flowing from the employment of inflationary procedures that members of this committee, from time to time, have protested and issued warnings against the pursuit of a course, when not required by the necessities of war, that opened the way for, and invited, consequences that might be seriously harmful, if not disastrous, to our economy.

There is, apparently, no easy way to arrest the inflationary tide now running with so much force in this country. The attack on it requires action on a variety of fronts since its causes are numerous.

We, the undersigned, members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, recommend the following:

1. A radical reduction in Government expenditures; in particular, abandonment of all public-work projects except those of an emergency nature.
2. A reduction in taxes.
3. A reduction in the Federal debt.
4. A return to a gold-coin monetary standard, and a revision of our monetary laws, in order to return to the people of the United States greater control over the Government's use and abuse of the public purse and to reverse the pronounced trend in this country toward a governmentally managed economy.
5. An increase in production, productive effort, and efficiency of all productive agents.
6. Abandonment of make-work, featherbedding, and other devices for collecting pay for work not done.
7. The maintenance of relatively low inventories and the avoidance of hoarding by business enterprises.
8. The retention by business enterprises of a large percentage of earnings for improvement and expansion of their businesses, and a revision of our tax laws to permit such retention without penalty.

9. The cautious use of credit, and an increase, where possible, of margins of safety against extensions of credit.
10. That sellers make special efforts to maintain the lowest possible prices consistent with a low margin of profit as a means of forestalling a possible large price decline and severe liquidation.
11. Reduction in tariffs and other restrictions to trade, domestic and foreign.
12. A recognition on the part of our Federal Government that it cannot buy large amounts of already relatively scarce supplies and at the same time not contribute to high or higher prices.
13. Abandonment of Federal subsidies except where matters of national protection—in air, army, and naval forces—are involved, and also repeal of price-parity and price-maintenance laws.
14. That the Government not confuse symptoms with causes and that it not attempt to control symptoms since such controls tend to conceal causes, distort the economic picture, and perpetuate, accentuate, and foster new, economic maladjustments.
15. That people not buy what they do not need and that they not borrow to buy things they can do without.
16. That the apparent tendency to loan too freely and too much to foreign countries be sharply curbed.
17. That interest rates be permitted to find their natural levels.
18. That the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System give greater attention to the type of administration of our monetary and credit structure that should foster more harmonious relationships in the various segments of our economy.

Eugene E. Agger (2, 4, 16, 17), Rutgers University; Benjamin M. Anderson (10, 18), University of California at Los Angeles; Charles C. Arbuthnot (13, 16, 18), Western Reserve University; James Washington Bell (2, 4), Northwestern University; Claude L. Benner (2), Continental American Life Insurance Co.; William A. Berridge, Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.; Ernest L. Bogart, New York City; Frederick A. Bradford (2), Lehigh University; J. Ray Cable, Missouri Valley College; Wilbur P. Calhoun (2), University of Cincinnati; Arthur W. Crawford, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; William M. Cumberland, Ladenburg, Thalmann & Co.; Rev. Bernard W. Dempsey, S. J., St. Louis University; Charles A. Dice (2, 3, 4, 17, 18), the Ohio State University; D. W. Ellsworth (7, 8, 10, 15), E. W. Axe & Co., Inc.; Fred R. Fairchild, Yale University; Charles C. Fichtner (10), Buffalo, N. Y.; Major B. Foster (18), Alexander Hamilton Institute and New York University; Roy L. Garis (16), University of Southern California; Lewis H. Haney (4, 7, 8, 15), New York University; E. C. Harwood, American Institute for Economic Research; Hudson B. Hastings (2, 4, 11), Yale University; William F. Hauhart, Dean Emeritus, Southern Methodist University; Henry Hazlitt (2), Newsweek; John Thom Holdsworth (2), the University of Miami; Montfort Jones (2, 14, 17), the University of Pittsburgh; Donald L. Kemmerer (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18), University of Illinois; William H. Kiekhofer, the University of Wisconsin; Frederic E. Lee, University of Illinois; J. L. Leonard, University of Southern California; Philipp H. Lohman (2, 4, 17), University of Vermont; A. Wilfred May (18), Executive Editor, the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, New York City; Roy M. McDonald (14), Donovan, Leisure, Newton, Lumbard and Irvine, New York City; David H. McKinley (2, 6, 10, 14, 15), the Pennsylvania State College; Frank Parker, University of Pennsylvania; Clyde W. Phelps, University of Southern California; Chester A. Phillips, the State University of Iowa; Charles L. Prather (2, 4), the University of Texas; Howard H. Preston (2, 4, 16, 17), University of Washington; Leland Rex Robinson (2, 16), 2 Western Forty-fifth Street, New York City; R. G. Rodkey, University of Michigan; Olin Glenn Saxon (10), Yale University; Carlton A. Shively, the New York Sun; Walter E. Spahr, New York University; William H. Steiner, Brooklyn College; Charles S. Tippetts (2, 4, 16, 17), Mercersburg Academy; Alvin S. Tostlebe (2, 4, 17), the College of Wooster; James B. Trant (2, 8, 17), Louisiana State University; Rufus S. Tucker (2, 8, 11, 16, 18), Westfield, N. J.; Russell Weisman, Western Reserve University; Nathaniel R. Whitney (10, 18), the Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati; Edward Wiest (2), University of Kentucky; Max Winkler, College of the City of New York.

NOTE.—Numbers in parentheses after names of signers indicate items regarding which they have reservations or to which they are opposed, fully or in part.

We're Preparing for the Wrong War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky from Look for December 9, 1947:

WE'RE PREPARING FOR THE WRONG WAR

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

(In an article for Look, December 17, 1940, Major de Seversky wrote: "American air power must be built to deliver knockout blows at great distances * * *. Not one nation has yet made full use of real air strength. Victory will go to the one that does." Result: Military experts scoffed. A year later, in Look, October 7, 1941, de Seversky wrote: "The Army continues to treat aviation as one more auxiliary to its services * * *. This is not air power—it is merely a miscellany of airplanes hitched to older, slower services. * * * The first [thing to do] is to wrest our military aviation from the control of the older services and merge it in one separate and unified Air Force." Result: The high command categorically rejected the idea of an autonomous air force as impractical. In Look, July 13, 1943, Walt Disney's dramatization of Major de Seversky's Victory Through Air Power repeated the aviator's call for air power. Result: Stategic air bombing at last got off to a slow start. During this entire period, military diehards, unable to rebut his arguments, accused de Seversky of doing a disservice to the war effort. But by VJ-day, the world finally was able to see what air power could do if given half a chance. And last February, de Seversky was awarded the Medal for Merit with a Presidential citation crediting his appeals to the public with an inestimable contribution to the final victory. Four months later, he received the International Harmon trophy. The award cited his work to prove the principles of long-range escort fighters and said their application helped to guarantee victory. Still more recently, as he had long advocated, the Air Forces at last became an independent, unified service. But real air power is still not a reality. In this article, Major de Seversky describes what we must do—while we still have time.)

The world is in turmoil. While we strive earnestly for peace, we dare not ignore the possibility of war. Certainly, a weak America would invite aggression, a strong America would discourage it.

If war does come, will we be ready for it? Not unless we have a clear prevision of how it will be fought and prepare accordingly. Not unless we concentrate our wealth and effort on the decisive weapons, instead of spreading them thin, indiscriminately, over all weapons.

In the victorious phase of the last war, we pulled an intellectual surprise in the form of strategic air power; long-range aviation striking at the industrial sources of the enemy's strength. Germany and Japan were not ready to use or to defend themselves against that kind of aerial potential.

But today every nation capable of engaging in modern warfare is thoroughly aware of the meaning of such real air power. The nation must, in simple common sense, channel its major resources into air forces.

The hope of another such surprise must be dismissed. Moreover, despite vastly increased aircraft speed, penetration to the heart of the enemy country will be more difficult and more costly than ever before. Defensive potentials are being rapidly raised through electronic detection, proximity fuzes, ground-to-air rockets, and other kinds of devices.

A future war will, therefore, resolve from the outset into a contest for right-of-way in the air ocean. The side that first achieves freedom of aerial navigation over the enemy country, while denying that freedom over its own country, will be in a position to win. It will then be able to deliver atom bombs and other destruction, while eliminating the enemy's ability to do so.

AIR POWER SHOULD COME FIRST

Unless we can attain control of the skies, all other military forces will be useless. They will never come into play. That being the case, we must immediately divert the major portion of our national resources to building unmatched air power in being.

In the last war we faced a fateful choice—and a golden opportunity—when we lost our fleet on December 7, 1941. We could have elected to put all we had into building true strategic long-range air power. In that case we could have attained complete control of the air all over the globe and defeated Germany and Japan by our own strength, without dependence on allies other than Britain. At the end of the war we would have had the decisive voice in organizing an enduring democratic peace.

Unhappily some of our leaders could not envision the possibilities of air power. They knew only the "true and tried weapons." They were obsessed by the inherited idea that war had to end on the ground, on the field of face-to-face battle.

Instead of building invincible long-range air power, capable of bypassing the enemy surface forces, we proceeded to rebuild the fleet to carry armies to battlefields all over the world. In this way we chained ourselves to the surface struggle, in which manpower was decisive. Since we lacked adequate manpower for victory, we proceeded to build Russia into the greatest land power on earth. Theoretically, this was to save American lives; in actuality, we created a

Frankenstein monster which now jeopardizes millions of our lives.

LONG-RANGE BOMBING FEASIBLE IN 1943

As an aeronautical engineer, I stated then, and repeat now, that we could have built the necessary long-range air power for all-out use by 1943. We needed only to tackle that task on the same scale, and with the same concentration of effort, that we brought to bear on developing the atom bomb.

In 1939 I consulted most of our leading aircraft designers and manufacturers. I can attest that industry was prepared to build aircraft at that time which, by 1943, could have flown directly from Alaska or Newfoundland to Asia and Europe, respectively; which could have deposited ten times the bomb load which was delivered in Flying Fortresses and Liberators on Germany.

In other words, had we decided that air power is the backbone of modern strategy, we could have dropped on Germany in 1943—not in 1944 or 1945—not 1,600,000 tons of explosives but 50,000,000 tons! Even laymen today concede that Germany would have collapsed under that weight of bombardment long before we mobilized the necessary forces for surface invasion—and without need to draw the Red armies into eastern and central Europe.

Against Japan we could have used strategic air power—the method that doomed that country when finally we did resort to it—years earlier. The bloody island-to-island ordeal from Guadalcanal to the Marianas would have been avoided.

WE WERE BLIND TO AIR POWER

But, alas, we ignored the new strategic possibilities. Aeronautical science was ready. Industry was ready. It was not a technological failure but a failure of strategic imagination-strategic astigmatism in high places.

We planned the most amateurish war on record, breaking every basic strategic principle. For instance, we undertook to build the biggest Army, the biggest Navy, the biggest Air Force, the biggest everything at the same time. In trying to be strong everywhere, we failed to attain maximum strength in any of the component forces. Yet we got away with it. Why? Simply because we were so terrifically strong and wealthy that we could afford the luxury of major errors and fantastic waste. Like a heavyweight in the ring with an infant, we could make any mistake and score a knockout—even by accident. We just smothered the enemy under the weight of our matériel downpour.

In another war, we may not be able to afford such luxury. In terms of manpower and natural resources, we may be the "little Nation," fighting a big nation—perhaps the whole Eurasian Continent. We cannot risk the profligate methods of the past. We have to determine which force is decisive and concentrate on it to assure a favorable decision. Little David pitted against Goliath, we will have to score a strategic bull's-eye.

Anything short of that may spell calamity.

Yet at this moment, we are again building in all directions at once, dividing appropriations fairly among all forces and weapons without deference to the kind of war we shall have to fight.

Let us visualize the next war. We know that World War I was a war of position, with two opposing forces in trenches shooting it out to a decision. World War II was a war of movement over the face of the whole planet.

WE FACE ANOTHER WAR OF POSITION

World War III will again be a war of position, only on a global scale. The two adversaries on respective sides of the earth will be like two fortresses possessing artillery that can strike at any part of the opposing fortress. They will shoot it out to a decision.

On one side of the globe is Eurasia, on the other America, with the Arctic area as the no man's land in between. Tactically, of course, there will be lots of movement, primarily in the air. But strategically the adversaries will be stationary, pinned to their positions.

The "walls" of these fortresses locked in a clinch will be their defensive air power; the ramrod that will seek to penetrate the walls will be the opposing striking air power. Our No. 1 job is to build the ramrod—the striking air force—capable of breaking through and destroying the air walls of the enemy fortress.

This, moreover, will not be merely a prelude to invasion. It will be the supreme goal in itself. I am entirely convinced that there will be no need for military invasion. The victor may decide to occupy and hold the conquered area for economic or other reasons—but invasion as a component of total military victory will be a thing of the past.

Even in the last war we did not have to occupy Germany and Japan from a purely military standpoint. After we assumed control of the air we could have bombed those nations into a pulp, destroying the last vestiges of their industrial civilization and leaving them to dig out of the debris for the next two or three generations.

OCCUPATION WILL BE UNNECESSARY

Occupation made sense in the past, when the enemy's means to wage war could not be finally eliminated without the entry of a victorious army. Today, when total demolition can be obtained from the skies, the concept has lost its validity.

The real reason for occupation, however, was political. Three ideologies—fascism, communism and democracy—were involved in the last war. After fascism was destroyed, the question that emerged was which of the remaining ideologies would dominate in the defeated areas. Occupation, both by the Russians and the democracies, was not a military necessity but a political race to stake out spheres of influence.

But in the foreseeable future, the world will be divided, geographically and politically, only into two warring ideologies. Whichever side wins, there will be no third party ready to take over the conquered regions ideologically. That is why the next war will end with total destruction of the foe, without need for military occupation.

Of course, if war should come tomorrow, before either side has forged longe-range weapons, we will have merely a continuation of the methods of World War II. In that case, I can see no likelihood of either side scoring a final decision. The best we can expect is a stalemate, with attrition working against us. We would be obliged to try to contain the enemy, fighting for time to build the indispensable long-range striking air force, which alone can bring us total victory. This transitory struggle would resolve itself into the two-fortress image I have projected.

Three to five years hence, the siege "artillery" will be represented by long-range bombers and escort planes. They will be of somewhat different military characteristics than those in the last war. Later, they may be replaced by robot planes, and still later by rockets. But the nature of the "artillery" will not alter the strategic equation. We will still have two fixed fortresses shooting it out.

OUTLYING BASES WON'T HELP

A decision will not be scored until long-range artillery is brought into play because under modern conditions, war cannot be waged to a finish from outlying bases. No country can absorb the losses involved in such an attempt.

No nation now has enough aircraft to strike in force across oceans and across the Pole—but their average range is long enough to prevent an enemy from holding bases anywhere within their striking radius.

In justifying distant bases, some experts insist that if you are closer to the target you need less fuel and can therefore carry more explosives. This slight tactical advantage, however, will be offset by big strategic disadvantages.

In commercial aviation, to cite an analogy, a lot more passengers could be carried if a lot of stops were made for frequent refueling. Yet over-all efficiency makes nonstop transcontinental flights more desirable. Similar over-all considerations rule out intermediary bases.

In order to gain the marginal tactical advantage of bases nearer to the enemy, we have to spend enormous amounts of our national resources for naval and land power to hold and supply and defend those stepping stones. That cost is ludicrously out of proportion to the benefits the bases offer—even if we could hold them.

During the last war, we used overseas bases because we had no alternative; owing to backward strategic thinking, air power of the necessary range for direct operations had not been prepared. And because we fought from advance bases, we had to provide colossal naval forces to clear the oceans of submarines; to transport and supply the armies that occupied and serviced the advance points. We had to provide almost incalculable surface forces of every kind to seize outlying bases and aircraft to shield that vast deployment of surface forces.

EUROPEAN BASES PROVED COSTLY

I had occasion to compare our action against Europe from European bases as against direct action across the Atlantic. I had to figure out the labor and material that went into naval and land forces necessitated by warfare based on distant points. Obviously, the investment was immense.

What would have happened if only a fraction of that investment had been put into long-range air power; and if we had mounted our bombing offensive directly from, let us say, Newfoundland? We might have deposited on Germany several times as much explosive for one-tenth of the cost of the same attack from close-up bases. What is more, the lives invested in fighting for and defending such bases would have been saved.

The only overseas base that can still be an asset to us is the British Isles, not only because they are separated from the Continent by a body of water but because they have the industrial power to generate their own fighting machine. England is capable of producing and maintaining an air force in being comparable to our own in size and quality. It will be an ally for our own aerial potential in the vtial struggle for control of the skies.

BASES NEED FULL AIR SUPPORT

Suppose the enemy had a powerful base on Bermuda. How long would it survive? Could it conceivably be provided with air power superior to what we could hurl against it from our mainland? Yet some of our military men seriously plan for such operations in reverse; they are already dumping our wealth into invasion forces to implement such fantastic and foredoomed plans.

It is possible to prescribe a definite rule: Outlying bases intended for decisive action should be so located that any air attack against them will involve for the enemy the risk of joining in a major air battle to be fought to a conclusion. In other words, these bases, whether fixed or floating, such as aircraft carriers, must be subject to protection by our entire air force in being. Unless a base can muster such total defense, it will be flattened out instantly by the opposing air force.

I come now to the atom bomb. Despite the hysteria churned up on the subject, the atom bomb does not alter the strategic relationships I have outlined.

The American people must grasp the fact that it is not a new military force, in the sense that the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are military forces. It is another explosive—immensely, horribly destructive, but before it can be instrumental in attaining a decision, it has to be delivered, like any other explosive, by one or a combination of military forces to the right target at the right time.

Let it be understood that I do not underestimate the atom bomb. It is every bit as potent and terrifying as generally described. I have seen it in action and I have seen its effects, so I know.

But I am discussing the atom bomb in cold terms of military science. I am convinced that the tactical values ascribed to it are all out of proportion. There has been too much loose talk, scare talk, and exaggeration. In letting the mere existence or possession of atom bombs distort the large strategic picture, we are in danger of generating a false sense of security on the one hand, a false sense of defeatist despair on the other. Another danger of exaggeration is that it may tempt us to mount a premature offensive with all of its tragic consequences.

ATOM BOMBS HAVE A LIMIT

We hear talk of a bomb so terrific that it could destroy nations, or the entire planet, at one blow. If that comes true, some scientist, we may be sure, will explode it just for the hell of it, to prove his point. In that case, the problem of national defense would certainly be simplified.

But, unfortunately, we are still dealing with bombs of finite, rather than infinite, capacity. Hence, the science of war making has not been canceled out. We must continue to give thought to strategy and the complex military machine to carry out strategy.

To think of the atom bomb as an apocalyptic force is a bit premature. The bomb may double or quadruple its capacity. But for the predictable future, there will still be a practical limit to its size. There will be a point at which further expansion of explosion in one missile becomes wasteful. For a long time the atom bomb will necessarily be of limited capacity, able to destroy a specific target and requiring control of the medium through which it is delivered.

After I had studied aerial destruction in Europe for 5 months, the Secretary of War asked me to make a similar survey in Japan. Accordingly, I put in 2 months in that country studying the results of our bombardment of Japanese targets. I spent several days in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Later, after I returned from Japan, the Secretary of War sent me as his representative to Bikini for the bomb tests there.

Judging by what I saw in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, no single bomb of the type dropped there—or two, or three—will, in my opinion, be able to destroy a large concrete and steel city like New York or Chicago. Atomic scientists who insist that a single bomb will automatically wipe out any major modern city are venturing beyond their depth. With the courage of their military innocence, they calculate the number of stock-piled bombs needed to destroy the key cities of this or that county, as equal to the number of cities. Their assumption, of course, is that the score of hits will be 100 percent, that the winds will blow in the right direction and other ideal conditions will prevail, as in a Bikini-type laboratory test.

Suppose we had operated against Japan or Germany on the basis of such simple arithmetic. We knew, let us say, that Germany had 82 major targets that had to be destroyed to cripple its capacity to wage war. Suppose that we had provided exactly the number of bombs theoretically needed to do the job, and no more. This, mind you, before the issue of control of the air had been decided.

Nothing more absurd could be imagined. People forget that even in target practice the average score is about 50 percent, and that under battle conditions the score seldom exceeds 3 percent.

The real novelty of the atom bomb, aside from its greater power, is its three-in-one character. It produces blast; it is an incendiary through flash-heat; and it is poisonous through its radioactivity. Against the poison factor, there is as yet no defense except mass: 6 feet of concrete or several inches of lead.

PRINCIPLES OF WAR ARE UNCHANGED

Again, at the risk of being charged with underestimating radioactivity, we should recognize that it does not change the basic principles of war. After all, what is the difference between a square mile of industrial area made untenable through being reduced to rubble by old-fashioned bombs, with people buried alive under the ruins, and the same square now roped off, due to radioactive contamination, with people dying in hospitals?

If the enemy should succeed in capturing control of the air over the United States, our atomic stock pile will not do us the slightest bit of good. Once the foe enjoys freedom of navigation over our country, he will proceed to demolish us at his own leisure—with atom bombs or with old-fashioned TNT or, for that matter, with sacks of potatoes, if they are heavy enough. As for the stock pile of atomic bombs, under those circumstances, we might just as well use them for pins in a bowling alley.

My point is that the atomic bomb is a most powerful weapon, but only in the hands of a country that is prepared to conquer the air ocean. Scientifically, atomic energy is, indeed, a revolutionary development. But it does not at this stage revolutionize the strategy based on long-range air power.

ATOM STOCK PILES NEED PLANES

After Bikini, one of our military columnists stated that the relative military strength of nations hereafter would be measured by their relative stock piles of atom bombs. Militarily speaking, that is sheer nonsense. The relative strength of nations will depend on superior means of delivery of these bombs—and that means air power.

Those who claim that there never will be any defense against the atom bomb, in my opinion, confess their intellectual bankruptcy. Such people are selling science down the river. Throughout my 30-year career as an engineer, I have observed that as soon as a statement is made that something cannot be done—it is done. Atomic energy itself is bound to produce the necessary antidote against the use of the atomic bomb.

The notion that the very threat of atomic attack will frighten an enemy into surrender is a dangerous fallacy. New weapons of destruction have always prompted extravagant claims that there could be no defense against them. Invariably, of course, some antidote emerged to curb the new weapon at least to the point where it could not by itself impede a nation's capacity for making war.

Before World War II, extreme claims were made for bombing and poison gas. It was said the poison gas from the skies would result in ghost cities and even ghost nations; also that such attacks would have the advantage of destroying people instead of things; and that an attack of that kind on a capital city alone would bring panic and precipitate immediate surrender.

Yet we saw no use of gas in the last war. This was not because of humane scruples, but because attack against human beings, who are mobile and intelligent, is infinitely less effective than attack against inert things. We saw bombs rain down on nations for years without producing panic and immediate collapse of morale.

The fact is that the human animal—when ideologically inspired—can take an immense amount of punishment. Once people are engulfed in war, regardless of the weapons used, it is not fear, horror or misery which makes them collapse but the actual elimination of the physical industrial means to make war.

Those who believe that war in the atom age will be short—a matter of days or even hours—are sure to be disillusioned. True, the atomic explosive is many times more powerful than its predecessors. But to destroy war-making capacity in order to cripple a nation will require many times greater effort and time because of improved defensive techniques.

Nor will the victory be "cheap," as some suppose. Because one plane dropping one bomb was able to destroy a flimsy, highly inflammable and unprepared Hiroshima, it does not mean that the same will hold true in the future. Air being the main arena of action, not thousands but millions of people will be involved in the decisive air battles of tomorrow, in the skies and on the ground. The drain on our resources will be even greater than in former wars.

Control of the air is the first indispensable condition of victory. We do not merely need planes to carry bombs, but planes capable of fighting their way through the opponent's defenses. As long as we use piloted aircraft—jet or even rocket-driven—it means combat for command of the air and electronic domination.

PUSH-BUTTON WAR IS REMOTE

Only with the advent of long-range, supersonic robot rockets will it become possible to talk of penetration without combat. The push-button warfare with its transcontinental and transoceanic rockets is still very far off. At the present stage, a rocket that theoretically could be fired from our mainland against a target several thousand miles away would have to weigh 400,000 tons, or the equivalent of eight battleships. To be effective, a great rate of fire would have to be sustained. Imagine firing 'billion-dollar bullets" every second or so. We would exhaust our total resources in a few minutes.

Until new materials and fuels are developed, therefore, guided missiles and rockets will be merely an adjunct of air power, in the sense that the torpedo is an adjunct of sea power.

Having put these weapons in their practical place, let us see how we can implement long-range air strategy with piloted aircraft. Right now, we are on the verge of getting aviation through the speed of sound. It is likely that in a short time jet-propelled aircraft will fly at 1,200 or even 2,000 miles an hour.

Beyond such speeds, we shall run into problems of heat generated by fraction. The VX2, for example, at its top speed heated up to 600 degrees centigrade. Even at 2,000 miles an hour, we must therefore expect temperatures that the human organism cannot endure. This may prove to be the limiting factor, for the time being anyhow, on speed in piloted aircraft.

In any case, such speeds will not affect basic srtegy. For the crew under combat conditions there is no difference between a 6-hour flight from London to Berlin and a 6-hour flight from Chicago to the Urals. They will still have 6 hours of fighting to overcome hazards and obstacles: attack by enemy aircraft, antiaircraft fire including proximity fuses, all sorts of ground-to-air rockets and guided missiles.

That means that the bomber of the future, carrying an atomic warhead, must be shielded by escort planes. These planes may take entirely new forms, but they will remain indispensable. Escort tactics will be different but basic principles will remain unchanged. As long as piloted air planes are used—as they must be in any war in the foreseeable future—we can expect no revolution in the basic strategy I have indicated. To let the power and the horror of the newest explosive distort our vision is to court disaster.

WE KNOW OUR POSSIBLE ENEMY

Our strategic picture today is clearer than ever before—because, if a new war comes, we

know the direction from which the war can come and the tasks it will set us. In the last war, we had to build weapons for universal application anywhere on the globe; that imposed design compromises for which we paid in reduced efficiency. In the next war, we know in advance the precise terrain and targets. We can design for combat under predictable conditions, against specific targets with a greater efficiency.

It would be suicidal to accept battle on the surface of the earth, where we shall, in the nature of the case, be hopelessly outnumbered. Our strategy for the future must be one that circumvents the potential enemy's manpower. Nor must we stake victory on untenable distant bases, fixed or floating, for reasons I have already indicated.

We can guarantee victory only through superior creative imagination; not through fantasy but through clear, practical vision of the nature of future war making as affected by the direction of technological progress.

Intensive research is imperative, particularly in the field of aerodynamics and electronics. Only in this way can we provide ingenious weapons to meet the new conditions—and gear now for unbeatable air power able to strike at the heart of the enemy's industrial set-up directly from our own mainland, bypassing the opponent's massed strength on the surface.

We are in an ideal position for clear thinking, clear planning, and the creation of appropriate weapons. Those weapons should be built with just one vital purpose: to give us undisputed domination of the entire air ocean.

Let us begin to build these weapons now. Let us not squander our limited resources on obsolete strategies and on weapons which will never be taken off the shelves. In war to come, even wealthy America cannot afford to disperse its strength. We can always count on the valor and spirit of sacrifice of our fighting men—but that alone may not be enough to turn the scales of victory.

City Manager for Washington?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me, I am very glad to have this opportunity of inserting in the RECORD, copy of an article written by me entitled "City Manager for Washington," which appeared in the National Municipal Review for December 1947.

This article sketches the development of the municipal government here in Washington since the Civil War and explains in a thumb-nail fashion the results of the study of the Subcommittee on Home Rule and Reorganization of the District of Columbia. I hope the Members of the House will take the opportunity to read this article because it will aid in their understanding of the home rule bill when it reaches the floor.

The study of this problem has been a most interesting and constructive education and I venture to think that an opportunity has at long last arrived for the Congress to do something constructive for the government of the capital city of the Nation.

The article follows:

CITY MANAGER FOR WASHINGTON?—CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE FINDS GOVERNMENT OF CAPITAL CITY A HOPELESS HODGEPODGE; SUGGESTS COUNCIL-MANAGER PLAN

(By. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS)

We like to think of the city of Washington these days as the center of world democracy—the capital of the democratic world—for the free peoples of the earth are looking to the United States and its Capital City for spiritual and material sustenance in these critical times. But how many of them know, and how many Americans realize, that the people of Washington live in a state of political peonage and that its charter dates back almost unchanged to 1874?

Today the city of Washington has almost 900,000 residents. More people live there than in 13 States of the Union. They pay millions in taxes, are exceptionally literate, and have all the earmarks of an advanced culture. But, believe it or not, they have no representation in Congress and elect none of their local officials.

In the Capital City of the world's greatest democracy you might expect to find a model system of local self-government. But if you examine it, as I have done, as chairman of a congressional investigating committee, you will find a patchwork set-up that looks like a political Donnybrook Fair. The present government of Washington, set up in 1874 as a temporary arrangement, has continued down to the present time by a process of drift and neglect, not in pursuance of any governmental principle or deliberate desire to deprive its residents of home rule.

Washington has not always been voteless and voiceless, nor did the founding fathers contemplate that it would be. James Madison, who had been a delegate to the constitutional convention and later served in the first four Congresses, informed the people in the Federalist that the inhabitants of the Federal District "will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them." And he went on to say that "a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will, of course, be allowed them."

These expectations were soon fulfilled. After shifting its site several times, the Federal Government moved to the District of Columbia in 1800. Two years later Congress granted Washington a municipal charter with a mayor appointed by the President and a city council elected by the people. Georgetown and Alexandria were municipal corporations when the district was created and they continued to operate as such. From 1812 to 1820 the council was permitted to elect the mayor. And from 1820 to 1871 the people were allowed to elect the mayor as well as the members of the council.

Meanwhile, Washington was beginning to grow up from its infant beginning. The Civil War and reconstruction periods swelled its population to 131,700 in 1871. But as the seat of the National Government the city was a sight to behold with its muddy streets, its open sewers, stinking swamps and sordid slums. The growing District was desperately in need of public improvements and social services which its weak and divided local governments were poorly equipped to provide.

TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT CREATED

Preoccupied at the time with the tasks of reconstruction, Congress was glad to delegate the work of rehabilitating the Capital City to local hands. By an act of February 21, 1871, Congress created a territorial form of government for the District, consisting of a governor, a board of public works, and a legislative assembly. The governor and the board of public works were appointed by the President and the legislative assembly was elected in part by the people. The assembly consisted of two houses: a council of 11 members appointed by the President to represent the National interest and a house of delegates with 25 members elected each year by the people. In addition, the people were permitted to send a speaking but nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives as Alaska and Hawaii do today.

Under this new regime, the old city charters were abolished and the towns within the District were merged into a unified city of Washington. Alexandria, and the Virginia segment of the 10-mile square had been receded to that State back in 1846. The governor was the central figure in the territorial regime. He administered the various departments, controlled the city jobs, and could veto acts of the legislative assembly, subject to overriding votes by a two-thirds majority. Congress retained power to veto the acts of either the governor or the legislative assembly. There were also independent boards of health, education, and law enforcement. Under this setup the people of the District had a voice in the house of delegates and a spokesman in the House of Representatives, but Governor Shepherd was the real boss of the town.

With great speed and energy Governor Shepherd launched an ambitious publitworks program which soon transformed the face of the Capital City. But his reckless expenditures shocked the taxpayers and Congress liquidated the Shepherd regime in 1874. In its place Congress created a temporary district commission to carry on the necessary municipal functions until a new government could be established. Some of the powers that had been exercised by the governor and the board of public works went to the new commissioners and Congress itself took over most of the functions of the legislative assembly. All suffrage rights were suspended. This makeshift system lasted until July 1, 1878, when with a few minor changes it was made permanent.

During the 70 years since 1878 Washington has grown to be a great city with almost a million inhabitants. It is one of the most beautiful capital cities in the world. In outward appearance it is the fitting Capital of a Nation now at the pinnacle of its power and prestige. But it is still governed by the antiquated charter of 1878.

HODGEPODGE OF AGENCIES

A committee of the House of Representatives of which I am chairman has just completed an exhaustive study of Washington's hodgepodge government. We find it is incredibly complicated, confused, and cumbersome. From a mere handful of agencies in 1878 it has grown like Topsy, until today there are about 125 major units of government rendering services in the District, of which 48 are Federal and 77 District agencies. And there are as many more sub-units.

Federal, State, county, and municipal functions are scattered among a host of governmental agencies without rhyme or reason. Authority over District affairs is divided among many independent boards and commissions. A dozen agencies share the ordinance-making power and executive authority is likewise hopelessly splintered.

At the top of this crazy-quilt setup is a board of three Commissioners, who exercise a split and ineffectual supervision of local affairs. None of the local officials is elected. Members of the Board and other key posts are appointed by the President and are often used to pay political debts. Training and experience in municipal administration are not the criteria of appointment. Vacancies in local judicial and administrative posts are often left unfilled for long periods by a busy President preoccupied with larger affairs, and outsiders are frequently selected for these places to the neglect and disappointment of local talent.

The administrative branch has developed haphazardly over the years. New agencies have been created from time to time as the need for the performance of new functions has arisen. As a result, the administrative structure of the District government consists of a conglomeration of bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices in large part independent of each other and collectively conforming to no consistent principle of organization. For many years the inevitable result has been confusion, duplication, overlapping of organization and functions, conflicts of jurisdiction, and unnecessary cost.

At the present time, for example, five governmental agencies in Washington are charged with police protection, three with recreation, two with water supply, two with road building, and two with the care of trees. Nor is there any unified personnel system for local employees.

As one local newspaper editor has put it, "the city could well adopt the nine-headed Hydra slain by Hercules as its symbol."

Intertwined with this tangled network of local agencies are more than two score Federal agencies which operate in the District and render services to it, such as the district courts and the United States Employment Service. At the hearings held by the District Investigating Committee last July it took Federal officials 4 days and 120 printed pages to explain the intricate relationships of their agencies and services to the District. And it took a huge, three-dimensional colored chart to display in understandable form the complex structure and interrelationships of the District government.

BUDGET BUREAU TOO

One of the numerous Federal agencies involved in this curious tangle is the Bureau of the Budget. This Bureau, which is in the executive office of the President, intervenes between the District Commissioners and the Congress. All local legislative proposals and appropriation estimates must pass its censorship before Congress can see them, even though the Bureau may know little of local conditions and needs. The city fathers must get a green light from the Budget Bureau before they can communicate with their city council or submit the local budget to the Appropriations Committees of Congress.

Madison's early assurance of a locally elected municipal legislature has remained unrealized since 1874. In place of government by consent of the governed, Congress has chosen for 73 years to sit as a city council for the disfranchised people of Washington. Each session much legislation dealing with District affairs is introduced in both Houses and referred to the District of Columbia committees. These committees often find it difficult to muster a quorum for consideration of such municipal matters, since members are naturally more interested in the affairs of their own congressional districts.

The House Committee on the District of Columbia, of which I have been a member for 5 years, has 25 members; the Senate District Committee has 13 members. Assignments to the District committees are unpopular and are often given to newcomers. Nine members of the House District Committee today are first-term members and two are second-termers. All the members but one of the Senate District Committee are freshman Senators, including the chairman, Senator BUCK.

Congressmen are reluctant to serve on the District Committee because it has often proved to be a political graveyard. They are more interested in national and international affairs than in enacting local ordinances for the capital city.

DISTRICT LEGISLATION

Look at the petty chicken feed which the District committees are asked to consider. Among the bills during the first session of the Eightieth Congress were measures to rehabilitate alcoholics, prohibit mixed boxing bouts, regulate barbers' hours of work, destroy starlings, save daylight time, regulate embalmers, and serve straws in Washington restaurants. It took acts of Congress to change the name of Conduit Road to MacArthur Boulevard and remove a couple of ancient posts in front of the White House. It is absurd that Congress should have to deal with such petty matters when great issues of peace and reconstruction are pressing for decision.

Consider the legislative hurdles that even a trivial district bill must surmount before it becomes the law of the land. First it is assigned to one of the six subcommittees which divide the labor of screening District legislation. (If the bill originated in one of the city departments, it has to run the gauntlet of the Board of Commissioners and the Budget Bureau before it can even be introduced in the House of Representatives.) After subcommittee consideration, possible hearings, and favorable action, the bill is reported to the full House District Committee. If the full committee approves it, the bill is then reported to the House, where it may come up for consideration on the second or fourth Monday of the month, which days are reserved under a House rule for consideration of District of Columbia matters. Few Members of the House are likely to be present on the floor on District Day, so that if the bill is approved it may be by a comparatively small minority of all the Members. The House approved the District appropriation bill for 1944 with only 28 out of 435 Members voting.

Having passed the House, all the steps described above must then be repeated in the Senate. If the Senate and House disagree about the bill, it is sent to a conference committee which will try to compose the difference, and whose report must go back to both Houses for their approval. Having finally passed both Houses, unless it has meanwhile gotten lost in the shuffle, our bill then goes to the President for his signature. Thus, there are at least eight stages in the ordeal that District legislation must go through before it can become effective.

In actual practice, under these circumstances, the affairs of the District of Columbia are controlled by congressional minorities; a large part of the work is done by committee staff aids; Congress as a whole is ignorant of and indifferent to District problems; and a Member's vote on District legislation often depends on the sentiments of the folks back home rather than upon the views of the voteless residents and taxpayers of the District. Small wonder, then, that relations between Congress and the Capital community are sometimes hostile and that the needs of the city of Washington are neglected. Congress at best is a clumsy city council. It should be relieved of the task of managing the city's routine business. I agree with the La Follette-Monroney committee that "the Nation cannot afford the luxury of having its national legislative body and the District committees in both the House and Senate perform the duties of a city council for the District of Columbia."

SOLVING THE PROBLEM

The solution of Washington's dilemma is an easy and simple one. It calls for no act of political heroism, no profound intellectual feat. All Congress need do is grant Washington a modern city charter. During recent decades great advances have been made in governmental organization and administration, particularly at the local level. In the early years of this century the commission type of city government enjoyed great popularity, but has been eclipsed in the last 30 years by the more effective managerial type of city government which had its inception in Staunton, Va., in 1908, and has since been adopted by 800 American cities. Eighty-one cities adopted council-manager government during 1946.

I believe that the council-manager plan, with suitable modifications to meet the peculiar conditions of our National Capital, is the answer to Washington's dilemma. This plan applies to city government the business-manager principle which has been successfully employed for many years by private corporations. The essential and admirable feature of the manager plan is the separation of the function of legislation from those of administration without a separation of powers, coupled with a concentration of administrative responsibility in the hands of one man under the control of the council.

It is interesting to recall in this connection that Mr. Richard S. Childs, chairman of the National Municipal League's council, who produced the city manager plan by uniting the commission plan and the Staunton plan, shares its paternity with the Father of our Country. In a letter to Benjamin Stoddert in 1792, George Washington said in part:

"It has always been my opinion, and still is so, that the administration of the affairs of the Federal City ought to be under the immediate direction of a judicious and skillful superintendent * * * one in whom is united knowledge of men and things, industry, integrity, impartiality, and firmness; and that this person should reside on the spot."

After a full month of hearings and an intensive nonpartisan study, my committee is recommending to Congress adoption of a new organic act for the government of the District of Columbia. Our plan proposes a representative local government chosen by the qualified electors of the District, responsible for providing all essential governmental services to the community, subject to the will of Congress. The plan also provides a streamlined efficient governmental structure for the District with clear distinctions drawn between areas of Federal and District responsibility.

COUNCIL-MANAGER PROVIDED

The new charter would provide the council-manager form of government. All powers of local government would be vested in an elected District council, including the power to tax and spend. The government would be organized into eleven departments along functional lines, with each function concentrated in one department instead of being splintered among several agencies. Financial affairs would be completely divorced from those of the National Government. Federal functions would be performed by Federal agencies and local functions by local agencies. The line of responsibility for the conduct of the District government would run straight from the voters to the District council, chosen at large in nonpartisan elections, to the District manager and the department heads. Federal employees with voting residences in the States would be allowed to vote in District council elections without jeopardizing their tax or employment status.

Under our plan the government of the District of Columbia would, of course, remain subject to ultimate control by Congress because of its constitutional authority over the seat of the National Government.

Under the proposed new charter Congress would have ample means of protecting the Federal interest in the District of Columbia. It could repeal or amend the charter at any time or veto legislation passed by the District council. A joint congressional committee would be set up to maintain continuous surveillance of district affairs. Local legislation on a par with that enacted by State legislatures would lie over for 30 days, subject to congressional veto, before becoming effective.

At a time when the United States is striving to make the world safe for democracy again, let us not forget that there are some major gaps in the democratic landscape at home, particularly in the Nation's Capital. The people of Washington want local home rule, not statehood. Our plan would give them a chance to solve their own problems. It would also relieve Congress of a work load it should not have to bear. We cannot expect Washington to remain a politically depressed

area, on the one hand, and capital of the democratic world, on the other. At present, it is a standing invitation to hostile propaganda. Congress has an enviable opportunity to create here a model local government. I hope it will seize this opportunity now and restore democracy and efficiency to the Capital City of our country.

Tribute to Confederate Veterans of the War Between the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable John H. Pinson, a representative in the Alabama State Legislature, from Sumter County, Ala. The speech was delivered on the floor of the Alabama House of Representatives on June 13, 1947, and is an eloquent tribute to the few remaining veterans who fought in the cause of the South during the War Between the States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, 86 years ago scenes were different here at the State capitol of Alabama.

Downstairs in the governor's chair sat Andrew B. Moore of Perry County. Where you sit, Mr. Speaker, William M. Brooks of Perry County presided over the Secession Convention, and where I stand, stood Montgomery's own, matchless, eloquent William L. Yancey, delivering the report of the committee of 13 which withdrew Alabama from the union of States. On the flagpole above the capitol building floated the Stars and Bars of the Confederacy, made by Mrs. Napoleon Lovett, of Marion, Ala., and raised for the first time on March 4, 1861, by Miss Letty Tyler, granddaughter of United States President John Tyler. From the Tennessee Valley of north Alabama, came the bugle call of fighting Joe Wheeler, answered by the cannon of Admiral Raphael Semmes in Mobile Bay. Alabama was on the march, girding to defend herself against the foe.

When a boy, down in the Black Belt of Alabama, I have often heard the Negro field workers singing their "Swing Low, Sweet Chariot," and "Old Black Joe," and it was sweet music. In late years, I have stood in the stadium at Pasadena and heard Alabama's peerless Band play our State songs, with tears in my eyes. In a home for aged, I have gone to Louisville, Ky., and in University House to see the Kentucky Derby, and stood in the old wooden grandstand, as the band played "My Old Kentucky Home," with a lump in my throat. I have sat in the diamond horseshoe at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City and heard Enrico Caruso sing the aria from Aida, and all the magnificence and grandeur of the dead and bygone civilization of Egypt and the Nile would pass in review before my mind's eye. I have stood in the coliseum at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington, the ancestral home of Gen. Robert E. Lee, and listened with rapt attention as the Navy band played our national anthem, and was proud that I was an American citizen, but I think the sweetest music I have ever heard has been right here in Montgomery, when one of our bands struck up the old marching song of the Confederacy, Dixie, the words of which were first sung here and written on the walls of an old theater in downtown Montgomery.

Of the mighty army which went forth to defend our State in the 1860's, only four of the grey clad heroes remain alive today. In 1945 when I introduced a bill in the State senate to increase the Confederate soldier's pension from $65 to $100 a month, and their widows from $30 to $40 a month, there were 26 of these veterans living. Twenty-two have died since then. This bill will increase the pension for these four old veterans to $150 per month, and to their widows $50 instead of $40. You do not have to worry about the money to finance this bill. The Alabama Legislature, with foresight and patriotism, 48 years ago, in 1899, earmarked one mill of the State ad valorem tax for the use of Confederate veterans and their widows. This tax now amounts to over $1,000,000 annually. It takes only about $65,000 increase to provide for the increase called for in this bill. Only one-third, or less of this earmarked money goes to the support of the Confederate veterans and their widows. The balance, amounting to about $800,000, we graciously turn over the department of public welfare for old-age assistance.

Then let us pass this bill quickly, without a dissenting vote, and send it forthwith, without engrossment, to the senate, that they may pass it. Then place it on the desk of Jim Folsom, that it may be the No. 1 bill signed by the Governor. In doing this, we will not only care for these old veterans but will honor ourselves.

I move the passage of the bill.

The High-School Graduate Faces the Atomic Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the 18th of December I delivered a commencement speech at a rural school called Turkey Creek School, in Hillsborough County, Fla. On that occasion I heard a valedictory address by a young member of the graduating class, James D. Danley. I said then, and I say now, that the address he delivered at that time would have done credit to any honorable Member of this body. So I ask leave to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered on that occasion by this young man, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Atomic energy, molecular composition, fission—these are five of the most important and closely related words in use in the world today.

On August 6, 1945, the United States made known a new field of scientific research by dropping a bomb on Hiroshima, a strongpoint in the Japanese defense. That, ladies and gentlemen, was no ordinary bomb. The decision to use it was one of the gravest ever made by our Government. It was understood that this bomb could do untold damage by radioactivity and would completely wreck Hiroshima, sparing no one or no thing. This, then, was the now dreaded atomic bomb. The effects of such a bomb have never yet been fully told, even through the tests on Bikini Atoll.

Now, we are faced with the problem of what to do with the atomic secrets. The futility of trying to withhold such important secrets is readily seen, because it would be only a matter of months, or should I say weeks, before every single solitary nation on earth would know the secret of the atomic bomb. Scientists say there is no efficient defense against the atom bomb; therefore, it is evident that atomic energy must be used only toward peaceful purposes.

To approach any world peace organization without an appreciation by the leaders of our country of the power of this new weapon would be unrealistic. No system of control heretofore considered would be adequate to control this menace. Both inside any particular country, and between the nations of the world, the control of this weapon would involve such thoroughgoing rights of inspection and internal controls as we have never heretofore contemplated.

On the other hand, if the problem of the proper use of atomic energy can be solved we would have the opportunity of bringing the world into a pattern in which peace and our civilization can be saved.

Professor A. M. Low, one of the world's most distinguished scientists, predicts that in the year 2000 A. D. an airplane with a top speed of less than 3,000 miles per hour will be considered out of date. Even now, jet-propelled planes are so fast that pilots have to use explosives when they wish to parachute. It is said anonymously that already planes have secretly been clocked at 1,200 miles per hour.

The family auto, if there is such a thing, will be equally at home on land, on sea, or in the air.

Speed will eradicate space. Clothes will be so cheap they will be discarded after a few wearings. I might add that Professor Low did not base these predictions on imagination, but upon thought and reason. He made a prediction in 1896 that in 1948 we would have a petroleum-driven vehicle that would travel on land at a speed of 125 miles per hour. Today, ladies and gentlemen, do we not have such a machine? Indeed, we have.

The high-school graduate in years to come, must be trained to meet the situations that will be brought about by such drastic changes. He will see much activity in the world, higher speed, greater distances, less time—all will try out for greater physical strength. In order to have a good body and a sound mind, a graduate in the future must have better food, more and greater disease protection, body care, exercise, and, last but not least, plenty of recreation. He must be able to relax and forget his personal business worries.

Minds as well as bodies, not attuned to the greater stress and strain, may crack under the extreme pressure to which they may be subjected.

A high-school student need not be a bookworm to survive in an atomic world. The main courses to be taught a high-school student of the future will train him: First, to preserve peace at any cost because peace is essential. If there is not peace, then in all probability the world will end. Next, to be open-minded to any advancement, no matter how small, which requires mental growth. Small minds, minds that may have been exposed to education but untouched by it, will be unable to grasp the significance of atomic portents.

The high-school student 25 years hence will have no use for such high-school courses as accounting and secretarial work because this will be accomplished by machines which transfer the spoken word directly to paper without any mistakes whatsoever. Math will be important only to those who make the machines which do the computing. Science, technology, vocational training, will be the watchword.

Democratic education must attain its cardinal objective for the atomic era, and that cardinal objective is peace.

As former Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, has said, "The bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki ended a war. They also made it wholly clear that we must never have another war. This is a lesson men and leaders everywhere must learn, and I believe that when they learn it, they will find a way to lasting peace. There is no other choice."

In order that schools may contribute to survival in a technological society, teachers in service must share with youth and adults in developing a program of community education concerning such imperative issues as the control and use of atomic energy, world government, and the development of a means of cooperative actions for the solution of problems.

Will atomic energy bring a millenium of cheap power, supplanting oil and coal? Will a protein-deficient world eat cheap beefsteaks made from yeast? Will our descendants have everlasting teeth from drinking water containing fluorine? Can the high school graduate overcome the power of atomic energy, or will it eventually destroy him and his world? It need not. Man, with the help and blessing of his God, can rise above his human weaknesses and hold this thing that he has found as a torch to light the world.

Everett Dirksen's Announcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid editorial which appeared in the January 4, 1948, issue of the Peoria Journal-Star.

The title of the editorial, "EVERETT DIRKSEN'S Announcement," was with reference to his decision to retire from the House of Representatives as Representative in Congress from the Sixteenth Illinois District at the conclusion of his present term. Representative DIRKSEN is completing his eighth consecutive term in the House of Representatives, during which time he has performed many outstanding and valuable services, not only to his district, which included the city of Peoria, Ill., but to the Nation as a whole.

The news that Representative DIRKSEN will not, after his present term, continue to serve his district in the Congress of the United States for "compelling personal reasons," was received with deep and obvious regret by every Member of the congressional delegation from the State of Illinois, as well as by every other Member of the United States Congress.

I have known Mr. DIRKSEN for many years, not only as a Member of Congress, but prior to that time. It is with regret and shock that I have learned of his decision. I have always regarded him as a trusted friend and a sincere colleague. His absence from the Halls of Congress will be sorely noted.

I believe the editorial from the Peoria Journal-Star best epitomizes the opinion that his colleagues, friends, and supporters hold for Mr. DIRKSEN.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Representative EVERETT M. DIRKSEN's announcement yesterday that he will not be a candidate for reelection to Congress is the most surprising political news in a long time for Peoria. "Compelling personal reasons," Mr. DIRKSEN said, made it advisable for him to reach this decision.

Mr. DIRKSEN has served brilliantly in Congress these last 15 years, and his withdrawal will be a severe loss to the Sixteenth Illinois District. He has not only kept in close touch with his constituents but has won for himself an enviable position in the national scene. He is also known abroad, having twice crossed the Atlantic on tours connected with fact-finding for Congress and also having toured South America on a similar mission.

Mr. DIRKSEN is rated the ablest speaker in the House of Representatives and among the best informed men in Washington. National publications several times have featured him and his work as representing the best congressional traditions.

He has also proven to be a potent force for the Republican Party in the national arena. He was called upon for numerous speeches on radio networks and in different States in the 1944 Presidential campaign, and was at one time near being nominated as Republican candidate for Vice President in the 1944 convention.

With Mr. DIRKSEN's withdrawal, his constituents of this district, who have come to rely heavily upon his representing their interests in the National Capital, will lose the benefits of his experience, his wealth of information, and his prestige in Congress. We do not doubt that his decision was a difficult one and that nothing but compelling reasons could have swung the balance as they did. But in his announcement he says that he is "interrupting" his career of public service, indicating that at some time he may again offer his services as Representative in Washington. We trust that the future will make it possible for Mr. DIRKSEN to return to the career which is interrupted at such a promising time.

An Open Letter to Henry Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of discussion during the past 2 weeks on Henry Wallace's speech accepting leadership of a third party during the coming Presidential campaign. It would be difficult to determine what good purpose he attempts to achieve when his contradictory statements are studied. However, I believe the result of his activities will be confusion among Americans over our foreign policy and our national security program unless we can clearly show that Henry Wallace is being used as a tool for an ism which is not Americanism.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an open letter to Henry Wallace written by Mr. Henry Gorrell, editor and publisher of the Veterans Report, which appears in the December 1947 issue of that newspaper:

AN OPEN LETTER TO HENRY WALLACE

MY DEAR MR. WALLACE: The International Communists have recently jailed Rumania's "Henry Wallace," one Jules Maniu, and they've hanged Nikola Petkov, who was as liberal as they make them.

Even more recently, Moscow ordered the dissolution of the only remaining liberal party in their sector of Germany—the Christian Democrats—and it probably will be some time before we learn just how many of its leaders have been jailed, hanged, or shot.

It's a dangerous game you are playing, Mr. Wallace, this game of "peace at any price," and of appeasement of the dictators. In case your memory fails you, it is a game that has been played—and lost—by men of the Western World also—men of equal stature to yours; men who were respected and trusted by the masses they represented. Remember Chamberlain, the "umbrella man" of 1939? He tried his appeasement theory out on Hitler and Mussolini. The result was nearly fatal to Britain and France, and to civilization as we have known it.

We regret your candidacy for President of the United States on a third-party ticket, Mr. Wallace, for your platform of peace, prosperity, no war, and no depression will have great appeal to a great number of Americans who are harassed by rising prices and haunted by the fear that another war lies ahead.

We'd be for you if we felt that your International formula was workable, Mr. Wallace. But, honestly, we believe that if you continue denouncing America's foreign policy and universal military training you will only weaken your own country and hasten the day when Communists here will have gathered sufficient strength to put you in jail—or worse—also.

Yes, Mr. Wallace, you'll gather up a lot of votes, for, as you say, we Americans are a peace-loving people, and our hearts have a habit of swelling with genuine good will toward all mankind.

But what about Maniu and Petkov? Perhaps you never knew them?

Well, Mr. Wallace, I knew them, for in 1940 I was a correspondent in the Balkans.

Take Maniu, of Rumania. Like you, Mr. Wallace, Maniu loved his country and his people. He was a man of the soil; a real democrat, and a bitter enemy of Hitlerite methods. When I last saw him in Bucharest, Maniu was challenging General Antonescu and his greenshirted Nazi gangsters to do their worst. I thought sure the Rumanian Nazi Party—the Iron Guard—would murder him, but it seems the Germans decided against it, on the grounds that there were too many other liberals in Rumania who might stab their troops in the back.

Came the German retreat toward the end of the war, and Maniu greeted the advancing Russian Army eagerly. You see, the Russians had signed agreements at Yalta and Potsdam; agreements under which they pretended to subscribe to the principle that people of all nations should have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live.

In the months and years that followed, Yalta and Potsdam agreements were forgotten by the Soviet Union. Sure, the Russians gave Maniu's National Peasant Party a free hand in Rumania—for a while. They needed him to keep the spark of democracy kindled in Rumania until they were sure of themselves. Then, they pounced. Maniu was denounced for an alleged conspiracy to overthrow the Rumanian Government—Communist controlled—by force and violence. His followers, all good liberals, were clapped in jail and denied trials. Maniu himself was tried and sentenced to prison.

Our State Department protested, but in vain. Big hearted, simple, peace-loving Maniu now languishes in a Rumanian prison. He is an old man, and probably will

die there. The Russians used him until they no longer needed him. Then just because he had many followers in Rumania, he became a danger to the Rumanian communistic movement and was branded a traitor to his country—a traitor, mind you, because he was alleged to have had repeated conferences in Bucharest with the American Minister and military attaché.

Maniu's trial was a judicial travesty. It closely followed a set pattern for all political trials staged by Communist regimes in the Balkans, whose obvious purpose is to eliminate every vestige of democratic opposition.

If you think you still prefer Russian "liberalism" to the internationsl approach of the leaders of our two parties—the President, Secretary Marshall, Senators Vandenberg and Taft—whom you claim are guilty of an evil conspiracy and are making common cause with the "Wall Street-military team," perhaps Petkov's trial may be of interest.

Petkov played an active and leading role in the establishment of a coalition government in September 1944 following overthrow of the Bulgarian Nazi regime. He was arrested on charges of conspiracy against the government on June 8, 1947. Although he was a member of parliament with a large following, they hanged Petkov recently against the strong protests of all the Allied Governments. You see, Petkov was a little too liberal for the Communists, who don't want any one man to swing too much weight within his own country. If he won't take orders from Moscow's Politbureau, its curtains for him. Petkov, like you, thought eventually the Russians could be brought around to their way of thinking.

No, Mr. Wallace, we aren't dealing with Russia in these times. We are dealing with an international communistic movement which has no regard for the rights of the common man.

O. K., you've clearly stated that you are no Communist, and that you don't like communism. But the Communists in this country like you, Mr. Wallace, simply because they can use you and your idealistic talk now to soothe us all into complacency.

It's not only your own country's interests that you are harming by your preachings, Mr. Wallace, but also those few countries in Europe that are making an honest effort to preserve their democratic ideals; ideals handed down by their forefathers to yours and mine.

Beware, Mr. Wallace, that by your preachings you do not split America into two camps; that you do not disillusion your own people and cause the eventual loss of their liberties, also.

That you are a good American, we do not question. Nor do we doubt your sincerity. But do you honestly think that labor unions can survive if you spur them on into sabotaging the capitalistic system? Destroy the capitalistic system in this contry, and you are only aiding and abetting economic and political chaos. This in turn, would only lead to communism over here. And the Communists have no use for labor unions. They don't have any real labor unions in Soviet Russia, or Roumania, or Bulgaria.

Don't forget Petkov and Maniu, Mr. Wallace, for you are the Petkov, the Maniu, of the United States. This is a tribute to your sincerity and your idealism, but if like Petkov and Maniu you inadvertently help the Communists to get a grip on your country, you and other liberals will be the first to suffer.

We don't think you will be successful enough to do this, Mr. Wallace, but imagine for a moment that your America had become a Communist-run nation. People would go to jail. That is the way opponents are handled in Communist countries. But many of our politicians would adjust and accept the inevitable. That's why the first man to hang in Communist America would be — — yes, you are right, it would be you Mr. Wallace.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY GORRELL.

America: The Proof of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial reprinted in the Minneapolis Argus on Friday, November 21, 1947:

The following thought-provoking editorial is reprinted from the Champ, publication of the employees of the Champion Motor Co., an east Minneapolis industry employing approximately 400 people:

"AMERICA: THE PROOF OF FREEDOM

"Peculiar as it may seem, when things are going good and peace is supposed to surround the world, some people are not satisfied. They do not realize or appreciate the freedom, the fellowship, the benefits, the comforts, and beauty of their own country. Perhaps this condition exists because other forms of government are misunderstood and the propaganda misleading in facts.

"American industry is operated nowadays with the welfare of the worker always in mind. Working conditions have never been so satisfactory to the average worker in history. New factories, modern machinery, pleasant working hours, plant athletic activities, Christmas bonuses, and other factors contribute to make the American method of working the best in the entire world.

"An impressive piece of copy recently appeared in an advertisement of the Warner & Swesey Co., Cleveland, Ohio, makers of machine tools, which depicts the reason why residents of foreign countries want to come to America where freedom is the key to peacefulness. The copy follows:

" 'Millions of men and women, in every country in Europe and Asia, would sell their souls for the chance to live in the freedom of America. They have experienced workers' governments, socialism, government ownership, communism, fascism, governments "run for the people," countries where the land and wealth are confiscated and given to the people. They have experienced all these so-called utopias, and they are frantic to leave them and come to America with its competitive system, its corporations, its opportunity for the man willing to work hard.

" 'There people aren't schoolroom theorists; they know from bitter galling experience that life, liberty, enough to eat, and the right to pursue happiness are possible only under the American method of private capital investment in the tools of production, which over the years steadily increases real wages—the American system where every man is responsible for his own welfare and too proud to let a government assume that responsibility for him.

" 'Too much of that American system has been whittled away these past years. We'd better get it back before it's too late, for if the American system is destroyed there will be no country we could look to with longing. "Liberty and the pursuit of happiness" would be a mockery.'

"Yes, fellow workers, the freedom, liberty, and happiness of our great country depend upon us. Loyalty to our present system will warrant a life of contentment in a country where every individual who desires to work can share the wealth and abundance of opportunities found at every turn in the road. From city parks to nature's playground, it's yours to enjoy. Let us fight for this freedom to continue—for America leads the way to a better form of government for the people.

"CAL JOHNSON,
"Public Relations Director,
"Champion Motors Co."

A New Director for Voice of America Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Durham Morning Herald, Durham, N. C., regarding the appointment of Mr. George V. Allen:

A NEW DIRECTOR FOR VOICE OF AMERICA PROGRAM

The strengthening of the Voice of America is another move in the buttressing of the attack of democracy on totalitarian government. It is believed that this program properly implemented will disseminate the truth to peoples abroad and let them know actually what is going on around the world.

It has been generally accepted that Secretary of State Marshall has made a splendid choice in the selection of George V. Allen to handle this rejuvenated function of the State Department. His choice pleases Durham. That is certain.

Mr. Allen is a native of this city, and a former member of the news staff of this newspaper. The pride in him is reasonable and well founded. During his 1 year and a half as Ambassador to Iran, Mr. Allen has substantiated a reputation acquired in nearly a score of years in diplomatic service.

During these years he has served as special adviser to Presidents and secretaries and has accompanied them to the several conferences in which most of the postwar Balkan problems were uppermost. When he went to Iran it was with some misgivings on the part of close observers. He was young and lacked experience of many diplomats, and the situation in Iran was ranked as "hot." Now these same observers are saying that George Allen has worked miracles. It is a fact that he has almost singlehandedly turned Iran from a sizzling diplomatic problem into one of relative calm.

George Allen knows how much the public will want, and how much the public will accept. He knows the thinking processes of Europeans and Asiatic. He has had evidence of the confidence in which he is held to the extent that in all details he is a worthy successor to William Benton. He goes to his new job as Assistant Secretary of State (subject now only to Senate confirmation) with another big job ahead, but it is one that he may be expected to fill with satisfaction to all.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 11 and 12 the Georgia Department of the American Legion, through its Americanism committee, held in Atlanta a 2-day seminar on the subject of communism.

It was my privilege to address this patriotic group on the first day of its sessions, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and members of the American Legion, for many years the American Legion and its members have been aware of the fact that communism is a real and dangerous enemy to our Government and to our people.

The average guileless, honest, friendly American can hardly believe that there exists in the world a conspiracy so cruel, so terrible, so cunning, and so determined to crush out liberty and destroy freedom and decency from every corner of the earth. More than 20 years ago the American Legion began to work at the task of convincing the American people that communism is the mortal enemy of most things which are dear and precious to us. At the beginning it was a thankless task. For a long time patriotic, honest, truthful, informed members of the Legion, who were moved by purest principles of patriotism, were subjected to vicious attacks and smear campaigns. They were called warmongers and Red baiters. They were subjected to ridicule and falsehood, and were made victims of cunning attacks which have finally come to be recognized as weapons used by the Communists against decent, patriotic Americans who have the ability to recognize communism and the courage to fight it.

It was my privilege in 1937 and 1938 to serve 2 years as State chairman of the Legion's Americanism committee for the Department of Georgia, the position which is now so ably filled by our present chairman, Hon. J. Walter LeCraw. Mr. LeCraw during those years was a member of the State committee on Americanism. He is a tireless worker and possesses that tenacity which is necessary to successfully carry on the important work of this committee. You are to be congratulated on having the assistance of two such forceful and earnest young Legionnaires as Tom Bobo and Bill VanHook, who went to Washington and attended the seminar there, and who are bringing back to this seminar here important knowledge of Communist activities which they acquired.

Although it has been a long and at times a seemingly hopeless fight, America and the world are belatedly recognizing communism for the menace that it is and are seeing it now in its true colors. I congratulate the Department of Georgia of the Legion for the active part which it is taking in carrying to the people of Georgia the truth about communism. Communism during the last 25 years has cruelly, ruthlessly, and without the slightest compunction, murdered millions of people in many sections of the earth. It has starved, actually starved, millions of men, women, and children through a deliberate, planned program of starvation. It has placed other millions of men, women, and children in actual slavery. It has cruelly separated husbands from wives and parents from children. It has destroyed virtue and debauched womanhood. It has attacked religion and has taught men, women, and children to embrace and commit the vilest crimes imaginable.

One of the greatest obstacles in fighting communism is the fact that its vileness, its cruelty, and its treachery are so shocking and unbelievable, that a normal, decent person finds it next to impossible to believe that such a thing in fact does exist, until positive, inescapable proof is forcefully brought to his attention.

Communists have long been aware of this reluctance on the part of the American people to believe the truth about communism, and they have made the most of this reluctance in promoting communism and in fighting its enemies.

One of the favorite methods of attack used by Communists is that of using smear terms, such as "witch hunt," "Red baiter," "warmonger," and similar terms which are calculated to discredit and ridicule any person who is effectively fighting communism.

The use of these tactics by Communists is illustrated by the testimony of a former Communist, Louis F. Budenz, who testified under oath on November 22, 1946, in Washington before the House Committee on Un-American Activities about the activities of the Communist Party, as follows:

"I do think it is time, from my experience, to raise the little iron curtain in the United States.

"What is the little iron curtain: It is the refusal in many quarters to permit a frank discussion of what the Communist Party actually is. Anyone who endeavors to tell the truth about the Communist Party is greeted with shouts of "witch hunt," "Red baiter," and things of that character.

"I claim that the honest, normal American citizen has a right to know the facts without this effort to put down a curtain upon the activities of the Communist Party."

By using this method, Communists have been able to nullify and destroy the work of many patriotic Americans who have fought communism in the past.

To be able to effectively fight communism, there are certain facts that we must know, and one of these is that it is a serious mistake to ever believe anything a Communist says.

Our willingness in the past to believe that Communists will tell the truth, has cost the world millions of lives of men, women, and children cruelly murdered by Communists, the downfall of many representative governments, and the substitution of Communist dictatorships for those governments, and insofar as the American people are concerned, communism has already cost us billions of dollars, and we are at this very moment called upon by the head of our Government, President Truman, and by our Secretary of State, General Marshall, to dig into our pockets and spend the additional sum of $17,000,000,000 for the sole purpose of stopping the spread of communism throughout the world.

What does this mean to you and to me? It means that if this money is spent under what we call the Marshall plan—this tremendous sum of money, $17,000,000,000—if it could be prorated among the population of the United States, would cost each man, woman, and child $121.42, or, for the average family of 4, the cost would be $485.68. Furthermore, the food, goods, and materials to be sent from this country to the European countries where this money will be spent will cause still greater scarcities of such items in the United States, and will be a direct cause of more price increases, which the American people will have to pay, for the necessities of life.

It is, therefore, easy to see that communism, instead of being something that we can evade, ignore, or laugh off, has reached the point where it has become one of the most important things in our daily lives. It has become a subject which can no longer be ignored. It has spread throughout the world to such a point that it has now become the duty of every American to learn the truth about communism, and to join forces with the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Congress, and our citizens in fighting this menace to life, liberty, and freedom, which at this moment threatens the entire world.

That we may be able to successfully fight communism, it is imperative that we know and recognize three facts about it. These are:

1. It is the avowed purpose of communism to conquer and rule the world.

2. No Communist is worthy of belief, and a Communist will tell the truth only when it suits his purpose to do so.

3. Communism is not a weak, poverty-stricken, or destitute thing. On the contrary, through its campaign of murder, concentration camps, slavery, and revolution, it has taken over the governments of close to a dozen countries in eastern Europe, and has brought under its control more than 100,000,000 persons there, and is making strenuous efforts to assume control of the governments and people of France, Italy, Greece, and China.

If the Communists could be successful in taking control over these last-mentioned governments, it is extremely likely that the Soviet Union, with that great concentration of power and strength, would then turn its full force upon the United States as its principal target.

Again I quote from the testimony of Louis F. Budenz, who for years was a member of the Communist Party in the United States, but who says that he saw the light and renounced the Communist Party. While testifying under oath on November 22, 1946, Budenz was asked this question:

"Question. Before you go on further, you made a statement just a few minutes ago that 'this is directed against the United States.' Do you mean directed toward the overthrow of the Government?

"Answer, I mean that the Soviet Government has now revealed through my experience in discussion within the Communist Party the fact that it is engaged in a war of nerves against the United States on a general pattern similar to that carried on by Hitler's Germany, but within its own variation, and that this war of nerves will go to the point of military conflict. That is, according to the design of the Soviet Government, it can go to the point of military conflict. At any rate, it is a war of nerves designed to undermine the Government of the United States."

That testimony is found on page 5 of Budenz' testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

On page 25 of his testimony the following statement which had previously been made to the same committee by William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in the United States was read to Budenz:

"When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises—that Government will not be a capitalistic government, but a soviet government, and behind that government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Budenz was asked if that statement does not express the policies of the Communist Party, and he answered:

"That expresses the present policy of the Soviet Union, veneered over with the appearance of working in the United Nations, but using the United Nations as a sounding board to discredit and belittle the United States and the American Nation."

Budenz also testified, as is found on that same page 25, that the above statement also expresses the policies of the Communist Party of the United States as they now exist.

For your seminar here today, I am quoting you sworn testimony of people who are in position to know the truth about Communists, and who have answered specific questions concerning the aims of communism, and the methods of attaining them.

I call your attention to the testimony of a prominent American citizen, who has held many positions of trust and honor in the American Government, namely Hon. William C. Bullitt. In order that you may know the responsibility and background of Mr. Bullitt, he was Special Assistant to the Secretary of State of the United States in 1933; was a member of the American delegation to the International Economic and Monetary Conference in London in 1933; was Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1933 until 1936; was Ambassador to France from 1936 to 1940; was personal representative of the President of the United States with the rank of Ambassador for all countries in 1941 and 1942 and was Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy thereafter for approximately a year and a half.

Because of Mr. Bullitt's actual residence in Russia, and because of his long and varied experience in our State Department, he is as well qualified as any American to give facts concerning communism. On page 2 of Mr. Bullitt's testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities he said this:

"The basis of Communist action in the world, whether in the United States or any other country, is the Communist creed, which is a belief that there will be no peace on earth until all the nations of the world are Communist. This is a very genuine belief which is held by a large number of people, and in the furtherance of that belief they have developed a doctrine that the end justifies the means, and that any means, even the most foul, are justifiable in order to achieve this domination of the world by communism."

Mr. Bullitt then quotes as a part of the Communist doctrine a statement from Lenin, from his collected works, volume 24, page 122, Russian edition, as follows:

"We are living not merely in a state but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

On page 3 of his testimony Mr. Bullitt says that Lenin's book contains this statement:

"It is necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth."

Mr. Bullitt was questioned about the untruthfulness of Communists. I quote these questions and his answers from page 18 of his testimony:

"Question. Now, you spoke about prosecuting these fellows. You know that no Communist will tell the truth, if it suits him to prevaricate, do you not?

"Answer. Yes; that is quite true.

"Question. No oath will bind a Communist, will it?

"Answer. No.

"Question. None whatever?

"Answer. No.

"Question. Nothing they will find will bind them, will it?

"Answer. No."

I wanted to bring with me today enough copies of Mr. Bullitt's testimony on March 24, 1947, before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to be able to give each one of you a copy of his testimony. It is so complete, and so revealing, that its contents ought to be brought to the attention of every American. I have distributed all the copies of Mr. Bullitt's testimony which I have been able to obtain. But I want to give you some of the important facts, which he brought to the attention of Congress, and I quote you the following statements from page 3 of his testimony:

"The doctrine that war is inevitable between the Soviet Union and the states which the Communists call bourgeois and imperialist, which includes the United States of America—indeed, all States which are not Communist—grows from the fact that what the Communists intend is the conquest of the earth for communism. It is entirely clear and one may find it in writing after writing, and there is not much point in my quoting further excerpts."

"The present situation in the world is the following: The Soviet Government, in the furtherance of its intention to control the earth for communism, has annexed Estonia, Latvia, Lithunia, and a large portion of Poland, a portion of Finland, a portion of Rumania, and has established absolute control, through puppet governments, over the whole of Poland, the whole of Bulgaria, the whole of Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Albania, and it is closing its iron fist steadily on Finland, on Hungary, on Czechoslovakia. It also controls fully the Red Army zones in Germany and Austria. Thus, the Soviet Government has brought under its control more than 100,000,000 persons in eastern Europe."

"In addition, through its fifth columns—and its fifth columns are like the Nazi fifth columns, since the truth is that communism is Red fascism and uses fifth columns just the way Hitler used them, only much more effectively. Hitler was never able to build up in the countries which he intended to conquer parties or fifth columns having anything like the strength of the Communist parties which have been built up by the Soviet Union. Using these Communist parties as fifth columns, Stalin is threatening the independence of the remainder of Europe.

"The Communist Party in France, for example, is extremely important. It is, in fact, the largest party today in the French Parliament. But there are so many other parties in the French Parliament that, although the Communist Party is the largest party, it only has 28 percent of the seats in the French Chamber of Deputies. Nevertheless, it has acquired control of the French CGT, which is the one big trade union of the whole country, and it can pull a general strike in France whenever it may choose. Since France has not yet recovered from the war and has a very difficult economic situation to deal with, the threat of a general strike is an appalling one."

On page 4 of his testimony, Mr. Bullitt said that in spite of the fact that 72 percent of the French Parliament is anti-Communist, there is a very good chance that the Communists through a general strike and revolutionary activity may be able to take over France. That statement was made on March 24, 1947, and French communistic activity in France in the last few weeks has demonstrated how accurate Mr. Bullitt's prediction was.

On page 5 of his testimony Mr. Bullitt states that murder is carried on on a very large scale by the Communists—that individual assassinations are not very often used by the Communist Party, but that murder on an extremely large scale is very frequently used and is a regular piece of the mechanism of establishing their authority.

He then states as his opinion on page 5:

"That, I think, confronts us with a very practical question of what to do under the present circumstances. The United States, without question, today is in danger, as President Truman very clearly brought out in his statement asking for support for Greece and Turkey. He said that the national security of the United States was involved. I believe those were his exact words. Perhaps I have not quoted him correctly, but that was the sense of some of his words. The safety of the United States is involved because the gradual taking over of countries, the gradual taking over of areas, while possible future victims are lulled into a false sense of security, is the essence of the Soviet tactics, just as it was the essence of Hitler's tactics."

In considering the danger of communism to the United States, one of the first questions which arises in our minds is, How many members of the Communist Party are there actually in the United States? I want to leave Mr. Bullitt's testimony for the moment as a source of information, and look to the statement of another great American, J. Edgar Hoover, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Hoover made a speech before the annual convention of the American Legion at San Francisco on September 30, 1946, dealing with communism. In that speech, membership in the Communist Party in the United States was referred to by Mr. Hoover as being claimed at 100,000. In referring to the number of members of the Communist Party in this country, Mr. Hoover said:

"The fact that the Communist Party in the United States claims some 100,000 members has lulled many Americans into a feeling of false complacency. I would not be concerned if we were only dealing with only 100,000 Communists. The Communists themselves boast that for every party member there are 10 others ready to do the party's work. These include their satellites, their fellow travelers, and their so-called progressive and phony liberal allies. They have maneuvered themselves into positions where a few Communists control the destinies of hundreds who are either willing to be led, or have been duped into obeying the dictates of others."

Let us consider what it means to the United States if there are 100,000 actual members of the Communist Party in this country today, and 100,000 is the figure used by Mr. Hoover.

The official publication issued by our Government in 1947, entitled "Communism in Action" says on page 97:

"When the Bolsheviks seized power in Russia in 1917, there were only 200,000 members, and the party has remained small, although with a heavy turn-over of membership following the periodic purges."

This official booklet gives the membership of the Communist Party in Russia in 1921, 4 years after the revolution, as 650,000 members, and in 1941 as being only 2,515,481.

It is, therefore, seen that great numbers are not at all necessary to render the Communist Party effective. In fact, the Communist Party purged its membership in Russia in 1939 down to the low figure of only 1,588,000. Yet the Communist Party was not weakened in Russia as a result of this purge. On the contrary, the party seems to have been strengthened, not only in Russia, but throughout the world.

Let us not be lulled into a sense of security because of the relatively small number of members of the Communist Party in the United States.

Those who are members are active and zealous, and the party is constantly engaged in increasing its membership, and in teaching those who are members how to achieve the goals and purposes of the party, which are revolution and seizure of power.

I want to quote you some actual sworn testimony given to the House Committee on Un-American Activities on February 6, 1946, which will show you how the Communist Party of Soviet Russia has reached its long arm down into the State of Georgia, in Walton County, and took a man to Soviet Russia, and schooled him for a year and 4 months in communistic and revolutionary activities.

The following testimony was given by William O'Dell Nowell, colored, who was born in Walton County, Georgia, in 1904. He was formerly a member of the Communist Party, and later renounced it and gave valuable testimony concerning communistic activity. The following questions and answers are quoted from his testimony on pages 14, 15, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, and 28:

"Question. What position did you hold in the Communist Party?

"Answer. I was a member of the district-buro, district secretariat, organizer of the American Negro Labor Congress, and director of education; that is, education propaganda. That constitutes about the most of it.

"Question. In connection with your Communist Party activities, were you ever sent to the Soviet Union?

"Answer. I was sent the first time in 1929. In 1931 I returned as a student to Moscow.

"Question. You first went in 1929?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. Then you returned to the United States?

"Answer. Yes, sir.

"Question. Then you returned again in 1931?

"Answer. That is right.

"Question. As a student?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. A student of what school?

"Answer. International Lenin School.

"Question. Where is the International Lenin School located?

"Answer. In Moscow.

"Question. Is it connected in any way with the Communist International or the Comintern?

"Answer. It is a school of the Communist International.

"Question. What is a student taught, generally, at the Comintern?

"Answer. Academic subjects with philosophy; of course, Marxism and Leninism; Marx economics; history of the labor movement; party organization; history of the Communist International; conspiracy; sabotage; and then quite some detail with regard to conspiracy. It includes building barricades, wrecking trains——

"Question. Wrecking trains, did you say?

"Answer. Yes. Seizing the essential facilities of a city, its water, lighting. On instructions, how to capture a city, we were told how to seize the most vital means of communications, transportation, lighting, water supply, and so on; food; and, of course, the Army, the armed forces; any arms, if any arms were stored; then, code, of course, transmission of messages; street fighting.

"Question. Were you given a course at that school in espionage technique?

"Answer. Yes. That was a part of the course on conspiracy.

"Question. How many separate times did you go to Russia during the time you were a member of the party?

"Answer. Twice. The first time in 1929. The second time in 1931.

"Question. How long did you stay on each occasion?

"Answer. On the first occasion I was there only a month, just as a delegate. On the second occasion I was there a year and 4 months.

"Question. A year and 4 months?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. Who defrayed your expenses on these two separate trips?

"Answer. The central committee, local district committee, contributed toward the first trip. The second trip was financed by the central committee of the party.

"Question. In Moscow?

"Answer. No; in New York.

"Question. Any part of your expenses on either trip financed from the Comintern in Moscow?

"Answer. Well, of course, the Comintern was furnishing all of the means, I suppose, but—as a matter of fact, I know—but it is credited to the central committee.

"Question. What I was trying to find out is just how did you get the funds while in Moscow; just by what avenue did you receive the funds?

"Answer. We were paid by the Comintern while studying. We were given 50 rubles a month, dormitory and board.

"Question. I believe you said you were born in Georgia?

"Answer. The State of Georgia.

"Question. Where?

"Answer. The county seat is Monroe. It is down below Atlanta about 40 miles.

"Question. Were you in Detroit at the time of the riots?

"Answer. Yes; I was.

"Question. Did the Communists stir that riot up, or help to stir it up?

"Answer. I think in large part it was due to Communist agitation.

"Question. How large a school was that in Moscow?

"Answer. We had students from about 18 countries, 18 or 20 countries, I think about 2,000 students all told.

"Question. Two thousand students; and how long a course was it?

"Answer. Well, 1-, 2-, and 3-year courses.

"Question. One-, two-, and three-year courses?

"Answer. Yes. Of course, those were year-round courses. You did quite a lot of work, approximately 2 years in 1 year.

"Question. Is it fair to state that many of the students in that school at that time with you are now leading Communists in the various nations in the world?

"Answer. Yes, sir.

"Question. Do they have any type of similar school here in America?

"Answer. Yes. Our local schools were fashioned after the Lenin school; the school that I organized in Detroit in 1933 was fashioned after the school there. We had another one in New York, and one in Chicago, and quite a few smaller schools throughout the country.

"Question. What was the name of the school in Detroit?

"Answer. Detroit Workers School.

"Question. What was the name of the school in Chicago?

"Answer. Chicago Workers School. Originally I believe they called it the Douglas School.

"Question. What is the name?

"Answer. Frederick Douglas. I am not sure of that. I know they changed the name. It was formerly the Chicago Workers School, but they named it after some well-known liberalist or something.

"Question. Isn't it the policy of the Communist Party to maintain in all large cities a so-called workers school, Mr. Nowell?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. That has been the policy, Mr. Chairman. They carry that out at the present time. I am just asking for information as to the type of school. Did you have a special building, a meeting hall, for the students to assemble in?

"Answer. Yes, we had an auditorium. Part of the building was set apart for meetings.

"Question. I mean did you have the entire building?

"Answer. We leased the building there in Detroit, rented it, and used the entire building for the school.

"Question. Do you know whether or not there are any funds set up to subsidize the agents or subagents of the comintern in the educational institutions of America?

"Answer. That is kept quite secret. Of course, it is well known to us that the whole of the party work was subsidized in Moscow. I don't state I could definitely prove that, but it was understood by the party functionaires that the whole party was subsidized.

"Question. They would subsidize instructors that would teach their doctrines; is that correct?

"Answer. That was part of the reason for sending us to Moscow. We were paid to study there and placed in charge of some form of education when we returned, at the expense of the party.

"Question. Did they teach you a technique for stirring up racial trouble in this country? You spoke of the riot in Detroit. Did they teach a technique for stirring up racial trouble around the country?

"Answer. Well, the technique employed naturally did that. They didn't say, 'Start race trouble,' but naturally, the methods they used, the way they went about doing things, often created racial antagonism and led to bad results. The general idea, the general teaching, was to bring about unity of all labor and equal rights, and all that sort of thing, but the aggressiveness and often the very vulgar manner in which the policy was carried out produced the opposite result, racial antagonism, rather than a way to social harmony."

An American can hardly conceive of the horrible conditions which exist in any country dominated by communism. I want to give you a few more sentences of the testimony of former Ambassador William C. Bullitt about life in Russia. On pages 12 and 13 of his testimony of March 24, 1947 he says:

"In the first place, life in Russia is lived under the constant fear of the knock of the secret police on the door in the middle of the night. No man when he goes to bed, and no woman, knows that in the middle of the night the secret police aren't going to arrive—and then comes disappearance. Then comes either death in a cellar with a shot in the neck or deportation to one of the forced labor camps. We do not know exactly how many men and women are in those forced labor camps today, but there is extremely reliable testimony that there are more than 10,000,000 human slaves today in those forced labor camps working under the NKVD in the Soviet Union at this time.

"It is worse than at the worst moment of Negro slavery. There were never so many slaves as there are today in the Soviet Union actually working in slavery.

"That being the basis for life, whether you have more or less makes very little difference, because you can't call your soul your own; you are scared every minute."

On page 16 and 17 of his testimony, he tells the tragic story of the planned and systematic starvation of three to five million Ukrainians, and the forcing into slavery of some 10,000,000 people. Here is his testimony about those horrible things:

"Question. In 1933, I think it was, they had a crop failure in the Ukraine, Do you remember that?

"Answer. I do; very well.

"Question. And the people of the Ukraine are among the best people in Russia?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. And they went down and took everything away from them and starved five or six million of the best people in Russia to death, in their own homes; that is correct, isn't it?

"Answer. Mr. Congressman, it was, in one way, even worse than that. They set the grain quotas higher than the total grain crop. They then took the entire grain crop, but because there wasn't more, to come up to quota, the man was a criminal, and, therefore, he was treated as a criminal, in addition to being starved, and his wife and children as well.

"Question. Yes.

"Answer. They managed to dispose, by systematically organized starvation, they managed to dispose of some three to five million Ukrainians.

"Question. The people in the Ukraine are among the best people in Europe.

"Answer. That is right.

"Question. Yet they went in there and took everything they made and starved, you say, five or six million of them to death?

"Answer. Three to five million.

"Question. Men, women, and children starved to death, eating, in their frantic misery, the bodies of their own children, of their own families; that is correct, isn't it?

"Answer. I am extremely sorry to say that I actually have two photographs of a father and mother and the skeleton of the child they had eaten, which were taken down there in the Ukraine.

"Question. Yes; that is what I am trying to bring out.

"Answer. I still have two photographs of that. There is nothing more horrible.

"Question. You spoke awhile ago of there being 10,000,000 people in concentration camps.

"Answer. I should say at least.

"Question. You said that they were infinitely worse off than the slaves were in the Southern States.

"Answer. What I said was this, sir, that there were more slaves today in the Soviet Union than there ever were at the height of slavery, not merely in the Southern States, but in the world."

In the short time I have to talk to you today I can only give you a sketchy picture of the horror, the misery, and the unspeakable human degradation which comes to people unfortunate enough to live under communistic rule.

In these critical days the country looks to the American Legion, as it did in the years following the First World War, to be one of the great forces to keep America safe and strong, and to preserve her institutions. One of the necessary steps is to eliminate communism and Communists from our Government and country.

I commend and congratulate you for taking part in the campaign to spread information concerning communism.

I urge you to continue your efforts to acquaint our people with the truth about this menace to our institutions of freedom.

I invite you to call upon me for any testimony, pamphlets, booklets, and documents dealing with communism which are available in Washington. I will take pleasure in sending you from time to time all of such documents as may be in print and available.

One Hundred and One Displaced Persons Versus 60,000,000 Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid and timely article submitted by Mr. William E. Zipp, vice president of the Ceco Steel Products Corp., of Chicago.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In a strange new land they stood—these displaced persons. Silent men with grim tasks ahead worked purposefully and with little thought of the fatigue that racked their weary bodies. They were building a new community—their community.

Women, hollow-eyed, their white drawn faces mirroring pain, went about setting their humble homes in order. On every side was hunger, privation—the plight of desperate people. "A picture of Europe, 1948?" you ask.

No, a picture of America, 1620.

For here, 101 displaced Pilgrims—men, women, and children of the new America—freedom-loving people all, were beginning a new way of life. They were meeting critical shortages and overcoming them—shortages of all the things that make for decent living—food, clothing, shelter; shortages that relatively were the greatest our Nation has ever known.

There was a 100-percent shortage of almost everything on that day, 328 years ago, when their storm-battered ship nosed into the quieter waters of rock-studded coastal bays. Yes, a shortage of everything except courage—a belief in the dignity of man—a passionate desire on the part of each to live as he liked.

Perhaps it was the strong driving force of the urge to be free men that enabled them to solve the critical shortages of their day. For, you see, no one could pass a law providing new homes or schools, nor were there any homes here ready for them to occupy.

So, with bare hands and primitive tools, they individually dug from the earth and cut from the forests their own homes and schools. Ceaselessly and endlessly they worked at their simple tasks, struggling for necessities, looking ahead, not behind, building a heritage for millions of Americans to come.

Are we less courageous than they?

Is war-scarred Europe more destitute than they were?

Is there less hope in our time than theirs?

Are our shortages more acute than 100 percent?

There is a simple answer to those questions and to the problems they pose. It is a word. A short word, without glamour, but a virile word of dynamic force—a word that in its simplicity might be overlooked, but a word so powerful as to be virtually magic.

It isn't a new word to Ceco thinking, for in January 1947 we said this word was the key to better times—to security for all.

May we say it again?

It is "work"—a four-letter word for continuing prosperity, for preserving freedom in America, and for providing hope throughout the world. As we said before, everyone must work more, produce more—management and labor.

Suppose we look at the simple mathematics of the problem. There just aren't enough homes, schools, hospitals, roads to satisfy the needs of all—not enough steel, automobiles, freight cars, food for America and the rest of the world. How can more of these scarce things be made available sooner, and at lower prices?

We, like you, have heard many so-called cure-alls. Some say too many have too much money; they bid against each other for scarce things and thus keep prices ever moving upward, so taxes must be raised, not lowered—must be kept high to draw off excess money. Credit must be curtailed so buying will be slowed down. Or prices must be regulated and goods rationed.

Others say don't buy unless your needs are desperate, quit eating certain foods certain days, don't build now; don't, don't, don't, verboten. It all has a familiar ring somehow. It's a creed of hopelessness—of negation.

Let's hear a new voice in America, raised high in a mighty crescendo, drowning out those voices of fear. Yes, a new voice of hope, which will say in clear, unmistakable tones of triumph—"Let's do something, yes, let's trade do for don't."

We of Ceco believe the American way to solve the problem of shortages and high prices is one of action, one of doing, of making more things, not buying less of what we have, of increasing prosperity, not dividing misery. And prosperity comes from making a lot for all, not dividing a little with all.

Look at it this way. There are some 60,000,000 adults—men and women—employed in the Nation today, making things for the more than 140,000,000 Americans and the many, many millions in all the other countries of the world. Now we can't increase our 60,000,000 employed to any great degree very fast. They just about represent today's manpower capacity—but, if everyone of those 60,000,000 executives, managers, labor, white collar people, all of America's working force, produced more individually, things would become more plentiful and prices would be reduced.

It's basically that simple.

Yes, we 60,000,000 Americans must work more, produce more, instead of less, and that goes for Europe and every other part of the world. Everywhere, we must increase man-hour output, bricklayers must lay more bricks, architects create more buildings, miners dig more coal, farmers raise more produce, stenographers write more letters, managers do more managing, and this must go clear back through the entire economy from raw materials to manufactured products.

Then, and only then, will scarce things be plentiful, will money stop bidding up prices, and inflation be halted and a sound basis be established for the security of all, both labor and capital.

Given a freer rein this past year the building industry made real progress in cutting down building shortages. For example, twice as many homes were completed in 1947 as compared to 1946, plant expansion is getting closer to demand. Ceco salutes construction men for the job they are doing.

We like to feel that in some measure we have been helpful in this progress. Here are some of the things we have done to help the building industry in 1947.

Our production in 1947 nearly absorbed manufacturing capacity, which was doubled in 1946. New fabricating plants were erected in Hillside, N. J., and Houston, Tex. Personnel in plants, offices, and sales force increased more than 50 percent. More than 100 improvements were effected in our products. More than one-third of our new products developed since the war were put in production.

But what about the future?

Today, as was true a year ago, the building industry faces an imposing demand for all types of construction. People want more homes, schools, roads, and will get them if an unhampered building industry is permitted to provide them—could get them at lower prices, too, if all would work to produce more, not less.

We of Ceco believe in America's future, in its ability to meet the challenge of world leadership—for after all a way of life that has given Americans more of the good things of earth than any other people anywhere doesn't have to be proven—it is proven, it is working.

As for the building industry, Ceco has confidence we can count on our architects, engineers, contractors, builders, and industry labor to provide the structural needs of our Nation. To this end the industry—America—can count on Ceco.

Communist Control of United Public Workers of America, CIO, Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, Local 471, United Cafeteria and Restaurant Workers' Union, CIO, which called its members out on strike, is an affiliate of the United Public Workers of America, CIO. The union officials complain that the Government Services, Inc., which manages the cafeterias, will not bargain with the union.

The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 provides that all officers of the union must sign an affidavit that they are not members of the Communist Party, and do not subscribe to its principles. The officers of the UPWA-CIO have refused to sign such an affidavit. By not complying with the law the officers of the union have taken from the members their right to collective bargaining before the National Labor Relations Board.

These officers have openly boasted of their desire and intention to cripple food service to 80,000 employees, thus causing grave inconvenience for these employees and the Government agencies that employ them. This is fully in line with the international Communist tactics of creating chaos wherever possible. It is the same pattern of agitation and activities of the UPWA in the Panama Canal Zone described in a very enlightening article in the November 1946 issue of Plain Talk magazine.

In order that the public will know the record of the officers who are depriving the members of their rights given them by virtue of the law, I am inserting at this point a report of the United Public Workers, CIO, and its affiliates. This report was compiled by qualified experts at the request of Government Services, Inc., a quasi-official, nonprofit organization, directed by Government officials who serve without pay, and it is my understanding copies of it have been furnished to members of the President's Cabinet and various other officials of the Government.

The report follows:

REPORT ON THE UNITED PUBLIC WORKERS-CIO AND ITS AFFILIATES

Despite the repeated claims of the United Public Workers-CIO that it engaged in the betterment of employment conditions of workers, this organization cannot be considered as a genuine labor union. It is rather a political front, organized to promote the ideology and the goals of the pro-Communist movement in the United States. It is participating in the Communist-sponsored drive to embarrass our Government and to disrupt the services of organizations in any way connected with the Government.

The intensified agitations of the UPW-CIO take on particular significance in light of the fact that Washington has been made the principal target of the Communist Party. Events in the Capital of the greatest Nation in the world are played under the intense international spotlight. Their perversion to the Communist cause will provide first-rate fuel for the propaganda machine of the Kremlin. The pages of the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, show beyond doubt the effective propaganda use which is being made of the activities of the UPW-CIO and its leadership.

That the United Public Workers-CIO and its principal officers are subservient to the Communist Party line is recognized almost unanimously, both in and outside of the labor movement, in Government, in Congress, and by the responsible press. Even a brief list of charges against the CIO will support this state[illegible]

The Washington Daily News has branded UPW-CIO a "left-wing, Communist-infested organization" and "the kind of an outfit that holds that Russia, with its totalitarian, Communist government, can do no wrong."

The Washington Times-Herald called the union "left-wing" and "fellow-traveling."

The Washington Post charged that it "has had an extreme left-wing label pinned on it" and is following a "pro-Soviet, anti-American" policy.

The Evening Star made the charge that the organization is a "decidedly Communist union."

The New York World-Telegram said that UPW-CIO is "Communist dominated."

Business Week classes the union as a "member of the so-called 'red bloc' of the CIO" which "follows the Communist Party line."

The American Magazine has referred to the union's policy as "both anti-American and pro-Russian."

Plain Talk magazine stated that UPW-CIO has a "flagrant pro-Soviet record * * * unsurpassed among the labor unions of America."

The Veterans of Foreign Wars urged at their twenty-eighth annual district encampment that the UPW-CIO be listed by the Attorney General as a subversive organization because of its "adherence to the Communist Party line."

Edward E. Rhatigan, former welfare commissioner of the city of New York, expressed his certainty that "the United Public Workers have pursued a Communist Party line."

President William Green, of the AFL, declared that UPW-CIO officials "owed their allegiance to another government," meaning, of course, the Soviet Union.

The noted American historian, Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., lists the UPW-CIO among those CIO groups that "can be relied upon to follow the (Communist) party line with fidelity."

These accusations are supported by the history of the United Public Workers-CIO, and its predecessors, as well as the personal records of most of its major officers. UPW-CIO was created by the merger of two Communist-controlled unions of Government employees, the United Federal Workers-CIO and the State, County, and Municipal Workers-CIO.

THE STATE, COUNTY, AND MUNICIPAL WORKERS-CIO

SCMWA-CIO was founded in 1937, under the leadership of well-known fellow travelers, and almost immediately won the reputation of being under the firm control of Communists. The Civil Service Forum, a recognized publication in the field, referred to the SCMWA-CIO as "the fifth column in civil service." After a thorough investigation, a member of a California State legislative committee reached the conclusion that "the so-called SCMWA is not really a union, just a racket, a Communist-controlled racket."

When the Communist-controlled Teachers Union of New York was thrown out of the American Federation of Labor, it affiliated itself with the SCMW-CIO. It is interesting to note that Nancy Reed, discharged from the New York State Labor Department as a Communist was the SCMW-CIO delegate to the Havana National Congress of Workers in 1939. When her ouster was made public, the union not only defended her, but actually asked for the removal of the official who conducted the investigation of her Communist connection.

SCMW-CIO has faithfully followed all the twists and turns of the Communist Party line. During the early period of Nazi aggression, it participated in the so-called stop Hitler movement. As soon as Hitler and Stalin signed their infamous 1939 agreement, the union reversed itself and became a champion in peace activities, demanding that the United States "stay out." Peace commissions were formed among local unions, and innumerable resolutions against involvement in the war were passed. SCMW-CIO worked closely with such Communist peace fronts as the American Peace Mobilization and boasted of sending 150 delegates to the Chicago Peace Mobilization of 1940.

With the German invasion of the Soviet Union, the State, County, and Municipal Workers-CIO, whipped up a veritable fury for our entry into the war and for full support to the Red army.

In the 1943 elections, six prominent New York members of SCMW supported the election to the city council of Peter V. Cacchione and Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., official candidates of the Communist Party. These same candidates were endorsed 2 years later by "500 officers and shop stewards of the SCMWA."

THE UNITED FEDERAL WORKERS-CIO

The pro-Communist history of the United Federal Workers, CIO, bears a striking parallel to its sister organization, the SCMWA-CIO. UFW-CIO was established in 1937, as the outgrowth of a Communist-led split in the American Federation of Government Employees-AFL.

Before the Stalin-Hitler agreement of 1939, the union demanded aid for the victims of Nazi aggression and for a world-wide fight against "Fascist aggression" as laid down by the Communist Party. As soon as the Nazis and Soviets reached agreement on the division of the spoils, UFW-CIO followed the party line in opposing American participation in the war and demanding an embargo on all shipments of arms to the nations that later became our allies. Union publications went all out against expenditures for the national defense—expenditures that might have saved thousands of American lives—the Selective Service System, and other measures designed to gird America for the attack that finally came on December 7, 1941. Communist-led strikes in vital defense industries received the full support of this organization of Government employees. UFW-CIO even came to the defense of Earl Browder, then national chairman of the Communist Party, who was sent to prison for passport fraud.

The organization also came to the aid of subversive Federal employees who were fired during this period and enlisted the support of prominent Communist fronts to their defense. The Federal Record, official UFW-CIO publication, showed a picture of the union president with Helen Miller, who was ousted from the Labor Department.

After June 22, 1941, when the Germans began their invasion of the Soviet Union, UFW-CIO joined in the Communist-inspired war cry, eventually demanding the opening of a second front, passage of the teen-age draft, declaration of war on little Finland, and a diplomatic break with Spain. Each of these demands conformed to the current line of the Communist Party.

During its period of existence, the United Federal Workers-CIO has cooperated with numerous Communist-dominated and front organizations, including the Workers' Alliance, Consumers' Union, Labor Research Association, Washington Bookshop, Washington Friends of Spanish Democracy, and the Washington Peace Mobilization. Congressman FRED E. BUSBEY, of Illinois, characterized the UFW-CIO as follows:

"Although the United Federal Workers of America claims that it is a bona fide union seeking to advance the interests of Federal workers, it is actually an organization which has as its primary purpose the advancement of the policies and organizations supported by the Communist Party."

FORMATION OF THE UNITED PUBLIC WORKERS-CIO

The United Federal Workers-CIO and the State, County, and Municipal Workers-CIO met concurrently in Atlantic City during April 1946. On the 23d, they voted to merge into a new union, and on the following day the first joint meeting was held under the vigilant eyes of the Communist Party. The

nature of the meeting and of its principal participants was exposed in the report of Jerry Kluttz, of the Washington Post.

"George Morris of The Daily Worker, official Communist party organ, and another New York reporter came into the convention hall at the Hotel Chelsea, Abram Flaxer, SCMWA president who was later elected president of UPWA, told them what he had told me earlier—that nothing newsy was on the schedule.

"Morris, however, told Flaxer that he was concerned over the sharp criticism directed at the Russian foreign policy by Emil Rieve, president of CIO's textile workers and a leader of the right wing in the CIO. * * *

"This had made Morris most unhappy, and he frankly told Flaxer that he needed a story from the public workers to offset Rieve's speech. Finally, The Daily Worker correspondent suggested to Flaxer that he 'pull out the foreign policy resolution and get it passed'. (Obviously, Morris knew what it proposed or he wouldn't have made the suggestion.)

"Flaxer returned to the platform and took over the gavel. It was only a matter of minutes before the foreign policy resolution was called up for action."

The resolution which was called up by Flaxer conformed clearly to the official line of the Communist Party. It represented an abject surrender to the interests of the Soviet Union and an open denunciation of the United States of America.

The UPW-CIO charged that the demobilization of American troops following the war "is being deliberately delayed" by "powerful influences" with "imperialist ambitions" which are trying to "drive a wedge between the peoples" of the United Nations. This clause coincided with the propaganda demands of the Soviet Union that United States armed forces be withdrawn from all countries and with the Communist-instigated soldier "strikes" aimed at American military operations.

UPW-CIO insisted that "an Anglo-American" bloc had been formed in the UN to "isolate the Soviet Union." The trumped-up charge that the western democracies are trying to isolate the Soviets is the line followed by Gromyko and Vishinsky in their hysterical outbursts against this country.

A handful of delegates rallied against the Communist-inspired foreign-policy resolution. They attempted to modify the demand for the withdrawal of American and British troops by including a provision that Soviet troops be withdrawn from "friendly countries." They were snowed under in an avalanche of party-line oratory and the overwhelming "no" note of the convention.

The New York Times reported that the supporters of the Communist-line resolution "said Russia had not been guilty of any act that could be deemed hostile * * * but that 'powerful interests' in the United States and England had stooped to every type of trick to stir disunity and provoke war * * *." Henry Bettcher, left-wing head of the Washington CIO Council, parried questions regarding the foreign policy stand of the new organization by the lame assertion that "Russia has already promised to withdraw her troops * * *. It would be silly to include it."

Although delegates showed unflinching confidence in the Communist dictator of the Soviet Union, only 2 days earlier they made a violent attack on the Congress and President of the United States "for carrying out a program of aggressive imperialism." The remaining program adopted by the UPW-CIO also conformed to the Communist Party line in all its essential features. A demand was made for the repeal of the Hatch Act, which wisely forbids civil servants to engage in politics. Resolutions supporting the Soviet-sponsored drive to break diplomatic relations with Spain and to expel the Argentine Republic from the United Nations were passed.

When news of the convention reached Washington, the UPW-CIO received the condemnation of almost all responsible observers. In a strongly worded statement, President Harry B. Mitchell, of the Civil Service Commission, denounced the union for "throwing an utterly uncalled-for proverbial red flag in the face of the American public." He bluntly informed the union that—

"There is no question but that evidence that individuals participated in the drafting of such resolutions or actively supported the adoption of such resolutions would be considered as relevsnt evidence in determining whether or not a person was following the Communist Party line."

"We should like," said the Washington Post, "to call attention to what appears to have been a successful effort by our Stalinist friends to gain complete control of the new United Public Workers of America, and to exploit it in the interests of the Communist Party line."

John H. Cline, of the Evening Star, wrote on May 5: "Here is an organization which has deliberately chosen to identify itself with the policy line espoused by Communist spokesmen which are openly hostile to the policy of our own Government. * * * The important point is that a union of its complexion has no place in this Government. And responsible Government officials * * * should be the first to denounce it."

In an editorial entitled "Federal Party Line," the Star declared that when a "union of Federal employees attacks the employer's foreign policies and uses as its text a theme which could have been lifted bodily from the Communist Daily Worker, it is time to ask whether the employer should sanction or in any way recognize such a union."

STRIKES AND SLOW-DOWNS

It is an almost universally recognized principle that government must remain immune from strikes. A strike against government is a strike against the people, endangering their safety, their welfare, and perhaps their sovereignty. This principle has been repeatedly violated in fact and in spirit by the UPW-CIO, as well as its predecessors.

At the 1946 convention, the union adopted a constitution which laid down a full-fledged procedure under which a strike might be called against the Government. President Truman, at his press conference following the convention, denounced the assertion that a union had any right to strike against the United States, pointing out that in such an event government would cease to exist. Congress was forced to enact legislation which unequivocally outlawed membership of government employees in any organization "that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States." In order to circumvent the act, the international executive board of the union adopted a resolution which gave up the right to instigate strikes against the Government. Before the end of the year, the United Public Workers-CIO endorsed, however, the Communist Party's drive in New York to legalize strikes against the Government, and during the early months of 1947 the union led the fight against outlawing strikes against the State of New York.

The tenuous nature of the UPW-CIO no-strike policy is shown by the strikes staged against the Government Services, Inc., a quasi-official, nonprofit corporation managing cafeterias in Federal Government buildings. In September 1947 the union distributed mimeographed flyers to employees of the Veterans' Administration, promoting what officials interpreted as a "slow-down."

RACE AGITATION

One of the principal activities of the Communist Party is to instigate race agitation and to promote prejudice and disturbances among minority groups as part of the program of breaking down the American political fabric. In this endeavor, the United Public Workers-CIO has been a faithful follower. The Daily Worker has repeatedly published inflammatory, but unfounded statements of UPW-CIO units, designed to give the impression that minorities were deliberately persecuted by the Government and by all those who did not follow the union's line. On a number of occasions, these misrepresentations have been exposed. For example, the Washington Daily News, reported late in 1946 that a UPW-CIO "complaint of alleged discrimination against Negroes and Jews in the New York City Weather Bureau office has backfired with a nasty bang. Officials say a thorough investigation showed the charge completely unjustified—and they do mean 'completely.' Also it turned up some unpleasant stuff on the records of the two chief complainants."

In 1947, union officials attempted to accuse one of the leading Washington government reporters, one who had been in the forefront of the fight against Communist control of UPW-CIO, of anti-Semitism. This charge was branded as completely unfounded by other newspapermen. Perhaps the low point of distortion was reached in September 1947 when David Cohen, international representative, made the fantastic claim that the Federal loyalty program would be used to dismiss Negro employees of the Government and to replace them with whites.

During the current dispute of UPW-CIO with Government Services, Inc., mimeographed letters are being mailed out to obscure the refusal of the union to disavow communism, as required under the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, by making oblique references to racial prejudice. A letter dated December 11, 1947, refers to the anti-Communist affidavits as "so-called 'purity' affidavits." In Communist lingo the term "purity" invariably refers to race prejudice.

SECESSION FROM UPW-CIO

As a result of the Communist road followed by the UPW-CIO leadership, a number of local and affiliated groups have withdrawn. Among the seceding groups are postal unions in Detroit, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Duluth, and Kansas City.

UPW-CIO'S COMMUNIST FRONT CONNECTIONS

The numerous Communist fronts with which the predecessor unions have been connected have already been listed. In its brief period of existence, UPW-CIO has endorsed the notorious Communist front National Negro Congress. Attempts have been made by some union leaders, with the so-called "Win-the-Peace Conference" staged by the Communist Party in Washington, to bent the propaganda drums for the Soviet Union.

The New York district UPW-CIO announced its support of the left-wing American Labor Party ticket. Communist literature is frequently distributed at UPW-CIO meetings, and UPW-CIO literature has been distributed at sessions of the Communist fronts.

PERSONNEL OF UPW-CIO

Nearly every leader and officer of the United Public Workers-CIO has a long record of Communist affiliations. Their undisputed control of the union must necessarily solidify the conviction that the organization is part of the Communist front network in this country. The principal officers are Abram Flaxer, president; Eleanor Nelson, secretary-treasurer; Robert Weinstein, director of organization.

Abram Flaxer

Abram Flaxer was born in Vilna, Russia, on September 12, 1904. He has been active in the Communist movement for more than a decade. According to the House Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Flaxer's allegiance to the Communist Party "is indisputably established by his presence at closed meetings of the party, by the statements of those who have been closely associated with him in the labor movement, by his complete loyalty to the party line throughout its various changes, by his defense of Communists and Communist fronts."

Flaxer was at one time active as an official of the New York local of the American Federation of Government Employees A. F. of L. According to the testimony of John P. Frey, head of the AFL Metal Trades Department, Flaxer was known as a Communist. In 1936 Flaxer joined the Communist-controlled Workers' Alliance in a request for a parade permit. The project had the complete endorsement of the Young Communist League.

When the State, County, and Municipal Workers was founded in 1937, Flaxer became president, a post which he held until the 1946 merger, when he became president of the United Public Workers CIO.

Before the signing of the Hitler-Stalin pact, Flaxer called for collective security and support for nations fighting fascism. He changed his tune as soon as Germany and the Soviet Union agreed on the conquest of Europe. During the so-called defense period, Flaxer, therefore, opposed aid to Britain and France, opposed United States participation in the war, and supported strikes despite the critical defense needs of the United States. He became a leading spirit in the Communist-front American Peace Mobilization, which agitated against military service, lend-lease, convoying of British ships, and other activities vital to the security of the Nation.

When Hitler invaded Russia, Flaxer made another sudden turn with the Communist line and began to advocate revision of our Neutrality Act and active participation in the "struggle that the Red Army, the people of the Soviet Union, are conducting."

With the end of the war, Flaxer and his organization again followed the Communists in demanding American withdrawals from our defense outposts, appeasement of the Soviet Union, and the adoption of a Communist-inspired program at home. When these efforts failed, he supported the charges that this country was engaged in imperialist moves against the faultless Soviet Union.

During the spring of 1946 the Atlanta local of UPW-CIO asked in a letter that Flaxer make a public statement in answer to the numerous statements in the press "that you were a Communist." It is significant that Abram Flaxer did not take the opportunity to make a denial.

Abram Flaxer has been affiliated with at least 30 Communist-front organizations, and this evidence can be found in the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The New York World-Telegram recently reported that it had documentary evidence to prove that Abram Flaxer is a member of the Communist Party. Among the Red front organizations with which Flaxer has been affiliated are the following: Committee on Election Rights, 1940, Prestes Defense Committee, Schappes Defense Committee, Joint Committee for Trade Union Rights, Committee for Defense of Public Education, Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee, Open Letter Defending Harry Bridges, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, American Committee to Save Refugees, United American Spanish Aid Committee, Nonpartisan Committee for the Reelection of Congressman VITO MARCANTONIO, National Negro Congress, Social Work Today (pro-Communist magazine), Public Use of Arts Committee, and National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Eleanor Nelson, secretary-treasurer

Eleanor Nelson, like Abram Flaxer, has shown complete submission to the Communist Party line. Her story, as well as that of most UPW-CIO leaders, is almost a monotonous repetition of the Communist Party program over the past decade.

During the early part of the war she was connected with the American League for Peace and Democracy, which stood for "collective security against the Fascist aggressors." She spoke at a Washington meeting, together with the internationally known Communist writer, Anna Louise Strong, urging repeal of the Neutrality Act, boycotts, and other measures designed to injure the Axis powers. Nelson ended her drive for "collective security" as soon as Hitler and Stalin signed their pact. After the German invasion she again supported an aggressive anti-Axis foreign policy.

Eleanor Nelson was secretary-treasurer of the United Federal Workers-CIO and member of the CIO executive committee. She has fought tenaciously against all attempts to oust subversive workers from the Government. She has been connected with a number of Communist fronts, including the National Negro Congress, and was speaker at a Washington meeting supported by the Washing Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy and the Communist Party.

Robert Weinstein, director of organization

Robert Weinstein has a record of Communist affiliation and was an instructor at the (Communist) Jefferson School in New York.

DISMISSALS OF UPW-CIO MEMBERS FOR DISLOYALTY

A large number of UPW-CIO members and officers have been discharged from the Government Service for being Communists or pro-Communists. Perhaps the most celebrated case is the firing of the five top officers of UPW-CIO at the Aberdeen Proving Ground "in the interests of national security". The five were: Harry Spector, president; Rheabel Mendelsohn, secretary; Phil Weiss, chairman of the organizing committee; Irving Spector, chairman of the grievance committee; and Abraham Kotelchuck, chairman of the legislative and educational committee.

The union immediately undertook an all-out campaign to the defense and possible reinstatement of the discharged employees, making unfounded charges that the War Department had launched a "union-busting" campaign because it dismissed employees whose loyalty to the United States was questionable.

Late in 1946, the Labor Department undertook ouster proceedings against a number of Communists in the agency, several of whom were members of UPW-CIO. Similarly, among the employees fired last fall from the Central Intelligence Group a large part were UPW-CIO members. Morton Friedman, whose dismissal on loyalty grounds was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States, was a member of the UPW-CIO, and the organization exerted heavy pressure on his behalf.

In Birmingham Malcolm Dobbs was dismissed from his post on the CIO Council for Communist activities. He, too, was a member of UPW-CIO.

FIGHT AGAINST THE LOYALTY PROGRAM

It is not surprising, under the circumstances, that the officers of the United Public Workers-CIO have been in the forefront of the fight against the loyalty program of the United States Government. Many of them would not be qualified to hold Government jobs because of their Communist affiliations. Some have actually been thrown out of the Government for this reason.

The attitude of UPW-CIO is in sharp contrast to the position of the legitimate Government unions, which have gone on record as unequivocally supporting the removal of Communists and other disloyal elements from the Government. In fact, some of these unions have even urged a strengthening of the loyalty procedure in the secure knowledge that their membership was safe from the Communist taint.

The campaign against the loyalty program undertaken by both the Communist Party and the UPW-CIO is too extensive to report fully. It has manifested itself in the form of trumped-up charges that the Government is "union busting," indulging in race prejudice, or is violating civil rights. The union has resorted to heavy financial expenditures in the drive to prevent the firing of Communists from the Government and has purchased extensive advertising space in the left-wing New York newspaper, PM.

The real reasons behind the desperate campaign of the United Public Workers-CIO were perhaps best expressed by James B. Burns, president of the American Federation of Government Employees-AFL, when he declared:

"Government employees whose interests are fundamentally American need have no fear of any investigative effort growing out of this program. Their record is one of achievement in service and the organizations to which they belong are devoted to upholding our national character. On the other hand, Government employees who are members of organizations or groups that carry out the dictates of foreign purveyors of disunity have every reason to worry. They fear the truth. It is well nigh impossible for them to hide their affiliation with groups which work only in the shadows against the very fundamentals of our democracy. It will be impossible for them to continue the pretext of being loyal Government employees."

LOCAL 471, UNITED CAFETERIA AND RESTAURANT WORKERS, AN AFFILIATE OF UPW-CIO

Like its parent organization, local 471 of the United Cafeteria and Restaurant Workers has followed the Communist Party line.

During the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact, UCRW and its leaders sponsored public meetings designed to impede United States defense preparations.

On May 1, 1940, a May Day meeting arranged as a benefit for local 471 and under the chairmanship of its business agent, denounced the administration for its "war drive." It should be pointed out that May Day is the principal holiday of the Communist Party.

On May Day, 1941, leaders of local 471 again participated in anti-war, anti-imperialistic demonstrations.

After the invasion of the Soviet Union, local 471 suddenly found itself supporting the war and on October 12, 1942, sponsored a "Second Front Now" rally. Speakers at the affair included such fellow travelers and pro-Reds as Clayton Powell, Jr., of New York; Reid Robinson, of the Communist-controlled CIO Minc. Mill, and Smelter Workers; and Russ Nixon, of the Communist-dominated United Electrical Workers. Many members of the Communist Party were present.

Since the end of the war, local 471 leaders have continued to integrate their activities with the party line. Two of the leading officers of the union have been closely identified with Communist-front activities. They are Richard A. Bancroft, president; Oliver T. Palmer, business agent.

Richard A. Bancroft

Bancroft was a radical student at Howard University. He was national president of the American Student Union, a Communist organization among students.

On January 26, 1941, Bancroft attended a meeting of the Communist-organized American Youth Congress. The meeting laid plans to recruit speakers to spread the party line. On May Day, 1941, he took part in a Communist-sponsored anti-war tirade, accusing the "capitalists" of attempting to drag the United States into war.

As soon as Germany invaded Russia, Bancroft changed his political outlook and by October 12, 1942, he was joining in the Communist-sponsored call for a second front.

After the war, Bancroft became a leader in the United Negro and Allied Veterans, Communist front among Negro veterans.

He was a speaker on July 29, 1946, at a protest meeting of the Red-front National Negro Congress and at another NNC meeting 2 days later.

On August 5, 1946, Bancroft appeared as speaker on Fascism at a meeting of another well-known Communist front, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. In 1947 he sponsored a community rally with several other known pro-Communists. The Communist smear sheet "In Fact" was distributed at the meetings.

Oliver T. Palmer

The record of Palmer is closely parallel to that of Bancroft. He joined in the anti-Fascist cry after the invasion of Russia, joining an "Action Conference" which included many fellow travelers.

He was a speaker at the National Negro Council Rally on July 29, 1946, as an officer of that Communist-dominated group. Among his fellow participants were such notorious pro-Communists as Max Yergan.

Mr. Speaker, from the foregoing report one can easily understand why the officers of the UPWA have refused to sign non-Communist affidavits.

I am sure the patriotism and loyalty of the members of the UPWA and Local 471 will equal that of any group in the United States, and my only object in making this report public is to expose the type of people who have gained control of this union. The members of the UPWA should start immediately to remove all officers of their organization who are not loyal to our country.

I have confidence that the motives of members of Local 471 are only activated by a sincere desire to improve their working conditions and increase their wages to take care of the increased cost of living. The rights and privileges to bargain collectively to gain their objective should not be denied them by officers who follow the Communist Party line.

Lee J. Noftzger—Praiseworthy Activities of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Assisting Widows Upon the Loss of Their Husbands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to one who rendered outstanding and devoted service to his country, both as a soldier under arms in time of war and as a public servant of his government in time of peace. At the same time, I wish to call attention to the splendid, humanitarian service tendered this man's widow by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States last week when she brought her husband's remains to the Nation's Capital for interment in Arlington National Cemetery.

Lee J. Noftzger passed away at Mercy Hospital, in Denver, Colo., on New Year's Day in the fifty-ninth year of his life. He left his widow, Mrs. Norma Noftzger, of Denver; a son, Richard L. Noftzger, of Ainsworth, Nebr.; his mother, Mrs. Thomas A. Noftzger, of Portland, Oreg., and a sister, Miss Millicent Noftzger, also of Portland.

At the time of his death, Lee Noftzger had for some time past served his country faithfully and diligently as a civil engineer with the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. Prior to this, during the second world war of his lifetime and on the second occasion wherein he answered his country's call to service, Lee Noftzger gave some of the latter years of his life to notable work with the War Relocation Authority at Rivers, Ariz., and Topaz, Utah.

Enlisting at Fort Riley, Kans., on August 17, 1917, Lee Noftzger saw considerable combat service overseas during World War I and was in the thick of the battle of the Argonne as a member of the One Hundred and Tenth Engineers, Thirty-fifth Division. He was honorably discharged from the Army on April 2, 1919.

Lee Noftzger was a Mason and belonged to the American Society of Civil Engineers and the Society of American Military Engineers. He was active in affairs of Francis Brown Lowry Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and Leyden-Chiles-Wickersham Post, American Legion, of Denver. It was his wish to find a final resting place in Arlington National Cemetery, across the river from Washington. His widow was without assistance in her time of sorrow in her desire to facilitate the granting of her husband's wish, being without relatives in Denver. In this emergency, the officers of Francis Brown Lowry Post stepped into the breach, making all arrangements for Mrs. Noftzger's passage to Washington and the forwarding of her husband's remains. Upon her arrival here, she was met at the train by Mr. Harry T. Chapin, chaplain of the District of Columbia Honor Guard of the VFW. Mr. Chapin made every detail of Mrs. Noftzger's sad mission entirely devoid of inconvenience.

I want also to commend the Office of the Quartermaster General, Department of the Army, for the very impressive ceremony provided by this branch of the service at the graveside in Arlington. The flag ceremony, the tributes of the firing squad and bugler and the message of the Army chaplain are indeed treasured last memories for Mrs. Noftzger and all the others who are given this token of their country's appreciation of service to its ideals.

Needed Antitrust Program for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an address which I delivered before the annual convention of the American Economic Association on Tuesday, December 30, 1947, at Chicago. In this address I attempt to outline the present status of our antitrust program and the legislation needed to carry on an effective program.

The address is as follows:

NEEDED CHANGES IN ANTITRUST LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is a great honor to be invited to address this gathering. I hope you will forgive me if my address is phrased more in terms of legal concepts than economic ideas, since my training has been that of a lawyer rather than that of an economist. However, I cannot say that I have fully escaped the influence of economists, since one of my friends in college days was Dr. Walton C. Hamilton, who occupies a sort of hybrid position as an economic lawyer or legal economist. Moreover, as a Member of Congress, I have had the opportunity to listen to the testimony of numerous economists, whom, I might add, generally offer the more carefully phrased, lucid, and sensible testimony presented before congressional committees.

In this paper, I wish, first of all, to state the fundamental reasons behind by belief in antitrust. Far from sharing the belief that trust-busting is "futile," I believe not only that it can be made effective but that it is the most desirable of the few basic courses of economic action available to us at the present time.

ALTERNATIVES TO ANTITRUST

As long-range alternatives to antitrust,[1] I know of only four basic approaches—the status quo, socialization, regulation, and deficit financing. To my way of thinking, the first two are not really alternatives at all. Allowing the status quo to continue merely means that we allow our economic destinies to be governed by the managers and directors of a few large corporate organizations. This alternative implicitly assumes a sort of blind faith that these corporate managers, in determining price, production, and other economic policies, will be guided by considerations that reflect the public interest. Although an increasing number of large corporations have, in fact, shown some evidence of concern with the public interest, I know of no reason why these corporate managers should be immune from Lord Action's well-known dictum that "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

As far as the second alternative is concerned, it is a waste of time even to talk about the socialization of industry. Not only is the whole idea of socialization repugnant to the political convictions of the American people, but there is little, if any, tangible evidence to support the contention that socialism would be efficient or workable as an economic system.

In my opinion, the third alternative—the regulation of industry—would probably never be advocated by a member of this organization who had ever been a Member of Congress. It is not difficult for me to imagine the buffeting and pounding to which the average Congressman would be subjected by the industries to be controlled. If any attempt were made to impose long-range controls over prices, production, wages, and so forth, over many of the Nation's basic industries we know that it would not be tolerated. This would stifle the spirit of initiative which has made our country great. This has been the typical history of most attempts at regulation, and there is no reason to assume that it would not prevail in the future as it has in the past.

[1] I wish to emphasize here the words "long range." In the short-range emergency situation which now confronts the country, antitrust is obviously incapable of meeting the drastic problems raised by the acute shortages of grains, livestock, and similar items. Consequently a few short-range specific controls must be put into effect if we are to avoid sky-rocketing inflation and a resultant inevitable economic collapse.

DEFICIT FINANCING

This leaves as an alternative to antitrust only Government spending, which, I believe, boils down to deficit financing. The question may be raised, of course, as to why the necessary funds over a long-range period could not be raised by taxation. The answer to that lies in a basic political paradox. It is only in prosperous times that taxation would yield sufficient funds to support an extensive public-works program; yet during prosperity, public spending is not needed, and since the need would not exist, taxes for this purpose would not be imposed. If anyone has any doubts concerning the reluctance of legislators to provide a governmental surplus in times of prosperity, let him examine the record of the Eightieth Congress.[2] In contrast, during a depression when public works really are required, taxation, within any conceivable, realistic bounds, would not yield the necessary revenue, especially when some $5,000,000,000 of the tax payments would have to be used to pay the interest on the national debt and an additional large sum would have to be used for national defense and other fixed purposes. Even if we were to grant the desirability of deficit spending during depressions, we must recognize the improbability of such deficits being made up by surpluses provided in prosperity. Hence, it would appear that the public-spending approach, as a long-range course of action, inevitably implies deficit financing—a fact which many of its supporters refuse to acknowledge. It may come to pass that at some future date the American people and their representatives in Congress will come to accept deficit financing as the basic long-range approach, or at least change their minds concerning the desirability of creating large surpluses during periods of prosperity, but I seriously doubt it.

By briefly discussing these other possible approaches I do not wish to convey the impression that my belief in antitrust rests only upon the greater disadvantages of its alternatives. In addition to this factor, which incidentally if of compelling importance to anyone who must take a daily stand on all manner of related and unrelated issues, my belief in antitrust rests upon positive and affirmative economic, sociological, and political considerations.

PRICES LOWER WHEN COMPETITION EXISTS

When I went to college I was taught that, in the long run, prices tend to be lower and production greater under competition than under monopoly. Perhaps there have been new discoveries in the field of economics which would tend to invalidate this basic maxim. But from all that I have observed from the vantage point of the House Small Business Committee and the House Judiciary Committee, this rule seems to be even more applicable today than ever before. For example, at a time when profits are exceeding all-time highs, when demand is the greatest in history, we are confronted with the anamolous situation that certain monopolistic industries refuse to expand their capacity. I wish to ask you economists whether or not such a situation could exist in a competitive industry.

A second economic reason behind my belief in antitrust consists of what Dr. Blair, in his paper, which he was good enough to lend me back in Washington, refers to as the "decentralizing technics." The thesis advanced by Dr. Blair that technology is now moving more in the direction of smaller rather than larger-scale operations certainly derives support from numerous instances which I personally have observed in my own region, the Tennessee Valley. Aided by low-cost electric power (which Dr. Blair lists as a major decentralizing technique), many relatively small enterprises have become established in the valley and have been successful in their competition with much larger enterprises.

The sociological basis for my belief in antitrust is my conviction that standards of human welfare tend to be higher in communities which are characterized by the existence of a large number of independently owned and operated enterprises than in comparable communities in which most of the economic activity is carried on by a few large plants owned by distant and outside interests. In this connection, I want to call your attention to a very provocative little study made by the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and printed by the Senate Small Business Committee, on Small Business and Civic Welfare, which compared the levels of civic welfare in three pairs of communities. One member of each pair was a small business community in which most of the economic activity was carried on by a large number of relatively small business enterprises. The other member was a typical big business community in which most of the employment and production was centered in a few giant absentee-owned plants.

By nearly all of the many sociological tests employed, the levels of civic welfare were found to be higher in the small business than the big business communities. This finding for industrial communities was substantiated for agricultural communities in a report prepared by the Department of Agriculture which was also issued by the Senate Small Business Committee.

POLITICAL BASIS FOR ANTITRUST PROGRAM

Finally, my belief in antitrust rests upon a fundamental political basis. Is there not some real merit in the argument that a great concentration of industry would inevitably lead to some type of collectivistic state in which our democratic liberties and political rights would cease to exist? There may be those who are convinced that some type of state control is inevitable and are willing to take their chances that this top control will be exercised benevolently and in the public interest. I, myself, would prefer not to take that chance. Certainly the pages of recent history lend little comfort to those who would stake their hopes on a wise, humane, and judicious exercise of a great centralization of political and economic power.

To summarize, my belief in antitrust as the most desirable program for economic progress is based upon (1) the serious and sometimes overwhelming disadvantages of its possible alternatives; (2) the economic considerations, (a) that in the long run prices tend to be lower and production greater under competition than under monopoly and (b) that modern technology is now tending more in the direction of smaller scale than larger scale operation; (3) the sociological consideration that levels of civic welfare appear to be higher in small business than in big business communities; and (4) the political consideration that the centralization of economic power will inevitably lead to the centralization of political power, which in turn will endanger if not destroy our democratic institutions.

After having thus set forth the bases for my belief in the desirability of a vigorous antitrust program, I shall now suggest certain changes in the law which are needed in order to make the antitrust program effective, since it certainly has not been particularly effective up to the present time. The specific points which I wish to suggest fall under the following general objectives:

1. Provide adequate appropriations.
2. Eliminate conspiracies.
3. Halt the growth of concentration.
4. Reduce existing concentration.
5. Remove the financial control over industry.
6. Use the economic fact-finding power of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PROVIDE ADEQUATE APPROPRIATIONS

It has become more of less of an accepted tradition in speaking about the requirements for an effective antitrust program to begin one's remarks with an invocation for appropriations—a tradition which has become well established and one which I see no reason to change. Actually, the facts concerning appropriations for the antitrust agencies are even worse than most of you have probably been led to believe. As chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee during the last session of Congress I had an opportunity to make a fairly thorough investigation of this whole subject of appropriations, the results of which are printed in the staff report of this subcommittee (which, unfortunately, is now out of print).[3]

Rather than take up your time with a detailed exposition of the findings of that report, I would like to call your attention to just a few simple figures—the requests made by the antitrust agencies to the Bureau of the Budget, the amounts approved by the Bureau of the Budget for submission to Congress, and the amounts actually appropriated by Congress. During the 10-year period, 1938–47, the requests by the Federal Trade Commission to the Bureau of the Budget averaged $3,101,019 a year; the amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget for presentation to Congress averaged $2,328,727; and the amount appropriated by Congress averaged $2,193,597. During the period 1939–47 the requests by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to the Bureau of the Budget averaged $1,986,077; the amount approved for submission to Congress by the Budget Bureau averaged $1,517,472; and the amount actually appropriated by Congress averaged $1,634,517—actually more than the amount approved by the Budget Bureau. To quote the report:

"Two facts stand out: (1) With the exception of the 1947 appropriation, Congress in each of the 10 years gave the Federal Trade Commission practically the amount approved by the Budget Bureau. Therefore, as far as the Federal Trade Commission's budget for the last 10 years is concerned, the Budget Bureau must be held, in the first instance, responsible for that agency's limited appropriation. (2) The Budget Bureau made very substantial reductions in the amounts originally requested by the Federal Trade Commission."

The report went on to state that:

"The Budget Bureau always musters good reasons for cutting an agency's appropriation. The consistent cuts by the Budget Bureau indicate more clearly than any amount of words either (a) lack of awareness of the importance of antitrust activity to the maintenance of the competitive-enterprise economy, or (b) a belief that the Federal Trade Commission's activities were not sufficiently significant to the antitrust program to warrant additional funds. If the latter was the reason, it is no answer to slash the agency's budget. Instead, the Budget Bureau should undertake, as the Executive's general manager, to bring about the administrative

[2] Cf. reports of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee on H. R. 1 and H. R. 3950.

[3] 79th Cong., staff report to the Monopoly Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, United States versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly, 1946.

improvements necessary to enable the Commission to properly carry out its functions." (P. 30.)

In regard to the Antitrust Division, the report stated:

"Here again, as in the case of the Federal Trade Commission, one finds that when sharp cuts are made they are made by the Budget Bureau. As a matter of fact, in 4 of the 9 years reported on, Congress appropriated more money to the Antitrust Division than has been approved by the Budget Bureau." (P. 51.)

It may surprise you to know (a) that the total amount received by the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division combined is less than the appropriation for the Securities and Exchange Commission whose functions, of course, are much more limited and restricted than those of the antitrust agencies; (b) that the annual appropriations for the two antitrust agencies combined would have been sufficient to carry on the war effort for a period of about 30 minutes; and (c) that the Federal Trade Commission has now the overwhelming total of eight economists, as does the Antitrust Division, to survey the entire economy, prepare economic reports for Congress, discover the areas of possible monopolistic practices, determine the relative significance and economic importance of the multitude of possible infractions of the law, develop economic data required on individual antitrust actions, and survey the results, from an economic point of view, of the effectiveness of the agencies' actions, for, as the monopoly subcommittee report pointed out: "There is oftentimes a great difference between a legal victory and an economic victory." [4]

IMPORTANCE OF ENOUGH FUNDS

The fundamental importance of appropriations to any antitrust program cannot be overstressed. Year in and year out the Congress has added to the number of existing antitrust laws, particularly those administered by the Federal Trade Commission. Yet funds have not been provided to carry on these increased responsibilities. As a result, the Federal Trade Commission has been forced to spread its regular appropriations over a wider and wider number of functions, thereby making it impossible for the Commission to do an effective job on any one of the laws under its administration. There is, I believe, no purpose in continuing this practice of increasing the number of statutes to be enforced, if the means of enforcing them are not also provided.

Up until this last month I was truly fearful that the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act would come to suffer the same fate that has already befallen other antitrust provisions of law, such as the State antitrust laws (many of which are not enforced at all), or, to take a more striking example, the Panama Canal Act of March 4, 1913, which contains a surprising provision that no vessel owned or operated by a concern that is doing business in violation of the antitrust laws shall be permitted to enter and pass through the Panama Canal. Monopolies are thus condemned to the arduous, time-consuming trip around the Horn, while competitive firms are given the definite advantage of some 9,000 miles.

To the best of my knowledge, this provision of law, which certainly indicates that Congress has tried to be imaginative in dealing with the monopoly problem, has never been enforced.

However, we now have some basis for hoping that the Nation's other antitrust laws will not go the way of the Panama Canal Act of 1913. For the first time in many years the Budget Bureau has approved a substantial increase in the amounts requested of Congress for the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division. The amounts requested for the next fiscal year are $3,802,000 for the Commission and $3,250,000 for the Antitrust Division, as compared with actual appropriations for the current fiscal year of $2,900,120 and $2,150,000, respectively. What Congress will do to these requests may prove to be an entirely different story. But at least it appears that the Budget Bureau has finally roused itself from that comfortable lethargy into which it has always fallen whenever the subject of antitrust enforcement has been raised. Of course, there is still a long way to go. The former economics adviser to the Federal Trade Commission has stated: "An annual appropriation of $150,000,000 for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and $100,000,000 for the Federal Trade Commission will not be too large if monopoly is to be driven out of business." [5] Although I do not know what the actual figures should be, I do know that they should be much higher than the present estimates, but at least we take hope from the fact that at long last the Budget Bureau seems to be moving in the right direction.

ELIMINATE CONSPIRACIES

The law is clearer and more definitive on the question of conspiracies than on any other aspect of the antitrust laws, owing largely to the resolute and uncompromising stand taken by the Supreme Court against monopoly by conspiracy. The Court has been particularly assiduous in dealing with conspiracies to fix prices. When independent competitors get together and enter into an agreement, arrangement, or understanding to fix the price of goods which they sell or purchase, they are violating the antitrust laws, without any "ifs, ands, or buts." As Dr. Milton Handler has pointed out:

"It matters not whether the prices are set by combinations of sellers or buyers, whether prices are raised, lowered, or maintained at existing levels, whether the prices are reasonable or unreasonable, whether the agreement fixed minimum or maximum prices, or whether price structures are tampered with by direct agreement or by any other means. Nor are the motives or intentions of the members of the combination material. It is of no moment that they may in good faith have regarded such an agreement as essential to their economic salvation. Nor would evidence be admissible, if such could ever be produced, that in practice the agreement resulted in demonstrable social and economic benefits to all those in or dependent upon the industry in which the combination operates. The fact that the agreement fixes or maintains prices is conclusive of its illegality." [6]

The Court has been equally hostile to conspiracies aimed at the control of output. Although, strangely enough, only a handful of cases involving this practice have gone to the Supreme Court, the few available decisions indicate that it is just as illegal for producers to conspire to control output as to fix prices.[7]

Likewise, the Court has frowned upon any sharing of the market through such means as allocating fixed percentages of the available business to each producer, dividing sales territories on a geographical basis, allotting customers to each seller, distributing business through a common sales agency which apportions orders, imposes production quotas on its members, or engages in similar activities. "Recognizing the dangers implicit in these arrangements, the Supreme Court has held that agreements and arrangements for sharing markets are illegal under the Sherman Act." [8]

HEAVIER PENALTIES NEEDED

Despite the clarity of the judicial decisions on this general subject of conspiracy, there are a number of ways in which the present laws could be made more effective. One of the most important steps to be taken is to make the punishment fit the crime. At the present time the maximum penalty by way of fine for violation of the antitrust laws is $5,000. In the words of the Temporary National Economic Committee:

"This amount is clearly inadequate as a deterrent to businessmen or to groups of businessmen whose incomes are in the millions, and the committee therefore recommends that the maximum limit for fines be raised to at least $50,000, leaving discretion with the court to assess the penalty according to the means and circumstances of the defendant and according to the extent to which it has profited by the violation of the act." [9]

I have, however, a different type of suggestion to offer in regard to this question of penalties. I would suggest that a systematic method of determining penalties be developed and incorporated in legislation—based on the following criteria:

(a) That this system of penalties should apply only to cases involving restraint of trade (i. e., antitrust actions);

(b) That the fine should be retroactive to the date on which it was found that the violation has been initiated and should be continuous on a daily basis from that time until the final determination of the case; and

(c) That in determining the penalty a fixed ration should be followed between the size of the company, as measured by its invested capital, and the amount of the fine.

In essence, this system would be based on two perfectly logical principles: that the illegal activity should be punishable during the entire period of its existence, and that the amount of the penalty should vary directly in accordance with the size of the company. Such a system would, I believe, do much to improve the appreciation and interest in the antitrust laws by many of our large corporations which today have only a nodding acquaintanceship with these "charters of economic freedom."

As an additional step to strengthen the law against conspiracies, I would concur in the recommendation of the Temporary National Economic Committee (which was also unanimous) "that the Federal Trade Commission Act be amended to provide that on request of the Attorney General, the Commission, or any member thereof, may hear evidence and make findings of fact and conclusions of law in any pending antitrust proceeding. These findings should be made advisory to the Federal court under whose jurisdiction the case is pending, and that court should be in a position either to pass finally on the Commission's findings and conclusions, refer the report back for additional information, or hear further testimony itself." [10]

The purpose of this provision, of course, would be that of speeding up the progress of antitrust cases initiated by the Attorney General by having them heard before a tribunal which has had long experience in matters relating to the antitrust laws. Any proposal such as this which would accelerate the slow progress of the antitrust cases through the labrynths of the courts should receive the unhesitating support of everyone who is interested in making the antitrust program effective.

GIVE FTC ORDERS MORE FINALITY

Finally, I wish to endorse a recommendation of the Federal Trade Commission itself, which it has made for many years, that its orders under the Clayton Act be given the same degree of finality and the same sanctions that its orders now have under the Federal Trade Commission Act. Cease and desist orders issued under the Clayton Act can now be enforced only by first obtaining court affirmance and a court decree commanding obedience to the order, and then following this with a contempt proceeding if the decree is disobeyed. In contrast, as a result of the Wheeler-Lea amendment, the Commission's orders under the Federal Trade Commission Act now become final within 30 days unless judicial review is initiated, and violations of any final order are subject to a specified money penalty, recoverable by civil penalty suit. In the words of the Commission's Annual Report of 1946: "There appear to be no substantial reasons why orders under both acts should not have the same status as to finality and as to penalties for violation." (P. 12).

HALT THE INCREASE IN ECONOMIC CONCENTRATION

While the Court has interpreted the provisions of the antitrust laws relating to conspiracies in a reasonably explicit and enforceable manner, the provisions relating to mergers and corporate consolidations have been so interpreted as to make them practically useless and unenforceable. Although in the opinion of many of the Supreme Court's own members, the Sherman Act was originally intended not only to prevent conspiracies but also to halt the unchecked growth of giant corporations, these members, unfortunately, have not been in a position to make the law, but only to issue ringing dissents.

Obviously, the same economic ends can be achieved through the power of giant corporations as through conspiracies. If, for example, prices are set by an ill-informed conspiracy of independent businessmen who have held letters which should never have been written, minutes which should never have been kept, and records which should long ago have been burned, the outcome of the case is fairly clear. The law has been violated and the evildoers will be punished. But if prices are set at the same level and under the same economic conditions by a giant corporation, the firm will not run afoul of the law, even though its prices are followed by the remainder of the industry out of instinct, respect, or appreciation of its economic power.

The ability of corporations to do, through mergers and consolidations, that which they are prohibited from doing in concert with other independent firms obviously makes a mockery of the law against conspiracies. Indeed, as the Federal Trade Commission has stated:

"The antitrust laws (Sherman Act and Federal Trade Commission Act) condemn attempts to control the market by means of mutual understanding or agreement among competitors, but if the same objective is achieved through the purchase of physical properties, it is lawful in the absence of monopoly and the antitrust agencies are powerless to act. In other words, the weaker, less effective cooperative methods of eliminating competition are prohibited, but the permanent and more effective method of consolidated ownership under a single management is permissible. Moreover, the more effective is the enforcement of the law against collusion among competitors, the greater is their incentive to achieve the same ends through purchase, consolidation, and merger." [11]

Nearly two decades ago, Drs. Dexter Keezer and Stacy May summarized the prevailing economic opinion, which is undoubtedly even more widespread today: "Almost every student of modern economic affairs is convinced that a concern which dominates an industry, without rivals of comparable size, is able to determine, in large measure, the policies of an industry without resorting to compulsive tactics." Yet, they pointed out, "Judicial interpretation of the antitrust laws has had the effect of legalizing almost any degree of concentration of economic power if certain legal formalities are observed." [12]

THE RULE OF REASON

In gradually developing what is flatteringly termed the "rule of reason," the Court came to adopt four basic standards to determine the legality or illegality of mergers and consolidations, namely:

1. The intent to monopolize.
2. Predatory practices.
3. The existence of power to exclude competitors or fix prices.
4. The effect on potential competition.

As may be seen merely from their listing, the first, third, and fourth are the ultimate in the hypothetical and thus the unenforceable, while the second has tended to become an anachronism in the modern world of big business. On the question of intent to monopolize, who can determine intent, particularly in well-informed and sophisticated corporations? How is an antitrust agency to find out what is in the back of the minds of those who promote consolidations? And of even greater importance, how is the attempt to be proved since the accused is presumed to be innocent until proved guilty? Why does a big company buy up a large number of small firms? Is it because of an intent to monopolize? The answers have become a matter of automatic reflex. The companies are bought up merely in order to improve their efficiency, or to keep them from going bankrupt, or to provide employment, or to resurrect an old broken-down plant, or to serve some other laudatory economic objective. By injecting this question of intent, the Court has made the art of mind reading—a practice which is prohibited in many States—the primary consideration in deciding whether or not a merger or consolidation should be halted. As Dr. Hamilton has observed, "To isolate from the complex of impulses playing upon a host of persons a particular motive, or to make one impulse to action dominant and the others recessive, is to indulge sheer fiction." [13]

Along with the question of the intent to monopolize, the Court, in cases against consolidations and mergers, has placed greatest emphasis on the existence of predatory practices. Such practices as the exclusion of competitors, discrimination, cutting prices below costs aimed at forcing competitors out of business, artificial restrains on potential competition, and the general abuse of power are some of the practices to which the Court has objected, and which, incidentally, have given rise to the ethically interesting but economically irrelevant distinction between good and bad trusts. The trouble with the injection of these practices into such cases lies in the consummate ease with which they can be avoided by any large corporation which has already achieved dominant size and power. Predatory practices are vestiges of the free-booting days of old whose use is no longer required by entrenched corporate giants and whose adoption today would be considered an unforgiveable blunder by any reputable corporation lawyer.

Perhaps the most ephemeral of all of the standards adopted by the Court is the question of whether or not the corporation has the power to exclude competitors or fix prices. Unfortunately, though understandably, the Court has not seen fit to answer the critical question of just how the existence of this power is to be determined. Is it to be inferred that when a corporation achieves a certain degree of control over an industry—say, 60 percent or more of its production—it then possesses the power to exclude competitors or fix prices? If the Court were to adopt some such measurable standard—a remote possibility—it would be doing what it has refused to do in defining a monopoly.

Similarly, the effect on potential competition requires an inquiry into the motives behind the businessmen who do not go into a particular industry. There are literally thousands of possible reasons why businessmen do not go into an industry, only one of which would be the power of the combine. The isolation of this one factor from all of the others is another one of those exercises in mind-reading imposed by the Court.

In the United States Steel case, the Court gave verbal expression to the nullification of the law which inevitably resulted from the use of these standards when it first uttered the celebrated dictum that, "The law does not make size an offense, or the existence of unexerted power an offense." [14]

As if it were not sufficiently explicit, the Court in 1927 left no room for doubt by stating in the International Harvester case that "The law * * * does not make the mere size of a corporation, however impressive, or the existence of an unexerted power on its part, an offense, when unaccompanied by unlawful conduct in the exercise of its power." [15] In a dissenting opinion to the International Harvester case, Justice Day, who was joined by two other members of the Court, objected in indignant sarcasm to this sanctification of size:

"From the earliest decisions of this Court it has declared that it was the effective power of such organization to control and restrain competition and freedom of trade that Congress intended to limit and control. That the exercise of the power may be withheld, or exerted with forbearing benevolence, does not place such combinations beyond the authority of the statute which was intended to prohibit their formation, and when formed to deprive them of the power unlawfully obtained." [16]

Although in the aluminum case the judicial interpretation of the Sherman Act in regard to consolidations and mergers has retreated slightly, though very slightly, as will be discussed below, the law of the land still apparently sanctions an extreme and almost complete monopoly of an industry if it is unaccompanied by what the Court chooses to regard as unlawful practices.

The Sherman Act was not only law directed against mergers and consolidations which has been undermined by the Supreme Court. Its passage was followed some two and a half decades later by the enactment in 1914 of the Clayton Act, as well as the Federal Trade Commission Act. Section 7 of the Clayton Act gave to the Federal Trade Commission the power to prevent the acquisition by one company of the stock of another company, if the result of the acquisition would be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

The purpose of this section was to halt the growth of trusts and monopolies. The decision of the Supreme Court in the Northern Securities case in 1904, and in the Standard Oil and Tobacco cases in 1911 had apparently established the principle that the Government already was armed with the power to break up existing monopolies. The problem, as Congress saw it at the time, was how to prevent the formation of monopoly, how to nip it in the bud. In section 7 of the Clayton Act, Congress thought that it had the answer.

But, as events later proved, it thought erroneously; it had not reckoned with the legal profession. The bill had hardly become law

[4] Ibid., p. 26.

[5] Willis J. Ballinger, By Vote of the People, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946, p. 308.

[6] TNEC Monograph No. 38, A Study of the Construction and Enforcement of the Antitrust Laws, by Milton Handler, 1941, p. 13.

[7] Ibid., pp. 14-16.

[8] Ibid., p. 17.

[9] Final Report and Recommendations of the Temporary National Economic Committee, 1941, p. 40.

[10] TNEC Final Report, op. cit., p. 40.

[11] Federal Trade Commission, The Present Trend of Corporate Mergers and Acquisitions, 1947, p. 3.

[12] Dexter Keezer and Stacy May, The Public Control of Business, Harpers, 1930, p. 49.

[13] TNEC Monograph No. 16, op. cit., p. 68.

[14] 251 U. S. 416.

[15] 274 U. S. 708.

[16] 251 U. S. 465.

before the great legal minds of the country were busily at work trying to discover a loophole in this new and potentially forbidding measure. And, before long, they had hit upon the answer. Instead of buying up merely the stock of a competitor, why not purchase its assets—that is, its physical plant, inventories, and everything else? While the law was very specific in prohibiting the purchase of stock, it said nothing about assets.

THE LOOPHOLE IN SECTION 7 OF CLAYTON ACT

Shortly after the end of World War I, corporations began to take advantage of this loophole. If they purchased assets entirely, and did not bother at all with any transaction involving stock, they were obviously free from any action by the Federal Trade Commission. However, in some cases, acquisitions of assets were not feasible unless the stock could be purchased first, and this raised a problem. If a firm went through this "double play," buying up the stock first and then using the stock to obtain the assets, was it not violating the law?

The Federal Trade Commission thought so. The law certainly did not specify that those who broke its provisions could gain immunity from its penalties by subsequently purchasing something else, such as assets. Yet in a 5-to-4 decision, with Justices Brandeis, Taft, Holmes, and Stone dissenting, the Court held in 1926 that where a corporation had gone through this "double play" the Commission was powerless to take effective action.[17] Specifically, the Court held that the Commission's only authority in cases of this kind was to order a divestiture of the stock of the acquired corporation—which, of course, had been automatically made valueless by the transfer of assets. The Court, in effect, said that the Commission was quite free to use the power which Congress had conferred upon it, as long as it confined the use of that power to ordering the divestiture of pieces of paper which happened to be worthless.

As a result of these decisions, plus an additional decision in the Arrow-Hart and Hegeman case which further widened the loophole, the Commission was completely deprived of power to halt acquisitions of stock when they are followed by acquisitions of assets. Today, when the Commission takes action to halt the acquisition of stock, it usually finds that, before it can enter its order, the acquiring company has bought up the assets, thus removing the case from the Commission's jurisdiction.

A typical instance of the futility of attempting to enforce section 7 is the case of the Consolidated Grocers Corp. Through a number of stock acquisitions in competing corporations, Consolidated Grocers had become in 1945 the largest wholesale grocery in the country with assets of $20,000,000 and annual sales of $100,000,000. It occupied a leading position in the wholesale grocery trade in numerous important trade areas, including Chicago, Baltimore, and Canton, Ohio. Since its acquisitions took the form of the purchase of stock, the Commission issued a complaint in 1946, charging a violation of section 7. But while the case was in the very process of being tried, the corporation acquired the assets of its subsidiary concerns which it had previously controlled only through stock ownership and dissolved the subsidiaries. The Commission had no alternative but to dismiss the case, which it did in February 1947. It is this situation which recently led the Commission to complain bitterly that, "* * * when the Commission tries to prevent acquisitions which take the form of purchases of stock, it usually finds that it is chasing a vanishing will-o'-the-wisp."[18]

The present impotence of the law raises the question as to why Congress, in granting the Commission power to prevent purchases of stock, did not also give it the power to move against acquisitions of assets. Inasmuch as purchases of assets are more binding and lasting, and thus more destructive to competition, this omission seems particularly paradoxical. The answer lies in the fact that at the time when Congress enacted the Clayton Act, most acquisitions took the form of stock purchases. By comparison, acquisitions of assets were almost unknown.

ECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF CLAYTON ACT

The economic background behind the passage of the Clayton Act in 1914 was the great merger movement which began at the very end of the nineteenth century and extended through 1907. During this period, which witnessed the birth of such huge consolidations at the United States Steel Corp., most mergers were effected through the purchase of stock. There were solid reasons behind this predominance of stock acquisitions. In the first place, it is much easier to purchase stock than assets. This is especially true in the case of holding companies, which mushroomed during this early merger movement, since the holding company can readily exchange some of its shares for the stock of the company to be absorbed. And, in the second place, stock acquisitions are peculiarly suitable in any era which is characterized by the flotation of enormous amounts of watered stock. The prevailing method of promoters in bringing together these huge consolidations was to form a great holding company, which would then issue under its own name vast amounts of stock. Part of the stock so issued would be used to pay off the owners of the separate companies absorbed in the consolidation. The greater the amount of watered stock, the easier was it to absorb companies through the medium of stock transfers.

That acquisitions of stock were indeed the customary and prevailing method of absorbing competitors was forcibly brought out by Justice Stone in his dissenting opinion in the Arrow-Hart and Hegeman case. He said that corporate mergers were "commonly" effected through stock acquisitions, that "only in rare instances" would a merger be successful without advance acquisition of working-stock control, that such control was "the normal first step toward consolidation," that it was by that process most consolidations had been brought about, that this was "the first and usual step" and that the statute therefore reached the evil of corporate mergers "in its most unsual form by forbidding the first step."[19]

The plain fact of the matter is that Congress simply did not foresee—nor could it reasonably be expected to foresee—the loophole implicit in the possibility of acquisitions of assets. It took action against the customary and prevalent form of mergers. Its intent was quite clear. It wanted to stop the growth of monopoly. In a report dated July 22, 1914, which accompanied the Clayton Act, the Senate Judiciary Committee said:

"Broadly stated, the bill, in its treatment of unlawful restraints and monopolies, seeks to prohibit and make unlawful certain trade practices which, as a rule, singly and in themselves, are not covered by the act of July 2, 1890 (the Sherman Act), or other existing antitrust acts, and thus, by making these practices illegal, to arrest the creation of trusts, conspiracies, and monopolies in their incipiency and before consummation."[20]

It is difficult to conceive of a more explicit expression of intent. Yet the Court, as in the case of the provisions of the Sherman Act relating to mergers and consolidations, nullified the law, and the extreme length to which the Court went in nullifying the law—holding, in effect, that a violation was perfectly legal, if followed by the acquisition of something not mentioned in the law—clearly reveals the one consistent element in the Court's treatment of the antitrust laws—its refusal to take effective action against the fundamental problem of size and power.

The remedy needed for section 7

For several years Senator O'MAHONEY and I have regularly introduced into the Congress bills designed to plug this outstanding loophole in the law and give to the Federal Trade Commission the same power to prevent acquisitions of assets as it now has in regard to acquisitions of stock. It may interest you to know that twice—that is, in both the Seventy-ninth (Democratic) and the Eightieth (Republican) Congresses—a bill designed to accomplish this objective has been approved by a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee; twice it has been approved by the full House Judiciary Committee; and twice it has been pigeonholed by the Rules Committee. On both occasions the reason given by the Rules Committee was the absence of time owing to an early adjournment of Congress. It is certainly to be hoped that at this meeting of Congress the Rules Committee will not be able to use this excuse and will permit the elected Representatives of the people to debate and vote on this bill.

The bill before the House at the present time is known as H. R. 3736. In report No. 596, dated June 17, 1947, by Representative JOHN W. GWYNNE (Republican) of Iowa, the majority of the Judiciary Committee stated:

"The history of legislation previously adopted to prevent monopoly, the great increase in recent years of competition-destroying mergers, the damage to small business, the blighting of opportunity for our young people—all cry out for the enactment of legislation to stop the rising tide of monopoly."

The report concludes with these words:

"In adopting the Sherman Act and later the Clayton Act, the Congress, without partisan division, gave expression to a virtually unanimous demand that our competitive economic system be protected against those forces of monopoly which would destroy it. The platforms of both major political parties have consistently carried planks approving the course thus charted. Both President Hoover and the later President Roosevelt recommended tightening up of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. President Truman has specifically recommended this amendment to the Clayton Act."

It is my personal conviction, if the Rules Committee ever permits this bill to come on the floor, that it will be passed by the House of Representatives, that it will be passed by the Senate, that it will be signed by the President, and that it will thus become the law of the land.

REDUCE EXISTING CONCENTRATION

It should be realized, of course, that this pending bill is designed to deal only with future mergers and acquisitions. It does not provide the antitrust agencies with any additional means of reducing the existing high levels of concentration. Although the importance of providing a check upon future mergers and acquisitions can hardly be exaggerated, especially in view of the current merger movement, yet it must be recognized that in many industries concentration has already reached such high levels that effective price competition has practically disappeared. In such industries a few large corporations have already attained such size and power that, without buying up a single additional firm, they are in a position to determine the industry's price and production policies and to control the market generally. How, then, is this problem of existing concentration to be met?

Before advancing any particular recommendation, it might be well first to make a brief review of the major problems that stand in the way of an effective program of "divorce, divestiture, and dissolution," as the Department of Justice terms it, or "divorce, divestiture, and disillusionment," as one rather cynical lawyer of the Department has termed it. First, there is the problem of the judicial interpretation of the law in regard to cases of this type; and, second, there is the administrative problem of developing new procedures which would enable such cases to be really effective in terms of economic results and to move with reasonable rapidity, without sacrificing the fundamental legal rights of the parties involved.

Of course, all of the legal decisions, as mentioned above, which nullify the effectiveness of the Sherman Act as a means of halting mergers and acquisitions, also nullify the effectiveness of that law as a means of reducing existing concentration.

There has, however, been a new legal development on this question of existing concentration in the form of the decision in the Aluminum case. The Supreme Court withdrew itself from that case on the grounds that several of its members had been officials of the Department of Justice at the time that the case was in process, and a decision was therefore rendered by a special court of last resort, headed by Justice Learned Hand. The court introduced the novel doctrine that 90 percent control of an industry was per se a violation of the Sherman Act, and that the existence of unlawful practices was not necessary to prove a violation of the law.

Actually, it happened that the Aluminum Co. of America was found guilty of such a practice. It had exercised an illegal price squeeze on its nonintegrated competitors, forcing them to pay a relatively high price for the raw ingot which they had to buy from the Aluminum Co., and then holding its own price on the competitive product, aluminum sheets, at a relatively low level. But the existence of such practices was incidental; 90 percent control was too much. Size and power, standing by themselves, were held illegal.

There are, however, important qualifications to even this modest departure from the old doctrine. In the first place, the idea that 90 percent control is in itself illegal was a ruling of a special court and has not been endorsed by the Supreme Court.[21]

In the second place, the special court itself qualified the new doctrine by holding that it was doubtful that 64 percent would be enough to constitute an unlawful monopoly and that 33 percent is certainly not enough.[22] In the International Harvester case, the Supreme Court had ruled that 64 percent was definitely not enough.

It is difficult, indeed, to derive much encouragement from the Aluminum decision, since its actual application to American industry would have little effect upon competitive conditions. If the 90-percent rule were to be adopted, it would not affect more than a handful of American industries. In 1937 there were only 21 important products (those with an annual value of over $10,000,000) in which the largest four producers accounted for 90 percent or more of the total output. Consequently, there are probably fewer than half a dozen important products in which the largest single firm accounts for more than 90 percent of the output.

If the Supreme Court were to recede to the 64 percent doubtful point—an unlikely possibility—the scope of possible action would, of course, be materially increased.[23] However, such a ruling would still permit an entire industry to be divided between only two firms, one controlling 63 percent and the other holding the remaining 37 percent. To cite a specific example, if the 64-percent point were adopted, there would be no definite legal bar in the steel industry to a merger of the eight concerns next in size to United States Steel into one company, which would represent 63 percent of the industry, and which, coupled with United States Steel's one-third, would put some 96 percent of the industry into the hands of two corporations.

Hence the most liberal interpretation which could possibly be placed on the Aluminum decision would still be subject to the criticism of former Assistant Attorney General Berge that the Sherman Act has merely set up the "domination of the few as a substitute for the domination of the one."

The second problem concerning the dissolution program, that of administrative procedures, is nearly as formidable as the question of judicial interpretation. From this point of view alone, the process of "unscrambling the eggs" is not an easy one. What standards are the antitrust agencies to utilize in determining such questions as: Whether or not a specific corporation should be dissolved; how many units should it be divided into; what should be the size and character of the resultant units; who should be permitted to own them; what measures should be adopted to prevent the resulting units from coalescing together in some community of interests (as took place following the formal dissolution of the anthracite coal mining companies from the railroads); how are the fundamental economic considerations of efficiency and competitive results to receive their due and proper importance in what is formally a legal procedure? In regard to this last question we must not forget the immortal words of the Supreme Court in resisting the arguments of Mr. Brandeis that the old tobacco trust be split into a greater number of units:

"This whole line of argument deals with the economics of the tobacco business. No doubt the novel problem presented to this Court is connected with questions of economics as well as with questions of law. But, this is a court of law, not a Commerce Commission, and the legal side of the proposition would seem to be the controlling one."[24]

I do not know the answers to these and many other related questions. I only know, first, that the problem of existing size must be dealt with; second, that even under the most favorable interpretation of the Aluminum decision, the existing law does not provide an adequate means of achieving this objective; and third, that the administrative problems involved in the program are of no small amount.

I know that my friend, Mr. Raymond, believes that he has the practical answer in the form of his limitist proposal which would impose some arbitrary limitation on the size of corporations, such as a general limitation that no firm with over 10,000 employees should have more than one shipping point. While this is, indeed, an interesting proposal, my offhand reaction is that it is too arbitrary and inflexible both from an economic and a political point of view.

Since I do not have the answers to these legal and administrative questions, and since the Temporary National Economic Committee did not go into this question of breaking up existing size, I propose that the old Temporary National Economic Committee be reconstituted and directed to obtain expert information and advice on this subject; and, on the basis of such information, to develop a new program of dissolution, to be accompanied by reports to the Congress and recommendations for specific legislation.

LESSEN THE FINANCIAL CONTROL OVER INDUSTRY

The matter of the financial control over industry is another one of those very broad problems, similar to that of reducing existing concentration, which requires more intensive analysis and study before I would care to advance any specific legislative proposal.

It will be recalled that the old National Resources Committee, after a study of intercorporate ties such as stock ownership, interlocking directorates, common affiliations with investment bankers, intangible personal relationships, and so forth, came to the conclusion th there were eight more or less clearly defined financial interest groups in the country; that these eight controlled 106 of the 250 largest nonfinancial and banking corporations; and that the assets of these 106 "controlled" corporations represented approximately 29 percent of all nonfinancial and banking assets.

Of course, as a lawyer, I am in no position to pass upon the accuracy of these estimates, but I think that everyone must recognize the existence of a definite financial control over important segments of American industry. You may recall that in his message to the Congress recommending the establishment of the Temporary National Economic Committee,[25] President Roosevelt stated:

"Close financial control, through interlocking spheres of influence over channels of investment and through the use of financial devices like holding companies and strategic minority interests, creates close control of the business policies of enterprises which masquerade as independent units.

"That heavy hand of integrated financial and management control lies upon large and strategic areas of American industry. * * *

"But modern efficient mass production is not furthered by a central control which destroys competition between industrial plants each capable of efficient mass production while operating as separate units. Industrial efficiency does not have to mean industrial empire building.

"And industrial empire building, unfortunately, has evolved into banker control of industry. We oppose that.

"Such control does not offer safety for the investing public. Investment judgment requires the disinterested appraisal of other

---

[17] *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Western Meat Co.; Thatcher Mfg. Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission; Swift & Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (272 U. S. 554; 1926).

[18] Federal Trade Commission, The Present Trend of Corporation Mergers and Acquisitions, 1947, p. 3.

[19] 291 U. S. 587, 600, 601.

[20] Senate Committee on the Judiciary, S. Rept. 698, 63d Cong., 2d sess., July 22, 1914, to accompany H. R. 15697, p. 1.

[21] It is true that in the recent Tobacco case the Supreme Court stated that it welcomed the opportunity to endorse certain statements the Aluminum case opinion. But the statements that were endorsed were to the effect that a monopoly cannot be disassociated from its power, that its power cannot be disassociated from its exercise, and that if 90 percent of the ingot producers had combined it would have constituted an unlawful monopoly. (328 U. S. 813–814.)

[22] 148 F. (2d) 416, 424.

[23] The TNEC found that of 1807 census products, there were only 97 of which the leading producer accounted for over 65 percent of the Nation's output (and they represented only 5.3 percent of the total number and 2.3 percent of the total value of all products surveyed); the leading producer accounted for over 60 percent of the output of only 152 products (only 8.1 percent of the total number and 3.3 percent of the total value). (Cf. TNEC Monograph No. 27, The Structure of Industry, p. 292.)

[24] 191 Fed. Rept. 376.

[25] S. Doc. No. 173, 75th Cong., 3d sess.

people's management. It becomes blurred and distorted if it is combined with the conflicting duty of controlling the management it is supposed to judge.

"Interlocking financial controls have taken from American business much of its traditional virility, independence, adaptability, and daring—without compensating advantages. They have not given the stability they promised."

I might suggest that on this problem of financial control some committee could begin its work by devising appropriate amendments to section 8 of the Clayton Act, which as you may recall, prohibits the same person from being a director in two or more competing corporations. However, the law is riddled with loopholes which make it largely ineffective. In the first place, a firm can evade its provisions by placing on the board of a competing concern not one of its own directors, but rather one of its officers or employees; the law applies only to interlocking directors, not to interlocking officers or employees. In the second place, an investment or banking firm, which is prevented by the law from placing the same men on the boards of two or more competing companies, can achieve the identical control by placing one of its men on the board of one company and another on the board of its competitor. Finally, the law applies only to competing concerns; for example, interlocking directorates between a supplying company and an end-product manufacturer, or between firms in different industries (even though closely related), or between a manufacturer and a distributor are thus perfectly legal. Like section 7 of the Clayton Act, section 8 is thus characterized by both a laudatory intent and the existence of devastating loopholes which can and should be plugged.

USE THE ECONOMIC FACT-FINDING POWERS OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Finally, I wish to call your attention to a provision of law which already exists, which requires no legislative changes, and which could become an extraordinarily effective measure in the public interest. I am speaking of section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which grants to the Commission far-reaching powers for the purpose of conducting economic investigations. The only thing required to make this law effective is appropriations.

The origin of this section has an exceedingly interesting story. After passing the Sherman Act in 1890, the Congress gradually became aware of the existence in many lines of industry of large corporations, which through their mere size and power, implemented by such specific practices as price leadership, could control the market without resorting to conspiracy or collusion or illegal activities of any kind.

Therefore Congress, convinced of the "curative power of publicity," felt that, at the very least, the people and their representatives in Congress should be informed of the economic practices and behavior of these large corporations—their prices, costs, profits, economic power, business practices, etc. With this thought in mind, Congress on February 14, 1903, established the Bureau of Corporations with power and authority "* * * to make * * * diligent investigation into the organization, conduct, and management of the business of any corporation, joint stock company, or corporate combination engaged in commerce." When the Federal Trade Commission was established in 1914, these fact-finding powers were enlarged and transferred to the new agency. It was under this section that the Commission has conducted its economic investigations which not only have resulted in new and improved legislation but also have acted as an important restraining influence upon the policies and activities of many of the Nation's largest corporations.

It is indeed a tragedy, considering its proven usefulness, that this highly useful function has been permitted to atrophy over the years. As early as 1927 Prof. William Z. Ripley, of Harvard, regretfully commented upon the "innocuous desuetude" of section 6 which he termed as a "stone dead letter." Urging a vigorous use of the fact-finding powers, Professor Ripley stated:

"This statute (the FTC Act) contains in section 6 a positive delegation of authority to this body which is entirely adequate to the performance of the service so greatly needed at the present time * * *. The record of debate upon the subject makes it clear that Congress intended this work to constitute one of its chief activities * * * here then we have plainly indicated the most obvious, the simplest, the most effective remedy of all * * *. No legislation is necessary. There is nothing revolutionary about it—nothing paternalistic * * *. Let the word go forth that the Federal Trade Commission is henceforward to address itself vigorously to the matter of adequate and intelligent corporate publicity, and, taken in conjunction with the help of agencies already at work, the thing is as good as done." [29]

At one time the Economics Division of the Federal Trade Commission numbered over 600 persons with over 200 economists and other professional employees. At the present time, as I have indicated above, it is down to the staggering sum of 8 economists, who, in addition to carrying out these broad powers of section 6, must also prepare all of the economic material required in the Commission's legal cases. I think it is about time that we resurrect this important provision of law which Professor Ripley termed "the most effective remedy of all."

AIDS TO SMALL BUSINESS

Before summarizing my specific recommendations for changes in legislation, I wish to mention briefly a number of additional points which I do not have time to discuss at length. It is my personal opinion that an effective antitrust program represents only one side of the penny. The other side consists of certain types of affirmative assistance which should be made available to small business, particularly financial aid and industrial research. In regard to the former, I would like to see the RFC greatly accelerate its program of loans to small business; in regard to the latter, I would like to see Congress pass some bill, such as that proposed by Senator FULBRIGHT, designed to bring to small business the benefits of modern science and technology.

In addition, there are other problems, particularly patents and cartels which are of such extraordinary complexity that I am unable to discuss them adequately within the time limits available to me. Also, I am withholding comment on the basing point system for the reason that this whole subject is now before the Supreme Court in the form of the Federal Trade Commission's case against the Cement Institute.

In conclusion, the recommendations which I wish to offer as needed changes in antitrust legislation, may be summarized as follows:

SUMMARY

1. In order to provide adequate appropriations:
(a) Awaken the Budget Bureau.
(b) Stimulate the interest of Congress.
(c) Make known to the people the critical importance of the monopoly problem.

2. In order to eliminate conspiracies:
(a) Increase the penalties for violation of the antitrust laws.
(b) Permit the Federal Trade Commission to serve as a master of chancery in antitrust cases at the request of the Attorney General.
(c) Give to the Commission's orders under the Clayton Act the same degree of finality and the same sanctions which they have now under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

3. In order to halt the growth of concentration:
(a) Pass legislation designed to plug the loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act and thus give to the Federal Trade Commission the same power to prevent acquisitions of assets as it now has in regard to acquisitions of stock.

4. In order to reduce existing concentration:
(a) Reconstitute the old Temporary National Economic Committee and direct it to make an intensive study of the legal and administrative problems involved, and present to the Congress specific recommendations for legislation.

5. In order to remove the financial control over industry:
(a) Send up daily prayers that the Department of Justice will win its present suit against the investment banking companies.
(b) Plug the loopholes in section 8 of the Clayton Act against interlocking directorates.
(c) Direct the proposed reconstituted TNEC to make an intensive study of the extent and significance of financial control over industry and propose specific recommendations for legislation.

6. In order to use the economic fact-finding power of the Federal Trade Commission Act:
(a) Provide adequate appropriations and personnel to the Federal Trade Commission.

[29] Wm. Z. Ripley, Main Street and Wall Street, Little, Brown, 1927, pp. 222-228.

An Open Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AN OPEN LETTER

To Mr. BASIL O'CONNOR,
President, the American National Red Cross.

DEAR MR. O'CONNOR: We received your terse note stating that unless the officers and directors tendered their resignations within 30 days the Van Wert charter would be revoked. If we thought for a moment that our resignations would advance the objectives of Red Cross, locally or nationally, you would receive them by return post, but, frankly, Mr. O'Connor, we cannot reconcile ourselves to resigning a trust for doing that which we believed, and still believe, is for the best interests of the Red Cross.

The Van Wert story is short—perhaps of little consequence—but in principle it certainly bears a second look. The sin was deliberate. After the war we rejoined our local Community Chest. Although the right to make independent drives in event of disaster or other emergency was reserved, the Red Cross membership was explained, membership cards were to be issued, and our quota was more than raised; yet, as such affiliation is not in keeping with the theories of the board of governors, our chapter is to be cast into outer darkness.

To presume to challenge this policy may be more of a bray than a voice from the wilderness, but to us, this action seems so arbitrary, so unreasonable and so out of keeping with tradition, that if continued as a national policy, it eventually will reflect on the motives and the very integrity of the Red Cross movement. We find it difficult indeed, to believe that such theory long will continue as an edict or mandate of the board, to be practiced without reason, judgment, or exception.

No one questions the functions of the Red Cross to promptly and adequately meet its responsibilities in the emergency of war or disaster. It is the obligation which is set apart to us in the field of charitable endeavor. An independent action and solicitation in such instances goes without saying, and such policy should be definite and firm, but surely there should be an exception in those usual and ordinary years in peacetime, in which the maintenance of membership and an adequate budget is our chief concern.

We are familiar with your arguments supporting the policy of independent financing, but again we are unable to follow you. It is true that personal contact with each contributor or member is much to be desired, but that is true of any charitable or philanthropic endeavor. While all of us have an intense interest in the Red Cross, is it your duty, or ours, to place it primary and above all other worth-while and important endeavors, and refuse to cooperate or associate with them? To us, such an attitude hardly is compatible with our charter or the eternal fitness of things. It senses of smugness, of a self-contained and rather arrogant satisfaction growing out of our established position, patriotic appeal, and financial assurance.

No, Mr. O'Connor, we should not become obsessed with one idea to the distress of all others. There is a time and place for Red Cross services, and a time and place for other services. Should you or we, or one of our dear ones suddenly require surgical attention, then we will be glad, indeed, that someone has taken the same interest in some hospital that you and we have taken in Red Cross.

Nor are we able to accept your postulate that joint fund raising necessarily involves control over our objectives and operations, and that if accepted in one community we are obliged to accept it in every community. We are not convinced that the trustees of any community chest, or that of any company which contracts with its employees to deduct Red Cross memberships, has the inclination, desire, or even the thought of assuming any control or supervision over our activities. The function of Red Cross is so well known, so firmly established, that it almost is a tradition.

As to the acceptance of joint financing in one community making it obligatory in all others, we think that should be a matter for the local men and women who make up the chapters to decide. They can better weigh and determine a local situation, the leadership, the public opinion, and the advantage of cooperating with a chest. What may be advisable one year may not be the next and what may be expedient for Portland, Maine, may not be expedient for Portland, Oreg.

In all modesty, Mr. O'Connor, we submit that local chapters may well be entrusted to use their good judgment in each instance. Should quotas not be raised, or independent emergency drives discouraged, or an attitude of restriction or supervision become evident, or the chapter otherwise function improperly, then and only then need the national office become concerned.

The suspension of a local chapter is not a matter to be taken lightly. As anyone from "main street" well knows, the matter is town talk and the conclusions not always are friendly to the national office. Contention in any charitable endeavor does not improve its standing in that community, and if such incidents are numerous—it becomes a national problem.

While we may be censored in raising this issue, we justify our action in the hope that it will correct a practice and modify a policy which we believe will impair the Red Cross endeavor. To not cooperate with the national office is to be criticized, but to "Mary lamb" a policy while serving on your chapter, and then in disgust, refuse reelection and to no longer serve—is quite another matter. We have heard of many instances of this kind, and of the two evils, we chose the former.

While we have the highest respect for the opinions of the governors and of your good self, yet in your antagonism to federated financing, it seems to us that your philosophy resolves into "everybody being out of step but me." With so many thinking men and women at variance with your philosophy, do you not think that your conclusions should be urged modestly, and the rod applied sparingly?

The community chest idea originated in Cleveland some 30 years ago, and without fanfare, propaganda, or program, has grown and developed throughout the land into a national institution, supported by the press and radio, and accepted by nearly everyone as the "Time to do his or her bit" and "To give his or her mite." Like Topsy, it just grew—typically American, and growing out of our inherent propensity to do things efficiently.

Another criticism of your policy, and perhaps a basic one, is its total lack of consideration for the wishes, preferences, or inclinations of the contributors. In your zeal to make Red Cross first and foremost, have you not forgotten the little man that makes Red Cross possible? If he should like to give a pink check for his contribution, he resents being told that it must be a blue check, and that we want it later instead of now. After all, the people who give the money should have some say as to the manner in which they give it.

It is possible that we may look at the situation more objectively than yourself. While we actually raise the money, we do not have the salary or the duties that go with your office, but in all other respects, we are as much interested in Red Cross as yourself, and may our motives be taken for granted.

We hope that at the spring meeting the board will reconsider and modify its policy as to joint fund raising; that in peacetime years, and when the right to make independent drives is reserved, the Red Cross membership emphasized, and quotas maintained, local chapters, at their discretion, may cooperate with employers and community chests in the raising of funds.

To this end we are sending copies of this letter to the governors, chapters, and others interested in this policy.

Yours very truly,
THE OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS, VAN WERT COUNTY CHAPTER, THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS.

The Jewish Agency for Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted I am inserting in the RECORD the statement of the Jewish Agency for Palestine which was published in the New York Times of Sunday, January 11; an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, January 12, entitled "Explosives for Palestine"; and a news story from PM for January 12.

I am inserting these articles in order to keep the record straight. There has been a great deal of misinformation and misinterpretation in regard to shipment of supplies to the new government of Jewish Palestine. I think it is important that we have the facts available to form calm and reasoned judgments in the matter.

Text of the Times story, including the formal statement of the Jewish Agency, follows:

"LEGAL" BUYING OF MUNITIONS ADMITTED BY JEWISH AGENCY—NEW PALESTINE STATE NEEDS ARMS TO FIGHT OFF ARAB ATTACKS, SPOKESMAN DECLARES—BUYER OF M-3 EXPLAINS DEAL

After its name had been brought before the Federal Bureau of Investigation in connection with the quantity of M-3 explosive found near Asbury Park, N. J., last Thursday, the Jewish Agency for Palestine declared through a spokesman here last night that it believed the material to be legally purchased and awaiting legitimate shipment.

A statement on behalf of the agency, which has offices at 16 East Sixty-sixth Street, said that it had made dollar credits available for the purchase of surplus war materials, under the authorization of the United Nations plan for raising and equipping militia.

Earlier, a witness gave the FBI the names of "several Palestinians" in connection with the Asbury Park explosives, and had understood that they were being legally bought for shipment to the Near East.

The witness, Leonard M. Weisman, 32-year-old businessman, said he acted as an adviser to the Foundry Associates, Inc., 41 East Fifty-second Street. He added that he understood the persons for whom he acted to be representatives of the Jewish Agency.

"I told them," he added, "that I did not want any of these goods to be shipped to Irgun or the Stern gang, as I do not approve of terrorist activities, but I said I would be happy to get such goods for Haganah or the Jewish Agency."

Mr. Weisman said that on returning at 2 a. m. yesterday from a business trip to Norfolk, he called the FBI and, at his invitation, it sent two agents to see him at his home, 311 Hawthorne Terrace, Mount Vernon. There later in the day he said he had told the Government operatives the following story:

Two days before partition of Palestine was voted by the United Nations on December 5 some Palestinians—Mr. Weisman said he had disclosed their identities to the FBI but was told not to make the names public—approached him to act as their agent in the purchase of equipment, including explosives, from the War Assets Administration. This equipment was to go to the Jews in Palestine "in the event the British withdrew suddenly and left the Jews unprotected and undefended."

"I am in sympathy with the Zionist movement," Mr. Weisman related, "and I told them I would be very glad to help, but I warned them I would not participate in any illegal shipment of such supplies under Federal Government regulations.

"They proved to me that they represented the Jewish Agency for Palestine and they furnished proof that the agency had set up funds in the United States 'of not more than $750,000' for this purpose.

"They wanted, in addition to explosives, canvas tents, shelters, hospital equipment, and supplies. We finally made arrangements for the purchase of about 200 tons of M-3 demolition blocks at $90 a ton and I went with them to the Seneca Ordnance Depot of

the War Assets Administration at Romulus, N. Y. We bought the explosives, as advertised in the newspapers as being good for export."

ASSERTS TRUCKING WAS LEGAL

Mr. Weisman said the check was for a sum slightly less than $18,000—he could not remember the precise amount—and that it was drawn by Foundry Associates, Inc.

"We bought legally and had it transported by trucks properly licensed to carry explosives," he declared. "In fact the Romulus depot released the shipment only after proper certification of such licensing."

This did not quite tally with what was happening to the drivers of three truck loads of the M-3 who were being arraigned before Police Justice Ernest E. Schirmer at Saugerties. Professing ignorance of the fact that they were carrying 69 tons of the explosive, part of the 200 tons purchased by Mr. Weisman, they were held in $2,500 bail each for transporting explosives without proper identifying markings on their trucks and having no flares on them.

In addition the drivers were fined for minor traffic law violations. Martin J. Jablonski, of New York, was fined $50 for driving an unregistered vehicle. Bruno Olszowy, of Garfield, N. J., was fined $10 for failing to note an address change on his chauffeur's license; and Stanley T. Golenia, of Clifton, N. J., was assessed $10 for having no flares in his truck and not having a photograph on his chauffeur's license.

TRUCKS HELD UNDER GUARD

State troopers said the trucks bore "explosives" signs only 1¾ inches high, while the State law requires signs at least 6 inches high on front, rear, and both sides of vehicles carrying explosives.

The trucks remained under guard at an undisclosed place near Kingston. Inspector Edwin McGrath of the Bureau of Mines, Tunnels, and Expoaives of the State labor department arrived at the Lake Katrine police barracks to take charge of the cargo. State Industrial Commissioner Edward Corsi said it would be stored in an approved magazine in the Calinans Quarry, outside of Kingston.

At the same time Mr. Corsi, in a statement issued at his office in New York, took to task the War Assets Administration for allegedly not complying with State regulations. If the Federal agency, which Friday put an embargo on all surplus war explosives, had voluntarily complied with State regulations, Mr. Corsi declared, "the illegal traffic in explosives would have been averted."

Mr. Corsi said that State regulations required buyers of explosives to obtain an owner's and possessor's license, and that dealers must record every sale.

"Our department then makes an immediate check of all large purchases," he said. "Obviously, if the War Assets Administration had voluntarily complied with State regulations required of private dealers this illegal traffic in explosives would certainly have been averted."

Mr. Corsi said that his department, in cooperation with State police, was conducting a State-wide search to determine whether other caches of explosives from the same source were being stored illegally under unsafe conditions.

JEWISH AGENCY STATEMENT

The statement on behalf of the Jewish Agency, made by a spokesman follows:

"The Jewish people of Palestine are in desperate need of arms for their defense. The ex-Mufti, of Jerusalem, who collaborated with Hitler in the destruction of 6,000,000 Jews in Europe, has now called the Arab world to arms to carry on his work of massacre and extermination. Through his connections with the Arab League and the Arab states, the Mufti has the facilities to acquire arms and munitions for aggression and invasion.

"The Jewish Agency for Palestine has the responsibilities of a state about to be born. It must protect the lives and homes of the 700,000 men, women, and children of Palestine. The United Nations decision made no provision for an international force but did provide for a Jewish militia to defend the Jewish state and to maintain public security.

"It therefore devolves upon the responsible defense forces of the Jewish community of Palestine to rush preparations in a race against time in view of the threatened Arab aggression in defiance of the United Nations decision and the announced early withdrawal of British troops.

"Accordingly, steps were taken to arrange for the legitimate purchase of war-surplus matériel and equipment. To facilitate these purchases the Jewish Agency made dollar credits available. The materials found near Asbury Park on Thursday were to the best of our knowledge legally procured to await legitimate shipment with the understanding that all such purchases and their transportation were in full conformity with American law. We are proud to give our aid to the embattled Jews of Palestine. We trust that material urgent for their defense may soon be shipped to them legally, and with God's help reach them in time to meet their grave emergency."

Mr. Weisman in his story denied that the 200 tons he purchased had any connection whatever with the shipment of what is now believed to be nearly 100,000 pounds of TNT found when a crate broke on the American export liner *Executor* a week ago.

Letterheads of the Foundry Associates were found yesterday in a warehouse of Charles Lowy at Asbury Park. In a farmhouse nearby and on trucks an estimated 59 tons of the M-3 had been recovered Thursday night and early Friday morning.

The address listed for the Foundry Associates was 41 East Forty-second Street. That is the address also of a number of Zionist organizations and of Mr. Weisman's three business concerns. He said that he was president of the Paragon Design & Development Corp., an engineering concern; the Materials Redistribution Corp., which exports heavy industrial machinery to South America; and the Pratt Steamship Lines, which operates a freight service between New York and South American ports.

Mr. Weisman, who is married and lives in a colonial three-story house, told a little about himself. He is a member of the Zionist Organization of America but has never visited Palestine. He was born in Pittsburgh and attended Carnegie Institute of Technology, but was not graduated. He has developed his three business concerns, he said, in the last 6 years.

"I am not ashamed of my participation in any part of this matter," Mr. Weisman said. "I believe that the United States, in aiding and leading the United Nations partition vote, indicated its stand sufficiently to make me feel that, first as an American and second as a Jew, I could do nothing improper in legally placing in the hands of the official Jewish Agency in Palestine the means of protecting the lives of Palestine Jews against marauding Arabs armed with British weapons.

"Historically, no American condemns De Valera in his securing from the United States the means to free Ireland from British tyranny. Our own American freedom was obtained through the aid of Lafayette, who placed arms in the hands of American colonists."

Mr. Weisman, referring to the visit of the FBI agents, said that "they went away satisfied that I am an honest young man."

Despite statements by informed sources that 71 or 73 tons of the 200-ton demolition block purchase were unaccounted for and were probably on the high seas, Mr. Weisman insisted that none of the shipment was missing.

Saying that it was difficult to make contact with his associates over the week end, Mr. Weisman promised that by 11:30 a. m. tomorrow at his office he would be in a position to account for every pound of the stuff.

Lt. Col. Robert R. Judson, commanding officer of the Seneca depot, insisted that the entire consignment was accounted for. Colonel Judson said that the Army, after the freeze order of the War Assets Administration, refused to deliver the last 64 tons of the explosive which he termed "composition C." "It is composed," he said, "of 90 percent TNT and half again as devastating. Before the embargo six truckloads of the explosive had been removed from the arsenal at various times," he said.

"Composition C," Colonel Judson said, "does not detonate readily but has to be touched off with a fuse or firing cap." He said that neither was shipped from the Seneca depot with the explosives.

OTHER CACHES HELD PROBABLE

Monmouth County Prosecutor J. Victor Carton expressed the belief that the consignment found in the farmhouse near Asbury Park was a local project and said he had learned that other local campaigns had yielded caches of arms and munitions. He said he believed there were undiscovered caches of munitions in the country ready for shipment to Palestine. He did not explain the ground for his belief.

Mr. Carton recommended that the War Assets Administration review all large sales of munitions to determine to what use they were being put. Inquiries in Washington brought no indication that WAA would make public a list of large purchasers of TNT or other explosives.

Mr. Speaker, following is the text of the editorial from the New York Herald-Tribune, expressing the point of view of a great libertarian Republican daily, and showing a sympathetic understanding of the Palestinian position:

EXPLOSIVES FOR PALESTINE

The statement by the Jewish Agency, formally accepting responsibility for the purchase of 200 tons of M-3 demolition explosives from the War Assets Administration for ultimate shipment to Palestine, clarifies some aspects of this mysterious subject. At the same time, it raises a great many more questions than it answers.

Neither the agency nor Mr. Leonard M. Weisman, who assisted in arranging the purchase, admits to any knowledge whatever about the 50 tons of war-surplus TNT accidentally discovered as they were being loaded on the cargo liner *Executor* under the criminal disguise of machinery. This was not only a patently illegal but an outrageous business, imperiling the ship and the lives of every one in the communities through which the explosives were handled. It is impossible to countenance this kind of thing, no matter what may be the pressures in Palestine; and if the Jewish Agency can furnish no information the Federal Bureau of Investigation will have to get it. And the War Assets Administration will need something more than its sudden interdiction on further delivery of explosives to exculpate itself of the suspicion of gross carelessness in allowing these dangerous tools to be sold off for concealed or unknown purposes.

All this is easy to see. Nothing could do the Zionist cause more damage in this country than the existence of clandestine gunrunning operations illegally shipping arms to Palestine. What is not so easy to see is the proper policy for the United States Government. The State Department has placed an embargo on all arms shipments to the Middle East. This is a simple but more than a little

Pharisaical solution. It cannot overcome the fact that the Palestinian Arabs are getting not only arms but armed men from the neighboring Arab states, that the British are not successful in maintaining order now and are about to evacuate, and that if Jewish Palestine is to achieve and maintain the independence which this country officially advocates its people will have to get arms from somewhere.

It is conventional to regard arms as in themselves immoral; Mr. Henry Wallace, for example, has been very vocal in condemning "programs which give guns to people when they want plows." This overlooks the fact that when a man really needs a gun he wants it more passionately than he could ever want a plow; and the lengths to which the Zionist interests are going in the effort to get explosives here might lead even Mr. Wallace to some second thoughts on the importance of arms in the contemporary world.

Clearly, the question of arming or recognizing Haganah seems in the first instance one for the United Nations Palestine Commission. But the United States cannot simply wash its hands of a matter in which it is so deeply involved. Everyone so far has shirked the question of security and defense for the proposed Jewish state, yet in the harsh world of today it is obviously the fundamental question in the whole Palestine problem; and if the other nations will not themselves fight for the Jewish state then they must clearly afford to it the means of fighting for and defending itself.

Mr. Speaker, the following news story by I. F. Stone from PM indicates still another point of view:

JOKERS IN THE PALESTINE ARMS EMBARGO

(By I. F. Stone)

WASHINGTON.—The arms embargo imposed on the Middle East by the State Department has more jokers than a diplomat has alibis. These jokers may cost the Jewish community of Palestine dearly, and put the American Government in the position of helping to destroy the partition scheme for which it voted at Lake Success.

The first and obvious joker is that this embargo, Pontius Pilate style, smugly washes its hands of the whole affair, placing attacker and attacked in the same category, denying aid to both. It refuses arms to Arabs fighting the U. N. decision—and to Jews defending themselves against those Arabs.

This is neutrality, Spanish Civil War style, an encouragement to the forces of lawlessness and disorder. It ill comports with the high moral tone the Truman administration is taking in foreign affairs. A man who stood by, while a bandit beat a victim, could hardly qualify for a Carnegie Medal on the ground that he had righteously refrained from helping either.

MORE SERIOUS LOOPHOLE

But if this were the only joker in the embargo, it could be dismissed with wry reflections on the hypocrisy of a policy that purports to uphold the U. N., but turns its back when a U. N. decision is attacked.

A more serious loophole is the fact that while imposing an embargo on both the attacking Arabs and the attacked Jews, the United States is supplying arms to Turkey and Iran. The embargo applies neither to these countries nor to Pakistan, which is becoming one of the pet states of American-Asiatic policy. Yet all three of these Moslem countries voted against the Palestine decision at the U. N., and there is nothing to stop them from passing American arms on to the Arabs.

BRITISH POLICY

The third loophole lies in British policy. When the British want American help, they act as if they would not blow their noses out of tune with Washington. But when the Americans want British help in return, as the President well knows in his 2 years of effort to get 100,000 Jewish DP's into Palestine, the connection seems to go dead at the London end.

To impose an embargo from Washington without a similar embargo order from London, as the State Department did, was to leave open the main Arab source of arms supply while shutting off the only source from which the Jews could hope to obtain arms.

The British have not only imposed no embargo, but have just renewed their military alliance with Iraq, an alliance under which they provide the arms for the Iraquian Army and police. The British have shown no readiness to stop supplying arms to Iraq, Transjordan, Syria, or Egypt. Attacks on Palestine are being organized from all four.

In addition, only a few days ago Britain, despite her shortage of dollars, made a $25,000,000 loan to Egypt, a loan in dollars, not pounds sterling. These dollars are in effect supplied by the United States through the Anglo-American loan, and Egypt can use the dollars to buy arms in Argentina or Spain, both of which have arms to sell and need dollars. Franco, worried over unrest in Moslem north Africa, would like better relations with the Arab League.

AS IN SPAIN

Thus the American neutrality embargo is working out much as neutrality did in Spain. The embargo imposed by the western powers helped to keep the republic pinned to the mat, while Franco with Axis help beat it into submission.

In this case the American Government, by the embargo, is shutting off supplies to Jewish Palestine while the Arabs, with the aid of Britain and perhaps American arms obtained indirectly through Turkey, Iran, or Pakistan, can go on with their attack on the Jews and on the U. N. decision.

Is this, perhaps, the State Department's purpose? Does the White House realize what is going on? Does it approve?

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. SARBACHER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to increase the disability, death compensation, and pension rates of World Wars I and II veterans, including increased benefits for widows, orphans, and dependent parents of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II. I feel that this legislation is vitally needed at this time, not only with the aspect of increased costs of living, but to bring about a fair adjustment in the over-all structure of disability, death compensation, and pension rates.

This legislation coincides with the mandate of the New York national convention of the American Legion, August 28–31, 1947.

Resolution 162 of the American Legion convention brought forth the following mandate:

Whereas the cost of living has increased to such an extent, and that compensation and pensions of veterans, widows, children, and parents have not been increased to meet these conditions, thus causing hardships and needs in many cases: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention request that our national legislative committee introduce legislation to help remedy these conditions, at the next session of the Congress to be held in Washington, D. C.

For the benefit of the membership of the House, I am enclosing an analysis of this bill which I believe will show clearly the desired changes, and effects.

ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO INCREASE WORLD WARS I AND II DISABILITY AND DEATH COMPENSATION AND PENSION RATES

Section 1 proposes a 15-percent increase of wartime rates of compensation payable to World Wars I and II veterans for service-connected disability. These are the rates allowed in those cases in which disabilities are incurred as the result of armed conflict; while engaged in extra hazardous service, including service under conditions simulating war; or, while the United States is engaged in war.

The increase will include statutory awards and allowances as well as basic rates.

Present rates range from $11.04 to $360 for directly service-connected disability. The rates are reduced 25 percent in cases service connected by statutory presumption.

Providing for payment in dollars, as is done in this section of this bill, will simplify awards and eliminate much administrative detail.

Section 2, to increase wartime service-connected death compensation rates payable to surviving widows, children, and dependent parents of deceased veterans of World Wars I or II. It is also provided that these shall be the rates allowed if the deaths of such veterans establish entitlement of these dependents to benefits under section 31, Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 28, 1934 (38 U. S. C. 501a)—result of training, hospitalization, or medical or surgical treatment; section 12, Public Law 866, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 17, 1940 (38 U. S. C. 501a–1)—result of examination; and, paragraph 4, part VII, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as added by Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 24, 1943 (38 U. S. C., ch. 12)—result of pursuit of vocational rehabilitation course.

	Present	Proposed
Widow, no child	$80.00	$75
Widow, 1 child	78.00	115
Each additional child (subject to apportionment regulations)	15.60	20
No widow, 1 child	30.00	50
No widow, 2 children (equally divided)	45.60	70
Each additional child (total equally divided)	12.00	20
Dependent mother or father	54.00	75
Dependent mother and father, each	30.00	40

Section 3 proposes a 25-percent increase in pension payable to World War I or II veterans permanently and totally disabled from non-service-connected disability, namely, from $60 to $75 and from, in specified cases, $72 to $90.

Section 4 increases the pension payable to widows and children for non-service-connected deaths of World War I or II veterans.

	Present	Proposed
Widow, no child	$42.00	$55
Widow, 1 child	54.00	70
Each additional child	6.00	10
No widow, 1 child	21.60	35
No widow, 2 children (equally divided)	32.40	50
No widow, 3 children (equally divided)	43.20	65
Each additional child (total equally divided)	4.80	10

Section 5: Establishment of the first day of the month succeeding enactment date as the effective date of the new rates will eliminate the vast amount of work that would be needed to figure awards with rate change made within a calendar month.

Presently the pension award of $60 for permanent and total non-service-connected disability is 43 percent of the compensation award of $138. For total service-connected disability; proposed award of $75 pension is 47 percent of the $159 compensation rate. The $60 death compensation paid a widow is 43 percent of the $138 total disability compensation awarded a veteran; the proposed $75 death compensation rate is 47 percent of the proposed $159 total disability compensation award. The present $42 death pension award to a widow is 70 percent of the $60 death compensation rate; proposed $55 death pension rate is 73 percent of the proposed $75 death compensation award.

I sincerely hope that the Congress will see fit to enact this much needed legislation as soon as possible.

The Truth About Poland's Eastern Boundary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the borders of Poland were the immediate cause of World War II. We all supposed when the United Nations won the war that the Polish boundaries would recognize the historical rights and needs of the Polish people. Consequently, it is very discouraging to notice the lack of proper attention by our Government to this problem, particularly with respect to Poland's eastern boundary with the Soviet Union.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a statement from the New York Journal-American of January 7, by Charles Rozmarek, an outstanding Polish American leader who is president of the Polish American Congress, representing 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, wherein he sets forth very clearly the true facts with respect to Poland's eastern boundary:

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE POLISH BOUNDARY DISPUTE AT YALTA

(By Charles Rozmarek, president, Polish American Congress, Inc.)

(The following statement dealing with the Yalta Conference discussions of Poland's boundaries was prepared by Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish American Congress, Inc., representing 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent. Mr. Rozmarek explains some of the underlying facts concerning the border discussions which he declares were not revealed in former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes' book, Speaking Frankly.)

In one of the installments of Mr. Byrnes' Speaking Frankly, printed in the Hearst papers and dealing with the Polish boundary dispute at the Yalta Conference, there were opinions and statements which do not correspond to historical facts and documents. Stalin presented his claims to Polish territories by cleverly distoring the truth. Now, the American public should be given the true facts underlying the situation.

According to Mr. Byrnes, President Roosevelt "felt that Poland's eastern boundary should generally follow the so-called Curzon Line," but he still held "that it would be desirable to adjust the southern end of the line so that the city of Lwow and at least a portion of the oil fields should be inside Polish territory."

Stalin opposed those endeavors. He is quoted by Mr. Byrnes as saying:

"The Curzon line is the line of Curzon and Clemenceau. * * * Lenin was not in agreement with the Curzon line. * * * Now some people want that we should be less Russian than Curzon was and Clemenceau was. You would drive us into shame. * * *"

Stalin here made it appear that Clemenceau and Curzon were speaking of a Polish-Russian frontier. As a matter of fact, that was neither Clemenceau's nor Curzon's meaning or wording. As is evident from Mr. Byrnes' story, nobody at the time exposed the fact that Stalin was distorting and falsifying Clemenceau's declaration of December 8, 1919, as well as Curzon's note to the Soviet Government of July 11, 1920.

The Clemenceau declaration expressed and contained the decision of the Supreme Council of the Versailles Peace Conference. The declaration text makes it entirely clear that Clemenceau and his American and British partners in the Supreme Council, in establishing the line of Polish administration (the so-called Clemenceau line):

1. Had no intention of tracing and actually did not trace a Polish-Russian boundary;

2. Distinctly recognized the rights of Poland to claim further territories situated to the east of the Clemenceau line;

3. Did not touch or decide anything regarding the former Austrian territory (i. e. Galicia, where Lwow and the oil fields were situated), since the Supreme Council expressly referred to "territories of the former Russian Empire."

The so-called Curzon line was proposed by Britain to the Soviet Government merely as an armistice line between the Polish and the Red Armies at a moment when the Bolsheviks threatened to crush Poland and to gain control of central Europe. The future boundary between Poland and Russia was to be established at a peace conference, anticipated by the same British proposal.

It should be remembered also that this very line was rejected by the Soviet Government, in an official note of July 17, 1920, as unjust and unfavorable to Poland. In the same note the Soviet Government expressed its intention to grant Poland more territory in the east than was offered by the British Curzon Line proposal. The Soviet Government also branded the British proposal as "an intrigue of reactionary Russian emigrees in Paris" who intended to diminish Poland's territory.

At Yalta, however, Stalin did not mention any of these facts. In effect, he himself demanded a line like that proposed by "reactionary Russian emigrees." Unfortunately, once more his method of distortion triumphed.

The British armistice line proposal in 1920 provided that "in eastern Galicia each army will stand on the line which they occupy at the date of the signature of the armistice." At the peak of its advance into Poland, the Red Army never captured Lwow and the oil fields never were east of the so-called Curzon line.

The British note to the Soviet Government also contained an error which—in a proper and fair atmosphere—would not be open to misinterpretation. A description of the Clemenceau line was included in the Curzon note. The error consisted in adding to the Clemenceau line an extension through former Austrian territory (Galicia), which left Lwow and the oil fields to the east. This delimitation, however, actually referred to another Galician subject of discussion and was not intended for inclusion in Curzon's note to the Soviet Government.

By inclusion of this careless and incorrect description of the Clemenceau line, the Curzon note proposed two conflicting lines in Galicia, Poland. Stalin, in presenting his case at Yalta, naturally chose to demand the erroneous one simply because it was advantageous for him; it granted him Lwow and the oil fields.

Furthermore, it gave him the chance to bargain on a new compromise line in case Roosevelt and Churchill exposed the error in the Curzon note, but nobody exposed it.

In newspapers and even in encyclopedias descriptions of the Curzon line include this error. The mistake never was rectified before 1944, as the whole Curzon proposition was discarded after its rejection by the Soviet Government. Not until January 1944 was it exhumed by the Soviet Commissariat for foreign affairs.

These are the facts about the Clemenceau line and the so-called Curzon line which the American public should know to evaluate Mr. Byrnes' revelations of the Yalta Polish boundary debate. These facts were known to Roosevelt and Churchill, but were not used to oppose Stalin's claims at Yalta.

The People of the Tennessee Valley Support TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority is the most notable achievement on the domestic front of our Nation in recent years. The TVA has proven to be a great benefit not only to the people of the Valley but to the Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Alfred Mynders, of the Chattanooga Times of December 31, 1947, and an editorial of the Chattanooga Times of January 1, 1948.

[From the Chattanooga Times of December 31, 1947]

NEXT TO THE NEWS

(By Alfred Mynders)

Chairman REVERCOMB, of the Senate Public Works Committee, tells the Times that "a thorough investigation into the program of the Tennessee Valley Authority at which all interested forces will be given an opportunity to be heard" will be started by his committee soon after the Eightieth Congress convenes on January 6.

Chairman DONDERO of the House Public Works Committee says that an inquiry will be started there.

Distributors and users of TVA power in the great Tennessee Valley are thus facing another spiritual whipping in the next Congress. It is always open season for the TVA in congressional halls.

Twice have congressional committees gone over the TVA with a microscope and on each occasion the TVA was given a clean bill.

Has anything new transpired since those other thorough investigations? Not a thing. The TVA is still operating under the law of Congress, the TVA Act.

There will be a rehashing of old charges which have been disproved, there will be a parade of the new propaganda retailing old rumors. The TVA has not changed, but the climate of Washington has.

Senator MCKELLAR kept the fight against TVA going for 5 years until at last enemies of any public power project which is conducted for the people seemed to gain the ascendancy in Washington. Now, the threat is to the future of the Tennessee Valley Authority as an independent and successful experiment.

Chairman REVERCOMB says that some amendments to the TVA act are certain to come out of the hearing. But he at least is not as violent as Chairman DONDERO, who went off half-cocked with a lot of bombast which shows that he knows very little about TVA or, at least, chooses not to give the facts.

If the Senate hearing is going to be thorough and if it is going to decide a definite policy toward TVA in the future, then let it come. Let's get all the facts and let's determine once and for all whether the dominant political party in Congress intends to destroy, or at least to cripple, a development which has meant so much to the people of the South and which meant so much in the winning of the war.

Does the dominant party intend to go back whole hog to the exploitation of power resources in order to pile up dividends and to pyramid profits to be siphoned into the big financial centers of the East?

Are any of the power lobby dupes so dense that they imagine that this country will revert to the form of exploitation practiced by the Insull empire?

We might as well know the answer to those questions before the November elections rather than to have those answers explode in our faces after those elections. The United States is not going to go Socialistic, but neither is it going to go plutocratic, if the people can help it.

Possibly there will be no more accurate test of the intentions of the party now controlling Congress than in its attitude towards the Tennessee Valley Authority. This may become a national issue because we can tell the real intentions of the majority party through the manner in which it tries to turn back the clock in the Tennessee Valley.

As for Tennessee itself, in the face of this threat to the TVA whose power is the lifeblood of industry and commerce in the volunteer State, surely in the next senatorial election every man must stand up and be counted.

The people of this State are tired of being kicked around on this TVA matter. They will not favor a man for the Senate who claims to be for TVA now, but who consistently voted with Senator MCKELLAR in keeping the old sores open. One cannot believe the people will vote for the Crump machine, which at least was passive if it did not indeed dictate Senator MCKELLAR's efforts to tear down the TVA.

But above all, if there is going to be a third investigation of TVA, let it give both sides; let it decide once and for all if the TVA is well operated or not; if it is unfair to any taxpayer; if it is best operated under its regional manner or by constant meddling from Congress—let all of these questions be settled and let us see just how far Congress would be willing to wreck the economy of a great region and to tear down a development which has aroused the admiration of the whole world, in order to appease what is sometimes called free enterprise, but what, to the private power lobby, means free exploitation.

[From the Chattanooga Times of January 1, 1948]

THESE THINGS, TOO

The fourteenth annual report of the Tennessee Valley Authority, just sent to the President, shows that the average domestic consumer of electricity in the Tennessee Valley region uses 60 percent more electricity in his home and pays 16 percent less for it than the average residential consumer in the United States.

But we hope that Congress in studying the report will notice some of the developments of TVA which do not bear on electric power. It is shown, for instance, that the TVA reservoir system in 1947 reduced what would have been the sixth largest flood in Chattanooga in 100 years by nearly 13 feet and averted $7,500,000 in flood damage.

Since the TVA's first reservoir, Norris, went into operation in 1936, about $21,500,000 in flood damage has been averted at Chattanooga.

Little notice is given in Washington to the TVA's great health program, but this annual report shows that of 13,705 blood films taken from residents along TVA lake shores, only 21 showed evidence of malaria infection, an incidence of 0.15 percent compared with 10 percent in 1938 when the first survey was made.

On soil improvement it is shown that in the Tennessee Valley, during the years from 1934 to 1944, more than a million acres of the valley's 11,000,000 acres of agricultural land was shifted from row crops to close-growing grain and pasture crops and more than a million acres had been terraced.

The report shows that not only are the great lakes of the South a fisherman's paradise for sport, but commercial fishermen, last year, obtained $300,000 in gross income from the sale of nongame fish. And musselling operations accounted for about $500,000 of income to the region.

The TVA is helping to preserve our forests. In cooperation with State foresters, the TVA, in 1947, set up nine new large forest-management demonstrations on 55,000 acres. Fire protection, which TVA encourages in cooperation with State and local forestry organizations, has been extended to 6,000,000 acres in the valley.

These are just a few of the ways the TVA is benefiting the valley aside from the power development. We hope that Congress will get the over-all picture.

American Citizens Appeal for Relief in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, a letter addressed to the House of Representatives by Mr. F. C. Mensing, national secretary of the Federation of American Citizens of German Descent in the United States of America, Inc., has been referred to me by the Clerk of the House as the Representative of the congressional district in which Mr. Mensing resides. Attached to this letter were copies of six resolutions, dealing with problems in Germany, which are stated to have been unanimously adopted on November 30, 1947, at the national convention of this federation held in Los Angeles, Calif.

Resolution No. 1 appeals to the Congress to appropriate $250,000,000 for the relief of starving people in Germany, and requests that this money be used for food and clothing only.

Resolution No. 2 urges the enactment of legislation to reduce the present postal service rate for gift parcels to Germany from 14 cents per pound to 5 cents per pound.

Resolution No. 3 states that the United States Military Government in Germany has transferred the custody of more than 500,000 German war prisoners to France and England, and requests the return of these German war prisoners to the homeland.

Resolution No. 4 appeals to the Congress of the United States to stop the demolition and dismantling of industrial factories in Germany which are essential to the sustenance of the German people.

Resolution No. 5 urges the Congress to establish a democratic and Christian peace in Germany in the near future.

Resolution No. 6 appeals to the Congress to enact legislation for the admission into the United States of 200,000 displaced German people, and German orphans for the next 5 years.

The New Challenge to a Free Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, at the request of some of my constituents, and under leave previously granted, I include in these remarks the text of an address which I delivered on January 8, 1948, at the installation dinner of the Southern

States Industrial Council in New Orleans, La.:

THE NEW CHALLENGE TO A FREE ECONOMY

It is axiomatic that free government and a free economy are completely dependent upon each other. They are mutually related and reciprocal. Each is indispensable to the other. Neither can exist without the other. In the generation which has passed since the close of World War I that principle has been repeatedly illustrated. When free government is destroyed the economic life of the people becomes subservient to the state. When a free economy collapses, or signally fails in its obligation to maintain a reasonably stable prosperity, fear and want drive nations blindly to discard their liberty and seek the specious refuge of authoritarianism.

The lesson is clear. How well we in the United States have learned it is a question yet to be answered.

Ours is a capitalist economy. In recent years skillful propagandists have attempted to discredit capitalism as a sinister form of exploitation. This, of course, is the typical Communist interpretation. True capitalism is the framework of any free economy. Webster gives us an excellent definition of capitalism:

"An economic system in which the production and distribution of wealth, the employment and reward of human labor, and the extension, organization, and operation of the system itself are entrusted to and effected by private enterprise and control under competitive conditions."

What more could be said in defining a "free economy"—a term of more popular connotation than the much-maligned "capitalism"?

The existence and survival of a free economy are always challenged by the aftermath of war, as well as by extreme fluctuations of prosperity and depression, inflation, and deflation, in the economic cycle. Its historic task—not yet well performed—has been to cushion and avoid, if may be, the periodic shocks in the cycle which bring poverty and desperation to great masses of people. But in critical times of want and insecurity the trend is always away from a free economy and toward a "captive" economy of an unvarying pattern—absolute governmental control over the economic system and over the economic life of the individual, and the elimination of all competition in business. These are the familiar characteristics of authoritarianism.

The highly organized and determined assault upon the free American economy during the last 15 years has followed the typical pattern. It is clearly outlined in public declarations of men and women who have been officials of the present national administration and its predecessors since 1933. They show without question a grim purposefulness to undermine and destroy the economic system of this country. Let me recall some of them to you.

Paul Porter, who as late as 1943 was head of the Shipping Division of the War Labor Board, and who subsequently headed the late and unlamented Office of Price Administration, helped write a tax plan for the Socialist Party of America in 1934. It said, in part:

"All natural resources of the United States, such as minerals, forests, and waterpower sites, all banks, insurance companies, and public utilities, and all basic industries such as mining and the manufacture of steel, automobiles, and textiles, shall be public property. * * * All owners of stocks, bonds, mortgages, land, buildings, or equipment affected shall be required to surrender them in return for Commonwealth bonds."

Dr. Adolph A. Berle, until very recently an Assistant Secretary of State, told the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1939:

"Briefly, the Government will have to enter into the direct financing of activities now supposed to be private; and a continuance of that direct financing must be inevitably that the Government ultimately will control and own those activities. * * * Over a period of years the Government will gradually come to own most of the productive plants of the United States."

Dr. A. Alvin Hansen, professor of political science at Harvard University, adviser to the Federal Reserve Board and consultant to the National Resources Planning Board, was quoted in the Chicago Journal of Commerce on June 27, 1942, as saying:

"Congress will surrender to the administration the power to tax, keeping to itself the right only to establish broad limits within which the administration may move. Congress will appropriate huge sums of money, surrender its power of directing when and how the money shall be spent. Other extraordinary powers, such as, for instance, to effect wholesale social reforms, will be delegated to the administration, which will retain most, if not all, of the extraordinary wartime powers."

Mr. Paul Blanshard has been an economic analyst and consultant in the Foreign Service Division of the State Department at a per diem compensation of $33 per day. His plan for the economic life of the United States was set out in one of his books, as follows:

"Socialists propose to supplant the competitive planning of capitalism with a highly centralized planned economy. Our aim is frankly international and not narrowly patriotic. * * * If we gained the control of the American Government we would probably begin with a complete revision of the national governmental system. We would write an amendment to the Constitution giving the Federal Government the right to regulate all private business and to enter into any business which it deemed proper, or we would abolish the Constitution altogether."

In Philadelphia, on April 15, 1932, he told the Academy of Arts and Sciences:

"Having once captured the Government and shelved the Supreme Court, we Socialists would nationalize as many large industries as we could chew. We would do it peacefully, if possible, and we would do it otherwise if necessary."

The same authoritarian philosophy expressed by these Government officials still dominates the administration as the President demands that Congress give him the power to use "police state" methods to control prices and the other symptoms of inflation. And it is only a short step from economic dictatorship to political dictatorship.

Since the close of hostilities in World War II our tasks of reconversion and readjustment to peacetime production have been virtually completed. Today we are deep into the second postwar phase. It is at best a difficult period of striving to establish reasonable relations between supply and demand. It is complicated by special problems such as monetary inflation and extraordinary programs for export and foreign relief. No nation in history has faced a like situation. No economic system, free or authoritarian, has had more exacting demands made upon it. Near-demoralization at home and outright chaos abroad make this a time of grave danger for our still free economy. A serious depression might well undermine and destroy it. Continued confiscatory taxation threatens to smother it. Labor-management disputes and industrial unrest tend to sabotage it. The national administration is frankly hostile and its policy is far more consistent with socialism and nationalization of basic industry than it is with the preservation and strengthening of a free economy.

Can a free economy survive in the United States in this unequal battle against both economic and political forces? The answer to that question depends entirely upon whether government and industry and labor adopt more constructive policies and cooperate with intelligence and determination to preserve it.

The course which the Federal Government is to follow has become a major political issue. It is always unfortunate for the country when a great economic crisis and a great political crisis coincide. It is nothing less than dangerous when they coincide in an election year. But that is the situation which we face in 1948. And it is just as well that we meet it and deal with it.

If we are to solve the menacing problems of inflation and meet the challenge to maintain either economic or political freedom in the United States, it seems to me that our national policy must be changed in at least four important respects. I would like to discuss each of these changes briefly.

The first is restoration of the integrity of the currency.

Almost every diagnosis of our inflationary ills reiterates the fact that there is too much money in circulation for the volume of goods produced, with the result that prices are forced progressively higher. The remedy usually suggested is a substantial increase in production with a view to satisfying demand and restoring competitive conditions. But the fact is that price levels have continued to rise in spite of the great advances in production during recent months; and it seems obvious that high prices are brought about by factors other and more powerful than the disparity between supply and demand. For that reason alone, the arbitrary power demanded by the President to fix price ceilings and control distribution through rationing could not effectively deal with the underlying causes of inflation. Unfortunately, our people do not realize that high prices are the result of inflation, and not its cause. The demand for price and rationing controls is simply an effort to exploit the popular misconception in this regard.

Inflation is a rank economic growth. It cannot be eradicated by cutting or trimming. It must be rooted out, and its roots are deep.

As long ago as 1915 the seeds of inflation were planted in the United States. In that year Congress authorized what then appeared to be, and perhaps was, an innocuous monetary step. It permitted the Government to deposit its own bonds with the banking system as a basis for expanded credit and the issuance of new money.

But a major step in the devaluation of the currency was taken in 1933. You well remember the period. It was back at the other end, the deflation, or depression end, of the economic cycle. Rexford Tugwell and Co. were about to "make America over." The administration was proposing to restore prosperity and relieve distress in the United States by sleight-of-hand tricks and by secret plays called by the quarterback. In May of that year the first of a series of rubber stamp Congresses was persuaded that more than anything else the country needed a little rubber in the currency, to make it more elastic. As one newspaper headline put it in my own city, Congress was eager to inflate. And they did, fantastic as it sounds in these days of skyrocketing prices. It looked like a good idea at the time, and few of them remembered that anything you keep on inflating is very likely to burst.

Steamrollering the strenuous objections of the little group that wanted to be honest with the people in money matters the House passed the so-called Thomas inflation amendment by a vote of almost 4-to-1. By its terms the Federal Reserve banks were authorized to buy $3,000,000,000 of Government bonds and issue $3,000,000,000 of new currency—Federal Reserve notes. As one of the sponsors of the measure said, it gave the President "the right to give this country any measure of inflation which, in his judgment, he thinks it needs." More than that, it authorized the President to fix the weight of the gold dollar, provided only that he could not cut it by more than one-half.

I have listened recently to many of my colleagues across the aisle in the House complain bitterly about inflation, and demand that something be done about it, quickly. Some of them have been there a long time, but their memories must be short. Fifteen years ago they were hot for inflation. Their remarks made in the House in those days would make interesting, if somewhat embarrassing, reading for them today. One of them said, in those rollicking early days of the New Deal:

"This [proposed] expansion of the currency will bring back commodity prices. It will benefit, and not injure, the wage earners. * * * Every salaried man and woman in America, from the President down, is having his salary rapidly reduced at present because of this depression, and it is going to be further reduced, if not wiped out, unless this [currency] expansion program is put into effect."

And here is a classic voiced by another congressional advocate of cheap money:

"Since we have recently suffered from drastic deflationary steps by the adoption of the economy bill, the closing of so many banks, reduction of purchasing power of the people generally, it is necessary that inflationary measures be enacted. * * * No nation has ever got out of a depression without inflation. * * * If quantity of credit is desirable, quantity of money is also desirable."

The gentlemen who voiced these sentiments are still in the House, and frequently denounce the Republican Party roundly for not doing something about inflation. What is more, some of you are pretty well acquainted with them. There are many instances of similar statements, but all of them are in accord with the views of the Congressman who made the amazing statement that—and I quote again:

"If any one thing was ever needed in the opinion of the American people, it is the inflation of currency to meet the increased purchasing value of the dollar."

Yes; he voted for the bill, too.

We must give them credit for doing a thorough job of inflation while they were about it. They bred a new species of blue-feathered buzzard which became such a Nation-wide pest that I understand that this organization originated as a hunting society to exterminate it. In addition to fixing price floors, they adopted a policy of artificial scarcity—of restricting production by manufacturers and farmers and destroying surpluses. And as recently as only a year ago the administration was still at it—pouring kerosene over $90,000,000 worth of potatoes, and plowing them under for fertilizer, while most of the world was starving to death.

The inflation of our currency has increased tremendously in the last several years. By way of comparison, at the peak of high prices following the First World War, on October 31, 1920, we had $6,700,000,000 of currency in circulation, amounting to $53 per capita. But by October 31 of 1947 the total currency in circulation amounted to $29,000,000,000, or about $198 per capita. This tremendous increase alone was enough to precipitate an unhealthy inflation. But six-sevenths of all outstanding currency was Federal Reserve notes, which amounted and still amount to more than $24,000,000,000. An alarming proportion of all outstanding Federal Reserve notes and of banking credit extended by the Federal Reserve System is backed by nothing more substantial than the Government's promise to pay in some form, some day, reinforced by an aggressive policy on the part of the Government to support above par the market price of its own securities. It is particularly significant that during the last week of December 1947, when the Government bond market broke following lowering of the support price, the Federal Reserve System purchased almost a billion dollars in Government securities in 3 days. The immediate effect was to increase reserves on which commercial banks can make additional loans. It was, in other words, a step which sharply expanded available commercial credit and the money supply at exactly the wrong time—when both the administration and the Congress were striving to curtail it.

Here is the germ of our inflation. And here is the threat of ruinous, runaway inflation if it is not curbed. Sooner or later—and gradually, we hope—a readjustment is inevitable. But until the total amount of currency in circulation is reduced by retiring a substantial proportion of the billions now outstanding in Federal Reserve notes, and until the practice of expanding commercial credit on the strength of Government securities is curtailed, price levels will remain on a high plateau. Our economy is a good deal more sensitive to deflation than it is to inflation, and the process of restoring the dollar to its true value and correct volume and of contracting bank credit will have to be as slow and cautious as the process of inflation was speedy and reckless.

Actually there is no way to check the expansion of credit or to retire Federal Reserve notes except by retiring Government securities held by the Reserve banks. This is the painful problem of reducing the national debt. I do not see how we can justify further postponement of debt reduction for this purpose, if for no other. Following World War I a debt-retirement program on a minimum annual basis was successfully undertaken. The inauguration of a similar program, however modest, following World War II would of itself tend to restrain the expansion of commercial credit. It is a responsibility which we must assume immediately.

I venture to predict that in the current session of Congress the entire problem of our banking and monetary system will receive special consideration. An increase in the gold reserve requirements is very probable. There will be a strong policy toward tightening bank credit and reversing the downward trend of interest rates. It is my conviction that a free economy cannot thrive in an atmosphere of cheap money and loose credit, especially when both are subject to manipulation.

The second step which seems essential to guarantee an economy which is both stable and free is the adoption of a sound internal fiscal policy for the Federal Government. It is estimated that for the coming year the President will ask appropriations exceeding $40,000,000,000, more than two and one-half billions in excess of the record peacetime budget submitted last year. And that is only the beginning.

In addition, the Federal Works Agency proposes to spend $5,000,000,000 per year for 15 years on public works.

The three armed services have already prepared budget estimates which, if approved, will cost $25,000,000,000 per year for national defense commencing in the early 1950's.

A special study of the economic development of the South contains a recommendation that over $27,000,000,000 be spent for that purpose.

Expenditures proposed under the Marshall plan average $4,000,000,000 annually for the next 4 years.

The Federal Government is expected to lay out $11,000,000,000 for new school buildings all over the country.

These are typical proposals. All of them are current, all are seriously urged, and there are many more like them.

In the often-repeated words of our Pennsylvania colleague, BOB RICH, "Where are we going to get the money?"

Don't be deceived by the propaganda that the costs of government are coming down. At the present time the contrary is true. The trend of Government expenditures is up, and the possibility of a peacetime budget of $50,000,000,000 a year or more within the next several years is not mere idle talk. It will be a grim actuality unless there is a sharp reversal of the present spending policies of the Federal Government.

We are still maintaining a thousand agencies and two million civilian employees to carry on the work of the Federal Government. I have discussed the personnel problem with officials of various offices and bureaus in Washington and elsewhere and every one of them has complained that he is understaffed. The fact of the matter is that all proper functions of the Federal Government could be satisfactorily performed with several hundred thousand fewer employees. And the sooner the reduction is made, the sooner the tremendous burden of Government can be reduced, and the sooner the several hundred thousand persons can be returned to productive employment.

Obviously, we need a great many fewer Federal employees, and they ought to be better paid. Perhaps if we adopted a policy of increasing the salaries of all remaining Federal employees by 5 percent for every 100,000 removed from the pay rolls, we would receive some cooperation from them instead of the bitter, last-ditch resistance to economy which opposed us in nearly every agency last year.

But economy cannot depend on pay-roll reductions alone. The mounting cost of fixed and unavoidable items in the national budget will compel us to curtail or discontinue appropriations for some of the services, aids, and subsidies now provided to special groups. This is neither a pleasant nor a popular task, but it is a necessary one. Fiscal stability has become a sine qua non. With the aid of the newly created Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government a really intelligent and constructive approach to this difficult problem can be instituted a year hence.

The third of the four essentials to which I referred is tax revision and reduction. So far as tax revision is concerned, there are few either in or out of the Government who will question the need for correcting the manifest inequities which have arisen under the Federal tax laws. There is perhaps none of you who does not immediately think of the existing unjust discrimination against citizens of community-property States under the estate-tax laws as amended in 1942, and the equally unjust discrimination against citizens of the non-community-property States under the income-tax laws. Many, if not most, of you are keenly aware of the need for abolishing the double taxation of corporate earnings and for making other changes in the Internal Revenue Code.

But for the purposes of this discussion my interest tonight is in the reduction of Federal income taxes. More than 2 years following the war surtax rates remain at the confiscatory levels reached in wartime, with no reduction except the straight 5-percent discount authorized in 1946. Yet in 1948 the President reaffirms the view that there must be no reduction in personal income taxes. I do not agree with him.

Persons in all income brackets are entitled to substantial relief from the burdensome tax rates which have been in effect since before the war. Those in the lowest brackets are entitled to the greatest relief. There can be no argument about that. In addition to increasing take-home pay, tax reduction would tend to reduce retail prices because income taxes are an integral and measurable part of every selling price.

But substantial tax relief is necessary for middle bracket and larger incomes because of the special function they perform in our

economic system. It is from these groups that the vast majority of new venture and investment capital originates. So long as we maintain a free capitalistic economy we shall depend on this source for new investment funds.

There is an alternative, of course; we could tax them to death, turn to the Government for all new financing, nationalize our basic industries and then look around for some free country to borrow money from—the way England has done. That is exactly the way Dr. Adolph Berle, late of the State Department, whom I quoted a few minutes ago, would have us do it.

Almost everyone realizes and agrees that for they time being incentive has been destroyed by the continuance of confiscatory income-tax rates and that only substantial tax relief will revive it. I well remember the words of one of my distinguished colleagues on the subject. He said:

"If you tax a man 20 percent of what he earns on Monday, 40 percent of what he earns on Tuesday, and 60 percent of what he earns on Wednesday, and you are going to tax him 80 percent of what he earns on Thursday, and 100 percent of what he earns on Friday, he won't work on Thursday and Friday."

A Fortune survey last spring proved how right he was when 70 percent of the business executives polled stated that they would not work 2 hours a day longer to double their incomes—solely because most of their additional earnings would go to the Government in income taxes.

I said almost everyone agrees that high taxes have destroyed incentive. Not everyone agrees with that proposition. In November the Treasury Department—and surely the Treasury Department is always objective and never rationalizes about such matters—took the opposite view. It declared that high taxes give greater incentive to individual effort and that tax reduction tends to make taxpayers relax in their efforts to earn income. This is how the Department arrived at that somewhat startling conclusion:

"If taxes take larger proportions of their incomes, the incentives of these individuals to work tend to be increased rather than decreased. They will try, within the limits of their abilities, energies, and opportunities to earn more to attain and maintain the desired incomes after taxes. A tax reduction would tend to reduce their incentives to work and slacken their efforts, since their objectives could be met with smaller incomes before tax."

Far be it from me to question what prompted them to put out that choice bit of sophistry as a press release. Experience is squarely to the contrary. It is a well-known fact that persons employed on a commission basis generally stop working for the year when they have earned $18,000, for beyond that amount the Government takes more than one-half of their incomes in taxes. The Treasury has innumerable statistics which disclose clearly the smothering effect of high surtaxes on personal incentive as well as on new investment capital.

The most striking example of this situation is found in current trends in new corporate financing. With an unprecedented demand for increased production and for new products, in this period plant expansions would ordinarily be financed principally with new venture capital, invested in stock or equity issues. This has been the practice and the experience until very recently. In 1925, for example, new security issues accounted for 47 percent of the total new investment in plant and equipment. In 1926 new capital issues were equal to 44 percent of the new investment, but in 1947 the percentage dropped to 25 percent. Even as between 1946 and 1947 the shift from equity, or new ownership, financing to borrowing is apparent; in the first 9 months of 1946 58 percent of the capital raised for corporate financing was obtained by selling common and preferred stocks, and the other 42 percent was raised by selling bonds. But in the same period of 1947 only 29 percent of new capital issues consisted of preferred and common stocks, and the remaining 71 percent of the total new financing was obtained by the sale of bonds, that is, by borrowing. And between the 2 years there was a definite shift from common to preferred stocks. During 1947 new equity issues generally found the market unfavorable and some stock issues were withdrawn in favor of debenture financing.

This situation emphasizes the extent to which under existing conditions high taxes have siphoned off income which would otherwise have been available for capital investment. It illustrates how excessive taxes, coupled with the double taxation of corporate earnings, have prevented the accumulation of new-venture capital and have made the ordinary risks of an equity investment singularly unattractive to such capital as may be available. There is no question but that in this way the present Federal tax policy has progressively stifled the normal and needed growth of our economy. It is an extremely unhealthy condition, particularly at a time when our productive facilities require expansion and adaptation to meet greater demands for consumer goods.

The principal opposition to income-tax reduction is based on the argument that we cannot afford it for budgetary reasons, including primarily the requirements of debt reduction. This reasoning ignores our experience in the 1920's, when each of four different successive reductions in personal income surtaxes was followed by an increase both in incomes and in Federal revenues from income taxes. This same reenergizing of the entire economic structure through stimulus of incentive and the release of venture capital would be brought about by substantial tax reduction at this time. Tax reduction is one of the keys to a long period of sound prosperity in the United States. It is my conviction that Congress will reduce income taxes this year, with or without the approval of the President.

Fourth, and finally, is the curtailment of the high rate of depletion of our national resources. We have enjoyed prosperity in this country because our soil, our minerals, and other resources have been developed and utilized primarily for the use and benefit of our own people. The result is a standard of living of which every other nation in the world is understandably jealous. We have tardily begun to realize what deep inroads have been made into our dwindling and irreplaceable mineral resources by war and by programs of foreign aid and relief. Intensive and protracted agricultural production has mined the fertility of our soil to the danger point.

In a study long withheld from publication, the Interior Department has disclosed the alarming extent to which our mineral reserves have been depleted. The Bureau of Mines reports that at the present rate the United States will exhaust all its known reserves of 21 out of 33 essential minerals in another generation. We have consumed 97 percent of our original supply of mercury; 65 percent of our lead and silver; 60 percent of our chromium; 70 percent of our tungsten, manganese, vanadium, and bauxite; 65 percent of our zinc; and 60 percent of our petroleum.

The prospect is not at all a pleasant one. We have less than 1 year's known supply of nickel and tin left. Manganese will last another 2 years and mercury 3 years. In 4 years our known supply of tungsten, antimony and platinum will disappear. We have enough reserve bauxite for 9 years and enough silver for 11 years. Our known reserves of lead will be used up in 12 years. The diminishing supply of good quality iron ore is a source of concern to every user of steel.

Our poverty in the minerals which feed our industrial machine is part of the price we paid in the war to preserve our liberty as a people and our freedom as a Nation. For many essential materials our peacetime economy will become increasingly dependent upon imports from countries not yet highly industrialized, and another war would create new and difficult problems in industrial production.

To what extent should we accelerate the depletion of our mineral resources and the exhaustion of our soil for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of needy foreign countries?

This is the paramount issue confronting the session of Congress which has just convened. Both sides of the question are affected by political considerations and befogged with propaganda. No one doubts the desperate need of the war-torn nations of western Europe. But I fear that very few have taken account of the far reaching and serious consequences of pledging a substantial part of our remaining resources to reconstruction abroad. I am sure that the average American citizen is badly confused by the prospect of our sending machinery to Socialist England so that she may barter her own machinery to Communist Russia in exchange for grain. Just how the spread of communism will be prevented by that particular do-si-do in the international square dance is yet to be explained.

The operation of our entire economy might very well be seriously impaired by any long-range, large-scale export program which dipped ever deeper into the dwindling reserves of minerals and soil resources of this country. We must proceed with great caution lest we hasten the day when the United States may become a have-not nation, dependent on the import of vital raw materials for her economic existence.

Let us pause and take stock of America—the richness of her soil, the wealth of her forests, the treasures of minerals in her mines. These are the means by which we live, and they are the only tangible heritage we can leave to our children. We must not be profligate with them.

I have not undertaken to diagnose all of our national ills. I have merely suggested four of the major changes in national policy which I regard as indispensable to our future prosperity. I offer them for your consideration and not as a panacea. Nor do I pretend that the accomplishment of any of them will be easy, or convenient, or painless. But I am satisfied that forthright national policies of restoring the integrity of our currency, reducing both the current cost of Government and the amount of its debt, relieving our weary people of part of the crushing weight of taxation, and conserving our national resources, will establish in America the sure foundations for a resurgent free economy which will become a tower of strength to our posterity and to the whole world.

It is, indeed, a time of great challenge. But it is likewise a time of great opportunity for progress and achievement.

General Arnold Says: "We Will Lose the Next War"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the same forces that crucified Gen. Billy Mitchell and prevented us from building up an adequate air force prior to World War II, which would have prevented the cowardly Jap attack on Pearl Harbor that practically destroyed the American Navy and resulted in the most humiliating disaster this country has ever experienced, seem to be working to prevent our building and maintaining an adequate air force at this time.

Gen. H. H. Arnold, one of the great soldiers of all times, warns us in an article which appeared in Sunday's edition of This Week magazine of the danger of pursuing such a policy.

General Arnold's statement follows:

"WE'LL LOSE THE NEXT WAR"

(By Gen. H. H. Arnold)

We won the last war. And it's the last war we'll ever win. If we have another, this Nation will lose.

We'll lose and the enemy we fight will lose, because victory in atomic warfare is no longer possible. One nation cannot defeat another nation today. That concept died with Hiroshima. War is like fire; you can prevent a fire, or you can try to put it out, but you can't win a fire, because fire is destruction.

If we fought Russia, the best we could hope to achieve is a moral victory, and that would be small comfort to the remnants of our people, crawling amid the burnt-out foundations and charred chimneys of a ruined nation.

So we must not, we cannot, talk about waging war with Russia. Even if we wiped out Russia, we would be wiped out in the process. War itself is defeat. We must talk about waging peace. We must wage peace with all the air power, with all the machines and money and men that we used to fight Germany and Japan. We must be stronger than any other nation in the world, because I am convinced we are one of the few nations in the world today that genuinely, devoutly, and unselfishly want peace.

Where do we stand, then, at this most critical moment in our Nation's history?

How does our air power compare today with that of other nations, either potential allies or potential enemies? Are we strong enough to prevent another war?

ONE-PUNCH OUTFIT

During the war, as commanding general of the Army Air Forces, I was responsible for 2,500,000 men. I still feel a deep responsibility toward these men, and I believe they want to know the facts.

That is why I am breaking a 2 years' silence to state these facts frankly. Any potential enemy knows our military situation anyway; the only ones who do not realize it are our own people. The cold truth is that at present we are almost as bad off, in a military sense, as we were before Pearl Harbor.

If another attack comes, the first blow will again fall through the air. Our Air Force would hit back with all the power it has. It could probably hit the enemy a staggering blow. But then it would be all over for us. Our Air Force today is a one-punch outfit. Without the ability to launch a sustained counteroffensive, we would have to surrender—or be annihilated.

We are little better than a third-rate power in the air. We have about 3,700 first-line aircraft in flyable condition, but more than half of these are being used for training and are not ready for combat. We have another 5,900 or so first-line planes in storage, but to put them in combat readiness would take from 3 to 6 months. And, remember, for many of our first-line aircraft in operation, and for all of our aircraft in storage, time is running out fast. In a very few years every last one will be obsolete.

IT TAKES TIME

Of course, we say, we have the atomic bomb. We comfort ourselves by stating over and over that it would take Russia 2 or 3 or 4 years to get that bomb into mass production. But do we remember how long it took us, last time, to get ourselves ready? If we started rebuilding at full speed, tomorrow morning, we would require several years to reach our full fighting strength.

All the planes and all the engines we used in World War II were on the drawing boards or in actual production at the time of Pearl Harbor, yet American aircraft production did not reach its peak until 1944.

Five full years were consumed last time in reaching our maximum in air power. And at that time we had strong allies to help give us the needed time. Our own factories were never under enemy bombardment. There were no atomic missiles to slow or cripple our production. Even at that, we barely made it; if we had been just a little more tardy, Germany's V-2 program would have been successfully launched, and we would probably still be fighting today. Our margin of victory was perhaps only a matter of weeks.

When Germany surrendered, the Air Force had more than 45,000 combat aircraft. What is more, there were 14,000 fighter pilots and 21,000 highly trained air crews to man our bombardment-type planes. At the time of Japan's surrender, we had 2,800 of the B-29 superfortresses that had smashed and seared Japan's war economy to a state of impotence.

American air power hovered for a moment at that magnificent height. Then, with the war over but with the peace yet to be won, the cries for demobilization mounted in America and echoed around the world. They did what the guns of the enemy had never done. Within a few short months, precipitous demobilization had so riddled the Air Force's wings that not one group was fit for combat.

To be sure, we have made some recovery since that low ebb of our national strength. America is beginning to realize that its part in the allied victories has placed us inevitably in a position of world leadership. We have begun to rebuild our military position.

But we are doing it far too slowly to be safe. The minimum requirement for the Nation's air security is an air-force-in-being of 70 combat groups, supported by the necessary number of service organizations. Although the Air Force was able to activate 55 of these groups by the end of last year, there are funds to sustain the remaining 15 on a skeleton basis only. And a glance at the future is even less encouraging. The Air Force budget for 1948 will permit the maintenance of only 40 combat groups—not much better than half the minimum requirement for the safety of the country.

WE'RE STALLING

Nor does the picture become any brighter when we look at aircraft production. The current Air Force budget allows us to purchase less than 1,500 aircraft of all types this fiscal year. This is just half of the 3,000 new aircraft the Air Force has stated must be procured each year to defend our shores.

Worse even than the decline of our military strength is the deterioration of our national pride. We are growing apathetic toward all national security matters. We hesitate and fumble and stall. We let the Congress cut military appropriations drastically, we debate endlessly over universal training, we let our strength dwindle a little more each day.

These are the plain and chilling facts. We have no time to lose; this golden opportunity to rebuild our military power may not last much longer. It will be too late to start after we are attacked. There are several basic steps that we must take at once, to insure the prompt recovery of our former position as the strongest nation in the world. These may be summarized under four headings.

1. A balanced national defense

We must maintain an adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force as a deterrent to any potential aggressor and as a power actually to stop war. If war does come, our first major task will be the air defense of the United States, its territories and possessions. After that, it would be the task of the Air Force to blunt the enemy's offensive capability through strategic bombardment. This would give us time to build our strength to the point where we could take the initiative.

Once this build-up of offensive strength has been attained, our Air Force would have to launch a full-scale strategic offensive to destroy completely the war industry and the war economy of the enemy nation. Then, when this phase was completed, our Air Force would join with our ground and naval forces to exploit the effects of our offensive and to establish control over the enemy nation.

Our Air Force today is woefully inadequate to perform this task. There is no threat to American sea power in the world; but American air power is dangerously below par. To give America a balanced defense, therefore, we must first of all increase the Air Force's share of our defense budget so it can perform its duty the way it is expected to.

2. Industrial preparedness

The heart and sinews of modern war lie in a nation's production. We must inaugurate a program of industrial preparedness, which will enable industry to maintain pilot plants, to stockpile machine tools, to redesign weapons and adapt them to mass production—in short, to take all steps necessary to insure volume output in a minimum time if another war should ever start.

3. Reserve program

We must support a reserve program which will enable our Army, Navy, and Air Force-in-being to expand rapidly in the event of war. The Air Force budget for 1948 will allow some form of training for only 80,000 members of all three civilian components—the Air Reserve, the Air National Guard, and the Air ROTC. While over 100 Air Reserve training detachments are needed, budget cuts have reduced our Reserve training facilities to 43. These budget cuts must be restored at once. Training takes time; and there may not be much time.

We must change many other old ideas, and fit them to the modern concept of war. Our commercial air lines, for example, form a very important part of our whole reserve system. We must keep our air lines healthy and strong, because we may need them in a hurry if a Pearl Harbor happens again.

4. Universal training

Last but not least, we must establish a program of universal training, to give the three services the trained manpower they need to insure peace. This program has been called for repeatedly by leading statesmen, clergymen, and military men. The temper of the times makes imperative that we set it in motion without further delay.

We cannot win another war. No one can win another war. Therefore, we must not fight another war. Our only hope in this atomic age is to apply our strength firmly and steadily for peace among nations. This is in keeping with our history, our traditions. We must maintain our strength—not to use as a belligerent, but to buttress our position as the world's referee for peace. That means that what we built up together for victory should not be allowed to go to seed. We must work for peace as wholeheartedly, as devotedly as we worked for victory.

Red Cross Chapter To Lose Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Van Wert (Ohio) Times-Bulletin of January 6, 1948:

RED CROSS CHAPTER TO LOSE CHARTER—REVOKED BY ACTION OF NATIONAL BODY FOR JOINING "CHEST"—BELIEVED TEST CASE IN NEW POLICY OF AMERICAN RED CROSS CONTROLLING FUND RAISING

Van Wert County Chapter, American Red Cross, will lose its charter Thursday, by ruling of the national organization, for refusing to drop its affiliation with the community chest's combined fund drives.

This arbitrary action of the American Red Cross against the local chapter, over the manner in which it chooses to raise its funds, is expected by local Red Cross and community chest officials to eventually reach Congress, and to put Van Wert into the national spotlight.

In the meantime, following public announcement of suspension of the local chapter's charter last October 17, Sprague Jones, president of the Community Chest board of directors, stated that any chest donor, whose donation included a subscription to the Red Cross, may have such Red Cross contribution refunded.

This is the first year since the war that the local Red Cross fund goal was included in the community chest quota, the drive having been conducted last October. Before the war the local Red Cross was also affiliated with the community chest.

The chapter suspension was made known here in a telegram of October 17 sent to Mrs. Marcile Borden, president of the local Red Cross board, by Harold B. Nearman of the eastern area of the American Red Cross.

CHARTER REVOKED DECEMBER 8

This same area official advised Mrs. Borden that he was recommending to the National Board of Governors that they revoke the Van Wert County charter at their meeting on December 8 because of the local chapter's violation of the nonaffiliation rule of the national corporation.

This action was taken at the December meeting in Washington, in denial of an appeal made in behalf of the local chapter by Attorney S. S. Beard, who attended the meeting. The ruling made at that meeting gave the Van Wert County Red Cross officers the option, in effect, of resigning or being fired from the national organization.

Speaking in behalf of the county board, Earl Shackley, a member of that board and chairman of the protest committee, said that the local officers would not resign because of their appreciation of the splendid cooperation of the chest and out of loyalty to the contributors and solicitors who gave so generously of their money and time to the Red Cross.

STATE OFFICIALS SPEAK

The heated argument with the National Red Cross stems from a violation of a recent policy set up by the national board, he explained, in which affiliation with other charitable drives is forbidden. In other words, he continued, the issue involves only the manner in which funds are raised, and the national board's attitude is one of a dictatorial nature prescribing this manner, with no consideration for local situations or desires.

In Columbus, State Red Cross officials said the policy was adopted in 1942, with the approval of President Roosevelt, honorary national chairman, according to the Associated Press.

The question of affiliation with community chests or other fund-raising organizations was the subject of considerable discussion before the war, they said, with a majority of chapters expressing themselves as opposed to affiliation.

FOUR HUNDRED AFFILIATED IN 1938

By 1938, they said, about 400 chapters throughout the country were affiliated, but many were not able to carry on their full Red Cross program with their shares of community chest donations.

Some large chapters, they added, shrank in size as a result, and consequently a policy of independence of all other organizations in money drives was adopted.

A situation similar to the one in Van Wert, though not so far advanced, now exists in Pittsburgh, State officials reported.

Should the revocation go through, they added, the Van Wert chapter will be the first in the country to lose its charter for any reason.

The reasons for a combined drive have long been known here. It eliminates duplication of time and effort on the part of solicitors, and duplication of being solicited on the part of contributors, it was pointed out. With a quota for the Red Cross established, it should be the prerogative of local agencies to determine the most desirable and efficient method of collecting the required funds, Shackley said the local chapter contends.

PROTEST COMMITTEE FORMED

The Van Wert County Red Cross board of directors decided by unanimous vote to again affiliate with the community chest in raising funds for all organizations in one drive. For this "flagrant violation of the rules," as higher Red Cross officials termed it, and the current decision of local officials not to resign, the charter is to be revoked.

Upon receipt of this decision, which was definitely confirmed by Basil O'Connor, president of the American Red Cross, in a terse note to Mrs. Borden, a protest committee was formed here with Shackley as chairman.

This committee sent out letters appealing to all community chests and Red Cross chapters, where there were community chests, for support in this cause and asking the agencies to write to individual members of the national board of governors protesting the nonaffiliation rule. Letters went to communities in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Kentucky, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

MANY COMMUNITIES RESPOND

The replies were encouraging. Sympathetic letters poured in from many communities, all accompanied with copies of letters which had been sent to higher authorities in the Red Cross. Nearly all of these communications not only favored the local cause but admitted to similar situations in other communities and the desire to conduct campaigns in the same manner. Some encouraged united action in opposing the national rule.

A copy of a letter written by Dan F. Gerber, president of Gerber's Baby Foods, Fremont, Mich., and an avid worker for charitable causes, to a Red Cross official says in part:

"I think the Van Wert incident has a lot of explosive possibilities. I know that before this incident I shared the resentment voiced at the Detroit meeting (sponsored by Henry Ford II to federate some 39 agencies' fund drives). If they persist in the revocation of the charter of the Van Wert County chapter, I would feel almost like a contemptible appeaser if I not only refused to contribute to the Red Cross but didn't actively and aggressively use every bit of influence I could muster in this community to get them to take their quota through our community chest or not get it at all."

MAKE FINAL MAIL APPEAL

Another letter, upholding the Van Wert case and saying, "There is a resentment by these various [local] units to Washington ignoring their own particular local problems," was written by Lewis A. Shea, chapter chairman of the Bridgeport, Conn., chapter, to E. Roland Harriman of Brown Bros. Harriman Co., 59 Wall Street, New York City, a member of the board of governors of the National Red Cross.

And there were many other letters, including a final, lengthy, explanatory letter from the Van Wert County board to O'Connor, stating that the board would not resign. This went out after that official's curt decision was received here following attorney Beard's unsuccessful appeal before the Washington meeting.

LETTER EXPLAINS POSITION

In a statement released yesterday for the local Red Cross board, Mrs. Borden said:

"The controversy with the board of governors involves a priniciple affecting all Red Cross chapters and community-chest organizations.

"It involves only the manner in which Red Cross funds are to be obtained in peacetime and does not curtail the activities of the Red Cross.

"In view of the splendid cooperation recieved from the chest during peacetime years, the local Red Cross board feels that it would be to the advantage of the contributors, the solicitors and the national organization to remain members of the local chest. We feel that the contributors, solicitors, and volunteer workers should have a voice in saying how the funds should be raised and we do not believe anything would be gained by a separate drive for funds.

"In view of our firm belief that our principle is right, we cannot, in all fairness to the community and ourselves, resign. As a result, our charter will probably be revoked."

LIKELY WILL BE TEST CASE

That Van Wert's may well become a test case, and that the situation is one of national scope, is evidenced by an open letter written to O'Connor by Robert Cutler, president of the Old Colony Trust Co., Boston. Lawyer, soldier, public servant, Cutler was national chest president from 1939 to 1942. His letter, copyrighted (1947) by the Atlantic Monthly Co., follows:

"The only true rule to serve as our guide is that the people in each American community, as freemen in a free society, shall have the right to decide how the money which they give to charity shall be raised and shared. It's their money and they work to raise it. Naturally, they think their voice should determine the amount of their goal and whether one campaign or many campaigns shall prevail."

Jones' statement in behalf of the community chest board of directors follows:

"Inasmuch as the community chest did, in cooperation with the local Red Cross board, solicit and accept funds intended for the Red Cross, and inasmuch as the local Red Cross chapter no longer has authority to accept these funds, the community chest board announces the following plan for the return of donations to those subscribers who wish to have their money returned:

"Any donor to the 1947 community-chest drive, whose donation included subscription to the local chapter of the American Red Cross, may have Red Cross subscription refunded by calling at or writing to the secretary of the community chest at the Community Clearing House, Van Wert.

"All funds earmarked for the Red Cross, not so withdrawn, will remain in the treasury of the community chest for later disposition."

The American Red Cross has refused to accept the check of the community chest for its half of the $3,500 raised for the Red Cross in the chest drive last October, according to E. C. Humphreys, chest secretary.

CHAPTER PROTESTS HIGH RED CROSS GOAL

WASHINGTON, January 6.—The American Red Cross goal of $75,000,000 for its 1948 fund-raising campaign brought a protest today from the El Paso, Tex., chapter that quotas set by the national organization are too high.

E. M. Kelley, Red Cross board chairman in El Paso, said in the Texas city that he is flatly rejecting a $33,000 quota there, adding:

"The war is over. If we can cut down 20 percent locally, the national body should be able to reduce 10 percent of its overhead."

Kelley said the El Paso chapter would seek $75,000 in 1948, of which $23,000 would go to national headquarters. This compares with a $99,000 goal last year with $26,000 for the national group.

Rank and File Labor Union Members Oppose Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a most interesting letter from a citizen of Tulsa, Okla., who has been for many years one of the leading members of a great labor organization. The author of this letter is an esteemed citizen of the community in which he has lived for perhaps a quarter of a century. He is a student of national and international affairs. Knowing this, I sent this gentleman a copy of the so-called Marshall plan and one of the publications issued by the Department of State in support of the Marshall plan, together with a booklet written by Henry Hazlitt entitled "Will Dollars Save the World?"

The following is the reply this gentleman has sent to me on the subject:

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: Referring to a book by William Hazlitt and the second volume of a report by a Committee on Economic Cooperation with Europe sent to my wife and me from your office, I have read Hazlitt. The other volume is very technical and very hard for the layman to understand but appears to be the opposite of Hazlitt.

According to a Mr. Taylor, a commentator, we have already handed Europe, including Britain, $22,000,000,000 in loans, gifts, lend-lease, etc., since VE-day.

According to Mr. Hazlitt (and I thoroughly agree) we cannot save the world with dollars.

According to Mr. Truman, we should have no tax cuts, we should do without and over a period of some 4 years should use another seventeen billion or more dollars to rehabilitate Europe.

According to the morning paper, DeGaulle in France has suggested the killing of French free labor unions and the forming of associations of labor and management, which actually would be a somewhat similar condition to Mussolini's corporate state.

I agree with Hazlitt. And I'll go farther by saying that it is my opinion that only so long as we patrol the European Continent with bayonets can we maintain any semblance of ideolcgies such as we think they should have, and I am not sure we should try to think for them. We do not seem to be saving the world from totalitarianism. Maybe that's what they wish over there. If it is, let them have it, for it will be only a question of time then until it will break up into another European war, and we had better be strong enough to protect ourselves then. We cannot do it if we send our strength and money over there now. Next time it will be hemispheric, the east against the west.

Let's keep our wealth and soldiers at home. Who wants to be world leaders if it costs the taxpayer the loss of his loved ones and penury and want? Brought down to fundamentals, life is still a struggle to get enough to eat, to wear, and a place to sleep for the average person. If Government steps in and takes all he makes and ships it to people in other parts of the world not so fortunate, then we have a form of world-wide socialism, which cannot eternally be enforced without totalitarian power. That I am opposed to, either in the form of bureaus or in the form of one-man power.

We have entirely too much government now. Instead of making it more omnipresent, let us reduce it considerably.

A Defeatist Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Willimantic (Conn.) Daily Chronicle, issue of January 6, 1948:

A DEFEATIST ATTITUDE

Politics or no politics, the defeatist attitude which President Truman takes toward legislation not of his own making is unworthy of the high office he holds. During the earlier session of Congress he said the Taft-Hartley law wouldn't work and thus encouraged union leaders in their efforts to sabotage it and to interfere in every way with its operation.

In announcing that he would sign the anti-inflation bill, which he presumably had read although later he couldn't find it, declared the law is too feeble to do any good and that the public should not be led to believe that it will either reduce living costs or keep them from going higher.

If that is the spirit in which he approaches the assignments which have been given him under the law what hope can there be of even moderate success? Negative administration can only produce negative results.

The President would have been within his rights in stating that he preferred his own police state anti-inflation bill, complete with OPA, and that he was disappointed by the measure which the Republican majority in Congress enacted into law. But having said that and thus gone on record for the 1948 campaign, he should have stayed his hand.

A President genuinely interested in checking high prices would have proclaimed his intention to do the best he could with the weapons placed at his disposal. He would not have predicted failure in advance.

If now the law does not prove to be an effective instrument for combatting inflation, it will not be clear whether more bureaucratic methods such as proposed by the President should be endured, or whether the fault lies in the fact that the executive branch of the Government made only a half-hearted attempt to put the provisions of the law into effect.

Mr. Truman obviously does not like the law. With the 1948 elections coming up, can't it be also the fact that he does not really want it to succeed?

What Do Republicans Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which was published in the South Pasadena (Calif.) Review on December 13, 1947. In view of the fact that the Congress will be faced with a number of important decisions during the coming year I believe this editorial is particularly timely and thought-provoking. The editorial follows:

WHAT DO REPUBLICANS WANT?

Soon the people of this country will be entering an election year, when citizens will exercise their rights of franchise, voting for what they believe to be their best interests.

Parties will be lined up against each other. Political oratory will ebb and flow. Platitudes will soar to new heights, platforms will be written and criticism of the ins, as well as the outs, will be heard on all sides.

But we are not so much interested in criticism, unless it is constructive, as we are in suggestion and program which will make this Nation a better democracy than it is now.

Just because a proposal is Republican policy or is Democratic policy is not really important. The important thing is whether such policy is good for all the people of this great country of ours.

The Republican Party has recently been entrusted with leadership in Congress at a time when every minute move this Nation makes has a major bearing upon the future of our present civilization, not here alone but in the world over.

We are not interested in politics for politics' sake. We are not interested in Washington decisions that are made simply for political party benefit.

We believe the people of this Nation will not entrust future leadership to a revitalized Republican Party unless it is willing to admit that good has come from opposition party leadership—correct the bad that has come

through wrong leadership, admit the errors of its own past, accept the successes of its opponents, and guide this Nation along the lines of fundamental truths.

The Republican Party should rise above party narrowness. The GOP and some of its leadership in the past has not been wholly savory. At times it has forgotten the welfare of many men at the expense of a few.

What the Republicans need today is more statesmanship and less reactionary political persiflage. Fortunately the party's younger element realizes this and is seeking to give the party a program of fundamental issues on which to rest its case.

The Republican Party must not be known as the party of the great industrialists or of any one segment of our population. By the same token the Democratic Party should not be known as the party of the segment of population known as union labor.

The Republican Party became great during the time of Horace Greeley because it stood for great human and social principles. It rose to power and prestige because of these principles.

There is a need today for a party dedicated to true human values and liberal democratic thought, not to opportunistic panaceas proposed by so-called liberals in recent years who would prostitute the American citizen before the ballot box in emotional appeals for votes and power.

Reorganizing Congress—What Remains To Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article written by David Cushman Coyle, eminent historian and political scientist, and published in the winter 1947 edition of the Virginia Quarterly Review. I invite the attention of Members to this thoughtful discussion of what was done and what remains to be done to bring our Congress up to date.

The article is as follows:

REORGANIZING CONGRESS

(By David Cushman Coyle)

The Congress of the United States has been more or less reorganized several times in its history. Many a man is now alive who remembers the great revolt of 1909–11, when young George Norris broke the power of Uncle Joe Cannon and his dictatorial Rules Committee in the House. The Senate in 1917, after a campaign against filibustering that started in 1845, finally adopted a cloture rule, by which two-thirds of the Senate can stop a filibuster but usually won't. Previous history shows that Congress can change its rules, but that any improvement is always stubbornly resisted, and that never yet has Congress done a thorough job of streamlining.

At present the need for streamlining is more acute than ever before, for two principal reasons. One reason is that so many important questions have to be handled by Congress as to strain the minds of legislators who must spend four-fifths of their time on errand-boy work for the home folks or deciding how many taxicabs to allow in the District of Columbia. Most Senators and Congressmen would like to be intelligent, but the system gives them almost no chance to learn or to think; and meanwhile history is moving at high speed.

The second reason is in the nature of the world crisis that we are in. First the Nazis, and now the Communists, deny the whole democratic idea, and one of their chief points of attack is the legislative incompetence of democracies. Once they can get the legislature abolished or really reduced to a rubber stamp, the rest is easy.

The American people still believe strongly in the institutions of democracy, and none of our Presidents has ever shown any sign of agreeing with the attitudes expressed by Mussolini, Hitler, or the Communists. Roosevelt never tried to be a dictator, even in the purge incident of 1938, for he never disparaged Congress as an institution, nor ever questioned the necessity for the free consent of the governed. And the repudiation by the voters of both Roosevelt's and Wilson's purge attempts can be taken as healthy signs of our sensitiveness to even the suspicion of an attack on the independence of the legislature. But we have all too much tendency to scoff at Congress for its stupid behavior, in terms which in time may undermine our faith in representative government as a principle—as did happen in Germany and Italy with fatal results.

The greatest single contribution our Congress could make to our security would be to show itself strong, efficient, and clear-cut, so that its actions would yield neither ammunition to our enemies nor confusion to our friends. Those who undertake to promote a more effective organization of Congress have to make clear that we come as friends, with no shadow of doubt that the legislature, for better or for worse, is the bulwark of our liberties; and that every criticism we make is an effort to buttress, not to discredit.

The Reorganization Act of 1946 came out of a year's work by a joint committee led by Senator La Follette and Congressman MONRONEY. The resolution setting up the committee limited the scope of its possible recommendations, forbidding any reference to rules; i. e., mustn't touch the Senate's sacred cow, the filibuster. But no resolution could prevent those who testified before the LaFollette Committee shooting joyfully at every sacred cow in the place, from the seniority rule for committee chairmanships to the passion for inefficiency of the General Accounting Office. And of course no resolution could protect these doleful animals from the barbs of the many private writers on this subject, such as Dr. George Galloway, who was made secretary of the committee, and Congressman ESTES KEFAUVER, whose book on the situation as of 1947 is the principal basis for the present article.

In due time the La Follette committee reported, and the Democratic Congress on August 2, 1946, passed a Reorganization Act including most of the committee's recommendations, leaving it to come into effect in the Republican Congress of 1947. A year later, Mr. MONRONEY put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his appraisal of the results to date (July 26, 1947). This report, together with ESTES KEFAUVER's book, A Twentieth Century Congress, should be read in full by everyone who has enough interest in the subject to read this present article. The resulting information can well be used as a basis for encouraging, or prodding, your Senators and Congressmen to carry on and make a good job of it.

The chief accomplishment of the Reorganization Act was cutting down the number of standing committees from 48 to 19 in the House and from 33 to 15 in the Senate. In the process, the overlapping of committee fields was largely overcome. The work is now divided among a large number of subcommittees, possibly too many in a few cases, but in general the new system makes sense. Subcommittee chairmen do not have the prestige that has been the chief obstacle to abolishing useless committees. Subcommittees can be set up and taken down with comparative ease, and the main committee can coördinate and direct their work.

The intelligent suggestion of Dr. Galloway and others, of having 13 parallel committees in each House, to allow for joint hearings and easy consultation, was not adopted. No progress was made in getting away from the seniority rule. The act piously exhorts chairmen not to pocket bills which their committee has approved, but makes no provision for sewing up the chairman's pocket.

Special committees in the past have varied in usefulness, from the great investigating bodies such as the Truman committee, to manifestations such as the un-American group. Most of the advocates of reorganization believe that special committees should be used seldom, if ever. There were 12 in the Seventy-ninth Congress and 4 in the Eightieth. Purely partisan muckraking has perhaps not been entirely successful lately. Note the futile history of the Pearl Harbor investigation and the rout of Senator BREWSTER, not to speak of the spectacle of Senator MCKELLAR breaking his teeth on David Lilienthal.

There have been some improvements in the operation of committees, such as requiring a quorum for approving a bill, helping witnesses prepare their testimony, and keeping conference committees from writing bills of their own. But the requirement of open hearings was entirely flouted by the House Appropriations Committee, which could not bear to face the public while it swung the ax.

The intelligence services of the Congress were considerably strengthened. The Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress, set up in 1915 to dig out information for committees and Members, had been limping along on a starving appropriation until the Reorganization Act gave it some real money and a chance to build a more effective staff of experts. The Legislative Drafting Service, a group of expert lawyers who draft bills, was enlarged. It had been swamped with work. The standing committees were given larger staffs, but this reform has been partly canceled by the appointment of unqualified persons to expert positions.

An important reform is the transfer of private claims to the departments or the courts. Private claim bills have wasted the time of Congress, and with notoriously unjust results. Private bridge bills and corrections of military records were also abolished.

The act required registration of lobbyists, and a long list was published, including some amusing items. (One, for instance, is lobbying for "a constitutional amendment which will prevent the election or appointment to any office * * * where such [persons] become toxt, or cocktailed or sick or muddled or boozy from smoke or drink and/or from other venoms that menace commonweal.") This registration is a gain, so far as it goes, but it does not touch the master minds who work entirely underground, and it may be evaded rather easily by lobbyists who do not devote a major portion of their time to lobbying. The main defense against illegitimate use of the right of petition must lie in general efficiency and good information services—to give the hard-pressed legislator a chance to know what he is voting about.

Probably the most spectacular failure in the new system came at the point where the Republicans had laid the most emphasis—the handling of the budget. For one thing, this Congress refused to appropriate the money for a study by the Comptroller General, provided in the Reorganization Act, on the economy and efficiency of the administrative agencies. It may be questioned whether the Comptroller General's office is equipped to recognize good or bad management; in the past its authority has generally been used destructively. It is perhaps fortunate that Congress failed to add to the Comptroller General's activity.

The legislative budget was reduced to an absurdity. After a hasty glance at the President's Budget and hefting that large unpleasant book, the Senate decided to cut the estimates 4½ billion, while the more exuberant House chose 6 billion as its goal; neither figure had any apparent foundation. The conference committee to reconcile these estimates quietly died.

According to the act, the Congress was supposed to decide early in the session on a limit for total expenditures. This limit would then serve as a guide for tax policies during the session, and any appropriations beyond the limit must carry either a special tax or a special authorization to borrow. This plan was widely approved by conservatives and also by liberals. It seemed logical, granting the traditional idea that a budget is mainly a device for controlling the tendency to spend. The absurd outcome of the first trial of the legislative budget, however, opens the question whether the plan really was bungled by the Republicans or whether it fell through by not making sense at all.

The President's budget, offered in January 1947, was primarily designed to help control inflation. For this purpose he proposed to maintain taxes and cut expenditures, except where a cut would injure the productive capacity of the country and thus hurt the other side of inflation control. The budget aimed at being a tight estimate of necessary costs, defined as "necessary" because any cut would waste more than it would save. There was no way to look over such a budget hastily and see if it was really tight. Congress had to work over it, item by item, trying to cut, listening to the cries of pain from the country, and then admitting that the item was already tight, with no more slack in it. A few rather abstract or scientific items could be cut, where the harm done would not show up quickly; and a few fake cuts could be achieved by reducing items that would have to be made up quietly later; perhaps a total of one or two billions in all, but no four and one-half or six billions.

Fiscal policy, actually, is not simply a matter of keeping the budget down. Fiscal policy starts with a judgment as to whether a tendency to inflation or deflation calls for a budget surplus or deficit, respectively. This in turn shows whether the budget should be tight or generous. From these two features would come a proper tax policy, whether to increase or cut taxes. In 1947 the President proposed to limit spending to strict necessities and get a surplus as a guard against inflation; and therefore to maintain taxes, since obviously Congress would never consent to increasing them. In this scene there was no place for the legislative budget. The only quick judgment that Congress could properly make was on one point: Did Congress agree that the largest possible surplus was indicated by the economic situation, as reported by the Council of Economic Advisers? If it did, then it could proceed to comb the budget for errors, to be sure it was really at rock bottom, and meanwhile could either raise taxes or suppress any attempt to lower them.

Liberals might do well to drop the idea of the legislative budget, since it only confuses Congress, which ought rather to be discussing the really critical question: Do we want a surplus, a deficit, or a close balance next year? Once that is decided, the others must follow, and any attempt to promise either the budget total or the tax rate in advance is liable to make those who do it ridiculous.

This, then, is the main outline of a year's experience with the Reorganization Act. The committee system is much improved, though still short of real streamlining, and still burdened with seniority chairmen. The expert staff services are much better, and can probably be further strengthened without any revolutionary changes. Some of the silly jobs such as private bills have been drastically reduced. Lobbyists have been listed, whatever that may amount to. The legislative budget was tried and failed completely, which may be a gain in the long run.

Whether the net effect of the 1946 act is good or bad depends on one question: Does it open the way for further reforms, or does it block progress for another 20 years?

Testifying in behalf of the bill which established the Hoover Committee, one Congressman said: "The legislative branch of the Government has been reorganized and streamlined by the Congress itself. The time is long overdue for a reorganization and streamlining of the executive branch." It is, and the Congressman's main position was well taken. But if many other intelligent Congressmen think Congress has now been streamlined, God help us. The efficiency of Congress as an institution was slightly better in 1947 than in 1946, but it cannot be said to have attracted the gasping admiration of a world torn by ideological conflict. In view of what, from the standpoint of management engineering, could well be done to streamline Congress, the job has hardly been touched.

II

What would a real job of streamlining mean?

First of all, as practically everyone except the committee chairmen knows quite well, the committees or the party caucus ought to choose the chairmen for usefulness, not for their value as antiques. The party in power wants to be a success, but not quite enough to be cruel to old fogies. Both parties need to develop a more hard-boiled concentration on the main chance. The Democratic Party suffers more than the Republican, because of the southern habit of electing men for life. The South needs more accent on youth, if it wants the Democratic Party to win national elections.

Congressmen and Senators ought to be paid about $25,000 a year, for personal income, aside from an allowance for a sufficient office staff. The whole cost of Congress, on an efficient basis, would be about twenty-five or thirty million (not billion) dollars, which is less than one dollar per thousand of the cost of government. Congress costs the American people about 15 cents apiece a year. A properly equipped and properly paid Congress would cost us about 5 cents more per year, or the price of one newspaper, in which the news might be much better if Congress were able to do a bang-up job. But why pay the poor dopes $25,000? The answer is that they are poor, but most of them even now are not dopes, and there would be fewer dopes if the pay were reasonable.

It is not that Congressmen have to work desperately long hours at their job. They do, but they like it, in the main. Their complaint is only that too much of their work is wasted on picayune matters. But they don't like trying to live on $12,500 a year, which seems so princely to most of their constituents. A Congressman has to keep two homes, and Washington, at least, is expensive. He has to travel, with his family, and the travel allowance does not cover the cost. He has to contribute to every good cause. He has to pay a big slice of his wages for printing and other campaign costs; including reprints of his speeches, not printed at Government expense. Or else he must accept contributions from wealthy supporters, and who do you suppose would expect him to show a bit of gratitude once in a while? Integrity costs money, in real life, and if the country wants its legislators to look the world in the eye and fear not any man, wouldn't it be sensible to pay them enough so they can pay their own campaign expenses? Incidentally if the national budget would finance the two major parties about $10,000,000 apiece, wouldn't it be possible to drop the hypocritical assumption that political parties live on the pure milk of human kindness?

To be a Congressman, a man and his wife must either love the job enough to be more or less reckless in their personal finances; or else the man must be incapable of making a living at home; or else they must have backing or money of their own. That is not the way to hire, in business or government. We should offer a living wage.

The work load of Congress still needs to be reformed, though most of the mess of private bills has been cleaned up. The biggest slice of a Congressman's or Senator's time is used up in being a Washington representative of his individual constituents. When they come to Washington they call on him, with family in tow, and expect him to take them all to lunch, at his expense, and give them passes to the galleries. Or they call to ask for a job, or for help in putting pressure on one of the agencies, or to get an amendment to a bill that will promote their interest, or to find them a hotel room or a block of theater tickets. Those who don't call write in for every possible kind of help, from getting a letter-carrier's job to asking the Patent Office for a list of things that have not yet been invented.

All these calls must be courteously and promptly met, or else. One Congressman, for instance, got an urgent request, at one of the hottest points of the war, that he arrange to have the President photographed with a basketball team that was coming to Washington from his district. He replied that no one ought to ask such a thing of the President. The next thing he knew his Senator, whose nuisance value was particularly high, had arranged the matter easily. About 50 votes were lost by the patriotic Congressman, and gained by the far from patriotic Senator.

What is even worse, not only the members of the District Committee, but all Senators and Congressmen, are aldermen of the city of Washington. Everyone from the League of Voteless Women to the Real Estate Board and the friends of local policemen and dive operators, can be found parked in the Congressman's office when he is already jumping sidewise trying to take care of his own constituents who have votes.

The Reorganization Committee recommended that each Member should have an $8,000 assistant to do the Washington Representative job. This is not a clerk's job. It takes knowledge of the town, tact, ability to give a few poisonous people and cranks a skillful run-around, and to serve promptly and effectively the mass of legitimate requests from the citizens back home. The Senate has adopted this recommendation, but the House did not do so in 1947. If it takes 2 or 10 high-paid assistants to keep the constituents off the Congressman's neck, it would pay the country, as well as giving better service to the homefolks. As for the Washington alderman job, that is something else.

There is nothing in the Constitution that requires Congress to govern the District of Columbia, and if there were, it ought to be taken out at once. The District is a weird combination of a branch of the Federal Government, a State, a county, and a municipality. While the Federal Government has 60 major units—departments, agencies, commissions, and boards—the District has 125 major units in its 4 governmental levels of action.

The District Committees of the Senate and House in the Seventy-eighth Congress handled 209 bills. Aside from all the time taken up in private lobbying and District Committee work, the House in full session uses 1 day every 2 weeks to deal with District matters. On these days the Congress acts as a city council, sometimes very much so. All this is a waste of time when matters of importance to the Nation and the world are on the docket. One or 2 days a year, mainly concerned with how much taxes the Government is willing to pay, would do the job if the District were allowed to govern itself.

Congressman KEFAUVER, in his recent book, proposes another important time-saver, the use of electric voting.

At present, when either House votes, the roll is called, which takes about 10 minutes in the Senate and 45 minutes in the House. Moreover, whenever anyone "suggests the absence of a quorum," unless the House adjourns, the roll has to be called, and the quorum call can be used to gain time (i. e., to waste it) or even as a sort of filibuster. KEFAUVER reports that in 1943–45, the war years, the Senators used up an average of 79.5 hours, or nearly 16 legislative days per year, in listening to the melodious sound of their own names. The House used an average of 121.8 hours, or 24 days per year. Since Congress usually meets 5 days a week, the House wasted a month on roll calls alone in each of the war years.

Electric voting is done with a key that each Member carries, which he alone can put into the appropriate slot in his desk. The system is used in 11 States. The Texas Legislature boasts of having voted by electricity 30 times in 30 minutes, though with what net result is not reported by Mr. KEFAUVER. At any rate, it is clear that both Houses of the National Legislature could save themselves a lot of time by putting in a set of pushbuttons.

Not only time would be saved. While a roll call is going on, while Congressmen are finishing their interviews or dictation with one eye on the clock so as to dash over to the House in time to be counted, those who are on the floor are at ease, all business is stopped except personal conferences, reading, or lobbying, and the deadening effect of mental shovel-leaning creeps over the assembly. The people in the galleries, who come hoping to see some action, get as bored as an Englishman at an American football game where the huddles take up most of the time. The show is a bad show, and the effect on thousands of tourists from back home is not good for the reputation of Congress. It does not promote that respect for democratic processes which is all-important.

It would be too bad if our civilization should collapse for lack of a set of pushbuttons in the right spot, but stranger things have happened.

The next big problem is a more efficient relation between the executive agencies and Congress. Normally they stand off at opposite ends of Pennsylvania Avenue and chuck stones at each other, which is a poor way to run a family. In domestic affairs at least, Congress is father, who goes out and finds the money; and the administration is mother, who keeps the house, takes care of the children, and runs up the bills. They should have some system for understanding each other's problems and attitudes.

Woodrow Wilson's first venture into political writing, when he was still a senior at Princeton, was an article in the International Review on Cabinet government. Wilson proposed that the cabinet should be chosen by the President from among the Members of Congress, as is done in parliaments such as the British. The Cabinet would then have seats in either the Senate or House, where they would introduce the Government's bills, and they would resign if defeated. Wilson tried when he was President to start the change toward a parliamentary form, but the war required his attention and nothing came of it. The parliamentary form of government requires either a King or a figurehead President, to hold over when the cabinet falls, and it requires a rigid party discipline, since every vote against the cabinet is a bid to throw the majority out of office. Although this is the standard democratic form in other countries, it does not seem well adapted to American political habits.

The Kefauver proposal is much less drastic. KEFAUVER proposes merely to have a question period every 1 or 2 weeks in each House, where Cabinet members and agency heads would have a chance to answer questions and present their problems. This was the original system used in the First Congress, but soon abandoned, probably because the Government was so small that everyone knew everyone else. The Confederate States Constitution had a provision for letting the Cabinet members appear on the floor, but the Congress did not pass the necessary laws.

The question period is the most conspicuous feature of the democratic form of government in other countries. It gives a chance for the citizens, through their representatives, to raise any sort of question about the administration of the law. If the question turns out to be of wide interest, it is discussed all over the country, and the Government has to yield to public opinion or show very good reasons why not. A question period here, if reasonably well managed, would probably arouse Nation-wide discussion from time to time in a wholesome way, as it does in England. It would undoubtedly give both Congress and the agencies a better line on each other's point of view, and would reduce the amount of sniping based on pure ignorance.

The idea of a question period has been supported by many prominent men, including Elihu Root, Charles Evans Hughes, Charles A. Beard, and Presidents Garfield, Taft, Wilson, and Hoover. A Gallup poll on the plan showed 70 percent in favor and 7 percent opposed. Most of the important newspapers in the country favor it. The proposition would seem to have a rather good chance of adoption sooner or later.

In addition to the question period there should be two other forms of organized contact at lower levels. Each agency could well have a regular day about once a month to confer with its corresponding committee in each house, preferably in joint session, for discussion of its current work and problems. At present the only contact is usually in budget hearings, which are exactly when father and mother are least likely to enjoy each other's company. Regular association would considerably ease the tension of the annual discussion of expenses between Congress and the agencies.

Each Department and important agency should also have an office on the Hill, headed by an Assistant Secretary or Assistant Administrator, who would be available for day-to-day cooperation with committees, and for most of the contacts connected with requests from constituents. The liaison agent could supply the committees with copies of administrative rules and orders, so that objections could be raised, and Congress could get a proper check on the use of its delegated powers.

Neither of these liaison arrangements is new or untried. The National Housing Agency during the war had regular and satisfactory meetings with its House committee under Congressman LANHAM. The Veterans' Administration and Civil Service Commission have offices at the Capitol. What is needed is more of the same.

Under the head of reorganizing Congress may perhaps be considered one of our most troublesome constitutional problems, the two-thirds rule for treaty ratification. At present most of our foreign relations are settled by executive agreements or other dodges—recent examples are the Bretton Woods agreement and UNRRA. Other nations are shy of making treaties with us, remembering how often our treaties have been repudiated by a minority in the Senate.

The House in the last Congress passed a resolution for a constitutional amendment allowing both Houses to vote on treaties, but the Senate Judiciary Committee pocketed it. We shall not be in a good position to handle our foreign relations until treaties are subject only to approval by majority vote. This is a flaw in our democratic form of government which is embarrassing to ourselves and exasperating to our friends abroad.

Another proposed constitutional change would make all elective terms 4 years. A 4-year term would relieve Congressmen of half their campaigning burden, would allow the voters to change the whole Senate if they liked, and would increase the probability of having the President and both Houses all belonging to the same party. This is perhaps not as important as the other proposed reforms. It would give the voters no voice except at 4-year intervals. And though the occasional deadlock between a President and a contrary Congress has been rather distressing at times, it has never gone so far as a flat refusal to make appropriations. In fact, one might almost say that our present example has strengthened Mr. Truman's position, put Congress on its mettle, and given the Nation better service out of both ends of Washington than it has sometimes had from a one-party team.

Many of those who testified before the Committee on Reorganization criticized the poor discipline of both the parties. It is notorious that some southern Democrats ordinarily vote Republican and some Republican liberals normally vote Democratic, much to the annoyance of neat-minded people. But there may be more to this lack of discipline than mere lack of neatness.

A two-party system is undoubtedly the best for running a democracy. Three parties commonly result in electing a minority President, and a dozen parties, after the European pattern, may get in such a hopeless mess that democracy itself is endangered or lost.

In England the two major parties are widely separated in their principles, so that if the public is dissatisfied with poor management by the Labor government, it can get no relief except by jumping to the Tories, a serious and upsetting change of base. A couple of years' observation of British politics during the war gave one the impression that it is dangerous for a country to have two parties with principles far enough separated to make the jump from one to the other a radical change. The English, not being logical, can take it calmly, but for most countries such a wide leap is revolutionary and can easily be violent.

In America, fortunately, Tweedledum and Tweedledee have both practically the same set of principles, with some difference of emphasis represented almost entirely by the character of their candidates. To a large degree, therefore, the intelligent middle group, which if interested can usually decide elections, is able to vote for or against the men who are running, without having the ghastly choice of a Communist-infiltrated "liberal" party versus a Fascist-infiltrated "conservative" one. Those would be the choices if our parties were to adopt a consistent and different set of principles.

Our parties are organizations for getting into office, and that is what they ought to be, since it is obvious that our Government, like all others, is one of men, not of laws. The men make the laws. In Congress they ought to have better caucus organization, not to discipline their Members, but to discuss what party line is best to take and why, with a canny eye on the voters. In most cases, of course, the party members, wanting their party to be successful, will go along. But the mavericks must not be too strictly disciplined, or the mixed character of the parties may be lost. The danger would be that both parties might split into liberal and conservative wings, and these into moderates and extremists, with a few independents running as one-man parties. As the discipline grew tighter, each group would be more and more pure, its principles would be clearer and its number fewer, till each recognizable principle, from the Townsend plan to prohibition, would have a tight little irreconcilable party. Then only a fitful coalition would ever organize Congress, just as in Europe. Like the British we are possibly too illogical to go so far, but meanwhile we can well be thankful to have two and only two parties, devoted to the praiseworthy object of finding successful candidates.

A comment on this viewpoint is supplied by the apparent desire of both our Fascist and our Communist elements to start third parties, for the evident purpose of undermining the democratic system. Too much party discipline would only play into their hands.

From this hasty review of the condition of Congress, it appears that the effort at reorganization has improved the efficiency of the legislature, but only about a quarter as much as could well be demanded by the needs of the day. Congress wants to be strong and respected. Most of its Members want most of the reforms that still need to be adopted. What is Congress waiting for? It is waiting for help from the people. The very fact that Washington is paved with sticky flypaper, that inefficient chairmen still control key committees, and obsolete rules interfere with business, prevents the streamlining that would make good organization possible. The numerous Senators and Congressmen of both parties who long for a more intelligent organization need the help and encouragement of the home folks; and the minority who stand in the way need a good kick, followed if necessary by a courteous but permanent welcome home.

People of the Southwest Oppose Marshall Plan and Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have said that the people of the Southwest oppose the so-called Marshall plan and price control. The two subjects are inextricably connected. Everyone seems to know that the more we send abroad and the more the Government enters into competition with our own citizens in buying the necessities of life, the more scarce the commodities become. The scarcer the commodities, the higher the prices. Thus the spiral of inflation is promoted by the administration's program. Inevitably the Marshall plan will boost prices and furnish a semblance of plausibility for the President's demand that Congress give him authority to control prices.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my section of the country, and I believe it is generally true through the Southwest, do not favor the continuation of the program of giving the substance of our people to foreign governments. They do not like the idea of having the President's representatives buy Argentina wheat from the Argentina Government at $5 to $5.80 per bushel, which the Argentina Government had bought from the Argentina farmers at $1.30 per bushel, and then pay for its transportation to foreign lands and give the wheat to foreign governments. Then the foreign governments dole it out through their favored millers, bakeries, and distributors, and it is sold to the people of those countries who have the money with which to pay for it. A lot of it is sold through the black markets. This does not reach the hungry. This is not a method of feeding starving people. On the contrary, it is merely a method that the New Deal administration has of subsidizing the Argentina Government and the European governments to which the wheat is given.

The following significant statement appears in the January 5, 1948, issue of Newsweek:

In a seemingly offhand speech at Harvard on June 4, Marshall proposed that western European nations get together, formulate a recovery program, and request from the United States enough help in the form of goods and materials to make it work. To his apparent surprise, Foreign Minister Bevin, of Britain, grabbed the Marshall plan with enthusiasm. A recovery plan was quickly adopted at Paris, even though the Russians pulled out and took their satellites with them. Mr. Truman's request to Congress for a $17,000,000,000 4-year European recovery plan is pending before Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I visited 59 cities and towns of my district week before last. I met the people during office hours in 54 post offices and in the evenings at the courthouses of the other 5 cities. Astonishing as it may seem, I talked to people in all walks of life, Democrats and Republicans, and in many instances without knowing their political affiliations, and I discussed with them the many issues of international and domestic interest. I did not suggest any topic for discussion or consideration, but requested them to suggest the topic in which they were most vitally interested. They mentioned the foreign-aid subject at least five times as often as all other subjects combined, and not a single person expressed himself in favor of appropriations by Congress for foreign aid. On the contrary, all who said anything at all on this issue insisted that no appropriation be made by Congress for such purpose. Hence I say the people of the Southwest are opposed to the so-called Marshall plan. Likewise they are opposed to its complement, or necessary accompaniment, the Truman request for price controls by the President.

Practically every letter I have received from my constituents on this subject, and there have been scores of them, expressed disapproval of the Marshall plan and price control. Typical of such letters, I am pleased to quote the following from a letter just received from a leading attorney, a Democrat, of Tulsa, Okla.:

I realize that persons of fixed incomes, as a matter of immediate selfish interest, might be inclined to favor rationing and price controls, but, very frankly, I haven't found anybody that wants price controls reimposed. Even the old-age pensioners, that is, those on the relief rolls, grumble about prices, but they express willingness to go along and let the law of supply and demand operate as it will. You, of course, know how I personally feel about the matter. I am against price controls and rationing, for all the reasons currently expressed by Members of the Congress and the Senate and for many other reasons. It is my feeling that the administration has to some extent badgered the Republican Congress on this issue, and I hope that Congress won't fall into the error of supporting any sort of price controls or rationing. We had just as well be truthful about these matters. The only answer to the problem of scarcity of goods and commodities is production.

Now, about the Marshall plan. I don't think that any plan to feed people to keep them from following this or that political or religious belief will ever work. It seems the administration seeks to scare the people of the country by saying if we do not do this or that communism will spread. And the this or that is always some sort of program which may be camouflaged but actually is a gift of some sort. Communism is simply a corrupt expedient. The ones who are for it and understand it know this, and I am inclined to think that more of those who are given credit for ignorance understand the expediency more than we sometimes imagine. A lot of those who are considered ignorant are not so ignorant but what they see in communism or socialism a way to take away from those who have and give to the have-nots. We have been doing this by law to a horrible extent.

The way to combat communism, socialism, and every other crooked, crackpot ism is to disseminate the truth and emulate it. I haven't found anybody, rich or poor, who thinks that this country can insure the peace of the world by adopting any kind of expediency, whether it be called the Marshall plan or something else. I believe I am correct in referring to the Marshall plan as an expediency.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick from the New York Times of January 10, 1948:

ABROAD—THE MARSHALL PLAN AMID THE OMINOUS THUNDER IN FRANCE

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

PARIS, January 9.—Secretary Marshall's statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has made a deep impression on that section of the French opinion which was able to read what he said. Unfortunately, that section is small. The highlights of the address were featured in Paris newspapers and helped reinforce Premier Schuman's argument before the Assembly last week when he asked how Americans could be expected to make sacrifices to help France if the French were not ready to take painful measures to help themselves. Less emphasis has been placed in France than in England on what European recovery will cost

Americans and more on the other side of the picture. A large part of the press is Communist controlled and keeps telling its readers day after day that American aid means American domination, that America seeks to use France as a battleground in the war against Russia.

Some of the propaganda is bound to stick. It is hard for Americans to realize the effect of this constant barrage on the confused and weary mind of Europe. With every weapon short of guns, Moscow is waging a real war for Europe, and this war is now concentrated on the Marshall plan. Even the secession movement from the CGT, regarded abroad as a defeat for the French Communists, is described by party leaders as a means of getting rid of "unreliables" and forging a surer instrument to carry out instructions. "It isn't a crowd we want," said one frank Communist organizer, "but an army."

ONLY A LULL

No one watching operations here can doubt that the Kremlin is in full accord with Secretary Marshall that "the whole world hangs in the balance." The French see France as the pivot on which the balance turns. They think the fight on the Marshall plan is concentrated in France.

Let no one imagine that the Communist failure in November or the grudging vote of confidence in the Schuman government means more than a lull in the Communist campaign. Already both the middle class and the peasants are in revolt against the new tax program. Communists are closing up ranks and stirring up the rural population to regain, among the farmers, the ground lost in the industrial centers.

Nothing is settled. The atmosphere is heavy with suspense, breathless and ominous with thunder on the right and left. This is the crucial winter for France and western Europe. The government prepares for another crisis by dividing the country into eight zones, each headed by a high commissioner charged to control the state police in time of emergency. Everybody speaks of trouble in February. The de Gaullists predict that the half measures of the government they call illegitimate will fail to halt inflation and that in a few weeks it will reach the point where the Assembly will be obliged to dissolve and call the elections de Gaulle demands.

They are at one with the Communists in expecting a catastrophe—and doing nothing to prevent it—but are exuberantly confident they have backing enough to take over and deal with it when it comes. Certainly the mystic Cross of Lorraine throws a long shadow over the land, and in the present state of flux, with labor moving and the middle class in a desperate fight to survive, no one can be sure of the final line-up.

THE IMPORTANCE OF UNDERSTANDING

There is no quiet on the western front from Greece to Ireland. The battle might have been lost this winter without the promise of the Marshall plan, but it is very far from being won. Only on the ground can one feel how near the breaking point Europe is and what stamina it takes just to hold the line.

The Marshall statement is welcomed as a sign that Washington understands the critical situation. Americans may think it strange that the comprehension of the complex and desperate nature of their problems means almost as much to the people over here as the material aid they are waiting for. The French especially, too weak and self-absorbed since the war to take the European lead, resent seeing Europe at the mercy of non-European powers. Lately, however, their attitude toward America has changed a little, partly because of the shift in our policy toward France but largely because Mr. Marshall has made occasion to identify us with Europe by referring to it as "the historic base of western civilization of which we are by inheritance an integral part."

There is no question of gratitude, nations are not bound together by loving sentiments but by common aims and common ideas. France, like Britain, pays official tribute to American generosity, but that is about as far as it goes. Our investment in European recovery is regarded everywhere as enviable and envied proof of the power to produce and distribute wealth and, as a grand-scale act of self-preservation. Recipients of our aid envy us most, it should be added, because we have the means to do this.

"The most admirable thing a nation can do," a highly placed French official remarked, "is to devote its resources to carrying out a policy of enlightened self-interest. That is what we think you are doing and what Secretary Marshall announces you are doing when he asks Americans to measure their sacrifices against the alternative. For this perhaps you will not get thanks, but you will command something much better—respect."

General Clay Uses Military Method in Dealing With Charges in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the sixth in the series written by Philip H. Parrish, editor of the Portland Oregonian editorial page, on European problems:

GENERAL CLAY USES MILITARY METHOD IN DEALING WITH CHARGES IN GERMANY

(This is the sixth of a series of articles detailing observations recently made in Europe by Phillip H. Parrish, editor of the Oregonian editorial page. The writer spent 7 weeks in Germany, Austria, France, and England.)

(By Philip H. Parrish, editor, the Oregonian editorial page)

That brings me to a job I would just as soon skip—that of making an estimate on how well our American representatives are doing in actual administrative work in conquered Germany and liberated Austria. The complications are infinite and my study has been limited.

However, I have tried to give a practical glimpse into the lives of the people of Germany's thronged industrial centers as they struggle to keep fed, clothed, and warm enough to survive. Then we have seen something of the other side of the city-country conflict and association—the peasant counting his grains of wheat and cunning lading out his liters of milk to the government collectors. There remains, before we close with the international problems which in the end will decide the whole tumultuous picture, this matter of how proper a job is being done by Gen. Lucius D. Clay in Berlin, Lt. Gen. Geoffrey Keyes in Vienna, and members of their staffs.

Both men appear to have the almost undivided respect of the American personnel on the scene, including the resident American press correspondents. That in itself is a high compliment.

In the case of General Clay, I intend to be cautious of news stories out of Germany in the future, not because he would influence them but because his frankness and friendship has made the correspondents his partisans. Then General Keyes is particularly beloved as well as respected.

NATIVES FEAR CLAY

On the other hand, General Clay gives an entirely different impression to the Germans. When he rises before the Laenderrat—the joint German governmental council in our zone—or before any other German group, he is stern and unsmiling. I inquired of every German I met along the way, and all fear him. His edict that they must work harder if they intend to eat more bothered them particularly, since they profess they do not know where they could work that would give them more food. Perhaps General Clay is right in maintaining the severe mien. It is the universal judgment that Germans are inclined to cry over themselves, more so if encouraged, and that the only way to stop them is to be strictly military.

Anyhow, that is the policy, with a history that goes back to General Dahlberg's mistake in breaking a chicken wing with the late Herman Goering, and to the strict orders against fraternizing issued when the fighting stopped. It has the drawback of keeping our American officer personnel decidedly naive concerning the people they are overseeing and trying to reform, but it prevents the corruption and break-down which could come with unlimited fraternizing and unlimited sympathy. I am simply reporting that General Clay still practices austerity with the Germans and that his example is official for our forces, though with decreasing effectiveness down through the grades.

And that leads into the great paradox now existing. Though we still maintain the stern attitude of the military conqueror, that is no longer our actual practice. We don't give orders any more, except in extreme cases. Last year's elections were held throughout our zone of Germany, and governments were set up, under appropriate constitutions, in the states of the zone—Bavaria, Wuerttemberg-Baden, and Greater Hesse.

LOCALS GET POWER

Then we passed virtually all powers of government back to the Germans with the admonition:

"We will tap you on the shoulder when we don't like what you are doing."

Personally I don't like a lot the Germans have been doing—and more specifically what they haven't been doing—but I don't find much tapping on the shoulder.

What has happened is the clearest possible proof that the political forms of democracy as we know them, such as regular elections and city, county, and state governments, are forms only. They are meaningless unless they spring from an inner understanding and determination on the part of the people. There must be democracy in education, religion, economics, and in legal procedure as well. There must be adherence to the bill of rights—freedom of speech, press, conscience, and public assembly. Without these the political forms are valueless to the people, and only serve as tools for the ambitious.

That is how affairs threaten to turn out in Germany.

We gave them political democracy eagerly and with the best of intentions—told them to run affairs for themselves.

REFORM LACKING

But we did this without reforming the offensively aristocratic educational system, without exacting concessions from the Catholic forces so powerful in the south or the Protestant forces so strong in the north, without breaking down the Schachtianism (after Herr Schacht, the economic dictator) which reduces all German economic life to government order, without reworking the government-controlled courts, without making certain of the survival of a free press—without, indeed, bothering about a lot of detail that looms overwhelming in retrospect.

Enjoying self-government, and not understanding the reforms suggested to them, the Germans bow their Bavarian or Swabian necks and procrastinate or refuse.

Take education, the United States has made just one great contribution to world educational practices—the common public school in which every child is supposed to have his chance on a basis of equality. (In spite of the modified aristocratic system in Britain, the people of the United States believe the common school to be a fundamental of democracy.) Yet, we apparently have let slip all chance of getting it accepted in Germany, and Germany has a system which, though dramatically successful with chosen individuals, is the absolute negation of democracy.

FAVORITES GET BEST

In Germany the method is to separate the "begabten" (gifted) from the "unbegabten" (ungifted), at the end of the fourth year. In practice the 10 percent named as gifted never fails to include most of the children of the privileged. The 10 percent goes to separate schools and are trained through the thirteenth year in preparation for the universities. The 90 percent designated at the tender age of 9 or 10 as ungifted are herded into the "volkschule" (people's schools), and their subordinate lot in life can never be changed.

The volkschule proper ends with the eighth grade, at which time the pupil, boy or girl, must choose a life's work. He or she ordinarily enters an apprenticeship, and attends a manual training or home economics school 1 day a week for 3 years. Then the boy—suppose he was apprenticed to a mason—could become a journeyman. After 2 or 3 years as journeyman, he could return to school and become a master. Then after another spell of work, perhaps when he was 30, he could take an examination to enter school a final time and become as good an engineer as anyone—but never socially or in the eyes of the German caste system.

EDUCATOR WORRIED

In Wuerttemberg-Baden, which is typical, the "hoehere"—the high schools for the gifted—have one teacher to 33 pupils even now, and nearly all men. The people's schools have around 75 to the teacher, the latter being more than half women. The high-school teachers do not recognize the people's teachers socially.

Admittedly such schools have been responsible for some of the greatest achievements in modern education; admittedly, also, they have supported the most ruthless military system of the modern world.

At our briefings at Berlin we found Prof. Thomas Alexander, of Columbia University, shaking his leonine locks and declaring:

"We did not get this system reformed before we gave the Germans governmental power, and now they are doing everything to prevent reform. But they will be reformed or I'll not remain on this job."

In which case, apparently, Professor Alexander probably will not remain.

In Bavaria, Dr. Alois Hundhammer, the bewhiskered minister of education, backed by the church, has defied the military government and made himself the most popular figure in Bavarian politics. If he were overridden on the educational issue, the Bavarians probably would make him minister-president. In Wurttemberg-Baden and in Hesse the educational ministers have given tentative promises, but only to the extent that the common school training would continue to the end of the sixth instead of the fourth grade. What a way to give democracy to Germany.

"Well, what would you do at this stage?" I was asked by my old friend Payne Templeton, who has the M. G. assignment with the Wuerttemberg-Badden schools. (We squired the girls and climbed mountains together at the University of Montana thirty-odd years ago.)

STATE RULES PRESS

I had to wash my hands of it: "Maybe it is too late. Maybe the whole idea of organizing Germany democratically has gone to the devil, now that we no longer order but only give advice."

And maybe it has.

For example, in the matter of a free press, without which popular government cannot work, General Clay, and before him General McNarney, took creative steps in this direction. They sifted all applicants and granted licenses to those who looked acceptable. Every available pound of paper is going into this press today, and General Clay scrupulously encourages true freedom of expression. But since restoration of government powers to the Germans, he also has felt he should not interfere on behalf of the press.

With what results?

Virtually every mayor in Germany has set up a press office which passes on the credentials and ration applications of members of the press. Does a publisher need a typewriter or writing paper or an allotment of gasoline for his deliveries? The mayor's press bureau must write "O. K." Those who criticize get nothing.

We met with a group of these newspapermen at Stuttgart and another at Frankfort.

They told us: "We are starving. We get the minimum of food allotment of 1550 calories a day, when many classes of workers who do not work so hard have been granted more; if we work overtime, it does not matter. But it matters for all others. It is only us who are not recognized * * *. Also, it is difficult when German newspapermen from the Russian zone come down and show their cards granting extra rations."

HUNGER RAMPANT

The situation is quite simple: We have set up a free press in Germany, and invited it to review the governments in the American manner. But we have left to the governments the power of life and death over the press and the individuals conducting it. I don't believe this press could exist even a few months after American removal. I remember too well the weazened young man who leaned across the table at Stuttgart and said:

"I am down to 94 pounds."

He looked as though a pound of beefsteak would be about the price of his corruption.

And so on through most of the social reforms should, I am convinced, have been firmly established before the granting of political power.

But enough for now. There only remains space to say, much too sketchily, that the failures in the democratization of Germany appear to be due in large part to the concern of military government with the more urgent economic conditions. From General Clay down one hears one or another version of the idea that it is no use to talk democracy while people are so hungry. I don't agree with that entirely. The fellows at Valley Forge were not well fed. But it all depends on how one happens to get hungry.

WEATHER IMPEDES

In any event, the first order of business in Germany—right or wrong—has been to get the shattered economy in operation again, and in this respect General Clay and his staff have performed well, in spite of the conspiracy of nature in the form of storm and drought, and the occasional slowness of supplies from home.

A year ago, just when the economic merger of the American and British zones was going into effect, the Continent found itself in swirling storms and the lowest temperatures of a century. Then this summer, at the opposite extreme, all precipitation stopped and the rivers fell lower and lower. The barges which carry much of the heavy traffic up and down the Rhine and its tributaries, particularly the coal from the Ruhr to the steel mills of the upper river and for distribution throughout upper Germany, had to be tied up. Most of them were still tied up when I was there. At Duisburg were great idle rows of them. And in turn this failure of the barges broke down the 30 percent of rolling stock which remains on the railroads.

Yet in spite of all this the American and British merger has had results, and largely, I think, through American impatience and determination.

HOPE POSSIBLE

Industrial production, including mining and power, dropped to a low of 28 percent of 1936 in February 1947. In December, 3 weeks ago, it was up to 42 percent. And industrial employment is up to almost 90 percent of 1936—meaning that adequate recovery is merely a matter of supplies and of more efficient work.

This is in large part the achievement of American M. G. and against remarkable difficulties—against difficulties of "bad food, bad money, bad government, and bad transport."

Something will have to be done about the "bad money" if the Germans are to be made to work hard, but now that a firmer western Germany is proposed, with the French to be taken in if possible, we can look for drastic action in regard to the currency. And with that, if it sticks, I don't see why western Germany shouldn't be able to get along.

Dairy Interests Not Responsible for the 10-cent Tax on Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under date of December 18 Senator FULBRIGHT served notice of his intention to introduce a resolution for the rescinding of all Federal taxes and license fees on the manufacture, coloring, and sale of oleomargarine.

No doubt the Senator is prompted to make this move due to the very high price of butter prevailing today. Those of us who are familiar with the long history of butter and its various problems will recall that all too many years has butter been selling at a price much below its true value. There has been a constant conflict between the farmers of the United States who produce butter and the organized interests of oleomargarine. And the effort has been made to lead the American people to believe that the taxes that have been placed on oleomargarine are restrictive, and a great deal of argument is made because certain conditions have been provided to prevent them from the coloring of oleomargarine to make it appear like butter.

I introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my remarks a comprehensive and very intelligent letter addressed to me on this subject from the distinguished dairy commissioner of the

State of North Dakota, William J. Murphy:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE AND LABOR,
Bismarck, N. Dak., January 5, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I realize that you will be especially busy during this session of Congress due to the fact that there are so many important problems which will be presented to you for action. However, I would like to bring to your attention and solicit your support in opposition to a bill which Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas will introduce in the Senate during this session.

Senator FULBRIGHT served notice on the Senate floor December 18, 1947, as recorded on pages 11590, 11592 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of his intent to introduce a resolution calling for the rescinding of all Federal taxes and license fees on the manufacture, coloring, and sale of oleomargarine.

The propaganda, as put out by the oleo interests, would lead the consumers to believe that there are restrictive taxes on all oleomargarine sold. This is not true. When oleomargarine is sold in its natural color, which is white, there is a Federal tax of only one-quarter of a cent per pound and I believe you will agree with me when I state that this tax does not in any way affect the retail price of the product. All of their propaganda against restrictive licenses and taxes is nothing more than window dressing for their main objective, which is to repeal the provision of the law which compels them to pay a 10-cent Federal tax on oleomargarine when colored yellow to resemble butter.

They would also lead the people to believe that large dairy interests are responsible for this 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine and again this statement is not true. Under the regulations issued by the Federal Security Commission at the time Paul McNutt was director, manufacturers of oleomargarine are allowed to add diacetyl to their product and, as diacetyl is a natural flavor in butter, the addition of this flavor in chemical form results in oleomargarine which has an aroma and flavor similar to butter. They also churn this product in skim milk, which further adds to its butter aroma and flavor. The result is that the only protection the consumers of the United States now have against the fraudulent sale of oleomargarine as butter is the 10-cent tax per pound on the product when colored.

This fight between the dairy interests and the oleomargarine manufacturers is not alone conducted to protect the dairy farmers as the consumers are also vitally interested in receiving a product when purchased which is easily distinguishable for what it is. As you know, yellow is the natural color of butter and all butter made, regardless of time of year or type of feed fed to the cows, contains the yellow color in varying degrees according to carotene content of the feed consumed by the cow.

The dairy farmers in North Dakota have a vital interest in the defeat of this proposed bill due to the fact that North Dakota, with over 50,000,000 pounds last year, is seventh among the States of the Nation in butter production. Our consumers should also be concerned, as when they purchase a pound of butter, they should know that they are getting butter instead of oleomargarine.

If this tax on colored oleomargarine is repealed and the enforcement of this law is taken out of the hands of the Internal Revenue Department, consumers of the Nation will have very little protection against the fraudulent sale of this product. The Federal Food and Drug Administration, the agency responsible for the correct labeling of products, does not have any jurisdiction over products in intrastate commerce and it would be a simple matter for the oleo manufacturers to set up plants to color and print this product and market it within the State where such plant is set up. The only law-enforcement agencies we would have to protect the consumers would be the State agencies and without licensing provisions it would be almost impossible to detect and prosecute the violators. I don't believe anyone holding a responsible position in the dairy industry has any objection to the consumers purchasing oleomargarine, but all of us would like to see to it that these consumers are aware of the fact that they are purchasing oleomargarine.

I am enclosing a booklet which is put out by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation which contains the history of six actual cases on the fraudulent sale of colored oleomargarine as butter. I call your attention particularly to the information contained on the second page, which I have marked in red, which is definite proof that even the oleomargarine manufacturers themselves were not able to determine the difference between this colored product and butter, as they themselves purchased some of this fraudulent product as butter.

This issue is, in my opinion, so important to the consumers of our Nation that I believe every effort should be made to bring out the facts during the committee hearings and on the floor of Congress so that the people of the Nation will get a true picture of what this fight is all about.

In my opinion it is imperative that the 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine be retained, not only for the protection of the dairy industry, but also to protect the consumers of the Nation against the fraudulent sale of oleomargarine as butter.

Respectfully,

WM. J. MURPHY,
Dairy Commissioner.

Montana Is Proud of the Butte High-School Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor at this time to tell the House about the Butte high-school band. I want the membership to know how proud I am of these boys and girls; their director, Henry Schiesser; and the friends who made it possible for them to participate in the Tournament of Roses at Pasadena, Calif., where they stole the show. I know I speak for the city and the State of Montana when I say I am proud of them, and I want to congratulate every single one of them for their fine performances in Salt Lake; Las Vegas, Nev.; and Pasadena. They are a credit to their school, their city, and their county. They are carrying on the traditions which have always made Butte famous and its people so outstanding.

Montana can boast of its mines, farms, and scenery, but these boys and girls are the resources which we treasure the most. To all of them I want to say "Good luck in the future" and for their performances in Montana, Utah, Nevada, and California a very well deserved "Well done."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD articles from the Butte (Mont.) Standard of January 5 and 6, and from Missoula Sportlite of January 8, 1948:

BUTTE HIGH BAND GETS ROARING WELCOME ON RETURN—MORE THAN 10,000 PERSONS TURN OUT TO GREET YOUNGSTERS AND TELL THEM "WELL DONE" FOR PERFORMANCES

More than 10,000 Butte residents started out Sunday afternoon to give its now nationally famous Butte High School Band an ear-splitting welcome. The band, on a 6-day special train tour of Utah, Nevada, and California, brought the mining city Nation-wide publicity of incredible magnitude.

The Union Pacific station was jam packed when the 12-car special train arrived, and hundreds lined Arizona street leading from the depot to the uptown district. Due to weather conditions, and the fact the boys and girls were dead tired, a parade uptown from the depot was dispensed with, the parade forming instead at the Finlen Hotel and then traversing several blocks of the business district before disbanding at the high school.

The huge throng paid tribute to the accomplishment of the band in being denoted the outstanding band in the Tournament of Roses parade in Pasadena on New Year's Day, a spectacle viewed by more than 1,500,000 persons. It was perhaps the noisest reception staged here since the late William Jennings Bryan came to Butte.

The crowd, which lined Arizona street from the depot to Broadway, quickly moved to the uptown area when word was passed along that the parade would form in the business district. City police officers working under Police Chief Bart Riley and Capt. Emmet Sullivan, and State highway patrolmen under direction of Capt. L. E. Black, ably handled the traffic, however, and there was no congestion although thousands of cars traversed the streets both before and after the parade.

Henry Schiesser and his young musicians, Mrs. Schiesser and the twirling groups, thrilled by the hearty welcome, and despite the fact they just Saturday performed in Las Vegas where shirtsleeves are the vogue rather than overcoats, put on a great homecoming show. They displayed the marching technique and peppery playing which won the top honors at Pasadena, and the applause of thousands in Salt Lake City and Las Vegas.

At Park and Main Streets they staged a 15-minute concert, playing their repertoire of selections which thrilled thousands at the Town and Public Market in Los Angeles, at Union Station in the same city, on Salt Lake's busiest street intersection and before thousands in Las Vegas.

During its uptown concert the band played California, Here I Come, the Victors, in compliment to the University of Michigan; which endeavored, but to no avail to have the band play in the Rose Bowl, the Notre Dame Victory March, in honor of boys and girls central high schools, their own school song, On, Butte High School, and as concluding number, Thanks for the Memories. This last was dedicated by the band to the residents of Butte and of other cities in the State, who made possible through contribution of $25,000 the band's trek.

The special train's arrival in Butte was approximately 2 hours behind schedule due to the fact that the tremendous reception in Las Vegas on Saturday, followed by a sightseeing trip to Hoover Dam, ran over the allotted time in that hospitable city.

The band's welcome home really started at Dillon where residents of Beaverhead County gathered on a rain-swept station platform to cheer as the train went through that community.

On board the special as it neared Butte the youngsters and adults aboard held a birthday party in honor of Jackie Perry, 18-year-old twirler, then held an Auld Lang Syne reception.

Band director Schiesser presided and introduced Eddie Price, chairman of the arrangements committee, who was given a fine ovation for his work. Price, in turn, complimented Mayor Barry O'Leary for his participation on the trip, with the mayor also receiving a big hand from the band group. Principal George Haney praised the boys and girls for their fine work in publicizing Butte, saying:

"In my 20 years of school work I have never been prouder of any group of boys and girls. Your discipline has been perfect. You are to be highly complimented for your splendid success."

Director and Mrs. Schiesser were given rousing cheers when praised for their superb direction.

J. D. Ford, agent for the Union Pacific, who made the entire trip with the group, and the various railroad and pullman company employees all came in for their share of appreciation.

But, it was not all one-sided. The band and Butte party in general were likewise recipients of compliments from the railroaders. One of the nicest tributes paid the band was a written statement read during the reception. It was signed by L. L. Young and George W. Price, representing the dining and pullman car attendants and read as follows:

"As members of the crew we wish to congratulate a wonderful group of people, and also a well-behaved group of children from Butte, Mont."

Followed cutting of a birthday cake for Twirler Perry and the band assembled in their respective car units to await departure from the train. The honking of automobile horns by cars parked along the railroad tracks from the station to Montana street was the first inkling the youngsters had of the reception awaiting them here.

After disbanding at the high school following the parade, the boys and girls were taken to their homes by their parents or in cars provided through efforts of John E. Corette, Jr., who with Carl G. Rowan and Ed DeGeorge served as aides to Chairman Price during the trip.

The youngsters did a great job of publicizing Butte. They had one major disappointment. They did not play in the Rose Bowl as they had been previously invited to do.

The reason is not difficult to understand by anyone who watched them perform on arrival in Los Angeles. The reason given by the University of Southern California, which opposed the plan, was that it would set a precedent if high schools were permitted to play at the Rose Bowl game, and that press of time would not permit such an appearance. This announcement was made on the afternoon of December 31 or less than 24 hours before game time.

But, they're the toast of the Tournament of Roses parade, Los Angeles proper, Salt Lake City, and Las Vegas. And, as good-will ambassadors they did a wonderful job. Here's an example:

Chief of Police R. F. Malburg, of Las Vegas, said after the band's performance there:

"This is the finest thing that has ever happened here. I want Butte residents to know that we of Las Vegas feel indebted to them and that if at any time a Butte resident lands at the Las Vegas airport and is unable to secure immediate transportation to the city he or she is to call police headquarters. From today on there'll be a standing order at the station to care for Butte people here in that manner."

BUTTE HIGH BAND MEMBERS CHEERED FOR MICHIGAN IN ROSE BOWL

Thanks for the Memories, a hit selection of the Butte high-school band from Salt Lake City on through its Los Angeles and Pasadena appearances, was played by the mining city pageantry musicians as they boarded their special train at Los Angeles for the trip home.

And the Butte youngsters brought many memories back to the mining city. Memories of a great ovation in the traditional Tournament of Roses parade in Pasadena overshadow all the rest. They brought factual souvenirs of their musical triumph in that renowned spectacle in pictures and print. Los Angeles papers were generous in their praise of the showing made by the group. The Los Angeles Times carried a four-column picture of the band and in an accompanying story told of the cheering that greeted the group as it swung smartly down Colorado Boulevard in Pasadena. "Butte was repaid for having raised $26,000 to enter the band in the Tournament of Roses parade by the cheers the band received," the Times said. "The Butte high band marched, and how," was comment of the Los Angeles Herald Express.

Discipline of the band on the trip was superb. Aside from splendid response to signals during its marching and playing, a tribute to the work of Director Henry Schiesser and the ability of Majorette Jean Ann Fisher, the band readily responded to directives of Principal George Haney, and to members of the chaperon group. All adults in the party were impressed with the fine manner in which the band conducted itself all along the line, and this behavior, as much as its great showmanship, was a boost for Butte wherever the group made a public appearance.

Among tributes to the band was one received from Ed Allen, chairman of the Tournament of Roses publicity committee, who said:

"I have never seen a finer high-school band or a group of boys and girls who conducted themselves in such orderly manner."

Gen. Omar Bradley recalled with pleasure his associations with mining city residents during the time he was stationed in Butte, as captain of an infantry unit during World War I. He extended his New Year's greeting to Butte through Mayor Barry O'Leary, Eddie Price, chairman of the general arrangements committee; and Principal George Haney, when the Butte group met the Army Chief of Staff at a luncheon held Thursday at the Brookside Country Club.

Jack Meyers was the only casualty on the trip to the *Helena*. He lost a shoe while clambering up the gangplank. Efforts of seamen in the motor launch to recover the shoe from Long Beach Sound were fruitless.

The University of Michigan band is probably the finest playing and marching collegiate organization in the country. It is, however, a different type of band than that boasted by Butte, in that the mining-city musicians are more noted for pageantry and intricate maneuvering. The Michigan band marches with military-like precision, using a high-step cadence of 180, or 60 over the normal marching time. The Butte band members were deeply impressed by the Wolverines' musical group's appearance in the bowl.

Slick, in their snazzy purple and white uniforms and twirling costumes, the mining city kids were prominent at the bowl in that they led a Michigan rooting section just west of the press box. Three Michigan cheer leaders, quick to take advantage of the Butte group's favoritism for Michigan, led them in cheers.

Fully 2,000 persons heard the final performance of the band played in Los Angeles. The boys and girls, tired as they were, gave another sparkling exhibition of their skill on the Union station patio just before boarding the train. The assemblage included scores from all parts of the Nation who were awaiting departure on the numerous trains leaving California's Gotham. Director Henry Schelsser had planned using only a few numbers on the departure program but was forced to use almost every selection in the repertoire as the crowd shouted, "more, more, more."

John E. Corette, Jr., was not an official entry in the Tournament of Roses parade but he marched nevertheless. Mr. Corette followed along in the wake of the band and garnered comments of hundreds of spectators.

"It was one continuous ovation for the 14 blocks I hiked," the vice president of the Montana Power Co. said.

Maurice Cantion, chief of police of RKO-Pathe, Culver City, and formerly of Butte, was the recipient of the heartfelt thanks of the entire Butte party. Cantion, on New Year's eve, took uniforms of the entire band to the RKO cleaning plant, and through cooperation of that picture company, had the outfits cleaned and pressed for the New Year's day performance at Pasadena. Sgt. Jimmy Cook of the RKO police staff took over the obligation of returning the uniforms to the special train. He brought them back at 4 a. m. New Year's morning.

Johnny Crowley, one-time Kalispell resident, now chief of the fire department of Culver City, was another big help. Johnny provided transportation to and from the Alameda street station for members of the Butte party and also to points along the band's sight-seeing tours.

Sheriff E. W. Biscoilu of Los Angeles County provided a 24-hour guard for the special train while it was stationed in Los Angeles.

Jimmy Trucano, Butte high, '22, was among the receptionists at Twentieth Century Fox Studios in Beverly Hills. Jimmy, who played with such Purple and White football stars as Tom Walsh, Tom Grady, "Chappy" Chapman, and the late "Shoes" O'Connor, is employed at the studio. He had previously informed his associates of the splendor of the band, and the boys and girls, playing on a lawn before a mansion set used in "Foxes of Harrow," didn't let him down. Carpenters, electricians, gardners, camera men and extras, all took time out to watch filming of the group for Fox Movietone News.

Elliot Levy, former Butte resident, now living in Las Vegas, cried as the band staged its stirring concert at Fremont and Second in Las Vegas. "Haven't wept for 10 years," he said, "but I'm so proud of those kids. They'll be the talk of Las Vegas for a long time."

A beautiful girl on a sleek, black horse, trailed the parade leaving the Las Vegas station. On the counter march she headed the show.

"We don't know who she is," R. W. Elkins of the Junior Chamber of Commerce said, "she wasn't invited to take part but she's doing a fine job of it."

A LOT OF PEOPLE GET A DIFFERENT SLANT ON BUTTE

We have an idea that millions of citizens from all parts of the Nation have a totally different notion of Butte, Mont., the richest hill on earth, after having seen the Butte high-school band perform during its week-long invasion of metropolitan areas from here to the Southwest coast and back again. The fact that Butte is rich not only in metal deposits but rich, as well, in the finer things of life may have come as a distinct surprise

to many people whose only impression of the mining city had been acquired from reading an almost continuous flow of magazine articles and books over a long period of years.

Of course, the mere fact that writers of national reputation had found Butte interesting copy may have indicated to the more discerning readers that people of Butte and the city itself possessed a much more substantial quality that the scribes had been willing to admit in their articles and their books.

The appearance of as fine a high-school band as exists anywhere in the Nation before the eyes of millions of people in Salt Lake City, Los Angeles, Pasadena, Las Vegas, and at way points thus has served to present the city of Butte in a light which has not been possible heretofore.

Butte citizens staunchly maintain that the old mining city has character. That it has color, traditions, unique local customs, ideals, ambitions, and all the other ingredients which go to make up a metropolitan community goes without saying. It is the peculiar mixture of all the various ingredients of a person or a community which add up to the one significant thing called character.

And the Butte high-school band stands today, as a result of its invasion of a broad outlying area, as a representative of the true character of Butte.

From all quarters have come the highest praise of the precise marching, maneuvering and playing of the Butte high band. Its being voted the outstanding band in the Tournament of Roses parade is testimony of this.

But perhaps much more significant is the fact that also from every quarter has come the highest praise of the fine young men and women comprising the band, their excellent behavior and discipline everywhere and their well-groomed, fresh, and wholesome appearance.

This, as the saying goes, is the pay-off.

Butte and all Montana may boast about production of the finest metals, crops, livestock, lumber and other materials. But all this is secondary. It's the young people that count.

The people of Butte and of all Montana doubtlessly were paying an unconscious tribute to the youngsters when they chipped in $26,000 to send the Butte high-school band to the Tournament of Roses. The money may be considered as having been repaid with tremendous interest already. The dividends will continue to roll in for years.

As for the youngsters themselves, they will have their memories. They said thanks Sunday afternoon in a demonstration at Park and Main.

[From the Sportlite of January 8, 1948]

BUTTE'S BAND LAUDED

This piece could be written in the hat's-off column, but it would be a bit late, inasmuch as a couple million Californians already have been lavish in their praise for the now nationally famous Butte (Mont.) High School Band.

Besides, it is no secret to all of Montana today that the 136-piece prep band from the mining city and its capable director, H. J. Schiesser, are the toasts of the Treasure State for their magnificent showing in the recent Tournament of Roses parade at Pasadena, Calif. Thousands upon thousands of spectators cheered Butte's marching musicians who occupied the No. 1 spot in the colorful pageant on Colorado Avenue, and with every step taken by the Butte boys and girls it brought acclaim to the mining city and all of Montana.

QUINN QUOTES

Frank Quinn, veteran newspaperman with the Butte Daily Post, who accompanied the band to California, proved adept at prying information out of celebrities. The roving reporter derived speeches from governors, admirals, colonels, prominent businessmen—all of whom extolled the merits of Butte's musical organization.

Perhaps most notable of the praise for the "note makers" came from California's Gov. Earl Warren. He said:

"I think it was a splendid thing for the people of Butte to join together in sending the Butte high-school band to the Tournament of Roses. I know that these splendid boys and girls will enjoy their visit to Pasadena and their presence was most welcome. It is a grand organization."

In their flashy uniforms, the Butte youngsters performed an intricate routine with perfect precision, putting personality, cheer, and color into every step, every note. As writer Quinn put it: "The mining city—in fact, all of Montana—can be justly proud of the flashy performance of these youngsters."

To us the showing of the Butte band symbolizes the paramount item that has stood out for years and years in the mining city's athletic teams—competitive spirit. The music-minded boys and girls gave it that extra "oomph" which brought their efforts higher and into more prominence than if they had just gone through the motions.

California's papers splashed stories, features, and pictures of the Butte band and all comment was favorable toward the Montana music delegation. To the California writers the band had much more luster than the University of South California football team, which certainly hit a few sour notes on that memorable Thursday afternoon.

Bombs, Bonds, and Burdens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, a copy of the radio speech made by me over NBC, January 9, 1948.

The two atomic bombs which, 29 months ago, brought victory in Japan, cost a billion dollars each to produce.

If the billions we spent to win World War II had all been used to buy atom bombs at this price, this Nation would have made 331 such bombs during the years from 1941 to 1945.

And if, after World War II, this country had been permitted to destroy, as a safety measure, only those atom bombs it had paid for in cash, it would still have on hand 180 bombs liable to explode at any minute. It would be forced to use any available means to prevent such an explosion—a blast of such magnitude that it would certainly wreck the United States as a nation.

We are, of course, in no present danger of an atomic explosion of this size. But we do have a public debt of $256,000,000,000 (and 180 of these billions stem directly from the money cost of World War II). Each of these billions can, unless systematically paid, cause a fiscal explosion as destroying to property as the impact of an atomic bomb.

Our Government can liquidate this war-created obligation if it chooses. For example, it could repudiate it through a method recently used by the Soviet Union; it could declare that the two hundred and fifty-six billions it now owes as a result of World War II will henceforth be worth only eighty-five billions. In other words, it could say, "Instead of waiting for all of our debt to explode, let's explode two-thirds of it right now." The price of any experiment of this type is, of course, a rigid dictatorship; and no American Government is, as yet, openly willing to pay this price.

But what the Truman administration would not dare attempt with an atomic push-button, it is perfectly willing to risk with a slow-burning torch.

It has not, and will not, resort to open repudiation—it will not explode all at once most of our bomb-laden war debt. But it has openly sought to minimize the burden of our war debt by resorting to inflation. When the cost of this inflation, in high debt, high taxes, and high prices brings protests from voters, the Democratic Party does not offer to end inflation; it simply offers to use inflation for its own ends by establishing an economic dictatorship in Washington. Faced with the necessity of increasing production, it prefers to ration scarcity.

This is the administration which told us after VJ-day that the United States should have a $30,000,000,000 budget, a national income of $130,000,000,000, and a permanent debt of $260,000,000,000. More than 2 years later, it is firmly addicted to huge budgets that involve from three to six billions of unnecessary, and, therefore, inflationary spending. This policy has boosted the national income to two hundred billions. If the administration does not curb its own spending, it will boost the 1948 national income to an inflationary high of $230,000,000,000—and each one of these dollars will have a purchasing power of 45 cents. At this pace, we shall be assured within the next 4 years that a per capita debt of $1,600 won't matter because it will be balanced by a per capita income of twenty-one hundred. These dollars, however, will have only a purchasing power of 25 cents. We shall also be told that an interest burden of $6,000,000,000 is only 2 percent of our national income, and is, therefore, of no particular consequence.

But, to redeem our present, tremendous debt, we need not hold to the administration's plan of accomplishing through a creeping inflation what we would not dare attempt through a Soviet-style repudiation. We are not faced with the unpleasant alternatives of destroying our debt burden through an explosive repudiation of consuming it with the slow fire of inflation. Properly harnessed, the material which produces an atomic explosion will yield beneficial atomic power. Properly harnessed, our explosive national debt can give us the power to find and retain peace and prosperity.

Of our present public debt, one-fifth is held in United States savings bonds by individuals. About one-eighth is owed by the United States Treasury to agencies of the United States Government or of the United Nations. Roughly, one-third of our total debt may be counted an asset rather than a liability. But the remaining two-thirds constitutes a potent and continuing threat to our prosperity unless properly handled through a program of steady and consistent debt reduction. These marketable billions—which can be sold for cash at the discretion of their owners—are the economic bombs which must be transformed into power plants during the next 20 years, if this Nation is to preserve its prosperity.

Of this vast sum, $47,000,000,000 is in low-interest debt, subject to annual redemption or renewal. The remaining $113,000,000,000 is held, however, in high-interest bonds; and these bonds, unless they are paid off as they fall due, must be renewed for periods of as long as 20 years. In other words, they will become a liability of the next generation; and since it is human nature to pay only those debts which are incurred for one's own benefit, to renew a bond issue on such long-range terms, is to create perpetual debt at a high rate of interest.

This is the path which the Truman administration is now relentlessly pursuing. While insisting that taxes be maintained at their present level to reduce the public debt, it proposes a tax-reduction measure which, through its rigid forty-dollar credit, regardless of income, would manage to increase food prices and discourage food production. The administration which would now penalize corporations for prosperity is also the administration which, in 1945, willingly reduced tax rates on corporations. Through forty billion dollar budgets, Mr. Truman boosts inflation. At the end of each year, many departments have large, unspent funds which tax even the skills of money-mad bureaucrats. These scientific spenders do a good job, however, in tossing these surpluses out of Washington windows at the end of each year, in the hope that the Treasury will not be unduly rich with unspent funds. These wasted sums are sufficient to solve most of our current debt problems.

The administration has been forced to this costly measure by its own uninhibited extravagance. It refuses to save money for debt reduction by curtailing Government spending; it seeks, rather, to curb your spending and mine through high taxes, rationing, and price control. It realizes, as I have suggested in a bill now before the Congress, that we must set aside $10,000,000,000 each year to pay the interest and principal of our national debt. But it contributes not 1 cent to this debt-reduction fund through its own efforts, even though a vigorous savings program might yield $9,000,000,000 during the next 18 months at no cost to the taxpayer. Its program remains the notorious "spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect" of the threadbare thirties.

Foreign aid, debt reduction, and tax reduction are not conflicting aims, although the administration is apparently willing to spend our last dollar to prove they are. Each of these aims can be made to help the other. In fact, if they are not made to work together, there is grave danger that each aim will fail separately. Properly administered, foreign aid will stimulate production and substitute useful goods for virtually worthless foreign currency. Properly administered, a planned debt reduction of five billions each year will trim Government costs, safeguard our savings, and release for private investment and production, money now kept idle in explosive Government bonds. Properly carried out, tax reduction can stem inflation by heading off demands for wage increases and improve our standard of living by encouraging production.

Through its present policies of unchecked spending, high taxes, and rising high debt costs, the Truman administration is bound to assure prosperity for bureaucrats by increasing, beyond all present limits, the burdens on all other Americans. By channeling into more constructive efforts, the energies it now wastes through inflationary spending, the administration could redeem our bonds, curb our tax and cost-of-living burdens, and forestall the chance that bombs will fall in another great war during this generation.

"We Are Overextended"—Lippmann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a pointed editorial by Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post. He points out the danger that exists at the present time in this matter of foreign aid and inflation:

WE ARE OVEREXTENDED

Never more than in the next 6 months while Congress is in session will so much depend on whether practical judgment is to be the master of our fears and our wishes. Practical judgment is first of all the act of comparing what this country can do with what if it were not opposed, or if it were omnipotent, it would be desirable to do. It will be obvious that it is impossible to do everything for which a strong, even a compelling, case can be made. Practical judgment then consists in choosing to what ends the available limited means shall be applied.

It is the principles of practical judgment which distinguish common sense from hysteria, and statesmanship from agitation, and national commitments which can be realized from entanglements which end in bankruptcy.

The necessity for practical judgment confronts us now because the claims upon our resources, our military power, influence, and competence are now excessive. They cannot all be met. The total will have to be reduced. The question as a matter of fact will be whether the total claims are to be reduced crudely and without a plan by Mr. TAFT and Mr. TAEPER, who will look at the budget but not at the high national interest, or whether they will be reduced by selection on the considered decision of Mr. Marshall, Mr. Forrestal, Mr. Snyder, and Mr. Harriman.

I think it is fair to name these four principal Cabinet officers as the men who must in agreement make the decisions, with the President's approval, which will bring into balance our responsibilities and our over-all resources, our commitments and our power, our means and our ends.

The limiting factor in making this decision is that the productive capacity of this country is now fully employed and cannot be expanded very much very rapidly. In the primary components of national wealth, in food, in raw materials, in steel, and in transportation, there is, of course, room for greater efficiency, harder work, better management, and productive investment. But for the practical purposes of those who make national policy the net improvement possible quickly is negligible as compared with the immense totals. There is not now, as there was in 1940, a very large reserve of unused facilities and unemployed labor.

Against these inelastic resources we must measure the claims. First and foremost are the huge deferred claims, the unspent purchasing power, accumulated by individuals and corporations during the war. This is the domestic inflation. It is, moreover, of a kind which is creating more inflation, and could potentially through the expansion of bank credit create almost unlimited inflation. If this inflation is not checked drastically and resolutely by taxation, a budgetary surplus, and by monetary restriction, it can devour all the means which we must find to maintain our military security and to support our foreign policy.

If the Democrats and the Republicans cannot agree on an anti-inflationary policy, the Kremlin will not have miscalculated when it holds that a domestic crisis in the United States will change the world situation in their favor. But the Democrats and the Republicans will not agree, and the real issue will be lost in cheap politics, if the Administration does not concentrate its effort on checking the cause of inflation rather than on demagogic palliatives to deal with the high prices which are only the effects of inflation.

The inflated claims of American consumers and of American business enterprise upon our limited resources are in competition with many other claims. The two principal ones come from the armed forces and the State Department. Here decisions of high policy will have to be taken. For it will be impossible at one and the same time to find the funds for a strategic Air Force, a Navy which commands all the oceans, a ground Army based on universal service, research and development of new revolutionary weapons, the Marshall plan for western Europe, the occupation and reconstruction of enemy territory, the support of Greece, Turkey, Iran, the Arab states, and China, and our implied obligations under the good-neighbor policy.

We are morally and politically over-extended. Decisive choices, each of which involves sacrifice, risk, losses, and deep misgiving are, therefore, unavoidable. We are at a point where the Truman administration cannot please all the services, all the departments, all the specialized divisions of the State Department, all the countries to which by its unconsidered and no doubt well intentioned declarations it is morally committed.

The process of deflation is an exceedingly painful process, especially for a democracy, especially in an election year. But we can no more avoid it than could the Russians, who have deflated themselves brutally but effectively, or than the British who are struggling with it, or the French who are face to face with the imperative need for it. Our margins of safety are greater than these of any other great power. But our commitments and our obligations are also greater, and the necessity of making both ends meet is now squarely before us.

We shall have to have from Secretary Forrestal a decision, as is required under the new military legislation, on how our military investment is to be allocated. We shall have to have from Secretary Marshall judgments as to where on the great globe our diplomatic effort is to be concentrated and pushed forward decisively. And in the presence of these decisions we shall have to concentrate our attention, refusing to let it be dispersed all over the surface of the earth. For the earth is much too large, and its troubles and disorders much too extensive, for us to regard ourselves as the ultimate fixers of everything everywhere.

The Wallace Candidacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial on the Wallace candidacy, written by Verne McKinney, an outstanding newspaperman in my State. The Hillsboro Argus, in which this was published on January 8, has, under the ownership of Mr. McKinney, won a number of State and at least one national journalistic award:

THE WALLACE CANDIDACY

Henry Wallace has envisioned himself as the savior of the world and is going to give the American people the opportunity to vote for him as an independent candidate for President. It is probably just as well for him to come out in the open so that the electorate can reveal its good judgment.

He has listened to the pleas of the radicals and the acclamation of Communist Party organs to the point where he is convinced that he is the hope of the world. The former Republican and then Democratic Secretary

of Agriculture, then Vice President, and then Secretary of Commerce has taken an appealing slogan—"Peace and Prosperity"—which, without question, everyone wants, but because of their common sense have different ideas as to how to reach that goal. Doubtless, every candidate will be for peace and prosperity.

While serving as Secretary of Commerce in President Truman's Cabinet, Wallace criticized the Nation's foreign policy at a time when the then Secretary of State James Byrnes was in the midst of a critical conference with world powers in Paris, jeopardizing our position and creating doubt as to our policy in the minds of other Government representatives. After resigning by request from the Cabinet he went abroad and criticized our policies before peoples in other lands, which to many seemed in very poor taste and a disservice to this country.

Wallace has charged that the present bipartisan foreign policy, which means standing firmly for the things for which this country fought, is leading us into war. The Wallace view, as we see it, is one of appeasement and opposition to adequate preparedness, which have proved in error twice within the lifetime of most Americans.

He opposes the Marshall plan of aid to Europe on the ground that it divides Europe into two warring camps, yet all nations, including Russia and her satellites, were invited to participate in the recovery program. He says he will fight against the spreaders of hate and falsehood against Russia, but what else could develop from such withering propagandistic blasts as were leveled against this country by Vishinsky and Molotov, of Russia, in recent months. Surely peace-loving Americans want understanding but what chance is there for it when nothing but abuse and insults are heaped upon us.

Wallace declares flatly against universal military training, which has been declared necessary by those charged with the defense of this country and is backed by the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, men who know from experience the need and value of adequate training and defense. Our deplorable lack of preparedness in 1917 and 1939 only served as encouragement to the forces of aggression.

Much of the Wallace support has come from the extreme radicals, from Communists and their official organ, The Daily Worker. Communists in their zeal to throw a monkey wrench into the Marshall plan for the recovery of Europe have called for the formation of a national third party under the leadership of Wallace. Nowhere have we seen any repudiation by him of such support.

Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of December 20, 1947:

TIME FOR COMMON SENSE

For 61 years, ever since 1886, the sale of margarine has been conducted under the handicap of restrictive and discriminatory law. Dairy and farm interests, affecting a tearful and altruistic concern for the consumer's welfare, have managed to block at almost every step the efforts made through the years to lift this yoke laid down in Federal and State law. Now Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas is determined to try again. He has introduced a bill to repeal all Federal taxes on margarine on grounds that they are directly opposed to the spirit of free enterprise. He sees these taxes and license fees as the only levy made on a domestic product for the benefit of a competing product.

With butter at about $1 a pound retail; with hospitals, schools, and other institutions struggling to keep their heads above water because of high prices and either forced by law to serve no margarine or otherwise handicapped in its use; with some States barring entirely the sale of colored margarine; with the people of low income who are the heaviest users of margarine bearing the chief burden of the unjust, discriminatory tax—surely this is the time to stop listening to the sob stories of the interests fighting margarine and to begin listening to the people as a whole.

Congress needs no long hearings to get the facts on this old story; if it needs to do any more than consult common sense it can examine the 317-page record of Senate committee hearings held in 1944. Albany also has some work to do on this question, and so have many other States. Margarine should be plainly identified. It should be subject to the same pure-food safeguards as anything else to be eaten. It should be produced, sold, and used on the same basis as butter.

Indian Traders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article written by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, entitled "Indian Traders," which appeared in Sunday's Washington Times-Herald, January 11, 1948:

INDIAN TRADERS

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Here is a little story about Mrs. Ruth Muskrat Bronson and her friends. Mrs. Bronson is a vibrant ladies' club speaker and registered lobbyist at the Capitol for the National Congress of American Indians. But let's just let this one go from left to right, in the order named, and see what happens:

1. Last year Secretary of the Interior Cap Krug, who looks after Alaskan affairs, asked Congress to pass a law opening the Tongass National Forest in Alaska to modern world development.

Specifically, he asked the power to join with the Secretary of Agriculture in appraising the timber and selling off cutting rights to make newsprint and other pulp products so badly needed on the west coast.

2. Tribes of Indians live in the Tongass region. It's a question whether they have any legal, titular claim to anything, since the United States Government bought Alaska outright from Russia on June 20, 1867, and the title passed between the two Governments without any provisions for Indian tribal claims of any kind.

But, nevertheless, Uncle Sam is a soft-hearted guy.

And so when Congress passed a law last summer authorizing the projects requested by Interior Secretary Krug, a section was inserted specifically requiring that all money from the Tongass timber sales be put in a special Treasury account until the rights to the land and timber are finally determined.

3. It looked like a good deal for some enterprising pulp and paper outfit to go up to Alaska and do some pioneering, also make paper for the United States west coast, which is so badly in need of same.

So the Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co., of Bellingham, Wash., got set to bid for the timber rights and put up a papermaking plant costing around $16,000,000.

4. Whereupon, the Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co. got a letter from Washington, D. C., signed James E. Curry, advising them that his clients, the Tlingit and Haid Indians of Alaska, would be heard from in the law courts and under no conditions to put any faith in certain bureaucrats who might say otherwise.

You can imagine how quickly Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co. lost interest in putting up a paper mill on land that the Indians and the United States Government would have to fight over with Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co. as grass under the elephants' feet.

5. Just by chance, there is a James E. Curry listed as counsel to the National Congress of American Indians, for which Mrs. Ruth Muskrat Bronson is lobbyist.

And just by chance, last summer after Interior, Agriculture, and Congress had hotted up the Tongass deal, Mrs. Ruth Muskrat Bronson drifted up to Alaska. And just by chance, she discovered that Indians up there were afraid they were going to lose the timber and so begged her to help them.

Next thing anybody knew, there was James E. Curry up in Alaska doing about, and lo and behold in time it came to pass that the Timber Development Corp., No. 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, found itself with contracts from Indian tribes up there for timber rights.

The contracts each affected a specified $10,000,000 worth of timber. And to tie up the Indians' ownership, if any, Timber Development Corp. deposited with the tribes $500 per contract.

Nice work, a $500 binder for a $10,000,000 deal, is it not? It is.

For the record it appears that Timber Development Corp. was organized by a New York attorney, Richard G. Green, No. 9 Rockefeller Plaza, and as he says himself the incorporators are all people in his office.

6. The Agriculture Department, through Chief Forester Lyle Watts, has denounced the Indian claims and said the Forest Service will oppose them. He invites pulp and paper makers to bid and get started developing Alaska. But Curry, Timber Development Corp., Mrs. R. M. Bronson & Co., have scotched all that.

In fact, Mrs. Bronson put out a press release here last month after the third contract between Alaskan Indians and Timber Development Corp. had been signed, flatly forecasting:

"* * * litigation that will bring to a head the conflict over ownership of timber in Southeastern Alaska that has been simmering for more than 20 years between the Indian inhabitants of the area and the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture."

She said the Indians are sticking by the Interior Department in its interminable bureaucratic war for power against agriculture, and that "Interior Department officials have urged the Indians to proceed to cut and dispose of their own timber resources, notwithstanding Agriculture Department objections."

But just the same, the forest service will invite bids for timber in Tongass forest in a few weeks, offering a United States Government contract on the same trees the Indians have already sold to Mrs. Bronson's pals.

So here we have Interior Department bureaucrats pulling one way, Agriculture another, pulp companies scared to bid for fear of lawsuits, and lawyers forming timber development corporations nobody every heard of before, and Mrs. Bronson busy lobbying.

When is the United States Congress going to investigate this sort of deal and clean up the whole Indian mess?

Truman Message to the Congress Held Bid to Left-Wing Element for Campaign Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Lawrence, who in my personal judgment is one of the most accomplished writers of the country, analyzes correctly the President's speech on the state of the Union in a syndicated article appearing in the Evening Star of January 8, 1948.

Under unanimous consent, I include it herewith:

TRUMAN MESSAGE HELD BID TO LEFT-WINGERS FOR CAMPAIGN SUPPORT—PRESIDENT SEEN VEERING FROM MIDDLE OF ROAD TO ATTRACT RADICALS

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman's message to Congress is a historic document—mostly because it signifies a complete turn by Mr. Truman to the radical left.

Until now Mr. Truman has been regarded as possibly following a middle-of-the-road course. Now he has embraced radicalism wholeheartedly. Whether this is a victory for Henry Wallace and an effort to keep many Democrats from following the third party or whether it represents a determination previously arrived at to make the issue of the 1948 campaign a fight in behalf of the radical point of view is not immediately explainable.

The first tenet of radicalism is to demolish the profit-and-loss system and wreck individual initiative so that the Government may take over the economic system. Mr. Truman embraces such a doctrine by insisting that all citizens should get the same amount of tax reduction—namely, $40 apiece—irrespective of what they earn. To his way of thinking a skilled mechanic earning close to $100 a week nowadays is on the same level as the unskilled laborer who gets less than that sum in wages.

The man who has spent a lifetime in his profession or in his trade—the doctor or the lawyer or dentist or accountant or college professor or storekeeper—all may earn different amounts but they must be considered on the same level so far as tax reduction is concerned. This is the Truman doctrine assimilated from the industrial union philosophy hitherto championed primarily by the CIO and other radical groups.

THEORY HELD COMMUNISTIC

It sounds all right in theory to say that everybody should get a cost-of-living credit of $40, but it is not this theory that has built America. The idea of penalizing thrift and success and skill and talent is not basically American. It is communistic.

Mr. Truman also accepted another piece of the American Communist Party program—to increase corporation taxes as a means of penalizing the success of those companies.

In wartime high taxes on corporations were feasible because wages and prices were stabilized and controlled. Today, however, if corporation taxes are increased so that every company pays to the Government in taxes 50 cents out of every dollar earned, the chances of raising any money in the investor markets will vanish for many companies.

America's stability today depends on the ability of companies to get working capital to finance their large operations. In one breath, Mr. Truman speaks of the need to spend $50,000,000,000 on expansion of American industry and in another he says the corporations must be taxed at much higher rates, forgetting, of course, that a cut in the rate of earnings will demolish the entire structure of credit for financing the expansion of productive facilities. It will also tend to kill competition and promote monopoly. It will stunt the opportunities of small companies to compete with large ones. Only by retaining earnings can small businesses be built up today. Risk capital is unavailable to them.

WOULD BRING DEPRESSION

Everybody who is at all familiar with the processes of industry knows that it is necessary to improve machinery and facilities if prices are to be brought down through increased productivity and efficiency. Mr. Truman, without stopping to think through his own recommendations, has swallowed the CIO propaganda about corporation profits. If the Truman program were adopted, it would bring the worst depression in all history. The only scheme the radicals would offer to remedy the situation then would be state socialism, which is but one step removed from communism.

The message is indeed historic. It means that New Dealism has been revived and that radicalism is going to be the Truman campaign program. Against such a program, the nonradical forces of America will doubtless be mobilized. The task of nominating a leader to fight radicalism has been made easier for the Republicans. Once the country understands the real meaning of the Truman proposals and their threat to employment, it will elect almost anybody the Republicans select. The President's so-called tax program is a blunder of such magnitude that it seems probable he will modify his proposals materially between now and next November.

The Uncalculated Risk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, of the hundreds of booklets, pamphlets, and newspaper articles that have been written on the so-called Marshall plan, I believe one of the latest and most convincing statements I have read is an article by Henry Hazlitt, entitled "The Uncalculated Risk," appearing in the January 5, 1948, issue of Newsweek, which I am pleased to quote, as follows:

THE UNCALCULATED RISK

(By Henry Hazlitt)

It has become fashionable to say that while the Marshall plan does not guarantee European recovery or a peaceful victory over communism it would be cheap even at $17,000,000,000 if it did bring these results. We are told that we are asked to take no more than a calculated risk—a gamble for tremendous stakes in which the odds are heavily in our favor. This argument, however, begs the central question. It takes it for granted that the European recovery program, in the form now proposed by the President, could do only good and no harm.

Yet Europe's economic crisis today is only partly the result of war destruction or of bad weather. It has been brought on mainly by Europe's own economic policies, which have destroyed the free-market mechanism and its incentives. Nearly everyone seems to assume that if this self-imposed crisis deepens, or if controls intesify shortages, Europe will turn in desperation to still more drastic controls and even to communism. The Marshall plan, it is thought, will prevent this by making the situation better.

It never seems to occur to those who hold this view that a deepening of this self-imposed crisis could lead to a demand in Europe, not for communism, but for a return to economic freedom. Yet there are already encouraging signs of this. Italy has restored relative freedom of foreign exchange. France has dropped some important controls. Former Premier Daladier recently declared in debate that inflation cannot be overcome in France as long as a managed economy prevails. In Britain the public faith in the managed economy has been visibly slipping. Is there not a real risk that the funds and goods supplied by the Marshall plan, by making the situation more tolerable than it otherwise would be, could delay or prevent a return in Europe to free markets and free enterprise? Will the Marshall plan be in fact so framed and administered as to save socialistic Europe from communism? Or will it be so framed and administered as to save Europe from capitalism?

At present, certainly, these questions cannot be answered with confidence. In his message to Congress on the Marshall plan President Truman admitted that our proposed $17,000,000,000 of help to sixteen European nations would constitute only some 5 percent of their total national production.

Yet he declared the two purposes of our help to Europe to be to lift the standard of living in Europe closer to a decent level, and at the same time to enlarge European capacity for production. Would a 5-percent difference in its standard of living decide socialistic Europe to return to capitalism instead of driving on to communism? To enlarge European capacity for production is to supply Europe with capital goods. To the extent that we do this we must necessarily defer our own capital expansion. Are we going to do it while Europe continues to follow the policies that systematically throttle its own capital production and investment—price fixing and profit control which discourage the output of capital goods and plant expansion; drastic income taxes that dry up the sources of capital accumulation; threatened socialization and seizures that discourage or prevent private investment?

Yet in the President's message there was not one serious word of criticism of the economic policies now being followed by European governments. There was not one hint that these policies have been in any way responsible for the present European crisis. Nothing was said of the effect of overvalued currencies in discouraging exports. European promises for the future were taken as the equivalent of accomplished facts. Mr. Truman warned Americans against the consequences of providing only half-hearted and halfway help. He said nothing of the consequences of half-hearted and halfway self-help in Europe. Yet on the President's own estimate what Europe does to increase its own production will be at least twenty times as important as the American contribution.

It is clear that the risks of the Marshall plan, in the form in which it has been presented to Congress, have not yet been soberly calculated.

Sound Government and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal of Commerce of January 9, 1948:

A STRIKING CONTRAST

"Government, if mismanaged, can be the greatest factor in producing an increasing inflation." (From Governor Dewey's annual message.)

The job of running the country is, of course, vastly more complicated than that of administering the affairs of only a single State, large as it may be.

Yet there are principles of sound government and administration that apply in either case. Foremost at this time is the adjustment of governmental policies to the fight against rising prices which is of equal concern to every public authority from the Federal Government down to the smallest municipality.

That is why the two annual messages presented to their respective legislatures on the very same day by President Truman and Gov. Thomas E. Dewey offer an interesting study in contrasts.

It is, of course, not news that everybody is against inflation. Yet while the Federal Government is floundering around in a vain attempt to weld its own policies into a systematic economic program instead of hysterically asking for blanket authority to revive wartime controls over the economy, Governor Dewey's program, as presented in his message to the New York State Legislature, shows a practical approach to the problem of how Government policies can be adjusted to the threat of continued inflation.

Governor Dewey's program is based on two considerations:

1. Government expenditures must be cut as far as possible without jeopardizing essential services and new programs must be financed in such a way as to cushion their inflationary effect; and

2. Taxes must not be increased at this time because some of the State's resources must be kept in reserve against the time when they may be needed to offset the effects of an economic set-back.

While the Federal Government at this time indulges in the pleasant preelection game of promising additional benefits to all large groups except business, New York State is launching its next fiscal year with a cut in expenditures that averages 9 percent for all its departments.

However, New York State is postponing expenditures for public works wherever possible because of the high costs and the directly inflationary effect of such governmental expenditures.

This policy means that New York State will not be able to meet many of the demands made upon it but, hard as the choice of refusal in such instances may be, the Governor says that "the severest of tests" will be applied to any program that would engender additional government debt or expand in anywise the expenditure of governmental moneys derived by taxes.

Unless restraint in adding to expenditures now is exercised, Governor Dewey is afraid that serious trouble may result at the first signs of business recession.

The Governor's financial advisers apparently are uneasy about the present level of income because the Governor hints that "in the midst of an inflationary spiral we may well be toward the top of the abnormal revenues which flow from that inflation."

This is by no means a predication of an early set-back in business but it shows statesman-like determination to be prepared for any eventuality. Otherwise, the message warns: "With the first mild recession in business, the government of the State, and consequently of all of its municipalities, would be in a catastrophic situation."

Truman Invites Disaster for the U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PARKE M. BANTA
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial entitled "Truman Invites Disaster for the U. S. A.," which was published in the Rolla Daily News, Rolla, Mo., Thursday, January 8, 1948. Attention is called to the fact that the Rolla Daily News is an independent newspaper published and widely circulated in a traditionally Democratic city and county in the President's home State.

TRUMAN INVITES DISASTER FOR THE U. S. A.

(An editorial by Edward W. Sowers)

President Truman is inviting disaster for this Nation to further his own selfish political aims.

Never in our recollection have we heard such a bombastic and dangerous program projected upon our Nation by a man in high position as was proposed by President Truman in his State of the Union address to Congress yesterday. It simply reeked with political overtures.

President Truman would sell this Nation out in order to extend his residence in the White House. He would destroy the American system of private initiative and leave us nothing with which to fight communism, the greatest threat upon the world today.

The President, outlining his campaign platform for 1948, proposes a further socialistic form of government, expansion of the bureaucratic Frankenstein, more and more taxes on business and industry which eventually will lead to unemployment of the masses. He would dump more billions of our money into foreign countries and make not one attempt to economize. In his entire address, not one word was devoted to cutting Government expenses.

Now, let us analyze Truman's major legislative proposals, one by one:

1. Tax reductions of $40 for every individual taxpayer plus an additional $40 for each dependent.

That sounds fine, and would practically eliminate income taxes for some 10,000,000 in the low income bracket, but if you will go a little further into Truman's plan you will find that his plan may eliminate the jobs of that same 10,000,000.

2. Increase business and corporate taxes 30 percent to make up for the estimated $3,200,000,000 loss in Federal revenue through the lower personal taxes.

There's where the rub comes in. Already business and industry taxes are so high that expansion of plants and further employment has become practically impossible. In fact, taxes take so much from business and industry that the desire for expansion has vanished. Private initiative is practically dead or dying in this Nation today. When you kill private initiative and profits you kill and prevent business and industry from laying aside reserve funds for expansion and jobs for the masses. And that kills our capitalistic system—the only weapon we have to fight communism.

3. Extension and strengthening of rent controls.

That is simply extending Federal controls on our life.

4. Increase in the national minimum wage from 40 to 75 cents.

That is all right but it will bar the employment door to many inexperienced young men and women. Many employers will feel that they might add more help at 40 or 50 cents per hour—but would not add any at 75 cents.

5. Public housing for low income families.

More millions thus to be spent. And remember, it is your money the Government is spending! Can you remember when people used to work for and build their own homes?

6. Authority to impose price-wage controls and rationing.

That means more bureaucratic control. You may not realize it but government has passed from local hands. It is now centralized with the bureaus in Washington. Is that democracy? Let us bring our Government back to the local level!

7. Continustion of farm price supports and extension of crop insurance.

Why, oh why, does the Government feel it has to support $3.00 wheat and $2.68 corn? Prices like that simply make prices of foods higher for that vast 10,000,000 who are told that they will get a mere $40 reduction in their taxes. That $40 will melt like a snowball in h—— under the heat of Truman's program for this country.

8. Approval of a $20,000,000,000 4-year Marshall plan for aid to Europe with a downpayment of $6,500,000,000.

That, in part, is your money Mr. Truman is proposing to dump into Europe—and 20 billion is a lot to add to our already stupendous debt of 260 billion. And many question whether aid to Europe will do us any good.

9. Adoption of universal military training.

There is much to be said for this proposal. We must keep this Nation's defenses strong to hold off the threat of communism.

10. Extension of unemployment compensation, old-age benefits, and adoption of a national health plan.

This means more "rocking-chair money" to pay dead beats who won't work. It means adding to the $10,000,000 already set aside in Missouri for that purpose. It puts a premium on laziness. It means paying out good money to no goods who won't work alongside of you. Moreover, it means socialized medicine. Socialism. A further drift away from the American system. More and more into the troubled Old World isms. Isn't the American way good enough, Mr. Truman?

11. Approval of Federal financial aid to education.

More money for the bureaucrats to spend. More control for the boys in Washington to exercise over our schools. More propaganda to pump into our youth. Let us pay for our schools at home and control them at home.

12. Admission of displaced persons to the United States.

Sure, throw down the immigration bars. Let the driftwood of foreign countries flood our Nation. We can use a lot more troublemakers in this country. At least they would mean more votes for bloom-brains like Henry Wallace and maybe some more for Truman.

If that's Mr. Truman's platform, then what a program for the American people to stomach.

It is definitely a platform for vote-getting and not for the good of the Nation. Not one word for economy, for less Government spending. Not one iota for curtailment of

exports to provide for home needs and bring prices down.

Mr. Truman's program sounds too much like Wallace's Communist-inspired Utopia. We believe that all thinking citizens will see through it. We hope that all good American citizens will look hard and think carefully and act wisely during this critical election year. We sincerely hope that some other Democrat or some Republican comes forward with a program for the good of the United States of America and not merely good for votes. We believe you will join us in wishing for Mr. Truman's return to his Kansas City clothing store or to the judgeship of Jackson County where he can do less harm and before he leads this Nation into disaster. This is no time to be misled by partisan politics. It is too critical a period in history.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to hereby incorporate in my remarks an editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, on the important problem of displaced persons in certain European countries. Legislation should be passed early in this session to admit a great number of European people who are anxious to become citizens of the United States. Mr. Snyder sets out some timely facts in the following editorial:

CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE ACTION ON DISPLACED PERSONS

The Marshall plan is assured of top place on the agenda of Congress as it gets down to work again. But no matter what is done about it on Capitol Hill, there are nearly a million people in western Europe who won't be affected, who will get no benefit from any of the billions we may send across the Atlantic.

These 850,000 people are the displaced persons still living in detention camps, the survivors of Nazi concentration camps; and slave-labor battalions. They are fugitives from all forms of religious and political persecution, and victims of barbarism and Nazi terror.

Their hope for help from the United States rests largely in the Stratton bill, which will be before Congress again in its new session. That bill would permit 100,000 a year to enter the United States for a period of 4 years. It doesn't ask that any money be spent on them; it would just give them a chance to build a new life in America.

If the bill is passed, some of them would come to Gary. A study made by the International Institute, which has been the contact organization for a number of DP's hoping to join relatives in the United States, shows what we might expect under the Stratton bill.

The study lists 217 displaced persons, representing 132 family groups, who would be vouched for by 166 sponsors. Sixty percent of these DP's are males. Of 174 for whom the Institute has age records, 30 are 20 years old or less, 127 are from 21 to 50 years old, and only 17 are over 50.

Out of the group, 81 are from Poland, 54 from Yugoslavia, and 24 from Lithuania. Twelve are from Rumania, and lesser numbers from other European countries.

The Institute found no reason to believe these displaced persons would be a burden on us here. Its study showed that they were largely cousins, nephews or nieces, sisters or brothers of their sponsors, and that their sponsors were able and willing to care for them.

An analysis of 91 sponsors for whom the Institute had full information showed only 23 had assets in savings and property of less than $10,000; 44 had from $10,000 to $25,000, and 24 had more than $25,000.

There's no hazard for us in providing a new oportunity for homeless people such as these displaced persons. They will be carefully screened before admission. They won't become public charges; affidavits of support must be furnished by every sponsor. And we have need of the work they can do.

Further, we will not be upsetting our immigration system by admitting them. If we should accept 400,000 during the next 4 years, we would use up less than half the quotas that went unfilled during the war years.

Another Democrat Opposes the Marshall Plan and Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, daily I receive letters from my constituents, Democrats and Republicans alike, protesting vehemently against the adoption of the so-called Marshall plan and the reimposition of price controls. I have sent copies of the Harvard address by Secretary Marshall, which has now become known as the Marshall plan, together with official documents issued by the State and Commerce Departments to many of my constituents. I have also sent one or two pieces of literature answering the administration's arguments in favor of the Marshall plan and price controls. Thus I have attempted to give my constituents the benefit of the best reasoning on both sides of this highly controversial issue, and I have asked them what they want Congress to do with reference to the Marshall plan and price controls.

The following letter from a lifelong Democrat and one of the most outstanding attorneys and citizens of my district, is truly representative of the answers I daily receive from my people. I quote the entire letter as follows:

JANUARY 5, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: You sent me, with many others in your district, a letter and data in connection with the so-called Marshall plan, and you ask the question in that letter: What do you want Congress to do with the President's proposal involving the appropriation of perhaps $15,000,000,000 of the people's money, and price controls?

The simplest answer I could give in the fewest words is to turn such proposals down and refuse them, and that is my answer, although I would like to make certain observations with that answer.

In the first place, the so-called Marshall plan is nothing but fantastic.

From all available information, we are not called on to feed starving people, yet the administration attempts to use nothing less than pure propaganda to get this effect, to get the consent of the people to such a plan when it is intended to rebuild the national economies of the recipient nations. If we merely feed the starving, anybody would be in favor of keeping body and soul together, and to do so the amount of money would be less than one-fifth of the proposed cost.

There is no obligation, morally or otherwise, to help any country that will not help itself. Production is the only answer to the basic economy of any of the warring nations. We cannot hire them to not be Communists. It is like buying friendship, which cannot be done. Regardless of the cost to this Nation, if repayment is asked, the United States will be called a Shylock, and these advances, if made, will ultimately buy us the enmity of all nations that we help. Too much government regulation exists in these European countries and that is the reason the people cannot produce.

Now as to price controls, the administration seems to want the same controls exercised by the European nations that want help. We have had controls before and our experience in that is the answer to the whole question. The idea is to control necessities and not luxuries. Controls make scarce the items controlled and increase the manufacture of goods not controlled. Absolute Government controls will put the United States in the same condition as Europe. Besides, nobody that has ever enjoyed the blessings of freedom wants to surrender to Government agents, acting as Gestapo agents, spying on their every act, and looking down our throats at all times.

Government meddling in business and the lives of people produces the conditions it complains of. If we are going to have a free country, let's have it; otherwise, change our Government to men that will leave us alone and give an opportunity to restore our own economy.

Poduction and more production is the answer and that can be accomplished only by lowering taxes and relaxing controls. We are not required to restore European economy. If such a thing is done, let the European nations work for their own economy first. They control everything except labor and laborers will not work.

Moreover, the minimum wage scale should not be increased now or at any other time by law. Our recovery was more rapid after the first World War and we had very few controls. Why should we now have controls 2 years and more after the war is over? Get rid of thousands of Government employees and the cost of Government can be reduced.

As you know, I am a Democrat but not a New Dealer. I expect to vote with the Republican Party until such time as new dealism is destroyed and we have a Democratic Party that is democratic and not socialistic and communistic.

Ever since the advent of new dealism it seems to have been the idea to establish a control over the people from the cradle to the grave and yet claim that the people are free. Where is the freedom we boast of if we are controlled by Government agents—carpet baggers—whose controls are changed from day to day, and nobody ever knows his rights?

Pardon this lengthy letter. I can write a book about controls by Government. The same ones we have had were tried during the Ceasars in Rome. None of them are new and none ever worked, and they will not now.

With personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours.

Italy and France Soon May Be Compelled To Ask United States Aid in Military Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Evening Star:

ITALY AND FRANCE SOON MAY BE COMPELLED TO ASK UNITED STATES AID IN MILITARY EQUIPMENT

(By Constantine Brown)

Italy and France, which are slated to receive assistance under the stopgap aid program and the full Marshall plan, soon may be compelled to ask that military equipment, particularly planes and tanks, be included in supplies sent from the United States.

While Congress is settling down to a lengthy debate over how much to appropriate for the European recovery program, the political situation in Europe is rapidly deteriorating and France and Italy once more have become the target of Russia's expansionist aims. Moscow has issued orders to its subordinates to stymie the efforts of the United States to bring order in the west.

The situation in France has improved temporarily, thanks to stern measures adopted by the government of Premier Robert Schuman. But it is admitted by French leaders that conditions in their country necessarily are tied up with those in Italy, where the Communists, possessing a strong Partisan army, are prepared to place the northern part of the country behind the iron curtain.

VIOLENCE NORTH OF RIVER PO

The Italian Communists "Duce"—Palmiro Togliatti—is preparing his men for action. In the last 10 days there have been many uprisings accompanied by violence north of the River Po. Communists penetration into army ranks was disclosed when hundreds of soldiers in various garrisons demonstrated against being kept in the armed service.

The Communist convention, now being held in Milan and attended by delegates from all the Soviet satellites, may decide to call a general strike preparatory to an armed rebellion against the present government of Premier Alcide de Gasperi.

The Soviet Government is giving them a helping hand. The propaganda against the United States has been intensified. The stopgap aid plan, giving Italy some $180,000,000 worth of American supplies, is being described as a move toward assumption of physical control over Italy.

Moscow's propagandists described the signature of the aid agreement in Rome as follows: "The agreement was submitted to the Italian government in the form of an ultimatum. It was not open to any discussion. Moreover, it was preceded by a very unambiguous reminder of the American warships with guns trained on Rome."

Hundreds of thousands of pamphlets containing this fairy tale are now being distributed throughout Italy. The statement that we had to use threats of force to persuade the Italian Government to accept our supplies, of course, is ridiculous to all informed Italians. But to the majority of people, particularly in north Italy, the story seems plausible since they know little about the nature of the agreement signed in Rome last week.

PARTISAN MOVES IN FRANCE

Underground Partisan units in France which were spread throughout the country are now reported to have been concentrated in areas close to the Italian border in order to make common cause with the Italian Partisans.

From available information it appears that after the collapse of the French Communist-led strike last December, Moscow instructed Maurice Thorez that when the Italian Communists began their moves in the north the French Communists should try to form at least a token democracy, regardless of how small, near the Italian frontier. This would offer an excellent excuse for Communist forces in the east to intervene in France.

Under these circumstances the French and Italian Governments feel that their present forces are inadequate to cope with the situation. The French Army is far better than the Italian and can put down any attempt by Thorez' followers to carry out a coup. But France lacks sufficient planes and tanks to offer real resistance to forces which might come from Italy.

Despite the gift of thousands of machine guns and millions of rounds of ammunition when American occupation troops were withdrawn December 15, the Italian Government still does not have enough strength to cope with even the Partisans, who are better equipped and more numerous at vital centers than the army of the new republic. Moreover, the Yugoslav Fourth Army is within a few hours' march of the Italian frontier.

Military observers maintain that for the immediate future it is more important to send planes and tanks than industrial equipment. But it is doubtful that the American Government will view the situation in that light.

A Dangerous Device

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial, I am very pleased to have this opportunity of bringing the attention of the Members of Congress to the excellent editorial appearing a few days ago in the Asbury Park Press, of Asbury Park, N. J.

It is entitled "A Dangerous Device" and it refers to the suggestion by the President to offset the decrease in revenue on account of reduction in income taxes by increasing the corporation taxes. The President justified this suggestion because he stated that corporate income after taxes had reached a very large sum during the past year, and his argument was based on the claim that the corporations were better able to pay than other types of taxpayers.

Apparently the President's reasoning is based on the false idea that increased costs to corporations can be met without increasing the price of their products. This theory was exploded when increased wages were advocated on the basis that there was no ground for an increase in the cost of products, but it seems that this economic fact has not yet percolated through the heads of the President or his advisers.

The editorial points out various other fallacies in the President's suggestion, but additional criticism may be found in the fact that the money of insurance companies, trust funds, and the like is invested in the securities of our great corporations and any impairment in the financial stability of these corporations would be to the everlasting disadvantage of a great many American citizens. The President's suggestion is certainly a dangerous device.

I commend the reading of this excellent editorial because it preaches sound doctrine:

A DANGEROUS DEVICE

The prospect that the current session of Congress will be a slugfest between the administration and the Republican majority has been strengthened by the report that President Truman will offer an increase in corporation taxes as the basis of his tax "reduction" program. Certainly if there is a more demagogic way in which to handle the tax problem the administration has not discovered it.

Obviously there is considerable appeal in a rise in corporation taxes. Superficially it is a gesture aimed at taking money from the wealthy and giving it to the lower income brackets. But in reality it is far from that. For corporation profits do not to any appreciable extent go into the purchase of yachts and a fleet of automobiles for stockholders. On the contrary, they are used to produce a reasonable dividend to millions of stockholders throughout the country, many and perhaps most of whom are living on modest incomes, and in maintaining the Nation's industrial plant.

This latter point requires emphasis. Because taxes have been exorbitant for almost two decades, most corporations have had limited funds for replacing wornout equipment and for expanding their facilities. As a result the total American industrial plant has been depreciating. This means that the factories and tools needed to keep men employed are dangerously limited to the point where thousands of corporations and millions of workers may soon find themselves lacking the facilities for production.

The situation has been aggravated by section 102 of the internal-revenue law, which requires corporations to pay out some 70 percent of their earnings in dividends and keep but a relatively small amount for replacing capital equipment and for enlarging their plants. With the population growing and the standard of living rising, there is need for larger plant facilities to supply the wants of the American people. Our tax policy, however, has forced a reduction in our industrial productive capacity and in job opportunities for workers.

The tax on the net profits of corporations now reaches 38 percent. When the balance is paid out as dividends each stockholder must pay a personal income tax on the dividend he receives, the rate depending upon the bracket in which his total income places him. Thus corporation profits are subject to a double tax. The owners of corporations, who are millions of small investors as well as wealthy persons, must pay not only a corporation tax ranging up to 38 percent but a personal income tax on top of this. This brings the total tax on corporation profits to outrageously high figures.

But even if it has no concern in the stockholders who own corporations, the administration should be concerned with the tens of millions of workers employed by corporations. Unless business is allowed a profit balance sufficient to maintain and expand its plant, the development of American industry, which has been the wonder of the world, will be curtailed. Then job opportunities will be lost, our productive capacity to fill our wants will be impaired, and in the event of war this country will be unable to meet the need for industrial equipment upon which victory will depend.

That dire prospect is the inevitable result of taxing corporations to the point where they must reduce productive facilities. It is simply bait concocted by an administration bent on making a capricious appeal for votes.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF of January 10, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, as the Congress once again convenes, I want to urge each one of you to write me whenever you feel like expressing your thoughts about the state of the Union.

Remember, also, that my Washington office stands ready to go to bat for you whenever you have a problem.

Let me know if you do not get an answer to letters you may write somebody down there. This is your Government and any official who throws your requests in the wastebasket ought to be thrown there himself.

A lot of folks tell me that the bureaucratic big shots in our Nation's Capital refuse to comply with the simplest request. I ask you, who do they think they are? Aren't your hard earned dollars paying their fat salaries?

Who is making it possible for these swivel chair appointees to buy the expensive cigars they chew, while they laugh and chuckle behind the scenes at sincere letters written by the rank and file of our citizens?

Who pays the shot for the luxury-loving official who may give sumptuous banquets at an elite Washington hotel while people I represent are groaning under the heavy tax burdens such expenses cause them?

The answer is, you are footing the bill. While I realize it is well nigh impossible to put a stop all at once to the lush living, the extraordinary cuisine, the rare dainties, and high-priced bill of fare some of these dandies overindulge in, I do feel they might temper their voraciousness with a little hard work in your interests.

Don't get the idea I am indicting Washington officialdom in blanket fashion. There are many, many painstaking and conscientious public servants. There are countless efficient career employees. There are numberless men and women on the Government pay roll who do a real job in making our way of life work.

But the laggards, the neglectful, the wrong-minded stick out like sore thumbs so often and cause blame to be heaped upon the shoulders of the majority who have the best of intentions.

So, I say to you, let me know if you don't get the service from Washington you are entitled to. Or, better yet, write me in the first place. I will personally see that you get a square deal. I will go to bat for you the minute I hear.

Too many big-time appointees like to think themselves far above common herd and close the door to ordinary visitors. The way to their attention is barred unless the caller or writer might be one of pomp and circumstance.

However, a 3-cent stamp is all you need to send a message to me. Or if you don't have one handy, just write me on a penny postcard.

No, they haven't taken the penny postcard away from you yet and they aren't going to if I have my way. They've tried to, though, and they'd do it if some of us in Congress didn't keep pretty wide awake.

Yes, this is still America. You have the right to appeal to your Government and to your Congressman. I can't accomplish the impossible, but I can do a little whip cracking, which I have done, and put some of the boys I've been talking about on their toes.

Don't let the doubting Thomases back home try to discourage your writing to me. Don't let the sophisticates, the self-sufficient, the worldly-wise try to shame you out of your constitutional right of corresponding with the man you elected. Bear in mind, you elected me, not the handful of scoffing, would-be important big-time operators who look down not only on you and me but the whole world.

No, I've never been able to win much favor with them, whether they come from Washington or up our way. But I'll let you in on a little secret: I don't much care what they think because they don't have to be reckoned with.

Why? Because they don't have the votes and you do.

In all seriousness, though, I want you to write me. I need your letters, your suggestions, your views, your reactions. This is going to be a difficult session of Congress. Much will be decided for a long time to come.

I've never suffered any illusions about my being able to solve the great issues we are facing without the advice of you home folks. When the day comes that your Representative is unable to have the benefit of what you are thinking, then my time has run out, and I will gladly relinquish my post.

So let me hear from you at any and all times and I'll be better equipped to do the job you expect me to do. I'll know more about what everybody wants and that means the policy of our Government will be decided along American lines instead of through dictatorship, tyranny, and arbitrary means. Just address me 1121 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Thank you.

Clarence E. Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Clarence E. Hancock every Member of this House who knew him is filled with a sense of personal loss.

While it is true that he has not been numbered among us during the past year, yet, the memory of such a man outlasts the confines of mere years in the recording of time. Such lives are timeless.

Truly he was beloved by all his friends and associates. For 8 years it was my privilege to sit with him in the Committee on the Judiciary. There I learned to know him well, and the better I knew him the more I admired him. He was a truly great soul. A friend, a guide, a counselor.

In his nature many fine qualities united to make him outstanding. Innately modest and retiring, he brought to all his work a true humility. Only the wise, the good, and the great do this.

I never knew Clarence E. Hancock to injure anyone by a single spoken word or deed of action. His nature was kindly, gentle, and serene. Nothing disturbed him. He was never hurried or rushed. He always had time to listen to every man's story and to respond with good advice and kind assistance.

A few years ago in speaking of the death of a colleague from the great State of New York, he said: "He served his city, his district, his State, and his Nation long, faithfully, and brilliantly."

Each statement therein made applies with equal force to the worth, the life, and the activities of Clarence E. Hancock. No man could have a better epitaph.

Everyone present on last Tuesday when his death was announced on this floor was saddened by the knowledge that he had gone on forever to join the choir invisible, but, by the same token, each person who heard the heartfelt words that came from the hearts knew that our former colleague was worthy of every word said of him.

Every man who knew Clarence E. Hancock is the richer for that knowledge. To all of us, he has left a priceless heritage. God grant that we will prove worthy of it.

To every man there openeth a way, and ways, and a way,
And the high soul climbs the high way,
And the low soul gropes the low,
And in between, on the misty flats,
The rest drift to and fro.
But to every man there openeth
A high way and a low,
And every man decideth
The way his soul shall go.

And, having chosen that high way, Clarence E. Hancock never faltered. Farewell, my friend.

The New (Raw) Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I have not seen a more convincing commentary on the President's message on the state of the Union than an editorial in the Boston Herald of January 8, 1948, and in order that my colleagues may read it, I am including the editorial under leave to extend these remarks:

THE NEW (RAW) DEAL

The message on the state of the Union delivered to Congress yesterday must have come from a tomb. It was certainly not the product of the conservative old Missourian named Harry Truman who used to sit for his State in the United States Senate. Nor even of

that early Presidential Harry Truman who vied with a Republican Congress to see which could decontrol first, which could out-conservative the other. No, something new has been added. The something new is most certainly the Presidential aspiration of Henry A. Wallace. Indeed, if it were not for the foreign-policy portions of the message one might have thought Wallace was its author.

There was never a better demonstration of what is wrong with our democracy than that a President of the United States could stand up, in such times, and make such a sordid appeal for votes—votes at $40 per head. And this from the man who has been chastising a Republican Congress for many months for even thinking of a tax reduction in these perilous days of inflation. This from the the man who twice vetoed a tax-reduction bill. He said it was not the time for such a cut. He has fully lived up to our prediction that when the election got near enough it would be time for a tax reduction, on his terms.

By proposing the ridiculous procedure of lowering individual income taxes to relieve the burden of inflation, the President not only flies in the face of his own economic advisers, but also abandons all semblance of economic common sense. He is trifling not only with the immediate future of our country, but with the longer term interests of democracy and free enterprise as well.

There are good and solid reasons for some tax reductions at this time, but the President didn't mention them. The tax portion of his message was in the same tenor as all of the rest—something for everyone, an angel hovering over the head of every citizen who votes for Truman next fall. While a good political case can be made out for individual income-tax cuts in the lower brackets, there is practically no economic case for it. Witness the President's principal financial adviser, Secretary Snyder, talking about the need for more sales of savings bonds to syphon off spending power from the public. The President would syphon it back again through his $40 a vote tax cut. Moreover, by passing the revenue loss over to the corporations, the President doubles the inflationary impact of his proposal. Corporations will have more cause, for higher prices. The fellows who save $40 in taxes will pay it all back through the corporations in the form of higher prices. It is quite clear that the President has been listening to his political advisers, and that they know very little about economics. Also, they grossly underestimate the intelligence of the American public.

What is really needed, taxwise, is to clear up impediments to investment. If the lower income groups need tax relief, which is doubtful, the higher income groups need it more. The reason is economic, not political. The President barely recognized the need for investment to keep our whole free enterprise system going when he said, in passing, that industry needs at least $50,000,000,000 of new investment in the next few years. Where does this investment come from but investors? Who are the investors? Such savings as the lowest income groups accumulate in the form of life insurance, and otherwise, are a factor, to be sure, but the really risk capital which is the dynamic factor in free enterprise comes from investors, the fellows who can afford to gamble. But now they can't afford it. There is, instead, too much "safe" money.

Then, the Chief Executive dragged out that old saw about high corporate profits. Sure, they're high, and why shouldn't they be? Some new investment will come from these profits, but more importantly if profits aren't the highest in peacetime history when production is the highest in peacetime history, then there's something wrong with capitalism. Indeed, if we get much more of this latest variety of Truman economics, we might as well give it up. For if we don't get leadership instead of demagoguery, if we don't face facts instead of serving soothing syrup; we cannot hope to make a go for long of a system which depends for its success upon self-imposed restraints.

If the President hoped to stir up political sentiments with that message of yesterday, he certainly succeeded. But we suspect they will not be generally to his liking. On the contrary, it was such a vulgarly obvious bid for votes from every segment of the population that all intelligent citizens will be offended. It will strengthen the opposition, giving power to the Republican Party's political propaganda that only the GOP is fit to govern. God forbid that the Republican Party, too, will enter this race for demagoguery. Not only common sense, but sound politics dictate that it should stick more firmly than ever to the middle road. President Truman has provided the opportunity that it has long needed—to be the party of the people, against the rash promisers, opposed to the lie that the Government can be all things to all people, defending the individual against the dangerous Truman mythology that we can preserve free enterprise by ignoring its substance. In the best interest of America, we hope the Republican Party will provide the leaders to make the best of this opportunity for statesmanship.

Otherwise, we get the Truman New (Raw) Deal, or something even worse.

Safety Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the National Safety Council continues to promote the cause of safety in this country in a perfectly splendid way. Recently its president, Ned Dearborn, delivered a strong address to over 10,000 men and women assembled in the city of Chicago for the purpose of making plans and projecting a much wider safety program throughout the country during the next 12 months. The address was so well determined and so inspiring that I include in the RECORD the full text for the benefit of my colleagues:

I would like to advocate a purge of certain public enemies.

These public enemies are not men. They are ideas and beliefs—murderous beliefs—which pile up a huge and needless toll of human life and limb. They make the prevention of accidents extremely and unnecessarily difficult.

The aim of all safety education is to change attitudes that obviously impede progress toward safe living. But it is hard to change attitudes. Let's examine some of these murderous beliefs—the public enemies that need to be purged.

We are all susceptible to the influence of labels, slogans, and verbal tags of various kinds. If these are wrong or misleading, their influence is bad; if correct and helpful, their influence is good. The following six concepts are bad. They lead to wrong labels.

1. THE "OTHER FELLOW" CONCEPT

Nearly everybody seems to assume that an accident will happen to the other fellow, but never to him. We seem to think we are smarter, or luckier, than the other fellow, and that accident victims must be dopes. Are we individually immune? Or worse, is there in us a lurking arrogant egotism which makes us feel that we are smarter or luckier than anyone else?

2. THE "YOUR NUMBER'S UP" CONCEPT

An amazing number of people subscribe to the philosophy that an accident happens, or it doesn't—that your number is up or it isn't up. In other words, accidents are inevitable when the time is right. Isn't this merely an easy way out of explaining our carelessness and misfortune? Or worse, do people really believe in fatalism to the point of predetermination?

3. THE "LAW OF AVERAGES" CONCEPT

Too many people shrug off accidental death and injury, saying that they are due to the law of averages. Is the factor of chance actually of such magnitude that we are doomed to destruction despite reasonable precautions? Or worse, are a certain number of persons—in proportion to total exposure—bound to be killed or hurt? Is there an inexorable law of fate?

4. THE "PRICE OF PROGRESS" CONCEPT

It is often said accidents are the natural price paid for progress. Must scientific advancement take place in some fields of human endeavor, and not in others? Or worse, is science a parasite that thrives on the blood of the very humanity it benefits? According to this concept, every forward step in human progress is offset by a backward step.

5. THE "SPIRIT OF '76" CONCEPT

Some people hold that safety is inconsistent with the spirit of our forefathers who took great risks to found our country or, in other words, that safety is sissy. In our efforts to prevent accidents, are we being disloyal to our forefathers? Or worse, is accident prevention actually cowardly, and therefore contrary to the true spirit of America? This point of view is very common.

6. THE "ACT OF GOD" CONCEPT

Finally, some folks who are sincerely religious feel that an accident is an act of God. Can there really be a supernatural carelessness? Or, worse, can there be divine retribution which visits us and our loved ones through accidents? This concept is closely related to the belief in some inexorable law of fate, with the added belief in a divine planning.

Adding it all up—is accident prevention impractical, sacrilegious, and effeminate? And are accidents unavoidable, inevitable, predetermined, a matter of luck, the price of modern living?

No. But unless we purge these concepts—these murderous beliefs—and supplant them in the minds of our citizens with positive beliefs we may as well give up the struggle to reduce accidents. We are wasting our time, effort, and money.

Can accidents actually be prevented? Yes—most of them can be prevented.

Can the common misbeliefs be changed? Yes.

One hundred years ago the idea of vaccination was intolerable to a large portion of the population. Today the idea is generally accepted. A similar change came about in attitudes toward inoculations, surgery, and other forms of disease prevention and cure. Only a little more than a century ago even physicians predicted that trains traveling at 15 miles an hour would bring fatal results to heart and respiratory action. You and I remember people saying, "The horse and buggy is good enough for me." Now some say, "The automobile is good enough for me." But tomorrow a New Yorker will say, "Let's wait until we arrive in San Francisco to have our breakfast." And day after tomorrow we will say, "Let's take a cruise next week end to see if what they say about the moon and Mars is true." And on long week ends we will visit another universe just for a change.

So we must make it our No. 1 job to convert the millions in our population to a new credo, new articles of faith, new attitudes.

It is an everlasting job—a job that can be done only if all the big and little guns of our great public information resources are kept constantly in action.

Now that the beliefs have been set forth, let us examine them analytically and constructively.

CONCEPT NO. 1—THE OTHER FELLOW

Our slogan this year—Be Careful, the Life You Save May Be Your Own—recognizes that you and I are not immune to accidents. Accidents do not always happen to the other fellow. The advertising council is rendering invaluable assistance in driving that point home. The slogan has caught on, and it is being used over and over again by people who write and talk about safety. Let's keep it going.

Who can rationally believe that some special dispensation forever especially guards him against an accident and act accordingly? The assumption is so obviously fallacious as to be absurd, and yet the very absurdity is the ghost that must be laid. You as a person may so act as to prevent accidents and to protect yourself from accidents, but you cannot with reason suppose for a moment that anyone else will so act for himself—or for you. One of the most active and influential safety leaders and his wife were crushed to death in Chicago while window shopping. A motor vehicle out of control brought instant death to both of them.

An accident can happen to you. Never forget that.

CONCEPT NO. 2—YOUR NUMBER'S UP

Fatalism is a complete denial of the efficacy of individual initiative. It is especially pronounced among oriental peoples because of the character of their philosophies. Western philosophies and religions do not uphold fatalism.

Fatalism would eliminate traffic lights and signs, safety guards on machinery, life guards at beaches, and any measures to eliminate or reduce accident hazards on our farms or in our homes. Fatalism is fantastic. Fatalism should be eliminated.

CONCEPT NO. 3—THE LAW OF AVERAGES

The law of averages, as used by those who take that defeatist point of view, has some vague relationship to the normal curve of distribution. Anyone with even elementary knowledge of statistics knows that a distribution curve can be skewed by circumstances and—what is even more important—it can be moved up or down the scale of possibilities.

The factor of chance must be accepted in any competent statistical calculation, but it is always a small part. The chance factor is dominant in, at most, 5 percent, and more likely only 2 percent, of all accidents. Thus the belief that chance dominates the frequency and severity of accidents is another absurdity which must be dispelled.

CONCEPT NO. 4—THE PRICE OF PROGRESS

Those who talk about progress and its inevitable price seldom know the meaning of progress. They probably refer to scientific advancement, especially in the last 75 years. They are doubtless thinking, too, of the constantly accelerating rate of advancement. Scientific discovery and invention are the expressions of that advancement in the public mind.

In the field of medicine during the last 50 years, methods, instruments, facilities, and training have brought under control such deadly human ailments as yellow fever, smallpox, diphtheria, malaria, polio, diabetes, and some heart conditions.

Physical and chemical sciences have brought us the steam and electric railroads, telephones, motion pictures, television, telegraphy, high-speed water carriers, the automobile, and the airplane. Only about one-fifth of the fatal motor-vehicle accidents and one-fourth of the fatal train and scheduled air-transport accidents can be attributed to mechanical faults or failures.

The same engineering genius that gave us the modern motorcar can give us complete mechanical safety. But we don't like to wear goggles in hazardous factory operations, and we are proud of our highly polished floors and scatter rugs, which are always good for a quick take-off and a one-point landing.

No, the blame is not on scientific advancement. The blame is mainly on human failure. That can be corrected.

CONCEPT NO. 5—THE SPIRIT OF '76

The courage and daring of our forefathers in risking all for their ideals and purposes is an American tradition to be preserved. Yet that spirit itself can easily be misinterpreted. Our forefathers took risks, but not unnecessary risks. Our pioneer settlers soon learned in Indian warfare that open fighting was extremely unwise. So they fought the Indians in Indian style. Not accustomed to the vicissitudes of the wilderness, our forefathers took immediate steps to build shelters that would protect them from the climate and unfriendly neighbors. They planted grain and vegetables to provide foods necessary to health, because wild game, berries, and fruit were not enough. They used the best safety knowledge they had in felling trees and in hewing logs. They kept their guns at hand and their ammunition dry.

They certainly were not sissies. Neither were they fools. They could turn their backs on a dare without loss of dignity or manhood. It's hard to imagine one of them daring another to stick his head out of the stockade so an Indian might take a potshot at him. And yet that is what we do when deliberately take unnecessary risks and openly invite accidents. It's no fun to be hurt. We need to remember that our heroes of yesterday and today, who are no sissies, protected themselves from unnecessary dangers—Lindbergh, in 1927, flying alone across the Atlantic, the football player wearing nearly a hundred dollars' worth of protective gear, the conditioned and skilled boxer, the trained soldier.

No, there is nothing manly about carelessly stepping in front of a moving truck, needlessly losing an arm in a corn picker, foolishly falling down the cellar stairs or being in dangerous waters when you can't swim.

CONCEPT NO. 6—THE ACT OF GOD

This theory of accidents is not supported in any religion commonly accepted in the Western World. A God on His throne in Heaven deliberately directing death and destruction is inconceivable.

It doesn't make sense that retribution is visited upon an individual as such in the form of an accident which may kill or destroy that which was created in the image of God. When natural causes are obscure or unknown in relation to effects, it is always easy to find an explanation in a divine source.

It will be no disservice to religion, and should be no affront to the religious, if these misbeliefs in acts of God and divine retribution are replaced by beliefs founded on the true ethics and morals of religion.

Can accidents be prevented? Yes; by constant public education to replace common misbeliefs with constructive and positive faith in word and deed.

This is no denial of the importance of enforcement and of engineering. Education transcends enforcement and engineering and makes them possible of improvement. Accident prevention is a problem of public morality. Without an ethical base and a moral code we cannot build a sound safety faith.

Safety must be a promise. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were hardly more than glamorous promises, when they were conceived, in an ugly, threatening world. Safety and a safety creed must partake of promise rather than threat, a positive promise of something bigger, better, and more glorious than we have had before or than we have now.

What does safety promise? Safety can promise 20,000 children a year a chance to live and have fun, a chance to grow up and become men and women. Safety can promise freedom from a large amount of unnecessary worry, anxiety, and grief. Safety can lift an enormous economic burden from the backs of 35,000,000 American families. Safety can put money in the pockets of every man, woman, and child in this country. Safety can contribute to our national strength, to world strength.

Let us as safety specialists and safety leaders help build in America a new safety faith that our great work may continue to add more speedily to the happiness and welfare of all mankind. Ours is a glorious opportunity, a tremendous challenge, a solemn duty.

Decline in Airplane Production Threat to Nation's Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to introduce in the RECORD an article from the Miami Herald of December 28, 1947, written by one of the aviation experts in our part of the country. This article well points out the threat to our national security by the decline in our aviation industry. To those of us who are vitally concerned with national defense this article will be of intense interest as it will warn us of the urgent need for immediate action toward maintaining our air defenses.

The article follows:

DECLINE IN AIRPLANE PRODUCTION THREAT TO NATION'S SECURITY—ONLY GOVERNMENT HAS RESOURCES FOR FINANCING IMPORTANT PROGRAM

(By Ned Aitchison)

Whatever 1948 may have in store for the Nation's aviation industry, its present predicament hardly can grow worse. It is, of course, a matter of grave concern to the United States when any major industry hits the skids and tumbles toward the bottomless pit.

For our complex economy is certain to feel the resulting effects.

But there is a double menace to the Nation in the troubles now besetting the aviation business, because our national security is tied up inseparably with that industry.

In this age of the atomic bomb, broad, swift, far-traveling wings hold the key to our entire defense structure.

So long as the aviation industry is geared to turn out the kind of planes we need, in the number that any emergency may require, we are sitting pretty, regardless of unsettled conditions around the world.

But when the industry loses that capacity—through enforced curtailment of resources, capital and manpower—the door is opened to a very dangerous situation affecting both our future security and the peace of the world.

Aircraft development is a terrifically expensive business. Only the Government has the resources needed to finance such a program. In wartime, when the Nation's productive capacity reached an all-time peak, plane manufacturers were assured a market for all the planes they could turn out. Expense in designing and building advanced types of combat and other planes was not a factor. The only thing that counted was to win the war, regardless of cost.

Today, the situation is exactly reversed. Military purchases of all types of aircraft have dropped to an insignificant fraction of the orders that poured in on the plane plants while the conflict raged.

Sales of new types of commercial transports have been extremely limited, far below the roster forecasts of late 1945.

Likewise, the expected avalanche of orders for private planes has failed to materialize.

These are the three markets upon which the aviation industry must depend to sell the planes it produces.

Millions of dollars of losses will be written into the operating accounts of American aviation manufacturing concerns for this year.

And, despite drastic further curtailments planned for 1948, the picture is no brighter for next year.

It is obvious, of course, that the aviation industry is different from any other major business in our whole economic set-up. Without Government support, in some form, it cannot be maintained on a basis necessary to assure our national security.

That means not so much the production-line capacity of the plants today as their ability to gear themselves to any situation this country may face in the foreseeable future.

It means that only through Government support (subsidiary is another name for it) can the research and study be maintained to assure us the best and finest military aircraft if and when we need them.

Without that support, it is inevitable that (1) we will lag hopelessly in the development of types of aircraft upon which our security will depend if an emergency develops, and (2) we will be deprived of the productive plant to turn out these planes as quickly and in such numbers as may be necessary.

That's the headache: Maintaining a huge and costly industrial set-up in peacetime as a guaranty of our future safety, or the alternative of leaving us wholly unable to meet any threat which may emerge out of the present troubled global situation.

Either way we can guess wrong—and it can cost a lot of money. But there is a lot more than dollars and cents involved in the decision. It involves, too, the possibility of our survival if the challenge should come to our peace and to our future.

Fortune magazine, in seeking answers to the complex matter, suggests: "All proposals for solving aircraft's problem acknowledge one condition—that only Federal credit is sufficient to keep the industry going. In fact, the aircraft industry never has been able to exist satisfactorily in a purely competitive, unsubsidized atmosphere, for its huge customer in war or peace always has been the United States Government."

Factors in the present chaotic conditions facing the plane builders are summarized by the magazine as follows:

Production today is less than 3 percent of the wartime peak, but plants, labor forces, and capital structures are still war-inflated. This year, the armed forces bought only 1,500 combat planes. Foreign orders faded owing to lack of dollar exchange. United States airlines canceled orders left and right. The private plane market ceased to exist.

It sees as a result of the developing situation a 10-year lapse in design of new planes, owing to costs of new development, adding: "Some new way must be found of meeting the financial risks that aircraft companies and their commercial customers can no longer bear alone or together."

It lists, without comment, some of the proposals as including Government loans to companies for construction of new aircraft; direct Government aid to carriers for purchase of planes; Government financing of plane development, experiment and production with the Government retaining title to the planes and leasing them to the air lines.

"Every one of these proposals," the magazine adds, "acknowledges that only the credit resources of the U. S. A. are sufficient to keep the aircraft industry going."

The rub is, of course, that military and commercial types of aircraft are tremendously expensive to create and build, and the field of sales for them is by that very factor extremely limited.

Yet when the chips are down and our national safety is at stake, we have to have the best and fastest planes in the world, in tremendous numbers.

There is no way to build these aircraft cheaply, or to conjure them out of a magician's hat at the last minute if we face an emergency. To have them, we will have to pay for them, and pay to maintain the manpower, productive facilities, and creative genius needed to turn them out on the proper scale.

To do less is to gamble with our national security and our very existence. It is a policy the American people will have to decide. For they must foot the cost, and their liberties are involved.

American and Canadian Taxes Compared; Contrary to General Belief, American Income Taxes Are Higher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to the Winnipeg Free Press for a very interesting and informative article entitled "How Taxes Vary," which will be a revelation to those who have been telling us that the American taxpayer is in a favored position when compared with his Canadian brother.

In addition to paying lower Federal taxes, our Canadian friends do not have to pay State income taxes which, when added to the Federal tax, places the American taxpayer at a serious disadvantage.

The Winnipeg Free Press is a most excellently edited newspaper, with a fine reputation for reliability, therefore the article which follows can be accepted as 100 percent authentic. The Free Press article follows:

HOW TAXES VARY

Those who pay Canadian income tax, and feel themselves hard done by, will be interested in a comparative table on income taxes payable in this country and the United States. The rates shown are those effective in the latter part of 1947 and are applicable to earned income, as distinct from investment income.

In the case of the United States, the compiled Federal and New York State tax is shown. Canada and the United Kingdom have no State income taxes. In the United States case also the tax payable was calculated after making the standard deduction of 10 percent from gross income up to $5,000, in lieu of contributions to nonprofit organizations, interest paid, State and local taxes, and medical and other personal expenditures exempt. For gross incomes over $5,000 there was also deducted the New York State income tax in excess of the amount of such a tax on a $5,000 gross income.

No similar deductions from gross income were made in calculating the Canadian and United Kingdom tax.

For the purposes of comparison the family allowance received by a Canadian taxpayer with children is deducted from the income tax payable by him, since for income-tax payers the family allowance takes the place, in part, of the former income-tax exemptions for children. This accounts for the negative income tax equal to the family allowances shown at low incomes in the following tables. Similar allowances are made for family allowances paid in the United Kingdom in respect of children after the first child.

Gross income in dollars	Single person		Married person without children		Married person with 2 children	
	Canada	United States	Canada	United States	Canada	United States
$600	-------	$8	-------	-------	−$144	-------
$750	-------	33	-------	-------	−144	-------
$1,000	$29	70	-------	-------	−144	-------
$1,250	70	121	-------	$24	−144	-------
$1,500	120	167	-------	66	−144	-------
$1,750	170	212	$29	109	−130	-------
$2,000	220	257	70	152	−108	-------
$2,250	270	304	120	195	−64	$5
$2,500	320	350	170	238	−14	48
$2,750	420	447	270	278	86	133
$3,500	520	548	370	421	186	221
$4,000	620	650	470	523	286	311
$5,000	820	858	670	726	486	505
$7,500	1,665	1,726	1,259	1,267	1,064	1,108
$10,000	2,253	2,333	1,959	2,141	1,786	1,824
$20,000	6,515	6,692	6,140	6,444	5,896	5,922
$35,000	14,478	15,416	14,095	15,088	13,811	14,471
$50,000	22,728	25,338	22,315	24,980	22,161	24,287
$75,000	37,680	43,706	37,246	43,310	36,976	42,534
$100,000	53,603	63,757	53,415	63,334	53,141	62,503

American Legion Endorses Proposal To Admit Displaced Persons Outside of Normal Immigration Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, much has been made by the people who believe that the United States can live behind an imaginary Chinese wall, shut off from the rest of the world, of the opposition by the American Legion to the admission of displaced persons from Europe outside the regular annual national quotas.

The wildest possible misstatements and misrepresentations and distortions of the clear facts have been perpetrated, and some of the opponents of immigration have even descended to invoking racial and religious animosities repugnant to American traditions.

I am very happy, therefore, to bring to the attention of the House again the fact that the American Legion has reconsidered its position and now endorses the principle embodied in the Stratton bill.

I am particularly happy to place in the RECORD the following letter, dated January 9, from Mr. Irving M. Engel, commander, Willard Straight Post, No. 842, of New York, which embraces many members who reside in my congressional district, clearly stating the approval of the Legion to immediate admittance of displaced persons as a humanitarian act:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
WILLARD STRAIGHT POST,
No. 842, NEW YORK,
January 9, 1948.

Mr. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: As commander of the Willard Straight Post of the American Legion, Department of New York, I am inviting your attention to the recent favorable action taken by the American Legion regarding displaced persons.

The action of the American Legion was taken on the recommendation of the National Americanism Commission made by its chairman, James F. Green. The recommendation was based on first-hand information on the DP problem obtained during a 2-month personal survey overseas by Past National Commander Paul H. Griffith and other prominent Legionnaires.

I invite your attention especially to the following paragraphs from Mr. Green's report to the national executive committee:

"Past Commander Griffith reported that these persons have been driven from their countries by persecution during the last war, or have fled from the tyranny of later established communistic dictatorships. There are no homes to which they may return and there is no hope of reestablishing them where they now are. Neither can they remain forever in the camps in which they are presently located, the objects of our Nation's charity. They must be permitted to reestablish themselves in new lands in which they may pick up the broken fragments of their lives and work out their own destiny under circumstances which will afford them an opportunity to succeed.

"These persons are men and women of character who represent a variety of skills which could be fitted advantageously into our national economy. The ability they have, the occupations they pursue are sorely needed in many part of our land. There are no Communists among them.

"He further reported his own conviction that our present national policy of selective restrictive immigration must be continued and strengthened; however, he informed the commission that the problem of displaced persons must be considered separate and apart from our normal immigration law and custom, as a humanitarian emergency requiring immediate correction applicable to the emergency alone. For that reason, he recommended to the commission that it reconsider its prior position, and make provision for the admission of displaced persons in specifically designated numbers in the United States."

An early solution of this problem is certainly indicated. In line with the present stand of the American Legion on this subject, your support of adequate legislation to admit our fair share of displaced persons is strongly urged.

Sincerely yours,
IRVING M. ENGEL,
Commander.

Richard Eberhart: Minnesota Poet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, Richard Eberhart, one of today's outstanding lyric poets, is a native of Minnesota. During the last war he served with distinction in the United States Navy, and it was on that occasion that I made his acquaintance. He has recently published a collection of his lyric verse under the title "Burr Oaks," the reading of which I strongly recommend. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the review of this book, which recently appeared in the New York Times:

BURR OAKS, BY RICHARD EBERHART, NEW YORK: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

(By Selden Rodman)

Among the half dozen inspired lyric poets writing today in English, Richard Eberhart deserves to be better known in America. His neglect here may be traced in part to the circumstances that he was educated at Cambridge, published by Oxford, and wrongly identified in the early thirties with the Auden-Spender-MacNeice group. Also in part it may have been felt that for an American the subject matter of Eberhart's early poems was too English, his idiom overly literary. Actually Eberhart's one widely quoted poem, The Groundhog, stems directly from Thoreau; and the dry energy of speech that informed such matchless early lyrics as I Walked Out to the Graveyard To See the Dead and I Wish I Could Live at the Pitch That Is Near Madness derives as much from the poet's native Minnesota or adopted Cambridge, Mass., as from the well-assimilated mysticisms of Nash, Blake, or Hopkins. Nevertheless an air of affectation hung heavily over A Bravery of Earth (1930), clouded stretches of Reading the Spirit (1937) and Song and Idea (1942), and has not been altogether dispelled from Eberhart's latest collection.

Burr Oaks is divided into three groups of poems. The first, consisting of short lyrics, contains six of Eberhart's finest—The Ineffable, The Full Weakness of Man, Mysticism Has Not the Patience, The Moment of Vision, I Will Not Dare to Ask One Question, and New Hampshire, February—and at least one of his worst, The Magical. The second group includes four longer poems. Triptych, an argument between a poet and a practical man, fails to come off; one's sympathy is all with the latter who can hardly open his mouth without being overwhelmed by a deluge of whimsy. The title poem is a remembrance of childhood, rich with pastoral imagery.

The Chinese Paper Snake, one of Eberhart's most successful poems, is a subtle and witty evocation, somewhat in the manner of Marianne Moore, of the cross-fertilization of cultures:

The father of a metaphysical principle,
Made in Hong Kong but sold in San Francisco,
The paper snake is foreign to the people of Maine
And has never been seen in the hives of Vienna.
Nearest to stillness his force is most potent.
Thus he adumbrates the meaning of innocence,
Liable in gross action to the unsalvageable and comic;
His least motions manipulate the fiercest evil.
Delicacy is also the mark of civilization
And this is a most uncultured Satanism;
Him no Spengler fingered into exotic play
Nor divested him of his striking parody.

The third part of the book contains six war poems, two of which, Dam Neck, Virginia and The Fury of Aerial Bombardment, have been widely reprinted, and one of which, At the End of the War, has been unaccountably neglected. In these, as in The Chinese Snake, the poem is held in control by its specific subject. Eberhart is an inventive poet, with a healthy urge to let violence and exuberance "shock out over the teeth," and the consequence is that the poems of ideas tend to fly apart like a reved-up machine without a governor. Sometimes the language gets so far out of hand as to be ludicrous, as when he speaks of "My being being being's essence, a mathema" with its "non-feverous, but non brittle-brainy lack-brawn Convolvement." When he adds that "It is to be non-mooned to morality as it is to be bubbly renunciatory"—as proof that "only my I was pure"—one is tempted to beg him to leave his ego alone.

Fortunately, the passage and the style are not typical. Eberhart can write straight, even sparely, and for the most part does. And when he does, he can impart to even so tenuous a subject as the poet himself an unforgettable majesty:

The moment of vision will come when it will,
The gift of the gods, the unshakable
Intuitive stewardship, and still
That matchless satisfaction of the maker.
To read the spirit was all my care and is,
To lose life to find hope,
To destroy in the heady grope
For new world's upon an old's effacement,
Through the breach of evil the breath of grace
The worthy one who did a worthier thing
Than all the worthies did—he kept that hit;
Him whom another age heard not
But now my surest music of the word,
Earth-thrown singer, who burnt his bridges.

Natural Gas Shortage in Pennsylvania Is Not Improving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since the advent of winter weather, western Pennsylvania is again faced with a serious shortage of natural gas.

Even with drastic restrictions in effect regarding the use of gas for certain purposes, the demand for natural gas is the greatest in the history of the industry. The supply of gas has increased over 300,000,000 cubic feet per day and is expected to increase to 400,000,000 cubic feet before the end of the winter.

According to the Federal Power Commission, local natural gas from wells in the Appalachian area continues to decline. With the increased demand for natural gas, due to cold weather, there is today a shortage that has caused industries to either cease operation or transport bottled gas to avert a shutdown.

A complete analysis of the natural-gas situation, as it affects Pennsylvania, is contained in the following letter from Mr. Harrington Wimberly, Acting Chairman of the Federal Power Commission:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, December 19, 1947.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN ZANDT: This will acknowledge your letter of December 4, 1947, in which you requested current information with respect to the natural gas shortage.

From the information the Commission has available, it appears that there will be some, but not much, improvement in the natural

gas picture in Pennsylvania this coming winter over the situation that prevailed last winter, which was described in our letter to you, dated February 27, 1947.

This is in spite of authorization by the Commission of various pipe-line projects to increase the capacity of pipe-line companies to deliver gas in the Appalachian area, such as the projects of Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. to increase its capacity from 263,000 thousand cubic feet per day to 600,000 thousand cubic feet per day and that of Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation (owner of the Big Inch pipe lines) to increase its capacity from 140,000 thousand cubic feet per day to 433,000 thousand cubic feet per day. Tennessee does not expect to have its new facilities completed until the end of 1948 and Texas Eastern expects to reach a capacity of 340,000 thousand cubic feet per day by February 1, 1948, and 433,000 thousand cubic feet per day by August 1, 1948. Other major projects approved recently to help the Appalachian area include a 20-inch pipe line of the United Natural Gas Co. extending from a connection with the Big Inch lines in Greene County, Pa., to its system at Ellwood City, Pa., and the Contesville-Port Jervis line of the Manufacturers Light & Heat Co. in eastern Pennsylvania. These latter projects are scheduled for completion some time this winter. Continuing difficulty in securing steel pipe is hampering the efforts of the gas companies and delaying completion of needed facilities.

Both Texas Eastern and Tennessee Gas appear to be making strenuous efforts to increase the capacity of their systems as authorized by the Commission, and these efforts have resulted in substantial increases in the volume of gas being delivered each day from Texas and Louisiana into the Appalachian area. A year ago this time, the Big Inch lines were being made ready for the transportation of natural gas. Today Texas Eastern is delivering 216,000,000 cubic feet per day through these lines and the quantity will continue to increase this winter as the company completes additional compressor stations. Since last December, Tennessee Gas has increased its capacity more than 100,000,000 cubic feet per day and its construction program is continuing. Thus the outside supply to the Appalachian area has been increased more than 300,000,000 cubic feet per day since last year and this increase will probably exceed 400,000,000 before the end of this winter.

However, local natur l gas supplies from wells in the Appalachian area continue to decline, and the demand for natural gas is the greatest in the history of the industry and is still increasing, despite restrictions and limitations on service to consumers for certain purposes, particularly space heating.

Estimates submitted to the Commission by the principal natural gas distributors in the Appalachian area show that, on a comparable basis (same temperature conditions) the demand of their customers on the peak day of last winter was 3,181,000,000 cubic feet and will increase to 3,378,000,000 cubic feet on this winter's peak day, or by 197,000,000 cubic feet. The total supply from all sources on last winter's peak day was 2,543,000,000 cubic feet and is expected to increase to 2,927,000,000 cubic feet on this winter's peak day, or by 384,000,000 cubic feet. Hence the deficiency in peak day supply will drop from 638,000,000 cubic feet to 451,000,000 cubic feet, or by 187,000,000 cubic feet. The deficiency in supply last year was 20 percent and this year is estimated to be 13 percent of peak day demand. Since the demand of their industrial consumers on this winter's peak day is estimated by these companies to be 635,000,000 cubic feet, the indications are that a curtailment of approximately 70 percent in the use of gas for industrial purposes will be required on the peak day (and lesser percentages on other cold days) in order to protect service to domestic and commercial consumers. Due to inadequacy of facilities or special circumstances, there may be some localities in which service to domestic and commercial consumers cannot be fully and adequately maintained on very cold days.

The Commission's Opinion No. 157, in the matter of Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., and Opinion No. 161, in the matter of Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co., contain information concerning the gas situation which you may find useful, and a copy of each is enclosed.

If you desire any further information concerning the natural gas situation, we shall make our best efforts to supply it.

Sincerely yours,

HARRINGTON WIMBERLY,
Acting Chairman.

Truman and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by Mr. Fred Brinkerhoff, of the Pittsburg (Kans.) Headlight, on the President's recent message on the state of the Union. He is recognized as one of the outstanding editors in Kansas and one who keeps his ear to the grass roots. I know the opinion expressed here is the opinion of the people throughout that section.

The editorial follows:

TRUMAN AND POLITICS

President Truman proposes a reduction of Federal taxes for individuals—$40 for each individual and the same amount for each dependent—and an increase in taxes on corporations to make up the loss in Federal income from individual reductions.

The tax cut for individuals which the President proposes would reduce the Federal Government's income by $3,200,000,000. To offset this loss and retain the Government's income at the present figure, the President would increase the tax on corporations he says are able to pay to take up this slack.

There is nothing in the President's program, which went to Congress after some boasting from Truman aides that the message was a "slugger," to promise reduction of Government expenses. The President said that the Government expenses would be cut down as much as could be safely done. There was no indication that the President believed any reduction could be safe.

The political appeal in the message is obvious. Mr. Truman proposes to throw a little saving to individuals. This he dubbed a cost-of-living cut. At the same time he proposes to hit business, which action would be popular with many individuals who are not in business. His $40 saving would go to more than 54,000,000 Americans. The increase would reach many thousands of corporations. The expected results would be appreciation politically by those receiving the small cuts and approval by them of the increased soaking of the corporations. Soaking corporations is generally considered a paying gesture in politics.

The thing that should appeal with tremendous force to thinking citizens is that the President is not proposing to cut expenses and reduce taxes. He is for maintaining expenses or increasing them and shifting a part of the cost from individuals to business. This will appeal to many as an evasion of the issue that sooner or later must be brought to a solution—that of expenses of government that the people of the United States cannot afford.

Last year Congress sent two tax-reduction bills to the White House. They would have required the reduction of expenses. They would have necessitated the mustering out of an army of pay rollers. The President vetoed them and thus defeated the wishes of the majority of Congress which included in the reduction a great many Democrats. It was maintained then that the tax reduction for which the people had voted overwhelmingly in 1946 should be made at that time. It was suggested that if thrown over into this year the matter would be made a political issue.

There is plenty of reason to conclude that tax reduction now has been made a major political issue. The Republican Congress will be charged with doing that. However, the Republicans of Congress brought in the tax bills last year. They said then that they would be back this year at the very start of the congressional session with tax-reduction legislation. The President was in opposition to reduction. Now he is shifting and proposes reductions—of his own kind—and increases of his own kind, too. Mr. Truman here in 1948 becomes a tax reductionist and cannot escape the charge of promulgating a program for political effect.

The Republican Congress should proceed with its own reduction program which would be an expense-reduction program as well.

Using all efforts to bring about economizing in the Federal Government is a responsibility of the Republican Congress. President Truman stands opposed to that program.

Communists on American Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the American merchant marine is a part of the defense of the United States as well as a part of our peacetime economy. During the past 5 years our Government built a great number of ships which helped to win the war. In the operation of these ships tens of thousands of persons were employed. With the war over the American merchant marine remains an integral part of the defense of our country. Nevertheless those who are engaged in the operation of the American merchant marine have little to say as to who is employed on such ships. The captain must take as crew, whomsoever is sent to the ship, without regard to his belief in America, without regard to his allegiance to America, and without regard to his being a Communist. It has been publicly demonstrated as to the number of Communists engaged in maritime activities throughout the world and it is well known that the philosophy of communism is being spread in utter opposition to America. Yet the commanding officers of our merchant ships flying the American flag, are obliged to take such Communists as part of the crew of an American-flag seagoing ship. It is folly to spend money to stop the progress of communism throughout the world, while the American merchant marine is wide open to the secret attacks of communism. Above all things the American merchant marine should be safe, and be free in its operation from communism. Mr. Speaker, I am requesting that the Federal Bureau of Investigation make an immediate investigation as to Communists serving as crews in the American merchant marine.

Hon. Albert Engel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, ALBERT ENGEL, is highly respected in this body for his industry, fairness, and study of public questions. There appeared an editorial in the Commercial Appeal in my city of Memphis, Tenn., which was most complimentary. It was certainly well and accurately written. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that editorial that he and all of you may know how a great newspaper in the Midsouth feels about him:

SPEED THAT COUNTS

Chairman ENGEL's announcement that flood-control hearings on 1949 fiscal year appropriations will begin next Monday is heartening, indeed, for it indicates a vastly beneficial change of pace and viewpoints.

The hearings start, according to that schedule, on the same day President Truman submits his budget message. In the past, flood-control hearings haven't got underway until weeks after the Budget proposals have been received by the Congress. Not infrequently appropriation measures have not been approved until after a new fiscal year actually begun, and there has been a consequent costly delay in continuing or starting flood-control construction.

It is Chairman ENGEL's hope that hearings can be completed within a period of 3 weeks and that the 1949 appropriations can get final approval by April 15, or not later than May 1. If that can be accomplished it will set a record—give Army engineers an approximate two and a half additional months on their working season.

In his first year as chairman of the War Subcommittee, Representative ENGEL proved, in 1947, that he is a sincere and practical friend of flood control, and of the areas where flood control is imperative. Now he is demonstrating further leadership qualities by insisting that the necessary funds be made available at a time which will enable attainment of maximum benefits.

The gentleman from Michigan is one of the few in Congress, during our long experience with flood-control matters, who has quickly come to realize that flood-control construction is something requiring months of preappropriation planning and that, in the main, it is done on continuing basis from year to year.

Failure to know what could be expected in the way of funds well in advance of the start of any given fiscal year has been the greatest barrier to achievement of peak construction efficiency. Worse, it has resulted in great waste and frequently has been an invitation to flood destruction. Contrary to the rule, haste with flood-control funds means vast savings—a fact which Chairman ENGEL obviously recognizes.

Our Navy in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of January 9, 1948:

OUR NAVY IN THE FUTURE

In his valedictory report to the Secretary of the Navy, Fleet Admiral Nimitz has drawn up an impressive argument against those who have come to belittle the role of sea power in the new age of rockets, guided missiles, long-range bombers, supersonic flight, atomic weapons, and other actual or potential wonders revolutionizing the grim art of warfare.

It may be, of course, that navies will one day be largely obsolete, but Admiral Nimitz, who has just retired as our Chief of Naval Operations, leaves little room for doubt that that day is distant. In his opinion, and it is a decidedly convincing one, our sea-air power, which now controls the oceans more absolutely than they have ever before been controlled by any other nation, will be of decisive importance to us "in the event of war within the foreseeable future."

This holds true, according to Admiral Nimitz, in both a defensive and offensive sense. But it is of particular significance offensively. Thus, given its present strength in relation to others, our Navy—surface, subsurface, and air—probably would have only a minor problem of defense in case of war in the next decade or so. Its attack role, however, would be very large. Wholly apart from what it would have to do to transport troops and arms to advanced areas—a thing that no other service is equipped to do on the same scale—it would be expected, especially in the opening stages of hostilities, to project its weapons against vital enemy targets on land, the reduction of which is the basic objective of warfare.

Moreover, as Admiral Nimitz persuasively argues, our Navy, if properly maintained and kept up to the minute in adjusting itself to revolutionary new weapons, would be admirably suited for such offensive operations. As demonstrated against Japan, it could have great, mobile, fast-striking task forces virtually as complete as any air base ever established. From these, set up offshore anywhere in the world, it could launch carrier planes capable of dropping atomic bombs, or it could use its heavy surface ships and submarines to project rockets and guided missiles. Indeed, as Admiral Nimitz sees it, our Navy—air, surface, and subsurface—should be able within the next 10 years to critically damage enemy vital areas many hundreds of miles inland. The task forces—the great floating bases—would make this possible and they would be able, besides, to defend themselves with arms and tactics specifically designed to cope with the special naval problems created by the atom and kindred instruments of mass destruction.

Certainly, as far as the foreseeable future is concerned, this estimate of our sea-air strength seems so sound that we can ignore it only at the risk of frittering away our present absolute control of the oceans—a control of vital interest to us, in Admiral Nimitz's words, not because it means riches and power as such, but because it bulwarks our national security and serves to promote that balance and stability among nations that will insure to each the right of self-determination. In sum, until there is genuine disarmament and collective security, our Navy must remain preeminent for the sake of our own peace and the world's as well.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, at a regular meeting of the Ogdensburg Rotary Club, Ogdensburg, N. Y., the following resolution was adopted endorsing the great St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project has received the endorsement of every President from Woodrow Wilson to Harry Truman. It has been approved by the Governor of this State and many other States.

It offers a splendid power site and deep water connection between the Atlantic and the world's greatest inland waterway, the Great Lakes.

Our supplies of high grade ore are being rapidly depleted in the West and upwards of one-half billion tons have been discovered in Labrador and the seaway is needed to transport it cheaply to the blast furnaces near the Great Lakes from Pittsburgh to Chicago.

The United States and Canada on March 19, 1941, signed an agreement to complete the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway and power project. Most of the construction work needed to complete this development of the Nation's No. 1 power project has been completed except in the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence River in the boundary waters between the State of New York and the Province of Ontario.

The completion of the seaway will modernize the existing channel for commerce already improved for use by ocean-cargo vessels.

The dual-purpose navigation and power project to be built will develop 2,200,000 horsepower of the cheapest electric horsepower in the world, to be divided equally between the State of New York and the Province of Ontario.

The completion of this great power project will reduce the household rates throughout the State about 63 percent, and will reduce the cost of power to industries by one-half:

Resolved, That we who live in the St. Lawrence Valley and for years have seen the waste of its mighty resource, declare the proposed project to be the greatest public improvement to be built in any part of the world, and strongly favor its construction in order to provide tens of thousands of jobs for returned veterans, displaced war workers; to promote foreign trade and domestic commerce in all parts of the United States; and to furnish 4,000,000 or more individuals—rural and industrial consumers of the State

of New York—with power and electricity at low rates.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to President Truman; the Governor of the State of New York, Hon. Thomas E. Dewey; to the senior Senator of the State of New York, Hon. Robert F. Wagner; to the junior Senator of the State of New York, Hon. Irving Ives; and to our Representative in Congress, Hon. Clarence Kilburn. That a copy also be forwarded to the Power Authority of the State of New York; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to other Rotary clubs in this State with the recommendation that they adopt similar resolutions.

CORNWALL ROTARY CLUB,
DONALD A. HUNTER, *President*.

Approved:

CLARK M. BOWMAN,
Secretary.

Inspired Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial by Mrs. Roe Chase, editor and publisher of the Anoka Herald, which appeared on January 8, 1948. Mrs. Chase is one of the outstanding editors in my State and her editorial "Inspired Control," reflects the conclusion of many Christian Americans, that most of our present-day evils result from excessive materialism and blind self-interest. I am sure we could solve many of our problems if we were to pay more heed to Christian principles. This is really an inspired editorial:

INSPIRED CONTROL

President Truman's call for new rationing brings up an old lesson—one we never seem to learn from history. Freedom and selfishness won't mix. When men do not voluntarily control selfishness, somebody has to step in to curtail freedom.

Why, however, is it always freedom that's curtailed? Efforts have also been made to end selfishness. But these nearly always simmer down to preachment. Somebody tells somebody else to be less selfish. And we need, not exhortation, but inspiration.

Unselfish men can inspire unselfishness in others. They can, with authority, call on others for the self-control that makes government control unnecessary. Without this authority we can't call for unselfishness in anybody. So the place to start is with you and me.

It may be hard for you and me to be unselfish. It may even be impossible if we try it on our own. But hundreds—even thousands—find that the secret of unselfishness lies in loving something bigger than yourself—love of family, love of country, love of God. The latter, they say, takes care of both the former. So those of us who are tired of having others control our freedom might take a chance at letting God control our demands.

Inner discipline of this kind insures continuance of freedom with stability in economics. Rising morals in you and me can begin to end rising prices in the Nation, without recourse to compulsion, rations, or controls.

Rent-Control Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of December 29, 1947, outlining the experience and the results of rent control in France over a period of 33 years:

RENT-CONTROL STORY—FRANCE'S RENT CEILINGS ARE 33 YEARS OLD; SO IS HER HOUSING SHORTAGE—SOME APARTMENTS COST BUT $10 A YEAR; UNREPAIRED BUILDINGS FALL APART—BUILDERS WON'T RISK MONEY

(By Charles R. Hargrove)

PARIS.—For 33 years France has enjoyed rent controls. And for 33 years France has suffered from a housing shortage. Today it's one of the world's worst.

Last year Paris saw 60,000 people turned out of 2,600 uninhabitable buildings. This year the number has about doubled.

Paris police recently warned about the danger of injury or death from falling pieces of balconies, chimneys, cornices, and window railings because "for years no repairs have been executed on the facades of the buildings."

The police, of course, called proprietors' attention to their "responsibility." The proprietors, after three decades of super low rents that meant investment losses, replied by reminding the Government of its responsibility for their irresponsibilities.

NOBODY WANTS TO BUILD

You can go almost anywhere in France today and see people living in makeshift homes. The state has no money to put into new houses. Private builders, even if they can get the materials and locate laborers, have no desire to risk their money in a field that has been so rigidly controlled by the Government. Although properties built now are not subject to rent control, they would have to carry rentals 5 to 10 times the controlled properties to make a profit.

It was the First World War that brought the first law designed to keep homes cheap, to compensate for soaring prices of food and clothing. What started off as emergency legislation has, over the years, developed into a series of laws voted by successive Parliaments. Rent legislation is now so complex it defies the comprehension of landlord and tenant and everyone else except a handful of experts.

The first law provided a sort of moratorium on rent increases. Subsequent laws were all based on two main principles: (1) The maintenance of rent ceilings that would rise with currency devaluation but never in proportion to the devaluation, and (2) the right of tenants, with few exceptions, to retain their homes despite lease expirations.

Following the First World War it was decided that buildings built after 1918 would be free from rent control; that was to stimulate building. But this privilege lapsed with World War II, and now all buildings predating 1939 are under controls.

RENTALS 1 TO 5 PERCENT OF ANNUAL INCOME

For that half of France's population which lives in cities, where house renting is the rule and house owning the exception, all this mass of legislation means that as long as you behave yourself nobody can turn you out of your apartment. And your apartment will cost you at best 1 percent of your annual income and at worst 5 percent.

Take an example or two.

Here is the proprietor of a house that has been split into two-room apartments with kitchens, running water, electricity and modern sanitation. Several tenants in this house earn the equivalent of $1,800 a year; yet they pay only $10 a year rent. The landlord's gross income from all rentals in this house is $978 a year. Yet after deducting costs of operating there is barely $100 left for him and that is subject to taxes.

Or take the theoretical but typical case of a mason living in what is officially classed as a "worker's dwelling," built in 1914. The rent then was less than 1 franc a day. Now it is around 4 francs (a little over 3 cents). But the mason back in 1914 earned 5 francs a day and now earns more than 900. Thus in 1914, the mason's rent was about 14 percent of his income; today it's a little over 1 percent.

The only condition for being able to settle your annual rent bill with the earnings from a day or two of work is that you stick to your apartment. That, of course, presents many practical problems. A young married couple, for example, is comfortable in a compact two-room place; but over the years the family may expand to five or six people to be cramped into the same space. Or a big family that occupies six rooms may shrink down again to a couple—bouncing around in unneeded space. In some cases such contracting families leave extra rooms empty.

SWAPS AND PREMIUMS

There is one possible way out of such dilemmas. Tenants can arrange to swap premises. Some newspapers, in fact, do a big business in advertising such trades.

In such a rental situation it is inevitable that a black market would exist. Generally there is no direct open cash bribe. But the person taking over an unfurnished apartment will pay an exaggerated sum for old wornout furniture left by the outgoing tenant.

Thus an ancient carpet might bring 48,000 francs (about $400). Sometimes American dollars are demanded, due to distrust of the franc. Instances are known where a million francs (about $3,400) have been paid to find a home this way.

Frenchmen have come to take it for granted that landlords should pay for the privilege of having them as tenants. But underneath there is a growing concern among those thinking Frenchmen who look further than their noses. Not only is most housing antique, it has become dilapidated.

MANY ANCIENT BUILDINGS

Real-estate men explain that a building in urban regions can normally be used 60 to 100 years. In Paris over half the buildings are more than 60 years old. Throughout France one building in five dates back more than 100 years; in certain areas the proportion runs as high as 70 percent. Some experts in this field forecast that over the next few years a high percentage of France's 9,000,000 homes will fall in ruins for lack of upkeep.

And for 33 years there has been almost no new housing. For 10 of those years there was war. Between the two World Wars and since the last one, building has been either suspended or so far below normal as to make little impression. The last war, what's more, destroyed or damaged an estimated 300,000 dwellings.

France's building industry, meantime, has become as out of date as her buildings. The secretary of the building federation recently estimated that in France it takes 25,000 man-hours of work to build a house. In Britain, he said, the figure is 9,000 and in America it is 4,500.

France's building-cost index stands at 6,500, compared with 100 in 1914. The rent index, in sharp contrast, has risen only to 500 from 100.

All political parties and classes of people agree France's housing conditions can't go on as they are. Already millions are living in hovels. But what happens when the hovels collapse?

REMEDIES ARE PROPOSED

There are several proposals—all with their own draw-backs.

Rents could be raised sharply, to a point where landlords could afford to repair their properties. But such sudden mark-ups would mean hundreds of thousands would have to get out of dwellings they couldn't then afford, or their wages would have to be raised sharply, adding to France's inflationary spiral.

The Tenants' Federation has put forward a plan to finance new buildings by the issue of special redeemable notes interchangeable with ordinary bank notes. That is the way to headlong inflation, monetary experts emphasize.

Another scheme, somewhat more reasonable and more likely of being tried, calls for a series of moderate readjustments of rents. A portion of all such increases would be earmarked for a fund to assist in new building. But even this more cautious approach to the problem implies stability of the general price level. When prices of other things rise as much as 25 percent in a few months, as they have recently, an increase of 5 percent or 10 percent in rents would still leave landlords' income lagging.

If the housing problem is allowed to drift along and owners are forced into bankruptcy, the state will be able to buy housing properties for a song. More conservative people in the Government suggest that Communists, so recently active in France, have not overlooked this possibility.

The Late Honorable Clarence Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the passing of my good friend and former colleague Clarence Hancock. I immediately thought of my first meeting with Clarence when I came to Washington in January 1943 to begin my first term in the House of Representatives. From the very start, I was greatly impressed with his quiet manner and what seemed to me to be very valuable information for a freshman in Congress to receive. A friendship started then that I shall always cherish. It so happened that we belonged to the same college fraternity and possibly it was due to that fact that he gave me so much good and sound advice. Soon I learned of his ability as a legislator and the respect all the Members of the House held for him. To this day it is not unusual to hear Members who served on the Committee on the Judiciary with him, express the highest praise for his judgment and their regret that he was no longer with them. Personally, I feel that one of the highest compliments that can come to a man is the support and confidence given him by his home people. This Clarence Hancock had. His great patriotic spirit for his country and devotion to the people of Onondaga County will always be remembered. His good-natured humor, sound advice, and delightful fellowship with the Members of our New York delegation are qualities we all admired and shall deeply miss.

My deepest sympathy goes to Mrs. Hancock and their son John. It was my good fortune to have known this family quite well. I have always admired the love and loyal family spirit that existed. I know that Mrs. Hancock and John will have the courage to bear this great loss, feeling that Clarence would have it no other way.

"Investigatin' Congress"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago I saw the following little article in the December 14, 1947, issue of This Week magazine. It is by Wally Boren, author of the popular Wally's Wagon column in that publication. We who are on the receiving end here in Congress are in the best possible position to know how exceptionally well expressed Mr. Boren's article is. I take the liberty of quoting one sentence from a letter I have subsequently received from Mr. Boren:

I am thinking of a follow-up piece; it's terribly important that the American public have a feeling of warmth and friendliness toward Congressmen—the foundation on which a respect for Congress, the institution, is built.

In short, let us differ on issues as much as necessary. But let not our differences break down faith in the great institution itself.

Here is Wally Boren's December 14 article:

You know, if I was a Congressman, I would get somebody tough to bargain for me. I would want a fellow that could get me some fair treatment.

Couple of weeks ago a Congressman stopped here. We don't have many Congressmen amongst our regular trade, so I started in braggin' about how I had fried a hamburger for the Honorable Mister X.

Those that recognized the name all knew somethin' bad about him. 'e had voted wrong on the tax bill or was bought body an' soul by the lobbyists or was known to be a horse thief.

Those that never heard of him before didn't want to now. He was a Member of Congress an' that was enough to stamp him as a nitwit an' a wife beater. Now I think this is all wrong. Congressmen do a lot of good things. But you just take a look at the papers. Or listen to the commentators on the radio. You could cram a year's praise of Congress on a postage stamp. The critcizin' an' complainin' about Congress hardly leave room on the air for the soap operas an' practically crowds the murder stories off the front page.

I was over to the library yesterday. Had to take Miss Coggins, the librarian, some lunch. So I asked her, did she have any books devoted to extollin' the good deeds an' high quality of the elected representatives of the people. Sure enough, she had one. It was wrote in 1904 an' the last time anybody took it out was the summer of '09.

However, Miss Coggins found 41 books that knifed the law-makin' boys—not countin' two shelves of history books heavily sprinkled with their misdoin's.

There was four books defendin' Jesse James, a couple that claimed Benedict Arnold was a martyr an' quite a few that figured some of our famous bandits an' grafters was only guilty of boyish pranks.

But I learn from Miss Coggins that the present Washington set-up is the Eightieth Congress in a row—an' the country is likely to survive a few more. I just can't believe the United States has managed to be as big an' rich, in spite of Congress.

Past is, I feel so patriotic an' so sympathetic towards Congress that if I knew my Congressmen's name, I'd write the stinker a fan letter.

WALLY BOREN.

Survival in Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the second in the series written by Philip H. Parrish, editor of the Portland Oregonian editorial page, on European problems:

SURVIVAL IN CHAOS—DISCOMFORTS OF ATLANTIC CROSSINGS OFFSET BY NEAR DISASTERS ON LAND

(This is the second of a series of articles detailing observations recently made in Europe by Philip H. Parrish, editor of the Oregonian editorial page. The writer spent 7 weeks in Germany, Austria, France, and England.)

(By Philip H. Parrish)

After my 1946 trip to Europe, and the articles resulting from the trip, a surprising number of persons asked why I hadn't written anything about how it felt to fly the Atlantic.

The reason was that it had seemed presumptuous to dwell upon the trials and palpitations of a party of VIP's (very important persons), when so many scores of thousands of our service personnel had made the crossing on bucket seats as a mere detail of the war—dutiful if not uncomplaining.

After all, we did have it better. Very frequently, if one were quick, there was a double seat or a space on the floor of the DC-4 where one could hunch into an hour of restless sleep. Not, however, in the broader space between the front seat and the baggage compartment. That was reserved, by unanimous consent, for Ralph McGill, learned and hearty editor of the Atlanta Constitution, as the only place ample for his girth. Experienced traveler that he is, Mr. McGill could curl up there like a great teddy bear.

COWLING FLOODED

Not that a VIP's feet smell better than others when you are sleeping in an aisle, and not that our journeys were without discomforts and adventures, or at least near adventures. All of Europe and even the Islands between were shrouded in cloud and rain and sometimes snow, so that several times we had to come down through the overcast under ground-control assistance.

Then there was that night of tropical downpour in the Azores, when we sat in our plane on the rocky ledge which forms the Lagens airfield, impatiently waiting for the engines to turn over and the ship to take

off on the final hop to Bermuda and home. But if they had turned over, we would have been fried on the spot or we would be running yet—one or the other.

Capt. Charles A. Thomas, our devoted chief pilot, came into the cabin.

"Someone in serving the plane overflowed the gasoline," he explained, not too happily. "About 50 gallons are loose in the cowling of the No. 4 engine. We caught it dripping and vaporizing in the rain."

GEAR FREEZES

So back we went up the hill through the storm to the officers' club, very glad to be alive, and not at all minding that the eternal gales of the Azores kept the club roof out of repair, so that water ran in on some of our beds. It was fortunate in another way that we returned that night. We found we had miscounted and had left Herbert Brucker, editor of the Hartford, Conn., Courant, behind asleep. Odd. Herbert was annoyed at having been overlooked but mollified by the thought that he might have been the only survivor. I think he would have considered it a form of justice.

Then there was that earlier incident at the Azores, on the way over, when the hydraulics handling the landing wheels froze and the wheels had to be shaken down with gravity. The Red Cross wagon and crew were waiting below for pieces of VIP's in event that didn't work. But we didn't know this until afterwards. In a way, it's better to know things afterwards.

All of which is to say that, as yet, air travel to Europe, particularly in Decemberish weather, isn't designed for pleasure, under the best of auspices. The north European plane is wrapped in much colder and closer clouds than western Oregon knows, and London is painfully as advertised, with the sun a red ball through the fog for a short time each day. And so far as living when one gets there is concerned, it is impossible in Germany and Austria unless one is an authorized traveler and can stop in army hotels, and it is difficult in such countries as Britain and France because of the fearful prices. Of course, one can always deal on the black market and buy British pounds at more than a 25-percent discount, or French francs at better than 260 to the dollar instead of the legal 120. But there is also the foreign jail.

VEIL WELCOME

For my purposes, however, it was actually helpful that clouds should have obscured the sea approaches to Europe and lain like a floor beneath us as we moved into the Continent. Last year I had leaned out the windows the better to see the hedgerows of Normandy, the roofs of Paris, the vineyards of the Rhine, and the little strip farms around the innumerable villages of the plains—all merging into an economy so strange to western eyes. But the scene was clear from memory, and this time I was satisfied to zoom down through the ceiling onto the Templehof Airfield, close to the center of Berlin, having my return in the very heart of the very worst.

That is, one stepped directly—it seemed a matter of moments—out of boisterous, crowded, unscarred Washington, with its jammed stores and jammed traffic, into the darkened ruins of what had been Europe's greatest city. One stepped from the brilliant, if perhaps unstable, peace of the New World into the Old World's grimmest example of what all-out war means in an industrial civilization. Here the scurrying, drab, dirty, and unsmiling people passing among the rubble of a city 60 percent destroyed, lived in obedience to Darwin's law of survival. Here an estimated 80 to 90 percent of the women had been raped by a barbarian conqueror. (Don't mention that, you say. But why not?)

Here a comparatively cultured people had released the lawlessness of war and now existed in the wretchedness they had designed for others.

TRANSITION SUITS

But I don't intend to preach. The point is that the suddenness of the transition from Washington to Berlin exactly suited my particular program—a program resulting from my observations in 1946 and considerable studying done in preparation for the second trip.

It is obvious, of course, that what has happened in Europe, primarily Germany, is what philosophers and imaginative writers have been stewing about for a century and a half—almost since the beginning of the industrial revolution, when people started massing in cities and leaving a dwindling percentage of the population to farming, fishing, and forestry. What about catastrophe? the philosophers wanted to know. What then? they asked. Anatole France made it the theme, and the smashing final chapter, of his Penguin Island. He conceived of a disgusted human as dynamiting the industrial agglomeration and leaving the blackened rocks to wild animals.

We know now, from experience, that M. France made his people much too amenable to dynamite. Industrialized man has undergone worse and lived, after a fashion.

BATTLE STILL ON

But the battle for survival isn't concluded. The people of these top-heavy and now almost smokeless industrial centers continue to burrow and hoard among the stones, and claw one another for what they can secure from the countryside, meanwhile eking out with foreign—largely American—generosity. If that generosity were withdrawn at this particular moment, western Germany—the industrialized heart of Europe—would inevitably resort to animal law within a matter of weeks, and I regard it a duty, as a privileged witness, to give the clearest possible report on the conduct of the two principal classes in Germany—the city masses and the peasant producers—so that readers can judge for themselves just how far they wish to go in discouraging or encouraging America's official policies.

Then there is the further necessity of always insisting that we, as Americans and citizens of the New World, stop judging the Europeans as though they were exactly like ourselves.

Perhaps the most shocking thing to me on these visits has been the discovery of the degree of difference. Not that I was unacquainted with the situation from the standpoint of theory. Obviously Europe, including European Russia, is only about the size of the United States and yet is fragmented into many nations, each with its ancient quarrels and prides. Obviously no one of these nations has resources for the American standard of material prosperity, and obviously they need to federate and destroy the disastrous customs barriers which entwine them in poverty.

What one is not really prepared for is the unplumbable depths of their resistance. One is not prepared for the narrowness of their minds as well as their fields. In the United States, where the population is made up of peoples of all races we cannot be prepared for a situation where each race or pseudo-race nurses its tribal heroes and its memories, and hates all its neighbors for wrongs of centuries ago. We cannot be prepared for the fact that there isn't a Lincoln or a Washington in all the galaxy of Europe's great. Through the centuries the Europeans have pulled their forelocks to strength and ruthlessness, while we in our brief history have denied the final salute to those whose strength lacked moral character.

STARK REALITY

I may not have agreed with the late Mr. Roosevelt's programs, but there was an ocean, and ages, between him and Hitler, and between the peoples who followed the two.

All this, which is ordinarily just schoolbook stuff, becomes stark reality to the visitor in Europe today—a Europe stripped of pretense and raw in its hunger.

I thought of all this during our flight above the clouds across western Europe, and tried to bear it in mind throughout our subsequent travels in Germany, Austria, France, and Britain. I felt that my report must do more even than give the maximum of details as to how the city masses and the peasants of central Europe were meeting catastrophe. It also must contain a background of psychological explanation of Europe—not in criticism and not for purposes of sitting in judgment. (There, but for the will of God, go I.)

But for the purposes of cautioning all of us in America to make due concessions on behalf of peoples who have been living under more restricted conditions, and who, at the same time, feel a constant sense of superiority as a result of having given birth to modern civilization. It is hard on western Europeans to have upstart America and upstart Russia struggling and maneuvering across their sacred acres.

MARSHALL HEARD

Having borne this thought in mind throughout Europe, it was strange I should have ended up in London at the Pilgrims dinner, and heard Secretary of State Marshall, the guest of honor, rise and express almost the same idea—in a voice quiet and patient. It was the night of the day on which he had made clear that the Russian position was unacceptable and could not be taken as a basis for further negotiation by the foreign ministers.

He spoke of the difficulties which the people of the United States have in understanding the exact conditions, and the outlook, of Europe. He was sorry for this. There seemed for a moment to be apology in his tone.

Then he added—and a touch of sadness in his voice made his message moving and magnificent—that the reverse must be realized. The difficulty of Americans in understanding Europe, he said, was less than the difficulty of Europeans in understanding America—the breadth of our continent, our traditions, our way of life.

I can only hope that the idea sank home among the assembled ministers and the lords of the empire. Understanding works both ways. Europeans should not always be talking and expecting; sometimes they should be listening.

But I am getting ahead of myself. Just now, for the purposes of this series, our DC-4 is coming down through the clouds onto Templehof Airdrome—an airdrome whose very name once caused the world to shiver, but which now rises silently up to meet us, grim and gray.

Burial of Veterans Dying Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War in accordance with existing law, the parents, widow or next of kin of one who died in the service of his country, who elect to bring their loved ones back to this country for burial, are allowed $75 for that purpose. This amount is not adequate to defray the necessary expenses.

Although I understand that a considerable number of morticians, with commendable generosity, have adopted a policy of not charging in excess of this amount at least in cases where such additional charge would constitute real hardship, several constituents have called to my attention the fact that they have been required to expend considerably larger sums in order to give to these war heroes the final token of honor, respect, and affection which they have so richly earned.

While it is unquestionably our duty to scrutinize carefully every assault upon the public purse, it came as a shock to me, as I feel it will to most of the Members, to learn that the families of these boys, who gave their lives that the rest of us might live in peace and in freedom, have been called upon to defray a large portion of the interment expenses. In many cases they could ill afford this outlay. It meant perhaps going without the actual necessities of life for an extended period in order that a fitting final memorial might be accorded a fallen hero husband or son. I cannot believe that those who sent us here want or expect us to economize at this expense to those who have already given so much. It is small wonder that I have detected a certain note of bitterness in some of the correspondence which I have received on this subject. To relieve, rather than to increase, the suffering of those who grieve should be our aim.

I have, therefore, introduced a bill to provide for reimbursement to the next of kin of their interment expenses in a sum not to exceed $200 provided the burial is in a military or national cemetery or a burial plot set apart in a private cemetery and provided without cost to the next of kin. The measure further provides that if the family prefers to have the remains rest in a family plot or one purchased or provided by the next of kin, a sum not to exceed $275 will be allowed for that purpose. This legislation is applicable not only in the future but also to those cases where burial has already been effected and where an expenditure has been made in excess of the amount allowed by the Government.

This bill, in my judgment, merits the support of those many Members who I know feel, as I do, a deep and continuing obligation to the widows, mothers, fathers, and close relatives of those who fell in defense of us and our great Nation.

Federal Loyalty Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Northern Virginia Daily, Strasburg, Va., of January 8, 1948:

FEDERAL LOYALTY TESTS

The very difficult matter of measuring the loyalty of Federal employees is now in operation. There are more than 2,000,000 persons on Federal pay rolls all over the country. The task of processing that many individuals is in itself a tremendous job. Yet it is essential to be sure of the loyalty of the people who serve and administer our Government. The definition of a thing as elusive as loyalty presents an added problem. The Loyalty Board, headed by Seth W. Richardson, former Assistant Attorney General under President Hoover, appears to be endeavoring to use common sense and good judgment in dealing with a problem so delicate and yet so vital.

The Board has stated two standards by which it will appraise the loyalty of Federal employees: First, that the employee is not serving a foreign power, and second; that he does not hold beliefs or belong to organizations calling for the overthrow of the United States Government. These seem to be very mild tests. Any employee who deserves to be on the Federal pay roll should be able to clear himself on both these counts.

Certainly there is nothing unreasonable or unfair in demanding such clearance. The affairs of the Federal Government are much too vital to be entrusted to people whose loyalty is open to question. If an uncertainty exists in any particular case, it is better to err on the side of national safety than otherwise.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, raised to new peace-time power, has complete authority in weighing the status of United States workers in the matter of loyalty. In most cases the FBI will give no special attention to the routine statements employees must sign. It is only in the case of adverse information that the worker will be brought before loyalty boards to be set up in various sections. This loyalty sifting is an effort to weed out Communists from Federal bureaus where many have found pleasant berths. Obviously there will be some outcry that the screening is in violation of the Bill of Rights. This is not true, of course, for the Federal Government, like any other employer, has the right to decide who shall work for it and who shall not.

It is important to bear in mind that Federal employees have no vested right in their jobs, any more than the employees of private businesses have. Their ability, their conduct, their character, their temperament, and their general suitability for their employment are all subject to the scrutiny of their employers as are the similar qualifications of other workers. In other words, Uncle Sam doesn't owe anybody a job and doesn't have to keep them employed if they don't suit him. No witch hunt is being made of the loyalty investigation. Those who make the loudest protest against being investigated are likely to be those with most to fear. For most employees the whole thing will be merely routine. No good American need fear complete investigation. He should, on the contrary, take pride in proving his status as a loyal American.

Taxes and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Jackson Herald published in Ripley, W. Va., and edited by Mr. Sattis Simmons.

Ripley is the center of enormous natural gas production territory in West Virginia, and one of the finest farm sections of the Ohio Valley. No doubt the good editor is reflecting the thinking of the people in his section. It should impress the Members of the House that the people back home are not being fooled by the administration's double-talk on taxes.

The editorial follows:

TAXES AND INFLATION

One of the prime arguments of those favoring high taxes is that such taxes are anti-inflationary, that to lower personal taxes will increase inflation by stimulating buying on the part of the public.

Under certain conditions this might be true, but not under the New Deal theories which are still activating the executive department of our Government. It is generally agreed that the first safeguard against uncontrolled inflation is a balanced national budget. Our Federal budget has to all intents and purposes been balanced. High taxes limit the spending power of the individual in a time when prices are high and consumer goods are scarce. But they do not necessarily prevent inflation. For the Government will not save the bulk of the money it gets as a surplus from high taxes and apply it on the national debt. What it has been doing and will do is to spend this money itself. It will do this through an inflated budget, with a greater than necessary public pay roll and through heavy spending in Europe.

Now if the Government collects, say, five billions more through high income-tax rates it takes this much spending power away from our people. But if Uncle Sam spends this money himself he is not curtailing inflation. Quite the reverse. It means spending more money on a million too many Government employees who produce nothing in the way of consumer goods which might hold prices down. It means spending more money in Europe which indicates, in turn, shipping more scarce goods out of the country. So far as inflation is concerned there is little difference whether his money is spent by the Government or by our own people, who could use it in their own interests if their taxes were reduced.

Century of Rising United States Debt Ending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it might be of some interest to the Members to consider the extraordinary and extravagant budget proposal by President Truman in the light of the facts and figures set forth in an article which I am including with this observation:

CENTURY OF RISING UNITED STATES DEBT ENDING; PER CAPITA BILL $1,789—CITIZENS OF 1836 OWED NOTHING, BUT A DEPRESSION THE NEXT YEAR STARTED BORROWING WHICH HAS GROWN STEADILY FOR 11 DECADES

WASHINGTON, December 20.—The United States is nearing the end of its eleventh

decade of rising public debt. Since 1837 the Treasury has been going deeper into the red.

Today the Federal debt is about $258,000,000,000, each citizen's share is $1,789, and the man with a family of four owes a little more than $7,000. He is paying interest on it, in taxes, at about 2 percent a year.

The lucky American of 1835 and 1836 owed not a cent of public debt. The account had been practically wiped out by good husbandry and sale of public lands.

In 1837, because of a depression, the Government began a little borrowing—$336,000—and the long upward climb began. The debt has been in the millions and billions since 1838.

The United States started out in life with a debt, a total of $75,880,000 in 1790 ($19.32 a person). This comprised chiefly Revolutionary War expenses of both the Federal Government and the States. The small young Nation tightened its belt and achieved a remarkable reduction of the debt to $45,000,000 by the time the War of 1812 began. This was despite President Jefferson's expenditure of $11,250,000 for the Louisiana Territory, deemed a gross extravagance by many.

GALLATIN PLAN CUT DEBT

The whittling was done largely through a plan of Albert Gallatin, fourth Secretary of the Treasury, whose statue was recently erected in front of the Treasury.

The debt first went into billion-dollar figures after the Civil War. The Union in 1866 owed $2,755,763,000 ($77.69 a person). This debt was retired slowly, but fairly consistently, until the Spanish-American War gave it a boost. Construction of the Panama Canal and some other expenses kept the figure high.

The national debt was about $1,000,000,000 in 1914. World War I raised it to $25,484,500,000 ($253 a person). In the 1920's we paid off at the rate of about 2½ percent a year and reduced the total to $16,185,308,000 in 1930.

Deficit spending in the depression years brought the debt to $40,445,417,000 in 1939. To finance the last war we borrowed about $225,000,000,000, bringing the national debt to its all-time peak of $279,764,000,000 on February 28, 1946.

No people in the world ever owed so much real money as we do. Foreign nations' debts through monetary inflation have reached numerically higher figures, but every dollar of our debt is a Government obligation which can be cashed in for money. It is, of course, an "internal" debt—owned by a large portion of our people, financed by the whole people.

DEBTS RELATIVELY MODERN

The whole idea of Government borrowing seems to be relatively modern. Very little was done until the latter part of the 1700's. Before that government loans were transactions between kings and private money lenders. (Kings had poor credit standings. The lenders often used to make them put up the crown jewels or the crown lands.)

Political philosophers frowned on public borrowing. David Hume, in 1752, warned that it would waste the public's money in interest charges, and that it would encourage idleness among those living on the interest. Adam Smith, in 1776, predicted that borrowing would ruin any state which tried it.

But the habit of borrowing grew with the development of democracies. The peoples willingly supported taxation, and government obligations were viewed as sound investments.

Scholars changed their opinions. C. F. Bastable wrote in 1892: "We may say that any state that pretends to be civilized regards the creation of a debt as one of the essential marks of its having reached that position."

Great Britain is one of the most practiced borrowers in the world. She had a debt of £50,000,000 in 1715. At the end of the Napoleonic Wars she owed £861,000,000. The British national debt had risen to £1,171,000,000 by the time World War I began.

Most of the British debt in 1914 was about 100 years old. The Government had redeemed only about 35 percent of it in a century. World War I raised the total of the British debt elevenfold, and interest charges just after the war amounted to 48 percent of the tax yield.

The British debt at present amounts to about $103,000,000,000, of which all but about $3,000,000,000 is an internal obligation.

The Labor Party during its administration in the 1920's seriously discussed a capital levy as a means of cutting or eliminating the debt. This means appropriating a proportion of all the wealth and property in the nation. But the plan was abandoned.

Some countries on the Continent, practically bankrupt because of debt and monetary inflation, have resorted to capital levies. In Czechoslovakia and Germany it seems to have had some success, but it was a failure in most countries. What can a government do with hundreds of billions of dollars worth of property?

Russia, despite her scorn of capitalistic processes, has contracted quite a substantial internal debt—182,000,000,000 rubles, as reported by the State Department previous to the conversion of the ruble this week. It is not yet known how the conversion affects this total. In terms of the new diplomatic rate of exchange this amounts to $22,750,000,000.

Before 1915 she borrowed from her people at 4-percent interest. Since then all her bond issues have been on a lottery plan. Instead of interest, lottery prizes are given to a portion of the bondholders. The rest receive only their principal after a certain term of years.

Road to Peace or to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Winchester Evening Star, Winchester, Va., of January 3, 1948:

ROAD TO PEACE OR TO WAR

With 1948 comes the third anniversary of the United Nations. And this New Year finds the world league not only in ill health, but so sick that many of its friends fear lest its cradle becomes its grave.

The failure of the United Nations to function as an effective instrument for world peace seems to rest almost entirely on the primary defect in the United Nations' charter—the veto power. This permits one nation, if it be Russia, United States, Britain, France, or China, to veto any act or policy agreed upon by the rest of the nations. Almost every experienced observer admits that a world organization cannot succeed so long as one nation possesses the power to nullify the hopes, the fears, and the wishes of all the others.

That being the case, why is it that the State Department and the President will not take positive steps leading to the elimination of the absolute veto? There can be only two possible answers: Either (1) the administration lacks faith in the world organization and desires that it remain as impotent as it is now; or (2) it believes that an effort to modify the veto would bring about the withdrawal of Russia, and that without Russia a world league would be doomed to failure. Of the two, the second seems the most probable. But it seems to us that the answer to that is twofold: (1) If Russia persists, as she apparently has every intention of doing, in blocking all efforts toward an effective peace, then isn't it better to have her outside the family of nations rather than inside; and (2) to the statement that a league cannot succeed without Russia, one has but to point to the very obvious fact that it is not now succeeding with Russia.

This newspaper believes that an effective, workable world organization is essential to a firm and continuing peace. In our opinion, the time has come for a showdown within the framework of the United Nations. This newspaper has opposed and continues to oppose unilateral action on the part of the United States, such as was taken in Greece and Turkey. We believe that the road to peace lies in collective action. If such is true, then isn't it time that we seek to modify what is given as the cause for unilateral action—the veto power? Isn't it time to bring this question into the open and to make a determined effort to strengthen the present world organization? If Russia is not willing to play ball unless she can call all the plays, then it seems to us we must consider organizing a team without Russia.

And as to whether the United Nations without Russia would be stronger or weaker than the present one, it would be well to consider a resolution of the Second Congress of the International, a world-wide Communist organization: "The Communist Party enters (a group) not to participate organically in its activities, but to undermine from within * * *." The resolution continues: "Every Communist representative in a parliament is required to realize that he is not a legislator searching for agreement with other legislators, but an agitator of the party sent to the camp of the enemy in order to carry out the decisions of the party."

Can anyone doubt that those have been precisely the tactics employed by Gromyko, Vishinsky, and Molotov?

The clause in the United Nations' Charter which permits the world organization itself to be sabotaged must, in our opinion, be eliminated, else the league which was born at San Francisco in 1945 will die at Lake Success in 1948. And isn't it apparent that an effective, workable world organization can be achieved only through the leadership of the United States? Isn't it proper to ask when will the State Department and the President supply this leadership? When will they face the issues forthrightly? When will we take determined steps to strengthen this organization which seems on its deathbed? If we delay much longer, it may be too late.

Mikolajczyk Tells of the Double Attack on Poland by Germany and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two additional installments of articles published in the Milwaukee Sentinel, telling Mikolajczyk's story of Poland which all the world should know. The articles follow:

MIKOLAJCZYK RELATES MIRACULOUS ESCAPE FROM RUSSIAN ARMY

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment IV)

Russia might have disposed of me as long ago as September 1939, and saved itself such subsequent embarrassment as I have been able to impose as an official of a Poland whose love of freedom remains unquenched.

For on September 18, as what was left of the Polish Army unit to which I was attached headed for the Hungarian border, to escape being pocketed between the ever-closing German and Russian forces, a group of us in trucks and light cars ran into a column of Red army tanks in a little Polish town near the border.

But for some reason which I'll never understand, they permitted us to pass, though we were completely at their mercy. The Russian heads which protruded from the open hatches of the tanks seemed unable to comprehend that we were Poles. They were perhaps not too bright, for as we passed by the tank column—expecting every moment to be blasted into eternity—several of the Red army men saluted us.

And so we moved into Hungary and were interned at Camp Hangony with perhaps 4,000 assorted officers and men, ragged symbols of unpreparedness.

Our only thought, now that we were still alive, was to reform our lines and somehow hurl back a punch at the Germans and Russians, who were calmly erasing Poland from the map of Europe by dividing it in half along a line agreed to by Ribbentrop and Molotov.

The morale of the Poles in internment was as low as that of a military man can get. And in the hope of raising it I started a tiny camp newspaper, the news for which was supplied by a sympathetic Hungarian, a retired colonel, who lived near our camp and permitted me—with the consent of the Hungarian prison authorities—to listen to his radio.

But inevitably the paper was banned and for the remainder of my career as a "publisher" in that camp I was forced to make verbal reports of what was happening to our homeland and the world.

One item of news aroused our camp as none other, for it held out a promise that we might renew the fight for our homeland. General Sikorski had escaped to France, and with the help of the French and British, was forming a new Polish armed force.

President Moscicki and his government had also managed to escape but had been interned in Bucharest. Thus stripped of his ability to carry on the functions of government, Moscicki appointed an old Pilsudski-Beck politician, Wieniawa Dlugoszewski, as president—an act which was permissible under the reshaped constitution which Pilsudski and Beck had inflicted on Poland in 1935.

AGREED ON SIKORSKI

France refused to recognize Dlugoszewski, who was Polish Ambassador to Italy, and Moscicki was then forced to name a second choice. Wladyslav Raczkiewicz, who was in Paris and acceptable to the Quai D'Orsay. Raczkiewicz took office and agreed to appoint General Sikorski his prime minister.

My every thought was to break out of Camp Hangony and join Sikorski in France. But I was only one. We all shared that desire and it fell to my lot to put the plan into effect.

First I had to secure civilian clothes, which the colonel provided for me. I let it be known around the camp that I had come down with typhus, which would account for my absence from my daily newscasts in the main compound and allay suspicion. Then I slipped into my new clothes and walked out the gate.

I knew only one word of Hungarian, the word for "good evening," and I had to travel 300 miles to Budapest to secure the funds and support needed for what we hoped would be a mass evacuation of our camp.

I used that lonely word of mine to greet the guard on the camp gate through which I passed, and all might have gone well, but he turned out to be in want of someone to talk to. He began asking me a stream of questions and when I was able to answer only "good evening," or nothing at all, his suspicions erupted. He flashed a light in my face.

HID IN DARK FIELD

Hundreds of workers happened to be streaming into the village that bordered our camp. I ran this way and that among the crowd, something like an American football player, and the guard was afraid to shoot for fear of killing one of the workers.

Once through the crowd, I threw myself into the dirt of a dark field and tried not to breathe when guards swept by on their bicycles, their lights sweeping the road and gullies.

I lay there an hour, then walked 12 miles to the nearest railroad station at Ozd, bought a ticket (I spoke German) and started for Budapest.

The train reached Budapest at 6 the next morning, but when I arrived at our legation in that city, two Hungarian policemen guarded the door. I kept walking and checked into a hotel, where I was immediately visited by the police.

Somehow, I was able to convince them that I had not escaped from an internment camp; that I was a Polish political refugee who wanted only to see some one in authority at his legation.

The police promised to escort me there the next morning, and then I realized, to my great annoyance, that this was Sunday. The legation was closed and I faced the task of remaining at liberty for 24 additional hours.

But at last Monday morning arrived, and I was at the legation virtually at sunup. The Polish colonel who received me thanked me for offering to Poland hundreds of trained airmen, infantrymen, mobile warriors, and technicians, but he said quite coolly that our camp would have to await its turn. Other camps also were providing troops to renew the fight.

But I convinced him we must have a priority, because of our youth and eagerness to get to France, and in the end he gave me enough money to buy a Leica camera and film, told me to make my way back to Camp Hangony, take as many "passport" pictures as I could, and deliver them to him. Then he would go to work on spurious passports which would enable the men to leave without too much of an offense to the neutral Hungarian Government.

I did get back, selected 700 men, photographed them surreptitiously, and made a deal with a patriotic and very brave Jewish merchant to supply clothes and trucks for us at much less than their cost.

We got all the way to the Yugoslav border—there were 28 or 30 in my particular group—before we were stopped. We were ordered back to Budapest by the Yugoslav guards. They put us on a train headed back toward internment.

But 16 of us jumped off the train after a few miles, walked on foot to the border, and rowed across the Drawa River in a fishing boat we appropriated.

There were a few stray shots at us in midstream. But we reached land, made our way to Zagreb, thence to Italy, and finally France.

I reported immediately to Sikorski. I was a private, he a general. I stood at attention, gave my name (we were very old friends), and told him I wanted to go on with the fight to free our country.

He smiled and then threw his arms around me. A new phase of my life was opening.

COLLAPSE OF FRANCE, NORWAY GREAT SHOCK TO MIKOLAJCZYK

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment V)

The Poles who escaped to France in the first savage days of World War II did their utmost to carry on the fight against the Germans and Hitler's ally, Russia.

In what was generally a welter of confusion and mounting despair we formed three divisions under the command of Generals Prugar-Kettling, Maczek, and Szyszko-Bohusz, made up of fugitives and Poles then residing in France.

Our fliers joined the soon-to-be-doomed French Air Force. Our land divisions were sent into the Maginot line and to Norway. But France fell with a terrible swiftness, and in the wild confusion around Paris and then Bordeaux we were appalled to learn that they had arranged for our Polish forces to capitulate with the French forces.

General Sikorski immediately urged General Weygand to retreat into North Africa and reshape the forces. But there was only numb defeatism at the top of France's military and political rule. Sikorski stormed out of his meeting with Weygand declaring that France might capitulate but Poland had every intention of continuing the fight.

It became my duty to evacuate the Polish Parliament in exile to Africa and to help speed our airmen to the same haven. It was not easy. As we moved through southern France to Port Vendres our men—though en route to reengage the enemy—were often assailed by the hapless refugees along the roads who cursed us as the promulgators of all their misery.

When the job was done, I made by way back through the Pyrenees toward Bordeaux in the abysmal days of Dunkerque. But the city was already occupied. I fled south and by June 24, 1940, reached St. Jean de Luz and caught what must have been the last ship to leave—the *Batory*, one of the Polish ships which Winston Churchill had ordered to the Continent to rescue Polish forces.

In London, where I later was named minister of the interior of our government in exile, my first job was to reorganize the Polish underground. Its morale was at the lowest ebb. It had survived both German and Russian invaders, bolstered by the hope that the British and French forces would soon sweep the enemies from our land. But the fall of France and the rupture of the British expeditionary force crushed all hope.

I had to reestablish communications, prevail upon large forces in hiding to come into the open and prepare for a long campaign by organizing themselves into less conspicuous and more efficient units. I set up propaganda organs that would keep the people informed, arranged for underground schools and social services and set about the task of gaining physical aid.

Britain's back was to the wall. There remained only the neutral but essentially sympathetic United States to turn to for help.

So in April 1941 General Sikorski and I journeyed to Canada, to arrange with Mackenzie King to permit Canadian and United States Poles to train on Canadian soil. And then we came down to Washington to see President Roosevelt.

PLEDGE FROM F. D. R.

Roosevelt promised to include Poland in the newly founded lend-lease program, and then asked Sikorski and me to visit United States cities where there were concentrations of Polish-American workers and implore them

to resist the Communist saboteurs then combating American efforts to supply the fighting democracies.

The general and I spoke in Chicago at Soldier Field, in Detroit, New York, and Buffalo. When Sikorski returned to London I remained and made many other speeches—including one in Humboldt Park in Chicago which drew an audience of 220,000.

The Communist press lambasted me without letup. I was "an agent of British imperialism attempting to force the United States into a war." My speeches were sometimes distorted. My only actual theme, of course, was for the workers to resist Red infiltration and continue to produce goods for the cause of democracy everywhere.

PREDICTED BERLIN RAIDS

The political isolation of the United States at the time was none of my business, and I made a point of saying so wherever I spoke. But I did predict aloud that the weapons of warfare would be improved; that oceans could no longer protect countries and that Berlin would eventually be bombed, "an attack on the heart of an octopus which will then be forced to draw in its tentacles wherever they may have spread."

Immediately after our encouraging visit to the White House, Sikorski and I went to Palm Beach, Fla., where Ignace Paderewski, President of our Parliament in Exile, was slowly recuperating from the combined rigors of his great age and the hardships he had undergone.

What a great old man he was. He was an artist to the tip of his fingers. The day we called on him he was preparing to go on the air with other leaders of conquered countries. But almost until it was time to speak he sat there slowly, feebly looking through his script.

SUPERB PLEA

But when his cue came he spoke in a suddenly strong voice and was letter-perfect It was a superb plea for the outraged and overrun democracies in a world threatened with totalitarianism.

Paderewski wept from weakness after he finished, and a reporter, touched by the emotional scene, asked him very gently if he would honor all of us by playing the piano.

Paderewski looked at the young man with a sadness that I cannot record, and with the tears still coming from his eyes he said very quietly, "I cannot play * * * so long as my country is not free."

It was the last time we were to see him He died shortly thereafter from pneumonia contracted while speaking at a rally of Polish patriots in New Jersey.

Wherever Paderewski is today, he must still grieve for his country. Poland is enslaved by a new and even more sinister totalitarian invader, and for that reason heaven perhaps must be deprived of his music until the old gentleman's wish is gratified on earth.

Relationship of Motion Pictures, Radio Broadcasting, and Comic Strips to the Administration of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement made by Arthur J. Freund, an attorney, of St. Louis, Mo., who is chairman of the section of criminal law of the American Bar Association. His remarks were made at a meeting of the criminal law section of the American Bar Association on September 24, 1947, at Cleveland, Ohio.

His analysis of the relationship of motion pictures, radio broadcasting, and comic strips to the administration of justice commends itself to all who are concerned with the dangers of unrestricted emphasis on the subject of crime through the various media of free expression.

The statement follows:

At the meeting of this section of criminal law last year in Atlantic City, there was authorized a committee on motion pictures, radio broadcasting, and comic strips in relation to the administration of justice. With the assistance of Mr. Carl B. Rix, president of the association, a committee of the association was appointed, comprised of some of the distinguished members of this association.

The problem concerns itself, so far as we of the bar view it, (a) with the emphasis placed by the three media upon the depiction of crime and the portrayal of the manner in which crimes of violence are committed, detected, and prosecuted; and (b) the manner in which the lawyer, the judge, and the processes of law are depicted.

Mr. Rix suggested that I act as chairman of the committee and Mr. James V. Bennett was designated as secretary. Members of the public relations committee of the association, together with officers, members of the board of governors, and important committees of the association comprise the membership of the committee, and a meeting was called for June 4, 1947, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington.

We invited the presidents or managing officers of the national associations of the media concerned, together with the presidents of the four radio broadcasting systems, and the three comic-strip syndicates to attend the Washington meeting to discuss informally the problems outlined. All of those invited, with the exception of the American Broadcasting Co., responded to our invitation.

Before proceeding further with an account of the Washington meeting may I give you my own views on the problems involved and what we hope to achieve.

It is probably fair to say that no one subject in the manifold areas portrayed in motion pictures, radio broadcasting, and comic strips receives greater emphasis than crime and the processes of the law. The listening, reading, and motion-picture public is overwhelmed with the voluminous treatment of this subject, a treatment so extended and continuous as to imply that crime, its methods, techniques, and detection, and the psychical abnormalities of those engaged in criminal pursuits were the major concern and chief subject of interest of the American public from the nursery to the grave.

May we say in all fairness that we recognize the contributions which have been made by the motion-picture and radio-broadcasting industries in programs devoted to mass education of the highest value and on levels wholly in the public interest. We do not believe that it is necessary to concern ourselves here with the good that has been done, and which we are confident will continue to be done by these media. We are not here however, primarily to praise Caesar, but rather to point to what we believe are some of his shortcomings.

It may be helpful first to discuss the manner of presentation of the lawyer, the judge, and the processes of the law in the three media. Our interest in this matter is not generated by motives of self-justification, but rather comes from a belief that grave harm is being done to a fundamental American institution, the administration of justice, through a course either designed or the inevitable effect of which is to breed contempt and disrespect for the keyarch of a free and democratic government.

The lawyer, the judge, and courtroom procedures are all too frequently depicted in an unfavorable manner. Whereas the doctor is almost always represented as a kindly, charitable, and capable professional person, the lawyer is usually portrayed as cruel, selfish, tricky, and unethical. The judge is, also, often shown either to be unworthy of his high office or he demonstrates his probity through the exposure or condemnation of corrupt or stupid counsel. The delineation of courtroom procedures usually strays so far from reality as to border upon the grotesque. This phase of our subject is of high importance, though we approach it with natural diffidence. The lawyer and the law's processes, seeming circumlocutions and delays have been the subject of satire and derisive humor for centuries. There is probably no other subject or group in our society which has a longer history as a target for ridicule. We know that there is some justifiable basis for this and that lawyers, possessing, as they must, the imperfections of ordinary mortals, are not always perfect and that the processes of the law do not infallibly operate to produce absolute justice. We cannot object with validity if instances of this character are reported or portrayed either in fact or in fiction. Such unfortunate circumstances are the exception rather than the rule, though the portrayals in the three media would lead the public to believe that the reverse were true. Furthermore, lawyers and judges, trained to and rigidly disciplined by an exacting professional code of ethics, feel generally that they are performing a vital service to society upon a high plane; and we may perhaps be forgiven for feeling that if unwarranted attacks are made upon the profession from without, the defense might appropriately also come from without our ranks. In any event, whether the legal profession may properly entertain a sense of grievance, if not irritation, upon being misrepresented and distorted, we are far more concerned with the destructive effects of such treatment upon the administration of justice in this country.

Although the lawyer, the judge, and the law have been the butt of ridicule for hundreds of years, the opportunity for mass education and the fixation of social attitudes has never been so great as now. Radio broadcasting, motion pictures, and comic strips reach millions of our people each day, whereas a century or less ago it was not possible to affect the mental processes of a people so quickly or with such continued devastating effect. The evil of the modern process as used by the three media, as we view it, is to infect the minds of the youth and adolescent with the conviction that lawyers are per se antisocial beings and that the law through the judges and courts is an instrumentality unwholesome to our welfare. We know that our Government can only operate through the law, and that if the time should come when the law cannot be enforced fairly and honestly, our republic as we now know it will cease to exist. However, in the motion picture, radio broadcasting studios, and in the comic strips this fundamental axiom all too frequently finds no recognition.

Perhaps something might be done by the media on the positive side. It seems conceivable that the portrayal of the dramatic incidents of the careers of great American lawyers would have a popular appeal. Possibly such portrayals of the accomplishments of John Marshall, Judah P. Benjamin, and William Howard Taft, to mention only a few, would approach in public interest analogous portrayals of Al Jolson or Louis Pasteur.

There may be other affirmative approaches in this area which the industries may be able

to suggest, initiate, and carry into effect. Their record of remarkable achievements in their respective industries demonstrates their ability to attain virtually any goal so long as they are convinced that the goal is one worth achieving.

The major specification in our bill of particulars, however, has to do with the emphasis on crime, criminals, and the techniques of criminals in the three media under discussion. We are wholly aware that crime does pay the motion picture producer, the radio broadcaster, and the comic strip syndicates, and that in this respect the dramatization and exploitation of crime is one of the best paying features of these media. Consequently, a vast host of economic interests has developed sympathetic to the notion that crime in this sense shall continue to pay. We realize that in dealing with such vast vested interests we must overcome obstacles which are not governed ordinarily by good motives or a desire to act in good taste or completely in the public welfare. Nevertheless, we are reluctant to believe that the minds of the leaders of these large enterprises will be completely insensible to the welfare of the Nation when the grave and critical nature of the problem is clearly revealed and understood.

It was said regarding the comics as far back as 1936, and it has equal applicability to each of the media today:

"Sadism, cannibalism, bestiality. Crude eroticism. Torturing. Killing, kidnaping * * * . Raw melodrama, tales of crimes and criminals; * * *. All these, day after day, week after week, have become the mental food of American children, young and old. * * *

"The repetition in word and picture of * * * bestial and degenerate scenes and characters is a * * * serious matter. Such things make their deep impression upon the plastic minds of growing children and have their dangers for the never-too-mature minds of countless adults."

More recently, Mr. Jack Gould, radio editor of the New York Times, wrote in the March 2, 1947, issue:

"Radio programs heard by children again have moved to the forefront of controversial subjects in broadcasting. Several parent-teacher groups in various parts of the country have indicated the 'crime shows' and the hair-raising serial 'thrillers' as psychological dangers to impressionable youngsters as possible stimulants to juvenile delinquency."

Outside of the classroom, the home, and the church, the motion picture, the radio, and the comic strips constitute the most powerful existing educational influences upon the mental growth of the child and adolescent. The usual routine is for the child to read the funnies, later he turns on the radio, and in his more extended leisure he attends the movies. The sequence is variable but the ingredients of the diet are staple.

In each step the emphasis in his menu is crime and criminals. In this there is often the seasoning of illicit sex relations. No one of the media alone at any one time or over any extended period can be said to be more harmful than another, but the insistent and continued repetition of these influences, each complementing the other, must produce a deteriorating effect upon the mind of the impressionable. Immature and undeveloped minds are molded to the concept that crime and criminal conduct is the norm of human behavior. Ethical concepts are twisted from reality, weakened, and all too frequently destroyed.

In addition, crime techniques are blueprinted with meticulous accuracy. Criminal methods are set forth step by step, thereby giving the recipient an accurate handbook for antisocial and often criminal conduct.

To illustrate what we have in mind, may we mention one representation in each media merely as an example of the evil we seek to correct. They are the comic strip Kerry Drake, the motion picture The Killers, and the radio broadcast Gang Busters. Each, however, is highly successful in its field, each makes the presentation of crime pay the producer enormously, and each has stimulated a number of competitors, or else is the result of prior competition or prototype. For example, The Killers was a contemporary of The Outlaw. The financial success of those sordid portrayals of crime was followed by Duel in the Sun, another dramatic account of the same character. This in turn apparently encouraged the production of Brute Force, of which Life magazine in the August 11, 1947, issue has this to say: "The production is a turn-about moral code which portrays each representative of law and order almost as a case history of depravity, while all the lawbreakers seem like real nice fellows."

We are aware of the body of opinion of some of the social-service profession and psychiatrists, that children and adolescents are in need of emotional release afforded by the portrayal of criminal and sadistic exploits. While children do need a certain amount of adventure in their entertainment, there must be a point beyond which the law of diminishing returns begins to operate. We think that current practices in the three media have long demonstrated the operation of that rule, and we do not hold with the minority of experts who defend these programs. While juvenile crime is on the increase in almost every locality in this country, the surprising circumstance is that the rate is not higher than it exists at the present time. However, the effects of the weakening of the moral codes and ethical concepts cannot be measured with any accuracy by crime rates or statistics. With almost every child and adolescent bombarded many times daily with the jargon of the criminal and the horrors and depraved methods of his activity, we should rejoice that we have as much normal and rational child and adolescent behavior as we do.

It is said that the criminal is always brought to punishment, and that thereby the moral lesson is given that the way of the transgressor, if not shown as hard, is at least futile. However, the overwhelming majority of opinion, both lay and professional, is of the view that the eventual capture and punishment of the miscreant in no real sense mitigates the evil created by the lurid portrayal of his criminal activities. On the general subject we quote briefly from an article by Bosley Crowther in the New York Times of May 11, 1947. Mr. Crowther speaks of motion pictures, but his views are equally valid to each of the media. He says:

"For a business which makes so much pretense of being explicitly moral and which proudly policies its members with a pious production code, the motion-picture business has been pulling some mockeries of late. Meekly, this sideline observer would like to ask who's kidding whom? Do the industry's moralistic guardians think that the public is being easily fooled—or are some of its less considerate members slyly slipping the business the bird?

"We refer, of course, to the several recent pictures—and others coming up, which emphasize baser passions for no other than sensational effects. * * * Do these films conform to the industry's actual notion of moral responsibility? And, more than that, are they such entertainment as meet the test of public interest and public weal?

"Again we repeat our questions: Is this regarded as fair and responsible by the industry? And does this technique—and the picture—meet the test of public good? We ask them again because it strikes us that the fiber of some of the people in films has shown signs of disintegration under the pressure of making sales. Last week we saw a full-page advertisement in a weekly trade magazine, calling attention of exhibitors to a forthcoming film. It promised 'tawdry love and vicious murder.' The kind that sells millions of newspapers and millions of box-office tickets.

"Invariably, the makers of such pictures excuse their admittedly coarse wares by protesting that they are only 'giving the public what it wants.' And they righteously remark that 'the transgressors are always punished in the end.' How absurd and hypocritical. The public's taste for films is as high as the imaginations and the talents of film makers are able to reach. And as for the transgressors being punished—what's the difference after the damage has been done?"

As Mr. Crowther points out, productions of this category are on the increase, and we could cite the figures to demonstrate this. As a result, the more wholesome productions in each of the media decreases by the operation of a law as inexorable as Gresham's law in economics: The bad productions tend to drive out the good.

The situation today in which we find the three media may be compared to the condition which prevailed in this country prior to 1890, when the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed, and in 1887, which marked the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission. A period of rapid business expansion resulted in a large number of abuses demanding control and correction. The railroads and business interests generally were either unable or unwilling to correct harmful practices, and the forces of competition often made it impossible for industry alone to correct the evils. As a result, Congress passed regulatory legislation which has been augmented through the years.

The three media have likewise had a tremendous economic expansion over the past quarter century and this very circumstance has created problems which require adjustment. I am sure that every lawyer here believes that regulation of each of the media is equally possible under our constitutional government, both National and State. Indeed, Judge Justin Miller, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters and a former chairman of this section, sounded a warning in a letter to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 20, 1945, wherein he said: "Only by intelligent anticipation of public reaction and by equally intelligent self-discipline can we prevent legislative intemperance."

The very essence of American democracy is founded upon freedom of expression. Legislative restrictions upon the three media, or any one of them, to restrict their free expression would probably entail administrative control resulting in some form of censorship. Someone or some group would have to determine what presentation was in the public interest and what was harmful to that interest. I think that the American public would deplore such legislation and it is my hope that it will never become necessary. However, with the present situation which confronts us, it might be advisable to study the problem of drafting legislation in conformity with the powers granted Congress by the national constitution, and to make a like study for the States. As I have indicated, I should deplore the enactment of any such laws; we know that many in the eighties felt the same way concerning restrictive legislation upon business, but it is clear that unless conditions improve in the media, legislation is inevitable.

As a corrollary, consideration can be given by the American Bar Association, through an appropriate group or section, acting alone in the name of the association, or in conjunction with other organizations in the public

interest, to appear before the Federal Communications Commission and oppose the renewal of a license of a key radio broadcasting station on the ground that the great volume of its programs devoted to crime portrayals warrants the Commission in refusing to grant the renewal of the license. While the Commission, as we understand its public views, has no desire whatever to censor the content of radio-broadcast programs, the law directs the Commission to grant licenses and renewals only if the public interest, necessity and convenience will be served thereby. Such intervention by the American Bar Association would focus national attention on the subject we are considering here today. A denial of license renewal by the Commission on such ground would produce results which no one can now foresee with any clarity or precision.

Are the self-imposed and self-regulated codes in the motion-picture and radio-broadcasting industries operating effectively in the public interest? We are advised that there is no such code formulated and in operation for the comic strips except as such small restraint comes from the syndicates which sell them and the newspapers which print them. It is obvious that the contents of this medium differ in no substantial respect with reference to the treatment of crime from the other two media. It is, therefore, entirely fair to inquire whether the codes which are in effect really accomplish as well as they should their stated purpose to achieve decency and operate in the public interest.

It would appear to one unacquainted with the industries except as an interested observer that the codes are not operating effectively. Perhaps with competition so keen and with the tremendous financial stakes involved the industries cannot effectively regulate themselves without some form of independent supervision.

We appreciate that the three industries cannot have one regulatory code. If the codes are to operate, there must be separate ones for each industry, and yet there should be common approaches in each with a like objective. We submit that consideration be given to the advisability of a complete reexamination of the codes now existing, both formal and informal, with special emphasis upon the desirability and feasibility of injecting administration and supervision by outside objective resources concerned not only with the welfare of the industry, but also of the public.

The third and final suggestion for consideration is one which combines the objectives of the two preceding. Facts, in a field so large and important not only to those engaged in the industries but also to the public at large, are difficult to determine. It may appear desirable to create an independent commission of interested persons and experts to study upon the highest professional basis the entire subject matter and to bring back findings and recommendations. A survey of this character would require the assistance of many persons in many fields. It would require continuing supervision and direction. The cost of such a survey and the method of its financing would also be an important consideration.

We are dealing with great forces affecting the lives of many millions of our people and the millions yet to come. If such a survey could be productive of substantial progress, the time and funds devoted to its formulation and publication could not and should not be counted in dollar value. A revelation of the facts so ascertained would do much to hasten proper self-regulation, should it be found, as many of us believe, that there are abuses which require correction. The draft of proposed forms of legislation, if such recommendations were made by the group, might in itself produce results that would eliminate the need for such legislation.

The views set forth here were not presented in detail at the Washington meeting of June 4, 1947, but their general substance was there given. A large majority of those appointed on behalf of the American Bar Association were present and the media were represented by a distinguished group of representatives. There was a full, free, and frank discussion of the subject matter and a general concurrence of views that the media would approach the problems with sympathy in a genuine endeavor to reach a corrective solution. A résumé of the proceedings of the meeting appeared in a recent issue of the American Bar Association Journal, and I shall not repeat them here.

There was a disposition during the meeting on the part of some of the representatives of the media to doubt the existence of any problem. On the one hand it was said that lawyers, judges, and the processes of justice were not unfairly portrayed. An elaborate self-analysis of motion pictures produced in 1946 was offered to substantiate this view. There were those of the media who took the position that no harm was done by the depiction of crime and that the portrayal of such episodes were a part of our modern way of life. The Washington meeting concluded with an agreement that the representatives of the media would report the views expressed to their respective organizations and that another meeting of the entire group would be held in the late fall of this year, either in Washington or New York. To this end, a committee of members of this association and those of the media has been appointed to prepare an agenda for the fall meeting.

We are deeply gratified that the National Broadcasting Co. has this month officially recognized the problems we seek to correct. In a code formulated for its future programs, it is provided among other corrective measures that:

"Law, justice, and officers of the law should be portrayed without disparagement or ridicule, but with respect."

It gives further recognition to our position that:

"The vivid, living portrayal of crime • • • dramas on the air, has an impact on the juvenile, adolescent or impressionable mentality that cannot be underestimated."

As a first corrective functional operation, the National Broadcasting Co. will broadcast its crime programs at hours when children are supposed to be in bed and fast asleep. With this explicit recognition of the harmful effects of these programs by the industry we may expect even better results.

The National Association of Broadcasters has also taken official notice of the harmful effects of the portrayal of crime. It proposes that crime should never be presented in a favorable light and that references to kidnapping should be barred. While this may be a short step, it is one in the right direction.

We are not expecting immediate results of our efforts and with forces so deeply entrenched we cannot hope that success will come to our endeavors except through the process of discussion with those of the media and a program of public enlightenment. We are gratified that the representatives of the media have agreed to sit down with us and consider the subject in a friendly, cooperative atmosphere for if there is a will to carry out the objectives we seek, a way will somehow be found to reach a solution of the problems.

I am hopeful that more portrayals of a positive character may be produced; portrayals of the lives and experiences of great lawyers, noble judges, and of episodes depicting the majesty and dignity of the law. We have embarked upon an important project affecting the lives of great numbers of our citizens. We are confident of a large measure of accomplishment.

The Late Robert L. Norton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article from the Boston Post of January 8, 1948, relative to the passing of the eminent and distinguished newspaperman, commentator, editor, and publicist, Robert L. Norton, who had been a staff member of that paper for many years. I also would like permission to include the statement which I issued at the time of Mr. Norton's untimely passing.

Bob Norton was a close and dear friend of mine and it is most difficult for me to express the great sense of personal loss which moves me at this time. He was unquestionably one of the outstanding newspapermen in the country and his profession and reading public will greatly miss him. He leaves an irreplaceable void in the ranks of the truly great political writers and thinkers of our time.

The article follows:

R. L. NORTON, NOTED POST WRITER, DIES—FAMED AS POLITICAL ANALYST—SERVICES TO BE SATURDAY

Robert L. Norton, of the Boston Post, one of America's foremost and best-known political commentators—confidant of Presidents and business leaders while Washington correspondent and columnist—died in his sleep early yesterday morning in his home, 53 Monmouth Street, Brookline. He was in his sixty-third year. Death was due to coronary thrombosis, a heart disease.

An erudite student of government and history, and an exceptionally keen observer of political trends, his widely read Personal Message From Your Washington Observer daily, and his special varied feature stories on Sunday were closely followed from day to day by upward of half a million readers. He died shortly after completing his regular day's work—just the way he often said he wanted to.

Funeral services will be held Saturday morning at 10 o'clock, with a solemn high mass of requiem at St. Cecilia's Church, on Belvidere Street, near Massachusetts Avenue, Back Bay.

He leaves, besides his wife, Marion, a son, Robert L. Norton, Jr., of Brookline, a naval officer in the war; a daughter, Mrs. Barbara Schlitzer, of Norton, and two brothers, Charles, a well-known Boston architect, and William, an official of the United States Treasury Department here.

SCOOP ON HARDING

Both children were absent when the noted columnist died. His daughter, accompanied by her husband, had gone to Utica, N. Y., to attend the funeral of Victor Schlitzer, her father-in-law. His son was attending a business conference in Dayton, Ohio.

For 48 years of his life Mr. Norton had been an active newspaper reporter. One of the greatest tributes ever paid him, he recently said, was when his editor described him as being a good reporter, and a true one.

Among his greatest newspaper feats—though one he never boasted of but referred to as "all in the day's work" was his world-wide scoop of the death of President Harding in August 1923 when he flashed the first word from San Francisco to the Post of the approaching death of the post World War I President.

KNEW MANY PRESIDENTS

Noted throughout the newspaper world for his dispassionate handling of the news, his resourcefulness, erudition, and fidelity to fact, he established an enviable reputation during the many years he conducted his column for the Post for his fairness, nonpartisanship, honesty, and integrity. His contacts and friends were legion—among the humble and the great alike.

He knew, had personal contact with, and wrote about every President since Theodore Roosevelt, and since 1908 had covered for the Post every political convention of importance held in the country. His circle of friends and acquaintances extended far beyond the political field in which he was a specialist.

He first entered the newspaper profession as a boy of 15, and after a short apprenticeship on the old Boston Advertiser came to work for the Post. That was at the turn of the century and since then he had been a Post man—first, last, and always.

BORN IN HUB

His matriculation into the field of politics came shortly after joining the Post. At first he handled general assignments, then became the city hall reporter. It was in that capacity that he revealed a propensity for political writing, commentating, analyzation, and interpretation which quickly won him recognition from every quarter.

He was born in South Boston and while still a child was moved with his family to Butte, Mont. There, while in the midst of his early education, his father, Charles Norton, died. Shortly afterward Mrs. Norton returned to Boston to resume her residence here.

Even as a child he displayed evidence of the sharp memory that was to serve him so well in his newspaper work ahead. He was able to recite to his teachers names, dates, places, and events long after he finished studies pertaining to them.

His profound knowledge, his erudition, his perspicacity regarding matters and events political carried him to lofts far above the newspapermen around him. And he had his other side. He was a naturalist and a philosopher. Money and the material things in life were not primary in his life. He could not be flattered nor bribed.

His true erudition came from literature, nature, and thought. He was never without a book. His affection for friends—and he made friends easily and quickly—was based upon his profound love of humans. He had no prejudices and did not differentiate among race, class, color, or creed. He always and truly sought to defend principles as he saw them in true light, and as they affected all people. In conducting his column and presenting his observations to the hundreds of thousands of Post readers who followed him daily, he was a true reporter.

Of him, his closest friends and associates said, "He came closer to being an altruist than anyone we met."

SIMPLE HABITS

He was wholly indifferent to materialism, and among the many friends he liked to talk about, from time to time, were servants, porters, trainmen, elevator boys, and waiters. He was quick to turn over to any of them in need every penny he might happen to have with him.

His habits were simple. He loved fishing and hiking. He detested hunting animals with pain-inflicting devices. Whenever he was able to, he spent week ends, and a holiday now and then, on his 65-acre farm at Mason, N. H. It was a dead-end farm and afforded him a full view of the mountains around. He loved going there, and a daily sight while there was Bob Norton, of the Boston Post, out strolling along the quiet country road, with Tara.

Tara was his 5-year-old pet Irish setter. The faithful hound was at his master's bedside when death came to the famous columnist in the midst of his slumber. Last night, at the usual hour when Mr. Norton would walk Tara, but was unable to, the setter sensed he had lost his master. This was evidenced by the forlorn manner in which the animal wandered about the Norton homestead—from cellar to garret—pleading with his sad eyes for Bob.

TRAVELED WIDELY

Mr. Norton's assignments for the Post carried him through two continents—his own country and Europe. He knew his America intimately—its cities and towns, its plants, its birds, and its rivers and streams—and he loved all of it.

His charming manner, soft voice, patience, and tolerance, won him friends wherever he traveled. In Paris, following World War I, he was publicly cited by thousands of Legionnaires, for his brilliant stories of the first American Legion convention in a foreign city. Following that convention he traveled extensively over the continent interviewing royalty, ministers, industrialists, and plain people. He treated stories of all of them alike—with truth and fairness.

Those stories, which appeared exclusively in the Post, attracted the attention of millions of Americans and won for Mr. Norton additional spurs in his field of reporting.

The faith Presidents, Cabinet members, political leaders, top businessmen, and others had in him was explicit, for "Bob Norton, of the Boston Post," never broke a confidence, never betrayed a news source, never violated a trust placed in him.

Among his closest friends, in addition to the Presidents since Theodore Roosevelt, were Bernard M. Baruch, Sinclair Weeks, James J. Storrow, James A. Farley, Alfred E. Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt (the latter long before he became the President), Murray Crane, David I. Walsh, the Lodges, and many others.

Mr. Norton followed certain set rules in his handling and presentation of the news and features he wrote for Post readers. He gave all sides of the story. He never resorted to innuendo, fanfare, or flourishes. He was factual, truthful, fair, and considerate—whatever the subject matter being reported or the party label attached.

PLANNED BUSY YEAR

In his chosen field his judgment was good, his perspective proper, his calculations based upon facts and not generalizations. He was familiar and conversant with all great topics—having been an active reporter in the midst of the great events of two tremendous World Wars and a dozen national upheavals.

He had wanted very much to live through 1948, he confided to friends only a few days ago. He was in the midst of preparations, for the Post, for covering of the coming political conventions of the two great American parties.

"This year—1948"—he told them, "may prove to be the most interesting in the history of our country. I pray I shall be able to report its political events."

STATEMENT OF HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS

I am stunned by the news of Bob Norton's untimely passing. He has been a dear and close personal friend of mine for many years. I am very deeply moved by his loss.

Bob Norton was an exceptional man. Of amiable personal qualities—kindly, generous, warm-hearted, loyal to his friends, sympathetic and tolerant by nature, he had a host of friends all over the country. I have never known a man, in or out of public life, who knew so many public figures and people in every walk of life as intimately and as well as Bob Norton, or who was more respected, admired, and loved by those who knew him.

A widely read veteran newspaperman, editor and commentator, trained in the traditions of the old school, he was exceedingly proud of his profession, and its members. He was particularly proud of his associates on the Boston Post. He had supreme confidence in the ability of the newspaper business and its personnel to adapt itself to the demands of changing times. He enjoyed the esteem of all his fellows because they recognized in him outstanding ability and achievement and one of the great figures of their craft.

He counseled and helped countless boys entering the newspaper business and politics and was the trusted confidante and adviser of many public men. Like many others, I frequently consulted him and held his judgments and opinions in highest regard. He was imbued with the loftiest sense of honor and would never violate a confidence. Because of his warm, gentle, human qualities, loyalty and wisdom, his friends in every walk of life were legion and intensely devoted to him as he was to them.

He possessed a most remarkable mind, one of the finest I have ever encountered. In the true sense of the word, he was an intellectual. No college professor, no holder of high collegiate degrees could possibly excel him in gathering facts and information, not only in public affairs, which was his specialty, but in many other fields, and then selecting, analyzing, and interpreting them in the light of contemporary events.

He was a sharp, penetrating analyst and a gifted diagnostician of political questions who always went right to the root of the problem. Though he liked to deal mostly with broad principles and concepts because his mind rose above pettiness of detail, this attribute never limited his faculty for presenting the facts in true reportorial style, whenever the occasion demanded. His great contributions throughout the years will need and will receive more careful and extended appraisal but it is unquestionable that in his passing, Boston, the State and the Nation lose one of the truly great newspapermen of our generation. His genius and unique capacity, his love of his work, his wide contacts, his broad human approach, his constructive achievements and above all his deep-rooted attachments to his friends and his fellowmen mark him indelibly as a man of great mind and great heart.

He will be sorely missed by countless readers who implicitly trusted his brilliantly written commentary on current events, but he will be missed most of all by those of us who knew and loved him for the great and noble soul he was.

I feel deeply and keenly his sudden passing and am bowed with grief. I extend my humble sympathy to the members of his bereaved family to whom he was so genuinely devoted during his life and also to the publishers and staff of the Boston Post for what is indeed an irreparable personal loss. Our dear friend and happy philosopher has gone. May he find his true reward in eternal peace.

President Truman Continues New Deal Wild and Reckless Spending Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 7, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I include, as part of my remarks, an article by David Lawrence entitled "Colossal

United States Budget Nearing Danger Point of National Economy," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of January 13, 1948, as follows:

COLOSSAL UNITED STATES BUDGET NEARING DANGER POINT OF NATIONAL ECONOMY—FORTY BILLIONS IN TAXES TERMED HEAVY DRAIN THAT PORTENDS TROUBLE

(By David Lawrence)

What's $40,000,000,000? The Federal budget of expenses proposed by President Truman for that amount is just about eight times what the Government collected in 1939.

It is more than twice all the profits made by American industry in the year 1947.

It is $13,000,000,000 more than the entire Federal public debt at the close of World War I.

It is more than the entire national income in the year 1933.

It is more than four times the Federal budget in 1939.

It is nearly eight billions more than the 1942 budget which included the first year of the war.

The colossal sums in the President's recommendation are intended to be spent in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949. This means that 4 years after the close of World War II the Government of the United States is spending at a higher rate than at any time in its peacetime history.

DANGEROUS DRAIN ON PEOPLE

Much more important than the sums to be expended is the size of the tax collections. Approximately forty-five billions are to be taken out of the national income in taxes and other receipts. This is such a substantial part of the money earned by the people that it constitutes a drain of dangerous proportions.

It is considered by many economists to be hazardous when the Government extracts as much as 20 percent of the national income for taxes. Assuming a national income of $200,000,000,000 the Federal Government will be drawing out of the stream of national income more than 20 percent.

What is most disconcerting about the President's budget, however, is that it exceeds the 1948 budget by $2,000,000,000. How long can the Federal Government go on increasing its expenses at that rate per annum?

The risk is that the Federal budget may increase fears of a maladjustment in the whole economic situation. There is a tendency to lose confidence in a government which keeps on spending and spending and taxing and taxing. Certainly the system of private initiative gives way to State socialism and Government programs of nationalization when taxes become so burdensome as to make it impossible for individuals to save for investment purposes.

Unless a market for risk capital is provided, many enterprises in business will be compelled to restrict their operations and start laying off employees.

The most depressing aspect of the whole problem is that the Federal Government shows no signs of putting its house in order. This is a sign of approaching trouble in any government. It is true that for the fiscal year 1948 a surplus of $7,000,000,000 is indicated and for 1949 about $5,000,000,000. But the fact that the administration has made no provision for tax reductions and wants to use these surpluses to retire debt without relief to individual taxpayers in the investor class will mean deflation in the midst of inflation.

WILL TEND TO CUT CREDIT

Unfortunately it will tend to restrict credit at the banks and discourage business from getting money in the capital markets generally. The deflation may set off a spiral of curtailment sometime in 1948 which may not be offset by the huge amount of tax-reduction bonuses designed by Mr. Truman for distribution among those in the low-income groups.

The announcement of the Federal budget will send a wave of discouragement throughout the business and industrial sections of America and intensify the drive to get Congress to cut the budget by several billion dollars.

It is true that a billion dollars today buys much less than it did in 1939, so that in terms of prewar dollars the budget would probably be around $25,000,000,000, but even this is a big expenditure for the Federal Government to be making as against $12,770,000,000 in 1941.

The President's huge budget will, of course, become a political issue in the campaign. It would seem that Mr. Truman might at least have tried to present a budget of expenses less than last year. His willingness to raise it by $2,000,000,000 must mean that he is confident the American people don't care how high the expenses of the Federal Government do go.

Oil Shortage Growing Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the acute shortage of petroleum products throughout the country and especially along the eastern seaboard which includes South Carolina, I am keenly interested in ascertaining the truth about the oil situation.

It had been my purpose to introduce a resolution calling for an investigation in the oil industry as suggested by the South Carolina Oil Jobbers Association in a resolution which is hereto attached. I find however there are two resolutions already pending, one, Senate Resolution 187 as introduced by the junior Senator from South Carolina, the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON; and another, House Resolution 420 introduced by Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts.

A very excellent and yet astounding summary of the petroleum problem is presented in an article appearing in the January 16 issue of the United States News, which I herewith attach.

I sincerely trust that a proper resolution will be adopted by the Congress and that authoritative information may be gathered and disseminated so that our people will know what to expect. I, of course, am cooperating with other Members of Congress in endeavoring to bring relief where there is now suffering.

The resolution and article referred to follow:

RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA OIL JOBBERS ASSOCIATION

Whereas the east coast and some other sections of the country are suffering from the worst fuel-oil shortage in history, and predictions point to a similar shortage of other petroleum products later in the year of 1948; and

Whereas there has been an increase in refining and sales by the major oil companies this year as compared to last year in excess of sales percentage wide by the independent marketers; and

Whereas there has been a sharp advance in the price of crude oil, and finished products at the refinery from which the 20 largest oil companies have received most of the benefits, while the independent jobbers' margin has remained stationary or been reduced; and

Whereas the costs of operation of the jobbers has been increased to the point where they are unable to maintain present facilities in line with good practice, and are prevented from building new facilities to take care of expanding demand from the public, while the major oil companies justify their greatly increased earnings as necessary to this end; and

Whereas efforts of the jobbers towards effectuating relief within the industry have proven futile; and

Whereas this trend if continued will eliminate the independent segment of industry and create a monopoly detrimental to the public interest and to our economic structure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Carolina Oil Jobbers Association in meeting at the Columbia Hotel, Columbia, S. C., on this 8th day of January 1948, That an investigation be requested by Congress to ascertain if the antitrust laws have been violated by the major units of the oil industry;

That the investigation be solely for the purpose of investigating such violations; and

That if a report be of such nature as to justify prosecution by the Department of Justice, it cover recommendations for appropriation in sufficient amount to carry such prosecutions to a just and final conclusion; be it further

Resolved by the South Carolina Oil Jobbers Association, That the South Carolina congressional delegation be requested to introduce legislation in the National Congress to divorce the marketing segment of the oil industry from the producing, refining, and transportation segments;

That this legislation be pressed for prompt passage and enforcement;

That copies of these resolutions be sent to all members of the South Carolina congressional delegation, to Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, and to the Attorney General of the United States.

[From the United States News of January 16, 1948]

OIL SHORTAGE GROWING WORSE—TREND TO COOLER HOMES AND LESS DRIVING

Oil shortage, now beginning to hurt, is to grow worse in 1948.

Homes using oil for heat will be colder next year than now.

There will not be enough gasoline next summer to meet all demands for pleasure driving.

Rationing by dealers, not Government, will limit consumer supplies. It will be many months before supply catches up with demand.

The shortage of oil for heating and of gasoline for driving, bad as it is now, is to grow worse during 1948. Some houses will be colder a year from now than they have been this winter. Many car owners are to have less gasoline next summer than they will want. There is danger that farmers will not be able to keep tractors and other machinery in constant operation for growing and harvesting seasons.

Demand for oil and oil products has climbed to dizzy heights since the war and threatens to run still further away from supply in the months ahead. Unless a business set-back cuts demand more sharply than now seems possible, scarcities are likely to continue for a long time.

Relief measures that can be applied during the year will be only partially helpful. Imports can be stepped up moderately, and will be. Exports will be cut. Refinery capacity and transport facilities will be increased. A plan to pool oil supplies, now being developed by producers and distributors, will ease the situation somewhat. But all these measures will provide only slight relief.

Rationing by industry and consumers, not by Government, will be necessary to stretch supplies in some communities. Service stations in some cases already are limiting sales to customers. Home owners will find it necessary to conserve oil by turning thermostats down. Restrictions will be voluntary, with no return to compulsory rationing probable.

For users of oil and gasoline the outlook is this:

Oil for home heating will become less plentiful before the present heating season ends. On the basis of the present outlook, oil supplies for homes will be reduced even more drastically next season. Deliveries to consumers already are being cut 10 to 15 percent by dealers in some areas, and further restrictions are likely. A 15-percent cut in oil means a 5-degree reduction in room temperatures. However, since the average room temperature is 73 degrees, much oil can be saved without causing real discomfort.

A big problem here is that of distribution—of making certain that oil is delivered to areas and homes that need it most.

Back of the shortage of heating oil for homes is a rapid increase in the number of oil burners being made and sold. New installations totaled 700,000 last year, raising the number of burners in use to 3,250,000. The number may reach 4,000,000 this year. Strikes in the coal mines have frightened many home owners away from coal as a fuel, despite warnings by Government and the oil industry that oil burners should not be installed without assurance of oil to feed them.

This demand has boosted oil consumption for home heating 50 percent since the war. Last year 320,000,000 barrels of oil were burned as fuel in homes. This year an estimated 346,000,000 barrels will be burned. To meet this demand, many refineries have been compelled to reduce production of gasoline.

Gasoline for driving is in greater demand than ever before. More cars are on the road and more are being built. There are increasing demands for gasoline from trucks and airplanes. Then, too, gasoline production is retarded somewhat because the demand for fuel oil prevents rebuilding of gasoline stocks.

The pinch in gasoline will begin to show up when motorists take to the road in large numbers next summer. The result will be allocation of gas to dealers by distributors. Gas stations, in turn, often may have to restrict sales to consumers.

Farmers are using steadily increasing quantities of fuel. Consumption of fuel for farm machinery jumped to 2,821,000,000 gallons in 1947 from 1,783,000,000 in 1941. Another large increase is indicated for 1948. Voluntary limitation of fuel for farm equipment is almost impossible. This year there may not be enough gas to go around. Partial loss of some crops might result.

Industrial demand for heavy fuel oil is 5 to 10 percent in excess of supply this winter, and the situation here also is expected to become worse. Relief must come from conversion to coal or from an increased supply of crude oil. Refineries, now producing at capacity, cannot relieve the heavy-oil situation much without producing less light heating oil for homes.

A shift to coal, in many instances, is not difficult. Electric utilities often have dual heating installations. Oil shortages and high oil prices are causing some plants to return to coal.

Diesel fuel demand, almost triple that of 1941, also is contributing to the over-all shortage. Use of oil for Diesel-powered locomotives is increasing rapidly. Of 604 locomotives on order recently, 534 were Diesel-powered. Demand for oil as fuel for ships also runs high.

Military needs for oil have increased sharply in recent months, with the military now taking 4 percent of the country's oil supply. Some is for civilian use in occupied areas and in foreign countries receiving aid from the United States. Congress is looking critically at this practice, but anything it does about it will not affect total United States supplies substantially.

Consumption of oil products, when all uses are added up, is greater than it was during the wartime peak. What is more, this country is burning more oil than the entire world consumed in prewar days. The following figures tell the story:

In 1934 the United States was consuming 2,800,000 barrels of oil a day. At the height of the war, in 1945, consumption had jumped to 5,300,000 barrels. Instead of dropping after the war, as expected, demand continued to climb, so that by 1947 the daily average was close to 5,900,000 barrels. Official estimates for 1948 are for a daily consumption average of 6,150,000 barrels, up 250,000 from last year. This assumes that production can be stepped up that much.

On the supply side, this country is expected to produce 5,700,000 barrels a day. The remaining 450,000 barrels required to make a daily average consumption of 6,150,000 must come from abroad. This will consist mainly of crude oil from the Caribbean area. Any increase above this amount is doubtful, since oil fields in such countries as Venezuela and Colombia are producing to capacity. Little oil can be expected from the rich fields of the Middle East because of distance and tanker shortages.

Total demand, if it could be filled, would run close to 6,500,000 barrels a day during 1948. Thus, the country will actually be short about 400,000 barrels a day from its maximum needs, as long as the United States boom continues.

Bottlenecks that restrict supplies of oil are not to be broken sufficiently in the next year or so to give much relief. The steel shortage restricts production of tank cars, tankers, pipe lines, and expansion of refinery capacity. But removal of all these bottlenecks, however, would not bring an end to the shortage. Supply of crude oil still would be limited in relation to demand.

Relief, over the years, must come from new oil discoveries in this country and from development of synthetic oil and gas.

Drilling for new oil fields, and deeper drilling in old fields, is going on at record rates. Many men in the industry dispute this view and believe that vast untapped resources remain to be discovered.

Synthetic oil, in important quantities, is some years away. Plants now under construction will produce small amounts of gasoline and fuel oil from natural gas, at costs that will be little, if any, higher than for production from crude oil. The effect on total supply, however, will be negligible.

Coal also will be turned into gas and oil in the next few years, but costs at first will be high. Production of synthetics from shale still is in the experimental stage and this, too, is handicapped by high costs.

All in all, the prospect is for a growing shortage that can cause annoyance and some discomfort to many people for many months to come. A sharp business set-back sometime in 1948 could change all this, but the immediate prospect is that the pinch will get worse before it gets better.

South Dakota Leads the Nation in Purchase and Retention of United States Savings Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the records have now been made available for 1947 showing the State-by-State record made in the purchase and retention of United States Savings bonds. This report shows that South Dakota—land of bright sunshine, good sense, and sound stability—leads the entire Nation both in the per capita purchase of United States Savings bonds and also in the percent of bonds retained. In fact, through 1947 South Dakotans bought approximately three times as many E bonds as were redeemed in our State.

Mr. Speaker, South Dakota led the Nation in the per capita E bond purchases, South Dakota led the Nation in the per capita E, F, G sales, and South Dakota led the Nation in having the lowest percentage of redemptions of bonds already purchased. Such an unprecedented and unchallengeable record, sir, comes not by accident. It is the result of a working combination of many factors including the patriotic and unselfish cooperation of many people engaged in the sales of war bonds, the great loyalty of the citizens of this fine agricultural State, and the fact that the vast farming acres of South Dakota and the business and industrial institutions of our cities are busy at work producing large quantities of the products needed in this world.

The people of South Dakota are not contaminated by European "isms"; they are not lured away from the path of sanity and soundness by the siren calls of communism; our laborers and our farmers dedicate an honest day's work for an honest day's pay, and do not fritter away their substance and the Nation's future by joining picket lines and participating in unjustifiable and unnecessary strikes. In addition, South Dakota folks are thrifty and they recognize in Government bonds an investment having value both to themselves and to the Republic which they love so dearly.

Mr. Speaker, there are 47 other States in the Union besides South Dakota. We invite competition in this business of purchasing and retaining Government Savings bonds. We challenge our neighbors and our fellow States to equal our record, and we serve notice that if they are to deprive South Dakota of its place at the top they must better the record we have made in 1947, as our people are resolved to improve our own percentages in the month ahead.

I am including with these remarks an editorial from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus Leader, published in Sioux Falls, S. Dak.,

which comments upon the great record South Dakota compiled in 1947:

SOUTH DAKOTA'S WISDOM AND WEALTH

South Dakota's remarkably fine record in the purchase of United States Savings bonds in 1947 is a source of gratification.

The following tabulation tells the story in brief form:

	United States [1]	South Dakota	South Dakota rank
Per capita E sales	$29	$79	First.
Per capital E, F, G sales	$48	$114	Do.
E sales as percent of redemptions	100	284	Do.
1947 sales as percent of 1946	89	147	Do.
Percent of quota reached	95	154	Second.

[1] Based on 11-month actual statistics and estimate for December.

Total savings bond purchases in South Dakota in 1947 amounted to $62,800,537—about $11,000,000 in excess of the average wartime sale of bonds in this State.

South Dakota bought about three times as many E bonds as were redeemed in this State—a national record and one actually 65 percent higher than North Dakota, the State in second place.

The exceptional bond record reflects the wealth and wisdom of South Dakota. It required good earnings to permit the residents to make such a showing and good judgment to decide to set aside so much money as a reserve for future use.

Aggression Is on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article written by me entitled "Aggression Is on the March." This appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union of January 8, 1948, and in the Manchester Evening Leader of January 8, 1948. Both papers are published in Manchester, N. H.

The article follows:

AGGRESSION IS ON THE MARCH—ISSUES BEFORE THE CONGRESS

During the next few months the second session of the Eightieth Congress must render decisions which will be of far-reaching importance and of impelling significance to the welfare of the country on a variety of exceedingly complex and grave national and international questions. Tax reduction and legislation to halt inflation have priority in the domestic field. Universal military training, extension of reciprocal trade agreements, the Marshall plan for the economic recovery of 16 nations in western Europe, the question of further assistance to Greece, and the achievement of air supremacy are questions which we must face realistically. Adequate preparedness, especially in the air, is the most important issue—barring none—before the Nation today. To solve the problems I have mentioned we must have constructive, progressive, and fearless leadership.

AID TO GREECE

When I was in Athens last October I had a series of conferences with several members of the Griswold Mission. On October 24, 1947, the New Hampshire Morning Union carried an article on aid to Greece which I wrote immediately after my visit to that country. In this article I stated, "Should the Soviets decide to make a stand by all-out assistance to the bandits, the United States must decide upon the course it will follow in the future. To finish the task of destroying or capturing the bandits, the United States will have to continue beyond June 30, 1948, its aid to Greece, and in all probability must appropriate 200 to 300 million dollars to carry on this work. I believe that our future course in respect to Greece is clear.

"We must continue to help Greece until she is free, until the Communist pressure is removed, until the bandits are surrounded or destroyed, and until there is no longer danger of the country being seized, controlled, and dominated by the Kremlin.

"If Greece capitulates to the Communists and falls into the hands of the Soviets, Italy would quickly be overtaken by the same disaster. I canot too strongly emphasize the strategic significance of Greece and the gravity of the current bandit issue. We have adopted a policy of keeping this country out of the hands of the Communists. We must continue this policy and must be ready and willing to increase our assistance until the bandits no longer exist and Greece is on her way to economic recovery and is completely free from Communist pressure."

My position in reference to Greece is the same today as it was when I wrote the above paragraphs. I shall support any and all measures to accomplish the objectives set forth in my report to this paper last October.

OIL

The integrity of Greece is of vital necessity to the United States. This is a Mediterranean outpost and should it fall into the hands of the Soviet Union, the injury to our country would be incalculable. In the Mediterranean area our stakes are tremendous. Russian domination of strategic outposts on this sea would imperial our safety. In the Near East, United States oil interests are vast and illimitable. This supply must be protected for our use in peace, and in the event of war the availability of petroleum reserves of this region for use by our country would be crucial. The vast oil supplies of the Middle East which will soon furnish the lifeblood of our economic system must not go unprotected.

THE MARSHALL PLAN FOR EUROPEAN RECOVERY

The Marshall plan for European recovery contemplates the spending by the United States of $17,000,000,000 from April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1952. The economic recovery of western Europe is essential in this world-wide fight against the spread of communism. An economically strong Europe would be a great bulwark against the Red tide of aggression. The Marshall plan is designed to prevent the sinking of Europe into an abyss of economic chaos more vicious and more devastating than anything mankind has yet seen.

I have long been a vigorous supporter of the Marshall plan. Weeks before the Secretary of State made his now famous speech at Harvard on June 5, 1947, I stated that we should adopt the principle of spending whatever is necessary to bring about the economic recovery of western Europe for the express purpose of stopping the march of the Soviet Union to the west.

There is a fundamental principle in our foreign policy, but the achievement of air supremacy should be considered on the same plane and this second principle is equally as fundamental in any realistic foreign policy for the United States. If I were forced to choose between the two principles, the Marshall plan or air supremacy, I would place air supremacy as of first importance; and as sad as it may seem, we are doing scarcely anything to create an all-powerful striking air force.

WITHOUT AIR POWER MARSHALL PLAN TOO GREAT A RISK

If we spend billions of dollars in western Europe without full military preparedness at home, without adequate air power, the money we spend may be lost and all our efforts to stop the Red tide by trying to bolster the economies of Europe may be to no avail. Without proper preparedness we will be indeed pouring our dollars down the proverbial rat hole. To secure our investments in recovery abroad we must have the power to protect our interests. United States air supremacy is a prerequisite to the successful operation of the Marshall plan, and without air supremacy I go so far as to say we may as well forget the whole business of trying to bring about economic recovery in Europe and Asia. The Marshall plan without an all-powerful air force would involve this Republic in a risk too great to take. By the expenditure of the billions proposed in the Marshall plan we can well do ourselves an irreparable injury unless we have an air force capable of making our voice heard and our will respected.

AIR POWER

Air power—overwhelming—is the only possible defense against assault in this atomic age. Any nation contemplating an attack on the United States will hesitate only if she knows that within a period of hours from the time the attack is made there will be delivered in reprisal a knock-out, devastating, retaliatory blow from the air. The United States can be immunized against attack from the air by building a completely unassailable and invincible air force. With air supremacy and atomic supremacy any aggressor would not entertain the idea of an attack upon us because it would be perfectly clear that the cities of the country making the attack, the industrial centers, the lines of communication, and great segments of the population would be wiped from the face of the earth by a practically instantaneous single paralyzing blow from the air. Only by being fully prepared to deliver such a blow within a matter of hours after the first indication of an impending assault upon us will we be able to consider ourselves to possess any measure of security.

THE SOVIETS, JUST AS HITLER, HAVE DRAWN US A PICTURE

The obvious reason for my recommendations for the achievement of air supremacy is that the policies being pursued by the Soviet Union lead us to the conclusion that if and when their leaders consider the time to be propitious they will move to attack us and to attack areas the integrity of which are essential to our security. Mr. Hitler in his book, Mein Kampf, explained to the world with striking lucidity his intentions. In fact, he drew a picture so obviously clear that even the most unobserving and the most disinterested person could not have possibly failed to thoroughly understand what the dictator of Germany had in mind if and when he was in a position to strike. For years the final victims of Hitler's fury sat idly by debating whether or not Hitler really meant what he wrote and debating whether or not he would really start a war. They got their answer.

The Communist philosophy as developed and written by Karl Marx informs us clearly that the ultimate goal of the Communists, with the spearhead in the Kremlin, is to dominate the world. If you doubt it, read the Marxian philosophy and there will be no question left as to what the guiding principles of the Communist Party are. Since the close of the Second World War, the Soviet Union by aggressive expansion, by the spread of communism, by the refusal to cooperate, by deliberate attempts to prevent the recovery of western Europe, by constantly rearming and by a never-ending stream of insults has clearly demonstrated that it believes fanatically in the Marxian doctrines and the Marxian objectives.

So by their philosophy and by their actions the Communists in Russia and elsewhere have told us—yes, they have drawn us a picture of their intentions. They have set forth their program. They are developing their plans to realize their goals. Can we blindly stand by and debate as to what they are going to do if and when there is an opportunity? We saw what happened in the 1930's. We can see that within a very short period of time history is repeating itself in almost the same pattern—aggression is on the march.

A TOUGH POLICY

I hope you will agree with me that our policy must become tough, and tough quickly. We must fight communism on all fronts. We should begin a program of counterpropaganda. We must appropriate the necessary money for the rehabilitation of those countries taking a stand against Soviet aggression. We should immediately put an embargo on all materials being shipped to the Soviet Union. The President should be directed by mandatory legislation from the Congress that the sending of goods to the Soviet Union must stop and that we will not tolerate the building up of a country who by her statements and her acts is avowedly hostile to the United States.

The question of strengthening the armed forces of the United States, particularly the Air Force, is the most crucial issue before the country, and if we postpone action we will be doing so at our own peril. I most carefully consider my words when I say if the Congress sanctions a condition of preparedness in any way short of the ability to bring the full might of the United States to bear at once against any aggressor who delivers an attack upon us or any nation, the integrity of which is vital to our security, we will, in my opinion, be negligent of our duty. To pursue a course of inaction will be most disastrous to the Republic. I am making this plea because I am convinced that, were I to remain silent at this critical moment, I would be failing to do my duty as a Representative of the people.

THE HOUR OF DECISION

The United States must decide, and must decide quickly, whether or not she will take the responsibility of world leadership. We must decide at once whether or not we will make ourselves secure against any and all aggressors. The price to maintain our destined position will be great, but the reward is freedom, and no price is too high for liberty. Great effort and sacrifice are required to make ourselves secure in a world where others entertain neither the hope nor the desire for a decent international society.

During the war I never heard anyone ask the question: "Can we afford to win?" We knew we had to win and we put forth the energy required to be victorious. We should not haggle, hesitate, and confuse the issues by asking the question: "Can this Republic in its very prime and in its enviable position of potential power afford to win the peace?" We cannot afford to lose.

Armistice Day Address by Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on last Armistice Day, Hon. John L. Sullivan, Secretary of the Navy, delivered a very appropriate and inspiring address at the Armistice Day ceremonies sponsored by the American Legion at Arlington National Cemetery. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This shrine in which we meet today is the symbol of America's sacrifice for humanity. This day which we have set aside for the remembrance of our war dead is the symbol of America's enduring hope for lasting peace.

The moment of silence which we have observed in humility and in reverence for those who here rest in honored glory signifies our Nation's gratitude to all who have fallen in the pursuit of this ideal. That unspoken tribute marks our rededication to the completion of the tasks for which they gave their lives.

These honors rendered, we ask ourselves in all sincerity why we are here. Surely it must be for a more important purpose than the formal expression of our gratitude. Certainly we are here to render more than mere words in return for the imperishable deeds of those who sleep around us.

We are here on these hallowed grounds, in their company, to take solemn counsel among ourselves as to how best we may accomplish the objectives for which they died.

If we are to give this occasion meaning, if this ceremony is to be more than solemn pageantry, if the wreath which our Commander in Chief has laid at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is to be a true measure of the Nation's gratitude—we must implement these symbols of affection and indebtedness with a determination to pursue with all our heart, with all our skill, with all our strength, and with all our resources the twin objectives of security for our Nation and a lasting peace for all the world.

Our goal must be their goal. We must work as hard and as unceasingly for security and peace as they who died to preserve them for our keeping. Our courage must match their bravery. Our devotion must equal their sacrifice.

Our Nation, in recent years, has been dedicated by two great Presidents to the pursuit of international peace through the twin avenues of adequate national strength and full support of the United Nations. The American Legion, under whose auspices we meet here today, is similarly pledged. This is the American way to peace. This is the will of the American people.

We propose to cooperate in every way to help the United Nations realize the hope of humanity which was written into its Charter at San Francisco 2½ years ago. Meanwhile, in this critical period, we do not propose again to risk world chaos or to encourage aggression in others by failing to provide for our own national security. History has demonstrated twice within a generation that unreasoning forces look with contempt upon an America too weak to defend her ideals. Until the United Nations has demonstrated its capacity to establish and to preserve world peace, the price of peace will continue to be preparedness.

The establishment of an effective new world order cannot be accomplished overnight. It will call for the utmost realism and idealism and unity in American thought and action. It calls now for loyalty to our aims, for cooperation among all groups of our economic and political life; for sacrifice by all—at the dinner table, on the job, everywhere and all the time—if we are to succeed.

The time has come for us to be firm with ourselves, if we would give true meaning to the firmness we would assume in democracy's cause abroad. The time has come when we must count it a privilege to be as bold in the pursuit of peace as we were daring in our recent battle for survival.

This opportunity which lies before us today to provide for our own security and to assure the peace of the world, may be our very last such opportunity if we do not seize it eagerly and pursue it with all our zeal.

The task is difficult. There will be delays and irritations. There will be bitter frustrations. There will be seemingly endless disappointments. We must not permit these to discourage us. In the trying years which lie ahead, when we feel our determination is flagging, we must remind ourselves that we are asked only to work for something for which many men died.

These men, our brothers, our sons, and our friends, watch us from some distant shore. To them we must be true.

In their memory, we must wage peace as they waged war—with everything we have. Above all, we must regain that harmony of spirit and that unity of effort which welded the people of America into an unconquerable power through the great crisis of the war years.

We must be strong. We must be strong in our economy, drawing the substance of our fruitful land to our own use and passing on the surplus to men and women overseas in return for the many raw materials and products which we require. We must be strong in our loyalty, taking unto ourselves freely such obligations as nurture among all Americans a true appreciation of the blessings of freedom and equal opportunity for all.

To secure an enduring and just peace, we must for the time being also be strong militarily.

In order to achieve the military standing which befits our position in international affairs, we enacted legislation under which our military services—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—recently were made in fact, what they had long been in effect, coordinates of the National Military Establishment.

These three services today—in equipment, in morale, and in leadership—are unsurpassed. Their effectiveness, however, is hampered by lack of a reserve of trained manpower. Crack ground units, vaunted air squadrons, and proud ships cannot be reinforced with phantom ranks, missing elements, or half-complements of crew. Manpower today is the crying need of all these services.

The remedy lies in legislation which would give us an adequate reserve of trained men. Such legislation is now before Congress in the form of a bill to authorize universal military training. Under this measure, each of the three services would obtain its quota of men to train. After training the men would be returned to civilian life, better fitted to become better citizens because of

their tour of military service. They would become our modern minutemen in any emergency.

They would provide the land, sea, and air reserve that in the future might well mean for us the difference between survival and oblivion. As Commander O'Neil so well said—they would serve notice on the world of America's willingness to accept the responsibilities of world leadership.

We became the victims of aggression 6 years ago because we had not learned the lesson which World War I should have taught us. Our guard was down, even though we knew that international banditry was on the loose in Europe and Asia. This must never happen again.

Conversely, 2 years ago when our military, naval, and air strength was at its peak, we exerted an influence in international affairs commensurate with our position as the greatest democracy in the world. In the months since VJ-day we have pared this strength down to but a shadow of its former self, and day by day, as demobilization progressed, our representatives in the council of powers found their tasks increasingly difficult.

The time has come to realize the peril of benevolent disarmament, unilaterally accomplished. We cannot jeopardize our security in the hope that others will again win for us the time we need to prepare to defend ourselves. The next time there may be no time.

In the words of Burke, "a nation is a contract in which three parties are involved—the dead, the living, and the yet unborn." Thus, America is today at once a legacy from the past, a trust of the present, and the hope of the future. Let us pledge here and now among our dead, that we the living will so plan and work among ourselves and with other nations, that peace shall be ours to cherish for ourselves and for generations yet unborn.

Much remains to be done to bind up the wounds of this tired, confused world. A great task must be performed if peace is to become the final fruit of victory, and if we are to keep faith with those who died. We must so conduct ourselves individually and as a Nation that their sacrifice will prove not to have been in vain.

Their place in history will rest upon our actions rather than upon our words. God grant our action will be worthy of their sacrifice.

The Palestine Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered in New York City on December 29, 1947, by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, who is chairman of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine and of the American Zionist Emergency Council. The address was delivered at a testimonial dinner given in honor of Dr. Silver just prior to his sailing for Palestine. The address is of such significance that I think it should be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was just a month ago that the decision was taken in the Assembly of the United Nations. It has been a month of unprecedented exaltation for our people all over the world. Their spirits leaped up like a brilliant flame in the glad surprise of the long hoped for and never quite expected victory. Their parched and thirsty souls drank deep of the waters of salvation. The nations of the world had again vindicated our claim to national restoration. By an overwhelming vote—only two Christian states dissenting—they decreed that the Jewish state shall be reestablished and set the date for its establishment for October 1948.

Thus the messianic drama of Israel which had been unfolding in many lands through long centuries of tragic acts and sorrowful scenes suddenly reached a triumphant climax in the dramatic setting of an international council chamber, where in an atmosphere of unspeakable tension, they voted, each in turn, and when the vote was tallied, they had decreed the end of the Galut. We have rejoiced in the fulfillment of a prophecy that has come true: "When the Lord will bring back captive Zion, we shall be like dreamers! Then will our mouth be filled with laughter and our tongue with song."

Our tired hearts were refreshed and uplifted when we witnessed the fine championing of our cause of liberation by one noble country after another, by the many countries of South and Central America, by the countries of western Europe, by all the dominions of the British Commonwealth and by other countries of good will. We were deeply moved by the strong, unfaltering support which we received from the Soviet Union and from Poland and Czechoslovakia. And we were, of course, profoundly pleased and happy with the role which our own Government came to play in the final hour of decision. Especially gratifying was that rare phenomenon—baffling and disturbing to all those who prescribe cold war as the remedy for an ailing and war-sick world and proscribe all suggestions of amity and reconciliation—which showed the two greatest world powers working in complete accord and unity of purpose to solve a grave international problem, and succeeded in reaching a solution.

Those who are despondent over the turn of affairs in international relations and the apparent irreparable rift which has been created between the East and the West might well take heart in contemplating the full and ready cooperation which did exist between the United States and the Soviet Union on the issue of Palestine. Here was an area where we were told imperial interests were inevitably destined to clash, and where power politics would most certainly tear East and West hopelessly apart. Nothing of the sort happened, to the utter consternation of all the preachers of the irresistible conflict. On the contrary—here was ready and friendly agreement. In my humble judgment there is much food for thought here, and strong warrant for a more hopeful world outlook, and a less intractable statesmanship.

In this connection it should be stated that those who were responsible for the earlier and now discredited propaganda that the Soviet Union, in its desire to penetrate the Middle East and its rich oil fields would side with the Arabs against the Jews, and, that Great Britain and the United States must therefore not favor the Jewish cause for fear of driving the Arab States into the arms of the Soviet Union, have now slightly revised their propaganda. The Soviet Union, it is now proclaimed, favored the setting up of a Jewish State in Palestine in the confident expectation that this would arouse the Arabs, create disturbance, and necessitate the intervention of the Security Council. The Security Council would have to send troops. The Soviet Union, being a member of the Security Council, would then have its own troops included in whatever international force is sent to Palestine. Once there, they will never be dislodged.

This is the new, or rather the revamped, propaganda which is being peddled about today in Washington by agents of all sorts—British, American, and Arab—as well as in the public press, and which along with the supplementary propaganda that the so-called illegal immigrants coming into Palestine are really Communist agents in disguise—is being adroitly spread to destroy United States-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics cooperation on Palestine, and to prevent the implementation of the UN decision. Every effort is being made to thrust Palestine back into the dangerous arena of power politics, from which the United States-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agreement and the action of the UN has most opportunely lifted it. There are even some Members in the Congress of the United States who out of ignorance or malice, are lending themselves to the spreading of this beseless and mischievous propaganda. Needless to say the Zionist movement has no orientation either to the west or to the east. If we need to define our orientation, it is definitely and unmistakably to the United Nations. We are happy that our problem received a solution by international agreement in which the east and the west harmoniously cooperated. We hope that it will remain so in the future.

It might be noted, in passing, that our frank joy in the decision of the UN to reestablish the Jewish state was not prompted by an infatuation with the idea of nationalism as such, or by the idolatry of statehood. We are not chauvinists. Zionists have been denounced as secularists and political nationalists. Of course we are secularists insofar as we oppose a theocratic state, and we are political nationalists insofar as we believe in the reestablishment of the Jewish state. But this does not exhaust the full content of our aspirations.

Israel's resolution through the centuries to rebuild its national life in its ancestral home was guided by sound instinct and inspired by the same prophetic idealism which twice beckoned our exiled ancestors from exile to national restoration in Palestine. In both instances, at Sinai and by the rivers of Babylon, there stirred a deep, mystic conviction that only in a free national existence, could that which was best and unique in its life find full scope and opportunity and what was best and unique was always conceived of as transcending the moiety of political independence, or the customary compensations of national status and security. It reached beyond that to a vision of "new things, things kept in stire, not hitherto known." • • • to a redeemed humanity and a world order reconstructed after the pattern of the Kingdom of God.

In 1929, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the death of Theodor Herzl, I wrote in a Herzl memorial volume which was published in that year:

"It is well that the political phase of Jewish Messianism is coming to a close in the upbuilding of the national homeland. We shall not have to lay so much stress in the future on the importance of nationalism. We shall henceforth be confronted not with its lack but with its consequences. Hitherto wanting the full complement of the attributes of nationalism, we were constrained to overemphasize its virtues. Many of the spokesmen of our cause were driven to extol nationalism, per se, which is after all a quite recent and, demonstrably, a quite inadequate human concept.

"It is not mankind's ultimate vision. Certainly it is not the substance of our own ancestral tradition, whose motif is not nationalism but prophetism. Nationalism is not enough. It is a minimum requirement, not a maximum program. Our national rebirth was made possible by a war in which nationalism was thoroughly exposed and discredited. Nationalism is a means, not an end. 'What is great in a man,' said Nietzche, 'is that he is a bridge and not a goal.' This is true also of men collectively—of nations and of national cultures.

"Nationalism will not suffice the eternally questing soul of our people. After its national life is secure Israel must push on to the frontiers of the new world—the world of internationalism, of economic freedom, of brotherhood, and of peace."

I believe that this motif of authentic Jewish lineage has not been wanting in the humble and consecrated labors of the present-day nation builders in Palestine, and I am convinced that Palestine will in the days to come become the workshop of our people's highest ideals and aspirations.

Our builders in Palestine will have much to endure and much to overcome, but they will assuredly match their hour. They have still to discover their political eyes. They are children of the crucible. They have come from the four corners of the earth and from all parts of the Galut, and the Galut leaves its mark on everyone. They hail from all cultural zones and from all political backgrounds. They represent most diverse personal experiences, and they must all be fused into an organic whole. They must learn unity in diversity and patience under stress and the knack of subduing the voices of the partisan, the doctrinaire, and the fanatic in the joyous tumult of building.

Edmund Burke defined the religion of the early American colonists as being a refinement on the principle of resistance. "It is the dissidence of dissent and the protestantism of the Protestant religion • • • agreeing in nothing but in the communion of the spirit of liberty." That might well define also the temper and character of our pioneers in Palestine. There is marvelous promise in all this for a free and unshackled life, but also much danger.

Our people will live in a land which is not a "fortress built by nature for herself against infection and the hand of war" as Shakespeare sang of England, but in a very open land whose borders are difficult to defend, and whose security must rest on the stout hearts, the political wisdom and the national discipline of its people. What they had gained with courage, they will have to keep with prudence.

But the spirit, the will and the capacity are there, and they will not be found wanting.

The Land of Israel will be small, made smaller by partition, but the people of Israel will make it great. The monumental contributions to civilization have been made by great peoples which inhabited little countries. Mind and creative endeavor will compensate for what our people has been forced reluctantly to relinquish. Generations to come, living in that land of challenge and renewal, will speak great words and do great deeds, and in the magnitude of their upsoaring, there will tower the majesty of that little land of revelation which, like some precious jeweled clasp, draws three continents together on the shore of the western sea. Not in opulence but in eminence will their destiny be fulfilled and the elixir of their pride will be distilled not out of dominion or far-flung borders, but out of the faithful and skilful building of the good society.

It is now a month since the historic decision, and while our happiness is unabated, our minds are turning soberly to the pressing and difficult problems involved in the implementation of that decision.

Those problems are ours—but they are also those of the United Nations. The UN accepted the responsibility to decide the future government of Palestine. It accepted after long and careful examination and debate the report of the special committee which it had appointed to make a complete and thoroughly objective survey of the entire situation. It has set up the machinery and fixed the time schedule for implementation. It was completely aware of all the difficulties involved, and was forewarned, not once but many times, by delegates of Arab States of their resolve to thwart by violence a decision of the UN favorable to partition. Nevertheless the UN acted, despite these threats and in the full knowledge of all that was involved, convinced that there was no other way out, and that a solution could no longer be postponed. If the UN were now to be deterred from its course by the planned violence by riots and demonstrations, calculated to convince the world that the UN decision is impossible of implementation, and thus by force to alter the settlement which it decreed, the UN would not only suffer an irreparable loss of prestige and authority, but its future effectiveness as the agency "to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and constitutional law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace"—would be disastrously undermined.

The Mufti and his henchmen are attempting to sabotage the establishment of the Jewish state but they and their collaborators in the neighboring Arab States, which are covenanted member states of the UN, and as such pledged to abide loyally by its decisions, are engaged as well in a shameless, frontal attack upon the very life of the UN itself.

We are confident that the UN will not permit itself to become the victim of insolent intimidation and the sport of organized hoodlumism. We are also confident that the Security Council of the UN—which is to act as the guide of the UN Commission appointed by the Assembly to implement its decision, will give this Commission every measure of support and encouragement, and should the situation in Palestine come to constitute a threat to the peace, as a result of the attempts to alter by force the settlement envisaged by the resolution of the Assembly, the Security Council will act with decisiveness and dispatch. The conference of some Arab delegates that the Security Council will fail to back up the action of the Assembly will prove as vain as was their earlier confidence to prevent a two-thirds vote in the Assembly itself.

The future of the UN will be enormously strengthened in the difficult months ahead if our own Government will remain indubitably firm thrcughout and lively and ardently cooperative with the UN in this matter. It has not always been so in the matter of Palestine. It was not always so during the protracted Palestine deliberations in the UN. Our officials were not always of one mind, and this resulted in confused counsel and stultified action as well as in the bewilderment of governments who quite naturally looked to the United States for guidance and leadership.

Our Government has, since the last war, assumed unprecedented diplomatic initiative and preeminent leadership in world affairs. It has not been content to remain passive, or only mildly active, as just one Nation among many, in the tasks of world reconstruction. Destiny has singled it out for leadership in this century and regardless of cost, it has boldly and wittingly assumed that role. In many parts of the world the impact of that political direction is now felt. Palestine is definitely within the orbit of those great political problems which America, true to its assumed role, must face, and to which it must bring the same determined leadership which has characterized its approach to other world problems. Should it fail to do so, and should it evidence, as on occasions it did, only a formal and passing interest, for the sake of the record or to allay criticism, the Palestine problem, in spite of the UN decision, will sag hopelessly, and the situation will move from bad to worse.

Time and again, both at Lake Success and Flushing Meadow, we heard from some American spokesmen the ominous slogan: "The Palestine issue is a matter for the UN, not for the United States. We will vote for the UNSCOP Report when the time comes, but we will do no more than that." We know who was the author of this quite transparent slogan and who defined that line. Fortunately he did not prevail. Involved in this slogan was the total renunciation by our Government of the clear responsibilities of the new diplomatic leadership which it had assumed in the world, and in that very part of the world. Our Government did not announce that Greece and Turkey, or the political and economic fortunes of Western Europe, or China, were matters for the UN and not specifically for the United States.

When the crucial hour of decision arrived, however, our Government rose to the challenge of the hour and the mandates of its destiny. Its voice rose clear and unmistakable; and in so doing, it encouraged other states to back up the recommendations of the UN Special Committee on Palestine. As a result, the resolution was overwhelmingly adopted. Our Government now stands committed to its implementation. The UN plan is now definitely a part of American foreign policy and should be as aggressively and determinedly advanced as other major policies of our Government. Our Government should assist the UN in every way possible and should employ all its diplomatic machinery and influence to expedite the matter. Delay is dangerous. Defeat will be catastrophic.

The problem is to tide over the next 10 months. Once the Jewish state is established and admitted to the UN, and the neighboring Arab states are confronted by an accomplished fact, they will as a matter of practical politics, seek ways for mutually satisfactory arrangements with the Jewish state and for peaceful cooperation—and the way will be open. Peace with the Arab world will then be possible. The dangerous period is the short formative one of the next few months. Here is where our Government can be tremendously helpful.

There is no provision in the UN resolution for an international police force to insure law and order during the transition period. Great Britain announced that it would be responsible for law and order as long as it remained in the country. It is clearly not doing it. If 100,000 soldiers and police cannot insure security in that small country or even patrol properly one main artery of travel in Palestine—the 42-mile road between Tel-Aviv and Jerusalem to enable men to travel on it without being killed by snipers, one is forced to question the sincerity of the government's declaration. It would be highly desirable to have an international force accompany the Commission of the UN when it arrives in Palestine to carry out the instructions of the UN. It need not be large, but it must know what it is there for. The present military force in Palestine is the

blunted instrument of the hopelessly blundering policy of Mr. Bevin which amounts to this, His Majesty's Government "loyally accepts the Assembly's resolution" but it will do nothing to implement it. The British forces in Palestine will maintain law and order but they will remain neutral when clashes result between the Jews who have loyally accepted the decision of the UN and who seek peace—and the Arabs who are violently resisting it and provoke war.

But whether an international force is sent to Palestine or not—it is immediately imperative that the Jewish people of Palestine shall be enabled forthwith to defend themselves. They have the manpower. They need arms. Surely those states—and foremost among them the United States—which voted to create a Jewish state must feel honor bound and duty bound to see that the citizens of that state in the making are properly protected against the murderous assaults of those who have resolved to defy the will and the conscience of the nations of the world. Here, again, the United States holds the key to the situation, both as regards the formation of an international force and the equipment of the Jewish militia. Our Government has not hesitated to send arms and military missions in other parts of the world to back up its foreign policy.

The problem of our refugees still remains most pressing. When will our refugees begin at last to move in large numbers into Palestine? What conceivable purpose is served by keeping these men, women, and children pent up in detention camps where they have languished for so long; or in driving them away from the shores of Palestine now that the United Nations has finally decreed that the Jewish state shall be set up in Palestine in 1948? What else but the meanness of spirit of a prestrate statesmanship and the spitefulness of a disgruntled bureaucracy can account for it? There are thousands of refugees in various parts of Europe who simply can no longer wait. They will not be permitted to remain where they are. They must move. Surely it cannot be Great Britain's wish to climax and close her political career in Palestine with some more stark tragedies like the *Exodus*. Why cannot the act of parting be sweetened by an act of generosity and humanity which will help to reconcile friends who should never have been estranged?

My dear friends, American Jewry has deserved well at the hands of the Jewish people. History will pay homage to the role which it played in this searching and heroic hour. It rose to the occasion splendidly. It knew how to close ranks. It acted with wisdom, dignity, and courage. It spoke effectively to the hearts and minds of the American people and its representatives in government, and to the responsible heads of our Government. It is generally acknowledged that what was achieved was due in a large measure to the magnificent labor of American Jewry.

But much remains to be done. November 29 was only the evening and the morning of the first day—the day when light broke through the darkness of our world. Our great community providentially spared for this hour must now shoulder the vast economic burdens involved in the setting up of the Jewish state. Judging by the remarkable demonstration a few days ago at the conclave of the leaders of American Jewry in Atlantic City, our people are fully aware of their new responsibilities and are resolved to meet them. Whatever aid may come from other sources, the primary responsibility is ours.

We shall also have to stand on guard during the next critical period to see that no political conspiracy of evildoers shall undo or harm the Jewish state as its builders proceed to lay its foundations. The Jews of America, proud and loyal citizens of this great country who have demonstrated time and again, in peace and in war, their devotion and patriotism, will in the spirit of American democracy wish to assist this new free and democratic country which will rise on the shores of the Mediterranean, and which will embody those same great biblical ideals of justice, brotherhood, and peace which inspired the founding fathers of this Republic.

World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Miss Nell Battle Lewis appearing in the column which she conducts regularly in the Raleigh News and Observer every Sunday under the title "Incidentally." Miss Lewis has conducted this column for years. She has a wonderful grasp of public questions and is intensely patriotic and thoroughly devoted to the ideals of the Republic, and tremendously interested in world peace. She has made an effective fight on communism, and brilliantly champions the cause of world peace through an enlarged and rejuvenated United Nations organization. This article sets forth her aims for 1948, which I think might well be adopted by our citizens generally throughout the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCIDENTALLY
(By Nell Battle Lewis)
AIMS FOR 1948

The aims of this column for the year 1948 are:

1. To combat in every way possible the infiltration of communism into American institutions, particularly those nearest at hand, i. e., in North Carolina. I intend to do this not merely because communism and democracy are basically irreconcilable, but because I, with many others, believe the representatives of communism to be bent upon the overthrow of democracy and because I believe that democracy, the cardinal principle of which is the freedom of the individual, deserves the stanchest defense by us all.

2. To advocate and spread in every way possible the idea of world federation as the greatest single political hope of mankind in this period of gravest peril. Incidentally's advocacy of world federation will be, as it has been, by favoring the strengthening of the weak international organization which already has been set up—the United Nations, that is, making this organization more than a feeble league of nations based on merely a multilateral treaty, one that would be powerless to keep the peace at any time of serious international stress (as we have already seen it to be), i. e., turning it into a real world government in which the member nations delegate part of their vaunted and now most perilous "sovereignty" to the central authority, and relinquish, under that authority with a world police force, the "right" to make war.

3. To foster and encourage in every way possible friendship and cooperation between the English-speaking peoples, not in a spirit of hostile exclusion of others, but believing that, with the common background of constitutional liberty which the Anglo-Saxon peoples have, their unity at this grave point in history is of the utmost importance to the world.

4. To continue to collect and discuss accounts of authenticated instances of phenomena not yet explained by any known law and generally known as "psychic," believing eventually discoverable law to underlie these phenomena, like all others. The ultimate discovery in this field would be that of the survival of human personality after bodily death, which already is strongly suggested—indeed, already in some minds (including my own) proved—by the results of psychical research to date. I consider such research of special value at the present time, when materialism is at its most dangerous height, when many of the old religious concepts have lost their hold on the popular mind, and when for many people human life has become spiritually meaningless, senselessly truncated at the grave. Reestablishment or reinvigoration of the idea of the immortality of the soul by psychical research, as well as through generally accepted religious channels, would be of incalculable value to us in our present materialistic confusion.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD LEAD THE WAY

"Till the war-drum throbbed no longer, and the battle-flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world."
—*Tennyson in Locksley Hall.*

Throughout this year all pieces in Incidentally advocating world federation will be opened by this quotation from "Locksley Hall," which of late has become familiar in connection with discussions of world unity. In Tennyson's poem this stanza follows close upon two setting forth the poet's interesting prophetic vision of aviation in which he—

"Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales.
"Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue."

As the prophecy of those two stanzas, made in the early 1850's, has now been fulfilled, it is to be fervently hoped that the stanza about "the parliament of man, the federation of the world" will turn out to have been equally prophetic and that its fulfillment will come soon.

In the extremely important leading article in the January issue of the Reader's Digest, Our Final Choice (between world government and the destruction of civilization), by W. T. Holliday, part of which has already been discussed here, Mr. Holliday makes the point that it is possible under the charter of the United Nations for a general conference of the members for reviewing the present Charter to be called by two-thirds of the members of the UN General Assembly and 7 of the 11 members of the Security Council. Thus, no one nation on the Security Council could veto the calling of such a conference.

By that conference, the present Charter of the United Nations could be changed into a federal constitution for the world, as the weak and inadequate Articles of Confederation were changed by the new American States into a Federal Constitution for this country.

The United States should take the lead in calling this conference. Mr. Holliday writes: "We ourselves are the crux of the problem. Do we want world federation? Will we work for it? Will we lead the way? We had better know for sure what we will do, before we try guessing what somebody else will do."

Now the most powerful Nation in the world, an adolescent giant upon whose reluctant shoulders leadership in the defense of civilization has devolved, the United States should immediately instigate in the United Nations organization the calling of such an international conference for the alteration of the UNO Charter into a federal world constitution.

Awards to High-School Students for Achievements in Scholastic Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, it will be generally agreed that the success of America's future will rest in the hands of the youthful students of today, now being educated in schools of the United States. The Baltimore Youth Advisory Board inaugurated the practice of recognizing youth excellence by selecting an outstanding boy and girl for the month to be given awards. It has been announced recently that these awards should be presented by Charles E. Moylan, Jr., the son of the Honorable Charles E. Moylan, associate judge of the supreme bench of Baltimore City, and Mrs. Moylan, and to Marguerite Rogus, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A. Rogus.

An article giving a full account of the awards was recently published in the Baltimore Sun, and I ask unanimous consent to have this interesting article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS HONORED FOR ACHIEVEMENTS

Two honor high-school students whose achievements are in the field of scholastic journalism are the Girl and Boy of the Month for November, it was announced yesterday by N. Ellsworth Bunce, advisor to the Baltimore Youth Advisory Board, sponsor of the awards.

The girl, Marguerite Rogus, 17, is a senior at Patterson Park High School, and editor in chief of her school's weekly newspaper, the Patterson Press. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A. Rogus, of 629 Rappolla Street.

JUDGE'S SON CHOSEN

The boy, Charles E. Moylan, Jr., 16-year-old City College junior, in addition to being managing editor of his school's newspaper, the Collegian, is president of the school's Quill and Scroll Society, president of its Press Club and assistant managing editor of The Greenbag, City's yearbook.

His parents are Judge and Mrs. Charles E. Moylan, of 401 Bretton Place.

Both were recommended for the awards by their schools and by a fellow journalist, William Evans, editor in chief of the Collegian.

ACHIEVEMENTS EMPHASIZED

In nominating Marguerite and Charles, the Collegian's editor emphasized their achievements in the Maryland Scholastic Press Association's contest, held at the association's annual convention at College Park on November 8.

In that contest, Marguerite and Charles won first awards in feature writing and editorial writing, respectively, in competition with more than 200 students from 28 Maryland public and parochial schools, according to the recommendations.

Always on the honor roll in her 7 years in Baltimore's public schools, Marguerite also won a Patterson letter for scholarship, described by her principal, Dr. Chester H. Katenkamp, as one of the highest achievements the school offers.

Charles attained early recognition for scholarship at City College. His general average of 97.6 for the first semester not only led the freshman class, but was the highest in the entire student body. He also has always been an honor student.

ON DEBATING TEAM

In that year Charles achieved another rare honor for a freshman by being selected as a member of the debating team of the Carroiton Wight Literary Society. The six debaters, four seniors, a junior, and Charles, won the annual debate with the traditional rival, the Bancroft Society. The team, of which Charles still is a member, also won last year.

He is his class's representative on the student advisory and executive boards; was one of two student speakers chosen to address Community Chest workers at the kick-off luncheon for the 1946 campaign, and speaks frequently at city-wide student-panel discussions.

ADDRESSED STATE TEACHERS

He was one of five high-school students chosen to address the Maryland State Teachers Association here on October 31, and, as a member of the City College chepter of the United Nations Youth Organization of Maryland, participated in a discussion broadcast here on November 10 on Preparing Youth for the World of Tomorrow.

When a member of Boy Scout Troop No. 64, Charles won 32 merit badges, qualified as a life scout and was a pitcher on the troops' baseball team.

Motion Pictures, Radio Broadcasting, and Comic Strips in Relation to the Administration of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the last meeting of the American Bar Association, Mr. Arthur J. Freund, a distinguished member of the St. Louis, Mo., bar and chairman of the criminal law section of the American Bar Association, made a very able address on the subject Criminal Law Section of the American Bar Association on Motion Pictures, Radio Broadcasting, and Comic Strips in Relation to the Administration of Justice. There has been a great demand for his speech. Therefore, I should like to have it reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the Appendix thereof, and I am informed that the cost of printing it will be $230.75. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the meeting of this section of criminal law last year in Atlantic City, there was authorized a committee on motion pictures, radio broadcasting, and comic strips in relation to the administration of justice. With the assistance of Mr. Carl B. Rix, president of the association, a committee of the association was appointed, comprised of some of the distinguished members of this association.[1]

The problem concerns itself so far as we of the bar view it (a) with the emphasis placed by the three media upon the depiction of crime and the portrayal of the manner in which crimes of violence are committed, detached and prosecuted, and (b) the manner in which the lawyer, the judge, and the processes of law are depicted.

Mr. Rix suggested that I act as chairman of the committee, and Mr. James V. Bennett was designated as secretary. Members of the public relations committee of the association, together with officers, members of the board of governors, and important committees of the association comprise the membership of the committee, and a meeting was called for June 4, 1947, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington.

We invited the presidents or managing officers of the national associations of the media concerned, together with the presidents of the four radio broadcasting systems, and the three comic strip syndicates to attend the Washington meeting to discuss informally the problems outlined. All of those invited, with the exception of the American Broadcasting Co., responded to our invitation. Curiously enough the American Broadcasting Co. carries over its network a very large quantity of programs devoted to the depiction of crime.

Before proceeding further with an account of the Washington meeting, may I give you my own views on the problems involved and what we hope to achieve.

It is probably fair to say that no one subject in the manifold areas portrayed in motion pictures, radio broadcasting, and comic strips receives greater emphasis than crime and the processes of the law. The listening, reading, and motion picture public is overwhelmed with the voluminous treatment of this subject, a treatment so extended and continuous as to imply that crime, its methods, techniques, and detection, and the psychical abnormalities of those engaged in criminal pursuits were the major concern and chief subject of interest of the American public from the nursery to the grave.

May we say in all fairness that we recognize the contributions which have been made by the motion picture and radio broadcasting industries in programs devoted to mass education of the highest value and on levels wholly in the public interest. We do not believe that it is necessary to concern ourselves here with the good that has been done, and which we are confident will continue to be done by these media. We are not here however, primarily, to praise Caesar, but rather to point to what we believe are some of his shortcomings.

It may be helpful first to discuss the manner of presentation of the lawyer, the judge, and the processes of the law in the three media. Our interest in this matter is not generated by motives of self-justification, but rather comes from a belief that grave harm is being done to a fundamental American institution, the administration of justice, through a course either designed or the inevitable effect of which is to breed contempt and disrespect for the key arch of a free and democratic government.

The lawyer, the judge, and courtroom procedures are all too frequently depicted in an unfavorable manner. Whereas the doctor is almost always represented as a kindly, charitable, and capable professional person, the lawyer is usually portrayed as cruel, selfish, tricky, and unethical. The judge is, also,

[1] The membership of the committee is set forth in appendix A.

often shown either to be unworthy of his high office or he demonstrates his probity through the exposure or condemnation of corrupt or stupid counsel. The delineation of courtroom procedures usually strays so far from reality as to border upon the grotesque. This phase of our subject is of high importance, though we approach it with natural diffidence. The lawyer and the law's processes, seeming circumlocutions and delays have been the subject of satire and derisive humor for centuries. There is probably no other subject or group in our society which has a longer history as a target for ridicule. We know that there is some justifiable basis for this and that lawyers, possessing as they must the imperfections of ordinary mortals, are not always perfect and that the processes of the law do not infallibly operate to produce absolute justice. We cannot object with validity if instances of this character are reported or portrayed either in fact or in fiction. Such unfortunate circumstances are the exception rather than the rule, though the portrayals in the three media would lead the public to believe that the reverse were true. Furthermore, lawyers and judges, trained to and rigidly disciplined by an exacting professional code of ethics, feel generally that they are performing a vital service to society upon a high plane; and we may perhaps be forgiven for feeling that if unwarranted attacks are made upon the profession from without, the defense might appropriately also come from without our ranks. In any event, whether the legal profession may properly entertain a sense of grievance, if not irritation, upon being misrepresented and distorted, we are far more concerned with the destructive effects of such treatment upon the administration of justice in this country.

Although the lawyer, the judge, and the law have been the butt of ridicule for hundreds of years, the opportunity for mass education and the fixation of social attitudes has never been so great as now. Radio broadcasting, motion pictures, and comic strips reach millions of our people each day, whereas a century or less ago it was not possible to affect the mental processes of a people so quickly or with such continued devastating effect. The evil of the modern process as used by the three media, as we view it, is to infect the minds of the youth and adolescent with the conviction that lawyers are per se antisocial beings and that the law through the judges and courts is an instrumentality unwholesome to our welfare. We know that our Government can only operate through the law, and that if the time should come when the law cannot be enforced fairly and honestly, our Republic as we now know it will cease to exist. However, in the motion picture, radio-broadcasting studios, and in the comic strips this fundamental axiom all too frequently finds no recognition.

Perhaps something might be done by the media on the positive side. It seems conceivable that the portrayal of the dramatic incidents of the careers of great American lawyers would have a popular appeal. Possibly such portrayals of the accomplishments of John Marshall, Judah P. Benjamin, and William Howard Taft, to mention only a few, would approach in public interest analogous portrayals of Al Jolson or Louis Pasteur.

There may be other affirmative approaches in this area which the industries may be able to suggest, initiate, and carry into effect. Their record of remarkable achievements in their respective industries demonstrates their ability to attain virtually any goal so long as they are convinced that the goal is one worth achieving.

The major specification in our bill of particulars, however, has to do with the emphasis on crime, criminals, and the techniques of criminals in the three media under discussion. We are wholly aware that crime does pay the motion-picture producer, the radio broadcaster, and the comic-strip syndicates, and that in this respect the dramatization and exploitation of crime is one of the best paying features of these media. Consequently, a vast host of economic interests has developed sympathetic to the notion that crime in this sense shall continue to pay. We realize that in dealing with such vast vested interests we must overcome obstacles which are not governed ordinarily by good motives or a desire to act in good taste or completely in the public welfare. Nevertheless, we are reluctant to believe that the minds of the leaders of these large enterprises will be completely insensible to the welfare of the Nation when the grave and critical nature of the problem is clearly revealed and understood.

It was said[2] regarding the comics as far back as 1936, and it has equal applicability to each of the media today:

"Sadism, cannibalism, bestiality. Crude erroticism. Torturing. Killing, kidnaping * * *. Raw melodrama; tales of crimes and criminals; * * *. All these, day after day, week after week, have become the mental food of American children, young and old. * * *

"The repetition in word and picture of * * * bestial and degenerate scenes and characters is a * * * serious matter. Such things make their deep impression upon the plastic minds of growing children and have their dangers for the never-too-mature minds of countless adults."

More recently, Mr. Jack Gould, radio editor of the New York Times, wrote in the March 2, 1947, issue:

"Radio programs heard by children again have moved to the forefront of controversial subjects in broadcasting. Several parent-teacher groups in various parts of the country have indicated the 'crime shows' and the hair-raising serial 'thrillers' as psychological dangers to impressionable youngsters as possible stimulants to juvenile delinquency."

Outside of the classroom, the home, and the church, the motion picture, the radio, and the comic strips constitute the most powerful existing educational influences upon the mental growth of the child and adolescent. The usual routine is for the child to read the funnies, later he turns on the radio, and in his more extended leisure he attends the movies. The sequence is variable but the ingredients of the diet are staple.

In each step, the emphasis in his menu is crime and criminals. In this there is often the seasoning of illicit sex relations. No one of the media alone at any one time or over any extended period can be said to be more harmful than another, but the insistent and continued repetition of these influences, each complementing the other, must produce a deteriorating effect upon the mind of the impressionable. Immature and undeveloped minds are moulded to the concept that crime and criminal conduct is the norm of human behavior. Ethical concepts are twisted from reality, weakened, and all too frequently destroyed.

In addition, crime techniques are blueprinted with meticulous accuracy. Criminal methods are set forth step by step, thereby giving the recipient an accurate handbook for antisocial and often criminal conduct.

To illustrate what we have in mind, may we mention one representation in each media merely as an example of the evil we seek to correct. They are the comic strip Kerry Drake, the motion picture The Killers, and the radio broadcast Gang Busters. Each, however, is highly successful in its field, each makes the presentation of crime pay the producer enormously, and each has stimulated a number of competitors, or else is the result of prior competition or prototype. For example, The Killers was a contemporary of The Outlaw. The financial success of those sordid portrayals of crime was followed by Duel in the Sun, another dramatic account of the same character. This in turn apparently encouraged the production of Brute Force, of which Life magazine in the August 11, 1947, issue, has this to say: "The production is a turn-about moral code which portrays each representative of law and order almost as a case history of depravity, while all the lawbreakers seem like real nice fellows."

We are aware of the body of opinion of some of the social service profession and psychiatrists, that children and adolescents are in need of emotional release afforded by the portrayal of criminal and sadistic exploits. While children do need a certain amount of adventure in their entertainment, there must be a point beyond which the law of diminishing returns begins to operate.[3] We think that current practices in the three media have long demonstrated the operation of that rule, and we do not hold with the minority of experts who defend these programs. While juvenile crime is on the increase in almost every locality in this country, the surprising circumstance is that the rate is not higher than it exists at the present time. However, the effects of the weakening of the moral codes and ethical concepts cannot be measured with any accuracy by crime rates or statistics. With almost every child and adolescent bombarded many times daily with the jargon of the criminal and the horrors and depraved methods of his activity, we should rejoice that we have as much normal and rational child and adolescent behavior as we do.

It is said that the criminal is always brought to punishment, and that thereby the moral lesson is given that the way of the transgressor, if not shown as hard, is at least futile. However, the overwhelming majority of opinion, both lay and professional, is of the view that the eventual capture and punishment of the miscreant in no real sense mitigates the evil created by the lurid portrayal of his criminal activities. On the general subject we quote briefly from an article by Bosley Crowther in the New York Times of May 11, 1947. Mr. Crowther speaks of motion pictures, but his views are equally valid to each of the media. He says:

"For a business which makes so much pretense of being explicitly moral and which proudly polices its members with a pious production code, the motion-picture business has been pulling some mockeries of late. Meekly this side-line observer would like to ask who's kidding whom? Do the industry's moralistic guardians think that the public is being easily fooled, or are some of its less considerate members slyly slipping the business the bird?

"We refer, of course, to the several recent pictures—and others coming up—which emphasize baser passions for no other than sensational effects. * * * Do these films conform to the industry's actual notion of moral responsibility? And, more than that, are they such entertainment as meet the test of public interest and public weal? * * *

"Again we repeat our questions: Is this regarded as fair and responsible by the industry? And does this technique—and the picture—meet the test of public good? We ask them again because it strikes us that the fiber of some of the people in films has shown signs of disintegration under the pressure of making sales. Last week we saw a full-page advertisement in a weekly trade magazine calling attention of exhibitors to a forthcoming film. It promised tawdry love and vicious murder. The kind that sells millions of newspapers—and millions of box-office tickets. * * *

"Invariably the makers of such pictures excuse their admittedly coarse wares by protesting that they are only 'giving the public what it wants.' And they righteously remark that 'the transgressors' are always punished in the end. How absurd and hypocritical. The public's taste for films is as high as the imaginations and the talents of film makers are able to reach. And as for the transgressors being punished—what's the difference after the damage has been done?"

As Mr. Crowther points out, productions of this category are on the increase, and we could cite the figures to demonstrate this. As a result, the more wholesome productions in each of the media decreases by the operation of a law as inexorable as Gresham's law in economics—the bad productions tend to drive out the good.

The situation today in which we find the three media may be compared to the condition which prevailed in this country prior to 1890, when the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed and in 1887, which marked the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission. A period of rapid business expansion resulted in a large number of abuses demanding control and correction. The railroads and business interests generally were either unable or unwilling to correct harmful practices, and the forces of competition often made it impossible for industry alone to correct the evils. As a result, Congress passed regulatory legislation which has been augmented through the years.

The three media have likewise had a tremendous economic expansion over the past quarter century and this very circumstance has created problems which require adjustment. I am sure that every lawyer here believes that regulation of each of the media is equally possible under our constitutional government, both National and State. Indeed, Judge Justin Miller, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters, and a former chairman of this section, sounded a warning in a letter to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 20, 1945, wherein he said: "Only by intelligent anticipation of public reaction and by equally intelligent self-discipline can we prevent legislative intemperance."

The very essence of American democracy is founded upon freedom of expression. Legislative restrictions upon the three media, or any one of them, to restrict their free expression would probably entail administrative control resulting in some form of censorship. Some one or some group would have to determine what presentation was in the public interest and what was harmful to that interest. I think that the American public would deplore such legislation and it is my hope that it will never become necessary. However, with the present situation which confronts us, it might be advisable to study the problem of drafting legislation in conformity with the powers granted Congress by the National Constitution, and to make a like study for the States. As I have indicated, I should deplore the enactment of any such laws; we know that many in the eighties felt the same way concerning restrictive legislation upon business, but it is clear that unless conditions improve in the media, legislation is inevitable.

As a corollary, consideration can be given by the American Bar Association, through an appropriate group or section, acting alone in the name of the association, or in conjunction with other organizations in the public interest, to appear before the Federal Communications Commission and oppose the renewal of a license of a key radio broadcasting station on the ground that the great volume of its programs devoted to crime portrayals warrants the Commission in refusing to grant the renewal of the license. While the Commission, as we understand its public views, has no desire whatever to censor the content of radio-broadcast programs, the law directs the Commission to grant licenses and renewals only if the public interest, necessity, and convenience will be served thereby. Such intervention by the American Bar Association would focus national attention on the subject we are considering here today. A denial of license renewal by the Commission on such ground would produce results which no one can now foresee with any clarity or precision.

Are the self-imposed and self-regulated codes in the motion-picture and radio-broadcasting industries operating effectively in the public interest? We are advised that there is no such code formulated and in operation for the comic strips except as such small restraint comes from the syndicates which sell them and the newspapers which print them. It is obvious that the contents of this medium differ in no substantial respect with reference to the treatment of crime from the other two media. It is, therefore, entirely fair to inquire whether the codes which are in effect, really accomplish as well as they should their stated purpose to achieve decency and operate in the public interest.

It would appear to one unacquainted with the industries except as an interested observer that the codes are not operating effectively. Perhaps with competition so keen and with the tremendous financial stakes involved, the industries cannot effectively regulate themselves without some form of independent supervision.

We appreciate that the three industries cannot have one regulatory code. If the codes are to operate, there must be separate ones for each industry, and yet there should be common approaches in each with a like objective. We submit that consideration be given to the advisability of a complete reexamination of the codes now existing, both formal and informal, with special emphasis upon the desirability and feasibility of injecting administration and supervision by outside, objective resources concerned not only with the welfare of the industry but also of the public.

The third and final suggestion for consideration is one which combines the objectives of the two preceding. Facts, in a field so large and important not only to those engaged in the industries but also to the public at large, are difficult to determine. It may appear desirable to create an independent commission of interested persons and experts to study upon the highest professional basis the entire subject matter and to bring back findings and recommendations. A survey of this character would require the assistance of many persons in many fields. It would require continuing supervision and direction. The cost of such a survey and the method of its financing would also be an important consideration.

We are dealing with great forces affecting the lives of many millions of our people and the millions yet to come. If such a survey could be productive of substantial progress the time and funds devoted to its formulation and publication could not, and should not, be counted in dollar value. A revelation of the facts so ascertained would do much to hasten proper self-regulation, should it be found, as many of us believe, that there are abuses which require correction. The draft of proposed forms of legislation, if such recommendations were made by the group, might in itself produce results that would eliminate the need for such legislation.

The views set forth here were not presented in detail at the Washington meeting of June 4, 1947, but their general substance was there given. A large majority of those appointed on behalf of the American Bar Association were present and the media were represented by a distinguished group of representatives.[4] There was a full, free, and frank discussion of the subject matter, and a general concurrence of views that the media would approach the problems with sympathy in a genuine endeavor to reach a corrective solution. A résumé of the proceedings of the meeting appeared in a recent issue of the American Bar Association Journal,[5] and I shall not repeat them here.

There was a disposition during the meeting on the part of some of the representatives of the media to doubt the existence of any problem. On the one hand, it was said that lawyers, judges, and the processes of justice were not unfairly portrayed. An elaborate self-analysis of motion pictures produced in 1946 was offered to substantiate this view. There were those of the media who took the position that no harm was done by the depiction of crime and that the portrayal of such episodes were a part of our modern way of life. The Washington meeting concluded with an agreement that the representatives of the media would report the views expressed to their respective organizations and that another meeting of the entire group would be held in the late fall of this year, either in Washington or New York. To this end, a committee of members of this association and those of the media has been appointed to prepare an agenda for the fall meeting.

We are deeply gratified that the National Broadcasting Company has this month officially recognized the problems we seek to correct. In a code formulated for its future programs, it is provided among other corrective measures that:

"Law, justice, and officers of the law should be portrayed without disparagement or ridicule, but with respect."

It gives further recognition to our position that:

"The vivid, living portrayal of crime * * * dramas on the air, has an impact on the juvenile, adolescent, or impressionable mentality that cannot be underestimated."

As a first corrective functional operation, the National Broadcasting Co. will broadcast its crime programs at hours when children are supposed to be in bed and fast asleep. With this explicit recognition of the harmful effects of these programs by the industry we may expect even better results.

The National Association of Broadcasters has also taken official notice of the harmful effects of the portrayal of crime.[6] It proposes that crime should never be presented in a favorable light and that references to kidnaping should be barred. While this may be a short step, it is one in the right direction.

We are not expecting immediate results of our efforts and with forces so deeply entrenched we cannot hope that success will come to our endeavors except through the process of discussion with those of the media and a program of public enlightenment. We are gratified that the representatives of the media have agreed to sit down with us and consider the subject in a friendly cooperative atmosphere for if there is a will to carry out the objectives we seek, a way will somehow be found to reach a solution of the problems.

I am hopeful that more portrayals of a positive character may be produced; portrayals of the lives and experiences of great lawyers, noble judges, and episodes depicting the majesty and dignity of the law. We have embarked upon an important project affecting the lives of great numbers of our citizens. We are confident of a large measure of accomplishment.

---

[2] John K. Ryan, How Moral Are Comics? Forum, May 1936, p. 301.

[3] Radio Crime Drama, Rowland, Educational Research Bulletin (Nov. 15, 1944), College of Education, The Ohio State University, vol. XXIII, No. 8, p. 210.

[4] A list of those present on behalf of the media is set forth in appendix B.

[5] July 1947, issue; vol. 33, p. 649.

[6] The complete statement of the National Broadcasting Co. is set forth in appendix C. It will be noted that the premise we seek to establish, namely, the harmful effects of the type of programs we discuss are recognized and a specific and positive approach will be used to meet them.

APPENDIX A

COMMITTEE ON MOTION PICTURES, RADIO BROADCASTING, AND COMIC STRIPS IN RELATION TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

FOR THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Carl B. Rix, former president, American Bar Association, Wells Building, Milwaukee, Wis.

William L. Ransom, editor-in-chief, American Bar Association Journal, 33 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.

Howard L. Barkdull, chairman, house of delegates, American Bar Association, Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

Loyd Wright, member, board of governors, 111 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

George Maurice Morris, chairman, public relations committee, American Security Building, Washington, D. C.

Judge Robert G. Simmons, chairman, section of judicial administration, Supreme Court, Lincoln, Nebr.

William Clarke Mason, member, board of governors, 123 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Henry Ccle Bates, member, public relations committee, 1 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

James D. Fellers, national chairman, junior bar conference, Apco Tower, Oklahoma City, Okla.

W. Carlos Morris, Jr., national director, public information program, junior bar conference, 1302 Rusk Street, Houston, Tex.

Charles B. Stephens, First National Bank Building, Springfield, Ill.

Tappan Gregory, president, American Bar Association, 105 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Judge John J. Parker, Federal Building, Charlotte, N. C.

Judge James P. Alexander, Supreme Court, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.

Judge Bolitha J. Laws, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C.

Hon. Earl Warren, State Capitol, Sacramento, Calif.

Arthur T. Vanderbilt, 744 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

Wayne L. Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

James V. Bennett, secretary, criminal law section, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

Arthur J. Freund, chairman, criminal law section, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

APPENDIX B

COMMITTEE ON MOTION PICTURES, RADIO BROADCASTING, AND COMIC STRIPS IN RELATION TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

FOR THE MEDIA

Donald M. Nelson, president, Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers, 6233 Hollywood Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif.

Robert W. Chambers, research director, Motion Picture Association, 1600 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Theodore W. Smith, assistant vice president, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 28 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

Sydney Schreiber, general counsel, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 28 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

Judge Justin Miller, president, National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Col. J. Hale Steinman, chairman of Federal laws committee, American Newspaper Publishers Association, Lancaster, Pa.

Elisha Hanson, counsel for the American Newspaper Publishers Association, 370 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Joseph H. Ream, vice president, Columbia Broadcasting System, 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

W. K. Hutchinson, International News Service, 235 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y.

Kent Clark, public relations, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 28 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

Eugene Juster, public service manager, National Broadcasting Co., RCA Building, Radio City, New York, N. Y.

Carlton Smith, general manager, National Broadcasting Co., RCA Building, Radio City, New York, N. Y.

Benjamin M. McKelway, Washington Evening Star, American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D. C.

Charter Heslep, Washington manager, Mutual Broadcasting System, Inc., 1440 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX B

COMMITTEE ON MOTION PICTURES, RADIO BROADCASTING, AND COMIC STRIPS IN RELATION TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

FOR THE MEDIA

Others invited who have indicated an interest to participate:

Cranston Williams, general manager, American Newspaper Publishers' Association, 370 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Wilbur Forrest, former president, American Society of Newspaper Editors, New York Herald Tribune, New York, N. Y.

Dr. Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Mollie Slott, general manager, Chicago Tribune-New York News Syndicate, Inc., News Building, New York, N. Y.

Barry Faris, editor in chief, International News Service, 235 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y.

Ward Greene, general manager, King Features Syndicate, 235 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y.

Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association, 28 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

Edgar Kobak, president, Mutual Broadcasting System, 1440 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

Lawrance Rutman, general manager, United Feature Syndicate, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

Robert McLean, president, the Associated Press, Bulletin Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

Hugh Baillie, president, United Press Association, News Building, New York, N. Y.

N. R. Howard, president, American Society of Newspaper Editors, Cleveland News, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. L. Ashby, general counsel, National Broadcasting Co., Inc., Radio City, New York, N. Y.

Niles Trammell, president, National Broadcasting Co., Inc., Radio City, New York, N. Y.

George T. Delacourte, Jr., president, Association of Comic Magazine Publishers of America, 149 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

APPENDIX C

NBC BARS MYSTERY PROGRAMS BEFORE 9:30 P. M., EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1

(Statement of the National Broadcasting Co. of September 15, 1947, released to the press)

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., September 13.—The National Broadcasting Co. convention here Saturday unanimously adopted a proposal by NBC that, effective January 1, 1948, "no series of detective-, crime-, or mystery-type programs" will be broadcast over NBC before 9:30 p. m., New York time.

This action, the object of which is "to reduce the exposure of juvenile and adolescent minds to crime suggestion," was taken at a closed meeting of NBC executives and representatives of 160 of the network's stations.

The proposal in full follows:

"Dramatization of crime, mystery, and detective stories, while a recognized and justly popular form of entertainment and literature, requires particularly mature and discriminating judgment in radio presentation.

"While mystery and crime stories are as old as literature itself, the vivid, living portrayal of such dramas on the air has an impact on the juvenile, adolescent, or impressionable mentality that cannot be underestimated.

"In order further to reduce the exposure of juvenile and adolescent minds to crime suggestion, effective January 1, 1948, no series of detective-, crime-, or mystery-type programs will be broadcast over the National Broadcasting Co. network before 9:30 p. m., New York time. Crime and mystery programs broadcast at 9:30 p. m., New York time, or after, will not be broadcast in the Mountain and Pacific coast time zones before 9 p. m., local time, or in the Central time zone before 8:30 p. m., local time. Individual delays—i. e., use of a recording of the original 'live' program—will be permitted on stations in these zones whenever the client does not decide to do a live repeat broadcast.

"It is important, therefore, to reiterate at this time, for the guidance of producers and sponsors of such programs, and for the information of the general public, the policies of the National Broadcasting Co.:

"1. No program will be broadcast which glorifies or justifies crime, criminals, or any antisocial practice, or which treats these matters in a cynical or condoning fashion.

"2. Lurid, overly realistic dramatizations of the morbid or criminal aspects of the story must be avoided: detailed portrayal of murders, electrocutions, hangings, third-degree methods, physical agony, torture of any kind, cruelty to children or animals, are not acceptable for broadcast.

"3. Programs which by virtue of detailed descriptions of the technique and methods of crime become blueprints for imitation by impressionable listeners must be avoided.

"4. Revenge shall never be justified as a motive. Episodes involving kidnaping of children, rape, adultery, or other illicit relationships are not acceptable. Suicide will not be detailed in method or presented as a satisfactory or justifiable solution to any human problem.

"5. No mention, direct or implied, of sex crimes, prostitution or sex perversions will be permitted.

"6. Law, justice, and the officers of the law should be portrayed without disparagement or ridicule, but with respect.

"7. Crime must always be punished, either specifically or by implication. Crime is not a subject for comedy.

"8. News of crime will always be presented factually. No appearance of persons involved or featured in current criminal or morbidly sentimental news stories will be allowed."

Automobile and Truck Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many inquiries are made as to the exports of automobiles and trucks. The following official table shows that the 1946 shipments of automobiles, trucks, busses, chassis, and parts equalled nearly one-half billion dollars. The table also shows that for the first 10 months of 1947 these exports had a value of $959,000,000, and that the 1947 exports will be somewhat over a billion dollars in value.

The table is as follows:

Automobiles, trucks, and busses, and parts: United States exports of domestic merchandise, 1946 and January to October 1947

Item	1946 [1]		1947 (January to October) [1]	
	Number	Value	Number	Value
Trucks and busses, and chassis, new	137,278	$197,900,244	185,305	$317,183,834
Automobiles and chassis, new	116,944	122,500,568	226,632	292,943,892
Truck, bus, and automobile parts	(2)	157,387,567	(2)	238,409,654
Total, new	(2)	477,788,679	(2)	928,537,380
Trucks and busses, and chassis, used	10,203	14,334,370	7,352	16,328,321
Automobiles, used	2,482	2,671,977	9,508	14,436,055
Total, new and used	(2)	494,795,026	(2)	959,301,756

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Not reported.
[3] Not available.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the week of February 22–29, 1948, will be National Brotherhood Week. For this occasion I have prepared a statement on the topic of the unity of all religions, races, and colors in America. I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the text of my statement in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BROTHERHOOD WEEK—PROTESTANTS, CATHOLICS, AND JEWS UNITE IN HARMONY

Mr. President, in accordance with the proclamation of the President, during the week from February 22, to February 29, 1948, America will celebrate National Brotherhood Week, which is sponsored by the American Brotherhood of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The purpose of this week is obvious. It is to draw attention to the paramount need in our times for Americans of good will—of all races, all creeds, and colors to work together harmoniously as children of the one universal God, as brothers unto another.

The first suggestion for Brotherhood Week came from a Catholic priest in Denver in 1932. The idea took fire and the first observance was held in 1934. Since then, Brotherhood Week has expanded so that at the present time, each year countless newspapers, magazines, and radio stations throughout the Nation generously cooperate in helping to foster its noble ideals.

RELIGIOUS BOOK WEEK

Sponsorship of this week is but one of the activities of the National Conference of Christians and Jews of which President Truman is honorary chairman and Robert P. Patterson, general chairman, and on which a very distinguished panel of American citizens in all phases of our national life ably serve. Among the other activities of the National Conference is Religious Book Week. The fifth annual Nation-wide Religious Book Week was celebrated in May of last year, and over 100,000 book lists featuring 200 books for adults and children were distributed. This year Religious Book Week will be celebrated during the second week of October.

PRESERVATION OF RELIGIOUS RIGHTS

Among the other activities of the National Conference are those handled by its Committee on Human Rights. This committee has, for example, called upon the United Nations to investigate the state of religious liberty in Yugoslavia involving the trial and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac and anti-Catholic activity. It has also recommended that the United Nations give favorable consideration to the proposed convention making illegal by international law the persecution of groups of people for the reason of their race, language or political opinion. The National Conference also has commissions on educational organization, on community organizations, and on religious organizations working actively with Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish groups throughout the Nation in fostering better understanding among all Americans. It is reported that once every day throughout the year, and many times within the same day, trio teams of a minister, a priest, and a rabbi or laymen of the three faiths appear before audiences from one coast to the other, thus representing the fundamental unity of the three great religious creeds of America.

I feel that it is deservant that recognition be paid to the outstanding work of the National Conference and to all those who participate in Brotherhood Week and the Conference's other activities in order to make America a land of still greater harmony and unity.

ORIGIN OF NCCJ

The national conference was established by such great leaders as Charles Evans Hughes, Newton D. Baker, Dr. S. Parks Cadman, Roger W. Strauss, and Carlton J. H. Hayes. The First World War, as we all recall, was followed by a period of widespread racial and religious prejudice, which was best represented by the spread of the Ku Klux Klan. We in Wisconsin successfully met the challenge of the Klan, as did all of the other States of the Union eventually. But knowing that much intolerance still existed, the great Americans whom I have mentioned founded this inspiring organization. Its president, Everett R. Clinchy, has performed invaluable work in the field of better human relations and has contributed mightily to the success of the national conference's endeavors.

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS

In August 1946 an international conference of Christians and Jews was established. In August 1947 an international emergency conference to combat anti-Semitism was held in Switzerland and widely attended by representatives of many nations. Short- and long-term recommendations were prepared by this emergency conference and detailed suggestions were made for the setting up and operation of councils of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews in all countries. The members of the conference signified the importance of close relations with the United Nations and with its related organizations, particularly the United Nations scientific, educational, and cultural organizations so as to secure their cooperation and assistance in the fight to eliminate hatred.

NEED FOR BROTHERHOOD

Edward Markham told us, "The crest and crowning of all good: life's final star is brotherhood." In the Old Testament, in the Book of Genesis, it is asked, "Am I my brother's keeper?" as indeed you and I are. Today 20 centuries after the coming of the Prince of Peace, mankind is still unfortunately widely divided. Barriers exist everywhere between nations, between races and religions. It is up to us in America to set a standard for the elimination of these barriers, to demonstrate conclusively that we, in the words of our first President, George Washington, "give to bigotry no sanction." It is, of course, in the week of Washington's birthday that Brotherhood Week is customarily celebrated.

Among the devices used by the sponsors of American Brotherhood Week in my own and other States have been publicity materials, such as posters and folders; program aids for educational, religious, civic, and other organizations; the sending out of copies of plays and pageants; and making available speakers for schools, clubs, and other organizations.

We in America have always believed that every man should be judged on the basis of his own merit, not on the basis of the color of his skin, nor on the basis of the temple, cathedral, or synagogue in which he worships, nor on the basis of the land from which his father comes, nor the accent of his words, nor the cultural mannerisms of his people. Yes; he should be judged only on the basis of his own intrinsic worth, his character, his deeds, his relations with his brother men.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN AMERICA

Americans well remember the days of the Ku Klux Klan, the Know Nothing Party, the APA, and other hatemongering groups. We have witnessed in the past outbursts of anti-Catholic feeling and particularly in the recent past instances of anti-Jewish sentiment. This last problem remains as one of the real problems of our American Republic. It is an unfortunate fact that even in this modern day and age there is intolerance against American members of the Jewish faith, in spite of the fact that they have proven that they yield to no group in their patriotism, in their love of country, in their complete devotion to human liberty. I do not want to magnify this problem out of proportion, but I do wish to point out that there has been unfortunately unjustified hatred and envy and fear of the members of the Jewish faith, in spite of their magnificent contributions to every phase of American life—in medicine, in education, in the field of entertainment, in statesmanship, in law, and, yes, on the battlefield.

AMERICA'S JEWISH VETERANS

In this latter connection, one of the most interesting works that has been published is the volume, American Jews in World War II—the Story of 550,000 Fighters for Freedom, by I. Kaufman. This work reports the monumental undertaking of the Bureau of War Records of the National Jewish Welfare Board of chronicling the splendid contributions made to American victory by the 600,000 Jewish men and women who served in

our armed forces—the equivalent of 40 Army divisions. (I have previously paid tribute to this record in the Senate on June 4, 1946.) Incidentally, I might note that the work of the National Jewish Welfare Board earned from the War and Navy Departments hearty joint commendation for "exceptional aid in the successful prosecution in the war and in the preservation of the enduring values of American democracy."

TEN THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIX WHO GAVE THEIR LIVES

The volume shows that the total casualties of members of the Jewish faith who served in the armed forces in World War II numbered 35,157, of which 10,425 made the supreme sacrifice. A total of 26,931 awards were given to American Jews, including all of the major medals and other tributes to heroism. In addition, members of the Jewish faith won more than 26,000 Purple Hearts, including those received by the 8,000 who died in action and the 18,000 who were wounded in action. The distribution of Jewish servicemen by services and activities was as follows: 80.59 percent in the Army, 16.6 percent in the Navy, 3.14 percent in the Coast Guard, and 1.81 percent in the Marine Corps. It should be noted that many of these figures are of necessity incomplete and it is estimated, for example, that the number of Jews killed in action may actually be as much as 15 to 20 percent higher than the number listed.

In volume 2 of this monumental work to which I refer, there is a list by State of origin of many of the men and women of the Jewish faith who died in their country's service or who were wounded or who have won awards, including many pages listing men from our own State of Wisconsin.

ALL AMERICAN VETERANS DESERVE TRIBUTE

This record is comparable to the record made by Americans of all creeds and colors—Catholic, Protestant, white, Negro. Tribute is deserved by all of them, not because they are members of any one group, but because they are members of the American community.

It is in this spirit of unity that American Brotherhood Week should be celebrated this year and every year.

CONCLUSION

America has grown great because she has accepted on a free and equal basis men and women of all the lands on earth and all the races and creeds on earth and enabled them to make their full contribution to our economic, political, social, and spiritual life. Let us celebrate this Brotherhood Week and then make of each of the other 51 weeks of this and every year a week of true brotherhood between all Americans.

Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, sometime ago our colleague the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] wrote an article entitled "Economy in Government," which was published in the Elks magazine for December 1947. Recently a friend of mine in Illinois sent this address to me and requested that I have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be so printed.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

(By Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia)

The cost of living in the United States—excluding taxes—for food, clothes, rent, etc., is almost twice its prewar emergency level of 1939.

The cost of governments in the United States—Federal, State, and local—is nearly three times the total 1939 governmental outlay, and the cost of the Federal Government alone is four times its 1939 expenditures.

Gross personal income in the United States—including pay-roll deductions, but excluding corporate income—is two and a half times the national pay check.

Direct personal taxes and payments collected by all governments in the United States—including taxes and payments withheld, but excluding corporate tax payments—are nearly nine times the 1939 take.

Separately, these four accepted facts are more widely discussed than the weather. Together they make a devastating case against the high cost of government and demonstrate conclusively that increased taxes are a predominant factor in the high cost of living.

While States and localities are just now shifting into high gear on postwar programs for which their current revenue seems generally to be insufficient, most of the tax increases to date, since 1939, have been in Federal assessments. Two efforts to reduce the taxes this year have failed.

Since the budget was submitted we have virtually committed ourselves to future foreign assistance which is unpredictable as to duration and ultimate cost. It is certain, however, that this program precludes the wisdom of Federal tax reduction unless it is accompanied by a substantial decrease in Government spending for other purposes.

The minimum figure suggested for this world relief program is $20,000,000,000. The magnitude of this program, which is proposed as a repellent to expanding communism, may be seen when it is compared with a total of $16,000,000,000 of Federal expenditures in the seven "emergency budgets" for the years 1932–38, inclusive. These were the pump-priming budgets of the depression era, which included AAA, CCC, FERA, WPA, PWA, HOLC, Resettlement, etc.

The importance of this comparison is forcefully significant when it is realized that these "emergency budgets" totaling $16,000,000,000 for home relief were accompanied by budgets for regular governmental functions which averaged less than two and one-half billion dollars a year; whereas now we propose to spend $20,000,000,000 at a greater annual rate in "foreign relief budgets" at a time when the President tells us that the Federal budget minimum is $37,500,000,000, of which nearly $33,000,000,000 is for regular Government functions and outlays, exclusive of foreign relief. This, broadly and briefly, is the Nation's postwar problem. It is as serious as it is perplexing.

The outstanding factors in the problem are these:

1. Taxes—especially Federal taxes—are a predominant quantity in our high cost of living.

2. The American people will not permit starvation abroad, any more than they will at home.

3. There is no irresistible pressure from home upon Congress to deflate the quadrupled peacetime Federal expenditures, ordinary or otherwise.

With respect to taxes, the President's recent economic report shows that the personal tax bill—paid directly to governments by individuals—accounts for more than $1 in every 10 in the cost of living. When the excise taxes on numerous items of merchandise, amusement, etc., and other indirect taxes are added, everybody's tax bill is more than doubled.

No current consideration of taxes should omit the fact that taxes on business have been at a point of diminishing returns for some time. This means reluctance to expand production, which in turn is one of the prime elements of inflation. Inflation—stemming largely from taxes which stifle business incentive—plus over-burdensome taxes on individuals equal high cost of living. Inflation is an abnormal economic condition which does not touch all segments of the population with the same degree of intensity. Therefore, some suffer. Lower prices and lower taxes, with reasonable income and profits, would be better for all.

With respect to foreign assistance, the people of this country are not of a nature to stand by while humans starve anywhere. We will feed the hungry without question. But beyond this, we owe it to ourselves to determine our limitations on ventures into global subsidies of debatable value because communism would thrive just as lustily on American insolvency as it does on distress in other areas.

Neither our own people nor those who would accept our aid should ever forget that the might of America lies in our strength at home—our fiscal solvency, our productive capacity under free enterprise, and our ability to finance our obligations without crushing taxation. Our financial stability is far more urgent for freedom in the world than any program of international subsidies which would severely strain our economy. Fiscal instability in the United States would serve the enemies of democracy far more than any lethal weapon that could be devised. By the same token our financial soundness is the only hope for those who seek our help. Without it there would be no bulwark against communism, and freedom could not survive either here or elsewhere.

With respect to the cost of government which we now not only indulge but condone, by apathetic acceptance, we are spending this year more than $30,000,000,000 for so-called ordinary Federal activities, exclusive of foreign aid. Unless this extravagance is curtailed with force and dispatch, this second full postwar budget may become the peacetime base for Federal budgets of the future.

We can pay such bills only by continuation of the present onerous tax rate against a minimum national income of $150,000,000,000 a year. If, in addition, we should continue spending four to five billion dollars a year for foreign aid, as we are this year, we can pay the bill at the present tax rate only if our national income is around $175,000,000,000 a year. Prior to the recent war-emergency years the national income for the best year in all our history was $83,000,000,000, or less than half of the $175,000,000,000. There is no more reason to expect perpetuation of the present inflated income than there is to expect perpetuation of the present inflated costs of living, and there is already a loud and persistent clamor for tax reduction.

So, on the basis of cold facts and reasonable expectancy, the absolute necessity for cutting ordinary costs of government and moving cautiously on foreign subsidies is clearly obvious. Not only is the need apparent, but most of us actually have observed both waste in Federal operations, and places where expenditures could be eliminated entirely without impairing either security or essential service. To this date there is no irresistible demand upon Congress to ferret out the nonessentials and waste.

In fact, economy in government is still unpopular. A whole generation nearly reached maturity during 17 years of deficit financing by the Federal Government. The prolonged period of heavy peacetime spending has hardened too many people to the misguided acceptance of a grant as a gift. Too many have come to regard government as a third party when, indeed, we ourselves are the Government. The Government's wealth is no greater than our own collective possessions—they are the only wealth of the Government. Government debt is our debt. When we receive money from the Government, it's our own money. If it pays you a dollar, you can wager it will cost you more than a dollar in the end, for the Government is not noted for administrative economy.

Red tape and overhead are not the only extra added costs to Government spending—especially when it is deficit spending. In all those years of spending more than we had, in peace and war, we piled up a national debt of $258,000,000,000, which today is costing $5,000,000,000 a year in interest alone. That puts the first $35 on everybody's tax bill. Payment of the interest involves the Government's integrity, and it cannot be cut until the debt is reduced.

There is one other item which is virtually irreducible, and that is refunds of taxes collected in excess of amounts due. This runs to more than $2,500,000,000 a year. These excessive collections are largely the result of the withholding system. Some social-security payments and other expenditures, more or less in the nature of trust obligations, also are in the untouchable category. All of these, including the interest payments total about $10,000,000,000, or a little more than a fourth of the entire Federal budget.

Neither national defense nor the Veterans' Administration should be overlooked. Every other item of expenditure should be scrutinized for proper reduction. If functions cannot be curtailed, economy can almost certainly be applied to administration.

National defense is a $10,500,000,000 item, and no one would do anything to impair our military security, but the War Department still is employing one civilian for every two men in uniform. It is equally difficult to understand the Budget estimate that the peacetime per man cost of uniformed personnel is nearly 98 percent of the per man cost in the recent war. The per capita cost is now placed at $6,790. In wartime it was $6,960. The difference is less than 50 cents a day.

The budget figure for veterans' affairs is $7,500,000,000 a year. No one would deprive the veterans of their benefits and services, but there is an employee in the Veterans' Administration for every 70 veterans of all wars. These employees total more than 200,000. Veterans themselves have possessions. They pay taxes. They have all the responsibility of citizenship. They stand to gain as much as others through more efficient administration and service.

The items mentioned constitute about seven-eighths of the Government in terms of ordinary Federal budget expenditures. It is probable that the percentage of reduction should be greatest in the remaining eighth.

Congress, in the past session, made some cuts, but they were little more than a token reduction. They must be deepened and broadened in the next session.

There are still 2,000,000 civilian employees on the Federal pay roll. That is twice the number employed in the prewar emergency year 1939. It is more than twice the total membership of the BPOE.

The Government still operates its Federal activities through more than a thousand agencies, many of which duplicate effort and overlap authority such as the score of agencies in the field of housing.

The Federal Government is still paying out on the average of three and a third billion dollars a year in domestic subsidies and grants, all of which are accompanied by Federal control over all who accept them, whether they are State and local governments, or individual including businessmen, farmers, etc.

We fought the recent war at tremendous personal sacrifice for freedom under democratic government. Public frugality and private industriousness are the requirements we have overlooked in 2 years of effort to consolidate the peace. Without these there may be uneasy peace, but not contentment.

Third Party Theme Song: "I'm Wild About Henry"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE M. REED
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial column entitled "Third Party Theme Song: 'I'm Wild About Henry'" by Dan Kidney, from the Indianapolis Times of January 10.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRD PARTY THEME SONG: "I'M WILD ABOUT HENRY"

(By Daniel M. Kidney)

DEAR BOSS: Why President Truman devoted so much of his state of the Union message to trying to appease Henry A. Wallace remains the $64 question here.

That rhetorical part of his speech to the Congress where he repeated the phrase, "This leads to peace—not war," was purely designed to win the Wallace followers—if any—who are not completely committed to the Communist Party line.

Maybe the Boston Globe poll, which showed Mr. Wallace has some supporters in Massachusetts, caused him to bother about this one-man third-party movement. For to a machine-made professional like Harry S. Truman, Mr. Wallace himself must rate as that most despised pariah of politicians—the political ingrate.

This is not without some reason. Because a Democratic President, the late F. D. R., promoted Henry to the Cabinet, Vice Presidency, and back to the Cabinet again. He probably couldn't ever have been elected even to the city council in Des Moines.

For Mr. Wallace has what political reporters hate—shyness born of arrogance.

He loves humanity but he just doesn't like people.

MAKES SENATOR TAFT APPEAR FRIENDLY

Mr. Wallace doesn't want followers. He wants worshipers. And the idolatrous Commies are just the ones to provide them for him—imprisoning him meanwhile.

The man is so aloft and self-satisfied with his own ego that he makes the somewhat frigid Senator TAFT seem friendly.

Where is the humility that his backers boast about? He kicked off his own nomination by saying he had served notice on the Democratic Party and its high command just what they should do—and not having followed his orders he was off them. If that's humility, both the dictionary and Bible need rewriting.

But to get down to cases. When Mr. Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture he held weekly press conferences. Reporters attended them religiously. But maybe 2 hours later he would pass them on the street and not even speak. That went on for years.

After President Roosevelt jammed him down the Democratic convention delegates' throats—some sore from booing him out of the hall at Chicago—he presided over the Senate for 4 years and didn't make a single close friend on either side of the aisle.

ALWAYS STOPPING IN TO SEE GARNER

Where former Vice President "Jack" Garner had a constant open house in his office, with both Democrats and Republicans flocking in for a drink or chat, no Senator ever came to see Henry unless on very urgent business. Senator PEPPER, of Florida, may have been an exception.

When he was replaced by Senator Truman, a whoop went up from Senators of both parties.

Later President Roosevelt appointed him Secretary of Commerce. Having helped depose him as Vice President, it would seem only natural that Senators should drop their opposition. But he only got confirmed for the Cabinet post by a single vote. New Dealers, like Senator HILL, of Alabama, pulled all possible strings to get that done. When they got through, Mr. Wallace never even said "thank you."

When Henry batted down the ears of a news photographer, he was in natural form. When he relented later and posed, he was doing just that—posing.

His favorite game here used to be boomerang. He likes that. For he can both pitch and catch. That should be the symbol of his third party and its campaign song should reflect the real reason for his running. It should be, "I'm just wild about Henry."

DAN KIDNEY.

Our Final Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have already commended the remarks which have been made today by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in support of the Marshall plan, and I have said that I agree wholeheartedly with what he has said. I have said that the Marshall plan must be enacted and that we must maintain our armed strength, although I deplore the condition of the world that forces such a policy.

However, Mr. President, there are other means which we should also be following. In that connection, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our Final Choice," by W. T. Holliday, president of the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio. The article appeared in the January 1948 issue of the Reader's Digest. Certainly Mr. Holliday, a man of wide practical business experience, cannot be classified as a starry-eyed idealist. In the article he is stating practical facts. On the first page of the article, as printed in the Reader's Digest, is an inset reading as follows:

World government is absolutely essential to avoid catastrophe; therefore it is possible. A stirring, forceful article pointing out the steps which should be taken right away.

So, Mr. President, I request that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FINAL CHOICE

(By W. T. Holliday, president, Standard Oil Co. of Ohio)

(World government is absolutely essential to avoid catastrophe; therefore it is possible. A stirring forceful article pointing out the steps which should be taken right away.)

I am one of those terrible people, a munitions-maker. As chief executive of an oil company, my business is just as essential to war as tanks or planes. So I am supposed to welcome war as a fine thing for my business.

But the next war will not be a fine thing for my business—nor for any business. It will simply be the dead end of all our business—and of a good many other things as well. Man, at long last, has developed the instruments with which he can destroy his world—and will destroy it, unless the power to do so is taken from him.

So I put this to your common sense: If you know that down cellar in your house there is a hundred pounds of dynamite, with a fuse of a certain length attached and lit, is it your main job to see that the beds are made and the cupboard is filled?

Let us wake up. The first job of all of us today is to secure world peace. Our only alternative is World War III. The horror behind these cool words is beyond imagination. Already the scientists, in the merest babyhood of atomic power, are talking about bombs a hundred times more powerful than the Hiroshima type, which could blast New York off the earth and kill 6,000,000 people. Just as appalling, the scientists tell us, are developments in warfare by deadly bacteria.

Whenever a civilization is faced with a new and fundamental challenge, there is only one thing that can save it from decline and fall: Its men and women must change their habits of thought to meet the challenge. Either they meet their new world with new thinking, or they go under.

Do all of us realize that our present and normal state of world affairs is nothing but raw anarchy? We are living under a world condition of lawless chaos that we could not tolerate for an instant in our immediate lives.

Scholars talk about "international law," but the plain truth is that there is no such thing. Law means enforced law. To enforce law, it takes a government. And where is their international government?

Well, you say, don't we have the United Nations?

We do—for what it is. But at present the United Nations is not constructed to do the job that needs doing; let us recognize its shortcomings and try to correct them. While there is still time.

The United Nations cannot maintain world peace for the simple reason that the United Nations is not a government. It has no world laws and no power to enforce them if they existed. The United Nations is nothing but a league, a many-sided treaty signed by 57 separate nations—each of which keeps all its independent power of deciding at any moment whether it will make war.

History is full of such agreements, from the leagues of ancient Greece down to the League of Nations. Every one has proposed to abolish war and every one has ended in war. If the league theory were all that history had to tell us about maintaining peace, the human race might as well shut up shop.

Under our noses, however, is a different fact of history that is equally well proved; it constitutes the only hope by which imperfect men in an imperfect world can live in peace together.

THE PROMISE OF FEDERATION

What is the real meaning behind the symbol of the policeman? If you look closely at the public peace in your city, you will be reminded that you and your fellow townsmen would be completely incapable of maintaining the peace by yourselves as individuals. The policeman represents public force, wished-for order, and agreed-upon laws. Most important, he represents the unseen fact that you and your fellow citizens have given up your primitive, independent right to settle your own disputes with your own force, and have assigned to him the power to handle something which you are individually powerless to handle. In a word, you and your fellow citizens have federated.

The essentials of federalism are all within the policeman. He does not tell you when to get up in the morning or what to eat for supper—his powers are his assigned powers, and no more. But when you have trouble within the scope of his duties and powers, he takes charge. And it works.

It is one thing to say that a federal world government would have supreme jurisdiction in maintaining the peace. But how would it enforce this peace? Right here is where you and I must change our habits of thought. It is hard for us to think of armies and navies not belonging to separate nations but to the world as a whole. Yet, it is a condition of world government that all the great weapons of mass destruction must be given up by the nations and handed over to the world government. Theoretically, the world government would have the power to make overwhelming war upon any nation that threatened world peace.

I say "theoretically" because the real nub of enforcing world peace would be something quite different. Otherwise we are back at the impossible paradox of making war upon a nation for the sake of preventing war. How do we get around that contradiction?

The writers of our Constitution were puzzled by exactly the same point. They wanted the Federal laws to be obeyed in the States. But they knew the Union could not merely ask the States to enforce Federal laws. And they knew that for the Union to proceed by force against a State as a whole, for the sake of punishing a few lawbreakers, would be like burning down the barn to get rid of the rats.

They solved the problem by giving the Federal Government the power to go straight to the individual citizen, within any State, and punish him for his violation of Federal law.

And that is how Federal world government would enforce world peace. Just as you and I, whether we live in Oregon or Ohio, are punished if we break the Federal laws against counterfeiting, any national citizen under world government would be punished if he broke world laws against fomenting international war. If this seems an extreme break with our old habits of nationalistic thought, the fact is that the world is already moving in this direction. The principle of individual guilt for fomenting war is simply setting up Nuremberg trials before the event.

The shape of this world government is clear in outline. At the top is a world constitution. Under this, world government is embodied in a world legislature for enacting the laws to maintain peace, world courts to interpret those laws and decide disputes, a world executive body to execute the laws, and a world police to enforce them.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST WORLD GOVERNMENT

The objections to world government are numerous, but I have never once seen the statement disputed that it is the only final answer to world war. In sum the critics more or less tacitly concede world government to be necessary—and loudly declare it to be impossible. They list a variety of obstacles.

I was invited not long ago to take the side of world federation in a debate against a well-known commentator. I replied that I would be happy to debate with him, provided he would really take the other side. He must do more than point out the problems and difficulties on my side—he must argue against world federation itself as a solution for war. The gentleman declined. He said there wasn't any debate.

Some declare, for example, that national sovereignty prevents world federation, because no nation would diminish its sovereignty enough to join. Let us see what this can mean.

Outside a nation's own borders, there is no such thing as national sovereignty—meaning inherent supremacy. Within its borders, the nation is, of course, supreme among its subdivisions and citizens. The only touching of this aspect of sovereignty by limited world government is its power to punish national citizens for fomenting international war. In this matter, world government has the supremacy. Yet, I hardly see how this takes any supremacy away from the nation, because so far as I know, in the matter of fomenting international war, no nation now exercises any rule at all over its citizens. If the nations really want war prevented under world federation, the sole sovereignty they would have to renounce would be the power of the nation itself to decide to wage war.

Others argue against a world government to prevent war on the grounds that it would be a negative and repressive government, a mere police state. To go a little deeper is to see that the only repression is of disorder, and that the law and order upheld by government is the necessary foundation for everything positive in social living.

Again, it is widely asserted that the world is not yet ready for world government, even of a limited sort. The critics on this score tell us we must first have long practice in international cooperation through such agencies as a world bank, a world food authority, etc. We need such agencies. But they would be no more capable of upholding the peace than the Universal Postal Union, a thoroughly successful example of world-wide cooperation, has been able to uphold the peace since it was founded in 1878. You cannot maintain the peace with a postman, banker, or grocer. It takes a policeman.

Last are the critics who declare that human nature itself is not spiritually ready, has not yet reached the state of perfection necessary for world federation. I am inclined to agree. Yet was human nature any nearer perfection in 1787, when our Constitution was written; will it be any nearer in 1937? The atomic bomb is not waiting for us to perfect human nature.

PROGRAM FOR ORGANIZATION

With all its shortcomings, the United Nations provides the framework for the working world federation we need. Let us see how the job could be done.

The first step is for some nation to introduce in the General Assembly a motion that the United Nations shall call a world convention to draft a world constitution. Article 109 of the charter provides that "a general conference of the members for reviewing the present Charter" can be called by two-thirds of the General Assembly and 7 out of 11 of the Security Council. That conference would be the constitutional convention—and no single nation can veto it.

At that conference, any alteration of the present Charter can be recommended by two-thirds of the nations represented. That alteration would be a federal constitution for the world—and no single nation can veto a line of it.

Now comes the rub. The next step is to submit that constitution to the nations themselves for ratification. Again under article 109, the alteration shall take effect when it has been ratified by two-thirds of the nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council. In other words, one nation can stop the rest from having constitutional government.

Now that is neither reasonable nor tolerable. It is a curious fact of history that our 13 original States, as they approached federation, were restrained by exactly the same rule of all-or-none. The Articles of Confederation, under which the Constitutional Convention of 1787 was called, said that any amendment adopted must be ratified by all 13 States. How did our infant Constitution manage to come into effect under conditions so stringent?

It didn't. By a bold and wise stroke, the drafters of our Constitution ignored the Articles of Confederation and wrote the provision into the new instrument that it should be established among the ratifying States when 9 out of 13 had ratified.

The delegates to a world constitutional convention would be just as bold, and just as wise, if they ignored the Charter of the United Nations and provided in the new instrument for its own ratification on more moderate terms. If two-thirds of the nations can write a constitution, it would seem reasonable that two-thirds of the nations could establish it among themselves.

Once this federation is established among a reasonable proportion of the world's nations, it forms an open and easily expansible system. For any nation that did not want to come in at first, there would always be a vacant chair.

FACING THE FACTS

Which brings us to today's constant question: What about Russia?

But that isn't the real question. The first question we must answer is this: What about the people of the United States?

We ourselves are the crux of the problem. Do we want world federation? Will we work for it? Will we lead the way? We had better know for sure what we will do, before we try guessing what somebody else will do.

The Russians are realists. And the only way to deal with realists is to give them something real to chew on. This world has no chance of abiding peace until we Americans see to it that our Government takes the lead in establishing a world order of greater and deeper realism than anything the Russians have to offer.

The Russians, too, are seeking an enlarging order, perhaps a world order. They call it "liberation," but the order they apparently want is an order of sheer Russian rule. In one word: Empire. But an empire of force is no longer genuinely workable, as the Russians themselves prove by the suppressive measures they find necessary to take among every people they have "liberated."

Federalism is not empire. Under a world federation the rule would be world rule, the law world law, arrived at by the voluntary cooperation of all the member nations. Which is exactly the reason for the much greater and more lasting workability—and hence superior realism—of federalism over empire.

We Americans must lead the way to federalism. If our Government spoke up firmly and clearly for an immediate world federation limited to the prevention of war, I am convinced that a huge majority of the world's nations would join us at once, and gladly.

I myself believe Russia would join. You may believe differently. Should Russia delay in joining, it is entirely possible to create a working and all-but-world-wide federation out of the United Nations without her help.

No one pretends that this would be an adequate solution. It would, for one thing, mean two worlds. Yet I wonder if two plainly defined worlds might not be preferable to the multiple, chaotic world we have today. At least the issue would be out in the open. And it would be a clear issue, instead of the myriad of small, sordid issues the world now finds insoluble without that clarity. And the issue would no longer lie between Russia and America, on a plane of dog-eat-dog rivalry, but between Russia with only 9 percent of the world's people on one side, and a federation of most, or very possibly all, the rest.

If we Americans really want an enduring peace for the world we must make this effort toward the only true source of public peace that has ever existed: Justice under law and government. We must speak up for it so that our representatives will hear and will act. One by one, whoever and wherever we are, we must stand up and be counted.

The alternative is the catastrophic destruction of our civilization.

It is better to stand up and be counted than be counted while laid out in rows.

National Coal Association Emits Loud Groans Over Mine Wages But Says Nothing About Coal Profiteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, pertinent in the coal-cost controversy, from the December 1, 1947, issue of the United Mine Workers Journal:

NCA EMITS LOUD GROANS OVER MINE WAGES BUT SAYS NOTHING ABOUT COAL PROFITEERS

Johnny "Two-by-Four" Battle, secretary of the National Coal Association, is moaning and groaning again about coal miners' earnings. Johnny's background when he was in the railroad yards at a time when railroad management thought that a dollar-a-day section hand wage was enough for any worker doing manual labor, made such a lasting impression upon his stalled mentality that he cannot progenerate with the progress of the times.

We admit that Battle's agents do a pretty good job of alerting the Bureau of Labor Statistics to give the NCA all the publicity aid at the Bureau's command to spread misleading propaganda as to coal mine workers' earnings. But when coal operators and miners get down to cases in wage negotiations the enterprising Battle and the BLS script are invariably discarded in factual considerations.

As an example of the splendid publicity cooperation accorded by the Labor Department, the NCA offered for release November 18 a tabulation by the Labor Department of earnings of employees in various industries which showed that the bituminous coal miners' wages, with 1935 to 1939 as a base, had increased 222.6 percent. The increase shown was based on weekly earnings of $71.25, which included some overtime payments for the sixth day of 8 hours, compared with the 1935–39 workweek of from 3 to 5 days of 7 hours. The $71.25 is all revealing, however, in that it shows that less than one-fourth of the industry could possibly have worked the sixth day although sales prices are based upon working and paying overtime for the sixth day. What's more, the $71.25 average includes mine supervisors and superintendents.

Metropolitan papers in the East failed for some reason to pick up the NCA release, but on the following day the Labor Department came to its aid with a release making the figures official and, of course, coming from a Government agency, metropolitan papers ran it.

The NCA release revealed that a Dr. Walter L. Slifer is now chief sniffer and snooper of the Bituminous Coal Institute, the statistical affiliate of NCA. We cling to the belief that Battle has never gone into the historical background of wage agreements in the bituminous-coal industry with Dr. Slifer. So at the risk of again being denounced for lese majeste at the push-button throne of the NCA secretary, we invite Dr. Slifer to investigate the wage rates prevailing in the bituminous-coal industry from 1920 until 1926, when a large number of the rich owners of coal companies repudiated their signed agreements providing a $7.50-a-day wage base, went nonunion and bankrupted the coal companies, squandered the assets of the stockholders and impoverished coal miners and coal-mining communities.

We would like for the new statistician to investigate the earnings of coal companies from 1925 until 1935, as well as the impoverished conditions prevailing in the coal-mining communities resulting from uneconomic wage rates and cutthroat competition, and compare them with the profits now being made by coal operators of from 50 cents to $3 per ton on bituminous coal sold f. o. b. the mines. If Dr. Slifer will do a little figuring, he will find that the basic wage scale of bituminous-coal miners, based on the current $13.05 basic wage scale, has increased but 74 percent over the $7.50 rate. And if Dr. Slifer will go back and make a comparison of freight rates and retail margins, he'll learn a lot about the big increase in freight rates and margins and how retailers' margins in many instances exceed the cost of coal f. o. b. the mines.

The Journal is receiving a great deal of mail these days from coal consumers complaining about prices and their inability to get stoker coal as well as other grades. Likewise many communications have been received from universities and high-school students. Thus far we have refrained from starting a crusade against excessive profits.

Even newspapermen have been insisting that we give them a break-down of costs in the various fields, freight rates, and retailers' margins. We have told them from time to time that we thought that they could get their information from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but this branch of the Government does not seem disposed to engage in any industry-wide investigation as to profits, merely confining its studies to wage compilations of about one-third of the industry's most prosperous mines which have the most favorable operating time.

Under the previous director of the BLS a questionnaire was designed to present to the coal companies to ascertain the number of employees not working the full pay periods and the number of mines that were operating less than 5 days a week, but Battle, as secretary of the National Coal Association, promptly advised the coal operators not to divulge this information to the fieldmen of the Department of Labor.

We don't expect nor hope for reform in the method of gathering wage earnings in the coal industry by the BLS, but for the information of the students of the schools and colleges where the Journal is regularly circulated, and to satisfy the curiosity of the newsmen, we have taken current figures published in the Chicago Journal of Commerce (Chicago being the largest coal-consuming market in the world), quoting f. o. b. mine prices on egg-sized coal from four important fields as well as the freight rate and

retail dealer's price. On the basis of these figures we have computed the retailer's margin, the latter exceeding the f. o. b. mine prices in three of the four fields.

Egg coal	F. o. b. mine price	Freight rate	Retail price	Retailer's margin
Pocahontas	$7.00	$3.83	$18.80	$8.97
Eastern Kentucky	5.28	3.60	15.60	6.72
Southern Illinois	4.50	2.44	12.20	5.26
Western Kentucky	4.25	2.64	12.70	5.81

The publicity fling of the NCA directed at miners' earnings, which in effect tries to portray unwarranted pay in a period of dollar-a-pound steak, $3.14 wheat, $15 shoes, $4 shirts, 90-cent cutter, 75-cent eggs, 60-cent bacon, and all else proportionately high, is but another evidence of a business association manned by small fry trying to enslave themselves into greater appreciation of their bosses by keeping alive the false hope that there can be a return to uneconomic slave conditions in American coal mines for which they can claim credit.

The Escape Clause for Benefit of Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a Government form headed as "Request for report on loyalty data." It is a very cleverly drawn form. I wonder if some Communist was the author of the escape clause, which is found under No. 11 of form 84A, which reads as follows:

Organizations with which affiliated other than religious or political organizations or those which show religious or political affiliations.

Except for the escape clause the Government already had on file, prior to issuance of form 84A, all information requested on the form, Request for Report on Loyalty Data.

It would be interesting to know to what expense the administration has gone in an effort to determine the loyalty of its employees, which with the escape clause, to which I have referred, made available to Communists, makes the whole thing a matter not only of waste but of stupidity.

It reminds me of the story of the lawyer who went before a judge with his client and pleaded for his client's release on the ground that there was an escape clause in the common law which the lawyer said was a hole that had been worn smooth by the scoundrels who had slid through it.

Under leave granted January 14, 1948, I wish to extend as a part of my remarks, form 84A, Request for Report on Loyalty Data.

Standard Form 84A
Promulgated August 4, 1947, by Civil Service Commission

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON LOYALTY DATA

[This form to be used for incumbent employees and excepted employees where investigation is conducted by agency (part VI—Executive Order 9835)]

To: .....

The following information is furnished for identification purposes on the person named below. Kindly furnish a report on any derogatory loyalty information contained in your files. (The fingerprints of this person are attached.)

1. Full name (initials and abridgments of full name are not acceptable):
(Surname) (Given name) (Middle or other names)
2. Aliases and nicknames ..... 3. Date of this request .....
4. Special numbers known to requesting agency (FBI number or FBI file number, passport number, Army or Navy serial number, seamen's certificate of identification, alien registration number, Social Security number, etc. Specify which): .....
5. Place of birth ..... 6. Date of birth ..... 7. Title of position, occupation, or profession .....
8. Sex. ☐ male; ☐ female. 9. Marital status. ☐ single; ☐ married. 10. If married, give spouse's full name, and date and place of birth .....
11. Organizations with which affiliated other than religious or political organizations or those which show religious or political affiliations:
.....
12. Dates and places of residence for the last 10 years:
Date Street City State
.....
13. Dates, names and addresses of employers for the last 10 years:
Date Employer Address
.....
14. This agency has loyalty information report(s) furnished by the agencies indicated below:
Agency which made the loyalty report Date of report Remarks
.....
15. This space reserved for return report to agency where no derogatory information is developed: .....
16. Name and address of requesting agency .....
17. Report of derogatory information developed .....
.....
Date. .....
(Name of reporting agency)

The Voice of the People Is Speaking—and How

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the first four letters in the Voice of the People section of the Washington Times-Herald this morning, are, in my opinion, very significant. The four, out of a total of seven writers, addressed themselves to a common subject.

It is hoped that some of our colleagues and the Administration will take heed and give some consideration to the voice of the people, a voice that has been almost completely ignored for the past 10 or 12 years. Yes, the voice of the people is speaking—and how.

The letters follow:

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE
LINE 'EM UP

There should be two Presidential tickets only in the field this fall, namely, a national ticket and an international ticket. Politics should be forgotten for the time being.

As some of the leaders of the two major parties are inclined to put foreign countries ahead of the United States of America in all things, the voters of the country should be put on the spot as to where they stand.

If they believe in the kind of Americanism that was proclaimed by Washington, then they should vote the national ticket. If, however, they believe that the last crust of bread should be taken from the hands of a hungry American child and sent across the waters and also believe that every American boy able to carry a gun should be sent overseas to help aliens to fight their incessant and never-ending wars, then they should vote the international ticket.

The national ticket should be headed by two men whose records for patriotism and American ideals are beyond reproach, and in this connection there are no two men in public life who are better qualified to head this ticket than Senator TAFT of Ohio and Senator BYRD of Virginia.

The international ticket should carry the names of two outstanding public men, who, judging from their speeches, would scuttle the old ship of state for the benefit of foreign countries.

R. A. BARBEE.

ATTENTION CONGRESS

My Federal income tax withheld amounts to about three times as much money for 1947 as I have been able to save for 1947.

I do not live extravagantly. I do not buy expensive clothing. I do have enough to eat, however, and have enough clothes to keep me warm.

However, I fear for the future welfare of our United States of America. I say, let us not make commitments for European aid for over a period of 1 year at a time.

A. C. OTTE.

FIGURED IT OUT

Based on an estimated population of 140,000,000 in the United States, the $17,000,000,000 sought by Messrs. Truman and Marshall for their so-called foreign relief amounts to approximately $12.43 for each man, woman, and child, or $30.36 a year for the 4 years fixed by those gentlemen as necessary to allow them to change human nature and produce "peace on earth, good will toward all men."

At the same time, in an outburst of warmheartedness, they are willing to forgive us our taxes to the tune of $40 a year so that each of us will pick up annually about $9.64, or slightly less than 3 cents a day.

Such generosity should be compared with that exhibited during the Roosevelt an era when the world was flooded with American dollars and goods.

When will the people wake up to the fact that the Truman-Marshall plan is nothing more than a continuation of the Roosevelt plan to scatter this Nation's wealth and resources to the four winds? Billions for foreigners, but only pennies for Americans. Apparently it is still wrong to be an America Firster.

W. H. SHIELDS.

ATTENTION CONGRESS

The tom-toms have started beating to sell the Marshall plan to the Congress and the American public. Accordingly, it is necessary for the public, in view of the critical situation in which the Nation now finds itself, to abandon its time-honored custom of "letting George do it," and do a little real thinking for itself.

During the last administration the Department of State and the Justice Department were filled with red sympathizers; this is a matter of public knowledge. No real cleaning out of this gang has yet occurred. The money will be wasted and when it is spent Europe will be no better or perhaps worse off than it is today. As to us, with our financial foundations seriously impaired, economic collapse will follow, in which the leftists expect to take us over and deliver us to Moscow.

G. ANDREWS MORIARTY.

Henry Wallace's Third Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE M. REED
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial column entitled "Henry Wallace's Third Party," by Dan Kidney, from the New York World Telegram of January 8.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HENRY WALLACE'S THIRD PARTY
(By Dan Kidney)

Henry Wallace thinks he is running, when he is only "taking a walk." He has been a "lifelong Democrat" since 1928. That was the year he bolted the Republicans to back Al Smith. Mr. Smith later "took a walk," but he never thought he was running.

Old Carl Hagenbeck could have strengthened the Wallace ticket by taking first place. The Hagenbeck-Wallace show was worth the price of admission, Mr. Wallace thinks he is setting up his own big top. Others think he is only carrying water for the Republican elephant.

When Henry heard the call to run for President on a third-party ticket he must have had a couple of his ears of corn to the ground.

Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR had better stick to his horse. The horse might bolt and throw him in a race, but Mr. Wallace is more likely to do so based on past performance.

It will be hard for Henry to convince the Iowa farmers that the Commies can bring them better prices. With their new cars and airplanes, they are perfectly willing to let the Russian rubes get fleeced of their rubles.

Twenty-four hours after he nominated himself for President in Chicago Mr. Wallace went to Milwaukee and made up a seven-point program. He had forgotten to put any points in his first speech. He was too busy accepting his own nomination. That was bound to be pointless.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the fight of the Jewish people to sustain the decision of the United Nations General Assembly for the partition of Palestine, against Arab efforts to destroy it, requires for its proper consideration such light as is cast on the subject by the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, January 12:

EXPLOSIVES FOR PALESTINE

The statement by the Jewish agency, formally accepting responsibility for the purchase of 200 tons of M-3 demolition explosives from the War Assets Administration for ultimate shipment to Palestine, clarifies some aspects of this mysterious subject. At the same time, it raises a great many more questions than it answers.

Neither the agency nor Mr. Leonard M. Weisman, who assisted in arranging the purchase, admits to any knowledge whatever about the 50 tons of war-surplus TNT accidentally discovered as they were being loaded on the cargo liner *Executor* under the criminal disguise of "machinery." This was not only a patently illegal but an outrageous business, imperilling the ship and the lives of everyone in the communities through which the explosives were handled. It is impossible to countenance this kind of thing, no matter what may be the pressures in Palestine; and if the Jewish agency can furnish no information the Federal Bureau of Investigation will have to get it. And the War Assets Administration will need something more than its sudden interdiction on further delivery of explosives to exculpate itself of the suspicion of gross carelessness in allowing these dangerous tools to be sold off for concealed or unknown purposes.

All this is easy to see. Nothing could do the Zionist cause more damage in this country than the existence of clandestine gunrunning operations illegally shipping arms to Palestine. What is not so easy to see is the proper policy for the United States Government. The State Department has placed an embargo on all arms shipments to the Middle East. This is a simple but more than a little pharisaical solution; it cannot overcome the fact that the Palestinian Arabs are getting not only arms but armed men from the neighboring Arab States, that the British are not successful in maintaining order now and are about to evacuate, and that if Jewish Palestine is to achieve and maintain the independence which this country officially advocates, its people will have to get arms from somewhere.

It is conventional to regard arms as in themselves immoral; Mr. Henry Wallace, for example, has been very vocal in condemning programs which give guns to people when they want plows. This overlooks the fact that when a man really needs a gun he wants it more passionately than he could even want a plow; and the lengths to which the Zionist interests are going in the effort to get explosives here might lead even Mr. Wallace to some second thoughts on the importance of arms in the contemporary world.

Clearly, the question of arming or recognizing Haganah seems in the first instance one for the United Nations Palestine Commission. But the United States cannot simply wash its hands of a matter in which it is so deeply involved. Everyone, so far, has shirked the question of security and defense for the proposed Jewish state, yet in the harsh world of today it is obviously the fundamental question in the whole Palestine problem; and if the other nations will not themselves fight for the Jewish state then they must clearly afford to it the means of fighting for and defending itself.

German Farmer Hard Hit by West Europe Drought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the fifth in the series written by Philip H. Parrish, editor of the Portland Oregonian editorial page, on European problems:

GERMAN FARMER HARD HIT BY WEST EUROPE DROUGHT—BLACK MARKET AGAIN REALITY—NEEDED GOODS GAINED BY BARTER

(This is the fifth of several articles by Philip Parrish, editor of the Oregonian editorial page, based on his observations during a 7-week tour of Germany, Austria, and England.)

(By Philip Parrish)

But the farmer always has his side of the story. The dwellers in the swarming industrial centers of Germany and Austria may alternately woo and curse the farmer—as all of them are doing under the postwar conditions of calamity—but the farmer is not without his own version, and his roster of wrongs and hardships.

Naturally I anticipated this, since I cultivated a lot of corn in Nebraska as a boy and trained professionally at Oregon State. My cheers would have been the loudest from the gallery if I had been present at the Democratic National Convention in 1896 when the late Mr. Bryan soared into the peroration of his Cross of Gold speech, declaring: "Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic. But destroy our farms, and the grass

will grow in the streets of every city in the country."

Besides, there had been my sobering experience of 1946, when, in clear weather, I had flown across America—the wide ranges of the West, the generous squares of the Middle West, the adequate rectangles of the East—and on directly over the crowded little strips and wedges of France, Germany, Austria, and Italy, bearing testimony as to how difficult it has been through the centuries to keep alive. And as to how the survivors have quarreled and puzzled over the resources of soil.

COUNTRY VISITED

Anyhow, my program called for breaking away from the schedule and getting off to the country to see for myself. That was managed in Austria where I let the party fly to Trieste without me, and instead took an overnight troop train to Salzburg in the west—scene of the music festival and headquarters of Maj. Gen. Harry (Handsome Harry) Collins, military commander in our zone of Austria.

Seven kilometers (4 miles) up a decent black-topped road which climbs into the Alpian valleys and foothills southeast of Salzburg, one turns in before what appears to be a sizable farmhouse.

It is the farm of Josef Schoenleitner, 51, a 5-foot-5 little man with bent shoulders and rosy cheeks, and his frau, Theresa, 47, hardly 5 feet in heavy boots. He had been a farmhand and she a domestic, but being ambitious they had acquired the place 25 years ago. Despite the ample appearance of the house from the outside—and alterations made during the 25 years—there are only four rooms so far as actual living quarters are concerned. These are on the first and second floors, front. Behind them are the broad central passages for workbenches and storage, and behind these the stable, all cozy under the one innocent-appearing roof. The third floor, even above the living quarters, is entirely haymow and storage place for the products of the fields.

SIX CHILDREN LIVING

Here the Schoenleitners had managed to raise a numerous brood, with six children known to be alive. One son is missing in Russia; another was killed in Italy; there are four girls ranging from 12 to 21; a son of 9 and another of 18—the latter sick in bed but not too sick to wring our hands and be excited over our gifts.

The Schoenleitners are friendly to Americans.

"American soldiers," Frau Shoenleitner told me through Lieutenant Colonel Keller, who interpreted, "were in our house at the invasion. We had to live with neighbors. They took a few souvenirs but not our money."

She literally ran with me to the wardrobe upstairs to show where the money had been kept, and which also holds the family's church clothes.

The farm is about 19 acres. (General Collins, when we described it to him later, thought it a bit above the average for size and economy.)

Only three acres are cultivated—ordinarily wheat, potatoes, and rye; 14 acres are pasture; 2 acres, wood and stream. One might call it a dairy farm, since the main income is from the cows, of which there are seven. Then there are two calves over 6 months, two under 6 months, and a bull; one sheep, five hens, five young pullets, and four cats.

It is the usual practice to send most or all of the cows "am alm" during the summer—that is up to the mountain pasture—where they graze and are jointly tended and milked. But this year Schoenleitner could send only two. It was too expensive. The drought over all of western Europe had dried the grass. So all the cows are very lank and poor, with winter still to get through, and little to feed them.

"Sehen sie!"

MANURE HOARDED

Now we were out in the dark and odorous stable part of the house, with the little barred windows common to all middle Europe, and the cows, sheep, chickens, and cats warmly huddled together. Frau Schoenleitner tromped indifferently and ankle deep along the soggy manure trough to kick one of the cows into getting up.

(Eighty percent of what is fed to farm animals is reclaimable as manure, and without the hoarding of it the peasant agriculture of Europe would fall in a single year. At the Schoenleitners—and their arrangement is typical—the liquid part runs out into a tank under the lowest part of the stable wall. The tank wagons which spread such manure are familiar sights in the landscape. They explain the three crops of grass ordinarily grown even on the clearings high in the mountains, and explain the parklike green of these high clearings.)

The farm, on its record, has been ordered by the Government to deliver 7,000 litres of milk a year. That is the quota assigned. But because of the drought there will be only 6,000. He says 4 litres a day (4½ quarts) are kept for home use.

From something over one-half acre he got 2,000 pounds of potatoes. His wheat patch of between 1½ and 2 acres produced 1,300 pounds from 300 pounds of seed. He got 450 pounds of rye from 120 pounds of seed on a half acre. These crops are not stored away from the house after the American fashion. What remains of the potatoes are in the cellar. The grain is in padlocked trunks in the loft and on the second-floor landing. If I recall correctly, the flour trunk was double locked. Schoenleitner opened it to show me how nearly empty it was.

In the loft was straw along with the hay. The straw will have to be mixed with the hay this year for feed, as well as used for the floor of the stables. A little string of drying tobacco leaves was hung in one corner. (Someone in Berlin had told me the farmers had set out to beat the tobacco market, with every farmer filling his own pipe.)

The potatoes in the cellar were the size of eggs at best, and scrawny. There were a dozen sugar beets, also. Such grain as remained was dry and small from the drought.

Schoenleitner had a workshop in the passageway between the house and stable where, temporarily, he was making brooms to sell. These were not fine enough for houses; but would do for stables and sheds. The broom proper was from the roots of a bush which grows in the mountains. The roots are unusually strong and stiff and straight. He goes into the mountains for the roots, and secures them to the handles in his household factory.

BARTER RULES

Others who are smarter than I, and who have more time for study, will have to decide to what extent the Schoenleitners, and all the other peasants of Austria and Germany, are hiding out on the food collectors—to what degree they deserve the appellation of "rapacious peasants."

This much certainly can be said in their defense, that everything they have to buy is usually obtainable only on a sort of a reverse black market. If the peasant requires a spade, a rake, a yoke, a scythe, a ball of twine, or a gallon of gas he cannot just go to a store and purchase it, even if he has a priority order. The holders of manufactured goods secrete them exactly as the peasant hides his food. The peasant must deal under the counter. All American officials admit the system is universal. And they have little hope of breaking it up until there is a firm currency—some way in which business can be done by means of money rather than through direct exchange of goods and services.

I deliberately omitted mentioning that the Schoenleitners were just finishing a new storage barn aside from the house. The shakes and most of the lumber were handhewn. Nevertheless, it was a building, and down in Salzberg no one could build except the butcher and baker.

So when we started the drive back down the rainy road, one of my companions said most sensibly:

"We might as well be realists. They have wanted that barn for 25 years and couldn't have it before."

I judge the Schoenleitner place was typical enough. Of course, as we drove on out of the Alpian foothills across the Danube valley to the Rhine, and finally down the Rhine valley, the individual farm disappeared. There was now the usual village arrangement, where the farmer lived in a community with his fellows and walked out to tend his strips of land, often widely separated. But the amount of land was about the same, the same restriction to hand labor, the same concern with the individual grain of wheat.

FIELDS DREARY

And everywhere—now that it was December—the farmer was indoors cuddling his oxen and his chickens. The frigid fields were empty to the horizon—as empty as a midwestern landscape in winter. It was a startling contrast with October—late harvest time—a year ago, when the country roads of Germany were busy as city streets, with everybody carrying something, or pushing a cart. In December the harvest had been distributed—as little as possible to the official collectors, as much as possible to the hungry folks from the city who came bearing their hidden possessions. Now the peasant was preparing for a new year—hoping that he might have seed, fertilizer and and pesticides from America early enough for it to do him some good—hoping that he might not have to slaughter more of his stock for lack of feed. His production was, roughly, somewhere around half of what it had been in the prewar years of adequate fertilizer, good seed and a nice balance between crops and animals. And he dreamed of restoring that production both for his own profit and the support of others.

Nor is it difficult to fit his dreams into the problem of the people of the United States, once one grasps certain fundamental facts.

The realities of the situation are as follows:

SOVIET GETS CROPS

In the actual and ideological division of Europe at the end of the fighting, Russia, as a result of geography, got the predominantly agricultural part. Almost everything behind the iron curtain is agricultural, including the Russian zones of Germany and Austria. And this advantage, so far as basic food needs are concerned, has been emphasized by nature. There have been good crops to the east of the curtain and poor crops to the west, almost exactly along the line.

This would be a serious enough situation for highly industrialized western Europe under the best of circumstances, but Russian forethought and ruthlessness have compounded the difficulties. Some 6,000,000 or more Germans have been expelled to western Germany from the German lands east of the Oder, assigned to Poland, and another group of close to 2,000,000 has been expelled from the Sudetenland by the Czechs.

Western Germany was never even 80 percent self-sufficient so far as agriculture is concerned. Now there is a greatly swollen population; now the neglects of war have destroyed much of the fertility; seed, fertilizer, and implements are short; drought has superimposed its cruel injury.

Under these circumstances, only the United States has been able to prevent utter collapse and utter tragedy. The rest of western Europe, including Britain, has been short also, and concerned with its own survival. And though contrary to public assumption, there has been no world-wide deficit of food production as compared to prewar totals; this has given the United States little relief in its support of the one true area of underproduction, western Europe; for the sufficient reason that though the world is producing as much as it did before the war, world population has increased by 200,000,000 in the intervening years, and only the United States can contrive surpluses to meet the local European need. Indeed, even in our case the sacrifice sends our prices soaring and fills the people with the fear of runaway inflation.

UNITED STATES MUST HELP

I do not know of anything to do but give and pray.

What we need to pray for is that United States itself does not suffer crop failure this coming year or the next year, and that if it does these do not coincide with a continuation of the droughts in western Europe. Indeed, even a break in the record crops the United States has been producing—a drop back to normal—would occasion the most violent world repercussions. And if we had a run of droughts such as those of the 1930's, coming prior to the recovery of western European agriculture, Malthus would turn over in his grave and cry, "I told you so."

We need to pray also that the American people come to a clearer realization of what they are doing, and why.

They are trying to keep western Europe alive until that area can restore its industry and its soil and live by its own efforts. They are doing this as a matter of self-interest—because anything else would mean western European confusion, permitting Russia to expand to the Atlantic. They are doing it also because they are a decent people with charity in their hearts.

AID SEEN GAMBLE

But it is a race against time, and a gamble. If the breaks of nature are against us, millions will starve in spite of us. The only sensible thing is to get our seeds and fertilizer and implements and insecticides to the scene early enough to mean the maximum for the planting and the harvest.

We are taking a long chance if we let a situation continue where a single month of American drought could upset the whole order of the Old World, and bring what is left of civilization cracking down around our ears.

Induction of Judge Rabin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on January 6 last, our former colleague Hon. Benjamin J. Rabin, who resigned from the House of Representatives on December 31, 1947, was inducted as a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. He had been elected as a justice of the supreme court in the general election held the previous November 4 for a full 14-year term.

Several hundred of Judge Rabin's friends were present at the induction in the spacious courtroom, designated as special term, part I, in the Supreme Court Building, Foley Square, New York City. The ceremonies were presided over by Justice Bernard Botein, with Justice David W. Peck, presiding justice of the appellate division, welcoming the new justice to the bench on behalf of the judiciary. As a colleague of Judge Rabin's in the House of Representatives, I was invited to address the court on the happy occasion. I am including herein, by unanimous consent, an extract from the New York Law Journal of January 9, 1947, which reported the proceeding:

Justice BOTEIN. As you all know, in recent years Justice Rabin has been a Member of Congress. I understand that the joy of his fellow Congressmen, upon his elevation to the bench, is tinctured only by regret at his leaving the Washington scene. I shall call upon an outstanding member of the New York delegation in Congress. He is no stranger to court rooms, being a distinguished member of our bar. In fact, if memory serves me right, he was a judge himself in this city for only too short a period of time. Will the Honorable WALTER LYNCH step forward, please.

Congressman LYNCH. Your Honors and friends of Judge Rabin, in the House of Representatives at Washington, encomiums, such as you have already heard and such as you will hear, are spread on the minutes of the session under the 1-minute rule, but generally, the Speaker is somewhat indulgent and grants leave to extend one's remarks in the RECORD. I hope that the Presiding Justice will be somewhat indulgent with me although I do not anticipate taking very much time.

It is a keen pleasure for me to participate in these induction ceremonies of my good friend and colleague, Judge Rabin. The rapid advancement of Judge Rabin may well have been presaged in the record that he established in World War I when he enlisted as a mess attendant and, after service in the Navy, was the recipient of the honor of a commission in the United States Navy. Having later completed his law school and practiced law, I think he now goes on the bench of this great court with more of a breadth of understanding and a wider background than any other judge, at least in my 30 years' experience before the bar. I say that for this reason: that he has served both the administrative and the legislative sections of our Government. As counsel and as commissioner of the State mortgage commission he gained a wealth of experience and won the complete confidence of thousands upon thousands of people who had their all invested in real-estate securities. And when he left and came down to the Congress of the United States he was greeted with open arms by the men who were then representing the various districts in the House of Representatives. He served for 3 years on the very important Committee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and it was only a short time after having been appointed to that committee—I have to take some little credit in securing his appointment as a member of the Ways and Means Committee—when I was told by the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that never in his long years as a Member of the House had a new Member shown such initiative, such reliability and such devotion to the work of the committee as Representative Rabin was then showing.

And so it is with a great deal of regret that we in the House, especially those of us in the Democratic delegation from New York, see him leave the legislative halls of Washington to take his place on the bench.

As a token of the regard of the Members of the House of Representatives, and in particular as evidence of the personal admiration with which Judge Rabin was held by the Speaker of the House, and by his colleagues in the House, I have been asked by the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, to present to Judge Rabin this autographed gavel which Speaker MARTIN wielded in the determinations of the House of Representatives of which Judge Rabin was so distinguished a Member in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses. [Applause.]

(Gavel handed to Justice Rabin.)

Justice BOTEIN. Thank you, Congressmen. Judge Rabin receives the gavel with added alacrity because in his capacity as a justice he takes judicial notice of the fact that Speaker MARTIN is a Republican.

Can We Make the United Nations Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH A. MEADE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following radio talk given by me over Station WBAL in Baltimore:

In many parts of the world today, thoughtful men and women are pausing to survey the progress and appraise the prospects of the United Nations organization.

With the war approaching its end in 1945, the United States and other major powers convened the nations of the world in a conference at San Francisco where a wartime organization of the nations fighting the totalitarian aggressors, was made a permanent organization. Some 50 nations of the world participated in the drafting and ratification of the United Nations Charter. We all recall the high hopes and aspirations expressed at those solemn ceremonies, the steps which have been taken to provide a permanent home for the United Nations, the secretariat and the equipment needed for the beginning of its work. What then, has come about in such a brief time to dash the hopes of so many who sincerely applauded the beginning of the United Nations organization? There is talk of irreconcilable differences in viewpoints; clashes of ideologies and conflicts of opinion that make agreement on anything impossible. I consider such talk malicious and irresponsible. When and where and for how long has there ever been unanimity of opinion between 50 nations or even 5 nations, for that matter, except in time of war? When was there ever a time when there was not on this planet the widest divergence in opinions, thoughts, aspirations and ambitions? Because these differences exist, as they have always existed through the centuries, are we to abandon hope that we can resolve these differences?

As we all know, the American Revolution began in 1776 but the Constitution of the United States did not come into existence until 11 years later and it was not accepted by the American people until 2 years after. Despite the unanimity with which we accept its principles today, they were adopted by our forefathers only after one of the most discouraging and bitter political struggles in our history. Some of the highlights of that struggle acquire peculiar significance

when we reflect upon the fact that the Charter of the United Nations has been adopted by 50 nations and that the United Nations is a going organization and that only 2 years after it was first convened.

It was difficult enough to devise a system of laws such as our Constitution which would force all individuals of one country to respect freedom and the rights of all other nations * * * such a thing was unheard of, not only as recently as the adoption of our Constitution but even as late as 50 years ago. Up until then, there had been little contradiction to the implied right of the strong to gobble up the weak * * * the supremecy of force over international law. There is little precedent to guide the United Nations in the building of an international code of laws. Twice within our lifetime we have witnessed the breach of all international decency by cunning and power-mad men. Only once before in history has there been an attempt to create an international order based on binding law, and all of us saw the League of Nations collapse into utter futility after its short life of only 20 years. But progress toward the goal is being made, faltering as the forward steps may be. It is only fair to say that the United Nations is a good bit further along than was the League of Nations, and we were never members of the League of Nations. It is impossible to overestimate the significance of that difference.

It is true that 2 years of United Nations' deliberations have put the spotlight on grave imperfections in its machinery. Prolonged and bitter discussion has given world-wide publicity to serious and mounting differences between the great powers. There is talk of war, of withdrawals from the United Nations, of expulsion of members and predictions of its rapid disintegration and decay. I discount most of these heated assertions.

Unfortunately, no concrete program has been offered by the United States under which the almost unbelievable moral and physical power of the United States can be brought to bear inside the United Nations to work for solutions to the most serious problems. Nor has any other nation, great or small, come forward with a constructive and practical suggestion for resolving the vital differences which now plague the world.

The differences which are being encountered with Soviet Russia are certainly troublesome. To ignore them would be foolish, to overemphasize them would be dangerous. Maybe it serves a useful purpose for the Russians to have a place to blow off steam. I believe our reluctance to assume international leadership stems from the widespread failure on the part of the American people to fully understand the unique position the United States now occupies in any world gathering. We are today the most powerful Nation in the world. Because of the fact, I think it is no exaggeration to say that the largest part of the world is looking to us for leadership in economic affairs, in industry, and in almost every phase of international activity. The decisions that you and I will be called upon to make in the next few months may well shape the course of world history for decades to come. They may well spell the difference between an uneasy truce over an indefinite period, followed by hostilities * * * or * * * they may mean the beginning of a new and fruitful era of peace for all the world. If we accept the leadership, then we must also accept the fact that it will take us along a path where new responsibilities and pitfalls will be awaiting us around every corner.

At a period in history when forthright resolution is demanded for us, we have only just begun to examine the way ahead. At a time when the whole world is looking to us for guidance, we stand hesitant and undecided * * * and it is probable that we shall appear even more hesitant in the eyes of the watching world in the months immediately ahead. As we move toward historic debate in Congress as to the role the United States shall play in the United Nations and toward a full discussion of our foreign policy, one great point in that debate will be the question: "Can we make the United Nations work?"

I firmly believe we can make the United Nations work. I believe we must make that job a major national purpose. I believe we can make our largest contribution by adopting and implementing a foreign policy for work both within and without the United Nations, and I believe that foreign policy should have two objectives—peace and production.

If we want to make the United Nations work, the first step is to convince the world by every means at our command that the United States is on such a firm basis of economic stability that it can carry out any and all promises and commitments that it may make. For unless we are on a sound economic basis at home, we shall have little influence abroad.

There is a shortage of goods throughout the world today. Because of these shortages, people who work cannot buy the things they need with their wages, so there is consequently a falling off of work. We have a glaring example of such a condition in the coal crisis in Britain. It is apparent, too, in the agriculture of most of the countries in Europe. The farmers find no incentive to produce when they cannot exchange their products for the things they need. Owners of plants damaged by the war, cannot get the steel, cement, and new machinery they need for rebuilding.

A major and tragic shortage everywhere in Europe is coal and without coal, you cannot have steel. The pressing need for food in western Europe is familiar to all of us.

There is only one place where these people can get much of anything in quantity and that is in this country. Thus, the financial calculations of the various governments are continually being thrown out of balance. The best example of that is our export balance. We are currently exporting goods and materials at the rate of $20,000,000,000 a year. We are importing only about seven or eight billion dollars worth of European goods. Two-thirds of the problems now facing the world stem from the fact that the United States is not buying enough abroad to make dollars available for the European countries to buy from us. And what is true of Europe is true of most of the other countries in the world. Thus, we come face to face with the problem that we shall either have to increase our purchases abroad or we shall have to lend or give other countries the things they need to reconstruct their productive economies.

What I propose then is:

Let the United Nations adopt as its foreign policy the objectives of world peace and world production.

Let us resolve to work within the United Nations with every means at our command and with the firm determination to achieve the greatest measure of success that we can possibly obtain from the workings of its international machinery.

Let us go steadfastly before the court of world opinion to discuss any and all issues that may arise and press for solutions or compromise.

Let us provide inspired leadership to take positive action on all fronts to raise the levels of world production, so that the principal causes of discontent and unrest can be removed.

Let us show a willingness to tighten our own belts and help the nations that are willing to help themselves.

Let us leave the door of the United Nations open at all times to any and all nations who sincerely want to demonstrate their good will.

If we can succeed with such a program, I firmly believe we shall have won the peace and that the United Nations will have become a permanent success. That, to me, is the best New Year's resolution the American people can make.

AAA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a summary of agricultural work in my district by Ralph Hudspeth, Chairman of the Agricultural Planning Committee of the Third Congressional District of Arkansas. Mr. Hudspeth lives at St. Joe in my district, and he is one of the upstanding farmers and farm leaders of Arkansas.

The summary follows:

At our meeting at Harrison, Ark., on December 22, 1947, the Agricultural Planning Committee of the Third Congressional District in Arkansas are passing on to you our thoughts for your consideration and action.

The interest in the welfare of agriculture on the part of our National Government evidenced by progressive legislation dealing with farm problems is greatly appreciated by the farm people. We find the people of this area are concerned with the conservation of humans as well as the soil. We realize a healthy, vigorous people cannot subsist on a land that has been allowed to deteriorate, erode, and become depleted. The two are closely connected and to preserve our people we must keep our soil in good repair.

The most important objectives for agriculture is the conservation of our people, soil, and water resources. If we expect to continue on a sustained-yield basis we must use our national resources intelligently. This is increasingly important at this time when agriculture is making an all-out effort to produce great quantities of food and fiber to alleviate suffering in foreign countries.

To maintain our way of life and to continue to support foreign aid it is essential that our National Government assist to a greater extent soil conservation through agricultural conservation practices.

The cost of controlling erosion as compared with the cost of continuing under the handicap of its destructive forces has been amply demonstrated. In the past, billions of dollars in erosion damage alone has been suffered by American soil. The cost to repair the damage of erosion is greater than the cost of preventing it. It is the responsibility of our National Government to make sure sufficient funds are made available so that conservation practices can be carried out in sufficient quantity to prevent erosion and to rebuild our soils to their original productivity.

It is false economy to reduce the agricultural conservation practice assistance below $300,000,000. We recommend that $500,000,000 be appropriated for conservation practices for the 1948 program year and as long as the emergency exists in foreign countries. This is only about one thirty-fourth of the proposed foreign-aid relief bill or 1.3 percent of our national income. Three hundred million dollars is not too great an amount for our National Government to assist in conserving the Nation's soil annually in normal times.

We are very much impressed with your testimony proposing a long-range agricultural program before the congressional committee. We agree with you that our soil requirements still call for double, five times, and even greater increase in the use of minerals and conservation practices; however, we realize these requirements cannot be met without our National Government fulfills its responsibility in making sufficient appropriations—we recommend $500,000,000—for agricultural conservation practices.

We are asking you as a representative of national agriculture to inform our President as to the needs of sufficient funds for conservation practices in 1948 and future years.

Date With Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe it will be of interest to our farmers who file their declarations of estimated income on income tax Form 1040ES, to read the following article before they send in their final income-tax return due about March 15, 1948.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by Malcolm Orchard entitled "Date With Uncle Sam," which appeared in his column, This Business of Farming, in the January issue of the Southern Agriculturist magazine:

DATE WITH UNCLE SAM
(By Malcolm Orchard)

Farmers have a tax date with the Treasury Department's internal-revenue service soon. Unlike a lot of farm jobs, this one cannot be postponed until some convenient date in the future.

The Federal tax laws require that all farmers with a gross income of $500 or more for 1947 shall file either a completed return, or a declaration of estimated income on or before January 15, 1948. With farm prices at one of the highest levels in history, few will fail to meet the requirements for filing returns this year.

If you choose to file a completed return, you are through with your tax chores for the year on January 15. If you elect to use the declaration method, you will have a second date to remember, the filing of a completed return prior to March 15.

Many farmers prefer to file their declarations of estimated income on Form 1040ES, then follow up with a final return on Form 1040 any time between January 15 and March 15. This method has the advantage of giving more time to assemble data and work up records to back up claims for deductions, if the return is ever checked.

No figures go with the declaration. Just add up your gross income for the year, determine your deductible expenses and add to this your allowable depreciation. Take the total of expenses and depreciation from your gross income and send a check for your estimated tax in full with declaration.

The Government is more lenient with farmers than with others in the guessing game that declarations of estimated tax have brought about. If a farmer guesses within 33⅓ percent of his correct final tax, there is no penalty when he pays the balance due prior to March 15. Other classes of taxpayers must be within 20 percent of the correct tax to avoid penalties.

Tax rates and personal exemptions are the same as last year. The lowest combined normal and surtax rate is 20 percent on your adjusted gross income after personal exemptions are deducted. This rate applies on the first $2,000 of taxable income, then rates range up to 91 percent on income in excess of $200,000. (See your tax instructions which come with your return forms.)

The personal exemption is $500 for the taxpayer and a like amount for each member of the family dependent upon the taxpayer for support. To be a dependent, the person must have an income of less than $500 for 1947. Age does not enter into the establishment of dependency.

Most farmers use the cash basis in making their returns, and must file Form 1040F with their final return. Form 1040F itemizes the farmer's income from all farm sources, and lists his expenses for labor, repairs, fuel, feed, and all other operating costs. Few farmers choose the accrual basis, chiefly because it requires more detailed record keeping and inventories.

Many farmers could save money by more careful handling of their allowable depreciation. You are permitted to charge off, at various rates approved by the Treasury Department, all machinery, barns, tenant houses, fences, work stock, breeding stock, and other equipment that enters into the production of farm income.

The straight-line method is usually used in accumulating farm depreciation. By this method, if you buy a tractor and equipment in 1946 at a cost of $2,000 and estimate the useful life at 10 years, you will take depreciation of $200 in your return each year for a period of 10 years.

If you have been careless about your depreciation schedule, it might pay you to take a new inventory of your farm property. If you owe any tax at all, each $100 in allowable depreciation will save you $20.

And don't forget that tax date, January 15. The penalties for failure to keep it are such that it will pay to remember.

Tribute to Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the departure for Palestine of Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, head of the American Section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine and chairman of the American Zionist Emergency Council, my distinguished colleague and friend the Honorable IRVING M. IVES, Senator from New York, delivered a memorable address at a testimonial dinner tended to Dr. Silver at the Hotel Astor in New York City on Monday, December 29, 1947, which follows:

We have come together for a purpose which I know gives pleasure to each and every person in this room. We are paying homage to a great man—a leader who has won a new place of dignity for his people among the nations of the world.

This event is gratifyingly unique in one particular respect. We have had occasion to honor Jewish leaders before this evening—for their noble efforts, for their strivings, for the great cause which they represented and which we hoped would one day be victorious. But tonight we do more than honor a leader and his cause. We come also, at long last, to hail an historic victory for that cause and to cheer the imminent establishment of the Jewish state. There is deep satisfaction for me, ladies and gentlemen, in the fact that I can come before my Jewish friends tonight, not to add my vote in protest against one of the greatest wrongs in history but to share in the exaltation over the United Nations' decision on Palestine and to honor the man who led the Jewish cause to that great victory.

Without entering into the pros and cons of that eternal question, whether men are, in fact, the makers of history or merely the instruments of history, I believe it can be said tonight that the man whom we honor—Dr. Abba Hillel Silver—provided that brilliant leadership, that statesmanship, and those policies without which the United Nations' decision favoring a Jewish state would not have been achieved. During the past year the Jewish people was confronted with one of the greatest challenges of all time. And if a people is to meet a challenge effectively and to overcome a long succession of crises, it requires not only the high resolve and moral stamina which the Jewish people possesses in abundance but also courageous leadership. Dr. Silver is living proof that, despite 2,000 years of national homelessness and dispersion, the Jewish people is able to produce leaders of the highest caliber.

It is unfortunately true that the Jewish people's struggle did not end with the United Nations' decision. Many trying days are ahead, during which the Jews of Palestine must establish their state under the most difficult circumstances, confronted by enemies seeking to destroy Jewish national life even before it is fully reconstituted. It is clear, ladies and gentlemen, that our task—yours and mine—is not yet over. While I have every confidence in the readiness and ability of the Jews of Palestine to defend their statehood, I trust that they will not have to do so with their bare hands. We hope that the Arab leaders will cooperate with the decision of civilized mankind and abide by their obligations as members of the United Nations.

If, however, attempts are made to destroy the Jewish state by force, then it becomes the civilized world's sacred responsibility to provide the Jews with the assistance necessary for the defense of their country. In the coming critical months we shall look once again to you, Dr. Silver, for that inspiration which has strengthened the Jewish cause in its other moments of crisis. You have led the Jewish people to its political triumph and now an equally heavy burden—perhaps an even heavier burden—has fallen on your shoulders. You and your colleagues in the Jewish agency and in the leadership of American Zionism must now work to translate the United Nations' guaranty into an established fact. I, for one, have great confidence that once again you will meet the challenge and also that the American people will not be lacking in the support and the moral encouragement that you will require.

During the past 4 years, while the Jewish people's struggle for statehood was mounting toward its climax, a strong bond of friendship was established between the American people and the Jewish National Home. May that bond be a lasting one, and may our country and the Jewish state be forever united in ties of deepest amity and cooperation.

It is my fervent hope that the relationship between the two Governments will be such as to encourage the Jewish state to look to us for the helping hand it will need during its early years, and that we, in turn, will stand ready to extend that support. I know how highly American concepts and American methods are valued by the Jews of Palestine today, and this is, indeed, a happy augury for

the future of both countries. I believe, too, that we may have occasion to learn something from the Jews of Palestine and that the democratic society which they have built in the Holy Land will serve to strengthen those principles upon which our own country has been built.

In this respect, too, we can derive inspiration from Dr. Silver, for he is preeminently representative of the very best in both Americanism and Jewishness. To me Dr. Silver represents the synthesis of two great cultures, of two great peoples—the successful blending of the lofty and prophetic concepts of Judaism, the indomitable will and determination of the Jewish people, with the American democratic tradition and the American way of life.

Tomorrow Dr. Silver leaves for Palestine, where he will see the fruits of his labors in the faces of the hard-working and proud future citizens of the Jewish state. I know that he will derive strength from them, as they will from him. I know, also, that all of you join me in wishing him Godspeed and many years of leadership in the great cause with which his name is forever linked.

Important Issues Are at Stake in the Strike of Cafeteria Workers Against Government Services, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under consent, I am inserting in the RECORD some material bearing directly on the strike of the cafeteria workers' union against Government Services, Inc.

I am not attempting here to discuss the merits of the charges of Communist leadership and inspiration leveled against the union, nor the countercharges of racial bias made in turn against the detractors, nor even to judge issues in the strike.

What I am doing is to complete the record, and to show that Government Services, Inc., in its quasiofficial status, is placing the American Government in a highly embarrassing position of refusing to comply with a duly enacted United States statute by collective bargaining with the chosen agent of its employees, and by strike-breaking tactics similar to those followed by the NAM members who have fought the National Labor Relations law since its inception.

BOGUS ISSUES RAISED

The fact is that in the eyes of many employers, whom I consider short-sighted in their policies, the union is damned if it does or does not bring itself under the jurisdiction of the Labor Relations Board.

The cafeteria workers union elected not to bring itself under the jurisdiction of the Board in accordance with a policy of the company, GSI, which dates back to organization of the union and recognition of its position as bargaining agent in 1938.

In other words, the company had stipulated that it would deal with the union only if it did not avail itself of the Board machinery.

But when rising costs of living made the already small wages of the workers shrink to less than subsistence standards GSI refused to meet with the union—the recognized bargaining agency—to discuss wages, hours, and working conditions unless it did bring itself under the Board. In other words, this strike is not a strike for higher wages only in the sense that the company has refused to bargain collectively on wages.

Government Services, Inc., a private corporation enjoying the privilege of carrying on business on Government property, is affiliated with the National Association of Manufacturers as a member in good standing. It is following the methods of the NAM.

It is using all the dodges provided in the Taft-Hartley Act to harass, discourage, and control unions, and provides another good reason for the repeal of this unjust act.

ISSUES CLEARLY SET FORTH

The red herring of crying red at the union leadership cannot hide the anti-union tactics of the company, nor obscure the fact that the accounting methods of the company are still under scrutiny by the Committee on Civil Service of another body.

The first insertion of material is a strongly-worded letter addressed to the President by Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which sets out the issues at stake so clearly that it makes anything I can say on this floor redundant.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to acquaint you with a deplorable situation which exists here in Washington, D. C., at the present time. I am referring to the activities of Government Services, Inc., in forcing a strike upon 1,500 members of a CIO union by flatly refusing to meet with them. GSI and this local union have maintained contractual bargaining relations continuously during the past 10 years although this relation has always been a reluctant one on the part of GSI.

Upon the expiration of the last contract on December 31, 1947, the corporation refused even to meet with the union representatives to discuss a new contract. The ostensible reason given is that the officers of the union have not filed the affidavits and financial statements of the Taft-Hartley Act. As of course you know, the filing of such information is mandatory only if the union elects to utilize the services of the National Labor Relations Board. Since this is not the case in the present instance, there is no moral or legal compulsion for the union to file for such utilization. Were any further proof necessary, I could cite the fact that a private corporation which operates similar cafeterias in the Pentagon Building has just signed a contract with the same union for the coming year, without raising any false legalistic issues of this kind. In the case of GSI, however, there was no alternative available to the union members but to leave their posts at the end of the year.

There are several special issues involved in this problem which should be brought to your attention. GSI is a nonprofit corporation all of whose trustees are officials of the Federal Government. In fact, the Government receives 50 percent of the net gains, so that the belligerent and unfair actions of the corporation reflect unfavorably upon the Government of the United States itself. The corporation's actions include the distribution of a pamphlet to all of its employees which is of a union-breaking character virtually unequaled in my long experience.

Further discredit is reflected upon the Government by the conduct of the Federal Works Agency which is responsible for the maintenance of the cafeterias. Not only has the Federal Works Administrator refused to close down the cafeterias, which would be the normal action of a responsible agency, but he has used the Federal building guards, who are Government employees, to escort strikebreakers to and from the cafeterias.

The situation is causing both tremendous inconvenience to 80,000 employees who normally eat in these cafeterias and a considerable loss of efficiency of the Government agencies themselves. It is little wonder, therefore, that public opinion in the District of Columbia has been greatly aroused against GSI. The Washington Post said this morning in its editorial columns: "But in this case, GSI, although it has long recognized the union's authority to represent the cafeteria employees, seems to have seized upon the affidavit clause as a convenient union-busting bludgeon." And this follows a similar editorial stand taken by the same newspaper on January 6, 1948.

May I also call to your attention the fact that all of the striking members are Negro workers and that therefore, the issue has aroused considerable feeling in the Negro community of Washington, which has the greatest interest in the fate of 1,500 of their brethren. Repercussions of this aspect of the problem have already spread widely throughout the country.

I would be remiss in the performance of my duties if I did not remind you also that the average take-home pay of the workers involved in the present dispute amounts to $21.91 per week for full-time work. This I regard as a disgraceful situation and the proper way to have it corrected, Mr. President, is to provide opportunity for this organization to engage with the representatives of the GSI in the spirit of good faith looking toward the attainment of an amicable and mutually satisfactory collective-bargaining contract.

I urge, Mr. President, that you take at once the steps necessary to insure that the Government cease its partisan intervention into the situation; that the Government proceed at once to demonstrate its impartiality by convening a collective bargaining conference at the earliest possible moment; that the Government officials who are members of GSI's board of trustees be made acquainted with their responsibilities as Government officials and further to refrain from union-busting activities and that they be required to meet with the representatives of this union.

I am certain that such steps will lead in a very short time to a complete solution of the problem.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MURRAY,
President.

CIO POSITION ON TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

The second insertion is a statement made by Mr. Murray setting forth the general position of the CIO on the Taft-Hartley Act.

STATEMENT BY PHILIP MURRAY AT THE NATIONAL CIO CONVENTION OCTOBER 14, 1947, AT BOSTON

Immediately after its passage, in the latter part of June 1947, the executive board of the national CIO met in the city of Washington, and there, for an entire day the whole Taft-Hartley structure was reviewed, not only by our general counsel but by many members of our board. The question arose

as to what the policy of this organization would be with reference to either fighting or qualifying it. I stated to the members of the board on that date that it was not my purpose, as president of the United Steelworkers of America, to either file or comply, that I had some personal convictions that ran very deep in matters of that description, and that unless the members of my own executive board, namely the United Steelworkers Executive Board, changed my mind about that, I was determined to neither sign nor file.

My reason was not confined alone to the provisions of the act to which General Counsel Pressman made deferences this afternoon. I stated I was unwilling to file an affidavit that I was not a Communist. That is a matter of principle. I do not know why the Congress of the United States should require me to do that, as a citizen. I think the Congress is very presumptuous, because I think if they could do that to me about this question of communism, they could do it with any other citizen about any other kind of issue. Whilst that was not the single and sole reason for my refusal to file or qualify, it nevertheless was important, extremely important to me, as a citizen of the United States of America. I shall not attempt to explain the manifold reasons upon the importance which I attach to that principle. I think it is sufficient for me to say that this is the reason, the reason that I have explained. It is reasonable to assume that if a man is required to file an affidavit of this description, the Congress that enacts legislation of that kind can readily enact a law which says to a labor leader, "What are you, a Catholic, Protestant, or Jew?" He might ask that same question of the business interests of this country, the small and the large businessmen, who have varying degrees of political belief. Why did not this Congress incorporate in this legislation a provision asking a member of a union holding office if he is a member of the Ku Klux Klan? They did not do it. Or the Silver Shirts, or the Black Shirts, or any other type of organization. The Congress did not do it. The Congress had in mind a diabolical piece of work, extremely discriminatory in nature, and revolting to a citizen who believes in decency, and in justice, and in freedom.

Those are my personal convictions about the matter.

POST EDITORIAL POSITION

Following are two editorials from the Washington Post discussing the rights of the strikers and the issues at stake:

[From the Washington Post of January 8, 1948]

BANNING CONCILIATION

The mischief hidden in the Communist affidavit provision of the Taft-Hartley Act is made manifest by the current strike in the GSI-operated Government cafeterias. The newly established Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, which ought by every consideration of common sense to be working earnestly to bring the disputants into agreement, is barred from any participation in the affair whatever. No one can blame Cyrus Ching or his agency for this apparent abdication of responsibility. Mr. Ching is on incontestable ground in asserting that the agency will not make its facilities available "where it appears, in a labor dispute, that the employer does not accept the authority of a union to act for the employees." The mischievousness of the Communist affidavit clause lies in the pretext it affords employers capriciously to deny the authority of a union when the union has failed, for whatever reason, to affirm that it has no Communist officers.

This appears to be precisely what the GSI management has done in respect of Local 471 of the United Cafeteria and Restaurant Workers Union. As we observed the other day, the fact that the officers of the union have not signed the affidavit seems to us to be irrelevant to the issue in the strike. The union is not complaining to the NLRB or seeking its protection and, of course, the signing of the affidavit is not a prerequisite to ordinary negotiations between unions and management. But in this case, GSI, although it has long recognized the union's authority to represent the cafeteria employees, seems to have seized upon the affidavit clause as a convenient union-busting bludgeon.

Mr. Ching cannot, to be sure, attempt to persuade GSI or any other employer to refrain from using a weapon which Congress has made available. The pity, and irony, of the situation is that irresponsible use of this weapon makes it impossible for the Mediation and Conciliation Service to find any way consistent with the law to fulfill the function for which it was created—that is, to settle disputes. As usual, the public, in its role as innocent bystander, including some thousands of Government employees, will be the loser.

[From the Washington Post of January 6, 1948]

GSI STRIKE

Whether the officers of Local 471 of the United Cafeteria and Restaurant Workers Union have signed the anti-Communist affidavit provided by the Taft-Hartley law seems to us to be irrelevant to the issue in the strike of 1,500 cafeteria workers against Government Services, Inc. The fact that the officers have not signed will be, to be sure, a black mark against the union in the estimation of many persons, including ourselves. It will seem to corroborate the charges that the local's parent union, the United Public Workers, is Communist-dominated. However, judging from the statement of Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant, 3d, president of GSI, GSI is making use of this reaction to support its refusal to bargain with the union.

The fact is, however, that the anti-Communist affidavit is required only for certification by or recourse to the National Labor Relations Board. It does not apply to ordinary negotiations between union and management. Actually, Local 471 never has been formally certified by the NLRB, either before or after the advent of the Taft-Hartley law. An informal election conducted by the Government originally confirmed Local 471 as a bargaining agent because of GSI's contention that its position as a quasi-governmental agency made the Wagner Act inapplicable. Thus GSI's insistence that certification be a prerequisite to bargaining in this case represents a complete switch from its previous stand.

Whether the union's demand for a 15-cent-an-hour raise and adjustment of working conditions is excessive we are not prepared to state. The employees represented are in the lowest wage brackets, as exemplified by the average weekly take-home pay of $21.91 cited by the union, and hence are particularly vulnerable to the squeeze of inflation. In any event, it seems to us that an acceptable settlement on this score should not be difficult if GSI were to forego its legalism and make a real effort to get together with the union. On this point it is significant that the union already has concluded an amicable agreement with the operators of the Pentagon cafeterias and is in the process of reaching a similar agreement at the Department of Agriculture.

The remainder of this material consists of telegrams in support of the union sent by various persons to officials of the Government:

JANUARY 7, 1948.

Maj. Gen. PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Federal Works Administrator,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently call your attention to a developing health menace arising out of Government Services, Inc., hiring of strikebreaker to handle foods being served to thousands of Government workers. These strikebreakers are being placed in kitchens to prepare and handle foods and beverages without any health examinations whatsoever. GSI is making no effort to determine whether any strikebreakers are sick or have any communicable diseases. Continued operation of the cafeterias under such health hazards endangers the safety of all Government employees. Does the Federal Works Agency wish to be a partner to GSI's dangerous hiring policy? We urge you to close all GSI cafeterias at once as the only way to guarantee full protection to Government workers who patronize the cafeterias.

MAX ROFFMAN,
Regional Director, United Public Workers, CIO.

JANUARY 7, 1948.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, are deeply concerned with the social and economic effects of Government Services, Inc., refusal to bargain with Local 471, CIO, to adjust wages and working conditions of its low-paid employees.

We and the Washington community are disturbed by the Government's failure to intervene in the situation and, by inactivity, allowing itself to be used in the company's attempt to break an important union of Negro employees.

Mr. President, we call your attention to this vital situation which affects the welfare of a substantial portion of the community. We urge you to use your good offices to induce this company which operates on properties of the United States Government, to bargain in good faith and in the American way with the union of its employees.

Mrs. MARY CHURCH TERRELL,
Past President, National Association of Colored Women.
Rev. W. H. JERNAGIN,
Fraternal Council of Negro Churches.
Dr. JOSEPH L. JOHNSON,
BELFORD V. LAWSON, JR.
Dr. E. FRANKLIN FRAZIER.

ADRIAN FISHER,
United States Department of Commerce:

In event of strike by GSI employees urge that proper officers of Commerce Department order cafeteria closed until settlement is reached. General Grant announced intention "to replace those who do not report for work" shows that management will resort to the use of strikebreakers. The property of the Government of the United States must not be used as a battleground by those who wish to wreck trade-unions. A solution should be reached more quickly if unfair tactics have no support from Federal agencies.

CLARENCE MITCHELL,
National Labor Secretary, N. A. A. C. P.

Maj. Gen. PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Administrator, Federal Works Agency:

We demand you close Interior Department cafeteria immediately in accordance with Acting Secretary's request, particularly since you have no authority to refuse such a request from the head of an agency. Obviously, you have taken the side of GSI in its union-busting efforts. We also demand you close all GSI cafeterias. By permitting operation you are placing the Federal Government in the disgraceful position of a strike breaker.

RICHARD BANCROFT,
President, Local 471.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1948.

The following telegram was sent today to Gen. Philip Fleming, Federal Works Administrator, by Allan Haywood, vice president and director of organization of the CIO in

regard to the dispute at Government Services, Inc.:

"I am advised that a strike among employees in Government cafeterias is imminent Monday morning. A letter to employees by Gen. U. S. Grant, representative of GSI, declares for a union-busting policy and should be condemned by every Government representative and agency. Other Government cafeteria services have negotiated settlements with the union. This dispute, too, could be settled in the same manner. I respectfully request you to stop these union-busting practices, bring about proper collective bargaining, and oppose operation of cafeterias with strikebreakers. The CIO will support these employees in their efforts to preserve their union. We will join with you in bringing about settlement by negotiation, conciliation, or arbitration. Respectfully request telegraphic reply."

Senator C. Wayland Brooks' Remarks on the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement which was made by Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS, the senior Senator from Illinois, on America's Town Meeting of the Air on January 13, 1948. I heard this broadcast and hope that many others did also. I believe that it would pay the Members of Congress to read Senator BROOKS' remarks and give consideration to them.

The statement follows:

The so-called Marshall plan was no plan at all. It started as a speech made at Harvard on June 5, 1947. Since then it has gone through several successive steps, each of which has been fully propagandized to sell the American people that this is finally the plan to save Western Europe and provide the basis for prosperity, plenty, and permanent peace.

It takes its place alongside of its little brothers, the Bretton Woods plan, the International Bank, the International Fund, the British loan, and the Greek-Turkish loan. These, too, were to solve the problem of a distressed world except this one is bigger and costs much more money.

The 16 European countries grabbed the idea and met in Paris. The President appointed three committees to report on aid. The European Nations Committee met with our State Department and the figures were announced. Up to a few days ago it was merely a figure apparently based upon a budget deficit between exports and imports. The 16 countries added up the imports they wished to have and subtracted the exports they think they can ship, and then they hand us a bill for the difference. That bill amounts to $22,000,000,000 over a 4-year period.

Is this a loan? Of course not. Those so-called loans are in effect gifts, for none of these nations can hope to repay such huge sums any more than they could after the First World War; nor can England repay the $3,750,000,000 she received for 3 years' necessities and spent almost in its entirety in the past 1 year.

The American committees and State Department have scaled down the figure to approximately $17,000,000,000, but that does not include the $800,000,000 each year we must pay to feed the German population in the American zone, or the approximately $500,000,000 we must spend to feed the people in the British zone when we fully take over the British obligation in the future.

Will this vast sum add to inflation here and increase prices? Certainly it will. First, the money must be provided by increased taxes the same as the other sums of billions we have scattered so freely around the world in loans, grants, and other forms of liberal generosity, since the war. This plan alone will add approximately $500 in increased taxes to every average family in the United States. These billions of dollars like the others will find their way back to compete in America with our own large demand, and force our prices still higher. These dollars will compete in America for grain, scrap iron, coal, petroleum, farm machinery, mining equipment, transportation and transportation equipment, and many other articles and basic raw materials already in short supply.

In 1947, under the Truman administration, we exported from America at the rate of $19,000,000,000 worth of goods and services, while we imported only $8,000,000,000 worth of goods and services. There can be no doubt but that this tremendous rate of exports played a material part in the increased prices we have had in 1947. This is particularly true in the case of wheat, affecting the whole food price scale. Whenever the Government announced a larger export figure the price of wheat went up. The Government demand for export of large amounts of the other items that made up the unprecedented excess of exports over imports added to the price, and at the same time added to the tax load of our people, which in turn reflected in wage and price rise again.

This will lead to continuing high or higher prices and the demand for rationing and price controls. The President has already asked for unlimited power to impose controls to be used in selective form. Make no mistake about it—once rationing and controls go on in peacetime in America, the time will never come to take them off, and we will ultimately be dragged down to the depths of European despair instead of helping them rise by work and production so they can shake off their chains of controls that bind them today.

Should the Marshall plan be adopted in its present form? It should not. We should not attempt to subsidize socialist governments that foster and follow policies that stifle individual initiative and retard production. Money will not cure the ills of Europe. Work and production constitute the medicine so badly needed in a sick world.

The solution of many of the problems of the European countries rests with their own governments. They must balance their domestic budgets; they must change their socialistic planning, bureaucratic controls, false currency values to pave the way to allow hard work and efficient production to aid them in real recovery. As long as those socialist governments believe that America will continue to make up their deficits they will continue their bad practices, and any or all aid we give them, no matter how many billions of dollars are involved, will be, in fact, "Operation Rat Hole."

We should start, if at all, with the basic production of food, coal, steel, and transportation in Europe. These constitute the basis of all other forms of production.

Our money and our help should be administered by patriotic American experts now employed in productive enterprise in labor, agriculture, and industry. Europe needs leadership in production more than anything else—production will form the only lasting bulwark against the spread of the misery of communism.

We should provide that leadership with any of the other essentials we provide to make progressive work and production possible. This leadership should come from American experts administering a separate organization for this purpose and not be manned by political hangers-on around Government departments and bureaus.

It should be on a yearly investment basis only, and its continuance should be determined upon the basis of the increased production in each country concerned.

We have no right to pile the mistakes of tomorrow upon the mistake of yesterday. We have no right to vote away the liberties of the American people. We have no right to vote away their finances unless the recipient people will cooperate with hard work and production to provide the goods their own people so badly need.

The Herter Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, fortunate indeed is a body of men which numbers among its leaders a man of the clear vision, devoted purpose, deep patriotism, and extraordinary ability which characterizes our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.

Much argument has been advanced regarding the alleged unconstitutionality of the Herter bill, H. R. 4579, providing for the administration of foreign aid.

Representative HERTER's letter to the editor of the Washington Post answering this argument is deserving of the thoughtful attention of the membership. Under leave to extend my remarks, it is included below:

HERTER BILL

A COMMUNICATION

I have read your editorial of January 7, entitled "President's Power." The gist of the editorial is that the Herter bill for foreign aid would invade the constitutional prerogative of the President because it provides that a portion of the foreign-aid program shall be carried out by an independent agency rather than by the Department of State.

The argument made in the editorial seems to me to rest exclusively on the premise that the agency provided for in the Herter bill is to be an agency independent of the President. A knowledge of what an independent agency is under Federal law, or even a casual reading of the Herter bill itself, would show that this premise is incorrect.

When Congress creates an independent agency, as it has done many times, it is merely saying that the new agency is not to be in any existing agency. This does not mean, however, that the new agency is not under the control of the President. Under the Constitution all of the Executive power is lodged in the President, and the various executive agencies are merely arms of the President. The President's control over such agencies can be made effective in many ways, the most dramatic of which is the power of removal. Only in the case of independent agencies vested with quasi-judicial functions can Congress place any limitations on this removal power.

The Herter bill does not in any way seek to limit the President's control. On the contrary, its provisions throughout recognize the duties, powers, and responsibilities of the President in the field of foreign relations. The bill, in section 11, creates a Foreign Aid Council consisting of the heads of the various departments and agencies (including the Department of State and the Emergency Foreign Reconstruction Authority provided for in the bill) participating in the foreign-aid program "to advise and consult with the President with respect to the establishment by him" of the programs of aid and of policies in connection therewith. The Secretary of State would be the Chairman of this Council.

The executive director of the Foreign Aid Council, who is also the chairman of the board of the Emergency Foreign Reconstruction Authority, can issue directives in execution of the President's program and policies only with the approval of the President (sec. 11, c).

The stated purposes and objects of the Emergency Foreign Reconstruction Authority itself (this being the independent agency about which the editorial complains) are, as set forth in section 20 (b), to "assist the Foreign Aid Council and its executive director in the performance of their respective functions" which have just been described—namely, to assist the President and to execute, with the approval of the President, programs and policies of foreign aid that have been established by the President. It is only in furtherance of these purposes and objects and in execution of such programs and policies that the authority has power to make arrangements with foreign countries (sec. 20 (b) (1)). The authority is required by section 20 (i) to make a report to the President every 3 months.

The chairman of the board of the authority, as well as its other directors, are all appointed by the President and can be removed by the President at any time for any reason, good or bad, or for no reason.

The editorial made mention of what it characterized as the enormous power of the authority to determine, prescribe and conclude the arrangements under which various commodities would be furnished to foreign countries. As I have previously indicated, this power can be exercised only in furtherance of the authority's stated objects, which are to execute, with the approval of the President, programs and policies of foreign aid established by him. There certainly is no constitutional requirement that arrangements of this character with foreign countries be negotiated and concluded by individuals who have the status of officers or employees of the Department of State rather than of some other agency in the executive branch of the Government over which the President has as much if not more control. If there were, much of what was done under lend-lease was done unlawfully.

For example the arrangements with Great Britain under which approximately 300 Liberty ships were turned over to Great Britain in the early part of the war were negotiated and concluded on behalf of the United States not by the Secretary of State or by one of his subordinates, but by Admiral Land, the War Shipping Administrator. The Land-Lease Administrator, and not the Department of State, was the operating agency which performed the function of implementing the various master lend-lease agreements.

Arrangements are constantly concluded with foreign governments by the Export-Import Bank for loans. So it is not at all unusual for agencies other than the Department of State to make arrangements with foreign countries, of the general type contemplated.

Furthermore, the bill does not in any way foreclose the negotiation of agreements with foreign countries through the Department of State or its agencies if this proves desirable, and specific provision is included in the bill—section 20 (h)—to give the new agency authority to utilize the services of any department of the Government with the consent of the head of the department.

All of the foregoing indicates that the Washington Post editorial is stating a legal conclusion on the basis of facts which do not exist. While the writer of that editorial asserts that one has only to read the Constitution to see how unassailable his position is, it would seem to me more logical to read the provisions of the bill first. The emergency foreign reconstruction authority provided for in the Herter bill is not independent of the President at all and is an independent agency only in the sense that it is not a part of any other Government agency. Moreover, its sole power is to execute, with the approval of the President, programs and policies of foreign aid established by the President himself.

The Herter bill represents the unanimous recommendations of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid. It was drafted with the assistance of Allen W. Dulles, a distinguished lawyer and chairman of the committee on international law of the New York County Lawyers Association, and Gerald D. Morgan, also a distinguished lawyer, who for many years was assistant legislative counsel of the House of Representatives. I have consulted them regarding your editorial, and they both concur in my reply.

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Representative from Massachusetts.
WASHINGTON.

Address of Hon. Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Henry A. Wallace announcing his candidacy for the Presidency reprinted from the New York Times of December 30, 1947:

For the past 15 months I have traveled up and down, and back and forth across this country. I have talked with half a million people in public meetings and with thousands in private gatherings. I have been working for, and I shall continue to work for, peace and security in America, grounded on a foundation of world peace and security.

Everywhere in the United States today, among farmers, workers, small businessmen, and professional men and women, I find confusion, uncertainty, and fear. The people do not ask, "Will there be another war?"—but "When will the war come?"

Everywhere I find that people are spending so much for food and rent that they cannot afford their customary services from the doctor and dentist. They do not ask, "Will there be another depression?" but "When will the depression start?"

Peace and abundance mean so much to me that I have said at a dozen press conferences and in many speeches when asked about a third party, "If the Democratic Party continues to be a party of war and depression, I will see to it that the people have a chance to vote for peace and prosperity."

To those who have come to me asking the conditions of my adherence to the present Democratic administration, I have said, "Let the administration repudiate universal military training and rid itself of the Wall Street-military team that is leading us toward war."

ANSWER OF THE DEMOCRATS

I have insisted that the Democratic administration curb the ever-growing power and profits of monopoly and take concrete steps to preserve the living standards of the American people. I have demanded that the Democratic administration cease its attacks on the civil liberties of Americans. In speeches in the North and in the South at nonsegregated meetings I have stated the simple truth that segregation and discrimination of any kind or character have no place in America.

My terms to the Democratic high command have been well known.

By their actions and finally by their words, they have said: "Henry Wallace, we welcome your support but we will not change our policies."

In answering me, the Democratic leadership also gave its answer to millions of Americans who demand the right to vote for peace and prosperity. Thus, the leadership of the Democratic Party would deprive the American people of their rightful opportunity to choose between progress and reaction in 1948.

So far as the Republican Party is concerned, there is no hope—as George Norris, Fiorello LaGuardia, and Wendell Willkie long ago found out.

When the old parties rot, the people have a right to be heard through a new party. They asserted that right when the Democratic Party was founded under Jefferson in the struggle against the Federalist Party of war and privilege of his day. They won it again when the Republican Party was organized in Lincoln's time. The people must again have an opportunity to speak out with their votes in 1948.

PLEA FOR A 1948 PEACE VOTE

The lukewarm liberals sitting on two chairs say, "Why throw away your vote?" I say a vote for a new party in 1948 will be the most valuable vote you ever have cast or ever will cast.

The bigger the peace vote in 1948 the more definitely the world will know that the United States is not behind the bipartisan reactionary war policy which is dividing the world into two armed camps and making inevitable the day when American soldiers will be lying in their Arctic suits in the Russian snow.

There is no real fight between a Truman and a Republican. Both stand for a policy which opens the door to war in our lifetime and makes war certain for our children.

Let us stop saying, "I don't like it but I am going to vote for the lesser of two evils."

Rather than accept either evil, come out boldly, stand upright like men, and say so loudly all the world can hear—

"We are voting peace and security for ourselves and our children's children. We are fighting for old-fashioned Americanism at the polls in 1948. We are fighting for freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. We are fighting to end racial discrimination. We are fighting for lower prices. We are fighting for free labor unions, for jobs, and for homes in which we can decently live."

We have just passed through the holiday season when every radio and every church proclaimed the joyous tidings of peace. Every year at this time the hearts of the American people swell with genuine good will toward all mankind. We are a kindly, well-meaning people.

But the holiday season soon passes and one of the first items on the agenda of the new Congress is universal military training. I say the first political objective of progressives is the defeat of this bill, which would deliver our 18-year-olds over to the Army and cost the Nation $2,000,000,000 a year.

WAR PREPARATION IS SEEN

The American people read of the fantastic appropriations that are being made for military adventures in Greece, Turkey, China—and billions for armaments here at home.

Slowly it dawns on us that these newspaper headlines have stepped into our every-day lives at the grocery store when we pay $1 for butter, 95 cents for eggs, and 90 cents for meat.

We suddenly realize that we can't have all the people of the world getting ready for the next war without paying for it in our daily lives with less food, clothing, and housing. War preparations create record profits for big business, but only false prosperity for the people—their purchasing power shrinks as prices rise, their needs go unfilled, and they are burdened with new debts.

Yes, corporate profits are over three times what they were in 1939, but every family is paying for our war policy at the grocery store.

Two years ago I denounced those who were talking up World War III as criminals. Of course, the bulk of our people are not criminals, but it is possible for a little handful of war mongers to stampede them. As Mark Twain long ago pointed out:

"The Nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war and will say, earnestly and indignantly, 'It is unjust and dishonorable and there is no necessity for it.' The handful will shout louder * * * and now the whole Nation * * * will take up the war cry and shout itself hoarse, and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth, and presently such mouths will cease to open. Next the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame on the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities."

STAND ON RESTORING EUROPE

This pattern as Mark Twain saw it 50 years ago is repeating itself on a scale so vast as to threaten the destruction of humanity. The rich monopolists have always been more ready to sacrifice their sons than their money, but now they have reached the point where they are willing to sacrifice both for the sake of world control.

It just doesn't make sense. The time has come for a new party to fight these war makers. We say that peace is mandatory and that it can be had if we only want it.

Universal military training is the first decisive step on the road toward fascism. We shall fight it to the limit and all Congressmen who vote for it.

A new party must stand for a positive peace program of abundance and security, not scarcity and war. We can prevent depression and war if we only organize for peace in the same comprehensive way we organize for war.

I, personally, was for the humanitarian aspects of the Marshall plan long before it was announced. Because I saw the postwar need of helping human beings, I was accused of wanting a quart of milk for every Hottentot.

I pushed for help for Greece against the opposition of the administration 8 months before the Truman doctrine was announced. But I have fought and shall continue to fight programs which give guns to people when they want plows.

I fight the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan as applied because they divide Europe into two warring camps. Those whom we buy politically with our food will soon desert us. They will pay us in the base coin of temporary gratitude and then turn to hate us because our policies are destroying their freedom.

We are restoring western Europe and Germany through United States agencies rather than United Nations agencies because we want to hem Russia in. We are acting in the same way as France and England after the last war and the end result will be the same—confusion, depression, and war.

FOR UNDERSTANDING WITH RUSSIA

It just doesn't need to happen. The cost of organizing for peace, prosperity, and progress is infinitely less than organizing for war.

We who believe this will be called Russian tools and Communists. Let the fear mongers not distort and becloud the issues by name calling. We are not for Russia and we are not for communism, but we recognize Hitlerite methods when we see them in our own land and we denounce the men who engage in such name calling as enemies of the human race who would rather have World War III than put forth a genuine effort to bring about a peaceful settlement of differences.

One thing I want to make clear to both Russia and the United States—peace requires real understanding between our peoples. Russia has as much to gain from peace as the United States, and just as we here fight against the spreaders of hate and falsehood against Russia, the Russian leaders can make a great contribution by restraining those extremists who try to widen the gap between our two great countries.

I insist that the United States will not be fully secure until there is real peace between this country and Russia and until there is an international police force stronger than the military establishment of any nation, including Russia and the United States.

I am utterly against any kind of imperialism or expansionism, whether sponsored by Britain, Russia, or the United States, and I call on Russia as well as the United States to look at all our differences objectively and free from that prejudice which the hate mongers have engendered on both sides.

What the world needs is a United Nations disarmament conference to rid humanity for all time of the threat not only of atomic bombs but also of all other methods of mass destruction.

DECLARATION OF CANDIDACY

It happens that all of my mother's and three-fourths of my father's ancestors came to this country before the American Revolution. I love the Americanism I was taught to respect in the public schools of Iowa half a century ago.

That Americanism was betrayed after World War I by forces which found their origin in monopoly capitalism, yellow journalism, and racial bigotry. Today there is a greater menace than ever before—a menace more serious than has ever confronted the human race.

That menace can be met and overcome only by a new political alinement in America which requires the organization of a new political party.

To that end I announce tonight that I shall run as an independent candidate for President of the United States in 1948.

Thousands of people all over the United States have asked me to engage in this great fight. The people are on the march. I hope that you who are listening to me tonight will lead the forces of peace, progress, and prosperity in your communities and throughout our country. Will you let me know that you have come out fighting against the powers of evil?

We have assembled a Gideon's army—small in number, powerful in conviction, ready in action. We have said with Gideon, "Let those who are fearful and trembling depart." For every fearful one who leaves there will be a thousand to take his place. A just cause is worth a hundred armies.

We face the future unfettered by any principle but the general welfare. We owe no allegiance to any group which does not serve that welfare. By God's grace, the people's peace will usher in the century of the common man.

Program of Special Conference of National Association of Letter Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose the adopted program of the special conference of the National Association of Letter Carriers, which has just concluded a 2-day meeting in Washington. This conference, presided over by Hon. William C. Daugherty, president, was attended by more than 700 delegates from 45 States. Included on their program were Representative EDWARD H. REES, chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; Hon. Donald Dawson, administrative assistant to the President; and Hon. Jesse M. Donaldson, Postmaster General.

PROGRAM

1. Since the inception of the National Association of Letter Carriers in 1889, the organization and its membership have established an unblemished record of sustained loyalty to the Government of the United States; 78,000 members of this association stand shoulder to shoulder with millions of like-minded American citizens in condemning communism, and all other forms of subversive activities.

We hereby reaffirm our faith in our democratic form of government, and we reiterate our pledge of continuing and unswerving loyalty.

2. Endorse the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson liberalized retirement bills, S. 637 and H. R. 4127.

Instruct our national officers to continue their best efforts to have this meritorious legislation enacted into law early in the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

3. Urge the Eightieth Congress to enact legislation immediately which will grant letter carriers an upward wage adjustment to enable them to cope with prevailing chaotic economic conditions.

4. Endorse the Morse-Aiken-Hartley bills, S. 1867 and H. R. 4650, both of which provide for increased benefits under the United States Employees' Compensation Act (specifically computing benefits on basis of 75 percent of $3,000 in lieu of present computation of 66⅔ percent of $1,800).

Both bills propose: "That the monthly compensation for total disability shall not be more than $225, nor less than $112.50 in which case his monthly compensation shall be the full amount of his monthly salary. The monthly compensation for partial disability shall not be more than $225."

5. Endorse the Langer-Butler bills, S. 205 and H. R. 1322, both of which provide for 26 days' annual and 15 days' sick leave per annum to postal employees in the field service.

6. Endorse the Teague bill, H. R. 3985. This measure relates to the appointment of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department. It is designed to grant full credit to such veterans for all time served in the military or naval forces in determining salary grades.

7. Endorse the Hagen bill, H. R. 4781, which will reclassify village delivery carriers into the city delivery service.

8. Endorse the Langer-Cole bills, S. 203 and H. R. 1186. Both are to allow 2 cents per mile additional equipment allowance for rural carriers.

Note: S. 203 passed by Senate June 23, 1947, amended to grant 1 cent.

9. Instruct our national officers to continue their best efforts to have the following general legislative proposals enacted into law at the earliest possible moment:

S. 58 (Mr. LANGER); H. R. 738 (Mr. REES) and H. R. 1613 (Mr. GEARHART): To allow tax exemptions on annuities.

S. 202 (Mr. LANGER) and H. R. 1187 (Mr. COLE): To classify rural delivery substitutes under civil service.

S. 204 (Mr. LANGER) and H. R. 1188 (Mr. COLE): To grant $1 per hour additional to rural carriers serving on Burch heavy routes.

S. 635 (Mr. LANGER): To adjust compensation of substitutes who have had continuous service since July 1, 1945.

H. R. 682 (Mr. CLASON): To provide for retirement after 25 years of service, irrespective of age.

H. R. 686 (Mr. SIKES): To provide optional retirement at 60 years of age, with at least 25 years of service.

H. R. 1271 (Mr. STEVENSON): To provide five tours of duty for rural carriers.

H. R. 1272 (Mr. STEVENSON): To correct longevity grades 12, 13, and 14, by allowing credit for all past service in lieu of present 3, 5, and 7 years.

H. R. 1323 (Mr. BUTLER): To establish an 8–9 hour law in the Postal Service.

H. R. 1551 (Mrs. ST. GEORGE): To grant $100 annual uniform allowance to letter carriers.

H. R. 1597 (Mr. CORBETT): To grant substitute postal employees time and one-half for overtime.

H. R. 1622 (Mr. JONES): To grant 90 minutes compensatory time for each hour of service on any compensatory day.

H. R. 1876 (Mr. FARRINGTON): To grant 25 percent wage differential to postal employees in the Territory of Hawaii.

H. R. 2050 (Mr. HAGEN): To provide credit for salary purposes to all carriers advanced from the status of village carriers.

H. R. 3571 (Mrs. ROGERS): To create a United States Civil Service Board of Appeals.

H. R. 2114 (Mr. SHAFER): To provide for 30 years optional retirement.

H. R. 4305 (Mr. FERNOS-ISERN): To provide a 25 percent wage differential for postal employees in Puerto Rico.

10. Declaration of postal policy: It has become common practice on the part of many to consider the Post Office Department as a business. In measuring the success or failure of postal operations, observers are prone to gage success by the presence or absence of the so-called deficit. Unfortunately, such thinking completely obscures many vital facts.

The postal system is basically and fundamentally a service. In early colonial days several attempts were made to operate a postal system for the purpose of personal profit. All such attempts failed. The young American Nation determined from these colonial failures that a postal system to be successful must be operated by the Government, with service as the one and paramount objective.

The Post Office Department is operated to give good mail service to the American people. Mail service and facilities are provided in every nook and corner of the United States. Such operations are established regardless of any consideration of profit. In fact, there are approximately 42,000 post offices, 20,000 of which conduct their operations at a loss. Do our competitive business organizations maintain comparable service? Of course not. Express companies, telegraph companies, and other public services maintain offices and service only where such operations produce a profit.

Third Assistant Postmaster General Joseph J. Lawler recently stated: "It has long been the policy of Congress to extend special below-cost rates to certain classes of mail and to provide facilities and service for the benefit of the general public regardless of the fact that the charges for such services and facilities do not cover the cost of their maintenance."

The only universal service in America today is the postal service. Millions of people do not have electricity; millions live without running water; millions live without telegraph and telephone service or facilities; millions do not have ready access to public transportation. But every American citizen is provided with mail service. It is the one and only universal service in the United States.

Those in charge of postal operations have the responsibility of requesting sufficient funds to operate the Post Office Department properly. Congress has the solemn obligation of providing adequate funds to furnish good service. Unfortunately, under our present system, the officials of the Post Office Department are required to estimate how much money will be needed almost 2 years prior to the period when the funds will be available. This estimate then goes to the Director of the Budget, and finally emerges in the President's budget message. Exalted economic prophets have proven dismal failures in anticipating economic trends. Under the circumstances it is rather absurd of us to expect postal administrators to be omnipotent forecasters. If the needs of the service are greater than anticipated, the public in all likelihood will receive inferior mail service.

In the matter of planning expenditures the Post Office Department is in a somewhat different position than other departments of government. Other departments can plan their activities and gage their expenditures accordingly. The Post Office Department cannot do this. It has no control over the volume of mail. It must deliver all the mail. It has no control over the area of delivery—if people move, the mail must move with them. Poor guessing and inadequate appropriations can result in only one thing and that is an inferior postal service. Congress should recognize these facts and when necessary vote adequate supplemental appropriations to maintain a first-class postal service.

There is an erroneous impression in Congress and among the public that the Post Office Department consistently operates at a loss. It can be readily demonstrated by available evidence that the Post Office Department over a period of years has actually operated at a profit. Misinformation to the contrary should be speedily dispelled.

Unfortunately since 1940 the Post Office Department has not reflected the credits authorized by the Kelly Act of 1930 and has never considered these credits in any cost ascertainment reports. The items included under the Kelly law contain the expenditures of Government departments for mail carried free of charge. The Post Office Department should be credited with payment for this mail either by a transfer of cash or credits from the Departments involved, and this expense should be allocated to the various departments of Government who use the postal service as a part of their operation.

It is true that even with the credit allowance provided by the Kelly Act, there are individual years, such as 1946, when losses are shown. It is also a fact that when all the years 1930 to 1946, inclusive, are examined, and the Kelly Act credits are included, that the Post Office Department shows a cumulative profit of $304,247,315. During the war period, the expense of handling mail for the Armed Forces was also absorbed by the Post Office Department without recompense. The Post Office estimate of the revenues they would have received for this service at regular postage rates is $168,000,000 for the fiscal years 1942, 1943 and 1944. No estimates have been made for 1945 or 1946.

We should at this point pause again to point out that every single function of the Post Office Department has been instituted by Congress with the sole motivation of providing service to the American people. Profit has never been a consideration. Perhaps it is because the operations of the Department have been so successful that the fundamental purposes of the post office system tends to be lost in a maze of accounting. It is true that in the past there have been years when the Postmaster General's reports have shown deficits and years when they have shown profits, but the figures for the 17 years just quoted do not support the contention that the Post Office operates at a loss, and we believe that in fairness to the Post Office, to its employees, and to its patrons accounting and cost keeping should be handled in a manner that will give a true picture of expense and income. To do this properly, the credits allowable under the Kelly Act would have to be extended to include many additional items.

If we project the trends of postal revenue and expense from 1930 to 1946 until 1957, we find revenues increasing substantially faster than expenses, this indicating that consistent increases in volume of business are more important as a means of absorbing expense increases than would be the increasing of rates, which would certainly tend to divert volume to other methods of delivery.

One hundred and seventy years of operation have definitely demonstrated two vital factors in successful postal operation: (1) greater volume promotes lower unit cost and more economical operation; (2) the reduction of the number of times a piece of mail is handled reduces the cost of operation. The best and most inexpensive way to handle mail is to deliver it immediately. Delayed appropriations and curtailed service are more costly in the final analysis. Adequate appropriations and good service promote efficiency in operation.

In this analysis we have made no attempt to estimate the cost to the American people in poor mail service. The cost of delayed mail to businessmen and individuals is enormous. The American people are entitled to and should demand good mail service.

We have not attempted in this study to show all of the operations that are conducted by the Post Office Department on a free or less than cost basis. Before closing, however, we want to briefly point out the major role that the postal service has played and is continuing to play in the development of the American Nation.

The Post Office Department developed our system of roads through the construction of post roads. Through preferential payments to railroads the postal service has kept many branch lines in operation. The Post Office subsidized the development of the merchant marine and the air industry. Yes, indeed it was communication in the garb of the Post Office that took transportation by the hand and conducted it to its present advanced state of development. It was the twins of progress, communication and transportation, that sped our country on to great expansion. What is the purpose of this policy, profit or service? Service and service alone must be the paramount purpose.

11. That this conference go on record requesting immediate action on the part of the Post Office Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Congress of the United States to provide proper equipment, supplies, and quarters to conduct the business of this

great institution. In particular the motor-vehicle equipment of the postal service requires immediate attention. The trucks now in use in the Department are almost entirely unsafe, antiquated, and detrimental to the health of the men who operate them as well as a menace to people on the streets. It is pertinent to observe that the trucks now in operation have an average service of 15 years and are in use 16 hours per day. The Army trucks now in use by the Post Office Department are a threat to the life and limb of the men who are required to climb in and out of them in the collection and delivery of mail. Vigorous steps must be taken to provide immediate replacement.

The prevalent shortage of keys, straps, sacks, storage boxes, cases, and, in short, all equipment make the delivery of mail difficult in the extreme. Efficient service cannot be maintained without proper supplies.

Post-office quarters are in a deplorable state. The unprecedented volume of mail has practically every post office and station in the United States bursting at the seams. Proper handling of mail is impossible under the present circumstances. The cost of the delivery of mail is greatly increased because of this congestion. Poor toilet facilities, poor ventilation, and poor lighting are a menace to the health of postal employees. The dictates of good service, the demand for efficiency, and the welfare of the men make correction of these conditions imperative.

We, the representatives of the letter carriers of the United States, by unanimous action request the Post Office Department, the Director of the Budget, and the Congress of the United States to correct these conditions to the end that the efficiency of the Post Office Department be restored to an economical basis, and that the health and welfare of the employees be protected.

Even in Rhode Island They Feel the Ill Effects of the New Deal Agricultural Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, most people realize that the President has the power, authority, and money to control prices whenever he wishes to assume the responsibility of doing so. The fact that chickens and eggs are bringing 50 to 60 percent of parity, no doubt, accounts for the following statement found on page 146 in the Sunday, January 11, New York Times. Inquiry by the reporter about President Truman's speech brought forth the following statement, and I quote:

Fred Bascombe of Bonnie Brook Farm, Cumberland, R. I., chairman of the northern Rhode Island soil conservation district, said: "I didn't pay any attention to Mr. Truman's message. We farmers are not interested in what he says, only in what he does. This administration is not interested in the plight of the dairy or poultry farmer. We've been taking it on the chin so long we're no longer interested in speeches."

Mr. Speaker, the Steagall amendment sounds good come election times, and reads fine, but little attention is paid to its provisions by the present administration.

Security Suckers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, during the war we as a Nation were security conscious lest information of a helpful nature be given through inadvertance to the enemy. Since the termination of hostilities, however, certain Americans have revived the practice of competing with one another to reveal strategic information. This is an alarming situation, especially when we recall the stories concerning the atomic-bomb spy ring in Canada. The national emergency has not terminated. There is adequate legislation on the books to cover these instances. Let the Department of Justice do its duty. One conviction will be a more effective deterrent than all the words which we could utter here in a week.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein the following editorial which appeared in Armed Force, formerly the Army and Navy Bulletin, of January 3, 1948:

SECURITY SUCKERS

We are a very generous Nation. We give away food. We give away clothing. We help others with our money and our resources. In no field, however, are we quite as generous as we are with our military secrets. Any agent who collects money from a foreign government for spying services rendered in America is an overpaid fraud.

Why should impoverished foreign governments pay money to agents when all they have to do is to subscribe to some of our publications? Much cheaper; and, actually, they get information almost as complete in detail. Last week, for example, any foreign government interested in determining whether man could fly in aircraft at speeds exceeding the speed of sound—a rather important military question—could have saved about 5 years in research and experiments simply by reading one of our leading aviation weeklies.

New aircraft designs? Location of armaments? Rearward firing guns? Performance characteristics? No agent need apply. Just read your magazines. Strangely enough, this wholesome generosity of ours does not seem to be paralleled by other nations. Even our friends, the British, for example, have not splashed the front pages with their aircraft and ordnance secrets. The fabled "iron curtain" which Russia has placed in front of its civilian activities is transparent as a department store window compared to the amount of military information which leaks out of the Soviet.

Somehow, the security consciousness which was successfully instilled in millions of civilian and military personnel during wartime has rapidly been dissipated in peacetime. Our military leaders are deeply perturbed. Officially they have no authority over anything except the regular establishments, which have not been completely blameless in this matter of leaking out information. Most of the serious breaks, however, have emanated from sources presumably beyond the reach of official discipline.

If the Air Force ever confirms the report that one of its planes has passed the sonic barrier it will be one of the most important developments in aviation since Wilbur Wright hedgehopped across the sand dunes at Kitty Hawk. It will also be a perfect example of the type of secret which should not be broadcast to the world until the military and naval leaders responsible for our Nation's defense decide that to do so will not endanger national security. Armed Force staff members heard unverified reports about supersonic flights more than a month ago, but we feel no particular sense of nobility for not having published them. Frankly, the present international situation has convinced us that right now is a splendid time to clam up.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The above editorial was set in type prior to the holiday development wherein the Air Force turned over to the Justice Department an alleged violation of national security by the magazine Aviation Week, which recently claimed that the USAF's XS-1 had passed the sonic barrier. Armed Force is gratified by the courage of Air Force leaders in taking this drastic step and hopes that it will lead to a clarification of security needs.)

Progress of the Foot-and-Mouth Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Representative GEORGE W. GILLIE, of Indiana, chairman of the special House Subcommittee on Foot and Mouth Disease, before the forty-eighth annual conference of the Veterinary Alumni Society, University of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia on January 6, 1948:

I suppose you might say that my purpose in being here today is to try to teach a bunch of old dogs some new tricks. For a good many years we of the veterinary profession have said that we could not live with foot-and-mouth disease. We haven't learned any of the tricks of living with this disease because all our planning, all our thinking, has been in terms of eradicating it every time it made its appearance on this continent.

Gentlemen, we are going to have to learn some new tricks. Foot-and-mouth disease is on the North American Continent. It is firmly established. It is going to be here for a long time—certainly for years, perhaps for a generation, possibly from now on.

So, whether we like it or not—and I, for one, frankly admit that I do not like it—we have got to learn the tricks of living with foot-and-mouth disease, if not actually in the United States, at least on the North American Continent.

Most of you here are as familiar as I am with the history of foot-and-mouth disease in this country. Some of you—like myself—have had your own unforgettable personal experience with it. I'm sure it isn't necessary for me to tell you anything about the past history of the disease nor of its dreadful effect on the livestock industry of any country where it becomes prevalent.

The main question before us today is what are we going to do about the outbreak that has now established itself in Mexico? I want to review just enough of the history of that outbreak to bring us up to date and to give us the necessary background for an analysis of the existing situation in Mexico.

Here are the facts as we know them.

On December 26, 1946, the Bureau of Animal Industry, in Washington, received word that foot-and-mouth disease existed in Mexico. The report was made by veterinarians of our own Bureau who had been sent to Mexico, at the invitation of Mexican officials, to assist in the diagnosis of the suspected outbreak.

It was assumed that the disease was brought into Mexico by Zebu bulls from Brazil, which had been imported into Mexico in violation of the Mexican-United States sanitary treaty. Notice that I say it was "assumed" the disease came in by way of these Brazilian bulls. There are some rumors to the contrary in Mexico, and I will refer to them a little later on.

According to our reports, however, the disease was first discovered in a herd near Vera Cruz in which there was one of these Brazilian bulls. The bull itself did not have the disease at the time of the first outbreak.

As soon as the disease was reported, the Mexican-United States border was closed and veterinarians from our Bureau of Animal Industry began informal cooperation with Mexican authorities in laying plans to combat the outbreak.

It was discovered that the disease had already spread to practically all the states of central Mexico—from the Gulf to the Pacific. It wasn't established everywhere throughout those states, but there were local centers of infection scattered clear across central Mexico.

Quarantine lines were set up in an effort to confine the disease. These were manned by the Mexican Army. There were two kinds of quarantine lines—the permanent lines north and south of the generally infected area, to keep the disease within that general area—and the more or less temporary lines which were established within the generally infected area to try to keep the outbreaks localized.

Early in February of last year the Department of Agriculture came to Congress with a request for authority, and for money, to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in efforts to stamp out the disease. That request was promptly granted.

The Committee on Agriculture of the House had already set up a subcommittee on foot-and-mouth disease, of which I had the honor to be named chairman. The Senate Agriculture Committee had set up a similar subcommittee under Senator BUSHFIELD.

With these two subcommittes already on the job, it was only a matter of days from the time the Department of Agriculture came to us until we had provided them by law with both the legal authority to operate in Mexico and the money they requested to start the job with. Incidentally, I would like to say here—and I believe the officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry will bear me out fully in this—there has never been a time since this outbreak was first reported when the program has been held up for 1 minute by the failure of Congress to take prompt and effective action in providing both funds and authority.

In fact, I think the record of Congress as far as foot-and-mouth disease is concerned pretty well disproves the idea that the processes of democracy are necessarily slow and cumbersome. It was less than 3 weeks from the time the Department of Agriculture first requested authority to go into Mexico until Public Law 8, granting that authority, had been passed by both Houses of Congress.

Late in June, when it looked as though the program might have to stop for the first few days of July because the regular appropriations for the new fiscal year were not going to be available, the Department appeared before the House Appropriations Committee and within a matter of hours a special appropriation of $1,500,000 was provided to keep the program going until the regular appropriation came through.

The same kind of speedy action was apparent in Congress when the Department of Agriculture recently announced abandonment of its slaughter program. Although we had only 1 day's notice that the slaughter program was to be terminated, our announcement of a hearing on the subject was released to the press within 30 minutes after the Department's own announcement of the termination of its previous program.

As far as the House Committee on Agriculture was concerned, we could have started hearings the next day. Most of our witnesses had to come from hundreds or thousands of miles away, however, so we gave them 5 days' notice and started our hearings on Wednesday of the following week, December 3.

The committee met almost continuously throughout Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of that week. Friday noon we finished the public hearings. That afternoon we had a series of private hearings in which we questioned one at a time several of the key witnesses who had appeared at the public hearings. We wanted to do this because we knew that there were some matters involved here which could not be discussed fully in public—and we wanted to get the whole story for our guidance before we took any action.

For the benefit of those who might have been aware that this private conference session took place—and may have wondered what was disclosed there—let me state that in no case did the facts or opinions expressed by the witnesses in their private conference with the committee vary in any material detail from the testimony they had given publicly. The transcript of that testimony—the public testimony—is now being printed and is available to anyone who is interested as soon as it is ready. If you want a copy, write to the clerk of the House Committee on Agriculture and ask that you be sent a copy of the hearing as soon as it is received from the printer.

After hearing all those who had indicated any desire to express themselves on this subject—as well as those who had been requested by the committee to appear—the committee worked late Friday night outlining its report and recommendations. Saturday morning it met in my office and formally approved the report. Saturday afternoon copies of the report—and the recommendations as to our future policy regarding the fight against foot-and-mouth disease—were delivered personally by the committee's staff assistant to the men in the Department of Agriculture and the State Department who were scheduled to meet the next day with Mexican officials to work out a new program and agreement.

Thus—let me repeat—in a matter of exactly 10 days from the time the Department of Agriculture announced the abandonment of its slaughter and eradication program, the House committee assigned to that subject had announced and held a public hearing, had drawn up and agreed upon its report and recommendations as to future policy, and had transmitted those recommendations to the executive departments responsible for carrying out the program. Does that sound, gentlemen, as though the processes of democracy are cumbersome and slow?

By the first of last April, American men and equipment were moving into Mexico. By the middle of June the slaughter and burial program was in full swing. By the end of November, when the slaughter program was stopped, more than 500,000 cattle had been slaughtered. In spite of this, the disease had continued to spread within the infected area.

It was still confined to the same general area in central Mexico, but it had flared up in scores of new communities and new herds within the area. When the program was getting under way, Mexican and American officials estimated that it might be necessary to slaughter some 1,500,000 or 2,000,000 cattle in order to eradicate the disease. By the end of November it had become obvious that it would be necessary to kill and bury virtually every cloven-hoofed animal in the infected area. That would mean the destruction of five or six million cattle and perhaps that many sheep, goats, and hogs.

That would mean the killing of about half the livestock population of Mexico. A complete eradication program would have meant that whole states would have been left, for a time at least, with no livestock whatever—no cattle, no hogs, no sheep, or goats.

The Mexican Government decided that it was impossible to carry out an eradication program of that magnitude—impossible economically and impossible politically. It is a decision that I don't believe we can quarrel too much with. I doubt very seriously if we could carry out an eradication program of that magnitude in the United States.

Naturally, operations in Mexico can be carried on only with the approval and cooperation of the Mexican Government. So when that Government decided that the situation had reached a point where it was impossible to continue with the eradication program, our officials had no choice but to comply. We were left with two alternatives—either continue in Mexico with a program acceptable to the Mexican Government and to us—or withdraw from Mexico and prepare to fight the disease in the United States.

That was the situation with which we were faced when we opened our hearing, just about a month ago, in Washington.

After considering carefully all available evidence—and listening to every suggestion—our committee unanimously adopted recommendations outlining a policy which we believe is the best that can be adopted. We transmitted these recommendations promptly to the Department of Agriculture and the State Department, as I described earlier, and they were made the basis of the new program which is now going into operation.

There were seven of those recommendations, but the basic policy—the only basis on which I believe it is worthwhile to continue in Mexico—is stated in recommendation No. 2. This recommendation reads:

"It shall be understood definitely by all participants that the program now undertaken is not an abandonment of the effort to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease from this continent but is merely a postponement of that effort until it can be undertaken and accomplished in a manner which is more acceptable to the Mexican people and tolerable to the Mexican economy."

In other words, gentlemen, we have not given up the fight against foot-and-mouth disease. We have been defeated in the first battle of the war. There's no use in us trying to kid ourselves about that. In our first battle we have been handed a serious defeat. But I can remember another war—not so long ago—in which we didn't do so well in our first few battles.

We are no more inclined to give up the war against foot-and-mouth disease merely because we have lost the first battle than we were to give up the war against Japan because they got the jump on us at Pearl Harbor.

In Mexico we have met a rousing defeat in our first battle. But we have fallen back in good order—our lines are intact—and we are ready to give battle again along lines that we believe will bring us eventual victory.

The strategy of our campaign from here on is outlined in the first recommendation of the committee. Let me read it:

"The campaign against foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico shall be conducted on the following basis: First, an all-out effort by

both countries to hold a quarantine line immediately north of the present infected area, including a sterile zone as wide as possible south of such line in which all infected and exposed animals will be subject to immediate slaughter and burial, in order to prevent the spread of the disease into northern Mexico and the United States;

"Second, extension and enlargement southward of that sterile zone as rapidly as circumstances will permit, with vaccination being employed by the Commission only as an adjunct to quarantine."

There is the plan that we believe is the best that can be worked out under the circumstances. First, hold the quarantine line north of the infected area. Second, work southward from that line eradicating the disease—by slaughter and burial—county by county, township by township, as rapidly as we can.

And in the meantime—and I think this is very important—put our best available scientists to work on the job of trying to find a scientific remedy for this situation.

Why do I think this plan holds our greatest hope of success? Why do I think this quarantine line can be held when we have always felt that it is virtually impossible to hold a land quarantine against foot-and-mouth disease? Let's analyze the situation. And like good generals, let's consider not only the probable results of our future moves, but let's also analyze the factors that contributed to our earlier failure.

First, what were the factors that contributed to the failure of our first eradication program?

The first factor that contributed to our downfall, I think, was the difficulty of the terrain in central Mexico. A glance at a road map of Mexico will show you that there are very few paved highways. If you have traveled through central Mexico—as our committee did last summer—you know that in most sections there are not only no highways—there are no roads whatever.

Mexico is still a primitive country—except for the few large cities. Out in the country 99 percent of the travel is on foot or on the backs or burros. You don't need roads for that kind of transportation—and in most rural areas of Mexico roads as we know them simply do not exist.

The lack of roads hurt our campaign in two ways. In the first place, it rendered transportation of our heavy digging and disinfecting equipment difficult, if not actually impossible. In a campaign where we were attempting to operate simultaneously and at high speed over an area 450 miles long and 250 miles wide, the difficulty of the terrain presented an almost insurmountable handicap—and, by itself, might have been sufficient to beat us.

But the lack of roads hurt us in another way, too. It made our interior quarantine lines—those thrown around local outbreaks to prevent the disease spreading to nearby herds—it made these quarantine lines almost ineffectual. Mexican soldiers could guard the roads—and they did guard them. On its trip in Mexico our committee passed scores of such quarantine lines and road blocks along the highways.

But where there was one Mexican using the roads to get from place to place, there were fifty or a hundred using the paths and trails that wind up the score across every hill—or simply striking out across the fields. Where farms are small, the countryside is thickly settled, and villages are close together—you don't use the road when you go over to visit your neighbor—even if there is a road. You cut right out across the field.

The Mexican army had, I suppose, thousands of miles of these interior, local quarantine lines. They couldn't possibly have a soldier every 50 feet along every one of those lines. The best they could do was to guard the roads and the main paths. And, as one of our witnesses put it, that is about like trying to keep ants out of your house by putting a domino between your house and the ant hill. So the second way in which the terrain and the geography hurt us was by making the interior quarantine ineffective.

A second big reason for the failure of our campaign, as I see it, was the character of the agriculture in the infected area. In the main, central Mexico is an area of small farms. There are a good many dairy herds, principally around Mexico City. There are a few large ranches, mostly over in the area toward Vera Cruz. But in general, central Mexico is a land of small villages, small farms, and small landowners. The typical farm contains only a few acres. It is operated by one man and his family with a yoke of oxen. Every family has, besides its oxen, its goats and probably a milk cow and maybe a hog or two.

Those in charge of the eradication program found that it was almost impossible to clean out an area and get all the susceptible animals. You would get most of them; yes. You would get oxen by the score, goats and sheep by the hundreds, some milk cows, and some hogs. But you can hide a milk cow in the woods. You can put a hog or a goat under the bed, or on top of a flat-roofed adobe house—and have him well out of sight. Our men would kill everything in sight, cover over the pit, and come back a week later and find animals by the score placidly grazing on the very ground they had cleared.

Hiding animals out when the eradication squad came around, or driving them over the mountain to leave with cousin Manuel in an uninfected valley, was, of course, merely an indication that Jose—the average Mexican farmer—simply didn't understand what the campaign was all about. He hadn't been thoroughly sold on the program. He didn't understand why he should cooperate 100 percent with the government men who were coming around to kill his animals.

Basically, lack of cooperation on the part of the Mexican farmers themselves was the one big reason for the failure of the slaughter campaign. With their full cooperation, the other difficulties might have been overcome. Without it, I don't think the job could have been done even if there had been no other handicap whatever.

In some places this lack of understanding and cooperation on the part of the Mexican farmers merely took the form of hiding out some of their animals, or failure to report an outbreak. In other places there was open and bitter resistance to the campaign.

Part of this was due to mere lack of information—and I don't think any of us realized when this program was started how extremely difficult it was going to be to get information about the program—just plain, factual information—to the Mexican peons. Those little farmers don't have radios, they don't have newspapers. Most of them don't read nor write. And many of them don't even speak Spanish. Most Mexican farmers are Indians and lots of them can't even understand Spanish.

Those of you who have had any experience trying to get American farmers to cooperate in the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, or in any similar campaign where you had no difficulties of language or illiteracy to contend with, will understand, I think, of trying to convince unlearned Mexicans that they should cooperate 100 percent with this program.

In addition to these difficulties, however, there is no doubt in my own mind but that poor public relations on the part of those conducting the campaign also contributed to the lack of cooperation among the farmers. I don't mean poor publicity—I mean public relations in its broadest sense.

I don't think there was a sufficient effort made to reach the farmer through the means of communication that he does understand, by word of mouth education, by working through the village mayor and political boss, and through the parish priest. I think a little more careful attention to this kind of an educational program in communities where an eradication program was scheduled would have helped. But I doubt if it could have been carried out simultaneously over the tremendous area where the disease was found to exist.

On its visit to Mexico the committee saw other examples of poor public relations. When we were there we saw animals being killed with a .22 caliber pistol. With the residents of the whole community lining the sides of the pit—including, of course, the owners of the animals being killed—we saw dozens of animals half dead, writhing in pain while they were shot time after time with that puny little weapon. Those animals are dear to those people. From long association many of them become almost like members of the family. When word of scenes like that spread to the next village it was an almost certain guaranty that there would be something less than an enthusiastic welcome when the eradication squad reached there.

Failure to have mules on hand to replace slaughtered oxen was also poor public relations. We saw farmers whose oxen had been killed who had been waiting 6 or 8 weeks to get the mule he had been promised. In the meantime his fields were unplanted or were growing up in weeds * * * and the corn and beans that were to feed the family this winter were not being grown. That sort of thing didn't make the farmer any more cooperative.

Another thing that turned out to be an important factor in determining the Mexican farmers' attitude toward this campaign was politics—just plain old politics. They have politics in Mexico just as we have in this country. And, just as in the United States, when there is a party in control of the administration, there are one or more parties who are out and would like to get in and who seize upon every opportunity to make political capital out of the problems faced by the administration. Just as in this country we have seen high prices, rationing, and similar problems seized upon by opposition political parties in an effort to embarrass their opponents politically, so in Mexico the campaign against the foot-and-mouth disease was used by opposition political parties in an effort to make political capital and to discredit the administration.

As in this country, this political propaganda was carried on through every medium—through the radio and press and in a word-of-mouth "whisper campaign" in the rural areas. In Mexico the "whisper campaign" was particularly effective.

An interesting rumor which was started and spread by those trying to make political capital of the situation was the report that foot-and-mouth disease was not new to Mexico but had existed there for a great many years. "This is not a new disease," the peons were told. "The affliction they call foot-and-mouth disease is the same as that disease with which you are all familiar, 'the flying herb,' which you have had among your cattle for many years. This whole campaign is merely a trick on the part of the administration and their Yankee friends to destroy the agricultural economy of Mexico."

Thus ran the argument advanced by those making political opposition to the program. They brought out some evidence to support their propaganda. This point of view was presented to the committee by one of the witnesses at our recent hearing. There is enough factual basis for the contention to permit this kind of argument to have a considerable effect upon the farmers of Mexico. There was an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in the southeastern part of Mexico in 1925 and 1926. Although it is believed that this outbreak was eradicated completely, there has been a disease called flying herb, which has been prevalent in Mexico for the past many years, and which, although it is not foot-and-mouth disease, has symptoms very similar to the more serious malady.

This was not the only type of propaganda used in the political campaign against the eradication program, but it is typical of the kind of opposition the program encountered in certain places, and there is no doubt that this opposition had a considerable effect in preventing the all-out cooperation of the Mexican farmer.

Strangely enough, the disease itself played into the hands of those opposed to the program and made more difficult the job of trying to convince the unlearned Mexican farmer to cooperate with the eradication campaign.

The disease in Mexico is caused by the type A virus and is at present a remarkably mild form of the disease. Since it is caused by a virus, it is impossible to tell when it may become hotter and more malignant, as virus diseases can do almost overnight. Up to the present time, however, there is no denying that the disease has been present in Mexico in a rather benign form. The mortality rate among cattle has been extremely low. Even calves and small animals have recovered from the disease. Recovery among older animals seems to be virtually complete when the disease has run its course, and in many cases even milk cows are not too seriously affected. The disease has been present to only a slight degree in hogs, goats, and other susceptible animals.

All this, of course, has added tremendously to the difficulty of convincing the Mexican farmer that he should cooperate in this program. It is not too difficult to obtain the cooperation of a man whose animals are desperately sick or dying before his very eyes, or if they have had the disease and recovered but have been rendered virtually unfit for any further use. It is much more difficult to convince him that he should cooperate if he sees that the effect on his own animals is relatively mild.

These are not all the factors which contributed to the failure of our wholesale eradication program, but I believe they are the most important, and I think you will agree with me that our failure is not exactly surprising when all these circumstances are taken into consideration.

Now, let's turn to an analysis of our revised strategy. Why do I think that the program the committee has outlined now has a chance of success where our previous program failed? There are two big reasons: First, the scope of our activities will be much more limited. Obviously, one of the things contributing to the downfall of the first program was the very size and scope of the undertaking. Second, many of the factors which worked against us in our original program will be working in our favor in the strategy we have outlined for the future. I will mention a few of these factors as we try to analyze the situation with which we are now faced.

Let's answer first the basic question: Why do I think we can hold the quarantine line north of the infected area when history indicates that no land quarantine has ever been 100 percent successful against foot-and-mouth disease? I hope that I am not indulging in wishful thinking, but I sincerely believe that if all of us—those from both countries—work together, as I believe we will, to maintain this quarantine the line can be held.

In the first place, the difficulties of terrain, the lack of roads and other transportation facilities, and the geography of the country itself seem to me to be in our favor in efforts to hold this northern quarantine line. Where all of these factors worked against us under our original program, I believe that they will be working for us under our revised program.

There are only a few highways and railways north and south across the main quarantine line. That line, as I think you know, runs from the vicinity of Tampico on the Gulf coast almost straight west to a point north and west of Guadalajara and then angles southwest to the Pacific coast. There are only three or four highways and railroad lines across this quarantine line. All north-south traffic that is going for any distance follows these main transportation arteries and these, of course, can be adequately patrolled. The quarantine line is being laid out so that it takes advantage of natural barriers such as rivers, mountain ranges, and other geographical features. The paths and trails run across these mountain ranges just as they run across the interior of the infected area, of course. But the traffic on these trails and byways is not through traffic. It is the village-to-village and neighbor-to-neighbor kind of traffic that is not going to transport the disease very many miles even if it goes on uninterrupted. This kind of traffic was fatal to our local quarantine lines inside the infected areas, as I pointed out previously, but it will hold relatively little danger, it seems to me, for our major quarantine line which is to prevent the spread of the disease from central Mexico into northern Mexico and the United States.

I believe that the agricultural economy of the country, which worked against us in our earlier program in the manner I have described, will be all in our favor in our efforts to hold this quarantine line. As I have mentioned, central Mexico, where foot-and-mouth disease is now established, is a land of small farms and many small villages. The people are poor and usually own only a few animals each. In that part of the country there are almost no ranges and there are very few beef cattle produced. North of the quarantine line, on the other hand, we have the beef cattle and open range area of Mexico. In northern Mexico is some of the best range land on the North American Continent. There are also some of the largest ranges in the world and some of the finest herds of beef cattle. In contrast to central Mexico, the cattle in the northern part of the country are primarily those in large herds belonging to wealthy and highly educated land owners who are fully aware of the menace of foot-and-mouth disease. In contrast to the people of central Mexico, those in northern Mexico are 100 percent behind the program to control and eradicate this disease. The big ranch owners in that part of the country have been the most active of any Mexicans in working to make this program a success.

The quarantine lines run almost exactly on the natural dividing line between the range lands of the north and the small, thickly populated farm lands of the south. The ranchers of the north know that it is to their own advantage to keep this disease out of their part of the country, and I think that we can be assured that our quarantine troops will have the backing not only of the influence and political support of the people in northern Mexico, but will also, very probably, have the physical assistance of the armed guards that most of these big ranchers maintain, to help in enforcing the quarantine line. In other words, by the very nature of our new operation we will be working with the wholehearted support of the people who can make it a success, rather than having to combat the indifference or opposition of the people whose cooperation is necessary as was the case under the previous program.

Another factor which will help us in holding the quarantine line in the north is that there is virtually no transportation of livestock of any kind from south to north in that part of Mexico. The large cities in Mexico, and a large percentage of the population of the country, are located in the central area where the disease now exists. That part of the country is a deficit area as far as livestock and livestock products are concerned. They don't produce enough for their own use so that there is a constant importation from northern Mexico and virtually no movement of livestock or livestock products from central to northern Mexico. There is so little traffic from south to north across this quarantine line, that in spite of the ineffectiveness of the quarantine which has previously been maintained, and in spite of the tremendous spread of the disease within the infected area, there has been no substantial spread of the disease across the north quarantine line. With the holding of a reinforced quarantine as our first major objective, I believe it will be entirely possible to prevent any spread northward across that line.

Most important in holding the quarantine line, however, is the fact that this will not be a mere line drawn on a map nor a mere single row of guards blocking highways at one point. South of the quarantine line there is to be a sterile zone, which will be, according to our recommendations, as wide as practicable. The quarantine line is now in many places 40 or 50 miles north of the nearest infection. At no point, as far as I am aware, is the disease actually existent right up against the quarantine line. In other words, there is a sterile zone already in existence for some miles south of the present quarantine line. This area, now disease-free, will be maintained and guarded by a second quarantine line to the south of that disease-free area. Every effort will be made to keep the disease from entering this sterile zone and any outbreaks which do occur there will be immediately eradicated by slaughter and burial. If this part of the program is carried out, it will prevent the disease from approaching within the immediate vicinity of the quarantine line, so that there will be almost no danger of local traffic carrying it across.

As it becomes possible to resume eradication operations these operations will be conducted so as to push the sterile zone continuously further and further south. In other words, we will start with a municipio, or a county, which is immediately south of the present sterile zone. It will be quarantined off. All infected and exposed livestock in that municipio will be slaughtered and buried. As soon as possible they will be replaced by new livestock. Then when we know that the area is clean and free of the disease, we will take another "bite" out of the infected area, moving the secondary quarantine line farther south and still further enlarging the sterile zone between the disease and our main quarantine line.

Knowing that our public relations have been poor in the past, we will see that the groundwork is laid carefully for the county-to-county eradication program that we will carry out in the future. The farmers in the area concerned will be solidly sold on the program before it is undertaken. With plenty of machinery on hand, animals will be disposed of promptly and their owners will be indemnified immediately. Mules will be on hand to be delivered to the farmer the day his oxen is killed. There may have to be relief food distributed for a period to take the place of livestock products which will not be available during the time the program is being carried out. In other words, in conducting this new campaign everything must be done to demonstrate dramatically to the Mexican farmer that it is to his advantage to have this disease eradicated from his community. By the time this has been done in two or three or a half dozen municipios, I believe we will find the job of education becoming progressively easier, so that as we

move farther south into the disease area we should have less and less trouble obtaining the cooperation that is so necessary.

That, gentlemen, is the strategy on which we expect to proceed in continuing this fight against foot-and-mouth disease. I have analyzed as best I can the factors which I believe contributed to our earlier failure and those which, it seems to me, hold out much encouragement for the success of our new program if it can be carried out as we have recommended.

There is one other important factor which I have not mentioned. That is the factor of research. Our committee has recommended, and I am sure the Bureau of Animal Industry intends to embark on, an intensified and greatly expanded program of research into the control and eradication of this disease. I am sure they will find improvements that can be made in our present methods. I am hopeful that they will make such progress that even before we have eliminated the disease from Mexico in the manner I have outlined they will have found some new method which will greatly facilitate the work.

There is another factor which is very important—the cooperation between our Department of Agriculture and the Mexican Government. Thus far that cooperation has been of the highest caliber. The present administration in Mexico has been and is today wholeheartedly and completely behind this program. I am sure that no one was more disappointed or more reluctant to give up our first control program than were those officials of the Mexican Government who were responsible for that Government's policies. I am sure we can count on their cooperation in the future, and if we have that, I believe we can do the job we have set ourselves to do.

Joseph K. Colton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article from the Gardner (Mass.) News announcing the retirement of my esteemed friend, Joseph K. Colton, for many years editor of that outstanding publication. Mr. Colton's career has been notable and his contributions to his paper, community, State, and Nation magnificent. I wish for him many happy years of retirement—a wish shared, I know, by all his friends and his legion of admirers, well-wishers, and a grateful public.

JOSEPH K. COLTON, WIDELY KNOWN EDITOR OF THE NEWS, ANNOUNCES HIS RETIREMENT—MEMBER OF STAFF 36 YEARS, RELINQUISHES POST BECAUSE OF HEALTH—ACHIEVED WIDE FAME AS VERSE WRITER—A. J. ABBOTT IS SUCCESSOR

Joseph K. Colton, managing editor and city editor of the Gardner News since 1928 and a staff member for 36 years, dean of the city's newspapermen and one of the most widely known men in the profession in the State, today announced his retirement from active work with the publication. His successor is Alfred J. Abbott, a member of the editorial staff for 16 years.

Although he is giving up the daily grind of a modern newspaper office because of his health, Mr. Colton, or Joe as he is known to his associates and to most readers of the News, will continue to contribute his widely read verses and other features when the occasion requires.

A newspaperman all his adult life, even before his graduation from Springfield Tech High School, his association with the profession covers a span of 43 years, having worked for the Springfield Union and Holyoke Transcript before being induced to come to the city by the late S. Walter Rogers, business manager of the News for many years.

Mr. Colton is directly responsible for the excellent standing of the publication among New England newspapers. His unfailing courtesy and understanding and unquestioned ability, his fair treatment with the city's best interests always uppermost in his mind instilled public confidence and trust that is vital to the success of any newspaper.

Quiet, friendly, and unassuming but forceful when necessary, Mr. Colton has built up a wide acquaintance and friendships among newspapermen and others throughout New England and elsewhere. His retirement will be felt keenly by the thousands of readers and his admirers.

Although his principal contributions were to the well-being of the News, his efforts were recognized by many columnists and other papers throughout the country. For some years, he was Gardner district correspondent for the Boston Globe, which featured on page 1 many of his holiday verses as well as numerous other articles, humorous stories, and sports features.

His verse, The Flag, was reproduced in countless papers and magazines; he provided John Kieran, former New York Times columnist, with material for a series on Lou Little, Columbia football coach, and Rabbit Maranville, with whom Mr. Colton played baseball at Springfield Tech High. Bill Cunningham has used Mr. Colton's rhythmic verses on several occasions in his column and his hundreds of features and editorials in the News have been clipped and collected by hundreds of readers.

One of the results of his verse writing in which Mr. Colton takes great pride is the custom of children in the schools of the city to recite his verses in assembly programs on holidays such as Memorial Day, Independence Day, Christmas, and Thanksgiving.

Gardner High School can thank Mr. Colton for the name "Wildcats" which identifies the school's sports teams. In the regime of Don Bennett back in the twenties, Mr. Bennett, quite a hunter, returned from a trip with a wildcat as a prize. Mr. Colton then and there decided that "Wildcats" would be a proper name for Bennett's lads, and "Wildcats" they have been ever since.

In the same field of sports, the retiring editor was responsible for a "Gardner-Fitchburg" letter in the Boston Evening Globe every year before the annual football game between the two rivals that attracted considerable attention and gave the local team a great deal of publicity throughout the State and New England.

LONG CAREER

Starting his writing career when a junior in his school as correspondent for the Springfield Union, he later went to Holyoke as Union representative in that city after which he obtained a position as reporter for the Holyoke Transcript. He joined the News staff in 1911 and was appointed editor in 1928.

In 1918 he entered the United States Army and was honorably discharged the following year. While in the service he wrote many verses for the newspaper at Camp Hancock, Ga., which he later published in book form under the title "Jimmy Boy, Recruit, and other verses". He is a charter member of Gardner Post American Legion and was the post's first historian.

Always remaining in the background, his name seldom appearing on the list of committees, Mr. Colton nevertheless has wholeheartedly supported every worth while community project and charitable drive held in the many years of his work at the city desk. His willingness to cooperate and his generous use of space to help others has endeared him to the many who have the pleasure of knowing him and coming in contact with him through the years.

The best wishes of his associates and his countless friends go with Mr. Colton in his retirement.

Mr. Abbott, his successor as managing and city editor, is a graduate of Gardner High School in the class of 1927. He attended New York University and joined the News staff in 1931 as a proofreader. He later was shifted to the news gathering and editing department and with the retirement of Mr. Colton takes over the full duties of the editor.

In that position he will carry on a long-established policy of the News, to supervise the gathering and publication of the news of the city and neighboring towns, and news in general, insofar as is humanly possible and with fairness to all.

What Congress Is Doing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me before the Toledo Federation of Women's Clubs:

My good friends, even with your much-talked-of feminine intuition, I doubt if any of you have any idea how glad I am to be here. Not only am I enjoying myself immensely with so many charming and beautiful ladies gathered together for the sole purpose, I am sure, of listening to me, but I am also glad to be here because this organization is, and has always been, a source of pride and inspiration to me.

I wonder if you realize that among men there is no exactly comparable organization in Toledo, or anywhere else. There is, to my knowledge, no example of a large number of men, belonging to different organizations with varying interests and purposes, who meet regularly, carry on business, and work together for the welfare of the community as a whole, completely forgetting or submerging their differences, or reconciling them if reconciliation is necessary. It is an indication of the intelligent and reasonable attitude of American women today. I congratulate each one of you. I hope you realize the importance of your membership in this group, and that you make every effort to transmit your ability to work together for the common good to those around you, to your children, your friends; yes, even to your husbands.

I realize the seeming hopelessness of teaching sweet reasonsbleness to husbands. I must say, in the defense of husbands, however, we usually behave better outside the home than in it, if there's any comfort in that.

Actually, I believe the women of the world can, and will, be the most powerful force in achieving world peace and world understanding. Once the women make up their minds they want peace and understanding more than anything else, no mere man, no group of mere men, will keep them from getting it. What I am saying is not just blarney. It is true, whether you like to think so or not.

"Never underestimate the power of a woman" is more than an advertising slogan for a Philadelphia newspaper. It is a fragment of the wisdom of the ages. And don't sit there beaming at me so sweetly, you all know it's the truth.

But it is high time we stopped talking about you, because you didn't come here to be insulted, or analyzed, or even patted on the back. You came to hear what a Congressman thinks Congress is doing. At least, you came to find out what a Congressman will say he thinks Congress is doing.

Now, there are always many versions of what Congress is doing. At the present time there are not only the interpretations given by the Republicans and the Democrats, not to mention the Wallacites. There are also the reactions of Americans, which differ in many instances from the ideas held by people of other nations who find their very lives affected by what goes on in the Senate and the House of Representatives in Washington.

In this country there are the Government workers in vast executive agencies, in and out of Washington, who may have a job or not, depending on what Congress is doing or what Congress does. There are the constituents who elect a Senator, or more particularly a Representative, and expect him to vote exactly as they would vote on each issue.

There are those who say Congress is doing nothing. They are equaled in number, sound and fury by those who insist Congress is doing too much! The first group says Congress is neglecting its duties. The second holds that the legislative branch is going far beyond the bounds set for it by the Constitution. They accuse Congress of exceeding its powers, of taking over the work of the executive branch, the judicial branch, and State and local governments.

These are the quantitative assessments of congressional activities.

The qualitative judgments vary just as widely. On the one hand we hear that the Congress is bent on destroying free enterprise. Not long ago I was accused of being in sympathy with the Communists. A constituent recently complained bitterly to me saying the Congress was obviously controlled by Jews. I didn't ask him about Mr. RANKIN whom he undoubtedly regards as the one free, upright Member of the House. On the other hand, the Congress is regarded by many advanced thinkers as quite out of date. If not that, it is the tool of the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Catholic Church, or the Ku Klux Klan. Congress has often been castigated as subservient to organized labor.

The man who said, "I don't care what they say about me, so long as they don't ignore me," would have been happy as a Congressman. What the Congress and its Members are doing invariably evokes comment. Everybody wants Congress to do something, but nobody ever likes what it does for very long at a time. I recently discovered the Library of Congress owns seventy-odd books lambasting Congress, but has been able to discover only one openly in favor of it. During the last 4 years there has been exactly one request for the book defending the legislative branch, while the eight volumes defending Jesse James are in constant demand.

This is no new situation. Walt Whitman defined what he called "the never ending audacity of elected persons." Mark Twain said his greatest fear was that he might become "that lowest form of human creatures," a Congressman. No wonder the sensitive soul who came to Congress full of idealism and determination to save the Nation in its hour of need sometimes falls into the mood of the old song, "I care for nobody, no, not I, and nobody cares for me."

Fortunately most Members of Congress have developed epidermis closely resembling the hide of the elephant. Perhaps the long-suffering elephant and the tough little donkey are particularly suitable emblems for political parties. It takes a thick skin to protect a legislator from the murderous barbs of criticism hurled at him. He must also guard himself from being engulfed in the enervating waves of adulation which pass over him infrequently, but which might lull him into a false sense of security, self-righteousness, or complacence. It is essential for a Congressman to be able to stand up under the torrents of abuse which fall on him, but perhaps even more important that he not stop work and begin celebrating when someone gives him a pat on the back. Congressmen have been known to break into tears of gratitude, actually go to pieces, when thanked or complimented for their work in Washington. The shock was just too much for them.

But, after all, I am not here to talk about what people think Congress is doing. I could give hundreds of examples, and then you could lecture me for awhile, since there are probably as many ideas on that score as there are distinguished women in this audience. I am here to give you my version of what Congress is actually accomplishing at the present time.

If we are to be scientific about our discussion, we must first stop and think, "What is Congress supposed to be doing?" I am not talking about just this Eightieth Congress now back in session. I mean any Congress. Strangely enough, many people, when asked what Congress is supposed to be doing, will reply "Pass laws."

The trouble with that answer, of course, is that it doesn't go far enough. It isn't wrong. It's incomplete. What laws? Dealing with what people, what situations? What are the limitations, other than the brain power of the individual Members?

Let us review the powers of Congress, which are the same today as they were when we studied civics back in high school. Only when we have in mind what Congress is permitted to do, and expected to do, can we judge whether or not the legislature is doing a good job.

We must remember, first of all, the provision of the tenth amendment, that the powers not delegated to the United States, nor prohibited to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people.

The Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States, but all such levies must be uniform throughout the States.

The Congress may borrow money on the credit of the United States. It may regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States, also with the Indian tribes. It is empowered to establish uniform rules of naturalization, and make laws on the subject of bankruptcies, to coin money, to determine its value, to set the value of foreign coin, and to fix the standard of weights and measures. It determines the punishment for counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States.

The establishment of post offices and post roads, the promotion of science and the useful arts by securing patents and copyrights, the punishment of piracies, felonies on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations, all these are within the power of the Congress.

The declaration of war, the raising and supporting of armies, the provision and maintenance of a navy, the calling forth of the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions, these are some of the responsibilities of the Congress. In addition, the Congress is empowered to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out its explicitly stated powers, as well as all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

In addition, of course, the Constitution provides that all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives. No money may be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriation made by law.

As they are stated in the Constitution, these acts are within the power of the Congress. They are not listed as duties. However, since no other body has the power to act in these matters, Congress, by implication, is duty bound to use its power when the welfare of the Nation depends upon some action being taken in these various fields.

Now with these powers, what is the Congress doing?

It is facing and preparing to act intelligently upon the two major problems affecting the people of this country today.

The first problem, and the most difficult and delicate one by all odds, is the maintenance of a stable world in which the people of the United States can live freely and confidently at peace with the people of other nations. There is little doubt, I believe, that peace and freedom depend upon economic stability in western Europe. The future of our foreign relations there and to a large extent, throughout the world, depends on what we do about helping the friendly European nations rehabilitate themselves in order to make the speediest possible economic recovery from World War II. The European recovery program is the base from which discussion of this problem begins. What Congress does will depend upon what the people of this country want. I believe you and the majority of my own constituents want to prevent human suffering now and later, if it is within your power to do so. I believe you want safeguards against graft and corruption in the use of money and materials intended for that purpose either here or abroad. I think you want to aid, not subsidize. I believe this is still a Christian Nation in which the vast majority of people try to live by the Golden Rule of Jesus, "Do unto others even as you would have others do unto you." If I am wrong, you and the rest of the people of the Ninth District will waste no time in telling me so.

The second major problem Congress is facing has many sides, and many prophets. Inflation is part of it. High taxes are another part of it. It is a close relative of the first problem, for high prices in this country are certainly in part a result of the tremendous amount of material being manufactured for use outside this country. The housing shortage is tied into the same pattern, and so are strikes and labor-management problems.

I believe Congress will attack this problem at the root, which is wild, uneconomical Government spending of the appeasement type. When things look bad, raise taxes, spend more money, and make the people think they are getting something for nothing.

Congress is facing the facts. It is reducing Government expenditures wherever the general welfare of the whole people will not be adversely affected. It is cutting out duplications, and they are thick as bees 'round a honeypot in the vast bureaus and agencies now operating in this country. Appropriation bills will no longer be gold mines for the departments. They will be sufficient to meet their real needs, and with the padding gone, the departmental budgets really have a new look.

The Congress will then be able to reduce taxes, perhaps by as much as three billion, or even four billion dollars. I have a feeling this will be the right time in Mr. Truman's estimation, to sign the bill.

These are the immediate problems which keep the Members of Congress busy all day, and sometimes awake all night. Besides, there are preparations for legislation which will come up in the future. Committees are meeting daily, holding hearings, talking over proposed bills, sifting reports, statistics, and

testimony, getting ready the documents which may become law or may be only the pioneer effort smoothing the way for legislation to be enacted 2, 3, or 5 years from now. During the special session I introduced a new veterans' housing bill, the fate of which will not be determined for some time. Almost every Member of Congress is working constantly either in committee, on correspondence, on the floor of the Senate or the House, or in conference with constituents or individuals who have information of value in preparing or voting on current measures.

I have listed the specific things Congress is doing today. From a long-range point of view, Congress is doing a great deal more, even, than I have described. If I were not convinced that the Congress served this greater, broader purpose, I would not consider my work there worth the headaches and heartaches it costs every conscientious Member, for Congress is trying to maintain its own sanity in the face of constant attack from special interest and pressure groups.

Congress is representing the individual citizens of the communities of this country who could be called the man on the street.

Congress is working constantly and tirelessly to give the people the kind of government they want. Congress is going to succeed, in spite of the almost overwhelming tide of pressure groups and special interests. The people want the American voluntary way of life, but only the people can make it work.

Congress is giving the people of the whole United States a voice in the Government. It is the safeguard against the bureaucrat, the demagogue, the rabble-rouser. Congress has always represented the whole people, and let us pray that in this great Nation of ours it always will.

Public Power Lauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I include as part of my remarks an article by Ruth Finney entitled "Public Power Lauded," which appeared in the San Francisco News of January 7, 1948, as follows:

PUBLIC POWER LAUDED
(By Ruth Finney)

WASHINGTON, January 2.—Public power got an unexpected good word today from Henry Luce's $1-a-copy magazine for businessmen, Fortune.

The January issue discusses the current power shortage at some length and concludes:

"Even while this power crisis has been developing, a purblind Congress has been hacking away at Federal power projects, cutting even maintenance funds below the bone, and decimating the staffs of power authorities. Some of the ancient antagonisms to publicly owned power have revived, and some private utilities are not without a hand in turning the clock back. As reported by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, newspaper columnists not of the radical stripe, one Senator remarked that around Washington early last summer you could not take a deep breath without getting a lung full of utilities' lobbyists. But the old cry that federally financed power is forcing free enterprise out of existence is hardly reflected in the $5,000,000,000 or so that the private power industry is committed to risk on the next turn of the United States economic wheel. In fact, this sum represents generating capacity greater than all Federal projects combined, and will cut the percentage of Federal power back to what it was in the middle thirties, before the biggest New Deal projects came in."

The article goes on to say that timing of Federal expenditures is important and that equipment manufacturers are loaded beyond capacity with orders from private utilities. But it continues:

"Nevertheless in the present tense situation, there seems no justification for some of the vindictive cuts made in land reclamation and power authority funds. Transformers at Bonneville are so hard pushed that they must be sprayed with a fire hose to cool them. Yet Bonneville last year had its budget cut from $26,000,000 to $8,600,000, a sum so inadequate that even the president of Puget Sound Power & Light, a competing private utility, pronounced it 'shocking.' This failure to extend or even to maintain Federal power projects threatens the Northwest's lusty new industrial development and has the West up in arms again.

"It may be well to recall that without the great blocks of Federal hydroelectric power that came into being through the late thirties, the war would have lasted much longer. For without big blocks of cheap power, the fantastic aluminum and magnesium schedules could never have been met, and the United States would never have been able to pile the atomic-bomb program on top of all the orthodox needs for power in wartime. The same situation faces the United States in winning the peace. All the most advanced industries, such as light metals, electrometal-surgical alloys, chemicals, aeronautics, and atomic fissionable materials, are tremendous users of power.

"One supersonic wind tunnel, vital in solving problems of supersonic flight, alone takes up to 100,000 horsepower. In the big economy that the United States is now building, the country cannot have too much power."

The President's Program for Making Democracy Work at Home Is Inspiring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with enthusiastic approbation, tempered only with reservations as to some phases of our official bipartisan foreign policy, to the address by President Truman last Tuesday.

It was with great interest that I found in the New York Post, a daily newspaper which has stood for democratic action for more than a century and has helped shape the thinking of four generations of Americans, an analysis of the state of the Union message which reflected my own emotions, written down and crystallized in the atmosphere of the Post editorial room.

I am inserting in the RECORD the editorial by my good friend, Ted Thackrey, who is editor and publisher of the Post, with pride and pleasure, and with the hope that Members will find opportunity to read it through for its good sense and enlightened approach. Millions of Americans will echo my own applause. The editorial is as follows:

STATE OF THE UNION
(By T. O. Thackrey)

The President's program for making democracy work at home, outlined in his report to Congress yesterday, is little short of inspiring.

Unfortunately, the same can hardly be said for his foreign policy, except for his earnest plea for support of the European recovery plan.

At home, the President is committed to the progressive advance of democracy; not by allying himself to its enemies, but to its friends.

Indeed, though the voice was that of the man from Missouri, the spirit of this aspect of his report on the Union was unmistakably that of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It was a bold challenge to reaction; forthright, specific, and without a single indication of the wavering so disheartening at an earlier period of his administration—the period of trial and error, mostly error.

Abroad, however, we continue to neglect the friends of democracy, while in Greece and in China we have allied ourselves to fascism. Indeed, the President called upon the Congress to increase the flow of American arms and men to shoot down Greek and Chinese citizens in revolt against the oppressions of their government.

Perhaps the saddest aspect of this tragic mistake is the fact that the only enthusiasm shown by the Republican-dominated Congress was for this aspect of the President's report, and this aspect alone.

Our excuse is that communism is on the rise in each of these unhappy countries, and that communism is antidemocratic; but we have failed to ask whether communism is any more antidemocratic than the governments we support; indeed we have failed dismally to consider the fact that our alliance with reaction has driven despairing democrats and liberals into the arms of communism—and that food, work, and political freedom are the allies of democracy—not bullets.

We say we are intervening for peace • • • but we are hastening the day when our national commitments are certain to collide with Russian national commitments in a clash of arms rather than a clash of ideologies or economics.

It will hardly be enough to determine then who fired the first bullet or which armed force was the initial aggressor.

And yet, all of the means to obtain peace in Greece and in China may be found by reshaping our foreign policy on an international basis within the framework of the United States.

Secretary of State Marshall, or the President of the United States himself, at such a grave moment in history, should boldly appear before the Security Council as well as the General Assembly to demand that the United Nations begin at once to assume the responsibility for maintaining the peace for which it was primarily founded.

They could, and should, make it clear that we are not merely willing, but desirous, of turning over to international authority, our "peace-making" commitments; that we will supply the means, and if necessary, the power to enforce United Nations decisions.

We should make it clear, as well, that every veto of action by a member of the Security Council will serve only to prolong and deepen our commitments on a national basis, and bring the risk of catastrophic world war that much closer.

There can be no doubt that if our approach is prompt, our intentions clear, and our determination to forge international agreements to replace national military adventure is undaunted by boycott or veto, we shall win a peaceful world, and advance the cause of law against chaos.

Until those steps are taken, even adoption of the progressive steps advocated by Mr. Truman will scarcely save a democratic world at home or abroad.

It is true, of course, that each failure of the Congress to enact the President's domestic program will weaken, if not destroy, our power to help ourselves, let alone others.

Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, continuation of our tax revenues by shifting the burdens from the least able to pay to the most able; a 75-cent-an-hour minimum wage; credit restriction; price-wage controls; national health insurance; Federal aid for schools; new vast Government projects for cheap power; advanced guarantees of civil rights: these are indeed measures for democracy, vital measures.

They will come because they must come—if we are wise enough in our foreign policies to gain the peaceful world in which they will have meaning.

Fuel-Oil Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
THE ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, January 14, 1948.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
United States House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The President has referred to me a copy of your telegram of December 6, 1947, which you kindly telephoned to the President's office on December 18. According to our records, the original telegram which you sent to Key West apparently was not received. I assure you that the problem raised in your telegram has received full attention.

Many steps have been taken to alleviate the oil situation in the last few months. Last October 1, when the impending domestic shortage of oil transportation facilities became evident action was taken to break out of lay-up and recondition at Government expense the 26 Mission-type T-2 tankers and 24 militarized T-2 type tankers remaining in the laid-up fleet. The Maritime Commission and the Department of the Navy acted with admirable speed, and since then these tankers are reentering active service as rapidly as they can be repaired in available yards. These 50 tankers are to be used in the Navy service, but they will release commercial tankers, now in Navy service, for the commercial trade. These are in addition to 100 tankers the Maritime Commission withdrew from lay-up and reconditioned earlier in 1947 to relieve the increasing demand for petroleum products. The Maritime Commission has also sold 55 Liberty tankers for repair and use by private operators. All usable laid-up fleet tankers are now either in operation, in repair yards being readied for operation, or have been sold to private operators for repair and operation.

The Coast Guard has cooperated in meeting the emergency by raising the permissible load line on tankers to increase carrying capacity. To increase barge movements of petroleum products and other essential commodities, the upper Mississippi was kept open 2 weeks longer than usual this fall and the Illinois River is being kept open all winter. The Office of Defense Transportation has, for many months, promoted vigorously a voluntary freight car production program, with emphasis on tank cars. This program is now very close to its goal of 10,000 freight cars per month.

It now seems probable that as soon as, or possibly before, these Government-owned tankers are all in operation, which should be in mid-February, the limiting factor on the movement of petroleum products in the United States will be basic supply, not transportation facilities.

The foreign sale of tankers was negotiated and approved in May and June, 1947, when American oil companies indicated no intention or interest in buying further tankers, and was made to alleviate the world petroleum transportation shortage. That is, at that date the only apparent method of getting these reserve fleet, commercial type tankers into use was through a sale—foreign. Tankers sold to a foreign country help the United States situation by relieving those countries of the necessity of relying on United States operators to supply their needs. The number of tankers under the United States flag is and has been more than adequate to meet all United States needs—if they were all used in the United States service.

Since the return on July 1, 1947, of petroleum products to the positive list of materials subject to export control, exports of major petroleum products have been subject to rigorous screening and limitation by the Department of Commerce, except for shipments to Canada. At present the United States is importing more petroleum and petroleum products than it is exporting.

Pursuant to the Hyde Park agreement, shipments of all commodities to Canada have not been subject to export control at any time during and since the war. However, negotiations with the Canadian Government have resulted in an agreement whereby the Canadian Government is limiting imports from the United States during the month of January to a daily rate equal to 50 percent of the daily rate of imports during the first quarter of 1947. Also, during this month, the Canadian Government will review their supply and inventory position, in cooperation with appropriate United States officials, to determine the appropriate percentages for February and following months which would result in Canadian needs for the fuel season being met on a basis of parity with American consumers.

The demand for petroleum products, and in particular fuel oil, has increased tremendously since the end of the war. The increase has been far greater than any of the forecasts made by the industry. There apparently is no possibility this winter of increasing supplies to the level needed to meet all demands in full, unless consumers can be persuaded to reduce their consumption significantly below the current level of demand.

Several important steps have been taken to secure voluntary cooperation for a rationing program. Through the National Petroleum Council, an industry organization created by the Secretary of the Interior, and the American Petroleum Institute, a petroleum conservation campaign has been launched covering the entire United States, except for the west coast and the Gulf States. The Council is also studying possible industry agreements and plans of action for distributing scarce petroleum supplies, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 395.

At the suggestion of the Department of the Interior, emergency fuel coordinators are being appointed by the governors of the affected States. Later this week, the Department of the Interior is holding a meeting of these coordinators, their industry advisers and other representatives of the industry to discuss methods of facilitating equitable distribution and of preventing or mitigating cases of acute hardship.

If I can be of further assistance to you, please call upon me.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. STEELMAN.

Houses Falling Apart, Vets Charge—Call on Representative Davis for Backing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of Congress from the floor of the House a matter of much interest to the veterans of the fifth district of Georgia which I represent. When I returned home in December after the extra session of Congress adjourned, State Commander Joe Crespi of the AMVETS, and Housing Committee Chairman Bill Bowdoin, requested me to accompany them and a group of veterans on a visit to inspect some houses purchased by veterans in a subdivision in the suburbs of Atlanta. In this particular subdivision 192 houses have been erected, and practically all of them have been sold to veterans. The warranty deeds conveying the title to the houses which I examined contained the provision that for a specified period the property conveyed can be sold only to veterans.

An inspection of property disclosed that the lots themselves, although small, are rather good lots, the streets are well laid off, and there are a number of trees in the subdivision, which has practically all city conveniences.

My information concerning the houses erected on these lots is that they were originally erected as part of a Government housing project at Portsmouth, Va., in 1942, and were used as defense housing so long as there was need for them; that when that need ended they were sold, were knocked down and brought to this subdivision and reerected.

The houses have four rooms and bath. There is no subflooring and no storm sheathing. The inside walls are of composition board. The floor sleepers are 2 by 6's, and they are not set into the sills, but simply rest on cleats nailed to the sills, with a nail approximately every 30 inches. These houses are underpinned with cement blocks, and each house has a small porch.

The houses were sold at prices ranging from $6,250 to $6,950, I was told.

Bob Lewin, a reporter for the Atlanta Constitution, was one of those inspecting the houses. As a result of the inspection, he wrote an article describing the houses, and giving the contentions of the veterans on the one hand, the developers of the subdivision, and the appraisers who valued the houses on the other hand, and setting forth the observations of the AMVETS officials who sponsored the inspection. Under leave previously granted I insert herewith this newspaper article:

HOUSES FALLING APART, VETS CHARGE—CALL ON REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS FOR BACKING

(By Bob Lewin)

Some of the veterans who bought homes in the Georgian Hills subdivision have called on Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, of the Fifth District, to help solve their problem of having gotten houses which they say are "falling apart."

Faced with the high prices of new housing, veterans snapped up offerings in the 190-home subdivision, created with prefabricated houses used during the war on a Government project in Virginia.

The houses were bought by a contractor, knocked down, transported to Atlanta and reassembled on new foundations in the subdivision, created for the special purpose. They paid from $6,250 to $6,650 for the four-room, bath, and porch houses. The Government, at the end of the war, sold the houses from original sites at $650.

DAVIS, one of a party of six, toured the 190-home subdivision, near Chamblee, shook his head in dismay, and said he didn't know what could be done.

"I'm not an expert on housing," he said, "but the houses I've looked at don't seem to be worth the money paid for them. Of course, they're second-hand homes, and you can't expect to find the same conditions you would in a new home".

Headed by Joe Crespi, Georgia State commander of AMVETS, the irate homeowners banded together and leveled blasts at the Veterans' Administration, VA housing appraisers, and the Federal Emergency Housing project.

Complaints lodged by 12 to 15 of the vets stated that walls were cracking, floors were sagging, doors were pulling away from their jambs, kitchen cabinets were coming off, and paint was peeling from the outside of the houses.

"We paid $18.50 to appraisers certified by the VA to come out here and look at these homes, and they let us down all the way," said Hilton Moore, commander of the new Georgian Hills AMVETS post.

A poll of several of the VA appraisers who certified the homes revealed they felt the vets got their money's worth. The appraisers, all of whom are with large Atlanta concerns, and have had over 25 years' building experience, said they O. K.'d the homes because of the desperate housing shortage and the low prices.

Ben Burgess, one of the appraisers, said: "The materials that went into these houses are some of the best available. The framing is better than you can buy today anywhere. They were built well to start with, and some were entirely reconditioned, because they were about 4 years old. I still think we gave a fair appraisal."

J. S. Shaw, another appraiser, said:

"There's not a perfect house built. Some things are bound to happen. I think we appraised the homes fairly, and still think the veteran got as much as they could for the money paid."

O. H. Werner said, "It's one of the best buys in this district, in a lovely section."

Perplexed by not knowing where to turn, the vets charged the Federal Emergency Housing project with neglect in allowing the homes to be shipped so far. They said this caused undue wear and tear.

"I can't deny that in some cases there was careless work," said Edward A. Judge, vice president of the Georgian Hills Co.. "But we tried to remedy these faults wherever we could. Some of the faults just can't be fixed."

Home owners in the subdivision admitted they had been fully warned about the homes before they were purchased, and that there had been no misrepresentation.

"We knew they were second-hand, 4-year-old homes," they said. "But we didn't expect the houses to fall apart, and we don't want the company to pull out and leave us with a load of repairs to make ourselves."

Judge, who has supervised the project since it was taken over from the Henry C. Beck Co. in a deed in lieu of foreclosure, said his company has lost money on the deal.

"Our books are open," he said. "The houses cost about $650. We paid Henry Beck Co. $3,840 for dismantling, transportation to Atlanta, and reerection. That comes to about $4,500. We spent about $1,700 on the lots. They were raw land. Today they have paving, lights, water, sewerage, landscaping and gas. And we didn't get a penny rebate from the county. Figure it out for yourself. In addition, there were extras, like tile, porches, chromed fixtures and so on."

At a veterans housing meeting held December 2 in the Fulton County courthouse, Bill Bowdoin, State housing chairman of AMVETS, lashed out at what he termed "the reputable and competent men" who allowed an appraisal figure price of $6,250 to $6,650 to be put on the homes.

Bowdoin says he has been told the houses could be built for about $5 a square foot. This would amount to about $3,250, and would include subflooring, storm sheathing, doors on closets, and novelty weatherboarding. The subdivision houses do not have the above features.

In a statement issued last year, C. Arthur Cheatham, director of veterans' service for Georgia, said:

"Georgia veterans have lost between $1,500,000 and $2,000,000 so far through faulty construction of postwar homes built with GI loans. But there isn't a great deal either the State or the VA can do, and that is why it is so important that veterans think not twice, but three or four times, before they go ahead and build homes these days."

Chief source of the trouble, according to Judge, has been the bad weather, and the sudden change from the long wet spells to the cold dry spell. Floor furnaces, delivering hot air into the homes, have caused warping and expansion.

The veterans, however, lay the blame on slipshod construction, and refer to the workmanship as deplorable. They point to an outside kitchen stairway supported by only one concrete brick laid loosely in the dirt.

"Look at that," they say. "One rain, and the whole stairway will collapse."

They point to cracks in the flooring, with cold air coming through, and the ground visible underneath. They point to fireproof insulation wrapping that burns.

And according to Crespi, they're not going to stop pointing, and they're not going to stop raising their voices until someone, somehow, can do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, as the controversy concerning these houses has proceeded, another Atlanta paper, the Atlanta Journal, on Sunday, January 11, contained an article carrying a further statement by AMVETS State Commander Joe Crespi, and also a statement by Veterans' Administration loan guaranty officer for Georgia, Robert J. Taylor.

I insert this article herewith:

CRESPI CRITICIZES HOUSE APPRAISING—AMVETS CHIEF SAYS SYSTEM NEEDS CHANGE IF PHYSICAL CONDITION OF BUILDING IGNORED

Joe Crespi, AMVETS State commander, expressed surprise Saturday at a statement by Veterans' Administration officials that the VA guarantees loans—not houses.

Robert J. Taylor, VA loan guaranty officer for Georgia, advised veterans Friday to see for themselves whether a house is well built and if they do not know enough about it to judge, to get the opinion of someone who does know.

"Since the veteran pays to the VA the appraisal fee which is later paid to the appraiser for the veteran, it seems to me that the latter is already employing someone to look after his interests," Mr. Crespi said. "When a house begins to show serious signs of material defects which could not have been detected by the buying veteran, in the space of weeks from the date of purchase, then I say that the lists of appraisers be revised or investigated."

According to Mr. Taylor, the appraiser who is paid by the veteran, only determines if the price of the house is in line with present market conditions. He said that the VA is essentially a credit organization that guarantees the loan and thereby improves the veteran's credit rating for the loan.

"The veteran needs a place to live, and whether he likes it or not, is compelled to buy it," Mr. Crespi declared. "Having paid for the service of appraisal he should be protected.

"Under the present VA system, the so-called veteran appraiser merely 'judges' according to the market and the cost in general of a home. Certainly no attention is being paid to homes of shoddy make-up or design when the stamp of approval is placed in the careless manner that it is. Thus the veteran buyer, the Government, and the lending agency are all three victims—the first being the less able to stand the loss

Mr. Speaker, the troublesome point in this controversy seems to be that the veterans who purchased these houses thought that they were being protected by the Veterans' Administration appraisers against defects which later showed up in the houses, while the appraisers, according to Mr. Taylor contend that it is the responsibility of the veteran purchasers themselves to determine whether a house is well built, and that the responsibility of the appraiser is only to determine if the price of the house is in line with present market conditions.

I believe that additional protection will be afforded veterans if legislation is adopted, or regulations promulgated, which will require the appraiser in every instance to furnish a statement concerning the construction of the house along with the appraisal report, for the use of the purchaser, and in that statement direct attention to any faulty construction, and to items which subsequently may cause dissatisfaction, as was the result in these particular cases. Many purchasers of homes are not familiar with details of construction, and are not in position to discover for themselves defects of construction. I urge that proper action be taken to afford further protection to veterans and to prevent occurrences of the kind complained of in these newspaper articles.

Help Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent excellent editorial from the Boston Traveller on the subject of the Finnish debt:

HELP FINLAND

Finland is as sorely stricken a country today as any on the face of Europe. It has lost many of its farms, its homes, its resources, its wealth but it still keeps all its honor. This very month it met as always its debt payment of $156,000 to the United States.

Finland is outside the Marshall plan but it is inside the circle of humanity. If we can be generous to every other nation, why not be generous to the one nation that has always kept faith with us? Why not cancel the Finnish debt?

Service in War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Independent, of Elizabeth City, N. C.:

SERVICE IN WAR AND PEACE

The busiest men in town these days are aviators and crewmen of the United States Coast Guard air station.

In the past few days the men of the air station have:

1. Delivered lines by helicopter from the grounded trawler *Charlie Mason* to two Coast Guard vessels off Ocracoke in an unsuccessful effort to get the ship floated again.

2. Carried a doctor to Hatteras to treat a sick man there.

3. Rescued a Navy pilot from the water almost before he had a chance to get his clothes wet after he had crash-landed into the Albemarle sound.

4. Successfully delivered life-saving rabies serum to a merchant vessel crewman aboard a ship 150 miles off Hatteras, at night.

5. Attempted to save another life of a Navy pilot by patroling waters of the Albemarle sound after the pilot had crash-landed.

6. Assisted in the air work necessary to bring a Coast Guard cutter into contact with a disabled tanker off the coast in the vicinity of Frying Pan Shoals.

Next week President Truman will present his budget figures to Congress. How the Coast Guard will fare in his requests, we have no way of knowing, but we do hope our friend, Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER will fight tooth and nail to see that the Guard's budget is not subjected to the usual snipping by Congressmen who are not familiar with the work the Coast Guard does. Maybe if the solons who delight in limiting financially the effectiveness of the Coast Guard could be given a review of the activities just at the Elizabeth City station, their minds would be changed.

On our front page today are two pictures which testify to activities of the Coast Guard in other areas. One shows sea operations and the other shows air operations. We are printing those to demonstrate to local readers that the Guard service is just as active on other fronts as it is on our own, and there is no reason to expound at great length on local operations.

Coast Guard mercy missions are legend among the people of the Albemarle.

We hope that Congress will review these matters of the Coast Guard and stop looking on it as a little brother to the rest of the services, deserving only the hand-me-downs. Coast Guardsmen during the war fought just as effectively and died just as dead as Navy men, Army men, or Marines. In time of peace it seems that the Coast Guard is the only service that has any outstanding record of actual benefit to the people in their daily lives. The rest are gearing themselves for specialized service in time of war.

During the war when the Army and Navy said they were too busy to fuss with helicopter operations, the Coast Guard took the rotary-wing infant and made a grown-up man out of it. Now the other services are profiting by Coast Guard development of the helicopter.

We think the guardsmen deserve extra consideration for their peacetime service, and we believe Congress should be educated to the point where they will harbor the same belief and so that when the budget scissors start snipping they will cut only the figures of these agencies of the Government (and politics) that are of no use to the people.

Newspaper in Great Dairy State of Wisconsin Speaks Up for Modification of Taxes on Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 8, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, when the Milwaukee Journal, one of Wisconsin's leading newspapers, complains about taxes on oleomargarine that makes news. The Journal article follows:

A Milwaukee housewife, who finds it impossible to provide near-dollar butter for a family of six on a meager budget, asks three questions about oleomargarine:

Why is it impossible to buy in many Milwaukee stores? Why, when you can get it, is the price so much higher than in Illinois? And why don't the manufacturers color the margarine themselves and save the housewife a messy job?

The reason many Milwaukee stores do not sell oleo is that, to do so, they must have both a State and Federal license. The State license costs $25; the Federal, $6. A store has to be sure of selling considerable oleo before it buys these licenses.

The reason the price is higher here than in Illinois is that Wisconsin has a tax of 15 cents a pound. Furthermore, a wholesaler, in addition to paying the Federal license fee of $200, must pay a Wisconsin license fee of $500. The high State fee, added to the high tax, means a considerable boost in price.

The reason oleo comes to the consumer white lies in the fact that there is a special Federal tax on colored margarine. There are also special fees for wholesalers and retailers of the colored product. The Federal tax on white margarine is one-quarter cent a pound. The tax goes up to 10 cents a pound if the margarine is yellow.

The Federal license for wholesalers is $200, if they sell only white oleo; if they sell the colored, the fee is $480. The Federal retail license similarly goes up from $6 to $48.

The way to get manufacturers to color their margarine at the factory is to get the special Federal tax and license fee repealed. The way to get cheaper oleo available in more places is to get both the State and the Federal taxes and license fees largely reduced or removed altogether.

Mr. Speaker, these facts provide ample evidence that the proposals for modification of oleomargarine taxes involve simple principles of economics and free enterprise.

A Series of Student Guest Editorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Oregon Daily Journal, published in Portland, Oreg., in my district, is publishing a series of student guest editorials, as explained in the editorial included below as a part of my remarks. Believing that the views of these young people are worthy of a wide circulation, I include an editorial entitled "Freedom for All," by Atwood Jones, student of Jefferson High School in Portland:

A SERIES OF STUDENT GUEST EDITORIALS

The attitude taken by all-too-many adults that high-school students are primarily interested in football games, parties, fads, and loafing around the corner drugstore is a serious reflection on the understanding and knowledge of grown-ups.

As a matter of fact, most high school students do more serious thinking upon the problems that beset us than do many adults. It is true they may lack the experience of grown-ups (time will give them that), but it also is true they approach problems with fewer prejudices and less selfishness than many of their elders.

Today in the guest editorial column the Journal runs the first of a series of editorials written by Portland high school students. These editorials represent the best thinking of the students—and it's pretty good. The writers choose their own topics and the winners are selected by student judges.

The problem of racial prejudices as discussed by Atwood Jones is an old and difficult one. We aren't born with such prejudices. How do they grow up within us? Read the editorial by Editor Jones. You answer him in your own mind and own conscience.

[From the Oregon Daily Journal, Portland, Oreg., January 5, 1948]

TODAY'S GUEST EDITORIAL

FREEDOM FOR ALL

(By Atwood Jones, student, Jefferson High School)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following editorial selected as the best by a jury of Jefferson high-school students, is the first in a series of guest editorials by Portland high-school students. The students pick their own subjects, and no suggestions or deletions are made.)

Democracy is one of the most abused words in the world today. Webster defined it as "the rights and privileges of private freedom for all." Thus each individual should have equal rights for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In a democracy every human being is so important that his value to society cannot be measured in nonhuman terms.

If America had freedom for all, Negroes would not have to attend separate schools in the South and be taught by teachers whose salaries are, in comparison with those of white teachers, a disgrace to humanity. Here

is a brief comparison prepared by the National Education Association for the school year of 1943–44. In Mississippi white teachers were paid, on the average, $1,107, whereas Negro teachers received $342; in Texas white teachers received $1,349 compared with $946 for Negro teachers.

The Negroes have been legally free from slavery about 75 years. In this interval, in spite of handicaps, disadvantages, and many set-backs, the Negro has given much to American culture. Most people are familiar with the names of such great Negro athletes as Joe Louis, Jesse Owens, and Jackie Robinson, or have heard the remarkable singing of Dorothy Maynor, Paul Robeson and Marian Anderson. Probably few people, however, know that Mary M. Bethune, educator; Ernest Wilkens, Jr., mathematician; and Dr. Perry Julian, research chemist, have made equally great contributions to our American culture.

Recently, theatergoers enjoyed an unusual treat in the music of the Portland Symphony Orchestra which accompanied Miss Carol Brice. Her magnificent performance was roundly applauded by the audience, but as a guest of the City of Roses she was not welcomed with similar hospitality. This great singer was refused service at two of Portland's well-known restaurants because she was a Negro. Even after she explained that she was a guest soloist with the Portland Symphony, Miss Brice was still denied service.

Prejudice such as was experienced by Miss Brice not only works a hardship on those it is directed against, but it also works harm on those who practice it. People who allow themselves to be controlled by hatred of others on the basis of race, creed, or color cannot themselves enjoy the full meaning of freedom.

Americans must eliminate from their own country prejudices, segregations, and discriminations before they criticize other nations for their failure to provide for full political and economic freedom.

Butter Versus Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, naturally with the high price which prevails today on butter, the question is being pressed hard by the people manufacturing oleomargarine as a substitute for butter.

Senator FULBRIGHT has announced his intent to introduce a resolution calling for rescinding of all Federal taxes and license fees on manufacture, sale and coloring of oleomargarine. It seems to me that this is a matter which deserves at least considered judgment before action is taken by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include herewith a letter signed by John Burnham, executive secretary of the North Dakota Dairy Industries Association:

NORTH DAKOTA DAIRY
INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,
Fargo, N. Dak., December 29, 1947.
Representative CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There is one matter which, I feel, should be brought to the attention of the North Dakota congressional delegation. Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas recently made, on the Senate floor, a spirited attack on the dairy industry, more particularly on the butter industry. He announced (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 18, 1947, pp. 11590 to 11593, inclusive) his intent to introduce a resolution calling for rescinding of all Federal taxes and license fees on manufacture, sale, and coloring of oleomargarine.

Senator FULBRIGHT, a Rhodes scholar and university president, makes very convincing his argument that:

1. To make it easier for the public to buy 35-cent oleomargarine instead of $1-per-pound butter would ease the rising living costs of consumers;

2. It would release more milk for other uses, such as fluid milk, cheese, and dried milk powder.

3. The butter industry has no right to enforce its belief that use of yellow coloring should be denied by law to a competitor of butter.

4. Oleomargarine today is as nutritious and pure as butter, and should not be penalized as an inferior product.

Those arguments seem unanswerable until one studies them awhile, but first a little background on North Dakota's dairy industry:

There are 475,000 milk cows in the State, with milch cows on 58,653 of the State's 59,650 farms. Milk production is 1,900,000,000 pounds, and the State produces between forty-eight and forty-nine million pounds of butter annually, making the State seventh in butter production. Leaders are Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Illinois, and Missouri, in that order.

With a relatively sparse population, North Dakota has no large fluid milk markets, and its cheese production is a small 155,000 pounds annually.

Now, to answer Senator FULBRIGHT, from the viewpoint of North Dakota's dairy industry:

First of all, North Dakota milk is produced largely from small herds on farms spread widely apart. Milk is separated on the farm and the cream is sent to processors for making butter. That type of milk production is entirely different from the highly concentrated production in Minnesota, Wisconsin, parts of Iowa, and New York State.

That production could not profitably be picked up as whole milk by trucks for processing in a condensary, dried-milk plant, or for fluid milk production. Butter is the one outlet feasible for North Dakota milk. To let down the bars on a vegetable-fat competitor would be a serious blow to this State's dairy industry.

Secondly, to maintain this butter industry in North Dakota is exceedingly important at this time. We have had years of high production of flax and cereal grains, a trend toward large, mechanized grain farms. You, Congressman ROBERTSON, realize that a post-war trend to diversification and balanced agriculture is imperative to build up our soil, to give a dry-year living to the farm family, to bring security to this farm family.

Thirdly, oleomargarine is produced largely by five or six large companies which have virtually a monopoly on its production. In all fairness, isn't the security of the agriculture of a dozen States more to be considered than the profits to half a dozen corporations? And, too, hasn't the Federal Government spent enough in soil-building practices so that it should not itself be the instrument for destroying the best soil-building practice of all—the maintenance of livestock on our farms, with organic matter restored to the soil?

Fourthly, butter even at $1 per pound is not out of line with the prices of other foods, household conveniences, automobiles, clothing, and other necessities of living. Why make a scapegoat out of butter alone? The very fact that the number of dairy cattle in the Nation and in North Dakota has declined steadily (6 percent in the Nation from January 1, 1946, to January 1, 1947, and a 7-percent decline in the same period in North Dakota) testifies to the fact that the dairy farmer is not making an outrageous profit. If he were, he'd milk more cows instead of less.

And lastly, I believe that the wage scales in industry today make $1 butter much less of a hardship than Senator FULBRIGHT suggests. The farmer and the laboring man in America's cities should both realize that a time of full employment for one is a time of good prices for the other, and conversely that time of low wages and unemployment means low prices for farm products.

I believe I can speak for more than 58,000 North Dakota dairy farmers, as well as for our 130 milk plants, in saying that we are watching alertly what becomes of this oleo attack on the butter industry.

Very truly yours,
NORTH DAKOTA DAIRY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,
JOHN BURNHAM,
Executive Secretary.

Resolutions Adopted at 1948 Annual Meeting of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives has recently concluded its 1948 annual meeting in Chicago. This great farm organization, through its member groups, represents some 2,500,000 American farmers.

I am sure that the resolutions adopted at this meeting are of interest to all Members of Congress and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include them herewith:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT 1948 ANNUAL MEETING OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES

The following resolutions were adopted at the 1948 annual meeting of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives at Chicago January 5 to 9.

Policies adopted by the national council remain in effect until rescinded or superseded by subsequent action. Therefore, these resolutions constitute an addition to established policy. They are in no sense a complete statement of such policy.

FOREIGN AID

The national council recognizes the needs of people of war-stricken areas and the necessity for the United States to assist in the alleviation of suffering and in the rehabilitation of production and industry.

We urge that in such effort it be the policy of the United States to encourage maximum self-help within countries and that our major emphasis be in helping the peoples of such countries to help themselves.

CURRENCY EXCHANGE FOR FOREIGN SALES

In bringing about a restoration of markets for agricultural products, ways and means must be developed for the private sale of such products in exchange for local currencies.

To that end export corporations, both public and private, should be organized and encouraged with facilities for handling such foreign currencies over a long-time period and making available to exporters some immediate return in domestic currency. The development of such a program should be coordinated with the foreign-aid program and the private sale of export commodities should replace Government handling as rapidly as circumstances will permit.

PURCHASE PROGRAM FOR FARM PRODUCTS

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives urges that farm products in surplus supply, either raw or processed, be included in purchase programs under aid or relief programs that may be established by Congress.

INFLATION CONTROLS

We believe that the most effective brake on inflation is high production by each segment of our economy and an informed people practicing self-discipline in buying in their own best interests.

We believe that free markets and full production provide the basic guidance for allocating material for production and consumption in an expanding economy rather than rationing and price control.

To be effective, efforts to control inflation must be supplemented by sound monetary, credit, and fiscal policies, and economy in public spending. During the period of extensive foreign aid, we recognize the need for continued export controls over certain scarce items.

UPGRADING THE AMERICAN DIET

It shall continue to be council policy to support upgrading of the American diet through research, education, merchandising, improved marketing techniques, promotional campaigns and the production of ample supplies of foodstuffs of superior nutritional quality.

The council believes improvement in the American diet is one effective way of preventing burdensome farm surpluses. In the long run the best food supply can be produced by the voluntary efforts of farmers operating in a sustained or increasing market.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

In keeping with the established policy of the national council, we recommend that the farmer cooperatives of the country take steps to acquire ownership of the banks for cooperatives and pledge our support to any plan which is within the resources of the farmer cooperatives to carry out. During the time ownership is being acquired by farmers and farmer cooperatives, Government capital should not be withdrawn so rapidly as to impair or endanger adequate credit service by the banks.

We approve the general principles of the plan developed by the joint committee representing the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, and the national council, which plan makes it legally possible to gradually replace the Government capital in the banks for cooperatives with farmer and farmer cooperative capital.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CONTRACTS

We recognize the substantial benefits that have accrued to agriculture through Government support loans against various commodities which have been administered for the most part through Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to contracts between Commodity Credit Corporation and borrowers, including farmers' cooperatives.

We do feel, however, that the contractual provisions between Commodity Credit Corporation and various farmers cooperatives providing for such loans, and the administration of these loans, have resulted in the exercise by Commodity Credit Corporation of unwarranted authority in the administration of the internal affairs of such cooperatives.

We believe that, in these contracts and in such operations, Commodity Credit Corporation should be concerned only with the safeguarding of its funds. We do not believe that the legislation authorizing these support loans either provides a mandate or gives authority to Commodity Credit Corporation to interfere in any way with the internal affairs of farmer cooperatives involved.

We believe that these borrowing cooperatives, like all farmer cooperatives, should be owned, controlled, and managed by their farmer members and that anything in the contracts mentioned or in administrative action which takes away this independence is unwarranted by legislative intent, is contrary to true cooperative principles, and is highly objectionable and dangerous to the public interest.

SECTION 32 FUNDS

The national council reiterates its policy that section 32 funds of the Agricultural Adjustment Act should be used only for purposes of expanding the utilization of farm products as provided in the act, and that unexpended balances remaining at the end of any fiscal year should be retained in the fund for use in subsequent years.

RESEARCH AND MARKETING

With respect to the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 the council recommends:

1. The appropriation for the 1949 fiscal year of $19,500,000.

2. In administering the marketing and research program, the United States Department of Agriculture should clearly outline its objectives and over-all policies so that proposed projects can be appraised on their merit as a part of the general research and marketing program.

Priority in the allocation of funds should be given to projects dealing with marketing and utilization, including new uses, marketing efficiency, marketing margins, quality improvement, consumer preference and human nutrition, and to urgent projects in production such as insect control and plant disease.

3. The appointment of a majority of producer representatives (including farmer cooperative representatives) on all committees.

4. A policy utilizing existing public research agencies insofar as practicable in the allocation of funds. Contracts should be made with private agencies when such is advantageous from the standpoint of time, economy, or quality of work.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND CONSERVATION OF WATER RESOURCES

There exists a grave shortage of electric power for rural and urban people, and a serious need for flood control, conservation of water for irrigation and domestic uses, the extension of navigation on our navigable rivers, and for additional reclamation projects in our national economy. We urge that in the building by the Federal Government of multi-purpose dams on the great rivers of our Nation a coordinated program be developed, embracing flood control, reclamation, navigation and hydroelectric energy, as necessary and essential to the future welfare of the people of this country, particularly to our farmers as a means of increasing production of food and fiber.

DOUBLE TAXATION OF CORPORATE INCOME

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives favors the elimination of double taxation of corporate income.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

The livestock population of this country is endangered by the foot-and-mouth disease which is now prevalent in Central Mexico.

The method of control and complete eradication of this disease is well known to our Government and has been successfully used to eradicate all outbreaks that have occurred in this country.

To protect our livestock and assure our future food supply, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives insists that our Government, in cooperation with the Government of Mexico develop and carry out a program that will completely eradicate this disease from the North American Continent.

SOCIAL-SECURITY COVERAGE FOR EMPLOYEES OF FARMERS' COOPERATIVES

Farmer cooperative associations operate in an important segment of the American system of private enterprise and the conduct of their several businesses reflects comprehensive activities in many fields which call for employment of persons in diversified positions and responsibilities.

However, there appears to have arisen some question as to what employees of farmer cooperative associations may be exempt from the provisions of the Federal Social Security Act under the provisions of said act applicable to agricultural labor.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives believes that all employees of farmer cooperative associations whose duties are not clearly within the exemptions specified in the act, should be definitely regarded as employees covered by the act and subject to its provisions.

FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO NATIONAL TAX EQUALITY ASSOCIATION

Farmer cooperatives have made their records of receipts and disbursements for the last 12 years available to the House Small Business Committee. Likewise that committee has officially requested the National Tax Equality Association to furnish to it the names of the contributors to the National Tax Equality Association and records of its receipts and disbursements for the past 2 years.

The public in general and farmers in particular are entitled to know who seek to destroy farmer cooperatives and to divide and alienate segments of private industry of this country.

Therefore, the delegate body of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives vigorously urges that the Congress of the United States take action to require the National Tax Equality Association to furnish to the Congress the names and addresses of each and every contributor and the amount contributed by each to the National Tax Equality Association during the past 2 years, together with a complete record of all receipts and disbursements for the like period.

PLANKS IN PARTY PLATFORMS

Farmer cooperative associations have been recognized and encouraged by the American people in the public interest under the administrations of the Federal Government by both the great political parties of the United States.

For many years the Democratic and Republican Parties have recognized by their actions the fundamental right of farmers to cooperatively market their own farm products and cooperatively purchase their own farm supplies.

In view of this long record, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives hereby calls upon the leadership of both great political parties to reaffirm, by platform pledge and prompt affirmative performance, their belief and faith in farmer cooperative associations.

At the same time, this council denounces the activities of those individuals who have violated the pledges of their parties by attempting to cripple agricultural credit and by seeking to destroy the right of farmers to cooperatively market their own products and to cooperatively purchase their own farm supplies.

APPOINTMENTS TO IMPORTANT PUBLIC POSITIONS

It has been the consistent policy of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives to examine the qualifications of men seeking appointment to important public positions.

having to do with agriculture and to either approve or disapprove those qualifications without endorsing a particular candidate as such.

During the next 4 or 5 years, there will be several new appointments made to many administrative agencies having to do with agriculture, in particular to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives will continue this policy and will investigate nominees proposed for important public positions, including commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and make appropriate representations to the President of the United States concerning its findings.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, on its own initiative, will propose to the President the names of persons who in its judgment are properly qualified for appointment to important public positions.

RAIL WAGE RATE PROCEDURE

Labor costs constitute a substantial portion of all rates charged for the transportation of goods and services; therefore, agricultural shippers and receivers have a vital interest in the negotiations for increased wages, changes in operating rules, and in decisions of arbitration boards, fact-finding boards and commissions. As shippers and receivers, we are not convinced the public interest is adequately served or protected under procedures followed up to this time.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives will study the procedures involved and at the appropriate time will petition Congress to introduce and pass legislation to correct the abuses that may be considered damaging to the public interest and to the shippers and receivers of farm commodities and farm supplies.

INFORMATION ON SHIPPING COSTS

In view of the growing importance of transportation to the successful marketing and distribution of agricultural commodities and farm production supplies, there should be prepared information on the effect that rates, charges, and services have on the free movement of agricultural commodities to the consuming centers of the Nation and the distribution of farm supplies in rural areas.

The Research and Service Division of the Farm Credit Administration shall be requested to prepare and distribute to farmer cooperatives a bulletin on transportation services and costs and their effect upon the marketing of agricultural commodities and the distribution of farm production supplies by farmer cooperatives.

GOVERNMENT FREIGHT REPARATIONS

The rail carriers of the Nation are faced at the present time with formal complaints filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission in behalf of the Army and Navy of the United States, which complaints seek reparations totaling, according to press reports, in excess of $2,000,000,000.

The rates and charges upon which these reparations are sought were agreed rates, under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, and the rail carriers of the Nation have no source from which to obtain the money with which to pay these reparation amounts other than through increased rates and charges for transportation services, a large part of which increased rates and charges must, of necessity, be borne by products of agriculture.

In the light of this situation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives shall make representations to the President of the United States to the end that the President, by virtue of his position as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States, shall cause these complaints to be withdrawn, so that any and all claims of such a nature arising from the prosecution of the war by the combined efforts of the armed forces and the Nation's rail carriers may be held as part of the inescapable cost of war. We take this position as a matter of fairness to the carriers and the public they serve, as well as in behalf of agriculture and its products.

CARE

The Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, known here and abroad as CARE has completed over 2 years of efficient, effective, nonprofit shipment of food, clothing, and household packages to war dislocated areas.

Thousands of farm families have been aided thereby in sending packages to friends, relatives or others on a direct person-to-person basis.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives recommends CARE to its members and urges that the support, which has helped ship $35,000,000 worth of packages, be continued and extended.

CRUSADE FOR CHILDREN

Because 230,000,000 children the world over are in desperate need of a daily food supplement, the United Nations is organizing a world-wide appeal for children this spring with the campaign in the United States conducted by American Overseas Aid, Inc.

The farmers of America want to do their share not only through increased production but through personal contributions.

The campaign was supported at Lake Success by the International Federation of Agricultural Producers of which the national council is a member.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives endorses the crusade for children and urges its members to publicize the campaign and pledges its support in the rural areas toward reaching the American goal of $60,000,000.

APPRECIATION OF PRESS AND RADIO

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives takes this opportunity to express appreciation to the press and radio for their generally fair treatment of farmer cooperatives in their publications and on the air.

We reaffirm our belief that a free press and a free radio are necessary to our democratic society. We have no fear that farmer cooperatives can be destroyed by false propaganda if the truth is made known to the people.

For the preservation of the American way, it is essential that all sides of controversial issues be fully presented by the press and the radio.

MEMORIAM—CHARLES H. WALKER

With the passing of Charles H. Walker, farmers have lost one of their most earnest workers in the field of cooperative endeavor. His State and community have lost a citizen who was a constructive builder. He sponsored many progressive changes in his industry during his long years of service.

He was vice president of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives at the time of his death, and he will be remembered by his associates for his kindliness and friendliness, and his prudent counsel on the problems of farmers' cooperatives.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "A Problem Deserving Deep Study," which appeared in the Cottonwood County Citizen, a newspaper published at Windom, Minn., of January 7, 1948, as follows:

A PROBLEM DESERVING DEEP STUDY

The propaganda pressure is pretty strong on this European relief matter. We are still being told that if we withhold our help and Europe goes Communist, then we must take the blame upon our own shoulders.

If feeding the world for a period of 3 or 4 years would guarantee perpetual peace we have not the least hesitance in saying that it would be a happy state of world condition most cheaply bought.

But we have serious doubts as to whether supporting nations without their doing anything in return is good policy. We cannot believe that nations are a great deal different from people. Take the average individual. Support him in idleness for a few years, assuring him at the same time that you owe him that support, and he will never willingly go back to supporting himself. If compelled to do so he will bear a grudge against the person who made it necessary for him to do that. Can we be sure that the nations of the world will not react in the same manner?

Just suppose that our Marshall plan does not bring the desired results. We bend the national effort for 4 or 5 years toward supporting the rest of the world, while neglecting to build up our own Nation to the strength necessary to withstand what we are told may come, an assault upon us by the Communist forces, when they gain control of Europe. Then the Marshall plan instead of strengthening us for the mighty struggle will have weakened us.

In other words will we be expending our resources in a vain attempt to get the friendship of the world only to awaken to the fact that we have not gained that friendship and that our enemies have built themselves up into a position to defeat us when our resources are depleted and our potential friends are not so friendly? It's a problem, and a mighty big one.

Cost of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN C. SNYDER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, reports show that the cost of government in the United States is $371 per capita and the cost of food is $330 per capita. The cost of government, we find, is four times greater than it was a few years ago.

In this respect, what has taken place in our embassies in foreign countries is indicative of what is taking place in all departments of the Government.

Under a Paris date line, July 1, Henry Wales reports that the number of employees in the American State Department there has risen from 118 members in 1940 to 1,200 as of that date.

Under a date line, Brussels, Belgium, July 28, reported by Larry Rue, the State Department has increased its employees nearly four times in Holland and more than doubled the number in Belgium.

Under a London date line of October 17, reported by Kermit Holt, the United States Embassy in London and associated Federal offices carried a pay roll of nearly 500 persons—more than double the number carried before the war.

Under a report by Barry Bishop from Mexico City on July 5, the report showed that the United States Embassy in Mexico was 3½ times its prewar size. We now have 350 people in Mexico connected with our Embassy staff.

All of our Government bureaus, including our Embassy staffs, have mushroomed from prewar levels. This growth is a material factor in the cost of government and the reason why the President is requesting a $40,000,000,000 budget.

Since the ending of the war, except in a few agencies of the Government, the work load is not two or three times its prewar level.

Before we can make much progress in economy in government, we must have economy in its operation. There is much room for improvement.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily News of January 2, 1948:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY ATTITUDES CHANGING

(By Phil S. Hanna)

Time and shibboleths are changing the attitudes of many people and economic groups toward the St. Lawrence seaway and power-development program. The shibboleth introduced into the picture comes from Senator AIKEN, of Vermont. Senator AIKEN professes to believe that the farmers in upper New York and New England are in desperate need of another TVA.

As might be expected the opponents of the St. Lawrence project include organized labor in mining and shipping. Vocal and active in opposition is Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., who is chairman of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference.

There is a refreshing note in the publicized opposition by the last-named group. They frankly say that they are out to protect their jobs and their investments. They are counseling labor groups not to favor the project because even though its construction would provide employment for a time it would result in permanent elimination of thousands of miners' and railroad workers' jobs.

THREAT TO AREA RAILROADS SEEN

But the coal people see another objectionable angle. Should the canal be built and the expected traffic develop, certain railroads in the area would have to be subsidized heavily. Those roads could not exist profitably having to rely on the traffic available to them during the frozen river season. Hence the opponents say: "Having subsidized navigation and power, the Government would also have to subsidize the railroads or take them over."

Subsidizing of that kind is just what the American counterpart of the British Socialist group want, says Mr. Huntress. With public power and railroads in government ownership, national socialism in the United States would be well on its merry way, he declared.

Of course, there are many arguments in favor of the project. But the last war ought to make us remember that no matter how many other transport facilities are developed a nation cannot get along without railroads. One begins to wonder if we can afford all the subsidies inherent in the St. Lawrence project?

Soviets Wage Economic War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the seventh in the series written by Philip H. Parrish, editor of the Portland Oregonian editorial page, on European problems:

SOVIETS WAGE ECONOMIC WAR—RUSSIANS PUSH PROGRAM TO OBTAIN ACTUAL OWNERSHIP OF PLANTS, OTHER ASSETS IN COUNTRIES THEY CONTROL

(This is the seventh of a series of articles detailing observations recently made in Europe by Philip H. Parrish, editor of the Oregonian editorial page. The writer spent 7 weeks in Germany, Austria, France, and England.)

(By Philip H. Parrish)

Before taking off on this latest European trip, I already had considerable evidence of the degree to which Russia has been using its propaganda front to screen its more serious activity—the economic penetration of Europe.

The Russians are materialists. They enter with zest into the battles of the words, but their deeper concern is with who shall be the owner when the talking stops. That—they think—will decide the war rather than the battles.

Dr. Frank Munk, of Reed College, gave me valuable advance help in this respect. His studies of Nazi penetration of Europe were important contributions to the literature of World War II, and from his standpoint the Russians have merely taken over where the Nazis left off, adding ruthlessness of their own. He pointed out the appearance of a giant holding company in the Russian-held zone of eastern Germany, which if given time would control the entire economy of that area; and called particular attention to the new 4-year plan for Czechoslovakia, which, if it went through as originally proposed, would fit Czech production into Russian heavy industry and make it virtually impossible for the Czechs ever to return to their hard-won world markets.

I pursued the idea all over Europe, and no revelation could be more disturbing. Everywhere behind the iron curtain, Russia is moving with all possible speed to acquire actual property ownership, so that it can, at its chosen occasion, recall its occupation forces and still be master. It fills the air with accusations of "capitalist imperialism" in the west and in Greece, and itself practices such imperialism without limit wherever it has the power. The very loudness of its accusations shows where its mind is running.

PATTERN VARIES, RESULTS SAME

The pattern of penetration varies from country to country, but not the results. The Baltic countries of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, along with part of East Prussia, eastern Poland, and Rumanian Bessarabia, have actually been incorporated into the Soviet Union and can be treated as desired. The two countries actually friendly to Russia—Bulgaria and Yugoslavia—are subdued economically through the cooperation of the Communist governments controlling them. Against self-respecting border states, such as Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Finland, adroit trade agreements are a chief dependence for the time being.

Then there are the former "enemy" countries and areas—Rumania, Hungary, and eastern Germany.

In regard to the procedure in these latter areas, I am able to present better testimony than my own. Among those who met us in Vienna was Capt. Daniel H. Swett, a native of Portland, who had been most helpful on my earlier trip. He is a case-hardened and decorated infantryman from the Eighty-eighth Division, now assigned to the Public Information Division in Austria, and as a result of material he had gathered on official missions to Hungary he had recently been denounced in the Communist press of central Europe as "the spy in uniform."

Captain Swett's detailed report on Russian acquisition of economic control of Hungary, never previously released, appears on this page today.

The system, as will be noted, is beautifully simple. The Russians take what they can for reparations from the conquered country, in the way of plants and other assets. Then they agree not to move these plants and assets to Russia (which they tried for a time with disastrous results). Instead, they will contribute the plants and assets as their share of new companies which will monopolize the future economy of the country. Whereupon they put excessively high valuations upon their seized assets, and excessively low valuations on what the country itself puts into the pot, and the trick is done. Russia has 51 percent, Captain Swett does not get around to that, but so far as I could judge the Russians are now dominant in 90 percent of Hungarian business and industry.

PLAN SAME IN GERMANY

In the Russian zone of Germany the system is the same, in general. But the one huge holding company does the job there—called the Soviet AG, for Autien Gesellschaft.

And after this financial and industrial control from the top, the Russians move down into the Sovietizing of the details of life. If they have time enough they will manage that also. In some of the communities of eastern Germany it is estimated that life already is 80 percent sovietized.

I am sorry to make this report but that is the way matters stand. The unpleasant reality is that the whole picture of eastern and central Europe is being altered behind the guardianship of the iron curtain, and mere withdrawal of the Russians and ourselves from the scene would not restore anything like a competing economy and a democratic way of life. The Russians will come out in actual physical ownership, and directing the detailed life of the people.

Myth of Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the New Ulm Daily Journal, New Ulm, Minn., of January 9, 1948:

MYTH OF SECURITY

A Minnesota committee containing the names of some of the leading educators in the State is forming to fight the universal military-training bill which is being pushed through Congress at the present session. In his annual message President Truman endorsed the military-training program.

Universal military training is being opposed by a number of important people and one of the ablest and most intelligent is Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times and an author of note.

In an article in Foreign Affairs Baldwin scoffs at what he calls the myth of security. He claims there is no such thing as complete preparedness or military security because we do not know the type of a war we may be called upon to fight next. Hitler, he points out, was completely prepared to fight a war against Poland but Germany was not prepared to fight the type of war they finally got into. Every nation prepares itself against the war it has just fought. France built its Maginot line to protect itself against trench warfare of World War I but was not prepared to defend itself against warplanes and mobile tank units which hurdled the Maginot line.

Baldwin claims there is no such thing as preventing war by being fully equipped with armaments and points out that the nations best prepared have been those which have been involved in war. He also raps the theory that disarmament means insecurity and claims the United States and the world made great gains from the Washington conference which stopped the armament race after World War I.

He also attacks the glib assertion that "the United States will be the first area to be attacked in a future war." The next war, he contends, will start with an attack on air and sea bases and against our allies closest to the attacking nation. He cannot see any real chance of a large scale invasion of the continental United States. At least he can see no chance as long as we control the seas and air.

World War II, this expert claims, developed no new principles of war which is more of an art than an exact science. From our last war we should have learned a few principles and the most important of these Baldwin claims are:

1. Victory in modern wars are won by big factories and not big battalions. After we got mobilized for war and landed our immense store of war machines in France, he claims, it was simply impossible to lose the war against nazism no matter what mistakes our generals might make. Our victory in World War II was an industrial more than a military victory.

2. Continental United States is not only an arsenal and a supply base but it is now our main operating base for our armed forces. In the future all global war will be directed from Washington as it was in the last war.

3. Offense has so far outstripped the defense that our entire ideas of war and defense have to be changed. He contends the best and only defense in war is to have more and better atomic bombs, more and better long-range, globe-girdling planes, better and faster intercontinental missiles and induced plagues so that no other nation will dare to attack us knowing we can return the attack 10 to 1.

4. Wars in the future will be "total" wars far beyond the imagination of even those who coined the phrase. With this he raises the question of how we can prepare for total war without weakening our democracy or how we can prepare for war without adopting the very principles we oppose in military states elsewhere.

The universal military training bill he contends is a mistake because we are thinking about fighting the next war the way we did World War I and in part World War II. The next war will be an entirely different affair, a war more of machines than manpower, and this military expert believes we will be wasting our strength building ourselves strong in the way we will be least effective.

This is something to think about before we get swept away by the talk of the militarists and the jingoes.

The Housing Situation

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning Mr. Richard Gray, president of the building construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor, appeared before the Joint Committee on Housing and gave one of the most comprehensive and most illuminating statements that I have ever read on the housing situation in the country today. He appeared before the so-called Gamble committee, who I believe are genuinely interested in getting to the bottom of the housing problem which we have at the present time. There is a genuine effort on behalf of the building trades of this country to work with the committee, which is doing a splendid job, in my opinion, in straightening out some of the difficulties that have beset the housing problems during the past few years. I hope that every Member of the House will take the time to read this very constructive statement:

STATEMENT BY RICHARD GRAY, PRESIDENT, BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPARTMENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 14, 1948

I am glad to have the opportunity to appear before the Joint Committee on Housing on behalf of the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor. Labor has deep concern in the solution of the extremely critical housing problem which continues to confront the country. The American Federation of Labor through its affiliates has in the past made a major contribution to the study of housing conditions and to the fullest possible discharge of its share of responsibility toward their improvement. It is our purpose to give the fullest cooperation to the Joint Committee on Housing to the end that its factual findings may square with reality, and that it may receive the best guidance in the formulation of policies in the public interest.

The present housing shortage is deeply rooted in the conditions that prevailed for many years before the war, and represented a grave national problem long before the war years. This shortage was greatly aggravated by wartime conditions and numerous maladjustments which grew out of the war. The attempts to solve the problem since the war ended were seriously handicapped by dislocations in the postwar economy.

Let me say at the very outset that keenly aware of the many difficulties surrounding the problem, organized labor and the building-construction industry has consistently made every effort to aid in the promulgation of agreements and policies designed to achieve the maximum volume of home building; to improve the quality of performance; to assure the best and fullest supply of mechanics and laborers needed in home construction, and to achieve stability.

This program of American Federation of Labor unions was not a token program, nor was it confined to verbiage. It represented the considered effort of unions who have attempted in the best way they knew how to render real service to the community and to the Nation.

Building and construction trades unions were not breaking new ground in this work. Experience of World War II prepared and equipped them for it. Early in the war when emergency need for skilled workers on many phases of defense construction became evident, our military branches of the Government were unable to secure qualified workers required for the construction of defense installations, especially in rural communities and outlying areas. Building and construction unions quickly volunteered to recruit skilled men in order to meet the construction requirements of national defense without delay. Over 350,000 mechanics and laborers were provided by unions to man the jobs for which no qualified workers were available from any source.

It should be noted also that the building and construction unions took the initiative in wartime in a program of wage stabilization. A full year before wage stabilization was applied to other industries by the Government, a voluntary wage-stabilization program was put into effect by agreement with the building and construction trades on all defense construction work.

I am mentioning these facts to make it clear that the building trades approached the postwar emergency in the same spirit of constructive contribution to the national welfare that guided them through the war. Labor's attack on the postwar problem of increasing the supply of homes at reasonable cost has been many-sided. In several specific respects unions have succeeded in making a valuable contribution toward solving it.

Unions have cooperated vigorously in assuring a maximum supply of qualified labor needed to do the job. These activities were twofold:

1. While this recruiting work has proved to be exacting and difficult because of the unsettled conditions, the record shows that the manning of housing construction in numerous areas throughout the Nation was successfully accomplished because of the tireless efforts of the unions concerned.

2. Under the leadership of the building and construction department, its affiliated unions have carried on an intensive drive to develop a Nation-wide apprenticeship-training program in order to increase the supply of skilled workers needed. The record of practical accomplishment in this program also demonstrates that we are making remarkable progress toward the solution of this extremely crucial problem.

Labor in the construction industry has also concerned itself with the achievement of maximum stability of wages in the building and construction trades commensurate with the rising living cost. It is notable that in the last 3 years the prevalence of black-market wages and the wide departures from the established wage standards have occurred almost entirely on nonunion jobs. Such practices of paying bonuses and making side payments have had an unsettling effect on wages throughout the housing field. At the same time union standards established under contract have been an important stabilizing influence throughout the industry.

Through the establishment of cooperating committees with the agencies of the Government concerned, such as the Construction Labor Advisory Committee in the Office of the Housing Expediter, our unions stood ready to help solve the multiplicity of problems brought to our attention by Government officials. This "trouble shooting" was a day-to-day job in which, through our affiliates, we were able to find successful and effective solutions to many problems which seemed insoluble at the time.

I would like to have the opportunity to inform the committee about some of the important aspects of the housing problem in which labor has had primary responsibility.

APPRENTICE TRAINING

In striving to increase apprenticeship training in the construction industry since the end of the war the Building and Construction Trades Department vigorously pursued two objectives: (1) To assure an adequate supply of well-trained and qualified mechanics to meet the Nation's construction needs in coming years; and (2) to help provide employment opportunities for veterans of World War II.

The national apprenticeship program is a cooperative effort in which labor and employers are jointly engaged. The record shows, however, that organized labor has been consistently the initiator of local as well as national programs designed to provide a firm and lasting basis for a steady supply of properly trained journeymen and mechanics to the trade.

Apprenticeship itself came to America with its first settlers. But the development of standards of training to match the requirements of the skill and to assure unbroken continuity of experience and training and the establishment of fair standards of apprentice pay has been the result of unceasing effort of trade unions.

Aware of the need to place apprenticeship on a stable and continuous basis in the community, unions have succeeded in establishing a number of years ago a number of community-wide programs. They have led in such pioneer efforts as the Detroit plan launched by the Bricklayers Union in the thirties, where on-the-job training was supplemented by classroom work in blueprint reading and other related subjects. They were prompt to respond to the challenge of modern technology as did the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers when they established the Electronics School at Marquette University in 1944, noting that the electronics branch of the electrical industry has grown to production totaling $4,000,000,000. Since 1944, over 15,000 craftsmen received this new and specialized training in this school alone.

With the goal of labor-management cooperation squarely before them, unions, long before the last war, began to drive for the goal of establishing national apprenticeship systems. That the building and construction trades led in this drive is evidenced by the fact that national apprenticeship standards were first established in the following 10 trades: Bricklaying, carpentry, cement finishing, electrical, painting and decorating, plastering, plumbing, stained glass, steam fitting, and tile setting.

The foundation for the Nation-wide program of apprenticeship was laid in 1934 with the formation of the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship, made up of employer, labor, and Government representatives. Of foremost importance in the construction industry has been the general committee on apprenticeship for the construction industry, which consists of representatives of building and construction unions and of trade associations in the building field. The services essential to the success of the program are provided by the Apprentice Training Service of the Department of Labor, headed by William F. Patterson.

The record of the apprentice training program since the end of the war is indeed remarkable, especially when one considers the many difficulties and obstacles with which the industry was beset in recent years. In 1947, more than 2,500 local apprenticeship councils were jointly established by labor and employers in the building and construction industry in all parts of the country. According to the Apprentice Training Service the following is the record of growth in the number of building trades apprentices in actual employment from June 1946 to November 1947:

	June 1946	November 1947
Total apprentices reported	49,092	112,221
Wood trades	17,946	41,065
Electrical trades	9,027	16,937
Pipe trades	6,782	16,096
Trowel trades	5,487	15,479
Paint trades	4,476	8,967
Sheet metal trades	3,363	8,029
Other trades	2,011	4,778

Thus, as the reports of the Apprentice Training Service of the Department of Labor indicate, the number of building trades apprentices employed was more than doubled in a period of 18 months.

There is evidence, however, that the actual progress has been much greater than these reports indicate. The reason for this is that the Apprentice Training Service does not receive reports from many of the smaller towns and trade areas in which effective apprenticeship programs are underway. The A. F. of L. Building and Construction Trades Department has just conducted a questionnaire survey in an attempt to determine the actual number of apprentices employed in January 1948. Due to the shortness of time, only a few complete returns have been received to date. But these indicate a much greater progress in the apprenticeship program than reported to the Government.

In the masonry trades, for example, the Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers International Union reports an increase in apprentices from 328 on January 1, 1945, to 11,858 on January 1, 1948. This is the actual number of apprentices in the membership of the union working under contract.

The Operative Plasterers' International Association reports an increase from 1,876 in September 1946, to 5,000 in January 1948. The International Union of Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers reported a rise from 358 in January 1945 to 2,200 in January 1948. The Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America reports an increase from 5,000 in January 1945 to 20,000 in January 1948.

It should be noted that in a number of the building trades the employment of regular apprentices is not customary. There are no apprentices, of course, in such trades as the hod carriers and common laborers or in the teamsters' trade. Elevator constructors provide an example of trades where there is no regular apprenticeship system, but instead, helpers are given the training and are stepped up when they can meet requirements. Asbestos workers adhere to the so-called improver system, with the ratio prevailing in the trade of one improver to three mechanics.

It is often erroneously stated that the unions are responsible for maintaining a rigid ratio between a number of apprentices permitted in proportion to the number of journeymen on the job. The fact is that this ratio is set by experience and is by no means dictated by the union concerned. In this connection these points must be made:

1. The employer always prefers to have seasoned workers on the job. The apprenticeship agreement places a responsibility and a financial burden on the employer which he is often reluctant to assume.

2. The training of the apprentice must give him proper supervision and actual experience in order to be of value. Too many apprentices with not enough supervision from a journeyman would gain little skill, would prove highly unproductive, and would be costly by turning out work of inferior quality.

3. Apprenticeship training must lead to employment at the trade the apprentice learns. When unemployment in construction is high, as has been the case for many years before the war, to train men with no prospect of work for them would have been wasteful and a bitter loss of time and effort to the apprentice himself.

The combined effect of these considerations has often been to establish a prevailing ratio between a number of journeymen and apprentices in a particular trade. When maintained over a period of years, these prevailing ratios were often embodied in contractual agreements.

It should be noted that with the end of the war building and construction unions, aware of the need for an increased supply of mechanics in most trades, took prompt steps to meet the emergency situation. Most of the unions took the initiative to provide for a larger number of apprentices in relation to journeymen and to give special consideration to veterans.

Moreover, many of our unions acted to raise the age limit for admission of apprentices and secured the removal of any age limit for veterans' admission to apprenticeship. The lathers' union, for example, had the age bracket enlarged from the existing one of 16 to 21 years of age to one ranging from 16 to 27, with no limit on veterans.

The building and construction trades department and its affiliates are gratified by the progress of the apprentice training programs. But they don't think that this progress provides any ground for complacency. In my report to the convention of the department held last October, I reported:

"To help provide employment opportunities for veterans and assure an adequate supply of well-trained and qualified mechanics in the years to come, the building and construction trades department continued to cooperate actively with employers and the Government in speeding the apprenticeship training program. By June 1947, over 2,500 local apprenticeship councils were jointly established by labor and employers in the building and construction industry in all parts of the country. Our goal for the coming year is to double this number of apprenticeship councils, in order to make apprenticeship training facilities available, under proper standards, in every sizable community."

This goal and this recommendation were adopted by the convention and are being vigorously pursued by our national and local affiliates in the current year.

Numerous irresponsible statements have been made alleging that building trades-unions have restricted the supply of apprentices needed in order to meet the increased volume of construction of housing after the war. The record shows just the opposite to be true. National, State, and local programs designed to increase and regularize apprentice training are being carried out not only with labor cooperation but also with labor's initiative. The record shows also that in many situations where, because of inadequate supply of building materials, the work has been intermittent the unions have done much to overcome the reluctance on the part of the employers to assume the responsibility and the financial obligation of taking on additional apprentices.

Equally important have been the efforts of unions to assure a fair standard of compensation to the apprentices placed into training. Inadequate compensation offered to apprentices has been a severe deterrent to veterans and other young people in the choice of their trade. The improvement of the apprentice pay under union agreements has been an important factor in increasing the

flow of applicants to train for the skills in which shortages exist or are likely to develop.

It should be emphasized that 9 out of every 10 apprentices now in training are veterans of World War II. In the development of our program we felt a special responsibility toward the veteran in assuring him the maximum opportunity of acquiring skills in the ranks of the building and construction trades.

PRODUCTIVITY

The volume of housing construction in 1947 indicates that a new record has been achieved. The number of units started in 1947, estimated at 860,000 new permanent units, was exceeded only once—1925, 7 years after the end of World War I. This represents an increase of almost 30 percent over the activity registered in 1946.

Of even greater importance is the number of dwelling units completed. Last year 745,000 dwelling units were completed, while during 1946 only 437,800 were made ready for occupancy. In other words, 70 percent more units were made ready for families in need of housing during 11 months of 1947 than in all of the previous year.

In considering this record of performance it is natural to raise the question about the charges made repeatedly, persistently, and often maliciously, that one of the most serious obstacles to the increase in the housing volume is the record of low productivity. It is widely claimed that the output of workers has been greatly reduced, that workers are soldiering on the job, that they refuse to turn out a record of output anywhere near the established standard of their trade.

A searching review of all available information reveals that productivity in the construction of homes, after having suffered a severe decline, has staged a spectacular comeback in the past 12 months. In analyzing the evidence it should be stressed that a record of man-hour performance in the construction of a given volume of dwelling units is by no means confined to the measure of the effort of the worker alone. Many factors, for which labor is in no way responsible, enter into the final record of performance, determining the efficiency on the job.

A brief review of the developments in the field of housing construction over a period of years would be helpful in making a valid assessment of the problem as it really exists. This record is divided roughly into four periods.

1. The decade from 1930 to 1940. During this time the construction industry suffered severely from widespread unemployment growing out of the depression. In 1932 housing construction came virtually to a standstill, with only 58,000 units built in that year. As the result of the depressed conditions persisting in the industry, the supply of new recruits to the various construction trades was curtailed. The fact that new and younger workers were not attracted to the trades during those years accounts for the later character of the available labor force. But in that period itself, the pressures for the utmost efficiency in construction were often absent, the morale was low and an attempt to stretch out the work was sometimes in evidence.

2. The war years, from 1940 to 1945. The labor force in the construction industry suffered severely from the draft. The younger men with skill and training in the construction trades were siphoned off into the armed forces in large numbers. The average age of the worker in the construction force was thereby substantially raised, and because of the heavy volume of wartime construction of all types, the labor force was heavily diluted with men of insufficient training.

Even more important was the increasing prevalence of the cost-plus systems of compensation to the contractors on wartime work. The cost-plus percentage fee and the cost-plus fixed fee methods gave rise to a strong pressure on the part of the contractor to overman the work in order to derive the highest profit from it. The impetus given by the employer to low productivity is probably the largest factor accounting for the inefficiencies growing into the industry during the war.

3. The initial postwar period, 1945–46. During this time the volume of construction was severely retarded by critical shortages of materials. Presence of local labor shortages in many areas led to labor hoarding by the contractors. The number of man-hours required for the output of the same volume of work rose to an all-time high and productivity reached an all-time low. The effect of the prewar and wartime experience on the labor force was also strongly felt. In fact, in much of the private construction the wartime practices of cost-plus compensation were carried over.

4. 1946 to date. Beginning with the closing months of 1946 and on through the construction season of 1947 the improvement in the building-materials supply had a marked effect on the improvement in productivity.

Impartial reports made by Government observers indicate that since July 1946 to the end of last year rapid progress has been made in bringing the productivity back to normal. There is still room for improvement, and we feel confident that this improvement will be rapidly taking place.

Perhaps the best available evidence of the actual record of productivity in home construction consists of the reports provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics originating from its field staff. Normally the construction of an average one-family house requires approximately 4 months from start to completion. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, during the first half of 1946 the time required to complete a one-family house averaged from 6 to as much as 9 months. As the Bureau points out, "The causes for the delays during 1946 were not hard to find. Both materials and labor were in short supply in many of the important housing construction centers. The materials manufacturers had not yet brought their production up to capacity and the labor supply had not become readjusted to peacetime requirements."

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics findings, the construction time period has been steadily declining since the middle of 1946, reflecting improved productivity. The reports indicate that, beginning in April 1947, there has been an especially notable improvement in the time it took to complete an average single-family unit. Evidence gathered by the Bureau during this period indicates "that the dwelling units started since June of this year will be completed in about 4½ months on the average. The reduction in the construction time period indicates improvements in efficiency on both labor and management."

RESTRICTIVE PRACTICES

In the course of the last 2 years a widespread campaign of propaganda has been conducted in an attempt to discredit unions in the building and construction industry, and to persuade the public that labor is responsible for either the high cost of housing or the housing shortage itself. These charges have appeared in newspaper articles, in special columns, in magazines, and in every other medium of publicity. They have covered a wide range of allegations extending from a blanket and unsubstantiated indictment of organized labor as being the source of what is termed in such charges as featherbedding, to instances allegedly occurring in particular communities as the result of policies pursued by specific trades.

Stories of this nature, publicized in periodicals with Nation-wide circulation, have had the effect of creating the impression that such practices are, in fact, widely prevalent and that they do constitute a major obstacle to housing progress. That such is not the case can best be established by a truly objective examination of the facts alleged.

For my part, I am not appearing before this committee to contend that everyone in the ranks of unions is blameless, that all trade unionists are devoid of sin, or that there have not been instances of abuses within labor's ranks. On the contrary, it is my purpose to this committee that there have been, are today, and will undoubtedly be in the future, instances of unreasonable actions, of abuses and dishonesty among labor men. But I assert that the abuses which do take place among unionists are no more numerous and no more flagrant than in any other group in our society. They are bound to occur with equal frequency among any group of comparable size. And, of course, they do occur among workers, among employers, among bankers and even among Congressmen.

What I consider to be my special responsibility here is not to deny any alleged abuse on the part of the men I represent, but to determine whether the charge is real—and, if it is substantiated, to take prompt and effective action to correct it. Wherever there are substantiated specific instances of such abuses, the Building and Construction Trades Department wants to know about them. Men who act in good faith and wish to serve a constructive purpose have reported instances of abuses directly to us. Every such instance brought to our attention is promptly made the subject of investigation. Wherever it proved to exist, prompt steps were taken to correct the abuse. This is the method we have followed in the past and propose to follow in the future.

We have found that the majority of the complaints brought directly to us have been often the result of either misinformation or misunderstanding of the problem. In some instances we have found that abuses did exist. I assert to this committee without reservation that wherever this has been the case, corrective measures have been promptly taken.

I submit that a good test of the validity of the charges made to date has been the method of presenting them. There have been organizations and individuals who, while withholding the alleged facts from anyone directly connected with the problem, strove to give them the maximum publicity possible. I believe their purpose and their motive was destructive, not corrective. At least 99 percent of the stories so presented have proved to be without any foundation whatsoever. Those who have perpetrated them must stand convicted of bad faith and of malicious intent in falsifying facts and misleading the public.

I am not appearing here to engage in recrimination. It would have been easy for me to trace the antiunion allegations to their source and to meet charges with countercharges. But I think that there has been much too much name-calling in the matter of housing; much too much pointing of the finger at the other fellow and saying that the other fellow is to blame. That does not get any housing built. In fact, I think that by now a good measure of the fellow's own guilt is how loudly he shouts of the cupidity of others, and how much money he spends on advertising publicity and lobbying to spread his venom on the public record.

I do not intend to provide a detailed roster of the types of charges made against labor and engage in the long recitation of detailed facts to disprove them. For one thing I know that the Joint Committee on Housing has been the recipient of every conceivable accusation made against labor in virtually every community of the Nation. I also know that the evidence before this committee, which is a matter of public record, has provided conclusive proof of the specious nature of these accusations. The charges made to the committee and believed to have some degree of merit were referred by the committee to the building and construction trades department. In an official letter from the committee I have a list of five items in which the committee felt there might be a degree of validity. As the committee knows, all of these cases have been satisfactorily adjusted or explained, with the exception of one which is in the process of adjustment at the present time.

To give a few typical illustrations of the types of charges made, I will cite two or three instances of such charges along with our answers to them.

Refusal to use the spray gun in painting homes: The charge has been made that in many cities union painters either refuse, or are forbidden by union rules, to use the spray gun on home building. It is made as a flat assertion with the idea of conveying the impression that a modern technological improvement is being held back by unions intent on perpetuating the slower, less efficient, and more costly methods, which would yield greater earnings to them. Among the publications in which this charge has been made during the past year are: Look magazine for April 1, 1947; the Wall Street Journal for October 10 and October 20 1947; the Washington Evening Star for October 27, 1947; and the New York Times for October 26, 1947. The layman, not familiar with the facts, is likely to feel indignant about the obstacles being placed in the path of progress by labor unions. It is significant therefore that these stories have failed to raise such pertinent questions as—How efficient and economical is the spray gun in the painting of a home? How safe is its operation and what measures of protection against injury should be maintained when it is in use? Nor do these stories indicate that their authors have gone to the sources of information and interviewed the painters themselves, whom they charge with these tactics.

All of these stories appearing in 1947 failed to mention the fact that the International Brotherhood of Painters, which they name as the culprit in the case, launched in the early part of 1944 a comprehensive survey of the use of the spray painting machine and in September 1946 rendered a detailed report to its convention on the basis of which a specific program on the use of the spray gun was laid down by the painters' international. The fact is that the 1946 convention of the International Brotherhood of Painters adopted a national program of standards to govern the use of the spray painting machine throughout the United States and Canada and recommended that these uniform standards be embodied in a national code after negotiation with the National Painting and Decorating Contractors Association and other employers concerned.

The international brotherhood's special committee on spray painting presented to the 1946 convention a detailed finding of facts which I will attempt to summarize briefly.

1. There are at least 103 manufacturers of paint spray machinery who produce machines ranging in price from $5 to $5,000. These machines are, of course, of varying efficiency. The spray painting machine has been greatly improved in recent years and on large flat surfaces makes possible much more rapid completion of work than with the brush and more rapid application of several coats of paint. It has had wider use in industrial construction than on residential construction. In building work, where actual spray painting effectiveness was studied, it was found that this work was supplemented by at least 50 percent of work with paint brush. While the efficiency of the spray gun is greater on flat surfaces, on any work requiring the painting of sash, trim, molding, etc., in different colors, it is necessary to resort to taping which offsets much of the gain in efficiency. In the case of single-family houses, it is doubtful that any substantial economy in cost can be achieved.

2. The study of materials in use in spray painting shows that there has been no change in their toxic or poisonous content in the past 30 years. After extensive consultation with health and safety officials in the Federal Government and in the several States and with the National Safety Council, it was found that the exposure to lead poisoning and other types of poisoning is considerable in the use of the spray painting machine, but that much of this danger can be prevented by the strict adherence to the use of modern protective measures. Some of these protective devices, including shields, masks, and ventilators, have been developed by the National Safety Council. Considerable improvement in the prevailing practice is still needed to protect the operator and those in close proximity to the spray machine when in operation. In addition to the danger of poisoning there is also a hazard of fire and explosion involved, especially when the paint spray is used in the interior work.

The program adopted by the International Brotherhood of Painters is a positive one. It is designed to insure the use of all necessary safety measures to protect the workers and, where these safety standards are met, to assure the widest possible acceptance by workmen of the spray gun on all types of construction. The national standards which the brotherhood is attempting to evolve would apply in the form of a model State code and a model city ordinance which would require the use of the essential safety devices during operations, would call for shorter working hours for spray machine operators, with periods of intermission, and would call for periodic physical examinations of the operators to determine the effect on their health.

I submit that those who make public charges against the painters' union about the use of the spray gun owe it to the American public to at least inform themselves about the facts they allege. The least they can do is to learn about the record of 4 years of organized study devoted by this union to an effort to solve the problem in the best public interest, yet providing for the worker the minimum measure of protection. I submit also that instances in which the workmen have refused to operate the spray machine where protective devices have been lacking and where the use of the machine has been clearly a menace to the worker's health are ones which should be presented to the public in the light of full facts surrounding such refusal.

The point that stands out emphatically in this connection is that the union concerned is making a real contribution toward better and more rational utilization of a modern technological development seeking at the same time to safeguard the safety and health of workers against hazard; and that it is certainly not standing in the way of reduced home-building costs.

Bricklayers' union limiting production to 400 or 500 brick a day, as compared with prewar record of 1,000 or 1,200 brick a day. One of the most unfair and malicious pieces of propaganda was a newsreel-type of movie produced in 1946 by the March of Time. This particular release of the film showed what purported to be a shot of an actual construction job, with two bricklayers working on a wall. The older man turns to the younger man, waving him to slow down. "Take it easy, bud," he says, "you will live longer. Five hundred brick a day is plenty," or words to that effect. Millions of moviegoers seeing this picture naturally thought it to be a shot of an actual occurrence illustrating a widely prevalent practice. But the trained eye of a brickmason could readily see that the scene was a deliberately—and expensively—staged hoax. Evidently the producers could not find a real bricklayer to do the scene and those who knew enough could readily see that the actor hired for it had never held a trowel in his life: He was clutching it in his fist, holding it straight up, the way no real bricklayer ever would.

Just to make sure that the charge would stick in the public mind, it was again repeated in an equally ill-documented article on housing in the Life magazine. The same charge was also made in an article published in Colliers last November, along with a number of other unsubstantiated allegations against unions. It was again repeated in the Wall Street Journal series on housing published last October and notable for its numerous inaccuracies.

Let me say emphatically that there has not been and cannot be a union rule limiting the performance of bricklayers on any job. The Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers International Union, while unable to run down vague and general rumors of this character, has given a thorough on-the-spot investigation to every specific instance where such or similar allegation was brought to its attention.

The union's investigations bring out forcefully the misleading character of the claims made against it, reflecting the accuser's complete ignorance of the trade and of construction methods.

The number of brick a competent worker can lay in a day depends, of course, on many factors, including the degree of his skill, his physical condition, the supply of materials and, above all, the type and thickness of the wall and the number of turns, openings, and corners. The union's investigations of the 500-brick-a-day charges illustrate the real nature of the problem. Some years ago the typical house wall was of solid brick masonry, 12 to 22 inches thick. Today brick-veneer construction has become much more prevalent than in former years. In this type of construction, the outside or curtain wall of brick must be backed with cement block or cinder block, with a heavy mortar fill. This backing up is counted in the number of brick the mason has laid. The work on this new type of brick-veneer construction is in sharp contrast with the daily output on a solid brick wall, on which the number of brick laid may easily be more than twice as great in a day. Any responsible masonry contractor will testify that even 400 brick a day on brick-veneer construction on a typical single-family house is a good record of bricklayer's performance.

But even in the case of a modern house of solid brick construction, it must be realized that the changes in design which now call for more and closer spaced windows, along with many other departures from the design of the older and usually larger typical dwellings have imposed heavier and more exacting work requirements upon the brick mason, reducing the number of brick he can lay per hour or per day.

Let me say that here again it must be said that there are no doubt numerous instances of individual workers slowing down production. Such cases can be found in shops and offices everywhere—they are not confined to construction. There is no doubt that there are also isolated instances of collusion between workers and their foremen or the employer himself. The cost-plus psychology and speculative character of boom-time building of the last 2 years have served to make such instances more numerous than in normal times. But such collusive practices cannot be charged to the workers alone: They cannot exist without participation of the employer who finds increased cost of construction profitable.

What I do challenge is the assertion that the union has been the instrumentality for

slowing down production, with the resulting increase in construction cost. The standard of skill and performance of its members is the most valuable asset that the union possesses. To maintain and preserve a high standard of achievement is a matter of the union's vital concern. Assertions that there is any degree of self-interest in the union's undermining the standards of its own trade fly in the face of both reality and common sense.

Nor can the union be held responsible for the character of supervision over the workers on the job. Much of good performance on the job depends on good management. It should be remembered that the employer's prerogatives in the construction industry are greater than is generally the case in other employment. The building worker is employed by the hour. He goes to work when the employer puts him on the job. The employer may take a particular worker off the job whenever the employer wants to, and the worker goes off the job. The worker's pay ends with the hour he is taken off.

In hiring, the employer exercises complete freedom of passing on the qualifications of the workers whom the union furnishes to him. He is free to reject any worker not satisfactory to him or to dismiss the man after trying him out. Under these conditions and with good management, there is every opportunity for maintaining production at a high level. Under these conditions also there is little room for what the antilabor spokesmen call featherbedding by the worker.

Numerous charges have been leveled against unions that have since been, or can be, completely refuted. The requirement for the three coats of plaster for each room has been publicized as one chargeable to unions. It has been shown to have been embodied in the basic standards promulgated by the United States Bureau of Standards, having nothing whatsoever to do with union rules.

It is argued that the unloading and sorting of plumbing supplies and equipment delivered to a large project should not be done by skilled plumbers, who are paid $2.25 an hour, but should be done by laborers who would be paid $1.10 an hour for this work, because this change would make it possible to cut labor cost on this operation in half. Experience has shown, however, that the unloading and sorting of such equipment is much faster, more efficient and economical, when done by men familiar with the character and function of the unassembled parts and that the cost of having this work done by untrained workers would in the end be actually higher.

I have cited these few instances of the many charges indiscriminately made against building labor primarily to explain the true nature of the problem involved and to point out how misleading they can prove to be when given fair study.

My request to this committee and to every fair-minded American is simple. I merely ask that, when occurrences take place indicating conditions for which unions are actually properly responsible and which call for correction, specific information, giving the time, the place, and the relevant facts be brought to me for attention. I pledge the cooperation of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor and of its affiliates to have them promptly investigated and, if found to be valid, corrected. But when the accuser refuses to be specific in his charges, when he denies us the opportunity to examine them, answer them and act upon them, I ask that the judgment against our unions be withheld, but that the accuser of labor, his motives and his actions, be then subjected to thorough public scrutiny.

JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES

Jurisdictional disputes present a perplexing problem that has caused grave concern to the officers and members of the building and construction trades unions for many years. A number of different plans have been placed in operation in an effort by the Department to reduce these jurisdictional disputes to a minimum, and provide for their orderly settlement.

Since the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 there has been a grave question in our mind as to what extent labor unions could exercise any authority in preventing stoppages of work due to jurisdictional disputes.

It is a human characteristic for an employer to seek an increase in his volume of business. It is likewise a human characteristic that workmen desire to extend their field of employment opportunities. Responsibility for proper allocation of work is by no means labor's alone. Actions taken by employers in the light of changing conditions are often deeply involved in the jurisdictional problem. Realizing this fact, the Building and Construction Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor has been for the past 2 months carrying on negotiations with various employees' associations who employ members of organizations affiliated with the building and construction trades department and drafting a plan for the orderly adjustment of jurisdictional disputes in a manner that will not be in violation of the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act. These negotiations have now reached a point where they are to be submitted for ratification to various employers' associations and to the affiliated organizations of the building and construction trades department. Upon ratification, the plan will be put in operation.

LABOR COSTS

In the current discussion of the housing cost an attempt has been made to confuse the labor cost at the site of construction with the labor cost entering all component parts. The share of responsibility on the part of the building construction industry for improving the housing supply and keeping down the cost cannot be properly determined unless we clearly differentiate between the site cost and other costs entering into the price of a house.

The two largest elements of site construction cost are materials and labor. As these costs rise so do total costs. It is therefore important to study the relative increase in each item. The best place to look for this information is the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The figures provided by BLS show that the index of union hourly wage scales in the building trades rose from 100.0 in June 1939, to 147.3 in July 1947. On the other hand, all building materials increased 107 percent during the same period. Lumber increased 222 percent between the two dates while paint materials increased by 155 percent. In this respect it must be remembered that lumber is one of the most important components of a house. Any increase in lumber causes a disproportionate increase in total construction cost. If we convert the building material index to a 1939 base we find that the level reached in July 1947 is 185.3. Substantial increases have occurred since then. On the same base all building materials reached 207.1 in November 1947, while brick was 161.2, lumber 317.1, paint and paint materials 195.4, and plumbing and heating 171.7.

While comprehensive information on the share of labor costs at the cite is not available for the country as a whole, and we therefore cannot determine exactly the differences in such costs which exist due to the varying types of construction under different climatic conditions, a number of special studies have been made in a number of localities which indicate the general relationship of labor costs to the total cost. In general these studies show that site labor cost varies between 29 and 34 percent of the total site cost of residential buildings. These studies also show that this proportion has remained approximately the same since before the war.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that an analysis of 106 single-family houses built in Chicago in 1947 showed site-labor cost to be 31 percent of the total construction cost. A study of defense housing built in 1940 showed that at that time labor cost at the site represented 32.3 percent of the total site cost. This indicates that there has been no substantial change in the relation between the labor cost and the total cost in the past 7 years. As a matter of fact, we know that according to a comprehensive study conducted in 15 cities in 1932 site-labor cost on housing construction at that time constituted 37.3 percent of the total construction cost.

Let me emphasize that this proportion indicates the relationship between labor cost and the actual site cost of building a house. In relation to the actual selling price of the house, site-labor cost would be considerably smaller.

In 1940 the average total site-construction cost of residential dwelling units was $4,065. The average selling price in that year was about $5,250. For September 1947 the total construction cost of a single-family house was $6,348. The selling price of such a house ranges from $8,500, on up, as high as the market could bear.

It is important to bear in mind that the actual cost to the home buyer is measured by the size of the monthly payments he must make. Virtually all housing is sold under long-term mortgages for the family buying a home. The cost of interest and amortization represents the largest share of the cost of shelter to them. Under standard FHA mortgage, the home buyer pays as much for interest and amortization over a period of years as he does for the house itself. The point I wish to emphasize especially is that in analyzing the cost of monthly payments we find that the cost of labor on the site represents a small proportion of the total cost of home purchase. Even a 50-percent reduction in the site-labor cost would reduce the monthly payments on the average single-family home only 8 percent.

CONCLUSION

The year just completed, 1947, was a banner housing construction year from the standpoint of volume. In the second half of the year, the highest rate of home building in the history of the country was attained. Yet the selling price of this new housing was so far out of reach of the average family in need of homes that this construction has had little direct effect in relieving the critical housing shortage.

Because the volume of residential building in the last 20 years lagged far behind the Nation's need for new homes, we have accumulated a huge housing deficit, made all the more severe by the lack of permanent home construction during the war. As the result, our replacement need alone is now so great that it can only be met over a period of years of maximum construction.

But new housing must also provide for growth and change. These have been intensified by wartime conditions. Our prewar rate of marriages was about 1,400,000 a year. In 1947 it was 1,900,000 and for 1948 it is estimated at 1,700,000. Before the war, the country's birth rate was at the rate of about 2,000,000 babies a year. In 1947, it was 3,730,000.

In 1947, according to the Census Bureau, 1,250,000 new families or households were established. Unable to find homes, these families are forced to increase the doubling up which has been going on throughout the war years.

According to a recent study published by Duke University, one of the most important problems to take into account in meeting the problem is the relationship between family income and prices of homes. The study showed that on the basis of 1945 family income and 1945 building costs, there would be an effective market for 15,000,000 homes between 1945 and 1960. The study showed, however, that if family income remained the same but housing prices went up 10 percent, the demand for houses would fall off by 2,000,000. If prices went up 25 percent for 1945, the market for new houses would be cut in half. Both family income and building costs have increased in the last 2 years. But family income has gone up only about 10 percent, while prices of homes went up more than 60 percent in the same period.

It is clear that the ability of the average family to secure a new home is the most important element in reaching an equitable solution to the present problem. The concerted attack that can be large enough to measure up to the size of the problem must not fall short of the long-range program which would assure a supply of housing of all types, and especially rental housing, at charges which the average family can afford.

The American Federation of Labor has long advocated a comprehensive long-range program in which all elements of the industry and the community could cooperate. Labor's approach has not been restrictive, but positive and aggressive. We urge Congress to deal aggressively with the Nation's foremost domestic problem in the interests of all Americans.

Huge Arms Costs Loom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the military expert of the New York Times, Hanson W. Baldwin, appearing in today's Times; it is well worth the attention of Members:

HUGE ARMS COSTS LOOM—PLANS FOR SPENDING FIFTEEN TO TWENTY-FIVE BILLIONS ANNUALLY SHOW A LACK OF COORDINATION

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Annual military expenditures of between $15,000,000,000 and $25,000,000,000 are forecast within the next few years, if measures already authorized or projected are approved by Congress.

The President's annual budget message which asked for about $11,000,000,000 (for national defense during the 1949 fiscal year), or about 28 percent of the total budget, and the report of the President's Air Policy Commission, which recommended the additional expenditure in the next 2 years of more than $1,500,000,000 annually, indicate the trend.

These two items are only two of many involving the eventual expenditure of billions of dollars annually for direct and indirect costs of national defense. All of these measures either have received congressional authorization, or have been approved by the military and are being, or will be, considered by Congress.

BREAK-DOWN OF COSTS

Here is an incomplete break-down of the costs of various national-defense measures as now outlined:

Annual appropriations to maintain the armed forces at an average strength of about 1,423,000 officers and men (slightly below present strength)—about $10,000,000,000.

Annual appropriations to increase the strength of our air power, as recommended by the President's Air Policy Commission—an average of about $1,675,000,000 for each of the next 2 years, plus even larger amounts later. (The Commission contemplated a military budget, not including the items outlined below, of perhaps $18,000,000,000 by 1952.)

Annual cost of universal military training—official estimates between $1,750,000,000 and $2,000,000,000; other estimates double this figure. The President included $400,000,000 in anticipation of congressional action in next year's estimated annual expenditures.

Annual cost of maintaining the National Guard at its peak strength of 723,000 (to be reached by the aid of universal military training) will be, according to the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, about $700,000,000 of Federal expenditures, plus $65,000,000 annually of State expenditures. In the present fiscal year the Federal costs of the Guard are an estimated $110,000,000.

The Army's Organized Reserve Corps, at planned peak strength, according to the same sources, will cost $400,000,000 annually to maintain, an increase of about $340,000,000 above the present appropriation.

No estimates are available of the ultimate cost of the Navy's Reserve when it reaches full planned strength.

David E. Lilienthal, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, recently recommended the doubling of our prior investment in atomic energy, or the expenditure in capital investments of about $2,000,000,000 in the next 4 or 5 years to expand our production of fissionable materials. This capital investment would be in addition to the Commission's annual operating budget of $500,000,000 to $600,000,000.

A 5- or 6-year program of stock-piling strategic materials has been approved by Congress—total recommended and authorized expenditures over this period to be $2,100,000,000.

Estimated costs of National Science Foundation to aid military research and promote scientific education—$33,500,000 first year; $122,500,000 in the fifth year.

In addition to these costs very considerable construction and capital investments are planned to provide the new weapons or the facilities for the expanded forces:

Cost of constructing the necessary new armories and facilities for the expanded National Guard (as estimated by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training)—$600,000,000.

Construction of new transsonic and supersonic wind tunnels (recommended by Air Policy Commission)—about $500,000,000.

Construction of new laboratories, test centers and proving grounds for guided missiles and new weapons—about $500,000,000.

Four-year construction program to modernize and strengthen the merchant marine (recommended by special Presidential Commission recently)—$600,000,000.

WOULD BE SPREAD OVER YEARS

These latter expenditures would, of course, be spread out over a period of years and they do not represent recurring costs, but each military capital investment entails a greater annual outlay for maintenance and depreciation.

These lists are by no means complete and could be greatly extended.

But they are definitive enough to prove what the President's Air Policy Commission confirmed—that there is not now and has not been any integrated and coordinated postwar plan of defense, and that individual plans and policies, largely uncorrelated, have, like Topsy, just "growed." These lists also lend great emphasis to the little-noted warning of Secretary of the Army Kenneth C. Royall, given in his testimony before the Air Policy Commission.

"We must realize," said Mr. Royall, "that there is a dollar limit on what this country can spend for national defense. There is an absolute limit beyond which we cannot go without endangering the economic security of the country."

Such a stop-look-and-listen warning sign ought to be carefully noted by Congress.

Is a Racket Being Made Out of the Use of Section 32 Funds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, section 32 funds are obtained by taking 30 percent of the custom receipts and setting them aside for removing agricultural surpluses. The following is the law:

TITLE 7, SECTION 612c, UNITED STATES CODE, 1940 EDITION

SECTION 32 FUNDS—APPROPRIATION TO ENCOURAGE EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

There is appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, an amount equal to 30 percent of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceding the beginning of each such fiscal year. Such sums shall be maintained in a separate fund and shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture only to (1) encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities and products thereof by the payment of benefits in connection with the exportation thereof or of indemnities for losses incurred in connection with such exportation or by payments to producers in connection with the production of that part of any agricultural commodity required for domestic consumption; (2) encourage the domestic consumption of such commodities or products by diverting them, by the payment of benefits or indemnities or by other means, from the normal channels of trade and commerce or by increasing their utilization through benefits, indemnities, donations, or by other means, among persons in low-income groups as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture; and (3) reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption. Determinations by the Secretary as to what constitutes diversion and what constitutes normal channels of trade and commerce and what constitutes normal production for domestic consumption shall be final.

The sums appropriated under this section shall be expended for such one or more of the above-specified purposes, and at such times, in such manner, and in such amounts as the

Secretary of Agriculture finds will effectuate substantial accomplishment of any one or more of the purposes of this section. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the amount that may be devoted, during any fiscal year after June 30, 1939, to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof in such fiscal year, shall not exceed 25 percent of the funds available under this section for such fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, the custom receipts from duties collected have been from $357,000,000 to $437,000,000 each year from 1935 to 1945. A large percentage of these custom receipts comes from duties on livestock products. If the duty collected on wool in 1946 was $150,000,000, wool then would furnish 30 percent of $150,000,000 or $45,000,000, which is just about the amount appropriated and provided for the present year for section 32, "Funds."

What happens to this money secured largely from the imports of wool and other livestock products? Here is where the special-privilege crops come in.

The following is the official report of the United States Department of Agriculture on the allocations for 1947 up to November 30:

Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities—approved programs and obligations by commodities—fiscal year 1948 (July 1 to Nov. 30, 1947)

	Approved programs as of Nov. 30, 1947	Obligations incurred	
		July 1 to Nov. 30, 1947	During November 1947
Purchases for direct distribution:			
Irish potatoes	$4,250,000	$2,614,954.59	$1,296,356.22
Sweetpotatoes	1,000,000	437,991.04	20,750.14
General vegetables	500,000	112,876.91	6,433.84
Dried fruits	4,600,000	26,323.75	26,323.75
Dried eggs	750,000	399,747.63	12,841.83
Transportation costs on prior year purchases		157.12	[1] −679.42
Total	11,100,000	3,592,051.04	1,362,046.36
Exportation: Cotton	1,000,000	676,485.65	270,953.39
Diversion: Cotton insulation	1,000,000	204,125.00	
Administration of marketing agreements	[2] 700,000	222,125.00	26,353.00
Other administrative expenses	[2] 1,060,000	575,028.45	98,008.34
Total	1,760,000	797,153.45	124,361.34
Grand total	14,860,000	5,269,815.15	1,757,361.00

[1] Erroneous payments, adjusted in November.
[2] Estimated annual obligations.

Just analyze this table. There is nothing to show that the wool men are to enjoy any benefits, but you will note that $1,000,000 is set aside to pay an export subsidy on cotton even if the Agriculture Department is asking for a 3 percent increase in cotton production this year. You will note that another $1,000,000 was allocated for cotton insulation. This subsidy is to manufacture insulation materials. Is there any provision for wool insulation? No. How about the other nonsubsidized manufactures of insulation material? How long must they compete with federally subsidized cotton insulation? One cotton Congressman tried to explain the cotton insulation on the basis of need for veterans' housing, but this subsidy was being paid before the war. On this basis the proposal to subsidize southern pine for lumber will no doubt soon be in order.

Where, I ask, in the law is there a provision to use these section 32 funds for administration of marketing agreements, or for other administrative purposes? Read the law and give the answer.

In the past other uses of these section 32 funds have been made. The official table from the United States Department of Agriculture is as follows:

TABLE IV.—*U. S. Department of Agriculture Production and Marketing Administration*

SECTION 32—TOBACCO PROGRAMS

Year	Diversion to byproducts and new uses				Exportation	
	Fertilizer experiment		Nicotine insecticide			
	Hundredweight	Value	Hundredweight	Value	Hundredweight	Value
1936			150,647	$1,090,213		
1937			179,645	1,718,756	3,469	$3,881
1938	35,000	$487,616	111,301	1,068,222		
1939	93,996	260,092	42,178	140,805		
1942			90,173	367,361		
1947			233,435	2,092,965		
1941			288,888	2,708,475		
Total	128,996	747,708	1,056,267	9,184,797	3,469	3,881

The fertilizer experiment program was designed primarily to relieve the market of surplus low-grade dark tobacco. Fertilizer produced under this program was distributed largely to institutions.

The nicotine insecticide program was originally an attempt to remove burdensome surpluses of certain types of low-grade dark tobaccos, and to assure production of needed quantities of nicotine sulfate for use in insecticides. Later, the war cut off imported materials such as derris root, and limited the availability of critical domestic materials—copper and arsenic—formerly used in the manufacture of insecticides. Nicotine sulfate, a tobacco byproduct, was used as a substitute in part for these scarce materials.

The foregoing shows the expenditure of these section 32 funds for grinding up tobacco and using it for fertilizer, and for subsidizing insecticide manufacture.

A $45,000,000 blank check to the Secretary of Agriculture should not be appropriated. It does not make sense to obtain funds from wool and spend the funds on cotton. The cotton-insulation program has long ceased to be an experiment. If the cost of food is $330 per capita and the cost of government is $371 per capita, it is an appropriate time to provide more food and less wasteful government.

The Late Honorable Clarence E. Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Clarence E. Hancock was a great personal loss to me. In my opinion, he typified the very best qualities of a public man as well as a personal friend. He never stooped to demagoguery. His thinking on issues before the House was always clear, logical, and on a high statesmanlike plane.

When I first came down here nearly 8 years ago, our former colleague Bert Snell had told me that I would find Clarence Hancock kind and helpful. I had met him a couple of times before coming down and we had some mutual friends. After becoming better acquainted, his counsel, advice, and example were always a great help and comfort to me. This was especially true of complicated legal bills coming from his Committee on the Judiciary. Not being a lawyer, I many times found myself bewildered by the legal language and technicalities of some of these bills. I would go to Clarence Hancock and he would patiently and clearly outline to me the real meaning of the legislation and it was refreshing and stimulating to hear him analyze the bill.

As we all know, he had a great record in the First World War, and his strong character was put to another test in the Second World War. Never from his speech or actions could one tell of the strain he was under while his only son, John, was bombing Japan as pilot of a B–29.

It was characteristic that when he decided not to run for Congress because of ill health, he never told our New York delegation until after the adjournment of the House in order to forestall any tribute that we would want to get together and give him.

I think his dear wife and son know pretty well the affection, high esteem, and respect that his colleagues held for him, and our sympathy goes out to them. Knowing him was one of the grandest experiences of my life.

Awake, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. TOWE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Awake, America," written by William Schulman, national commander of the Legion of Guardsmen, North Bergen, N. J.:

AWAKE, AMERICA

The way things are going we cannot blind ourselves to the fact that growing tension between the Soviet Union and ourselves easily could produce a shooting scrape. Operating just short of the chalk line of war always involves the risk that someone will miss his step and cross it. In a real knock-down fight, the Russians will prove no push-over. They are smart, and with plenty of know-how. They are regimented to a single despotic will, and, as the Germans discovered, will not yield when the going grows tough. Under circumstances, good sense would dictate that we take every possible move to protect ourselves. Instead we have followed an opposite course, and have allowed our military defenses to disintegrate. In the United States the great bulk of aviation manufactures are either insolvent, or seeking to make ice boxes and prefabricated houses instead of planes—while the Russians plants are being expanded.

We may be mistaken in our judgments and the Russians may not want war, but they are getting ready for it.

What are we doing to meet the crisis?

Part of our plan lies in the huge international ransom by which our State Department hopes to buy peace; this, together with the Greeks, the Turks, and the Saudi Arabians, is supposed to protect us, if and when the greatest test of wills comes.

A modern military machine is a highly organized, complex apparatus. It is composed of specialists and technicians, and places a premium on technical skill, mobility, and all out concentrations of attack power. Its first principle is that the only good defense is a powerful offensive. Today the potentials of machine warfare are far advanced over what they were.

In war of the future, great bodies of men will land directly by air in the center of the enemy's territory, in lightning operations, after the way has been paved by a shattering attack of bombers and guided missiles. Except for the mopping up work, the entire operation will be primarily an air operation. Shattering surprise and massive destruction power will be brought to the highest point of military effectiveness ever visualized by man. Everything, including the supply trains, will be air-borne. Even in the case of germ and chemical warfare, the airplane will play the decisive role.

To establish an adequate air army will prove expensive, but it will not be half as expensive as the Marshall plan of international philanthropy, nor a fraction as expensive as a lost war.

With the great productive machinery of America behind such a defense establishment, neither Russia nor anyone else would dare to entertain the idea of aggression against us.

The mere act of building this air force would tend to revitalize our dying aircraft industry, whose present desperate situation is the most dangerous phenomenon in America today. Only an industrial establishment which is strong and alive can make for a military establishment which has power to win. The two are interlocked and cannot be dissevered from each other.

On the same score, private flying also should receive the sympathetic attention of Government. Aviation easily could become a necessary subject in the public schools. Subsidies to private groups who wish to learn the art of gliding or flying properly could be in order. In and out of schools, 10,000 or 20,000 such groups could exist in the United States within a year. The planes and equipment they would use would entail considerable amount of Government assistance, but the money would remain in America.

Events are moving fast and there may not be much time left. Common sense demands that we be done with the current crop of pipe dreams and illusions, and get down to cases. America can only be safe if she is strong; and strength in terms of this century means unquestionable military superiority in the air. Without this, nothing else counts, and with it, nothing else matters.

WILLIAM SCHULMAN,
National Commander,
Legion of Guardsmen.

Navy Department's Wage Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. McGARVEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by John P. Frey, president, metal trades department, American Federation of Labor.

I wish to compliment Mr. Frey and also his workers for the fine job they are doing.

The statement follows:

THE NAVY DEPARTMENT'S WAGE POLICY UNDERMINES CONFIDENCE

(By John P. Frey, president, metal trades department, A. F. of L.)

In the middle of November 1947 the Navy Department issued its new schedule of wages for navy yard employees. This was about a year overdue.

An examination of the new wage rates established, revealed an amazing inconsistency. There was an absence of realism, and a wholly unjustified, unbalance of wages for the same classification of labor as between the several navy yards.

In one navy yard, whose wage classification had been below the average of other navy yards, although the mechanical skill required in this yard equals that of any, none of the classifications of labor received an increase in the hourly wage rate, while 19 of the classifications were reduced from 4 to 8 cents per hour.

In another navy yard increases in the hourly wage rate up to 14 cents per hour were given to 24 classifications; 35 additional classifications received from 15 to 19 cents per hour; 58 additional classifications received increases of from 20 to 25 cents per hour, while 10 additional classifications received over 25 cents.

To accomplish this unbalance and unjustified result, the Navy Department arbitrarily set aside its long-time interpretation and application of the law of 1862, the law establishing the rule for the setting of navy-yard wage rates.

Then, to close the door to labor's right to have an adequate voice in the collection and examination of wage data from private industry, the Navy Department abolished the Navy Wage Review Board, upon which labor had an official representative since 1921.

In 1861, Congress enacted a law basing navy-yard wages upon wages being paid in private shipyards in the vicinity. In 1862 this law was amended to read—

"That * * * the rate of wages of the employees in the navy yards shall conform, as nearly as is consistent with the public interest, with those of private establishments in the immediate vicinity of the respective yards, to be determined by the commandants of the navy yards, subject to the approval and revision of the Secretary of the Navy."

When the law of 1861, amended in 1862, was enacted, the navy yards were constructing wooden warships only. It was apparent that the steam power being introduced in wooden ships, required the services of skilled metal workers. This led to the amending act of 1862.

Two provisions of the law of 1862 are vague and indefinite. How large an area would constitute "the vicinity" of the navy yard, and what construction should be placed on the words "the public interest?"

These two provisions were interpreted by commanders of navy yards according to their own judgment, judgment which led to wide and conflicting variations in wages as between navy yards. The "vicinity" of navy yards was sometime limited so as to exclude more favorable wage data for work of a comparable character in the immediate industrial area. Some navy yards were situated in large industrial areas, such as Boston, Mass., Brooklyn, N. Y., Philadelphia, Pa., Vallejo, Calif., and Bremerton, Wash. Other navy yards such as Portsmouth, N. H., Newport, R. I., Washington, D. C., Norfolk, Va., and Charleston, S. C., were more isolated but nevertheless close to large industrial areas.

As the result of wage rates formulated by navy-yard commanders, and the action upon these by the Navy Department, a wide variation in wage rates for the same classification of labor developed, particularly in the navy yards along the Atlantic seaboard. The local navy-yard wage boards appointed by the yard commanders, while well qualified as naval officers, possessed widely varying degrees of practical experience with the realities of the wage structure in private industry.

Since 1862 an industrial revolution has taken place more far reaching than the replacing of wooden ships by the present types of warships. The navy yards of our country, for many years, have required the highest degree of skills obtainable. No manufacturing establishment requires the same high percentage of thoroughly trained skilled workmen.

The Navy Department recognized the necessity of paying approximately the same wage rate to navy-yard employees as was paid in private industry for comparable work. The unsatisfactory, conflicting, and unbalanced wage rates established in navy yards, was due largely to the fact that the navy-yard wage boards, appointed by navy-yard commanders, were insufficiently familiar with the industries and the types of skilled workers employed in them, to determine the comparability of the work in private industry and the comparable skill required in navy yards.

Navy-yard labor had long protested against the inequality of navy-yard wage schedules for the same type of workmen. Navy-yard labor was insisting upon the right to collect wage data for comparable work in

private industry, and to discuss this data with the local navy wage board.

In 1921, on the initiative of Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and the thorough approval of Secretary Daniels, a navy wage review board was established. This consisted of two representatives of the Navy Department, and one appointed by the president of the A. F. of L. This gave labor's representative an opportunity of examining the wage data collected, and of assisting the Navy Department's representatives in determining whether some of it was invalid because it was not for comparable work to that done in the navy yards.

This board of three continued to function annually until in 1938 or 1939, when, because the CIO had organized a few of the workers in some navy yards, the navy wage review board was increased to five, three representing the Navy Department and two navy-yard labor. The Navy's majority on the board was the determining factor, but labor was in a position to give navy-yard employees a voice in the determination of the comparability of wage data.

Under the operation of this committee over the years, the Navy Department enlarged the areas to be known as the immediate vicinity of the yard. Circumstances compelled this modification for the American metalworking industry had enormously developed since 1862, and enlarged the areas in which the private plants were located so greatly that the original vicinity of the yard had become inadequate as a basis for comparisons.

The marked differences in wages paid to the many classifications of labor in navy yards was gradually adjusted so that they were on a basis of approximate uniformity for the same classifications. The unbalances which had existed prior to 1921 were largely eliminated.

In June 1947 the Navy Department abolished the Navy Wage Review Board without notifying the labor members of the Board, or the organizations which had appointed them. It then returned to the vicinity of the yard as applied in 1862. At the same time the Navy Department materially restricted the opportunity of navy yard employees' wage committees to discuss wage data with the local Navy wage board.

In doing this the Navy Department eliminated navy yard labor's opportunity to an adequate voice and to representation, at a time when other large departments of the Government employing civilian workmen had established permanent joint committees, giving to labor the right to representation and participation in the discussion and consideration of wage rates.

The present policy of the Navy Department on the question of labor's right to an adequate voice on the comparability of wage data is as reactionary and as obsolete as the wooden warships of 1862. To abolish labor representation after it had been in existence since 1921 was to move backwards, and this action was as arbitrary as it was bureaucratic, unsound, and impractical.

The Navy Department's present policy has undermined the confidence of navy yard employees, a confidence which it is necessary to have restored if our navy yards are to continue to attract the highly skilled workmen required.

The present unrealistic and autocratic attitude of the Navy Department is unacceptable to free American workmen, who long ago won their right in private industry and in most governmental departments employing civilian mechanics to have an adequate voice in the discussion and consideration of their terms of employment and conditions of labor.

The American Navy, under the Navy Department, is now by far the most efficient in the world. It is forward looking. It is progressive and constructive. It should be big enough to recognize that it cannot afford to go back to the period of wooden warships to find the basis for its present-day industrial-relations policy.

Enough Said

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following is from page 19, table II, of Publication No. 572 of the United States Department of Agriculture, showing nutritive value of various foods:

Product:	*Calories*
1 pound oleomargarine	3,327
1 pound lard	4,086
International units, vitamin A	[1]

[1] Plain oleomargarine is considered to have no vitamin A value.

The above shows that lard has 22 percent more calories. Lard can be purchased for much less than oleo. Not all oleo is fortified with vitamin A.

If anyone feels the need of vitamin A there is nothing stopping him from going to the village drug store and purchasing some vitamin A tablets.

If lard was given a shower both to give it taste and odor of butter; if lard had some vitamin A injected into it to give it some of the properties of butter; if lard was colored to look like butter, then a product with 22 percent more calories than oleo can be obtained for 25 percent less money. The price of lard has been from 17 cents to 27 cents per pound since June.

Since Europe is in need of calories, why not lard instead of oleo?

Truman Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fairmont Sentinel, Fairmont, Minn., of January 8, 1948:

POLITICS

Knowing that some sort of refurbishing of the individual income-tax picture is necessary, President Truman asked for a blanket reduction of $40 a head for each taxpayer and his dependents. The loss, according to the President, should be made up from increased corporate taxes. The plan is, of course, a hasty appeasement move to placate the impatient public until a more thorough tax program can be put into effect.

The $40 reduction, on one hand, and increased rate for corporations, on the other, is as senseless as it is ineffective. The lower-income-bracket taxpayers would benefit somewhat from an immediate reduction—if it was to apply on 1947 income and paid back to the original payee—but increased corporate taxes would lead inevitably to one thing—higher prices.

Many folks in the low-income bracket, with a number of dependents, pay no income tax now and would receive absolutely no benefit from the President's current plan.

Tax reduction, to be of benefit to everyone, must be applied to everyone, big and little. Corporations cannot reduce the price of their products if more and more taxes stare them in the face. The individual can do nothing but ask for wage increases if his taxes aren't reduced, if he is in the moderate-income bracket. The lower-income taxpayer, who now pays no income tax, received no consideration from blanket reductions.

We cannt go along with an across-the-board tax-reduction program that does not prove beneficial to all proportionately.

Problems of Small Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, last evening I had the good fortune to be one of the many Members of Congress who attended the dinner of the National Small Businessmen's Association. I do not believe I ever attended a more enthusiastic meeting. Since I am a small businessman myself I felt right at home with this group and met several members of the association who are in my line of business. Representatives from the great majority of our States were present. These men are sincere in their efforts, and we all know that their combined forces make up the backbone of our domestic economy. These men were not in Washington with any particular gripe. All they want is a 50–50 break, and, believe me, this Congress should see that they get it.

Elmo Roper's column in today's New York Herald Tribune, which appears below, entitled "Business Seen Taking Chances in Boom," attracted my attention. I judge that the majority of the men present at last night's meeting were retailers—the men back home who operate on their main street. They are the men who guide the destiny of their community; they serve on their local school boards; they hold local municipal offices; they are expected to contribute to every local benefit; and, I am sure, they take an active part in the church of their choice.

What has the New Deal done for this group of small businessmen? Not a thing helpful. They have only been harassed with demands for ridiculous and unnecessary reports—threats of restriction on their trade—and the like. Mr. Truman wants to bring back that wartime condition by again inflicting controls upon us. What are we going to do about it?

In his article Mr. Roper brings to our attention the chances that business is taking today. These small businessmen have to carry an inventory if they are going to do business. They always have to take the chance of a falling market and an inventory loss. They are taking that chance now and facing a slap like we all took in 1920—destructive to the point of ruination in many cases. They stand ready to take the results without a whimper if the Government will only leave its hands off. If we are going to have free enterprise, let us keep it free.

Mr. Roper's article follows:

BUSINESS SEEN TAKING CHANCES IN BOOM

(By Elmo Roper)

Last week I reported that the business leaders of the country—as polled in the Fortune executive forecast—expect prosperity to last at least through the first half of 1948. They think that the year ahead will bring record volumes of production, investment, sales, and profits.

But will the Nation later pay a price for such prosperity? What are some of the developments inherent in this golden era of boom which might well be the cause of another "bust" unless watched carefully?

Most talked about, and perhaps most important, is the future of prices. The executive forecast asked the cross section of business leaders:

"What about the cost of living? On a 1935–39 base, the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index was 153.3 last January; in July it was 158.4. Compared to July 1947, where do you think the index will be by July of next year?"

	May 1947	January 1948
	Percent	*Percent*
Up sharply (15 percent or more)	1	5
Up moderately (between 5 percent and 15 percent)	6	54
Pretty much unchanged (plus or minus 5 percent)	26	27
Down moderately (between 5 percent and 15 percent)	62	12
Down sharply (15 percent or more)	4	1
No estimate	1	1

In May of last year, the survey of businessmen reported that they expected lower prices, but the cost of living for most Americans actually skyrocketed to new highs. Today the same businessmen expect even higher prices. One can only wonder if there is a limit beyond which customers will be priced out of the market.

As to the reasons for the expected higher prices, clues are found in the answers the businessmen gave to the question:

"Could you indicate below each of the following what you are planning for during the first half of next year?"

	Prices you will charge	Cost of materials and products you buy	Your own labor costs
A sharp increase	2	5	4
A moderate increase	34	55	65
No appreciable change	55	34	27
A moderate decrease	6	4	2
A sharp decrease	1		
No estimate	2	2	2

According to the leaders of management themselves, the reason for higher prices will be still higher costs of materials and bigger pay rolls for labor. Others will charge that the expected higher profits will contribute substantially to the higher ultimate prices. The important news to the American consumer, however, is that more than 90 percent of these businessmen anticipate no price relief in 1948, and more than 33 percent think that prices will rise even higher.

One of the earmarks of booms has been the large degree of speculation rampant in the stock market. Much of this speculation has been curtailed by the Securities and Exchange Commission regulations, but until now the stock market has seemed to be unduly "bearish" in the face of a sizable boom. Not so in 1948, say the business executives. They expect that stock-market prices will be stable or rising this year—a signal for an increased volume of trading. They were asked:

"During the first half of 1948 do you expect generally rising, stable, or falling stock-market prices?"

	May 1947	January 1948
	Percent	*Percent*
Rising	17	26
Stable	29	33
Falling	24	17
Won't guess	29	24

Besides a large amount of activity on the stock exchanges, booms are usually marked by excess inventory accumulation. One of the factors which has always hastened any collapse has been the panic which hits dealers and wholesalers as well as manufacturers who think they are going to be caught with high-priced inventories which they cannot sell. This, of course, has always led to frantic unloading of inventories, resulting in price wars which bring on a crash.

It is not encouraging, therefore, to report that the retailers and wholesalers of the Nation are today not shortening their inventories as they were last spring. Instead, they seem to look forward to relaxing somewhat their former policy of caution. This is indicated in the question which asked retailers and wholesalers:

"For the first half of next year, apart from normal seasonal practice, are you planning to increase inventories, shorten them, or hold them at about the same level?"

	May 1947	January 1948
	Percent	*Percent*
Increase	3	8
Hold at about same level	29	60
Shorten	65	31
No estimate	3	1

These are but a few of the potentially dangerous undercurrents which are by-products of today's boom. After the last Fortune executive forecast in May it seemed that the over-all caution of business toward the boom served to limit rash speculation and unsound ventures.

Today a good deal of the caution seems to be gone from business attitudes. Perhaps this optimism about the future is justified. However, it is also possible that the wave of optimism will sweep away that ounce of caution so necessary to prevent a collapse.

Rarely in the past has the future of so much of the world depended on the decisions which American management must make in 1948.

The Strange Case of Heinz Norden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on October 5, 1947, and on December 19, 1947, the Washington Post took occasion to charge me with injustice to two civilians who lost their jobs with the American military government. What is involved here is not merely my personal reputation but rather the ramifications within the American military government in Germany disclosed by these cases. I shall limit myself at this time to the case of Heinz Norden, who is one of those involved. I shall attempt to prove that the case demonstrates inexcusable ignorance or negligence, or both, on the part of those responsible for the American military government in Germany, and I hope that after these facts are made known there will be a searching investigation of the entire situation.

Following its usual tactics, The Washington Post, which is becoming more and more identified as the Washington edition of the Daily Worker, published the disarming denials of Heinz Norden instead of searching for the actual facts in this case. This is not the first time that the Washington Post has defended persons with Communist records.

Here is a man who, according to his own letter, published in the Washington Post of December 19, 1947, was assigned by the American military government in Germany to the work of counterintelligence and was approved for this job by Brig. Gen. Edwin L. Sibert, then Chief of Intelligence. He was later sought out by Brig. Gen. Robert A. McClure, director of information control under the American military government in Germany, and appointed editor in chief of the official magazine, Heute—Today. His record was cleared by a loyalty board of the American military government in Germany. His record and work have been approved by Maj. Gen. John Hester on March 13, 1945; by James A. Clark, chief, information control division, office of military government for Bavaria, on November 6, 1947; and by Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

What are the facts regarding this man's record? Are they such as to warrant his appointment in such sensitive posts as counterintelligence and as the official editor of a magazine in our zone in Germany? Do they warrant his clearance by the Army's loyalty board?

First. According to Heinz Norden's letter of March 6, 1942, he was a member of the American Labor Party. This organization has been repudiated as Communist controlled by numerous labor leaders of the State of New York. It has been cited as a front for the Communist Party by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. Today it is joining hands with the Communist Party in support of Henry A. Wallace.

Second. According to Heinz Norden's letter of December 15, 1947, he was a financial contributor to the American League Against War and Fascism. If Mr. Norden did not know what he was contributing for, he certainly has no place in counterintelligence. If he did know, then there is all the more reason to bar him. The American League Against War and Fascism was active on an outright treasonable program. Attorney General Francis Biddle has declared that it was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." Vice chairman of this organization was none other than Earl Browder, then general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States. This organization has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944.

Third. The Daily Worker of January 28, 1938, page 2, cites Heinz Norden as

a speaker at a model legislature conducted by the American Youth Congress. Former Attorney General Biddle referred to the American Youth Congress as a "front organization of the Communist Party." He said that "since its inception (it) has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth." It has also been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. This is the organization which booed President Roosevelt on the White House lawn during the Stalin-Hitler pact.

Fourth. In his letter of July 28, 1943, Heinz Norden has admitted being a member of the Book and Magazine Guild, an affiliate of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, a Communist-controlled union within the CIO.

Fifth. The Daily Worker of February 14, 1939, page 4, shows Heinz Norden as chairman of a City-Wide Tenants' Council. This organization was officially represented in the American Peace Mobilization at its meeting on April 5, 1941. It will be remembered that the American Peace Mobilization picketed the White House during the Stalin-Hitler pact and opposed lend-lease and our defense program in general. There is no question that the City-Wide Tenants' Council was one of a network of Communist fronts supported by the Communist press and operating in New York City. According to the Daily Worker of November 27, 1936, page 2, and Heinz Norden's letter of March 6, 1942, he was a representative of the tenants' league which was active in a housing development in New York City known as Knickerbocker Village, in which activities well-known Communists were active.

Sixth. According to the admission of Heinz Norden in his letter of March 6, 1942, he attended a meeting of the Communist Party held in Madison Square Garden and occasionally read the Daily Worker and the New Masses, official Communist publications.

Seventh. According to a pamphlet entitled "The People versus H. C. L.," page 3, December 11-12, 1937, Heinz Norden was a sponsor of the Consumers National Federation. The California Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of 1943 has characterized this organization as "created by the Communist Party and used for the purpose of spreading propaganda in schools and through women's clubs." It was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Eighth. According to a letterhead dated November 25, 1941, Heinz Norden was a member of the board of directors of the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights. This organization was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. This organization was a predecessor to the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which has been cited as an organization defending well-known Communist leaders by Attorney General Biddle.

Ninth. In his letter of December 15, 1947, Heinz Norden admits that "I may have 'belonged' to some Communist-front groups," although in his letter to me of January 8, 1948, he declared: "At no time was I a member of any organization dominated to my knowledge by Communists."

Tenth. In this letter of January 8, 1948, Heinz Norden admits that he joined the American Veterans Committee, which has a chapter in Munich. Observers who have returned from Germany declare that the American Veterans Committee in our occupation zone is strongly infiltrated with Communist influence.

Eleventh. In his letter of January 8, 1948, Heinz Norden admits membership in the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America. This organization later merged into the present United Public Workers, which has been openly shown as Communist controlled by facts presented on the floor of this House. The State, County, and Municipal Workers and the United Public Workers have both been headed by Abram Flaxer, whose Communist record has been exposed by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report on March 29, 1944.

Twelfth. Heinz Norden was the translator of a biography of Karl Marx written by Franz Mehring, published in 1935 by Covici, Friede, Inc. The book was dedicated to Clara Zetkin, the leading woman Communist of Germany. The translator's preface states:

> In 1933, on the fiftieth anniversary of the death of Marx, a new edition was published and it is a translation of this edition which is now before the reader. Franz Mehring dedicated the first edition to: "Clara Zetkin, heiress to the Marxist spirit," and the first American edition therefore respects his wishes. * * * After Mehring's death a new era in Marxist research was opened up with its center in the Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow and many facts unknown to him were brought to light. The fiftieth edition was, therefore, brought up-to-date by means of an appendix. * * * This appendix, which the reader will find at the end of this volume, deals with all points of importance brought to light concerning Marx and Marxism.

It is evident from this note by Heinz Norden and his sister, Ruth Norden, who also occupies a post in the American military zone in Germany, that they were cooperating with Communist propaganda headquarters in Moscow in bringing forth this work.

Thirteenth. Heinz Norden and his sister, Ruth Norden, collaborated in translating the works of other pro-Communist writers, including Dawn Breaks, by Franz Carl Weiskopf; The Great Offensive, by Max Werner, and other works by the latter author.

Fourteenth. The records of the Navy Department, Bureau of Personnel, disclose the following in regard to Heinz Norden:

> Norden made application for enlistment in the naval service on December 14, 1941, and was accepted for enlistment on February 3, 1942. However, upon receipt of information that Norden had, while in New York City, close and active association with and in behalf of groups considered to have interests inimical to those of the United States, he was discharged on February 16, 1942.

Mr. Speaker, I am no investigator, and I do not have any special facilities for obtaining this information. I assume that the Department of National Defense could much more easily have obtained this information. Therefore, I state most emphatically that the employment of Heinz Norden in counter intelligence and in the post as editor of the magazine Heute, was an inexcusable violation of responsibility by the officers of the American military government. His clearance by the AMG loyalty board is all the more reprehensible. An examination of issues of the magazine Heute does not show that it was an effective organ in counteracting the barrage of slander directed from Communist sources at the United States. In answer to a specific request from me, Heinz Norden could not give any examples where he criticized the Communist Party or the Soviet Union.

I hope that the proper committees of the House and the Department of National Defense will investigate this matter thoroughly and hold the proper individuals responsible for the circumstances surrounding this case.

Bill's In Trouble—Poem by James Barton Adams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the ageless poem, Bill's in Trouble, by James Barton Adams, first came to my attention a number of years ago when a close personal friend of mine on the day I first filed for our legislature gave me a reprint which has been run in the Portland Oregonian. According to my information, James Barton Adams wrote this poem over 50 years ago, while serving on the Denver Post. With the convening of many State legislatures and another congressional session just getting under way, the time is appropriate for a republication of this immortal classic, which I include under leave to extend my remarks:

BILL'S IN TROUBLE

I've got a letter, parson, from my son away out West,
An' my ol' heart is heavy as an anvil in my breast,
To think the boy whose future I had once so proudly planned
Should wander from the path of right an' come to sich an end!
I told him when he started out toward the settin' sun
He'd find the row he had to hoe a mighty rocky one—
He'd miss his father's counsel, an' his mother's prayers, too;
But he said the farm was hateful, and he guessed he'd have to go.

I know thar's big temptation for a youngster in the West,
But I believed our Bill had the courage to resist,
An' when he left I warned him o' the ever waitin' snares,
That lie like hidden sarpents in life's pathway everywheres,
But Bill he promised faithful to be keerful, an' allowed
He'd build a reputation that'd make us mighty proud;
But it seems as how my counsel sort o' faded from his mind,
And now the boy's in trouble o' the very wustest kind!

His letters came so seldom that I somehow sort o' knowed
That Billy was a trampin' on a mighty rocky road,
But never once imagined he would bow my head in shame,
An' in the dust'd waller his ol' daddy's honored name.
He writes from out in Oregon, an' the story's mighty short;
I just can't tell his mother, it'll crush her poor ol' heart!
An' so I reckon, parson, you might break the news to her—
Bill's in the legislatur', but he doesn't say what fur.

—*James Barton Adams.*

State of United States Army Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, in amplification of the remarks I made under the 1-minute rule I am pleased to include herewith details of the status of United States Army vessels insofar as conversion and safety-at-sea work are concerned as furnished by Maj. Gen. Edmond H. Leavey, the chief of transportation, as follows:

Briefly, however, the status of safety work on our passenger transports is as follows: Nine vessels have already been completed (4 being conversions and safety-at-sea work, and 5 being safety-at-sea projects only); 18 vessels are now at shipyards (10 undergoing conversion and safety-at-sea work concurrently, and 8 having safety work only performed); contracts have been awarded on 6 vessels which have not yet entered yards (3 each for combined conversion and safety, and safety work only); and 4 others on which contracts have not yet been made will go to shipyards prior to March 31, 1948 (3 for combined conversion and safety, and 1 for safety-at-sea work only). One additional passenger transport will undergo safety-at-sea work only, in the Far East during the current fiscal year.

It might well be mentioned at this time that our safety-at-sea work is not restricted to passenger vessels. On both cargo transports and certain seagoing harbor craft also, our program is progressing very rapidly. It is expected that all such vessels will be fully certificated by the Coast Guard not later than March 31 in the same manner as are commercial-operated and privately owned vessels of various types.

The older vessels which are not included in our permanent postwar fleet and which we are presently operating will be retired as rapidly as the permanent fleet vessels complete their safety-at-sea work. Since these vessels will shortly be retired they have, of course, not been included in the safety-at-sea or conversion program.

A tabular summation follows:

U. S. Army passenger and troop transports—status of vessels in safety program

Vessel	Type	Nature of work	Present status
Sergeant Curtis F. Shoup, ex-Spindle Eye	C1-MAV-1	Conversion and safety-at-sea	Completed.
Private Elden H. Johnson, ex-Pinkney	ZC-2	do	Do.
Private William H. Thomas, ex-Fitzey	ZC-2	do	Do.
Sergeant Charles E. Mower, ex-Tryon	ZC-2	do	Do.
General Harry Taylor	C-4	Safety-at-sea	Do.
General R. E. Callan	C-4	do	Do.
General A. W. Brewster	C-4	do	Do.
General A. W. Greely	C-4	do	Do.
General R. M. Blatchford	C-4	do	Do.
General C. C. Ballou	C-4	do	In shipyard.
General C. H. Muir	C-4	do	Do.
General D. E. Aultman	C-4	do	Do.
General C. G. Morton	C-4	do	Do.
General E. T. Collins	C-4	do	Do.
General H. B. Freeman	C-4	do	Do.
General W. F. Hase	C-4	do	Do.
General Fred C. Ainsworth	C-3	Conversion and safety-at-sea	Do.
General David C. Shanks	C-3	do	Do.
General George W. Goethals	C-3	do	Do.
General Henry Gibbins	C-3	do	Do.
General E. D. Patrick, ex-Hughes	P-2	do	Do.
General Simon B. Buckner, ex-Eberle	P-2	do	Do.
General Alexander M. Patch, ex-Coontz	P-2	do	Do.
General Daniel I. Sultan, ex-Benham	P-2	do	Do.
General Hugh J. Gaffey, ex-Capps	P-2	do	Do.
General Maurice Rose, ex-Rodman	P-2	do	Do.
USAT Hope	C1-B	Safety-at-sea	Do.
General M. M. Patrick	C-4	do	Contract let; vessel to enter shipyard in February.
General H. F. Hodges	C-4	do	Contract let; vessel to enter shipyard in March.
USAT Comfort	C1-B	do	Contract let; vessel to enter shipyard in February.
Admiral W. S. Sims	P-2	Conversion and safety-at-sea	Do.
Frederick Funston	C-3	do	Do.
James O'Hara	C-3	do	Do.
Admiral H. T. Mayo	P-2	Safety-at-sea	Contract to be let third quarter, fiscal year 1948; vessel to enter shipyard in April.
USAT Mercy	C1-B	Conversion and safety-at-sea	Contract to be let in March and vessel to go to shipyard immediately.
Pvt. Jose F. Valdez, ex-Round Splice	C1-MAV-1	do	Contract to be let and vessel to enter shipyard third quarter, fiscal year 1948.
Sgt. Jonah E. Kelley, ex-Link Splice	C1-MAV-1	do	Do.
Pvt. George J. Peters, ex-Lock Knot	C1-MAV-1	Safety-at-sea	To have work accomplished in theater during fourth quarter, fiscal year 1948.

Summary

Type of vessel	Safety-at-sea		Safety-at-sea and conversion	
	Completed or in shipyard	Yet to go to yard	Completed or in shipyard	Yet to go to yard
P-2	0	1	6	1
C-4	12	2	0	0
C-3	0	0	4	2
ZC-2	0	0	3	0
C1-MAV-1	0	0	1	1[1]
C1-B	1	1	0	1
Total	13	4	14	7

[1] Includes 1 in Far East.

Speculation in Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, "Help wanted—male" is the sign now hung out in Washington. "No applicant will be considered who intends to use his official position as an opportunity to reap personal gain" will, I hope, be the No. 1 requirement established by those charged with the responsibility of selecting substitutes for the faithless to their trust as they begin their exodus from the Nation's Capital.

Shocking indeed is the disclosure of the name of the family of the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture on the latest list of insiders engaged in market speculation in commodities.

A revised standard of propriety is recognized as the foremost need in Washington officialdom in a commendably frank editorial in the normally pro-administration Washington Post, which,

under leave to extend my remarks, I quote:

INSIDE INFORMATION

Gov. Harold E. Stassen's query addressed to the President answers itself. The query is this: "Does a man who has admitted under investigation that he made approximately a million dollars ($932,703 to be exact) in personal profit by speculating since the war in increased prices of food and commodities belong in the position of assistant to the Secretary of the Army for procurement and industrial mobilization?" The answer, of course, is no. And the answer remains the same if it is asked respecting a member of the United States Senate intimately involved in agricultural problems, a physician with easy access to the seats of the mighty or any other high public official whose position might enable him to profit from inside information about the development of governmental policy.

Mr. Pauley's reiterated response to Governor Stassen that his trading was not based on inside information is beside the point. A man wagering large amounts of money on the fluctuations of commodity exchanges is, to begin with, not a man free to devote his full time and attention to his public office. However conscientious and disinterested he may strive to be, moreover, it is impossible for him—or for the public—to feel sure that his actions and motives are altogether unaffected by his private interests. Finally, such a man is a constant embarrassment to his associates. They must be always on guard lest some careless observation, some chance remark, convey the kind of inside information Mr. Pauley professes never to have gleaned. Public servants, in short, should not be persons inevitably subject to suspicion.

Strange Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting article which was sent me by a constituent with the suggestiron that it be inserted in the RECORD:

STRANGE ECONOMICS—COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISORS' REPORT FULL OF HALF-TRUTHS, BANALITIES, SAYS ECONOMIST

(By Lawrence Fertig)

One of the most amazing documents to come out of Washington has been prepared by the President's Council of Economic Advisors. Mr. Truman will undoubtedly base his State of the Union message, to be delivered this week, very largely upon it. It is hard to recall any public statement by a group of economists which contains so many misstatements, half-truths, and banalities as this report incorporates. One shudders to think of the Nation being guided by such economic precepts.

Can you imagine anyone who thinks that increased production at the present time is inadvisable? The Council thinks so. Why? Because increased production in catching up with the market demand may force disastrous price-breaks, result in production cut-backs, and thus prove to be its own undoing. Prices are soaring because there is too much money for our present production.

In increased quantity of goods would plainly lower prices and cause a better balance and a much healthier situation. Apparently the Council thinks that less production, which would cause higher prices, and a bad imbalance, is now preferable. Dr. Nourse's committee admits that there are shortages of basic materials in many industries, but it doesn't see how increasing hours of work from 40 to 44 hours would help that.

ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL

More work in digging a greater quantity of copper ore, and more hours of work in making more copper pipe would not, according to the Council, decrease the shortage of this product. When the average man reads this he will be forgiven for being reminded of Alice in Wonderland.

Do you know furthermore that the standard of living of the average man has been lowered by the fact that the tractor and the reaper are now employed instead of the plow and hand labor? "Accumulations of capital over the years," says the report, "have in the past involved deprivations to the rank-and-file worker."

All modern machinery, such as tractors, reapers, power-driven machines, etc., represents "accumulations of capital." By means of this machinery a worker can produce in an hour what he formerly produced by hand in a week. As a matter of fact, without these accumulations of capital the American worker might be living on the scale of a Chinese coolie or a South American peasant.

Because of the accumulations of capital represented by modern machines the American worker enjoys the highest standard of living in the world. Can you imagine anyone—no less an economist—denying these simple facts? The Council's statements are a direct paraphrase of the discredited concept fathered by Karl Marx in his famous book, Kapital. Marx stated that the worker would get less and less as industrialization increased.

EXPAND GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

Throughout the report there are overtones of the necessity of an expanding role in our economy for the Government. It points out that the Government has never prevented private schools, private physicians, oculists, dentists, and commercial ventures in music, drama, art, and radio. But, asks the report, will these private ventures "bring the level of total activity in the economy up to an acceptable total of maximum production?"

If not, the Council suggests, it may become necessary to "channel more of our resources through Government agencies in these areas." There we have the final pearl of wisdom of the new economics; Government schools of art, dancing, music, and radio in order to bring a good life, as conceived by the Government planners, into the lives of everyone.

Where in this report for the Nation's economic guidance, the reader will ask, are there specific suggestions for meeting the real danger of the day—inflation? What suggestions are made to control our supply of money, which is at the base of inflation? The answer is, nowhere. The Council thought that other matters outlined above were more important.

Annual Funds for ERP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times and which may be of interest to Members:

ANNUAL FUNDS FOR ERP—EVENTS SHOULD GUIDE US, IT IS SAID, NOT FROZEN FORMULAS

(The writer of the following letter is an economist, active for many years in the international labor movement. He is the author of Famine Stalks Europe, a study of wartime food and relief conditions.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The decision of the administration to drop the original $17,000,000,000 demand for a 4½-year European recovery program and seek annual appropriations instead is all to the good. It shows President Truman and his advisers responsive to growing public and congressional resistance to long-term foreign commitments and to the statesmanlike objections set forth by Senator VANDENBERG.

Under the modified proposal, Congress will be asked to appropriate $6,800,000,000 for the 15-month period from April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949. Succeeding Congresses will authorize appropriations for whatever aid funds may be needed during the following 3 years. Whether an initial $6,800,000,000 appropriation is too little or too much need not concern us at the moment. More important and in the long run all-decisive is the question of any long-term authorization, even as a gesture on the part of the Eightieth Congress, on which the Europeans are likely to place as much reliance as on appropriations in dollars and cents.

I am, and have always been convinced that the answer to the world's ills is not a rigid, long-range American plan of international aid. I am equally certain that the interests of both the United States and Europe will be served best by providing help as circumstances require, not by an assumption of economic, financial, and moral obligations over a period of nearly 5 years. Not frozen formulas, but events should guide our future course.

FOREIGN NEEDS AND OUR ABILITY

It is not lack of sympathies for the peoples of Europe that made me arrive at this conclusion. Nor is this a plea for a carping and niggardly aid program. It is the recognition that only by discarding long-term governmental blueprints and engaging ourselves solely to the extent determined by foreign needs and our own ability shall we be able to assist the recovery of Europe in a constructive, efficient, and mutually beneficial manner.

There is in my opinion little substance to the belief that Europe is doomed unless we commit ourselves and our resources for years ahead. The opposite might well be true. No one here or in Europe can foresee the future. Conditions might, and undoubtedly will change. The Europeans, too, might in time change their minds; they might seek ways and means different from those contemplated today.

Be that as it may, a limited year-by-year aid program will place the nations of Europe on their mettle. It will strengthen the spirit of self-help and mutual assistance. It will deflect their eyes from the hypnotic lure of seemingly inexhaustible American riches. Last, but not least, it will permit the periodic adjustment of American policies, economic, and otherwise, to whatever changes occur in the international sphere and the power balance of Europe.

These remarks are prompted by personal observations in Europe in recent months, in the course of which I had opportunity to become reacquainted with the views and outlook of European organized labor. Wherever I went I found a spirit of self-assertion and independence, a state of mind which while grateful for help from across the seas wants to make the future of Europe dependent on its own strength.

STAND OF SENATOR TAFT

Curiously enough, similar thoughts were voiced by Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, arch enemy of labor, in an address prior to approval by the Senate of stopgap aid to Europe. The Republican leader argued that the approach of the Truman administration to the problems of postwar Europe was wrong; that mere continuation of methods practiced by the administration so far would not get us or Europe anywhere.

Mr. TAFT, it must be kept in mind, was not dealing with questions of stop-gap aid. His shafts were directed against fantastic long-range commitments and the kind of Washington planning of which the whole world stands in awe.

It so happens that Europeans in all walks of life have similar apprehensions. Though they may say little for public consumption, they are plainly worried over a rigid and overextended American aid program. Their concern is, of course, not with American interests and American domestic aspects, but with the impact of an American-financed international WPA on the European economy and the livelihood of their peoples. These fears the Communists are cleverly exploiting for their own ends.

There is perhaps a lesson in it. American trade-union leadership professes strong dislike for Senator TAFT and what may be called, for want of a better name, Taftism. Yet the TAFT view of limited foreign aid, together with his insistence on independence and freedom from political and economic shackles, whether at home or abroad, strikes responsive chords overseas, particularly among the labor people. It is a strange phenomenon, and American labor which so far has contributed little to the debate on the practical aspects of the European recovery program, might well give it some thought.

ALEXANDER S. LIPSETT.

NEW YORK, January 7, 1948.

Strike of GSI Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a statement by Oliver T. Palmer, chairman of the negotiating committee, Local 471, United Cafeteria Workers, UPW-CIO, outlining the position of the union in its dispute with Government Services, Inc.:

Government Services, Inc., a corporation operating 42 Federal cafeterias, has forced a strike of its employees. This strike has one very simple cause—the corporation refuses to meet and deal with the collective bargaining agency selected by the vast majority of its employees.

In precipitating this strike the corporation has duplicated in every respect the strike-breaking tactics of the most anti-labor employers of this country. The corporation has repeatedly ignored its collective bargaining obligations; it has shown complete bad faith in its relationship to the union; it has deceived its employees with respect to their rights under the law. In short, its deep-seated antagonism to the union has produced the same forms of antiunionism which typify the most open-shop employers in industry. The tactics of this employer bring us back to the flagrant type of anti-unionism of an earlier day. Such conduct would be shocking if engaged in by a private employer. When, as here, it is engaged in by an employer which sanctimoniously trades on its peculiar quasi governmental status it cannot go unanswered.

In a statement issued on January 3, under the name of Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant, 3d, there appears what purports to be an account of the dealings between the union and the employer and an enumeration of the reasons which motivated this employer not to deal with the union. Before considering in detail the points made in this statement, two basic facts must be brought home to the members of the public who, after all, will be the final sufferers as a result of the action of this corporation.

1. The union involved, United Cafeteria Workers, CIO, has been the collective-bargaining agent for these employees since 1938. It is not a union certified by the National Labor Relations Board and has never been a union certified by the National Labor Relations Board. The absence of a certification is no accident. It comes as the result of the insistence of Government Services, Inc. When in 1938 the union first sought bargaining rights the corporation refused to grant bargaining rights on the ground that its governmental status gave it an immunity from the Wagner Act. When the employer could no longer resist the demands of its employees for collective bargaining the employer finally consented to an informal election which was conducted by the Labor Board at the request of the Secretary of the Interior. When the union won the election, bargaining ensued and the union has operated under collective-bargaining contracts from 1938 until the end of 1947. Of course, the status of the union was no different than a great many other unions which acquire standing as a collective-bargaining agency through designation by the employees but without a Labor Board certification.

2. The second point which must be borne in mind is that the obligation to bargain, as GSI surely knows, does not depend upon certification. It is the law under the Taft-Hartley Act, as it was under the Wagner Act, that the failure to obtain a certification is not a defense to a refusal to bargain and that an employer may not as a condition of bargaining with a union insist that it be certified. Why has GSI suddenly decided that the union should obtain a Labor Board certification? It cannot be because of the requirements of the new law. The new law imposes no such requirement. As a matter of fact, the new law broadens the scope of exemptions of governmental corporations and makes even more plausible than formerly the corporation's claim to an exempt status.

General Grant, in his statement of January 3, seeks to explain this sudden change of heart. He relates as justification for this insistence that the union obtain a Labor Board certification, certain events which occurred in connection with the 1946 strike. That strike was precipitated because the rank and file rejected a management offer of a wage increase which was taken by the negotiating committee subject to ratification of the membership. This offer was smaller in amount than that offered by other Government cafeterias. The corporation has always smarted over the fact that it was unable to force on the employees this inadequate formula and was compelled to accept an arbitration award which granted the same wage increase as was granted to workers in other Government cafeterias.

General Grant enumerates the following specific reasons for refusing to deal with the union:

(a) He states that the new law is the "law of the land." As I have already noted, there is nothing whatsoever in the Taft-Hartley law which imposes upon any union the obligation to submit to the filing requirements. On the contrary, under the new law, as under the old law, an employer is required to deal with the freely chosen bargaining agent of its employees, and he cannot refuse to deal by insisting that the union prove its majority by one means rather than another. No union is required under the law to prove its majority by resorting to the services of the Taft-Hartley Act Labor Board. As I have already pointed out, this same employer has not only continued to deal with the union, although it had not been certified, but in fact insisted that the Labor Board had no jurisdiction to certify it. The new law, far from justifying this employer's sudden reversal of position, makes it more suspicious in view of the fact that previous exemptions in favor of Government entities are broadened.

(b) General Grant suggests that the situation of GSI is unusual because of its relationship to the Federal Government and that it is not free to ignore the law because of that fact. This involves a deception that the union is requiring the employer to deal with it in violation of the law. This is emphatically not the case and General Grant knows that it is not the case.

(c) General Grant next argues that he has a right to insist that the union submit to the filing requirements of the Taft-Hartley Act because "an unqualified union cannot utilize the services of the National Labor Relations Board in solving labor relations problems."

The sole purpose of the Board in connection with labor-relations problems is to redress unfair labor practices either by unions or by employers. A union by failing to qualify does not insulate itself from the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board to redress unfair labor practices. Consequently, General Grant's fear appears to be that the employer may commit unfair labor practices for which the union will have no redress. This is the first time in all my experience as a labor leader that an employer has sought to justify violating one provision of the law because in the future he may also violate other provisions of the law. This is a curious contention to come from an employer who boasts of peculiar responsibilities by virtue of contracts with the Federal Government.

(d) The next point made by General Grant is that other labor unions are interested in organizing in GSI and that it might be the victim of a jurisdictional strike. Here again we find an employer seeking to plead its own wrong-doing in order to evade its bargaining obligation. It is well known that no other labor organization has any following among the employees here involved. It is true that the corporation has since November deliberately sought to promote the activities of rival labor organizations among the employees. But because these illegal maneuvers might conceivably bear fruit is hardly a justification for the refusal of GSI to deal with the union which now represents an overwhelming majority of its employees. If, as General Grant contends, jurisdictional strikes are a possibility it seems strange that no rival labor organization, despite the efforts of the corporation, has petitioned the Labor Board for an election.

(e) General Grant next suggests that contract negotiations would be pointless because unless a union qualified itself under the Taft-Hartley Act it is not legally eligible to speak for employees. This is simply not true. Literally hundreds of thousands of employees enjoy the benefits of collective bargaining agreements signed by unions who have not submitted to the requirements of the Taft-Hartley law. Contrary to the suggestion made by General Grant, the binding character of a collective bargaining contract in no sense depends upon whether or not the union

which is party to such a contract has complied with the filing requirements. It is an interesting fact that the strange theories of law which have been embraced by General Grant are not shared even by other employer operators of Government cafeterias. General Grant should know that at the very time he issued his statement the National Foods Corporation, which operates 18 cafeterias in the Pentagon Building, signed a collective bargaining contract with the same union.

(f) General Grant next suggests that the corporation has a right to insist on the "loyalty" of the union officials because of the present emphasis being placed on the loyalty of Government employees. The general ignores the fact that there is nothing in the law which requires a union to employ the facilities of the Taft-Hartley Act, and that if the union here involved, like a number of other CIO and AFL unions, has decided not to use the facilities of the Taft-Hartley Act that decision may not be reversed by his bureaucratic fiat any more than the union would have a right to insist that the corporation cancel its membership in the National Association of Manufacturers. General Grant has chosen to suppress the fact that there are thousands of employers under contract with the Federal Government whose relationship with the Government is fully as intimate as that of GSI to the Government and that none of these employers has seen fit to use its relationship to the Federal Government to evade its bargaining obligations.

This is an obvious attempt to capitalize on the witch-hunt hysteria which now dominates the Nation's Capitol. Never before has anyone, in or out of public life, raised any question whatsoever about the loyalty of the Government cafeteria employees or their representatives. We deeply resent the slur upon our members contained in GSI's argument on this issue. It is typical of the contempt management has shown for its Negro employees for the past 27 years.

Though this is not the place, it might be interesting to examine the records of the congressional committee that has been investigating GSI's operations which have already revealed GSI's "loyalty" to the Government in terms of questionable financial practices, unpaid debts to the Government, and violation of rationing regulations.

The list of reasons supplied by General Grant for refusing to deal with the union barely conceals the basic antiunionism of this employer. The background of the entire controversy supplies further proof of this employer's bad faith and animosity toward the union.

On November 28, 1947, on the occasion of the first meeting between the union and the employer, the union was confronted with an ultimatum that it would not be recognized unless the filing requirements of the Taft-Hartley Act were met. Neither at this initial meeting nor at any time until the filing of a petition for an election by the employer did the employer in any way intimate that it doubted that the union represented a majority of the employees.

This high-handed rejection of collective bargaining by the corporation was of course a violation of the law.

After refusing to meet with the union in November, the corporation distributed to each of its employees a copy of a propaganda pamphlet published by the National Association of Manufacturers purporting to "explain" the Taft-Hartley Act.

It may come as a surprise to the public to learn that an employer so closely identified with the Government would seek to influence its employees with the notoriously partisan propaganda of the NAM. However, this corporation only insists upon a "special status" when it will serve some antiunion end.

Immediately after seeking to mislead the employees with a distorted and false account of the union's obligations under the Taft-Hartley Act, the corporation sent the employees a series of letters condemning the leaders of the union and charging them with violating the law. This, of course, was a gross misrepresentation of the law but more importantly it was a deliberate attempt of the corporation to divide the rank and file from its leaders through tactics repeatedly condemned by the Labor Board. At the same time the corporation continued its attack against the union in another way. It permitted representatives of a rival labor organization into its cafeterias for the purpose of inducing defections from the union. However, this maneuver was unsuccessful and no petition for an election was filed by a rival labor organization. As a result, the corporation improvised a question concerning representation and hastily filed an unsupported election petition on or about December 18, 1947.

When the corporation's petition was rejected by the Labor Board it continued its program of antiunionism, bad faith and misrepresentation. It announced to its employees that the effect of the Labor Board's rejection of its petition for an election was to remove the union as the qualified bargaining agent. This was a blunt misstatement of the facts. The corporation told its employees in effect that the status of the union was precisely the same as though it had lost the election whereas in fact, as the corporation well knew, it had lost and the status of the union remained completely unchanged since the Labor Board had refused to hold an election at the company's request.

In addition, the corporation, misrepresenting the law again, told the employees that a strike called by the union would not be a legal strike. The employees were given no explanation and, I know of none, why a strike for recognition is not a legal strike. In order to completely intimidate the employees the corporation threatened to hire replacements for all strikers ignoring the fact that a strike instigated by an employer's refusal to recognize a union is a strike caused by the employer's unfair labor practices in which the strikers are fully protected.

Finally, the corporation announced itself as happy to grant a 6½-cent wage increase—obviously a bribe to break the strike and the union which has represented the employees for 10 years.

In addition, it announced to the employees that glad news that there no longer would be deductions for union dues and pointed out that the employees could now spend this money on themselves.

General Grant and his associates seem to be unaware that:

1. It is still a violation of the law to refuse to deal with the freely chosen bargaining agent of the employees or to impose conditions upon such an agent as a prerequisite to dealing with it.

2. It is a rejection of the collective-bargaining principle to substitute for dealing with the union an attack upon its leaders and a systematic campaign to destroy the confidence of the members in its leadership.

3. It is still a violation of the law frequently condemned by the Labor Board to refuse to deal with the majority representative and instead to encourage on company time and property organizing activities by a rival union.

4. It is still a violation of the law to threaten employees with discharge for engaging in a strike precipitated by the employer's unfair labor practices.

5. It is still a violation of the law to bargain individually with employees by offering them a wage increase and bypassing their collective-bargaining agent.

The fact that this sordid course of conduct was sponsored by an agency close to Government hardly justifies it. On the contrary, it makes it more alarming.

Finally, it is important to note that the national CIO completely supports the position of our union in this dispute and views the conduct of GSI, in precipitating the strike, as "union busting" and a matter of utmost importance to its entire membership.

We believe, moreover, that fair-minded men and women in this community will share our views with respect to the conduct of this employer and fully support the strikers.

Address of Gen. Joseph T. McNarney Before National Conference of United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of address by Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, National Conference of United Jewish Appeal, Saturday evening, December 13, 1947:

It is very difficult for me to make a speech before a Jewish audience tonight. I tell you very frankly that I do not know what I ought to say. It is difficult for anyone not of the Jewish faith to understand fully what is in your hearts in an hour when all you have dreamed of, all you have fought for, and all you have sacrificed for, is on the verge of being consummated. One would have to be born into the Jewish fold to have an awareness of what it means to be a member of a people that has, for almost 2,000 years, been considered homeless, and suddenly—after the period of its greatest misery and tragedy—finds itself once again on the verge of having a homeland.

You will note that I have not said that the Jewish people already has a homeland. The United Nations has made a tremendously significant decision on the future of Palestine which, as so many have already said, is also a tremendously significant decision for the United Nations itself, and indeed for the whole world. It took more than the wisdom of Solomon to resolve a problem that has baffled the statesmen of the world for so many years, and if the solution of the problem is not a perfect one, neither is the world a perfect world. Yes, it took more than wisdom—it took courage, for the tensions and the conflicts that had grown with the years could not be expected to be wiped out overnight by the vote at Lake Success.

Democracy on a world scale is too new for that. In the United States, and in some other lands, there has been a history of experience in democracy. We have in our own country evolved a system of government whereby our internal differences are settled in the common interest of all the people through the freely expressed decision of the majority. Even here this principle was not fully accepted until after we had experienced a long and bitter War Between the States. The lack of a determination on the part of the nations of the world to settle their disputes by peaceful means has twice within our memory plunged the world into bitter strife. Having before them concrete examples of the destruction, the sorrow, the suffering caused by war, and mindful of the scientific and technological advances, which, if put to warlike uses, might well result in the destruction of our very civilization, the nations of the world established the United Nations, agreeing among themselves to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors.

The decision of the United Nations with respect to Palestine represents the opinion of the majority of these nations. I firmly believe that this decision was based on a realization that fundamental human rights cannot be ignored if the nations of the world are to live together in peace with one another. I firmly believe that this decision is in the common interests of mankind. Perfect or imperfect, it has been made. It is now incumbent upon the nations of the world to accept this decision and to insure its implementation by peaceful means. Whatever may happen, the United Nations is on trial. In my opinion, the principal reason for the failure of the League of Nations was its inability to enforce, if necessary, its decisions. We cannot ignore the fact that the current and prospective situation in Palestine constitutes a serious threat to peace. I hope and pray that it will not lead to a breach of international peace. But whatever happens, the United Nations must not fail; it must, if necessary, enforce the peace, for in modern war there can be no winners, only losers.

There is one interesting angle to the deliberations on the Palestine question. The Jewish people, as a whole, was a displaced people, without a national government. Yet, in the face of this lack of an official status as one of the constituent nations, their case was fairly heard and acted upon in the common interest of all the peoples of the world. To me this is a most hopeful sign for the future of international peace and security, and a significant advance in progressive development toward self-government in other regions of the world. It appears that this advance toward self-government should eventually result in a Jewish state with membership in the United Nations.

But if the Jewish people are at last to realize their age-old dream of a homeland, they are, by the same token, obligated to assume new responsibilities. There are no free rides in history, no matter how much injustice there has been in the past, and no matter how much suffering has been experienced. If the Jews are to be a part of the world democracy, I say to you as a friend of your people, the Jews will have to pull their own weight.

For the Jews of Palestine, this will mean a willingness to give blood and sweat and tears to the building of the new nation. It means intelligence, statesmanship, and above all tolerance in the conduct of its internal affairs. I think that the events and the achievements in Palestine in recent years are sufficient evidence that the Jews of Palestine have the will to build for themselves a new nation. Whether or not, after centuries of frustration and persecution they can practice tolerance and conduct their affairs in a spirit of true democracy remains to be seen. As a friend of your people, I hope and believe they have what it takes to do so.

For you, the Jews of America, it means a readiness to do more, far more than you have ever done before, in the way of providing the dollars without which the efforts and the intelligence of the Jews of Palestine will be futile, and without which they will lack that sense of solidarity, sympathetic understanding and interest that will give them the moral strength to carry on.

Nor can you limit your horizons to Palestine alone at this early date. There is a long hard road ahead. There are still hundreds of thousands of Jewish survivors in Europe who are desperately in need of help, and who cannot hope to leave Europe for many months—perhaps for years. As military governor I got to know the Jews, living under our flag in the United States zone of Germany. I had to know them, as almost daily cables passed across my desk or decisions had to be made which vitally affected their very lives.

When I arrived in Germany in 1945 the average displaced persons center was a depressing conglomeration of bomb scarred burned out German Army barracks, housing three to four thousand people. There was little or no material with which to patch up holes or blown-out windows. There was insufficient fuel and stoves to warm the limited floor space assigned. One saw hungry, scared, milling people everywhere. One seldom saw children engaged in play. The laundry on the clotheslines was pitiful rags. The mere maintenance of law and order presented many difficulties especially among the concentration camp victims who had an almost hysterical fear of any show of force or authority. Today the buildings look much the same with the exception that roofs have been repaired and windows contain glass. Living space is still extremely limited with several families sharing large rooms. During 1946 the Jewish movement from eastern Europe was accelerated, especially following the Kielce Pogrom. In accordance with America's historic policy we offered temporary haven to these persecuted groups. This added to our problem, but with United States Army and UNRRA funds, surplus and captured enemy equipment, we were able to house, feed, and clothe them after a fashion. But idleness, a monotonous diet, limited activities and the inability to lead normal home lives could not help but breed a feeling of frustration and lead to the progressive deterioration of this group, that wished nothing more than the privilege of living by their own efforts in freedom and dignity.

Privacy is still at a premium, but the people do look better. The children have warm clothing and leather shoes. They have their own schools. The young adults are learning useful trades and there is a limited amount of gainful employment. This improvement is largely due to the efforts of JDC. It was your contribution that has sustained their morale and has kept them from sinking into deep and hopeless despair.

I know you are aware of the fact that Army appropriations have been reduced, surplus and captured German equipment has been expended, and the International Refugee Organization has limited funds. This means you will have to do even more to help them now, than you have done in the past.

I have talked to literally thousands of Jews in Germany. I know their hopes and their aspirations. To the vast majority home is Palestine, most of the remainder look toward America. The Palestine emigration problem should now be resolved within a reasonable period. The Stratton bill permitting emigration of DP's into the United States appears to have a good chance of passing. But even so your people in Germany face an extended period of waiting before they actually embark for their new homes, and this period of waiting will be difficult for them. Only those who are familiar with the German scene can imagine just how difficult it will be.

You must continue to help them. It would be tragic indeed if they were to be let down now, after all they have been through, and after all you have done for them.

I have dwelt on the problems of the displaced persons because I know them best. But there are in other parts of Europe additional hundreds of thousands of Jewish men, women, and children who may find it possible to start again in their native lands. Many of them are in serious trouble. We all know what the situation throughout Europe is. We know of the crop failures, the fuel and housing shortages, and the wild inflation. We are cognizant of the ever-present threat of economic collapse which could bring in the wake more years of fear, of suffering, and hunger, which for your people began even before the Nazi hordes began to overrun the Continent.

I know that through the United Jewish Appeal you are performing a great task on their behalf. You are doing many things, without which they might be lost. You are giving them basic relief; you are providing orphanages and nurseries for the children; you are enabling men and women to start over again with loans and training; you are supporting hospitals, and doing endless other services. I hope you will continue to do them. I am sure you will.

I know that through the United Service for New Americans you have helped thousands of newly arrived immigrants find homes and employment and that you have cared for them during the difficult period of adjustment. This essential service cannot be neglected.

You Jews of America have done much for your people. The splendid record marked up by you who are here tonight will attest to that. But much remains to be done, you cannot falter now when what you have fought and sacrificed for is on the verge of being consummated. I believe 1948 will be the crucial year—the year in which the efforts of United Jewish Appeal may well measure the difference between success or failure.

The Late Honorable Clarence E. Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

CLARENCE E. HANCOCK MOURNED BY CITY

Saddening to his hundreds of friends in Syracuse and central New York was the news of the death in Washington of Clarence E. Hancock. For 19 years he represented this area in the National House of Representatives—a fact eloquent of the high regard in which he was held.

Native to Syracuse, educated here and at Wesleyan University, Mr. Hancock had consistently identified himself with the best interests of his home community. He had served it efficiently as corporation counsel before entering the wider field opened up to him in Washington.

Still earlier he had shown his patriotism and public spirit as a member of the National Guard in the trouble with Mexico. Then he continued his military career by service overseas in World War I.

To his task as lawmaker Mr. Hancock brought sturdy qualities of character and that soundness of judgment which had won the confidence of all who knew him in the days of his private practice of law. Although his party, the Republican, was for a long time in the minority, he was given important committee assignments and his opinions carried weight. When he retired in 1946, on account of his health, compliments for a faithful stewardship and fidelity to convictions were voiced.

Attractive in personality, and possessing complete integrity and a high sense of honor, Clarence Hancock was popular in social circles here and at the National Capital. Wherever he was known he will be keenly missed.

CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

The death of Clarence Hancock brings a sense of deep personal loss to Syracuse.

He was one of its best known citizens because of his long and distinguished record in military, civic, and national service.

In paying tribute to him his friends—and they are legion—will place even more stress on his appealing human qualities than they will on this public service brilliant as it was.

Clarence Hancock was a man of friendliness. He liked people, seeing the good in them, forgiving the bad. He was a man of great integrity, doing what he believed right even if it cost him heavily. He was a man of fine ability, earning the respect and admiration of his colleagues in Congress, both Republican and Democratic. He was a modest man, never claiming his just dues for his notable accomplishments. He was a quiet man, content to work behind the scenes, doing his work without fanfare, but with brilliance. Most of all, he was a good friend.

His life was one of service. He was a veteran of military campaigns in Mexico and France as a member of cavalry Troop D, ending the First World War with a distinguished record and the rank of captain. Returning to Syracuse and entering upon law practice, he soon was appointed corporation counsel. Then he was elected Representative of the Thirty-fifth Congressional District, at that time comprising Onondaga and Cortland counties.

His career in Washington covered two decades. At the time of his retirement a year ago because of ill health, he was in line to become chairman of the powerful Judicial Committee as control of Congress returned to the Republican Party. It was in this and other committees that he accomplished work that made him one of the outstanding Members of the lower House.

His death takes from Syracuse a man who served it and his country well and faithfully. He was a man of sincerity, understanding, generosity, wisdom.

Profits Are Important to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herein a very enlightening and constructive statement by Mr. George H. Coppers, president of the National Biscuit Co.

Mr. Coppers shows the importance of profits to labor. He shows that the private-enterprise system not only gives more to investors—many of whom are laborers—but gives vastly more to the laboring men who work in the plants built and operated by the private enterprise system. Fair competition while it may have some weak spots gives far more to everyone especially the laboring man, than a regimented system. It also opens the channels of opportunity for advancement infinitely more than a partial or totally regimented economy. I commend to my colleagues a reading of Mr. Copper's statement which is as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH PROFITS?

Because I believe that this country will ultimately be whatever the people want it to be—a free economy such as we now have or a Government controlled economy such as they have in many European countries—I think it important that we all know as much as possible about this free economy of ours and what it does for us as compared with the controlled economies of other countries and what they have done for their people.

Because millions of dollars are being spent by enemies of this country and its free economy (which they call the capitalistic system because that sounds as though it were run by capitalists) to teach the people a lot of lies about business and the evil men who run it, I think that businessmen should tell their employees all they can about this system and how business operates under it and who gets what out of it.

There are about 28,000 employees of Nabisco and they with millions of employees of other businesses are the ones who will decide whether we shall keep our free economy or exchange it for something else. And so from time to time I hope to use the pages of our magazine to talk with you on subjects that I think have been pretty badly mangled. Needless to say I don't expect to be original. I will merely try to haul out a few facts from the rubble of confusion, dust them off and hold them up so we can see them.

SOME FACTS ABOUT PROFITS

One subject that gets an awful kicking around is that of profits and who gets them. Recent polls have indicated that the man on the street believes that employees get anywhere from 10 to 50 cents of each dollar of income produced while the owners or stockholders get 50 to 90 cents. He believes it because he has been told it so often by those whose business it is to stir him up and make him dissatisfied and hasten the time when he will demand a change—communism or something else.

What are the facts? First, let us look at National Biscuit Co. In the year 1946, after payment of all expenses except salaries and wages paid to employees, there was left 39.6 cents out of each dollar of income. Of this amount 30.8 cents was paid to the employees in salaries and wages, 4.2 cents was distributed to the 60,000 stockholders as dividends and 4.6 cents was retained in the business for new plants, machinery, and other future needs.

But this is not the whole story. Out of each dollar of income Nabisco spent 51.1 cents for raw materials, supplies, and services. We cannot say exactly how much of that went to employees of other companies, but we do know from figures published by the United States Department of Commerce that from 1929 to 1945, out of every dollar of income produced from manufacturing in the United States 86 cents was paid to employees, that is, to employees of manufacturing companies directly, and indirectly to employees of suppliers. No other country in the world has such a record, least of all the countries where the Government runs business.

WHAT IS PROFIT?

Profit has become a nasty word. People think of it as something that a fat capitalist in a silk hat gets from squeezing the life blood from his workers. But what is it really? It takes about $6,000 worth of buildings, machinery, and equipment to create one job. Who puts up the money? Stockholders do. What do they get out of it? Profit—sometimes. In the 18-year period from 1925 to 1942 the average return on capital invested in the food and allied businesses was 5.24 percent; in chemicals and allied products 3.50 percent; in metal products and processes 4.67 percent; in paper and pulp products 3.49 percent; in textiles and their products 1.53 percent; and in the whole corporate manufacturing industry 3.67 percent. What's wrong with that? Your bank would charge you more for the use of its money.

Another thing to remember about profits is that they make for employment. The success of an enterprise and the well-being of all who work for it depend on profit. It is no accident that low wages and low profits occur in the same year. They are part of the same pattern. Eliminate profits altogether, eliminate the free-enterprise system and what happens to wages? In the Monthly Survey of the American Federation of Labor for July are some interesting figures comparing wages in America with wages in Europe. The article says that a basket of food is the best unit to use in measuring income. It is a basket containing items for adequate nourishment and of which the average American family of five would need about four a day. One hour's work by a factory worker in the United States in 1940, according to the A. F. of L., would buy 2.83 baskets; in Britain, 1.26 baskets; in France, 1.11; and in Russia, only .40. This means that in 1940 the American worker could buy with his wages seven times as much food as a Russian could with his. Russia has done the best job of eliminating the profit system and the free-enterprise system. It has the least individual freedom and the lowest wages.

Why Not World Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from a veteran in my district, Mr. Eugene P. O'Grady, 2049 West Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, who is president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Division 5, whose thoughts seem most timely:

The average citizen of every country must, by this time, be asking himself the question, "What has happened to the world; why all the chaos, suffering, misery, and fear that seem to have befallen the human race within a period of a few short years?" True, we have had two world wars within 25 years, each war fought for the noble purpose of bringing peace, happiness, and liberty to the subject peoples of the world, guaranteeing to each individual political and religious freedom. These wars cost billions of dollars, millions of human lives, and untold suffering, yet, the result seems to be complete failure to accomplish these lofty ideals. Is it any wonder the people live in consternation and despair?

The answer foremost in the minds of these millions of the common people and also thoroughly understood by the leaders who have been selected to determine the final basis of peace settlements has come down, ringing through the years, in the words of a great American, when William Penn exclaimed, "Those who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants." But because of political and materialistic agreements, the leaders refuse to propound such a doctrine in the Council of World Representatives.

Every sane human being upon this earth must believe in a Supreme Power because it would have to be the unrelegated thoughts of an insane mind or a fool to consider man supreme within himself and that life and all within the universe is not subject to a Supreme Power. Therefore, sane people of all nations recognize a God that directs the universe and the destinies of the inhabitants thereof.

Therefore, we must conclude that God gave man a code of laws or rules to govern his conduct while on this planet. That being so, the moral law is the basic law from which all civil law is patterned and is the code by which the lawmakers or statesmen of nations pattern the constitution which is always the guide or foundation on which the future progress of their nation depends. Those millions of Asiatics who are outside the pale of western Christianization recognize such a code of law purported to be those of the deity they worship, such as Mohammed, etc., all determining the requirements which dictate to man the order "to do good and avoid evil," proclaiming a just regard for righteousness and punishment for those who violate such God-given commands, such a conclusion has never been legitimately contradicted.

Why then should that great body of statesmen representing 57 nations, whose subjects believe in a Supreme Ruler of this universe, and who bow their heads in obedience to His never-changing law, whether such law be the Commandments given to Moses or those of Mohammed, Confucius, etc., be so inconsistent in not recognizing as the basis of peace and international justice, the moral law, which an all-wise Creator gave to man as his guiding light for all future time. Its application to mankind would bring peace, happiness, and prosperity. Consequently, it would bring the same to nations. The common people of this world believe it can be accomplished. They believe, irrespective of color or race or religion or no religion, in the divine author of the moral law as the creator of the universe. Why then should its application as the basis of international peace be sidetracked and at the same time hope for a peaceful and satisfactory settlement of world affairs? Why not be consistent?

Let us start at home to prove our point. The Constitution of this, our beloved Nation, proclaims our belief in God. We administer an oath to our lawmakers, calling on God as a witness. We ask God's guidance upon our deliberations every day in our congressional sessions and even stamp on the coin of the realm, "In God we trust," and yet, we do not seem to have the faith and courage to back up our belief by making such an application of the law of God the foundation of our membership in the United Nations. We know all people of the world believe as we do—at least all people and rulers who are blessed with normal minds. We know they will support us in applying justice to every nation and its citizens because they all want equal rights and the equality which God intended for them. We know and we believe, if we are not hypocrites, that such a cause would be blessed by God and would succeed, even as we know that God will not be mocked and will never allow success if we are dishonest. Can anyone dispute the words of Penn, already quoted, "Those who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants." Is it too late to realize the truth of that statement? The answer is, "No." The people of the world should never surrender to madmen who deny the existence of God, or those money-mad men who pretend to believe in a God of wisdom, justice, and goodness, but refuse to obey His laws and deny their application to His children.

We cannot suggest to any country less than freedom of speech, press, and religion, free trade, complete independence to form their own government as the majority of its citizens so decide. If we do suggest such freedoms and mean it, then the wishes of all peoples should be satisfied and world peace at last a reality, and world disarmament would become a possibility within a few years.

Of course, to the power politicians such a proposal is fantastic, unworkable, nonsense—it would destroy the power of the Big Four, the veto, it would end the brass hat rule—the war contracts would not—the easily made millions would vanish—the wastage of taxpayers' hard-earned dollars would cease—the destruction of billions of dollars in property would never occur again and the taxpayers and survivors in wrecked nations would not have to rebuild war ruins. Yes, the silly idea of such a peace would be sheer nonsense to the war lords in the ruling dynasties, who wallow in luxury—the reward they inherit from the reducing of a world and its people to ruin.

If the democratic nations advocate a positive proposal for world peace—a peace that would really mean peace for all peoples—a peace that would bring in its train the abundance of God's gifts, which God and nature intended for man's use, benefit, and progress, what could Russia's answer be? It would have to be acceptance, or her repudiation by the nations of the world.

Sane people everywhere know that the answer to the debacle at Lake Success will inevitably lead to war. Why not try seriously to offset it now by proposing a formula for world peace that would give justice and freedom to all people? There should never be a war. The statesmen at Lake Success can prevent it if they have the courage and honesty to try to do so.

The Russian representative at the League of Nations in Geneva years ago offered a proposal for world disarmament which was declared fantastic, crazy. (He might do it again.)

He walked out with the result—World War II. Can we take any chances with a world war III which may be world destruction?

Why then do we refuse to apply the application of the moral law to the world and end war for all time? Can we not apply the moral law before it is too late? Ninety percent of the people of the world would cooperate in bringing about such a positive solution. The natural instinct in man craves for peace, happiness, and freedom. Why then should the world bow to a handful of individuals whose satanic impulses crave for power, greed, and destruction? Crusaders are needed to arouse a world to start on the road to an honest peace while there is yet time.

We want a fighting, virile, national or international organization of the people (not a booster's club), which will dictate its policy to all world statesmen and demand of their respective governments the enforcement of the code of law which has predated governments, constitutions, and statesmen, and which was given by an all-wise Creator to all men for all time. Obedience to such a law would guarantee to all justice and equality. What more does the world want?

Then the answer to the world chaos and misery which we see today and the hope of peace and happiness for tomorrow is to apply to the world's ills the law which man's Creator gave as the guidepost to all His children.

Heinz Norden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 14, 1948.

The Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DONDERO: I am in receipt of your letter dated December 19, 1947, in which you state that according to an article in the Washington Post of December 19, 1947, Heinz Norden, former editor and staff member of the magazine Heute (Today), published in the American zone in Germany, had received praise from the Department of State. You request to be informed whether this statement is true.

Inquiries have been made in the divisions of this Department concerned with matters of this nature in the American zone in Germany. These inquiries have indicated that the Department of State has not commented on the work of Mr. Norden. It may be recalled that United States Government authorities did not renew Mr. Norden's contract as editor of the magazine Heute when his old contract expired late last year.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor
(For the Secretary of State).

Shall We Break Down Our Immigration Laws and Make the United States the Dumping Ground for the World?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted by the House, I extend my remarks and include therein excerpts of a radio speech by me on a program of the American Forum of the Air, over a Nation-wide network of the Mutual Broadcasting System, at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 13, 1948, on the question: "Shall we open our gates to displaced persons?"

Senator J. Howard McGrath, Member of the United States Senate and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and Hon. Ugo Carusi, former Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and now with the State Department, for the affirmative, and Congressman Ed Gossett, of Texas, and myself, for the negative.

As the question was presented it would include all the displaced persons of all the world but the discussion mainly centered on H. R. 2910, the so-called Stratton bill. Knowing that this violates our basic immigration laws, would establish a precedent that would be very harmful to our country and would be very unfair to both native-born and naturalized citizens of this country, I have opposed and I shall continue to oppose the Stratton bill and other similar measures. With our population rapidly increasing and our resources decreasing, and with our housing shortage and demand in the near future for employment of millions of veterans and other American boys and girls, and with our country already having more people of foreign birth according to its population than any other country of the world, I feel constrained to oppose any weakening of our immigration or naturalization laws. I certainly do not want to make our country the "dumping ground" for the world.

I wish every law-abiding citizen and person in the world could have a country like ours. I have no feeling of prejudice

against any other countries or their people, but I think my oath of office requires me to do that thing and take that course that will serve the best interests of our country and our own people.

Mr. Moderator and my fellow Americans, I became a Member of Congress on March 4, 1919. Millions of aliens from Europe and Asia plan to come to the United States. Congress, in 1921, under President Wilson, passed an emergency foreign immigration bill, but the pressure of foreign immigration increased. Space in every available ship, especially in Europe, was booked 2 or 3 years in advance. After most thorough investigation of the entire problem by appropriate committees of the House and Senate, agencies of the Congress and representatives of the Federal Government, and after literally weeks of debate and discussion, passed our present basic immigration law in 1924 by a vote of 5 to 1. During the consideration of that bill, many nations of the world, especially Europe and Asia, maintained strong and vigorous lobbies against it. This measure was adopted, not as a matter of offense against any nation or group of people but in the best interest of both native and naturalized American citizens and our country as a whole. During my years of service in the House and Senate, I know of no measure that was more carefully prepared and the rights and interests of all groups so sincerely considered and preserved as in this 1924 act. It was designated as the "Second Declaration of American Independence." Every nation in Europe was given a quota according to the number of persons of such countries living in the United States on the basis of the census of 1910. This basic law has worked well. It was generally observed until after 1933. Since 1933, many efforts have been made to weaken and break down the Immigration Act of 1924.

WORLD WAR II INCREASES PRESSURE

With World War II over, millions of people from Europe and Asia again sought means to come to our country. In the present Eightieth Congress, 86 general bills and 580 or more special private bills have been introduced in the House and 200 or more general and special private bills have been introduced in the Senate. Of course, all of these private special bills seek to set aside or modify, for particular persons or groups, our immigration and naturalization laws. Approximately 75 percent of the general bills attempt to greatly weaken and break down our basic immigration laws. The other general bills seek to strengthen our basic immigration laws.

UNITED STATES HAS BEEN LIBERAL

The United States has been liberal in the admission of aliens. We now have about 3,500,000 aliens living in this country. They have not been naturalized and are not citizens. The 1940 United States Census listed 11,500,000 people in this country of foreign birth and over 23,000,000 who had at least one parent born in a foreign land. This same 1940 census listed 6 cities of more than 500,000 population in this country with less than 40 percent of the white population of native parentage. There were 11 cities between 100,000 and 500,000 population where less than 40 percent of the white population were of native parentage. In 1940 1,047 newspapers in this country were printed in foreign languages. These papers are read by some 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 peoples. The immigration service shows that approximately 37,000,000 aliens came into the United States in 1946 for various purposes. Of course, the most of these leave the United States. But no one can tell how many remain, but many do remain.

In no other country in the world has so many aliens entered, or has so many aliens resided and now reside, as in the United States One of the important considerations in the adoption of the immigration act of 1924 was the matter of assimilation of aliens. We did not desire to have aliens come to this country who could not and would not be assimilated and who would not seek to know and understand our Constitution, our institutions and the American way of life. I think every fair-minded person must admit that we have large numbers of aliens in this country who have refused to embrace the American way of life and persons who are opposed to our Constitution or our free institutions.

THE STRATTON BILL, H R. 2910

One of the 580 special bills before the Congress is the Stratton bill, H. R. 2910, which proposes to bring into this country from the so-called displaced persons camps of Italy, Austria and Germany, 400,000 aliens—100,000 a year for 4 consecutive years. The Stratton bill evidently is the result of a small but well-financed active group of persons who know what they want and by very extensive and misleading propaganda they have sold this proposal to many sincere persons. My distinguished colleague, Mr. GOSSETT, myself and other members of the Judiciary Committee have heard scores of witnesses both for and against this bill. He, I, and others are definitely of the opinion that it would be very unwise for the Congress to pass the Stratton bill or any other similar bill for this particular group. I list some of my objections to this bill.

1. It establishes a very unwise precedent and will be harmful and not helpful to our country.

2. It is most unfair and discriminatory as against the tens of millions of other needy displaced persons of Europe who are in much worse condition and much more unfortunate than these 400,000 persons who have enjoyed the bounty of the American taxpayers for nearly 3 years.

3. Europe must rehabilitate her cities, homes, industrial plants, and transportation facilities. There is a critical manpower shortage. If these persons are able-bodied and are good carpenters, machinists, mechanics, laborers, nurses, teachers, etc., as has been urged their services are more in need in Europe than they are in the United States.

4. There are more than 200,000 Polish veterans who fought on our side on land, sea and in the air in Britain, France and Italy. Their fine records attest their great courage and patriotic service to us, the other allied nations, and to the freedom of the world. They cannot return to Poland. They, their wives and their children are displaced in various parts of Europe. They are men without a country. Many thousands of these Polish veterans who were flyers and helped to destroy the air power of Hitler. They fought the Germans in France, and the Germans and Italians in Italy. Our Government has withheld its bounty from these Polish patriots. Our colleague, Congressman MACKINNON, of Minnesota, introduced H. R. 3620 to permit these 200,000 patriotic Poles and their families to come to this country. I have not heard the administration or other friends of these displaced persons urge Congress to pass the MacKinnon bill and bring to this country these 200,000 Poles. Why this discrimination?

WHO ARE THE 400,000 DISPLACED PERSONS?

There were about 9,000,000 persons in Europe, civilians and others whose status had been changed during the war, and approximately 8,000,000 of these displaced persons returned to their homes themselves or were aided by the Allied countries to do so. Beginning late in 1944, some persons began to attach themselves to the Allied armies, mostly the American armies. This number increased rapidly up until VE-day, and thereafter until they numbered approximately 1,000,000. Hundreds of thousands of these persons have joined the displaced-persons camps since the war was over in Europe. A lot of them were urged into our camps by the officials of certain European countries. Great Britain and France took a part of these displaced persons, but about 600,000 of them sat down on the lap of your Uncle Sam in the American camps. There was a much smaller number in the French and British camps. They became known as displaced persons. They have been better fed, housed, and clothed than other groups in Europe. They are not in concentration camps. They can leave anytime.

Our displaced persons, their wives, and children were provided food, shelter, clothing, household equipment, medical care, and schools for their children through the American Army, UNRRA, and the International Refugee Organization. The cost amounted to about $75,000,000 annually to keep them. The American taxpayers paid and are paying the bill. We have continued to provide these services and care for these so-called displaced persons for almost 3 years.

TWENTY THOUSAND CHILDREN BORN IN THESE CAMPS ANNUALLY

We have been told that these DP's desired to work but could secure no work. This is not true. Responsible people who have visited these camps state that not more than 5 percent of the people in these camps have engaged in any remunerative work. Not more than 15 percent of them have done anything more than take care of their quarters. The other 80 percent have spent their time in idleness. Our Government has suffered to the persons of these camps many inducements to get them to leave and go to other countries where there was not any danger of persecution. France insists that she needs at least 3,000,000 workers. Great Britain needs hundreds of thousands of workers. Australia offered to take 2,000,000. Belgium, Canada, and some South American countries have offered homes and work to these displaced persons. There is a great manpower shortage in Europe. France, nearly 3 years after the war, has 383,000 German prisoners of war and Great Britain has 275,000. Russia has more than a million prisoners of war. France and Great Britain claim they are working these prisoners because of the shortage of manpower. Since the war ended, we have furnished free, France, Britain, Italy, Austria, and Germany, in food, coal, and other supplies costing billions of dollars. Millions of tons of coal have been sent.

Why does not this administration be realistic and insist that we return these war prisoners to Germany and let them help to rehabilitate their own country, help feed themselves and their people, which is costing American taxpayers billions of dollars, and at the same time insist that these 400,000 DP's seek employment in France, Britain, Belgium, and other countries in Europe where their services are needed and where there is no danger of either political or religious persecution, but the friends of the DP's say that France, Britain, Belgium, and these other countries are not the countries of the DP's. Our answer to that is that the United States is not their country. Europe must be rehabilitated, and if these DP's are worth anything as workers, either as laborers, nurses, or in any other capacity, they can be more useful in Europe than they can in our country. Our taxpayers have not only supported the DP's and their wives and children but we have from time to time offered to provide transportation and from 2 to 3 months of rations if they would leave the camps and locate in one of these countries where their services are needed, but they choose to sit on your Uncle Sam's lap. While they have done very little work, they have not neglected matters of romance. There have been born in these camps more than 20,000 children annually that the Stratton bill proposes to bring to the United States in violation of our basic immigration law.

In fact, they urge the Congress to pass this special bill giving this particular group of displaced persons priority over millions of other displaced and needy persons, their wives and their children. Even the 200,000 Polish patriots, their wives and children who have been denied the bounty of the American taxpayers seem unable to enlist the sympathy and help of the backers of the Stratton bill. If we admit these 400,000, it will be charged up to the quotas of their country. Perhaps a million or more have heretofore made applications for visas and passports to come to our country and they may be among the very best citizens of their country, but if we passed this special bill, the quotas for these countries will be absorbed for the next 10 years or more. We know little or nothing of the background of these 400,000 DP's except the children that have been born in these camps. We know little or nothing of their record in the countries where they lived. They came and sat down on your Uncle Sam's lap and told their story with very little, if any, record to back up their claims. We know of no services that they have rendered to the United States or the American people, but we do know of the services of the 200,000 or more Polish patriots and other veterans, and millions of other needy displaced persons of Europe, and we do know what they would mean to our country if they were brought here.

SIT DOWN FROM 3 TO 7 YEARS

The Stratton bill proposes to bring in 400,000 DP's but an amendment will be urged when the bill comes up for 15,000 additional. These 15,000 got into this country during the war or when they saw the war was coming, on one pretext or another. The time for them to leave the country has long expired. Now it is insisted that we amend the Stratton bill, H. R. 2910, and let these 15,000 remain in this country.

The Stratton bill provides we bring 100,000 a year. It would take at least 4 years to bring into this country the 400,000 DP's. It would likely be 6 months or more before any of them could be brought over and therefore, 100,000 of them would continue to sit in the camps on Uncle Sam's lap for nearly 4 years; 300,000 for 3 years; 200,000 for 2 years, and 100,000 for 1 year. Therefore, these DP's would be sitting down for a period of more than 3 years and a part of them as long as 7 years, and of course, all of that time they, their wives, their present and future children, will be taken care of by the taxpayers of this country. We have been reminded that many wonderful people have come to this country as immigrants and succeeded in a big way. That is very true and we are very proud of each and every one of them, but if you will read the story of each of the splendid women and men you will find that they did not, as able-bodied persons sit down for a period of from 3 to 7 years and depend upon the bounty of their adopted country or anybody else. They accepted employment and took advantage of all opportunities that presented themselves. Judging the future by the past, I would rather think that these 400,000 DP's would more than likely sit down again after we got them into the United States.

If we establish this precedent, no doubt in due course, we will have demands to admit Koreans of north and south Korea, admit Chinese of north and south China, admit DP's from north and south Italy; also admit DP's from France, Jews and Arabs, as well as other countries, who can and will claim that they are under governments who have or will persecute them for their religious or political beliefs.

VETERANS OPPOSE

The representatives of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and 85 other veteran and patriotic organizations appeared before our committee and expressed strong opposition to the Stratton bill, and any other bill that would weaken our basic immigration laws. They pointed out that this would establish an unwise precedent, that it was not only inimical to the best interests of our country but to the veterans and their dependents. They made it clear that there were approximately 2,300,000 young veterans taking vocational or educational training under the GI bill of rights, and that these veterans would soon be ready for positions, and they did not want their chances lessened by bringing in additional groups such as the displaced persons. They also emphasized the housing shortage, and stated that there were perhaps more than 2,500,000 veterans who have been unable to secure shelter for themselves and their families by reason of this housing shortage, and these veterans and their families are forced to double up with other persons. This is true as to millions of other American citizens.

The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, regular veterans have gone on record repeatedly in their national conventions in opposition to any change in our basic immigration laws. They did this as late as 1947. They also emphasized that times are flush now but more than likely the time is not far distant when jobs and opportunities would be scarce and the veterans and their dependents would be seeking jobs they could not find. It matters not what anyone may say but the admission of these 400,000 displaced persons is in direct conflict with the best interests of the working people of this country. Through all the years the labor groups have opposed such legislation as this. I am somewhat surprised that some of them have changed their attitude as to this particular bill. They must know there are literally millions of needy working people and their families in Europe who would like to be supported by our Government for three long years and continue that support for 3 or 4 years more, and we have many needy veterans and other needy people in this country who are not receiving 1 penny of support from our Government. Many of these veterans fought through World War I and World War II.

Our country has been liberal to those of the Jewish faith. Dr. Rabbi Phillip S. Bernstein, one of the most noted authorities on the Jewish people and their affairs, testified before our committee that there are approximately 10,000,000 Jews in the world. Five million or more of these are in the United States. Therefore, we have in the United States about one-half of all the Jewish population of the world. Russia is next with 2,250,000. France and England have a small Jewish population. I wish again to emphasize that no country in the world has as many foreign-born, according to its population, as the United States.

FAIR SHARE

Many persons insist that we should take our fair share of the DP's, but, of course, there are millions of needy DP's in Europe alone. We have admitted tens of thousands of refugees during and since the war. We have admitted nearly 100,000 GI brides and their children. Former Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization of the United States, Mr. Ugo Carusi, who was born in Italy, testified that the number of crossings of aliens of our borders annually is about 37,000,000. Of course, some of these make more than one crossing in a single year and the greater portion return to their countries, but out of these millions of crossings, there is no doubt but what many have remained in this country.

POPULATION INCREASING—RESOURCES DECREASING

The Census Bureau reported on October 1, 1947, that the population of this country had increased from 1940, 13,038,000. This is a tremendous increase in 7 years, and the total population of the United States was approximately 143,000,000. We have approximately 15,000,000 service men and women of World War II and several million veterans of World War I. Every year millions of young men and women are finishing their high school or college training: 2,300,000 World War II veterans are taking educational or vocational training. These young veterans and young people finishing their schooling are now, and will be in increasing numbers, seeking opportunities for their brains and hands. I have lived through two or three depressions and I know the sad story of millions of our own citizens, including veterans and their dependents, walking the streets and highways of the country seeking employment they cannot find.

By reason of a recent destructive war we have greatly depleted our natural resources—timber, coal, iron, lead, and the fertility of millions of acres of our soil. It is no time for us to bring great groups of people from foreign lands into our country to take away the opportunities of our own defenders and other citizens. I think this should be the attitude of the native-born and naturalized citizens to place the welfare of our own country and our own people first. A very large percentage of these immigrants find lodgment in our great congested cities and centers. Very few of them go to the farms. Many of them bring their ideologies with them, which are not in harmony with the American way of life, and in view of these considerations I feel that I would do a very great injustice to the people of our own country to change and break down our immigration laws which I helped to pass in 1924. I have and shall continue to oppose measures to make our country the "dumping ground" of the world. We have been especially generous to Europe in two great world wars. In the last war we gave the blood of approximately 350,000 American boys. A million others were disabled by disease or wounds. We spent approximately $350,000,000,000 in World War II. We inherited the greatest debt and the highest taxes this country or any other country has ever had. We gave about $50,000,000,000 in lend-lease during the war, and since the war closed we have given to Europe in the way of money, credits, food, material, and equipment amounting to more than $24,000,000,000. We have proved ourselves to be the most generous nation that has ever existed, and they are now calling on us for 17 more billion as a minimum. We must change our course or bring disaster upon the finest, best, and most wonderful country that has ever existed in all history.

The Road Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call your attention to an editorial appearing in the Italian Tribune.

Each week the Italian Tribune is delivered to my office and each week for the past year I have read its editorial page with a great deal of interest. This publication is one of the finest foreign-language newspapers, in my opinion, now printed in the United States. Its opinions are free, independent, and nonpartisan and I wish to include in my remarks a copy of the editorial appearing in the January 9 issue of the Italian

Tribune which I feel is fairly representative of the type of editorial that has been presented in this paper for a long, long time.

The editorial is as follows:

THE ROAD AHEAD

This is the age of confusion.

But that does not mean it need be an age of cynical resignation to failure—and of the gradual abandonment of rights and principles that took 2,000 years of almost continuous conflict for mankind to secure.

No one can minimize the problems that confront the nations, ranging from the terrible specter of unleashed atomic energy down to such temporary difficulties as shortages of materials. The very extent and number of these problems have added to the confusion. They have, as the old French proverb says, made it hard to see the forest because of the trees. They have obscured the fact that there is really only one basic problem, and that all the rest hinge upon it in one way or another.

That problem is easily put: Sooner or later, the peoples of the world, including the United States, will have to make a complete final choice between the chimera of security and the reality of freedom.

There is a danger in nursing such words as "freedom" and "liberty" these days. Dictators and tyrants have attempted to pervert them of any semblance to their true meanings. Hitler, after all, established his slave state and fought his disastrous war for world enslavement with freedom and liberty as his rallying call. Even so, the real free man can be described. He is free to express his opinion, whether or not it is in agreement with the majority or with the government in power. He is free to worship as he pleases. He is free to print what he thinks in a newspaper, or elsewhere, subject to the old-established laws of libel and public decency. He is free to work or not to work, and to change jobs of his own volition without dictation from employer, labor leader, or politician. He is free to run for public office on any platform he devises, or to vote for the candidate of his choice. He is free to engage in business under a competitive system which penalizes and favors none. He is free to determine his own destiny, and he is not the tool of the state or any other interest.

These are not separate, unrelated entities. Every last one of them is dependent on the others. When one freedom is lost, all the rest are endangered. No dictatorship has ever been established all at once. A right is abrogated here, another there; the state seizes business, then takes over the labor unions; new "interpretations" are placed on the rights of free speech and assembly—so it goes, step after step, until the job of despotism is completed.

Dictators trade on fear—fear of want, fear of hunger, fear of cold, all the natural, material fears. They promise a maximum of material security to the tragically confused people they entice. And this poses another question: Can a people, in return for the surrender of their freedoms, obtain more goods, a higher standard of living, greater measure of protection from adversity?

The question answers itself. The greatest material advancement in the history of the world has been in the nation where there has been the greatest amount of freedom for the individual—the United States. It is not accident that the pay of the average American worker, measured in terms of purchasing power, is 10 or a dozen times that of the average Russian worker. A still better comparison is found with present-day England, the country to which we are bound the closest by the ties of a common language, inheritance, and tradition. Socialism, which can be the vanguard of dictatorship, has aggravated every English economic problem. It has produced less goods for export, not more goods for export; less coal, not more coal; less agricultural production. Worst of all, it has sapped the energies and ambitions of the people. There can never be progress in a state where individual opportunity, initiative, and enterprise are discouraged and the government does all the thinking.

The superstate is not only spiritually barren but materially inefficient. When we attempt to trade freedom for security, we lose both. This thought was perfectly expressed by Somerset Maugham, the most distinguished living British novelist; when he said: "If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose its freedom; and the irony of it is that if it is comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that too." That says it all in a sentence.

The hope of this Nation is that our people will profit by example. The hope of the world is that it will be able to break the shackles of oppression. The hope of mankind lies in a reaffirmation of the rights and dignity of the individual.

Address by Rear Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., Superintendent, United States Naval Academy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to enclose an address by Rear Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy, at the second century celebration at Ripon College, Ripon, Wis., on Thursday, October 30, 1947.

Admiral Holloway is one of the outstanding heroes of the war. In addition to his having commanded the battleship *Iowa*, in July 1945 he took over the Training Command Pacific. At the end of the war Admiral Holloway was senior member of a board appointed by the then Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, which proposed to the Congress an integration plan whereby young men might attain permanent commissioned rank in the Navy from schools other than Annapolis. This plan was known as the Holloway plan. Fifty-two colleges in this Nation contribute to the officer strength of the Navy under this proposal, along with Annapolis, and they have equal rank with their contemporaries at the above-mentioned school, as well as equal status with graduates of the Naval Academy.

Rear Admiral Holloway was born at Fort Smith, Ark., on June 20, 1898, and he was graduated from the Naval Academy with the class of 1919. His career in the Navy reads like a storybook. For brilliance in performance of duty, courage and daring, he won many citations. For his service in Operation Torch, he was commended by the Secretary of the Navy, and authorized to wear the commendation ribbon with the following citation:

For outstanding performance of duty as squadron commander of Destroyer Squadron 10, assigned to screen the air group, western naval task force, during action off Casablanca on November 8, 1942; and in the operations connected with the amphibious landings on the west coast of Africa and the capture of Casablanca, November 8 to 11, 1942. Expertly directing the destroyer screening action, Rear Admiral (then captain) Holloway prevented the many enemy submarines in the area from delivering effective torpedo fire and, by his aggressive fighting spirit and courageous leadership, contributed materially to the winning of a decisive victory over the enemy. His intrepidity, initiative and professional skill reflect the highest credit upon Rear Admiral Holloway and the United States naval service.

In 1943, as commander of a destroyer and destroyer escort shake-down group, Atlantic Fleet, he was awarded the Legion of Merit, with the following citation:

For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the Government of the United States as commander of DD-DE shake-down group from March to November 1943. Responsible for the detailed operational, administrative, and material problems incident to initiating the program of this command, Captain Holloway has built up an efficient organization, turning over to the fleet competent, seagoing vessels and thoroughly indoctrinated personnel. His conspicuous success in fulfilling this important assignment, and his skill in collaborating with other commands have contributed vitally to the effective prosecution of the war.

Many intervening citations were received. As commander of the battleship *Iowa*, which participated in the strikes at Luzon, which ship, through its antiaircraft fire, accounted for many enemy aircraft, he received a gold star in lieu of a second Legion of Merit with the following citation:

For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the Government of the United States as commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Iowa*, flagship of Commander Battleship Division 7, during action against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific war area from October 30, 1944, to July 24, 1945. With his vessel operating as flagship of several important striking and covering forces and as flagship of a strike group bombarding Muroran, Hokkaido, on July 15, and Hitachi, Honshu, the night of July 17-18, Rear Admiral Holloway rendered distinguished service throughout the intensive actions and by his brilliant leadership and outstanding skill, contributed materially to the extensive and costly damage inflicted on the enemy. Achieving and maintaining a high standard of readiness and training on board the *Iowa* during this extended period, Rear Admiral Holloway, by his superb tactical ability, sound judgment, and loyal devotion to duty, contributed materially to the success of our forces in carrying out effective operations against the Japanese in this vital war area.

In August 1945 Admiral Holloway was appointed Commander Fleet Training Command Pacific. In September 1945 he was detached from the Fleet Training Command Pacific, and transferred to duty with the Bureau of Personnel as assistant chief of personnel for demobilization. So expeditiously was this billet handled and with such complete and thorough efficiency, Admiral Holloway received this citation:

For outstanding performance of duty as assistant chief of naval personnel for demobilization from September 26, 1945, to September 1, 1946. Serving with distinction in a position without precedent, Rear Admiral Holloway skillfully directed and supervised the Navy's personnel demobilization plan, and brought the program to a successful conclusion without detriment to the country's security. Coordinating the intricate activities and movement of personnel from all parts of the world, he personally visited every part of the country to insure the prompt and expeditious administration of demobilization processes. His devotion to duty throughout was in keeping with the highest traditions of the naval service.

On January 15, 1947, he was appointed Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., where he is now located.

Admiral Holloway married the former Jean Gordon Hagood, daughter of the distinguished Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood, of Charleston, S. C. He has two children—Lt. J. L. Holloway III, United States Navy, and Mrs. Lawrence Heyworth, Jr., wife of Lt. Lawrence Heyworth, Jr., United States Navy.

It is always interesting to me to note that the States of Arkansas, Texas, Oklahoma, and Missouri have names and towns and places that signify their close relationship with South Carolina. Many of the Members of this House have names which are originally from South Carolina, and to this section trace their backgrounds. Historically, it is well known that after the Civil War a great immigration went to these States from South Carolina, and I am proud as a South Carolinian to say that the State contributed these men and women to those States, and that Admiral Holloway comes from Arkansas.

Admiral Holloway's splendid address follows:

It is a pleasure to be present at Ripon College and to participate in the observance of Ripon's long and distinguished record among the educational institutions of our Nation. Ripon and the Naval Academy were born in the same period of this country's educational history and have a common heritage in the foresight of the patriots of the middle of the last century. Yesterday began your precentennial observance and earlier in the week the officers and men in the Navy celebrated Navy Day. This evening I would like to focus upon the inspiration for both of these celebrations by discussing the Navy and education.

Education and training are vital factors in naval organization and planning. While it is true that a navy must be built of ships, planes, and other matériel ad infinitum, it is likewise true that all the matériel in the world is useless without men prepared to operate it. The men received by the Navy vary tremendously in intellect, capacity, and personality. They come from all parts of the United States and from every walk of life, and their background is anything but uniform. These men have to be selected and classified, rated, and advanced, rotated, and integrated according to the needs of the Navy and the abilities of the individual. These steps are all inherent in a diversified and comprehensive training program. But training is for the more immediate objectives and its implications may, in a military sense, be called tactical. The Navy distinguishes between education and training, the former conceived to be more profound, more basic and strategical in its long-range implications. Men are selected with a view to giving them, according to their talents and according to the demands of their billets, training, education, or a combination of the two. People even of minimum intellectual ability can be trained for special tasks and people of limited experience but of profound intelligence can be effectively trained in certain specialties in a very short time.

When war struck our country in December 1941 the Navy was confronted with the most challenging personnel problem in its history. We had to convert into a smoothly functioning organization some four and one-half million officers and men. We called upon the knowledge and experience of the colleges, universities, testing agencies, and industrial management, and blended this with the Navy's own experience in procurement, classification, training, and assignment. Personnel research and test development reached a new high in the Bureau of Naval Personnel that was demanded by the exigencies of time and the magnitude of the task. A unit of personnel trained in psychology was established within the Bureau under the name of the Test and Research Section. Objective evaluation was given to such factors as previous education and training, age, and occupational experience of trainees. Special attention was given to methods of measurement, follow-up studies, and predictive factors. Billets were analyzed as to their multiple requirements in regard to the type of persons suited to fill them and the training most appropriate for their successful accomplishment. Not only was an excellent study of immediate needs made but investigations were so exhaustive that paths of future research were indicated which will keep students of personnel research and test development busy for many years to come. The success of the Navy in World War II was due in no small part to selecting the right people for the right job and rendering them effective in the minimum amount of time.

In peacetime the Navy faces a different problem, both in education and training. The rapid training courses, the compressed college course of 3 years at the Naval Academy, the intensive postgraudate instruction and other speed projects are not the normal procedure. What is learned rapidly is sometimes forgotten rapidly, at least in certain fields. Furthermore, motivation was often closely associated with the instinct for self-preservation during the war and we should be highly optimistic if we thought people would be willing to carry on at breakneck pace during peacetime. In peace, time-saving is not as overwhelmingly an important consideration; too much streamlining may even be a deterrent. We are building the profound and deep-rooted foundations of military thought, processes, competence, and objectiveness. Wisdom and perceptiveness come with time and length of service in the profession. An ideal process is that of giving meaning to previous training and education through experience and creating an awareness through experience of the value of future training and education. So in the Navy training and education never end. Intellectual processes are poured on in the course of field experience and progressively integrated with that field experience. We must keep available a nucleus of professional excellence upon which we may rely and around which we may expand when it becomes necessary to mobilize for war. The professional Navy men must be prepared for the moment when they are called upon to take the enormous amount of education and talent, talent in techniques, talent in engineering, talent in almost every profession, evaluate it, select it, place it, train it, and finally deploy it objectively in battle, in campaign, and in total war.

It would be utterly impossible to evolve naval officers who would be at the same time shipbuilding experts, atomic physicists, and research men in fuels and lubricants. That we do not attempt. The role of the perceptive professional officer is to furnish objectives and high-level planning and coordination to a group of experts, to act as a centripetal force administratively. I might say, parenthetically, that coordinating a group of experts, numbering two or over, sometimes calls for considerable tact and understanding. An appreciation of broad objectives is essential.

A naval officer's education begins when he is a midshipman at the Naval Academy or in one of the 52 universities having NROTC programs. This is clearly undergraduate work. It is not concerned with research or specialization any more than would be found in any undergraduate course leading to a bachelor of arts or bachelor of science degree. The Naval Academy is the first phase of the Navy university. It occupies a position analogous to that of Columbia College in relationship to Columbia University where only 3,000 of the university's total strength of 30,000 are enrolled. The Naval Postgraduate School, although located at Annapolis, is quite distinct from the Academy. Here work is done toward the master's or doctor's degree, some of it at the school itself and some under the supervision of the school at various universities throughout the country, wherever the best facilities may be available for various research projects. This is one of the graduate schools of the Navy university. At Newport there is the general line school where a 1-year course in professional work is given to officers who have completed 5 to 8 years in the field. Here I might say that it is the Navy policy to avoid sending men into graduate work immediately upon completion of undergraduate work. Another general line school is being established at Monterey, Calif. There are the operational and staff colleges, such as the Naval War College at Newport, the Armed Forces Staff School at Norfolk, and the National War College at Washington. The area of research and development is ably represented by Bellevue in electronics, Whiteoak in ordnance, Point Mugu in guided missiles and fluid mechanics, and the Engineering Experiment Station at Annapolis. To all of these should be added the numerous research projects assigned under Navy sponsorship to many outstanding research institutions of our educational world.

The Navy realizes that our future national security is dependent upon our scientific knowledge and our ability not only to convert that knowledge rapidly into weapons but to apply it to tactics and strategy. Basic research is essentially a peacetime activity, since during a period of hostilities it is extremely difficult to conduct basic research and to convert the knowledge so gained into practical applications in time to be useful.

The Office of Naval Research was established in August 1946, for the purpose of encouraging scientific research, coordinating and disseminating to the Offices and Bureaus of the Navy world-wide scientific information, providing the necessary services for the conduct of specialized and imaginative research, and supervising, controlling, and administering matters concerning patents and inventions.

The law which established this Office provided also for the establishment of a naval research advisory committee, consisting of not more than 15 persons preeminent in the fields of science, to consult with and advise the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of Naval Research.

To give some idea of the work of the Office of Naval Research I should like to describe briefly the three main activities supported by it, namely, the Naval Research Laboratory at Anacostia, D. C., the Special Devices Center at Sands Point, Long Island, N. Y., and the Research Group in the Office of Naval Research.

I. THE NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY

Although Congress appropriated funds as early as 1916 for the establishment of the Naval Research Laboratory, it was not until 1923 that it was officially commissioned. Since that time, the Naval Research Laboratory has become the largest Government research institution in the United States, employing about 3,600 people, 1,000 of whom are scientists. Included among these are some of the most competent and well-known scientists in the country. The accomplishments of the laboratory over the past 25 years are well known and I am sure all agree that the early developmental work on radar alone

was well worth all the money the Navy has spent on the Naval Research Laboratory. Since the war, the laboratory has converted from a wartime "crash" development program to a long-term peacetime program in basic and applied research. The future program of the Naval Research Laboratory will include work in the applications of radio and radar to all the fields involved, such as communications, detection, recognition and guidance. In addition, a very active program is being conducted in studies of high temperature metallic alloys. It is essential that we produce materials which can stand temperatures far higher than any we have today before real progress can be made in the guided missiles program or in gas turbines. The development of high energy fuels for rockets and torpedoes is being continued with increased emphasis. In underwater sound work, the laboratory has been preeminent for many years and will continue to be so. I have every reason to believe that the future accomplishments of the laboratory will be on an even higher scale than they have been in the past.

II. SPECIAL DEVICES CENTER

The special devices center at Sands Point, Long Island, N. Y., has an outstanding background in the development of training equipment. This unique organization consists of about 360 people, military and civilian, of whom 94 are scientists or engineers. In addition to the development of synthetic training equipment, the center is including in its program work in human engineering in which is sought fundamental knowledge on the reactions of men as related to machines, and the adaptation of machines to man's limitations in the submarine field, the aircraft field, etc. In the realization that in another emergency, we will have to train more men to do more complex things in less time than we have ever done before, special devices center is making important investigations into the complex problems of the mass training of personnel. Television and radio techniques are being thoroughly investigated.

III. RESEARCH GROUP

The Research Group in the Office of Naval Research itself is composed of scientists, engineers, and naval officers grouped together. Their function is to plan and initiate the basic research program which we are conducting in the universities of the United States. After they plan and initiate the program it is their job to evaluate the results of the program and get those results to the people who are handling the development programs. Great good will come from the association of civilian scientists and naval officers in the Office of Naval Research in a mutual appreciation of problems. It should result in the finest guarantee of security for our country.

The basic research program itself in the universities now amounts to about $50,000,000. The work is scattered through about 100 schools and involves something more than 600 individual studies. There are certain general results which have already come from this program in basic research in the universities. One of the most important is the fact that today we have over 2,000 scientists and over 2,400 postgraduate students working on naval problems. By working on these naval problems, they are becoming familiar with the Navy's needs and could immediately be mobilized to the support of Navy programs should an emergency arise. While it is not the intent of these contracts to form a scientific reserve, actually such a thing has been done by means of these contracts.

Another general result from the program has been the financial aid which we have given the universities. Such aid has made possible the training, at the graduate or the Ph. D. level, of a considerably larger number of young scientists than could otherwise have been trained.

Summing up, we see a Navy university of tremendous scope embracing undergraduate work, graduate work, operational and staff study, research and development.

A moment ago I spoke of 52 universities having NROTC programs which together with the Naval Academy constitute the undergraduate phase of the Navy university. The naval science course pursued at the NROTC universities consists of twenty-four semester hours, plus certain drills and summer cruises. The remainder of the NROTC midshipman's time is devoted to whatever course he may wish to follow, such as prelaw, engineering, or general academic. Upon graduation, the NROTC midshipman is commissioned as an ensign in the Regular Navy and begins his service of 2 years in the fleet. At the end of the 2-year period, he may return to civilian life if he wishes as a Reserve Officer on inactive duty or he may request selection for a permanent commission in the Regular Navy. The integration of the graduates of the Holloway plan with the graduates of the Naval Academy will be of mutual benefit. The Naval Academy will provide the basic professional input of officers for the fleet, maintained at a constant level. The NROTC graduates who follow a Navy career will be an invaluable vitalizing input to the professional content of the Navy, and those who do not will constitute the best Reserve of all time, consisting of NROTC graduates who have had 2 years' active experience in the fleet.

In its beginning the Naval Academy was the sole naval educational institution. Today it is only a part of the Navy University. Until quite recently the Naval Academy was the only undergraduate college for the training and education of naval officers. This, too, has been modified through addition of the NROTC program. With changes in function have come changes in objectives. These in turn are reflected in the curriculum and organization of the Academy. To understand this, it must ever be borne in mind that the Academy is essentially a part of a large educational schematic. The needs of the service are the prime consideration in the plans of the Academy. Annual curriculum studies are made to insure that we are keeping abreast or even a little ahead of the times. New department heads are assigned every 2 or 3 years, bringing with them fresh ideas on the needs of the service. They are often all set to reform practices which existed when they were midshipmen at the Academy and are happily surprised to find that long lines of progressive predecessors have already cured the ills they planned to correct. The Academy is not static. It is ever conducting self-examination. This does not mean that change is made for the sake of change or that there are not constant factors. Indeed there are many of them. One, of course, is the preparation of high-school graduates. We keep our curriculum on the undergraduate level so that the high-school graduate may enter the Academy and succeed. This is particularly necessary since our students are nominated from every State in the Union and we wish to provide an equality of opportunity for all. Another constant is our large civilian faculty in the nonprofessional departments. In departments such as aviation, seamanship and navigation, and ordnance and gunnery, we find the most expert to be experienced naval officers.

What is the Naval Academy curriculum? It is a prescribed one. Every midshipman has the same courses, except that he may elect in foreign languages, French, Spanish, Portuguese, German, Russian, or Italian. In certain departments he may be in a regular or fast section depending on his previous training and ability. Essentially, however, it is the same course for all. The curriculum is drawn up in consideration of the needs of a naval officer both in his professional career and as a citizen of his country. It is an undergraduate curriculum that is constantly and carefully compared with the curricula of leading colleges throughout the country. The establishment of a prescribed curriculum that will have just the right proportion of social-humanistic studies, of scientific studies, and of professional and military studies is a tremendous responsibility. We realize that such a problem has no perfect answer. However, we believe we arrived at a rather good solution. Our formula is based upon our appraisal of the needs of the future naval officer and citizen, the example and advice of leading civilian educators, our curricular experience at the Naval Academy and the considerations of available time, money, instructors, and facilities.

What is the Naval Academy to contribute to the future naval officer? It is to develop him broadly so that he will become a valuable citizen of his country both in domestic and in foreign circles, to prepare him consummately for his professional career, to provide him with scientific insight built upon basic knowledge, to endow him with qualities of leadership and character, and to develop him physically so that he will have the vigor to carry out his task.

I don't believe too much emphasis can be put on the importance of approaching studies according to the fundamental concepts involved. The calculus need not be justified as a narrow range of knowledge essential to lower level operating technique. Rather, the thinking that led to the development of a thousand and one strictly naval techniques in the fields of fire control, propulsion, and electronics, orients to instinctive reactions and concepts having roots in fundamental mathematical theory presented at undergraduate level.

I do not value what we do at the Naval academy in our department of English, history, and government, solely because it develops a capacity for effective articulation, both verbal and written, and a literal knowledge of events, with some literary polish as an appendage. In addition to these and other values, literature and history and the social sciences contribute to the development of character—history is a panorama of great and good men as well as evil ones and in literature we find sentiments and thoughts of noble characters across the field of time which help to establish our standards of life and civilization.

By the same token, I am not content in the field of foreign languages that the only thing accruing to our student is linguistic facility in the narrow field of the interpreter; I hold for example that the study of Spanish must encompass also a concept of the Spanish civilization and its contributions during recorded history, the place of this civilization in the western orbit in our present world, the people and the institutions associated with this beautiful language and so on. These are concepts that, at some future time unforeseen by us, the present student may draw upon in meeting some problem and decision in policy or planning or administration in years to come.

What is the role of the Naval Academy in the over-all scheme of naval education? The Naval Academy should represent the ultimate in professional and personal standards. The Academy and its graduates should be a binding force in the creation of a solidarity of loyalty and ideals of service in the Navy as a whole. I am convinced of the paramount importance and essentialness to the service of this role. I conceive the contribution of the Naval Academy to be both spiritual and professional. The daily life is one of discipline, frugality, and subordination of personal freedom, all pointed to ideals of devotion to duty and responsibility to country. The role of the austere life in connection with training and leadership and character is well recognized by students of military education and leadership. The Naval Academy is an undergraduate institution which no man should enter unless he wishes to make the Navy a life career. It is a known quantity in having a capacity to inspire large groups and high percentages of graduates of intelligence and character to stay in the Navy in years of comparative penury and hardship and to be available in the hour of war.

Both West Point and the Naval Academy face squarely this question of instilling a permanent desire for military and naval service, and have achieved a great measure of success. This professional esprit must continue to permeate the services as the touchstone and binding force in loyalty and devotion to the public interest.

In conclusion, I should like to leave with you my firm conviction that the plans of the Navy and those of civilian education are inseparably interrelated, and that this continued relationship will redound to the advantage of all, the Navy, education, and the Nation.

Arguments For and Against Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARVE TIBBOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith an article entitled "Arguments For and Against Federal Aid to Education," by M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general of Pennsylvania, published in State Government, December 1947.

This article is one that shows the extensive research and diligent study that Miss Burr has made on Federal aid to education:

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

(By M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general of Pennsylvania)

It is a fundamental concept of Government in the United States that certain of the powers of Government are of such intimate concern to the individual and to the community that they belong solely, and must remain solely, in the several States and their political subdivisions. Any control by the Federal Government over the exercise of those powers, to say nothing of the centralization of such powers in the Federal Government, must inevitably threaten or destroy local self-government or home rule.

In the absence of a responsibility directly imposed upon the Federal Government by the Constitution, the Congress should not appropriate enormous sums for recurrent subsidies to the States, on a continuing and ever-increasing basis, for purposes which are the direct concern and prerogative of the State and local governments. It is urged, and rightly so, that the States should finance their own needs with respect to functions of government that are primarily State and local. The national debt is nearly $300,000,000,000, whereas the total indebtedness of the States does not greatly exceed $2,000,000,000. The Congress of the United States has sufficiently heavy responsibilities in finding ways and means of reducing the national debt and paying the billions required for interest on that debt, of balancing the Federal budget, of adopting measures for the adjustment of Federal-State tax relations, of aiding in postwar adjustments in fields definitely within the scope of Federal responsibility, and of meeting the world-wide emergency which requires that we give such aid as we can toward relief and rehabilitation in other lands.

If State and local governments are to finance their own needs, they must not be deprived of sources of revenue which will enable them to help themselves. Recent and continuing studies concerning the possible ways of coordinating Federal and State taxation are evidence of the realization that one of the most important keys to the preservation of home rule is an equitable division of tax sources. By assuring that the States shall have adequate tax sources, the States can enlarge the taxing powers of local units of government. As stated by Gov. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania: "By enlarging the tax base, local communities can more fairly distribute the cost of government and be enabled thereby to solve their local problems in the way that people want them solved at home."

The comments above apply generally to proposals which would have the effect of pyramiding Federal subsidies or grants-in-aid. Here let us consider one of the most far reaching of the pending proposals, popularly referred to as Federal aid to education. This proposal, in one guise or another, has long been a source of controversy.

Among the more important of the numerous bills on the subject introduced in the Eightieth Congress are S. 199, introduced by GEORGE D. AIKEN, and S. 472, introduced by ROBERT A. TAFT, for himself and others, both bills referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The companion to S. 472 in the House is H. R. 1871, introduced by LAURIE C. BATTLE. However, the more active House bill on the subject during the first session was H. R. 2953, introduced by EDWARD O. MCCOWAN, which differed from the original S. 472 principally in that it set a different minimum allotment per child. The House Committee on Education and Labor deferred action on H. R. 2953 until further inquiries could be made regarding the need for and desirability of such legislation. The avowed purposes of the proposed legislation, and its broad scope, are indicated in the titles of the Senate bills:

S. 199. To authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States in more nearly equalizing educational opportunities among and within the States by establishing a national floor under current educational expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance at public elementary and secondary schools and by assistance to nonpublic tax-exempt schools of secondary grade or less for necessary transportation of pupils, school health examinations and related school-health services, and purchase of nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment, including books.

S. 472. To authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare and for other purposes.

The comments in this review are directed primarily to S. 472, introduced on January 31, 1947. After extensive hearings, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on July 3, reported favorably on the bill, with various modifications.[1]

The modified S. 472 would authorize the granting of $300,000,000 to the States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and a like amount for each fiscal year thereafter. Apportionment among the States would be based on a somewhat complex formula whereby, as explained in the Senate committee's report, the States would be required "to develop plans for guaranteeing a floor of $50 per pupil in average daily attendance under expenditures in all local school jurisdictions within the State."[2] The United States Office of Education, a supporter of the proposal, has pointed out with respect to the bill: "Aid would be given primarily to public schools, but any State which contributed part of its own revenues to nonpublic schools could allocate a proportionate amount of Federal funds to such schools." The United States Commissioner of Education would administer the program.

The adoption of S. 472 would embark the Federal Government upon a permanent program of subsidies to the States, involving large expenditures of Federal funds, for the purpose of aiding, if not directing, the States in the exercise of functions which heretofore have been conceded to be the constitutional responsibility of State and local governments. Although the Senate committee, in its report, repeated many of the well-known arguments in favor of S. 472, it took the precaution to state: "The question of whether or not the Federal Government should establish a policy of financial assistance to the States for public elementary and secondary education was not at issue before the committee." In short, the committee washed its hands of the policy question.

Proponents and opponents of the proposed legislation both agree that educational opportunity in the United States today is unequal; that it is desirable for every child to have, so far as may be possible within the framework of our constitutional system, an equal opportunity to obtain a basic elementary and secondary education in adequately equipped classrooms; that there is an urgent need for improving the educational opportunities of children, the equipment of schools, and the occupational conditions of teachers in many areas of this country.

They also agree (and it is particularly important to bear this in mind) that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to control or supervise elementary or secondary education in this country. Local responsibility for, and control of, education is part of the bedrock of our American form of government. Proponents of the legislation are extremely careful to reiterate the assurance that Federal aid under S. 472 would not infringe in any way upon the prerogatives of State and local governments in the administration of their educational systems, and some have stated that any thought of Federal supervision or control is merely baseless emotionalism. Indeed, the bill itself purports to prohibit any department, agency, officer, or employee of the Federal Government from exercising any direction, supervision, or control over any school or any State educational institution or agency

[1] S. Rept. No. 425, 80th Cong., 1st sess.

[2] Under S. 472 as originally proposed, 23 of the 48 States would not have been entitled to any aid. The raising of the minimum from $40 to $50 per child 5 to 17 years of age in average daily school attendance, with a modified formula, has the apparent effect of making all of the States eligible. According to the figures set forth in the report of the Senate committee (No. 425, 80th Cong., 1st sess.) showing the grants-in-aid which States would be eligible to receive upon compliance with the conditions and obligations set forth in S. 472, the allotment of Federal aid would range from a low of $135,000 in the case of Nevada to a high of $22,825,000 in the case of North Carolina. The States which would be eligible to receive the major share (each approximately $10,000,000 or more) would be North Carolina, Alabama, Texas, Georgia, Mississippi, Kentucky, Tennessee, South Carolina, Arkansas, New York, Louisiana, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Oklahoma, in that order.

with respect to which any funds under the legislation are made available.

Proponents of the bill usually argue that "the States are not able to meet the financial load, help is needed, and the Federal Government must come to the rescue, having a responsibility for preserving the general welfare, education being naturally a vital factor in the general welfare"—or words to that effect. They argue that educational opportunity in America must be equalized and that the only way to accomplish this end is by the granting of Federal aid in such a way that disparities among the various parts of the country will be wiped out.

The United States Commissioner of Education, testifying in favor of S. 472, cautioned against Federal control of education, while at the same time insisting that only Federal aid would wipe out the educational disparities. He admitted that there is a possibility that "a system of education centrally controlled might be prostituted to propagandistic purposes of a political party in control of the Government."

Those who oppose the bill have called attention, on the other hand, to certain factors which cannot be ignored. Federal aid in the field of education is a particularly dangerous device. There is just cause for anxiety lest the proposal, if adopted, undermine the responsibility of State and local governments. It is inevitable, no matter how pious may be the declaration of principle in the bill and however well-intentioned in the inception, that Federal aid on a permanent, recurring basis as proposed would lead to some form of Federal administration, supervision, or control in the field of elementary and secondary education. This is clear from S. 472 itself. While the bill purports to throw safeguards around the constitutional prerogatives of the State and local governments, it would impose definite and essential obligations on the States receiving aid under the legislation, with the United States Commissioner of Education quite clearly having broad administrative powers.[1]

Legislation of the kind envisaged by S. 472 could not, in the absence of centralized control, genuinely equalize educational opportunity and hence would not achieve its avowed object. It is conceded that such control is not desired.

No stronger arguments against the proposal in S. 472 have been pronounced than by Senator TAFT himself, together with Senators WALSH, BALL, and WHERRY, in the minority report concerning S. 637, similar in many respects to the present proposal and considered in a previous session.[2] For example:

"We do not subscribe to the doctrine that because our public schools and our educational facilities are a vital element in our national welfare, they thereby become the proper concern and implied responsibility of the National Government.

"Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. They should so remain."

In that same minority report it is stated:

"The bill, therefore, does not do the very thing which it is supposed to do. Equalization, as a matter of fact, cannot be secured except by complete Federal control and direction. Everyone agrees that complete Federal control and direction are worse than the inequality which now exists. * * * Congress ought not to give away Federal funds to the States, with no Federal control over the spending of the funds. If on the other hand the Federal Government is to retain control over the expenditures and to dictate them, then it means Federal control of education * * * an alternative equally obnoxious. There is no middle ground."

[1] See particularly secs. 7 and 8 of S. 472.

[2] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 14, 1943, p. 8318.

To contend that Federal authorities would continue indefinitely to administer a general program of Federal grants-in-aid for equalizing educational opportunities and facilities without participating more and more in the supervision of educational systems is wholly unrealistic. The history of governments refutes any such contention.

In any event, as pointed out in the above-mentioned minority report by Senator TAFT and others, "Federal subsidies to the States for matters which are clearly not within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government are certainly not justified on the ground that the States are unable to finance adequately the activities which are constitutionally assigned to them."

Another factor that must be clearly understood, though not as important as the fundamental responsibility of local government, is that Federal aid of the kind which S. 472 would provide is not needed. That is not to deny that there are some areas in the country where there is great need for improvement in the school systems. However, there is no real evidence that the States, with the exceptions of those few areas, are unable to finance adequately their own educational programs. This proposal for Federal aid has not been initiated by the States themselves; that is, their duly constituted legislative and executive authorities. Moreover, in comparison with the National Government's Treasury, the State treasuries are in good condition. In nearly every State, education is given a prior consideration in allocating the funds which are available.

It is true that local government in certain regions of the country have found it difficult or have been unable to meet entirely the financial requirements of a high standard educational system, the difficulties having been accentuated by the strains of war. However, that does not prove the need for a Federal dole. On the contrary, there has been a notable increase of activity on the part of the States within the past 3 years to mend their educational fences. For example, during the past year the legislatures in some 40 States have authorized increases amounting to about $500,000,000 in State funds for schools. County, city, and town appropriations have been increased by about $250,000,000 for the 1947–48 biennium. In addition, several State legislatures have appropriated funds for commissions to study their State school needs. Some of the States have revised and strengthened their departments of education. In some instances the tax bases within the States have been broadened and governors have recommended study and revision of their over-all tax system to bring about, among other things, more adequate support of the schools. In a recent survey by the United States Department of Commerce it was shown that, on the basis of State budgets examined, there had been an average increase of over 28 percent in the budgeted expenditures by the States for schools.[3]

The States are profiting by past experience and are assuming their responsibility to an increasing degree. Certainly it has not been demonstrated that the States themselves have urged the Federal subsidization which S. 472 would provide. Even as to the comparatively few States, mainly in the South, which could receive the major part of the aid under S. 472, it cannot be shown that they are impotent to meet their educational problems when, during the past year alone, they have increased their State expenditures for education by well over $100,000,000. The solution is not in subsidizing the States but in making it possible for the States to help themselves.

The formula provided by S. 472 for the allocation of grants-in-aid gives no assurance whatever that equalization can be accomplished in those States which are reputed to have the greatest need. In some of those States, in fact, equalization is contrary to their existing constitutions or traditional practices. Some of them have educational systems which are not well adapted to equalization of educational opportunity. An obvious example is that of segregation, with consequent duplications in the system. Perhaps it is not for the rest of us to tell the States having such a system to change it. At least, it is difficult to perceive how equalization could really be accomplished in such areas without virtual centralized dictatorship in education. Federal funds alone cannot correct errors in certain of the State school systems.

The aid contemplated by S. 472 is not genuinely needed. Through an adequate program of cooperation by the Federal and State Governments in adjusting their tax systems upon an equitable basis, and through other means, the States would be far better able to fulfill their responsibilities.[4] Even the Congress would not be harassed with proposals for ever-increasing Federal subsidies, and one of the principal threats to the preservation of local self-government in America would be removed.

It is entirely reasonable to point out that one of the best means by which the Congress could encourage the State and local government to finance their educational programs would be by reducing the nonessential Federal taxes for nonessential Federal expenditures.

It is a matter of great importance that the Congress consider what tax levies should be left to the States or should be divided with the States. The Congress has under consideration proposals relating to coordination of Federal and State taxation.

Meanwhile, there are several immediate objectives which could be accomplished. One of these is the proposal in H. R. 3653, introduced in the House by RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, during the first session of the Eightieth Congress, whereby the 80-percent credit now allowed against the Federal basic estate tax would be allowed also against the Federal additional estate tax. If such a proposal were adopted, the States would derive a considerable advantage, and one, moreover, to which they are eminently entitled. The field of inheritance and estate taxation is one which has always been recognized as of principal concern to the State governments. The increase in income to the States if the additional 80-percent credit were allowed would be considerable from their viewpoint. The slight effect upon Federal revenue from estate taxes would be more than offset by the increased ability

[3] State budgets submitted in 1947, U. S. Department of Commerce.

[4] As an example of the greater potential advantages to be gained through an equitable adjustment of Federal-State tax relations, without subsidization of the kind proposed in S. 472, it may be pointed out that, although Pennsylvania taxpayers would pay at least $30,000,000 to the Federal Government toward the administration of aid under S. 472, the return to Pennsylvania in the form of aid to elementary and secondary education would be only approximately one-third of that amount. On the other hand, the amount which Pennsylvania might obtain from its own tax sources if the 80 percent credit were allowed on the Federal additional estate tax, to say nothing of additional revenue which might accrue to Pennsylvania through a more equitable coordination of Federal and State taxation, would be expected to exceed three times the amount which Pennsylvania would be eligible to obtain under S. 472. Other States would stand to gain similarly, in varying degrees. In short, the States may gain more, in both tangible and intangible benefits, from a proper allocation of tax sources than from any allocation of grants-in-aid under S. 472.

of the State and local governments to finance their local needs.

The States, if given a chance, can finance those activities which are distinctly and constitutionally their responsibility. This can be accomplished without any semblance of undermining home-rule in the field of education. "In any event," as stated by Governor Duff, "the people back home know better than anybody else what their problems are and how able and willing they are to pay to solve them."

Up to this point, there has been no comment regarding private and parochial schools. The constitutions and laws of nearly all the States provide expressly against the use of public funds for any but public schools.

Federal legislation for educational grants-in-aid, particularly in the elementary and secondary fields, which would have the effect of by-passing State educational authorities for the purpose of giving Federal aid to private and parochial schools, could lead only to troublesome controversy. One hesitates, as a rule, to cite a dissenting opinion in support of a proposition; but truth is truth, wherever one may find it. Associate Justice Rutledge, in his dissenting opinion in the case before the United States Supreme Court involving transportation of parochial school children in public school busses in a New Jersey township,[1] made the following remark which is well worth our serious attention:

"Hence today, apart from efforts to inject religious training or exercises and sectarian issues into the public schools, the only serious surviving threat to maintaining that complete and permanent separation of religion and civil power which the first amendment commands is through use of the taxing power to support religion, religious establishments, or establishments having a religious foundation whatever their form or special religious function."

Any proposal that would open the door, however slightly, to centralized supervision of basic education, to say nothing of making Federal funds available as a favor to religious educational institutions, even on a modest scale, is a proposal calculated to inspire strong mental reservations, especially among those who are genuinely concerned with the "general welfare" of the American people. Potential advantages to be gained in some areas by a guaranty of $40 or $50 per child of school age are hardly a sufficient excuse for surrendering the heritage of unquestioned local control over elementary and secondary education.

Next to the right to worship as one sees fit—to have entire freedom of religion, free from any taint of political sponsorship, favor, subsidy, or coercion—there has been nothing closer to the hearts of the people of America than education and the determination to keep the educational system under vigilant local supervision, or under the watchful eye of "the people back home."

There seems to have been a tendency on the part of some proponents of S. 472, or of similar proposals, to refer to activities of the Federal Government in the field of education—especially aid for vocational education and rehabilitation, agricultural extension work, Indian schools, military and naval schools, school aid under land-grant legislation, aid to hospital training, veteran rehabilitation, etc.—and to compare these with the proposed aid under S. 472. There is no real comparison. Attempts to compare the proposal in S. 472 for so-called equalization in elementary and secondary education with such other types of aid are merely begging the issue.

However, we can derive a useful lesson from the experience with Federal aid under vocational education acts. They may offer a hint of ultimate experience under legislation such as that proposed in S. 472. We may cite, in this connection, the comprehensive article entitled "The Administration of Federal Grants-in-Aid to Education," written by the commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Education, a supporter of the Federal aid-to-education proposal.[2] Those who are interested may read the article. We shall quote only two excerpts:

"Of course, it is true that in any one of these items the Federal Government is in a position to deny the States funds if the concept of vocational education does not agree with that of the Federal Government. It is probable that each must embrace the concept of vocational education concurred in by representatives of the Office of Education * * *

"Again, it may be said that frequently the administrative rules and regulations devised by a bureau may extend farther than the congressional act intended. In other words, usually the congressional act allows considerably more leeway in the administration of federally allocated funds than the rules and regulations otherwise permit. Naturally, the Federal Government is concerned over the proper use of the funds allocated and, unfortunately, in many of our localities money emanating from an outside source is expended sometimes less wisely than the funds raised locally."

So we see that cooperation with the Federal Government in the administration of Federal grants-in-aid usually develops, and logically so, into a situation where the State's concept of education must agree with that of the Federal authorities.

CONCLUSION

The administration in any degree of elementary and secondary education in this country is not within the competence of the Federal Government and is not a proper subject for a permanent program of grants-in-aid on the basis envisaged in S. 472. Even while recognizing the Nation-wide concern in the improvement of educational opportunity in America, the potential byproducts of Federal intervention through a program such as that proposed in S. 472 are so much a threat to local self-government and home-rule that not even the so-called national interest or general welfare is adequate justification for the adoption of such a proposal. There are other and better ways, in the long run, to accomplish the ends desired, one of the most evident being the equitable division of tax sources in order that State and local governments may be better able to help themselves.

[1] *Everson* v. *Board of Education* (330 U. S. 1) (rehearing denied, 330 U. S. 855).

[2] State government, August 1944, pp. 380 et seq.

The Late Robert L. Norton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Post:

PRESIDENT IN TRIBUTE TO NORTON—"GRIEVED TO LEARN OF PASSING," TRUMAN DECLARES

WASHINGTON, January 7.—Official Washington today mourned the passing of Robert L. Norton.

President Truman learned of Norton's death immediately after he had delivered his State of the Union message to a joint session of Congress—an occasion which Mr. Norton had covered many times.

PRESIDENT GRIEVED

"I am grieved to learn of his passing," Mr. Truman said. "He was a fine craftsman, a good reporter, and a loyal friend."

Charles G. Ross, the President's chief secretary, and a colleague of Mr. Norton's for 25 years, was especially distressed at the news from Boston.

"Bob Norton was an old friend, in what reporters called the 'old days,'" Ross said. "We worked on many a story together. I know many men in public life and in the newspaper business who will miss him."

LOSS TO JOURNALISM

Attorney General Tom Clark expressed grief at Mr. Norton's passing. "The death of Robert L. Norton, for so many decades Washington correspondent for the Boston Post, is a loss to journalism and America, and to the entire field of public education through an informed press," Clark said

Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, said: "I am stunned by the news of Bob Norton's untimely passing. He has been a dear and close personal friend of mine for many years. I am very deeply moved by his loss. He was an exceptional man of amiable personal qualities—kindly, generous, warm-hearted, loyal to his friends. Sympathetic and tolerant by nature, he had a host of friends all over the country. I have never known a man in or out of public life who knew so many public figures and people in every walk of life as intimately and as well as Bob Norton, or who was more respected, admired, and loved by those who knew him.

"A widely read veteran newspaperman, editor, and commentator, trained in the traditions of the old school, he was exceedingly proud of his profession and its members. He was particularly proud of his associates on the Boston Post. He had supreme confidence in the ability of the newspaper business and its personnel to adapt itself to the demands of changing times. He enjoyed the esteem of all his fellow workers because they recognized in him outstanding ability and achievements as one of the greatest figures of their craft."

REMARKABLE MIND

"He counseled and helped countless boys entering the newspaper business and politics and was the trusted confidant and adviser of many public men. Like many others, I frequently consulted him and held his judgments and opinions in highest regard. He was imbued with the loftiest sense of honor and would never violate a confidence. Because of his warm, gentle, human qualities, loyalty and wisdom, his friends in all walks of life were legion and intensely devoted to him, as he was to them.

"He possessed the most remarkable mind—one of the finest I have ever encountered. In the true sense of the word, he was an intellectual. No college professor, no holder of high collegiate degrees could possibly excel him in gathering facts and information, not only in public affairs, which was his specialty, but in many other fields, and then selecting and analyzing and interpreting them in light of contemporary events. He was a sharp, penetrating analyst and a gifted diagnostician of political questions who always went right to the root of the problem. Although he liked to deal mostly with broad principles and concepts because his mind rose above the pettiness of detail, this attribute never limited his faculty for presenting the facts in true reportorial style, whenever the occasion demanded. His great contribution throughout the years will need and will receive more careful and extended appraisal, but it is unquestionable that in his passing Boston, the State, and the Nation will lose one of the truly great newspapermen of our generation."

WILL BE MISSED

"His genius and unique capacity, his love of his work, his wide contacts, his broad human approach, his constructive achievements, and, above all, his deep-rooted attachments to his friends and his fellowmen mark him indelibly as a man of great mind and great heart. He will be sorely missed by countless readers who implicitly trusted his brilliantly written commentary on current events, but he will be missed most by all those of us who knew and loved him for the great and noble soul that he was. I feel deeply and keenly his sudden passing and am bowed with grief. I extend my humble sympathy to members of his bereaved family to whom he was so genuinely devoted during his life and also to the publishers and staff of the Boston Post for what is indeed an irreparable personal loss. Our dear friend and happy philosopher has gone. May he find his true reward in eternal peace."

Phelps H. Adams of the New York Sun, president of the Gridiron Club of which Mr. Norton was a veteran member, bespoke the grief of club members as follows:

"I was deeply grieved to learn of the death of Bob Norton. Among the scores of newspapermen who knew him during his years of service here in the Capital, he was universally regarded as one of the ablest and finest members of the press corps. As a mark of the affection and esteem in which his colleagues held him, he was elected to membership in the Gridiron Club just 25 years ago. His passing after a quarter century of service in that organization is a profound loss to us all. As indeed it is to the profession which he chose to embrace and which he served with such distinction."

MANY MOURN PASSING

Others who mourned his passing included:

Senator SALTONSTALL: "I was distressed to learn of the death of Mr. Norton. I knew him well and liked him much. He was quick, witty, and an astute observer. I read his comments as often as I could. I am sorry we will no longer hear from him."

Senator LODGE. "I was profoundly shocked to learn of the death of my old and valued friend, Robert L. Norton. He and I had been friends for years, going back to my early days as a newspaper reporter when he helped me and instructed me in many ways.

"I saw him only recently at the Gridiron dinner. I had been his guest at the dinners several times. I had an appointment to spend an evening with him next week."

SHREWD OBSERVER

"Bob Norton was a very able newspaperman and his writing was of a very high quality. He was a most shrewd observer and many men in public life confided in him and set great store by his judgment. My deepest sympathy goes out to his family. I shall miss him and think of him often."

Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont. "I knew Mr. Norton as a fair and able reporter. I am sorry to hear of his death."

Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont. "Too bad. Too bad. Bob Norton was widely read and greatly respected in our State."

Speaker of the House JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts. "The news of the sudden death of Bob Norton comes as a great shock. It was my privilege to enjoy his friendship for more than 30 years. He was one of the really great political writers of our time. His long experience, his wide information and his intimate friendships with Presidents, political leaders, and leaders of industry and commerce made his interpretations of events of great value. We shall miss his timely and able column as we will the capable and friendly man whose pen crested it. His death is a distinct loss to Boston and Massachusetts and will be keenly regretted by thousands of his personal friends."

FINEST TYPE

Representative JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, who said Norton was a close friend of his and of his family for many years, expressed his grief and added, "He was one of the finest type of newspapermen for many, many years."

Representative CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts. "On hearing of his death, I feel a sharp loss of a good friend—a loss not confined to those who loved him also but to the whole Nation, in that he was one of the ablest and most far-seeing members of the press."

Representative MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine. "I'm sorry as I can be. We had wholehearted admiration and respect for him in Maine. His death is an unfortunate loss."

TERRIBLY SHOCKED

Representative CHARLES PLUMLEY, of Vermont, called Norton one of his best newspaper friends.

"His readers," PLUMLEY said, "have sustained a great loss and his friends will never find anyone to take his place."

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts: "I am terribly shocked. He was a personal friend of mine for many years, and I have read his excellent articles for many years. He had a fine grasp of national and international matters."

Representative THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts: "We all mourn his passing. He was one of the ablest newspaper columnists in New England. We in public life had great respect for his views. Anybody who knew him admired him for his fairness and his fineness."

Representative RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts: "Mr. Norton was one of the ablest men in his chosen field I have ever known. His life was rich in experience in National and State affairs. He enjoyed friendships and confidences of men in leadership in both. Through his understanding and power of analysis, combined with his integrity and independence in writing, he measured up to the highest traditions of the newspaper profession. He has been a close friend of mine for many years. His death is a great personal loss."

The Superintendents of the House and Senate press galleries, William Donaldson and Harold Beckley, expressed regret at Bob Norton's passing for the 500 newspapermen and women who were his colleagues. Mr. Norton was a member of the galleries for more than 30 years.

MRS. COOLIDGE IN TRIBUTE TO WRITER

Mrs. Grace Coolidge, widow of the late President, visiting at Columbus, N. C., gave the following tribute:

"I regret to learn of the death of Mr. Robert L. Norton, who was Washington correspondent for the Boston Post for many years, including those days when Mr. Coolidge was in the White House. We both considered him one of our good friends and appreciated his loyalty to us and to his paper."

AN ASSOCIATE'S TRIBUTE

(By Joe Harrington)

For a dozen years we shared an office in the Post with Bob Norton and a sturdy bridge of affectionate friendship grew between the two desks. The cluttered room didn't change when the news of his death came over the phone, but it will never be the same.

Though writing words on copy paper is the way we make our living, they turn out to be a feeble medium for expressing our appreciation of Bob. We can't capture in a few paragraphs the essence of hundreds of conversations, jam sessions, arguments, and the views we swapped on everything from the price of a pair of shoes to what was happening to the world at the moment.

In an attempt to appraise an old friend objectively, we'd say that graciousness was his outstanding characteristic. His first words on entering the room on his return from a trip to Washington, a political conference, or a swing around the doubtful States in an election were: "Hello, you old boll weevil. How are things with you?" Then: "How's the family? What are the kids doing?"

We're sure everyone who knew Bob Norton will have the same report to make about this side of his character.

STOOD ALONE

He carried out his thoughtfulness in little things, too. He'd come back from a luncheon at the Parker House, where his opinions were frankly sought by bankers and industrialists, and patiently listen to a garrulous ward heeler, who wanted to tell him what was wrong with the country. He'd hear the fellow out, then pat him on the shoulder and thank him for his information.

Professionally, he stood alone. Commentators blossomed in droves during the war years, on the radio and in newspapers, and most of them remained with us. But none of them could approach Bob Norton's incisiveness in dealing with an involved situation where the arguments pro and con were flavored with the political considerations of the people involved. He had an amazing faculty for cutting through the hokum that beclouded an issue and serving up the meat to the readers of this newspaper, stripped of the confusing garnishes and sauces.

Always articulate, he talked like he wrote. His conversation, as well as the "pieces for the paper" as he called them, were frequently highlighted by parallel background incidents—something that happened in a previous administration or a remark that had been made to him by a President for Bob was a top newspaperman.

DECIDED GREATNESS

There was a decided greatness about the man. Nothing irked him more than instances of human meanness or petty graft. Time and again when he was scanning the day's news he come across an item from here in the city or from some distant capital that caused him to explode with wrathful indignation. With the prelude: "Listen to this * * *" he'd let himself go with a searing identification of the perpetrators involved. It wasn't the act so much as the small spirit behind it that always got him.

Not only will Bob be grievously missed in the room in the building and wherever good newspapermen gather but assorted clown-and-outers in these environs will note his absence on the streets. Through his years in writing politics from the city hall reporters' room to the international press galleries, he had a long list of fellows who had seen better days. For them he was a soft touch.

If you questioned the wisdom of his generosity he'd remind you that at one time the recipient was a nice fellow and quote the words of Joaquin Miller:

"For all that you hold in your cold dead hand, is what you have given away."

Our Most Dangerous Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. FOREST HARNESS, is one of the most able and distinguished Members. His responsibility as chairman of the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda by Government Agencies and Employees has been well discharged. The Reader's Digest in December carried a very enlightening article written by Congressman HARNESS which every citizen should read. It follows:

OUR MOST DANGEROUS LOBBY

(By FOREST A. HARNESS, Member of Congress from Indiana)

Probing the operations of our most dangerous lobby, a congressional subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has uncovered startling evidence of attempts by Federal officials to make Big Government bigger and to extend, by another vast grant of power, the authority of the state over the lives of all of us.

Our committee has found that Government employees are back of the campaign to pressure Congress into passing a national compulsory health insurance law. This campaign was planned inside the Government, on Government time, supported by the Government's publicity and propaganda machine, and paid for by the taxpayer. Confronted with these facts our committee—Democrats and Republicans—voted unanimously to expose them and to turn the evidence over to the FBI and the Department of Justice for prosecution under the law which forbids Federal employees to use Federal funds to influence legislation.

Of recent legislative proposals, none has stronger, more obvious appeal to the devotees of the all-powerful, all-supervising state than national compulsory health insurance, often described as socialized medicine. Compulsory health insurance—cornerstone of every socialist regime—proposes to solve our health problems not from the community up but from Washington down. Instead of voluntary and group health insurance, backed where necessary by grants-in-aid, we would have a Federal law enforced by Federal agents. Estimates of its cost run as high as $7,000,000,000 a year. It would swell by many thousands the number of employees in the Federal bureaucracy.

Bills to launch plans of this sort were introduced in each of the last four sessions of Congress. Each time Congress was subjected to intense, highly organized pressure in their behalf. Unconvinced of the scheme's workability, and unwilling to contribute on such a scale to bureaucracy's urge to expand, Congress resisted this pressure. But, without doubt, the heat will again be turned on Congress in January to pass an even bigger and costlier bill.

Our investigations revealed that headquarters for the drive for this scheme is in the Federal Security Agency in Washington. The FSA is already a vast social service establishment with 35,000 employees. Administration and enforcement of the health-insurance law would be added to its domain. Its size and power would thereby be immeasurably increased.

Government officials at the FSA supplied the law's out-in-front promoters with ammunition for their propaganda. They sent representatives abroad, at Government expense, to bring back data on how similar schemes work elsewhere; arranged a campaign to carry the idea to the various States; and even sent a mission, loaded with proponents of the idea, to work out a health program for Japan.

The files of the Social Security Administration in the FSA bulge with information favorable to the compulsory-insurance idea. The files and SSA's staff of experts have been at the service of those advocating the bill. Staff members largely drafted the present bill—as they had its predecessors. They wrote testimony for witnesses to read at Senate hearings. "The staff and resources of the Bureau of Research and Statistics in the Social Security Administration," we found, "were devoted freely to the preparation of pamphlets and propaganda literature for the CIO, AFL, and Physicians Forum. Much of this material, prepared at Government expense, supported what certain witnesses referred to as 'socialized medicine.'" All opposing arguments were "dismissed contemptuously."

To add to the fund of material available, arrangements were made last spring to send an investigator to New Zealand, at Government expense, to bring back the story of that country's compulsory health insurance experiment. The man chosen for the mission has been "documented by the House Un-American Activities Committee for long association with Communist-front and fellow-traveler organizations." Our exposure of the facts halted this junket.

To increase pressure for the scheme, Federal job holders helped to set up two organizations—the Physicians Forum and the Committee for the Nation's Health—and have been active in both.

The Physicians Forum claims about 1,000 doctors in its membership, two-thirds of them in or near New York City. Its chairman, Dr. Ernst P. Boas, has been identified by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a member of eight Communist-front organizations. Under cross-examination at last summer's Senate hearings, he admitted that his organization is not registered as a lobby, although it had received and spent, at least $10,000 for the promotion of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell compulsory insurance bill.

The heads of both the New York and Washington offices of the Committee for the Nation's Health are formally registered with the Government as paid lobbyists. Chairman of the committee and one of its principal founders is Michael M. Davis, Ph. D., formerly employed by the Social Security Administration. Dr. Davis' son is an official of the Public Health Service lately assigned, at Government expense, to the British Ministry of Health in London to observe Britain's system of socialized medicine.

On the eve of the introduction in Congress of a compulsory health insurance bill late in 1945, 10 of the most influential backers of the idea, all Government employees, met in Washington to plan a drive to stir support at the grass roots for the measure they had helped prepare. The device agreed on was the Health Workshop. This, we found, was the name given to conferences, planned for numerous States, to indoctrinate leaders of farm and labor organizations, women's clubs, church groups, and others. Instructions sent out from the Government for training Workshop leaders included techniques for the organization of citizen groups, formation of pressure groups, methods of bringing about group action.

This campaign was launched last year in Minnesota and North Dakota. Our committee held hearings on the Workshop conference which was held in Jamestown, N. Dak. Committee counsel Frank T. Bow brought out in the hearings that representatives of six Federal agencies, traveling on the Government, went from Washington and elsewhere to direct it. It was ostensibly devoted to a consideration of the health problems of North Dakota, but no North Dakota doctor was invited. The only doctors on hand were on the Federal pay roll—and they were not M. D.'s but Ph. D's.

In the literature sent in advance to each of the delegates were pamphlets published by the CIO, the A. F. of L., and the Physicians Forum, advocating compulsory insurance and urging pressure on Congress to get it. This literature was mailed from the Federal Security Administration at Government expense. No material opposing compulsory health insurance was sent to delegates or made available at the meeting. No speaker opposing it was invited or heard.

Before adjournment the delegates, representing numerous State-wide organizations, voted to poll Congressmen and candidates on their stand on the national health program. They agreed to form the Dakota Action for Medical Care Council to coordinate and continue agitation. Our committee unanimously concluded that the Workshop program "was calculated to build up an artificial, federally stimulated public demand upon Congress for enactment of legislation for compulsory health insurance."

The members of our committee, of both parties, also unanimously agreed that these efforts of certain Federal bureaucrats to organize pressure against Congress to advance their ideas and increase their authority are a threat to our representative institutions. We agreed that, with democracy almost everywhere under attack, these efforts must be exposed and fought. To that, we are sure, the American people will agree.

Navy Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I am, by request, including the Navy Day address I made before the Rotary Club in Montpelier, Vt., October 27, 1947:

This is Navy Day. It is a day of peculiar interest to all the people and to Vermonters in particular since the first naval forces under Continental pay and control were those established in the spring and summer of 1775 by Generals Arnold and Schuyler on Lake Champlain and by Gen. George Washington near Boston.

Incidentally, I have recently read a book entitled, "George Washington, the Naval Strategist of the Revolutionary War." True it is that he determined the naval strategy of that war and is justly accorded high praise by all naval authorities for the military excellence of his plans.

On October 13, 1775, the Continental Congress voted to establish a committee to handle naval affairs. This body, called the Marine Committee, was the great-great-granddaddy of the present Navy Department. It began with three members: John Adams, of Massachusetts; John Langdon, of New Hampshire; and Silas Deane, of Connecticut.

Imagine that, three men setting out to construct a Navy from scratch and send it into action against the world's greatest sea power. But one of those members made up for a hundred ordinary. This was doughty John Adams, a "nutmeg" of a character with a blue spark to his eye and the fire of independence in his soul. He was a lawyer, but he knew how to stick to the point—the point now was an American Navy

He drove the committee into action, and he launched the project on the same day the committee was formed. Historians put him in the book as the founder of the American Navy.

It is common in the naval service to refer to Congress as the "Father of the American Navy." It was Congress that had to legalize this fledgling and provide it with food, weapons, and clothes.

Certainly it was an infant on that October 13, 1775, when Mr. Deane, prodded by John Adams, stood up to propose that the Colonies equip "a swift sailing vessel, to carry 10 guns, for intercepting such transports as may be laden with warlike stores for the enemy."

Did Congress take kindly to the infant? Well, hands were raised in alarm. A Pennsylvania delegate said he didn't like it at all. Such naval force, he said, would be sure to anger King George. The Royal Navy would blockade the entire American seaboard. "I am clearly against any proposition to threaten," said Pennsylvania's Dr. Zubly. "The people of England will take it we design to break off or separate."

At this, Mr. Chase, of Maryland, wanted to know if it was any more threatening to fight the enemy at sea than on land. Many Members of Congress thought it was—the King would declare that sea war was piracy. This aroused John Adams, whose sarcasm could rasp like rosin on a string. Why mince matters? The fight for freedom was on. And with a few warships of their own, the Americans could force Great Britain to keep a large fleet on the job and expend much to gain little.

So, in truly democratic fashion—all sides being heard—the Navy was born.

From the Journals of Congress we learn that on Wednesday, July 3, 1776, the Continental Congress resolved, "That the Marine Committee be empowered to contract with shipwrights to go to Lake Champlain on the following terms:

"To allow each man 34 dollars and two-thirds per month; 1 month's pay to be advanced on their giving security, if required:

"Each man to be allowed a ration and a half, and one-half pint of rum per day:

"Their tools and arms to be valued.

"Two-thirds of their wages to be paid monthly, to whomsoever they shall leave the power of receiving it:

"Their pay to commence from the day they sign articles, and continue untill they are discharged, with an allowance of 1 day's pay for every 20 miles between the place where they are discharged, and their respective homes."

The lake force to which I have referred, and to the growth of which the men furnished under and by virtue of the resolution contributed their services, saw no important service for a year, and was then defeated by a greatly superior British squadron, though it gained a strategic victory by delaying the invading British Army.

THE BATTLE OF MACHIAS

If I ever knew it I had forgotten that the first sea battle of the Revolution was fought by a crew of lumberjacks off Machias, Maine, a few weeks after the battle of Lexington. To Jeremiah O'Brien and his wood choppers goes the honor of waging and winning the earliest American engagement. As the historians tell the story it goes as follows:

The fight took place off Machias, Maine, a few weeks after the Battle of Lexington. In May 1775, British General Gage sent two sloops and an armed schooner to Machias to commandeer a load of lumber for the redcoat garrison in Boston. Instead of lumber, the British got a load of O'Brien—a fighting Scotch-Irishman with hair as red as their coats.

Entering the harbor of Machias, the British war schooner under command of a haughty young midshipman, was surprised to find this O'Brien and a crowd of some 40-odd loggers waiting on the wharf. The young mid directed his two sloops to tie up, and then, holding His Majesty's schooner off-shore, he hailed to learn what the crowd on the wharf wanted.

For answer there came a bellow from O'Brien, "Surrender!" and the lumberjacks brandished muskets, axes, and pitchforks.

The English sailors had to laugh. His Majesty's schooner was armed with three 3-pounders and four swivel-guns—enough to blow the whole village of Machias to matchwood. With a sneer for the rabble on the wharf, the Britons simply turned their backs on the scene and sailed out to the harbor entrance to stand by. So a knight might have refused to do battle with a serf, considering the fellow unworthy of his steel.

This irritated O'Brien and his boys into seizing one of the lumber sloops and giving chase. Piling up lumber along the gunwales for protection, the loggers worked furiously while O'Brien steered the craft straight for the enemy. In the harbor mouth, the schooner turned to fight, her guns roaring out, like a lion wheeling on a small and annoying badger. The Americans replied with a rattle of musketfire and sharp marksmanship that, at first volley, didn't strike the Royal Navy men as so funny.

Cannon balls vs. bullets, the one-sided battle raged for over half an hour—one-sided for the Americans who riddled the British and dropped the young midshipman on his quarterdeck. The sloop, protected by its jerry-built bulwarks, closed in. Swinging the axes, rifle butts, and pitchforks, and led by indomitable O'Brien, the lumberjacks swarmed aboard the Englishman like timber wolves, and down came King George's flag.

Up went a strange new flag—a fitting flag for valiant lumberjacks—a white flag on which a green pine tree stood above the legend, "An Appeal to Heaven." The first American naval encounter had ended in victory for the Americans.

Considering the odds, it was something to be proud of. And it was symbolical, this victory achieved by "made in America" valor, sharpshooting, and New England pine. The lumberjacks of Maine had felled a long-standing giant—the tradition that the King's Navy was invincible—and reared in its stead the tree of liberty—your Navy.

WASHINGTON'S RAIDERS

Washington's fleet, known as Washington's Raiders, saw effective service preying on the sea communications of the British Army in Boston, and in capturing British prizes carrying ammunition, much needed by the American soldiers. This all happened before Congress in October 1775 adopted the resolution providing for the fitting out of two Continental ships, which act was the legislative birth of the permanent Continental Navy. Congress appointed a Naval Committee, which directed the purchasing, outfitting and the operations of the earlier ships, prepared legislation organizing the new naval service.

The first Continental Fleet put to sea in February 1776, proceeding to New Providence (Bahamas) landed and captured a large supply of munitions with which it put out to sea again and delivered its spoils of victory to our Army at New London, Conn.

NO NAVY AT ALL

After the Revolutionary War the Navy went out of existence completely and was not reestablished until 1794, when Congress provided for the construction of six new frigates. In 1798 we bought more ships and went to war against the French. Closely following this 3 year quasi war with France came the Barbary wars. Captain Edward Preble was the highest ranking officer of the squadron under his command with the frigate Constitution as his flagship. Under his command and leadership the loosely knit Navy of that day became a unified fighting force for the first time, and this unification has lasted until now.

Today the Navy is 172 years old. The observance of Navy Day was inaugurated in 1922 by the Navy League of the United States. The date, October 27 was selected because it is an anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt, often and justly called the father of the modern Navy. It is not a holiday, for no executive order, so far as I know, or proclamation was ever issued establishing this day as a holiday, nor has any congressional action ever been taken authorizing it. But today all over this country people are participating in ceremonies in honor of the Navy and its achievements.

Theodore Roosevelt once said, "Whatever arms have cost us they have made and kept us a great Nation."

Peace at any price for generations has been anathema to Americans. Perhaps that is one reason why we have come to believe that peace has no price. The record disproves that belief. The record shows that peace demands its own price, though an infinitely small fraction of the price war demands. The record shows that a nation can achieve peace only by waging it, by relentlessly working for that objective with the same unity and the same determination with which war is waged. Passive defenselessness has never won peace and probably never will.

OUR OPPORTUNITY

The world stands tonight on the threshold of its greatest opportunity. I believe we will seize that opportunity. I feel that this may be humanity's last opportunity. I pray God the day may come when there is no longer a need for any Navy or any Army.

The arrival of that day can be speeded by the reasonable maintenance of America's might until the hopes and dreams of today are translated into the living, effective world organizations of tomorrow. That happy event will be postponed and perhaps may never materialize unless America retains and develops a navy which will be capable of snuffing out any threat against the just and enduring peace for which the entire world yearns.

I hope I appreciate the opportunity which has been afforded me over some 7 years to learn something of what the Navy means to us. We take too much for granted; are too easily destructively critical; treat our blessings too lightly, and hardly ever stop to think of the hours of nerve-racking toil and study somebody has had to contribute to protect us and preserve us as a nation.

We have been fortunate on these shores, more fortunate than any nation in history. God has granted the American people a supreme opportunity to try a new way of life that pledges every man justice and equality. We have never employed this great gift with half the strength and devotion of which we are capable, but we cherish it as the heart of the American tradition.

NAVAL AIR POWER

May I take a few minutes to suggest that I have learned that out of the experiences of the Pacific war and the Battle of the Atlantic, came reaffirmation of the fact that integration of air, surface, and subsurface forces is essential to successful naval operations. But out of the experience of the Pacific war there also emerged a newer fact—that the influence of naval air power on sea power is decisive. The demonstration of that fact began on that day of infamy when Japanese naval air power struck us at Pearl Harbor. It gained strength when our carrier supremacy frustrated the enemy's supreme effort to move against Australia—at the Battle of the Coral Sea. It was conclusive when our carrier supremacy scattered an enormous Jap invasion armada at the Battle of Midway. Naval air power flanked and supported the strides along New Guinea which were pointed at the Philippines. Naval air power wrote finis, in the early days of the war, to the enemy's use of Rabaul, once a powerhouse as an important naval base. The Gilberts, the Marshalls, the Marianas, the Philippines, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa were all made vulnerable to our surface and land forces by our carrier-based air supremacy. Naval air power is the punch of a modern navy—and of any future navy. That is why when we speak of the Navy, we speak of a combination of air and sea power For naval purposes air power is indistinguishable from sea power. The plane, as much as the surface vessel and the submarine, is the symbol of our modern Navy, our air-sea power.

THE PEOPLE'S NAVY

Thus, America faces the future with the most modern, efficient Navy in the world. Today it prepares to defend the Nation from attack, to defend this hemisphere from attack, and to make our power available for use against any would-be aggressor or international criminal. How well your Navy will be able to discharge these responsibilities depends largely upon the people of the United States who own this Navy.

I doubt if there exists in this country today widespread public appreciation of the task that lies ahead. No people ever supported its fighting forces as well as the American people backed up their fighting men in this war. No other people ever supported their fighting fronts with such a prodigious increase of uninterrupted production. No other people were ever in such complete partnership with their government in financing a war. The unrelenting effort, the stamina, and the determination of the American home front is one of the most thrilling chapters of this war. Unfortunately, no other people, when wars end, let their armed forces become impotent as quickly as we do.

Today we are not certain that democracy will survive. The world was not made safe for democracy in 1920. The world was not made safe for democracy by World War II. Never did such a situation confront America as now challenges us to a duel to the death in order to keep alive our democratic ideals. New forms of totalitarianism have arisen, extended their territories, increased their prestige. Some are saying that we must abandon democracy in America. Others are saying that we must make it work in America, and can do that only by isolating ourselves from the world. More than in 1917, we must recognize that democracy cannot be safe in a lawless world, continually threatened by totalitarian wars.

The American people must learn to look squarely in the face the implications of their political desires for democracy, security, peace, and prosperity in the world in which they live and from which they cannot escape. Their institutions and systems of life cannot be defended behind material ramparts. There are no ramparts in this world which aggressive powers equipped with the latest devices of science cannot penetrate. The ramparts to defend are the ramparts of law, and the place to defend them is the place where lawlessness begins.

IN RETROSPECTION

It seems hardly possible that on the 7th of November it will be 2 years and a half since Germany surrendered unconditionally to the Allies—and one-half of World War II was over. As the guns fell silent in Europe, the Pacific front blazed with the battle of Okinawa. Day after day Navy ships ringed the island. Destroyers and destroyer escorts took their picket stations, keeping close radar guard, instantly warning the land forces of the approaching Jap air attacks. Heavier ships were on day-or-night call for precision shore bombardment. Transports and supply ships fought their way into the beaches and out again. All the vessels in the area were exposed to the fanatical Jap airmen, aiming their planes—often in flames and carrying a 500-pound bomb—for the bridge of the target ship. For 82 days the battle raged, with heavy casualties in American ships and men because of the suicide air attacks of Japan's last "secret weapon," the Kamikaze Corps. But when Okinawa fell at last Uncle Sam gained sea, air, and ground force bases on Emperor Hirohito's doorstep.

Every day the big B-29's battered Jap cities. Roaming close to the shores of Japan, Admiral Halsey's Third Fleet methodically smashed to pieces the last remnants of the Imperial Navy. Clearly the knockout was coming soon. Yet when it did come, the knockout blow staggered the world, for it was struck with a fantastically powerful new weapon—the atomic bomb. Two of these bombs, in the development of which Navy experts had played a vital part, leveled the Jap cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. On August 14, 1945, President Truman announced that Japan had surrendered.

Japan signed the surrender terms on September 2 (Tokyo time) on board the great battleship *Missouri* lying in Tokyo Bay. She and her comrades of the fleet had come a long, perilous way since the Japs fired the first shot—the shot that backfired 'round the world.

PHILOSOPHY OF FREEDOM

Today America has become the last great nation of the world which puts her complete faith in a philosophy of freedom, a philosophy which recognizes the inherent rights of every citizen—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of enterprise.

That philosophy in a century and a half made this country the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. That philosophy made America strong enough to win the war.

Our people want peace and security. The peace of the world and the security of all requires the maintenance by us of a strong national defense. Congress has provided and will continue to provide the necessary funds for the maintenance of an army, a navy, and an air force to guarantee that the United States will continue to be supreme on the land, on the sea, and in the air.

Americans from the very first have dreamed great dreams and done great deeds. And so long as America dreams, and when the peoples of other nations comprehend the meaning of the American dream, I know there is inspiration and hope and opportunity for humanity.

On the wall of the room in which Victor Hugo died in the Place des Vosges, in Paris, is written, over his signature, this prophecy: "I represent a party which does not yet exist: The party of revolution, civilization. This party will make the twentieth century. There will issue from it first the United States of Europe, then the United States of the World."

Tomorrow keeps new yesterdays in store. Who knows—the prophecy of Victor Hugo may come true.

Dr. Frank D. Fackenthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, Columbia University, which is one of the outstanding institutions of learning in my congressional district, is fortunate in having had on its staff for the past 45 years an educator of outstanding ability, Dr. Frank D. Fackenthal, who took over the duties of president of Columbia University when Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler retired.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article on this subject from the magazine section of the New York Times of January 11, 1948:

HONORS FOR DISTINGUISHED ANONYMITY—COLUMBIA REMEMBERS THAT DR. FACKENTHAL HAS SERVED HER 45 YEARS AND WITHOUT PUBLICITY

(By S. J. Woolf)

Columbia University next Thursday will award the Alexander Hamilton Medal for distinguished service and accomplishment to one of its alumni. It is the second award; last year the medal was bestowed upon Nicholas Murray Butler. This year at a dinner at the Waldorf the alumni will honor the man who has served as president of Columbia for 2 years and has devoted his life to his alma mater.

In preparing his speech of acceptance Dr. Frank D. Fackenthal decided to gather as much material as he could concerning Hamilton, Columbia's most famous alumnus. A professor at Rutgers said to him: "I'll tell you why Hamilton went to Columbia. He originally intended to enter Princeton, but it was too strict for him, so he went to your college because there he could do what he wanted."

Dr. Fackenthal tells this story with a smile, as something of a commentary on educational fashions. In Hamilton's day, of course, the elective system had not been adopted. Dr. Fackenthal rejoices that it is no longer as popular as it was for a time after its introduction and that students are now required to take a certain number of specified courses so that they will not go out into the world as uneducated specialists. Dr. Fackenthal considers this modification of the elective system one of the great advances he has seen in his academic career.

"In the old, old days," he says, "the colleges and universities were sanctuaries of study. Courses were strictly prescribed and although a well-rounded education was provided, the needs and aims of the individual student were not considered. Then, largely through the efforts of Dr. Charles W. Eliot, of Harvard, came the adoption of the elective system and the pendulum swung to the other extreme. Young men and women selected courses without regard to what they eventually wanted to do. In many cases they were too young or immature to make their own decisions and often they selected 'easy' courses.

"Now, although we have not gone back to the old-fashioned immutable programs, and notwithstanding that this is an age of specialization, we see to it that engineers know something about poetry and mathematicians are not entirely ignorant of history. All our courses are to a degree interrelated and even our instructors are encouraged to take up the study of subjects other than those they teach.

"When I was a young man, students could enter either the law or medical school after graduating from high school. Now they must attend college for at least 2 years before they can take up their professional studies.

"After all, the function of colleges and universities is to provide programs of study, instruction in classroom and laboratory, participation in the academic life, all so carefully planned that they will graduate educated men and women whose thinking will be on a high level, and who will be prepared to play their part in a rapidly changing world. In order to do this certain courses in literature, sociology, and history, to name but a few, are essential, irrespective of what line of activity each student intends to follow."

He was posing in my studio as he spoke. His appointment had been for 10 o'clock, and although the weather was bad he apologized for being 2 minutes late. Meticulousness seems to be a characteristic of this man who has spent most of his life within academic walls, and whose only hobby has been his university.

Yet he is no pontifical pedagog, no dry-as-dust professor. The cloistered life has not dulled his humaneness; his intense blue eyes beam sympathetically and a broad smile spreads often over his face. Although he is inclined to weigh his words, at times they have a certain lightness to them.

"I must be careful about what I say," he told me, laughing. "I almost got myself into trouble the other day. I was talking with some students from India who complained about their lack of money. Jokingly, I said

to them that most of our difficulties could be solved if we did away with money entirely. Unfortunately, they thought I was serious and I began to hear reverberations about my peculiar economic ideas."

Unlike Dr. Butler, Dr. Fackenthal has never played a part in public affairs, has not often made public addresses, and his talks to students have been marked by brevity. He is shy and retiring and does not even wear his Phi Beta Kappa key. For years he has been content to rest in the shadow of anonymity. Though for a long time he has carried a heavy burden in the administration of the university, it is only since he became acting president, 2 years ago, that his real worth has come to be generally recognized. The last 2 years, the most difficult in the history of higher education, have been two of Columbia's most successful years.

Yet, while his work is now appreciated, the man himself remains unknown to many of the students; as he climbs the broad steps leading to his office in the Low Memorial Library, he is as often as not unrecognized. This does not worry him. He has neither flair nor desire for publicity.

He regards it a privilege to have worked so long with Dr. Butler and he has enjoyed his work—enjoyed it so much that he has not had a regular vacation in 40 years and except on Sundays has been at his desk every day.

For long before he became acting president, Dr. Fackenthal played an important part in running an institution with an enrollment approaching 40,000 and an endowment of almost a hundred million dollars. The university, founded as Kings College in 1754, now embraces Columbia, Barnard, and Teachers College, as well as schools of law, medicine, engineering, architecture, journalism, business, dentistry, pharmacy, library service, and graduate faculties. In addition, it is connected with institutes concerned with the problems of education, sociology, and public health.

Most of its buildings, including a dozen residence halls and a library containing about 2,000,000 volumes, are on Morningside Heights, but its school of medicine, the college of physicians and surgeons, is located at the medical center overlooking the Hudson at One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Street, and its college of pharmacy is on West Sixty-eighth Street. Much of Rockefeller Center is built on land belonging to the university.

Columbia also owns an estate of 67 acres at Irvington, where, largely through Dr. Fackenthal's interest, a laboratory has been erected to house a gigantic cyclotron. But this is not his first connection with atomic energy. During the war he had a part in organizing the research in atomic fission carried on at Columbia. And after the war he had a share in reconverting the laboratories to peacetime use.

During the time he has served as president many new projects have been inaugurated. The American Press Institute was established and men selected by the newspapers live on the campus and meet the leaders in many fields of journalism. He has also been tremendously interested in the new School of General Studies in which adults who are employed may obtain a complete academic education in late afternoon and evening classes. In addition, he used his influence to obtain both for the faculty and the non-academic staff an increase in salaries.

In his opinion Dr. Butler was the perfect university president—a public figure, an able administrator and executive as well as a scholar. He says that running a university is as big a task as running a city. There are ever-present problems of both finance and education. These mean conferences with deans and heads of departments, with financial advisers over allotment of funds, with representatives of the student body, and, last but by no means least, with the board of trustees.

He pointed out that these duties required primarily administrative ability coupled with a humane outlook and a deep concern for the students as individuals. While scholarship is desirable in a president, it is not essential so long as the man is willing to listen to the advice of members of the faculty. What is important is that the head of a university should have the ability to instill confidence and arouse enthusiasm in the students and make them aware of their social responsibilities.

He feels that our young people realize these responsibilities today more than they did in the past.

"They are more serious and more interested in what is going on in the world than their parents were a generation ago," he told me as he leaned back in his chair and clasped his hands in his lap. "Before the last war the young people were brought up with the idea that wars were a thing of the past. They were rudely awakened; they found that much that they had been taught was false and became a disillusioned lot. Now that the war is over they are determined that the same thing shall not happen again."

"At the end of the First World War there was a veering away from anything German. Students shied off from studying the language or learning anything about our former enemies. Now just the reverse has happened. Today there is a remarkable interest among our students not only in the Germans but also in the Japanese and courses relating to these two peoples are extremely popular." (A copy of Mein Kampf occupies a prominent place in the bookcase in his office.)

"This is partly owing to the number of veterans who are with us, many of whom have been either in Germany or Japan and want to learn more about the countries and the people. This to me is a most encouraging state of affairs, for with an understanding of other nations comes a better chance for a lasting peace. And right here I want to say that the influence of the GI's has been all for the good. They are a serious, intent group whose experiences have broadened their outlook on life.

"The world has grown smaller since I entered Columbia 45 years ago," he went on. "No longer do mountains or oceans or distances form barriers between peoples. The economic, social, and political interests of the world are so closely intertwined and communications are so rapid that all nations are affected by happenings anywhere. The barriers that remain are those of misapprehension and misunderstanding. One of the functions of our institutions of learning is to help remove them.

"In order to help accomplish this we have inaugurated at Columbia new courses in languages as well as a School of International Affairs covering the laws, economics, history, and literature of different nations."

One of the nations studied is Russia and when Dr. Fackenthal spoke of it I asked him how a university could stop the spread of subversive ideologies.

"By telling the students what these ideologies are," he replied, "And by showing them how much better democracy, as we understand it, is.

"Democracy is a stimulating system under which to live because it is not static but changes and varies. Free and uncontrolled education fits the people to select the changes they desire. Having been made fully aware of the fundamental principles of the democracy under which we live, the citizen will prefer to make warranted changes in it rather than discard it. Recognizing its guarantees of freedom, he will not be fooled by such word as 'democracy,' 'progressive,' or 'liberal' applied to systems about which he has been taught and which he knows are basically different from our democracy.

"We are not afraid to let our students learn the truth. We know they will make up their minds that an organized society which fears independent thinking is unworthy of man's God-given intelligence. Our colleges and universities stand for three centuries of refutation of such a doctrine—for three centuries of belief in the exhilarating and unlimited possibilities of life under a free government."

Dr. Fackenthal went on to tell about some of the problems he has had to face as acting president. One of the most serious was the increase in the number of students. Today, with an enrollment almost twice as large as it was 3 years ago, Columbia maintains the same thoroughness in teaching and bestows the same attention on the individual student. This, he points out, has not been easy to do.

The increase has been largely the result of the GI bill of rights. Notwithstanding his praise of the veterans as students, and despite the fact that their tuition is paid by the Government, he does not favor lump-sum Federal grants for privately endowed institutions except for special research problems, for fear that such grants might be the opening wedge for political control over the schools of higher learning. However, he does approve of the establishment of scholarships by the Government.

Looking at the educational field, he sees a new responsibility forced upon colleges and universities by the break-down of family life and the neglect of religion, affecting two of the most important factors in the molding of character.

Frank D. Fackenthal was born 54 years ago in Hellertown, Pa., where his father was a maker of furnaces. When he was 13 his father was made manager of Peter Cooper's glue factory in Brooklyn, and when the family moved to that city, then known for its baby carriages and rubber plants, rather than for a tree that grew there, the boy went to a public school. During his vacations he obtained a certain amount of business experience. He sold cigars at the Brighton Beach Hotel and later was a cashier in a trust company.

When he was 19 he entered Columbia, and during his early years there had to travel by trolley and elevated to the comparatively new buildings on Morningside Heights. It was not until he was in his junior year that the subway was completed. Then he began traveling on that and has been doing so daily ever since. A bachelor, he still lives in Brooklyn with his 94-year-old mother.

At Columbia he was business manager for the college paper, the Spectator, and occasionally appeared in dramatic shows. Before he was graduated he joined the staff of the secretary of the university and was put in charge of obtaining employment for students. Since then his entire career has been connected with his alma mater. He was successively chief clerk, secretary, and provost. In that office he played an important part in directing the over-all administration of the university. He received authority, under the direction of the president, to act on most matters relating to academic administration.

But the president was ailing and by degrees most of his duties devolved upon the provost. When Dr. Butler retired in October 1945, Dr. Fackenthal was made acting president and moved into the office which Dr. Butler had occupied. There, in a setting of tapestries and books, he carried on his work at a desk presented to the university by A. T. Stewart. It was characteristic of him to have a partition put up, behind which he could modestly retire when Dr. Butler made his occasional visits. It was like him, too, when Dr. Butler died, to have the desk removed to another building where objects connected with the history of the university are on exhibition.

One of the innovations for which he is largely responsible, and which he considers exceedingly important, is the university development plan, which provides for the growth and future of Columbia, and he envisions not only Columbia but all universities playing a more and more vital part in the making of a better world.

"It rests upon them," he says, "to raise the standards of conduct, dispel the hallucination of aggressive war, increase the regard for the rights of others, and so clear the way for the ever-higher life of generations to come. This is education's true role."

But Dr. Fackenthal's influence on education will not cease when General Eisenhower becomes president of Columbia on June 7. He is already a trustee of the university and as soon as he retires as acting president he will become chairman of the trustees' committee on education and in this post he will continue to play a leading role in guiding Columbia's academic policies.

Some Problems of the United States Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article entitled "Some Problems of the United States Merchant Marine," by Frazer Bailey, president, National Federation of American Shipping, appearing in the November-December 1947 issue of the Grace Log. The article is as follows:

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

(By Frazer Bailey, president, National Federation of American Shipping)

The relation of ocean shipping costs to the value of goods moving in international trade is little understood by the average person, and the relative amount often credited to shipping is frequently exaggerated.

There has been much press and public comment concerning the early exhaustion of the United States loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain, and some intimation that ocean transportation charges absorbed a substantial part.

In an effort to establish the facts, the National Federation of American Shipping has been in communication with the interested Government departments in Washington. It has analyzed a speech in the British House of Commons on August 7, 1947, by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Dalton, in which he gave a complete accounting with respect to the American loan.

SUMMARY OF FACTS

The following is a summary of the facts established by this investigation:

1. British purchases of American commodities for the year ending June 30, 1947	$1,540,000,000
Exports to United States of America	340,000,000
Trading deficit with United States of America	1,200,000,000
Purchases in other parts of the Americas	
Canada (mainly food)	$220,000,000
Central America (mainly oil and sugar)	260,000,000
South America (mainly meat and cereals)	135,000,000
Total	615,000,000
Total gross purchases from Americas	2,155,000,000

2. Applying estimated average freight rates to tonnage exported from the United States to the United Kingdom and Eire in the same period, the following are liberal estimates of the ocean transportation charges for such exports:

By American vessels:	
Third quarter 1946	$13,000,000
Fourth quarter 1946	7,000,000
First quarter 1947	12,000,000
Second quarter 1947	16,000,000
Total	48,000,000
By British and other vessels:	
Third quarter 1946	20,000,000
Fourth quarter 1946	13,000,000
First quarter 1947	20,000,000
Second quarter 1947	24,000,000
Total	77,000,000
Total payment, vessels of all flags	125,000,000

3. On the basis of the foregoing, the total aggregate ocean transportation charges from the United States to the United Kingdom and Eire amounted to 8.1 percent of the dollar expenditures in the United States under the British loan—American vessels receiving 3.1 percent and British vessels receiving 5 percent.

4. A portion of the amounts paid for transportation in the United States vessels was disbursed for necessary expenses in foreign ports. These expenditures, payable in foreign currency, still further reduced the small dollar drain from shipping. While it was customary to use 25 percent of the total freight charge to estimate such disbursements, the federation in its calculation used only 15 percent in view of the substantial proportion of bulk cargoes involved. It concluded that the net payment in dollars to United States ships amounted to less than $40,800,000, or 2.6 percent of the value of the total British purchases of United States commodities for the period.

5. If all ocean transportation now carried on United States vessels were transferred to British vessels, a minimum of 25 percent of the freight charges would have to be made in dollars, in order to pay port disbursements and meet other expenses of purchases and services in the United States. If all transportation to the United Kingdom and Eire now being carried aboard American vessels were transferred to British vessels, the British dollar shortage would be reduced by less than $28,800,000, or 1.8 percent of the British loan.

6. The proportion of United States shipping participation in the United States-British trade is continually diminishing as additional British ships become available. The following are the latest percentages for April: Foreign, 57 percent; United States, 43 percent. For May: Foreign, 62 percent; United States, 38 percent.

7. It should be noted that the amount expended for tobacco, alone, during this period was 12 percent of the total purchases, or $185,000,000. That is more than 450 percent of the dollar currency used for ocean transportation to the United Kingdom and Eire by United States ships. The purchases of films represented 4 percent of the total purchases, or $62,000,000 and 152 percent of the dollar currency used for ocean transportation by American ships.

DOLLAR EXCHANGE

8. It is also interesting that $615,000,000 of United States currency was expended in purchases in other parts of the Americas. Those nations were unwilling to take sterling for their exports but required dollar exchange which they could in turn use in purchasing requirements in the United States market. During the same period large expenditures of dollar exchange were made by Great Britain to other European nations for food and other items for similar reasons.

9. Mr. Dalton did not, in his speech of August 7, make a single reference to ocean transportation costs. He explained the heavy drafts upon the loan as due to: (a) Increase of between 40 percent and 50 percent in commodity costs in the United States since the loan was concluded, (b) a set-back to our hopes of the export drive, and (c) the speedy growth in dollar starvation all over the world. His explanation shows the necessity for British purchases with dollar currency in countries other than the United States.

WAR-BUILT SHIPS FOR FORMER ENEMY NATIONS

The people of the United States favor every reasonable effort to assist in the recovery of the devastated European nations. This should, however, represent the generous effort of the whole people of our country and should not be a disproportionate burden upon the coal, wheat, flour, railroad, or shipping industries because they are more directly involved in the relief effort.

The National Federation of American Shipping is opposed to recent proposals to turn over United States war-built ships to Germany and perhaps to other former enemy nations. The ships would be used primarily to transport relief cargoes with foreign crews.

Such actions would lead only to long-range damage to our merchant marine entirely disproportionate to any saving in immediate outlay for ocean transportation for these relief commodities. It is necessary that this statement be made to prevent public misunderstanding of the factors involved.

The effect of such a proposal, if carried out, could bring about incalculable damage, not only to our merchant marine, but to our national defense, to our foreign commerce (including its effect upon our economy), and not least, its effect upon our position in world affairs if we are weak upon the seas.

A proposal that recipients of relief and of reconstruction aid should be put in a position to come and get it with a decrease in burden upon the United States taxpayer naturally has appeal upon first consideration, but it ignores less obvious factors to the contrary.

First, let us consider the immediate economy in relief appropriations. No one will deny that ocean transportation of relief supplies costs money. But so do the relief supplies themselves—and in many times greater proportion. The idea originated with former President Hoover. He estimated a saving of $40,000,000 in ocean transportation of relief cargoes, including United States military supplies and personnel. This estimate was based on the assumption that 75 United States Liberty ships would be turned over to the Germans. The War Department reduced the estimated savings to $14,000,000.

No one can begin to estimate correctly, at this time, what relief cargoes, military supplies, and personnel need be transported to Germany, Japan, or any other former enemy country. To say, therefore, that the turning over to such former enemies of any number of our reserve fleet will result in a specified saving to United States dollar outlay is pure conjecture.

There are, however, certain facts we do know. While no contention is made that these constitute a rigid precedent, it must be admitted they furnish a logical guide for reasonable expectancy. Mr. Dalton's figures gave a complete accounting with respect to the United States loan, and conclusively showed that our flag carriage of United States exports and imports is continually diminishing as foreign fleets increase and as the volume of relief cargoes diminishes.

The following are the latest percentages:

	United States-United Kingdom trade		United States-world trade	
	United States ships	Foreign ships	United States ships	Foreign ships
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
January	39	61	61	39
February	41	59	61	39
March	37	63	61	39
April	43	57	56	44
May	38	62	53	47

If we use the latest British experience as a guide, with our diminishing participation, there appears no justification for turning over to our former enemies 75, or any other number, of our war-built vessels to be manned by foreign crews to haul relief cargoes.

Next, let us consider the long-range effect of the proposal. Because of additional deliveries from foreign shipyards, foreign fleets within the next few months will, in the aggregate, reach the level of their 1939 capacity, at which time they were transporting more than 70 percent of United States imports and exports. The Maritime Commission estimates that the active United States postwar fleet will approximate 11,400,000 dead-weight tons, only slightly more than prewar. This includes all oceangoing passenger, cargo, and tank vessels. An active fleet of this size is far short of the minimum requirements to support our defense even in its initial stages. In this situation, is it not ill-advised to place any additional obstacles in the way of our merchant shipping?

ECONOMY

It is not denied that some economy would result in the cost of the recovery program if a substantial number of United States vessels were turned over to former enemies to be manned and operated by them. It must be obvious upon reflection, however, that such economies will fall far short of the long-range damage to our shipping, commerce, and national defense.

Consideration must be given to the damage which will result to the foreign commerce of the United States if it becomes dependent upon foreign-flag carriers. It requires no persuasive evidence to show that trade follows the flag. Not only is this true in the sympathetic and attentive handling of the shipments which comprise our imports and exports, but it is equally true for passenger service for the business executives and salesmen who promote these international transactions. We do not have to look further than the consistent policy in support of American shipping by the Foreign Trade Council of the United States. They have declared, "Two wars within a generation have found us with a merchant marine inadequate to the needs of our national defense and of our commerce when the foreign ships upon which it so largely depends were withdrawn. The convention reaffirms the stand it has taken for the past 31 years for the development and maintenance of a privately owned and operated merchant marine capable of serving as an auxiliary to the armed forces, and of carrying a substantial part of our foreign trade."

The United States is noted for its achievements under pressure and equally for its ability to relax and to await in apparent complacence the need of another supreme effort. Even a laid-up fleet is only a partial answer. What is required in an emergency is an active fleet, manned by trained officers and crews. We have been reminded by our military leaders that we must not rely this time upon much advance warning. Military preparedness, having the support of an adequate active merchant fleet, will discourage those who would risk international conflict. In any event it would materially shorten the duration of such a conflict with the obvious savings in life and wealth. When we are pouring out our wealth to Europe to save the lives and economies of unfortunate people, a relatively lower cost in ocean transportation should have no serious consideration.

This is particularly true when it is proposed to turn certain of our defense assets into the hands of certain European governments which, it is an understatement to say, are unstable. These ships might conceivably be used against us.

The shipping industry has no confidence in the return of vessels after relief cargoes cease. Some people have proposed that the vessels be transferred temporarily to foreign governments. Whatever the original agreement may be, we would fully expect to face their competition in an international trade manned by cheap-wage foreign crews. We cannot forget the 95 ships turned over to Russia (then our ally) under a similar wartime arrangement. The State Department can neither obtain their return, nor even get a reply to requests or demands.

The instability of many European governments must not be overlooked. Any American property entrusted to a present regime carries the risk of falling later into the hands of a new government, of a possibly different ideology or affiliation, and its possible use against us later—commercially or otherwise. Former enemy nations are far from free of this risk.

The Japanese press (Nippon Times, Yokohama, June 4, 1947) applauded the Hoover suggestion and indicated the expectation that United States war-built vessels would soon be manned by Japanese crews.

The State Department is reportedly opposed to the plan, primarily upon the ground that inasmuch as Congress refused to charter American ships to any foreign nation, including our allies, we should not enter into such an arrangement with our former enemies.

The Maritime Commission submitted a report to the Bureau of the Budget. While not specifically opposing the proposed plan, the Commission set forth a number of reasons why it should not be submitted to Congress.

At its annual national convention in New York City, on August 31, 1947, the American Legion adopted the following resolution: "and that we aggressively oppose any sales, charter, or deliveries of American war-built vessels to nations, persons, or organizations of those nations who were at any time enemies of the United States during the course of World War II."

There is no more justification for manning United States ships engaged in hauling relief cargoes with German crews than for using former enemy personnel to raise the wheat, mine the coal, or man our railroads.

Shall our officers and seamen be "beached" and their jobs turned over to former enemies? Shall we deliver into the hands of former enemies war-built vessels which in the future will compete against our own ships with low-wage foreign crews?

The Jewish Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable John Hilldring at the National United Jewish Appeal Conference, Atlantic City, N. J., December 13, 1947:

This is my first speech in over 30 years as a private American citizen. I am glad that it is to this conference of the United Jewish Appeal that I make this maiden speech. My experience in the Government, particularly since the beginning of the war, has given me a unique vantage point from which to observe Jewish affairs at a critical juncture in history. I would like to share some of my impressions with you, in the hope that they will be of assistance in your planning for the future.

The most vivid recollection I have is naturally the United Nations decision of November 29, 1947, to create in Palestine a sovereign, independent Jewish state. This event should be—in fact must be, the key point of your deliberations here in Atlantic City. You have every right to rejoice in the event and to take full pride in the important part which you played in its achievement. It is also true, however, that you must take cognizance of the enormous task that lies ahead in giving reality to the United Nations decision, and to make appropriate plans for the part which it seems to me you must play in converting a simple decision into an effective, economically self-sufficient nation in 9 short months. I will return to this point later.

My mind goes back also to our frantic efforts, even before VE-day, to revive the handful of Jewish survivors liberated from the concentration camps by our advancing armies. I remember those who were nearly killed with the kindness of our own troops. There were some who were so emaciated and disease-ridden by their Nazi tormentors that they were literally unable to survive the wholesome food furnished them by our armies. Our problem then was to keep them alive. We rushed special food to them, doctors and nurses, and called heavily upon the Joint Distribution Committee, which was in the forefront of the advance.

I remember our feeling of amazement at the stamina and recuperative powers of these concentration camp survivors. In the main, they nursed themselves back to health. Soon they were running schools, editing newspapers, and learning new trades.

While the Government of the United States assumed toward the displaced persons in the occupied areas of Germany, Austria, and Italy primary responsibility for food, clothing, and medical care, this was not and could not be enough. World Jewry, and particularly American Jewry, rallied instantaneously to the challenge that was theirs and which was reflected in the desperate plight of their coreligionists in Europe. The Jews of America, through the United Jewish Appeal, assumed with great energy and intelligence the unprecedented task of raising, through voluntary contributions, the sum of $100,000,000, plus an immense volume of donations in kind of food, clothing, amenities, and medicines for the alleviation of the suffering and misery of their people. Slowly but surely the downward slide into the abyss was halted. Slowly but surely the eloquent upward march toward human dignity was begun.

Not only was the task just mentioned one of alleviation of pain and misery, one of assuaging the pangs of hunger, one of mending broken bodies, one of rehabilitating tortured minds. Its most important purpose and result was to bring to these frightened and dismayed survivors of Hitler's scourge the realization that they had somewhere in the world friends—real friends. These gifts and sacrifices of American Jews kindled hope in the hearts of the oppressed Jews of Europe which to them at that time was, if such a thing were possible, more important than food and clothes and lodgings. As one who witnessed the event from the sidelines, I can testify that a magnificent job was done.

But it was not long before we realized that we were not coming to grips with the Jewish problem simply by ministering to the needs of those few who had managed to live. The Jewish problem was not so simple. We were soon faced with the so-called infiltrees. How undescriptive this term is. The infiltrees were mostly Jews fleeing anti-Semitism in Poland. I stated last year, and I repeat now, that I am proud that my country did not bar these unfortunate people from their only haven in Europe. Our problems were increased, but precious human lives—more than 160,000 of them—were saved. Despite all the help given by the Army and UNRRA, I do not think that it would have been possible to have saved these lives, had it not been for the assistance given by the agencies of the United Jewish Appeal.

As recently as last summer it became clear that it was not possible to isolate the problem of Jewish displaced persons from the condition of Jews in other parts of Europe. When conditions in Rumania became unbearable for many Jews they fled to the only safe haven they knew—the United States zone of Austria. How they got there I do not know, but they did. I must admit that they caused considerable concern—even consternation. Some of our military and political officials, with no bias against Jews, wondered where the end would be if Jews oppressed in any country fled promptly to the United States zone of Germany or Austria. It seemed to me that this was the final proof that the answer to the Jewish problem in Europe lay neither in closing the borders of our zones nor in offering temporary haven in them. The only real answer lay in finding areas of the world where Jews might live in security and in peace.

I found, I am ashamed to say, that there are not many such areas left in the world. I found also that most of the Jews had already reached the same conclusion themselves and yearned for a homeland of their own where, at least internally, they could be masters of their own fate. It was therefore a great privilege on my part to be able to participate in the deliberations of the General Assembly of the United Nations which resulted in the historic decision to set aside part of Palestine as a Jewish state.

I hope that the decision of the General Assembly will be viewed in its true perspective—as the considered opinion of the nations of the world. It was perhaps inevitable that the inflamed passions involved in the complicated Palestinian situation should have produced all sorts of charges and countercharges. The United States delegation was accused on the one hand of doing too little and on the other hand of doing too much in support of the modified majority plan. It has been alleged, as well, that there was a wide gulf between the Department of State and the United States delegation at Lake Success as to the methods which should be employed in eliciting the adherence of other nations to the partition plan. It has been said that, except for the heavy hand of the Department, the United States delegates would have brought in the votes at any cost and by any means. I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to categorically deny these rumors. There was never the slightest difference of opinion between the Department and the delegation on this important issue.

The United States Government took the position that every member of the United Nations, large or small, interested or disinterested, was entitled to its own independent judgment on the merits of the problem. To this policy the United States delegation subscribed wholeheartedly, not only out of a sense of loyalty, but even more so from deep conviction. Certainly, we tried as best we could to persuade other countries of the logic and justice of our position. I am glad that we succeeded. But we succeeded not because of threats, intimidation, or pressure indulged in by any member of the United States delegation or by any official of your Government. I am sure that the cause of the new Jewish state is immeasurably more secure and that the hearts and minds of all Americans, Jews, and non-Jews alike, will be comforted and reassured by the knowledge that its officials did not resort to sordid tactics in the Palestine dealings.

I am glad and proud to be able to say that in my judgment the overwhelming vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations was a voluntary and heartening recognition by the nations of the world that the Jews of Palestine and the homeless Jews of Europe must be given an opportunity to live their lives in a country they can call their own.

We are naturally all disturbed and concerned about the violence which has continued in Palestine since the decision of the General Assembly. Personally, I have confidence that these disturbances will be minor in nature and will not endure for long. The truth is that some violence was inevitable regardless of what solution was adopted by the United Nations. I am convinced that even more violence would have occurred if no decision at all had been taken. It is important that you should understand this. Otherwise, I am afraid that after the many years of strife and tension and discouragement there might be a tendency to despair at this late hour. I am convinced that there is no cause for despair. On the contrary, there is every reason to be optimistic about the future of the Jewish state in Palestine.

However, with all optimism about the absence of serious violence, it is nevertheless true that from this very night until October 1, 1948, not an hour too much in available for the accomplishment of a colossal task.

We have so far only a decision to create a state. It remains now to actually create it. The machinery of government from the township to the national level must be produced. An army must be bu t and trained and equipped. A financial structure must be born and reared and ready to function. Vast economic arrangements must be developed. The highest attainments of statesmanship must be available to the leaders of the new Jewish state to bring all of these forces to bear in the proper manner at the proper time if the new state is to emerge as the vital and vigorous nation that Jews all over the world and their friends fervently hope and expect.

It ill behooves me to lecture or advise my Jewish friends about their duty. However, may I not as a friend, with propriety point out that the job in Palestine is by no means done. Particularly for the next year, there will be great need for patience with the people of the new Jewish state and with their leaders. Especially should we all understand the magnitude of the burden that rests on the shoulders of the leaders of the Jewish people, and we should, while withholding criticism and irrelevant and unwanted advice, stand ready to respond to the requests of the Palestinian leaders for assistance.

If we will dedicate ourselves to these objectives—if we will have understanding of the size of the problem, if we will eschew carping criticism, if we will hold ourselves ready to help when our help is needed, if we will pray for wisdom and courage and strength for the new leaders of the new Judea, then I am confident that there will emerge in due course a virile, a prosperous, and a happy land in Palestine.

In any case it is self-evident that, despite its tremendous achievement to date, the year 1948 will be by all odds the greatest challenge in the history of the United Palestinian Appeal.

In providing for the future development of Palestine I hope that you will not forget the Jews who must still pass another winter or perhaps other winters in Europe. At the maximum rate of absorption into Palestine many hundreds of thousands of Jews who desire to emigrate there will have to remain in Europe for months or even years. They must not be abandoned, especially when their goal is so certainly in sight.

You should also remember the important responsibilities which you have undertaken, and must continue to undertake, for the reception of displaced persons in the United States. At the time of your last conference only a few inveterate optimists like myself believed that there was any chance of obtaining emergency legislation to admit displaced persons into the United States as immigrants. It has been most heartening to observe the upsurge of official and popular sentiment in support of this idea. I am now quite confident that the Congress will pass this legislation at its next session. Meanwhile the United Service for New Americans has been performing outstandingly in arranging for the reception of Jewish displaced persons entering the United States under the President's directive of December 22, 1945. So efficiently has UJNA developed its operations that it has been advising non-Jewish agencies with less experience on how to organize for the great task which will be theirs if the desired legislation passes. I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of continuing to support the United Service at the highest possible level.

I would like to say a word about the International Refugee Organization. Under the inspiring leadership of Hallam Tuck, I think that it is now operating as effectively as could be expected under the circumstances. I know that the IRO will render all possible assistance to the Jewish DP's. Nevertheless it must be realized that budget limitations necessarily confine IRO to what has been properly called an austerity program for all DP's. And it must also be remembered that IRO does not handle the great burden of the Jewish problem consisting of persons who are not displaced.

I hope that the days of talking of anguish and sorrow are past—the days of extermination and frustration and indignation. The nations of the world have at last recognized the Jewish problem for what it is—a challenge to the collective conscience of mankind. They have met that challenge without flinching. They have given the Jews the opportunity they have sought for 2,000 years. As one who has observed the courage and resilience of the Jews of the Old World in times of direct distress, I am supremely confident that they will respond to this opportunity with vigor and enthusiasm and determination.

We in America must help them to do so.

Foreign Policy in Modern Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include excerpts from an address recently given by Mr. Cyril J. Bath, of Cleveland, Ohio, before a group of representatives from the Departments of State and Commerce, Carnegie Institute, and members of the United Nations Associations.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY CYRIL J. BATH

Eight billion seven million dollars for our national expenses in 1939 was considered inflationary. But $42,520,000,000 in 1947 has brought inflation with it, and this is taking its toll from every pocket in the Nation and proving a higher burden than taxes. Even if we expect our foreign policy to prove futile in maintaining the peace and regard war as inevitable, it is still obviously necessary that we take realistic steps to recognize the extent of our resources and the nature of the problems we face economically. Indeed, the national planning that we fear abroad and scorn at home may prove to be our gravest diplomatic and military weakness.

The Marshall plan contains within its ample outlines conceptions that may be well suited to helping Europe to help herself, but if the funds to do it are an overdraft on our existing economy it will fall short in delivering goods and it will add to the scarcity at home while raising prices in both markets. Mr. Krug may figure out in detail that we can afford the Marshall plan of so many billions but the facts are that the raw-commodity prices are already proclaiming an existing imbalance between prices and available goods; an imbalance of the gravest nature and any further expenditure can only aggravate the situation. We are, and there is no blinking the situation, approaching the limit of our resources and wheat, as usual, is only the bellwether of the raw-commodity flock. We in the cities, after all, are only the remakers of things. The raw commodities are what count. Food, the prime munition of war or peace or of any human endeavor, comes first and the demand is reflected in wheat and corn, cattle, butter, hay, and oats. And then clothing, reflected in the prices of wool, cotton, rayon, and hides comes close after. And then lumber and all building materials and coal and petroleum. These things have a market the world over. We must remember that most of the world is engaged in the simple business of living, eating, and getting some sort of loin cloths and shelter. Significantly, too, are the raw prices of copper, scrap iron, and tin. The average of the prices of the raw commodities is the raw-commodity index. It is the most significant and the most important line in modern life.

In the 150 years that we have kept records there has never been a depression with the raw commodity lines moving up and we have never failed to get a depression when they went down, and the depth and the intensity of the depression depended upon the severity of the decline. Now we are facing a raw-commodity price level that spells a worse inflation than this country has known since the civil war. This price level is a product of supply and demand. It used to be violently affected by changes in gold-currency value too, but that is now gone. The value of the money by which we judge prices today is the value of the circulation notes of our Nation, that is, our money, our promise to pay good on demand. As we issue more promises than we have goods, the goods go up in terms of the money—the price rises, and as it rises it is an evidence of the loss of faith in the dollar itself and this induces further increases in prices as against goods. We cannot watch this movement so readily in fixed priced goods but they will follow the raws and the raws are galloping up. The plain truth is that to restore the value of dollars we must either reduce our expenditures or increase our production. Dollars are the outward and visible sign of a sound or an unsound economy. They are the product of a double-entry system of bookkeeping. Any protracted imbalance between the promises to pay that we have made and our inability to produce will result in a fall in the value of dollars, our promises to pay, our circulating notes if you like, or our national stock if you like.

To add a Marshall plan to the present imbalance without some constructive correction of the balance sheet is to invite grave disorder in our domestic affairs and discredit in our international undertakings.

I recommend a review of our expenditures and our productive capacity. Let us call in men like Pearson of Cornell, and similar students of food and crops and farm prices, to tell us about our overworked land and what we can do about increasing its productivity. (Note their recent reports—"Starvation, Half Truths and Untruths.") Let us look into the taxes that prevent our steel mills from increasing the supply of steel scarcely less vital than wheat, and why machinery, the muscles of production, cannot be purchased economically by our manufacturers. Let us look at the opposite side of the ledger and see if we must spend such enormous sums on Army and Navy and to support our military policies around the world. Let us, in other words, call on the best auditors we can muster to examine the economic background of our economy. Perhaps they will note too that profit sharing and proper recognition of the dignified partnership of labor give a highly productive element. With such a report, let us seek the support of sensible business people throughout the Nation. I think particularly of life insurance presidents and their boards to whom the present route in dollar values spells very grave administrative costs and very fearful problems for their insured. I think of manufacturers of all kinds who are caught by the tax laws in such a manner that they are forced to report as earnings funds that really represent the liquidation of their businesses because they cannot replace plant and equipment at the exaggerated costs without a consequent increase in depreciation which at present they are not allowed to take.

We might form a commission to study the economics of peace and prepare an audit. I am rather confident that the course of events will provide us an audience.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 14), 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at 10 o'clock this morning before the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very grateful for the opportunity to speak this morning to so splendid a group as the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense.

Annually you gentle people make a pilgrimage to Washington for the purpose of doing your bit to see that this Nation of ours shall never again suffer for the want of an adequate and sound national defense. There has never been a time in all the years you have been coming to Washington when the defense of our Nation occupied such an important position in the structure of governmental responsibility as it does today.

It was only Monday of this week that the President of the United States sent up to the Congress the largest peacetime budget in the history of the Nation, for the fiscal year 1949. In that budget message, the President said, among other things, the following:

"The expenditures of the Federal Government are still inescapably dominated by war and its aftermath. In the fiscal year 1949, 79 percent of our expenditures directly reflect the costs of war, the effects of war, and our efforts to prevent a future war."

The President of the United States was talking about veterans' benefits, interest on the public debt, and international affairs, most of which are financial burdens of World War I and World War II. National defense and part of the funds for international affairs are budget items which the President believes necessary to protect our safety and our security, and possibly to prevent another war. In other words, out of the total of $39,688,000,000, requested by the President, 79 cents out of every tax dollar will be used for the payment of obligations incurred in past wars and for our future protection through a sound and adequate national defense. This 79 percent represents an enormous sum of money. By itself, it is almost four times as much as the cost of running the Federal Establishment in the years before the recent war.

I take no satisfaction from the size of this expenditure. I hoped, as I am sure all of you did, that when we brought the war with Japan to a close, we could sign peace treaties with the nations with whom we were at war, and through the medium of genuine international cooperation, settle down to a long period of peace and prosperity—that swords could be beaten into plowshares—and that mothers and fathers of sons growing into young manhood need have no fear that their sons might be called on to take up arms against aggressors who proposed to jeopardize the security of the United States. We learned all too soon after the end of the war that although hostilities had ceased, a lasting peace could not be brought about immediately, nor was it in early prospect. Today in China, Palestine, India, and other parts of the world, war continues to take its toll.

What is our patriotic duty in such circumstances? It seems to me that our duty is twofold. On the one hand we must continue to have faith in the United Nations organization, with the fervent hope and prayer that sooner or later the peoples of the earth, regardless of their race, creed, or color, will be able to find a solution to the troublesome problems of the world, and work out a way by which we may all live in peace. The many obstacles that have been thrown in the path of the peacemakers by the leaders of the Russian Government make this problem a perplexing one for the legislative and executive branches of our Government. It is, however, a problem which this generation of Americans must take the lead in solving.

Americans are idealistic, but in a crisis we become realists in the true sense of the word. Realism in the situation in which we find ourselves today involves weighing carefully the activities of the forces of world communism, stemming from Moscow, and trying to find a formula under which the peace-loving members of the family of nations can live under the same roof with communistic Russia.

Certainly the rulers of the Russian people have given us little indication of their desire to live in peace with us. But of one thing I am certain—that while we strive for peace, under no circumstances must our defenses be weakened. They must grow stronger in the days ahead. God forbid that war may come again, for if it does, it means the utter collapse of civilization in this atomic age. If such should happen, I am equally certain that those who might be left on earth would have no further worry about the expansion of communism.

For this and many other reasons I cannot understand the activities of the leaders of our powerful and late ally in the world forum of international affairs. To characterize them most mildly, they have been obstructionists at every turn. They have abused the veto power in the Security Council of the United Nations organization. They seem bent on wrecking the only organization which holds any promise of being able to create a permanent peace. In Greece, in Turkey, they actively menace the security of those countries through their Communist satellites. In France and in Italy, their fellow Communists are creating as much confusion as possible, with the view of weakening the struggling Governments of those countries. Everywhere we turn in the world we find evidence that they are trying to undermine free governments and to create that seedbed of chaos in which the doctrine of communism is able to take its firmest root.

We have seen how nation after nation in the eastern half of Europe has fallen under the domination of the rulers from the Kremlin. One by one governments have fallen like ripe apples from a tree into communistic hands. In the conquering of European countries through cold war the Kremlin knowingly and willingly violated the pledge of free elections agreed upon at the Yalta Conference.

The countries of Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Yugoslavia were victims of Red terrorism and economic chaos. The peoples of those countries had no choice. Any demonstration of resistance to the communistic rule meant indefinite internment in concentration camps, or death.

Another potent factor which helps convince me that we are going in the right direction is the attitude of the Russian Government toward the Marshall plan, and, indeed, the attitude of Communists all over the world. The Communists understand, perhaps, much better than we do that the success of the European recovery plan will defeat their program of Communist expansion throughout Europe and Asia. The plans being made by the Comintern throughout Russia's satellite countries as well as the efforts of the Communists in the western democracies of Europe to sabotage the Marshall plan should be sufficient to convince doubtful Americans as to the advisability of moving forward with the Marshall proposal. Those who oppose the Marshall plan, I think, should suffer some slight embarrassment in finding themselves in complete agreement with the Communist party line.

My friends, I should like to make it crystal clear that the Marshall plan is not a relief plan. The concept of this experiment has its roots in the economic, political, and monetary recovery of the 16 European nations banded together for the first time for the purpose of studying and solving economic problems common to them all. When this country makes grants or loans under bilateral agreements the money involved will not be frittered away. The sanctity of contracts between nations will be faithfully adhered to, otherwise cancellation or annulment will be in order.

In sponsoring the Marshall plan, I obviously look to the immediate results to lift these nations from their economic lethargy, but it will be only after complete fulfillment of the plan that the people of western Europe, through the help of this Nation, will have laid the foundation for long years of freedom, economy, prosperity, and political stability. If my conclusions are correct such a program guarantees that no limitation shall be placed upon the liberty and the freedom which Americans so cherish and enjoy. In such a program, too, lies the best and, what seems at the moment, the only hope for a lasting and permanent peace in the world.

In this statement, I do not want to be misunderstood. I recognize in the Marshall plan a calculated risk. It is not a fool-proof formula for world peace and prosperity. But I pose this question—what is the alternative to the Marshall plan? Here it is as I see it:

We can forget about Europe and tell the European nations they are no concern of ours; that they must work out their own destinies; bring our armies home; give Germany to the Kremlin; reorient our foreign policy; retreat once again into the isolationism which we once embraced as a Nation; and then become the hated enemy of every nation in the Old World.

Only Wednesday of this week, Secretary of the Army Kenneth Royall said that if the Marshall plan failed, the Department of the Army would seek additional appropriations for national defense. I undertake to say we could spend three times the seventeen billions required for the Marshall plan during the next 4 years, preparing the Western Hemisphere for another war.

My friends, I have tried to set forth briefly what I conceive to be the world-shaking issues in the Marshall plan. The debate upon a plan which seeks to encourage a real economic federation in Europe as well as to secure our liberty and economic freedom at home poses a serious challenge to the Members of the Eightieth Congress. They look down the road of world recovery for years to come and down that road lies the way to peace. My hope is that the Members of Congress who oppose this plan will be open and frank about it. One is either for or against it. There should be no ducking or dodging. This plan is too important to the peace of the world to be defeated by half measures through indirection. It is too important to have the debate degenerate into reams of figures and technical detail over the precise number of dollars necessary to do the job. If we are going through with the Marshall plan, we must do it right. Too little and too late is worse than nothing at all. General Marshall said, "An inadequate program would involve a wastage of our resources with an ineffective result. Either undertake to meet the requirements of the problem or don't undertake it at all."

I sincerely hope that the debate may be kept on a high level, a debate, if you please, that can take its place side by side with other historic debates on international issues which affected our national sovereignty.

This debate should not be marred by petty puny politics and complicated technical arguments on which the major opponents of this bill like to dwell. This is true for many reasons. Two of them which should appeal to the opposition seem to me to be as follows: For many years we have had in Congress a bipartisan foreign policy, sponsored by Senators VANDENBERG, Republican, from Michigan, and CONNALLY, Democrat, from Texas. These two great Americans have labored side by side for years in the advocacy of a foreign policy which would accomplish a peace with honor. No two Members of Congress in the history of this Republic have been faced with such momentous problems. In their patriotic cooperation to render high public service in a world crisis, I have yet to see a shadow of partisan politics enter their deliberations.

We are fortunate indeed to have Gen. George Marshall as Secretary of State. It is doubtful that the world has ever produced a greater military genius than General Marshall. And when the time came for him to retire from his long service in the Army of the United States, he did not hesitate to accept important world assignments committed to him by the President of the United States. General Marshall is the architect of the Marshall plan. As Secretary of State, he commands the respect of the nations throughout the world. In the presentation of this plan to the people and the Congress of the United States, he stands forth with no political ax to grind and wholly devoid of any personal ambition. It was only a short while ago that he told the American people that he was not a candidate for any public office, and that he was not available for any elective office under any conditions. So here stands a man in whom the American people and the Congress of the United States can place their trust. Here is a conscientious Secretary of State who is presenting a plan for world recovery in the highest American tradition. Here is a man laboring for the country he loves with complete unselfishness. In these gigantic, world-shaking undertakings, it seems to me that the people of the United States who are unable to examine all of the details of such a program must place their trust and confidence in someone, and George Marshall should be that man. As for myself, I thoroughly believe in General Marshall. I know of the outstanding service he has rendered to the Nation in time of war. I recognize what this fine American hopes to do for his country in time of peace.

Not only am I going to support the Marshall plan, believing as I do that it is one of the strongest links in our chain of national defense, but I am also going to support to the hilt the President's proposals dealing with the security of our country. The President's recommendation in the budget for $6,100,000,000 is for veterans' services and benefits. The veterans' program must be carried out with efficiency and expedition. Their cause is a just one.

The President also recommends $7,000,000,000 for international affairs and finance, which includes the sum required for the first year of the Marshall plan. The President also requested $11,000,000,000 for national defense. Insofar as the national defense item is concerned, I am willing to go further. I think the time has come when we must make plans immediately to build the air force and the Navy's air arm to a point of world leadership. We held that position immediately following the war. So long as the world remains in turmoil and trouble, we must be supreme in the air. I shall support any additional appropriations which make that supremacy possible. We must be everywhere armed, everywhere vigilant. Our precious liberties must be preserved at any cost. Yet, while we must be adequately prepared for attack from any aggressor, it is also imperative that we continue working night and day with the help of God toward preserving the peace of the world. I am confident a well-prepared, united, and informed America is the only instrumentality in the world today capable of ultimately finding the way to peace.

Address by Hon. Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana, Before the National Small Businessmen's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 14), 1948

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on January 14, before the National Small Businessmen's Association, at the Wardman Park Hotel, in Washington, D. C., the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, the majority leader of the House of Representatives, delivered a very able address. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Well, here we are together again. We met on the Capitol steps this morning, and I assume that during the day you have been busy carrying out your "Mission Washington."

It was rather rugged up there on the Capitol steps with freezing temperature. There you encountered the "just one more club"—the news photographers of Washington, whose motto is "just one more picture."

You know that it is not all pictures and banquets in Washington. As you mingled with Members of the Congress and others in the Government you found that a lot of hard work is done here. Literally tons of literature pour into a Congressman's office during a session of the Congress.

I understand you have come to Washington to see the operation of the Government at close range. Your president tells me you have not brought a special ax to grind—that you are here to learn and to cooperate. That certainly is a patriotic purpose.

I feel right at home in a group of small businessmen. I come from a comparatively small community, and I know that a great part of the economic strength of our country is in the millions of small business enterprises—the small shops and factories, retail stores, and service establishments of every kind.

Therein lies the real genius of the American way of business life. Therein has been proven the old saying that from small acorns huge oaks grow

And I hasten to add that therein also lies the graveyard of many an ambitious dream, because the small businessman has to fight with all his might to keep his enterprise alive.

When we talk about small business we are in fact talking about the American business system, because 98 percent of all the approximately 3,500,000 business units in the United States come within the ranks of small business.

In war and peace the small businessman has to struggle to keep afloat. You will recall those years of stepped-up national preparedness prior to World War II. Remember the difficulty that small businessmen had in getting tied into the preparedness program so that they could pull their patriotic load? It was back in 1940 that we Republican Members of the Congress, though in the minority, established an unofficial committee to study the plight of small businesses.

Speaker MARTIN, who at that time was minority leader appointed a committee of which I was chairman, to make the study, and we held hearings in many communities. Hundreds of small businessmen attended and expressed their views.

Later the House of Representatives established an official committee on small businesses, and I was ranking Republican member of it. We had to fight then and during the war to protect the rights of small businesses and to see that they were treated fairly in priorities, allocations, and in getting their rightful share of Government business.

We are still fighting for the rights of small businesses. During the first session of the Eightieth Congress we passed a bill to require that small-business representatives be consulted by every Government agency in making the transition from war to peace on the industrial front. And the Eightieth Congress is going to continue to do its utmost in assisting small businesses.

You have come to Washington on a mission, and when you return to your respective homes you will be asked by your friends and business acquaintances to report your impressions.

And so I am going to take advantage of this opportunity to do a little missionary work on my own.

We Members of the Eightieth Congress need your help, your active cooperation, in preserving our American way of life. We need your help in resisting constant pressure, under one disguise or another, to change our system of government.

Congress needs this kind of cooperation to save the American competitive enterprise system.

This is the system that has been handed down to us by the founding fathers through the generations.

It is the kind of government and way of life that has made America a bulwark and lighthouse for liberty-loving peoples all over the world.

It is a way of life that rolled up the knockout punch for victory in the war.

It is the way of life that has brought to our people the highest standard of living of any nation on the face of the globe.

And it is the way of life that has produced the goods that the whole world is now drawing upon for recovery from the war.

Yet, incredible as it may seem, there are among us people preaching alien philosophies of government. Some of them are skillful in their efforts. They set up so-called front organizations and they sugar-coat their totalitarian schemes. They talk democracy and practice tyranny.

We don't like Communists at home and we don't like Communists' aggression anywhere

I am quite confident that with your help and with the help of the overwhelming majority of the American people, who are alert to the dangers of government regimentation to our way of life, we shall maintain our citadels of freedom.

Small businessmen have vivid knowledge of regimentation, directives, rules, and regulations and snooping into their affairs by busybody bureaucrats.

The Eightieth Congress is doing its utmost to establish and maintain a healthy economic climate in which small businesses may flourish.

Now I would like to discuss some of the major issues before the Eightieth Congress. In the premise they are problems that confront the American people.

As far back as I can remember the dawning of each new year has brought forth the weighty, rumbling warning that this is a year of decision. Sometimes it is varied to something like: We are at the crossroads.

In all seriousness I want to say that this year 1948 is, indeed, a year of momentous decisions. Of course, we are going to have a Presidential election this year, but I did not come here to make a partisan, political address.

In the brief time available, I want to discuss some matters of overwhelming immediate concern.

Let's look at prices. We all know that many prices are too high. High prices are the result of inflationary causes. The years of deficit-spending by the Government, during and prior to the war, vastly increased the supply of dollars.

Unloosing of demand for peacetime goods pent up during the war; industrial strife in 1945 and 1946, and the tremendous volume of exports from our short supplies, these are among the basic issues of the inflation that has fired the boilers of high prices.

I need not paint for you small businessmen the tragic effect that production stoppages had on our national economy. The year 1946 was the blackest year in our entire history in the matter of strikes and lockouts.

The people demanded action and the Eightieth Congress passed the fair and just Taft-Hartley Act. It is doing the job demanded by the people and intended by the Congress. Given proper administration, it will be very helpful in keeping production more constant.

Workers are finding from experience under the act that it is protecting their right to organize, to bargain collectively, to control their unions, and to strike if they believe that is necessary.

The Congress passed an anti-inflation bill. As you know, it calls for voluntary cooperation by industries, bankers, farmers, and miners in combatting inflation. It was never intended as the complete answer to the price problem.

The Government already possessed powers to combat exorbitant prices. Members of Congress in voting for the anti-inflation bill did so with confidence in businessmen cooperating in the interest of all the people.

We voted for the bill with the firm belief that the men and women engaged in business know more about their respective problems than do bureaucrats in Washington. But you know as well as I do that there must be leadership. Therefore, I am looking hopefully at the steps being taken by the administration to carry out the purposes of this act of the Congress.

Now, on Government expenditures: The cost of government is outrageously high and the American people want a drastic reversal of the ruinous trend.

Economists tell us that one out of every $4 in the national income is being consumed by Federal, State, and local taxes. In other words, about fifty billion of the $200,000,000,000 of national income. I believe that is an alarming situation.

With Government expenditures and taxes remaining firm and the national income declining—though I do not forecast a substantial business decline—it can be readily seen that the burden upon the people would be well-nigh unbearable.

The Congress has been asked to appropriate nearly $40,000,000,000 for expenses of the Federal Government during the fiscal year 1949; that is, the 12 months beginning next July 1.

That forty billion is more than four times the Federal budget in 1939, more than twice all the profits made by American industry in the year 1947, and it is $13,000,000,000 more than the entire Federal public debt at the close of World War I.

We are in the third year after World War II and confronted by the highest Federal budget in the entire peacetime history of our country.

The Eightieth Congress is going to cut that budget. It means that every item in the budget will be scrutinized closely and not a dollar that cannot be justified will be appropriated.

You know as well as I do that several billion dollars can be wrung out of that budget without hurting anyone. But it requires resistance to pressure groups, each having a pet project to consume the taxpayers' money.

We are going to make certain that our country's defenses are adequately provided with funds. And we are going to see to it that no necessary function of the Government shall be eliminated or crippled.

Appropriation committees of the Senate and House are now working on the budget. Subcommittees for the various Government departments, boards, and bureaus are combing money requests with fine-toothed combs.

This is going to take months to accomplish, but I assure you that the present Congress is economy minded and we will do the job the people want to be done just as we have been doing since January 1947. You have heard already from responsible leaders in the Congress that we are going to pass a tax-reduction bill. We are going to reduce taxes, not increase them.

The tax bill that the Congress passes will be geared to production of goods that are so urgently needed by the people. We shall reduce taxes so that the workers will have more take-home pay, and we will reduce taxes so that the people will find it profitable to risk their earnings in investments that result in production and more jobs.

I cannot tell you now what the total amount of tax reduction in dollars will be. There is a substantial surplus in the Federal Treasury and we are surveying the Government expenditures to uncover the soft spots where cuts must be made.

In closing I reiterate that we in the Congress need your support and the active support of every segment of our population in saving the American system of competitive enterprise.

We shall do our part and we are counting upon you, so that we may keep America strong and a citadel for the republican form of government.

World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Raleigh News and Observer:

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of December 28, 1947]

THE DANGER OF BIGNESS

"What is the chief evil and danger of our generation?"

That question was asked in the early 1920's of Justice Louis Brandeis, who was truly regarded as the wisest and most learned liberal of his day.

"Bigness," was the answer of Judge Brandeis. He pointed out how, when industry, commerce, and Government grew into overlarge proportions, they were too big for the best human direction. The truth of that diagnosis has come to be accepted as monopoly has mulcted the people which calls for the enforcement of antitrust laws, and giant governments overexpanded have invited their own destruction.

And yet—and yet—in the light of what Brandeis said and the experience of Hitler's dream of world domination in worship of bigness, there are many who still worship the great god "bigness." It is this faith, misplaced, in the power of bigness which causes placing faith in an organization of one world in which every country in the world would live under a single government, all of every tongue and continent and race united in a supergovernment. They believe the hope of a peaceful world lies in a single parliament with one legislative body, one executive, and a single armed force.

Is that ideal based on experience or wisdom?

Look about the Europe of today, with the great British Empire "on which the sun never sets" surrendering its diadem of India and destined to be reduced under the spirit of the Atlantic Charter; with the strong empire of Germany not long ago master of most of Europe disgraced, defeated, and down and out; the old-time Spain with its domination of South and Central America and ruling the sea, now a tenth-rate power under the rule of a stooge of Hitler; the story of France, destined to lose its African empire, just emerging from the German occupation; and Russia under Communist rule with ambitions that endanger its future and the peace of the world.

And then compare the bigness of these countries and their wars and misgovernment with the small countries in Europe—Switzerland and Luxembourg, which have been models of the sort of government that has blessed their people. While nearly every other country has been cursed by wars, the little republic of Switzerland has had no avid eye on other lands, content to live in independence under a government that has kept it out of war. It stands as a warning to countries aspiring to expansion by forcible conquest. Because of its peculiarly isolated position as a free republic, the peacemakers after World War I chose Geneva as the site of the League of Nations, and today the magnificent buildings are open to international economic and peaceful organizations.

The other European country whose history disproves the argument for one world government is Luxemburg—called "a 999-mile paradise in a nutshell." It is a small country, with room for everybody, beautiful, well-kept, whose citizens like to call it "Little Switzerland." There are no beggars there and little poverty. It did not escape the hard hits of war, lying in the path of Nazi onrush to conquer France. A writer in Newsweek, after a recent visit to Luxemburg, says "It is a little paradise snuggled down in the folds of a heaving, agitated continent."

The history of Switzerland and Luxemburg disprove the theories about the dream of one-world government. Their history ought to silence those who worship at the shrine of bigness.

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News Observer of January 7, 1948]

WORLD FEDERATION

The failure of the United Nations to secure the promised peace has caused men hopeless of world peace to fly to the arms of consolidated "bigness." They tell us the only way to reach the goal is to have one government for all the world—a sort of Tower of Babel for our century.

Former Justice Roberts is the ablest advocate of embracing what Justice Brandeis said was the greatest danger to America—Bigness. Until the United States is lost in the one-world government, Mr. Roberts would have Uncle Sam adopt universal military training. He tells us that western Europe, far from being bankrupt, is actually rich in freemen, and these are the best assets we have outside of the United States. He proposes a trans-Atlantic convention representing all the democracies to advance the one-world government.

Uncle Sam will not permit himself to be swallowed or lose his identity.

We Must Save Europe Without Losing America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 14), 1948

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "We Must Save Europe Without Losing America," which appeared in the NEA Journal of January 1948.

This statement was formulated by the legislative commission of the National Education Association, which consists of the following members:

H. M. Ivy, Meridian, Miss., chairman; Arthur F. Corey, San Francisco, Calif.; Frank C. Heinisch, Omaha, Nebr.; J. Easton Parratt, Salt Lake City, Utah; Forrest Rozzell, Little Rock, Ark.; Mrs. Grace Dodge, Boothbay, Maine; A. O. Mathias, Cincinnati, Ohio; Robert Wyatt, Indianapolis, Ind.

It was approved as a statement of policy by the executive committee of the National Education Association, consisting of the following members:

Glenn E. Snow, St. George, Utah, NEA president; Pearl A. Wanamaker, Olympia, Wash.; Ivan R. Amerine, Columbus, Ohio; Edgar G. Doudna, Madison, Wis.; Gertrude E. McComb, Terre Haute, Ind.; Martin P. Moe, Helena, Mont.; Corma A. Mowrey, Clarksburg, W. Va.; L. V. Phillips, Indianapolis, Ind.; Beulah Keeton Walker, Dallas, Tex.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST SAVE EUROPE WITHOUT LOSING AMERICA

World War II ended in victory over the forces of fascism. No sooner had it ended, however than a bitter struggle between the two conflicting ideologies of communism and democracy arose.

It is perfectly clear that democracy and the system of free enterprise are under vigorous attack in western Europe. It is also clear that they are seriously threatened even in our own country.

Today the American people are called upon to support democratic ideals around the globe. There is no other choice. Retreat into isolation is impossible in today's world.

The future of freedom throughout the world is indissolubly linked with our own.

AID GRANTED ABROAD

Congress has in recent years granted large amounts of aid to western Europe and China.

It has just appropriated over $600,000,000 of immediate stop-gap aid. The next few years, under the Marshall plan, may require from twelve to seventeen billion dollars of aid.

If it will help to keep the peace, to get Europe on its feet, to stem the tide of totalitarianism, this aid will be a small price to pay compared to the three hundred billions spent on the last war.

It is of the utmost importance, however, in the trying years ahead, that we strengthen our defense at home as well as abroad.

We must conserve and develop our human resources with care and foresight. The basic defense of our Nation and of the cause of freemen resides in the intelligence and physical well-being of all citizens.

There is no surer means of strengthening the enemies of democracy than by neglecting these two basic human factors in American life.

THE PRICE OF IGNORANCE

To tolerate ignorance within our Nation is to invite disaster. The alien propagandists would wish for nothing better than for large numbers of our young people to reach adulthood in ignorance, without a deep and abiding faith in the American way of life.

Unless every child in his early years acquires a thorough knowledge of, and a love for, the democratic institutions in our great Republic, he inevitably is a potential threat to the security of our country.

It is a shocking fact that, while the Federal Government wisely appropriates billions of dollars for foreign aid of all kinds to help turn the tide of human affairs strongly in the direction of democracy, it has so far refused to spend even a few million dollars to help public elementary and public secondary schools to eliminate the ignorance which invites acceptance of alien ideas at home.

THREATENING CIRCUMSTANCES

Advocates of communism, for example, find strong potential allies in such threatening circumstances as the following conditions within the United States:

Five million children were without opportunity of becoming well grounded in the foundations of American life because they were not in school at all, according to the United States Census of 1940.

Some communities in some States in 1940 spent 60 times as much for the education of a child as did some communities in other States.

Ten million adults in 1940 had so little schooling as to be almost illiterate.

Three million of this number had never been enrolled in any school whatsoever.

Twenty-five percent of our people over 25 years of age in 1940 had 6 years or less of schooling.

Educational neglect caused selective service in World War II to reject the equivalent of 20 combat divisions, almost as many combat divisions as were deployed in the entire Pacific area during the war.

Right now, in 1947–48, there are: 100,000 teachers employed on emergency substandard certificates—1 in 9 as contrasted with 1 in 200 in 1939–40; large shortages of qualified teachers in many States; salary schedules so low in many States that often the ablest high-school graduates shun teaching as a career; not less than 2,000,000 children denied proper instructional opportunities as a direct result of the teacher shortage; overcrowded classrooms and heavy teacher load in every State; educational slum areas in many States and communities; millions of children denied adequate school buildings, equipment, and instructional supplies.

Such conditions are tragic. They provide the kind of soil in which alien ideologies most readily take root and flourish.

The State legislatures in 1947 did a commendable job of providing the funds to start the schools back on the road toward their prewar status.

The additional appropriations, however, do not offset the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar and overcome the wartime deterioration in our schools.

A BREAK IN THE DIKE

The lack of good schools from which vast numbers of our youth suffer today is a major break in the dike of security for American democracy.

Many States lack the ability to finance good schools for all of their children. The States that are poorest are, as a rule, the ones that have relatively the most children to be educated; yet, as a rule, these less able States make the greatest effort to operate good schools.

Without Federal aid the States with less economic ability will, in the years ahead, continue to have large numbers of children who do not have a fair chance to become citizens well-grounded in the meaning of American democracy.

With Federal aid this grave threat to the American way of life can be averted.

CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS

Pending in the Eightieth Congress are two bipartisan bills, S. 472 and H. R. 2953, which authorize $300,000,000 per year to assist the States in more nearly equalizing educational opportunity through public elementary and public secondary schools.

This legislation provides for (a) the maintenance of State and local control over educational instruction and policy; (b) the distribution of funds to the States so that the largest amounts will go to those in greatest need; (c) the expenditure of Federal funds for the same purposes for which State and local school revenues, under State constitutions and State laws, are spent; and (d) no discrimination in the use of Federal funds for separate schools operated for minority racial groups.

The pending Federal legislation places its greatest emphasis upon the improvement of the public schools where they are most meagerly supported. A minimum acceptable standard of educational opportunity is the immediate objective.

To this end, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has recommended the enactment of S. 472 by the United States Senate. The House Subcommittee on Education has favorably recommended H. R. 2953 to the House Committee on Education and Labor.

This, or similar, legislation should be enacted at the earliest possible moment.

FOR A NEW ERA

The Nation requires today a school program which will equip our youth for a new era in national and world affairs. Restoration of the State systems of education to their 1940 status is an ill-conceived and dangerous objective. The public schools of the Nation must be lifted to a level far above that of 1940 if this great Republic is to be successful in the drive to make secure the way of free men.

Financial aid to other nations of the world is but part of our obligation. An equally important part is the strengthening of defenses in our own country.

This part of the job must be done in the Nation's front line of defense—its public schools.

It is time for the Federal Government to share in the support of public education, which is our greatest bulwark against the foces which seek to destroy freedom within our own country.

It is commendable to expend billions of dollars to halt the march of communism abroad, but it is the height of folly, at the same time, to refuse to spend a few millions to complete the bulwark at home against the same forces in the minds of otherwise neglected and forgotten American children.

IN THE MINDS OF MEN

Every citizen who is concerned about the preservation and the strengthening of the American way of life has a vital stake in the ideological war that is now raging.

The battleground of the world is in the minds of men.

The victory for freedom must be won on both the foreign and the home fronts.

It cannot be won on the home front without good schools for all children and youth.

Only thus can we develop in the coming generation an imperishable faith and conviction in the ways of freedom and give to our children the knowledge and foundation skills with which to make democracy work.

The Battle of the Family Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 14), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Battle of the Family Budget," by Richard L. Neuberger, which appeared in the New York Times Magazine on January 11, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BATTLE OF THE FAMILY BUDGET—A REPORT ON HOW A HOUSEHOLD OF FIVE STRUGGLES TO MAKE ENDS MEET ON AN INCOME OF $210 A MONTH

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

PORTLAND OREG.—A 6-cent spurt in the price of hamburger a few weeks ago was particularly unwelcome to Martha Andrews. Martha is a 28-year-old housewife with a husband, Ted, aged 34, and three small children—Ted, Jr., aged 8; Jane, 2, and Robert, 7 months. While Ted was off fighting in Europe with General Patton's Third Army his mouth watered for Martha's baked hams and veal roasts. However, meat loaf, hamburger patties, and spaghetti with meat balls have become the regular diet in the wartime housing unit in which the Andrews live, and that is why the rise in the cost of hamburger from 42 to 48 cents a pound at the corner butcher shop did such damage to Martha's budget.

The Andrews are an average American family. Ted earns $250 a month pumping gasoline at an independent service station and garage 4 or 5 miles east of Portland, on U S 30 along the timbered shores of the Columbia River. This is $75 more than he earned at the same work before he went to war in 1942. Of the three children two were born after Ted returned from the Army with a medical discharge early in 1945.

For a time the rising cost of living merely inconvenienced the Andrews. Now it has passed far beyond the casual stage. Ted is not sure what the family would do if it had a serious illness. A small legacy left by Martha's parents is down to $350 and that is their only reserve. Half a dozen series E War bonds were cashed to pay for Christmas presents.

The Andrews take some comfort from the fact that practically all their friends seem to be in a similar predicament. Martha is certain of that from her conversations with other housewives who live in the housing project which was occupied by Henry J. Kaiser's shipyard workers during the war. She also gets letters from her married sister in Spokane, and Ted hears occasionally from men with whom he served in the Army.

All these sources indicate to the Andrews that their experience is by no means unique in this period of the highest prices in American history. Indeed, Martha says, "I suppose there must be millions of families all the way across the United States in just exactly the same boat. If they can keep afloat, I guess we can, but it's getting harder all the time."

How have the Andrews made out thus far? What fate do they think 1948 holds for their strained and battered budget?

It is easy to tell where the money goes today. The two chief items are food and rent. Forty-four percent of the monthly income, or $110, goes for food; rent, including light, heat, and water, is $49.50. And the remaining $90.50 of Ted's salary seems to disappear like a snowman in the noonday sun. Ted insisted on having a telephone installed when the new baby was on the way; this costs $2.75 for a four-party line. He spends $16.50 a month to carry his GI life-insurance policy. The family has no car, and transportation for Ted to and from work comes to $9. They budget $15 a month for medical care and prescriptions, and the total is nearly always spent.

All of this comes to over $200, and still some big items must be taken care of. So far as clothing is concerned, Martha improvises all she can. Jane is very much a little girl, but she wears slickers, "Dr. Dentons," and overalls which her brother Ted, Jr., long ago outgrew. Martha paid $20 to a crippled friend with sewing skill to make an old coat into a trim suit, complete with the "new look." Ted wore his GI shoes to work until the uppers split away from the composition soles, and then had to count out $15.50 for a new pair which would withstand grease and gravel.

With five $500 deductions, including his own, Ted Andrews' income taxes are small. He pays $42 a year to the Federal Government and $6 to the State of Oregon. Ted says he has no complaint about taxes, but he and his wife resent the high prices that keep them from saving. "After a few dentist's bills and other odds and ends," says Ted, "we don't even have enough left when the month is over to pay for a week's summer vacation 75 miles away at the beach."

Martha allocates $25 for food each week. Last week she spent $24.89, in this way:

Meat	$7.00
Milk (9 quarts)	2.07
Cheese	1.00
Eggs (3 dozen)	2.13
Bread (7 loaves of 1½ pounds each)	1.47
Staples (sugar, coffee, flour, etc.)	2.25
Fruit (canned and fresh)	3.00
Vegetables (canned and fresh)	3.00
Margarine (3 pounds)	1.32
Baby food (canned)	.72
One quart ice cream	.43
Ted's contribution to coffee-and-soup fund at garage	.50

Before the war, with less money, Martha was able to serve leg of lamb or even prime ribs for Sunday dinner and some kind of meat or fish the other 6 nights. Now she buys roasts only occasionally, and on at least two evenings a week the principal course consists mainly of rice, macaroni, or noodles. Many months ago Ted cut out the irregular indulgence of a hot lunch at the diner across the highway from the garage. He and the other workers bring sandwiches and make coffee or heat canned soup over a hotplate.

Only on Sundays does Martha serve ice cream to her family. Otherwise they finish the principal meal with fresh fruit from the grocery store or peaches canned at home. At breakfast only the children get the juice of fresh oranges; the parents drink canned juice, which is cheaper. Eggs are the great luxury all enjoy; it was to enable Ted to start for work with two fried eggs under his belt that, nearly a year ago, the Andrews gave up butter. The one time that Martha entertained the other wives in the housing unit she served a big golden omelet and homemade applesauce.

Martha says all the culinary skill taught her by her mother has vanished in the onrush of inflationary food prices.

"I used to be famous for meat loaf," she tells me. "Everyone raved about it. The recipe was my mother's. But now I have to fill the meat loaf so full of bread crumbs or rice to stretch the hamburger that it has no resemblance to the original. Thanksgiving Day also upset some notions which had lasted since childhood. Even on the farm turkey was a delicacy—yet Ted and I treated ourselves to a Thanksgiving turkey because it turned out to be only a few cents more a pound than hamburger."

She is indignant at warnings from the Government not to waste food. "How many families do they think are able to waste any food at these prices?" she asks, her dark eyes flashing. "That Thanksgiving turkey lasted us a whole week. We had it roasted, warmed over, served in cold slices, creamed and made into hash, croquettes, and soup. I don't believe I threw out enough of that turkey to fill a coin purse."

High prices have forced on the Andrews many economies. They get books at the public library instead of buying them at a bookstore. Except when a jovial customer has thrust a pack in his direction, Ted has not smoked a cigarette since the end of 1946. A pipe satisfies his taste for tobacco. Martha puts up her own jams, jellies, fruits, and vegetables. She and other housewives in the Vanport housing project even buy jars and lids in big quantities to get them cheaper. During the summer months Ted, a 6-footer who was star tackle in high-school football, often spends a Sunday helping cultivate a nearby truck garden along the Columbia bottomlands. Then he comes home laden with heads of cauliflower, bags of peas, and ears of golden corn.

Martha cuts the children's hair, washes her own and gets a permanent but once a year, and then at a beauty school for less than half the regular price. Ted postpones his haircuts as long as he can; when he finally does get one, it is from a beginner at a local barber college for 40 cents instead of at a commercial shop for $1.

The high cost of hamburger and bread long ago ruled movies out of the Andrews budget. However, Ted discovered that by joining the Portland auxiliary police force he could get into shows free, and occasionally he sends Martha into a movie which he tells her is really colossal, while he stays at home with the children. He and Martha can't go together because they can't afford a baby-sitter. Teen-aged youngsters in the neighborhood want 50 cents an hour.

In his spare moments at the garage Ted works with the two mechanics. Within the next 9 or 10 months he expects to be tuning up motors and straightening out bent fenders. Then his salary will jump to $300, or perhaps even $350. However, he believes the increase will do him no good "unless somehow prices are brought into line." The worst of it is, says Ted, is feeling that he is on a treadmill. "At these prices," he says, "you can't build or buy a house, you can't get an automobile, you can't save for a vacation, you can't even put away some money for your children's education. That's the worst of the whole thing. We're just standing still. We can't get ahead of the game. Prices eat up every cent I earn."

The Andrews are resentful of economic conditions in general but their resentment is channeled in no particular direction. They didn't like it when in September their rent was raised $7 a month. The units of their housing development are of flimsy construction and the squeak of boards in the apartment next door is clearly audible in the Andrews home. But their special interests do not shape their whole philosophy. A member of the auto mechanics union, Ted believes organized labor "made it tough on the white-collar fellow by getting pay boosts the white-collar fellow had to help pay for, without any assistance from a union of his own." Ted also thinks business profits are too high and that "the rich man is getting richer."

Ted and Martha are registered as Republicans, principally because they were brought up in rural Oregon, which is predominantly Republican. Ted worked on a farm until he and Martha, the daughter of a German-born wheat rancher, were married in 1938. They moved to Portland a few months later and Ted greased cars while Martha was a member of a championship girls' swimming team.

The Andrews voted a straight Republican ticket in November 1946. They admit they are disappointed, for they thought even then that prices had risen far higher than they should. "We hoped the Republican Congress would bring down the cost of living," says Martha. "Instead, prices are worse now than they were at the time of the election—much worse. I don't know how we will vote this year, but I'm sure it will be for the party we think will do the most to end these fearful prices."

There doesn't seem to them to be anything they can do directly. "I thought at first that buyers' strikes might be the answer to high prices," says Ted. "That was all right when it came to automobiles, radio sets, new refrigerators and even shoes and clothes. But you can't save on food when you have three little children. I believe I'd buy my children milk with the last dollar in my jeans, even if it was 43 cents a quart instead of the 23 it is now."

Ted and his wife have strangely conflicting fears. On the one hand, they fear that inflation may get further out of bounds, that prices will go higher. Ted predicts that his next raise will simply keep him where he is now. Yet the Andrews also fear a deflation, the possibilities of a crash. "If we have another big depression, where will I be?" Ted asks.

When they express these fears, Ted is grim and his wife somber. Yet, on the whole, the Andrews are not a gloomy or melancholy family; in fact, they are quite the contrary. The three children are chubby and cheerful. The parents likewise are in excellent health. Martha, straight and trim, still can flash 100 yards through the water in 66 seconds. And Ted, when he takes a rusty set of clubs and rides on the trolley to a public golf course, can negotiate 18 holes in the low eighties.

Ted had hoped to study civil engineering at Oregon State College, but the $90 a month of the GI bill of rights was not enough to feed five mouths at 1946 prices, let alone those of 1948. Ted overcame that disappointment, and now he takes solace in the belief that some day he will be an expert auto mechanic.

Despite their fears, Ted and his wife are hopeful that both the luxuries and necessities of life will again be available at prices which make sense and that the adjustment will come before the country suffers permanent economic damage.

Admiral Nimitz's Valedictory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 14), 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the final statement made by Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, on the day of his departure from the Navy Department. This article, which amounts to the distinguished admiral's valedictory, I believe so well expresses the situation prevailing today that every Member of Congress and the people throughout the country should read it. Hence, I am taking this opportunity to make it a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of January 7, 1948, summarizing the context of Admiral Nimitz's study.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 7, 1948]

ADMIRAL NIMITZ'S VALEDICTORY

Admiral Nimitz's valedictory study of the function of the Navy in a possible next war displays a mind alert to the lessons of World War II. Though he calls upon history to prove that the basic pattern of naval warfare and the use of sea power has not changed

since the seventeenth century, he finds it quite consistent to weave into that pattern the use of all the new weapons of defense and offense and dwells not so much on sea power alone as on air-sea power as occupying the leading role in the initial stages of a future war. In other words, here is a highly distinguished sailor, who has recently retired as Chief of Naval Operations, who is very obviously abreast of the times.

Several points obtrude in the text of his study. One is that surface ships, and particularly transports and cargo ships, are as essential to successful naval operation as they ever were, perhaps more so; that a vast importation of supplies, which they alone are capable of handling, will be necessary; that for national protection against sneak attack an all-encircling radar screen must be set up on land and sea and by the use of submarines under the sea, and that both for the defense of vital areas and for offensive purpose, when and where necessary, we should establish floating air bases replete with supply and repair vessels which can maintain themselves at sea for months at distances far removed from land bases and on which task forces, battleships, and so on can depend as they would on land bases.

Though he doesn't say so, those would obviate the diplomatic difficulties relating to the creation of such establishments on foreign territory (as witness Panama's rejection of the United States request for land bases to guard the Canal). There would also be, as the admiral points out, the great advantage of secrecy and mobility with power to penetrate offensively the enemy's territory for several hundred miles inland. Such floating bases were first devised by the Navy in the Pacific campaign. One is now operating in the Mediterranean. Admiral Nimitz strongly urges a development of the system.

He also calls attention to our shortage of military manpower, the intimation being that he strongly favors universal military training. One can readily understand his sentiment in this respect.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY.

On the day of his departure from the Navy Department, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, forwarded to the Secretary of the Navy the attached paper, prepared in his office, expressing his views on the function of the naval forces in maintaining the future security of the United States.

The paper states that the Navy provides the first line of defense on, under, and above the sea. It states further that if war cannot be prevented, the Navy's function is to carry the war to the enemy so that it will not be fought on United States soil.

"STATEMENT BY FLEET ADMIRAL NIMITZ

"THE FUTURE EMPLOYMENT OF NAVAL FORCES

"1. Sea power: Sir Walter Raleigh declared in the early seventeenth century that "whosoever commands the sea commands the trade; whosoever commands the trade of the world commands the riches of the world, and consequently the world itself." This principle is as true today as when uttered, and its effect will continue as long as ships traverse the seas. That this period extends beyond the foreseeable future is apparent when it is realized that the 100,000 long tons of cargo which 44 ships can transport from San Francisco to Australia monthly would require for the same purpose 10,000 four-engined C-87 airplanes manned by 120,000 highly trained personnel, plus 80 seagoing tankers to provide gas along the route and at the far end of the run. Cargo-carrying aircraft will no more replace vehicles of the same type on the seas than they will those on land. In fact, cargo-carrying ships will become increasingly important to the United States both in peace and in war. Our national resources in petroleum products alone are inadequate for the prosecution of a long war. A realistic appraisal of the requirements in matériel for this Nation to engage in war shows that an uninterrupted stream of imports will be essential, and that the volume of these imports is such that they must come by sea.

"2. The United States possesses today control of the sea more absolute than was possessed by the British. Our interest in this control is not riches and power as such. It is first the assurance of our national security, and, second, the creation and perpetuation of that balance and stability among nations which will insure to each the right of self-determination under the framework of the United Nations Organization.

"3. Our present control of the sea is so absolute that it is sometimes taken for granted. As a result, there is a faulty tendency, under the assumption that any probable enemy in a future war possesses only negligible apparent fleet strength, to give no major offensive role to the Navy—only a supporting role and the prosecution of antisubmarine warfare. Opposing fleets have been eliminated, it is reasoned, hence ours should be reduced to a mere support force and its appropriations transferred to certain types of aircraft which would be the answer to all our problems of offense and defense. The answer is not so simple. Technology in warfare, as in all else, has simplified some details but has greatly complicated the aggregate. The submarine and the torpedo, far from eliminating combatant surface ships, produced the depth charge, sonar and electronic sounding, and the antisubmarine aircraft which in two wars have successfully defeated them. Similarly, the airplane in its application against naval forces has already given creation to the proximity fuse, homing missiles, electronic ranging and gun control, and carrier attack aircraft which, during World War II, repeatedly defeated concentrations of Japanese land-based aircraft wherever encountered.

"4. Our present undisputed control of the sea was achieved primarily through the employment of naval air-sea forces in the destruction of Japanese and German sea power. It was consolidated by the subsequent reduction of these nations to their present impotence, in which the employment of naval air-sea forces against land objectives played a vital role. It can be perpetuated only through the maintenance of balanced naval forces of all categories adequate to our strategic needs (which include those of the nontotalitarian world), and which can flexibly adjust to new modes of air-sea warfare and which are alert to develop and employ new weapons and techniques as needed.

"5. Employment of naval forces in the past: A report made in 1657 by one of Cromwell's admirals that: 'After we destroyed the ships we plied our guns against the forts,' indicates that the purpose of achieving sea power and the recognized practice of applying pressure against an enemy wherever he can be reached by naval forces has not changed from that day to this. The basic objectives and principles of war do not change. The final objective in war is the destruction of the enemy's capacity and will to fight, and thereby force him to accept the imposition of the victor's will. This submission has been accomplished in the past by pressure in and from each of the elements of land and sea, and during World Wars I and II, in and from the air as well. The optimum of pressure is exerted through that absolute control obtained by actual physical occupation. This optimum is obtainable only on land where physical occupation can be consolidated and maintained. Experience proves that while invasion in some form—of adjacent sea areas, covering air spaces, or enemy territory itself—is essential to obtain decisions in war, it is sometimes unnecessary to prosecute invasion to the extent of occupying a nation's capitol or other vital centers. Sufficient of his land, sea, or air territory must be invaded, however, to establish the destructive potential of the victor and to engender in the enemy that hopelessness which precedes submission. The reduction of Japan is a case in point.

"6. Naval forces have always played a vital and often deciding role in warfare by invading adjacent sea areas to project their pressure on enemy territory. Before the invention of gunpowder, in the days of Greece and Rome, there was no such thing as a fleet in being. Naval forces were built as they were needed, and the transport had equal standing with the man-of-war. The latter served to clear the narrow seas for the transport to discharge its force of men and weapons upon enemy territory where the decision was obtained. In the long history of British domination of the seas, it is safe to say that the Royal Navy fought as many engagements against shore objectives as it did on the high seas. Singularly it was the defeat by his shore batteries of a Royal Navy squadron off Toulon that gave Napoleon early in his career a disdain for British seapower. It was this same British seapower, in the form of a tight blockade which denied world intercourse to him but assured it to his enemies, and in the victories of Copenhagen, the Nile, and Trafalgar, which was the controlling factor in his eventual defeat. Also the great British strategic bastion of Gibraltar was captured in 1704 by a force of Royal Marines and seamen landed from a naval squadron which had first pounded the Spanish garrison into a state of confusion and despair.

"7. The naval history of our own Civil War is a vivid portrayal of the employment of naval forces against an enemy without a fleet. Naval forces were a controlling factor in the Confederate defeat and in shortening the war. The Confederate States had no fleet. They were a consolidated land power with the advantage of interior lines and the possession of several large sea and river ports affording access to world commerce which they vitally needed. The Federal States outlined their naval missions as (a) the blockade of southern ports along a coastline of more than 3,000 miles; (b) the reduction, in conjunction with the Army, of Atlantic and Gulf strongholds; and (c) the occupation and control of the Mississippi and its tributaries. The blockade was established and soon Confederate commerce, as such, ceased. Naval operations started on the western rivers in the first year of the war—November 1861. They were mainly in conjunction with the Army, but frequently objectives were accomplished by naval gun and mortar fire alone. By April 1862, with the passage of Farragut's squadron past the Mississippi entrance forts and the capture of New Orleans, the Confederate States had been sealed on the western, Gulf, and Atlantic boundaries. It is safe to state that had they been unmolested by sea power and had they received money, men, and munitions from Europe, South America, and Mexico they might well have consolidated their secession.

"8. The development between World Wars I and II of naval aviation provided naval forces with a striking weapon of vastly increased flexibility, range, and power. The development and use of this weapon in World War II against both sea and land objectives is one of the great achievements in modern warfare. It spearheaded our Pacific attack. First, it swept the sea of all naval opposition. Then it became the initial striking weapon in the capture of Guam, Saipan, and Iwo Jima—the advanced bases from which long-range bombers were able to strike the vital centers of the Empire. Finally, like the British squadron in 1657, our Navy "after destroying the ships it plied its guns against the forts" and participated directly in the destruction of those vital centers on Okinawa and the home islands by gunfire and bombing; in spite of the concentration of Japanese air power our Navy made possible the success of our gallant Ground Forces.

"9. In all of these operations the employment of air-sea task forces demonstrated the ability of the Navy to concentrate aircraft strength at any desired point in such numbers as to overwhelm the defense at the point of contact. These operations demonstrate the capability of naval carrier-based aviation to make use of the principles of mobility and concentration to a degree possessed by no other force.

"10. Employment of naval forces in the future: In addition to the weapons of World War II, the Navy of the future will be capable of launching missiles from surface vessels and submarines and of delivering atomic bombs from carrier-based planes. Vigilant naval administration and research is constantly developing and adding to these means. In the event of war within the foreseeable future, it is probable that there will be little need to destroy combatant ships other than submarines. Consequently, in the fulfillment of long-accepted naval functions and in conformity with the well-known principles of warfare, the Navy should be used in the initial stages of such a war to project its weapons against vital enemy targets on land, the reduction of which is the basic objective of warfare.

"11. For any future war to be of sufficient magnitude to affect us seriously it must be compounded of two primary ingredients: vast manpower and tremendous industrial capacity. These conditions exist today in the great land mass of central Asia, in east Asia, and in western Europe. The two latter areas will not be in a position to endanger us for decades to come unless they pass under unified totalitarian control. In the event of war with any of the three, we would be relatively deficient in manpower. We should, therefore, direct our thinking toward realistic and highly specialized operations. We should plan to inflict unacceptable damage through maximum use of our technological weapons and our ability to produce them in great quantities.

"12. Initial devastating air attack in the future may come across our bordering oceans from points on the continents of Europe and Asia as well as from across the polar region. Consequently, our plans must include the development of specialized forces of fighter and interceptor planes for pure defense, as well as the continued development of long-range bombers. Offensively, our initial plans should provide for the coordinated employment of military and naval air power launched from land and carrier bases, and of guided missiles against important enemy targets. For the present, until long-range bombers are developed capable of spanning or bordering oceans and returning to our North American bases, naval air power launched from carriers may be the only practicable means of bombing vital enemy centers in the early stages of a war.

"13. In summary it is visualized that our early combat operations in the event of war within the next decade would consist of:

"Defensively:

"(a) Protection of our vital centers from devastating attacks by air and from missile-launching submarines.

"(b) Protection of areas of vital strategic importance, such as sources of raw materials, our advanced bases, etc.

"(c) Protection of our essential lines of communication and those of our allies.

"(d) Protection of our occupation forces during reinforcement or evacuation.

"Offensively:

"(a) Devastating bombing attacks from land and carrier bases on vital enemy installations.

"(b) Destruction of enemy lines of communication accessible to our naval and air forces.

"(c) Occupation of selected advanced bases on enemy territory and the denial of advance bases to the enemy through the coordinated employment of naval, air, and amphibious forces.

"14. Of the above activities or functions there are certain ones which can be performed best by the Air Force and certain others which can be performed best by the Navy—it is these two services which will play the major roles in the initial stages of a future war. The Eightieth Congress took cognizance of this fact when, in the National Security Act of 1947, it specifically prescribed certain functions to the Navy, its naval aviation and its Marine Corps. In so doing the Congress gave emphasis to the fact that the organizational framework of the military services should be built around the functions assigned to each service. This is a principle which the Navy has consistently followed and is now organized and trained to implement.

"15. Defensively, the Navy is still the first line the enemy must hurdle either in the air or on the sea in approaching our coasts across any ocean. The earliest warning of enemy air attack against our vital centers should be provided by naval air, surface, and submarine radar pickets deployed in the vast ocean spaces which surround the continent. This is part of the radar screen which should surround the continental United States and its possessions. The first attrition to enemy air power might be by short-range naval fighter planes carried by carrier task forces. Protection of our cities against missile-launching submarines can best be effected by naval hunter-killer groups composed of small aircraft carriers and modern destroyers operating as a team with naval land-based aircraft.

"16. The safety of our essential trade routes and ocean lines of communication and those of our allies, the protection of areas of vital strategic importance, such as the sources of raw material, advanced base locations, etc., are but matters of course if we control the seas. Only naval air-sea power can insure this.

"17. Offensively, it is the function of the Navy to carry the war to the enemy so that it will not be fought on United States soil. The Navy can at present best fulfill the vital functions of devastating enemy vital areas by the projection of bombs and missiles. It is improbable that bomber fleets will be capable, for several years to come, of making two-way trips between continents, even over the polar routes, with heavy loads of bombs. It is apparent then that in the event of war within this period, if we are to project our power against the vital areas of any enemy across the ocean before beachheads on enemy territory are captured, it must be by air-sea power; by aircraft launched from carriers, and by heavy surface ships and submarines projecting guided missiles and rockets. If present promise is developed by research, test, and production, these three types of air-sea power operating in concert will be able within the next 10 years critically to damage enemy vital areas many hundreds of miles inland.

"18. Naval task forces including these types are capable of remaining at sea for months. This capability has raised to a high point the art of concentrating air power within effective range of enemy objectives. It is achieved by refueling and rearming task forces at sea. Not only may the necessary supplies, ammunition, and fuel be replenished in this way but the air groups themselves may be changed. The net result is that naval forces are able, without resorting to diplomatic channels, to establish offshore anywhere in the world airfields completely equipped with machine shops, ammunition dumps, tank farms, warehouses, together with quarters and all types of accommodations for personnel. Such task forces are virtually as complete as any air base ever established. They constitute the only air bases that can be made available near enemy territory without assault and conquest; and furthermore they are mobile offensive bases that can be employed with the unique attributes of secrecy and surprise—which attributes contribute equally to their defensive as well as offensive effectiveness. Regarding the pure defense of these mobile air bases the same power projected destructively from them against the enemy is being applied to their defense in the form of propulsion, armament, and new aircraft weapons whose development is well abreast the supersonic weapons reputed to threaten their existence.

"19. It is clear, therefore, that the Navy and the Air Force will play the leading roles in the initial stages of a future war. Eventually, reduction and occupation of certain strategic areas will require the utmost from our Army, Navy, and Air Force. Each should be assigned broad functions compatible with its capabilities and limitations and should develop the weapons it needs to fulfill these functions, and no potentiality of any of the three services of the Military Establishment should be neglected in our scheme of national defense. At the same time each service must vigorously develop, in that area where their functions meet, that flexibility and teamwork essential to operational success. It should also be clear that the Navy's ability to exert from its floating bases its unique pressure against the enemy wherever he can be reached—in the air, on sea or land—is now, as it has been, compatible with the fundamental principles of warfare. That our naval forces can be equipped defensively as well as offensively to project pressure against enemy objectives in the future is as incontrovertible as the principle that every action has an equal and opposite reaction.

"20. In measuring capabilities against a potential enemy, due appreciation must be taken of the factors of relative strength and weakness. We may find ourselves comparatively weak in manpower and in certain elements of aircraft strength. On the other hand we are superior in our naval air-sea strength. It is an axiom that in preparing for any contest, it is wisest to exploit—not neglect—the element of strength. Hence a policy which provides for balanced development and coordinated use of strong naval forces should be vigorously prosecuted in order to meet and successfully counter a sudden war in the foreseeable future."

The Causes of Industrial Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 14), 1948

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on the subject The Causes of Industrial Peace, recently delivered by Mr. Clarence Francis, chairman of the board of the General Foods Corp., before the fifty-second annual congress of American industry, National Association of Manufacturers, in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CAUSES OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE

(By Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp.)

There is something both ironic and hopeful in the fact that we should be discussing the causes of industrial peace here today.

It is ironic that Americans, the most advanced people technically, mechanically, and industrially, should have waited until a comparatively recent period to inquire into the most promising single source of productivity, namely, the human will to work.

It is hopeful, on the other hand, that the search is now well under way. And perhaps the delay is not so strange, after all. Medicine was centuries old and the doctors were still bleeding people when the first hesitant steps were taken in preventive medicine. Along the path of progress the most obvious signposts are often the least noticed. It is obvious today, but it came as a great discovery, that a cause of freedom from disease is health. We are learning now that a cause of freedom from industrial strife is healthy human relations. Just as there are degrees of health, so there are degrees of industrial peace. The sort we seek is a vibrant, affirmative, productive peace. We know that it can exist because we have seen it exist. There have been few times within recent memory when we have lacked examples of this fact.

Yet, ignoring these signposts, we have lived amid the din of industrial disorder from the start. Our economic expansion has been marked by periodic disruptions from the days of the anthracite and rail strikes of the 1870's through the sit downs of the 1930's, right on down to the present.

Why has this been so? Basically, I think, it is because too many employers somehow fell into the grave initial error of treating labor as a commodity, because management and labor leaders became preoccupied with the rules of industrial warfare, because we concentrated on the vocabulary of difference—demands, grievances, disputes, prerogatives, rights, and all the rest, and because, by implication, we accepted the notion that the interests of labor and management are basically opposed.

That's an irony, surely, since the interests of 60,000,000 Americans at work are served not by the cultivation of disunity and discord but by unity and cooperation. The tragedy is that millions of working Americans, whether organized or not, are suffering from the nonexistence of mutual endeavors to create smooth relationships.

You are not the kind of men who came to responsibility by leaving things to chance. I do not believe any industrialist—ever again—dares leave the development of good working human relationships to chance.

To me the ideal in industrial peace would be—not 15,000,000—not 30,000,000, but 60,000,000 Americans working together in well-planned and understood human relationship. Think what that would mean in terms of national unity, production, and prosperity. When we consider such a goal, we are necessarily compelled to adopt the broadest possible outlook in our quest for total industrial peace.

For this reason, I beg to be excused from dwelling at length on the Taft-Hartley Act, the Wagner Act, or any of their legislative predecessors. I do not mean to discount the importance of labor legislation. But conceding its importance, we must grant that it is but one of a number of trees in a very large forest. The rules of the Marquis of Queensbury have their application, but they will hardly suffice as a philosophy of life.

In other words, you can legislate the conditions under which management and labor can quarrel.

You can legislate the conditions under which management and labor can maintain an armed truce.

You can even legislate the conditions under which management and labor can enjoy a negative sort of peace without fighting at all.

But you cannot legislate harmony into the hearts of men.

To attain positive industrial peace, we need something more than bylaws and compulsory rules. We need productive teamwork. We need men working willingly together toward known goals. We need, in short, workers who are informed workers who enjoy a sense of security, workers who are given a feeling of individual dignity, workers who are properly and fairly paid, workers who are given nonfinancial incentives.

You will notice that this list lays little stress on wages as such. This might once have aroused the protests of the old-school, hard-headed employer whose philosophy was "treat 'em rough and tell 'em nothing," who said with finality, "loyalty goes with the pay envelope." But I think you will grant with me today that it may be possible to be hard-headed without being practical. I don't think it is practical to assume that wages are all-important. I just don't happen to think it is true.

Look back over the history of labor relations. The industries that have been wrecked, stymied, and disrupted by strikes most often—the industries most plagued by low morale, slow-downs, and feather-bedding—are among those in which the highest wages are paid. In those industries, I believe, both management and labor have been barking up the wrong tree for decades. Unfortunately, they do not seem much closer to true harmony today than they ever were. And I think we must all agree that you cannot expect a high degree of efficiency from an industry beset by quarrels.

On the other hand, I happen to know of a company that established two almost identical operations during the war. Both plants were making the same item with the same equipment under virtually the same set-up. The only important difference between the two operations was this: One was located in an area where the whole psychology is one of militancy and agitation over rights and prerogatives. The other was located in a small city off the beaten path where the employees were newly recruited to industry with no background of chronic conflict and mutual antagonism. The measured man-hour productivity in the second of those two plants exceeded that of the first by 25 percent.

This and many similar examples indicate that employee attitudes are a vital factor in positive industrial peace. Can we go one step further and conclude that employee attitudes, over the long run, are conditioned by management attitudes toward employees? I believe we can. For it has always seemed to me that:

You can buy a man's time.

You can buy a man's physical presence in a given place.

You can even buy a measured number of skilled muscular motions per hour or day.

But you cannot buy enthusiasm; you cannot buy initiative; you cannot buy loyalty; you cannot buy the devotion of hearts, minds, and souls.

You have to earn those things.

Now we cannot safely assume that we know the employees' attitude unless we inquire. There are today means by which attitudes can be measured. I have seen such measurements taken under conditions which permitted employees to confide freely to a third party their real feelings about their jobs, their immediate superiors, and their company. I have seen some very cocky supervisors—and managers at high levels, for that matter—get some severe shocks when the returns came in. And many of these studies, believe me, covered people who were mighty well paid.

I realize that there was a time when any employer who so much as advocated an interest in employee attitudes would have been cried down as a softy, a Santa Claus, a namby-pamby, a Pollyanna, a wet nurse, or what you will. Today no one of us should fear to stand up on his hind legs and proclaim that improved employee attitudes can be vindicated on a business basis in terms of cold, hard dollars and cents.

The real irony is that of the employer who rushes out of his office past scores or hundreds or thousands of people whom he doesn't understand and who don't understand him and goes home for the week end to spend hour after hour trying to earn the confidence of a dog in order to teach him to hunt or to earn the confidence of a horse in order to teach him to jump.

When will we learn the wisdom of Pope's admonition that "the proper study of mankind is man"? I think we are learning. Turning from irony to hope, it seems to me that the brightest star on the industrial horizon is the rise of education and practice in human relations. This is a matter both of philosophy and techniques applied at the places where people work. Through the years, slowly, haltingly, and after many failures, we are evolving a code. Experience is giving us a body of techniques and, better still, a set of tested principles. Call it human engineering, industrial relations, personnel management, or what you will, it is a code and it is growing. Thomas G. Spates, one of my immediate associates, prefers to call it personnel administration, and in the hands of a man like Tom Spates it becomes something vastly broader than any set of rules for conducting contract negotiations or keeping personnel records.

In today's complex industrial structure, the development of better understanding between management and labor can't be left to chance. When you want to get to know a man better you don't begin by writing letters to his lawyer. You try to find some way of demonstrating your good will and communicating it to the man himself.

This is just as true of dealings between management and employees as it is of dealings between individuals outside working hours. Techniques and organization are needed—in small companies as well as big ones. And I am prepared to stand before you and say that, when the techniques, organization, and principles of good human relations are carefully applied, the end result is bound to be a greater measure of industrial peace.

Do I speak from experience? Partly—but I wouldn't want you to get the impression that any company, including General Foods, has attained the ultimate in good personnel administration. But this I will say confidently: A number of companies in a number of industries—including many that are represented in this room today—have carried the code of human relations forward with conspicuous success. Some of them, indeed, have been islands of harmony in a sea of unrest. So I think today we may say, on the basis of evidence, that good personnel administration is practical and desirable because it has worked. And on the reverse side of the medal we are brought face to face with the conclusion that the company which suffers repeated and prolonged labor troubles has no one to blame but itself.

As recently as 10 years ago, it might not have been possible to point out the pattern of a personnel administration program leading to industrial peace. Today I believe we have learned enough about the principles to enumerate them roughly step by step.

Step one, to me, is top management self-analysis. If management attitudes determine employee attitudes, we must begin by determining our own. Why are we in business anyway? Are we simply in it to make money or do we acknowledge a stewardship toward employees, stockholders, and consumers? Do we believe that what is good for America is good for business—or vice versa? Have we a management policy, a code of our own? Do we believe in our own validity and can we ask others to believe in it?

Do we, above all, believe in the freedom and dignity of the individual in a free American economy? Do we believe in the Bill of Rights? This is not flag waving. This is a concrete question of motivation.

As a nation we have fought wars—and today we are making unprecedented moves in foreign affairs—because of our belief in freedom. These things have direct, fundamental bearing on our own destinies, as individuals and as businessmen.

Do we then believe that political and economic freedom are inseparable, and that they are equally the rights of employers and employees? There is no literal warrant for this interpretation in the Constitution, but I happen to be one of those who believes that you cannot put freedoms in separate compartments or maintain one kind of basic freedom without the other.

Next, what experience do we want the people who work with us to have? Do we value cooperative attitudes? Do we want our employees to get a sense of dignity, achievement, satisfaction, and security through working harmoniously with others in a well-organized, rational, productive industrial structure and at fair wages?

Above all, are we willing to work to create these conditions?

And finally, are we willing to say that we will?

Even today relatively few managements have put their personnel policies on record for all to see. I do not happen to believe in panaceas in industrial relations. Far too often we have been beguiled by the belief that some one thing—profit sharing, the guaranteed annual wage, incentives—would prove a cure-all. Industrial peace is a lot of things. But of them all, I believe the most neglected and the most promising is the fairly simple matter of a written personnel policy. If you write it down you have got to live up to it or die trying. If you set a high standard, you will fall far short of perfection. But your performance, simply because you have pledged yourself to the standard, will be better than it would be if you lacked a specific goal.

Now there may be those who will say: "Well, this is all well and good for companies that are just starting to experiment with relatively peaceful backgrounds. But what about the company that is already pinned down by conflicts and restrictions involving not only itself but perhaps a whole industry?"

I think we've got to be realistic and recognize that such situations exist. But my answer—based on the examples of a number of companies—would be this: there is no situation so bad that it can't be helped materially by the application of human-relations principles just as there is no patient so ill that he can't be helped by health measures. And step 2, to repeat, is a formulated policy.

In 1936 our company set out to prepare a statement of personnel policy. There were few companies on whose experience we could draw. It was the work of months to evolve a document to which the various levels of management and supervision could subscribe. Finally we nailed to the masthead a simple set of principles and policies relating to organization, administration, consultative supervision, employment, hours of work, wages, working conditions, and benefits. I can't quote it in full here but to me the real substance of it has always lain in this conclusion:

"The officers of General Foods want to make clear that, in addition to other responsibilities, each operating executive, manager, and supervisor who directs the work of others will be held responsible for the wholehearted and effective execution of the principles of personnel administration and employee relations set forth here. We want, and need, the cooperation, interest, and loyalty of all employees. We want employees to be happy in their work relationships and well informed regarding the enterprise in which we all are engaged. We want this business to be conducted in an efficient manner and in a spirit of friendliness to the mutual advantage of employees, management, stockholders, and consumers."

Back of that is a memorable statement of management philosophy made by Colby M. Chester when he was chairman of our board:

"An employee is a human being and as such is entitled to the respect and consideration which one honorable person automatically extends to an equally honorable person."

Mr. Chester didn't reduce that to writing until 1944, but he has lived it through a life of sterling business leadership, making it a part of the character and moral code of the business.

Now, assuming that the first two steps—management self-analysis and the preparation of a written policy—have been taken, the third follows naturally. Management has subscribed to a set of principles. All levels of management must now proceed to make those principles effective. This means that both the personnel administration and public-relations functions—which add up to human relations—must be represented in the highest echelons of management to provide the techniques and assist in the formation of policies by which the principles are made effective. Incidentally, it is significant, I think, that, in a recent organizational change at General Foods, both the personnel administration and public-relations departments report directly to the chairman.

After step three has been taken the process branches out into new discoveries, new activities, new methods of securing the utmost in the effective utilization of the entire personnel. Among the visible effects are not only a greater freedom from friction but a positive improvement in organizational effectiveness, in lowered turn-over, better morale, greater productivity, and reduction in unit costs. We have seen real results. But we still have far to go. I can't go deeply into techniques here, but I just wish I had time to tell you of some of the things we have learned about evaluating, training, and organizing management itself to do a better job. This is just one phase of a broad, overall program—and we have barely scratched the surface. We have had our problems, and I rather think we've been lucky at times. But we have been at it long enough to convince ourselves that sound personnel administration does pay.

But let us face the even bigger issue: Just as health is necessary to physical survival, so today I believe that good human relations at the places where people work are necessary to the survival of private enterprise.

"No human institution," says Howard Chase, another of my immediate associates, "whether it be a State, a church, a lodge, a labor union, or a corporation, can survive for very long the sustained mass disapproval of man." And he adds: "The American people have never demanded perfection; they have mistrusted anyone who promises it. But they do demand from their industrial and political leaders the will to progress toward the great and simple goals."

Beyond doubt we live in a questioning age. All over the world people are looking dubiously at established institutions—hopefully at new ones.

On the negative side we know that we simply cannot afford the consequences of industrial conflict. We cannot allow the terrible danger of class consciousness to weaken our internal structure. We cannot permit the collapse of the world economy. We dare not let hunger and poverty lead millions into communism.

All true. But, on the positive side, let us consider not what we have to lose but what we have to gain. Why should our policies be dominated by a negative dread of communism instead of a positive confidence in America? As Gardner Cowles said in a recent significant speech: "No one flees toward Russia." Communism is a dream. It has never worked and it never, in my opinion, will work. America is the symbol of an active reality which has already accomplished more for human betterment than any system on earth.

There's the real challenge.

All the raw materials of a great future are at hand for the American people and for the world. People want leadership. People need hope. They want to hear from us about plans and progress. They want to help us build a better future. They want to be on the team—not just with it. And if we have confidence in our system, in ourselves, and in those who work with us—and if we give the facts—we cannot fail.

Marshall Foch once said: "The most powerful weapon on earth is the human soul on fire." Can't we unleash the constructive impulses of people in a war on poverty and misery in a drive toward peace and plenty?

The process, to repeat, begins here at home in the places where people work. It calls for (1) management self-analysis; (2) written personnel policies; (3) functional representation of those policies at the highest levels of management; (4) constant striving for ever higher standards of personnel administration with emphasis on management personnel; (5) analysis of employee attitudes and elimination of genuine causes of dissatisfaction.

And of these the greatest is management self-analysis. Are we building? Are we striving to inprove the system we represent? Are we vindicating ourselves as leaders of people? Do we believe in the creation of human satisfactions as well as in the creation of things? Will we discharge the responsibilities as well as the prerogatives of leadership? Will we act in time?

On the answers to these questions, I believe, will depend the future not only of free labor and free management in America but of freedom itself in the world.

Labor and the St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 14), 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Labor and the St. Lawrence Waterway, delivered by Mr. Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, before the New England Projects Conference at Boston, Mass., January 12, 1948:

LABOR AND THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

When the St. Lawrence seaway proposal came before the American Federation of Labor for consideration in 1940 it met with emphatic disapproval. A special committee had then been appointed, of which I was chairman, together with its secretary-treasurer, Mr. George Meany, and vice president, Mr. George Harrison, to inquire into the report on this subject to the executive council of the American Federation of Labor. Our committee unanimously reported opposition to the construction and maintenance of the St. Lawrence deep waterway and power project.

This report received the unanimous approval of the executive council and of the American Federation of Labor. Its findings and decisions have not been altered, changed or modified since. To the contrary, time and subsequent developments have not only vindicated and confirmed conclusions set forth at that time, but have strengthened

the soundness of the findings and decisions noted.

Today, in view of changing world affairs and relations affecting our national well-being and security, it is more important and urgent than ever that we refrain from venturing into an enterprise that can in no way profit our people but which does contain elements of grave danger to large sections of our working population, and undoubtedly will cause untold losses and hardships to business due to dislocations of some of our enterprises.

At the outset it is not to be assumed that labor claims for itself the right, nor does it seek to prevent public benefits merely because of an immediate and passing injury to the interests of labor. If the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project carried a great public benefit with only a slight impairment of the interests of a small segment of American labor, labor would hardly be justified in manifesting opposition. Labor, on the other hand, is an important, indeed, an essential part, of the American population. Its interests constitute a significant part of the general public interest.

If, therefore, it is doubtful whether the development of transportation and power by the St. Lawrence project would or would not benefit the country generally and at the same time it is clearly evident to inflict a clear and definite damage to certain localities, certain business enterprises, and to large and important segments of American labor, then the enterprise should not go forward.

It is only speculative oratory that presents a doubtful general public benefit. Contrarywise, there is evidence in abundance to prove injury will be inflicted on specific localities, specific industries, and specific segments of labor if this enterprise is to come to pass. That is exactly the case with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Let us assume, for purpose of argument, that the 7-month canal proposed could, and would, take care of the transportation needs of the country as well—that is to say as cheaply—as the 12-month railroads, bus, and trucking industry and that transmitted water power would be as cheap through the area as local power from steam and/or oil plants. Where does that leave us?

A recent publication of the Department of Commerce evidences that the proposed canal would not only undermine but actually render useless the Port of Buffalo, its mills and grain elevators, and build up Montreal as a shipping point. It also makes clear that the small lake carriers would go into the scrap heap and that ocean shippers from the Canadian Port of Montreal—probably European bottoms—would carry grain from Montreal to Liverpool, bypassing the Port of New York as well as of Buffalo.

This report throughout shows, not only for the grain shipments but for Brazilian and Cuban ores, that Montreal would be built up as a transshipping point, that oil tankers from abroad would change bulk at Montreal or supply pipe lines at that point.

Montreal would be built up as a coal handling center and jobs would be created for the port-labor of Montreal at the expense of the port-labor of New York, Buffalo and other American ports.

To accomplish this destruction of our industries, trades and callings, and do an irreparable injury to some of our cities and populations, it is proposed that an enormous amount of funds be supplied by the American taxpayers. In addition, the bulk of work entailed is to be performed in Canada, employing Canadian labor and using Canadian materials in the construction itself. Every consideration—approached from an American point of view—leads to the conclusion of inadvisability of entering into an enterprise of this character.

This proposal is not only inequitable and unfair in that it enriches Canadian interests at the expense of our home industries; it likewise unjustly discriminates against home interests having so largely contributed to our national growth and well-being. Moreover, it seriously affects the employment opportunities of a large segment of our American working population in favor of an extremely doubtful and temporary advantage to a few commercial enterprises and foreign interests.

It is of utmost importance to note that the St. Lawrence development is a high capital, low operating cost development while our railroads, our trucking and automobile industry and as well our steam and oil power plants are low capital developments with somewhat higher operating costs. What that means for labor is that the St. Lawrence project would give much employment during the 5 or 6 years of the construction period and that when completed, the party would be pretty well over as far as labor is concerned.

Our railroad plant and rolling stock, our trucking and automobile facilities, and our oil and steam-power plants, on the other hands, are continuously expanding to meet the market needs which provide a constantly increasing high and continuous employment without time limit to the labor that maintains and operates these enterprises and systems.

The coal miners, the railroad crews, the truck and bus workers, the operators, distributors, and maintenance workers of our oil and steam powerhouses—all these constitute a very large segment of our population. They represent just about the highest type of stable and of steady labor in the world.

Assuming the total cost, throughout the life of the St. Lawrence project, would be precisely the same for construction and operation as the total cost in the same period for construction and operation of railroads, bus, and trucking, erection and operation of steam and oil powerhouses and the labor employed, nevertheless, the timing element would be entirely different. With the St. Lawrence, it would be feast followed by famine.

The huge expenditure on the St. Lawrence project—if undertaken will be made largely by employing first one trade, and after completion of their work followed by another and still another, etc., successively turning each group of workers loose to shift for themselves. These men would be attracted from their homes. When finished in their work, they would largely become floaters and add to a growing itinerant class. Their families, if any, would either have to pull up roots or be separated from the head of the family. This is not the habit nor the wish or desire of American workmen.

Moreover, the steadily increasing round-the-year employment of workers of the railroads, bus, and trucking industries, the local steam and oil powerhouses means a much more real income for the American workers than the broken time which would go with field labor under interruptions common to construction problems due to the difficulties of coordination, work in the open, and particularly so under the rigors of northern winters.

It is self-evident that both the seaway and power developments involve gravely the future interests of the coal industry and its workers in both the United States and Canada. Their interests are menaced not alone by a possible and highly probable replacement of white power development, but also by a possible and highly probable rivalry at some future date when Russian coal mined by workers whose standards of living is far inferior to that of the workers of Canada and the United States will enter into competition with the coal industry of both the Dominion and the United States. Coal may easily be transported as ballast in foreign ships to Canadian ports and to the Great Lakes section on the American side, and thus add to the element of possible and ruinous competition from abroad.

It is quite true that in a progressive society there is ever-present a constant shifting of the character of employment and of property investments, including the rise and fall of communities and of peoples. However, one would hardly advocate substituting artificially, politically or by ill-founded legislation, one character of property investment and character of employment of a large section of the Nation's population and of industries for an extremely doubtful and at best highly limited field of investment and uncertain and unstable form of employment, and for the sole benefit of a comparatively small section of our national population.

It is not the miners, railroad employees, trucking, and automobile workers and those dependent upon these industries and enterprises for their livelihood who will be adversely affected by the St. Lawrence project. The La Follette Seamen's Act, passed for the express purpose of insurig fair wages and decent American standard of living for our seamen in the merchant marine is threatened by this proposal.

If this project is carried through, ships flying foreign flags will be free to engage in commerce between all the Great Lakes cities and the ports of Cuba, Mexico, and South America. What chance will American vessels have, paying high American wages, maintaining high standards of living, in competition with ships flying the French, Chinese, British, and Italian flags. The waterfronts of Buffalo and of other large American lake cities would ultimately become blighted because of this unfair competition.

Advocates of the St. Lawrence River power project would have us believe the competitive situation of our New England textile mills would be greatly improved by the purchase of electric power from the St. Lawrence River to the textile mills and other New England enterprises. As a matter of fact, the planners of the St. Lawrence project intend giving to general industry little if any share in the economies which they say it will bring about.

To that end, they have invented quite an ingenious soothing sirup for industrial power users in that they allege that an enlarged volume of residential and rural electric loads to be attracted by the St. Lawrence development will somehow produce savings in distribution costs which it is said can ultimately be shared with industrial customers. This is more than a snare and delusion. It might fittingly be described as a misrepresentation.

It is to be noted that the output of the St. Lawrence power from New York State to other States is of a doubtful character because of New York law and because of the inescapable cost of transmission. These requirements and provisions and limitations that are to govern make the service to be rendered in other States of a most uncertain and doubtful character—both as to the volume and as to cost.

With regard again to the textile industry, it is well known, of course, that power costs are already a small percentage of total costs. A further reduction of electric costs will and can not, therefore, provide any substantial help in competing with southern mills. The remedy in this regard is of a more complex and more difficult nature.

There is embraced in the whole of this proposed development and resultant trends by far the greater danger of giving impetus and an incentive to the furtherance of nationalization of railroads by reason of grave additional burdens imposed, excessive difficulties to be faced, and dangers to be encountered by our railroads in taking care of peak loads in time of inoperation of the St. Lawrence seaway and in the great loss of trade, patronage, and income to be suffered at a time of operation of the seaway. Add to this the potential danger in the power proposal which may lead straightway to nationalization of the electric-power companies, if we take past performances of the Tennessee Valley as a yardstick, and one can immediately foresee and at a glance note the ultimate dangers to which we are heading.

Reference to a supplemental agreement signed last year by the Corps of Engineers and the Power Authority of the State of New York evidences that the State of New York is authorized to sell power in other States, but only to municipalities and to cooperatives in those other States. In other words, the free-enterprise systems in Vermont and New Jersey or other communities could not buy St. Lawrence power direct from the Power Authority of the State of New York. A little TVA, as a go-between, would have to be set up. The whole of the arrangement seems well designed to undermine the structure upon which our American economy has thus far been founded.

Then again, omission from the resolution, in any authoritative form, of a plan for the disposal of the proposed electric-power output is in line with absence of guiding principles for determining toll rates and disbursing toll revenues.

The supporters of the St. Lawrence project present a glowing but quaint, if not highly modernistic, picture of its contribution to the future building up of industry in the State of New York. That is absolute nonsense. From 8 to 10 times as much construction work and investments to pay for it have to go into the typical factory as into the power plant to supply its energy requirements. For high-grade industry the cost of the energy may run 2, 3, or 4 percent of the cost of running the manufacturing plant.

If the power could be had free, gratis, for nothing, it wouldn't be as great a help to building up industry and giving employment as could be had from a reassurance of the stability of our free American economy and the absence of unwarrantable governmental interference or of governmental competition. The canal and its power development would on both of these accounts injure the industry of the community.

The argument that the project is vital to national defense, on which proponents relied heavily, was completely demolished before the Senate subcommittee last year by the then Under Secretary of War, Kenneth Royall. He flatly said it is not vital to national defense. While affirming its helpfulness in that direction, he added: "The committee will note that the views I express are somewhat less positive than those previously expressed by the War Department. It would mean an added defense commitment which would require more men and equipment and money than would be necessary if the seaway were not constructed."

Those conversant with military affairs have clearly and definitely emphasized that that part of the country most vulnerable to enemy attack by rocket and bomber is the St. Lawrence section. One well-placed bomb, from rocket or plane, would wreck the project. Vice Admiral Wilson (former Navy Chief of Staff) and Major General Bradley (retired) testified before the Senate subcommittee that the defense value of the project had progressively declined in the last 15 years, and that on the score of national defense it could not be justified.

Were additional evidence necessary to support that testimony, it is to be found in the report made to Congress on December 1 by Brig. Gen. Joseph C. Mehaffey, Panama Canal Zone Governor. That report, concurred in by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, disposes of the national-defense argument.

Finally, what is the answer the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project give to all of these questions? Perhaps no better authority might be cited than statements and explanations made by one of its chief advocates; I refer to Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of the neighboring State of Vermont.

Ruth Montgomery of the Daily News asked the Senator about his plan to develop the St. Lawrence Valley industrially by bringing several million English citizens over there and colonizing them along the St. Lawrence. The Senator said, "Well, I didn't know that I had said anything about that to anybody," and then he went on to say that the stretch in the Province of Quebec, "could become the greatest industrial region of the whole world."

He was asked whether he would change our immigration laws to permit more people to come to the United States. That was a question of high political import which he dropped quickly by saying, "Well, they would come in on the Canadian side. The British would settle in Canada. They could do that. Canada could absorb 15 or 20 million of them."

Now that is all very well. But the Senator must have had in mind something more serious than the limited amount of power that the St. Lawrence would develop for New England if he was going to take care of 20 million Britishers.

However, what interests labor most is that he hopes to spend United States money in Canada to help make that part of Canada the greatest industrial region of the whole world and quite regardless of its demoralizing influence upon our home industries and those dependent upon them. The arch advocate of the St. Lawrence development has so far forgotten his New England that he would set up an industrial region in Canada to compete with the fine industries of New England and of the rest of the United States in the world markets, possibly even including the United States.

While interested and concerned in having the necessities of British labor taken care of in a very real way, one can hardly picture using United States money to hire Canadian labor to build up the greatest industrial region of the whole world in order to make ghost factories out of our high-grade American enterprises at the same time killing off American railroads, injuring our own bus and trucking industries, undermining our coal mines, depopulating our American ports, destroying some of our American cities, and inflicting an irreparable damage to the wage earners of America.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 14), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an editorial which appeared on Monday, January 5, 1948, in the Detroit News, on the important subject of the St. Lawrence seaway. As my colleagues know, this subject is scheduled for consideration before the end of this month. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT IS TIME TO STOP FIDDLING

Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, urging early action on the St. Lawrence seaway, said Congress has "fiddled around with this measure for 14 years."

It has been far more than 14 years, and "fiddling" inadequately describes the shrewd obstructionism of interests opposing the project. However, we follow the Senator without difficulty and understand the feelings that inspired his outburst.

Here is a project advocated by every President since Taft as promising vast benefits to the Nation, and particularly, of course, to this Great Lakes region.

Here is a project whose promise again and again has been proved by actual events.

In both World Wars, for example, it would have saved untold millions and, by official estimate, speeded victory.

It would have enabled direct ocean shipments from war industry centers to war theaters and added Great Lakes shipyards to the twice narrowly won effort to outbuild the U-boat threat.

At the present moment, its contribution of 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectric energy would be answer to the approaching menace of a national power shortage. It would ease, as WILEY says, the strain on our overseas shipping capacity and solve out of hand the Midwest shortages of fuel, gasoline, and building materials.

Here is a project more than comparable to the Panama Canal as a national asset, a project that, built in the beginning, would have paid for itself over and over.

And here is a project that, after 30 years, remains unbuilt—because its great promise has been seen as a great threat by vested interests opposed to progress and change.

The power, transportation and commercial interests that have opposed the seaway have not "fiddled".

They have fought with every tool, including a lavish use of money, known to the propagandist's trade.

They have succeeded in convincing millions that a project urged by seven Presidents is only a dream—even while they fought it for an obviously contrary reason.

There truly has been "fiddling" aplenty in the seaway's long history, though all on the part of its advocates.

Congressmen from the Great Lakes States have fiddled, while the project's enemies have been busy. The Congressmen have fiddled because people back home, succumbing to a kind of battle fatigue, also have fiddled. They have been silent when they should have been shouting their own demands for action.

The future of this whole area and its citizens depends on the seaway—most literally, now that Great Lakes iron ores are nearing exhaustion.

The future of the Nation may depend on it, for in a new war the seaway readily could represent the margin between defeat and victory.

It is time to stop fiddling and start demanding. It is time Detroiters in particular begin demanding of Michigan Congressmen that they win this fight.

Censorship Through Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 14), 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a brilliant and courageous article, Censorship Through Fear, by William Wyler, which appears

in the December issue of the Screen Writer. Mr. Wyler, as we all know, is one of the outstanding directors in the motion-picture industry, and is the director who has won the last two academy awards.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENSORSHIP THROUGH FEAR

(By William Wyler)

The demand for Federal censorship and house cleaning of the film industry is predicated on the assumption that Hollywood is dominated by Communists. The Hearst press claims: "So, of course, there has been a continuous and persistent production of communistic films."

Of course, this is one of the grossest misstatements of fact ever perpetrated by newspapers of large circulation.

It would not have been possible to make this statement had it not been for the groundwork of the Motion Picture Alliance and the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Those groups have been making this unsubstantiated claim for so many months that by now the mere repetition in print of the words "communistic films" causes people to believe there are such films.

Responsible opinion in the industry and in such sections of the press as the New York Times and Herald Tribune knows that such a claim is the sheerest nonsense. If there were any pictures which even attempted to undermine the American way of life, it would be impossible to keep them a secret.

So, of course, there is absolutely no need for Federal censorship.

The demand for it, as well as Mr. Thomas' demand that the industry clean house, is designed to keep all liberal and progressive persons off the Hollywood pay rolls, and to make sure that the films produced conform to Mr. Thomas' and Mr. Hearst's peculiar and arbitrary standards of entertainment and Americanism.

I use the word "peculiar" advisedly. To me, persons who attempt to destroy the basic safeguards of American freedom guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution, in the name of preserving that freedom, have a peculiar view of Americanism, to say the least.

But of more direct concern to me than the future danger of censorship is the present danger of self-censorship through fear.

An incipient form of blacklist already exists. Some producers would just as soon "play it safe" and not hire certain writers with a known progressive background. "Why look for trouble? Why hire someone who might be subpenaed by the Thomas committee?"

Also, some producers are starting to eliminate "doubtful" stories, scenes, and lines. By "doubtful" they mean controversial. So prevalent has the fear become that these producers are beginning to doubt their own patriotism, or their ability to determine what is patriotic.

My answer is that by playing safe, these short-sighted producers are accepting the standards of the Thomas committee and are merely inviting further trouble. The men in and out of public office who have attacked our industry would like nothing better than to have the Producers' Association adopt a hush-hush policy.

Unless these two trends are sharply reversed, this self-censorship will destroy our free screen, result in financially unsuccessful pictures, which in turn will affect the livelihood of every man and woman who works in the studios.

As far as I know, there has never been any way to preserve liberty and individual rights except by openly attacking any attempt to curtail them.

Our Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 14), 1948

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Congress," published in the New York Daily Mirror for January 12, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CONGRESS

O for the good old days when Congress delivered grandiloquent addresses on the tariff and similar simple matters.

Nowadays each Senator and Congressman must be an expert on the state of some 50 countries.

He must know the policies and purposes of ibn-Saud and Tito, of Pauker and Hoxha, of Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Tze-tung. He must know the geography of Pakistan and Turkestan, of Iran and Iraq, of France and Greece.

He must be a walking State Department and he needs to be able to discover when an employee of the Government of the United States is practicing diplomacy on him—diplomacy being the gentle art of lying about trivialities and fabricating about major issues.

He must be a super FBI to discover the wiles of the hired hands who pad the pay rolls and other Government expenses.

He must know that the teeth of the children of Georgia require dentistry and that foot-and-mouth disease threatens our food supply. He must know the value of a super air fortress over a submarine.

And so the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives no longer come to Washington for a few weeks of each year. They have an all-year-round job.

Those who take their committee appointments seriously never finish their work. It goes on and on.

And when smart-alecks talk about congressional junkets to Europe or Asia or South America, they give the impression that these representatives of the American people vote themselves fancy vacations.

It is precisely the opposite.

This year more than 100 Members of Congress traveled in Europe and out of it came, for one thing, the work of the Herter committee—the most solid study of the so-called Marshall plan.

It is no longer possible for the little fellows in the State Department to bluff the Congress by hiding reports and not knowing how to answer questions. Plenty of Members of Congress are better informed than plenty of so-called experts.

An excellent example of that was on the Town Meeting of the Air a few days ago. William C. Bullitt and Congressman Walter H. Judd were debating Owen Lattimore and Richard Lauterbach on the subject of China.

Lattimore is one of the smart experts close to the White House in Roosevelt's day; now director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University.

What Congressman JUDD did to Lattimore in this debate should not happen even to one who is not an expert.

JUDD knew. Lattimore opinionated.

JUDD hurled facts at Lattimore which he and Lauterbach dodged. And when Bullitt hit an intellectual solar plexus, you could hear it all the way between New York and Nanking.

The American people are to be congratulated on their Congress. No harder-working men exist anywhere. And they are truly representative of the varieties of Americans.

Maybe some New Yorkers do not like some Congressmen who come from the South and West—and it is certain that lots of folks in the South and West dislike some New York Congressmen. But that is the kind of people we are, and the Congress mirrors the nature and character of our people.

Maybe the good old times were easier or even better—but for what we face today, it is sound to put your trust in Congress.

Disabled American Veterans' Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I obtained consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by Mr. John L. Golob, national commander, Disabled American Veterans, before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on Monday, January 19, 1948. The very sincere and comprehensive statement follows:

As national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, I want to express the appreciation of our organization for the opportunity to present that part of our major legislative program which will be considered by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Today we are observing a traditional annual custom wherein the commanders of veterans' organizations appear before you in turn to submit the highlights of their legislative programs, and as we understand it, there will be hearings on some of these measures at later dates.

There is no real necessity for me to outline the purposes of the Disabled American Veterans to members of this committee, but, for the record, I might say we are a congressionally chartered organization which has been in existence since 1920. Our membership is confined to the war wounded and disabled veterans. Our aims and efforts are directed to assisting them, their dependents, and families of deceased veterans. We have some 400 full-time paid national service officers throughout the Nation to assist all disabled veterans and members of their families.

During the first session of the Eightieth Congress this committee favorably reported a number of legislative proposals. If we are to have completed congressional action on these, and such other bills as may be reported by your committee before adjournment, it will be necessary for the House to consider them at an early date. The Senate must yet act upon some of them. We are appreciative of the fact that during the first session of this Congress your committee favorably reported a number of our legislative proposals and it is earnestly requested that you take the steps necessary to see that they are brought to the floor of the House.

Included in these measures which have been favorably reported and which the DAV has adopted resolutions to support are:

H. R. 3016, authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish stenographic assistance for the use of paid, full-time representatives of organizations recognized by

act of Congress, and who have been assigned office space in the Veterans' Administration.

H. R. 3748, to increase service-connected desth rates of compensation for widows, children and dependent parents of Spanish-American War, World War I and II veterans.

H. R. 3889, to establish by statute a presumption of service connection for certain enumerated chronic and tropical diseases which are shown to exist within 1 year from discharge from active service, or within the incubation period of such tropical diseases.

H. R. 4242, to increase annual income limitations governing the granting of pensions to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans.

H. R. 4243, to provide for a disability rating of 100 percent for arrested tuberculosis for the first 2 years of arrest, then 50 percent for 5 years, with a minimum thereafter of 40 percent for those diagnosed as moderately advanced or less.

In addition to the foregoing favorably reported bills, there is another measure still pending before your committee which we consider of prime importance. It is H. R. 2716, introduced by Mrs. ROGERS, which provides for the payment of an allowance to the dependents of service-connected disabled veterans. Letters reaching our Cincinnati and Washington offices reveal many deplorable conditions existing among the families of disabled veterans, particularly where such families are attempting to exist on disability compensation checks. We have made a Nation-wide survey on this subject, and at the time of hearings on the dependency-allowance bill, we shall submit detailed information pertaining to individual case histories to show the extreme hardships many of these families are undergoing. During wartime Congress considered the plight of soldiers' dependents and made provisions for payments to his wife, children, or other dependents in excess of his base pay. We are now asking that the veteran receive similar consideration.

I would like to cite at this time one typical example to show the pressing need for this legislation. Just the week before Christmas our Washington office received a telephone call from Walter Reed Hospital. A master sergeant, married, with two children, was being hospitalized there. With his allotments and combat infantry pay he received $269 per month. He had been in the Japanese death march and suffered from recurrent draining osteomyelitis. It was the hospital authorities' opinion that this veteran should be discharged to a Veterans' Administration hospital where he could receive the same medical treatment as he is receiving at Walter Reed General Hospital. These veterans are being discharged because appropriations have been cut and all patients with chronic disease or injuries that are in need of further hospitalization are going to be discharged shortly after the first of the year. In this case the master sergeant on being discharged from the Army would receive $138, or $131 less per month, and because of the nature of his disability would be unable to work. This is but one example of thousands of such cases. The DAV pleads with you to consider H. R. 2716 at an early date and to report it favorably to the House.

The members of this committee are fully aware of the tremendous increase in the cost-of-living index in recent months, until now it is estimated that a family of four must have an income of about $3,400 per year to live. This is more than double the compensation received by a totally and permanently disabled veteran.

There are many other bills pending before your committee which have our endorsement but as to which no hearings have been held. One of these is H. R. 1279, authorizing the insertion in the rating schedules of the Veterans' Administration a minimum rating of permanent partial 10 percent for wounds incurred in line of duty during World War I or II. We recommend the early passage of legislation to increase the subsistence allowances for men training under Public Law 16. We also urge the immediate construction of the many veteran hospitals now in the blueprint stage. This is an urgent need of the disabled veteran.

Legislation should be enacted to rate a veteran on entering a Veterans' Administration hospital as 100 percent disabled for the duration of his hospitalization.

Another major objective of the DAV is to assist disabled veterans to find suitable employment. The end result of the aid and assistance needed for hospitalization, rehabilitation, and vocational training is the ultimate absorption of the disabled veteran into suitable employment. To accomplish this transition every possible assistance must be given him and the DAV has adopted a national employment plan, coordinated on the National, State, and local levels to bring about the disabled veterans placement in suitable, gainful employment.

Large numbers of disabled veterans will require service and assistance of various kinds over a period of years.

The peak service load of compensation for disabled veterans of World War I was not reached until November 1941. It is estimated that the service volume for World War II disabled veterans will reach its maximum around 1968.

The Disabled American Veterans, chartered by Congress to cooperate with the Veterans' Administration, is particularly qualified and equipped to handle the problems of these men, from the time they leave the hospital until they have been placed in suitable jobs.

Indicative of the manner in which the DAV employment program is being received, I would like to read several short quotations from some of our outstanding, nationally known businessmen. Robert R. Wason, past president, National Association of Manufacturers, stated: "The DAV is not appealing for your sympathy nor to your patriotism, but is presenting a practical plan for making useful, independent citizens of our disabled veterans. It is to be commended for its excellent work." H. W. Anderson, vice president, General Motors Corp., has stated: "General Motors' experience has demonstrated that successfully placed handicapped workers cease to be handicapped from the standpoint of earnings and productivity." Henry Ford II has stated: "No man at the Ford Motor Co. is disabled * * * there are 6,286 men and women who are physically limited * * * all of them have handicaps similar to those we find in many returning veterans * * * every one of these employees does a full day's work * * * receives a full day's pay * * * their absenteeism and accident rate are considerably lower than those of other employees. No jobs were created for them. Instead they were fitted to the job."

Our last national convention adopted a well-considered program pertaining to employment of the service-connected disabled veteran. It is too lengthy to submit in detail, but some of the outstanding points of that program include:

1. Extend effective preferences for veterans, their wives, and widows for all governmental jobs for which qualified.

2. Condemn efforts to remove benefits already extended by Congress by Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 or other laws.

3. Amend the Veterans' Preference Act to grant 10-point preference to widowed unremarried mothers of any deceased person who died while actively serving in the United States armed forces, or of a veteran who died of a service-connected disability, or of any war veteran who is permanently or totally disabled.

4. Liberalize regulations of the United States Civil Service Commission relative to reductions in force, suspensions, transfers, dismissals, demotions, and reinstatements.

5. Liberalize civil-service retirement.

The DAV strongly advocates the enactment of legislation to authorize and direct the Veterans' Administration to make reimbursement to the several States, all State workmen's compensation benefits paid out under the provisions of any workmen's compensation act for compensated service-connected disabled veteran employees.

While not a subject for consideration by this committee, we look to this session of Congress to provide the necessary funds so that the Veterans' Administration may furnish efficient and adequate service to the veteran and his family.

Immediately prior to the convening of this session of Congress it became necessary for me as commander of the DAV to call to the attention of the members of the Appropriations Committees an existing deficit in the Veterans' Administration. This letter reads, in part, as follows:

"Following complaints reaching us from various sections of the country, we have conducted a survey which discloses the fact that out-patient service, including medical treatment and necessary physical examinations of America's wartime service-connected disabled, has been sharply reduced and restricted. This is due to a reported shortage of approximately $32,000,000 allocated to this phase of the medical program to complete the current fiscal year.

"We are convinced that you, too, believe that the required medical treatment of America's war disabled is as important as any action this Nation may take toward the care and rehabilitation of Europe's war refugees. With this thought in mind, we ask that you urge the convening Congress to act immediately to clear up an unfortunate condition, lest its continuance prove disastrous to thousands of our own war disabled."

This will be a subject which will be considered by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, but we know the deep interest that each member of this committee has in the proper functioning of the Veterans' Administration. We hope the expert knowledge possessed by you in this field will be passed along to members of these Appropriations Committees.

Another bill before your committee which has our endorsement is H. R. 486, to provide follow-up out-patient treatment for war veterans with non-service-connected disabilities following hospitalization for such disabilities.

The Disabled American Veterans, like most veterans' organizations, adopts a large number of resolutions at our annual national convention, but one of our most important mandates requests that "First things should be done first." This in Disabled American Veterans' language, means adequate provision for America's wartime service disabled veterans should be a primary obligation of our Nation.

We are hopeful our national defense will be maintained at the necessary level to deter future warlords against acts of aggression or transgression. We hope our national security will be strengthened through appropriate laws to protect our free American institutions against the subversive forces within our midst.

Housing for veterans should receive immediate attention by the Congress in order to alleviate the deplorable conditions in which the veterans, their families, and dependents are required to live. Our resolutions on housing, while general in nature, urge the Congress to adopt a realistic housing program which will make available adequate, low-cost, multiple rental units in sufficient quantity to satisfy the demands of the veteran. In addition the resolutions urge the Congress to protect the disabled veteran by providing proper preferences or priorities for him. In this connection, however, we are not in favor of loading additional administrative duties on the Veterans'

Administration which will result in a decrease in the service now being rendered the disabled veteran.

The Veterans' Administration was established primarily for the benefit of the service-connected disabled veteran, and any lessening of that service due to excessive administrative functions not directly attributable to such prime objective will be strenuously opposed by us.

I have outlined some of the major points of our legislative program. The past record of your committee indicates you are sympathetic to the cause of the veteran and his family. We believe you will continue your considerate attention. With this hope, I again express my appreciation to the chairman and members of the committee for this opportunity to meet you and to appear before you.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, 1947–48

I. Preserve America and its freedoms by (1) maintaining adequate specialized, modernized armed forces, backed up by an adequate reserve of trained young men, through universal military training; (2) such preparedness for war as will best preserve our peace; (3) cooperating with our allies to enforce the preservation of peace; (4) protecting our representative form of government against subversive forces and influences; and (5) so promoting our democratic institutions and methods as to accord equalized opportunities for all Americans.

II. Promote welfare of America's disabled defenders by (1) greater uniformity and simplification as to their various types of benefits; (2) providing living-cost allowances for their dependents; (3) increasing all compensation and pension payments proportionately to increases in the cost of living; (4) providing adequate hospitalization and medical treatment for all extending their disabilities; (5) of equalized opportunity for their suitable employment by (a) requiring the Veterans' Administration to make reimbursement of all benefits paid, under the operation of any State Workmen's Compensation Act, as to any service-disabled veteran employee, and (b) by greatly extending their opportunities for vocational training and permanent employment with Federal agencies.

III. Promote the welfare of the dependents of service-disabled veterans by providing living-cost pensions to the widows, children, and dependent parents, (1) of those who shall have died while serving actively in the armed forces of the United States or by reason of service-connected disabilities, and (2) of those who, during their lifetimes, were handicapped by compensable disabilities.

IV. Promote the welfare of America's war veterans by (1) extending social-security credits to them for all of their military service; (2) more effective preferences as to all governmental employment; (3) hospitalization and domiciliary care for all those in need thereof; (4) greater liberalization and uniformity as to all governmental insurance policies; and (5) living-cost pensions for those who become unemployable.

The World Problem We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and timely address by John Cowles, of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, entitled "The World Problem We Face." Mr. Cowles recently visited Europe.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After I had consented to talk to the Life Insurance Association of America on such a sweeping subject as The World Problem We Face, I began to realize what a presumptuous title that was.

I also began to realize that life insurance executives, by the very nature of their business, are accustomed to deal in concrete facts rather than loose generalities. Life insurance is based on actuarial tables, not rhetoric. Consequently, I am going to be as specific as I can in discussing the world problem as I see it.

I believe all of us would agree that our aim is to try to sustain and strengthen freedom in as much of the world as we reasonably can, in the interest of our own national security if nothing else.

We are preparing to spend billions of dollars in an unprecedented effort to bring about those conditions whereby we may have European and consequently world economic recovery, peace, and prosperity with individual freedom.

The problem is how to make our efforts effective, so that there will be at least a chance that we may be successful. I believe there are widespread misconceptions in the United States about some phases of the problem and I want to discuss those in some detail.

Of course we should give to France, Italy, and Austria at the earliest possible moment, food, fuel, and fertilizer as emergency stopgap aid. If we did not do this, there would be extreme suffering this winter. In addition, the slowing down of production and employment as a result of the lack of food and fuel might result in such social and political disintegration as to make probable a successful seizure of power by the Communist minority.

Congress should also appropriate immediately perhaps $50,000,000 additional for the United States Information Service, and our State Department personnel engaged in this activity should be completely overhauled and reorganized. The Voice of America should be enormously expanded. It is now little more than "the whisper of America." We should tell the people of Europe what we have given and are giving in food, fuel, and fertilizer. Wherever possible, our products should be marked with the American flag. Russia has claimed credit for much of the aid that we have sent, either directly or through UNRRA, to Europe. Few Europeans have any idea of the volume of aid America has furnished and is furnishing.

Byron Price, who is now the Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations, should be drafted to head our United States Information Service. Price did a superb job with the Office of Censorship during the war and has the confidence of Democrats and Republicans alike. If American newspaper editors were polled as to who in America was best fitted to head the United States Information Service, I believe Price would receive more votes than all others combined.

Since we are obviously engaged in fighting a cold war with Russia to win men's minds in Europe, there is little point in feeding their stomachs if they think that Russia is their benefactor.

Much of the press on continental Europe is now, as it always has been, venal and corrupt. Many editors or owners are now on the Russian pay roll.

We need a competent, hard-boiled organization in Europe, to get to the people with the facts about the United States and about Russia.

Our Government also should have ample funds to support and protect those political leaders and their families, now living inside the iron curtain, who would rejoice at a chance to escape to a place of refuge where they could tell the world of the Moscow terrorism, without endangering their lives.

An American like Gen. "Wild Bill" Donovan, who successfully organized and conducted OSS during the war, would be invaluable in the American set-up in Europe.

We should also be doing much more to get the people of western Europe the facts about conditions behind the iron curtain.

We should tell them, day after day, of the millions of slave workers in Russian concentration camps. We should tell them the fact that Russian workers are only a fraction as well off, in terms of what their wages will buy, as are the poorest people in America. We should tell them how the Russians have looted the countries that have gone Communist.

We should do everything possible to unify the American, British, and French zones of Germany and to get western Germany to producing again. Before the war, the Ruhr was second only to Britain as the source of coal for Europe. Recovery in western Europe is impossible until German coal and steel production is greatly increased.

Before we can make sound decisions to the long-range Marshall plan, we should disabuse our minds of various fallacies and misconceptions. Here are some of the things Americans need to understand:

Terrible as the war destruction in Europe was, the problems confronting Europe today stem less from the physical ravages of the war than from the ideological consequences of the war years.

The economic policies which almost all the European governments are following today are actually retarding recovery. These policies are based in part upon the sincere but mistaken views of the governments currently in power. They are based in part upon the fact that the governments are too weak politically to do anything other than continue on their present course, even though they may privately recognize its unwisdom. The Communists, moreover, in their determination to prevent western Europe's recovery, seize every opportunity to throw sand into the gears.

We should realize that it is naive to assume that we will necessarily stop the spread of communism permanently in western Europe simply by pouring in our dollars for a few years. Too many Americans suppose that bountiful financial aid will alone achieve that greatly to be desired result. Loans or gifts may help greatly, but most people are inclined to oversimplify the problem. We should rid our minds of the idea that there is anything even remotely scientific in the estimate of the Paris sixteen-nation conference that western Europe needs $25,440,000,000 to cover its prospective dollar deficiency and to provide currency stabilization in the next 4 years.

No one can have the slightest accurate information as to what the cost would be. It depends upon the future economic policies of the different governments, the weather and crops in the next 4 years, the world price level, what actions the Communists may take, and many other unknown factors.

We must not think that most Europeans understand our motives in connection with aid to western Europe—they do not. Many officials and businessmen in Europe regard the Marshall plan as a clever scheme whereby the United States, under the guise of altruism, can export unmanageable surpluses, and in that way, postpone a serious price recession and business slump in America. Europe has not the slightest understanding of the fact that the commodities which we are sending abroad are contributing to our serious price inflation here at home.

We should abandon the widely held idea that we ought not to attach conditions or stipulations to our aid. It is senseless even to consider large-scale aid unless we do attach conditions, and thus give ourselves a chance, at least, to accomplish our purpose. Aid from the United States will have only a temporary value, if that, unless the country aided changes the policies that are retarding or preventing its economic recovery.

I think it is a mistake to maintain the fiction that the funds that we advance under the Marshall plan are loans which presumably will be repaid. I don't believe that they will be repaid, and I believe that we will clarify our thinking if we will regard them as gifts.

In my judgment, there is little chance that the Marshall plan funds will produce economic recovery in western Europe unless we use the gift of those funds as incentives to persuade European nations to change those economic policies which are now impeding recovery.

The agreement made by the 16 countries at Paris should be an integral part of any arrangements we make with the separate nations.

In the Paris agreement each nation, at least in general terms, undertook to do certain things and to cooperate in certain ways for the recovery of western Europe. If a nation is not doing what it promised to do, and if it is not meeting its production targets, we should be in position to turn off the spigot and stop further aid.

Great tact and diplomacy, in addition to basic economic intelligence, will be required of the individual who has charge of our European aid program. Lewis Douglas, the American Ambassador in London, could probably perform this function better than any other individual.

Perhaps the single most important thing that western European nations could do to stimulate production and trade would be to devalue and make their currencies freely convertible into other currencies. Italy recently did this. Almost all of the other European currencies are now over-valued in relation to the dollar. They have fixed rates for conversion into the dollar and into each other that are completely unrealistic. International trade and production both would be enormously stimulated if the currencies were allowed to find their true levels.

Inflation is growing rapidly throughout Europe. We ought to insist that governments receiving American aid adopt policies that will stop or at least slow down the rate of further inflation. We ought to insist, within reason, that the European nations meet the production targets set up at the Paris conference.

By using our Marshall plan funds to persuade the European nations to abandon those price controls that are retarding production, we would also be helping to bring about real recovery. Artificially low fixed prices on wheat and an overvalued franc are perhaps the two basic things that are wrong today in France.

Of all the misconceptions held by Americans about the Marshall plan, none seems to me so preposterous as the assumption that it is "immoral" for us to impose conditions in connection with our huge financial gifts.

In addition to using our Marshall plan aid to persuade the beneficiary nations to remove those price controls that are retarding production and to end the overvaluation of their currencies, I believe that the sooner we end price controls and the sooner we devalue the currencies in western Germany and in Japan, the better.

Of course, we should also insist that civil liberties must be maintained in all the beneficiary nations as a condition of their receiving continued financial aid under the Marshall plan.

Congress should set up an independent agency, working under the general direction of the State Department, to procure all the commodities we intend to give Europe. By following a unified procurement program, we can minimize the inflationary effect as compared with permitting competitive bidding for American supplies by various foreign nations.

Congress ought to stipulate, moreover, that insofar as possible, we should spend the American dollars abroad, and not within the United States, to buy the commodities which we propose to give to Europe. If we can buy grain in Argentina, for example, instead of in the United States, it will reduce the serious inflationary situation that confronts us here at home.

The more one sees of Europe, the more one realizes that preserving a strong and sound United States is the single most important contribution we can make toward world recovery.

Some of the proponents of the Marshall plan seem to me hysterical in their attitude that we should pour $20,000,000,000 or $30,000,000,000 into Europe without imposing any real conditions and without any consideration of the effects upon the American domestic economy. I am interested in seeing the recovery program prove effective and, consequently, succeed. I don't believe it will succeed in bringing about economic recovery in western Europe unless we insist upon the European nations doing those things that are essential for bringing about recovery. I am sure, moreover, that there is a limit to the amount of aid that America can provide without serious risk of run-away inflation and a wrecked economy here at home.

There are strong reasons for believing that the amount of American aid which has been suggested is excessive. It is entirely possible that more good could be accomplished if the amount were substantially reduced from the totals suggested by Secretary of State Marshall and Secretary of Commerce Harriman.

Only a detailed analysis would disclose how much this reduction should be. It would be most unfortunate, however, for the public to assume that it is unpatriotic or an act of isolationism to suggest that the administration's proposals should be carefully scrutinized and probably reduced.

American aid can be extremely helpful in getting western Europe back on its feet if the aid is wisely given and if it is used as an incentive to encourage European nations to do those things which are essential for recovery.

Every American should understand, however, that simply pouring goods and dollars into western Europe, unless the program is administered with great wisdom and ability, will neither insure economic recovery nor stop permanently the spread of communism.

America will shortly make one of the most momentous decisions in its history. I hope we will give generous aid to Europe—extremely generous. But I also hope that we will be intelligent and realistic, as well as idealistic. Only by such an attitude is there much likelihood, I fear, that American funds will prove effective in bringing about real economic recovery in Europe. And unless our billions of dollars prove effective and do bring about genuine economic recovery, we can't have the peace and prosperity and individual freedom in the world for which America is striving.

Human Relations: The Key to Corporate Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, if our United States private economy is to prosper we must all remember that men and not machines will make it possible.

The following article entitled "Human Relations: The Key to Corporate Survival" by Howard Chase, director of public relations, General Foods Corp., is an excellent analysis of the effort to make average working men and women feel that they have a vital stake in our industrial economy:

HUMAN RELATIONS: THE KEY TO CORPORATE SURVIVAL

(By Howard Chase, director, department of public relations, General Foods Corp., New York)

A dozen approaches to this dramatic subject have convinced me that I have only three things to say:

1. In all the history of man the periods of freedom have been measured in years, but the periods of serfdom have been measured in centuries. If the values and traditions of a free people wither away, the free corporate structure cannot survive.

2. The sense of human frustration in the world today is the most dangerous enemy of freedom. Frustration does not bludgeon a man into slavery. Its attack is more insidious. As the vampire bat which sucks blood while its victim sleeps, human frustration undermines the will to be free and plants the seeds of blind rebellion.

Man, whose motivations and impulses are the grist for your mill, lives 24 hours each day. However convenient it may be to compartmentalize him into an 8-hour producer, a 4-hour consumer, and a 4-hour citizen, such a policy from the beginning of time has produced frustration.

My second point in essence, then, is a warning. Perhaps Alexander Pope best stated it: "The proper study of mankind is man."

The warning: Study the 24-hour man, study his consuming practices, to be sure, but also his hopes and aspirations, his family loyalties, his religion, his fellow-worker relationships.

With the analytical techniques at your disposal, you can be and should be advocates of seeing man whole. If you use your talents to that end, you become the enemy of human frustration, and thus your profession can become a great new supporting force for freedom.

3. My third point borders so closely on the obvious that I almost hesitate to share it with you. It is simply this: No human institution, whether it be a state, a church, a lodge, a labor union, or a corporation can survive for very long the sustained mass disapproval of man.

* * * * *

Now, how solid are the foundations of our system of freeman and free business? How solid is any human institution? There is a little story about a conversation between Mrs. Woodrow Wilson and Queen Mary which may be illuminating. Mrs. Wilson asked the Queen what she thought of freedom of the seas.

The Queen, who took British rule of the seas as a simple fact of life on this planet,

chillingly replied that she hadn't quite made up her mind about mixed bathing.

We know now that Britannia no longer rules the waves. A 300-year-old domination is ended; yet the British battleships, cruisers, carriers, destroyers, have never been so numerous nor looked so impressive—nor been so relatively impotent.

The American corporate business system of mass production is less than one-third the age of the once all-powerful British Navy. Like the fleet, it, too, has advocates who curiously resemble the doughty Queen—aware perhaps that new forces threaten old patterns and privileges. But they keep the stiff upper lip at all costs.

HYPNOTIZED WITH BATHTUBS?

Like the fleet too, the fabulous historical accomplishments of American business are written on the record. A dynamic business system has provided the steel sinews for victory in two great wars. The evidences of men and women cooperatively at work are everywhere about us in great cities, magnificent transport systems, the farms which are literally feeding the world, great educational and cultural systems which may be our temporary despair but which remain the envy of other peoples.

All these are the fruits of a corporate system, using the cooperative and freely offered services of freemen.

Why, then, has this business system lost steadily in the competition for men's minds and men's loyalties?

The tangible fruits of our common efforts, the brands, the things we make and deliver, are synonymous around the world with high standards of living. A so-called subsistence standard in America would be princely living for 75 percent or one and one-half billions of the world's people.

Is it possible that we have so exalted our ability to deliver brands and physical products that we have lost sight of the human needs of the 24-hour man?

Have we so hypnotized ourselves with bathtubs, telephones, central heating systems, and automobiles that mass production has become an end in itself, a kind of twentieth century worship of the golden calf?

Can it be that the American corporation, crying its wares and not a way of life, as the Pharisee cried his virtues in the public place, will suffer the Pharisee's infamy in history?

How is it, in the face of incontrovertible evidence, that what freemen produce is good, that the sands of despotism close in on the few remaining oases of freemen?

These questions I pose as worthy of your attention. It is important that 3 to 4 out of every 10 Americans are prepared to say yes to almost any question that reflects discredit on our corporate system. Any review of the process of historical change confirms its importance.

For instance, the phrase human relations is derived in part from humanism—and humanism represented a fifteenth century revolt from 1,200 years of dogma. In this revolt, western civilization broke through rigid medieval traditions of scholasticism and theology. The Encyclopedia Britannica says sweepingly, "This movement • • • is the parent of all modern development, whether intellectual, scientific, or social." The existence of your own profession is witness to the power of that revolt and the freedom of inquiry it made possible.

CAN CAPITALISM SURVIVE?

Certainly the high priests of feudalism swore that theirs was the best of all possible worlds. But mass movements toward greater dignity and freedom of the individual destroyed feudalism in the western world after 1,200 years of its existence. Many high priests of today's mass production cry out that this is the best of all possible worlds. Can we be sure that capitalism—an infant of less than 200 years—can survive a new human groping for spiritual satisfaction?

I propose that we have no such assurance and that only superhuman effort—first to comprehend human wants and aspirations, and then to move convincingly toward satisfying them—can prevent the tragic decline of a system magnificently productive of things.

I have wished from the beginning of this article that I could plunge into description of techniques by which tangible objectives in human relations could be obtained. I suspect you wish the same thing. But experience has taught me that ideas precede techniques—that long lists of shiny techniques with money-back guarantees are useless unless the spirit and heart and mind are the rocks upon which techniques are built.

Are we ready for techniques? Do we share with Tom Spates, the General Foods vice president of personnel administration, this belief:

"If those things which you hold most dear to your hearts as American citizens are to survive much longer, then something more than has been done up to now must be done if we are to retard progress of the creeping collectivism which is clogging the wellsprings of freedom in this land. I say to you with the conviction born of a quarter century of studious application to the subject of human relations that there is only one remedy left to cure this fatal malady. This last remaining remedy is stored in the heads and hearts of top executives of American business. It must be released and put to use—by the devotion of an ever-increasing proportion of their time to the problems of people—to the discovery of the human resources and liabilities which comprise pay-roll expenditure, and their transformation into an inspired team with unity and purpose."

This is the positive expression of a philosopher whose life is devoted to fighting human frustration of men at work.

THEY FELT EXPENDABLE

But what are the manifestations of frustration? An associate of mine told me about her experience in a New York department store. His fellow clerks said that the employees' cafeteria was run at a loss purposely by the company "so they can write it off on their income tax." The extra-low cost desserts were attributed to the bosses' desire to provide calories "so we'll work harder." That there was no other moderately priced food in the vicinity, that space devoted to the cafeteria could have been put to money-making uses—these facts went unappreciated. No one had assured these girls that they were anything but talking, selling, mechanical dolls. Above all, they felt expendable and they were rightly bitter.

Management had fallen far short in two ways in dealing with individual and mass frustration. First, we have failed for the most part to understand the basic needs and aspirations of people. We have been preoccupied by the unrealistic belief that men work for wages alone. A study just made in one of our own plants reveals that, despite a recent prolonged strike, there is an amazing residue of loyalty toward General Foods, greater than that expressed (in this study) by any other part of the community or the Nation. This holds although the majority of employees believe that another company may pay higher wages. The implication of the fact that men and women almost automatically tend to rate their company as a better place to work, as engaged in finer research, as making better products, as giving the public more for its money—these implications have not yet been understood or capitalized by American management.

The man with a job wants to believe that where he spends his working hours is the best place for him to be.

A JOB FOR EVERY DAY

The second failure of modern management is to tell its story, to identify its activities with the good life, to show by word and deed, not once a year but repetitively, that its goals are linked with the best interests of its employees, its customers, its owners, and the general public.

If I talk in parables and lean heavily on human experience in attempting to describe why human relations are the key to corporate survival, it is because from experience are derived the human attitudes. If these attitudes are positive and loyal to a system, they can and will support it through good times and bad. But if they are attitudes born of human frustration, any system that depends upon them is founded upon the sand and will fall.

A LOOK AT CITIZEN SAM

Gordon Allport describes Citizen Sam:

"Take, for example, Citizen Sam, who moves and has his being in the great activity wheel of New York City. Let us say that he spends his hours of consciousness somewhere in the Bronx. He wakens to grab the morning's milk left at the door by an agent of a vast dairy and distributing system whose corporate maneuvers, so vital to his health, never consciously concern him. After paying hasty respects to his landlady, he dashes into the transportation system whose mechanical and civic mysteries he does not comprehend. At the factory he becomes a cog for the day in a set of systems far beyond his ken.

"To him (as to everybody else) the company he works for is an abstraction; he plays an unwitting part in the 'creation of surpluses' (whatever they are) and though he doesn't know it, his furious activity at his machine is regulated by the 'law of supply and demand,' and by 'the availability of raw materials,' and by 'prevailing interest rates.' Unknown to himself, he is headed next week for the 'surplus labor market.' A union official collects his dues; just why he doesn't know. At noontime that corporate monstrosity, Horn & Hardart, swallows him up, much as he swallows one of its automatic pies. After more activity in the afternoon, he seeks out a standardized daydream produced in Hollywood, to rest his tense, but not efficient mind. At the end of the day he sinks into a tavern, and unknowingly victimized by the advertising cycle, orders in rapid succession Four Roses, Three Feathers, Golden Wedding, and Seagram's which 'men who plan beyond tomorrow' like to drink.

"Sam has been active all day, immensely active, playing a part in dozens of impersonal cycles of behavior. He has brushed scores of 'corporate personalities,' but has entered into intimate relations with no single human being. The people he has met are idler-gears like himself meshed into systems of transmission, far too distracted to examine any one of the cycles in which they are engaged. Throughout the day Sam is on the go, implicated in this task and that—but does he, in a psychological sense, participate in what he is doing? Although constantly task-involved, is he ever really ego-involved?"

And what is the effect of this life in terms of attitudes toward his business system?

Depth studies of Citizen Sams today reveal these prevailing beliefs:

1. Management is more interested in the dollar sign than in humanity.
2. Management manages without heart.
3. Management has to be forced to provide decent working conditions.
4. Management has to be forced by Government and by unions to share profits.
5. Management still makes fantastic profits.

A WAY TO LABOR PEACE

But where management has recognized Citizen Sam as a human being, where genuine effort has been made to make him feel that he is an appreciated vital part of an important operation, where management has talked turkey about its problems in terms Citizen Sam understands, there has been greater labor peace, greater understanding, and ultimately better production. These are the fruits of an all-out planned attack on human frustration, the enemy of free man and free institutions. My third and last point, if you can remember that far back, was simply that neither your company nor the economic system you represent can survive if the majority of the people decide firmly that they disapprove of the cut of your jib.

If they disapprove, conflict is inevitable and cannot be legislated out of existence. In today's complicated and fast-moving society, conflict can only be resolved by communication between groups, and this Mayo refers to as "the outstanding problem facing civilization today."

HUMAN PROBLEMS FIRST

In no sense does this comment cast discredit on the technologies and the managerial, marketing, and sales skills that make mass production possible. It is another way of saying, however, that whereas in the past perhaps 95 percent of management's brains and energies were devoted to solution to technical problems, and only 5 percent—if that much—to human problems, in the future management of corporations that survive will devote the major share of their brains and energies and sympathies to human problems.

KEY TO CORPORATE SURVIVAL

I am convinced that this process of identifying business with the great goals of the human race, the great but simple goals, is all that can maintain today's free corporate system. We have achieved mass production, in peace and war, and nowhere have achieved mass serenity of the peoples of this land. Instead, we have only contributed to their growing frustration, their decreasing stability, their reduced happiness. Examine the knots and tensions in your own lives for evidence.

Let us never for one moment give up our magnificent technologies. But do let us use our every power to identify the owners and managers of those technologies with the simple goals—better education for everybody's children, better health and nutrition, better housing, better opportunities based on ability, more security for the aged and infirm, more respect for the opinion of any man who has opinions.

These are the qualities that add to human relations. These are the industrial goals to which today's brass hats, and those whose ideas will be around tomorrow, must pay first allegiance. The American people have never demanded perfection; they have mistrusted anyone who promises it. But they do demand from their industrial and political leaders the will to progress toward the great and simple goals.

The politicians have always understood this. Corporate survival depends on how quickly corporate management catches on.

To summarize once more, liberty and freedom are always on trial. Again and again they have been retired to the shadows where they gather rebellious strength during eras of human suppression; they are on trial today.

Secondly, the greatest asset of those who would destroy free men and free institutions is the sense of human frustration which we—in our mad rush toward technological, but not human progress—have allowed to develop. The future, not only of a business system but perhaps of western humanitarian civilization, hangs upon the willingness of today's men of business to concentrate their brains and energies into an all-out attack on human frustration.

It may be unorthodox to conclude with a definition. Be that as it may, the dictionary's first definition of "corporate" is, "Combines into one body; united." The second definition is, "Formed into a body by legal enactment." We can evaluate the success of our combined attack on human frustration if our fellow-workers in our shops and plants choose of their own free will to be "combined into one body; united."

For if they do, it will be a token that we will have played our role in the restoration of human satisfaction, in the restoration of stability. We will have given back to modern man what he most needs and wants: A sense of participation in a way of life, a dedication to a common cause in which every man can play a vital part.

Shipments of Heavy Industrial Equipment to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Charles K. Morrill, commander of the AMVETS of Essex County, Mass., relating to shipments of heavy industrial equipment to Russia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTY COMMANDER,
AMVETS OF ESSEX COUNTY,
Newburyport, Mass., January 5, 1948.

CHARLES A. ALLEN,
State Commander, AMVETS,
State House, Boston, Mass.

DEAR COMMANDER ALLEN: My trip to Washington, D. C., during the last week of the Eightieth Congress to make a personal protest of shipments of heavy industrial equipment to Russia and her satellites was a move of progress. While there I conferred with the State Department, Commerce Department, Armed Forces Committee, Senate Committee on Appropriations, Interstate and Foreign Relations Department, and numerous Congressmen.

Therefore, with the information I had received before going to Washington and the additional information I was able to obtain in Washington, due largely to the efforts of Representative GEORGE J. BATES, of Massachusetts, senior member of the Armed Forces Committee, I request that you bring the contents of this report to the immediate attention of the State executive board which meets on Sunday, January 4.

I would like to see that the Massachusetts Department of AMVETS receives full credit for starting this protest which originated with me on November 15, 1947, and was the first protest in the Nation to reach official Washington.

While in Washington, I also conferred with National Commander Edgar C. Corry. Commander Corry is calling a national executive meeting so that the national organization can take an official stand on shipments to Russia.

I offer the State executive board the following resolutions with all sincerity, as I feel that the world today is at the crossroads of civilization and that it will take the combined efforts of all World War II veterans to prevent a World War III.

1. That the United States Government curtail all shipments of heavy industrial equipment to Russia and her satellites.

(A) During the year 1946 we exported to Russia $352,000,000 of American products; $152,000,000 was in lend-lease items.

(1) Electrical machinery	$43,789,000
(2) Machine tools	41,307,000
(3) Internal combustion engines	15,214,000
(4) Mining and pumping machinery	13,856,000
(5) 290 steam locomotives	22,000,000

(B) During the first 9 months of 1947 we exported $113,663,722 to Russia.

(1) Lend-lease "pipeline" goods	$16,200,000
(2) UNRRA relief goods	31,900,000
(3) Machine tools	18,364,000
(4) Electrical machinery	14,252,000
(5) Mining, well, and pumping machinery	10,707,000
(6) Construction and conveying machinery	6,246,000

2. That the United States Government curtail all shipments of petroleum products to Russia and her satellites.

(A) Exports of petroleum products in 1946.

	Gallons
(1) Aviation motor fuels	42,000
(2) Motor fuel and gasoline	42,000
(3) Gas, oil, and distillate fuel oil	42,000
(4) Lubricating oil	42,000
(5) Residual fuel oil	42,000

(B) During the first 9 months the exports were in the same amount as in 1946.

3. That the United States Government issue no further credit to Soviet Russia.

(A) An agreement signed on October 15, 1945, granted the Russians a $250,000,000 credit covering the estimated volumn of goods still in inventory or procurement in the United States at that time.

(B) This credit was granted in order to enable American manufacturers to complete their Russian orders without suffering serious losses.

4. That the United States Government make public the list of individual firms that have been doing business with Russia during the current year through the cover-up of private purchasing agencies who have been acting on behalf of the Soviet Union so that the American people will know what firms are more interested in the dollar than in national security.

5. That the United States Government place a broader scope on export controls and final destinations of American products. At present only 25 percent of United States exports come under Government control; the other 75 percent is left up to the desecration of private business.

6. That the United States Government have an equal exchange of visas with the Russian Government. Over 3,000 unrestricted visas were granted to Russia so far this year. Less than 80 restricted visas were granted to the United States.

7. That the United States set up control commissions in European nations that are receiving lend-lease to see that the final destinations of lend-lease items are going where the American people are led to believe and not being reshipped to satellites of Russia.

8. That the United States Government have all lend-lease items separately identified by American flag markings so that the people of unfortunate European nations will know what America is doing to help them reestablish themselves and their nations.

9. That the United States Government order that all ship manifests be made public so that the American people will know the type, amount, and destinations of cargo leaving this country.

10. That copies of these resolutions be sent to the 48 State commanders of AMVETS and that they be requested to take them up immediately with their executive boards, and after adoption to send same to all the Congressmen in their respective States demanding action at once.

In closing I would like to point out that Communist Russia has overrun more nations since World War II than Nazi Germany did in starting the war. Russia has conquered, absorbed, or now controls all parts of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, Germany, Yugoslavia, Poland, Austria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Outer Mongolia, Albania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Kuriles Islands, Dairen, Port Arthur, and Sahkalin. Russia has also requested or demanded Spitzbergen of Norway, two provinces of Turkey and the Dardanelles of Turkey.

America has repeated mistakes which followed World War I, and led to World War II. We have junked our Army, stripped our Air Forces, scuttled our Navy, talked tough to a dictator—shipped war tools to this dictator.

Fifteen million veterans could have kept this from happening, but eleven million of them failed—failed because they failed to join the old-line veterans organizations, and failed to help organize a new organization through which they could speak for themselves.

Yours in comradeship,

CHARLES K. MORRELL,
County Commander, AMVETS, Essex County, Newburyport, Mass.

The Food Situation in the Agricultural West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting letter from Mr. Gerald Gordon, secretary-manager of Associated Industries, Topeka, Kans., in which he gives valuable information as to the food situation in the agricultural West. I send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES OF KANSAS, INC.,
Topeka, Kans., January 12, 1948.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We note that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee is beginning hearings on price controls, allocations, and rationing as of today, January 12. We of Associated Industries of Kansas sincerely hope that the Eightieth Congress will not tinker with price controls and rationing. Considering the fact that the Republicans are in control in Congress, such actions are startling, to say the least. We realize that there are some ideas among Senators, especially those from the eastern part of the country, that a real meat shortage is about to plague our country. In this regard, please consider some of the following facts:

Cattle slaughter in the last 3 months of 1947 was half again as great as prewar; herds are smaller now because livestock raisers killed their cattle to cash in on high meat prices and to avoid high cost of feeding—a very natural procedure. Secretary of Agriculture Anderson predicts that by spring per capita meat supplies will be down to an annual rate of 125 to 135 pounds per person. The average per capita consumption in 1947 was about 157 pounds, but in 1939 the per capita consumption was 133 pounds. Despite Secretary Anderson's low estimate on meat by spring, the Agriculture Department has predicted that meat supplies for 1948 as a whole will come to about 144 pounds per person. This would afford a much higher consumption rate than prewar.

In closing, we ask you to remember that rationing of meat was not successful even in wartime. If rationing were attempted at this time it could not possibly work; too many people learned how to avoid it during the war years, and last, but not least, while some of the high-priced hotels and restaurants might have plenty of meat, rationing would bring a scarcity on the shelves of local butcher shops and grocery stores. Working people would still pay high prices for meat—if they could get it. We believe the rank and file of Americans are pinning their faith in the sound actions of this Congress—we sincerely hope they will not be disappointed. From these hearings they have reason to be apprehensive lest meat rationing should prove merely to be a "foot in the door" for further regimentation and rationing by a "police state" minded administration.

Cordially yours,

GERALD GORDON,
Secretary-Manager.

California Good-Will Milk Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, California Maritime Academy is located near the city of Vallejo in the Third Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent. I am very proud of the California Maritime Academy and the work that they are doing. Last Wednesday afternoon, January 14, 1948, the training ship of this Academy, *Golden Bear*, started on a 4-month trip and during that time the *Golden Bear* will be known as the "California good-will milk ship."

As the name implies, the ship is filled with milk which has been donated by California for the use of distressed Europeans. By the time the ship leaves San Diego, in holds of the ship, there will be 1,500 tons of dried and evaporated milk which, of course, means many more tons of natural milk.

The food is being sent to Europe by private citizens of California and will be deposited on docks of Marseilles, Genoa, Naples, and Athens.

Vallejo, the home port of the *Golden Bear*, was the first town to make its deposit. Present at the ceremonies when the ship took off was Gov. Earl Warren, who said:

This is a great day in the life of the State, and this is the greatest cruise any training ship has ever made from the California Maritime Academy.

The drive was really started by the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce under the leadership of Mr. L. E. Gibson who is a member of the Academy Board of Directors. It is interesting to note that the *Golden Bear* was a man-o'-war a few years ago. We hope that it epitomizes the change that may occur in the next 50 years when men-o'-war will become peace ships and when the world will be so strongly organized and knit together for peace that the original use of battleships will be unnecessary.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article about the California milk ship which was printed in the Vallejo News-Chronicle on Wednesday, January 14, 1948:

WARREN LAUDS SPIRIT OF CITY'S FRIENDSHIP
CROWD SEES FIRST LOAD GO ABOARD

California Maritime Academy's training ship *Golden Bear* sailed from Morrow Cove this afternoon on the first leg of her mission of charity and goodwill to France, Italy, and Greece with the "Godspeed" and best wishes of Gov. Earl Warren and Vallejo civic leaders and officials.

The Governor, who spoke from a gaily decorated platform to the hundreds of visitors and Friendship drive workers, said, "This warm-hearted thing you are doing is a great thing and worthy of the people of California. I am grateful to the people of Vallejo for placing the first cargo on the Friend Ship and for being here today to wish Godspeed to the *Golden Bear*. I too wish the ship Godspeed and hope we shall be here to welcome them on their return."

GREAT DAY

Governor Warren, who was introduced by Luther E. Gibson, member of the academy board of directors and Vallejo publisher, told the spectators. "This is a great day in the life of the State, and this is the greatest cruise any training ship has ever made from the California Maritime Academy."

In paying tribute to the unidentified Vallejoan who originated the Friend Ship plan, he said, "It is a fine thing to know this idea originated here. It is a very happy thought and I think this unnamed gentleman should be identified."

"The boys and officers of the academy realize the great purpose of this trip. Vallejo's great idea spread rapidly and was soon translated into action. There is no finer thing the State could do and no finer way to express our friendship than sending this ship to Europe," he continued.

DOUBLE MEANING

The Governor pointed out the relief mission had a double significance. "Over and above the precious cargo, the fact that the food will be distributed by 100 of the finest boys in the States is important. These boys represent a cross section of the hearts and homes of California. When in Europe, they will represent us with dignity and honor in every respect."

Mr. Gibson, in his introduction of the chief executive, said, "A beautiful day to do a beautiful deed for our fellow men. This ship, a man-of-war a few years ago, is now transformed for this annual cruise into a ship of good will and mercy. It represents truly the big hearts of the citizens of Vallejo and Solano County and the people of California in the desire to help the less fortunate.

"I have been given the privilege and pleasure of introducing to you a man whose heart is as big as all California. It was our own Governor who has led the State-wide appeal to fill the *Golden Bear* with the necessities of life in order that those starving and unclothed people of Italy and Greece and France might have food and clothing. His energy and enthusiasm have inspired all of us."

HIGH HONOR

Mr. Gibson added, "I personally cherish this high honor. The Governor, with his great heart, has gone forward to lead the people of the State to gather tons of food and clothing for the starving of Europe. This great heart of our Governor is as big as our great State. I present to you Governor Warren."

WELCOME GOVERNOR

The combined Vallejo High School and Junior College band played for the colorful ceremony at the academy docks. As the crowd cheered, three little girls in costumes of Greece, France, and Italy welcomed the Governor when he arrived.

Commodore Russell M. Ihrig, United States Navy (retired), commandant of the academy, and Capt. R. M. G. Swaney, commanding officer of the *Golden Bear*, escorted the Governor to the speaker's platform where he was joined by cochairmen of the drive, fraternal, civic, naval, and governmental officials.

HONORARY CADET

Loading of the *Golden Bear's* cargo from Vallejo-Solano County, which included 22 tons of food and clothing, continued during the festive ceremonies at the pier. The midshipmen, including the honorary cadet for the voyage, Earl Warren, Jr., paused only for the brief presailing program in their duties to prepare the ship for sailing.

Banners and pennants waved in the breeze and decorated the ship during the Carquinez Straits ceremony in the sunshine. The program, which was photographed by newspaper and newsreel cameramen, concluded with the blessing of the Very Reverend Thomas P. Byrne, pastor of St. Basil's Catholic Church, A Boy Scout guard of honor stood before the speaker's rostrum during the program.

OTHERS SPEAK

Al St. John was master of ceremonies for the farewell fete and introduced city and county officials and representatives. Among those who spoke briefly, wishing the *Golden Bear* and her crew bon voyage, were Hollis Gray, president of the junior chamber of commerce and cochairman of the friendship drive; Rear Adm. Frank J. Lowry, United States Navy, commandant, Mare Island-Vallejo area, United States naval base, San Francisco; Capt. Wallace R. Dowd, United States Navy, commandant, Mare Island Naval Shipyard.

Dr. D. B. Park, president of the Vallejo Rotary Club, drive sponsor; Ernest D. Wichels, cochairman of the drive; Commodore Ihrig; Frank O. Bell, chairman of Solano County Board of Supervisors; Ellis Randall, president of Vallejo Chamber of Commerce; Russell F. O'Hara, civic leader; Mayor George Demmon; H. E. Gamble, mayor of Suisun; A. T. Alistaire, Fairfield-Suisun Chamber of Commerce, and midshipmen officers.

St. John also offered a bon voyage to John L. Cleek, Times-Herald staff member, who is making the trip as far as San Diego with the *Golden Bear*.

The Academy's greatest day was climaxed with the *Golden Bear's* sailing shortly after 1 p. m. The training ship, with a crew of 100 midshipmen, started up Suisun Bay for Stockton for another loading tomorrow. Cargo will be taken on Friday and Saturday at Oakland, Sunday at San Francisco, January 21 and 22 at Long Beach, and January 23 and 24 at San Diego.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Read It Carefully, Senators" from the Detroit News of yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

READ IT CAREFULLY, SENATORS

The minority report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Subcommittee in the Senate urges defeat of the project to enable further study.

This is an entertaining suggestion, made of a project that has been studied by this country and Canada for better than 30 years.

The report says new factors have arisen, naming the finding that the seaway will help national defense and the proposal, now before Congress, to make it repay its cost by charging ship tolls.

The national defense aspect is not in fact new, by any means. But the tolls idea is. It is a concession made with the purpose, it was thought, of softening up the opposition in the seaboard States. The tolls would handicap seaway shipping and thus, it was hoped, would make eastern and Gulf port interests less resentful of the competition they fear from it.

That hope was in vain. The report merely falls back on prepared positions, arguing now that the tolls would not pay for the project, because shipping—the very shipping feared as competition—would not use the seaway. Four Senators sign this document—all from seaboard States.

The report is otherwise entertaining, as when it speaks of a need for further study of the cost of deepening Great Lakes connecting channels.

This additional burden on taxpayers, it says, has been conveniently ignored by advocates of the project. The fact, conveniently ignored by the report, is, of course, that the channel deepening is and always has been included in the total seaway cost, as agreed with Canada and now before the Senate.

Or, again, where the report chastises seaway advocates for irresponsibly failing to consider the effect of winter freezing on the hydroelectric power to be developed by the St. Lawrence dams.

This, in view of the 30-year history of the project, would be a truly remarkable oversight, if it were an oversight, which it naturally isn't.

The minimum wintertime head (71.3 feet) and water flow (180,000 cubic feet a second) have been calculated and rechecked, not once but many times, being basic to the international agreement on water rights.

Incidentally, the thing really of interest in this is the comparatively slight variation—as also at Niagara Falls—between the summer and winter flow, a fact making the St. Lawrence a superlative power source.

The report is excellent at ignoring whatever else its arguments find dispensable. It shortens by 2 weeks the ice-free season on the Great Lakes chain, ignoring readily available Government records on the point. It raises again the bogy of fogs in the St. Lawrence estuary, though it is of record that marine insurance for vessels plying that terrifying waterway is no higher than anywhere on the oceans.

In its entire discussion of the tolls question, the report ignores official findings that tolls as proposed in fact will repay the seaway's cost. It ignores in any case the unique novelty of this concession to the seaway's enemies. No tolls ever have been charged on other inland waterways, nor for that matter on seaboard harbors improved at Federal expense.

The report says of the project's defense aspect that the 1941 findings on that score now are invalid, since the new concept of transpolar bombing has shown it ot be peculiarly vulnerable to attack.

This ignores the finding of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, no earlier than last year, that the seaway has "distinct military advantages and would materially increase the industrial and transportation potential of the United States."

In that connection, the report again becomes amusing when it dismisses the imminent exhaustion of Lake Superior iron ores as a reason for opening up the seaway.

It speaks learnedly of developments in the concentration of low-grade taconite and jasper ores on the Mesabi Range as dispelling any fears of ore shortage. Yet the alleged vulnerability of the seaway to transpolar air attack surely would be shared by these concentration works, which, if we rely on them exclusively, would become the bottleneck of the whole steel industry and of the national economy.

It would seem wise, in war especially, to have two iron ore sources—Lake Superior, plus the rich deposits in Labrador. But the report, needless to say, ignores that.

We would not want to leave the impression that this report is a laughably implausible document. It isn't. We do not remember ever reading a piece of antiseaway literature that failed to contrive, for the careless reader, a plausible case. The powerful interests opposing the seaway lack neither the money nor the talent to see to that.

The report, in fact, is highly plausible, and we are just afraid that some Senators who will be voting this spring on the seaway will not be careful readers.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Southworth Lancaster, the present traffic manager of the Boston Port Authority, concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and its effect on the port of Boston, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald yesterday.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS ON ST. LAWRENCE

To the EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

The editorial of January 10, entitled "St. Lawrence Bogey," is a good summary of the objections to the so-called seaway project. I have only one comment.

It says that the project would damage the port of Boston by diversion of trade. This is true. It then adds that this diversion includes coastwise shipping. This probably will not follow so far as the general cargo trade is concerned. Such coastal shipping would receive scarcely any direct ill effects because the seaway will be almost useless for the domestic traffic which coastal steamship companies seek. Ultimately there would be certain harmful indirect results, but practically the entire impact would fall upon Boston's export and import trade.

The tonnage which the seaway is expected to move has been variously and ingeniously computed by its proponents, who show a different total each time a new argument is needed. Very roughly, this tonnage would be made up of 60 percent domestic freight and 40 percent foreign cargo. Quite apart from any question of the economic morality of the project, these ratios should be attained if the seaway is to fulfill the claims of its supporters. But this proportion of domestic freight cannot possibly be realized.

Consequently the principal seaway tonnage would be the foreign cargo, the lesser component, which would not be enough in volume to keep the seaway occupied for the seven ice-free months of the year nor to yield tolls sufficient to make the seaway pay for itself. Yet, paradoxically, it would be enough in volume to deal a knock-out blow to Boston by cutting heavily into the export and import tonnages which are the heart of the port's development. In dollars, this diversion of foreign trade has been reliably computed as a minimum annual loss to the port alone of $1,280,000. The actual loss might be twice as great.

With this drastic shrinkage in foreign trade, it would then become a question whether the coastal traffic remaining could support plans for the port's expansion.

This would be the result of the millions in tax money to be poured into the shallow ditch of the St. Lawrence River. New England must contribute its share. St. Lawrence proponents are not satisfied with cutting Boston's throat. They want Boston and New England to help pay for the knife.

SOUTHWORTH LANCASTER.

CAMBRIDGE.

The Freedom Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a distinguished former Representative from Alabama, my colleague when I was a Member of the House, Hon. W. B. Oliver, has brought to my attention a letter written by Miss Patti Bees, on Why I want to see the Freedom Train. The letter won first prize in a recent contest held by the Montgomery, Ala., Advertiser and Journal for the best letter written on the subject by an Alabama high-school student. Miss Bees is a student in the Seale High School, at Seale, Ala., and the State of Alabama is proud of her. I ask unanimous consent that her letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as it appears in an article from the Montgomery Advertiser and Journal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUNG CITIZENS EXPRESS VIEWS ABOUT FREEDOM—PARTICIPANTS IN LETTER CONTEST SEE RENEWAL OF FAITH IN DEMOCRACY

Of all the excellent letters entered in the contest, that of 16-year-old Patti Bees, a senior III of the Seale, Ala., high school, was finally selected as the winning entry. Miss Bees wrote with sincerity and simplicity and summed up the reasons why most of the American people today are making every effort to visit the Freedom Train.

CHANCE FOR ALL

She wrote:

"Symbolic of our American heritage and way of life, is the Freedom Train. It brings to all Americans, everywhere, a chance to see and explore the documents granting them the right to live and prosper in a great country which God, by His goodness, has granted us. Seeing this train comes as an unprecedented opportunity to me, who will now be able to view rare and precious documents that previously have been secluded from the public eye.

"It brings to mind that we are one United States, and that our Government is 'of the people, by the people, and for the people.' It will flourish always, through the leadership of stalwart and courageous men who have fought and will continue to fight so that other Americans might enjoy that which rightfully belongs to them and theirs.

"It will cause me to stop and renew my faith in my flag, my country, and my forebears, in order that I and my successors might live in a land, forever free and democratic."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials relating to the St. Lawrence waterway project, the first from the Brattleboro Daily Reformer of January 14, the second from the Rutland Herald of January 13.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Brattleboro (Vt.) Daily Reformer of January 14, 1948]

Whatever the merits or demerits of the St. Lawrence waterway project, it would seem that after nearly 30 years of service as a controversial topic it might be possible for opponents and sponsors of the project to present their cases without resorting to demagoguery. At the moment it is the opposition that is taking the honors in the field of misleading statements. The Boston Herald recently stated: "New England is against this project and must win this fight." This simply is not a fact, since New England (meaning all its citizens) has never voted on this issue. And in New York, Mayor O'Dwyer labels the project as "Roosevelt boondoggling"—ignoring the fact that Roosevelt was the fifth, and not the first, President to recommend the project. The complexity of the issue is so great that Joe Citizen should be spared the further confusion of misstatement.

[From the Rutland (Vt.) Herald of January 13, 1948]

SEAWAY OPPONENTS

Vermonters who attended the forums where the St. Lawrence seaway project was discussed, or who followed the series of articles on this subject published in the Herald, will not agree with some of the arguments being advanced against the proposal.

Typical of these were the remarks of Carroll B. Huntress, chairman of the national St. Lawrence project conference, an organization actively fighting the seaway. It's interesting to note that his objections were discussed and answered not only at Vermont forums but in the articles in this newspaper.

As a result Vermonters have a broader base of knowledge to use in evaluating such attacks. While some of these arguments may be accepted at face value by those in some other States, they have already been discredited in several particulars by facts with which many Vermonters are familiar.

The appeal to local or State interests is commonplace in attacks such as Huntress made. But Vermonters know that the main factor favoring the seaway is not what Vermont or New Jersey might get out of it, but its value and importance to a large section of the Nation.

High Tax on Big Incomes Held Hurting Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article entitled "High Tax on Big Incomes Held Hurting Production," by Francis P. Douglas, which appeared in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., on January 18, 1948. In my opinion, it is a very important article, and is appropriate to the subject which is before the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH TAX ON BIG INCOMES HELD HURTING PRODUCTION—ADVOCATES OF LOWER LEVY AGAINST WEALTHY MAINTAIN RICH MAN'S CAPITAL COULD BE BETTER UTILIZED TO HELP NATION

(By Francis P. Douglas)

Public discussion and polls are directing attention anew to the high rates of taxes those in the upper income brackets pay.

The propriety and statesmanship of taking more than half a man's income in taxes is being called into question by responsible individuals and organizations. One line of reasoning behind advocacy of going easier on the rich is that the country needs the rich man's money in a form other than taxes. That form is capital, to expand production.

There is no unanimity in this, by any means. The claim of the lower brackets to the first call on relief from the tax burden has been stated often and ably. Outlining the current attacks on the high rates at which taxes are assessed against incomes in the upper brackets does not indicate any disposition to disregard or minimize the other arguments.

50 PERCENT TOP URGED

The United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers both urge that a ceiling of 50 percent be placed on income taxes. A number of other organizations are supporting their position.

As for individuals who advocate this policy, they include one Republican candidate for the Presidency—Harold E. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota. Neither the State nor Mr. Stassen are given to reactionary policies.

One organization of high standing, however, the Committee for Economic Development, does not urge that the top rates be cut back to less than about the level of 1935.

In that year the New Deal turned to what it called a taxation for social reform program, traceable to the earlier share-our-wealth campaigns. In the doldrum days of the depression the share-the-wealth idea was attractive to many.

People sang the song about the rich getting richer and the poor having children. Its catchy tune belied its cynicism, but many thought there was some truth in the words. There was a widespread feeling that the rich were too rich and the poor were too poor.

FEWER MILLION-DOLLAR MEN

In 1935 individual surtaxes were boosted beginning at 31 percent on $50,000 and reaching 75 percent on amounts over $5,000,000.

A good deal of social reform in this line had already been accomplished by the depression. In 1929 there were 513 persons with million-dollar incomes; in 1935 the number had fallen to 41.

With the war all taxes were upped until the man with a million-dollar income was taxed about 90 percent. That is the case today. And in the more modest brackets, a man who earns $18,000 finds that if he earns another thousand the Government will take half of that in taxes.

In the words of the Committee for Economic Development, the taxpayer from then on has only a minority interest in his income.

The argument for the need of capital for production, from those in the upper brackets, runs about like this:

Prices are high because too many people with money are competing with one another for the available supply of goods. To get prices down and lick inflation it will be necessary to reverse this condition. Goods must be supplied in such abundance and at such prices that the sellers will compete with one another for the consumer's dollar.

CONANT'S VIEWPOINT

It is now practically impossible to produce more goods at no extra cost because almost every employable person in the country is working. If you lengthen the hours you run into overtime and higher production costs.

The way to do it is by supplying the worker with more efficient tools and machines and by developing new companies and new industries. That means the investment of huge amounts of capital.

One of the chief sources of new capital is people with big incomes. But why should a man with a big income risk his money when, if his venture is successful, he is allowed to keep less than half of the return? Why should a man work hard and take chances when he will have only a minority interest in the profits resulting?

The last part of this argument received unexpected support from President James B. Conant of Harvard. He warned that the present tax system is having a profound effect on the incentives which thus far in our history have contributed to the taking of risks and the seizing of opportunities.

"Americans believe in the equality of opportunity in a fluid society without hereditary privileges," he said, and that belief is reflected in high inheritance taxes. High taxes on earned income have the reverse effect on the fluidity of our society, he maintained. "Therefore, insofar as the national expenditures permit, the case for keeping income taxes low is overwhelming, both in terms of social ideals and incentives."

STASSEN'S REASONING

Mr. Stassen, in his book, "Where I Stand," said he believes that a government that demands more than 50 percent of a citizen's labors, or ingenuity, or inventiveness, or other incomes is a government killing the future of its average citizen and weakening the long-range strength of its economic system.

In explanation of that last point is this passage:

"In order to operate successfully our system requires enormous capital. If that system is to continue striding forward it needs great sums of venture capital, risk capital, dynamic capital. We have now reached the point where our tax program is a real threat to the long-term future sources of dynamic capital."

Laurence Arnold Tanzer of New York, testifying on behalf of the United States Chamber of Commerce before the House Ways and Means Committee, said that the Government taking more than half of any person's income inhibits individual effort so severely as to amount to stifling it in most situations.

By reducing higher surtaxes, he said, the Government stands to gain, not lose revenues.

The Treasury, apparently feeling it had to reply, recently issued a study of The Tax Treatment of Earned Incomes in which it examined the question of taxes reducing incentive.

Offsetting the adverse effect of high taxes on incentive, according to the Treasury, are considerations "based on the high demand for income by many individuals who desire to maintain relatively fixed or even increasing levels of consumption and saving. If taxes take larger proportions of their incomes, the incentive of these individuals to work tend to be increased rather than decreased. They will try within the limits of their abilities, energies and opportunities to earn more and maintain the desired incomes after taxes."

The study conceded, however, that there is no doubt that the response of some individuas to high taxes is a reduction in effort.

NAM'S PROPOSED SCALE

The National Association of Manufacturers is advocating a tax revision which would start with a rate of 12 percent instead of the present 19 percent and progress to a top rate of 50 percent on taxable incomes in excess of $100,000. In addition it urges a couple of measures which would be beneficial to the white-collar worker.

Don G. Mitchell, president of Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., and chairman of the taxation committee of the NAM, asserts the need of venture capital cannot be met, except in small part, out of the savings of the low-income groups.

"There are, in fact," he told the NAM at its convention last month, "only two sources from which we may expect the bulk of the necessary venture capital. These are retained corporate earnings and savings from the middle and upper incomes."

"Mr. Mitchell, citing Commerce Department figures, says the deficiency of capital formation since 1930 amounts to $125,000,000,000. However, not all of this has to be made up. For example, a machine tool which normally would be replaced after 5 years, but which is used for 10 years need be replaced by only one machine, not two.

President Truman in his State-of-the-Union address to Congress saw the need as not so great. He said, "$50,000,000,000 would be needed over the next few years."

POLICY IS CHALLENGED

Reverting to the NAM's insistence on tax cuts for the upper brackets, it should be recorded that such a policy has not by any means passed unchallenged.

For instance, Stanley H. Ruttenberg, assistant director of research for the CIO, testifying before the Senate Finance Committee at the first session of the Eightieth Congress, quoted Business Week magazine as saying that an answer to the tax problem must be found in this question: "Should the tax system be designed to encourage consumption or to minimize restraints on enterprise and new investment?"

Mr. Ruttenberg's answer was simply this: "It does little good to encourage such new investment if the low-income individuals do not have sufficient money to buy the items thus produced." The guiding principle of a sound tax program, he said, must be first to reduce taxes upon low-income individuals, certainly not to lower taxes upon the wealthy or on corporations.

Mr. Truman concurred in the argument that the low-income groups need relief, recommending a credit of $40 for each taxpayer and an additional credit for each dependent to offset the increase in the living cost. And to make up for this tax loss, estimated at $3,200,000,000, Mr. Truman suggested that corporations can well afford to carry a heavier share of the tax load at this time.

WOULD HELP CORPORATIONS

This runs counter to the program of the Committee for Economic Development. The CED did not urge a ceiling of 50 percent on individual tax rates. Its long-range program calls for an initial rate of 11.5 percent instead of the present 19 percent, hitting the 50 percent rate at the $150,000 bracket and graduating the scale on up to a top of 77.5 percent on incomes of $1,000,000 or more.

But the CED would provide more relief for corporations and there is a substantial body of opinion believing this would provide capital more speedily. It would place the corporation tax rate at 30 percent instead of 38 percent and drop it to 11.5 percent when revenues permit. It also would alleviate the double taxation on money paid out in dividends, allow businesses to carry losses forward and backward and give greater leeway in depreciation allowances.

Whether the NAM or the CED program would yield more capital is not going to be proved by the adoption of either one of them by Congress in the near future. But they do chart some of the considerations to which the framers of tax bills will give their attention.

Nor are we going to see shortly the reduction of the income tax on the top brackets to 50 percent. The soak the rich policy, however, is being reexamined to see just what the results are.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a résumé of the history and objectives of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, who will hold their fifty-second annual memorial service on May 18, 1948, in New York City.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1896 veterans of the Jewish faith who had borne arms in the tragic struggle between the American States inaugurated an observance that has been regularly conducted on the Sunday nearest Memorial Day for more than half a century. These Americans, among them men who had earned the Nation's highest decoration for valor, constituted a small segment of the 10,000 men of their faith who had served in the contending armies of their country's fratricidal conflict. Let it be marked that they came together in peace because certain of the basic principles for which they had offered themselves in war were under threat by misguided and unreasoning men. For there was abroad in their time a canker that has not yet ceased to afflict the vitals of mankind. Mean and disruptive devices of religious calumny sought to becloud their military contributions, while their coworshippers were subjected to indignities ominously reminiscent of Old World bigotry.

They assembled in the house of their faith to venerate the memory of those of their coreligionists who had fallen in the battles of the Republic and to plead for strength of spirit to meet the tests of peace. They emerged with a concept of civic responsibility. This statement of principles, conceived more than a half century ago, is the preamble to the constitution of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America:

"We, citizens of the United States of America, of the Jewish faith, who served in

the wars of the United States of America, in order that we may be of greater service to our country and to one another, associate ourselves together for the following purposes:

"To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America; to foster and perpetuate true Americanism; to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions; to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed; to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men; to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster the education of ex-servicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

These are the principles which today guide more than 100,000 veterans of our last four wars who make up the present membership of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. How mindful they have been of their heritage was demonstrated last October on the occasion of their fifty-second annual encampment at St. Paul, Minn. More than 2,000 delegates, representing every section of the country, adopted a series of resolutions attesting to their organization's awareness of its responsibility in contributing to the peacetime safety and stability of our country.

They voiced a plea for legislation to provide this Nation with a military and civilian defense establishment of sufficient strength and preparation to cope with any emergency. To speed the economic rehabilitation of more than a half million war veterans who continued to draw unemployment allowances under the GI bill of rights, they asked for a national conference of business, labor, and governmental representatives that might formulate a program to absorb our jobless veterans into the Nation's productive economy. They dedicated themselves to year-round observance of National Employ-the - Physically - Handicapped Week and pledged themselves to urge upon business and industry the employment of our war-injured veterans in the many occupations to which handicapped persons can adapt themselves gainfully. They asked for consideration of such increases in governmental allowances to the widows and orphans of our war dead as would enable these deserving citizens to keep pace with the post-war rise in living costs. They urged humane and judicious assistance to those deserving nations overseas whose struggles to establish free governments are being handicapped by hunger and illness, by inadequate shelter and lack of productive machinery. And they reaffirmed their historic opposition to totalitarianism, reminding avowed or proven Communists that there is no place for their kind in the ranks of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

To implement these and many other decisions of similar import, they chose as their national commander for this year my friend, Col. Julius Klein, of Chicago. Colonel Klein is the first midwesterner so to be honored in the 53-year history of this organization. One of the foremost citizen-soldiers of the State of Illinois, Colonel Klein is descended from a distinguished family that settled in the city of Chicago more than a century ago. He is a veteran journalist, editor, and soldier who served in both World Wars.

As a war correspondent and Army officer in World War I, he won the praise of the Honorable James W. Gerard, our Ambassador to Germany in the administration of President Wilson. In World War II he commanded troops in the South Pacific and in the Philippines.

He holds the Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters, the Bronze Star, the Soldiers Medal for Heroism, the ribbon of the French Legion of Honor, and the Philippine Distinguished Service Star, awarded him personally by former President Osmena. He was also special assistant to the former Secretary of War Patterson, and was commended by that Cabinet officer for his services following VJ-day.

In 1933 and 1934, Colonel Klein, then a member of the Illinois National Guard, was assigned to conduct an investigation of subversive activities in the Middle West. That investigation produced the first dossier of disloyal elements in this country.

His election as national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America has been applauded by leaders in all areas of American life. Gen. Douglas MacArthur expressed the view that "no better choice could have been made" by the organization.

General Eisenhower wrote: "Under your leadership, I am certain this fine association of former servicemen and women will uphold the patriotic ideals which have characterized it throughout its history."

General Bradley, in voicing his congratulations, said: "In addition to being one of our oldest veterans' organizations, your group has consistently demonstrated a true spirit of service to the veteran and to the Nation. Please accept my cordial congratulations upon your election."

Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, under whose command Colonel Klein served in the Pacific, wrote: "With your rich experience on all levels of the Army, and with your fine background and knowledge of the world, you should be able to do a great deal for the organization, which is a real power for good in the country."

In adding the congratulations of the United States Navy, Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz took occasion to note the following: "In following the convention of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, it came to my mind that men of the Jewish faith have always been fearless in the defense of our country. It is Navy Day as I write and names like Jones, Barry Truxton, Decatur, and Perry are in the minds of the American people. Too few know of the tremendous importance to our early American history of names like Salvador, Lushington, Franks, and Russel. Commodore Ordroneaux and Commodore Levy are names reflecting great bravery and the making of splendid naval traditions. To all these men of the Jewish faith our country is grateful. World War II again found the Jews ready to serve and die. This they did, and our country is stronger for their sacrifices."

The sentiments of these and other military leaders were echoed by the leadership of our major political parties, the most notable figures of Jewish religious and private life, by newspaper editors and State officials in every section of the country, and by thousands of former enlisted men who served under Colonel Klein in wartime.

At this juncture, I should like to introduce into the record, editorial comments by three major newspaper organizations relative to Colonel Klein's election as national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

The Chicago Herald-American wrote:

"Col. Julius Klein, a Chicagoan, who has given exceptional service to the Nation in two World Wars, will now give further important service as head of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

"He will be elected president of the Jewish War Veterans at the organization's convention in St. Paul, October 16 to 19, having been endorsed by the State departments of Illinois, California, Virginia, and other States.

"Colonel Klein has received many decorations, in both the First and Second World Wars, for gallantry in action and for meritorious service.

"To his service in the Second World War, Colonel Klein added effective postwar service in furthering the Army's readjustment program.

"For this work he received a letter of warm personal commendation from former Secretary of War Patterson, to which General MacArthur added a postscript, saying: 'He (Patterson) said nothing more than you deserved.'

"In these disturbed and dangerous times, the Nation is fortunate that such men as Colonel Klein are willing to serve their country in peace as well as in war."

The Chicago Daily News said:

"For the first time in its history, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States have turned to the west for leadership. Chicago takes pride in the election of one of its citizens, Col. Julius Klein, as national commander, in which post he will guide the influence of the 800,000 Jewish war veterans on national affairs.

"In 6 years of World War II service Colonel Klein made a distinguished record. He was cited for heroism under fire in the South Pacific. Among his other honors, President Osmena of the Philippines gave him a Distinguished Service Star and President Roosevelt awarded him the Soldier's Medal. War Secretary Patterson and General MacArthur had paid him high personal tributes.

"Colonel Klein is a man of unusual energy and a keen interest in public affairs. The Jewish war veterans have chosen one who will combine aggressive leadership, seasoned judgment, and faithful integration of their welfare with the over-all interests of the Nation."

They were joined by the Gannett newspapers, who wrote:

"At the convention of Jewish War Veterans in St. Paul, Minn., Col. Julius Klein, of Chicago, was elected national commander.

"Colonel Klein saw active service in both World Wars. He was awarded the rare Soldier's Medal and won other decorations and citations for 35 months' service in the South Pacific and the Philippines. After VJ-day he was appointed special assistant to the Secretary of War.

"He now becomes spokesman for 800,000 Jewish veterans of the two wars, bringing to the task aggressive leadership combined with seasoned judgment and devotion to the Nation's interests."

The Chicago Tribune reported Colonel Klein's election as follows:

"Col. Julius Klein, of Chicago, today became the first midwesterner to be elected national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

"Colonel Klein, who is 46 and veteran of both world wars, was elected on the first ballot at the concluding session of the organization's fifty-second annual encampment. He defeated Jackson J. Holtz, Boston attorney.

"Klein succeeds Milton A. Richman, of Hartford, Conn. The Jewish War Veterans organization has a membership of 104,000 and has 612 posts.

"Klein is a public relations consultant and former newspaperman. He saw 35 months of action in the South Pacific and the Philippines during World War II, and after VJ-day was special assistant to the War Secretary.

"In acknowledging the election, Klein pledged himself to a program of 100-percent Americanism, without deviation to any 'ism,' communism or fascism.

"He said that the organization has a dual purpose: 'To work with the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veterans' groups as the spokesman for the 550,000 Jewish veterans of World War II and the 250,000 veterans of World War I, from whom the membership is recruited, and to work with all organizations, Jewish and nonsectarian, for the furtherance of the principles of American democracy.'

"Klein described world communism as the greatest threat to world peace, asserting it is part of 'an imperialistic pattern that seeks to enshrine the state over the rights of the individual man.'"

Under the leadership of this distinguished American, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America can be expected to grow in stature and to expand its usefulness to our country's institutions. Its veterans' service program has already been broadened to supplement existing Federal and local programs on a scale that is saving the taxpayer many thousands of dollars annually. This organization's service offices, now established in the major cities of our country, are aiding more than 6,000 veterans and their dependents monthly. Its ladies' auxiliary is serving the welfare and morale needs of as many more veterans who are recovering from battle injuries in hospitals of the Veterans' Administration. Under Colonel Klein's administration, plans have been initiated to expand these services greatly and to develop still further the organization's programs for carrying the spirit, as well as the letter, of Americanism into all strata of our daily society.

There can be no comfort in this organization for the forces that seek today to assail our way of life both from the left and the right, from beyond our shores and within our gates. The very existence of a Jewish war veterans' organization signals the abiding determination of the American people to stand united against any challenge to the inheritance willed to us by all the men of our history who served their God in separate tabernacles and their country in a common faith.

Cooperative Housing Venture Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cooperative Housing Venture Pays Off," from the Washington Post of yesterday. The article deals with the problem of housing, which is certainly one of the important problems before our country. It is a very interesting account of how the housing problem has been solved in one community in Maine by a cooperative housing venture, which has resulted in the production of housing adequately at somewhat less than one-half current costs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MILLINOCKET, MAINE, COOPERATIVE HOUSING VENTURE PAYS OFF

(By Earl Aronson)

MILLINOCKET, MAINE, January 17.—Tidy new homes rising rapidly here to ease the housing shortage are monuments to the cooperative spirit in this little northern Maine paper manufacturing town.

The people, the Great Northern Paper Co., and a bank joined the community endeavor which is providing dwellings at a cost of about $575 per room, compared with approximately $1,500 elsewhere.

With many willing hands pitching in, new houses—complete with cellar, electricity, plumbing and heating—are going up at costs of $4,000 to $6,500. Without the cooperative action, the cost would be approximately double.

The paper concern, principal industry for the 6,300 inhabitants, began the enterprise a year ago. It laid out 51 lots. Seven others were laid out elsewhere by individuals. The company constructed sewers and built streets.

The Great Northern reserved five lots in scattered parts of the development and on them is building six-room houses to rent to employees for $45 a month. These homes, not part of the cooperative plan, cost $8,500.

AVERAGE LOT COST $240

The other 46 company lots—averaging 100 feet deep with a 60-foot frontage—were sold for an average of $240 each on an easy monthly payment basis. The purchasers planned to build their own dwellings, hiring what labor was necessary to do work they and their friends couldn't accomplish.

A dozen men went into the woods to cut logs for lumber. Others began casting cement blocks for construction.

Paper-company officials offered their business experience to determine the best means of financing the new buildings.

Since many lot owners were war veterans, they first called in Veterans' Administration officials for discussion, and the Millinocket Trust Co. presented an attractive proposition with loans which can be liquidated in 10 to 15 years The interest rate is 5 percent.

Great Northern helped to trim building costs. It offered special rates for use of its horses and trucks by men who felled their own logs and for milling. The company furnished without charge—except for overtime—a bulldozer and operator to excavate and backfill; a cement mixer and operator and several sets of form panels and miscellaneous equipment. It also provided services of several expert carpenters to instruct the inexperienced.

This helped cut the cost of cellars from $700 to $150.

Company assistance was not limited to employees or war veterans or to the original project or any one section of town.

DIFFERENT HOME DESIGNS

Ground for the first house was broken last April. Eight homes were completed and occupied by mid-December. Frank Bowler, chief engineer of Great Northern's spruce-wood division, said then that by this month "25 families will be living in their own homes in the 51-lot project on the east side of Millinocket stream."

Work will continue through the winter when weather permits. Construction has started on all but six lots.

The typical dwelling has five or six rooms and a bath. Some are bungalow style; others have two stories. Walls are insulated. Garages will be built later.

The houses are not monotonously similar. The individual owner's taste in design and color is carried out as practically as possible. Company architects who planned the five company houses also designed the others.

The original cooperative plan for small groups of volunteers to work a few hours in the evening or on days off was outgrown quickly. Volunteers increased and as many as 40 worked on a single building at one time. They brought their own tools.

The owner of one finished home supplied electric current to illuminate night work on nearby houses. When the Bangor Hydro-Electric Co. learned of his generosity, it whittled his bill to average monthly size.

When spring comes again a sandy area—which used to be an estuary—leading to Millinocket stream, will be graded and beautified as a public park. A Great Northern employee versed in landscape architecture is blueprinting the project. Katahdin Garden Club will collaborate.

Double Harness for the St. Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in the New York Times magazine of yesterday there appeared an excellent two-page spread, with photographs of the proposed St. Lawrence development, the best I have ever seen anywhere. Accompanying the photographs, which, unfortunately, cannot be reproduced in the RECORD, was a good factual statement relating to the proposed St. Lawrence development.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Double Harness for The St. Lawrence," which, as I have said, appeared in the New York Times magazine of yesterday, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUBLE HARNESS FOR THE ST. LAWRENCE

The tremendous proportions of the St. Lawrence River project are shown in the accompanying maps and drawing. For 50 years the complete development of the river has ben vigorously debated. Today what is officially called the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is before Congress for action. The resolution reported to the Senate approves an agreement between the United States and Canada to complete the project.

The pending measure provides for (1) development of 2,200,000 horsepower in a major hydroelectric project in the International Rapids section of the river; and (2) improvement of relatively short sections of the existing Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway to provide a continuous channel with a minimum depth of 27 feet.

Improvement of the International Rapids section would remove the chief bottleneck against navigation and at the same time create, engineers say, a huge volume of low-cost energy. It is estimated that the cost of the works will amount to $513,884,000.

The St. Lawrence, with the Great Lakes as its reservoirs, is unique among the rivers of the world. It has a relatively constant flow of water and the river at the International Rapids section can be harnessed to give an annual output of 12,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy.

The key to the development is the International Rapids section. The powerhouse here would operate the year around, and engineers of the power authority say that the seaway and power project would serve directly about one-third of our population in an area of 300,000 square miles.

The three great features of the project in the International Rapids section are the Barnhart Island powerhouse, the Long Sault Dam, and the canal and locks to carry vessels around the barrier formed by the dam and the powerhouse.

According to the plans the powerhouse will be the longest in the world and its transmission towers will carry electricity to switchyards on the American and Canadian shores of the river. The dam, 3,000 feet long and 150 feet high, is designed, with the powerhouse and dikes, to impound the outflow of the Great Lakes and drown out the rapids.

These locks would be the same size as the MacArthur Lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and the eight locks of the Welland Canal bypassing Niagara Falls—already completed links in the seaway project. Most of the oceangoing cargo vessels would be able to navigate all of the locks in the 2,340 miles from the mouth of the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Duluth at the head of Lake Superior.

The Cost of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Frank C. Waldrop, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of Sunday, January 18, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S YOUR MONEY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

If you are not interested in $183 of your money, now is the time to skip this item and turn to something else, for this is a factual report on your money. And everybody knows that figures make dull reading.

So if you're flush with cash, with all your bills paid, including taxes, and plenty of meat in the refrigerator, don't waste your time here. This is for poor folks.

The poor folks who have to worry about their money ought to know at the outset that this report is available through the courtesy of Senator JAMES P. KEM (Republican, of Missouri), who fell to wondering just how much money the Marshall plan will cost his constituents if it goes through as put by General Marshall on his "take it or leave it" demand basis.

Now for the dismal figures.

Between July 1, 1940, and July 1, 1947, according to the Library of Congress legislative research reports, the United States Government has run up bills totaling $73,092,056,013 for loans, property credits, advances, relief, and rehabilitation grants and other authorizations to foreign governments.

Call the 1940-46 money all for war purposes, says Senator KEM, and just consider the $24,099,211,067 of the 2 years between July 1, 1945, and July 1, 1946, aid in support of reconstruction and peace.

On the basis of the last official census of the United States of America, that works out to $183 a head for every man, woman, and child in the county. On the basis of the average United States family, that's $616 for each American household.

To put it another way, the average American family spent $25 a month for those 24 preliminary months of aid to foreign nations while the Marshall plan was being trimmed up and drafted for demand upon Congress to appropriate more and bigger piles of cash.

That same average cut per family would pay the whole income tax bill for a married man with two children, making $4,000 a year.

So you see, foreign aids and relief have already come to a considerable amount.

Senator KEM drew the comparison even closer home by comparing the anual tax receipts of each county in his home State of Missouri, with the foreign aid already granted and that asked by General Marshall, calculated as if each person in each of those counties had to pay the $183 per head, as aforesaid.

Taking the per capita basis above cited, he showed that since VJ-day, the bill rolled up already and now proposed by General Marshall averages out against a typical Missouri county, that of Macon up in northeast Missouri, at $7,039,284—more than Macon County has collected in taxes for 20 years, all added together.

Out in the Ozarks there is Taney County, which spends about $90,000 a year on county roads and schools. The foreign-aid project averages out to 10 times that much per year for Taney countians.

Or take a look at the way it works out for Kansas City, that up-and-coming town. Recently, after much wrangling and wrestling between politicians there, Kansas City voted $41,500,000 worth of bonded debts upon itself for self-improvement, to be strung out over a 15-year period.

On the other hand, the averaged-out cost to Kansas City for 2 years of foreign aid, much as it may well surprise Kansas City, equals $73,049,524. Add to that the Marshall plan, and Kansas City has $58,000,000 more of finance for foreign aid loaded upon it in the next 4 years.

As Senator KEM pointed out, Kansas City couldn't even tax itself to provide for its own improvement as per the bond issue above noted, without a two-thirds majority vote of its own people. But the foreign aid and the Marshall plan—what two-thirds vote?

Don't say it's unfair to use average figures, and claim it's silly to tell the people of Taney County, Mo., that the foreign aid works out on them at 10 times their annual tax bill.

Who pays the money, in the short and long run? If more than average taxes are collected in actual first-hand cash from Kansas City, still Taney County feels it eventually in higher prices that pass the bill on.

The route by which the tax collector gets to you may be obvious or devious, but he gets there just the same. The estimate of tax obligation on the basis of per capita and average, is the only one that can possibly serve to indicate just how pervasive and oppressive this foreign relief is in fact to the people of the United States of America.

Here in Washington, the taxpayers are going around in dizzy circles because the government for the District is asking something more than $101,000,000 for 1 year of administration in this world capital.

What would happen if it ever penetrated these already dazed characters' brains that their foreign debts laid up against them for the 2 years aforementioned work out on the basis of the Library of Congress' figures, to $146,500,000, more or less?

Don't ever tell it around town. Some civic-minded luncheon speaker would, for sure, jump up and say we're slackers and haven't done enough.

State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of January 9, 1948:

STATE OF THE UNION

Harry S. Truman stood up in the House of Representatives in Washington on Wednesday and gave the customary Presidential report on the state of the Union. It is well that Americans of all classes, creeds, and varied origins understand each other so well and particularly have such a basic knowledge of politics. Otherwise, from the violent reaction to the Truman speech by the party of the opposition, the citizens would surmise that the Nation was in a mighty sorry state.

There are lots of things the matter with the United States. It is not a perfect Union. One of the greatest body of laws man ever conceived, the Constitution, has been amended and amended again down the years, to meet conditions which arose in each generation or to take care of abrasive points which the founding fathers, with all their celebrated wisdom, overlooked.

But with employment the highest in history, with production still lagging which means jobs for the future, with the forthcoming wheat crop looming better than anticipated, with the Nation beginning to buckle down to the solution of the housing problem and with no war really imminent, it may be that we are, on the whole, doing so well that some of us are getting captious.

On the other hand, although the principal and most vehement critics of Mr. Truman's speech, are outstanding members of the GOP, perhaps they are right when they say that the Truman remarks were pure politics. In an election year, running for a second term, Mr. Truman would hardly be human if he did not put his best foot forward.

But the members of the Republican Party who so eagerly—as soon as he finished his oration—put their best feet forward also, for the purpose of tripping him up in the ambition to remain in the White House, are not, like Caesar's spouse, above suspicion. Some of the most indignant deriders of the Truman declarations as "demagoguery" are themselves candidates for the same post to which the man from Missouri aspires.

Only too recently we pointed out that the big issue before Congress this year, bigger than curbs on inflation or complete passage of the Marshall plan, was the question of who would be President of the United States when January 1949, rolls arcund. What Mr. Truman said yesterday and the scolding he has since received confirms that thought. It would be too bad if politics took precedence over important matters such as taxes and high prices, but that's the democratic way of it. The alternative is dictatorship and we will not stand for that.

What was amazing about the reaction to what President Truman said was the shock, real or simulated, expressed by opposition leaders because he plumped so strongly for additional social betterment. One would gain the impression some folks had the idea that all social progress, affecting particularly the little man, came to a close when Franklin D. Roosevelt reached the end of the road in his rose garden at Hyde Park.

A long time ago in this country, a man had to own property in order to vote. In a time, not so long ago, men worked 12 hours a day, for $1 a day. Since then we have come a long way. The mass of the people are living better and giving their children greater opportunities, while the Nation, all around, enjoys historic prosperity.

Perhaps Mr. Truman's altruistic aims went beyond the times in which we live. But some of the planks for making America better for more people in the future, indicated that in these matters he would like the Nation to continue to go forward. In the main, we do not think the bulk of Americans are too worried about that direction. They are concerned we know, at the moment, about what may happen if impetus which the war gave us stops.

A High Farm Income Is in the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, although this Congress has many pressing problems where time is important, we also have a responsibility to look ahead. We must do those things that will assist and safeguard the American economy in 1949, 1950, and in the years that follow.

A high national income is imperative if the United States Government is going to carry the burdens he has already undertaken, discharge the national debt, and maintain the defense of our country. Without a high national income our Government will have difficulty in securing the revenue needed for these things. The way out must be the way of private enterprise or we will find ourselves facing greater problems. The way to maintain a high national income is to maintain a high farm income. This is a truth that has often been expressed from the floor of this Congress. It means that if America is to avoid a depression or a slump we must avoid a depression or a slump in farm income.

It is gratifying to know that a number of my colleagues have been giving definite attention to this principle. Through them I have received a brief prepared by Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst; Dr. John Lee Coulter, consulting economist; and J. Carson Adkerson, mining consultant.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit certain figures and tables prepared by these men. The first one covers the years 1929–41, inclusive, and the year 1946. That table is as follows:

Relationship of gross farm income

Year	Gross farm income (billions)	Percent of national income	Retail sales (billions)	Percent of national income	National income (billions)
1929	$13.0	14.8	$87.1	54.0	$87.3
1930	10.5	14.0	41.3	55.0	75.0
1931	7.6	13.0	34.5	58.0	58.6
1932	5.7	13.7	26.4	63.0	41.6
1933	6.4	16.4	28.7	65.0	39.5
1934	7.8	16.0	31.0	63.7	48.6
1935	9.0	15.7	34.5	60.8	56.7
1936	10.0	14.9	39.2	58.8	66.9
1937	10.6	14.4	42.2	57.3	73.6
1938	9.4	13.9	39.7	58.9	67.3
1939	9.9	13.6	42.0	57.9	72.5
1940	10.3	12.6	45.4	55.8	81.3
1941	13.1	12.6	53.7	51.0	103.8
Total	123.3	14.1	502.7	57.5	872.9
1946	27.1	15.2	102.0	57.3	178.0

This table bears out the principle that for every dollar of farm income we have $7 added to our total national income. It follows then, that if the farm income is increased by $5,000,000,000 the national income is increased $35,000,000,000.

By the same token, should farm income be reduced by $5,000,000,000 the Nation suffers a loss of $35,000,000,000 in total national income. Again, I suggest that the time is now to be thinking about our income level for next year and the years that follow.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen whose brief I have referred to have also prepared a table showing a comparison of food expenditures to the national income, which is as follows:

Comparison of food expenditures to national income

Year	National income (millions)	Expenditures for food (millions)	Percentage of national income
1930	$75,003	$18,125	24.1
1931	58,373	14,770	25.0
1932	41,690	11,394	27.3
1933	39,584	10,915	27.5
1934	48,613	12,961	25.2
1935	56,789	13,702	24.1
1936	66,041	15,326	22.0
1937	73,627	16,508	22.4
1938	67,375	15,762	23.3
1939	72,532	15,786	21.9
10-year average	178,532	42,003	24.28
1946			24.1

NOTE.—Expenditures for food do not include tobacco or alcoholic beverage.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a recapitulation or tabulation of a national poll on universal military training conducted by George Gallup, which discloses that the citizens of the United States are in favor of universal military training 2 to 1.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this important matter will come before the Congress for action in the near future, I feel that it is of interest to the Members of Congress, as well as to the country as a whole that they might be informed as to the position of the people of our country in regard to this matter; hence I am submitting the complete tabulation of the poll, as follows:

VOTERS 2 TO 1 FOR PEACETIME TRAINING
(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

President Truman's request to Congress for a peacetime military training bill finds public sentiment receptive. However, the proportion of voters in favor of universal military training is smaller today than it was 6 months ago.

If the country were to vote in an official referendum on the much-discussed UMT program, approximately two-thirds would favor it today, as shown by the results of a Nation-wide unofficial sampling referendum by the institute.

The vote:

"Do you think Congress should or should not pass a law to require every able-bodied young man (who has not already been in the armed forces) to take military or naval training for 1 year?"

	Percent
Should pass law	65
Should not	24
No opinion	11

A previous poll on the issue, reported July 25, 1947, showed a vote of 75 percent in favor, 18 percent opposed and 7 percent without opinions. The question read: "In the future do you think every physically fit young man (who has not already been in the armed forces) should be required to take military or naval training for 1 year?"

In measuring attitudes on this controversial issue facing the new Congress, the institute used its new, multiple-question technique which makes it possible to probe opinion from many aspects.

VETERANS FOR IT

For example, the survey tested voter awareness of the arguments for and against military training, recorded intensity of sentiment, measured the attitudes of people who have a member of the family of draft age.

It found that:

1. Majorities in every section of the country favor peacetime training.

2. Veterans of World War II show a higher percentage in favor than the population as a whole.

3. The best argument for UMT, in the opinion of the people questioned, is the need for preparedness and protection while the world is upset. The second best reason given by voters is that it is good training and good discipline for young men.

4. The strongest reasons against UMT, voters say, are that it is unfair to young men to take a year out of their lives, disrupting their education, and that it will encourage war and warlike attitudes.

5. Persons who have a male member of the family of draft age vote in favor of military training by almost the same percentage as those who have no family member who would be affected by UMT.

6. Although some labor-union leaders have opposed UMT, the rank and file of union members questioned in the poll showed a vote of approval of nearly 3 to 1 of the training program. The occupation group least in favor is the farmers of the country.

7. Intensity of sentiment is about the same on both sides of the issue.

Opinion on peacetime military training has been measured periodically since 1942, always with a majority found in favor. The trend follows:

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
	Percent	Percent	Percent
December 1942	66	27	7
November 1943	68	29	8
December 1944	70	25	5
November 1945	75	21	4
July 1947	75	18	7
Today	65	24	11

PREPAREDNESS PARAMOUNT

Detailed results of today's poll are given in the following tables:

"What would you say is the strongest (best) reason for universal military training?"

	Percent
Preparedness, protection	72
Good training, good discipline for men	17
Show Russia we can't be pushed around	6
No good arguments in favor	4
Don't know	5

"What would you say is the strongest (best) reason against universal military training?"

	Percent
Unfair to interrupt careers and education of young men	18
Will encourage war, make men warlike	13
Undemocratic, breeds regimentation, nationalism	7
Hard on parents, young people needed at home	6
Cost too great	4
Not needed, atomic age makes obsolete	3
Miscellaneous	4
No good arguments against	30
Don't know	17

Both the above tables total more than 100 percent because some people gave more than one argument.

"Do you think Congress should or should not pass a law to require every able-bodied young man (who has not already been in the armed forces) to take military or naval training for 1 year?"

	Should	Should not	No opinion
BY SECTIONS			
New England and Middle Atlantic	Percent 64	Percent 26	Percent 10
East Central	65	25	10
West Central	67	24	9
South	68	16	16
Far West	66	22	12
BY OCCUPATION			
Professional and business	65	26	9
White collar	70	21	9
Farmers	56	30	14
Manual workers	69	21	10
Union members	68	24	8
Veterans	73	21	6
BY EDUCATION			
College	67	25	8
High school	68	23	9
Grade or no school	64	24	12
Those with relative draft age	63	26	11
Those with no relative involved	66	23	11

"How strongly do you feel about this—very strongly, fairly strongly, or not at all strongly?"

	Very	Fairly	Strongly
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Those in favor of UMT	51	43	6
Those opposed to UMT	49	40	11

Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Bay City (Mich.) Times of January 13, 1948.

SURPLUS
(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—President Truman shows a remarkable lack of faith in the continuing productivity and prosperity of America when in his budget message he predicts a surplus of $12,200,179,054 during the next 18 months and still opposes tax reduction. This estimated surplus of revenues over expenditure assures passage of a tax reduction over his veto.

The President invariably year after year has indulged in this sort of underestimation. By predicting a $12,000,000,000 surplus this time, he convinces even the most skeptical that a tax cut of $5,500,000,000 retroactive to January 1, 1948, is not only desirable but safe and practicable.

There can no longer be any doubt, that the congressional state of mind in an election year will be such as to assure an overwhelming vote for an immediate tax decrease. And it will come in time for the March 15 declaration and payment.

Two provisions of the pending House tax bill which will command such support as to assure its passage, are the increase in personal exemptions from $500 to $600 and the community-property permission for married couples to split their collective incomes for tax purposes.

These two features of the bill are calculated to cost the Treasury $2,600,000,000. But that becomes relatively a small item when it is considered the President predicts a $12,000,000,000 surplus, even after allowing all he asks for foreign relief and a grandiose program of socialistic experiments, which will not be granted.

No sooner had President Truman taken the White House oath of office than his Government experts, including Henry Wallace, then Secretary of Commerce, the Treasury, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, made predictions of depression and unemployment as high as 8,000,000.

Apparently the President ever since then has been operating with these dire predictions in mind. He has sold America short in every one of his budget messages. In his last previous budget message, of January 1947, he estimated the tax revenues for the present fiscal year ending next June at $37,700,000,000. But now he revises that figure to read $45,200,000,000. This was an underestimate of revenues by $7,400,000,000, or 20 percent.

He was even further off as a prognosticator in his estimates for the last fiscal year, ending last June. A year ahead he had estimated the receipts at $31,500,000,000. But when the figures were in they showed receipts to be $43,300,000,000, or 39 percent higher than estimated.

Republican sponsors of tax reduction, on the other hand predict continuing boom prosperity for several years, with increasing tax liability. Also they say that lower rates will not mean a proportionate loss of revenue, because of the encouragement reduction gives to new industrial enterprise.

Ratings for Service-Connected Arrested Tuberculosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. SARBACHER, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, on July 19, 1947, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, favorably reported the bill I introduced, H. R. 4243, Eightieth Congress, a bill to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis.

The purpose of the bill is to insure that veterans who have incurred active tuberculosis in the service of their country, either in time of war or peace, will receive compensation proportionate to the degree of disability resulting from arrested tuberculosis so long as they live.

Under existing regulations of the Veterans' Administration, provision is made for payment of compensation for service-connected arrested tuberculosis for specified periods following an arrest of active tuberculosis. In some instances where pronounced symptoms of the disease are manifest after arrest, ratings of 20 or 30 percent are authorized for life. However, in certain other cases where pronounced symptoms of tubercular disability are not manifest, veterans having arrested tuberculosis are ultimately rated as no percent disabled.

The committee, after extensive hearings and thorough consideration of the matter, is convinced that an active tubercular process has residuals which continue throughout life and that a veteran having arrested tuberculosis should be relieved of the fear that his compensation may be terminated notwithstanding the fact that his disability continues.

The following table shows the differences between ratings made under existing regulations of the Veterans' Administration and those proposed by the bill:

Rating for arrested tuberculosis under Veterans' Administration regulations

Period:	Percent disability
6 months after arrest (may be continued for successive periods of 6 months, up to a maximum of 2 years, under certain conditions)	100
Balance of 5 years	50
Next 5 years	30
After 10 years—	
(A) If veteran had far-advanced active lesions, for life	30
(B) If veteran had moderately advanced lesions and residuals continue to show certain evidence of disability, for life	20

Ratings for arrested tuberculosis proposed by H. R. 4243

Period:	Percent disability
2 years after arrest (may be reduced to 50 percent for failure to follow prescribed treatment or to submit to examination when requested)	50
Next 5 years	50
After 7 years (for life)—	
(A) If tubercular condition is diagnosed as far-advanced	40
(B) If tubercular condition is diagnosed as moderately advanced or less	30

Under the terms of the bill, at the rates of compensation now provided under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and the veterans regulations issued thereunder, a veteran having arrested tuberculosis incurred in wartime service will be entitled to at least $41.40 per month so long as he lives. A peacetime veteran having the same disability will receive at least $31.05 so long as he lives.

I am firmly convinced that the bill is meritorious and should be promptly enacted to insure the welfare of veterans having arrested tuberculosis.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes:

NATIONAL AFFAIRS
(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, January 9.—Was President Truman being a bit puckish in his proposal to Congress for a $40-a-head tax reduction that would remove about 10,000,000 persons—and that many potential voters—from income-tax rolls and cut taxes for everybody else?

The question is merely raised.

Whether he was or not, he must indeed be chuckling now over the angry shrieks from big business interests and their friends in Congress—the latter now numerous—whom President Roosevelt kept in a perpetual dizzy. Mr. Truman, it may be recalled, suggested that the $3,200,000,000 cost to the Treasury of his tax proposal, which would chiefly benefit low-income groups, be made up by higher taxes on corporate profits, now at an all-time peak.

"Demagogic," was the outcry. Maybe so.

But nothing has so dramatized the unbalanced state of our economy today—the lush "take" of big corporations, on the one hand, and the scrimping in millions of households, on the other—as this simple factual paragraph in the President's message that preceded his tax proposal:

Many of our families today are suffering hardship because of the high cost of living. At the same time profits of corporations reached an all-time record in 1947. Corporate profits totaled $17,000,000,000 after taxes. This compared with $12,500,000,000 in 1946, the previous high year."

The President, of course, does not expect Congress to enact his tax program. The Republicans, who control Congress, have their own. He was simply engaging in the familiar political poker game—raising the player across the table. It is such an old game that the howl from Republicans, who play it, too, had a slightly synthetic ring.

The Republican offer in the bill prepared by Representative KNUTSON (Republican, Minnesota), House Ways and Means Committee chairman, is not so generous to the low-income groups. The Republicans do theirs differently by increasing the exemption from $500 to $600. The President's proposal would be translated into an exemption of about $700. The Knutson proposal would relieve from income tax about 7,000,000, who now pay it, as compared with 10,000,000.

The Republican scheme would cost the Treasury more. The figure is $5,600,000,000, compared with $3,200,000,000 of the President's plan. That is because it relieves taxpayers in the higher brackets to a greater extent than the Truman proposal. Maybe the President's offer will induce Republicans to do better for the little fellow. Certainly his two vetoes of the bill sponsored by Republicans in the last session, in which he revealed how little it did for the small taxpayer and how much for the big one, must have been influential in the much more gracious Republican offer to low-income groups this year.

The President's pungent remarks about profits direct attention, too, to the present campaign of the National Association of Manufacturers to try to "kid the public" about the size of big-business profits, as it is put in an illuminating article by Nathan Robertson in the revived Progressive magazine.

Mr. Robertson explains how the NAM is taking advantage of the public's blind spot on statistics by the suggested sample newspaper advertisements it is sending to its members. In these a profit figure based on sales would be used instead of profits measured on net worth, which is the standard prescribed by economists. Bluntly the NAM said, "The average American does not distinguish between profit on sales and profit on net worth."

As an example, Mr. Robertson took recent advertisements of General Electric Co. telling how its profits are only 7 cents on each dollar of sales, or 7 percent, whereas they are just short of 22 percent—an all-time peak—when figured on the basis of the company's net worth as given by Moody's Investment Manual.

Maybe this helps to explain General Electric's recent price cut that it advertised so widely.

Could somebody have a guilty conscience?

Wholly Political

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of January 9, 1948:

STATE OF THE UNION—WHOLLY POLITICAL

President Truman's State of the Union message was a campaign document.

Nobody expected anything else.

The exigencies of the domestic political situation rather than of the Nation dictated its contents and tone.

With Mr. Wallace bidding for the "lunatic fringe" of the Democratic Party it became necessary for Mr. Truman to shift far to the left of center and attempt to outbid Wallace.

The President of all the people stood up before Congress as a partisan candidate for nomination on a platform of undiluted New Dealism, which even F. D. R. soft-pedaled in 1944.

What a spectacle. The conservative whom F. D. R. chose for a running mate, as an antidote to Wallace radicalism, forced by Wallace's third-party threat into vying with him for left-wing votes.

The President promised to ask Congress to enact laws protecting the civil rights of all citizens.

The Government, if Mr. Truman has his way, will be given authority and money to raise and equalize health and educational standards throughout the country. A special Department of Health, Education, and Security would be created.

An increase of the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour is proposed.

"Within the next decade," said Mr. Truman, "we must see that every American family has a decent home."

All of these noble goals are to be attained, of course, at the cost of further centralization of power in Washington and further expansion of an already topheavy bureaucracy. They offer "security" in exchange for freedom.

The 10-point anti-inflation program which President Truman outlined to Congress on November 17 must be promptly enacted. Otherwise he will not be responsible for the runaway inflation and subsequent depression, which he sees ahead.

The legislation which this program envisaged, if Congress had enacted it, would have revived OPA, with its subsidies, subterfuges, and black markets. At one time Mr. Truman repudiated all such controls as belonging to a "police state."

Yet he now demands that a Republican Congress spread them upon the statute books. As ingenious as anything in the message is its tax-reduction proposal.

A tax credit of $40 would be given every income-tax payer and a similar credit for each dependent. This would cost the revenues $3,200,000,000.

As a means of recouping the Treasury the tax on corporation profits would be hiked by $3,200,000,000.

The possibility that this device for redistributing wealth might impair the ability of corporations to sustain or expand employment does not seem to have been explored sympathetically by Mr. Truman's political strategists.

Congress is also asked to "act promptly" on the European Recovery Program—"this decisive contribution to world peace."

Without rearguing here the hashed and rehashed pros and cons of this adventure in power politics, we may pertinently ask who under the sun can yet say whether tossing another $17,000,000,000 into Europe will be decisive for peace or anything else.

We haven't bought peace in Greece.

A Republican Congress was elected as a revolt of the American people against the New Dealism which Mr. Truman has now taken down from the shelf and dusted off. This Congress could not accept the state of the Union message, as a course of action, without violating its mandate.

The political planners in the White House know that. They have asked for the impossible, and, if they don't get it, they will seek to make campaign capital out of their opponents' truculence.

The Republican leaders can escape the trap only by coming up with domestic and foreign policies of their own, which will meet the situation, without forcing this Nation further down the road to socialism.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

NO ROOM FOR COMPROMISE

Not long ago, after Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, had delivered the Marfleet lectures at the University of Toronto, Canada's leading newspaper, the Globe and Mail, said of him: "No one who has listened to or read the words of Senator FULBRIGHT could fail to be impressed by his breadth of vision and sound grasp of facts. * * * He is of the caliber of world statesmanship."

It was a high compliment, and a deserved one. The Arkansan's reputation as one of the Senate's ranking authorities on international affairs is no accident. He has devoted much of his public service to the advocacy of and intelligent and effective American foreign policy. He speaks with authority when he estimates the current situation in Europe, as he did this week in a Little Rock address, and reduces it to this stark simplicity: Beyond a doubt communism will dominate all of Europe, Africa, and Asia unless the economic collapse of the western nations is prevented.

The Marshall plan, Senator FULBRIGHT believes, can prevent that collapse and the critical threat to American security it implies. But the Marshall plan, he says, is facing grave dangers in this divided Congress.

"Although I feel certain that Congress at this session will pass some form of aid for the western European countries, my principal fear is that the Marshall plan may be whittled and pared until it is insufficient to meet the needs of those nations. A half-way measure will be worse than none at all, for it will fail to accomplish its purpose and allow the collapse of Europe while at the same time making certain permanent improvements from which Russia will benefit."

Yet, already the threat of congressional opposition to the Marshall plan has forced the administration into a major compromise. In his state of the Union message President Truman, upon the recommendation of his senatorial advisers, abandoned his previous insistence that the plan be established on a 5-year basis and asked only for financial commitments for the first year of operation. This is not important in itself, perhaps, but it is symptomatic. The Marshall plan, as Senator FULBRIGHT insists, must have wholehearted, consistent support if it is to succeed; otherwise we shall only write another tragic chapter in history under the heading: "Too little, too late."

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Clifford Ward from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel:

GOOD EVENING
(By Clifford B. Ward)

Several thousand flesh-and-blood American marines, mostly kids, like your boy and my boy, are on their way to the Mediterranean area to implement the Truman doctrine, which has gone sour as many of us predicted it would. When it was proposed to stop communism in Greece and Turkey by merely spending huge amounts of American dollars there in ways that native politicians on the scene advised, some of us asked if this wasn't where we had come in and if we were not again meddling in a manner that a bunch of American kids would have to lay down their lives to correct.

Maybe those marines going overseas to edge themselves into the path of bullets from two sides haven't any parents and haven't any claims to a modest amount of security during peacetime but I doubt it. I imagine most of them are lads who like to hear the Brooklyn Dodger games over the radio, follow the college football returns during the autumn season and have dates on Saturday nights with their favorite girls. If you asked any one of them what the Truman doctrine is, they wouldn't know and if you asked them what our foreign policy is, all they would know is that to some of the folks who are loudly interventionist, no American lives, except their own, are too precious to surrender for the sake of a foreign quarrel.

It's a terribly ghastly and unpatriotic thing to be an isolationist, except when the interventionists want to be isolationist. They wanted to be isolationist in Poland, in Latvia, in Lithuania, and Esthonia. They want now to be isolationist in China, but not in other areas.

Today, the interventionists are loudly insisting that millions of American boys be required to give 1 year of their lives to military training. I am for military training as a physical thing, but against it as a moral thing. Except in war, this country has no right to confiscate a year of a boy's time except as a punishment for a crime. Those behind UMT don't want it as a defense measure, they want it as a means of indoctrinating the youth of the country with the idea that it is a privilege to stop a fight between a Greek and a Turk, a fight between a Jap and a Chinese or a fight between a German and a Frenchman. Maybe it is, but I am difficult to convince.

This country needs a strong national defense, but the defense should be against the weapons that threaten it. Those weapons are atom bombs and germ warfare. Massed manpower on a huge scale can't defend this country against atom bombs and bacterial warfare.

There is a new war brewing and the war is against an ally whom we made victorious and then appeased with plunder that we should never have approved. But the dragon's teeth for this new war coming up, let us remember, were shown at such places as Tehran and Yalta, where we entered into secret deals that wouldn't stand the honest light of day and where an American President made a mockery of the high-sounding principles that we enunciated when we entered the war.

The Russians are burglars, but even burglars respect honest men who tell the truth and keep their words. It is even possible to reform burglars, but not by trying to be better burglars than they are. We tried to win the admiration of Russians at Yalta by attempting to be better burglars than they are and today the Russians are black-mailing us.

It's odd, isn't it? We won't let one man in the country treat an old lady for a cold in the head unless he can prove to a State examination board that he knows all about medicine, but we will let almost any stupid playboy who has donated the proper amount to a party campaign fund, become a diplomat in a position to start a war.

Christmas Greetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, the most treasured gift I have ever received from Ohio's greatest poet, who is known as the James Whitcomb Riley of Ohio, is a Christmas greeting this year on which he has placed this message:

Homer, believe it or not, but you were the inspiration for these verses, written years ago.
LEW WILLIAMS.

The poem follows:

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS

Just give me the throb of a human heart;
The clasp of an honest hand;
A cheery smile on a lonely mile,
A kindly word or two the while,
And a friend who can understand.

Then may I plod the long trail again
With no fear of worry or strife;
And the way will be smooth and easy to wend
For my Christmas gift is the heart of a friend
Who has brightened the highway of life.

—*Lew Williams, the Buckeye Poet.*

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on January 17, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, this month the Townsend Clubs of America are celebrating the birthday of Dr. Francis E. Townsend who reached his eighty-first year of age this past Tuesday, January 13. It is a great pleasure to me to join these millions of crusaders for justice in this event, honoring the founder and leader of this magnificent American movement.

In the 13 years since the Townsend program was launched social security has become a dominant issue in this country. Dr. Townsend is, indeed, to be congratulated for founding, steering to Nation-wide prominence, preserving, and strengthening this great movement. I fail to recall another individual who has gone so far or achieved so much for the benefit of his fellow countrymen out of his own efforts and leadership. Joining the millions of my fellow citizens who support his efforts in recognizing the opportunity he has created for all of us to unite, from one end of this country to the other, for the purposes of justice is, indeed, a happy pleasure. At this time, with nearly 150 Members of this Congress already having joined the effort to get a complete showdown on the Townsend bills in this Congress, I think it is a very encouraging situation. To Dr. Townsend I say, "Congratulations and best wishes for another 13 years of the service you are so able to render to the American people."

To my friends, the Townsendites, I say, "Go out and finish the work you have carried to so high a position. No effort has ever yet done so much good for so many people. We are just beginning to see hope of really valuable results. It is a fight and it is getting to be a hot one. That is what we want. That is the forge from which great achievement will come. America and its people need, as never before, what only you can give, namely, power and invincible support to this magnificent work."

As I get reaction from home from day to day I am beginning to discern rumblings of dissatisfaction.

Whether we realize it or not, people are asking, How much is this whole aid program going to cost?

Can't we do more for less money?

Will communism be drowned under the flow of dollars to foreign countries or will the Communists succeed in cutting in on these millions?

Are the American people going without the necessities of life as the result of so much being shipped out?

Should Congress set aside half the sum demanded to carry out the Marshall plan and use this to rebuild our air forces?

Are we neglecting our own defenses, jeopardizing our own economy, impoverishing the American people and generally weakening our own powerful position by participating in this gigantic venture into feeding and equipping the entire world?

No, this is not just your Congressman asking these questions. They are included in countless letters I receive every day from the rank and file Americans I represent.

They have the right to ask these questions. They have the right to answers also.

I am asking them now before I take any stand in favor of the Marshall plan or any other plan. I am a Representative in the American Congress, not the British Parliament or the French General Assembly. My first duty is to the Americans I represent.

Then, too, there is another question. How about the private holdings in this country of thousands of foreign subjects. They amount to millions upon millions of dollars.

Should not moneys such as these be considered as dutifully applicable to foreign aid as the tax dollars American citizens are being called on to pay for this purpose?

British capital or French capital or Dutch capital or any other capital ought to be on tap to help the needy in Europe as readily as ours. Yes, and a little more readily.

The very cheapest we can get out of helping Europe and Asia, I'm told, is to the tune of several billions, already spent.

If that's the case, then the United States will eventually be called upon to pay the whole shot.

Let's make this thing more equitable. We have our burdens, others should have theirs. We haven't yet begun to pay for the recent war, to say nothing of paying for the winning of the permanent peace.

America must be kept strong at all costs. America must be saved along with the rest. I for one want to preserve and keep our country because she is dearer to me than all the other nations of the world put together.

The High Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the New York World-Telegram in the accompanying editorial deals with the boomerang caused by the President's attempt to find a scapegoat upon whom to pin the blame for the high price of commodities.

There is no doubt that speculation in grain is one of the causes, although a much more important one is the reckless spending policy of the administration. Both of these can only be remedied by an internal house cleaning.

THE GREAT GRAIN SNOOP

Speaking here, Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson complains that the great grain snoop now going on in Washington is making it more difficult for the Government to employ first-class men.

The great grain snoop is what Mr. Anderson calls the current search by a Senate committee for Government insiders who have profited recently in commodity-market speculation.

But Mr. Anderson's complaint raises a question: Who brought on this great grain snoop? To which the answer is: Mr. Anderson's boss, President Truman, brought it on by trying to pin the blame for high food prices on commodity speculators. Suppose Mr. Truman hadn't said so much about the greed of gamblers in grain and other commodities who, according to repeated statements from him, were profiting in human misery and kicking the cost of living about like a football. In that case it's safe to say the Republicans never would have started the hunt for Government insiders.

Considering what has come out, however, we can understand Mr. Anderson's distaste for the great grain snoop.

First there was Edwin W. Pauley, President Truman's good Democratic friend and appointee as special assistant to the Secretary of the Army. Mr. Pauley, having claimed that he got rid of his commodity holdings at great loss when he learned that Mr. Truman disapproved of speculation, later had to admit making a $982,000 profit.

Then there was Brig Gen. Wallace Graham, the President's personal doctor. He said he didn't know what speculation was or what commodities were; that he never understood what his broker was doing; that he lost his socks by getting out of the market when he learned what Mr. Truman thought of speculators. But later he had to acknowledge a $6,165 profit.

And there's Democratic Senator ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma, in Congress for 25 years, a good many of them as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee which has a powerful influence on the Government's farm-price policies. His constant theme has been that the Government should do everything possible to make farm commodity prices higher and ever higher. He now concedes that he and Mrs. Thomas have speculated in commodities for many years, always on the "long" side—the side that made money when prices went up—and he sees nothing improper in that.

But for Mr. Truman, as we've said, the Republicans probably wouldn't have started "the great grain snoop." However, we can't see Secretary Anderson's plaintive objection inducing them to stop it now.

Henry Wallace and a Third Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by George E. Reedy:

Henry Wallace is learning that founding a third party isn't all beer and skittles. Sometimes its nothing but a morning-after headache—with no aspirin in the house. That, is just about his situation, according to reports from Chicago.

The so-called Progressive Citizens of America are holding their big convention in the Windy City. It is an appropriate place for such a meeting. So far, about all that has been produced is a long string of speeches praising Henry.

The delegates have been unable to decide a single question—not even the best method of nominating Wallace for the Presidency. But they have disclosed some interesting back-room arguments that might well kill the whole third-party idea.

It seems that the delegates are only agreed on two major points. They want to see Wallace run for the Presidency—and they don't care if Truman is beaten by a Republican. Outside of that, there is nothing except organized confusion.

The reason for this situation is obvious. The delegates represent every point of view, from extreme left-wing to mildly middle-of-the-road liberal. Trying to find a program that will fit all these people is like trying to feed a lion and a gazelle out of the same bowl.

The mild liberals, of course, stand no chance against the left-wingers, who know where they are going. But the Communists are afraid to go too far, because they might frighten the few remaining liberals out of the organization.

The result is a policy that recalls the famous character who jumped on his horse and rode off madly in all directions. That way, you usually meet yourself coming back.

The situation is best exemplified by the confusion over the stand that the new organization will take on the congressional elections. Some of the delegates are determined to support liberal Democrats or Republicans, no matter how they stand on Russia.

That, of course, is not a tasty prospect for the left-wingers who are swarming through the convention. Their only real purpose is to do a few peculiar things to American foreign policy. The rest is merely a cover-up.

A good example is the stand the so-called progressive citizens are taking on Paul Douglas in Illinois. He is running for election to the Senate against "CURLY" BROOKS, who now holds the seat.

Douglas, a former Chicago University professor, is a New Dealer by any definition. He is the personification of all the domestic policies the progressive citizens are supposed to stand for. Yet they are preparing to oppose his campaign.

If anybody wants to know why they will oppose him the answer may be found in a rather simple fact. Douglas has been very critical of the Soviet Union. That is enough to cast him outside the pale with many of Wallace's followers.

Other delegates can't quite follow this line of reasoning. They don't get the idea, but they are beginning to get suspicious. If they should pull out, of course, there may be nobody left to support Wallace—except a few very shady left-wingers.

That is the last thing the Communists want. It wouldn't be worth their while to back a third party in which they were the total membership. Therefore, they would pull out, too. It may well be that the whole organization will break up, and there will be no third party on the 1948 election ballot.

Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Secretary of Defense James Forrestal before the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, January 19, 1948:

In response to the invitation of your chairman, Mr. SHORT, I am pleased to have this opportunity to testify on the subject of oil. It is gratifying to those of us who

are immediately concerned with the grave responsibilities of safeguarding our national security to have congressional committees such as yours give us the opportunity to discuss with you problems so intimately connected with national life as those relating to oil. Full knowledge of facts is an indispensable element to successful operations in any field of endeavor, and in the case of this Government of ours, full knowledge of facts is a "must" if we are to have orderly functioning of democratic processes between the executive branch and the legislative branch.

I propose to consider the following four general topics in my testimony today. In the first place, I wish to underscore the importance of oil to the National Military Establishment. Secondly, I will explain the new administrative set-up within the National Military Establishment to handle oil matters. Thirdly, I will outline the National Military Establishment's attitude toward oil production and reserves within the Western Hemisphere, particularly within continental United States; and fourthly, I will give consideration to the National Military Establishment's attitude toward foreign oil outside the Western Hemisphere, particularly Middle East oil.

Petroleum is the primary source of motive power for military forces. It is the lifeblood of a war machine. In World War II our armament depended on oil. Without oil, our Army could not have marched, our Navy could not have sailed, and our Air Force could not have flown to final victory. There was a time when the major item of supply to a fighting force was food, as Napoleon graphically pointed out when he said that an army marches on its stomach. In World War II, however, the volume of liquid fuel shipped overseas was nearly 16 times that of food. Petroleum and petroleum products amounted to over 60 percent of the overseas military shipments. During the last war the peak consumption of oil for military purposes and for programs supported by the military was 1,375,000 barrels a day.

With respect to the future, it is not anticipated that any new source will soon replace petroleum for military motive power. Indeed, rather than writing down the military value of oil, our future strategic needs of oil must be calculated on the basis of a greater rate of oil consumption than we had during the last war. The maximum military requirements of petroleum in the event of a war emergency are now estimated nearly to double the requirements of World War II. Further, the essential civilian requirements—especially in the light of wide change-overs from coal to oil for domestic and industrial purposes—are anticipated to be appreciably higher than during the last war. It now appears that the United States military and civilian needs for a major war effort would exceed by at least 2,000,000 barrels a day the foreseeable production from the continental United States. The basic fact that oil is an absolutely essential commodity for the fulfillment of the mission of the National Military Establishment is incontrovertible.

The second item of my testimony agenda is to explain the new administrative set-up in the National Military Establishment whereby oil matters will be handled.

At the meeting of the Munitions Board of January 8, a format for the charter of the Armed Services Petroleum Board and for the charter for the Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency were approved. Briefly stated, the Army-Navy Petroleum Board is to be reconstituted as the Armed Services Petroleum Board.

This new Board is to be established as a joint board of the three Service Departments and will consist of six members. Three of the members will be designees respectively of the Chief of Staff, United States Army; of the Chief of Naval Operations; and of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. The remaining three members will be the Quartermaster General of the Army; the Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the Navy; and the Director of Maintenance, Supply and Services of the Air Force; or their alternates.

The Armed Services Petroleum Board is to be charged with a dual responsibility. First, it is to be responsible to the three secretaries for inter-service planning and coordination of efforts in the field of petroleum. Secondly, the Board is to be responsible for making recommendations to and performing such services, duties and functions in petroleum matters as may be required of it by the Munitions Board, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Research and Development Board as they exercise their respective statutory functions for the Secretary of Defense.

The new Board will be responsible for its own internal regulation and administration, and personnel and facilities requirements will be met by the three military departments.

A word would appear appropriate on the reason for the reconstitution of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board. Briefly, the reorganization of the military establishment by the National Security Act of 1947 prompted the reconstitution of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board. It was felt that the old board could not adequately coordinate petroleum activities among the agencies and departments in the National Military Establishment. To keep in step with the changes effected by the National Security Act and to carry out the Congressional mandates expressed in the act, the Armed Services Petroleum Board is being organized. Because of the particular importance of petroleum to all military operations in war and peace, it was determined that there is still a need for some agency under the three Secretaries which will assist them in the day-to-day performance of their duties with respect to petroleum products. It was also believed that the new petroleum board would be a convenient and economical vehicle for obtaining coordinated recommendations from the Departments for use of the Munitions Board, Research and Development Board and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency is to be established as a joint agency of the three military departments and is to be responsible for all purchase functions relating to petroleum and petroleum products within the National Military Establishment. This agency will consist of the Quartermaster General of the Army; the Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the Navy; and Director of Maintenance, Supply and Services of the Air Force. As in the case of the Armed Services Petroleum Board, the budgetary, staff, space and facilities requirements of the Petroleum Purchasing Agency will be met by the Departments of the Army, Navy and Air Force.

The Petroleum Purchasing Agency will have all the powers necessary for it to fulfill its purpose of streamlining the purchasing of petroleum and petroleum products for the armed forces. For example, it will solicit and analyze bids, negotiate, award, execute and administer contracts, obtain all necessary clearances in connection with any of its contracts, and so forth.

The creation of the Petroleum Purchasing Agency is also prompted by the National Security Act of 1947. That act has as one of its objectives the coordination of procurement activities among the armed forces. The Petroleum Purchasing Agency has been determined to be the means whereby such coordination is to be achieved so far as petroleum and petroleum products are concerned. The agency will provide a single point of contact between the petroleum industry and the Departments of the National Military Establishment with respect to purchase.

The third point which I propose to consider is the National Military Establishment's attitude toward oil reserves and production within the Western Hemisphere, particularly within the continental United States. The strategic importance of the location of oil can hardly be overemphasized. During the last war we enjoyed the tremendous military advantage of possessing on our shores or close to them a vast fund of oil. The difficulties which we encountered in the early days of World War II with German submarines in the Caribbean area, which is relatively close to home, is a forceful reminder of the urgency of maintaining ourselves as self-sufficient as possible in our petroleum needs, and such self-sufficiency is the primary goal of the petroleum policy of the National Military Establishment.

In terms of accessibility of petroleum resources, those within the continental limits of the United States are obviously first in importance. The latest estimate of proved crude reserves for the United States is 21,000,000,000 barrels plus, which is about 31 percent of the total proved reserves of the world. The proved reserves of the rest of the Western Hemisphere amount to about 11,000,000,000 barrels or 16 percent of the total proved reserves of the world, and roughly three-fourths of this amount are concentrated in Venezuela and 10 percent in Mexico. In connection with the oil of Mexico, Venezuela and other countries in this hemisphere, it is our hope that exploration of the subject at the forthcoming Bogota conference will lead to further development of petroleum resources of the Western Hemisphere.

Regarding the quantity of reserves as a fund which supports a certain optimum withdrawal, it is clear that the National Military Establishment favors policies which will promote discoveries of new petroleum reserves. In line with this point of view, the National Military Establishment wishes to support the development of the great area of Alaska. Discoveries and development of large crude pools in Alaska could have a heavy impact on the efforts to balance the availability of petroleum with requirements in the event of war. Alaska has shown considerable promise in respect to petroleum resources. I believe that continued Government support of the exploration being conducted at naval petroleum reserve No. 4, in Alaska, under the sponsorship of the Office of Naval Petroleum Reserves is well warranted.

Naval Petroleum Reserve, No. 1, in California is also of military value because of its strategic location on the west coast. Naval reserves other than the two I have just named should be returned to the Department of the Interior, and steps to effect such return are going forward.

In the commercial field it is believed that exploration for new pools still represents great potential for increasing our petroleum productive capacity. The tidelands areas in particular are believed to hold great promise in adding oil to our available resources. It is the view of the National Military Establishment that development of the tidelands areas should proceed as rapidly as possible and that all necessary action should be taken to permit rapid development of those areas. Delays in the development of the oil potential in the tidelands is considered contrary to the best interest of the United States from the viewpoint of national security. I do not mean to imply that the National Military Establishment would in any way condone or favor practices that are contrary to sound conservation principles but I do wish to emphasize that undeveloped oil fields provide no power for the machines of either war or peace. The National Military Establishment, together with the Department of Justice and the Department of the Interior, is currently engaged in drafting a statute dealing with the tidelands, and it is my hope that this statute will be ready for your consideration in 30 to 60 days.

The production story of the Western Hemisphere in 1947 is here briefly summarized. The United States accounted for slightly over three-fifths of the world's production and the rest of the Western Hemisphere, another fifth. As with petroleum reserves, production in Western Hemisphere countries other than the United States was concentrated in Venezuela with over 14 percent of the world's petroleum production and Mexico with slightly less than 2 percent. In terms of barrels, the latest estimates for 1947 production are as follows: The entire Western Hemisphere, 2,433,000,000 barrels; continental United States, 1,855,000,000 barrels; the Western Hemisphere exclusive of continental United States, 578,000,000 barrels; Venezuela, 433,000,000 barrels, and Mexico, 57,000,000 barrels.

To be sure, these figures by themselves sound imposing, but let us now reconsider our anticipated petroleum demands in the event of an emergency. As I stated earlier in my testimony, the United States military and civilian needs for a major war effort would exceed by at least 2,000,000 barrels a day the foreseeable production of the United States. The daily average production for the United States last year was a little over 5,000,000 barrels. Emergency demands for petroleum, therefore, would require United States production to be stepped up by at least 40 percent or would require heavy reliance by us upon foreign oil. The magnitude of a 40 percent or more increase is reflected in the fact that 1947 production was an increase over 1947 production by only 7 percent. The daily production of crude oil for the entire Western Hemisphere last year came to 6,666,000 barrels.

The current petroleum supply situation has also been unsatisfactory from the viewpoint of the services. During the past year considerable pressure has had to be placed upon industry by the military services in order to secure commitments to fill the purchase requirements. In August 1947 the Navy considered it necessary to issue instructions to reduce all operational activities to the essential minimum. At the same time the Air Force allocated extremely limited amounts of aviation gasoline to its commands. Tightness of the supply situation has been relieved to a certain extent and it appears that our military commitments will probably be met for the balance of fiscal 1948. However, in view of the increasing demand for petroleum, it is certain that continued pressure will have to be placed on industry if military requirements are going to be met.

It is appropriate to note here that the current military demands total 343,000 barrels a day. Of this amount, 244,000 barrels come from continental United States, 39,000 barrels from other sources in this hemisphere, and 60,000 barrels from the Persian Gulf. Calculated on the basis of crude production in the United States, the here-and-now military demands have amounted to only 4.4 percent of the total United States production, as contrasted to 32 percent at the wartime peak.

The National Military Establishment is intently interested in ways and means of ameliorating the tight petroleum supply situation in the United States. I note the advancements made in secondary recovery methods and the development of new effective recovery practices. It is believed that Government interest in secondary recovery and Government encouragement of such recovery are highly desirable. The prospects in the synthetic field and the possibilities in the utilization of foreign oil are eminently worthy of comment.

In the synthetic field the prospects for converting natural gas into liquid hydrocarbons appear promising and the military have hopes that the commercial developments in this undertaking will be successful. However, early commercial development of synthetic liquid fuel from coal and oil shale seem far away because of the high cost of the processes—high cost in terms not only of money, but also in terms of material, particularly steel. Nevertheless, the development of these processes is of great importance to national security as a means of supplementing our regular oil supply. The manufacture of synthetic liquid fuels from coal and shale has the considerable advantage of very extensive coal and shale resources in the United States. I am of the firm opinion that the United States Government should not only support pilot-plant operations in the synthetic liquid-fuel industry but also should support a few large-scale plants sufficient to provide the engineering know-how and to advance technical developments. The encouragement and promotion of the synthetic liquid-fuel developments is an important part of the petroleum policy of the National Military Establishment.

The utilization of foreign oil outside the Western Hemisphere brings me to the last topic of my testimony.

The Middle East oil resources at once become the focus of attention. Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and the island of Bahrein are estimated to have over two-fifths of the world's proved crude reserves, or a total of about 28,500,000,000 barrels, and last year these sources accounted for 10 percent of the world's production. The significance of the latter figure is accentuated by the fact that only 199 oil wells account for all of the Middle East oil production. By way of contrast, the United States position in world crude-oil production is maintained by some 440,000 producing oil wells.

From a national security point of view I consider it most fortunate that American enterprises are leading the development of the Middle East oil fields.

It is anticipated that the petroleum of the Middle East will replace petroleum from the Western Hemisphere going to the European areas. The consequential benefit to our national security is patent. The demands on our own oil resources and those of the Western Hemisphere will be lessened, and the consequent savings will mean more petroleum security for ourselves. The European recovery program, for example, will require that large amounts of petroleum products shall flow to western Europe—and it is to our interest to see that this petroleum, to the maximum extent practicable, is supplied from the wells of the Middle East. At the present time, incidentally, our total imports of petroleum are about in balance with our total exports—at a figure of approximately 450,000 barrels a day.

Further, the trend of demand versus availability has, in my opinion, become such that if military operations or individual living standards in the United States are not to be limited because of an economy of oil scarcity, we must adopt an active policy of favoring sizable importations of oil. The National Military Establishment favors the importation of oil to the extent that it provides needed supplies and conserves Western Hemisphere resources but not to the extent that it would discourage or depress United States exploration and development of promising major petroleum resources.

As I indicated earlier, the military has obtained and proposes to continue to obtain petroleum products from sources outside the Western Hemisphere. Insofar as it is consistent with United States policy, the military will generally give priority in peacetime purchases to those areas of supply which appear to represent doubtful accessibility during periods of major conflict unless unreasonable costs are involved or encouragement is needed elsewhere.

Gentlemen, I hope that these remarks will be helpful to you in your wholesome investigation of a problem vitally affecting our national security. If I might be of further assistance, I wish you would let me know.

Thank you.

Michigan's Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of Michigan. I am therefore pleased to present, for their information, an outline of such laws, as compiled by Robert L. Berry, department adjutant of the DAV, 2371 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich., who will be happy to furnish more specific information as to the application of any such State law.

This résumé of Michigan laws, affecting veterans and their dependents and organizations, is quoted in full as follows:

BONUS

Active honorable duty in military or naval service in World War II for a period of more than 60 days between September 16, 1940, and June 30, 1946, residents at time of entering service and for a period of at least 6 months prior thereto, $10 for each month of domestic service and $15 for each month of foreign service up to $500 maximum. Next of kin may be paid sum to which deceased serviceman would have been entitled if able to prove that they were dependent on veteran when he entered service. Applications and information may be obtained from the Adjutant General's Office, Bonus Section, Lansing 1, Mich. Applications must be notarized and mailed to above office by March 19, 1949.

Fifteen dollars for each month of service in World War I from April 6, 1917, to August 1, 1919. The time limitation on applications for benefits under this law expired December 31, 1932.

Payments of Civil War bounties have expired.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

County allowances are granted for the burial of certain veterans and wives and widows of veterans with privilege of removal of bodies to soldiers' burial grounds. Provisions have also been granted for the burial of the remains of the Michigan members of the north Russia forces of the American Expeditionary Forces in cemeteries in northern Russia or for their removal to the United States for burial by the Federal Government.

Counties are authorized to purchase burial plots for deceased Civil War veterans. Powers have been granted to the Grand Army of the Republic, Sons of Veterans, Military Order of the Loyal Legion, World War Veterans, and the United Spanish War Veterans, as corporations, to establish cemeteries. Power has also been granted to the State military board to purchase burial plots for certain Civil War veterans.

Municipalities may furnish, at public expense, metal markers for soldiers' graves to mark graves for memorial purposes. The county shall apply to the United States for a suitable headstone and shall have the headstone set in place.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment has been made of legal instruments and the making of oaths, affidavits, or affirmations by members of the armed forces.

In divorce actions, if one of the parties to the action is in the armed services such party's testimony may be taken outside the court, in such manner as the court may direct.

Proof of wills of persons who have died in the armed services is covered by an act effective until 1 year after the end of World War II.

Protection is granted to persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

Provision has been made for withholding from sale during the war and for 1 year thereafter State tax lands in which persons in military service owned any estate or enforceable legal interest at the time title was vested in the State.

Disability of minority for qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights has been removed.

Powers of a trustee engaged in war service has been suspended.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Provisions have been made for absentee registration and voting.

The Parole Board of the Bureau of Pardons and Paroles of the Department of Corrections shall issue final orders of discharge to any parolee honorably discharged from the armed forces during the term of the parole originally granted.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Persons authorized to administer oaths may not charge a veteran or his legal representative more than 15 cents for administering an oath or giving any official certificate in connection with a claim for pension, bounty, or back pay. Such persons may not charge a widow, guardian to a minor child, or other legal representative of a veteran more than 25 cents for administering an oath.

The fee of a judge of probate is limited to 15 cents for a certificate of guardianship, administration, or of the death of a pensioner or the widow, children, or other legal representatives of a pensioner, for the purpose of procuring payment of any installment of pension.

The State Commissioner of Health is required to furnish without charge one copy of any vital record to a veteran or a member of his family for use in connection with a claim for pension or compensation.

Transcripts under seal of any records of the offices of Secretary of State, Adjutant General, judges of probate, county clerks, and justices of the peace pertaining to pensions, insurance payments, or annuities are to be furnished without charge to veterans, their widows, or other dependents.

Discharge papers are recorded and indexed free of charge by county clerks.

Local councils of veterans' affairs may be established by any county, city, village, or township in cooperation with the State Office of Veterans' Affairs. Authority is given the boards of supervision, etc., to make appropriations.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Admission to the bar has been granted to applicants called into the armed forces of the United States or who volunteer therefor. Credit has been granted to World War veterans on application to take the bar examination.

Exemption has been granted to high-school and county-normal-school students who have been enlisted or inducted into military service during World War II from the requirement of taking a course in civics in order to graduate.

School districts maintaining an approved high school may operate veterans' institutes for education of World War II veterans. Schools may continue for 7 years after the close of World War II.

The State will render financial assistance to institutions of higher education maintained by a school district as a university, college, or junior college to assist in cost of education of veterans of World War II. The school receives $250 from the State Board of Education for each veteran in attendance. Five hundred thousand dollars was appropriated for the year ending June 30, 1947.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid has been extended to children of veterans, disabled or killed in action, including those killed in action or who died while serving in the armed forces of the United States between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, or have died since or become totally disabled. Free tuition is granted in State institutions of secondary or college grade.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Leaves of absence have been granted to municipal court judges in the armed services. Legislative request was made that Congress endorse a proposal that veterans of World Wars I and II be represented at the World Peace Conference.

Preference has been granted to veterans in county civil service. Preference is granted to veterans in employment in public departments and on public works of State and local units, with right to hearings on removal.

Preference has been granted to veterans in State civil service.

Preservation of benefit rights has been granted under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Teachers must be reinstated within 90 days after termination of military service with preservation of status or seniority rights and benefits under established regulations of the school district.

The commandant and subordinate officers of the Michigan Soldiers' Home are required to be veterans.

War service credit has been allowed State employees for retirement purposes.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

State bonus claims are not assignable or subject to garnishment, attachment, or levy of execution.

GUARDIANSHIP

Provision has been made for the appointment of the commandant of the Michigan Soldiers' Home as guardian of a member of the Home in certain cases.

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modification which provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of the veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Provision has been made for admission of veterans to the State Veterans Facility, formerly known as the Soldiers' Home. In 1931, a commission was created to transfer the Soldiers' Home to the Federal Government. Widows, wives, and mothers of soldiers, sailors, and marines may also be admitted to the home.

Aid has been extended to the American Legion children's billet at Otter Lake.

Provision has been made for care of widows, wives, and mothers of veterans of certain wars at the Soldiers' Home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An inmate of the Soldiers' Home, if adjudged insane, may be committed to a State hospital for the insane. Commitment of an incompetent veteran may also be made to a Federal hospital.

Hospitalization has been provided for persons afflicted with tuberculosis. Use of certain wartime emergency funds for hospital and medical care and other purposes has been granted for the benefit of World War veterans.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

Medals have been awarded for service in the Spanish American War or the Campaign in the Philippines.

MEMORIALS

Highway, United States Route 23, has been designated as United Spanish War Veterans' Memorial Highway.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Towns and cities may appropriate money for proper observance of Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Armistice Day.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Aid has been extended to Spanish-American War veterans. Banks and building and loan associations may make loans to qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

County relief may be extended to veterans, their wives, widows, children, and mothers. A postwar reserve fund of $50,000,000, has been created to liquidate the State's obligation to returning servicemen, their widows, or dependents.

State allowance has been made for care of dependents of enlisted and drafted men.

TAX EXEMPTIONS, EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Members of the armed services when furnished with a driver's permit, and when operating an official motor vehicle in such vehicle, are exempt from State license requirements. This feature is not applicable to civilian personnel.

Operators' or chauffeurs' licenses of persons in the armed services are extended until 30 days after discharge from such service. This is not applicable to civilian personnel.

Veterans are exempt from license fees for peddlers' licenses.

Licensed embalmers and funeral directors in active military service may be relieved of the payment of renewal and revival fees.

No license of a person who was licensed to engage in a profession or occupation by the State shall expire while such licensee is in the armed forces.

Disabled veterans of the Philippine Insurrection, the China Relief Expedition, the Spanish-American, Indian, Civil, Mexican Wars, and World Wars I and II are entitled to $2,000 homestead exemption from taxes. Exemption is not available to owners of taxable property of greater value than $7,500. Memorial homes of World War veterans have been granted exemption.

Personal property of certain veterans' organizations is exempt.

Intangible property of posts of the Grand Army of the Republic and Sons of Union Veterans are exempt from taxation.

Pensions received from the United States Government are exempt from personal-property tax.

TRANSFORTATION PRIVILEGES

Common carriers may provide free transportation to inmates of soldiers' homes.

UNIFORMS

Rights have been extended to inmates of veterans' or soldiers' homes with respect to wearing the uniform of the United States Army or Navy.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Appropriations (1942–43) to provide funds for conventions for certain veterans' organizations were made. Counties were authorized to appropriate $1,000 toward the expenses of veterans' conventions. Counties of 50,000 population or over may appropriate $5,000. Counties of 500,000 population or over may appropriate $25,000. Annual reports of the Grand Army of the Republic to the Governor shall include names and military record of deceased members. They shall be printed and distributed to posts.

United Spanish War Veterans' annual report to the Governor shall be printed and distributed to camps and auxiliaries

Incorporation has been granted to certain veterans' organizations and auxiliaries.

Unauthorized wearing or use of the registered name or insignia of certain veterans' organizations is a misdemeanor.

Any county, city, town, village, or school district may lease public buildings to veterans' organizations for 5 years at a nominal rent.

Armory privileges have been extended.

Certain veterans' organizations have been granted quarters at the State capitol.

State appropriation has been made for securing war devices and trophies from the United States Government and distributing same to veterans' organizations.

American Legion has been authorized to administer the Michigan patriotic fund to be used for welfare hospitalization, care, and assistance to disabled veterans.

Tax exemption has been granted to personal property of certain veterans' organizations. Intangible property of posts of the Grand Army of the Republic and Sons of Union Veterans is exempt from taxation.

Memorial homes of World War veterans are exempt from property tax.

Mr. Speaker, most of the above-mentioned laws have been enacted by the Michigan Legislature during the last 27 years, through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

The people of the State of Michigan have evidenced their confidence in the service work of these veteran organizations by making biennial appropriations to the several major veteran organizations.

Most of the 93 DAV chapters in the State, whose membership dues average about $5 annually, maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers.

In addition to such State-wide service, the DAV maintains nine full-time national service officers, under the direction of Sydney J. Allen, at 1201 Guardian Building, Detroit 26, Mich., to extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the preparation, presentation, and prosecution of claims before the Veterans' Administration.

The DAV is primarily concerned in seeing that all war-disabled veterans and their dependents receive their just entitlement to rights and benefits provided under the many complicated laws, Federal and State.

To provide gainful employment for all such disabled veterans, the DAV has developed a Nation-wide man-job-matching method program.

During its more than 27 years of service activities, the Disabled American Veterans has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation, nationally and in each State.

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932, the DAV is composed solely of men and women who were wounded or disabled as a result of their service to the United States in time of war.

Having specialized in the protection and formation of the justifiable needs and welfare of America's disabled defenders, the DAV feels that it has been thereby rendering a great service to these veterans and to our Country.

The service-giving activities of the DAV have made me proud to be one of the life members of this association.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, no funds could possibly be more wisely spent in these critical times than in counteracting the false and misleading propaganda which is being disseminated abroad regarding this country. This was recognized in the House last June when we passed by an overwhelming vote the so-called Voice of America bill.

The other body has now, by unanimous action, enacted legislation, differing in details, but similar in purpose.

The conferees from both Houses, I understand, have ironed out their points of difference and agreed on a measure which, I feel sure, will go a long way toward combating in many quarters overseas the savage and vicious attacks which are daily being made on this country and our motives and objectives. Even so, the program envisaged in this bill will involve an expenditure less than one-quarter of that laid out by the Soviet Union in its "information program" to thwart our attempts at world reconstruction and recovery, to dominate the minds, souls, and destinies of increasing millions throughout the world and to impose upon them a godless, totalitarian despotism.

The hour is late but, let us pray, not too late. The ammunition afforded by this bill, wisely administered, may prove the turning point in the current war of words. I urge early action on, and approval of, the conference report.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial on this timely subject from the New York Times:

VICTORY FOR THE "VOICE"

The Senate's unanimous approval last Friday of the State Department's cultural and informational program is as good an evidence as could be had of the changing climate of opinion in this country. Six months ago there was so much opposition to this measure and so much indifference to it that the Senate did not even bring it to a vote. In the House the similar measure introduced by Representative MUNDT of South Dakota passed, after a parliamentary rumpus, on June 24, by a vote of 272 to 97. Strangely enough, the program was allowed to continue without formal and separate legislative approval. Funds for it, reduced from the requested $31,381,220 to $12,400,000, were included in the regular State Department appropriations, sanctioned by vote of both Houses on July 3.

Now the withheld approval seems about to be granted. The Senate bill, introduced by Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, differs from the Mundt bill in some respects, notably in separating the radio broadcasting program ("The Voice of America") from the provisions for exchanging students, teachers, specialists, books, and periodicals. These changes do not seem damaging and it is thought the House will accept them. No specific expenditures are mentioned in either bill, but Senator SMITH suggests an immediate increase of $5,000,000 in this year's allowances and a total of from $35,000,000 to $40,000,000 for the next fiscal year. An economy-minded Congress, all things considered, might regard these increases as a true economy.

As long ago as last May, Secretary Marshall emphasized the necessity for making known to the world "what our motives are, what our actions have been, what we have done to assist people outside our borders." There is a greater necessity now, for, since May, the European recovery program has been announced, its principles generally accepted in this country and by democratic forces abroad, and a vicious attack launched upon it by the Cominform and other Russian mouthpieces. The storm of lies and misrepresentations about the United States has drifted across Europe and around the world like this winter's snows.

The old word "propaganda" has lost much of its stately meaning. We do not wish to reply in kind to the attacks upon us. But the truth about the United States will bear frank telling, and it is the truth, we believe, that now goes out in twenty-odd languages to thirty-odd countries, including European Russia and the Maritime Provinces of Siberia. If errors are made, they are certainly no part of a planned policy; nor should we forget that the "voice" is directly supplemented by the program for better acquaintanceship between our own students and scholars and those of other lands. We try to throw our beams of light across the earth and we raise our own curtains to let light in. The months have proved—and they have evidently convinced the skeptics in Congress—that in this bloodless war of words and ideas we must bring up our heaviest battalions.

The Louisiana Gubernatorial Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed and shocked when I read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday noting that my colleague from Louisiana, Mr. DOMENGEAUX, had again abused his privilege as a Representative in Congress by inserting in the RECORD a statement charging the Honorable Earl K. Long, a candidate for Governor of Louisiana with income-tax fraud. The people of the great State of Louisiana are well aware of the fact that my colleague's eleventh-hour accusation is to try to stop the tide of Mr. Long's candidacy. I am of the opinion that my colleague, Mr. DOMENGEAUX, has resorted to these unusual tactics in a desperate effort to save the $20,000 wager that he has up that Mr. Jones will get more votes in the first primary than Mr. Long. Certainly, I am interested in the Louisiana gubernatorial campaign but I have not at any time inserted a single statement in the RECORD dealing with Louisiana politics, because I do not believe that the taxpayers' money should be wasted in such a manner. But on account of the many slanderous remarks inserted in the RECORD against the Honorable Earl K. Long, I must now vouch for his integrity. He is a fine, conscientious gentleman; able, honest, sincere, and a man with great ability.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a resolution should be adopted by the House prohibiting any Member of the Louisiana

delegation from again using the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to air Louisiana politics. I believe that it is obvious that my colleague, Mr. DOMENGEAUX, flew to Washington for a few hours to insert his remarks in the RECORD so as to have congressional immunity, because certainly he would not dare make such a statement without congressional immunity.

Air Policy Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, the subject of national defense is of the utmost importance to every loyal American. We should, however, be alert to any and all propaganda favoring universal military training as a necessary means to national security. An editorial in the Washington Post of January 16 by Marquis Childs, contains some interesting information with regard to economy in our armed forces, supposed to result from the consolidation of the services; and the need for more up-to-date efficiency. Under leave to extend my remarks I include this editorial which follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)
AIR POLICY REPORT

In their searching and highly significant report the President's Air Policy Commission did not pass judgment on how the total defense budget is divided between Army, Navy, and Air Forces. But anyone who reads that report carefully can tell that the Commission felt a lot of money now being spent on defense is being wasted because it is going for "yesterday's war."

Neither the Army nor the Navy have faced up to present-day realities. Millions and millions of dollars are being spent in ways than can never serve the security of the United States. This is true in spite of the merger of the armed services 6 months ago which was meant to stop such wastes.

The facts are known, in part at least, to men in high position, some of them in uniform. Waste on yesterday's war—or even day before yesterday's war—is particularly obvious in the Navy. For example, shore installations are being maintained on the Pacific coast which can have no possible relation to any future war.

In the old days when America was relatively isolated by the two oceans this kind of waste did not matter too much. The Military Establishment was hardly more than a museum piece. At the outbreak of a war we would brush it aside and build a new modern war machine. Behind the barrier of the oceans there was always time.

But as the Air Commission's report—called Survival in the Air Age—makes dramatically clear, we shall never again have that much time. In the age of jet bombers and guided missiles there is no second chance. An atomic Pearl Harbor means final and utter defeat and disaster.

The commission's report is the first overall, impartial examination of the postwar Military Establishment and over-all strategy, if any. The commission was not authorized to pass on how the total defense budget should be spent. They came close to it, however, when they said:

"We view with great anxiety the pressures from many sides directed toward the maintenance of yesterday's establishment to fight tomorrow's war; of unwillingness to discard the old and take on the new; of a determination to advance the interest of a segment at the sacrifice of the body as a whole. All this is understandable. For it comes in large part from loyalty of each service to its traditions. But we can no longer afford the waste it involves. Hope rests only with the ability of the Secretary of Defense under the President to discharge effectively the authority vested in him with one objective in mind—the maximum in security for the minimum cost. It is imperative that this be done; for unless it is we will not have a Military Establishment capable of defending the country."

The Air Commission called on Secretary of Defense James Forrestal to show what had been done thus far to integrate the services and bring about essential economy. In tangible results Forrestal could show very little.

Members of the Commission were fully aware of the tremendous task that was dumped in Forrestal's lap. In the past the Navy has been the only force maintained in being between the wars. It was kept in being to guard the sea approaches to the United States.

Vested interests have grown up around the Navy that are like barnacles which fasten on a ship too long in port. It is an institution hoary with tradition and hedged around by guardians of that tradition.

Forrestal's job is now to keep the Navy as a force in being and as a security weapon safeguarding American interests all over the world while at the same time creating a second force in being in the air to guard the air approaches to the Nation. To carry out the second half of this assignment means inevitably that the Navy must be pruned (1) because many of its functions are now those of yesterday's war and (2) because the money simply will not be available unless there is a drastic pruning.

The vested interests are not, of course, all inside the Army and the Navy. For many years after they had outgrown any conceivable usefulness for defense the Army continued to maintain posts that in their day had been useful in fighting the Indians. When it was proposed to abolish these posts, nearby towns rose up in indignation and brought congressional pressure to bear to stop the move. That happened repeatedly, and naturally Army officers who didn't want to see any change could ally themselves with these interests.

Those days are gone forever. If Congress and the Nation persist in living in that kind of a past, then the awakening will eventually be a rude one.

Hoosier Watch Dog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel:

HOOSIER WATCH DOG

One of the most zealous guardians of American freedom against totalitarianism is Representative FOREST A. HARNESS, of the Fifth Indiana District.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda in the Executive Departments, he has a particularly strategic position in which to attack Federal bureaus and employees who have used public funds and facilities to foster schemes designed to entrench totalitarianism in America.

President Truman's demand for legislation providing compulsory health insurance, made in his recent message on the state of the Union, focuses attention on the expose by the Indiana Congressman's committee of the campaign to pressure Congress into passing this legislation.

Mr. HARNESS found this campaign was planned on Government time, paid for by the taxpayers in violation of the Federal statute making it unlawful for Federal employees to use tax funds to promote legislation.

Although Congressman HARNESS' committee of Democrats as well as Republicans voted unanimously to expose these Federal employees and turn the evidence over to the FBI and the Department of Justice for prosecution, the President has yet to utter one word of rebuke to employees of his administration.

Indeed, he has again joined them in an urgent plea for the proposed legislation.

Of the proposed compulsory health insurance law, HARNESS declares "there is no legislative proposal that has stronger, more obvious appeal to devotees of the all-powerful, all-supervising state than national compulsory health insurance, often described as 'socialized medicine.'"

Compulsory health insurance, the Indiana legislator insists, is the cornerstone of every Socialist regime. It would swell the number of bureaucrats by many thousands and would cost the taxpayers billions of dollars a year.

Mr. HARNESS' investigation revealed that headquarters for the intensive drive is in the Federal Security Agency in Washington, to which would be added administration and enforcement of the health insurance law. The FSA already has 35,000 employees.

Last year HARNESS stopped a joint health service Government mission to draw up a socialized-medicine program for Japan, when he exposed it as a grossly unlawful expenditure of Federal funds.

The Nation can be grateful for the zeal of this Hoosier watch dog.

Letter of J. Edgar Small, Esq., of York, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter:

YORK, PA., *January 14, 1948.*
Hon. CHESTER H. GROSS,
York, Pa.

DEAR MR. GROSS: There have been a thousand reasons presented to me during the past few months why I should be convicted of the fact that the Federal Government should appropriate billions of the taxpayers' money for the so-called purpose of preventing the spread of communism in Europe. But at the present time I am unable to think of one of them.

Mr. Harry Hopkins left the cat out of the bag in some lucid moment as to the real purpose of the "brain trusters" advising the New Dealers' Administration when he said, "The way to succeed politically is to tax and tax and to spend and spend and to elect and to elect."

Shortly after Harry was sworn in as President of the United States he declared that he would follow in every respect the New Deal philosophy. It is now quite obvious that it is the intention of the administration to enlarge the New Deal to include almost the entire planet so that we won't stop at furnishing two bottles of milk to every family in Europe as Henry Wallace suggested years ago, but now it is proposed that this donation be enlarged to the global extent of rehabilitating the economy of all the nations of Europe.

I am beginning to be astounded with the possibility of a Republican Congress being influenced to go along with the Democratic New Dealers with this program. The influences which seem to be now effective in leading our present Congress astray are appalling when you consider the tremendous force and effect of this well-planned and executed propaganda of the Federal Government. I shudder when I actually perceive the extent of this influence when the Federal Government determines upon some definite line of action, such as the rehabilitation of Europe. They have the power inherent by reason of their high position to lead, mold, and direct the thoughts of the people making use of all the public relations employees employed in every bureau and department of Government who have free access to the press and to the radio. Yet this power is so tremendous that they have actually influenced the minds of a Republican Congress, that it is their duty to go along with this diabolical scheme to take the money out of the pay envelopes for 60,000,000 employees and hand it over to Europeans with the result and effect which is the real undisclosed purpose of providing them with the means to purchase commodities and foodstuffs from America which will have the effect of tremendously accelerating our own cost of living. This whole thing is a tremendous pipe dream and in any angle it is viewed it becomes more cockeyed.

No doubt old Stalin is chuckling in his boots as he becomes more and more convicted of the fact that we are about to commit national suicide. For God's sake do something about this before it is too late. Mr. Marshall stated that the Congress should either appropriate all the money decided by the New Dealers or none at all. This in my estimation, is splendid and opens the door to accept the latter plan.

If the New Dealers are restricted by Congress by setting up an independent agency to control the expenditure of this tremendous amount of money, then they don't want to have anything to do with it. It is perfectly obvious that their whole plan consists in elevating the entire economy of the United States by advising purchases of materials so that wages can be raised and the production and income of the Nation greater during the next 4 years so that they can be elected and that their entire term of office will be guaranteed to maintain this tremendous high level. Of course, the result of all this some day will lead to a tremendous financial bust predicted by Stalin.

These New Dealers do not intend to lift a finger towards staying ascending prices. Instead of cutting down the cost of Government they are constantly adding to its cost, all of which is unproductive money and accelerates the spiral. They are now engaged in adding to the tremendous stock piles of food and materials in Government warehouses. They have planned domestically to expend ten more billions of dollars per annum, in addition to the seventeen they desire to sink in Europe. Their whole conception of the conduct of affairs is so fantastic that you can hardly conceive of any reasonable Republican going along with any of their plans. The only thing for a Republican to do in Congress when he finds that it is a desire of the Democrats to do anything, is to hit it and hit it hard and you will be on safe ground.

Hoping that you have not been inoculated with this New Deal propaganda and will use the head that God has given you, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
J. EDGAR SMALL,
Attorney at Law.

P. S.—If no emergency exists at home, the New Dealers can find one some other place.
J. E. S.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a speech I made to the Business and Professional Women's Club of Memphis upon the occasion of their first meeting in 1948. I spoke upon the equal rights amendment. A record was made of my remarks in Washington, forwarded to Memphis and broadcast to their meeting at the King Cotton Hotel. Later in the week, radio station WMC broadcast the speech as a regular facility. The speech follows:

My friends, I am grateful for this opportunity to speak to the Business and Professional Women's Club of Memphis in this unusual way. In the fall when Miss Brasher and Mrs. Richardson came to my Memphis office and invited me to speak briefly by remote control from Washington to your first meeting in 1948, on the subject of the equal-rights amendment, I confessed to them that I had little or no knowledge of the subject. Without reservation, however, I agreed to study the question and to prepare for this occasion which has now arrived.

I had long known the fine reputation enjoyed by your organization in Memphis and many of your members are personal friends of Mrs. Davis and of me. The high character of your business and professional services is generally known. It then followed naturally that I should want to be more adequately informed on a piece of projected legislation which holds your interest and endorsement.

My failure to know more about this particular amendment, I think, can be shared by the majority of the Members of both Houses of the Congress. During the war years much of the legislation presented to the National Legislature concerned our country's preparation for participation in great World War II, which so threatened the institutions, the happiness, the economy, the welfare, and the philosophy of our Government. We know now that Japan was preparing for this last war for 40 years. Russia, through its series of 5-year plans, had prepared for 25 years. Italy had been making ready for 20 years, and strange as it may seem, Germany, which precipitated this terrible experience throughout the world, had been intensifying its preparation for 12 years. Our own country which loved, and still loves, peace, had grown to be the happiest, the richest, and most powerful nation of all nations of the world. With an army of less than 260,000 officers and men, and thinking not in terms of war, found it necessary to prepare in a short period of 3 years not only for actual participation in battle, but through those efforts to turn back with our sons, the sacrifice of human blood, and the expenditure of our wealth, our inventive genius, and all of our great resources, these war lords. We now turn to a consideration of those principles which will insure a full, complete, and lasting peace. We are now in the midst of another war—this one a cold war, so called.

I think 1948 will be a year of great challenge, and as we seek to restore the economy of our own country, and as we may more completely contribute to a restoration of the economy of the world and world peace, we must think soundly and substantially on certain domestic questions. So then it was with amazement that my study of this bill during the Christmas holidays revealed the seeds of equal rights were sown almost 100 years ago.

As a matter of fact, two women of precocious political faith, Lucretia C. Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, first recorded the efforts of women at the Seneca Falls conference on July 18 and 19 in 1848. Out of the convention tumbled these demands for women builders of the Republic: Equal rights in the franchise, in education, in the professions, in public office, in marriage, in personal freedom, in control of property, in guardianship of children, in making contracts, in the church, and in the leadership of moral and public movements. In entering upon the great work before them, these two women said: "We anticipate no small amount of misconception, misrepresentation, and ridicule; but we shall use every instrumentality within our power to effect our object." They spoke in accurate prediction and in the same sort of fearless language their fathers and grandfathers used in drafting the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The efforts of the conferees and their descendants toward realization of the avowed objectives are a part of the story of the Nation's unfolding.

Any conclusion bearing on woman's status under the laws of the United States of America must take into account the common law, on which the fabric of the Nation's jurisprudence is woven.

The common-law rules of property sprang from various causes, notably tradition, military or economic exigency, natural male dominance, and the social status of women. Shifts in these have effected an almost complete overturn in laws governing the property owned by a woman prior to her marriage and that coming into her individual ownership after her marriage by gift, inheritance, will, or accumulation from her premarital possessions.

In general, it has been the rule that where specific statutes abrogating them have not been enacted, common-law principles apply. In the century just passed, much ground has been covered in superseding by specific laws the old common-law injustices to women. The largest remaining area to be reformed to the present-day trend lies in the matter of ownership and control of property acquired by the efforts of husband and wife after marriage.

An instance of legislative effort to recognize women's status as an individual in society is the action of one State in amending its constitution so that women are no longer barred from election to the highest public offices; another is the enactment by one State of a law expressly safeguarding a married woman's right as an individual to her personal earnings; another is one State's assurance that the right of any person to declare intention to become a citizen of the State shall not be denied or abridged because of sex or marital status; or the reform by six States of their juror qualifications to remove the ancient bar of sex; or the action by two States to bar discrimination against teachers in contracts of employment because of marital status, or by another State to prohibit this form of discrimination against any public officer or employee.

Good examples of legislative action to relieve economic pressures appear in the tightening of State control over legal obligations for support of families or dependent relatives, the removal of legal disabilities arising from woman's marital status, and the adoption of a State-wide system of community for marital property to divide burdens of taxation.

If the aggregate of legislative action in these fields seems small in comparison with the total number of States within the Union, it must be remembered that these achievements are not initial but final steps in a clean-up movement among the States to remove lingering discriminatory laws which have escaped attention in the broad reforms of the past century.

No amendment to the Constitution should be passed without wholesome examination of the facts.

It is significant that those who argue about the equal rights amendment agree on principle but differ on method. Both proponents and opponents of the amendment resent the more than 1,100 old, discriminatory laws against women which linger in State constitutions. I refer to a few—such as those which:

Prohibit a wife from engaging in independent business and keeping her earnings without husband's consent.

Specify that property acquired after marriage, by cooperative effort of husband and wife, belongs to and is controlled by the husband in the absence of valid agreements otherwise made between the two.

Restrict women in the making of contracts.

Refuse women the right to serve on juries.

Give the father first right to custody, services, and earnings of minor children.

Permit the husband to secure divorce on the basis of his wife's unchaste character while the same advantage is not permitted to women in the same States.

Supporters of the amendment believe that correction of these laws will be more speedily effected through a simple, constitutional adjustment. Opponents, fearful of sharp, clean Federal action, prefer to wait for the slow, voluntary action of the States, action which, amendment proponents contend, may never come about and, if it does, may be of a highly impermanent nature. Without a Federal directive, States would be left free to pass those special laws for women, which many believe must give way to adequate laws for men and women alike.

In 1944 the Democratic Party platform contained this language: "We favor legislation assuring equal pay for equal work regardless of sex. We recommend to Congress the submission of a constitutional amendment on equal rights for women."

Likewise, the Republican Party platform contained this language: "We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women. We favor job opportunities in the postwar world open to men and women alike without discrimination in rate of pay because of sex.

The matter has been before the Judiciary Committee in both the Senate and the House. Let me quote now from the Senate Judiciary Report of 1946:

"We should like to point out that the proposed amendment is in harmony with the principles to which our Nation has subscribed in ratifying the Charter of the United Nations. * * * Believing that the time has come for Congress to submit this resolution to the State legislatures for their consideration, the Committee on the Judiciary votes, January 21, 1946, to report this resolution to the Senate with the recommendation that the resolution do pass."

Now here is what the House Judiciary Committee reported:

"The committee definitely feels that the laws of many States and the United States, under the guise of protecting the safety and welfare of the female sex, have, in fact, discriminated against such sex in various economic fields of activity or have entirely excluded females from participation in economic fields in which they are as equally proficient as men and in which they can serve without injury to their health or the public interest. The arduous and efficient service rendered by women both in the armed services and in industry during the present war has clearly demonstrated that women are capable of fully participating in the economic activities of this country where not precluded from doing so by discriminatory laws and regulations."

Now, ladies, you have gained another advocate for the passage of your bill. I promise to do all that I can to interest other of my colleagues in this important legislation.

Speaking very practically, if each club represented in your fine federation will do as well, the bill will pass during the Eightieth Congress if properly presented after the so-called Marshall plan and other pressing world matters are out of the way.

Two months ago I should have been glad to have a limit placed upon my radio time. Now, I must confess that the time allowed is much too short for me to discuss adequately my genuine interest in this legislation.

I thank you.

Mikolajczyk Tells of the Fate of the Poles After Hitler Attacked Russia and of the Fate of 11,000 Polish Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two additional installments of articles published in the Milwaukee Sentinel describing the reaction in England and the United States when Hitler attacked Russia. The fate of Poland was held in an iron vise of conflict and the London Polish Government was the real barometer of liberty. The liberty of a brave people cannot be ruthlessly sacrified without grave consequences for all parties concerned.

Following are Mikolajczyk's two additional installments:

MIKOLAJCZYK SAYS RUSSIA'S WAR ENTRY BEWITCHED CHURCHILL

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and President of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment VI)

When Hitler attacked Russia on June 22, 1941, climaxing a series of inter-Axis political clashes of which we had been informed by the Polish underground, Winston Churchill went immediately to the wireless to welcome the Soviets to the side of the fighting democracies.

The United States, still neutral, took a somewhat less enthusiastic view. Sumner Welles reported, "In the opinion of this Government, any rallying of the forces opposite Hitlerism, from whatever source they may spring, will hasten the downfall of the German leaders and will therefore be to the benefit of our own defense and security."

Our Polish Government-in-Exile had something to say, too, in behalf of the country most deeply concerned. Poland had been debased by both Germans and Russians. In addition to unprecedented cruelties to our civilians, the Fascists and the Communists had divided Poland in two with the Ribbentrop-Molotov line. It was still divided on June 22.

Our cabinet met in London and made up its mind. Our Prime Minister, General Sikorski, issued a statement. Poland, he said, did not rule out the possibility of an understanding with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

WANTS RIGA TREATY RECOGNIZED

But unlike Britain and the United States, we had certain conditions to present. Russia, Sikorski said, must recognize again the Treaty of Riga, which established the border the Red Army had crossed in 1939. Russia must also set free the 1,500,000 Polish men and women the Reds had driven into Russia in 1939 for slave labor and worse. Polish prisoners of war in the U. S. S. R. must be freed and given every opportunity to renew the battle against the Germans.

The conditions we offered were most certainly generous. We had ruled out reparations and indemnities, though entitled to both. We had promised to forgive, if not forget that Molotov in 1939 had said, "Poland, as an independent state, is doomed forever"; that the Reds had stabbed us in the back; had cold-bloodedly appropriated half of our country—with which it held a nonaggression pact—burned our cities, killed our people, and driven many others into pitiless serfdom.

RUSSIA UNWILLING

But to our astonishment, when we sat down with Russian Ambassador Ivan Maisky in London to draw up our new pact with this huge new bedfellow in the camp of the Allies, we learned that Russia was not willing to accept all of our conditions.

Stunned and unbelieving, we asked Anthony Eden to help us obtain this bare minimum of demands, but found him immersed in almost the romantic enthusiasm of Churchill himself—over the very presence of the Russians in the war against Germany.

We objected but were asked to remain silent in the interests of "Allied unity"—a phrase used faithfully by the Western Powers, and abused by the Russians from the very beginning of their forced fight against Hitler.

We remained silent, and we compromised.

VALIDITY LOST

The pact which Sikorski signed with Maisky in London on July 30, 1941, provided, among other things, that:

1. The Soviet Government recognized that the Soviet-German treaties of 1939 as to territorial changes in Poland (the Ribbentrop-Molotov line) had lost their validity;

2. The Soviet Government granted an amnesty to all Polish citizens imprisoned in the U. S. S. R.

"A valuable contribution to the Allied cause," Eden said enthusiastically.

But, to us, it was a moral defeat. It was the beginning of the appeasement of Russia which continues to this day.

We had asked for Russia's recognition of the 1921 boundaries by name, not just a dissolution of the Ribbentrop-Molotov line. And we fought the inclusion of the word "amnesty" in the new pact, for it made it appear that Russia was doing a generous thing in releasing 1,500,000 Polish citizens they had criminally carried off to captivity.

QUIT IN PROTEST

We failed, and could not raise our voice. Three members of our Cabinet resigned in protest. The rest of us stayed, hoping that the handwriting that seemed so plain to us on the wall of history was somehow an illusion.

General Sikorski lived for the day when Polish armies re-formed in Russia, would fight at the side of Red army men, and that in the heat of battle the two groups would be united as understanding brothers.

With that in mind he set about the task of providing a Polish-Soviet military agreement, which on August 14, 1941, was signed in Moscow. It was agreed that:

1. A Polish army would be organized immediately in Russia;

2. The army would be part of the sovereign forces of Poland;

3. Polish soldiers in Russia would receive the pay, rations, and maintenance accorded the Red Army;

4. Russia, aided by such lend-lease as Poland was to receive from the United States, would outfit and feed the Polish Army in Russia.

AMBASSADOR BUSY

Between the time of these two pacts, our Ambassador to Russia, Stanislaw Kot, who, though a sick man, had flown across Germany to get to his post, was busy with the task of releasing and caring for the multitudes of Poles imprisoned in Russia. Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, the great soldier who had been named commander in chief of the Polish Army in Russia by General Sikorski, scoured the country for his old troops and other Poles fit to fight.

In London our misgivings mounted as we began receiving reports from Kot and Anders that the Russians were releasing our people with grudging reluctance.

The tone of our first pact with the new ally continued to be a source of alarm, and when President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill met to fashion their Altantic Charter we hoped for better days.

The precepts of that charter are, of course, familar to all. Suffice it to say that it calls for "no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned" and the "right of all peoples" to choose the type of government under which they will live, and promises that "sovereign rights and self-government will be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Our efforts to get the British and United States Governments to clarify—for the Russian mind—the spirit and letter of the pact we signed, were generally without avail. Neither country was in a mood to speak bluntly to Russia, though Russia, now in full retreat before the German forces, might have been attentive. It was in sore need of Allied aid.

UNITED STATES "UNDERSTANDING"

But the best we could get out of Washington was Welles' statement that it was the "understanding" of the United States that the Polish-Soviet pact meant that our country's old borders would be reestablished after the war. Eden said in Commons, "There is * * * no guarantee of frontiers."

In Moscow a representative of the American Red Cross was rebuffed three times when he sought permission to send food, clothing, and medical supplies to the Poles in Russia. The Soviet authorities plainly regarded the Red Cross as a "foreign agent" secretly bent upon spying and meddling in the domestic affairs of the U. S. S. R.

RUSSIA INVIOLATE TO ALLIED LEADERS, MIKOLAJCZYK SAYS

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment VII)

The silence of the Polish Government-in-exile, during the autumn of 1941 when we were attempting to empty the Russian work-concentration camps of 1,500,000 captured Poles, had been imposed upon us chiefly by Britain.

There was a widespread feeling in Britain, as Hitler's forces overran what had been the Russian zone of Poland and swept on toward Moscow, that Russia would capitulate to Germany and renew that totalitarian monster born of the earlier German-Russian pact. Churchill wanted nothing to offend the feelings of Stalin.

Some of this feeling penetrated Washington, and over both Washington and London there settled a state of mind which decreed that Stalin was the noblest of leaders and that all things Russian were right.

The Polish Government-in-exile was getting a sharply different view of matters. Many of the Russian labor camp commanders were refusing to yield the tens of thousands of emaciated and work-broken Poles under their yoke. Other Poles, released by the so-called amnesty, were being rearrested and put back into slavery. They were dying like flies.

Our Polish soldiers, released as prisoners of war, found their way to General Anders' headquarters as best they could, while our hampered diplomatic and military staffs in Russia scoured the far reaches of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for camps that had contained them as prisoners of war.

We could never be absolutely certain about the number of Polish Army men the Red Army had captured and hauled into Russia. We had mainly to depend on an item in the Soviet Army paper Red Star, dated September 17, 1940.

The Red Star item had revealed that in addition to civilians, 181,000 members of the Polish Army were then being held in Russian prisoners-of-war camps—a list which included 12 generals, 58 colonels, 72 lieutenant colonels, and 9,227 officers of lower ranks.

Slowly, bravely, the remnants of these forces began to report to General Anders, but he noted with growing concern that there were only a few officers among them. He communicated this news to us and we asked Moscow—only to be told that all the men had been released.

We repeated our inquiries about our missing officers, without avail, and at the same time arranged—through a meeting between Norman Davis, of the American Red Cross, and Constantin Oumansky, in Washington—to have Red Cross aid delivered to our stricken people in Russia.

These were fretful times for our government, for we were unable to reveal our difficulties to the world's public opinion. Nothing must distress Stalin. Nothing.

MADE GOOD READING

Russia's formal acceptance of the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter made comforting reading in the British Empire and in the United States. But in London the Polish Government had had a taste of the insincerity of Russian statements, and that taste was bitter.

Ambassador Maisky signified Russia's intention of abiding by the new world Bill of Rights established by Roosevelt and Churchill in the Atlantic. He denounced "all and any attempts of aggressive powers to impose their will upon other peoples," in a historic mockery of a meeting at St. James's Palace on September 24, 1941.

Maisky said the foreign policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would henceforth be guided by "the principle of self-determination of nations."

"The Soviet Union," he said, "defends the right of every nation to the independence and territory integrity of its country, and its right to establish such a social order and to choose such a form of government as it deems opportune * * * It proclaims its agreement with the fundamental principles of the declaration of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill."

ROLE OF SILENCE

Hats were thrown in the air. A bit later, when Russia announced that it would permit Polish Catholic and Jewish chaplains to administer to the spiritual needs of the army we were attempting to form in Russia, Stalin was widely lauded for his religious tolerance. Our long efforts to achieve that goal were, of course, overlooked. Our role was silence.

Lend-lease shipments for Poland, to be routed to wherever Poles fought, began in September 1941 with a notation by President Roosevelt that "this action demonstrates our intention to give material support to the fighting determination of the Polish people to establish once again the independence of which they were so inhumanely deprived."

GETS STALIN AUDIENCE

On November 14, 1941, Ambassador Kot was able to gain an audience with Stalin at the Kremlin. Molotov and Vishinsky were present. Kot immediately brought up the matter of missing officers.

Stalin looked surprised. "Are there still Poles who have not been liberated?" he asked.

"Many," Kot said. "We are particularly concerned with the case of about 11,000 officers who were detained in the Starobielsk, Kozielsk, and Otashkov camps. They were transferred to an unknown destination in the spring of 1940 and none have reported to General Anders."

"Our amnesty knows no exceptions," Stalin said. He ground out his cigarette and picked up a phone. Then he made a personal inquiry of someone about the officers.

NO CHANGE IN EXPRESSION

Kot reported to us that Stalin listened to a voice on the other end of the line for some time, without a change in expression, and then hung up and refused to speak about the officers through the rest of the meeting.

The terrible truth was beginning to dawn on us in London. We had received reports from families of the men. Those reports jibed with an awful precision. Mail from the officers had ceased during April and May of 1940.

In the face of such difficulties, General Anders nevertheless raised an army of 70,000 Poles in Russia, the equivalent of eight divisions. That fall and winter they trained—many of them barefooted—under appalling conditions. Russia provided supplies for only 40,000 of them. Some of them were at times forced to go without food as long as a week.

As for our civilians in Russia, we were eventually able to place 7,000 Polish relief workers among these more than a million and a quarter Poles. These workers found our people reduced close to the animal stage from starvation, terror, and work. The Russians had spared no one; had heaped on the more intelligent Poles the most menial work. They had turned mechanical engineers into ditch laborers. They had detailed doctors, scientists, and chemists to fertilizing fields with manure.

London and Washington were reluctant to join in our own snuffed-out protests, and it was in such an atmosphere that General Sikorski flew to Moscow on December 1, 1941, for a personal appeal to the man who must have been secretly amused by his trusting or overly timid allies—Joseph Stalin.

War or the Marshall Plan, So Say Experts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jerry Greene calls the turn on

double talk in the Times-Herald of January 19, 1948, in his column Capital Circus. Top-flight Cabinet officers should be telling the people the truth about our present international situation and not engage in testimony that is designed to scare our people into ill-advised legislation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial by Mr. Greene:

CAPITAL CIRCUS

(By Jerry Greene)

If these United States are as close to war with Russia as the administration stalwarts are telling the Congress day after day, then these dignitaries plugging for the Marshall plan are committing a fraud on the people which is little short of criminal.

For, if the danger of armed conflict is so imminent, if the Marshall plan alone stands between the cold war and a shooting war, then the top-flight Cabinet officers in this Government are being derelict in their duty.

They ought to be out demanding, immediately, the huge expenditures for defense they say will be necessary if communism isn't checked in western Europe.

After endless days when alternatives have been pitched at Congress by the dozens, a poor, feeble effort on the part of any taxpayer to understand the strange campaign for the Marshall plan can lead to but one door—the iron-studded portal of the booby hatch.

You have Defense Secretary James Forrestal telling the House Foreign Affairs Committee if the European recovery program doesn't go over, he will have to ask for 25 or 50 percent increases in appropriations for defense.

At the same time, Army Secretary Kenneth Royall is telling the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the only alternative to the Marshall plan is another two and a quarter billions in cash for his Department and reenactment of the draft.

After the next Pearl Harbor?

Never since the day when the man in the tall silk hat leaned out of his wagon over the neck of the banjo player and sold the same bottle of medicine to grow hair on the head and remove it from other parts of the body has this Capital been confronted with such peculiar advice from high places.

What started out to be a European recovery program has, over night, turned into "shell out or get ready to fight."

When the hoop-la about the Marshall plan was started by the Secretary of State himself, there was the assumption that Europe's economy must be restored and we would benefit thereby. Also, there was the firm intention to help tired and hungry peoples to determine their own form of government which they might not be able to do otherwise, in view of insistent Communist pressure.

That, apparently, is out the window. Take Forrestal's reply to a GOP questioner before the House committee: "The alternative is that we would live in an armed armistice. We would have to create and maintain a military power so strong that none would dare attack us or start a new war. And this would mean that we would have to deny ourselves the production necessary for a return to normal conditions."

If we aren't living in an armed armistice today, why does Truman want $11,100,000,000 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force in fiscal 1949?

Now let's look at the Secretary's threat about having to maintain this strong military power so nobody will attack us if Congress doesn't pour out the dough for this Marshall plan. There are those around town who, from the Secretary's own words, assumed that the United States already was trying to become invincible.

Just exactly 24 hours before he talked to the House committee last week, Forrestal, without any reference to European-recovery spending, told a press conference:

"We must keep a force of such strength as to deter any nation that would plan otherwise to do what Hitler did."

The President's Air Policy Commission had that same idea and the hell with whether Europe recovers or not. The Commission demanded more billions right now for aircraft production and said the United States ought to be spending $18,000,000,000 a year for national defense by the end of 1952—when Russia is expected to have the A-bomb and planes to carry it.

This frenzy about the Marshall plan or selective service, save Europe or fight, looks even more phony and strictly along the propaganda line when Marshall and Forrestal and Royall fail to turn up a timetable for their gloomy predictions and when they neglect to mention the world's hottest spot—the Middle East.

The danger of a clash which might bring on a real war is as great in Palestine, Iran, and vicinity as anywhere else. What would the Marshall plan do to stop that?

Additionally, some of the Congressmen are asking, since it is obvious that Europe is going to get some help from the United States, when will the Army-Navy-Air Force people know whether or not we need the draft again or those added billions?

Our best intelligence agents report that Russia doesn't want a war for another 4 or 5 years at best—certainly not until she has an atom bomb or two hidden under the Steppes. This is common knowledge around Washington and this assumed fact is causing an increasing number of people to wonder what's back of all that scare testimony turned loose on Capitol Hill in recent days.

The General Electric Price Policy and the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by United Electrical, Radio, Machine Workers of America, CIO:

To what extent was the recent announcement of the General Electric Co. of a price decrease of from 3 to 10 percent (average 5 percent) on radio and television sets and large and small electrical appliances in the public interest? This determination can only be made by an examination of the over-all price policy of the General Electric Co.

GENERAL ELECTRIC PRICE POLICY ON HEAVY ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT

The company publicized widely its December 31 announcement of price decreases on 40 percent of its products. But a statement by the company on December 12 that it was dropping its policy of firm pricing and allowing increases up to 20 percent on locomotives, generators, turbines, and other heavy electrical goods, comprising 60 percent of its production, was quietly buried in the financial pages of most newspapers. General Electric's lead was followed shortly thereafter by the Westinghouse Corp., which announced an identical policy providing for increases up to 20 percent on its heavy equipment. General Electric's 12-percent price rise in tubes in December 1947 was not reported in the press. Thus the company is breaking the price line and setting the stage for pyramiding increases on products which are bound to influence seriously the price structure of American industry and therefore the cost of living of the American people.

PREVIOUS PRICE INCREASES OF GENERAL ELECTRIC

Once before in 1947 General Electric broke the price line. On April 28, 1947, the company, the last major corporation in the industry to settle with the UE for a 15-percent-wage-package increase, was the first to announce simultaneously with the wage settlement a 6 to 17 percent price rise on all of its products. (New York Times, April 29, 1947.) Not until some months later did its competitors follow suit and increase prices.

The General Electric Co. not only helped break the price line in the electrical industry in April 1947, but also destroyed the movement for voluntary price reductions popularly known as the Newburyport Plan. It was reported at the time that Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, was deeply disturbed by this action of the company. (New York Post, April 28, 1947). The Union also criticized the company's price increases as unnecessary—a contention borne out by the company's latest price move.

For the entire year 1947 General Electric admits an increase of 20 percent in its average weighted prices. (New York Herald Tribune, December 22, 1947.) This does not include the proposed 20 percent increases on heavy electrical equipment.

INCREASING COMPETITION FOR RADIO, TELEVISION, AND APPLIANCE MARKET

The price decreases of the General Electric Co., such as they are, were prompted by adjustments as to an increasingly competitive market for radio and television sets and large and small appliances. For some time the trade journals have been carrying stories of increasing competition for a rapidly developing buyers' market. The General Electric price action would appear to be but a near post-Christmas adjustment to this competitive market.

On November 5, 1947, the Journal of Commerce reported that electrical buyers believe "that holiday buying this year may be our last big sales fillip before merchandising gets back on a really competitive footing.

The Wall Street Journal of November 26, 1947, reports: "The youthful television industry is poised for its major competitive war." On December 23 the same journal under the heading Radio Battle Royal, states that leading radio makers "plan to hit the market early next year with new and less costly models, in the opening salvo of what promises to be the fiercest competitive fight the industry has seen in years."

The New York Times of November 11, 1947, reports "Consumer resistance to high-priced gadgets" on electric ranges and points out that "many customers have decided to pass up deluxe models and wait for less expensive standard merchandise."

Business Week of November 8, 1947, notes that "a normal supply situation can be expected in 1948" for electric motors.

The Journal of Commerce for October 29, 1947, states that "Manufacturers of household refrigerators expect to be back in a full-fledged competitive market before the end of 1948."

The market condition is summed up by Business Week, October 4, 1947, as follows: "Producers of vacuum cleaners, washers, water heaters, and the like are telling dealers that the time has come to get out and sell. Floor stocks are becoming adequate, and in a few cases current production is sitting too long on manufacturers' loading platforms."

DISTRIBUTORS' REACTION TO GENERAL ELECTRIC'S PRICING

It has been widely recognized in the electrical industry that General Electric prices have been out of line with those of its competitors. On the occasion of its April 1947 price increase dealers noted that General Electric prices were out of line, and one dealer called the company the "least realistic" and most inept of major appliance producers when mass merchandising was involved. (New York Times, April 29, 1947.) Again, in January 1948, upon the announcement of price reductions by General Electric, the company's prices were criticized, one large distributor stating "it is well known that GE prices before the reductions were not competitive on many appliances. The reductions, among other things, served to bring GE into line." (New York Times, Jan. 1, 1948.)

PRODUCTIVITY INCREASING

For the industry as a whole, Factory Management and Maintenance, September 1947, reports on the basis of a survey among electrical manufacturers that productivity has increased 13½ percent between January 1946 and June 1947. The magazine also reports that electrical manufacturers foresee further increases in productivity from June 1947 to June 1948 of 9.6 percent. In the New York Herald Tribune of December 22, 1947, Charles E. Wilson indicated that increasing productivity in the General Electric Co. is reaching the point where price decreases are becoming possible.

THE PROFIT STATUS OF THE GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.

The profit picture of the General Electric Co. also throws some interesting light on the net results of the company's price actions over the past year. The year 1947 has been the most profitable one General Electric has enjoyed in its 55-year history. The Company's 1947 profit rate comes to the record-breaking figure of $75,280,000, 52.5 percent above its wartime yearly average (1942–45) of $49,348,000 and 82.6 percent above its 1939 level of $41,236,000.

In its effort to minimize the extent of its super-1947 profits, General Electric has undertaken a publicity campaign relating its profits to total sales instead of to its net worth (total stock owned by stockholders plus accumulated surplus). Even with war-inflated net worths General Electric in 1947 was earning 20.8 percent on its net worth—far above its wartime level of 13.9 percent and its prewar 1939 level of 13.5 percent.

Distilled Spirits or Food—Need for Legislation Urgent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson is now doing the very necessary job of limiting the use of grain by distillers in this time of world-wide food shortages.

Secretary Anderson's power to allocate grain to distillers was conferred by Public Law 395, enacted by the Congress in the last days of the special session just before Christmas. The power granted by Public Law 395 expires on the 31st of this month—only 12 days away.

Unless the Congress takes speedy action to continue Secretary Anderson's power to allocate grain to distillers, a tremendous amount of grain needed by human beings will be made into whisky in the months to come. The price of corn will jump. Farmers will find cash corn so expensive that they will turn to wheat for animal feed. This will not only raise the price of wheat and bread, but will make it practically impossible to meet the wheat-export goals which are such an essential part of our bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, on December 19, 1947, I introduced H. R. 4799 to continue the President's authority to allocate grain to distillers under the Second War Powers Act. Many of my colleagues on both sides of the floor have introduced similar bills, authorizing the President to allocate grain to distillers, or forbidding the use of grain for distilling entirely. A bill very similar to mine has been introduced under bipartisan sponsorship in the Senate. Hearings on this bill will be held before a subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee beginning next Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, the bills which my colleagues on both sides of the floor and I have introduced in this House have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and to the Committee on Banking and Currency. So far as I am aware, no hearings on these bills have as yet been scheduled. With the fullest appreciation of the many pressing duties which now confront both of these committees, I respectfully urge the chairmen of both committees to schedule hearings on these bills at the earliest possible moment so that this House will have the benefit of a careful study of all the facts in this complex situation. In this way, it would be possible to avoid the need for taking action at the 11th hour, without any hearings, as we had to do in the critical situation which confronted us just before Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's distilleries have ample supplies of whisky and neutral spirits. Their production and profits over the past few years have been enormous. There is plenty of whisky available for current sale. It will not hurt this industry to give up or cut down on the use of precious grain for beverage spirits for the next several months. Only in this way can we keep down the price of corn and wheat and prevent the start of another inflationary spiral. Only in this way can we export enough food to keep the freedom-loving peoples of the world going during this most critical year in world history.

If the Nation's distillers had any vision, they would welcome restrictions on their use of grain in the next few months. The greedy, self-centered, and short-sighted actions of many distillers are doing more to bring about the return of prohibition than 15 years of earnest labor by temperance workers. Several distilling companies have even challenged the constitutional power of this Congress to restrict their use of grain in order to protect the public welfare.

Mr. Speaker, to help us put the brakes on inflation at home, to help free peoples abroad, and, yes, to help the distillers themselves, I urge that this House, and particularly the Judiciary and Banking and Currency Committees take early action on the grain allocation bills which are now before us.

Proposing a Six-Point Program as an American Approach To Exercising the World Leadership Required for Permanent Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, we Americans should face up to the realistic fact that dollars alone cannot buy peace or outlaw war. As we discuss the substantial figures of the Marshall plan, or the European recovery program, as it is now being more popularly referred to, we should keep in mind that unless we raise our vision above the levels of a cash register or expand our leadership beyond that of the functions of an international paymaster or supply agent, we will get neither world security nor national solvency as a permanent dividend for our expensive and expansive efforts.

Now is the time, therefore, Mr. Speaker, for this Congress and this country to give consideration to the practical concurrent steps which we must take as essential concomitants if our economic and even military aid to Europe is to result in peace for the world, security for ourselves, and increased opportunity for others. We need not, and we must not, limit our activities to doing one thing only, and we must proceed with a comprehensive and constructive program for winning the peace if we expect our astronomical financial sacrifices to bring us the precious dividends of peace.

It is not my purpose to engage in critical generalizations, Mr. Speaker, nor to take the time of the House in a fault-finding, nagging discourse pointing out what I believe to be the obvious earlier errors of our State Department from the days of Cairo or before down to the very present. Neither do I care at this time to detail the errors of commission and omission which in my opinion continue to plague and perplex the Congress and the country as we strive to fashion a nonpartisan foreign policy which will warrant and receive bipartisan support.

I shall content myself, today, with saying simply that the failure of the White House and the State Department to follow through on its so-called Marshall plan or European recovery program suggestions by simultaneously or even subsequently proposing other specific steps for rounding out and shaping up a comprehensive and constructive multiple-front program for waging a peace are a great source of regret and concern to me. Positive action, now, can in my opinion win and hold this peace but it must be

action all along the line and not reliance simply upon a program of sending our dollars and supplies across the seas while we fail to press forward on other fronts which have equal or even greater significance if we are to avert war and maintain world security. The cash register psychology of this administration and the dollars-can-do-it-alone proposals which it presents without supporting them with the necessary concurrent actions so that our dollars and supplies can really help win the peace are a sorry manifestation of a myopic approach to world peace which the Congress and the country must correct if the administration continues to fail to supply leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I have never been one to criticize or castigate unless I have some suggestion for rectifying the conditions about which I feel compelled to complain. Therefore, I am now proposing a six-point program which, in my opinion, can provide a sound basis for an American approach to its responsibility of exercising the world leadership required for permanent peace. I offer these, sir, with all humility. I do not propose them as the final answers nor the perfect panacea. But, sir, I am prepared to defend them and to explain them and I have confidence that if we arm the economic aid program with the five fingers of concurrent action which I propose in addition to that program that we can make of the so-called Marshall plan a hand of friendly and firm assistance which can succeed rather than permitting it to become the hand of futile charity passing our hand-outs to some and disappointments to others without supporting our generosity with actions which can make it effective.

THE PROPOSED SIX-POINT PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, I now call attention briefly to the six points which I propose as a comprehensive and constructive basis upon which to function if we are really to wage a peace rather than simply to engage in wishful hoping that handfuls of dollars and shiploads of supplies will bring order out of chaos and tranquillity out of torment.

Point 1. I favor the extension of American economic aid abroad to friendly countries. This must be kept within the limits of our ability to provide and finance, and should be made available on such a basis as to protect our own self-interests and national security and so as to provide the best possible dividends in strategic returns for the United States.

Point 2. In addition to point 1, which is generally referred to as the European recovery program, we should move concurrently with action in the United Nations to revamp the policies and procedures of that organization so that Communist Russia and her satellites can no longer block efforts at preserving the peace through collective security, the establishment of an effective international police force, and the effective control and elimination of atomic armaments for aggressive war. The United States should now, without further devitalizing delay, exercise the necessary leadership to secure action by the United Nations in eliminating the procedural techniques which have enabled the Russian Communists to veto constructive proposals, and exercise absenteeism or deliberately dilatory tactics to disrupt collective security and block progress toward permanent peace. Once this is done, our economic aid abroad will strengthen nations willing and eager to work and cooperate for peace—until this is done, our aid abroad may be a noble undertaking, but the needs of the world are too great and too permanent to permit even the great United States to correct or cure them by unilateral action alone.

Point 3. We must develop and utilize an adequate and effective program of American information abroad to tell the truth about the United States, our plans, our purposes, and our ideals. Today, at long last, the House adopted in final passage my bill, H. R. 3342, setting up such an information service and what is now required is adequate financing and appropriate administration to put this information service into action as a great factor in our campaign to wage and win an effective and a lasting peace.

Point 4. The United States must face up to its expensive error in approving the so-called Morgenthau plan for Germany, and we should abandon all vestiges of that program without further delay. Instead, we must develop a program for utilizing the economic and manpower resources of Germany and Austria to strengthen the economic tone of non-Communist Europe while carefully safeguarding against any form of remilitarization which might permit these occupied and defeated enemy countries again to precipitate aggressive warfare. We should bring Germany and Austria back into the western world and encourage them in the development of successful democratic governments.

Point 5. We must develop and apply a set of relationships with Soviet Russia and her kept Communist satellite countries which will be based on policies which are strictly realistic and reciprocal. This means, Mr. Speaker, we must stop sending freight cars, farm machinery, petroleum products, tractors, trucks, and such other war potentials to Russia until such time as the Soviets demonstrate a willingness to cooperate for peace. It means, too, we must put our other relationships with Russia on a "tit for tat" basis, whereby we do not continue granting visitors' visas to Communists seeking entry to the United States as we are now doing until and unless the Communist countries extend similar privileges and opportunities to American citizens desiring to visit within their boundaries. One-way concessions to the Communists must cease; they must cease now, sir, and they must cease on all matters, whether they be diplomatic, military, or economic considerations. There must be no further appeasement of the Russian Communists if we are to help strengthen the world to resist their aggression. Our present policy of aiding those who resist communism while appeasing the Communists themselves is too much like bailing water out of the boat with one hand while bailing it back in from the Red Sea with the other.

Point 6. We must maintain a strong, modern, and alert defense establishment in the United States capable of supporting our program for peace and second to none in the world. The United States has become the ripest, plumpest, prettiest apple on the tree and it is the envy and the target of the Communist world which aims its efforts at plucking it for its own rapacious appetite. The surest way to lose the peace and to fumble or blunder our way into another war is to manifest weakness to the world or to permit ourselves to become what appears to be an easy victim for a tough aggressor. An ounce of prevention in preparedness today may well produce far more than a pound of cure against the ruinous epidemic of devastating war.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion if we move forward on these six points today with prompt and positive action we can win the peace and we can protect the world and ourselves against the menace of aggressive communism. Only the first and last of these points will cost us heavily in money or material. And if we pursue the last five of these programs actively we can materially and subsantially reduce the costs of the first point—the so-called Marshall plan. Let us keep in mind that dollars alone cannot win the peace.

Let us do what we must and what we can under point one of this six-point program but by supporting and supplementing action by concurrent activities on the other five points we can greatly reduce the total costs of economic aid abroad and with the billions saved thereby we can built permanently for peace and strengthen our economic foundations at home so as to provide prosperity for all our people and peace for all the world. This is a challenge which this country must accept and I hope enlightened members of both major American political parties will unite in developing and promoting a comprehensive, multiple-point program for peace which does not rely alone upon sending our money and materials abroad but which while holding that policy to the essential minimum will supplement it with constructive action which can maintain permanent peace. We can have enduring peace this time if we deserve it. Let us unite our efforts in exercising the type of leadership which will make it possible.

Rationing and Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter I have received from Mr. Glen Wenke, a farmer living in my district, which explains just what will happen if rationing and price controls are put into effect. What he says is based on just what happened during our previous experience with controls.

In addition to what Mr. Wenke says let me point out that our exports still amount to a billion dollars more a month than our imports, which fact greatly aggravates the very condition that causes shortages and high prices—a greater demand for goods than goods to supply it. The only condition that will bring down prices is for the supply of goods to equal or exceed the demand. Mr. Wenke's letter follows:

SPENCER, NEBR., *January 12, 1948.*

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I see by the papers they intend to ration meat. Well, if they do there will be less meat, for the farmer has had all he wants of rationing. During the war, when our hogs got 1 pound overweight we could not get the ceiling price and had to take a loss on them. Now, if they ration meat again my sows that are bred will go to market, and lots of others will do the same. In a year there will be less meat. Only about one out of a thousand cattle and hogs are now bringing top prices. The others are not bringing enough to more than pay for their feed. We farmers might as well sell our sows and sell the grain and let them holler for meat. We know what OPA was. Then we had black markets. You could buy anything you wanted if you had the money to pay black-market prices.

Yours truly,

GLEN WENKE.

St. Lawrence River Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Evening Tribune, Thursday, January 15, 1948, concerning the St. Lawrence River seaway and power project:

BAD FOR NEW ENGLAND

Ever since the St. Lawrence River seaway and power project was proposed initially a number of years ago, New England for the most part has been opposed to its realization as something that would be harmful to the best interests of this part of the country and now that the long deferred matter is scheduled to come up again in the United States Senate next week the case against the idea from this viewpoint seems stronger than ever.

Originally, the proposal was simply to make the river navigable in its upper reaches to provide direct connection by water from American and Canadian ports on the Great Lakes with Europe, and that constituted New England's main objection. That opposition was based on the contention that grave injury would be done to the port of Boston, to which Middle Western States send a considerable part of their goods to be shipped overseas by boat. The power phase of the project was added later and received the support of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and other prominent proponents of public power. Definite action was postponed during World War II, but now the plan is being pressed again.

Last year United States Army engineers testified at a hearing in Washington, D. C., that the complete seaway and power development cost would not be more than $500,000,000, but opponents insist that it would run eventually into billions of dollars. Although Canada also is interested, another basis of the objection is the belief that ultimately the United States would pay the bulk of the expense.

As evidence of prevailing sentiment on the subject, more than 400 representatives of New England business, industry, and labor met in Boston this week and voiced vigorous protest against the plan. United States Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, opposed the navigational features, although expressing himself in favor of getting more and cheaper electrical energy. A spokesman for the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers declared that the seaway would cost 20,000 railroad workers their jobs.

Other speakers stressed various points of opposition, with a sensational high point being reached in the declaration of Vice President Matthew Woll of the American Federation of Labor that associated with the general plan for the project is the intended settlement of 20,000,000 British people in a new industrial area on the Canadian side of the St. Lawrence River that would inflict irreparable damage on American wage earners, industrial enterprises, cities, and ports. That sounds fantastic and exaggerated, but if only a small part of it is likely to come true, New England would make a serious mistake if it did not enter the most formidable remonstrance possible to the current attempt to secure favorable action on the seaway and power project by Congress.

European Recovery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. CROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WEST GROVE, PA., *January 13, 1948.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This session of Congress will decide not the welfare of us Americans but our very existence.

You have before you a recommendation of General Marshall basing European recovery upon economic measures, namely, the expenditure of billions of American dollars. If carried out, this great sacrifice by the American people, raising our own cost of living to unbelievable heights, will be just as successful as the British of old, trying to buy off the Danish ravagers.

If Russia occupied Canada and we had no army, air force, or navy, would any of us be interested in building up our own business? That today is the position of every European country outside the iron curtain.

Why is our country threatened as never before?

Simply because first Roosevelt, Hopkins, and Marshall, and then Truman and Marshall, failed completely, in spite of repeated warnings, to analyze correctly the Russian menace. Yet you gentlemen, selected by our people because of your patriotism, foresight, and integrity, consider seriously again following the disastrous policy of President Truman and General Marshall.

In the autum of 1945 Russia, by breaking again and again her agreements for Europe and Asia, was exposed in her true colors. Then we had the mightiest military power in world's history on land, sea, and in the air, and a monopoly of the atomic bomb. That was the time for the showdown with Russia. And now today, due to the policy of Truman and Marshall, we are about to face this showdown with one tenth of our military power and with God and the Kremlin alone knowing if we still monopolize the atomic bomb.

From the bottom of my heart I say, if Truman is nominated and defeated our Democratic Party is sunk. If Truman is nominated and elected our country is sunk!

Very sincerely,

GEORGE H. EARLE,
Formerly Governor of Pennsylvania,
Democratic National Committeeman,
American Minister to Austria and Bulgaria.

The Voice of America Has Work To Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the House today has given its approval to the final passage of H. R. 3342 which has for its purpose the establishment of a permanent American information service abroad and the utilization of all available information media, student-teacher exchanges, and numerous other devices for the creation of the mutual understandings essential to a lasting peace.

In connection with today's great forward step in setting up this new and comprehensive permanent service feature in our State Department, Members may be interested in the following article appearing in yesterday's Sunday section of many American newspapers:

WE'RE LOSING THE PROPAGANDA WAR—BECAUSE WE DON'T EXPLAIN THEM FULLY, UNITED STATES PLANS AND POLICIES ARE MISUNDERSTOOD AND MALIGNED—AN EFFECTIVE INFORMATION PROGRAM MUST SPEAK ABROAD IN LANGUAGES THAT WILL BE UNDERSTOOD, IDEAS THAT WILL BE COMPREHENDED

(By Ken W. Purdy)

The United States of America is probably today the most maligned major nation in the world, the least understood, and well on its way to being the most detested. There isn't a city in the world, from Bangkok to Berlin, from Spitzbergen to the nether reaches of Patagonia, in which the wildest, most improbable and fraudulent tales about United States plans and purposes are not repeated a thousand times an hour. The food we send to children abroad is designed to stunt their growth, our medicines make illness worse, we are imperialists, money-grubbers, Fascists, selfish materialists, uncultured oafs, stupid, a lucky people whose luck is running out, heartless gangsters, naive do-gooders, a mongrelized rabble, lynch lovers, war fomenters, and so on through the entire catalog of invective and abuse in six-score tongues and dialects.

We are able to do next to nothing to counteract this torrent of planned falsehood.

Of course, we have the means with which to do the job, and the technicians in ample number. The difficulty does not lie there. But up to the present time, the Congress of the United States has not authorized the job to be done. Which is to say that the United States people have not authorized it to be done.

There are two basic reasons for the inaction of Congress on the question of an effective United States propaganda service, and all other arguments are subsidiary to these: (1) Isolationism. Many Americans, and

many Members of Congress, believe that the United States can stand alone, untouched and unharmed, even if the rest of the world collapses. Unfortunately, this has not been true at least since 1918. But to those who believe it to be true, there is no reason to spend money explaining ourselves to the rest of the world. (2) The fear that an official Government propaganda department, if given enough money to be effective, would use its facilities to further the political ambitions of the party in power. The record of the wartime Office of War Information, Overseas Branch, should be sufficient proof that this admitted danger can be overcome.

One way or another, during the next 10 years, we Americans will learn that isolationism is as dead as the mustache cup, and no more to be mourned. We can learn it through a world-wide depression, leaping across the globe like a prairie fire; we can learn it through a third world war—or we can learn it through simple self-education.

It is now commonplace to say that the third world war, if it comes, will begin with another Pearl Harbor. This is certain truth. In the staff schools and war colleges of the world, it has been well noted that the two greatest attempts at world domination in modern history—the two German attempts—failed primarily because they took on America last, instead of first. This is a mistake that will never be made again.

Too many of us think in terms of 1900, when the deadliest weapon in the world was a cannon capable of fair accuracy at ranges under 10 miles; when the French Army, the greatest in the world, stood between us and all western nations of doubtful friendship; when the British Navy, the greatest in the world, patrolled the Atlantic Ocean, serving our identical interests. In those days the Chinese had barely begun to break out of the cocoon of their ancient ways, and the Japanese had yet to win—prophetically, by a sneak naval attack—what we considered their funny little war against the Russians. They have both grown up since.

WORLD CONDITIONS DO NOT WAIT ON US

Today the Russians, currently the only nation with the taste for warlike threats and the muscle to back them up, could drive in trucks to the English Channel and step into Britain at will. In the East, the peoples of Asia are beginning to ponder the fact that together they outnumber, and by a handsome majority, all the white men in the world. Times have changed. It is not 1900 any more. "The time?" a most knowledgeable foreign correspondent said recently, "The time is Germany, 1932."

The answer is always the same. There are no barriers between us and other nations. We live next door to France, and Australia is just down the street.

The shrinkage of the world is a fact, like your age. It can't be changed.

It is not alone the danger of war that demonstates the childishness of isolationist thinking. There is a little matter of economics to be considered, too. A good apple cannot exist in a barrel of rotten ones, and a prosperous America will not survive a bankrupt Europe. Imagine your own State, by a miracle left in prosperity with the other 47 in bitter depression. For how long do you think? A couple of weeks, perhaps. The anology is exact.

Since then, we must live with the rest of the world, it behooves us to know our neighbors, and to see that they know us. To that end, what are we doing?

WE LET PROPAGANDA EFFORTS LAPSE

After VJ-day, we Americans, in what we now recognize as an unwise and adolescent wish to forget the whole thing immediately, demobilized our Army, wrapped most of the Navy in cellophane against moths and rust, and fed a good many thousands of airplanes into metal-baling machines. Naturally we also very speedily reduced the propaganda department of the Government, the Office of War Information, to skeleton proportions. The lesson in the fact that the British, although accepting desperate economies elsewhere, chose this time to double their appropriations for foreign propaganda, somehow escaped us.

The vestigial organization, its name changed to the Office of Information and Cultural Affairs (OIC), asked for $37,000,000 with which to carry out its operations in 67 countries during the fiscal year 1947. After a series of violent attacks in Congress, the agency received $12,400,000—or less than what American women spend on cosmetics in a week. The pleas of Secretary of State Marshall and of General Eisenhower availed nothing. The reduction was made anyway.

The OIC's director, William Benton, an advertising expert of demonstrated ability, then resigned. For months he was not replaced, partially because acceptance of the job carries with it the practical certainty that the individual concerned will be subjected to violent personal and professional attacks, and may well suffer permanent damage to his reputation and his private earning capacity.

Headless, then, and handicapped by insufficient funds, the OIC attempted to carry on its job. It has done as well as could be expected. It has done as well as, say, a small boy operating a toy pump in a sinking boat. He will drown, of course, being a boy doing a man's work, but while he pumps, he pumps well, and much credit should be his for the effort.

Part of the over-all job it has tried to do, though a small part, is the library, necessary to any modern propaganda activity: A center of information set up in a foreign country to which students, newspaper people, writers, and other moulders of opinion may come for background material, statistics, periodicals, and so on. The United States has a grand total of 56 people engaged in this work from one end of the world to the other. That is about the number of individuals to be found attached to a Russian legation in a small South American republic.

America produces more movies than any other country in the world. We invented the thing. Through the film medium, a great deal could certainly be done to inform the rest of the world of our nature, our purposes, our wish to be helpful and friendly. The United States Government carries six people on its pay roll for this purpose. And so it goes.

Congressman KARL D. MUNDT, of South Dakota, who went to Europe to see for himself, was shocked to find that in Prague, Czechoslovakia, one of the world's most crucial areas at the moment, United States propaganda is dispensed by two Americans and three Czech assistants. There are no facilities whatever outside of Prague. The Russian propaganda budget for Czechoslovakia is estimated at about $6,000,000 a year, or half what we spend on the whole world.

The United States radio program, the Voice of America, is a thin and piping treble, although there are pending proposals to strengthen it. We broadcast a total of 17 hours a day to Europe. This is not to be read as a steady 17 hours going to all of Europe; it is a total of 17 hours, made up of such components as half an hour a day to Austria, the center of the fight for the minds of the central European peoples, and 90 minutes a day to Greece, westernmost bastion of the United States, testing ground for the Truman doctrine.

As Congressman MUNDT remarked, in pointing out that an expenditure of less than 1 percent of our current yearly outlay in Europe would give us an altogether adequate information service, "We're battling with pea shooters and popguns against heavy artillery."

The weighty opinions of the authorities have long since been registered. Said former Secretary of State James Byrnes: "There was a time when we could afford—or thought we could afford—to be unconcerned about what other people thought of us. * * * That time is past."

Or, as Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG remarked a few weeks ago, "I am heartily in favor of all practical means to combat the self-serving propaganda from Moscow and her satellites. * * * The most disreputable campaign of libel and slander which has ever belabored the ears of the world."

In lieu of a functioning professional propaganda organization, various stop-gap methods have been proposed. So far, aside from such suggestions as an improved coordination between White House and State Department public relations, and the recruiting for Foreign Service of more men with journalistic backgrounds, the proposals have been of little value.

Typical was the plan offered by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, who urged that United States newspapers and magazines be sent abroad in quantity, by air transport. Said WILEY, "* * * I believe that America's great press wire services, her leading magazines, and similar institutions can do a magnificent job for us without involving us in the possibilities of a Government propaganda mill with a partisan approach."

NEWSPAPER EXPORT WON'T WORK

WILEY's proposal will probably be graciously received by the State Department, the temper of Congressmen scorned being known, but it will be received in despair by the experts. The percentage of the English-reading population in any given European area is, of course, small. Of those who can read English, the greatest number is to be found among the wealthy and the intellectuals, most of whose minds are either long made up or else unlikely to be swayed by a perusal of the news. Export of periodicals in any amount likely to be agreed to by the United States press would not reach those masses of the people who must be reached.

This idea was, of course, one of the first to occur to OWI personnel during the war. Why make our own magazines, it was said, when the country is full of them, all ready to go? But very few were ever sent, and of those that were, most were ineffective and some were actively resented. To a Parisian who learned English in school, Time magazine, for all its usefulness to us, simply does not make sense. The New Yorker completely mystifies him, as does all our humorous material. He likes picture magazines, but Life, certainly the best picture magazine in the world, has not been able to make a notable success of its international edition, mostly because (1) it is in English, and (2) it is made up of material edited for Americans. The Frenchman has picture magazines of his own, which take into account his foibles, his habits, his tastes, and so, of course, he prefers them. Reader's Digest has been the sole real success, because it is edited to be read in the various countries to which it is sent, and is translated into the languages used there.

Newspapers sent abroad would have to be most carefully selected, lest they defeat the purpose. Papers of the New York Times category would be useful if perhaps 500,000 were available, which they would not be unless the Government paid for their production and furnished the necessary newsprint. So heavy an expenditure would be more useful in other directions.

The heavy percentage of local news which makes United States papers so interesting to their own readers would naturally be incomprehensible for the most part anywhere, England included. Other papers would serve only to confirm for foreigners what anti-United States propaganda says of us. For example this story, from a major United States daily: "Surgeon claims cure for reds. A world-renowned brain specialist came up yesterday with a sure way to rid the world of Communists. Make a hole in their heads, he said—but by surgery, not a bullet." The story went on to say that Communists and "liberals" who underwent lobotomies were changed into individuals of conservative political beliefs. Lobotomy is a form of brain surgery indicated in some types of mental disease, which it often cures—at a price. The price frequently is loss of initiative, some lowering of intelligence, and the acquisition of a placid, noncurious mentality. One does not have to be a propagandist to know what the Russian machine would do with this story. "United States surgeons turn liberals into moronic serfs" would be the least of it. And they would cite our own newspapers as proof of the falsehood.

No, this is not the answer.

When there is plumbing to be done, one should send for the plumber. For an aching tooth, a dentist and only a dentist is indicated. Propaganda is best done by propagandists.

The core of the machinery is ready in the much-battered OIC, now called the Office of Information and Educational Exchange. It requires only money, say about 25 cents per United States citizen per year, and a reasonable go-ahead.

The fear that such an agency will turn itself into an instrumentality for the reelection of President Truman, or the election of the 1948 Republican candidate, is largely illusory, since its function is fixed by law, and it is forbidden to operate in this country. Few Greeks will go to the polling places in Athens next year to vote in our elections. The Belgians do not hold the United States franchise. In 4 years with the OWI, which was constantly under totally unjustified attack for attempting to influence United States politics, the writer never saw a written directive or heard an oral instruction to do any such thing—even had it been possible, which it was not. The fact that Franklin Roosevelt meant America to most of the world, as Winston Churchill meant England, and as Josef Stalin means Russia to us today, was of course duly exploited, as it had to be. But nothing more.

The United States does not need a propaganda machine in the European pattern. The truth is the best propaganda. One of the reasons for the current set-back of the Russians in Europe has been the extreme cynicism of their propaganda; people wearied of being told one thing today, another tomorrow, ended by believing nothing.

It may be argued that propaganda is a preliminary to war, and that to propagandize against the Russians, as they propagandize against us, is to invite war.

GOAL OF OUR PROGRAM: TO SPREAD TRUTH

If propaganda is preliminary to war, so is diplomacy, yet we did not dismantle the State Department. Nor should we propagandize against the Soviets. We should instead propagandize for the truth, as nearly as we can determine the truth. The accuracy of United States propaganda depends of course in a measure upon the validity of United States policy. It is hard to argue truthfully that we come as liberators if we support reactionary elements with which most of the natives in a given country are out of sympathy. Further, we should not attempt to bludgeon others into our own beliefs. Historically, sugar catches more flies than vinegar, and the man who attempts to break up a fight by urging that the combatants adopt his views usually gets a rousing punch in the nose for his pains.

It may be—it should be—that the world, although at the moment divided in two, will yet learn to live peaceably as one. But meanwhile it is as well to believe that when the Russians say that capitalism and communism cannot exist side by side, they mean what they say. There is every indication that they mean it.

The success or failure of the Marshall plan is the most crucial issue before the world today. It does not appear that anything else can save the peace. If for no other purpose, an apparatus to explain its true purpose is vitally needed.

In this, perhaps the most crucial era of modern history, there is no sound reason for our keeping silence, or speaking in a whisper. If the Rumanian radio says, as it did recently, that United States corn shipped to feed Rumanian children was adulterated, and made them ill, a reasoned reply should be made. The corn may in fact have been contaminated or spoiled in shipment. Such things have happened. But that an entire nation should be allowed to believe that Joe J. Jones, American, tried to poison the children of Rumania, is ridiculous, and to allow it to happen is folly.

After all, Mr. Jones, it's you they're talking about.

The White House Balcony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Daily News, of Los Angeles, Calif., discussing the proposed addition of a balcony to the south facade of the White House is entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District as an indication of their disapproval of the contemplated White House structural changes:

(By Harold L. Ickes)

With all of the hush-hush secrecy of the Pendergast gang getting ready to steal an election in St. Louis, President Truman, an honored and dues-paying member, has suddenly announced that a contract has been let for mutilating the south facade of the White House by building thereon a scabrous balcony.

President Truman has not asked the people what they think about his proposed liberty with their White House. He simply tells them what he proposes to do.

The White House balcony episode, at this writing, would appear to have resolved itself into a question of good sense and good taste, on the part of Truman. There is a further question, whether the Commission of Fine Arts is a watchdog, with, or without, teeth. One might have assumed that Truman would have learned a lesson during the first year of his fortuitous occupancy of the White House when public opinion compelled him to abandon his purpose to build a distorted west wing.

Apparently that experience netted him only the disjointed notion that, when it comes to laying vandal hands on public property, secrecy is the best policy. In any event, the public was given no hint that a disfiguring balcony was to be added to the beautiful south portico until the contract for it, in serene disregard for the disapproval of the Commission of Fine Arts, had been let. This represents neither good taste nor good sense.

As for Truman's taste, perhaps the least said the better. The chief reason given for his yearning for a balcony is that it would provide privacy for himself and his family in the hot summer months, when neither he nor his family would be in Washington, generally speaking. Has Truman overlooked the fact that the matter of his continuing as the tenant of the White House will be decided at the polls this year? Has it occurred to him that the people may reject him as a tenant; and that his successor and his family may not like an iron balcony inside the majestic pillars of the south portico? Or is the letting of the contract purely a boastful gesture of confidence?

These are, really, the lesser aspects of the taste displayed. The larger one is Truman's apparent lack of perception that the White House is as truly and as definitely a national shrine as is the Lincoln Memorial.

Lincoln, and other national heroes before and after him, lived and toiled there. Americans, proud of their traditions, make pilgrimages from far places that they may gaze, if only for a few minutes, at their White House, in which the spirit of great leadership still lives. To them it is the historic mansion in which the great Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt lived and wrought for their country. They do not conceive of it as the dwelling place of a Chester A. Arthur—or of a Harry S. Truman.

It does seem as though Truman could have put a curb on his adolescent yearning for a balcony until there could have been a real expression of public sentiment regarding it. There was an expression, by proxy; and Truman may fairly, I think, be regarded as adding insult to injury by willfully going ahead in defiance of it.

The Commission of Fine Arts was created, in 1921, to provide a continuing and expert body of men to protect historic landmarks against damage through erratic personal idiosyncrasies of individuals. Truman, it appears, consulted this body—and proceeded to disregard its advice.

At first, a member of the commission gave out an informal statement to the effect that the members were opposed to the balcony. However, the commission decided to string along with the President.

Later, the chairman, Gilmore D. Clark of New York, issued a formal statement in which it was revealed that there had been two meetings to consider the balcony, and the vote was unanimously against it, on the ground that "such a feature would permanently change the appearance of the south facade of the White House."

If, as the commission says, its authority over Presidential whims is no more than advice on request, then, clearly, it should be given teeth; or it should resign, as a body, in protest.

Self-respect requires no less. Undoubtedly it could have exercised more pressure than it did. But it ducked. On the strength of this unhappy precedent, the protection of public shrines is likely to degenerate into an apparently answerless question of "Who is stringing whom?" And American voters do not like to be "strung."

The White House does not belong to you, Mr. President. You do not even occupy it under a permanent lease. It belongs to the people of the United States who have graciously allowed you to live in it as they will allow others after you. You have no more right to mar it than you would have to change the physical appearance of the Washington Monument or the Lincoln Memorial.

Secretary Harriman's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a clipping and an editorial appearing in the Chattanooga Times of January 15, 1948, concerning the excellent speech made by Secretary W. Averell Harriman at the seventy-first annual dinner of the Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce.

The clipping follows:

Harriman, who will testify before the Senate Banking Committee this afternoon at 2:30 eastern standard time on the Truman program to curb the rising cost of living, said: "Congress has authorized a program of voluntary agreements with industry which I am charged with administering. I shall give this program my fullest support. But from my experience in business and government, I do not believe our present needs can be met without addition of the limited powers the President has asked for. Of paramount importance to us and other countries is the maintenance of a stable America."

LAUDS MARSHALL PLAN

The Secretary of Commerce termed the European recovery program "an indispensable step in building a stable peace. We know that political stability can only be attained by improving economic conditions. There are forces in Europe who wish to take advantage of economic chaos and hunger to establish totalitarian dictatorships."

He said a "program of the contemplated magnitude will be costly and will mean sacrifices by the American people, but the benefits to be gained, I believe, will far outweigh the immediate sacrifices. • • • Our returns will be in furthering peace and world stability."

ASKS MIDDLE EAST HELP

"I believe that we can help in the less developed areas of the world, such as the Middle East, where I spent many months during the war, to expand agricultural products through American imaginative projects."

Harriman's address was delivered to a capacity audience of 450 members of the Chamber and their wives and friends in the Read House ballroom.

"I firmly believe that a recovery program for Europe of the size and nature proposed by President Truman will serve the cause of peace and in fact is an indispensable step in building a stable peace," Secretary Harriman said.

"We are proposing to assist the people of western Europe to regain their economic stability. We have given generously already to alleviate the conditions of economic disruption and hunger that existed immediately after the war. Through hard work they have rehabilitated factories, and industrial production has been expanded to almost prewar levels in most of the countries. But we find it is not yet enough to balance the needs."

"WORKSHOP OF WORLD

"These countries on the whole are, next to us, the great workshop of the world, and they must import food and raw materials to convert to finished manufactured products. They must export to live, and so far they have not been able to cover their requirements with their exports. More aid from the outside is needed or else there will be extreme difficulties.

"We know that political stability can only be attained by improving economic conditions. There are forces in Europe who want to take advantage of economic chaos and hunger to establish totalitarian dictatorships.

"The countries of western Europe, including western Germany, include some 270,000,000 of the most talented, industrious and freedom-loving people of the world. They are largely the people from whom our traditions and way of life stem. If western civilization in Europe collapses we shall face world conditions quite different from anything we have before known.

"We have learned that wherever governments are under the control of the people and wherever the people are free to make the ultimate decisions, the cause of peace is furthered. Historically, we can find no such assurance in dictatorships."

SELF-HELP PROGRAM

"At Secretary Marshall's suggestion the 16 nations have developed a cooperative program of helping themselves and helping each other. The success of the program will depend primarily upon their own efforts, but they have asked us for the aid that is necessary to make the program effective.

"Although the amounts from us are large, they are a small percentage of the total job to be done. I, for one, have no doubt that if we support this program with determination it will be successful in reestablishing western Europe on firm foundation and enable it to go forward in its traditions of democracy, freedom, and expanding human values. Not to have such faith is to deny the validity of the free institutions that we so firmly adhere to.

"This program is one of the most far-reaching undertakings for peace and human progress ever contemplated by this or any other country. It is noble in concept but is based on considerations of our own self-interest and in fact on our own self-preservation.

"We must understand and evaluate the alternative—if we should fail to take this step."

QUOTES HIS COMMITTEE

"The President last summer appointed a committee of 19 distinguished private citizens drawn from different backgrounds and experience to give its judgment on a foreign aid program. I served as chairman of that committee. A section of their report deals with the interest of the United States in European recovery. They emphasize our humanitarian and economic interests and then conclude with their views on the consequences of a collapse in Europe. I will quote from the concluding sentences:

"'The domestic consequences are such as no American could easily tolerate: The swift and complete conversion to a military footing which national security would require; the abrupt but necessary change in our relations with the rest of the Western Hemisphere; the immediate and sweeping limitation of our economic and political life, perhaps extending even to our very form of government.

"'In such prodigious terms is the interest of the United States in European recovery defined. The committee is convinced that a sound program for western European recovery should be formulated and adopted by the United States with the same boldness and determination and the same confidence in the worthiness of the democratic cause which characterized our action in World War II.'"

COSTLY PROGRAM

"A program of the contemplated magnitude will be costly and will mean sacrifice by the American people, but the benefits to be gained, I believe, far outweigh the immediate sacrifices. We cannot expect direct repayment for a substantial part of the aid given. Our returns will be in furthering peace and world security. In addition, western Europe has been a great factor in international trade, and with recovery I believe we will get an indirect return over the years from expanding world trade.

"We have a great interest in expanding world prosperity, and much can be done if American experience is followed. All estimates indicate that there will be a continuing shortage of food for some years to come. The Congress has recently authorized the Department of Agriculture to engage in broad projects 'to stimulate and increase production of food and agricultural commodities in non-European countries.' This far-sighted legislation is bound to have important results.

"Here, close at hand, we have one of the great American developments—the TVA. In other areas we have great irrigation and reclamation projects that have opened up large areas for cultivation.

"As President Truman has said, the TVA does not belong to the people of the Tennessee Valley alone, but to all Americans. The TVA is a help not only to this region, but to the whole country, to expand and develop production and standards of life. At this time when people the world over look to America for guidance, the TVA has added significance."

CAN AID MIDDLE EAST

"I believe that we can help in the less-developed areas of the world, such as the Middle East, where I spent many months during the war, to expand agricultural production through American imaginative projects. Surplus foods from this area can help provide for the increased populations of the world and develop new trading areas that will bring improved life to many other countries. Peace can only be based on stable economic conditions.

"We are today facing difficult conditions due to inflation. You all know the difficulties which high prices are causing for many families. We want to share those things which are in short supply in a democratic fashion. The form of rationing which results from price increases gives a disproportionate share to those with higher incomes at the expense of those with lower incomes.

"The President has proposed to the Congress a program to deal with inflation and rising prices where they affect the cost of living and industrial production. All of these measures are needed to deal adequately with the situation at home. We must bend every effort to increase production, but in the meantime we must direct some of our effort to the most essential national needs. We must find ways to deal with our domestic problems.

"And so we face real problems at home and abroad. With the greater cooperation that exists today among all groups, I have confidence that the decisions of the American people will be wise and far-sighted."

Harriman declared that it is pretty hard for the American people to face the fact that there is a new aggressive force "out to destroy eventually" the things that this country believes in. There are men, he continued, who will use every means to accomplish this. He said that these men are the leaders of the Soviet Union.

Harriman declared that everything possible has been done to break down Russian suspicions and "it is unfortunate, but true, that they have made their decision to go their own way." He charged the Russians have broken all their agreements made during the war. American policies abroad have but one single motive and that is to lead to world peace, he said.

RESTRICTIONS NEEDED

"I don't like sacrifices. I don't like high taxes," Harriman asserted, adding that what this country has set out to do cannot be done "out of our surplus and will require some restrictions."

He warned that inflation, in his opinion, will continue "up to a bust unless we do something about it. We must give the Government the same type of authority that we give authorities to cope with a traffic jam."

He asserted that he for one is not going to ask labor to hold the wage line unless Congress gives the power to hold the price line. Harriman said that "business does not go with clean hands" unless it is for giving the Government the authority to hold the line." He said that the controls needed, and he mentioned steel among other items, does not mean that President Truman will set up a great new agency. He saw success for the program if sacrifices are made now and if the controls asked to cope with the situation are granted in time.

Representative KEFAUVER introduced Harriman as "one of the truly great Americans of our time." He added that "I feel when the final words are said after we come through this situation, which we will, high on the list of those responsible will be the names of Secretary Harriman and Secretary George C. Marshall."

The Chattanooga Times editorial is as follows:

THE HARRIMAN SPEECH

William Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, former Ambassador to Russia and England, head of the President's Advisory Committee on the European aid program, made an interesting guest speaker at the seventy-first annual dinner meeting of the Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce.

He said frankly that if Europe goes Communist, Scandinavia, Africa, and the Mediterranean area will follow and America will be placed in a precarious position. If the European recovery plan is adopted, he said there was no reason why democracy could not be saved.

Looking more youthful than his 56 years, Mr. Harriman spoke sometimes haltingly and this lack of glibness was refreshing. ESTES KEFAUVER, in introducing him, told of his prowess in sportsmanship—an expert on skiis, member of the Yale crew, an international polo player—those are a few of his sports. He is famous as a breeder of Labrador retrievers.

The meeting did great credit to the Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce. Not only did it show that the Chattanooga C. of C. does not insist on hearing only the customary conservative philosophy, but there was a delightful absence of stuffed-shirt atmosphere.

Roy McDonald, retiring president, held up a booklet and said that his annual address was in it and that they could read it when they got home or give it to somebody else.

Earl Carter, incoming president, cracked wisely and delightfully.

ESTES KEFAUVER made a fine introductory address. The capacity audience arose and gave Mr. Harriman an ovation at the start and applauded him for several minutes at the finish. And the speaker was a charming type, not a ponderous politician.

Still a great power in the railroad world, Mr. Harriman's devouring interest is in working out the problems facing America at home and abroad. Many in the audience might not have agreed with what he said, but he pulled no punches.

"I shall not advocate holding the wage line unless Congress gives the power to hold the price line.

"I shall not advocate labor making the sacrifices unless business joins with clean hands.

"I do not think it undemocratic to ration meat when it is in short supply."

He appealed for the Truman program.

Many in the audience wondered what old E. H. Harriman, "the last great individualist" and "the last figure of an epoch" would have thought of the speech. We know he would have been proud of the son who was speaking.

Edward H. Harriman gobbled up railroads and ship lines. He practiced free enterprise unrestrained. Although the Interstate Commerce Commission and Teddy Roosevelt and the famous Equitable Life Assurance Society investigation found nothing to condemn in E. H. Harriman except a ruthless practice of free enterprise, he became the subject of extraordinary public abuse. Teddy Roosevelt's trust busting was beginning and Harriman was made the chief subject of public disapproval.

And here, Tuesday night at the Read House, was his distinguished son preaching that all Americans should share equally in sacrifices for the common good.

If old E. H. Harriman was the last figure of one epoch, his son seems one of the first figures in a new epoch—one to save free America and to prevent it from being engulfed in the totalitarian world which threatens to come up like thunder across the big pond.

Truman's Grains of Sand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star for Thursday, January 15, 1948:

TRUMAN'S GRAINS OF SAND

The fact that the United States is riding a wave of inflation toward peril wouldn't be news, except that the President said it yesterday in his second annual economic report to Congress. Everyone knows inflation is bad and is growing worse. Everyone would like prices on things he buys to be lower.

All Harry Truman has said is, "Me, too." Thus, he hopes to cast the Democrats as the only crusaders against the high cost of living

With the same purpose in mind he asked Congress in his state of the Union message "to make available to the Government the weapons that are so desperately needed to fight against inflation." The weapons were described only by plaintive reference to his inflation-control message of November 17.

If they are all Harry Truman would use to stop inflation, inflation will not be stopped. They can be written off as mere grains of sand instead of heavy sandbags to hold down high-flung prices.

Of the fundamental causes of inflation—the largest peacetime budget in history, a foreign-aid program that greatly reduces our basic industrial, feed, and food supplies, and forces their prices upward, expanded cheap Government-insured credit aided and abetted by a Government-manufactured low interest rate originally designed to fight deflation rather than inflation, a money supply four times prewar, and the highest incomes in history, all of which have caused the demand for goods to outrun supply—of these causes Harry Truman has said almost nothing. He has proposed no sandbags to weight down their effect.

Instead, he has asked that Congress spend $39,700,000,000, an inflationary balloon $2,000,000,000 larger than that of a year ago. Thus, he seeks to have the Federal Government perpetuate the Roosevelt Santa Claus legend and himself in office.

People like the effects of inflation on income but not on living costs. And so, while talk of halting inflation is common enough, anything actually done to gain that end would prove unpopular with some group. It has become a national pastime to blame everyone else for inflation—a pastime in which the Truman administration has participated freely.

We suppose that is part of the price of an era in which too many people have come to expect Government to socialize their losses and individualize their gains—if the gains fall below certain brackets.

If any serious stopping of inflation is to be done in 1948, an election year in which politicians often become cross-eyed from riveting one eye on the national destiny and the other on the ballot box, the past 2 weeks are evidence that it must be done by Congress.

It can start by going to work on the budget. First, by detailed economies that carve the fat off necessary services. Second, by flatly refusing to take up new enterprises which, though desirable, can best be deferred to more normal times.

Aid Plan, Backed by Might, Urged for Our Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in the Congress I have taken a position in regard to our foreign policy, universal military training, and all other matters which were, in my opinion, to the best interests of our country. I have, unhesitatingly, from time to time, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my views on all of these important subjects over a period of the past 5 years, and it is a source of great satisfaction to find, at least, one of the most prominent Washington columnists who agrees with my ideas as reflected, especially in his article in the Washington Sunday Star, January 18, 1948, and I ask unanimous consent that I may include in this insertion the copy of the article by Mr. Constantine Brown, Washington columnist, referred to, as follows:

AID PLAN BACKED BY MIGHT URGED FOR OUR PROTECTION—ANALYST SAYS UNITED STATES IS REPEATING THE MISTAKES IT MADE AFTER WORLD WAR I BY FAILING TO CURB SOVIET AGGRESSIVENESS

(By Constantine Brown)

Americans have profited little from the lessons of two world wars. This lack of willingness to learn from experience is at the root of the predicament in which we find ourselves today.

This country has fought two wars in the last 30 years. Both brought victories on the battlefield, but we lost them because our diplomats and politicians failed to take advantage of our triumphs.

In 1917 the United States went to war to end all war and to make the world safe for

democracy. In 1940 our Government decided that we must intervene once more to destroy the tyranny of dictators and establish a long period of peace.

CHARTER AND 14 POINTS FAILED

We fought two ideological wars. Unlike both our allies and our enemies, we sought no new territory and no other gains. The only profit we hoped to obtain was an era of peace for ourselves and the rest of the world.

In both cases before we engaged in military operations our wartime Presidents—Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt—frankly exposed our program to the world. These were contained in Mr. Wilson's 14 points and in Mr. Roosevelt's Atlantic Charter. Both were admirable documents which met with the whole-hearted approval of the vast majority of citizens of this country, but were paid only lip service by our war associates.

Some of the provisions of Mr. Wilson's 14 points were put into practice. None of Mr. Roosevelt's ever became anything more than a pious wish. The doctrines of Mr. Wilson were by-passed politely over a period of several years. Mr. Roosevelt's were thrown into the trash can only a few months after they were announced to the world.

In both wars the allies would not have survived the enemy's onslaught if it had not been for the complete assistance of the United States. Before we became actively engaged in war we advanced large sums of money to the French and British. Because of the bitterness engendered by the debts of World War I Mr. Roosevelt decided long before we entered World War II to give grants to the victims of totalitarian aggression in the form of lend-lease.

UNITED STATES NOT FIRM ENOUGH

Neither wartime President took advantage of the fact that without the United States the victims of aggression would have been defeated. They did not press the beneficiaries of American support to implement—unreservedly and honestly—the doctrines we espoused.

The 14 points were gradually torpedoed after 1919. The Atlantic Charter was brutally murdered by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—the chief recipient of American wartime aid. Both could have been saved if our Chief Executives and their confidential advisers had remained adamant in support of the principles for which this country was sacrificing its sons and substance.

World War II was the inevitable consequence of World War I and we fared far worse after VJ-day than after November 11, 1918. After 1918 we had at least an illusion of peace for 21 years. After World War II we did not enjoy that illusion for even that many weeks.

Through their Government the American people now are following—but on a larger scale—the same policies which we believed would bring peace after World War I. We decided then to help Europe out of her troubles and devised the Dawes and Young plans, which eventually were followed by Herbert Hoover's moratorium.

We were told then—as we are more forcefully told today—that money can buy peace. We poured a few billions—chicken feed compared to our present expenditures—into Germany to recreate her economic potential.

LEAGUE DIED OF INACTION

Since VJ-day we have sent some $20,000,000,000 to Europe and Asia to restore the national economies of the war-torn countries. The important difference between now and then is that whereas after World War I we sent abroad principally dollars, we are now called on to divest ourselves of our already depleted raw materials.

The League of Nations—like the United Nations—was an American creation. Although the United States Senate never ratified the League Covenant, and we did not take our place at Geneva, we did encourage its work, and in some instances—like the Sino-Japanese conflict over Manchuria in 1932—we did take a modest seat at that international gathering.

The League died of inaction. Europeans openly blamed the United States for the League's failure, because we created it and then refused to have anything to do with it. The truth is that the major powers—there were five after World War I—decided to make that peace organization into an instrument for their plan to maintain conquests and promote their own selfish objectives.

The League survived, however, until the UN was created and occasionally did give the appearance of trying to live up to the purposes for which it was created.

The principal trouble with the League, its supporters stated, was that it had no teeth. It had no power to prevent aggression by military intervention. This, we were told, was due to the fact that no such measures could be taken so long as the United States was outside.

We decided to repair this deficiency for the sake of world peace. We entered enthusiastically into the United Nations and provided ample teeth for it by providing for the creation of military, naval, and air forces to intervene in case of aggression.

But when this new instrument for world peace was established the world had shrunk. Only two great powers remained: the United States and the U. S. S. R. Our statesmen refused to recognize this obvious fact and, forgetting the lessons of history, agreed to give the five major powers—among which China, France, and Britain were included out of courtesy—the right to veto.

If the framers of the UN statute had remembered history they would have taken a cue from the fact that Poland, when she was an important power in the eighteenth century, collapsed and was partitioned, for one reason, because her Parliament was made up of noblemen, each of whom possessed a veto over all legislation. There were selfish and unpatriotic persons who took advantage of this prerogative to serve the interests of the country's enemies.

WARMED-OVER METHODS

In the 58-nation parliament in the twentieth century the veto of one of the five permanent members of the Security Council can prevent the UN from taking necessary steps to enforce peace and organize a military force for peace enforcement. The Soviet Government's representatives not only have used but have abused that right in order to serve the selfish interests of Moscow.

There is, however, little difference between the fundamental principles of the conclave of nations as presented to the world in 1917 and as they exist today. The former took 24 years to die; the latter, in their present form, are already on their last legs and continue to live after 2 years only because of artificial respiration administered in the high-sounding speeches by representatives of the west.

Thus after World War II we adopted as our national policy the warmed-over ideas and methods used after World War I, without taking into consideration that the interests and aims of non-American nations are wastily different from those of the people of this country.

Now we are told that we must make a last and supreme effort to bring peace, at least in the Western World, by adopting the Marshall plan, just as we were told after 1918 that we must contribute our wealth to restore peace in the world. The principal difference is that the amounts involved now are enormously larger.

Since we have no other national policy in the field of foreign affairs, there is nothing that we can do but try it again, regardless of the fact that the cost of the European recovery program will be felt strongly by the rank and file of the American people. Conditions all over the world are far worse now than after World War I.

TODAY'S CONFLICT DIFFERENT

An ideological "cold war" is being waged now by a combination of nations representing some 400,000,000 persons—Russia, the nations behind the "iron curtain" and the Chinese Communists. After World War I ideological warfare was scarcely noticeable.

Today the conflict between east and west is different. The whole question is whether western civilization—whose principal representatives are the peoples of this country and this hemisphere—can survive the onslaughts of the semi-Asiatics from the east.

The existence of western Europe—the cradle of civilization of both the Americas—is threatened physically by strong military forces, backed by the best fifth column the world has ever seen. To continue our assistance in an effort to save what is left of it—and possibly save ourselves—we must include in the ERP the necessary military assistance which the western governments are asking in hushed voices and which our political leaders do not dare discuss in public.

POLITICS OVERSHADOWED

This is an election year, but the world situation—much as we might like to deny it—transcends by far domestic political issues. Those who say that mere economic and financial assistance to the 16 nations of Europe which have not accepted Soviet domination, can save the situation are rendering a disservice to the mass of people in the United States.

We are repeating now on a much larger scale the methods we employed after World War I. They failed and led us into another world war. The end of the last struggle sees us in a far worse position than ever before. Not only our economic but our social structure is threatened.

To refuse to admit that economic and financial assistance will have to be backed for our own self-preservation by thorough military preparedness would be rendering the worst disservice of our history to the people of America.

The men in the Kremlin can throw out of gear any attempt at economic recovery in Europe simply by moving military masses. And it is highly probable that they will do so unless they are shown that the western nations are prepared to meet their challenge and oppose force with force.

The Communists and Minority Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the citizens and press of Georgia are alive to the menace of communism, and are losing no opportunity to expose the insidious devices which Communists resort to in spreading their cruel dictatorship.

On January 11 and 12, the Georgia Department of The American Legion, through its Americanism committee, held a 2-day seminar in Atlanta, which was attended by delegates from every section of the State. They were furnished information, pamphlets, and publications dealing with communism to carry back to their respective communities for distribution.

On January 12, the second day of the seminar, the Atlanta Constitution published an editorial under the heading "The Communists and minority rule," which lists some of the steps taken by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, native Georgian, and military governor of the American zones in Europe, in his campaign to keep the Army of Occupation and the German people informed about Communists and communism.

Under leave previously granted, I insert this editorial herewith:

THE COMMUNISTS AND MINORITY RULE

A few weeks ago Gen. Lucius D. Clay, the Georgian who has done such a magnificent job as military governor of the American zones in Europe, and also as commander of the small occupying Army, announced a policy of publicly refuting each Communist lie.

This policy infuriated the Communist leaders to an almost rabid attack on General Clay. He now has followed it with a series of pamphlets and posters designed to educate and inform the American Occupation Army. It also will be available to the German population. Prepared by the Army's education and information branch, the posters include one, "How to spot a Communist." It says:

"The party line—if he echoes it, he's probably a Communist (probably underlined).

"The Communist press—if he endorses it, he's probably a Communist (probably underlined).

"The Communist policy—if he supports it, he's probably a Communist (probably underlined).

"And if he does all three—he is a Communist (is underlined)."

While this is interesting, by far the most impressive are those pamphlets which give the progressive steps used by the Communists minority to oust representative government and to kill or imprison the opposition. To support its arguments that only a small party membership was all that was needed in those countries to gain control, with the help of the Red Army, they are listed as follows:

"In Bulgaria, 450,000 Communists, only 7 percent of the population, run the Government."

"In Rumania, 500,000 Communists—some 3 percent of the population—maintain themselves in power through force and fear."

"In Poland, 600,000 Communists—2 percent of the population—are in control."

"In Yugoslavia, a handful of Tito-led Communists also have come to control the Government and Yugoslavia's 61,000,000 people."

"In Greece, 400,000 Communists—6 percent of the population—have caused enough turmoil for the Government to ask the United Nations to force the Communist Party in Greece to abandon seditious methods."

We now know it was Communist influences which spurred on the "bring the boys home" campaign which practically wrecked the American occupation army before, even, Japan was conquered. They inspired and led demonstrations which were close to mutiny. Many editors of Army papers were cleverly persuaded to be the front men, and were carefully fed praise and backslaps.

Truthfully does one of the popsters conclude:

"American Communists do not think first of their own country. If it came to a showdown, they would certainly pledge allegiance to the Soviet Union."

A Voice From the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis Bromfield:

A VOICE FROM THE COUNTRY—TRUMAN ABOUT-FACES ON VITAL PROBLEMS

(By Louis Bromfield)

The President's message to Congress was, on the whole, cheap, political, and characterized by absurd economical thinking. His tax proposal was infantile. These things are serious in a great nation, but not perhaps so serious as the confusion and the forces which lie behind them. It is doubtful that we ever have had a President with such a record of snap judgments, confusion, and mind changing, nor one more apparently subject to pressures from advisers, both those chosen by himself and those imposed upon him by circumstances.

To be sure, this is an election year, and a graduate of the Pendergast machine and of local politics is not likely to underestimate the element of politics nor be adverse to moving with changing winds.

None of these things, however, wholly explains Mr. Truman's sudden—almost hysterical—about-faces on questions of vital importance to the Nation and to the world.

From the beginning the President has bewildered newspapermen who were tough and experienced and used to political shiftiness; but it is doubtful whether, beginning with the first blunders of the Wallace-Madison Square Garden incident, they ever have encountered so many colossal examples of mind-changing, confusion, and compromise.

The list is long and sometimes grotesque, as in the case of the Harriman incident when the President was proposing one policy to newspapermen when his Secretary of Commerce was at the same moment proposing exactly the opposite course to Congress.

The attack on grain speculators, at the very moment that two of his most intimate friends, Mr. Pauley and his personal physician, were engaged in speculation on a large scale, is another. The denunciation of Government controls as police government, and the advocacy of those very controls a few days later, is a third. There is not space here even to begin the recording of all of them.

LOST CONGRESS' RESPECT

The record does not lead to respect either for Mr. Truman's integrity of conviction or for his powers of judgment. One is led to suspect that not only is Mr. Truman too small for his shoes, but that he has no confidence even in his own judgments. Consequently, his opinions and proposals are regarded with less and less respect by Members of Congress and by the people themselves.

Behind him, of course, lies the wreck of the Democratic Party organization, which is split nationally in one way and in all 48 States in 48 other varying fashions. For this fact, Mr. Truman is not himself directly responsible. It is the heritage of the New Deal administration which sought to be all things to all people, and of the unwillingness of Mr. Roosevelt to allow any other Democratic leader to develop or attain power.

The general confusion began with the retirement of Jim Farley, the giant. Since then the party organization has suffered a hop-skip-jump organizational leadership with backwoods politicians and political pygmies in posts of great power. The fantastic plans of Henry Wallace have not improved the situation, or the presence of Republican majorities in both Houses of Congress.

In some respects the absence of virtually all leadership in the party of the Chief Executive of the Nation scarcely could come at a worse time in the history of the Nation and of the world.

It is fortunate indeed, in view of the world situation, that General Marshall heads the State Department, and that Congress itself, always the most immediate representative of the common sense of the people (and never more so than now), has the leadership and ability of men like Taft and Vandenberg on the national and international fronts.

It never should be forgotten that neither Mr. Truman nor Mr. Wallace, symbolizing in a sense the disruption of the Democratic organization, arrived at their present positions of prominence either by outstanding achievements or by the will of the people. Both were invented by Mr. Roosevelt as instruments of political convenience and imposed upon the people.

Taking all things into consideration, it would seem that the time has come to retire Mr. Truman and give the Democratic Party a breathing spell in which to reestablish and reorganize itself as the traditionally liberal party. At the moment it appears to have no policy or principle or leadership save those of backwoods political opportunism.

Time for Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article contained in this morning's Washington Post concerning the Government's intention to restrict the use of certain grains for the purpose of making liquor while the very same grains that we are shipping abroad in the form of foreign relief are being used for the manufacture of liquor and resold back here to the United States:

TIME FOR COMMON SENSE—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

In the next few days the Congress will be asked to consider legislation to extend the shut-down of American distillers. Since this involves an industry which pays annually more than two and a half billion dollars in taxes, and employs directly and indirectly more than 2,000,000 American workers, we think it might be useful for you and for the public to have some of the facts about the recent voluntary 60-day shut-down.

Schenley entered into the voluntary agreement and has lived up to its obligations 100 percent.

Some American distillers did not shut down.

The Canadian distillers did not shut down.

The British distillers did not shut down.

No other country in the world closed its distilleries.

For the announced purpose of providing food for hungry people in Europe, the shut-down has been an absolute, costly, and utter failure.

The purpose of our Government was to save wheat. We believe that not only was there no saving of wheat, but that wheat was actually lost.

The distilling industry uses practically no wheat. The actual figure is less than one-thousandth of 1 percent of the total wheat crop.

This industry uses principally corn, some rye, and some barley malt. Most of this grain, if not so used, would ordinarily be fed to animals.

Normally, we use about 2 percent of the total corn crop.

It was estimated by the President's Food Committee that the 60-day shut-down would save approximately 10,000,000 bushels of grain, but actually little or nothing was saved because in the process of distilling we return to the farmer feeds for poultry, hogs, dairy cattle, and beef cattle which, in the opinion of experts, have an equal or greater feeding value than the grain we used.

We take out only the starch. We save all the protein and oil and add yeast. The resulting products are rich in protein, vitamins, amino acids, and other feed values.

We are convinced that the final result is this—if a farmer has 10 bushels of grain and sells us 2 bushels for distilling, and then feeds the 8 bushels which he kept and the residue which we return to him, he will get as much added weight in feeding his animals as he would have achieved if he had fed them the original 10 bushels.

We think he actually gets more.

Suffice it to say that the benefits of a balanced diet have been proved over and over again for both animals and human beings.

Our own Department of Agriculture, in numerous bulletins, has published many formulas for the use of distillers' feeds to balance animal diets.

We admit, frankly, that the exact percentage of feeding value which we return to the economy is debatable.

You may think that instead of being more, it is even as much as 50 percent less. Let's assume that you sincerely believe that the Luckman plan saved 5,000,000 bushels of corn, or less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total grain available.

But it wasn't corn the Government wanted to ship abroad. It was wheat.

We knew that our feeds would add weight to cattle, but the Government apparently was not interested in getting more meat. Now the Secretary of Agriculture tells the country that we are faced with a terrible meat shortage. It does get a little confusing, doesn't it, gentlemen?

In addition, we think they lost more wheat than they thought they saved.

When the farmer doesn't get our feed do you honestly believe he is going to let his poultry and hogs and cattle starve?

And maybe this particular farmer hasn't any corn. Maybe he has wheat. So he feeds the wheat to the chickens and hogs and cattle—and it was wheat that we wanted in the first place to ship to Europe.

The government of every country in the world, except our own, has adopted the principle that distilling takes nothing away from the food economy. This is proved by the fact that none of these governments have shut down their distilleries. Surely they are not purposely taking food out of the mouths of starving people.

England is running at capacity; Canada is running at capacity; 11 countries which have submitted their needs under the Marshall plan, have asked for grain for distilling and brewing.

Even assuming that the shut-down saved a few million dollars' worth of corn, let's see what it cost:

It completely dislocated an industry which pays to the Federal and State Governments more than $2,500,000,000 a year in taxes.

It threw thousands of American workers out of work. We know because we alone kept more than 1,000 on full pay.

It increased the price of the neutral grain spirits now in storage in the United States more than 150 percent.

It opened the door wide for foreign distillers and foreign workers to take over the business of American distillers and the jobs of American workers.

We admit that these are strong statements, but we will prove every one of them right up to the hilt.

There is one other fact that ought to be clarified. The public was told that the stocks of whisky in the United States were adequate—that we have over 550,000,000 gallons of whisky. What we have, actually, is about 65,000,000 gallons of whisky in this country which is 4 years old, or older. This is about 1 year's supply. The rest is green whisky not yet fit to drink. (Government figures show what is put away—not what is there after evaporation and outage.)

This is less aged whisky per capita than in any distilling country on the whole face of the globe.

Now you may well ask us why we agreed voluntarily to shut down when we knew all of these facts and had communicated them to the Luckman committee.

We assented because we were conscious of an obligation to the American people, who decided in 1933 that they would prefer to have a sound distilling industry with employment and taxes and Government regulation instead of bootleggers, gunmen, and rot-gut. They put that in our Constitution.

So, when the call came to help hungry people, we wanted to contribute our share, heaped up and running over. We knew no grain would be saved, but when we were told that a great sacrifice on our part would be a tremendous psychological contribution for the purpose of securing assent from others to make comparable sacrifices, we agreed.

No other American industry was asked to make any comparable sacrifice.

No other country asked its distillers to make any sacrifice.

We think it is time for a little common sense.

We think this whole question of the shut-down of distillers and the allocation of grain for restriction of production should be investigated by the Congress of the United States. Not in an hour, not in a day, but in a full-dress hearing with opportunity for all to be heard. Not just distillers, but the communities that are being ruined, the workers who are being thrown out of work and the farmers who have an interest in the feeding of their stock and the disposition of their products.

We believe that the public interest would be best served by full disclosure of all the facts in the full light of day.

Discovery of Gold at Coloma, Calif., on January 24, 1848, by James Wilson Marshall Started First Great Migration to California

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 1848, James Marshall and Capt. John A. Sutter, the founder of Sacramento, Calif., were partners in the ownership and operation of a sawmill. On that day Marshall found some yellow metal in the stream where the sawmill was located. He was uncertain as to what it really was, but it later turned out to be gold. This started a great migration to California. It was the beginning of one of the most romantic and exciting eras in our history.

California seems to be a magnet that stimulates migrations. During the depression of the thirties we had the great migration to California of the "Okies" and "Arkies." These names are merely nicknames of the great volume of people who came from the Dust Bowl seeking better opportunities in California.

Then during the recent war we had a tremendous migration to California of almost 3,000,000 people from almost all the States of the Union. They came as servicemen, as war workers, as agricultural workers, and so forth. Many of them have remained and thousands more are pouring in every month and in the course of a few years become as truly Californians as the real "native son."

Mr. James D. White has written an interesting story about the first, or shall we say the gold migration, which was printed in the Washington Post on Sunday, January 18, 1948.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article, which I am sure will be found most interesting:

JIM MARSHALL FOUND GOLD JUST A CENTURY AGO, AND OPENED UP A CONTINENT

(By James D. White)

COLOMA, CALIF., January 17.—A century ago next Saturday a young man stooped down in this sleepy village and picked up the first gold found in California.

He was a shy young wheelwright named James Wilson Marshall. His life never was the same again. Nor, for that matter, was California's.

His discovery led to history's greatest rush to dig gold. It was gold that rocketed a raw new American territory into statehood. It helped finance the Union in the Civil War. It hastened by a generation the building of a transcontinental railroad. It lured men of many races and ways of life into the violence of a lawless frontier and the ruthless, creative experience known as empire building.

THREE-YEAR CELEBRATION

So this January 24, 100 years later, Coloma will be jammed with thousands of Californians celebrating Jim Marshall's discovery. Famous actors will reconstruct the event over national radio networks. The mining industry will exhibit old and modern mining machinery. Visitors can pan gold in the same stream where Marshall found it.

The program will launch 3 years of celebrating by Californians as the centennial dates of their historic beginnings roll around: Discovery of gold will dominate '48; the gold rush and State constitution in '49; admission to the Union in '50.

The State Centennial Commission, which has received $250,000 from the Legislature for this year's events, is asking for a million for all 3 years. Communities all over the State will commemorate local echoes of the great news at Coloma 100 years ago and the chain reaction that followed.

It began slowly. Jim Marshall thought the yellow metal he had picked up was heavy enough to be gold. But the men helping him alter the sawmill where he found it in the millrace were doubtful.

He rode down through the Sierra foothills to Sacramento, 50 miles distant, to show it to Capt. John A. Sutter, his partner in the sawmill. They dunked it in vinegar and nitric acid. It was gold.

Sutter was worried. He held large land grants from the Mexicans and wanted to develop the rich valley, but to do this he needed men, and to keep men he had to have lumber to build houses for them. That was why he and Marshall had built the mill. Now he was afraid his men would leave him stranded.

They did.

Two weeks later California became American territory through the treaty which ended the war with Mexico. This threw Sutter's and Marshall's claims and titles in doubt; neither subsequently benefited from the discovery of gold. Both were nearly ruined and both died disappointed men.

PURELY WESTERN CONTAGION

When the news reached San Francisco, nobody believed it at first. Then gold arrived and was tested by jewelers. Word spread and the rush began.

Shovels sold for as high as $50 and a man's labor became worth pretty much what he figured he could make panning gold. Town by town the fever spread. Communities emptied as people flocked to the Sierra foothills and horses and cows grazed in unharvested fields.

Shops were boarded up. San Francisco's two newspapers closed as editors followed printers to the gold country.

It still was just a California phenomenon. The East did not get what it regarded as reliable confirmation until the following September, when the new American Governor of the Territory reported it to the President.

Again, nobody was too excited. But when gold arrived in New York and was assayed, the news swept around the world. El Dorado, sought for centuries, had been found.

It was too late for travel that year across the high Sierra, but ships could sail around the Horn or to Panama where a short crossing could put a man on the first boat up the west coast. Immigrants began pouring into San Francisco, and by '49 the rush was really on.

Buying outfits in San Francisco, Sacramento, or Stockton, the newcomers hurried into the hills. Many struck it rich along the 250-mile mother-lode area that stretches from Mariposa in the south to the Feather River country in the north. Others failed, went into business, and got rich in stores, shipping lines, manufacturing. Everything was in demand in a world where a man might and often did make thousands of dollars in a single day.

Gold seekers kept coming, and in '49 alone some 25,000 arrived by sea and 42,000 came over the mountains from the East.

Not all were Americans. Mexicans, Peruvians, and Chileans came from Latin America, Kanakas from the Sandwich Islands. A great influx of southern Chinese began, to continue many years through the period of railway building.

SHIPS LEFT TO ROT

Old French prints of the time depict soldiers at San Francisco's Presidio, handcuffed to their sentry posts. They are shown wearing Napoleonic uniforms, so the picture is apocryphal, but not too far from what did go on. In San Francisco Bay in '50, some 500 sailing ships stood idle. Captains had followed crews to the gold fields, and some of the ships never were reclaimed.

California labored in chaos. With Mexican authority gone, the new Territory was not yet a State, and there was a considerable legal vaccum. A State constitution was drafted by October 13, 1849, at Monterey, but Congress did not decide California should come into the Union as a free State (without slavery) until September 9, 1850.

In the meantime some remarkable things had happened in California as local committees took things in their own hands to keep the peace.

The miners were human, and after working hard on diets such as beans and ship's biscuits, fortified by whisky, they often found diversion in violence. They were being mulcted by swindlers and claim-jumpers, and highwaymen preyed on the vast gold shipments. The population was 98 percent male, a tough crowd of venturesome characters who had come a long way to get rich.

Things were getting out of hand, so when the pioneers needed a law and couldn't find one, they made one up and if necessary enforced it with the means at hand—and the means were as tough as the times.

After the six-shooter came the hemp necktie. In Hangtown (now Placerville) they strung one man up for stealing a sack of flour. They gave a convicted murderer 2 years, and dismissed another who killed an Indian. At Hornitos a mob lynched a Chinese by tearing his arm off through an unbarred jail window, using a horse and lariat.

REAL CHINESE LAUNDRY

The miners did prodigious things with their wealth. All the way around the Horn they sent for pianos for music, iron shutters for their stores, and brick and lumber for their churches and schools.

They built long canals and flumes for hydraulic mining and started the California habit of piping water great distances.

Too busy to quarry stone, they shipped in enough from China for at least one store, which still stands and is all that is left of the once-thriving town of Butte City. San Franciscans at one time were so busy that they found it easier to ship their laundry to Canton by clipper than get it done locally.

Among such giddy economics the State of California was born. The great lode held out many years, and in the richer pockets mining still goes on, balanced delicately now on the market price of gold and the cost of production.

California still yields more gold than any other State, but Californians celebrating at Coloma next Saturday realize that gold was just the beginning of riches.

Their annual agricultural production alone amounts to about $2,000,000,000—as much as all the gold mined here since 1849.

Theirs is the second largest State, third in population and edging toward second place with nearly 10,000,000 people.

These people, notes the State chamber of commerce, now have the highest average per capita income (ranking 32 percent above the national average) and operate more radio sets and motor cars than the people of any other State. Some wonder just what it means that they spent more in 1946 for motor transportation than they did for eating.

Anyway, they lead the Nation in taking fish from the ocean, in growing fruits and vegetables and putting them in cans, in pressing wine, in refining borates, and in recording simulated life on celluloid.

Its population of many strains has not merged without friction, but as the generations pass the differences fade, diluted by a steady stream of newcomers.

One thing goes on. These people are Californians and westerners, the spiritual grandchildren of the pioneers who found gold here at Coloma 100 years ago.

Greek Contest Grows More Bitter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote the following editorial in the January 14 issue of the Christian Century:

Latest developments in Greece are more confusing than ever, but they at least show that the tension there is growing rather than diminishing. Some sort of show-down, or explosion, seems not far away. On the Russian side (why not be candid and discuss the Greek situation in terms of its real elements?) a 'free Greek' government has finally been proclaimed by the Communist guerrilla leader, Gen. Markos Vafiades. This constitutes a bid for recognition as the government of Greece from the neighboring Russian satellite nations. Such recognition would open the way for every imaginable kind of gun-running and intervention according to the familiar 'foreign legion' pattern. It might also lead to the often forecast Balkan federation of Communist-dominated nations. This Russian move has been countered from the American side by diplomatic and military action. Undersecretary of State Lovett has warned the Russian satellites that if they recognize the 'free Greek' government 'this step would have serious implications.' Mr. Lovett leaves to the imagination of Marshal Tito and his friends what those 'implications' would be. At the same time the American military mission, which is now 'advising' at every divisional headquarters of the Greek army, has pepped up that force sufficiently to repel an attempt by Markos' guerrillas to capture the little mountain town of Konitsa and make it the capital of the 'free Greek' government. This sudden activity is probably to be read as an effort by the Greek army's higher command to prove that the $300,000,000 sent it from the United States last year—including 47 shiploads of military equipment—has not been utterly wasted, and that the army of 140,000 men is not entirely helpless before 20,000 guerrillas.

In the same issue of the Christian Century is another forceful editorial entitled, "What's the Next Move in Greece?" As part of my remarks I am including it also:

WHAT'S THE NEXT MOVE IN GREECE?

Despite the repulse suffered by Russia's pawns at Koritsa, it is evident that something will have to be done soon to rescue American policy in Greece. The $300,000,000 so reluctantly appropriated by Congress last spring is almost gone; the Konitsa setback has not materially diminished the ability of the guerrillas to terrorize and control most of the country; President Truman knows how close the doctrine which bears his name is to collapse in the first country where he has tried to apply it. More money, much more money, will have to be poured into Greece. Perhaps more troops will also have to be sent there. That may be the meaning of the recent dispatch of marine battalions to the eastern Mediterranean. But will Congress, already sniffing at everything it suspects may be an "Operation rathole," appropriate? Rumors abound that the Athens government will turn to the UN and ask it to put pressure on American Congressmen. That is, on the theory that a plea for more millions will have more persuasive power if it comes from the UN than if the State Department sponsors it. Whether such tactics will be employed by the Truman administration, or will work if they are, remains to be seen. But while all this is going on, the question remains unanswered whether Russian forces are to take part in the partition and policing of Palestine. If they do, and the Red Army is thus placed almost within sight of the Suez Canal and athwart the oil pipe lines from Arabia, the Truman policy of pouring out millions to contain Russia on the Greek border will look like one of the silliest examples of confused thinking and action in the history of modern power politics.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to extend in the RECORD a letter from my dear friends, Hon. William A. Pittenger, of Minnesota, who, as the Members know, has been a life-long advocate of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. I am sure that the colleagues who served with him in the House, and also the new Members, will be glad to read this letter. For years he has been our champion and I am in hope that he will return to us to lead this fight as he has in the past.

DULUTH, MINN., *January 19, 1948.*
Hon. CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been privileged to serve with you in the House of Representatives over a period of some years. Since coming to Washington in December to help in my advocacy of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, I have had occasion to consult you at different times on this controversial measure. I am writing this letter because I want you to know how deeply I appreciate your cooperation and leadership in connection with the pending legislation. I take this means of reporting to you and to your colleagues the fact that I am in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and that I am in Washington to render all possible help in support of this pending legislation.

Very frankly, I do not find much activity in Congress in behalf of the pending legislation. It is my hope that more men will become actively interested and give you their support. I do find that the propaganda factories are particularly active at this time giving misinformation to our people in reference to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The powerful lobbies are at work, but there appears to be no lobby working in the interests of the American people. I have been privileged to see bits of propaganda that come from the most powerful lobby in America. I do not dignify this lobby by giving it a name, but it has an office here in Washington, D. C., and is now viciously at work to misinform the American people regarding the seaway project and by misstatements and other methods to shape public opinion against a development that will contribute to the resources, wealth, and happiness of the American people.

Just the other day in one of the local newspapers a columnist reiterated the objections of the opponents of the seaway. He argued that the seaway would cost a lot of money, that it would be icebound and not open to navigation for about 7 months of the year, and that it would take business away from the American railroads. Of course, if the seaway would not be any good, the argument that it would take business away from the railroads is pure nonsense. These inconsistencies do not bother the opponents of the seaway who believe that to the extent that this project benefits the American people they will be harmed accordingly. So, they may be expected to foul their own nest by trying to influence Congress against this project. In view of the misleading statements that have been made, mostly a tissue of falsehood and incorrect series of half-truths, friends of the seaway project should have in mind certain facts.

First, the proposed legislation would deepen some 60 miles of connecting channels in the Great Lakes region from an existing depth of 14 feet to a depth of 27 feet. This would give the Great Lakes region a fourth ocean seacoast and would move the Atlantic Ocean something like 2,600 miles to Duluth, Minn. We already have a 14-foot channel, and all it needs is some additional work in certain spots to permit oceangoing ships to enter and traverse a 27-foot channel.

Five Presidents of the United States and numerous Army engineer boards have endorsed the project. They have pointed out the immense benefits to the American people, and they have estimated that the benefits far exceed the costs of construction.

The project has a twofold purpose. I have just called attention to the fact that the navigation features would be of benefit to the Midwest, and this means to some forty to fifty million people. In addition, it would make available to the people of New York and New England cheap electric power at Massena, N. Y., which is now going to waste.

I do not here discuss the agreement between Canada and the United States which was entered into in 1941, but I do know, as a Member of Congress at that time, that the American people are protected in every way by the proposed agreement.

I am constrained to say that the worthwhile value of this project can be measured by the strength of the vicious propaganda that is being put out to defeat action in Congress.

In conclusion, it seems strange to me that Congress is asked to authorize $17,000,000,000 for Europe, and at the same time people that I choose to designate as enemies of progress are doing everything they can to defeat this measure.

Very sincerely yours,
WILLIAM A. PITTENGER.

Address of Secretary of State Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Secretary of State Marshall before the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, Thursday, January 15, 1948:

During the past week I have appeared before congressional committees of the Senate and the House to discuss the European recovery program recently recommended by the President.

Other officials of the executive branch are now testifying before the same committees as to the details of the program. It has been widely publicized and discussed. Its purpose and principal features are now well known.

Therefore, I am reluctant to add another statement to the mass of material on the subject. But this issue is of such great national importance that I feel justified in referring tonight to some aspects that may be of especial interest to the leaders in business.

Businessmen quite naturally are concerned about the possible effects on their own position—about how this program will affect the supply of raw materials, prices, sales, profits, and the condition of doing business.

Measures affecting the national economic interest in the long run will influence the private affairs of all of us. In considering the effect of this particular measure upon our individual or collective lives and fortunes, it seems logical first to appraise the present position of the United States in world affairs.

RECALLS FRUITLESS PARLEYS

In order to put current events in proper perspective, it is necessary to go back at least to the Council of Foreign Ministers at Moscow last spring. We met there, as you know, to consider peace treaties for Germany and Austria. That effort to reach agreement failed utterly because the Soviet Union insisted upon conditions which the three western powers could not in good conscience accept.

The reasons for the Soviet attitude have now become clearer and were well defined at the recent London Conference, where resort to similar obstructive tactics and propaganda appeals led again to failure.

Our experience at Moscow was productive in one sense at least. It necessitated a complete reappraisement of the situation in Europe which was steadily deteriorating, and brought us to the important conclusion that we faced the choice of quitting Europe altogether or of completing the task of European recovery. We had no intention of quitting.

Once the basic decision was taken the United States put into effect certain measures susceptible of immediate application. These concerned Germany, where we have major responsibilities as an occupying power.

TOOK NECESSARY STEP

It was apparent that there was no immediate prospect of a German peace treaty nor any likelihood that the Soviet Union would cooperate in establishing a balanced economy for all of Germany as provided in the Potsdam agreement.

Therefore, we had to take what steps we could to enable the Germans to pull their own weight in Europe and at an early date to terminate reliance upon Britain and the United States for the essentials of existence now lacking in western Germany.

The British and American zones were then being integrated economically in the interest of efficiency and economy. This process was accelerated. In addition, the two Governments decided upon an appreciable increase in the level of industry. This is a rather technical matter which is not readily understood.

It should be remembered that the Potsdam agreement called for the economic integration of all four zones of Germany. To enable Germany to be self-supporting, a stipulated portion of the German industrial capacity, factories, machinery, etc., was to be retained in Germany.

Industrial capacity in excess of this requirement was to be destroyed or distributed among the Allied Nations as reparations.

PEOPLE BECOME DEPENDENT

But the refusal of the Soviets to cooperate in establishing a unified economy for Germany invalidated the level of industry and reparation calculations made at Potsdam.

It soon became apparent that the plants and equipment originally selected for retention in the western zones could not—with that area sealed off from the Soviet zone—produce enough to support the increased population of the bizonal area. This left the people in the bizonal area heavily dependent on Britain and the United States, especially for foodstuffs.

The only feasible solution was to increase the industrial capacity to be retained in western Germany at the expense of reparations. This was done.

Incidentally, these measures which we have undertaken together with the British for the revival of economic life in our two zones have all been on the basis of a continuing invitation to the other occupying powers to join us in these necessary and constructive steps.

Such measures as these, which we could undertake single-handedly or in cooperation with other governments, yielded some results. But they did not get to the heart of the problem—which was, the general economic recovery of western Europe, which, after a promising start, had plainly begun to falter.

UNITED STATES HAD ONLY ONE CHOICE

It became unmistakably clear that if Europe was to recover, rather than suffer a perhaps fatal relapse, vigorous action would be required.

The United States was the only nation in the position of economic power and leadership to take the initiative in the matter. The alternatives to such action were so repugnant that for our own self-interest, if for no other reason, we could make only one choice.

These then were the considerations that led to the suggestion of last June 5. It was stated that a continuation of the procedure of intermittent relief measures was no longer possible. It was also stated that recovery must depend primarily on their own exertions.

The suggestion was made that if they would take the initiative and unite in developing a sound and workable cooperative program to restore their economic system to a self-supporting status, we should do whatever we were able to do, consistent with our own capacities and needs.

The response was instantaneous. In the countries where freedom of opinion and action still prevailed the idea quickly caught hold and served as a strong stimulus to morale, as well as a spur to action in a material way. It focused attention on the necessity of treating economic recovery as a continental and cooperative matter rather than a problem confined to the narrow purview of each nation.

REDS SPURN BID

The response of the Soviet Union and the states under its domination was revealing. Their reaction was immediate, sharp, and defensive.

Our proposal to Europe contained no geographical or ideological qualifications of any kind. Any government sincerely desirous of entering into a combined effort to promote the rehabilitation of Europe was free to participate.

It was made clear, however, that we would not aid—in fact, we would vigorously oppose—any nation or group which sought to delay or impede recovery.

This was the suggestion: The nations of Europe were left to their own choice—insofar as they were free to to do. Sixteen countries, led by Britain and France, rallied together at Paris to work out a joint program to which each pledged itself to contribute what it could.

The Soviet Union, though invited to serve as a cosponsor of the conference, spurned this invitation and refused to participate. Moreover, the Soviet Government evidently directed the eastern European countries subject to its influence or control to refrain from attending, even after some of these had indicated a desire to participate and one had actually accepted.

SOVIETS OPPOSE PROGRAM

Subsequently, a high Soviet official, a member of the ruling Politburo, made a public statement that it would be the policy of his government to oppose and attempt to defeat the European recovery program by every possible means. That statement has been confirmed by the actions of the Communist parties in several European countries, notably France and Italy.

The 16 western nations set up the Committee of European Economic Cooperation and proceeded to draft a program for achieving recovery to a self-sustaining basis in a 4-year period.

Far from interfering with the sovereign rights of the countries involved, as hostile propagandists have alleged, the United States refrained throughout the summer from any suggestion or advice to the European representatives at Paris, despite the fact that repeated and urgent appeals for such counsel were made.

We were determined that the initiative in this phase of the procedure should be confined entirely to the European countries involved. Only at the conclusion, and then at the insistence of the participants, did we express our views on some aspects of the preliminary draft of the Paris program as they might relate to the prospect of American support or aid.

After the Paris program was submitted to our Government, it was given an intensive and critical examination. No peacetime project in Government history has received more careful attention and study from a large number of highly qualified individuals both in and out of Government.

LAUDS PLAN PROPOSED

Numerous modifications were made in the Paris program, as the result of studies made by various groups from the executive branch and by the Krug, Nourse, and Harriman committees.

As a result, the measure recommended to the Congress represents the combined judgment of a large number of the Nation's best talent. It is the plan, we believe, best adapted to serve the interests both of the United States and the European countries we wish to help.

There may be flaws of omission or phrasing and no doubt the proposal will be improved in some particulars in the light of congressional hearings and debate, but the principal features have been shaped with utmost care, to meet many vital considerations affecting the national interest.

Radical alteration of the basic structure would, I fear, jeopardize the prospect that the measure will successfully accomplish the purpose for which it is designed.

There is a general determination to secure the most efficient administration of this program that is humanly possible, taking into full account the unavoidable factors of Government legal requirements and diplomatic relationships.

MAY MAKE HISTORY

The proposal is now under close scrutiny in Congress and the resulting publicity should keep the Nation well informed as to the issues. This is especially desirable because we are dealing with a matter which may largely determine the course of history—certainly the character of western civilization—in our time and for many years to come.

The American people frequently hear assertions that events have thrust our Nation into a position of world leadership which imposes on us unprecedented responsibilities. There is truth in these assertions.

The practical question is: Shall we acknowledge and accept the obligations and exactions of leadership and, if so, in what manner shall we exert that leadership?

I dare say no group is more determined to assert its leadership in vigorous and decisive fashion than the business element. Your traditions and instincts, your business experience, tell you that to be a leader you must act like one.

But, of course, the great problem of the leader is the responsibility for what follows as the result of his decisions and actions.

AMERICANS TO PAY BILL

If we agree that the United States has become a world leader and in view of the critical state of the world perforce must assert its leadership, then we must examine all aspects of the problem.

Our contribution to the European recovery program will cost the businessmen of America money—it will cost all Americans money. But on this occasion I refer to the situation of the businessman of America, the great and small industrialists—what are his reluctances in the matter of the foreign aid program?

Expenditures of the magnitude required to set in motion a constructive rehabilitation program in Europe—that is, a cure and not a palliative—will be an evident factor in the matter of Federal taxes.

The appropriations necessary to carry out this program effectively, particularly in the initial 15-month period, must be considered in connection with tax rates.

There are subtle distinctions among the inconveniences and sacrifices that may be expected to result.

Waiting for delivery of a new model car while continuing to drive an old one is an inconvenience. Paying higher taxes than we would wish entails definite sacrifice, as does doing without some scarce goods or articles until there are enough to go around.

PART OF JOB FINISHED

These are some of the realities to be faced in our daily private lives. These are some of the exactions of leadership. But each of the comprehensive analyses of the problem yet made, and there have been a number, resulted in the same general conclusion that the United States can successfully carry out the proposed program.

The fact is that the largest part of the job of assisting Europe, as measured by the rate of exports from this country, is behind us.

The volume of commodities planned for shipment from the United States during the first 15 months of the program is less than the volume of our exports during the past 15 months. Moreover, the program contemplates a steadily decreasing volume of exports in succeeding years.

The goods and services to be financed with American dollars actually will constitute but a small proportion of Europe's total requirements—perhaps on the order of 5 percent. Our aids will be marginal, but that margin is absolutely necessary to enable the European economy to gain sufficient momentum to make real progress towsrd a pay-as-you-go basis.

It is, in effect, the proverbial nail for lack of which the battle of European recovery may be lost.

The fatal deterioration and collapse of Europe economically and therefore politically would result in consequences of a most serious nature for this country.

The situation we then would face would necessarily impose on us such burdens in the way of taxes, discomforts, sacrifices, and impairments of the rights and privileges we now enjoy as to make those that now confront us seem trivial by comparison.

In the field of foreign trade, for example, this Government is pressing for international agreements to remove or minimize arbitrary restraints on business between nations and to eliminate harmful discriminations.

Many of the restrictive practices we oppose appear in the system known as state trading, where the foreign commerce of a country is conducted by the government as the sole or dominant buyer and seller.

We recognize that many of the present state-imposed restraints are defense mechanisms, resorted to as a result of abnormal conditions caused by the war, and susceptible of correction when stability is assured.

BUSINESS HAS SPECIAL STAKE

The long-term significance of state control of foreign trade, however, is a matter for serious concern. Thus, business has a special stake in European recovery by virtue of what this recovery may mean for the practices and atmosphere of world trade.

There is no doubt that if the countries of Europe should be forced to meet their present problems without further assistance from

this country, the result could only be a radical increase in the restrictions and controls in force throughout that area affecting international trade and investment.

And more important, perhaps, than the actual restrictions themselves would be the deterioration in the atmosphere in which international business would have to be conducted.

If the businessmen of this country are again to enjoy the former facilities for residing, traveling, and doing business among the European peoples, then it is essential that the Europeans retain their confidence in this country and in the soundness of liberal institutions in general.

CALLS SITUATION SERIOUS

It is idle to think that Europe left to its own efforts in these serious problems of recovery would remain open to American business in the same way that we have known it in the past.

I have been talking about Europe, but the situation is even more serious than that. Europe was at the heart of a great world trading and financial organization. Her failure to recover would have disastrous effects in many other areas.

The economies of Latin America and Canada, for example, are organized on the basis of having markets in Europe. If Europe fails to recover, and she certainly cannot do so without our aid, the repercussion will be felt throughout the entire world.

The cumulative loss of foreign markets and sources of supply would unquestionably have a depressing influence on our domestic economy and would drive us to increased measures of Government control.

MUST MAKE DECISION

By contrast with these possibilities, the cost and temporary adjustments required by the European recovery program appear reasonable, as I think they are. I have attempted only to present an estimate of the stakes the businessmen of America have at issue in this matter.

We are all stockholders in the same company—the United States of America. The paramount question before us, I think, can be stated in business terms.

We are required to make a decision as to which is the wiser course: Whether to make a capital investment in European recovery involving a sum that though large is well within our means, with a good prospect of realizing long-term gains; or whether to spend our abundant capital for the satisfaction of our immediate wants, in the hope that the day of reckoning can be indefinitely deferred.

I am not a businessman, but I have some knowledge out of my experience of what has been required in the past to preserve certain of our national assets in security, peace, and freedom.

I consider the prudent course in this situation is prompt and effective action to assure solvency and stability in Europe.

I think that is our role as a leader in a distressed world.

I think we must judge ourselves in our present security and abundance in comparison with distressed people, sick and suffering, but already inspired by a great hope that the new world will help redeem the old.

Hidden Red Ink in TVA's Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Reader's Digest for December 1947:

THE HIDDEN RED INK IN TVA'S BOOKS
(By John T. Flynn)

In 1916 war raged in Europe. To insure a supply of nitrates, Congress voted funds for two nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals and a dam to produce hydroelectric power to run the plants. The dam, finished in 1925, became a Government headache. Finally, in 1933, Senator George Norris put through a bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority to operate the plants for fertilizer and the dam for navigation, flood control, and power.

But TVA is no longer just a plant and a dam. There are 28 dams on 650 miles of rivers running through 7 States. TVA owns 10 steam plants; has built villages, parks, stores; makes fertilizer; carries on forestry, agricultural, and recreational operations. Moreover, it is now proposed to establish as many as nine more TVA's all over the country for the Missouri, Columbia, Arkansas, and other valleys.

I strongly advocated TVA. But in the interest of TVA and the country I think TVA's financial picture should be set straight.

Its managers have made extravagant claims. Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, its first chairman, told Congress in 1934: "After a preliminary period * * * this program will be amortized in 25 years." David Lilienthal, its next chairman, said, in 1944:

"Even if the total investment in power, navigation, and flood control—the entire $700,000,000—were charged against power, revenues would pay the entire cost in less than 60 years."

It cost $762,000,000 to built TVA. The Government borrowed and put up the money and pays interest on it. In addition the plant must be operated. The operation costs over 14 years up to June 1946, including the interest paid by the Government, were $339,000,000. The revenues were $209,000,000. Thus there was actually a deficit of $130,000,000.

But TVA has a different figure. It arrives at it by leaving out of its accounts the $129,000,000 paid by the Government as interest on the loan.

TVA carries on many activities. Power production is only one of them. The figures given above are for the entire program, including power. Now let us look at the power enterprise alone. TVA insists it is selling power cheaper than the private companies and doing so at a profit. Let us see.

The total investment in TVA power—using TVA's own accounting assumptions—is $462,000,000. All of this was borrowed by the Government. A TVA propaganda book claims that the total net profit from power since the beginning in 1933 to June 30, 1944, was $38,000,000. But, alas this left out the fact that $53,000,000 was paid by the Government as interest on the money borrowed to build the power plants. Hence r power deficit of $15,000,000.

TVA, of course, will never accept these figures. If one questions its accounts it replies: "Go to our reports. It is all there, verified by a firm of independent accountants." But it is not all there. Nowhere can you find any record of the interest charges paid by the Government. The firm of accountants it cites took particular pains to point this out, saying: "The net results stated for this program do not include any charge for interest." And the General Accounting Office of the United States in an official report expressly calls attention to this same failure and wants it corrected.

The Government has financed hundreds of housing projects. There is a loss of over $4,000,000 a year on these. But the projects faithfully record their interest costs. If, following TVA, they ignored this item, they could boast of a profit of $14,000,000 a year.

On the Government-financed Bonneville Dam project the Treasury charges 2½ percent interest. Why not on TVA's power debt? As a matter of fact, TVA's debt for its power investment alone is split into two classes. There is a small one of $58,000,000 and a large one of $404,000,000. The Government holds both. TVA does pay 1 percent on the small one, but nothing on the big one. Why is the interest on the small debt—however inadequate—a proper cost item while the interest on the big one is suppressed in its accounts?

If TVA were a private corporation the law would require it to state its debt and interest payments with exactitude. TVA ignores this. Each year it reports its revenues and its expenses (without interest). It calls the difference "net income." This is inexcusable in any case. It is doubly so in TVA, which started out as a scientific yardstick to measure public-utility rates. But a yardstick must contain all 36 inches. The interest costs actually amount to more than a third of TVA's annual power costs. What sort of yardstick is it which leaves out a whole foot?

No one need take my word for this. The United States General Accounting Office says:

"Unless all costs for TVA's power operations are included in its income statement * * * it cannot be conclusively shown that the power operations are self-supporting."

It then insists that the interest on the Government loans must be included and that the proper rate is 2½ percent.

The TVA, of course, greatly improved its showing during the war. The whole valley was turned into a war arsenal. TVA revenues doubled, as did those of many corporations. However, TVA reports its war record for power with the same 2-foot yardstick. It reports net income for the 6 years from 1941 to 1946 as $72,000,000. But what it omits is a bill for $57,000,000 of Government interest on the power debt.

However, these years do show a net power income even when interest is included. At least they seem to do so. But the General Accounting Office is unwilling to say so. It points in its TVA report to various costs left out, one alone amounting to as much as $500,000 a year, and concludes that "power rates appear to produce gross revenues in excess of costs of power production," but "there can be no consistent showing of whether TVA is self-supporting and liquidating unless every element of cost is recorded on its books and shown in its final statement."

The TVA Act says its power project must be self-liquidating. The GAO says it will never be until its electric rates produce enough to liquidate its debt. The Appropriations Committee of the House says it should liquidate its debt in 40 years. This alone would mean an annual minimum payment to the Government of $11,000,000. Who should pay the cost of the power plant which produces power if not the people who enjoy the use of that power as is done by the customers of every private utility in the land?

The General Accounting Office has said the books do not tell the whole story: It is not all there. All of which recalls the complaint of Dr. Arthur Morgan, first TVA chairman, who declared that there ought to be an impartial investigation of the obscure financial record of the power program.

We may now ask: Is TVA selling power at less than it costs? What should power costs include? Obviously the following: (1) All operation costs. The GAO says all are not included. (2) State taxes. It pays some, but less than a private company of the same size. (3) Federal taxes. It pays none. Other utilities pay large sums. TVA boasts that other utilities pay only a part of their profits in taxes, while TVA pays all its profits. But it has no profits. (4) Interest on the Government power debt to build TVA. (5) Liquidation of the debt incurred to build TVA.

Actually, the estimates of the cost of TVA power given above are probably much too low. They are based on certain assumptions made by TVA directors. Upon these assumptions I have put the debt for power at $462,000,000. I believe, however, that a more rational allocation of power costs would put that debt at not less than six hundred million.

Many of the great dams in the Tennessee River and tributaries are called multipurpose dams. It is claimed they were built not only to produce hydroelectric power but to control navigation and floods. The directors of TVA have declared how much of the structure is for power and how much for navigation and flood control. But no one has ever officially checked this allocation. The private accounting firm which audited TVA's books specifically disclaimed any responsibility for the allocation used. And the General Accounting Office has made the same disclaimer.

Competent engineers have disputed TVA's claim and have insisted that the dams are almost wholly for power production and that the element of flood protection or navigation control in them is small. They are supported in this by the leading authority on flood control in Congress, WILL M. WHITTINGTON, a Democrat, former chairman of the House Committee on Flood Control, a supporter of TVA and a Representative of Mississippi, which enjoys a large measure of benefits from TVA. In a speech in the House he declared that "TVA is primarily for the development of power."

There can never be any authoritative accounting of the cost of TVA power until the total amount of the investment in power has been settled. It is this that the General Accounting Office referred to when it recently reported that "the power debt should be finally determined."

I have examined patiently most of the evidence on both sides of this subject and have gone to the TVA country to check on the respective claims. I believe there is no escaping the conclusion that the allocation of power investment and costs made by TVA is arbitrary and that if it is ever audited by a competent board of impartial engineers and accountants it will be found that the power investment and debt is not four hundred and sixty-two million but six hundred million at the lowest.

The reason for TVA's claim of lower power investment is plain. The more costs TVA can unload on navigation and flood control, the less the costs of power will seem. By the accounting trick here described TVA has cut more than one hundred and fifty million from the debt due for power. They can also reduce the seeming cost of operating the dams, because now they charge off most of the cost of operating the common purposes of the dams to navigation and flood control.

Do I want TVA destroyed? Certainly not. But we must submit TVA to the yardstick which it now tries to forget. Just as we had to have commissions to stop private utilities from soaking the customers, we should have some authority to prevent publicly owned power projects from soaking the taxpayers.

What should be done seems to me inescapable. (1) The outstanding Government debt on the power enterprise should be determined definitely and the TVA should pay the interest on it. (2) The TVA should pay off this debt in 40 years. (3) These items and all other costs should be included in the rates charged for power. (4) The TVA directors should not be the sole judges of the amount of the investment in power. (5) All the nonpower activities of TVA— agriculture, fertilizer production, forestry, and other projects—should be transferred to appropriate departments of the Government. They should be divorced from the TVA power project to which they have no rational relationship. (6) The costs of these activities should be paid out of authorized congressional appropriations like any other costs of government.

There is an aspect of TVA which disturbs me more than its fiscal vagaries. It has operated as a Federal corporation under a charter which has enabled it to do an incredible number of things and to escape Government scrutiny. The Federal charter is a comparatively new device to enable the Federal Government to expand its powers immensely. Mr. Lilienthal, in his book, TVA—Democracy on the March, calls attention to the vast growth of Federal power. It has become so great that, he says, it cannot be wisely administered from Washington. But the power must not go back to the governors, mayors, legislatures, and councils elected by the people. It must go to great regional areas administered by directors appointed by the President, to a corporation cunningly devised to accumulate power and to elude congressional authority. We will see the country split into a few great regional provinces run by corporate provincial governors. This is what Mr. Lilienthal calls "democracy on the march." I think it is democracy in retreat, a return to the European system of centrally controlled provincial governors. With TVA as a beginning the advocates of regionalism are planning under the guise of flood, navigation, and forestry control and other excuses to blanket America with this new type of government which represents a complete revolution in our political system.

The TVA should be specifically instructed by Congress that it is not a provincial Government agency of a regional province but a Government-owned power enterprise. If the people of the United States want to adopt the regional form of government they should do so—but only after full discussion and a formal decision. I do not think it should be presented to them suddenly as an accomplished fact.

Tennessee Valley Authority

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is seeing too much "red."

It is all right for him to complain when he realizes that the Federal Reserve System is spiraling us into a stratosphere of inflation; but when he attacks the TVA and inserts in the RECORD that fallacious article written by Mr. John T. Flynn, attacking that great Authority, I call his attention to the fact that I answered that statement several weeks ago.

Mr. Flynn is just as far wrong as he could possibly be. The Tennessee Valley Authority is not only the greatest development of its kind ever undertaken by man, but it is absolutely sound, and it is rendering one of the greatest services the American people have ever had.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. It might be rendering a great service, but the Federal Government has put a great deal of money into it, and it is never going to be able to pay it back.

You will wreck the United States if you continue your policy of getting the Government into all kinds of business.

Mr. RANKIN. Every dollar invested in the TVA will be paid back with interest; and at the same time it is adding, and will continue to add, billions of dollars to the wealth of the Nation.

On December 4, 1947, I answered Mr. Flynn's attack on the TVA in a short speech on this floor, which I am reinserting in the RECORD at this point. It reads as follows:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the December issue of the Reader's Digest carries an article by my old friend John T. Flynn called The Hidden Red Ink in TVA's Books. In his article Flynn unblushingly declared that I advocated the TVA. And he asks rhetorically, "Do I want TVA destroyed?" And then answers "Certainly not."

Yet that is what he advocates. For the proposals he makes concerning the TVA are just the ones which have been advocated openly by the Power Trust and its satellites who make no attempt to disguise their hatred for this highly successful regional agency. Mr Flynn's points and his arguments can be found in any propaganda handbook of the Power Trust lobby.

Right at the beginning of the article he has a financial analysis which follows down the line on the kind of analysis made by the Edison Electric Institute, the Power Trust propaganda organization. He seeks to show that the TVA has a deficit by the simple ruse of charging navigation and flood-control costs, with an assumed interest charge, against power revenues. Of course, he shows what he calls a deficit. Yet certainly Mr. Flynn knows that in other parts of the country, on the Ohio and the Mississippi and other rivers which the Government has developed for navigation and flood control, the costs are not borne by the electric consumers.

The navigation dams on the Ohio and the levees on the Mississippi are not paid for by the electricity consumers along their banks. They are paid for by the Federal Government in the interests of the general welfare.

There can be no justification for assuming that things should be different in the Tennessee Valley—that there, unlike any other place in the country, power consumers should not only pay the power costs but those of flood control and navigation as well.

Mr. Flynn tries to make several points with respect to TVA power. And for an economist he has a strange notion of what interest is. He says it is an element of cost. But as any regulatory commission could tell him, interest is not a cost but a part of the return on profit. Rates of return are set by regulatory commissions without reference to interest. Out of this return, the utility pays whatever interest it has to pay—depending on the amount of bonded debt in its capitalization and on the interest rate it must pay.

But Mr. Flynn goes further than that. The TVA is required by law to pay back to the Treasury money invested in its power system within 40 years. That is something that private utilities do not do; they usually refund their debts, that is, they replace old bonds by issuing new ones. Mr. Flynn seems to think the TVA ought not only to pay back to the Treasury the money invested in the power system, but to pay interest on the money on top of that.

There is nothing the enemies of TVA would like better than to see the TVA hampered and hamstrung by just such a double burden. It would place the TVA under a handicap under which no power system, public or private, could survive. The TVA cannot, like a private utility, go out and borrow money. It has only two sources of funds—appropriations by the Congress and revenues from its power sales. The double burden proposed by

the TVA's alleged friend, Mr. Flynn, would tie up this second source of funds, revenues, so that it is doubtful if it could fulfill its obligations to provide electric service to the 750,000 consumers who are dependent upon it.

Mr. Flynn claims that competent engineers have said the dams are almost wholly for power. Of course, some engineers have said that. Every time the utilities have gone to court against the TVA they have rounded up as many such competent engineers as they could lay their hands on and put them on the stand. They did it in the so-called Ashwander case. That is the case that followed Newton D. Baker's $50,000 private opinion, paid for by the Power Trust, that the TVA was unconstitutional. The United States Supreme Court did not uphold that private opinion.

They tried it again in the 18-company case, and, after listening at length to the competent engineers, this is what the three-judge Federal district court said:

"Certain expert witnesses, in answer to hypothetical questions, stated that the dams might be operated for the primary purpose of power. Thousands of pages of testimony and numerous exhibits were introduced to show that Congress might have adopted a better plan than the TVA unified system. Experts equally qualified testified to the contrary.

"The court is of the opinion that the relative value of these various plans is immaterial, since it has been established that the TVA project is reasonably adapted to use for combined flood control, navigation, power, and national defense, and that in actual operation the creation of energy is subordinated to the needs of navigation and flood control."

So much for Mr. Flynn's competent engineers.

Mr. Flynn declares that all the nonpower activities of the TVA—agriculture, fertilizer production, forestry, and other projects—should be transferred to appropriate departments of the Government. In that statement Mr. Flynn shows either that he has never read the TVA Act and does not know what the TVA unified development of resources is, or that he has read the act, knows it very well, and thus knows just how to go most effectively about destroying it.

Mr. Flynn looks on the TVA as simply another power system, in business solely for the money there is in it. It is true that power is important in the unified development of the resources of the Tennessee Valley—it is the paying partner, the only activity which brings in revenues in the commercial sense. But power is only a part of the whole regional development program which has done such great work in controlling floods, promoting navigation and commerce, and restoring the soils and forests of one of the great regions of the country. The TVA is much more than a power project. Either Mr. Flynn does not know that—or he does know it and wants to destroy it.

Mr. Flynn's anxiety to destroy the TVA leads him to some strange conclusions. Former TVA Chairman Lilienthal, he says, "calls attention to the vast growth of Federal power. It has become so great that, he says, it cannot be wisely administered from Washington. But the power must not go back to the Governors, mayors, legislatures, and councils elected by the people."

Mr. Flynn here has missed the point. The powers Mr. Lilienthal referred to are Federal powers—the powers to develop interstate streams and so on—which never could be held or exercised by States and local governments. The TVA, under the direction of Congress, does not exercise new powers, but simply administers in a new, integrated, and much more effective way the powers which the Federal Government has always possessed. Nor does the TVA, as Flynn suggests, have these powers in itself; the powers are exercised by the Congress, which sets the policies; the TVA carries out those policies.

When Flynn suggests that the TVA has taken over State and local powers and functions, he raises a bogey without any substance. If, as he claims, he has spent months investigating TVA and has gone to the TVA country, then he ought to know better. Just the contrary is true. Two years ago, one of the leading newspapers of the country—the St. Louis Post-Dispatch—asked each of the governors of the seven Tennessee Valley States whether the TVA had encroached upon the rights of the States. The consensus was a vigorous "No." Moreover, the governors said, the TVA had in most cases increased the effectiveness of State and local agencies with which it cooperated in the regional program; they were stronger than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, I was coauthor with Senator Norris, of Nebraska, of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have fought its battles from the beginning. No one could be more jealous of its reputation or more solicitous of its success than I am. I repeat what I have said on this floor time and time again, that it has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times.

From the building of the Pyramids down, there has been no single development that compared with that of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is now generating between twelve and fifteen billion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year that was formerly going to waste. That power is being distributed to the people within the distribution radius at reasonable rates.

Its yardstick, showing what electricity should cost the ultimate consumers, is saving the users of electricity outside of the TVA area hundreds of millions of dollars annually. It is one of the few great developments the Government has ever undertaken that is paying its way. Every dollar of the cost of construction and operation that can be legitimately charged to power, as I said, will be paid back to the Government within 40 years; and in the course of time the revenues derived from this power will return to the Government every dollar invested for all purposes.

It is controlling floods on the Tennessee River and helping to control the floods on the lower Mississippi River, thereby saving untold millions of dollars of such damages as are being experienced along the Missouri and Ohio Rivers almost every year.

It has provided a navigation channel from Paducah to Knoxville, something like 600 miles, enabling the people of that area to use this great stream for transportation purposes.

At the same time it has carried out its program of reforestation, soil conservation, and experiments in the development of fertilizers that have been of untold value to the farmers of the Nation.

But the private power interests that are owned by the vast holding companies, which exact tribute from every power consumer they serve, are turning heaven and earth to destroy the TVA and to take from the people of that area the benefits this great project provides; just as they are trying to take from the people along the Columbia River and the Colorado River and other similar streams their enormous wealths of hydroelectric power.

Out of the Tennessee Valley Authority grew our program of rural electrification. It has already resulted in the lighting of more than 2,000,000 farm homes. The Rural Electrification Administration now has in its files applications for $300,000,000 to build lines to serve the farmers of the Nation, and they are coming in at a rate of from twenty to twenty-five million dollars a month, or more.

Instead of attacking the TVA, it would behoove the Members of this Congress to join me in my efforts to secure additional appropriations for rural electrification. We are going to need at least $500,000,000 for that purpose from now to the end of the next fiscal year. We need a deficiency appropriation for that purpose now, and, in my opinion, we are going to have one, either during this short session, or in the early part of the session beginning in January.

While this Congress is appropriating billions of dollars for people in foreign lands, let us develop our own national resources, especially our water power, and see that it is distributed at the cheapest possible rates, and at the same time let us provide for the electrification of every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

Let us not permit selfish interests to interfere with this great program by hampering the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Gutter Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Detroit Free Press of January 9, 1948:

GOOD MORNING
(By Malcolm W. Bingay)
GUTTER POLITICS

Of course, as I always say, I am not quite bright in the head. Therefore, I do not understand a lot of things that other people take for granted. I have reference especially in this epistle to that message of President Truman's supposed to be on the state of the Union.

The things that baffles me is not the message. That is as easily obvious as a half-wit kid trying to do card tricks at a midway carnival. Everybody can see the extra aces tucked in his pockets.

It requires nothing beyond a fourth-grade intelligence to get the pitch. But what do most of our better newspapers do? They come out with editorials lauding this chap Truman for his "high ideals." Says the Wall Street Journal, "f'rinstance":

"Opens with an admirable statement of the basic political ideals which all Americans cherish * * * as he says, we are a people with a faith * * * profound devotion * * * welfare * * * rights * * * human beings."

You betcha!

The staid old New York Times even outdoes the Wall Street chum: "We share his faith * * * foundations of our democracy * * * happiness of our people," and so on.

When they get all through with that, they pause, take a breath, and start off again:

But, comma.

Then they make plain that the tax plan is nothing but a soldier's bonus for every citizen—a pay-off of the voters. "The voters' bonus bill of 1948."

They must know that no man could stoop so low in demagogery and still have any sincere thoughts on the state of the Union.

If, in the darkest hours of its most desperate need, a nation has a president who cannot raise his views above the lowest order of Pendergast precinct politics, then there is little hope left for that country. Especially when the papers and the critics take seriously the platitudinous sugar coating of his horrible plans to pile inflation upon inflation "to tax and tax, to spend and spend, and elect and elect."

Not in the maddest moments of the worst of the New Deal hysteria did any demagog in that gang ever suggest such staggering proposals.

Harry S. Truman doesn't know much, but he does know that his whole tax proram is so utterly impractical that nobody can be for it.

He offers everybody everything without stint. Lower taxes, higher wages, new doles, billions upon billions for all of us and the rest of the world—a mathematical phantasmagoria out of a nightmare.

The wilder it looks the smarter the little man thinks he is. Knowing that no Congress would dare pass any such program without having it used against them by psychiatrists in making out commitment papers, he feels that he is quite safe.

As the campaign begins to boil he will say, "You see, I promised you the earth and all that's in it, and heaven, too, but those dirty Republicans wouldn't let me get it for you."

There isn't a politician in Washington who does not understand this. They know the program is the bunk and Truman knows that they know it is the bunk.

Well, then, what about the people?

Oh, hush, they do not understand practical politics. The Republicans will make counterclaims, knowing all the time that what Truman is doing is playing a game in the gutter, to shake off Henry Wallace.

He has got to out-Wallace Wallace and the GOP gang gets a great kick out of his desperate efforts.

Never before in the history of the human race has there been such a delicately desperate world situation. Never before in the history of this Republic have our people been faced with such awful responsibilities and judgments. When there is no vision, the Bible says, the people perish. And we see our highest ideals prostituted by lip loyalty in order to put over the lowest and dirtiest of political tricks.

Franklin D. Roosevelt would have shuddered at the crudity of it all.

But the papers and the commentators speak of expressions of ideals and sincerity.

That's what makes me sore.

I'm thinking of the Presidency and all that it stands for in the eyes of the people. That state of the Union report does not rise above the sordid report on the state of the precincts in the Pendergast machine, of which Harry S. Truman is so proudly a member.

Even a northern city boss or a southern Bilbo must have been somewhat nauseated in hearing it.

The Folly of Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over the National Broadcasting Co. network, January 16, 1948:

There is an urgency upon us—we must face it—to clear away the hysteria, the confusion, the muddle thinking, the myopia, physical and moral, that surround the issue of compulsory universal military training. Before we rush into a measure that will affect every concept in our structure of life, let us completely realize its meaning.

It is difficult to think rationally on the subject of universal military training when, all unaware, our attitudes are being subtly shaped by the flood of propaganda emanating from governmental and military sources. We are now being told to think about it; we are being told (with all the weight of authority behind it) how to think about it. It is a poisonous injection and our only immunity against it is an aware and enlightened public opinion.

The panic is upon us. We hear such nonsense as the prevention of war by the construction of a war machine. While we with feverish activity harness our manpower, our natural resources, our science, and our skills to the purposes of war, will other nations sit idly by? With the enactment of universal military training, the armament race is on, every nation in the world bending its energies and economies to meet the competition.

The result? A trigger-happy world, ready to unleash the mad dogs of destruction before the word "go." International nerves are strained and raw. It is not difficult to foresee the explosive signal that will be given should the United States depart from its basic tradition of no peacetime conscription. How else can it be interpreted? For the first time in our history, we embark on a program of peacetime conscription. Do we thus reassure a sick and troubled world that our intentions are honorable?

Today, we are spending more than $10,000,000,000 annually on our armed forces, more than $70 a piece for each person in the United States. We have the largest Navy and the best equipped Army in the world, and in addition thereto, have the atomic bomb. Look at this picture and then ask yourselves what hope can there be for international sanity and amity if on top of all this we add peacetime conscription. Let us not for one moment underestimate the potency of a psychological climate.

To me there is complete inconsistency between the Marshall plan dedicated to the purpose of restoring the health of Europe's economy and a measure such as peacetime conscription. If the United States seeks absolute security, so must every other sovereignty in the world. In the present day concept of war, it is total war, not only with atom bombs but with transoceanic missiles, radio-active dust, supersonic, and biologic weapons. All this adds up to the realization that an absolute security calls for military control of every phase of our life. It means the mobilization of industry, the military direction of the kind of output; it means control over the farmer and the laborer; it means the dispersal of cities and the building of underground communities; it means directing science and education toward military objectives primarily. Unless all this is done, how ridiculous is the notion that peacetime conscription is our greatest security. I do not contend that we weaken our defenses already existent, but I do maintain that peacetime conscription in no way adds to our security. If we are asking for the absolute, then we might just as well stop living. Absolute security is incompatible with living. Of course, if a man never goes outdoors, he will never risk slipping on the street, or if he never heats his dinner, he can never run the risk of a gas explosion.

As we do, so shall others, each seeking total security. How consistent is that with the need for greater production of civilian goods in war-torn Europe. And, again, how consistent is this with our plan to build healthy democracies in Europe? Can democracy flourish under military control?

Please keep in mind what I have outlined of security measures is not an offspring of my imagination. Such measures were recommended by the President's Commission on Universal Military Training. I quote from the report itself:

"We do not wish, however, to exaggerate the benefits that would be derived from the establishment of a universal training program. Only when combined with the other elements that enter into a balanced security system would it provide the measure of strength necessary to deter an aggressor from taking up arms against us or from violating the rights of less powerful nations."

No one has called for legislation providing for underground factories or industrial mobilization. Yet by the admission of all authority, universal military training would be ineffectual in and of itself. What actual purpose would it serve? I have little patience with those who talk of universal military training as necessary to the health and education of our youth. The function of the military is to train for war. I refuse to subscribe to the absurd contention that the military is better fitted than the home, the school, and the church to take care of our youth in terms of health, education, and spiritual welfare, particularly in the formative years. Let us find the defects in our educational system and apply the remedy there. Let us remedy the defects of our medical services. Let the economy of our democratic system of free enterprise be so strengthened as to eradicate poverty, illiteracy, and ill health. Do we have to call upon the military to do these things for us? I most certainly prefer those who ask for universal military training straightforwardly to those mealy-mouthed apologists for the introduction of complete military regimentation of our lives. Call it what it is—peacetime conscription. Never mind the pink ribbons.

It must be faced squarely today that the military has already entered our lives in unhealthy proportions. A general of the Army is Secretary of State. The President's personal chief of staff is an admiral. Occupied areas are under military men who shape policy every day. The shaping of policy in peacetime is not a normal military function. In the Foreign Service we have General Smith as Ambassador to Moscow, Admiral Kirk is Ambassador to Belgium. In South Africa and Panama retired generals head the legation and the embassy. Some 13 American military missions exist in South America today, again shaping policy. General MacArthur is absolute ruler of Japan. Two military men, Eisenhower and MacArthur, are possible contenders for the Presidency. The military has contacts with many leading universities dealing with basic scientific research. I state these facts certainly not to malign any of the men I named, but rather to indicate how wide the net of military control is being swung.

I cannot, too, understand the talk of peacetime military training as a lesson in democracy. It is a dedication of the individual life to the purposes of the state, a concept which is totalitarian. It places in constant stream the malleable minds of our youth under the tutelage and discipline of professional officers who necessarily bear the military cast of mind. There is nothing democratic about inculcating in our youth the need for immediate and unquestioning obedience. In war we have no choice; we do in peace. Peacetime military training is inconsistent with any intellectual freedom. It means complete submission. It precludes any criticism on the part of the conscriptee and makes for a standardized conduct that destroys the initiative a successful democracy must have. The President's Commission on Universal Military Training states in approval: "It would teach the trainees to think like soldiers in military organizations and to develop habit responses to situations that will save lives in the event of war." How will, may I ask, an unquestioning obedience

fit into a free democratic life which demands an alert, critical appraisal at all times?

Remember, too, under a system of universal military training, the military could select the best leadership among the youth of promise and siphon them away from civilian activities, thus robbing our democracy of the leadership it sorely needs.

In a study made by educators it was estimated there would be a loss of about $2,000,000,000 in goods and services as a result of the withdrawing of 1,000,000 youth from productive work. It would, in addition, add from three to five billion dollars to the defense budget, as estimated by Hanson Baldwin, military expert of the New York Times, who has more than once in his column exposed the fallacies of a peacetime conscription program. But the cost in dollars is not nearly so important as the cost in the increase of venereal disease, the corruption of the democratic base of our Government, and the militarization of our country, resulting in a totalitarianism. Thus we stand in the acutest danger of ending up by becoming that which we sought to oppose.

Assuming that we dare for a moment to embrace the barbarism that war is inevitable, it does not prove the effectiveness of military peacetime training. In the rapidly changing techniques of war, boys trained 10 or even 5 years ago would have to be retrained. Selective service would have to function as if there had been no peacetime conscription program. Our industries, instead of expanding production for peacetime goods, would be kept busy supplying weapons soon to be outmoded and then resupplying others. Again we come to the same conclusion, universal military training serves no purpose, is completely ineffectual unless the country becomes one armed camp. Why this emphasis upon the weakest element, manpower, in modern military techniques? Universal military training neither prevents nor shortens war. This past war was not prevented nor made any shorter by reason of universal military training in Germany, Russia, Italy, France, or Japan. In all these countries save France there flourishes nazism, communism, or fascism. Remember, too, a wall of human flesh is no defense against the atom bomb.

The evidence of national hysteria is all around us. The hysteria is reflected in such governmental activities as loyalty review boards where the accused is not even granted the elementary rights accorded a prisoner at the dock who committed a minor criminal offense. The Government employee when accused of so serious a crime as disloyalty cannot even be told of the nature of the evidence against him nor is he permitted to confront the witnesses against him. The national hysteria is reflected in the methods of the Committee on Un-American Activities, where is revealed such a disregard for civil liberties that many fear to speak freely. The national hysteria is reflected in the absurd censorship imposed at the source by our Army and Navy officials. There can be no doubt that acceptance of the principle of peacetime conscription is still another manifestation of our hysteria. We cannot afford the luxury of taking these symptoms of hysteria lightly. Hysteria is highly contagious. It leads from majority rule, with protection of minorities, to mob rule, untempered, malicious, and corrosive.

What we seek is a restoration of sanity and values in the world today. That is where our moral leadership should take us instead of the path of preparing for destruction. This is a plea for reason and temperance.

Examine the proposal of peacetime conscription. Examine it carefully and logically. Ask yourself what it means to you, to your children, to your country and to the world.

United States Being Duped?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News. The statement adds to the ever-increasing evidence that the people are getting wise to the foreign spending of this administration and have come to the conclusion that the American people are being duped, and that our foreign policy has been a complete failure as far as contributing to peace and the rehabilitation of Europe is concerned.

The editorial follows:

UNITED STATES BEING DUPED?

Just how far and how much are our Government officials being duped in their efforts to aid foreign nations is a question uppermost in the minds of many Americans today. And, at the same time, one wonders at the capabilities of some of the Government officials charged with the administering of the American aid designed to feed the hungry and stave off communism in some of the war-torn countries.

News reports from Greece tell of United States officials being displeased with the Greek attitudes. The United States has poured considerable into Greece where the cold war took on a little heat as government forces used bullets instead of words in battling with Communist sponsored guerrillas.

Dwight Griswold, chief of the American mission to Greece has deplored the noncooperation of the Greeks in assisting the Americans to assist themselves in their struggle against the guerrilla bands and in rebuilding the nation.

One story out of Greece has it that the Greeks purposely did little themselves to halt the guerrilla activities and hoped that the Communist battlers would make even further trouble in their land. It was felt that this would lead to a complete let-down of the gates on American aid and that the United States would pour millions of dollars more into the country. Thus the Greeks could sit back in comfort and without work while the Americans fed them and rebuilt their country.

Congressman McDonough Urges Repeal of Tax on Women's Handbags, Luggage, Toilet Preparations, and Cosmetics; Also the Repeal of War Excise Taxes on Admission to Theaters and Places of Amusement

REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for repeal of the war-time excise taxes on certain articles that were classified as luxuries during the war, but which by everyday use and custom have been clearly established as necessities to most people in the United States. I refer specifically to the 20-percent war-excise-tax rate which has been levied since 1943 on luggage and leather goods and since 1944 on toilet preparations and cosmetics.

It is also time to reduce the war-excise-tax rate on admissions to theaters and places of amusement such as sporting events and concerts to the prewar rate of 1 cent on each 10 cents.

The present tax on luggage and leather goods was enacted on the assumption that all leather goods were articles of luxury. That there was no justification for such an assumption was proven when the War and Navy Departments listed women's handbags, one of the items subject to this tax, as required articles of apparel for the WAC's, the WAVES, and the women's branch of the Marine Corps. Women's handbags, purses, and billfolds generally serve the same purpose as a man's pockets, and are just as essential.

While expensive handbags, toilet cases, or luggage might be classified as luxuries, these articles when moderately priced and used for commercial and other essential traveling certainly must be recognized as necessary articles. But the tax applies to all leather goods without regard for price or use.

The wartime excise-tax rate on toilet articles and cosmetics is levied on the same over-all basis, and includes all items regardless of whether the use of articles is a necessity, as in the case of certain baby oil and powder, or a luxury as in the case of imported perfumes.

At the time this tax was enacted, arguments in favor of the levy admitted that cosmetics were universally used by women, many in the low-income group, but held that if a person of low income chose to spend part of their income for such articles, the high tax should still apply.

Today many toilet preparations and cosmetics are essential to every woman who needs to get and hold a job. Now that the war is terminated this tax should be repealed.

The high tax on admissions also places an excessive burden upon the low-income groups, and in addition taxes sporting events and many cultural events such as concerts, operas, fairs, and legitimate theater offerings.

It also levies a tax on entertainment of children, even when special programs are shown that are particularly suitable for a child audience.

The present tax of 1 cent on each 5 cents for admissions is exorbitant, and it should be reduced to the prewar tax rate of 1 cent on each 10 cents.

Most arguments against reduction of any taxation at this time center on the fact that national income must remain high to meet enormous national expenditures and pay something on the national debt.

However, opponents to tax reduction generally will not be found among leading advocates of greater economy in government.

If we appraise Government expenditures carefully, and only appropriate funds for those purposes which are actually necessary to provide full and effective security and protection for the United States and to provide all essential services to our citizens, both veterans and civilians, and not to support nonessential bureaus or duplication of services in the Government; I am confident we can and must give tax relief to our citizens now. We can accomplish this in part by repeal and reduction of these excise taxes without impairing our national economy.

I, therefore, urge the Members of Congress to support legislation to repeal the excise-tax rate on leather goods, luggage, toilet articles, and cosmetics, and to reduce the excise tax on admissions now.

Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me on January 19, 1948:

Fellow citizens, I am grateful for this opportunity to briefly present my views on pressing legislative problems to the people through the facilities of WWJ and the Detroit News.

Federal taxes is the first problem chosen for discussion. There are strongly conflicting arguments on this subject presented to me for consideration by people of varied views and opposed interests. My philosophy on taxation and the course I have always tried to follow was predicated upon the principle of ability to pay. My philosophy of Government spending is to provide those essential services which the people cannot directly and effectively provide for themselves.

I have always opposed all forms of sales and excise taxes as being unfair, discriminatory, punitive, and regressive. My theory is to tax the profit, not the product. Let an industry or an individual make or sell his production, then tax his profit, if any, at the lowest possible graduated rate. Small profit, small tax; big profit, bigger tax; no profit, no tax. Never tax production as such; it stifles initiative and reduces the number of jobs, which in turn further reduces production in an endless and vicious cycle. Right now the trend of discussion centers upon tax reduction and whether it is feasible or desirable.

As I view the situation, tax reduction and the immediate personal gain may be attractive even if it is not the soundest course bearing upon the present and the future. I advocate the application of current surpluses to the reduction of our wartime debt. I point out that for every billion dollars of suspended reduction of the war debt, you, the taxpayer, will be called upon to pay an approximate additional two and one-half billion dollars over the years to come. Besides, you are risking the value of your savings bonds and reducing the purchasing power of your dollar through dangerous inflation.

My proposals for tax reduction are based upon increased personal tax exemption for dependents, the repeal of wartime excise taxes and provision for splitting incomes between husband and wife for tax purposes in order to equalize the tax burdens between taxpayers living in community-property States and States not so favorably situated. The fourth proposal embodied in a bill bearing my name, would reduce surtaxes one percentage point in each bracket.

If my ideas were to prevail, and ultimately they might in part, as is indicated by the belatedly corrected course of Chairman KNUTSON of the Committee on Ways and Means in accepting the proposals for increased exemption and for income splitting between husband and wife which, had they been previously included, might have saved the Knutson tax bills from a distinctive double veto which was twice sustained by a Republican-controlled Congress. I will not at this time undertake to perform a post mortem on the dead Knutson bills. I will let them rest where they were buried. The present tax-reduction proposal by Mr. KNUTSON I will dissect in due time. Now I will say only that aside from the provisions having to do with liberalized exemptions and splitting of incomes, KNUTSON'S latest bill is even worse in its favoritism toward the big income taxpayer than the bills which were killed by veto. The wealthy will obtain thousands more while the little fellow will get but a few more dollars in relief. The small taxpayers that are to be dropped entirely are forced upon the author by the liberalization of exemptions, something he has heretofore always opposed, but now is forced to accept in order to increase the chance for enactment of a more pernicious plan of favoritism in the high brackets.

The President's proposal for a $40 cost-of-living credit recognizes the brutal pressure of inflation upon the lowest income groups. It is an honest across-the-board tax cut for everybody—without fake or fancy arithmetic. Moreover, the average American family of four, earning less than $4,300 a year, would receive greater relief under the President's proposal than under the Republican tax bill. The President's plan could well be substituted for the liberalized exemptions contained in my own bill and that bearing the Knutson label.

The President's idea to maintain Federal revenues at current levels by imposing a tax on the excess profits of corporations has been carefully thought out. It would not injure small corporations, nor even big corporations, as such. The approach is to determine what constitutes excessive profits, and apply a 75-percent rate against this tax base. The tax would apply to no more than 25,000 corporations out of the total of approximately 400,000 business corporations in the country. Corporations with excess profits of $50,000 or less would pay no excess-profits tax.

The President's proposal will discourage corporations from charging the excessive prices out of which these excessive profits are made. With corporate profits after taxes now at an annual rate of over $17,000,000,000 nearly double the $10,000,000,000 profits earned in banner war year 1943—the excess-profits tax is a safe, sound, and equitable method of offsetting the loss of revenue from the $40 cost-of-living credit. By maintaining Federal revenues at current levels, the President will be able to retire the Federal obligations now held by the banks which are used as the basis for inflationary expansion of credit.

Reasonable reserves for all corporations are essential to their safety and continuance. Excess profits are not, as contended by Mr. KNUTSON, used in venture capital. The contrary is true. Smart money—inside money—is used for expansion to further enhance profits for the insiders in going concerns. Venture capital involving risks for wildcatting for new untried industries for making and selling new ideas and products comes from the average uninformed investor and from what is termed "the sucker." So that if we argue for venture capital, we had better plan tax relief for the average taxpayer, the worker, the veteran, the white-collar worker, not for the wealthy or the millionaire. They, as a general rule, plan their investments safely.

In discussing taxation I feel compelled to call to your special attention a proposal now before committees of Congress which is masquerading as a tax simplification. It is nothing of the sort. It strikes at the very heart of our unemployment-compensation system and the operation of our public-employment offices. It threatens the adequacy and promptness of benefit payments to working men and women when they lose their jobs through no fault of their own. Because it does so, it is equally a threat to the corner grocer, to the butcher, to the druggist, to our churches, our doctors, even the bankers. In fact, to every man and woman in the community.

This proposal to which I refer is to allow to the States a 100-percent tax offset instead of the present 90-percent offset under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. This proposal would cut the Federal Government out of its present cooperative role with the States in both the unemployment compensation and public employment service programs. It would repudiate the national interest in these two programs.

As the Social Security Act and the Unemployment Tax Act now operate, the Federal Government collects a three-tenths of 1 percent tax on pay rolls of employers covered by unemployment compensation. The Federal Government in turn pays the cost of administration of unemployment-compensation programs and the State-operated public-employment offices of our Federal-State employment service system.

Congress now has before it a call for action on a short, simple, innocent appearing little bill, which—offered as a simplication of our tax system—would actually turn over to each State this tax now collected by the Federal Government, and would leave the administration of both the unemployment-compensation and employment-service programs solely to each State.

Why is this proposed change important to every one of us? Because it would remove the Federal Government from all responsibility for the administration of these two programs, for the maintenance in all States of minimum standards of benefit payments. It would cancel out the Federal Government's role in assuring the purpose of the Social Security Act, which is pay benefits promptly when due, to insured workers.

I cannot imagine a more brazen proposal, unless it would be to saw the Washington Monument into 51 sections and ship the pieces to the States.

States would at once be thrown into competition in reducing benefit payments and tax rates, in lengthening the waiting period, in multiplying reasons for disqualifying workers from benefits. The entire system of unemployment compensation would quickly be destroyed.

I have described this proposal as a capsule atomic bomb. I mean just that. The initial explosion would be followed by cancerous activity eating away the tissue and fiber of the entire unemployment-compensation and public-employment-office programs.

Michigan, as you know, has been a leader in the field of unemployment compensation

and public employment service. We know that our progress has been possible in part because the Federal Government took the initiative in establishing, and has used its influence in maintaining, minimum standards in all the States. The role of the Federal Government has been to keep the more backward States from unfairly breaking down standards of benefit payments and employment services available to both workers and employers.

This proposal is an insidious attempt, under the guise of a tax revision, to wreck two programs—programs which are vital to the well-being of citizens of Michigan and citizens of the Nation as a whole.

I want to report that, because of my deep interest in unemployment compensation and the public employment service, I have met with the proponents of this alleged tax proposal, and have endeavored to point out the evil of their intent.

Michigan has a particular stake in defeating this vicious proposal. We have a heavy concentration of durable industrial production, particularly automobiles and related items. As a result, within our borders, there is limited opportunity to shift from job to job when employment turns down. We want the system maintained whereby Michigan workers may be aided in seeking jobs, not only within the borders of our own State but wherever there may be unfilled job openings. Such a system is best for those who have jobs to fill, as well as for those seeking jobs.

We know that labor-market conditions in Michigan are influenced by developments outside our State. The labor market must be kept Nation-wide, as wide as the market for automobiles.

We do not want our industries to be compelled to leave our State to go to other States that attempt to offer temporary tax advantages by chiseling down benefit payments to unemployed workers, and by restricting employment offices to merely local registration centers for unemployed workers waiting for jobs to turn up in their communities.

More important, we do not want our well-established industries to have to compete with industries in other States who may be willing to turn the clock back to the conditions that prevailed in the thirties.

The vicious proposal to rub out Federal-State cooperation in our unemployment compensation and public employment services, as I have stated, is promoted under the innocent label of amending the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to provide a 100-percent tax offset to the States. It must be defeated.

My views with regard to the Marshall plan are in strict accord with the recommendation of the President, the expressions and objectives of Secretary of State Marshall, and they square with the views of our own distinguished senior Senator, ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan. The expenditures entailed by the Marshall plan are intended to secure peace and harmony among nations and world salvation from communism. The defeat of the plan at this time would spell disaster and would lead to war.

To me the problem is as simple as that. Peace and tranquility with the Marshall plan; war and turmoil without it.

On domestic issues other than taxation, I am actively supporting the President's program against inflation, for adequate housing, for aid to needy veterans, Federal aid to education, and for a national program of health insurance. As you know, I am coauthor of the so-called Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, and of a bill to expand social-security coverage and benefits. I regret that time does not now permit a full discussion of these issues.

Nehru Denies Shipment of Arms to Arab League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of a cable I sent to Jawaharlal Nehru and the text of his reply:

JANUARY 14, 1948.

HON. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU,
Government of India, New Delhi, India:

It is reported in the Roz El Usef, a newspaper published in Cairo, Egypt, that the Arab League secretariat has acquired a large quantity of arms and ammunition sent by the Indian and Afghanistan Governments and that the secretariat is arranging for the safe transfer of this consignment to Palestine. If true, this action on the part of your government is a violation of the decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations on Palestine. Trygvie Lie, Secretary of the United Nations, has urged all nations to uphold the decision. I am sure that Trygvie Lie and many friends of India in the United States will be shocked if you do not repudiate this reported violation of international comity. India has much to gain from a strong United Nations. Actions of this character wound the prestige of the United Nations to which India has, and is now in the act of so doing, applied for redress of wrongs.

EMANUEL CELLER,
Member of Congress, U. S. A.

JANUARY 16, 1948.

EMANUEL CELLER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Report in Roz El Usef that Indian Government has supplied large quantity of arms and ammunition to Arab League is wholly devoid of foundation, and I am surprised that anybody should give credence to it. India is fully conscious of her obligations to the United Nations and can rightfully claim that she has discharged them faithfully.

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.

The Last Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the last public utterance of the Honorable Josephus Daniels, a speech delivered on December 18, 1947, here in the city of Washington, D. C.:

REMINISCENCES—EXTRACTS FROM ADDRESS BY JOSEPHUS DANIELS, THE WOMEN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 18, 1947

When I was honored by your invitation to speak at the Women's Democratic Club in our National Capital it seemed an opportunity for an "ex" to discuss the domestic and foreign policies which challenge more wisdom than men and women in and out of office have seemed to possess. Having no official responsibility, I naturally felt, as do all outsiders, fully capable of providing a blueprint to build a warless world. I, therefore, went to work to draft a modern plan of 14 points, more or less, that would end soaring prices at home and bring peace to a frustrated world.

However, before I had gotten far in formulating plans for legislative and executive action needed in this postwar era of doubt and drift, word came to me that it was not desired that I instruct executives and legislators on how to solve world problems but confine myself to reminiscences. Whether the new subject was assigned for fear my 14 points would run counter to the views—or lack of views—of some in the seats of the mighty I do not know. It was probably prompted by a desire that controversial questions should not be intruded because they might mar the harmony of the pre-Christmas gathering. Always obedient to petticoat rule, I turned from proposing constructive public policies to the more pleasant field of looking backward and recalling some incidents, as witnessed from an inside seat, in the 50 years since (as a deserving Democrat) I came to Washington in 1893 to hold a small office for a brief period. It was in the second Cleveland administration and my recollections may not be without interest to those charged with guiding affairs in this era when the problems of all the world seem to wait upon Uncle Sam for their solution.

I have been privileged to have seen every President of the United States since the days of Andrew Johnson, and to have known all of them since I was received at the White House by President Garfield in 1881. In a life beyond fourscore years I have been honored with a commission from every Democrat who has occupied the White House since I was born. It was, perhaps, because of knowledge of this experience that you invited an "ex" to reminisce instead of advise. I hope you were not influenced by the same feeling that caused the president of the North Carolina Society for the Preservation of Antiquities, presenting me facetiously, to say: "Exhibit A of North Carolina antiquities."

Having lived in Washington for 10 full years and holding commissions from four Presidents, and spending much time here between officeholding and conventioning and in diplomatic service, I feel that Washington is a second home. In a sense it belongs to all Americans. It has a pull upon all who have a yen for politics and a flair for public service with an indefinable attraction for all who have once breathed its atmosphere. I love it—the cave dwellers whose hospitality I have enjoyed; its beauty more stately than any of the world's famous capitals; its public officials and bureaucrats; and most of all, like most Americans, I love to see the wheels of government go round. So I come back tonight, cheered by troops of cherished associations and fond memories.

I am particularly happy, on the first occasion of speaking in Washington in recent years to make my come-back to the Democratic women of this club. Preachers emphasize the doctrine "Ye must be born again," but many understand it as little as did Nicodemus of old. However, in matters intellectual we all know the truth of the new birth when we emerge from the shell of ignorance into the perception of a new truth or a new doctrine. I remember as a boy hearing an emotional Christian give his religious experience. He related with something of the glow that never was on sea or land how on a certain night at a certain hour in a certain place God spoke peace to his soul.

In somewhat the same manner I was born into the new light of faith in woman's suffrage. Until my conversion I had never seen an advocate of that strange doctrine or heard anyone profess it. Of course, I had heard of those noted women, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, Anna Howard Shaw, Carrie Chapman Catt, and other pioneer advocates of votes for women. They were ridiculed as strange creatures who wanted to wear the pants. They wished to unsex themselves, as critics said, by wishing to frequent polling places, often unfit for the fair sex. I had read about Mrs. Catt who was pictured as a woman whose creed would destroy the home by taking women out of their God-given sphere. From such atmosphere and environment, where election day meant no more to women than old time military muster day, a great light shone round about me, even as that which illuminated the pathway of Saul when he was suddenly converted on his way to Damascus. My conversion to woman's suffrage came with as sudden a change. I recall the place and the hour when going to a woman suffrage meeting in Washington to scoff I remained to pray. It was a summer night in the late nineties. I had come to Washington to attend a meeting of the Democratic National Committee. That business ended, I was taking dinner with a fellow member and his wife at the old Ebbitt Hotel not far from the White House.

"How would you like to go to hear Carrie Chapman Catt tonight?" the lady asked. "Let's go to hear the pussy cat."

"I do not like her name or her cause," I replied.

She said "Neither do I, but I'd like to hear her speak. We should not close our minds."

Thus challenged upon my creed of "trying anything once" I accepted. We arrived at the crowded small hall late and had to stand while the lady with unanswerable logic called unbelievers in the cause of repentance and acceptance of her creed. No, I did not go to the mourner's bench and rise professing a new faith, but I did find myself carried along by the force of the heights of her great argument so irresistibly that I had a new birth of political faith. From that hour I was never disobedient to the heavenly vision and never doubted that my country would recognize the equal right of women to voice in government.

My conversion, not loudly professed in an atmosphere that had not been exposed to the convincing reasoning of Carrie Chapman Catt and the moving eloquence of Anna Howard Shaw, brought forth no early fruit. However, I pondered it in my heart, never doubting its coming until 20 years later at Woodrow Wilson's inauguration I saw marching down Pennsylvania Avenue, led by an American political Joan of Arc, a phalanx of women carrying banners with what was then a strange device "Votes for Women." The demonstration organized to urge votes for women as an integral part of the New Freedom, Woodrow Wilson, reared in the old-time southern conception of the place of women, was adamant to their entreaties, persuasions, and demands. With him in his first term other issues of reform had precedence. However, though denied a seat at the New Freedom table, these militant women never doubted that before a change of administration they would melt down both indifference and opposition. In the inner circle of the Cabinet, William G. McAdoo, Franklin Lane, and Josephus Daniels, were adding their persuasion to the winning voice of Helen Gardner, the first woman Wilson named to an important post. The women were not discouraged when the only dent they could make in Wilson's armor was that in 1916 he favored a plank in the national platform of his party advising the States to grant the right of women to vote.

When persuasion did not move Wilson to go all the way, these resolute women took a suggestion from a letter written long ago by Abigail Adams to her President husband in which she said: "If particular care and attention are not paid to the ladies we are determined to foment a rebellion and will not hold ourselves bound to obey any laws in which we have no voice or representation." Animated by that spirit, on a wintry day, a number of militant suffragists picketed the White House and declined with resentful indignation Wilson's invitation to come into the Executive Mansion and "get warm."

Though outwardly nearly freezing they were hot with rage inside against his seemingly immovable position, and were so militant that some of them were arrested for disturbing the peace and sentenced to confinement in prison. It looked like they had reached the end of their crusade with the arrest of their leaders and the iron bars enclosing them. But these ladies, each like Valiant in Bunyan's immortal Pilgrim's Progress said: "I am Valiant, a pilgrim, and am going to the Celestial City though a host organize against me"—only their destination was the ballot box and not the goal of Valiant.

It was not until the patriotic and sacrificial contribution of women in World War I, including the first women to wear military uniform (the yoemen (F) and marines in the U. S. Navy), that Woodrow Wilson embraced woman suffrage and appeared before the Senate (September 30, 1917) and urged submission of the nineteenth amendment for ratification by the States. He based his eloquent appeal in the name of true democracy. But enough Senators were in opposition to make success then impossible. Again President Wilson cabled from Paris (February 10, 1919) to a number of Senators urging them to submit the amendment. William Jennings Bryan hurried to Washington to intercede for it. All in vain—the provision was defeated by one vote. It was clear, however, that the reform was gaining and could not long be delayed. On the 19th day of June 1919 the suffrage amendment was submitted to the States.

The fight was long and often in doubt until the Volunteer State of Tennessee obtained the honor of casting the deciding vote that conferred full citizenship on women—an honor which my wife (who was appointed by President Wilson as the official delegate from the United States to the World Woman's Suffrage Conference at Geneva in 1920) had coveted for North Carolina. We rejoiced with millions of others, when, in the Wilson administration, the nineteenth amendment was proclaimed on the 26th day of August 1920.

Though liberal men of both parties had cooperated to secure the ratification of the woman suffrage amendment, little recognition of women as equal partner in government came until Franklin Roosevelt's inauguration. Then the first woman, Frances Perkins, took a seat in the inner circles of the administration as a member of the Cabinet. Florence Allen was named as the first American Portia on the United States circuit court, and Ruth Bryan Rhode and Daisy Harriman were elevated to high station in the ranks of diplomacy. A number of able women like MARY NORTON and EDITH ROGERS pioneered in able and useful service in Congress, and it became almost a rule that a woman should hold a place on every important agency of government under Roosevelt and Truman, not only in civilian tasks but likewise as enlisted personnel and officers in the Army and Navy in World War II where they more than made good.

More still: In my State, in World War I, the wife of the Governor of North Carolina was so abundant in labors at home and with the troops in Europe that it was truly said "The State has two Governors for the price of one." The United States could have made a like boast in 1933–45 for in distinguished public service, then and since, Eleanor Roosevelt proved herself a full partner to her illustrious husband. Uncle Sam had two Chief Executives for the price of one.

What does this reminiscence of the sufferage fight sum up to for the women of the national democratic clubs and other women citizens? The command for the women of today is: Go into politics. Go in red headed. Quit shivering on the brink and plunge into the stream and demand an equal part in navigating the ship of state by women officials who have demonstrated their fitness.

There were more women voters in 1944 than men and a majority of them cast their ballots for Roosevelt and Truman. They will equal or outnumber the male voters in 1948, and they, as harbingers of progress and peace, ought to demand the election of more qualified women to posts of power. It is rare to find a static woman. Just as when housekeeping they move the bed and change the location of furniture, so in public life women are not wedded to the status quo. They are not content with things as they are. The attitude of women of vision and responsibility is in the slogan "Change but forward." Militant and progressive liberalism must be the democratic marching order in 1948, and the result will depend on women voters.

The first President under whom I held office was Grover Cleveland. In the 1892 campaign, I, with many other Democrats, had joined in the song that put him in the White House:

Four more years of Grover
Then we'll be in clover.
Out they go, in we go.
Four more years of Grover
Then we'll be in clover

Deserving Democrats (why use the overworked adjective since all Democrats are deserving?) flocked to Washington, I among the number, in the near panic year of 1893 to hail the realization of Grover's return to the White House, with patriotic desire to lend a hand.

It was in my apprentice days in the second Cleveland administration that I first knew and had a run-in with Theodore Roosevelt, then Civil Service Commissioner. The abuse of the doctrine "to the victor belong the spoils" had caused Grover Cleveland and Theodore Roosevelt to wish to remedy the abuses by substituting civil-service examinations so that clerical and some other appointments to office would be free from politics. The reform as to clerical and like appointments, though not without its evils, was an improvement. This was true even though at the first it was weakened by giving life tenure to those who owed their appointment to political influence. I believe then (and, with some reservations, I believe now) except in war days and times of emergency that all key positions in an administration should be filled by members of the party entrusted with the administration of government by the vote of the people.

The pendulum has swung far—too far—from government by party men to government by men who do not think enough of the obligations of citizenship to even vote, much less take an active part in shaping public policies. In the old days the doctrine "to the victor belong the spoils" was carried to an extreme. But, bad as it sometimes was, it had the virtue of insuring government all down the line by a responsible party which could be driven from power for abuses. Today the pendulum has swung too far toward a government manned by men who if they have any political principles manage to conceal them. Too many men in office are like chameleons, ready to make lightning

changes in their attitude to stay in office in defiance of the mandate of the voters for a change.

The citizen who does not vote (I do not refer to the good people in Washington City, who are unjustly disfranchised along with idiots and convicts) and take interest in public affairs through political activity advertises that he is a civilian AWOL. No slacker at the ballot box ought to be regarded as eligible to hold office. There is need for a new birth of the sort of freedom that gives precedence in official station to men in accord with the party in power who have convictions that send them to the ballot box, to the primaries, and to the conventions.

'Today, when the term "communism" is heard oftener than any other word in the English language, I distinctly remember when I first heard that word used in public discussion. It was when Cleveland was preaching the gospel of tariff reform. He charged that the Republican policy was founded on a "communism of pelf."

There was another tariff story in the Cleveland days that had wide currency. I recall it ran like this.

"One night Mrs. Cleveland aroused Grover from his slumber by saying, 'There are burglars in the house.'

"The House had passed a good tariff bill, which the Senate was emasculating and shaping it into one Mr. Cleveland characterized as 'party perfidy and party dishonor.' Half awake, he said to Mrs. Cleveland:

"'There are no burglars in the House, my dear, but you'll find plenty of them in the Senate.'"

It is interesting to recall that when Cleveland was opposing the fiasco of a revolution in Hawaii that dethroned Queen Liliuokalani, a young student at Groton by the name of Franklin Roosevelt was taking the same position in a school debate. In answering his opponents young Roosevelt asked, "Why did not the United States Government submit the treaty to a general vote of the inhabitants?" He answered his question by saying, "Because it was known that they would vote against it to a man."

This proves the consistent policy of most Democrats against imperialism and colonization. At the time when McKinley was, as he said, "benevolently assimilating the Filipinos," this same young Roosevelt in college was denouncing the policy of imperialism in the Philippines. Uncle Sam ruled that people until Franklin Roosevelt pledged independence to the Philippines as soon as victory was won in World War II. That pledge was carried out by President Truman. When Roosevelt appended his name to the Atlantic Charter, promising self-government all over the world, as he was a man carrying out the vision that guided him as a schoolboy at Groton and a student at Harvard. The boy was father to the man.

In 1889, while Mrs. Cleveland had no thought but of a second term, Mr. Cleveland was telling the press that the happiest day in his life would be when he could lay down the heavy burdens imposed upon him by the office of Chief Executive. He thought he was sincere. But the truth is that it took little persuasion to induce him to seek election for a second time in 1892, and he never quite forgave the majority of his party for not renominating him in 1896.

I recall a story told me by a faithful Negro messenger from New Bern, N. C., who served long and acceptably in the White House. It ran like this:

"In March 1889, when the Clevelands were packing up after the defeat in the previous November, Mrs. Cleveland said to her Negro friend, who was to stay in the White House service:

"'Keep everything here in good shape and before 1893 put everything back as it has been these past 4 years. We are coming back then. I wish to find the White House and its furnishings just as they are now.'

"He promised, and when the Clevelands returned, he reported for duty, saying he had kept his promise, and she would feel perfectly at home."

If Mrs. Wilson were not present, I could tell how disturbed the Democratic politicians were when they learned about the romance that made Edith Bolling Galt mistress of the White House. However, at the risk of rushing in "where angels fear to tread," I will tell it, anyhow. Upon my return from a speaking trip in the West in 1915, I found an imperative message from Postmaster General Burleson to call him at once on a matter of the highest importance. He was the political high priest of the Cabinet. News, having gotten out, that President Wilson had won the love of Washington's most charming lady and that marriage was imminent, the Democratic politicians had hurried to Washington to tell Burleson that if Wilson married before the 1916 election it would cause his defeat. They were scared stiff at the thought. So was Burleson, who communicated his fear to me. What could be done to save the party? We did not know then that Edith Bolling Galt entertained a like trepidation and at Cornish earlier in 1915 had set herself against a wedding before the election.

"What can be done to save the party?' That was the question I asked Burleson.

He replied: "Wilson must be induced not to marry until after the election in November 1916."

"How can that be done?" I asked.

"While you were away we discussed it," answered Burleson, "and we all agreed that you were the member of the Cabinet to approach him and tell him the weal of the country depended upon his reelection; that marriage prior to that date would defeat him; and that he should not contemplate such a step until he had been reelected."

"Why was I selected for this dangerous diplomatic mission?" I inquired.

"Wilson thinks as much of me as of you, but as the first Mrs. Wilson and your wife were the closest friends in the administration circle, we think he will be more apt to listen attentively and be influenced by your advice," Burleson said.

I was an ambitious young man and the tender of this position as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary had its appeal. I felt sure that an appeal for postponement of the marriage would find no echo in Wilson's heart. I suspected he would wish another Secretary of the Navy, who would think of navigtion on the salt water rather than aspire to direct sailing on the matrimonial sea. I declined the mission and kept my job, and Wilson was shortly happily married.

Wilson followed his heart and his election after his marriage was another proof that "all the world loves a lover." The country, when it came to assess the worth and wisdom of the new mistress of the White House, rejoiced that the President had not permitted political devotion to interfere with marital happiness. Instead of the bride driving away votes, she attracted them. And, in the years that followed, though she meticulously refrained from public participation in affairs of state, the country learned to admire and respect the noble lady whose wisdom and counsel were above the value of rubies in the anxious days of war; who rose to statesmanship in Paris when some upon whom Wilson leaned failed. She was a ministering angel in the long years that followed the breakdown as Wilson lost his health and shortened his life by consecrated devotion to the League of Nations. He correctly believed that American entrance into the League would insure lasting peace. History has proved he was right, for if the United States Senate had been guided by the same wisdom in 1919–20 as it displayed in 1945–46, no Second World War would have cursed the world.

Time does not permit of other stories about occupants of the White House in the years I was privileged to "have an inside seat" in days of peace and war. I'd like if there was time to recall how Wilson broke precedents and delivered his message in person to Congress; drove the horde of lobbyists, thick as locusts in Egypt, out of Washington; and recall the long fight Wilson made for the League of Nations even when broken at the wheel. I would like to dwell on how Franklin Roosevelt converted depression into prosperity, declaring "the only thing to fear is fear" and followed the declaration by New Deal healing legislation; and how both these Democratic Presidents successfully waged war to end totalitarianism and outlined workable peace programs. But time forbids.

Summing up, let me give you an impression based on association, long experience and study of the careers of national leaders. It is my mature conviction that no man since Andrew Jackson ever willingly left the White House, and I doubt that this could be said of Old Hickory if Rachel had been living. Theodore Roosevelt was not the only "willin' Barkis" who died hoping to be given a new lease on residence in the Executive Mansion. There's an appeal about the great office of President which does something to a man and few privileged to hang up their hats there have been happy after its doors were closed to them. No matter how much, like Cleveland, they declared that they looked forward with joy to laying down their onerous duties, or like Coolidge hoping his "I do not choose to run" would result in being drafted, each and everyone of our Chief Executives has been so enamored with the power and glory of the greatest office in the gift of mankind that not one has contemplated a change of residence except with regret. The blow was softened for Taft by a seat on the Supreme Court Bench. Wilson would have felt the urge to be a candidate in 1920 on the League of Nations issue if he had not been stricken. I am not sure Franklin Roosevelt would not have responded to a fourth encore, and there is not room to doubt Herbert Hoover liked it better as a residence than salubrious California's beloved Stanford University, and Harry Truman finds the White House more attractive than Independence, Mo.

It is not only men who have lived in the White House who have yearning to live in that residence, but there is an impression that on Capitol Hill—and in some State houses—the Presidential bee has stung others into a desire to move into the White House. Once bitten by that bee, there is a tradition that no man ever recovers from it.

But—I am in danger of treading on forbidden grounds. If my subject had not been assigned me I might tonight have outlined the course of government that all Allied nations should have pursued after V-day and should pursue now to reach the promised goal. Or—and that gives me pause—I might have advised a course that would have been fatal to the attainment of the peace which alone can save the world from chaos.

If the United Nations must continue to debate and practice manana while there is lack of a program guaranteed to bring the peace, for which all women prayed in the cruel days of war, the responsibility will not lie at my door. I was ready and chart and compass to point the route to the safe harbor and was only deterred from its presentation by being shunted off by the Women's Democratic Club to the uncontroversial theme of Reminiscence.

Even tonight, however, in the swirl of conflicting tides and eddies, I am a confirmed optimist. I dare to believe that doubt and confusion will give place to the universal peace for which our best beloveds fought and died and the goal for which women prayed and sacrificed. In this Christmas season let us invoke the blessing, long deferred, promised with the advent of the Prince of Peace, and have the faith that we shall live to see an upswing toward the peace which will cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

Blueprint for Disruption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry Hazlitt from Newsweek magazine for January 19, 1948:

BLUEPRINT FOR DISRUPTION

(By Henry Hazlitt)

President Truman's annual message to Congress was primarily a campaign document. It seems to have been written chiefly in fear of losing extreme leftist votes to Henry Wallace. The basic philosophy it embodies is unmistakable. It is the philosophy of the welfare state, the doctrine of salvation through bureaucracy. Free enterprise, free markets, and free prices are no longer to be trusted to stimulate and guide production and consumption. Everything is to be in charge of omniscient and omnipotent bureaucrats.

Everyone is promised economic security, regardless of what he contributes to production. We are to have bigger job insurance, bigger old-age benefits, bigger survivors' benefits, bigger education. The Government is to subsidize our medical care and our housing. It is also to reclaim land, replant forests, build more TVA's. On top of this, it is to spend in 15 months on European aid alone as much as it used to spend in the same period before the war for all its purposes combined.

Mr. Truman, by some miracle, is at the same time for economy. "Government expenditures have been, and must continue to be, held to the lowest safe levels." But the proposals he makes would immeasurably increase even present expenditures, and the Federal Government is already spending in 1 year as much as it took it 5 years to spend just before the war. Of course, all this money is to be taken in taxes only from the rich.

What Mr. Truman forgets is that the entire wealth and welfare of the country depends upon production. The total amount of the national product is far more important to the average family than any possible redistribution of it, yet Mr. Truman's schemes and taxes would undermine, discourage, and disrupt production. It would destroy incentives. The producers would not be permitted to enjoy the fruits of their production, and others would be handed the fruits whether they produced anything or not.

Mr. Truman's speech is a tissue of self-contradictions. He is for free enterprise and free competition, but demands price fixing. He wants to "continue price supports for major farm commodities." But he declares that the price of food is too high and that it must be reduced by Government edict. While prices are to be held down, costs of production are to be forced up. The minimum wage is to be increased from 40 to 75 cents an hour. This would be a wage boost of 87½ percent. All workers above the minimum would, of course, insist on the maintenance of their existing differentials. Production costs and prices would be forced up enormously, and this might cause heavy unemployment even in spite of monetary inflation. If we can raise wages just by passing a law, and do it without such harmful consequences, why not $1 an hour or $2 an hour? Why stop anywhere?

We must enlarge our industrial capacity, continues Mr. Truman: "At least $50,000,000,000 should be invested by industry to improve and expand our productive facilities over the next few years." But such funds could only be provided out of past profits and would only be invested if there were an inviting prospect of future profits. Yet, Mr. Truman is shocked by existing profits, even though, as a percentage of the national income (especially when proper allowance is made for depreciation and inventory replacement) corporate profits today are not at all abnormally high. Mr. Truman wishes to increase taxes precisely where the increase would do most damage to production—on the corporations that are the very means of the workers' livelihood. He would do this in order to free some 10,000,000 voters in an election year from all income taxes, and to create the short-lived illusion that present enormous Government expenditures can be paid for only by a minority, by the rich, by somebody else.

Candidate Truman's program is demagogy run riot. It is a blueprint for disruption. He asks this country to imitate slavishly all the disastrous economic policies that have brought Europe to its present critical state, and he wants us to call this process American leadership.

A Modest Request

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., recently:

A MODEST REQUEST

The most frugal Congressman will find it hard to quarrel with one item in the President's 1949 budget. That is the modest request for $24,000,000 for ship construction, and $15,300,000 for contract authorization.

Those figures look even more modest beside the billions asked for other branches of national defense. We say "other" because it is generally accepted that a shipbuilding industry and a modern, adequate merchant marine are important to our safety.

The President said that scarcity of steel, surplus warbuilt tonnage, and "uncertainties regarding the future economic requirements for shipping" prompted his decision. He does not think that the Maritime Commission should start any construction now without contracts for sale to private operators.

In this, Mr. Truman goes further than the State Department in its analysis of European-aid requirements. Even on the Marshall plan's home grounds it is felt that our maritime position, especially in the passenger field, is unimpressive. The Department recommends that European shipbuilding be deferred after ships now under construction or contract are finished.

The Keller committee, Truman's advisory group, proposed a "modest start" on eight United States passenger ships in fiscal '48, and a big construction program for the next 3 years at a cost of about $150,000,000 a year. But no start has been made on the 1948 program and it is too late to make one before the fiscal year ends. So Mr. Truman's recommendation, in effect, puts the 1948 program into 1949.

The Maritime Commission now has almost $90,000,000 for ship construction. And there are passenger lines with approved plans for new ships, and money in the bank.

The operators say they could get ships built in foreign yards for half or less what they would cost here. But that wouldn't help American shipbuilding, and besides they wouldn't be able to get an operational subsidy. So they want a 50-percent construction subsidy.

The Commission is permitted to grant a 50-percent subsidy if it can be shown that the difference between American and foreign construction costs is really that much. They think the difference is nearer 40 percent. There the matter rests.

All the dire and oft-repeated predictions seem to be coming true. The last construction job on the horizon for private yards will be finished by August. Shipyard employment is down to 80,000 and is expected to go to 10,000.

The United States still has only one first-class passenger ship to compete with foreign luxury liners. There are only 30 passenger vessels remaining of the 113 operating under the American flag in December 1941. In spite of war-built surplus, there is a shortage of tankers and fast cargo ships.

European aid, like shipbuilding, is a factor in national security. But the postponed fiscal '48 building program would only take an estimated 60,000 tons of steel out of a national production of about 85,000,000. There is little chance that Congress in its present mood will up the budget for ship construction. But perhaps it will at least see fit to iron out some of the difficulties in the laws covering subsidy payments.

Veterans' Education Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under the present inflationary high cost of living the economic condition of GI's attending colleges and universities over the country is indeed critical. The majority of the Members of Congress, I believe, are anxious to pass suitable legislation which will aid the veteran in overcoming the unreasonable increase in the cost of living since the original veterans' subsistence legislation was passed.

I am herewith incorporating a news item from the Daily Northwestern, of Evanston, Ill. I have received a great number of letters from GI's attending universities at various points in the Middle West, all registering identical protests.

The news item follows:

TUITION JUMP TO SPELL "CURTAINS" FOR MANY GI'S

While Veterans' Coordinator Chester E. Willard yesterday determined that it is too early to announce the effect the recent tuition hike will have on the veteran, comments from campus GI's indicate that it will spell curtains for many of them.

With tuition boosted to $505 beginning in the fall quarter, veterans will run into the red. Every Northwestern student enrolled under the GI bill of rights will finish the 1948-49 school year actually owing the Government money.

VA ALLOWS ONLY $500

Here's how it works: Currently, the Veterans' Administration allows its students $500 a year for tuition and books. That means the veteran may take any course of his choosing and buy all the books that are necessary as long as he doesn't exceed the $500 limit.

Inflation has forced hundreds of ex-GI's into part-time jobs. Many veterans already hold 40-hour-a-week positions in Evanston and in Chicago. Wives of married students are working as office clerks in campus buildings. Under the old tuition of $400, single men as well as married couples have found college life tough sledding.

Most veterans stayed under the ceiling and gave little thought to winding up as debtors. Books averaged $60 a year. That left $10 surplus. But what happens now? Veterans will pay for their books and supplies and still get billed for $5 in June. Meanwhile, board and room bills remain unpaid.

SUBSISTENCE FALLS SHORT

His $65 monthly subsistence allowance falls short of paying for room, board, washing, cleaning, and incidentals. Two may be able to live as cheaply as one, married veterans agree, but not on $90 a month.

If Congress doesn't pass the subsistence bill now pending, Northwestern's enrollment will suffer a drastic decline. Customary Conga lines in front of registrar's offices will be missing. GI Joe will have gone to work.

Truman's Tax Juggling Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 8, 1948:

TRUMAN'S TAX JUGGLING ACT

A major portion of President Truman's message to Congress on the state of the Union was a prospectus of that brave new world of the future when the Government will insure everybody against everything from the cradle to the grave, when no one will need the courage and foresight to plan for his own economic needs because an all-wise Government will meet every contingency that arises.

Another part of the message contained a recommendation that Congress appropriate $6,800,000,000 to finance the first 15 months of operations under the European recovery program. This was not unexpected, and the subject is scheduled for thorough debate in the coming weeks.

A third section of the message consisted of a reiteration of the President's views on a number of subjects, such as his advocacy of universal military training, of bestowing upon the Federal Government the power to ration and to impose price and wage controls, and of the admission of a number of displaced persons to the United States, and of his opposition to the Taft-Hartley Labor Act.

The only element of surprise in the message was provided by the President's tax proposals, which consisted of a remarkable hodgepodge of faulty economics and a scheme to juggle taxes in return for votes. But perhaps this should not have been a surprise, since 1948 is an election year.

The President's recommendation that a tax credit of $40 be allowed each individual taxpayer and dependent would provide substantial tax relief only to persons in the lowest income-tax brackets. It would provide only infinitesimal relief to those in the higher brackets, while exempting an estimated 10,000,000 persons now on the Federal income-tax lists from paying any Federal income tax whatever.

This proposal is an aggravated example of the New Deal's "soak the rich" philosophy and is nothing more than a brazen bid for votes.

But the President's statement that Government revenues must not be reduced until inflation has been brought under control, and that taxes on corporations accordingly should be increased by $3,200,000,000, is utterly fantastic and wholly inconsistent with other portions of the President's message.

The President seems to think that it is highly inflationary if individuals and corporations spend the money they earn, but apparently he believes the Government can spend the same money without producing any inflationary effect. The fact is that when there is a large amount of money in circulation, the effect is the same, as far as inflation is concerned, whether the Government collects and spends it or whether it is spent by those who earned it in the first instance.

In the early part of his address, the President said that industry should invest $50,000,000,000 over the next few years in new facilities in order to maintain the present level of productivity and go on to greater accomplishments. Where would industry get the money for this enormous investment, or what incentive would there be for the owners of capital to invest it, if profits were to be taxed away, or if the Government, through excessive taxes, were to prevent industry from accumulating surpluses?

The President attempted to justify an increase in corporate taxes on the ground that corporate profits totaled $17,000,000,000 in 1947 as compared with $12,500,000,000 in 1946. In making this comparison, he conveniently overlooked the fact that the profit dollar is just as much inflated as the food dollar. He also ignored the fact that the cost of replacing worn-out machinery and of building new facilities must be paid with inflated dollars. This part of the President's message might well have been taken word for word from a report by the CIO's economists.

The President is greatly concerned about the high cost of living. But nowhere in his message was there any recognition of the effect on the cost of living of high taxes and our foreign aid program.

Taxes are as much a part of the cost of doing business as wages and the prices of materials. Eventually all these costs are passed on to the consumer. Unnecessarily high taxes are bound to result in unnecessarily high prices. But either the President is not aware of this relationship, or he chose to ignore it.

Likewise, he ignored the relationship between foreign aid and domestic prices, although no single factor has contributed as much to high food prices as the Government purchases of grain for export.

One can only conclude from the President's message that the Nation will be in a deplorable state if it must depend much longer for its guidance on an administration as confused and as willing to play politics with its economic welfare as the Truman administration has shown itself to be.

Improving Army System of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to be able to give my support to these amendments to the Articles of War which we are now considering as our experience during the recent war demonstrated that changes to the Army system of justice were necessary. Over 11,000,000 Americans not accustomed to military law were brought under this jurisdiction during World War II and approximately 80,000 were convicted by general courts martial. Of course, a far larger number were convicted by special courts martial.

In many of these convictions it has since been established that the result was not justice for the accused in that he did not have the same rights he would have been granted by civilian courts, and in many instances his punishment of long period of confinement and dishonorable discharge was too severe for the offense committed.

At the present time we have a Regular Army Establishment five times the size of our previous peacetime Army. Also it is likely that universal military training will be enacted into law, which will require all young men to participate in some form of military training. Therefore these amendments to our military system of justice are urgently needed.

I believe it will be a great step in the right direction if the following amendments are accepted: First, enlisted personnel to be included as members of a general or special courts martial; second, the trial judge advocate and the defense counsel for the accused to be lawyers; third, that officers as well as enlisted men be tried by special courts for minor offenses and that lesser penalties than those now provided be imposed in many cases; fourth, for pretrial investigations to be conducted before every general courts martial and that counsel be provided the accused during the investigation if requested; fifth, that a more adequate review of sentences by courts martial be established.

The Late Honorable Guinn Williams, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, before I returned to Washington, my colleague, the Honorable O. C. FISHER, of the Twenty-first Congressional District of Texas, announced to this body the death in his home town of San Angelo on Friday, January 9, of the Honorable Guinn Williams. For 10 years, Guinn Williams represented that district of Texas which I now have the honor to serve. He was reared on farms within this district, and for many years was the most distinguished citizen of one of the best-known little cities in Texas, Decatur, the county seat of Wise County.

I want at this time to pay tribute to his memory. He was truly a great American. He came of sturdy pioneer stock. He was one of those rugged, courageous, aggressive, God-fearing individuals who helped to make of Texas and the Southwest a great empire with noble traditions. If our Nation possessed more men of his towering stature, many of us would have less fear for the future strength and security of this Republic. In a busy life filled with multitudinous activities, in the many capacities both private and public in which he served his day and generation, he did all things well. He possessed strength of mind, clarity of vision, and honesty of heart which won him universal confidence and esteem and which endeared him to his many thousands of friends. He embraced and lived by a code of fair play and fair dealing, a spirit of live and let live. Even in his last years, amidst the strife and confusion of our times, he never lost a sense of true values and of direction.

His distinguished services in this body, from which he voluntarily retired, have been and will be elsewhere recorded in the RECORD.

During a constructive and busy life, he did not neglect to rear a splendid and distinguished family to whom he taught, and in whom he inspired his traits of good character and outstanding citizenship. His life will continue to be an inspiration to them and to us.

He left our country much better because he lived, and much poorer because he had to go. No more could be said of any man.

The Need for Action on the GI Educational and On-the-Job Training Allowances Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this means to call to the attention of the House the number of letters which I have received from the students at the Montana State College, Montana State University, Carroll College, Montana School of Mines, and Montana State Normal College, all in my district, as well as from Northern Montana College at Havre, Eastern Montana College at Billings, Rocky Mountain College at Billings, and also from interested individuals throughout the State concerning H. R. 4212.

It will be recalled that last year during the first session of the Eightieth Congress, S. 1394 passed the Senate and was referred to the Veterans' Affairs Committee. This committee unanimously reported out H. R. 4212, which has since been held up in the Rules Committee and for which no rule has been given. H. R. 4212 supersedes the previous measures including H. R. 870 which was introduced by Mrs. ROGERS and which had been given consideration. H. R. 4212 is the bill which the committee finally decided to approve.

Both of these measures, S. 1394 and H. R. 4212, will raise the allotment for single veterans in educational institutions from $65 to $75 per month and for the married veterans from $90 a month to $105 and $120 a month, depending on the number of dependents. In an effort to shake this bill out of the Rules Committee, a number of us in the House, myself included, signed a discharge petition, but in order to bring that bill to the floor of the House we must have 218 signatures. At this time we are still very short of that number, and I call upon the Rules Committee and the House, in view of the desperate situation in which many of the GI's and their families find themselves, to either sign the discharge petition so we get the necessary number of signers or get the Rules Committee to give us a rule so we can consider and vote on this very important bill.

I am wholeheartedly in support of this measure, and I will do everything I possibly can to see that it is passed at the earliest opportunity.

I want to also call to the attention of the House a bill introduced by me on January 3, 1947, H. R. 265, which will remove the monthly maximum placed on the incomes of veterans receiving both compensation and salary allowance for on-the-job training. It is my understanding that a bill similar to this, introduced by the gentleman from New York, Congressman PAT KEARNEY, has been reported out of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and that for this measure also the Rules Committee has refused to give a rule.

I should like to urge upon the membership of the House that both the Meade bill, H. R. 4212, which will allow an increase in education subsistence allowances, and my bill, H. R. 265, or the Kearney bill, H. R. 246, which will increase the maximum for veterans in earnings while on the job training and also the subsistence allowances for those veterans going to school be reported out to the House and passed at the earliest opportunity.

Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I received this morning from one of my constituents. I do not wish to include his name because I have not requested his permission to make his letter public. The writer of the letter is a close personal friend of mine and one whose judgment I seek and respect. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that he reflects the thoughts of the vast majority of the people in my district. It follows:

JANUARY 19, 1948.

Mr. FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRED: I spent Saturday afternoon and Sunday figuring my income tax, also that of my mother's, and this morning I am in a bad mood. Upon coming into the office this morning, I found that my disposition is no different than that of the others around here and we have concluded that we are victims of politicians—Democrats and Republicans included. We do not even count Communists, although there is a smoke screen raised on that issue.

The way we size it up is that the Republicans made a miserable failure of putting across their tax plan which they so freely promised all of us who voted for them. They failed, just for one reason—they succumbed to political pressure of their own party, as well as the Democrats, and voted for the appropriation the boys wanted. In turn, the Democrats kicked them in the face and let the override of high-tax Harry's veto fail.

If the present tax bill is to pass, and to prevent everyone moving to a community-property State, leaving perfectly good positions your friends JOHN TABER and LEO ALLEN will have to let the other boys know that the "tap" is shut off until the tax bill is passed.

We cannot continue to go on year after year digging down into our meager investments to pay our income-tax bills.

This letter is not written with any idea of being funny, it is in a very serious vein, and I think you and the other Republican leaders must realize that when sentiment of this kind begins, it will be felt in places where it will be rather effective.

I heard a very interesting lecture the other evening on why Europe's recovery program broke down—due principally to lack of administrative know-how. If men who have administrative ability in this country commence to think of retiring to get out of all the worries connected with high taxes, and working at half time for the Government, it will indeed be a sad state of affairs.

Very truly yours,

Displaced People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the second session of the Eightieth Congress is confronted with a great number of major problems, both from an international and a domestic standpoint. During the last session, committee hearings were held on the question of American contributing its share, along with other nations, toward taking care of the unfortunate

displaced persons now standing by in European camps. During the recent war, over 8,000,000 people were uprooted from their homes and either fled or were forced to find haven in other European countries or localities. Over 7,000,000 of those people today have already been repatriated. The displaced persons remaining today number approximately 900,000. The problem facing democratic nations is to admit these displaced persons to countries where they can establish themselves and become useful citizens. Other countries have already assumed their just burden and have admitted to their borders and reestablished a great number of these homeless people.

Members of Congress visiting Europe during the last summer, learned about this problem first hand. They found that these displaced persons are self-reliant and self-respecting people, determined to make their own living and reestablish their lives if given an opportunity to do so. Many of them were pioneers in the battle against nazism and Hitler tyranny and are now ready to combat and oppose the forces of communistic oppression. They are eager to become useful citizens in any free country. It is impossible for the European economy to support them and of course the United States Army cannot continue to support them indefinitely. They cannot be repatriated as it would be impossible to compel all of them to return to persecution and ultimate liquidation. We should immediately open our doors for the admission of a reasonable number of these people outside the immigration quota system, subject of course to our regular immigration requirements.

Almost all of them are in the American, British, and French zones of Germany and about 530,000 are in the American zone alone. Throughout our country, and especially in the Middle West, millions of acres of productive land could be utilized by most of these new citizens. In the last few years we have had a serious decline in our farm population. More than 2,000,000 persons left our rural areas during the war who did not come back at the cessation of hostilities. American farmers have a big job ahead, producing food for America and the hungry people in the world. The American farmer is short-handed. By channelling a great percentage of these displaced persons to the rural areas, it would relieve the scarcity of farm help and aid in providing food for millions, not only in our country but throughout the world. A great majority of these displaced persons are from the Baltic and Slavic countries. Thousands of their fellow countrymen came to America in the last century and today their descendents are the backbone and sinew of this great republic. They became good farmers, good citizens, and patriotic Americans. There is no reason to believe that their unhappy and homeless countrymen might not do as well. Congress should take immediate action on this pressing problem.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SHENANDOAH, IOWA, *January 13, 1948.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We hear considerable about the proposed military-training matter. People are considerably divided as to the matter.

So far the military situation seems to be the principal part of the argument; but to thousands of people there is an entirely different slant to the matter. During the recent world war, our Government had thousands of boys in camps which was necessary, but in so many cases the Government did not protect the boys from the inroads of liquor and red-light women, as the Government should have done; and thousands and thousands of our good home boys turned out to be booze sots and diseased. That happened over and over again during those trying days; and many citizens are afraid to favor military training for fear the same thing will be repeated—good young fellows taken from their homes and subjected to the power of sinful booze and the things that go with it. Thus much of the military argument in favor of conscription is being lost, whether good or bad, by a definite consideration of liquor back of it all. The Government must lick the liquor situation before the people will really like saying yes to the proposed military training.

Yours truly,

JAMES PEARSON.

Graft and Peonage Spur Red Gains Against Chiang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the folqwing article by Ivan H. Peterman from the Philadelphia Inquirer:

GRAFT AND PEONAGE SPUR RED GAINS AGAINST CHIANG

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—The Chinese situation, ever a ponderous skeleton in the international closet, is making such ominous noises these days, that it threatens to tumble out in full view. This despite top secrecy on General Wedemeyer's report.

Manchuria is now 98 percent Red. All the rich, potentially powerful areas are in the hands of Chinese Communists. Chang Chun and Szeping Kai, important industrial cities beyond Mukden, were more or less abandoned last week. The Nationalist government decided to shorten lines, defend the capital, Mukden.

Thus down the oriental drain goes the vast province—among the great hopes of the impoverished Far East—on which so much of China's rehabilitation depended. And the Reds drive on * * * toward the Great Wall, toward the Yellow and Yangtze Rivers, toward Nanking, Shanghai, Chungking and victory. All this in spite of the advice, the superior arms, and encouragement of the Western Powers.

Why? What's the matter in China? What happened to the Republic pieced together by Sun Yat-sen.

I put these questions not to some ancient oriental philosopher, not to a Buddhist mystic or down some wishing well, but to a recently returned American in whose judgment I have complete faith. He gave a story shocking in hopeless outlook, unbelievable by today's enlightened standards. It explains a lot about China.

The Chinese today are paying the bill for centuries of subjugation, ignorance, laissez faire. For passive acceptance of a rotten lot, for cruelty from the top and simple-minded resignation by the masses. Only 15 percent of the population can read or write. Does one have to say more?

Americans first arriving there are unable to understand. They see people having not even a faint idea of democracy; they see graft accepted as part of the general scheme. Everyone grafts. Money is ridiculously worthless. Prices are idiotic.

"The best we could hope for China would be a benevolent despotism of some sort. Democratic principles can't be entertained in our lifetime. The Chinese aren't ready." My friend shrugged.

But why do they go Communist if it offers so little?

"Anything the Reds offer is a lot more than the average Chinese may have. In China, the landlord—the rich, all-possessing head of a community—has everything. The people, working his lands, his mills, his inn, his factory or shop (for he owns the village and countryside surrounding) those people are virtual slaves. They work for him, buy from him, pay taxes through him until they've nothing left.

"When the Communists come, the landlord takes off. If he does not flee, he's apt to be stood against a wall. He's liquidated. Then the Red leader calls the peasants together. 'We give you the land for yourselves,' he says. 'Here each to your own parcel. What you raise and produce is your own, except for a small but necessary tax.'

"Then, to the able-bodied, he hands a rifle, tommy gun, or other weapon. With ammunition. 'Use this if the government forces return,' the leader tells them. 'Use it if the landlord reappears. Resist, then retire to the hills if you must, but be loyal to us. We will come and help if necessary. Until then, return to your farms, your jobs, and wait until the victory is won.'"

My friend tapped reflectively upon the table.

"A rather hard procedure to beat, isn't it? Tough to combat. Difficult to sell to unchained millions still sweating under such landlords, isn't it?"

Are China's Communists closely held by Soviet Russia?

I wouldn't say so, except through their leaders. The latter are carefully trained, some in Moscow. The Chinese peasant, the fellow who is handed the gun, doesn't know anything about communism and has no interest beyond his own rice patch. Yet he is firmly held because of his hate and fear of the landlord, the old order.

Chiang's government is getting worse. Since General Marshall left that country, discouraged and disgusted at its failure to adjust differences and pull together, China has been on the toboggan. Chiang is a creature of his own military lieutenants, warlords, etc., who accept him as a titular head of the mismanaged, grafting, economically, and politically corrupt federation.

If Chiang goes? Few of his subordinates could even suggest a successor. Many believe if that occurs, if the warlords are gradually ousted or forced to flee, China may retrogress to the scattered province condition prior to Dr. Sun's revolution. Nevertheless, the Nationalist leaders won't reform, the landlords refuse to improve conditions, and China, gasping again and again for American help, struggles like a drowning man—weighted with the lead of injustice, but refusing to let go.

This is the proposition American taxpayers will be asked to underwrite. We can't afford to let Russia control China. But can we afford to maintain Ming Dynasty traditions while upholding the rights of landlords to starve millions? Such is the Chinese problem.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune entitled "No Time for the Seaway" on Sunday, January 18, 1948:

NO TIME FOR THE SEAWAY

Among the many items which Mr. Truman displayed so temptingly in his budget message was that venerable and highly controversial project, the St. Lawrence seaway. This vision of cheap power and a direct route for deep-water vessels from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean has haunted many Congresses and many political campaigns. It has aroused regional support and regional opposition, as well as much argument over the basic merits of the proposal. With a hotly contested national election in the offing, Congress again seems in a mood to give serious consideration to the seaway.

New York City—indeed, the whole region which makes up the port area—cannot afford to ignore the economic implications of the seaway project. The Port of New York Authority is a public body vitally concerned with the manifold activities which result from New York's splendid harbor and geographical position. It is also an agency which has earned and won a splendid reputation for its sound judgment and broad knowledge of the problems of the port. The Authority has asserted that half of the traffic which the seaway would acquire would be at the expense of the port of New York and that this diversion of business would affect the livelihood of some 200,000 persons in the port district—entailing a severe blow to the whole metropolitan area.

This threat cannot be dismissed lightly. But the national interest is paramount, and if the gain to the country as a whole will outweigh New York's loss, the former must prevail. No single community, even one so large as that comprised in the New York port district, can legitimately set its own well-being against a proved case for any proposal which would meet a national necessity.

The case for the seaway, however, is not proved. It has been attacked, authoritatively; on a number of grounds—that it would not, on the scale now contemplated, provide the highway to the sea which its advocates foresee; that its locks would be vulnerable to air assault; that the potential traffic would not justify the investment, annual charges, and loss to established ports. These objections are weighty enough to justify continued objections by New Yorkers to the plan.

And there is an even more urgent reason why, at this particular time, the seaway project should at least be held in abeyance. The costs of government, the mounting pressures of inflation, the unsettled international scene, all are powerful arguments against any major capital expenditure that can be avoided or averted. If an undertaking of the magnitude of the seaway were to enter the competition for scarce goods and labor, the costs of the project would certainly increase. The national budget would be burdened by a substantial additional sum, and the whole effect would be inflationary. Even if Congress were only to authorize the project without appropriating for it immediately, the effect upon other future commitments, such as the European recovery program, might well be unfortunate. There is, therefore, every reason why the seaway should be held in abeyance now, and no reason why it should occupy the time of a busy Congress.

Resolution of Litchfield County (Conn.) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of all the Members of this honorable body the following resolution which was adopted by the Litchfield County Farm Bureau at their annual meeting on January 9, 1948.

A close reading of this resolution will point out that not all individual groups of our citizens are bent upon receiving benefits for themselves to the detriment of other groups. I believe that the program embodied in this resolution is one which might well be enacted by the Congress of the United States. I direct your attention to it so that you may be aware of the fine concepts of Americanism demonstrated by this wonderful body of Connecticut citizens. The resolution follows:

We believe that all civilization depends fundamentally upon the food, shelter, and clothing, in that order, which are available to their people, but that all of these depend in turn upon a healthy soil. To that end we urge soil conservation as an integral part of a coordinated farm program adequate to the needs of our people and the world for food, shelter, and clothing.

The Litchfield County Farm Bureau believes that the parity-price concept might be useful in appraising the agricultural situation, but that the present parity system is inadequate, since it does not consider all the costs of production nor conditions of supply and demand, and is inapplicable to present conditions, since it is based on a situation that existed prior to World War I.

We demand a change of the parity-price formula so as to make it flexible, permit of regional differentials, include all of the costs of production and take into account conditions of supply in relation to demand.

While agreeing that agricultural planning is necessary, the Litchfield County Farm Bureau believes that plans should be developed from the ground up and that they should be locally administered. To this end we recommend that all the functions and contacts of the Department of Agriculture with the farmers of the country be coordinated and handled locally by one agency in the interests of both economy and efficiency.

The Litchfield County Farm Bureau deplores the use of subsidies to farmers in the interests of other groups. Where low-income groups exist we believe these should be subsidized, if necessary, through such instruments as the stamp plan, rather than subsidizing the general public at vast national expense.

The Litchfield County Farm Bureau deplores the inflationary trend which is both increasing the farmer's cost of living and lowering the margin of profit in his farming operations. It believes that the Federal Government already has the power to control this inflation.

We recognize that prices are now maladjusted; but believe that any attempt to control them through price control is an attack upon a symptom and not the cause of these maladjustments, and that the effect might well be to drive many northeastern farmers out of business by withholding from them grains essential to the production of milk and eggs.

We urge the Congress to make available to the department of education of the State of Connecticut sufficient funds to insure the continuation of an adequate school-lunch program.

The Share of the Sixth Missouri Congressional District in Foreign-Aid Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for the mind to conceive the size of the gifts this country has provided in the past and is being called upon to provide in the future to various foreign countries. Perhaps it will help my constituents to get a better understanding of their individual or per capita share of this program if it is broken down into county and town and compared with local county revenues. The Library of Congress has prepared such an analysis.

Assistance this country's taxpayers have given other countries from July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1947, totals $73,092,058,013. This includes war expenditures.

The assistance we have provided foreigners since the end of the war, from July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1947, amounts to $24,099,211,087. This sum

does not include approximately half a billion dollars just voted by Congress at the request of the President as stopgap aid pending a decision on the Truman-Marshall plan.

The Truman administration is now asking Congress for seventeen additional billions for foreign aid, with six billion eight hundred million of it to spend in the next few months.

The amount already provided since the end of the war equals $183 for every man, woman, and child in America, on the basis of the last official census. It has cost each average American family more than $25 per month for each of the last 2 years. That is the main reason for high taxes and high prices.

The official figures prepared by the Library show three things:

First. The cost of foreign aid since VJ-day to the residents of each county and principal town in the Sixth Missouri Congressional District.

Second. The per capita cost to residents of each county and town of the proposed Truman-Marshall plan for $17,000,000,000 more.

Third. The county revenue received from all sources from March 1, 1945, to February 28, 1946, the last dates available for such comparison.

Sixth Missouri Congressional District

County and cities	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947—peacetime assistance	Foreign aid proposed by Truman-Marshall plan now pending	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual tax receipts
Barton	$2,589,084	$2,065,608	$4,654,692	$164,274
Golden City	158,661	126,582	285,243	
Lamar	547,336	436,832	984,168	
Liberal	141,693	112,563	253,650	
Bates	3,574,173	2,751,926	6,325,699	249,503
Adrian	158,844	126,728	285,572	
Amsterdam	31,476	25,112	56,588	
Butler	540,314	431,868	972,182	
Hume	89,121	71,102	160,223	
Rich Hill	364,592	291,124	655,626	
Rockville	61,488	49,056	110,544	
Cass	3,574,722	2,851,964	6,426,686	366,637
Belton	177,636	141,766	319,459	
Creighton	49,776	39,712	89,488	
Drexel	82,359	65,709	148,050	
Garden City	109,617	87,454	197,071	
Harrisonville	424,926	339,012	763,598	
Pleasant Hill	378,294	309,228	687,522	
Cedar	2,140,551	1,707,762	3,848,313	92,443
El Dorado Springs	428,286	341,982	770,518	
Stockton	146,583	116,946	263,529	
Greene	16,569,003	13,218,986	29,787,989	1,148,942
Ash Grove	201,483	160,746	362,229	
Republic	144,570	115,340	259,910	
Springfield	11,266,754	8,980,758	20,147,302	
Henry	4,083,279	3,257,698	7,340,977	301,548
Clinton	1,105,503	881,986	1,987,489	
Urich	85,095	67,890	152,985	
Windsor	434,289	346,428	780,717	
Johnson	3,955,911	3,156,082	7,111,993	378,115
Holden	332,694	265,428	598,122	
Knob Noster	117,120	93,540	210,660	
Warrensburg	1,070,544	856,728	1,930,572	
Pettis	6,100,488	4,867,056	10,967,544	562,254
Green Ridge	64,050	51,100	115,150	
La Monte	89,853	71,686	161,539	
Sedalia	2,738,234	2,082,488	6,720,812	
Smithton	73,692	58,284	132,016	
Polk	3,184,200	2,540,400	5,724,600	
Bolivar	482,388	384,856	867,244	183,549
Humansville	143,838	114,756	258,594	
St. Clair	2,405,718	1,919,316	4,325,034	
Appleton City	217,404	173,448	390,852	126,172
Osceola	217,770	173,740	391,510	
Vernon	4,682,238	3,735,556	8,417,794	
Bronaugh	48,495	38,690	87,185	
Nevada	1,497,123	1,194,426	2,691,549	282,149
Sheldon	84,729	67,598	152,327	

Summary by counties, Sixth Missouri Congressional District

County	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947—peacetime assistance	Foreign aid proposed by Truman-Marshall plan now pending	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual tax receipts
Barton	$2,589,084	$2,065,608	$4,654,692	$164,274
Bates	3,574,173	2,751,926	6,325,699	249,503
Cass	3,574,722	2,851,964	6,426,686	366,637
Cedar	2,140,551	1,707,762	3,848,313	92,443
Greene	16,569,003	13,218,986	29,787,989	1,148,942
Henry	4,083,279	3,257,698	7,340,977	301,548
Johnson	3,955,911	3,156,082	7,111,993	378,115
Pettis	6,100,488	4,867,056	10,967,544	562,254
Polk	3,184,200	2,540,400	5,724,600	183,549
St. Clair	2,405,718	1,919,316	4,325,034	126,172
Vernon	4,682,238	3,735,556	8,417,794	282,149
Total	62,899,367	42,071,954	94,931,321	3,855,586

Mikolajczyk Tells How United States and Britain Appeased Stalin While Stalin Was Crushing the Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two additional installments of articles published in the Milwaukee Sentinel that continue to describe the abandonment by the leaders of the United States and Great Britain of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, when it came to dealing with Stalin in his crushing of Poland. If some of us cannot understand now why we are confronted with the communistic ogre, it will be remembered that our leaders grievously sinned against human freedom in the abandonment of Poland to the rapacity of the Communist dictator. Following are two additional installments of Mikolajczyk's story:

RUSS WITHHELD UNITED STATES FOOD FROM FOLES

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment VIII)

Prime Minister Sikorski, my predecessor as head of the Polish Government-in-Exile, flew from London to Moscow in December 1941 for several reasons.

He believed that by seeing Stalin, and sitting down with him man to man, he might be able to explain the unfriendliness of Russia's retention in labor camps of many of the 1,500,000 Poles the Reds had forcibly taken into the U. S. S. R. during the time when Hitler and Stalin were collaborating in the rape of Poland.

He believed, too, that Stalin, as a military man, would be able to shed some light on the 11,000 Polish Army officers who had not reported to General Anders for service in the Polish Army being formed in the Soviet to continue the fight against the Germans.

He hoped he would be able to remove the obstacles surrounding the supplying of the Polish Army in Russia. At this time, supplies for the Poles were so short that three soldiers were existing on one soldier's rations, which at their best were far below those of any other Allied army. He hoped, also, to expedite the delivery of promised United States and British, as well as Russian, military aid for the Polish troops in Russia.

At the same time he hoped to be able to obtain proper care for Polish citizens who had been released from their work-concentration camps and who were in desperate need of the relief we could now offer them through American aid and our operatives in the U. S. S. R.

He did not know that such relief was about to be stopped, for a reason which was shocking then and remains just that today: the food and even the tin containers in which it was packed were too good to suit the Russians.

That is the truth. Russian citizens, examining what was being shipped to our people from the United States, began to wonder aloud how a country where the despotism of capitalism was rife could produce such bounty. So their Communist overseers stopped the shipments, as needed as they were.

General Sikorski flew from Kuibyshev to Moscow protected by Russian fighter planes. The Germans were so close to Moscow that their cannonading could be heard in the streets of the frozen, blacked-out capital. The general brought up the matter of the missing Polish officers as soon as he was seated in Stalin's study.

"They were liberated," Stalin said, "they just have not yet reached your quarters."

Sikorski insisted that this was not possible; that if they were alive they would be ready and eager to rejoin the fight against Germany.

Stalin muttered something about their probably having escaped.

Unable to gain any more information from the Red leader, Sikorski turned to General Anders, who sat at his side, and lauded him to Stalin.

He reminded Stalin that Anders had been wounded eight times in the fight against the combined Nazi and Red forces in 1939 and then had been arrested by the Russians when he sought to come to London to continue the fight.

Stalin looked solemnly at Anders.

"How long were you in prison?" He asked the commander in chief of the army we were trying to form to help Russia fight Hitler.

"Twenty months," Anders answered evenly.

"Were you treated well?" Stalin asked.

"No," Anders answered directly. "I was treated very badly in the camp in Lwow. In Moscow it was a little better, if the word 'better' can be used."

Stalin looked back at him and shrugged. "Such were the conditions," he finally said.

TALK OF FRONTIER

Before the long night was over, Stalin agreed, however, to outfit our forces in Russia and sternly bawled out General Panfilov, his deputy chief of staff of the Red Army, for ignoring his orders to supply the Polish troops—most of whom were housed in stoveless tents in subzero weather, so eager were they to carry on.

The following night, December 4, 1941, with the Germans only a few miles from Moscow, Stalin entertained Sikorski lavishly at the Kremlin. At the height of the party, however, he turned suddenly to Sikorski.

"Now we will talk about the frontier between Poland and Russia," he said.

SLIGHT ALTERATIONS

Being essentially a military man, and knowing Russia was retreating in the face of the Nazi tanks, Sikorski was taken by surprise at this twist of Stalin's mind. He replied that he had no authority to discuss such matters; that Poland assumed that the old prewar boundaries would prevail once the war was won.

"I'd like to see some alterations in those frontiers," Stalin insisted over his vodka. "They'll be very slight alterations."

Sikorski resisted this and Stalin dropped the subject.

Following this evening a joint Polish-Russian mutual assistance pact was announced. It pledged the two governments not only to fight the war until the German invaders were destroyed but to promote a durable alliance of democratic countries for lasting peace. Specifically, the pact's three points were:

1. Poland and Russia, together with Great Britain and other allies, would wage war until the final victory over Germany.

2. Both governments would render each other full military assistance and in peacetime their relations would be based on good neighborly collaboration, friendship, and mutual honest observance of their undertakings.

3. After victory, it would be the task of the Allied states to insure a durable and just peace.

This pact of friendship, signed by both Sikorski and Stalin, as published by Tass, official Soviet news agency, declared that after "a victorious war and appropriate punishment of the Hitlerite criminals" there must be restored in Europe "respect for international law backed by the collective armed might of all the Allied states."

Sikorski left Moscow a troubled and bewildered man. On his mind was the fate of the 1,500,000 Poles in Russia, their misery, their hunger, their helplessness in the face of a desperate need.

Still too clear was the picture of thousands upon thousands of Poles dying in the Russian camps from hunger and disease. He knew only too well that if the pact he had just concluded did not work, the 1,500,000 Poles in Russia would be doomed forever.

REDS GET UNDER WAY

On the surface everything was all right. He clung tenaciously to the hope that, somehow, the thousands of missing officers would appear, that the Reds would indeed supply our men and not renew demands for border alterations which, in the light of the conditions of the war, were presumptuous and, in the light of solemn pacts, criminal.

But the Red machinery was well under way A Soviet news broadcast soon flatly stated:

"The question of frontiers between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Poland has not been settled and is subject to settlement in the future."

Later, in London, Sikorski was informed by the British that Stalin had reported that the main post of the Polish forces in Russia was being shipped to Tehran and North Africa "on request." Stalin, who had promised only a few days before to supply them, now accused them of cowardice.

LUBLIN BEGINNING

But no new word ever came of the whereabouts of the missing 11,000 Polish officers.

There were other disturbing factors for the Polish Government in London. While Sikorski and Stalin were signing a joint declaration of their war aims against Hitler, Stalin was establishing the "Organization of Polish Patriots" at nearby Saratov, under the leadership of a Polish Communist woman writer, Wanda Wasilewska, who later became a member of the supreme council.

Wanda, who hailed from the prewar Polish town of Lwow, which was occupied by the Russians during the time of the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement in 1939, is married to a Mr. Korniejczuk, a Ukranian, who now serves as a deputy in the Soviet foreign ministry.

It was the beginning of the Lublin Government. It was the beginning of the police state which "liberated" Poland was to become.

UNITED STATES, BRITAIN GAVE STALIN FREE HAND IN CRUSHING POLES

(Installment IX)

The composite "ear" of London and Washington began to grow deaf to the pleas of the Polish Government-in-exile at the beginning of 1942.

The British were determined to do nothing to disturb their Anglo-Russian relations; even to the extent of overlooking the interests of Poland, their ally over whose problems they had gone to war in 1939.

So we began to look to America to bring the necessary pressure on the Red chieftain. But the Russians, though hard pressed in a war of survival, could and did act the part of a conquering power in diplomatic circles. What is worse, they were permitted to get away with it—and their political aggression continues to this day.

In 1942 Molotov felt secure in telling Secretary of State Cordell Hull in Washington, when Hull questioned him about Soviet pressures on Poland, that it was none of his business.

United States Ambassador to Moscow, Admiral Standley, began having difficulty seeing Molotov or Stalin when the subject dealt with anything except additional lend-lease supplies.

Appeasement of Russia grew by the hour, both in London and Washington. The American people felt, it seemed to the anxious Poles in London, that there was something almost shameful about their inability to open the second front which Stalin and his cohorts were crying for.

Careful Communist propaganda, which stressed the activities of the Red Army and neglected all Russian depredations, made its weight felt in the free press of the Allies.

The picture of Russia became easily distorted. Ambassador Ciechanowski reported from Washington that pro-Soviet elements had moved into important places in the United States war agencies and that any American who attempted to bring up such distasteful matters as, for instance, the cold-blooded murders of the two Polish Jewish Socialists—Victor Alter and Henryk Ehrlich—was pilloried as a Fascist.

We finally had to protest to the United States Department about the tone of the OWI broadcasts to Poland.

Such broadcasts, which we carefully monitored in London, might well have emanated from Moscow itself. The Polish undeground, fighting a sadistic Nazi foe which in time was to murder more than 5,000,000 of our people wanted only to hear what was going on in the United States—toward which it turned haggard but hopeful eyes.

It was not interested in pro-Soviet propaganda from the United States since it duplicated that which was being sent from Moscow itself.

We turned from Churchill to Roosevelt, then back to Churchill again and thence to Roosevelt, without avail. They were sympathetic but continued to impose silence upon us—reluctant to inject anything into their relations with Stalin which might displease him.

Each counted upon making a personal plea to him in respect to Poland at a meeting which Stalin continued to postpone.

UNBEARABLE MUTENESS

In the echelons beneath Churchill and Roosevelt, our position worsened. We were constantly told not to make any move which might anger Stalin or give him an opportunity to break relations with our group in London.

That imposed on us an often unbearable muteness in the face of ridiculous charges being increasingly flung at us by Communist writers and fellow-traveling journalists in the world press, including the free segment of it.

We could not even speak aloud when our Ambassador to Moscow was abruptly handed a note on January 16, 1943, telling him that the 1,500,000 Poles who had been forcibly taken into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1939 had been made Russian citizens.

PROTESTS IGNORED

Our own diplomatic protests to Moscow were ignored. When we took the matter to Washington, Mr. Wells suggested General Sikorski should again call on Stalin, but we

pointed out such a move would be futile unless he could go with the written assurance the United States would back him up.

We had thereafter to reckon with the Roosevelt administration's definite appeasement of Russia. It became a heavy cloud over our London efforts, but we tried to understand it: Russia was beginning to throw back the German forces.

The United States and Britain had been unable to open the second front, partially because of heavy contributions to Russia's war effort, and their forces were undergoing scant progress in North Africa.

FEARED CAPITULATION

As for the British Government, it apparently had begun to fear Germany might now abruptly capitulate or negotiate a peace with the Red Army before British forces could step back on the continent, and that Britain's position in Europe might thus be irreparably damaged.

After Roosevelt's return from Casablanca, we were told he considered the status of Russian-Polish relations so "delicate and difficult" he did not choose to intervene at just that time—though we pointed out to him that more than a million and a half pawns of aggression, whose husbands and sons were now fighting the Germans, were being held as hostages by a colleague in the anti-Hitlerite fight.

"KEEP SHIRT ON"

He said he could do nothing except marvel at the workings of the Soviet mentality, and would not at that time restate the principles of the Atlantic Charter to which Russia had subscribed.

Our people in Russia, back on starvation rations and increased slavery, were forced at gun point to sign Russian citizenship papers. Those who balked were jailed, beaten, and in some cases shot.

We tried to tell Churchill and Roosevelt that our continued silence was regarded by Stalin as an invitation to renew his political aggression against all democracies.

The best answer we got was "Keep your shirt on."

There followed a period of buck passing, with Poland in the middle.

Everything would be changed just as soon as Roosevelt and Churchill could sit down with Stalin—at Stalin's leisure.

Everything.

Amendment of Federal Employees Classification Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a bill which I have introduced in the House today which will benefit thousands of Federal workers throughout the country by clarifying the Federal Employees Classification Act of 1923 so that within-grade salary advancements date from the first day following completion of each 12 months of service. Heretofore bookkeeping delays had resulted in loss of pay from 5 to even 30 days each year amounting to a considerable sum during an employee's tenure in office.

The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of subsection (b) of section 7 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, as precedes the colon is amended to read as follows:

"(b) All employees compensated on a per annum basis, and occupying permanent positions within the scope of the compensation schedules fixed by this act, who have not attained the maximum rate of compensation for the grade in which their positions are respectively allocated, shall be advanced in compensation successively to the next higher rate within the grade at the beginning of the first day following the completion of (1) each 12 months of service if such employees are in grades in which the compensation increments are less than $200, or (2) each 18 months of service if such employees are in grades in which the compensation increments are $200 or more, subject to the following conditions."

List of Property Taken Over by Alien Property Custodian Which Has Recently Been Returned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tabulation:

Property returned to American citizens and friendly nationals that had been vested under findings that it was owned by nationals of Germany

Order No.[1]	Returned to—	Description of property	Value
N. 1	Automatic Regulator Co	6 patents	
N. 2	Radio Corp. of America	44 patents	
D. O. 1	Edsar Ausnit	100 percent capital stock of Cie Atlantic Corp.	
		100 percent capital stock of Cie Oceanic Corp.	$8,000.00
D. O. 3	American Lumber & Treating Co	7 patents	
D. O. 4	Welding Research, Inc	1 patent application	
D. O. 7	Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Co	2 patents	
D. O. 8	William Kroll	1 patent	
D. O. 11	The National Cash Register Co	20 patents	
D. O. 13	Anaconda Wire & Cable Co	1 patent	
D. O. 15	Elton H. Remington	do	
D. O. 16	The International Nickel Co	do	
D. O. 17	Roadstown Corp. of America	do	
D. O. 19	Karl Ludwig Kehlf	1 patent application	
D. O. 20	Paul E. Hawkinson Co	1 patent	
D. O. 21	Remington Rand, Inc	do	
D. O. 24	Brumbaw Goldman	do	
D. O. 25	Allied Chemical & Dye Corp	do	
D. O. 27	Bagpak, Inc	8 patents	
D. O. 28	do	1 patent	
D. O. 29	W. F. & John Barnes Co	2 patents	
D. O. 31	Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Co	1 patent application	
D. O. 35	Bernhard Erben	1 patent	
D. O. 36	Harold G. Henry	do	
D. O. 38	Monsfort Investment Co	do	
D. O. 39	National Cash Register Co	do	
D. O. 40	do	4 patents	
D. O. 41	do	1 patent	
D. O. 44	Wallace R. Turnbull	do	
D. O. 45	Radio Corp. of America	do	
D. O. 46	Eugene Mittelmann	do	
D. O. 49	The Anglo California National Bank of San Francisco	do	
D. O. 50	United States Metal Powders, Inc	2 patents	
D. O. 51	do	9 patents	
D. O. 52	do	14 patents	
D. O. 54	Link-Belt Co	1 patent	
D. O. 55	Walter Wishnick	2 patents	
D. O. 56	General Electric Co	1 patent; 1 patent application	
D. O. 57	B. S. A. Tools, Ltd	1 patent	
D. O. 58	Davis & Co., Inc	do	
D. O. 59	The Fate-Root-Heath Co	1 patent; 1 patent application	
D. O. 60	Radio Corp. of America	1 patent	
D. O. 61	Imperial Knife Co., Inc	do	
D. O. 62	General Electric Co	1 patent application	
D. O. 64	Franz Pueuing	1 patent	
D. O. 65	Walter Soberaheim	Securities	44,000.00
D. O. 71	Alfred Marshutz	1 patent	
D. O. 72	Aluminum Co. of America	do	
D. O. 73	American Dinorid Corp	do	
D. O. 81	The Hoover Co	do	
D. O. 82	Lewis Larsen, trustee	do	
D. O. 84	Reynolds Metals Co	do	
D. O. 87	United States Radium Corp	do	
D. O. 89	Robert Henigsberg	do	
D. O. 90	Leopold Lion	do	
D. O. 91	Bessie E. Steeves, administratrix of the estate of Aubrey.	do	
D. O. 92	Georg Szekely	2 patents	
D. O. 93	Leopold H. P. Klotz and North American Investing Co., Inc.	Notes issued by Luscombe Airplane Corp.	457,000.00
Do	do	Notes issued by American Investing Co., Inc.	251,000.00
Do	do	225,000 shares of capital stock of Luscombe Airplane Corp.	488,000.00

Footnotes at end of table.

Property returned to American citizens and friendly nationals that had been vested under findings that it was owned by nationals of Germany—Continued

Order No.[1]	Returned to—	Description of property	Value
D. O. 94	Maurice Stern	1,734 shares common stock of General Aniline & Film Corp.	$109,000.00
D. O. 95	Chemipuls Process, Inc	4 patents	
D. O. 97	The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co	1 patent	
D. O. 99	Mechanite Metal Corp	2 patents	
D. O. 100	Precise Products Corp	do	
D. O. 105	Mary A. Leppla	Personal property	100.00
R. 4	Arnold Janowitz	1 patent	
Do	Paul Nickelsberg	do	
Do	Franz Schitzky	do	
Do	Arthur M. Seligman	7 patents	
Do	Delamere Co., Inc	1 patent	
Do	Norbert Bernheimer	do	
Do	Max Jacoby	do	
Do	Inter-Allied Patent Corp	do	
R. 6	Arno Brasch	5 patents	
R. 8	Walter H. Lowston	1 patent	
Do	Hans Lewin	do	
Do	Ingersoll-Rand Co	do	
R. 9	California Spray-Chemical Corp	do	
R. 10	International Shoe Co	do	
R. 11	Petrolite Corp., Ltd	do	
Do	Rudolph Wiedmann	do	
R. 12	Bagpak, Inc	2 patents	
R. 13	The Celotex Corp	do	
Do	Walter M. Weir	1 patent	
R. 14	Maywood Chemical Works	9 patents	
Do	The Singer Manufacturing Co	1 patent	
R. 15	Dr. Walter R. Heuer	do	
R. 17	Albert H. Bronstein	do	
R. 19	Charles S. Hirlich	do	
Do	H. Hue & Co., Inc	do	
Do	The Light Conditioning Co. of America, Inc.	do	
Do	Pyrene Development Corp	do	
R. 20	Eastman Kodak Co	do	
Do	Dr. August von Borosini	do	
R. 21	Shell Development Co	1 patent application	
Do	Ottmar Loew	1 patent	
R. 22	Builders Iron Foundry	do	
R. 24	Standard Brands, Inc	do	
R. 28	Herman H. Frischer	7 patents	
Do	Karl W. Ponnansky	1 patent	
R. 29	Erning Lochner	Cash	12,855.06
R. 31	Henri Wentes Jonkhoff	4 patents	
R. 32	Stephanie Schyblisky Posament	Cash	2,668.49
Do	Josephine M. Loesch	do	14,197.57
R. 34	Joachim Kothe	9 patents	
R. 35	Henry J. Beal	Cash	111.76
R. 37	Rudolf A. Sems	do	1,528.96
R. 38	The First National Bank of Chicago with will annexed of the estate of Alfred Quensel.	do	30,901.84
R. 46	Enrique Kummerfeldt	362 shares of common stock of Central American Plantations Corp.	1,000.00
Do		Cash	26,436.00
R. 47	Amalie Fese	do	874.69
R. 50	Anemostat Corp. of America	1 patent	
R. 54	John L. Nicholas	Cash	246.83
R. 61	Serge Koussevitsky	do	4,208.10
R. 62	Erminia Binda	do	5,302.46
R. 63	Leslie Co	1 patent	
R. 64	Kurt M. Vogel	13 patents	
R. 66	Elizabeth Lewin	1 patent	
(2)	J. Robert Bonnar		7,080.00
(2)	Elizabeth S. Hallbach and F. H. Stafford, as trustees		557,550.00
(2)	Henry F. Hermann		3,540.00
(2)	Percy Kuttroff		26,550.00
(2)	Rudolph Lenz		47,200.00
(2)	H. W. Martin		41,300.00
(2)	Lennart Swenson		8,614.00
(2)	A. T. Wingender		4,720.00
(2)	George La Valle		5,900.00
Total			2,160,032.28

[1] N indicates nullification order; D divesting order; R return order.
[2] Amounts paid in settlement of litigation involving vested stock in General Dyestuff Corp. For details see Annual Report, Office of Alien Property Custodian, fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, pp. 72-73.
Source: Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, Jan. 15, 1948.

The Taft-Hartley Law Really Hurts Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article reprinted from the December 1947 issue of the Railroad Trainman:

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW REALLY HURTS LABOR

(Gerhard P. Van Arkel, attorney, Washington, D. C., who served as General Counsel for the National Labor Relations Board and who resigned when the Taft-Hartley law was enacted, and who is regarded as the best authority in the Nation in matters involving the National Labor Relations Act and the emasculated law known as the Taft-Hartley Act, analyzes an article by Mr. J. Mack Swigert, law partner of Senator TAFT, which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of October 25, 1947.)

The October 25, 1947, issue of The Saturday Evening Post contains an article by J. Mack Swigert, partner of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, called The Taft-Hartley Law: Does It Really Hurt Labor? This well-known corporation lawyer has little difficulty in concluding that the act is really very good for labor. It's a little like a doctor saying, "But I feel no pain," when a patient complains of a bad headache. Corporation lawyers generally find that the Taft-Hartley Act does wonderful things for labor, and loftily pooh-pooh the bitter protests against the act from the officers and members of all trade unions—AFL, Railway Brotherhoods, CIO and independents.

Mr. Swigert's first point is that labor's gains under the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act are fully protected. But the truth of the matter is: 1. The right to strike has been circumscribed in every manner that legal ingenuity could devise. 2. By providing that the National Labor Relations Board may not order the reinstatement of persons discharged "for cause," and then defining "cause" to cover a wide range of union activities, the act substantially removes the protection of the Wagner Act against discrimination because of union activities. 3. By hampering procedures, separating the functions of the National Labor Relations Board, widening the power of the courts to review board proceedings, making the technical rules of evidence apply in board hearings, and a host of minor changes the enforcement of any rights which existed under the Wagner Act becomes extremely difficult. 4. The protection against "company unions"—organized and controlled by the employer—has been materially weakened.

5. The Norris-LaGuardia Act forbade the courts to grant injunctions against strikes unless violence were involved and certain other conditions were met; the Taft-Hartley Act restores "Government by injunction" by compelling the Government to seek injunctions against certain types of strikes. The great majority of Supreme Court decisions of the past 10 years which conferred a measure of protection on labor's right to organize have been overruled. This—from the point of view of a corporation lawyer—is the manner in which the rights of labor have been fully protected.

Mr. Swigert's second point—seen from his neutral corner—is that the Taft-Hartley Act has granted "14 privileges * * * to the workingman without his knowledge, like a legacy to an unknowing heir." The workingman cannot be expected to cheer the unsolicited legacy of a worthless and debt-ridden estate.

His important thesis is that the Taft-Hartley Act has emancipated the workingman "from domination by unions and union bosses." Curious, how much that "domination" is resented by corporation lawyers and other paid spokesmen for big business, and how little by the workingmen who are supposedly so oppressed. In elections held by the NLRB, by secret ballot, workers have for many years voted by majorities of almost three-fourths—a majority substantially larger than Senator TAFT received when he last ran in Ohio—in favor of such "domination." Mr. Swigert has dealt with enough unions on behalf of corporations to know that the stronger the union the more it can do for its members. But he can't, for propaganda reasons, say that; so the strength of the union becomes the "strength of a few labor bosses" to present the illusion that the rank and file play no part in making the union strong. It must be readily conceded that the Taft-Hartley Act gives the worker a right he did not have before: To belong to a weak rather than a strong union.

How about these 14 new "freedoms"?

1. THE RIGHT TO WORK

Let's call it denial of the right to engage in free collective bargaining with an employer about the closed shop, since that's what Mr. Swigert is really talking about. The closed shop, which has worked well in many industries, is out. So is the union security agreement—by which employees must join the union 30 days or more after being hired—unless the union goes through the elaborate rigmarole imposed by the act. And, contrary to Mr. Swigert's assertion that this prevents discrimination against colored citizens, it is noteworthy that such discrimination is expressly sanctioned (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, p. 6372) by the provisions of the act. The purpose of these sections is to weaken the power of unions in collective bargaining by encouraging workers to stay out of unions. So that there could be no doubt about it, Senator TAFT expressly wrote into section 7 of the act the right to "refrain from" engaging in union activities. Workers had that right before, but the real complaint of the sponsors of the act is that not enough of them undertook to exercise it.

To prove his point Mr. Swigert sheds a few hot crocodile tears for someone he apparently does not know, since he incorrectly states his name. Mr. E. E. Pfoh violated a law of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, which forbade direct solicitation of members other than pursuant to authorized action of the brotherhood. He was tried pursuant to the constitution of the brotherhood where he had two full hearings, and, after full consideration of the facts, was expelled from the union. Pfoh took an appeal to the courts and had a full jury trial in the Common Pleas Court of Cuyahoga County, Ohio. An appeal was taken and on June 25, 1945, the Court of Appeals of the State of Ohio, directed that judgment be entered for the brotherhood, a decision which the Supreme Court of Ohio refused to review. Mr. Swigert has the right of any citizen to disagree with a decision of the courts but to put forward this case as an example of arbitrary action by a union in expelling a member is certainly ill-advised. How many of the employees of the corporations which Mr. Swigert represents have an equal right of hearing, and appeal to the courts if they are wrongly discharged from their jobs? What appeal have the purchasers of the products of those same corporations if prices are arbitrarily raised? What can the stockholders do if those same corporations arbitrarily refuse to distribute dividends owing them? If Mr. Swigert is worried about the power to take arbitrary action, he would do well to examine more closely the practices of his clients instead of worrying about a nonexistent evil in the trade-union movement. Union members are protected, not only by the laws of their unions, but by the law of the land, as the Pfoh case shows, against arbitrary expulsions.

2. PROTECTION FROM UNION THREATS AND VIOLENCE

Propaganda has been carefully spread for years that would tie unions to threats and violence. The same propaganda carefully conceals the use of threats and violence on the corporation side. The reports of the La Follette committee document with care the purchases of tear gas, tommy guns, machine guns, and the like by our large corporations for use in labor troubles. Take a little look at labor history, and immediately you see that the real violence has been on the management side; from the Homestead riots through the Ludlow Massacre down to the Chicago Memorial Day killings. Every union leader—and every corporation lawyer—knows that violence during a strike discredits the union and the strike, and there have, for that reason, been many cases of the hiring of agents provocateurs by corporations to cause violence during a strike in order to break it.

And if there are threats and violence, local police are invariably present with a patrol wagon to take offenders before the magistrates. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, threats and violence are (so they say) to be remedied by the issuance, many years after the fact, of a "cease and desist" order directing the offender not to do it again. What is needed is genuinely impartial enforcement of existing laws against threats and violence which are adequate to protect the public against any abuses which may arise; the Taft-Hartley Act is in this respect merely a continuance of the propaganda effort to make it appear that unions and violence are synonymous.

3. OUSTER OF UNSATISFACTORY UNION

The purpose of the Wagner Act was to "encourage collective bargaining"—and you cannot have collective bargaining without unions. The unexpressed purpose of the Taft-Hartley Act is to break up unions and defeat collective bargaining. Before, if employees, were no longer satisfied with the union representing them, they would join another or merely cease to be active in the one representing them. But now every legitimate union may be harassed at least once a year by petitions, instigated by employers, seeking to "decertify" the union; another handsome union-busting device for anti-union corporations.

4. RELIEF FROM HIGH INITIATION FEES

Many unions provide their members with large benefits; unemployment benefits, old age retirement funds, burial benefits, and the like—just as do many lodges and fraternal societies. New members, who become immediately eligible to these benefits, are usually required to pay an initiation fee to make up their fair share of what all the members have paid in. What is usual practice in every lodge or fraternity, is "unconscionable extortion" (in the eyes of corporation lawyers) when done by unions. Now the Government is given power, in effect, to run the financial affairs of labor organizations by determining what are reasonable initiation fees. What would you think if the Government were given the same power over the funds of your church or lodge? What would Mr. Swigert think about a law permitting a Government agency to reduce unreasonable profits?

5. BAN ON COMPULSORY CHECK-OFF

In every industrial plant the wages and hours must be uniform. The benefits obtained by the union go to all workers, union members or not. But usually the union members who pay the dues, do the work, and support the union resent the "free riders" who, like drones, accept the benefits of the union without its burdens. By banning the compulsory check-off, the Taft-Hartley Act gives another powerful inducement to those cheapskates who will not carry their fair share of the union load by agreeing that their dues shall be checked off.

6. OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT OWN GRIEVANCES

In every group there are persons who will put their own advantage ahead of that of others; there are "teacher's pets" in industrial plants as there are in schools. And if the individual worker can settle his own grievance without the union, as the Taft-Hartley Act provides, the "teacher's pets" (most frequently the non-union members) are going to be better treated than the other employees. Fairness?—or a union-busting device?

7. AN END TO JURISDICTIONAL STRIKES AND SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

For many years corporation lawyers have been actively at work attempting to prevent the giving of legal advice by trust companies, newspapers, mortgage associations, and the like. This effort to preserve the jurisdiction of lawyers is called "maintaining the ethics of the profession" and is highly laudable. But when carpenters attempt to protect their right to do carpentering, in order that they may maintain their livelihoods, it becomes, in Mr. Swigert's vocabulary, "a struggle between labor leaders for dues-paying members" and highly sinister.

As for the secondary boycott, let us consider for a moment the case of *Bedford Cut Stone Co.* v. *Journeymen Stonecutters' Association* (274 U. S. 41). There a majority of the Supreme Court, in an opinion which Messrs. Holmes and Brandeis said "reminds one of involuntary servitude," held that it was proper to enjoin a union of stone masons from refusing to set stone quarried by men "working in opposition to the union." The opinion shocked the public, and the agitation which followed a decision that workers might not combine to protect their wages was largely responsible for the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Now—under identical circumstances—the Taft-Hartley Act says: (1) That the Government must ask for an injunction against action; (2) that anyone injured may sue the union for damages suffered; (3) that all the men participating may be discharged by their employers with impunity; and (4) that the union participating is guilty of an unfair labor practice. Fairness?—or an effort to make it impossible for workers to maintain their wage standards?

8. OPPORTUNITY TO BARGAIN IN A CRAFT UNIT

"Divide and rule" is sound industrial as well as political practice. As Chief Justice Taft said in *American Steel Foundries* v. *Tri-City Council* (257 U. S. 209): "They (trade unions) were organized out of the necessities of the situation. A single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer. * * * Union was essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on an equality with their employer. * * * To render this combination at all effective, employees must make their combination extend beyond one shop." It is unfortunate that such intelligence concerning labor problems is not an inheritable characteristic. But, because the individual is helpless in dealing with his corporate employer, industry for years divided and ruled by preventing labor organization. And since, under the stimulus of the Wagner Act, labor has for the most part succeeded in organizing, corporation lawyers now seek to have them organize in the smallest possible group. Often this has advantages, particularly among highly skilled workers. But when employers offer such a gift horse, labor has legitimate grounds for looking at its teeth.

9. EQUALITY FOR INDEPENDENT UNIONS

Why are corporation lawyers so solicitous about the welfare of "independent" unions? The employee representation plans which followed enactment of section 7 (a) of the NRA in 1933 were financed by, dominated by, and supported by, large corporate employers. Their only purpose was to frustrate genuine independence of workers and to provide a sham collective bargaining sufficient to fool the public. Ever since they were outlawed under the Wagner Act, corporations have been thinking back to the good old days of the "independent" union which never bothered management on such unpleasant topics as higher wages or shorter hours. So the Taft-Hartley Act attempts to put these bogus unions on the same plane as affiliates of the genuine trade union movements.

10. LIBERATION FROM COMMUNIST CONTROL

During the year or two before the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, the American trade union movement did an effective job of ridding itself of most of the few Communists leaders in its midst. In union after union, workers in democratic meetings daily vote into office non-Communist officials. But—if a Communist does get into office—the penalty under the Taft-Hartley Act is paid not by the Communist officials, but by other officers and the union members, all of whom, Communists and non-Communists alike, are denied access to the procedures of the Government. It is a new philosophy in America which states that my access to the courts shall be curtailed because I belong to an organization which has an official with political beliefs over which I have little or no control—and a dangerous one. It is far too easy to go a step further and demand that all union officials take pledges that they are not Democrats or Republicans, before union members may seek relief from governmental tribunals.

11. A LOOK AT THE BOOKS

The Taft-Hartley Act requires unions to file all sorts of data with the Secretary of Labor, which, says Mr. Swigert, "is not nearly so detailed a report as corporations are required to give the Securities and Exchange Commission." Throughout his article Mr. Swigert appears to believe that unions should be run like corporations; an interesting suggestion since this would mean that unions should be run for private profit, with limited liability, by a small, tightly-run, management group. In any event, minority stockholders' suits in the courts have shown that (except where securities issues are floated) the stockholders have an extremely difficult time learning how their corporations are run. It's dollars to doughnuts that Mr. Swigert opposed, and now opposes, the registration requirements of the Securities Exchange Act and would even more strongly fight a law giving stockholders a look at the books.

12. EXEMPTION FROM PERSONAL LIABILITY

The technique of pointing out how much worse it might have been is now standard practice in defending the Taft-Hartley Act. Mr. Swigert makes quite a point of the fact that the individual is not suable under this Act, though his union is and though his union's funds belong to him and other individual members. The vice here is that a citizen, in order to sue a Federal court before the Taft-Hartley Act, had to show that the amount in controversy was more than $3,000 and that there was diversity of citizenship; that is, that the parties to the action were citizens of different states. But now, under the Taft-Hartley Act, only in the case of union agreements, are these requirements removed: a pointed reminder of the bias and one-sidedness of the act.

13. ESCAPE FROM FORCED POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

On June 5, 1947, the following interchange took place on the floor of the Senate between Senators PEPPER and TAFT. Senator PEPPER: "So a workingman's organization (under the Taft-Hartley Act) would be deprived of the power even of advising its membership of the antilabor record of a man who might be a candidate for public office?" Senator TAFT: "Correct." A church, a lodge, a fraternity—in short, any voluntary organization in this country—may take a position on a political candidate and emphatically may make the political and voting record of candidates available to its membership. But not a labor union. And this has nothing to do with forced political contributions; it is still criminal for a union to make any expenditure on behalf of a candidate even though the union members unanimously vote to make it. Fairness?—or a threat to the political freedom of all of us?

14. SECURITY AGAINST ABUSE OF HEALTH AND WELFARE FUNDS

In the hearings before the Congress, and during the debates, not a single instance was cited of abuses of health and welfare funds. This was not oversight, for the Eightieth Congress dredged up every trade union abuse, no matter how trivial, and expanded the few it found to distort and warp and public's understanding of the American labor movement. Under the Taft-Hartley Act it is now, for example, illegal to set up funds for vacations with pay. Corporation lawyers may enjoy them but a union, by voluntary agreement with its employers, may not provide them for workers through funds set up for that purpose.

There are quite a few things about the Taft-Hartley Act which Mr. Swigert fails to mention. The manner in which the act narrows the responsibility of corporations for the activities of their "agents" and broadens it for unions. The numerous exemptions from the coverage of the Wagner Act, so that large groups of workers are outside the scope even of the extremely limited protection provided by the act. The irrational separation of functions and the setting up of the General Counsel of the Board as a labor czar. The nonsensical free speech provision of the act by which what an employer says may not be used in evidence—contrary to the rule applied in all courts. The renewal of government by injunction in the case of strikes affecting a substantial portion of an industry. The adroit manner in which it has deprived the States of power to deal with management-labor relations by making Federal law alone govern, except that State laws more restrictive of union security agreements than Federal law are allowed to stand. The provisions which allow harassment of the citizen by making the issuance of subpenas mandatory.

As Chairman HARTLEY, of the House Labor Committee, is fond of pointing out employers and unions throughout the country are busily engaged in finding subterfuges to evade this law. Bootleg union security agreements, the abolition of no-strike clauses in contracts, the predating of agreements, and the like, are tributes to the unrealistic provisions of this second prohibition law. American management and labor have too much sense to give up their accepted methods of collective bargaining in the interests of corporation lawyers, whether they are in or out of Congress. The campaign now being conducted by the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, and the like, to go slow and take it easy are the best of all possible demonstrations that even the authors of the act fear the resentment of the American people if the people really learn the full potentialities of this act. Fortunately, Senator TAFT and Mr. Swigert, as small-town corporation lawyers, do not represent that neutral opinion to which the American people turn for guidance.

Glass-House Tenant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the winter 1947 edition of a magazine published by the University of Nebraska Press at Lincoln, Nebr., contains a very interesting article on Congress by our colleague the Honorable KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska. Under unanimous consent, I include this article in my remarks:

GLASS-HOUSE TENANT

(By KARL STEFAN, Member of Congress)

During the crowded days of the first session of the Eightieth Congress a related series of events took place which will not be easily erased from my memory.

A friend and associate of mine, a long-time Member of the House of Representatives, had been appointed by the President to a position of national importance in an administrative agency. It was necessary that his appointment be confirmed by the Senate. However, before the Senate committee charged with the responsibility of examining the character and qualifications of the appointee could call its own witnesses, a commentator-columnist launched a major publicity blitz against the appointee's good name. The traducer went to the limit of combing the former Member's home district for men to testify in support of his argument that the appointee was lacking in patriotism. He came up with some hand-picked witnesses. The Senate committee permitted their testimony. Then, because of that very testimony, the committee voted overwhelmingly to confirm the President's appointment. The entire Senate accepted the verdict of its committee. These results were a blow to the commentator-columnist, a vindication of my friend.

But what could my friend do? There were still those who did not believe him, still those who did believe the untruths about him.

My friend could publish denials in prominent newspapers for days on end. Yet, when these published denials had to cease because they were no longer news, the columnist could begin again. He would always have the last word. He would always have the final plea before the public sitting as a jury.

My friend could ask for radio time over the same network as that which employed the commentator. Again, the commentator would reply to the reply. The advantage of the last word would still be his.

The customary formula for the smear-blitz is usually "attack-defend-attack-attack-attack." For the Congressman, such defense is an expensive luxury. He absolutely does not have the time. Only in extremely rare instances does he have the money.

The case of my friend, the Presidential appointee, calls to mind what happened on one of those sultry, humid days shortly before the Seventy-ninth Congress became history.

Some 20 Members of the House were breakfasting together for what, to many, would be the last time for several months—and the last time altogether for some.

On my right was a Member from a southern State. He had served brilliantly on important committees. Although he and I had had differences of opinion, I respected his convictions and admired his cool, logical, unemotional analysis of problems affecting us all. Conversation veered to the dean of his State delegation who had recently died in office.

I noticed that my neighbor's hand shook so violently that he was forced to lower his coffee cup. At first his lips moved soundlessly. We were all silent when he did speak.

"He didn't die," the man on my right said. "He was murdered. His murderer is still at large. Yes. And he's doing mighty well for himself."

No names were spoken. No names were needed. All present knew against whom this accusation was aimed. My neighbor's associate had been an elderly man. His heart condition was well known, not only to his colleagues, but to the press and the public. His personal financial interests were the same as those of hundreds, even thousands, of businessmen in his section. However, at the very time of the most serious phase of his illness, he had been made the subject of a one-man campaign of character smearing in the press and over the radio. In the midst of this campaign, without having had his opportunity to answer the charges made against him, he died. In our minds, his detractor was a real-life Gilbert and Sullivan character—at once, judge, jury, public prosecutor and lord high executioner.

This set me thinking about conditions I have known to exist during my more than 12 years in Congress. Every Congressman is a tenant in a glass house, in the sense that he lives completely exposed to irresponsible examination and judgment by his ill wishers. It doesn't do us any good to throw stones, no matter how little we deserve the stones cast at us. A calm, objective study of this most controversial subject is, I think, sorely needed.

When Joe Doakes decides to run for Congress he deliberately puts his privacy in moth balls. He has consciously made his own decision. With his eyes open, and of his own free will, he has walked the plank.

There is a prevailing notion about Members of Congress being so thick-hided as to be impervious to criticism. That is only a myth—and not a very good one, at that. In reality, your national legislators invariably react to what is written of or said about them. Their reactions are not the same in each instance. Circumstances, personalities, and the manner in which our faults are presented make for variety. Still, there are bound to be certain similarities in our responses to the frontal attacks of the broad echelons of criticism.

Our most immediate reaction is to that category of criticism coming from our home districts. Our constituents elected us to represent them in Washington. They are entitled to the best service, the highest type of representation, which we can furnish them. They have the right to comment to us and about us by letter, by phone, or in person.

It is not surprising that we actually welcome a good going-over from home. It helps us to become more efficient public servants.

Judge Anderson calls on me at my office to see if I can't speed the passage of flood-control legislation which he favors. He has no disagreement with me about what I am doing. He does think it is possible for me to get swifter action. Perhaps he is right. Perhaps I am. We each have a 50–50 chance. It could well be that the pressure of "must" legislation, committee meetings, and special assignments has kept me from giving Judge Anderson's project the attention to which it is justly entitled. It also could be that I had done all within my power to bring flood control out on the House floor, but that other bills had had priority.

My phone rings. It is a long-distance call from Bob Wentz, secretary of Blank City's Chamber of Commerce. He wants to know why I voted for a bridge across Smith River at Bluffville instead of voting for one at Blank City. The weight of evidence presented to me has clearly shown that Bluffville is the logical place for the bridge, although, had it been put across at Blank City, it might have extended that community's trade territory. Bob has no new evidence; so I stick by my guns. Maybe he isn't convinced, but he sees the way I figure things out.

This letter is from a former Wave who lives in my home town. She is bitter because I haven't as yet taken a stand on an important naval issue. The truth is that I do realize how vital this subject is. However, I haven't made up my mind definitely. On such a decision there can be no turning back. I must assemble all possible facts before casting my vote one way or the other. Still the Wave does not share my uncertainty; so I write a letter in reply, telling her exactly what I intend to do about the affair in which she is concerned and why.

These people—and people like them—whether or not they agree with me, have the highest priority in telling me what they think of me. They elected me; and they will reelect or reject me. They are the true representatives of the only constitutional pressure group in the United States—the American citizen.

Group criticism from my home district, when supported by fair polling of the rank and file of the group, is also welcomed.

When, after a secret ballot of the entire group, a delegation from a farm organization calls upon me to object to something I have or haven't done, what they have to say has real meaning. Should that delegation call on me without having consulted the rank-and-file membership, I would respect their views as individuals, but I would not consider them as duly qualified spokesmen for the group as a whole. And this goes for chamber of commerce delegations, labor delegations, and veterans' delegations as well. I was selected to represent my district by the secret ballot and by majority rule. It is no more than fair to expect criticism from groups to be presented, governed by the same rules.

One of the chief ventures into futility, as far as I am concerned, is the mimeographed letter or the penny post card which drags me over the coals. These messages, identical in wording, even to typographical errors, and distinguished only by differing signatures, are promptly discounted.

Next in order in the futility field is the mass march-on-Congress procedure. Members who are actually in favor of a measure have been known to change their votes when confronted by this vicious form of intimidation. We former teachers, lawyers, preachers, radio announcers, merchants, ex-servicemen, and farmers do not take easily to mob threats. We are the same kind of Americans that you are. Being condemned by the lawless merely raises us in the esteem of the law-abiding.

Each Congressman gets plenty of the trial-by-battle treatment. Read your CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Or, better yet, go up into the House galleries the next time you are in Washington while your Congress is in session. There you can be an eyewitness to the verbal crossfire to which your Congressman is subjected. Republicans strike at Democrats. Democrats blast Republicans. Republicans blast Republicans. Democrats strike at Democrats. This method is healthful. In this way individual and party opinions are winnowed. In this way the chaff is separated from the wheat.

Nor would any examination of America's glass-house tenants be complete without considering the role of our system of elections. Most of us have opposition in the primaries and in the general elections every 2 years. That opposition is seldom remiss in tearing apart our legislative service records. If the evidence so presented is sufficient, we are returned—to private life.

There is just one test which Congressmen apply to all types of criticism. That test is: Is it informed criticism? It is difficult to take seriously the slurs of delegations who have repeatedly called on us to do what we can to further legislation when that legislation has already been passed. It is impossible not to resent letters taking us to task for not getting bills out of committee when those same bills have already been debated, voted upon, and signed by the President.

Grown-ups don't like being told off for something they haven't done when they have done it any more than children like it—even if the ones who do the "telling off" have the best right in the world to do it.

Even with the recital of this formidable roster of critics of Congress the whole story has not been told. There still remains the impact of press and radio.

Objective "hard news," whether it is reported over the radio or in the press, is an aid to Congress. When what happens is told as it happens—not slanted, warped, twisted or angled—it is an expression of the freedom of speech guaranteed by our Constitution. When truth is so manipulated as to become falsehood it approximates the evil, fraudulent methods of reporting under dictatorships. From my observation of straight news reporting on Capitol Hill, I am happy to state that 90 percent of the correspondents on this beat shun such totalitarian methods themselves and scorn the few who do go in for counterfeiting hard news. Radio reporters of hard news maintain the same high percentage of honesty in their newscast.

Newscasters and reporters call the news as they see it. That is their job.

It is the job of columnists and commentators to shed light on the story behind the news.

Newspapers often accompany a column with the announcement that "John Doe's ideas are his own, and may or may not reflect the editorial policy of this newspaper." In like manner radio stations increasingly identify their purveyors of criticism by: "Joe Blow's opinions are his own, and are not necessarily those of this station or of Puffle's Fish Food, his sponsor." With the disclaimer given, the columnist and/or commentator is free to criticize Congressmen without danger of action against the hiring corporation, and with the name of the hiring corporation behind him.

Should a member protest the injustice and untruth of these protected attacks, the commentator has merely to scream: "The freedom of the press is in peril." He may then wrap his spotless mantle about him and retire to his ivory tower. Even if a retraction is pressed for and obtained, it is seldom published in Bluffville newspapers, and never repeated for the radio public, with the habit of listening same time, same station, to hear.

My estimate of the effectiveness and honesty of this columnist-commentator clan is 70–30—70 percent sincere in their attitude toward Congressmen; 30 percent either kowtowing to alien ideologies, too far removed from the Washington scene to evaluate it accurately, or plain and fancy sensation-hunters. Congressmen will never stop fighting against overt attempts to undermine our form of government by blackening the name of our Congress. There can be no quarter for that style of vilification. Neither is it astonishing that on-the-spot Congressmen do not take lightly to the unrestrained language of night-club nestors, keyhole-peepers, and professional character assassins. Nor do we hold back our contempt for those who would strike at us through our wives and children.

There are depths, as well as heights, of criticism.

No means of appealing to the public has enjoyed a more phenomenal growth than that of the cartoon. Even as the tabloid has condensed the conventional-sized newspaper, so has the cartoon condensed the editorial page. And over a hundred million newspaper readers get daily criticism of Congress in the form of cartoons. The Congressional symbol is, of course, a paunchy man with a string-bow tie and a flapping Stetson. Or, as an alternate to that symbol, a doddering ancient with a patriarchal beard may be used. Whatever the symbol, it is employed equally in criticism and praise and, in many instances, cartoon and lead editorial are synchronized.

Editorials themselves are important in the scheme of criticism directed at Congress. While editors are not without flaw, neither are they likely to be completely uninformed. They may be misinformed, that is true. Yet, in directing thought through editorials, most writers—although following the policy of their paper—feel it their duty to the public to present both sides of a question, even if one side is given a more favorable presentation. Editorial comment in legitimate newspapers is an incentive to Congress to improve itself. Editorial comment in propaganda sheets, where such comment is not confined to the editorial pages but is present in every news item, is merely ignored.

To my knowledge no Member of either House has maintained a column of national circulation since the late Senator Royal Copeland of New York issued his daily advice on medical subjects. Many of us send weekly or monthly columns to newspapers in our districts, pointing up the high lights of legislative events. It is to the lasting credit of national radio networks that they have requested the appearance of Members on public-service programs, often to answer poorly-informed attacks on their integrity. In addition to speaking over the major radio chains, Members make numerous recordings of speeches to be sent home for use over local radio stations.

Your national legislators have nothing to fear as long as the American press and radio retain their present standards of fairness and efficiency. Your Congress will meet and welcome criticism as long as that criticism is informed.

Haym Salomon—A Son of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to introduce in the RECORD an article from the New York Journal-American of January 9, 1948, written by my good friend, Harry H. Schlacht, editorial writer for many years for the Hearst newspapers and formerly director of the War Production Board in New York City. This article was written on the occasion of the one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of the death of the great Jewish patriot of the Revolutionary era, Haym Salomon, who helped in large measure to finance the American Revolution.

The article follows:

HAYM SALOMON—A SON OF LIBERTY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Let us thank God for our heroes of yesteryear, who have by their vision, their courage, their faith, and their lives made our Nation great and bequeathed to us our glorious heritage.

We commemorate the one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of the death of Haym Salomon. We salute the great Jewish patriot of the Revolutionary era whose qualities of mind and heart endeared him to our founding fathers. We honor the memory, the inspiration, and the example of this son of American liberty.

There was a time "that tried men's souls," and also their purses.

The life story of Haym Salomon is both fascinating and tragic. He came to our shores seeking religious freedom; to help build a Nation which gives to bigotry no sanction; to persecution no assistance.

He gave all he had, he gave all he could borrow that this Nation might be conceived in liberty.

He advanced $640,000 in freedom's holy cause. He died penniless.

Haym Salomon helped to feed, clothe, and equip the Continental Army. His contribution to the cause of our independence should be deeply engraved in our hearts and indelibly inscribed in our historic annals.

He loved America so much. He served America so well.

He toiled, sacrificed, lived, and died in the very shadow of anonymity. Pride and vainglory were alien to his nature. He would have shrunk from worldly acclaim. He loved America with deeds and dedication.

He was a simple man—the badge of a great soul.

He was a man of great character, of noble self-sacrifice, of wholehearted patriotism, and of martyrlike devotion to high ideals.

He was an institution to himself. He became part of our glorious inheritance.

Indeed, Haym Salomon glorifies the race from which he sprang. The Jews have played a noble role in the government of our country. They were identified with our colonial growth. They have fought in all the wars of the Republic. They have won the highest commendation from every President of our Nation.

Let all Americans remember and acclaim this great benefactor and patriot.

You may travel where you will on a thousand battlefields; you may travel where the delicate poppies carpet the earth with their rich, red blossoms, or where the glistening white stones rise above the flower-strewn mounds—there you will see, side by side, one beneath the cross of Christianity and one beneath the Star of David—Christian and Jew—pillowed in eternal glory.

The fought together. They bled together. They worshipped together. They died together for God and country.

No, Haym Salomon shall not be the forgotten man in American history. He belongs to us. He is ours by more than patriotic self-devotion with which he came to the aid of our Nation in the crisis of our fate. He is ours by that unshakable gratitude for his services which is the precious portion of our inheritance. He is ours by that tie of love stronger than death which will link his name for the endless ages with the names of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Morris, and the other immortals of our history.

The World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WCOP, Boston, Mass., on December 30, 1947:

The world situation, what we should do, what may happen, is the uppermost thought in our minds today.

As this year draws to a close, it is my purpose to convey to you the situation, as I see it, and while the situation is disturbing to convey to you a message of confidence and of optimism for the New Year, if our country follows the proper course.

In establishing and following this course—the right one—each American can play his or her part.

This can be done by analyzing conditions practically and rationally, and not emotionally, and in the molding of a public opinion that will demand that Members of the Congress view world conditions and the part we shall play therein from the angle of the national interest of America, and not for political advantages, or for partisan purposes.

The national interest of our country transcends political considerations, and yet, there are Members who will try and make politics out of our national interest.

My talk tonight is confined to the world situation.

A sound public opinion will be of inestimable value in doing the right thing for America by the next session of Congress.

This is where you and all other Americans can play an important part.

At the outset, let me state that the basic issue is atheistic or international communism or Christianity.

We might just as well face this fact. To think otherwise would only deceive ourselves, and loose or hopeful thinking will only produce harm.

By "Christianity," as I use it tonight, I mean all who believe in God—Catholic, Protestant, and Jew.

It is about time that all organized religions appreciate the significance of the challenge of atheistic communism, and unite in one front to meet it. The challenge of atheistic communism is a danger to all—not one—and a danger to all of the countries that still are free from Soviet control or domination.

As a matter of fact, atheistic communism is the enemy of all religions. It directs its attacks at the Western World first because its leaders realize that it must destroy, or drive underground those religions that recognize the omnipotence of God in order to win. The other existing religions would be easy prey if the western civilization falls.

Another observation, the people of no nation, even Russia or the Soviet Union itself, have freely accepted communism as a form of government.

It has always been forced upon a people, and it can only maintain itself through ruthless persecution and fear.

It is a challenge and a force we should not underestimate.

On the other hand, with the forces of organized religions of the Western World united, and America adopting the right policies we should not overestimate it.

We should not underestimate our own power and strength. We must remember the Soviet Union, and its satellite nations have their marked weaknesses.

Viewing our national interest from a sound and practical viewpoint, it is imperative—necessary that the Marshall plan proposed by our courageous President, Harry S. Truman, pass the Congress. At least, the main substance of this plan should be enacted.

The basic purpose of this plan is to commit our country to an affirmative policy to meet the challenge of atheistic communism by relieving suffering humanity and helping free nations to rehabilitate themselves morally and economically.

It is essential in our national interest that we do this. I place the wisdom of such affirmative actions on our part on the basis of our own national interest.

The tactics of the Communists are well known. They will use any means to attain their goal. They will use force, deceit, and any means outside the law which will result in uncertainty, confusion, chaos, and fear—all steps prior to actually taking over a government.

They have done this in the Soviet Union itself—in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Manchuria, and wherever they may have puppet governments.

We know of the conditions in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, as well as what the Communists are attempting to do in Greece, Turkey, Italy, France, and China.

It is the primary intention of the Soviet Union to gain control through puppet governments of all of Europe, and if they are successful, and they will only be successful if America fails in its rendevous with destiny,

this means the Communists will gain control of not only Europe but Asia and Africa as well.

Every American viewing our national interest, and its future, cannot afford to sit idly by, see our country do nothing, and permit this to happen.

If you were to read the papers tomorrow or a month from now, and read that Italy or France had been actually taken over by the Communists—how would you feel?

I believe you would be weighed down with a feeling of despondency. You would know that the best interests of our country had been adversely affected and to a very serious extent.

The Marshall plan is designed to prevent such a thing from happening.

If America fails, or takes only half-way measures, we will be adversely affected. To prevent this, America must use its great power in cooperation with other nations who want only their freedom and independence.

We must bear in mind that the people of Poland and the other satellite countries now dominated by the Communists will drive them out just as soon as they can.

There is no doubt but that there are conditions behind the iron curtain that are very disturbing to the Soviet regime. The cloak of censorship has prevented news of such conditions leaking out to the public at large.

The freedom-loving people behind the iron curtain who are waiting for the first opportunity to drive the oppressors from their lands look to America with hope. Those countries outside the iron curtain depend on America to save them from being enveloped by their enemies within and without.

If America fails to act, the only course left for these peoples is to make the best terms possible with Moscow, and any terms are but the beginning of the end.

Those oppressed look to Washington with hope—to Moscow with fear.

In addition to our response to the call of humanity, we have a direct and personal interest involved. It certainly would not be for our best interests if Europe were to come under the control and domination of communism. We can stick our heads in the sands if we so desire but it might not be long before they will be chopped off. We cannot meet the challenge of communism by avoiding it, or believing it is nonexistent.

Communism achieves its evil aims of taking over governments when human suffering and distress exists. Like so many buzzards, Communists hover overhead during a period of trial and tribulation.

By taking affirmative action along the lines of the Marshall plan—and I am sure the European countries affected will cooperate in this fight against the spread of communism—we will gain many advantages. The success of this program will be consistent with our best interests; our national defense will be strengthened; it will be the means of saving the next generation of our youth from the horrors of another World War; it would be the means of halting communism and its spread over Europe, Asia, and Africa; it would be the means of setting a pattern for the establishment of peace in view of the failure and refusal of the Soviet Union to cooperate with understanding for peace in the world.

We are aware of the fact that Russia does not have unlimited power. Russia knows of our industrial strength, and knows too, of its own weaknesses.

It is because of this that Russia is, through its secret agents who are traitors to their own countries, resorting to creating disorder and chaos so that the Communists will gain control country after country.

After the Communists gain control of a country their policy of liquidation follows with concentration camps and death the fate of those who fail to agree with the Communists.

An aroused public of fair-minded persons everywhere, backed by America, is the only answer to this challenge.

We have seen the failure of the recent London Conference of the Big Four. We know the failure was due to the deliberate refusal of the Russian Foreign Minister Molotov to cooperate with the United States. It was obvious he was there to create confusion and uncertainty. He certainly made no constructive contribution for permanent peace.

The Communist effort to gain control of Greece has failed because of the effectiveness of American assistance. Months ago it was believed that Italy and France might come under the control of the Communists, and while the danger has not completely passed, the forces of decency are in a much stronger position. It is a fact, too, that the rest of western Europe is making recovery because of the assistance and leadership of the United States.

When President Truman sent his first message to the Congress, the now famous Truman doctrine, the issue was joined. President Truman's efforts have given hope to the non-Communist countries.

The passage of the Marshall plan is necessary to bring complete success, and with success, a lasting peace.

In his recent and historic Christmas message, Pope Pius XII called upon all honest men to unite for the rehabilitation of the world. While his holiness Poe Pius XII mentioned no particular country by name we feel sure he had in mind the Soviet Union and its leaders as the harbingers of destruction, as well as their efforts to extend their ideology.

The Pope spoke of peace through a union of honest men. The Boston Post in its editorial of Christmas morning emphasized the importance of his message when it said:

"So 2,000 years after the Sermon on the Mount, Christ's present-day outstanding representative on earth repeats that only through a league of honest men can the nations of the world enjoy peace and prosperity." By honest men, Pope Pius must have had in mind honest nations.

As an honest nation and certainly the most powerful nation in the world today, America must, and with your help will, assume its rightful place of leadership.

A league of honest men and honest nations will achieve victory for the forces of decency.

With affirmative action on the part of United States we can look forward to the New Year with confidence.

Our Swollen State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an interesting article from the current issue of Pathfinder magazine:

OUR SWOLLEN STATE DEPARTMENT

Twenty years ago the listing of the Department of State required just over 1 page of the Congressional Directory. Now it takes 13 pages of the same reference book, merely to give the names of the divisions and bureaus and offices in this single governmental department.

If you are concerned about what is happening to your Government you will find it useful to visit the nearest public library and examine copies of the Congressional Directory. A new volume is issued for every session of Congress and the volume for the second session of the Eightieth Congress, which convened on January 6, will be available shortly.

Each volume is a mine of well-arranged information. But what makes the Congressional Directory particularly valuable is its continuity. You can compare the current issue with one of 20 years ago, as I have been doing. That shows you the changes that are taking place. It also shows why it is difficult to bring taxes down.

The way in which the Department of State is spreading out is simply fantastic. Twenty years ago it had a dozen divisions, each moderately staffed and headed, for administrative purposes, by four Assistant Secretaries and an Under Secretary.

Now it is almost impossible even to count the number of assistant secretaries, executive assistants to assistant secretaries, special assistants to assistant secretaries, and so on. Under them are a score of separate and often overlapping offices, each composed of numerous divisions. It is a fair guess that Secretary Marshall himself cannot name all of the divisions over which he presides.

As an illustration of runaway bureaucracy one may take the new Office of Intelligence Research, with a director, a deputy director, an executive officer, and five subordinate divisions. Each of these divisions has its chief and sometimes an assistant chief as well, so that the modest title of one petty officer is "Chief of the Division of International and Functional Intelligence of the Office of Intelligence Research of the Department of State." You probably never heard of the man who has this title.

But alongside the Office of Intelligence Research has grown up a separate Office of Intelligence Collection and Dissemination, with a separate director, a deputy director, and four subordinate divisions. There is, for instance, an Acquisition and Distribution Division of the Office of Intelligence Collection and Dissemination. It has a chief and an assistant chief.

Of course all these agencies continuously get in each other's way. So to keep them straight still another division has been established, entitled "Division of Foreign Activity Correlation." It isn't getting things very well correlated, however. Perhaps that is because of the Office of Special Political Affairs. This has a director, a deputy director, a special deputy director, a special assistant to the director and—for good measure—an executive officer above all that.

This maze of bureaucracy explains why there is so much congressional opposition to letting the Department of State administer the European recovery program.

During the war and postwar years the State Departme: t has grown to such size and complexity that its right hand no longer even knows what its left hand is doing. And there has really been a left hand in this department, as the loyalty investigations have shown.

Whatever money is appropriated for European relief from now on must be spent efficiently. That is why there is growing support for the Herter bill, which would make the administration of ERP responsible to Congress, rather than to the Department of State.

Time for Greatness in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Miami (Fla.) Daily News of January 13, 1948:

TIME FOR GREATNESS IN THE CONGRESS

The sound American custom of looking at the price tag before buying reaches finest flower in the country's scrutiny of the President's annual budget message. Unfortunately, the representative democracy—for all its advantages—is an imperfect machine for translating the mass decision. Nor do the political considerations of a Presidential election year provide the best lubricants for the Congress. Indeed the result quadrennially is a chaotic pandemonium of stripped gears, cracked pistons, and—inevitably—overheating.

Couple this fact with that of President Truman's unprecedented peacetime budget of $30,669,000,000. There you have it.

But, it must be presumed, the President had the willing ear of his thoughtful countrymen when he told them the realities of our existing international and domestic requirements during 1948–49. The outstanding fact of the budget message is that 79 percent of the expenditures he proposed "directly reflect the costs of war, the effects of war, and our efforts to prevent a future war."

(The efforts to prevent a future war? They include $11,000,000,000 for national defense and $7,000,000,000 for foreign and other international affairs. They account for 46 percent of the record-breaking total.)

Now what of the ordinary expenses of Government, which are already the target of the Republican sharpshooters? They account for only 21 percent of the total.

Withal, the President holds forth the hope of again balancing the budget, and again reducing the national debt. And, he still maintains, income taxes can be cut $40 for each individual and each dependent.

There is little in the record of the Republican Congress' first session to warrant optimism about judicious economy in the forthcoming appropriations. Take the reaction of Chairman BRIDGES (Republican of New Hampshire) of the Senate Appropriations Committee that the President has presented "an extravagant program beyond the means of the Nation to meet this year." By all economic barometers, the Nation's unprecedented peacetime budget comes at a time of unprecedented prosperity.

If there is fat in the budget, the lopping-off will be best performed by the surgeons of Congress, such as the Republicans' own Representative DIRKSEN, rather than by the butchers. If there are more BRIDGES than DIRKSENS on the appropriation committees, and the record of the eightieth more than suggests there are, the result may be that famed in the pronouncement, "The operation was a success. But the patient died."

Now, indeed, is a time for greatness in the Congress. The President's message on the state of the Union ticked off the main spending projects for next year. The budget message affixed the price tags. The world recovery so adhesively linked to world peace, the national defense so vital to our security, these and many other endeavors can best be assayed not at the cost of doing, but at the cost of not doing. History will record this fateful session not for its effect on our November election as the politicians would, but, in the perspective of the years, for its effect on our world.

Address Before Women's Patriotic Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a speech made by me before the Women's Patriotic Conference in Washington, D. C., on January 16, 1948:

As a Congresswoman and, even worse, as a woman politician, I am constantly asked what the woman's point of view is on every question before Congress and the Nation, and I can only say that there is no woman's point of view. Women are citizens and they are individualists, and they agree together even less than men, and that is what makes them so interesting and so valuable politically.

You women here today represent many great patriotic organizations; you are just as interested in the affairs of these organizations as any man, and you are just as interested in national defense as any other patriotic American.

It is a very great tribute to women that the chairman of the Veterans' Committee in the House of Representatives is a woman, Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, and I think it is highly appropriate she has been named to this high office. She is well named "the Veterans' Angel." She is exactly that, untiring in her efforts for their best interests. All women quite naturally have a very strong urge to work with and for the veterans. The mere fact that we cannot bear arms makes it all the more our duty and our right to see that all veterans shall be given their just due and that, above all, they shall never be forgotten.

After every war we bow our heads and pray again that those who died in the conflict may not have died in vain and that their sacrifice will be the last one necessary to insure peace.

But human nature being what it is, we have a very real responsibility to see that our heroes have not made the supreme sacrifice in vain. We, the living, must be on the alert to keep this country strong. We must, all of us, be alive and diligent in working for national defense.

I believe that we are now in a difficult position. For the first time in our history we have not sufficient resources to do all the things that we are being called upon to do.

We must therefore take stock, we must determine what things come first. I submit to you that as women and Americans we must put peace as our first objective, and that to attain peace we must have an adequate, nay, a powerful program for national defense.

The possibilities of another war are too frightful to contemplate. All the scientists have warned us that it means probably the end of civilization. National defense today means more than armies and navies, it means air force, atomic weapons, and the knowledge of germ warfare—probably the most horrible weapon of all. It also means the planning of complete mobilization of the entire population because the next war will be a war against the entire civilian population of the world.

The greatest thing that has been done in years was done during the first session of the Eightieth Congress, and that was the creation of an over-all Office of Defense and the appointment of a Secretary of National Defense. This is by all odds the most important position in the whole Cabinet, and second only to that of the President.

It is now possible to coordinate all our resources for national defense—civil, military, and scientific—and it would be well to let our friends and enemies abroad know what a tremendous step we have taken to strengthen our country and to put her in the position of being invincible, so that she may maintain the peace of the world.

You have great influence, you represent many groups of patriotic men and women all over the country. There can be nothing more valuable than for you to explain to those in your immediate circle that our country, though rich and powerful, does not have unlimited resources, that we cannot support the whole world and maintain our own strength.

We must not be foolishly sentimental and fall into a trap. Remember Lenin said: "The way to destroy the United States is to make her bleed herself white." We are in a fair way to do that very thing.

No one can destroy us from without but our own thoughtless stupidity can destroy us. If we destroy ourselves all hope for the survival of freedom and liberty will perish from the earth.

If we remain strong and keep our defenses high we can maintain the peace of the world, and in peace, the war-torn peoples may be able to build up once more their own civilization and their own economies.

Let us resolve to put first things first. And let the first thing be a free America. She cannot be free unless she is strong, she cannot be strong without adequate national defense. It is my hope that you will leave this meeting and these deliberations more determined than ever to keep America the hope of the world.

Most Desired Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and editorial:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 20, 1948.*
Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am sending to you herewith an editorial from the current issue of the Christian Advocate, official organ of the Methodist Church, a weekly having a Nation-wide circulation of over a quarter of a million copies. It is entitled "We Join in This Appeal," and the opening paragraph thereof reads as follows:

"Voicing concern over the uncertain future and the bitter hatred engendered by widespread poverty and social unrest, Pope Pius XII in a historical encyclical entitled 'Optatissima Pax' (translated 'Most

Desired Peace') at Christmastime condemned class hatred and those who exploit the depressed poor of the world. He warned that it is 'necessary for each—and especially he who has greater goods—to put the common welfare before private advantages and profits'."

In my humble opinion, such editorial is worthy of space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in furtherance of your own well-known views on the general subject.

With personal regards and assurances of high esteem, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES PATRICK MCGOVERN.

[From the Christian Advocate of January 22, 1948]

WE JOIN IN THIS APPEAL

Voicing concern over the uncertain future and the bitter hatred engendered by widespread poverty and social unrest, Pope Pius XII in a historical encyclical entitled "Optatissima Pax" (translated "Most Desired Peace") at Christmas time condemned class hatred and those who exploit the depressed poor of the world. He warned that it is "necessary for each—and especially he who has greater goods—to put the common welfare before private advantages and profits."

Defining the conditions necessary for the establishment of a peaceful social order, he declared: "It is absolutely necessary to pacify spirits, bring them back to mutual understanding, to reciprocal cooperation, so as to be able to carry out those doctrines and those directions that are consistent with Christian teachings and the conditions of the present hour." Then in an appeal directed especially to children, the head of the Roman Catholic church pled for prayers in behalf of world-wide peace.

In the basic principles of this encyclical every Protestant worthy of the name most surely joins, and the Christian Advocate, as the official organ of a powerful denomination, appeals to its readers and to the Methodist Church to assemble their prayers in behalf of this objective so devoutly desired by all true Christians.

Simultaneously with the Pope's encyclical there comes an appeal from J. Edgar Hoover, the director of the FBI, that parents all across America shall engage in the practice of daily prayers with their families. "If there is hope for the future of America, if there is to be peace and happiness in our homes," he says, "then we, as a Nation, must return to God and to the practice of daily family prayer. Our generation, it seems, has allowed old faithful religious practices to slip into oblivion. As a result, family life has been weakened and the Nation has suffered."

We cannot ignore such an appeal, except at the peril of the Republic.

Statement of Philadelphia Housing Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARDIE SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Philadelphia Housing Authority to Joint Congressional Committee on Housing, January 8, 1948, Philadelphia, Pa.:

The Philadelphia Housing Authority is most happy that your committee is here today to investigate housing conditions in Philadelphia. When our chairman, Mr. William Reinhardt, learned that the Joint Committee on Housing planned to visit Philadelphia he wrote to Chairman GAMBLE suggesting that the members of your committee visit several of the Philadelphia Housing Authority's projects in order to learn first-hand the advantages which tenants in our low-income projects are enjoying in comparison with the disadvantages under which their neighbors in adjoining slums are forced to live.

We regret that the pressure of time has prevented you from accepting Mr. Reinhardt's invitation but we believe that if the members of your committee and every Member of Congress could visit one of the low-income public-housing developments in any of the 40 States where housing authorities are established, Congress would take immediate action to extend the benefits of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to more of our lowest income citizens.

Since your committee cannot visit our housing developments and see the results with your own eyes, we will endeavor to review what the Philadelphia Housing Authority has done, and what it proposes to do just as soon as Congress provides additional Federal assistance to local communities for slum clearance.

In 1937 the Pennsylvania Legislature in enacting into law the housing authority law of Pennsylvania declared that there "existed within the various counties of the Commonwealth, numerous slums and unsafe, unsanitary, inadequate, or overcrowded dwellings, which conditions are accompanied and aggravated by an acute shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings within the financial reach of persons of low income, such conditions arising from overcrowding, dilapidation, faulty construction, obsolete buildings, lack of proper light, air, and sanitary facilities."

The legislature further determined that: "Private industry alone has been and now is unable to overcome the obstacles which have prevented and are now preventing it from clearing slum areas and relieving the shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for persons of low income, and the construction, pursuant to this act, of housing projects for persons of low income would therefore not be competitive with private enterprise."

In 1945 the Pennsylvania Legislature confirmed and expanded this policy of slum clearance and aid to families in the lowest income groups by enacting a redevelopment law and the city of Philadelphia has since established a redevelopment authority.

The Philadelphia Housing Authority and the other local housing authorities throughout Pennsylvania are therefore official agencies of this Commonwealth whose established policy is to provide housing for families in the lowest income groups whom private enterprise cannot profitably serve. The people of Pennsylvania and the people of Philadelphia through their respective representatives at the State and local levels have clearly endorsed the principles of public housing and we feel that the Members of Congress should give great weight to their wishes and to the wishes of 120,000,000 Americans in the 40 States which have passed housing legislation similar to the housing authorities law of Pennsylvania.

Pursuant to the housing authorities law of 1937, the Philadelphia Housing Authority constructed three low-rent housing projects totaling 2,859 dwellings at an average capital cost, including land, of $5,400 per dwelling. For each one of these dwellings a substandard dwelling was eliminated in the city of Philadelphia.

At the time of initial occupancy of these dwellings, prior to the war, a maximum income limit for the largest families at admissions was established at $1,399 and the average rent, including all utilities, was $18.94 per month. With changing economic conditions income limits at admission have been increased and now range from $1,875 to $2,275 per year with rentals from $13 to $39 per month, including all utilities. Prior to the war, income limits for continued occupancy ranged from $1,550 to $1,900, but during 1947 as income limits for admission were increased, the limits for continued occupancy were increased and now range from $2,350 to $2,900 for the largest families for whom a rent of $43 per month is charged.

Of the 2,859 families living in these homes 419, or 14.6 percent, are receiving relief or some other form of governmental aid.

During the war, because of the housing shortage and because many of the tenants were essential war workers, the high-income tenants were not required to move when their incomes exceeded the maximums established by the authority.

In June 1947, however, the authority served notice on 850 tenants whose incomes were in excess of the maximum income limits for continued occupancy, notifying them of their ineligibility and at the same time "vacate notices," effective December 31, 1947, were sent to 56 tenants with the highest incomes among these ineligibles. These tenants would have been required to vacate by December 31, 1947, but for the passage of the McCarthy bill (S. 1361) deferring the eviction of over-income tenants until March 1, 1948.

During the period of occupancy of the three low-rent projects, the Philadelphia Housing Authority has paid to the city of Philadelphia $334,163.25 as payments in lieu of taxes to help defray the cost of municipal services rendered to the three housing projects. During the same period the authority has used only 63 percent of the annual contribution available to it under its assistance contract with the Federal Government.

The Philadelphia Housing Authority also has under its jurisdiction four federally owned permanent Lanham housing projects comprising 2,400 dwellings and 4 temporary Lanham projects totaling 2,191 homes. In addition, the authority leases from the Federal Government, and operates as a low-rent housing project, Hill Creek, containing 258 homes. The authority has almost completed as agent for the city of Philadelphia, the construction of 1,781 temporary homes for veterans. More than 10,000 veterans have applied for the 1,781 homes. In all, the authority will have under its jurisdiction, upon completion of its veterans' program, 9,620 homes.

Of the 9,192 homes which have been completed thus far, more than 4,100 or 43 percent, are occupied by veterans of World War II. With veterans receiving preference for all vacancies and with the eviction of many high income tenants during 1948, it is estimated that veteran occupancy will increase to 55 percent of the total by the end of the year. If Congress permits the transfer to the Philadelphia Housing Authority of the 2,400 homes in the permanent war-housing projects, veterans of low income will be given preference in the occupancy of these units, and veterans' occupancy would reach 75 percent of the authority's accommodations.

In 1945 the Philadelphia Housing Authority held public hearings in order to determine the public's attitude toward the extension of a public housing program in Philadelphia. These hearings were attended by more than 500 persons representing educational, religious, civic and social groups, Federal, State and city officials, real estate and builders' associations, labor organizations, private groups and individuals interested in the practical solution of the vital housing problems confronting the city and the authority. As a result of the testimony developed at the public hearings, the authority, on July 23, 1945, submitted its recommended program to the city of Philadelphia and the city planning commission. This report recommended the construction of 19,500 homes for families of low income, over a 6-year period. Copies of this report and a supplementary report submitted 1 year later, as well as a stenographic transcript of the testimony taken at the public hearings is attached hereto for the information of the committee.

The Philadelphia Housing Authority and the city of Philadelphia have jointly requested the Federal Government to transfer title to the four permanent war housing projects, Passyunk Homes, Abbottsford Homes, Bartram Village, and Oxford Village I, comprising 2,400 homes, to the Philadelphia Housing Authority for use as low-rent housing projects This request by the city and the authority is presently being studied by the Public Housing Administration and a report containing recommendations by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency will, in all probability, be submitted to Congress in the very near future. Preference, of course, will be given in the occupancy of these homes to low-income veterans who are so badly in need of rental housing in Philadelphia today. Since these projects as constructed are not readily divisible for sale as individual units and since the Federal Government did not conform in many respects to the Philadelphia Building Code in the construction of these projects, which fact would seriously affect their sale to private individuals, it seems apparent that their operation by a public agency for rental to veterans of low income is in the best public interest.

Turning to the housing conditions as they exist in Philadelphia today, we find that there are almost 200,000 veterans living in Philadelphia and it is conservatively estimated that 50 percent of them are living doubled-up with relatives, in temporary shelters such as rented rooms, trailers, or tourist cabins, or in dwellings needing major repairs or lacking one or more standard plumbing facilities. For the nonveteran today's housing picture in Philadelphia is just as bad. The 1940 census revealed that of the 557,537 homes in Philadelphia 107,917 or 19.3 percent of the total housing supply was substandard. Taking into consideration normal obsolescence and deterioration and the increase in families since 1940, housing conditions are undoubtedly much worse at this time.

What is being done to relieve this admittedly serious housing condition?

For the low-income veteran, and the nonveteran living in substandard and overcrowded housing, the answer is—nothing.

Here are the facts: The Census Bureau reports that the average weekly income of Philadelphia veterans wishing to buy homes is $48 and the average weekly income of those veterans who wish to rent homes is $39. Based on the normally accepted ratio of carrying charges and rentals to income, the average veteran cannot afford to pay more than $5,500 for a home or $40 per month rent. The Census Bureau further reported that one-fourth of these veterans stated that they could pay $4,200 or less for a home and one-fourth reported that they could pay $33 or less for rent.

The conclusion is inescapable that at least 50 percent of Philadelphia veterans are priced out of the housing market today, and without some action by Congress to relieve the situation they will be without hope of purchasing or renting housing within their means for at least several years. If there is any doubt as to the accuracy of this statement, a reference to the news columns of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of Saturday, January 3, 1948, should suffice. The headline announcing new housing in Philadelphia reads: "Big spurt in rental housing, chiefly garden-type apartments, predicted for Philadelphia area in 1948." The captions underneath the two accompanying photographs contain the following references to rentals, respectively:

"Rents are $75 and $85 per month, plus $6 for garage.

"The apartments contain four and a half rooms and bath and rent for $90 a month without utilities."

Under the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill Federal assistance will be given to local communities to construct 125,000 low-rent dwellings a year for 4 years, or a total of 500,000 during that period for the entire country. Senator TAFT, the principal sponsor of the bill, estimated that this minimum provision for families of low incomes, including veterans, will provide only 10 percent of the estimated need of low-income families living under substandard housing conditions.

However, the special interests—the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the United States Savings and Loan League, and the National Association of Home Builders, who cannot see any profit in public housing for their members, have effectively prevented the House Banking and Currency Committee from reporting the House version of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to the House floor for a vote. These pressure groups well know that the Representatives in Congress of the 40 States with their 120,000,000 constituents which have adopted public housing legislation would overwhelmingly approve the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill if it was brought to a vote. Knowing this, the opponents of public housing pickled the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill (S. 1592) in the House Banking and Currency Committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress after its passage in the Senate, and these special-interest groups are endeavoring to do the same thing with the revised Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill in the Eightieth Congress. We trust that the Joint Committee on Housing will use its efforts to assure fair play and democratic process by urging their colleagues in both Houses to bring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to a vote.

Some of the opponents of public housing charge that it is un-American and communistic for the Government—local, State, or Federal—to extend direct aid to low-income families living in slums. Senator TAFT has ably refuted this argument by pointing out that this country long ago adopted a policy of educating its children at public expense, of providing free medical care for those unable to afford it, and direct relief payments to those unfortunate citizens unable to feed and clothe themselves. The Senator points out, therefore, that there is no change in the basic policy when Government provides a minimum program of public housing for assistance to the lowest income groups. Those who shout about un-Americanism and communism should remember that communism feeds on want and distress. The seeds of that want and that distress are being sown daily by the continued failure of Congress to provide housing for those with the greatest need and the least chance of satisfying that need. The chaos in France and Italy today should be sufficient proof of this fact.

The House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning of the Seventy-ninth Congress, after making an exhaustive study of public housing, made the following report:

"The committee recognized that there is an area of housing at the lowest rent levels which private industry cannot afford to serve and which local government is not fully capable of serving. The problem of public housing is therefore one of national as well as of local concern. Any program of Federal cooperation with local governments for postwar construction must accord a permanent place to the making up of the large deficiency in housing for low-income families."

Similarly, the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment, which held hearings from June 1, 1944, to February 7, 1945, at which hearings appeared many national organizations interested in the problems of housing as well as Government officials connected with housing, made the following statement on public housing in its report to the Senate Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning:

"The entrance of the Federal Government into public housing has produced a much greater controversy. It is contended by many that the whole job of housing can be done by private enterprise and that this form of Government activity results in competition which acts as a deterrent to the expansion of private operations.

"The subcommittee agrees fully that the Government should not go into housing as a business or compete with private enterprise in this field any more than in any other field, but it does not agree with the contention that the problem can be solved at the present time by private enterprise alone. Unaided private initiative has not provided a sufficient supply of decent houses in the past. Although the subcommittee believes that a revivified industry will constantly reduce the need for direct aid, it sees no likelihood of change that would permit private initiative to meet all the requirements of the immediate future.

"The justification for public housing must rest on the proposition that the Federal Government has an interest in seeing that minimum standards of housing, food, and health services are available for all members of the community. The American people have been impressed with the fact that, in a country capable of our tremendous wartime production, there is no reason why hardship and extreme poverty cannot be prevented."

In closing, the Philadelphia Housing Authority will welcome any formula which your committee or the Congress may evolve for solving the housing problem of our low-income groups. If private enterprise can do the job—so much the better. All we ask is that the Congress take immediate action to put into effect a Federal program to aid families of low income who cannot afford to pay for decent housing.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PHILADELPHIA HOUSING AUTHORITY,
WILLIAM REINHARDT, *Chairman*.

The Marshall Plan and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD. I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WBAL on January 18, 1948:

Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS has graciously permitted me to occupy the time usually allotted to him for his excellent weekly program, for which I am very grateful. I also desire to thank radio station WBAL for making this 15-minute period available to me so that I might express my views on subjects of general interest, not only to the residents of the Third Congressional District whom I have the honor to represent, but of vital importance to the citizens of the entire United States. It is not my intention to quote a lot of figures concerning the Marshall plan, or any other plan, but there are some cold facts staring us in the face, and we cannot escape our responsibility in seeking the path to permanent world-wide peace.

Regardless of what may be said, peace will not come until people have food, housing, security, and the basis for hope of the future. Under the stimulation of the announcement of the Marshall plan, representatives of 16 European nations met in 1947 and submitted a general program of economic and fiscal rehabilitation which called for American financial aid for over a 4-year period. Congress is now deliberating as to the actual way the Marshall plan will be applied. While this Nation is debating just how far our participation in world affairs shall go, riots, civil war, bloody elections, and strife are rampant in many parts of the globe. These people are seeking a way out of chaos and uncertainty. We Americans think and know that democracy is the only sure remedy for the ills of the world. If we are wrong, then we, too, will be caught in the maelstrom of world unrest.

We Americans have high ideals and pride in our American way of life—and we have cause to be. That is because we enjoy real freedom, especially the four freedoms as stated by our late lamented great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

But we must remember that our high ideals and pride can vanish if our people suffer want through inflationary prices. The United States is the richest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth. Initiative and production enabled us recently to win a war on two fronts. That same initiative can rescue us from the fear of inflation if we will but realize that we must help other nations while we are helping ourselves. We might as well face the fact that we are the only nation left that can aid world reconstruction, and if we are to survive as a free nation, we must enable all nations—large or small—to remain free.

Even more important than economic reconstruction is our obligation to keep alive the hope of the world by demonstrating that democracy is a workable, humane form of government, in which the people are the rulers of their destinies. At the same time, we must insure adequate living wages for our workers and a reduction in the price of essential commodities. It is a fallacy to suppose that, great as this Nation is, we can keep on raising wages and raising prices, because there is small consolation to the working man or woman in a small salary raise if the price of every-day necessities takes a jump at the same time. Congress is working on a solution to these problems, and we hope the answer will be found during the present session of the Eightieth Congress. We always have been able to solve our domestic problems no matter how difficult they may appear at the time—that is one of our inherent characteristics as free Americans.

Another problem affecting our Nation is the demand for a reduction in taxes. If we look at taxation in the light of a payment to the Government to insure liberty, then we can better stand the burden—but in no event can we hope to escape a fair and equitable taxation. As Congressman from the Third District of Maryland, I am sympathetic with the pleas of my constituents that their tax burden be lightened. President Truman has just presented a proposal to Congress to ease the tax load of the men and women least able to stand heavy taxation. Here again I am sure the solution to the problem will be found, and that some form of tax reduction will be announced in the very near future. But the solution, whatever it is, must be fair and just to all segments of society. That, too, is part of the American way of life.

In theory, excessive price rises could be avoided by taxing the people so heavily that the Government could take back, in the form of taxes, all the extra money it paid out for necessary expenditures to keep down prices, that is to say, by the Government subsidizing producers to keep down inflation, but of course, that is only a nice theory. We must deal with practical, hard facts. In World War II, the percent of the total expenditures obtained from taxation in the fiscal years of 1942 through 1946 was approximately 46 percent, leaving 54 percent derived from borrowing. This result was achieved despite the fact that costs of the war to the United States were about 10 times as great as the cost of World War I. It reflected an even more vigorous use of the income tax and excise taxes.

Here we have a direct cause of inflation, because, even with a modernized tax system and its drastic application, we still had to borrow over one-half of the total war costs. I merely mention this fact to show the high cost of war, the method of financing armed conflict and its resultant effect on our home economy. We must find a solution for world peace and a remedy for our economic ills as quickly as possible. We cannot afford to have another war. Our country is doing everything possible to avert such a disaster. If, in spite of our best efforts, war should come upon us, we must be prepared not only to defend ourselves but to carry the fight to the aggressor.

I am a firm advocate of a strong America, not for purposes of aggression, but solely for defense! We have recognized the fact that if the United States is to retain its position of leadership in world affairs, and if it is going to be able to implement its foreign policy so that the peace may be kept, we must be ever alert to possible attack from without and within.

And now, may I say a few words in behalf of our veterans, the men who preserved our liberty and all we hold dear. The two great wars of the twentieth century were brought about by a challenge to the heritage of human freedom, on which the American heritage of democracy is founded. Each time our Republic has met that challenge and the force of her industrial power and the might of her armed citizens have been largely instrumental in overcoming it. Without our veterans, much of the world would have lost that concept of free democratic government of which the United States of America is the prime example.

How, then, can we best honor our veterans? In my opinion, we can best honor our veterans by helping to create a world in which freedom and peace are inseparable. We can make sure our veterans receive the benefits to which they are entitled, namely, educational opportunities, the right to engage in gainful pursuits, and a home for himself and his family. I pledge my support to these objectives. I am also in favor of adequate compensation for those veterans pursuing educational courses in our schools and colleges, they are entitled to adequate subsistence while at school!

To sum up my remarks, I sincerely hope the Marshall plan can accomplish its purposes because the world will then have been saved from another terrible conflict.

As I stated before, I am 100 percent back of our working men and women who have aided in making this Nation great. I favor an adequate living wage, because as has been so truly said, "The laborer is worthy of his hire."

Along with other Members of the Eightieth Congress, I am giving serious thought to the rapidly mounting spiral of inflation. It must be curbed and quickly. President Truman has asked for certain specific powers which would give him weapons to fight the cost of living. I shall support any legislation which, in my opinion, will best remedy these conditions, and shall continue to look to President Truman for leadership in this threat to our economic life.

A strong nation is a peaceful nation, if that nation is imbued with the principles of true democracy which has for its slogan, "Live and let live." To that end I favor preparedness. I will vote for those measures pertaining to housing which are beneficial to both, veterans and nonveterans, and I pledge continued support for all legislation that will advance the welfare of all our veterans.

To my friends and constituents of the Third Congressional District, I pledge continued efforts in your behalf. I welcome your views on the important matters affecting our Nation and my chief aim is and will continue to be, "The greatest good for the greatest number."

Again, my thanks to Senator TYDINGS and radio station WBAL for this opportunity to express my views on the vital problems confronting our Nation at this time. My only interests will be the interests of our citizens. I thank you.

Mine Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to place in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in regard to mine safety. I cannot urge too strongly the necessity for the enforcement of mine safety regulations if disasters such as the Centralia mine tragedy of last year are to be averted. The editorial follows:

SIX THOUSAND MINE SAFETY VIOLATIONS

Why should Congress pass a Federal mine inspection law with teeth?

The answer is written in large letters for all who read the Interior Department's report on violations of the Federal safety code:

More than 6,000 violations were found in the 1,000 mines which were inspected last year.

Only 14 of the 25 coal-producing States cooperated with the Federal mine safety code.

The Governor of Illinois, whose negligence and compromising of the State mine inspection service was followed by 111 deaths at Centralia, wrote in protest: "It seems to me that at the present time the forcing of a Federal mine safety code upon the State is a violation of State's rights."

As Representative PRICE of the East St. Louis district says, there is no need whatever for further hearings on this issue. The Landis bill to provide Federal safety enforcement should be reported out of committee and passed.

What is Congress waiting for, another Centralia? Governor Green took that risk and men who had pleaded with him were brought lifeless out of Centralia Coal Co. mine No. 5. Does Congress want the same risk on its part paid for in the same way?

Jack Beall on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks I have listened with interest to Jack Beall's weekly radio broadcast on communism which is heard every Saturday at 6:45 p. m. eastern standard time over the American Broadcasting Co. network.

Mr. Beall has devoted long hours of research to this subject and through his broadcasts is doing much to bring home to our American citizens the policies of and the methods used by the Communist Party of the United States in its efforts to overthrow our republican form of government. I take this opportunity to commend Mr. Beall for the splendid work he is doing.

I was so impressed with his broadcast of January 10 that I requested his permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that my colleagues may have the benefit of the factual information it contains regarding this menace of our republican form of government. It is as follows:

Good evening. One hundred years ago this month, two Germans drew up in writing a program to change the world. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, in London, prepared their Communist Manifesto. It was a program to turn class against class, and to bring about bloody revolution.

The Communist Manifesto, which was written out in German, in a cheap London flat, just 100 years ago this month, became the bible of the revolution in Russia. Marx became the major prophet of both democratic socialism and of communism. The two parties agree on Marx's materialist approach to history, his dialectic, his economics, but they have now divided on how socialism is to triumph in the world. The Socialists appear to be more consistent Marxists by holding that capitalism is bound to collapse of its own weight. They contend there is no need to precipitate it by violent means. They are the evolutionary party which has grown up about the teachings of Marx, particularly in Das Kapital. On the other hand, the Communists are the revolutionary party which has grown up around these same teachings, but which put more emphasis on the Communist Manifesto, as a program.

Almost everybody has heard the closing words of the Communist Manifesto. Here they are again:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries unite!"

Of course, there has been a slight change in that attitude of disdaining to conceal their views and aims. More recently—particularly after the Harry Bridges trial—every effort has been made by the Communists to gloss over the angle of bloody revolution. For a while, they even made noises like patriots. Earl Browder, at one time, offered to pal up with J. P. Morgan. But that was a short-lived period—a tactic. It has not changed the basic views and aims. Let me quote you a few other words from Communist Manifesto.

Said Marx: The phases are, first, a more-or-less veiled civil war, within existing society—"up to the point where that war breaks into open revolution and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat."

The high-sounding term, "bourgeoisie," can be translated as employer and the proletariat are the people who work for wages.

In the Communist manifesto we find this other gem: "You (meaning the bourgeoisie) reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so, that is just what we intend."

Fairly crisp and to the point, I'd say.

And Marx repudiates in the Manifesto, the Christian code of ethics, by saying that law, morality and religion are, to the proletarian, "so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk, in ambush just so many bourgeois interests."

This puts the Marxian mark of approval on Lenin's famous dictum that his followers should "use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion and concealment of truth" to achieve the desired ends.

Here are some other quotations, by later Marxists of the Soviet persuasion, on the use of force and violence in the overthrow of governments. They may be important to you to know if some Communist or fellow-traveler denies that communism contemplates overthrow of the state by force and violence. I take this from the Theses and Statutes of the Third International. "The Communist International makes its aim to put up an armed struggle for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie and to create an international Soviet Republic, as a transition stage to the complete abolition of the State."

Lenin says in his The State and Revolution: "The replacement of the bourgeois by the proletarian state is impossible without violent revolution."

Again, Lenin says this with particular reference to England and the United States: "The preliminary conditions for every real people's revolution is the smashing, the destruction, of the ready-made state machine."

Stalin—the present high priest of communism—said in his Foundations of Leninism: "The law of violent proletarian revolution, the law of the smashing of the bourgeois state machine, as a preliminary condition for such a revolution, is an inevitable law of the revolutionary movement in the imperialist countries of the world."

In 1929, Stalin wrote a letter to the Communist Party of the United States in which he said: "I consider the Communist Party of the United States is one of the few Communist Parties to which history has given decisive tasks from the point of view of the world revolutionary movement. It is necessary that the American Communist Party should be capable of meeting the moment of crisis fully equipped to take the direction of future class wars in the United States. You must forge real revolutionary cadres and leaders of the proletariat who will be capable of leading the millions of American workers toward the revolutionary class war."

That is the man who is represented by some of his smoother-talking followers as holding that world revolution is not necessary—but that socialism in one country—Russia—is acceptable.

William Z. Foster, the present head of the Communist Party, United States of America, said, back in 1928, when he was a candidate for President of the United States: "We working class," he said, "must shatter the capitalistic state."

We must build a new state, a new government, a workers' and farmers' government, the Soviet Government of the United States. * * * In all our agitation around these demands we must emphasize the absolute necessity for the proletarian revolution. Our strategy is to utilize these immediate demands to educate and organize the masses, in preparation for the final revolutionary struggle, which will abolish capitalism, altogether. * * * Our party is a revolutionary party."

Benjamin Gitlow, a high Communist functionary in this country until his break with the party, said at the Harry Bridges trial, in 1942: "The present Communist Party interpretation of the Communist Manifesto is to lay down the policy that it is necessary to overthrow capitalism. It is necessary to do it forcibly, through a violent revolution."

In May, of 1942, Attorney General Francis Biddle, in reviewing the deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges, found that the Communist Party in this country believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow, by force and violence, of the Government of the United States.

A relatively short time after that, the Communist Party dissolved itself. This was the era when Browder was preaching a second front and all-out production—because Russia had been attacked by Hitler. It was something of an embarrassment to be threatening us, as allies, with overthrow by force and violence. Besides that, there was a law on the books that might be interpreted as forcing all representatives of a foreign power, in this country, to register. Certainly, that was the last thing the Communists here wanted to do. So, they changed their name to Communist Political Association. They left out references to the historic mission of the party, which was in the original constitution.

I might say, here, that this historic mission is the forcible overthrow of the government of whatever country they are in.

If you talk to a Communist and ask him about this matter of force and violence he will probably come back at you with some of the party double-talk about the party not wanting violence. It will be forced upon the party he will say, because no capitalistic government will ever yield power without a struggle. If the struggle comes, it will be the fault of the capitalist society for not submitting quietly, in other words. It is something like a highway man excusing himself for shooting his victim—the victim had no right to resist—it was all the fault of the victim.

After the war, in July 1945, the party came back, under its old name, and restored to its constitution the reference to the historic mission.

A great deal of the appeal of both the Socialist Party and the Communist Party has been based on the claim that Marxism is "scientific"—that it follows scientific principles. Its founder, Marx, they claim, was an infallible prophet of the inevitable decay of the capitalist system and its supplanting by socialism, because he used scientific principles, founded on Hegelian philosophy.

Now, I think almost anybody would agree, who thought about it, that the so-called social sciences can hardly be called sciences at all. Who would dare call economics a science, in the meaning of an exact science, or an infallible system?

And yet this pretension to being scientific and infallible has got Marxism a long way. Maybe people are impressed with it—the way they are impressed with the big, mouth-filling words. If you call a wage payer a member of the bourgeoisie, or a wage receiver a proletarian, it is so much more scientific-sounding, isn't it?

Marx had the hardihood to speak of iron laws—one of them amounts to the simple assertion: Collapse of capitalism is inevitable. He bolstered this by the assertion that no system is able to digest unlimited forces of production and that every system must collapse when the "forces of production have outgrown it."

Marx thought that the industrial revolution, brought on by the application of

steam power, would prove this last assertion of his—he confidently expected the collapse of capitalism because it couldn't digest the production of the steam engine. In 1848, the year of the manifesto, there was a great deal of unrest all over Europe. Communists did gain power, for a few days, in France, but the big explosion didn't come. Capitalism and free enterprise have gone on to digest the steam engine, electric power, the internal-combustion engine, and the wonders of modern physics and chemistry. It is now reaching out to digest the products at atomic power and yet the system refuses to collapse.

I'm very unscientific and very ignorant, of course, to have thoughts like this, but I can't help feeling that, when the Communists took the tack they did—that they had to help this inevitable collapse of the capitalist system by doing some positive acts, themselves, it showed a fundamental lack of faith in the inevitability of the collapse. Certainly, the Social Democrats, who claim to be just as good and sound Marxists as the Communists—don't exhibit this lack of faith. They are content to let the system fall of its own weight, then pick up the pieces by being voted into power. I am not a Socialist, but I have a great deal of respect for them, as good democrats with a small "d." One cannot say that they are potential traitors to their country, in behalf of another country.

Another of the iron laws of Marx was that the poor proletarian had to get constantly poorer. There was no possibility of his getting better wages than just the bare minimum upon which to subsist and to reproduce his kind. Under capitalism, nothing stretched before him except increasing want and misery and nothing—literally nothing—could halt the process. Engels said this was true, even of America.

I submit that every workingman today, who drives his own car, is making a fool out of Karl Marx and his inevitable scientific, iron laws. I doubt if Marx—far-seeing prophet that he was—foresaw radio. But if he had, he would not have considered it possible for the proletarian to own such a luxury. Every one of you men who work for wages—shall I call you proletarians?—every one of you who is now listening to me over his own radio, is kicking the stuffing out of Karl Marx and his scientific, inevitable laws.

Usually, a man who predicts the end of the world can get a certain following. They will go up on the mountain with him and wait for the crack of doom to come. But when it doesn't come, he is discredited. He can't get people to follow him the next time.

But Marx and his followers have been predicting the crack of doom many times. Marx has been shown up, many times, as not being an infallible prophet. And yet he is still harkened to, his followers still talk about him as though what he said was predestined to come true.

But I would say this of a prophet who has made many demonstrably bad guesses: maybe he isn't so scientific and maybe his main prediction isn't as inevitable, after all.

This is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

Problem of the Expellees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has been much concerned over the problem of rehabilitation of European countries and the problem of the displaced persons.

In this connection, certain matters have come to my attention which I think should be in turn brought to the attention of the House of Representatives as a whole.

This particular matter which I have in mind refers to the problem of the expellees. There are no doubt Members of this Congress who have some question as to just who are expellees and what their problems are and what solution might be offered for these problems.

To that end, and in explanation, I would like to make the following statement:

PROBLEM OF THE EXPELLEES—WHO THEY ARE

Expellees are the people of German nationality or German ethnic origin who, at the end and after the end of the war, were driven from their homes in East Prussia, Silesia, Pomerania, the Sudetenland, Hungary, Transsylvania, and so forth, into the borders of the Reich proper as constituted by the Potsdam Agreement of 1945 and split into four zones—American, British, French, and Russian.

HOW MANY ARE THERE?

An official census has never been undertaken. According to United States Government sources and careful investigations by the American Friends Service Committee—Quakers, also by the Staatssekretaer für Fluechtlingswesen—State Secretary for Expellees, the figures as of November 1946 are as follows: American zone, 2,904,000; British zone, 3,193,000; French zone, 50,000; Russian zone, 3,912,000; Berlin, 37,000; total, 10,096,000. According to statisticians, this figure had grown to about 12,000,000 by December 1947, so I am informed.

HOW THEY LIVE

According to impartial observers, most of them active in relief work, the lot of these people is pitiful. Because of Germany's economic condition, most of them are unemployed. There is some help from the German "laender" governments, from occupation authorities and from American as well as British relief organizations. The problem, however, is so immense that all these endeavors have proven nearly futile. The province of Schleswig-Holstein, an agricultural district, for instance, has been invaded by more than 1,000,000 of these people, nearly doubling the population, increasing the hardships of postwar life in a devastated Reich and changing the entire economic picture in this and all other parts of Germany, even if conditions were normal. The tuberculosis rate and the child-mortality rate are tremendous; the former 1:45, according to British health authorities. Germany, always over-populated, is even more so today. It is estimated that 70,000,000 people live in a territory which has been shrunken to less than half the size of our State of Texas.

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION AND THE EXPELLEES

No provisions whatsoever for these expellees are contained in the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, successor to UNRRA. In fact, it is explicitly stipulated that people of German ethnic origin, whether German nationals or members of German minorities in other countries are excluded from the activities of IRO. The IRO constitution was adopted by the Senate of the United States and signed by President Truman on July 1, 1947, without any changes whatsoever.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY

The true history of these millions of expellees has not yet been written I know. In fact, there has been a concerted drive by certain groups to keep it from the American public. These people were driven from their ancestral homes—with just what they could carry on their backs—on a few hours' notice. This was done with the more or less tacit approval of the western democracies. Looting and raping were rampant. The fate meted out to these people by the "liberating" Allied armies is fully on a par with what Hitler's legions did in Poland and other countries. We preached decency and Christianity, but we did not practice them. Morally, we failed completely. From the standpoint of an enlightened self-interest, we have failed again. Soviet Russia and her satellites have dropped the problem into our laps and we have done nothing to solve it. We have not yet learned the first lesson of history; that it is the intolerable pressure of people living in a confined space which creates aggression and warfare. This is especially true of overcrowded central Europe which has always been unable to feed her own people and had to depend on tremendous imports to avoid famine. With the German granary in the east turned over to the Poles—if not "de jure," but at least "de facto," by our signature under the Potsdam agreement—we have made an already insoluble problem much, much more insoluble.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

It is estimated that among these expellees there are at least 3,000,000 people who lived outside the borders of the Reich of 1938. Over 2,000,000 came from Czechoslovakia, the rest from the Baltic states, from prewar Poland, from Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Rumania. These people had settled there or had been settled there hundreds of years ago. They spoke an often old-fashioned German. Otherwise, there was no kinship whatsoever with the people in Germany proper. These peasants and artisans from Swabia, Saxony, and other parts of the Reich were given land by the Hapsburg emperors in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries along the eastern and southeastern borders of the old empire to serve as a bulwark against Turkish aggression and to christianize these outposts. They were hard-working, practical, and often prosperous people, which may well be the principal reason for their expulsion. It is only natural that they felt the constant pressure of the Slav millions all around them and that their separate language and customs as well as their prosperity should have aroused the prejudice and envy of the rest of the population. This has happened to other races and peoples in the course of history. And it has often been considered a crime by those who were envious of success.

HOW TO FIND A SOLUTION

To solve this immense problem will take many decades. The United States could contribute by giving the expellees who are of German ethnic origin—but not German citizens expelled from the eastern provinces of the Reich—the same status as enjoyed by the displaced persons. A bill patterned after the Stratton bill should be introduced immediately. As far as all expellees are concerned, the United States delegates to IRO, vigorously assisted by Congress, should bend all their efforts toward the goal to admit all expellees to the benefits to be derived from IRO. As far as the expellees of German ethnic origin are concerned, the United States and British occupation authorities should appoint a commission composed of experts in agriculture, handicraft, industry, mining, and so forth, to make a census of these people with their special skills. In a nation such as ours, where the number of farm workers decreases from year to year, there should be ample opportunity—benefiting our entire agricultural life—for vigorous, hard-working farmers with a tradition of hundreds of years of tilling the soil successfully. One need only look at the prosperous farms in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and so forth, where many a German peasant settled a generation or more ago to become an efficient American farmer and a good American citizen to boot. Among these expellees of German ethnic origin there are famous glass blowers from Bohemia, clever cabinetmakers, experts in husbandry, chemists, foresters, and many, many others who—in line with an enlightened selective immigration policy—could well contribute toward making this land of ours richer and more prosperous. All Americans have the fullest sympathy for the displaced persons who live a life of sorrow in the camps of central Europe. They should be given help and admittance into the western nations in accordance with a carefully conceived plan. The lot of the expellees is just as hard and just as undeserved. Moreover, their number is much greater. I ask for them the same that may be given to other displaced persons, as far as selective immigration and the work of IRO are concerned.

In a Stew Over Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the remarks made this morning in a radio broadcast by the Mutual Broadcasting System's news commentator, Mr. George E. Reedy, over Station WOL, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Reedy expresses the concern of many of us over the important question of rent control. His remarks follow:

There seems little doubt that Congress will extend rent control for another year. But before it happens the legislators are going to have to make a mighty embarrassing decision. It won't be an easy one.

It centers around the 15-percent voluntary rent increase that was slipped into the present law during the last session. At the time it was passed nobody seemed to realize that it would come back to haunt our legislators at a later date.

At the time it was supposed to be merely a cushion against too abrupt relaxation of wartime controls. It offered the landlord a 15-percent increase in his income. But in return he had to give his tenants the security of a long lease in exchange.

The whole idea was based on the assumption that the last day of February would mark the end of rent control. At the time that did not seem too far-fetched. There were some prospects that the housing shortage would ease off in the coming year.

Now that 1948 is actually here, however, those prospects aren't worth a plugged nickel. There are still too many people fighting over too few homes. Even more important, there is not a decent set of plans to solve the situation.

Consequently, there is nothing much that can be done, except extend the Rent Control Act for a longer period. But it is here that the rub comes. Congress simply has to make somebody mad, and there is no way of getting around it.

First of all, let's take the people who agreed to pay 15 percent more rent in return for a long-term lease. They did it only because they expected controls to expire at the end of February. They felt they were following the advice of Congress.

Should Congress simply extend the present law they are going to feel that they were suckers. That is something that irritates almost anybody. They are not going to feel kindly toward the men who are responsible for the situation.

Jacking the others up an additional 15 percent won't help the legislators in the slightest. It will not soothe the feelings of those who signed the long-term lease. It will arouse the ire of those who held out against an increase.

One solution might be to wipe out the 15 percent and send everybody back to the level at which the whole thing started. This, however, would only anger the Nation's landlords, who have already proved themselves a potent force.

The basic difficulty is that any general increase granted now will fall unevenly on the shoulders of the Nation's renters. It will hit those who made the voluntary-lease agreement harder than it hits those who didn't.

No matter how you look at it, it's a tough decision to make, especially in an election year. Hindsight, of course, is always better than foresight, but many a legislator wishes now he had taken a different course when the bill was up last year.

The present situation could have been avoided either by a general rent increase or no increase at all. The important thing was to keep the whole population on an even keel. The mistake was to permit some boosts but not others.

Some of the best brains of the Republican Party are pondering over this dilemma now. Nobody can forecast their answer at the moment. But it had better be good. Rentals and the housing shortage are key 1948 election issues.

The Late Rear Adm. Ingram C. Sowell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WIRT COURTNEY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution passed by the L. O. Crane Post, No. 63, American Legion, Lawrenceburg, Tenn., upon the death of Rear Adm. Ingram C. Sowell, a citizen of Lawrence County and a life member of that post:

Whereas Rear Adm. Ingram C. Sowell was an honored and beloved citizen of Lawrence County; and

Whereas he rendered valorous and distinguished service to his country during two world wars; and

Whereas he demonstrated his love for his home community and this post by the gift of a plot of ground from his hallowed home place for Legion and civic purposes; and

Whereas he was awarded a life membership in this Legion post; and

Whereas on December 21, 1947, Comrade Sowell passed from this life to his eternal rest and reward: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the L. O. Crane Post, No. 63, American Legion, in regular session at Lawrenceburg, Tenn., does hereby express its great grief for his incalculable loss to our country and to this post, and stand in reverent silence as our charter is draped for this departed comrade; and extend its deep sympathy and sincere solace to his bereaved family; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be made a part of the minutes of this meeting, copies to the press services, a copy sent to our Congressman for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the original of this resolution be transmitted to the surviving companion of Comrade Sowell.

ROBERT L. LUMPKINS,
Post Commander.
HORACE W. BLAIR,
Post Adjutant.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release issued today by the Power Authority of the State of New York, relating to the development of the St. Lawrence River system.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Development of the St. Lawrence system as one of the major natural resources of North America, with early construction of the Barnhart Island powerhouse and Long Sault Dam on the New York-Ontario frontier, is recommended by the Power Authority of the State of New York in its annual

report for 1947, submitted today to the Governor and the Legislature.

The project approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations and favorably reported to the Senate, Eightieth Congress, January 7, for debate this month, should be judged squarely on the basis of public need, the Power Authority states.

Completed engineering plans, public hearings held by committees of the Eightieth Congress, and growth of power demand in New York and neighboring States to record peaks in 1947 are reviewed in the report.

"At the beginning of 1948," the report said, "the immense value to New York State and the Nation of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system has been brought into bold relief by—

"Power shortages in the project area itself, including parts of New York State and the Province of Ontario.

"Rising costs for fuel and transportation.

"Expanding demands for more production to help meet domestic and overseas requirements for food and manufactures.

"Renewed emphasis on the importance of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence resources to the security of the Western Hemisphere."

Joining in signing the report were the five trustees of the power authority, Gen. Francis B. Wilby, Geneva, chairman; Fred J. Freestone, Syracuse, and Interlaken, vice chairman; George Stephens Reed, Lowville; Gerald V. Cruise, New York City; and Samuel J. Joseph, New York City, who retired late in 1947 to become county judge of Bronx County; and Ralph G. Sucher, executive secretary and counsel. Trustee Jacob Grumet, New York City, was appointed by Governor Dewey January 16 to succeed Judge Joseph.

The report contains testimony and recommendations by Secretary of State Marshall, former President Hoover, Secretaries of the Army, Commerce, and Interior, Lieutenant General Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Permanent Joint Board on Defense, and others on record for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence development.

The pending United States-Canadian agreement of 1941 to complete the project and Senate Joint Resolution 111, favorably reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, provide, the report states, for—

"Development of 2,200,000 horsepower at a single site in a major hydroelectric power project on the New York-Ontario frontier, half of which will be located in New York State, producing in the New York power plant 6,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours of low-cost hydroelectric energy a year.

"Improvement of relatively short sections of the existing Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway to provide 30 feet depth over lock sills and a continuous channel of a minimum navigable depth of 27 feet, a minimum depth already in use over 90 percent of the length of the system."

The report throughout stresses the need for hydroelectric energy to meet a part of the record growth in demand in New York and neighboring States as well as in the Province of Ontario. Shortages which occurred in 1947 and caused curtailment of industrial power use are detailed in the report. Statistical tables and charts prepared by the power authority supplemented by data drawn from published reports of the Public Service Commission, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, and other agencies are printed in sections II, III, and V.

A complete physical description of the project presented by the power authority at public hearings of the Committee on Public Works, United States House of Representatives, July 16, 1947, appears in appendix 14. Detailed estimates of cost based on 1947 prices, presented by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, at public hearings of the subcommittee, Committee on Foreign Relations, June 13, 1947, appear in appendix 8.

The report is illustrated by charts showing relative growth of power requirements, supply, and use in New York State and the United States; maps of the St. Lawrence River system; and photographs of the Long Sault Rapids, project sites on the New York-Ontario frontier, and other major works comparable to the proposed St. Lawrence development.

A drawing of the works in the International Rapids section, as they will appear when built, based on engineering plans completed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, was prepared for the authority by Alexander Leydenfrost with technical advice from Ivan Sattem, engineer, and is published in the report.

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT

Following are excerpts directly quoted from the report issued today:

Conclusions and recommendations

"The policy declared in section 1 (of the Power Authority Act) is implemented in section 5 of the act which authorizes and directs the power authority, in cooperation with United States nd Canadian authorities, to plan, construct and operate the St. Lawrence power development in New York State to the end that the project shall 'be adaptable to,' and 'consistent with and in aid of the plans of the United States for the improvement of commerce and navigation along the St. Lawrence River.'

"Section 5 of the Power Authority Act further provides that 'the said project shall be in all respects for the aid, improvement, and benefit of commerce and navigation in, through, along, and past the St. Lawrence River and the International Rapids section thereof, and that in the development of hydroelectric power therefrom the said project shall be considered primarily as for the benefit of the people of the State as a whole' and shall be utilized to 'permit domestic and rural use at the lowest possible rates and in such manner as to encourage increased domestic and rural use of electricity.'

"Pursuant to the declared policy of its act, the Power Authority has successfully upheld the rights of the people of the State of New York in the St. Lawrence power development and has obtained recognition of these rights under the terms of the joint resolution now before Congress."

Need for hydro development in New York State

"The people of the State of New York possess one of the greatest natural resources of hydroelectric power in the world in boundary waters shared with the Province of Ontario, which carry the outflow of the Great Lakes eastward to the sea.

"In the development of power from these boundary waters, the United States-Canadian Agreement of 1941 and the joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 111-House Joint Resolution 192, now pending before the Eightieth Congress give priority to the construction of works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

"In many previous reports, the Power Authority has recommended public development of (1) the 1,100,000 horsepower potentially available to the State from the St. Lawrence River and (2) the additional power, estimated in these reports at more than 780,000 horsepower, which could be made available to the State by redevelopment of Niagara at full head. In renewing these recommendations, and at public hearings on the pending agreement and joint resolution in 1946 and 1947, the Power Authority has directed attention to the growing need for development of New York's major resources of water power on a parity with low-cost hydroelectric projects in other areas."

Rising consumption of coal and oil in fuel-power plants

"The relative decline in hydroelectric-power capacity in New York State, as compared with steam capacity, and as contrasted with hydroelectric expansion in other areas, has inevitably been attended by (1) rising consumption of coal and oil in fuel-power plants of the State; (2) higher costs to customers for electric service than prevail in areas with developed hydro; and (3) a lower rate of usage of electricity and electrical appliances than prevails in such areas.

"As indicated in table V and chart 6, consumption of coal and oil for production of electric energy in power plants in New York State has increased enormously from World War I through the years following World War II. Consumption of bituminous coal reached its peak in 1943, at the time of greatest need of fuel for domestic supply and war production, with a total of 10,316,253 tons. Consumption of oil reached a total of 1,505,707 barrels in 1941, during the national defense emergency, and after declining during the war, rose to a new all-time high of 2,206,127 barrels in 1946. The consumption of these exhaustible fuels has proceeded in 1947 at a rate far in excess of that of any year prior to the war. Chart 7 shows fuel consumption in power plants for the United States as a whole."

Plan for hydro development presented in previous reports

The report for 1947 refers to previous reports of the Power Authority recommending coordinated development of St. Lawrence and Niagara power, and quotes from the Eighth Annual Report of the Authority its conclusion that "a very material reduction in the present cost of power could be achieved with full protection for all present and future private investment in the power industry serving New York State."

"The plan assumes that distribution of power will remain as today, largely in the hands of the private power systems, provided they cooperate in the public purpose of attempting to sell electricity in abundance at the lowest possible rates. It develops an objective rate schedule which offers the incentive of increasing profits as residential use approaches the goal of complete electrification."

The report for 1947 continues:

"Passage of the joint resolution favorably reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Eightieth Congress, will provide the necessary enabling legislation for development of New York State's major resource of hydroelectric power in the boundary waters of the St. Lawrence River. It will also set up procedures for later development of the additional power latent in the boundary waters of the Niagara. The need for initiating this program by early construction of the St. Lawrence project, as provided in the pending United States-Canadian agreement and joint resolution, has been confirmed by events of 1947, detailed in the present report."

New York State power requirements and supply

"During 1947 the rate of production and consumption of electric energy rose in the fall of the year to new all-time high records in New York State and the Nation, exceeding wartime peaks.

"Electric-power requirements in New York State expanded to a point at which voluntary curtailment of use of power by industry was asked in up-State areas in October 1947. While the curtailment was temporary and was attributed by utility companies, in part, to drought conditions, it reflected also continued growth in the demand for electric energy from the more than 4,000,000 residential, rural, commercial, and industrial customers in New York State."

Power shortages in Canada related to New York State power supply

"The large imports of hydroelectric energy from Canada during and since the war must be taken into account in connection with electric power requirements and supply in New York State.

"Over the last 4 years, 1943 to 1946, inclusive, New York State has imported an average of nearly 2,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric energy a year from the Dominion of Canada to meet requirements in this State. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, which will share with New York State in the development of power from the St. Lawrence River, has been a principal supplier of this imported energy.

"Expanding requirements in the Province of Ontario must be considered in appraising the need for increased sources of supply within New York State. In its last annual report for 1946, the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario described the causes of the power shortage which has developed in that Province as follows:

"'In southern Ontario the Commission, although able to meet all its commitments in respect to delivery of power under its firm power contracts, was not able to meet all the power demands of large industrial users who purchase power on an interruptible basis. Substantial reductions in delivery of both power and energy to this class of customer were necessary during the late fall and winter months of 1946-47; to these customers the power shortage was very real and serious.'"

St. Lawrence power required to provide for growing needs and future expansion

"In recommending prompt development of the St. Lawrence River in annual reports and at congressional hearings preceding United States entrance into World War II, the power authority presented estimates indicating substantial growth in the power requirements of the State by 1950, to a point approximated during the war and in 1947. Had the St. Lawrence development been initiated in 1941, its production of hydroelectric energy would have been available to help meet the growth in requirements and would have served to overcome the lack of reserve capacity which became acute in 1947.

"Neither the St. Lawrence project nor the development of additional power on the Niagara can now be expected to relieve existing shortages or to supply needed reserves in up-State areas in 1948, 1949, and the next succeeding years. Construction of the St. Lawrence project, however, would make available to New York State the largest block of low-cost hydroelectric energy which can be readily provided to meet the growing requirements of the State and provide for future expansion. On the basis of the data contained in the present report, the power authority therefore urges authorization and construction of the St. Lawrence project under the measures pending before the Eightieth Congress as the most direct, efficient, and economical means of serving this need."

Use of the project to conserve iron ore and other critical materials

"The Senate subcommittee also received testimony on the value of the St. Lawrence project, in both its power and navigation phases, as a means of augmenting and conserving supplies of critical materials essential in time of war.

"Extensive evidence was taken and the testimony of many witnesses was heard on the depletion of high-grade iron ore deposits in the United States, the discovery of new high-grade iron ore deposits in Quebec-Labrador, and the need for completion of the St. Lawrence waterway to provide a means of transporting ore to the major plants of the steel industry in their present locations in the littoral of the Great Lakes."

New York State's rights in the St. Lawrence power development upheld by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

(In section V of the power authority's report for 1947 appears a section of the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, approved December 18, 1947, and submitted to the Senate January 7, 1948. This section, not previously published in the press, appears below.)

"Extensive testimony was received during the hearings on the need for 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectric energy, as well as for the improved navigation facilities, which will be created by the dual-purpose plan for development of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

"The use of electric energy by industry, agriculture, and residential customers in the project area rose to new all-time high records in 1947. Actual power shortages developed in New York State and the Province of Ontario which fully confirm testimony taken at the hearings. Continued delay of the St. Lawrence project and resulting lack of adequate reserves of power in these important areas would obviously weaken the security of the United States and Canada.

"Previous reports made by the Committee on Foreign Relations on the self-liquidating power project are set forth in the summary appearing on pages 50 and 51 of the hearings. The committee concurs in the recommendations contained therein." (From the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Jan. 7, 1948.)

The recommendations reaffirmed by the committee in the report dated January 7, 1948, appear on pages 121-123 of the power authority's report for 1947.

Tax on Vegetable Oils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from the director of the Arkansas Resources and Development Commission, replying to a letter which was written to Representative CHARLES R. ROBERTSON, of North Dakota, by Mr. John Burnham, executive secretary of the North Dakota Dairy Industries Association, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, January 14.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARKANSAS RESOURCES AND
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1948.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I have just read the letter from Mr. John Burnham, executive secretary of the North Dakota Dairy Industries Association, which was written to Congressman CHARLES R. ROBERTSON, of North Dakota, and which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, January 14. In this letter, Mr. Burnham attempts to defend the position of the dairy industry in favoring continued tax on vegetable oils, prepared for table use, and to take you to task for introducing a resolution for removing this tax from margarine.

Mr. Burnham's argument against repeal of the margarine tax grows weak in his disregard for the only two legitimate uses of a tax within this country, which are (a) for revenue and (b) to pay for services in maintaining sanitary inspection and to secure disease and insect control. The present margarine tax does not appear to be imposed for the two principal reasons of taxation. In his zeal to main the present taxes against margarine and in favor of butter, Mr. Burnham chooses to continue the violation of the Constitution of the United States which prohibits tariffs between States. A tariff barrier between States is about all that can be claimed for the present tax against margarine.

The North Dakota Dairy Industries Association assumes that by your resolution to eliminate the Federal margarine tax, you are acting in a selfish manner and discriminating against the dairy States. He is undoubtedly presuming that your State of Arkansas does not have any dairy interests. To prove his point some dairy statistics of North Dakota are given in his letter to Congressman ROBERTSON.

For the purpose of making a simple comparison between Arkansas and North Dakota in the dairy business, here is a table showing some comparative figures taken from the census report. The figures used in Mr. Burnham's letter are supplemented in this table by similar figures from Arkansas. They are as follows:

North Dakota:	
Total number milk cows in State	457,000
Total number farms in State	59,650
Farms reporting dairy cows	58,853
Annual production, milk, in pounds	1,900,000,000
Annual production, butterfat, in pounds	49,000,000
Arkansas (1945):	
Total number milk cows in State	480,000
Total number farms in State	198,769
Farms reporting dairy cows	152,082
Annual production, milk, in pounds	1,478,400,000
Annual production, butterfat, in pounds	63,280,000

According to these figures, North Dakota produces about 49,000,000 pounds of butterfat per year and Arkansas about 63,000,000 pounds of butterfat per year. The actual pounds of butter that North Dakota may make and sell is not readily available to me at this time, but the records show that in 1945, Arkansas sold into the market about 1,300,000 pounds of butter. North Dakota probably sold a great deal more butter. The butterfat in Arkansas was consumed or sold in connection with whole milk and other dairy products and not butter. It is safe to assume that a fairly large proportion of the butterfat produced and sold in Arkansas, regardless of the form in which it was finally consumed, is in competition to margarine. Nevertheless, I know that the people of Arkansas, who are in the dairy business just as much as the people of North Dakota, are overwhelmingly in favor of your resolution to eliminate the Federal tax on margarine. I hope you will continue your efforts to get this resolution passed and signed into law.

Very sincerely yours,

H. K. THATCHER, *Director.*

Accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] made an enlightening address on the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress before a meeting of the Republican National Committee at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington on January 20.

In his address, the Senator discussed issues confronting our country and the Congress. Therefore, I believe his colleagues in the Congress and others throughout our country will be interested in reading what he said. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman Reece, members of the Republican National Committee, and guests. It is indeed an honor to be invited to address the Republican National Committee men and women again. I shall never forget the happy friendships and relationships I made as western director for the States west of the Mississippi River under the leadership of JOE MARTIN. It was then that I met many of you, and I have cherished these friendships down through the years.

Your coming to Washington is timely. You are here for the kick-off of the new session of the Republican Congress.

In this new session we will carry forward our constructive legislative program that was so well advanced in 1947—a program that has kept faith with the mandate from the people in the 1946 elections.

The passage over the President's veto of the Labor-Management Relations Act, a cut in governmental expenditures, and a balanced budget for the first time in 15 years, they are some of the accomplishments of the first session of the Eightieth Congress.

It was through the efforts of the Republican National Committee, State and local organizations, and the leadership of Republican Members of Congress and candidates on the firing line, that the Republican Congress, governors, and countless State and local officers were elected in the 1946 landslide.

Next June, in Philadelphia, our party's delegates will meet in a free and open convention. They will nominate the next President of the United States.

No clique of alien-minded radicals has captured control of the Republican Party. Ours is a united party with an alert, able, and progressive leadership and a sound, forward-looking program.

The American people know that the Republican Party is the only safe and truly liberal medium through which their will for sound, sensible government can be achieved.

This is not a wild guess nor an excessive statement.

During the past months I have traveled much across the country. I have made speeches and I have talked to many persons. The signs are plain. The ground swell for the Republican Party and good government is unmistakable.

But right here let me utter these words of caution. Do not be overconfident. Overconfidence has lost many worth-while contests.

There are those within our party who feel that because the Democratic Party is divided, all we need to do is stand by, play for the breaks, and let the opposition defeat itself.

But even though the Democratic Party breaks apart at the seams, we—all of us—have to keep battling for Republican victory and good government.

The radical masters of the Democratic Party are past masters in planning confusion and chaos.

They want to divide our united party.

They are fighting all our conservative measures in Congress to cut the frightening high cost of government.

They are fighting our efforts to reduce the intolerable and indefensible wartime tax burden.

They are fighting all our efforts to buttress and hold fast to our American way of life.

What the present administration apparently wants is confusion, emergencies, and crises—to tax and tax, and spend and spend.

A return to sound, constitutional government will end their hope of gaining control over the lives of everybody through orders, directives, and a police state.

We hold that the principles proclaimed by the founding fathers, and so ably enunciated by Abraham Lincoln—the first Republican President of the United States—are as true today as when they uttered them.

Lincoln championed true liberalism. He fought for the greatest good for the greatest number. He stood firm for all the unalienable rights that are guaranteed by our Federal Constitution.

What would Lincoln do if he were President today?

We know by his precepts and examples. Lincoln never faltered in his faith. He believed the individual is the primary unit of liberty. If Lincoln were President how well we all know he would strive to bind the wounds of war in the spirit of Christian brotherliness. He would tell us, as all history shows, that people cannot be bribed into friendships, but must be won by example, precept, and reason.

Lincoln's way was honesty, simplicity, and understanding, and to stand on principles without giving offense.

Two of his statements are especially pertinent in these times. Lincoln said:

"The prudent, penniless beggar in the world labors for wages awhile, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account another while, and at length hires another beginner to help him."

That's freedom of enterprise, and the Republican Party is pledged to preserve that freedom.

And what would be Lincoln's attitude toward present-day Red-Fascist attacks upon competitive enterprise and the property system? I recall for you these words by the Great Emancipator:

"Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

This is the right to own property—to own a home. Such rights are basic in a free enterprise system.

That is why those of us who believe in these fundamental principles in our American life view with alarm President Truman's almost daily appeals to the Congress for power and more power; power to regiment our people; power to combat communism abroad with totalitarian methods at home; and the kind of power that creates a police state.

Now, let's break this down to specific issues.

What about communism? The Republican Party has been fighting communism at home and abroad a long time. It is the Republican Party that is fighting to keep from the backs of the voters of this country the regimentation upon which communism thrives.

We don't like Communists here and we don't like Communists' aggression abroad.

It is the Republican leadership that has in most instances provided the policy that has been successful abroad in keeping the iron curtain from entirely encircling Europe.

It is the Republican leadership that caused a reversal of Russian appeasement and the scrapping of the stupid Morgenthau plan, that has held back recovery in Europe. Every competent observer knows that the recovery of all Europe depends on a recovery of the German people as well.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

On the domestic front, let's take a look at the Taft-Hartley Act. President Truman's indefensible veto of that act was a purely political gesture to radicals and a small, powerful group of labor barons.

Workers now know from its operations that it protects their rights, including the right to organize; the right to bargain collectively; the right to control their unions; the right to an accounting of their union funds; and the right to strike.

Why, the Taft-Hartley Act emancipates the workers. It is doing exactly what it was intended to do: Provide sensible machinery for the settlement of labor-management disputes, so that we can have more constant production of the goods so urgently needed by the people.

President Truman vetoed the Taft-Hartley Act. In his recent message to the Congress on the state of the Union, he stated:

"I made my attitude clear on this act in my veto message to the Congress last June. Nothing has occurred since to change my opinion of this law."

I now challenge the President to tell the country if he is going to ask the forthcoming Democratic National Convention to favor the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Will the President repudiate the overwhelming majority of Democrats in Congress who voted to override this veto?

LIVING COSTS

Another important issue of this campaign will be living costs. President Truman has lost faith in the American people. His is a defeatist attitude. His only remedies offered are controls, controls, and controls. He has lost faith in the free-enterprise system and the ability of the American people to produce and distribute their products.

Controls won't drive prices down. Controls stifle production. Controls foster black markets, confusion, and chaos. These are the results of a regimented state. But let me frankly tell you after 5 years as Chairman of the Small Business Committee of the Senate where we handle thousands of claims of the small businessmen of this country, Washington cannot blueprint the economy of 140,000,000 people.

But there are constructive measures that must be taken with courage to halt inflation and bring the cost of living within the reach of all of our American people.

Governmental expenditures must be cut and they will be cut during the present session of this Congress.

The cost of government in the United States is more than the food bill, and you cannot cut Government expenditures and at the same time appropriate nearly $3,000,000,000 more money than was appropriated last year.

The primary causes of high prices are 15 years of deficit spending, reckless dilution of the currency, and an unequal and unwon battle to bring production abreast of consumer demand. This production lag is due in part to past industrial strife and is vitally affected by huge shipments abroad of the food and materials so scarce for our domestic use.

Although we face the choice of dealing with these problems or risking economic catastrophe, the Democratic administration has shown no disposition to meet and solve any one of them.

The $40,000,000,000 budget that the President asked for the fiscal year of 1949 is the highest peacetime budget in our country's history. It is more than twice all the corporation profits in 1947, and is more than four times the 1939 prewar budget of $9,000,000,000.

Let me restate to you, this Congress is going to cut that budget. Tax reduction and payment on the debt depend upon the budget and we are going to cut that budget to lighten the outrageously high tax burden of the American people.

Twice the President vetoed tax-reducing bills last year, but my friends this is an election year and he now admits that there is need for personal income tax relief, though he presents a tax plan that is as phony as a $40 bill.

With one hand he would give the people tax relief and with the other he would take it away from them in higher prices, because we all know that taxes enter into the cost of everything we buy.

He would increase the consumers' cost by boosting taxes on business. The bill that will be passed by the Congress will reduce the burden for everybody and it will mean more take-home pay and more incentive capital for business, more production, and more jobs.

Finally, on the domestic front, our people should know more about how foreign commitments affect our own domestic economy. Our experts and imports should be reviewed and only those quotas that our economy can stand without further inflationary effects should be fixed, so that the dollar may become stabilized and so that no further inroads will be made on our economy by the inflationary spiral brought about by the gulf between exports and imports.

The net excess of exports over imports last year was $11,000,000,000. If we go through another year on that basis our living costs will be higher and higher and the inflationary spiral will surely climb. It should be remembered that this Administration under the Second War Powers Act has had absolute authority over exports and imports all through this period. They are the ones responsible for this net of exports. Upon them is the responsibility of placing a ceiling on those exports, for we cannot wait until bankruptcy is threatened.

We must call a halt because only a sound, solvent America can lead and help the nations of the world. We want to help and do all we can to help other people help themselves.

If we are to avert the national calamity of a runaway inflation, we must treat the causes rather than the symptoms.

These dangerous conditions cannot be cured by quack remedies, emotional outbursts, catchy slogans, or propaganda designed to divide the American people and set them at each others throats.

We cannot save Europe by going down with Europe to depletion, confusion, and want, any more than one man can save another who is drowning by going down himself.

The misery, the want, and the chaos in Europe today, are the direct result of totalitarian regimentation and ruthless police state methods. These methods have failed even in Russia. They have just made a capital levy of 90 percent on their people.

Contrast this with the production America has attained under the competitive enterprise system and the standards of living of the American people.

THE MARSHALL PLAN

This brings us head-on with the so-called European recovery program, which, of course, is an issue that is to be thoroughly discussed and debated in this session of the Congress.

In the campaign I hope to see the entire foreign policy of the United States reviewed. Our people have a right to know all the facts. They should know what commitments have been made politically and economically. It should be made plain to the individual voter that foreign commitments, no matter how alluring they may be, affect them in their business and home life.

I am quite sure, whatever European recovery plan is finally passed, that it will require that the administration of a great portion of it be in the hands of competent business executives who will get 100-percent results out of the taxpayers' dollars.

Certainly if we are to loan or give money and goods to Europe the time has come when conditions should be prescribed that the European countries produce; that they show satisfactory progress reports.

After all, the purpose of those plans is to aid the recovery of European people. If we require the governments to produce results the individual people will benefit.

And then there is the question of the amount and whether the money should be given or loaned or both.

Those who are responsible for this legislation on the floors of the House and Senate must tell the American people frankly what every venture or commitment in foreign affairs means to them—why the impact—why the price increase—and then, if the American people want to tighten their belts in carrying on such a program it is for the American people through their representatives to decide.

Now, I want to talk about party organization. It is one thing to talk the issues, but it is another thing to go into the homes of America and discuss these issues with the voters who go to the ballot box to decide them.

Our publicity then will depend primarily upon the party organization which, of course, runs from the national committee to the precinct worker. It is our job to take the candidates and the issues to the people. That is the purpose of political parties.

Candidates should welcome an opportunity to discuss the issues. The party workers and the voters have a right to see the candidate, to hear the issues discussed, to know the ideology of those for whom they are working, the same as the salesman ought to know his merchandise.

It is the responsibility of candidates who are nominated to be aggressive and to welcome the opportunity of leading in the discussion of these issues in any forum or on any platform throughout our different States.

Furthermore, there must be an expansion and strengthening of all our divisions at the national committee's headquarters.

The Women's division, under Assistant Chairman Jane H. Macauley, is doing a grand job. Our Republican Party is especially strong among women voters.

Don't forget that the hand that rocks the cradle also does most of the buying for the homes, and the women are alert to what is going on.

The Young Republicans' Federation is growing by leaps and bounds. In the schools and colleges, where the radical New Dealers and the communistic fellow travelers are so busy, much organization work needs to be done.

Among the so-called minority groups a lot of information must be spread—knowledge that the Republican Party is the champion of the rights of all patriotic minorities, knowledge that the Republican Party had its birth in seeing that the rights of minorities shall be protected, and knowledge that it was not the Republican Party that sold small countries of Europe down the river to Soviet Russia.

I remind you that if we had gotten 470,000 more ballots in 10 States in the 1944 Presidential election, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey would be in the White House today.

Of course, we look for a landslide Republican victory come next November. But let's not take anything for granted. Let's work on the basis that victory may be decided by a difference of only 1 percent of the votes—10,000 in a few States or 100 in a county.

To get that job done we need organization and we have a lot to do. We must have teamwork all along the line—national committee, State committees, and local committees, and tieing into the Republican leadership in the Congress.

Chairman Reece and his staff at national headquarters have been doing a good job. Mr. Reece agrees, as do all of us, that between national conventions the policies of our party are made by the record of our Members in the Congress.

In Congress today is where the issues are being fought out and the record made. Mr. Reece has inaugurated a plan for close liaison between the Republicans in Congress and the national committee headquarters.

Men have been assigned by the committee to the Senate and House Republicans, to assist them in party matters, to keep committee headquarters constantly informed on plans and accomplishments in the Congress, and to transmit to the Republicans in Congress any suggestions or information that committee headquarters desires to give.

As I see it, the Republicans in Congress make the record and the Republican National Committee sees that the party's record is energetically disseminated among the people through an efficient publicity division and divisions covering all other phases of the campaign.

We have talked about the political and economic issues confronting the American people. We have discussed the need of party organization in order that the issues may be fairly brought to and understood by the people throughout the country.

But there is one final point I wish to make. We have need in our country today—an aching, yearning need—for a spiritual and moral revival among our people. The Republican Party is prepared to provide the leadership in such a revival, based on the eternal truths and the principles of freedom embodied in our American Constitution.

The eyes of the world—the hopes of all the world's people—are pinned at this critical moment upon America. The survival of world civilization depends largely upon our ability to keep America strong.

Let me say here and now: America is going forward; America is going Republican.

Republican National Committee Dinner Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] on January 19,

1948, at the Republican National Committee dinner at the Mayflower Hotel, in this city.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the national committee, and guests, 1948 is an important year both for our Nation and our party. If we face up to the challenges of the day it is my firm belief that the ticket we nominate at Philadelphia in June will be elected in November.

I am not one of those who believe that all the virtues are to be found in our party or all the faults in the opposition. If we will only take a realistic look at conditions at home and abroad, we must acknowledge that there are a number of problems that must have American rather than partisan solutions.

Our Nation can survive without our party but our party cannot survive if the republic is destroyed from within or without.

The United States has grown from a colony of 3,000,000 people to a Nation of 140,000,000 in the short space of 172 years. During this time our two party system has played its part in the development of our national well-being and the carrying out of national policies.

This, in spite of the fact that at no place in the Constitution or in the Declaration of Independence does one find any mention of political parties. Yet the very necessities of the situation and the actual functioning of Government developed the need for our two party system.

Political parties come and go but our Constitutional government continues. The Federalist and Whig parties played their part and passed from the political scene. But their demise did not leave for long a void. Other more vigorous groups took their places. Political parties must justify their existence or make way for others that will.

Certainly we cannot command the respect or support of the voters by making our party merely the vehicle for replacing Democratic officeholders with Republicans. We dare not, in the critical years ahead, consider political activity as an end in itself.

Rather it must be as a means to serve the Nation. We must keep our eyes on the future, not on the past. The great questions to which Americans want answers relate to 1948 and the years ahead and not to 1947 and the years behind.

The national interest must in all cases override any partisan advantage. It was in this spirit that the framers of the Constitution drafted that document.

It was not we the Federalists or the Republicans, it was not we the employees or the employers, it was not we the merchants or the farmers, it was not we the landlords or the tenants, but it was, "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Both in the field of foreign affairs and domestic economics the people must be told the facts in clear, concise, and accurate terms. It is no time for sugar-coated generalities or for pleasant platitudes. When sickness strikes our loved ones we want the most competent medical advice possible. Breaking the thermometer so we won't have knowledge of the fever curve is no cure for a high temperature.

From time to time we hear criticism because an individual has made a speech which is interpreted as being the position of our party. We know, however, that the only organization that can speak for the Republican Party of the Nation is the national convention that will be held in June of this year when it adopts the party platform. In the meantime I certainly believe that the expression of varied points of view serves a useful purpose. Republican Members of Congress, governors, and leaders who hold no public offices in fact have an obligation to make a contribution toward the constructive solution of current problems. If they remain mute because they fear criticism, I do not believe they would be discharging their obligations.

On all the great questions of the day there are bound to be honest differences of opinion among the members of both parties. Unless there is to be an irreconcilable split, somewhere along the way a common meeting ground must be found. As a general rule, but not always, the Republican Party seems better able to compose its differences than is our opposition.

The American system of profitable business and well-paid labor go hand in hand. Destroy one and you destroy both. We can, I firmly believe, do more under our American system for our people than the new socialism of Britain or the communism of Russia can do for their respective peoples. We don't need their methods but we can use some of their crusading zeal.

In American industry it is highly desirable that employees who are helping to build such industries or businesses have ever-increasing opportunities to improve their economic position through their contributions to increased productivity. In maintaining the profit system it is vital that an ever-increasing number of our people have a personal interest in its continued existence.

Labor or management must not be shackled. Business must be able to operate with profit and efficiency. There is no constructive future for workers or investors in closed factories or bankrupt firms.

The world needs peace in the international field and America needs domestic tranquillity if full production is to continue to raise our standards of living and permit us to help other nations to help themselves.

That we have a serious economic inflationary situation confronting the Nation is clear. Our responsibility as Republicans is to be sure that the cure is not worse than the disease. What are some of these contributary factors to the present inflationary spiral?

We have a public debt amounting to $256,899,844,854 (as of December 31, 1947) which compares with a pre-World War I debt—(as of March 31, 1917), of $1,282,044,346. The high point of World War I debt was $26,596,701,648 (as of August 31, 1919) and the post-World War I low point amounted to $16,026,087,087 (as of December 31, 1930). Our pre-Pearl Harbor debt was $61,363,867,932 (as of November 30, 1941).

Certainly this huge public debt unparalleled in the history of the world is a contributing factor to the inflationary dangers confronting us. Until substantially reduced it will be a constant threat to the solvency of the Federal Government. It seems to me that a consistent program of debt reduction over the years should have the unqualified support of the Republican Party. Not less than $2,500,000,000 should be provided for debt reduction in each fiscal year.

Another contributing factor to inflation is the total dollar supply (currency, commercial, and savings bank accounts). In 1929, which was considered a boom year, it amounted to slightly over $54,000,000,000. In 1947, it amounted to more than $163,000,000,000. While it is true that production and services have also increased during that period of time the increase is less than 75 percent. No one can deny that Government spending has contributed to the increase of the money supply. This pressure against limited supplies of goods can have but one result.

The cost of the Federal Government has increased by leaps and bounds. In 1913 it amounted to $692,000,000, and by 1932 the cost had increased to $4,502,000,000. In 1941 it amounted to $18,988,000,000. The President of the United States a week ago today presented his budget calling for expenditures of approximately $40,000,000,000.

Interest on the public debt alone will amount to over $5,000,000,000, which is greater than the total peacetime expenditures of any year prior to 1933.

The debt in 1947 was 180 percent of the national income. Three years ago, for the first time in our history, our debt exceeded our national income.

There is certainly room for a skilled congressional operation on the budget presented by the President. The job should be done with a surgeon's skill and not with a meat ax.

Frankly, I do not agree with the views of some of our opponents who follow the tortured reasoning that money spent by the Federal Government is not inflationary while that spent by individual American citizens is in that category.

Despite the need for European recovery funds and adequate national-defense appropriations, together with a debt-reduction program, it is still possible to have a moderate tax-reduction bill this year. After the Republican administration takes office in January of 1949 and the full cooperation of the executive departments of the Government is secured in cutting out the fat from the Federal budget, there will be excellent prospects for additional tax-relief legislation next year.

I was greatly disappointed in listening to the President's message to Congress to find in his State of the Union message, wherein he recommended the reestablishment of a controlled economy for our Nation, that he did not outline a program for reducing Federal expenditures below their 1947 high level. The Government should contribute to the common effort of overcoming inflationary pressures.

A major contribution that can be made to meeting the inflationary problem is to increase and assure the continued productivity of this Nation. In traveling through Europe last year I had the opportunity of getting behind the "iron curtain." Neither in Poland nor in any other country outside of the "iron curtain" did I see anything that encouraged me to believe that controls during peacetime would increase our productivity. To the contrary I came back with the strong belief that such peacetime controls would stifle it.

You cannot, in my judgment, go part way down the road to a controlled economy with regard to manufactured goods or agricultural products. If you control prices you must be prepared to control wages, profits, the allocation of raw materials, and ultimately (as in Britain) the allocation of labor. If we permit this Nation to undergo that type of a rigid control in peacetime, I have grave doubts whether we can come out from under them in the foreseeable future. Speaking as one Member of the Senate I shall oppose their reimposition.

One of the great troubles with this administration is that associated with it are those who have worked with controls so long they have apparently lost confidence in the free enterprise system. While they give it lip service they have no confidence in its ability to do the job.

Businessmen throughout the Nation instinctively know this. They also know that today the power of Government is vast and its actions have a far reaching effect upon economic affairs, not only of this nation but of the world. As a result, under present conditions, many do not believe they can plan with any degree of accuracy or feel confident in making long term investments for the expansion of productive enterprise.

We must face up to the question as to whether or not we believe it is in the best interest of world peace and our own national security to have a rehabilitated western Europe. I have no doubt in my own mind

that this is not only desirable but is essential. An essential corollary is that we must provide this Nation with an adequate national defense on the sea, on land, and in the air and I lay special emphasis upon our air program. This will require an effective constantly modern striking air force in being and not on blueprints. No man can say with certainly how long it will be until other nations are able to manufacture the atomic bomb. Sometime in the not too distant future they will do so. Any nation which has in mind a full scale Pearl-Harbor attack upon the industrial and communications centers of America must be made to understand that no such blow will prevent this Nation from launching a swift, sure, and inevitable retaliation on a far greater scale.

This is not a happy prospect but it is a realistic one. To do less than be fully prepared in these uncertain times would be worse than folly, it would be treason.

Let us make it crystal clear that there is not an atom of satisfaction that the Politburo in Moscow can gain from the Republican victory on November 2.

The peace cannot today be saved by appeasement of international blackmailers anymore than it could be at Munich. The sacrifice of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, and Manchuria did not buy peace but rather made certain that power-hungry aggressors would be encouraged to raise the ante.

Our Nation has assumed obligations under the United Nations Charter. The Republican victory will not weaken but should strengthen the system of collective security.

I firmly believe this for two reasons. First, because a sound national economy and a solvent Federal Government is a prerequisite to a strong America and only under those conditions can we help to rehabilitate the war torn free world. Secondly, a Republican victory will mean a more consistent foreign policy.

It just does not make sense to ask the American people for billions of much needed help to save western Europe from going behind the iron curtain while we permit large shipments from our resources to the one nation that is a threat to human freedom. It certainly does not make sense to make mighty efforts to prevent 200,000,000 Europeans from being enslaved by the Communist terror while complacency is shown about communistic activity which seeks to engulf 400,000,000 of our traditional friends, the Chinese. It most emphatically does not make sense to send numerous strong notes on the Petkov case and then to have our Government give full recognition to the Soviet satellite government of Bulgaria 10 days after they have murdered the leader of the opposition.

For better or for worse we live in the age of the airplane and the atom.

As a Nation we can no more return to isolation than an adult can return to childhood. We cannot, we dare not, turn our back on the rest of the world. If we do, the light of human freedom will go out and some day, in the not too distant future, from out of the ensuing darkness would come the knife thrust or the shot to strike us down.

The Government would not be dealing with candor if it did not make clear that the policies we follow in Greece and Turkey involve risks. If Greece, Turkey, or Iran should succumb to overt outside pressure and lose their independence or have their territorial integrity violated without swift action to support them by all the law abiding nations of the world, then the whole fabric of collective security will disintegrate and the United Nations would join the League of Nations in oblivion.

I feel certain that our people have a growing realization based on the experience of two world wars that peace, in this day and age, is indivisible. The international picture is no different in one respect from that faced by a law abiding citizen. As long as gangsterism runs riot and the police force is unable to cope with crime neither he nor his family is safe. Pulling down the shades of his house and stuffing cotton into his ears so that he can neither see the murder, rape, and larceny taking place on the streets nor hear the cries of anguish of the victims is no solution to that problem either.

Lincoln, in his day, clearly understood that human freedom is also indivisible. In his second annual message to Congress he said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. * * * the fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We, even, we here have the power and bear the responsibility. * * * in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the real concerns in many States of our Nation today is the grave shortage of electric-power facilities for full production. Just today, for example, there was handed to me a copy of the 1947 annual report of the power authority of the State of New York, which describes the adverse effects of the power shortage in the Empire State in reducing production and employment. In this connection, I recently asked Chairman Olds, of the Federal Power Commission, to supply me with up-to-date data on how the St. Lawrence seaway would help answer the power shortage. Mr. Olds sent me a frank reply, and I ask unanimous consent that its text be included in the Appendix of the RECORD. This is but one more strong piece of evidence which, along with countless others, has been presented on the urgent need for the seaway and power project.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, January 16, 1948.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This is in reply to your letter of December 20, 1947, requesting information as to how St. Lawrence project power could help solve present and future power needs.

This Commission's New York regional office recently surveyed the major electric utility systems in New York and New England, including those considered to be in the market area of the St. Lawrence project. In nearly all cases representatives of the systems expressed concern that break-down of major items of equipment or adverse water run-off conditions might affect their ability to meet their expected peak loads.

The Niagara Hudson System, which operates in the greater part of up-State New York, has, on at least one occasion, found it necessary to reduce its over-all load consumption by lowering the voltage on its system as much as 5 percent. The Connecticut Valley Power Exchange has resorted to the same device to decrease its peak-load demands, by reducing voltage 3 percent when hydro storage was being used. On the system of Central Vermont Public Service Corp. it has been necessary to reduce peak loads in the St. Johnsbury division by requesting industrial power customers to turn to night operation.

In northern New York the Niagara Hudson System was forced to cut deliveries up to 15 percent for some time to industrial customers of the Buffalo-Niagara Electric Corp., New York Power & Light Co., Central New York Power Corp., and New York State Electric & Gas Co. This curtailment of electric load has probably resulted in proportional reductions in the output of products of some of the industrial establishments.

In connection with your questions as to what difference the St. Lawrence project's power output would have made in terms of production, employment, etc., if the power were now available, the assistance of the United States Employment Service was enlisted. That agency reports that the Labor Market Letter for November 1947 for the Buffalo, N. Y., district states "Shortages of electric power during the past month, which threatened to curtail production and shorten the workweek in many plants, had no serious consequences. Some factories operating two or three shifts were compelled to reduce night work for a short time, but this did not result in any lay-offs. A possible recurrence of a similar shortage plays only a minor role in management's planning for the coming months." However, the Labor-Market-News for the Caribou Employment Service office for December 1947 stated, "The power shortage, along with freight-car shortages, have resulted in some unemployment. The lack of power has served to make operating schedule adjustments necessary in potato warehouses, starch factories, and fertilizer plants, and in many instances these establishments have had to purchase auxiliary power units to meet their needs."

These quotations indicate the immediate effect of the power shortages. The long-range effects of the shortage of low-cost power in the region may be seen by such an action as the withdrawal of the Aluminum Co. from the Niagara Falls area; it is also understood that the Norton Abrasives Co. is seeking another location where less costly power would be available. These are direct indications of the potential loss of employment and of industrial output for the New York area which may assume serious proportions if construction of the St. Lawrence project should be too long deferred.

The tight power situation in the St. Lawrence market area points up the urgent need for new capacity and gives emphasis to the statements made previously that even under normal conditions of load growth the entire capacity of the United States portion of the St. Lawrence project could be absorbed in the New York and New England area within about 5 years from the time the project begins to produce power. In fact, the total amount of generating capacity that the electric utility industry in New York and New England, exclusive of Maine, has definitely planned to install in 1948, 1949, and 1950, will be greater than the entire capacity of the United States portion of the St. Lawrence project. The planned installation of new steam-electric facilities through 1950 does not mean, however, that the tight power situation will be remedied. It is possible that the power situation might stay as it is or become worse. During the peak load week of December 1947 New England's energy consumption was 9.1 percent in excess of the like week of 1946 while the Middle Atlantic area's consumption in the peak load week of December 1947 was 8.3 percent above the like week of 1946. In spite of these indicated rates of load growth, present known capacity additions in New York State and in the section of New England which is considered to be in the St. Lawrence market area, will be

at a rate of about 5 or possibly 6.5 percent in 1948, about 5 percent in 1949 and about 4 percent in 1950. It thus appears possible that generating capacity will not be installed fast enough to keep up with load growth in the period through 1950, much less supply the depleted reserve capacity. If the St. Lawrence project had been started early in 1945, it would probably have been ready to help relieve the power situation in that area by late 1948. If the project were started immediately it might be possible to get the plant in operation by 1950 or 1951. It appears from the foregoing factors that barring a major depression, the power supply situation will still be tight in the St. Lawrence power market area at that time.

About 90 to 98 percent of the generating capacity additions, now definitely planned in the St. Lawrence market area for the period 1948 to 1951, are of the fuel-burning type. The New England News Letter published by the New England Council attributes to the head of the New York Power Authority a statement to the effect that "the St. Lawrence development would annually save 5,000,000 tons of coal or 20,000,000 barrels of oil, both wasting assets and would reduce the pressure upon transportation facilities." The news letter also points out that "New England's proportionate use of fuel oil, a costly fuel, to all fuels accounted for 34 percent, whereas the Nation obtained only 16 percent of its power in this manner."

These statements point up the national defense value of the St. Lawrence project. It will be remembered that petroleum products and transportation facilities were in the strategic category during World War II. The greater the percentage of hydroelectric power that can be developed in the New York and New England areas where there is no appreciable amount of local coal, oil, or natural gas, the less their power production will be affected by peacetime or military demands upon the transportation and petroleum industries in time of war.

Sincerely yours,

LELAND OLDS,
Commissioner.

The Case Against Compulsory Arbitration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on compulsory arbitration prepared by me.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE AGAINST COMPULSORY ARBITRATION [1]

(By WAYNE L. MORSE [2])

The proposal that the Federal Government should require arbitration of labor disputes in all basic American industries means that a system of compulsory arbitration will be imposed upon labor and industry and that voluntary and free collective bargaining procedures in a substantial part, if not eventually all, of industry in the United States will be abandoned. Any program of compulsory arbitration will inevitably lead to increased governmental control and dictation of wages, prices, profits, and conditions of employment. The informed leaders of management and labor, and virtually all careful students of labor relations in the United States, agree that governmental dictation of the conditions under which labor will work and industry will employ, logically leads to economic socialism or fascism.

It may properly be asked why a system of compulsory arbitration of disputes in basic industries is undesirable, when we contemplate the many benefits that flowed from the existence of the National War Labor Board during World War II. That board settled innumerable disputes, although in the final analysis it exercised the power of compulsory arbitration. But it must be remembered that the War Labor Board was a wartime agency, created for a specific emergency period; it operated under a no-strike pledge by the major labor organizations and a no-lockout pledge on the part of American industry. The present proposition envisages, on the other hand, a system of governmental compulsion, during normal peacetime periods, when, insofar as possible, both labor and management should be free to exercise their legitimate economic weapons in the event a full utilization of the procedures of free and voluntary collective bargaining fails to resolve their differences.

Any plan whereby the Government is made available to fix the conditions under which men shall work has the tendency of retarding and impairing the procedures of voluntary collective bargaining. To the extent that compulsory governmental machinery is available, to that extent we will find voluntary procedures abandoned. This proposition is clearly demonstrated by a study of the experience of the War Labor Board. In thousands of disputes labor or management or both went through only the form of collective bargaining before invoking the machinery of the Board. As a result, the Board was engulfed with many thousands of cases which could better have been settled by the parties themselves but for the availability of the Board. Unions and management were indirectly encouraged to make extreme demands and to refuse to yield on many disputed points in the hope that the Board would give them more by way of decision than would be obtained in the give and take of voluntary bargaining. To a substantial extent labor and management lost the art of free collective bargaining during the war period.

When the War Labor Board went out of existence, representatives of labor and industry had to relearn the technique of dealing with each other, with the knowledge that they could not call on the Government to settle their differences for them. There can be no doubt that a contributing factor to the labor-management disputes in the immediate postwar period was the fact that both sides had to adjust themselves to a condition of voluntarism as opposed to compulsion.

The availability of a governmental agency to decide a dispute not only prejudices the particular case, but has important and disastrous effects upon related industries and persons in the same or other industries not involved in the immediate dispute. For example, the Little Steel Formula evolved during the early days of the War Labor Board, or the 18½-cent wage increase pattern recommended by the Government in 1945–46, established patterns for the economy as a whole, from which deviation in individual cases was virtually impossible. The net effect of these governmental decisions—whether they be labelled as recommendations, directives, or reports of fact-finding panels—was to impose a uniform pattern on all industry, totally in disregard of numerous relevant considerations in individual cases, such as competitive factors, locations, nature of product, history of wages, and employment regularity, to mention only a few.

The present proposal would limit governmental compulsion to basic industries. At first glance it would seem that no difficulty would be encountered in arriving at an agreement as to what industries are basic in the national economy. But in view of the integrated nature of our economy, it would be exceedingly difficult to differentiate the industries that are basic from those that are not. Even if a clear line of distinction could be drawn, the fact remains that governmental dictation of employment conditions in the basic industries would establish precedents that could hardly be ignored in the nonbasic industries. Thus, the result would be that for all practical purposes a system of compulsory arbitration would be imposed upon all industry. Here again the experience of the War Labor Board is illuminating. A one-time general counsel and public member of the War Labor Board has summarized that experience as follows: [3]

"The War Labor Board's wartime experience reveals the difficulty of drawing a reliable distinction between disputes that threaten the public interest and those that do not. The criterion of the Board's jurisdiction was an interference, actual or threatened, with the war effort, evidenced by certification of the Secretary of Labor. It was soon found that strikes or potential strikes could not be isolated nor confined within geographical boundaries, nor could their contagious effects on workers not immediately involved be precisely foretold. And it was not easy to explain to workers that their dispute was not serious enough to warrant Government's formal attention. The risk was that such a statement would be accepted as a challenge to aggravate the nature and threatening quality of the dispute. As a consequence, all disputes were held to be subject to the Secretary's certification because, with infrequent exceptions, each contained the seeds of widespread and contagious industrial conflict. It is doubtful that a peacetime agency could successfully resist the adoption of a similar practice."

Legislation is feasible only to the extent that it is workable. It may well be asked by what means would the Government enforce its decision if it were authorized to dictate the settlement terms of a dispute in a basic industry. Constitutional objections aside, how would the Government compel employees to work for a stipulated wage under conditions to which they objected? Again, without going into the serious constitutional problems, how could an employer be compelled to keep his plant open if he did not wish to do so? Although it is possible that the threat of jail sentences or loss of rights under the National Labor Relations Act or other remedial legislation might induce employees to work under terms and conditions distasteful to them, nevertheless, any such sanctions would do great violence to personal freedom and our system of free enterprise. If the recalcitrant party were an employer, governmental seizure and operation of his properties would be the only effective sanction available. Unless the people of the United States are prepared to embark upon a system of public ownership, management, and operation of basic industries, any such procedure would break down in the long run.

Were the Government to assume the role of decision maker in the disputes between labor and management in so-called basic industries, it would eventually be necessary for the Government to assume control over prices and profits, because the relationship of wages, prices, and profits is an exceedingly close one. Hence, if the Government undertakes to decree what wages an industry shall pay, it logically follows that the Government will have to assume some responsibility in making it possible for management to make a profit under the wage structure established by the Government. And since the wages of the workers have been dictated by the Government, it logically follows that the Government owes a responsibility to the workers to see to it that the profits of management are not unreasonable. From the standpoint of insuring a reasonable profit to management, it follows that prices must be regulated and not left to be controlled by the free play of competitive forces. In fact, price-fixing would probably lead to governmental subsidies to industries, since demand for the product at the governmentally fixed price may diminish. Thus, we see that the Government will be regulating important aspects of business even to the extent of determining who shall remain in business and who shall not. For if the Government finds it necessary to subsidize business on any large scale, it obviously should have the power to decide that only efficient concerns shall operate. Otherwise, the Government would be wasting the people's money.

In discussing the general subject of compulsory arbitration of labor disputes, it is necessary to distinguish proposals for the compulsory settlement of jurisdictional disputes in businesses affecting interstate commerce, similar to those made in the Eightieth Congress by my bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act (S. 858), and in substance incorporated in the Senate Committee bill (S. 1126). The gist of those proposals was that the National Labor Relations Board, or an arbitrator appointed by it, would render a final decision enforceable in court in any dispute between unions regarding the assignment of particular work tasks, unless the parties to the dispute within 10 days satisfied the governmental agency that they had settled the dispute voluntarily or agreed upon a method for settling it. The expectation was that the Board would appoint arbitrators in most such cases. This proposal would have served to minimize, if not eliminate, a serious source of friction between labor organizations and would have curbed a particularly unjustifiable practice that over the years has caused great economic injury to both workers and management. It would not, however, have resulted in governmental regulation or dictation of wages, prices, profits, or conditions of employment. It is not unlikely that labor organizations would have established their own tribunals for the voluntary settlement of their jurisdictional disputes rather than have the Government decide such controversies. Thus, the area and occasion for governmental compulsion in this regard would have been reduced to a minimum. The final version of the Taft-Hartley Act did not adopt this approach, but instead limited the remedy for jurisdictional disputes to unfair labor practice proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board. While the solution adopted may alleviate the problem, it does not seem as effective as the approach originally suggested.

With regard to so-called national emergency or paralysis strikes, the Taft-Hartley Act studiously avoids the ultimate sanction of compulsion by the Government insofar as the final settlement of the dispute is concerned. Conciliation and mediation procedures are made available, including investigation and reports by a board of inquiry and a secret ballot among employees conducted by the National Labor Relations Board. While the Government, through the Attorney General, may obtain an injunction for a period not exceeding 80 days, the terms upon which the dispute is to be adjusted cannot be fixed by the Government. If all procedures fail to effect a settlement, the President will submit a report to the Congress, together with his recommendations. Thereafter, Congress must take action, if it so decides.

My experience in the field of labor relations convinces me that if any compulsory arbitration is established to settle disputes in any industry, the result will be that employers and workers, and the Nation as a whole, will have taken a long step away from our system of free enterprise and private property economy toward a form of totalitarianism. It would constitute a serious setback to the development and improvement of procedures designed to facilitate the peaceful settlement of labor disputes by means of conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration. These procedures have been improved and strengthened in recent years and it is significant that all economic groups, particularly industry and labor, vigorously oppose any system of compulsory arbitration and place their faith in the machinery of free collective bargaining. Just as it was politically and economically unsound for the people of this Nation to exist half slave and half free, so it is politically and economically unsound for American labor and industry to develop and grow if half their disputes are to be settled by governmental dictation and half are to be settled by voluntary agreement.

[1] Prepared for American Labor: The Twenty-first Annual Debate Handbook. Copyright 1947. All rights reserved.

[2] WAYNE LYMAN MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon, holds degrees from the University of Wisconsin, the University of Minnesota, and Columbia University. His distinguished record in the public service includes chairmanship of the President's Emergency Board, 1941; and membership on the National War Labor Board, 1942–44.

[3] Freiden, The Public Interest in Labor Dispute Settlement, 12 Law and Contemporary Problems 373 (1947).

The Potato Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion concerning the potato support program. It is not my purpose to offer criticism of the administration of the program although it could have been improved. At least some effort has been put forth to follow the support program as provided by the Steagall and the La Follette-Taft amendments. The potato growers have not been subjected to the sorry treatment afforded the chicken and egg producers in regard to support prices.

The following is a complete official report on the product in each State in the United States from 1939 to 1948:

Potatoes—Production in the United States, by States, 1939–47

State	Production								
	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947 [1]
	1,000 bushels	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*
Alabama	4,752	4,386	5,616	3,952	4,794	3,132	4,935	4,046	3,220
Arizona	196	240	273	592	1,320	1,276	1,530	1,836	1,740
Arkansas	3,000	3,564	3,634	3,680	4,320	3,120	2,736	3,293	2,523
California	21,705	21,820	19,541	23,130	27,805	34,500	36,700	46,320	37,260
Colorado	11,858	13,065	12,229	15,840	17,220	18,190	17,745	19,780	19,240
Connecticut	2,918	3,198	3,003	3,260	3,440	3,678	3,482	4,392	3,423
Delaware	320	443	300	335	308	252	315	354	336
Florida	3,868	4,481	3,341	4,116	3,703	3,445	5,285	6,249	3,272
Georgia	1,541	1,728	1,272	1,625	1,953	1,224	1,716	1,998	1,422
Idaho	27,690	32,640	27,450	30,590	45,470	39,648	45,090	45,360	28,600
Illinois	3,330	3,471	3,060	3,294	1,922	1,365	1,805	1,764	1,056
Indiana	5,280	5,145	5,750	6,480	4,100	3,300	3,915	4,480	3,750
Iowa	5,152	5,880	5,100	6,090	4,365	1,836	2,750	2,880	975
Kansas	2,080	2,352	2,520	2,700	2,730	1,121	1,394	1,632	1,188
Kentucky	3,432	3,528	3,354	4,512	4,823	2,850	3,762	3,996	3,366
Louisiana	2,240	2,280	2,623	2,530	3,534	3,363	2,862	2,280	1,643
Maine	36,100	42,720	43,800	43,840	72,000	52,224	54,549	78,402	62,700
Maryland	2,100	2,304	1,824	1,964	1,513	1,556	1,915	2,244	2,067
Massachusetts	2,337	3,026	2,670	3,135	3,750	3,480	2,899	3,094	3,178
Michigan	20,902	17,548	20,020	16,562	22,365	18,792	18,040	18,327	12,390
Minnesota	19,024	22,227	16,053	18,050	22,698	14,700	19,140	17,305	14,220
Mississippi	1,380	1,188	1,280	1,575	1,500	2,170	1,872	2,170	1,400
Missouri	3,696	4,920	4,680	4,680	4,500	2,250	2,600	3,354	2,120
Montana	1,275	1,800	1,610	1,725	2,640	2,125	2,125	2,210	1,620
Nebraska	10,731	11,340	9,630	12,580	12,050	9,100	11,720	11,725	8,090
Nevada	330	391	432	483	680	760	576	672	483
New Hampshire	1,020	1,258	1,023	1,088	1,472	1,102	1,020	1,225	893
New Jersey	7,844	9,288	9,545	10,136	11,431	9,088	12,567	14,076	13,140
New Mexico	210	180	216	272	360	288	338	240	306
New York	26,069	28,457	28,540	28,857	30,603	29,868	30,440	43,000	35,090
North Carolina	5,200	5,316	5,972	9,476	11,960	7,395	8,784	12,616	9,216
North Dakota	12,410	17,710	14,606	17,000	21,594	20,650	23,460	18,750	20,100
Ohio	10,700	9,500	10,614	9,130	8,624	6,305	7,021	7,560	5,460
Oklahoma	1,944	2,156	1,755	2,106	2,257	1,768	990	1,760	1,035
Oregon	6,171	8,400	7,700	7,310	12,760	11,220	12,324	13,230	10,140

[1] Preliminary.

Potatoes—Production in the United States, by States, 1939–47—Continued

State	Production								
	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947 [1]
	1,000 bushels	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*
Pennsylvania	19,635	20,910	21,490	17,595	18,810	19,782	16,577	20,696	17,985
Rhode Island	858	864	896	1,075	1,147	1,288	1,232	1,722	1,512
South Carolina	2,712	2,880	2,470	3,024	3,100	1,488	2,592	3,576	2,440
South Dakota	2,106	1,800	1,740	2,816	3,680	2,560	2,945	2,842	1,840
Tennessee	3,268	3,612	2,800	3,570	4,200	2,091	3,120	3,404	2,880
Texas	2,856	3,420	5,814	4,268	5,874	4,400	4,214	5,183	4,536
Utah	2,069	2,103	1,793	2,312	2,430	2,090	2,240	3,330	2,898
Vermont	1,638	1,520	1,711	1,422	1,750	1,472	1,225	1,292	1,680
Virginia	7,749	10,164	6,708	7,242	9,794	5,976	8,772	10,076	9,450
Washington	7,667	7,125	7,875	6,765	10,580	7,650	9,120	10,120	8,540
West Virginia	2,816	3,465	3,564	3,795	2,673	2,310	2,900	2,999	3,375
Wisconsin	15,470	12,960	14,578	10,650	16,508	11,844	12,160	11,865	10,080
Wyoming	1,759	2,275	2,100	2,240	2,295	2,174	2,302	2,542	2,480
United States total	342,372	376,920	355,697	368,899	458,887	383,424	418,765	484,174	384,407

[1] Preliminary.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

You will note that so far as per capita of population is concerned the potato production is around three bushels per person. Many factors influence potato consumption. The above table shows the States that have kept in due bounds under the support program so far as production is concerned.

No. 2 and ungraded potatoes are selling for 6 to 10 cents per pound in the cities. It appears ridiculous to be feeding or destroying No. 1's while these ungraded potatoes sell for this price. If the producer receives 2 cents per pound and the consumer is compelled to pay 6 to 10 cents per pound, all the responsibility of the cost of living cannot be blamed on the producer by any means. The fact that such sorry-looking ungraded potatoes are selling at retail for 6 to 10 cents per pound make it difficult to understand why so many millions are needed for supporting the potato prices. Again, I repeat this food product has had support even though chickens and eggs do not and have not had the legal lawful support to be guaranteed by the Steagall and the La Follette-Taft amendments.

Socialism and Communism Have Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a well-known writer and liberal, one John Dos Passos, has written a very interesting confession in the current issue of Life magazine. His article is entitled "The Failure of Marxism." I am including it as part of my remarks and I am sure this article will be of great interest to some Members.

THE FAILURE OF MARXISM—BOTH SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM, AS THEY ACTUALLY WORK OUT, BETRAY THE HOPES FOR THE BETTER LIFE THAT THEY ONCE INSPIRED

(By John Dos Passos)

Not long ago I found myself talking to a pleasant and well-informed woman reporter in a newspaper office in a prosperous city in the middle western Corn Belt. Although the region is usually chalked up as black Republican in politics, the paper she worked for wore a liberal complexion. I was trying to explain to her that socialism as I had seen it working last summer in Great Britain was not necessarily a force for progress. "But I thought you were a liberal," she kept saying almost tearfully, "and now you have turned reactionary." "The Socialists are the conservatives now," I told her, "and the Communists are the real reactionaries." But she remained unconvinced. The reason our conversation was so fruitless was that she had decided that certain words like "liberal," "labor," and "rationing" had a virtuous connotation and there was no way of getting her to look directly at the events that lay behind the words.

It was just this sort of wall of incomprehension you used to meet years ago when you argued the right of working people to form unions and to strike for improved working conditions, or tried to explain that we ought to show a sympathetic interest in the social experiments that were going on in the Soviet Union. Then it was the capitalist slogans that were holding the fort; but during the past 20 years a new set of words has gradually become charged with a virtuous aura in the public mind. Now public ownership, planned economy, controls, and socialized have become words heavy with virtue, while profits, free enterprise, investment, and even dividends have taken on an evil context that needs to be explained away.

The public mind in America that 20 years ago dismissed unheard anything that smacked of a socialistic notion is now receptive to socialistic notions. Partly this comes from a reasoned change of attitude brought about by the success of some of the socialistic measures of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, but partly it comes from the unthinking acceptance of the vocabulary of liberal propaganda that spread out in ripples from New Deal Washington, becoming vaguer and more confused and more destructive of clear thinking as the ideas that engendered it lost their vitality at the source. It is in this confused region of the popular mind that the Communists have been able to carry on their most successful propaganda operations. Thus it comes to pass that the liberals who think a man is defeated in argument when they call him a reactionary show very little curiosity about the actual functioning of socialistic-going concerns that have come into being in the last 20 years. The liberal vocabulary that had some meaning in the 1920's has now become a definite hindrance to understanding events in the world of the forties.

Exactly 100 years have passed since Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels issued the Communist Manifesto, which became the first document in the formulation of modern socialism. Nineteen years later the bible of Marxism, Das Kapital, was published, giving immense documentation to Marx's theories that the collapse of capitalism was imminent; that it would inevitably be followed by a socialist utopia.

In the 1920's there were a number of us in the United States who were convinced that this doctrine was valid. Those of us who were willing to be called Socialists had some definite things in mind that we thought would be achieved if ownership of industry were taken out of the hands of the finance capitalists and vested in the community. We thought public service could be substituted for money profit as the driving motive of human behavior. We thought that with the ascendancy of an antimilitarist working class throughout the world, war, and the threat of war, would be replaced by peaceful cooperation in international affairs. Of course it must be admitted that we were caught by the illusory belief that revolution would install utopia. We were carried away by the blind enthusiasm for a new dispensation at hand that was sweeping the masses of the western world.

The revolutions have happened, and regimes and empires have crashed in the mud, but the old problem of how to control man's domination by man remains unsolved.

Enough socialized systems and institutions have been going concerns over a long enough period of time for us at least to begin to get some idea of how they are working out. It's a most curious comment on the blindness induced by dogmatically held beliefs that in all the avalanches of print for and against socialism and free enterprise there's so little comparative examination of capitalist and socialist organizations; there's so little effort to try to discover how they work out for the men and women directly involved.

First let me give an example of a socialized institution that seems to me to have been a success. Rural electrification was one of the New Deal's pet projects. It encouraged the establishment of local committees that gave a much-needed impetus to local self-government in a very important field. Not only did it furnish increased electric service all over the country, but by its brisk competition it shook the private companies out of their lethargy, so that they greatly increased their service, too.

At the other end of the scale in the experience of the average American come the Army and the Navy. We are not accustomed to thinking of the Army and Navy as socialized institutions, but that is exactly what they are. We all admit that in the times of ruin and rapine in which we live we can't do without these vast engines for waste and destruction, but I've yet to meet a veteran of either of these services who thinks that the Army way or the Navy way or even the Air Force way is the best way of running human affairs. About the best face we can put on our Military Establishment is to say that in spite of its cumbrous bungling it has so far managed to defeat our enemies in battle

and that up to now our civilian set-up for production has been so monstrously efficient that we've been able to afford the waste of materials and the frustration of individual effort that the military system implies.

As citizens of a self-governing community it is our first duty continually to be asking ourselves what it is we want from our institutions.

At home in America we have seen enough of the working of socialized enterprises, successful and unsuccessful, to begin to understand the basic problem. We must realize that from the point of view of the well-being of men and women the contradiction is not between capitalism and socialism but between the sort of organization that stimulates growth and the sort that fastens on society the dead hand of bureaucratic routine or the suckers of sterile vested interests. We should by now have learned that the road must be kept open for experiment. We should have begun to learn that no society is stronger than its weakest members. By our habit of government we are committed to trying to keep a rough balance between the demands of different sections of the population. We haven't solved the problem of defending every man's freedom against domination by other men, but we have made a little bit of a beginning.

THE MUSEUM OF SOCIALIST FAILURES

The rest of the world is becoming a museum of Socialist failures. Our first problem now is to understand clearly the needs of our own society and its relationship to the shaky socialized regimes of Europe and to the regime of the law of the club that centers in the Soviet Union. To do this we must free our minds of the stale and rotting verbiage left over from the noble aspirations of old-time Socialist theory.

It was failure to see the world clearly on the part of Franklin Roosevelt and his advisers that deprived us of the fruits of our wartime victory to the point that the things Americans hold most dear are in greater peril today than on the dreadful afternoon of Pearl Harbor. The responsibility for this loss of the peace lies not only in the small group of political leaders in Washington but in the whole body of thinking Americans whose thinking had just not caught up with the times.

The basic reason for this national failure was that as a Nation we had forgotten that our sort of self-governing community can survive only in a world where new avenues for men's ingenuity and enterprise are constantly opening up and where the areas of individual liberty are expanding. We had forgotten that liberty, like peace, is indivisible. We had forgotten that the only sensible foreign policy for the United States was to encourage liberty and oppose oppression.

While not forgetting our own shortcomings, if we are to catch up with the times and to see clearly the hideous world of growing servitude—a world of slavery like chattel slavery in the old South and the slavery of ancient times—which we have helped produce, we must understand the workings of the enemies of liberty and peace. The chief of these, in power and efficacy, is the government of the Soviet Union.

WILSON AND LENIN

When the Communist revolution exploded in Russia in the fall of 1917 the First World War had settled down to a stalemate along the trenches in northern France. The stubborn resistance the French were putting up to the equally stubborn German invasion was bleeding Europe to death. Among the rank and file of all the armies the feeling of mutiny against the senselessness of the butchery was rising to desperation. At that time two separate flares of hope appeared on the eastern and western horizons. In Washington Woodrow Wilson announced his Fourteen Points and in Petrograd Lenin and Trotsky fired the hungry and disorganized Russian mobs with the belief that communism would bring them peace, land and food. No one who was in Europe in '17 and '18 can ever forget the surge of crazy confidence in the future that swept the continent when Armistice Day came and the fighting stopped.

The people's trust in the American way faded as Wilson let himself be trapped into the stale committee rooms of the old men of Versailles, but from Russia came leadership and decisive action. While in Paris they haggled about oil and superannuated boundaries, Lenin let Finland and the Baltic countries form their own governments, let the conscript soldiers go home, distributed land to the peasants and encouraged the formation of workers' soviets, or councils. To many of us at the time these soviets seemed to be a new organ for self-government. For a moment it looked as if the working class under Marxist leadership would succeed in renovating Europe.

It was not to be so easy. The old vested interests of Europe banded together for their own protection; by backing the reactionaries in the Russian civil war they ruined the hopes of free development for the new social system. The Communist Party hardened fast into a military caste. The soviets and trade unions in the Soviet Union, instead of developing into organs of self-government, developed into machines run by a tightly organized and fanatically dogmatic Marxist minority for the domination and exploitation of the masses. Lenin threw overboard the humanitarian baggage of western socialism, an act symbolized in the transfer of the capital from European Petrograd to Asiatic Moscow. The civil war became a struggle for order, any kind of order. The only order the Russians knew was despotism. From the czarist autocracy the Communist government inherited the secret police. Individual liberty had hardly a breathing spell before it was stamped out again, first in the unorganized mass of the people and then, as Stalin struggled for power against Trotsky, within the Communist minority itself.

By the early thirties the social organization of the Soviet Union resembled much more the slave-run military autocracy of the Ottoman Turks than it did any of the European blueprints for a Socialist utopia. This reaction to methods of government that had gradually been losing favor among civilized men for 500 years was accompanied by the building up of one of the most extraordinary propaganda facades in history. A constitution was promulgated on the western model. The entire vocabulary of western self-government was borrowed and applied to the machinery of despotism.

UTOPIA—WITH SECRET POLICE

By killing off the old European-trained Communists and exiling Trotsky, Stalin cleared out of the Kremlin the last traces of western humanitarianism. The organization of a free self-governing Socialist community, which had been the first aim of the Russian revolutionists, was pushed forward into the future, when the millennium should come. Through the pull of this millennial dream Stalin's regime managed to retain its grip over the aspirations of a large part of the European working class. The Communist Party, appealing through this basic utopian dogma to the emotions of confused and tortured people, backed and kept in line by the ruthless and skillfully exercised authority of the secret police, managed to create one of the most efficient machines for the dominating and exploiting of mankind the world has ever seen.

It seems likely, from what we hear faintly through the screen of lies that hems in the Soviet Union, that there the illusions have lost their power in the face of the regime's failure to produce even the rudiments of decent living for its subjects, and that the Kremlin now rules a depraved and exhausted people by brute force. Outside the Soviet Union, however, the utopian illusions of communism still dominate many men's hopes and dreams. Even some Americans opposed to the Communists still talk as if it were an excess of progressiveness and idealism that caused Russian socialism to fail. We find Frenchmen and Americans and Canadians, in all other respects apparently capable of sane and normal thinking, who are willing to turn their backs on the traditions they were brought up in and to give their allegiance to the Kremlin, even to the point of committing treason. The success of the aggressions by the Soviet state in the last few years rests in great part on the Kremlin's command over adherents and sympathizers in the outside world. Largely because the rest of the world has not understood it the Russian socialized state has been allowed to develop into a military force for pillage and conquest. Still the faith of many of our liberals in the Kremlin's idealistic aims has not faltered.

Those of us who believed in socialism in the twenties hoped it would promote self-government, expand individual liberty, and make for a wider distribution of the good things of life. It is obvious even to Mr. Henry Wallace that the Soviet Union is not the place to look for these things. Not even the American Communists really claim any of these achievements; what they say among themselves is that present miseries will be atoned for by the regime of justice and bliss that will be established once communism has completed its conquest of the world.

The Russians are barbarians, the western Socialists will tell you; in England it will all be different.

How different is it? If you go around Great Britain asking questions of as many different kinds of people as possible, as I did last summer, you sense that in its ultimate implications British socialism is turning out to be not so very different from the Russian brand. Of course, there's not the gory police terror of Stalin nor the Hitlerian pomp and parade through which the Kremlin daily expresses its power over the bodies and minds of men. There's not the proselytizing enthusiasm of a quasi-religious dogma that accompanies the agents and armies of expanding Russia. There's not the daily and visible and universal servitude; but neither has socialism brought any broadening of personal liberty. On the contrary, personal liberty in Great Britain has been contracted.

The very humane and well-intentioned people who are running the Labor government are the first to deplore the losses of liberty you bring to their attention. They reassure you with pious hopes that the direction-of-labor measure, which limits the individual's right to work where or when he likes, will be only a passing phase. Listening to these pious hopes, I couldn't help remembering similar reassurances from equally humane and well-intentioned Russian Communists who used to tell me, in the early days, that military communism was a passing phase which would disappear as soon as reactionary opposition was crushed. Thirty years have gone by, and military communism marches on to fresh massacres. A man has a right to ask the British Labor Party whether 30 years from now direction of labor won't be the cornerstone of a new system of exploitation of the productive workers by a new ruling class.

If there is one thing that mankind should have learned from the agonies of the last four decades it is that it's never safe to do evil that good may come of it. The good gets lost and the evil goes on.

DISTRIBUTION OF POVERTY

Of course we must admit that the present situation of the people of Great Britain would be difficult enough if a choir of archangels, superhuman in brains and in self-abnegation, had assumed the government. The island's economy was built up as the processing and financing center of an empire which has irrevocably gone. The class that had ruled

that economy through control of the government, ownership of the land and domination of centralized finance and industry had become overweeningly rich and powerful. In their wealth and self-satisfaction the owners of Britain neglected to keep their industries tooled up to date or to protect the standard of living of their working people or to conserve their natural resources. When the Labor government came in after the war it inherited a concern that had long been bankrupt.

Government control of virtually the entire economy had already been instituted during the war. About all the Labor government has done is to amplify the wartime apparatus of bureaucratic management. The living standards of the working people who were Labor's chief constituents had improved during the war, and the Labor government has continued that improvement, particularly for the lowest-paid third. Because there isn't enough to go around anyway, this has been done at the expense of the middle class, traditionally the nursery of British brains and initiative. Virtually everybody has been reduced by high taxes and high prices to the same bare level of subsistence. Incentive for effort and innovation has tended to disappear. A man is better off if he soldiers along in the shop and spends his Saturdays betting on the races than if he works himself sick trying to rise in the world. The more his income rises the more taxation will take his earnings away from him and the more he'll feel the dead weight of the bureaucratic tangle hampering his every move.

Bernard Baruch's remark, that socialism might not succeed in distributing wealth but would certainly distribute poverty, has never been better exemplified. Up to now socialism in Great Britain has accomplished very little more than to freeze the bankrupt capitalist economy at its point of collapse. Its bureaucratic machinery, operating along the lines of the machinery of bankrupt capitalism, has not been able to stimulate the sort of revolutionary initiative and thoroughgoing reorganization of the economy that might give the British people a chance to escape from their dilemma. Socialism has acted as a brake instead of as a stimulus to enterprise.

Man does not live by bread alone, the Socialists will tell you. The answer is that as strong as the urge to eat is the urge to exercise power over other men. In the past British institutions have done a moderately good job in curbing this deadliest of instincts. But in spite of political democracy British capitalism too often gave too much power to people whose only social gift was the knack of accumulating money. Now British socialism gives too much power to people whose only knack is getting themselves elected to offices in trade unions. At the same time the liberty of movement and the freedom of action that allowed people to escape from under the heel of the capitalist have been seriously weakened.

THE WRONG LEADERS

England has a new ruling class. Added to such remnants of the old ruling class as have remained in office through holding administrative jobs in government, industry, and the civil service, is an infusion of new blood from the trade-union leadership, leavened by an occasional intellectual who has talked or written his way into office. Now, the main training of trade-union officials is in hamstringing production for the purpose of wringing concessions from the owners for the workers. Neither idealistic intellectuals nor civil service employees have any training in industrial production. The result is that at the very moment when the British people need to throw all their energy into discovering new ways of producing food and clothing and housing and export goods, they find themselves in the hands of a ruling class that is hampered by tradition and training from doing anything effective to stimulate production. In recent months there has developed a tendency to give technicians an increasingly bigger share in policy making, but on the whole Britain's new ruling class tends to be so blinded by the utopian glamor of the word "socialism" that it has found it difficult to envisage the problem which confronts the nation.

Well, if the government can't help them, why can't they help themselves? The British people, in my opinion, represent in themselves at this moment just about the highest development of western civilized man. In the middle and upper classes you find a higher level of education than we have reached in America. The level of individual skill and craftsmanship in most trades is higher than ours. In the professionally trained part of the population, though there may be some flagging of creative spirit, there's still a great reservoir of first-rate brains. The British people proved themselves to be still a great people by the dignity and discipline with which they fought off the German air attacks during the war. This great highly trained, highly disciplined, and civilized nation is in danger of dying of inanition because in all the elaborate structure of the state there are so few cracks left where individual initiative can take hold.

The British will tell you that they are "quite free, quite." But we don't need to believe them. When a man can't change his job without permission from someone sitting at an office desk, when he can't perform any of the normal operations of buying and selling necessary to carrying on a business without a complicated correspondence to secure licenses from the Board of Trade, when he can't appeal to the courts from administrative decisions, when he can be sentenced to jail for refusing to work in the mines, he's no longer a free agent. The Briton still has his secret ballot in parliamentary and municipal elections. He's free because he can vote, he'll tell you. Unfortunately the record of history tends to prove that it's very doubtful whether the vote alone, without economic and personal liberty of action, has ever protected any people against the exercise of arbitrary power.

A sinister footnote to the loss of concern for individual liberty that seems inevitably to follow the socialization of enterprise appears in the growing toleration of new forms of slavery. We are growing used to the stories of the vast slave camps in the Soviet Union and its satellite countries, but it comes somewhat as a shock to find the humane British tolerating the use of gangs of German prisoners to do agricultural labor. In all my conversations with farmers in England last summer I found only one man who disapproved of the practice. The farmers paid the prisoners' wages to the government and the government allowed the prisoners nothing more than pocket money. The farmers found that they got more work out of the prisoners if they fed them a hot meal in the middle of the day, but they didn't seem to feel that the working of prisoners of war in this way constituted a backsliding in civilization; most of them regretted that the prisoners would soon be sent home. The wages of agricultural workers in England have been much improved in recent years and the Socialists take justifiable pride in this achievement. The question they didn't ask themselves when they tolerated the enslavement of the defeated Germans was how long a highly-paid plowman or tractor operator would be able to compete with slave labor.

This brings us squarely up against the dilemma of our time. Under the cover of the dazzle of Socialist illusions, and just at the moment when our technology is opening up the certainty of really widespread well-being in material things, the masses of mankind are being plunged back into a regime of misery and servitude such as has not existed in the West since the days of serfdom. We can't go on forever blaming on war damage a situation that results from the fact that socialized economies have not been able to produce. So far the socialized economies, instead of opening up new aspects of self-government and broader reaches of liberty for the individual, have backslid with dizzy speed into aboriginal oppressions. In the Soviet Union, failure to solve the problems of production at home has thrown Russian communism into a dangerous habit of aggression upon the rest of the world. As for Great Britain, we can hope that they will find a way to combine socialism with liberty, or at least that the failure of the socialized economy to provide its people with a decent life at home will produce a new explosion of British migration and colonization that will transmit to the future world of the West the valuable heritages of English culture. In America what we don't want to forget is that we won't have any Western World fit for a freeman to live in unless we keep the avenues open for the freedom and growth of the individual man in the constantly proliferating hierarchical structure of modern industry.

Socialism is not the answer to the too great concentration of power that is the curse of capitalism. We've got to do better than that.

Business Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday January 21, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal:

BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

Senator BROOKS, of Illinois, has announced that he will lead a group of Members of Congress who will demand that any financial aid extended to the nations of Europe be handled by a business management rather than by the State Department.

Senator BROOKS frequently is accused of being an isolationist, and he undoubtedly has tendencies in that direction. He has been one of the severest critics of the Truman administration's plans for extension of aid to the European nations, so that he might be expected to take a stand against permitting the State Department to administer whatever funds are voted by Congress for European relief.

However, the record of the State Department in past administration of assistance projects gives him some firm ground upon which to base his demand that someone else be placed in charge of the Marshall-plan aid.

State Department representatives have made pretty much of a botch of their handling of such projects in the past with the result that the United States has been shelling out a lot of assistance without getting any credit for it and without accomplishing the purposes which it set out to achieve. Latest failure is in Greece, where we are told that more help is going to be needed just after we have heard stories of great waste and spoilage of previous contributions.

Asserting that production is the key to European recovery, Senator BROOKS asserts, "Nobody in the State Department has ever demonstrated any ability to get production" and the record will bear him out in that.

The Illinois Senator suggests the selection of leaders from the fields of industry, agriculture, and labor to organize the recovery program, much in the same manner as leaders from those fields worked together to organize the American war-production program that resulted in victory in World War II.

The American people who are going to stand the cost of the Marshall plan cannot afford to have their contribution to world recovery wasted. If the Marshall plan assistance doesn't work, tragedy for the entire world may well result.

It is imperative then that the funds supplied by America be administered efficiently and to the best advantage. The State Department, staffed as it is with a lot of well meaning but ineffective visionaries, hasn't demonstrated that it possesses the ability to do the job.

We should obtain the best men available in our country to supervise the expenditure of our money in Europe and that certainly calls for the "business management" which Senator BROOKS is advocating.

Aid to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Ralph S. Trigg, Deputy Administrator of the Department of Agriculture, with the schedules attached thereto. The schedules show, first, inventories held by the Commodity Credit Corporation as of October 31, 1947. Incidentally, those are the latest schedules on record, I believe. The schedules include figures as to commodities in process of sale or otherwise obligated, and thus do not represent commodities available for sale or other disposition. Second, the schedules show deliveries to cash-paying foreign governments, by country and by commodity, for the fiscal year 1947 and the quarter ending September 30, 1947. I believe the schedules will prove of interest in view of the serious problems that confront us, particularly with regard to aid to Europe and its impact upon our domestic economy.

I am informed that the manuscript will exceed the two pages which may be printed without a statement of the cost, the estimate being that it will make approximately three pages, at a cost of $213. This is the first time I have asked for this special privilege, but I believe these schedules are well worth while printing. I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 31, 1947.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: In accordance with our letter of December 10, 1947, the following information is enclosed:

1. Schedules showing inventories held by the Commodity Credit Corporation as of October 31, 1947. These schedules include commodities in process of sale or otherwise obligated, and thus do not represent commodities available for sale or other disposition.

2. Schedules showing deliveries to cash-paying foreign governments, by country and by commodity, fiscal year 1947 and quarter ending September 30, 1947.

The following information is submitted with reference to Mr. Mynot's telephone request concerning the grain export allocations for January 1948, as shown by the press release dated November 19, 1947 (USDA 2655–47). The allocations were made in anticipation of the needs of the various countries and with the expectation that the necessary funds would be available from some source. Should the needs of the countries change or funds not be available, the grains would be available for reallocation. No sales will, of course, be made unless full reimbursement for all costs is obtained by the Commodity Credit Corporation. As indicated by the press release, approximately two-thirds of the flour under allocation during January will be obtained through regular commercial channels by the countries concerned.

It is anticipated that deliveries to the following countries will be on a cash basis: Belgium, India, Netherlands, and Portugal.

Deliveries to the United States-United Kingdom zone of occupied Germany and the occupied zones of Japan and Ryukyus will be paid for from funds appropriated to the Army for occupied areas, while deliveries to Greece will be paid for from funds appropriated under the Greek-Turkish aid program (Public Law 75, 80th Cong.).

Deliveries to Austria, China, France, Italy, and the French zone of occupied Germany under the January allocations are subject to funds being made available from the proposed interim-aid appropriations or from other sources. The allocation of grain to these countries in advance of any financial arrangements merely reflects the advance planning necessary where limited supplies must be apportioned among potential recipients. Should funds not be available during the month for which the allocation is made, the quantities planned for export are adjusted or reapportioned.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Deputy Administrator.

Inventory as of Oct. 31, 1947

[U. S. Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Quantity	Value
Price-support program:			
Cotton:			
American-Egyptian	Bales	999	$212,352.01
Upland	do	15,268	1,396,935.03
Eggs:			
Dried	Pounds	29,160,438	30,776,765.20
Liquid or frozen	do	61,254,320	19,812,896.62
Fruits, dried	do	1,600,500	129,001.94
Milk, dried	do	60,913,702	5,624,857.46
Peanuts	do	111,769,669	11,286,086.12
Potatoes, white	do	64,036,510	1,517,148.09
Seeds:			
Hay and pasture	do	8,906,088	723,121.95
Winter cover crop	do	36,995,524	2,398,139.16
Soybeans	Bushels	1,060	2,525.68
Turkeys	Pounds	1,433,108	510,768.22
Wool	do	394,394,037	218,321,357.94
Total price-support program			298,711,925.45
Supply program:			
Barley	Bushels	1,451,679	2,728,879.32
Corn	do	25,850	41,325.98
Cotton, export to Japan	Bales	163,964	16,602,437.28
Feed for Government facilities	Tons	30	2,640.00
General supply program[1]	Pounds	407,809,286	28,054,831.98
Oats	Bushels	2,174,964	2,720,458.24
Sorghums, grain	do	358	765.46
Wheat	do	71,745,358	198,918,016.01
Total supply program			246,009,354.27

[1] The break-down by commodity of the general supply program is provided in table 2.

Inventory as of Oct. 31, 1947—Continued

Commodity	Unit of measure	Quantity	Value
Foreign-purchase program:			
Coconut oil	Pounds	1,651,014	$177,558.51
Linseed oil	do	6,230,463	2,192,573.87
Total foreign-purchase program			2,370,132.38
Grand total, all programs			547,151,412.10

General supply program inventory, Oct. 31, 1947

Commodity	Unit of measure	Quantity	Value
Eggs, dried	Pounds	2,476,055	$3,389,812.11
Milk:			
Fluid	do	21,758,604	2,262,571.11
Dried	do	1,623,510	678,669.99
Soap and related products	do	720,000	54,885.08
Fats and oils	do	373,201	52,056.55
Beans, garbanzos, and lentils, dry	do	5,180,000	466,945.97
Breakfast cereals	do	6,640,000	434,666.00
Feeds and grains	do	2,030,000	91,408.25
Flour, grits, meals, and related products	do	333,699,800	19,108,284.13
Peas, dry	do	4,480,000	282,400.00
Rice	do	120,000	7,104.00
Seeds, field	do	138,293	49,979.35
Meat products, canned	do	1,884,490	267,018.40
Pork:			
Fresh or frozen	do		[1] 8,046.46
Salted, smoked, or pickled	do	1,100	349.99
Lard and other animal fats	do	3,759,860	606,159.80
Fish and seafood, canned	do	1,929,979	236,303.46
Macaroni, vermicelli, and similar pastes	do	989,660	104,417.20
Miscellaneous	do	725	756.13
Total	do	407,809,286	28,054,831.98

[1] Subject to adjustment.

Summary of cash sales to foreign governments, fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, and quarter ended Sept. 30, 1947

	Fiscal year 1947	First quarter, fiscal 1948	Balance of commitments Sept. 30, 1947
Afghanistan	$1,841,933		
Arabia	898,823		$432,021
Belgium	43,031,069	$3,272,238	5,717,526
Bolivia	1,379,584		
Brazil	3,274,078		
Canada	413,192		4,090
Colombia			1,010,591
Cuba	1,571,368	2,606,223	
Czechoslovakia	284,542	457,134	
Denmark	42,480	842,203	907,573
Finland	8,829,642	3,442,133	
France	83,691,988	12,578,457	11,891,399
Great Britain	305,936,231	32,273,985	19,919,556
Greece	499,059	855,347	
Hungary	784,227		
Iceland	113,026		
India	60,585,477	7,619,764	7,277,668
Ireland	1,622,371	2,549,107	1,513,809
Italy	13,133,088		
Mexico	6,126,739		
Netherlands	40,997,987	7,627,902	5,419,975
Norway	8,578,899	2,833,372	983,651
Peru	1,399,245	1,701,029	
Philippines	28,043,580	1,070,982	248,250
Poland	2,641,611	1,705,916	
Portugal	11,715,172	3,284,729	872,666
Rumania	1,084,685		
Siam	371		
Spain	172,389	33,423	
Sweden	782,039	790,023	1,892,885
Switzerland	7,807,062	3,441,970	2,782,003
Union of South Africa	817,599		998,330
Uruguay	3,433,685	1,653	
Venezuela		374,465	401,997
Total	641,214,191	89,361,896	62,543,951

Cash sales to foreign governments, fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, and quarter ended Sept. 30, 1947

	Unit	Invoiced deliveries				Balance of commitments Sept. 30, 1947	
		Fiscal year 1947		Fiscal year 1948 (first quarter)			
		Quantity	Dollars	Quantity	Dollars	Quantity	Dollars
Afghanistan:							
Wheat	Bushels	224,000	$558,631				
Flour	Pounds	23,473,145	1,283,302				
Total			1,841,933				
Arabia:							
Wheat	Bushels	254,110	650,868			149,333	432,021
Flour	Pounds	4,528,716	245,955				
Total			896,823				432,021
Belgium:							
Butter, preserved	Pounds	6,088,728	3,117,329				
Cheese	do	[1] 309,561	614,712				
Milk:							
Evaporated and condensed	do	11,327,703	1,446,460		$909		
Dried	do	4,621,164	914,253				
Butter oil	do	250,050	160,800				
Potatoes, Irish	do	29,558,100	220,152				
Wheat	Bushels	7,174,590	17,052,927	1,318,223	3,274,348	1,922,668	5,717,526
Corn	do	500,000	774,469				
Flour	Pounds	44,617,363	2,126,711				
Seed, field	do	456,700	42,787				
Beef, frozen	do	8,593,426	2,304,332	[1] 11,212	[1] 3,029		
Veal, frozen	do	1,130,197	305,066				
Mutton, frozen	do	663,472	102,432				
Meats, canned	do	3,385,653	1,177,075				
Pork:							
Frozen	do	33,443,592	8,005,040				
Cured	do	2,130,472	477,424				
Lard	do	14,525,218	2,414,337				
Fish, canned	do	3,500,016	901,858				
Sugar	do	20,007,250	969,875				
Total			43,031,099		3,272,228		5,717,526
Bolivia: Wheat	Bushels	643,114	1,379,584				
Brazil: Wheat	do	1,375,444	3,274,078				
Canada:							
Soybean oil	Pounds	2,146,452	413,192			2,000	4,040
Ration kits	Kits						
Total			413,192				4,040
Colombia: Wheat	Bushels					354,667	1,010,591
Cuba: Rice	Pounds	19,381,400	1,571,368	26,019,300	2,606,223		
Czechoslovakia:							
Coconut oil	do			1,920,620	457,134		
Wheat	Bushels	141,548	284,542				
Total			284,542		457,134		
Denmark:							
Soybeans	Bushels	16,347	42,480				
Wheat	do			343,467	842,203	317,333	907,573
Total			42,480		842,203		907,573
Finland:							
Corn	Bushels	361,740	636,083				
Wheat	do	2,935,340	7,372,796	1,383,461	3,442,133		
Flour	Pounds	17,913,475	820,963				
Total			8,829,842		3,442,133		
France:							
Hemp line	Pounds	6,435,742	1,555,078				
Furs, dried	do	224,600	272,394				
Milk:							
Evaporated and condensed	do	62,713,229	8,522,776	[1] 1,205	165		
Dried	do	15,433,425	6,482,463				
Oleomargarine	do	18,748,782	5,301,855	538,450	155,128		
Shortening	do	1,471,978	369,991				
Soybean oil	do	2,023,725	328,042				
Potatoes, Irish	do	92,835,900	764,881				
Breakfast cereals	do	1,197,865	79,801				
Corn	Bushels	3,880,068	7,031,600	1,372,088	2,558,314		
Wheat	do	9,481,122	22,242,632	3,927,198	9,859,996	4,088,936	11,891,369
Flour	Pounds	144,108,188	6,754,743				
Beans, dry	do	139,300	13,149				
Peas, dry	do	[1] 229,653	[1] 15,382				
Beef, frozen	do	30,394,327	9,660,467	3,453	3,543		
Meats, canned	do	5,057,565	1,654,550	7,598	1,311		
Lard	do	53,028,510	10,167,809				
Sugar	do	34,000,000	1,862,479				
Ammonium nitrate	Short tons	1,000	43,430				
Total			83,091,988		12,578,457		11,891,369
Great Britain:							
Cotton	Bales	4,141	522,724				
Cheese	Pounds	88,866,514	40,278,921	[1] 25	[1] 12		
Eggs:							
Dried	do	90,011,067	113,658,576	18,858,861	26,582,497	11,418,105	14,856,172
Frozen	do	15,643,830	4,995,514				
Milk:							
Evaporated and condensed	do	156,653,985	20,408,836	[1] 129	72		
Dried	do	57,622,096	9,414,653	135,705	12,559		

[1] Deduct.

Cash sales to foreign governments, fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, and quarter ended Sept. 30, 1947—Continued

	Unit	Invoiced deliveries				Balance of commitments Sept. 30, 1947	
		Fiscal year 1947		Fiscal year 1948 (first quarter)			
		Quantity	Dollars	Quantity	Dollars	Quantity	Dollars
Great Britain—Continued							
Beans, dry	Pounds	3,941,545	$323,110				
Soybeans	Bushels	102,502	268,956				
Wheat	do	28,136,831	68,601,870	1,852,221	$4,765,363	1,664,675	$4,919,928
Corn	do	3,777,774	6,600,335				
Flour	Pounds	96,159,692	2,443,499	5,400,000	336,188	518,062	113,456
Peas, dry	do	586,633	52,095				
Seed, field	do	110,464	23,040				
Seed, vegetable	do		[1] 34				
Lard	do	4,631,615	1,689,312	2,555,370	575,669		
Cornstarch	do	19,957,359	1,171,756				
Fish, canned	do	77,921,223	20,399,363	[1] 80	1,649		
Vitamin products	do	2,534,945	784,635				
Tobacco	do	18,915,032	7,231,070				
Total			365,696,231		32,273,985		19,919,556
Greece:							
Flour	Pounds	7,685,000	499,059		363		
Wheat	Bushels			349,067	855,044		
Total			499,059		855,347		
Hungary: Wheat	Bushels	322,000	784,227				
Iceland: Butter	Pounds	235,440	113,026				
India:							
Milk:							
Evaporated and condensed	do	1,554,000	342,755				
Dried	do	17,123,411	4,252,383	10,496	878		
Vegetables, dried	do	14,127,445	4,223,754				
Corn	Bushels	3,620,166	6,455,770				
Wheat	do	19,219,958	44,539,598	3,127,208	7,618,886	2,429,994	7,277,668
Vitamin tablets	Tablets	18,197,680	61,217				
Total			60,565,477		7,619,764		7,277,668
Ireland: Wheat	Bushels	645,467	1,623,371	1,029,500	2,549,107	609,000	1,813,809
Italy:							
Potatoes, Irish	Pounds	15,372,500	67,244				
Corn	Bushels	4,004,525	7,024,674				
Wheat	do	2,727,160	6,041,090				
Total			13,133,008				
Mexico: Wheat	Bushels	2,561,644	6,126,739				
Netherlands:							
Army spread	Pounds	999,882	494,377				
Milk, evaporated and condensed	do	392	43				
Fruits, canned	do	1,861,650	218,746				
Vegetables, dried	do	804,476	285,792				
Potatoes, Irish	do	2,240,322	414,459				
Corn	Bushels	357,534	557,567				
Wheat	do	10,861,563	26,442,904	3,080,452	7,627,902	1,847,930	5,419,975
Flour	Pounds	17,919,515	909,671				
Rice	do		2,203				
Beef, frozen	do	4,062,946	907,539				
Beef and gravy	do	11,308,370	3,731,255				
Lard	do	5,040,840	838,068				
Fish, canned	do	8,033,667	778,423				
Sugar	do	126,629,768	5,324,537				
Ammonium nitrate	Short tons	700	30,401				
Total			40,997,987		7,627,902		5,419,975
Norway: Wheat	Bushels	3,535,673	8,578,539	1,140,400	2,886,272	321,067	983,651
Peru: Wheat	do	634,108	1,399,245	683,700	1,701,029		
Philippines:							
Rice	Pounds	364,511,978	27,431,939	19,709,098	1,070,932	9,711,663	248,250
Fish, canned	do	1,298,566	203,384				
Sugar	do	6,860,000	410,207				
Total			28,045,530		1,070,932		248,250
Poland:							
Milk, evaporated and condensed	Pounds	1,429,760	110,161				
Wheat	Bushels	1,606,000	2,468,450	696,067	1,705,916		
Total			2,641,611		1,705,916		
Portugal:							
Potatoes, Irish	Pounds	43,557,100	348,457				
Corn	Bushels	906,855	1,496,485				
Wheat	do	3,927,460	9,693,456	1,329,400	3,284,729	317,333	872,666
Flour	Pounds	6,272,000	296,774				
Total			11,715,172		3,284,729		872,666
Rumania: Corn	Bushels	644,500	1,044,685				
Siam: Seeds, vegetable	Pounds	125	371				
Spain: Potatoes, Irish	do	43,296,400	172,389	5,142,000	33,423		
Sweden: Wheat	Bushels	335,981	782,039	322,157	790,023	329,813	1,802,886
Switzerland:							
Corn	do	258,266	596,424				
Wheat	do	3,111,610	7,230,638	1,387,638	3,441,970	920,267	2,782,003
Total			7,897,062		3,441,970		2,782,003
Union of South Africa:							
Wheat	Bushels	324,000	772,181			317,333	998,330
Flour, soya	Pounds	448,200	25,328				
Total			817,509				998,330

[1] Deduct.

Cash sales to foreign governments, fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, and quarter ended Sept. 30, 1947—Continued

	Unit	Invoiced deliveries				Balance of commitments Sept. 30, 1947	
		Fiscal year 1947		Fiscal year 1948 (first quarter)			
		Quantity	Dollars	Quantity	Dollars	Quantity	Dollars
Uruguay:							
Potatoes, Irish	Pounds			110, 200	$1, 665		
Wheat	Bushels	1, 311, 900	$3, 433, 685				
Total			3, 433, 685		1, 665		
Venezuela: Corn	Bushels			190, 024	374, 465	193, 016	$401, 997
Grand total			641, 214, 191		89, 361, 895		62, 843, 951

[1] Deduct.

NOTE.—These data, in some instances, reflect adjustments to prior periods.
FMA, Fiscal Branch, Financial Analysis Division, Dec. 12, 1947.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, the need for clarification of the purpose and motive behind the European recovery program is brought out by Andre Visson's article in the Washington Post of January 18. Under leave to extend my remarks, the article is quoted below:

DOLLARS ARE NOT ENOUGH
(By Andre Visson)
ERP MISCONCEPTIONS

At the very moment when the administration is doing its best to make Congress understand the necessity for and the purpose of the Marshall plan, reports from Europe indicate that many Europeans also appear to be in need of clarification.

To be sure, Europeans do not question the necessity for American aid to assure and speed up their victory. But many of them are at a loss to understand the real motives behind the determination of the United States to pour billions of dollars into European countries where both political and economic conditions are so uncertain, and at the very time when so many people, both in Europe and in the United States, are beginning to fear that World War III may be around the corner.

The most perplexing thing to European minds is the American insistence on the humanitarian aspect of our aid to Europe. European nations have never had an opportunity to practice humanitarianism on an international scale. So they simply cannot understand that any nation could seriously consider the giving away of billions of dollars just for humanitarian purposes. Whenever Europeans hear responsible Americans insist on the humanitarian aspect of the Marshall plan they become suspicious and ask themselves, "What do these Americans really have in back of their minds?"

The fundamental European misconception about the Marshall plan is that the funds and goods which Europe is to receive will come from American surpluses. One of the most important tasks for American information services abroad will be to give Europeans the real facts, and especially to emphasize that the Marshall plan definitely means a sacrifice on the part of every American taxpayer.

Another, perhaps even more urgent task for the Administration, is to make Europeans realize how wrong they are in their suspicion that the Marshall plan may be used for American economic expansion. The bogey of American imperialism, unfortunately, is not limited to Communist circles. Many western European industrialists welcome the Marshall plan for the opportunity it offers them to obtain the badly needed raw materials with which to renovate their obsolete equipment and improve the general economic and social conditions in their countries so as to increase the people's resistance to communism. But at the same time they cannot help having fears about the increasing American economic grip.

Lord Beaverbrook's press in England protests against what it terms the "selling of British sovereignty for scrambled dry eggs." And the French industrialists, complaining about the clause on the import of American movies which was attached to the loan obtained by Leon Blum in 1945, wonder what new clauses of a similar character we may attach to the grants and loans given under the Marshall plan.

The Socialists in western Europe, on the other hand, are afraid that we may attach some political strings which may curtail or even completely end any further socialization in the countries receiving American aid. Socialist leaders are planners, and all planners want the greatest possible independence of foreign influences. Thus we have the paradoxical situation, that while Socialist planners insist on political internationalism, in the economic field they tend to behave like isolationists.

This trend is more obvious in England than in France. Sir Stafford Cripps wants short bilateral agreements which would not tie his hands too much. All western Europeans, whether Socialists or not, believe in international free trade as an economic ideal. But European Socialists—especially the British—are most reluctant to put off their socialistic reforms, even for the sake of world recovery. And they are prepared to resist most strongly any American demands to curtail socialization.

Thus we have the bogey of American "economic domination" raised both by Lord Beaverbrook's "imperial isolationists" and by Sir Stafford Cripps' "socialistic planners." Both groups are prepared, if necessary, to increase British austerity if it will lessen Britain's dependence on American aid.

I do not believe that it will be too difficult to prove to Europeans—Socialists and conservatives alike—how unfounded are their fears about the alleged American intentions to control and dominate the European economy. The motto of all imperialists throughout history has been: "Divide and conquer." The United States follows exactly the opposite line. It says to the European nations: "Unite, the better to help yourselves and to make it easier for us to help you to become stronger."

No imperialist nation has ever tried to strengthen those whom it wanted to conquer. No imperialist nation has ever tried to bring together those whom it wanted to dominate politically or economically.

Europeans should learn that of all the developments in western Europe, few have been more heartily welcomed both by responsible Americans and by American public opinion than the customs union of Belgium, Luxemburg, and The Netherlands. While the ideal development from the Soviet viewpoint would be to see all western European nations reduced to the size of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, from the American viewpoint the ideal would be to see the newly formed customs union of Benelux expand to include all western Europe. And this, every intelligent European will have to admit, can hardly be interpreted as American imperialism.

Los Angeles Needs Additional Postal Facilities Because of Tremendous Population Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the population of Los Angeles has increased at an unprecedented rate during the war and postwar years. War workers and servicemen from all parts of the country came to southern California, most of them to the Los Angeles area, and since the war most of them have remained. Latest estimates indicate that the population of southern California has increased by 1,000,000 since 1940, most of this increase in the Los Angeles area. And the migration still continues.

During this same period many nationally known concerns have moved their headquarters to Los Angeles, and new industries have sprung up in this area and now have become permanently established in Los Angeles.

All of these factors have contributed to a tremendous increase of almost 100 percent in the amount of mail which must be handled by the Los Angeles post office. And during this same period not one single square foot of space has been added to operate this post office even though it has been necessary to almost double the number of persons employed.

The receipts of the Los Angeles post office for the year 1942 were $15,000,000. In 1947 these receipts increased to almost $29,000,000. With the growth of Los Angeles continuing at its present unprecedented rate, it has been estimated that the Los Angeles post office will reach, the $40,000,000 class the top bracket in which only New York and Chicago are now classified, by late 1951 or early 1952.

These figures present conclusive proof of the necessity for immediate provision for additional post-office facilities for Los Angeles.

H. R. 4845, which I have introduced, would authorize construction of a parcel-post building adjacent to the Terminal Annex Post Office. It will also provide for extensive remodeling and the construction of an additional floor on the Terminal Annex Post Office where the tremendous volume of incoming and outgoing mail is handled.

It would also provide for the construction of a post office garage building. Since the post office garage facilities in Los Angeles are used not only for storage and repairs on vehicles operated in southern California but also for repairs and servicing of vehicles operated in the Southwest area including Arizona and Nevada, this garage building is necessary to maintain efficient mail service.

The construction of adequate parking space and loading-zone facilities would also include landing space for helicopter delivery of air mail.

More space is needed for the handling of the mail in the Los Angeles Post Office. At present with almost double the number of employees working in space designed originally to accommodate only half that number, resulting unsatisfactory working conditions tend to lower the morale of workers and may not maintain maximum protection of the health of employees.

The need for construction of the additional facilities for the postal service in Los Angeles is evident if working conditions for employees are to be restored to normal and satisfactory postal service maintained in Los Angeles. I, therefore, urge the Members of the House to act favorably on H. R. 4845.

Reduction of Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the United States Savings and Loan League at the fifty-fifth annual convention, San Francisco, Calif., September 1947:

The United States Savings and Loan League desires to commend the first session of the Eightieth Congress, particularly the House Committee on Appropriations, for their work in making a start at retrenchment in the war-swollen activities and expenditures of the Federal Government. Their task was a stupendous one, made more difficult by the organized resistance and propaganda technique of the bureaus and agencies whose appropriations were threatened. The achievement of any reduction required courage, conviction, and a knowledge of what was truly essential and what could be eliminated without impairment of necessary or helpful services. They deserve the gratitude of every taxpaying American citizen and should be encouraged to renew their efforts for a more economical and efficient Federal Government in the coming second session.

Salary Increase for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the postal employees of this country are suffering great hardship as a result of the increased cost of living. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me on January 16, 1948, before the United States Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

I appreciate this opportunity of appearing before the committee in support of increase in salary for postal workers.

I have received numerous letters and wires from my constituents in Utah emphasizing the fact that under present living conditions, the salary which is received by most of them is not sufficient to maintain a decent standard of living.

Today we hear very little about the almighty dollar because it has lost its mightiness. The purchasing power of the dollar, as we all know, is far below its prewar purchasing power. It is dangerous to quote figures nowadays because with the vicious rise in prices recently, statistics compiled a month ago would be obsolete today.

I am sure, gentlemen, that we are all aware that the cost of living has far outdone any increase in salary that postal employees have received in recent years. This fact has been borne out by evidence already presented by other witnesses before this committee. I do not feel that it is unjustified to urge a reasonable salary increase at this time.

The employees of the United States Government, as I understand, are expected to meet all financial obligations, otherwise they are subject to dismissal. The cost of living has soared to such heights that the least little extra expense not expected puts a person behind, often in debt, and makes it impossible to save for a rainy day. In fact, a rainy day is here now for most of the employees of the Postal Department and other underpaid Federal employees unless a salary comparable to the cost of living is given to them. I therefore feel that it is only fair to them as loyal Government employees to recommend a reasonable salary increase at this time.

Memorandum Summarizing Labor's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statements of the Congress of Industrial Organizations:

THE BASIC 40-HOUR WEEK CAN GIVE THE U. S. A. FULL PRODUCTION

A sunny fair day is the best time to repair the roof.

A period of high employment and high wages is the best time to strengthen our protections against long hours, low wages and unemployment.

In other words, 1948 is the best time to strengthen provisions of the wage-hour law, so that it will operate in the public good in good times and bad.

The CIO believes that the Wage-Hour Act should be improved by the Eightieth Congress—to increase the minimum wage from 40 cents an hour to 75 cents; to bring protection of wage-hour standards to important, sizable groups of workers who are now exempt and thus do not now enjoy protection of the law.

But, powerful forces, in and out of Congress, are moving in just the opposite direction. They would weaken, not strengthen, the wage-hour law.

They would use the present sunny weather, not to strengthen the roof, but to punch holes in it. The damage would be serious enough right away—but it will show up even more quickly if an economic storm breaks upon us.

At the present time the law provides (1) for a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour; (2) for time-and-one-half pay for all hours over 40 hours a week which a worker puts on the job.

Notice this: The law does not prohibit the employer, in any way, shape or form from keeping workers on the job more than 40 hours each week. He can employ his workers 44 hours, or 50 hours, or 60, or 70. The law does say that he must pay them no less than 40 cents an hour—and that for each hour over 40 hours in any workweek, he must pay them time-and-one-half their regular rate of wages.

Forty cents an hour for 40 hours is just $16 a week—not enough in these days of soaring prices for any adult to support himself, let alone his family, on decent American standards.

A 75-cent minimum would guarantee a $30 weekly income—still pretty low, but a big improvement over the present minimum rates. It is still below the minimum necessary for an adequate American standard of living—and purchasing power.

People who oppose improving wage-hour standards don't like to talk cold, $16-a-week facts; they seem to prefer propaganda claims and doubtful theory.

They say the present law hurts production. The false implication is that the employer may not work his employees more than 40 hours a week—and so production is cut, but that simply isn't so.

They say an improvement in minimum wages would be inflationary. That isn't so either. The CIO recognizes that most workers are making more than 40 cents an hour today; but CIO feels that Congress should remember three facts:

1. The Department of Labor's minimum budget for a family of four now ranges between $3,000 and $3,500 a year, which is far more than a large proportion of our industrial workers now receive. For a full year's work at 75 cents an hour a worker would bring home only $1,560.

2. The amount of inflation deriving from an increase in minimum wages from $16 a week to the still below-standard $30 a week is not enough to have any effect on the American economy; and, it isn't inflationary to put butter on children's bread and clothes on the backs of workers who need clothes.

3. Every cent of buying power for necessities will be important—and in depression both workers and businessmen will be grateful for the positive effects of a 75-cent minimum and for the fact that it will act as a meaningful floor under wageslashing and sweatshopping.

These same groups who want to weaken the Wage-Hour Act argue that the overtime pay provisions should be lowered in the hope of increasing output. But many Government studies show clearly that lower overtime rates will not increase production.

For one thing, overtime work cuts overhead costs, makes it easy for employers to pay higher wage rates for that "cheap time." In many big industries—auto, textile—longer working hours per employee would have no effect on production, since the basic difficulties arise from material shortages in which the labor problem is insignificant. In the steel industry, where operations are on continuous process basis, working hours cannot be added to their working day. In many other industries, cutting the overtime pay rates would merely stretch out the working time of employees already on the job. They would be working at a cut in hourly wage rates. And, lastly, lower overtime rates would act as no real incentive to workers to do overtime work where it is necessary. Pay to compensate them for the risk of accidents, increased fatigue, etc., that come with long hours, is only fair.

Thus, a cut in overtime rates will bring no higher production, but it will produce a bumper crop of bad industrial relations and friction.

We cannot use wage cuts to buy the sort of production and industrial stability we need.

Many groups appearing at wage-hour hearings say, in effect: "O. K. Let's raise the minimum wage, but let's weaken the law here, and here, and there, and there." Such changes amount to piecemeal repeal of the act. The minimum wage, whatever it may be, should apply to all industry; and the law should give protection to everybody in interstate commerce or whose work affects interstate commerce. If we fail to do so, we have created an incentive to wage-cutting and sweat-shopping and thereby are digging a grave for full consumption, full production, and full employment.

In summary, CIO says: Raise the minimum wage under the wage-hour law from 40 cents an hour to 75 cents an hour. Extend the law to cover important groups of workers, now not protected. Abolish exploitation of children for profit. Don't tamper with the overtime provisions of the Wage-Hour Act. Don't make the law meaningless by weakening its important provisions while going through the motions of raising the minimum rate. Don't make that gesture a joke played on millions of the lowest-paid workers of the Nation.

A constructive program on the Wage-Hour Act will help America, help industry, help labor.

For your convenience, we list herewith a point-by-point examination of CIO's views on the hours provisions of the act.

CIO'S VIEWS ON THE HOURS PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

1. The law prevents the undermining of good standards through unfair competition: The act was intended to put a floor under wages and to provide national standards in regard to child labor, the length of the work week, and overtime payment so as to provide basic minimum protection to American working people. It is especially helpful to unorganized wage earners who are least able to protect themselves. The law contemplates that employers will succeed in the competitive struggle through better management rather than through sweat-shop conditions.

Without minimum legal standards, some firms will seek to undersell their competitors by lengthening hours and slashing wages, thus undermining the decent standards established by unions and other employers. State laws on wages and hours, where they exist, are limited and completely inadequate to meet the national problem.

2. The provisions in regard to hours are flexible: The law does not prohibit hours longer than 40 a week. It provides merely that pay for such excess hours should be at one and one-half times the regular rate. The effect is to establish 40 hours as a standard rewarding the wage earner if he must work longer, and requiring the employer to pay more for the extra time, which brings savings in overhead for him.

3. The threat of weakening amendments is real. Proposals have been made for nullifying the hours provisions by various methods. Some advocate outright repeal; others, changing the hours to 44 or 48; others changing the rate at which overtime is to be paid. Of the latter, some suggest that overtime be paid on the basis of time-and-one-half the legal minimum. Even if the legal minimum is increased considerably it is still a minimum. If overtime were paid at time-and-a-half an increased minimum, it would still be below the average hourly earnings of many workers, and would be meaningless.

This is merely a design to increase profits by getting extra work out of each worker without fair compensation. It undoubtedly would result in a lowering of pay for overtime which would also result in decreased purchasing power and a lowered standard of living for a large segment of the population. Furthermore, all incentive to work overtime would be removed. In short it is a left-handed way of killing the 40-hour week.

Another suggestion calls for a new definition of "regular rate of pay" on the grounds that under the present interpretation regular bonuses are included in "regular rate of pay." Actually both management and labor accept the fact that such extra wages for production as regularly paid premiums, incentive rates, and bonuses are part of the regular wage and must be counted as such. If the definition of "regular rate of pay" is altered to exclude all except the straight hourly rate, it will simply mean a wage cut which workers are not going to accept.

Another proposal states that overtime pay should be any sum agreed upon in a bona fide collective bargaining agreement. Such an amendment would be an underhanded way of annulling the 40-hour week for unorganized labor, because in nonunion shops the workers have no way of carrying on negotiations and cannot participate in setting up fair agreements. This proposal would also lower overtime payments for members of new or weak unions that do not have sufficient economic strength to negotiate fair agreements.

4. The present overtime provisions are not a bar to increased production. American output can and should be increased, but this must be done by planning to overcome bottlenecks in steel, power, food, etc. These bottlenecks will not be remedied by a change in the basic workweek. Production is already at record-breaking levels in many fields and shortages of materials and power arise from this very fact. Capacity must be expanded in steel to meet demand at home and abroad. Until this is done, metal-fabricating industries, such as autos, will be limited in output not by working hours but by lack of material. Similarly, an industry like cotton textiles could not produce more in 1948 with a longer workweek because there is not enough raw cotton and synthetic yarns. If some employers work long hours and use a larger share of the cotton supply, others will have to lay off employees.

The Council of Economic Advisers has supported the pattern of an 8-hour day and 5-day week. The council also states that "Even in those manufacturing lines where materials are adequate and weather impediments not the significant factor, it is not clear that merely stepping up the amount of labor effort would meet the real economic problems which confront us."

To insure greater production, there should be concrete plans for greater capacity in steel, etc.; careful allocation of scarce materials; a constructive farm program; compulsory licensing of patents; elimination of waste; and constructive cooperation between management and labor through industry councils to overcome bottlenecks.

5. Much manpower is now being wasted or used less efficiently than is possible. Many workers are unemployed, many more are underemployed in terms of hours or their potential skills. Women and minority groups are often denied training and advancement. Too little effort is made to adapt working hours to the needs of older people and partially disabled victims of war or industrial accidents. Improved training, health, and placement policies, with more efficient employment offices, can substantially increase the supply of labor. The proper approach is to make improvements in these matters, not to let employers take the easier course of simply imposing greater burdens on their employees.

6. The 40-hour week, with time and one-half pay for overtime, has become accepted as the American standard: It must be remembered that many workers must spend an hour or two getting to and from work each day in addition to the time at the work place. The speed-up, poor ventilation, and other bad working conditions often undermine the workers' health even in a 40-hour week. Longer hours have been proved repeatedly to mean more accidents, sickness, and waste. A recent study of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics confirms these facts and also indicates that output in the extra hours is apt to decline.

Millions of workers are close to or above 60 years of age or are veterans whose health was impaired or mothers with children to care for. They would suffer especially from a change in the scheduled week and so would their children. Undoubtedly some would be driven from the labor market.

The basic 40-hour week, with payment of time and one-half for overtime, is now embodied in most union-management contracts. These terms were found in 85 percent of a large group of agreements recently studied by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. Amendments of the Fair Labor Standards Act in this regard would affect first of all the unorganized workers not covered by such agreements. Insofar as employers would seek to change the overtime provisions in union agreements, industrial unrest would be increased.

American wage earners want adequate real wages rather than longer hours, especially since they know lay-offs may come without warning. Some few workers may be driven by low wages to work hours beyond their strength but they will pay the cost later and so will the Nation. The remedy is to increase their pay and limit rising prices, not to eliminate overtime provisions.

7. Inflation will not be remedied by changing the basic workweek or ending the payment of time and one-half for overtime: Food prices are highest of all due to shortages, and rationing of meat and other products with control of their prices is essential. Labor costs is a very small part of the bill in the food industry, and working hours are already long.

Industrial prices have soared because of shortages or because of deliberate setting of prices by companies at a level that is too high to permit mass consumption. With profits at the record-breaking level of $17,000,000,000 after taxes, it is clear that the cost of the overtime payments is not a real deterrent.

As former Commissioner of Labor Statistics Lubin testified, an employer is apt to make additional profits, and not lose anything, by lengthening the workweek, even though he pays time and one-half rates.

For example: Present straight-time hourly earnings in manufacturing average $1.21. A 44-hour week at customary overtime rates would yield weekly earnings of $55.66. If the employers got what some of them are asking for, the worker would receive only $53.24, a reduction of $2.42. Applied to a wage for the 44-hour week, it would mean a wage cut of about 4½ percent.

Below the Belt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of January 21, 1948. This editorial illustrates the type of thinking which marks the Republican national chairman but which I think is not typical of the majority of the Republican Party. It is too bad that Mr. Reece does not have the common decency to represent the views of honest Republicans rather than his own. His vicious and unfair attacks on the Democratic Party, the Democratic President, and the Democratic national chairman will not, and should not, sit well with the American people. As the editorial says, Mr. Reece hits "below the belt" when he continues the tactics which have marked him as the hatchetman of the Republican Party.

BELOW THE BELT

Republican National Chairman Carroll Reece's latest pronouncement gives a disquieting preview of things to come in this year's Presidential campaign.

According to Mr. Reece, Henry Wallace's entry into the field has resulted in the desperate efforts now being made by Mr. Truman to recover his disreputable lost foreign legion. And so that no one shall be in doubt as to the meaning of this foreign-legion reference, Mr. Reece goes on to discuss the domestic partnership of the Democratic Party and the Communist Party.

One must expect, of course, that the Republicans will make what political capital they can out of the Wallace challenge to President Truman. But the line which Mr. Reece seems bent upon following is a pretty shabby reward for a President who has had the courage to stand up for what he believes to be essential to the security of this country, knowing full well that such a stand would alienate the Wallaceites and that it might throw the election to the Republicans.

There have not been many rules in American politics and we have come to expect our political battles to be rough. But, granting all of this, Mr. Reece still is hitting below the belt, and it is quite likely that a good many Republicans will find it hard to stomach this smearing of a President who, if Mr. Wallace and the Communists have their way, is going to be liquidated politically because he refused to surrender on such vital points as military preparedness and the Marshall plan.

Time for Action on Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, aid to the displaced persons of Europe, tragic and helpless victims of war, is beyond all partisan consideration.

American public opinion has solidified in favor of immediate action. The highest leadership of both major parties is fully in favor of immediate action on the Stratton bill, or on some acceptable and practicable form of it.

The facts are known. The only remaining segments of public opinion rejecting the necessity of immediate action along the lines of the Stratton bill are the irreconcilables who refuse to accept facts.

Under leave, I present for the RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune published yesterday which expresses the views of the most distinguished editorial voice of the Republican Party—a view with which every American who glories in this country's past can agree:

FOR ACTION ON THE DP'S

Excellent reports on the displaced persons from Members of Congress and others who visited the European camps last year have discredited opposition to the resettlement of a reasonable number here. That opposition had its chief basis in the murky and mistaken suspicions of American isolationists. A move by State governments to facilitate the resettlement of needed farm workers, particularly in the Middle West, indicates that opposition on economic grounds was likewise baseless.

There is everything to be said for permitting a fair share of the displaced persons to come to our shores. The United States responsibility for leadership toward a just and permanent peace requires that we offer a solution of the war's gravest human problem. Resettlement is now the only acceptable solution for the hard core of refugees remaining in the DP camps. This country must open its doors if it hopes that other nations will open theirs. The refugees are, for the most part, people this country wants and needs. They hate tyranny; they have miraculously maintained self-respecting ambition through years of camp life. There are large groups of Poles and Balts who cannot return to their homelands for fear of persecution. They are like the 48 sailing Estonians whose plight, following their landing in Miami in late 1946, stirred the sympathies of the country. Such people still come to our shores in their small ships. Twenty-three reached Savannah last summer, only to be interned on Ellis Island. This group has just received permission to enter Canada. Is it not time that the United States opened its doors, took such people in?

It is far more costly to support a barren existence for the displaced in camps than to permit them to be self-supporting. If we are to offer that solution—it will be to our eternal shame if we do not—the offer must be made soon. Some of the best of the displaced are filtering off to countries which bid for special skills; the morale of the others cannot be maintained forever in internment camps. We urge that Congres speed the action required to admit a fair share of those whose loyalty to democratic principles is something to be nourished and sustained in this modern world.

Need for Investment Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 13, 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the enterprise system which we operate here in the United States is one which must continually expand in order to accommodate the new workers coming from an increasing population and, furthermore, all to the end that the goods and services which our people require and have reason to assume, will be available to them, may be produced.

It is a fact that here in the United States we do have more buildings, machinery, and machine tools for the use of our people than has any other country. Skilled and intelligent workers who desire to work have access to this machinery and machine tools, and when the skilled intelligence of the worker is combined with the productive machinery and tools, there comes forth great production per individual worker and these goods are placed on the market at prices which the masses can afford to pay.

There was a time when England and the western Europe countries enjoyed heavy production and a better standard of living than at the present time. But in due course, western European governments and England adopted a procedure and has since followed a course which has not been conducive to the individual citizens of those countries accumulating savings and investing them in buildings, machinery, and machine tools and thereby providing themselves with modern equipment. These people of western Europe and of England have participated in too many wars, have taxed their people beyond the capacity of the people to pay taxes and at the same time maintain their productive machinery and the necessary skilled workers.

The United States, Canada, and Japan stepped ahead of England and western Europe in the building and operation of modern machinery and machine tools, and the western European countries along with England began to lose their export markets to Japan, United States, Canada, and Australia.

Now the United States appears to be moving in a direction which imposes upon our people tax burdens for the purpose of maintaining heavy military operations, for the purpose of extending aid

to these countries to which I have referred, and for the purpose of providing Federal revenues to do so many other things which are not encouraging to the exercising of thrift and the investment of savings in the necessary buildings, machinery and machine tools to provide the people of the United States with the industrial goods which our citizens expect and demand.

Today there is a shortage of funds to be invested in capital goods. This shortage is becoming more acute. Mr. Truman, as you will remember only a few days ago, called upon our people to invest $50,000,000,000 in the tools of production. At the same time, Mr. Truman followed the usual New Deal angle and proposed a taxing formula that would siphon off much of the money that would normally go into capital investment. If the people are to accumulate money for capital investment purposes, those who receive income will have to be permitted to retain enough of it to so invest. People of large incomes have historically furnished a great amount of the capital for investment here in the United States. If those with substantial incomes are forced to put most of it in the tax box, from what source can capital for production purposes be obtained?

To illustrate some of the forces with which we must deal, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following article from the New York World-Telegram of December 19, 1947, by Lawrence Fertig:

TOOLS AND PROGRESS—BIG RISE IN NEW MACHINERY INVESTMENT NEEDED TO AVERT LIVING STANDARD DROP, SAYS ECONOMIST

(By Lawrence Fertig)

It is a startling fact, not generally recognized, that the standard of living in this country must decline over the year unless there is a tremendous increase of investment in the tools of production. Better tools and more tools, which can turn out more goods at lower cost, is the basic reason why any country increases its living standard in the long run. All other schemes—tinkering with money, raising wage rates, subsidizing one part of the population at the expense of another—are mere delusions. Production is what counts and tools make production.

It is disturbing to note that, by comparison with past decades, we have been falling far behind in our new capital investments. In every decade between 1880 and 1930 we increased our production plant from twenty to forty billion dollars (measured in dollars of 1929 purchasing power). In the 1920 to 1930 decade the increase totaled thirty-five billions. But from that point on our investment fell off.

As a matter of fact, during the 10 depression years after 1930, we actually decreased our productive plant by about $17,000,000,000, and today it is interesting to note the investment behind each worker in industry is actually smaller than it was in 1930 (measured in 1929 dollars). During the current year the capital market has been far from vigorous.

SAVINGS SHRINKING

The SEC reports that new securities issued for cash during the first 9 months totaled three and nine-tenths billions—a billion dollars less than last year, and this in the year of the highest volume and highest earnings in history.

The curious fact about this situation is that it is the direct opposite of the predictions made by the British economist, Lord Keynes, who was the father of the New Deal economic school and his followers. There could not be enough investment opportunities, they said, to absorb the oversupply of the people's savings. But where is this oversupply today?

Our actual savings are shrinking rapidly. There is not enough saved to meet the tremendous new demand for capital. Capital savings are made, to a great degree, by those who earn larger incomes—above $10,000 a year.

Despite the fact that there are twice as many such incomes as there were in the years 1925-29, the total of such incomes is about a billion dollars less. And as everyone knows, a great part of these earnings is taxed away by the Government. How can enough capital be accumulated to improve the average man's living standard if the Government takes it away in taxes?

Obviously a radical tax decrease in high-income brackets will have to be made if this situation is to be remedied. Labor leaders who oppose this move for political purposes will be cutting off their noses to spite their faces. Such opposition will, in the long run, lower the living standard of every laboring man in the country.

CONFIDENCE SHAKEN

It is confidence in the future, more than anything else, which encourages a man to give up his hard-earned savings for a possible future return. That confidence was badly shaken during the 1930's, first by the depression, and then by the experiments and business attacks of the New Deal.

More recently that confidence has been cooled by the widespread predictions (especially by administration representatives) of a coming depression. Another factor in dampening investment ardor has been the persistent barrage against high profits and fear of some Government action.

In a year like 1947 in which wages and salaries will probably total 125 billions, dividends paid out will be about six billions and total corporate profits will amount to 17 billions. When such dividends and profits are declared unconscionable by administration officials, many people hold fast to their preciously saved dollars and who is to blame them?

The Detroit Board of Education Requests Increased Allowances for Veterans' Educational Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution that was adopted by the board of education, Detroit, Mich.:

Whereas there are in attendance at Wayne University approximately 8,000 veterans, the majority of whom are receiving educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; and

Whereas it is evident that the rising costs of living are forcing many of these veterans either to withdraw from school, seriously modify their schedules of study, or undergo undesirable personal privations to remain in school: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this Board inform the Veterans' Administration of its belief in the necessity and importance of an upward adjustment of the subsidies for educational benefits; further,

Since married veterans under Public Act 346, and especially married veterans with children, are most sorely affected by the inadequacy of present allowances, that special consideration be given to such adjustments of subsistence allowances as will enable those veterans to pursue their educational programs; and further,

Since many Wayne University veterans must engage in some measure of outside employment to supplement their income from other sources, that favorable consideration be given to raising the level of restrictions on earnings for veterans attending school so that they may to a greater extent than now possible assist themselves in meeting the increased costs of living.

Keeping Guard on Our Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial appearing in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer on Friday, January 16, 1948:

KEEPING GUARD ON OUR FISHERIES

Encouraging progress is reported by Congressman HOMER R. JONES in his efforts to bring about the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of State charged with representing the interests of the American people in ocean fishery matters of international character.

This is of vital importance—not only because of the benefits which would be derived by the fishing industry from such a step, but because of its effect on the welfare and security of the whole Nation.

The Pacific Fisheries Conference, held in San Francisco last September, did not overstate the case in its "policy for fisheries—a policy for peace" when it declared:

"War or peace may hang upon the fishery clauses written into the peace treaty granted to Japan. Controversies over fisheries have led to war in the past. This danger is doubled today when nations compete for food in order to survive.

"Alone among industries, ocean fisheries are international affairs. In the fisheries alone, Americans compete in physical contact with men of other nations in areas where only international law applies—and few holds are barred. • • •

"Other nations recognize the international importance of fisheries, and the need for a firm voice in their behalf. They have ministers; we have subordinates. In our State Department there is no official of rank who can meet with the fishery ministers of other maritime nations on a basis of equality. Now, when we are granting a treaty of peace to Japan—the foremost fishery nation of the world—there is among our diplomats no authority competent to represent American fisheries."

The Seattle Chamber of Commerce has gone on record in support of the Pacific Fisheries Conference demand and only this week laid the matter before the Western States Council, as part of its program for the development of Alaska. Council approval would bring the concerted backing of all the chambers of commerce in the 11 western States.

Meanwhile Congressman JONES has been enlisting the support of Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, chairman of the Republican policy committee.

Senator VANDENBERG has promised to urge the State Department to give urgent consideration to the matter, and Senator TAFT expressed deep interest in the subject when he visited Seattle last autumn.

Thus we have reason to be optimistic, but we must not be complacent. We must keep up the fight until it is won.

The urgency of the situation was well expressed by Miller Freeman, chairman of the Pacific Fisheries Conference, in his keynote address.

"Almost alone," he said, "America liberated the Pacific—but we do not ask that it be made an American lake. We seek only equal opportunity for our fishermen on this greatest of oceans—but an equality measured in realism which recognizes:

"1. Difference in standards of living.

"2. The iniquity of employing debased currency and debased labor as weapons of international competition.

"3. The rights of Americans in the markets of America.

"4. The preferential position which a record of conservation and protection confers in fisheries.

"Finally, that the young men of the Pacific, who redeemed the Pacific, will not be driven from the sea."

As Mr. Freeman observed so eloquently, we must see that "the things America bought with blood are not given away by visionaries"—and an adequate fisheries secretariat is essential for that purpose.

President's Civil Rights Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed December 17, 1947, by the Willard Straight Post, No. 842, the American Legion, New York:

Whereas the concepts of Americanism and the American way of life are inseparable from the concepts of human equality and political fredom; and

Whereas an essential condition of human equality and political freedom is that individuals and minority groups shall enjoy guaranties of civil rights and be protected by the State in exercising them; and

Whereas the members of the American Legion have fought in two wars to defend Americanism and the American way of life: Be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, New York County Organization, endorses the report of the President's Civil Rights Committee, headed by Charles E. Wilson, president of the General Electric Co., and urges the President and the Congress to take action to effect the carrying out of the recommendations of that report; be it further

Resolved, That the commander of the county organization transmit copies of this resolution to those Senators and Representatives who represent New York County in Congress and to the legislative representative of the American Legion in Washington for information, and to the Department for its consideration.

IRVING M. ENGEL,
Commander.
FRANK GLICK,
Adjutant.

Truman, New Deal Regular

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for January 19, 1948:

TRUMAN, NEW DEAL REGULAR
(By Roscoe Drummond, in the Christian Science Monitor)

(Latest message to Congress as well as 10-year voting record in Senate show President to be devoted to liberal cause, says correspondent, but he may not press program on unwilling Republicans, preferring to concentrate on European aid, inflation, and defense.)

WASHINGTON.—There is nothing in his annual message to Congress which makes President Truman any more or any less of a New Dealer than he always has been.

His entire voting record as a 10-year Senator from Missouri and every State of the Union address which he has delivered to Congress show that Mr. Truman has consistently embraced all the essential social and economic objectives of the administration in which he was elected Vice President in 1944.

Mr. Truman has not departed from these purposes since he has been in the White House, and his election year message of this week does not add to the public-welfare program he has espoused in the past. The President has varied his tactics, as when he greatly muted his requests upon Congress after the Republicans won control of both Houses in 1946. At different times it has been suggested, either superficially or wishfully on the basis of surface events, that Mr. Truman was turning to the political right. He wasn't.

ADDRESSING THE VOTERS

The fact is that, without altering his objectives, the President made only a mild and moderate appeal for them to a Republican Congress which he knows is not going to follow his leadership. Actually, he was addressing himself more to the voters than to Congress and was setting forth the platform on which he will be campaigning for election next fall.

Even in the field of public-welfare legislation, the difference between the Republican and the Truman position is one of degree and of method.

Both the Republican and Democratic leaders are on record as endorsing a widening of social-security coverage and benefits, Federal aid for education, housing and medical care, and a higher minimum wage.

The Truman approach is to ask for large Federal appropriations to achieve most of these ends and to create new Federal agencies to administer them.

The approach of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Governor Dewey, and others, if they can carry the Republican Congress with them, is to begin spending in these fields in a more modest compass and to have Federal funds made available to the States and administered by the States. Mr. Truman is not alarmed at increasing the role and authority of the Government in public-welfare functions, while the Republicans wish to avoid expanding Federal bureaucracy by increasing State bureaucracy.

TAFT OPPOSES TVA

An examination of his speeches shows that Senator TAFT, for example, does not stand out against the stated social welfare objectives of the New Deal, except that of applying the TVA technique to the Federal development of other river valley projects. He resists and rejects its methods. He, as do most Republicans, wants the administration largely by States; the New Dealers, like Mr. Truman, want administration largely by Washington.

Thus, as contrasted with the New Deal concept of the "social security state," the Republican spokesmen, like Senator TAFT, bespeak the concept of the "social security states"—the 48 States aided financially by the Government to achieve social and educational objectives which their own resources do not permit their people to enjoy.

The tenor of his messages suggests that Mr. Truman may not press his long-range New Deal objectives upon the present session of Congress. He stated them in general terms, offered no specific recommendations. He has made his record and can stand on it.

The need right now is to concentrate on what imperatively needs to be done in the interests of the internal and international security of the country and not to stir up controversies which can't even safely be entered upon—let alone settled—until first things have been put first.

The first things are: Passage of the European recovery program on time; meaningful measures to control still-mounting inflation; the beginning of universal military training.

Inability To Deport Alien Communists in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith a news article by Joseph Dear captioned "Russians hard to send back once admitted to United States," which was published recently in the Wilmington (Del.) Sunday Star.

I recommend a careful and thoughtful reading of this article for it points up a serious need for some revision in our immigration and naturalization laws and emphasizes another real threat to our national security.

You will note from this article that, according to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, there are now approximately 3,000 Russians legally in the United States. It is reported that more than 1,500 of them were admitted in 1947 alone. In addition, there are known to be at least 80 other Russian aliens who are deportable because they have been adjudged to be Communists and who are roaming at liberty about this country because Russia has refused to take them back or because acceptance of them by Russia is still pending. The use of the word "pending" is questionable, however, since many of these cases have been in that status for periods up to 15 years. In addition to

these approximately 80 Russians, the immigration authorities state that there are approximately 45 other alien Communists who are deportable, but who, after short periods of detention, have been freed because their governments have refused to permit them to return.

I am told that under our existing laws the only requirement with which these alien Communists must now comply is to report to the immigration authorities any change in permanent address. Consequently, it seems to be admitted that this Government does not know what these alien Communists are doing; what their sources of income are; or what associations they maintain.

This situation, I say, needs prompt and appropriate remedial action. We are spending billions of dollars annually for national security. Yet, these aliens who are known to profess an ideology which includes the overthrow of our Government—by force, if necessary—are allowed to roam at will throughout our country.

Certainly this is an incongruous situation which merits our immediate attention. Therefore, it is my earnest hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will study this problem in an earnest effort to find and to establish legislation which will tend to control the present situation and make certain that no new cases of this nature can arise.

In this same connection, I wish to commend the Committee on the Judiciary on the prompt action it has taken to consider H. R. 4555 and House Joint Resolution 263, both of which were introduced during the recent special session and both of which would establish a reciprocal arrangement controlling the number of citizens of Soviet Russia and its satellites residing in or visiting the United States.

The afore-mentioned article from the Wilmington (Del.) Sunday Star follows:

RUSSIANS HARD TO SEND BACK, ONCE ADMITTED TO UNITED STATES

(By Joseph Dear)

WASHINGTON.—Once a Russian gets into this country it is almost impossible to get him out.

He may be a Communist agent disguised as a businessman here on a 2-month trip, he may be visiting friends and relatives, he may have entered the country illegally, he may have entered lawfully with the intention of taking out naturalization papers; but no matter how he comes, the United States is powerless to deport him unless Russia agrees to take him back.

This little publicized possibility exists because of the present immigration laws. The joker in these statutes is: Aliens can be deported only to their own country, and only if that country is willing to readmit them.

These revelations were made by Immigration Commissioner Watson B. Miller to the Sunday Star.

They have some lawmakers on Capitol Hill worried.

Suppose Russia should purposely refuse to readmit a citizen because she wanted him to stay in the United States and operate as an agent? Suppose it has been done many times already?

More than 1,500 Russians were admitted to the United States in 1947, says Representative CHARLES AYRON, Republican, of New Jersey, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Apparently they can stay, if their country wants them to, no matter how Uncle Sam feels.

Miller also stated the United States cannot keep deportable aliens in custody "for an unreasonable length of time," even if it is known they are agents of a foreign power.

According to the Immigration Commissioner, an agent would have to be given virtual freedom after a period of 4 months to 1 year, if his native country would not issue him a passport.

Miller disclosed that Russia "became diffident" about issuing passports to its traveling citizens about 1938.

Even if a Russian should enter the country illegally, he could stay as long as his government deemed it necessary.

Immigration laws state aliens can be deported to the port of embarkation for the United States.

If the alien sailed for this country from a French port, the United States could return him to the French port and let authorities there worry about him.

But if the alien sailed from a Russian port, or from the port of a Russian satellite country, the United States could not deport the alien unless Russia was willing to lift one of her iron curtains to readmit him.

Earlier this week Commissioner Miller testified to a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee that Russia has refused to take back between 160 and 180 of her deportable aliens now in the United States.

Some observers suggest Russia would refuse responsibility for the actions of her agents. If an agent were arrested in the United States for a criminal offense, Russia would claim the agent acted completely on his own initiative.

Veterans Hospital at Birthplace of Booker T. Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous leave to extend remarks granted to the Members of the House on January 19, 1948, at the time that H. R. 3814 was approved by this body, I wish to extend my remarks as follows:

It gives me particular pleasure to urge the establishment of a veterans hospital at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Virginia. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee I cast my vote in favor of this legislation when it was first considered by our committee.

By our action here today, we are providing $5,000,000 to honor a great American in the manner in which he would most like to be honored—not by erecting a marble shaft or a bronze statue, but by creating a vital, living thing which will be of benefit to the people of the community where Booker T. Washington was born and lived. It is highly appropriate that on this occasion the rules should be suspended in favor of so worthy a bill.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee has had the benefit of the loyal cooperation of the Booker T. Washington Memorial Association and of its president, Mr. S. J. Phillips, during the time this bill was pending in committee. The assistance which they rendered was of inestimable value and I should like to extend to them my personal appreciation.

No Grain Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I attempted to make a factual study of the whole problem of grain allocation for beverage distilling purposes. In a few days this matter will once again face the Congress, and I think it very important that we approach the problem in a realistic and unemotional manner. Unfortunately, when any legislative problem affecting the distilling industry comes before the Congress, the wet and dry issues inevitably become involved. Such issues have absolutely no place in the matter of allocation of grains, and I have tried to approach the problem from the standpoint of what should be done to assure maximum food production. Maximum food production is needed to increase domestic supply and thereby control further price advances and to provide foodstuffs for export to the starving people of the world. In my opinion, serious curtailment of beverage distilling operations does not increase the over-all food supply, and this point I will attempt to prove.

AMOUNT AND TYPE OF GRAIN USED

In 1935 through 1940 this country produced an average of about 4,500,000,000 bushels of feed grains per year. The distilling industry used 24,000,000 bushels per year, which amounted to 0.76 percent. I think we Members of the Congress realize that the distilling industry uses less than 1 percent of our annual grain production. Much of our grain remains on the farm, but of the grain which is actually marketed, less than 2½ percent is used by the distilling industry. Except during the war years, when the distillers were directed to use wheat because at that time it was in surplus and we had no means of shipping it to Europe, the consumption of wheat by the distilling industry is almost negligible. It amounts to about 1 bushel out of every 25,000 bushels raised. For the most part, distillers use grains which are not in themselves end-food products. Corn is the grain used in largest quantity in the production of distilled beverage spirits. Corn is not primarily a human food grain, but it is a means toward beef, pork, dairy, and poultry products.

THE ANIMAL FOOD VALUE OF THE BYPRODUCTS

To understand this problem, we must know something about the byproducts from the distilling process. Two principal byproducts of the industry are distillers' light grains and distillers' solubles. Distillers' light grains are secured by the drying of the coarse grains which have been screened from the spent stillage. For each 100 pounds of grain used by a distiller, about 16 pounds of light grains are obtained. By an evaporation and drum-drying process, distillers' dried solubles are obtained. This amounts to another 16 or 17 pounds from each 100 pounds of grain mashed. It can, therefore, be seen that 32 to 33 pounds of dry byproduct is obtained from each 100 pounds of grain used. The interesting fact to note is that this 33 pounds, when used as a supplement feed, has greater value for animal nutrition than the original 100 pounds of corn. The plus value comes from the addition of yeast in the distilling process. A recent test was made on 30 head of steers averaging 840 pounds each. They were fed during the course of this test 1,000 bushels of corn and 13 tons of roughage. In 112 days, they gained an average of 160 pounds each. Thirty similar steers, averaging 840 pounds each, were fed 800 bushels of corn plus the distillers' feed made from 200 bushels of corn, and only 11 tons of roughage. These cattle in 112 days showed an average gain of 205 pounds per head. In other words, by using the same amount of corn and 2 tons less of hay, the cattle fed with distillers' feed made from a portion of the corn showed an average increased gain of 45 pounds. This is the way to produce more food.

We are all very much concerned with the acute shortage of dairy products. In 1943, 24,000,000 pounds of dry skim milk was used in animal feeds. This can be completely replaced with 29,000,000 pounds of distillers' dry solubles and the dry skim milk can then become available for human consumption.

Since the grain used by the distillers is feed grain, which will ultimately lead to animal products in our agricultural economy, I cannot see how human food supplies are increased with the curtailment of distilling operations, when the byproduct from the distillery proves to be a better animal food than the grains used by the distillery in the production of that exact amount of byproduct.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley Before Lynchburg Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine speech made by Hon. James A. Farley before the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of Lynchburg, Va., on January 15, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very happy to meet with the businessmen and civic leaders of Lynchburg. Never was there more need of such leadership as this body is giving to its city, its State, and its Nation. Our major economic problem is production, and it is up to American business to meet that problem with vigor and vision. I congratulate you and wish for you a prosperous and productive new year.

A very special reason for my happiness in being here is rooted in many personal memories. Lynchburg gave Carter Glass to the world and to history. Here he was born, was educated. Here, too, he was a civic leader and a businessman. And here he was always at home.

No man in this century gave more devotion to his State, his Nation, and the world. His statesmanship was in the great Virginia tradition of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Marshall, and Wilson. He was a worthy successor to these great builders. And his constructive achievements will live as long as the Nation endures.

I cherished his personal friendship for many years. The proudest moment in my life was made possible by an act of splendid unselfishness by Carter Glass. In 1940, he stood before a not-too-friendly National Democratic Convention in Chicago and commended me for whatever services and loyalty I had given to the country and to my party. When he did that he was giving of the fast-ebbing physical strength of 82 years, and he was braving the resentment of time-serving men. But when personal and public loyalties were involved, Carter Glass never counted the cost. He gave all that he had, over the long years, in the most difficult situations and on to the very end of a long life.

We might tonight, in framing our policies and planning our course, draw our inspiration and our ideas from the faith of Carter Glass. For his ideas live on. The dangers we face he always saw. The remedies for our present ills were what he believed. His spirit can carry us through, if we are as loyal to that spirit as he was loyal to us.

Carter Glass was a man who thought for himself. He never hesitated to tell the truth as he saw it. A long succession of Presidents knew and respected him, but he never hesitated to criticize them when the public interest was involved. He laid it on the line in words no man could misunderstand.

And that, above all, is what is needed in these times. Time-serving and face-saving in public office only deepen the dangers that we face. These times call for plain speech and courageous action.

But while Carter Glass blazed with independence, he believed in party government. A man cannot serve by himself alone. He serves when he works shoulder to shoulder with like-minded men. If we all go our separate political ways, we shall be lost in a wilderness. We shall be the prey to alien and domestic enemies.

We should belong to a party—some party. When our party is wrong we should say so and we should try to make it right. Sometimes that way is hard. We may be misunderstood for a time. But in the long run, a party is controlled by the best blood within it. In the long run, a party comes back to its best traditions. In the long run, it finds its way home. That Carter Glass believed and that should be the faith of all of us, whatever party we join.

We have already heard of the rise of a new party. So far, it seems to be a one-man party. Perhaps it will end as a one-man party. It is significant that the founder of this new party has in one lifetime already been for a few years in each of the old parties. In neither party has he found happiness. We may only hope that now that he has a party of his own, he can be happy in it and be loyal to it.

Another great principle for which Carter Glass stood was sound finance and sound, economical administration of government. In these days we are in great need of the lessons taught by Carter Glass in keeping our country on the road to stability and prosperity. A great war and great foreign demands since that war have given us full employment and a full measure of prosperity. Our task now is to see that we can sustain this high level of production and jobs without the old familiar slide down into the depths of depression. Never was it so essential to do this, because our whole influence in the world depends upon our remaining strong and stable. The Communist world is eagerly expecting that economic trouble at home will weaken us abroad. We must disappoint that hope at all costs.

This effort to avoid economic disaster should, in the last analysis, be no mere party issue. It ought to be an American issue. Nonpartisanship in this field has already shown itself in the cooperation between Democrats like Senators BARKLEY, CONNALLY, GEORGE, and BYRD, with Senator VANDENBERG and Congressman EATON, like-minded Republicans.

We must find the means of curbing inflation without destroying freedom of enterprise, and we ought to do it without seeking partisan advantage.

One of the basic principles of Carter Glass was that, while government could do many things which might destroy confidence and retard natural economic progress, it could not provide a substitute for economic progress. The great ideal of government ought to be to discover the needs and trends of free enterprise and to lend what aid it can to furthering those needs and trends. Government spending can never be a real and lasting substitute for private investment and venture capital. Taxation should be used for two purposes—to gather revenue for the legitimate expenses of government and to promote the essential expansion of our industrial production through private funds. Taxation should not be an instrument for redistributing wealth for political advantage.

Moreover, we should, in times like this, when Government revenues are high, attempt to reduce, not increase, the costs of Government. Whatever can be saved should be saved here and now, for we cannot be assured that our national income will always remain at the immense and unprecedented levels it has now reached. In his incessant labors to reduce the costs of Government and the burdens of taxation, your able Senator, HARRY BYRD, has well served his Nation.

I am not one of those who indulge in vain hopes or gloomy predictions of the future. Last year many of our experts were predicting a great recession of business in 1947. They little reckoned on the great productive capacity of the American people. They made the mistake of selling the United States short. They were proved to be wrong.

But because they were wrong and because we ended the year prosperously, we must not assume that good times are to be with us always and that we need not exercise all prudence and energy. We can move forward if we are alert and if we work as we should.

The great demands of our people and the vast needs of Europe and Asia require production and yet more production. We cannot produce without work. And we cannot constantly reduce our work hours and increase our leisure hours without courting trouble. Labor and management must work shoulder to shoulder at the task of lifting our standard of living through the making of the goods necessary to that standard of living. A man does not attain a full life by a full pay envelope alone. His life is made up of what his money will buy.

Our greatest inflationary problem is in the realm of food. From August 1939 to August 1947 farm products rose nearly 200 percent. Food rose 150 percent. But the products of machines, such as motor vehicles, metal products, house furnishings, and agricultural implements rose on an average less than 50 percent. (These figures are from Bureau of Labor Statistics.)

Thus, the most serious problem before us is the price of what we eat and drink. The prospects for checking inflation in that direction are not particularly dark.

In 1947 European crops were worse than in 1946. To make matters worse, our own corn crop was 850,000,000 bushels less than in the preceding year. We had a better wheat crop, but that did not make up the difference. All of this means that our meat supply will be shorter and shorter for some time. I think we have every reason to believe that the food

situation will be very much better this year. I am optimist enough to believe that we will not have two successive years of bad corn crops. Moreover, there will be less demand for corn for animal feeding, because there will be fewer animals.

The wheat prospects are not so good as last year, but they are far above the prewar average. The new estimates of the wheat crop are now almost up to 1,300,000,000 bushels. This is 50 percent higher than before the war. The Canadian wheat crop looks good. And the Argentinian wheat crop is already larger than was anticipated.

In Europe, the crop prospects are better than they were last year and the year before. More acres are being planted. The winter weather has been more favorable. Europe has more fertilizers and better seeds than last year.

Over the world the situation in fats and oils is better. Rice prospects are somewhat better than last year, especially in places like Burma.

Even Russia is going to export a large amount of grain. Some of this will go to England, and that will relieve us of part of our burden.

In the face of these favorable prospects, it is not rash to believe that the inflationary trend may be checked by natural causes.

I am not a business prophet, but I am certainly able to distinguish between a good prophet and a bad prophet a year after the facts are in. As you remember, a year ago many of our economists were telling us that 1947 would be very bad, especially in the latter part of the year. The prophets were all wrong. They are not prophesying with such certainty this year, and perhaps that should be a note of warning to us. I certainly would be frightened if they were all predicting good business for the whole year, because they have been wrong in the past.

However, I find among reliable businessmen a note of caution, particularly with reference to the second half of the year. This spirit of caution is a very good thing, because it will mean careful inspection of all the signs and careful control of inventory and prudent investments.

Since the President's budget has got itself involved in a political controversy, I shall limit my comments on Government finance to a few very general remarks. I am not in the administration and I am not in Congress and, therefore, I can look upon this controversy with some detachment. It seems to me, however, that at a time like this it may be wise to defer as many of the Government expenditures as possible and perhaps hold them for a period, later on, when there is greater unemployment and greater need for stimulating business.

It is not wise, however, in the troubled state of the world to economize in matters that affect our national defense. We are living in a world in which our diplomacy must be firmly backed up by undiminished strength. We should maintain our Navy in a state of the highest efficiency and provide for a sound and national system of military training. Whether this is to be based on conscription or not is a matter for Congress, after a careful examination of the facts, to determine. Above all, however, we must not starve those agencies in our military services which are developing higher and higher degrees of scientific perfection. The next war, if it must come, will be a clash of scientific and mechanical inventions and developments. We have led the world in this field and we must continue to lead it, not only as a measure of national defense, but as a sound measure for production in civil life.

I am sure that if Carter Glass were here, he would favor the general principles of the Marshall plan. Carter Glass served under the great war President, Woodrow Wilson. He supported Wilson loyally on that great man's effort to establish the machinery of peace. Glass was no isolationist. He believed that the great power of this country, of necessity, would project it deeper and deeper into the affairs of the world. We cannot remain safe and prosperous in this country if Europe is permitted to disintegrate and to fall into the hands of communism. We must lend a strong hand in preserving in western Europe ideals and institutions from which we derived our own principles and system of government. President Truman and General Marshall have proposed a plan which utilizes to the full the cooperation of all those countries and also offers to them material means of recovery.

This is not a party question, nor is it a question that ought to be thrown into the arena of partisan debate. We are asked to provide assistance over a period of years and to fix the amount of our assistance for the first 16 months at something over $6,000,000,000. Those of us who are not in the Government are unable to ascertain all the facts that are involved, and I have confidence that our congressional leaders in both parties will ultimately make a wise judgment in this vital matter.

Whether Congress can or should pledge any amount for the years beyond July 1949 is beside the question. The important thing, it seems to me, is to agree on principles of wisely helping Europe in attaining recovery and in building up free institutions as long as that may be necessary. We can determine that as we go, if we agree on the principles now.

However, it is not the amount of aid that we give that is most significant. It is the way it is to be administered. We must avoid as far as possible the mere subsidizing of governments through the careless giving of money and goods. Our aid ought to be built into the vital economic structure of these countries. If France, Italy, and other countries have sound and productive economies we can feel assured that a prosperous people will not turn to communism. They will support governments based on principles of freedom, justice, and fair representation of all groups. Communism grows only in confusion.

I am convinced, therefore, that in setting up the administrative machinery to conduct our European aid we should draw into its management some of the best strains that America's free-enterprise system has created. We must look for management and direction to those who have successfully managed and directed great productive enterprises in the United States. In setting up this plan we ought to have the trained and experienced advice of men like B. M. Baruch, Herbert Hoover, and many others that I might mention. These men ought to be drawn into this service regardless of the party to which they owe allegiance.

And we ought to make sure in setting up this program that every dollar that is not needed for the actual relief of hunger and cold is used to build productive enterprise so that Europe will ultimately attain a sustaining basis.

Along with all this economic help should be the wisest and the most trained service in the diplomatic field. The time is past when we can look upon the foreign service of the United States as a minor part of the Government. We need training of the most intensive sort in our institutions of learning and in our Government to see that those who represent us abroad truly stand for all that is best in American life.

I have had some experience in the field of exports, and in the course of my business I have traveled over the past years in most of the civilized countries in the world. I have met hundreds of foreign businessmen and public officials. I have seen how American enterprises are respected abroad. And I have come to realize with more and more intensity how important it is to develop the best brains in matters relating to foreign service—both in business and in government. The greatest export that this country can provide is an export of brains.

With respect to that, I think we might be guided by the spirit of Virginia's great educator—Thomas Jefferson. I need not remind you that Jefferson gave the last and best years of his life not to public service but to the development of education. It was his firm belief that free governments could survive only with an educated citizenship. In the educational system that he conceived, there was to be not only training of average citizens, but the training of leaders. That is why he conceived the great idea of the State university—an idea that has gone out from Virginia and has permeated every State in the Union. In my own State of New York, a subject of discussion now is the establishment of a State university. This idea, which is so vital in this year of 1948 in the State of New York is a direct outgrowth of the thinking of Thomas Jefferson.

America is launched upon a career of world-wide influence and activity. In this we are not following the lines of the old imperialistic exploitation. When the Roman Empire stretched its power over the world, it was in pursuit of selfish gain. Wherever it went, it exacted tribute from conquered states. The same thing was true of the Spanish Empire of 400 years ago. And it was true of the British Empire in its earlier stages.

Americans must avoid this mistake that, in every case that I have mentioned, brought proud empires down to death and dissolution. While we cannot avoid the enormous spread of our influence, we must win the confidence and respect of the peoples with whom we come in contact. At the present moment we are manifesting what may be called "imperialism in reverse." Instead of exploiting those countries with which we come in contact, we are offering help. There is no reason why we cannot continue this wise and unselfish policy. We have at home the greatest sources of wealth in the world. We can, if we maintain a sound economic system and retain the blessings of political liberty, support ourselves at home on a continually rising standard of living and at the same time help stabilize the world. Wherever our goods are sold throughout the world, we want those who buy them to know that they are getting full value and that we are seeking no selfish ends.

It is this vision of constructive international cooperation that should enlighten our public policies. The great statesmen who came from Virginia—Washington, Marshall, Jefferson, Madison, Wilson, and, I may add, Carter Glass—stood for this kind of foreign policy. It is for us, upon whom the responsibilities of a new generation have fallen, to continue this enlightened policy. The tasks ahead of us are very great, but with the light of the past to guide us and with the firm determination to be loyal to our traditions, we can move on to increased influence and sound and stable peace.

The Federal Government's Position in Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1948, Congressman RALPH A. GAMBLE, chairman of the Joint Committee on Housing, made a statement opening a public hearing on the Public Housing Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

This statement contains startling information about the ever-upward rising cost of Government ownership and operation in housing.

How many of you are aware that already, in this Nation, whose strength was derived from and rests upon private enterprise, our Federal Government's position, direct and contingent, in housing, foots up to $20,000,000,000?

The statement follows:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S POSITION IN HOUSING

(Opening statement by Chairman RALPH A. GAMBLE at hearing of Joint Committee on Housing, January 20, 1948)

Early in our inquiry, Mr. Raymond M. Foley, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, kindly prepared for us an excellent summary of all Government agencies related to housing, whether or not under his supervision. Although I sent this summary to the members of the Joint Committee on Housing I now should like to include also a copy in the record.

In preparing for the hearing today Housing and Home Finance Agency, at our request, provided further voluminous information on the Federal Government's present over-all position in housing. While I, personally, was most concerned with expenditures, commitments, and results, I also was interested in the effect which Federal Housing policies may be having on the housing shortage, which every member of this committee is trying to overcome.

From this latest information which I now submit in its complete form for inclusion in the record, a brief analysis has been made. The outstanding fact of this analysis is that the Federal Government's position in housing today involves at least $20,000,000,000.

The expenditures made by the central agency, its predecessor agencies, and the various agencies which at one time or another have been engaged in construction and other activities related to housing from about 1933 down to June 30, 1947, appear to total approximately:

Operating expenditures	$1,624,000,000
Construction expenditures	2,754,000,000
Subsidies to low-rent housing and to producers of materials	80,000,000
Total expenditures	4,458,000,000

The financial commitments by the Government for housing which come under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Finance Agency may amount in the periods through which these commitments run to the following sums:

Contribution to low-rent housing during the next 50 years

Maximum amount less loans and loan commitments, which would be wiped out by such contributions	$641,000,000
Insurance, maximum now authorized plus $1,000,000,000 which the President is empowered to add to the authorization	9,158,000,000
Total commitments	9,799,000,000

The expenditures and the commitments of the Federal Government which fall under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Agency therefore total as a maximum approximately $14,257,000,000.

In addition to the expenditures and commitments summarized above the Federal Government has made further expenditures and commitments in other agencies, as—

Insurance of GI housing loans through the Veterans' Administration.

GI housing loans as of Dec. 25, 1947:

Number of loans guaranteed	1,056,771
Amount of Federal commitment	$6,107,000,000

Federal National Mortgage Association, under the jurisdiction of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has provided a secondary market for the purchase of mortgages on homes through the RFC Mortgage Co., the authority for which expired June 30, 1947, and through the Federal National Mortgage Association. The amount of the mortgages purchased or for which there are commitments to purchase totals:

For RFC Mortgage Co	$146,000,000
For Federal National Mortgage Association	4,700,000
Total	150,700,000

Public housing under the jurisdiction of the War and Navy Departments.

This housing is located at posts or stations of the Army and Navy, so is not considered herein as part of the public-housing commitments of the Government.

Much has been said by the public and in the hearings about the lack of help and participation by the Federal Government in the housing program past, present and future.

Consequently, it should be helpful to the country to know more about the participation by the Federal Government. According to a compilation of figures from the multifarious Federal agencies which I have just seen, I wonder whether the Government's right hand knows what its left hand is doing? I personally doubt it.

As indicated by the above summary, the Federal Government has made specific commitments and obligations by direct guarantees of bonds and contingent guarantees, and/or contingent liabilities of guarantees on bonds and/or subsidies, from 1933 up to June 30, 1947, apparently involving at least $20,000,000,000, plus such expenditures and commitments as have been made by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its underlying agencies since June 30, 1947. I would say that was a sizeable amount.

Against this must be offset, of course, revenues from operation, such as rentals on properties directly operated by the Government, fees, and insurance premiums, etc., and the difference between the interest rates which the Government charges for use of credit and the rates at which money is made available by the United States Treasury. Much of the income from the operations of Federal housing agencies which has been reported by the Housing and Home Finance Agency up to June 30, 1947, appears to be of a nonrecurring nature, or at least subject to very substantial shrinkage in the years ahead.

There is also the asset value of properties either directly owned by the Government or which it may be forced to take over. Apparently there is no well-defined and comprehensive appraisal of asset values. The realization values that may be obtained through liquidation are, of course, impossible to estimate. As one example of the uncertainty of realization from capital expenditures may be cited the war housing programs which to date have cost $2,468,024,000, from which the realization as reported by Housing and Home Finance Agency to June 30, 1947, has totaled only $16,826,900.

The reserves accrued to date, principally on physical properties, appear to total only about $162,000,000, to which should be added the reported net worth of insurance funds amounting to about $152,000,000, making a total of about $334,000,000 compared with potential commitments by H & HFA alone of nearly $15,000,000,000.

The information on expenditures and commitments made under the United States Housing Act indicates that there are loan commitments, of more than $106,000,000 for construction of dwellings that has been held up largely because the cost of completing the projects would be in excess of the limits set in the United States Housing Act of 1937 as amended. Considerable land has been acquired and some expenditures have been made on these projects which are designed to provide 17,649 urban dwelling units and 6,460 rural dwelling units. In view of the present serious shortage of dwelling units, especially of the multi-family type, it would appear that every effort should be made to utilize as promptly as possible any lands and structures now frozen under the "deferred projects". Public Law 301 authorizes State and local authorities to activate these projects through contributing funds required in excess of the limits set for Federal funds. Action either by such bodies or provision of authority for private developers to complete the projects would contribute directly toward solving the housing shortage.

The information submitted by Mr. Foley contains a comprehensive discussion of the effect of Federal housing policies on the housing shortage, the subject of one of the questions put by the committee. The conclusions expressed in that treatment of the subject appear to boil down to the following:

Rental ceilings on new construction, based on a fair return on investment, have not impeded the volume of desirable new construction.

The solution of the housing shortage is large and sustained production of houses, especially rental and low-priced homes.

Increased capacity and production of basic materials and better use of the materials is necessary to a higher rate of production of homes.

Some price increases are necessary to increase of production.

FHA title VI insurance has increased effective consumer demand for dwellings.

Title II insurance which requires the mortgagor to put up substantial equity has not been as extensively used in 1946 and 1947 as the more liberal title VI insurance.

The Veterans' Administration loan program does not provide as great a direct aid to production as that offered by FHA title VI insurance.

Government aids to the production of housing have increased production substantially—and also have added consumer pressure.

Veterans have been given a preferential position in the supply of new housing which, however, has tended to be most effective in the higher income groups of veterans.

To the extent that credit aids increase demand without increasing production or reducing costs and prices they are not only futile, because the extra credit is drained off in higher prices, profits, and incomes, but they are also harmful to the economy as a whole because of their inflationary influences. Future Government credit aids for housing should be guided by this principle. Legislation embodying these principles have been before Congress during the last 2 years.

The Public Housing Administration has the responsibility for all development of housing projects in which the Federal Government is interested; for operating the federally owned projects and for supervising the fiscal side of the operations of the locally owned low-rent housing projects. It is also responsible for disposing of the properties embraced by the vast program of war housing and

other projects assigned to it for liquidation. The low-rent housing developments covered by the United States Housing Act of 1937 comprised a total of 215,310 dwelling units in which about $884,000,000 has been invested. Federal loans and direct construction account for $504,000,000. The average investment per dwelling unit is $2,340.

In order to maintain the low-rent nature of the developments, the Federal Government under the law is authorized to contribute up to $28,000,000 yearly to the expenses of operating and meeting the debt service and other expenses of the housing projects. Up to June 30, 1947, a total of $56,211,600 has been contributed to the expenses of the local housing authorities.

From an immediate monetary standpoint one of the most important phases of the operations of the Public Housing Administration today is the responsibility for disposing of the war housing built under the Lanham Act and various other acts enacted to provide housing for war workers. The total investment by the Federal Government in property assigned for disposal is almost $2,000,000,000. This includes expenditures made under the veterans' reuse program, which converted some of the war housing structures to use for distress cases and others to meet the demand for dwellings to house veterans and their families at educational institutions.

Nearly 700,000 dwellings units are involved in this program. Of these over 100,000 dwelling units are of a type comparable with the low-rent housing built under the Housing Act and nearly 80,000 are demountable structures which can be left in place or moved as desirable. The temporary structures must be disposed of, according to the law, before July 25, 1949; the permanent housing "as expeditiously as possible."

The Public Housing Administration reports that it has budgeted for its operations for the fiscal year 1948 a total of $11,500,000 for administrative expense. A total of 1,872 persons were employed as of December 31, 1947, in administrative work compared with employment of 4,273 as of June 30, 1946, and 3,380 at June 30, 1947.

As of December 31, 1947, Housing and Home Finance Agency had a total of 11,888 employees, of which 6,296 were with PHA.

The record as to dates of approval by PHA of the budgets for locally owned projects with local fiscal years ending in the Federal fiscal year 1947 is as follows: Of budgets approved for 254 statutory projects, only 62 were approved in advance of the beginning of the local housing authority fiscal year; 61 were approved within 1 month after the beginning of the local fiscal year; and of the remainder, 30 were approved within 2 months, 40 within 3 months, 25 within 4 months, 8 within 5 months, 8 within 6 months, and 20 were approved more than 6 months after the beginning of the local fiscal year. There were 10 instances where project budgets were not approved for that fiscal year.

To sum up: Including commitments, the Federal Government's position, direct and contingent, in the ownership, operation, and insurance of housing today, appears to involve at least $20,000,000,000. How is this position justified in the face of demands for price reductions, tax reductions, increased appropriations for our armed services and increased appropriations for European relief?

In this experiment, of the type that led to the establishment of the present British Government, it appears that the Housing and House Finance Agency has 11,888 employees, of which 6,296 are with the (Federal) PHA, and that, of the latter 6,296 PHA employees, 1,872 are assigned to administrative work, which work carries a budget for the fiscal year of 1948, of $11,500,000. When the urgent national demand is that every worker be a producer how can this economically nonproductive expense be justified?

In the above total, no account is taken of employees and administrative expense in the 254 statutory local housing projects. I wonder what this bill to the taxpayer foots up to? I propose to find out.

Finally, I note that considerable numbers of these local housing authorities apparently keep on spending money regardless of whether or not their budgets are approved by PHA, as required by Federal regulation, based on the law. What is the law? And what can the taxpayers do to regain fiscal control of these local public-housing operations, which now apparently function in a financial no-man's land, free from real control by the Federal, State, or municipal governments, yet heavily endowed by the Federal Government, and sustained by Federal subsidies, plus local subsidies, in the form of virtual tax forgiveness?

Communism Defined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Defines Communism," which appeared in the first issue of the Young Republican News of Washington, D. C., under date of January 15, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFINES COMMUNISM

Recently a nationally known radio commentator awarded a $10,000 mink coat for "the best definition of a Communist."

We already had a best definition from William Z. Foster, head of the Community Party in the United States.

Under oath before a Committee of Congress, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he revealed the world-wide objectives of communism.

The testimony:

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, does your party advocate the destruction of religious belief?

"Mr. FOSTER. Our party considers religion to be the opiate of the people, as Karl Marx has stated, and we carry on propaganda for the liquidation of these prejudices among the workers.

"The CHAIRMAN. To be a member of the Communist Party do you have to be an atheist?

"Mr. FOSTER. Many workers join the Communist Party who still have some religious beliefs, and when he joins the party he will soon get rid of them.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, can members of the Communist Party in Russia be married in the church and maintain religious belief?

"Mr. FOSTER. My opinion is that a member of the party of the Soviet Union who would be married in the church wouldn't be of any value to the Communist Party.

"The CHAIRMAN. And now for loyalty to our country. If I understand you, Mr. Foster, the workers of America look on the Soviet flag as their flag.

"Mr. FOSTER. The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag. That's the Red flag.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, do you owe allegiance to the American flag? Does the Communist Party owe allegiance to the American flag?

"Mr. FOSTER. I stated very clearly that the Red flag is the flag of the revolutionary class and we are part of the revolutionary class and all capitalist flags are the flags of the capitalist class and we owe no allegiance to them."

The Tariff Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of January 20, 1948:

THE TARIFF ISSUE

A year ago it appeared likely that the tariff issue would be one of the big fights in Congress. But for better or worse, the new Republican majorities were beguiled from going to bat for their historic pledge of tariff protections.

The result has been a huge increase in the number of tariff reductions, coupled with a determined effort on several New Deal fronts to "freeze" this Nation into a free-trade policy.

Despite the fact that several phases of the tariff issue will come before Congress in connection with other matters, it does not appear probable that the tariff question, as such, will be fought through to a conclusion at the present session.

The fact of the matter is that the tariff issue, large as it looms during normal conditions, is dwarfed by other special issues raised by current foreign and domestic policies.

Inflation is uncurbed. What matters high or low tariff if the Nation is going broke? The Marshall plan calls for the siphoning off of billions of dollars in money and commodities—the giving of them to foreign countries so that, among other things, they can afford to buy more of our exports. This will produce, for its duration, a wholly abnormal state of world trade in which tariff questions will have little immediate importance.

The war clouds grow. Defense expenditures are climbing steadily. Stock piling is a new device of government by which, along with subsidies and insurance, the effects of unsound trade policies can be concealed from the American people. Moreover, our Government has frankly seized upon the dictatorial device of monopolistic control of exports and imports.

Still further, it is gradually becoming apparent to a growing number of persons that protective tariffs never were the war-breeders and trade-barriers they were depicted; and that there are a number of other trade controls (quota systems, import licensing, currency juggling, slave labor, government subsidies, etc.) which, while not so loudly maligned as the much-abused tariff, nevertheless include the real offenders in upsetting proper trade relations.

It is very likely that the Truman administration is going to refrain from making an issue of the protective-tariff principle. This is true for several reasons. One is that the hopeful nations abroad, eager to industrialize, are very insistent on their right to do what the New Deal free traders insist is wrong in this country—which is to protect their own industries by setting up tariffs to keep out American goods at prices less than their own production costs.

Another interesting development is the awakening of a new tariff consciousness in the South and in the West, where there are now innumerable baby industrial plants that would be the first to close if this country were to be flooded with cheap slave labor, foreign versions of the articles they are manufacturing.

Both Republicans and Democrats realize quite well that the general tariff situation in this country is ambiguous and anomalous—so much so that there is a distinct touch of humor in the matter. The ruling law on tariffs, a hold-over from the Hoover administration, is strongly protectionist, both in its general statements and in its detail. Yet under that law, by means of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, there has been worked out the closest approach to outright free trade in a century.

Again, the Constitution says that the control of trade is a function of Congress, yet under the present laws Congress has next to nothing to say about tariffs, virtually all the authority has been usurped by the President and State Department, and the courts, supposedly created to rule on such disputes, either cannot or will not assume jurisdiction.

From present indications, nothing short of an economic crisis is going to break the deadlocks thus produced.

But the crisis may be nearer than is generally realized. Soaring domestic prices could be one of the factors which would hurry it along. Every cent which our home-front prices rise make it just that more attractive for foreign producers to send their output here, where there is not only the demand, as in their own countries, but also money with which to pay for the goods.

Two factors have, thus far, held back the almost inevitable flood of cheap foreign merchandise which the tariff protections were erected to keep out. The tariff protections themselves have been swept away. The only remaining automatic protections are, first, lack of industrial production abroad, and, second, lack of available ships to carry the goods to American shores.

England has made a desperate effort to build up her industrial machinery to the stage where she could skim the cream off the American market while we, delayed by strikes, Government red tape and interference, and a general slow-down of individual energy, are still unable to meet our own requirements.

Because England has been experimenting with socialism, she has missed the boat—and may have to look to it to keep her own head above the water. But that does not mean all the other nations of the world will be equally unsuccessful.

Meanwhile, the Truman administration, worried though it professes to be about the course of inflation and the nearness of another depression, is industriously trying to perpetuate the executive authority over foreign trade and the present free-trade policies.

One approach is through the International Trade Organization charter now being written at Habana. This will include all the essential provisions of the Trade Agreements Act, so that ratification of the charter by Congress would make the program perpetual.

Another approach is by putting the provisions of the act right into the trade agreements so that, once these are accepted by Congress, they again would become permanent.

This means that the fact that the present Trade Agreements Act expires this summer, so that one would expect a vigorous pro-and-con battle on it, may be a matter of no importance whatever. The strategy of the Administration appears to be, not to demand an extension of the Act, but to get its provisions enacted permanently in some different fashion.

Of course, the long and short of all tariff arguments this year is that they are going to be answered in the presidential election.

It really makes very little difference, in the long run, precisely what may or may not be done with the various legal and treaty questions during this summer. But it makes all the difference in the world who is elected next November.

If the next President is a protectionist, all the globaloney laws conceivable, on the books, won't seriously impede him in restoring the principles of the protective tariff.

And if the next President is a disciple of free trade, under whatever current term may be fashionable, then no imaginable process or legal barrier can possibly prevent his continuing the long-standing New Deal practice of using American production, American industries, and American jobs as political bribes to foreign powers.

Constitution Is Ignored in Civil Rights Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Donald R. Richberg, which appeared in the Washington Star of January 4, and which I think is of very great interest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTION IS IGNORED IN CIVIL RIGHTS HYSTERIA—MOVE TO LEVEL INEQUALITIES RESULTING FROM DIFFERING ABILITIES CITED AS THREAT TO END COMPETITIVE FREEDOM

(By Donald R. Richberg)

People are pleased to be told they have a "right" to do what they want to do. They applaud the politican who assures them that they have a "right" to enjoy the things they desire.

It is much more comforting to be assured that you have a right to obtain a good job from some one, than to be informed that you have a duty to do a good job for someone. But, let's not forget, that no right can be enforced for one person without compelling another to fulfill a duty. In the language of the courts: "When a right is invaded a duty is violated." "There is no right where there is no remedy."

A PHILOSOPHER'S VIEWS

Even the basic right of my individual liberty cannot be enforced except by imposing restraints on your individual liberty. The claim of a right is worthless unless it can be enforced; and, as more rights are enforced against more and more people, there will be less and less liberty; more and more domestic conflicts, less and less internal peace.

Long ago a great philosopher pointed out that "the right of all to all things" means "the war of all against all." The surest way to destroy the fundamental freedoms of American life would be to build up a vast legal structure of social, economic and political rights, all of them creating corresponding duties, and all of them enforced by governmental restraints upon individual freedom.

Communists and their dupes complain that a "hysteria" of anticommunism is causing the suppression of civil rights in the United States. So now they are diligently fomenting a counter-hysteria for expanding civil rights until the basic rights of life, liberty, and property will be completely lost in a maze of petty rights and duties and regulations which only a communistic dictatorship could possibly enforce.

BAD EXAMPLE OF HYSTERIA

The horrible and outstanding example of this civil rights hysteria is the recent report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, which is probably the most mischievous document that has been published since Marx and Engels produced the Communist Manifesto 100 years ago.

In the name of liberty this report proposes to compel American men, women, and children to live and work in a social and economic system created and regulated by Government, a system in which their most profound emotions and ambitions are to be suppressed at the will of political monitors.

Here are the two most fundamental recommendations of the committe, in its own language:

"The elimination of segregation, based on race, color, creed, or national origin, from American life."

"The enactment of a Federal Fair Employment Practice Act, prohibiting all forms of discrimination in private employment, based on race, color, creed or national origin."

Please note that segregation is to be eliminated—not only from Government operations, but everywhere "from American life." That is precisely the aim of the committee, which announces, with the voice of omnipotent omniscience: "We can tolerate no restrictions upon the individual which depend upon irrelevant factors such as his race, his color, his religion or the social position to which he was born."

A CURIOUS OBSERVATION

Hundreds of millions of Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Mohammedans, Buddhists, and Hindus have believed and taught for centuries the one way of living, or the one road to salvation, was divinely ordained and revealed in the articles of their particular faith. Anyone's religion is necessarily a restriction on him and, if he is to be free in the exercise of his religion (a freedom expressly guaranteed in our Constitution), then he must be free to restrict his associations with others in accordance with his feelings and his convictions as to what is necessary and desirable. Yet the committee would have a man forced by law into associations which may be repulsive to him—not because of any narrow prejudice but because of his profound religious convictions.

Race and color may seem irrelevant to the committee. Yet differences of race and color have divided mankind for centuries. They may fade in the coming centuries. But they cannot be wiped out by a State or Federal law; and every such foolish effort only intensifies prejudice and intolerance, creates disrespect for law, and is itself an intolerant violation of individual liberty.

Curiously enough the committee observed that an essential part of our freedom is that we are free to be different. Evidently the committee is willing to have us differ in our taste for cigarettes, but not in our taste for companions. But, in another breath, the committee says: "In a democracy, each individual must have freedom to choose his friends and to control the pattern of his personal and family life." Nevertheless, in order to eliminate segregation and to prevent discrimination, the committee insists that this free American shall be compelled to spend his working life with undesirable associates, and to send his children to schools, to eat in restaurants, to live in hotels, and enjoy

all public amusements in the company of those whose company he would not voluntarily choose.

LOGIC HARD TO FOLLOW

The logic of the report is very difficult to follow. But, as the king said in Alice in Wonderland, "If there's no meaning in it that saves a world of trouble, you know, as we need'nt try to find any."

Let us assume, however, that every like or dislike based on race, color, or religion is unreasonable and unfair and that such prejudices ought to be eliminated from human thinking. Nevertheless, is it proper or even possible for the government of a free people to attempt to prevent men and women in business or social life from acting in accord with their prejudices? Now this is an entirely different question from asking whether the Government itself should deny equality of opportunity to some of its citizens.

Political equality, in the right to vote, in the administration of justice, and in the rendering of public services, is due to all citizens. But unless government is to destroy an economic system of competitive freedom and a social system of free association, it cannot undertake to level down the inequalities that result from differing abilities and opportunities, or to interfere with the voluntary selection of one's associates in work or play.

No one would dare to propose that an employer be given the right by law to compel a man to work for him. That would be "involuntary servitude"—slavery. Yet it is solemnly proposed (in Senate bill 984, which is evidently approved by the committee) that an employer shall be forbidden to refuse to employ a "qualified" man because of his race, color, or religion. This means, in practical effect, that if a Government regulator says that a man is "qualified" and rules that he has been denied employment because of race, color, or religion, then he must be employed.

LESSON OF EXPERIENCE

We know from experience under the Wagner Act that the employer would be presumed to be wrong. "Sentence first, verdict afterwards" is the conventional procedure. It seems to be forgotten that an employer works for his employees just as they do for him. He is obligated by law to do a great many things for his employee. So the proposed law would force an employer into involuntary servitude to men who are under no obligation to work for him.

Superficially, it may seem to be a noble project for government to insure to all citizens an equality of opportunity to earn a livelihood and to enjoy the benefits of society. But, no government can insure equality of opportunity to human beings who differ so widely in natural capacity and who, because of parental variances in ability and fortune, are so differently nurtured. It should also be pointed out that the benefits of a democratic, free society are not gathered by an omnipotent government into one treasure house for distribution to a dependent population. On the contrary, individuals in a host of big and little enterprises, work and produce things and seek to gain out of their cooperation with others the benefits and satisfactions which they desire and for which they are willing to work and sacrifice.

The concept of a society in which all are working for the common good and obtain only their proportionate share of the total product is the idealism of communism. Now that the world has had a good look at communism in actual operation, it has become quite clear that only a ruthless despotism can compel human beings to live and work in such a regimented society. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated up to date that the productivity of free men and women, working primarily for their own gain and reaping individual rewards, is far, far greater than the productivity of a people working ostensibly for equalitarian progress. Indeed, the reward of individual merit has been reluctantly adopted in Russia as a drastic compromise of communistic theory which was necessary to prevent economic disaster.

SLOGAN SIGNIFICANT

It is most significant that the shrill slogan of all those fomenting the civil rights hysteria is "equality," although the great declared purpose of the Constitution was not to achieve an impossible equality among unequal human beings but to secure the blessings of liberty so that men could be free to be different and to realize their differing ambitions with their differing abilities. Every law which seeks to give a man a right to something which as a freeman he cannot gain for himself, must impose burdens and restraints on the freedom of other men.

We may, reasonably, tax the fortunate. We may, reasonably, prevent the abuse of freedom by those who heedlessly or ruthlessly injure others in the pursuit of selfish gain. We may reasonably enact laws to protect the right of every citizen to an equal participation in government and to equal treatment in all Government operations. But, let us be watchful against every effort to create by law a right in one man to compel others to associate with him or to accept obligations to him in the domain of private enterprise or private life. Let us realize, not only that it is a part of our heritage that a "man's house is his castle," but also that freedom of association in work or play is the most precious of all our liberties.

It is well at this time to recall the words of the late Justice Brandeis—whom no one would ever accuse of religious intolerance or racial prejudice. He wrote:

"PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

"The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings, and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure, and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men."

Increase of Death Compensation of Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill introduced by me to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph IV of part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided in part I, paragraph I hereof, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified next below:

Widow but no child	$60
Widow with 1 child	84
Widow with 2 children (with $15 for each additional child)	102
No widow but 1 child	48
No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	72
No widow but 3 children (equally divided, with $12 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided)	96
Dependent mother or father	54
Dependent mother or father (or both), each	30"

SEC. 2. Subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Any veteran or the dependents of any deceased veteran otherwise entitled to compensation under the provisions of part II of this regulation or the general pension law shall be entitled to receive the rate of compensation provided in part I of this regulation, if the disability or death of such veteran resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, or (2) while engaged in extra hazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, or (3) while the United States is engaged in war."

SEC. 3. Paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The surviving widow, child or children, or dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided for in part II, paragraph I, hereof, shall be entitled to receive compensation at 75 percent of the rates specified for such dependents in paragraph IV, part I, hereof, as now or hereafter amended."

SEC. 4. The increases provided by this act shall be effective from the first day of the second month following the passage of this act.

Federal Office Building Needed in Los Angeles To Adequately Serve the Public Demands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there is great need today for a new Federal office building in Los Angeles. The population in southern California has soared during the war and postwar periods until today that area has a population increase of at least 1,000,000 since 1940. Most of this increased population is located in the Los Angeles area.

At the same time the present Federal building in Los Angeles has become overcrowded, and the Federal Government has found it necessary to rent additional commercial space to house its activities, including warehouse and storage facilities.

This rental-space area has now reached the staggering figure of approximately 1,410,805 square feet. And the cost for the annual rental of this space amounts to approximately $1,284,306.

At the same time, private businessmen, lawyers, doctors and others are unable to find office space in the downtown area in Los Angeles where the Government has taken up much of the office space normally available for professional men.

The construction of a new Federal office building would effect a large annual saving to the Government in rentals, and it would release office space in the Los Angeles metropolitan area that is needed by business and professional men.

It would centralize the activities of the Government and eliminate great inconvenience to the public because of present inadequate quarters and the wide dispersion of locations of various Federal offices in the Los Angeles area where at present Government business is carried on in 43 different buildings.

A new Federal office building is needed in Los Angeles to serve the public and to provide adequate space for Federal agencies in that area. I have introduced H. R. 3795 to authorize the construction of a new Federal office building in Los Angeles, and I urge the Members of the House to give this bill favorable consideration.

The following is a list of the locations of Federal agencies in the Los Angeles area where rental space is now being used:

Treasury: Heilman Building, Juasti Warehouse, Juasti Building, Bendix Building, 621 South Spring, 617 South Olive, 417 South Hill, 110 Broadway, First National Bank, Tenies Building, Citizens Bank, Ninth and Hill.

Navy: 210 West Seventh.

War: 751 South Figueroa, 621 South Hope Street, 815 South Figueroa, 556 South Flower, 808 South Western, 220 North Virgil, 3636 Beverley, 111 West Seventh Street, 610 South Main, 1252 East Colorado.

CPA: 1206 Santee, Ninth and Hill, 117 West Ninth Street.

OPA: 1206 Santee, 110 East Anaheim, 85 East Colorado, Chase Hotel.

War Assets: Transportation Building, 155 West Washington Boulevard, 3636 Beverley, 836 Santee, Bendix Building, 215 West Fifth, 2019 Bay Street, Fries and A Street.

Agriculture: Ninth and Hill Streets, 148 South Mission Road, Black Building, 909 South Olive, Western Package Products Co., Financial Center Building, Wholesale Terminal, Live Stock Exchange, Bendix Building.

Commerce: Commerce Exchange, 1500 Fourth Street, Builders Exchange, Pacific Building, Eleventh and Colorado, 1515 Fourth Street, Burns Building, Lockheed Air Terminal, 3201 Winona Street, Municipal Airport, 411 California, Singer Building.

Interior: 751 South Figueroa, Rowan Building.

Justice: Security Building, Rowan Building.

Labor: H. W. Heilman Building, 1206 Santee.

Veterans: 1031 South Broadway, 2334 Mortenur, 215 American, 301 Olive, 1905 Lincoln, Legion Building.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. SOMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following item appearing in the New York Times on January 14, 1948, being the statement of Mayor William O'Dwyer in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway:

Mayor O'Dwyer renewed yesterday his opposition to the plan for a St. Lawrence seaway, sending telegrams to that effect to President Truman and Senators Robert F. Wagner and Irving Ives.

The mayor has denounced the seaway proposal as a piece of Federal boondoggling that would ruin the port of New York by taking business away from this harbor.

He was joined in his opposition yesterday by the Chambers of Commerce of Brooklyn, Queens, and Staten Island; the Central Trades and Labor Council, the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, the New York Board of Trade and the West Side Association of Commerce. The Commerce and Industry Association registered its opposition last Monday.

MAYOR'S MESSAGE

In identical messages to the President and the two Senators from New York, Mayor O'Dwyer said:

"I respectfully urge that you refrain from support of Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project in view of its high cost to all United States taxpayers and its lack of possible benefits to inland areas to compensate for tremendously destructive effect upon port of New York. Cost to the United States of construction of navigation project alone would be hundreds of millions of dollars.

"Maximum annual revenues from United States commerce would be small as compared with heavy annual interest amortization, operation and maintenance charges. New York and New Jersey taxpayers would have to pay 25 percent of these costs and in addition would have to bear the heaviest part of the burden of diversion of commerce from port of New York.

"While project would not be self-supporting and would serve no essential purpose, over one-third of our overseas traffic would be diverted from the port of New York. This would gravely injure general economy of entire New York-New Jersey port area, dealing a severe blow to its greatest industry, and causing possible loss of jobs upon which 200,000 people are dependent.

"I submit that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence proposal carries no proof or even promise of national or essential benefits, but without doubt threatens to increase the cost of national government and to impair the welfare of the country's greatest port. I am in sympathy with the potential public development of power from the St. Lawrence, but the figures indicate that the State of New York could obtain St. Lawrence power at a lesser cost under a compact between the State of New York and the Province of Ontario without adding unnecessary and destructive seaway."

BLOW TO CITY SEEN

Opposition to the seaway among mercantile groups in the city centered on its high cost and their belief that it would take shipping away from the port of New York.

Cornelius M. Callaghan, executive vice president of the maritime association, described the project as one that would be a fatal blow to the American merchant marine. James J. Danahy, vice president of the West Side Association of Commerce, said the project would injure not only the city but the Nation as a whole. George F. Mand, president of the Bronx Chamber of Commerce, said it would be detrimental to the city's interests.

The Public Records of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me, I am very glad to include in my remarks an article by Meredith B. Colket, Jr., entitled "The Public Records of the District of Columbia" and urge that my colleagues in the House read this article.

In its study of the District government the Subcommittee on Home Rule and Reorganization has in many instances referred to the records of the District and it is a fact that there are many historical documents which have disappeared and which should have been preserved.

The city of Washington, commonly known as the District of Columbia, plays a very definite part in the history of our country and the development of our Government, and steps should be taken without delay to collect and preserve all the historical documents which can be found.

The article I refer to follows:

THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Meredith B. Colket, Jr., of the National Archives, and Curator of the Columbia Historical Society)

Before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia there has just been decided a case designated simply as *U. S.* v. *Groen*. The question involved was whether certain property owners were entitled to fill in land below the 1794 waterline of the Potomac River. Necessary evidence could not be obtained from printed materials, so it was essential to examine original records before presentation of the case. Mr. Robert R. MacLeod, an attorney in the Lands Division, Department of Justice, attempted to trace certain records in order that the Government might effectively present its case. His research took him into a labyrinth of documents—from the Surveyor's office, the Washingtoniana Division of the Public Library, and the Columbia Historical Society on the one hand, to the National Archives and the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress on the other. All had original governmental records relating to the subject of his inquiry; but none could produce a specific document he desired, a document that had disappeared since the days of Governor Shepherd. Thus forcibly does Mr. MacLeod bring to our attention the fact that while the Federal Government has centralized and, to a considerable extent, organized the inactive records of permanent value of the Government of the United States, the records of the Government of the District of Columbia are dispersed and are without a home.

The records of the Federal Government were not always housed in a beautiful building on Pennsylvania Avenue. They were scattered in basements and attics, in many

cases heaped in great disorder, the valuable interspersed with the valueless. Not the least of those who advocated their careful preservation was the distinguished American scholar who subsequently became executive director of the American Council of Learned Societies, Dr. Waldo G. Leland. Just 40 years ago he addressed the Columbia Historical Society on the archives of the Federal Government, and became cocompiler of a guide to the Federal records, which has become a classic in the field of archival publications. His address, subsequently published in the Records of the Columbia Historical Society, became one of the milestones in the march toward the establishment of a central archival depository for the Federal Government. Today, the lawyer, the political scientist, the historian, the biographer, scholars of many interests, can utilize with an ease never before possible these Federal papers. Such records have been recognized, however belatedly, as worthy evidences of the experience of our past, and have been received and nurtured in a depository well suited to their needs. The records of the local government at the seat of our National Capital, on the other hand, have been as orphans, ill-clothed and ill-fed, almost entirely neglected, though a few have found their way into such agencies as the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress.

It is our purpose tonight to call attention to the pathetic state of our local records and to give special emphasis to the problem of maintenance in a proper building of those inactive records of permanent value.

An inquiry into the nature of the District records reveals some interesting separations of governmental authority. From an archival point of view, it is clear that the records of the District of Columbia embrace those records of agencies created by Congress to perform municipal functions for the District, their subsidiaries, and their legitimate predecessors. Included in this category are the records of the present government of the District of Columbia, consisting of the records of the Commissioners, which have been on file since the Organic Act of 1878, together with the records of those offices under the Commissioners, such as those of the Assessor, the Board of Education, the corporation counsel, the health officer, the municipal architect, and the Surveyor.

The records of the predecessor governments of the present municipality include those of the temporary government of commissioners, 1874–78, and of the Territorial government (with a governor appointed by the President) which was in existence from 1871–74. Before 1871 the District records consisted of the records of the county of Washington, the boundaries of which are coterminous with the present District of Columbia. The county of Washington had been created by act of Congress approved 1801 and subsequently its powers were vested in a levy court. The records of the District not only include the records of the levy court but also the records of two municipal corporations, the city of Washington created in 1802 and Georgetown, granted municipal powers by Congress in 1802, but which had been given a government under the laws of Maryland in 1751 and later became a town. The records of the District of Columbia do not, of course, embrace the records of the county and city of Alexandria, the land of which was retroceded in 1846 to the State of Virginia.

The records also extend, however, to local entities which do not seem to be clearly within the orbit of the present Commissioner government, such as those of the Recorder of Deeds and the Register of Wills.

In addition to the type of records falling under the jurisdictions above described, there are some records relating to local affairs of the District of Columbia which are created by agencies not purely or wholly municipal in character. These agencies are agencies of the Federal Government, and are charged with dual responsibilities. This springs from the fact that Washington, D. C., is not only a municipality; it is also the seat of the National Government. Thus, some of the most important records of interest to the student of local history are the records of the Commission of three appointed by President Washington in 1791 under authority of Congress to survey the Territory. Among other Federal agencies is the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, which is charged not only with planning memorials of interest and benefit to the Nation, but also with developing recreational facilities of foremost benefit to the local residents. The District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, one of two Federal courts in the District forming a part of the local court system, deals in part with matters of distinctly a Federal character, but also has jurisdiction over matters which in the States would be handled by State courts.

The separation of functions into local and Federal has, of course, resulted in the separation of records into local and Federal. But the line of demarcation is not always a clear one, for when Government entities are abolished or reorganized by Congress, the innocent records are sometimes split in all directions. Thus, records of the Record Office for the Territory of Columbia which, according to the Sentinel of Liberty of May 13, 1800, was moved from Georgetown to the city of Washington, have been dispersed widely throughout the city. These were the records of the three early Commissioners. The Commissioners had been charged by Congress to perform the Federal functions of surveying the Territory, purchasing land, and providing for suitable Government buildings. But also they had been granted by the Maryland State Legislature specific municipal powers which were binding until Congress provided its own local law. In 1791 the Commission had been empowered to appoint a clerk to record deeds, to license the building of wharves, to regulate the unloading of vessels, to make building regulations, to provide penalties for violations, and to grant licenses for the retailing of liquors in the city of Washington. Today one can find a central core of the records in the National Archives. But one can find other important ones in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress (which had received them from the Department of State before there was a National Archives), still others in the Surveyor's Office of the District of Columbia, and others with the Recorder of Deeds. Some, including an important early volume of the Proceedings of the Commissioners, can't be found at all. Understandably enough, the very nature of the arrangement of the files prevented any really logical functional separation of records so that the separations that have been made must have been on an arbitrary basis.

Sometimes as functions are transferred from the local government to the Federal Government, or vice versa, records, the victims, must transfer their character as rapidly as chameleons change color. Before 1936 physicians' licenses were recorded with the Health Department, between 1896 and 1929 with the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, a Federal agency, and, since 1929, with the Commission on Licensure, a local agency. The Commission on Licensure possesses the early registers maintained by the Health Department, but not those filed with the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. If the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Home Rule which were released 2 weeks ago are approved, there may be created similar record problems of this character.

The public records of the District of Columbia not easily available to the scholar are those in the custody of the government of the District of Columbia. It is toward these that our attention is centered. Where are these records, what are they, and of what value are they? A room in the basement of the District Building, Fourteenth and E Streets NW., contains 31 large wooden boxes. In these are some of the most valuable records of our city government. For the period before 1871 are record sets of the laws of the Corporation of the City of Washington, the Ordinances of Early Georgetown, the Proceedings of the Council of the City of Washington, and Ordinances of the Levy Court. For the period of the Territorial government there are the original laws of the legislative assembly and basic correspondence relating to the policy of the government. For the period of the subsequent Commissioner forms of government are incoming and outgoing correspondence from 1874 to 1929. These records were boxed and stored away as a precautionary war measure 5 years ago. Material in them is practically unobtainable to the historian today, although under certain circumstances the Commissioners have been most courteous in seeing that specific information is secured. The secretary's office of the board of commissioners has kindly given me the carbon of a typed list describing the contents of each box and it gives me great pleasure to make this available for inspection.

Such records, however, represents but a single high light in the unfortunate story of our city's records. If one would examine the basement storeroom in the District Building, one would see hundreds and hundreds of early volumes of the city and great quantities of unbound materials rapidly gathering dust. They are in such shape as practically to bar scholarly use. One could multiply the volume many times if one should visit those storerooms and offices throughout the District including even rooms in the new District building on Indiana Avenue.

The best historical materials from the public records are to be found in the correspondence and minutes of the Commissioners and the correspondence of the primary departments and boards under the Commissioners. But there are many other records which contain a wealth of research data, including ledgers, journals, tax lists, assessment lists, birth and death records, statistics, surveys, and reports. From such records one can obtain excellent materials dealing with the history and growth of the school system; the transition of the city streets from dirt paths to beautifully paved boulevards; the development of the commercial areas and the segregation of the residential areas; the spread of the city northward and eastward; the development of the early system of canals and how they operated; the responsibilities of the local government in the Civil War, when large numbers of troops were quartered within the city limits, and in World War II, when the city had to support an abnormally large population; the part the city played in welcoming distinguished guests from the day when Lafayette paid a visit to the day President Aleman paraded here; the history of the old city markets; and the impact of the early automobile on city life, with the regulatory measures established to control its use.

The political scientist should have an opportunity to study the system of the Commissioner government, to examine its actual operations and evaluate it as a successful governmental entity. He should make studies and comparisons of many phases of civic life and determine in what ways Washington is advanced over other cities and in what respects it lags behind. He can inquire into the success of our zoning regulations. For perspective he can see how certain areas became beautiful developments of which the citizens can boast because of careful planning, while others became an unreasoned combination of business firms and dwellings because of the lack of planning.

The sociologist should have a greater opportunity to inquire into the success of the city in improving family and community life. He should be able to see how the undernourished and impoverished are aided, how the child-welfare program is working, and whether recreational facilities are adequate.

The public records, of course, are by no means the only sources for information about city life. Primary vital source materials include (1) public records, (2) newspapers, and (3) private letters, diaries, memoirs, merchants' accounts, and the like. The public records, except for some for the very earliest years, have been sadly neglected. The newspaper, on the other hand, has been given a high place by the student of local history. W. B. Byran, for example, in A History of the National Capital, drew heavily on such excellent sources of local information as the Star and the National Intelligencer. An interesting story can be told of how files of the National Intelligencer fill in an important gap in the public records, a gap resulting from the loss of an early Journal of the Board of Aldermen. Private letters, diaries, and memoirs of this city have not been assembled in a systematic manner and there lies ahead a great field of collecting and assimilating. It is only by intelligent utilization of all of these varied sources of information that the scholar can produce scientific, thorough, and well-integrated studies of our local life. There are indeed many valuable forms of local records that in no wise can be duplicated among records of a more national character.

The assembling of these public records in a central place should not only prove a boon to scholarship but should create a wider civic interest. Our community lacks a critical biography of its great benefactor, Governor Shepherd, and many deserving figures of lesser fame. Our community lacks and desperately needs a well-woven history of the city's development from the date in 1878 when Historian Bryan stopped his narrative. Our local schools need a good text on the local government of our community. Our schools of higher learning, such as George Washington, Catholic University, and American University, and especially their graduate bodies, could be encouraged to study our local life and to produce works of outstanding merit..

Centralization of these records is important enough for the scholar of the present; but it is also most important for posterity. The passing of each decade means the losing of many more valuable records through carelessness, neglect, fire and other hazards. Until a thorough survey is made, it is impossible to tell exactly what records are lost. But it is not hard to echo the sentiment of H. C. Gauss as printed years ago in the published records of the Columbia Historical Society "The history of the records of the city of Washington is that of most of our American records. They have been used for the purpose of the moment without thought of perpetuation." Over 90 percent of the city's records for the 70-year period from 1801 to 1871 including most records of the mayors, the boards of aldermen and the common councils have completely disappeared. What seems to be available today of the regime of Governor Shepherd may only be a fraction of what once existed. Oldtimers say that when the District building was moved from First and Indiana Avenue to 462 Indiana Avenue great quantities of records vanished never to appear again. Sometimes valuable early local records turn up in the hands of descendants of city officials and are sold. In such cases the manuscript division of the Library of Congress has lent a helping hand. Some of the earliest records of old Georgetown were secured some years ago by the Library of Congress, which preserves them and makes them available for research purposes.

Other municipalities have had most tragic records losses. Records of the cities of San Francisco and Chicago were destroyed in large quantities at the time of spectacular holocausts. It is reported that during the Revolutionary War the early records of the city of New York were moved back and forth in the province, depending upon the fortunes of war of the patriot armies. During the nineteenth century these records were stacked loosely in large boxes; while it is suspected that many people helped themselves. New York City was quite fortunate, on one occasion, by bringing suit and recovering an original holograph letter signed by George Washington and addressed to the mayor and aldermen of New York. This municipal record was recovered in 1868 as the document was exchanging hands for $2,050. Other less fortunate New York City records got into the hands of rag dealers and junkmen about the turn of the century. Some of these, recognized as of considerable value, were purchased by individuals and deposited with the New York Historical Society.

Philadelphia, a city which particularly holds sacred the history of its past, is also a great loser of local records. In 1848 one gentleman wrote of the deplorable maintenance of the early records, how some which had been in the mayor's court were removed to a waste room. When the room was wanted for other purposes, the records were dumped into a cellar. Finally the cellar was used for the caring of stray dogs so the records were carried in boxes, bags, and baskets to a loft of the Supreme Court room. To use the writer's words: "In the summer of 1845 they were in the utmost disorder and neglect, and were rapidly disappearing." This man succeeded in preserving a few samples which he gave to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

Concentrated efforts were made at different periods in Washington's history to improve the condition of the records. Early in the present century the board of managers of the Columbia Historical Society appointed a committee on the early city records. This committee, which was composed of such well-known antiquarians as W. B. Bryan, H. T. Taggart, and M. I. Weller, was authorized to contact the Commissioners. They carefully examined the records of the city of Washington for the period 1802–71. Those records that were not bound were arranged into two groups, papers connected with the mayors' office and of subordinate offices of the executive branch of the city government, and papers connected with the business of the various city councils. It is to be regretted especially that the recommendations then made for the publishing of certain of the early records by this society could not be consummated, for District officials are today unable to explain what became of these records. Fortunately, some were copied by members of the Columbia Historical Society. From the copies now in the library of the society are obtained important evidence for legal cases in which the Government has an interest.

In November 1938 an attempt was begun by the Historical Records Survey to describe the records of the government of the District series by series, and to publish inventories showing the work accomplished. Projects of such a nature had already been undertaken in many other cities. Consequently, municipalities such as Cleveland, Ohio, can boast of informative published inventories of the utmost interest and usefulness. The survey of city records for the District of Columbia was headed by Mr. H. B. Dillard, now of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress. Approximately two dozen individuals were employed in the work. Unfortunately, the project got under way too late to make a lasting contribution; for, when the project came to a close in 1941, the only production was a 31-page processed inventory of municipal archives of the District of Columbia. This has little value to present-day historians, since it deals with but four minor boards, all of which have been created during the last 25 years. It illustrates, however, what could be done.

The material collected by the survey workers was transferred to the Library of Congress. A careful examination shows that this data is extensive and would take one man a great many years to duplicate. Almost entirely in stencil form is inventory No. 2 of District records which describes the records of about two dozen local offices in detail. It is a pity that thousands of the taxpayers' dollars went into the preparation of this second inventory, yet not $100 needed to put it in final form has been found. Here lies a challenge to a civic-minded group to investigate the possibility of issuing and marketing this partial inventory of our city's records.

For years records-minded citizens of the District have recognized the importance of obtaining copies of the early Maryland land grants pertaining to this area as well as other records such as tax lists created prior to the establishment of a federally authorized local government. A systematic and intelligent examination of basic Maryland records including those filed at the Hall of Records, Annapolis, ought to be undertaken. Such a study should result in the careful reproduction of essential materials to be maintained permanently for public inspection in Washington.

The Board of Commissioners of the District government has, in late years, given special consideration to two different aspects of the record problem. One was the duplication on microfilm of strategically valuable records so that in the event of their destruction in wartime, the information would not be lost. The second was the destruction of records in order to save space. The dual program was effected by the establishment in 1942 of the Committee on Microfilming and Disposition of Obsolete Records, with A. R. Pilkerton, auditor, as chairman. This committee instigated a general survey of all District records with a view of microfilming those of greatest strategic value. All plats in the surveyor's office, in the assessor's office, in the Water, Sewer, and Electrical Divisions of the Engineers Department were microfilmed at a cost of $5,500. The tiny film, totaling 2.5 cubic feet in volume, was deposited in temporary storage with the National Archives.

The second problem, the problem of space, was and is an acute one, since inactive records of the District have been occupying space valued at $1.50 per square foot per year. This space is desperately needed for current administrative use. Should these records be microfilmed, and then destroyed, the District might not only save space but might also sell the records as waste paper. Microfilming, however, runs into money and should not be undertaken for this purpose without careful consideration of the character of the records and their arrangement. To date, the District has not microfilmed records with the view of destroying the originals.

The committee recognized that it was better to ascertain what were the noncurrent records of no value and destroy these than to microfilm records simply because they were noncurrent. The District has centered its records program, therefore, on the disposition of useless papers. It is estimated that, since the establishment of the committee, 33,000 pounds of records have been destroyed each year. By an order dated 1945 the Commissioners asked the heads of departments to prepare a comprehensive survey of records in their custody. In the case of useless records, they were directed to make accurate descriptions of the records

and to present conclusive reasons why each category of records had no further value. In accordance with a Commisioner's order of May 28, 1946, the primary responsibility of disposing of old records was vested in the departments themselves. The department heads were instructed to designate an experienced and responsible person in each office or department to go through the files from time to time in order to retire old records and thus reduce the need for new file cases.

It is earnestly hoped that disposition of records is not based entirely upon a determination of whether documents have future administrative value. It is earnestly hoped that careful evaluations are given as to the research values of administratively obsolete files. We should look forward to the establishment of a responsible district officer, whether he be called archivist, supervisor of public records, or records administrator, to be responsible for passing upon the future research values of records no longer of use to the departments. That District officials are giving consideration to this problem of future use is suggested by a report from a custodian of medical records: "The retention of medical records appears to be a matter of purely professional determination and ought to be approached from that angle rather than soliciting a layman's opinion."

Proper and careful evaluation of the records of a municipality is of the utmost importance. Records should be analyzed, series by series, to determine (a) what groups of records have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to be maintained permanently, and (b) what groups of records can be destroyed safely. It is wise to vest responsibility of such evaluation into the hands of a single accountable records official, whose actions are subject to review by a committee. He could draw some information from the Federal Government, but he would find that many types of records have no parallel in Federal experience; he could learn something from other municipalities, but he would find that they have not yet evoked a clear program as to the types of municipal records that should be preserved; he should also consult experienced persons skilled in specialized fields of technical knowledge; but above all he must have a clear historical perspective and sound judgment. No records should be destroyed unless formal permission is granted in writing after a written description of the records is made and reason for destruction given.

One must always guard against the philosophy not uncommon throughout the country that because certain records in a basement have not been used for years they have no value and must be thrown out. By destroying them one may save space and, by the sale of waste paper, add to the municipal treasury, but, at the same time, one is apt to throw away rich historical material about the early history of the city and its growth, material which future generations will have serious cause to regret.

The problem of the proper maintenance of noncurrent records of permanent value is, from the point of view of administration, but a phase of the larger story of a sound records program. Such a program calls for the establishment of a basic records act covering the maintenance, preservation, repair, duplication, authentication, and disposition of records. It calls for an act setting up a records office of trained personnel to deal with records. Finally, it calls for the construction of a public-records building.

Whether the records office should be an independent establishment or should become a part of the Board of Education or some other agency is a matter of detail that need not be explored at this time. The matter of a place for the housing of the records, however, is a matter worthy of special consideration. It is not sound for agencies of a local government to place inactive records in basements and storage vaults. It is recognized that many inactive records have a degree of administrative use but not a sufficient degree to maintain them near the operating offices. Such records should be among those centralized in a single place.

Other cities have had extremely interesting experience in handling their inactive records of value. In the past they have often turned over the more valuable to historical societies or libraries, and sometimes local entities have made a small annual contribution for their make-up. Here in Washington, before there was a National Archives, the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress became the depository for Federal records. But a library has only limited facilities, and, as the work of a municipality increases and its records increase, a library finds it has not the technical training, interest, or storage facilities for the upkeep of records. But the library can afford a splendid service as a temporary stopgap for the preservation of the basic records of a municipality until the formal archival program is innovated.

It has been pointed out that there is a close relationship between certain local records which have been created by Federal agencies and records of the government of the District of Columbia. It is of primary importance that adjustments be made in this overlapping of local and Federal records. The National Archives might be of especial service in this connection, but also it could be relied upon for advice. The National Archives has developed a wide range of experience in the field of archival operations. The National Archives possesses elaborate technical equipment and knowledge, especially in such fields as photoduplication and repair. Finally, a close relationship could be fostered readily because of the physical proximity of the National Archives and the District government offices.

It is recognized that the National Archives Building is not large enough to house the inactive Federal records for plans are being formulated for the construction of an additional building or buildings. To what extent there can be a close cooperation and development with the National Archives is a matter of future administrative determination and legislative action. It is clear, however, that the primary responsibility for the maintenance of District archives lies with the District government, not with the Federal Government.

I would like to see a public records office of the District of Columbia, a building separate and distinct from other local government buildings, that could offer the departments, boards, and agencies, a high caliber of service on the older records. I would like to see the historian, the sociologist, the political scientist, the lawyer and the genealogist also have ready access to some of the basic records of our everyday life. Such an institution could do many things to improve the record situation in the District. Such an institution could house the bulk of the inactive files of the District as the office of recorder of deeds houses a specialized group of records. A program of this character is very much in line with the kind of thing that is being developed during the present decade in many of the States, counties, and municipalities of the Nation.

In closing, I should like to quote from the recently published report of the advisory committee on New York State's records system, a report prepared by a committee of three consisting of Dr. Solon J. Buck, Archivist of the United States, Dr. Luther H. Evans, Librarian of Congress, and Miss Margaret C. Norton, archivist for the State of Illinois. In this case a State archives is proposed:

"A separate building is of benefit to the records agency and records program in a psychological sense in its relation to other agencies and to the public. It is a symbol of the State's maturity and permanence. It is an obligation the State owes to its own history and to the men and women who produced it. It is an obligation it owes to their descendants of the present and the future. The records of the past that are worthy of preservation are their rightful heritage."

Now is the psychological time to plan a records program and a public records building for the District of Columbia. In the first place, the practical knowledge and rich experience accumulated by the National Archives during the past and present decades are ready to be tapped. Second, a formal records program could be given impetus and fostered by the Auchincloss subcommittee of the House District Committee. Such a committee might initiate much needed legislation relating to District records. Third, a drive for a public records building might logically form part of the program of the recently established National Capital Sesqui-Centennial Commission for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the removal of the Capital of the United States from Philadelphia to Washington. Out of a similar celebration in 1900 grew many excellent programs for civic planning and improvement, centered in the McMillan plan. The part that the Columbia Historical Society has played in creating an interest in the history of this city makes our organization a fitting one to sponsor and encourage the development of a vigorous, substantial, and worth-while records program.

Return of World War II Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the father of a deceased serviceman regarding our program for the return of World War II dead whereby the next of kin may elect to have the remains returned to this country for burial. It has been stated that the boxes the Government uses to enclose the caskets are not suitable to use in burial and if the parents or the widow choose to secure an adequate vault for burial purposes, they must purchase one at a price of $150 to $300.

You can readily see that the $75 allowance for home burial of returned war dead is not sufficient to defray these expenses. I urge that the Congress give serious consideration to this matter in order that the allowance may be increased to provide suitable burial for our war dead.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter received from Mr. Cyrus McCaskill, of Ennis, Tex., who has forcefully described this situation:

ENNIS, TEX.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Sixth District of Texas, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TEAGUE: There is a condition existing respecting the burial of the returned dead war veterans from overseas which I do not believe is generally known, and which, I think, is a reflection on the good faith our Government should have for our sons who gave willingly their lives for the protection of America.

As you know, I have a son, a first lieutenant of infantry, now buried in the Third Army Cemetery, Hamm, Luxemburg. His body should be returned about August 1948. He willingly gave his life for our country and I would not have him to know that our Government thinks so less of his honorable deeds to give him a decent burial in the land he gave his life to protect. Accordingly, I am furnishing you a report on the information the undertaker here, J. E. Keever, funeral director, gave me respecting the returned war dead.

J. E. Keever, funeral director, showed me through his storeroom of vaults (boxes) which the next of kin in charge of the returned dead purchase to enclose the caskets of the loved ones. The vaults run in prices from $150 to $300. There is no part of this cost borne by the Government. He also showed me the thin, fiber, boxes the Government enclosed the returned caskets in, and he frankly stated that they were not suitable for boxes to use in burial. Are our sons due a decent burial at the cost of the Government in whose service they gave their lives? The kind of burial their loved ones are only willing for them to have? The Government, unlike a corporation, pays nothing for the lives taken in the protection of their country. My son was a minor. I had with love and care given him an education to his senior year in college. Now he gave his life in action for his country. All we ask is that our Government give him a decent burial in the land he gave his life to protect. Will the Congress of the United States permit for any less?

I shall thank you to call this matter to the attention of the Texas Members of Congress. With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CYRUS MCCASKILL.

Antilynching Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to appear yesterday before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on behalf of my antilynching bill, H. R. 4528.

It is my hope that favorable committee action will ensue and that this or similar legislation, so sorely needed to maintain our domestic tranquility, as well as our world position as the leading proponent of fundamental freedom and equal justice, will soon be the subject of debate on the floor of the other body. My understanding is that it has been accorded a favored position on the legislative calendar, which should insure this result. It then remains to be seen whether the bitter opponents of such measures, who have so effectively blocked action for years, can again succeed in this Congress in denying to a large, although admittedly minority, segment of our citizenry the equal protection of the laws guaranteed to them by the United States Constitution.

In order that there may be no undue delay in the final enactment of legislation, if the minority opposition in the other body is successfully routed, it is my sincere plea to the House leadership that an early date may be set for hearings on antilynching legislation in this body. Although it is true that such bills have frequently passed the House only to suffer defeat in the Senate through a well-organized filibuster, the party of Abraham Lincoln, it is submitted, should not accept these previous defeats as a precedent but should press on toward the victory of even-handed justice over racial discrimination which now lies within our grasp.

Practically all of the bills which have been introduced in both Houses to correct the existing blot on the fair name of our country provide for punishment to lynchers and those who fail to prevent lynching or apprehend offenders and also for compensation to the victims of lynchings. With regard to the latter, I fear that in many instances the provision for monetary recompense to those who suffer at the hands of lynch mobs may be rendered nugatory unless there is embodied in the legislation a provision peculiar, so far as I am aware, to my bill, H. R. 4528.

The various measures provide that a determination of the amount to be paid to the injured person, or his next of kin, within certain minimum and maximum limits, shall be made by a court in an action brought and prosecuted by the Attorney General of the United States, and that if payment of any amount awarded is not forthcoming, it may be enforced by any process available under the State law for the enforcement of money judgments against governmental subdivisions.

It is well known to lawyers that in any jurisdiction technical difficulties exist to the collection of a money judgment against a municipality or the State itself which are not present in the case of an established liability against an individual. Thus, oftentimes, in fact, so far as I am aware, without exception, it is necessary to bring a separate action in the nature of a mandamus proceeding to compel the legislative authorities of a city, town, or county to levy a tax to collect a judgment, unless they take such a step on their own initiative. In addition, I entertain the fear that those States which might be unsympathetic to this Federal legislation might pass laws or take administrative action which would render it even more difficult than it now is to turn the piece of paper which we call a judgment into cash in hand for the unfortunate victims of lynch mobs.

Therefore, I have provided in H. R. 4528 that if such a judgment is not paid, upon proper certification by the Attorney General, the amount of the award shall be paid out of the unappropriated funds in the Treasury of the United States and deducted from any funds which would otherwise be available for payment to the State, where the violation occurred, under any grant-in-aid program. It is submitted that this provision has teeth in it, which will insure that the legislation is effective to accomplish the purposes desired. I trust that in the hearings before the committees of both Houses and in the framing of legislation this provision will have sympathetic treatment.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN C. SNYDER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, it seems that the President, who, under the Constitution, is charged with making the foreign policy of our Nation, has definitely committed our country in giving aid to 16 western European nations, under what is commonly known as the Marshall plan.

The Congress is being asked to implement that policy by the appropriation of money. Under the Marshall plan we are being asked to appropriate some $6,700,000,000 for the next 15 months.

It is the responsibility of the Congress to examine carefully the items for which aid is being requested. Among the nations who will get aid we find Ireland, Portugal, Turkey, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. Certainly in some of these countries it is not necessary to appropriate money to stop communism, and some of these countries were not devastated by the war. In fact, some prospered to a very high degree by reason of the war. Many of the countries for whom aid is requested are not broke.

I call attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Martinsburg Journal, Martinsburg, W. Va., on Saturday evening, January 17, 1948:

THEY'RE NOT BROKE

The idea that the 16 "beggar" nations of Europe, who are clamoring for another $17,000,000,000 cash hand-out from the United States taxpayers, are broke, is completely erroneous. Entirely aside from reputed foreign holdings of $15,000,000,000 to $17,000,000,000 liquid assets in the United States, Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Turkey, Norway, Sweden, and Portugal at least have formidable holdings of critical minerals which we would need should we be called upon to fight another war. The magazine World Report gives us an excellent picture of what these nations could do to compensate us with minerals if they were willing. Here is the list of what they have:

Asbestos, Southern Rhodesia; bauxite, British and French Guiana, Dutch East Indies, Surinam; chromite, New Caledonia, Southern Rhodesia, Turkey; cobalt, Belgian Congo, Northern Rhodesia; columbite, Nigeria; copper, Belgian Congo, Northern Rhodesia, Norway, Sweden; corundum, Nyasaland; graphite, Ceylon; lead, Morocco, Tunisia; manganese, Gold Coast, Morocco; mica, Madagascar; nickel, New Caledonia; tantalite, Belgian Congo; tin, Belgian Congo, Malaya, Dutch Indies; tungsten, Portugal; zinc, Belgian Congo; diamonds, Belgian Congo, Gold Coast, Sierra Leone.

It will be remembered that when war was imminent many months before December 1941 Congress authorized the stock-piling of rubber. When asked afterward why the rubber stock pile had not been assembled, Jesse Jones, RFC Chairman, gloomily replied, "We thought Singapore would hold out longer." It was one of the saddest confessions ever made by an American patriot. If we now take these needed minerals from the nations clamoring for our dollars, they might stand us in good stead in some future day of need.

American Legion Supports Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. CROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement of James F. O'Neil, national commander, the American Legion, before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Wednesday, January 21, 1948, on the Marshall plan:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I desire to take this opportunity to express to you as national commander of the American Legion our appreciation for this opportunity to appear before your committee on this matter so vital to the peace and security of our country as exemplified in the action taken by the national organization of the American Legion.

The American Legion strongly endorses the European recovery program now before Congress. The American Legion gives full support to the principles of this program. The report of our Foreign Relations Committee shows an early appreciation of conclusions which have been largely accepted by most Americans.

The greatest menace facing America today is the aggressive spread of communism, fostered by a powerful totalitarian state. We must combat this resolutely. In doing so, our most important instruments at this moment are the constructive principles of what has generally been known as the Marshall plan of approach to European rehabilitation and our active policy in the Balkans.

The principles of this plan which the American Legion is advancing are of vital concern to every American. Its purpose is to help rehabilitate western Europe, whose nations are holding back the rising flood of communism. If that dam should break, the Red tide would pour through to the Atlantic. We cannot ignore the fact that the Communists are actively hindering European rehabilitation for the very purpose of creating chaos. This we must not permit.

Our American economy must be kept sound, strong, and healthy. But time is of the essence, since the Communists are hard at work striving to bring about an economic collapse, both here and abroad. Therefore, we earnestly recommend that the principles here set forth shall be given fullest support by the people of the United States, to whom they are of vital interest, and that the American Legion accept leadership in this task.

At the meeting of the National Executive Committee of the American Legion at Indianapolis, October 30 to November 1, 1947, the report of the foreign relations committee stated flatly: "The Marshall plan is vital, not only to the rehabilitation of the world, but to our own self-preservation."

The resolution on the foreign situation adopted by the national executive committee at that meeting stated: "That in our endorsement of the Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of western Europe we emphatically urge that the President and the Congress of the United States:

"1. Maintain the closest supervision over all such expenditures, the use and distribution of all materials and the purposes to which they are devoted;

"2. Insure that the people of countries receiving our assistance be made fully aware that the United States is the source of such aid; that it be made clear that the purpose of this aid is not to interfere in any nation's government, but to assist it in resisting totalitarian infiltration or aggression and to reestablish a self-sustaining economy."

These passages I have quoted indicate the extent to which the American Legion has supported and now supports the Marshall plan. I do not wish to enter into the organizational details of the program. We feel that those are in good and expert hands, the hands of Secretary Marshall and of the Congress of the United States. But I am sure that a great proportion of our total membership, who see in Secretary Marshall the defender of the peace as well as the architect of victory, would go along with his considered judgment on these questions.

The American Legion speaks for a great and Nation-wide body of patriotic Americans. The largest veterans organization in history. Our total membership as of December 31 was 3,272,060. The membership of the American Legion Auxiliary was 933,052. American Legion posts today number 16,816. Units of the American Legion Auxiliary number 11,987.

But the place of the American Legion in the Nation is far larger than its numbers. The American Legion is a cross-section of the country and reflects the over-all sentiment of the American people. It includes all kinds and all professions and types of business. It is essentially a grass roots organization, for it is in the little towns and communities that the Legion posts are most active and play the greatest role in civic and community life. Its entire membership are veterans, the men and women who fought and worked to win two world wars. A great part of our members have survived battle; they know what war is, and they want to prevent war being brought to America.

In these questions of national security—and the European recovery program is, among other things, a question of national security—the voice of the American Legion should consequently be counted as particularly significant.

The European recovery program, adequately implemented and effectively carried out, will perform three vitally important functions for the United States, in each of which the American Legion has the deepest interest.

First, it will block the expansion of communism. The American Legion has fought communism for 25 years. The insidious manner in which this would-be world-conquering ideology is now seeking to expand over Europe has been demonstrated in the totalitarian tyranny forced upon the formerly free nations of eastern Europe and the Balkans, in the strikes inspired recently in France and Italy and in the so-called "Protocol M" providing for strikes and sabotage in Western Germany.

That the Communists are engaged in a cold war against the United States, as the immediate phase in their struggle for Europe and the world, has been amply shown. A failure to bring about the economic recovery of western Europe at this critical time would have disastrous consequences for the United States. It could reverse the favorable trend in western Europe, which has developed on the basis of confidence in the Marshall plan, and result in the economic, political, and social collapse of the western European nations and the spread of communism to the Atlantic.

Such a catastrophe would increase immeasurably the threat of communism to the United States and our American way of life, as Secretary Marshall indicated when he stated in his testimony that: "The way of life we have known is literally in the balance." It would be very likely in the future to heat up the cold war the Communists are waging against us. For as they expanded their hold on Europe and Asia and gained new territories, industries and resources and manpower, they would become stronger. What valid grounds are there for believing they would not eventually attack us if they ever thought they could do so successfully? The men in the Kremlin look upon the United States as the citadel of capitalism and free enterprise and the principal obstacle to a Communist-controlled world. We cannot afford to risk the peace and security of the United States and the future existence of some of our great cities on a hope that they would refrain forever from seeking to eliminate this obstacle by war.

The European recovery program, adequately implemented and effectively carried out, is our best means of preventing a Third World War. That is its second great function for the United States, a function of particular concern to the 4,000,000 veterans of the American Legion.

We see in the European recovery program a direct insurance of the future peace and security of the United States. And because it must be expected that war with the new weapons now being developed would strike without warning within our country, we see in this program an insurance of our great cities and of millions of American men, women and children.

A week ago, the Secretary of Defense made it clear in his testimony that if this program were not to be carried out, he would feel constrained to ask the Congress for an increase in defense appropriations of 25 to 50 percent. Why would we need such increased appropriations? Because without this program the United States would be less secure. Because without this program there would be increased danger of war.

The Secretary of Defense explained also that totalitarian control of western Europe and its industrial and military potential could be a threat not only to the peace of the world but also to the very existence of the United States.

Those of us appearing before you who are not officers of the Government are in a position to speak with greater freedom. I wish to place before you certain aspects of such a situation which I believe demand your most earnest consideration.

Communist control of western Europe, the probable result of failure to implement this program, would bring at least half a billion people under the control of the Soviet Government. It would marry the manpower and natural resources of eastern Europe to the industries and industrial efficiency and skill of the western European workshop. The offspring would necessarily be a vastly increased war potential at the disposal of the Soviet Government, a war potential which could in the future surpass our own.

Such a war potential, including within it the precision industries of western Europe, would increase tremendously the capabilities of the Soviet Government for production of atomic bombs and the means of delivering them, such as bombers, guided missiles, and rockets. Through control of the Atlantic coast of Europe, the Soviet Government would have gained bases for future use of such weapons against our country.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two, 4 years from now, is the year in which this program is designed to make western Europe self-sustaining. Nineteen hundred and fifty-two, 4 years from now, is also the year in which the President's Air Policy Commission reports we must become prepared to meet a sustained atomic attack upon the United States.

If failure to implement this program will increase the threat of war to our country, we must recognize clearly the kind of war with which we would be threatened. After 1952, 4 years from now, that war could be atomic war, with consequences for our people and our cities entirely beyond either our previous experience or our imagination.

We must recognize also that the danger of war which failure to implement this program would create is not solely long-range, but could arise acutely even within a year. To appreciate this it is only necessary to look at the map, note how the colonial territories of western Europe extend widely over the earth, and then consider whether our Government and the American people would be willing to remain passive while all these territories became bases and potential springboards of the Soviet Union. Some of these territories, such as parts of north Africa, are of great strategic importance. Others, such as the French and Dutch territories in the Caribbean, are within the American Hemisphere. It seems clear that for the Soviet Government to extend their system into this hemisphere through control of these territories would be a direct contravention of the Monroe Doctrine.

I believe that all those who have questioned the need of adequate implementation of this program should face squarely the acute and dangerous problem which the collapse of western Europe would raise for the United States in respect to these far-flung colonial territories, and should themselves consider just what action would be required to solve that problem.

The third function of the European-recovery program, which is of particular interest to the American Legion, is the rehabilitation of western Europe.

A large number of our members are businessmen who know the importance of foreign markets and continuing exports to our economy. A large number are workers in industries which have important export markets. The many who have given serious study to economic problems realize that this country cannot long remain an island of prosperity in an impoverished and chaotic world. They realize also that European recovery actually involves the whole world, due to the central role of Europe in world trade. The world cannot regain economic health without Europe, while European recovery will rapidly benefit all other continents.

A great proportion of our members have fought in Europe in the two World Wars. Their battles either saved or liberated the people of Europe from tyranny. Only they have known the peoples of Europe at first-hand and wish to see them healthy, prosperous, and free. Today the free peoples of Europe are threatened with a new tyranny to which, without the aid contemplated in this program, they could be forced to bow. To untold thousands of the veterans who fought in Europe such a catastrophe would mean that they had fought in vain, and that their comrades who did not come back had died in vain.

When Secretary Marshall appeared before you he said, "Though the war has ended the peace has not commenced. We must not fail to complete that which we commenced." The veterans of the American Legion agree wholeheartedly that we must complete the task of winning the peace for which we fought. The cost of this program is small, very small compared to the cost of war, and involves a reasonable assessment each citizen can and should bear for the prevention of war. It is also small compared to the program's value as an instrument for winning the peace and as an insurance of our peace, our national security, and our American future.

The American Legion has always worked for peace and is still working for peace. The only way to prevent war and critical situations such as exist in Europe today is to act firmly, promptly, and adequately but with complete readiness if war should be forced upon us. Time is of the essence. There must be no appeasement. Respectfully I urge upon this committee speedy consideration of this legislation so vital to the peace and welfare of our people and its speedy enactment into law.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Huntsville (Ala.) Times of January 13, 1948:

TAX REDUCTION NOT EVERYTHING

The perpetual slogan of the Republican Party in Congress is "Cut taxes."

Apparently little else matters to most of its Members. National security, aid to Europe, internal improvements—all these are secondary to a reduction of taxes.

Everyone, of course, wants tax reduction. It is a natural urge, for Federal taxes as a result of World War II, are at fantastic heights. They are a sore drain on individual and corporate pocketbooks. They add to the mounting cost of living.

But national welfare and private interest often conflict. They do so today, greatly.

At a time when our national security is scarcely less perilous than when we were at war, because of the attitude of Russia; when the possible collapse of Europe stares us in the face, unless food and funds are provided for reconstruction; when the national debt is at an astronomic height, it is certainly debatable whether the time is here when there can be any slashing of taxes, just because individuals are galled and vexed by the burden they impose.

And certainly the gnashing and ranting of the Republican majority upon this sole topic is not either very informative or impressive.

National security and debt reduction are assuredly entitled to prior consideration.

The Old Age and Survivors Insurance Law Should Be Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following radio address made by me recently to the citizens of my district:

The present social-security law, enacted in 1935 and which went into effect in 1937, has now been in operation for 10 years. As is the case with nearly all laws, time and experience have revealed injustices and inadequacies in this one. In simple justice to the more than 40,000,000 workers who are covered by this act and to the 30,000,000 others who at present are denied its protection, the shortcomings and defects in social security which time and experience have revealed should be corrected by this Congress. The correction of exposed and revealed injustices in old laws often is of as great or more importance to the people than the enactment of new legislation.

My attention was first attracted to injustices in the present old-age and survivors' insurance clause (title II) of the Social Security Act by a group of public-power district workers in the State of Washington.

These workmen, for many years, had been employees of a private power company. For six of those years these men had paid social-security withholding taxes to the Government for old-age and survivors-insurance protection. Then a public power district bought out the holdings of the private company.

As employees of the private power company, these workers paid withholding taxes every pay day and were entitled to old-age and survivors-insurance benefits at the age of 65. But, now as workers for a publicly owned utility, they no longer are permitted to pay withholding taxes, even though they wish to do so, and forfeit all benefits from the payments in withholding taxes which they made over 6 years as employees of the private company. They not only are denied old-age benefits but the money they have paid into the fund for this protection is forfeited to the Government. They never will get any old-age benefits for the payments they made. Not a cent of money they paid into the fund ever will be refunded to them. Obviously, this is unfair and unjust.

The same injustice is perpetrated by title II (the old-age and survivors insurance clause) of the present social-security law on every worker of a privately owned bus line, water company, or other utility that later is transferred to public ownership.

The policies of private insurance companies carry a cash surrender value and paid-up insurance clauses. The policyholder is assured of getting back something of what he has paid in should he for any reason discontinue making premium payments. Why should not our Government be as fair to those whose money it collects for old-age protection as private insurance companies are to their policyholders?

Obviously, the Government should assure the worker some measure of old-age protection for the money the worker has paid in withholding taxes or part or all of the worker's premium payments made in the form of withholding taxes should be refunded to him. Otherwise, the money collected from a worker to whom no benefits accrue and to whom no premium refunds are made becomes an unjust and discriminatory tax because it is levied not on everyone but only on a limited group.

This injustice is all the more apparent when we consider the worker's withholding taxes are taken away from him by compulsion, he having no choice as to whether he wishes to come under social security or stay outside of it.

If employees of private power companies that later are acquired by public bodies were the only ones affected by this unjust provision of old age and survivors insurance the need for amendment of the act might not be so pressing. However, many other groups of workers are similarly affected.

The same injustice would have occurred had these people been employees of a privately operated bus line, a privately operated water company, or any other private utility that later was transferred to public ownership.

But public utility district employees are not the only ones injured by this injustice in the present social-security law.

A young store clerk may pay social-security taxes for 9 years and 9 months (39 quarters) and then become a partner in the business. As a clerk he is in a covered employment. As the owner, or part owner, of a business he is in uncovered employment. By changing his status from employee to employer, he forfeits not only old-age pension benefits at 65, for which he has paid, but he also loses all the premium payments, in the form of withholding taxes, which he has made.

The same is true of any employee in a covered employment who quits to go into business for himself, as merchant, manufacturer,

or farmer. These people should not lose everything they have paid into the fund.

Likewise, workers who quit covered employment to take a position with the State, a county, a city, a port district, a school district, or with any governmental body lose both benefits and also what they have paid into the fund, for governmental workers are not covered with old-age and survivors insurance under the present Social Security Act.

An individual's loss in such payments may total a considerable sum. A worker receiving a $250-a-month salary in a 9-year-and-9-month period has $585 paid into the fund by himself and his employer for his old-age protection. Yet, under the present law, he will not receive back a cent of this $585 or be entitled to obtain any benefits should he leave his covered employment at the end of 9 years and 9 months. Obviously, this is unfair and unjust. It is a wrong that Congress ought to right. How can Congress correct this?

The simplest and quickest way to right this wrong is for Congress to broaden social security to bring under it many groups which now are not covered.

At the present time there are an estimated 7,300,000 self-employed persons, not counting those in agriculture, who are in business for themselves. These 7,300,000 people are mostly small businessmen and professional people—lawyers, doctors, and accountants. Social security should be broadened to include and protect them. By covering these business and professional people, the injustice to the covered worker who quits his covered employment to go into business for himself can be largely eliminated and his investment in social security previously made by him through withholding-tax payments thereby can be preserved.

At the present time the owner of a small incorporated business is legally an employee of his own corporation, pays social-security taxes, and is entitled to old-age and survivors' insurance benefits. The owner of an unincorporated business is not. Certainly, the owner of the unincorporated business should enjoy the same rights as his competitor, who is the owner of an incorporated business.

The Social Security Administration estimates that there are 4,300,000 employees of State governments and their political subdivisions, including public power districts, public bus lines, and other public utilities. Today these public employees are denied a chance to participate in social security. The act should be broadened to admit them, with possibly a provision for teacher, police, and firemen groups, who in some communities and States have their own old-age pension plans, being permitted to come in or stay out of social security as they elect.

The benefits of old-age and survivors' insurance should also be extended, I feel, to employees of medical, health services, religious, charitable, and membership organization employees who are not now covered.

The broadening of old-age and survivors' insurance coverage of self-employed persons, of employees of States and their political subdivisions, and of several other special groups will bring an additional 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 persons under old-age and survivors' insurance protection.

This, in my opinion, is both good business and good humanitarianism. It will provide old-age and survivors' insurance protection for almost everyone and at the same time, within not too many years, largely wipe out the tax drain for State old-age public assistance which now is costing the States and Federal Government almost $1,000,000,000 a year.

Under title II of social security everyone, if possible, should pay during the earning years of his youth for the protection he obtains in his old age. This is not added tax expense for the general public, for all will be paying while they earn for protections in the period when, through old age, their power to earn declines.

Another injustice in the present social-security law is the provision which takes away the pensions of a covered worker of over 65 whenever he or she earns in a covered employment more than $14.99 in any calendar month.

This provision leads to many absurdities. For example, a Congressman who has built up social-security pension qualifications while in private life, can draw his social-security benefits at age 65, while at the same time drawing a salary of $1,000 a month from the Government. This is true because the Congressman obtains his $1,000 salary from an uncovered employment.

At the same time another person over 65, if he earns as much as $15 working part time in a covered employment, loses all social-security benefits.

Under the present law, a person over 65 who has an old-age and survivors' insurance pension can continue to receive that pension even though he draws $1,000 or more a month in profits, interest, or rents, while one who has no income at all except his social-security pension, forfeits that pension if he earns as much as $15 in any month in any covered employment. Obviously, this is unjust and unfair to pensioners. It is absurd. More than that it is economically unsound in the light of the present desperate need for more and more production to supply the goods and services which the people of this Nation want and need and which they are prepared to buy were these goods and services available.

In my opinion, the amount of money a worker may earn in any calendar month in covered employment without forfeiting his old-age benefits should be raised to at least $50 a month or the clause limiting the pensioner's earnings should be wiped out altogether.

Workers over 65 who are in good health and find happiness in working part time should be encouraged, not discouraged, for working part time if they desire to do so. They should not be penalized for working. Work alone produces wealth. The more people who work the more goods this Nation will have to divide and the higher our American living standards will become.

Another defect in present social security and old-age survivors' insurance is that it does not now provide as adequate monthly pensions to persons over 65 as the huge sums being collected by withholding taxes justify.

I am convinced that any fair-minded study of social security's income compared to its outgo during the last 10 years will reveal that substantially higher monthly pensions can be paid to persons over 65 without disturbing the soundness and stability of old-age and survivors' insurance.

The old-age and survivors' insurance reserve fund—a fund that represents the amount of money social security has collected from workers over and above what it has paid out on November 30, 1947, contained $9,380,000,000.

In the 5 months between July 1 and November 30 of last year, social security and survivor insurance fund receipts were $680,000,000 more than it paid out during those same 5 months. In short, old-age and survivors' insurance reserves from which pension payments are made are increasing at the rate of more than a billion dollars a year, more than $110,000,000 a month or $3,800,000 a day.

This great surplus of income over expenditures is not something new. It has been going on for a long time. During the last fiscal year which ended last June 30, the Federal Government collected from workers for old-age and survivors' insurance $1,459,000,000 in withholding pay-roll taxes and the old-age and survivors' fund received another $163,500,000 from interest on investments.

From these gross receipts of $1,623,000,000 there was paid out last year for both administration and for old-age and survivors' pensions a total of only $455,400,000 with the result that last year alone more than a billion dollars were added to the old-age and survivors' reserve fund. Of every $1 collected for old-age and survivors' insurance, 26 cents was paid out for benefits and 74 cents went into the reserve.

In the light of the great increase of receipts from withholding taxes over and above expectation, and of disbursement below expectations, I feel that a substantial increase in present benefits is easily possible without any danger to the financial soundness of the reserve fund.

The maximum monthly pensions which now may be paid to a worker over 65 and who has paid into the fund continuously since its start 10 years ago are $44 to the single worker, $66 to a couple both of whom are over 65 and $33 to a surviving spouse. The pensions payable to persons who have not been covered for the full 10 years or whose earnings were less than the maximum $250 a month taxable salary, are much lower.

This schedule of old-age-pension benefits is, in my opinion, inadequate in the light of present day living costs and should be increased and, I believe, can be increased safely probably by about 25 percent.

Our goal in old-age and survivors' insurance should be the bringing of every possible group under its protection. By doing this we will be providing nearly all Americans protection in their old age. At the same time, we will be reducing the heavy drain in taxes levied on the people by the States and Federal Government to support the present system of State old-age assistance which now costs approximately $1,000,000,000 a year, for the more people we have under old-age and survivors' insurance, if its pensions are made adequate, the fewer we will have on State old-age assistance.

The broadening of old-age and survivors' insurance and the making of its pensions more adequate provides a way to make old age more secure and general taxes less burdensome.

I sincerely hope Congress will do something this year toward making social security a better and a more just law by so amending it that some of the defects and shortcomings in this law which time and experience have revealed will be eliminated.

Scio-Ohio Pottery Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 1947, a fire destroyed the main plant of the Scio-Ohio Pottery Co., located at Scio, Harrison County, Ohio, in my district. It is another episode in the challenging story of a prosperous little Ohio town.

In November 1932, using the run-down buildings of an abandoned pottery, Mr. L. P. Reese, president of the Scio-Ohio Pottery Co., began the construction of this plant. He interested the townspeople in his idea; and, with only the hope of jobs, virtually everyone turned out during Thanksgiving week, 1932, to repair roofs, replace broken windows, rebuild the road, and clean up weeds and debris. He then redesigned the kilns and set up machinery and equipment, using the assembly line theory for the mass production of tableware. In the intervening years the plant has grown, until last year it produced more individual pieces of pottery than any other plant in the United States, and has brought unexampled economic health and wealth to the community where it is located.

In the week before Christmas, 1946, Mr. Reese gave a Christmas party, at which time he distributed bonuses totaling $705,000 to his 825 employees. The bonus was computed on a sliding scale based on length of service and was made possible by the accumulation of profits while wages were frozen during the war. Eighty people received $3,500 each, and a man who went to work the day before received at least $10.

In early December 1947 Mr. Reese issued invitations for another Christmas party at which he intended to distribute bonuses in excess of $440,000. When the fire almost completely destroyed the plant the 1947 Christmas party had to be canceled, but 2 days later Mr. Reese announced that the plant would be rebuilt. Immediately the citizens of Scio and the surrounding countryside began to clear the charred ruins for reconstruction of the plant. So spontaneous and genuine was their response to the challenge posed by the destruction of their sole industry that men, women, and children of that community, whether former employees of the pottery or not, turned out as one man to aid in clearing the grounds to make way for the new building which will house the pottery. This constituted such unusual community action that the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of December 14, 1947, published a feature story describing it. The article follows:

SCIO, OHIO, December 13.—This is one place on earth where good will toward man is more than just a theory.

The town which L. P. Reese put on the map with the Scio-Ohio Pottery Co. now is helping to rebuild the pottery plant which was half ruined by a $1,500,000 fire last Thursday.

Saturday men, women, and children wielded brooms, pushed wheelbarrows, and helped sort seared and broken china in the twisted shell of the gutted plant.

Working as hard as the rest were Reese, who started the factory 15 years ago, January 5, and his brothers, George, the purchasing agent, and Scot, superintendent of the plant.

MINISTER AIDS

Also working, in lumbermen shirts and wool caps, were the Reverend Herbert B. Shilliz, a Methodist minister, and the mayor of Scio, P. W. Ostler.

Gone are the plans for the Christmas party and the annual Christmas bonus with which Reese rewarded the townsmen who built the plant from scratch.

Said Mayor Ostler, "The town is back of them 100 percent. The industry is the town."

R. W. Bushy straightened over a shovelful of debris and said: "You're doggoned right I'm going to help rebuild. I helped when the industry started 15 years ago and I'm going to do it again."

ALL PAID

Last night at a meeting in the Scio High School auditorium, L. P. Reese handed out the paychecks for December.

His message to the people, was that the pottery would rebuild, that those who helped rebuild would be paid, and that those of the 830 employes who could not be employed in the rebuilding should get other temporary jobs, seek unemployment compensation and be on hand when the pottery reopens on full schedule

He expects to have two or three kilns operating in three weeks, but full production is at least 6 months away.

Stacks of yellowed and cracked plates, cups, and dishes littered the cinder-covered floor of the pottery.

Back in the war days, said George Reese, "L. P.," the "long-headed" brother, foresaw that any of the 139 items which the firm produced would not be considered essential, so he cut down production to such necessities as cups, saucers, plates, meat platters, and bowls.

MANY ORDERS

Said George Reese:

"The result was we never lost one hour during the war and we're still running a year behind on orders."

In the fire, $400,000 worth of tableware was destroyed. Ironically, Thursday was not shipping day, and the fire hit the products which were to be shipped on 11 waiting freight cars the next day.

Biggest item, though, is the machinery.

Last week a $9,000 cartoncealer was operated for the first time. It was destroyed.

But promises of help are coming from many directions. Companies in Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and New York are calling "L. P." and telling him they'll do all they can to put the firm on its feet again. That also includes the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Meanwhile, in portions of the plant which the fire did not touch, secretaries and clerks are going on with the paper work.

MUSEUM

At the height of the fire, when it was feared the entire plant would go, files were hastily cleared; "the museum," a room wellfilled with animal trophies shot by both L. P. and employees, was emptied.

Strange combinations of papers, mounted animals and intact pottery found its way into the homes of the workers, who are now returning the goods they saved.

In the steel skeleton of the ravaged part of the plant men swing at work like monkeys in the cages of a weird, king-size zoo. Women on the floor below pile the unbroken china in stacks

While the self-appointed salvage crews clear up the debris, Aaron Wagner, the construction engineer, is taking inventory of the destroyed machinery and placing his orders immediately with George Reese.

It isn't much of a Christmas party that Scio is celebrating this year, but it is certainly demonstrating that good will is there.

According to M. W. Horton, druggist:

"We've been here 67 years, and we have seen the Reeses come, and now we've seen them go, but we know they'll be back again, twice as good as before."

Mr. Speaker, the man whose energy, ability, and foresight led to the construction of the Scio-Ohio Pottery Co. and the development in that community of one of the most successful businesses in America is an unusual man. I know him well and count him among my warmest friends. The people of Scio and those who work in the pottery are splendid people. I know many of them personally; they are industrious, thrifty, and dependable. The combination of an unusual leader, like Mr. Reese, working with splendid men and women, like the citizens of Scio, has resulted in an employer-employee relationship that is almost without parallel in the United States. The fact that such a relationship exists in Scio points to the possibility that other such relationships between employer and employees can be established elsewhere in these United States of America to the immense profit and advantage of both employer and employees and the ultimate welfare of our Nation as a whole.

In conversation with Lou Reese last week he told me that the new building to house the pottery will be ready for occupancy and operation by February 13, 1948. I think this a truly remarkable accomplishment of remarkable people.

Expand and Extend Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Rural Electrification Administration Administrator, Claude R. Wickard, announced a major change in REA loan proced re. The announcement was to the effect that loans will no longer first be allocated and later a loan contract signed. Instead, the allocation and contract will be effected at the same time. This will not only speed up the process of making funds available for furtherance of the rural-electrification program but serve to allay the often-advanced criticism that funds are available within the Rural Electrification Administration which have not been contracted. Heretofore, an allocation was necessary prior to the signing of the loan contract. The existence of this procedure allowed many so-called friends of REA to proclaim their "support" of REA while at the same time claiming that REA had all the money it could use, as they pointed to unadvanced funds. The smoke screen of allocation made their argument seem real but in fact not representative of the true situation. Henceforth, unadvanced funds will be contracted for by REA and borrowers in a single step.

During the special session of the Congress, an effort was made to appropriate a sorely needed $200,000,000 deficiency for REA loan authorization. This measure failed of passage by a few votes because some Members of the House insisted that REA was retaining at the time substantial unadvanced loan funds. Actually these funds had previously been allocated and there presently exists a need on the part of the REA for funds for the approval of outstanding applications for loans which cannot be approved by reason of insufficient appropriations for furtherance of the rural electrification program.

Mr. Speaker, moneys provided to REA do not represent gifts but loans for a most needed purpose in our own country and every cent appropriated for building rural electrification power lines will be paid back and returned to the Treasury of the United States. It is hoped that the Congress will appropriate adequate

funds for furtherance of the rural electrification program during this session of Congress.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial from the Rural Electrification Magazine, January 1948, entitled "Year for Courage and Action." The editorial is as follows:

YEAR FOR COURAGE AND ACTION

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight—a year for men of courage and foresight.

We have passed through one of the most trying years in the short history of the rural electrification program. Complex problems—material shortages, a critical power supply deficiency, inadequate loan authorizations, and intensified private utility enmity—hampered the program last year. Happily, deliveries of materials have improved during the last 12 months and the outlook for '48 is brighter. But the shortage of generating capacity lingers—and even the utility officials who deny that any shortage exists (merely an "excess of demand over supply," as they say) are worried about winter peaks. An attempt to secure a deficiency loan authorization for REA during the special session of Congress failed during the waning days of 1947; hopes flicker dimly for a deficiency authorization during the regular session. The obstructions and delaying tactics of the private utility industry are something we evidently must resist as long as we seek to exist.

But courage and foresight saw us through 1947, and enabled construction of 62 percent more miles of rural line than were built in the preceding year. Courage and foresight can pull us through in the most trying of years ahead.

It will take courage to fight—to fight until we win—for adequate loan authorizations, to convert unadvanced funds into completed construction quickly enough to silence our critics, and to stave off utility spite-line and lobby attacks. It will require courage, and probably provident rainfalls and pure luck tossed in, if the power shortage is not to plague our people.

As we begin the new year there is more reason for hope than despair, though. Our hopes are pinned on the unity and cooperative spirit displayed by the Nation's rural electric systems during the year just past. Their foresight in joining State organizations and their national association in order to meet mutual problems as they arose is encouraging. Their support of REA before congressional committees adequately answered utility attempts to drive a wedge between the Agency and its borrowers early last year.

All of this promises that new records established by the rural electrification program in 1947 can and should be shattered in 1948. More money should be advanced, more miles of line energized, and more new members served than ever before in any one year.

The year 1948 will be a year of growing maturity among REA-financed systems. Older co-ops and power districts are already assuming tasks formerly performed as a part of REA's divisional services. And they are doing it without, in any way, increasing the Government's negligible risk. As the new year begins, only one-half of 1 percent of interest and principal payments to REA are 30 days overdue. The record continues to be one of the most enviable of all time.

It is probably true, as opponents of increased REA loan authorizations have stated, that Congress will continue to add new loans each year. However, from the standpoint of finishing the rural electrification job in the quickest and most efficient manner, Congress has failed to provide adequate loans during the past year and demonstrates an unwillingness to correct a deplorable situation. Applications on hand in REA now exceed unallocated (uncontracted) loan authorizations by the staggering amount of $157,000,000—an amount which is pyramiding at a rate of $25,000,000 each succeeding month.

We must meet this problem of inadequate loan authorizations head on in 1948, and meet the other problems just as squarely, too, if the rural electrification program is to accomplish what it should this year.

Naval Air Transport Service Has Record of No Passenger Fatalities During 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, even though the Naval Air Transport Service is a unit of the United States Navy, yet its chief mission is the transportation of passengers and cargo.

The record of completing a calendar year without any fatalities on the part of the NATS reflects credit upon the United States Navy and, in particular Rear Adm. J. W. Reeves, Jr., United States Navy, and all of his officers and men for their efficiency in maintaining and flying NATS planes.

I take pleasure in joining thousands of Americans in complimenting the NATS for the splendid record that has been established as revealed by the following statistics:

The Naval Air Transport Service flew more than 320,000 passengers a total of almost 500,000,000 passenger-miles during 1947 with no passenger fatalities, according to an operational summary released by Rear Adm. J. W. Reeves, Jr., United States Navy, commander of NATS.

Approximately 75 percent of the route miles flown by NATS lies outside the continental United States, and is flown in support of deployed fleet units and shore establishments.

Although figures included in the operational summary cover only scheduled flights, the Naval Air Transport Service had no passenger fatalities throughout the system during the year. Approximately 90 percent of all transport flying done by NATS is scheduled flying, while the other 10 percent is carried on as special missions, training, and test flights.

The operational summary follows:

NATS operational summary, 1947

I. SERVICES PERFORMED

1. Route miles (December 1947):	
Domestic	7,972
Overseas	32,863
Total	40,835
2. Transport hours flown	[1] 117,569
3. Transport plane-miles flown:	
Domestic	[1] 5,044,660
Overseas	[1] 16,981,110
Total	22,025,770
4. Passengers loaded	[1] 312,522
Air-evacuation patients loaded	8,254
Total	320,776
5. Passenger-miles flown:	
Domestic	[1] 106,826,143
Overseas	[1] 370,975,997
Patient-miles flown	[1] 18,091,035
Total	495,893,175
6. Cargo loaded tons	[1] 25,526
7. Cargo ton-miles flown	[1] 34,231,775
8. Mail loaded tons	[1] 5,053
9. Mail ton-miles flown	[1] 10,760,292
10. Total tons loaded	[1] 59,558
11. Total ton-miles flown	[1] 98,770,966

II. SAFETY RECORD

1. Passenger fatalities per 100,000,000 passenger-miles	0

III. DEPENDABILITY OF SERVICE

1. Percent scheduled flights canceled	5.1
2. Percent scheduled departures delayed (Jan. 1–Dec. 13)	11.3
Average hours per delay (Jan. 1–Dec. 13)	2.80
3. Percent scheduled miles completed (Jan. 1–Nov. 30)	98.0

IV. SATISFACTORINESS OF SERVICE

1. Percent of passengers who submitted reactions	57.1
2. Percent passenger reactions received that were unfavorable	1.5
3. Ratio of actual to scheduled shipping time of NATS priority cargo	116.1

V. EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY

1. Average number of transport aircraft assigned	116
2. Average aircraft operational utilization hours:	
R5D	[1] 6.8
RAD	[1] 2.4
JRM	[1] 6.9
3. Average load factor (January through November)...percent	86.9
4. Average personnel on board	[2] 5,760
5. Average month ton-mile per unit of personnel	1,427

[1] December estimated.
[2] These on-board figures include transport personnel only.

Rubber in National Defense and National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, this Congress will soon be called upon to consider legislation having to do with rubber both in relation to our national defense and in relation to our national economy.

Recently the Chemical Engineers Club of Washington made the rubber problem the topic of a symposium and, under the unanimous consent privilege given me, I desire to submit for consideration of Members of Congress the views of two of the speakers, Rear Adm. C. E. Braine, chairman of the Army-Navy Munitions Board rubber committee, and Mr. C. B. Hadlock, of the Office of Rubber Reserve of the RFC.

Their statements follow:

THE NATIONAL RUBBER SITUATION FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

(By Rear Adm. C. E. Braine)

One of the peacetime duties of the Navy Department is war planning. This includes industrial-mobilization planning, which is one of my functions in the office of the Under Secretary. One of the most important materials in this program is rubber.

Industrial-mobilization planning is no different from any other planning. First, we estimate the situation. What do we desire to achieve? What is available to us? What obstacles must be overcome? Then make our decisions. Such planning is similar to attacks on all problems, but in this case the scope is so broad and so many factors are involved we need a supercharge of magic. This element, fortunately, has been provided by the wholehearted patriotic cooperation of scientific societies, business associations, industry, labor and government, which all together form our great democracy. A democracy is based on a view of the role of the people's will in government. If we will to have a strong national defense, which means wish it with a knowledge of the price and a willingness to pay for it, we shall have our will. If we merely want it, making no great effort to find the means, we go the way of many admirable societies which died because they were politically inadequate to the necessities of the times in which their fate was decided. We hear that 1948 will be a year of momentous decisions. I agree that decisions made now will affect our lives drastically, and I hope that we do not lose sight of the lesson of history in regard to the importance of rubber to our life and as a necessity for national defense.

Fortunately, I believe, that the price the taxpayer will have to pay in this case will be small and soon we will have a new self-supporting national asset in the form of a new industry using American management and labor. We must become as self-reliant as possible and not have to depend on others. Information which is not secret indicates that due to the brains and ability of the American chemists we soon can expect substantial improvements in American-made rubber. This does not mean that the entire product will be synthetic, and I am not losing sight of the proper proportion of natural rubber. Such amounts must be stock-piled for safety, but without an impossibly large stock pile, we must retain an active and readily expendable, technologically advanced, American rubber-producing industry. This should be backed up by retention of sufficient stand-by capacity from our presently owned plants to permit rapid and prompt mobilization if needed. This proposed plan for the rubber industry does not differ radically from that for other basic materials, such as magnesium. During the war, certain progress was made in the growing and processing of certain plants within the limits of the United States which gave a sap from which a natural rubber could be obtained. Peace came before this was perfected, but the promise was there, and a small development program along these lines is being carried on by the Department of Agriculture at our request.

I am sure that Mr. Kennedy will cover the State Department's position in regard to cooperation with rubber-producing countries. We fully realize the importance to national defense of a healthy world and have no wish to ruin any country. However, others are much more willing to cooperate with a strong country than a weak one, and we must always try to be in a position where decisions regarding our national defense are in our hands.

You are all aware I am sure of the history of the American rubber industry. After VJ-day the Interagency Committee on Rubber Policy continued under Mr. Batt's chairmanship. The military departments were members of this committee and their views in respect to defense matters were given full consideration. When this committee was dissolved, it was re-formed under the Army and Navy Munitions Board and I became chairman. In general the membership remained the same representing all departments and agencies of the Government interested in rubber. Therefore, when the Army and Navy Munitions Board undertook to send a draft of legislation to the Congress in July the resultant effort followed the lines this committee had been pursuing for the past several years. This draft met certain objections particularly from parts of industry. An analysis of these differences of opinion showed that the controversial features were not important from the defense viewpoint as long as legislation was passed securing our basic aims. These were clarified in writing and I am delighted to say that everyone with whom I talked gave them full support, with the exception of the size of the active industry to be retained. All agree there should be such an industry but figures vary depending on the viewpoint.

This does not mean that there was an unanimous agreement on methods of supporting this industry, its management, or the ownership of plants. But the Munitions Board speaking for the military departments has decided that such decisions which affect our country and its citizens as a whole are not proper matters for their jurisdiction but properly must be decided by the Congress. We all stand ready to offer our official and personal opinions and to assist as we can, and I am sure that the hard work and intelligent study of Mr. Shafer's committee will bring forth the best possible legislation which will protect our defense interests and the welfare of the whole country.

The most recent comment on this matter by Mr Hargrave, chairman of the Munitions Board, is that legislation should provide:

(a) About one-third of the total new natural and general purpose synthetic rubber used in this country should be general purpose synthetic rubber manufactured in our plants.

(b) A small amount of synthetic rubber of the type suitable for use in inner tubes should also be kept in production.

(c) The total operating and stand-by capacity for the manufacture of general purpose synthetic rubber should be about 600,000 long tons per year.

(d) The simplest possible method, with the minimum of Government control, should be used to accomplish the above objectives.

(e) Mandatory usage appears to be the best method of fulfilling these prerequisites; such mandatory usage to be confined to as few products as possible.

They also emphasize the need for the active operation of as many plants as possible in dispersed locations.

The Munitions Board will continue to be interested in rubber from the viewpoint of rubber products required by the military forces. The other aspects of the whole picture will come under the cognizance of the National Security Resources Board which handles all raw materials subject to the restrictions placed by the Congress in the new legislation.

As a naval officer, I can state wholeheartedly that our country needs a self-reliant domestic rubber-producing industry as a vital element of our national defense and should war never come, as we hope, I believe it will be a national asset.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER INDUSTRY AND ITS RELATION TO OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY

(By G. B. Hadlock)

If there are any full-fledged economists listening to me tonight, I hope they will bear with me for a moment while I invade their field of operations. It is not my purpose to expound any weighty arguments that might leave me over my depth. Instead I shall ground my approach to a fundamental segment of economic principle—the law of supply and demand. That law governs just about everything we have in our daily lives.

As long as there is a free play of economic forces in the world, the old law of supply and demand works with clock-like precision. But when those forces are distorted by artificial means of one sort or another, somebody has to suffer. This is clearly shown when the supply of a basic commodity is restricted by means of a reduction in output, through arbitrary curtailment of productive acreage, or the withholding of goods from the market. The laws of this country have worked rather effectively to eliminate artificial controls over domestic production, but wherever we are dependent upon foreign sources for our supplies of vital materials we have to pay the other fellow's price. He can release supply when prices are high, and contract them when they are low.

This Nation was paying the other fellow's price for crude rubber a few years ago, and there was nothing we could do about it. Not only that, but we had to haul our purchase over 11,000 miles. All too often that purchase represented only what the British and Dutch dominated cartel was willing to allow us. Certainly that constituted a precarious supply line for the largest consumer of rubber in the world.

But that was the shape of things before your synthetic rubber industry came into being. As long as enough rubber came in to cover our requirements and we could all buy a new car every year or so, there was little or no occasion to ponder over the fact that 92 percent of the world's rubber was produced so far away. As the war in Europe grew in intensity and spread its influence to the Far East, the danger to a continuance or dependable shipping became more and more apparent. Almost suddenly the supply of ships soon became alarming. As stocks in the hands of manufacturers began suddenly to drop dangerously low, it began to look as though this Nation on wheels might soon become a nation of pedestrians. Let us not lose sight of that scare when we consider the value of our newly established synthetic rubber industry.

But this new industry could not be created overnight. It took over 2 years of unremitting labor, employing the best technical brains in the Nation, to produce the first pound of synthetic rubber. Meanwhile, the best that your Government could do was to buy all the crude rubber there was to be found, wherever it was and whatever the price demanded. The RFC stood on the doorstep of the rubber cartel—virtually with hat in hand—seeking to purchase all the crude rubber they would sell us.

The last lot to leave Malaya on January 25, 1942, was under a rain of Japanese bombs, but that final cargo was more precious than gold. It was one small thumb in the dyke that was getting weaker every passing minute. We combed the wilds of the Amazon Valley for rubber and spent $135,000,000 before another 100,000 tons was added to our rapidly dwindling stock pile.

The sight of that small handful of rubber cast a gloom over every thinking man and woman. The sad story was brought home with poignant effect as the public was admonished to turn in their old tires and household rubber articles—bath mats to garden hose—so that our armed forces might move forward on wheels.

Such was the atmosphere as the man in industry enthusiastically joined hands with the Rubber Reserve Organization in getting that first synthetic rubber plant in operation.

We were deep into the war when the first ton of synthetic rubber oozed through the Firestone plant at Akron, Ohio, on April 26, 1942.

We were now over the hump—operating an American-owned, strictly independent source of rubber. It was now upward and onward, free of the hesitation that had characterized the plans of 1940 for the first synthetic

plants. A new industry had been established on which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had expended about $760,000,000, adding about one-third to the Nation's rubber industry investment. Included in this new industry were 51 plants representing $335,000,000 in butadiene plants, both alcohol and petroleum; $77,000,000 in styrene plants; $51,000,000 in butyl rubber plants; $200,000,000 in copolymer and neoprene plants; and $20,000,000 in various miscellaneous projects representing catalysts, minor chemicals, etc.

Starting with 500 tons in April 1942 those plants turned out 2,241 tons during the year, rising to 738,000 tons in 1944, and 802,000 in 1945. While capacity was estimated at 833,000 tons, an operating rate of a million tons had been achieved by VJ-day. At the height of production in 1945, there were about 22,000 employees engaged in these operations. We are now employing approximately 12,000 persons in the production of approximately 400,000 tons annually.

I shall not attempt to draw any comparisons of synthetic rubber with the natural product, because I am rather confident that my audience of eminent chemists have already given some thoughtful consideration to that subject. But let me dwell for a brief moment on the fact that this synthetic rubber has performed a war service that is virtually without parallel. When General Eisenhower swept across Germany and on to Berlin, synthetic rubber was on every moving vehicle. It went with General MacArthur into Tokyo. It is keeping up that service today wherever American troops are stationed, while here at home it affords us continued and efficient transportation. Through postwar exports, synthetic rubber has kept transportation in foreign lands at a high peak of efficiency.

Here at home no vehicle of essential transportation ever had to stop because of a lack of wartime rubber. Although rigid conservation was demanded by the War Production Board, rubber was available for every essential industrial use. Rubber balloons were out for the duration, as were rubber toys, and rubber heels were not as easily obtainable as they were prewar, but rubber moved into war plants with constant regularity, permitting an uninterrupted flow of munitions to our fighting forces. We were breathing easier with this dependable supply of synthetic rubber, but without it we could have lost the war.

It is certainly not easy for me to tell an audience of chemists anything about the quality of today's synthetic rubber. I do think, however, that you will agree with me that a product that has performed such an outstanding job is entitled to a more acceptable designation than the word "synthetic" connotes. I venture the opinion that time and public acceptance will ultimately bring about the discarding of that tag label and the products that flow from our plentiful supplies of petroleum, coal, and alcohol will be known only as rubber.

Then synthetic rubber will join a respectable group of other products that have enriched our lives through the miracles of chemistry. In this group there are many essential materials, only a few of which have come out of the caldron of war. Rayon and nylon come quickly to mind as staunch competitors in the field formerly preempted by silk. In the manufacture of dyes, whoever today would think of reverting to the archaic methods employed before Perkins, an Englishman, who in 1856 synthesized dyes for the first time. By the turn of the century, the natural product from indigo fields had virtually vanished, along with the enormous expense of money and labor for their cultivation.

Actually, there are horizons unlimited for the further development of synthetic rubber. In this age of scientific research and development the potentialities are limited only by the capacities of man's mind. Contrast this, if you will, with the improvements that have been made over the years in the quality of natural rubber. And the synthetic product is right here at home, closer by 11,000 miles, with potentialities for increased production dependent only upon the opening up of more valves and using up available quantities of raw materials.

Where and how is this synthetic rubber used? Here in these United States, 76.2 percent of all synthetic-rubber production goes into the transportation industry, 23.8 percent into auto accessories, mechanical rubber goods and general-purpose uses, such as adhesives.

This market did not have to wait for rubber from foreign lands when the collapse of Japan put us back on a peacetime footing. While shortages were evident in a wide assortment of other essential materials, there has never yet been any delay in getting as much rubber as is needed. The automobile manufacturers, largest of any user, have been delayed time and again by the lack of steel, copper, and lead. As a consequence, you may have to wait another 2 years before automobiles are in ample supply. But that delay has come about at a time when the automobile manufacturers can get all the rubber they want. What a different story this would be if we had to wait for rubber to start moving in this direction from the Far East after the surrender of Japan. Today there is rubber for every requirement, from the large industrial establishments employing from 60,000 persons down to the little shops with as few as 10 persons. They have all been able to swing back into peacetime activity. We have had good quality rubber heels for a long time now, and the little rubber dog and toy balloons are all over the place again.

Plentiful and cheap, synthetic rubber has made it possible for you and me to have new tires on our automobiles. At 18½ cents a pound GR–S, we can now buy a tire for $15. Do you remember the state of things after World War I, with crude rubber selling at $1.06 per pound, and tires selling at $35.00. This plentiful supply of synthetic rubber has made it stand out as a one essential commodity in which there is no black market, no gray market; only a normal everyday buyer-seller market.

What has this contributed to our postwar national economy? Well, take a look at the earnings of our tire manufacturers. In 1946 and 1947 they have benefited tremendously, with earnings at all-time records. These earnings have been made with a minimum of hazard that formerly characterized their operations. No longer do they have to carry huge inventories over periods of from 6 to 9 months, and face the ever-present possibility of having to write off inventory depreciations at the year end. Today these rubber companies can get their raw materials as they are required, carrying an inventory that normally amounts to a 30-day supply.

Now I anticipate that some people may chide me about some of these things I have said tonight in view of the temporary short supply of GR–S. The present situation is the result of human error—failure of industry and Government to foresee consumption requirements and to plan accordingly. Errors of planning certainly cannot indict the fundamental truths nor detract from the value of our synthetic-rubber industry in our national economy.

In short, the rubber industry has today reached a state of stability unknown before. The synthetic product has brought this about. It has also placed this Nation in the enviable position of substantial independence of foreign supplies in the event of another war, which I pray God never blights this fair land again.

Government Services, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Government Services, Inc., operates some forty-odd cafeterias in Government buildings serving thousands of Federal employees. Because the officers of the union to which the employees belonged and who worked in those cafeterias, would not sign the affidavits, especially the anti-Communist affidavit, required by the Taft-Hartley Act, the company refused to deal with them, so they went out on a strike and threw a picket line around the Government buildings where the cafeterias were being operated. There was this exception. The marshal of the United States Supreme Court and the Secretary of Labor closed those two cafeterias, that is, the cafeteria operating over here in the Supreme Court Building and the one in the Labor Department.

The point is this: the picket lines' purpose was to close those two cafeterias. The corporation rendering the service was able, as I understand Mr. Fleming, to give adequate service to the Government employees. All the cafeterias were open except those two. By what right was this done? Yesterday Mr. Schwellenbach testified that he knew of no law which authorized him to close that cafeteria; nevertheless, he closed it.

The Marshal of the United States Supreme Court, Thomas E. Waggaman, requested the cafeteria in the Supreme Court building, which serves the employees of that building and the members of the public who desire such service, be closed. That, at least, is the testimony.

We do not know whether the cafeteria in the same building which serves the Supreme Court Justices was closed.

Carved in stone over the entrance to the Supreme Court building is the legend "Equal justice under law." Recently we have heard not a little about the evils of discrimination about the right of every man to vote, about the right of the Negro to equal opportunity to work, to attend institutions of learning, about the right to vote without the payment of a poll tax required of his white brother.

It is more than passing strange that in a building set apart to, among other things, prevent unconstitutional discrimination, men and women, white and black, should, by a Federal official, who draws his compensation from the Federal Government, be denied the opportunity to work just because the officials of the union, who will not officially declare that they are not Communists, do not follow the teachings of an organization, which by force advocates the overthrow of our Government, threaten to picket that building. It does not seem possible that the Justices, sworn to see that every citizen is to have equal justice under law, know of this action by their Marshal.

It does not seem possible that any Federal agency, having charge of public buildings, any court charged with the duty of administering equal justice, the head of the Labor Department, should join a picket line in its efforts to close a cafeteria which is being operated in accordance with the law of the land.

That which the picket line of local 471 was unable to do, that is, close these two cafeterias, the board, headed by Mr. Fleming, the Marshal of the United States Supreme Court, and the Secretary of Labor, accomplished by order.

Thus, these two agencies and the Marshal assisted this union, whose officials refused to forswear allegiance to the Communist Party or their Communist affiliation, in depriving men and women, black and white, of the opportunity to earn a livelihood. They aided that union in depriving thousands of Government employees of the opportunity to eat a needed meal in a cafeteria lawfully operated. It would seem that here in Washington we should have a little more clear thinking, a little more of equal justice under law, a little less of political maneuvering, a little more support by Government agencies and officials to not only the letter of the law enacted by Congress but to the spirit of that law. It would seem as though, while we are being asked to appropriate some $17,000,000,000 to stop communism abroad, we have a little less support to communistically inclined individuals here in the Capital.

Strong Air Force Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herewith an editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of date of Tuesday, January 20, 1948, which states one of our most vital needs today:

STRONG AIR FORCE NEEDED

Stark facts regarding the inadequacy of American air power as it exists today and looking to the frightening possibilities of atomic warfare within a few years are presented to the people of the United States by the President's Air Policy Committee.

This group—all civilians—unanimously declare that the Nation must spend billions to enlarge and strengthen the Air Force and must plunge into air research as never before against a not distant day when we shall no longer have a monopoly of atomic weapons.

That day is computed as the beginning of 1953—5 years hence. It is the time when, these five men believe, "other nations will have atomic weapons in quantity and the equipment to deliver them in a sustained attack on the United States mainland."

It is the time when, they also declare, we must have "a counteroffensive air establishment in being which will be so powerful that if an enemy does attack we will be able to retaliate with the utmost violence."

But what, in the reasoned judgment of this committee, is the condition of the United States Air Force today? They assert it is "inadequate even now." For that grim atomic future—now so close—the prospect is infinitely worse. On the present basis of planning and preparation, American air power would be "hopelessly wanting" in a period of "serious danger of atomic attack."

What the committee sets forth is not fear mongering. It is a cold, reasoned analysis of conditions which cannot be denied and which it would be a fantastic extreme of folly for the American people, their Congress, or their Government to ignore.

Even without the vast perils of the atom it is indisputable that our country can be protected against all possible risks only by dominant air power.

On the record we do not have it now. We have not begun, seriously, to achieve it. To do so will involve enormous costs, the most thorough planning, and great efforts. Not to do it involves—invites—destruction.

Chairman Thomas K. Finletter and his associates on the President's committee soberly express the conviction that in the absolute sense the United States can be secure only if war itself is "abolished under a regime of law."

We should not despair of that. We should pursue, however, what the Finletter group outlines as a double-barreled policy abroad: to achieve world peace through support and development of the United Nations and at the same time "prepare * * * for the possibility that war may come."

We must, indeed, strive for peace with all our might. But we must never, in the sad present state of world affairs, make the unutterable mistake of neglecting our defenses.

The Air Force now plans to create 55 groups. The committee urges 70 by the end of 1949, with double the present basis of 3,500 first-line planes. It recommends swift modernization of the Navy's air branch. It earnestly urges extended air research, particularly in supersonic speeds, and calls attention to the condition that such research is now virtually at a standstill.

These recommendations and many others of great importance with reference to both military and civil aviation will call for Government outlays high above any that have heretofore been envisoned. It is, at least, encouraging to note that President Truman's current budget proposals seek substantial advances toward the committee's goals.

Are we, in this vital matter, going to count the money cost and say it is too much? We dare not be so blind. We should seek peace, by every honest means. We must not, however, run a single risk of atomic warfare against us. America must be made invulnerably strong in the air as quickly as the task can be done. There is little enough time. We must make the most of it.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, after a thorough study, I cannot escape the conclusion that the most equitable method of tax reduction is by an increase in the personal exemptions and reduction of percentage points on the surtax. My bill, H. R. 5064, effects a graduated tax reduction ranging from 100 percent for a single person with a $700 income or married man with a $1,400 income, down to 4 percent in the highest income brackets. Though differing in details, this is the principle embodied in the tax-reduction bill which I introduced last year.

Conceding that the so-called Knutson bill, H. R. 4790, is a definite improvement over H. R. 1 and H. R. 3950 passed last year, I feel that, in the light of greatly increased living expenses, still further consideration should be given to those who now simply find themselves unable to make both ends meet.

There is certainly some bare minimum beyond which we should not go in forcing our people to contribute directly to the expense of running the Government. That principle is now recognized in the $500 exemption for a single man and $1,000 for a married man. If these figures were fair when established, certainly a $200 increase now is amply justified.

I do, however, subscribe to the doctrine that there should be some reduction all along the line. To argue that equality is achieved by reducing the tax of a married man, who is now paying $100 to $20, and of a man who is paying $10,000 to $9,920 is political demagoguery of the rankest type and a long step toward destruction of the very economic system which has permitted our lower income groups to enjoy a standard of living to which none other in the world is even remotely comparable.

My bill is in the nature of a compromise measure which, I feel confident, if enacted would either not suffer a veto or, if vetoed, would speedily be enacted in both bodies by the necessary two-thirds majority. It would insure tax-reduction legislation at this session of Congress.

Attached are schedules showing the tax under present law, under the President's proposal, H. R. 4790 and H. R. 5064.

It will be noted that the significant difference between H. R. 4790 and H. R. 5064 is that under my bill for single persons the reduction in tax under a $1,000 income is substantially more, and above $25,000 income substantially less, and also for a married couple with two children is substantially more under $5,000 and substantially less above $20,000.

Schedule showing income-tax reduction under various proposed plans

[Net income in first column is after allowable deductions, but before personal exemption]

SINGLE PERSONS, NO DEPENDENTS

Net income	Tax under present law	Tax under President's proposal	Tax under H. R. 4790	Tax under H. R. 5064	Percentage reduction under H. R. 5064
$600	$19	0	0	0	100
$700	38	0	$14	0	100
$800	57	$17	27	$16	72
$1,000	95	55	53	46	52
$1,200	133	93	80	76	43
$1,500	190	150	120	122	36
$2,000	285	245	200	198	30
$3,000	485	445	371	355	27
$5,000	922	882	727	709	23
$7,000	1,435	1,395	1,165	1,151	20
$10,000	2,347	2,307	2,003	1,929	18
$20,000	6,645	6,005	5,855	5,811	13
$30,000	25,137	25,097	22,483	23,127	8
$100,000	83,541	63,501	69,602	87,032	6
$500,000	407,857	407,857	366,949	386,730	5
$1,000,000	840,107	840,107	755,974	800,268	4

Schedule showing income-tax reduction under various proposed plans—Con.

MARRIED COUPLES WITH 2 CHILDREN

Net income	Tax under present law	Tax under President's proposal	Tax under H. R. 4790	Tax under H. R. 5064	Percentage reduction under H. R. 5064
$2,000	0	0	0	0	100
$2,500	$96	0	$12	0	100
$3,000	196	$30	80	$30	84
$4,000	288	220	233	182	32
$5,000	888	420	386	328	63
$7,000	1,040	880	708	708	33
$10,000	1,932	1,702	1,210	1,260	27
$20,000	5,860	5,730	3,656	4,856	18
$30,000	24,110	23,961	15,986	21,770	10
$100,000	62,301	62,141	44,224	57,946	7
$500,000	405,670	405,440	343,940	387,015	5
$1,000,000	838,870	838,690	732,990	800,205	4

The Share of the Sixth Missouri Congressional District in Foreign-Aid Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for the mind to conceive the size of the gifts this country has provided in the past and is being called upon to provide in the future to various foreign countries. Perhaps it will help my constituents to get a better understanding of their individual or per capita share of this program if it is broken down into county and town and compared with local county revenues.

Assistance this country's taxpayers have given other countries from July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1947, totals $73,092,058,013. This includes war expenditures.

The assistance we have provided foreigners since the end of the war, through June 30, 1947, amounts to $24,099,211,087. This sum does not include approximately half a billion dollars more recently voted by Congress in special session at the request of the President as stop-gap aid pending a decision on the Truman-Marshall plan.

The Truman administration is now asking Congress for seventeen additional billions for foreign aid, with six billion eight hundred million of it to spend in the next few months.

The amount already provided since the end of the war equals $183 for every man, woman, and child in America, on the basis of the last official census. It has cost each average American family more than $25 per month for each of the last 2 years. That is the main reason for high taxes and high prices.

The official figures show four things:

First. The cost of foreign aid since VJ-day to the residents of each county and principal town in the Sixth Missouri Congressional District.

Second. The per capita cost to residents of each county and town of the proposed Truman-Marshall plan for $17,000,000,000 more.

Third. Total foreign aid provided and proposed.

Fourth. Net amount of taxes received by each county for county, county road and bridge, special road and bridge, and school purposes. The county tax total was derived from real estate, personal property, merchants and manufacturers, railroads and utilities, and covers a period from March 1, 1945, to February 28, 1946, inclusive, the last dates available for such comparison.

Sixth Missouri Congressional District

County and cities	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947—peacetime assistance	Foreign aid proposed by Truman-Marshall plan now pending	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual county tax receipts from all sources
Barton	$2,589,084	$2,065,608	$4,654,692	$164,274
Golden City	158,661	125,582	284,243	
Lamar	547,536	436,832	984,368	249,508
Liberal	141,093	112,566	253,659	
Bates	3,574,173	2,751,526	6,325,699	
Adrian	158,844	126,728	285,572	
Amsterdam	31,479	25,112	56,588	
Butler	541,314	431,868	973,182	
Hume	89,121	71,102	160,223	
Rich Hill	364,902	291,124	656,026	
Rockville	61,493	49,056	110,544	
Cass	3,574,722	2,851,964	6,426,686	366,637
Belton	177,693	39,742	319,459	
Creighton	49,776	39,712	89,488	
Drexel	82,380	65,700	148,050	
Garden City	109,617	87,454	197,071	
Harrisonville	424,926	339,012	763,938	
Pleasant Hill	378,594	309,228	696,822	
Cedar	2,140,551	1,707,762	3,848,313	92,443
El Dorado Springs	425,256	341,582	770,318	
Stockton	146,583	116,946	263,529	
Greene	16,569,003	13,218,986	29,787,989	1,148,942
Ash Grove	201,483	160,746	362,229	
Republic	144,570	115,340	259,910	
Springfield	11,206,554	8,940,748	20,147,302	301,548
Henry	4,083,279	3,257,698	7,340,977	
Clinton	1,105,503	881,166	1,987,489	
Urich	85,695	67,290	152,985	
Windsor	434,259	346,458	780,717	378,115
Johnson	3,955,911	3,156,682	7,111,593	
Holden	332,794	265,428	598,122	
Knob Noster	117,120	93,440	210,560	
Warrensburg	1,073,544	856,728	1,930,272	
Pettis	6,100,488	4,867,056	10,967,544	562,254
Green Ridge	64,050	51,100	115,150	
La Monte	89,852	71,696	161,539	
Sedalia	3,738,524	2,982,488	6,720,812	
Smithton	73,092	58,284	132,916	
Polk	3,184,200	2,540,400	5,724,600	183,549
Bolivar	482,388	384,856	867,244	
Humansville	143,838	114,756	258,594	
St. Clair	2,405,718	1,919,316	4,325,034	126,172
Appleton City	217,404	173,448	390,852	
Osceola	217,770	173,740	391,510	
Vernon	4,682,238	3,735,556	8,417,794	282,149
Bronaugh	48,405	38,690	87,185	
Nevada	1,497,123	1,194,426	2,691,549	
Sheldon	84,729	67,598	152,327	

Summary by counties, Sixth Missouri Congressional District

County	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947—peacetime assistance	Foreign aid proposed by Truman-Marshall plan now pending	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual county tax receipts from all sources
Barton	$2,589,084	$2,065,608	$4,654,692	$164,274
Bates	3,574,173	2,751,526	6,325,699	249,508
Cass	3,574,722	2,851,964	6,426,686	366,637
Cedar	2,140,551	1,707,762	3,848,313	92,443
Greene	16,569,003	13,218,986	29,787,989	1,148,942
Henry	4,083,279	3,257,698	7,340,977	301,548
Johnson	3,955,911	3,156,682	7,111,593	378,115
Pettis	6,100,488	4,867,056	10,967,544	562,254
Polk	3,184,200	2,540,400	5,724,600	183,549
St. Clair	2,405,718	1,919,316	4,325,034	126,172
Vernon	4,682,238	3,735,556	8,417,794	282,149
Total	52,889,367	42,071,954	94,931,321	3,855,586

From the tables here provided, the individual reader can readily compute how many years it will require for his county to pay its per capita share of foreign aid, assuming all of the county's revenues could be diverted to such a purpose. It is fantastic to assume that the people, if given opportunity to do so, would vote to place such a mortgage on their counties and so obligate themselves and their descendants. As their representative in Congress, I cannot bring myself in good conscience to vote to place such an obligation on them, to keep their taxes and cost of living high.

The best thing we can do for our own national security and the peace of the world is to have an economically prosperous and sound America. A continuation of extravagant foreign aid may keep the boom going until after the election, but, judging from history, it is also the sure road to bust as well as boom, to war and the loss of liberty. Returns from 53,000 questionnaires I recently distributed in my district on the subject, to all rural, star, and post-office boxholders, and 12,000 telephone subscribers show my constituents about six to one against the Truman-Marshall foreign-affairs policy.

Real Democratic Party Should Benefit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe it will be of interest to know of the reaction of a county Democratic party leader to Henry Wallace's announcement to seek the position of President on a third-party ticket. Mr. A. B. Brady, chairman of the Robertson County Democratic Executive Committee, Hearne, Tex., very ably describes the response of a true Democrat to the recent action of Henry Wallace.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Chairman Brady's statement which appeared in the newspaper, the Hearne Democrat, on January 9, 1948:

REAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY SHOULD BENEFIT

A. B. Brady, chairman of the Robertson County Democratic Executive Committee, thinks that Henry A. Wallace's bid for the Presidency on Third Party ticket should benefit the true Democratic Party. Mr. Brady has issued the following statement:

"It will make true Democrats take more active interest in the campaign. It will at least show the real alinement of the voters that still believe in the democratic principles of Thomas Jefferson from those of Mr. Wallace and his communistic backers. It is true that in Mr. Wallace's imaginary campaign for liberalism there will be some innocent and sincere people to fall in his camp.

"Let us not forget that it was a Henry A. Wallace who formed the first Republican Thousand-Dollar Club (every member gave a thousand dollars) to help elect his personal friend, Herbert Hoover, in 1928.

"Is there anyone living now that was living then that could forget what happened after the election of Herbert Hoover and the overwhelming Republican House and Senate? Could anyone forget that 4 years of terror in which the economical structure of our country almost collapsed? Is there any one in Robertson County that could forget that cottonseed dropped to $8 a ton; cotton to 6 cents a pound; nice size hogs as low as $4 and $5 each, and some cattle $7 and $8 a head; eggs, 3 dozen for 25 cents? Many other items of like drop in value could be enumerated. But most of all, can anyone forget the poverty-stricken situation of the 25,000,000 people that were out of work during the Hoover administration? Mr. Wallace and his thousand-dollar clubbers promised the voters a chicken in every pot and a car in every garage. Well, voters, you know what you got.

"Then came along that great leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who led the country out of chaos and the throes of revolution. Then came the turn-about-face. Things looked greener in the other fellow's pasture and Wallace got on the bandwagon. He was so convincing that Roosevelt eventually chose him as his running mate. Wallace's ideas were so mystifying that Roosevelt dropped him for a running mate on his fourth race and chose that great leader, Harry S. Truman to run in the place formerly held by Mr. Wallace. Mr. Truman, to appease Mr. Wallace, gave Mr. Wallace a place in the Presidential Cabinet. When our administration saw that we had to get firm with Russia, Mr. Wallace buoyantly repudiated the stand of the administration, much to the embarrassment of our Government and its foreign policy.

"President Truman had to ask for Wallace's resignation. There was only one camp left for Mr. Wallace—the Red camp and so sprung the third party with Mr. Wallace as its Presidential candidate.

"Loyal Democrats do not fall for false theories. While this country and all its people prosper, the farmers of Russia turn their wheat over to the Government and in turn are given back black bread to eat.

"Loyal Democrats do not forget the Thousand Dollar Clubs and the great Hoover depression. Don't forget that $8 a ton cottonseed, 6-cent cotton; 15 cents a bushel oats; 50 cents a bushel wheat, and that miserable 25,000,000 people out of employment.

"Let us be on the alert and as active, loyal Democrats we will not have to worry about the grand old party of Thomas Jefferson, Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and of our now great President, Harry S. Truman, being overwhelmed either by Henry A. Wallace, and the Red baiters of Joe Stalin's atheistic communism, or by Taft or Dewey or anyone of the Republic Party. In other words we are going to defeat Wallace's Russian theories and the Republican depression theories. Let us remain democratic and our country prosperous."

Former President Realistic and Patriotic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Ted Lewis, which appears in the Washington Times-Herald of even date, which covers a statement by former President of the United States Herbert Hoover, which, in my opinion, is at long last a realistic and patriotic program for this country to assume to protect and preserve our own great Nation.

The article is as follows:

HOOVER CITES PERILS, ASKS DRASTIC REVISION OF MARSHALL PROGRAM—SEES CAVE-IN OF DOMESTIC UNITED STATES ECONOMY IF PLAN GETS APPROVAL IN PRESENT FORM

(By Ted Lewis)

The Marshall plan in its present form threatens to cause a cave-in of our domestic economy "and thus defeat all world recovery," Herbert Hoover said yesterday in urging a sweeping revision of the program.

In a letter to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the former President proposed that:

1. Congress refuse to make even a "moral commitment" for 4 years of aid, but confine assistance to 15 months only.

BIPARTISAN COMMISSION

2. A bipartisan policy commission heads up the foreign-aid program, which is too big to be handled "by one man or any one department of our Government."

3. The proposed $6,800,000,000 appropriation for 15 months, plus the $2,000,000,000 slated for other aid abroad during the same period be reexamined for possible economies.

4. The $5,000,000,000 in holdings in this country of citizens of the 16 Marshall-plan nations be used as collateral for United States loans by those nations.

IMPACT ON UNITED STATES ECONOMY

5. A flat $3,000,000,000 of initial aid be in the form of gifts of food, coal, fertilizers, and similar goods. Steel and other capital goods "can be paid for out of the increased productivity they create."

6. An absolute prohibition be made against use of American money by the aided nations for payment of goods from other countries.

Hoover's proposed changes were based on the major premise that the Marshall plan at present fails to take properly into account the impact on domestic economy of a huge relief burden involving hiked exports, a drain on natural resources, and continued "excessive taxation, all of which might bring depression and thus destroy the strength of the one remaining source of aid to a world in chaos."

SUGGESTS SCALING DOWN PLANS

He specifically proposed that in view of the oil shortage, plans for sending $650,000,000 worth of petroleum products to western Europe in the next 15 months be scaled down. Similarly he urged that steel and machinery shipments for the period be cut.

In suggesting that "even a moral commitment to a 4-year program is unwise," Hoover said, "we cannot enforce ideas upon other self-governing peoples, and we should keep ourselves entirely free to end our efforts without recrimination." Moreover, he added, Europe could always bank on the United States for "aid against hunger and cold."

Backing foreign aid in principle he reminded that "the front against communism lies not alone in Europe" and that "the food supply and reconstruction of industry in Germany, Japan, Korea, and China are inseparable from the 16 (Marshall plan) countries."

Subsistence Allowance for GI Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House first-hand facts which I have received from students attending the University of Maine. These summarize impressive and constructive facts emphasizing how imperative it is that we increase the subsistence allowance for GI students who have proved their earnestness and perseverance in equipping themselves with a better education. The education of our youth is the most important investment of our country.

We must match the courage and determination of these young people by immediate action to give them greater financial aid and encouragement through an increase in their subsistence allowance.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Dalmar S. McPherson dated December 17, 1947, and a letter from Bernard W. Dubay dated January 11, 1948; also a survey of housing and economic conditions at the University of Maine as submitted by Mr. Dubay, representative of the GI student body:

ORONO, MAINE, *December 17, 1947.*

MR. EARL WHITE,
Men's Senate, University of Maine, Orono, Maine.

DEAR EARL: Following is a résumé of answers to certain questions on the group study of south apartments made for the department of economics and sociology.

There were 115 families answering both, the question, "How many children do you have?" and "Approximately how much a week has it cost you to live this past year?"—all of whom live in south apartments low-rent housing and all of whom are veteran students.

Answers were tabulated as follows:

Number of families	Number of children	Average cost of living per week per family during 1947
8	0	$33.92
51	1	36.23
7	2	35.00
1	3	40.00

Average cost of living of all families was $36.56.

Of the 115 families, 53 husbands worked part time, 34 wives worked full time, and 12 wives worked part time to supplement Government subsistence.

Not one family was able to manage on Government subsistence, and most used part of their savings or received aid from their relatives to supplement the subsistence money.

On a monthly basis, you can see from the above that the average family's expenditures have been quite far above the monthly $90 income supplied by the Government.

Sincerely,

DALMAR S. MCPHERSON.

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE,
Orono, Maine, January 11, 1948.

Representative MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: Enclosed are the results of surveys concerning economic conditions, housing conditions, and part-time working possibilities with rates of pay. I hope this information will help in our fight for a subsistence increase.

The student senate asked me to express their gratitude to you for the way you aided Roger Thurrell and me during our recent Washington visit.

Sincerely,

BERNARD W. DUBAY.

SURVEY OF HOUSING AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE

Enrollment figures

Number of men veterans	2,600
Number of married veteran students (approximately one-third of total enrollment of all men)	900
Total university enrollment at Orono	3,894

Housing conditions

(Figures from the housing manager's office)

Number of university dwellings (including trailers, cabins, and FPHA units)	[1] 247
Number of students on housing manager's waiting list	674
Number of expected vacancies in 1948	31

[1] Of these 247 dwellings, 65 are occupied by faculty members.

SUMMARY

About one-fifth of all the married students attending the University of Maine can expect to get university dwellings. The others must seek housing in Bangor, Orono, and Old Towne. All these towns have housing shortages, Bangor having the most critical shortage. Many students are living in dormitories or fraternity houses, while their wives and children are forced to live with their parents or in-laws. Most of these students have given up hope of being able to find housing in the immediate locality. Dow Field personnel are taking some of the apartments and houses in the area, making it more difficult for the college student to find a place to live. Any aid toward housing military personnel of Dow Field would also help the married students at the University of Maine.

PART-TIME WORK FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

(From Mr. Brockway at the University of Maine placement bureau)

In an interview with Mr. Brockway, he stated that there are not enough part-time jobs for all the students who desire to work.

The wages paid for part-time work are between 60 cents and 75 cents per hour. The university pays 60 cents per hour for part-time work.

Mr. Brockway's statement: "Considering the existing rates of pay for these part-time jobs, the University of Maine administration does not expect a student carrying a full course of study to be able to earn more than $30 a month."

European Recovery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of January 22, 1948, embodying excerpts of a statement of former President Herbert Hoover concerning the proposed foreign-aid program:

EXCERPTS FROM HOOVER'S STATEMENT ON THE ERP

First of all I wish to make clear my conviction that we should help to the full extents which does not weaken our own economy and thus defeat all world recovery.

There are three dominant reasons why we should do so:

First, the spiritual character of the American people has always led them, and will for all time compel them, to prevent hunger and cold to the full extent of their surplus, and even to the extent of personal self-denial.

Second, while the defeat of communism in western Europe is of vital importance to the preservation of moral and spiritual values for which we stand, it is also of vital importance to us that the economic and political unity of western Europe should be stimulated.

Third, the project builds for peace in the world.

We must take some risks, and I should have liked to be able to give unqualified endorsement of the ECA as presented to the Congress. I am compelled, however, by conscience to say that the plan as presented should have certain constructive modifications and more safeguards.

SIX MODIFICATIONS SUGGESTED

I suggest six directions of such action:

First, as to its organization.

Second, as to the scope of the plan.

Third, as to positive conditions to which the recipient countries should agree.

Fourth, as to the period to which we are committed.

Fifth, as to limits of burden upon the United States.

Sixth, as to some suggestions for lightening the burden to the American taxpayer and upon our economy, and yet preserve our purpose.

No one would contend that the political relations involved in this plan should not be controlled by the foreign policy branch of the Government. But this plan is far more business and economic than political.

By this proposal, together with other authorities, and our other foreign-aid projects, we are placing the control of the whole American economy in the hands of the organization which directs these operations. Its policies can determine the volume of exports, and thus prices, wages, rationing, inflation, and the progress of the incomplete reconstruction in the United States.

Beyond domestic questions, there are momentous foreign economic policies to be decided by the administrators of these powers.

HERTER PLAN FOR CONTROL BACKED

Such power should not be placed in the hands of any one man or any one department of our Government. Obviously the administrative work involved should be conducted by one man. But its policies should be directed by a group, no doubt including department heads, but also including nonofficial citizens. The proposals of Congressman CHRISTIAN HERTER insofar as they imply group conclusions come nearer to meeting this requirement.

I assume it is intended to carry out this operation as a bipartisan enterprise, for only thus can we hope for success. There is far too much at stake to permit partisan approach. If these policies are to be bipartisan, then the members of this board or commission should be selected by prior consultation with the congressional leaders.

Even if administration of these funds is limited to the 16 countries, the scope of policy determination must be far wider. The front against communism lies not alone in Europe, it stretches through Latin America and Asia. We have to bear in mind that the exports of the United States include also very necessary exports to those countries which supply us with essential imports and whose economies are positively linked with our own as, for instance, the Latin-American States.

We must, if we pursue this national policy, include aid to China and other nations, together with the occupied territories of Germany, Japan, and Korea. There are thus not 16 countries directly under relief, but 20, and possibly more

The food supply and reconstruction of industry in Germany, Japan, Korea, and China are inseparable from the 16 countries. Both logic and administrative management suggest that they be placed in the hands of this commission.

GERMAN TRIZONAL UNION NEEDED

Moreover the reopening of German and Japanese industrial plants is not only essential to provide needed materials in Europe and Asia but the situation is at present an "operation rathole" to the extent of $1,500,000,000 for each year of charitable food from the United States to keep these people alive. With restoration of their production and exports that sum could be applied to reconstruction by ECA, not used to keep idle thousands of German and Japanese plants and workmen. Specifically those of the 16 countries concerned should agree to the trizonal economic union of western Germany, a peace with Japan, a cessation of plant destruction and removal, and abolition or increase in levels of industry in these two countries.

The plan originally proposed an authorization to ECA of $17,000,000,000 and a 4-year program. The first 15 months' appropriation is proposed at $6,800,000,000. But in addition to this, we are committed to western Germany, Japan, Korea, and possibly China, and perhaps others, for supplies amounting to about $2,000,000,000 in this same period of 15 months, or a total of nearly $9,000,000,000.

It was prudent not to require that commitments be made by the United States at the present time for more than the first 15 months, until July 1, 1949. We cannot even hazard what the export and financial possibilities of the United States will be for more than a year in advance. Food being

the largest item in the whole program, we can only judge from harvest to harvest.

Even a moral commitment to a 4-year program is unwise. We cannot enforce ideas upon other self-governing peoples, and we should keep ourselves entirely free to end our efforts without recrimination.

Whether the American economy can stand a burden of $9,000,000,000 of relief in this 15 months must arouse great anxiety.

PRICE-WAGE PROBLEMS WEIGHED

Another disturbing question is the effect upon prices, wages, and inflation generally of the volume of exports and finances here proposed. In the fiscal year 1946 we exported $4,400,000,000 more goods than we imported. In the fiscal year 1947 we exported $7,000,000,000 worth of goods more than we imported. (In both cases services are omitted.)

These differences were represented by gifts and loans to foreign nations. They were bumper-crop years, yet the volume of exports in fiscal year 1947 and since have undoubtedly raised prices and started inflationary spirals. It seems difficult to believe that we can continue at the rate now proposed and not produce the same effect.

It is an illusion that scarcity and thus increasing inflation can be more than temporarily retarded by compulsory fixing of wages, prices, and rationing. Aside from the reduction of primary freedoms involved, history and our national experience prove that any such course sets up chain reactions which ultimately decrease production and defeat their very purpose. A part of western Europe's present difficulties is due to these practices.

The only safe road for us is not to overexport. We can to some extent increase the amounts available for export and hold prices by adopting strong voluntary conservation measures; by using voluntary restraints on prices and wages; by doing more and harder work with uninterrupted production. Such voluntary organization, if vigorously and systematically administered, avoids most of the evils of the coercive system.

If some of the imported quantities scheduled be reexamined in the light of supplies, if certain principles were established by Congress, if certain requirements were fixed, and if an effective business organization were set up, I am confident that the burden upon the American taxpayer could be lessened and our essential purpose accomplished.

FOOD DEMAND HELD VERY HIGH

First. The food programs, when correlated to the needs of the rest of the world, would appear greater than the world supply during the first period from April to June 1948, and at the same time maintain rations in the occupied areas and some "plan" countries at an endurable level. Further, these programs seem to imply a dependence upon world harvests much greater next year than last.

Second. The program for agricultural reconstruction seems imperative, but the program for industrial production implies not alone a restoration of prewar productivity but a great increase in such production above prewar. That is indeed greatly to be desired, but whether Americans are able out of production and taxes at this time to provide more than a restoration to prewar levels is another question.

Third. The program calls for export of about $800,000,000 of capital goods, including steel and machinery from the United States in the 15-month period. Both the Harriman and the House of Representatives reports cast doubt upon our ability to supply this amount of steel production and to maintain our necessary exports to other vital quarters. A House report states that these demands are "a staggering deficit to impose upon steel in the United States * * * it is difficult to see how * * * it would be possible to fulfill this program without seriously weakening our economy." The capital goods programs of the 16 nations of necessity may need to be extended over a longer term.

HOME NEEDS EMPHASIZED

In fact, our productive machine today is crippled by the insufficient railway equipment for the prompt delivery of goods; our food production is lessened by scarcity in agricultural machinery; we have sporadic oil famines due to lack of oil-well, refining, and transport equipment; our automotive industry is short of raw materials; we are dreadfully short of building materials for veterans' homes. No further evidence of shortages is needed than the black market where steel is selling for over 100 percent premiums.

It would seem that the possibilities of early steel and machinery production in Germany should be more vigorously undertaken, obviously with readily effective curbs as to any munitions diversion. With removal of the inhibitions on these German industries, with vigor and working capital, a large segment of this program could be supplied from that quarter, instead of by increasing scarcities and delaying reconstruction and increasing taxpayer costs in the United States. It may be said that Germany cannot do this and export coal to the 16 nations. Pending increase in Ruhr coal, some increase in United States coal exports might be found to be better. The same policies should be applied to fertilizers and to oil refining in Germany.

In any event, it would appear that the 15 months' capital goods program must be extended over a much longer period.

Fourth. The estimates of over $650,000,000 of petroleum supplies to the 16 nations for the next 15 months represent a considerable increase over the last 15 months and would seem to be greater than the supply. Pending development in the Persian Gulf, the world is already short of oil and there seems no source for any such an increase.

Fifth. Inquiry might be made into methods of relieving the United States Treasury of some of this cost through collateral loans by, say, the RFC or by the Export-Import Bank.

There are citizens in some of these European states who have large private property in the United States and in other parts of the Western Hemisphere. Prior to the war, the British Government collected a group of such investments and borrowed money on them in the United States.

There are large sums of this character still outstanding, and they could be collected by the various European governments, paying their citizens in their own bonds; these assets could then be pledged as security for loans in the United States. If there is protest that taking over these privately held resources is a hardship to the owners, it may be pointed out that the alternative is a far greater hardship for the American taxpayer. In the first instance, the owner would be reimbursed in full in his own currency; in the second, the American citizen would be taxed the full amount and never see it again.

Sixth. Some expansion of private enterprise in supplying of capital goods to the 16 nations, and thus relief to the United States Treasury, might be found in the use of foreign currencies realized from the sale by the recipient countries of United States goods coming to them as gifts or grants.

Seventh. It is proposed that this nearly nine billions in 15 months shall be by grants, which are gifts, as well as by loans. I suggest the Congress should define some general principles of distinction between gifts and loans.

We must disillusion ourselves of the idea that loans from the United States Government, except where secured by transferable property, or other specific security, are real loans. They are gifts. There are economic as well as political reasons why such loans will not, and cannot, be repaid. We will act more intelligently if within the minds of our own people and those of the recipient peoples we separate our gifts from our loans. We should separate charity from business.

AMERICANS WILL GIVE COMMODITIES

That division can be made clear if we confine our gifts to the actual American surplus of consumption goods, such as food, coal, fertilizers, and cotton (not for reexport), which are essential to maintain life. I believe the American people are perfectly willing to give these commodities as a gift to those countries which cannot pay for them. While giving these away will be privation, yet we can reproduce the agricultural products and we have ample future resources in coal and some fertilizers.

The total of such relief goods from the United States during this 15 months might amount to $3,000,000,000. Such an amount of gifts would enable participating countries to use their exports to pay for other goods in their programs.

The relief exports to Germany, Japan, and Korea should be a first charge on all reparations.

Eighth. I do not believe we should be called upon to make gifts or grants of steel and other capital goods. They can be paid for out of the increased productivity which they create.

Ninth. I do not believe we should make gifts or grants of American money to pay for goods from other countries.

The program of supplies apparently calls for a large part of $3,500,000,000 of Western Hemisphere goods to be purchased with American money from Canada, Argentina, and other Western Hemisphere states. Of this amount under $200,000,000 represents capital goods, the rest being mostly agricultural products. As the latter represents surplus production of the other Western Hemisphere countries, it would appear that they should be anxious to sell and, no doubt, to cooperate in creating world stability. It would seem, therefore, that these states should extend credits to the 16 countries for such goods. A partial guaranty, or advance, against such credits by the United States through the Export-Import Bank is the most that we should be asked to give.

The State Department and ERP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article entitled "Our Swollen State Department," by Felix Morley, which appears in the issue of Pathfinder for January 28, 1948:

OUR SWOLLEN STATE DEPARTMENT

(By Felix Morley)

Twenty years ago the listing of the Department of State required just over one page of the Congressional Directory. Now it takes 13 pages of the same reference book, merely to give the names of the divisions and bureaus and offices in this single governmental department.

If you are concerned about what is happening to your Government you will find it useful to visit the nearest public library and examine copies of the Congressional Directory. A new volume is issued for every session of Congress and the volume for the Second Session of the Eightieth Congress, which convened on January 6, will be available shortly.

Each volume is a mine of well-arranged information. But what makes the Congressional Directory particularly valuable is its continuity. You can compare the current issue with one of 20 years ago, as I have been doing. That shows you the changes that are taking place. It also shows why it is difficult to bring taxes down.

The way in which the Department of State is spreading out is simply fantastic. Twenty years ago it had a dozen divisions, each moderately staffed and headed, for administrative purposes, by four assistant secretaries and an under secretary.

Now it is almost impossible even to count the number of assistant secretaries, executive assistants to assistant secretaries, special assistants to assistant secretaries and so on. Under them are a score of separate and often overlapping offices, each composed of numerous divisions. It is a fair guess that Secretary Marshall himself cannot name all of the divisions over which he presides.

As an illustration of runaway bureaucracy one may take the new Office of Intelligence Research, with a director, a deputy director, an executive officer, and five subordinate divisions. Each of these divisions has its chief and sometimes an assistant chief as well, so that the modest title of one petty officer is "Chief of the Division of International and Functional Intelligence of the Office of Intelligence Research of the Department of State." You probably never heard of the man who has this title.

But alongside the Office of Intelligence Research has grown up a separate Office of Intelligence Collection and Dissemination, with a separate director, a deputy director and four subordinate divisions. There is, for instance, an "Acquisition and Distribution Division of the Office of Intelligence Collection and Dissemination." It has a chief and an assistant chief.

Of course all these agencies continuously get in each other's way. So to keep them straight still another division has been established, entitled "Division of Foreign Activity Correlation." It isn't getting things very well correlated, however. Perhaps that is because of the "Office of Special Political Affairs." This has a director, a deputy director, a special deputy director, a special assistant to the director and—for good measure—an executive officer above all that.

This maze of bureaucracy explains why there is so much Congressional opposition to letting the Department of State administer the European recovery program.

During the war and postwar years the State Department has grown to such size and complexity that its right hand no longer even knows what its left hand is doing. And there has really been a "left" hand in this department, as the loyalty investigations have shown.

Whatever money is appropriated for European relief from now on must be spent efficiently. That is why there is growing support for the Herter bill, which would make the administration of ERP responsible to Congress, rather than to the Department of State.

Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD my own remarks and include seven resolutions passed at the annual meeting of the Nebraska Reclamation Association which was held this month.

Mr. Speaker, the Nebraska Reclamation Association at their annual meeting at Kearney, Nebr., on January 15 and 16, passed some resolutions which I recommend as good reading for my colleagues.

The development of reclamation, which includes electric energy, has been retarded in Nebraska until recent years. The Nebraska Reclamation Association is giving new force and focusing the attention of the public upon the great need for developing and using the natural resources which we have in the State. Nebraska has a large supply of water which is not now being used, either for irrigation or the production of electric energy.

It is my opinion the Nebraska Reclamation Association is rendering a great service to the State in promoting the full use of all of our natural resources. Nebraska can well be the new Garden of Eden if we use wisely the great reservoir of water now stored in the State.

The resolutions follow:

Resolution 1

Whereas we recognize that the greatest obstacle to progress in the field of reclamation is the subversive influence of special interest groups; and

Whereas these groups operate under various pretenses as interested in the public welfare and under names often misleading; and

Whereas associations with genuine interest in progress are frequently infiltrated with a purpose to hamper their efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge State associations and the National Reclamation Association to safeguard democratic processes in their activities and to avoid undue influence of special-interest groups seeking selfish ends.

Resolution 2

Whereas a Nation-wide as well as a State-wide shortage of electrical energy exists: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, (1) The Nebraska Reclamation Association reaffirms its faith in public-power development as a corollary of irrigation as the most beneficial and efficient means of providing ample electrical energy for every use; (2) we commend the Nebraska public power and irrigation districts for the efforts they have put forth to meet the emergency involved in the current shortage of electrical energy and for their effective coordination and planning under the most difficult conditions; (3) we ask the utmost of cooperation from both State and Federal governmental bodies in the efforts of the Nebraska hydros to erect additional facilities for the production of electrical energy and we, as an association, pledge our complete cooperation toward that end.

Resolution 3

Whereas the conservation and effective use of water resources is undeniably essential to the welfare of all of the people of Nebraska; and

Whereas the harnessing of the tributaries of the Missouri River flowing through Nebraska is an integral part of the development of the whole Missouri Valley; and

Whereas the solution to the most beneficial use of water in Nebraska can only be achieved through the mechanism of such an over-all program as the Pick-Sloan plan, which already has been given the approval of the Federal Congress; and

Whereas attempts to obstruct the development of the Missouri Valley can only serve to delay the further application of water to Nebraska acres: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, (1) We endorse the Pick-Sloan plan, and we call for an acceleration of that plan in conformity with Nebraska law in Nebraska, as well as in conformity with the laws of other States in the entire Missouri Valley, so that we may enlarge our available supply of electrical energy, bring more acres under irrigation, and strengthen our existing means of flood control; (2) we recommend the construction of a high-level dam at Fort Randall so that the maximum amount of electrical energy may be produced there to help alleviate the present power shortage and contribute materially to the repayment of reclamation district construction costs, thus reducing the cost of irrigation to the farmers.

Resolution 4

The Nebraska Reclamation Association wishes to commend in highest terms the Nebraska Legislature for the passage of L. B. 350, authorizing the formation of reclamation districts. We believe that these districts will have a far-reaching beneficial effect on the irrigation program in Nebraska.

We also wish to commend the sponsors of and the participants in the reclamation district now being formed in the central Platte Valley for their prompt adoption of this aid to a balanced use of gravity and pump irrigation.

We recommend that other areas in the State having similar problems give serious consideration to the adoption of that procedure.

Resolution 5

Whereas in the expenditure of Federal funds for the reclamation of lands by the application of water from a Government-financed project, the national policy under which the Bureau of Reclamation functions has been to limit the acreage owned by individual persons, before construction costs are paid, to 160 acres: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Reclamation Association favors a policy of limitation of acreage to individual farmers on family-sized farms and opposes the application of water from Government-financed projects to large tracts of land under centralized ownership farmed by tenants under corporate management.

Resolution 6

Whereas the need for an adequate knowledge of the supplies of ground water in the State of Nebraska has long been recognized; and

Whereas the various State and Federal agencies studying ground water have collected immense amounts of data and are diligently continuing their surveys: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend the substantial progress that has been made and urge the various agencies involved to fully coordinate the data obtained so that the greatest possible benefits may be derived therefrom; be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Nebraska delegation in Congress to continue diligently to seek adequate appropriations for the further development of this investigation to the end that at the earliest possible date we may have a subsurface map of our State which will not only give information as to water levels but also the permeability of materials and the rate and directions of movement of our ground water.

Resolution 7

Be it resolved, That we believe that a sound reclamation program in Nebraska can only be developed when a large majority of our citizens understand the full significance to the future welfare of the State involved in the conservation of our soil and water resources. We highly commend the University of Nebraska, its board of regents, Chancelor Gustavson and the faculty, for their recognition of the importance of the need for highly qualified technicians in this field and their effort to offer a complete course in the conservation and development of our natural resources. It is particularly noteworthy and significant that increased emphasis is also being placed by them on the research phases of reclamation problems and their solution. We express our special gratitude to Chancelor Gustavson for using his exceptional talents in marshaling the various research agencies into a coordinated program designed to bring to bear on our urgent problems the combined results of their research.

Commercial Fishing Operations in the Trustee Island Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in the far Pacific and in the general vicinity of Guam, Samoa, and all of the trustee island area, we are taking on new responsibilities.

In my opinion, it is very important that American citizens operating American commercial fishing equipment, be permitted to do business in the general area here referred to so that our own people will have the opportunity to study weather conditions and observe ocean shipping activities and operations of the nationals of other countries.

There is an American firm with headquarters now in Honolulu which desires to expand its commercial fishing operations into the trust territory area. A few days ago, the members of the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs had an opportunity to hear an explanation of this general subject by Mr. Carl H. Holm. We are informed the State Department, the Department of the Interior, and the Navy Department are now all giving consideration to this question.

For the information of the Members of the House, I submit the following letter which I have just received from Mr. Holm:

ARLINGTON, VA., *January 14, 1948.*

Hon. FRED L. CRAWFORD,
United States House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAWFORD: I desire to extend my very sincere thanks for your kindness in arranging the unrecorded executive meeting of your committee this morning to which I was allowed the privilege of stating our views in connection with the establishment of American industrial enterprise in the trust territory.

Especially do we appreciate your acute understanding and appreciation of the problems involved.

I know that the members who were present and heard your very succinct explanation gained considerable benefit in foreseeing the obstacles which must be surmounted before American free enterprise, along the line we propose, can be with security established in that area.

I should like again to emphasize the importance of the three main considerations which are in need of determination prior to the investment of American industrial capital in any project in the area.

First, it is necessary that such industrial enterprise be afforded the opportunity to purchase or lease on a long term basis real estate for operational bases.

Second, it is necessary that products of the area enter the United States duty free.

Third, the importation under special permit of a limited number of nonnatives to the area for purposes of special training of the natives in the nature of the particular industry involved.

It is difficult to overemphasize the pioneering effort necessary in activities such as those which we contemplate. They involve transportation of every item of material, ingredient, and living requirement more than 4,000 miles southwestwardly from Honolulu, and 6,000 miles from continental United States. We are therefore entering an area more than 6,000 miles from the mainland from which we must transport all of the industrial essentials and to which we must transport our finished product.

Your explanation of this aspect of the problem this morning reflected a complete understanding of the situation on your part. The necessity of security of investment as an incentive for the establishment of industry under the American system of free enterprise in the area is one of prime importance without which there can be no development of the area. I think also that the consideration so far as the present world food situation is concerned is one which should strike the chord of common sense in the deliberation of those having to do with the determination of the policies for the trust territory.

The sooner American enterprise is allowed to enter the area then so soon are native problems to be converted from a dole existence to one of self-sustaining economy.

I shall be pleased to present any additional information the committee may deem beneficial.

I am leaving Washington tomorrow for Honolulu.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Very truly yours,

CARL H. HOLM.

Need for Fullest Information and Facts Concerning European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, like all other Members of Congress and, I hope, all of our people, I have been devoting much thought and study to the European recovery program, or Marshall plan, as it is familiarly known.

Never before has so much effort been expended to convince the Congress and the people that they should loan—or give away—so much money to so many foreign nations. The initial proposal involves spending at the rate of $5,440,000,000 per year, a sum in excess of the total Federal expenditures in fiscal year 1933.

Thus it behooves all of us to study carefully all phases, all aspects, all implications of the Marshall plan proposal. In fact, the President's Committee on Foreign Aid had this to say:

The people of the United States face a momentous decision. It is one that should be made only after the administration has laid before them and their Congress all the available facts bearing on the critical world situation which it has so fully and frankly given to this committee. The committee has faith in the sound judgment of the people and of the Congress when they have learned the whole truth.

In that statement of the President's committee, I wholly concur. However, in that 286-page report I was unable to find any reference to the fact that as of last September the 16 European nations seeking our aid, or their nationals, have in the United States alone assets totaling nearly $12,000,000,000. Nevertheless, as the result of correspondence with the Department of State initiated by me last October 24, I have been informed that the 16 nations comprising the Committee of European Economic Cooperation, or their citizens, do have in the United States gold and dollar balances as well as securities and other assets approximating $12,000,000,000.

It has been explained to me by the State Department that the great bulk of these foreign assets in our country are required as working balances so that the flow of foreign trade will not be hampered and as reserves against their currencies, their note circulation, and certain of their bank deposits.

I am further informed that only a relatively small portion of these foreign assets could be utilized to offset the cost of the Marshall plan to our own taxpayers. Certainly, however, every foreign dollar which can so be used should be spent for that purpose before a corresponding dollar of the American people's money is used.

However, the principal point I wish to make in connection with these billions of foreign assets is the failure of the President's committee and of the executive departments of the administration to disclose, initially and forthrightly, the existence of these foreign assets with such explanation as may have been deemed necessary so that the people and the Congress would have, in the words of the President's committee, "laid before them all the available facts." Failure to make such disclosures certainly serves to create a basis of suspicion with respect to other aspects of the proposed program—a basis of suspicion which, perhaps it can be clearly established, has no basis in fact.

It should also be clearly understood that the approximate $12,000,000,000 of foreign assets to which I have just referred represents only the known assets of these foreign governments and their private citizens in the United States. It is a generally accepted assumption that they also have in the United States, within their own boundaries, and in other countries, additional undisclosed assets in amounts which, therefore, have not been determined.

In my letter of October 24 to the State Department, I asked to be told

what efforts had been made to ascertain where such other assets exist and in what amounts. In reply I was told—and I note that within the past few days the Secretary of the Treasury has reaffirmed this position of the State Department—that the problem herein involved is how far our Government can properly go in aiding foreign governments to obtain information which has been supplied to our Government on a confidential basis by the banking community, or the compulsory disclosure by our banks which would violate the relationship between banks and brokers and their clients. Yet, very recently, information has been released publicly disclosing the private business of private American citizens concerning their activities in the commodity markets. Such speculative activity by our private citizens is not illegal, although certain basis for criticism may exist. It is not my purpose to condemn or condone either speculative activities on the commodity markets or the public disclosure of the private transactions of our private citizens.

What I am unable to understand, however, is why, under these circumstances, the business of foreigners remains sacrosanct. Why is it so disturbing to our Government to disclose the assets and business transactions of foreigners at precisely the same time when that same government discloses similar information about our own citizens? I believe that in rendering aid to European countries, not one dollar of our taxpayers' funds should be used if there is a dollar of foreign assets which could first be used toward achieving foreign recovery and rehabilitation.

Let me give you an example of the type of thing which I hope can be avoided, and which I believe must be avoided, before our people agree to pour out billions of their own funds on behalf of those in other countries. In connection with the $522,000,000 provided for Austria, Italy, France, and China in the interim-aid bill approved in December, it was stated, and frequently emphasized, that these funds were solely to provide fuel, food, fertilizer, and medicines for the people of those countries throughout the winter months—in other words, to preclude human suffering. Nevertheless, we find that of the $228,000,000 allocated for France, $26,000,000 was to service that country's foreign debt; $17,000,000 was to enable France to make payment to Belgium on its commercial account; $3,000,000 was to enable France to make payment to Brazil on its commercial account; and $10,000,000 to enable France to make an additional contribution to the International Monetary Fund.

I want to make it entirely clear that it may have been important for France to make these payments. It may even have been advantageous to the United States for us to provide the funds for those purposes. But what concerns me is the apparent assumption that the United States is the only nation responsible for the economic recovery of Europe, or perhaps the assumption is that we are the only country rich enough and wealthy enough to do so. That, of course, raises another question: Is it not quite an assumption in itself to assume that this Nation, which now has a national debt of considerably more than one-quarter of a trillion dollars—and I suppose we had better get accustomed to the word "trillion"—is wealthy?

But I want to go back for a moment to our gift of $3,000,000 to enable France to pay Brazil. If it is true that Brazil is financially unable to contribute large sums toward European recovery, could not that country at least forego payments on accounts for the time being and either renegotiate or grant an extension of time to France?

I want to make this point clear: I am not opposed to rendering aid to foreign nations when it is practicable and in the interest of the United States and its people to do so. Nevertheless, every effort should be made to ascertain and understand all of the facts so that the ultimate burden to be borne by this country and its citizens will be kept to a minimum.

In connection with the comments which I have just made, I believe that at least a portion of an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared a few days ago in his widely syndicated column is pertinent. That portion of Mr. Lippmann's column follows:

There is a notion, held by some in Washington, that the only way to win the support of Congress for the Marshall plan is to frighten it. I believe that nothing but mischief can come of that, and that to organize a propaganda of fear would be wrong in itself, would not deserve to work, and would not in fact work.

A campaign of fear, designed to ride roughshod over all doubts and hesitations, would be at bottom an attempt to rob the Congress of its right to be convinced and its duty to deliberate. The notion, though it is put forward by fervent, even frantic, opponents of the totalitarian system, is profoundly undemocratic.

It lacks a decent respect for the dignity of representative government, and it rests on the self-righteous assumption that the true believers in whatever it is that is to be stampeded through Congress are entitled to do evil that good may prevail.

The practitioners of this notion have been operating for nearly a year, ever since the crisis of last March during which the Truman doctrine was improvised.

That crisis, which arose out of a diplomatic failure to anticipate and to prepare for the recession of the British power in the Eastern Hemisphere, caused a panic within the administration. The panic caused it to stampede Congress into voting aid to Greece.

The campaign of fear employed to stampede Congress, though it may have been successful in lining up the votes, committed the United States so publicly and so irretrievably that it was then impossible to make a success of the Greek policy.

In order to frighten Congress, the administration put itself in a position where, in fact, it was married indissoluibly to any Greek Government in Athens which, no matter what else it did or did not do, proclaimed its anticommunism.

The propaganda employed to sell the Truman doctrine for Greece deprived the United States of its leverage and influence in Greece.

The State of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an article by Felix Morley in the Nation's Business of January 1948 under the heading "Trends of Nation's Business." This article recites the disastrous results throughout history from all attempts at State controls or regulations which suppress individual initiative:

TRENDS OF NATION'S BUSINESS
THE STATE OF THE NATION

The humble potato has played a considerable role in history. Failure of that crop in Ireland a century ago was the proximate cause of the famine which cut the population of Erin by one-third. A volume could not trace the full effect of the hundreds of thousands of Irish immigrants who then swarmed to this country.

It was in 1847 that the Irish potato crop fell away to almost nothing. It was in 1947 that a catastrophic decline in the English potato crop became apparent. The acreage sown has gone down, but the yield per acre is off even more. The total British potato crop for 1947 is estimated by the Ministry of Food as 20 percent under 1946.

Writing of the Irish potato famine, the English historian, J. A. R. Marriot, says: "So severe and general was destitution that by June 1847 no less than 3,020,712 persons (nearly 40 percent of the population at that time) were daily supported on government rations." But food subsidies did not avert starvation in Ireland a century ago. And they are not averting a destitution not far removed from starvation in England now.

On November 9, 1947, potato rationing went into effect in Great Britain, on the basis of 3 pounds of the tubers per person weekly. Cards must now be punched to obtain one of the few basic foodstuffs heretofore unrationed in Great Britain. The present potato ration is 11 percent below the average prewar consumption of this vegetable in England, and 44 percent below the average consumption during the recent war, when the acreage planted in potatoes was greatly increased. Even this ration may have to be cut.

English historians, seeking to gloss a far from admirable chapter of English history, generally ascribe the Irish famine to the malevolence of nature. Bad weather was held responsible then, much as bad weather is blamed for the current decline in English production. Professor Marriot, however, went beyond climatic irregularity to assert that "the most obvious" cause of the Irish famine "was the appalling rapidity with which during the last century and a half the people of Ireland had multiplied." The same might be said for present food shortages in England.

But there was one contemporary Englishman, the great Quaker member of Parliament, John Bright, who was not interested in alibis for governmental failures, no matter whether the government was that of his own or another country. Early in 1848, speaking of "the agonies which have been endured by the population of Ireland," he told the House of Commons that:

"We must retrace our steps. We must shun the blunders and, I would even say, the crimes of our past legislation. We must free the land; and then we shall discover, and not till then, that industry hopeful and remunerated, industry free and inviolate, is the only sure foundation on which can be reared the enduring edifice of union and peace."

What John Bright was criticizing in this famous speech was absentee landlordism. What he meant by freedom of the land was the removal of state controls, exercised over Ireland from London, which made it virtually impossible for the Irish peasant either to own, or to improve, or even to cultivate intelligently the soil on which he labored. When arbitrary state controls produced the Irish famine, John Bright blamed neither the weather nor the Catholic Church. He put his finger on the source of the decay—a governmental system dedicated to suppression of individual initiative in behalf of a privileged governing class.

In the century since John Bright argued for industry free and inviolate, the wheel has come full cycle in the British Isles. The Irish people have achieved their independence and, far from fearing famine, now eat in a manner which is the envy of their English neighbors. And there is bitter irony in the fact that the English Socialists, who worked devotedly for Irish freedom, have misguidedly fettered on their own people a governmental system as crushing as the one from which they helped to liberate Ireland.

On November 17, President Truman asked the special session of Congress for authority to impose a price-fixing, wage-fixing, rationing and production-allocation program going beyond anything which the American people endured as a part of the war effort. In a radio broadcast that night Senator TAFT aptly referred to English experience under what the President has himself described as a "police state" economy. Said Mr. TAFT:

"The English have complete price control and rationing, and they haven't got enough to live on. They have no incentive to get production. Men don't work longer hours, because there isn't anything to buy with the money they will earn. Surely, with that example before us, we don't want to socialize and regiment America."

The tragedy of the English experience should be better appreciated in this country. I have before me material from the official British Information Services, issued 10 days before potato rationing went into effect in Great Britain. It points out that "Government subsidies control the price of basic foods" and mentions potatoes at 2¼ cents a pound as an illustration of the advantage of this price-fixing policy to the consumer. Almost before the ink was dry on this propaganda the British housewife found herself unable to buy more than 3 pounds of potatoes a week, and forced to queue up to obtain even that pathetic hand-out.

Ten years ago I was in Berlin, when the Nazis were going strong and very proud of their planned economy. But the anxious German people had a grim joke, passed round by word of mouth because in a police state no paper dared to print it. "Hitler keeps down the price of eggs," they said. "The only defect in his planning is—there are no eggs."

That is the catch in national socialism everywhere. The British Government has certainly kept the price of potatoes down, but nobody in England can now have more than "one medium-sized boiled potato" a day. It is interesting to see how a "ministry of public enlightenment" can play both ends against the middle. At the end of October the British information services were emphasizing the cheapness of potatoes. At the end of November they were emphasizing the scarcity of potatoes.

The potato is only a symbol, though an important one. If a controlled economy meant merely a shortage of this particular food, men would survive the hardship. The Irish peasants survived by emigrating to the United States. We are no longer so hospitable to immigrants. But we are glad to give of our surplus to save demoralized Europeans from starving in their own countries.

But that sort of help can never be more than a palliative. Before Ireland could become prosperous it had to be freed, as John Bright pointed out, of absentee landlords. Before England can become prosperous again it will have to be freed of absentee bureaucrats—those who are absent from productive enterprise so that they may hamper the production of others with countless decrees, controls, taxes, and regulations. There are fewer potatoes in Britain than there were 2 years ago. But in this period the Ministry of Food has added more than 10,000 employees to its pay roll. By ironic coincidence, the percentage decline in potato production is the same as the percentage increase in officials planning for agriculture.

Perhaps the most tragic part of the English picture is the effort to eliminate the disasters of a controlled economy by adding more controls. On December 8, conscription of labor, on the true national socialist pattern, started in Great Britain. The first men and women to be drafted, for mining, agriculture, and textile factories, are the "spivs" and "drones"—those who have no occupation or who live by betting operations and the like. Are there no "spivs" and "drones" among the 53,600 employees of the Ministry of Food?

The great majority of Americans are descendants of men and women who came to this country to escape those countless regulations which kept them from being productive in Europe. America today attests what men and women can do when they build on what John Bright called the only sure foundation.

Will a free people accept the national socialist devices which have been so disastrous for Europe?

FELIX MORLEY.

Mikolajczyk Tells of the Appeasement of Russia Even at the Nuremberg Trials With Regard to the Massacre of the 11,000 Polish Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two additional installments of articles published in the Milwaukee Sentinel which describe how the murder of 11,000 Polish officers was contained in the Nuremberg indictments, but when it appeared the proof indicated that the Russians were guilty of this crime the matter was strangely dropped.

Following are Mikolajczyk's two additional installments:

RUSSIANS MURDERED 11,000 POLE OFFICERS AT NAZIS' SUGGESTION

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment X)

The complete story of the murder of 11,000 Polish officers in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk has never been told.

But because I am free today I can shed new light on a catastrophe which, while numerically small in the great picture of World War II's mass murders, remains significant because it gave Russia a long-awaited reason to break diplomatic relations with Poland and because it remains a milestone in the appeasement of the U. S. S. R. by the British and Americans.

I have already outlined the repeated inquiries made of Stalin and other Russian leaders by the Polish Government-in-exile concerning the missing officers.

As late as March 13, 1942, Russian Ambassador Bogomolov had replied—in a formal note—that the 11,000 missing officers had been released in the so-called amnesty of July 1941. But less than 400 of these men, who had been held as prisoners of war at the Red Army camps of Kozielsk, Starobielsk, and Ostashkov, had reported to General Anders. These 400 were sent to Moscow when the others were sent westward to their doom.

In London we had been receiving disquieting news from our Polish underground concerning these men—the very cream of Polish manhood. We learned, for instance, that they had written to their families in the spring of 1941 that they would be sent home. Germans in Warsaw readily told our citizens that the officers could be expected on an exact date in April of '41.

Then all mail from the officers suddenly stopped. And all we were able to receive from the Russians thereafter were evasive replies or outright untruths that the men were free and just did not choose to report to General Anders for further prosecution of the war against Germany.

Here is the true story. There are two "holes" in it—voids that can be supplied only by American and British sources who, at this late date in communism's war on civilization, still do not choose to speak.

TRAIN UKRAINIANS

In the spring of 1941 when Hitler and Stalin were still allies, the Germans decided to train 30,000 Ukrainians for service in the German armies. They set up training camps at Krosno and near Zakopane. The Ukrainians in question had escaped from the Soviet-occupied zone of Poland and had made their way across the Ribbentrop-Molotov line to the German zone of occupation.

The Russians soon learned of these training plans and protested to their Axis ally. Communications were exchanged and out of these came a deal whereby the 30,000 Ukrainians were to be exchanged for the 11,000 Polish officers the Russians were holding.

But the Germans tired of the whole business, and when the deal was completed, and the Ukrainians delivered, the Nazis remembered certain fundamental Nazi precepts; among these being the need of room, but no more people, and the planned extermination of the intelligentsia of conquered countries.

MURDER FOR ECONOMY

So the Germans informed the Russians that the Polish officers could be murdered, to save transportation and other problems.

Still believing they were going home which, as bleak as the prospect was, must have lifted their hopes a bit, the Polish officers from Kozielsk, Starobielsk, and Ostashkov were led into the Katyn forest and, in what must have been a scene that sickened Heaven, were murdered. Each man was shot through the back of the head, after his hands had been tied behind him by fence wire.

The Russians threw the bodies in a long single grave. Beyond the crime of the act itself, they made one other mistake. The ground in which they placed the dead officers was of a peculiar composition which virtually mumifies dead objects placed in it. What might have become unidentifiable skeletons in a few months remained almost perfectly preserved corpses • • • with papers and other means of identification intact.

DISCOVERED BY GERMANS

On April 12, 1943, as the Germans retreated slowly back into Poland, after having advanced to within sight of Moscow, the German News Agency announced the discovery of the bodies and added that the men had been killed by Soviet political police following the occupation of that region by the Red Army in 1939.

In London the Polish Government faced the stern reality of restoring the suddenly broken morale of our Poles who were now fighting bravely on the same side as the Russians. The Germans, making heavy capital of their discovery, posed as the outraged defenders of human rights. They placarded Warsaw and other Polish cities with startling posters condemning the Russians for their act.

We ordered a counter-propaganda wave that reminded the Germans of their infinitely greater crimes against the Polish people—including their hideous extermination of Polish Jews—and anxiously awaited some convincing denial by the Russians.

ASK RED CROSS AID

On April 14, with Moscow still silent, we asked the International Red Cross to investigate the German claim. We knew it was fruitless to appeal to the Russians to investigate—for, unknown to the world, we had been quietly asking for such information for nearly 2 years. We had to secure some explanation now for our outraged people.

The Russians were informed immediately of our appeal to the Red Cross for an impartial investigation. On April 15 the Soviet information bureau called the German allegations "vile fabrications."

The Polish cabinet met the next day and made a public announcement that we had asked the Red Cross to inquire into the tragedy, and we made it very strong that we were unwilling to accept the German side of the story.

LIST GERMAN CRIMES

Our formal statement declared:

"The Polish Government denies to the Germans the right to draw from a crime which they ascribe to others; arguments in their own defense. The profoundly hypocritical indignation of the German propaganda will not succeed in concealing from the world the many cruel, repeated, and still lasting crimes committed on the Polish people."

We listed a number of those crimes, "* * * so as not to enable the Germans to lay impudent claims to appear in the role of defenders of Christianity and European civilization."

On April 18, a campaign of abuse against the Polish Government opened in the Russian press. The following day Pravda, in its lead article, declared that members of General Sikorski's government had "swallowed a carefully baited hook thrown out by the German propaganda agencies."

Our simple appeal to the Red Cross, Pravda said, aided the German fabrication of "a foul lie which will fill all people of common sense with repugnance * * * Those Poles who willingly snatch at Hitler's forgery and support it and are ready to cooperate with the Hitlerite hangman of the Polish people, will go down in history as Hitler's helpers. The Polish people will turn away from them."

Stalin, as I have earlier noted, had set up his own Communist-dominated Polish "government" in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and we in London now knew that he had seized upon the Katyn murders as a reason to break with the true government in London.

The blow fell officially on April 25 when Molotov handed a note to Tadeusz Romer, our Polish Ambassador to Moscow. It was the now historic note which began:

"The Soviet Government considers the recent behavior of the Polish Government with regard to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as entirely abnormal and violating all regulations between the two allied states."

The note accused the Germans of the murders, charged that we in London had been plotting to seize territory (the area of Poland which the Red army had occupied as Hitler's ally in 1939) from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and it concluded:

"All these circumstances compel the Soviet Government to recognize that the present Government of Poland, having slid on the path of accord with Hitler's government, has actually discontinued Allied relations with the U. S. S. R. and has adopted a hostile attitude toward the Soviet Union.

"On the strength of the above, the Soviet Government has decided to sever relations with the Polish Government."

FINDS WELLES CHILLY

General Sikorski immediately asked to see Anthony Eden and was criticized for his "impetuous" act. In Washington our Ambassador found Sumner Welles suddenly chilly and impatient.

We who had been advised by Britain and the United States not to reveal to the world our long quest for the men were now placed in the difficult position of provocateur in a split among two Allied powers.

The International Red Cross dropped our plea on April 27 because no "corresponding invitation" had been received from Moscow.

TRIAL AT NUREMBERG "CONVICTED" SOVIETS OF POLISH MASSACRE

(Installment XI)

Before I leave the question of the Russian murders of 11,000 Polish officers in the Katyn Forest in the spring of 1941--which was used as a pretext by Stalin to break relations with the Polish Government and recognize a Polish Communist "government" which he had formed in the U. S. S. R.—I must trace this tragedy to its bitter end at Nuremburg.

When I returned to Poland as a member of the cabinet in the Communist-dominated provisional government in 1945, I soon discovered that the Polish people had maintained their hatred of the Russians because of the Katyn murders.

I learned that Russian-trained Polish officials were considering staging a "trial" in which it was planned to acquit the U. S. S. R. of the murders and pin the crimes on the Germans.

General Prosecutor Sawicki, acting for Minister of Justice Swiatkowski, approached me and asked if I thought it would be a good idea to stage such a hearing.

"Katyn stays in the hearts of the Polish people," he said.

"Certainly," I replied. "Let us have a public trial and introduce all the proper documents. A fair trial will unquestionably prove the identity of the murderers."

Sawicki hesitated before he asked me what I would be prepared to testify when called to the stand.

"Only what I know," I answered. "I know positively that there was a secret agreement between the Germans and Russians by which the Germans released 30,000 Ukranians to the Reds, in exchange for our 11,000 officers, and that the Germans gave the Russians permission to shoot our men because the Germans did not want to be bothered with them.

"I would testify, too, that we in London made repeated efforts to gain information from the Russians about the whereabouts of the men. I would point out that Russian Ambassador Bogomolov stated formally, a year after they had been murdered, that they were 'released,' and I would tell of the vigorous efforts of the retreating Germans to salvage all documents pertaining to this crime."

Sawicki asked me what I knew about documents. His concern was obvious. I said:

"The Katyn documents were taken by the retreating Germans from Cracow to Breslau, from Breslau into Germany and finally to Czechoslovakia, where there is every indication they were recovered by the American forces."

I told him, too, of Polish Red Cross documents concerning Katyn which were sent "to the west."

Sawicki left me, mumbling that such testimony would not "prove" the identity of the murderers. He reported this conversation to the Polish security police and then he and Swiatowski went to Moscow, where they were ordered to drop all plans for such a trial.

HOPES FRUSTRATED

Poles still looked forward to the official war criminal trials at Nuremberg as their hope of repudiating the Russian lies. But, once again, we were frustrated.

The indictment against the Nazi war leaders made specific mention of the Katyn murders. But the prosecution of German crimes in eastern Europe was handed to the Russian members of the international tribunal. The court ruled that prosecution and defense might call three witnesses each.

Goering, Ribbentrop, and the others on trial were permitted to introduce the official German White Book which accused the Russians of the murders. They were also permitted to put on the stand a scientist who testified unequivocally that the Russian claims of innocence were false because trees—growing out of the communal grave of our officers—were old enough when the grave was discovered to prove that the men had been buried there sometime in the spring of 1941. The Russians occupied the Katyn area at that time.

OWN STAR WITNESS

The Russian prosecutor produced his own star witness—a Bulgarian scientist who had been used by the Nazis in 1943 as an official observer of the opening of the grave.

The Bulgarian now testified that the Germans had permitted him to examine the grave for only 15 minutes and that he had been coerced, at gun point, into making his report which accused the Russians.

As for the Bulgarian witness, the tribunal failed to note that he had been arrested by the Russian secret police when the Red Army entered Bulgaria, had been confined to prison for a long period, and now was telling an entirely different story from the one he had presented before

The ultimate sentence of the Nazi war leaders eliminated mention of Katyn, though it had been prominently mentioned in the indictment.

Obliquely, then, the Germans—though certainly guilty on other counts—had been acquitted of killing the 11,000 Polish officers.

REDS ESCAPED BLAME

But the blame was not pinned on its real perpetrators, the Russians. Why? Because not even Nuremburg, the first such court of justice in the history of civilization, was immune to the appeasement of Russia by its allies.

The rupture of Polish-Russian relations in April 1943, over the Katyn incident, did not lessen our participation in the war against Hitler and our efforts to reestablish our relations with the Kremlin.

On April 28, 1943, 3 days after the break, General Sikorski formally denied the Russian charges that we sought any part of Russian territory. He reminded Stalin that thousands of our men were fighting the common enemy wherever that enemy could be reached, and said that Poland would continue to live up to the pacts it had signed with Russia concerning prosecution of the war and restoration of Polish sovereignty after the war.

INDIRECT ANSWER

Stalin answered indirectly on May 4 of that year, in the course of replying to two questions submitted to him by the Moscow correspondent of the London Times and New York Times. I quote the questions and answers:

1. "Does the Government of the U. S. S. R. desire to see a strong and independent Poland after the defeat of Hitlerite Germany?"

Stalin: "Unquestionably, it does."

2. "On what fundamentals is it your opinion that relations between Poland and the U. S. S. R. should be based after the war?"

Stalin: "Upon the fundamentals of solid good neighborly relations and mutual respect, or, should the Polish people so desire, upon the fundamentals of an alliance providing for mutual assistance against the Germans as the chief enemies of the Soviet Union and Poland.

General Sikorski took note of that.

"It is difficult for me not to show reserve," our prime minister said, "even in the face of such a favorable declaration by Premier Stalin, at the very moment when the Polish Ambassador has left Russia and the masses of Polish population in the U. S. S. R. are left without the care and assistance of their government."

At 11 p. m. on July 4, 1943, General Sikorski's Liberator struggled off the short runway at Gibraltar, was sorely buffeted by a gale and failing engine power, and plummeted into the water.

He, his beloved daughter, all of his staff, and a British Member of Parliament attached to him went to their deaths. The only survivor was his Czech pilot. Poland and the world had lost a great man.

Objectives of ERP Must Be Defined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from one of my constituents which contains many thoughtful considerations with regard to the contemplated European recovery program.

Unless we clearly understand our objectives before we take positive action the resources of our country would be dissipated or even used against us rather than in the defense of our civilization. "Make haste slowly," was an old Roman saying, and applies to the tremendous problem facing Congress.

Following is the letter of Alfred J. Kieckhefer, president of the National Enameling & Stamping Co., Milwaukee, Wis.:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *December 18, 1947.*

The Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There has been much discussion relative to the proposed Marshall plan, and this undoubtedly is one of the most important issues that Congress will have to deal with in the very near future.

I have talked personally to Mr. Ernest Weir, of the Weirton Steel Co., Mr. Walter Harnischfeger, of the Harnischfeger Corp., and Mr. Floyd Blair, vice president of the National City Bank, all three of whom spent from 4 to 7 weeks in Europe this past summer visiting England, France, Belgium, and Germany. They made many contacts with various people in the countries enumerated, talking to individuals in all walks of life. They naturally have been able to bring back much information that is valuable, particularly as it pertains to the consideration of the Marshall plan and the impressions that I am about to give you are the result of the combined thinking of these three men. There isn't any question that if the Marshall plan is accepted or rejected such decision must be based upon careful and intensive study of the facts, also very deliberate judgment as to what our aid could reasonably be expected to accomplish.

Up to this point it is very apparent to me and to many people that our efforts up to this time to aid foreign countries fall far short of reaching their objectives. We apparently had two aims, one to relieve the existing starvation period forced upon the people in the war area, and second, that by means of help that we give we hoped that we would thus enable the beneficiaries of our aid to get back into production and thus work to a self-supporting basis. To some extent relief to the starving people has been accomplished. The second of our objectives has not been realized in countries that are now asking further help under the Marshall plan.

It is intended, of course, under the Marshall plan that further aid be given, but the success of the method of giving such aid depends entirely upon the administration of the plan, the follow-through that we make on it, and the measure of cooperation that we procure from the benefited nations. It is also essential that there be a mutuality of helpfulness between the participating nations.

If our sole aim is to help the people of Europe to get back into production and enjoy a reasonable standard of living, it is very necessary that the plan itself be administered in a nonpartisan way not only domestically but in a larger sense abroad as well. We cannot support any particular type of government in any of the countries of Europe that will fall under the Marshall plan except that we must be hopeful that by aiding the people to the extent that they can live decently and be gainfully employed there can be justified the type of government that will insure them a better way of life. If we extend money it must be utilized for the purposes for which it is granted and except in a dire emergency there can be no compromise whatsoever in the matter of utilization of the funds given.

It seems apparent to me that under any Marshall plan we should have before us balance sheets of the benefit countries. If we do not know precisely their economic conditions and their own potentialities for self-help we cannot make effective a practical plan. It is a well-known fact that gold hoarding has long been in vogue in some of the nations we now propose to help. This is undoubtedly due to the lack of faith that people have in their own paper currency. What program is contemplated by the governments asking aid to force this gold into circulation? If a nation's people are facing starvation, surely it is their obligation to help each other as best they can without asking outside aid. It is a well-known fact that in farming communities in some of these countries food is being withheld or diverted into black markets. If this is a known fact, and many people have so reported, what is the plan that is set up by these governments to undertake to get the food distributed to the people in the populated areas? The most important need in these countries is a sound financial program and it seems to me that if they are intending to set up a sound fiscal program a prime requisite would be a stabilized currency.

Very recently there has been published in the papers the estimated amount of dollars invested in America by foreign countries which total is about $15,000,000,000. It has also been stated that there are approximately $10,000,000,000 of gold exchange in our own country owned by foreign nationals and their countries. Of course, not all of these assets are owned by the countries or their people who would participate in the Marshall plan but the people of these countries and their governments do own a part of this reserve and it would appear that one of the required plans for self-help should be the use of a part of these assets by participating nations in their own rehabilitation programs. This phase in connection with the Marshall plan, of course, should be very carefully explored because it is not to be expected that the nations should utilize all of these assets as some of these investments and some of these balances are not in excess of their minimum needs for the proper conduct of their commerce. We therefore must know just what is proposed to be done by way of using these balances and investments by our prospective debtors.

Undoubtedly the argument will be made that these assets are privately owned and consequently not available to the governments with whom we are dealing. It is most important for us to explain to the people of foreign nations our own position with respect to the help that we are asked to extend to them and that the Government of the United States has no money to give or lend to Europe. All our Government has is a debt of $260,000,000,000 and the power to tax its people. Any aid we give to Europe will come from our taxing power unless we intend to go further in debt in which case the ultimate payment of the added debt will result in further taxes. Expressing it a different way, if we agree to the Marshall plan the American people will be giving their private property to aid the distressed people abroad, therefore, to the extent that the distressed people have investments and balances over here beyond their commercial needs it is only right that they use these for their own national objectives as they call upon us for future aid.

It is about time that we put over to the people of Europe that this Nation does not have an inexhaustible supply of resources. We have only to think back to realize that our destruction of livestock, our plowing up of crops, and other unjustifiable programs have undoubtedly led people of Europe to believe that we are so wealthy that we can afford to waste. The British Empire has much more in the way of natural resources than we possess. Half the development of these resources has not kept pace with that in this country. It is up to the participating countries to step up their production to justify our tapping our resources to aid them in an emergency.

It is most vital that in the consideration of the Marshall plan that you give very careful thought to the set-up toward the end that we do not exhaust our own natural resources. Exploitation in the past years has resulted in a production that has taken a very heavy toll of many materials and much of our natural resources. The aid, therefore, that we give abroad should be directed toward the development of their resources so as to enable them to produce all or more than their needs on their own account. They must be made aware of the fact that we have to lighten the withdrawal of our resources in the years to come and that some day undoubtedly our grandchildren may be forced to draw on them for some materials.

In the careful analyzation of the question as to the Marshall plan, particularly referring to England, I feel that England can and still does do business on its own exchange with many of the countries under consideration in the plan. Some of the segments of the British Empire right now are short of much desired dollar exchange and thus there is a limitation to the extent to which they can deal in sterling even with their mother country. However, they certainly can do more than they are doing at present. France, likewise, is a nation with greater possibilities for supplying her own needs than she has exhibited. All of these matters are essential to a proper evaluation of the Marshall plan.

Any aid under the Marshall plan even though expressed in dollars will actually be fulfilled in goods and services. With our postwar domestic demands there is definite competition for our goods and services between our own people and those of Europe. It is only academic that at the present time to a great extent this competition has been responsible for the increased food prices that have developed and the result is that every man, woman, and child in this country is paying a secondary tax to aid Europe when they purchase the necessities of life.

There is a very definite political aspect in the Marshall plan, both at home and abroad and therefore it is vitally important that the administration of the plan here and abroad be carried on in a strictly nonpartisan way. We are extending aid to the peoples of Europe but not to the party in power in any particular nation. We do not lend endorsement to the British socialistic program in helping Great Britain. Unfortunately, however, much of the money set up for use by Great Britain has been wasted by the British socialistic program. We are seeking to help people toward a fuller and more comfortable way of life, hoping that they will choose a form of government that will bring about a more peaceful world and a higher standard of living in an atmosphere of freedom and self-determination.

We must not overlook the fact that much of the fund must be used for the purpose of production of goods and services for which there is an expanding import need in this country. The measure of cooperation in this respect, therefore, is that we must recognize that as a creditor Nation we must increase our imports.

If we accept the Marshall plan and if we put into effect the checks and balances suggested above and if we are given real cooperation by the participating countries in the fulfillment of the conditions of the plan it could prove an incomparable contribution toward a peaceful world. It is believed that some of the nations are conscious of these conditions but now is the time when the promises that they make to us must be backed up by performance. Unless we consider the proposal from all of its practical aspects and put on an intensive program both here and abroad, the money we extend will not enable Europe to reach its objective. Throughout the history of the world a wanton prodigality has brought contempt upon the people of the nation that has practiced it. The constructive creditor, on the other hand, has merited respect.

While the Marshall plan will be debated in Congress we must not lose sight of the fact that it is the problem of every citizen of this country and of the peoples of the participating nations. It needs the best and most logical thought of every individual. If it is put into effect we must set up the workings of the plan so that it will not fail us or the hopeful people of other nations who are willing to work for an opportunity. We here must realize that if the plan is made effective it will result in an artificial stimulation of our economy during its life and therefore we must plan carefully and wisely to avoid a serious depression when the production due to the plan has ceased, and make preparations to meet a normal situation when eventually and inevitably we face it.

It is a very important responsibility that has been placed upon your shoulders as a representative of the people of the State of Wisconsin. It requires very careful analysis on your part of those particular things that I have brought to your attention above. I believe you are aware of the seriousness of this problem and before putting yourself on record as for or against the Marshall plan you will make very careful studies of all of its aspects. Your responsibility is tremendous because of the many important reactions that will result to our economy because of the adoption of this plan.

Yours very truly,

ALFRED J. KIECKHEFER,
President, National Enameling and Stamping Co.

European Recovery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Henry J. Taylor:

Exactly who gets the money in the latest European recovery plan? Seventeen billion dollars. I've just found out for sure. I think you'll be very surprised to know.

Our money doesn't grow on trees. It's hard for most any of us to get along at best. Before we're challenged further by the idea that the $17,000,000,000 new European plan must be all or nothing and start paying the bill in our homes and work places and the high cost of living, we need some facts that are contrary to public impression and which were withheld in the original presentation of the plan itself.

Fact No. 1 is who gets the money. It's hard to imagine that fact was left out but it was, and I think we have a right to know. We've already spent $22,000,000,000 abroad since the end of the war. And now we're expected to spend seventeen billion more. Yet, in the mountains of words and figures, this fact was of itself an amazing omission. Actually, the plan, to be truly revealing, should never have been given to Congress and to the public without this fundamental information—who gets the money?

After all, who is more entitled to know where his money goes than the man who pays the bill, which means us all? But the State Department in Washington could not reveal and still feature the anti-Communist angle, my friends, on an over-all $17,000,000,000 basis, on an all-or-nothing basis. So in order to be factual and exact in discussing on the air this latest project, so important in your land and mine, so heavily involved in our inflation, high prices, taxes, the cost of living that is bearing down on us all, and on our future, I've been making for weeks in Washington every possible attempt I could make to get official information regarding what countries in terms of percentages were to get our new seventeen billions.

So at long last here are the facts to plug that loophole, the official figures obtainable only yesterday. They indicate much we've not been permitted to know.

First, you will find that in percentage of dollars, a full third of our $17,000,000,000 plan is primarily another aid-to-England project. The lion's share of the funds goes to the British Isles, one-third of the entire amount, $5,348,000,000 of the seventeen million—billion, to be exact. Now, certainly, that part hasn't anything to do with buying off Communist popularity there and to this large extent the Marshall plan should not have been presented to us an anti-Communist measure any more than the last $3,750,000,000 we gave England in 1945.

Maybe they need it, I don't know. But they certainly don't need it to stop communism in England. No one has even had the nerve to suggest that the British are on the verge of voting Communist. Had the fact that a third of the money we sent—or are to send—was to go there been made public, and early, it would have been impossible to present the powerful appeal for the overall seventeen-billion fund on an anti-Communist basis, all-or-nothing basis, in the official support for the outlay, at least to the extent of one-third of the entire proposition.

Now, next with England, seven additional countries are ruled out in the same way, where there is, by common consent, no more idea of the population voting Communist than there is in England—this plan or no plan. I refer to Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Denmark, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, and little Iceland. So let's see what they'll get. Some of the figures are unbelievable, my friends, but they are correct and official and at last come from our State Department itself.

Do you know how much all of us are to be taxed for the Dutch? Holland is to get $2,436,000,000 American dollars. Fantastic as it may seem, the plan gives Holland, a little country with fewer people than live in New York City, $2,436,000,000. And if that's a calculated risk against communism in Holland it's quite a calculation, yet imaginable. The plan is nevertheless presented as "take the whole plan or nothing, all or nothing." Why the figure for Holland alone means a charge on us for $308 for every man, woman, and child who lives on the shores of the Zuider Zee.

Denmark is supposed to get over a half billion dollars, $582,000,000 to be exact. For this one little country alone, with a population less than Chicago, that's as much as all the stopgap aid for which the special session of Congress so dramatically called last November. Denmark, a half billion dollars.

Now Ireland: Ireland was not in the war, Ireland is an island. The Communists would have to swim to get there and if there's a Communist there now not an Irishman knows it. But Ireland is to get a half billion dollars, $497,000,000 to Ireland to be exact. So, my friends, $3,500,000,000 out of the seventeen billion go to Holland, Denmark, and Ireland.

For good measure, even Iceland. Apparently there must be quite a Communist threat in Iceland and a lot of western civilization tottering on the brink there besides, for Iceland (SIC) comes into the Marshall plan, and for $38,000,000. Fewer people live on that island than live in Trenton, N. J. And Iceland is just about as much in the throes of chaos, just about as much tottering on the brink of giving up western civilization as Trenton, N. J., except that there isn't much western civilization in Iceland (SIC) anyway. But they're to get $28,000,000 from us, all or nothing, just the same.

Then there's Norway, where the Communist vote is about 7 percent. But Norway is in for $234,000,000 from us. The plan gives $234,000,000 to Norway.

Next comes Portugal in deciding whether or not the propaganda for the plan is padded in its over-all anti-Communist appeal to our public. Now, in Portugal, the Communist vote happens to be nonexistent. For 20 years the country has been and remains in the hands of a Fascist dictator, Dr. Salazar. Portugal did not fight in the war. Portugal profited immensely in the war by Portuguese standards. Yet Portugal gets our money just the same. Portugal gets one hundred and fifty million American dollars in the Marshall plan. All or nothing. Can the seventeen billion be cut? Can the first installment now asked for $6,800,000 be cut? Well, I should say so, and now.

The anti-Communist angle is valid to a degree in some places where the money is to go, like Italy. But, my friends, the simple truth is, now that we get the figures, so belatedly published and in a most confusing way, only yesterday, the truth is that over ten billion of the seventeen billion is going to countries—I visited every one of them myself—that are by common consent no more on the verge of voting Communist than the State of Indiana, which I visited last week and which hardly looks on the verge of voting Communist to me.

Or take another angle: The appeal is made to us that we are aiding the victims of war-torn countries in gratitude for their losses in the war. Now, there are other appeals that are sound and very much better. That isn't a very good one. How many billions are ruled out on that one? Of the 16 countries in the Marshall plan, over $6,000,000,000 out of the $17,000,000,000 are to go to enemy countries—Germany, Italy, and Austria—for which there are other reasons to help, not gratitude. Seven hundred million goes to countries that stayed neutral, did not fight in the war, and, in fact, got richer than they've ever been in their lives during the war, largely at American expense. They might well be giving something back to us—as if anything like that could ever happen. Sweden and Switzerland, however, have asked us for nothing, praises be.

Now, my friends, all summer long in one European country after another, in England, France, Italy, Greece, Switzerland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Holland, Germany, and in broadcasting in Paris, where the 16 nations were meeting to put in their requests for additional American funds in substance now being decided, I tried to say on the air as factually as I could, right there on the scene and repeatedly, from London, Rome, Athens, Zurich, Berlin, Brussels, Paris, and a dozen other places, and since I've been home, that the objectives of the Marshall plan are good—heaven knows there's no question about that—but that the gigantic amounts asked for were overstated, inflated, padded, padded, and padded, and shockingly weak in respect to how the money should be administered to get the results on which we pin our American hopes.

In short, I think we should be for the objectives of the Marshall plan. But the plan is no longer just an idea, you know. It's now a tangible piece of proposed legislation, ready to be enacted into law and to absorb billions in our American people's money and goods. It shouldn't be approved as written. I'm convinced it will not be. Once we get the air pumped out of the claims and make the necessary changes suitable to the real problem over there, which is a production problem and needs realistic, production-minded American handlers to whip it, we can stop sailing in the pattern of the twenty-two billion that has already gone with the wind since the end of the war and really get some place, really serve ourselves and Europe and the cause of lasting peace by the changes that must be made in the plan, and save ourselves billions and billions besides, that would have been wasted had we allowed our judgment to be blitzed.

The Spirit of Old Greer County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESTON E. PEDEN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an editorial which appeared in one of southwestern Oklahoma's leading newspapers, the Altus Times-Democrat, Altus, Okla., for January 18, 1948. The pioneer Oklahoman mentioned in this editorial is D. C. Jester, Mangum, Okla., 90-year-old Greer County resident.

It is heartening to know that there still exists this loyalty and patriotism as demonstrated by Mr. Jester's unselfish act.

The editorial follows:

Maybe you're not worrying about what has happened to the spirit that built America—the spirit that came ashore when the *Mayflower* landed. But you should be, because we can all take self-inventory and discover it's about gone from within us. What we are thinking today is of today only, and that's a crime being committed against generations to come.

Had it not been for the spirit of thinking of the good that you can do today to make a better tomorrow, southwestern Oklahoma would have been left to the prairie grass. The men and women who came here first and stuck it out couldn't have been thinking of that current day only. They wouldn't have stayed. They stayed because they were possessed of a spirit of America that gave them the foresight to see the fruits ahead for their children and grandchildren—springing from the seeds of labor they planted.

What kind of path are we preparing today for our children and their children? Right now it looks like a blind alley. Although we may deny that we were personally, individually responsible for the recent war, certainly it was our war, and certainly we are responsible now for preparing for peace—or another war.

The cost of what has happened and what is to happen is prohibitive. Seventy-nine percent of the almost $40,000,000,000 budget for the 1949 fiscal year is devoted to peace and/or war preparation. Don't do it, you say. Then let's line up and cut our own individual throats in unison. That's stupid, of course, so we will spend the money gambling for peace and gambling against war.

But here we are trying to dodge the issue of paying the fiddler. We all want income tax back on a prewar basis when there's not a thing in this world except maybe the ocean tides still the same. We don't want to pay our share of the freight—and justly our share should be more than that the future generations will have to pay.

We've lost the spirit of taking care of our own troubles and making every effort to make the path ahead a little smoother for the next generations.

That is, most of us have lost it. There's still a drop or two of the old Greer County spirit left, because, we guess, there are still a few of the old Greer pioneers still living. And there is proof. The Bureau of Internal Revenue Saturday told the story. A 90-year-old Greer County farmer refused an exemption he was entitled to under Oklahoma's community-property law even though it would save him about $500 in income taxes. He made an income-tax payment of nearly $3,000, passing up the exemption of $500 with this statement: "I've got plenty of money and my Government needs it more than I do."

He looked out after us by helping conquer the prairie grass. He loved his country then for the hopes it held tomorrow. And he still does.

Most of us, we fear, love our country for the haven it provides us today.

Russia—The Truth Will Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, it seems that it takes an appropriation crisis for the Congress to obtain vital information on matters connected with our foreign policy, and while it seems to be expected that the Congress is not presumed to know anything about such matters, and is expected to vote for any and all appropriations presented to "save" Europe from communism, starvation, and so forth, regardless of the effect upon our own economy or the welfare of the people, the protection and the preservation of our own beloved United States, and these so-called secret documents are fed to us as the occasion arises for such action as is desired by those in authority. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in these remarks the latest release reported by the State Department published under Associated Press caption in the Washington Times-Herald, of even date, as follows:

FACTS SHOW PLAN TO DIVIDE EAST EUROPE—CAPTURED DOCUMENTS REVEALED BY MARSHALL

Secretary of State Marshall threw the book at Soviet Russia last night—a massive array of captured Nazi documents baring details of the partnership between Russia's present leaders and Hitler's Reich for the division of eastern Europe.

With Marshall's sanction, the State Department published the entire record of 260 formerly secret records disclosing that Russia:

1. Backed Germany heavily in her war against the west, furnishing supplies by the hundred thousand tons, striving to the last for friendship with Germany and aiding the Nazi campaign to keep Turkey neutral.

HAD PACT AGAINST UNITED STATES

2. Agreed with Adolf Hitler that the United States, as well as Britain, should be shut out of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

3. Lost Hitler as an ally, and paved the way for Germany's invasion of Russia, by demanding among other things a military base within range of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles and assurance that the oil-rich area south of Batum and Baku in the general direction of the Persian gulf be recognized as the center of the aspirations of the Soviet Union.

Starting with an official report of the first Soviet bid for closer ties with the Nazis, months before World War II, the book embodied evidence whose release Russia blocked at the Nuremberg war crimes trials.

PLANNED TO SPLIT POLAND

Included in the 362-page volume were secret agreements, signed by Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov, to partition Poland and slice eastern Europe into Russian and Nazi spheres of control. The final entry dealt with Hitler's invasion of Russia.

The State Department said the documents were all from the official archives of the Nazi foreign office, were captured by American and British troops and were published now to complete the record.

While there was no reference to the present state of United States-Russian relations, the circumstances nevertheless gave the sudden release the effect of a major diplomatic stroke.

The first document records a proposal for better and better relations between Moscow and Berlin—advanced April 17, 1939, by the Russian ambassador to the Reich. This was at a time when Britain and France were seeking to enlist Russia in a collective security pact to head off Nazi aggression.

FACTS TOUCHED OFF WAR

The agreements to divide eastern Europe were in the form of strictly secret annexes to the published Russo-German nonaggression treaty of August 23, 1939, which sealed Poland's fate, rebuffed France and Britain and touched off the world conflict. They were signed by Nazi Foreign Minister Von Ribbentrop, who was hanged at Nuremberg as a war criminal, as well as by Molotov.

Other documents detailed Russia's help to the Nazis in the form of grain, oil, cotton, and other materials until Adolf Hitler turned on his partner with the signal for the Wehrmacht invasion.

In the array of first-hand evidence were:

1. Reports of Count von der Schulenburg, Nazi ambassador in Moscow, on Molotov's prewar negotiations with the British and French envoys at a time when he was treating secretly with the Nazis. Schulenburg advised Berlin that with the British and French Molotov "sat like a bump on a log" but with the Nazis he was "very communicative and amiable." The envoy noted earlier that Molotov "is known for his somewhat stubborn manner."

STALIN SHOWN ANTIBRITISH

2. A very secret memorandum on a discussion in Moscow among Ribbentrop, Stalin, and Molotov the night of August 23-24, 1939, quoting Stalin as remarking that if England dominated the world "this was due to the stupidity of other countries that always let themselves be bluffed."

3. Terms of the German-Soviet trade agreement by which Russia for 2 years helped the Nazis defeat the British blockade. A foreign office memorandum showed that even in April 1941, when relations between Hitler and Stalin were becoming strained, the Nazis received from Russia 208,000 tons of grain, 90,000 tons of petroleum, 8,300 tons of cotton, and 6,340 tons of copper, tin, and nickel. Four thousand tons of raw rubber were shipped across Siberia.

4. German embassy reports on Moscow's difficulties in justifying the Red Army's grab of eastern Poland. In the end Stalin himself drafted a joint communication.

PRAISED FRENCH INVASION

5. A very urgent telegram of June 18, 1940, from the Moscow Embassy reporting to Berlin that Molotov had expressed the "warmest congratulations of the Soviet Government on the splendid success of the German armed forces" in their invasion of France and the Low Countries.

6. Scores of documents detailing subsequent Nazi-Soviet quarrels over division of territorial spoils beginning with the Red Army's occupation of the Baltic States. Russia went beyond the secret agreement and seized northern Bukovina and the strip of Lithuania allotted to Germany, and Berlin claimed compensation.

7. A record of a conversation between the Fuehrer and Molotov in Hitler's air-raid shelter November 13, 1940, on terms for Russia's full partnership in the Axis. Hitler argued that Soviet expansion should be in the direction of the Indian Ocean, and opposed any new Russian move against Finland or territorial changes in the Balkans. Molotov demanded a free hand in Finland, quarreled with Nazi actions in the Balkans, and said Russia had the right to "obtain a guaranty against an attack on the Black Sea via the straits."

JAP TALKS DISCLOSED

8. Detailed memoranda on conversations among Hitler, Ribbentrop, and Japanese Foreign Minister Matsuoka. In one of these Ribbentrop asserted Nazi flyers reported American planes they had encountered were "junk."

Hitler and Ribbentrop, one memorandum said, sought to dissuade Matsuoka from negotiations for a Soviet-Japanese pact, urging instead that Japan attack Singapore. The document quoted Ribbentrop as contending "Roosevelt would not let it come to war since he was well aware of the impossibility of any action against Japan." Japan, he advised, "could occupy the Philippines and in this way deal a severe blow to Roosevelt's prestige." Hitler was quoted as promising that if the United States did fight, Germany would go to war beside Japan.

Congressman Gallagher Congratulates Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES GALLAGHER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I notice in an Associated Press item from Hyde Park, N. Y., in today's Washington Post a statement by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt to the effect that the Russians are dangerous.

In view of the fact that Mrs. Roosevelt has heretofore advocated a "Be nice to Russia" policy, I want to congratulate her upon her ability to do an about-face stunt. Russia is not a friend of the United States, and we are glad that the doors of the White House are no longer open to the Communists, so far as this lady is concerned. The Republicans believe that we should look after America, while doing something for the rest of the world. The news item reads as follows:

SOVIET DANGEROUS, SAYS MRS. ROOSEVELT

HYDE PARK, N. Y., January 20.—Calling the Russians dangerous, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt says that unless the United States "finds ways to be strong enough, so Russia will work with us, we will have to build for another war."

"We need tact as well as strength in dealing with the Soviet," she said last night. She recently returned from last month's Geneva meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, of which she is chairman.

"If the United States withdrew from Europe, Russia would go in everywhere we went out," the President's widow told a meeting of the Hyde Park Historical Association.

"We are the most powerful Nation in the world," she said. "Russia is next. She is newer, therefore not so secure. • • • They infiltrate where they can, and they are going to expand if they can. They really believe their way is the only way to govern the world. We have to believe just as strongly in our way."

"The Communist economy is not one of plenty, but one which people turn to when there is nothing else to turn to," she said, adding:

"Europe is in that position. It's Russia or the United States. Either we work together in the United Nations, or face each other as enemies. That would be very painful for all of us."

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Daily Mirror of January 20, 1948:

BREAKING IT DOWN

What a good day it would be if one should go by without a single cry of crisis out of Washington.

The approved Capitol formula for meeting every crisis is, of course, greater power for the Federal Government over the lives of the people, plus more of the people's wealth to ward off the most critical effects of the crises.

There is a crisis, and so the planners get busy with their schemes to ration meat again—thus inviting back the black market, with its hundreds of millions of dollars out of our pockets to fatten the underworld and escape the tax collector, with its substitution of filthy crooks for honest dealers.

There is a crisis, and the New Dealers are able to figure it out, to the penny, no less, how many of our billions can set Europe back on its feet.

It is as if we were to be narcotized by repetition. As if it were planned that our senses should be so dulled that nobody would sit down soberly and count the costs.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, however, discloses that one man, Senator KEM, of Missouri, has done some cost-figuring, and done it in such a down-to-earth manner that it can be easily understood.

Senator KEM asked the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, for some figures and came up with these whoppers:

Our foreign loans, property credits, advances, relief and rehabilitation grants and other authorizations, from July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1947, came to $73,092,058,013.

Writing off the war years, the Senator found that peacetime foreign relief, July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1947, totaled $24,099,211,087.

Since it is hard for anybody, particularly the administration, to understand what a billion dollars is, Senator KEM broke the figures down to common terms.

The little $24,000,000,000 item cost $163 for every man, woman, and child in America, $616 for each family. KEM comments:

"Foreign aid has cost each American family $25 a month for each of the past 24 months. This would pay all the income tax a married man with two children pays on a $4,000 income."

Still the Senator wasn't satisfied. So he took all the counties and cities in Missouri and prepared a table showing how much each has contributed to foreign aid on a per capita basis.

His native Macon County, for instance, has paid $3,915,468 for foreign aid since VJ-day. That is a figure more than 10 times the county's annual tax receipts, $332,332.

The Marshall plan, if adopted, will cost the residents of Macon County as much in the next 4 years as all their county, county road, and school taxes will cost in the next 9 years, according to Senator KEM's figures.

Progressive Kansas City, Mo., recently voted a $41,500,000 bond issue for civic improvements. It was a tough job. It required and got a two-thirds majority ballot. It will take 20 years to pay off.

But, per capita, the people of Kansas City have provided $73,049,524 in foreign aid in the past 2 years. The Marshall plan would tap them for $58,000,000 in 4 years. Senator KEM writes his own editorial, saying:

"It is interesting to speculate how the people of Kansas City would vote on a $58,000,000 bond issue to pay their share of the Marshall plan.

"It would be even more interesting to see what would happen to city officials who would raise every city tax and license fee the necessary 85 percent for the next 4 years, just to pay Kansas Citians' per capita share of the Marshall plan."

World Crisis in the Mediterranean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently read a report on the crisis prevailing in the Mediterranean which I consider so significant that I am making it a part of my remarks.

It was authored by Dr. Christopher Norborg, who was formerly with the Office of Strategic Services, and whose book Operation Moscow received so much comment in past months. Dr. Norborg is a former Minnesota resident but now resides in Washington, D. C., at 3817 Cathedral Avenue NW.

The article appeared in the January 17 issue of American World Intelligence, which is a biweekly intelligence letter mailed from Washington. The article is important because it gives a clear bird's eye view of the tremendous Soviet pressure upon a strategic area, where the destiny of America and the world may well be decided.

The article follows:

Some time ago American world intelligence mentioned how the commander of the United States Mediterranean Fleet had stated that our fleet was not leaving the Mediterranean, since the United States had permanent interests in those waters. During the past weeks dozens of new reports have come in to give an over-all intelligence picture of what is really happening in that explosive area, from Gibraltar to Basra, from Klagenfurt to Eritrea and Oran.

Five years after the north African invasion American troops embarked once again from these shores to wherever they will be needed in the Mediterranean during the coming months. At the same time the chairman of the United Nations Palestine Commission, Dr. Karel Lisicky, defined, in New York, the prospects of his mission's success in these pathetic words: "No one can expect miracles from five lonely pilgrims going to Palestine." The Mediterranean and the Near East have become the show-down area between American commitments and Soviet expansion—between the Truman doctrine, backed by armed force, and the Cominform, backed by Soviet power. Military logic says that, irrespective of the numbers of armed forces present, where a big power flies its flag, its total military power is engaged.

The United States is facing an explosive situation directed by Moscow according to the classic advice of Nikolai Lenin: "Stop the imperialist war and start the civil war." Washington has served notice that it is about to demand a stop to Soviet civil war in Greece, Iran, and, if need be, in Italy. American military power backs the integrity of these states, even if the attack should take the Soviet form of "a people's revolt." Our military moves in this theater of tension indicate that we are no longer trying to pay off realities with words.

The American Ambassador to Iran said: "Patriotic Iranians • • • may therefore rest assured that the American people will support fully their freedom to make their own choice." That commitment was made in face of recent intelligence reports of renewed Soviet troop activities north of the Araxes River and intensified Soviet espionage from the Baku MVD headquarters via Erivan, Miyandaub, and Mahabad. The world has not heard the last about Kurdish resistance and the Mosul oil fields.

To Moscow, the open transfer of four American fleet submarines and eight motor mine sweepers to Turkey can only mean that the Black Sea is no longer a Soviet lake. The transfer of the British military mission to Salonika can only mean that the Soviet pressure on the Dardanelles is going to be stopped. The Anglo-Russian declaration of August 13, 1941, is being enforced where Moscow declared that it had "no aggressive intentions or claims in regard to the straits." The ridiculous Bulgarian demand for western Thrace is going to be rejected as is any Soviet-Yugoslav appetite for Macedonia.

Power politics has its own stern logic: The moment the Truman announcement of American assistance to Greece was uttered it was obvious that Mr. Dean Acheson was merely daydreaming, when he testified: 'The present plans do not include sending troops to Greece and Turkey." The constant military expeditions which Mr. Tito continues to operate from Corizza (Albania), Bitol, Prilep, and Skoplje into Greek territory must either stop or be crushed by military power.

Recent intelligence reports prove that the chosen instrument for Soviet pressure on the Mediterranean is the Cominform, about which further details are now coming to light. It was created to relieve Moscow of any "responsibility" for the actions of the satellite Soviets. Headquarters was, therefore, placed in Belgrade. The reported top leader will be the present Bulgarian Premier, Georgi Dimitrov, who will abdicate the moment Tito and Moscow find the time right for uniting Bulgaria and Yugoslavia into one state, "from Trieste to Varna."

During Tito's November visit to Sofia, the Bulgarian Vice Premier, Traitcho Kostov, received great applause when he demanded "the complete unification of the South Slavs by the creation of one common Yugoslav motherland." And Mr. Kimon Georgiev, the Foreign Minister, echoed, "We South Slavs are so situated that only if we are firmly united can we effectively defend our interests." The creation of this greater Yugoslav Soviet Republic makes any real settlement of Trieste impossible.

Which fact fits into the picture of the Soviet Ambassador. Mr. Kostylev's approach to Italian Foreign Minister Count Sforza that Moscow might back Italian claims to a mandate over the former Italian colonies provided Italy would break with America. Count Sforza pointed to America's postwar record of great helpfulness. At that, the Italian Communist Party has grown from 402,000 (December 1944) to 2,253,000 members (reported October 1, 1947), with no less than 105,000 students and intellectuals, and with 52,500 Communist cells (as compared with 38,200 such party cells in France). The relative peacefulness at present on the Italian scene does not deceive informed observers. Neither does it change the burden of the American commitment: "If we betray Italy as we betrayed Poland, I leave it to you to decide where that leaves us as the greatest nation on earth" (Congressman LODGE, in the House of Representatives, December 5, 1947).

From London the report comes that Mr. George Marshall has received the promise of the Egyptian Government that Egypt will remain neutral, when the question comes up about the disposal of the Italian colonies: Overpopulated, democratic Italy may be considered. Above all, arrangements will be made whereby famed Tobruk goes to the British as permanent base in a defense triangle: Cyprus, Tobruk, and southern Red Sea harbors: main weapons to be jet-fighters and guided missiles.

When the British Foreign Office announced to the United States State Department that British warships would intercept two Panamanian ships out of Soviet controlled Constanza, it based its decision upon intelligence reports from Istanbul to the effect that the Jewish refugee ships were carrying as high as 4,000 young Soviet-trained troops to Palestine. This discovery squares with the announced policy of eastern European Communist parties "to control immigration to Palestine and to see to it that the best fitted elements emigrate." Recently the Jewish organizations of Rumania, Poland, and Bulgaria have been reorganized by the Communists to give the leadership to the democratic elements among the Jews. The Bulgarian Jewish National Organization in its recent congress voted to lead the movement into the anti-imperialistic formation. From the Stern gang and the Irgun Zwai Leumi the men of Moscow received resolutions of thanks for the Soviet attitude in the question of Palestine.

Throughout the Mediterranean, as elsewhere, the Cominform has ordered the Communist Parties to enroll as the storm troops in the fight against the imperialistic Marshall plan. In the case of the free German movement the Belgrade directive significantly enlists the members to fight American intervention in European affairs.

Students of history have suggested that the month of February 1948, marking the centennial of the February Revolution and of the Communist manifesto, may have been chosen by the Politburo (Moscow) as the occasion of a global demonstration of the strength of the Marxist idea.

In fact, rumors indicate that the next month may see the announcement of a Communist liberation center for Asia, where American political initiative has suffered from lack of imagination and extremely faulty timing.

Congressman Gallagher Protests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES GALLAGHER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an editorial from the Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C., under date of January 21, which deals with the fuel-oil shortage.

This editorial says "the Truman outfit" is too busy sending petroleum to other countries in the world and is overlooking the people of the United States.

We have a fuel-oil shortage in Philadelphia, Pa. People are having a hard time to heat their homes. I suggest that the Democratic administration take notice of its mistakes and read this editorial, which is as follows:

WHERE'S OUR OIL GOING?

Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal day before yesterday, pursuing the Truman administration's policy of trying to scare the boots off the American people to gain administration ends, painted a horrific picture of our oil situation at a session of a House Armed Services Subcommittee.

We're already short of petroleum for one reason or another, said Mr. Forrestal—which was scarcely news to Atlantic seaboard and Midwest home owners, hard pressed for fuel oil to heat their houses.

But, according to the Defense Secretary, that is only the half of it. The rest of it is, the man says, that in another major war our own oil production would most likely run short of our needs by 2,000,000 barrels a day; that the uproar in Palestine may result in Arab cutting of various Near East pipe lines; and that we'd better get busy now on building up a synthetic-oil industry in this country at an eventual cost of $8,000,000,000.

It so happened that last Saturday evening our Ambassador to France, Jefferson Caffery, told the American chamber of commerce in Paris that between December 16 and January 10—the first 24 days of the stop-gap aid program—France had received $53,000,000 worth of essential materials from the United States. Among these, Mr. Caffery added, was 200,000 tons of petroleum; he didn't say in what form, whether crude, gasoline, light or heavy fuel oil, or shipments of all of those commodities.

According to reliable sources of information here, the Caffery statement must have been oversimplified—meaning it seems impossible that 200,000 tons of petroleum could have gone to France from the United States in those 24 days. That comes to 1,500,000 barrels of crude, and 14 tankers would have been required to carry it.

November United States petroleum shipments to France totaled 294,000 barrels; October 251,000; September, 141,000—with December figures as yet unavailable here. It doesn't seem likely that United States shipments would have ballooned to 1,500,000 barrels between December 16 and January 10.

It is entirely probable, though, that Caffery's over-all figure was correct, and that France did receive in the period under discussion 200,000 tons from various sources—the United States, South America, the Near East, and so forth.

One more statistic, if you don't mind: Under ideal refining conditions, you can get a 17 percent yield of No. 2 fuel oil out of a mess of crude petroleum. That means the 200,000 tons that went to France would have yielded 34,000 tons of this favorite heating oil. Whatever petroleum is sent out of the United States carries with it a potential 17 percent of fuel oil which Americans don't get.

United States oil companies control, process, and distribute about 80 percent of all the world's petroleum outside Russia.

On the face of these facts and figures, it looks to us as if the Truman outfit is being far too zealous about funneling oil to other countries and far too lackadaisical about the defense, manufacturing, and home oil needs of the American people. Maybe we're wrong, but we think a clear and detailed accounting is due the people as to just what the administration is doing with petroleum and its products.

Federal Trade Commission Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I am extending the following testimony of Mr. George J. Burger given before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices. It is important because it carefully relates a serious handicap regarding antitrust enforcement. As chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House, I addressed a letter to the same subcommittee on the same subject several days before this testimony.

Mr. Burger's testimony follows:

My name is George J. Burger. I am a member of the board of directors of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., head office San Mateo, Calif., a national organization, which has the largest individual membership of any business organization in the Nation. I am also in charge of the Washington Office of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., located in the Bond Building, Washington, D. C.

I also own and operate the Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City. I represent only independent tire and tube retailers and independent tire rebuilders. My clients are located in each of the 48 States of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to take this time to thank you and your committee for giving me the opportunity to appear and present to you in as few words as possible the reason for my appearance. My sole purpose is to speak on anti-trust-law enforcement and as to those agencies responsible for their enforcement and the part the Federal Trade Commission may have in handling their portion of these antitrust laws. I say to you, without fear of contradiction, that to permit any program to continue that would not be all-convincing that there is a vigorous program of these laws being enforced, then I say that small business of this Nation might just as well know now as later on that they are through.

I make this statement not as a professional witness but as one who has owned and operated a retail establishment from 1909 to 1935, and know well from actual experience, that due to the violations of these laws and the lack of all-out enforcement by the Federal Government, it is impossible for small business to continue. Some of you might say this is quite an irrational statement and I will answer that by saying that I will refer you to the testimony of the then Assistant Attorney General, the Honorable Wendell Berge, appearing before the Senate Civil Service Committee on February 13, 1947. You will find that he made some very startling statements as to what has taken place in the enforcement of these antitrust laws during the past 35 or 40 years. In substance, his statement was that merely lip service has been given to the laws by the administrations during that long period. How did this happen? It was merely due to the fact of a lack of sufficient and adequate appropriations to have these laws vigorously enforced. Further, when appropriations were made by the Congress, no directive was made as to how these appropriations were to be expended when in productive or unproductive activity by those agencies. Were these appropriations utilized in matters entirely foreign from the antitrust enforcements? In my opinion, all aid that the Congress may consider as a help to small business of this Nation in the near future, such as tax relief, capital loans, educational programs, and so forth—all these will be of no avail to save the life of small business until we get at the cancer that is destroying, namely, lack of sincere, vigorous, antitrust law enforcement. I know this from costly experience and so do thousands upon thousands of other small businesses know this to be the fact.

At this time it is necessary to place on the record the wisdom of the Congress when, in the fall of 1940, they voted to establish the Small Business Committees in the Congress. Goodness knows what would have happened to small business, especially during the war years, if these committees had not been functioning. These committees, it can be truthfully said, went a long way to save the life of all small business during these past 6 years, and more important, it was a signal to all Federal agencies and to Big Business themselves that these committees would not permit small business to be destroyed through ruthless and unfair practices, and that for the first time small business of this Nation could take their rightful pleas to a congressional committee where all just and fair claims did receive the rightful attention. It is important to note that due to the actions of these committees, all Federal agencies having anything to do with the small-business problems were now aware of the objectives of these committees, and the result has been more sympathetic actions to small-business problems. Goodness knows what would have happened as to the trend that was taking place in our economic structure had not these Small Business Committees been set up in the Congress.

Still the basic situation facing small business has not changed and in fact, is getting even more precarious, that is, as to their future. Concentration is increasing in the Nation's industry, and if there can be any question as to that statement, I respectfully refer the committee to the reports of the Senate Small Business Committee, Seventy-ninth Congress, Economic Concentration and World War II and Future of Independent Business, Senate Committee Print No. 16. Then the staff report to the Monopoly Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, Seventy-ninth Congress, also the testimony given by various Federal Trade Commission officials before congressional committees in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses. Small business, as a whole, is afraid to come forward and lay the facts on the line before congressional committees because they are fearful of retaliation from their source of supply. I don't make that statement just to hear myself talk, but know from actual happenings where some talked out of turn, or were afraid to talk because they were afraid of creating a business war. They knew that antitrust laws were being violated but were fearful of talking. You may find that the Federal Trade Commission has had similar experiences along this line, and yes, even the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

Special credit must be given to the House Small Business Committee in the Eightieth Congress. Because of their actions they have been able to get two agencies of the Government to cooperate in the enforcement of these antitrust laws as they apply to one major industry for the first time in the history of these two agencies. Of course the major industry that is affected by this joint action through the House Small Business Committee, has already set in motion penalties for the ones that were "spark plugs" in bringing about the constructive action of the House Small Business Committee.

Not a week passes by but that some members of the federation's Nation-wide membership lay before us concrete evidence of antitrust law violations, and in the majority of cases, although their information is factual, the pleas are "Please don't quote us, as we are fearful of retaliation." Surely the House Small Business Committee had this experience within the past month when they attempted to move in immediately on a serious charge of law violation. I do not want the committee to feel that the witness is merely making broad statements, but I will stand for any questioning to confirm what I said as to these practices, etc. Surely, in view of the fear in the minds of all small business, this situation cannot go on, and if it does, small business of this Nation is facing ruin quicker than Members of Congress can expect.

As I review the reports of the budget requests of the Federal Trade Commission, appearing in the staff reports of the Monopoly Subcommittee, House Small Business Committee, Seventy-ninth Congress, and note the reduced amounts approved and recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress, which include the enforcement of the Robinson-Patman law, I can readily realize now why this most important law is for all practical purposes a "dead-letter law" insofar as a help to small business of this Nation. I do not make this statement in any way to damage or belittle the constructive work of the Federal Trade Commission, but when one stops to realize the magnitude of what the FTC is expected to do, and what they have to do it with, I can now readily realize the impossibility of full enforcement of the Robinson-Patman law. I quote from the staff report to the Monopoly Subcommittee, House Small Business Committee, Seventy-ninth Congress:

"Any shortcoming of the Federal Trade Commission which may be pointed out in this report should not be allowed to obscure the highly salient fact that the appropriations to the Federal Trade Commission, even if the agency were devoting all its time to handling the most significant antitrust cases, would be insufficient to allow it to fulfill its function in helping to reverse the trend of concentration.

"The unfavorable odds against which the staff of the Federal Trade Commission must work is nowhere more glaringly illustrated than by the case against the Cement Institute. In this case only three Commission attorneys participated in the trial, yet they were opposed by lawyers from 41 law firms, many of them amongst the largest and most successful in the country. Press releases, according to the Federal Trade Commission, have appeared to the effect that the defendants in this case spent in excess of $5,000,000—$5,000,000 against three Commission attorneys. Five million dollars represents twice as much money as the entire Federal Trade Commission receives in 1 year, * * * The Federal Trade Commission lost this case against the Cement Institute by a 2-to-1 decision in the circuit court of appeals.

"Two facts stand out: (1) With the exception of the 1947 appropriation, Congress in each of the 10 years gave the Federal Trade Commission practically the amount approved by the Budget Bureau. Therefore, as far as the Federal Trade Commission's budget for the last 10 years is concerned, the Budget Bureau must be held, in the first instance, responsible for the agency's limited appropriation; (2) the Budget Bureau made very substantial reductions in the amounts originally requested by the Federal Trade Commission."

The Robinson-Patman law was given to the Commission by the Congress early in 1936 and in my opinion Congress would not have been criticized as over-generous or wasting the taxpayers' money if any amount equal to each fiscal year's budget of the Commission was granted exclusively for the enforcement of the Robinson-Patman law. If this has been done the results would be a virile, progressive small business of this Nation and less concentration taking place in Nation's industry. Big business interests of this Nation, as Congress is aware, left no stone unturned to bring about the defeat of the Robinson-Patman law when it was being considered by the Congress, and Congress only voted that law when the facts were presented to them, namely, that without the law, small business, both producers and retailers, would be destroyed. Surely the Federal Trade Commission, on March 4, 1946, presented the happening as to what took place with one major producer and one major distributor. Some years later, a Member of the Senate, when reviewing that operation, stated it was not competition but destruction for all other producers and retailers in that industry. It was largely due to the facts that were brought out at that time by the Commission and some others, that Congress was convinced that the Robinson-Patman law was necessary to save Nation's small business.

What a discouraging situation confronts us and the people I am speaking for when we see that not until July 1947, fully 11 years after the enactment of the Robinson-Patman law by the Congress, was any action taken to enforce the Robinson-Patman law, and it is to the credit of the present House Small Business Committee that the Commission for the first time has instituted action pertaining to one major industry's pricing policies under section 2 of the law. Under the law, the Commission has the power to fix quantity discounts, and no attempt was ever exercised by the Commission under that provision to protect small business against price discrimination until the House Small Business Committee explored the situation in that certain industry. How far the Commission will be able to go will depend upon the funds available in this major undertaking. If their funds are in an ample amount to do this job, then the job will be done sooner; but if, on the other hand, they are not ample, the result will be delays and more delays until the ones who would have benefited by their efforts will have ceased to be in the business world.

Members of the committee may wonder if the Commission was lacking or faulty in its administration. I will answer that before the question arises, as I have had the closest contact with the Commission for 11 years or more, as the Commission well knows. I will state definitely for the record that due to the many twofold duties of the Commission, and due to the lack of adequate appropriation, it was utterly impossible for the Commission to center its main activity on one special action. They did the best job possible under conditions prevailing.

I recall a certain major case instituted by the Commission under the Robinson-Patman law in 1938–39. This case was of major importance and many other industries were watching the development of the planning by that certain major producer. This producer, in less than 6 months after the Robinson-Patman law was placed on the statute books, as some competent business authorities felt and states, his sole action was to circumvent the Robinson-Patman law. All other leading industries were watching the development of the scheme and were wondering whether they would get away with it. Well, they were until the Federal Trade Commission moved in and found them guilty of the violations under the law and the producer admitted his guilt and accepted the Commission's cease-and-desist order; but the irony of the situation has been that the Commission has not been able to follow through in seeing to it that their order was being complied with, and by that I mean that the Commission could make the closest study of the order being carried out if they had had sufficient funds to do so. However, they did not have the necessary competent manpower to use and, due to the lack of sufficient appropriations, could not make this necessary follow-through. The result of the failure of the Commission to follow through on that case brought about just this: All members of that particular industry knew as well as those in other industries that the Robinson-Patman law was just another "eighteenth amendment." This time the victims were small-business institutions of this Nation.

On July 14, 1947, by invitation to the National Federation of Small Business from Senator ROBERT TAFT, chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I presented testimony in behalf of the president of the federation, Mr. C. Wilson Harder. He requested that special all-out attention be given to the antitrust law enforcement. He recommended that a special appropriation be given to the Federal Trade Commission in the enforcement of section 2 of the Robinson-Patman law. Although the request was well received by that committee, no action has been taken up to the moment.

If the annual appropriations by the Congress to the commission was for just the enforcement of the Robinson-Patman law, in my opinion, the appropriation would not be too much, nor would the taxpayer's money be wasted. When we look at what the Commission has to do with its limited appropriation, then we can see now more than ever why we have only received a "hit or miss" administration of the law by the Commission.

I do not know whether the reduced appropriations of the Commission rest with the actions of the Bureau of the Budget or the responsibility rests with the Congress. If it is due to the Bureau of the Budget, then I believe the Commission should be granted the authority to lay these facts before the Congress of their own free will, when it happens and then Congress make known publicly where the responsibility lies for reduced appropriations. Nation's small business wants these facts and the sooner the better. Then, on the other hand, if no responsibility rests with the Bureau of the Budget or the Congress as to the necessary funds for the Commission to operate on and to vigorously enforce the laws entrusted to them, small business will then, for the first time, know how to approach the Commission, and if they are found wanting in their administration of the laws, to advise the Congress what should be done, and done at once with the Commission.

Both the Sherman and Robinson-Patman law will go a long way, and in fact a definite way to protect small business, provided lip service action does not continue by the administration and Congress does not close their eyes to the situation. Every so often Members of Congress have repeatedly stated opinions on the problems of small business, but no one does anything about it. You will find this statement appearing repeatedly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

To make certain for the first time that something will really be done to immediately protect small business, and after all, I am not speaking for myself, but for the entire membership of the National Federation of Small Business who, by the way, has time and time again, by their own vote urged increased appropriations for the administration of all antitrust laws, and speaking also for the people that I represent through the Burger Tire Consultant Service, I recommend:

1. That the committee recommend the full amount requested for the fiscal year by the Federal Trade Commission.

2. That if and when the Bureau of the Budget should reduce the appropriation

requested by the Commission, that the Commission be permitted to make this action public information.

3. That not less than $500,000 of the total request to the Bureau of the Budget be earmarked for cases under the Robinson-Patman Act, with strong emphasis to the Commission of cases involving the establishment by the Commission of maximum quantity limits on discounts as specified under section 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act. This is necessary if the function of the Commission is to promote free and fair competition in interstate trade.

Make no mistake, business of this Nation will get back to normal quicker than many of these so-called experts will tell you or lead you to believe. It cannot go on the way it has been since the end of the war. Signs are appearing in quite a few industries that they are catching up with orders, and when this condition arrives you members of the committee must realize this will be the time when small business will face the most severe squeeze play, and it is our purpose in appearing now before you so that you will see that this important agency of the Government, empowered with important laws to protect the public and the business structure, both big and small, are put in a position to function effectively which, after all, will be saving our Nation's economy.

Signs and actions are appearing of attempts by congressional actions, or otherwise, to bypass the antitrust laws due to the so-called emergency, to suspend these laws. We cannot close our eyes to these attempts and the two services that I am speaking for will fight to the last ditch in the protection of Nation's small business to defeat all such attempts, no matter where the actions come from. This is definite, and we are committed to this fight, and so should any other small business groups be who are supposed to be fighting for small-business interests. This should be their principal objective.

It is encouraging to small business institutions of this Nation to note the new activity of the Federal Trade Commission in its 1949 operation, namely, administered pricing program. We are glad to see this instituted by the Commission because we know from experience of the ruthlessness and vicious practices of major producers putting on special programs in an area, but not in all the areas throughout the Nation. The Commission is to be commended on their action and the results can be beneficial to the consumers of this Nation and also the small business enterprises of the Nation. We think the American public has a right to know the facts.

Finally, the Robinson-Patman law and all other antitrust laws were voted by the Congress so that the public would be protected from gouging, and so forth, and also that small business would be protected and permitted to exist in the business world. These laws were not put on the statute books to protect the inefficient.

If time had permitted, Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to lay before your committee more factual data, but believe me I am speaking the truth and the whole truth, and I trust my pleas in the sole interest of the Nation's small business will not have been in vain, and that the agencies empowered with the enforcement of these antitrust laws may receive the necessary and adequate appropriations that they may do a real job. Let us start to protect our own Nation's business economy now. That is more important to the people of this Nation. Many youths of this Nation want to go into business for themselves. If they have the ability to open a business and put their own money into their own business, let us hope that the little they may have to start a business with and also that are now operating in small business, their investments will not be ruined due solely to the lack of enforcement of the antitrust laws.

The Nazi-Soviet Documents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 22, 1948:

THE NAZI-SOVIET DOCUMENTS

From the collection of Nazi-Soviet documents for the war years 1939 to 1941, seized by American troops in Germany, made public last night by the State Department and printed extensively in the Times this morning, we cite one item as typical. It is taken from the secret additional protocol to the celebrated Russo-German nonaggression pact of August 23, 1939.

This was the treaty, signed by Molotov for Russia and by von Ribbentrop for Germany, which was negotiated shortly before Hitler's unprovoked attack on Poland. This treaty has always been defended, by apologists for Russian diplomacy, and on the basis of its published text, as an agreement designed to stabilize the relations of the Soviets and Germany in the interest of peace in eastern Europe, and the text published at the time does, indeed, say much of refraining from acts of violence and eschewing aggressive alliances. But behind this published text, it is now revealed from the seized files of the German Foreign Office, there stood a "secret additional protocol," in which the Russian Government and the German Government—in advance of Hitler's attack on Poland—drew the boundaries of their respective spheres of influence in the Baltic states and Poland, in the event that what was nicely called the political rearrangement of these areas should be brought about. Thus, in Poland, the line between Russian and German influence was to follow approximately the rivers Narew, Vistula, and San. But more than this. The secret protocol went on to say:

"The question of whether the interests of both parties make desirable the maintenance of an independent Polish state and how such a state should be bounded can only be definitely determined in the course of further political developments. In any event, both Governments will resolve this question by means of a friendly agreement."

So here were Stalin and Hitler calmly deciding, just before Hitler struck his blow at Poland, that they would consider later, and resolve by friendly agreement, whether there would even be an independent Polish state, after Hitler's blow had fallen. Certainly this evidence offers the unhappy Polish people an opportunity for ironic thought on the fidelity with which their present puppet government supports, in the UN and elsewhere, the policies of that same Russian Government which was ready in 1939 to will all Poland out of existence, as a plain matter of political plunder.

The documents now published by our State Department deserve close study. They cover the whole period from 1939 to the June day in 1941 when Hitler double-crossed his partner in the nonaggressive pact and suddenly threw his legions into Russia. The relationship which these documents reveal in those critical and history-shaping years is that of two mutually suspicious and untrustful but equally cynical and ruthless governments matching wits while they plotted a division of power in eastern Europe in the event of a war which had not yet begun but the certainty of which was sealed by their maneuvers.

Palestine Partition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, most thoughtful Americans are gravely concerned with the results of our action in bringing about a partition of Palestine by the United Nations. Most Americans are ashamed of the fact that we permitted partisan domestic politics to influence our international conduct. If we continue such a course we will bring shame and disgrace upon this Nation. Doubtless, American troops will soon be called upon to go into Palestine to quell the disorder which our action has promoted. No American wants his son to die in the sands of an un-Holy Land in defense of an illegitimate state. The Arabs and a billion people over whom they exert influence are watching us. If we send American troops into Palestine we not only play into the hands of Russian Communists, but we further alienate the good will of half the world's people who occupy half the world's land area.

This sentiment is expressed in a resolution just received by me from the Public Affairs Luncheon Club of Dallas. This club is composed of hundreds of the leading women of Texas. Their club exists to study public affairs. Their action is characterized by intelligence and good citizenship. Their appeal to this Congress should certainly not go unheeded.

I commend their resolution, which is as follows:

Whereas the partition of Palestine by action of the United Nations has resulted in strife and violence in that country; and

Whereas it is becoming apparent that if the decision of the United Nations to establish a Jewish state in Palestine stands and is enforced, it must be by military power which would threaten the peace of the whole world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Public Affairs Luncheon Club, here assembled, are unalterably opposed to the use of any part of the United States Army to enforce the partitioning of Palestine, and that we do earnestly beseech our representatives in Congress to oppose, with all their influence, any effort to send a military force from the United States to Palestine; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be incorporated in the minutes of this organization and that copies also be sent to Senator TOM CONNALLY, Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, to the Honorable J. FRANK WILSON, of Dallas County, and to the Honorable ED GOSSETT, of Wichita Falls.

Adopted December 15, 1947.

Respectfully submitted.

MRS. PAULINE ADOUE HALL,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.
MRS. MAURICE C. TURNER,
President.

The West Virginia Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. CROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the West Virginia plan for veterans' housing:

Housing: Corporation sponsored for World War II veterans.
Erection: Production-line methods.
Financing: Title III, Public Law No. 346.

I. PROPOSAL—WHAT IT IS

A. To suggest a way to contribute to the solution of veterans' housing problem, viz., by corporation sponsorship of home construction projects for resale at cost to World War II veteran employees of the corporation.

B. Making use of production-line methods for building homes as developed by the Byrne organization, at Baltimore, Md., Moline, Ill., and elsewhere.

II. OPERATION—HOW IT WORKS

A. Finance arrangements made by corporation to—
1. Procure extension of bank credit to—
(a) Acquire suitable land.
(b) Develop the subdivision re—
(1) Surveying, landscaping, plotting,
(2) Water.
(3) Sewerage.
(4) Streets.
(5) Electricity.
(6) Gas.
(7) Parks and playgrounds.
(8) Schools (if necessary).
(9) Stores (if necessary).
(10) Miscellaneous improvements.
(c) Coordinate construction of houses.
2. Contract with veteran employees to purchase houses and lots at actual accrued cost by—
(a) Loans from banks and loan associations for 100 percent purchase price which is guaranteed under title III of Public Law No. 346, under escrow trust agreements.

III. RESULT—WHO BENEFITS

A. To corporation:
1. Will improve corporation's relations with its (a) employees, (b) community, (c) customers.
2. Will indirectly increase production.
B. To veterans:
1. Will ease housing shortage by (a) enabling war veterans, who cannot presently purchase building lots or make usual down payments, to purchase corporation-sponsored houses at cost; (b) enabling corporation's war-veteran employees to move into their own homes, thus releasing additional housing for its nonveteran employees and other community citizens.

IV. GENERAL

A. Fortifies private enterprise methods for solving problems of public concern by—
1. Financial sponsorship by corporations to provide homes for their veteran employees.
2. Utilization of banks and loan associations to finance veteran home loans.
3. Multiple construction methods which maximize values and minimize costs.

V. FEASIBILITY OF WEST VIRGINIA PLAN

A. Plan in operation in West Virginia and other States.

B. The John Byrne organization has demonstrated that by using production-line methods the cost of housing can be reduced from one-third to one-half. In this manner veterans can secure good homes within their incomes.

VI. ENDORSEMENT OF WEST VIRGINIA PLAN

A. National convention of the American Legion, August 28, 1947, at Madison Square Garden, New York, N. Y.

B. West Virginia Bankers Association in convention at Wheeling, W. Va., October 26, 1947.

Mr. Speaker, a method has been developed whereby World War II veterans who have regular jobs but who have no substantial savings with which to buy building lots or make down payments on homes, could purchase suitable homes under the loan guaranty provisions of title III of Public Law No. 346.

These loans are particularly attractive because, first, under corporation sponsorship the veteran would get full value for the money he puts in his home; second, the veteran has a steady job whereby he can keep up his payments, and, third, the loan is guaranteed by the United States Government.

These loans would also be attractive to banks as the servicing of such a large number of loans could probably be arranged with the corporation sponsoring the project.

This plan eliminates faulty construction and thereby decreases the number of defaults on veterans' loans.

The proposal is that the original finances can be provided by some corporation, labor union, or cooperative, which can arrange for the purchase of a site of land on which to construct a substantial number of homes, on a multiple-construction basis, such as worked out by the Byrne organization, thus effecting substantial economies of construction and making it possible for the corporation, labor union, or cooperative to sell the completed homes to World War II veteran employees on an actual cost basis, including the cost of landscaping, surveying, plotting, and improving the land, under a contract for sale that could be worked out ahead of time, supplemented by regular trust agreements with a bank or building and loan association, which might be persuaded to advance the necessary funds, particularly where all the coordinating planning should have been approved by the loan guaranty division of the regional office of the Veterans' Administration, as to the contemplated individual loans to be advanced by the bank or the loan association to the individual veteran home purchasers.

Upon completion of such an arrangement the sponsoring corporation, labor union or cooperative would thus be reimbursed as to all of its original expenses. The bank or the building and loan association would feel secure as to its individual loans on the basis of the loan guaranty under title III of Public Law No. 346, extended by the loan guaranty office of the Veterans' Administration. The loan guaranty office of the Veterans' Administration could feel assured of the repayment of such loans, that is providing, of course, that the planning has been coordinated and the construction had been safely performed and supervised, because of the fact that all such veterans would be regular employees of a particular sponsoring corporation, or members of the particular labor union or veterans' cooperative.

Ordinarily, it would be more feasible for a corporation to sponsor such a multiple-construction project as to its own World War II veteran employees, than would be the case as to a veterans cooperative, or as to a labor union, because of its ability to give assurance of the probable continuance of employment of its World War II veteran employees and purchases of such sponsored homes.

Sponsorship of such homes for its World War II veteran employees by the corporations would probably directly bring considerable additional good will to the corporation, on the part of its employees, on the part of the local community in which its plants may be located and on the part of its customers. Satisfied employees—not constantly worried about the housing shortage, would be relieved of much of their anxiety, and consequently their energies would be converted into greater productiveness and serviceability to the corporations, that had assisted them in the solution of their housing problems.

The feasibility of the West Virginia plan nationally is established because it is already in operation on a sound basis in several States.

Navy Veterans Support Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following resolution which was adopted unanimously by the East St. Louis (Ill.) Navy Club, Ship No. 58, at its last regular meeting in the interest of the Marshall plan and calling for the maintenance of our Military Establishments at the highest possible peak of efficiency:

EAST ST. LOUIS NAVY CLUB, SHIP NO. 58,
East St. Louis, Ill., January 6, 1948.
Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Congressman, Twenty-second District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was presented to the East St. Louis Navy Club, Ship No. 58, at the regular meeting and approved unanimously:

"The East St. Louis Navy Club, Ship No. 58, views with alarm the steady deterioration of the relations between the United States and Russia, and the ceaseless and relentless encroachment of Russian domination in Europe.

"The East St. Louis Navy Club, sees in the attitude of Russia, as has recently been evidenced in the United Nations organization meeting, a distinct threat to world peace. The East St. Louis Navy Club believes that it is becoming increasingly clear that communism is the greatest external foe of the United States of America and must be recognized and treated as such: Therefore be it

"Resolved by action of the East St. Louis Navy Club, Ship No. 58, at the regular meeting, That we recommend and endorse the

following course of action by the United States of America:

"1. Maintain our Military Establishments at the highest possible peak of efficiency and instantly ready for action at any time.

"2. Effectuate the Marshall plan of aid to Europe, but under the direct supervision of the United States of America."

L. L. HEEGENROEDER,
Commandant.

Pensions of Widows of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Boston, December 31, 1947.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to call to your attention a very serious situation which is confronting the widows of World War I veterans; namely, widows' pension. It is a serious thing at this time because of the increase in the mortality rate among the veterans of World War I whose average age is now over 50.

The statute, section 11, Public Law 144, provides: "Payments of compensation under the provisions of this act shall not be made to any widow without child or children whose annual income exceeds $1,000 or to a widow with a child or children whose annual income exceeds $2,500. In determining annual income any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under law administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered." In interpreting this statute, the Veterans' Administration has made such a narrow construction that widows who have as their only asset a small commercial life-insurance policy have been denied the pension which you wanted them to receive.

I give you two illustrations of decisions of the Veterans' Administration which are numbered among the thousands throughout the country. A Massachusetts veteran died while on vacation in the State of Maine. The widow had to take care of burial expenses in Maine and in Massachusetts amounting to approximately $800, and her health was such that it was impossible for her to work. Her husband left her a commercial life-insurance policy in the face amount of $1,000. When the policy was payable there was a dividend added to it of $98.08. The Veterans' Administration denied the widow a pension on the basis of her annual income being in excess of $1,000.

Another example is of a widow whose husband died January 31, 1947, and she, too, took care of the burial expenses and of his last illness. She was unable to work, and her husband left her a commercial life-insurance policy for $1,000. The Veterans' Administration denied the widow a pension and said, "It appears that after the veteran's death on January 31, 1947, she received, as beneficiary of said veteran's commercial insurance the sum of $1,000, which on a proportionate monthly basis is at a rate in excess of $1,000 per annum. The fact that she expended a sizable portion of the proceeds of the commercial insurance for expenses of the funeral and burial of her husband would have no bearing upon the statutory limitation."

It is my contention that the Veterans' Administration is not correct in its interpretation of the act that the proceeds of such commercial life-insurance policies are income, since everyone of the 48 States, the United States Treasury, and the Collector of Internal Revenue do not consider such proceeds as taxable income. In addition, the Veterans' Administration has refused to give any consideration to the payment by the widow of burial bills and those of last illness in determining her annual income.

May I call to your attention the fact that, under the interpretation of the act by the Veterans' Administration, a World War I veteran with commercial life insurance policies of a large amount who provided for the proceeds to be paid to his widow in installments of less than $1,000 a year would be enabled to still have his widow receive a pension despite this amount of insurance. In addition, a widow of a World War I veteran who had a $10,000 converted Government life insurance policy would be entitled to the widows' pension. However, the widow of a World War I veteran in dire circumstances whose husband, after going through a depression and two postwar periods, and therefore unable to provide for anything save a small life insurance policy to cover the expenses of burial and last illness, is penalized by the interpretation of the Veterans' Administration that such a policy constitutes annual income.

I have under appeal one of these typical widow's cases to the Board of Appeals in Washington, and I am awaiting word for the date of a hearing on it. If there is anything that you can do to expedite this hearing, which is the case of Gertrude Rae Moor, widow of Frank E. Moor, XC-1,789,883, it would be appreciated. In the meantime, however, may I suggest that you contact the Veterans' Administrator and acquaint him with the situation which I have presented to you, and also the possibility of introducing legislation that would correct this problem. In considering corrective legislation I suggest three possibilities:

1. The proceeds of commercial life insurance be placed on the same basis as Government life insurance.

2. That at least a commercial life-insurance policy be exempted from consideration as a widow's annual income in the amount of $3,000.

3. That in determining the annual income of widows, expenses of burial and last illness be deducted and that the income of such widow would be on a net basis.

Since the publication of the fact that the veterans' division is to appeal this widow's case, many widows have contacted me revealing their unfortunate situation, and I can sincerely inform you that a check-up of the Nation would reveal thousands of like widows who have suffered by the adverse decisions of the Veterans' Administration in rejecting their claim for a widow's pension.

It seems to me that it is a challenge to all of us who wish to be of some service to the widows of the men who served in World War I and I will be pleased to join with you in anything that may accomplish this purpose.

Sincerely yours,
CLARENCE A. BARNES,
Attorney General.

A bill relating to the eligibility for pensions of certain widows and children of veterans of World Wars I and II

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (c) of the act of June 28, 1934, entitled "An act to compensate widows and children of persons who died while receiving monetary benefits for disabilities directly incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service in the World War," as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 38, sec. 503 (c)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Payment of compensation under the provisions of this act shall not be made to any widow without child, or a child, whose annual income exceeds $1,600, or to a widow with a child or children whose annual income exceeds $2,500. In determining annual income the Veterans' Administration shall not consider (1) any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and (2) any payments by reason of insurance on the life of the deceased veteran: *Provided*, That where payments to a widow are disallowed or discontinued hereunder, payment to a child or children of the deceased veteran may be made as though there is no widow."

Self-Imposed Fair Play Standards Best Control of United States Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert the following article appearing in the January issue of the Southern Banker, by Hon. John D. Goodloe, Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation:

SELF-IMPOSED FAIR PLAY STANDARDS BEST CONTROL OF UNITED STATES ENTERPRISE

(By John D. Goodloe, Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.)

Much has been said and written about the achievements of the American private enterprise system, what makes it tick, what its essential elements are, the dangers it faces, the changes necessary to insure its preservation, and so on. It has been defended and occasionally by a few openly attacked. It is not strange that so many sincerely profess faith in its ability not only to maintain the highest standard of living in the world, but to continue to make available to an increasing number of our people more of the materials necessary for health and enjoyment of life. It is strange, however, to observe the difficulty encountered in any attempt to specify the component parts of that system, the interacting relationships of those parts, and the constant adjustments which are occurring.

ERRONEOUS GENERALITIES

The amazing success of our private enterprise system in supplying a per capita quantity of consumer goods far exceeding that produced by any other country in the world is frequently explained, and sometimes erroneously, through broad generalizations. For example, the many natural resources possessed by the United States are pointed out as an explanation. While we have abundant natural resources, we have not been exceptionally endowed compared to many countries of the world. This fact became alarmingly clear during the recent war when it was necessary for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to seek abroad, and to stockpile, many raw materials necessary to meet our industrial requirements. These included natural rubber, tin, nickel, manganese, mercury, cobalt, industrial diamonds, and quartz crystals. There are many other materials, such as lead, copper, chromium, uranium, and bauxite, which must be imported in quantity to supplement production in this country.

While we have about 35 percent of the world's proved oil resources, those reserves have been determined largely through the initiative of private industry in persistent exploration and discovery. When we consider that the land area of the United States is only 7 percent of the total world land area, it becomes apparent that we must look elsewhere for an explanation of the success of the American private enterprise system. Nor can it be explained by pointing to the large population of the United States which provides a working force for high production. Our population constitutes only 6 percent of the total world population.

The answer lies not in these factors, but rather in the unique character of American competition, the influence of which is felt in every direction and in every activity. Geographical areas compete with other geographical areas; small business competes with large business; industries compete with each other; new inventions compete with old methods; airplanes compete with railroads and bus lines; coal competes with oil; nylon competes with other fabrics; aluminum competes with steel; and so on ad infinitum.

Of equal importance insofar as the individual is concerned is the fact that opportunity is provided as nowhere else to engage in business or professional activity on such a basis that personal return is governed primarily by the individual's ability, initiative, and resourcefulness. A leading American advertising agency recently conducted a survey to determine the starting salaries of top executives of 50 of the largest businesses in the United States. The average for the 1,943 men surveyed was $13.40 week. Only seven had started at more than $25 weekly. This can be matched in no other country.

Critics of our system frequently state that it is basically selfish; that inherently it is an application of the law of the jungle to the economic relationships of people. Nothing could be farther from truth. Obviously there is a small minority which will never obey the rules. Human nature being what it is, I suppose this will always be true. This is not a condition peculiar to the American system. Nevertheless, the vast majority of American businessmen recognize the rules of fair play and operate within those rules because they sincerely believe in them. Indeed, it is good business to do so since violation of these self-imposed standards of conduct promptly brings disapproval.

HIGH ETHICAL PLANE

My 16 years with agencies of the Government—particularly the RFC—whose functions have involved close and intimate working relationships with private industry during the depression years, and especially during the war, has been more than sufficient to convince me that the vast majority of businesses is conducted on an extremely high ethical plane and with full recognition of its tremendous responsibility. This does not mean that American competition is soft.

Business is not engaged in a game of touch football. The going is much more rugged than that. Competition always results in some casualties. Some enterprises cannot survive for a wide variety of reasons—bad management, failure to keep abreast of technical improvements, new inventions, and numerous others. Occasionally, although most of the rules governing business relationships are unwritten, the Government must step in and establish other rules, including, for example, the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Act, the Securities Act of 1933, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Robinson-Patman Act. None of these laws, however, are designed to interfere with private competition, but to preserve it.

Undoubtedly the American system of free enterprise is and will continue to be affected and influenced by Government, acting, we trust, at all times within its proper sphere. Tax laws will be enacted; tariffs will be lowered or raised; interstate commerce will continue to be regulated; freight rates will be subject to Government control; and working conditions in mines and factories will continue to be a proper field for Government action. All these and many more affect the operation of our competitive system. But in the main adjustment to changing conditions in a free enterprise economy will of necessity be achieved through voluntary decisions of private management, farmers, and labor. Admittedly this is all very complicated; it is interacting and interrelated. Nonetheless the simple fact is that it has worked, if judged in terms of the standard of living made possible through its operation.

At the present time, and certainly in the next few years, the American system is, and will be, put to the severest test in history. This Nation must assume obligations of staggering proportions with respect to the reconstruction of devastated areas the world over. Those responsibilities, as well as the demand for goods at home, will require production possibly rivaling even that of the war years. It is a challenge which can be answered successfully only through the closest cooperation of Government, industry, the farmer, the laborer. Such cooperation can exist only if all parties concerned recognize to the fullest extent possible the individual and collective responsibilities imposed by world conditions.

The RFC was originally established in 1932, when we were balanced precariously on the brink of national bankruptcy, and many well-informed people thought the complete destruction of our great American economy was inevitable. The RFC quickly became one of the most important of the several forces responsible for pulling the country out of that terrible depression. Acting through the RFC, the Government provided billions of dollars to banks, insurance companies, railroads, and other business enterprises. This not only permitted the continued operation of those enterprises but more important, from the standpoint of public interest involved, protected and preserved the investment therein of the millions of depositors, investors, and policyholders.

During those grim depression days in the early thirties, as well as during the critical war years, the RFC and industry were able to work together successfully without any ill effect on our free economy or any substantial diminution of the rights and liberties of the individual citizen. We are proud of that record of cooperation and mutual understanding.

When the clouds of World War II first began to appear, Congress, to expedite our national defense program, gave the RFC extremely broad powers and tremendous financial resources to meet the impending emergency. You are all familiar with the tremendous and important role the RFC played in our war effort. Among its major achievements were the purchase of hundreds of critical and strategic materials and the construction and operation of thousands of defense plants for the production of airplanes, tanks, guns, ammunition. Success of these wartime activities was largely attributable to the cooperation and assistance RFC obtained from private industry, due in a large measure to RFC's recognition of the desirability—indeed, the necessity—of utilizing the personnel, experience, facilities, and know-how of private industry, as well as the belief of RFC in the willingness of industry to work with the Government on a friendly and fair basis. We are proud of the wartime record of our relations with industry.

EMERGENCY POWERS OUT

The present Congress has enacted legislation extending the life and functions of the RFC until June 30, 1948. Under the revised law the emergency powers granted the RFC in 1940 were eliminated, and with this action I am in complete agreement and so testified before both the Senate and House Committees. They were too broad for the normal, peacetime activities of the RFC, having been designed basically for wartime use. However, the extension of the RFC recognizes the desirability of having an organization in existence whose powers, in the event of another emergency, can rapidly be expanded.

The RFC is especially qualified from the standpoint of experienced personnel and organization to deal effectively with such emergency situations. The corporate form of governmental organization responsible to the Congress permits flexibility of operation hardly possible in the case of the usual "old line" Government agency or department. With its 31 field offices strategically located throughout the country, the RFC is in position to move promptly and effectively whenever Congress determines that in the national interest its services are required.

Action by the Congress in extending the life of RFC is also a recognition of the fact that there is a field within which Government can supply credit on a safe and sound basis without competition with the credit facilities provided by private credit institutions. In fact, it has always been RFC's policy to assist and augment the credit facilities of those institutions, and I think it is a fair statement that the loans which RFC makes result in the establishment of new businesses and the preservation of old businesses, thus ultimately creating a sound market for the services of private financing institutions.

The illiquid position of the banks in the early and middle thirties prevented them from making many loans which in the national interest should have been made. It also forced the liquidation of loans which in the national interest should have been extended. In those circumstances, the gap which RFC was intended to fill was relatively large. Today, in contrast, the proportion of deserving borrowers who cannot obtain credit from private sources is smaller and the proper area for RFC operation is correspondingly smaller than in the thirties.

Whether the present period of full employment, high production, and favorable markets and prices will continue indefinitely is not for me to say. So long as we can maintain a free competitive economy and can enjoy conditions which will provide individuals with maximum opportunity to engage in competition on a fair basis, we need have no fear for our country's future.

One Hundred Sixty-seventh Anniversary of the Battle of Cowpens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, January 17, was the one hundred sixty-seventh anniversary of the Battle of Cowpens, a notable conflict in the American Revolution in which Gen. Daniel Morgan led our troops to victory over Tarleton and his redcoats.

In recalling this historic battle, I wish again to express my wholehearted support of Mr. RICHARD'S bill, H. R. 3570, now pending in the House, to establish the Cowpens Battleground Park on the site of this Revolutionary victory. A similar bill is pending in the other body.

To commemorate this battle in the South Carolina up-country, a song, Cowpens Battleground, has been published by four South Carolina chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Cowpens chapter, Spartanburg; the Kate Barry chapter, Spartanburg; the Mary Musgrove chapter, Woodruff; the Daniel Morgan chapter, Gaffney.

Music for the song was composed by Mr. Geoffrey O'Hara, and the lyric, which follows, by Mr. Harry Wilkins, well-known poet-businessman of Spartanburg and Gaffney.

COWPENS BATTLEGROUND

O sacred spot of Cherokee,
Where heroes bled and died,
O cradle of true Liberty,
Your glory is our pride.
Here freely ran the warm, red blood
Of strong, young Spartan men,
While battling in cold, winter mud
As British ranks grew thin.
From Carolina's rugged hills,
And faithful Georgia's plains,
Virginia's far-off winding rills,
Men came thru drenching rains,
Then from historic Delaware,
And ardent Maryland;
It seemed they came from everywhere,
This patriotic band!

With Blue Ridge Mountains standing guard,
And Thicketty near by,
Those lean Americans fought hard,
That Right should never die!
By that old Mills' Gap wagon trail
Brave Morgan charged his men:
"We must not fail; we cannot fail!
Today we die or win!"
On your immortal hills and dales,
Redcoats breathed dying breath,
In cattle pens of ancient rails,
And Tyranny met death!
We honor patriot sires today,
Applauding their renown,
And thank Jehovah, we can pray
Without consent of Crown!

Study of the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JANUARY 22, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is enclosed a draft of joint resolution authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reimburse the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government for certain sums expended in connection with its study of the Veterans' Administration, which the Veterans' Administration recommends be enacted into law.

The purpose of the proposal is to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reimburse the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to the extent mutually agreeable to the Administrator and Chairman of the Commission for sums expended by it in extending its study of the Veterans' Administration pursuant to the act of July 7, 1947 (Public Law 162, 80th Cong.), as amended.

Since my appointment as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, I have received numerous complaints about the service being rendered to veterans in connection with their contracts of national service life insurance. Apparently similar complaints have been made to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, as evidenced by its inquiry into the matter of such insurance.

I feel very strongly that veterans are entitled to the best possible service, not only with respect to insurance but also as to all benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration. To this end it is believed that a study of Veterans' Administration's operations and procedures would prove helpful to the Congress and to those of us who administer the laws, and would be in the interest of all citizens, veterans and nonveterans alike.

Apparently my predecessor, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, had a similar view concerning the need for such a study, at least with respect to insurance activities. On September 9, 1947, inquiry on behalf of General Bradley was made to the Comptroller General concerning the authority of the Veterans' Administration to expend appropriated funds for the payment of compensation or expenses to a limited number of specially qualified persons under a contractual agreement whereby they will survey the established procedures and practices of the Veterans' Administration with respect to national service life insurance. By letter (B-69461) dated September 22, 1947, the Comptroller General advised that the procurement of the services of experts for such a purpose would be in contravention of the terms of section 5 of the act of April 6, 1914 (38 Stat. 335; 5 U. S. C. 55), and therefore unauthorized.

General Bradley discussed with Hon. Herbert Hoover, chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the possibility of the Commission undertaking the type of study indicated. No conclusions had been reached at the time that General Bradley left the Veterans' Administration to return to active military duty. After my appointment as Administrator I contacted Mr. Hoover concerning this matter and he agreed to extend the facilities of the Commission to examine into the organization and procedures of the Veterans' Administration in the field of insurance and other authorized activities beyond that contemplated by the Commission in its budgets.

As you know, the Commission is required by the act of July 7, 1947, supra, to investigate present organization and methods of operation of all Federal agencies in the executive branch of the Government. It is understood that the amount of funds available to the Commission would not permit as detailed a study in the Veterans' Administration as was indicated in my discussions with Mr. Hoover. It is the purpose of the proposed joint resolution to supply the funds necessary to meet the additional cost of a more detailed study than the Commission originally contemplated.

In submitting this proposal consideration has been given to the advisability of seeking authority of the Congress for the Veterans' Administration to contract directly with experts to conduct the desired studies. It was concluded that it would be more feasible and sounder policy to utilize the facilities of an existing Government agency which is authorized to engage in such activities.

By reason of the nature of such work, Mr. Hoover and his staff are unable to state with any degree of certainty the probable cost of the proposed extended studies in the Veterans' Administration. However, it has been indicated that the cost would be in the neighborhood of $100,000.

The early and favorable consideration of this proposal will be greatly appreciated. The need for expeditious action in this matter is indicated by the fact that the Commission's report to the Congress is due within 10 days after the Eighty-first Congress is convened and organized.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed resolution for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrator.

Halt! About Face!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by T. O. Thackrey, from the New York Post of January 21, 1948:

HALT! ABOUT FACE!
(By T. O. Thackrey)

We have become so obsessed with war hysteria that we are establishing a dictatorship of fear in democracy's citadel, where reason once ruled in the name of the people and with their consent.

It is time to call a halt.

We have become so determined to beat our plowshares into swords that we have abandoned all—or nearly all—thought of the harvest.

It is time to about-face.

In the name of strengthening democracy we are deliberately and grimly preparing for war—war which may destroy Russia but which is certain to destroy the very democracy in whose name we are preparing to wage it.

As a prelude, the over-age gentlemen who speak so persistently about saving democracy from the perils of Communist dictatorship are tearing up liberty, freedom, and progress by the roots.

We cry that we are determined to die for democracy, when the truth is that we are merely determined to die: democracy requires that we live for it; that we nourish it by extending it; that our vast resources are used to produce a maximum of food, clothing, shelter, health, education.

Our slogan has become bullets, not bread; guns, not butter: and if that has a familiar sound, it is because we have not yet wholly forgotten that this was Hitler's way—and has been the call to arms of every dictator from Attila to Hirohito.

It is time to halt, about-face.

The President's budget calls for an expenditure of well over half our national resources for military purposes.

The President's Air Policy Commission calls for upping that expenditure by billions—not millions—in an ever-increasing ratio over the next 5 years—for military air power alone!

Our only constructive foreign policy—bread instead of bullets, butter instead of guns, tractors rather than tanks—the European recovery program is beginning to lose its greatest constructive force by talk of military conditions—an alliance of arms for the new war.

Is this, then, to be America's price for bread?

It is time to call a halt. Time to about-face. We must give, and give freely, if we are to win friends. It is no bargain to a starving man, if he must pay for the food which gives him life, by merely making himself ready for death by bomb, bayonet, or bullet.

A great and progressive and democratic civil administrator has been removed from the Civil Aeronautics Board—ex-Harvard dean James Landis. The President insists—and here even the Senate restrains him—on replacing this able civilian with a major general of the Army, who is to retain his Army status if the President succeeds.

Is this toward peace—or toward war?

It is time to call a halt; about-face.

In the name of protecting ourselves against communism at home we have begun by denying Government employees the very safeguards of fair trial, freedom of conscience and the right to confront their accusers—rights we fought a revolution to preserve and have fought in two world wars to retain.

It is time to call a halt; about-face.

Sometime ago the proposal that the United States adopt universal military service in peacetime, to give us reserves of military strength if our plans and efforts to achieve the peace should fail seemed sound, sensible, and wise to us, and we gave it our support.

It is time to call a halt; about-face.

We are no longer willing to see this added regimentation of our national human resources in a program already beyond bounds in its emphasis on war, and its neglect of equally determined effort to win the peace.

Only if we reorient our policy—determine to place our best brains, our power, our resources, our all-out effort—at work on the constructive task of restoring hope by making the United Nations, and work within its framework, the cornerstone of our policy, would we be willing to consider peacetime conscription as useful, if necessary.

Only, of course, if we do so, neither peacetime conscription nor peacetime budgets with 75 percent of our resources for military purposes will be necessary.

The Distilling Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, in my State of Kentucky, and in other States with distilling capacity, the recent distillery holiday seriously interfered with the food-producing efforts of the farmers. Cattle had been purchased in the West and brought to Kentucky for finishing. The feeders contracted with various distillers for their byproduct. The distillers then were shut down by the efforts of the Luckman committee. There was no feed available for the cattle and they were taken to the stockyards and sold. These were unfinished cattle, not ready for market, and the farmer who had purchased the cattle lost the freight from Texas to Kentucky. In other cases in Kentucky, the distillers fed corn out of their elevators to the livestock in their feeding lots because no byproduct was available.

A protein concentrate is necessary to obtain milk production, egg production, broiler growth, and in the finishing of beef and pork. Distillers' dried grains, along with soybean meal, cottonseed meal, and other products provide such a concentrate. When the distilleries shut down, the supply of concentrate is diminished with resulting higher prices. We talk at great length here in the Halls of Congress about the price of butter and the price of beef, and in the very next breath we pass legislation to cut off the flow of protein concentrates so vital in the production of these items. The farmers of my State are having great difficulty in planning an intelligent, comprehensive feeding program, in view of the hit-or-miss policy of the Congress and the Department of Agriculture in the operation of the distilling industry.

DISRUPTION TO EMPLOYMENT

It was stated by the Citizens Food Committee, otherwise known as the Luckman committee, that only 414 persons had become unemployed due to the voluntary shut-down in the distilling industry. I consider this statement completely at variance with any realistic study of the facts. Most of the major distillers attempted to keep all of their employees at work during the holiday because they were assured it would be temporary in nature. They made work for the men and the National Distillers Products Corp. alone incurred an idle-plant expense for this period in excess of $1,000,000. Obviously, over a long-term period, regardless of their desire to do so, the operating companies cannot continue to maintain these padded pay rolls even though they have a strong desire to take care of their loyal employees. Apparently, the Citizens Food Committee gave no expression to the tremendous lay-offs that occurred in the allied industries. The white-oak cooperage industry is dependent entirely on the operation of the distilleries of this Nation. Thousands of men were laid off during the holiday in the forests, in the sawmills, and in the cooperage plants. The distillery employees of my State rightly feel that it is a great injustice to discriminate against them, especially in view of the fact that no over-all food saving develops as a result of this discrimination. There are counties in Kentucky where a distillery provides the only industrial pay roll and there are many farmers in Kentucky dependent on the byproduct from the operation of that distillery.

LOSS OF TAXES

From a 56-pound bushel of corn, average distillers can produce 4¾ gallons of 100-proof whisky. At the present excise-tax rate, the Federal Government collects $42.75 in excise taxes alone from the whisky produced from 1 bushel of grain. The average State government collects an additional $6.90. These two figures total $49.65 in excise taxes alone. There are many additional revenues received directly and indirectly by Federal, State, and local governments through other taxes, licenses, and permit fees. In the calendar year of 1946, Federal, State, and local governments received a total of approximately $2,500,000,000 from taxes and fees levied on distilled spirits. Congress is now making efforts to reduce personal income taxes. The elimination of the above-named excise taxes will in no way simplify that problem.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Activities of the distilling industry to improve the Nation's complex economy by helping to provide high protein feed concentrates has received the blessing and the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture. Last year Assistant Secretary Charles E. Brannan had this to say: "The Department of Agriculture is quite proud of the fact that it not only urged but aided the distilling industry to get into this program." We now find the Department of Agriculture urging a program which reduces the supply of high protein feed concentrates, even though they exceed in animal food value the grain from which they are produced. In a press release on October 27, 1947, 2 days after the inception of the recent distillery holiday, the Agricultural Research Administration of the Department of Agriculture pointed out that insects and rodents account for a loss of 9 percent of the stored grain and cereal products in this country every year. This means that rats and weavil destroy about 10 times the grain used by the distilling industry. It seems to me that if some time and money were expended on an educational program to reduce this loss, we would make a real contribution toward our over-all agricultural economy. Here is a real opportunity to do something to provide more food for the world.

I sincerely trust, Mr. Speaker, that the very competent Committee on Banking and Currency and its distinguished chairman will arrange to hold exhaustive hearings on this entire matter and not rush through legislation extending the powers of the President from month to month to curtail the use of grain for beverage-distilling purposes. It is my honest conviction that the food production of this country is not in any way increased by such curtailment. Let us examine this thoroughly from a practical, unemotional, and dispassionate point of view.

Fuel-Oil Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the Christian Science Monitor editorial of Friday, January 16, Why Is Fuel Oil Short?

WHY IS FUEL OIL SHORT?

Will that oil in the tank hold out until the tank truck comes again? Which will win in the first big race of 1948, the creeping depletion of fuel-oil reserves or the "rustle of spring"? For some millions of people, anxiety prompts another question: Why is fuel oil so short this winter?

The situation, when stated in general terms, is not hard to understand. Petroleum production is at an all-time high. But consumption is even higher. A month ago it was estimated that the demand for fuel oil would run 3.3 percent ahead of supply until the end of the heating season. That

means dipping into reserve stocks at the rate of almost 7,000,000 gallons per day. These reserves are distributed all the way from big refinery tank "farms" to the small dealer's retired tank car.

Some storage nearest the consumer is pretty slim. A process of progressive depletion allows safety margins almost to zero. The margin in transportation is also thin. Tank-car production, although increasing, has not caught up with the need. Too many tankers, Navy and others, were laid up, and it takes weeks to condition them for service.

In such a situation any interruption in the flow from well to consumer—whether by strikes, bad weather, or inability to shift short transportation around quickly—can cut down that slender margin into a frigid famine. Interruptions from all these causes have occurred. They have aggravated shortages basically created by increased demand.

Nevertheless, there is something about the specific crises and the conservation measures so far undertaken that seem disturbingly unreal. The petroleum industry rests its campaign on urging not only reasonable building temperatures, which make sense, but also such things as insulating and weatherstripping, which either were done during the war or can hardly be done now before the pinch is over. In some areas it has announced 15 percent cuts in consumer deliveries, but has yet to make clear who does the rationing—the buyer or the seller.

One is forced to wonder why the petroleum industry underguessed so badly—why it waited so late to go after more tankers. Also why the oil-burner manufacturers (who installed 475,000 units in 1946 and were putting out 50,000 a month last summer, 127,591 in September) and the oil producers haven't paid attention to each other's figures.

For the present, however, those dependent on fuel oil are chiefly concerned with their prospects of keeping warm. Where real oil famines occur, it is going to take measures more immediate than insulation and more positive than utterly unpoliceable thermostat setting to prevent freezing homes before spring.

State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I inserted in the RECORD the third in a series of editorials on the State of the Union, taken from the New York Post and written by Ted Thackrey, whom I am proud to call friend, and who is, with his wife, Dorothy Backer Thackrey, editor and publisher of the Post.

The editorial brought so many comments from Members who had not seen the series, and who wished to read all of Ted Thackrey's sharp, realistic, and commonsense comments that I am inserting I and II of the series today:

[From the New York Post of January 6, 1948]

STATE OF THE UNION—I

(By T. O. Thackrey)

It is a tragic paradox that at this moment in history, when the United States of America is the envy of the world because of unwatched power and material wealth, we are also the despair of mankind because of the poverty of our statesmanship.

At home and abroad we have permitted fear, timidity, and cupidity to usurp the leadership of courage, self-confidence, and humanity without which democracy cannot survive, nor can freedom, liberty, and justice.

Tomorrow the President presents to the Congress his report on the state of the Union. In this fateful session the Congress, by its actions, will serve either to rekindle the light of the world or extinguish hope's flickering flame for centuries to come.

Now is the time for all of us, as citizens responsible for the representation we have in the White House and the Congress, to examine the state of the Union and demand that the power and the resources which belong to us be used to serve the desperate needs of the many, rather than the selfish and destructive aims of the few.

It is only faintly helpful that we are in the year of national elections, whereby we can before its close register with our votes our approval of certain public officials and our disapproval of others.

But even this period is too long a time to wait; in those short months decisions will be taken in the name of the people that may rob us forever of an effective voice in our destiny.

It is the purpose of this and succeeding editorials to observe the nature of our more outstanding problems, look squarely at our failures as a Nation to measure up to our responsibilities, and to suggest remedies within our power to apply.

First, let us determine to rid ourselves of fear, recognizing that fear is the father of hysteria, and hysteria the murderer of reason.

No wiser words have been spoken in our time than those of Franklin Delano Roosevelt when he reminded us at another time of crisis that there is nothing to fear save fear itself.

Even the most superficial examination of our resources and strengths should be enough to prove that it is not the means we lack to banish fear, but the will to progressive and constructive action.

Our irrational fears have blinded us, not only to our strength, but have obscured for us, in a kind of red haze, the recognition of our real enemies * * * the enemies of all people, everywhere.

The enemies of mankind are war, hunger, poverty, disease, ignorance, slavery, discrimination, bigotry, insecurity, hate.

Fear of all, or some, of these disasters has gripped us as a nation in such a profound neurosis we are in danger of suffering the fate of the giant who was bound helpless as he slept by the pygmies of Lilliput.

Yet we alone among all the peoples of the world have the instruments and means to conquer these real enemies.

The United Nations, conceived by President Roosevelt and established at the call of America, deriving the major share of its material support justly from us since we have the greatest means, is the finest instrument ever fashioned by man to substitute international law for the blind passions of brute force between nations.

Fear has driven us too often from its halls. Courage and self-confidence must require us to persistently demonstrate our reliance upon its machinery to provide peaceful and just solutions.

It has been fearfully protested that the United Nations is weak, without power to enforce its decisions, helpless in the face of conflicting national interest.

And yet, if in place of nationalistic adventures sparked by fear, we determined to place our entire military establishment wholly at the command of the United Nations.

[From the New York Post of January 7, 1948]

STATE OF THE UNION—II

(By T. O. Thackrey)

While a hostile Congress listens to the President's report on the State of the Union, our destiny is being shaped by momentous events outside the legislative halls in Washington.

War—the most destructive scourge of mankind—is beginning in Palestine because of our neglect; in Greece and in China our arms, our munitions, our dollars, and even our military forces are pledged to Fascist-minded governments in their fratricidal conflict with communism.

In a blind terror of being scorched by an ever-advancing red flame, we have chosen to fight it with the gasoline of reaction instead of the water of reason.

Only in the European recovery program have we given genuine evidence of confidence in the strength of our democracy and a determination to use its vast resources to conquer democracy's real enemies—poverty, hunger, disease, and ignorance.

Even there, a reckless Republican Congress appears determined to make certain that our aid will once again be too little and too late.

It is not enough merely to bemoan our carelessness in electing Senators and Representatives who are bent on crippling humanitarian programs and frustrating the President's effective and specific plan for controlling inflation. It is not even enough to resolve upon their defeat at the polls next fall.

Grave as the effect of congressional heedlessness will be upon our lives, it is possible that we could, nonetheless, survive long enough to take an active rather than an academic interest in politics.

We cannot, however, survive a continuation on a global scale of a foreign policy which is more and more substituting unilateral action on a nationalistic basis for collective action within the United Nations.

If the United Nations seems weak, we must strengthen it.

If it lacks power, we must supply it.

It will be effective only if we insist upon making it effective; it will have both the means and the will to make decisions and to enforce them, if, and only if, we endow it with our best statesmen and support it with at least as generous a hand as we lavish on our ill-favored Fascist friends abroad.

It is argued that Russia is acting unilaterally; that the national interests of Russia and the United States are colliding around the world; that Russia refuses to abide by United Nations decisions which conflict with her policies; that Russia will veto, boycott, and perhaps finally withdraw, and this is, in the main, true; but the failures of the United Nations can scarcely be said to be exclusively Russian—they are American and British, also, and for the same basic reasons, an insistence on holding national sovereignty above international authority.

But unless our national interests are merged with international interests, and even made subordinate to them, it is inevitable that our national collisions around the world will result in war on a global scale.

The United Nations is an instrument conceived by us, nurtured by us, and shamefully neglected by us in the very functions it was organized to bring about—a peaceful compromise of differences among nations.

We must determine not only to make use of the United Nations as our basic instrument of foreign policy but to make certain that its decisions can be enforced and are enforced.

Specifically, Arabia in making war upon Palestine, and Great Britain by condoning war, are in fact making war on the United Nations.

The United States has not been above supplying arms to Arabia while piously embargoing shipments at the moment arms might have been useful to the Jewish state.

Arms, military power, funds—all these should be supplied—but to the United Nations for enforcement of its will. The United Nations will act promptly and effectively if the United States insists.

Certainly, here no conflict will be found with Russia. Judea was the fruit of Russian-American cooperation.

The United States without delay should present both to the Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations our intimate knowledge of the threat to the peace of the world in Greece and in China.

Our national commitments to each of those unhappy countries should be withdrawn in favor of international commitments to the United Nations, together with an insistence that the United Nations promptly determine the formula for peace, and that we, in turn, will place our power and our resources at the disposal of the United Nations rather than to any faction in either area.

This is a formula for peace.

This is a formula for a really democratic foreign policy.

It is, in fact, the only means of maintaining and advancing democracy, and establishing a world of law rather than anarchy.

Gambling in Grains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and in compliance with a request from the Honorable Adam Frick, of Portsmouth, Ohio, I am inserting the following letter in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Adam Frick, of Portsmouth, Ohio, was mayor of that city for several terms. He also represented Scioto County, Ohio, in the general assembly or State legislature for two terms.

PORTSMOUTH, OHIO, *December 13, 1947.*

Re gambling in grains.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMAN: Even before the induction of Roosevelt into the Presidency, following the cruel state of conditions which bankrupted most farmers of this republic, I insisted that gambling in grains be denied by appropriate Federal legislation. During the current decade I have pressed the matter at every opportunity, but have had to wait until now for recognition.

Grinding farmers' grains had been my business for well over a half century, now three score ten and ten years. During that time I have always had to do with the American farmer, and still have my major investments in these very necessary objectives. Legislation has in the interim been enacted allegedly to benefit, better the lot of the farmer, like county agents, university extension services, and countless isms, under very attractive titles. None of these introductions have saved agriculture from conditions which continue to drive youngsters from our farms. Propagandists of this twentieth century, want farmers wheat, corn, and hogs at 1914 levels, even every other less necessary convenience has risen 200 percent.

I am very deeply grateful for your timely recognition, as of October 5, 1947, of the evils that grow out of gambling in farm commodities. Arresting this sinister practice, which has been permitted uninterruptedly, will redound to the benefit and peace of all mankind on or off the farms. Legislation to prohibit this juggling in food commodities must immediately be enacted. Let those who want to live by way of gambling put their money on Joe Louis, Babe Ruth, Knute Rockne, Maude S., Man of War, or their successors, but not on the sweat of our folk who toil with the Lord in his earth.

Senate investigations reveal that the American taxpayer has paid for these added bureaucrats stationed over all of our 48 States who compile figures and forecasts, not for the welfare of mankind but for the benefit of those who seek to gain riches on odds to harm the others. These insiders grease the way for friends who can carry on the high-handed practices uninterrupted. Pauley says "seeking him out is mere peanuts." He should be commended for that frank statement, alarming as it is, because it confirms what I have always recognized. For these sins there is no fitting name.

Millions—yes; billions—have been made in grain speculation. True, millions—yes; billions—have been lost. But at that, all have had a demoralizing effect on the producers, who sweat in bringing in the sheaves. Prices at the farm must have governmental protection. Wheat, corn, and hogs are necessary to the human race each and every day. Their prices must be fixed at the farm, and be the same every day through the year, not shoved up and then down at the pleasure of these gamblers who never have seen a grain of wheat, corn, or a hog, neither would grow them for even twice the current price. You cannot stop the bit of opening through which these leaks drip information to friends in and out of these various departments that quicken their pace to the trading posts where the farmers sweat and labors are trafficked in every hour of the day, while he and his family on the farms have their hands to the plow and their backs bent working with that which brings daily bread. Pauley says that if Congress wants to outlaw trading, such as it is, then pass a law to that effect. Do that and give our farmers the protection due them and every other from a government by and for all people.

Very truly,

ADAM FRICK.

If trading in these commodities is an honorable business, why the squirming?

Mr. Lewis' Reply to Mr. Krug

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter written by Mr. J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, which I am informed, was mailed to leaders in the coal industry, and also a copy of a letter written by Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, in reply to the letter from Mr. Krug.

Mr. Lewis, in his wisdom, has correctly stated that the bituminous-coal industry is the outstanding example of an American industry doing an adequate production job without cost to the taxpayers and independent of bureaucratic advice. The labor and operators in the coal industry have done an unprecedented job in production and the same can be said of practically all of our industry. The bottlenecks which have been most troublesome in the postwar period can be traceable in most cases to governmental interference. The men who have developed and operate the coal industry know best how to continue this production.

JANUARY 19, 1948.

The bituminous-coal industry of the United States is on the threshold of a new era in which the prospects for a higher level of economic well-being are bright and in which even greater accomplishments can be made in coal research, safety, conservation, and other activities of importance to the industry. To obtain these objectives, however, particularly in the coming years when the demand for American coals probably will be confined largely to our normal domestic markets, will require foresight, planning, and action by the leaders of the coal industry.

It is believed that there is much that can be done cooperatively by the industry's own leaders to assure a stable future for its affairs. For that reason, and in order that I may have the benefit of the industry's point of view in current and future coal matters, I am anxious to establish a Coal Advisory Council composed of outstanding leaders in the coal industry who will serve as consultants and advisers to the Secretary of the Interior. Accordingly, I am pleased to invite you to become a member of the Council and to meet with me in the Secretary's conference room, Interior Building, in Washington, 10 a. m., Tuesday, January 27, 1948, personally to discuss the organization of the council. I shall appreciate a reply by telegraph if you will be able to attend.

Sincerely,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of Interior.

JANUARY 22, 1948.

Hon. J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I refer to your letter of January 19, re appointment of a coal advisory council. I suggest as follows:

1. It is questionable that you possess the authority to designate yourself or anyone else for the task of designing a pattern of production, distribution, or regulation for the bituminous coal industry. It is the outstanding example of an American industry doing an adequate production job without cost to taxpayers and independent of bureaucratic advice.

2. You have previously demonstrated your total lack of ability to comprehend the problems of the coal industry, as well as your complete lack of concern for its requirements. For 2 years you have done nothing to aid the industry in securing machinery for replacements or railroad cars to transport its product to market. Fifty million tons of production were lost during the calendar year 1947 through such inaction.

3. I can conceive of nothing more anemic or futile than a coal industry advisory council attempting to give private advice to you. You have had such a committee to advise you on oil, and it is to be fervently hoped that the consumers of coal will be spared the present unhappy fate of the consumers of oil.

4. The coal industry has no present problem affecting production that management and men in the industry cannot meet if provided adequate mining equipment and transportation. Congress has not bestowed upon you the power to establish controls for this industry. Recently you asked for such power, including the power to freeze wages, which was a gratuitous insult to the men employed in the mining industry. In the absence of the necessity for such a committee and congressional authority empowering you to act, which I am sure Congress will withhold from you, the undersigned in the exercise of commonsense reasoning is forced to decline your invitation.

Yours truly,

JOHN L. LEWIS.

Challenges and Responsibilities of American Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 21), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Challenges and Responsibilities of American Law," which I delivered at a luncheon meeting of the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D. C., on January 22.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF AMERICAN LAW

Mr. Chairman, members of the Federal bar, my friends, it is a privilege to appear before your group this noon, and at the outset I wish to express my appreciation.

In a very real sense, I feel that I have a great deal in common with this group today. We are all members of the same profession, and we are all servants of the people. We work for the people and we work with the people.

In addition to the professional standards and ethical requirements which members of our profession must always seek to maintain, we also have an additional obligation as public servants—particularly those of us who are at times acting in a quasi-judicial capacity.

Our job is to serve the people and it is absolutely imperative for us to remember that at all times. It is not enough for us to be good lawyers; we must also be good and faithful servants.

COUNSEL TO LAWYERS

On this matter of being better servants of the people and better lawyers, I should like, by way of introduction, to cite a bit of counsel that I respectfully submitted to a group of lawyers, judges, and embryo lawyers back in my own State sometime ago.

When we were in college we used to present to one of the old practitioners who taught us, various questions which he couldn't answer. Some of the boys used to indicate surprise at this apparent lack of knowledge on his part.

This teacher would therefore comment to them in this manner: "A lawyer isn't one who always knows. If he always knows, he is either a darn fool or a darn liar and he will make a poor counselor. Don't be ashamed to say 'I don't know.' You will be fortunate to know even after you have spent time to look up the law."

You and I know that a lawyer or anyone else who always knows the answers is generally an unsafe person to follow, and folks usually find him out to be unsafe. Here is another suggestion that came to us in law school days, and it is just as valuable today in Washington as it was then. It is this. Every day take at least 15 minutes apart from your work and profession. Lose yourself, so to speak, in reading the great truths in the Bible, in listening to good music, in reading good books or poetry (if need be in your lunch hour). Do your Boy Scout good deed. In other words, get apart from your law, and you will be a better lawyer because such action clears your brain and you will be better able to see your way. By "seeing your way," an old practitioner said, "you will be able to see the issues clearly and then prepare your case accordingly."

The same wise counselor gave us three other vital guidespots for life:

(A) Develop a sense of humor. Be able to laugh at yourself and with other people.

(B) Develop a good disposition. It oils the wheels of everyday life making for friends and clients, and it saves you from resentment and jealousy.

(C) Seek common sense (which includes faith). It will solve more problems than mere ability or great talent.

Man does not live by bread alone, and wise is the lawyer who realizes that he does not live by or for his law business alone or law work alone.

Now what about your legal work and mine in government?

PROBLEMS OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

Our interest in government is not only that of the average taxpaying American citizen but is also that of a worker within the governmental machinery itself. We are in the process of developing new techniques of administrative procedure—particularly with respect to hearings examiners—techniques which, I feel, will do much to eliminate the criticisms which have been directed at governmental lawyers in the past.

Most of us who are present here today are involved in the vast networks which we call administrative law.

This network has grown out of the myriad complexities of present-day government and is probably the outstanding legal development of the twentieth century just as the growth of equity was the outstanding legal development of the eighteenth century, and the expansion of legislative activity was the most widely discussed phase of legal development in the nineteenth century.

There are, of course, those agencies of government whose function is purely executive. There are other agencies which exercise in addition to executive powers subordinate legislative or judicial powers in some degree, at least.

HIGH STANDARDS FOR GOVERNMENT LAWYERS

Administrative law is largely an operating system rather than a common-law subject, although there is a large degree of common law in State administrative law. Only portions of administrative law can be derived from court decisions. Administrative law evolves in a surprising degree from established practices of administrative agencies. That is why it is so imperative that in our administrative agencies, we have the highest caliber legal talent available.

I am certain that this group here today shares with me the fervent desire to maintain the highest possible standards for our corps of Federal lawyers.

However, it is not my purpose here today to discuss either administrative law or the role which attorneys in the Federal service play in the field of administrative law.

Instead I am going to discuss briefly the subject which has been suggested to me as being of particular interest to this group, both as lawyers and as citizens of the District of Columbia.

EFFECT OF THE RECENT RICHMOND DECISION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Undoubtedly every member of this group is familiar with the recent majority decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at Richmond which in effect invalidated a 1940 act giving Federal courts the same jurisdiction to hear disputes between a Washington man and a citizen of a State which those courts already possess in cases involving disputes between citizens of two States.

I am certain at the outset that you gentlemen, as lawyers and as citizens, do not want to reside in a kind of judicial no-man's-land. That is why you are rightly concerned with this recent decision.

I am reluctant to comment on the decision or even on the possibility of legislation permitting citizens of the District of Columbia to sue in Federal courts unless I preface it by stating very definitely that I do not want to have any statement of mine construed in any way as instruction or advice or comment for the Supreme Court in the event it decides to review the Richmond ruling.

I have constantly sought to maintain separate and independent the three coequal branches of our Government, each one of which is sovereign in its own sphere. Of course, it is obvious that the Supreme Court has absolute right to make whatever decision it deems appropriate if it reviews this case.

BACKGROUND OF 1940 ACT

The act of April 20, 1940, represented an attempt to include the District of Columbia within the diversity of citizenship jurisdiction of Federal district courts. In other words, the provision was worded so that a suit between a citizen of a State and a citizen of the District of Columbia amounted to a diversity of citizenship conferring original jurisdiction on the Federal district courts in that class of claims.

My interest in this matter stems, in part, from the fact that a similar provision is now pending before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary as a part of the proposed codification of title 28 of the United States Code in section 1332 thereof.

The proponents of such legislation point out that the need for the legislation is based on the case of *Hepburn* v. *Ellzey*, wherein Chief Justice Marshall ruled that the District of Columbia was not a "State" within the meaning of the term as used in the Constitution and that consequently a citizen of the District could not sue in the courts of the United States on the ground of diversity of citizenship. These citizens, of course, can sue in the Federal courts of the District itself.

The constitutionality of the provision in question has been considered in Federal courts a number of times and there have been eight decisions holding the statute unconstitutional.

There are two cases upholding the constitutionality—the most recent decision on the issue is, of course, that of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in the Tidewater Transfer case.

It is indicated that a writ of certiorari will be sought in the Supreme Court in this particular case. I might add that in both circuit court of appeals decisions, one circuit judge dissented from the judgment of the court.

BASIS FOR AFFIRMING ACTS' CONSTITUTIONALITY

The courts who have upheld the constitutionality have considered:

1. The dictum of Chief Justice Marshall in *Hepburn* v. *Ellzey*, supra, that "This is a subject for legislative not for judicial consideration"; and

2. Article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution gives Congress, among other powers, the authority to "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District" as might become the seat of the Federal Government. Consequently, this power would appear to go so far as to authorize Congress to grant citizens of the District of Columbia the privilege of suing in the Federal courts of the several States.

BASIS FOR AFFIRMING UNCONSTITUTIONALITY

Those courts which have denied the constitutionality point to article III, section 2, of the Constitution, providing that the judicial power of the United States shall extend among other instances to controversies "Between citizens of several States," since the term "State" has been defined by the Supreme Court as excluding the District of Columbia. These courts thus hold that Congress could not constitutionally enact legislation beyond the judicial authority conferred on the United States.

Chief Justice Marshall once said that the statute cannot extend the jurisdiction beyond the limits of the Constitution.

The argument has been that Chief Justice Marshall's dictum in *Hepburn* v. *Ellzey* was not intended to decide literally that legislation could be enacted to remedy the situation, since the term "legislative" was used in a broad sense which would include the process of amending the Constitution. This raises a number of very interesting legal questions. One thing is, however, certain and that is that when the citizens of the District are denied a privilege accorded to those of the States, their situation is unusual and unfortunate.

PROBLEM BEFORE US NOW

Chief Justice Marshall's statement about the anomaly of the present situation under which the United States courts are open to aliens and citizens of other States, but not to District of Columbia citizens, stands as a very clear definition of the present problem.

To establish a kind of judicial twilight zone, in which there is a District black-out of the privileges accorded to the citizens of the several States, hardly seems fair to the people of a great city—a people who have made the same sacrifices in the war as the citizens in the several States. I believe that this subject is a proper subject for study by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and it is possible that it should perhaps be the subject of a proposal for a constitutional amendment—a matter in which I have already indicated my keen interest.

CONCLUSION

Now, in closing, I wish again to pay tribute to the interest which your group has in maintaining its professional and ethical standards in the administrative law field.

The lawyer in government is a career man whose work should be rewarded and whose tenure should be safeguarded in a manner commensurate with his interest and his professional standards.

It has been my privilege in the first session of the Eightieth Congress to work with members of your group, particularly in connection with the consideration of nominees for judicial office. While I do not desire to see the legislative branch encroach in any way on the proper exercise of the executive authority to nominate and appoint, I am equally zealous in maintaining that "advice and consent" shall be more than a phrase. It is my continued intention to consult with bar-association groups and with groups such as this one to secure competent professional advice on the professional standards and acceptability of nominees proposed by the executive branch.

In the field of judicial nominations and in many fields relating to administrative law, it should be possible and probable for the legislative branch to consult with lawyers in the Federal service in furtherance of our mutual interest in good government.

Address by Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, in Reply to Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 21), 1948

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] at Providence, R. I., on January 19, 1948, in reply to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow citizens, last Thursday United States Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, an avowed candidate for the Republican nomination for President, addressed a gathering of his fellow Republicans here. He evidently had the purpose of getting the support of the Rhode Island delegates at the Republican National Convention. Senator TAFT was speaking as a candidate and he clearly defined the ultra-conservative course that he will follow, if and when he receives the Republican nomination for President, and if and when he is elected President of the United States.

Senator TAFT criticized severely the so-called New Deal, inaugurated and developed by our great President, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. For the information of Senator TAFT and as a reminder to our Republican friends, I desire to point out that at each succeeding election President Roosevelt increased his plurality in our State and that in the 1946 election Rhode Island was one of the few States to elect a Democratic United States Senator and two Democratic Representatives in Congress—in other words, a complete Democratic congressional delegation—also, a Democratic Governor together with a complete Democratic slate of general officers. In my opinion, the last place in the world for Senator TAFT to criticize the New Deal was here in "Little Rhody," where the 1932 depression is still sadly remembered for its hardships and sacrifices, and the New Deal is remembered for its assistance to our businessmen and those in need, for its liberal social-security program and its help to all our citizens.

As chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, Senator TAFT is in the foreground as a leader in his party and under his guidance the policy of the Republican majority in the Senate is formulated and promulgated. As leader of this majority his lot is not a happy one and his ultra-conservative policies and his ultrapartisan maneuvers for carrying them into effect are not in accordance with the views of many of the liberal members of the GOP who subordinate party to country when legislation affecting the welfare of all our people is concerned.

Among these Republican Senators who have many times disagreed with Senator TAFT and his policies, are Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, Senator BALDWIN, of Connecticut, and that former Rhode Islander, Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont. These Senators, all New Englanders, all staunch Americans, have from time to time disagreed with Senator TAFT and have publicly stated that fact. Senator AIKEN called for the resignation of Carroll Reece as chairman of the Republican National Committee and stated that "he failed miserably to win the confidence of the voting public." Carroll Reece, it will be remembered, was named chairman of the Republican National Committee by Senator TAFT and his friends. Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, a liberal, called upon the Republican national chairman, in a public statement, to issue a "manifesto" assuring the country that the Republicans in Congress "are Americans before they are party members" and that they stood ready to cooperate with the Democrats in important foreign and domestic policies. Of course, as yet, Mr. Reece has not complied with the suggestion that he resign nor heeded the appeal that the Republican Party cooperate with the Democratic Party in foreign and domestic policies. If Mr. Reece had so complied he would have found himself in conflict with his patron, Senator TAFT.

After Senator TAFT's radio address criticizing President Truman's message to the special session of Congress last November, Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, and Senator BALDWIN, of Connecticut, together with other Senators attending a Republican Party conference, are reported to have rebuked Senator TAFT for his radio criticism. These liberal Senators wanted it definitely known that Senator TAFT was speaking as a Presidential candidate rather than a Senate leader and that he was speaking for himself and not for the Republican majority in the Senate.

These Senators had many complaints regarding Senator TAFT's speech and pointed out that many of the suggestions made in the President's program had previously been recommended by a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, of which Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, was chairman and of which a majority were members of Senator TAFT's own party. In this connection we should remember that Senator TAFT's policy is clear. As expectant contender with President Truman for the Presidency, he must not admit that President Truman is right about anything he says or does. I don't suppose there is anyone familiar with politics who could not have foretold that whatever the President's program would be, Senator TAFT would be ready to condemn it, as he did that very same evening. If the Senator himself had drafted the message that he thought President Truman ought to deliver and had President Truman delivered it, the Senator still would have found no difficulty in pointing out how full of faults it was—sins of commission and also omission.

Speaking of sins of omission, I believe that many of those who listened to Senator TAFT last Thursday evening were sadly disappointed that he did not discuss at length either price controls, or anti-inflation measures, or adequate housing, or other subjects affecting the daily life of the average citizen. The most important subject under discussion in the Senate is that of controlling prices and I believe that this subject is of more interest and concern to the average citizen than any other matter affecting him and his family. But Senator TAFT conveniently ignored price controls, and did not advise his Rhode Island friends as to whether he concurred with the suggestions of Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, who only recently in a public statement reported that he and numerous other liberal Republican Senators favored meat rationing. I do not believe it is necessary for us to establish another OPA. However, it does seem necessary that some form of control be exercised in order that the price of food and commodities may be brought within the reach of our average citizens.

What Senator TAFT's proposals are to combat the inflation already mounting, we cannot tell, for he ignored this subject entirely. Perhaps he was fearful that he might unwittingly agree with President Truman.

With regard to housing, you may have forgotten, as Senator TAFT apparently has, that he was one of the sponsors of the Taft-Wagner-Ellender housing bill. This measure, after lengthy hearings, was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Banking and Currency and has been on the Senate Calendar since last April. It may have served the purpose of being something to which Senator TAFT may point as proof of his interest in the subject, but no action has been taken by him, so far as I know, to have this bill considered, and in the meantime tens of thousands of our citizens, including thousands of veterans, are begging for housing and Federal assistance to obtain homes for their families.

Neither in his address here nor in his many addresses as a leader of the Republicans in the Senate has he offered any inkling as to when this housing bill, or for that matter, *any* housing bill, will be considered either by the Senate or the House. If he has forgotten, I beg to assure him that the people of Rhode Island have not.

There is another matter which Senator TAFT failed to mention but which is looming large in the coming campaign, namely, the Taft-Hartley labor law, of which he is a cosponsor. Here, again, he seems to have felt that he has fulfilled his duty on the subject when he lends his name to the introduction of a bill, or, perhaps, he hesitated to do this because he was speaking in a large industrial center and our population includes substantial groups of working people. I voted against this Taft labor bill and also to sustain the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley bill, as it was then called. I regret that this was enacted into law over the President's veto and I hope that at some future date this act, if not repealed, will be amended so that it will be impartial in its treatment of labor and management.

Senator TAFT in his speech here dwelt at length on the President's budget and in particular on compulsory military training and appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Forces. I am not surprised that he assumed the role of a military strategist. Nor am I surprised at his suggestion that "If the air is as important as this report indicates it would seem that there might be a further cut in the expenditures for the Navy and the ground forces." Those of us who must listen to him daily in the Senate have learned that there is no subject on which he hesitates to set his own opinion above that of any expert. We Rhode Islanders, living on the Atlantic seaboard, are, I know, definitely in favor of a large Navy, adequately equipped and supplied and fully manned to protect our shores against the enemies of our peace and security. So I know that you agree with me that our Navy should be given the best of modern equipment and that our officers and enlisted men should be the best trained and the best paid Navy men in the world.

With regard to our ground forces, both Army and Navy, I am definitely in favor of retaining a large Military Establishment until the pence of the world is secured and nations behind the iron curtain and elsewhere realize that the United States will not tolerate the spread of their doctrines by aggression. Senator TAFT seems to disagree with this proposal to an extent he left rather uncertain.

President Truman has himself recommended all the cuts for the Army and Navy which he felt safe for the country. However, I have no assurances that Senator TAFT and his Republican policy committee and the Republican majority in both Senate and House will not recommend further cuts. I am firmly convinced that if the Marshall plan is not put into effect for our self-protection we will be forced to adopt not only universal military training but also a pence-time draft. I trust that the Republican majority in Congress will not follow Senator TAFT and cut further the appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Forces.

With regard to universal military training, I am at a loss to understand how he believes that we can maintain our huge air bases, our Naval and Military Establishments through voluntary enlistments. The Army, including the Army Air Corps, is now about 100,000 enlistments short of the quota established for this year in spite of strenuous efforts made to stimulate recruiting. Compulsory military training has been discussed in the Senate committees and has been advocated by many patriotic Americans who believe that until peace is assured, the United States must have a well-trained, well-equipped Army, Navy, and Air Force, not to be used for aggressive action but to forestall another catastrophe such as Pearl Harbor and what followed.

Senator TAFT, when speaking here, cautiously avoided mentioning to his audience the secret meeting of 20 Republican Senators, the majority of whom disagreed with Senator VANDENBERG, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and President of the Senate, as to his views on the Marshall plan. Senator TAFT, according to press reports was not present at this meeting. However, many of his colleagues were in attendance and voiced their opposition to the plan sponsored by General Marshall for European recovery. The Marshall plan, my fellow citizens, is the only program for world recovery submitted to the Congress of the United States. It is sponsored by that great American, soldier, and statesman, George C Marshall, and recommended for enactment by President Truman in order to establish and maintain peace in the world. A plan such as this should not be adopted piecemeal—it should not be cut down here and there. To be effective it should be adopted in its entirety. I believe, with most of the members of my own party and with many of the members of the Republican Party, that no consideration of party politics should affect our vote on this matter of such great importance to our country and to the world. Furthermore, we must consider, not only the sacrifices which we must make to carry it out, but also, the greater sacrifices we will almost surely be called upon to make if it is *not* carried out. Senator TAFT seems to have concentrated his attention on the former alternative only. Let us consider the whole question, both as world citizens and primarily, as Americans.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 21), 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an editorial endorsing the St. Lawrence seaway carried in the Manitowoc Herald-Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKING THE SEAWAY

Senator WILEY, chairman of a subcommittee which held hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway, was justified in his remarks the other day about relative amounts of Federal money shoveled into other sections of the country and the Midwest. He was equally right in pointing out that the proposed deep-water route to the Atlantic would not be merely a middle western project.

"The St. Lawrence seaway * * * is an integral part of not only America's economy but of the economy of the entire North American Continent," he declared. He could have added, without exaggeration, that the proposed project would be important in the economic scheme of things for the whole world. Certainly this is true now with so many nations depending on American foodstuffs for their very existence.

The Wisconsin Senator went into statistics to show that other sections of the country, particularly the South and far West, last year received many millions of dollars more in United States appropriations than the Midwest. He wisely added, however, that it would be "obviously absurd" to appropriate money for the development of the Middle West merely to equalize the amount given each region.

Mr. WILEY offered his figures not to promote logrolling, or you vote for my bill and I'll vote for yours, but to shame certain sectors of the country into withdrawing completely selfish opposition to the waterway. The South has long been a stubborn foe of the project and the Pacific coast also seems to have rallied to the antiseaway banner. Their enmity stems from real or imagined competition with the Mississippi River system and West coast ports.

Sectionalism should not be permitted to block a project which is manifestly a national and continental improvement, particularly when it promises to be self-liquidating and self-supporting. Of course, it will benefit the Midwest more than any other region, but that is not the principal reason for urging its passage.

The St. Lawrence measure is expected to come to a Senate vote late this week. If passed, it will then face House action. Manitowoc supporters of the plan should waste no time in contacting their Senators and Representatives and demanding vigorous action.

Antiseaway forces have persistently nudged Congress and can be expected to shove their campaign accelerator to the floor during these last remaining days.

Meat Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 21), 1948

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Thin Line Between," from the Morning World-Herald, of Omaha, Nebr., of January 21, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A THIN LINE BETWEEN

Two Republicans this week introduced a bill which would authorize the Department of Agriculture to spend $1,000,000 in getting ready for meat rationing, when the crisis comes, if it comes.

True, the two introducers—Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, and Representative JAVITS, of New York—are not members of the Republican high command. But they are elected representatives of the party, and the fact that they introduced such a measure tends to smudge, more than ever, the line of distinction between Republican principles and Democratic principles.

It is a mighty thin line these days, and has been during the past two Presidential campaigns.

In 1940 and again in 1944 the Republican candidates and their official spokesmen, in most cases, failed to come to grips with the basic issue. They refused to make a frontal attack on Government paternalism and New Dealism. Instead they adopted a sort of me-too attitude, talked in terms of we-could-do-it-better.

Naturally they lost. The American people don't like pale imitations. If they are going to get New Dealism they would prefer to get it from the original, bold New Dealers, rather than from trembling Republicans wearing New Deal masks.

Now another election year is at hand, and various Republican officials and leaders—among them Senator FLANDERS and Representative JAVITS—again are showing signs of the fidgets. Apparently they can't bear the thought that some of President Truman's "Mr. Fixit" proposals will win a handful of votes in Bennington or the Bronx.

In fairness it should be acknowledged that some of these me-too Republicans may be acting in accordance with principles rather than political expediency.

If so, they should be given credit for sincerity—but not for understanding.

Take this business of meat rationing, for example. What would be the effect of it, out here in the cattle country?

Hart Jorgensen, director of the Omaha Livestock Foundation, broadcast that question last week to farmers and feeders.

"If they put controls back," wrote one, "I'm going to unload and vacation in California. I'm through."

"If rationing returns," wrote another, "the farmers will ship what they have on feed and stack their feed bunks as they did before. It takes about 2 years to start up in feeding, but you can get out quickly."

"I am not a large producer," said a third, "but was completely forced out under the former controls."

So it went, without exception. The farmers and feeders have been through it all, and they know what Government control can do to production. The consumers ought to know, too. It was less than 2 years ago that rationing drove good meat off the legitimate market and left in the butchers' trays only an occasional cut of tough Utility beef.

Rationing doesn't make more of anything. It simply divides the scarcity. And because of muscle-bound controls, rationed items generally become scarcer and scarcer.

If the American people are reconciled to a lean future, if they see nothing ahead but shortages of this and shortages of that—getting worse year by year—then they had better make up their minds to accept rationing and wage control and price control and all the other planned-economy machinery.

And they might as well rehire President Truman to run the show for them because he and his crowd have had quite a lot of experience in making people dance.

But if the people are determined to have an economy of abundance, if they intend to have more meat and more food of all sorts and more oil and more steel and more jobs in years to come—then they had better put a stop on restrictive Government controls and let the free economy get busy in a big way.

It is the latter possibility which gives the Republicans their chance in 1948. Provided they have enough courage to make a fight, and don't content themselves with a feeble "me too" every time a totalitarian mind has another brainstorm.

Opposition of Certain Railway Brotherhoods to the St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 21), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the opposition by certain railway brotherhoods to the St. Lawrence seaway project.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROAD LABOR SHOULD NOT OPPOSE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

I know that every Member of this body feels a very deep respect and admiration for America's great railway brotherhood organizations which have been pioneers in the field of labor and which have on countless occasions set a model example for labor unions throughout the Nation in fair, democratic, peaceful bargaining procedures. Moreover, the outstanding record of American railway labor in the First and Second World Wars is so well known that it does not require repetition.

It is with regret, therefore, that I have recently noted that some representatives of the railroad brotherhoods have apparently been speaking to Members of the Senate, urging opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project.

May I say that I respect the right of representatives of the brotherhoods to present their suggestions to their Congressmen just as it is the constitutional right of every American of whatever organization to point out to his Congressman what he regards as justice and equity in legislation. However, I believe that if the representatives of railway labor continue to seek to influence a vote against the seaway, they will be doing the gravest possible disservice to American railway labor. They will be swallowing hook, line, and sinker the most spurious, obsolete and outdated conceptions of alleged seaway competition with the railroads, which have been foisted by seaway opponents.

WHY RAILROADS SHOULD NOT OPPOSE SEAWAY

1. In the first place, only a very small segment of railway labor is involved at all in this seaway development, and this is some of the railway labor of the Northeast. It is astonishing to find railroad brotherhoods of the Midwest and Far West presenting opposition to a project which does not even affect them and which affects only a few eastern financial interests adversely rather than the railroads themselves.

2. Even the effect of the seaway project on railway labor in the Northeast will be both remote and comparatively insignificant. The effects will probably not be felt for around 15 years or so. At that time, our Nation will be so vastly expanded that the minor diversion of traffic from railroads to the seaway, if any—and even minor diversion is open to doubt—will be completely insignificant in relation to the total expanded needs for railroad transportation. We are today a Nation of 143,000,000, and within 15 years, with increased population, with increased demands for goods, with increased overseas shipments and a perhaps $250,000,000,000 economy, the railroads will still be operating at capacity, even with the seaway completed.

NEW RAILROADS WILL FEED SEAWAY

I am convinced that the overwhelming rank and file of American railroad labor appreciates and understands the need for the continued growth of all forms of transportation in our country. They know, too, that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway will inevitably involve the vast expansion of railroads to feed seaway commerce.

VOTE FOR SEAWAY IS VOTE FOR LABOR

I appeal, therefore, to every Senator and to every Member of the House who may be approached by a railway labor representative to call these facts to his attention. A Senator or Representative who casts his vote for the seaway is casting his vote for American railway labor and for the American Nation as a whole. Railway men of Wisconsin recognize this, and I believe that the railway men throughout the Nation understand it.

REACTIONARY OPPOSITION TO SEAWAY

Railway labor has always prided itself on what it regards as liberal and progressive causes and has fought what it regards as reactionary. To oppose the seaway is, I believe, the most dyed-in-the-wool reactionary (in the truest meaning of that term) effort conceivable. To oppose the seaway is to try to strait-jacket our economy—to choke it to death rather than to allow it to evolve. The welfare of railroad workers will hardly be served by trying to freeze in immobility a transportation system that was good for a $70,000,000,000 economy, but is hopelessly inadequate for a $210,000,000,000 or $250,000,000,000 economy of the future.

In the name of their own enlightened self-interest the brotherhoods should support and fight for the seaway rather than serve as the dupes for a few selfish interests which have fought railway labor anyway.

The Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1948

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, one of the real concerns of the Nation today is the economic betterment of our veterans and our small businesses to set the country back on the path of peace and national security. I have here a copy of a Nation-wide radio address given by Commander in Chief Ray H. Brannaman, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, prior to a meeting with Congressmen and Ambassadors here in Washington, January 3, before the session of the Eightieth Congress opened.

With it is a State plan, as a basis for the veterans' plan to win the peace, which the commander in chief said "may well prove to be the turning point in our history as it provides a direct method of reducing the increasing threat of war and of securing peace and prosperity."

In developing a tentative State plan, which I have designated the Idaho plan, I hope it will be of value to persons in other States with similar problems to further the effectiveness of the proposed Veterans' Economic Development Corporation if enactment is secured.

At this point, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter that is self-explanatory:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 5, 1948.

Hon. HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DWORSHAK: It was a particular honor to have you attend our luncheon Saturday in Washington given for distinguished Members of Congress, for Ambassadors and representatives of nations under the Marshall plan, of China, of the Philippines, and for representatives of the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II.

In "the veterans' plan to win the peace" that I announced over the NBC national network and at the luncheon, your Idaho plan can serve to implement plans in the other 47 States. We wish to compliment you on your plan as it will help the people of the communities, including veterans, by bringing new industries to the communities, expanding present businesses, modernizing agriculture and by creating new industrial uses for agricultural products.

We find that experts from other nations are interested in developing programs similar to the Idaho plan to enable their people to prosper and to hold the line against communism and war. It is not an overstatement to say that if applied here at home and abroad, such a plan would help win a bloodless World War III before the shooting starts.

Your championship in Congress of small business in the United States and the establishment of veterans in businesses and profitable careers has our support. The bill that you introduced in the Senate on July 17, 1947, S. 1652, entitled "The Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act," will enable millions of veterans to catch up with the economic parade at home and abroad. Your bill will interest the taxpayers particularly as no appropriation of taxpayers' money is contemplated. In addition, it is estimated that it will reduce taxes as it will save a billion dollars a year of the present cost of government.

The bipartisan support of your bill and its early passage is indicated by the companion bills introduced in the House by ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; EDITH ROGERS, of Massachusetts, chairman of the important Veterans' Committee; WOLCOTT, of Michigan, an authority on finance and chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee; and past Chairman SPENCE, of Kentucky; by Congressman KEARNEY, of New York, and VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, both former commanders in chief of the Veterans' of Foreign Wars and members of the American Legion. The unusual support of your bill in the Senate is shown by the introduction on July 17 of companion bill S. 1652 by you and Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman of the important Appropriations Committee on your behalf and on behalf of Senators BARKLEY, of Kentucky; BUTLER, of Nebraska, chairman of the Public Lands Committee; REVERCOMB, of West Virginia, chairman of the Public Works Committee; FLANDERS, of Vermont, of the Committee for Economic Development; MORSE, of Oregon, chairman of the Veterans' Committee of the Committee on Labor and Welfare; and Senators CAIN, of Washington; CAPEHART, of Indiana; FERGUSON, of Michigan; HAWKS, of New Jersey; KNOWLAND, of California; JENNER, of Indiana; MARTIN, of Pennsylvania; JOHNSON, of Colorado; FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas; EASTLAND, of Mississippi; MAYBANK, of South Carolina; and HILL, of Alabama. In addition to the approval of your bill given by President Truman, it is significant also that small business associations and others are enthusiastic about the prospects of your bill's helping to enrich the people in the communities.

As our Veterans Economic Development Corporation bill helps others as well as veterans, it should implement your Idaho plan as a new milestone in the illustrious history of Idaho and of the Nation. More power to you, and we veterans are behind you.

Best wishes,

Sincerely,

RAY H. BRANNAMAN,
Commander in Chief.

Mr. President, in the above letter, Commander in Chief Brannaman says that a program such as the Idaho plan is of interest to experts from other nations because it would enable their people to prosper and to hold the line against communism and war.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, which recently toured Europe to evaluate the requests of the nations under the European recovery program, I visited England, France, Germany, Austria, Trieste, Italy, and Greece.

While I was abroad, our experts in Washington met with the ambassadors and ministers of the European countries, China, and the Philippines, to implement the plan to win the peace by developing the production program in the United States to meet the critical needs of other countries, and by installing in other countries pilot industrial and modernized agricultural operations to demonstrate to those people our system of free enterprise and proficiency.

In these pilot operations in free countries, American experts, with the cooperation of American veterans, will help to speed the modernization of their economy by on-the-scene demonstrations. Not only will this modernization increase the self-sufficiency of the free peoples, but will also increase their purchasing power for American goods and services.

As a preface to Commander Brannaman's radio address I wish to quote from a luncheon talk he made the same day.

This plan to win the peace is timely and urgent. It is evident that World War III is being launched against us by the enemies of democracy as surely as we foresaw that the acts of aggressor nations would bring World Wars I and II. In fact, we are still at war because the enemies of democracy are defeating the peace by refusing to conclude World War II.

This Nation of 140,000,000 people in a world of 2,000,000,000 people is called upon to tip the scales between war and peace. Fortunately, among us is a segment of our population which can balance our forces toward peace. It is the group of 20,000,000 veterans who were selected for their strength and leadership to supply the balance of power which won two world wars. As they supplied the skilled military leadership, they can now under American technological leadership, at home and abroad, constitute a great factor in preventing war.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a major portion of the radio speech referred to above:

THE VETERANS' PLAN TO WIN THE PEACE

(Radio address by Ray H. Brannaman, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, January 3, 1948)

Today, representing the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, an organization composed solely of overseas veterans, I want to present to you a plan for peace and national security. All of us desire peace and security for ourselves and our Nation, and to this end we offer a plan for peace and security for each of us in which you can, as an individual, help and be a part. This plan concerns your present welfare, that of your children, and of their children. It is a plan that may well prove to be a turning point in history. Many people believe it provides a direct method of reducing the increasing threat of war and of securing peace and prosperity. It may be one method to make our contemplated aid to Europe less costly to the American taxpayers.

Our domestic policy is failing because we have adopted a philosophy of scarcity, less work, less production, dog eat dog, everyone seeing how much he can get and how little he can give.

At this moment the crisis here at home is acute. One reason that our cost of living is rising in a dizzy spiral is that our productive capacity in goods and certain foods in the United States has not kept pace in the last decade with our population increase and demands. Clearly this shortage of productive capacity in both food and manufactured products will continue to raise our living cost until it gets out of reach. Unless we act promptly, the expression "boom and bust" will be a reality and not an idle warning. Our standard of living—our very system of personal freedom and free enterprise—is in jeopardy.

Fortunately, we have a plan at this time which can help us meet this double crisis. This plan will enable us not only to correct the weaknesses in our national economy but also to help friendly foreign countries to reinforce their own economies, thereby strengthening the democracies to resist communism and avoid war. The plan is provided by the Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act, one of the most constructive pieces of legislation ever to be introduced in the United States Congress.

Identified in the Senate as Senate bill 1652, this bipartisan proposed legislation was introduced by 19 distinguished Senators. In the House it is identified by six different numbers, one of which is House bill 147, and was introduced by six Members.

The Veterans Economic Development Corporation, popularly known as the little man's RFC, was originally designed to provide veterans with adequate financing to enter business—to make sure they would not become the apple sellers of this generation.

The plan is simple and has two main objectives: The first objective is to develop the maximum human and physical resources of each community. Careers for veterans, as well as continued full employment for other citizens, will be fostered through the following: The establishment of needed new businesses or the expansion of existing businesses; the modernized productivity of agriculture; the utilization of unused natural resources; and the improvement of self-liquidating public projects. Capital for these ventures, and also the technical know-how, will be made available by the Veterans Economic Development Corporation, which will borrow money through the United States Treasury at a low rate of interest and then extend loans to veterans and others at 4 percent, the duration of the loans being up to 20 years.

The second objective of the Veterans' Corporation is to help friendly foreign countries to help themselves through a similar program of modernization abroad by supplying American technical experts who will provide the necessary knowledge for pilot operations in the foreign countries asking our aid.

Essentially, the Veterans' Corporation will be of aid to small business, the foundation upon which our whole system of free enterprise has been built. It should reverse the unhealthy tendency for small industrial companies to merge or sell out to larger companies that have the technical engineers and capital to operate successfully.

Perhaps its best feature is that it will operate without cost to the taxpayers, and will require no appropriation. Furthermore, the Corporation would not compete with private banking. In effect, this "littleman's RFC" would work for individuals and small business just as the original RFC has for big business and big industry.

The veterans' organizations are now taking an inventory of industrial opportunities in every State. We find there is hardly a community that does not need new businesses, the expansion of present factory facilities, and self-liquidating public projects. In most of our States, in addition to critical housing needs, our agricultural economy is out of balance with our industrial production.

States, counties, and municipalities would be helped to finance useful self-liquidating local public projects, such as parks, buildings, airports, irrigation systems, and so on. Municipalities and private enterprise would be enabled to break bottlenecks in housing.

Further, through the Veterans' Corporation, both veterans and nonveterans could exploit the hundreds of thousands of enemy patents, secret processes, and manufacturing methods that our veterans have captured, and they could utilize our unused war plants and equipment.

Senator BUTLER, chairman of the Public Lands Committee, points out that this bill would help provide for the development of irrigation and the vast mineral deposits of western States could also be developed.

The plan is remarkable for its down-to-earth common sense. I have said that almost everywhere in the United States there is work to be done that is not being done. This veterans' corporation would be, in fact, a fulfillment of the age-old objective to match the ambitious man with the career opportunity, and to finance him so that he may make the most of it. It would utilize profitably the efforts of 2,800,000 veterans who are now in training.

While the primary objective of the plan is to set the United States on its feet economically, the possibilities of its application in other countries are equally promising.

It is significant that the veterans' corporation program is the only program of foreign aid which would enable American technicians with American know-how to be on the spot in the communities of those countries seeking our help. This would assure American taxpayers of the wise investment of the billions of dollars to be given to other countries by the United States if the Marshall plan is adopted.

This piece of legislation, if enacted into law, will place into the hands of millions of veterans and others the tools to work with; place them in a position to be self-supporting; to start a new business or expand an old one; to explore new fields at home and abroad. It will enable veterans to recoup their time and opportunities lost while serving their Nation in uniform. It will save the taxpayers of the Nation approximately a billion dollars a year in the present cost of veterans' affairs.

This bill has the support of James F. O'Neil, the national commander of the American Legion; John Golob, commander of the Disabled American Veterans; Edgar C. Corry, Jr., commander of the American Veterans of World War II; and many others.

I plead with every person listening to me today to adopt a philosophy of plenty—a philosophy of big production. I further plead with you to sell this philosophy to others, because the philosophy of bigger production, both in factories and on our farms, is the only philosophy that will reduce prices, help us feed and clothe the world, and help us place in the hands of our own people, as well as those of the rest of the world, the tools with which to work so that they may become self-supporting.

The veterans' economic development corporation bill will serve as the sparkplug to reach this objective. It provides every Member of Congress the opportunity to serve many millions of our veterans and at the same time insure prosperity and peace for the Nation. The bill is now in the hands of Chairman TAFT, of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and of Chairman WOLCOTT, of the House Banking and Currency Committee. We hope this bill will be passed in this session of the Eightieth Congress for the good of the veterans and of the Nation.

I thank you.

Mr. President, nearly everyone with whom I talk, asks "What are we going to do about meeting our own needs as well as those of other countries? What can we do about rising prices? How can we prevent another war?" Everyone will agree that these are directly related problems. We must start in the communities to solve the problem for the individual person and for our State. To serve the interests of our people, I have devised the Idaho plan, which I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as it appears to interest people of other States who are also designing a State plan to enrich the people in their communities:

THE IDAHO PLAN

The Idaho plan is designed to develop, under the provisions of the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation, the resources of Idaho to promote the prosperity, welfare, and health of all our people. Career opportunities for veterans as well as continued full employment for others would be fostered through the development of needed new businesses, the modernized productivity of agriculture, the utilization of unused natural resources and the implementation of needed self-liquidating public projects.

The Veterans' Corporation, with authority to extend credit totaling $5,000,000,000, will direct its loans toward supplementing the loans of banks and other existing private lending agencies, and the capital needed will derive from existing public money. No appropriations from Congress will be necessary, as only profitable self-liquidating projects will be considered.

Planning activities would be on a State, county, regional, or community level. A State planning board, with the assistance of a know-how committee composed of technical experts, would plan for the physical development of the State, cooperating with other State agencies in the preparation of programs. It would also assist regional and county committees and community planning boards. It would further extend technical assistance to individuals, new businesses and projects.

Since the veterans' economic development program is essentially a grassroots program—designed to serve small business and industry and agriculture in the community—emphasis on planning would be on a community level. Thus, while the State planning board and know-how committee would engage in planning on a State-wide basis, their primary function would be to serve the interests of the communities and to bring to bear the cooperation of the Federal Government on local projects whenever advisable and necessary.

Because of this emphasis on local planning, the following outline on State and community planning will list specific opportunities for development and expansion under the section on community planning.

Technical experts of friendly nations seeking our help under the Marshall plan and other forms of aid have shown great interest in applying this Idaho plan to their own countries under the provisions of the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act.

COMMUNITY PLANNING

1. Local planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups.

2. Planning board sets up a know-how committee.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State planning commission or State know-how committee.

(a) Inventory to determine present and future economic needs, including preparation of town and agricultural maps on the following:

Population distribution and trends, property tax surveys, land use, zoning ordinances, traffic studies, recreational facility requirements, health and welfare survey, community center redevelopments, highway maintenance, fire protection, water supply, housing, school system, farming, utility services, transportation service—airport, etc. using facilities of Federal, State, and regional agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.

4. Opportunities for development and expansion:

(a) Local industries as to research for new products, use of captured enemy patents and new processes, use of natural resources, and new industrial plants for agricultural products.

(b) Land-use development, giving attention to irrigation, underground water resources, reforestation, erosion control, soil treatment, and fertilizers.

(1) Water power development as to utilities, industrial uses, and agricultural purposes.

(2) Agricultural practices relating to livestock improvement and new crops.

(c) Commerce in fields of sales development, new market centers in growing communities, farm cooperatives, assembly, processing and warehousing facilities, air transport, and trucking.

(d) Mining, geological surveys.

(e) Tourist and recreational areas: Beaches, lakes, wood trails and roads, camping areas, sports, fish and game stocking, restoration of historical areas, scenic improvement, hotels, cabins and restaurants, stream and pond pollution control, and handicrafts.

(f) Public service (self-liquidating): Utilities and transportation of passengers.

(g) Public health and welfare (self-liquidating): Medical clinics, fire prevention, sanitation, stream pollution abatement, and sewage disposal.

(h) Public works and public improvements (self-liquidating): Housing, parking areas and buildings, and municipal projects.

(i) Education (self-liquidating): Colleges, professional and trade schools (improvement), community recreation centers, vocational and social guidance, rural school consolidation and transportation.

STATE AND REGIONAL PLANNING

1. State planning board established, representing all groups.

(a) Supplements and implements work of existing State planning agencies.

(b) Cooperates with and serves community planning boards.

2. Planning board sets up a State know-how committee composed of technical experts in various fields.

(a) Know-how committee gives technical advice to planning board, to community know-how committees, to county or regional committees, to individuals, to new businesses and projects.

3. Planning Board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State know-how committee or State planning commission.

(a) Takes inventory to determine present and future economic needs of State and geographical area, preparing State, regional, and county maps and statistical studies—

(1) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and regional departments and agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.

4. Planning board integrates county, community, and regional plans, eliminating overlapping, confusion, and unprofitable enterprises.

Mr. President, from my studies of the needs of the people of Idaho, I find that there is hardly a business or agricultural community in our State that will not profit from the benefits of this Idaho plan. To mention only a few of the benefits that will enrich the lives of practically everyone, I refer to the new scientific processes, trade secrets, and patents that our veterans have captured from enemy countries, which now are of commercial profit to businesses in our communities. These were developed by the best scientists of Europe over a period of 10 years behind an iron curtain of secrecy. At a recent meeting our expert who made an inventory in Germany of this material said its value to American businessmen is estimated to be as high as $20,000,000,000.

Industrial development in the communities of Idaho and new uses for agricultural products will save on freight rates and provide more profitable labor for our workers, fertilizer plants, canneries, potato-starch factories, cheese factories, tanneries, fiber-processing plants, woolen mills, clay plants, pulp-and-paper mills, and other needed businesses. To add to the creative wealth of the people of our State, the unused mineral deposits and natural resources of Idaho can be developed.

As our veterans are fresh from the war, where they demonstrated their patriotism, resourcefulness, and adaptability in utilizing the products of science, they can now help spearhead the economic development of Idaho for the benefit of all the people in our communities. Teamed with our community fathers and leaders, veterans and everyone else can benefit from the Idaho plan, which will be implemented under the provisions of the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act, which we have introduced in this Eightieth Congress.

The Strange Case of the Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 21), 1948

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the January 1948 issue of the Reader's Digest, which is entitled "The Strange Case of the Taft-Hartley Law," written by Claude Robinson, president, Opinion Research Corp.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STRANGE CASE OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

(Condensed from Look)

(By Claude Robinson, president, Opinion Research Corp.)

Shortly after passage of the Taft-Hartley bill over President Truman's veto, my organization decided to sound out the ordinary worker's real opinion of it. We sent interviewers into the concentrated manufacturing areas of the East and Middle West where 7 out of 10 American manufacturing workers live. They talked with union members and nonunion employees in large factories and small plants; with manual and white-collar workers, and with both Roosevelt and Dewey voters. To all they addressed this simple question:

"Do you think Congress should have passed this bill or not?"

"No," said 54 percent. "Yes," said 31 percent. And 15 percent had no opinion. This meant that slightly better than one out of every two workers is against the Taft-Hartley law.

So we decided to find out what features of the law made it unpopular. Selecting several of the most controversial provisions, we asked each worker about each one, without telling him it was part of the Taft-Hartley law. To our surprise, a majority in each case approved all these provisions of the bill. Even the section outlawing the closed shop drew the approval of more union members than were against it.

This is the question the Opinion Research Corp. asked: "If you were in Congress, would you be for or against laws to do the following things?"

1. Require unions to give 60 days' notice before they can go out on strike.

All employees:	Percent
For	78
Against	16
No opinion	6
Union members:	
For	70
Against	25
No opinion	5

2. Give the company the right to sue the union if the union breaks its contract.

All employees:	Percent
For	77
Against	13
No opinion	10
Union members:	
For	70
Against	20
No opinion	10

3. Require unions to make reports on money taken in and what they spend it for.

All employees:	Percent
For	86
Against	11
No opinion	3
Union members:	
For	85
Against	12
No opinion	3

4. Prevent Communists from holding union offices.

All employees:	Percent
For	76
Against	18
No opinion	6
Union members:	
For	77
Against	19
No opinion	4

5. Prohibit unions from spending money or making contributions in connection with political campaigns for Federal offices.

All employees:	Percent
For	56
Against	36
No opinion	8
Union members:	
For	50
Against	42
No opinion	8

6. Forbid a company to have a union shop until a majority of the workers vote for it. (A "union shop" is defined as one in which the worker does not have to belong to the union to get a job, but must join after he is hired.)

All employees:	Percent
For	79
Against	14
No opinion	7
Union members:	
For	77
Against	18
No opinion	5

7. Outlaw the closed shop. (The "closed shop" is defined as a shop in which no one can get a job unless he already belongs to the union before he goes to work there.)

All employees:	Percent
For	60
Against	30
No opinion	10
Union members:	
For	48
Against	43
No opinion	9

8. Allow the Government, in industries considered vital to the country's welfare, to get a court order preventing a strike for several months while settlements are attempted.

All employees:	Percent
For	78
Against	14
No opinion	8
Union members:	
For	70
Against	21
No opinion	9

The vote results, when averaged up, show a 73-percent approval of these Taft-Hartley provisions. On the basis of our investigation, it seems clear that the American worker favors what is in the Taft-Hartley law—but doesn't know it.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 21), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway," published in the Washington Post of January 21, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

When the Senate begins debating the Vandenberg resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada for development of the St. Lawrence seaway, it will reopen a controversy which has had passionate adherents on both sides for many years. The fight has usually evoked more emotion than deliberation. But that is doubtless inevitable in the case of any project affecting so many varied interests as does this one. We can only hope that the Senate will cut through the special pleading and the barrages of propaganda that are coming from both sides and render a decision in keeping with the national interest.

Mayor O'Dwyer claims that the proposed seaway would take away from New York one-third of its overseas traffic. Whether or not this estimate is well founded, the fact that some traffic between the Middle West and Europe will be shifted away from the bottleneck of New York is one major reason why the project has found favor in the eyes of a vast number of citizens. Far too much of the Nation's tran-Atlantic traffic is dependent upon the facilities of one great port. Economically as well as from the viewpoint of national security we think it is desirable to improve and develop other channels of commerce. The argument for extending this waterway into the heart of the North American Continent to serve the great agricultural and industrial areas bordering on the Great Lakes is especially strong because of the advantages given to the seaboard areas several decades ago by the construction of the Panama Canal.

In addition, of course, the St. Lawrence project would make possible the generation of a vast amount of hydroelectric power. The plan calls for generators with a capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower at Barnhart Island in the International Rapids section of the river. No doubt the Senate will give careful attention to complaints that this power would not be available in winter because of ice conditions and low run-off from the Great Lakes. There are many technical aspects of the project that call for scrutiny. We have little doubt, however, that the project will be approved on grounds of high policy. The St. Lawrence treaty previously negotiated with Canada failed to obtain the necessary two-thirds vote for ratification in 1934, but it won 46 favorable votes to 42 negative ones. The resolution now awaiting action will require only a majority vote, for it was negotiated under the terms of a treaty already in effect. Moreover, Senator VANDENBERG and other sponsors have added a proviso to the effect that the deep-water navigation works should be made self-liquidating by charging reasonable tolls. Allocation of materials for construction of the seaway will have to be carefully weighed against other demands and our commitments under the European recovery plan. But the arguments for ratifying the agreement at this time are unquestionably strong.

National Security and Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Commission on Air Policy, after long and serious deliberation, reported that our only real security in this age of the atomic bomb, bacterial warfare and the rapid development of supersonic aircraft and guided missiles was the elimination of war itself "through a regime of law." Realizing the practical remoteness of this ideal, however, it suggested that our national-security policy must be twofold: First, to work toward the elimination of war through support and development of the United Nations; and second, to prepare to defend ourselves for the possibility that war may come.

In preparing for a war that may come in spite of all of our efforts to prevent it, the only course open to us is to arm ourselves so strongly that not only would other nations hesitate to attack us because of our ability to strike back powerfully and swiftly, but so strongly that, if we were attacked, we could smash the assault quickly and surely. The Commission, dealing largely with air policy, concluded that other countries, by the end of 1952, would not only have atomic weapons but the planes and missiles necessary to deliver them on us in quantity. Our only course, therefore, is to develop an air defense that can break up such a sustained attack, and an air offense which would cause any nation contemplating such an attack to think twice before bringing a rain of destruction down upon themselves.

Such an air force will require huge sums of money. It will have a serious impact on our national life. But, the alternatives are so risky and so filled with menace to the security of our Nation that we can ill afford to do less. But this is not all. There are other requirements for a sound national defense, a defense not only necessary in and of itself but necessary as a possible deterrent to war.

At this point, I wish to make clear that I am not discussing the type of warfare that is referred to by sensation seekers as push-button warfare. It is possible that this type might become a reality in 25 or more years. What we are discussing now is that type of warfare which is possible today, or in the light of recent developments, within the next few years. If the estimates of the Commission on Air Policy are correct, we are discussing the type of warfare which will be possible in 1952.

What, then, are the other requirements, besides a powerful air force, for adequate national security, in these days when war is total, terrible, and swift?

It is the general concensus of military men and of civilians who have studied the matter that these are the other basic requirements for national security:

First. A coordinated and highly efficient intelligence service. Intelligence means knowing what the enemy, or potential enemy is doing and thinking. Good intelligence is vital.

Second. Continuous scientific research and development. We must keep abreast of latest developments in basic and applied science, but we must do more. We must keep ahead of the rest of the world.

Third. Industrial mobilization. We must be ready to back up our armed forces with industrial readiness. In this day and age, war requires that all of the resources of the Nation be mobilized for its prosecution.

Fourth. Unified armed forces. We have already placed under a single Cabinet head all of our armed forces. There is much that remains to be done by the Secretary of Defense to make unification more than just a paper affair. A strong Army, Navy, Marine Force, and Air Corps must be molded together into an effective offensive and defensive organization.

There is no serious disagreement that the five points I have mentioned are vitally necessary in any program of preparedness for the possibility of war. The only persons who disagree are those who either believe that we should disarm entirely—and the fallacy of that belief is obvious—and those whose sympathies lie closer to other nations than to their own country.

The main area of disagreement concerns a sixth point which has been suggested by many as being vitally essential to an adequate national security policy. That point is the immediate adoption of a universal military training program.

As your representative, I have expressed my opposition to peacetime conscription on many occasions. To me, as it must be to all Americans, the thought of drafting young men into military training during a time of peace has been repugnant. It has gone against everything that my schooling and my instincts have taught me to believe.

Yet today, I am telling you that I believe universal military training, as outlined in bills presently before Congress, is vitally necessary to our national security. I have not arrived at this conclusion lightly, nor without a great deal of study and soul-searching. I want to explain the reasons for this sincere belief of mine in some detail.

I approached this problem by attempting to find the answer to just one question only. I tried to throw sentiment, emotion and prejudice aside and arrive at a clear-cut answer to this question: Will universal military training make our Nation more, or less, secure? If I could find the answer to that question, I knew that I would have the answer to the basic question, "Should we adopt universal military training?", because national security, to my mind, supersedes all other considerations.

My search for this answer took me back again to a study of what kind of war is possible now, and more important, what kind of war will be possible within the next few years, when other nations have developed and produced atomic weapons in quantity and the means of delivering, or dropping, them upon our homeland.

We have already discussed the first phase of such warfare. The attack would come through the air without warning. I might say, parenthetically, that we would have no warning of the attack except through our intelligence service, and I might also add, that we, as a democracy, would probably have to be attacked before we went to war. It is not in our nature to declare war first.

A military leader has described the initial attack in these graphic words:

The attack would be primarily at the great cities and would cause great destruction both to physical structures and the people. It might involve atomic bombs, radioactive materials, biological warfare, and crop-destroying chemicals. The atomic bomb would probably be used against cities in preference to military targets. We would have chaos, with communications disrupted, millions of persons sick, wounded, and dying, civil disorder, and sabotage.

Of course, as I have mentioned previously, it would be the duty of an enlarged United States air force to make

this first attack as ineffective as possible and to crush it with counteroffensive measures. Present indications are, however, that even with superdefensive measures, large numbers of planes or missiles would get through to their targets.

The military leader continues:

The initial bombing attack would likely be followed by air-borne troops.

In such a war, where such a devastating initial attack is possible, what kind of armed forces do we need to prevent chaos from engulfing our whole land and leaving us open prey for further follow-up attacks?

First, it is absolutely necessary to have a highly trained body of men, equipped with the latest weapons, ready to strike back through the air to seize either advance bases for future operations or to follow up our own bombing counteroffensive in the homeland of the enemy. The objective of this force must be to make the further launching of attacks against us impossible. This will be the assignment of our regular standing Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Corps.

Now, many people opposed to universal military training agree thus far. They believe that comparatively small, well-trained, and well-equipped forces are absolutely necessary, but they claim that future wars, because they will be fought between such forces, render large bodies of troops unnecessary and even dangerous. They call this concept "World War I thinking."

Here is what I believe is the fallacy in the argument of these sincere people.

We must be realistic. We must grant to our potential enemies an intelligence equal to our own. The bare fact is that in future wars it is entirely within the realm of possibility that we shall be invaded by air-borne forces who will have the same objective as our own striking force, namely, to make it impossible for us to attack their homeland. We must be ready to crush such an invasion.

There is only one way to defend against air-borne invasion against any one of a hundred strategic points in America—that is, by well-trained reserve units in every part of our own country ready and able to meet possible invasion.

There are other reasons for having these units instantly available; with large-scale destruction, they would be needed to handle problems of evacuation, medical care, fire fighting, and repair of essential communications and transportation. They would be needed to maintain order in an atmosphere of disorder and demoralization. They would be needed to combat organized sabotage. They would be needed to clear radioactive areas. They would be needed for a hundred and one jobs, which we cannot rely upon local police and improvised civilian agencies to do satisfactorily.

This will require large numbers of trained men organized into reserve units. True, we could expand the size of our Regular Army to provide these men, but this would require that practically the whole Nation be under arms constantly.

To maintain such a large number of men in reserve units, it is my opinion that universal military training, which will give the rudiments of training to our young men for 6 months, then require that they join one of our reserve armed forces units and train with it for a certain period is essential and necessary. Our reservoir of trained men left over from the last war will not last forever. It must be constantly refreshed.

Thus, straight logic, based upon a review of what is possible in the future, has led me to believe that universal military training is vitally necessary, in this era of uneasy peace, for our national security.

Universal military training will cost money. So will the other five points in an adequate national defense. They will cost money that could be more productively used in other places in our national scheme of things. However, if it will prevent a war, or make us relatively more secure against attack, it is money which must be spent.

There are dangers, of course, in a universal military training program. One is that we would consider it, in itself, as a sort of Maginot line against aggression. I have already pointed out that it must be considered as only part of our national defenses. Another is that it would give too great power to our military leaders, and another is that it might become dangerous to the morals and education of our youth. For these latter two reasons control of the program must be rigidly overseen by an alert citizenry.

Further, the program itself must be universal in its application to all persons of a given age. Only those handicapped persons who can make no material contribution or whose absence from home would create extreme hardship could be excluded. The training undergone by the trainees must be geared to modern warfare and must be intensive; close-order drill will not suffice in the atomic age. The need for skilled craftsmen, technicians, and so forth, must be considered. In short, in adopting a universal military program we must make sure that we will devise a program which will contribute to, and not detract from, our national security.

A final word: It is apparent that logic and the national welfare dictate a military program that is far greater than we conceived would be necessary at the end of the war. This crushing burden upon our national economy can only be dropped when we have achieved real security in a world in which war is no longer possible. We must devote all of our intelligence and energy toward making such a world a definite reality.

Forrestal All Out for Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to submit for inclusion herein a copy of a newspaper article by John A. Giles, columnist, appearing in the Washington Sunday Star, of date January 25, 1948, giving the views of Secretary of Defense Forrestal in regard to universal military training, as follows:

UMT FOES' ARGUMENTS FALLACIOUS, FORRESTAL LETTER TELLS ROBERTS

(By John A. Giles)

Arguments by foes of universal military training that atomic weapons and push-button warfare had made "mass armies" obsolete and UMT unnecessary were branded as fallacious yesterday by Secretary of Defense Forrestal.

Mr. Forrestal, who is leading the Army-Navy-Air Force fight for passage of the UMT bill, made this charge in a letter to former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, chairman of the National Security Committee. Justice Roberts released the text of the letter at a press conference.

The committee, which is composed of individuals and 55 Nation-wide organizations with a membership totaling 16,000,000, was formed last fall to crystallize the campaign for UMT.

"DISTURBED" OVER CHARGES

Justice Roberts said he had become "disturbed by the possible effect of published charges by opponents of UMT to the effect that push-button warfare makes mass armies obsolete and, therefore, universal military training," and that he wrote Mr. Forrestal for his views.

"This argument is fallacious for two reasons," Mr. Forrestal wrote. "In the first place, the push-button era of warfare has certainly not yet arrived and may be many years in the future. In the meantime, we must anticipate that any future war might be of a total aspect involving at the outset a possible sudden and violent attack upon our homes and cities.

"We must therefore be prepared at all times for an immediate mobilization of trained men on a large scale throughout the country. I firmly believe that UMT is the only effective democratic means of providing the necessary trained and ready reserves in such an emergency."

WON'T GIVE "MASS ARMY"

"Secondly, UMT would not give us a 'mass army' in the popular sense. On the contrary, the entire military-training program emphasizes the technical and specialized training that modern warfare requires.

"Before World War II it required a ground crew of three men to service a combat airplane. Today's planes require 12 and more men to keep them in the air. Scientific development of weapons requires not only greater numbers of highly trained men, but longer periods of training as well. The UMT program is designed to furnish the basic elements of such training prior to any future emergency."

Mr. Forrestal also branded as not sound the argument that a greatly increased striking Air Force would obviate the need for UMT.

ERP CALLED VITAL

"True, national security cannot be obtained through any single measure to the exclusion of any other," he wrote. "From the broad standpoint it includes, in addition to a strong Military Establishment, the preservation of a sound free-competitive system of enterprise in our country, the recovery of Europe, the solution of problems of Greece, Turkey, China, and the Middle East, and the revival of the machinery of production throughout the world.

"In short, the European recovery program is a vital element of national security. UMT is another vital element. One cannot discuss security in terms of only one of its elements nor in terms of the United States alone."

Calling UMT the basis of manpower planning for all of the armed services, Mr. Forrestal declared it absolutely essential to our national security.

Justice Roberts, in releasing Mr. Forrestal's letter, said it effectively destroys the mass-armies fallacy.

ARGUMENT CALLED NONSENSE

"The argument that we don't need millions of men behind the machines is pure nonsense," Justice Roberts said.

The demoralization that would be created by a blitz atomic attack alone necessitates the enactment of UMT, he declared.

The American Legion, meanwhile, charged last night that the House Rules Committee is gagging Members of Congress on universal military training, and demanded that it report a training bill to the House floor for a vote.

In a letter to Chairman ALLEN, John Thomas Taylor, Legion legislative chief, said opinion polls show the public favors universal training by a 2-to-1 margin.

CONGRESS HAS EXCEPTION

"Every group in America except one has expressed its views on universal training or had full opportunity to do so," he declared. "That one exception is Congress. There is no valid reason for further bobbling this legislation and preventing a vote by the House membership."

Mr. ALLEN was not available for comment.

Representative HARNESS, Republican, of Indian, said yesterday he is personally convinced the universal military training bill will not be reported by the Rules Committee for some time He is a member of the committee.

"I think whether the bill is reported will depend on developments between now and the time it is placed on the committee's agenda," he said. "I have taken no position as to the merits of the bill."

No Humanity for Germans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, since the early part of last year I have called your attention on a number of occasions to the serious question with respect to the German prisoners of war, who are being held as slave laborers in England, France, the Soviet Union, and several other countries of Europe. It has been practically impossible to obtain any definite information or cooperation from the U. S. S. R. and while England and France have gone through the movements of cooperating they really have done comparatively little toward eliminating the inhumane practice of involuntary servitude on the part of these prisoners of war. I have had much correspondence with the Secretary of State and the Acting Secretary of State about this matter. It is my definite intention to ask that steps be taken to end this slavery, which is inhumane, and which we should discourage by refusing to give aid to any countries which indulge in such practices. I would also suggest that the Members of the House read the article entitled "No Humanity for Germans" which appears in the current issue of Human Events. It reads:

NO HUMANITY FOR GERMANS

(By Oswald Garrison Villard)

It should be obvious that the failure of the foreign ministers to create even a basis for an approach to a peace with Germany has intensified the miseries, the psychological sufferings and the growing hopelessness of the German people. But Secretary Marshall has yet to emphasize this simple humanitarian aspect of the tragedy.

This is the more regrettable because the Secretary of State did say, in his comment on April 28, 1947, on the similar failure of the Moscow Conference: "The patient is sinking while the doctors deliberate. So I believe that action cannot await compromise through exhaustion." Moreover, Secretary Marshall has discussed the horrible situation of the Chinese masses, after years of starvation, revolution and warfare, with an appreciation of what this has meant to those pitiful people.

But the Secretary wound up his radio report of December 19, on the utter failure of the London Conference, without a single word as to where this failure left Germany, or as to the outlook for another move.

He merely said: "I fear there can be no settlement until the coming months demonstrate whether or not the civilization of western Europe will prove vigorous enough to rise above the destructive effects of the war and to restore a healthy society," and that "the situation must be stabilized" before any other attempt to solve the impasse. He gave no encouragement to the suffering and half-fed Germans and Austrians to hold out, or to believe that the state of war in which they are still kept will be terminated—not even in the face of the increasing signs of desperation among a literally starving people.

The patient may continue to sink; the doctors have ceased even to deliberate. They seem content to stand each other across the dying body.

This policy of drift means a continuing refusal to reintegrate our conquered subjects into the life of what used to be called one world. The Germans remain beyond the pale. They cannot send cables or radio messages, or use the telephone for any communications outside their existing frontiers. The airmails are closed to them, though they may receive air-borne letters, but these can only be answered by the regular mails which are 4 weeks or longer in transit to the United States. All mail remains liable to wartime censorship, and the ensuing delays, although hostilities ceased in the early summer of 1945.

II

Germans cannot receive from abroad any moneys, large or small—not even from friends and relatives overseas—even though the large sums which would pour in would considerably improve conditions and cut down our Government's expenditures.

As a result the Germans cannot purchase foreign books, magazines, or newspapers. Very few American publications seep in, while their own censored press remains inevitably inefficient and inadequate in the presentation of news and the molding of a free public opinion.

All our efforts at denazification and democratization are thwarted by the lack of materials for extensive assistance to schools, to adult education through the labor unions and otherwise, and because we are withholding the very books and newspapers which would familiarize the Germans with our attitudes, policies and democratic processes. If our Government would but lower the high postal rate charged on food and clothing parcels and remove the present limit on weight (22 pounds), there would be a still greater volume of relief shipments by Americans.

Worst of all, the Germans and Austrians cannot buy hospital equipment or supplies—even such articles as rubber operating gloves and toilet essentials—or the necessary drugs. If they receive some—but not enough—penicillin and streptomycin, it is in part because our military government is fearful that venereal and other contagious diseases may spread to infect our troops.

Travel is almost an impossibility for any German. Even merchants and salesmen are gravely restricted, despite the military government's assertions that it is bent on building up the economy of Bizonia. It is extremely difficult for any German to get permission to cross into Switzerland, though the Swiss Government raises no particular objections. There is a case on record of an elderly woman, seeking a permit to visit Switzerland, who was accused by an American colonel of trying to avoid the hunger punishment.

Again, the Germans cannot understand why anti-Hitler refugees in this country, even men who served in the American Army during the entire war, are frequently refused permission to return to Germany and help to rebuild their country along democratic lines. They are cut off by a brass curtain, as impenetrable as Russia's one of iron.

III

Two facts stand out clearly in this picture. One is that to alter the conditions cited as controlling in our zone requires no further conference of Foreign Ministers, nor any other step beyond a decision by the President to take such action, especially as we have now voluntarily assumed one-half of Britain's expenses in maintaining its zone.

President Truman could certainly order the necessary postal changes, end the ban on airmail, permit the use of the cables, and insist that the American banks now established in Germany be allowed to do business with the Germans instead of only with the occupying forces. This improvement would require only one stroke of the Chief Executive's pen, and the recall of officers now devoting their time to the intricacies of red tape would improve the present desperate housing conditions. So would a further reduction of garrisons which offer no threat to the Russians and are not needed to hold down the unarmed Germans.

One word from the White House to the Army, and the State Department would end its stubborn refusal to allow the return of the anti-Nazi refugees and would make possible the importation of the needed drugs. The Postmaster General can regulate the size of the packages to be sent abroad and the rate to be charged for them. If the President should desire the "Bizonians" to have access to all American books, magazines, and newspapers it would not be difficult to make the necessary currency changes to enable the free import of American intellectual material.

There is an even more important step which Mr. Truman could take if he desired to influence the German mentality in the direction of the the democracies and against the communism of the East. There are still over 3,000,000 prisoners of war in captivity, in violation of the laws of war and of the Geneva Convention; forced to work for beggarly pay in involuntary servitude. For some of this slave labor the United States is morally responsible since it "loaned" German prisoners to the French and British Governments after the surrender.

In 1947, in response to proddings from the International Red Cross, the United States demanded of France the release of the numerous prisoners in that country, with a resultant promise, according to the press, that they would be set free last fall. The

Red Cross has again protested against the continued enslavement of many of these men—an unprecedented outrage of every principle for which America stands.

Millions of Germans have a direct or indirect interest in these "loaned" prisoners. The longer the prisoners are detained, contrary to law and to human decency, the more the German public will regard as pure hypocrisy American assertions that ours is a Christian country, and therefore spiritually and ethically fitted to reform German thinking.

IV

In two speeches prior to the London Conference, General Marshall exalted with true American modesty the complete altruism and unselfishness of our foreign policy. Always, he suggested, it has been wholly just and actuated by the highest motives—forgetting the Mexican War (denounced in 1885 by General Grant as "one of the most unjust ever waged by a stronger against a weaker nation"); and our attack on Spain.

Such self-laudatory interpretations of our history are not only contrary to truth; they do violence to the best in our American traditions. And the tendency to gloss what we are doing with hypocrisy is the second important fact in the present status of our relations to Germany and Austria.

Hypocrisy is attested by the severe criticisms of our policies and their results, as voiced by returning soldiers, civilian officials and journalists—Whitelaw Reed, editor of the New York Herald Tribune, declares that German conditions under our flag are "subhuman."

Letting the patient live—or die if he can—goes counter to our historic policy of generous aid to any and all peoples in distress, to the spirit of General Grant at Appomattox, to our consideration for the Filipinos after the conquest, to the most praiseworthy good-neighbor policy acclaimed by Franklin Roosevelt, to every one of the democratic and humanitarian ideals which were voiced as our reason and our purpose in entering the war. Our sadistic policy in Germany is also contrary to every teaching of history. Nobility begets nobility, and generosity, generosity. This is what the Secretary of State must remember if he wishes to make American foreign policy of today conform to what he thinks and asserts it has been in the past.

There lies a surer road to the restoration of goodwill, true peace and prosperity for all Europe, than the present frantic effort to purchase safety for democratic institutions with dollars. The present turn of events in Germany shows that even if the patient can be resuscitated at the last moment, he is all too likely to hate those who sanctimoniously preached the outlawry of war, and ended up by demanding the outlawry of charity for a fallen foe.

You Can't Fool the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln is accredited with having said that you cannot fool all of the people all of the time. That certainly is applicable to my constituents. They are alert, and do not have to be told by their Representative in Congress what is going on. The many sources of information through which they get information is almost unbelievable. But today, they are wise. They know what is going on. You cannot fool the people. The New Deal Administration certainly is not fooling them. They are not to be fooled any longer.

Typical of the many letters I am receiving, I quote the following one which I have just received from one of the fellows back home:

Attached is a copy of the letter which I have just written to the regional manager of the Veterans' Administration trying to get my son his $65 per month, which he applied for about 2 years ago, and for which they sent him another form instead of the final certificate. I am sending this letter to you only for your files, you need not follow it up.

I see that Mr. Pauley has finally got his foot too far in the door. Maybe if the Thomas committee would take a look at the actions of Mr. Pauley just before the "aid" to Greece was signed, they might find where Mr. Pauley got a hand in that, too. For it was told to me that he owned considerable of the Greek shipping, which was organized just a few weeks before the aid bill was passed, and that the bill provided for one-half of the tonnage to be hatted in Greek Bottoms, and since Greece had no merchant marine, Mr. Pauley and his friends provided the Greek Bottoms, and thereby hangs another nice New Deal tale.

If we are to help the people of Europe, let's help them. If we are to help the European Governments, let's loan it to them. For you know as well as I that we'll be Uncle Shylocks in a year's time. But if this is a measure to help find jobs for the displaced personnel of OPA, CCC, GPU, and XYZ, then let's manufacture an island or some such spot where they can all rest and relax listening to the soap operas.

Let's get a foreign policy as well as a domestic policy; but first let's get some kind of a vacuum cleaner that will get our own house in order. Really the boys who pay the taxes don't give a damn so long as they are paying them for something in which they can see results; but when their debt is not reduced, when there is more talk of more spending, and no thought of abolishing so many damn departments that no one single person can make heads or tails of it, well, they are getting a little wrathy, and they are going to put a lot of people in who can clean house.

Southern States Industrial Council Insists Upon Careful Scrutiny by Congress of the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the Southern States Industrial Council, which comprises an organization of business men from some 16 Southern States, has expressed itself in no uncertain terms on the Marshall plan. The board of directors of the Southern States Industrial Council insists upon careful scrutiny by Congress of the Marshall plan. The following is a resolution adopted by the board of directors of this organization January 8, 1948:

Whereas British and European recovery is almost wholly dependent upon the efforts of the people themselves, it being authoritatively estimated that a 10-percent increase in production in those countries would do more to advance their economic recovery than any amount the United States conceivably could contribute in loans and gifts; and

Whereas it was the opinion of this board, expressed at a meeting held in New Orleans on January 26–29, 1946, that the proceeds of the British "loan" would be largely wasted and would accomplish few if any of the desirable purposes which the sponsors of this American subsidy of British socialism urged in its support, which opinion and prediction have since been fully confirmed by events; and

Whereas it is the opinion and belief of this board, expressed at a meeting held in New Orleans on October 31–November 1, 1947, and hereby reaffirmed, that "with or without American aid, any program for the economic rehabilitation of Europe is foredoomed to failure unless and until the people of Britain, France, Italy, and other claimant nations are provided with additional incentives to work, produce, save, and invest, which incentives * * * are available only under a system of free enterprise."

Resolved—

1. That the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives be and they hereby are respectfully urged to explore all aspects of the so-called Marshall plan at the forthcoming hearings, including but not being limited, to the following:

(a) The history of postwar foreign aid to date; the amounts expended; the purposes for which such expenditures were made; and the results accomplished.

(b) Information about production and productivity in the claimant countries; controls in effect and the effect thereof on production; the development and status of cartels; tax burden and what the money is spent for; plans for further nationalization; and the gold and dollars now available to those countries without enactment of any Marshall plan.

(c) How the Marshall plan would operate; the specific purposes for which this money is to be expended and in what amounts; what safeguards are contemplated against use of funds for collectivist political and propaganda purposes; extent to which these countries have implemented the self-help and mutual-aid aspects of the plan; and the effect of any such program on the strategic position of the United States and the claimant countries vis-à-vis the U. S. S. R.

(d) The probable impact of the proposed plan upon the people of this Nation, their daily lives and scale of living, their natural resources, the taxes they pay, the direct and indirect costs of the plan, including the resulting additional inflation and higher prices, and whether the adoption of such a plan will necessitate the reimposition of compulsory price control and rationing.

(e) Possible alternatives to the Marshall plan, including the elimination of the now infamous Morgenthau level-of-industry program under which American taxpayers are compelled to pay German reparations.

2. That the Senate and House committees be respectfully urged to report their findings in language understandable to the average United States citizen, employing terms commonly used in this country, such as bushels (instead of metric tons) in the case of grain.

3. That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress; that the council tender its assistance to the aforesaid committees in their efforts to assemble all the facts which might assist the Congress and the American people to arrive at a sound and realistic conclusion with respect to the momentous public issue here involved; and that the staff of the council be instructed accordingly.

Fulcrum of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial from the Washington Post for January 25, 1948, entitled, "The Fulcrum of Democracy." This editorial urges Federal support for education:

FULCRUM OF DEMOCRACY

On Monday, the Republican Steering Committee of the House will meet to decide whether it will permit the Eightieth Congress to act on proposals of Federal aid to education. Here are some stark and stubborn facts for the committee to consider: Five million youngsters between the ages of 6 and 17 are not attending schools of any kind in the United States today. There are some 10,000,000 adults, according to the 1940 census, whose education has not gone as far as completion of the fourth grade. Half a million young men had to be rejected for military service during the war because they lacked even the rudiments of an education.

The quality of public education in the United States, moreover, has dropped deplorably. Niggardly pay scales have caused a tragic exodus from the teaching profession so that in countless communities today classes are conducted by teachers who have no qualifications for their task. Gross inequalities exist throughout the country in educational opportunity—the key to all other opportunities. More than a million children in 1939–40 attended classrooms which cost more than $4,000 a year. On the other hand, more than a million attended classrooms which cost less than $500 a year. This is scarcely a democratic system of public education. The public schools, once an American pride, have been allowed to deteriorate in so many respects that rebuttressing must be undertaken if we are to avoid a colossal waste of human talent.

The inadequacies and inequalities in educational opportunity stem from want of funds. Only Federal aid can furnish the remedy. The Republican Steering Committee is committed, to be sure, to tax reduction and to a program of governmental economy. Let its members ask themselves, however, not whether we can afford to tax ourselves and spend public money for public schools, but whether, as a Nation dedicated to the concept of government by the consent of the governed, we can afford to let ignorance sap our efficiency, our productivity, our capacity to guide ourselves with intelligence in a period of unparalleled difficulty. Such economizing would be nothing more than parsimony. Education is not a luxury. It is the fulcrum of a democratic society.

The Cafeteria Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Washington Star, Washington, D. C., of January 22, 1948, in reference to the strike which has been in progress against the cafeterias in Government buildings here in Washington. This editorial presents in clear language the issue involved in this controversy.

Information has reached me that the War Department and the Department of Agriculture, notwithstanding the issue that has been raised, have ignored and bypassed the spirit and clear intent of a Federal law. These two departments have entered into a contract, so I am informed, with Local 471, United Cafeteria and Restaurant Workers, of the United Public Workers, CIO, after that union had disqualified itself as a bargaining agent by refusing to file non-Communist affidavits, as the law provides.

The purpose and intent of the Federal statute was to encourage labor unions to free themselves from the domination of Communist influence. In spite of that fact, it is difficult to understand why an agency of the Federal Government would deliberately proceed in defiance of the clear intent of the law. Such action can only result in disrespect and encouragement to others to ignore the law of the land.

The Federal Government should be the first to fully comply with the purpose of the law, and the last to ignore it or bypass it.

The editorial follows:

FINDING THE CAUSE IS EASY

Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach is correct in contending that the Taft-Hartley law does not prevent Government Services, Inc., from negotiating with the UPWA-CIO Cafeteria Workers' Union in the current strike. But he is wrong if he fails to see any difference between GSI and any private employer confronted with a problem similar to the one which GSI faces. That problem is whether to bargain with a union which refuses to certify that its leadership is noncommunistic.

Mr. Schwellenbach has been directed by President Truman to investigate the strike, which began January 5, when GSI declined to negotiate a new contract unless the union complied with the anti-Communist provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. The Labor Secretary will not have to do much digging to learn that the real issue in the strike is not wages or working conditions but the refusal of the Cafeteria Workers' Local 471 to sign the non-Communist affidavit.

GSI officials have never argued that they are prohibited by law from bargaining with a union which adheres to such a policy. They have asserted, with much logic, that GSI is in a position apart from that of the average restaurant operator. GSI has a unique relationship to the Federal Government in that it was founded by Government officials to serve Government employees. Its board of trustees is composed of administrative officials of various Federal departments. It is, in short, a quasi-governmental agency with quasi-governmental responsibilities. Congress holds it strictly to account for its policies and its actions, as witness the long and still uncompleted investigation of its activities by a Senate committee.

It is contended by GSI—again with much logic—that Congress, in writing into the Taft-Hartley law the anti-Communist provisions, had in mind purging labor unions of communistic influences. A quasi governmental body like GSI would certainly be sticking its neck out if it were to become a party to a union scheme to circumvent the intent of Congress in this respect. GSI should not be subject to criticism for eschewing an untenable position. It would undoubtedly bring down on its head plenty of criticism from Congress if it were to collaborate with the union in any such subterfuge, especially at this time of increasing vigilance against communistic infiltration of the Federal departments.

Secretary Schwellenbach should have little difficulty in finding a simple solution of the controversy. All that is necessary is that the union certify that it is free from Communist domination. That should be an easy thing to do if the union is, in fact, not under communistic leadership. Whether the union, after so certifying, could again qualify as bargaining agent for a majority of GSI employees is a question which only another election could determine. For a large number of new employees have filled the vacancies caused by the walkout. Thus, the recalcitrant union leaders not only are subjecting their followers to the unnecessary hardships of a strike but may be taking their jobs away from them permanently.

Missourian in Peru Describes How Uncle Sam Is Played for a Sucker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I just received in the mail a copy of the St. Clair County (Mo.) Republican of January 1, 1948, which contains a copy of a letter written by a Missourian showing how the South American governments are playing Uncle Sam for a sucker. Apparently this man has written to his home county newspaper, the St. Clair County (Mo.) Republican, purporting to give a description of the way in which our American dollars are being used to subsidize the Argentina Government under Peron's 5-year plan. This is a letter worth reading and I have copied the same from the above-named newspaper and pass it on for your information:

LIMA, PERU, SOUTH AMERICA,
December 18, 1947.

THE REPUBLICAN,
Osceola, Mo.

HI FOLKS: Christmas greetings from South America; first off I enclose $1.50 which will pay up until July, at which time we expect to be in or around Osceola on vacation.

Summer is in full swing here on this side of the equator and schools out for the season, the beaches swarming with people trying to keep cool, both from the heat of the season and the political situation, while the kiddies are working up a frenzy over the coming Christmas season we try to join in, but it's just a bit odd to get accustomed to Santa Claus coming calling in the middle of the summer.

We have just returned from a vacation around the southern part of South America, including parts of Peru, Bolivia—where it is an effort even to breathe, due to the altitude—Uruguay, Montevideo, its capital with the wonderful beaches and clean streets and government buildings, with prices reasonable. Several provincial cities in Argentina and, of course, the New York of South America, Buenos Aires, with their beautiful modern stores, prices sky high, and the highly

nationalistic attitude of their people; however, their steaks are delicious and not too expensive if one doesn't let his appetite run away. (Brother does Peron have a nice little racket that the United States pays for especially with their wheat—the Argentine Government buys up all the farmers' wheat for 75 cents to $1.20 a bushel, sells it abroad to the poor European countries which the United States has staked, call it a loan if you wish, sells it to them for $5 and $6 payable in United States dollars per bushel; the difference in what is paid the farmers and what it is sold on the world market is put into Peron's 5-year plan; this, of course, is just one of their schemes.)

After visiting in Argentina we visited Santiago, capital of Chile, Valparaiso their main seaport, and Vina Del Mar, where the "big shot" politicians and tired businessmen go for rest and relaxation on the beach and in the casino. They have at least done one good deed in that country—they have thrown most of the Communists out and are trying their best to get on their feet again. And so back to Peru. We traveled by plane, train, ship, and bus, had a wonderful trip, but glad to be back home.

We, here in Peru that receive United States dollars, are living in sort of fool's paradise. As the demand for dollars is quite high we receive over double the legal rate in local currency, and at the moment I would say Peru is one of the best places for anyone with dollars to live in South America, but again the political picture is rather shaky and who knows what may happen next. Ah, yes, but Señor, that is manana, so let us enjoy today's blessings.

We expect to be seeing you some time around the middle of July 1948. Meanwhile, I'll keep well informed of the doings of Osceola and surrounding country; through your paper we do enjoy it and can hardly visualize that building boom going on around there now.

Wholly to the Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to quote the following editorial from the Tulsa Daily World, of Tulsa, Okla., of January 16, 1948:

WHOLLY TO THE LEFT

Opinion, generally, is that President Truman has abandoned whatever rightest or conservative leanings he may have had and is now wholly committed to New Deal leftist policies and methods. To what or whom is this presumably final switch due? Apparently, he has a revised set of advisers and they have, in their desire to keep him and themselves in office, decided that the way to get support is to prolong big spending, restore the wartime controls, and, possibly, put on some new ones, to cater shamelessly to the CIO, and kindred elements. Mr. Truman has apparently assented in full; he is striking out for more new dealism than we had before, or at least for aggravated application of the ideals in effect for 15 years.

This is tantamount to saying that the President of the United States played politics in his economic message to Congress as in his Budget message. That is what we meant to say. The defense for the President will be that the Republican majority in Congress is playing politics, too. That is, to a considerable extent, true. Under that state of facts, what will the people favor? What will Congress do to fulfill its trust? Whose politics are the soundest? Congress, apparently, has to prove that its way is better than the President's way, and that is what the people want—the best way out of this awful mess of prices and ruinous Federal costs, this deadly flirting with inflation, this pandering to extremists, this vicious circle called liberal or progressive. It is a demagogic course the administration is evidently bent upon.

The key word is "votes." Mr. Truman was not always thus. He was an acceptable Senator, but he appears to have lost the trust and support of his former colleagues of both parties. The Presidency or something has spoiled him.

An example of the evil attention the President has attracted is found in the comment of Prof. Harold Laski, the noted British leftist (possibly a Communist), who remarked: "It is difficult not to say with vigor that President Truman's address to Congress (the budget message) is the best document that has come out of the White House since Franklin D. Roosevelt died. * * * The real point is that the probable nominee for the Presidency next November has come squarely out for continuation of the New Deal at home and for swift and generous aid to European recovery abroad. * * * He has entirely taken the wind out of Henry Wallace's sails." This is a way of saying Mr. Truman has amplified and particularized the New Deal policies at home and abroad. Upon this endorsement from England and upon the general purport of his two messages, the President must go before the country as an unqualified advocate of controls as a remedy for everything and for an unlimited course of action and involvement abroad.

Mr. Truman, with considerable tiresomeness, continues to advocate controls, tax reduction for the small folk and "sock the rich" for the big ones. Nothing about reduction of costs, nothing about reducing the cost of living except by more costly regulations, nothing about escape from the wildly variegated political bondages imposed in wartime.

Appointment and Installation of Archbishop O'Boyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in the past few days the District of Columbia gained a new citizen of outstanding merit, whose worth in the spiritual sense and also in a very practical way as well, has been recognized by citizens not only of his own particular faith, but of all faiths and of no particular faith.

I refer to His Excellency, the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, newly consecrated archbishop of Washington and as such the spiritual leader of 165,000 Catholics in the District of Columbia and the five adjacent Maryland counties included in the new archdiocese of Washington.

Archbishop O'Boyle's appointment and installation constitute a merited recognition of the importance of the District of Columbia in church affairs in this country. Likewise, the progressive record of the new archbishop elsewhere, as an administrator and organizer, as well as a leader of deep spiritual character, mark him as an outstanding churchman who can be counted on to afford the finest type of spiritual leadership in a day when moral values are so all important.

Because his coming is so significant an event in the history of the District of Columbia, now become a separate archdiocese, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the statement made by Archbishop O'Boyle to the people and an excerpt from his installation address, as reported in the Catholic Review, the official publication of the archdiocese.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCHBISHOP O'BOYLE'S PROMISE

I know I speak for all the Catholics of this archdiocese when I promise wholehearted support and cooperation in every genuine endeavor to promote the common good.

We may rightfully claim an organized Catholic life going back long before the Revolution, even to the time when the *Ark* and the *Dove* cast anchor off our shores, and the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was first offered by Father Andrew White in the colony dedicated to the patronage of our Blessed Lady.

It is to a high and ancient lineage that we succeed. If the future is worthy of the past, the fine Catholic life of our people in the District of Columbia and in the historic counties of Prince Georges, Montgomery, St. Mary's, Charles, and Calvert in Maryland will shed on the name of their new archdiocese a luster that will allow us to share the glory that all associate with the mother church of Baltimore.—From Archbishop O'Boyle's address at his installation.

ARCHBISHOP O'BOYLE THANKS WASHINGTON FOR ITS WELCOME—TELLS PEOPLE OF HIS ARCHDIOCESE THAT HE WILL DEDICATE HIMSELF COMPLETELY TO THEM; TOGETHER THEY WILL PROMOTE THE SALVATION OF SOULS

(In response to requests from the press, the following statement by Archbishop-elect O'Boyle was made public at the rectory of St. Matthew's Cathedral shortly after his arrival from New York:)

The gates of the city of Washington have swung open to welcome me with traditional hospitality. Since my appointment was announced the priests, sisters, brothers, and laity of the archdiocese have been very kind in their expressions of fealty and their promises of service. They have reflected my own attitude on the matter. I come with a desire to serve and to help all the people.

I am encouraged by the prospect of close association with the beloved Bishop McNamara. As he assisted at my consecration he will, I hope, stand at my side all my days. The good priests, sisters, and brothers will, I know, serve in our vineyard with the same fervor and zeal which have always marked their labors.

DEDICATES HIMSELF TO PEOPLE

Naturally I am not yet entirely familiar with the many good works and noble institutions of the archdiocese. This knowledge will be my future pleasure. I am, of course, aware that the five counties in Maryland mirror the infancy of our Church in this country. The future, moreover, offers the pleasing prospect of absorption into the life of that great center of Catholic culture—the Catholic University.

To you—the people of the archdiocese—I dedicate myself humbly and completely. With your help we shall go on together as one family doing God's work for God's honor and glory. Thus will we all promote the salvation of souls—our common responsibility.

I shall earnestly try to be worthy of the great traditions of love of Church and country which have come down from the first American bishop, John Carroll; from the saintly Cardinal Gibbons; from the dynamic leader, Archbishop Curley.

TRIBUTE TO HIS PREDECESSORS

They dedicated their full lives to the salvation of souls. Their attainment in this direction is my ambition. If my years among you help to increase the goodness and sanctity of your lives, then, and only then, will I have discharged the responsibility which I now beseech you to share.

I am humbly grateful to the Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, for the vastly greater opportunities now offered me as a devoted citizen to advance my constant interest and support of everything that contributes to the common good of the archdiocese of Washington and of our beloved country.

European Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Would You Vote the Bonds?", published in the Joplin (Mo.) Globe of January 22, 1948. The Joplin Globe is an important newspaper in the great lead and zinc district of Missouri.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOULD YOU VOTE THE BONDS?

Wouldn't it be a good idea to put this European aid program on a business basis? To that end, why not add the amount Uncle Sam has expended for the purpose since VJ-day to the amount we are proposing to give to the 19 suppliant nations under the Marshall plan, allocate the total to the various counties and cities of the land and ask the taxpayers to approve bond issues for whatever their share comes to, so it can all be put on a pay-as-you-go basis?

Sounds all right, doesn't it? Quite in line with good business practice?

All right. Here are the various bond issues citizens of the different counties, cities, and towns in this part of Missouri would be called upon to approve:

For Joplin, a bond issue of $12,220,376.
For Carthage, a bond issue of $3,482,465.
For Webb City, a bond issue of $2,313,857.
For Sarcoxie, a bond issue of $347,753.
For Carl Junction, a bond issue of $341,841.

Perhaps it would be better to vote the bonds by counties, in which case the taxpayers of Jasper County would be asked to approve an issue of $25,893,945. Newton County an issue of $9,553,831. McDonald County an issue of $5,181,421. Lawrence County, $8,105,573. Barry County, $7,745,634. Barton County, $4,654,692. Vernon County, $8,418,794. Dade County, $3,700,592.

These figures are taken from a statement prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for United States Senator JAMES P. KEM, of Missouri, and printed, at his request, in the January 16 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The various allocations are divided into two parts, first the foreign aid already extended by Uncle Sam from July 1, 1945, the approximate end of the war, until June 30, 1947, and second, the foreign aid proposed by the Marshall plan. For purposes of comparison, annual tax receipts for the county are included. Thus the tables for Jasper and Newton Counties, as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are as follows:

County and cities	Foreign aid, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947	Foreign aid, proposed by Marshall plan	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual tax receipts
Jasper	$14,403,015	$11,490,930	$25,893,945	$980,344
Carl Junction	190,137	151,694	341,831	----------
Carthage	1,937,055	1,545,410	3,482,465	----------
Jasper	147,132	117,384	264,516	----------
Joplin	6,797,352	5,423,024	12,220,376	----------
Sarcoxie	193,431	154,322	347,753	----------
Webb City	1,287,039	1,026,818	2,313,857	----------
Newton	5,314,137	4,239,694	9,553,831	307,865
Diamond	88,928	70,956	159,884	----------
Granby	266,265	212,430	478,695	----------
Neosho	973,194	776,428	1,749,622	----------
Seneca	199,653	159,286	358,939	----------

If bond issues for the amounts stipulated were put up to the voters, do you think they would be approved? Neither do we.

The question is rather foolish, of course, because the voters are not going to be asked or permitted to express their sentiments on the matter. Not, at least, unless it should become an issue in the next election, which is not probable since Congress is being urged to approve the aid program en toto promptly or risk dire results.

Is it really our duty to help to such an extent these people of Europe who are suffering from a war we didn't start? And isn't it naive to call it aid? Sounds more like complete sustainment, if you get what we mean.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent summary of the work of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, showing what a great advantage it has been to the citizens of this country, and at so little cost to the Government. The summary appears in the form of an editorial published in the Pawtucket Times, of Pawtucket, R. I., on January 23, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLC REPORT

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation is preparing to wind up its business undertaken during the period of severe depression. It does so with some satisfying attainments. It appears certain this agency will cease business operations with no loss of any sort to the Government and there is a possibility of a small profit.

More impressive than any other achievement is the news it has served the purpose for which it was created and so more than four out of every five of its original debtors have succeeded in avoiding the loss of property. Thus we learn through the latest HOLC report that home owners who have used the agency have paid off 86 percent of a total of $3,500,000,000 lent to them in the depression years. At the close of the HOLC year on November 30 the agency had a profit of $18,000,000, which was built up chiefly from interest on loans. Figured closely, it is revealed the net deficit of the agency comes to about $5,200,000, which is less than two-tenths of 1 percent of its total loans.

It is reported that during the last year of high income and record employment a total of 71,000 borrowers paid off their mortgages entirely and ahead of schedule with about 323,000 accounts remaining on the books. About 97 percent of these are being paid on time and the total investment of the Corporation is down to $497,000,000.

Its operations have been cut to a great extent also with but 600 now employed, which is a drop of 312 in a year. The last of the branch offices was closed not long ago and all business is conducted from headquarters in New York City.

This was a Government venture into business which was born of depression. It was based upon recognition of a quality of human honesty which has been the backbone of business on credit. It has long been recognized that most people will pay for the things they acquire if they possibly can. In other words, by far the great majority of people are honest. The experiment of the HOLC has proved this all over again and there is satisfaction that the helping hand to many has saved cherished property at no loss to the taxpayers who provided the funds to make this possible.

Congress' Major Surgery for Truman's Bloated Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress' Major Surgery for Truman's Bloated Budget," from the San Antonio Express of January 14, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS' MAJOR SURGERY FOR TRUMAN'S BLOATED BUDGET

Popular sentiment on national tax reduction has reversed since last spring. The American Institute of Public Opinion today reveals a strong majority favoring immediate income-tax cuts. Previous Gallup polls indicate that demand to be for genuine general reduction, not for any tricky, ineffective political shift of the direct burden from one economic group to another.

Congress' great majority—including most Republicans and many Democrats—are well advised to agree, in opposition to the Truman administration. As deficit spending during an inflationary period is unthinkable, that demand equally is for over-all reduction of Federal expenditures—enough to enable substantial tax relief without preventing continuing debt retirement.

Consequently, President Truman's intolerable fiscal 1949 budget will be so slashingly revised before congressional approval that little purpose would be served by its detailed analysis here. Even were this not election year, Congress would not "rubber stamp" that proposed unprecedented peacetime outlay ($39,700,000,000). Nor will it allow near war-peak annual revenue around $45,000,000,000 to pile up a 2-year surplus exceeding $12,000,000,000—far more than is needed for debt retirement.

Suffice it to reject the President's budget on sound general principles:

1. The budget is sharply inflationary; it would drain off net income desperately needed for production-expanding industrial investment—the only long-range prosperity-stabilizing force.

2. The budget is extravagant. Congress can pare virtually every item, save perhaps the national-defense outlay, without disrupting essential works and services if economically administered.

3. The budget is political. The President included numerous vote-getting recommendations on matters better left to State and local governments or private enterprise, or deferred to a more propitious time for Federal consideration, or not done at all.

The United States' economy simply cannot support that combination of Rooseveltian domestic New Deal and Wilsonian world-saving. Something has got to go, and Mr. Truman has endangered his Marshall plan seriously by insisting on simultaneous impossible schemes at home.

The rapidly upward cost-of-living trend must be checked, for world, as well as national rehabilitation and stability. All the urgent adjectives at the command of the White House speech writers cannot obscure that glaringly compelling fact. Congress' main task now is to apply careful, but major surgery to that bloated Presidential budget.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Daily News of today:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—WHY?

The St. Lawrence seaway proposal, discussed off and on for the last quarter-century, is hotting up again in Congress. Many are the politicians who are for it, in both parties, and many are those against it, likewise in both parties.

We're against it, for two main reasons.

The first of these is that we are against virtually anything you can name which will injure the port of New York, and we've long been convinced that this project would do just that. Anybody who wants to call such an attitude selfish, ignoble, and generally horrid is welcome to do so. It's still our attitude. "I'm gonna dance with the guy what brung me."

The second reason why we're against the seaway is that we think it would be impractical at any time, and especially so just now, with labor and material prices skyhigh and the Nation short on steel, which the St. Lawrence project would eat up in great quantities.

Mayor O'Dwyer calls the scheme an outsize boondoggle, and we think he has something there.

As most readers probably know, the plan calls for an elaborate deep-water passage plus a big electric power set-up, the whole thing to sprawl all the way from Duluth, Minn., to Montreal, Quebec.

The object of the deep-water passage would be to let oceangoing liners and freighters into Great Lakes ports—Buffalo, Chicago, Cleveland, Duluth, Milwaukee, and so on. From the power project, it is claimed, great wads of kilowatts could be generated for up-State New York and Canada's Province of Ontario, and this would drive power rates downward on the New York side; also, the whole layout is alleged to be desirable from the point of view of national defense.

It all sounds big and broad visioned until you look at some of the catches.

One of these, as remarked above, is the cost. The original estimate, back in 1921, was $252,000,000. That guess has now gone up to $674,000,000, of which the United States would pay $491,000,000. Out of the $491,000,000, incidentally, New York State would have to pony up $161,000,000—the cost of the entire power project.

HUGE COSTS AND DUBIOUS RETURNS

Another catch is that this $674,000,000 estimate covers a channel only 27 feet deep, whereas big modern ships of the type the seaway people want to let into the Great Lakes need channels as deep as 35 feet. That would balloon the cost above the $674,000,000 estimate—and then there would be the heavy expense of dredging many Great Lakes ports' harbors to let the big ships dock in them.

When it comes to national defense, the seaway looks like as much of a liability as an asset. A big series of locks would have to be installed. One bomb, well placed, will knock out one such lock. The next war may easily start with a surprise air attack on our eastern and midwestern industrial centers from across the world's polar cap.

Can we afford to risk having a goodly part of our troop transport and supply ship strength bottled up in the Great Lakes some morning by a bombed-out St. Lawrence seaway lock?

As for the power project, it could be built by the State of New York alone or in cooperation with the Province of Ontario, without help from Washington or Ottawa, assuming a majority of New Yorkers and Ontarians wanted to go ahead with it—which such a majority seemingly has no present desire to do.

As for the selfish interest of the Port of New York in defeating this scheme, the seaway's friends admit that the project, if completed with full-depth channels, would divert huge tonnages of shipping from Atlantic ports. They also admit that fully 50 percent of such tonnages would be drawn off from the Port of New York.

For these reasons, we think the St. Lawrence seaway project should be abandoned.

It would cost too much, especially at this time; the returns on the investment would be dubious at best; and, as we've said for years, we think New Yorkers owe it to themselves to fight the proposal every time it bobs up.

Peace on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address on the subject Peace On Earth, broadcast by the well-known commentator, Mr. Arthur Gaeth, on December 24, 1947, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Out on the White House lawn tonight a big green Christmas tree is now sparkling with several hundred lights, and 5,000 spectators are gathered on the lawn in the cold atmosphere. The President pushed the switch just about 2 hours ago and after the carollers sang Adeste Fideles, he sent a message of good fellowship to the world, promising additional commodity assistance to countries in need.

Everywhere in this Capital, Government business has come to a halt for the next few days—except over in the Department of Agriculture where that list of grain speculators lies heavy on the Department's conscience. Congressional investigators will soon receive another roll including 71 local, State, and Federal employees who have been dabbling in the commodity market. At the same time, Harold Stassen who started all this, told a news conference out in St. Paul that he hopes to follow through and add some more facts to the speculation story.

From Vatican City, Pope Pius warned the world that it is heading for a new war. He accused world diplomats of practising deception and raising it to the dignity of a new system of strategy.

From Chicago, next Monday Henry Wallace is scheduled to announce his candidacy for the Presidency on an independent ticket.

In the Holy Land, scene of the first Christmas, violence marred this evening. At least four persons were slain and four others were wounded in communal strife.

Each year on Christmas Eve we yearn to hear again the story of Jesus. Nineteen-hundred-fifty-one years ago a child was laid in swaddling clothes on the clean straw of a manger in Bethlehem. That infant grew into a sturdy carpenter's son in his native Palestine, a then satellite state of the Romans. But he left carpentry to become a teacher. He was proclaimed a people's prophet. His followers, imbued with the traditions of their times, saw him ultimately as the great Jehovah—God incarnate.

In His first public pronouncement—in the Beatitudes—He offered hope to the poor in spirit, comfort to those who mourned, protection to those who were persecuted for righteousness sake. He extolled the peacemakers. He spoke in easily-comprehensible parables. He would have us act as the despised outsider—the Samaritan—when he found an innocent victim of thieves by the wayside.

The Master advocated prayer in secret and in humility—and He prayed a people's prayer—for daily bread, for the forgiveness of trespasses. He was outspoken against those who devoted their lives only to wealth. He had no sympathy for the fellow who saw all his neighbor's faults but none of his own. He taught his followers to treat others as they themselves expected to be treated.

This Jesus was unbeloved by the religious leaders of His time. He drove money-changers out of their temples. He was a constant scourge to those who offered lip-service to the law but didn't live it. So they conspired to do away with Him. They finally induced the representative of a foreign power to permit His crucifixion. Yet, in the hearts of His followers He did not die. They perceived the miracle of the resurrection. They sought to establish a kingdom of God on earth—one which will ultimately unite all mankind. The essence of Christ's teaching is peace—and the establishment on earth of the Kingdom of heaven.

Centuries have passed. We Christians never realized the peace. Only slowly have we begun to free mankind from want and fear. Millions have been slaughtered in Christian wars. Always there have been Judases to betray—although many have caught the meaning of the gospel and built hospitals, shared with others, and comforted the distressed. That help has extended across borders and nationalities and it has cast a shadow of brotherhood.

In this rich, productive country of ours we have accepted Christianity. Yet, how often it is with difficulty that the concept shines through the clouds of prejudice and discrimination. True, at Christmastime, we hunt out all the unfortunate. We see to it they have a Christmas dinner and presents—we talk about and do something for the hundred most needy families in our community. Somehow we awaken to the meaning of the words we recite so glibly out of our prayerbooks and scriptures the rest of the year.

Then, after the holiday is over, only too rarely do we sense that those who live about us are our brothers and our neighbors. In community after community in this great land, we brand as if with an iron, the black and the white, the saved and the sinners, when it comes to providing fundamental opportunities in education, housing, and earning a living; too often our charity continues to be degrading instead of opening vistas for self-respect.

Even now a Freedom Train is moving from community to community across the land. It is a museum of documents which form the cornerstone of the political and economic liberties we champion. But that Freedom Train will not stop in Birmingham, Ala., as was scheduled next Monday—so-called free and equal citizens in this country were to be segregated into classes so they could view their Declaration of Independence. The colored people announced they would boycott such meaningless freedom. The train will pass right through Birmingham.

From Jefferson, Lincoln, and Roosevelt—all Christians—we learned much about the application of political liberty. Much less receptive have we been to the concept of economic opportunity and security. Our fight against economic combines has been extended over 50 years—but we find that today the forces of monopoly are as active as ever and that they have friends in Congress and in court. Many seek to charge what the traffic will bear—not to work for prices that will expand increasingly the commodity wealth of the Nation to the greatest possible number. Some of us are shocked that the worker or the farmer should be doing so well and that we no longer hold them as bondsmen. Too many still find it difficult to conceive that our way of life should make possible medical attention when people are ill, social security when they have grown old and contributed to society all their strength allowed, or a decent minimum standard of living. We find it difficult to believe in Christ's miracle of loaves and fishes—that He would give to believing people something for which they had not slaved.

Here in our midst the light does shine through from time to time, but it still causes many of us to blink, to squint, and rebel. We do have the highest standards of living achieved anywhere for the greatest number, but we forget that only as we continue to increase and expand it can we hope to keep all at work and our way of life alive. It is more blessed to give than to receive operates in a very tangible and practical way in a democracy because only economically free people can actually be politically liberated. It seems that from the workers of Hawii we obtain the best example of practical brotherhood. In times past, the employers of the islands brought in workers from all over the world—there is a polyglot population but when they organized it was not along racial lines. The leadership shows Hawaiians, Portuguese, Spanish, Italians, Swedes, Chinese, Japanese, and even some Anglo-Saxons.

Now, we look beyond our own domain, we are suddenly plagued. We find ourselves in a cold war. Not so many moons ago, after months of bloody slaughter, we expressed the pious hope, with the other peoples of this shrinking globe—that all of us must learn to live together as brothers. We cannot all be alike because through the ages we arose from different environments and traditions, but we can all be tolerant and worship at the same altar—breathe the same fresh air. Yet, how easy we have found it to forget the mote in our own eye while we see the beam in another.

Today correspondents report the Communists are responsible for us losing our air bases in Panama. We seem to overlook the fact that for years, while we protected our communications from that land, we put the inferior silver label on the natives—while we blessed ourselves with a gold one. When we built the Canal, American workers were paid in gold—the natives were given silver—and that label of inferiority continued throughout this war—until resentment flashed—and we are pulling out—speaking about building another canal.

Now in the broken and shattered world in which we, almost alone, can live in plenty—it is the Communists we must fight in Europe and Asia—not the people we must help. That is becoming the basis for our recovery program—and we wonder why countries are torn with strife—why classes fight each other to the death. Through the recent weeks, many sections of a friendship train crossed the continent—picking up food donated out of the goodness of the American heart. The idea touched all with the warmth that goodness carries. Among the needy in France it was unloaded and received with the same spirit with which it was given—no one had any opposition and everyone blessed the giver. If international brotherhood ever is to take root, assistance must be divorced from politics. We have learned in Greece and may soon learn in China and elsewhere that when we play politics with aid, we engage in an "Operation Rat Hole."

Today the Russians curse us as warmongers—we revile them as dirty reds. When a 24-year-old Russian agronomist, just out of college, took his first trip abroad and stopped in Karlsbad, Czechoslovakia, he requested from a Russian-speaking acquaintance of mine: "Pokazete mi Bourzoj"—show me someone of the bourgeoisie. He expected to see a strange character, possibly as he had seen the Soviet Punch—Krokodil—depict him. When this same acquaintance took a group of Russian agriculturalists to Texas during the war, to show them developments on American farms, one of the farm occupants told the company to wait while he got his shotgun, when he was told through the door who his visitors were. He apparently expected long-bearded Bolsheviks with guns in their belts.

Our world has grown so small—yet we continue to live so far apart. Our governments and our press continue to raise barriers of distrust. We know other peoples have erected walls to stop us from going to look and see—but now our own country, which has boasted freedom, has begun imitating the others—intimidating expression—casting chains that bound so many for years.

We have just made the most important discovery since fire. Fifteen pounds of atomic fuel will produce enough energy to meet all the demands of the United States for 1 year. A carload of it would heat every building, light every light in the world for a thousand years. Radioactive isotopes today can make the body as transparent as a pane of glass and we are on the way to discovering the causes for all the secret ailments of mankind. If we survive, the day can come when man will be able to live a thousand years.

But we see the atom merely as the basis for destruction—our motto continues to be: "Kill or be killed." All our Christian teaching has never enabled us to escape organized savagery called war. The light of Christmas never dissolved human greed. His example never impressed governments that bludgeons in international relations today will bring no revival, create no millenium or era of peace.

Robert Hutchins, president at the university where atomic enegy was developed wrote in this month's American Magazine that there is no bomb secret and there is no defense against the bomb. He maintains we are foolish if we believe the Russians haven't learned how to make the bomb—if we believe they have no bombs. He explains how two of the new-type bombs—dropped in or off the shores of this country might annihilate great sections of our population through its rays. Rays from the bomb dropped at Bikini were picked up in Los Angeles within a week—and we can make bombs today 1,000 times as powerful.

No nation can dominate militarily for more than a moment at the dawn of this atomic era. No people by power can force other peoples to be good. Christ said that long ago.

Says Hutchins: "Many of us who have thought the situation through have concluded that our only salvation lies in the establishment of an international morality. I believe that all nations must sit down together and agree to be good • • • instead of glowering at one another, nations must understand that we are inevitably destined to have one world or none at all."

This is Christamas Eve. The bells are ringing for peace on earth, good will toward men. What do they say to you? Is there hate or indifference in your heart—or a prayer to God to help you understand to have a sense of responsibility and belongingness toward and with the other fellow—whether he be light or dark, American, French, Chinese, or Russian. This awakening must begin in our homes—then it may ultimately reach Congress and from there into the United Nations and on to the Russians and others. Remember—the word is still stronger even than the atom bomb—pass it along. What a Christmas spirit would arise if a hundred million of us let such a wave swell and encompass our people. Christ and His Christmas message have not failed us—it is we who have failed Him.

And now a Merry Christmas and to all a goodnight.

Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include an excellent address by Michael W. Straus, United States Commissioner of Reclamation, on the subject, Reclamation Looks Forward. This address was given before the Nebraska Reclamation Association at Kearney, Nebr., on January 15, 1948. The address follows:

It is my good fortune to again be permitted to come before the Nebraska Reclamation Association at its annual meeting, particularly in this special week when in Washington, which I left last night, the President and the Congress are undertaking action which will have major and beneficial effects on the many plans you are developing at this meeting.

Not only did I want to be with you here in Nebraska now, but it is no great state secret that whether I wanted to or not, force of circumstances has just about required my presence here, for Nebraska, with your able support, is rapidly becoming the brightest star in the reclamation constellation. Reclamation is moving forward in this State with a determination and a speed that really keeps the Bureau of Reclamation scrambling. That's only one reason I wanted to be here.

Another reason is because of your energetic congressional delegation that virtually ordered me here. Senator KENNETH WHERRY is the aggressive chairman of the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee that handles the reclamation appropriations that make possible our work in Nebraska and in the West. He follows Nebraska affairs closely and the Senate committee under his able leadership has always supported the reclamation program. Senator WHERRY asked that I come to Kearney in his stead when pressing duties kept him in Washington. Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, on whose knowledge and support reclamation frequently relies, is chairman of the Senate Public Lands Committee which writes the reclamation laws and thereby calls the signals for the Bureau, of which I am proud to be the Commissioner. And your representatives in the House, CARL CURTIS, with whom I frequently counsel, and Dr. MILLER, CARL STEFAN, and HOWARD BUFFETT, have like interests. So, when I got your invitation with such forceful seconding from your delegation, I had little choice. With that surprising originality of most bureaucrats, I replied, "Yes, sirs."

Now, I don't want to waste your time and mine by looking backward and extolling the virtues of what has already been accomplished or admiring the beauties of the Nebraska landscape and praising the historical accomplishments of your fine State. I would happily do all that, but we have more pressing business on hand. And I am not going to insult the reclamation leaders of Nebraska by a flock of adjectives and a welter of oratory intended to sell you reclamation. You are already experts on the subject, and anyway that would be too easy. Selling water in the West today is about as hard as selling a sandwich to a starving man. Likewise, I will refrain from vital statistics and description of this or that fine Nebraska project and will not bore you by discussing the relative virtues of a 102- or 107-foot earth dam, or a wooden or iron gate in this or that project. I won't do it for several reasons, but chiefly and truthfully because of the fact that Mr. Avery Batson, the regional director of reclamation, and the Bureau's staff in Nebraska have far more familiarity with the details of the individual Nebraska projects than I have and, incidentally, they are far more competent to perform that particular task than I am. They have already done so or will do so during your meeting here in Kearney.

I ask you to lean back a bit with me and take a broader look at reclamation's problems. They are very real and, in the end, the developments here in Nebraska that will help establish the future economy for the next few decads in your State, will be governed by the solution of those broad problems in which you will participate.

Here in Nebraska, while reclamation is not a new and untried experiment, we are now doing some trail blazing—pioneering which I think is going to lead the way for the water resource development in this country and throughout the world. Nebraska is a pivotal State in the comprehensive Missouri Basin program—the first such program on such a scale that has been embarked upon in this country or anywhere in the world. The Missouri Basin is seven States and one-sixth of the total area of the United States. Here, together with the able Corps of Army Engineers and other local, State, and Federal agencies, there has been blueprinted an integrated and a comprehensive plan for the ultimate development of the natural resources with which the area is blessed. And contrary to history in many other areas, you are not going forward blindly on this little segment or that individual bit of work, but moving forward on a planned basis that takes all resources and benefits into consideration, fitting the picture together to make a comprehensive whole watershed development on a scale heretofore never undertaken. As the principal source of all our well-being in this country and in Nebraska, particularly, is the wealth of our natural resources, our water and our lands and our other blessings, what you are doing here is going to set the framework of the lives of your grandchildren and their grandchildren. So, let us keep our perspective as we meet and solve the thousand tough problems which will arise, and be conscious of the fact that the world is watching a great endeavor—a pioneering effort well worth watching.

In the Republican River Valley here in Nebraska you have, through your own good efforts, got a flying start toward attaining the benefits of the Missouri River plan. Two of your big dams, the Harlan County and the Enders, are already under way and we shall be in a position to get started on Medicine Creek when the weather permits construction to open next spring. At the propitious moment in the wake of disastrous floods last spring, you demonstrated the need to proceed at once with Culbertson and Bonny Dams and to expedite Medicine Creek. You did it so effectively that I was able to go before the Congress in its closing minutes last July and secure funds to get work under way on eight more Missouri Basin dams. It is indeed a pleasure and a test for reclamation to work with the people of Nebraska. But let us lift our sights and take a far look at the horizon and see how and where we can get along with our goal of putting a million acres of the rich Nebraska farmlands under irrigation in our times to achieve all the benefits of the multiple-purpose Missouri River Basin plan.

President Harry Truman, who is not unfamiliar with the midlands landscape, helped us in aiming at our goal when, within the week, in his State of the Union message to the Congress, he said:

"We must expand our reclamation program to bring millions of acres of arid land into production, and to improve water supplies for additional millions of acres. This will provide new opportunities for veterans and others, particularly in the West, and aid in providing a rising living standard for a growing population. * * *

"We must continue to erect multiple-purpose dams on our great rivers—not only to reclaim land, but also to prevent floods, to extend our inland waterways, and to provide hydroelectric power. This public power must not be monopolized for private gain. Only through well-established policies of transmitting power directly to its market and thus encouraging widespread use at low rates can the Federal Government assure the people of their full share of its benefits. Additional power—public and private—is needed to raise the ceilings now imposed by power shortages on industrial and agricultural development.

"We should achieve the wise use of resources through the integrated development of our great river basins."

Well, that's the program. That has been your program in the Nebraska Reclamation Association for some years. But this is a very big country and it needs a lot of education before your and my program becomes fully supported as a national program. And, of course, words alone aren't going to achieve the end. It takes perseverance, work, skill, men, material, and money.

I don't like to talk about this program primarily in terms of money because it goes far beyond money and leads directly to the way of life of those who come after us. All the money in the world won't get you a good program alone without your local wisdom and the technicians' training. And it takes foresight to build the Missouri Basin plan these days as anybody knows who has built a house, a store, a barn, or a shed within cost estimates recently. But it does take money. And it just happens that the dollar mark is a yardstick that a lot of people use and it is going to be used on the Missouri Basin program. So, we better measure ourselves somewhat by the measure that is going to be applied to us under the law.

You may have noticed that sometimes Reclamation discusses, of necessity, some money matters with the Congress. You may also have noticed that the President did not confine his support of your program to words. Just as I was leaving Washington he transmitted his budget to the Congress calling for a $268,000,000 appropriation for Reclamation for the next fiscal year. Now it happens to be true that that is the largest reclamation appropriation ever sought of the Congress at one time. It is nearly double the amount of last year's Presidential requests. You are probably going to hear quite a lot of discussion on this subject in the next few months. Here again I ask you to lean back a bit with me and get your program into perspective.

Arithmetical and historical comparisons of these sums with the past are an interesting numbers game, if you like to play numbers, and it may bring an unwarranted, understandable feeling of achievement that at last our reclamation program is pointed toward a goal more nearly in keeping with our needs for developing water, land, and power resources. But interesting as these comparisons may be, they are no adequate way to scale our needs. We should not and must not gage our progress forward by looking through a rear-view mirror. Funds that were adequate in yesteryear are not adequate for the present or the future because programs of the past are no relation to the scope or velocity of present and future reclamation programs. The road to our destination, where reclamation development will have caught up with national and Nebraska needs, is long and rough, and the goal is still far, far away. To get there, we shall have to keep our eyes fixed on the road ahead and look forward through the windshield and not backward through the rear-view mirror. We will also have to keep the gas pedal shoved flat to the floor board. And that is the situation in the Bureau of Reclamation today as we are striving and struggling to keep up to your thinking.

We should not take as our criterion last year or the year before any more than the boy who came to the stream and took as his criterion the tremendous leap of, say, 8 feet over the stream. He should not have boasted about that tremendous 8-foot leap, for the stream happened to be 16 feet wide and he went splash in the middle. And that is the way it is with our endeavor in the Missouri Basin, and we cannot go "kerplunk" because we misjudged the size of our task.

Federal reclamation projects throughout the West, under construction or authorized for construction, now come to a grand total of some $4,435,000,000 at today's prices. We are scarcely well embarked on this tremendous undertaking. Reclamation is reaching out to satisfy our growing needs of water resource development and must grow with our rapidly expanding national economy to a degree beyond any comparison of the concepts of the past decades. There is little good new agricultural land to be opened up in this country without irrigation. We are past that stage of development. Our frontier is gone, except as we extend it by irrigation. Our population is increasing. I suspect that Americans are going to continue to want to eat well and a lot of them have never eaten as well as you people have here, where the food comes from. And beyond that there are a lot of people in this world, outside the United States, who are getting hungry, and some of them are already starving. One way or another we are going to help feed them. The Missouri Basin and Nebraska are going to do their share and more than their share in providing that food.

And a further word about our backlog of authorized projects: We still have a tremendous project planning and investigations job to place much of these planning data in shape for construction to go forward, as well as to provide for authorization of new work.

Now, let us get a little closer to home, at least in the Missouri Basin program, and see how these broad figures affect the Missouri Basin plan, which is a comparatively new plan and is now coming up for its fourth regular annual appropriation. Also, take a look to see where we are heading. The first Missouri Basin plan reclamation appropriation was only made as recently as 1946 and amounted to $3,200,000. The second regular appropriation of 1947 was $17,500,000 and about the same amount was provided for 1948 in the regular appropriation—the funds being used today. There also have been sizable supplemental appropriations. Over the 3 years to last July 1 a total of $55,000,000 was provided. This week, for the coming single fiscal year starting July 1 alone, the President has asked that $63,900,000 be provided—in other words, as much for reclamation's work in the Missouri Basin program in the coming year alone as in the past 3 years combined. This thing, once started, rolls like a snowball. But with all the midlanders' and the honest Nebraska respect for a dollar, don't let us be fearful of the figures when we use the dollar yardstick. We are going to get our money's worth. This money is not just spent and gone. It is transformed into producing assets of real value that will serve us and those who follow us as long as snow and rain fall and water runs downhill. It is just about the best investment Uncle Sam can ever make.

We have a Missouri Basin plan for the ultimate comprehensive development, to be sure, and it is moving forward successfully. But the people of Nebraska and the Missouri Basin and the United States have not as yet decided how long they shall take in achieving all those benefits, and that is one of the great problems I hope you will consider. The President has asked that almost $64,000,000 be provided for the Missouri Basin plan in the coming fiscal year. That's a lot of money, but much more will be needed before this long-range plan is achieved and the benefits reaped. The construction program to meet the plan's needs is measured in many millions of dollars per year, and you might be interested in the fact that the rate of construction progress now being achieved in the Missouri Basin starts work and sets a pace which in a few years will require annual appropriations of $100,000,000 to $150,000,000 if we are going to think of getting this job done within our times—say, within 20 years—if any of us consider that within our times. So, you see, that perspective shows this is the greatest water program of the world today, and it is high time we made up our minds how long we'll take to do the task.

Now, it happens that rivers and transmission lines, acre-feet of water, and kilowatts are no respecters of arbitrary political subdivisions such as State lines. Water is where you find it and it runs downhill, and hydropower gets up and walks on transmission lines from natural sources to markets, paying no attention whatsoever to State lines. Reclamation, which deals with water and power, does it realistically on the basis of nature's map as it is found, and that is the way the Missouri Basin plan you have brought into being considers these resources, even though Nebraska happens to be one of the States that lies wholly in the basin. But, nevertheless, just to rifle our sights for a moment on what generally may be considered the State of Nebraska in which you have particular interests, although occasionally we will stray over that unnatural State line, you will be interested to know that the President's budget of almost $64,000,000 for this seven-State area of the Missouri Basin in the coming year happens to provide for some $17,855,000 for work primarily of direct interest to Nebraska. The principal part—some fifteen and a quarter million—is for construction of Enders, Medicine Creek, Culbertson, Bonny, and Bostwick, plus transmission lines centering in Nebraska. Additional sums are provided for preconstruction work or surveys and investigations for such projects as Columbus, Grand Island, Middle Loup, Kansas Basin, Lower Platte, Niobrara, North Republican, and South Platte.

Now, that's what the cash register shows. But don't become myopic by staring at the cash register. Large as these sums are they must be viewed not as expenditures but as investments in capital goods—our national agricultural and industrial tools of production. Those are capital goods that bring immediate returns, profits year after year, over many years to come, from our national agriculture and industry. Our producing plant is the envy of the world and makes us the strongest nation in the world. The continuing dividends that will be enjoyed from them dwarf the initial investment. In fact, the growth of our country will be sorely retarded if we fail to go forward with this investment, just as it would if industry should timidly freeze up the flow of new capital investment.

That's not just a reclamation theory; that is an established reclamation fact. Over all the West in the past 45 years of reclamation you, through your Government, made an investment of about a billion dollars in reclamation, in turning waste lands and waste water into productive investment, in opening and establishing the West of today on the soundest economic basis in this world—firm and prosperous communities with assured water supply and industry where sagebrush grew before. Now from that billion-dollar investment dribbled into reclamation over 45 years, there came a yield in the single year of 1947 in crops grown solely by Federal reclamation water of $538,000,000—a return in crop values in the last single year of almost half the total investment of nearly half a century. In addition, revenues from reclamation power sales totaled over $23,000,000 for the single year and the demand for both water and power naturally is increasing instead of diminishing as our country is developing. That's why Uncle Sam is investing. In fact, it is a good investment for anybody in any league, anywhere.

Now, there are a few other things on which I'd like to report to you briefly because they are problems with which we all are confronted. Perhaps the most important of these is that we must find a way of securing steady continuity in carrying forward our reclamation plans—we must take reclamation off the merry-go-round. Past reclamation programs have, by various and sometimes temporary jurisdictions, been alternately cleared and blocked, speeded and slowed down, frozen and thawed, and commanded to "Giddap" and then "Whoa." As one of the great construction programs of the world, reclamation merits and must secure better treatment. You cannot accomplish a multiple-million-dollar complex program by, in alternate years, squeezing it fat and then stretching it thin as if it were an accordion. At least, it cannot be done on an economical and rational basis. While it is inevitable that each shift in the world kaleidoscope reflects on reclamation's and Nebraska's program and that each Congress, by appropriation action, refixes schedules in the light of its latest estimate of comparative needs, reclamation and Nebraska must win for themselves a minimum firm program base that the West can rely upon in scheduling its work intelligently several years—I will say not less than 6 years—in advance. We can provide such a program. It's up to us together to find a way of securing it.

I am hurrying back to Washington from meeting with you here because of two legislative matters which are up and in which you are vitally interested and which will fix a couple of basic ground rules under which Federal participation in your program proceeds. You have a big stake in these measures.

The first is the so-called Rockwell bill, otherwise known as H. R. 2873, with an identical measure known as S. 1608 pending before the Senate, where it was introduced by your own Senator HUGH BUTLER last year. The measure is about to come out on the floor for passage in the House backed by the unanimous favorable report of the committee that gave it long hearings.

The Rockwell bill is of primary interest to you because it will make feasible, under existent law, many sections of the Missouri Basin plan that are now only sketched roughly as possibilities. It does this by reducing the interest rate on the investment in power facilities on reclamation projects from 3 percent where it now stands to 2½ percent (which is still more than your Government pays), by settling long controversies over the application of this interest, and by fixing the amortization period on power investment at 78 years or the useful life of the facilities, whichever is the shortest. Of equal importance, the Rockwell bill would make nonreimbursable to the Federal Government its expenditures on reclamation projects which may be properly allocated to recreation development, fish and wildlife development, silt control, and general salinity control. On the decision of this matter by the Congress will depend whether many of the projects in which you are interested can proceed under reclamation law. I am happy to be able to report to you that the National Reclamation Association and the Bureau of Reclamation and all the interests involved seem to have been able at last to reach agreement on the many features of this bill, and the National Reclamation Association has taken positive action to endorse the measure. On behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation, I wish to report to you that Reclamation approves it in the form in which it is going to the floor of the Congress. It is most important that it be embraced in that form into reclamation law.

The other immediate legislative problem and one on which I offered testimony the day I left Washington, although it sounds technical, is of major importance to Nebraska and the Missouri Basin plan. It is a bill that revises the law under which repayment contracts are made by irrigation districts benefiting from the Missouri Basin development. It does this by revising the so-called 9 (e) clause of the Reclamation Act of 1939. Under this law in its existing form, it is not possible for the Bureau of Reclamation to provide a continuing and pertinent

water right at low annual payments to water users. That is because the present law prohibits Reclamation from making any commitment of water beyond 40 years under this clause in the 1939 act. The tradition of the West and of this area is that permanent water rights accrue by development and use. Reclamation recognizes this tradition and has joined in asking the Congress to provide the authority for making repayment contracts which give assurance of continuing and permanent enjoyment of the water that Reclamation develops. It is Reclamation's hope that this legislative action is taken, for with it, a better, more attractive, and liberalized type of repayment contract can be written in the Missouri Basin and in Nebraska which not only I, but many others, believe will be most attractive to you and meet the West's natural desire and requirement for permanent and assured water.

There are many other items which I might discuss but Reclamation has developed over the past half a century from the wisdom of the communities and the areas which have sampled it and found it to their liking. You will be in session here several days and this convention is but one more milestone in Nebraska's achievement in the Missouri Basin program. You will be solving, by your own wisdom, many a problem over the years that is no thornier than those which have already been overcome. As some of these problems seem large and magnified under the microscope of close attention, my only counsel is to keep them in perspective against the great fabric of the Missouri Basin plan.

All the signs and indicators now point to success in this great endeavor. Through your wisdom and support the program has been successfully launched. Reclamation is proud to be in partnership with Nebraska on this great venture and with you looks forward to the future.

Pushmataha, Choctaw Diplomat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, from my early years I have heard and read much about Pushmataha, one of the greatest chiefs of the Choctaw Tribe of Indians whoever lived. He was known far and wide and beloved by many. Many times was he the guest at the White House.

Recently there appeared a well-written article in the Evening Star of Washington, written by John Clagett Proctor on the life of "Pushmataha, Choctaw Diplomat." Under leave to extend my remarks I desire to include this article, as follows:

PUSHMATAHA, CHOCTAW DIPLOMAT
(By John Clagett Proctor)

Poor Pushmataha! Methinks I heard this brave Indian's name mentioned on the radio recently, and it carried my mind back to an account of this Indian's visit to Washington in 1824, during the second administration of President James Monroe.

This celebrated Choctaw Indian chief died in Washington about midnight December 23, 1824. He had come to this city with several other chiefs to see the President for the purpose of obtaining a settlement of the debt due from the Government, originating in the treaty held at Doak's Stand in 1820, and known as the "net proceeds claim."

Three of the four chiefs who came here—including Pushmataha—died waiting for a settlement. The fourth, seeking what might await him if he stayed here, went back to the tall timbers and at least had the satisfaction of passing away among those who loved him more and appreciated him better than did the white man at Washington.

DEBT PAID IN 1888

Of course the Government paid the debt—it always does pay its just obligations—but not until 1888, 64 years after poor old "Push" had gone to the happy hunting ground where even United States coins will not pass as currency. However, the unfortunate result was that more than $1,000,000 paid by the Government could then only be used by the grandchildren and great-grandchildren of Pushmataha.

While in Washington this great Indian frequently was the guest of the President and the White House and was often dined and wined by other public officials, notably Gen. Andrew Jackson, who was then serving in the Senate and was always glad to see him. It was General Jackson whom Pushmataha had joined with a large number of his warriors in the Creek War in 1813–14, engaging with distinction in all the battles of that eventful period—Talladega, Holy Ground, and Pensacola—and later accompanied the general to New Orleans, where he witnessed the battle of January 8, 1815, but not as a participant.

MEETS GENERAL LAFAYETTE

While Pushmataha was in Washington, General Lafayette was a guest of the Nation, and the Indian chief had the pleasure of meeting the Marquis, to whom he is said to have made a brief but very eloquent address, closing with the following prophecy which was fulfilled before the close of the year: "We heard your name in our distant wigwams. I longed to see one who had come a long way to assist our friends of the white race when they were a small people. I have seen and shaken your hand. This is our last meeting on earth. Soon the great ocean will divide us. We shall see each other no more till we meet in the happy hunting ground."

Pushmataha was born in what is now the State of Mississippi about the year 1764 and before he had reached his twentieth year he had distinguished himself on the warpath. He early joined an expedition against the Osages on the western side of the Mississippi and, so it is said, because of his youth and propensity for talking, he was a good deal laughed at by the more experienced men of the party.

The principal speech made by Pushmataha upon his visit to Washington was addressed to John C. Calhoun, then Secretary of War. As recorded by McKenney and Hall, the following is what he said:

"Father, I have been here some time. I have not talked—have been sick. You shall hear me talk today. I belong to another district. You have no doubt heard of me. I am Pushmataha.

IN THE BEND OF YOUR ARM

"Father, when in my own country I often looked toward this council house and wanted to come here. I am in trouble. I will tell my distresses. I feel like a small child, not half as high as its father, who comes up to look in his father's face, hanging in the bend of his arm, to tell him his troubles. So, father, I hang in the bend of your arm and look up in your face, and now hear me speak.

"Father, when I was in my own country I heard there were men appointed to talk to us. I would not speak then. I chose to come here and speak in this beloved house. I can boast and say and tell the truth that none of my fathers or grandfathers, nor any Choctaw, ever drew bows against the United States. They have always been friendly. We have held the hand of the United States so long that our nails are long like birds' claws, and there is no danger of their slipping out.

"Father, I have come to speak. My nation has always listened to the applications of the white people. They have given to their country till it is very small. I repeat the same about the land east of the Tombigbee. I came here when a young man to see my Father Jefferson. He told me if ever we got in trouble we must run and tell him. I am come. This is a friendly talk. It is like a man who meets another and says, 'How do you do.' Another will talk further."

MENTIONED BY RANDOLPH

The celebrated John Randolph, of Virginia, who served in Congress, off and on, from 1799 to 1827, upon one occasion alluded to the Indian chief in a speech upon the floor of the Senate, and to his grave in Congressional Cemetery. He said:

"Sir, in a late visit to the public graveyard my attention was arrested by the simple monument of the Choctaw chief, Pushmataha. He was, I have been told by those who knew him, one of nature's nobility; a man who would have adorned any society. He lies quietly by the side of our statesman and his magistrates in the region—for there is one such—where the red man and the white man are on a level. On the sides of the plain shaft that marks his place of burial I read these words: 'Pushmataha, a Choctaw chief, lies here; this monument to his memory is erected by his brother chiefs, who were associated with him in a delegation from their nation, in the year 1824, to the Government of the United States. Pushmataha was a warrior of great distinction. He was wise in council, eloquent in an extraordinary degree, and on all occasions, and under all circumstances, the white man's friend.' He died in Washington on the 24th of December 1824 of the croup, in the sixtieth year of his age. Among his last words were the following: 'When I am gone let the big guns be fired over me.'

"The day after the funeral of Pushmataha the deputation visited the office in charge of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The countenances of the chiefs wore a gloom which such a loss was well calculated to create. Over the face of one of the deputation, however, was a cloud darker than the rest, and the expression on his face told a tale of deeper sorrow. 'Ask that young man,' said the officer in charge of the Bureau, 'what is the matter with him.' The answer was, 'I am sorry.' 'Ask him what makes him sorry.' The loss, the answer was expected to be, of our beloved chief. But, no; it was, 'I am sorry it was not me'."

THOUSANDS WITNESS FUNERAL

"The ceremonies of the funeral, the reader will bear in mind, were very imposing. The old chief had said, 'When I am gone, let the big guns be fired over me,' and they were fired. Besides the discharge of minute guns on the Capitol Hill and from the ground contiguous to the place of interment, there was an immense concourse of citizens, a long train of carriages, cavalry, military, bands of music, the whole procession extending at least a mile in length, and there were thousands lining the ways and filling the doors and windows, and then the military honors at the grave, combined to produce in this young chief's mind a feeling of regret that he had not been, himself, the subject of these honors. Hence his reply, 'I am sorry it was not me;' and so he explained himself."

The Congressional Cemetery was established in 1807, by the vestry of Christ Episcopal Church parish, G Street between Sixth and Seventh Streets SE., and here are interred more than 60,000 bodies, many distinguished Washingtonians who helped establish the Capital City, celebrated Members of Congress and outstanding members of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

To an extent it is a Federal cemetery, although, as stated, it is governed by Christ Church, and in this connection we find that the United States holds title to sites in ranges 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 54, 56, 57, 59, and 60, which are occupied by 87 Members of Congress and other high Government officials. In these ranges are also 96 cenotaphs which were erected to the memory of persons whose remains have either been removed from the cemetery for burial elsewhere or who were never buried in this cemetery. It appears to have been the practice at one time to erect cenotaphs to the memory of distinguished persons regardless of whether or not they were actually buried in the Congressional Cemetery. It is one of the outstanding cemeteries of Washington and one of its oldest.

Rhode Island's Freedom Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the Freedom Train, now traveling throughout our country, carries many historic documents. Permitting the American people to view these documents is reviving and developing the spirit of Americanism in the hearts of many who have taken for granted the freedom that we enjoy without realizing the real basis for these freedoms and the price that was paid by our forefathers to gain, and pass on to us, this great heritage.

My home State of Rhode Island, though small in area, is great in historic background. In fact there are so many historic documents in our State archives that we could furnish a freedom train of our own. In order that my colleagues, and all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, may be privileged to gain in small measure a knowledge of some of our prized documents, I am inserting, as a part of my remarks, a brief summary of some of the most important documents that may be viewed by any visitor to our statehouse which is located in the city of Providence.

Secretary of State Armand H. Cote has just transmitted to me a summary prepared by Miss Quinn, his assistant in charge of archives. It follows:

The Freedom Train came to Providence and young and old from all over Rhode Island came to view its treasures. Had you but glanced from its windows as you went through, you would have realized that it had come home for there silhouetted against the sky was the dome of the State house topped by the symbolic figure of the "Independent man," a silent guardian of the records which prove that Rhode Island and its people have always been devoted to the idea of freedom and to the ways of democracy. Its very name Rhode Island and Providence Plantations is an evidence of a people who learned to act together. Its legislative body, the general assembly, is a reminder of the fact that long ago government was accomplished through the will of the majority acting in an assembly.

The very oldest document in the State archives, written the 7th day of the first month 1638 is an agreement entered into by the founders of Portsmouth on the Island of Acquidneck to incorporate themselves into a body politic. Their first action under that agreement begins with the words, "We that are freemen incorporate," after which they proceed to elect William Coddington as judge or president to govern them. In turn the judge gives his oath that he will maintain the "fundamental rights and privileges of this bodie politick." From that day forward Rhode Island never turned from its goal, the records tell a continuous story of the building of a government by the inhabitants assembled together freely. At first all acts were agreed on in concert. Then the powers of the assembly were delegated to a judge and elders, with the freemen meeting in quarterly sessions only. As the number of inhabitants grew, this form of meeting became too cumbersome and a petition was presented to parliament by Roger Williams for a "Free Charter of Civil Incorporation" for a "Society * * *, which may in time by the blessing of God upon their endeavor, lay a sure foundation of happiness to all America." This petition resulted in the grant of a Parliamentary patent in 1643–44.

In 1647 the four towns—Providence, Portsmouth, Newport, and Warwick—met in a general court of elections to put the new charter in effect. "It is agreed by this present Assembly thus incorporate, and by this present act declared, that the forme of Government established in Providence Plantations is democratical, that is to say, a Government held by ye free and voluntarie consent of all or the greater part of the free inhabitants." A code of laws was drawn up at this same assembly and the administering of justice according to the laws agreed upon and established throughout the whole colony. In May 1648 "It is ordered that six men of each Towne shall be chosen, in whome ye General Court shall continue." Always the emphasis is on this free choice, "the inhabitants shall choose" and "by the election were chosen."

Because the Patent of 1643 did not seem specific enough in the powers and duties it conferred upon the Government, a petition was presented to King Charles II, which resulted in a most liberal charter being granted on July 8, 1663 to the Colony of Rhode Island and the Providence Plantations. By this charter the colony was permitted to elect its own Governor and general officers who were not subject in any way to approval by the Crown, and to enact such laws as were deemed necessary, provided only that they did not conflict with the laws of England. Rhode Island remained under this form of government until the adoption of the State Constitution of 1842, which is still the basic form of government. When the charter was put into effect according to the provisions contained in it, one of the first acts of the assembly was a discussion of the advisability of allowing the freemen to put in their votes by proxies, because of the difficulties of travel, rather than requiring them to be present at the election of officers to be held at Newport and so perhaps depriving them of their voting privileges. At this same session the section of the charter having reference to liberty of conscience was repeated as an act of the assembly: "That noe parson within the sayd Collony at any time hearafter shall be in any wayes molested, punished, disquieted or called in question for any differance of opinion in matters of Religion and doe not actually disturb the Civell peace of the sayd Collony."

With such a beginning it was but natural that Rhode Island should refuse to submit to any government not of its choosing. So in addition to a continuous legislative record dating back to 1638, which includes not only the acts and resolves of the assembly but also petitions from private citizens which give more than a fair picture of the life of the times, there are these milestones on the path of freedom preserved in the archives of the State:

The Portsmouth compact with the signatures of the founders of the Island of Rhode Island, dated March 1637–38.

A certified copy of the Parliamentary Patent of the Providence Plantations for 1643.

The Code of Laws of 1647.

The King Charles Charter of 1663.

The first revision of the laws of 1705.

The first printed revision of the laws of 1719, which made possible a wider distribution of the laws by which the Colony was governed.

The Commission of the Board, dated September 2, 1772, which inquired into the burning of H. M. S. *Gaspee* in June of 1772, in Narragansett Bay.

The Rhode Island Declaration of Independence, the name by which "An act for altering the form of allegiance" has become known.

The Test Act of Oath of Allegiance to the United Colonies signed on June 16, 1776, by the Governor, the general officers, the members of the House of Magistrates, and most of the deputies.

A certified copy of the Declaration of Independence, signed by John Hancock and indorsed on the back: "Made part of the laws of the State of Rhode Island &c—nemine contradicente."

The Constitution of the United States as ratified by the Constitutional Convention on May 29, 1790.

An engrossed copy of the Bill of Rights forwarded by President Washington in October 1789 and ratified in June of 1790 by the General Assembly which met immediately after the ratification of the Constitution.

The Constitution of the State of Rhode Island of 1842, adopted after the so-called Dorr War.

How To Help Europe Back on Her Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the February 3, 1948, issue of the magazine Look, which is entitled "How To Help Europe Back on Her Feet," written by our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. HERTER:

HOW TO HELP EUROPE BACK ON HER FEET
(By Christian A. Herter)

The problem of temporary relief to Europe has now been dealt with. Congress has passed legislation allowing France, Italy, and Austria to maintain their meager economies through April. Some assistance is also provided for China. Now, what next?

It is obviously wishful thinking to believe that this interim aid program is anything other than a stop-gap program. No one in his right senses can believe that France, Italy, or Austria can feed themselves or keep their industries running after April of this year and until the next harvest without still further help. It is equally ostrichlike to refuse to face the fact that not only these countries, but other countries in Europe are going to have further aid from the United States unless their internal economies are to be allowed to disintegrate completely.

This at once poses the question of what the United States can and should do. When I

use the word "can," I speak in terms not of what the United States is able to do under any or all circumstances, but what the United States is physically able to do without weakening its own domestic economy. No one favors jeopardizing our internal strength. The maintenance of that strength is the one beacon light guiding the peoples of the world who believe in the essential rightness of the freedom of the individual as against the slavery of the police state.

The Select Committee on Foreign Aid of the House of Representatives, of which I am privileged to be vice chairman, has submitted to the Congress a number of reports dealing with the principles and organization which we believe should govern any foreign-aid program.

There is much justice in the frequent complaints that the peoples of western Europe are not doing as much for themselves as they should be doing. Either they are not working hard enough, according to these complaints, or they are not securing all the food they can from their own land; or they are failing to take courageous measures to stabilize their monetary systems.

To discuss all these points in detail and find the reasons behind some of the failures would go beyond the scope of this article. The essential fact remains that, in spite of the many shortcomings we could criticize, internal recovery in most of the western European countries outside of Germany has been very real. Recently, we have seen encouraging signs in the right direction—increased productivity in the coal mines of the Ruhr and of Great Britain, increased productivity in the British textile industry, as well as industrial recovery in Italy.

Obviously, the most discouraging phase of the continental picture lies in the continuing disruptive efforts of the Communist minority. It endeavors to demoralize and obstruct economic recovery, to terrorize governments and to invalidate any help that the United States is able to give. It is this continuing opposition from the Communist side that makes many people in this country despair of the efficacy of any help we might give.

Whatever doubts may be entertained as to the efficacy of our help, we cannot afford not to make the try. In my opinion, it is this communistic opposition that requires us to do everything we can, within the limits of our readily available resources, to continue our help.

The stakes for which the United States and other freedom-loving peoples are today playing are the greatest stakes in history. Behind every move that is made on the international chessboard lies the specter of war. The specter is not confined to a duplication of the destruction and horrors of the last war. It is a nightmare in the shape of the unknown destructive potentialities of the atom bomb. In that case, and I think few would deny it, what action can the United States take in order to be most effective and to minimize any gamble on the future it is willing to risk?

The Select Committee on Foreign Aid has recommended that a specific type of new organization be set up within our Government to handle part of the problem. It also laid down the objectives for any program of foreign aid—objectives running parallel to the pledges made by the 16 nations that met in Paris to consider the Marshall proposals. We felt that any American aid given should be given only to complement and assist the European nations in carrying out their own programs of self-aid.

The new organization, which we proposed under the name of the Emergency Foreign Reconstruction Authority, was to take a Federal corporate form. As we saw it, it should have a bipartisan board of eight directors appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. One of them would be the full-time Administrator for the Authority. Paralleling this Reconstruction Authority and to act in an advisory capacity, we proposed the creation of another group. This was a Foreign Aid Council comprising certain Cabinet officers, as well as the head of the Export-Import Bank; and the American representatives of the World Bank and of the International Monetary Fund. The Secretary of State would be the Chairman of the Council.

It would be the responsibility of the administrator and the directing head of the Reconstruction authority to lay our programs of foreign aid and to consult with the Foreign Aid Council. He would examine carefully all European requests and screen them against what we had or could make available in surplus and what other nations could contribute. He would also direct the purchase of such food, fuel, and fertilizer as could be made available to the nations in need. At the same time, he would coordinate any programs which the World Bank or the Export-Import Bank might agree upon with respect to loans to these nations with which they could buy raw materials and capital goods. Finally, he would be responsible for the administration of export controls.

In other words, subject to this board of directors and in consultation with the Foreign Aid Council, he would be fully responsible both for the execution of the foreign-aid program and for the protection of our own domestic economy.

I have stressed this organizational side particularly because the committee feels that a properly integrated organization attracting the very best brains we can find in this country is an absolute prerequisite to any intelligent treatment of the problem. It is the best guarantee that there will not be a repetition of some of the mistakes we have made in the past in foreign-aid mistakes that unhappily but justifiably have shaken the faith of many persons in this country as to the efficacy of any foreign-aid program.

Assuming that a proper administrative setup for programs of foreign aid can be achieved, we are then faced with this question: How far can the United States go in making commodities or dollars available to foreign countries without injuring its own economy?

I don't believe anyone can answer that question with any degree of assurance at this time. Many figures have been advanced. Some studies have been submitted by committees appointed by the President to indicate that we could tentatively commit ourselves to a $20,000,000,000 program.

To me, that type of thinking is entirely unrealistic. In the first place, any program by which we finance exports from the United States should consider two things: Not only the situation of the 16 nations of western Europe but also our trade relations with the whole world. I stress this most emphatically because there are many people who feel that our present price rises in the United States have been due entirely to the aid we have been giving to Europe. Just a glance at the figures of our exports for 1947 will disprove this entirely.

During the first three quarters of 1947, we exported at an annual rate of $19,000,000,000. Of this amount, only about one-third went to the 16 nations of Europe that made up the Paris Conference. The rest went to every section of the globe and was paid for in accumulated dollars, gold, Export-Import Bank loans or private credits. It is true that a major proportion of the bread grains exported went to the 16 European nations. Yet, at the same time, our exports of bread grains or their equivalent in flour to South America doubled the prewar figures.

During the whole of 1947, the President, acting through the Secretary of Commerce, had complete power to control any or all of our exports. Yet we allowed to go out of the country this colossal volume. If exports are as great a factor in our price rises as many have alleged them to be, then we have clearly not utilized our export controls as they should have been utilized. But assistance to the war-torn countries has been only as indicated by the figures—one third of the bulk.

It is obvious, however, that exports alone are not wholly responsible for increasing prices. Inflated currency, bank credit and purchasing power—each must take its fair share of the blame.

To come back to the question of how far we can go, we must make three major calculations, each of which will vary very considerably year by year.

The first calculation is the extent to which the nations in need of aid have increased their own productivity both agriculturally and industrially. The second is the quantity of commodities, not dollars, that we have in surplus and can supply without intensifying our domestic scarcities. And the third calculation we must make is how many dollars we are willing to make available to these nations in need in order to secure commodities in surplus supply in other sections of the world.

Each of these calculations is obviously subject to very wide variations and cannot be charted ahead with any degree of accuracy. For that reason I feel that no program of foreign aid should be projected further than 1 year ahead, however much we want to continue helping as long as real progress is being made.

As an example of the difficulties of making accurate calculations, let me take the third category I have mentioned—namely, how many dollars is the United States willing to supply in order to secure commodities in other countries for assistance to those who are in need? The British purchase most of their food from Canada and the Argentine. Canada is badly in need of dollars and cannot make much use of additional sterling. To what extent should the United States supply dollars with which Great Britain will buy Canadian wheat or Argentine meat or Brazilian fats and oils or Cuban sugar? And to what extent should those nations be willing to accept sterling?

At this juncture I do not believe anyone knows the answer. But I think it is clear that the United States should not take the entire burden of supplying credit in dollars. It is also clear that each of these other supplying countries should make some contribution of their own.

Let's also look at the first and second calculations that must be made in drafting a long-range foreign-aid program. With the movement of foodstuffs and particularly cereal grains such an important factor, how could anyone successfully estimate ahead how great the harvest of any one nation will be? The droughts with which the world has been plagued in the last few years have continuously upset our calculations. No one yet can foretell just what effect there will be on next year's crop after the drought of last fall in both Europe and the great grain-producing areas of our country. The best that Congress can do, in my opinion, is to make prudent guesses and then make frequent adjustments in the light of developments.

The hazards in estimating what can properly be done by the United States are another reason why I have felt so strongly that an organization administering foreign-aid programs is of paramount importance—an organization of men in whom the United States has full confidence.

Obviously, the great decisions that will have to be reached in the near future will be based primarily on the self-interest of the American public. There are always humanitarian considerations in giving help to persons who are in need of food and clothing and shelter. But the problem ahead of us is not limited to these humanitarian considerations alone. It involves the question whether in our own self-interest we wish to see western Europe once again producing and living under conditions that promise freedom of the individual. We must measure this objective against the alternative of having police States on the entire continent of Europe.

It is difficult for most of us who are struggling with our day-to-day problems here at home to try to visualize the kind of world we will be facing if communism spreads to the English Channel. It is even harder for us to visualize the repercussions of such a contingency, both on the Far East and on our neighbors to the south.

It was not many years ago that we were faced with the real prospect that Hitler, if successful in his conquest of Europe, would jump across to South America. Today, unless we are willing to visualize realistically possibilities that are not in the realm of dreams, we are doing a disservice both to ourselves and to our children. We must seriously consider the possibility of a world in which we alone will be trying to maintain the freedom of the individual surrounded on all sides by Communist-governed totalitarian States.

Under such conditions, none of our own freedoms, either in trading with the world or in the maintenance of our own economy, could continue. By default, we would have surrendered to a totalitarian and slave existence.

A Redeclaration of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

A REDECLARATION OF RIGHTS

The life of our Nation is dependent, first, upon the extent to which freedom, truth, and justice are reflected in the daily lives of its citizens; and, second, the willingness of its people to make every sacrifice essential to maintaining these fundamental rights. The cornerstone of this Nation is individual liberty, keyed to the axiom that the Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. In the exercise of the inalienable rights guaranteed to us by the Constitution we have achieved a greatness that finds no parallel in all history, and men everywhere have hailed America as the great exponent of the Jeffersonian philosophy that that government is best which governs the least. This is the only real security a citizen can rightly demand or attain.

Achieving greatness has demanded struggle and sacrifice, and remaining great demands an awareness to the designs of those actuated by a purpose to destroy rather than to build. Events have occurred during our generation which make it obvious that the proponents of collectivism and of the socialistic philosophy that "the Government will take care of you" are seeking changes in the fundamentals of our governmental structure that are incompatible with and destructive of our democratic institutions, and one who gives the matter a second thought will realize that we are rapidly losing our constitutional republican form of government. For this reason it is essential that these dangers be revealed and the American people made aware of same.

We charge that the collectivist policies adopted by the Government have destroyed the basis of our monetary system, have devaluated the dollar and have deprived the citizen of his property without just compensation; have promulgated a fallacious theory of national debt; have sought to tear down local self-government and to make the States subservient to the will of Federal bureaucrats; have indulged extravagance in government and loosed a horde of unessential Federal employees to harass the people; have sought to control wages and working conditions and have destroyed equality of contract in employment relations; by the use of subsidies, grants-in-aid, and favoritism have sought to seduce labor and the farmer and to make them slaves to a Socialist state, and by the use of threats and coercion have prevented the exercise of constitutional rights; have sought to control our economy by organizing great Government corporations to compete with private business, by seeking to control all business and by depriving the individual citizen of his constitutional right to work; have used the power to tax as a means of destruction, thereby destroying the initiative to work and produce, have sought to destroy the profit motive and thereby to wreck the free-enterprise system, and have by deceit, duplicity, and guile sought to control our educational system, thereby to lead the American people into the ways of socialism and to destroy the American way of life.

Realizing that the future welfare of this Nation is at stake; we, the officers and directors of the Southern States Industrial Council, do declare our condemnation of the practices which have produced the above conditions, and we unreservedly pledge ourselves to the attainment and preservation of the following rights:

1. The restoration of a sound monetary system, based on the gold standard.
2. The adoption of a systematic plan for payment of the national debt.
3. The balancing of the national budget in times of peace.
4. The reduction of Federal expenses, and the elimination of all unessential Federal employees.
5. The withdrawal of the Federal Government from competition with private business.
6. The restraint of all monopolies, whether of Government, business, or labor.
7. Elimination of Federal subsidies and establishment of a public policy condemning same.
8. The establishment of a sound tax system that will restore and protect the incentive to produce.
9. A return to States' rights, and the restoration of local self-government.
10. A public policy rededicated to the protection of the right to acquire and own private property, and guaranteeing equality of obligation in all contractual relations.
11. The guaranty to the individual of his constitutional right to work, without fear of domination or control from any source.
12. Restoration of the dignity of the individual and a return to the fundamental principle that the Government is the servant of the people.

We call upon all people to support us in this effort to reestablish the guiding principles under which this Nation was founded, and under which it has lived and prospered.

Christian Principles in Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered on January 10, 1948, by Mr. J. C. Penney, director of the Laymen's Movement for a Christian World. This address is entitled "Christian Principles in Business," and I heartily recommend the reading of this message by the Members of the House, as well as those who receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Penney is president of the J. C. Penney Stores which number approximately 1,600:

CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES IN BUSINESS
(By J. C. Penney)

I have adopted as the basis for my talk the principle taught by Christ, "Render unto Caesar the things that belong to Caesar and unto God the things that belong to God."

As a businessman I shall not be expected to know anything about homiletics. I am not even sure that this text would be regarded by sermonizers as applicable to my theme. But I think of these words as applying directly to the greath truth that there can be no arbitrary line drawn between the secular and the sacred even though we are directed to "render unto Caesar the things that belong to Caesar and unto God the things that belong to God." In other words, I believe the Great Teacher was admonishing men to do their duty and their whole duty; that even though those who came to Him obeyed all the laws of their faith and failed to pay their taxes, they could not hope to be free from condemnation.

Just as certainly, He meant that taxpayers, however respected by their business associates, had not done their full duty until they had returned proper thanks and service to their Creator.

The man who does not give to business what honest business deserves—his best—is failing in his duty. He may succeed in a measure; but his success is always less than it might have been and is of a kind that will disappear under pressure.

I believe much of the difficulty in the world of business is due to the fact that too many people are trying to get material gain without giving their best or are foisting unfair values upon the public. When we discuss honesty in the abstract there is no difference of opinion. It is only when the principle is applied to our activities, particularly our commercial enterprises, that we may contradict one another. No one will say there is ever justification for an employee taking a dollar from his employer, or for the head of an organization to increase his prosperity by deceiving the public or by underpaying his employees. But how often many of us fail not only to give the best goods for the prices offered but also fail to give to business the best of our minds and talents—the best of our loyalty.

Success, first of all, is a matter of the spirit. When I see a young man or a young woman identifying himself or herself so closely with his or her work that the closing hour passes unheeded I recognize the beginnings of success. Such young people are doing more than is required of them—that is, more than the employer requires—but not more than their conscience demands.

My father was both a clergyman and a businessman. One of the things about him that impressed me was that to him there was no difference between his farm and the church when it came to the matter of faithfulness. He did his best on the farm, in the details of his daily living, and in his relationships with his fellowmen; and he was devoted and consecrated in his religious service.

If it is possible to live the Christian life at any point it should be possible to live it in all relationships of one's life. A man should first ask himself, when he faces a

question of business choice. "Is this worthy of my best?" If the answer is "Yes," he should go into it not only retaining his self-respect but also holding fast to the highest Christian standards.

Some men attain positions of distinction in the business world, and are entrusted with responsibilities involving the well-being of hundreds or even thousands of their fellowmen, while others never get beyond the village store or the country office. But again and again I find those who are in positions often regarded as insignificant doing so much for the people of their communities that others in spectacular positions are shamed by comparison.

Why is this? It is because these unknown people are giving everything they have to their work; unselfishly counting their gains not by money profits but by the service they can render. These humbler members of society do not separate the secular from the sacred. They recognize them as united and in their own lives they are one.

The world at large never heard of my father but I know he was a successful man. I know he lived largely because he lived truly, because he rendered "unto Caesar the things that belong to Caesar" even as he rendered "unto God the things that belong to God."

We shall not be judged by the Heavenly Father by the material success we achieve, nor only according to what we do. We shall be judged by the honesty of our purpose and by the spirit with which we pursue life's duties in all their various phases. We should examine carefully our motivating purpose in life. Is it the thought of material reward—how much we can get by our own efforts to be spent on our own interests? Or is it our purpose to release such powers and talents as we may possess, to release them fully and make them work not only for the support of our dependents and to give us economic sustenance, but also to build a better community, a better state, a better nation, and a better world?

For my life program I adopted six principles. I believe they contain the essentials of success. Since they have a direct bearing on my subject, Christian Principles in Business, I quote them here:

"I believe in preparation. A man must know everything possible about his business; he must know more than any other man knows. Generally, we find what we look for. Our achievement depends largely upon our preparation.

"I believe in hard work. The only kind of luck any man is justified in counting on is hard work; this means sacrifice, persistent effort, and dogged determination. Growth is never by chance; it is the result of a combination of forces.

"I believe in honesty. The kind of honesty that keeps a man from taking something which belongs to someone else, of course; but I believe in that finer honesty that will not allow a man to give less than his best, that makes him count not his hours but his duties and opportunities; that constantly urges him to enlarge his information and to increase his efficiency.

"I believe in having confidence in men. I have found my most valuable associates by giving men responsibility, by making them feel that I relied upon them. And those who have proved unworthy have only caused the others, who far outnumbered them, to stand in a clearer light. In a large measure this principle is responsible for the success of the J. C. Penney Co. Use good judgment, of course. One cannot throw away common sense. But I urge you to believe in yourself and trust your fellowmen.

"I believe in appealing to the spirit of men. One of the wisest men who ever lived said, 'For the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.' Every enterprise in which I have been interested demonstrates this fact.

"I believe in a practical application of the Golden Rule as taught by the Master nearly 2,000 years ago. 'Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets.' "

The Golden Rule is one of the most fundamental laws that can be expressed in words. We find it specifically stated in the literature of 11 known religions. Of its origin but little is known, for Christ was not the first to give it expression, though His was the perfect pronouncement.

The Golden Rule is a law of love. It underlies all true religion. Observance of the Golden Rule ensures observance of civil law and carries us past the letter of the law to the spirit which "giveth life." It makes us willing to sacrifice what is commonly called personal liberty for the welfare of others and willing to forego indulgences which however harmless they may seem in our own lives, work ruin in the lives of others.

For many hundred years after the Golden Rule was spoken by the Master it was regarded as beautiful idealism rather than as a law to be put into practice in the everyday lives of men and women. Its early application encompassed only the narrow scope of friends and neighbors. As horizons widened and the definition of "brotherhood" took on broader significance, gradually people came to realize that the Golden Rule was a basic principle to be applied in all one's relationships.

Inherent in most normal human beings is the disposition to defend the weak against the strong, to sympathize with those who are exploited. The Golden Rule permeates the ideals of our public and private justice, even though those ideals are not always translated itno reality. Disregard for the Golden Rule creates untold misery and suffering. It is, I believe, the disregard for the rights and welfare of humanity, through greed and the lust of conquest by a few minorities, that has brought the world to such a terrible impasse at the present time.

Even in our generation we used to think of business as secular and of service as religious. Since no arbitrary line between secular and sacred exists, the realization that the Golden Rule was meant for business as well as for other relationships has in a small way penetrated public consciousness. But men have feared if they were too generous they would be unable to meet the competition of their more unscrupulous neighbors. They have not realized that another principle laid down by the Master was also essential. "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it."

We have been finding out that by an immutable law the spirit and practice of service underlie even material success. As a seed must be buried in the cold, damp earth before its blossoms can come forth into the sunshine, so every success must be preceded by sacrifice. Self-denial is the basic requirement for accomplishment in any field of endeavor. The law is inescapable. This I know not only in theory but from personal experience. Success comes only to those who will follow the hard road and who are willing to sacrifice everything except honor to achieve their goal.

Diligence in business results in advancement. Unselfishness creates good will which in turn brings forth an increase in material prosperity. Not that I advocate unselfishness for selfish purposes—I am merely setting forth cause and effect.

In founding the J. C. Penney Co., the Golden Rule was made its foundation stone. Throughout the more than 43 years of its existence this company has endeavored to apply the Golden Rule in its relations both with the public and with its employees. Because of this radical departure from the policies prevailing in the community where the business had its birth, its early failure was predicted.

It is my experience that employees will respond to the stimulus of fairness and liberality. Such an attitude brings about a harmony of mind and purpose between employer and employees that enables workers to turn out more and better work and that causes them to bring to their tasks all the devotion of which they are capable.

Up to the outbreak of the war, business was gradually learning the application of the Golden Rule in its dealings with society at large. The leaven of doing unto others seemed to be gradually leavening the lump. Executives of many industries proclaimed their belief in the practice of this principle. Increasingly, year by year, the Golden Rule was being incorporated into business practices, with a decided improvement in relationships between employer and employees, and in an increased number of satisfied customers.

But the world, including our own Nation, had not progressed far in its application of the Golden Rule in international affairs. In its present reversion to barbarism, much of our advancement toward the universal practice of Christian principles appears to have been lost. Nevertheless the long backward perspective shows progress to be on the upward swing. The important thing is that the movement, whether rapid or slow, be upward toward the goal.

Lest I may have given the impression that I have made a perfect record in the application of Christian principles to all phases of my life, I must make a confession.

As I have said, I was born of Christian parents, to whom I owe all I am or ever hope to be. From my early youth I tried to live uprightly and in accord with the moral principles my parents had taught me. But when I had achieved some success, and commenced to get the feel of money, I allowed the purpose of making money to dominate me. The goal of accumulating a fortune had taken possession of me and was crowding out the most important considerations. I had to learn that although I had kept the Ten Commandments there was one thing more.

A great tragedy came into my life. Something that meant far more to me than material possessions, and that money was powerless to restore, was taken from me. When bitter sorrow forced upon me the truth that money could not buy the more valuable things of life, I saw life differently. I began to think more about my obligations to society, as represented by the churches, the hospitals, and other service organizations.

The glimmerings of conviction that it was not enough for men to be upright and moral were breaking in upon me when another fiery ordeal came my way—one that almost broke me physically and mentally. It brought me to a new sense of humility and dependence upon God; and, as happens when man reaches his extremity, and sincerely and earnestly seeks God's aid, it was forthcoming. A light illumined my soul. I cannot otherwise describe it and never could I be the same man again.

Still there was much ground for me to cover. Although seeming to grow in spiritual stature it was years before I arrived at the point where I felt I could affiliate with the church. After I assumed the responsibility of church membership, thus rendering unto God the things that are God's in that particular respect, I was made to realize that merely being a church member, and attending church regularly, was not enough. There was yet the one more thing.

I came to see that I must take still another step—that I must give myself over to God's purpose. It is difficult to find words which express what happened. I became convinced that in order to take the practice of Christian principles to its ultimate end, I must find God's will for the use of the talents I possessed and experiences I had had. I awakened to the realization that knowing God's will was not easy; that one must seek it through prayer and that our prayers are often strained through our own selfish desires and colored by our own wills, so that one must keep returning to the source of all life in order to be renewed.

These steps came to me through my contacts with the Laymen's Movement for a Christian World, an association of laymen of all denominations who are trying to find out how Christian principles can be applied in their everyday affairs. If in this work I shall be privileged to bring new hope and encouragement to my fellowman I shall be rendering unto God a service into which He seems to be leading me, and which I trust is to some extent a fulfillment of His will for my life.

I close with one word especially to young businessmen. The practice of Christian principles, as I have stated, was necessary when our business was started 44 years ago. But some men who did not follow them succeeded. It is my firm conviction, however, that the stepped-up business cycle, with mass production, and recently by the use of atomic energy, now makes this practice a practical necessity. In my early life, one could put religion in one compartment of his life and his business relations in another and be successful. But this is not true in the same way today. I therefore urge you younger men who have the greater part of your adult life ahead of you to study with great earnestness the relation between Christ's two commandments, to love God and to love your neighbor as yourself. With a balance of these two great laws worked out in your everyday life you are assured a life of spiritual satisfaction and I sincerely hope, one of material prosperity.

But this satisfaction on the spiritual side, and prosperity in the material sense, depends on a prayerful search of the right way according to God's will. It must be sought by prayer and mediation if it takes the place of one own self-will and ambition which we know is strongly set in all of us.

REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN D. JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert a copy of a letter I wrote in response to one I had received from an REA cooperative manager in my State.

On January 22, 1948, I made a speech on the floor of the House in which I referred this letter and pointed out that this cooperative manager had stated to me in his letter, in part, "It is becoming increasingly difficult to explain to our farmers in Oklahoma why Congress takes the attitude it does in refusing to set up funds for REA."

In my reply to this manager, which I am inserting in the RECORD today, I pointed out that it is most unfair for the inference to be passed on to the farmers in Oklahoma that the Oklahoma Congressmen are unfriendly to the REA program and did not vote for these funds.

I further pointed out that I hoped he would exercise great care in explaining to the farmers that the individual Oklahoma Congressmen voted for these increased appropriations.

The letter I have referred to is quoted hereafter in full:

JANUARY 22, 1948.

Mr. HOWARD G. CROCKER,
Manager, Northwestern Electric Cooperative, Inc.,
Woodward, Okla.

DEAR MR. CROCKER: I received your letter of December 31, 1947, stating that "our board of trustees are very much concerned over the House of Representatives' attitude in turning down the request for $200,000,000 for deficiency appropriations recently introduced by Congressman JOHN RANKIN," and explaining in the rest of the letter the need for these additional funds.

It will please you, I am sure, to know that I am entirely in accord with the objectives and needs of the REA, as outlined in your letter. However, I am greatly concerned with that portion of your letter which states, in part, "It is pretty hard to explain to our farmers and ranchers why Congress takes the attitude they do in refusing to set up funds with which to build these lines."

It is my hope that when you and the other 26 cooperative managers in the State of Oklahoma to whom I am sending copies of this letter tell the farmers that Congress has refused to provide additional REA funds, you will exercise great care in explaining that the individual Oklahoma Congressmen voted for these increased appropriations.

I remember one occasion last summer, in July, I believe, when Congressman JOHN RANKIN offered an amendment which would have provided an additional $125,000,000 for REA, his amendment lost by only 10 or 12 votes. All eight Congressmen from Oklahoma, six Democrats and two Republicans, voted for the Rankin amendment on this occasion. Your own Congressman RIZLEY voted with the rest of the Oklahoma delegation for these additional funds. That was a roll-call vote and is a matter of record.

A similar situation happened just recently, on or about December 17, 1947, when Congressman RANKIN offered the deficiency appropriation referred to in your letter, which was in the amount of $150,000,000, and this amendment was also defeated by a small majority.

While the Congress as a whole certainly should be held responsible for their attitude in refusing these additional funds, it is most unfair for the inference to be passed on to our farmers in Oklahoma that the Oklahoma Congressmen are unfriendly to the REA program and did not vote for these funds.

Last summer, Mr. Clyde Ellis, your national representative, made a speech in Stillwater, Okla., and while I do not know exactly what he said, he must have left the impression that the Oklahoma Congressmen were unfriendly to the REA program, because I received several letters from my constituents who heard his speech wanting to know why I voted against these additional funds. Fortunately, I was able to dissipate that misconception in those instances by sending the individuals who had written me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing the roll-call vote on the amendment, and that I and the other seven Oklahoma Congressmen voted for it. The part I deplore most about that incident, however, is that there must have been hundreds of people who heard Ellis' speech who did not write me or the other Oklahoma Congressmen, and who now have the false impression that all of us voted against it.

I know of no better way to express my interest, sympathies, and attitude toward the REA program than by my own recorded votes on roll calls, which are a matter of recorded fact in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

You enclosed to me a list of approximately 2,000 applicants for electric service in your area. I am taking the liberty of having my letter to you duplicated, and am sending it to that list of persons, and only wish it could be sent to all the REA users in Oklahoma.

Under normal circumstances when Congressmen have voted for and fought for a program, as we 8 Oklahoma Congressmen have done for REA on the occasions I referred to (last July and December), it certainly would not have been amiss to have a letter of appreciation from at least one of the 27 REA cooperatives in the State of Oklahoma commending our position, while maybe deploring the attitude of those in Congress who voted against providing the funds. Personally, not only have I never received a letter of commendation from any REA manager, but I have been led to believe that the inference is being made to farmers by some cooperative managers, and certainly the speech of Clyde Ellis in Stillwater last summer left that inference, that the Oklahoma Congressmen are unfriendly to the program.

The chances are that no one, maybe even including Mr. Ellis, specifically said that Oklahoma Congressmen were against the REA program, but when REA personalities point out that "the Congress" did not provide these funds the persons being addressed either through a speech, individual conversation or written letter could quite easily draw that conclusion. I hope I am in error in this assumption, that I would like to be so advised if I am.

I appreciated hearing from you, and I hope that you will likewise appreciate the frankness of my reply.

Sincerely yours,

GLEN D. JOHNSON.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PARKE M. BANTA
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to me by Miss Anna Dierssen, of Lowndes, Mo., dated January 18, 1948. Miss Dierssen is superintendent of the Lowndes Consolidated Schools. She is a capable teacher with may years of experience:

LOWNDES, MO., *January 18, 1948.*

Mr. PARKE M. BANTA,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BANTA: It is not often that I feel impelled to write to our Congressman; but this is one of those times, particularly since I did not get a response written to your questionnaire of last November.

The present Congress, I am convinced, should do something definite about economy in government; for it is obvious that we have reached a spending peak beyond which it would not be safe to go. With the exception of national defense, I believe almost everyone would like to see expenses reduced all along the line. In some particular fields definite, immediate reformation can and should be made.

It is to one of these fields that I wish to call your attention.

There is one kind of dole that should be discontinued the moment the present appropriation expires. This is the millions appropriated for the school lunch subsidy.

In the first place, there is no need. Never before were parents so well able to feed their children; and every child that does not have adequate support from parents is amply provided for by ADC. The excuse is sometimes made that parents who can afford to, do not give their children the right food. Neither do they clothe them properly in all cases. Last year I saw high-school girls from comfortable homes going to school in the snow practically barefooted, no stockings, and their toes sticking out of strap sandles. This year and every year, I see little girls going to school in all weather, naked as Igorotes from the waist to the ankles. Shall the Government help buy them some clothes? The need is far greater than for helping to provide their food.

In the second place, one of the chief reasons why parents want their children to eat in a lunchroom is that mothers do not like to fix lunches. They are frank about it usually. If their children live at some distance from school, they do not like to bother fixing package lunches. If they live near at hand, they like to have the whole day to themselves. The strongest proponents of the lunch program live almost in the shadow of the schoolhouses. This is all wrong. If parents are unwilling to prepare food for their children at noon, then they should be willing, or if not willing, compelled to pay full value for lunches at school or in a commercial lunchroom.

In the third place, this subsidy hacks at the very root of personal independence. Let me give you the Cairns family, for example. Four little girls, ranging in ages from the first grade to the tenth. Healthy and happy and at the top of their classes. The father is a renter who makes a good living for his family with very little for frills. Their cellar is typical of the hill community in which they live, full of all manner of canned foods. They have milk. They have meat. They are able to fix wholesome package lunches for their children, but they do not have cash to pay 15 cents a day for the subsidized lunch. That clause that says the child who cannot afford to pay shall eat anyway and his poverty will be kept secret? Well, not for the Cairns and their kind. They feed their own, even if little friends who eat the dole do rather turn up their noses at their children.

In the fourth place, messy cooking is going on in small schools all over the land, to the detriment of good school work and to the distraction of many a teacher, who has to watch a pot while she hears classes. Kitchens have been crowded into laboratories and libraries, and incidental funds needed for the repair of buildings and the replacement of worn out stoves and broken-down seats have been taken to pay the cook. Some schools are literally being fed to children's stomachs rather than to their minds.

In the fifth place, the lunch program is sinfully wasteful. Whole plates of food go back scarcely touched, especially small children's plates. The garbage pail after one of these lunches is something before which to draw a veil. Who dreamed up the idea that children would be better off eating in a public place, exactly the same food that scores of other children of all ages eat? The result is otherwise. A mass of food is rejected. The reason is that each child's eating needs the individual attention which only a parent can give. What better place is there for a child to eat than at the family table under his mother's eye? And if he lives too far to come home for those five meals, what better food than a package lunch that she knows he will eat? The lunchroom food must come out of great common pots. Even in the large schools this is the only practical way. The waste is, therefore, inevitable. Quantities of macaroni, white beans, green beans, hominy, beets, sauerkraut, and, of course, greens go into the garbage, not to mention bread pudding and milk.

In the sixth place, the food is not as good as home food. The lunchroom cooks largely out of tin cans and paper cartons. The farm cellar is full of canned fruits and vegetables. Apples, oranges, lettuce, and cabbage, the fresh foods regularly used in the lunchrooms are obtainable in all small communities for less than a parent pays for his child's subsidized lunch. And the farm child has plenty of fresh milk. He does not need the thin cocoa made from cans of condensed milk that appears rather frequently. Nor does he need fried bologna and wieners, about the only meats he ever sees in the lunchroom. He has meat and poultry at home. As for the city child, his parents have access to year-around markets of fresh vegetables, fruits, and meats, and they can always buy the best of milk.

As for the mythical value of the lunch being hot, with the exception of soup, it is usually stone cold before the child gets to it because of the mass serving.

There is quite a sentimental haze around this school-lunch business, but it looks quite starkly different after one penetrates the haze. It is just one of those things that starts almost by accident under a special condition and goes on long after that condition has been removed; and people follow along, never taking the trouble to ask questions. It started when there were surplus commodities to dump, and mothers went in shifts to cook for their young. But these conditions are long since removed. There are no surplus commodities, and mothers expect the school board to hire a cook. It is time to discontinue the dole aspect of the business entirely.

The lunch subsidy is an entering wedge of socialism, subtle and subversive. Its effect is to pauperize the population from the kindergarten on. And this is an evil. If everybody learns to eat the bread of depependence, who will be left to work and provide the dole?

To cure this evil the Government needs only to pare this item from the next appropriation bill. As long as those millions are appropriated, people will lose their reason and fight tooth and claw to get their share. As soon as the subsidy is discontinued, the cooking nuisance will disappear almost overnight from the small schools where it serves no good purpose and more often than not does harm; and in the larger schools, if it is retained, it will be put upon a self-sustaining, self-respecting basis.

I am earnestly hoping that this matter will receive your thoughtful, realistic consideration in the present Congress.

Very truly yours,

ANNA DIERSSEN.

Josephus Daniels—A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound grief and a distinct sense of loss that I today pay homage to the memory of Josephus Daniels. His story was truly an American story which perhaps could happen only in America. His father died when he was two and his mother opened a millinery store to support her three sons. From this, Josephus Daniels rose to become Navy Secretary in World War I and to hold that post longer than any other man in history.

In his espousal of the Democratic Party and liberalism, Daniels adhered throughout his life to a very definite principle—that of attaching himself to some belittled cause that was right. Such a course, he said, will bring success, and, more important, the satisfaction of doing something worth while. "If a cause is right, it will succeed," he said. "If it isn't, nothing you can do will make it succeed. Most of the things I have advocated in my life have failed at first. Later most of them succeeded, and those that didn't deserved to fail." He was always the fighting liberal, the foe of monopolies, greed, and the privilege for the few.

Daniels was a Tarheel editor at 18. He acquired the News and Observer in 1894 and merged it with his State Chronicle and North Carolinian. It was a period of violent partisanship in the South. Railroads, the Power Trust, and politicians were accustomed to buying editors or papers outright. Neither Daniels nor his paper could be bought. A railroad once poured $250,000 into a newspaper, trying to put him out of business. Daniels survived so well that years later he turned down a $1,000,000 offer from William Randolph Hearst. He would, Daniels said, as soon sell his wife and children as his paper.

When Daniels fought, it was with his entire paper. Even the personals went to war. Once he killed a gubernatorial hope with this apparently harmless item:

J. Elwood Cox was a visitor in town yesterday, traveling by train and using Southern Railway pass No. 6743.

In public life Daniels was attacked as forcefully as he ever attacked. For the order he issued—but never wrote—drying up the Navy during World War I he was lampooned and ridiculed. When he went to Mexico in 1933 as Ambassador irate Mexicans remembered the shelling and occupation of Vera Cruz by his Navy in 1914. They stoned the embassy. An associate wrote that Daniels' amiable patience and beatific smile would turn the stones to roses, and when Daniels left Mexico, though he was still unable to speak the language after 8 years he was showered with gifts.

When Daniels finally resigned as American Ambassador, as he neared the age of 80, most people would have considered him entitled to rest. He had seen his country go through virtually four wars—the Civil War, which was raging when he was born; the Spanish War, the First World War, in which he played a vital part, and the Second World War, which was just beginning.

Instead of retiring, Josephus went back to his first love, newspapering. And every day of the week Josephus got up at 5 or 6 in the morning and beat out his daily column or editorial.

Mr. Daniels kept an active and vigorous interest in politics, and there are many who still chuckle about Daniels when he took issue with former Democratic Chairman James A. Farley's gloomy report on Democratic prospects in the South.

The gobble-uns'll get you ef you don't watch out—

He wrote—

A split in the Democracy of the South or its secession from the National Democratic Committee is the idle bubble of a dream of those who are in the hopeless minority.

Daniels' twinkling smile, black string tie, and black planter's hat will be remembered affectionately and proudly by many. His faith in the people will long be a monument to his memory.

A Statesmanlike Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. CROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Henry Chamberlin from the Wall Street Journal.

A STATESMANLIKE APPRAISAL—ECONOMIC PITFALLS AND POLITICAL ADVANTAGES OF ERP ARE EXPERTLY ANALYZED BY EX-PRESIDENT HOOVER

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Herbert Hoover has added to his long list of valuable services to his country by his statesmanlike appraisal of ERP, contained in his letter to Senator VANDENBERG. Our only living ex-President yields to very few men in his mastery of the basic facts of the American and world economy. When he pronounces a judgment on a large domestic or international issue it is based not on some emotional catchword, but on solid and precise knowledge. This is why his judgments should always be treated with respect.

Many advocates of ERP are so obsessed with its urgency that they are inclined to be impatient with criticisms of detail. Many opponents are so impressed by dangers and difficulties that they lose sight of the very great political stake America has in turning back the world-wide offensive of Soviet communism.

Mr. Hoover sees the two sides of the Marshall plan, its political desirability and its economic pitfalls, as well as anyone who has commented on the proposal. He speaks of the "vital importance" of the defeat of communism in western Europe, of the front against communism that lies not alone in Europe, but stretches through Latin America and Asia.

HE SEES THE DANGERS, TOO

At the same time he recognizes the force of the arguments about the dangers to the American economy inherent in the Marshall plan. As Mr. Hoover says:

"The volume of exports and finance proposed may accelerate an already dangerous inflation; it further delays our recuperation from the war; it drains our natural resources and continues excessive taxation; all of which might bring depression and thus destroy the strength of the one remaining source of aid to a world in chaos."

Most of his letter to Senator VANDENBERG is devoted to constructive, concrete, practical suggestions for diminishing the burden on the American economy without sacrificing the purpose of helping the noncommunist part of Europe back to its economic feet. One of the most obvious means of achieving this end is to get the unused industrial resources of Germany and Japan back into production as quickly as possible.

It would be both futile and absurd for America to advance large sums of money to Britain and France and smaller sums to China and Korea while permitting continuance of the artificial conditions of industrial desolation in Germany and Japan that have contributed so much to European and Asiatic depression. Mr. Hoover seems to emphasize this point when he suggests that those of the 16 European nations concerned with these problems should agree to "the trizonal economic union of western Germany, a peace with Japan; a cessation of plant destruction and removal; and abolition or increase in 'levees of industry' in these two countries."

TO SHIP $800,000,000 OF CAPITAL GOODS

Mr. Hoover draws attention to the fact that ERP in its present form calls for the shipment of about $800,000,000 worth of capital goods, including steel and machinery, from the United States during the first 15 months of the plan. At the same time we lack sufficient railway equipment; there is a shortage of agricultural machinery, affecting food production; there is a scarcity of building materials and steel is selling at 100-percent premiums in the black market.

What would be more reasonable than a vigorous revival of steel and machine building industries in Germany, with proper safeguards against diversion of production to military ends? Mr. Hoover comes out for this sensible idea, which should also apply, he says, to fertilizer production and oil refining in Germany. It would certainly represent a peak of sheer economic absurdity for America to impose crippling deprivation on its own economy in order to send to Europe machinery and equipment which could be produced in Germany, or anywhere else, for that matter.

It may be objected that Germany could not simultaneously export coal and raise appreciably its level of steel, machinery, and fertilizer output. Mr. Hoover suggests that increased American exports of coal to European countries which cannot satisfy their own needs might be better than American exports of steel, machinery, and fertilizer.

The ex-President correctly brands as an illusion the idea "that scarcity and thus inflation can be more than temporarily retarded by compulsory fixing of wages, prices, and rationing." Some of western Europe's difficulties may be attributed to these practices.

AIMS FOR OTHER CONDITIONS

Mr. Hoover calls for group determination, on a non-partisan basis, of ERP policies, for a clear distinction between gifts and loans, for refusal to enter into a 4-year commitment, for the making of relief supplies to Japan and Germany a first charge on reparations, and for a refusal of American grants or gifts of money to pay for goods from other countries.

Two other witnesses on ERP, Mr. Bernard Baruch and Mr. John Foster Dulles, have called for closer political association among the recipients of American aid and for a reduction in trade barriers as between these European nations. Some assurances along the lines of closer economic relations were given in the original blueprint, drawn up by the representatives of the 16 nations at Paris. There can be no doubt that Europe's division is communism's opportunity, and that a broad west European federation, sponsored by the United States, would be the most effective curb on Communist aggression.

If it proves possible to combine Mr. Hoover's economic statemanship in framing the details of ERP with some bold imaginative stroke in the direction of closer association among all nations, regardless of which side they fought on in the war, which lie outside the Soviet orbit of control, the prospects of fruitful American-European cooperation will look much brighter.

Sermon of Most Rev. Raymond A. Kearney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the sermon delivered by the Most Reverend Raymond A. Kearney, auxiliary bishop of Brooklyn, at the red Mass in the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Catholic University of America, Sunday, January 25, 1948:

Just 2 months ago the bishops of the United States had their annual meeting on the campus of this university. As a result of their prayerful deliberations there came forth a statement that in the judgment of the bishops was the most opportune to offer to our people at this particular time. The theme of this statement was the error of secularism.

When one encounters an extraordinary or unusual word he goes at once to the impartial source of the dictionary. And there we find that secularism is "any view of life, education, etc., or any policy or program referring to such, based on the premise that religion and religious considerations, as of God and a future life, should be ignored or excluded." The atheist and the materialist is of course a secularist; he excludes all consideration of God and the hereafter, for in his creed there is neither. And this we readily understand. But there are some who profess a belief in God, and who sometimes solemnly invoke His name, and who on formal occasions wish to be clearly understood as believers in the deity, and yet are infected with a secularist viewpoint. "They fail," the bishops' statement says, "to bring an awareness of their responsibility to God into their thought and action as individuals and members of society." They have a view of life "that limits itself not to the material in exclusion of the spiritual, but to the human here and now in exclusion of man's relation to God here and hereafter." Secularism is the practical exclusion of God from human thinking and living.

We have in mind here the multitudes who give God lip-service, who proclaim their belief in Him, and who would be shocked if one were to suggest that in fact they really were not believers. We have in mind those to whom God and religion is sort of a luxury, an ornament, a thing apart; comfortable, seemly, decorous, on the Sabbath day; not missed at all throughout the rest of the week. God and religion are to them, something quite appropriate to the church, the sacristy and the cloister; but should have no influence in the affairs of the community of nations, nor in the political or economic world, nor in domestic life, and far less in the individual and personal life that each one of us must lead.

The statement of the hierarchy points out the effects of this secularist attitude on the individual, the family, the Nation and international society. We may note that secularism means the concentration of man on the temporal affairs of this life to the denial or disregard of the hereafter. Its fundamental principle is that all human conduct is to be guided by earthly considerations. "It destroys nourishment, kills roots, rots everything from within." As a result the individual is blinded to his responsibility to God. His thoughts, aspirations, and deeds, are his own, without reference to God. The statement goes on to say, "The greatest moral

catastrophe of our age is the growing number of Christians who lack a sense of sin, because personal responsibility to God is not a moving force in their lives. They live in God's world quite unmindful of Him as their Creator and Redeemer. The vague consciousness of God which they may retain is impotent as a motive in daily conduct. The moral regeneration which is recognized as absolutely necessary for the building of a better world must begin by bringing the individual back to God and to an awareness of his responsibility to God. This secularism, of its very nature, cannot do."

If the individual has lost a sense of responsibility to God, then the family, the Nation, and ultimately the community of nations has necessarily followed in the same path, for ultimately it is the individual who makes up these segments, and the whole, of human society. The family has come into decadence with "a 60-fold increase in the divorce rate during the past century." In the field of education secularism has taken a toll as no where else. The philosophy of naturalism, which excludes God, has been accepted, and has been taught, and is being taught, on the very highest planes and in the highest places, of our entire educational system, so that as a result a totally secularist viewpoint is being brought through our teacher-training institutions to every little red schoolhouse in the country. In fact, we are reliably informed that the concepts of the natural law, and all that follows therefrom, are becoming less and less important in the matter of training our youth in the profession of the law. In the field of economics the disregard of God and God's laws has led to a grave disorder and we live ever fearful that a national catastrophe might be the result of friction and misunderstanding between capital and labor. In the international community disregard of God has in fact led to this unparalleled crises in civilization, wherein in the councils of states His name may not be so much as mentioned. This is the secularism that Pope Pius XI called the "plague of our age."

We have said that we quite understand this attitude on the part of atheists. All who adhere to a philosophy of naturalism, positivism, materialism, have the same note in common; they do not believe in a personal, intelligent God, and they are, logically, secularists. But it is difficult to understand those who do profess a belief in God, who do invoke His name, and yet would exclude Him, or ignore Him in their daily affairs. Some perhaps are insincere in their expressions of belief, conforming externally to tradition, convention, decorum, or some such thing. But nevertheless there are some who are sincere and who nevertheless see things only from the worldly viewpoint, to the exclusion of God in human affairs. They are "Sunday Christians." They pray, sincerely enough. They go to church if not always, at least always sincerely. They do believe in God, or at least they sincerely believe they do. Still, they regard their God as no reality in their daily affairs, private, domestic, political, or anything else.

For the out-and-out atheists we can do nothing but pray. We can pray that divine light might eventually enter their souls and that seeing they may yet believe. But for the others there is a greater hope. They have not yet outlawed God. I believe their trouble is that they have done only shallow thinking about God, or perhaps they have done too little thinking, or even no thinking about God. I believe that if they would think a great deal about God, and ask "Who is God?" and "What is God?" they would turn to God with delightful amazement and exclaim from the depths of their souls: "Too late have I known Thee."

Therefore today I should like to talk to you about God—just plain God. The God that Socrates and Plato and Aristotle learned to know about the kindly light of revelation by the sheer, fine penetration of human reason. The God that great thinkers over ages and ages recognized as the one Supreme Being. The God that philosophers and theologians, no less than peasants and artisans and workers of every sort from the beginning of time have come to know, to love, and to serve. The God who has never seriously been denied, until this fateful modern age. The God of old. The one true God before whom every other god is a false god and a demigod.

I have in mind the God whom the founders of our Republic knew when with a spirit of deep religion they gave to posterity our sacred Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Endowed by their Creator. That is the God I know—the Creator. The Creator of the universe—the land, the sky, the sea, and everything contained within it. The Creator who produced everything that is out of abysmal nothingness. Who is therefore greater than the whole of creation, and distinct from it. The first and final cause of everything that is.

The Creator is eternal. A billion years is to Him as a fleeting instant. He always was, and always must be. If there is such a thing as creation, there never could have been a time when there was absolutely nothing, for out of absolutely nothing nothing positive could have followed. So there must have been some Being who never had a beginning, who always was, and who brought into existence whatever has been, or is, or will be, in the universe. So the Creator is the Eternal Being, without beginning. And being without beginning, He is perfect and can never have an end, for a perfect being must be without flaw of any sort, and so He cannot wear out, or age, or annihilate Himself.

The Creator as the perfect Being has all perfections and no imperfections. He is simple, immutable, immense, infinite. He is infinitely all-wise, all-powerful. He is infinitely holy, good, merciful, and just. In fact, He is goodness, mercy, and justice. He is everything that is positive and loveable—infinitely so. He is the one, true Supreme Being.

The Creator is also the Infinite Lawmaker. By a single act of His will He has tossed into space the ball of the universe and set it spinning through time and through the ages according to His divinely conceived plan. In the act of creation He who is the Eternal Law has promulgated the natural law in His creatures by His all-wise and providential determination of the natures and essences of His creatures. He is the Supreme Legislator directing all things with consummate wisdom, each according to its own nature. But this natural law implanted by the Creator in the nature of things demands when we think of mankind specification by positive enactment. Hence, the eternal and natural laws must be supplemented by human law enacted by earthly authority. And all human law must ultimately be in one way or another a derivation from the natural law or a determination of it. Therefore positive law is valid only insofar as it is a development and application of the law of God for the common welfare of mankind. Positive human law is good law only when it is intended, and in fact, does serve to keep man and this universe spinning in accord with the eternal decrees of the Maker of all of us.

Such is the God whom the philosophers over the ages have given us. But the same God of whom St. Paul says, "He is not far from any one of us" (Acts xvii: 22) has also revealed Himself to man, so that we are not left entirely to the resources of natural reason to know Him, but aided by the gift of faith we might come to know Him more perfectly and thus to serve more faithfully. It is the same God who spoke to Moses and said, "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob." The same who said, "I am who am. Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel: He who is sent me." (Ex. iii: 14). The same God who thundered: "I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt not have strange gods in My sight" (Deut. v: 6–7). It is the same God to whom St. Paul refers as the One "who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets" (Heb. i: 1), i. e. by Isaias, Jeremias, and all the others, major and minor, calling men to repentance and holding forth always the pledge and promise of a Redeemer. It is the same God whose praises the Psalmist loved to sing in unparalleled, divine song: "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised; and of his greatness there is no end" (Ps. 144: 3). And again "I have known that the Lord is great, and our God is above all gods; whatsoever the Lord pleased he hath done, in heaven, in earth, in the sea, and in all the deeps." It is the same God who in the new dispensation so loved the world as to send His only-begotten Son to purchase by His Blood a fallen human race—the God of mercy and of love. He is the God of old—a jealous God, who will have no false gods in His sight. He is a God to be loved and to be feared; to be loved, because He is Love, to be feared, because we have loved Him so little.

These reflections may in a very feeble way convey some slight notion of the God I would know and serve. Anything less is a tin god—a false god. There is only one true God—the God of old—supreme, infinite, eternal God—the way, the truth, the life—thrice holy—infinitely merciful yet infinitely just. He is everything that is good and true and beautiful. He is all. St. Teresa used to say, "Who has God, wants nothing." God is all; the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end; the absolute, the God of old still lives.

There is, however, one thing to be remembered. There is one thing God cannot do. He cannot make Himself anything less than He is. He cannot act contrary to His own infinitely perfect nature. He cannot make Himself less wise, less good, less just, less anything. He cannot abdicate His godliness. He cannot, for instance, ignore something, or not know something, He would be less than perfect, and this He cannot be. Hence, He knows, and by His immutable nature, must know, all things great or trivial. He knows therefore the secret of the atom, the cause of cancer, and He knows too the fall of a sparrow in flight, the tick of a pulse, the innermost passing thought and desire of child or man.

Now, if God cannot ignore anything, however trivial, neither can He be indifferent to anything. It is His world, all things must proceed in an orderly way toward their ultimate destiny. Inanimate nature, plant and animal life, all proceed in accordance with divine plan as expressed in the natural law written into their being. Only man, made a little less than the angels, created in the image and likeness of God, endowed with the light of intelligence and the power of free will can frustrate the divine plan by rebelling against the will of God and by sprinkling as it were a mean handful of grit into the divinely conceived machinery of the universe. But God being all-good—infinite goodness itself—cannot be indifferent to man's conduct. If man's actions are good and noble, the divine will is being accomplished. Otherwise, man is guilty of the blasphemy of disobeying his Maker. God therefore has a stake in everything we think, desire, or do. He judges the innermost thoughts and desires of each of us, and of each of us in our capacity as private individuals, and of each of us in his social relation to the family, to his neighbor, to his country, and to the community of nations. He cannot be, and will not be, excluded from the affairs of His children. Hence, the secularist viewpoint of ignoring or denying God's part in the affairs of men and nations is essentially wrong if one acknowledges a sincere belief in God the Creator.

God is supremely interested in the temporal welfare of His creatures and it is for this reason that the natural law plainly calls for the existence of the State. The State has the sacred responsibility of promoting the common welfare of men. God is therefore intimately concerned with every bill intended for the common welfare and presented to the Congress, or to any legislative body. He is concerned with the motives that inspire it, the objectives to be attained, the means of attaining them. No court ever hands down a decision that is not already automatically appealed to the Infinite Judge, who from eternity has already confirmed it or set it aside as shocking to infinite justice. There can be no international parley that can hide from His fearful scrutiny decisions that have to bear on the welfare and the pursuit of happiness of all His children the world over, everywhere. We cannot afford to exclude God from anything. He will not allow it.

Many pious people say this prayer: "Go before us, O Lord, we beseech Thee, in all our doings with Thy gracious inspiration and further us with Thy continual help that every prayer and work of ours may begin from Thee and by Thee be happily ended." Yes; every prayer and work of ours should begin with God, for only then can it be happily ended.

We need more God, and no less God in all human affairs. We condemn the merely secular viewpoint as invalid. This is God's world and everything in it must go according to His will. We cannot afford to look at things from the world alone; we must see things through the eye of God and under the thought of eternity. God and religion are not reserved to the church and for Sunday. On the contrary, every single act of ours must be checked against God for accuracy. The master of a ship makes his port when he checks his course by God's fine handwriting in the sky. Man, too, may eventually make his eternal destination by adjusting his course according to the eternal law which is God.

Such is the God that I know—so imperfectly. I commend Him to you; and I commend you to Him. You who have grave responsibilities in public life toward the Nation and your fellowman need this God of old. You need Him, not now and then, but always. You need Him in all things. With Him, like St. Paul, you can do all things; without Him, nothing. He is your wisdom, your strength, your power. He is your all and He demands all. He will have no false gods before Him. To Him do we pray today for light and guidance that those who make our laws and those who interpret them and judge men by them, might with His blessing do all things for the welfare of our Nation and for the good of a stricken world in accord with the will of God.

If by chance you should sometime in the future recall this sacred occasion, I hope you will remember just this: "He who has God, wants nothing."

National Junior Chamber of Commerce Honors the 10 Outstanding Young Men of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce annually selects the 10 foremost young men of the Nation under 35 years of age. The selection for the year 1947 was made by a committee of eminent citizens, headed by Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corp. The presentation ceremony for the young men selected during 1947 was held at Chattanooga, Tenn., on January 21, 1948. Jaycee President John Ben Shepperd; Clifford D. Cooper, vice president; Raymond E. Roberts, editor of Future, the magazine for young men; Frank Fister, executive vice president; and other national officers of the organization were present. The highlights of the program were the addresses of Shelby R. Brammer, president of the Chattanooga Jaycees; John Ben Shepperd; and Hon. Harold Stassen, of Minnesota. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the addresses of these three men:

ADDRESS BY SHELBY BRAMMER, PRESIDENT OF THE CHATTANOOGA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Chattanooga salutes the more than 2,000 local Junior Chambers of Commerce tonight on the occasion of a nationwide observance of the twenty-seventh anniversary of the founding of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce in St. Louis, Mo. The climax of this observance is in Chattanooga tonight where we are honoring the Nation's 10 outstanding young men of 1947. The keynote here tonight is service. Outstanding service has been rendered by these men who have been brought from all over the Nation to receive the distinguished service award. New York City and Whittier, Calif., is here. Washington, D. C. and Knoxville; Waukesha, Wis.; Omaha; Berkeley, Calif.; Baltimore, Md.; in fact, all America! Stand by, for the presentation of the distinguished service awards to your illustrious native sons. And now, here is John Ben Shepperd, of Gladewater, Tex., president of the United States Jaycees. His job has taken him to Alaska, through most of the 48 States, to England, France, Belgium, and from here he goes to Washington to testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on the Marshall plan. It is very fitting that this widely traveled leader of young men presents the Nation's 10 outstanding young men.

ADDRESS BY JOHN BEN SHEPPARD, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Thank you, Shelby Brammer, and let me express the gratitude of these swell young fellows as well as all the members of the United States Jaycees for the wonderful southern hospitality shown us all here in Chattanooga. In a moment we will meet the 10 young men and hear the Honorable Harold E. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota, and the principal speaker at the distinguished service award banquet being held here at the Read House.

For a decade the United States Jaycees and our monthly magazine, Future, have sponsored the selection of the Nation's 10 outstanding young men. We hope that by calling attention to their accomplishments that not only all young men but citizens everywhere will strives the harder to follow their example and keep our American system of freedom of opportunity going onward and upward.

From scores of ballots that flooded into our national Jaycee headquarters in Tulsa a panel of nine distinguished American business and professional men picked the 10 men we have tonight. The judges' panel was composed of men over 35 years of age and they made their selections without regard to the affiliations of these men but judged them on the basis of their individual contribution to their business or profession and for their outstanding services in behalf of the general welfare of our whole country.

Now to meet the Nation's 10 outstanding young men of 1947. The first one we want to recognize is Thomas R. Reid, of Baltimore, Md., who, unfortunately, is confined to a hospital. But here representing him is W. Wallace Ashley, president of the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce, and Ed Ellis, a personal friend and fellow worker of Mr. Reid. Mr. Ellis is president of the North Carolina Jaycees. Tom Reid has distinguished himself as the representative of employers at international labor conferences in Montreal, Canada, and Geneva, Switzerland, in 1946 and 1947. He is one of the few men in the country whose job is to handle human relations and he is in charge of that function for McCormick & Co. of Baltimore. He is the leading exponent of multiple management, a plan in which the young men of a business or industry are given an opportunity to aid management and to prepare for bigger jobs later. He became the paid executive head of the United States Jaycee organization before his thirtieth birthday and he was one of the founders of Future magazine in 1938. I am proud to present this ruby-studded distinguished service award key to you, Ed Ellis, for Thomas R. Reid, and please, Mr. Ashley, convey our sincere hopes that Tom is recovered soon.

Our next young man is from New Orleans and it is with regret that we heard that Chep Morrison, illustrious mayor of that city could not leave his busy desk and is not here with us. He has attracted considerable attention already for his work in spark-plugging many civic construction and improvement projects in his city and he has traveled extensively in Latin America in the interests of improving our trade relations. New Orleans and particularly the Jaycees there are proud of Chep Morrison.

The next young man is also influencing our national thinking on municipal affairs and, like Mr. Morrison, he, too, is a mayor. James Quigg Newton, Jr., was elected mayor of Denver, Colo., last spring and he has since been seeking out experts and specialists—not political friends—to reorganize his city's health and police departments and set up sound personnel policies. He spearheaded an expansion program for the University of Denver, a privately endowed school, and a multimillion dollar improvement program is under way. Last year Denver Jaycees recognized his work as president of the university's board of trustees by naming him the outstanding young man of Denver. Mr. Newton, we join Denver in saluting you. Here is your distinguished service key.

Imagination and youth, combined with infinite courage and hard work, made our next young man truly outstanding. He is LaVon P. Peterson, age 28, of Omaha, Nebr., where

he founded the world's only school for training blind persons to repair radios and electronic equipment. He has been blind since birth but his radio engineering institute has many blind graduates, who, after 1 year's study are in business for themselves. During the war he trained men for our armed services to repair radios in complete darkness. It is indeed a pleasure to bestow this honor upon Mr. Peterson for his service to the handicapped. Here is your key, Mr. Peterson.

From Knoxville, Tenn., comes now Adrian Sanford Fisher, age 33, a man who is general counsel for one of the Government's most vital functions, the Atomic Energy Commission. He has served as an adviser on the group which actually drew the Marshall plan. He wears a Phi Beta Kappa key and is a graduate of the Harvard Law School. He was nominated by the Knoxville Jaycees.

Also, in the field of atomic energy from Berkeley, Calif., we have Dr. Glenn Theodore Seaborg, age, 35, chemist in nuclear reactions at the University of California. He formerly isolated element 94, plutonium, and recently his work has led to discovery of elements 95 and 96, Americum and curium. He isolated and identified U-233 and demonstrated that it undergoes fission with slow neutrons and he understands what radioactive isotopes mean. Chicago Jaycees named him their outstanding young man of the year 2 years ago. San Francisco Jaycees nominated him for this honor and we take great pleasure in presenting you with the DSA key, Dr. Seaborg.

Waukesha and all Wisconsin is aware of the work of Congressman GLENN R. DAVIS, age 33, who was active in framing veterans' legislation and the investigation of Veterans' Administration regional offices. He supports United Nations participation by the United States and has worked for bipartisan, long-range foreign policy. He favors aid to Europe's displaced persons. Glenn fought in the Pacific and we hope this key inspires you, Glenn, to further, greater things in the field of good, progressive government.

Another Congressman who has done an outstanding job is RICHARD M. NIXON, of Whittier, Calif. Aged 34, he was a member of the Herter committee which studied Europe's relief needs on the spot. He has devoted many, many months to making a thorough investigation of the needs for foreign aid. His work for fair labor legislation and on the Un-American Activities Committee of the House has reflected much credit on him. Mr. NIXON you have set an example of hard work in behalf of good government and this service is an inspiration to young men everywhere and we are proud for you to wear the DSA key.

From Memphis, Tenn., we have here with us tonight Dr. Robert A. Hingson, aged 34, the first physician to use hypospray. With Dr. Waldo B. Edwards he developed a successful technique of continuous caudal analgesia which gives complete relief to women during childbirth. He has trained many physicians in this technique, he has written extensively on pain control and is a surgeon in the United States Public Health Service. He is professor of anesthesia in the College of Medicine at the University of Tennessee. It is with pleasure and pride we award you this key for distinguished service in the field of medicine.

Last to be introduced, youngest man of our group of young men and from the Nation's largest city, New York, we call to the microphone Cord Meyer, Jr., aged 27, an ardent advocate of world government. He is president of the United World Federalist. Mr. Meyer has written and lectured extensively on the necessity for a world federation with sufficient power to keep the peace and peace is precious to him as it is to all of us, especially after he fought and was wounded in the Pacific with the marines. He was chosen young man of the year recently by the New York City Young Men's Board of Trade and we would like to hear a brief message from you, Mr. Meyer. In presenting you with this DSA key let me say we are impressed as the judges were by your organization's proposals. We wish you continuing success in your efforts for international law and order.

We are indeed proud to bring to the microphone now one of the truly outstanding young men of the decade. He gained an interest in the affairs of government and citizenship as a charter member of the East St. Paul, Minn., Junior Chamber of Commerce. His broad background and capacity for sound thinking was recognized by the people of Minnesota and they elected him their Governor. Later, President Roosevelt named him one of our delegates to the San Francisco United Nations charter conference. Even before these very important missions the judges of our annual impartial search for the Nation's 10 outstanding young men were impressed by his record, and in 1939 named him for the honor we are here bestowing on these other young men. Here is Harold E. Stassen, who was the principal speaker at our banquet tonight and who will now address you.

ADDRESS BY HAROLD E. STASSEN, OF MINNESOTA

President Shepperd, members and guests of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, I join in a salute to the 10 young men who have been selected as the 10 outstanding young men of the year. The record of their achievements, in a brief span of years, in a wide variety of fields of endeavor, is a thrilling testimonial to their individual abilities and equally to the dynamics of our American system.

We are all aware that we meet at a time when the most extensive and crucial world-wide competition of ways of life is under way.

Thus in addition to commending each of these young men for the remarkable achievements I take this opportunity to urge upon each of them, and upon the millions of young men and young women of their generation, an increased participation in the public affairs which have a direct bearing upon this conflict of ways of life around the world. The vigor, the resourcefulness, the enthusiasm of youth is very much needed on the public scene today.

I urge that it be directed in three principal phases.

First, that the ingenuity and expressive nature of youth be directed to the advocacy of the rightness of the fundamental concepts of individual freedom of the American system. America must not take an uncertain or apologetic attitude toward either its political system of representative government or its economic system of capitalism. It is a fact and it needs to be dramatically emphasized throughout the world that our modern people's capitalism in America is as different from the imperialistic monopoly capitalism of a century ago as is the ruthless economy of Russia different from the Utopia painted by Karl Marx.

Our modern people's capitalism has attained by actual statistics a higher production and wider distribution to all the people of the necessities and the luxuries of life than any other system in the history of the world.

Through that high production we are able to extend major assistance to war-torn countries of other parts of the world. This we should do thoroughly, willingly, and on a sound and businesslike basis. But we should not lose sight of the fact that the principles of individual economic freedom are a greater asset to any country than any goods that America can send.

With this affirmative advocacy of modern people's capitalism there must be carried on a constant campaign of interpretation to the people of our own country of the essential requirements of our system, of the importance of large sums of capital held in the hands of citizens rather than controlled by the men in Government, with incentives always present to invest, to buy, to sell, to work, to invent, to earn. The interpretation to the people is a vital safeguard against the recurring effects of the demagog to present unsound and treacherous proposals which would undermine the fundamentals of our individual freedom.

The second phase of the effort of youth is of equal importance. The drive and ingenuity of youth should be focused upon the correction of the weaknesses and shortcomings that do exist in our American system. We must never be smug or complacent about the success of America. Such an attitude leads directly to deterioration. Currently the two major shortcomings of our excellent economic system are in housing and in health. America today, with all of its superb production ability is 2,000,000 houses short of its essential requirements. This housing shortage falls with devastating effect upon the youth of the land, including particularly the veterans of the war, as they are naturally the late comers to the housing market and are caught by the extreme shortage. Major new action is required to break through the housing jam. The youth of the land should think through and come forward with new suggestions and aggressively seek results. It is not desirable that Uncle Sam should become a huge landlord, but it is essential that the power of government be used to break through the retarding effects of outdated building ordinances, of outmoded restrictive union practices, or retarding combinations of contractors and material men, and translate to the house-building field some of the efficiency and economy of our mass production techniques in other branches of industry. This requires that huge projects be initiated by the Government under private contract to open the way and to take the loss necessary to develop the new techniques.

In health we must work out the means by which major burdens of medical and hospital care which fall upon the ordinary family in event of serious illness or major accident are lifted from their backs by an insurance principle. But we should not make the mistake of bringing the whole medical profession and hospital administration under the hand of government.

Likewise, we need the increased use of the modern automobile and airplane in extending mobile health clinic services, fanning out from hospital centers of mercy and from specialized medical groups to the neglected areas of the country. It is a startling fact that nearly 1,200 of the counties of the 3,070 counties of our country are today without hospital care.

The greatest danger to our free economy is boom and bust, and here again young men with a willingness to learn the lessons of the past and to pioneer in new methods of combating hoarding, profiteering, monopoly, and excess speculation can do much to avoid the serious fluctuations of a free economy without making the sad mistake of adopting over-all centralized governmental control.

The third phase of the effort of youth in public affairs which I urge is a realistic counterpart to our meeting of the challenge of totalitarian competition on the economic and ideological front. It is the imperative necessity of remaining strong in a military sense during these critical years. Our generation knows all too well the grim lesson of what it means to be unprepared and weak in the face of an enemy who has turned to force in an attempt at domination.

There are many sincere people who would make major cuts in our budget for defense in order to secure larger tax reductions. But it is of grave importance that we reach agreement in this country on the vital necessity of remaining strong in the years immediately ahead. To do so we must enact some form of required service and training. We dare not drift along, with our active manpower a hundred thousand men short of minimum requirements and our reserves not up to strength. Likewise, we must move ahead in research and keep up front in air power. If we do there is less likelihood of men in other parts of the world making a mad decision to seek domination by force. And if they do make such a tragic move, tragic for themselves and for others, there should be no question of our victory, with a minimum cost of suffering and of men.

These three phases of the affirmative advocacy of the way of freedom, the constant improvement of our weaknesses, and the steady strengthening of our position, are the greatest assurance of an expanding freedom for ourselves and others in the years ahead and of opportunities for millions of the youth of tomorrow, equal or better than the opportunities which the 10 young men we honor tonight have demonstrated exist in America today.

JAYCEES BUILD FOR LEADERSHIP

Mr. Speaker, one of the crying needs of the Nation is more young men who will assume government leadership. Today the United States as the No. 1 Nation has the responsibility of world direction and it needs courageous young men to carry on the job successfully. The junior chamber of commerce is doing the best job of preparing young men for this task. Within 27 years more than a thousand clubs have been formed and membership has grown to 250,000 These young men render great service in sponsoring and energetically putting over projects in their communities. Equally important is the program of the Jaycees in building for leadership. Any young man under 35 years of age who has a desire to serve can join this democratic organization. The members, in my opinion, represent the best hope of responsible leadership in the years to come.

Ed Allen's Fireside Thoughts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert below Ed Allen's Fireside Thoughts, for January 17, 1948, which I commend to the membership because the thoughts expressed therein are sound and timely:

ED ALLEN'S FIRESIDE THOUGHTS

I liked this yarn so much that it seemed too good to keep—it happened in a little place called Nut Town, where a man by the name of Uncle Sam ran a grocery store. It seems that at times business was good with him and then again it wasn't so good. The whole ups and downs of business worried this old boy until one day he had a bright idea. The trouble, he decided, was due to the fact that his customers were suffering from a "dollar shortage."

Well, thought he, I'll fix that—so old Uncle Sam went to the bank and borrowed $100 in brand new $1 bills—these he gave to the people who passed his store with only one provision, they were to spend the money in his store. That night he was delighted to find his cash register full of new $1 bills—he had had a wonderful day, he had found an easy way to get rich. Every day after that he distributed $100 to the good people of Nut Town and his business continued to boom. Of course, he began to owe a lot of money for goods he had failed to pay for, but that didn't matter—he just arranged to pay them off with I O U's.

Uncle Sam's plan worked so well that it came to the attention of some of the big bureaucrats in Washington. Wonderful! They decided, and called a meeting of the big brains to decide how they could expand old Uncle Sam's plan to take in the whole world. Imagine the excitement—here was an idea that would give the people of the world all of the things their hearts desired, but best of all—we here in America would get richer and richer and enjoy prosperity forever and ever. All that the big brains needed to put their come-and-get-it plan into action was around 19,000,000,000 fresh, crisp, new dollars to give people suffering from a dollar shortage. All they were to do in return was to promise to spend this money in our American stores. They promised all right—and what's more they even promised to be nice and friendly. Well, Congress, of course, not being very smart, asked a lot of foolish questions but finally gave the bureaucrats the money which was loaded in ships and taken abroad. When the ships got there they turned around and brought the money back to pay for all the things the foreigners wanted. Boy! Was business good. Never had we known such prosperity. Of course, things got pretty scarce—prices and taxes skyrocketed—and there was talk of controls and rationing. But shucks. That wasn't the fault of the plan—but because of greedy businessmen.

So we see from this simple beginning in a little grocery store in Nut Town how we went on the biggest binge the world has ever known. Speaking of a dollar shortage, when the dawn comes, which it surely will, with some semblance of reason returning to our drugged minds and with trembling hands, we start to count up our real assets, it really will be something—believe me.

Stabilizing the Rubber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a statement by Mr. R. P. Dinsmore, vice president of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., on our rubber problem. It follows:

STABILIZING THE RUBBER INDUSTRY
(By R. P. Dinsmore)

The last war proved that we are dependent on adequate rubber supplies in order to carry on our military activities and our vital domestic economy in such a period. We were saved by the rapid promotion of our synthetic rubber industry in World War II, and it is generally agreed that we cannot rely upon crude rubber imports in a future emergency, but should preserve the synthetic manufacturing capacity and skill, together with knowledge of how to use it, against a future emergency. The minimum production and use advocated to accomplish this is 100,000 long tons per annum—many believe a higher figure is desirable.

In an effort to frame legislation to accomplish this purpose Congress has made investigations and conducted hearings, which disclose a disheartening conflict of opinions as to what should be done. On the one hand certain industry leaders advocate turning over the entire business to private enterprise, free from any control or restriction. On the other hand are those who advise continued Government production of synthetic with continuation of the present mandatory use in transportation items. Various intermediate views have likewise been expressed.

We may assume that all of these opinions are honestly held and frankly voiced. The differences no doubt arise from personal judgments as to the weight which should be assigned to the various factors. There seems to be little, if any, conflict in the view that national security must be protected, or that our system of private enterprise should not be hampered by Government operations beyond the bare necessities clearly required by national security. It is the difficulty in reconciling these two objectives which has created sincere differences of opinion.

If synthetic rubber can compete with natural rubber in cost and quality, there would be no problem. Private enterprise would insure an adequate supply at competitive prices. This, however, is not the case and there is no assurance that it would be brought about by any private operation which is now in prospect. There is merely the belief or faith, in some minds, that the application of private-business genius would inevitably produce this result. It has been rather generally agreed that national security requires the maintenance in active use, or standby, of 600,000 long tons of annual general purpose synthetic-rubber capacity. To make this capacity effective, there is needed plant capacity for raw materials, including 425,000 short tons of butadiene, 132,000 short tons of styrene, and at least an assured supply of the corresponding quantities of antioxidant, modifier, soap, salt, etc.

There will be required a stock pile of natural rubber, which may be as much as 800,000 long tons (see RMA statistical committee report of November 1947), and a stock pile of synthetic rubber at least equivalent to 3 months' output of the idle portion of the 600,000 tons capacity. This latter to enable immediate rubber conversion to an emergency-use basis, while the idle plants are being reactivated.

To permit crude rubber stock piling, 275,000 long tons minimum of GR-S must be produced annually until sometime in 1949.

The need for high priority for these national security moves is evidenced by our experience in the past war, the present unsettled state of the world, and the probability of swift, unheralded attack, if we should once more become the objective of an aggressor nation.

While recognizing the necessity for giving primary consideration to national security, it is inevitable that an industry which is the product of our free-enterprise system, would view with deep concern Government control of the production, use or sale of its major raw material, rubber. This is because such control deprives the industry of its normal right to purchase rubber on a free competitive market; because industry cannot freely select the most economical rubbers for use in all its products; because Government thereby has an unusual influence on competitive relationships at home and abroad; because industry fears the exercise of Government control for purposes harmful to the industry, in order to promote relationships with foreign countries,

some of which have manipulated the price of rubber to our detriment; because the industry feels a proprietary interest in synthetic-rubber production which was built up and maintained by its experience, skill, and managerial ability; and, in general, because industry fears the deadening effect of Government monopoly. It may be added that the rubber industry believes that it has in the product of its own enterprise, an economic weapon which should be utilized to combat excessive prices for natural rubber. It believes that sufficient GR–S should be produced for this purpose.

As previously stated, these problems could all be avoided if GR–S should be produced at a price and quality competitive with natural rubber. As it is, any free-enterprise scheme must have so many qualifications and restrictions in order to provide for national security, that it becomes a hodgepodge with little freedom left except in the name. It remains to inquire whether or not the most serious objections to Government operation and control can be overcome and what remaining advantages any scheme of private enterprise might have.

Wide discussion has failed to evolve any more feasible scheme for insuring the use of the minimum amounts of synthetic rubber than by continuing present specifications for small tire transportation items. However, mandatory use should be limited to these items by law, subject to change only by Congress after recommendations by a joint committee of the rubber industry and the supervising Government agency. Flexibility may be permitted the agency as to the amount of GR–S to be used in each of the permitted items. The importation of such tire items should be subject to the prevailing specifications. Export of such items should be permitted free from such specifications. The Government should produce in its synthetic rubber plants sufficient rubber to supply voluntary industry demands, which will always be stimulated by high natural-rubber prices. An adequate stock pile of GR-S should be carried to permit reasonable demands to be promptly filled.

Cost of the synthetic rubber is a matter which directly affects fair dealing with the public. It should be realized that if the public must buy tires containing certain percentages of synthetic rubber regardless of cost, that rubber should be priced as favorably as possible. If it is unfavorably priced, there is a heavy burden placed upon the tire user. For this reason, the write-off of synthetic plants, which were built for emergency defense and are continued for the same reason, should not be saddled upon the rubber-consuming public. It should be carried by all of the taxpayers. Aside from a small charge for plant renewals and improvements, the rubber should be priced at actual cost.

Since natural rubber is the only important competitor of synthetic, its probable market behavior directly affects the acceptance of GR–S and the consumer burden. It seems clear that while natural rubber is in short supply, any moderate increase in demand may cause a substantial price increase. On the other hand, we have recently seen how a sudden falling off in demand creates a substantial decrease in price. At present, 2 to 4 cents price advantage seems necessary to create a voluntary preference for the synthetic. Thus if GR–S were selling at 16 cents per pound, it would be fairly competitive with natural at 18 to 20 cents. These should be realistic levels under present conditions, and fair to all concerned. They would stimulate voluntary use, which would aid in the accumulation of the needed natural rubber stock piles.

If proper pricing policies were to be adopted, it is doubtful whether either industry or the tire-consuming public would suffer by Government operation in comparison with private enterprise. Mr. Hadlock testified before Mr. SHAFER's committee that rubber could be produced for an out-of-pocket cost of about 14½ cents per pound, but that other necessary charges brought the cost up to or above the 18½ cents selling price. If legislation permitted Rubber Reserve to cut these additional charges to around 1 cent per pound, as the industry recommends, the rubber could be sold at 15½ to 16 cents per pound, thus extending the period of time over which GR–S would be competitive. On the other hand, if private industry produced the GR–S profits on the major raw materials and the rubber would have to be added, there seems to be little hope, by use of present plants and under present conditions, of equaling or bettering a Government cost. The probabilities are that the costs in private plants, for some time forward, would be at least 1 cent per pound higher.

Synthetic rubber would be favored by higher natural rubber prices or lower GR–S costs. Although plantation rubber costs have undoubtedly increased and may, for some time, continue to rise, native rubber and small, one-family, plantation rubber appear on the market in increasing quantities as the market price drops. It is evident, therefore, that only a successful restriction plan or a better balance between supply and demand than is probable in the near future, would hold natural rubber prices at 18- to 20-cent levels. On the other hand, a radical reduction in the cost of synthetic rubber production would require both cheaper processes and cheaper raw materials. This is true for the major intermediates, butadiene and styrene, as well as for the rubber itself. It is believed that these savings possibilities are purely theoretical at the present time. If they should become realities, private capital would then become available to develop them, even if completely new plant designs were required.

In any event, within 18 months or so, when natural rubber becomes plentiful, we may see it selling for anywhere from 12 cents down to 6 cents. Under these circumstances there is little likelihood that GR–S, whoever makes it, can compete. In fact, its only use will be for required security purposes, for a limited special need or to meet any rigged prices by crude producers. If this is a correct prediction, the loss of such a business is not much hardship to industry.

The foregoing has been a discussion of the conflicting needs of national security and industrial economy. It seems obvious that the requirements of national security require, for a time, Government controls which are generally obnoxious to private industry. The position taken here has been that we cannot have a mixed economy, and, for that, I believe the present-day world abounds in practical examples more convincing than any I might adduce. An effort has been made to show reasons why the best compromise, under conditions which will prevail in the next year or two, is continuation of Government operation and control. The question naturally arises as to whether there is a conceivable change of conditions when the situation might be reversed. Granted that reversal will not be possible until adequate stock piles have been accumulated, it seems clear that, thereafter, private ownership can safely be substituted whenever the National Security Resources Board (or its then equivalent) decides that the guaranteed maintenance of the present sythetic-rubber industry is no longer essential to national security. This might come about from the development of a fully competitive rubber or for other reasons not now apparent.

It is clearly evident that we are not yet in a normal peacetime condition. There are alarming manifestations of world unrest which directly threaten our future security. No sensible patriotic viewpoint can ignore these facts or subordinate them to our inherent preferences for private enterprise, particularly in this case where private enterprise has so little to offer and so little room in which to turn. It would be wise to continue Government control subject to simple and specific limitations and adequate congressional review, until such time when a reversal to our normal practices can take place without serious threat to our Nation's welfare. Within the present pattern, encouragement of voluntary use of GR–S brings us most nearly to the desired objective.

Meanwhile we may as well recognize the unpalatable fact that by every indication, both from our own work in this country, and from what we know of the German's work, it is unlikely that the GR–S type of rubber will ever be entirely competitive. It is probable that the competitor for natural rubber must come from new, undeveloped fields of polymer chemistry, while GR–S takes its place as just another obsolete weapon of the late war.

Trend to Monopoly Must Be Stopped—National Federation of Small Business Spearheading Drive To Strengthen Antitrust Laws—Speech of Edward Wimmer, Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, small businesses are greatly concerned with march toward monopoly and big concentration in this country. They realize that monopoly means the death of free enterprise and of our opportunity to survive and expand. The National Federation of Small Business, foremost small-business organization in the country, appreciates this situation and is doing something about it.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a thoughtful and stirring address made by Edward Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Small Business, over a radio network on January 24, 1948. The address is as follows:

Thank you, and greetings, everyone.

This week, ladies and gentlemen, I am going to devote most of my time to a discussion of one of the most controversial and hard-fought legislative proposals ever to come before the lawmakers of this Nation. I am speaking of a measure commonly referred to as the O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill to outlaw mergers and consolidations between competing corporations. You may be of the opinion that such a bill as this would not affect you directly, but believe me, no matter what your position in life, I can assure you that the future of the O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill will have a direct bearing on your future. I say this because, in my humble opinion, if mergers and consolidations of competing corporations are not halted in this country, the American way of life will be halted, and the O'Mahoney-Kefauver proposal is the only legislation now ready for passage designed to meet this emergency.

There are many other problems closer to your own thinking which I would like to discuss at this moment. The present and growing threat of inflation, for example. The tax situation. The growing threat of the consumer-cooperative movement. The threat of socialized medicine and compulsory military training. The liquidation of savings. The dangerous overloading of the debt structure and many other things, but discussion of these problems will have to come later, not because they are not as important as today's topic, but because it will not do any good to solve any of those problems if we fail to solve the merger problem. If you have been a regular or periodic listener to these federation programs, you have heard me speak on the O'Mahoney-Kefauver proposal. This past year I testified in favor of it, as did our president, Mr. C. Wilson Harder, and our Washington representative, Mr. George Burger. We also polled our membership, and the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of its immediate passage. Last year the bill was reported out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously, and it is now in the Rules Committee. The job is to obtain early consideration of the measure by the House and Senate.

Permit me to give you some background information on the merger question, which I think is of vital interest to every thinking American who loves this country. First of all, I think we can agree on the thesis that widespread, independent ownership of farm, home, and enterprise, is the foundation of a free economy, which in turn is the foundation of free government. If you believe in the concepts of human dignity and freedom as expressed by the founding fathers in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, you must believe with me that such concepts as they expressed are not only basic to free enterprise and free government but are also in keeping with the concepts of Christianity. Therefore, anything which seriously interferes with the expansion of a free economy, must likewise interfere with the expansion of free government and Christianity, since one is inseparable from the other. When we get this truth securely in mind, we find it a lot easier to effectively approach the many social, economic, and political problems we are now called upon to solve. Will you approach the merger problem with me, with this thought in mind?

The O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill, known as H. R. 515, is not ill-conceived legislation, nor is it a radical measure from any standpoint. It merely amends a law which was passed in 1914 by a Congress fearful of the growing concentration of economic power in a few corporations, which was already taking place at that time. The law was called the Clayton Act, and its purpose was to stop mergers and consolidations of competing corporations, on the grounds that such mergers and consolidations were tending toward monopoly and were contrary to the concepts of democracy. This act, the Clayton Act, specifically stated in section 7, that no corporation could acquire the stocks or share capital of a competing corporation, when such acquisition tended to lessen competition. Section 11 of the act provided that the Federal Trade Commission, created that year, should have jurisdiction over the fulfillment of the Clayton Act and be empowered to order a divesture of any stocks or share capital involved in any merger which tended to create monopoly. Such a law would have not only prevented the combining of enterprises in the private-enterprise field but it would have stopped the combining of consumer-cooperative enterprises. It would have been better, however, if this act had never been passed, for it served no real good, and only tended to defeat following attempts to check the march of monopolistic forces. The Federal Trade Commission had no law with teeth in it, and the amount of money which is granted the Commission is not enough to carry on its essential work, even if the law had been enforceable. Why is all this true? Let me explain.

The Clayton Act stipulated that no corporation could acquire the stocks or share capital of any competing corporation, so the monopolizers merely acquired the physical assets, they bought the property itself, and then the stock. When they had done this over a long period of time with little opposition, they became so bold as to begin acquiring the stocks and share capital of competitors. The O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill would be the thumb in the dike now needed to stop this acquisition and keep the whole structure of our economy from cracking wide open, and I will tell you why.

You know as well as I do, that concentration of economic power was the basic cause of the collapse of every ancient and modern democracy in the history of the world, and both Woodrow Wilson and Howard Taft stated within a few months of each other, that concentration of economic power had reached such proportions prior to 1918, in this country, that it jeopardized the future of free enterprise and free government. Reports published in 1919, revealed that 200 nonfinancial corporations owned 33 percent of all the corporate assets in the United States. In 1919, due to the nullified Clayton Act, there was a total of 379 important mergers. Each year the number increased, until in 1929 there was a record high of 1,079 mergers, and the 200 nonfinancial corporations had jumped their ownership of corporate assets from 33 percent in 1919, to 48 percent in 1929, which leaped to 55 percent in the early thirties. If the Clayton Act, and in fact, if all our antitrust laws had not been full of loopholes, thousands upon thousands of corporations which have now lost their identity would still be competing on the open market, and 20 banks would not now be holding nearly a third of all the loans and investments of all the banks.

During the thirties, merger and consolidation and expansion of giant chains and holding companies continued, and in 1939, Franklin D. Roosevelt sent his sensational monopoly message to Congress, urging immediate strengthening of the antitrust laws, with new provisions for immediate halting of all mergers, plus the breaking up of all giant holding companies. The Temporary National Economic Committee, created by the Seventy-fifth Congress, looked into every phase of economic concentration, and as chairman of that committee, Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY performed a service of immeasurable value in determining our future handling of this problem. Congressman ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, in pushing his bill as far as he has, is measuring up to the highest standards of political statesmanship.

The TNEC study showed for one thing, that the average small- and medium-sized plant could operate at a lower cost than many of its largest competitors, and that during period of stress, the small- and medium-sized plant, when independently operated, was more likely to make a fight for a share of the available business. Dr. Frank Fetter in his testimony before the TNEC said that any outright combination of formerly independent plants, however attained, puts an end to competition among constituent members, giving a degree of control over production and price policies not attainable by the trade-association agreement. "Yet," declared Dr. Fetter, "few combinations have been questioned in the courts, and others have been given a clear bill, except when the abuses where so exaggerated as to shock public opinion and the court." End of quotation. Like ourselves, Dr. Fetter is not opposed to big business. What he is opposed to is big business combines, and some of the topmen in the industrial and financial world support this opposition. Owen D. Young said in 1933, that it was impossible for any man to direct the conglomeration of great numbers of operating companies with holding companies superimposed on the operating companies, and holding companies superimposed on the holding companies, investment companies and affiliates, such as the Insull combine. Arthur H. Anderson, head of one of the largest accounting firms in the United States, says that properties have been added to properties so fast as to cause what he terms industrial indigestion. Charles R. Flint, who recorded himself in Who's Who as the father of trusts, testified that the so-called intellectual giants of the industrial world were inclined to centralize too much, and he expressed his belief that it was a far wiser economic policy to sustain the independence and individuality of the separate concerns.

That is all we are trying to do, ladies and gentlemen, in our support of the O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill, for we believe that sustaining the independence of enterprise is to sustain the independence of this Nation. What chance will the youth of tomorrow have to start an independent business if present trends continue unabated, and think of the loss of opportunity to the average workman where his choice of jobs is limited to fewer and fewer, but bigger and bigger corporations, and the greater the combine, the farther away is the worker from all personal contact with the men who have the final word on all decisions. No one needs to be against big business to oppose this trend, any more than one needs to be opposed to labor unions because they are big, but like the combines in the industrial and financial field, labor has been merging and combining, with Government growing bigger and bigger, to keep from being taken over by one or the other. Attempts are being made to take monopoly powers away from labor, but how can this be done when labor can prove it needs monopolistic bargaining powers to deal with monopolistic business. So you see there is much more at stake in the passage of the antimerger legislation we are supporting, than shows on the surface.

Senator O'MAHONEY described H. R. 515 as a "mirror in which will be reflected the development of the future," and I think this is a good way to look at all major legislative proposals. What do they mirror?

During the holidays I made a broadcast on building bridges for America's children, and my point was, that what our organization is trying to do, is no more nor less than to help create an economy in which the boys and girls of tomorrow will have their opportunity to go into business for themselves; engage in the professions and their other chosen vocations as independent, individual human beings, enjoying every liberty set down in our wonderful Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Such is the basis of American family life, and only in a society where all men can exercise a free will and the inherent good which God gave to man, will you find any high degree of material and spiritual progress. The opportunity to open a little store is therefore something far more important to society than the mere granting of a personal business privilege, and this kind of thinking must dominate and determine our future course in all things. The reason why the Federation puts so much stress upon the importance of the independent farm and independent retail store, is because the independent farm is the fountainhead of independent enterprise, and the business of millions of small manufacturers, banks, wholesalers, jobbers, brokers, insurance companies, auto dealers, and so forth, is dependent upon the individually owned store, and think of the number of salesmen alone who would be knocked out of the economic picture if the small retailer were to disappear. This business of keeping the independent in business, whether he be a grocer, candlestick maker, artist, doctor, farmer, miller, or whatever he is, is therefore the task of all patriotic Americans for upon the destiny of the independent, rests the destiny of the Nation.

Thank you for listening, good luck, and good thinking to you all.

Three Largest South Dakota Newspapers Herald Passage of the Mundt Bill (H. R. 3342) To Establish a Permanent United States Information Service Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, with the passage last week of H. R. 3342—the so-called Mundt bill to create a permanent United States information and educational exchange service in our State Department—this country has at long last equipped itself to tell people throughout the world the truth about the facts and functions of freedom as they are practiced in this Republic.

As indicative of the general approval which this new legislation is receiving throughout the country, Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD recent editorials clipped from the three largest daily newspapers of South Dakota. Newspaper comment, generally, throughout the country is registering the same enthusiastic approval of our Congressional action as that demonstrated in the three following editorials:

[From the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Daily Argus Leader]

AMERICA MUST TELL ITS STORY IN EUROPE

The Nation is now generally convinced that the American story must be better told in Europe if we are to counteract effectively the propaganda coming out of Moscow.

In consequence, it is now a strong probability that Congress will approve promptly the bill originally presented by Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, to promote the Voice of America.

This subject last week commanded the attention of the Washington Post, which said in a lead editorial:

"One of the most hopeful auguries of the new session of Congress is the manner in which action has been expedited to put the foreign information program on a sound basis for the future.

"Last week the Senate Republican Policy Committee gave the green light to the Senate version of the Mundt bill as one of three pieces of 'must' legislation for January.

"In addition to providing the basis for expansion of Voice of America broadcasts, libraries and other facets of the information program, the Mundt bill also goes into another significant aspect of our cultural relations—the exchange of students, teachers, and technical materials and the assignment of specialists to other countries on request.

"Passage of the Mundt bill itself, of course, does not assure the funds necessary to do the job. But it is the first step in what many Members of Congress have rightly come to regard as an inescapable choice. The second equally essential step will be to vote the money for any adequate program, both in a deficiency appropriation and in next year's budget."

The expected passage of this bill is a significant step in the development of an American international program.

So far we have been, as Representative MUNDT put it in a speech in Sioux Falls, "feeding the stomachs of Europe while Russia has been feeding the minds of Europe." As a result, we have received little credit and, in truth, much abuse. The Russians have succeeded in implanting in the minds of many Europeans the impression that we are giving only small aid and that what we are giving is material that we do not consider good enough for ourselves. Furthermore, they have promoted the idea that we are doing this solely to promote our capitalistic economy and that we even are somewhat interested in starting another war just to produce prosperity in the United States.

Such arguments are, of course, childishly inaccurate, but they have been, unfortunately, accepted in some quarters of Europe.

It is obviously sound policy for us to spend some money—at the most, however, only a trifle compared to the relief cost—to make sure that Europe understands our motives and our benefactions.

This is the purpose of the Mundt bill, and there's satisfaction in the realization that its merit is being appreciated in Washington.

The second editorial, Mr. Speaker, is taken from the Aberdeen American News published in Aberdeen, S. Dak.:

"VOICE" TRIBUTE TO MUNDT

Unanimous approval by the House Monday sent to President Truman the legislation authorization rtrengthening of the State Department's "Voice of America" foreign broadcasts for offsetting Russian propaganda.

The enthusiastic endorsement in both Houses, of the legislation is a tribute to the leadership of Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota. One of the first to see the need for this type of information dissemination, he fought for the measure against great odds last year and won national recognition for his efforts.

Congressional delegations to Europe last summer and fall learned that the South Dakota Representative knew what he was talking about.

They saw for themselves that the great aid America was giving Europe in her fight against communism was not as effective as it should be because America was not doing the necessary job of selling herself. And they saw also the effectiveness of Russia's vicious propaganda campaign.

It is time, these Congressmen have decided, that Europe start learning the truth about America.

The action of Congress on this important measure which assures the world America is going to speak up for the freedom and for the kind of democracy it cherishes is encouraging to persons who are beginning to see the threat once more of the isolationist influence.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to an editorial appearing in the Rapid City Daily Journal, published in Rapid City, S. Dak., out in South Dakota's famous summer playground—the beautiful Black Hills:

WELL DONE, KARL MUNDT

The Mundt bill has passed both Houses of Congress and is awaiting President Truman's signature, marking the end of a strenuous campaign by South Dakota's KARL MUNDT.

MUNDT has worked vigorously and often with the odds stacked against him to push through his Voice of America legislation. He has insisted it is folly to feed the stomachs of the Europeans while the Communists feed their minds.

The unanimous approval both Houses of Congress gave MUNDT's bill is a stirring tribute to the efforts of the active South Dakotan.

The scores of Congressmen who visited Europe last summer and fall were shocked at the way America is being misrepresented abroad. Day and night the Russians are carrying on a vicious anti-American campaign, telling the people of Europe we are dollar diplomats, that we want to enslave the people of Europe, that we are warmongers, that the United States wants the Marshall plan in order to create a permanent market for American goods.

In France last summer when that country was suffering from its worst drought in 100 years, Communists set fires in the scanty wheat fields of Normandy and Britanny. The Communist newspapers of France charged the fires were started by American agents who wanted to make France spend its last few dollars on American wheat.

Some American shipments to France were a mixture of corn and wheat flour. The Communists told the French that Americans in their country only feed corn to hogs and evidently the Americans do not think any better of the French than they do of their swine.

To most of the people of Europe, America is still a utopian country, a land of plenty and the place where a man of humble beginnings may rise to the highest office in the land. They do not want to believe the Russian propaganda and most of the Europeans do not believe it fully. However, it is like water dripping on a stone. If it drips long enough, it is certain to leave an impression.

Against Russia's clever and expansive propaganda system, America has little defense. We have a United States information service, but it is grossly inadequate. We have three men stationed in France, for example, to tell the truth about America to the French; the Russians have hundreds hired to misrepresent America and to promote the communistic philosophy. It is like sending a teenager to do battle with a giant.

KARL MUNDT's legislation will do much to convey the truth about America to the bewildered Europeans. It provides for the exchange of students—Europeans would be sent to American universities and Americans would go to schools in Europe, resulting in a better knowledge of their respective lands.

It provides for well-equipped libraries where the people of Europe can read about this great land of ours and learn that it isn't a nation of scandalous divorces, lynchings, and gang murders as the Russians make it out to be. It provides for chairs of American culture in foreign universities, the sponsoring of American lecturers and technicians.

Most important, it provides for a virile information service of facts and sets up the machinery which will enable America to make out the Russian propaganda for what it is—lies.

After Truman signs the Mundt bill, Congress must still appropriate the necessary funds for its operation.

But the bill has passed, a vital step on the way toward better world understanding. KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, is to be commended for the great task he successfully performed to help feed the minds as well as the stomachs of the people in the harrassed lands across the Atlantic.

Industry Needs Medicine and Vice Versa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I include in my extension of remarks a well considered and challenging address made by S. Bruce Black, president of the Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., of Boston, Mass., at the annual dinner held in Cleveland, Ohio, on January 5, 1948, of the Congress on Industrial Health, American Medical Association:

INDUSTRY NEEDS MEDICINE AND VICE VERSA

It is indeed a privilege to have this opportunity to speak at this meeting of so many leaders of American medicine and I am grateful for this occasion to state industry's needs as seen through the eyes of an organization such as my own. I am not a doctor and I do not presume to tell you what you need to do. But my experience with industry and its relations to medicine leads me to make certain observations as to what industry's medical needs are.

That we may better understand what I believe is needed, I would like to go back 40 years, to the days before workmen's compensation laws were enacted. At that time when a man took a job he assumed the risks that went with the job. If he sustained an injury while at work he could not collect moneys from the employer unless he proved that his employer was negligent; he had to prove this in a court of law, and it was accepted that if a fellow worker's negligence caused the injury, that injury was not the responsibility of the employer.

When the philosophy was adopted that such disablement is part of the cost of production and should be incorporated in the price of the product, workmen's compensation laws were passed. Industry became legally liable for the injuries to its workers, became obligated to provide benefits during the time lost from work, medical and surgical care that injuries required, and death benefits to dependents if the injuries were fatal.

It became evident that if industry were to pay such costs it should have some control over those costs. This brought about the development of three specialized skills—safety engineering, industrial hygiene, and industrial medicine, to reduce the number of work injuries and occupational disease disabilities by removing their causes and industrial medicine to minimize the consequences of injury and disease and to restore the disabled to useful employment.

Even though some groups frown at the mention of profits, it is certainly true that the profit motive underlies our American way of life. Needless to say, survival in a free competitive system requires industry to control its production costs. Only in that way can it stay in business. Workmen's compensation is a part of the production cost. The experience of the individual plant largely determines the cost the plant pays for its insurance for workmen's compensation. Two plants making the same product may pay very different costs for compensation insurance. When a plant's compensation losses are low, the compensation insurance costs are low and that part of their production cost is low. When the compensation losses are high, the reverse is true.

The changing social concept that made the injuries arising out of the production of a commodity a part of the production cost produced a need, a demand for an in-plant medical program. Management found a few pioneering physicians who would enter their industries and develop medical programs. There was a time when many physicians looked upon these pioneers, questioned the propriety of their practices, attempted to restrict them to first aid, and felt that the care of the injured belonged exclusively to the private practitioner. Perhaps some physicians still hold this viewpoint.

Nevertheless, industrial medicine has grown, and it has grown because the changing social trend has created a specific demand and need for it. It has grown to its present status, where it should soon be generally recognized as a specialty within the field of medicine. Industrial medicine encompasses all those aspects of medicine that relate to industry. It includes, in addition to prevention, the diagnosis and treatment of industrial injuries and occupational disease, industrial hygiene and toxicology, mental hygiene, industrial sanitation, legal medicine, administration, employee relations, and health education. In those plants large enough to support a full medical program, both the industry and the employees have generally benefited from modern industrial medicine. The practice has developed steadily out of the obvious need and out of its own effectiveness. Smaller industries need a similar type of medical care to achieve the same ends. Ways and means are now developing to furnish that care, but progress is slow and the problems are many. But where can industry find the doctors for such care? Where can it find physicians who are interested in and have training in industrial medicine? I know of only a few medical schools in the country that are making a serious contribution to this field. And those few doctors that may become qualified—how is industry to find them? And, conversely, how is the qualified physician to approach industry?

The vast majority of industrial cases, rightly, are now being treated by the general practitioner. Industry has found too many times that the general practitioner has too little knowledge of or interest in the man's job or his working environment. How can it be said that he is giving his patient the best possible medical care without such knowledge? Industry has found that he limits his treatment generally to curative practices and has given little attention to the preventive medical aspects of a case. This is so because his practice is curative medicine, not preventive.

Industry has found that because of his lack of knowledge of the plant environment and the work, that his sole contact with the industry is likely to be the patient's statement which he takes at face value. This often leads to unnecessary and costly litigation, ill will, loss of time from work, poor employee relations. We do not feel that industry is unreasonable in asking the American Medical Association to join hands with it to improve the practice of medicine as it applies to the industrial problems.

Industry needs practitioners who are interested in the effect of the working environment on the man, who are aware of the basic elements of industrial medicine, who are willing to see the problems of industry, who are willing to pursue the preventive aspects of a case. Industry needs a preventive medical control plan.

Fundamentally, industrial medicine concerns itself with the health of the worker. This means that the physician must be familiar with and concerned with occupational conditions, proper plant hygiene and sanitation and the health of the workers. It would be wrong to state or imply that he gives no treatment beyond simple first aid, whether the condition or injury is connected with his work or not. I know of no industrial physician who thus restricts his medical activities to first aid.

We have now reached the threshold of a change as vitally significant to the practice of medicine and to the running of an industry as were the new workmen's compensation laws. It is becoming more generally accepted that the catastrophe of sickness and surgery should be provided for beforehand. Opinions differ as to how this provision should be accomplished. Should government tax industry and the worker and provide medical care? Should individual initiative determine whether or not a person will so protect himself beforehand? Or should industry provide for medical care and sickness losses?

Let us first understand that the cost of individual sickness insurance must necessarily be high. It must be high because it must be preceded by a determination of insurability. It must be high because those individuals who would be most likely to take advantage of it are those who would most need it. And it is high because of the need for individual premium selling and collecting.

These impediments can be minimized by the method of writing accident and health insurance on a group plan so that a sizeable segment of population will be insured under one premium and hence experience will be average. Thus there is no need for the expense of individual selection and no need for individual premium collecting. The group most suited to such an approach is an industrial or business group.

At the present time industry is alive to the importance of its workers' health. It costs money to hire a worker. It costs money to train him. And the longer a well and competent man works for the company the more important to production are the skills which he acquires. Ill health in a worker means decreased productiveness, inattentiveness, greater liability to accidents, decreased quality of product, increased scrap, costly absenteeism, and a host of other effects which can be summed up as lowered production and increased production costs. There is a direct relation between worker health and worker productiveness. Thus if industry can invest in a program that will improve employee health, that investment will be worth while.

This country is essentially an industrial country. Whether it survives in world competition will probably depend on the skills and the industrial production that this country can achieve. This means that the industrial population cannot be permitted to lose its effectiveness at an arbitrary age of 55 if it is in any way possible to prolong the health of the worker for another decade. Just how far such prolongation of productiveness can be carried is fundamentally a medical and biological question but it certainly can be carried farther and faster with the cooperation of industry than without it. Other things being equal the civilization or national economy which can be served by the greatest number of productive working years from each individual worker is going to survive and triumph in world competition.

Industry is adopting more and more group accident and health plans for their workers. Many industrialists have accepted the responsibility of paying for worker ill-health and medical care. Unions recognize the value of group insurance and it is being included in many contract negotiations.

This movement is a continuance of the social trend represented by the development of the workmen's-compensation system. Industry's adoption of group accident and health plans stems from an awareness of this trend. Preventive medicine as well as medical care are inherent in these plants. Industry needs organized medicine to work with it, in developing the best possible ways to meet these problems, for I believe, industry would prefer to see their solution remain in the hands of private agencies.

Industry itself has not made the best possible use of the abilities of modern medicine, and this has been for two reasons: First, in many cases industry has not been aware of its specific needs or the answers to those needs. And second, organized medicine has not offered a full and realistic answer to those needs. In our work in industry we find this to be so. Where industry thoroughly understands what medicine can do for it and where medicine is willing to adjust its practices so that it contributes to industry's well-being as well as the individual work's well-being, we are noting increasing industrial medical progress.

As I have already stated, workmen's-compensation costs are a part of the production cost. If, as the trend indicates, nonoccupation accident and health is to become a part

of production cost, then industry must be very much interested in a medical program and the use of medical skills. Of course, industry as a whole is very much interested in the individual; at the same time industry has to be interested in the cost and the industrial return on every investment. In working with industry and interesting industry in making greater use of good medical practice, we have concluded that if the medical profession can answer some of the cost-control problems that industry faces, as well as furnishing good medical care for the individual, then the time is ripe for a joint program between medicine and industry.

When industry assumes the cost, the obvious question is, "How can such costs be controlled?" There is little control if present-day medicine offers only a curative approach to illness. There is little control if medical service is offered only as an absentee-type of supportive treatment. There is little control when physicians certify as disabling, conditions which would not be considered disabling if the requirements of the job were understood or if the worker were placed in work which he could safely perform. There is little control unless the physician is willing to approach each case from a preventive as well as a curative point of view.

And what does industry need to control costs under group health and accident insurance? It needs many of those elements of a medical program that have grown out of the workmen's compensation system, and in addition to that it needs greater knowledge of and emphasis on preventive medicine. By preventive medicine I mean two things: The prevention of illness and the prevention of losses.

Knowledge of the prevention of illness is growing. Perhaps the American Medical Association can focus greater emphasis on this phase of medical knowledge and research as it applies to illness and to aging processes. Perhaps it is appropriate to suggest that the great preventive accomplishments of the past have been achieved in dealing not with individuals but with masses.

Of great immediate importance is a need for prevention of losses through medical care. This includes prompt and effective treatment of minor illnesses to prevent the development of more serious and disabling conditions. This also includes a recognition of the importance of keeping a man at work, a recognition of the economic significance of the day's wage to the worker and the day's productive effort to industry and the Nation's economy. This will mean more active treatment aimed at maintaining the workers' wages and the workers' productiveness. And when, in spite of this, serious illness occurs, it means prompt effective treatment to restore the man to health and to productive effort as soon as possible.

When a change in social trend creates a need, that need will somehow be filled. Adoption of group health and accident plans by industry is a response to a social trend. It is creating a need for industrial medicine and preventive medicine such as I have indicated. It would appear that this can best be supplied by the physician who because of his knowledge of work capacity and environment is best qualified to decide what work the employee is able to accomplish.

Industrial medicine is maturing. Soon definite patterns will have become fixed and applicable to the practice of medicine in industry. The American Medical Association can offer aid and leadership in the development and fixation of these patterns. If they become fixed without such aid, the patterns may not be entirely pleasing to any of us. Right now there is serious need for strong, active, realistic cooperation and direction of these trends. The American Medical Association should, I believe, stress the ascendant element of preventive over purely curative medicine to facilitate and implement the practice of industrial medicine. It should bring this thinking to the general practitioner who is now treating most of industry's illnesses and injuries. There should be close cooperation between the association and the physician serving industry, looking toward higher standards of industrial medical practice, perhaps by establishing a certifying board as has been done in other specialties. In some such way, industry may know who is a qualified industrial physician.

And, finally, some very challenging questions grow out of group accident and health benefit plans. Shall the industrial physician treat all illness and injury that is ambulatory? In nonoccupational conditions, shall we have only advising and educating function? Will group practice offer the answer to group insurance? How is a preventive medical program to be developed that will be effective?

These questions should be answered by organized medicine. As always happens where the need is great enough, questions such as these are somehow answered by somebody. We believe that industry would prefer to have them answered by the American Medical Association than by forces outside of organized medicine. Industry needs organized medicine to implement its health program. American medicine needs industry, because this is an industrial Nation and because industry is becoming the focal point for the medical care of the majority of American workers.

Time for Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 19, in the Washington Post, there appeared a statement signed by the Schenley Distillers Corp., captioned "Time for common sense," an open letter to the Congress of the United States.

I want to address myself to the statement which, throughout its entire length, impresses me with its forceful and sound reason. I believe that this statement should prompt the membership of the House to consider the points raised by the signers of the advertisement. Unrefuted arguments advanced in the statement should compel at least a cautious advance if not an abrupt halt to the policy of grain restriction, not only to the distillers but it seems to me that the same argument might be applied to the impending restriction on the production of beer, the workingman's favorite beverage.

I want to go along with the program of feeding the hungry but I want to be sure that the restrictions are justified and that they will produce an additional volume of food for the unfortunate people of Europe before I would further impose grain restrictions.

I submit the advertisement as part of my remarks for I feel that it is more readily understandable than any interpretation that I can give as relates to its contents.

TIME FOR COMMON SENSE—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

In the next few days the Congress will be asked to consider legislation to extend the shut-down of American distillers. Since this involves an industry which pays annually more than two and a half billion dollars in taxes and employs directly and indirectly more than 2,000,000 American workers, we think it might be useful for you and for the public to have some of the facts about the recent voluntary 60-day shut-down.

Schenley entered into the voluntary agreement and has lived up to its obligations 100 percent.

Some American distillers did not shut down.

The Canadian distillers did not shut down.

The British distillers did not shut down.

No other country in the world closed its distilleries.

For the announced purpose of providing food for hungry people in Europe, the shut-down has been an absolute, costly, and utter failure.

The purpose of our Government was to save wheat. We believe that not only was there no saving of wheat, but that wheat was actually lost.

The distilling industry uses practically no wheat. The actual figure is less than one-thousandth of 1 percent of the total wheat crop.

This industry uses principally corn, some rye, and some barley malt. Most of this grain, if not so used, would ordinarily be fed to animals.

Normally we use about 2 percent of the total corn crop.

It was estimated by the President's Food Committee that the 60-day shut-down would save approximately 10,000,000 bushels of grain, but actually little or nothing was saved because in the process of distilling we return to the farmer feeds for poultry, hogs, dairy cattle, and beef cattle which in the opinion of experts have an equal or greater feeding value than the grain we used.

We take out only the starch. We save all the protein and oil and add yeast. The resulting products are rich in protein, vitamins, amino acids and other feed values.

We are convinced that the final result is this: If a farmer has 10 bushels of grain and sells us 2 bushels for distilling, and then feeds the 8 bushels which he kept and the residue which we return to him, he will get as much added weight in feeding his animals as he would have achieved if he had fed them the original 10 bushels.

We think he actually gets more.

Suffice it to say that the benefits of a balanced diet have been proved over and over again for both animals and human beings.

Our own Department of Agriculture, in numerous bulletins, has published many formulas for the use of distillers feeds to balance animal diets.

We admit, frankly, that the exact percentage of feeding value which we return to the economy is debatable.

You may think that instead of being more, it is even as much as 50 percent less. Let's assume that you sincerely believe that the Luckman plan saved 5,000,000 bushels of corn, or less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total grain available.

But it wasn't corn the Government wanted to ship abroad. It was wheat.

We knew that our feeds would add weight to cattle, but the Government apparently was not interested in getting more meat. Now the Secretary of Agriculture tells the country that we are faced with a terrible meat shortage. It does get a little confusing, doesn't it, gentlemen?

In addition, we think they lost more wheat than they thought they saved.

When the farmer doesn't get our feed, do you honestly believe he is going to let his poultry and hogs and cattle starve?

And maybe this particular farmer hasn't any corn. Maybe he has wheat. So he feeds the wheat to the chickens and hogs and cattle—and it was wheat that we wanted in the first place to ship to Europe.

The government of every country in the world, except our own, has adopted the principle that distilling takes nothing away from the food economy. This is proved by the fact that none of these governments have shut down their distilleries. Surely they are not purposely taking food out of the mouths of starving people.

England is running at capacity; Canada is running at capacity; 11 countries which have submitted their needs under the Marshall plan, have asked for grain for distilling and brewing.

Even assuming that the shutdown saved a few million dollars worth of corn, let's see what it cost:

It completely dislocated an industry which pays to the Federal and State governments more than $2,500,000,000 a year in taxes.

It threw thousands of American workers out of work. We know because we alone kept more than 1,000 on full pay.

It increased the price of the neutral grain spirits now in storage in the United States more than 150 percent.

It opened the door wide for foreign distillers and foreign workers to take over the business of American distillers and the jobs of American workers.

We admit that these are strong statements, but we will prove every one of them right up to the hilt.

There is one other fact that ought to be clarified. The public was told that the stocks of whisky in the United States were adequate—that we have over 550,000,000 gallons of whisky. What we have, actually, is about 65,000,000 gallons of whisky in this country which is 4 years old or older. This is about 1 year's supply. The rest is green whisky not yet fit to drink. (Government figures show what is put away—not what is there after evaporation and outage.)

This is less aged whisky per capita than in any distilling country on the whole face of the globe.

Now you may well ask us why we agreed voluntarily to shut down when we knew all of these facts and had communicated them to the Luckman committee.

We assented because we were conscious of an obligation to the American people, who decided in 1933 that they would prefer to have a sound distilling industry with employment and taxes and Government regulation instead of bootleggers, gunmen, and rot-gut. They put that in our Constitution.

So, when the call came to help hungry people we wanted to contribute our share, heaped up and running over. We knew no grain would be saved, but when we were told that a great sacrifice on our part would be a tremendous psychological contribution for the purpose of securing assent from others to make comparable sacrifices, we agreed.

No other American industry was asked to make any comparable sacrifice.

No other country asked its distillers to make any sacrifice.

We think it is time for a little common sense.

We think this whole question of the shutdown of distillers and the allocation of grain for restriction of production should be investigated by the Congress of the United States. Not in an hour, not in a day, but in a full-dress hearing, with opportunity for all to be heard. Not just distillers, but the communities that are being ruined, the workers who are being thrown out of work, and the farmers who have an interest in the feeding of their stock and the disposition of their products.

We believe that the public interest would be best served by full disclosure of all the facts in the full light of day.

SCHENLEY DISTILLERS CORP.

The Next Great Fight for Equality for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Clarence Poe, from the Progressive Farmer for December 1947:

THE NEXT GREAT FIGHT FOR EQUALITY FOR AGRICULTURE

(By Clarence Poe, president and editor)

First of all we most heartily congratulate the members of the House Committee on Agriculture upon the patriotism and progressiveness which have caused them to go to the farmers themselves and ask, "What do you think Congress should do?" At the House committee meeting we attended, crops farmers, cattle raisers, dairymen, women farmers, tenant farmers, Negro farmers, 4-H clubsters, all spoke up—and spoke with such vigor and ability as to make everybody proud of our southern farm folks. Of course, leaders in agricultural research, education, and organization will be heard in Washington, but it was an inspiration to see this committee traveling north, south, east, and west to get the views of "grass roots farmers."

I

For our own part we should like first of all to ask the able members of this committee to consider the one question which must be back of all its other questions, namely, "Just what great purpose does Congress intend to serve, just what great national interest does it wish to promote, as a result of whatever long-range agricultural policy it adopts?"

All too many present-day speakers, writers, commentators, and statesmen seem to think that the chief purpose of any agricultural policy, whether short-range or long-range, should be merely to produce (and produce cheaply) the food and raiment for an urban civilization, a civilization of our towns and cities. Our own convictions, on the contrary, is that it is the high duty of government to promote and maintain a rich and satisfying rural civilization for our farm people themselves. So Congress must not merely ask, "How can soils be so conserved and handled as to produce food and fiber at the lowest possible cost to city consumers?" On the contrary, Congress and Government must conserve and promote human values as well as economic values. Farm men and women must not only have satisfying incomes, but must have a satisfying way of life. As we have said over and over—

"Farmers work just as hard as any other class. By feeding and clothing humanity, they make just as important a contribution to human welfare as any other class. Hence they are just as much entitled to all the advantages of modern civilization as any other class. But just because the necessities of their occupation compel them to live in widely separated places, they have not heretofore been regarded as entitled to these advantages. From now on farm folks must demand such Federal, State, and local cooperation as will give farmers—on absolutely equal terms with other classes—the privileges and benefits of twentieth century civilization."

II

There are two great fights for "Equality for Agriculture" that farmers must make and about which Congress should help. The first great fight is for the farmer's economic rights. Here the No. 1 need is for "parity prices"—to see to it that the farmer gets prices for his products that will enable him to get a fair exchange of his goods for manufactured goods—and for sound crop insurance and tenant purchase programs, etc. By adequate, organized effort American farmers may win permanent recognition for this form of "Equality for Agriculture," the farmer's economic rights.

What we now equally need to have recognized is the farmer's right to another form of "Equality for Agriculture." By this we mean the duty of society and government to give the farmer reasonably equal access to all the benefits and advantages of twentieth century civilization.

A recent member of the Government of Australia made a trip through the South and while here made one statement that should be thundered from the housetops: "In our country," he said, "we have come to think of it as a duty of government to provide for the education, health, and general welfare of all classes of our people regardless of how widely scattered the duties of their occupation may take them. They are not to blame for that."

That, it seems to us, must now likewise be recognized as the duty of our American Government. Already we have gone far in this direction but not yet half far enough.

III

For a long time it was thought all right for Uncle Sam to deliver the townsman's mail daily to townsfolks, but rank socialism to do so for farmers. Now quick mail service to farmers has helped American business no less than agriculture.

Electricity is one of the godsends of twentieth century civilization—but only recently has Government begun to recognize its duty to give its benefits to farmers on something like the same terms on which city people have so long enjoyed it.

For a long time it was thought all right to have 9 months' school for town and city folks and 3 months for country folks. Now equality of educational opportunity for rich and poor, town and country, is winning increasing acceptance in all States—and must be accepted by Congress also. The illiteracy of one State hurts every other State. Without Federal aid to our poorer rural States equality of educational opportunity is absolutely hopeless for this generation or the next of rural youth. To give help here is the No. 1 duty of Congress to the farmer.

Hardly less important—and perhaps even more sacred and Godlike—is the supreme duty of Government to provide for our farm people equality of opportunity in the matter of hospital and medical care. A great start has been made in this direction. Congress must now go forward until it reaches the complete ideal we set forth in addressing the Senate Committee on the Hill-Burton hospital-aid bill—

"For every person, rich or poor, high or low, urban or rural, white or black, an equal right to adequate hospital and medical care whenever and wherever he makes the same grim battle against ever-menacing death which sooner or later we must all make for ourselves and see our loved ones make."

IV

A richly satisfying rural civilization and not the mere support of a town-and-city civilization—this must be the aim of our new and broadened fight to win for farmers "Equality for agriculture." Just because the farmer's work compels him to live far from

congested centers is no reason for denying him the equal benefits of education, electricity, roads, recreation, libraries, hospital and medical care, and other agencies of twentieth century civilization. To so equalize the costs of these benefits as to insure equal rights for farmers must be one of the major features of any long-range agricultural program for America.

Veterans' Homestead Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, today I have filed a bill which I think will be of great assistance in handling veterans' housing and homestead problems. The bill is substantially the same as that sponsored by the American Legion and other veteran organizations which was introduced in the House by Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee (H. R. 4488) and by 22 other Congressmen.

There is one important difference, H. R. 4488, commonly known as the Veterans' Homestead Act authorizes the incorporation of nonprofit veteran associations or cooperatives which are empowered to build low-cost housing units for rent or sale to veterans. The bill which I have filed authorizes the existing veteran departments of the various States to carry out this work in lieu of the associations or cooperatives.

The aims of the Veterans' Homestead Act are excellent. I feel that its only weakness is the provision calling for the formation of veteran cooperatives to act as the agency for the issuance of bonds and for supervising the program. There is already established in each State, departments authorized to assist veterans. They have files showing the condition of the veterans in the various States and they are familiar with the local housing needs. These existing departments are better prepared to be the nucleus around which this organization should be developed.

FOLLOWS USUAL FEDERAL-STATE PATTERN

The bill recommended is a somewhat new approach to the problem of veterans' housing. It follows the practice which Congress years ago formulated with respect to Federal aid for highway and road construction and improvement. In the main, the planning and the details, as well as the actual construction of roads and highways, are left to the department of highways of each State. The Federal Government simply furnishes financial aid and exercises an over-all supervisory function which guarantees that the highway departments of the several States shall have expert assistance in the planning of roads and highways and their construction and maintenance and financial aid.

STATE DIRECTION BETTER

This bill provides a similar dual responsibility for veterans' housing. It recognizes that fundamentally the laws which govern the construction and ownership of real property is that of the State wherein the property is situated. Each State may therefore lend its aid to sponsoring such local housing developments which are best adapted and most suitable to the needs and abilities of the veterans of those communities; and each State is able under existing laws or such laws as it may see fit to enact, to curb and abolish antiquated building codes and practices which tend to create monopoly in the building industry and inflated construction costs.

DUPLICATION OF EFFORT WOULD BE REDUCED

This bill needs no Federal bureau to execute it. To execute this law from the standpoint of the Federal Government would require only a small personnel staff in the Veterans' Administration, whose duties it would be (a) to negotiate Federal securities upon a national offering and upon terms more advantageous than would be available to the individual States; and (b) the adoption of simplified regulations which would permit allocation of such Federal funds for community housing developments in the States upon the hypothecation of reasonable security representing indebtedness of the purchasers of such property, and that the particular housing development was suitable for the purposes intended, and constructed under approved building methods and sold at prices fair and consistent with the prices of similar housing accommodations in the community where such housing development is undertaken.

Finally, this bill gives each State both the privilege and responsibility of assisting its own veterans in acquiring homes and home ownership; and it especially gives the various commissions or departments which all the States have created to deal with veterans' affairs and aid veterans, a real opportunity to be of service to the veterans. In most States a substantial sum is being spent in salaries to State officials whose chief duties are filling out forms for veterans for pensions and compensation, all of which is being done by private pension attorneys, the Red Cross, various veterans' organizations, and even the Veterans' Administration itself through its contact agents, and other employees. In some cases, the States have land which is not needed for other purposes and they could well be transferred to the State department of veterans' affairs for building sites. These State commissions and departments of veterans' affairs could give the veteran expert advice on building costs and practices; assist him in providing municipal and private utility services; clearing disputed titles; combining architects and other fees and costs in a manner to reduce the cost to the individual veteran; these departments could, if such is necessary in any community or particular case, form a cooperative or other corporation and obtain the charter therefor at little or no cost to the veterans. They could act for the veterans in processing and closing loan transactions, and remove other obstacles and perform other services to the veterans of their own State, all of which today make the task confronting the veterans who want to buy, build, and finance a home all but impossible when all of the details in connection therewith are undertaken by the veteran individually.

Watch on the Rhine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal.

TODAY'S GUEST EDITORIAL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the third in a series of editorials written by students of Portland high schools. The following editorial was selected as the best by a jury of Lincoln High School students. Other editorials written by high-school students will appear on this page on succeeding Mondays.)

WATCH ON THE RHINE

(By Joann Cohn, student, Lincoln High School)

"The foundation of every state in the education of its youth."—Diogenes.

Can there be any other factor as influential in the development of a country's governmental philosophy as education?

In this period of world history there is a continual underlying conflict of various ideologies, and a country forms its ideologies through the education of its people. In the case of Germany, emphasis has always been put on German education, German culture, and German totalitarianism. When Hitler came into power, he found the German school system perfect for his dream of world governing by Germans. The strict militaristic teachers complied with his instructions to subordinate all general learning to nazism. This Nazi ideology produced youth leaders who thought only subjectively, considering themselves superior in every field of knowledge. This way of thinking has become inherent in the German youth of today.

Obviously young people, thus taught, cannot be a force for peace and world cooperation. What are the Allies doing to change the philosophy of the German youth of today? What must they do?

1. Zones have been set up in the four divisions of Germany to study educational systems, provide textbooks, and appoint teachers of designated areas.

2. The United States Office of Education has sent staff members to the American zone to serve as consultants on educational problems; the three other occupational staffs are serving in the same way.

However, these attempts to reeducate a misled people will be useless if there is no unity in the four systems. For example, according to a recent report in a leading magazine, there are four completely different histories being taught in the zones, each planting the seeds of diverse philosophies of liberation movements, materialistic concepts, socialism, and pure democracy. Can there be any unity of learning, and consequently thinking and acting, among the people if such varied ideas of government and history are being taught?

In the systems' theories there is also disunity. As an illustration, the Russian system is based on an 8-year "rush" to graduation into the trades and industries while the United States theory is emphasis on learning and changing from old ideas.

The four zones have one factor in common, however, the difficulties under which the youth must be taught. These are:

1. Hunger and cold prevent complete concentration on the part of the pupils and teachers.

2. There are not enough "reeducated" teachers having a clear concept of what and why they are teaching.

3. Text books and study materials are very scarce; for example, in one university a senior rarely has more than one of the three required technical books, the price in the school black market being 150 marks, half of a white-collar worker's monthly salary.

In the face of these difficulties and many others, the Allies are attempting to bring about a rebirth of a people who could contribute a great deal to the advancement of civilization. Education is the means by which this rebirth will be achieved. The steps toward the achievement are simple but necessary:

1. A coordinated educational system, based on the same general concepts.

2. Firm administration during occupation.

3. Gradual liberalization by encouraging the forming of a government to act wisely and justly.

4. A continual education of the citizens of tomorrow; teaching for world cooperation and unity.

One can see that reeducating Germany will require patience, hard work, and above all, understanding and a common goal.

For world stability and peace in the future, the youth must be wisely educated in the ways of democracy and justice today.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, throughout each year, Western Massachusetts Branch, Polish American Congress, Inc., an organization maintained by true friends of Poland, actively carries on a militant campaign to secure justice for Poland.

I am sure that the great majority of Americans do not understand fully either the underlying or the direct causes of the loss of their freedom by the people of that country. It is one of the outstanding tragedies of all history. A great nation of 35,000,000 industrious people was wantonly attacked by Hitler and his Nazi cohorts. Its leaders were promised the active military support of England and France if they would resist. They did; and the heroic defense of Poland and of Warsaw, its capital, will never be forgotten. But the brave defenders have seen England and the United States, their allies in winning World War II, withdraw all effective support of their country and permit it to be enslaved by Russia.

The members of Western Massachusetts Branch, Polish American Congress, Inc., are endeavoring to place before the American people information dealing not only with the facts about Poland during and since the war, but with efforts both here and abroad to aid Poland and its citizens. Many of them cannot safely return to their native land as long as it remains behind the iron curtain of Russia. As an American citizen and as a Member of Congress, I believe our country is under obligations to live up to the principles of the Atlantic Charter. I regret that those who wrote it were among the first to treat it as a scrap of paper. Their failure to abide by the principles they wrote down is one of the causes of present day international unrest and has given Russia much of her present apparent strength.

I have sought to aid the Polish soldiers and sailors who fought on our side throughout the entire war. I have introduced bills which would permit them to enter the United States and to become American citizens. I know thousands of people of Polish background in my own congressional district. Whether foreign-born or native-born Americans, they are a credit to themselves and to our country. Their names in countless number—many with gold stars opposite them—are printed on the honor rolls of every city and town. Need one say more?

It was my good fortune to be privileged to deliver the first of the 1948 weekly radio speeches of Western Massachusetts Branch, Polish American Congress, Inc. My remarks on Poland were as follows:

Mr. Chairman and friends, I deem it a privilege to have the opportunity to speak on this program for Justice for Poland. With the passage of many months following the ending of hostilities in the recent war, many persons in the United States are inclined to accept as accomplished facts the occupation by Soviet Russia of Poland, the Baltic States and other countries. They are not giving consideration to the struggle for national freedom of the peoples submerged by the overwhelming power of Russia. Even though they are fully informed of the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter, by which the territorial integrity of these nations ought to be recognized and preserved, they consider discussion of the subject to be futile at the present time. I, therefore, believe it is most fortunate that groups of American citizens, such as your own, are willing to devote your efforts and your money to the high purpose of keeping before the American public the plight of Poland under present day Russian domination.

Following a military inspection trip to Europe in 1945, I spoke on this program. I had visited concentration camps for displaced persons and refugees in Germany. Some of them like Buchenwald and Nordhausen were horror camps where the Nazis brought death to thousands of innocent civilian victims of World War II. Many of these victims were citizens of Poland. Their country had been the first to offer resistance to Germany's military might. Their country was on the side that won—our side. With the ending of hostilities, it seemed certain that treaties of peace would be made by the allied nations concerning Germany, Austria, and Italy. So, in 1947 Italy is independent once again. Foreign soldiers have left her soil. Austria is recognized by the Big Four as a liberated country today. Germany, our arch enemy in the war, is being built up again with our money into an independent nation. What about Poland? Poland was one of the allied nations and perhaps it has suffered greater devastation and losses than any other single country on the side of the Allies.

In 1945 it already looked as if Russia intended to incorporate Poland as an integral part of the Soviet system. Unfortunately, the agreements which had been entered into by the leaders of Great Britain, France, Russia, and the United States not only failed to maintain the territorial integrity of Poland as a free nation but, in fact, were calculated to reduce Poland to the status of a Russian satellite state. Polish people throughout the world will never forget the secret treaties of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. They will never be able to understand the failure of the representatives of the United States to demand that the rights of Poland be determined in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The success of the Russian diplomats in securing these secret agreements is now well known to the world. The failure of our American representatives at those conferences has been an important factor in the successive failures of General Marshall in China and, more recently, at the conferences of the Big Four nations in London.

Although the United States furnished the planes and matériel with which the war was won and although our armies successfully overcame Italy, liberated France, and conquered the larger part of Germany and Austria and all of Japan, today we are hard pressed to maintain our present position in Europe and the Far East. The feeling is general that the main cause of our present difficult situation in our relations with Russia is the failure of our State Department and the responsible officials of our own Government to have a foreign policy and program during the war years. Therefore, we were never in a position to secure any particular objectives, for the administration had evolved no postwar program for a world which our armies would once again restore to peace. Two years after the hostilities have ended conditions have become fixed to a great degree. It seems likely that Russia will insist on keeping under its direct control or domination Poland and several other European nations. To the freedom-loving people in those countries, this decision is unbearable; acquiescence in it for any great period of time is unthinkable. It is most important that the fires of freedom shall be kept alive, both in the subjugated countries like Poland and in the United States and other countries where freedom of the individual still exists. Ultimately, the pressure from within and without Poland must give to its brave people freedom, independence, and a standard of living better than they have ever known.

Meanwhile, friends of the brave Polish patriots who fought with the American soldiers in Italy and elsewhere are seeking means for improving their present position as displaced persons or refugees in different foreign countries, particularly England. The number of these soldiers has been estimated as from 100,000 to 200,000 men. It is believed that somewhat less than half of them would like to come to the United States to begin life anew. Many cannot safely return to their beloved Poland since they have borne arms against Russia as well as against Germany in years gone by. In order to help them, I prepared and sponsored a bill now before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. By its terms, any individual who served in the Polish Army or the armed services of Great Britain or France during the period from September 3, 1939, to September 2, 1945, would be entitled to consideration as a nonquota immigrant into the United States, subject to the usual immigration requirements. The benefits of my measure would also extend to his wife and unmarried minor children. In October 1947 I flew over Italy near Mount Cassino, where more than 4,000 Polish soldiers are buried who were fighting shoulder to shoulder with American soldiers in the common Allied cause. If those Polish boys had not been there and sacrificed their lives, it might well have been that an equal number of American young men would be lying in their graves today.

Thousands of other Polish soldiers are buried on other battlefields of the last war. Those surviving fought valiantly, suffered many hardships, and, in many cases, were wounded. I believe that, at this period when the United States is permitting immigration from Europe, these Polish soldiers are entitled to preferential consideration. Their hatred of communism is best evidenced by their unwillingness and inability to return to Poland, their homeland, because of its subjugation by the Soviets. Many of them have close relatives who are already citizens of the United States. The record which the Polish people have made in recent years, during their steady migration to this country, is the best evidence that these Polish soldiers would make fine, industrious, and intelligent citizens of our country.

I am pleased to note that my original bill has been incorporated into other more general bills which have been referred to the same committee for action. In order to conform to the desires of other Congressmen, I have filed a later bill which would permit, under certain conditions, a person born in Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Germany, Austria, or Italy and who, during World War II, bore arms against the enemies of the United States, to apply for admission for permanent residence to the United States and to be admitted as a nonquota immigrant, if otherwise qualified under our immigration laws. Both of my bills are under consideration in the House committee along with other legislative proposals for handling immigrants during the present period of international stress. It is likely that, in the regular session of Congress in 1948, such legislation will be voted upon in the committee. It is my hope that such measure as may be reported favorably will contain provisions permitting the admission of the Polish veterans who, through their own brave efforts, have already proven their yearning for the freedoms enjoyed by citizens of the United States.

It would be some recompense to these brave Polish soldiers. Further, it would mean much to the people of Poland who have once again been subjugated by a foreign power. It would mean even more to the friends of Poland and its people as they wage their fight for justice for Poland.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., Colorado Springs, Colo., on October 24, 1947:

I appreciate your cordial and generous reception. Our committee has uniformly received warm support from the medical profession in all parts of the country, and your professional journals have been most encouraging in their analysis and interpretation of our investigation.

Since you are all familiar with the aims and general scope of the subcommittee's work in ferreting out Government propaganda paid for with the taxpayers' money, I shall explore with you tonight one special segment of that inquiry which has not yet been incorporated in a formal report to the House of Representatives. I refer to the closely knit interbureau propaganda organization which exists in Washington for the obvious purpose of agitating for socialized medicine, or state medicine, in other lands. The Bureau of Research and Statistics in our own Social Security Board in Washington is the world headquarters of socialized medicine. The world movement is all paid for by the American taxpayers—and none of it ever has been authorized or approved, as such, by the Congress in its appropriations measures.

As if it were not enough for our medical bureaucrats to be trying to force socialized medicine upon the 140,000,000 people of the United States, they are also forever busy with conferences, round tables, and special missions to advance socialized medicine in Japan, China, India, Burma, Indochina, or Ceylon. During the last 3 years they have sent special survey missions to South America, Hawaii, England, and New Zealand.

That the American people know nothing of these enterprises is a fact of fundamental significance to our committee. And a fact of almost equal significance is that our medical bureaucrats resent any inquiry from Congress as to what they are up to or how much they are spending in these overseas promotional campaigns.

A third fact of great significance, to my mind, is this: While many of these conferences relate primarily to matters of health service and hospital administration, the arrangements and programs are almost entirely in the hands of lay bureaucrats—social welfare workers, statisticians, actuaries, specialists in playgrounds, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, or collective bargaining. Rarely, if ever, does a qualified, recognized, and experienced member of the medical profession find a place on these overseas missions. Yet every mission has some aspect of socialized medicine as a part of its agenda.

I submit that these are matters of fundamental significance to the American people. All these overseas missions and enterprises are supported largely by United States funds. Many of the thinkers and planners who throw these conferences together all around the world are full-time employees of the United States Government. Their salaries range from $4,000 to $10,000 a year. They are supplied with office space, office equipment, secretaries, telephones, stationery—all paid for by the American taxpayers. They get free postage for all their propaganda material, which is distributed literally by the ton from Washington every year. Their reports and findings are printed free of charge by the Government Printing Office.

Yet all this work is carried on under a cover of secrecy and intrigue in the Social Security Board and the United States Public Health Service—to the point that every inquiry for information must be first registered, approved, and cleared by the top level bureaucrats. In the sense that the taxpayer pays all the bills, this is all the public's work. Yet every project is shrouded in almost military secrecy until it is ready in final form for the propaganda literature from the Government Printing Office. Plans and projects still in the formative stages are simply none of the public's business, as our medical bureaucrats view their work.

The next important international meeting to discuss extension of socialized medicine is scheduled to be held in New Delhi, India, October 27 through November 8. This conference is called the Preparatory Asian Regional Conference. The agenda includes proposals looking toward the development of broad social-security programs in the countries of Asia. Nominally, this conference is arranged and directed under the auspices of the International Labor Office, a remnant of the old League of Nations. The significant thing about the conference is that while the headquarters of the ILO are in Montreal, Canada, the announcement of the New Delhi meeting comes to us from Washington, D. C., where a branch of the ILO is maintained at 734 Jackson Place. Through that office, the work of the ILO is closely integrated with the studies and projects of the Social Security Board. A number of persons formerly on the staff of the ILO are now full-time Government workers in the Social Security Board; and a few former employees of the Social Security Board are now on the staff of the ILO. To put it another way, these two offices in Washington are but branches of the same enterprise. ILO is the international or world arm of the Social Security Board; and the Social Security Board, through the Bureau of Research and Statistics, is but the American operating unit of the ILO.

I should make it clear that there is no thought on the part of our investigating committee to inquire into the operations and programs of the International Labor Office. That is a matter far beyond the scope of our authority. Neither may we challenge the funds which are being spent by the United States Government in support of the ILO. That program of international cooperation has been duly approved by Congress.

But what does interest our committee is the extraordinary system of working arrangements which exists between the Social Security Board and the ILO in this matter of socialized medicine. Our investigation has convinced me that the Social Security Board is in fact the supply base, so to speak, from which flow most of the basic studies and research reports which power the ILO campaign for socialized medicine in other lands. And this conclusion is confirmed by the fact that members of the Social Security staff usually are the United States delegates to the ILO meetings overseas.

It will be a difficult and tedious matter to establish, through careful audits, just how much of the funds appropriated by Congress for the domestic work of the Social Security Board are actually diverted to the world programs of the ILO.

But I may say that such an audit is now in process, and that a detailed work analysis and project study within the Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Board will be available for the consideration of Congress before the next appropriation bills are considered for Social Security operations in the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1948.

You have all read in your newspapers recently the story of the special health mission to Tokyo. I shall discuss this mission briefly here, merely because it seems to me to illustrate the whole scheme of the Social Security Board's operations in the world-wide campaign for socialized medicine. A little more than a year ago a Federal civilian employee in Washington (one Stanchfield) was detached temporarily from his job to go to Tokyo to make a preliminary survey of social security and health needs. Upon his return to Washington early this year, Mr. Stanchfield proposed a general health mission to Tokyo. His proposal was presented directly to Mr. Arthur J. Altmeyer, Commissioner of Social Security.

Next, on March 5, 1947, Mr. Altmeyer proposed the mission in a formal communication to the War Department. In that letter Mr. Altmeyer designated the particular individuals who should make up the mission, and then went further to suggest that William H. Wandel, Chief of the Program Division, Bureau of Unemployment Security, be appointed chief of the social insurance division of the public health and welfare section of the supreme command for the allied powers in Tokyo. It is perfectly apparent from the letters we have taken from the War Department files that the personnel of this mission and the planning of its program originated in and was dictated from the Social Security Board in Washington.

Up to this point there had been no hint that the proposed health mission had been requested or urged either by General MacArthur or any responsible Japanese source. The suggestion came first from Mr. Stanchfield, who had been sent to Tokyo from Washington for that particular purpose.

Next we found a letter, under date of June 14, 1947, from Mr. Wandel in Tokyo reporting directly to Mr. Isadore Falk in Washington on the progress of the work in Tokyo. In one revealing passage of this letter, Mr. Wandel said:

"We think that our need is for someone who is primarily not so much an economic analyst as one versed in health insurance. Health insurance is the major field of social security in Japan. * * * Permanent revision requires amalgamating national health insurance with health insurance on a compulsory basis."

When the Tokyo Health Mission finally was named, it comprised two men from the Public Health Service, one from Mr. Falk's bureau, and one from the Federal Housing Authority. This mission departed for Japan on August 28 this year, with the understanding that Mr. Altmeyer and possibly Mr. Falk would follow when the work had been sufficiently organized in Tokyo.

Because this instance offers a shocking demonstration of bureaucratic intrigue in violation of the purposes and intent of Congress, I have brought the matter to the attention of the House Appropriations Committee, with the suggestion that when the next budget comes up from the Social Security Board and the Public Health Service, all those engaged in spreading socialized medicine around the world be stricken from the public pay roll, unless, of course, Congress shall determine to support such world propaganda with funds specifically allocated for that purpose.

In my letter to Chairman TABER of the Appropriations Committee, I made eight specific charges against the Tokyo Health Mission. I wish to summarize them here, because they are the nub of our case against the Social Security Board and the United States Public Health Service in relation to all this propaganda supporting socialized medicine.

My charges against the Tokyo Health Mission are as follows:

1. That the health mission to Japan is composed entirely and exclusively of men long identified in the public record as advocates and proponents of socialized medicine not only in the United States but throughout the world.

2. That the real purpose of this mission is to lay the groundwork for a system of socialized medicine in Japan.

3. That the scheme for such a mission originated in the Division of Research and Statistics in the Socia' Security Board in Washington, and nowhere else.

4. That the nominal request for the mission was engineered through the General Headquarters of the Supreme Commander in Tokyo by Federal employees sent from Washington for that particular purpose.

5. That Gen. Douglas MacArthur does not favor—and does not approve—any plan to establish compulsory socialized medicine in Japan.

6. That the dispatch of this mission to Tokyo for the purpose indicated in Mr. Wandel's letter to Mr. Falk under date of June 14, 1947, is a gross misuse of public funds.

7. That the real purpose of the mission is not to assist Japan in working out her basic problems in health and welfare, but to force upon that country a compulsory system of socialized medicine.

8. That although the questions here involved are of a health and medical nature, the Surgeon General of the United States Army was not consulted in reference to the problems involved.

I deem it inappropriate for Federal employees, at the expense of the American taxpayer, to travel throughout the world preparing or assisting in the preparation of legislation to be adopted by foreign countries when similar legislation, long pending, has not been approved by the Congress of the United States.

It is interesting also to note how closely the Social Security Board's program to assist the development of socialized medicine in Japan follows the general outline published on October 1 by the International Labor Office for the forthcoming Asia conference at New Delhi, India. Regarding the general objectives of the New Delhi conference, the preliminary handbook, or work guide, summarizes general objectives in this language:

"The report suggests the gradual development of a public medical care service in the Asian countries which would be freely available to those who need it, whether they live in urban or rural areas, and whether they are workers or dependents."

This, of course, is a bald proposal for the nationalization of all medical services, to be paid for out of the general revenues rather than by special pay-roll taxes.

So the socialized-medicine plan for Asia, as now put forward through the ILO goes even further than the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill for the United States. The plan for Asia follows precisely the master plan for socialized medicine as developed in Communist Russia, where all medical services are the direct function of the government, with all costs paid directly from the general funds of the Treasury.

It will be interesting to watch the final report and recommendation of the Tokyo Health Mission to see whether it follows the direct government-payment plan put forward by the ILO in the New Delhi agenda, or the special pay-roll-tax plan incorporated by Altmeyer, Falk, and Cohn in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. In other words, the Health Mission to Tokyo must make a choice on the Japanese plan. Will that choice fall to the Russian side, with direct medical payments from the general treasury, or toward the Social Security Board's version of socialized medicine under compulsory health insurance?

Another fact of fundamental significance, as I see it, is that the government propaganda which urges socialized medicine for the United States presents a shamefully distorted picture of what voluntary insurance, medical-service plans, and hospital prepayment plans have accomplished during the last 10 or 15 years. To read the government literature on our health needs, one would gain the impression that there had been no change in the insurance picture in this country during the last quarter century.

This flagrant distortion of the picture is a crime against the Nation. To have the government agencies urging their programs on the basis of conditions which have not actually prevailed in this country since the 1920's is not only an alarming abuse of governmental powers, but a serious and challenging negation of the entire philosophy of American public service.

The Federal advocates of compulsory health insurance insist that the problem of prepayment medical care plans cannot be administered effectively by the traditional enterprise system of insurance. They ignore the fact, as reported by the Health and Accident Underwriters Conference, that more than 42,000,000 persons already are covered by various forms of health and accident insurance. During the decade, 1934-44, the number of such policies in the United States increased fivefold, from roundly 8,000,000 to 40,000,000. In 1920, there were only 4,000,000 policies of this type.

There are more than 400 companies offering such policies today, and the total premiums in this field of insurance now average about $50,000,000 a month, or $600,000,000 a year.

In addition, another group of 5,000,000 persons are enrolled in various types of prepayment medical care and hospital-service plans.

Combining these two groups of insurance arrangements, we find that approximately 5,000,000 people already are protected by various forms of health and accident insurance, as compared with only 4,000,000 thus protected by their own individual arrangements in 1920.

What then is the basis of the contention by the advocates of socialized medicine that the insurance problem in the health field cannot be handled by the existing insurance system? The fact is that, on the basis of individual coverage, considerably more than one-third of the American population already has solved the problem of emergency medical and hospital expenses through the medium of insurance, individually arranged and paid for directly from month to month as an established item in the family budget.

In various forms, as determined by the State insurance laws, this type of protection is now available in all of the 48 States. As actuarial experience develops, these plans are being improved from year to year. Intense competition between more than 400 different insurance companies tends constantly to offer the insured more comprehensive protection and to eliminate abuses which impair the function of insurance principles in the field of health.

Concealing or ignoring such fundamental developments in the insurance field during the last quarter century, our medical bureaucrats present an utterly distorted and unreal definition of the problem they presume to alleviate.

This systematic distortion is a somewhat universal characteristic of collectivist propaganda methods. Every argument for statism must begin with the assumption that no other solution is available, for only a spirit of hopeless defeatism ever can impel men to give up the rights and privileges of freedom in favor of Government regimentation.

Another fact of basic significance revealed in our committee explorations is that socialized medicine, historically, has always been linked pretty closely with dictator forms in Government.

The brand of dictatorship makes no difference—communism, fascism, nazism, socialism—all are alike, in that they enforce a system of state medicine.

Whatever the name of the dictatorship, or whatever the pattern of the particular brand of collectivism in a given country, the system of socialized medicine is always pretty much the same. It is based on compulsion, and is generally administered by a Nation-wide system of political manipulation. The physicians and surgeons themselves usually are forced to a subordinate position in the determination of policies and programs. Now, if the medical profession and all our hospitals can be taken over by the Federal Government and forged into a new and gigantic health bureaucracy, then it would only be a question of time until Washington likewise moved into the field of education, religion, the press, the radio.

Freedom soon would be in total eclipse.

That must not come to pass in mighty America, the last great citadel of freedom and liberty on the face of the globe today.

Ours is a great responsibility to hold aloft the bright torch of freedom and honest representative government. And it has been most encouraging to know that we have the great body of the American medical profession standing behind us in this effort in Congress.

Evidence of this support comes to us from the State medical journals in all sections

of the country. The North Carolina Medical Journal, for example, in its August issue this year, described our committee report on the Health Work Shops as one of the most important publications ever issued by the Government Printing Office.

Many other State journals have been similarly laudatory in their appraisal of our reports, and several have printed the complete text of our findings. Other State-wide medical groups have asked us for extra copies of the reports, to be mailed to every doctor, dentist, registered nurse, and lawyer in the State. Such a response convinces me that even the vast diversion of Government funds to illegal propaganda will not prove sufficient to force a system of socialized medicine upon the American people.

But the question yet remains why we should permit the expenditure of something between $50,000,000 and $75,000,000 a year in Government propaganda?

Even if this Government literature told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, I still think we could get along with a lot less of this Government prefabricated thinking.

I insist that the American people are well able to come to their own conclusions on these matters of public policy. They do not need millions of dollars in Government guidance every year.

Our figures from the Budget Bureau show that Government expenditures for publicity and propaganda increased from $28,000,000 in 1941 to $74,829,467 in 1946.

Now everybody in Washington recognizes that certain information services are an essential part of any institutional operation. But Congress insists that there is a clear line of distinction between legitimate information services and those additional operations which tend to build up public opinion in favor of more projects, broader programs, or Federal invasion of new spheres of public service. It is primarily the latter operations which our subcommittee seeks to itemize as to cost and scope. It is my contention that, at least, the people are entitled to know how much they are spending to educate themselves to more spending.

In the Department of Agriculture, committee investigators found 525 persons engaged in public relations work. Salaries ranged from $10,000 down to $1,888 a year.

Total budget estimates for Agriculture's Office of Information for the current fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1947, were $2,307,000, an increase of $335,350 over the previous year.

In addition there was another authorization of $2,260,784 for Department of Agriculture printing.

Here, then, for one Department, we have a total of $4,500,000 for publicity and propaganda.

And all of this material is distributed postage free. If Agriculture and all the other Federal departments had to pay regular postage rates on their voluminous mailings, the total publicity and propaganda cost likely would be increased by at least another $10,000,000 a year.

Our figures indicate that the Federal Security Agency currently is spending about $2,000,000 a year in its public-relations activities—whether you prefer to call it publicity or propaganda. And we know that a great percentage of these funds are going to generate supporting public opinion for bigger and better programs in health, pensions, and welfare.

Yet we have the testimony of an observer at one of the health workshops that, when left to their own devices—without the aid and promptings of the Federal monitor—the laymen at the Jamestown Health Workshop could not think of any immediate, pressing and urgent health needs in their own State.

That incident is not without significance, as it relates to our investigations. Why should Federal taxes be spent by the millions merely to support teams of bureaucrats running around the country telling the people what terrible health they are enjoying?

It seems to our committee to be a proper function of the Congress to determine whether the diversion of public funds from legitimate purposes to purely propaganda purposes for socialized medicine, does not, in fact, constitute a criminal violation of the law.

And on this point, I may say that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is giving that question some serious study at the moment. As you know, we advised the Attorney General, Mr. Clark, last June what we discovered about the Health Work Shops, and we have since been informed that some of the vouchers are in the hands of the FBI for investigation.

All this federally financed activity for socialized medicine heads up in the Bureau of Research and Statistics in the Social Security Board.

Our committee investigators have found in that Bureau a veritable nerve center of socialized-medicine propaganda for the entire world.

Mr. Isadore S. Falk is the Director of Research and Statistics in the Social Security Board. He has been in the Government service for some 12 years. He has always been noted for his militant and aggressive advocacy of socialized medicine.

Our committee, of course, does not challenge the right of any citizen to hold whatever views he may wish on any subject of political or economic policy.

But we are interested that funds appropriated by Congress for public administration shall not be diverted to a world-wide system of propaganda calculated to advance socialized medicine the world around.

Such operations, until specifically approved by the Congress, are positively illegal. And our committee will not rest until they are uprooted and stamped out of the Federal picture.

Americans must never fall into the attitude that all sound opinions are made in Washington and handed down full-fashioned to the people.

That is the way of dictatorship.

Public opinion must be maintained in its free and virile state—in full harmony with the great American tradition of liberty.

If we do that by stamping out Government propaganda at its roots, then we shall have rendered a great service, not only to medicine, but to the whole cause of liberty and freedom the world around.

We all know that freedom is not free.

We all know that bureaucratic powers feeds upon itself—and upon the rights and privileges and liberties of the people

If we are to support and defend liberty and constitutional government in America, we must begin by keeping clean and undefiled the wellsprings of public information from Washington.

Government propaganda poisons these wells of public information.

Government propaganda is a method of dictators.

Our purpose will be to uproot and destroy government propaganda wherever we may find it.

Iowa Generosity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, when the Friendship Train rolled across the continent several weeks ago, Iowa added more cars of food than any other State in the Union. Quite recently, the Iowa Farm Bureau inaugurated a campaign whereby each of the 99 counties of Iowa were asked to contribute at least a car of corn, or its equivalent in money, for direct European relief. To date, Sioux County, in the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa, which also happens to be my own county, is top donor with cash of about $12,500. An editorial which appeared in the Des Moines Register of January 22, 1948, tells the full story, and I include it herewith as a part of my remarks:

A FINE RECORD ON EUROPEAN RELIEF

Iowa Farm Bureau members have completed a remarkable, whirlwind campaign for European relief funds which does credit both to the big hearts of Iowa farm people and to the organizing and promotional ability of Farm Bureau leaders.

The State Farm Bureau office reported Wednesday that it had received $224,211 in cash from county Farm Bureaus. And although the official campaign ended last Friday, the money is still rolling in. Fifteen counties have not yet been heard from, and one county organization sent its donation direct to relief agencies instead of through the State office, so the real figure undoubtedly should be much greater than $224,000.

In addition to cash donations, one county sent a carload of pancake flour, another sent a car of skim milk—and all counties have sent a mountain of clothing. When the campaign began the goal was a carload of corn, or equivalent value, from every county. Farm Bureau members were told to take an old coat or pair of pants to town with them in addition. The clothing donations have far exceeded expectations. "Instead of giving only an old coat," one State Farm Bureau official said, "they must have cleaned out their clothes closets."

To date Sioux County is top donor, with cash of about $12,500; Webster is next with about $11,000; and Hamilton third with $10,000.

In this campaign the Farm Bureau has accomplished more than the collection of a lot of money, food, and clothing for relief of war victims in Europe. It also has made the recovery and relief of Europe a personal thing to thousands of Iowa farm people. This accomplishment may, in the long run, turn out to be the greater of the two.

What Is National Income?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial taken from the Saturday Evening Post of January 24, 1948. We speak so glibly about our national income and so few people really know what constitutes the same. The following editorial, therefore, is most enlightening and instructive:

THE EUROPEANS CAN'T EAT OUR NATIONAL INCOME

There are so many sound arguments for American participation in restoring the depleted capital equipment of Europe that it was disappointing to find Mr. Truman guilty of belittling the case by attempting to show, that in comparison with our national income, the cost of the Marshall plan will be trivial. The President figured that the plan will cost less than 3 percent of our national income during the life of the program.

To compare the worth of tangible assets, from food to locomotives and power plants, which will have to be sent to Europe, with the national income makes no more sense than to compare Johnny's marbles with the Treasury balance at the close of business on January 17. The amount by which we aid Europe or Asia represents actual commodities available or to be made available in this country, and the proper comparison is between the commodities we send abroad and the total inventory of commodities at home. To compare goods for export with that figment of the statistician's imagination known as "national income" is misleading because it misrepresents downward the actual sacrifice that must be made.

What is national income? As estimated by the Department of Commerce, national income includes scores of items which appear in a dozen classifications, but actually represent more or less the same transaction. Thus a man who earns $5,000 a year adds $5,000 to national income under wages and salaries. If he pays $700 a year in rent, that goes down as part of the national income under rental income. Incidentally, if the citizen owns his own home and it is worth $15,000, he is put down as having paid something like $1,500 in rent and this amount is also totted up as national income. The cost of the service of his bank to him as a depositor is included in his income, although the bank may not have charged him anything. Proceeds of insurance policies are part of national income, as is the time that farmers spend working for themselves and the value of the home-grown food they eat. Food and shelter provided free to soldiers and sailors go into the national-income pot, as do the amounts received by the suppliers of these things, the amounts the suppliers pay out to their help, the profit they retain for themselves, what they pay in rent, what their landlords receive and what the grocers patronized by all these people receive and pay out, and so on ad infinitum.

In short, national income is more than anything else an index of the velocity of money and to some extent of the amount of inflation present in the economy. It is a rubber yardstick unfit for measuring the ability of a country to export wheat and canned orange juice and spare parts for tractors. If a rich insurance policyholder dies and his wife collects a $1,000,000 benefit, the national income goes up by $1,000,000, but the amount of Wisconsin cheese in the country is just the same as it was when the policyholder was alive. Anyway, our advice to the Marshall plan strategy board is to lay off figures that merely sound good. What America does on behalf of world recovery should be done with our eyes open to the real cost, not because the man said that $17,000,000,000 is only 3 percent of the number of angels that can dance on a decimal point.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter I have received from the Committee for the Marshall Plan, signed by former Secretary of War, Hon. Robert P. Patterson, and a copy of a letter I have sent to him. It is my frank opinion that unless public opinion is rapidly and actively aroused that legislation that will effectively enable the Marshall plan to be carried out will not pass the Congress. To pass a halfway measure would be meaningless. It is up to those persons and groups who realize the danger that confronts our country, and who also want a decent world in which to live in, to arouse public opinion in support of effective legislation that will enable our country to perform its mission in this critical stage of the world's history. It is only by effective affirmative action on the part of the United States that this can be done.

COMMITTEE FOR THE MARSHALL PLAN TO AID EUROPEAN RECOVERY,
New York, N. Y., January 19, 1948.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK: The Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery was formed on November 17, 1947, to provide a focus for wide public support of the European recovery program. The committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European policies outlined in Henry L. Stimson's article in the October 1947 issue of Foreign Affairs, and I am enclosing a copy of this article for your consideration. Mr. Stimson, himself, is the national chairman of the committee, and the members include over 300 leaders drawn from business, labor, farm, religious and civic organizations througho it the country.

In December, the committee published a four-point program of those principles which the committee believes are essential for an effective recovery program. The four essentials are that United States aid must be prompt to be effective, that it must be adequate to achieve real recovery, and not merely to provide stopgap relief, that it must not be subject to conditions which involve interference in the domestic affairs of the recipients, but instead that any conditions must be limited to ones we could honorably accept ourselves, and, finally, that enough of our aid should be in the form of grants so that Europe will not be saddled with a hopeless load of debt.

We believe that the decisions facing the Congress in this session are of momentous importance and will require understanding by the American people of the reasons that lie behind the European recovery program and of our own vital national interests in the successful accomplishment of its objectives.

If we embark on the plan proposed by Secretary Marshall, we must decide now to undertake a 4-year recovery program although we should appropriate specific funds annually. If we merely continue piecemeal aid we will risk the chance of securing stability and peace in the world which we so intensely seek.

The committee believes that Americans will respond to the challenge, and it earnestly asks you and all other Members of the Congress to give support to an adequate and timely program. The committee has prepared background material which it is furnishing as widely as possible in the hope that it will serve to help create an informed public opinion. We will be glad to make any of our material available in quantity if you should care to have it for your own use.

The time is short; the need is urgent. But as Mr. Stimson has said, "If the issues are clearly presented, the American people will give the right answer."

Very sincerely yours,
ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Chairman, Executive Committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1948.

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
New York City.

DEAR SECRETARY PATTERSON: I am in receipt of your letter, with enclosures, of January 19, in support of the Marshall plan. I strongly believe that our country should use its powers effectively in our national interest, as a means toward peace, and to stop the progress of international communism and the vicious results that follow wherever the Communists take over a government and a people. I am a strong supporter of the Marshall plan to this end. I want to frankly state, however, that unless public opinion is more thoroughly aroused than it is to the dangers to our country if nothing (or halfway measures) is done, that I am fearful of the results. This observation is based on 20 years of legislative experience in the Congress. The situation in the Congress at present to enact legislation that will effectively have the Marshall plan carried out does not look good to me. It is better to face this situation when time exists to arouse public opinion than to wait until it is too late.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours.

The Price of Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette:

THE PRICE OF DEFEAT

Thurman Sensing, a publicist employed by the Southern States Industrial Council of Nashville, is singing a song of isolation these days, and he presented a few stanzas of it to the Greater Little Rock Chamber of Commerce at its last meeting.

Europe, said Mr. Sensing, should be able to manage its own recovery without aid from the United States. And by way of illustrating his point he chose a theme nicely calculated to arouse the instant sympathy of any southern audience. The South, he pointed out, also suffered military defeat but managed to rebuild her economy without outside assistance.

And this, of course, is true enough as far as it goes. Every southerner takes honest pride in the saga of the Confederates who came home to face the natural consequences of a lost war compounded by the evils of reconstruction government. But it detracts nothing from the glory of their effort to point out that, in spite of all they could do, the South paid an inordinate price for her defeat, and is still paying for it. It is no accident that a region so blessed with natural advantages lags so far behind the national average in industrialization, per capital income, education, and health. And our imperfect political system is a direct heritage from reconstruction.

Moreover, the South through the years of her travail still had the protection of United States sovereignty. If she received little direct aid from outside her borders she did enjoy the indirect benefits of a stable national economy. And, even more important, she enjoyed complete and absolute protection against foreign encroachment. She could, and did, remain weak and impoverished for half a century without inviting invasion or revolution.

The relationship of the Federal Government and the conquered Confederate States would have been quite different, we feel sure, if a powerful and ruthless Mexican Government had been openly plotting domination of the Western Hemisphere back in 1865. In the shrunken world of 1947 the Russian threat to western Europe is exactly comparable. Self-interest, if nothing else, demands something more of us than permission for our ex-enemies and ex-allies to keep their horses and mules for the spring plowing.

Address by Alexander DeMaioribus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 6, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me, I should like to insert in the RECORD an address recently given by Mr. Alexander L. DeMaioribus. A few weeks ago Mr. DeMaioribus retired from the city council of Cleveland, Ohio, after having served in that body as a city councilman for more than 20 years, and as president of the city council for many of those years. Mr. DeMaioribus, in announcing his retirement, issued a statement which embodies so clearly the basic principles of our Republic that I hope it will obtain wide circulation throughout our country. The adherence to these views enabled this man, himself of foreign extraction, to win high public office in his home community as well as the post of chairman of the Republican executive committee of Cuyahoga County, the most populous area in the State of Ohio. I believe this statement reflects glory not only upon its author, but upon the system of government under which we live.

Mr. President, Mr. Mayor, and gentlemen of the council, after more than 20 years of public service, I am leaving the city council with a firm conviction that our form of government offers the greatest opportunity for the progress of mankind that has ever been devised. It offers a challenge to the world to follow our pattern and achieve an era of peace.

These are not mere political platitudes. I have been privileged for the past two decades to witness the living processes of our Republic. Men and women from every walk of life, representing every religious, racial, and philosophical background, have discussed their viewpoints with those whom they have elected to office, freely and fearlessly. They have not hesitated to seek their rights, because they know that under our system those rights are respected.

Nothing better than this has ever been offered to any nation. Our Government and our American citizenship are the world's most prized possessions today. Many of our sons whose names are derived from ancient civilizations or from European origins have died heroically and nobly as Americans that we may live and speak and act as free men. There was no prejudice in the opportunity to die for our country. There must be no prejudice in the opportunity to live for it.

As I leave public office, I am more than ever impressed with the greatness of the vision upon which our country was founded. We live in an age when the poison of hate and intolerance planted in the Old World are a source of danger and infection here. We must translate all the brave words and noble ideals of our history into daily practice. Never should any American harbor the prejudices based on group distinctions. We as Americans must judge ourselves as individuals, because the essence of the American tradition is the worth and the sanctity of the individual. And we must recognize that this belief in the right of every individual to advance, to succeed, and to be valued on his own merits must be emphasized at home, no less than in our schools and our public services.

In these United States of America, where we are endowed with the fundamental rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," there can be no hyphenated Americans. We are a new and a proud people, the product of a melting pot, which must drain off impurities and leave the strong, solid metal.

I am proud to have been a small part of this great Nation. I thank the people of this great community who have given me the opportunity to speak for them in our city council as a member and as a former president of the council.

I am determined to devote my efforts as a private citizen to the development of an ever more vigorous civic spirit in our community. This is one of the most intelligent and dynamic cities in America. We must keep it that way. We can do this if we resolve to be true to our faith in democracy and true to our children, the sons and daughters of the native born and of the foreign born alike.

In these times when the world is groping for leadership and the courage to rebuild its broken spirit, we in America can furnish the inspiration by showing how a free people can live in peace and good will toward all mankind.

The time is now, and we are the people upon whom God's providence has placed the responsibility for the future of civilization. I pray that we shall not fail.

International Implications of the Rubber Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. W. T. Phillips, of the State Department, recently participated in a panel discussion of our rubber problem. His address was entitled "International Implications of the Rubber Problem," and I submit it for the RECORD under leave given me to extend my remarks. It follows:

INTERNATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RUBBER PROBLEM

Admiral Braine has described to you the importance of rubber to national security. There is general agreement that the United States must take all practicable measures to prevent a recurrence of the rubber shortage which confronted us after Pearl Harbor. We must create an adequate stock pile of natural rubber in accordance with Public Law 520 and we must maintain an adequate synthetic-rubber industry in accordance with Public Law 24. We can count on these two measures to give Admiral Braine the wherewithal to fight another war, if another war must be fought; and, I am sure, we can count on the admiral and his associates to put that rubber to good use.

Fighting a war, or preparing to fight one, is but one aspect of national security. The other aspect is to remove the causes of war, so that the war need not be fought. This second aspect is the principal concern of the Department of State.

As one method of preventing war and minimizing international unrest, the United States must do all that it can to prevent economic depression anywhere in the world, including those areas that produce natural rubber. The mandatory usage of synthetic rubber should be held to the absolute minimum required for national security in order not to deprive natural-rubber producers of the right to compete on equal terms for the United States rubber market.

In writing Public Law 520, the Stockpile Act, the Congress was careful to insert a provision that "materials acquired under (the) act shall be released—only—when, in (the) judgment (of the President) such release is required for purposes of the common defense." This wise provision prevents the security stock pile from being used to influence the commodity markets. A similar policy should be followed in regard to the synthetic-rubber industry while the industry remains in Government hands.

The principal countries producing natural rubber understand that it is to their interest as well as ours that the United States retain a synthetic-rubber industry. They realize that the United Nations could not have won the war without synthetic. They may differ with us on how large our synthetic-rubber industry must be, but they do not deny the need for its existence. Their principal fear is that it will be misused as an economic weapon to depress the price of natural rubber. To a certain extent this effect is unavoidable, since the mere existence of an industry able to produce a million tons of synthetic rubber per year prevents unreasonable increases in the price of the competitive natural product. However, the Government must be careful to operate the synthetic plants only for purposes of national defense or for the purpose of supplementing inadequate availabilities of natural rubber and not for the purpose of influencing natural-rubber prices.

The importance of natural rubber to countries participating in the European recovery program constitutes another reason why the Department of State favors limiting mandatory usage of synthetic to the absolute minimum essential to national security. The United Kingdom, for example, is, as you know, making a determined effort to increase British exports of all commodities. Natural rubber is the largest single dollar earner to the British Commonwealth. It is estimated that 550,000 tons of rubber, valued at $330,000,000, were exported to the United States from British territories in 1947.

During the prewar period (1938–40), rubber constituted, on the basis of tonnage, 38 percent of all exports from Malaya, 37 percent of all exports from the Netherlands Indies, and 6 percent of all exports from Ceylon and Indochina. In the words of the Batt report, "The prosperity of all Southeast Asia was based to a very large extent upon rubber."

The war not only created a synthetic rubber industry in the United States, it also expanded the production of natural rubber in Latin America, Ceylon, and Liberia, whose producers went all-out for the war effort, seriously over-tapping cultivated plantations and penetrating disease-ridden jungles in search of wild rubber. The war brought temporary prosperity to the rubber producers of these areas, but it also brought serious problems of postwar retrenchment and readjustment.

The war also brought a marked expansion in the rubber products manufacturing industries of countries on every continent. New or expanded facilities were constructed in Mexico, Cuba, Venezuela, Colombia, and Peru; in Portugal, Italy, and the Netherlands; in Australia and the Union of South Africa. Three tire plants were built in New Zealand, and production in India was doubled. As soon as the backlog of consumer demand which was built up during the war has been filled, these new or expanded industries will present problems not only to the countries in which they are located but also to the exporting countries, such as the United States, which formerly supplied these markets. They are an invitation to and an excuse for protectionism.

Countries attempting to protect their domestic industries from foreign competition or commodity surpluses have relied traditionally on certain devices. They have restricted or prohibited imports; they have arranged bilateral contracts between governments; they have raised tariffs, and they have formed cartels to restrict production. All these devices, except the last, are currently being employed by various countries producing or consuming natural rubber. Import restrictions or prohibitions are in effect in Argentina, Brazil, Ceylon, Cuba, and India. Argentina has concluded trade agreements with other American Republics, including Bolivia and Brazil, providing for the purchase of crude rubber by Argentina. Bolivia and Spain are at present negotiating a clearing agreement in accordance with which Spain would agree to purchase, along with other commodities, about 3,000 tons of natural rubber in exchange for Bolivian purchases of Spanish products of the same value. Tariffs have been raised in Mexico and Cuba.

All these devices may be effective in solving for the short run the narrowly limited conditions which they were adopted to correct. Their broader effects, however, are unfortunate. They force consumers to buy relatively high-priced products, thus lowering the standard of living. They decrease the total of world trade and interfere with normal trade channels to the detriment of other countries.

The United States favors what we believe to be a more constructive approach. Instead of having individual countries raise tariffs, thus restricting world trade and raising prices to consumers, we prefer to see tariffs lowered by reciprocal trade agreements, as was done by the 22 countries meeting at Geneva last year. Instead of having trade conducted by means of contracts between governments, we prefer to see trade in the hands of private individuals. The rapid return of the rubber trade to private hands in the chief producing areas, as well as in the United States, was a heartening sign.

We prefer measures expanding consumption to measures restricting production. This opinion is shared by the other countries participating in the international rubber study group, including the major producers of natural rubber. In this connection I quote from the press release describing the accomplishments of the fourth meeting of the group, held at Paris last July. Admiral Braine was on the United States delegation to that meeting. The group considered what action could be taken to expand world consumption of rubber. * * * They hoped that no avoidable obstacles would be placed in the way of international trade in, and the use of, rubber and that maximum assistance should be given to the countries desiring to make an extensive use of rubber but which, on account of the war, cannot afford to pay in foreign currency for the rubber imports they require.

"The group is convinced that the problems of rubber can be permanently solved only by a sustained and continuous expansion in its use."

One method of increasing consumption is to lower prices. One method of bringing about lower prices is to lower unit costs. That is an old story not only to you technicians but also to your competitors, the men who grow natural rubber. At their urging the Malayan Government has removed all restrictions on new planting and replanting, leaving the producers free to expand their plantings of high-yielding trees.

The United States is doing its part to encourage the economic production of natural rubber in tropical America. If successful—and the Department of Agriculture is confident that the program will succeed—this endeavor will help the economies of the producing countries and also will contribute to hemispheric defense by providing a supply of high grade rubber for admixture with the synthetic rubber of the United States.

The Department of Agriculture is furnishing technicians and advice to the 12 American Republics participating in this cooperative undertaking. There is at least one experiment station in each country, with three central experiment stations, one each in Costa Rica, Haiti, and Guatemala. The annual cost of operating the three central stations is approximately $300,000 and is borne by the United States alone.

The greatest achievement to date has been the successful combating of the South American leaf blight. American technicians have learned how to control the disease on infected trees and how to select new strains which are resistant to the disease. Until the disease had been controlled, the successful cultivation of rubber in tropical America was impossible, and the substitution of cultivated rubber for wild rubber is a prerequisite to the economic production of rubber in the Western Hemisphere.

All practicable measures for expanding consumption, improving the quality of natural rubber, and lowering costs of production, however, may well prove too slow to forestall an impending world surplus of rubber. The Inter-Agency Policy Committee on Rubber predicted a postwar world capacity for producing, every year, 3,000,000 long tons of natural and synthetic rubber. World consumption was estimated at half this figure. The postwar rubber boom has lasted longer than was foreseen; however, it still seems probable that a surplus will develop once the Netherlands Indies have resumed full production and consumption has returned to normal.

Faced with a surplus during the twenties, the countries producing natural rubber resorted to two restriction plans. I have no need to describe to a group from the rubber industry the effects, both good and bad, of those plans. From the point of view of the United States, the effects were unfortunate.

The postwar alternative to another producers' cartel is found in the Draft Charter for the International Trade Organization of the United Nations. The Geneva draft at present is being refined and perfected at Habana, and it is because of his deep interest in promoting the views of the United States and protecting its interests at Habana that Mr. Kennedy was compelled to ask me to take his place here tonight.

The intergovernmental commodity agreements provided for in the ITO charter have marked advantages over the prewar restriction schemes. Such agreements must provide consuming and producing countries with equal voting power. They must be designed to moderate pronounced fluctuations in the price of a commodity on a basis of prices fair to consumers and remunerative to efficient (and note the qualification "efficient") producers. They must provide for the expansion of production—where this can be accomplished with advantage to consumers and producers. They must be designed to assure the availability of supplies adequate at all times for world demand at reasonable prices, and provide for measures designed to expand world consumption. Full publicity must be given to any intergovernmental commodity agreement proposed or concluded, to the statements of considerations and objectives advanced by the proposing countries, to the nature and development of measures adapted to correct the underlying situation which gave rise to the agreement, and, periodically, to the operation of the agreement. This is a far cry from the Stevenson plan or the international rubber-regulation agreement and assures full protection for the interests of the United States.

Oil—Here's Where It Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with the American people suffering a shortage of oil, it is interesting to know just how they are in that position. The Times-Herald, in a recent editorial, shows what is happening to our supply. I include it as part of my remarks:

WHERE'S OUR OIL GOING?

Secretary of Defense James Forrestal day before yesterday, pursuing the Truman administration's policy of trying to scare the boots off the American people to gain administration ends, painted a horrific picture of our oil situation at a session of a House Armed Services subcommittee.

We're already short of petroleum for one reason or another, said Mr. Forrestal—which was scarcely news to the Atlantic seaboard and Midwest home owners hard pressed for fuel oil to heat their houses.

But, according to the Defense Secretary, that is only the half of it. The rest of it, is the man says, that in another major war our own oil production would most likely run short of our needs by 2,000,000 barrels a day; that the uproar in Palestine may result in Arab cutting of various Near East pipe lines; and that we'd better get busy now on building up a synthetic oil industry in this country at an eventual cost of $8,000,000,000.

It so happened that last Saturday evening our Ambassador to France, Jefferson Caffery, told the American Chamber of Commerce in Paris that between December 16 and January 10—the first 24 days of the stopgap aid program—France had received $58,000,000 worth of essential materials from the United States. Among these, Mr. Caffrey added, was 200,000 tons of petroleum; he didn't say in what form, whether crude, gasoline, light or heavy fuel oil, or shipments of all those commodities.

According to reliable sources of information here, the Caffery statement must have been oversimplified—meaning it seems impossible that 200,000 tons of petroleum could have gone to France from the United States in those 24 days. That comes to 1,500,000 barrels of crude, and 14 tankers would have been required to carry it.

November United States petroleum shipments to France totaled 294,000 barrels; October, 251,000; September, 141,000—with December figures as yet unavailable here. It doesn't seem likely that United States shipments would have ballooned to 1,500,000 barrels between December 16 and January 10.

It is entirely probable, though, that Caffery's over-all figure was correct, and that France did receive in the period under discussion 200,000 tons from various sources—the United States, South America, the Near East, etc.

One more statistic, if you don't mind: Under ideal refining conditions, you can get a 17 percent yield of No. 2 fuel oil out of a

mess of crude petroleum. That means the 200,000 tons that went to France would have yielded 34,000 tons of this favorite heating oil. Whatever petroleum is sent out of the United States carries with it a potential 17 percent of fuel oil which Americans don't get.

United States oil companies control, process, and distribute about 80 percent of all the world's petroleum outside Russia.

On the face of these facts and figures, it looks to us as if the Truman outfit is being far too zealous about funneling oil to other countries and far too lackadaisical about the defense, manufacturing and home oil needs of the American people. Maybe we're wrong, but we think a clear and detailed accounting is due the people as to just what the administration is doing with petroleum and its products.

What was it Senator TAFT was saying a while ago, about how, if Americans are to pull most of the world out of the postwar slump, they should insist on rationing of scarce commodities in all the countries aided before such commodities are rationed here?

Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's request for a 4-year $17,000,000,000 European recovery program is not reasonable. No Congress can bind its successors to future expenditures.

Authorities in Europe say that $20,000,000,000 will not stop communism but may delay it. Many people in Europe believe we are making a mistake because we are creating idleness by these loans and gifts. Foreigners have already developed a tendency to relax their effort to support themselves.

Before we adopt even a 1-year program the American people should have a satisfactory answer to the following questions:

First. Do not you believe that, foreigners holding $3,500,000,000 worth of American securities should be required to dispose of them before we make them any more loans?

Second. Should not foreign countries be required to locate and use several billion dollars worth of hoarded gold and money before we go bankrupt in helping them?

Third. Will the American taxpayers be required to give any more money to Italy in order for Italy to pay Russia $360,000,000 in reparations?

Fourth. Should the American taxpayers be required to furnish money to protect the $15,000,000,000 investment of the American international bankers in foreign countries?

Fifth. Do you think we should finance the royal households of Europe, when Great Britain's royal household, alone costs $2,129,080 per year?

Sixth. Do you not believe any foreign-aid program should be limited to surplus food and materials?

Seventh. Why should not Americans help supervise a foreign-aid program when we furnish the goods and money?

Eighth. Are we to furnish Great Britain with steel and machinery in order for her to trade Russia machinery for grain?

Ninth. Why should not we spend part of this money to purchase more airplanes and set up an air patrol for our national security?

Tenth. Why should not we spend more time and money in halting the encroachment of communism at home before we spend too much abroad in fighting communism?

Artificial Currencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of January 22, 1948:

ARTIFICIAL CURRENCIES

Pegging artificial price tags on money is as futile an operation as any other kind of price fixing. The economic planners are now being reminded of it.

The French Government, according to reports from Paris, is about ready to admit that its attempt to set a fictitious value on the franc has failed. The British, who still persist in overpricing the pound sterling, are finding their monetary OPA increasingly burdensome. The International Monetary Fund, which was supposed to stabilize currency prices and get them freely interchangeable, has spent 2 years figuratively wringing its hands.

The trouble is that if a country wants to charge more for its money than the money is worth in terms of actual goods, a stabilization program won't work. On the other hand, if the price tag on a money is set at a realistic rate—that is, one acceptable in the market place—then there is no need for any stabilization devices.

The very fact that a government adopts currency controls and unlimbers the popular stabilization devices is prima facie evidence that its currency is not worth what it says it is. With sufficiently rigid controls the government may seem to maintain the artificial price, but only at a tremendous, although partially hidden, cost to its own people.

The theory that over-valuing a currency is a smart thing to do comes from looking at only one side of the balance sheet.

Britain's big problem, for example, is to get dollars to buy goods here. Since our prices are in terms of dollars, the more dollars a Briton can get for his pounds the cheaper he can buy here. Therefore it seems sweetly reasonable to value the pound as high as possible, relative to the dollar. If the pound is devalued, it will take more pounds to buy the same amount of United States goods; in other words, our goods become more expensive for British customers. Hence, so the argument goes, Britain (or whatever country is debating the problem) will find it expensive to let its currency sink to its free market value.

But the other side of the balance sheet looks quite different. The European countries want to earn more dollars by increasing their exports to the United States. To sell here they have to compete with American goods for the consumer's money, and in this instance the artificially high price of the pound or the franc, or whatever, is a disadvantage.

Britain, for one example, wants to sell autos here. The smallest one will cost an American $1,300 when his dollars are converted into pounds, not far from the price of a bigger, more powerful American car. However, if the United States customer could get more pounds for his dollars he could buy the British car cheaper. The British auto manufacturer would then have a competitive price advantage and sell more cars.

It is quite true, of course, that a cheaper price for the pound or franc would restrict British or French imports from the United States. But in order to maintain artificial currency prices those governments have had to restrict their imports anyway by an elaborate system of trade and currency controls. Artificial currency values, however, restrict exports as well. By struggling to keep fictitious price tags on their monies the trade-deficit nations abroad are guaranteeing that this unbalance will remain chronic. To balance their trade with the United States under this system will require more and ever more American loans. In short, we will have to keep subsidizing the foreign governments so they can keep a "favorable" price on their money.

Until the French currency action is officially announced we cannot judge it. But if it moves the franc closer to its real trade value it will be a step in the right direction.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the national board of directors of the Fleet Reserve Association, an organization composed of thousands of Americans who have served honorably in the United States Navy, recently adopted a resolution urging the enactment of a universal military training program. I take pleasure in presenting this resolution to the Congress:

Resolution urging enactment of universal military training

Whereas by the grace of Almighty God and a united, resolute people our great Nation has, in the past, had ample time to prepare for war; and

Whereas the experience of two world wars, plus the tempo of the times, dictate to thinking minds that future wars will be fought around new concepts, using such destructive material as guided missiles, disease germs, chemical gases, atom bombs, overwhelming air forces, and new mechanized units, with actual attack before declaration of war; and

Whereas it is essential that as a united democratic people we demand that this great Nation make every preparation, as soon as possible, in order that the United States of America will be adequately supplied with men and material to meet any act of aggression which might be committed; and

Whereas if our form of government is to survive, we owe to ourselves and our children a fighting chance of survival of conflict, this to be accomplished by systematic mental and physical training of the youth of our land: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the national board of directors, Fleet Reserve Association, That we urge the enactment of legislation to provide for universal military training; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be brought to the attention of the President and the Congress of the United States as being policy of the Fleet Reserve Association.

By FREDERICK E. GRAMMER,
National President, Fleet Reserve Association.

Medical Supplies and Hospitals Major Requirements in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the chief need of Greece today is for medical supplies and hospitals, in the opinion of Peter Boudoures, of San Francisco, head of Greek relief activities on the Pacific coast, who has recently returned to this country from a trip to Greece.

Mr. Boudoures says that mass X-ray surveys—made with American equipment sent overseas by Greek relief—reveal that nearly 60 percent of the youth of Greece, both boys and girls, have or have had tuberculosis.

For the information of the Members of Congress, I append an interview with Mr. Boudoures, recently published in the San Francisco News:

Mr. Boudoures has no respect for the Greek Government, not even the liberal prime minister, aged Themistocles Sophoulis, who admitted his hands were tied by self-seeking rightist politicians.

He believes the quasi-civil war which now paralyzes Grecian rural areas was brought about by (1) Rightist persecutions of liberals and democrats (as well as radicals), (2) British policies of division, which he denounces in the strongest terms, and (3) the familiar tactics of Russia in preventing the recovery and democratization of key areas of Europe.

Thousands were jailed when the Royalist Government moved in on the liberal elements of Greece, he said. Many remained in jail—not charged with any crime—for months. Their wives were beaten or murdered; their homes were burned; their children orphaned.

BRITISH AID THE BRITISH

This was the Government placed in power and supported by Great Britain. The British failed so miserably to help war-torn Greece to recover that they withdrew, in disgrace with every element of Greece but the extreme right. The United States was then asked to take over the botched job.

Instead of being strong in our policy, we have vacillated, Mr. Boudoures said.

"We say we won't interfere in Greek internal affairs," says Mr. Boudoures. "What nonsense! What else are we doing there? Let us get over this hypocrisy and direct the spending of the money as we see fit, to support our democratic beliefs—or get out and refuse to help at all."

RUSSIAN ROLE

"The Russians are doing everything in their power to disrupt and delay Greek recovery. We must fight fire with fire—or abandon Greece and its unhappy people to the struggle between communism and the royalists.

"We must spend more money on the military program. If the villages are guarded, if the northern frontiers are patrolled, the guerrillas will collapse.

"They were offered amnesty—yes. But are they to lay down their arms and return to the mercies of corrupt and callous officials of the extreme right, who occupy every local office throughout the country? That is why Sophoulis is helpless. He can't protect them, and they know it," Mr. Boudoures said.

Chemical Engineer's Club of Washington Considers National Rubber Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Chemical Engineer's Club of Washington, devoted its recent meeting to a discussion of our national-rubber situation and presentations were made in the form of a symposium. The moderator was Adm. C. E. Braine, chairman of the Army-Navy Munitions Board Rubber Committee. Other participants were G. B. Hadlock, of RFC's Office of Rubber Reserve; Donald D. Kennedy, Chief, International Resources Division, Department of State; J. P. Coe, vice president of the United States Rubber Co.; and R. P. Dinsmore, vice president of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. I have submitted for the consideration of Congress the views of these men on particular phases of this problem. It was my privilege to join with them in the discussion, viewing the problem from a legislative angle.

The program for the symposium follows:

RUBBER SYMPOSIUM, JANUARY 13, 1948, AT 8 P. M.

MODERATOR ADM. C. E. BRAINE

1. Statement of Problem from Viewpoint of National Defense, Adm. C. E. Braine, chairman, Army-Navy Munitions Board Rubber Committee.
2. Synthetic Rubber Industry and its Relation to our National Economy, Mr. G. B. Hadlock, Office of Rubber Reserve, RFC.
3. International Implications of Rubber Problem, Mr. W. T. Phillips, State Department.
4. Present Technological Status and Future Outlook for Synthetic Rubber, Mr. J. P. Coe, vice president, United States Rubber Co., New York, N. Y.
5. Stabilizing the Domestic Rubber Industry, Mr. R. P. Dinsmore, vice president, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.
6. American Synthetic Rubber Industry from Viewpoint of the Congress, Hon. FRED CRAWFORD, Member of Congress.

CONGRESSMAN CRAWFORD'S STATEMENT

Looking at the rubber problem as a Member of Congress, I made the following statement:

Mr. Moderator, gentlemen of the symposium, ladies, and gentlemen:

It is an honor to appear here tonight to participate in a program which includes such leaders in the various rubber fields as our moderator, Admiral Braine, Mr. Hadlock, Mr. Phillips, Dr. Coe, and Dr. Dinsmore.

It has been my duty and pleasure to study the rubber problems of this Nation for the past 2½ years. I participated in the work of the Interagency Policy Committee on Rubber and I have recently accompanied subcommittee No. 3 of the House Armed Services Committee on its inspection trip to Texas, Kentucky, and Ohio. I am fully aware, as are many of my colleagues in the House, of the complexities and the magnitude of our American-made rubber producing industry. I know, in addition, that there exists more than one opinion on many phases of the problem. A group of my colleagues is endeavoring to present legislation which in their opinion will provide adequate national security in rubber and at the same time be sound, practical and satisfactory to the consumers of rubber and to the taxpayers.

Let me say right here that this American-made rubber producing industry comes close to being the most outstanding accomplishment of chemists, physicists, engineers, and businessmen turned out in World War II. Without it this Nation and its allies would have been in bad shape when it came to producing the goods and materials for war. Also, I am positive that the movement and supply of our armed forces would have been curtailed. Furthermore, I hate to envision what would be happening to our production efforts right now and what the past 2 years since VJ-day would have been. The prices of tires would be double or triple and it's a cinch we would still have tire rationing.

I want to say something else that is a pleasure to be able to say with conviction, the American-made rubber producing industry as administered by the Office of Rubber Reserve of the RFC is the greatest example of good government administration and operation that I have observed in my 13 years as a Member of Congress.

However, I have been impressed by certain of the remarks made by Dr. Coe on the subject of the selling price of GR–S latex in comparison with the price of baled dry GR–S. It appears to me that this subject should be reviewed by the Office of Rubber Reserve. If this is not done voluntarily, I believe the Congress should request that it be done.

Sale of intermediates in the manufacture of synthetic rubber such as GR–S type II latex at a delivered price that would enable private enterprise to further process the intermediate and still be on a fair competitive basis with government synthetic rubber. In due course we may find that it will be quite necessary for intermediates in the manufacture of synthetic rubber GR–S type 2 latex at a delivered price that would enable private enterprise to further process the intermediate and still be on a fair competitive basis with Government synthetic rubber.

No bills dealing with rubber legislation have as yet been introduced in Congress, but that doesn't mean that a lot of work hasn't been done in preparation. It is quite probable that a bill or bills will be introduced in the House within a week. So anything and everything I say tonight with reference to future legislation is said for myself and on behalf of my colleagues whom I know to be in accord with my views. We have no way of guessing at this time what form the final legislation will take. We do know that something must be done by March 31, 1948.

I believe we must have a going American-made rubber industry.

To do that we must run some of it and keep more in stand-by condition available quickly in any future emergency.

Personally, and I think there is pretty general agreement on this point, I believe there should be 600,000 long tons of rated production capacity for general purpose rubber. We call this GR–S today. And in addition, there should be 75,000 long tons of rated production capacity for special purpose rubbers, such as butyl, neoprene, and the various N-types.

Then, I believe that one-third of each of the above amounts must be the minimum that will be in operation at all times. I know this is a controversial point. Some people think 100,000 is enough, others say 300,000 or more. That 225,000 figure to my mind is a fair compromise and one that will satisfy national defense and not place undue hardship on the consumers and the public.

Though I don't like the basic principle involved, it looks to me as though mandatory use specifications is the best answer to assure that these minimum tonnages will be consumed. If the price of natural rubber goes high enough, more American-made rubber than required by specification will be used. I feel strongly that more than the minimums mentioned above must be used during at least the next 2 years, because this country must buy natural rubber for the strategic stock pile. Unless the Netherlands East Indies' troubles are ironed out, I don't see that there will be enough natural rubber for world consumption and for our stock pile. So I foresee that the minimums outlined here may well not enter the picture for say 2 years, but nevertheless they must be there in any programs.

Now, also we must arrange for the continued improvement in the quality of our American-made rubber so that in an emergency it can be used in large quantities in more products that will give top service. To do that, it may be necessary for the Government to support certain programs of research and development that private industry will not undertake. I believe this research should be paid for by all taxpayers through appropriations and not paid for only by the users of rubber products, such as car owners, farmers, and trucking companies. Every American citizen will benefit from better American-made rubber, so, to my mind, he should pay the cost of research.

Then, too, the producing facilities not in use, but required in case of emergency, must be kept in top shape. Because we don't want all our eggs in one basket and because the day will come, I'm sure, when we will have surplus farm crops, I feel strongly that included in the stand-by facilities there should be at least one plant that can produce butadiene from alcohol flowing from agricultural products. This also should be a cost to every taxpayer and so should be paid for by moneys appropriated by the Congress.

I want to go back again for a moment to research and development. Our American-made-rubber program has a patent-pooling and exchange of technical information agreement hitched to it. I'm sure that was a good thing during the war, as an asset to help get rubber quickly and to get the best rubber anyone knew how to make. But citizens and industry of our country have, since the beginning, had the protection afforded by patents, I want to see that returned to our people and our industries. But this is a very tough and involved ball of yarn to unwind honestly and equitably. My guess is that there will be considerable debate on this topic, it might even have to be in the form of an amendment from the floor to any bill.

Another hot potato is, Who should own our rubber-producing facilities? Basically again, I believe American industry should own and operate this new giant war baby of ours. But you don't find new venture capital for new giant war babies on every street corner. Ordinarily, a new industry would be developed in small units as demand required. That was not so in the case of our American-made rubber producing facilities. We did things in a big way to satisfy the needs of war. I say let's try to dispose of our Government plants, but be sure we have them available if we need them again. This is such a large and important problem that Congress, the elected representatives of our people, must have the final say. Hence, even though we may appear to be wrapping plant disposal up in considerable red tape, we may have to require a concurrent resolution of the Congress before any facilities may be sold or leased.

Just two more items that make good common sense: Make any rubber goods imported into this country conform to the goods we require our rubber manufacturing industry to produce, and exempt from regulations any goods made exclusively for export.

The Government agency or agencies that will continue to administer the provisions of any proposed legislation should be determined by delegation of authority from the President. Personally, I hope he may find a way to wrap most of the rubber program up in one package. It should be more efficient than having several outfits in the picture.

Then finally we have a problem concerning the financial structure of our American-made rubber producing industry. Personally, I would like to see it streamlined and segregated. However, this may or may not appear to the leaders of the Congress as an opportune time to act on this subject.

It is not within my imagination to believe that a law will be approved which will intentionally impede progress on synthetic rubber developments sponsored and fostered by private industry. Therefore, we may in due course find that—

(a) Permission may be granted for an operating company to install equipment and other required facilities within a synthetic rubber plant under its operation in order to carry out research, development, and production projects on synthetic rubber, with any developments and patents therefrom to remain the exclusive property of the operator.

(b) Leasing of plants or portions of plants to an operating company for such periods as those plants or portions of plants are not required for normal Government synthetic rubber production may be advisable.

(c) Sale of raw materials such as butadiene and styrene to an operating company at a fair and equitable price in order that the operating company may carry out the functions described in (a) and (b) will be necessary.

I leave with you one big basic statement—we will have an American-made rubber producing industry in the United States of America.

I thank you.

Meat Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, our experience with OPA and its bungling is so recent that I am sure its lessons have not been entirely forgotten. We all can recall how announcements were made by the Director of OPA from time to time of impending scarcities in various kinds of food and that the result of such announcements was a run on the stores by people who were anxious to lay in supplies of the item which it had been announced would be scarce. The effect of that was to create an artificial scarcity and thus to seemingly justify the continuance of OPA regulations and rationing. Certainly we do not want a repetition of this unhappy experience; but, in recent weeks, we have seen announcements by the Secretary of Agriculture which are strangely reminiscent of our experiences under OPA. I am in receipt of a telegram from the manager of a hotel in my district which calls attention to this fact and is as follows:

All wartime scarcities were preceded by Washington ballyhoo which caused people to hoard and created unwarranted glutting of markets. It seems from here that Anderson and Department is doing same on meat. Present-day deep-freezing equipment permits storing hundreds of thousands of pounds of meat indefinitely. Meat Institute says no need for alarm in fact Anderson's Department seem only one crying "Wolf." Looks like they are trying to create need for rationing and urge someone expose them or shut them up if possible.

This hotel manager, who must keep in close touch with the markets for all food, states the facts of the present situation, and it would seem that the Secretary of Agriculture would be well advised to stop his alarmist reports on meat because those reports can only make worse the present situation and undoubtedly create artificial shortages in meat where none exist.

Article by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the European recovery plan aid cannot be divorced from the control of inflation here at home.

Mr. Baruch's sage advice has been ignored, on the over-all economic interdependence of foreign aid and domestic inflation control.

The flank attack on adequate rehabilitation aid has now received an impetus by the recent report of former President Herbert Hoover. I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix my remarks and include an article by Mrs. Roosevelt which appeared January 24 in the Washington Daily News:

PEOPLE ARE SMARTER THAN REPUBLICANS THINK

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, Friday.—The Republicans have apparently repudiated the Baruch plan. First, they insist on supporting the Knutson tax-reduction bill. And then, ex-President Herbert Hoover comes out assailing a continuing plan for European aid, and wants to cut the aid requested by Secretary of State Marshall to $4,000,000,000 for 15 months.

He wishes to bar gifts of capital goods and to put into food the majority of what we send abroad. Since neither he nor the Republicans as a whole have made any suggestions as to holding down the prices of food, he is courting an increase in the cost of living and a consequent resentment on the part of the American people.

Naturally, the Republicans hope that the people would blame the Democratic administration for the disasters that would follow these measures—in inflation and high prices at home and in discouragement in Europe. The Congress, in which the Republicans have a majority, would then escape the blame. It would be wonderful for them if the people of the United States had as little political knowledge as the Republicans suppose, but I doubt if that will prove to be true.

To cut the President's budget figures so as to offset the tax cut which the Republicans propose, will mean, of necessity, nothing done on the welfare measures proposed by the President. I should be very much surprised if both the intellectuals and labor and even some of the farm voters, having read Bernard M. Baruch's proposals, do not wonder why the majority in Congress insists on pursuing measures which must bring hardship both to our own people and the people of the world.

Perhaps the Republican high command thinks that Henry Wallace will take so many votes away from the Democrats, and so little from the Republicans, that it does not matter what the Republican Party does. Victory will be theirs, they assure themselves. When any political party gets this feeling, it is time for that party to beware.

This column is a warning to the Republicans that the voters of this country are more intelligent than they evidently think. Why should I, a Democrat, warn the Republicans, when everything they do is a help to the Democrats? I certainly should let them go on riding high if it were not that the results of their policies will bring suffering to the little people of our Nation, and to the people of Europe and Asia, who suffer enough as it is.

Mr. Hoover is evidently on the side of those who wish to build up again an uncontrolled industrial Germany. The Quaker in him does not believe in war, and yet he has been close enough to history to see how two wars have been brought about by a highly industrialized Germany.

Three Heroes of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, as long as men admire valor and subscribe to the attributes of character manifested in the virtue of individual honor, personal and official integrity, truth and justice, wherever found, the ship of state will sail on triumphant over every storm, hewing opportunity from the shoals of adversity to reach the shores of a glorious destiny.

The Nation should be grateful to the United Daughters of the Confederacy, as that great organization, representing the finest in southern tradition and American womanhood, eschewing every purpose and attempt to fan the flames of sectionalism, keeps aglow on the hearthstones of memory the embers of courage, sacrifice, and devotion to duty so strongly symbolized in the lives and characters of Matthew Fontaine Maury, Robert Edward Lee and Thomas Jonathan Jackson.

The quality and character of its leaders determines a nation's place in history and a people carve their own image in the shrines and monuments they erect to their heroes.

The brilliance and genius of Maury, the Pathfinder of the Sea, his devotion to his native State and his immeasurable contribution to the safety and progress of navigation, wrote an indelible chapter of honor and achievement in the history of his country.

No nobler general ever lived than Robert E. Lee; no braver soldier ever fought than Stonewall Jackson. Both, supreme as gentlemen, the knightliest knights who ever wore the gray, the fruition of the brave heart of embattled Virginia. They exchanged ambition for the sacrifice of service, glory for immortality.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a brilliant address, entitled "Three Heroes of Virginia," the author of which is Dr. M. C. Harrison, head, department of English and foreign languages, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va. This adress was read from the VPI Broadcasting Station on January 19, 1948, by Mrs. M. C. Harrison, representing the Dr. Harvey Black Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy:

The month of January contains the birthdays of three native sons of Virginia whom this old Commonwealth delights to honor and whom she will continue to honor as long as time endures. The three Virginia heroes whose birthdays we remember today are Matthew Fontaine Maury, who was born on January 14, 1806; Robert Edward Lee, who was born on January 19, 1807; and Thomas Jonathan Jackson, who was born on January 21, 1824.

All three of these men were loyal to their native State in her time of greatest need, putting aside selfish interests and emoluments to serve Virginia when Virginia cast her lot with the Southern Confederacy.

Maury had become internationally famous as the scientist who had charted the ocean winds and tides to the extent of shortening sailing time between various parts of the world, saving millions of dollars' worth of cargoes from loss by storms, and insuring greater safety for thousands of human lives on the great deep. He had received the name of the Pathfinder of the Sea. His studies of the ocean bed between Newfoundland and Iceland had made possible the laying of the first Atlantic cable. Foreign countries bestowed on him medals, honorary degrees, and other awards.

When Virginia seceded from the Union, Maury served first in an advisory capacity in Richmond. Had President Jefferson Davis acted upon his counsel with regard to building an effective Confederate Navy the Federal blockade would have been an impossibility. Lameness prevented Maury from commanding a ship of war, but he invented an electric torpedo that blew the boilers through the deck of a Federal gunboat in the James River below Richmond. Mr. Davis made the mistake of sending Maury as an agent to England instead of using his genius to the fullest advantage at home.

Thomas Jonathan Jackson, usually called by his battle sobriquet of Stonewall, is known the world over wherever men study the history of brilliant military strategy. A stone wall on defense, he was a thunderbolt in attack. Whether operating independently, as in the valley campaign of 1862, or commanding the Second Corps of the Army of Northern Virginia, as at Second Manassas, Fredericksburg, and Chancellorsville, he was the glory of his friends and the terror of his foes. The sun of the Confederacy set when Jackson died, in May 1863, of pneumonia induced by the wounds which he had received at Chancellorsville. The most discerning military critics have believed that if Stonewall Jackson had been living at the time of Gettysburg that battle would have been a stupendous southern victory.

The peerless Lee will live as long as men revere courage, honesty, honor, sincerity, and truth. Though humble as the simplest private in his ranks, he was the greatest captain of his generation; in fact, one of the superb soldiers of all time. Could unselfish devotion to a cause, unsparing effort, and the genius of leadership have sufficed, Robert E. Lee would have led the Southern Confederacy to victory. But even when his army, because of the enemy's overwhelming numbers and resources, had to lay down its arms Lee's greatness of soul shone like a star of unprecedented magnitude.

All three of the heroes whom we honor today were men of spiritual integrity and religious faith. Jackson, "the Blue Light elder," habitually led his men into battle with hand and arm lifted in attitude of prayer. Maury, the scientist, found God in all of nature's works. Lee's last act of duty was attending a vestry meeting in the church of which he was a member, and his last effort before being borne to his death bed was to ask a blessing at his family's table.

All three of our heroes are associated with the college town of Lexington, Va. Maury died there while employed as a professor in the Virginia Military Institute. Jackson's remains were buried there. And all that is mortal of General Lee rests beneath the chapel of the college of which he was president and which now bears his name. Drive through scenic Goshen Pass and stop for a silent moment at the Maury Memorial. Step into the Lexington cemetery and lift your hat before the bronze likeness of old Stonewall. Stand in awe and reverence before a recumbent figure faultlessly carved from symbolically pure Carara marble—a figure that reposes in the chapel of Washington and Lee; a figure that Gen. John J. Pershing was proud to salute. Then give thanks to God that you have been in touch with souls that placed principle above expediency, honor above ease, and righteousness above reward.

Extend Rent Control Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, millions over the country today are very much concerned about the extension of the Rent-Control Act. Neither landlords nor tenants should be kept in suspense as to whether this act will be extended and if so, how long the extension will be.

The leadership of the Congress should use all due haste in calling up this legislation and have it acted upon at the earliest possible time.

One of the reasons for a prompt decision is set out in the following letter from Mr. Jacobs, chairman of the Gary-Hammond, Ind., Rent Advisory Board:

The Honorable RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: As the expiration date of the present rent-control law draws closer, and the housing situation failing to show sufficient improvements since the enactment of that law, it is the general opinion of this Board that the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947 should be extended.

Another reason for this Board's request for an extension on rent controls is the shortage of rental units in this area. There has been during the past year a noticeable gain in

housing construction, although the majority of the units built are for selling and not renting purposes which, in itself, does not alter the renting situation.

Whatever legislation that may be passed upon relative to this act should be passed in sufficient time before February 29 so that all concerned will know just what they may expect on that date. This act should not have an eleventh-hour decision like the OPA had.

Very truly yours,
DAVID G. JACOBS,
Chairman, Gary-Hammond Rent Advisory Board,
By DELIA B. NAIVE,
Secretary.

A Prolabor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln said, "Labor is the great source from which nearly all, if not all, human comforts and necessities are drawn." There is practically unanimous agreement with this statement of the great emancipator.

When labor is fully employed at good wages it means prosperity for every segment of our population. Surely, every person with sufficient intelligence to read and write is deeply interested in maintaining a high degree of prosperity, and certainly any member of a legislative body would be derelict in his duty if he did not use his good offices to promote the general welfare.

In 1946 the country suffered almost continuous paralyzing work stoppages; 116,000,000 man-days of production, which was so desperately needed, were lost. Who was responsible for this is not debated here. The fact that our industry was not operating was sufficient evidnce that there was something radically wrong with the then existing labor laws or the administration thereof.

It was the duty of the Congress to endeavor to solve the problem of labor-management relations, and the study resulted in the Taft-Hartley Act. Every union man owes it to himself, his employer, and his neighbor not to idly accept criticisms of the law by some person whose own interest is better served by opposing any change in the old law, but to give thorough study to the new provisions and its operation since enactment. This study no doubt will reveal that the position of all concerned has been improved. The opinion of a vast majority is that the law is working and it protects the interest of the individual worker, the union, management, and the public.

Since the passage of the act there has been a much better understanding on the part of unions and companies alike as to what is involved in collective-bargaining process than there has been at any other time in our history. In 1947, 35,000,000 man-days were lost, and the law operated only the last 5 months, in comparison with 116,000,000 in 1946.

Many of the rank and file of labor are doubting their leadership charges that the Taft-Hartley Act is a slave-labor law, because the workers have not become slaves and their unions have not been destroyed. They are now experiencing greater freedom from the excessive power of officials.

The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 has not retarded the growth of the labor movement. On the contrary, union membership has increased under the law. The Teamsters' Union, alone, has acquired approximately 100,000 new members since the passage of the act, according to Daniel J. Tobin, international president.

The new law has not affected the ability to bargain for higher wages and better working conditions. Actually, the best contracts ever negotiated, have been signed.

The section dealing with the separation of the prosecution and judicial powers of the NLRB is being accepted by union leaders with considerable enthusiasm.

The following statement by Henry Hazlitt, as published in Newsweek, gives some most interesting information. I direct your attention particularly to the poll of union members on the 10 major provisions of the law. I think their viewpoint at that time has been fully justified:

A PROLABOR LAW
(By Henry Hazlitt)

The fate of the Taft-Hartley Act is an ominous illustration of the power of propaganda. The Wagner Act left the individual worker at the mercy of the union boss. The new law protects the individual worker's rights and interests. It is precisely because the new law does curb the hitherto unbridled powers of union leaders over the rank and file that these leaders opposed its enactment with every technique of propaganda. They did not shrink from any misrepresentation, however fantastic, including the device of denouncing the measure as a slave-labor law.

This was not enough to shake the determination of an overwhelming majority of Congress to pass it. Yet it had its effect, not only on the astonishing language of the President's veto, but on the rank and file of workers. A recent survey conducted by the Opinion Research Corp. found that 54 percent of the employees questioned, and 64 percent of union members, disapproved the law.

But the survey also uncovered a strange paradox. Notwithstanding their declared disapproval of the new law, a majority of workers favored every individual provision of it on which they were questioned. Even a majority of union members favored every feature of it but one. Here is the result:

[Percent]

Favor law to—	All employees	Union members
Require 60-day cooling-off period	78	70
Allow companies to sue unions	77	70
Allow freedom of speech for employers	69	61
Require union financial reports	86	85
Prohibit Communist union leaders	76	77
Prohibit union political contributions	56	50
Allow check-off only with worker's consent	68	74
Allow union shop only with majority vote	79	77
Outlaw closed shop	60	48
Delay strikes in public-service industries	78	70

The new labor law makes it an unfair labor practice for a union as well as an employer to restrain or coerce individual workers in the exercise of their bargaining rights. It illegalizes excessive or discriminatory initiation fees. It refuses to certify a union or allow it to bring complaints to the Labor Board unless it has published a report of its receipts and disbursements, as well as a statement giving its name, the names, titles, and salaries of its principal officers, the manner of the election, the initiation fees and dues of the union, a detailed statement of its constitution and bylaws showing the procedure followed regarding qualifications for or restrictions on membership, election of officers, calling of regular or special meetings, levying of assessments, imposition of fines, authorization for strikes, authorization for disbursement of union funds, audit of union financial transactions, expulsion of members, and the grounds for it.

Every member of a union will want to know every one of these facts. It is only union bosses who find their arbitrary powers threatened, who want to continue to be high-handed, secretive, and irresponsible to the rank and file of their unions, who have anything to fear from such publicity. It is not surprising when such union bosses announce that they will bypass the new law.

Equally important protections for the rank and file are the provision requiring written consent of individual workers for the check-off of union dues, the provision making it unlawful for an employer to buy off a corrupt or blackmailing union leader, and the provision to assure that so-called welfare funds really are used for the union members' welfare and not merely to make labor leaders financially independent of the rank and file of their unions.

If we are thinking not of retaining unrestricted power for a small union oligarchy but of the rights of the union rank and file and the rights of the individual workers, then the much-abused Taft-Harley Act far more deserves the title of a prolabor law than the misconceived Wagner Act ever did.

Poetry Prizes for American Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, James Patrick McGovern, special Washington correspondent of the Arizona Daily Sun, a distinguished member of the bar of the District of Columbia, and former captain in the American Expeditionary Forces during the First World War, has established the McGovern Poetry Award in the American University and Catholic University of America, both in the National Capital. Succinctly stated, the prizes, selected by the presidents or other executive officers of the two universities, in their uncontrolled judgment and discretion, are to be awarded annually to students for the best original poems submitted in competitions open to all undergraduates, representative of the various cultural, religious, and racial differences of the Nation, thus reflecting Captain McGovern's desire for the tolerance, understanding, and brotherhood that knows no distinctions of race, creed, or color. His special object is to foster the humanizing and creative qualities to which the encouragement of the writing of poetry lends itself, particularly as he believes that its cultural and spiritual values, as contrasted with the practical and material aspects of much of our college training and of society generally would be salutary in a world which appears to owe much of its strife—nationally and internationally—to the inordinate importance attached to the possessions of wealth and to the slight attention given to those of the mind and heart, an unwise promotion of the material to the neglect of the spiritual. The Catholic University of America has not yet issued its announcement on the subject, but the American University released a press statement under date of January 6, 1948, reading as follows:

To encourage the writing of poetry, James Patrick McGovern, Washington lawyer and member of the firm of Magee, Beedy & McGovern, Munsey Building, has established the McGovern Poetry Award in the American University. Two awards of $75 and $50 will be made at the commencement on May 31, 1948, to students who have submitted the most meritorious verse when Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature delivers the commencement address. More than 4,000 students of the university are eligible to make entries for the awards. President Paul F. Douglass has appointed, as the committee in charge of the award, Mr. McGovern, as honorary chairman; Prof. Merritt C. Batchelder, chairman of the division of humanities of the College of Arts and Sciences; Dr. Rudolph von Abele, assistant professor of American literature in the School of Social Sciences and Public Affairs; and Dr. Elgin Groseclose, Washington novelist and alumnus of the American University. All manuscripts must be submitted to Dr. von Abele not later than April 15, 1948.

In furtherance of the endowment Captain McGovern has written a poem for publication in the official organs of both universities, which reads:

THE HEART'S UNDYING QUEST

Poetry has nature's root and flower,
The soul of life from essence of the earth;
Born of truth and beauty, it reaps power
To make the mortal of immortal worth.
The spirit which is nurtured in its seed
Can build such health, such faith, such harmony
That wisdom of the heart and mind then lead
To peace and brotherhood and liberty.
The art of poetry owns a domain
Unique and universal in its sphere,
With words like pageants gleaming in its train,
With strains of music blending for the ear;
It is the diamond light of man's unrest,
The rhythms of the heart's undying quest.
—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Truman Can Check Inflation If He Desires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has the power and authority to reduce speculation and, in addition, he can knock inflation into "kingdom come," if he is so disposed. Airtight secrecy is the answer to speculation and if put into effect prices would drop materially. Congressional action is not needed. For months the administration has had a policy that precipitated speculation resulting in an increase in the inflationary spiral. Mr. Raymond Moley, writing in the Chicago Journal of Commerce, calls the turn on this situation. I include it as part of my remarks:

HOW TO CHECK INFLATION
(By Raymond Moley)

An experienced trader in commodities, who hesitates to speak in his own name publicly, points out that it lies entirely within the power of the administration not only to squeeze and reduce speculation, but to attack inflation on a wide and vital front. He says that if Government grain buying could be as secretly managed as the stabilization fund in the Treasury, there would have been no such rise in commodities as has been seen since September, and that in the next 3 or 4 months prices could be materially reduced.

No congressional action at all would be needed for such managed buying. Just skill and secrecy in planning are necessary.

The commodities trader pointed out that the Government already owns 400,000,000 of the 500,000,000 bushels of wheat needed up to May or June. Why not halt buying for a while and enter the market only intermittently for the next few months? Over the period between now and June, only 20,000,000 bushels a month are needed. This amount could be secured without question and at great savings.

A sudden stoppage of Government buying, even though it be temporary, has a powerful effect on speculators. This was shown in late November, when a sudden rumor ran through the exchanges that the Government would stop buying for the rest of the year. Prices dropped suddenly.

The Government's actions over past months have created exactly what the President deplored in his statement on the Republican anti-inflation bill, namely, "speculation, hoarding, dumping, and other actions." Throughout 1947 the administration lost little opportunity to proclaim the danger of shortages and to point out that the supply would fall short of the need. The Department of Agriculture said that we could safely spare 570,000,000 bushels. Government propaganda did much to draw speculators into the long side of the market.

The Department of Agriculture will deny that its buying policies could have been altered in the past few months to prevent the rise. It says it had to buy and that the magnitude of its buying was so great that prices inevitably had to rise.

The Department will, however, find it hard to deny that the farm bloc would have entered vehment protests against real stabilization. It would also find it hard to deny that a valiant effort now to hammer the price of wheat down would be politically injurious to Mr. Truman's chances of winning more support in farming States. It must be admitted by Republicans, also, that they have shown no zest to hit the cost of living in the vulnerable spot, which is the price of wheat.

Meanwhile, the tom-toms are sounded about speculation. And the Republican Congress gave the administration its desired power to hit the distillers again. That curb, which extends to January 31, will no doubt be up for an extension early in this session of Congress. It saves little grain and is of doubtful constitutionality. But it is a safe way to divert attention for a genuine attack on inflationary grain prices.

Discrimination Against United States Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week, Harold Morris, commander of the Indiana American Legion, the State and national adjutants of the American Legion, and others came to Washington to meet with the Indiana congressional delegation to protest the sale of 140 defense houses located at Knox, Ind., to real-estate speculators.

Negotiations were about to be consummated for the sale of these homes, known as Parkview Heights housing project at Knox, Ind., to a real-estate firm from Lorain, Ohio.

These houses have been almost exclusively occupied by veterans of World War II who have been negotiating for a long period of time with the Public Housing regional director in Chicago for the purchase of these homes.

The intent of Congress in passing legislation for the sale of all surplus war housing, as well as other surplus material, was to give the veteran the No. 1 preference.

The facts relating to the negotiations for purchase of this project, as related by Commander Morris and John K. George, a veteran of Knox, Ind., who rents one of these homes, has convinced me and the other members of the Indiana delegation who met in conference last Saturday, that the veterans' purchase application was ignored and the intent of Congress to give the veterans preference was completely disregarded.

Knox Homes, Inc., who entered negotiations with the Public Housing Administrator in the Chicago regional office proceeded to solicit contracts for the reselling of these homes at almost double the amount of purchase even before the contract was signed by the Government. No doubt incidents of this kind in selling surplus housing installations have and are occuring in other localities throughout the country.

The veterans' group from Knox, Ind., have been trying to purchase this property for a period long previous to when the Knox Homes, Inc., made application, but for some reason have not been extended the aid and cooperation in consummating this purchase which the Congress intended the veterans to have.

Through the efforts of the Indiana congressional delegation, a conference will be held this week at the Legion headquarters in Indianapolis, Ind., with the Chicago Regional Public Housing Administrator, with the hope that Knox Homes, Inc., will be denied the opportunity to purchase this property. The veterans group were at all times ready and willing to pay a price equal or in

excess of that offered by Knox Homes, Inc.

I mention this case of veterans discrimination because it is merely one of numerous incidents which have taken place over the country in the disposal of surplus Government real estate and personal property.

In the purchase of surplus personal property, the veteran's preference has almost been made a mockery because of the Administrators' insistence that veterans should buy in allotments far above their capacity to pay.

Another malicious violation of veteran's preference has been the fact that speculators have used individual veterans as a front to secure Government surplus and then sell the same at high and unreasonable profits.

I propose to submit an amendment to the Surplus Property Act, calling for a severe penalty, both for the speculator purchaser and also the veteran who engages in a conspiracy to defeat the intent of Congress which was to give the veteran a No. 1 preference on all surplus Government war property, both real and personal.

Investigate Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial recently published in the Boston (Mass.) Herald.

This editorial is particularly pertinent in view of the unanimous action taken by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which was reported by the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WOLVERTON), earlier this afternoon.

The emphasis on the fact that the problem is now producing crises in sections of this country, is not necessarily local but rather looms as of national and possibly of world concern, is of great importance. It is clearly recognized, in the action of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that we are not only dealing with emergency conditions now but with long-range problems which may affect the very peace of the world, quite apart from its comfort and industrial capacity.

May I underline two sentences:

A nation forewarned is a nation forearmed, even if the American way too often is to ignore warnings of an approaching crisis, and then, when it comes, to hunt a scapegoat. * * * Facts, rather than divergent fancies, appear justified, now that petroleum as a source of heat and power are here to stay.

The editorial is as follows:

INVESTIGATE OIL

Cold and snow and the 68-69 prescription for the household thermostat have brought home to New England that there is a fuel oil shortage and that observance of the 15-percent reduction rules can mean the difference between a healthy home comfort and shivering for the balance of the winter. Climate and geographical position and lack of tankers have combined to build up the impression that the oil scarcity is peculiarly New England's own.

Within a week, three distinct Washington advices from official sources indicate that the problem is more than that of an area. It looms as of national and possibly of world concern, or specifically that portion of the world which clings to democracy. Concern has common foundation not in decrease of supplies, but in tremendous increase in demand. Statistically, Secretary of the Interior Krug points to rise in domestic demand from 367 gallons per capita in 1941 to 608 gallons in 1947.

This is fundamentally the basis for his appeal for development of lignite coal and shale deposits and his warning that known United States petroleum reserves would be exhausted in 10 years. It explains the supplementary statement of the director of the Department's oil and gas situation, Max Ball, that 4 or 5 years would elapse before the supply of oil caught up with demand. Of military concern, expressed by Secretary of Defense Forrestal, is peril to the Near East flow from Moslem or Soviet pipe-line interference.

Since the huge wartime demands upon petroleum, a drain that has not dwindled but increased, there have been two schools of thought on the future of our petroleum. Broadly, industry estimates see no danger of exhaustion on the premise that new deposits can be brought into use faster than consumption increases. The administration agencies' view is that known resources cannot stand the postwar gaff, and that coal and shale, the so-called marginal sources, be readied for liquid fuels conversion about 25 times the country's present proved reserves.

A nation forewarned is a nation forearmed, even if the American way too often is to ignore warnings of an approaching crisis and then, when it comes, to hunt a scapegoat. For the facts on what we can expect in petroleum, a special commission to prepare a national petroleum policy in the manner of the Finletter commission on aviation should be set up at once. Facts, rather than divergent fancies, appear justified, now that petroleum as a source of heat and power is here to stay.

Address of Senator Raymond E. Baldwin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, experienced public servant in State and Nation, liberal statesman and forceful leader, Senator RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, of Connecticut, was the principal speaker at the annual dinner of the New York State Bar Association held last Saturday evening in New York City.

The enthusiastic reception accorded his address was thoroughly merited not alone by his always masterful delivery, but equally by the thoughtful and constructive character of his remarks.

As we grapple with the gigantic problems embraced within the European recovery program, it seems to me helpful to bring to the attention of the membership of both Houses the views of one of our distinguished colleagues, who, in experience and devotion to the best interests of our Nation, represents public service in its finest expression. His address follows:

It is sometimes said that our good Pilgrim fathers barely tolerated lawyers—regarding them as a necessary evil to be carefully watched. One of these founders of our country is said to have observed a tombstone inscribed, "Here lies the body of Jonathan Baker, a lawyer and an honest man," and reflectively observed, "A lawyer and an honest man. I wonder what the two of them are doing in one grave."

Perhaps that is a reason historians disagree as to how many signers of the Declaration of Independence were professionally concerned with the law. Some say 26. Others say 32. At any rate, well over half of those who took this lead in finally declaring our purpose of seeking independence were lawyers or judges. And since that time lawyers have consistently played a crucial role in the direction and development of our Nation's policies.

It is a welcome opportunity to talk with bar association members because you can appreciate, better than those not so intimately associated with the law, the problems and the difficulties we have before us in the Congress.

Rather than talk shop here tonight—which I would like very much to do—I would like to talk over with you what I am sure we all believe is the most vital and threatening question before our Nation now—that is whether or not we should enter into a vast program to rehabilitate Europe in an effort to prolong peace.

Certainly there is no issue to which Franklin's warning "we must all hang together or most assuredly we must all hang separately" can more aptly be applied.

One of your own members, the present distinguished Governor of your State, Thomas E. Dewey, was one of the first to impress on our people the vital necessity for regarding foreign policy as a bipartisan American issue. On several occasions during the 1944 campaign, Governor Dewey called for a unified bipartisan foreign policy. I recall particularly that in Louisville, that September, Governor Dewey said, "It is a nonpartisan matter when we are in war. So also we must learn to make peace a nonpartisan matter to be achieved through united effort."

There are those who refer to such an attitude as a "me too" attitude. Those who do may be guilty of allowing the other party to rule their thinking. It does not follow that either party must always be wrong or always right. Of course, being a stanch Republican, I have been—and am—convinced that right is considerably more likely to be on our side.

Certainly in the matter of foreign policy we can have no rift in our policies that would allow other nations or other ideologies to divide our thinking to the damage of our own principles. This does not mean that we expect, or require, conformation to any rigid thinking on foreign policy, but it does mean that we should cease to regard foreign policy as a weapon of political campaigns. We are—and should be—Americans before we are Democrats or Republicans, or Wallaces. Surely there are still principles, hopes, and causes that all Americans have in common.

The development of our present foreign policy is the product of a bipartisan exchange of views. And I might say, in passing, that it was primarily the efforts of Senator VANDENBERG that changed the administration's recent policy of appeasement to one of firmness. It is the Vandenbergs, the Wilkies, the Deweys of the opposition party that have succeeded, to some large degree, in making sure that American differences regarding relations with other nations cease "at the water's edge."

It is my sincere hope that we will continue to show the world a united, firm, wise, and generous attitude.

We are facing today, a condition different from any in history. There are no precedents. At no time, since God placed man on earth, has one people, one nation, come to such a dominant position of leadership in the affairs of the whole globe. It is gratifying to know that this has not come about as the result of a ruthless, military march in which we started off as the aggressor. The natural wealth of our land, our own love of peace, our free minds and free souls, have built a mightier nation than all the military conquests of history. As a free people, we do not seem to understand and fully appreciate our own strength. We are reluctant to assume the responsibility of dominance in world affairs, such as has never been the case with any nation heretofore. Such a position of leadership brings with it challenging responsibilities. More than any other nation, we, the people of America, are charged with the keeping of the peace.

Not all of us believe peace lies at the end of the same road.

There are those who argue with conviction that we can withdraw to the shores of our own land and build here a wealthy, safe, and secure island of peaceful plenty. Those who foster that belief, daring the advance of science, ignore the changes of modern years, and give themselves up to the inevitability of war.

It is possible that we could build, here, such a strong defense that no nation, or combination of nations, could take our own land from us. But those who depend on such defense here must acknowledge the horrible fact that war then, whether we would win or lose, would be fought on our own streets. Many of those who advocate such an escape from threatening problems couple their arguments with the claim that any other course is too expensive.

During the next 4 years at the present rate of spending, veterans' affairs will cost us about $25,000,000,000, national defense about 45 billion, and service on the war acquired debt about 16 billion. Those three costs of war and costs of defense will, at the present rate, cost more than four times as much as the proposed European recovery plan. We cannot avoid them now, but we can avoid their larger counterparts for the future. Peace is not a gift. It must be paid for—and worked for.

Let it be entirely understood that such expenditures for the aid of other nations are not the heedless spendings of a wastrel nation. They are investments in peace. They are selfish guaranties of our own security. The reconstruction of Europe will bring us a higher budget and add to our taxes. The failure to build freedom and prosperity in other nations would soon make necessary for higher taxes, for defense against a hungry and envious world. There are also those who choose to follow the path of appeasement. Appeasement was not discovered in 1939.

In our own history, we tried appeasement with the pirates of Tripoli. England had an early experience appeasing the Vikings. Those attempts, like others, only prolonged the inevitable day when stronger methods had to be used. Appeasement cannot work because appeasement ignores a human trait of insatiable greed for power once that power has been tasted. Is there any reason to suppose that left to develop her own ambitions, the Soviet Union would halt her expansion over Europe at the present boundaries? There are those who say that makes little difference—that peoples absorbed in the Soviet ideology will soon recognize the failures of the system and will gladly return to our democratic fold. Those wishful thinkers can be shown that once a free people is bound by the chains of dictatorship, there is no turning back. Greedy, envious leaders of other ideologies could then use the wealth and the manpower of exploited nations to threaten our people. It is of great importance that this Nation develop friendly, mutually trusting relationships with the Soviet Union. But I see no way for us to interminably extend our own understanding so long as Soviet leaders refuse to reciprocate. We have, since the war, seen instance after instance in which the Soviet Union has disregarded our mutual plans and has sought to inflame other people against us by violent, and—I might say—malicious misconstructions of our purposes. We can only sincerely hope that Soviet leaders can come to recognize the rights and hopes of free people and join efforts to build peace.

This year of 1948 will be a year of fateful decisions. The fate of peace may well be decided in these next months. There is before us now, the so-called Marshall plan, a plan which bears out our traditional belief that in prosperity and freedom there is peace. The plan has been criticized. It is unfortunate that in those criticisms there is seldom offered an alternative hope.

No loyal, thinking, American favors the spending uselessly, any part of our hard-earned wealth. Our land is not a land of limitless resources. We are not a people of boundless wealth. We cannot waste our substance in riotous giving. It is vitally important that we guard our own economy if we are to keep ourselves free and the world at peace. Poverty here cannot help relieve poverty abroad.

Most of us are now aware that our efforts of the past 2 years during which we spent nearly $17,000,000,000 on relief for Europe must be declared essentially a failure. The generous, willing assistance of our people has been squandered with little or no effect—squandered because the administration chose to follow that familiar policy of reckless spending on useless doles—with a view to relieving rather than rebuilding Europe. So we find ourselves, today, scarcely further ahead than we were 2 years ago. It is indeed discouraging to realize that the generosity of our people has been so ineffectively used. During that time, we have come to be threatened by a dangerous inflation at home. That loss of our wealth—is in itself serious. Even more serious is the fact that this failure has led many of our people to question whether our Government can apply our aid in such a way that we can look forward to the day when the need for it will cease.

It must be clearly understood that in undertaking any new effort, we divorce our efforts from the past. We are starting anew, conscious of the failure of the past, but undiscouraged in our efforts to build a just and permanent peace.

Until this time we have been somewhat in the position of the embarrassed helper of an impoverished friend who anonymously slips a check under his friend's door and hopes that it will help to tide him over. Now we have finally come to the point of walking frankly and openly up to our friend's door and knocking to tell him "I want to help you out of your trouble but I want to see that you use my help in such a way that you'll soon be back on your own feet and able to earn your own living."

This plan must do more than express a pious hope if it is to justify the expenditure of our own wealth. Reconstruction must be accomplished. You, as close associates of many of the powerful business and labor interests of this Nation, can help impress upon our people the vital necessity for their demanding and insisting that this plan be made realistic, efficient, and productive. You can lead our people in insisting that selfish interests must be submerged if we are to maintain the security and freedom of our own homes.

Let me be specific. It is very well to say that we must have a trained expert staff working, for example, on the problem of the reconstruction of the French railroads. It is all very well to say that we do not want to entrust such technical operations to the hands of profesisonal civil servants, but where are we going to get the trained personnel? Where will we actually get the hard-headed resourceful experts we claim are needed? It will be difficult to convince outstanding men that they should abandon their present work to patriotically accept low-paying positions for uncertain periods of time. We run the risk of collecting comparatively unqualified staffs. We run the risk of including on those staffs some who might have, or develop, selfish financial interests. Therefore, unless we secure the full and patriotic cooperation of leaders in labor, management, and agriculture, it will be necessary to rely primarily on professional civil servants who may, or may not, be fully qualified for the work to which they might be assigned. We, in Congress, cannot—by law alone—make this plan work efficiently and effectively. That is up to all who seek peace.

I might say here—it does not necessarily follow that the employment of such professional Government workers is disastrous. More frequently, it is the policies that have brought failure. For example, our State Department is commonly charged with a major responsibility for the lack of effectiveness of postwar relief. At the risk of defending a sometimes unpopular cause, it is only fair to recall that less than 8 percent of the direct relief given to Europe in the past 18 months came under the authority of the State Department. The balance has been administered by such a variety of agencies as the Treasury, the Export-Import Bank, UNRRA, the Army, and the Maritime Commission—a variety so great as to certainly preclude any probability of effective coordination.

The European recovery plan offers hope but it also presents problems. Let's review what some of these encouraging signs are and also look at some of the problems.

The very fact that 16 nations of Europe have agreed to take cooperative measures to stabilize their money, to reduce trade barriers, to provide for the free movement of people between their countries, and to cooperatively use their individual resources is most encouraging. The selfish nationalism of Europe has been the cause of war for centuries. We, who are here tonight, will probably never see the day when the world becomes fully united in a combined effort to preserve the peace forever, but we may be witnessing, now, a beginning of a United States of Europe that will be a vitally important step in that direction. The significance of these 16 nations joining together, should not be overlooked. It is an encouraging and hopeful sign.

Other nations can be expected to join in helping carry out this program. As a matter of fact, at least three of the participating nations, Portugal, Switzerland, and Turkey, will probably be able to pay for the imports we send them. In addition to that, Portugal and Switzerland have indicated their willingness to extend credit to the other nations involved.

This plan places definite responsibilities on the recipient nations and encourages the full use of their own efforts. Each participating country must conclude an agreement with the United States making guarantees of full and open cooperation.

The task we face is not easy. Because of increased population, the loss of overseas investments, the servicing of foreign debts, the increased prices, and the reduction in supplies available from eastern Europe and southeastern Asia, the nations of Europe need to build greater production than they had in prewar years.

They particularly need to restore grain and livestock production, to increase coal production above the prewar production level, to expand the production of electricity, to greatly expand facilities for refining oil, to increase steel production, to expand and rebuild inland transportation and to restore merchant fleets. What kind of an organization can best deal with those complicated and varied problems? This effort should be directed by hard-headed, effective business administration. There can be no quarrel with that. We can depend no longer on the policies of spend and hope that we have seen in the past. However, there might arise difficult administrative problems as to whether we might run the risk of dividing this authority and so create some threat to the proper integration and continuity of foreign policy.

Two somewhat contrary proposals have been made concerning the organization to be established. One is the suggestion of the President which would establish the Economic Cooperation Administration headed by an administrator responsible to the President. He would be independent of all other agencies except where the actions of the Administrator would affect foreign policy, in which cases he would be subject to the direction and control of the Secretary of State.

Under the Herter plan there would be established an independent Government corporation called the Emergency Foreign Reconstruction Authority, whose powers would be vested in a chairman acting under the direction of a bipartisan board of eight. This chairman would also be the executive director of a foreign aid council composed of his eight directors and six other administration officials, including the Secretary of State and four other Cabinet members.

This difference raises a practical question of administrative procedure. Under both plans it is clear that the chairman or the administrator would be responsible for all phases of the program except possibly those affecting foreign policy. Under the administration plan, foreign policy matters would be subject to the control of the Secretary of State. Under the Herter plan this point is not entirely clear. Foreign policy may, also, in effect, be controlled by the Secretary of State, provided the administrator accedes in case of disagreement or provided any difference of opinion were resolved by the President.

It has been made clear both by the Secretary of State and the Herter committee, that in any event the actual organization should and would be set aside from, and not made a part of, the Department of State.

This apparent difference of opinion also brings up a constitutional question. The Supreme Court has consistently held that the power of conducting foreign affairs resides in the executive alone.

In *Marbury v. Madison*, Chief Justice Marshall said, "By the Constitution of the United States, the President is invested with certain important political powers, in the exercise of which he is to use his own discretion. * * * To aid him in the performance of these duties, he is authorized to appoint certain officers, who act by his authority, and in conformity with his orders. In such cases their acts are his acts; and whatever discretion may be used, still there exists, and can exist no power to control that discretion. * * * The application of this remark will be perceived by adverting to the act of Congress for establishing the department of foreign affairs. This officer and his duties were prescribed by that act, is to conform precisely to the will of the President. * * *" The act to which Marshall referred did not direct the President to act through the Secretary of State and left the President free to act through another officer if he chose. Traditionally, the President has placed that responsibility in the Secretary of, and Department of, State. There would seem to be grave question as to whether Congress could direct the President to assign any part of that authority elsewhere—if this should be attempted.

However, that is largely a technicality, since for all practical purposes—the direction of foreign policy could remain in the hands of the Secretary of State under either proposal by possible interpretation.

I feel confident that the Congress, has as its purpose, the establishment of an efficient authority close to the working level of the project and that some arrangement will be worked out whereby the lines of authority will be clearly established and a division of authority in matters of foreign policy will not be created. From a strictly political viewpoint, this technical disagreement furnishes an excellent opportunity for bipartisan cooperation—in which both the Congress and the administration must recognize the responsibilities and concern of the other.

The amount of aid that is to be given presents an issue of vital consequence. We are agreed that there is little use in setting up an inadequate program which would only delay the economic collapse of these nations. The fact must certainly be granted that no human being can, with exact accuracy judge what the minimum amount for success must be. We are required to accept the estimates and the judgment of those who have most carefully studied the case. To arbitrarily and without full consideration take the position that this sum now set at 6.8 billion for the first 15 months can be reduced by two or three billion is patently unwise. Whether that sum can be scaled down, whether that amount of aid can be extended without a dangerous effect on our internal economy are matters requiring careful and objective study. However, the amount we appropriate is of far less importance than how we spend it. Next year, after we have had the experience of 1 year of operation, we will be in a far better position to balance the results against the needs and against our capabilities. It has been argued that because an estimated two billion of the amount requested by the administration may not be spent during the fiscal year covered by this appropriation, we need not appropriate more than about 4.6 billion this year. The legislative budget is, of course, based on expenditures, not on appropriations. However, the additional two billion concerned here would be authorized for contracts requiring future expenditures. If that amount is not appropriated, we would be in no position to sign the contracts involved, since the parties concerned would have no assurance that the appropriation called for would be supplied, and we would incur a lot of ill will while we were trying to expound the proposition that one who deals with a public official is bound by the limitations which the law places upon that public official's authority.

No doubt, during the long and careful consideration that will be given to this program, many worth-while changes will be made. As a matter of fact, already one significant change has been effected. The administration at first requested an overall appropriation for the full period of 4 years. Because this plan depends for success on the maintenance of our own prosperity, and the encouragement of signatory nations by incentive, it would be most unwise to commit ourselves for a period longer than 1 year. We have now no assurance that our economic conditions here will be such in another year that this plan can be carried out for the full period. More than that, we would have destroyed one of the best guaranties of the plan, in that these nations, knowing that the degree of their success will be reflected in the following years' appropriations, should be more anxious to make sure that they can present to us the satisfactory certificate of progress.

It was again Senator VANDENBERG who saved the administration from that possibly tragic error.

There has been much concern and much discussion of the guaranties that are to be provided under this bill and the restrictions that are to be applied to our aid. So far as the restrictions are concerned, Congress will certainly insist that the labor and raw materials and supplies available within these countries be properly and fully utilized; that trade restrictions and tariff barriers and selfish financial interests not interfere with the reconstruction of these nations; that our own needs are taken into account fully, and that there be made available to the United States such materials as may be required to help our deficiencies here and to meet deficiencies in the future; that the countries take immediate and effective action to stabilize their respective currencies; that they move as rapidly as possible toward a condition of independence of our aid; and that our dollars, our goods, and our services carry on them the label "Made in the United States of America." We want to have these people understand that it is the strength and the wealth and generosity of free people living under free institutions of government that come to their aid now.

There have been suggestions that this aid should also have political strings attached to it. I do not believe that a free, democratic America, concerned with the development and maintenance of the principles of freedom and democracy abroad, can properly place itself in the position of making political demands on any nation, even though we may devoutly wish their systems were different. To do so would be to risk a justifiable charge of political interference. As a matter of historical record, our attitude on this point was first clearly defined by President Monroe in his address to Congress which later became known as the Monroe Doctrine. Monroe, at the suggestion of John Quincy Adams, after demanding that European nations not interfere in the Western Hemisphere, said, "Our policy in regard to Europe remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concern of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us."

Obviously, at that time the present condition was not foreseen. Even so, it does not illustrate our traditional belief in the political rights and freedoms of all people.

I am personally of the opinion that the types of government now in existence in some European nations are not the most conducive to the encouragement of a rapid reconstruction. However, that is the province of the citizens of those nations.

We can, however, and should properly, demand two qualifications: First, that there shall be free elections in which eligible voters can freely elect the government of their choice. Secondly, these nations must meet certain standards of accomplishment. I do not suggest that we can, in any detail, demand that rigid schedules of production be adhered to. There are too many uncontrollable factors that might prevent meeting such schedules. However, we should establish a system of periodic review whereby the concerned nations could be frankly told our opinion of their progress and frankly warned that adverse reports of the effect of our aid would heavily prejudice their chance for further assistance. It would, therefore, be to the interests of the peoples involved to see that their governments are capable of directing adequate progress.

There is also the question of whether or not we should extend aid to nations now under the domination of the Soviet Union. It goes without saying that these peoples attract our particular sympathy because they have not only suffered the destruction and dislocations of war, but have, in that time of despair, seen their freedom fall under a wave of political aggression. Our offer should in no way exclude these most unfortunate of people, if we can be assured of our reasonable insistance on observation, review, and free elections within those countries. From our past experience, it would seem particularly appropriate, in those cases, to make extraordinary acute observations as to the use made of our assistance.

There are those who will continue to oppose this effort. Some will oppose it with the emotional and attractive argument that we cannot, in view of our threatening inflation at home, waste our needed resources on thankless peoples who have already been charged with being derelict in the pursuit of their own economic reconstruction. That is negative thinking.

Our problem in keeping the peace is not what can't we do, but what can we do? I have no hesitation in saying that I find the cost of this project a sobering subject. I believe it holds a possible threat to our own economic security. However, until such time as another plan is produced offering a cheaper, more promising way toward peace, I see no other alternative.

If those who oppose this plan could demonstrate practical ways and means of better insuring our prosperity here and better assuring peace in the world, I would not hesitate to drop my interest in this plan and actively support the other. To say this, or any plan, guarantees peace would be foolhardy, but so long as it has in it any better hope for peace and security for us, we cannot afford to sit idly by waiting for that more costly alternative of war. We have made errors in the past—serious and costly errors. Our last 2 years have been substantially wasted insofar as the reconstruction of Europe is concerned. But we cannot allow ourselves to be so influenced by failures of the past as to reach the conclusion that we shall not try in the future.

We can be assured that if we do nothing there is the grave probability of disaster. If we go forward with any plan, there is always the risk that it might fail, but the risk and cost of the former is infinitely greater than the risk and cost of the latter.

This year we start fresh. We cannot expect only a few weeks of argument. We can, and we should, look forward to years of work for peace.

We cannot buy peace. We cannot vote peace. We must, and we shall, build peace.

We have before us, two constructive but fundamentally similar approaches to what now seems the best way toward peace. We now have the opportunity to change and improve them. Let us use that opportunity. Let those who deny the value of these plans bring before us a better one. If they cannot and do not, let them join all Americans in what must be a common effort, a common contribution, and a common sacrifice to answer our prayers for peace.

Discussion of Federal Taxation of Earnings of Colleges and Universities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the question of taxation or tax exemption for the earnings of colleges and universities is one of wide interest and concerns many people. Under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD the following material which deals with both sides of the question:

WASHINGTON LIAISON SERVICE,
Washington D. C., January 13, 1948.

Mr. LLOYD MOREY,
Comptroller, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

DEAR MR. MOREY: Your report on Federal taxation of earnings of colleges and universities is before me.

The only single point at issue at the present time is the proposed application of Internal Revenue Form 990 to educational institutions that are now tax-exempt. You say that the use of this form is unnecessary because land-grant institutions report to the United States Department of Agriculture and "all public institutions and most private institutions publish their financial reports in much detail and also report to the United States Office of Education." You urge this point of view seeking to have it adopted as a substitute for the application of Form 990. I have just concluded a conference with Mr. Emery M. Foster in charge of research and statistics of the United States Office of Education and he repeatedly told me that this agency does not receive any reports which could be used by the Bureau of Internal Revenue as a basis of tax collection. Mr. Foster says and I agree with him that reports of this kind should be received by the United States Office of Education but they are not now currently so received.

It is true that the land-grant institutions do report to the United States Department of Agriculture but these reports are not in such form as to be suitable for the Bureau of Internal Revenue because as you say, the form of accounting which is used in your institutions is not on a profit-and-loss basis. Therefore any talk about substituting reports now received by either the United States Department of Agriculture or the United States Office of Education for a report which might be used directly by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for information purposes is not convincing.

The true value of your report is the statement you make under the head of "Fair competition." You say:

"The mere fact that some services essential in educational institutions may compete with similar activities carried out under private ownership and management would not in itself justify the taxing of income of such services."

Frequently here in Washington we have difficulty in getting candid statements of this nature. This is the economic philosophy at work in the tax-exempt institutions you represent. It is helpful to have the statement for the record.

In a word, you say that you admit that you are in business and want more of it. This is just the opposite to the point of view expressed by Dr. George Zook, president of the American Council on Education, who admits that the universities are in business and wants them to get out as soon as possible.

Examine this situation for what it is. Here you have tax-exempt, nonprofit educational institutions whose very existence is made possible by the earnings of business organizations and individuals who pay taxes in order that these nonprofit institutions shall endure. The nonprofit institutions then take the funds collected from business organizations and individuals who have to operate on a profit-and-loss basis and use these funds to compete with them in the business world. You say truthfully: "No case is known where any sum is included over and above actual costs (speaking of the costs of research projects worked out in educational institutions). Far more frequently the amount realized is below actual costs if indirect administrative and physical operating costs are included."

Now there you have the whole story in a very few words. The nonprofit educational institutions which take on outside industrial research projects take them at a loss and beat down the market for legitimate business organizations which have to buy their equipment without tax exemptions, pay their directors of research an amount for adequate living and pay their laboratory employees fair wages. And yet you say you have a right to compete with the voting tax-paying worker.

Dr. Zook will soon come before the House Appropriations Committee with a request for a great increase of Federal aid for education. Now if it can be shown that he is asking for a vote of confidence and many millions of increased Federal funds to be allocated to educational institutions which will use these funds for the purpose of beating down the price of research in this country under the guise of nonprofit operations, I seriously doubt if any economy-minded Congress will go along with him.

Your observations closing your report seem true to me. You say, "The principal points at which the committee appeared critical are the following:

"(a) Income of alumni corporations or foundations from patents which proved to be commercially profitable.

"(b) Business activities of a strictly commercial character carried on by or on behalf of institutions, even though the entire net income is turned over to the institution itself.

"As a minimum, committee members expressed the belief that such business activities should pay all taxes that any private corporation would pay as direct expenses, irrespective as to whether or not it makes a profit. Some indicated that they would favor continuing the exemption of net income but this point of view was not unanimous."

Under these circumstances it would seem that the application of Internal Revenue Form 990 will be a necessity.

Sincerely,

H. M. DUDLEY.

REPORT ON FEDERAL TAXATION OF EARNINGS OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

I. PROPOSALS

Complaint of American Council of Commercial Laboratories, 225 Broadway, New York 7, N. Y. A. R. Ellis, of Pittsburgh Testing Laboratory, chairman of the tax committee, Washington activities carried on by Washington Liaison Service, 1507 M Street NW., H. M. Dudley, operator.

According to an article appearing in the New York Times and other leading newspapers on July 9, this organization on July 8 filed a complaint with Congress charging that 52 land-grant colleges and universities are engaged in business operations netting millions of dollars annually on which they pay no taxes. The complaint stated that in 1943–44 these institutions received more than $22,000,000 for sales and services on which they not only paid no taxes, but also did not have to disclose how they made the money.

This report also attacked educational institutions and foundations for doing research for private companies which would be required to report information and actual total income. * * * "We in the commercial testing research industry do not object to tax-exempt institutions conducting pure research * * * however, when they operate in the field of industrial research for the benefit of a few industries and keep the results of that research confidential to their industrial sponsors and when they operate in the field of testing materials, we deem that they should pay taxes on their fees in that field as well as the rest of us."

New York Times article: The article published in the New York Times and other papers was prepared by Robert S. Allen and distributed by the North American Newspaper Alliance. In addition to the report of the complaint of ACCL, the article stated that the Government has intensified an investigation of the business activities and profits of two tax-exempt organizations—the Aero-Dynamics Research Corp. of Washington and the Robinson Foundation of New York.

It also referred to business activities of the University of Pennsylvania, New York University, Union College, Duke University, and to the research programs of the University of Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation and the Mellon Institute for Industrial Research connected with the University of Pittsburgh. The article also referred to a study on tax-exempt organizations by the Russell Sage Foundation. (See par. 3.)

Report of Russell Sage Foundation: The report of the Russell Sage Foundation referred to in the New York Times article is briefed in the attached statement marked "B."

Statement by Ways and Means Committee: Under date of November 16, a release was made by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, reading as follows:

"Upon the conclusion of hearings on cooperatives, the Ways and Means Committee will take up foundations, religious, educational, and other tax-exempt organizations.

"We have had no requests for time in connection with such hearings, which leads us to wonder if those activites which operate businesses in competition with private enterprise feel that the profits of such activities should be taxed."

Filing of Form 990 with the Bureau of Internal Revenue: In its activities, ACCL, through Mr. Dudley, is urging that section 54 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code be amended to require that all educational institutions engaging in business amounting to sums of money in excess of $5,000 annually be required to fill out this form. Filling out this form, he asserts, would make available to the Treasury and the Ways and Means Committee detailed information as to the extent of business activities of colleges as a basis for determining whether changes in the law should be made. Recently he stated that "failure of the colleges to testify" in opposition to this request "should be taken by the committee as positive evidence that they do not oppose this change in the law." (The proposal to have this form returned by colleges and universities is not a new one. Several years ago it was made by the Treasury Department, but educational organizations (and others) were exempted from the provision.) However, private corporations not for profit, except religious, educational, charitable, fraternal, and fully owned public, are required to file this form.

II. STEPS TAKEN

Hearings before Ways and Means Committee: On December 11, as a result of the initial steps taken by President J. L. Morrill, University of Minnesota and of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, and Russell I. Thackrey, executive secretary of that association, the following persons testified before the House Ways and Means Committee: Dr. George F. Zook, president of the American Council on Education, leader of the group; Lloyd Morey, comptroller, University of Illinois, also representing the Central Association of College and University Business Officers, and jointly with Messrs. Peterson and Lunden, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities; R. B. Stewart, vice president and controller of Purdue University; A. W. Peterson, director of finance, University of Wisconsin; L. R. Lunden, comptroller, University of Minnesota.

Edward Blythin, financial vice president of Western University, filed a statement with the committee. H. W. Herzog, comptroller of George Washington University and president of the Eastern Association of College and University Business Officers, was present. The principal points presented to the committee are outlined below

Significance of tax exemption: Tax exemption is a basic principle to American education and has been written into the laws, and it is believed with the approval of the American people. Its continuance, both on the Federal and the State level, is basic to the maintenance of education. Publicly supported institutions in general are exempted from all kinds of taxation and in particular are exempt from taxation by other governments. Educational institutions and organizations of all kinds are exempt from most kinds of taxation.

The effect of increased taxation: Land-grant colleges were established through direct subsidies of the Federal Government to the States. The Federal Government continues to make annual grants to these institutions. Much service is being rendered by all colleges and universities to the Federal Government. To tax the earnings of such institutions would simply be to reduce the amount available for their operation from this source and thus require an increase in the amounts provided from tax revenues of the States, of the Federal Government, or the charges against students for tuition, or an increase in gifts from private sources, or to reduce the services of these institutions.

Another fundamental issue is that of "control" over the educational program of colleges and universities. Taxation of income of these institutions by the Federal Government inevitably would result in some measure of Federal control. There should not be any such external control where problems of fundamental research are involved.

Fair competition: The mere fact that some services essential in educational institutions may compete with similar activities carried out under private ownership and management would not in itself justify the taxing of income of such services. Federal, State, and local governments carry on services which compete with private interests. The important question is what is the public interest involved and for what is the income used.

Institutional business operations are carried out generally on the basis of "fair competition" with any local business operations of a similar kind privately owned. No institution engages in any business activity merely for the purpose of being in that business. It does so because of educational needs, or of the needs of income for educational purposes.

A broad research program is essential to make the instructional program complete. Adequate support for research is difficult to secure. Research projects are used for training future scientists and teachers.

Policies with respect to research contracts vary in different institutions. The policy followed at the University of Illinois, which was placed in the record, is as follows:

"When the university undertakes a scientific investigation or piece of research, whether of its own initiative or at the request of outside parties, the results of the investigation are the property of the university, to be given to the public for the advancement of knowledge. The university will not in any case make an agreement with an individual or corporation to give it permanently the exclusive benefits of the results of such investigation or research, even though the investigation or research be conducted with money contributed by said individual or corporation."

Institutions do not and never have made "profit" out of research. When all costs, direct and indirect, are included, even if any net income does appear from a given project, it will mean that general costs borne by the institution have not been allocated to the specific activities. Any such net income is used only for educational purposes and hence is not taxable.

Nature and use of income: The item of "Sales and services" referred to as received by land-grant colleges, as per Bulletin 16, 1946, United States Office of Education, includes income from "organized activities relating to instruction." Under this head are included experiment farms, dairies, medical-school hospitals and clinics, and university presses. The amount of land-grant colleges for the year ended June 30, 1944, is $21,790,232. None of these activities are self-supporting. Their income only partially covers operating costs. It rarely provides anything for cost of facilities or general overhead. There is never any real profit from such operations. The expenditures, as institutional accounts will show, always exceed the income.

Colleges and universities also operate auxiliary enterprises of a business character. Under this heading are included residence halls, dining halls, book stores, union buildings. These are all essential adjuncts to the educational program. Intercollegiate athletics frequently appears under this head. An effort is made to make such activities self-supporting. However, their incomes rarely cover more than operating costs or, at the most, replacement of equipment. Complete charges for depreciation, of general institutional overhead, or for entire replacement of building are practically never recovered. Buildings for such activities usually are supplied by public appropriation or gifts and do not have to be amortized. If any net income does arise it is used only for educational purposes.

Research projects are undertaken by educational institutions with financial aid from private concerns or from the Federal Government. The receipts from such projects vary from (a) a nominal subsidy for a program already established out of institutional funds to (b) complete payment for both direct and indirect costs. No case is known where any sum is included over and above actual costs. Far more frequently the amount realized is below actual costs if indirect, administrative, and physical operating costs are included. The cost determination for Federal research contracts has been proposed through a joint committee of institutional business officers, based on a standard formula. Research programs for defense purposes were carried out during the war on a similar basis. This problem should be handled in this manner rather than through the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

In some instances income relating to research programs is carried out through separately organized foundations. In a typical case, all the proceeds go to the institution to be used for educational purposes.

Many institutions with endowment funds have investments in business properties or business activities, including farms. Some of these have been received by direct gift or bequest. Others have been acquired by purchase. Institutions must seek investments with better return than can now be secured from investments in securities, due to the fact that the average return on investments has gone down materially in the last 20 years. All income derived from such sources is turned over to the institution and even if net profit on a business basis does arise, it is used solely for educational purposes and hence should not be taxed.

Educational institutions are not engaged in business in the ordinary sense of that term. They do not operate activities for the purpose of making a profit for distribution to individuals in the form of profits or dividends. All net income made is used solely for educational purposes.

Financial reports: The complaint of the ACCL referring to the receipts "for sales and services" of land-grant institutions, stated that these institutions "did not have to disclose how they made the money." The particular item referred to falls under the category of "sales and services of organized activities relating to instruction" which is one of the headings used in the standard reporting classification now followed by nearly all universities and colleges. One needs only to refer to these published reports to secure details of the items included under these headings. Among them are farms, dairies, airports, hospitals and clinics, concerts, athletics, publications. Similar detail can be secured concerning all other items in the summary standard classification upon which the report of the United State Office of Education is based. The charge that educational institutions do not disclose how they make their money is utterly without foundation. Few, if any, areas can be found in which the financial reporting is more complete. All public institutions and most private institutions publish their financial reports in much detail and also report to the United States Office of Education, while land-grant institutions also report to the United States Department of Agriculture.

Accounts and reports of educational institutions, however, are not maintained on a "profit and loss" basis. Costs of "general administration" and "physical plant operation and maintenance" for the entire institution with few exceptions are carried under these headings and not allocated to educational functions and activities. Also specific accounting ordinarily is not taken for depreciation on plant investment since the funds for such investment are usually provided by public appropriation or private gift and do not have to be amortized. These facts emphasize the policy of taking published summary reports of such institutions as a basis for the conclusion that they have business operations "netting millions of dollars annually."

One of the objectives in this agitation is to require all educational institutions "engaging in business amounting to sums of money in excess of $5,000 annually to fill out Internal Revenue Form 990." It is asserted that the filing of such forms would make available to the Treasury and to the committee detailed information as to the extent of business activities of the colleges as a basis for determining whether changes in the law should be made in the future and limitations of tax exemption written into the law.

Certainly educational institutions have no objection to full reporting of their financial operations. Generally speaking they now do so very completely. Form 990 is designed for concerns organized and operated for profit and privately owned. To require them to fill out a form of this kind would put a great amount of added burden upon them and unnecessarily duplicate reports already made to governmental agencies. Furthermore, because such institutions are not engaged in business in the usual concept of that term, because they do not operate activities for the purpose of making a profit, and because their net incomes, if any, from operations of a business character are not distributable to individuals in the form of profits or dividends but are used solely for educational purposes, they should not be subject to tax and should not be required to make a financial reporting to the Federal Bureau of Internal Revenue. If any individual situations do exist in which unfair advantage is taken of Government through tax avoidance when taxes in fact are legitimate, these situations should be dealt with individually. Educational institutions as a whole should not be penalized because of a few instances of this kind. The Government should not jump at conclusions based on assumptions that may be erroneous. All facts should be secured and considered before any general change of rule is adopted.

Letter of Dr. Guy E. Snavely: Under date of December 5, 1947, Dr. Guy E. Snavely transmitted to Chairman KNUTSON of the Ways and Means Committee a letter of protest against proposed changes in tax exemption on behalf of the Association of American Colleges, of which Dr. Snavely is executive director.

Testimony of New York University: On December 12, the hearing was continued at which time Mr. Gerde, counsel for New York University, reviewed in detail the operation of business enterprises being carried on for the benefit of New York University by the corporation set up by alumni of that institution. Questions concerning this situation had been raised the previous day by the committee. Mr. Gerde stressed the point that all the net income from these activities was turned over to New York University for its educational operations, and in his judgment should not be subject to Federal income tax.

Attitude of committee: Based on expressions made by members of the committee during the hearings, it appears unlikely that any effort will be made to tax the incomes from any business activity carried on by an educational institution as a part of its regular operations. The principal points at which the committee appeared critical are the following:

(a) Income of alumni corporations or foundations from patents which proved to be commercially profitable.

(b) Business activities of a strictly commercial character carried on by or on behalf of institutions, even though the entire net income is turned over to the institution itself. As a minimum, committee members expressed the belief that such business activities should pay all taxes that any private corporation would pay as direct expenses, irrespective as to whether or not it makes a profit. Some indicated that they would favor continuing the exemption of net income but this point of view was not unanimous.

(The foregoing report has been prepared by the undersigned on the basis of notes made during the hearings but without having access to the report of the hearings. It is believed to cover the principal points which were made and the principal issues at stake, although some points may have been overlooked.)

LLOYD MOREY.

DECEMBER 15, 1947.

A Coal Miner's Sacrifice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the finest tribute a man can receive is that which comes from a fellow worker. With my remarks I include in the RECORD such a tribute. It is a refreshing thing to pick up a community newspaper and find that a neighbor had the thoughtfulness to put into words his feelings for a man whose work he must have followed admiringly for so many years.

Many must have had the same thoughts of Sidney Sullins, but it is good that one among them thought to express his admiration publicly so that Sidney Sullins, and all the good men who go patiently about their daily tasks, may know that their greatness does not go unnoticed, even in this hard world.

Under leave to do so, I include the tribute to which I refer. It appeared first in the Trenton (Ill.) Sun, and later came to my notice in the Lebanon (Ill.) Advertiser. It follows:

A TRIBUTE TO A GREAT AND MONUMENTAL MAN

When sitting in your warm home during these wintry days, I wonder how many of you appreciate the work and sacrifice some miner had to make so that this would be possible for you and your family.

Sidney Sullins, at the age of 74, still working every day, started to work at the East mine in Trenton 55 years ago. Those who know Sid Sullins will say, "He is the hardest and best workingman I have seen," and so it is today. At his age he has the hardest job in the St. Ellen mine at O'Fallon. Leaving town at 5:45 in the morning and driving to the O'Fallon mine summer and winter is a big job in itself without the work. Not for old Sid. He always has a big smile.

Having worked in the mine 55 years, averaging about 200 days a year and producing 6 tons of coal per day, he has put on top of the ground 66,000 tons of coal. Of that total, he has used about 550 tons himself, leaving the remainder for use by others. When he comes home from the mine, he works in his garden in summer, and when the mine does not operate he goes to work on a farm. Just stop for a minute and think how much he has put into this world and how little he has consumed himself.

When I think of old Sid during the war pushing a wheelbarrow from place to place gathering waste paper after working hard all day in the mine, I think only of a great and monumental man, whose greatness is far above the little puppet who helps produce nothing and lives like a leech off the efforts of workingmen.

Joe Martin Is the Best Friend War Veterans in This Country Have Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include, in part, an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, Sunday, January 25, written by Tyrrell Krum, lieutenant commander, USNR, retired, veterans' editor of that newspaper:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(By Tyrrell Krum, lieutenant commander, USNR, retired)

Here's some of the best news I've been able to report to you for many a long day. * * *

I had a lengthy talk with Speaker of the House JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., in his chambers at the Capitol one day last week and gained from him the first official information to be given to the public on what the Republican leadership has in mind in the way of major veterans' legislation for the remainder of the Eightieth Congress.

In the first place, the Speaker said that he is strongly in favor of the House concurring at the earliest possible moment in two Senate-passed legislative measures:

1. The now famous Kearney bill (H. R. 246) which would remove the ceilings placed on combined subsistence and earnings by veterans engaged in training on the job under the terms of the GI bill of rights.

2. Veterans' subsistence increase bill (H. R. 4212) which calls for an upping of the amount of Government aid paid to all veterans pursuing full-time institutional training in schools, colleges, and universities under the GI bill of rights.

Speaker MARTIN said that the third point in the three-pronged program of veterans' legislation which he hoped would make the grade before much more water has passed over the dam would be a suitable and workable veterans' housing bill.

The two items dealing with job-training and college subsistence were both passed by the Senate during the last days of the 1947 session just as the Congress was packing its bags to go home for the summer. Although they originated in the House, the Senate enacted them in House form in the hope they would be concurred in by general consent in the last-minute rush of business.

The original Kearney bill was reported unanimously by the House veterans' committee early in the session and it was hoped that action would be taken immediately thereafter to end the confusion and despair that had descended on hundreds of thousands of World War II veterans who had seen most of their earnings guaranteed them by the GI bill of rights snapped away by the Democratic-controlled Seventy-ninth Congress.

However, the Kearney bill, along with the increase-in-subsistence measure, was jammed into a legislative pigeonhole in the House Rules Committee by a bloc of antiveteran Democrats led by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia. There it remains to this moment.

The measure would remove the old $200 ceilings on the combined wages and subsistence which job-trainees may receive monthly and place them at new high levels as follows: $250 monthly for a veteran without a dependent; $325 for a veteran with one dependent, and $350 for a veteran with two or more dependents.

The subsistence increases for veterans going to school and colleges would go up from $65 to $75 for a man without any dependent; from $90 to $105 if he has one dependent, and from $90 to $120 if he has more than one dependent. This, too, is still in the Rules Committee.

The income restrictions placed on the widows of World War I veterans should be substantially relaxed to make up for the inflated cost of living.

Veterans' pensions should also be raised in accord with the increased cost of living. These and other bills probably will have a chance this year.

We want to congratulate our old friend, JOE MARTIN, on the strong position he has taken on veterans' legislation. And we repeat what we've written before: For our money JOE MARTIN is the best friend war veterans in this country have today.

The Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of William C. Doherty, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, at joint installation of officers, Branch 148, Akron, and Branch 1629, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, Saturday, January 17, 1948, Carovillese Hall, Akron, Ohio, broadcast over radio station WADC:

ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, this broadcast on postal service, policy, and wages comes to you from the letter carriers of Akron and Cuyahoga Falls and their auxiliaries where their officers have just been installed. Mr. Howard M. Nicol, of Cuyahoga Falls, president of the board of directors of the Sick Benefit Association of the National Association of Letter Carriers is now introducing the principal speaker of the evening. Mr. Nicol.

Mr. NICOL. I now give you Brother William C. Doherty, of Washington, D. C., president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, a native of Cincinnati, Ohio, a former letter carrier, and a member of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, Brother Doherty.

Mr. DOHERTY. Mr. Chairman, postmasters, brother letter carriers, other postal workers, and friends of the radio audience, I would like to entitle my address here this evening, "Service Foremost." Since the inception of the National Association of Letter Carriers in 1889, the organization and its membership have established an unblemished record of sustained loyalty to the Government of the United States. Seventy-nine thousand members of this association stand shoulder to shoulder with millions of like-minded American citizens in condemning communism, and all other forms of subversive activities.

We hereby reaffirm our faith in our democratic form of government, and reiterate our pledge of continuing in unswerving loyalty.

It is common practice on the part of many to consider the Post Office Department as a business. In measuring the success or failure of postal operations, observers are prone to gage success by the presence or absence of the so-called deficit. Unfortunately, such thinking completely obscures many vital facts.

The postal system is basically and fundamentally a service. In early colonial days several attempts were made to operate a postal system for the purpose of personal profit. All such attempts failed. The young American Nation determined from those colonial failures that a postal system to be successful must be operated by the Government, with service as the one and paramount objective.

The Post Office Department is operated to give good mail service to the American people. Mail service and facilities are provided in every nook and corner of the United States. Such operations are established regardless of any consideration of profit. In fact, there are approximately 42,000 post offices, 20,000 of which conduct their operations at a loss. Do our competitive business organizations maintain comparable service? Of course not. Express companies, telegraph companies, and other public service companies and services maintain offices and service only where such operations produce a profit.

Third Assistant Postmaster General Joseph J. Lawler recently stated: "It has long been the policy of Congress to extend special below-cost rates to certain classes of mail and to provide facilities and service for the benefit of the general public regardless of the fact that charges for such services and facilities do not cover the cost of their maintenance."

The only universal service in America today is the postal service. Millions of people do not have electricity; millions live without running water; millions live without telegraph and telephone service or facilities; millions do not have ready access to public transportation. But every American citizen is provided with mail service. It is the one and universal service in the United States.

Those in charge of postal operations have the responsibility of requesting sufficient funds to operate the Post Office Department properly. Congress has the solemn obligation of providing adequate funds to furnish good service. Unfortunately, under our present system, the officials of the Post Office Department are required to estimate how much money will be needed almost 2 years prior to the period when the funds will be available. This estimate then goes to the Director of the Budget, and finally emerges in the President's budget message. Exalted economic prophets have proven dismal failures in anticipating economic trends. Under the circumstances it is rather absurd of us to expect the administration to be omnipotent forecasters.

If the needs of the service are greater than anticipated, the public, in all likelihood, will receive inferior mail service. In the matter of planning expenditures, the Post Office Department is in a somewhat different position than other departments of Government. Other departments can plan their activities and gage their expenditures accordingly. The Post Office Department cannot do this. It has no control over the volume of mail. It must deliver all mail. It has no control over the area of delivery—if people move, the mail must move with them. Poor guessing and inadequate appropriations can result in only one thing, and that is inferior postal service. Congress should recognize these facts and, when necessary, vote adequate supplemental appropriations to maintain a first-class postal service.

There is an erroneous impression in Congress and among the public that the Post Office Department consistently operates at a loss. It can be readily demonstrated by available evidence that the Post Office Department over a period of years has actually operated at a profit. Misinformation to the contrary should be speedily dispelled.

Unfortunately, since 1940 the Post Office Department has not reflected the credits authorized by the Kelley Act of 1930 and has never considered these credits in any cost-ascertainment reports. The items included under the Kelley Act contain the expenditures of Government departments for mail carried free of charge. The Post Office Department should be credited with payment for this mail either by a transfer of cash or credits from the departments involved, and that this expense should be allocated to the various departments of Government who use the postal service as a part of their operation.

It is true that with the credit allowance provided by the Kelley Act, there are individual years, such as 1946, when losses were shown. It is also a fact that when all the years 1930 to 1946, inclusive, are examined, and the Kelley Act credits are included, that the Post Office Department shows a cumulative profit of $304,247,315. During the war period, the expense of handling the mail for the armed forces was also absorbed by the Post Office Department. The Post Office estimate of the revenues they would have received for this service at regular postage rates is $168,000,000 for the fiscal years 1942, 1943, and 1944. No estimates have been made for 1945 and 1946.

We should at this point pause again to point out that every single function of the Post Office Department has been instituted by Congress with the sole motivation of providing service to the American people. Profit has never been a consideration. Perhaps it is because the operations of the Post Office Department have been so successful that the fundamental purposes of the Post Office System tends to be lost in a maze of accounting. It is true that in the past there have been years when the Postmaster General's reports have shown deficits and years when they have shown profits, but the figures for the 17 years just quoted do not support the contention that the Post Office operates at a loss, and we believe that in fairness to the Post Office, to its employees and to its patrons, accounting and cost keeping should be handled in a manner that will give a true picture of expense and income. To do this properly, the credits allowable under the Kelley Act would have to be extended to include many additional items.

If we project the trends of the postal revenue and expense from 1930 to 1947 until 1957, we find revenues increasing substantially faster than expenses, this indicating that consistent increases in volume of business are more important as a means of absorbing expense increases than would be the increasing of rates, which would certainly tend to divert volume to other methods of delivery.

One hundred and seventy years of operation have definitely demonstrated two vital factors in successful postal operation: (1) Greater volume promotes lower unit cost and more economical operation; (2) the reduction of the number of times a piece of mail is handled reduces the cost of operation. The best and most inexpensive way to handle mail is to deliver it immediately. Delayed appropriations and curtailed service are more costly in the final analysis. Adequate appropriations and good service promote efficiency in operation.

In this analysis I have made no attempt to estimate the cost to the American people in poor mail service. The cost of delayed mail to businessmen and individuals is enormous. The American people are entitled to and should demand good mail service. I have not attempted in this study to show all of the operations that are conducted by the Post Office Department on a free or less than cost basis. Before concluding, however, I want to briefly point out the major role that the postal service has played and is continuing to play in the development of the American Nation. The Post Office Department developed our system of roads through construction of post roads. Through preferential payments to railroads the postal service has kept many branch lines in operation. The Post Office subsidized the development of the merchant marine and the air industry. Yes, indeed, it was communication in the garb of the Post Office that took transportation by the hand and conducted it to its present advanced state of development. It was the twins of progress, communication and transportation, that sped our country on to great expansion. What is the purpose of this policy, profit or service? Service and service alone must be the paramount purpose.

One reads in Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations that every man is rich or poor according to the degree in which he can afford to enjoy the necessaries, conveniences, and amusements of human life. Perhaps another way of saying it is that man cannot be expected to give the best service when their minds are on the vital problem of how to live decently. No one will say that living decently is synonomous with living extravagantly; it does not mean living a plush or chrome plated existence. Rather the connotation of the phrase "living decently" would imply living in the accepted American way of life. That simply means providing for one's family in matters of health, welfare, and amusement according to the American standard of living.

I recently returned to Washington, D. C., from a trip which took me across the country to the west coast. The trip provided ample first-hand opportunity to get out among the grass roots of the membership of our organization. I can say from personal observation reinforced by numerous conversations everywhere along the route of my travel, that letter carriers perforce are daily concerned with the vital problem of living decently on their present postal wage. The present high cost of living has brought home to letter carriers the economic facts of life more than anything else within recent years. To even the naive those facts of economic life are not encouraging. They have given letter carriers much concern, and will continue to be a vexing problem until relief is obtained in some measure. This concern has manifested itself in various ways. For one thing, it is readily discernible that a marked lack of interest in their jobs exists among recently appointed postal workers. Any fair-minded person even remotely acquainted with the postal service will admit that a lack of interest in their work is something new among postal employees. It is a condition little to be desired by employer and employee alike. For if there is any one thing in their association with the postal service about which postal employees have been most proud, it has been a pride in their work, and devotion to duty. Call it esprit de corps or what you will, nevertheless it has always been prevalent among postal workers at every level. Indeed, well might it be said that a common spirit of loyalty to their work is the very thing that has rightfully made the United States Postal Service the greatest institution of its kind. It is to be earnestly hoped that in the immediate future the same prideful feeling can be recaptured.

While we express our sincere desire for the return of pristine glory of the postal service, nevertheless, the economic equation being what it is, letter carriers must look for concrete evidence of reciprocity in the matter of faithfulness to duty and pride in their work. The simple truth of the matter is that no country can underpay its employees and expect them to remain proud of their jobs. Private industry long ago learned the wisdom of providing their employees with incentives for remaining on the job. On the other hand, Government has always lagged in setting up equitable wage standards, and attractive conditions of work. Neither Government nor private industry should be so foolish as to believe they can attract and hold high type of employees without proper regard for the economic welfare of those employees.

As mentioned earlier, the greatest concern of letter carriers at the moment seems to be the eternal struggle to strike a balance between present postal wages and costs of living, especially the present cost of food. While it is true in some quarters that prices of certain few manufactured items have shown signs of stabilizing, prices of food have continued to soar upward. It is hardly necessary to point out that food constitutes almost half the worker's budget. As food prices go, so goes the family budget. It is estimated that today letter carriers are paying approximately 43.4 percent more for food than in December 1945. While no statistics are readily available to answer the thought we have in mind, it would be interesting to learn if consumers are eating as well as they did 2 years ago. Also, are they eating more or less? On the basis of my conversations, with letter carriers on my recent trip it appears there is a general agreement that the average household has not as yet been forced to eat considerably less or reduce drastically the content of their diet beyond what is accepted as the norm for an adequate diet. With reference to the alarming increase in food prices, nothing we could show by way of statistical data could be half as eloquent as a housewife's attempt to shop on a letter carrier's salary. Any slight change in diet or any attempt to provide variety necessarily alters her budget. Again it should be noted that food prices have advanced an estimated 43.4 percent during the last 2 years.

The over-all rise in the cost of living jumps to 26.9 percent, computed from January 1, 1946—the effective date of the wage increase granted letter carriers under the provisions of Public Law 386.

All these figures add up to one conclusion; letter carriers have reached the saturation point in their attempt to cope with the present day economic problem, particularly when the only instrument granted Government workers—real dollar value—has been reduced by approximately one-half. Workers in the fixed salary bracket have never been able to get too far ahead of the economic parade, and when the purchasing power of those fixed salaries is slashed in half the struggle goes beyond the desperate stage, the outcome is inevitable. Economic chaos stalks in and takes over. Unless the purchasing power of the letter carrier's dollar is restored to some semblance of the wage value, the struggle to enjoy the necessaries, conveniences, and amusements of human life is a great deal like the old bromide about sending a boy out to do a man's job. It simply cannot be done, and the chances are that the boy will be worse off joining the battle than if he stayed at home. Everybody in and out of the Government has their own idea about the cause of the present high cost of food and living in general. Labor blames industry, business places the onus on labor, the two major political parties blame it on each other. Nobody denies its presence. It is big. It is real. It presents a serious menace to our economy. Labor's Monthly Survey, published by the American Federation of Labor for September–October 1947, attributes the upward sweep in cost chiefly to (1) the worldwide food shortage and a 25 percent loss in the United States corn crop (from bad weather); (2) the hike of prices in manufactured products for wholesale distribution, which have been carried over into prices workers pay. There are other possible factors entering into the picture, although they would seem to be incidental to the two main reasons advanced by the A. F. of L. survey.

The position of this association remains unchanged in its desire for a strong, permanent economy. We realize that although we are not actively engaged in outside industry there must be full production and full employment in industry. If it were left up to letter carriers to decide, we believe the majority of them would much prefer the return of a 100-cent purchasable dollar in place of the present 47-cent dollar. They would prefer a reduction in the cost of living to a further inflated dollar increase only. Perhaps it is an oversimplification of a problem that is actually much more complicated, but either Congress and/or big business will have to reduce prices, or Congress will have to increase wages of letter carriers. There must be some equalization in the present wide ratio between salaries and purchasing power. We not only believe letter carriers have a justifiable claim for an upward adjustment of their present salaries, but we expect the Congress to do something about it.

Let me tell you frankly, the letter carriers of this Nation have done something about this vexing economic struggle they are having today, also the more serious situation facing their retired brothers who are compelled to live on a mere pittance of an annuity granted them in 1935. An annuity which they helped buy with their own money, and which has long since proven wholly inadequate for these loyal men who gave the best days of their lives to the service of their Government and who today are expected to hold body and soul together on the meager sum which, in many instances,

runs below the maximum of $23 per week. On this amount, they must yet pay Federal income taxes.

The national conference held in Washington on Monday and Tuesday of this week was highly successful. At the top of many other good bills which have for their aim the improvement of working conditions and the welfare of active and retired letter carriers they placed two bills—liberalization of the Civil Service Retirement Act; and an increase in salary for active letter carriers to offset the rising cost of living. 700 letter carriers from 45 States responded to the call of your national president to meet and counsel with your resident national officers on plans to alleviate the plight of both active and retired letter carriers.

In the matter of the extremely important subject of retirement liberalization, the Stevenson bill, H. R. 4127, frozen in the last session of Congress, has some very desirable features in its present form. It provides an outright increase of 25 percent or $360, whichever is lesser, for all those now on the retirement rolls. Further, it sets up a new formula for determining annuities. Carriers retiring in the future with an average 5-year high of $3,000, and 30 years of service, upon reaching age 60 may retire with an annuity of approximately $1,040 per annum. It provides a mother's prayer of many years in the form of a widow's annuity equal to 50 percent of the deceased husband's earned annuity. There is one other great feature which was cut out of this bill in last-minute desperation to pass it the last session of Congress, and which our senior Senator from Ohio has already committed himself as being in favor of restoring, and that is the minor dependent's provisions. Originally, it provided for 25 percent of the employees' earned annuity to each minor until the minor reached the age of 18. It also provides for increasing the employee's contribution to the retirement fund from 5 percent to 6 percent of his annual salary. We, as well as other interested employee groups, are pressing for immediate enactment. I predict this or comparable legislation will be passed by Congress within the next few weeks.

On the subject of salary increase, my friends, I dare not be so optimistic. There are numerous bills representing a variety of opinions. To be exact, there have been 46 salary-increase bills introduced in Congress in behalf of Federal employees, 27 of which affect the postal workers. Among this lot is a measure granting an increase of $800 per annum for regular and 40 cents per hour for substitute letter carriers. We know, however, from past experience, it is an easy matter to have a bill introduced but an entirely different matter to get it passed.

The conference representatives, coming as they did from all sectors of this great Nation of ours, and representing a truly cross-section of opinion as regards the increased cost of living, and the salary figure necessary to meet it determined upon two important points: (1) To be realistic in gaging cost increases, and (2) to be honest with ourselves and the Government.

The conferees brought with them extended studies on the major items entering into the cost of living; and the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows the cost of living had risen 26.9 percent from January 1, 1946 to September 1, 1947. Using the Bureau's recognized monthly increase of two points and computing it from September 1, 1947 to January 1, 1948 and adding it to the September figure we receive 27 percent as our total. Thus an $800 per year permanent increase in salary and 40 cents per hour for hourly employees is entirely in line with such figures. The Conference voted unanimously to support such a bill; it also voted to inaugurate a Nation-wide campaign for a voluntary contribution of $1 from every member of our great association to implement this legislative campaign. You can rest assured, my friends, that a sustained drive of our membership has on this day been launched.

It is encouraging to learn that experience of past legislative campaigns has left a good mark on our membership. We step out of one campaign right into another. It might be well they are so timed, and that we have the will, the stamina, and spirit to marshal all our forces of energies for the privilege of securing a living wage. I have pointed out the conspicuousness of reciprocity by its absence. I reiterate: Why should postal workers be compelled to spend themselves entreating our employer, the Government, to recognize economic changes as they occur and meet these new situations? After all, Congress should not have to be told that the present unprecedented high cost of living affects letter carriers the same as other American citizens. As in the past we take our case to the American people tonight for relief. Let us put forth our best efforts behind an all-out drive that will bring swift results. As in the past, too, we encourage the fine cooperation our ladies' auxiliary has given us in the past.

I believe the ladies realize what is before us this time and that we will need their assistance more than ever. I am confident of the valuable aid we will receive from our Ohio ladies, also that the letter carriers of Ohio will uphold their high mark of interest and productivity in our forthcoming campaign. In closing let me leave these thoughts with you:

It is a fact postal employees pay all taxes the same as any other citizen. It is a fact letter carriers have to buy their own uniforms. It is a fact we can retire upon reaching age 60 on an annuity that is grossly insufficient today, but bought with our own contributions to the retirement fund. It is a fact that we have security, of a kind, but actually we have less security than the average craftsman because we spend 11 years to learn the post-office job. We learn a job that gives us no valuable training that we can use elsewhere if we decided to change jobs. Therefore, if we fell out with Uncle Sam or just didn't like the work and wanted to change after 11 to 15 years, we would have to start all over again and learn a new trade or craft; whereas any craftsman can change jobs overnight and take his skill with him to advantage. By this process we surrender a certain amount of economic independence. These are the answers you must be prepared to give to those who are misinformed, who misjudge, or who are indifferent to the welfare of others. I know you know the job that is ahead of you, and if we use our best efforts to sell our case to the people that Congress will really love us this year.

Russian Aims Always Same

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, January 25, 1948, by Lester Allen, entitled "Russian Aims Always Same":

RUSSIAN AIMS ALWAYS SAME—AMBITION OF SOVIETS TO EXPAND BY GRABBING TERRITORY IS SAME AS GREEDY POLICY OF CZARS

(By Lester Allen)

For the citizen sweating out a living, and pondering the somewhat baffling developments of Uncle Sam's quarrel with the Soviet Union, the jargon of diplomacy and high international political blathering is no help at all.

The American mind, rather sharper than most at perceiving a phony, has not digested the somewhat sinuous turns of American-Soviet relationships. One day the Soviet Union is a barbarous land. A few months hence it is courageous. And then it is in the dog house again.

Now, after 30 years of confused thinking, the United States has adopted a firm, clear foreign policy aimed at hemming in the Soviet Union—the experts call it "containing the Soviet Union"—and putting a stop once and for all to the seesawing. Whether this means war with the Soviet Union the individual can decide on a few basic facts.

CONDITIONS EXIST

Bowing out from the job as operating head of the Navy, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz said: "For any future war to be of sufficient magnitude to affect us seriously it must be compounded of two primary ingredients: Vast manpower and tremendous industrial capacity. These conditions exist today in the great land mass of Central Asia, in East Asia, and in western Europe.

"The two latter areas—east Asia and western Europe—will not be in a position to endanger us for decades to come unless they pass under unified totalitarian control. In the event of war with any of the three we would be relatively deficient in manpower. We should, therefore, direct our thinking toward realistic and highly specialized operations. We should plan to inflict unaccountable damage through maximum use of our technological weapons and our ability to produce them in quantity."

DOUBLE TALK

That's a sample of the kind of guarded double talk the average man is expected to understand at a glance. What Admiral Nimitz means is that only if the Soviet Union grabs western Europe and its industry can we get into a knock-down and drag-out fight with the Soviet Union, and that if they succeed in grabbing western Europe we will have to hit the Reds with atom bombs before they hit us with some.

There are no ifs, ands, or buts about it. The Soviet Union has an avid desire to conquer the world for no other reason than that the greedy dictatorship wants more power. For a long time the earnest liberals who apologized for the seedy look and the sturdy beggar gall of Stalin and his henchmen believed that there was a sincere effort to better the lot of common men and establish a communal way of life for the proletariat. That last is a fancy word that means the wage earners or the laboring classes.

ABSOLUTE MONARCHY

Czarist Russia was an absolute monarchy with an exclusive noble class, and a vast mass of laboring people, farmers, artisans, and laborers. The former exploited the latter for every breath in their bodies and every twitch of their nerves. It was a rotten, pulsating mess and there wasn't the slightest excuse for it.

This Czarist Russia maintained vast armies of forced laborers in Siberia, kept huge standing armies of conscripts massed on the western and southwestern borders of Russia, and had all of Europe in a stew from the Congress of Vienna which ended the era of Napoleon down to 1917 when a couple of revolutionaries with one clean shirt between them were moved into Russia by Germany as a sort of time bomb to blow up what remained of Russian resistance in the First World War.

Lenin and Trotsky accomplished their mission for the Germans, and, to their amazement, wound up in the seats of the mighty. Pre-World War I Russia had been whittled back by the time Lenin and Trotsky had made themselves secure, losing Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, and Bessarabia in the process.

This was a very fortunate thing for the British, who had made a bargain with Czarist Russia to give the Russian northern Persia, the Straits of the Dardanelles and Constantinople, as well.

SAME OLD SYSTEM

By the time Lenin died and Stalin had eased Trotsky out into the cold, the Soviet Union was back in its same old condition—a few favored men at the top and the rest groaning under the same old Czarist system, only under another name. There were the same Siberian forced-labor camps, the same secret police, the same old objective—power.

Russia of the czars wanted mastery of the Balkans and control of the Dardanelles, also a generous chunk of Manchuria and China. The Soviet Union wants the same thing. And the Soviet Union finally got most of it without fighting a lick. When Stalin made the pact with Hitler he grabbed Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and most of pre-World War I Polish Russia. He also invaded Finland and got what he wanted of that. The Germans said help yourself and Stalin did.

At the time there was a lot of guff written in the United States about the Soviet Union being an old meany to make a pact with Hitler and about brave little Finland, but the instant the Germans poured over the Russian frontier that tune soon changed. No one mentioned at that time that Russia was still acting like the old Czarist Russia and that because of his oppressions Stalin was every bit as frightened of being assassinated as was Czar Nicholas because of his oppressions.

REGAIN AREAS

When World War II came to an end Russia moved right back into the very areas which old Czarist Russia had always wanted and for the very same reasons. The reasons were that no one stood guard on those areas with a big stuffed club to whack the bear on the nose.

In short, Russia has never taken on any nation as big as itself on equal terms and emerged victorious. The Japanese kicked the stuffing out of them in the Russo-Japanese war. Even the Turks of the Ottoman Empire larruped them to a frazzle. Russia only moves in under the guise of friendship, or when weakness was so manifest that it was like taking candy away from a baby.

The acquisition of territory by the Soviet Union came from precisely the same reasons and in the same way that Czarist Russia acquired territory. They were not due to Russian courage or Russian martial skill, but merely because there was weakness or sloppy sentimentality. The Germans must be given credit for being very hard-headed about the Russians. Hence German amazement when the rolling power of American arms didn't sweep right on through Germany and hit the bear a swat on the nose. The Germans cannot understand it.

In Washington today the men who make the foreign policy are reading their Russian history, and they know precisely where the Russians intend to go. If they are given the chance. They are going to grab all of China if they can, and they are going to get western Europe's industries to produce arms and war materials to beef up their strength.

WANT TO FIGHT

If we have any illusions about the German viewpoint we may as well discard them. The Germans would dearly love to be armed to the teeth and sent at someone's throat. If the Russians do it, the Germans will turn on France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, and Portugal. If we arm them, the Germans will fling themselves on Russia.

The whole history of Russia has been an endless cycle of territorial acquisition, despotism, and chaos, as if the Russian people were forever fated to let their blood at the whims of ironic and mirthless men whose sole passion was power.

Without the industry of western Europe, Russia can't make war against us now. Ten years hence it is possible. If the Soviet Union is not stopped in its expansion, the living standards of the Western World will be depressed to Russian serf levels.

For the average man in the United States that means that the arduous road to Utopia that Americans have been hewing out of solid granite for almost 500 years will come to a dead end.

Czarist Russia loathed and detested the middle class. By Czarist Russia is meant those at the top who issued the decrees. The Soviet Union has the same loathing for the middle class, and, for precisely the same reason. Space does not warrant tracing that Russian loathing for the middle class, the stabilizing influence of western economies, back to the French revolution, which horrified and dismayed the Russian ruling class.

It has been discovered that the generalization that there is no counter-revolution existent in Russia and no possibility of a counter-revolution because of the activity of the secret police is much too inclusive. The bumbling of Soviet efforts to build mass production industries is not ineptitude, it has been found, but a mournful kind of sabotage, a put-on kind of stupidity, undertaken out of no organized counter-revolutionary effort, but as a sort of dolorous duty the average Russian feels toward his soul.

EBB IN RED TIDE

It is also known in Washington now that the disintegration of Communist influence among writers and thinkers in the United States is viewed by the Soviet Union as a first symptom of an ebb tide of Communist influence in the world. The fellow-travelers who spoke so well of the Soviet Union are recanting publicly and in print. The same men who in the 1920's published passionate novels and tracts urging the rise of the new masses today are throwing brickbats.

Some of the leaders of the Politburo have an obsession that the Communist leaders in western European countries may be drawn into the fold of the socialism practiced in Great Britain, and that the counter revolution will derive its strength from British sources. This may be due to the fact that the British have always understood the soiled Russian motives more perfectly than the Russian themselves.

POLITBURO UNEASY

This probably accounts for the frequent summonses sent out to the Communist Party leaders in France, Italy, and other western European countries to come to Moscow for another shot in the arm of ideology. The defection of hundreds of thousands of French trade unionists from the French Communist front was another symptom that made the Politburo uneasy.

But for the average American citizen, striving to understand what all the cold war is about, there is the assurance that if the Soviet Union is contained the day of the counter revolution in Russia is not too far distant— and the Muscovite is still the same Muscovite that he was under the Czars.

Meat Rationing Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, numerous letters are being received every day in opposition to any proposed meat-rationing plan. An editorial in the St. Louis Daily Livestock Reporter of January 7 sums up the situation, and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to quote it for the information of all who read the RECORD and are interested in this all-important subject:

[From St. Louis Daily Livestock Reporter of January 7, 1948]

The stage is being set for meat rationing. The Secretary of Agriculture has joined the ranks of those implanting the idea. Everybody who reads has taken note of talk headed in that direction, and more will be forthcoming, intended to prepare the public mind for acceptance of the idea and forestall objections. The Secretary implies that he doesn't want it, but that it may be forced by public demand—and is putting in his two cents' worth to build up that demand. Half a dozen Members of the Senate are going along, a couple of them actively promoting the idea. The excuse is an expected serious meat shortage before this year is out; in fact, before it is half out.

This is a proposition that ought to be nipped in the bud before it comes into full bloom. That could be accomplished by an outpouring of opposition on the part of stockmen and others who are convinced that rationing would not accomplish anything constructive, but on the contrary would only make a bad situation—if bad situation it proves to be worse. Rationing would neither increase the supply of meat nor promote its equitable distribution. The fact is, of course, that in both respects its effects would be just the opposite. The record shows that wherever it has been undertaken, in this or other lands, its effect has been to reduce production. And as for distribution, it has invariably taken meat away from the workers and given it to the big spenders, in the same process making a few black-market operators.

Why don't intelligent people see that? They do. But meat is a prime necessity in the American diet. Practically all the people want some of it every day. Thus it lends itself to political exploitation as does no other one thing. The politician seeks to get credit for trying to do something about meat; and he finds ready support from the Government marketing experts, who, as bureaucrats, are hungry for the power that meat rationing would put into their hands. That is the explanation, and a very simple one it is; but at the same time it gives rise to a movement that isn't going to be easy to check. For in theory rationing promises much for the harassed housewife who finds it difficult to make the dollar reach these days.

and meat is one thing she just has to provide. So she is disposed to take at face value the claimed advantages for rationing, coupled, perhaps, with price fixing. In other words, she is easily duped, and don't think the politicians overlook that.

Members of Congress should be flooded these days with protests from stockmen. It won't happen. People who go to the effort of anticipating difficulties. They holler only after they are hurt, and then it is usually too late. So the campaign to pave the way for acceptance of meat rationing will go on apace, and the rationers will almost certainly have their way, if the meat shortage comes up to expectations.

Misleading Language Misinforms the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, for quite some time I have been concerned about the loose and careless usage of words, phrases, and terminology in such a manner as to convey a meaning other than that which is substantiated by the facts. Whether such usage is accidental or deliberate makes little difference insofar as the results are concerned, namely, the creation among readers and listeners of a false impression and improper understanding of the matter under discussion.

Only a few days ago there was brought to my attention an important example of the use of inaccurate terminology which, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to your attention and to that of the Members.

Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, submitted not so long ago a report setting forth this country's capacity to produce sufficient goods to aid Europe and also to satisfy domestic needs. In that report, Dr. Nourse referred to "the tremendous increase in American productive capacity during and since the war."

As the result of an inquiry from Mr. A. W. Rucker, president of the tool owners union, which has its headquarters in Lexington, Mass., Dr. Nourse now has admitted that he made a major mistake in the report of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Replying on November 7, 1947, to a letter from Mr. Rucker, Dr. Nourse stated:

> The phrase which you underscore was a somewhat unfortunate one in the particular context, and it would have been much better if the word "production" had been used instead of "productive capacity."
>
> Referring to your more specific question of whether the council has any measures of percentage increase in American productive capacity, the answer is that we do not have, and we do not think that it would be feasible to construct such an index.

Although this admission by Dr. Nourse was published in a syndicated column by Mr. Ray Tucker which appeared in approximately 200 newspapers having a total circulation of about 10,000,000, I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that such publication can be considered as correcting or offsetting the false impression gained previously by so many readers of the reported findings of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

In view of the fact that the President's Economic Advisers, who presumably are well trained in semantics and the importance of accurate terminology, have made at least one serious error of this nature, some of the Chief Executive's own statements in his state of the Union message become more understandable.

One particular example is the President's statement that "Wholesale prices had increased 40 percent, and retail prices had increased 23 percent" between June 1946 and October 1947. These figures he immediately compared with the rise in prices between October 1947 and January 1948. The latter increase, the President said, was "at an annual rate of 18 percent" for wholesale prices and "at an annual rate of 10 percent" for retail prices.

It may be seen at once that the President was using, for the purpose of causing readers and listeners to make quick comparisons, percentage figures which are not comparable. The natural thing for the average thoughtful reader or listener to do was to add the President's second set of percentage figures on price increases to the first set. Doing so would cause him to believe that between June 1946 and January 1948, the price increases had been 58 percent on the wholesale level and 33 percent on the retail level. Such, however, is not the case as a close analysis of the language used by the President will itself show. Based on the administration's own figures, the actual increases were not 58 percent and 33 percent respectively, but 44.5 percent and 25.5 percent—and in these figures there certainly is a vast difference.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it can be seen that the President, by the simple expedient of placing actual percentages of price increase in juxtaposition with percentages of annual rate of price increase, has evidently intended to create acceptance of false and misleading conclusions. These are merely examples of many instances in which figures are used to create among our people a false assumption, thus increasing the difficulty with which the majority party is faced in having the people accept and understand the true state of affairs with which this Nation is confronted.

Views of a Citizen Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter recently received from a veteran of 17 months in the European theater of operations, with respect to the need for increasing the amount of assistance to veterans. This letter so aptly states the veterans' case that I am sure all Members of Congress will profit by reading it. It follows:

JANUARY 19, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE MACKINNON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am a student at the University of Minnesota. I am married and have a little girl 11 months old today. I served in the Army of the United States for 3 years; 17 months in the European theater of operations, in the Rhineland and central European campaigns, with the Seventieth Infantry Division. That is merely by way of background and not as staking out a special claim. I would, however, like to call your attention to a story on page 1 of this morning's Minneapolis Tribune, wherein it was reported that married veterans are spending an average of $176 a month, which is $86 over the subsistence allowance. It is clear that $90 is no longer the subsistence allowance it was intended to be, and all any veteran feels he is entitled to. I also feel that the educational program of the Veterans' Administration is not merely a benefit to the individual veteran. It is that, but it is also a sound investment for the entire community. The return will be a sound citizenry trained in the skills and sciences we are today so sorely lacking if we are to be capable of leading a distraught world. I hope among the score of demands on your time you will be able to consider these views, and do what you can to secure passage of a bill raising the subsistence allowance.

Respectfully,

MORTON NEWMAN.

Why I Fought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from a letter written by Mr. T. W. Small, of Beaumont, Calif. It gives his reasons for fighting in both World War I and World War II. It expresses simply, but eloquently, the feelings of many soldiers, as well as many civilians, toward our Government:

> Many years ago as a young man I came to realize that I was a part of the finest government world history had ever known—a republic—in which the difference of opinion of the citizenry resulted in a type of political action, through legislation enacted by duly elected representatives of the people, giving each citizen a proportional power in determining what our governmental policies should be. What more could any freeman ask. I knew then, as I do now, that so long as my country was governed by legislation, enacted by the men and women elected to Congress by the action of voters with differing opinions, my country was worth fighting for and living for.
>
> To you, and to your worthy associates in the House and Senate, my very best wishes for I know all of you will be in there doing your level best to avoid the pitfalls of a pseudo democracy, thereby assuring every American government as our founding fathers decreed: government by representation, a republican form of government.

Address of Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, at Memorial Dinner, Greater Lawrence St. John's Preparatory School Alumni Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address which I delivered at the memorial dinner of Greater Lawrence St. John's Preparatory School Alumni Association, held in St. Mary's Auditorium, Sunday evening, January 25, 1948:

Members of the alumni and friends of St. John's Preparatory School, from our earliest days the name of St. John's Prep has been familiar to most of us. Being a preparatory school, it seemed to our youthful minds to be a cut above the ordinary high school. The fact that it was located out of town added to its glamour. Those who attended St. Johns Prep were distinguished as belonging to an exclusive realm of the educational world. They were going to school not because they had to but because they wanted to.

So it appeared to our youthful fancy.

As we grew older, however, we began to discern other and more fundamental differences. St. John's was a prep school, intended to train its students for a continuance of their education in the colleges and universities of our land. It taught them the necessary disciplines to separate the true from the false in the history of man's experience. It readied them for the specialized and exacting studies of the arts and the professions, giving them the know-how of earning a living in service to others. It prepared the way for the acquirement of facts and techniques.

Above all, it taught them religion.

The individual student came to know his obligation to that which is greater than himself or any other man or group of men. Through its inspiration, its solace, and its strength, he understood the meaning of his journey through life and of its final goal.

He realized that his life must not be spent entirely on the treadmill of doing things. It must be measured by his development of mind and heart in his relations with his fellow man. His life will have meaning only as it becomes an example to others by his conduct in the home, at work, or even at play. Within him and all his fellow men is the divine spark which may or may not come to life.

There are more than 900 degree-granting universities and colleges in the United States. There are millions of students in the high schools and even greater numbers in the grammar schools. We have a production line of education that turns out millions of young people with diplomas every year on schedule. We have developed a technology and a manufacturing plant which can make atom bombs. We have more material goods than any other nation on earth, but we have no peace of mind. We've got things, but we don't know how to use them for the good of all.

To me, this is an indictment of our whole educational system. We are taught to do one job well, without being able to relate it to other jobs or other people. We've got the cars, but the one fault seems to be the simple mechanism of the steering wheel and the person behind it.

When it comes to making machines we're tops. In the field of human relations, however, we're like a ship without a rudder. There are many opinions but no facts. Each one of us is right, and the other fellow is wrong. And all because we have not learned to discriminate between the good and the bad, the true and the false.

Who's to blame for high prices? Just about everycne. And what's the answer to taxes? Write your own ticket and insist that it's the correct answer to this age-old problem.

In a democracy, of course, we realize that both sides, or all sides, must give in a little so that we may come together in a common area of understanding. We've got to try and see that there may be some elements of good in the other fellow's viewpoint as well as some weak spots in our own. This makes for effective compromise without conquest or capitulation.

But what about Russia? There's the puzzle within a puzzle. This largest land area in the world is the most secret. High prices, taxes, and nearly every other domestic issue is being affected by the question of Russia and her motives.

There are a few trigger-happy people in our country who think that we could solve the problem by dropping a plentiful cargo of atom bombs over that strange country. Obviously, as a Christian Nation, believing in the ultimate triumph of moral principles, we will do no such thing. By the application of superior force, we could destroy many Russian cities, kill millions of her people, and lay waste her economy. That would set back the material strength of communism, but it would not eliminate the evil of communism, which would live on in the minds of some men. Bear in mind that, although we have destroyed the armies of fascism, we know that its philosophy has merely gone underground. Witness the results of the poll taken in Germany which reveals that the people show no remorse over Hitler and his methods, but simply blame him because he lost. Denazification is not easy. Decommunization would be just as difficult.

On the other hand, we do not agree with those who would appease Russia, at any risk to ourselves, in the hope that she would reform. Unfortunately, words of sweetness and light will not convince the power-mad regime which now controls much of Asia and Europe of the error of its ways.

We must do it by superior example, by showing that democracy provides a higher standard of living without sacrificing basic human freedoms.

That is what your Congress is trying to do as it debates the needs of the 16 European nations outside the iron curtain of Soviet domination. Under the Marshall plan we do not intend to supply arms and munitions to these countries. Rather, we will provide them with an economic transfusion. For, if we get them back on their feet again as going concerns where people prosper with freedom, this cannot help but make the present rulers of Russia take pause. Free peoples cooperating fairly can build a far better way of living than repressive communism can ever produce. The Soviets know this. They will try to sabotage our efforts both here and abroad. They understand that, if we succeed, they will be discredited.

We've got the right idea. The question is, Can we deliver the goods in time to make it work?

Last year the incoming Congress immediately slashed the appropriations for our informational program abroad. This year the Congress has reversed itself and has provided for a complete selling campaign to go along with the material help we give to the distressed nations of Europe. Last summer many Congressmen went abroad to get a first-hand picture of the situation. They returned, convinced that we would have to counteract the flood of Communist propaganda that is sweeping Europe. By giving the facts of United States help, the conditions under which it is being produced, and why it is being given, we can defeat with visible proof the Soviet policy of spreading despair.

The necessary goods will be produced and delivered by the American people in order to prevent another war. It is an investment for security and peace. Even the United States, with all its strength, would be impoverished by another war. We have lost our isolation. The next time we would be hit, and hit hard. Both victor and vanquished would be weakened, perhaps beyond recovery.

We cannot have another war. And yet, in the present state of world affairs, we must be realistic. While we work for peace, we must be prepared to defend ourselves from a sudden and devastating attack. Until such time as mankind can develop a system to outlaw war we must have an Air Force second to none, both as a warning to and as an effective counterblow to any aggressor.

The recent report of the President's Air Policy Commission says that "the people of the country are not kept fully informed of the dangers of the military situation they are facing and of the preparations they ought to make to defend themselves against these dangers."

Asserting that our Nation's Military Establishment must be built around the air arm, the report goes on to warn us that other nations do not appear to have atomic weapons in quantity. This leads us to believe that some other nation has the A bomb in some lesser amount. The Commission estimates that by the end of 1952 we shall be no longer safe from the possibility of atomic attack.

On the danger from germ warfare, the report says that biological weapons are undoubtedly being studied in all parts of the world. That extremely violent bacteria and viruses exist is common knowledge. In any all-out attack on the United States the possibility that they may be used should not be overlooked. The danger from these weapons is, however, not only in time of war. They can be distributed in our cities and among our crops and herds in advance, say a year or so, of a planned attack. They may also be used as part of a campaign to weaken us, without any intention of following up with a conventional military attack. Our plans to anticipate and prevent such sabotage, insofar as this can be done, must be intensified.

These are grim words which should keep us on the alert. It is our duty to be prepared for any eventuality, even as we strive to work out, in cooperation with other nations, a system for guaranteeing a real and lasting peace.

This will demand effort, sacrifice, and vigilance.

We will help Europe, even as we work to strengthen ourselves. But these twin goals must be won without endangering our way of life and especially our civil liberties.

Prepared by education and by faith, we who have been trained to discriminate between the true and the false are twice armed. We shall equally reject the lies of Soviet propaganda and the lies of those who would use the threat of communism as a pretext for curtailing our freedoms here at home.

With clear sights we shall hold fast to the course we have set for our development and shall not be misled either toward the right or toward the left.

Remembering those who went before us, we shall keep our balance as Americans.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on January 24, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, tonight, I want to address myself for a moment to the scores of postal employees from Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott who are listening to this program.

To you letter carriers who work steadfastly through the year, let me say I met with your local delegates in Washington and spoke at the dinner given New York Congressmen by your State organization. You can bet I am going down the line with them for a pay raise.

This raise embraces all branches of the postal service. I am for it because the Post Office Department was here when George Washington was President and is the oldest, most time-honored division of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

My stand in favor of a raise for you boys is not just lip service to you. The officers in your local chapter of railway-mail employees will tell you I went to bat for all the postal workers at a hearing last week before Senator LANGER'S committee which was listening to testimony about various bills to raise your pay.

Of course, you postal employees know what corner I've always been in. You know every vote I've ever cast on the subject has been in favor of better pay and more desirable working conditions for all of you.

So I was happy to talk in your behalf at the committee hearing and I will vote for that long-delayed raise for you when the bill comes up in the House.

A few would-be big shots who call themselves Republicans hereabouts are making overtures to the Political Action Committee of the CIO to put a candidate up against your Congressman in the Republican primary this year.

Although these disgraceful tactics are being carried on with the utmost of secrecy, sources friendly to me, yet close enough to this cabalistic clique, reveal to me what's happening.

Thus, John L. Lewis, Phil Murray, and William Green will stick their noses into our primary for the first time in the history of this district. With them will come a curious assortment of soreheads, left-wingers, mugwumps, and generally obnoxious plug-uglies.

But they will be well-heeled with thousands upon thousands of dollars, squeezed from the pockets of unwilling members who are sweating to pay their leaders fat salaries in addition to lining their war chests against the people's representative.

Yes, this gigantic slush fund will be thrown into our patriotic district in a desperate attempt to slap down your Congressman. But the labor barons won't be the only contributors. There will be a few anonymous givers, entirely undercover, who would blush crimson, then purple, if their names were brought to light.

Of course, they've gotten away with these subterranean operations against me for years, but I think now I have found a leak through which I can discover their chicanery. I am reasonably sure I can put my finger on them and if I do, they will squeal to high heaven.

Why? Simply because they occupy positions of pseudo respectability in our midst. In spite of the public's knowledge that they are hypocrites, they still can't afford to be found in the same political bailiwick as the left-wing labor boys. They would frankly be afraid of being placed in a position like that, even though it were for the purpose of going in with Beelzebub himself to erase me.

Naturally, they will tread very stealthily. They know the Republican voters will never tolerate an invasion by John L. Lewis as their candidate in the 1948 primary. They know they can't make the Taft-Hartley opposition an issue among Republicans of this section. They know, also, that they will take plenty of heat from my friends if they get funny.

I realize that little has been done in this valley to tell the people the truth about the Taft-Hartley Act. While great stress has been laid on the good this measure is doing in other localities, we have seen little in reference to it, except in condemnation of my vote for it.

Plenty of space has been given to agitators' speeches vilifying your Congressman. But not one word has been uttered in defense of one who has challenged the racketeers and gangsters for the protection of the general public.

Be that as it may, their deliberate omission of all praise and decent reference in my direction will not change the picture. They can bring in all the big-time, national barons they like. They can engineer all the smear and vicious innundoes against me they want to.

But their tons of propaganda, their limitless campaign funds, raised from outside this district, as well as by the naive and the unwitting from within, will not equal or approach the power of the patriotic Americans who will spring to my assistance.

For their information, more people will hear the truth over this program and you can count on my revelations of their nefarious work each week from now on until they are shown up to the public for what they are.

Thank you.

Old-Fashioned Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in the Kansas City Kansan, after it had been printed in the El Dorado (Kans.) Times and possibly other Kansas papers, the following editorial containing some sound and sane philosophy:

OLD-FASHIONED COMMANDMENTS

The ten commandments of old-fashioned economy and philosophy, written by Uncle Mac, in the Arkansas Gazette, are being circulated in Topeka, and were published in a paper there recently. We have no hesitation in lifting them for publication here, and suggest that they may be profitably read and preserved, if for no other reason than as a voice out of the dim, dead past:

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
3. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.
4. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
5. You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.
6. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.
7. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.
8. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.
10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

Keep American Ships Under the American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, Americans from coast to coast are rising in surprise and indignation as they learn the details of the European recovery program insofar as shipping is concerned. They want American ships kept under the Stars and Stripes. They want our own people to have the jobs of carrying cargoes for which we are paying the bills rather than turning these jobs over to foreigners and putting our own seamen on relief or unemployment insurance.

I submit herewith the following resolution adopted by the Philadelphia Industrial Union Council in opposition to the proposed transfer of American ships:

Whereas the policy of the administration of President Truman has been responsible for the sale of great numbers of merchant vessels to foreign ownership as well as to certain United States citizens who immediately changed the flag and registry to some foreign nations in order to evade taxes and employment of American seamen; and

Whereas thousands of American merchant seamen are unemployed as a direct result of the vast amount of cargo being carried to and from this country in foreign vessels; and

Whereas a provision in the Marshall plan would give to foreign nations a further 500 merchant ships and thereby greatly aggravate the unemployment of American seamen; and

Whereas 25 leaders of labor unions effecting 50,000 maritime and other workers in the Philadelphia area, both A. F. of L. and CIO, met in the hall of the National Maritime Union to take action against the growing unemployment of American seamen and other industrial workers, resulting from the giving away of American ships to foreign nations and the transfer of American ships to foreign registry, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

"*Resolved*, That we are opposed to and ask an immediate halt to the assigning of American ships to foreign countries and to foreign flag registry and in particular the sending of Marshall-plan aid to Europe in foreign ships with the loss of jobs and wages to American maritime and other industrial workers. The taxes for foreign aid are paid by American citizens, and we are definitely opposed to forcing them into unemployment because of the generous aid given abroad. That all Senators and Congressmen be advised of our opposition to this phase of S. 1619, and asked to vote against this section. The support of the Marshall plan, with the above situation corrected, is unanimous. Further that we give full cooperation to the American Bureau of Shipping in carrying this program out."

We request the concurrence of the Philadelphia Industrial Union Council in this resolution and that said council forward same to the national CIO headquarters with a request for concurrence.

Adopted unanimously by Philadelphia Industrial Union Council, January 22, 1948.

WARREN C. EVANS,
Delegate for Marine Engineers, Beneficial Association, No. 13.

UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution with respect to UNESCO adopted by the board of education of the City of New York on January 8, 1948:

Whereas the Second General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, held in Mexico City November 1947, unanimously adopted the following resolution prepared by Jacques Maritain and submitted by the French delegation:

"The representatives of education, science, and culture, meeting together at Mexico City at the UNESCO General Conference:

"Aware of the responsibilities imposed upon them by the constitution of the organization to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law, for human rights, and the fundamental freedoms of the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language, or religion;

"Concerned at the dangers to peace resulting from currents of thought conducive to the idea that another war is inevitable;

"Troubled by the indifference, resignation, and even calm acceptance which such currents of thought meet in certain sections of public opinion;

"Address a solemn appeal to all who are concerned for the dignity of man and the future of civilization, particularly scientists, educationalists, scholars, artists, writers, and journalists throughout the world;

"Adjure them to denounce the pernicious idea that war is inevitable;

"To act as the mouthpiece of the conscience of the nations, refusing collective suicide;

"To combat, by every means in their power, surrender to fear and every form of thought or action which may threaten a just and lasting peace"; and

Whereas the public schools of the city of New York should be a vehicle to the maintenance of peace in the world and should direct their thinking to the best means of maintaining peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approves the resolution adopted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and requests the superintendent of schools to circulate this resolution among the schools.

Let's Make Up Our Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a copy of an article by the eminent columnist, Constantine Brown, of Washington, which appeared in the Sunday Star of Washington, D. C., on January 25, 1948, as follows:

LACK OF CLEAR-CUT POLICY BLOCKS UNITED STATES STRATEGISTS—ANALYST SAYS OUR TOP MILITARY LEADERS ARE HANDICAPPED IN THEIR ATTEMPT TO MAKE ANY PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

(By Constantine Brown)

The quandary in which our top leaders find themselves over the course America should take at this critical hour in world affairs is much greater than most people realize.

The war planners in our armed forces are churning water to make butter. They feel frustrated in their efforts to make plans on what to do in the event of certain emergencies, which some of them feel to be imminent.

These men can reach no conclusive decision because they do not know what our national policy is. Their liaison officers in the State Department return empty-handed when they try to learn the answers to certain pertinent questions. The State Department, on the other hand, has not been able to formulate a real national policy, because in recent years we have had none.

The Truman doctrine, for instance, could be as much a national policy as the Monroe Doctrine, but after having formulated the new policy concerning nations threatened by the U. S. S. R., State Department policy framers fear that its implementation by the military might lead us into trouble rather than establish the lasting peace they expected when they urged President Truman to make his declaration 10 months ago.

MATTER OF APPROPRIATIONS

The State Department, headed by a distinguished soldier, is unwilling to take the offensive. Secretary of State Marshall, who knows better than any one else the state of America's armed unpreparedness, feels that unless Congress is in a mood to provide much larger sums than the armed forces already have asked, in order to meet their present limited needs, it is of no use to expect any strong measures.

Congress, which is anxious to carry out some big economies as election time approaches, knows only superficially the exact state of things between this country and the nations behind the iron curtain and is unwilling to take any initiative to increase appropriations.

Thus, the staffs of Army, Navy, and Air Force must mark time until the State Department tells them what our national policy is. The State Department no longer receives instructions from the White House and is reluctant to undertake any kind of implementation of policy which might necessitate the use of forces which we do not possess, unless Congress appropriates the money and passes some kind of conscription measure to expand our forces. Congress is sitting tight because it is not its business to make policy.

MARSHALL PLAN POLICY

This vicious circle is little understood in this country, but it is well known abroad and particularly in the U. S. S. R. For the time being we are using the Marshall plan as an instrument of national policy, although the Secretary of State himself, as well as other responsible officials in the Government, fully realize that the European recovery program must be described as an implementation of policy rather than as policy itself.

Many members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee were concerned during the war with the haphazard manner in which the administration was conducting foreign relations. They called, individually, on President Roosevelt, had talks with his chief adviser—the late Harry Hopkins—and occasionally summoned their principal legal informant on foreign affairs, Secretary of State Hull.

They received kind treatment in their talks with Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull. Many pertinent matters, such as the real effect of the Tehran and Yalta agreements, were kept from them under the excuse that we were then tied to a number of Allies and that revelation of other agreements than those publicly announced would cause embarrassment and jeopardize the administration's war effort.

The Senators had to be satisfied with the frequently reiterated statement: "Gentlemen, at this time our foreign policy is to win the war." When some Senators like Robert La Follette, Jr., pointed out in 1944 that war in itself was not a policy but the implementation of policy, the other stereotyped answer concluded the argument: "To say more would be against public interest."

SITUATION WAS INHERITED

The present lamentable state of affairs must not be attributed exclusively to those now in office. They inherited a situation not of their own making.

The improvisations which we called foreign policy during the last two World Wars are the result of inherent defects in our system and in our psychology. It is true that wars are implementation of policy. The Europeans, to whose rescue we went twice in a quarter century, fought their wars not for ideologies, but for certain definite purposes.

The Central Powers started World War I for the purpose of acquiring more territory and greater prosperity by imposing onerous peace conditions on their opponents. The Allies, who were then at the height of their economic and social prosperity, accepted the challenge in self-defense.

They defeated the Central Powers with the assistance of the United States. But their leaders did not think in global terms; they were concerned primarily with repairing the damage suffered at the hands of their enemies.

While President Wilson and his associates agreed magnanimously not to exact reparations of any kind, David Lloyd George, Georges Clemenceau, and the lesser lights among the Allies demanded their pound of flesh. President Wilson was thinking in terms of one world, peaceful and united. He was thinking in terms of helping the world. The representatives of the other powers were thinking about what was best for their own country, regardless of all others.

SELFISH INTERESTS FOREMOST

While the United States was striving to make a better world globally the others were interested only in their own national segments of the world. They talked loudly about a better world, but actually were thinking about what was best individually for Britain, France, Italy, and the other members of the great coalition. This explains the cat-and-dog fight at the 1919 Peace Conference and the hostility of the former Allies toward each other, as shown particularly at the London Naval Conference in 1930.

A similar situation, on a much larger scale, occurred during and especially after

World War II. Once more we entered the war as crusaders.

During World War II we ignored the storm signals which came from some of the greatest European nations. For the sake of harmony among the enemies of the Axis, we actually handed over to Russia those nations to whose defense we rushed with lend-lease.

Because we did not wish to offend the hard-fighting and hard-pressed Russians as far back as 1943, we never placed conditions on our billions of lend-lease to Russia in keeping with the terms of the Atlantic Charter. And, according to those who were at the center of affairs in those days, nothing would have been easier than to talk with friendly but blunt frankness to Prime Minister Stalin about the actual objectives of the American people in World War II.

Mr. Stalin cannot be blamed for the present situation. He intended from the very first to enrich and enlarge Russia with new territories. He was not interested in one world.

Prime Minister Churchill was interested primarily in the British Empire. That was the reason he so carefully avoided mentioning the Pacific areas in the charter which he and Mr. Roosevelt drafted in the fall of 1941. He was interested in control of the Mediterranean to safeguard lines of communication throughout the world.

It was for that reason that he threw overboard the royal government of Yugoslavia and betrayed Gen. Draja Mihailovich by diverting his support to Russia's stooge, Marshal Tito. In the end, he was double-crossed by Mr Stalin, but when he changed horses in Yugoslavia he was convinced that he was acting in the best interests of the Empire.

ACTED FOR THE EMPIRE

It was the same reason which prompted the British Government to send troops to Greece. No one can blame Mr. Stalin, Mr. Churchill, or any other head of a government for acting first in the interest of his own country and secondarily in the interest of the international community.

Not so in this country. Our leaders did talk after 1939 in terms of the threat to our own security. But they thought in global terms.

Even after Pearl Harbor, when men—far more important than goods or money—had to be shipped to all parts of the world to be killed there, we still thought in terms of one big and kind-hearted world.

There were a few courageous men in Mr. Roosevelt's immediate entourage who pointed out to him the risks of not having a definite national policy. They were either silenced or removed from the scene. To suspect Russia was treasonable because it meant breaking the harmony between the great powers (the little nations had ceased to count).

This country was created by those who escaped political, social, and economic oppression by autocrats who were ruling Europe. Men from all nations of the Old World came here and worked together, paying no attention to their former social status, religion, or race. They fused into one great hard-working, idealistic nation and got the idea that what has happened in America could happen across the Atlantic as well.

IDEA PROVOKES LAUGH

Our people sincerely believed that when it became obvious that wars did not pay, the people of Europe themselves would put an end to them, joining hands to work for their own good. It was for this reason that the idea of one world which provoked such laughter among Europeans and especially the men of the Kremlin, took root so quickly in the United States.

Many men in the Government are still convinced that a peaceful solution of present world problems is possible if we show continued good will and complacency toward the Russians. They all see the hair-raising reports of what the Soviet is preparing, but they are still willing to brush them off as inevitable exaggerations of a new nation which has tasted victory for the first time and is prankish. Because of this frame of mind, we are still today—as we were before we became a world power—without a clear-cut national policy.

Present Technological Status and Future Outlook for Synthetic Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous-consent permit given me, I desire to submit for consideration of my colleagues a recent statement on the rubber situation by Mr. J. P. Coe, vice president of the United States Rubber Co. His views follow:

PRESENT TECHNOLOGICAL STATUS AND FUTURE OUTLOOK FOR SYNTHETIC RUBBER

(By J. P. Coe)

I like the designation of technological status because it contemplates the practice aspect of the technical situation in synthetic rubber as distinct from the strictly scientific aspect. For the purposes of this symposium, I believe we are concerned with the use of synthetic rubber rather than with the chemistry and the physics involved.

With this in mind, it is my position that synthetic rubber has now proved itself technologically; that it exists and will continue to be manufactured and used on its own merits as material required by industry because of its usefulness; that independently of its importance to the national security and aside from the economic means that will be employed to convert the industry from a wartime to a peacetime basis synthetic rubber is now established in the arts.

First, let me define synthetic rubber. Increasingly since Columbus, rubber—caoutchouc—the exudation of the bark of Hevea Brasiliensis—has been recognized as important because it would do for us things no other material would do. Outstandingly, rubber can be stretched many times its length and still return. It is strong, tough, chemically resistant, heat and cold resistant, possessed of very good electrical properties, easily fabricated into articles, thermoplastic in the raw state and since the discovery of vulcanization is thermosetting.

Until synthetic rubber, no other material would do what rubber would do.

Synthetic rubber, in my definition, is man-made plastic material which also can be stretched greatly and still return and which possesses some of the other properties of natural rubber adequately or to an enhanced degree.

It is important in this definition that synthetic rubber does not need to be a complete duplicate of natural rubber chemically or physically. To be called rubber, it must be rubberlike, and notably that means it must be stretchy, as other plastic materials are not, and it must possess some other rubber-like properties. In addition, it must equal or surpass natural rubber in certain respects or it will not be accepted as useful.

Let us consider the synthetic rubber called neoprene. It is a rubberlike material: stretchy, strong, chemically resistant, easily fabricated into articles. In addition, it is resistant to oils. For example, it is good for the linings and covers of hose exposed to oil, and it enables us to make such articles better than we can make them of natural rubber. Natural rubber is notably allergic to oils. A common expedient before oil-resisting synthetics were developed was a flexible metal lining inside rubber impregnated hose used at gasoline filling stations. Neoprene is entirely adequate in mechanical properties for the manufacture of hose, and it is not important whether its elastic properties or its tensile strength are equivalent to those of natural rubber. In these respects, it is adequate and in addition it is oilproof.

Such uses of raw materials ordinarily do not attract popular attention. Consequently, it is not generally known that neoprene was first sold commercially in 1932 at $1 per pound, when natural rubber was selling for 3 cents. Sales in that year amounted to only 2.3 tons and in 1933 to 24 tons. However, in 1934, the volume tripled; in 1935 it doubled again, and the increase up to wartime—1934–42—was on the average almost exactly 100 percent each year. Probably no one knows the thousands of articles for which neoprene is now considered essential, even though—prewar—its price was three to five times that of natural rubber.

I have gone into the matter of neoprene in some detail to illustrate the following:

1. Synthetic rubber has been with us commercially and on its own merits for 15 years.

2. Not necessarily must it be sold for the price of natural rubber.

3. We are concerned with improvements over the natural product rather than with duplication or substitution.

4. Such advances in industry take place usually without knowledge by the general public except in the improvement of the articles they buy.

Closely allied to neoprene but with different properties is the type of synthetic rubber usually referred to by its German name Buna N or Perbunan. There are also the trade names Chemigum, Ameripol, Hycar and Butaprene. These are all oil resisting rubbers and hence useful for special purposes. In 1944, national consumption amounted to 14,000 tons chiefly for special war uses. Their manufacture is privately financed and they are sold at the present time for about twice the price of natural rubber. With war uses past the new peacetime uses already consume 5,000 or 6,000 tons per year.

Still another specialty rubber is the product called butyl rubber. In many respects butyl is not as rubberlike as the ones previously mentioned. However, it is sufficiently rubber-like for many articles and it has two outstanding and valuable properties. It is highly resistant chemically, even to strong nitric acid. Glass is also resistant to nitric acid but glass does not stretch. Butyl is highly impermeable to air, and for this reason plus its chemical inertness and other mechanical properties, it is valuable for the manufacture of inner tubes for pneumatic tires.

I believe all inner tubes for passenger tires today are made from butyl rubber—at least half from preference by the experts in the manufacture of inner tubes—in order better to serve the need of the consumer. At present it sells for 18½ cents per pound compared with recent prices of natural rubber between 14 and 25 cents. Consumption is 50,000 tons per year with a free-use consumption of probably 30,000 to 40,000 tons per year.

It happens that in volume the largest consumer of rubber is the pneumatic tire to the extent that between the two World Wars this amounted to about 70 percent of our total rubber consumption. For transportation of merchandise and of people and notably for rapid movement of war materiel, tires were of critical national importance during the war. Large supplies of rubber for this purpose were of utmost importance; so much so that deprivation of our natural rubber supply, in the planning of the Axis Powers, might easily have given them military supremacy over us. Accordingly, in 1940 and 1941, we took the synthetic rubber technology we then possessed and decided to produce in large quantity chiefly for tire manufacture a general-purpose synthetic made from butadiene and styrene and known since as GR–S.

GR–S has had a great amount of publicity. Speeches have been made, articles have been written, Government committees have investigated, and Congress has legislated. Most of the automobile-driving public has become interested in the question: Are synthetic rubber tires as good as natural rubber tires?

Admiral Braine has already outlined the importance of synthetic rubber to our national security. Mr. Phillips has explained the effect on international economics of any major change in our prewar practice of purchasing from other countries our quarter to half billion dollars' worth of rubber. Mr. Hadlock has the great problems of administering a manufacturing business which has produced perhaps more volume of synthetic organic chemicals than any other industry in a like period. Mr. Dinsmore is concerned with the economics of our conversation problem and Mr. CRAWFORD will have to take all of this and write some rules for us to go by.

Fortunately for me, this evening I am free of such economic and international and military problems. I am concerned only with the question of how useful is synthetic rubber now and in the future.

GR–S was used 1942–47 to the extent of 2,734,000 long tons. That is about as much as the total rubber used in the United States, 1936 to 1940.

The Allied armies won uncounted battles, the industries of the United States transported millions of tons of merchandise, and the motoring public traveled billions of miles—all with tires made from GR–S. That is the best bit of technical evaluation I know anything about. I might quote abrasion tests of treads and internal hysterisis data, and tensile strength of samples, and processing costs in manufacturing, but such data are nothing compared with the simple fact that GR–S in very wide use over a period of several years has made good serviceable tires.

How good? As good?

The engineers who spend their lives trying to find out the answers to such questions said during the war they could make a tire with natural rubber 15 percent better than an all-synthetic tire. I think no motorist is likely to judge so carefully that he can decide whether his last set of tires ran 15 percent longer than his previous set or not, but the engineers believe that over-all natural rubber has the edge. Some of them tell me that at present-day driving speeds 15 percent is too low.

It is also true that in large, heavy tires for certain definite reasons mostly concerned with hysterisis, at the present time we prefer natural rubber. However, such ratings I consider somewhat academic because no one contemplates or has contemplated for the near future a complete swing from natural to synthetic rubber in tires. We approached that in 1945 and we got along very well. Since that time on a somewhat freer basis we have departed from that position and have reverted to the use of more natural rubber because we think it is somewhat better for tires.

The Rubber Director, Col. Bradley Dewey, in 1944 said he thought that from a quality standpoint for about half our national tonnage requirements we could use either synthetic or natural rubber as we chose, depending chiefly on the economics involved. Whether it is one-half or one-quarter, that emphasizes the fact that a modest price advantage or a modest quality advantage will result in a large use of synthetic on a free basis.

Let us not here attempt to decide of what materials the manufacturer will fabricate our pneumatic tires. Let us trust such decisions to the tire engineers. They have served us well over the past 30 years and have given us improvement in tire life tenfold, coincident with faster driving and lower prices. The product of these improvements is a saving to the driving public of perhaps a billion dollars a year in tire cost.

I have already shown that substantial quantities of synthetic have been used for years and are continuing to be used despite a price disadvantage. Having a continuing advantage in price, unquestionably the tire manufacturer would use a great deal of synthetic. The price competition bids fair to be close. It was estimated a year ago that GR–S types could be produced on a private-operation basis for a price of around 15 cents per pound. With the dollar now a little thinner, that figure may now be a little higher. In Malaya with a less up-to-date dollar and no farm-parity program, good estate operators are not too happy with a 15-cent price for natural rubber. This invades Mr. Dinsmore's territory, but in discussing the future technological outlook, I must list price advantage as a great stimulus to the use of butadiene-styrene rubbers.

Again let me assert that if large quantities are used on a free-economy basis, that material is ipso facto, technologically, a success.

Butadiene-styrene rubbers are possessed of special advantages in resistance to aging and certain of them have specially good processing qualities. For those reasons, plus uniformity, the wire and cable industry a year ago made a concerted and formal request to RFC for a continuing supply of those types specially designed for wire and cable insulation. They stated that at even price they preferred the synthetic to the natural rubber. Certain companies stated they would pay a higher price. May I here encroach on Admiral Braine's territory and express the opinion that such voluntary and preference uses for GR–S types outside the tire industry, even in moderate amounts, should be fostered in the interest of the national security.

For, now, a few years asbestos sheet packing has been considered technically superior if made with a particular GR–S type than if made with natural rubber. Tiling manufacturers prefer GR–S. Battery manufacturers sometimes prefer GR–S.

I have here a tag from a boy's raincoat, recently purchased, and reading, "Buna GR–S rubber guaranteed not to crack, peel, stiffen, or rub off." These are relatively small-volume items but as Mr. Livingston used to remind us we shall make our technical progress in small steps.

I am told some tire manufacturers prefer GR–S latex for solutioning their tire cord. Here is a fundamental economic advantage, also—in case Mr. Dinsmore should overlook it. It costs substantially more to bring into the United States natural rubber in the form of latex than in the dry coagulated form. It costs substantially less to produce synthetic latex than dry synthetic—also in the United States. With apologies to Rubber Reserve's pricing policy.

I have referred above to special GR–S types. Four hundred and thirty commercial variations of butadiene-styrene rubber have been developed as the result of the large and aggressive research program instituted and supported by Rubber Reserve since 1941. Today more than 50 varieties are in regular production and 72 percent of the total production of GR–S is of types developed since 1942 and tailor-made to meet special requirements of industry.

A great deal has been said in the past regarding the difficulty of processing synthetics in the rubber manufacturing plants. It was stated 3 years ago that processing disadvantages in tire manufacturing were costing an amount equivalent to a price increase of 7 cents per pound. Nevertheless, the tire industry in 1943 and 1944 accomplished a change-over from natural to synthetic with such speed and satisfaction that it constituted in my opinion one of the war-production miracles.

At present we hear little said about difficult processing. This is partly because of improvement in the synthetics and partly because of processing skills acquired by the consumer. At present we hear almost as much about processing advantages as about processing disadvantages, although we have still some serious problems in that category.

I do not wish to mislead. Synthetic rubbers have faults and disadvantages. So has natural rubber. So have all the raw materials we use. None of the synthetics yet have fully the elastic properties of the natural product. Generally they are not as strong. In the rubber factory they are not as sticky and therefore do not fabricate as well in a great many instances. Great progress has been made in overcoming or working around these difficulties but there is a great deal of work yet to be done in the improvement of many qualities.

But again I am not speaking of complete substitution. We like rubber footwear to be soft and stretchy, and hence the footwear manufacturer prefers natural rubber. Nevertheless, in certain instances he uses some synthetic with his natural to improve factory processing.

There are certain very important processing advantages which accrue to the manufacturer by compounding the rubber in latex form in the synthetic plant. The largest and most important example is in compounding with carbon black, but there are many other instances involving other compounding materials—some of them difficult to handle by ordinary rubber-factory methods. Carbon black can be added in the synthetic plant with a minimum of dirtiness, whereas in the tire plant its presence is almost a civic nuisance. In addition, this procedure shortens the processing time in the tire plant and enhances the quality of the product.

Of major importance at present is the development of rubbers polymerized at low temperatures—0° to 40° Fahrenheit versus 122° to 128° Fahrenheit past practice. This development is now entering the production stage with two large manufacturing installations nearing completion. Preliminary data has indicated the possibility of tire-tread quality substantially improved over anything we have known heretofore with natural rubber and the more conservative of the tire engineers rate it as "perhaps at least equal to natural rubber according to incomplete data." If this improvement should be established by service performance of tires over this year and next it is to be expected that such rubber will be used almost regardless of price. Since tire-tread rubber amounts to about a third of the national rubber consumption, this use would definitely put butadiene-styrene rubber on an independent footing.

An independent technological basis for synthetic rubber is the sine qua non of its continued existence. Particularly is it needed to support private research conducted in the interest of profit to the investor because as we all know such research in the past has produced great advances in the American scheme of things.

We require further research in the synthesis of rubbers from other raw materials than butadiene and styrene. Already we have had very encouraging results with substitutions for styrene in the copolymer, as with mono and dichlor styrene.

We need continued research on a private basis if we can have it—or on a public-funds basis if we cannot—but we must continue. We in the synthetic-rubber industry are completely confident that steadily we shall improve and frequently we shall add new and valuable items to the synthetic-rubber catalog. We do not expect to achieve full success

overnight. Already natural rubber has been surpassed and supplanted in many places on a strictly merit basis. Already the intensive study of the synthesis of elastomers has increased manyfold our intimate knowledge of the chemistry of rubber, and has disseminated this knowledge among thousands of chemists not previously familiar with it. The chemist will never stop whether he works in a cave or in a marble laboratory. He will succeed more quickly if well supplied with the tools for research.

The future outlook for synthetic rubber from the technological standpoint is very very bright.

Social-Security Law Should Be Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very fine letter from Mr. W. J. Tutt, of Des Moines, Iowa, relative to the need for revision of the present Social Security Act. He points out a glaring injustice that needs to be remedied by immediate passage of corrective legislation.

The letter follows:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *January 15, 1948.*
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAUL: The Social Security Act as it affects persons in the older age brackets is a puzzle to some of us who are now past the age of retirement.

The writer is in that class—past the 72-age mark.

I am advised by the local office of social security that the limit of any possible earnings I might make after social benefits obtain, cannot exceed $14.99 per month. To a certain class of businessmen who tried to weather the NRA of the 1930's, and lost, they now find themselves with a meager social-security benefit, and a restriction on income (possible) above that benefit. In my case, total social benefits is less than $40, with $14.99 total possible earnings above that. Can a man support a home and wife today on that?

I have not made application for benefit for I can still work, but the day may come when I cannot work as I do now.

It seems to me, Paul, that if the present set-up is as has been explained to me, instead of being called social security, it properly should be called social poverty.

Many businessmen who went through the trying period of the 1930's—and I was one of them—were obliged to take a complete loss of their business. They are now past the retirement age and not able to recoup the financial losses.

What does social security hold for them?

Many of these men could employ their time and sales commission to help augment their social benefit, but not above $14.99 per month. That, I think, is very unfair. For 10 years now, 1 percent of all of my earnings has gone to social security. It looks now, at age 72, I don't stand any show of getting that back. Can you offer any suggestion? Best wishes to you.

Yours,

W. J. TUTT.

The Herter Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, whatever other objections may be leveled at the Herter bill, H. R. 4579, I am convinced that the taint of unconstitutionality cannot successfully be charged against it.

In this discussion, one concession should be made at the outset. In the broad sphere of international relations—that is, the area of negotiation, agreement, and diplomatic exchange—the President is the sole organ of the Federal Government.

In this vast external realm, with its important, complicated, delicate, and manifold problems, the President alone has the power to speak or listen as a representative of the Nation. * * * Into the field of negotiation the Senate cannot intrude; and Congress itself is powerless to invade it. (*U. S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* ((1936) 299 U. S. 304).)

In addition, the President is given by the Constitution the responsibility to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed"—article II, section 3—thus of necessity conferring on the President a certain amount of discretionary power in order that he may effectively enforce and execute congressional law and policies both home and abroad. See Sayre, The Constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act, 1939, volume 39, Columbia Law Review, pages 751, 759.

Yet the problem is not settled when these powers are conceded, for they—like all other governmental powers—"must be exercised in subordination to the applicable provisions of the Constitution"—United States against Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.

The Herter bill, H. R. 4579, in the interest of coordinating the formulation of foreign-aid programs, creates a Foreign Aid Council, consisting of certain members of the President's Cabinet and others, with the Secretary of State as chairman. In this activity the Council shall advise and consult with the President. The bill also establishes an Emergency Foreign Reconstruction Authority, with capital of $500,000,000, which shall assist the Council, meet emergency needs of foreign countries for food, fuel, and fertilizer, make available to such countries limited categories of other consumer goods which will provide incentives to production and distribution, and make available limited quantities of productive machinery.

The board of directors of this Authority shall be bipartisan and shall consist of a full-time chairman, who shall be the executive head of the Authority and executive director of the Council, and seven other members appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate. The Authority must make periodic reports to the President, who in turn shall submit them to Congress. Commodities furnished to foreign countries are to be paid for, and the methods of payment, under certain circumstances, are outlined. These features of the bill, therefore, indicate on their face no interference with the President's conduct of foreign affairs. Instead they set forth means whereby money and commodities may be made available, on certain terms, to aid foreign nations in their reconstruction following World War II. In so doing, Congress is exercising certain powers residing in it by constitutional grant.

In article I of the Constitution, Congress is given certain express financial powers. Section 8, clause 1, provides that—

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

It is settled that under this provision Congress may appropriate and spend money for the general welfare, and that the means of so doing rests primarily in the discretion of Congress. (*Helvering* v. *Davis* ((1937) 301 U. S. 619); Turner, the Fifth Horseman of the Apocalypse ((1947) 22 N. Y. U. L. Q. Rev. 19, 21–24).)

In section 9, clause 7, it is prescribed that—

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

Thus the absolute control of the moneys of the United States is in Congress, which is responsible for its exercise of this great power only to the people; and Congress may indicate the class of persons who shall not be paid out of general appropriations but who shall come to Congress for relief. (*Hart's case* (1880), 16 Ct. Cl. 484; affirmed, *Hart* v. *U. S.* (1886), 118 U. S. 62.)

In this respect Congress does not interfere with the executive functions or powers.

Moreover, "Congress in making appropriations has the power and authority not only to designate the purpose of the appropriation, but also the terms and conditions under which the executive department of the Government may expend such appropriations." The matter is one "solely in the hands of Congress." (*Spaulding* v. *Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.* (S. D. Cal. 1945) 60 F. Supp. 985, affirmed (C. C. A. 9th, 1946) 154 F. (2d) 419.)

It has even been urged that where a treaty calling for expenditures is involved, Congress—the House acting first—has the power, as distinguished from moral obligation, to refuse an appropriation. (Corwin, The President's Control of Foreign Relations ((1917) 92–98); Crandall, Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement ((2d ed. 1916) 177–182); Borchard, Treaties and Executive Agreements—A Repiy ((1945) 54 Yale L. J. 616, 654–655 (but conceding the power with respect to executive agreements)).)

In *Turner* v. *American Baptist Missionary Union* ((C. D. D. Mich. 1852) Fed. Cas. 14, 251), the court said with respect to a treaty—and it would follow with respect to any other law calling for the expenditure of money:

The representatives of the people and States exercise their own judgments in granting or withholding the money. They act upon their own responsibility.

The Herter bill involves the expenditures of large sums of money for foreign aid and reconstruction. In carrying out such purposes, Congress is not limited to the mere act of appropriating the money. It may set up the machinery for the expenditures and specify the conditions under which they may be made. It may create agencies or representative bodies to supervise and coordinate the expenditures and report thereon. The power to do such things is a natural concomitant of the exclusive power to appropriate and spend, for Congress has also the power to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof"—Article I, section 8, clause 18.

Through control of spending, Congress may put into effect and implement a national policy, and in so doing does not necessarily infringe on the powers of the Executive. See Hart's Case, supra; Turner, op. cit. supra.

In 1935 former Attorney General Cummings declared:

Not only may the Congress protect and aid those specific national activities over which it has been delegated authority by the Constitution, and in so doing enter into fields of the country's life beyond the Federal authority save for their effect upon such specific national activities, but it may also provide adequate protection and aid for agencies created by it to exercise Federal powers. This is so even where such agencies have been given some functions which, considered alone, might be beyond the power of Congress to authorize (38 Op. Att. Gen. 258, 265–266).

As stated in *Farmers' and Mechanics' National Bank* v. *Dearing* ((1875) 91 U. S. 29):

The power to create carries with it the power to preserve. The latter is the corollary from the former.

In addition to the foregoing, Congress has the constitutional authority "to regulate commerce with foreign nations"—article I, section 8, clause 3.

Concerning this power, the Supreme Court in *Henderson* v. *Mayor of the City of New York* ((1875) 92 U. S. 259, 270) stated:

As we said in *United States* v. *Holliday* (3 Wall. 417), commerce with foreign nations means commerce between citizens of the United States and citizens or subjects of foreign governments. It means trade, and it means intercourse. It means commercial intercourse between nations, and parts of nations, in all its branches. * * * To regulate this trade and intercourse is to prescribe the rules by which it shall be conducted.

Since the Herter bill contemplates that commodities and machinery will be furnished and will be paid for in cash or other commodities, or in the furnishing of strategic materials, and since the bill also deals with certain export controls and allocations, such transactions and exchanges would seem to be within the broad definition of "commerce with foreign nations" set forth above.

It is true that in carrying out the terms of the Herter bill, the activities of the agencies created by Congress thereunder might sometimes conceivably come close to the line of authority deemed to reside solely in the President. It is equally true that the doctrine of separation of powers is firmly imbedded in American constitutional law. But the doctrine at its strongest does not demand an absolute and complete separation. As a practical matter of government there must be a considerable accommodation of power, and each branch has certain authority which necessarily infringes upon the authority of the other branches. *Ex parte Grossman* ((1925) 267 U. S. 87); Frankfurter and Landis, Power of Congress Over Procedure in Criminal Contempts in "Inferior" Federal Courts—A Study in Separation of Powers ((1924) 37 Harv. L. Rev. 1010).

In the latter article, the authors point out that from the beginning the Supreme Court has refused to draw abstract, analytical lines of separation and has recognized necessary areas of interaction; moreover the Supreme Court has consistently sustained congressional discretion when moving in the general legislative field not bound by specific limitations, even though the particular field may border on territory dominantly in control of another department of the Government—Frankfurter and Landis, (op. cit. supra, pp. 1014, 1016).

In Ex parte Grossman, supra, the Supreme Court declared:

The Federal Constitution nowhere expressly declares that the three branches of the Government shall be kept separate and independent. * * * Complete independence and separation between the three branches, however, are not attained, or intended, as other provisions of the Constitution and the normal operation of Government under it easily demonstrate.

The Court then enumerated instances demonstrating the proposition that each branch of the Government is subject to certain positive and negative restraints by the other branches. These instances, the Court said, show that the independence of each branch of the Government, legislative, executive, and judicial, is qualified and is so subject to exception as not to constitute a broadly positive injunction or a necessary controlling rule of construction.

The method of handling any program of foreign aid goes to the very heart of the problem now before Congress. As the ardent advocates of this, that, or the other plan advance their arguments, it seems helpful to clarify the issues by eliminating the contentions which seem to lack substantial merit. One of these, it is submitted, is the attack on the Herter proposal on the basis that it violates constitutional limitations. It does not deserve opposition on that ground.

Address of Walter H. Van Hoesen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Walter H. Van Hoesen, president of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association at the annual dinner held at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on Tuesday evening, January 13, 1948:

It is worthy of more than passing note that 1,400 executives of steamship lines and other concerns active in foreign trade should be gathered under one roof, and I am pleased to speak on behalf of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, in expressing to you our appreciation for your attendance on this occasion.

It is significant of the role played by foreign-freight forwarders when so many of you take advantage of the opportunity to get together. Most of us are acquainted one with the other, but the demands of daily business prevent us from getting together very often for the purpose of discussing problems of mutual concern. I think it fair to say that we here tonight handle a larger proportion of world commerce than any other group.

During the war the foreign freight forwarders at the port of New York, with the cooperation of all the firms represented by you, were engaged almost entirely in expediting the movement of essential materials and supplies. Our functions consisted of the routing of consignments to and from all parts of the world by way of New York. We obtained steamer space, secured export licenses, prepared documents, and attended to the hundred and one other details which are of daily occurrence in the conduct of our business. Many of us held high positions in the various Government agencies, and I am informed that in no instance was the confidence misplaced.

Since the war our efforts have been turned to assisting in the revival of world trade through regular channels. We have aided in reestablishing contacts between widely separated consignees and shippers; we have sought to overcome obstacles created by currency and other restrictions imposed by practically every country in the world. During the last year we have been able to move billions of dollars in combined value of imports and exports through the port of New York. The months ahead may be even more difficult than the period during and since the war days. Economic conditions in the countries of Europe have become increasingly critical, and we are now shipping large quantities of goods under an interim-aid plan approved by the Congress. A long-range program of foreign relief is certain to follow under the provisions of the Marshall plan as it may be finally adopted. It is likely to involve the expenditure of from sixteen to twenty billion dollars in food and other products which will have to be shipped during the next 3 or 4 years. It will be a stupendous task to see that foreign-relief shipments are handled properly with a minimum of delay and expense to the United States Government.

The New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, believing that its members are adequately and best qualified to

have a part in this work, has offered the facilities of its members to the Government agencies with which the traffic will originate. Members of the Congress have stated for the record that it is their wish to have foreign-relief shipments handled by commercial forwarders whenever possible, and Government officers have stated that it is their intention to take advantage of our assistance. I am confident that we shall have the cooperation of all those engaged in foreign transportation so that the job may be well done.

The Year of Decision for Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Human Events for January 7, 1948:

THE YEAR OF DECISION FOR ITALY

(By a correspondent in Rome)

What will happen to Italy in the near future?

There are many reasons for anxiety, in spite of American support; notwithstanding inclusion of the moderate Socialists in the government and the calling off of the general strike in Rome. Attacks against the foundations of the young Italian Republic have become particularly insistent since ratification of the Italian Peace Treaty by Russia last September. Now, with evacuation of the Allied occupation forces, these attacks seem to have reached their peak.

This belief is strongly confirmed by the alarming events which took place throughout Italy during the last 2 months of 1947. In France, the Communist attempt to paralyze the country by a general strike completely failed. In Italy, on the contrary, demonstrations of a similar kind have on the whole succeeded.

We refer to the unexpected and daring assaults which the Communists tried in Milan during the last week of November, when for 3 days they took over all local government, and also to the general strike which was called in Rome during the second week of December. There is an attempt to minimize the importance of these connected "incidents." In fact it is hardly possible to view these events placidly. Their alarming significance is too evident.

The direct action of the Italian Communists in Milan revealed a number of disquieting facts. It showed that: (1) In Italy, at any time, well-disciplined Communists can be mobilized in sufficient strength to assume control of all municipal functions; (2) it is possible to set up a Communist soviet, which can force the national government to negotiate with it; (3) at least a part of the police forces are unreliable; (4) the great majority of the Italian people is politically tired and does not react with vigor and decision against occurrences which threaten the very existence of democratic institutions.

The recent Italian disorders prove incidentally that there is a great difference between the struggle which the French and the Italians are waging against Communist onslaught. The way in which the French stood up to the test is significant. It shows that the French people, having by tradition a strong feeling for the close interdependence between their internal and external politics, are again conscious of the historical greatness of their country.

II

The popular reaction to the Communist offensive in France shows that the French people realize the necessity for a close cultural, economic, and political collaboration between France and the great Anglo-Saxon democracies; that they understand the vital importance of defending their colonial empire and their national prestige. For all those reasons the French resolutely and in ever-increasing numbers turn against those alien elements which are trying to drag France into the abyss of political impotence and collective slavery.

The Italians, on the other hand, give only a feeble indication of understanding the events of our time. Twenty years of Fascist rule, culminating in a lost war, have made this country politically apathetic. The Italian sense for foreign politics, and its importance for national life, is surprisingly undeveloped. The people lack historic appreciation of their own institutions.

In regard to colonial empire and world prestige, the Italians no longer have anything to defend. Through their eastern frontier, difficult to control, undesirable strangers pass by the thousands. All the big Italian cities swarm with Russian spies and foreign agents. Efficient check on their subversive activities is in this country more difficult than in France. The French have already arrived at a point where, in their struggle against communism and Russian penetration, they are to a great extent helping themselves. The Italians still depend on the help, advice, and support of others.

This must be kept in mind if one realizes that in Italy the decisive battle with the Communists is still to come. Communism in Italy is at the present time on the defensive. This does not mean that the party has given up the struggle. Very much to the contrary. As a Moscow-trained tactician, Palmiro Togliatti, the leader of the Italian Communists and one of the shrewdest revolutionaries of our time, knows only too well that the best means of defense is to attack.

Togliatti certainly sees with displeasure that the general trend is against his cause. The Communists in Italy, too, are gradually losing ground. The number of their antagonists is growing, and the present Italian Government, its prestige noticeably increased by the inclusion of the independent Socialists (Saragat) and Republicans (Pacciardy), has a fair chance of winning in March the first free parliamentary elections of the new Italy. But these very facts force Togliatti to redouble his efforts and attacks against the De Gasperi government, against its American friends, and, in general, against everything which blocks the transformation of Italy into a Soviet satellite.

III

"Every day a stroke, every day an attack, every day a revolt of some sort," is therefore Togliatti's present slogan. "Not a moment's peace for the De Gasperi government and its supporters."

This attitude seems strange and incomprehensible to many American observers of Italian events. "The Italian Communists," they argue, "are fighting a hopeless battle. Should they lose, they will be weaker than before. So what sense is there in squandering their forces?"

Those who argue in this way unwittingly put the Communists on the same level with any other ordinary political party. This is a great error, for the Communist Party is not political in the ordinary sense. It is a very extraordinary party. When a political movement is backed by a mighty and unscrupulous world power and, in addition, can count on the support of hundreds of thousands of "fifth column" agents in almost every country, then such a party is not fighting a hopeless battle. It can very well permit itself the occasional luxury of squandering its forces, because they are practically inexhaustible.

Confirmation of this could lately be seen in France. Most likely a nation-wide general strike will before long be called in Italy, too. With the important difference, however, that the Italian Communists are much more easily supported from across the border (Yugoslavia) than their French comrades. Therefore, the situation of Italy—should it come to direct action on a grand scale—would have a more dangerous aspect and be more difficult to solve than was the case in France.

In view of these prospects, the question arises: What can be done by the United States to give the young Italian Republic more efficient support in its struggle against communism?

IV

Until recently the great majority of Americans have laid stress on the economic side of the problem. "It would be quite sufficient," they said in substance, "to give the Italians enough to eat. Then the specter of communism will disappear." Even the Marshall plan seems to a great extent based on this assumption.

Is this thesis incontestable? We in Italy doubt it. Those of us who have seen the Communist agitators succeed in districts where there is hardly any economic distress have necessarily come to the conclusion that there must be some error in this calculation. Italy cannot be saved by economic aid alone. Something more is needed. And it must be forthcoming soon, if one wishes to save Italy from falling, like so many other European countries before her, a prey to Communist and Russian aggression.

The interest shown by Americans over the fate of Italy is greatly appreciated by all democratic-minded and freedom-loving people. "But what precautions," one hears them asking, "have been taken to assure that the help offered Italy by the Marshall plan will come in time?" Russia, after a long period of hesitation, in September suddenly ratified the Italian Peace Treaty. That is generally interpreted as demonstrating Moscow's wish to synchronize the departure of the Allied forces from Italy with the particularly difficult midwinter season; and with completion of the necessary underground preparations.

What are the plans of the vast Communist underground organization in Italy? Overthrow, by legal or illegal means, of the Christian democratic government of de Gasperi and its replacement by a leftist government of the so-called people's bloc would be the first step. The next move would be a radical fusion of Italy's whole internal and foreign policy with that of the Balkan bloc. The Communists hope that the installation of a new leftist regime in Italy and the turning of its policy in a new direction may be accomplished before March, the date fixed for the first parliamentary elections of the new Italian Republic.

The coup can be expected to take place before adoption of the Marshall plan and before any revision of the Italian Peace Treaty. Representative government is necessarily slow in avoiding and preventing dangers that threaten peace. Moreover, 1948 is the year of the Presidential elections.

The whole public life of the United States of America, the Kremlin calculates, will, to a great extent, be paralyzed during 1948 by the election campaign. This, therefore, will be the right time, first to lull American public opinion by a show of collaboration with the western democracies, then to strike a hard blow at a place—Italy—where success seems most likely to be assured in advance.

The Rights of Labor—Democracy Versus Totalitarianism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the following article entitled "The Rights of Labor—Democracy versus Totalitarianism" has been published in booklet form by the International Labor Relations Department of the American Federation of Labor, Matthew Woll, chairman. It is a splendid comparison of the rights of the workingman under the Soviet system and his rights under our free American form of Government. Every Member of this House, yes, every member of the laboring class of our Nation, should be familiar with its contents. If every man and woman who has to work for a living knew the facts contained in it there would not be a corporal's guard of Communists holding office or influence in the labor movement in our country.

The American Federation of Labor and its International Labor Relations Department are entitled to our commendation for preparing and distributing such a valuable booklet. The article follows:

THE RIGHTS OF LABOR

Though democracy and totalitarianism vary in particulars in different countries, each system has certain essential distinguishing features.

The sharp contrast between these two systems is clearly illustrated in the following comparison of the rights of labor in the two countries which are the strongest protagonists of democracy (United States) and totalitarianism (Russia).

This comparison holds basically true for all democratic nations and totalitarian countries.

1. RIGHT OF ASSOCIATION

U. S. A.

The American worker enjoys the right of association and organization into (differing) economic, educational, political, and religious bodies of his own choosing as well as the right of combination into trade unions free from domination by employers, by the Government, or by any political party in or out of office.

U. S. S. R.

The Russian worker can join only such organizations as are approved by the Soviet Government for whom the choice is predetermined by the Communist Party—which is the only party in existence. The Communist Party has unquestionable monopoly control and domination over the entire vast government machine, the trade unions, all economic agencies, all cultural organizations, and all religious denominations.

Article 126 of the Soviet Constitution provides for the existence of only one political party—namely, the Communist Party. It declares that this party is the leading core of all organizations of the working people, both public and state. Thus, it is the Soviet Constitution itself which provides that all associations of any kind whatsoever are to be run and directed by Communist Party "cells." On March 14, 1947, Pravda, central organ of the Russian Communist Party, declared:

"The trade-unions enter a new period of their activities and in this important period the party organizations must give them the necessary help, incessantly watch the preparations for the conclusion of collective agreements and strengthen the entire organizing and educational work of the unions. * * * In this respect, the directing and leading role of the party organization is particularly important."

2. RIGHT TO JOIN A UNION

U. S. A.

The American worker enjoys the right to join a union of his own choosing and to elect its officers for a specified period. These elected officers are subject to rules and regulations and to a constitution adopted by the union membership.

The A. F. of L. holds its convention annually.

U. S. S. R.

Since 1932, the all-Russian trade unions have not held a single national convention. In the spring of 1937 the central council of the trade unions decided to hold a convention in October of that year. But somehow this convention was never held. The blood purges were on. Thus, Russia's Central Council of Trade Unions has been headed for years by individuals who were never elected by a convention.

3. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

U. S. A.

The American worker enjoys the right of genuine collective bargaining. American labor enjoys the right to fight against any attempt by government or employers to restrict or reduce the effectiveness of collective bargaining, such as the Taft-Hartley law. The American worker enjoys the right to fight for the extension of effective collective bargaining.

U. S. S. R.

Every trace of genuine collective bargaining has withered away in Russia. The practice of collective agreements was discontinued in 1934, except for the lumber and water transport workers and commercial employees whose collective agreements expired in 1935.

On July 8, 1933, Trud, central organ of Russia's trade unions, announced: "No other than economic officials can be primarily responsible for the wage scales, fixing of production quotas, piece rates, etc. Today the idea is rooted in the consciousness of some comrades in the factories that the trade union has to have equal say with the economic agency in fixing wages. This is a leftist and opportunistic deviation, an attempt to destroy the one-man leadership and to interfere with the administration. This must be ended."

In Pravda, on December 29, 1935, A. Andreev, in behalf of the Politbureau of the Communist Party, announced: "The wage scale must be left entirely in the hands of the heads of industry." In an attempt to allay the workers' dissatisfaction over being robbed of this right, the Russian authorities maneuvered in the spring of 1937 to bring back "collective agreements." But this was an obvious sham.

The aim of the new type of collective agreements now operating in Russia is not to defend the interests of the workers but "to guarantee that the production plan of the government is fulfilled and surpassed."

4. RIGHT TO STRIKE

U. S. A.

The American worker has the right to strike. American labor has the right to fight back against any attempt by employers or Government agencies to infringe upon the right to strike, such as the Taft-Hartley law.

U. S. S. R.

In Russia, there are neither strikes nor strikers. If coal miners, maritime workers, machinists, or any other workers were even to talk or threaten strike—let alone actually engage in a strike—they would be liable to prosecution for counterrevolutionary activities or sabotage which would result in their deportation to some penal labor camp in Siberia or a similar region.

5. RIGHT TO CHANGE JOB

U. S. A.

The American worker is free to change his place or type of employment. He can change jobs or move from city to city.

U. S. S. R.

The Russian worker has no right to change or leave his job on his own volition. Under a decree issued on June 26, 1940, the management of an enterprise can grant a worker permission to leave his job only if he is unable to continue on his job on account of illness or disability and if the management cannot provide him with another job in the same factory, or if he has become eligible for an old-age pension, or in a few other cases. Any Russian worker leaving his job without such permission is guilty of a crime punishable by 2 to 4 months' imprisonment if he is employed in a nondefense industry and from 5 to 8 years if he is employed in a defense industry.

According to a decree of December 20, 1938, the Russian worker must carry a "labor book," similar to the one Hitler's regime imposed on the German workers. In this "labor book"—deposited with the plant manager for "safekeeping"—are noted all infractions of the extremely rigorous "labor discipline" rules to which Soviet workers must submit.

According to the decree of June 26, 1940, and the ensuing decision of the Supreme Court of the U. S. S. R. on August 15, 1940, any worker who, "without any valid reason," is absent from—or late in coming to—work for more than 20 minutes is considered as having committed a crime punishable by a maximum of 6 months of "corrective labor" at his place of work with "a 25-percent deduction from his salary"—if this absence or lateness occurs three times during a month or four times during two consecutive months.

6. RIGHT TO EMIGRATE

U. S. A.

The American worker has the right to leave temporarily or to emigrate permanently from the United States.

U. S. S. R.

Any Soviet worker who attempts to leave Russia temporarily or to emigrate permanently from the U. S. S. R. is liable to prosecution for treason—a crime punishable by 25 years at penal labor.

7. PUBLIC SCHOOLING

U. S. A.

The American worker is entitled to have his children receive a public-school education free. In many sections and cities of the country, high-school education facilities are also free. Some city- and State-endowed colleges provide the children of the American worker with an opportunity to secure even a university education free.

U. S. S. R.

Since 1940, the Russian worker must pay for his child's education beyond the seventh grade (decree of October 2, 1940). Consequently, the number of Russian workers' children getting anything more than the most elementary education is very small.

8. FREEDOM OF OPINION

U. S. A.

The American worker enjoys the right of freedom of opinion and expression and has the right of access to the opinions of others.

U. S. S. R.

The Russian worker is not entitled to voice any opinion other than the one approved by the monopolistic, monolithic Communist Party which alone determines all the policies of the government and of all cultural

artistic, scientific, religious, sport, and economic bodies. Non-Communist critics of the party line or dissidents within the party risk deportation, imprisonment, concentration camp, or liquidation upon the slightest evidence of expression of differences or diffusing of such different opinions or communicating them to others.

9. ACCESS TO INFORMATION

U. S. A.

The American worker enjoys the right of free access to the opinions and publications of the workers of other countries. The American worker has the right of exchanging opinions and information with the workers of other nations in regard to trade-unions, economic, political, social, religious, cultural, and scientific matters.

U. S. S. R.

No Russian worker is allowed to subscribe to or receive the publications of labor or other organizations outside of the U. S. S. R.—unless he receives special permission from the government. For the Russian worker to request permission to receive such material is to invite investigation and surveillance and risk severe punishment by the dreaded secret political police (M. V. D.)

To this date, the Moscow government has denied Russian labor the right to receive the A. F. of L. publication "International Free Trade Union News" in the Russian language edition.

Any Russian worker who would attempt to exchange by mail opinions or information with the workers of other countries would run into grave risks, since all mail going out of or into Russia from abroad is subject to the strongest censorship and since any communication with people abroad might be regarded by the Soviet police as espionage or counterrevolutionary activity.

10. RIGHT TO CRITICIZE GOVERNMENT

U. S. A.

The American worker has the right to criticize publicly his Government, the dominant party in office, even the highest Government official, the leadership and program of any political party or any particular Government policy or law. The American worker has the right to organize and work for the repeal of any law he deems to be unjust, unfair, or hostile to the best interests of the public or the working people.

U. S. S. R.

The Russian worker does not enjoy even a shred of such rights. He dare not criticize and cannot change the government of his own country. Generalissimo Stalin and the Communist Party, which he rules with a rod of steel, are supposed to be infallible in every field of activity and avenue of expression. The deification of Stalin knows no bounds.

To attempt criticism or even questioning of this all-inclusive infallibility would be to insure disaster for the Russian citizen guilty of such rash judgment.

11. CIVIL LIBERTIES

U. S. A.

The American worker enjoys freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention, search, and seizure. He is entitled to a fair public trial by jury or competent and unprejudiced court constituted in accordance with normal judicial procedure. The American worker has the right of habeas corpus and enjoys freedom from arbitrary imposition of penalties. In cases where individuals or groups or local or State authorities seek to infringe directly or indirectly upon these rights or succeed in limiting these rights (through interfering with civil rights or discriminating in employment on account of race, color, or creed), the American workers have the right of assembly, organization, and judicial guarantees for defeating such attempts at infringement. Thus, some States have already enacted laws to help overcome these antidemocratic and un-American practices. In Congress, similar corrective legislation (FEPC) is still under consideration. Its enactment, fully supported by the A. F. of L., has so far been blocked by reactionary forces exploiting parliamentary procedure.

The American Constitution, however, is a living document. Our Declaration of Independence is a ringing charter of freedom.

U. S. S. R.

The Russian worker is subject to surveillance, investigation, and arbitrary detention and arrest by the secret police force (the MVD) which may send any individual to a concentration camp without trial by a court.

The rights allegedly guaranteed to the Russian people by the Soviet Constitution are practically nullified by a whole series of utterly antidemocratic laws and decrees and a tyrannical penal code. Thus have the Russian workers been deprived of their rights as human beings and producers.

12. FREEDOM OF LABOR

U. S. A.

In the United States, involuntary servitude in any shape, manner, or form, or under any guise has been outlawed by the Constitution and discontinued. Today, there is no longer any State which resorts to the chain gang as a system of punishment for convicts.

Besides, American labor enjoys the right of fighting against—and the opportunity to defeat, abolish, or repeal—any practice or legislation which even in the least degree smacks of forced labor.

The United States no longer holds any prisoners of war.

U. S. S. R.

In Russia's numerous concentration and penal labor camps, 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 people are doomed to slave labor. These "corrective" (forced) labor camps are operated under the jurisdiction of the dreaded political police (MVD) and are filled with millions of Russian political dissidents and millions of other liberated nationalities and prisoners of war. Slave labor constitutes a very important segment of Russian economy.

13. FREEDOM OF PRESS

U. S. A.

Freedom of the press is guaranteed in the United States. There is no press censorship.

U. S. S. R.

All books or periodicals published in Russia—except Communist Party publications—are subject to censorship. Any publication may be prohibited if "it contains agitation or propaganda against the Soviet Government or the dictatorship of the proletariat" or "if it reveals state secrets"—the latter being interpreted by the Russian authorities in an elastic and rather all-embracing manner.

14. RIGHT TO VOTE

U. S. A.

In the United States the elections are free. The workers enjoy the right of fighting freely and energetically against the limitations and infringements imposed on free elections through such schemes as the poll tax and white primaries. The extent to which the American people adequately exercise the right and opportunity of participating in free elections depends, in large measure, upon the extent to which labor utilizes the rights and potentialities of the free and secret ballot and discharges its responsibilities of good citizenship.

U. S. S. R.

Under the one-party system in Russia, there are not and there cannot be any real elections. Actually, the vast majority of the Russian citizens are disfranchised. They are marshaled to participate in the farce of "electing" candidates who cannot be opposed. Public officials, including judges, are in effect appointed by the Communist Party, since the nomination of an uncontested Communist candidate is equivalent to his definite selection for the office in question. Hence, Russia's so-called elections are nothing but an empty formality. The solemn "election" ceremony is designed to confirm post facto these appointments through a sham popular consultation at which attendance is compulsory and no opportunity is given the voters to choose between contestants.

Prospects for Trade in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the record, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, delivered before the National Foreign Trade Convention at the Hotel Jefferson in St. Louis, on the very timely topic of prospects for trade in the Far East:

The postwar picture of the world seems disheartening and melancholy. After two victorious world wars against predatory powers bent on conquest, we have not made the world safe for democracy as Americans understand it. Nor have we removed fear from struggling humanity or extended the "four freedoms" to the extent promised. Ancient sovereign nations of central and eastern Europe have fallen under the heel of a new oppressor, our ally of yesterday, Soviet Russia, and the independence of the other nations of Europe is threatened. Manchuria, Korea, North China, and the nations bordering Soviet Russia are being, directly or indirectly, coerced to bow to this insatiable dictatorship.

Are there any bright aspects to this melancholy picture? I believe there are, when we view it as a whole, in perspective, and from the long range point of view. I shall try to point out four such hopeful aspects. There may be and doubtless are others.

First, there is today potentially a larger area for world trade than ever before in the history of the world. That area is coextensive with the countries committed in varying degrees to representative government under free democratic institutions in our sense of the term. This area, roughly, is the entire world outside of Soviet Russia, and her controlled satellites.

The spirit of freedom has awakened the vast masses of the world and stirred them to activity for national independence. In the Far East, China with scarcely more than the brave determination of her people, withstood the cruel might of Japan, shook off foreign domination, and took her place among the independent nations of the world. The Philippine Republic is launched on her independent career. Indochina is hopefully struggling for her national freedom. Indonesia is shedding her colonial status and with the help and guidance of the United Nations is striving to take her destiny in her own hands. India and Pakistan have taken their equal place as dominions in the British Commonwealth. Burma is receiving from Parliament her independence. In the Near East, Egypt and the Arab states are enjoying independent sovereign status.

In the vast area then, from the near to the far east, containing more than one-half of the peoples of the world, colonialism and semisubject status have yielded to national independence and self-government. It may be said that almost all the peoples of the world outside of Russia and her satellites, are today striving toward government from, by, and for the people, nurtured by free democratic institutions. This potential is a larger trading area than ever before.

Secondly, today national self-sufficiency, so fashionable between the wars, and corrosive isolationism, are discarded. Today as never before the interdependence of nations is taken as an axiomatic principle underlying the relationship among nations.

Thirdly, there is more intelligent, vigorous, and methodical effort to solve the world's problems through cooperative action than ever before in the history of the world.

Fourthly, so long as Soviet Russia will not join us and the Allied Nations to establish peace and then cooperatively through the United Nations to go on with the tasks of reconstruction, I believe the very violence of her attacks is a bright aspect in the depressing world picture. When she uses the veto in the Security Council of the United Nations, for example, solely as a device to wreck and demolish every cooperative plan put forth by the other nations, we, and the other nations are put on guard. When we are told, in a strangely familiar way, that we are decrepit, that our free-enterprise system will collapse, and in the same breath, that though we are at the brink of the abyss, we are out to enslave the free peoples of the world, and further that the true and genuine democracy is the one practiced behind the iron curtain, naturally we are alerted, and I believe, that all other peoples outside the reach of the Soviet Army are similarly alerted.

Now whatever our personal view of the world situation may be, whether optimistic or gloomy, the question remains what are we to do about it? Obviously it is not enough to point the finger of guilt at Soviet Russia for sabotaging constructive efforts and perpetuating chaotic conditions. We must exercise our leadership and play our full part in remedying the situation. We must put our shoulder under the long-range program of our Government and the United Nations to achieve the objective sought in common by all, namely, to increase production, raise the standard of living, increase purchasing power, reduce trade barriers, and increase the flow of goods among nations. If we do our best in promoting these ends, Soviet Russia's disruptive opposition can well be accommodated.

At this point I should like to make some comments touching upon both short- and long-term projects:

1. In our dealings with Europe necessity has brought us to a realization of the wisdom in the words "The Lord helps those who help themselves." We cannot undertake to do the impossible in these matters, but we should give prompt and realistic help to countries which are working to help themselves but have been seriously handicapped by crop shortages resulting from the drought of last summer, wartime destruction of plants, lack of coal and other raw materials, and the like.

2. Apart from prompt credits for food, the granting of credits to foreign countries should be conditioned primarily upon the utilization of the funds for producing and exporting goods so as to acquire the dollars needed to equalize their balance of payments. In making future credits we should learn from and be guided by our experience with previous extension of credits. We should insist that the credits be used for the stated purpose.

3. Naturally, the recovery in Europe is in a large measure dependent on recovery in Latin America and the Far East. The importance of building a strong economy in the Western Hemisphere has been recognized and we are all looking forward to the elaboration of a realistic plan of self-help and mutual aid at the Bogotá Conference next winter. Incidentally, let us hope that the Conference will go deep into some of the obstructions to the bringing into a country of capital and "know how" that are found in laws and practices which are not in harmony with present needs.

4. As for the Philippines, we have a special interest in helping this new state get on its feet after the devastation suffered at the hands of the Japanese. Presupposing a continuing policy of nondiscrimination against Americans, it should be possible to rebuild prosperity with our aid on the foundations laid before that country become independent.

5. The Chinese Government is believed to be earnestly endeavoring to bring order out of chaos. It must be remembered that China has been engaged in warfare since 1931, first with the Japanese and then with the Chinese Communist forces. Inevitably transportation is disrupted, production is reduced, inflation has gotten out of control, the currency has become almost valueless and, putting it mildly, trying to carry on business under such conditions is exceedingly risky. Nevertheless, steps are being taken to establish order and the Government has listened to objections presented by the National Foreign Trade Council and other organizations against discriminatory features in new legislation. A treaty of establishment has been signed and we hope that a fair basis is being laid for an eventual and safe recovery of business relations. May the Chinese authorities facilitate the continuation of American enterprises previously established there under a different regime so that by their example others will follow. Correspondingly, may the American authorities take cognizance of present difficulties in the application of laws intended to facilitate trade with China.

6. Indonesia, the Malay States, and Burma, as well as India, are all countries which should afford splendid fields for development in the future. They are all seeking the aid of American capital and technical guidance.

The new dominions of India and Pakistan, emancipated Burma, and the Malay States all need what we have to offer, and we can use their raw materials. However, there is need for treaties on taxation and establishment to assure American enterprises of the treatment they are accustomed to enjoy in other lands. As soon as hostilities cease in Indonesia obviously whatever we can profitably do in that rich country will benefit in some degree individuals in the Netherlands and Great Britain who have invested in companies operating in Indonesia. This observation, of course, applies to the benefits accruing as the result of reconstruction in Latin America and the Far East to many Europeans who have invested in those territories.

7. In short, the American program for reconstruction must be global because economically the world is indivisible. One part of the world cannot be economically sick without endangering the health of other parts. Mr. Krug has reported that our resources are sufficient to cover our own needs and those that may have to be provided under the Marshall plan. However, we must husband our forces so as to be able to help our friends also in the Western Hemisphere and the Far East. Obviously, we cannot afford to give away all this substance without receiving in return not only goods but also safeguards for Americans who trade or invest in the other countries.

As we cannot foresee changing conditions and needs we cannot expect to make a rigid 4- or 5-year plan.

As generally speaking, aid must be contingent on what the other country produces, the need of our assistance should be evaluated on a year-to-year basis. Longer term needs might be referred to the World Bank.

8. It has been suggested that the aid should be handled by a specially created corporation rather than by the State Department or another department. Such a proposal merits consideration. Obviously, if the corporation were headed by men with business experience and run along lines similar to those followed by the world-trading corporations represented here, the corporation should be in a good position to carry out its program realistically. Moreover, it should regularly consult with the men represented at this gathering in order to have the advantage of their experience in formulating plans and reaching decisions.

Statement by Otis D. Ashworth, Commander, Department of Mississippi, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week Hon. Fielding L. Wright, newly elected Governor of the great State of Mississippi, delivered his inaugural address to the Mississippi State Legislature. In his address he warned against continued efforts on the part of both major political parties to cram antisouthern legislation down the throats of the people of the South. Governor Wright's speech was inserted into the RECORD in the other body by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, and can be found on pages 466 and 467 of the RECORD of January 23, 1948. In this connection, I include herewith a statement issued by a distinguished Mississippi Democrat, Rev. Otis D. Ashworth, Department of Mississippi, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States:

Along with other God-fearing Mississippians who believe in States' rights and the efforts of our own people to improve the lot of all our citizens irrespective of race, color, or creed, I am wholeheartedly in accord with Governor Wright's recommendation that we warn our national leaders against further trampling of our ideals.

Governor Wright did not suggest that we secede from the party but on the other hand said we should make our voice known and felt within the party councils. We should let our national leaders know that we will demand of them the same loyalty to our ways of life that we have given our party during the past 80 years.

As the Governor so ably said, "This is a new day in State and national politics, and circumstances may make necessary a new, and we hope, a temporary approach to national politics by our State and Southland."

Leaders in all national parties are attempting to force repeal of segregation laws, destroy our dual system and our social institutions, and reconstruct us by using the power of the Federal Government against us.

Southern States have waged a strong fight to regain influence in the party since losing it when they agreed to abolish a rule that required two-thirds majority vote.

Mississippi has for 80 years been democratic, and the efforts by some to force Mississippi to submit to legislation that would destroy every vestige of States' rights and the right to govern her internal affairs has

been most vigorously condemned by Governor Wright in his timely warning.

I only regret that we do not have a President with Governor Wright's ability and courage. It is my impression that the Governor did not threaten to bolt the party, for, as a matter of fact, the party "took a walk" on Jefferson democracy long ago.

In my opinion, the Governor gave an invitation for the national party leaders to return to the party.

Appointments and Citations Made by the Australian Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday at noon at the Australian Embassy, I was privileged to witness the appointment by the Australian Ambassador of Adm. Thomas C. Kinkaid, United States Navy, to be honorary companion of the Military Division of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath—C. B.—and the appointment of Vice Adm. Daniel E. Barbey, United States Navy, to be honorary commander of the Military Division of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire—C. B. E.

These citations were made upon Admiral Kinkaid who commanded the Allied naval forces in the Southwest Pacific and Vice Admiral Barbey as commander of the amphibious forces, Seventh Fleet, in recognition of outstanding services in their respective capacities leading to the reconquest of New Guinea and for their spectacular and successful seaborne operations which resulted in the destruction and neutralization of considerable enemy forces in territory administered by the Commonwealth of Australia.

Though I, as a communication watch officer, had been attached to the staff of the Seventh Fleet under Admiral Kinkaid and subsequently in a like capacity under Vice Admiral Barbey when he replaced Admiral Kinkaid as commander of the Seventh Fleet, I was not so attached at the time mentioned in these appointments and citations which commence with November 1943, but I had ample opportunity subsequently to observe both of these fine, courageous men of the sea who have adhered to the highest traditions of our Navy upon which service they reflect great credit as individuals, as outstanding leaders, men of great courage and skill, cooperative with others joined in a common cause, true Americans.

I know I speak for all former Seventh Fleeters, officers and enlisted, who served under the commands of Admirals Kinkaid and Barbey in the Pacific and express their admiration and congratulations to each upon the honors which have been bestowed in grateful appreciation by the people and Government of Australia through his Majesty the King.

I did not have such a personal acquaintance with Vice Adm. Arthur S. Carpender, United States Navy, retired, Col. Sidney Forrester Mashbir, United States Army, or Col. Abraham Sinkov, United States Army, who also received appointments and acknowledgment of their services at the ceremonies mentioned. I am sure that we all join in the sincerest congratulations in recognition of their distinguished services in the Southwest Pacific area and include the citations for each that accompanied their respective appointments.

His Majesty the King has been graciously pleased to appoint Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid, United States Navy, to be honorary companion of the military division of the most honorable Order of the Bath (CB).

"Admiral Kinkaid assumed duty as commander, Allied Naval Forces, in the southwest Pacific area in November 1943. During the period of his command, successful assaults were made on enemy-held territory from Cape Gloucester to Leyte Island. These spectacular and successful sea-borne operations resulted in the destruction and neutralization of considerable enemy forces in territory administered by the Commonwealth of Australia.

"Admiral Kinkaid commanded the Allied Naval Forces, including His Majesty's Australian ships *Shropshire* and *Arunta* in the notable victory in the battle of the Surigao Straits. The award is bestowed in recognition of outstanding services to the Commonwealth whilst in command of Allied Naval Forces which were engaged in the capture of Japanese positions vital to the reconquest of New Guinea. By his inspiring leadership and wholehearted cooperation, Admiral Kinkaid has rendered invaluable service to the cause of the United Nations."

His Majesty the King has been graciously pleased to appoint Vice Adm. Daniel E. Barbey, United States Navy, to be honorary commander of the military division of the most excellent Order of the British Empire (CBE).

"Vice Adm. Barbey assumed duty as commander, Amphibious Forces, Seventh Fleet, in November 1943. During the period of his command, he rendered distinguished and meritorious services to the Commonwealth of Australia in the successful amphibious assaults on enemy strongholds in New Guinea and elsewhere in the southwest Pacific area. By his skillful and resolute conduct of these hazardous operations, Vice Admiral Barbey has given outstanding service."

His Majesty the King has been graciously pleased to appoint Vice Adm. Arthur S. Carpender, United States Navy (retired), to be honorary commander of the military division of the most excellent Order of the British Empire (CBE).

"Vice Admiral Carpender took over from Admiral Leary the command of Allied naval forces in the southwest Pacific area in September 1942 and held that appointment until November 1943. During that period the organization worked smoothly and efficiently and a number of additional facilities were provided for Naval Forces. Successful landings covered by the Allied squadron took place at Lae and Finschhafen. Vice Admiral Carpender rendered valuable and successful services in the organization and operation of Allied Naval Forces in this area."

His Majesty the King has been graciously pleased to appoint Col. Sidney Forrester Mashbir, United States Army, to be an honorary officer of the military division of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, for distinguished service in the Southwest Pacific Area.

"Colonel Mashbir was the coordinator of the Translator and Interpreter Service and the information obtained from documents and prisoners processed by his section was of the greatest value to operations in this and other theaters of war."

Col. Abraham Sinkov, United States Army, officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire (military division).

"The work done by Colonel Sinkov has been altogether outstanding and his enthusiasm and exceptional cooperation, far in excess of the normal course of duty, have provided a constant inspiration to his comrades-in-arms of the Australian military forces. His technical work in the field has been unsurpassed, and his contribution to the Signal Intelligence organization in the Southwest Pacific Area has been outstanding."

Federal Tax Collections in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily Tribune for January 27, 1948:

UNITED STATES RETURNS MILLIONS FOR TAX BILLIONS—ILLINOIS SECOND IN FEDERAL LEVIES

(By Robert Young)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—Illinois received $106,262,992 from the Federal Government in the fiscal year ended last June 30, but during the same year individuals and corporations in the State paid $3,447,148,353 in taxes into the Federal Treasury, comparative figures showed today.

The nearly $3,500,000,000 of Federal tax collections in Illinois in the 1947 fiscal year included $1,644,731,039 in individual income taxes, $610,044,861 in corporation levies, and $1,192,172,453 in other taxes.

The $106,000,000 in Federal funds allotted in Illinois in the same fiscal year included various grants and payments under such Government programs as social security and old-age assistance, agricultural adjustment and extension work, public roads and works, school milk, wildlife conservation, veterans' administration, National Guard, vocational rehabilitation, aid for the blind, child and maternity care, and nurses training.

STATE CONTRIBUTES

Most of the Federal grant total—$78,328,692—went to Illinois under the 18 programs administered by the Federal Security Agency. All but two of these programs are on a Federal-State partnership basis, with the State contributing funds of its own to match the Federal payments.

The five "Chicagoland" States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, and Wisconsin paid a total of $7,222,047,236 in Federal taxes during the year ended last June 30 while they were receiving $324,478,490 in grants and payments from the Government. The Federal funds allotted to Illinois were more than double those received by Indiana, Iowa, and Wisconsin and exceeded those of Michigan by nearly $25,000,000. Illinois tax collections, however, topped those of Michigan by more than $1,500,000,000 and those of the other 3 States by as much as $3,000,000,000.

TABLE OF COMPARISON

The following table compares Federal tax collections with Federal grants and payments in the 1947 fiscal year for the five "Chicagoland" States:

State	Taxes paid	Federal grants
Illinois	$3,447,148,353	$106,262,992
Indiana	916,678,240	49,131,194
Iowa	348,763,454	41,996,267
Michigan	1,779,428,893	81,476,062
Wisconsin	730,031,296	45,611,975

Federal tax collections in Illinois for the 1947 fiscal year were the second largest among all the 48 States, being exceeded only by New York's $7,723,855,345.

The Nisei Discover America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert an article from the Reader's Digest entitled "The Nisei Discover America." More properly, this should be entitled "The Nisei Discover Chicago and the Middle West." Chicago has afforded these citizens an opportunity to make use of their talents and abilities, and has enabled these people to make their proper contribution to the American way of life. Because of proposed and pending legislation, I believe it is appropriate for Members of Congress to know as much about these people as possible.

The article follows:

THE NISEI DISCOVER AMERICA

(By Bradford Smith, condensed from the American Magazine)

Before the war there were about 300 Japanese in Chicago. Today there are between 15,000 and 20,000—more, probably, than there are in any other city in the country. Most of them are Japanese-Americans (Nisei), with a sprinkling of Japan-born parents (Issei).

Before the war most of our Japanese lived in Little Tokyos on the west coast. Today, 5 years after being evacuated from their homes to desert camps, many have gone back. But the Nisei have discovered America. In midwestern and eastern cities like Chicago, Minneapolis, Cleveland, St. Louis, New York, and Philadelphia they have found that they are not excluded from residential areas and preferred types of employment. Their skills are sought after, their abilities put to use.

The move from the West began with a trickle from the relocation centers in 1943. Victims of wartime prejudice and hysteria, thievery, and vandalism, they were as suspicious of other Americans as most Americans were of them. But as the need for manpower grew desperate and as the record of the fighting Nisei corrected the impression regarding them, Midwest employers began to call for more. Nisei who found that they could lead normal lives began to write to other Nisei in the centers, urging them to come out.

The Nesei and their parents have almost completely altered their prewar employments. On the coast they were farmers, produce merchants, fishermen, gardeners, and domestic help. In Chicago many have turned to factory work and work for more than 2,000 employers. Wage earners report an income from 2 to 10 times what they got on the west coast. Some Nisei are supervising employees of all races, a situation practically unheard of in California. Less than 10 percent are employed in domestic jobs.

A good many have set up shop for themselves. The American-born are lawyers, physicians, dentists, optometrists, photographers, commercial artists. They operate garages, beauty parlors, packing services, groceries. The older men with capital generally put it into real estate. One estimate says they have invested more than $2,500,000 in property and small enterprises.

Al Doi, a young college graduate, came to Chicago to teach Japanese to military government classes at the university. Later he started a business. He now employs more than 150 women making artificial flowers. They earn $35 to $50 a week. Being an Oriental helps in this business, I was told. Customers think Orientals have an artistic touch other folks don't have.

There is the Hiura family, with nine grown children. Five of the sons are in Chicago—three of them optometrists, two dentists. They are all busy, and much of their trade is non-Japanese.

Many women have found well-paying jobs in the clothing industry, earning as much as $20 a day operating sewing machines. Their reputation as good workers soon spread. When Kuppenheimer recently appointed a Nisei as personnel manager it was partly in the hope that he would attract 500 Issei women as garment workers. So far the demand greatly exceeds the supply.

When the wartime need for stenographers was at its peak, Nisei girls were hired, at first reluctantly, then with enthusiasm when their good qualities became known. These girls rarely had a chance at good secretarial jobs back on the coast.

Before evacuation Sam Terao helped his father run a restaurant in Seattle. Two years ago they came to Chicago looking for a similar business in which to invest. One of the prospects was a kosher delicatessen. Sammy didn't know gefuilte fish from matzoth, but it looked like a good business, and he bought it. For a couple of months business was very slow. The neighbors hesitated to get their strudel from an oriental. But when Yom Kippur came, Sammy saw the shops closing up all around him, and decided to close, too. After that business picked up remarkably. Customers found that Sammy could make as good a pastry as if he had been brought up in the synagogue.

Recently I asked Sammy if he intended to stay.

"Sure," he replied. "I'll never go back West. It's better for us here. The evacuation was a blessing in disguise, as far as we're concerned."

Another young Nisei said: "It's been over 2 years since I left Tule Lake with a few dollars in my pocket and half-hearted hope. Today I have a swell job, a sense of responsibility, and self-respect."

In spite of the housing shortage in Chicago, which has forced many Nisei into an undesirable area north of the Loop, no Little Tokyo has developed there. Nor will there ever be anything like the kind of segregated community which, on the coast, was the result of prejudice and discrimination, and which led to all the mistaken notions about the "Japs."

In Chicago the Japanese are part of the great city. Their stores, interspersed with others, cater to the general public; and whereas in Los Angeles the Nisei had to look to their own community for employment, they now work for all kinds of employers. Instead of setting up their own churches, they attend more than 100 of Chicago's established churches, and find themselves welcome. The pastor of the First Baptist Church, by the way, is the Reverend Jitsuo Morikawa. Attendance has doubled since he went there.

The Nisei have stretched out socially. The younger group is finding outlets in characteristic American ways—in basketball tournaments, bowling leagues, dancing, sports, and discussion groups. By doing things together with other Americans, the Nisei are overcoming the bitter hurt and disillusionment caused by the evacuation.

Adjustment has been harder for the alien parents, the Issei. The Little Tokyos of the west coast made it possible for them to make a living without knowing much English or following American ways. Resettlement caused a complete change in their lives.

But their faith is fixed on the American-born generation. Mr. Osato and his wife sent three sons into the Army, though evacuation and the acts of hoodlums had deprived them of their little shop, their personal possessions, and much of their savings. Their daughter left a relocation center to take an office job in Chicago and, when she had saved some money, sent for her parents. The city frightened Mrs. Osato and her first trip alone on the elevated required great courage. She made it in order to get a job at a packaging plant. Meanwhile, Mr. Osato had taken a dishwashing job. It hurt his pride, for he was a merchant, an independent man. But the main thing was to carry on until his boys came back and finished their education.

The Nisei often feel a touch of homesickness for the West. For one thing, Chicago's weather has been hard for them to take. Jimmy Takemura quit a good job as laboratory technician to return to Los Angeles. For weeks he tried to get work, but no one would employ him in his specialty. He is back in Chicago. "Chicago is colder," he explained, "but it is also wider." You can't have everything.

In Chicago, as in other cities, many people have learned for the first time that there is nothing "mysterious" about an oriental. They know that American principles of fair play demand an equal chance for all Americans, regardless of race. And that is the meaning of Sammy Terao, who runs a kosher restaurant in a town settled by the Indians, discovered by the French and ruled by an Irish mayor.

Let's Have an Interoceanic Canals Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the American Coalition, composed of a large number of women's patriotic societies, while in annual convention in the city of Washington a few days ago, adopted a resolution urging the creation of an Interoceanic Canals Commission for the purpose of studying the whole interoceanic canal situation and for making recommendations in the premises.

I am pleased to present this resolution for the consideration of the Congress:

INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Whereas there have arisen the questions of increased facilities of the Panama Canal and the Canal's adequate defense, together

with proposals for the construction, maintenance, and operation, by the United States, of another waterway, at a new site, connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; and

Whereas these matters are of such grave importance to the United States, and to world advantage and security, that it appears wise and necessary that there be created, by congressional action, a commission charged with the duty of investigating these questions in the most thorough manner possible, and making findings and recommendations in the premises: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention assembled, approves the principles and purposes embodied in H. R. 4833, recently introduced by Representative WILLIS W. BRADLEY, of California, and respectfully urges the prompt consideration and enactment by Congress of this measure.

Establishment of an Enduring Peace and the Fight Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks in part made by me before the B'nai B'rith, Jewish Community Center, Fitchburg, Mass., January 26, 1948:

Declaring that the two greatest problems facing the country at present are the institution of an enduring peace and an immediate attack upon inflation and high prices, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, guest speaker at the Jewish Community Center before members of the B'nai B'rith pleaded for toleration and mutual understanding between various groups of our people.

"One of our greatest and strongest and most cherished American traditions is equal opportunity and equality under the law for all. Racism, prejudice, and bigotry directed against an individual or a group is violative of this fundamental American principle. Our nation has weathered many storms and has achieved incomparable progress and prosperity because it has been able to enlist the service, loyalty and devotion of our citizens regardless of race, creed, class, or station in life. I am very proud of the fact—as we all must be—that respect for the rights of others and toleration for the origin and the beliefs of others is an outstanding characteristic and practice of the people of this congressional district and our Commonwealth. Let us endeavor to spread our example of sterling Americanism throughout the Nation so that the evil and detestable spirit of intolerance and bigotry and all its abominable works may be stifled and banished. There is no place for hatred of race or creed or class in America."

PHILBIN discussed current international problems and urged recognition of the principle of self-determination as the surest path to lasting world peace. "Wars are caused sometimes by unbridled militarism and warmongering," said the Clinton Congressman, "but the underlying causes of many wars spring from injustice and oppression—efforts by strong nations to subjugate or dominate the weak and deny to them their God-given right of individual liberty, self-expression, and self-government. No peace treaty or arrangement based upon injustice or oppression can be lasting, and no peace treaty based upon betrayal and repudiation of democratic ideals or solemn agreements can long endure. If we intend to adhere, not only to the expressions of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms but also to the basic doctrines set forth in our own unmatched Constitution, then we must acknowledge the right of every people to set up and order their own government and that principle includes the Jewish people just as much as it includes any other people in the world.

"We believed that the question of a free, autonomous Jewish homeland had been settled long ago. We believed long ago that the great British Empire had acted in good faith and would carry out its promises and pledges regarding this question. There is no reason why these promises and pledges should be broken, and if we intend to be true to our own principles and our own war aims, if we intend to stand by and live by our own faith in democracy, there is no reason why our Government should not strongly repudiate the betrayal of a great race whose only crime is that it seeks to establish a homeland for its own people, not only as a self-governed political entity possessing all the attributes of our democratic form of government, but also as a haven and refuge for an afflicted and oppressed people who have been beset by misfortune, tragedy, and cruel, heartless, and merciless persecution never exceeded in the annals of history."

Touching upon the problems of the displaced persons in Europe, Congressman PHILBIN pointed to the fact that an overwhelming number of these unfortunate persons are non-Jews. "It matters not what their racial origin is or of what nationality, creed, or group they are composed. They are human beings and fellow creatures. Most of them have suffered terrible persecution, all of them have been driven from their homes and native land to which they may not safely return. They are without means of support in war-shattered countries where the doors of opportunity are closed, and where hunger, starvation, misery, and distress are prevalent. Our Government has held out the hand of succor and relief to this sorely afflicted group and our Congress has appropriated money to assist them until such time as they are able to become resettled and earn their own livelihood. In the name of charity, mercy, and justice we cannot turn our backs on these unfortunates. In common with other democratic nations of the world, in conjunction with the United Nations, we must assume a full, generous, and wholehearted share of the burden of taking care of them and aiding them to find a refuge and a haven under free institutions where they can escape from stark tragedy and make their own way in life. We cannot and must not evade our plain humanitarian duty toward these people."

Congressman PHILBIN also touched in some detail upon current problems of our domestic economy which he stated were extremely grave and critical. "Talking about inflation and high prices is no solution," he said. "Under the leadership of the Government, labor and management must promptly tackle these problems in the free American way as I urged long ago, so that our people and especially our working men and women and their families may be relieved from the onerous burdens of skyrocketing prices of essentials and necessaries of life. Americans do not want a controlled or regimented economy because that is the way of the totalitarian state. We do not want black markets and bureaucratic domination of the lives of our people. But we insist upon an immediate, forthright, affirmative attack upon inflation which, if it continues, will not only further diminish our standards of living but in the end will undermine our fundamental business institutions and drive us toward the abhorrent police state."

Let the Present Board Decide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times for January 25, 1948:

LET THE PRESENT BOARD DECIDE

President Truman once again has called attention to the difficulty in obtaining qualified men for important Government posts because of the low pay in such posts and the fact this Nation does not train youth for Government service as a career, as does Britain.

The particular instance to which Mr. Truman refers this time is vital to Shreveport and a huge mid-South travel area extending north, south, east, and west from this city for it involves three appointments to the five-man Civil Aeronautics Board. The Board has before it the application of Delta Air Lines for a new New Orleans-Washington-New York air route which automatically would give the mid-South Shreveport travel area, with its potential 35,000 passengers a year, a one-carrier, one-plane service to and from those nationally and internationally important cities.

Recently the CAB has lost two members, and will lose a third on May 1 through the resignation, announced a few days ago, of Harllee Branch. Previously Clarence Young had resigned to take a much more lucrative job than the $10,000 a year the CAB post pays, and Mr. Truman did not reappoint Chairman James M. Landis when his term expired the first of this year. Mr. Branch is resigning for the same reason as did Mr. Young—he has devoted many years to public service at low pay, he is not a man of independent wealth, and at the age of 68 he must think about a more lucrative post for his declining years.

Despite this personnel shortage on the CAB and the President's self-stated inability to remedy the situation—he said he had offered the chairmanship to six persons and was turned down by all—there is no need for the CAB to delay its decision in giving the huge Shreveport Mid-South travel area the through air service that is so vital to its present and its future. Nearly 10 months ago a CAB examiner fully approved installation of this service, recommending that Delta be the operator. It has been nearly 6 months since the CAB held its own hearings on the examiner's report.

The Times believes that the entire Mid-South area affected by the pending decision stands united in being willing to rest its case with the three present commissioners—Mr. Oswald Ryan, acting chairman; Mr. Josh Lee, former Senator from Oklahoma, and Mr. Branch, who does not leave the board for another 3 months or more. All are fully qualified by background and knowledge of Mid-South air needs, and by knowledge of the pending applications to provide the needed service, to make the decision. Although Acting Chairman Ryan was not present at the CAB hearings on the air lines' application, he has, of course, the record of those hearings and the examiner's report, and his long and commendable record as a member of the CAB fully qualifies him to act. Mr. Lee is from the State of Oklahoma whose oil interest tie right into our own area and he is fully qualified to judge our air needs. Mr. Branch was the first chairman of the original CAA when it was formed back in the 1930's. He is a former Atlanta, Ga., newspaperman and probably no one in any Washington air agency is better qualified than he to judge the needs of this southern area as to air transport. The fact that Mr. Branch has resigned effective May 1 does not affect his qualifications or his jurisdiction in the pending case. We have full confidence in their judgment and integrity—in fact, in view of Mr. Truman's difficulty in getting qualified men for the CAB any delay would create undue jeopardy for our own case by running the risk that this highly important decision later would be made by men not having the personal qualifications of the present CAB.

Aside from those factors, there are others which we believe should carry weight with the present CAB members, particularly the rapid industrial and commercial growth in the Shreveport travel area.

Shreveport, for example, now has 254 manufacturing establishments, a considerable number having come here since the war. It has, according to recent statistics from Sales Management magazine, effective annual buying income of $175,225,000 for 1946 against $170,213,000 in 1945; its retail sales in 1946 grossed $126,353,000 against only $95,213,000 the previous year; it has grown from 98,000 to 128,000 since 1940; it is a city that did not swell either in population or economically through a war boom, but which has grown steadily through both the war and postwar years.

This record of growth, and of increasing prosperity, is matched through the whole mid-South travel area now so sadly lacking in through east-coast air transport. The Times sincerely commends study of these facts to the present CAB personnel.

National Guard and Reserve Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune for January 27, 1948:

NOT GOOD ENOUGH

Representative SMATHERS, of Florida, has introduced a bill to encourage enlistment in the Reserve by pledging to reservists the same death and disability benefits accorded officers and men of the Regular services injured or killed during training. Present law extends these benefits only if the training period is 30 or more days.

Mr. SMATHERS believes that his scheme would give the Nation security without resorting to peacetime conscription because it would act as an inducement to the 12,000,000 veterans of World War II, most of whom show no interest in the Reserve program.

As an attraction, however the proposed legislation is not good enough. The Tribune recently noted some observations made by Maj. Gen. Henry D. Russell, of the Georgia-Florida National Guard Division, on the lack of pension provisions applying to members of the National Guard and Reserve Corps. Regulars receive retirement benefits, and, in qualifying under disability retirement rules, get 75 percent of their salary in any temporary grade they hold. The payments are tax-free.

The guard and Reserve do not ask for any such fancy rewards, but they do feel that men who put in years between wars in these organizations without any compensation at all and are ready to respond in time of national emergency do merit some modest retirement benefit. The amount discussed in legislation which has twice passed the House, only to be defeated in the Senate, is small. It is as nothing compared with costs for conscription, which have been estimated as high as $6,000,000,000 a year, yet this provision against the old age of guardsmen and Reserves would probably suffice to develop a sufficient militia and Reserve to give the country adequate force to deal with any threat.

Future of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the closing but thought-provoking remarks of my distinguished colleague, the Honorable ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE, from the Third District of Connecticut, which were delivered over the National Broadcasting Co. network on January 24, 1948, on the "Coffee With Congress" program:

I believe that the future of America lies in our ability to arouse in each and every American the responsibilities which rest upon our Nation today. We are the champions of democracy. Yet in order to maintain and further that basic spirit of the American republic we have to realize that gouging our neighbor, that black marketing and gray marketing, that profit without honor, is not the American way. We have to decide what is a just profit? What is a just wage? What is an honest effort? When is a good job well done? The American tradition of free enterprise so well portrayed in the farming communities of New England, the spirit of community cooperation, of community consciousness and community pride, those are the answers we seek. The pride of being a good neighbor and a good friend. We have to prove ourselves not only at home, but abroad. We have to show the world that our system works, and works well. In order to do that, we have to maintain order and a decent way of life in these United States. We have to demonstrate that the poor boy can still become the rich man and that the pasture poet can reach greatness in the mansions of the mighty. We cannot be strong abroad unless we are vigorous and powerful at home. We cannot hold ourselves up as the model of man's freedom unless we have within our National grasp the achievements, which such a philosophy will give. Each of us must answer the question for ourselves. Are we giving an honest day's labor? Are we giving the customer a fair purchase? Are we giving the buyer an honest bargain? Only in basic honesty and integrity can we find the strength and the courage and the conviction of being right. We must give a hand to our neighbors and join hands together, believing that as always the best way is the way of men united, freely, in a common purpose under law. I say, let us build on our own soil that our work may stand forth for all men to see and admire and follow. The hope of America and of the world lies in our hearts and hands. Can we do a good job at home and abroad? Together we can move mountains.

Increased Compensation for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I have long advocated increasing the compensation of our Federal employees. They constitute a large part of a forgotten class of our American workers who have suffered most as a result of the increase in the cost of living.

A most cogent argument in support of the salary-increase bills now before the Congress is furnished by two letters that I received in my office yesterday. These letters outline the financial status of two St. Paul, Minn., postal workers, and have attached to them itemized statements reflecting their monthly expenses for the bare necessaries of life. These letters and their attached figures argue much more effectively than words in support of the passage of adequate salary increases for these workers.

Under unanimous consent, I include this material as a part of my remarks:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 22, 1948.*

Hon. EDWARD J. DEVITT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DEVITT: I am writing to you in regard to a much-needed salary increase. I work in the St. Paul post office as a clerk. My salary is, at the present time, on a $3,100 a year basis. I am the father of four children, three boys and one daughter; one in grade school, one in high school, one in college, and one is married. We also have my wife's sister living with us.

On the attached page I have listed my budget on the bare necessities of living. If you will study my budget you will notice that there is no money left for clothing, household goods, recreation, or sickness, over which we have no control. I send my children to Catholic schools for which I pay tuition which is not listed as this is not a necessity.

If you will honestly study this budget with the present-day prices and no prospect of any drop in prices, you will realize that they are rather accurate. So I beg of you to please work and vote for a salary increase for the postal clerks and carriers.

Yours respectfully,

LOUIS W. GARDNER.

Rent	$40.00
Union dues	1.25
Lights and gas	10.00
Water	1.25
Paper	1.40
Telephone	3.25
Fuel	26.00
Transportation	8.00
Haircuts	2.00
Hospitalization	4.00
Income taxes	14.00
Vegetables	125.00
Total	262.15

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 22, 1948.*

Hon. EDWARD J. DEVITT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing this letter at the request of the legislative representative of the St. Paul Post Office Clerks Union, to bring before you the financial problems confronting me, a typical post-office clerk, the sole support of a wife and three children ranging in age from 1 to 8.

Our present salary is insufficient to take care of the bare necessities of life. To substantiate that statement, I have outlined my budget on the accompanying page, and you can readily see that a pay raise is a "must" if I am to properly maintain my home.

I am a veteran, 34 years of age, and have been forced, because of the serious housing shortage, to live in a Quonset hut, for which I pay $37 per month rent. This does not include any of the utilities. During the past year I have had medical and doctor bills in excess of $1,000, and, having no money saved to take care of these expenses, I have had to borrow money and also seek assistance from one of the welfare agencies in this city. These are just a few of the problems that confront me.

I therefore respectfully request your favorable support of any legislation introduced recommending a pay raise for postal employees.

Very truly yours,

ANGELO M. TODORA,
Post Office Clerk.

Budget

Net income for 1 month	$240.00
Expenses:	
Groceries, meat, and milk	110.00
Rent	37.00
Insurances (life, health, and accident)	18.00
Electricity	6.00
Telephone	3.00
Newspaper	1.80
Credit union (to repay loan made to meet medical expenses)	13.00
Church	2.50
Carfare	5.00
Lunch	8.00
Tuition	2.00
Fuel oil (used 12 months per year for heating and cooking)	20.00
Clothing	20.00
Drugs	5.00
Barber	1.65
Union dues	1.25
Miscellaneous	5.00
Total	259.20

You will note that the above budget makes no allowance for doctor or dentist bills, which is an absolute necessity with growing children; nor is any allowance made for recreation or savings.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to quote from a portion of an address by our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] before the Twenty-third Conference of the New England Council at Boston during November. This deals ably with the unanimous recommendation of the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid that a corporate agency should be established with responsibility for screening the requests from foreign countries, determining what commodities are available with which we can meet those requests without weakening our own economy, allocating them, and then instituting a competent continuing examination over the exercise of export controls now lodged in the executive department by congressional legislation. Certainly the amazing decisions recently made by the Office of International Trade in approving applications for the export of petroleum products in the first 3 months of this year is a glaring example of the probability that, without the creation of such authority, this country will be constantly under the strain of shortages in such vital materials as petroleum products, steel and steel products and products manufactured with steel, as well as an unlimited number of items not only needed here to maintain a sound domestic economy but absolutely essential if we are to maintain a production schedule which would permit the fulfillment of an European recovery program.

I submit that the House of Representatives was most foresighted in the creation of this committee, that the reports which have been made unanimously by the committee have amply justified the action by the House and that we can all have great confidence in the soundness of its ultimate recommendations when the program comes before us for action. Speaking personally, I think it is regrettable in the extreme that opposition has developed toward this phase of the committee's recommendations, but I am encouraged by the apparently increasing growing endorsement of it in the course of the hearings now being conducted in the other body.

The address referred to follows:

The Select Committee on Foreign Aid of the United States House of Representatives agreed that if American dollars were going to be spent, and wher I speak of American dollars I mean commodities, that we ought to have a very clear idea as to what we were doing, how we were going to do it, and how we were going to make it effective for ourselves and the recipient countries.

We came to the conclusion that there were certain categories of aid that could be financed as commercial operations. First, was the capital goods that are required. We felt that the International World Bank was set up for the very purpose of long-range loans for capital goods, and that that first category ought to be financed that way.

We felt that in the financing of raw materials, specialized machinery, such as agricultural machinery, etc., that could be taken care of by the Export-Import Bank, which is today operating, to my mind, in a very hard-boiled and realistic manner.

FOOD, FUEL, AND FERTILIZER

But those would be commercial loans. We felt we had every right to expect repayment on that kind of loan, provided the third category of commodities was taken care of in a different way.

That third category is food, fuel, and fertilizer. They are the things that are absolutely essential if there is to be anything done for these countries. They represent, roughly, 60 to 65 percent of the total requirements over there. We felt that it was right to put a dollar sign on the loans of these already established lending agencies, and that the loans from those lending agencies were perfectly proper loans, with reasonable hope of repayment.

But at once we struck this dilemma. What are you going to do in the financing of these commodities? You can either make a dollar loan for their purchase, and be entirely hypocritical about it, knowing that there is very little chance of repayment, and the other countries, knowing that they have very little chance of repayment. If you do that, you stop these other agencies from functioning as they should function.

The alternative is to give it away. We have had some very unhappy experiences in giving away something for nothing. So we have come to the conclusion that we ought not to give away anything for nothing; that in the first instance in the food, fuel, and fertilizer category we ought to make all the purchases, or direct all the purchases ourselves in this country, so as to stop competitive purchasers in a very tight market, which in many instances have driven prices up very high.

In the second instance, we felt that we could make deliveries on allocations of those commodities to the best of our ability, and then take local currencies in payment, those local currencies in the meantime not to be translated into dollars until such time as the international monetary system feels it is safe to do so, but in the interim to be used for constructive purposes within those currency areas themselves for reconstruction of those countries. All of which requires machinery to operate.

And in the setting up of that machinery, we were convinced that only this category required new machinery. We feel that a new corporate set-up should be established, an emergency one, with a very brief span of life, but set up in such a manner so that it might attract the kind of abilities and technical skills that today you can't attract in many cases of a similar nature requiring action, because frequently your line of procedure is such that an able man is certain to find himself unable to get anything done.

We are convinced that this new corporate machinery must be set up, that it must have the responsibility for screening the requests from foreign countries, finding out what commodities are available to meet those requests, allocating them, and then exercising a really strict watch over export controls.

COMBINED RESPONSIBILITY

We believe that unless we combine responsibility in some such new set-up as that, we are going to have distributed responsibility such as we have had in the past. And we are not going to have the technical skills available to make sure that the requirements that are asked for are proper requirements, that the available supplies are properly available without injuring our own economy, and finally, that the money, when spent on the other side, is properly spent by technical supervision, not by governmental supervision, of a broad character.

Why Create Further Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a news release from the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., which I think is quite newsworthy:

The administration was bluntly charged today with definitely creating inflation in our own Nation by C. W. Harder, president of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., which has the largest individual membership of any business organization in this Nation.

In a statement issued in the form of a letter to George J. Burger, director in charge of the Washington office, Mr. Harder cited four manifests of steamships unloading in the Philippine Islands. One of these manifests from a British ship shows, Mr. Harder pointed out, that the United States Government is paying English concerns to transport American relief supplies. Furthermore, in the face of a critical shortage of gasoline and oils, the administration is shipping huge quantities of oil some 6,000 miles away to the Philippines for relief purposes, despite the fact that such products are available less than half that distance from the islands.

Other manifests show tremendous shipments of wheat to the Philippines Mr. Harder revealed. This in the face of the known fact that the Filipinos do not want wheat, they prefer rice. "How can we expect to have decent prices for grain, either in the United States or Canada, when this kind of condition is brought about," Mr. Harder demanded.

Mr. Harder called upon Members of Congress to recommend a full-scale investigation not only of these items that are going to the Philippines, but also the manifests covering all foreign shipments. Mr. Harder bluntly stated that the ulterior motive of the bureaucrats in Washington is to create reason for an emergency so they can build up controls. Therefore, he insisted, they definitely are creating inflation in our own Nation.

Mr. Harder further disclosed that he had received significant information from a man whom he declined to identify by name beyond saying that he has been on a great many missions throughout the world for the Government and private enterprise during the last 30 years. This man declared that the United States is in no financial condition today to either listen to pressure of foreign politicians or cater to the favor of cartels with an attempt to build up nations for them to promote their selfish interests, which in the end has bad repercussions in our domestic markets in their competition with independent business.

Mr. Harder deplored the disheartening aspect of the Nation being jeopardized by terrific waste being created by spending huge sums of money that he said are actually doing a lot more harm than good. "One," he said, "is siphoning off the incentive of the people in these foreign nations to help themselves.

"There is no problem before any national legislator today," he concluded, "that is more important than this."

The Defense of the New Jewish State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over radio station WEVD, Saturday, January 24, 1948:

THE DEFENSE OF THE NEW JEWISH STATE

If there were no other reasons—and very many other reasons do exist—for intervention in favor of the Jews of Palestine, the upholding of the authority and prestige of the United Nations would suffice. If member nations continue to conduct their foreign affairs as if there had never been a decision on Palestine, the United Nations is thereby reduced to a nullity. If the United Nations cannot effect an implementation of its legally arrived at recommendations, all its panoply must crack with its futility in open display.

Such is the case with Palestine. Every member nation was well aware of the difficulties that would surround partition. The Arab spokesmen made no secret, to put it mildly, of their intended belligerency. The disorders in Palestine, fomented by the Arabs, are no surprise to anybody. Therefore, it follows logically that both implicit and explicit in the partition decision was the fact that force would be necessary to effectuate partition.

Yet what has happened so far is a do-nothing policy both on the part of the United Nations and on the part of the United States which took the leadership in the UN discussions. The do-nothing policy has actually, ironically enough, resulted in favoring the Arab violation of the United Nations decision.

The United States has placed an embargo on arms to Palestine. The only effect this has had is to deny arms to the Jews who are not only defending their homeland, but defending as well the decision of the United Nations. The Arabs can easily obtain and do obtain arms from the neighboring Arab countries. As sovereign peoples they can negotiate for the purchase of arms from countries willing to sell. The Jews of Palestine, as defenders, are not yet sovereign and are not in the favored position of the Arab states. Thus, the total effect of the embargo has been to permit the arming of the aggressors and the disarming of the defenders. A crueler perversion of purpose I have yet to see.

The United States has imposed the embargo on arms to Palestine in the name of neutrality. How an attitude of neutrality is arrived at by our State Department is more than I can understand. The United States took open and unquestioned leadership in arriving at the Palestine Partition recommendation. As a member nation, as well as the leading influence, it is committed to uphold partition. There is no question of neutrality here. Its vote in the United Nations was not neutral. It was affirmative. How consistent is that with an arms embargo that plays into the hands of the Arab insurgents? If the United States had voted against partition, we might be able to see the logic of such an embargo. I am leaving aside all the other commitments the United States had made, verbally, anyway, to favor the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. I demand that the embargo be lifted.

The Arab people because of the embargo assume that the United States doesn't really support the partition plan. In fact, they are being told that the action at Flushing Meadows was only a gesture for political purposes on the eve of a Presidential election. It is passing strange that nothing has been done in Washington to dissipate the views that have been spread over the Arab world about the insincerity of the United States. I demand that definite clear-cut action be taken by the State Department to support, not sabotage, partition.

Six hundred Arabs commanded by Syrian officers crossed the borders of Palestine last week in an attempt to storm Jewish quarters in Upper Galilee. This was a raid under the direction and auspices of the Syrian Government, a member nation of the UN. It was incumbent upon some other member nation to lodge protest with the Security Council for this unprecedented and defiant action on the part of a government which was sworn to uphold the decision of the United Nations. Certainly, the logical member to so protest is the United States. The fact that we did not protest emboldens the Arabs to further maraud and plunder. I demand that our United Nations delegates offer protest and that a persistent follow-up ensue.

The situation in Palestine deteriorates each day. Arab leaders like Faris El Khoury of Syria and Janal Huessini, representative of the Mufti's higher committee for Palestine have openly declared that American public opinion has turned in favor of the Arabs and against the stand taken by the United States at the UN. Arab newspapers published in the United States are assuming this attitude. This is a natural corallery to the absence of any definite and concrete support of the partition decision and in the absence of any protest of the Arab incitements.

It is difficult to understand the mawkishness of our State Department with its arms embargo and its failure to remonstrate against the Arab war againt the Jews. Or perhaps it isn't so difficult to understand. There are those in our State Department who are avowed Arabphilles and they do not hesitate to do all in their power to undermine the leadership we took on the Palestine issue at Lake Success. Their knuckles must be cracked. If they do not cease the tune piped by the Arabs they must go.

Surely, it should be clear to even these obstructionists that neutrality is a mockery and that the final result will only make for more bloodshed. Whether they wish it or not, or the Arabs wish it or not, partition will be. The new state of Judea will be. It is the matter of cost, the degree of murder, rapine, and plunder that must be withstood before peace is reestablished.

It is clear the British are taking no steps to avert a catastrophe. Adequate policing is deliberately withheld, the Haganah is not permitted to operate legally as a defense force. There is no embargo of arms imposed by Great Britain and it is common knowledge that Britain even prior to the military pact she signed with Iraq wherein provision is made for the supply of arms to Iraq, sent 150 armed vehicles, 75 planes, 2,000 nonmilitary vehicles to Palestine's neighbor.

It is noted significantly that our arms embargo is imposed against Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Trans-Jordan, Iraq, and Palestine. Yemen is not included, nor is Pakistan. These last-named countries can buy unlimited arms from the United States and route same to Palestine Arabs. Thus, our embargo shuts off much needed supplies to the Jews, while the Arabs, with the aid of Britain directly and with American arms indirectly supplied through Turkey, Iran, Yemen, or Pakistan, can continue their gruesome acts of aggression and violence.

Over and beyond that, fullest responsibility rests with the Security Council to take immediate steps to implement its decision on Palestine. There must be developed an international constabulary. The UN Palestine Commission of five members is agreed on this. The only difficulty is as to who is to constitute this force. The obligation of the UN cannot be shirked any longer in this regard. Partition was recommended by the General Assembly as a measure for meeting a situation likely to impair the general welfare of friendly relations among nations. The affirmative and expeditious action of the Security Council is imperative if its authority as an international body is to be permanently and firmly established. There are many historic precedents for an international force to police areas in dispute.

The difficulties in Palestine today could be overcome if—

1. The United States embargo were lifted at once.

2. The United States filed notice of violation by Syria of the terms of its membership with the UN.

3. An international constabulary were established immediately.

4. The port of Tel Aviv were opened immediately to Jewish immigration and for the entrance of food and matériel necessary to sustain the Jewish defenders of their homeland.

What is asked for is neither unreasonable nor impossible. They spell out peace in Palestine. They likewise establish the effectiveness of the United Nations to act as the international agency for peace. What is needed most of all is the will to act.

A United States City at Work: Bridgeport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Parade for January 25, 1948:

A UNITED STATES CITY AT WORK: BRIDGEPORT

(By James B. Golden)

(Never before in peacetime have more Americans been employed, never have they made so many things, done so much. To see, in miniature, America at work, Parade went to Bridgeport, Conn., found what follows.—Editor.)

Bridgeport, industrial nerve center of Connecticut, is today the same prosperous, productive giant that it was 4 years ago when it was working around the clock at the peak of war production.

Like industrial areas throughout the country, Bridgeport went through a period of reconversion but in a relatively short time. Now, for more than 2 years the city has been on a firm economic basis.

The brighter side of Bridgeport's economic picture reveals industry going at full tilt, pay rolls and employment at peak peacetime highs, retail sales soaring. Optimism permeates the city.

The other side of the picture is darker. A few, but nevertheless some, forsee a recession during the first 6 months of this year. Labor, faced with a steadily mounting cost of living, says it must get more in its pay envelope if it is to buy as much from local merchants as in the past. Housing continues to be the number one municipal headache.

That, generally, is Bridgeport today—and, with a few variations, almost any other industrial city in the United States.

Unlike other sections, Bridgeport, with an industrial population of 30,000, as early as late 1938, had begun to turn out war material. But good jobs attracted workers from other States to such an extent that in 1943 the population, industrially, was about 115,000. Today the figure stands at 75,000, or two and one-half times the number holding jobs in 1939. Unemployment is negligible—4,314—and the majority of these are between jobs.

That industry was able to absorb this great influx is due to the long-range plans started in 1943. Every activity in the community was invited by the Chamber of Commerce to participated in planning the physical and human reconversion of the area. The blueprints drawn up were so accurate industry went from total war production to peacetime manufacture within 30 to 40 days.

The General Electric Corp., one of the largest plants in Bridgeport, literally went from torpedoes to washing machines in 1 week flat.

GE's vice president, Hardage L. Andrews, foresees unprecedented prosperity for the immediate future, but adds that this prosperity may be accompanied by a slight price and employment recession.

LIKE ALL AMERICANS, BRIDGEPORT LEADERS ARE GLAD TO HAVE PROSPERITY BUT DREAD A POSSIBLE RECESSION

Like most leaders of industry and labor, like housewives and men on the street in every corner of the United States of America, the people of Bridgeport realize that they are living in an era of high production and of accompanying high prices.

They enjoy the feel of cash, but are regretful to find little of it left when they have paid for the goods they want, the services they need.

Like all Americans, they are apprehensive of what may follow a period which, economically, at least, seems unstable. In Bridgeport, they take refuge in the fact that their basic plants are diversified, so that if some of them were affected by an economic set-back others might not be.

One of Bridgeport's industrialists who feels this way is Lewis Lucas, treasurer of J. L. Lucas & Son, machinery rebuilders, employing about 90 men. He is optimistic about his firm's future, considers that the world need for machinery will keep his men at their lathes and benches for a long time to come, even if other industries experience hardship.

Bridgeport's merchants, like those in other cities, are also sanguine. Daniel Van Dyk, president of the D. M. Read Co., one of the large local department stores, reports that the rise in the city's population and the return of merchandise in quantities has pushed retail sales to a peak. Dollar volume has increased 55 percent since VJ-day, he reports, and unit sales have gone up nearly 10 percent. "This year promises to be an even greater one than 1947 for the merchants of Bridgeport," Van Dyk predicts.

This business optimism is shared by Raymond L. French, executive secretary of the local chamber of commerce, who is in daily contact with local business and industrial leaders.

GOOD TIMES FOR NEXT 6 TO 12 MONTHS

"No one in Bridgeport looks for a big economic drop for 2 years," he told Parade. "The majority of people here feel that present prosperous conditions will last for at least 6 months to a year, provided there are no big strikes in such industries as coal and steel. Still, I know a few men who feel that a recession will set in before June."

In justifying his optimism, French points to Bridgeport's diversified industrial pattern, its peak savings bank deposits, cordial relations existing between industry and labor, and the fact that wages there exceed the United States average by about $4.50 a week.

Bridgeport's labor leaders, on the other hand, are somewhat more cautious in assaying the city's prosperity. Both Irving Abb, president of the Bridgeport Industrial Union Council of the CIO, and Joseph Cleary, vice president of the A. F. or L. Central Labor Union, acknowledge that Bridgeport's wages are higher than average, but stress that the cost of living is correspondingly higher.

"Unless wages allow workers to maintain a decent standard of living, unless they can purchase the products they produce," Abb and Cleary agree, "inevitably we will have a short boom, then bust."

On one thing, though, the entire community can reach agreement, and that is on the remarkable work done by the Community Advisory Service Center for Bridgeport's 32,000 veterans of World War II.

In this respect Bridgeport may not be typical of other cities since the service center has been exceptionally successful in helping to solve the thousand and one problems the veteran faced when he returned to his home.

Launched in early 1944 it became a community-wide project comprising 36 committees with about 800 large and small organizations participating. Everyone pitched in to see to it that the returning veteran's reintegration into the workaday life of the city was as painless and speedy as possible for all concerned.

Under the direction of Dr. Randall B. Hamrick, the center has taken care of more than 150,000 requests for help by veterans. These ranged from mother-in-law trouble to requests for GI loans.

The vocational training and educational aspects of the center's activities consumed the most time and had the greatest results. By judicious counseling, Dr. Hamrick said, the labor turnover among veterans was cut by more than 25 percent.

THE CONSCIENCE OF THE CITY

The center is prepared to carry on its work especially with the city's 3,300 disabled veterans. "To that end," Dr. Hamrick said, "one man, Reverend McEnerney, has been appointed as the relentless conscience of the community to look after their needs."

Bridgeport's socialist mayor, Jasper McLevy, who just entered his fifteenth consecutive year as the city's chief executive, said that in Bridgeport, as elsewhere in the country, the greatest single difficulty was housing.

"During the war it was an acute problem," he said in his small office on the third floor of the city hall. "And it continues to be acute."

Since the end of the war, he went on, there has been quite a bit of private building of one- and two-family homes in Bridgeport's environs.

"But, even though this single-enterprise construction has taken some of the pressure off us, much of our housing is still overcrowded. Moreover, this new construction is beyond the financial means of the average worker in Bridgeport."

As for the future, Mayor McLevy declined to make any long-range predictions.

"The city is in good financial shape," he said. "And without making any predictions as to future prosperity or depression, we here in Bridgeport are in a sound position. Because of the great diversification of our industries—we're manufacturing everything from lipstick to cases of washing machines—I believe that even if an economic emergency does arise, we will be able to meet it and cope with it."

WILL THE CITY'S PROSPERITY LAST?

Bridgeport's economic stability is buttressed, as most people will tell you, by the great number of different industries in the Bridgeport industrial area.

The difference of opinion on various subjects, especially economic, is just about as varied as the industrial output of the city. It ranges all the way from predictions of great prosperity to the dim view of a recession shortly.

Parade reporters talked with many businessmen, key figures in industry, labor leaders, working men. Some of their views are presented here:

A. F. of L. Leader Joseph Cleary talks with teamsters' union member, Mike Powers, both agreeing that every wage increase we've gotten has been wiped out by the rising cost of living.

Gilbert Valery, expert machinist, is one of the thousands who went to Bridgeport during the war, decided to remain. Employed by the firm of J. L. Lucas & Son, he is rebuilding a milling machine.

Executive secretary of the chamber of commerce, Raymond L. French, mirroring business and industry thinking, says, "No big economic drop for 2 years • • • good business for the next year."

General Electric Vice President Hardage L. Andrews predicts unprecedented demand for company products because of new residential construction, home remodeling, and rural electrification.

Irving Abb, spokesman for the CIO in Bridgeport, believes that relatively few are aware of what will happen if the cost of living continues to go up. "The others are riding a bubble," he said.

Bridgeport has been home for Alex Hogg since he arrived from Scotland in 1906. Head of the Lucas shipping department, he says "I've got a good job. The Lucases are good people to work for."

While making no predictions, Mayor Jasper McLevy has faith in Bridgeport's ability to ride out an economic storm, should it come, because of the diversification of its industry.

American Aid to China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith by request a statement issued by the American Chamber of Commerce, Shanghai.

It was the desire of the American businessmen in Shanghai that Members of Congress be informed of local conditions, as they find them.

The statement follows:

MAKE AMERICAN AID TO CHINA EFFECTIVE

(A statement from the American Chamber of Commerce, Shanghai)

American help to China has already been far greater than is generally realized, but its size and importance have been minimized by terrific waste. Further aid to China of any nature should be so planned and controlled that it will truly be aid, and that which is sent henceforth should be safeguarded. The fact must be faced that unless proper channels are employed the Chinese capacity for self-help will be further inhibited and a need will be built up for perpetual future grants.

The American business community of Shanghai has special interest in and knowledge of the economic sphere. We urge most earnestly that in giving economic aid, there be emphasis on points promoting constructive practice or preventing the development of evils now growing. As a prerequisite to any further aid which may be granted, it is our considered opinion that full agreement must be reached on the following points:

1. Conditions should be attached to any economic aid which will curb the present tendency of the Chinese Government to foster its own enterprises or companies in which officials have interest, and to encourage rather than stifle private enterprise both Chinese and foreign. Current policies restrict private trade and force business increasingly into official or quasi-official channels, building the Chinese equivalent of a Japanese Zaibatsu or a Russian Amtorg.

2. There should be elimination of Chinese Government sponsored monopolies in trade, and such official enterprises as the Shanghai fish market which has handicapped UNRRA efforts to increase China's food supply.

3. There should be a reversal of the Chinese Government policy of delegating its functions to monopoly-bent guilds which development is most dangerous and in our view represents a menace to sound individual enterprise whether Chinese or foreign.

4. There should be insistence that China adhere to international practice with reference to shipping in inland waters. Abnormal restrictions on foreign vessels, on behalf of a small group of private Chinese interests now greatly reduce China's communications facilities while increasing shipping costs.

• • • • • •

6. There should be encouragement for rather than discouragement of the entry of foreign capital into China. This can be gained only by the elimination of present unsound restrictions and controls.

Relief in some of these cases and assistance in others seem to us essential if fruitful results are to come from fresh aid. Unless the standard processes of private business are given opportunity to function in China with relation to new help, such help must fail as all previous efforts have failed in getting China's economy in gear with the rest of the world. A sound procedure will give the Chinese people an opportunity to get on their own feet.

Resolution of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, GREETINGS AND SALUTATIONS

To the UNITED STATES SENATOR OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, HON. EDWARD MARTIN:

Whereas in true accordance with the established principles and high ideals exemplified throughout your military and civilian career, you, fearless of condemnation, did express your sincere sentiments in an address to a delegation of Pennsylvania Communists attending that Party's Veterans National Convention, such address appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, May 9, 1947, Eightieth Congress, first session, of which portion is quoted:

"First, let me make clear that I respect the veteran and all that his uniform stands for. But when you come here, representing the Communist Party, you have no right to claim the respect and treatment due to veterans. No one can be faithful to American ideals and accept the teachings of communism.

"I will not now, nor at any future time, discuss the welfare of our veterans with men who uphold your communistic philosophy, even though you have worn the American uniform. Anything I have to say on that subject will be said to the officers and members of recognized veterans' organizations, or to other patriotic unaffiliated veterans. And if I want advice about veterans' needs, I shall go to those same groups. They recognize the great gulf between American freedom and communistic dictatorship. They do not straddle. They stand four-square on the side of individual liberty and rights of free men. You are on the other side.

"The Russian people can have the form of government they want. We are not trying to force our system on them. I will fight with all my power any effort to foist their system on this country whether it comes from you or anybody else.

"I have had over 40 years of service in the armed forces of my country; I love its uniform and its flag. I respect that uniform even when worn by a Communist, but I have no respect for the philosophy you have accepted."

Whereas we fully appreciate the manner in which you exercise the true spirit of democracy by being one of our kind of folks, in witness of which you have said: "Share the same concerns, the same years, and the same high aspirations for our country's future. This devotion has been shaped by our kind of folks having worn our country's uniform in battle;" and

Whereas your outstanding military record throughout the 44 years of service, with which we are conversant, has brought you the distinction of advancement through the military ranks from private during the Philippine Insurrection, 1898, to commanding general of the Twenty-eighth Division, World War II in 1942; and

Whereas not being satisfied to rest upon your military laurels but desirous of serving your people, you as a civilian were inaugurated Governor of the State of Pennsylvania on January 19, 1942, and were elected to the United States Senate on November 5, 1946; and

Whereas your membership in the Hawkins Home Post, No. 927, Washington, Pa., of our beloved organization, makes us justly proud to claim you as a comrade, one in harmony with our spirit of comradeship and in full accord with the ideals for which we stand: Therefore be it

Resolved, that in appreciation of outstanding achievements, the expressed determination further to serve God, country and fellow man and in commendation for patriotic service and accomplishments we, the officers and members of the Department of the District of Columbia, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, do herewith present to you this citation.

Given under my hand and seal this 27th day of January 1948.

ALBERT M. ARMSTRONG,
Department Commander.
MARTHA J. REYNOLDS,
Department President of the Ladies' Auxiliary.

Attest:

CLYDE W. KEHN,
Department Adjutant.

The Importance of Secondary Roads to Our National Transportation System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address that I delivered before a midday meeting of the American Road Builders' Association in Washington on Monday, January 26, 1948:

THE IMPORTANCE OF SECONDARY ROADS TO OUR NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

While looking over a recent table issued by the Public Roads Administration (table RM-3, 1945, issued March 1947), a startling figure attracted my attention. This table told me that at the end of 1945, there were over 3,000,000 miles of rural roads in the United States. That number can be better

appreciated if you consider that it represents a distance greater by more than 120 times the distance around the earth at the equator.

My first reaction to this discovery was what that of any American would have been—one of intense national pride in the courage, the initiative, the know-how, the tireless energy, and the vision of the hard-working Americans responsible for getting this tremendous job done. That reaction has not changed since. In fact, my admiration for the road builders of my country has been strengthened by the knowledge that, of the more than 3,000,000 miles of rural roads, nearly two and one-half million miles were classified as county and other local rural roads.

The place of the roadbuilder in American economy is definitely established. He, together with the farmer, the trucker, the railroader, the processor, the warehouseman, and the shipper, is a member of a team upon whose success in getting our basic agricultural products to the ultimate consumer depends our security as a people in war and our prosperity as a people in peace.

It is vital to our way of life that each member of this team performs to the full extent of his ability and resources. That is why road builders, especially those engaged in the construction and maintenance of secondary roads, cannot be lax in the constant study of their job and their determination to get it done.

Let's look at the function of secondary roads in the winning of the late war. There is no truer maxim than "an army travels on its stomach." This Nation not only fed its own armed services, but it also fed the fighting men of our allies, the peoples of the liberated countries, the peoples of the conquered countries, and the people whom the armed forces of our own country and those of our allies took prisoner. The American farmer did that under conditions which would have broken the will of lesser men. He did it with only about 40 percent of the normal number of farm workers. He did it with old men, women, and little children pitching in to do the work. He did it with worn-out, broken-down machinery and equipment. No man ever gave so much to so many with so little with which to do it.

You men, charged with the responsibility of building and maintaining secondary roads, know what the American farmer went through during the trying years of war. You know because of your own trials. You know because you were the link between the American farmer and the primary distribution point of his products.

The American farmer was equally alive to the problems of the road builder. He knows that your trucks were at Salerno, your tractors were at Omaha beach, and your bulldozers were at Tarawa, Saipan, and Okinawa. He knows that your skilled workers who might have been building that road up to the lane in front of his place from the concrete highway 3 miles away were busy elsewhere—working in the jungles and the mountains on the Burma Road, repairing the vital lines of supply behind General Patton's fighting Third Army. It broke the heart of many a road builder during those trying times that he couldn't do more. The wartime road builder labored in blood, sweat, and tears and became a silent partner in the victory.

The end of the shooting war by no means meant the end of the battle for secondary roads nor for the urgent need for those roads. That battle, that need, still exists today.

It is a conservative estimate that 60 percent of the goods produced to tide Europe through the winter of 1947–48 originated on American farms. However, not a single European could have been saved from starvation had not that vast production been moved from the farm to the market, from the market to the processor, from the processor to the shipper, and from the shipper to the European distributing center. In this instance, life depended on the moving of goods. So, the miles between the farm itself and the hard-surfaced primary road became the first line of battle.

Farmer Swanson fought through eight miles of gumbo to get his truckload of life-giving food to the concrete. He did this over roads you constructed, Mr. Road Builder. He did this over roads which, through no fault of your own, you had not been able to maintain and repair in the war years.

Yes, the official figures tell a story, but they do not tell the whole story. They say that there were nearly two and one-half (2,397,629) million miles of county and local roads in 1945. But they do not tell the struggle of Farmer Swanson in that single figure. You have to look beyond. You have to find out that of the original two and one-half million miles, nearly one and a half million miles consisted of nonsurfaced roads, three-quarter of a million miles were primitive and unimproved and only a little over one-half million miles were graded and drained. We Nebraskans have learned by experience what heavy rains and floods can do to nonsurfaced roads.

It is up to road builders, State officials, and officials of the Federal Government to get together on building new farm-to-market roads—where such construction is both feasible and possible—and, when it is not expedient to build new roads, to get those secondary roads in repair that do exist, so that food products can roll from the farm to the consumer, wherever that consumer exists, whether at home or abroad.

The operation of roads now in use is no small task. Recently, a check was made on operation costs by the Highway Research Board and the results were issued as a "Progress Report of the Project Committee on Maintenance Costs" in December of 1947. It is my considered opinion that the conclusions of this spot-check should be passed on to the American public, since it is your fellow Americans who gain by the work the road builders do.

The report states:

"1. The total cost of maintaining and operating the 10,000 miles representative of the entire system of State highways in 1947 is 71 percent higher than the 1935 cost and 58 percent higher than the 1940 cost.

"2. The 1947 maintenance labor rates are 98 percent above the 1935 level and 77 percent above the 1940 level.

"3. The 1947 cost of maintenance material is 46 percent above the 1935 level and 45 percent above the 1940 level.

"4. The 1947 equipment rental rates are 53 percent above the 1935 rates and 43 percent above the 1940 rates.

"5. The 1947 overhead costs are 62 percent higher than in 1935 and 47 percent higher than in 1940."

Naturally, the identical percentage rates of maintenance increases do not pertain all over the Nation. In some localities, they are lower than those quoted; in others, they are higher. The same trend is noticeable in construction as in maintenance, in secondary roads as in primary roads—costs are up all along the line.

How does this trend affect the lifeline of America—her secondary roads?

Secondary roads depend for their construction and care upon the public treasury, whether that treasury is that of the Federal Government, the individual States, or communities. These public treasuries, in their turn, rely upon taxation for their funds. To meet taxation demands, money is being taken in the form of taxes from the farmer who supplies the world, from the road builder who connects the farmer with his market, from the processor who changes the original farm product into a more efficient commercial form, from the manufacturer who builds road machinery and equipment, from the steel companies, the coal companies, and the oil companies.

The burden of our existing national debt, plus the burden of supplying and reconstructing the world is a millstone about the neck of American progress. Every place in government—from our Federal Government to our township government—conscientious servants of the people are seeking to cut expenses so that taxes may be lowered and the unbearable burden eased. All too often road building and maintenance have been selected as a target for reduction.

I decry this situation. To me, it is the essence of false economy. It is not my idea of common sense to cut down the corn and let the weeds grow. Neither is it my idea of common sense to curtail essential Government services while continuing or adding to useless governmental frills. Yes, the very increase in the cost of road construction and maintenance has placed the entire national, State, and local program in peril. And the obvious point of greatest danger is the secondary road system.

Hundreds of thousands of people live along the Lincoln Highway. Thousands of communities get their living because of that highway. Local trade and tourist trade help the merchants. Thriving merchants build up towns and cities. If the Lincoln Highway should fall into disrepair an atomic howl could be heard from every hamlet through which it passed. Legislators in State and National Capitals would be bombarded by letters, telegrams, and phone calls. Officials of the Public Roads Administration would never have a quiet moment.

But what about the 11-mile spur of road, once graded and drained, yet neglected all through the war—which ends in Farmer Swanson's barnyard?

There are 30 families on that road. The condition of that road means life to these families. It not only means the difference between failure and prosperity, it actually does mean life. Ask any doctor in any small town and he will tell you it means life should he be able to get 11 miles off of the paved road in a half hour instead of 5 hours.

The Swanson children are entitled to a high-school education. Farmer Swanson pays taxes to keep up a consolidated school a mile west of the place his road meets the concrete. Yet, his children are under a handicap from the start. Either he must make arrangements for them to live in town or they must begin their school day after having had a fierce struggle to get to school at all, placing them on an unequal basis with their fellow students.

As for the economic side, the story is well known but needs retelling. Swanson can grow a bumper crop. Still, it would be the same as if he had grown nothing at all if he isn't able to move that bumper crop.

Can't these 30 families on the Swanson road protest and demand improvement? They can and they generally do. But they are few and not united. Their voices are not loud. They are refused help outright. They are put off by promises. What they have to say may be heard in the county seat, and the echo of what they have to say may be heard as far off as the State capital. It seldom gets farther.

You know the results of these two examples I have cited—the vocal beneficiaries of the highway, the silent users of the Swanson road. The highway gets the priority in repairs. The secondary road is repaired—if and when anybody gets around to doing it. In the Old Testament, we read about the ancient Hebrews making bricks without straw for an Egyptian king. We thought that to be a high point of hardship. Yet, in modern America—in 1948—thousands of American farmers will be helping to feed the world without roads.

On November 26, 1947, Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, and I announced the joint introduction in both Houses of Congress of a bill to establish a department of transportation. We said in a joint statement at that time: "Efficiency is and has been sadly lacking in governmental functions with respect to all forms of transportation and it is our aim in the introduction of this measure that coordination of the many scattered agencies and bureaus under a single department with a single head will work toward the efficiency needed to bolster the transportation facilities of the Nation."

It is my firm belief that unless new secondary roads are built and unless the ones already in use are made fit for year-around use, this bill and all others looking toward efficiency in war and security in peace are doomed to certain failure.

Secondary roads demand—and they must get if we are to survive and help others to survive—the most careful planning, the most immediate attention, the hardest work and the most unceasing study of every sincere, forward-looking citizen in this Nation today.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease in Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is of utmost importance that the foot-and-mouth disease existing in Mexico be confined to the areas now affected and that every effort be made for the systematic eradication of that disease throughout Mexico. The Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, under the leadership of its president, Gibb Gilchrist, has carefully studied the situation in Mexico and has given its endorsement to the program of eradication of foot-and-mouth disease by zones.

Dean C. N. Shepardson, of the school of agriculture at A. & M. College, has recently issued a news release which contains the statements of Dr. J. C. Miller, head of the animal husbandry department; Dr. R. C. Dunn, dean of veterinary medicine; and Dr. H. Schmidt, chief of the division of veterinary research.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following news release from the A. & M. College of Texas, College Station, Tex.:

COLLEGE STATION, TEX.—Declaring the prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico to be the most serious threat to the livestock industry of the United States in its history, a committee representing Texas A. & M. College today gave full endorsement of the college to the program of eradication by zones. This is the program which the House Committee on Agriculture recommended on December 3, 1947.

Strengthening of the border patrol between the United States and Mexico and increased precautions to prevent the spread of the disease within the United States were also urged. It was pointed out that an aggressive attack designed to completely eradicate the disease through destruction and burial of infected animals was the only practical solution to the problem. Vaccines, the committee said, have not proved effective in stopping hoof-and-mouth disease, and little hope was held out for development of a permanently effective vaccine.

Issuing the statement on behalf of Texas A. & M. College were Dr. J. C. Miller, head of the animal husbandry department; Dr. R. C. Dunn, dean of veterinary medicine, and Dr. H. Schmidt, chief of the division of veterinary research. Their statement follows:

"The livestock industry of the United States received a severe shock when about a year ago the first reports of the presence of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico reached this country. The Bureau of Animal Industry immediately sent veterinarians into Mexico who soon verified its presence. Following the verification an agreement was promptly negotiated with Mexico for its speedy eradication by the slaughter and burial method. Due to the difficult terrain, lack of communication, and other obstacles, the disease has continued to spread until the infected region now covers about one-third the area of Mexico and involves almost half the livestock population.

"In spite of the slaughter of some 500,000 cattle and many small animals, the disease continued to gain ground until the Mexican Government—whose wholehearted assent is of course a necessary prerequisite to any activity on Mexican soil—notified the United States Department of Agriculture on November 24, 1947, that the economy of that country could not stand the immediate slaughter of the tremendous number of livestock which had by that time become infected or exposed to the disease.

"Accordingly, on November 26, 1947, the Department of Agriculture announced a modification of its program. In plain words this meant abandonment, at least for the present, of efforts to eradicate the disease from Mexico by the slaughter and burial method which has several times conquered it in the United States and acceptance instead of a quarantine and vaccination program designed to control the disease so as to prevent its spread outside the present generally infected area.

"On the same day the House Committee on Agriculture announced a hearing beginning December 3, 1947, in which all interested parties were invited to participate, for the purpose of analyzing the threat to the livestock industry and the economy of this country presented by the failure of the eradication campaign, and to consider the best steps which might now be taken to keep the disease out of the United States.

"Having considered carefully all of the evidence available, the committee made the following recommendations, which are endorsed by the A. & M. College of Texas:

"1. 'That the campaign against foot and mouth disease in Mexico shall be conducted on the following basis: First, an all-out effort by both countries to hold a quarantine line immediately north of the present infected area, including a sterile zone as wide as possible south of such line in which all infected and exposed animals will be subject to immediate slaughter and burial, in order to prevent the spread of the disease into northern Mexico and the United States; Second, extension and enlargement southward of that sterile zone as rapidly as circumstances will permit, with vaccination being employed by the commission only as an adjunct to quarantine.'

"2. 'That it shall be understood definitely by all participants that the program now undertaken is not an abandonment of the effort to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease from this continent but is merely a postponement of that effort until it can be undertaken and accomplished in a manner which is more acceptable to the Mexican people and tolerable to the Mexican economy.'

"3. 'That the best available scientists and economists be assigned immediately to research and study in Mexico and elsewhere on the disease itself, its prevention and control, and the effect of the disease and of proposed eradication methods on the economy of Mexico and the United States.'

"The decision of the Mexican-United States Commission to withdraw its forces to a strategically more favorable line undoubtedly was a wise one under the prevailing conditions provided it was for a new, better-organized, and more aggressive attack envisaging the complete eradication of the disease. Merely trying to hold a quarantine line against foot-and-mouth disease without complete destruction of the hosts of the virus and therewith the virus itself in affected areas has been tried many times and has never been successful. Vaccines against foot-and-mouth disease developed in recent years have not proved effective in stopping the disease elsewhere and to rely upon their use to prevent the further spread of the disease in this instance would be temporizing with a very serious situation.

"For the information of those who hope for a vaccine which will give permanent immunity, it should be pointed out that there is little hope of increasing the effectiveness of vaccines against foot-and-mouth disease by further research because the present effectiveness of vaccines is now practically equal to the immunity established by recovery of the animal from an acute infection.

"An aggressive attack of the disease behind the quarantine line is therefore urged, using the only method that promises success, that of slaughter and burial. Confinement of efforts to merely control the disease is not acceptable to the United States livestock industry.

"Representatives of the livestock industry at the A. & M. College of Texas are acutely aware of this situation and therefore urge that everything possible be done immediately to halt the spread and eventually to stamp out the disease in Mexico.

"It is further urged that:

"1. Every effort be made to strengthen the border patrol between the United States and Mexico to prevent the movement of man or beast across the border from Mexico to the United States other than through legal channels.

"2. The greatest precaution be exercised through sanitary measures, to prevent the spread of the disease to the United States through commercial and tourist travel.

"3. Livestock producers and handlers, extension and vocational agriculture workers throughout the United States familiarize themselves with the visible symptoms of the disease and be on the alert to report immediately any suspicious cases to the nearest licensed veterinarian, State veterinarian, or the Bureau of Animal Industry.

"4. That State and Federal authorities be prepared to have available on short notice the necessary heavy machinery for prompt slaughter and burial of any infected or exposed animals found in this country."

Caesar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune for January 27, 1948:

CAESAR

It can't be said that James C. Petrillo is totally indifferent to collective bargaining. He deals with the employers of his musicians on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, but he is willing to sit down across the table with parties whom he considers equal to himself in importance and power. The only party that so qualifies, in Mr. Petrillo's mind, is the United States Government. In Washington he has just offered to dicker with Congress.

His lawyer has suggested that Petrillo will lift his ban on recordings if Congress will permit him to resume his shake-down of recording companies for a so-called union benefit fund, of which he has sole control. Contributions to such a fund are prohibited by the Taft-Hartley Act.

As a union czar, Mr. Petrillo has taken the position that he can shut down a whole industry, furnishing employment to thousands of people and products which millions of people want to buy. Having done this, he offers to dicker on the conditions on which his criminal interference with interstate commerce will be stopped. He has even found a Member of Congress, Representative KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, to write Petrillo's provisions into a bill to be introduced in the House.

John L. Lewis never exhibited such megalomania as this. Some day very soon the ceiling is going to fall on Mr. Petrillo, and the rejoicing will be great.

Address of Commodore Robert C. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Commodore Robert C. Lee, executive vice president of the Moore-McCormack Lines, at the annual dinner of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association held at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on Tuesday, January 13, 1948.

The First World War, as some of you are old enough to recall, was fought with the slogan that it was the "war to end all wars." A lot of the young officers of the Army and Navy—among them myself—took the slogan seriously and began looking around for other means of support. I resigned from the Navy in the early days of 1920 and decided to go into business in New York. I knew about business just what any naval officer having had my training and experience would know, which was absolutely nothing. It looked to me like being a foreign-freight broker was an easy way to make a living and that was my first attempt. It did not take me long to switch to something else.

It strikes me that some wrong thinking is being done by a sector of the shipping industry, of which you are an important segment, on the subject of its stability. The man who hopes to get his cargo to market under modern competitive conditions cannot depend upon "horse and buggy" methods of transportation. It was said of the late unmourned Mussolini that he at least had the trains of his country moving on time. When you consider that he held that country in domination as long as he did, with little other than regular trains and the conquest of a virtually defenseless neighbor to offer his people, it would seem clear that regularity of transport can be an important factor in modern life.

The recent tie-up of transit due to the snowstorms emphasized our dependence upon transportation. We came to appreciate the meaning of schedules once we found that schedules as such no longer existed. We have adapted our everyday living to schedules, to the knowledge that we can plan our day, distributing our time among our social and business activities the most effectively.

The same is true with our trade. If we had to live with nothing more than hope that our cargoes would eventually be picked up and eventually landed at their destinations, nothing of the efficiency that had made American business the model of the world would be available to us. You can no more imagine your trade routes dependent upon the uncertainties of tramp shipping than you can imagine a home routine of setting your alarm clock at daybreak and getting to your station in the hope that a train would come along sometime before 10 o'clock.

There was a time, of course, when people lived like that. But we have gone far beyond. We think in terms of budgeting, whether it be our time or our finances. That is living, that is business, as we practice it today. We cannot deviate from it and keep our place in the world. Those relatively few people who think we can carry on world trade, of all things, without thought of budgeting, are not realistic. They belong in a dream world; and you men know that foreign trade has no place in dream worlds.

In addition, there is, of course, the broader aspect of this matter of merchant tonnage which concerns the expansion of our merchant fleet, and its maintenance as an instrument effective in keeping the United States in first rank in world trade and also in front rank in national defense. We in shipping have long pounded away at the claim that our merchant marine is a vital arm of national defense. I think the record of our merchant ships during the war should set at rest all questions of the merchant ship as a fighting instrument. Perhaps the picture has changed and we now must switch the emphasis from national defense to trade.

Let me quote a man who is not a ship operator, but who has spoken as clearly as any man can speak in fixing the value of merchant shipping as a factor in the development of this Nation's trade. I quote Vice Adm. E. W. Mills, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships. He said recently:

"The value of a merchant marine to our country, aside from its essential support to the armed services, does not accrue from the income that is derived from operation so much as it does in foreign trade development and the protection of our foreign trade from absorption by other nations. It has been repeatedly demonstrated in the history of the United States that we can build and operate ships to prosper in world trade; that we do so in the future as well as now is essential to our welfare and the peace of the world."

Admiral Mills made that statement knowing that in the recent war our merchant marine was able to deliver its timeliest blows in time—I emphasize in time—only because we had started to build ships before the war came and so were able quickly to expand our tonnage to met the war emergency until it became one of the two or three more vital instruments in the victory.

I could quote another man who speaks, not for a ship line but for our Government, the Honorable Richard Parkhurst, a member of the United States Maritime Commission. He said:

"The whole problem of the merchant marine is now under the most searching scrutiny in many responsible circles, both in and out of Government. I sincerely hope that the outcome of these studies will result in a sound program of long-range development on a scale which will insure not only first-class American-flag service in the domestic and foreign trades, but also a modern and dependable maritime organization shipside and shoreside, which will be able at a moment's notice to place itself again, if needed, in the front line of defense of our country."

Both these men emphasize the need of building and maintaining a merchant marine both as a carrier of our trade and as an arm of national defense. You, as businessmen, know that you do not solve today's business problems today; you solved them yesterday or last month, even last year. Certainly in an activity like shipping which involves a variety of men and a variety of talents and materials, we cannot afford to wait for our need to arise before we start to plan and build our ships.

But how can we plan and build unless we have some degree of certainty in our planning? We cannot operate on a hit-and-miss basis; millions of dollars are involved, and we must provide some sort of insurance for those millions. The operator who comes to you with a bargain, whether its freight rates or a diamond, is likely not to be around when the time comes to test the quality of the diamond or the quality of his shipping service. He cannot afford to back up his bargain. On the other hand, the man who hangs out his sign and takes a long-term lease will back up his wares; so will the ship line that comes to the shipper, places all his cards on the table, and says in effect, "Here is what we need if we are to survive. This is our cost, this is the rate that must be charged if we are to maintain our ships so they can best serve you." The ship lines that function together in our freight conferences are in that position. They are the lines that will back up their claims, they are the lines that will be on hand when the shipper needs service and needs it fast.

I look with profound suspicion upon anyone who cloaks himself with all the virtues, even though he is doing it by means of advertising in the public press. My experience with these "holier than thou" fellows is all to the bad. The conference system has its defects, as what human endeavor does not?

My belief is that ocean transportation needs regulation the same as any other public utility. No better system of regulation has yet been devised than that set up by the Congress of the United States permitting the establishment of conferences and laying down the law for their regulation. It is an American system devised by the American people and probably not understandable to some Europeans. Like most other things American, it will probably prove better than anything they have ever thought of.

The thoughtful American citizen must today be somewhat appalled by the position we occupy in the world, because of the tremendous responsibility that position imposes upon us. It is as near certain as anything could be that the future of civilization as we know it here, and as they knew it in western Europe, depends almost entirely upon our strength. A very vital part of that strength is the American merchant marine.

The Farm Program of the American Farm Bureau Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have just heard a statement of the farm program of the American Farm Bureau Federation as presented to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry today by Mr. Allan W. Kline, president of the Bureau. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The American Farm Bureau Federation realizes that all segments of our society are interdependent. We, therefore, urge the adoption of sound over-all policies which will lead to a high level of production, employment, income, trade, and a stable general price level. Stabilization at levels considerably higher than during the prewar period is essential if this Nation is going to meet the financial and other obligations resulting from the war.

2. The American Farm Bureau Federation believes that farmers and consumers have received fundamental benefits through the numerous basic agricultural laws which have been enacted. We realize the necessity for revising this legislation to meet changing conditions. We do not believe, however, that an entirely new and revolutionary farm program should be written, but rather that we should confine our efforts to refining and improving the present program. We believe revision of this basic legislation should be deferred for the present in order that postwar conditions in which the legislation will have to operate will be more clearly appraised, and additional consideration can be given to needed changes.

3. Agriculture's reconversion period is still ahead. We in agriculture are still operating under wartime urgency. Therefore, we recommend that the Steagall Act and the Bankhead Commodity Loan Act, which were enacted into law to assure consumers of adequate supplies of food and fiber and to protect farmers during the reconversion period, be extended for an additional year.

4. We urge retention and strengthening of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and related measures, including conservation of soil, water and forest resources, machinery for acreage adjustments, mandatory commodity loans, and marketing quotas when needed for basic agricultural commodities.

5. We believe that when the permanent farm program is written, existing legislation should be amended to provide a program based upon mandatory variable price supports for agricultural commodities. Such variable price supports should be applicable with or without quotas. The level of such supports should vary from 60 to 90 percent of parity, depending upon the importance and peculiarities, as well as the supply and price position of the commodity. Sufficient flexibility should be provided to give producers of a commodity maximum authority to determine the level of the support price of their particular commodity, and to utilize the marketing-quota features of the program. Sufficient flexibility in acreage adjustment programs should be provided to meet changing needs and to permit adjustment of individual production plans so as to encourage efficient land use and avoid freezing acreage allotments in rigid historical patterns. We believe that the protection provided in section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, which authorized import fees or quotas in cases where imports prevent the successful operation of certain domestic agricultural programs, should be extended and used when necessary.

6. We favor modification of the parity formula. This should be done by retention of the present parity formula, with adjustments among the various agricultural products according to the price relationship which existed among the products on the basis of a 10-year moving average. In making the transition from the present to a modernized parity formula, the parity price of a commodity should not be lowered by more than 5 percent in any one year. The Secretary of Agriculture should be required to adjust the parity price for any commodity that is out of line with the parity price for other agricultural commodities.

7. The welfare of agriculture and the Nation as a whole requires the restoration and maintenance of our soil fertility and the conservation of our soil, water, and forest resources. We therefore urge the Congress to provide adequate funds to continue and expand the agricultural conservation practices program.

8. The Commodity Credit Corporation, the key agency in the stabilization program for American agriculture, should be made permanent. In granting a new Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, we urge the Congress to provide adequate lending authority, and to provide sufficient flexibility of operation to assure that unforeseen contingencies which arise in agricultural production and distribution can be met. The corporate funds should not be used for financing programs of foreign or domestic relief except as may be incidental to the disposal of agricultural commodities acquired under its loan or support programs, unless these expenditures are reimbursed by appropriations. No funds of the Corporation should be used for consumer subsidies.

9. As a part of the long-time program, we urge aggressive efforts to stimulate increased consumption of agricultural commodities through research and education; the school-lunch and improved nutrition and health programs; development of new and expanded domestic and foreign markets for agricultural products; diversion of surpluses into byproduct uses; disposal of surpluses in export markets at competitive world prices, using export payments when necessary; development and use of international commodity agreements, and wisely planned programs designed to utilize a maximum of surplus agricultural commodities. We favor the retention of section 32 funds for use in supporting farm prices and in disposing of agricultural surpluses in foreign and domestic markets. All funds appropriated in section 32 should be used for the purposes originally intended and for no other, and these funds should remain available until expended.

10. Marketing agreements have proven their value during the past decade as a method of effectively handling difficult problems, especially in fruits, vegetables, nuts, and milk. The advantages of this program should be extended to other producers who can demonstrate the need for and feasibility of this type of program.

11. We favor Government crop insurance, provided rates on a sound actuarial basis with regional adjustments are maintained. We feel that further study and experiments should be made before it is extended to all areas of the country.

12. Farmers are rightfully concerned over the duplication, overlapping, and conflicts which exist in the administration of various phases of the farm program. In the interest of economy, efficiency, and effective coordination without centralized control, we urge that the administrators of the regulatory features of the programs, including conservation payments to farmers, be made responsible to bona fide farmer committees of the Production and Marketing Administration at State, county, and local levels; that the educational, demonstrational, informational, and technical service features be assigned to the State agricultural extension service; and that all research phases in the States be administered by the State agricultural experiment stations. To attain these objectives, we urge enactment of the Reed-Stewart bill (S. 1621), and the companion house bills, Cooley bill (H. R. 4150) and the Hill bill (H. R. 4151).

13. The cooperative credit system as provided in the farm credit legislation is essential to the welfare of American agriculture. Steps must be taken to make the farm credit system fully cooperative, farmer-owned and farmer-controlled. The farm-credit agencies should be placed under the direction of an independent bipartisan policy board. We favor legislation which will encourage the complete ownership of the banks for cooperatives by the cooperative associations. We favor a land-bank commissioner type of loan, to be made by the Federal land banks, provided that the proportion of the loans above the present 65-percent lending limit be underwritten in some manner designed to insure the banks against loss on the extra risk portion of the loans. The present ceiling on loans by the Federal land banks to any one borrower should be eliminated. The farm-credit system must be kept strong in order that it may serve as a reservoir for agricultural financing in the years ahead.

14. We believe cooperatives are an important part of the private enterprise system. We resent the attacks by certain groups upon farmer cooperatives. We believe that cooperative earnings currently returned to members as patronage refunds should not be subject to tax in the hands of the cooperative, since such refunds are taxed as income of the individual members. We will support such changes as may be necessary to require that there be income-tax exemption or deduction from taxable income on only reasonable reserves and on that portion of cooperative savings which are currently distributed or clearly shown on the books of the cooperative to be the property of the patron and subject to tax in his personal income. The American Farm Bureau Federation will support any needed revision of law or regulation which will define more clearly reasonable and necessary reserves.

15. The American Farm Bureau Federation believes that a national soil-fertility program is essential to the long-time welfare of the Nation. The fertilizer industry should be encouraged to expand its plant capacity for the production and distribution of fertilizers. Farm organizations should acquire adequate natural resources of phosphate and potash and develop programs for the production and distribution of high-concentrated materials. The Tennessee Valley Authority should construct and operate an experimental phosphate plant, for a period of not to exceed 5 years. At the end of that time the plant should be disposed of to private industry. The TVA should acquire reasonable phosphate reserves in the Florida area. The phosphate and potash reserves in the intermountain area should be developed. A limited test demonstration program should be

provided for under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with the land-grant colleges.

16. The foundation of the American Farm Bureau Federation's program is education and research. We urge the Congress to provide the full amount of funds authorized by law in order to carry out the agricultural education and research programs. Farmers are increasingly concerned over the failure of retail prices to reflect downward movements in the farm price of agricultural products. We believe research should be conducted on methods of making the free market operate more effectively. Expanded research and educational programs are essential for the continued development of American agriculture.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a statement which I gave to the press yesterday on the subject of the St. Lawrence waterway. In this statement I pointed out that a victory for the seaway would enhearten friends of democracy throughout the world, and that a defeat would be a real blow to democracy and a source of joy to our enemies.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENEMIES OF DEMOCRACY WILL REJOICE IF SEAWAY IS DEFEATED

I am confident that the St. Lawrence seaway bill can pass the Senate. We have already seen, however, evidences of the tactics of the opposition—suggesting more interminable delays, throwing up smoke screens, presenting a thousand and one picayunish questions to try to cast doubt on the reliability of the estimates of seaway proponents although those estimates have been attested to by the greatest engineers of the land in voluminous study for several decades. If the opposition persists in obstructionism, daily sessions of the Senate will be requested next week.

If we can enact the seaway resolution, as I firmly believe we can, it will serve to enhearten the friends of democracy throughout the world, because America will be able to ship abroad more food, more raw materials, more machinery, speedier and cheaper than ever before in addition to importing those items we need.

If we do not enact the seaway resolution, however, there will be rejoicing in Moscow which will have, as the old saying goes, "A horse's laugh" on the United States for a number of reasons:

RUSSIA WOULD MOCK OUR INCONSISTENCY

Foreign expenses

1. For one thing, the Russians would laugh at the ridiculous inconsistency of the United States which, following the war, has invested billions upon billions of dollars in UNRRA, in the International Bank, in postwar lend-lease, in the British loan, the Greek loan, interim aid, without even the semblance of expectation that it would be returned. Yet, the United States, if it turned down the seaway, would refuse to loan—loan, not give—to its own people a relatively small sum of $428,000,000 for the St. Lawrence seaway itself, including costs during the 6 or so years of construction, which come to the small sum of around $71,000,000 a year. The seaway plus the power project would only cost seven hundred and twenty millions—of which two hundred and thirty millions is in Canadian cost. In the last 14 years Uncle Sam has spent $1,615,000,000 on river and harbor projects alone in our country—not a cent of which in construction costs is reported to be repaid. Yet the seaway and power project would be self-liquidating in full.

Power crisis

2. The Russians would laugh because they would know that in the event of another national emergency, America would find itself desperately short of power. The Russians recognize that even now there is a terrific power deficit in the New England area (even while some men in New England are trying to sabotage this project which would supply more power than any other single American project with the exception of Grand Coulee). Meanwhile, the Russians are increasing their 1945 capacity in electrical energy by 2.1 times by 1950. The United States, however, expects to increase its capacity by only 1.3 times during that 5-year period. Thus, the relative advantage held by the United States in power is fast diminishing.

Rail bottleneck

3. The Russians would ridicule America which is even now finding its railroads a terrific bottleneck of transportation and yet refuses to develop the seaway which could help relieve the staggering load on our overloaded railroads.

Widespread endorsements

4. The Russians would sneer at us for the ineptness, the near-sightedness and the incredible stumbling of a constitutional republic, which, after 14 years of solid study and debate on this issue, after bipartisan endorsement by every American President—Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman—after endorsement by the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, outstanding leaders of American railroads themselves and countless other leading individuals (Hull, Stimson, Byrnes, Stettinius, Dewey, Stassen, Hughes) and organizations, still questions the value of this mighty project.

Sectional versus national

5. The Russians would rejoice if the United States Senate succumbs to petty provincial sectionalisms, to the narrow greed of certain few selfish interests, seeking to maintain their financial grip in northeastern transportation even if it means sacrificing a national project as vital as this. The Reds would rejoice at the triumph of fear, fancy, folly, and frustration here.

Ignoring leadership

6. The Russians would be pleasantly amazed if the United States, which committed 14,000,000 men to the trust of our military authorities in the Second World War, were to refuse to accept the judgment of these same military authorities—the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and others, that this project would be valuable to national defense—as a great, 2,500-mile sea highway for importing Labrador ore and other items as well as exporting items.

BUSINESS SUPPORTS SEAWAY

The grounds of the opposition are a mass of misrepresentation, misrepresenting the views of the rank and file of American railway labor, misrepresenting the views of their own constituents who, for example, in the New England area, in New York State and elsewhere, have time and time again indicated their vigorous support of the seaway, although some of their leaders purporting to represent them, oppose the seaway.

Fifty-four percent of New England business in one poll favored the seaway, 55 percent of Mid-Atlantic business, 75 percent of North Central business, 55 percent South, 73 percent Midwest and 62 percent mountain, with a national average of 63 percent of American business for the seaway.

Conditions in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding the situation in Palestine and our own policies in relation thereto, together with certain memoranda dealing with the statutory and constitutional situation, as well as clippings from the New York Herald Tribune dealing with this matter.

Mr. President, the situation in Palestine is one which should invite the very earnest attention of every one concerned with the peace of the world. I do not take further time because of the other problems which are pressing, but I do hope this subject will have the considered attention of the Senate and of the country before it is permitted to drift into chaos and one of the worst menaces to world peace.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT ARMS EMBARGO AND RECALL OF PASSPORTS OF AMERICAN VOLUNTEERS IN PALESTINE

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BREWSTER

On December 1 of last year I stated in this very Chamber that "The United Nations has not only given birth to the new nation of Palestine, but must see to it that this infant shall be properly nourished and developed." Instead of nursing this infant, the State Department has recently placed a double-barreled embargo upon a people whose only objective is to defend themselves against willful and organized massacre. One, embargo on arms and defense ammunition going to the Jews; second, embargo upon those who are desirous to fight voluntarily for law and order in the new state. By these two embargoes our State Department permits the slow starvation and strangulation of the very state to the birth of which it has given its blessing.

It is difficult to understand just what the State Department proposes to accomplish by these two acts, unless it means to disavow its own policy, one made crystal clear by our underwriting of the United Nations decision to partition Palestine.

In the same speech of December 1, I submitted a proposal that through the mechanism of the United Nations a volunteer force be organized to guarantee law and order in the new state. It so happens that a number of young Americans, who find themselves in Palestine today, have expressed their eagerness to help defend the rights of men, women, and children against Arab onslaught. Those young Americans wish to act as volunteers, but they must reckon with an embargo on their enthusiasm, which says, that they must remain idle if they wish to remain American citizens.

The action of the State Department in instructing the Consulate of Jerusalem to withdraw the passports of American citizens in Palestine who volunteered to help in the defense of the Jewish community and of the United Nations' decision, against brutal attacks, is extremely shocking. It is bad enough that neither the United States Government, nor the United Nations Security Council on which America is a leading member and often exercises initiative, has taken any steps to implement the United Nations resolution and to curb the brazen aggression of Arab States against Palestine in defiance of the resolution and of the United Nations Charter. It is bad enough that the American Government went out of its way to prohibit the export of arms to those who are today the only ones to defend the United Nations resolution in Palestine. But, this last action of the State Department, aimed at preventing American citizens from voluntarily defending an international decision, is so blatantly contrary to all tradition of American history, that one can only express one's amazement at the length to which the administration seems willing to go in an attempt to kill, by indirection, a policy which has been officially supported by it and agreed upon by the United Nations.

What exactly, does the Department of State wish to happen? Taking no initiative at the United Nations against the aggression of the Arab States; refusing to exercise its influence vis-à-vis the British Government to fulfill its responsibility in maintaining law and order; raising all kinds of objections to the project of creating an international force; cutting off the supply of arms to the Jewish community of Palestine now under attack; unwilling to have even American volunteers participate in the securing of international law in Palestine—though perfectly willing to send American troops to other areas; and now seeking to prevent the flow of high-minded American youth who, as private individuals, desire to come to the assistance of a righteous cause—the administration seems to be bent on making certain that the decision to establish a Jewish State, to which it gave ostensible support, be now permitted to die.

This enthusiasm of young Americans for a worthy cause is not without precedent. Before the last war many American boys enlisted in the Canadian Air Force, the British Royal Air Force, the Free French, and other Allies, before we declared war. I have my doubts that any of those who volunteered either had their passports recalled or lost their citizenship. Many American boys fought in the cause of Ireland, when that Nation after 800 years of struggle regained its freedom, independence, and standing in the family of nations.

And if we go back to our own Revolutionary War, when the Thirteen Colonies were fighting for their independence, we too, welcomed aid from France, Poland, and other countries without burdening their enthusiasm with conditions to renounce their national citizenship and adopt ours.

MEMORANDA ON STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR ARMS EMBARGO

Statutory authority, pursuant to which shipments of arms and ammunition out of the United States may be curtailed by the President, is found in the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), which reads as follows:

"SEC. 6. Whenever the President determines that it is necessary in the interest of national defense to prohibit or curtail the exportation of any military equipment or munitions, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or material, or supplies necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation thereof, he may by proclamation prohibit or curtail such exportation, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe. Any such proclamation shall describe the articles or materials included in the prohibition or curtailment contained therein. In case of the violation of any provision of any proclamation, or of any rule or regulation, issued hereunder, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment. The authority granted in this section shall terminate June 30, 1942, unless the Congress shall otherwise provide."

The termination has been variously extended and this section is in operation at the present time. The Secretary of State ordered discontinuance of shipments of arms to Palestine on December 5, 1947, and his reasons for that action are set forth in a press release dated December 5, a copy of which is attached:

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
December 5, 1947.

"In view of the current disorders in the Middle East, the United States is discontinuing for the present licensing of all shipments of arms to the troubled areas. The shipments of arms and ammunition licensed to the countries of the Middle East area affected during 1946 and the first 10 months of 1947 are as follows:

Country	Description	1946	1947
Egypt	Arms	$70.00	$709.63
Do	Ammunition	688.10	222.17
Lebanon	Arms		800.00
Do	Ammunition		2,020.00
Syria	Arms		
Do	Ammunition		
Saudi Arabia	Arms		2,060.00
Do	Ammunition		306.44
Transjordan	Arms		
Do	Ammunition		
Iraq	Arms	432.00	
Do	Ammunition		
Palestine	Arms		
Do	Ammunition		

"Similarly this policy extends to this type of article which may be located outside the United States, including transfer and retransfer of lend-lease arms and ammunition and the sale of United States surplus arms and ammunition."

MEMORANDUM

The basic authority pursuant to which the Secretary of State is authorized to license shipment of arms, ammunition, etc., to foreign countries, lies in the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) adopted November 4, 1939.

Section 12 sets up a National Munitions Control Board under the administration of the Secretary of State and subsection (d) thereof, reads:

"It shall be unlawful for any person to export, or attempt to export, from the United States to any other state, any arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of subsection (1) of this section, or to import, or attempt to import, to the United States from any other state, any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in any such proclamation, without first having submitted to the Secretary of State the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale and having obtained a license therefor."

This authority has been implemented by Presidential proclamation at various times and the current proclamation, No. 2717, promulgated February 14, 1947, is attached:

"ENUMERATION OF ARMS, AMMUNITION, AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR[1]

[Released to the press by the White House February 15]

"BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*A proclamation*

"Whereas section 12 (1) of the joint resolution of Congress approved November 4, 1939, provides in part as follows (54 Stat. 13; 22 U. S. C. 452 (1)):

"'The President is hereby authorized to proclaim upon recommendation of the National Munitions Control Board from time to time a list of articles which shall be considered arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purposes of this section.'

"Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority conferred upon me by the said joint resolution of Congress, and pursuant to the recommendation of the National Munitions Control Board, and in the interest of the foreign-affairs functions of the United States, hereby declare and proclaim that the articles listed below shall, on and after February 20, 1947, be considered arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purposes of section 12 of the said joint resolution of Congress:

"Category I

"(1) Rifles and carbines using ammunition in excess of caliber .22, and barrels for those weapons;

"(2) Machine guns, automatic or autoloading rifles, and machine pistols using ammunition in excess of caliber .22, and barrels for those weapons; machine-gun mounts;

"(3) Guns, howitzers, and mortars of all calibers, their mountings and barrels;

"(4) Ammunition in excess of caliber .22 for the arms enumerated under (1), (2), and (3) above, and cartridge cases or bullets for such ammunition; shells and projectiles, filled or unfilled, for the arms enumerated under (3) above;

"(5) Grenades, bombs, torpedoes, mines and depth charges, filled or unfilled, and apparatus for their use or discharge;

"(6) Tanks, military armored vehicles, and armored trains; armor plate and turrets for such vehicles.

"Category II

"Vessels of war of all kinds, including aircraft carriers and submarines, and armor plate and turrets for such vessels.

"Category III

"(1) Aircraft (piloted), both heavier and lighter than air, unassembled, assembled or dismantled: (a) classified from the standpoint of military security; or (b) especially designed for warlike purposes; or (c) having a weight empty greater than 35,000 pounds;

"(2) Nonpiloted aircraft and guided missiles, unassembled, assembled or dismantled;

"(3) Any part, component, accessory, or device, of or pertaining to an aircraft either heavier or lighter than air, whether shipped alone or in an unassembled or assembled aircraft: (a) which is classified from the standpoint of military security; or (b) which (1) is not in general use in commercial aircraft and (2) is either especially designed for warlike purposes or adaptable substantially to increase the efficiency or performance of aircraft used for warlike purposes.

"Category IV

"(1) Revolvers and automatic pistols using ammunition in excess of caliber .22;

[1] 12 Federal Register 1127.

"(2) Ammunition in excess of caliber .22 for the arms enumerated under (1) above, and cartridge cases or bullets for such ammunition.

"Category V

"(1) Livens projectors, flame throwers, and fire-barrage projectors;
"(2) a. Mustard gas (dichlorethyl sulfide);
"b. Lewisite (chlorvinyldichlorarsine and dichlordivinylchlorarsine);
"c. Methyldichlorarsine;
"d. Diphenylchlorarsine;
"e. Diphenylcyanarsine;
"f. Diphenylaminechlorarsine;
"g. Phenyldichlorarsine;
"h. Ethyldichlorarsine;
"i. Phenyldibromarsine;
"j. Ethyldibromarsine;
"k. Phosgene;
"l. Monochlormethylchlorformate;
"m. Trichlormethylchlorformate (diphosgene);
"n. Dichlordimethyl ether;
"o. Dibromdimethyl ether;
"p. Cyanogen chloride;
"q. Ethylbromacetate;
"r. Ethyliodoacetate;
"s. Brombenzylcyanide;
"t. Bromacetone;
"u. Brommethylethyl ketone.

"Category VI

"(1) Propellent powders;
"(2) High explosives as follows:
"a. Nitrocellulose having a nitrogen content of more than 12.20 percent;
"b. Trinitrotoluene;
"c. Trinitroxylene;
"d. Tetryl (trinitrophenol methyl nitramine or tetranitro methylaniline);
"e. Picric acid;
"f. Ammonium picrate;
"g. Trinitroanisol;
"h. Trinitronaphthalene;
"i. Tetranitronaphthalene;
"j. Hexanitrodiphenylamine;
"k. Pentaerythritetetranitrate (penthrite or pentrite);
"l. Trimethylenetrinitramine (hexogen or T_4);
"m. Potassium nitrate powders (black saltpeter powder);
"n. Sodium nitrate powders (black soda powder);;
"o. Amatol (mixture of ammonium nitrate and trinitrotoluene)."
"p. Ammonal (mixture of ammonium nitrate, trinitrotoluene, and powdered aluminum, with or without other ingredients);
"q. Schneiderite (mixture of ammonium nitrate and dinitronaphthalene, with or without other ingredients).

"Effective Febuary 20, 1947, this proclamation shall supersede Proclamation 2549, dated April 9, 1942.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"Done at the city of Washington this fourteenth day of February in the year of our Lord 1947, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-first.

"By the President:
[SEAL] "HARRY S. TRUMAN,
"G. C. MARSHALL,
"*Secretary of State.*"

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Loss of United States nationality.

The controlling legislation on the subject of loss of United States nationality is contained in the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940. The pertinent direct quotes from the law read as follows:

"SEC. 401. A person who is a national of the United States, whether by birth or naturalization, shall lose his nationality by:

"'(b) Taking an oath or making an affirmation or other formal declaration of allegiance to a foreign state; or

"'(c) Entering, or serving in, the armed forces of a foreign state unless expressly authorized by the laws of the United States, if he has or acquires the nationality of such foreign state'."

To accommodate those persons who entered the armed services of other nations prior to our entry into the First or Second World Wars, Congress amended the Nationality Act on April 2, 1942, as follows:

"SEC. 323 A person who, while a citizen of the United States and during the First or Second World War, entered the military or naval service of any country at war with a country with which the United States was or is at war, who has lost citizenship of the United States by reason of any oath or obligation taken for the purpose of entering such service, or by reason of entering or serving in such armed forces, and who intends to reside permanently in the United States, may be naturalized by taking before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301, the oaths prescribed by section 335. Any such person who has lost citizenship of the United States during the Second World War may, if he so desires, be naturalized by taking, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335. For the purpose of this section, the Second World War shall be deemed to have commenced on September 1, 1939, and shall continue until such time as the United States shall cease to be in a state of war. Certified copies of such oath shall be sent by such diplomatic or consular officer or such court to the Department of State and to the Department of Justice (as amended by the act of April 2, 1942)."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 28, 1948]

ACTION ON PALESTINE

While the United Nations Commission prepares the report due February 1, the situation within Palestine steadily deteriorates. What had been plain to many observers from the beginning—that partition could not succeed without being enforced—is now too plain for anyone to deny. Yet the means of enforcement are still far from being put into effect, to say nothing of being generally agreed on. The major constructive move of UN, the best example of cooperation between the western countries and Russia, and a policy to which our own country stands deeply committed, all are in jeopardy because men have not been able to act according to the clear compulsions of necessity and interest.

The timetable of the steps which were to lead by next October to the establishment of a new Jewish state has already been cast into the discard. A port will not be opened to substantial Jewish immigration by the beginning of February. In all likelihood, provisional governments for the Jewish and Arab areas will not be set up by the beginning of April. What will ensue when Britain's withdrawal is completed by August becomes increasingly problematical, in view of fighting which seems to be changing its character from spasmodic riots to settled war.

The United States cannot undertake by itself enforcement of the partition plan, nor should it seek by unilateral action to arm the present Jewish militia for their own defense. But our direct stake in a solution, derived from a humanitarian concern for the Jews, a belief in UN, and a strategic interest in the Middle East, permits no evasion of responsibility. The United States must act, and the obvious form of action is through UN, demanding that the Security Council take immediate steps toward a settlement. The amount of force that will be required to reach the settlement will diminish in proportion as we move swiftly and place the whole force of our prestige behind that of the international organization.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 27, 1948]

CHAOS IN PALESTINE

COST OF TIMID PROCRASTINATION

(By Sumner Welles)

Within the past 8 weeks, Palestine has become a shambles. Open warfare, carnage, assassination, and reprisals are the order of the day. The tally of the dead and injured is mounting hourly. To an increasingly callous public, Palestine seems to have already become just one more tragedy in a world that is filled with them.

There is all too little recognition in this country of the danger to American security and of the threat to the survival of the United Nations that are inherent in this drift toward chaos.

Our national effort is now directed toward the preservation of the independence of Italy, Greece, and Turkey as the surest means of preventing Russian domination of the Mediterranean. If large-scale hostilities break out in the eastern Mediterranean, which enable the Kremlin legitimately to claim that Russia must take armed action to safeguard her vital interests by restoring peace in a region adjacent to her frontiers, is it likely that our policy will be successful?

The Arab Higher Committee has informed the Secretary General of the United Nations that it will try to prevent the establishment of an independent Jewish state in Palestine by every means within its power. This is a flagrant violation of the solemn commitments into which the Arab states entered when they subscribed to the United Nations Charter. It is nothing more nor less than a declaration of war upon the United Nations.

The newspapers in Syria and in the Lebanon openly boast of the recent invasion of Palestine by troops equipped and trained in those two countries. One hundred and ten Egyptian officers have been granted 6 months' leave with full pay to command Arab volunteers in Syria. The Egyptian Government has appropriated $2,000,000 to help to arm the Arab forces fighting against partition. The Cairo press reports that arms and ammunition are being sent by friendly governments to Arab League headquarters for the use of these forces.

The Arab League would never have dared pursue this policy of defiance had the Arab states known from the outset that the United Nations was able and prepared to enforce its partition decision.

In the final days of the Assembly debate the United States suggested the establishment of an international volunteer constabulary to serve in Palestine. The proposal was obviously ill-advised. These volunteers could not have been adequately screened. The Soviet and American Governments would each have claimed that such a constabulary was a Trojan horse containing agents of the other. The suggestion was fortunately rejected.

When the partition resolution was finally adopted it included a mere appeal to both Jews and Arabs to create local militias. Such a recommendation, without any provision for United Nations control, was tantamount to an incitement to conflict.

Until now, the United Nations Palestine Commission, set up by the Assembly to supervise partition, has done nothing more effective than discuss how such militias could function or whether the Security Council should be asked to intervene.

The Security Council, notwithstanding the acts of aggression committed in Palestine, and notwithstanding its clear-cut obligations under article 39 of the Charter to take action "to maintain or restore international peace and security," continues to be silent. And in this case, since the Soviet Union officially supports partition, the veto is not the cause of inaction.

If the wave of anarchy in Palestine spreads further, human passions will soon be out of control.

The British Government persists in its stultifying policy of noncooperation. But the blame for what is going on should be laid primarily upon the United Nations for its timorous procrastination. It should also be laid upon the United States for its failure to assume leadership before the adjournment of the Assembly by insisting that adequate measures be taken to prevent this threat to the peace of the world, which could then already be clearly foreseen.

If the United Nations either will not or cannot enforce such decisions as its decision upon the partition of Palestine, it cannot survive.

I long since urged in this column that the measure that could best prevent the outbreak of a major war in the Near East, and at the same time avoid increased antagonism between the United States and the Soviet Union, was the dispatch by the Security Council to Palestine, in accordance with article 43 of the Charter, of a United Nations police force composed of small contingents from the regular military establishments of five or more of the intermediate or lesser powers.

A token force should be sent immediately to Jerusalem as a symbol of United Nations authority. This should be gradually increased to replace the British troops as they evacuate. There is no plan that has yet been suggested that can prevent rivalries between the major powers, keep the peace in Palestine, and restrain the ambitions of the Arab League.

If the whole of the Near East is not soon to be aflame in a devastating conflagration, if our own national policy is not to fall ignominiously, and if the United Nations is to preserve any semblance of authority, instant action by the Security Council is imperative.

United Nations in 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject United Nations in 1948, broadcast December 31, 1947, by Arthur Gaeth, the well-known commentator.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Truman greeted his last news conference of the year today voicing confidence that the world will achieve a workable peace through United Nations in spite of difficult 1947.

When Mr. Panyushkin presented his credentials, the President told the newly appointed Soviet Ambassador that both Russia and the United States must show a mutual spirit of good will and confidence in solving the present world situation.

In Vatican City, the Pope pleaded with the great powers to remember that peace is indivisible. He emphasized that the Holy See does not accept the thesis that the year 1948 may be the most disastrous in history.

The stories of the President's personal physician, Dr. Graham, and his brokers, Bache & Co., do not agree. Graham said he had been an unwitting speculator in grains. The company said, "Tain't so; he'd been a customer since 1946 and all transactions were made with his knowledge."

In a few hours we will enter what may be one of the most perplexing of years. Certainly it will be exciting. First of all it will be a grab-your-man year. Then, we will have national elections. Mr. Wallace added to the perplexities when he threw his hat into the Presidential ring on Monday. Speculation has it that as a result Mr. Truman can't win. Mr. Wallace couldn't win anyway so that the Republicans will be able to turn to the politico's favorite, Mr. TAFT, and he'll be the next President.

But, not so fast. Not so fast. Anything can happen. The Republicans have promised they would open every session of Congress with a prayer and close it with an investigation. They are in an uncovering mood. Their Senator BREWSTER is now in Arabia risking his neck but looking into oil. He thinks there is something unsavory in that oil area. Syria and Lebanon refused to let him into their country. The State Department frowned, but he is there, and he is investigating. The Republicans can uncover and make their political opponents look bad but they cannot cover up a congressional record—that they must make.

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight will not be a year to chart in advance. Top administration economists talk about no depression and prosperity in 1948. But the way things are going, we won't need a depression for many people to get hurt and then take it out on someone in voting.

For example, in 1947 we had a national income which increased 12 percent or $22,000,000,000 over 1946 but that huge buying power couldn't force down prices. Agriculture didn't increase production one bit. While industrial products increased 9 percent, the goods we stocked in warehouses and on shelves went up one-fifth or $8,000,000,000. While you and I spent almost $28,000,000,000 or 22 percent more money in 1947, the purchasing power of our wages and salaries in terms of what they bought before price control was wiped out was actually 6 percent less.

If conditions continue as they are—and Congress has done nothing to change them in spite of all the talk—Mr. Truman told his press conference today they didn't even give him a slice of bread with their legislation instead of what one correspondent called a half a loaf—if conditions continue, some economists think the cost of living can rise another 25 percent in 6 months—that Congress may be forced by May to vote price control and rationing. Republican Senator WILSON of Iowa recently told his colleagues to quit kidding the public. While buying power hasn't increased and people are taking from their savings—while the national income went up 12 percent corporation profits after taxes went up 33 percent—a disproportionately large gain. No wonder the President's economic advisers stated in their report of December 13 that "the accumulations of capital over the years * * * involved deprivations of the rank-and-file worker and that our system cannot go on progressing or even functioning efficiently unless its expanding product goes to all potential consumers."

All this plays a role in the way people vote. In spite of Mr. Wallace, the Republicans have no election security.

It is with their foreign policy the Democrats can have trouble, not only from the Republicans but from the electorate. They have operated on a crisis basis. Now, if the next crisis were to include sending troops abroad—American mothers and fathers might do some deep thinking.

Greece is still in a crisis. Walter Lippmann wrote on Tuesday that it might not be the Yugoslavs or Russians who are making that crisis but the actual conditions inside Greece. Our people who said last March that if we would only let the Greeks have $300,000,000 and 78 advisers, that would pull them out of a hole—are now saying we must let the Greeks have two divisions of our soldiers—then they'll pull through—otherwise our reputation is at stake. We are feeding 100,000 Greek soldiers—have sent them 74,000 tons of military equipment. And the 20,000 guerrillas seem to be gaining in strength. Are the Russians and their supporters responsible? Much closer to the truth may be the fact that the people lack confidence in their government. Now that a revolutionary government exists, more Greeks may actually try to get in touch with it, continuing to undermine the monarchist regime—so that our "Operation Rathole" can continue indefinitely. It could cost us another billion.

A new clamor has begun for China—not only that we send supplies but also hurry up some troops, or Chiang will be beaten. In Nanking, President Chiang Kai-Shek today called for an end to the Communist menace which he said came from within and from without. To keep the record straight—Henry Stimson, Republican in President Roosevelt's Cabinet, stated in his biography—excerpts which have been published in the Ladies Home Journal—that during the war the United States offered to train Chinese divisions but Chiang opposed. Stimson says the whole Chinese regime was riddled with graft and personal power politics—that Chiang's entire preoccupation was with keeping himself in power. Chinese leaders cried for our help but they wouldn't help themselves. Now that the times are catching up with Chiang—advocates of the American century want to pour American wealth into China.

Over in France there is trouble. Certain Americans have begun flirting with De Gaulle. While Stimson was in favor of supporting him during the war, he said about De Gaulle that he had inextricably confused the cause of France with the cause of General de Gaulle. Roosevelt regarded him as a narrow-minded French zealot with too much ambition for his own good and some rather dubious views of democracy.

It is in this field of foreign affairs that Mr. Truman and the State Department may have their biggest troubles with the voters. Our policy backs national leaders who can be accused of not having had the best interests of their own people at heart. Our policy aims to aline the American public with causes which in the long run will not succeed, while they bring us the animosity and antagonism of the Chinese, Greeks, French, and others, for intrenching such leaders—and the American people pay for it.

To keep out of those rat holes will not be easy. There are Russian and American power politics involved. Both countries have sought to weaken UN, an institution they cooperated to create. There is no hope of escaping the inevitable result of power politics in an atomic era. Over 300 years it has only led to war. There is hope in collective security—where no nation can have its own way, where there must be compromises—and where patience and faith must be maintained if the long-range goals of peace and a world in which all people can exist

in spite of environment and belief—are to be maintained.

Tonight, on the eve of a new year—a year in which the most important problem confronting world peace is that of blunting the horns of the Russian Foreign Commissariat and the American State Department and turning them back to graze in the international pasture with the rest of the world—I asked the Secretary General of the United Nations for a special New Year's message. The man who will speak to you by transcription is a 51-year-old Norwegian—son of a carpenter, Oslo University graduate, long-time labor lawyer, and Norway's Foreign Minister during the war. He is a man given to much common sense, not easily discouraged in causes for the interest of humanity. The Honorable Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations:

"Throughout the world, tonight, men and women and children say farewell to another fateful year and turn their thoughts to a fresh New Year, full of hope that it will bring them a better future.

"The year 1947 was the second full year of peace after the Second World War.

"We could not have expected that this period, in the immediate aftermath of a world catastrophe, would be free of troubles.

"What we did hope for was steady progress back toward a normal world, in which human beings could pursue their lives in freedom from fear and hunger and the many problems which afflict humanity.

"We hoped that this year would help to dissolve the differences which have divided the great powers since the war—that it would restore the feeling of comradeship which brought them victory.

"Some of those hopes have been realized. Many countries which were stricken by the war have begun to recover economically and to restore to their peoples a fair degree of normal living. Other peoples have realized aspirations for independence which they have cherished for many generations.

"In the councils of the United Nations the member nations have found it possible to come to agreement on many matters which affect the well-being of the world.

"Yet we have been disappointed in the greatest hope of all—the hope that the great powers would be able to move, definitely and progressively, toward an understanding on the questions which divided them.

"This lack of understanding has prevented us from achieving all that we should have achieved in relieving the plight of tens of millions of suffering human beings.

"Let us look these facts full in the face as we turn toward the year to come. Let us, above all, not forget for one second that our first duty in these tragic times is our common, collective duty to improve the situation of these miserable millions of our fellow men.

"In this situation we all have one thing in common—the United Nations. In the Charter we have a solemn and binding set of principles and an agreement regarding the methods which we must follow in realizing those principles. Today 57 nations subscribe to those principles. These 57 nations meet regularly to settle their differences in accordance with the rules laid down in the Charter and to devise methods by which they can accomplish the constructive goals of the Charter.

"During 1948 we must continue to hope for a change in the tide of disagreement between the powers, so that we may be allowed to move more swiftly forward in settling our problems. We must never give up hope for an agreement and we must never stop working for it.

"On the other hand, and at the same time, we must make the most of what we have. We must stand behind the United Nations and increase its strength. We must believe in it and we must make sure that other people believe in it. Its prestige must be so great, in the minds of all people, that it will be able to defend, and to practice, the principles for which it stands.

"With the combined support of ordinary people, all over the world, the United Nations stands today as a mighty barrier to war and the hope of all mankind for a better world. Believe in it, work for it, defend it during the years to come."

Thank you, Mr. Lie. It is the hope for the future we dare not lose. We must back it with support for the United Nations, insisting that our leaders must not bypass instruments of cooperation, faulty as they may be, until better ones are achieved—that going our own headstrong way because we have power makes only for war and not for peace.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two statements on the St. Lawrence waterway which I have issued today, as well as an editorial on the same subject from the Detroit News of January 26.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN AGAINST ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

The worst propaganda deluge of half truths and untruths has assailed the Members of Congress on the St. Lawrence waterway, surpassing the propaganda barrage, I believe, of any previous issue in the Eightieth Congress. All sorts of letterhead organizations, inspired by a certain few selfish interests, have poured in a mass of unjustified criticisms of the St. Lawrence seaway in a futile hope, I believe, to defeat the project.

Even distinguished organizations like the railroad brotherhoods, from which we might have expected a more forthright approach, have deluged their members with fear propaganda to the effect that railroad jobs would be destroyed by a project which would actually create thousands of new railroad jobs and would have an insignificant, if any, adverse effect on existing railroad jobs.

A whispering and rumor campaign has been set in motion against the St. Lawrence seaway too. Among the false rumors and innuendos is the one to the effect that the St. Lawrence seaway will compete with funds which would otherwise have been made available to other projects throughout the United States. This is a base rumor, which should be nailed as a complete fabrication.

The St. Lawrence seaway actually involves insignificant appropriations, probably around $70,000,000 at the most, for each of the years of its construction. It would be ridiculous to assume that this small sum would detract from the hundreds of millions of dollars which we are spending for other domestic purposes. The seaway is entirely unique, a natural sea artery presented to us almost complete by nature and unlike any other project anywhere else in our land.

The opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway stand accused before the American Nation of unleashing this fear campaign, a campaign designed to arouse the most provincial, sectional feelings, the most selfish interests, rather than to appeal on a national basis to the common sense and wisdom of the American people in looking after the interests of their entire country.

COMMENTS ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The headlines in every American newspaper regarding America's current problems belie the ridiculous contentions of the opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway, which are fantastically out of step with our times. The headlines tell us of a fuel-oil shortage because of lack of transportation, which the St. Lawrence seaway might have helped divert, if it had been previously established.

The news of the terrific bottleneck in shipment of foods via rail also serves to render ridiculous the assertions of the seaway's opponents that this new 2,500-mile sea artery is not necessary. Reports of Russian industrial and electrical energy expansion abroad are a further stark commentary on the incredible short-sightedness of opponents of the waterway.

Opposition to the waterway on sectional grounds is obviously wholly unjustified because of its value to national defense and commerce and because no harm would actually be done to any single section of the country by the waterway. On the other hand, opposition to the seaway on national grounds is even more ridiculous because of the testimony of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the national defense value of the seaway as well as the endorsements of every leading American political figure—every President since Harding, on the national importance of the seaway.

If the opposition to the seaway succeeds in once again delaying this project, it will have on its conscience the guilt of delaying the natural development of our country and of sabotaging, in part, our future progress and military defense.

[From the Detroit News of January 26, 1948]

MIDWEST WANTS ROUTE TO THE SEA

"The perpetually 'dream-walking' St. Lawrence plan seems a reverie beneficial only to a small Great Lakes section—and Canada."

This observation winds up a Boston Herald editorial on the seaway, which in several other respects is careless with the truth about the project.

The small section to be directly benefited by the seaway includes some 40,000,000 Americans, almost the population of Great Britain. It includes 46 percent of American manufacturing capacity, 85 percent of the steel industry. It includes a very large part of the country's food production.

This section, though landlocked, originates a respectable portion of American foreign trade, which with opportunity would be bigger. It wants access to ocean transportation, which Boston has.

It feels that, if it is all right to spend Federal money on deepening Boston harbor, it is equally right to spend on damming and flooding out a few miles of St. Lawrence rapids that alone bar deep-draft navigation from the Great Lakes to tidewater. However, the seaway plan now calls for ship tolls, plus electric power revenues, to repay the cost in full, making it no burden at all on the Treasury.

The seaway is a dream, yes; yet much more than a dream.

It is a project, for which blueprints long ago were ready, the test bores made for the navigation and power works. During its 30 years as a project, it has been studied as to potential traffic and economic benefits, local and national, far more thoroughly than any public project in American history.

And that includes even the Panama Canal, which had to overcome a similar campaign of lying misrepresentation.

Seven Presidents of the United States have urged construction of the seaway, and all

that has stood in its way has been the kind of dog-in-the-manger opposition typified by the Boston Herald's sneer at Midwestern aspirations.

This project may in fact remain perpetually a dream, until the Middle West at long last gets mad over that sort of thing and strikes back.

That "small section," besides people and industry, also has votes. It has plenty, for example, to block the harbor improvements for which Boston, New York, and the rest so cheerfully expect midwesterners to pay.

Ideology or Balance of Power?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 21), 1948

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding and excellent article entitled "Ideology or Balance of Power?" by William G. Carleton, reprinted from the Yale Review. Mr. Carleton is professor of political science at the University of Florida. I am informed by the Public Printer that it is estimated the article will make 2½ pages of the RECORD at a cost of $165.67.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDEOLOGY OR BALANCE OF POWER?

(By William G. Carleton)

If you are a teacher of a college class in international relations, as I have been for the past decade, the moment will inevitably come that you half dread and half eagerly welcome: one day some student will rise and ask the $64 question. "Professor," he will say, "are we Americans wary of Russia because we fear communism or because we fear that Russia will upset the balance of power? Which is more important—that thing we call ideology or the balance of power?" That question raises the fundamental philosophic issue of our time—the issue which goes to the very heart of international relations.

What is the chief element in formulating the foreign policy of a nation? Is it ideology or is it balance of power? Is it both? If both, which weighs the more?

Did Sparta and Athens fight the Peloponnesian War because of the conflict of their social and political systems or because each feared the collective power of the other? Was Whig Britain at war with Bourbon France because of the rivalry of different institutions or because of the clash of competitive imperialisms? Did Burke's Britain fight revolutionary France because of Tory fear of the Jacobins or because Britain feared for the balance of power? Did the United States go to war with Germany in 1917 and again in 1941 because of a conflict of cultures or a conflict of power?

What is this thing called "ideology"? There are, of course, ideologies and ideologies, and the term needs clarification.

Nations differ from each other in cultural and institutional patterns. But institutions inside nations are forever undergoing changes. These changes bring on institutional conflict within nations. Some fear these changes while others favor them. Very often the institutional conflict taking place inside one nation is at the same time also taking place inside other nations. In other words, the struggle for institutional change often cuts across national boundaries.

In one age, the emphasis is on one aspect of cultural or institutional change; in another age, the emphasis is on another aspect. In the sixteenth century and the early seventeenth century, the chief institutional conflict inside countries involved religion. In some countries the Protestants won, and in other countries the Catholics won. But inside Protestant countries, there were Catholic minorities, and inside Catholic countries, there were Protestant minorities. Later, the chief institutional conflict was over constitutional and representative government. In some countries constitutional government won, and in other countries absolute monarchy held its own; but in countries where constitutional government won, there were still those who clung to the divinity of kings, and in countries where absolutism won, there were minority groups which favored constitutional and representative government. Still later, the chief institutional conflict was over political democracy. However, in countries where democracy triumphed, there were minority groups which opposed it, and in countries where democracy made little headway, there were minority groups which championed it. Today, in this middle of the twentieth century, the chief institutional conflict centers around the ownership of productive property. The struggle is one of capitalism versus some form of collectivism. Inside almost every country this struggle is taking place in one way or another. In some countries collectivism is farther advanced than in others. Those in one country who favor collectivism find themselves in sympathy with those in other countries who favor it. Those in one country who oppose collectivism find themselves in sympathy with those in other countries who oppose it.

The decisive institutional conflict of any age has come to be known as the ideological conflict. While, in general, that conflict was in the seventeenth century waged over religion, in the eighteenth century over constitutional and representative government, and in the nineteenth century over political democracy, in the present century it is being waged over socialism.

That the institution or ideological conflict is waged inside many nations at the same time, that the new institution struggling to be born is farther advanced in some countries than in others, that this conflict cuts across national lines and leaves people and groups within the various countries with ideological sympathies for similar groups in other countries—all of this enormously complicates international relations. International wars often take on the appearance of deep-seated ideological conflict involving not only national interests but future institutional and cultural development. Men who belong to minority groups are often torn between two loyalties—loyalty to ideology and loyalty to nations. Such men may be damned as Trojan horses and fifth columnists if they follow their ideological impulse; they may be damned as disloyal to their ideology if they follow their national impulse.

What if a situation arises in international policies in which ideology and national interest do not coincide? In that case, which is put first by those who conduct the Nation's foreign policy—ideology or national interest?

As we look back on the past, it seems that, when the hour of decision struck, the national urge was generally stronger than the ideological. During the Thirty Years' War, in an age when the chief ideological conflict was religious, Catholic France went to the aid of Sweden and the German Protestants in their conflict with Catholic Austria. To Cardinal Richelieu and other French leaders of the day it was more important for France to check Austria, for the Bourbons to humble the Hapsburgs, than for Catholics to stand together against Protestants. In the late seventeenth century and in the eighteenth century, it usually seemed more important to the absolute monarchs of Vienna and Berlin to check the French nation than that Hapsburgs, Hohenzollerns, and Bourbons should stand together in ideological alliance to maintain absolutism against the slowly rising tide of constitutionalism. Britain fought Bourbon France. Revolutionary France, and Napoleonic France, for while the ideologies shifted and changed, the national rivalry and imperialist conflict did not. In more recent times, Tsarist Russia has been allied with republican France, democratic Britain with oligarchic Japan, democratic America and democratic Britain with Communist Russia, and Communist Russia with Nazi Germany. National interests make strange bedfellows—in the face of a threat to the balance of power, nations will make alliances with the ideological devil.

Where, in general, the dominant ideology within the Nation and the national interest do coincide, in what direction have the ideological minorities usually gone? In a crisis, what have these minorities done—have they followed their ideologies or their national patriotisms? In the past the tug of national loyalty has generally won out over ideological persuasion. British Catholics rallied to Elizabeth in her fight with Catholic Spain. Charles James Fox's Whigs rallied to Pitt in the national fight against Napoleon. And in the two global wars of this century the Socialists did what they boasted they would never do—in the main, they rallied to the national standards. A Coriolanus and an Alcibiades, a Vallandigham and Petigru, a Quisling and an Einstein, a Laval and a Thomas Mann are relatively rare in history. (This is, I know, an incongruous list of saints and sinners, but they have this one thing in common: in one way or another, all sacrificed homeland for ideology.) And should all our hopes of peace collapse and the future see a third world war involving the Soviet Union against the United States, it is still a safe prediction that Eleanor Roosevelt and Col. Robert McCormick, Max Lerner and Hamilton Fish, Philip Murray and John Bricker, Henry Wallace and Lawrence Dennis would be fighting side by side in the name of national interest and national survival.

However, it would be a mistake to come to the conclusion that because ideology has not played the leading part in historic international relations it has played no part at all. It has played its part, an important part. Where national interests and dominant ideology within the Nation coincide, a national war can be made to appear an ideological one, morale can be strengthened, and enthusiasm intensified. If a nation possesses considerable ideological unity it will be in a stronger position to win a war, if a nation's enemies are ideologically divided those enemies will be more susceptible to fifth-column tactics. When a country is rising to challenge the old balance of power, nations thus threatened will make alliances more easily and earlier if they have similar institutions and cultures; alliances will be more difficult and will come later (perhaps too late) if the nations thus threatened have dissimilar institutions and cultures.

Just as national interests and balance-of-power considerations seem to have been the most important causes of war, so also they seem to have been most affected by war. The results of international wars seem to have been more significant in their national and balance-of-power aspect than in their ideological aspect. The Grand Alliance against Napoleonic France checked France and saved the European balance of power but did not succeed in arresting the spread of revolutionary ideas. The Grand Alliance

won the war nationally but in the end lost it ideologically. However, when nations outside of France became more and more influenced by French revolutionary ideas, those ideas took on the appearance of being their own—they were assimilated into their own national cultures. Again, at the close of the First World War, it appeared that middle-class democracy would triumph in the world, but now we can see that instead, the First World War marked virtually the end of the advance of middle-class democracy in any large areas of the world. However, the First World War did parry the German threat to the balance of power; it did temporarily satisfy the national interests of the victors; the war was won nationally even though it was lost ideologically. Again, the victory of the United Nations in the Second World War saved the world from a second German threat to the balance of power—that much is certain. Perhaps, it will also have hastened socialism, but, in any event, the ideological results are not so clear as the national ones.

It seems, then, that the influence of great wars on the cultural and institutional trends of the time is exaggerated. These trends arise out of conditions and forces operating within the nations. Wars affect them. Wars may accelerate these trends or slow them up. Wars hardly create them.

The Marxists would claim that what appears to be the national interest has in fact been primarily the interest of the dominant class in control of the state and that class interest has governed the foreign policy of national states and involved national states in wars for class ends. The great national wars, according to Marxist doctrine, have been wars in the interests of the dominant economic classes in the warring nations—conflicts of rival imperialisms. Where, in the past, ideology has seemed to split the dominant class, such ideological conflict, according to the Marxists, has been superficial or at least secondary to that class' economic interest. When a threat has appeared to the economic interest of the dominant class, these secondary ideological ranks have been closed in the class interest masquerading in the name of the nation. Of course, say the Marxists, the Catholic landlords and businessmen of Elizabeth's day rallied to the fight against Catholic Spain because their profits were involved. Of course, the Marxists say again, the Charles James Fox Whigs, enamored though they were of many of the principles of the French revolution, rallied to the war against revolutionary France because their dividends from the British East India Co. and from many another chartered company were at stake. (They fail to recall that the peace party in Britain led by Fox did not actually rally to the war until France under Napoleon had threatened to control the Channel and invade Britain.)

To be sure, the great conflict is ideological, say the Marxists—an ideological conflict between the exploiting capitalists and the exploited workers—and when this ideological conflict comes to the fore and cuts across national states, then the conflict between nations will be seen to be a sham and a swindle, the ideological factor will become stronger than the national factor in international relations, national wars will be converted into civil wars, and the erstwhile dominant economic class, now embattled, will find it more and more difficult to cloak its class interests in the garment of nationalism.

It may be that the Marxists are correct as to the future. It may be that the ideological will supersede the national as the No. 1 factor in international relations. It may be that now the great institutional conflict within nations has come to be directly economic (and not indirectly so, as in the case of many of the ideological conflicts of the past) and the fundamental issue easier for all to see, that more and more will men respond to the class and ideological appeal rather than the national appeal. And if men more and more are learning to think as the Marxists do (the postwar elections in Britain and especially in Continental Europe indicate that they are) then it is quite possible that our century will see international relations conducted in fact and in name more along ideological than national lines. Indeed, the Second World War was in many ways a series of civil wars, with Socialists and Communists in Axis countries praying for an Allied victory and fascists in Allied countries supporting collaboration with the Axis. Ideological minorities were cooperating with the national enemy on a scale never equalled in the days when Protestantism or constitutional government or political democracy was the pivot of ideological conflict—though perhaps some of this cooperation should be credited to the increase and improvement in the means of communication. And today, Henry Wallace speaking to Britain in a way hostile to the views of a majority of his own countrymen or Winston Churchill speaking to America in a way hostile to the views of millions of Left-wing Britons is another example of how in our time ideology cuts across national boundaries.

At present, the United States and the Soviet Union face each other as the predominant powers of the earth. Each is viewing world politics in a different light from the other.

Our policy-makers are thinking more in the old terms of nationalism, self-determination, and the balance of power. Soviet influence on leftist parties the world over is looked upon largely as old-fashioned aggression and imperialism. There is widespread fear that Russia as Russia will upset the balance of power in Europe and Asia. Poland and Rumania and Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and China are appealed to by our Government on the basis of national self-determination. (National self-determination, once a liberal rallying cry, has become also a conservative shibboleth.)

The Soviet leaders, on the other hand, are thinking more and more in terms of ideological conflict, class warfare, social politics. To Soviet policy makers the contest in the world today is not so much one between the United States and Russia as it is between world fascism and world communism. And those in other countries who follow the Soviet lead take much the same view. Communists and extreme leftists the world over are giving their allegiance not so much to nations as to ideology. Russia is merely the instrument to be used in spreading ideology. Moscow influences Communist parties in all countries, and Communist parties everywhere influence Moscow. There is common indoctrination, consultation, cooperation. It is a two-way street, though the preeminence of Russia in the movement makes the outgoing counsel from Moscow weightier than the incoming counsel.

If a third world war should come—a war between the United States and the Soviet Union—for millions of leftists the world over that war would be viewed almost exclusively as an ideological one. In countries where the extreme left is in control, national policy would be made less on the balance-of-power idea and more on ideological considerations. In the United States, where Marxist ideas have scarcely penetrated at all, the war would be viewed in the old nationalistic terms. It would be a war to protect our shores from invasion, to uphold the balance of power, to save the world from Russian domination. As has already been said, in a final show-down nearly all of us would stand together. Our Communist fifth column would be smothered by the avalanche of nationalistic sentiment. American psychological warfare abroad would naturally reflect our own view of the situation, and we should probably err on the side of making too much appeal to nationalistic sentiments, which in large areas of the world would be effective only in rightist circles. Our own failure to take into account the enormous strides the ideological point of view has made among the masses of people in Europe and Asia in recent decades, and particularly since the Second World War, might betray us into making very serious mistakes in the conduct of that war.

Should the Communists eventually win control in important countries outside Russia—in China, in Germany, in France, in Italy—it is quite possible that ideology would triumph over nationalism and a new international state emerge. After all, the nations themselves were built not so much on contract as on class and functional foundations. The feudal states of western Europe were put together into national states by the rising bourgeoisie joining hands across the boundaries of feudal provinces and communes. Just as the national state (which sometimes cut across nationality) was made by the bourgeoisie, so a new international state may be made by the cooperation of leftist parties joining hands across national boundaries. If an international state should come about in this way, then, of course, the old balance of power as played by national states will be relegated to the historical limbo. The Communists still confidently expect that communism will lead to such an international state.

Of course, the Communists may be wrong about this. Nationalistic forces may be stronger than Communist intentions. When the Communists come into actual power in a country they inherit the national paraphernalia—the nation's history, culture, aspirations—and concessions have to be made to them. The Russian Communists have made many concessions to nationalism. The Chinese Communists have often pursued a course independent of Moscow, and if they should gain actual power in all China they might have to follow an even more independent course. Thorez, Communist leader in France, says over and again: "Different countries, different methods." And the moderate Socialists, even more than the extreme Socialists or Communists, have, of course, made many more concessions to nationalism and have proclaimed this as a virtue. Moreover, if the United States should use the moderate left (Socialists) to check the extreme left (Communists), such a policy might help to prevent a third world war and also help to halt a trend toward a Communist world state with the Soviet Union as its nucleus. Then, too, it is even possible, as Edward Hallett Carr has suggested, that in a state where everybody's work and wages and social security are dependent upon government, where the mass of people will seem to have as direct a stake in the national government as at one time only the bourgeoisie enjoyed, the mass of people may feel even more keenly their tie to the national government, and Socialist states might end by being a nationalistic or even more nationalistic than bourgeoisie states. If this should turn out to be the case (although the Marxist analysis that private ownership of the productive processes and private profits are the basis of imperialism and international conflict may prove to be sounder) then socialism, like the Commercial Revolution and the Protestant Reformation and the French Revolution and the early stages of the Industrial Revolution before it, will have ended by intensifying nationalism, in spite of the aims and intentions of many of its disciples. And then, should socialism spread and thus turn out nationalistic, the old historic pattern of the national balance of power would continue the dominant role in international relations, even though Socialist and Communist states remained nominal members of an international organization like the United Nations.

Of one thing, I think, we can be sure; even the creation of an international Communist state would not end the conflict over power. Within the international state would be different social and economic groups with different interests. They would fight for control, just as groups and classes within national states now fight for control. The international state would end the national balance-of-power conflict, but it would not end the ideological conflict inside it. The ideological conflict of the future will be different, but it will continue in some form. Even if the Marxists should achieve one-half of their ideal, the international state, they would not succeed in achieving the other half—the abolition of all its internal group differences. Within the international state would be geographical sections, cultural diversities, a wide gamut of different industries and economic enterprises, and various social classes: commissars, managers, unskilled technicians, skilled workers, unskilled workers, farmers, and so forth. These various factors and groups would generate conflict over government policies and there would arise struggles for power which even Communist purges could not keep down. These struggles would cut across the old national lines.) And there are those, like James Burnham and the oversimplifiers and distorters of Arnold Toynbee, who are so impatient with the slower and wiser methods of bringing an international state that they would have America attempt to build a universal empire to end "a time of troubles." Whatever method of putting the world together will ultimately prevail is still anybody's guess, but that the world in our time is in painful process of being put together is more than a guess—it is a hypothesis based upon a growing accumulation of evidence.

In short, evidence is already strong that the Marxists may be able to make the ideological conflict rather than the national conflict the pivot of midtwentieth-century international politics. As a result of this ideological conflict the more extreme Marxists—the Communists—may even be able to establish an international Communist state, but this is far less certain either because they may not win the ultimate international conflict even after succeeding in making the issue an ideological issue, or because the forces of nationalism may be too strong for the Communists once they inherit the various national governments. But even should the Communists win and establish an international Communist state, it is almost certain that new social and economic groups would arise to continue the struggle for power within the international state, peacefully perhaps, but a struggle nonetheless. If so, then national conflict over the balance of power would disappear, but ideological conflict within the international state would persist.

Should there be a third world war and should the United States, using the old shibboleths of nationalism, win the war, it is doubtful even then if political nationalism and the balance of power would continue as they have done in the past. We are perhaps too close to events of the last 30 years to be able to see just how far the old foundations of nationalism have already been eroded away. In the fifteenth century, participants in the wars of Louis XI and in the Wars of the Roses were too close to those events to realize that feudal power was being overthrown before their very eyes and a strong national power built. So probably with us today. The historians of the twenty-second century, more clear-eyed than we, may look back and see that the great international wars of the twentieth century were in fact dissolving nationalism and building internationalism.

For nationalism today is truly beset from all directions. Among the dissolving agents are: the cumulative impact of technology and science resulting in the continued drastic elimination of distance and space, the atomic bomb, the release of atomic energy, and the overwhelming necessity of having to extend international functionalism to control what in the future will probably be the world's most important source of industrial production; the palpable absurdities of Fascist nationalism and the revulsion from fascist nationalism even in countries which experienced it; the realistic education given millions of men who participated in the great wars of the twentieth century in areas remote from their homelands; the glaring fact that real national power in the international power conflict is today possessed by only two nations, leaving all other nations as mere outsiders with no important power; the growth of international cartels; the Socialist appeal to the brotherhood of man; the Communist insistence on international action and the actual cooperation of Communist parties from country to country; the Socialist outlook of many of the "nationalistic" leaders of the colonial countries in revolt against imperialism; the body of practical experience in international cooperation gained through the League of Nations and the United Nations. The Communists would put the world together through something like a Communist International; a majority of the people of Britain and the United States would prefer to see the world put together by the slow functional growth of an organization which originated in contract—the United Nations. (Inside the United Nations, too, there would, of course, be power politics, but as international functionalism grew it would come to be less and less power politics based on nationalism and more and more power politics based on ideology, that is, group and class conflicts cutting across the old national boundaries.

Thus anyone called upon to answer the crucial question in international relations today would be, I think, on safe ground in saying that, from the rise of national states and up to about now, the chief element in international relations has been nationalism and the national balance of power. But he should warn the questioner not to be misled by this historic fact or by the superficial aspects of the present diplomatic duel between the United States and the Soviet Union, especially as that duel is generally interpreted in the United States. Because this middle of the twentieth century may be witnessing the epoch-making shift in the foundation of international politics from the nationalistic balance of power to ideology, evidence of which we shall ignore at our peril.

Philosophy of Cyrus P. Ching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on Mr. Cyrus P. Ching, Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, by Mr. Louis Stark, from the magazine section of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NO. 1 LABOR CATALYST

THE PHILOSOPHY OF CYRUS P. CHING, CHIEF MEDIATOR, CAN BE SUMMED UP IN THE PHRASE: "GETTING ALONG WITH PEOPLE"

(By Louis Stark)

WASHINGTON.—All a labor conciliator has to know is: How labor feels; how management feels; what the law of the land is; how human nature operates. If this seems an exacting set of qualifications it may be said at once that they are presented in impressive array in the person of Cyrus P. Ching, who recently became the Nation's No. 1 conciliator. His official title is Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, which Congress set up as an autonomous agency after 34 years under the Labor Department. The change signalizes the coming-of-age of conciliation; it also brings to a key post in the Government the man who has been called the dean of industrial relations experts.

It will be Mr. Ching's job to direct the Mediation and Conciliation Service in its efforts to settle—or, better yet, prevent—serious labor disputes. His team will consist of a 12-member labor-management panel, appointed by the President, and a staff of 225 conciliators. These latter will be the field force, to be dispatched to any part of the country in which labor troubles threaten.

The conciliation chief, 6 feet 7 inches tall, Canadian-born and hardy as a northern pine, is a disarming man. As he unwinds his long frame to greet the visitor and his deep-furrowed face breaks into a slow smile, he gives the impression of a country boy grown up. Which he is, except that most of his "growing up"—nearly 50 of his 71 years—has been among the contentious ranks of employers and employees rather than on his father's Prince Edward Island farm.

It was as director of industrial and public relations of the United States Rubber Co. and an industry member of the National Defense Mediation Board and National War Labor Board that Mr. Ching gained the experience and developed the philosophy that led to his present job. The essence of this philosophy may be expressed in his dictum that all relations in life, including those called public and industrial, are human relations and that there is therefore no one program for solving the problems that arise between employers and employees.

"Promoting proper labor relationships is nothing you can do overnight," he says. "It isn't anything you can do by law. You can set up machinery to soften the blows of people not inclined to get along together. You can pad their gloves a little, and it may be necessary to have a referee to do that. But in the last analysis labor relations begin down in the bottom department of the plant between the foreman and the employee."

The practical phase of the Ching labor philosophy can be summed up in the phrase, "getting along with people"—which may or may not be easy, according to the circumstances.

"There is not too much literature on the subject," he observes dryly. "However, one of the modern articles I have read in this field is in chapter V of the Book of Exodus. Pharaoh, the boss, in order to cut down expenses after suitable time studies had been made, said the boys would have to furnish their own straw to make bricks. Most of the straw had apparently been gathered by someone else and when they went out to get it there was nothing left but stubble and the quality of the bricks deteriorated.

"There was discussion also of the speedup system and some reference was made to outside agitators. The sitdown strike had not come into vogue at the time, so there was a walkout and the Israelites walked across the Red Sea and for the time being this incident was closed."

Regarding his new job, to which he was appointed by President Truman in August, Mr. Ching says the office of the conciliation chief "will not be a fire department."

"Stopping a strike is the same as putting out a fire. The more fires—disputes—the conciliators run to, the more fires there are going to be. People get used to having conciliators put out their fires.

"But we cannot measure the efficiency of a conciliation service by the number of fires it extinguishes. We can measure it only by

the machinery we build up to encourage people to settle their own disputes. In other words, the test of conciliation is how few disputes lead to strikes and how many disputes are settled directly by the parties, with whatever help we can supply. My job is to contribute to fire prevention."

Mr. Ching may occasionally contemplate the turns of fortune that led him to devote his life to human relations in industry. It was not for lack of opportunities that he did not enter a half dozen other fields.

When he left his father's windswept Canadian farm, he enrolled in a provincial business college with no clear idea of which way he was headed. Barely 19 when he finished college, he struck out for the great Northwest, where he bought grain for elevator companies. Home on a visit after several years at this work, he received a letter not to return, because poor crops in Alberta had wiped out his job.

In those days young men in the Maritime Provinces who considered leaving Canada made for either Boston or California. Young Ching chose Boston. On October 31, 1900, he stepped off a train in the Hub City, carrying a gripsack, a copy of Bryce's The American Commonwealth, which he had read at 14, and $31. He went to work as a streetcar motorman.

For 3 months he was on the extra list and earned $8 a week. Later he was assigned to a regular run at $2.25 a day. One day he saw an employee in the car barn struggling with the accounts of the conductors and other employees. The man was plainly unhappy and the new motorman volunteered help. The offer was gratefully accepted. It was Mr. Ching's first opportunity to use his business-school training.

A year later the new elevated system was inaugurated, and men had to be trained to handle the electromagnetic brake system which controlled the multiple-unit cars. Mr. Ching soon mastered the technique and was eventually placed in charge of equipment and service.

Here he gained his first insight into what he felt was the wrong way of dealing with employees. He learned that the grievances of the men were not concerned primarily with wages and hours but with the manner in which they were treated as human beings. There was a spy system on the road and the men lived in perpetual fear of being fired. They did not trust one another, lest a fellow-employee should turn out to be a company stool pigeon.

In 1912, just before the historic strike on the Boston Elevated, Ching, then 36 and head of the rolling stock and the shops, was called into the company office to discuss "a little trouble." The management had no inkling of the real feeling of their employees.

"Pardon me, this is not a little trouble," the shop chief said. "There will be a strike next Wednesday." There was, and that was how he became an industrial-relations officer.

Ching's first act in his new assignment was to abolish the road's espionage system. He assured the employees that no company spy would attend union meetings and that henceforth he would deal with the union on an aboveboard basis. In a short while peace was restored.

Relations between the men and the management were not always smooth, however. The local union once threatened to strike over a grievance. "You won't strike," Ching told the union's spokesmen. "We'll arbitrate this dispute. I'm going to be arbitrary about it and name the arbitrator."

The impartial arbitrator he chose was William D. Mahon, the president of the A. F. of L. streetcarmen's union. The dispute was over interpretation of the contract and Ching felt the union president would interpret it fairly. But whatever the verdict, he was ready to abide by it.

During this time he became acquainted with Samuel Gompers, then president of the American Federation of Labor. He had such faith in the labor leader that he frequently called on him for help in working out labor problems on the Boston Elevated. One result of such cooperation was that the Boston Elevated had no further tie-ups while Ching remained with the company.

When Ching left Boston for the United States Rubber Co. he did so in characteristic fashion. He looked over the world of business, decided that rubber seemed a promising industry, then arranged to talk things over with Fred Hood, the leading rubber manufacturer. Hood advised him to offer his services to a competitor, the United States Rubber Co. Ching promptly wired C. B. Seger, president of the latter company, that he would call on him in New York the following morning at 10 o'clock.

"I don't want a job," he told the rubber executive the next day. "I want to help you run this company. My references are the motormen, conductors, and directors of the Boston Elevated." A month later he went to work.

One of Ching's first tasks was to handle a threatened strike in a Montreal subsidiary. The company's policy was that employees had no right to strike, that they were expected to do as they were told. The "special representative," as Ching was called, prepared a letter for the local manager's signature, notifying the employees that the company was soliciting their views on mutual problems. A copy of the letter was sent to the press.

Mr. Ching's solution was distinctly novel. He might have been fired for it, but he was not, and gradually the "open discussion" policy bore fruit. In the years that followed and up to the enactment of the Wagner Act in 1935, United States Rubber dealt with employees through joint labor-management committees.

Today the admiration of organized labor for Mr. Ching is unusually high. Most labor leaders feel that he is not bound by the past, but is adaptable and open to conviction. They also know that once having made up his mind he is not likely to change it.

"If Cy Ching gives his word, we can be sure he'll carry it out," one labor leader remarked recently.

Looking back at his earlier Government service and finding therein certain guideposts for the future, Mr. Ching believes that the time he devoted to the National Defense Mediation Board just before the war represented a greater contribution to public service than his duties with the better known War Labor Board. In the former case the emphasis was on mediation and conciliation, on voluntary action by the parties to disputes rather than on compulsion. In the resultant atmosphere of judicious compromise and ironing out of differences, he felt completely at home.

Later when he joined the War Labor Board, which was in the habit of issuing "directives," he was less happy. "The War Labor Board pushed people around," he says today. "That type of labor adjustment is not so satisfactory as the voluntary method."

As a pioneer innovator in industrial relations Mr. Ching has found himself frequently classified as a left-wing industrialist, but this does not disturb his equanimity. At a time when the Wagner Act was distinctly unpopular with business men he addressed a meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce and advised its members to deal with unions.

"If we have confidence in our employees and they in us and they decide to join a labor organization, then should we not welcome that organization as another means of dealing with employees?" he asked. "The question of what organization our employees wish to join to deal with us is not so important as the nature of the dealings."

That speech, which was greeted with what he says was "the loudest silence I ever heard," was prophetic. In it he observed that industrialists usually deplore the inflexible regulations imposed on them by Government, and added:

"If industry persists in its attempt to put handcuffs and leg irons on organized labor and labor goes along with the politicians to put more shackles on industry, some of these days we'll both find ourselves where neither of us can do anything but spit at each other and then the politicians will stand by and laugh at us both."

Regarding the immediate future of labor relations he is making no predictions, but he is confident of one thing: In the long run the industrial scene will be more peaceful as the principle of collective bargaining is better understood.

Public Opinion Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Harvey M. Brown, president of the International Association of Machinists, which appeared in the Machinist, the weekly newspaper of that organization.

Mr. Brown's article comments on an article recently published in Look Magazine about so-called opinion polls on the Taft-Hartley Act which were conducted by that magazine. The latter article was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and so I think Mr. Brown's article should be printed there also.

I think the light Mr. Brown's article throws on the subject will be of interest to many Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN: THERE ARE JOKERS IN OPINION POLLS

Of all the propaganda now being distributed in defense of the Taft-Hartley Act, that best liked by employers everywhere is an article reprinted from Look magazine.

Look reported the results of one of those supposedly impartial public opinion polls through which it made the discovery that American working men and women really like the major features of the Taft-Hartley Act, even though they dislike the law itself.

This finding by the Opinion Research Corp., Princeton, N. J., so popular with the National Association of Manufacturers that the NAM News reprinted it in full, praising Dr. Claude Robinson, president of Opinion Research, as a research pioneer.

The Look article, NAM said, is based on "conservative, established public opinions sampling techniques."

To help our readers better understand this type of propaganda, we are this week reprinting here a careful analysis of the Look poll. The analysis was prepared by the staff of the Machinist, weekly publication of the International Association of Machinists.

Look itself explained how this poll was taken in the following words:

"We talked with union members and nonunion employees, with skilled, other manual and white-collar workers * * * we interviewed only persons who are employed and who live in cities of 25,000 population or more."

Each worker was asked if he had ever heard of the Taft-Hartley law, and those who said they had were then asked this question:

"Do you think Congress should have passed the bill or not?"

Look's tabulation showed the following results: 54 percent said "No"; 31 percent said "Yes," and 15 percent had no opinion.

Next, Look said, it wanted to find out what features of the law were most unpopular so it asked each worker 10 additional questions, each purporting to be a simple, nontechnical statement of a major provision of the Taft-Hartley law. In each case the person questioned was not told that the questions were related to the Taft-Hartley law.

When Look averaged the replies to these questions, it found that 73 percent of those questioned said they favored all of the 10 proposals and Look and Dr. Robinson, therefore concluded:

"On the basis of our investigation, it seems clear * * * that the American worker favors what is in the Taft-Hartley law, but doesn't know it."

In order to see whether American working men and women are as gullible as Look made them out, the Machinist examined the 10 questions for jokers. Here are its findings:

1. Look's pollsters asked: Do you favor a law to require unions to give 60 days' notice before they can go on strike?

The Taft-Hartley Act does much more than this question implies. It denies unions the right to strike unless they have given notice 60 days in advance to both Federal and State mediation agencies, thus giving the employer 2 months to prepare to defeat the strikers. The effect of this provision is to require all unions, in self-protection, to file strike notices as a matter of course when negotiations begin, whether they intend to strike or not.

Look should have asked: Do you favor a law that will encourage unions to file strike notices before beginning negotiations, whether or not they believe the dispute can be adjusted peacefully?

2. Look's pollsters asked: Do you favor a law to give the company the right to sue the union if the union breaks its contract?

In at least 35 States the company had the right under State law to sue a union, or anyone else, for breach of contract. The Taft-Hartley Act gives the company the right to bring suit against a union in Federal courts regardless of the size of the damages claimed. The result is to encourage the company to sue the union, by permitting it to shop around between State and Federal courts for an antilabor judge.

Look should have asked: Do you favor a law that encourages employers to take court action against the union?

3. Look's pollsters asked: "Do you favor a law to allow employers to talk to the workers or promise rewards for not joining?"

The Taft-Hartley Act permits the employer to call meetings on company time and compel attendance. The employer can defame unions without violating the law. Under the act, the employer can make deliberately false statements about the union.

Look should have asked: "Do you favor a law that gives the company the right to call compulsory meetings and force employees to listen to antiunion speeches?"

4. Look's pollsters asked: "Do you favor a law to require unions to make reports on the money they take in and what they spend it for?"

This section of the Taft-Hartley Act was framed deliberately to force unions to publicize their weakness when their treasuries are low, and their suability when their treasuries are substantial. The weak financial report is invitation to the employer to launch an all-out attack on the union either through expensive and costly court suits or resistance to bargaining demands.

Look should have asked: "Do you favor a law that will advertise the financial weakness of small unions, thus notifying the employer of the correct timing for an attempt to break the union?"

5. Look's pollsters asked: "Do you favor a law to prevent Communists from holding offices in unions?"

The Taft-Hartley Act does not prevent Communists from holding any office in the union. The act does require all union officers to swear that they are not Communists before the union is permitted to use the National Labor Relations Board.

Look should have asked: Do you favor a law which penalizes an entire union's membership when a single union official fails to sign a non-Communist affidavit?

6. Look's pollsters asked: "Do you favor a law to prohibit unions from spending money or making contributions in connection with political campaigns for Federal offices?"

The Taft-Hartley Act prohibits the expenditure of any trade-union funds for political purposes, including the publication in union newspapers of the voting records of Members of Congress.

Look should have asked: "Do you favor a law which prohibits a trade-union spending any of its funds to support or oppose a candidate for public office, including the publication of the voting records of Congressmen?

7. Look's pollsters asked: "Do you favor a law to allow the check-off only if the worker agrees in writing?"

The Taft-Hartley Act requires that each individual union member must sign a check-off authorization before his dues can be deducted automatically—whether or not the local union has approved such a deduction by majority vote of its membership and whether or not the employer has agreed to make the deductions.

Look should have asked: Do you favor a law that makes it more difficult for a union to collect dues from its members?

8. Look's pollsters asked: "Do you favor a law to forbid a company to have a union shop until a majority of all the workers vote in favor of it?"

The Taft-Hartley Act prohibits an all-union shop unless a majority of those covered by the agreement vote for it. Under the law as written anyone who fails to vote in the election because of sickness or negligence is counted as a "no" vote. Nowhere else in the United States are citizens penalized because of the failure of others to vote. Congress, itself, adopts laws by a majority of those present and voting, not by a majority of the entire Congress.

Look should have asked: "Do you favor a law forbidding a company to have a union shop unless a majority of all eligible voters, and not merely a majority of those voting, declare in favor of it?"

9. Look's pollsters asked: "Do you favor a law to outlaw the closed shop?"

The Taft-Hartley Act ignores the traditional right of union members to refuse to work alongside strikebreakers and nonunion free riders who accept the benefits of unionism without accepting any of the responsibility for them.

Look should have asked: "Do you favor a law compelling union members to work with strikebreakers and free riders?"

10. Look's pollsters asked: "Do you favor a law that, in industries considered vital to the country's welfare, allows the Government to get a court order preventing a strike for several months while settlements are being attempted?"

The Taft-Hartley Act empowers the Government to intervene in disputes involving the public welfare only by taking the side of the employer. The law requires the Government to obtain an injunction forcing men to work for the profit of their employer at wages the men have decided are too low.

Look should have asked: "Do you favor a law which would force men to work in disputes involving the public interest without at the same time penalizing the employer?"

11. Look's pollsters stopped at 10 carefully hand-picked questions. Here are a few questions which apply to the Taft-Hartley Act which Look did not ask. Would you favor a law which:

Gives employer charges against labor unions priority over all union charges against employers?

Urges union members to vote on the employer's last offer, but makes no provision for the stockholders voting on the union's last offer?

Substitutes damage suits for grievance procedure?

Permits employers to petition for elections before a union has completed its organizing campaign?

Vests in one person the power to determine when the weight of the Government shall be pitted against a union, with no right of appeal to higher authorities?

Permits the Government to interfere in collective bargaining by preventing labor and management from reaching voluntary agreements that they find mutually desirable?

Gives the company the right to enlist the aid of a Government agency to keep his men at work when there is no question of a national emergency?

Comment: Dr. Robinson's technique—which Look bought—is to ask an innocent question and then leap to the conclusion that the answer fits the not-so-innocent Taft-Hartley Act. That law cannot be justified by asking a few plausible questions which overlook the context of the provision as used in the law. After analyzing Look's findings, the Machinist could only conclude that American working people are much more aware of what's in the Taft-Hartley Act than Look's editors.

Presentation of Gold Medal to Dr. Archer Chester Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, before the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, at Cleveland, Ohio, on January 7, 1948, on the occasion of the presentation of a gold medal to Dr. Archer Chester Sudan, of Kremmling, Colo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for this opportunity of greeting the members of the American Medical Association. And I am particularly honored in being asked to present this gold medal to Dr. Sudan, whom you have selected as an outstanding general practitioner.

If I were a doctor, it seems to me that I would value this medal as the greatest honor that could possibly be conferred upon me by my profession. The general practitioner

symbolizes something that is very close to the heart of America. The vast majority of contacts between the citizen and the medical profession are those of a suffering individual turning to the general practitioner for relief. The particular illness may be small or great, but to the afflicted individual it is all-important. In the hour of his need he turns to the family doctor, the general practitioner, with yearning hope for relief.

And then the great kindly doctor goes to work. With an understanding heart, he learns his patient's symptoms. The family doctor has probably known the patient for years—perhaps he even brought the patient into the world—and can fit the symptoms into a background and history that could never come from questions and answers between strangers. Out of the reservoir of his professional skills the doctor prescribes his remedy. But at the same time he prescribes, either consciously or perhaps more often unconsciously, to the mind and emotions of the patient. The very presence of the doctor inspires confidence, hope, and faith.

It has always seemed to me that the great doctor possesses something far beyond professional techniques and skills. He has an indefinable quality of heart, a quality of spirit that lifts him from mediocrity to greatness. It is the quality of understanding. It is a great compassion coupled with a high degree of intelligence and professional skill. It is indeed a rare combination. This award goes to the doctor who, in the opinion of your profession, possesses those qualities most honored by your profession.

Those of us who are charged with the administration of health agencies cannot endow the general practitioner with those qualities of spirit which make for greatness, but we can, at least, endeavor to put within his reach as many as possible of the resources of modern medical science. And I pledge to you and to your fellow practitioners that during my tenure as Federal Security Administrator everything within my power shall be done to bring you these aids.

As most of you know, I only became Federal Security Administrator at the end of last August. I came from the legal profession. And what did I find? I found a controversy raging between the proponents and opponents of national health insurance that was absorbing a substantial part of the time and emotions of those who must furnish leadership in the battle for better health. I found that this controversy had diverted attention and energies from other programs that were completely noncontroversial and upon which everyone agreed. For example, there is, by and large, complete agreement as to the necessity for more medical research, for more and better medical education, for more hospitals, for local diagnostic clinics, for local health officers.

I quickly came to a conclusion as to what should be done. It was obvious that we should be moving ahead in the noncontroversial areas while we are fighting over national health insurance.

Having come to this conclusion I sought an opportunity to discuss the situation with the officers of the American Medical Association because I need, in my job as Federal Security Administrator, all the help I can possibly get from organized medicine. I had a most cordial talk with your officers. I told them frankly how I stood on the issue of national health insurance. President Truman had made known that he and his administration favored national health insurance, and, naturally, I had no right to accept an office in his administration unless I was wholeheartedly prepared to go along with the President's policies. Furthermore, I explained that I happened to agree with that policy thoroughly, and that it was one for which I expected to fight. On the other hand, I told your officers that while we were disagreeing over national health insurance, I did hope we could work together in the various noncontroversial areas to which I have referred above.

I could not have asked for more cordial response. Your officers expressed their complete willingness to cooperate with me in these noncontroversial matters and everything that has happened since our first talk has been in harmony with this program.

I believe that with this cooperation between the organized medical profession and the Federal Government we can make enormous strides in bringing you and your fellow general practitioners the aids of modern science.

In the field of medical research, for example, there is so much to be done. Look at cardiovascular diseases—our No. 1 killer. Compare cardiovascular research with our cancer research program. Cardiovascular diseases kill $3\frac{1}{2}$ times as many people as cancer and yet, as nearly as we can figure—and these figures may not be entirely accurate—last year the total expenditures by both Government and private institutions, foundations, and the like for cancer research were around \$26,000,000 while the expenditures for research in cardiovascular diseases were about \$2,500,000. In other words, cardiovascular diseases, which kill three and a half times as many people as cancer, had only about one-tenth as much money spent in attempts to find their cause and cure as was devoted to cancer research. I do not, for one instant, say that too much money was spent on cancer research, because it was not. But I do say that not nearly enough was spent on cardiovascular research. It is in that field particularly that the Federal Security Agency hopes to give some leadership and perhaps obtain some legislation, and with your cooperation, put over a program of vast significance. There have been within very recent months some rather startling developments in the study of cardiovascular diseases. We may have found something that actually turns back the degenerative processes of arteriosclerosis.

Our best research work is being done in cancer. We have more money for it than for any other type of medical research. That is the result of a great program of publicity. It was a grand job but there are other things that must be done too. Take, for instance, mental hygiene. Two-hundred million dollars a year is being spent in this country for the hospitalization of those who are mentally ill. A fraction of that sum spent in mental research could probably cut that figure in half and could save the expenditure of a hundred million dollars a year. And this is not a wild dream. The Army and Navy during the war did brilliant work with mental cases at many hospitals. The Federal Security Agency saw this particularly in the Navy work at St. Elizabeths. They were able to release 65 percent of the military patients that went into those hospitals within 3 months and another 20 percent within 6 months. Those were highly successful programs and a wonderful job was done and they show what can be accomplished by the use of the latest techniques. As a matter of fact, more research is needed in connection with practically every human illness.

To help the whole field of medical research, the Federal Security Agency is planning a great research hospital at Bethesda, Md., which will be the answer to the dream of the research worker. Congress—and Congress has been very generous about this—has appropriated over \$2,500,000 for the purchase of land and the preparation of plans for this research hospital. It will be the first time anything like it has ever been built. We are planning a 500-bed hospital—on one side of the building the hospital and patients, and directly across the hall on each floor will be the research laboratories to study the disease of those patients. There will be 150 beds for research study of cancer patients. There is practically no opportunity today to study chronic cases of cancer in hospitals because the hospitals must necessarily keep their beds in use by patients whose conditions can be improved or have some hope of being cured. Such an institution will complement, rather than compete with private hospitals.

These are merely a few examples of the things that must be done in the way of medical research.

But medical research, however impressive, is just one phase of medical progress. Another vital consideration is the proper distribution of medical facilities and personnel. An honest appraisal of the situation existing at present shows room for great improvement.

A step has been taken in this direction by the hospital construction program. Last year the Federal Government appropriated \$3,000,000 to help the States survey their health center and hospital needs and seventy-five million to defray part of the actual construction costs. Each dollar of Federal funds must be matched by \$2 of State and local funds. Since the program is to run over a 5-year period, the grand total of Federal and State expenditures for hospital construction under this program comes to a potential \$1,125,000,000.

This program seeks to locate hospitals and health centers in the places that need them most. It will remedy somewhat the uneven distribution of facilities and will be a factor in securing better distribution of personnel.

The better distribution of medical personnel is still an unmet challenge, but it is hoped that it, too, will be solved in the not-too-distant future. An attack on the problem has begun already. Your association has set up a bureau of information to aid physicians in determining where they are most needed. Another example of the increasing awareness of the situation was evident when Dr. Steve Pascal Kenyon, president of the Georgia medical society, in a speech at the southern medical society meeting recently suggested that the States guarantee general practitioners in rural districts a minimum yearly income. Such a plan would make for great progress. A number of States, including Maryland, Virginia, Mississippi, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Indiana, have approached this problem by enacting legislation. As one example of State legislation, the 1945 session of the Mississippi Legislature, after a study of the shortage of physicians, medical school tuition and living costs, set up a medical education scholarship program designed to obtain general practitioners in rural areas quickly. Under the same program deserving students are aided to meet the costs of a medical education. Here is the way the plan works: Any Mississippi boy or girl who has completed a pre-medical course and is acceptable for enrollment in a class A medical school—but who needs funds to complete a medical education—may apply for a loan up to \$1,250 a school year for a maximum of \$5,000 in 4 years. The student must sign a contract agreeing to return to the State and work for a minimum of 2 years in a rural area approved by the State Medical Education Board. Should the student practice medicine in the approved area for 5 years, his loan is discounted at one-fifth of his total loan for each year.

In other States, the medical associations have attacked the problem directly and established their own funds. In Kentucky, for example, the State medical association joined with the Louisville School of Medicine in a campaign to raise scholarship funds. Within a few months, \$150,000 was subscribed. Students are able to secure loans to pay for their tuition from this fund, providing they agree to practice in rural areas after graduation. In Indiana, the State medical society bears the principal cost of six \$500 scholarships offered annually to students who agree to practice in areas designated by the association as most urgently in need of medical service.

I have touched merely on a few of the jobs ahead of us—fronts on which we are all agreed. I think it would be fitting indeed if we could signalize this year as an outstanding one in the public health program. For within 12 months we mark two great anniversaries: the centenary of the American Medical Association in 1947, and the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the United States Public Health Service in 1948.

Federal participation in national health programs, you know, dates back to 1798, with the establishment of the Marine Hospital Service, from which the Public Health Service has developed. History already has recorded part of the job which the Public Health Service has performed so magnificently, but we are hoping that this is just a beginning.

May I say to you, Dr. Sudan, that for my part I take very seriously my responsibilities as Federal Security Administrator for the future developments in medicine. Those qualities of greatness, of compassion, of understanding which so characterize the general practitioner will ever be an inspiration to me as I endeavor to do my part in the struggle for the better health of America. It is a struggle that deserves the best that is in us. It demands the cooperation of all, particularly the cooperation of organized medicine and Government. I know I need the help of organized medicine. And we must never be satisfied until we have attained the best possible health for the last one hundred and forty-millionth person in this broad land of ours. Only when we have achieved that, can we say "well done."

Dr. Sudan, with pride and humility, I bestow—on behalf of the American Medical Association—this medal honoring an outstanding general practitioner. It is a recognition of the finest qualities of one of the finest of professions. More I cannot say.

Pride in Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 21), 1948

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pride in Service," from the National Tribune and Stars and Stripes of November 27, 1947, which I received from Hon. A. M. Causey, adjutant of Col. Thomas J. Smith Camp No. 11, United Spanish War Veterans, Bowling Green, Ky.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EDITOR'S CORNER

PRIDE IN SERVICE

In recent months our desk has been swamped with protests from veterans of Spanish-American War service who are resentful over slurs cast in their direction by veterans of later wars. From time to time we hope to reproduce some of these letters because we believe that facts speak in greater volume than words, and we are certain that few of the younger veterans are supplied with a knowledge of some things that took place before they blessed us with their presence on this earth.

Two comrades have forwarded to us in as many weeks a list of reasons why they are proud to be veterans of the Spanish-American War. Their pride is based on being:

Veterans in America's first war for humanity.

Veterans of the only 100-percent volunteer army the world has ever known.

Veterans of the only war in history that has paid dividends.

It was a war that was not fought to a draw—we dictated the terms.

It was responsible for the building of the Panama Canal.

It was responsible for the passage of the National Defense Act.

It caused the abolition of yellow fever and kindred diseases.

It united the North and the South so that there now is no North, no South, no East, no West, but one great people united under one great and glorious flag.

It furnished every commander in World War I from the Commander in Chief on down.

It was the first campaign fought on foreign soil.

We did not bring the flag home—we left it where we put it and it is still there.

We fought the war with poor equipment, poor food, antiquated guns, and black powder.

The commands preserved their State entities and were responsible for the honor of their States.

It caused the improvement in maintenance of the Army and Navy and for the formation of a standing Army through training camps.

It marked the industrial reconstruction of the South.

It taught the lesson of unpreparedness that claims more lives than war.

It caused the United States of America to take the head of the table in the concert of nations.

It marked the rebirth of a Nation.

Four hundred and fifty-eight thousand were engaged in this conflict, exceeding in number those engaged in the Revolutionary War, the Mexican War, or the War of 1812.

The losses in deaths from all causes were 4.3 percent as compared with six-tenths of 1 percent for the Civil War and seven-tenths of 1 percent for World War I.

The average length of service was 14 months as compared with 9 months for World War I and 11 months for the Civil War.

The pay was \$15.60 a month as compared with \$30 for the World War I and \$50 for World War II.

We received no bonus, no war-risk insurance, no adjusted compensation, no vocational training, and no hospitalization until 1922, 20 years after war was over.

The cost of the war was \$1,800,000,000; the Civil War, \$8,100,000,000.

The Marshall Plan and the Price of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking letter, written to me by an outstanding attorney of Denver, Hon. Joseph F. Little. It deals indirectly with the Marshall plan, but it is broader in its direct application, being world-wide in its scope. It proposes a sensible practical cure for the world's monetary problems.

In this day of planned economy, currency tinkering, printing-press money, unilateral devaluation of currency, threat of communism, and an epidemic of world-wide devastating inflation, it is refreshing to find someone proposing to deal with causes instead of symptoms. Mr. Little's letter is a down-to-earth, grass-roots, bird's-eye analysis of what is wrong with money. I urge Members of Congress to read it and study it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J. F. LITTLE,
Denver, Colo., January 19, 1948.

Hon. ED C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Last November I talked with you about the Marshall plan and the price of gold. I would now like permission to extend my remarks.

Both the Bretton Woods agreement and the proposed Marshall plan contain stipulations for currency reform and currency stabilization. These stipulations have just as much permanent value as the well-intentioned promises of a future bankrupt. I don't believe that they provide any rule or standard by which currency shall be stabilized and thereafter maintained. Until we have a world standard of value which complements world-wide standards of measurements, world trade will probably continue in a chaotic condition. The Marshall plan does not go far enough. It treats effects but not causes. It is similar to a doctor treating a typhoid epidemic without purifying the water system. Nations have learned that by devaluing their currencies in terms of other currencies they can get at least a temporary economic advantage over other nations. They have learned how easy it is to manufacture paper money, and unless and until they are required to adhere to an objective standard of value over which they have not absolute control, currency tinkering will continue despite Bretton Woods or similar agreements.

The gold standard provided not only a relatively stable monetary standard, but also a check on currency inflation. Under it the amount of a nation's currency was limited by its gold supply. Unfortunately gold production has not kept pace with the increase in world trade and commerce. It never has. Consequently it has been necessary from time to time in the past to increase the value of gold. I think it must be done again. Despite its huge gold reserve, this country could not maintain the gold standard at \$35 an ounce for any length of time.

Most everyone knows that at \$35 an ounce gold is very undervalued. Mining costs are more than four times as much as they were when gold was revalued at \$20.67 an ounce. These costs are at least twice as high now as they were when gold was revalued at \$35 an ounce. And if we now went back on the gold standard and made paper money redeemable in gold at \$35 an ounce, our gold reserves would simply disappear. Gold would be exported to get the higher world price. This has happened twice before, once after the act of 1792 and again from 1929 to 1932. Foreign holders of our paper money would reap a sizable profit and much of our gold would go into private hoards as an investment to await an increase in price.

I think managed currency is responsible for much of the present world ills. Its very origin is suspicious. Lenin argued that debauching a nation's currency was one way of procuring a revolution in that country. Managed currency denies one fundamental

qualification for a monetary substance, namely, it must have an intrinsic value of its own. Money must be an investment in itself. Managed currency is only valuable for what it will buy now. Recent reports from Europe indicate French farmers refuse to sell grain; laborers refuse to work. Because of shortages the paper money they would receive wouldn't buy much now and if they hold this paper money until goods are again available, the paper money may be worthless.

The history of managed currency is too brief for any absolute conclusions, but its record so far has been one of continuous depreciation in value and all Europe knows it. On the other hand, gold never depreciates. It either remains stable or gains in value. Gold currency or currency redeemable in gold has an intrinsic value of its own, a value which never depreciates.

Under the Marshall plan we are to give Europe up to $16,000,000,000. As past history indicates, it will be a gift, paid for by the American taxpayer. No doubt some immediate aid is necessary for Europe, but we should also insist that Europe use the means at its disposal to help itself. European governments have several billions in gold. In addition there is an unknown amount, probably quite large, hidden in private hoards. We can never bring this latter gold out of hiding at a price less than its actual worth. If the price of gold were increased to its present actual value, which, judging from present costs of production and black markets, is now around $60 per ounce, I think it would result in these five benefits: (1) the increased value of Europe's gold would correspondingly decrease the amount required under the Marshall plan; (2) the American taxpayer would benefit by not having to provide the amounts now required under the Marshall plan; (3) an increase in the price of gold would increase the value of our own gold stocks, which increase could be applied toward the payment of our national debt; (4) a real tax cut would be justified at this time; and (5) since gold is everywhere recognized, European gold could be used to buy its needs in other parts of the world and thus reduce inflationary pressures in this country.

If the Marshall plan provided immediate aid on condition that the recipients and the United States reform their currencies and return to the gold standard, we would not only save ourselves a lot of money, but we would eliminate one of the causes of Europe's troubles.

At present we are in a cold war with the dictator nations. Yet in money matters we work hand in glove with them. Managed currency is a chief support of dictatorship. Deprive the dictator of the power to regulate the value of his fiat money and require his money to be valued by an objective standard over which he has no absolute control, and every dictator would find it more difficult to participate in world trade. Had the Russian ruble been on a gold standard or had it possessed any intrinsic value, that country would never have succeeded in its recent deflation of the ruble.

Finally, if our huge national debt is ever to be paid, we must continue the high level of prosperity in this country. The Nation is gradually adjusting itself to higher wages and prices. If further inflation could be prevented and our economy stabilized at or near present levels, we could not only pay our national debt, but remain quite prosperous. So long as the price of gold, our basic monetary medium, remains at the level of 1935, there is always the possibility that our economy may be forced back to that level with resultant national bankruptcy. On the other hand, an increase in the price of gold commensurate with our present economy will tend to stabilize that economy at existing levels. Such a plan is no more inflationary than the Marshall plan. It could be far less inflationary, for if we return to the gold standard the amount of currency this or any country could issue would be limited by the amount of its gold.

I apologize for the length of this letter. As you know, I have a personal interest in gold mining, but even if it were otherwise, I would still feel the same way. After the First World War this country loaned several billions to Europe, one of the reasons being that it would help save Europe from Bolshevism. I sometimes wonder whether the Marshall plan is another world-wide share-the-wealth scheme.

I sincerely believe that gold will sometime increase in price. If so, are we going to give Europe the double advantage of the benefits of the Marshall plan and the increase in the price of gold, or would it be better to require that Europe use its gold now at a higher price to help fill its needs?

I know that any increase in the price of gold will benefit the gold miners, but that is one industry which has special reasons for being heard. It is the only industry which was arbitrarily closed down during the last war. It is the only industry which is by law compelled to sell its product to one customer at a price fixed by that customer. I don't know of any other industry which has since 1935 had its costs doubled, while the price of its product has by law remained the same.

Many thanks for your consideration.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

JOE.

European Recovery Plan Endorsed by Spiritual Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as an indication of the upsurge of moral and spiritual force which is supporting the European recovery program, commonly known as the Marshall plan, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from one of our great Americans, Charles P. Taft.

Mr. Taft is the president of the great Protestant association of religious groups known as the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. I also include the resolution of support passed by the Federal Council:

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., January 28, 1948.

Hon. C. HOLIFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOLIFIELD: The European recovery program is wholeheartedly supported by the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in the conviction that (this program) can b one of history's most momentous affirmations of faith in the curative power of freedom and in the creative capacity of freemen.

The motives and objectives behind this program should be, in the judgment of the federal council, above political partisanship, and should transcend considerations of narrow self-interest.

The federal council believes that the United States must be zealously on guard against imposing, or appearing to impose, conditions in the granting of foreign aid which would seem to threaten the political independence of the nations of Europe, or their right to choose their own way of life. It is pointed out, however, that the United States has a right to expect that the nations participating in this program carry out their own expressed intention to work cooperatively, to maintain monetary stability, and to reduce trade barriers, in order to make the program effective.

The federal council is also of the opinion that if, in addition to voluntary controls, certain governmental controls should be required to assure a fair allocation of needed goods for foreign aid and domestic consumption, such controls should be adopted.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the action taken by the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches in Atlanta, Ga., January 13, 1948. I have been authorized to appear before the appropriate committee of Congress to present the statement. The federal council is also initiating a program of study among its constituent communions based upon this statement.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES P. TAFT,
President.

THE CHURCHES AND THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

(A statement submitted by the Department of International Justice and Goodwill and adopted by the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, January 13, 1948)

As Christians, we support the European recovery program in the conviction that it can be one of history's most momentous affirmations of faith in the curative power of freedom and in the creative capacity of free men.

The ways and means of that program will, of necessity, be largely economic and political. The motives and objectives behind it should be essentially moral and spiritual. They should be above political partisanship. They should transcend considerations of narrow self-interest.

The European recovery program must be a material investment, though not primarily for material reasons. It must also be an investment in the world's moral and spiritual resources and in the means for their speedy release. If it is to contribute thus to the healing of the nations and to the fruitful employment of the creative will and spirit of the peoples, the material investment must be an expression of these Christian convictions:

First, that man, who is endowed by his Creator with inalienable rights, is also endowed by Him with inherent aspirations for a life of freedom and fellowship.

Second, that these God-given aspirations can now, with our help, be given conditions more favorable for fulfillment.

Third, that to provide all men with a better opportunity to fulfill them is the only basis for the hope that the world can make a peace which will be durable because it is just.

The nations of Europe have been struggling courageously with their problems. Some of these nations, however, are fearful of the possibility that the United States may seek to make Europe over in its political and economic image, just as they are fearful in the knowledge that Soviet Russia is seeking to make Europe over in its image.

The European recovery program must be the means by which Europe and the world are released from such fears and freed from the shackles they impose. This it can be if, in its framing and administration, it clearly expresses our conviction that Europe possesses abundant assets of mind and spirit. To these we can add our moral and material aid, for the remaking of Europe and the consequent enrichment of our civilization.

This program, therefore, cannot be a prescription of what we expect the nations of Europe to do. It must be an expression of confidence in the peoples of Europe, who have been making earnest efforts at self-help; a vote of confidence in what, with our aid, they will choose to do for themselves.

But our aid is indispensable. In the wake of the devastations of the war, these nations have been visited by unanticipated dislocations and disruptions through two postwar years. We are called upon to help them to overthrow these accumulated obstacles to recovery. But that help will fail of its most important purpose if, in extending it, we attempt to fashion or shape their future. It will succeed if we affirm and undergird the rights, the desires, and the capacities of these peoples to work out, for our common good, their own destiny.

An undertaking so conceived and directed merits our material sacrifices because it is a cause which enlists our Christian conscience and conforms to our Christian commitments.

If it is to fulfill its potential promise, the European recovery program must be guided by a positive and dynamic conception of the reconstruction task. To this end we urge that consideration be given to the following principles.

1. Basic reconstruction is an enterprise for the releasing of the creative energies of men. It is for this that we are providing them with tools. The material obstacles to recovery in Europe lie partly in the shortage of capital equipment, partly in the instability and unexchangeability of currencies and partly in artificial financial and trade restrictions. But deeper obstacles lie in the fear of another war and despair for the future. It is of the utmost importance that the curative and creative possibilities of the European recovery program shall be so emphasized and so kept to the forefront as to appeal to the consciences, arouse the wills, and enlist the best efforts of men of good will on both sides of the Atlantic. There is, we believe, no other way by which the full potentialities of this program can be realized.

2. American aid for such a recovery program cannot be devoid of risk. Vast uncertainties are involved. We should be aware, however, that the risks of failure are much smaller and much less certain than the risks of inaction. American aid must therefore be an act of faith, a faith which has a sure foundation in our Christian conception of what man is and may become.

3. Financially, the prudent and conservative course is for us to plan now and boldly. Less than an adequate initial program will delay the day when Europe can take over for itself the task of restoration. Less than that may reduce the entire program to the level of costly relief.

4. The United States must be zealously on guard against imposing, or appearing to impose, conditions in the granting of foreign aid which would seem to threaten the political independence of the nations of Europe, or their right to choose their own way of life. We must not hamper efforts to establish European cooperation. As the European recovery program is carried forward, our Nation must seriously honor the basic purpose of the program, not to infringe but to protect and strengthen and enlarge European freedoms and the development toward a community of free societies.

5. We have a right to expect that the nations participating in this program carry out their own expressed intention to work cooperatively, to maintain monetary stability, and to reduce trade barriers, in order to make the program effective. Such a procedure is the best insurance that out of this struggle for recovery there will emerge a more healthful European economy and a more united European community. The United States must make sure that its own policy toward Germany not only fits into this cooperative pattern but provides a demonstration of it.

6. The European recovery program should give encouragement to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and other United Nations agencies to undertake, as the area of cooperation is extended, an increasingly important role in the recovery effort. We are bound both by our commitments to the United Nations and by the purpose of the European recovery program to see to it that United Nations machinery serve to develop broader trade relations within Europe and eventually as a means for the fuller coordination of the economic relations among the nations.

7. From the start it is essential that the European recovery program encourage the development of trade between the participating states and the countries of eastern Europe. The resources of these countries are required for the recovery and development of western Europe just as they, in turn, need the manufactures of western States. It is encouraging that the present opposition of the Soviet Government to the European recovery program still does not prevent mutually beneficial trade agreements with eastern Europe. It is also important for the United States to persuade and assist nations outside of Europe to provide goods for European recovery, thus broadening the area of cooperation and speeding reconstruction. The recovery program, together with the contributions of other nations, should meet the net import needs of the cooperating European countries that are essential to their recovery.

8. If the United States is to fulfil its long-term responsibility in the world economy it must help enable other countries to manufacture and sell their own goods and services in order to buy what they need. Therefore, the European recovery program should be linked with long-range planning to increase American imports so that European economic life as well as our own may be maintained at a high level.

9. The American people will be called upon to accept certain specific limitations on their own economic desires during this critical period in order that the larger good of world recovery may be served. In view of the great human objectives, Christians should accept such limitations willingly. In emergencies such as this our customary waste of food and other scarce commodities is scandalous and un-Christian. If, in addition to voluntary controls, certain Government controls should be required to assure a fair allocation of needed goods for foreign aid and domestic consumption, we believe that such controls should be adopted. From the point of view of morality and even of self-interest the stakes are too high to permit either selfishness or short-sightedness to prevail.

These principles, we believe, can make the European recovery program a cooperative effort to deal with the basic causes of tyranny and war. Such an effort is in keeping with the constructive peace strategy for which our churches stand.

Rose Ellen Speaks for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting with my speech today a copy of the prize-winning talk, I Speak for Democracy, by a friend, constituent, and fellow citizen of mine, Miss Rose Ellen Mudd, of Missoula, Mont.

Rose Ellen, a senior in the Sacred Heart Academy, in Missoula, was one of the four winners in a Nation-wide contest in which over 20,000 high-school students participated. The contest was sponsored by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Broadcasters, and the Radio Manufacturers Association. They are to be commended for the initiative they have shown in sponsoring this project, and the Missoula Junior Chamber of Commerce and radio station KGVO of Missoula are to be complimented in fostering Rose Ellen's interest and eventual victory.

Rose Ellen's triumph is due to hard work, good teaching, a lively interest in life, and a deep and profound respect for the ideals which have made this country great. She is a distinct credit to the fine school she attends—the Sacred Heart Academy—she is a credit also to Missoula and Montana and I know I speak for all the citizens of our State when I say we are proud of Rose Ellen and the renown and prestige which she has achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to inform the House that at the awards' luncheon yesterday Rose Ellen had the largest State delegation in attendance to applaud and give her the credit due. In attendance were Senators James E. Murray and Zales N. Ecton and also the Honorable Justin Miller, Montana University law graduate and now president of the National Association of Broadcasters.

The Sacred Heart Academy, the city of Missoula, and the State of Montana were all honored in Rose Ellen's victory, and I know how happy her sister Tex and her whole family were. Montana could not have had a more charming entrant than Rose Ellen nor could we have had a more talented and outstanding speaker. We, of Montana, know how hard she worked to achieve this goal; we know that the road was not easy, but we know also that what she won she earned. Her speech is a challenge to all Americans—to read, to study, and to practice. In no other country in the world are there the opportunities for our young people as there are in the United States. We do Rose Ellen honor here today, but she has done us a greater honor by bringing with her to Washington the charm, the integrity, and the ability which have made her what she is. Good luck, Rose Ellen, we're all proud of you.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Rose Ellen Mudd)

I am an American. As an American, I can do many things. Is it a coincidence that the word American ends in "I can"? That "I can" is the basis for democracy? It expresses the free will and determination of a free people—people who govern themselves.

"I can" was the spirit of the pioneering Americans when they faced the hardships of an unknown, uncivilized land, and overcame them. Their spirit remained when they faced overwhelming odds and great dangers to gain their freedom from England.

"I can" was the spirit of the Nation, when, looking at the political systems of the other countries of the world, and their results, the American statesmen formed our Constitution and the Bill of Rights. They vowed to

insure, to themselves, and to us, their posterity, the rights of mankind—freedom of speech, of the press, of religion. Freedom from want, and from fear. Freedom from the tyranny of government—the right to rule ourselves. The voice of America, the Constitution, was born.

"I can" was the spirit of the people when our liberty was threatened in 1918, and again in 1941. We had to win to save an ideal. The voices of democracy spoke, and we did. The cost was great, but the willingness to pay was greater, for we knew the worth of the prize that was threatened.

The men of America who instituted our democratic principles, the great emancipator who enforced them, the American people who have held them so securely—all have the spirit of the Constitution, and a wholesome pride in their superior government which gave them freedom. With this spirit democracy has triumphed many times in many things.

To share this great gift with the rest of the world is our goal. But first we must show the world the worth of democracy, and help others to see its advantages. Our spirit of brotherhood, tolerance, and respect for our fellow men—that is the essence of democracy. We must speak for democracy in a strong voice—telling the world of its greatness, and urging it to enjoy it with us.

I am an American citizen of 1947—in whose hands a portion of the peace of the world lies. I, too, remember the Constitution, its meaning, and its worth. I have a share in the voice of democracy, and I wish to speak in its behalf. I want the people of America to live democracy. I want to share the blessings of freedom with the world, for I know that to keep the world, I must help to keep the peace.

I have the spirit of "I can." I want to share that spirit, and with God's help, I will.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article from the New York Times captioned "Two hundred and nineteen college heads vote against universal military training." This action was taken by the Association of American Colleges at a recent meeting. The association is comprised of practically all the leading liberal arts colleges in the country. In voting overwhelmingly against any form of compulsory universal military training, these representative American educators overruled the urgent personal appeals of Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University, and a member of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training.

It is very pertinent to note in connection with this action that the association also voted in favor of an adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force thoroughly trained and equipped, for auxiliary agencies to support our armed forces, and for technical and scientific research and experimentation for war as well as for peace. These educators have performed a distinct public service. They have made a real contribution to current thinking on national defense problems. They have outlined a strong, vibrant, pro-American, democratic program thoroughly in line with the basic doctrines of the Nation. They have also expressed the considered views of predominant American church groups, labor organizations, agricultural and farm associations, and other important and influential organized groups.

The article follows:

TWO HUNDRED AND NINETEEN COLLEGE HEADS VOTE AGAINST UMT—ONLY 69 AT CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION BACK MILITARY TRAINING

(By Benjamin Fine)

CINCINNATI, January 13.—After a spirited debate the Association of American Colleges today voted overwhelmingly against any form of compulsory universal military training.

In its place the group, representing the 700 liberal arts institutions, and one of the most influential education organizations in the country, adopted a seven-point program for national defense. A strong Army and Navy, a firm foreign policy and broader scientific research program were proposed by the 600 educators attending the conference.

Overriding urgent appeals by Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University, and other key leaders, the association voted 219 to 69 against military training.

Numerous college heads waxed bitter as they threw academic reserve to the winds in a vigorous battle of words. During the discussion they split sharply into two diametrically opposing opinion groups. Many arguments were advanced for, and against, the proposal to adopt a military training bill. Friends of the national measure warned that this move was essential for the defense of our country, while its opponents insisted that a service bill would be a menace to the democratic way of life and would serve no useful purpose.

DODDS PLEADS FOR UMT

In speaking for compulsory military training, Dr. Dodds, who was a member of President Truman's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training, pleaded with his colleagues to support his position. This program is needed, he declared, to make the United Nations function. Conceding that military service in peacetime is at variance with the American philosophy of education, Dr. Dodds held that it is now justified on the grounds of great necessity.

"There is no question in my mind that America must engage for a time in power politics," Dr. Dodds continued "in my opinion, the real issue turns on how we use our power, not on whether or not we should exert power."

Pointing to the disintegration in world affairs, Princeton's president observed that Russia had demonstrated an unwillingness to make use of the United Nations so long as Moscow can attain its goals through old-fashioned methods. In the meantime, he said, it is Russia's policy to do all possible to pull the United Nations into contempt. The time has come, he added, to consider Russia's record and not on the basis "of what we had hoped for."

"This does not imply that war is imminent or even inevitable," Dr. Dodds held. "It does imply that appeasement unsupported by power and clear evidence that we are willing, if need be, to use that power is hopeless."

FOUR POINTS FOR TRAINING

A compulsory military training program, he declared, would have these four important military benefits.

1. It would initiate our young men into the substantial psychological adjustments of a soldier's life under conditions uncomplicated by the strains of war. It would develop responses to situations that would win battles and save lives, if war should come.

2. It would make a young man familiar with the basic essential techniques of soldiering, and advance him in unit and branch training to a point at which the National Guard and the Organized Reserve could build a more competent soldier than they have ever been able to do in the past.

3. It would facilitate the classification of our young men into the various branches of the armed forces and industry, and the channeling of them into field and branches important to national defense.

4. It would afford the only practicable means for building up the National Guard and Organized Reserve to the size and efficiency which our security requires. One of the difficulties that the National Guard has had to face in the past is that even after repeated enlistments, it could not hope to carry along citizen-soldier so far as 6 months of universal training would accomplish.

DR. GUERRY IN OPPOSITION

Opposing this viewpoint, Dr. Alexander Guerry, president of the University of the South (Sewanee, Tenn.) be ineffective and inadequate for national defense. It would not serve the purpose it is intended to serve, he maintained, adding that an adequate Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force would be more effective in the building up of a strong national defense.

Universal training, he declared, would change the character of the American people and the nature of this country. He warned that the Federal Government and the military would extend their control over the lives of the people and gradually take away all freedom.

"Little by little they will destroy our initiative, our independence, our differences and diversities which are, with unit, the source of our strength and greatness, and lead us into more and more regimentation," Dr. Guerry predicted.

It is folly for this country to adopt military training at this time, he said, as it would amount almost to an open declaration on our part of the inevitability of war. A strong armed force, he urged, would be infinitely better than a program of universal military training.

Military service would not develop discipline and citizenship in our people, he continued. The arguments advanced that military service will make better citizens "are so wrong and misleading that they are proof in part of our impending misfortune if this Nation adopts a program of compulsory military service."

MANY BACK THE UN

In the general debate that followed the statements presented by Dr. Dodds and Dr. Guerry, many of the college presidents urged that greater reliance be placed on the United Nations as a force in shaping world peace.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president of Morehouse College, in Atlanta, warned that military training would set a pattern for a world armament race that could only end in war.

Other speakers insisted that if the association went on record as opposed to military training, the public might believe that they took this position because of selfish interests.

After the motion to support compulsory military training was defeated, the association, by unanimous vote, adopted a resolution favoring this seven-point platform:

1. A firm, clear foreign policy for the United States.

2. A willingness and determination by the United States to take its role in world affairs and to accept the responsibility of world leadership that has come to us.

3. An adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force thoroughly trained and equipped.

4. Development of auxiliary agencies to support our armed forces.

5. Development of technical and scientific research and experimentation for war, as well as for peace.

6. Reduction in armaments of all nations as circumstances permit.

7. A constant declaration of our desire to live at peace with other countries, and an everlasting effort on our part to help build and maintain an effective federation of nations for the purpose of putting an end to war and aggression and preserving peace, liberty, and justice for all peoples on this earth.

Price-Rise Blueprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Maryland Gazette January 15, 1948, entitled "Price-Rise Blueprint," as follows:

PRICE-RISE BLUEPRINT

When President Truman made his first political speech of the 1948 campaign—his report on the State of the Union to the Congress—he laid down a perfect blueprint for increasing inflation and prices.

The speech was in effect a sort of political cafeteria, where any individual or group of voters could get whatever they desired. It was a campaign document in every sense of the word and will probably be treated as such by the Congress.

If all the expenditures and controls he recommended were enacted into law, the Nation would see the Federal pay roll increase by leaps and bounds and the costs of government soar to new highs. He recommended subsidies and increased services that would more and more inflict the country with the regimentation of a central government.

It is noteworthy that in the entire speech the President gave no indication of a plan to drastically curtail the expenses of the administration, or cut down on the size, or eliminate any of the agencies or departments that blossomed and grew under the spend-and-spend philosophy of the New Dealers.

His suggested program of allowing a $40 tax credit to every income-tax payer and $40 additional for each dependent, and making up the loss in revenue by increasing taxes on corporations is a sure way of running up the costs of various articles to consumers.

The President points out that his income-tax-credit plan would be a saving of $3,200,000,000 to individual taxpayers, and that this sum should be made up by increasing the taxes on business.

Although it is obvious that the program was suggested with an eye on the ballot box next November 2, it is economically unsound. Businessmen, or corporations, to survive, must charge their taxes into selling prices. Therefore, if the President's plan were adopted and additional taxes were levied upon corporations, these taxes would be passed on down the line to the consumers, with the result that the very persons whom the President suggested be aided would be carrying the burden.

For instance, if a manufacturer is selling an article at present for $40 and makes a $1 profit, a tax increase of $1 would wipe out his profit. He would be forced to boost his selling price to $41 to absorb the tax.

So, in effect, when the President recommended that a single person, for instance, be allowed a $40 credit on his income tax, then, because of the increased taxes on business and higher prices that would necessarily result, the citizen would probably pay out the $40, or more, during the year on his purchases. In other words, he would indirectly be contributing $40 in higher living costs to get a credit of $40. That, in a general way, would be the negating effect of the Presidential suggestion.

This is on a par with using the taxpayers' money to pay a subsidy on a food article in order to save the taxpayer money. We have had plenty of experience with that sort of foolishness in the past.

But the Presidential message was contradictory in itself. He pointed out that the Nation is "far short of the industrial capacity we need for a growing future." Then he continued:

"At least $50,000,000,000 should be invested by industry to improve and expand our productive facilities over the next few years."

That statement is correct, but the President did not explain how the $50,000,000,000 was to be invested in industry when he was proposing to lay a new tax on industry to consume $3,200,000,000 annually of the money that could be invested into expanding "our productive facilities."

He talked about business profits, but spoke, like most of those that do, in general terms. It is true that last year some concerns made money, but there were many who had a higher gross return, but less net return than in 1946, because of higher operating costs and the high tax burden.

The investors who put their money in the stock of the Nation's corporations and who would have to supply the $50,000,000,000 the President declares should be put into productive expansion, take a more pessimistic view of the situation. The stock market, the yardstick of the investor on the worth of the Nation's business, is an indication of this.

The following quotations on the stock of several companies on December 31, 1946, and December 31, 1947, show how the stock investor has discounted all the rosy reports that are made by the President and others on the business profits of the Nation.

Corporation	1946	1947
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.	$171.50	$151.375
National Dairy Products Corp.	36.875	29.00
General Foods Corp.	43.25	35.75
Borden Corp.	49.25	41.25
Consolidated Gas, Electric Light & Power Co.	79.00	71.00

General Motors Corp. stock was selling for $75.625 per share on December 31, 1945. Because of the strike it dropped to $52.50 on December 31, 1946, and on December 31, 1947, had regained only back to $58.25 per share.

Remember, the people who put their money in the stock of the business corporations are pretty hard-boiled about it. They are investing to make a profit and naturally seek to invest in corporations where they can get the highest return for their money. If they were convinced that business were at such high peak, there would be a great demand for stocks, sending up their selling price. However, the demand is just the opposite—the market has been dropping.

As stocks are looked upon as an inflation hedge, this dropping market in times of inflationary tendencies is indicative.

Most corporations today are in the position in which a home owner would be if in 1941, when the war started, he decided that in 5 years he would have to purchase a new automobile, heating plant, and refrigerator, and decided to lay $1,000 annually for 5 years aside to pay for them in 1947. So he would have saved $1,000 for this purpose in 1942, but the regular and excess-profits tax would have stepped in and taken up all but $200. The same thing would have happened in 1943, 1944, and 1945. In 1946 the tax left him, say, $500 of his $1,000. So, in 1947, instead of finding himself with $5,000, he would have had only $1,300, yet he needed the automobile, heating plant, and refrigerator, as his had worn out during the 5-year period. So he faced the task of trying to buy them for $1,300, only to find that a price increase had run them to a total of $6,000 instead of $5,000.

Naturally, he would have to get along with his old equipment. The same thing has happened to many factories. They were not able to accumulate funds during the war period to purchase new equipment, on a rising market, when the war ended. Therefore, the Nation's productive machinery does need replacement.

Yet we have the suggestion that more and more taxes be placed on business—at the same time the President points out that business should purchase more production facilities.

What this Nation needs is a holiday from political thinking, and a curtailment of domestic governmental costs that would allow a fair tax reduction for both individuals and corporations.

"Let the Eagle Scream"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday Frank Fister, of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of America, gave me an article written by my friend, the president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, John Ben Shepperd. The article, Let the Eagle Scream, appeared in the Christian Science Monitor November 28, 1947. With Mr. Fister I commend the reading of this very timely, worth while, and well-written article:

"LET THE EAGLE SCREAM": UNITED STATES WARNED TO HOLD TORCH OF DEMOCRACY ALOFT—HEAD OF JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HITS APATHY

(By John Ben Shepperd, president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce)

It's time to let the eagle scream.

As is often the case when a people are born to advantages, Americans, humanly enough, are apathetic toward their system of government—a system unique in that it grants and protects the sanctity of the individual and freedom of religion, speech, and enterprise.

Even in the face of organized efforts which ultimately would change our Government, our system of democracy, and free enterprise goes pathetically undefended, unsung, unheralded.

IN PALM OF OUR HAND

Yet it is as simple as this—freedom is held in the palm of our hand, in the hand that records our vote. There is too much criticism and too little constructive thought and effort in governmental affairs by the majority of the people. It has become a popular pastime to slur "politicians." There is a stigma connected with running for or holding public office.

Of the various ideologies that form the basis of governments elsewhere, the most formidable one is communism.

This is a system which admittedly would sacrifice the right of the individual to work

and earn for himself according to his ability and diligence—a system which would discard our type of freedom in favor of one which would divide the wealth of a country, at least in theory, equally among all its people. But because of human inequities, because of the love of power on the part of straw bosses and imposing leaders and the lack of checks and balances, we have had illustrated to us too well that such a system cannot work, and that it utterly destroys the initiative, the effectiveness, and the dignity of men so governed.

COMMUNIST THREAT

Yet communism is well organized in this country. Communists are a zealous lot. The best weapon with which to fight their insidious infiltration is with good old-fashioned American salesmanship. Fire must be fought with fire, and for every pro-Communist or fellow-traveler speech in this country, let's come back with three for democracy.

Yes, now is the time to let the eagle scream. Too many of us are unnecessarily selling America short. We go out of our way to be critical. We are too partisan. We put national security on a political basis.

To protect our democratic system and free enterprise, we must take stock of our heritage. To perfect it, the approach to our problems must be positive. To promote it calls for public education. We must educate our people to think, to take stock, to study—a thorough knowledge of American history is the best manner of promoting a love for its advantages.

The necessity of educating the public was brought forcibly to my attention while on a recent tour of Europe, where I observed the spirit of young men sinking into discouragement and chaos due to lack of security and opportunity for advancement. They had lost hope, ambition, the incentive to produce.

Talking to them about their form of government or the ever-present threat of communism, they would reply, "What can we do about it? Today we may be working on our job—tomorrow our Government may move us across the country to an entirely different kind of work. We do not have the opportunity to utilize our training or the experience gained in the war by entering a new business because our Government has closed these fields of endeavor to us."

On the way home, the thought occurred to me that our country would be in a tragic state and would be easy prey to communism if our young men—who have their lives before them and have the most to lose if our free-enterprise system were lost—should lose their hope, their ambition, the incentive to produce.

In 1944, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce passed a resolution asking that a fifth freedom be added to the then recently announced Four Freedoms, and that this freedom be the freedom of opportunity of enterprise. With this in mind, I launched, during October, the "Fifth Freedom Flight" through 27 States, with stops in 63 major cities, in an effort to mobilize not only our 250,000 members, but all young men toward a keener appreciation of the American way of life.

The enthusiastic response to the message indicates a vast untouched range of potential understanding of young American citizens of their business and governmental heritage.

The Fifth Freedom Flight of the "Jaycees" is a sample of what can be done. A contest we are sponsoring in co-operation with the National Association of Broadcasters, "I Speak for Democracy," enables youngsters to compete for prizes on a national basis and creates an incentive for added interest in the rich traditions of our country.

BROADER KNOWLEDGE

Historical quizzes and other forms of competition are other means of broadening the understanding and knowledge and thereby promoting love of our country and its institutions. No one should miss the Freedom Train as it goes through our communities. We should have larger and more intelligent celebrations of our American historical anniversaries, such as the Fourth of July and Lincoln's and Washington's Birthdays.

The scream of the eagle must be heard around the world. We must adopt a positive program of selling our way of life to the whole world. When we help the less unfortunate in Europe under the Marshall plan, we should accompany it with the old-fashioned gospel of democracy—pointing out that only under our system of free opportunity and enterprise has a people been able to work and produce enough to relieve the chaos of a troubled world.

Don't keep our eagle buried in the glass case of a museum. Let him fly high. Let the eagle scream!

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we as a country in our own self-interest should give such aid as is possible within the limits of our own financial and economic capacity. I further believe that the administration of our European recovery program is of vital importance because if it is not well-handled our efforts abroad may have been utterly wasted and our own domestic economy severely strained.

In this connection, I am pleased to call the following article by Walter Lippmann to the attention of the membership of the House:

RELIEVING THE DEPARTMENT

(By Walter Lippmann)

Secretary Marshall and his successors will be among those who benefit the most from the refusal of Senator VANDENBERG and his committee to put the European Recovery Program under the Department of State. They will be relieved of a great burden.

The argument in favor of the original proposal was that since ERP is an engine of foreign policy, it must be subordinate to the Secretary of State. If that were a sound view, then every other department and agency of Government which acts outside the 3-mile limit should also be under the the direct control of the Secretary of State. Under this theory of government he would become in effect the prime minister; yet in the American system it is not the Secretary of State but the President who makes foreign policy and conducts foreign relations. The President can be, and has often been, his own Secretary of State. But the Secretary of State cannot be his own President.

Even when the President recognizes his own limitations, and selects, as Mr. Truman has, a man of great prestige and superior ability, it is impossible to delegate to the Secretary of State the conduct of foreign relations. They involve so many departments of Government so continually and so intricately that they cannot be controlled, or even coordinated, by the head of one of these departments.

When the Department of State attempts to do what only the President can do, it does not really take control of all the multifarious activities which enter into foreign relations. It becomes a kind of receptacle of those activities which have not been preempted and nailed down by some other department, as for example, propaganda; or are white elephants, as for example, the military government of occupied areas.

The most serious consequence of taking over so many ill-assorted operations has been that the Department has become an unwieldy bureaucracy. The unwieldiness of the machine causes the responsible men at the top to become so immersed in the details that the great decisions of high policy are really made in bits and pieces by subordinates down deep in the bureaus. Policy is not formed at the top by men who have time to consider the whole situation. They are too busy for that. They make policy in the main by settling disputes which come up to them from below.

The difficulties have been compounded by the practice which Mr. Byrnes adopted, and Mr. Marshall has continued, which is to treat the Secretary of State as a roving ambassador. No one can form and plan and really direct a global foreign policy—particularly one so vastly overextended as our own is today—if he is away from Washington attending international conferences or making speeches so much of the time. A consecutive, systematic, and thoroughly considered judgment cannot be arrived at by long distance telephone, from cables, and through occasional consultation.

It was never more necessary than it is now that this condition be corrected. On the one hand, the country has commitments all around the world which, if they are not to be beyond our resources and our power, require careful and consistent judgment and planning. On the other hand, the situation, as Mr. Churchill said the other day, is evolving rapidly to a point where things are coming to a head. If we are prepared, lucid, resolute, and inventive, it may be that events can be developed which can lead to a settlement of the war we have won and of that other war which all must dread.

Only men who are not too busy to think can hope to be prepared. They will be much too busy to think if from day to day, and at any hour, they are called upon to listen to the anguished entreaties of foreign ambassadors, to decide the disputes among the departments of the Government, to iron out the difficulties arising from agreements that prove to be unworkable, which the administration of the European recovery program will unavoidably demand. That would mean only that in assuming too much control of the Marshall plan, the Department of State would lose sight of, and would neglect, all the other things that need to be done if the grand purpose of the Marshall plan is to be achieved.

American Jews in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Samuel C. Kohs:

AMERICAN JEWS IN WORLD WAR II—THE RECORD AND HOW IT WAS COMPILED

(By Dr. Samuel C. Kohs)

(The epochal story of American Jewry's participation in World War II is told in full in the two-volume set of books—American

Jews in World War II—just published by Dial Press. This chapter on the record and how it was compiled is taken from the preface to volume II of this historic work, which is based on the material compiled over a period of more than 5 years by the National Jewish Welfare Board's Bureau of War Records, whose director was Dr. Kohs.—THE EDITOR.)

In the summer of 1941 half the world was at war, and war clouds were already gathering over the United States of America. It seemed probable that soon we, too, would be drawn into the conflict. The selective service law was in operation, and American Jews, like other Americans, were being drafted into the United States armed forces or were volunteering for military service.

Among American Jewish leaders it was readily recognized that one important project that must be carried out if war came would be that of compiling a record, as complete as possible, of the Jewish contribution to the war effort.

The National Jewish Welfare Board had officially represented the coordinated interests of American Jews in World War I and in the years of peace, and it was therefore the logical body to which this job in the approaching Second World War might be entrusted. It was the Jewish Welfare Board that by common consent undertook to set up an organization which would gather, assemble, classify, and interpret the facts of Jewish participation in World War II.

That organization, when established, was named the Bureau of War Records of the National Jewish Welfare Board. It was launched on October 9, 1941, barely two months before Pearl Harbor. It was sponsored at the outset by 21 national Jewish organizations and ultimately by 38.

Representatives of the sponsoring organizations made up an advisory committee of the bureau. Then a technical committee of eminent statisticians was named, to guide the bureau in its processes and to review its findings. Chairman of both committees was Dr. Louis I. Dublin, second vice president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. and its chief statistician. A better choice to assure a sound and scientifically correct result could hardly have been made.

The bureau needed, first of all, to analyze the job that lay ahead of it, to assess the problems it would face.

The technical committee immediately entered on a preliminary inquiry into the nature and scope of the program before it. A conference with War and Navy Department officials soon disclosed that Jewish servicemen could not be identified as such by an examination of the official records. This outlined the first and major problem. The bureau would have to work directly through the communities themselves, and would have to develop with them the ways of measuring the extent of Jewish participation.

It would have to start almost from scratch. There were, for one thing, no reliable figures as to the number of Jews in the United States, or even in the larger cities in which the greater part of American Jews live. All that made it clear that the Bureau would have to operate on a decentralized plan, relying on the local communities, with their own leaders and local devices, to gather the much-needed basic information, such as the number of Jews in the service from each community and what proportion they formed of the local Jewish population. Local communities meant the Jewish groups, in the several States, in hundreds of counties and in over a thousand cities and towns.

The national office, located in New York, became the planning, promotional and supervisory organization. It set itself the tasks of:

1. Formulating procedures for organizing local war record committees.

2. Outlining techniques for gathering local information.

3. Establishing standard clerical forms—record cards, reports, letters of inquiry and the like.

4. Instructing local communities in setting up and operating local war records files.

5. Obtaining the authentications of all casualties (killed, wounded, missing, prisoners) and awards.

6. Obtaining regularly from local committees the statistics on the number in service and the local count of casualties and awards.

Though it soon became evident that the JWB Bureau of War Records could not hope to have a complete name-by-name record of Jews in the armed services, it urged every local community to keep a complete record of all such local servicemen—a task which was practicable except in New York and a few other large cities.

It was, all in all, a tremendous effort. More than 1,200 separate communities in the United States were involved. Each had its own war records committee or, in the case of the smallest communities, its JWB correspondent, working to gather the vital facts. They made up perhaps the greatest voluntary Jewish record gathering organization ever assembled.

The Bureau began at once establishing rosters, as complete as possible, of the following: Jews who died in the service, the wounded, those captured by the enemy, and those reported missing in action. These were the four official categories of casualties of the armed forces. As the war continued, the figures in each changed—and they were still changing, with new information continually coming in, up to the day this volume went to press.

The Bureau worked primarily from published Government lists of casualties and of awards, but these carried no indication of religion. Names of servicemen and of their nearest kin gave the first indication of possible Jewishness, but these had to be sent to the local communities for authentication of religious background. Often the family of the serviceman could not be found at the listed address, delaying the process of authentication. In this difficult job of authenticating cases, the Bureau received much help from the local committees which also furnished much information independently.

To fill in the picture of total Jewish participation in the armed services, the Bureau embarked on a series of special studies of two types: 1. Population studies in Jewish communities, to obtain analyses of sizable Jewish populations together with the numbers in the armed forces; 2. Studies of the contributions of special Jewish groups; namely, physicians, dentists, recent immigrants, farm families. It was also necessary to make an analysis of the distribution of Jews in uniform among the several branches of service.

The first of the population studies was made as early as August 1942; most of them, however, were actually made in 1944 and 1945, when the greater part of the Nation's armed forces were already mobilized; in all, 26 community studies were made. In most of these communities, these studies were inclusive of all Jews. In New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, which have a very large proportion of the country's Jewish population, the Bureau used scientific sampling procedures to arrive at its results. In all cases, what was sought was: The percentage of the community's Jewish population in the service, compared with the percentage of the total local population in the service; and the percentage of the Jewish draft-eligible men in service, men between the ages of 18 and 44, compared with the percentage of all draft eligibles in service. The results of these population studies are summarized in table I. It should be emphasized that intercity comparisons cannot be made on the basis of this table because the studies were made at different times and local conditions also affect the situation for particular cities.

Table I shows that in 25 of the 26 cities, the percentage of Jews in the service was higher than in the general population. In most of these cases, as well as in the single case where the Jewish proportion was lower, the margin of differences was too small to be of any significance but in a few cases, the difference was too large to be simply a matter of chance. What stands out as important is the general tendency shown by these figures.

In like manner when the proportion in service of the total draft reservoir is considered, the studies show that the percentage for the Jewish population was higher than for the general population in 23 of the 26 cities. Again, most of the differences are too small to warrant much emphasis, but the general tendency is again unmistakable that the Jewish participation in the armed forces was fully up to all expectations.

TABLE I.—*Jews in the armed forces: Statistical summary of 26 Jewish community population studies made by Jewish Welfare Board bureau of war records*

City	Year of survey	Percent of population in service		Percent of draft reservoir in service	
		Total	Jewish	Total	Jewish
Trenton, N. J.	1942	4.2	5.2	20.5	22.7
Lynn, Mass.	1943	8.4	9.3	37.9	38.5
Portland, Maine	1943	8.9	12.0	45.2	48.1
Stamford, Conn.	1943	9.4	10.3	42.6	44.3
Toledo, Ohio	1943	10.0	11.3	42.2	48.1
Allentown, Pa.	1944	8.4	10.5	33.6	42.0
Denver, Colo.	1944	8.5	11.8	40.4	50.7
Fort Wayne, Ind.	1944	8.2	13.1	38.3	54.1
Hammond, Ind.	1944	6.3	11.9	32.3	46.6
Los Angeles, Calif.[1]	1944	11.5	14.6	50.4	55.0
Madison, Wis.	1944	9.7	13.3	40.7	51.6
New York, N. Y., I[1]	1944	11.0	11.4	46.6	46.3
Oakland, Calif.	1944	7.9	10.1	35.7	41.6
Seattle, Wash.	1944	10.1	11.7	45.2	51.9
Spokane, Wash.	1944	10.0	12.2	49.5	53.5
Wilmington, Del.	1944	8.6	11.7	47.8	45.3
Youngstown, Ohio	1944	12.7	15.7	47.1	59.3
Beacon, N. Y.	1945	8.0	10.4	34.7	41.3
Boston, Mass.	1945	9.3	12.1	45.4	47.1
Chicago, Ill.[1]	1945	10.6	11.1	46.6	47.7
Dallas, Tex.	1945	9.3	11.2	39.6	48.0
El Paso, Tex.	1945	7.4	13.9	38.0	59.0
Galveston, Tex.	1945	11.6	10.6	46.7	46.6
Little Rock, Ark.	1945	8.5	12.4	39.1	55.6
New York, N. Y., II[1]	1945	12.0	12.8	47.2	52.0
Oklahoma City, Okla.	1945	9.0	12.5	39.3	51.4
Shreveport, La.	1945	13.0	13.8	54.8	59.3

[1] Sampling surveys.

On the basis of these population studies and other pertinent data, some of the statistical experts affiliated with the bureau's technical committee made estimates from time to time as to the number of Jews who were in the armed forces during World War II. Their final estimate, as of January 1, 1946, placed the probable minimum number who had answered the call to service in the armed forces at 550,000. In the absence of any reliable and definite figure as to the total number of Jews in the country and the age and sex characteristics of the Jewish population, several types of estimates were used which all yielded a figure of this order and which, therefore, the experts judged to be the most reasonable and valid figure.

TABLE II.—*Distribution of Jewish servicemen in armed forces by branches and activities as compiled by JWB bureau of war records*

Armed forces:	Percent
Army	80.59
Navy	16.46
Coast Guard	1.14
Marine Corps	1.81
Total	100.00
Army:	
Army Air Force	23.11
Army Ground Force	21.09
Army Service Force	36.39

	Percent
Army activities:	
Army Air Force: Flying personnel	4.67
Army Ground Force:	
Armored Force	2.28
Artillery	5.16
Cavalry	.40
Infantry	12.83
Paratroops	.42
Army Service Force:	
Adjutant General	0.85
Chemical Warfare	.68
Engineers	3.81
Finance	1.18
Medical, Dental	10.92
Military Police	1.51
Ordnance	2.60
Quartermaster	3.44
Signal Corps	4.52
Transportation	1.15
Navy activities:	
Officers:	
Line officers	9.38
Staff officers:	
Medical, etc	3.92
Supply	1.20
Engineers	.28
Other officers	2.67
Enlisted men:	
Aviation	1.45
Artificer, etc	3.64
Seamen	5.19
Specialist	5.20
Seabees	.76

At the time of writing, the JWB Bureau of War Records had a roster of more than 35,000 Jewish casualties of World War II. Included were 10,500 Jewish war dead, 8,000 of whom were killed in action, 18,000 wounded, 3,000 missing in action, 3,600 taken prisoners by the enemy.

TABLE III.—*Number of Jewish casualties and awards authenticated by JWB Bureau of War Records*

(Reflecting the status of the bureau's files up to July 1, 1946, except for deaths, which have been processed up to January 1947)

Number of casualties:	
Deaths in service:	
Combat	8,006
Noncombat	1,753
Unspecified	667
Total	10,426
Wounded in action	18,008
Missing in action	3,041
Captured by the enemy	3,637
Total casualties	35,157
Number of awards:	
Medal of Honor	1
Distinguished Service Cross	74
Navy Cross	37
Distinguished Service Medal	47
Legion of Merit	344
Silver Star	1,627
Distinguished Flying Cross	2,391
Soldier's Medal	222
Navy and Marine Corps Medal	30
Bronze Star	6,090
Air Medal	16,068
Total, without Purple Hearts	26,931
Estimated Purple Hearts (deaths in action and wounded in action)	26,009
Subtotal	52,940
Miscellaneous awards [1]	8,508
Total	61,448

[1] Principally Presidential unit citations, letters of commendation, and awards by foreign governments.

NOTE.—These statistics represent the number of casualties and awards, not the number of men involved. Awards of oak leaf clusters (Army) and gold stars (Navy) are included as additional awards of the same medal. Number of Jewish men receiving awards, 36,352.

The Bureau's files, also, contain records of just under 27,000 awards, exclusive of the Purple Heart, foreign awards and commendations, and unit citations. All men killed in action or wounded in action were automatically granted the Purple Heart, but the Bureau specifically recorded only those Purple Hearts which the servicemen's families reported as having been received. In the accompanying table III the number of Purple Hearts awarded Jewish servicemen was estimated on the basis of casualty statistics.

Some 20,000 of the 27,000 listed awards were granted for valor in combat (for example, the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross). Six thousand were Bronze Stars, earned either in action or for service, and 643 were awards for meritorious service (i. e., Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit) or for heroism not connected with combat (as the Soldier's Medal).

Impressive as these figures are, they are far from complete. As indicated earlier, the names of the men who suffered casualties or received awards were, for the most part, derived originally from official Government releases which themselves varied in adequacy, being most complete in the case of those killed in action and least complete with respect to awards. In addition, the JWB Bureau of War Records and its local committees were unable to authenticate the names of all the Jews who appeared in these lists. It is probable, therefore, that the count of the number of Jews killed in action, for which the record is fullest, is 15 to 20 percent less than the actual number and that the numbers listed for noncombat deaths and awards is only about half the true number.

This means that there were hundreds of Jewish war dead and thousands of the wounded or decorated heroes whose names do not appear in the lists assembled by the JWB Bureau of War Records.

Rationing of Grain to Distillers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper articles:

GOVERNMENT WITHOUT ETHICS—A PRIVATE CITIZEN CHALLENGES THE RISE OF A POTENTIAL DICTATORSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES

The recent arbitrary and discriminatory action of the Federal Government through Secretary of Agriculture Anderson in rationing grain to the distillers smacks strongly of police-state control methods. Worse than that, it shows absolute disregard for the integrity of Government itself.

When the distillers voluntarily agreed to shut down production of alcohol for a 60-day period, they were promised that "no effort will be made to extend the shut-down."

Then Secretary Anderson, using section 4b of the Taft anti-inflation law, disregarded the Government's promise—dictatorially interpreted the law as being retroactive—and arbitrarily forced a discriminatory and unfair ration system on the distillers.

The stated purpose of the Government was to save wheat, but a statistical analysis of the distilling industry's wheat consumption makes this stated purpose ridiculous.

The actual purpose would appear to be a combination of politics and an effort to achieve some form of prohibition through subterfuge.

There is nothing new in the tactics adopted. Dictators have used them for years—first to make a promise and later to break it, at will—and second, to achieve police-state control over the desired objective.

It is rather depressing to see such a spectacle in our own Government.

Of course, most of you who read this probably won't bother to do anything about it. Dictators know this and that is how they achieve their power.

Encroachment on the rights of the people is usually subtle—but gradually expands until the population wakes up and finds out it can happen here and they are powerless to do anything about it.

Today it discriminates against the liquor industry. Tomorrow it may discriminate against the paper industry. And the next day perhaps against your industry.

There is no stopping totalitarian methods once they are permitted to get a foothold. As Thomas Jefferson once pointed out: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." That vigilance requires a revision of section 4b of the Taft anti-inflation law under which Secretary Anderson acquired his arbitrary powers. An extension of that law containing that section will be acted upon by the Congress within the next few days—and it is essential that it be amended to prevent further use of such dictatorial powers by Secretary Anderson.

I hold no brief for the liquor industry and I am not in any way connected with it—but I have a great respect for fair play, justice, and equality in government—and am American enough to believe that our Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" should retain the high code of ethics, integrity, and honesty which has made us the greatest Nation in the world today.

TIME FOR COMMON SENSE—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

In the next few days the Congress will be asked to consider legislation to extend the shutdown of American distilleries. Since this involves an industry which pays annually more than two and a half billion dollars in taxes, and employs directly and indirectly more than two million American workers, we think it might be useful for you and for the public to have some of the facts about the recent voluntary 60-day shut-down.

Schenley entered into the voluntary agreement and has lived up to its obligations 100 percent.

Some American distillers did not shut down.

The Canadian distillers did not shut down.

The British distillers did not shut down.

No other country in the world closed its distilleries.

For the announced purpose of providing food for hungry people in Europe, the shut-down has been an absolute, costly, and utter failure.

The purpose of our Government was to save wheat. We believe that not only was there no saving of wheat, but that wheat was actually lost.

The distilling industry uses practically no wheat. The actual figure is less than one-thousandths of 1 percent of the total wheat crop.

This industry uses principally corn, some rye, and some barley malt. Most of this grain, if not so used, would ordinarily be fed to animals.

Normally, we use about 2 percent of the total corn crop.

It was estimated by the President's Food Committee that the 60-day shut-down would save approximately 10,000,000 bushels of grain, but actually little or nothing was saved because in the process of distilling we return to the farmer feeds for poultry, hogs, dairy cattle, and beef cattle which in the opinion of experts have an equal or greater feeding value than the grain we used.

Sixth. We should encourage individual savings and the investment of a larger share of commercial profits in plant improvement and equipment for better methods of production.

Seventh. There must be better management-labor cooperation to check the mounting price spiral. This calls for a determined effort by management to hold the price line. It calls for labor to hold the line against another and another round of wage increases. One cannot succeed without the other. It calls, in short, for the finest kind of Americanism on both sides of the industrial street.

Eighth. We should not damage our domestic economy and increase the cost of living by exporting basic materials that are in short supply.

Ninth. Government competition in the food markets should be ended. We should curb those excessive price supports and subsidies which are economically unsound. The people pay for these supports and subsidies with higher taxes at one end and higher prices at the other.

Tenth. We must put the Golden Rule into our business practice. There is plenty of work, business and opportunity for all in America if we play the game on the level.

The suggestions I have outlined have an important bearing on the future welfare and progress of our Republic. They can be achieved only by united, determined and unceasing effort to rebuild and strengthen the spirit of America.

We need more of the spirit of our ancestors—the spirit of patriotism, courage, industry, thrift, sacrifice, and love of God. We need a reawakening in America—great mobilization of right thinking, hard working God-fearing men and women standing together in love of our country and our Flag.

Loyalty and fidelity to the ideals and principles enunciated by the founding fathers will preserve our freedom, our independence and will safeguard our foremost place among the nations of the earth.

Let us not take for granted or hold too lightly the precious gift of being an American. In this world there is no more proud heritage. In every corner of the earth today there are millions of people, decent hard working people, who would crawl halfway around the globe on their hands and knees for the privilege of being American citizens.

I wonder if our young people—and many older ones—fully appreciate the true meaning of the American way of life and the American system of free government. Our schools should teach that lesson and it should be expounded from our pulpits.

That would make a better America—and better Americans of us all.

American Stability and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "American Stability and World Peace," which I delivered at the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Dress Manufacturers' Association, in New York City, on January 3, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The growth of the dress manufacturing industry in eastern Pennsylvania in recent years has been most gratifying to all of us who are interested in the continued preeminence of Pennsylvania as an industrial State. Heavy industry has always had its headquarters in Pennsylvania almost from the beginning of our colonial history. Pennsylvania steel and Pennsylvania coal are the two great pillars supporting our entire economy in the United States. From these two giant industries, hundreds and hundreds of related industries have received their initial impetus and are now titans in their own right. It took a depression to teach us in Pennsylvania a lesson we are not going to forget, and that is that complete reliance on one or on a few primary industries brings with it acute danger at the moment of dislocation or even mild recession in the fortunes of those few industries.

We learned the need of diversification, and throughout Pennsylvania communities large and small have been putting to good use that lesson we learned in our State in the early thirties.

The textile industry has always been an important one to Pennsylvania, particularly in and around my own native city of Philadelphia. In the last 10 years or so, however, we have seen a notable trend on the part of the dress-manufacturing industry elsewhere to come into Pennsylvania, into the smaller communities, to set up new plants which in many cases have been the first and only instances of industrial diversification some of those towns have known.

We in Pennsylvania appreciate this invasion, if I can call it that, of our hard-coal areas and of other regions of Pennsylvania by plants such as yours. You have brought wealth into our State in the form of employment and employment opportunities, and I know it is appreciated all down the line. I trust that you are meeting with the utmost in cooperation from officials on the local, county, and State levels in Pennsylvania in trying to help you make your business problems easier. I know labor appreciates the new opportunities your industry has provided in our State, and I understand that you, in turn, have found labor in Pennsylvania to be cooperative, reasonable, skilled and alert, and enterprising and anxious to see your business prosper so that labor in turn can prosper.

My good friend Jim Costello, who is the impartial referee in your contract adjustment cases with the ILGWU, tells me that labor-management relations in your industry are on a splendid basis of true cooperation and mutual respect, and that is good news indeed. The health and welfare fund set up for your employees with centers already established in Allentown, Harrisburg, and Wilkes-Barre is, I believe, a reflection of truly enlightened free enterprise at work in a free America.

All of which is to say that I want you to know that we in Pennsylvania look forward to your industry becoming an increasingly important part of the community.

We have just completed the greatest boom year in our Nation's history. And as we enter 1948, everyone, I am sure, looks forward with hope that this new year will see a continuation of our high level of economy. On the other hand, however, business has been so good in this past year that, conditioned as we have become to the economic cycle of boom and bust in America, there is now a widespread feeling in the hearts of many that we are on the brink of a possible collapse. We all pray that such a collapse will not occur. The economists and industrial leaders generally reassure us that 1948 in all probability will be an exceptionally good year for business. Industrial expansion is continuing; as a matter of fact, our entire economy is still an expanding one. Nevertheless, there is almost universal recognition of the fact that there are aspects of our booming economy which justify some real misgivings.

Simply stated, we are in an inflation and everybody knows it now. A year ago, even a few months ago, there was great resistance to any acknowledgement of the existence of serious inflationary factors in our economy. At this time a year ago, optimism was transcendent and there were few, if any, expressions of alarm or disquiet.

Optimism is still present and justly so. In the past year the United States has known for the first time the achievement of an employment goal of sixty million jobs. We have vast purchasing power—vast potential purchasing power, that is—in the hands of our people. Wages and income are at records we never before considered possible. We have a vast productive machine and it is turning out goods at an amazing and almost incomprehensible rate. We have a huge backlog of unfilled consumer demand at home and we have an unfilled export market which is staggering in its volume, assuming, that is, that any purchasing power will exist abroad to buy our goods.

All of these factors lend support to our hopes for a high level of prosperity in America, not just for 1948 but for years to come. And yet as we start 1948—still riding the crest of this boom—I think we all have a feeling that our economy needs some shoring-up, some better foundations if collapse is to be averted, and this glorious edifice of American economic well-being not turn into a house of cards.

I do not have to dwell on the disastrous consequences of economic collapse in speaking before a group like this. Your own industry is peculiarly sensitive to the ripples of the economic tide, either for good or for ill. Inflation, I know, is already a serious problem to you; a sudden deflation would be calamitous.

During investigations in which I participated this past summer and fall as a member of the eastern subcommittee of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, on an assignment from the Congress to seek out some of the basic factors responsible for the steadily soaring price level on the eastern seaboard, we heard abundant evidence from businessmen of the continued shrinkage of mass purchasing power as a result, primarily, of upward food prices and of the prices of other primary necessities. Department store executives, although conceding increasing sales volumes in dollars—and higher profits—nevertheless acknowledged serious concern over a declining sales volume in units. They discovered significant buyer resistance on many items heretofore considered necessary items, and the explanation for this resistance was almost unanimous—other items considered of more primary necessity to the family were siphoning off a disproportionate share of the consumer purchasing power.

Food was the dominant item in this category. Housing was another. Overspending on these items—overspending based more on compulsion than on extravagance—meant underspending on other consumer needs.

Business has not yet felt the full impact of this unbalance, but business has seen sufficient signs of future danger to be worried about it, and well it might. If allowed to continue unchecked, the trend can be disastrous.

I have no intention or desire to stand before you tonight and deliver a professorial lecture on elementary economics. Although we Members of Congress are always suspected

of attempting to pose as experts on every subject which happens to brush against our coat sleeves in legislation passing across our desk. I do not pretend to be an economic oracle. If I did, all that would be necessary to make me feel foolish would be to recall the violent disagreements taking place among the experts who spend their entire lives in continual study of all the factors involved in our economic situation.

Furthermore, I would not presume to try to convince you gentlemen, who every day must risk your investments on your own individual interpretations of the economic facts of life, that I know more about your business and business generally than you do.

Nevertheless, as a Member of the United States Senate, where almost daily we must face problems which vitally affect you and all business and all of us as citizens of this democracy and of the world, I have the responsibility of informing myself as thoroughly as possible on the great issues of the day so that my actions and my votes in the Senate will be based insofar as possible on reason and knowledge rather than on prejudice and hunch.

When you extend me the courtesy of listening to me expound some of my views, I think the least I owe in return is honesty in the presentation of my opinions on those things on which my views and my votes are important to you as constituents and as Americans.

That is why I feel I must intrude a degree of pessimism into this otherwise pleasant occasion.

In the past year I have noted a rather alarming retreat on the part of many Americans, including some in influential positions, into a lost past which I firmly believe can never be recaptured. We hear again the nostalgic talk of the good old days of isolationism and of economic anarchy of the 1930's.

The basis for this nostalgia is understandable, even if we cannot approve it. After all, the upheavals which have occurred in America and in the world in the last 20 years have constituted a series of shocks, one after another, which could not have left us in anything but a somewhat nervous condition. Our entire economic outlook in the United States was completely revolutionized in those 20 years and many who can remember their comparative freedom from any variety of interference from Government in their business affairs still look back with uncompromising longing for those old days. Internationally, those 20 years saw the complete destruction of a peace which we had thought was permanently won and the resurgence across civilization of forces which we could hardly imagine could exist in this twentieth century—bestial, depraved, savage forces which, for a time, threatened to engulf all humanity. Then came the most terrible war mankind has known, climaxing, in the discovery of atomic energy, the age-long search of man for the power with which to destroy his fellow men, himself, and his world.

Again we had peace—and high hopes. And now those hopes have been cruelly bruised by national hatreds and nationalistic ambitions once again on the march.

When a man is hit often enough on the head with a baseball bat, he may develop immunity to the blows—and become senseless and spiritless—or he may try to escape the blows by ducking. If he is always frustrated in his attempts to duck—if he still gets bashed in the head with that ball bat despite every effort to dodge—he must eventually go insane. We in America, and peoples everywhere, for that matter, have been experiencing such a constant series of blows for those 20 years just past—and some among us have become so used to them they no longer pay any attention to them—they are insensible to the shocks—while others are engaging in violent evasive action which fails to succeed. The great majority, however, not only here but throughout the world, I believe, are still seeking a way to curb those blows rather than helplessly sustain them or continue unsuccessfully to try to dodge them.

As a Nation of people who have invented the most amazing machines, in a world of people who have harnessed science to mankind's needs, we as a people and civilization generally have still failed to solve the primary human problem of living together in peace and in mutual assistance and friendship. All the terrible blows and shocks which fall upon us result from this failure to make good on the first and primary teachings of every religion mankind has known.

Our economic dangers here in our own America arise from that same failure, too.

This inflation in which we are now adrift did not suddenly develop from the whim of any one man or the manipulations of any small group of men in industry or in Government. It has been a mushrooming thing, arising primarily out of the selfishness and the greed of each and every American who attempted to profit at the expense of his fellows—to get whatever the traffic would bear.

Of course a lot of Americans got hurt by this, and for them there has been widespread sympathy, I might say universal sympathy, but when it comes to taking concrete steps to get at the core of this problem, each wants the other fellow to make the first sacrifice. Obviously, in that type of psychology—waiting for the other fellow to be the first repentant sinner—none will repent and none will make peace with his soul and his conscience.

Are we, then, to let this inflation run its course to the bitter end? We all in America say that such delay would be disastrous. Most of us in America realize our obligations in this respect are not confined to our own people and our own prosperity but to the entire world—for we know that the United States—a strong and solidly prosperous United States—is the sole and only hope at this moment in world affairs for the achievement of a decent peace and an enduring peace in a world where freedom might still continue to exist. Our help abroad is sorely needed, desperately needed. Yet it must be recognized if our own people at home are to suffer hardship and great denial through inflation and bust, the rush back to isolationism will be dramatic and swift and heartbreaking.

Already in my mail in the Senate I am receiving hundreds of communications from Pennsylvanians pinched by the high prices they must pay for food and other necessities who insist I vote against the Marshall plan or any form of aid to foreigners abroad because they have been led mistakenly to believe that the inflation at home is solely the result of our foreign-aid program. As we get into the Marshall plan debates in the Congress soon, this opposition will increase—unless we find means of curbing inflation.

I am finding also in my mail widespread opposition to the admission into the United States of even a pitifully few of the victims of Hitler brutality and of Communist regimentation and much of this opposition stems also from economic insecurity among large elements of the population at home. They are so convinced of the inevitability of depression in America that they fear—now, today, in the midst of this great boom end of continued labor shortages in America—they fear that any displaced persons admitted to this country threaten their own job security.

Yet we know we must help Europe regain her economic health; we know that in decency and in fairness and in justice and also because we want and need many of the brave souls in displaced-persons camps, that we must do our share in the world-wide problem of resettlement of the victims of totalitarian brutality. We know we must do these things not only because they are right and proper and just and decent things to do but also because we know that America's own future safety in a world of atomic bombs, and the safety of America's own brand of political freedom and decency, demand the existence of a world in which freedom and decency can survive unchallenged. Such a world cannot exist if we in rich and prosperous and well-fed America sit idly by while starvation and misery and desperation seize whole populations abroad.

So what do we do about it? To go back to that illustration of the hapless fellow being smashed on the head with a ball bat, I maintain that we must look into the facts objectively, study the curve of that swinging bat, analyze the force and the direction and the strategy behind it, and then boldly seize the club itself and wrest it away from our tormentor—in this case an unbridled economic force which now has us at its mercy.

We know what we must do abroad if we are to win a decent and peaceful world. It means sacrifices by us here, yes; it means resolute action and courageous action. It means the calling back into the fabric of our national thinking and values some of the spirit of brotherhood and sacrifice and religion which carried this country and all of our people triumphantly through the horrors of World War II.

It means guaranteeing American strength by guaranteeing the strength of our American economy—the economy which must bear the initial burden for world recovery. At present levels of production and income, we can bear that load now a thousand times easier than we could bear the financial burden of World War II or of any future war. In a depressed America, the load represented by the Marshall plan might well be impossible to sustain.

Without the Marshall plan, I am convinced we would be thrown at some future date into circumstances which might well lead to war—a war neither we nor civilization could afford. With the Marshall plan, we still face dangers; but no course, no bold instance of national and international initiative such as this plan reflects, was ever free of some dangers. The greater danger lies in inaction and in despair.

If we are to have a strong America as the best guaranty of a stable world, we must seize upon the inequities in our own economic situation; we must see to it that America's mass of good citizens enjoy decent standards of living, at decent wages enabling them to buy their needs at decent prices. Next spring we face a certain meat shortage in America. Are we to allow it to be rationed entirely by price—with the average worker priced out of the market? Would that make for labor peace in America? Would coal be mined if the miners were unable to afford meat?

Further wage raises by themselves would not solve the problem, and I sincerely believe the responsible leaders of labor all realize this. But wage raises—or at least, wage demands and strikes—are bound to occur if prices are not brought more in line with economic necessity.

What we must achieve in America now, in the midst of this inflation, as the only successful means of curbing this inflation and of assuring continuation of our prosperity, is sufficient purchasing power—actual purchasing power, that is—in the hands of our people to enable them to maintain decent standards. If our working people have money to spend on the things they help to produce, we all benefit and prosperity is assured.

This can come only through lower prices for necessities and through raising of the incomes of those in our lowest economic levels. With this spreading of purchasing power, in the presence of continued shortages of many strategic and necessary items, we must have

machinery to assure equitable distribution of those supplies which do exist. This does not mean a return to OPA.

It means, however, a return to economic sanity, to a measure of economic restraint, to some of that great and noble spirit which enveloped every real American during those terrible days of war—days when a fellow American was a friend, a brother, a comrade, a neighbor—and not just a sucker to be taken for all the traffic would bear.

Citation of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, by Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Statement by Senator Martin to Communist War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on January 27, 1948, in Statuary Hall of the United States Capitol, at a ceremony presided over by Hon. J. H. McVey, attended by Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, past national commander, and in the presence of a full color guard, the Department of the District of Columbia, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, presented to the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] a citation for outstanding achievement and patriotic service to his country.

On the same occasion, Hon. Charles M. Sullivan, chairman of Un-American Activities Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, praised the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, honor guests at the ceremony, and pledged to them the full and continued support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

In presenting the citation, Hon. Albert M. Armstrong, department commander, reviewed the distinguished military and civil career of our colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and emphasized particularly his loyalty to the institutions and governmental system of the United States. He recalled the speech made by the Senator from Pennsylvania on May 9, 1947, to a group of Communists, attending an alleged veterans' national convention of the Communist Party, in which he strongly rebuked them for their disloyalty to this country, and declared his own opposition and the opposition of the patriotic veterans organizations of the United States, and of all patriotic veterans, to communism.

I am happy to call to the attention of this body that a great veterans' organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, has again recognized the achievements and patriotism of our colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, outstanding military and civil leader, and that the organization, with other patriotic veterans, is engaged in an unrelenting fight against communism, and in the fight to preserve the institutions and governmental system of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the citation given the Senator from Pennsylvania by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania to Communist war veterans on May 9, 1947.

There being no objection, the citation and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREETINGS AND SALUTATIONS

To the UNITED STATES SENATOR OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, HON. EDWARD MARTIN:

Whereas, in true accordance with the established principles and high ideals exemplified throughout your military and civilian career, you, fearless of condemnation, did express your sincere sentiments in an address to a delegation of Pennsylvania Communists attending that party's veterans' national convention, such address appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, May 9, 1947, Eightieth Congress, first session, of which portion is quoted:

"First let me make clear that I respect the veteran and all that his uniform stands for. But when you come here, representing the Communist Party, you have no right to claim the respect and treatment due to veterans. No one can be faithful to American ideals and accept the teachings of communism.

"I will not now, nor at any future time, discuss the welfare of our veterans with men who uphold your communistic philosophy, even though you have worn the American uniform. Anything I have to say on that subject will be said to the officers and members of recognized veterans' organizations, or to other patriotic unaffiliated veterans. And if I want advice about veterans' needs, I shall go to those same groups. They recognize the great gulf between American freedom and communistic dictatorship. They do not straddle. They stand foursquare on the side of individual liberty and rights of freemen. You are on the other side.

"The Russian people can have the form of government they want. We are not trying to force our system on them. I will fight with all my power any effort to foist their system on this country whether it comes from you or anybody else.

"I have had over 40 years of service in the armed forces of my country, I love its uniform and its flag. I respect that uniform even when worn by a Communist, but I have no respect for the philosophy you have accepted."

Whereas we fully appreciate the manner in which you exercise the true spirit of democracy by being one of our kind of folks, in witness of which you have said: "share the same concerns, the same fears, and the same high aspirations for our country's future. This devotion has been shaped by our kind of folks having worn our country's uniform in battle"; and

Whereas your outstanding military record throughout the 44 years of service, with which we are conversant, has brought you the distinction of advancement through the military ranks from private during the Philippine Insurrection, 1898, to commanding general of the Twenty-eighth Division, World War II in 1942; and

Whereas not being satisfied to rest upon your military laurels but desirous of serving your people, you as a civilian were inaugurated Governor of the State of Pennsylvania on January 19, 1942, and were elected to the United States Senate on November 5, 1946, and

Whereas your membership in the Hawkins Home Post, No. 927, Washington, Pennsylvania, of our beloved organization, makes us justly proud to claim you as a comrade, one in harmony with our spirit of comradeship and in full accord with the ideals for which we stand: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in appreciation of outstanding achievements, the expressed determination further to serve God, country, and fellow man—and in commendation for patriotic service and accomplishments we, the officers and members of the Department of the District of Columbia, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, do herewith present to you this citation.

Given under my hand and seal this 27th day of January 1948.

ALBERT M. ARMSTRONG,
Department Commander.
MARTHA J. REYNOLDS,
Department President of the Ladies Auxiliary.

Attest:

CLYDE W. KEHN,
Department Adjutant.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO COMMUNIST WAR VETERANS

I have left a busy Senate floor to see you, because you are Pennsylvanians. I have listened to you. Now I want to tell you what I have got to say.

First let me make clear that I respect the veteran and all that his uniform stands for. But when you come here, representing the Communist Party, you have no right to claim the respect and treatment due to veterans. No one can be faithful to American ideals and accept the teachings of communism.

I will not now, nor at any future time, discuss the welfare of our veterans with men who uphold your communistic philosophy, even though you have worn the American uniform. Anything I have to say on that subject will be said to the officers and members of recognized veterans organizations, or to other patriotic unaffiliated veterans. And if I want advice about veterans' needs, I shall go to those same groups. They recognize the great gulf between American freedom and communistic dictatorship. They do not straddle. They stand foursquare on the side of individual liberty and the rights of freemen. You are on the other side.

The Russian people can have the form of government they want. We are not trying to force our system on them. I will fight with all my power any effort to foist their system on this country whether it comes from you or anybody else.

I have had over 40 years of service in the armed forces of my country. I love its uniform and its flag I respect that uniform even when worn by a Communist, but I have no respect for the philosophy you have accepted.

Some of you, I believe, were willing to fight under my country's flag solely because Russia was fighting the same enemy.

As late as June 21, 1941, your party and its members in this country were denouncing Americans who opposed the Nazis as imperialistic and war mongers. At that late date you Communists could find nothing wrong with Adolf Hitler or the things he stood for. I remember well your slogan, "The Yanks are not coming."

The next day, June 22, 1941, the Nazis invaded Soviet Russia. On that day, and not until that day, was your party's hate for the unspeakable Nazi regime born. On that day, and not until that day, did you suddenly decide that fighting the Nazis was a holy cause and the highest form of democracy. Your slogan of the day before was dead.

That is one reason why I don't respect you.

I have some sympathy for those of you who have been misled while in the service or since. It is not too late for you to wake up.

It is inconceivable to me how you can follow the teachings of a nation whose basic

principles are violently opposed to everything America's uniform symbolizes.

You men stand here, veterans of the American armed services, but preaching alien communism. You are secure in your right to preach it and to criticize our country only because of this Nation's Constitution.

That is Americanism in action.

Is there any doubt what would happen if men like you convened in Moscow, in Russian uniform, to criticize the Soviet Government? Suppose for an instant you were able to get inside the walls of the Kremlin and to stand before the men who make Russia's laws. Suppose you were to tell them that you don't like the Soviet Union—to attack its leaders—and to say that America's form of government was better than Russia's.

You know what would happen.

The lucky ones among you would be those who faced a firing squad and died quickly. The others of you would go in chains to the slave camps, to toil and starve till you died the slow, hard way.

That is Soviet communism in action.

Yet, you have the colossal effrontery to tell the American Congress how you want things run.

There is a place for those of you who prefer to live under communism. I suggest that you go there and stay there.

If I can help to speed your departure, call on me.

I understand you are returning to your convention this afternoon to carry back my views. To assist you, I have made copies of my stand which you can present to your convention.

The Chicago Subway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a few days ago Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, delivered an address before the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, during the course of which he directed certain remarks to Mayor Kennelly, of Chicago, concerning a transaction in connection with FWA assistance in the construction of the Chicago subway. The address was delivered at the annual meeting of the association, held on January 21. I ask unanimous consent to incorporate General Fleming's thought-provoking address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mayor Kennelly, members, and guests of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry:

I have some business to transact here today, very pleasant and important business, with Mayor Kennelly, and it seems to me very fitting indeed that our transaction should take place on this occasion before this audience.

Annual meetings are always a good time to take stock, to look back and see what the years have brought, to look forward and try to see some of the things that lie ahead.

This association brings to bear on today's problems a long perspective—44 years, I believe. That is about the length of time that Chicago and its citizens have been subway conscious. The subway has been a familiar concept for four decades, but during much of that time it appeared unattainable.

Forty years take us back to the time of Daniel H. Burnham, the Chicago plan, and Burnham's oft-repeated injunction to those who help to mold a city's destiny:

"Make no little plans," Burnham said, "they have no magic to stir men's blood and probably will not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work. * * * Remember that our sons and grandsons are going to do things that would stagger us. * * *"

He was right on both counts, and I think the city of Chicago has provided a dynamic demonstration. Didn't Burnham call it "the unchanging genius of this place"?

That spirit was strong 11 years ago when Mayor Edward J. Kelly came forward with the fundamentals for a practical solution of Chicago's transportation problems. I am not going to detail the various steps between that proposal and October 25, 1938, which is the date of the subway grant agreement with the Public Works Administration for construction of Chicago's initial system of subways.

The major terms of that agreement are worth reviewing here today for several reasons, not all of them financial by any means. As you will recall, the Grant agreement dealt with many aspects of transportation, it was scrutinized closely by many civic groups as well as officials. And the very fact of its acceptance proved again that Chicago had lost none of her vision or determination. On the contrary.

Consider these major requirements and the responsibilities which they imposed:

1. The subway was to be built in accordance with engineering plans agreed upon by the Federal Government and the city.

2. The city agreed to do its utmost to bring about unification of its transit system and in so doing to create a new corporation which would forward this development satisfactorily.

3. The city agreed that the work was to be carried out under the supervision of both the city's and the Government's engineers.

4. The city agreed to prepare a comprehensive plan for the extension of the initial system of subways and further agreed that as soon as means were available it would first provide for the extension of both terminals of the Dearborn Street subway westward to Halstead Street and the removal or demolition of the elevated railway structure in Lake Street and Wabash Avenue in the Loop.

5. The construction of the Congress Street superhighway.

I do not propose to enlarge on the intricate and difficult problems which were implicit in such a far-reaching agreement. But I would like to discuss just one of the important matters covered by the agreement. On October 1, 1947, the Chicago Transit Authority, created through the cooperation of State and city representatives, acquired title to the properties of the surface and elevated lines. Thus, after many years of endeavor, the city finally achieved the unification of its local transportation facilities and, incidentally, fulfilled one of the major requirements of the Grant agreement. The State, the city, the Federal court, and the many others who have worked for unification deserve commendation for this accomplishment. We in the Federal Works Agency appreciate the privilege of having played a role in this worthy undertaking. With unification, other objectives of the Grant agreement will be fulfilled. The termination of the long-continued receivership and bankruptcy proceedings of the local transportation companies, the extension of universal transfer privileges to the users of the local transportation facilities, and the coordination, improvement, and modernization of the local transportation facilities can reasonably be expected through unification.

The State Street subway has been in operation since 1943, and I understand that the Dearborn Street subway should be completed in 1949. The comprehensive plan for the extension of the subways has been prepared and approved.

The fact that you have met those problems and the way in which you met them offers further proof of this great city's civic resourcefulness and determination. For I think we all know how much skill, patience, and cooperation were needed.

In other words, Chicago has carried out both the letter and the spirit of its agreement. That is, of course, the formal basis of my transaction with Mayor Kennelly. But I am going to tax his patience and yours a little further, for I do not believe that the money involved is the most important part of our transaction—not even when the sum is nearly $5,300,000 and the estimated total cost of this initial subway project comes to more than $64,000,000.

Behind the financial assistance which the PWA and the FWA have extended lies a long record of cooperation that has never been excelled to my knowledge, and I have seen many fine examples of teamwork between Federal, State, and local officials.

It is no exaggeration to say that such teamwork made possible and practical the subway program which is now going forward. Just what do I mean by that fulsome statement? Let me be quite specific.

Not so many years ago most engineers felt that subways were not practical for Chicago because of the character of the subsoil. But about the same time—back in the early thirties—Chicago had launched a great sanitation project. This undertaking called for construction of the two largest sewage treatment plants in the world, in addition to miles of sewers much the same in size and character as the tunnels which would house a subway.

The sanitary district requested and received a loan and a grant from PWA for the construction of such facilities. It is interesting to note that this occurred in 1933 at a time when the sanitary district was unable to obtain funds through private sources. Its bonds were selling on the open market much below par. The Goverment purchased the district's bonds at par upon a 4 percent interest basis and later was able to dispose of such bonds at a profit. Here then is an excellent example of appropriate relationship between the Federal Government and local and State governments.

In carrying out this project the sanitary district's engineering organizations worked closely with Government engineers under the able direction of PWA's project engineer, Joshua D'Esposito. The knowledge and know-how which they gained and shared were indispensable to the construction of a subway system. Without this know-how and the friendly, cooperative working relationships that were then established, the completion of the subway system undoubtedly would have been more difficult.

Yes, that earlier experience in teamwork made a great contribution to our engineering knowledge.

I would like to take another leaf from Daniel H. Burnham's book and discuss the human side of these plans and projects. Burnham saw in his dreams the finest commercial city in the world standing here on the shores of Lake Michigan—and that meant the finest city in which to work and live.

Today the lives and welfare of your citizens, no less than the growth and progress of your commerce and industry, are dependent on the adequacy of the transportation that is available. To a very large degree that means motor transport.

Let me digress a moment here. Some of you may well ask, "How does the Federal Works Agency fit in this picture?" Well, in the first place, when the Federal Works Agency was established it was assigned the task of gradually terminating FWA. Secondly, the function of the Federal Works Agency is to act as the main civilian construction arm of the Federal Government and to work with States and cities in the solution of common problems. That is, our operations are in the field, not in Washington. Our activities are concerned with highways, with public buildings, and with community facilities of all descriptions. We are not exclusively concerned with any one type of construction; rather we are concerned with the integrated growth of local communities, including many phases of urban development, if I may use that term. We act as a part of a team, and I say it with pride, as part of a team of top construction people representing the Federal Government, States, and localities interested in a cooperative solution of local problems. I think I can repeat that this very occasion testifies to an excellent example, not of bureaucracy from Washington, but of a cooperative effort on the part of many governmental jurisdictions. As I am sure you know, the Government contributes to both the Congress Street Superhighway and the Northwest Superhighway. The city is now buying rights-of-way on Congress Street. I believe the Federal Government's help on these two highways will come to about $20,000,000, as currently appropriated.

You know, too, that this money is channeled through the Public Roads Administration of the FWA. But once more I want to say that these financial transactions do not begin to measure the real contribution which we are making. Nor do they indicate the fine cooperation that is taking place between the Federal Works Agency and highway officials of Chicago, Cook County, and the State of Illinois.

At this point I want to mention another component of the Federal Works Agency—the Bureau of Community Facilities. BCF should be well known to some of you, at least, as a result of its advance planning program and because it administered war community facilities and services under the Lanham Act. BCF has advanced interest-free funds to cities, counties, and States to prepare plans and specifications for needed and useful public works—water supply and sewers, schools, highways, and the like. Some 400 of these advance planning projects were approved for counties and municipalities in the State of Illinois, for which nearly $3,350,000 of Federal funds was made available—to plan projects with a total estimated cost of about $236,000,000.

No more funds are currently available for additional planning, but bills which would restore this opportunity are pending in Congress.

The Public Buildings Administration is the third member of the Federal Works team and the largest manager of Federal property in urban areas. Federal offices and court buildings as well as the post offices are constructed and maintained by PBA in the localities and much else in addition. PBA is associated with many cities on their civic center plans. They are now actively engaged in cooperating with the Chicago Planning Commission in connection with the planning and location of future Federal buildings.

From this thumb-nail sketch of the Federal Works Agency, it should be clear that we have more than mere money to offer urban communities. As we are a construction agency, we like to look on ourselves as giving out construction services.

In this connection I want to underline one very important role which I think we are especially well fitted for—that is in working with cities to formulate plans and programs for urban redevelopment. In the past, the Public Roads Administration has worked closely with the highway commissions of State governments and their staffs. PRA helped the States build their modern highway systems. Recently Congress has authorized an extension of this function to include urban highways and at present, again in partnership with the State governments, a new chapter is being written. It could well be called City-State-Federal teamwork on highway building.

It goes without saying that express highways, like the West Side and Northwest superhighway, are of the utmost importance in urban redevelopment. They will act as boundary insulators and traffic expediters serving many urban redevelopment areas of the future. Meanwhile they will provide probably substantial relief from the traffic problems which exist in this and every other city. More than any other single element, highways are the backbone of an urban community and the underlying basic consideration in the over-all city or metropolitan plan.

That is why not only highway planners but housing planners, urban redevelopers, and city planners must more and more join hands. Their technical and administrative resources combined offer more than the sum of their separate parts. Surely, since urban redevelopment is a team proposition, local, State, and Federal officials and private groups are going to be associated as never before.

As these programs are advanced, the Federal Works Agency stands ready to help. We have a considerable reservoir of knowledge and experience for you to draw upon. The importance of this cooperation has been well stated in the Second Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisors to the President last month. I quote:

"The application of some Government resources at all levels to the preparatory stages of urban redevelopment would have an extraordinary leverage effect upon opportunities for the private employment of men, money, and materials. Just as the hard surface road accelerated the automobile industry, and the automobile industry in turn touched so many points in our growth after the First World War, so an appropriate exercise of public initiative in urban redevelopment could serve to touch off varied economic developments of almost incalculable proportions."

Mayor Kennelly, I might say that I don't often have this pleasant a task to perform, and I do want to assure you that there is enough more where this came from to cover the balance of our commitment to the city.

In the meantime, let this advance payment carry with it my heartiest congratulations on a great undertaking, well conceived and ably executed.

Editorial Tribute to the Late Josephus Daniels From the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a tribute to the late Josephus Daniels, which appeared in the New York Times on January 16, 1948. Mr. Daniels was always opposed to imperialism in any form. He preached against it in the columns of his paper, and as Ambassador to Mexico he tried to undo, in his short tenure, the damage which had been done in the hundred years preceding. He was a truly great American.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOSEPHUS DANIELS

Americans whose adult memories go back to the First World War will find it hard to believe that Josephus Daniels was in his eighty-sixth year when death came to him yesterday. Their picture of him was formed when he was President Wilson's Secretary of the Navy, and this picture stuck—a shrewd, kindly man with smiling wrinkles about the eyes, wearing a wrinkled suit, a flowing bow tie, and a slouch hat; a man out of an older and more rural America who was entirely at home in this new America. His critics poked fun at him and some denounced him because he took beer and wine out of the fighting ships, because he changed "port" and "starboard" to "left" and "right," and because he was concerned about the common sailor. But when war came, in 1917, the Daniels Navy was found to be in grand fighting trim. He was similarly assailed in 1933, when President Roosevelt sent him as Ambassador to Mexico, but he made warm friends down there and was a principal architect of the existing firm structure of good over-the-border relations.

He called himself a sort of "managing editor of the Navy," and was at heart a newspaper man all his working life. He first smelled ink when he was twelve, and by getting up early, working late, and publishing the truth as he saw it, he made the Raleigh News and Observer not only a power but a property. Like his friend the late William Jennings Bryan, he was a prohibitionist. His deep religious faith gave him serenity.

His life spanned part of a civil war and two great world conflicts. It linked the present with the best qualities of the past. He was a distinguished statesman and a notable editor, but above all he was a homespun, lovable, profoundly sincere American, of a type we greatly need today and can't always seem to find.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the St. Lawrence seaway, appearing in today's New York Times. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD for the reason that, in my opinion, it is a very fair editorial and expresses extremely well some of the feelings I have on this difficult subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate has now embarked upon debate of a subject which has engendered more controversial heat, display of sectional self-interest, and contradictory supporting evidence than almost any other congressional issue that can be recalled. President Truman, as did his predecessor, has appealed for support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project on the grounds that it will "strengthen and expand our industry, our agriculture, our domestic commerce, and our

foreign trade." He also argues for it on the basis that it will develop the largest potential hydroelectric power site in the Nation. He contends that the project is vitally essential to national defense.

A vigorous attempt was made in 1941 to undertake the seaway and hydroelectric program as a war measure. We opposed it editorially at that time, when it was advocated by the late President Roosevelt as an urgent defense measure, on the ground that it could not be finished in time to be useful in the war, and that it would mean diversion of sorely needed manpower and materials. We believe time has proved the correctness of this position.

Today, we believe, this important matter should be decided on the basis of the broadest national considerations. It should not be decided, for instance, on the grounds of what is good or bad for New York City. Nor can the argument be properly grounded on the interests alone of certain of the Great Lakes ports. Mayor O'Dwyer, whose office naturally requires that he devote his concentrated attention to advocating what will preserve and enhance the welfare of his own city, is making an active fight against the seaway. He fears that it will wreck New York's position as a port, and would endanger the prospects of financing the great harbor improvements we hope to begin here soon. The mayor will be pardoned for seeing the seaway with one eye only. But Congress cannot and should not be swayed by sectional considerations. It must look to the larger future and the greatest good of the greatest number.

It is necessary to distinguish, within the maze of controversy, the important fact that these are really two projects, and not one. The seaway, which would provide passage through locks to Great Lakes ports of oceangoing vessels for about 7 months of the year, is one of these. The power project is the other, and it should be divorced completely from the seaway in deciding the issue whether either is to be built. Whatever view is accepted as to advisability of the power development, it can proceed on the St. Lawrence without the seaway, and should be decided on its merits alone.

While the seaway is an idea that has long gripped the imagination, it must be noted that there are reputable people of proved good judgment who are opposed to it, and that they back their opinion with plausible arguments. The Port of New York Authority has pointed to the questionable figures on construction cost, toll revenues, traffic, economies to shipping, and the absence of consideration given to the costly necessity for deepening and improving Lakes ports and channels for deep-draft vessels. Some high Army and Navy officers have noted the weaknesses of arguments that the seaway is "vital" to our defense. It can, indeed, be logically argued with some force that the seaway would be a net addition to our defense problems. The Senate committee minority report makes some very impressive points in this respect.

There is, finally, the question—in the face of large and necessary outlays to assist recovery abroad, our huge war-inherited national debt, and the urgent desirability of certain other costly improvements—whether the seaway and power projects warrant priority. As the Senate minority report said, "The basic problem resolves itself down to this: It is not simply a question of whether a project is useful. It is, in the last analysis, a question whether it is more useful than some other project." One of these other projects is the building of a sea-level Panama Canal, or contriving some other means of making that essential sea passage less vulnerable. President Truman himself has stated this need, and it means an expenditure of perhaps two and a half billion dollars. Can we undertake a St. Lawrence and a Panama program simultaneously? Which comes first? There is also the demand of Missouri Basin States that the Federal Government spend nearly two and a half billion dollars in flood control, soil conservation, a navigation and electric power development in their area.

To state the arguments against and the questions involved in the St. Lawrence developments, and the alternative demands of our Federal resources, is not necessarily to endorse those arguments. But certainly they are substantial enough to compel both friends and foes of the St. Lawrence improvement to put the highest national interests in control of their vote, forgetting political and selfish sectional advantages.

The Old Master

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Advance, Lynchburg, Va., of January 16, 1948, making reference to the speech in Lynchburg, Va., made by former Postmaster General James A. Farley.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OLD MASTER

In addressing the annual meeting of the Lynchburg Chamber of Commerce James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, exhibited succinctly and suavely, with keen intelligence and wit, the qualities that brought him to his former prestige in the Democratic Party, in political circles generally, in the Government, and to the continuing high place he holds with all who know him and know very much about him.

Because of his friendship with the late Senator Carter Glass, and what he said of him in his address, Mr. Farley spoke to a Lynchburg audience, and by radio to a State audience, as if he were a citizen of Lynchburg and many of his listeners must have felt this and warmly accepted him.

In his support of the Marshall plan, fully recognizing the place and responsibility of the United States in the world, and in his remarks in general upon the vital matters affecting the present and future of this country, Mr. Farley spoke with a statesman's grasp of affairs and point of view. Especially in his plea for nonpartisanship in foreign policy did he exhibit those qualities that made one of the most astute politicians of his time rise at need above politics to hold the respect of the opposition and proclaim himself first an American of exceptional loyalty and devotion to the national welfare.

In his references to Mr. Wallace and his third party, Mr. Farley showed how, without malice, the most penetrating and devastating comment can be made.

The Farley address established a high level for the annual chamber of commerce programs, and obtaining him for this meeting is something meriting the thanks of this community. "Big Jim," the old master of Democratic politics, distinguished American, has further established himself as an honorary citizen of this community.

More Post Offices, More Money for Postmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Home News, Bronx and Manhattan, New York City, entitled "We Want More Post Offices; Postmen Need More Money," appearing under date of January 27.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A BETTER BRONX—WE WANT MORE POST OFFICES; POSTMEN NEED MORE MONEY

For a better Bronx would belie its own name were it to minimize the borough's need for the 15 post-office projects Postmaster Goldman hopes to wring from a slash-the-budget GOP Congress.

These would be a boon to populous neighborhoods now underserved. The Parkchester and Jerome Avenue-Fordham Road areas, slated for new branches, are prime examples.

For thousands of Bronxites, the Goldman scheme holds promise of stations nearer their homes, shorter waits, and expedited mail pick-ups and deliveries.

But greater is the need and more urgent the want of underpaid clerks and carriers on whose loyal labors the efficiency of present or augmented facilities must mainly depend.

For them, a substantial salary rise is not a mere matter of convenience. It is a matter of feeding the children, as postal spokesmen declared at Senate hearings on the Chavez-Langer bill for a $1,000 yearly boost.

President Truman is keeping in abeyance the question of pay increases for Federal personnel. He would rather have effective anti-inflation laws.

But the plight of post-office workers is exceptional. Their basic scale, starting at $2,100, reaches a puny $3,100 top after 10 years. From 1925 to 1945, they had no raise. Since then, there have been two belated $400 boosts, but 2 years of worst inflation have elapsed since the second.

All uptown Congressmen back the Chavez-Langer measure. We commend them. We are glad to see conservative Bronx Republican Representative POTTS standing with Democratic colleagues for the $1,000 raise, instead of for an $800 proposal.

GOP axmen who aim to chop billions off the Truman budget, will be extra allergic to a pay-lift outlay not even in the budget listing. They may frown upon both the $1,000 and $800 plans.

We'll expect Potts and Washington Heights liberal Republican Representative JAVITS to help set them right. The postal army marches on its stomach. Its stomach mustn't be empty. Its faithful "couriers" are deterred by "neither snow nor rain," but this doesn't mean it can be left out in the cold.

The Bronx could sooner forgive Congress for withholding new post offices than for neglecting post office workers.

SQUEEZE ON SURFACE

The Home News supports Bronx Councilmen's demands for investigation of Surface Transportation Corp. inadequacies both under normal conditions and in snow. Perhaps no bus service in New York draws as much complaint.

Talk of cancelling the 50-year borough-wide franchise granted in 1940 to the parent

Third Avenue Transit System is premature, we admit. It may also be reckless, unless Third Avenue Transit's Bronx operations are ascertainably a financial good thing which the company would hate to lose, and unless some other big outfit could and would undertake to replace Surface at the same 5-cent fare. In Queens and Staten Island, the city of New York itself had to take over from franchised firms.

Orchard Beach service was terrible in the summer of 1946. The Bronx protested, the Public Service Commission intervened, and the summer of 1947 saw a healthy change. For years, Surface refused free transfer to the Fordham-City Island route from the Castle Hill Avenue and Boston Road lines. But it gave in when the city threatened to oust it from the lucrative Highbridge route.

Our Pacific Possessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY CORDON
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Pacific Possessions" from the New York Times of Sunday, January 4, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PACIFIC POSSESSIONS

Among the measures Congress will have to deal with in its new session is a concurrent resolution for establishment of a Joint Committee of Senate and House to undertake a thorough study of the trusteed islands of the Pacific and make recommendations for their governance. We believe that this resolution should be acted upon favorably and promptly. The sooner the committee is appointed and sets to work the better. The question of the former mandates and of our other Pacific islands is one that calls for quick and intelligent solution.

The three former groups of islands that Japan held under mandate from the League of Nations—the Carolines, Marianas, and Marshalls—and which the United Nations turned over to the United States, are now governed by the Navy Department, as are Guam and Samoa. The latter have been governed by the Navy, as was to be expected and as was inevitable, and the trusteed islands also are being governed first from the viewpoint of national security, with the welfare of the island peoples secondary. That is an unnecessary and unsatisfactory arrangement.

The time is propitious for a revaluation of our attitude toward our "colonials" and for the formulation of policies that will make the United States a leader in wise and humane treatment of dependent peoples, instead of one of the laggards in this field, as we now are. With the Pacific islands no longer holding the strategic position that they did when Japan was a big and aggressive power, our military leaders are understood to be willing to relinquish the responsibility to some civilian authority. Organic acts have been drawn, with Navy Department collaboration, for the transfer of Guam and Samoa to such an agency, and a similar act for administration of the trusteed islands has been drawn by the State Department. This is piecemeal solution, however, of a problem that is integrated and should be considered as a whole. The joint committee proposed by Senator CORDON, of Oregon, would be authorized to take this broader view.

As Senator CORDON said, in proposing his resolution for establishment of the joint committee, Congress has done little thinking in the past about the offshore possessions of the United States. There has been a awakened interest, especially in the Pacific, the last 2 years. Such House leaders as Representatives CRAWFORD, POULSON, and GRANT have set their colleagues to studying maps and histories of that great ocean. Several Representatives saw Army or Navy service in that theater. The drives for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska have stimulated further interest. Senator VANDENBERG has put United States adherence to the South Pacific Commission on the "must" list of legislation for the coming session. A study by a joint committee next year should encourage Congress to do some intelligent planning of its own.

The President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in yesterday's Star there is a very important editorial under the caption of "Not 'phony'." It deals with a statement recently made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] with respect to the President's "phony" budget. I hope that all Senators will read this editorial, especially the Senator from New Hampshire. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD another editorial upon the same subject, found in the Washington Post of this date. It should be enlightening to my good friend the Senator from New Hampshire.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star]

NOT PHONY

Senator BRIDGES is on highly vulnerable ground in accusing the President of having submitted phony budgetary figures on the European recovery program.

The accusation is based on the fact that the President, in his budget message to Congress, has asked for an appropriation of $6,800,000,000 for the first 15 months of the ERP, but has estimated that the program's actual expenditures will amount to only $4,500,000,000 through June 30, 1949. Mr. BRIDGES is making a great to-do over this. He sees something slick and underhanded in it, and he suggests that he is going to do his best to cut the appropriation down to the estimated expenditures.

In taking this position, however, Mr. BRIDGES is either playing politics or betraying a degree of budgetary confusion that does not become him as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. To begin with, far from resorting to anything underhanded, the President has made a special point of explaining in his budget message why the requested appropriation is larger than the expenditures estimate. The explanation is simply this: (1) Under the ERP, the Government will have to place orders for goods far in advance of delivery; (2) payments for the goods will lag months behind the deliveries; (3) but though the actual expenditures in the fiscal year thus will be less than the appropriation, the appropriation must be had before the Government can place the orders.

In other words, although ERP expenditures in fiscal 1949 may be $2,300,000,000 less than the $6,800,000,000 appropriation sought by the President, that does not mean that the appropriation should be cut. If $6,800,000,000 is really needed for the first 15 months of European recovery, then that sum should be appropriated, though spokesmen for the Harriman committee apparently believe that this total forward obligating authority could be perhaps $1,000,000,000 less. In any case, with an adequate extra margin, the Government would be legally incapable of incurring the obligations it will assume in placing orders for the project—orders for things like machinery which may take several months to build and deliver and for which payment may not be made until late in fiscal 1950. To do as Mr. BRIDGES suggests, to appropriate no more than the estimate of actual expenditures through June 30, 1949, would be to undermine the ERP by placing it on a too-little-too-late basis. More than that, such a course would run counter to a sound, time-tried budgetary practice applied repeatedly in the past to large-scale procurement programs involving foreign shipments, such as Army operations, lend-lease, and UNRRA.

The President's budgetary set-up for European recovery thus is not only not phony; it is not even novel. Mr. BRIDGES may be able to make a loud political noise by arguing otherwise, but, like a drum, the issue he has raised seems altogether empty.

[From the Washington Post of January 30, 1948]

PHONY ECONOMY

Senator BRIDGES' charge that the President had sent a phony budget on the European recovery program to Congress is utterly unfounded. It may indicate nothing worse than that the Senator had failed to read the President's explanation of the discrepancy between the $6,800,000,000 appropriation requested for the first 15 months of ERP and the $4,500,000,000 budget cost of the program for the same period. The explanation is simple: the gap between requested appropriations and estimated expenditures would permit the recovery administration to ship and to place an additional $2,300,000,000 of orders during the fiscal year 1948-49 for which payment would not be made until the following fiscal year. That would enable officials in charge of the program to arrange, as the President explains, for more economical and systematic placement of orders.

The actual cost of the ERP would not be affected in any way by cutting down the amount of the initial appropriation, unless one assumes that the larger appropriation would be an encouragement to wasteful commitments. As a matter of fact, the danger that Marshall plan funds might be wasted would be decidedly increased if the ERP were hampered in carrying out its program by congressional restrictions on spending. Such a policy would impair the chances of success of the Marshall plan and be phony economy.

Nevertheless, it might be shrewd politics to reduce the size of the initial $6,800,000,000 appropriation (provided, of course, the sum voted was adequate to cover actual outlays during the 15-month period) as a concession to congressional reluctance to vote at this time for the spending of so large a sum. But the ERP not only has to have sufficient funds to pay its bills when they fall due, it must also be in a position to make deliveries of goods for which payment will not be required during the 15-month period.

Most of the $2,300,000,000 difference between estimated actual outlays and the $6,900,000,000 requested by the President will, in fact, be needed to meet payments on goods shipped during the 15-month period, but not paid for until the following fiscal year. Consequently, although it is not necessary for Congress to appropriate immediately the full sum requested for ERP, it is necessary for Congress to authorize the spending of most, if not all, the additional $2,300,000,000 requested. Otherwise the ERP would be severely hampered in carrying out its program because of inability to enter into contracts calling for future payment.

Under the circumstances, the $6,800,000,000 figure that Secretary Marshall regards as an irreducible minimum with which to start the program cannot be substantially reduced without jeopardy to the entire program. The most that can be done is to cut the initial appropriation to the amount required to cover actual outlays for the first 15 months. That would leave it up to Congress to review the program later on and vote the additional appropriations required to cover authorized obligations incurred in excess of the initial appropriation, as well as funds for the continuance of the program.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Ascension," published in the Boston Herald of January 28, 1948. The editorial deals with the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE ASCENSION

The St. Lawrence seaway and power perennial sticks its head out again, this time from Senate soil with the sunshine of a Truman instead of a Roosevelt political blessing. Its appearance has the customary and time-worn generalities of great engineering enterprise and rich natural resources and benefit to the whole United States that have met their match in specific objections from shipping and railroads and labor unions and commerce groups over the Nation as well as in directly affected New England.

Our own area remembers too acutely the vision and eventual nightmare that was Quoddy to take much stock in another walking dream aimed to harness not merely the tides but to bring a Middle West doorstep to the Atlantic Ocean. The waterway would be no year-round "sunny pleasure dome," but have the 5 months' obstacle of "caves of ice." This St. Lawrence balloon has been up again and again. The current Truman enthusiasm is nothing but a New Deal Sir Echo in backing the political instead of the practical.

Over its battered years, the St. Lawrence project has been successively a navigation imperative, a power blessing, a defense thanwhich, an unemployment (that didn't take place) panacea. Now, apparently, it is a chance to spend maybe a billion dollars for a part-time service on a theoretical self-liquidating basis, without benefit of precedent in tolls of engineering traffic survey. Somehow the raw mixture does not mellow with age.

Specifically, the waterway's proposed 24-foot draft does not accommodate ocean-going vessels. Ocean ships, too, are not designed in hull, engine, or steering gear for operation in swift current, narrow channels at low speeds. Picture, as an extreme, of course, the *Queen Mary* trying to negotiate the Cape Cod Canal. The railroads, with lines to established coast ports, would lose some of their pay load freight, and then have the physical burden tossed back in the tough going of winter months.

Canals now exist along the proposed system. Their improvement for practical purpose would be a matter of millions, not billions. And from the defense angle, the Great Lakes area—probably the sole beneficiary from the project—once proposed as a haven for wartime shipping, is now more susceptible to attack by air than the seaboard areas, west or east. One bomb on the dams of the project and the Great Lakes-ocean link would fall apart.

The St. Lawrence proposal, in its persistence, assumes the guise of a policy of attrition. In the endurance test, only flood control and soil erosion pleas have been missing in the cycle of arguments that the public power proponents customarily run. Rather than the interests blocking forward progress of a Nation's welfare, a small segment of the Nation seems determined that subsidized navigation and power shall be foisted on the taxpayers for the benefit of a few. We should do more than take air out of the balloon. It should be punctured for keeps.

Program of Baltimore Youth Advisory Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there has been wide general interest displayed, and, I am confident, much helpful awareness of youthful problems aroused among the younger people of our State, by the program initiated by the Baltimore Youth Advisory Board in paying public tribute to an outstanding boy and girl each month.

Announcement has just been made that the awards currently are being presented to William J. Riggin, 15, son of Harry R. Riggin, and Alverta Jones, 18, daughter of John E. Jones, a post-office employee, both of whom have been cited for outstanding excellence in accomplishments and deportment.

An account of the awards was published in the Baltimore Sun of Sunday, and I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AWARD HONORS HELPFULNESS—BOY AND GIRL OF MONTH HAVE AIDED YOUNGER CHILDREN

Selected for their services to others, a south Baltimore boy who hopes his home workshop will lead to a career in cabinet making and a northwest Baltimore Negro girl who plans to be a social-service worker are the boy and girl of the month for December.

The selection of William J. Riggin, 15, of 125 East Cross Street, and Alverta Jones, 18, of 1116 Whitelock Street, was announced yesterday by N. Ellsworth Bunce, adviser to the Baltimore Youth Advisory Board, sponsor of the monthly awards.

Will, as the boy is known at the Southern Police Boys' Club, where he is a self-appointed assistant to patrolman William Mitchell, shop instructor, is a serious youth, shy and quiet.

HELPS SMALLER BOYS IN SHOP

He spends most of his spare time helping the smaller boys in the club's shop, or making tables, chairs, and wooden toys in his own shop at home.

He was nominated as a superior representative of nearly 3,000 members of the city's four police boys' clubs, whose toy-making during the fall months brought a happy Christmas to several hundred worthy but poor children, who would otherwise have been without toys at Christmas.

He was recommended to the three judges—Thomas J. S. Waxter, director of the department of public welfare; Wallace Reidt, of the Criminal justice commission; and Mr. Bruce—by Patrolman William Armstrong, director of the Southern Boys' Club, and his principal, John N. Schwatka, of Southern Junior-Senior High School.

TO ENTER MORGAN COLLEGE

The girl of the month, who has been active in her Y. W. C. A. Teen Club, which recommended her, begins her studies for a social-service career early next month at Morgan College. By special arrangement, Alverta will enter Morgan a few days before her graduation from Douglass High School.

At Douglass, where she is a better-than-average student, Alverta has played the 'cello in the Dunbar-Douglass interschool orchestra for the last 3 years.

For her age, she has already had a broad social-service experience.

HELPER IN KINDERGARTEN

Besides her Y-Teen Club work, she has served as a helper in a kindergarten conducted by the Society of Friends, and as instructor in the Bible school of the Union Baptist Church, Druid Hill Avenue and Dolphin Street.

She was a delegate to the Y. W. and Y. M. C. A. high-school conference at Morristown, N. J., in 1946, and won a scholarship offered by the Society of Friends to attend the Institute of International Relations high-school conference at Northeast, Md., last August.

"I like working with others, especially with the younger children," Alverta says. She hopes to get her master's degree in sociology when she finishes at Morgan College, and to qualify as a Y secretary.

FATHER IS POST OFFICE CLERK

Her father, John E. Jones, is a clerk in the parcel-post department of the post office here.

The toys Will took a lead in making for the needy and crippled children included wooden "Black Marias"—police patrol wagons—pull toys, fire engines and trucks for boys, and small jewel boxes of highly polished cherry wood for girls.

During the summer, Will plays second base for the Baltimore Tigers' sand lot baseball team, and helps his father, Harry R. Riggin, with general painting and repair work. He attends Lee Street Baptist Church.

WELL EQUIPPED HOME WORKSHOP

He has equipped his home workshop with a table saw, a jigsaw, a sander, and hand tools.

Will's grades at Southern Junior High School are all above average, but his best record is in his specialty, the manual-training course.

Begun last spring, the Youth Advisory Board awards are made to draw public attention to "youth excellency" as opposed to juvenile delinquency.

Winners of the monthly awards become candidates for the titles Boy and Girl of the Year and for trophies donated by the Sunpapers. Selection of the annual awards will be announced at the Youth Advisory Board's annual city-wide student convention in April.

Continuation of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made today before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, considering Senate bill 1741, to continue rent control.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First of all, I want to express to the chairman of this subcommittee, Senator CAIN, of Washington, my appreciation for the pledge he has made to be disinterested and objective in his approach to the subject of continuing rent control despite his expressed general opposition to the theory and practice of rent control.

I am sure previous witnesses have already convinced the entire subcommittee that the housing situation in the United States is still desperate and that rent control must be continued. Nearly all of the members of the subcommittee, as I recall, have already gone on record in appreciation of the need for an extension, and so I know it is unnecessary for me to duplicate this ground by calling up a battery of statistics to prove what we all see every day in our contacts with our citizens.

Of course there is the opposition of some of the organized segments of the real estate industry to any further continuation of rent control—sentiment for the murder and burial next month of rent control—but I think this opposition can be considered largely pro forma and irresponsible. From the very start of rent control in 1942, this element contended without any let-up that rent control was unnecessary, even in war.

I am appearing before you today primarily in behalf of my own bill, S. 1741, which up to a few weeks ago was the only rent control extension bill pending before the Senate. Beginning this month, several new bills were introduced, all of which vary either in basic philosophy or in detail, or both, from my bill. I want to make clear to the subcommittee that although I would of course be pleased to see my bill made the vehicle for extending rent control, nevertheless, my main interest is, first, to see that rent control is extended, and second, to have rent control materially strengthened in line with the anti-inflation recommendation of President Truman, made in his message to the Special Session of Congress in November and reiterated by him in His State of the Union message earlier this month.

When I introduced my bill last July, shortly after the enactment of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, which took effect July 1, and under which rent control is now administered, I did not have the benefit of experience under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 because the act was so new. Thus, in attempting to amend and strengthen that act, as well as to provide for its extension beyond the coming February 29, I had to depend to a large extent, in drafting my bill, on my own estimate and on the estimates of various individuals whom I consulted as to how the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, which was then so new, would actually work in practice.

It has been a source of some surprise and of great satisfaction on my part that the bill I submitted at that time has stood up so well in relation to developments which have occurred since I introduced it.

There have been, however, some developments which could not very readily have been foreseen in July of 1947, but which today obviously cry for remedial action and, as a result, I will, as I go along, recommend some changes in my bill to bring it up to date and to meet new situations unforeseen as we began our experience under the so-called Wolcott Act.

These changes will, I believe, improve the bill, but will not materially change any of the fundamentally important aspects of it. As I said, experience under the Wolcott Act since July 1 has more than justified the basic approaches which my bill contained from the start.

The members of the subcommittee, I presume, are already familiar with the main points of my bill, and I will merely cite them now for the purpose of refreshing your memories.

First, and most important, I think, it would halt the present chaos in regard to evictions. This is the No. 1 necessity for adequate rent control. I will develop this matter later in my presentation, but right now I want to say that we cannot consider rent control effective in preventing widespread hardship and dislocation as long as tenants throughout the country can be thrown out of their accommodations almost over night.

The second important feature of my bill, in order of importance, is recontrol of new rental construction and of new conversions and of the so-called voluntary-lease accommodations and of nearly all other types of accommodations which were decontrolled under the Wolcott Act.

The third important change from the present act made under my bill is the restoration to the Housing Expediter of all of the enforcement powers including criminal sanctions and triple-damage civil actions, which that office held and used up until the time the Wolcott Act took effect last July 1.

A fourth important provision of the bill is the reestablishment of jurisdiction within the emergency court of appeals on all litigation involving rent control. As you know, the present act and, I think, most of the other bills to extend the act, leave jurisdiction in any State or Federal court, so that practically every State court in the Nation is suddenly put in charge of a complex type of litigation with which it has had no previous experience, whereas the emergency court of appeals, all through the war and up until last July 1, accumulated a massive historical experience on such matters.

THE VOLUNTARY LEASES

The matter which seems most to be bothering the members of the subcommittee according to press reports of interviews with you gentlemen, and of statements some of you have made so far in the hearings, is what to do with landlords and tenants involved in these voluntary leases in order to be fair to them now that rent control is about to be extended, in complete contradiction of the express statement on the part of Congress last year that rent control definitely would end on February 29, 1948.

As the Housing Expediter testified here the other day, there are only about three choices in solving this dilemma. One would be to raise everybody's rent 15 percent. That method would be designed to make up to the one million or more tenants who signed rent increase leases under the Wolcott Act the fact that, had they not signed such leases, they would not have been better off. They signed, in many cases, because they faced the threat that otherwise they would have no protection against rent increases come next March 1. I sympathized with the dilemma many of these one million or more tenants faced in deciding to sign such leases.

However, the great bulk of the tenants of America either refused to sign such leases or were not even extended the opportunity to do so because their landlords perhaps figured it was better to wait until rent control ended and there were no ceilings on rent rather than to tie themselves up all through 1948 on a set rental schedule. Those tenants who refused to sign such leases when they were proffered to them ran the risk of having their rents raised substantially more than 15 percent after March 1. The suggestion that these tenants now have their rents raised 15 percent or so would thus force them to do what they had declined voluntarily to do. Any formula to increase all rents by a flat percentage would be a discrimination against those landlords who had voluntarily agreed to give their tenants long leases at an increase less than 15 percent. They may have thought they were being very decent in asking the tenant to agree to less than 15 percent in such a lease, but if the suggestion now being made is written into the act raising all rents by 15 percent, these particular landlords would be justified in feeling that their decency had boomeranged against them.

There are better arguments than that, however, against raising all rents 15 percent. The most important single argument against it is that such a step would be a terrific blow to our hopes for curbing this galloping inflation and restoring a semblance of economic sanity in this country before we let inflation push us off the cliff onto the rocks of depression.

The second choice in meeting the problems arising out of these voluntary leases is to leave them in effect unchanged. This is the choice taken in my bill. This provision in my bill is based on the assumption that the tenants who signed these leases actually did receive something for their money—they received primarily a guarantee of security in their tenancy throughout 1948 which other tenants do not have and will not have even if rent control is continued and eviction controls restored. That is because these leases are iron-bound. The tenant cannot be evicted for any reason other than violation of the terms of the lease. Sale of the dwelling he occupies cannot lead to his eviction at any time during 1948 or however long the lease extends beyond next January 1. These tenants, I repeat, are therefore, safe in their tenancy and no tenant who has not signed such a voluntary lease has that same guaranteed security. Even if full eviction controls, such as proposed in my bill, are written into the law, it will still be possible for many tenants during 1948 to lose possession of their homes. Thus the tenants who did sign leases actually did get something for their money. For that reason, I do not think we must punish all of the other renters of America by raising their rents 15 percent in order to be fair to those who, for one reason or another, voluntarily entered into rent-increase leases during 1947. I was against the provision of the Wolcott Act which authorized the 15-percent increase leases, and I was against the flat statement written into the bill that rent control would end February 29, 1948, because I was sure rent control would not end and could not end so quickly, and that by writing into the law the provision it now contains, the Congress was merely scaring a lot of Americans into raising their own rent voluntarily.

The third choice in dealing with these leases would be to invalidate them—roll all rents back to what they were before those leases took effect. This step, I believe, would be unconstitutional, and I don't want an unconstitutional bill enacted. Equally important, it would be unfair to those landlords who negotiated leases in order to improve the property and obtained tenant consent to the leases on that basis. This is not to say that I do not have full sympathy for those who signed the leases I am referring to under various types of coercion and intimidation. I tried to help them last year when this whole difficulty could have been avoided. I repeat that although they may have been forced to sign such leases in order to achieve a sense of security in their accommodations, they do have that security, and so the money they are paying is not a total loss.

Those were the three choices which occurred to the Housing Expediter when he testified here recently on how the voluntary lease dilemma could be resolved in a rent extension bill. His suggested method, incidentally, was the same one which is contained in my bill—that is, allowing all such leases to continue until their termination date without raising everyone else's rent.

Now, gentlemen, the fact remains that Congress made a blunder—a bad blunder—in promising flatly last June that all rent control would end next March 1. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who was chairman of this subcommittee last year, told me in an exchange on the floor of the Senate last June that rent control would be extended if the need for it were proved this year, but he insisted the need would not exist and that insofar as he was concerned, the bill we passed last June would be the last rent control bill. A majority of other Members of the House and Senate took the same view.

They were wrong. They underestimated the need. They miscalculated. On the basis of a judgment which turned out to be faulty, of a calculation on their part which turned out to be over-optimistic and unrealistic, over a million tenants and their landlords proceeded on the theory that rent control would definitely end a few weeks from now, and those tenants and their landlords proceeded to negotiate iron-bound leases protecting the tenants against that eventuality, and, at the same time, granting the landlord an immediate rent increase. And now there is this feeling among some Members of Congress that extension of rent control now would, in some way, be unfair to this group of tenants and landlords.

Gentlemen, it might be unfair to most of the tenants so affected and to some of the landlords—landlords now collecting a higher rent than they might otherwise be getting—but the unfairness arising in this situation is due entirely to the miscalculations—the mistakes—of the Congress which voted last June for the individual provisions of the Wolcott Act, which caused this present difficulty. We should not force all the millions of tenants in America to suffer for that mistake.

We should, I believe, recognize the extreme and far-reaching effects of our actions in this body and should be conscious at all times of the responsibilities we have to the Nation and to the people of the Nation. That responsibility was forgotten, I am afraid, in the drafting and enactment of this phase of the Wolcott Act. If any Government agency or minor bureaucrat were to be guilty of an error in judgment of the magnitude of this one when it was made by the Congress last June, the screams emanating out of the Congress in the direction of that hapless soul would be piercing enough to hound the poor fellow to Timbuctoo, where he would be forced forevermore to hide in shame for his sins.

In all fairness, then, the Congress should admit its mistake and proceed expeditiously to remedy it. Because the whole philosophy of the Wolcott Act now in operation was that rent control was sure to expire this coming month, the act was in outline and in specific detail a rent-decontrol act.

The fallacy of decontrol so soon is now obvious. Rather than patch up a bad law as you might retread an old tire for a few more miles of duty when you are still on a long trip, we should go back and correct the fundamental weaknesses of this act and restore rent control, insofar as possible, to what it was prior to last July 1.

It is not possible to restore it completely to its old form in view of the irreparable damage already done through such provisions as widespread decontrol and the 15-percent leases. But we must get back as closely as possible to the previous act, which was designed to run as long as the need for it existed, whereas the Wolcott Act was expressly designed as nothing more than an 8-month stopgap.

Now, to be specific, in connection with the changes provided in my bill:

1. Eviction controls: The present act, for the first time, sets up definite standards governing evictions by law. Previously, the authority to regulate eviction rested with rent-control officials who, in turn, set standards which, on the whole, operated fairly. The OPA, and later the Housing Expediter, set uniform policies and provided, among other things, for stipulated waiting periods before a tenant could be evicted. These waiting periods were designed to prevent those who could afford to buy homes from evicting the occupants overnight when, in hundreds and hundreds of instances, there was just no place for the occupant to move.

These waiting periods undoubtedly caused a certain amount of inconvenience and perhaps even hardships to families who had purchased homes because they could find no other way in which to obtain shelter, and then had to wait to get into them, but the inconvenience was at least overcome by the fact that these same purchasers were often protected in their old quarters until they could move into their new ones. Even though there was a high turn-over in real estate during the period in which these waiting periods on evictions were in effect, it was mild compared to the experience since last July when tenants became subject to eviction on almost no notice at all. A prospective purchaser, who might otherwise have kept up the search for a vacant dwelling, knowing he would have to wait as long as 6 months to get the occupant out of a property he bought, now has to wait at most only about 30 days to get into his new house, and the inclination then is to go ahead and buy.

I am certainly no opponent of real estate sale of tenant-occupied properties, but I do think that in view of the continuing shortage of available rental housing—and the tremendously inflated costs of new homes—it is cruel and un-American to allow Americans to be pushed around and deprived of any security whatever in their occupancy of a home. Many cities have attempted to meet this problem by setting up local eviction controls but, as has already been testified here by representatives of some of the cities, it appears likely that many of these local ordinances will be found to conflict with State constitutions or State laws.

Some of the proposed rent-control bills before you would specify definite waiting periods prior to eviction. My bill refrains from writing into law inflexible standards which may become onerous or impractical in particular areas or situations, and instead, it restores the power to the Housing Expediter to establish what standards the day-to-day conditions warrant. As housing supply becomes more nearly in line with demand, these rules can be relaxed. If written into law, however, they could not be relaxed or strengthened, either way, except by law. A few months after the Congress enacts this new rent legislation, the Eighteith Congress will be drawing to a close and it will be next January before any changes could take place in rent laws. On the other hand, if he had the necessary authority, the Housing Expediter could, and should, revise regulations according to developing conditions.

The present eviction control standards, besides their general inadequacy, work hardships on landlords as well as on tenants. Under a law setting up a narrow range of fixed reasons for evictions, the landlord finds himself bound in without any recourse. To give a simple illustration: under OPA, and until last July 1, a property owner could obtain possession of his property for members of his immediate family—a veteran son, for instance, just back from the service; a daughter who might marry. Under the present act, however, with its definitely stated eviction causes, the landlord can evict a tenant on possession grounds only if the landlord himself is to occupy the premises. This is much too strict a standard and allows no leeway for circumstances or cases. Now, rather than patch up this inadequacy by amending the law to set down additional standards for eviction, the sensible thing to do is to restore to the proper officials, the Housing Expediter's Office, the authority to set standards according to conditions, rather than according to the theories of this Member of Congress or that.

The worst feature of present eviction controls, or lack of them, is that no one today knows what is occurring in this country in regard to evictions under the present act. The Joint Committee on Housing has no reliable information on it. The Housing Expediter has no way of finding out, for no one has to inform him of any eviction actions. This committee of Congress perhaps could have found it out if it had put its staff to work on the assignment, as I had requested it to do last November in urging that hearings be held during the special session of Congress on rent control extension.

I pointed out, in a letter to Chairman TOBEY November 16, that since the decontrol features of the Wolcott Act were based on the thoroughly mistaken expectation that rent control could end by March 1, 1948, that the hearings should develop whether there was any justification for the relaxations in controls which were legislated in the Wolcott Act. Those relaxations which could not be justified in terms of results, should, I said then, be corrected in a new bill.

As for eviction controls, I asked that the committee determine through its hearings and the efforts of its staff whether elimination of Federal controls has, in any way whatsoever, contributed anything to the alleviation of the housing shortage—which is, of course, our fundamental concern. I asked, also, that a complete picture be obtained by this committee of the extent of hardship which has been visited upon tenants as a result of the elimination of eviction controls and the fact that masses of our people can be and have been thrown out on the street on 30 days' notice or less.

I do not know whether the committee is in possession of any factual information on this matter. I sincerely think that unless proof is available that these hardships on the part of many Americans are making it possible in some way for more housing to be built, that we must end those hardships by restoring controls.

We know the hardships are occurring. We don't know whether they have been worth it in terms of additional housing. There is no evidence that it has been worth it. Therefore, I say, in the absence of any evidence, that it is in the public interest for tenants to be subject to 30-day dispossession of their homes in this period of acute housing shortages, let's protect the tenants.

The original real-estate industry has a novel argument against this; one which perhaps has not been brought to the attention

of the committee, but which certainly has been brought to the attention of real-estate brokers. It is this:

"The larger part of the housing market for years has been persons who bought existing homes for their own occupancy. If this is shut off by legislation, wouldn't the business of realtors be most seriously affected?"

Now, of course, no responsible person proposes that all tenants be frozen indefinitely in occupancy. It is a very brazen distortion of fact to say that the reestablishment of waiting periods in evictions would seriously affect the real-estate broker. All during the war, and up to last July, brokers made sales and commissions on sales involving tenant-occupied properties. The brokers will continue to sell tenant-occupied homes under my bill and will continue to make their fees. The difference is, however, that the tenant would have a breathing spell in which to find new quarters. Is that too much for him to ask for?

By restoring the old Federal controls over evictions, as my bill provides, he would end this travesty in which no one knows what is going on in such a fundamental field as housing. There are no over-all statistics. There is no central information. To evict a tenant under the present act, the landlord goes to the justice of the peace or to his local courts and gets a writ, and that's about all there is to it. The newspapers may mention the fact. No one keeps count. Numerous cases have been called to my attention of landlords suddenly deciding to occupy quarters they had rented out and often this decision came soon after the tenant had refused to sign a 15-percent rent-increase lease or had perhaps complained to health officials or rent officials over the maintenance of the property.

2. Recontrol of dwellings decontrolled under the Wolcott Act: The major argument for decontrol of various types of housing last June, including new construction and new conversions, along with units which had not been rented during the prior two years, was that this would give a tremendous impetus to new construction and to conversions and would coax out of hiding a lot of housing kept off the market because of owner indignation over rent control. Now undoubtedly this has taken place to a degree. The big question mark is how effective it has been, and what kind of housing and at what prices has it brought onto the rental market. There is, unfortunately, no way of really knowing. The Bureau of Labor Statistics would probably be best able to report on this, but BLS took a heavy budget cut last year in the name of government economy, and one of the phases of its work to suffer was the collection of housing and rent statistics in many cities.

We do know that the construction industry has boomed steadily upward, as it has ever since the war ended and as it was doing under rent control up to last July 1, but do we know how much of this property is for rent and at what prices? I have seen new homes advertised for veteran tenancy—new homes and thus not subject to rent control—on such terms as $150 a month on a 5-year lease. This, mind you, for conventional six-room houses.

On the other hand—and this is very significant, gentlemen—much if not most of the large-scale multiple family rental housing now being built is being built under a form of rent control imposed by FHA. You have probably heard testimony on this from FHA officials. On all loans of $200,000 or more, FHA retains the controlling voice in the corporation involved and sets a rent based on a fair return of about 6½ percent on investment. The average rentals set under this formula are somewhere around $82 a month, including all utilities. This is certainly not low and takes into account present-day construction costs, but at the same time it is far below rents I understand are charged in new developments not subject to any controls. My bill, incidentally, provides that rents set on new construction and conversions take into account present construction costs.

It was freely predicted during the hearings here a year ago that decontrol of conversions would bring forth a flood of new units on the market, provided by home owners who would convert their upstairs space into investment property. Does anyone know that this occurred? Are there any figures available?

All I have heard in this connection is complaints from tenants that newly converted quarters they now occupy are being rented to them for as much as $115 a month for the upstairs of a house which was formerly a single-family home renting for say $55 a month. I don't know how widespread this sort of thing has been and, I'm afraid, neither does the committee nor does the Housing Expediter who, prior to last July, could have given us day-by-day statistics on what was happening.

The real inequity in this matter of turning loose new construction and conversions is one directed at the owners of older property, who are still under somewhat rigid controls. They write me with understandable indignation over the fact that while their rents have been held down, a new property next door, one which might perhaps be described as junk or of cracker-box construction, was renting at astronomical figures with no hindrance from the rent-control authorities. They ask if that is fair.

I don't think it is fair. I say the way to correct this inequity is not to turn all rents loose, as some propose, but rather to control all residential rents in the same area in substantially the same fashion. Of course, rents on new construction must of necessity be somewhat higher than the rent for a similar home built before OPA's demise let loose the terrific inflation in construction costs.

3. Enforcement powers: The Housing Expediter has already, I am sure, outlined in sufficient and convincing detail the ridiculous inadequacy of the enforcement powers the Congress left with him in writing the Wolcott Act. I think there can be no disagreement over the fact that Federal laws should either be enforced or repealed.

For example, here we have an act which says tenants can be evicted for certain reasons, but there is no machinery whatsoever to follow up eviction cases in the local courts to see that they are legal under the act. If the majority of Congress insists on allowing the present unjust and cruel eviction provisions to stand, it should, at the very least, provide the Federal Expediter with the power to enforce this law, inadequate as the law is.

But if we are going to write a good law this time, then we should restore the old enforcement powers, not only as they affect evictions but also rent overcharges, bonuses, and other illegal practices. At present the tenant can sue his landlord for a rent overcharge, but if you gentlemen are receiving the kind of mail I am from constituents, you will know that many tenants are actually living in a state of terror over prospective eviction, since, for an unscrupulous landlord, eviction is now comparatively so easy to engineer. The decent landlords are not overcharging and charging a bonus and trying to get away with illegal practices, and the decent landlord is the one who would not stoop to trickery to get a tenant out. I emphasize this because the chairman of the subcommittee, I understand, has questioned the accuracy of any statement that many tenants are living in terror of their landlords under this act.

Such tenants do not sue their landlords for overcharges unless and until they have given up all hope of staying in the dwelling. That kind of protection against violations of the law is farcical.

You have already heard testimony on how overcharge damage suits plummeted down to an extremely low volume per month after this present act went into effect last July. Now that could mean that those landlords who tried to flaunt OPA in the days when there was effective enforcement have suddenly turned into law-abiding citizens, now that all enforcement has virtually been repealed. But I don't think it indicates that at all.

4. Reestablishment of exclusive jurisdiction of the Emergency Court of Appeals: This is an attempt to restore some of the continuity to the judicial aspects of rent control. The Wolcott Act, as you know, lodged jurisdiction on appeals from administrative rulings with those courts "which historically have had such jurisdiction." It leaves matters up in the air. Previously the Emergency Court of Appeals had gained extensive experience in reviewing the reasonableness and legality of agency rulings on rent matters, and from all I can gather, was regarded as fair in its conduct. Now sundry courts throughout the land, with little or no experience in these matters, are suddenly made experts on this very complex subject of rent regulations, and the lack of uniformity in decisions which develop from such a situation is obvious.

There is room in rent-control administration for area differences, but there is no room in effective Federal control for vast differences of opinion among courts all over the Nation as to the legal aspects of rent control. I think the landlord, particularly, would benefit from having a court experienced in this matter enjoy the jurisdiction over it.

These are the major changes in my bill from the present act. Much of the machinery for carrying out these changes comes under grants of administrative discretion. I think such discretion is necessary to a fair and equitable operation of rent control. I think some of the bills to strengthen some of the features of rent control provide too little discretion and set up too rigid requirements in regard to recontrol and rollbacks.

APPROPRIATIONS

My bill provides for continuation of present machinery for the granting of so-called hardship rent increases in individual adjustment cases. These powers, by themselves, are meaningless unless the Housing Expediter has the funds to administer them promptly and fairly. When Congress cut the appropriation for the Housing Expediter last year, it did a disservice, I feel, to all landlords who are entitled to rent increases and have to wait unduly long for processing of their applications. This is the wrong kind of economy. I know that this matter is not properly before this committee, but I think the committee in its report should stress the importance of providing sufficient funds so that all individual cases can be handled expeditiously.

I have found an alarming lack of knowledge on the part of many small property owners of their perfectly legal right to seek—and in most cases—obtain rent increases commensurate generally with the increases in their net operating costs. I think the real-estate industry, as an industry, has failed this segment of the industry, by not making them aware of their rights. The bigger operators, I am sure, are perfectly aware of their opportunities to seek adjustments and seem to be making good use of them.

If all the landlords entitled to individual adjustments were to apply for them, as they should, the work load on the Housing Expediter's staff will be great and additional funds no doubt will be needed. They should be granted.

FURTHER PROPOSALS

My bill provides only a 1-year extension for rent control. At the time I submitted

my bill last July, it was right after the Congress had flatly stated rent control was to have only an 8-month life until March 1, and would end abruptly then. When I introduced my bill, it seemed optimistic on my part to ask even for as much as a year's extension beyond March 1. Now, however, nearly all of the bills before you, including those from members of the majority party, specify an extension of at least until June 30 of 1949, and in some instances for as much as 2½ years. I think everyone is convinced by now that not only can rent control not end next month, but it probably cannot end next year. I would suggest, then, that my bill be amended to provide for the termination date no sooner than June 1949, and later, if the committee will consider it.

I think it would be highly proper to put into the bill, too, standards on the composition and activities of local rent advisory boards. My bill makes clear that the recommendations of these boards must be substantiated in the judgment of the Expediter if they are to be approved. I have the feeling the committee may try to tie down the Expediter quite narrowly on this, and I urge caution in the setting up of any straight and narrow requirements which may be found to be impractical at a time when the Congress will not be in session to correct the situation.

CONCLUSION

We are again experiencing a last-minute rush to save rent control from a premature demise. We had the same experience last June. So far, the House has not even scheduled hearings on the matter, although rent control is to end in less than 30 days. In the last-minute rush last year, we passed a bad bill, a bill based on a grievous error of judgment that it would be possible to end rent control this soon.

The committee has a mighty difficult job and wants, I am sure, to be fair. The simplest method of eliminating many of the present complaints against rent control would be merely to authorize blanket across-the-board increases. But it would, however, be one of the greatest contributions we could make to further inflation.

Rents cannot be considered an isolated part of the economy. General rent raises will cause further inflation and the landlord will again suffer a squeeze. The only way to be really fair to all landlords as well as to tenants is to go after this inflation and halt it. The committee must consider rent control as one part of an over-all attack on the cost of living, on an inflation which is hurting the landlord, particularly, because his income is generally static while living costs rise.

It has come to my attention that there is now pending in the House District Committee a bill by Representative O'HARA, a high-ranking majority member of that committee, providing for an extension of rent control in the District of Columbia—as is—for another year beyond March 31. I suspect that Mr. O'HARA's bill reflects the attitude of the majority party leadership, since the leadership and the Congress last year extended rent control in the District of Columbia without change while completely changing the entire concept of rent control for the remainder of this country.

Hence, Members of Congress living in the District of Columbia were not subject to the 15 percent "voluntary" increases arranged for the tenants in other parts of the country. Hence, too, eviction controls have remained strong in the District while being abandoned elsewhere. Hence, too, enforcement of rent control is strong here while practically nonexistent elsewhere. Hence, Members of Congress are well protected and will probably continue to be well protected as tenants for another year.

If we do not provide substantially similar protection for America's tenants elsewhere, then the Congress will be justifiably subject to the most vigorous criticism.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding the St. Lawrence seaway prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT A VOTE AGAINST THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY MEANS

I have spoken in the Senate on the many advantages of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project to America—its great importance for our present generation and for all the generations that are to come. I should like now to present some thoughts as to what a vote against the St. Lawrence seaway means.

I respect, of course, the judgment of every Member of the Senate who casts his vote in accordance with his conscience, whether it be for or against the seaway. However, I do feel that those Members who are opposed to the seaway should be fully informed of the grave implications of their action, if they are not yet so advised.

ANTISEAWAY VOTE HURTS NATIONAL DEFENSE

On the basis of national defense, a vote against the seaway is a blow struck against the national defense, according to the statement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and according to the testimony presented to the committee by Secretary of State George C. Marshall, as well as the views submitted by every leading military authority consulted by the committee and of men who wrote to the committee—General Eisenhower, Admiral Leahy, General Eaker, and others. (This is with the lone exception of two military men who testified against the seaway but who, according to their own open admission, had not read fully the voluminous background of the seaway.)

From the standpoint of an American interested in the development of the natural resources of his own land, a vote against the seaway (for which the appropriations in any one year would be around $70,000,000) is ridiculously inconsistent with American expenditure of over $15,000,000,000 since the end of the war for foreign purposes, exclusive of military aid and occupation costs.

From the standpoint of any American, a vote against the seaway is a capitulation to fear, to fancy, to folly, to frustration, to the most narrow and provincial selfish interests of a few.

From the standpoint of any of the other sections of the country requiring appropriations for their own internal improvements, a vote against the seaway is a dangerous precedent against future action calculated to sustain whole regions of our economy to develop wealth and economic health.

ANTISEAWAY VOTE VIOLATES BUSINESS OPINION

From the standpoint of American business, a vote against the seaway is a vote against expansion of the American free enterprise system, and it is a vote against the overwhelming support of the seaway by American business, expressed in every poll of business opinion (as well as of public opinion).

ANTISEAWAY VOTE IGNORES POLITICAL LEADERS

From the standpoint of a member of the Republican Party, if a Republican votes against the seaway, he ignores the judgment of the outstanding leaders of the Republican Party of today and yesterday—former President Herbert Hoover, Presidents Harding and Coolidge, Presidential candidates Harold Stassen and Thomas Dewey, Charles Evans Hughes, Henry L. Stimson.

From the standpoint of the Democratic Party, if a Democrat votes against the seaway, he recklessly sets aside the judgment of President Truman (who recently again endorsed the seaway in a special letter to the Senate) as well as the judgment of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and of former Secretaries of State James Byrnes, Cordell Hull, Dean Acheson, and countless others.

ANTISEAWAY VOTE HURTS AGRICULTURE

From the standpoint of American agriculture, a vote against the seaway is a vote which spurns the judgment of the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, and countless other agricultural organizations which have endorsed the seaway as vital to agriculture for relatively inexpensive transportation of foods.

From the standpoint of American labor, including railway labor, a vote against the seaway is a vote against future jobs which will be created not only during the construction of the seaway but far more important, which will develop from the building of this great highway of commerce to fill the needs of a growing nation.

ANTISEAWAY VOTE HURTS NEW ENGLAND, MIDWEST

From the standpoint of New England, a vote against the seaway and power project is a vote against the needs of the people of New England which is already desperately short of power and is already suffering from a loss of production and employment as a result of this power deficit. (The seaway and power project are, of course, an interrelated unit which must be developed together.)

From the standpoint of the Middle West, a vote against the seaway is a vote which denies the Middle West access to deep draft oceanic shipping and which denies the Middle West the opportunity for the use of Labrador ores which will be absolutely indispensable if the Middle West industry is to be maintained after the expected early depletion of the Mesabi Range.

From the standpoint of engineering, a vote against the seaway is a vote against a project which has been described as an engineer's dream because with the small amount of improvements required for the short distance of 119 miles, a great artery over 2,300 miles long will be opened up and one of the great power projects in the world will be developed.

From the standpoint of an economy-minded citizen, a vote against the seaway will inevitably mean a terrific drain on the Federal Treasury because billions of dollars will be required in Federal funds for the development of plants which could use low-grade ores once the Mesabi range is depleted.

CONCLUSION

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway will sooner or later definitely be enacted. Future generations will hold us to account if it is not enacted in the Eightieth Congress.

Opponents will stand accused before history of lack of wisdom, lack of foresight. The Senators and Congressmen who supported the Panama Canal have obviously been vindicated. The Senators and Congressmen who support the Great Lakes seaway need no vindication whatsoever now, because of the tremendous wealth of evidence which supports their patriotic stand, but history will doubly confirm the justice of their action.

I pray that we of the Eightieth Congress be adequate to our responsibility.

American Aid to the Peoples of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 30 (legislative day of Monday, January 26), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, on the European recovery plan before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, January 27, 1948.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appear today to voice support of the basic principles of American aid to the war-ravaged peoples of the world. Such aid should be given in human kindness to the fullest extent of our capacity to do so. I make this statement at the instruction of the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, speaking on behalf of the 1,627 branches, youth councils, and college chapters of the association and its biracial membership of more than one-half million Americans.

Whatever aid is voted by the Congress should be given without political or other strings. We should neither ourselves use nor permit to be used for political purposes the aid we give.

The European recovery or Marshall plan admittedly is a stopgap and temporary program. It is unfortunate that it has become embroiled in both national and international politics. Already its original motivation, rooted in the traditional generosity of the American people to aid others in times of distress, has been largely obscured by the real or alleged purposes attributed to the plan. But it is the hope of the NAACP membership and, I am certain, of countless other Americans that as far as is humanly possible unworthy motives and political implications will be speedily and permanently eliminated. We believe that this can be done, and I shall quite briefly lay before the committee certain suggestions for its consideration. I should like to preface these suggestions with the observation that unless the United States and all other nations which are able to do so cooperate in feeding and helping to rehabilitate war-devastated areas of the earth the physical suffering and the obliteration of hope all over the earth will almost inevitably lead us into another war whose consequences, in the light of the splitting of the atom and of a germ warfare, are too frightening to contemplate.

During the war I traveled as a war correspondent in both the European and Pacific theaters of operation. I was, thereby, enabled to see not only the physical destruction of bombing and shelling but the even more tragic harm done to the bodies and aspirations of human beings of every race, creed, color, or political orientation. I was convinced as never before that mankind's concentration on devising ever more devastating weapons of war was leading us to a situation which imperiled the entire world. Unless we can find speedily some means of eliminating war and of providing security to human beings everywhere there is little hope for civilization.

Let me repeat that we urge that the Congress vote the full sum requested for the program. It will be a strain upon our resources but, with proper safeguards, our economy can stand that strain. We urge extension of aid not only to the countries of Europe, but to the needy in Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean. In this connection, there is almost as much physical suffering as a result of the abysmal failure of a rubber-raising experiment by the United States Government in Haiti as in some of the worse spots in Europe. I want to remind the United States Senate that hunger is as painful to brown, yellow, and black stomachs as it is to white ones.

In this connection I would like to ask consideration of expansion of the recovery program to ask every other nation to give whatever surplus of food, machinery, or technical skill it possesses to aid those less fortunate than themselves. No other nation is as fortunate in being able to give aid as is the United States. But Russia, some of the countries of South America, and even some of the countries of Europe, can give assistance to others or will be able to do so in the future when American aid enables them to reestablish production and a more stable economy.

The facilities, both present and future, of the United Nations as a world organization should be enlisted in the distribution of aid and the implementation of the recovery plan.

We do not know what controls should be established in the distribution of aid, but certainly safeguards are necessary to insure first, the equitable distribution based upon need; second, the prevention of use of assistance for political purposes by ourselves or any other nation; and, third, to prevent the kind of misuse of American materials which has occasionally been true. A distinguished and reliable diplomat told me recently that American cigars and cigarettes were sold at the current black-market prices at a dinner party given by the high officials of a certain European country. I, myself, saw another nation enjoy the gratitude of the starving people of a European country during the war when American food was distributed without mention of the fact that the food was given by America.

Several of the European nations which are to benefit from this relief plan, if it is voted by the Congress, receive much of their economic strength from colonies in Africa, the Caribbean, the Pacific, and Asia. Some of these European countries have made it clear, now that the war is over, that they contemplate no fundamental change of the status of their colonials. In aiding these white nations of Europe to rehabilitate themselves, we of the United States have a moral obligation to require that these countries adopt programs under which people currently subject to their rule shall speedily be given the right of self-determination and the chance for freedom which these nations ask for themselves. It would be utter folly for the United States to help white Europe to rehabilitate that part of the world and permit it to continue to deny freedom and opportunity to colonial peoples. It would be folly because we have already seen in Indonesia, Asia, and Africa that the myth of white superiority has been destroyed forever. Nothing will speed World War III more than attempts to reestablish white supremacy. Any effort to do this will speed revolt among the hundreds of millions of brown, yellow, and black people who are determined to have freedom also.

Closely tied in with this is the necessity of assuring equitable treatment of Americans, particularly of minorities, here at home. A dozen European recovery programs cannot overcome the danger to the good name of the United States which is daily being done by the continuation of discrimination based on race, creed, color or national origin. Within the last month the United States Army has found it necessary to send a directive to all of its personnel reminding them that race and religious prejudice in the United States is doing more than any other thing to lower the prestige of the United States abroad and to cast doubt upon the integrity of our intentions.

Finally, the foreign aid we give is going to keep in short supply most commodities in domestic consumption. Already the current prices for many foodstuffs and other commodities are in excess of the black market prices of the days of price controls and rationing. The steadily rising spiral of inflation which is already taxing to the bursting point the budgets of small-wage earners and others will inevitably be accentuated by the European recovery plan. It is absolutely imperative, therefore, that a comprehensive system of controls be formulated and enacted now by the Congress. This should be a comprehensive one which takes into consideration the viewpoints and needs of every element of the American people—management, labor, the white-collar class and especially minorities who are limited by bigotry in earning a decent living.

We endorse the recovery program and pledge our aid to its fulfillment. But we believe its chances of success in helping less fortunate peoples of the earth to reachieve a normal way of life can be fulfilled only if we throw about the aid we give the broad understanding, the unselfishness, and the determination to help all those in need irrespective of race, creed, place of residence and political belief. By so doing we shall demonstrate that the free society of which we boast can be made a reality and thus demonstrate its superiority above all others.

Mahatma Gandhi's Kind of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with appreciation to the appropriate comment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] on the tragic death of Mahatma Gandhi. Whatever differences we of the west might have had with the distinguished leader of millions of people in the Orient we all admired his steadfast devotion to the ideals of peace and his advocacy of the settlement through nonviolent methods of the controversies of his country. The following comment by the Christian Science Monitor appeared prior to Gandhi's death and is, therefore, all the more significant. The Monitor editorial was entitled "Two Sorts of Power," and under leave previously granted I include this interesting tribute to the methods adopted by the fallen leader:

TWO SORTS OF POWER

Looking back on Mahatma Gandhi's fast, one is struck with its significance in a world bristling with arms. Here is the challenging evidence of a power totally different in kind from the brute material force which is still the court of last appeal for sovereign states unrestrained by world law.

There is no guaranteeing the permanence of the concessions and pledges he has won from all parties. Yet the fact remains that a nation has moved in the direction of peace because one man appeared ready to stake his life on men's innate response to an unselfish ideal.

The International Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I realize that for me to attempt to defend our Republic against its ruthless destroyers, the internationalists, interventionists and Communists, is like a lone voice crying in the wilderness.

Through the communistic-ridden State Department, aided and abetted by the group I have just mentioned, equipped as they are with the most powerful tax-supported propaganda agency in the world, the truth relating to the activities of the Truman administration here and abroad is submerged and obscured by a flood of false propaganda relating to our domestic and foreign affairs.

Once the sovereign citizens of our Nation know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, there will be a house-cleaning in this Government which in thoroughness will far exceed that of the purification of the Augean stables by Hercules, and it will not be a mythical cleansing of our bureaucratic government either.

It has already been demonstrated that the corrosive influence operating day and night to weaken the foundations of our free Government cannot be removed in a day as was alleged to have been done by Hercules when he directed a river through the Augean stables.

Yet much can be done on November next, this year, 1948.

Now, then, I may not be able to get the truth to the country at large through the medium of this and other speeches, but the citizens I have the honor to represent will be given the facts so far as I am able to ascertain them. I can say this, however, that once they have the facts in their possession with reference to any issue upon which their mature judgment may be brought to bear, either on foreign or domestic issues, their conclusion as to what should be done with reference to the issues will be sound.

I know that one of the burning issues right now is shortages and inflation, which means of course a steady advance in price of food, shelter, clothing, and practically everything grown or manufactured in this country.

What has been the cause of the ever increasing inflation and shortages?

Increase in currency.

Devaluation of the dollar.

Deficit financing from the very first of the Roosevelt administration.

Exports of goods to foreign countries paid for by our taxpayers.

How have the internationalists and interventionists contributed to our shortages?

This group has insisted on one world and the sharing of our taxpayers' money and their savings among nations. The result of this has been that billions and billions of dollars of our taxpayers' money have been poured into foreign countries with no other purpose than to share the wealth with the people of the world. Neither accounting nor control has been required of those nations which have been the recipients of the New Deal largess.

The program of the internationalists in our own Government has been to send billions of dollars abroad as loans, gifts, and credits, which will never be repaid except as a few of our industries will profit from the sale of their products abroad at premium prices paid for with our taxpayers' money. Articles sorely needed here, which cannot be obtained by our taxpayers except in some instances at a premium price in a gray market, are shipped in vast volume abroad whether needed there or not.

The latest scheme of the internationalists is to put the entire world, except our own taxpayers, on a permanent annual allowance of our dollars to the extent of from two to six billion dollars a year. Another proposal published in Lloyd's Bank Review, London, October 1946, from the pen of a Princeton professor, is that an international employment stabilization fund be created to prevent mass unemployment. This fund of from thirty to forty billion dollars to lend at critical times to the most suitable applicants, however poor credit risks they might be, to the extent necessary to get its funds into operation.

Do I need to tell our taxpayers that this capital of thirty to forty billion dollars to carry out this international scheme would be largely furnished by them? Then along with this proposal comes one from another source that would have 10 percent of the total output of this country be set aside as a contribution to world rehabilitation for a period of 10 years. This, too, at our taxpayers' expense.

There are many other grandiose plans to make taxpaying slaves of our people by these inflationary schemes, one of them being the Marshall plan. A very ingenious scheme has been hatched to create the expenditure of $17,000,000,000 abroad. It is a program to dismantle productive industrial facilities in Germany in the American, English, and French zones of occupation to create shortages of food and other necessities until the industries now being dismantled can be rebuilt outside of these zones with our taxpayers' money. In the meantime our taxpayers will be kept short of oil, building material, food, and other necessities which could be supplied from the industries now being torn down by the short-sighted program of the English, the French, and our own internationalists. I am not referring to the dismantling of war industries.

On December 27, 1947, Herbert Hoover warned:

> At a time when the world is crying and even dying from lack of industrial production, we apparently pursue the policy of destruction of the gigantic production equipment in the western zone of Germany. It means less essential goods to all Europe, greater delay in recovery of the world, and larger drains on the American taxpayer.
>
> I can only repeat a statement—

Continued Mr. Hoover—

> in my report of 10 months ago: "The removal and destruction of plants, except arms plants, should stop. • • • We can keep Germany in economic chains but it will also keep Europe in rags."

What are some of the German plants now being dismantled?

They are plants necessary for the production of the very articles of food and necessities, including nitrates, pipes for conveying fuel oil, and other factories, numbering almost 918.

This whole plan of destruction of plants in the British, American, and French zones is contrary to the advice of our leading American economists.

Furthermore, the plan is neither approved by the Hoover mission nor by most of the Senators and Representatives who have visited Europe with an open mind to study the subject of aid for reconstruction.

The following table taken from a publication by Common Cause, Inc., gives a list of war plants and surplus industrial plants in the three zones, as follows:

	United States zone	British zone	French zone
Total number	186	496	296
War plants	104	126	36
Surplus plants	82	299	260

Among other things the Herter committee report shows that the urgent needs of the 16 nations participating in the Paris Conference would mean raising the minimum steel deficit in the United States from 1,600,000 net tons to 5,000,000 net tons, a staggering deficit to impose on the consumers of steel in the United States, so runs the report.

These industries in the three zones in Germany which are being rapidly dismantled will place the burden of furnishing the products upon our taxpayers, which would ordinarily be produced by the plants now being dismantled. This means that our people must suffer a further shortage of steel cars to haul our grain, less fuel oil to heat our homes, lack of industrial equipment, fewer farm implements and parts, and practically no nitrates for our own farmers.

I mention the latter because the foreign plant destruction program calls for the dismantling of Europe's biggest nitrogen fertilizer plant, at Oppau. The nitrogen deficit in Europe will be supplied from this country. The cost of all this destruction and dismantling of nonwar plants in Germany will be paid for by our taxpayers. The shortages of the articles of prime necessity here which might have been produced abroad will be drawn upon for export to Germany. Here again our taxpayers will pay the bill as well as suffer further shortages not for 1 year but for years to come.

I have caused a factual survey to be made touching the present shortage of steel in the United States. Here it is in question and answer form:

1. Question. What was the prewar production of steel?

Answer. In 1939, a prewar year, the United States produced 52,800,000 tons of steel.

2. Question. What is the present production of steel?

Answer. The present rate of steel production in the United States is estimated at 88,000,000 tons.

3. Question. What are the prospects for increased production of steel?

Answer. The reported production objective for steel in the United States is 92,000,000 tons for 1952.

4. Question. Is steel allocated?

Answer. No. Pursuant to Public Law 395 (80th Congress), however, the Steel Industry Committee met on January 8, 1948, and decided on a policy of steel allocation. A program of allocation, therefore, is now in the making.

5. Question. How much steel was exported?

Answer. Three and eight-tenths percent of all steel produced in the United States was exported in 1936. Seven and seven-tenths percent in 1937. Nine and nine-tenths percent in 1946. Ten and at -tenths percent was exported during the first 5 months of 1947.

6. Question. To what countries have steel exports been sent?

Answer. For the first 5 months of 1947, 6 percent of available steel exports was sent to Africa; 3.5 percent to Russia and eastern Europe; 10.5 percent to Asia; 13.5 percent to Canada and Mexico; 23.5 percent to western Europe; and 43 percent to Latin America.

7. Question. Is there a black market in steel?

Answer. (a) On September 3, 1947, "World Report" made the following comment on the United States domestic steel shortage:

> "Europeans have a hard time trying to reconcile American Steel exports with American Government policy. Allies of the United States in World War II note that one out of four shiploads of steel for Europe in 1946 went to former neutrals, Eire, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, the Azores and Sweden. None of these suffered any appreciable damage in the war.
>
> "The countries of western Europe, now at work on the Marshall plan, are wondering if the United States will continue to allow 13.5 percent of its steel shipments to Europe to go to the countries behind the iron curtain, where Russia is trying to organize a rival plan.
>
> "Nearly all of the European countries in Russia's sphere of influence have imported steel from the United States in recent months. Although the amounts usually have been small, they have been showing a tendency in some cases to increase rapidly.
>
> "Largest buyer in the Soviet group, except for Russia herself, is Finland, whose steel imports from the United States jumped from $104,716 in April, to $757,000 in May, to $818,270 in June. It is probable that a large proportion of such imports eventually find their way into Russia as reparations in the form of manufactured goods.
>
> "Albania, whose government outdoes all others in vilifying the United States received an average of only $2,500 worth of steel from the United States during the first quarter of 1947. In April Albania stepped that up to $33,000; in May to $70,000.
>
> "Tiny Albania actually bought more steel from the United States in May than Greece did, although the United States is supporting Greece in the dispute between the two countries.
>
> "Yugoslavia, principal opponent of United States policy in the Balkans, also has regularly been buying American steel."

(b) On September 12, 1947, Senator EDWARD MARTIN, chairman of Senate Steel Subcommittee To Study Problems of Small Business, said the following:

> "This committee has uncovered a definite gray market in steel. Some industry witnesses who appeared before us early in our hearings twisted and squirmed in an effort to avoid admitting the existence of this gray market. It did them no good. Why they tried the head-in-sand technique of the ostrich I do not know. I do know, however, that we have sound estimates of well above 2,000,000 tons of steel which have been diverted into the gray market this year. I do know that many small fabricators of steel products have been pushed through the wringer by the pressure of the gray-market operators.
>
> "We have had men before the committee who testified under oath they were paying an average of $280 to $300 per ton for steel. We had testimony of some cases on the Pacific coast where the price paid was as high as $600 a ton. These prices are outrageous as compared to a legitimate mill price of $75 to $90 at that time. Our staff has examined the books of companies substantiating these facts. It is a vicious condition.
>
> • • • • •
>
> "In exploring the dislocation of steel distribution, we have found these things:
>
> "1. The gray market in which many legitimate manufacturers have been subjected to exorbitant prices and commissions or victimized by swindlers posing as steel brokers.
>
> "2. Diversion of steel into other than normal channels by firms which obtained steel on the historical quota basis; steel sales under priorities where the steel was not used for priority purposes; barter deals in which mills accepted scrap in trade for finished steel which was sold on the gray market.
>
> "3. Established users of steel, even those with priorities, unable to obtain their basic quotas from their normal suppliers. The crack down on newcomers into the manufacturing field who had no historical quota of steel and who have been forced either to go out of the market or to pay gray-market prices. At the same time some others, without historical quotas, were supplied.
>
> "4. Expansion of integrated operations by some of the large steel companies which has contributed to loss of supply for small manufacturers and erecting concerns. Steel mills have withdrawn distribution from certain areas, ruthlessly leaving former customers high and dry. In many cases, historical quotas have been totally ignored."

(c) On the same day, before the same subcommittee, Benjamin F. Fairless, president, United States Steel Corp., said:

> "The question of gray markets has been raised. In the light of the facts submitted to this committee, it is obvious that some tonnage of steel products has been sold in the gray market.
>
> "While we do not know the amount of steel moving in these channels, we deplore the fact that any steel should be sold at exorbitant prices or used for other than regular fabricating purposes.
>
> "From my knowledge of the industry, there appear to be two ways in which steel in this category can originate. First, from warehouses which have sold steel in bulk instead of performing their normal function of selling in small quantities to numerous customers. Second, certain fabricators receiving steel from regular sources for normal fabricating purposes may have found it more profitable to resell that steel in the form they received it rather than actually to fabricate it into their own finished products."

How steel production has shifted
[In thousands of tons of ingots and castings]

	1939 production	Present rate	1952 objective
NORTH AMERICA			
United States	62,900	85,000	92,000
Canada	1,500	3,000	3,500
Total	64,309	88,000	95,500

How steel production has shifted—Continued

	1939 production	Present rate	1952 objective
WESTERN EUROPE			
Germany (United States and United Kingdom zones)	18,900	3,140	12,000
Great Britain	15,119	15,950	17,960
France	9,407	6,700	12,100
Belgium	3,429	3,100	4,500
Italy	3,005	1,600	3,200
Germany, Saar	2,500	500	2,000
Luxemburg	2,016	1,600	2,900
Sweden	1,231	1,370	1,800
Austria (United States and United Kingdom zones)	750	410	750
Spain	560	660	700
Netherlands	0	120	180
Total	56,917	35,160	58,690
SOVIET AREA			
U. S. S. R	28,739	18,000	27,000
Czechoslovakia	2,555	2,500	2,600
Poland, postwar territory	2,400	1,600	2,200
Germany, Soviet zone	1,440	160	300
Hungary	800	600	800
Rumania	300	70	300
Yugoslavia	240	100	940
Total	36,474	23,030	35,040
ASIA-AFRICA			
Japan, prewar territory	7,655	600	8,850
India	1,198	1,400	2,700
Australia	1,946	1,500	2,000
Union of South Africa	345	630	1,500
Total	9,484	4,230	10,100
LATIN AMERICA			
Brazil	126	515	825
Mexico	77	275	350
Chile	3	80	100
Argentina	0	130	300
Total	205	970	1,625

Source: World Report, Aug. 12, 1947.

SCARCE STEEL—A BIGGER SHARE OF UNITED STATES PRODUCTION GOES ABROAD

Percentage of United States steel production sent abroad

1936	3.8
1937	7.7
1946	9.9
1947 (first 5 months)	10.6

The customers

Country:	Percentage sent
Latin America	43.0
Western Europe	23.5
North America	13.5
Asia	10.5
Africa and Oceania	6.0
Russia and eastern Europe	3.5

Source: World Report, Sept. 2, 1947.

This disclosure is only more evidence of the stupidity of the Truman policy, domestic and foreign.

We are short 12,000,000 homes in which to house our veterans and our workers.

The great hue and cry of the international propagandists is "more dollars for the nations of the earth." It is not a case of "hands across the sea." Now it is "hand-outs overseas or else."

There is another international racket in which certain of our American exporting industrialists are participating at the cost of our taxpayers. A leading industrialist, however, who is more interested in our flag and our Government than he is in any foreign socialistic-controlled government or any communistic regimes abroad, now steps forward

and exposes the foreign export rackets. I here insert The Export Trade Fallacy, by C. M. Burgess, president, Burgess-Norton Manufacturing Co.:

THE EXPORT TRADE FALLACY

Most everyone of importance states that the United States must have a large export business if a depression is to be avoided. This statement comes from sources, who on many other subjects have widely divergent opinions but on the subject of the necessity of export business seem to have conspired to mislead the public. The public—the man on the street, the farmer, and the laborer—believe these statements because they hear or read of nothing in dispute of the cry for more export business. The subject should be viewed in the light of reality and in consideration of present and probable future world conditions.

Export business at the expense of the taxpayers, whether industrial, farm, or natural products, is not essential to this country. In fact, in view of past experience, present, and probable future domestic and world conditions, export business in any large volume on a credit basis, as advocated by its proponents, would be very detrimental to the United States at any time.

We are advised by the Department of Commerce that for the past 12 months our exports have been about 17 percent of our production, largely on a credit basis, and proponents of export business urge an increase in that figure. In 1939–1940, goods exported amounted to 9 percent, all on a cash basis. These were good normal years of business, profits, taxes, wages, and employment. A dollar was worth $1.10. Now we have 17 percent export business, doubled and tripled taxes, necessarily inflated wages, and a 50-cent dollar, with no prospect of any improvement. In 1939–1940, we were paid by the other countries for everything we exported and we in turn paid these countries for our imports. In 1946 and 1947, the taxpayers of the United States furnished the money with which the foreign countries paid for our exports, and we continue to pay those same nations for our imports. We furnish the money for the "round trip." This would not be too bad if those countries would pay back the loans and gifts made them. This, as you know, they have not done and do not intend to do—even if they were able to do so. This will in a very few years bankrupt the United States and it will financially ruin us much sooner than will any reduction in our export business. In order for any foreign country to repay our loan to them, that country must send to us more goods than we send to them. The profit made on the sale of such goods to us could then be used to pay off the loan we made to that country. To be able to sell any considerable amount of goods to us, the foreign country must undersell the cost of similar goods as made in the United States. This the foreign country could do—if it would go to work. However, in that case, our own producers of similar goods would soon find themselves restricted as to domestic sales on account of imported low-cost goods, and our wages and standard of living would be greatly reduced, unless we again put high tariffs on all competitive imported goods. We have only two alternatives:

1. Furnish the money with which our exports are purchased and go broke, or

2. Stop the foreign loans and gifts, invoke protective tariffs, and get out of the export and import business.

If we follow the latter course, we will have prosperity, our own debt reduction instead of increase, and continued high standards of living for an indefinite time.

Crack-brained economists, certain isolated industries who would selfishly benefit from huge export business, and foreign government agents will not agree to this. Their propaganda working 24 hours per day in newspapers, magazines, and radio has sold the American public a fear complex—a fear that a reduction in exports will mean unemployment and depression. This propagandizing of "fear" into the minds of the American people reached its present climax when on September 3, British Foreign Minister Bevin in England called upon the United States to divide its twenty-two billions in gold, for which we paid money. Failure to do this, he said, would curtail our export trade and cause us to experience an economic depression. It was nothing more or less than the beginnings of a recipient of charity from us for over 30 years. England, the ruined, bankrupt country, begs haughtily but in panic for alms. If it would do the world and the United States any good, I would say give it to them. But it will only go the way of all former gifts and the records show that only a small percentage of those previous loans and gifts ever came back to us. England exists today only by reason of the United States military and financial assistance. Do you go on helping a person when that person makes no effort to help himself? I don't. Better divide the gold among the American taxpayers, or use it to build roads and schools and public housing.

Our own Government, still controlled by the New Deal element, attempts to influence the farmers to be in favor of foreign gift loans—by stating that a decrease in the export of grain and meat will cause farm prices to go down. The farmers want prices to go down, just so long as they can sell all of their farm products. Loss of export business will not curtail farm sales as seriously as will a consumers' strike. We already have evidence of consumers' strikes against high food prices. If lower prices for farm products result from decreased exports, then consumer costs will be less and the economic condition of the country will improve, resulting in less cost of operation of a farm. The farmer will suffer temporarily—but the general public will gain permanently. Ask any farmer if he would not rather feed cattle with lower priced grain and obtain a correspondingly lower price for his beef cattle or milk, and he will say, "Yes."

President Truman was quoted in his press conference August 22 as discouraging any tax reductions in 1948 or 1949. He said we will need any surplus to finance the Marshall plan for the economic recovery of Europe. The operation of this plan, at a cost to the United States of fifty to seventy-five billion dollars over 5 years, will ruin this country—or will at least reduce us to the standards of England and France, and make of us a second or third rate power while Russia advances to the top position. This money will be dissipated in foreign countries with no beneficial results to the United States. This same amount of money, kept in the pockets of the American taxpayers, by reason of tax reductions, will buy goods made in America, build badly needed roads, schools, houses, and provide for an adequate defense—at the same time maintaining a high rate of employment and our accustomed standard of living, and continued prosperity for many years in the future.

Ordinary common sense, not embellished with the theoretical mathematics of those who care not for the continued system of the American way of life, clearly indicates that we can well afford to give up our export business and keep our money at home. This should be our plan until we can be paid for our exports—with the other country's money, not with our own money.

Such raw materials as we must import (and they are few), and such goods as foreign countries must have from us, will continue to be purchased and sold—for cash—on a protective tariff basis. This would give us all the export business we need. Nothing other than a war will prevent or stop such necessary trading. All nations will be glad to get our dollars, and if they have to have something from us which they cannot do without, they will pay us cash for it.

Who are the proponents of this so-called free world trade? It should be called for free—from the viewpoint of the foreign buyers, as we are giving the money from our taxpayers' pockets with which to pay. * * * They are * * * New Dealers, left-wingers, poor Democrats, misguided teachers and professors, culturalists, One Worlders, and all the un-American element who want to divide our wealth with the world, because "it is the thing to do." Assisting them are the foreign propaganda agencies whose countries are jealous of our position and desire to bring us to their level. Ask any one of these people if they would like to live as the average peasant or working slave of Europe or Asia lives—give up his car, his home, exist on black bread and potatoes, and he'll say—"no, of course not!" Yet that is what will happen in this country if the theories expounded by these people and supported by such statesmen as Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, were to go into effect. Senator LUCAS in an address to the American Legion, Department of Illinois Convention in Chicago, August 18, said that he advocates a pooling of all the food of the world's production and an even distribution to all the peoples of the world. Think a minute what that would mean. It would mean that we in this country would have about one-fourth as much food as we now have. Should we starve in order to feed others who may in 10 years or less wage war against us? Europe and Asia created the conditions that exist there today. Why should we lie in the same gutters with them?

Herbert Hoover in an address in New York on September 22, stated that the principal reason for the high cost of living in this country was because of the large volume of food which we are exporting to Europe. Just another reason why the reduction of food exports would be beneficial to this country.

Then we have certain big business interests tied in with big international banking interests who are so short-sightedly selfish that they want to have a flow of money credits going around and around, so that a few dollars will stick to their fingers as this money and these credits pass through their particular businesses.

Next we have the Communist type, the true radical, who hopes to wreck this country to where a dictatorship is necessary and believes that he will then be one of the smaller fry dictators. Or the true Communist, agent of Russia, who will do anything to make it easy for Russia to take us over when we are no longer a strong Nation.

Who will suffer first and most because of the activities of the above elements? The American farmer, laboring man, small business owner, home owner. That means you.

We want tax reductions and debt reductions—not increases in either. We want prosperity and continued high standards of living. We want peace in and for this Nation, but want this country to win the next war, if and when there is one. We can't have all this if we continue to concern ourselves more with Europe than we do with the United States. It is about time the citizens of the United States began to look after their own country. Our ancestors fought for it. We should keep it for our children—not give it away to others.

It will be recalled that for several years prior to Pearl Harbor our internationalists and interventionists and war profiteers furnished more than 10,000,000 tons of scrap iron to assist Japan in her preparation to assault and demoralize our Navy. Now the same group are conducting the same warlike program to build up war machines in Europe. Tito, the dictator, has received his portion of steel and now brags of his well-equipped war machine. All of the satellite countries of Russia have each been allotted their quota of steel. Our oil, as was the case of Japan, is being shipped abroad.

The irony of all this is that our taxpayers pay for these exports, then if war comes our boys will be killed by the steel tanks and other deadly equipment our taxpayers have furnished and paid for by the "sweat of their brow."

Veterans' Allowances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday next it is the intention of the Republican leadership to bring to the House floor, under suspension of the rules, legislation designed to increase GI students' allowances, and legislation to raise limits on total income of GI's now taking advantage of on-the-job training.

There is a desperate need for passage of this legislation. In my congressional district are two universities and one vocational school. Thousands of veterans are enrolled in these schools, and thousands more are enrolled in on-the-job training projects. I have learned at firsthand the financial difficulties that these veterans are encountering, and I am convinced that unless this Congress does something to relieve the situation immediately, the purpose of the GI bill will in part be thwarted.

At Champlain University, Plattsburg, N. Y., and Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, the records indicate that the veteran is not wasting his time. He takes seriously the advantage given him to secure an education.

In surprising numbers the GI has reached and maintained the high scholastic standing required by these universities, but to meet the financial requirements to complete his education, is for him an insolvable problem.

When Congress passed the GI bill, butter was not $1.08 per pound; clothing costs were at least visible; and the price of family necessities in general were within striking distance. The increased cost of living just as quickly affects the student and trainee as it does people in other walks of life, and Congress must be cognizant of that fact.

I fear that sometimes we overlook the fact that students and trainees do not enjoy increased wages to combat increased prices. Unfortunately these GI's find themselves always "in the middle" of wage and price conflicts.

In addition, we Members must keep in mind the fact that many, many veterans attending college and taking training today are at the same time raising families. Existing allowances under the GI bill necessitates short cuts in living by these families in order to get by. They are compelled to forego the essentials and the necessities in order both to live and to get an education. Who will deny the fact that above all, veteran family life should be protected as well as encouraged. As officials and as individuals we should do everything possible to help these veterans and their families enjoy the heritages of happiness and good health now. Drudgery and additional sacrifices, if they must someday be encountered, should at least for them be assignments for life's later years.

Tuesday each Member of the House can meet the obligation Congress assumed when it guaranteed our veterans an opportunity for training and education. If, as I believe it will appear, the situation necessitates our increasing the benefits under the GI bill, let us on Tuesday meet that situation, and let us meet it to an extent that will adequately meet the demands.

Musicians Used $1,500,000 Welfare Fund for Free Concerts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the communication that I have received from Mr. James C. Petrillo, president, American Federation of Musicians, enclosing a reprint of an unsolicited newspaper article describing how the American Federation of Musicians invested more than $1,500,000 of their employment fund in the public interest during 1947:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS,
New York, N. Y., January 29, 1948.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: We musicians do so little tooting of our own horns that we are unjustly accused of blowing them.

Therefore, in the interest of informed opinion and fair play, I invite your attention to the enclosure. It is a reprint of an unsolicited newspaper article describing how the American Federation of Musicians invested more than $1,500,000 of our employment fund in the public interest during 1947.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES C. PETRILLO, *President.*

MUSICIANS USED $1,500,000 WELFARE FUND FOR FREE CONCERTS—RECORD AND RADIO ROYALTIES PROVIDED 11,000 RECITALS IN 514 TOWNS AND CITIES

The American Federation of Musicians yesterday opened the books of its 1947 welfare fund—now banned by a clause in the Taft-Hartley law which forbids such funds—in an effort to prove its sincerity in its current battle with the recording and broadcasting companies. It was this fund, made up of millions of dollars received from recording and transcription, which James C. Petrillo, the union's president, said last week must be restored before any arrangement could be made for resumption of recording by the musicians.

During 1947, the union disclosed, it used $1,500,000—nearly all of the money received from recording and transcription in the previous year—to provide more than 11,000 free concerts, dances, and other musical services in 514 communities in the United States and Canada, more than half of them for veterans. The musicians who participated were union members and were paid union scales, the money coming from the union's welfare fund, and in some cases from cosponsors, such as civic organizations, service clubs, newspapers, and universities.

Regardless of whether the union is right or wrong in its refusal to continue recording music, the program of musical events provides an interesting insight into its policy to provide more employment for musicians and to advance American musical culture. Considering the number of teen-age dances (2,437) and similar events which it gave, the union appears to have interpreted culture in a liberal sense.

From royalties paid by recording and transcription—from a quarter of a cent on 35-cent records, 1 cent on $1 records, up to 5 cents on $2 records—the federation sponsored a wide variety of free musical services.

THIRTY THOUSAND MUSICIANS HELPED

National records of the union, audited by the Boston accounting firm of Lybrand, Ross Brothers, and Montgomery, show that the federation footed the bill for the services of more than 30,000 of its members. Local cosponsors, among them the Red Cross, the YWCA, the National Guard, the American Legion, city and State departments, port authorities, junior leagues, schools, universities, churches, and newspapers, provided additional necessary outlays.

Locals of the union promoted and furnished music for teen-age dances in most of the major cities, with the blessing of mayors, police chiefs, and juvenile court judges; 42 were given in Newark, N. J.; 40, in Cincinnati; 33, in Minneapolis; and so on for a total of 2,437 in the country.

This jazz diet was supplemented by symphonic concerts of semiclassical music, while in many of the hospitals and welfare institutions of children chamber music proved highly popular.

Fan mail—and the Federation needed hay-baling equipment to handle the volume—was particularly full of gusto when it came in from the youthful audiences. From the Toledo, Ohio, Child Study Institute one girl wrote the conductor of a string orchestra: "It was one concert that I enjoyed without getting bored." A boy, festooning his letter with crayon drawings of horns, said, "It was the first string orchestra I ever heard, and I liked it very much."

High on the priority list of the union came music for veterans' hospitals. The 2,317 performances by symphony, band, and chamber music groups were primarily for enjoyment. But the medical directors' letters indicated that the music often had real therapeutic value. In one instance, a young soldier who had been a concert pianist was pulled out of his apathy when the visiting symphony conductor persuaded him to come forward and play the Warsaw Concerto with the orchestra. His cure began at that point, the medical director wrote.

In the Los Angeles area, a Music for the Wounded program was set up, with broad community backing, and the $63,000 allocated to that local by the federation was augmented by benefit concerts, so that still more musical service could be made available for the veterans. On this phase of the program Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower wrote to the vice president of the Los Angeles local, expressing thanks to the artists who had participated, adding, "Music is of great recreational value to the sick and wounded in our hospitals, and it is my earnest hope that the success of this year's concert in the Hollywood Bowl will assure a continuation of your splendid program."

PROGRAM FILLS A GAP

A yard-long work sheet detailing the activities of the musicians' union in Detroit showed that in general they provided music where otherwise there would have been none; Seventy-one piece symphony orchestra concerts in the State fair grounds; nightly band concerts during August in Belle Isle Park; 17-piece gypsy string music for veterans' hospitals; Christmas party music for underprivileged children; a concert by a 40-piece symphonic band, and 4 performances by 10-piece dance orchestras.

A break-down of the figures indicates that half the funds went for popular music, and half for music commonly called serious or highbrow.

The largest musicians' local in the country, in New York City, featured groups of strolling players, who visited veterans' hospitals in the metropolitan area, playing and singing request numbers at the patients' bedsides. Nearly 60 percent of the local's allocation of $91,000 (to which the local added $10,000 for overhead expenses) was spent in this and other types of musical entertainment for veterans.

NEW YORK PROGRAM

The New York program furnished employment, at one time or another for some 5,000 of local 802's 25,000 members. One hundred symphony players performed at a memorial concert in honor of the late Mayor F. H. La Guardia, playing under the baton of Alexander Smallens, the mayor's favorites: Wagner's Siegfried Funeral March; Bach's choral prelude, Come Sweet Death, and the adagio movement of his Toccata in C major; and Beethoven's Fifth Symphony.

In Philadelphia the union revived the 20-year dormant tradition of outdoor concerts in the Labor Plaza, which is equipped with an admirable shell for band and symphony performances. A symphonic band was used to bridge the gap between lowbrow and highbrow music; how successfully, is indicated by the fact that summer audiences exceeded 175,000.

In many other communities the federation's funds had a pump-priming effect on the musical life of the community. One major and several minor symphony orchestras were revived. In one instance the union's allocation of $10,000 for free symphony performances resulted in the raising of an additional $120,000 budget for the orchestra by other musically interested groups in the city.

The federation has paid particular attention to smaller communities and rural areas. In general the allocation of funds was $10.43 a member. For the large locals in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles this figure held only for the first 5,000 on the roster; beyond that number only $2 a head was granted. Account was taken of the fact that the larger centers already have much free music.

A Balcony for the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harold L. Ickes:

MAN TO MAN

(By Harold L. Ickes)

During the approximately two years and nine months of his accidental occupancy of the White House, President Truman has spent more than $650,000 of taxpayers' money on the Presidential mansion and grounds—since he became President on April 12, 1945, up to January 8, 1948. Moreover, he still has a balance of $477,120.24 under Public Law 334, which he can spend at his pleasure and which seems to be burning his pocket.

These figures do not include Mr. Truman's salary or his allowances for travel and entertainment. Mr. Truman does not have to tell how he spends this money unless he wants to. He does not even have to spend it wisely. He is like the spendthrift son who has been given a too-generous allowance by an indulgent father.

The American taxpayer is not of a kidney to be troubled by the small matter of supporting a President in a manner in which he is trying to become accustomed. However, in these days, when the business of keeping a roof over his own head calls for the Houdini touch, surely it can be taken as no reflection on his generosity if, confronted with the figures which I have mentioned, he raises his voice, as this taxpayer hereby does, to ask Mr. Truman "how come?" and "what for?" Do they do things that way in Independence, Mo.?

The White House is a roomy mansion, mellowed by time and hallowed by the great, with intervals in between. Mr. Truman, his endowments, genius, sagacity (or their opposites) notwithstanding, is a Federal worker. He, unlike other civil employees of the Government, is supplied with living quarters—the secluded and beautiful old house fronting on Pennsylvania Avenue. At least twice since he moved in he has given the impression of thinking that he owns it. He appears to be looking forward to living there for a long time to come.

Of course, the people happen to own the White House, and they may decide in November upon a new tenant who might question the good taste of Mr. Truman's proposed bubble-gum balcony. If Mr. Truman wants to be certain that his brief occupancy of the White House may become a living memory, he might carve his initials on one or more of the big trees on the lawn. I do not approve of carving one's initials on trees any more than I do of defacing public monuments, but this would be a lesser evil.

The White House, of course, like any other old house, sometimes needs repairs and replacements. The Truman couple, for the most part, live there alone, now that George E. Allen is no longer about. When two nice people, both on the other side of middle life, had to spend considerably more than half a million dollars in 2 years and 9 months—approximately $20,000 a month—to keep the house in repair and themselves comfortable, a hard-pressed taxpayer might be excused for wondering whether the house has been the scene of some American Legion parties or if the Trumans use Chanel No. 5 in the swimming pool. Certainly no act of God can be held responsible, since neither fire, tempest, flood, nor quake has befallen it.

Where has it all gone, Mr. President? Could it be that the piano in the East Room has needed a layer of solid gold? We taxpayers do not want to be petty about such things; and reading your budget message, we can see that $650,000 is just peanuts to you. But consider that little item of an iron balcony for your study that the Commission on Fine Arts has unanimously found would disfigure the White House. You say that you want it for privacy, and we want to protect you against Peeping Toms. But it was on the south portico, it is recorded, that President Woodrow Wilson proposed marriage. He did not seem to think that there was a lack of privacy. And he lived there for eight long years, Mr. Truman. Have you the right to disfigure the beautiful south facade when your tenancy may end in a few months?

This taxpayer has a suggestion to make. It occurs to me that there must be an oversupply of rather fine second-hand palaces in Europe, what with all of the kings who have been going out of business. Why not bring one over, say from the Balkans? Set it up in Lafayette Park, complete with moats, terraces, promenades—and especially balconies.

Mr. Truman could still use the old White House with which he seems to be so dissatisfied, for servants' quarters. A defunct royal house might be glad to throw in a supply of discarded liveries and gilded military trappings. Then, when a President of Brazil or some other of our sister republics, comes avisiting, Mr. Truman and his refurbished entourage could just plain knock his eye out.

It must be the Scot in me, but it is the economy that appeals. With planetary reconstruction ahead, someone has to think of these things.

Housing in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, in Massachusetts, there are approximately 600,000 veterans; 50,000 of these veterans are in desperate need of housing. It is estimated that 350,000 new residential units will be needed in my State alone in the next 10 years. The demand centers particularly on housing for "low income" groups of veterans and nonveterans. Next to the high cost-of-living prices the No. 1 domestic problem today is "housing."

While I sympathize particularly with the veterans population, I believe that the National Government should attack this problem now for the benefit of our entire population. It is for that reason that I have given my support in public utterances to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

It is the result of several years of study by Congressional committees and was reported out favorably by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last year. It will take care—or, at least, attempt to take care—of the housing needs of all income levels and represents the best thinking on the subject today.

I am glad to inform Congress that our people are doing something about the matter. The Massachusetts Legislature has given thought to the need for State action on housing, and for the lower income group in particular, since 1911. In more recent years it has enacted laws authorizing the establishment of local housing authorities empowered to undertake low-rent housing, war housing, and veterans' housing projects, permitting savings banks and domestic life-insurance companies to build and operate rental-housing projects, providing for limited dividend and nonprofit veterans' housing projects, allowing the creation of both public and private urban redevelopment corporations, and authorizing cities and towns to build housing for rent and sale to veterans. Presently, the Massachusetts Legislature is considering legislation providing for annual contributions by the State, patterned after the public housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Nevertheless, except where the Federal Government has entered the picture with its broader tax base and greater ability to carry the load, these State laws have resulted in very little housing. Private enterprise just isn't willing—and possibly it cannot be blamed—to build for the average person, veteran or nonveteran, even with the tax and other incentives offered by the State. The cities and towns are extremely reluctant, except in a few scattered cases, to increase their already burdensome tax rates. With Federal annual contributions made available by the TEW bill, however, and the private financing incentives provided by the other provisions of the TEW bill, Massachusetts could lick the housing shortage. What is needed is something that will not just waste money on a temporary expedient but will prevent recurring shortages and emergencies. What is needed are the long-range provisions of the TEW bill. A recent report by a special recess commission of the Massachusetts Legislature shows that Massachusetts needs over 350,000 new dwellings in the next 10 years.

While discussing this subject, I would like to call to your attention an article entitled "New Housing Program in New England." The authors are Harold Robinson and John I. Robinson, two well-known attorneys who probably know more about the housing problems of New England than any other persons. For 7 years Harold Robinson was regional counsel for New England for the United States Housing Authority and other Government agencies. John I. Robinson is chairman of the Springfield Housing Authority.

Today there is activity in the New England States on housing laws. These lawyers have set forth some interesting facts on existing laws and activities in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. After reading their article, I am sure you will be convinced that the several States are working hard on this problem, but they alone cannot do the job. Congress must aid them through the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill or some other advantageous measure.

The Robinson article appeared in the Daily Bond Buyer, of December 1, 1947, and is as follows:

NEW HOUSING PROGRAM IN NEW ENGLAND

(By Harold Robinson and John I. Robinson)

Three New England States, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, recently enacted legislation which will involve the borrowing and expenditure by public bodies of large sums of money for the construction of permanent homes for veterans.[1] These differ from the laws concerned with veterans' housing adopted in many States outside of New England in 1946 and 1947 in two respects: they entail permanent, as distinguished from temporary, housing and will mean the issuance of short-term notes and long-term definitive bonds backed by State guarantees or a pledge of State annual contributions. In the latter respect, they should be of considerable interest to investment houses and purchasers of housing authority issues.

[1] See New England Spends for Housing, the New England Townsman, September 1947, by the authors.

In Connecticut, the amount of bonds that may be issued is $15,000,000; in Massachusetts, a theoretically possible but inconceivable $120,000,000; and in New Hampshire, $7,000,000. In anticipation of the issuance of definitive bonds, New Hampshire housing authorities may sell short-term temporary notes.

The basic philosophy behind each program is the same: the recognition of the need for some form of subsidy if housing is to be provided the veteran of World War II. Each program is in turn attributable to the same four factors: an initial shortage of housing even for those able to afford inflated prices; a shortage of housing at rents and prices within the financial reach of the average veteran; a realization of the potential political threat of the house-hunting veteran; and the failure of the Congress to enact a national housing program. Nevertheless, as might be expected, each program is predicated upon a different form of subsidy and will involve different modes of administration and financing.

CONNECTICUT

The Connecticut legislation, Public Act No. 405, 1947, entitled "An Act Providing for State Assistance for Moderate Rental Housing Projects," provides for a State guaranty of the notes and bonds of local housing authorities. It is aimed at the "moderate," rather than "low" income group of the earlier housing authority law, although the definition of "moderate" is so broad and general as to permit of considerable administrative latitude. Once rents are established, eligibility for admission is restricted to persons whose gross annual income is no more than seven (or in the case of three or more minor dependents eight) times the rental. While the act is particularly directed toward taking care of the moderate-income veteran of World War II, it is written in terms of veterans' preference so as to eliminate the possibility of units remaining idle.

The act is a compromise between long-term public ownership and emergency legislation. On the one hand, it provides for amortization periods of 35 years and the possibility of conversion during that period to a low-rent housing project providing Federal financial assistance is obtained. On the other hand, it permits the sale of a project at any time after five years if the State housing authority has determined that the acute shortage of moderate-rental housing in the locality has terminated. Such a sale may be for an amount not less than 80 percent of the principal amount of the obligations and interest then outstanding. In either the case of sale or conversion to low-rent housing, the State's guaranty will cease. Presumably, any contractural arrangement with bondholders could not be abrogated by sale or conversion without the consent of bondholders. This is a problem that must be worked out in the form of contract of guaranty and in the bond itself.

The act is predicated upon the hope that the saving in interest rates, possible because of the State guaranty, and the absence of profit will be sufficient subsidy in themselves to permit achieving a moderate rental. No cash subsidy is contemplated. Indeed, the words of the act are: "Such guaranty and pledge shall be given only when the committee has determined that the housing notes or bonds of the local authority will be sufficiently amortized."

Certain supervisory powers are vested in the State housing authority which was established by earlier legislation. However, the power to contract with local housing authorities for the State guaranty is vested in a new committee composed of the Governor, attorney general, comptroller, and commissioner of finance and control. The committee must approve the amount, the term, the time of sale and any other conditions it deems relevant prior to notes or bonds being advertised for sale. As yet no announcement has been made of the form of notes or bonds to be issued, the form of contract to be entered into between the State and the local housing authority, the conditions to be attached to the guaranty and the type of local authority activity that might lead to a forfeiture of the guaranty. The background of negotiations between the United States Housing Authority and investment houses and bond counsel, in the early days of the low-rent housing and slum-clearance program under the United States Housing Act of 1937, should prove of inestimable value.

One defect in the act, which should be corrected at the special session of the General Assembly that may be called to reduce the sales tax, is the inclusion of temporary notes within the aggregate amount of notes and bonds that may be issued. Section 10, in limiting the aggregate issue, makes no exception for temporary loan notes. Presumably, therefore, any temporary issue is included in the $15,000,000 aggregate.

In view of the opinion of the Court of Errors and Appeals in the case of *Michael Franco* v. *City of New Haven* last summer, there is little if any question of the constitutionality of the act. That case, it is true, involved the sale of city bonds and the expenditure of State funds for temporary housing instead of local authority bonds and State guaranties for permanent housing. Nevertheless, no distinction was drawn by the court between temporary and permanent housing and the language of the opinion clearly indicates that the present program would be upheld without question.

As of October 24, 1947, the following earmarkings had been made:

	Maximum guaranty	Units
Darien	$160,000	18
Greenwich	638,000	73
Hartford	2,958,000	336
Manchester	421,000	48
Meriden	711,000	81
Middletown	479,000	54
New Britain	1,218,000	138
New Canaan	116,000	13
New Haven	2,857,000	324
Shelton	189,000	21
Stamford:		
City	856,000	97
Town	232,000	26
Wallingford (borough)	203,000	23
Waterbury	1,769,000	201
Wethersfield	174,000	20
Willimantic	218,000	25

Tentative earmarkings were also made for Derby, Norwich, Stonington, and Watertown.

MASSACHUSETTS

The Massachusetts program is of an entirely different nature and financing, although the philosophy of need for assistance is the same. The Massachusetts legislation, chapter 479, Laws of 1947 amending chapter 372, Laws of 1946, does not provide for any initial State assistance. It merely authorizes the cities and towns of the commonwealth to borrow up to an additional 2 percent of their average assessed valuation for the purpose of constructing single family, two family and multiple dwelling units for rent and eventual sale to veterans of World War II. Originally, the act prohibited sale before the end of the 5-year emergency period. It was amended in 1947, however, to permit sale before the end of 5 years and to authorize the granting of an option to purchase, both with the approval of the State board of housing. Inasmuch as the primary purpose of the act, making available housing at rentals of $40-$45, would be nullified by sale, it may be expected that most communities will keep title to the dwellings during the 5-year period.

Since the localities are permitted to rent at less than the economic rent, it is expected

that some loss will result annually. Moreover, since the sale market may drop in 5 years, sale prices will not necessarily equal cost. The Commonwealth, therefore, has pledged itself to reimburse any city or town for one-half the loss suffered when all the housing constructed by the city or town has been disposed of, but in no event more than one-half the cost of the undertaking to the city or town.

Not many cities have undertaken projects under the revised legislation. Boston is proceeding with a program of some $20,000,000. West Springfield has sold 10-year bonds (20-year maturities are permitted) in the amount of $350,000 at .0118 and has 43 single-family houses under construction with six scheduled for occupancy in early November. Springfield is undertaking a multiple units project costing about $1,600,000; Worcester is considering the expenditure of some $2,000,000; Amherst already has 21 houses under construction; Everett, Lynn, Cambridge, Watertown, Framingham, and Somerville are among others having projects in the planning stages or under way. Nevertheless, the response has been disappointingly light and slow in comparison to the total need. According to the special message of Governor Bradford to the legislature on April 24, 1947, fully utilized, the act makes possible the construction of 16,000 units and permits municipal borrowings of $120,000,000. Of course, these figures are theoretical maxima only and should not be taken too seriously.

The constitutionality of the expenditure of public funds for the program contemplated by the Massachusetts legislation was upheld in an opinion of the justices of the supreme judicial court while the legislation was still pending in the legislature. No question of validity, therefore, can now arise as it did in connection with earlier legislation (see Robinson, Public Housing in Massachusetts, and the later opinion of the justices dealing with temporary housing) to plague the municipality or the purchaser of municipal bonds. Borrowings are on city or town bonds which are payable from general tax revenues so that their value should have no relation to the project income.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

New Hampshire has adopted the annual contributions technique of the United States Housing Act of 1937 in its housing program. In July of 1947, the general court (as the New Hampshire legislature is called) enacted legislation, chapter 286, laws of 1947, authorizing the payment of subsidies by the State annually to local public-housing authorities for low-rent housing projects. The total amount of annual contributions that may be contracted for is $245,000 a year for 45 years. Again taking a leaf from the Federal legislation, the act authorizes the State to guarantee temporary loan notes of local housing authorities sold in anticipation of the issuance of definitive bonds. The total notes outstanding at any one time may not exceed $7,000,000—the amount of authorized construction—but, since it is the amount outstanding that governs, refunding its permissible and the error, if it was an error, of the Connecticut legislation, is avoided.

The agency of the State that will administer the program is the newly created State housing board. While the notes and bonds issued will be those of the local authority, the State housing board will necessarily approve the contents and form. Here again, it is assumed that the experience of the United States Housing Authority (the present Public Housing Administration) will not be overlooked, but that the board will utilize the experience of the Federal Government.

To date, only Manchester and Nashua have made application for aid. Others will undoubtedly follow. The State housing board has taken the position that its primary function is to disseminate information about the program, not urge its use. It has rightfully placed the burden of seeking assistance upon the community.

The constitutionality of the legislation in New Hampshire, too, is free from doubt, for the sponsors took the wise precaution of securing an opinion of the justices during the pendency of the bill.

CONCLUSION

The Massachusetts' program is a 5-year program. In New Hampshire the authority to contract for subsidies and guaranties lasts until June 30, 1951. The deadline in Connecticut is July 1, 1949. During that period—really a stop-gap period pending passage of Federal legislation—there should be substantial issues of interest to purchasers of municipal bonds. If Federal legislation is not soon forthcoming, moreover, it is quite likely that there will be increased programs in these States. Investment houses and bond houses would do well, therefore, to inform themselves of the three new housing programs in New England and keep current on the municipalities taking advantage of the State aid.

Some Sobering Realities Regarding Our Present Tax Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, while we are considering the pending tax-reduction measure, it seems to me that we should ponder some of the factual information that is available to those who would read. The following is a compilation of facts on the subject by one of the greatest economists of this country.

SOME SOBERING REALITIES REGARDING OUR PRESENT TAX BURDEN, AS COMPARED WITH 1929-30

Many small incomes and estates are even now free from all taxation. Several of our States have not yet imposed personal income taxes. Yet in this third year of peace, our Federal Government alone is collecting taxes at the following rates on the higher brackets.

Individual incomes, around 86½ percent beginning at $200,000 (and 50.35 percent at only $18,000); the top Federal tax bracket on net estates before credits is 77 percent; corporate net incomes over $50,000 are taxed at 38 percent. To all of the foregoing top rates there is in many cases an addition of several percentage points resulting from State taxes on the same incomes or estates.

As of the present time, our Federal, State, and local governments are collecting around $56,000,000,000 annually in taxes of all kinds, or roughly close to 30 percent of the estimated national income which will be produced this year ($180,000,000,000 to $195,000,000,000, depending somewhat on the method of calculation).

In normal periods before the Second World War, our State and local governments collected in taxes around twice as much as did our Federal Government. Now, in the third year of peace, our Federal Government is collecting taxes in an amount about four times as high as the taxes collected by all of our State and local governments, i. e., for fiscal 1947 close to $45,000,000,000, as compared with around $11,000,000,000.

Federal tax rates and collections are holding up stubbornly, while State and local government taxes are bound to increase rapidly for the next few years, because of the extraordinary population growth during the present decade, and the resultant need for many new improvements and facilities, such as roads, schools, sewers, water supply, etc. Also, wages and salaries of Civil Service employees have almost doubled over the past 10 years.

Looking back a few short years, we find that in the prosperous period 1929–1930, the weighted average taxes collected by all governmental bodies in some 50 leading countries of the world, amounted to little more than 15 percent of the estimated national income produced by those same countries. At the same time, in the United States the ratio was scarcely 11 percent, or little more than one-third our present ratio.

A few of the more backward countries levied taxes up to 25 percent or more on their national income. The Communist and totalitarian state of Russia headed the list at about 29 percent, or slightly under the present United States rate. Greece was next, at 27.5 percent. Other very important high-tax countries some 15 or 16 years ago were Germany, at 22 percent of the national income; France, a little more than 21 percent; and Great Britain, just under 21 percent. Where are all these countries now? Bankrupt or totalitarian.

For long years experts and writers on public finance, based on the historical records, have assumed that no nation could long endure and be prosperous and free, with taxes as high as 25 percent of the national income. Further, any ratio exceeding 15 percent was formerly considered too high to be reasonable, and any country with a ratio exceeding 20 percent seemed definitely headed for trouble.

What will, in due course, happen to the United States of America, unless we soon cut our taxes and our public expenditures to a point where the over-all "take" will be not more than 15–20 percent of the national income produced in years of normally good, but not "inflated," business activity?

It is not commonly understood that a very mild and to-be-expected decline of 15 percent in industrial production, and of 15 percent in our price level which has more than doubled since 1940, would probably lead to a 25- to 30-percent drop in our national income produced. We should, in fact, in the light of all past experience, be prepared for a much sharper drop within the next few years, on our present monetary standard. At any rate, it would not be surprising to see our present national income (according to recent "adjusted" computations) drop from a current level approaching $200,000,000,000 per annum to a level some place between $125,000,000,000 and $150,000,000,000. Even the extreme low of such a decline would leave our national income at a point fully 25 percent higher than any prewar year in our history.

It should further be noted that in times of depression or adversity, public expenditures, under our present philosophy of government, tend to increase and not to decrease. Hence, our total public budgets and tax collections, under the assumptions above indicated, could easily turn out to be as much as 40 to 50 percent of our entire national income. Does anyone believe that we would be other than a nation of slaves under such conditions?

Hence, as stated above, as there is little probability or possibility of any decline in the State and local government expenditures and taxes, we must look to the Federal Government for any substantial reductions. Even though the present budget of $40,000,000,000 or more should be cut in two, as should and could be done if the voters were sufficiently aroused, we would still be confronted with a total tax burden which by 1950 might be close to $35,000,000,000, or still fully 25 percent of a reasonably shaken-down national income. Even such a burden as this would be, year in and year out, almost unsupportable—and it is the kind of burden which has completely ruined the finances of the once-powerful Great Britain.

In order to effect the necessary reductions in our tax burden, top-bracket rates will have to go far below the theoretical 50 percent level, if we are to encourage the creation of venture capital, and the maximum production of goods, and are to maintain our free enterprise system. We will have to get back once more to top brackets nearer 25 percent, and virtually all citizens will have to pay something directly toward the support of their Government.

In considering the question of top-bracket rates, long experience indicates that any newly launched business has far less than a 50 percent chance to succeed. Also, even among established businesses, year in and year out, not more than 50 percent make profits. Hence, it is evident that the cards are definitely stacked against either the individual enterpriser, or the corporation, if the public powers levy taxes exceeding 25 percent of the total taxable net income; and probably any top-bracket rate over 25 percent tends to check individual initiative.

The American voter must be definitely informed as to the inevitable disasters which lie ahead, provided our Government continues to spend our money in peacetime at anything like the present rate. It is the road to fiscal ruin and to individual enslavement by the state.

The larger incomes and estates have already been substantially redistributed. Within a few short years it will be impossible further to mislead the mass of the voters by telling them that the rich, or those of moderate incomes, can bear the tax burden, while the masses will largely escape taxation. There will soon be no rich. All incentives to risk taking and the production of more wealth and income will be removed. The spirit of enterprise will be broken. Our standard of living will be reduced to that of the moribund countries of the Old World which we are now, no doubt mistakenly, trying to support and revivify at our further expense.

Unless our course is speedily reversed, like the Gadarene swine, we shall rush madly down the steep place into the sea; and we ourselves, through our public extravagances and lack of willingness to fight each day for freedom from over-centralized government, will have become the unconscious agents of our own suicide.

Estimated wealth, income, public debt, and taxation per capita of leading countries

[Arranged in order of net income—most data as of 1929]

Country	Wealth per capita (1)	Public debt per capita (including local debt) (2)	Percent of debt to wealth (2÷1) (3)	External public debt per capita (4)	Net wealth per capita (1−4) (5)	Income per capita (6)	Total taxes per capita (7)	Percent of taxes to wealth (7÷1) (8)	Percent of taxes to income (7÷6) (9)	Net income per capita (6−7) (10)
United States	$3,239	$243.0	7.5	$0.0	$3,200	$570	$77	2.38	10.6	$657
Canada	2,827	454.0	16.8	148.0	2,679	571	66	2.33	11.6	505
New Zealand	3,089	1,080.0	35.0	594.0	2,495	495	80	2.6	17.8	396
United Kingdom	2,514	908.0	37.3	115.0	2,399	415	86	3.42	20.7	329
Australia	2,934	878.0	44.2	455.0	1,579	591	86	4.21	21.9	505
Switzerland	2,612	337.0	12.9	12.0	2,600	348	44	1.7	12.7	304
Denmark	1,714	145.0	8.5	78.0	1,636	328	45	2.55	14.3	284
Netherlands	1,293	212.0	16.4	2.3	1,291	323	55	4.22	16.8	268
Sweden	1,095	111.0	10.4	19.0	1,046	262	43	4.0	16.4	219
Norway	1,067	200.0	18.7	89.0	978	267	50	4.7	18.8	216
Argentina	1,608	157.0	9.8	74.0	1,534	250	34	2.08	13.4	189
Germany	1,249	208.0	16.7	147.0	1,102	242	53	4.25	22.0	173
France	1,653	450.0	27.2	180.0	1,474	219	46	2.81	21.2	150
Uruguay	1,622	181.0	9.3	92.0	1,530	189	20	1.86	16.0	143
Belgium	1,376	194.0	14.1	98.0	1,278	175	32	2.3	18.0	135
Spain	1,372	132.0	10.4	7.7	1,264	158	23	1.8	14.5	135
Irish Free State	933	53.0	5.7	11.0	922	170	42	4.54	25.0	128
Austria	742	72.0	9.7	58.0	684	156	30	4.1	19.5	126
Chile	848	86.0	10.1	74.0	774	155	31	3.65	20.0	124
Czechoslovakia	710	79.0	11.1	15.0	695	131	19	2.61	14.1	112
Finland	761	32.0	4.2	26.0	735	125	23	2.98	18.2	102
Italy	723	233.0	32.2	119.0	604	120	19	2.67	16.0	101
Cuba	834	41.0	4.9	38.0	796	118	30	3.63	25.6	88
Puerto Rico	421	32.0	7.6	----------	421	91	10	2.46	11.4	81
Hungary	638	75.0	11.8	66.0	572	93	16	2.47	17.0	77
Union of South Africa	900	182.0	20.2	112.0	788	96	21	2.37	22.1	75
Rumania	587	60.0	8.5	41.0	546	84	11	1.82	12.7	73
Yugoslavia	569	42.0	7.5	39.0	530	78	10	1.77	12.7	68
Japan (proper)	676	59.0	9.3	13.0	622	79	13	2.1	16.7	66
Costa Rica	406	42.0	10.3	35.0	371	77	17	4.25	22.4	60
Greece	483	85.0	17.6	61.0	421	73	20	4.1	27.5	53
Poland	543	18.0	3.3	15.0	528	63	10	1.89	16.4	53
Venezuela	481	3.3	0.7	1.5	480	64	13	2.73	20.5	51
Algeria	302	5.8	1.9	5.8	296	55	9	2.9	15.7	47
Colombia	565	28.0	4.9	21.0	544	57	10	1.78	17.8	47
Russia (U. S. S. R.)	423	68.0	16.3	58.0	368	65	19	4.42	28.8	46
Egypt	414	31.0	7.5	11.0	403	55	10	2.3	17.5	45
Peru	407	24.0	5.9	19.0	388	54	9	2.08	15.8	45
Portugal	479	81.0	16.9	26.0	453	57	13	2.76	23.7	44
Bulgaria	398	54.0	13.6	47.0	352	52	8	1.91	14.7	44
Salvador	290	13.0	4.5	12.0	278	49	8	2.8	16.4	41
Brazil	397	44.0	11.1	33.0	364	47	8	2.12	17.9	39
Philippine Islands	238	5.3	2.2	----------	238	40	3	1.33	8.0	37
Mexico	427	53.0	12.4	30.0	397	49	13	3.03	26.5	36
Guatemala	213	7.2	3.4	5.9	207	38	6	2.8	15.3	32
Bolivia	258	22.0	8.5	20.0	238	32	6	2.37	19.0	26
Ecuador	225	13.0	5.8	11.0	214	30	6	2.7	20.0	24
British India	150	17.0	11.6	8.0	142	24	4	2.76	17.0	20
Average of 48 countries	991	150.0	15.1	48.0	943	181	28	2.81	15.4	153

Issued Nov. 7, 1930.

We Live on Next to Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in Tom Breneman's magazine, February 1948 issue, entitled "We Live on Next to Nothing":

WE LIVE ON NEXT TO NOTHING

(Anonymous)

Twelve thousand dollars used to be a lot of money. That is the amount we saved for the years when my husband, Lewis, could no longer work, and that is the amount which took wings and simply flew away.

Meanwhile old age just snuck up on us. Like many a person whose silver hairs have begun to outnumber the gold, we woke up to find ourselves on the shady side of the years during which one can make a living, and yet needing the means of subsistence more than ever.

Lewis was successful in business back in Virginia where we built a fine home with a fireplace in every room, and we lived well, attended by servants. I was an active worker in the church, and our social life was very satisfying. Little did we dream of the bleak years which were to lie ahead.

Lewis' business took him all over this country, Canada and Mexico, and I began to travel with him. Hotels were our home, and we leased our Virginia place. However, the tenants kept demanding improvements, which finally annoyed us so that we sold the house. That was a serious mistake.

In 1926 we found ourselves in Oregon where Lewis made his headquarters in a city near the Pacific Ocean, traveling up and down the coast. We leased a furnished apartment at the Clevedon Court and, since we had no children and I had a great deal of time on my hands, I took a job in the millinery department of a large store. Sometimes I received as much as $200 or more a month while Lewis was making $300, and thus we cleared $500 a month for several years. During this time we added to our savings until we had accumulated the $12,000 I previously mentioned. We had two cars, fine clothes, ate at the best hotels and restaurants, attended the symphony concerts and many social affairs. Fortune had indeed smiled on us. But her smile was soon to turn into one of mockery.

Disaster struck suddenly. I became ill and Lewis sent me to a hospital. The doctors could not diagnose my case, and I remained in a private room, with a nurse, at $7 per day. Our savings began to melt. Lewis, who has always been a devoted husband, became greatly distressed because of my illness, for several times I almost died; and, probably as a result of my unfortunate condition, he neglected his business.

I had been in the hospital for 3 years, and my weight had dropped from 140 to 95 pounds when the next blow fell. This was the loss of his share of the business due to the dishonesty of his partner. He gave up his office in the Exchange Building and sold one of the cars.

Then the next stroke of fate descended upon us. Lewis was planning to sell the other automobile, although it nearly broke his heart to have to part with it. One day, while driving on a country road, he was forced into a ditch by a truck, and the car

that some loss will result annually. Moreover, since the sale market may drop in 5 years, sale prices will not necessarily equal cost. The Commonwealth, therefore, has pledged itself to reimburse any city or town for one-half the loss suffered when all the housing constructed by the city or town has been disposed of, but in no event more than one-half the cost of the undertaking to the city or town.

Not many cities have undertaken projects under the revised legislation. Boston is proceeding with a program of some $20,000,000. West Springfield has sold 10-year bonds (20-year maturities are permitted) in the amount of $350,000 at .0118 and has 43 single-family houses under construction with six scheduled for occupancy in early November. Springfield is undertaking a multiple units project costing about $1,600,000; Worcester is considering the expenditure of some $2,000,000; Amherst already has 21 houses under construction; Everett, Lynn, Cambridge, Watertown, Framingham, and Somerville are among others having projects in the planning stages or under way. Nevertheless, the response has been disappointingly light and slow in comparison to the total need. According to the special message of Governor Bradford to the legislature on April 24, 1947, fully utilized, the act makes possible the construction of 16,000 units and permits municipal borrowings of $120,000,000. Of course, these figures are theoretical maxima only and should not be taken too seriously.

The constitutionality of the expenditure of public funds for the program contemplated by the Massachusetts legislation was upheld in an opinion of the justices of the supreme judicial court while the legislation was still pending in the legislature. No question of validity, therefore, can now arise as it did in connection with earlier legislation (see Robinson, Public Housing in Massachusetts, and the later opinion of the justices dealing with temporary housing) to plague the municipality or the purchaser of municipal bonds. Borrowings are on city or town bonds which are payable from general tax revenues so that their value should have no relation to the project income.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

New Hampshire has adopted the annual contributions technique of the United States Housing Act of 1937 in its housing program. In July of 1947, the general court (as the New Hampshire legislature is called) enacted legislation, chapter 286, laws of 1947, authorizing the payment of subsidies by the State annually to local public-housing authorities for low-rent housing projects. The total amount of annual contributions that may be contracted for is $245,000 a year for 45 years. Again taking a leaf from the Federal legislation, the act authorizes the State to guarantee temporary loan notes of local housing authorities sold in anticipation of the issuance of definitive bonds. The total notes outstanding at any one time may not exceed $7,000,000—the amount of authorized construction—but, since it is the amount outstanding that governs, refunding its permissible and the error, if it was an error, of the Connecticut legislation, is avoided.

The agency of the State that will administer the program is the newly created State housing board. While the notes and bonds issued will be those of the local authority, the State housing board will necessarily approve the contents and form. Here again, it is assumed that the experience of the United States Housing Authority (the present Public Housing Administration) will not be overlooked, but that the board will utilize the experience of the Federal Government.

To date, only Manchester and Nashua have made application for aid. Others will undoubtedly follow. The State housing board has taken the position that its primary function is to disseminate information about the program, not urge its use. It has rightfully placed the burden of seeking assistance upon the community.

The constitutionality of the legislation in New Hampshire, too, is free from doubt, for the sponsors took the wise precaution of securing an opinion of the justices during the pendency of the bill.

CONCLUSION

The Massachusetts' program is a 5-year program. In New Hampshire the authority to contract for subsidies and guaranties lasts until June 30, 1951. The deadline in Connecticut is July 1, 1949. During that period—really a stop-gap period pending passage of Federal legislation—there should be substantial issues of interest to purchasers of municipal bonds. If Federal legislation is not soon forthcoming, moreover, it is quite likely that there will be increased programs in these States. Investment houses and bond houses would do well, therefore, to inform themselves of the three new housing programs in New England and keep current on the municipalities taking advantage of the State aid.

Some Sobering Realities Regarding Our Present Tax Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, while we are considering the pending tax-reduction measure, it seems to me that we should ponder some of the factual information that is available to those who would read. The following is a compilation of facts on the subject by one of the greatest economists of this country.

SOME SOBERING REALITIES REGARDING OUR PRESENT TAX BURDEN, AS COMPARED WITH 1929–30

Many small incomes and estates are even now free from all taxation. Several of our States have not yet imposed personal income taxes. Yet in this third year of peace, our Federal Government alone is collecting taxes at the following rates on the higher brackets.

Individual incomes, around 86½ percent beginning at $200,000 (and 50.35 percent at only $18,000); the top Federal tax bracket on net estates before credits is 77 percent; corporate net incomes over $50,000 are taxed at 38 percent. To all of the foregoing top rates there is in many cases an addition of several percentage points resulting from State taxes on the same incomes or estates.

As of the present time, our Federal, State, and local governments are collecting around $56,000,000,000 anually in taxes of all kinds, or roughly close to 30 percent of the estimated national income which will be produced this year ($180,000,000,000 to $195,000,000,000, depending somewhat on the method of calculation).

In normal periods before the Second World War, our State and local governments collected in taxes around twice as much as did our Federal Government. Now, in the third year of peace, our Federal Government is collecting taxes in an amount about four times as high as the taxes collected by all of our State and local governments, i. e., for fiscal 1947 close to $45,000,000,000, as compared with around $11,000,000,000.

Federal tax rates and collections are holding up stubbornly, while State and local government taxes are bound to increase rapidly for the next few years, because of the extraordinary population growth during the present decade, and the resultant need for many new improvements and facilities, such as roads, schools, sewers, water supply, etc. Also, wages and salaries of Civil Service employees have almost doubled over the past 10 years.

Looking back a few short years, we find that in the prosperous period 1929–1930, the weighted average taxes collected by all governmental bodies in some 50 leading countries of the world, amounted to little more than 15 percent of the estimated national income produced by those same countries. At the same time, in the United States the ratio was scarcely 11 percent, or little more than one-third our present ratio.

A few of the more backward countries levied taxes up to 25 percent or more on their national income. The Communist and totalitarian state of Russia headed the list at about 29 percent, or slightly under the present United States rate. Greece was next, at 27.5 percent. Other very important high-tax countries some 15 or 16 years ago were Germany, at 22 percent of the national income; France, a little more than 21 percent; and Great Britain, just under 21 percent. Where are all these countries now? Bankrupt or totalitarian.

For long years experts and writers on public finance, based on the historical records, have assumed that no nation could long endure and be prosperous and free, with taxes as high as 25 percent of the national income. Further, any ratio exceeding 15 percent was formerly considered too high to be reasonable, and any country with a ratio exceeding 20 percent seemed definitely headed for trouble.

What will, in due course, happen to the United States of America, unless we soon cut our taxes and our public expenditures to a point where the over-all "take" will be not more than 15–20 percent of the national income produced in years of normally good, but not "inflated," business activity?

It is not commonly understood that a very mild and to-be-expected decline of 15 percent in industrial production, and of 15 percent in our price level which has more than doubled since 1940, would probably lead to a 25- to 30-percent drop in our national income produced. We should, in fact, in the light of all past experience, be prepared for a much sharper drop within the next few years, on our present monetary standard. At any rate, it would not be surprising to see our present national income (according to recent "adjusted" computations) drop from a current level approaching $200,000,000,000 per annum to a level some place between $125,000,000,000 and $150,000,000,000. Even the extreme low of such a decline would leave our national income at a point fully 25 percent higher than any prewar year in our history.

It should further be noted that in times of depression or adversity, public expenditures, under our present philosophy of government, tend to increase and not to decrease. Hence, our total public budgets and tax collections, under the assumptions above indicated, could easily turn out to be as much as 40 to 50 percent of our entire national income. Does anyone believe that we would be other than a nation of slaves under such conditions?

Hence, as stated above, as there is little probability or possibility of any decline in the State and local government expenditures and taxes, we must look to the Federal Government for any substantial reductions. Even though the present budget of $40,000,000,000 or more should be cut in two, as should and could be done if the voters were sufficiently aroused, we would still be confronted with a total tax burden which by 1950 might be close to $35,000,000,000, or still fully 25 percent of a reasonably shaken-down national income. Even such a burden as this would be, year in and year out, almost unsupportable—and it is the kind of burden which has completely ruined the finances of the once-powerful Great Britain.

In order to effect the necessary reductions in our tax burden, top-bracket rates will have to go far below the theoretical 50 percent level, if we are to encourage the creation of venture capital, and the maximum production of goods, and are to maintain our free enterprise system. We will have to get back once more to top brackets nearer 25 percent, and virtually all citizens will have to pay something directly toward the support of their Government.

In considering the question of top-bracket rates, long experience indicates that any newly launched business has far less than a 50 percent chance to succeed. Also, even among established businesses, year in and year out, not more than 50 percent make profits. Hence, it is evident that the cards are definitely stacked against either the individual enterpriser, or the corporation, if the public powers levy taxes exceeding 25 percent of the total taxable net income; and probably any top-bracket rate over 25 percent tends to check individual initiative.

The American voter must be definitely informed as to the inevitable disasters which lie ahead, provided our Government continues to spend our money in peacetime at anything like the present rate. It is the road to fiscal ruin and to individual enslavement by the state.

The larger incomes and estates have already been substantially redistributed. Within a few short years it will be impossible further to mislead the mass of the voters by telling them that the rich, or those of moderate incomes, can bear the tax burden, while the masses will largely escape taxation. There will soon be no rich. All incentives to risk taking and the production of more wealth and income will be removed. The spirit of enterprise will be broken. Our standard of living will be reduced to that of the moribund countries of the Old World which we are now, no doubt mistakenly, trying to support and revivify at our further expense.

Unless our course is speedily reversed, like the Gadarene swine, we shall rush madly down the steep place into the sea; and we ourselves, through our public extravagances and lack of willingness to fight each day for freedom from over-centralized government, will have become the unconscious agents of our own suicide.

Estimated wealth, income, public debt, and taxation per capita of leading countries

[Arranged in order of net income—most data as of 1929]

Country	Wealth per capita (1)	Public debt per capita (including local debt) (2)	Percent of debt to wealth (2÷1) (3)	External public debt per capita (4)	Net wealth per capita (1−4) (5)	Income per capita (6)	Total taxes per capita (7)	Percent of taxes to wealth (7÷1) (8)	Percent of taxes to income (7÷6) (9)	Net income per capita (6−7) (10)
United States	$3,239	$243.0	7.5	$0.0	$3,239	$734	$77	2.38	10.6	$657
Canada	2,827	474.0	16.8	148.0	2,679	571	66	2.33	11.6	505
New Zealand	3,089	1,090.0	35.0	594.0	2,495	695	90	2.6	17.8	395
United Kingdom	2,514	938.0	37.3	115.0	2,399	415	86	3.42	20.7	329
Australia	2,054	878.0	43.2	455.0	1,579	391	86	4.21	21.9	305
Switzerland	2,612	337.0	12.9	12.0	2,600	348	44	1.7	12.7	304
Denmark	1,714	145.0	8.5	78.0	1,636	328	44	2.55	13.3	284
Netherlands	1,293	212.0	16.4	2.3	1,291	323	55	4.23	16.8	268
Sweden	1,065	111.0	10.4	19.0	1,046	262	43	4.0	16.4	219
Norway	1,067	200.0	18.7	89.0	978	267	50	4.7	18.8	217
Argentina	1,606	157.0	9.8	74.0	1,534	250	34	2.08	13.4	216
Germany	1,249	208.0	16.7	147.0	1,102	242	53	4.25	22.0	189
France	1,633	450.0	27.2	180.0	1,474	219	46	2.81	21.2	173
Uruguay	1,622	151.0	9.3	92.0	1,530	189	30	1.86	16.0	159
Belgium	1,376	194.0	14.1	98.0	1,278	175	32	2.3	18.0	143
Spain	1,272	132.0	10.4	7.7	1,264	158	23	1.8	14.5	135
Irish Free State	933	53.0	5.7	11.0	922	170	42	4.54	25.0	128
Austria	742	72.0	9.7	58.0	684	156	30	4.1	19.5	126
Chile	808	86.0	10.1	74.0	734	155	31	3.65	20.0	124
Czechoslovakia	710	79.0	11.1	15.0	695	131	19	2.61	14.1	112
Finland	761	32.0	4.2	26.0	735	125	23	2.98	18.2	102
Italy	723	233.0	32.2	119.0	604	120	19	2.67	16.0	101
Cuba	834	41.0	4.9	38.0	796	118	30	3.63	25.6	88
Puerto Rico	421	32.0	7.6		421	91	10	2.46	11.4	81
Hungary	638	75.0	11.8	66.0	572	93	16	2.47	17.0	77
Union of South Africa	900	182.0	20.2	112.0	788	96	21	2.37	22.1	75
Rumania	587	60.6	8.5	41.0	546	84	11	1.82	12.7	73
Yugoslavia	560	42.0	7.5	29.0	530	78	10	1.77	12.7	68
Japan (proper)	636	59.0	9.3	13.0	622	79	13	2.1	16.7	66
Costa Rica	406	42.0	10.3	35.0	371	77	17	4.25	22.4	60
Greece	483	85.0	17.6	61.0	421	73	20	4.1	27.5	53
Poland	543	18.0	3.3	15.0	528	63	10	1.89	16.4	53
Venezuela	481	3.3	0.7	1.5	480	64	13	2.73	20.5	51
Algeria	302	5.8	1.9	5.8	296	66	9	2.9	15.7	47
Colombia	565	28.0	4.9	21.0	544	57	10	1.78	17.8	47
Russia (U. S. S. R.)	423	60.0	15.3	55.0	368	65	19	4.42	28.8	46
Egypt	414	31.0	7.5	11.0	403	55	10	2.3	17.5	45
Peru	407	24.0	5.9	19.0	388	54	9	2.08	15.8	45
Portugal	479	81.0	16.9	26.0	453	57	13	2.76	23.7	44
Bulgaria	398	54.0	13.6	47.0	352	52	8	1.91	14.7	44
Salvador	290	13.0	4.5	12.0	278	49	8	2.8	16.4	41
Brazil	397	44.0	11.1	33.0	364	47	8	2.12	17.9	39
Philippine Islands	238	5.3	2.2		238	40	3	1.33	8.0	37
Mexico	427	53.0	12.4	20.0	407	49	13	3.03	26.5	36
Guatemala	213	7.2	3.4	5.9	207	38	6	2.8	15.3	32
Bolivia	258	22.0	8.5	20.0	238	32	6	2.37	19.0	26
Ecuador	225	13.0	5.8	11.0	214	30	6	2.7	20.0	24
British India	150	17.0	11.6	8.0	142	24	4	2.75	17.0	20
Average of 48 countries	991	150.0	15.1	48.0	943	181	28	2.81	15.4	153

Issued Nov. 7, 1930.

We Live on Next to Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in Tom Breneman's magazine, February 1948 issue, entitled "We Live on Next to Nothing":

WE LIVE ON NEXT TO NOTHING
(Anonymous)

Twelve thousand dollars used to be a lot of money. That is the amount we saved for the years when my husband, Lewis, could no longer work, and that is the amount which took wings and simply flew away.

Meanwhile old age just snuck up on us. Like many a person whose silver hairs have begun to outnumber the gold, we woke up to find ourselves on the shady side of the years during which one can make a living, and yet needing the means of subsistence more than ever.

Lewis was successful in business back in Virginia where we built a fine home with a fireplace in every room, and we lived well, attended by servants. I was an active worker in the church, and our social life was very satisfying. Little did we dream of the bleak years which were to lie ahead.

Lewis' business took him all over this country, Canada and Mexico, and I began to travel with him. Hotels were our home, and we leased our Virginia place. However, the tenants kept demanding improvements, which finally annoyed us so that we sold the house. That was a serious mistake.

In 1926 we found ourselves in Oregon where Lewis made his headquarters in a city near the Pacific Ocean, traveling up and down the coast. We leased a furnished apartment at the Clevedon Court and, since we had no children and I had a great deal of time on my hands, I took a job in the millinery department of a large store. Sometimes I received as much as $200 or more a month while Lewis was making $300, and thus we cleared $500 a month for several years. During this time we added to our savings until we had accumulated the $12,000 I previously mentioned. We had two cars, fine clothes, ate at the best hotels and restaurants, attended the symphony concerts and many social affairs. Fortune had indeed smiled on us. But her smile was soon to turn into one of mockery.

Disaster struck suddenly. I became ill and Lewis sent me to a hospital. The doctors could not diagnose my case, and I remained in a private room, with a nurse, at $7 per day. Our savings began to melt. Lewis, who has always been a devoted husband, became greatly distressed because of my illness, for several times I almost died; and, probably as a result of my unfortunate condition, he neglected his business.

I had been in the hospital for 3 years, and my weight had dropped from 140 to 95 pounds when the next blow fell. This was the loss of his share of the business due to the dishonesty of his partner. He gave up his office in the Exchange Building and sold one of the cars.

Then the next stroke of fate descended upon us. Lewis was planning to sell the other automobile, although it nearly broke his heart to have to part with it. One day, while driving on a country road, he was forced into a ditch by a truck, and the car

was demolished. He crawled out, lucky to escape with his life. He was taken to the hospital where I was a patient, and it was discovered that he had a hip injury. Our money was so nearly gone, however, that he could not remain for a thorough examination and treatment.

Doctor and hospital bills had pyramided until our $12,000 had shrunk to almost nothing. Finally our funds were so depleted that it was necessary for me to be sent to the county hospital. Strangely enough, I began to improve after this change and, in a few months, I was discharged, weak and thin, to take up life again, but not where I had left off.

While I was in the hospital Lewis had allowed moths to get into our clothes. They destroyed, among other things, six of his tailor-made suits and my silver fox furs. I cried when I saw the latter, completely demolished except for the tails. My fur coat, miraculously, escaped.

We were confronted with the necessity of adjusting our standard of living to what could hardly be called a wheelbarrow income. Some southern friends of ours found a plain bungalow which we were able to rent for $10 a month, since the depression was then in full swing, and we purchased some cheap second-hand furniture.

We would have starved had not our old acquaintances from Virginia assisted us. Then the stark fact that we would have to go on relief stared us in the face. My husband's spirit quailed at the thought, for it seemed impossible that we, who had lived so well, should have to take that step. However, we could not continue to accept charity from our friends, who were in very modest circumstances. Although he would rather have faced a firing squad, Lewis applied for WPA employment and, with a gang of men, he was sent to work in a park near our home.

Doctor bills continued to come in, including one for $500 from the attorney for the estate of one of my physicians who had died. Of course, we could not pay them. Anyhow, it seemed $12,000 had been enough compensation for the doctors and hospitals.

The next blow of fate was the unexpected development of a sharp ache in Lewis's hip which had been injured in the automobile crash. Soon he could not bear his weight upon it. An examination at the county hospital disclosed that cartilage had formed about the socket bone of the hip, and absolutely nothing could be done to alleviate this condition which resulted from improper treatment at the time of the accident.

Soon Lewis was unable to walk, except with crutches, and, as his condition became worse, he found it necessary to lie down most of the day. So we lost the small income derived from the relief employment.

I joined a WPA sewing project and worked for 2 weeks every month at a school in the neighborhood. In my spare time I took care of children and did housework by the hour for families who lived in the fashionable district up the hill. Also, I began to sell household products from door to door. At first I could hardly carry the case of groceries and drugs, but my health improved, likely as a result of walking in the fresh air.

Finally, Lewis reached the age of 65, applied for a State old-age pension, and was granted the munificent sum of $24.75 per month. But it looked big to us then.

Ten full years of hardship ensued until I attained the age of 65 and could also secure old-age assistance. Because I lived with my husband I could not obtain as much as a person living alone, and my pension amounted to $19.45.

Then the next blow fell. The house which we had rented for so many years for $10 per month was to be sold. Our landlord had been good to us, often allowing us to wait several months about paying when $10 was too much to raise. However, his own circumstances were such that he could no longer be lenient.

In desperation, I managed to find an upper flat in an ancient, sagging building in our neighborhood which was occupied by pensioners. There were two lower flats which rented for $15 a month each and two upper flats which were $10 apiece. One of the latter, with living room, bedroom, kitchen, and bath, was available, and, as beggars cannot be choosers, we took it gladly. My husband dragged himself up the long, dark flight of stairs, and we were "at home" again.

We have been there ever since, oppressed by a tyrannical landlord who, we know, plans to evict us at the earliest possible moment. Last year our water tank began to leak, and when the rooms began to be flooded he turned it off instead of fixing it. Now when we want hot water we must heat it in a teakettle. We're not having such a hot time, I can assure you, especially when we take a bath. Like a vulture, the landlord is watchfully waiting until rent controls are removed, and where we will go then and what we will do I cannot say.

I am now 72 and Lewis is 83. Crippled as he is, it seems pitiful that he will have to move. A few months ago he had a stroke from which he has scarcely recovered, and I have high blood pressure so that I am threatened with a stroke at any time. When his stroke occurred, I rushed to assist him and fell, breaking my foot. Both of us were ill at once, and the old lady across the hall came in and helped us. I had to wear a cast on my leg, and when I was able to get out to shop I had to go up the steps at our flat one at a time, sitting down and working my way up backwards. We didn't dare to ask for medical aid from the old-age assistance office because we feared that this would lead to a reduction of our pensions. A private physician presented a bill for $75, although he knew we were on relief.

Our combined pensions now amount to $66. Our rent, which is extremely low for these times, cuts this to $56. Water is furnished, but the gas and electric bills average $5, which leaves $50 for everything else. Because we are not able to carry fuel up to our rooms we use a gas range and an oil circulating heater. The relief office allows $3 per month for fuel, which is included in our $66 pension; but a barrel of oil costs $5.50 and lasts for only two weeks in cold weather, while the price is rising all the time.

Our food costs about $40 a month, sometimes a little less, although I carry in everything from the chain stores, up the long flight of stairs. We do not take fresh milk, for it is now 20 cents a quart. Butter is something which belongs to the dear, dead days of long ago. Every other Sunday we have fresh meat, usually hamburger mixed with bread crumbs to make it go farther. We almost never use eggs. Fresh bread is also something which belongs to the past, for we purchase day-old bread and doughnuts, and sometimes, as a special treat, a day-old pie or, in very rare instances, cake.

We do not subscribe to a newspaper, which is $1 per month for the daily issue, since a dollar is such a large amount in our domestic economy. Of course a telephone is out of our world, and no amusements are possible. The radio, a small table model, is our only luxury. My husband, suffering constantly, lies on his couch, listening to it day after day.

Like condemned criminals, awaiting the day of execution, we tremble as the time for the lifting of rent controls approaches. We know that we cannot find another place to live for less than $25 or $30 a month, and pensions will not be raised to provide for this additional expense. The first day of March 1948, when it comes, will be, for us, the end.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, since rent control and the housing shortage are two questions uppermost in the minds of so many people, and because they are definitely related, one to the other, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include an article in the January 27 issue of the Wall Street Journal. This explains in some detail the inequalities resulting from an attempt to control rents, and the inability of Government regulations to cope with existing conditions. The article follows:

RENT AND SUPER-RENT—A ROOF NOW BRINGS A FITTANCE OR A FORTUNE; DOUBLE STANDARD GROWS—FLAT COSTS $45 MONTHLY, ITS DECONTROLLED TWIN, $135; ONE APARTMENT JUMPS 200 PERCENT—MAZE OF CONTROL, DECONTROL

Postwar America has developed a two-level rent system.

Take the case of a two-family house in a Boston suburb—typical of many. The upstairs family pays $45 a month for their rent-controlled flat; the downstairs neighbors hand over $130 a month for its uncontrolled twin.

Almost 3,000 miles away on the west coast, a decontrolled Los Angeles apartment is renting for $125 a month. Not long ago it went for only $42.50.

In Chicago, a five-room unfurnished flat in a new suburban building rents for $97 a month. Next door a bigger (six-room) unfurnished flat is frozen at $75.

Why the double standard? It harks back to the bumbling maze of rent controls, decontrols and uncontrols hacked out in Washington since the war.

Most urban rents throughout the Nation are still *frozen* by Federal law at rock-bottom levels compared with other rocketing cost-of-living prices like butter and beef. (While food costs in the Government's consumer price index have climbed 116 percent from prewar, rents are up only 10 percent). But some rents have managed to shake loose, and they are headed skyward, all the higher because the bulk of rents are so strictly controlled.

SOME FROZEN, SOME NOT

The causes are various, new dwellings, those put up or converted since February 1947, are exempt from Federal rent control. Witness the Californian who's turning his two-flat house, which rented at a ceiling of $40 each, into four apartments that will bring $70 apiece. Or the brand new Pittsburgh apartments going at $150 to $160 a month while similar five-room units within hollering distance are frozen at $60 to $75.

Uncontrolled, too, are old quarters which hadn't been rented for 2 years before February 1947. That brings on many a strange case of two-level rent. Like the San Francisco landlord who lived downstairs in a two-flat dwelling and charged his upstairs tenant the $55-a-month ceiling. The tenant moved out—but then bought the place. He moved back into his $55 upstairs quarters and now rents out the downstairs, identical with his own flat, for $150. It's all legal: The lower flat has no ceiling since it was never before rented.

One Cleveland concern hunting homes for its personnel was offered one at the edge of fashionable Shaker Heights for $125 a month. Across the street a similar place is renting at a ceiling of $45 a month. The owner of the first house had been living there himself. Now that he's moved out, he can charge whatever the traffic will bear.

In San Francisco's Sunset District a man rented his five-room unfurnished house last year for $90 a month. OPA made him cut back to $45 a month. When the new rent-control law went into effect June 30, his house was decontrolled because he hadn't rented it before the February 1 deadline. So he hiked the rent to $125. Houses right around it are still frozen under ceilings from $35 to $45.

Biggest headache, says a west coast rent director, are the 15-percent-hike leases that tenants and landlords are allowed to negotiate. If a lease is broken and the tenant moves out, the place is automatically—and conveniently—decontrolled. The landlord can legitimately charge the next tenant as much as he'll pay. "We've heard of cases where landlords paid tenants to move out to decontrol the units," he reports.

Adding a few extra pieces to a furnished apartment can be a dodge for lifting rents. The law lets landlords hike rents if they provide increased services of major improvements.

In Watertown, Mass., an apartment that used to rent for $50 a month has been boosted to $125 since the owner remodeled it at a cost of $400.

One Pittsburgh landlord has a six-room house which he rented for $45 a month. When the family moved out, he remodeled it into two units by installing a sink in a second-floor room and rented the flats at a neat $55 each. The local rent-control office has slashed the fee to $27 each, but the landlord is appealing to the regional office.

Where rents have mounted when controls came off, landlords blame drastically higher costs. They tab them off on their fingers: High taxes, higher costs of repairs, fuel boosts, bigger checks to janitors. Boston landlords say repairs cost two and a half times what they used to.

To make ends meet, one Portland, Oreg., landlord, whose apartments are frozen at $40 a month, has fired his janitor and now handles his own eight-unit building. His job includes sweeping out and collecting garbage. Despite this, he claims, his profits last year were a niggardly $400.

One Chicago real-estate dealer who remodeled six rooms into two modern apartments claims he won't get his money out of the $6,880 remodeling job for over 8 years—even though he has lawfully hiked the rent from $18 a month to $60 for one apartment and $75 for the other.

BEATING THE CEILING

Meantime, doughty landlords and desperate tenants have dreamed up a host of gimmicks of most dubious legality for beating the rent ceilings still stamped on most dwellings. A Wall Street Journal survey of 11 big cities across the Nation has turned up dozens of trite gags, a few ingenious ones.

One San Franciscan sold a tenant the kitchen sink for $150, stipulating in writing that it was to stay behind when he moved. Another landlord sold a key to his place for $400 over and above the rent.

A New Yorker who has a wife and 3-month-old baby pays $15.50 a week for a $15 room (bath down the hall). The extra 50 cents is for legal fees. When the landlord's appeal for higher rent was turned down, he hired a lawyer to push the case. The tenants are paying the fees.

One west coast couple insist they're running a child-care home. They take only tenants with children and charge them $55 a month extra for minding the youngsters. But the landlord's wife stays safely away and the tenants are left to tend their own offspring.

The Boston rent control office has hauled one landlord into court for allegedly making his tenants buy linoleum for their apartments, as well as refrigerators and other accessories he promised to provide. To top it off, if the tenants asked permission to do any wall papering themselves, the landlord insisted his contractor do the job. He got a kick-back from the contractor.

MORE RENT JUGGLING

An ex-GI autoworker in Detroit rented a 5-room flat over a beer garden with a ceiling of $30 a month. To get the place he paid a year's rent in advance—at $52 a month—paid $500 for some furniture in the place and promised to pay $200 of fixing up. His first year's rent: $1,324, almost four times the ceiling.

Judge Harry S. McDevitt, presiding judge of the common pleas court and chairman of Philadelphia's housing rent commission, reports a new rent racket in the city of brotherly love.

It works this way: A landlord, after refusing for several months to accept rent money sent by registered mail, employs a conniving constable to serve an eviction notice. When the case comes before a magistrate, the landlord accepts the "overdue" rent but insists the tenant pay the constable fees—anywhere from $40 to $50. The constable splits the fee with the landlord.

Other cities report rent deals ranging from having the tenant redecorate the apartment to cooking the landlord's meals or tending his furnace or baby. Veterans in New York City claim some landlords are asking a new car at ceiling price in trade for an apartment.

Often the tenant makes the advances. Apartment hunters advertising in Chicago papers make no secret of the fact they're willing to break the law to get a place. Most common come-on is: "Will meet your terms," but would-be tenants also plead in print: "Will buy furniture," "Will decorate," "Rent no object," and "Help me, I can help you" (from a carpet executive).

FEW TENANTS KICK

Most tenants don't kick—whether they suggested the arrangement or not. Take the most familiar rent-beating gadget, the bonus payment. As a spokesman for one veterans' group in New York City says, "There are hundreds of examples. All I have to do is ask somebody." But few ever get reported. The rent-control office covering the entire Pittsburgh area, for instance, reports one bonus case in the courts.

One Philadelphia real-estate operator says one of every three landlords in that city is a "Simon Legree." He's backed up by Judge McDevitt's estimate that a third of the city's dwelling owners are "chiseling on rents." Rent-control men in Boston estimate that 23 percent of the rents in greater Boston are illegal.

Black-market rates vary. Pittsburghers report that "it's usually some negotiated figure." A United Auto Workers spokesman says the going under-the-counter rate for three- to four-room apartments in Detroit is an average $65 to $70, compared with a $45 ceiling. Philadelphia reports an average apartment rental rate of about $70 but, as one broker put it: "You might get on the waiting list if you hint you'll pay $100; at $125 you would be placed." Rent controllers in Cleveland say rooming-house overcharges usually run $2 to $3 a week over the ceiling, but some have been known to go as high as $60 a month over the limit.

Nation Must Look to Northwest's Hydro Plants To Supply Power and Heat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ivan Bloch:

NATION MUST LOOK TO NORTHWEST'S HYDRO PLANTS TO SUPPLY POWER AND HEAT

(By Ivan Bloch, industrial consultant, formerly chief, Industrial and Resources Development Division, Bonneville Power Administration.)

To the average Pacific Northwest citizen, the talk of power and fuel shortages seems unreal. "Why," says John Jones, "I flip the switch and get all the lights I want, and Mary doesn't worry about using the electric range. What's this all about?" And although most home owners don't have too much trouble getting fuel oil for the furnace, actually there are a large number who have reason for concern.

Sawdust is pretty hard to get in some communities. Slabwood no longer walls Portland sidewalks. And prices of all kinds of fuel, like everything else, are getting higher.

Energy shortages are pinching industry hard. Many industrial plant operators are scouring sawmills for waste and hogged wood fuel, bombarding the oil companies with requests for more oil. Many of them cannot operate their plants at full capacity because of lack of electric power.

In Portland the Oregon Steel Rolling Mills is reported to be running its two steel-melting furnaces only part of the time. The Puget Sound Power and Light Co. has requested its industrial customers to curtail their use of electricity during evening peak hours. There is serious doubt that the fifth and sixth potlines at the Alcoa Vancouver and the Permanente Metals Spokane aluminum reduction plants, respectively, can be serviced with the 35,000 kilowatts each will require.

The Reynolds Metals Co., Longview aluminum plant, closed down temporarily for rehabilitation in May 1947, must remain idle until next spring because power cannot be supplied to it.

Plans for aluminum wire, rod, and foil production announced by both Alcoa and Kaiser are clouded with uncertainty because of short power supplies. Several industrial concerns considering the establishment of phosphorus and fertilizer plants in southern Idaho and Montana are stymied for lack of assured low-cost power supplies. About 200,000 kilowatts of new industrial capacity for the Northwest, which would mean the employment of as many as 10,000 workers, are similarly held back until word is given that adequate electric power will be available in the near future. Sawmills that had hoped to electrify cannot do so; pulp and paper plants must continue to burn fuel oil; home builders are being specifically discouraged by electric utilities from installing electric house heating.

The power situation is so tight that every fuel-burning generating plant in the region is "on the line," consuming thousands of barrels of oil. Voltages frequently have dropped because of the great burdens upon power systems. The engineers of the great Northwest power pool spend uneasy evening

hours, watching the needles of their demand meters quiver ever higher to the limits of the power capabilities of the system. Only by the most careful use of power and the close scheduling of the region's existing power generating plants can disruption of the power system be prevented.

The power shortage is here, and is likely to get worse before it gets better. On oil, President Collier, of Standard Oil of California, on his December 3 visit to Portland, was quoted as saying: "As far as 1948 is concerned, we have sufficient fuel supplies—we feel we have—for the year." He did not seem to say much about succeeding years. Wood is not as easy to get as it once was and is much more expensive. Coal? Sure, if you can pay the price for Rocky Mountain coal, and provided your furnace can take it.

No one is really worried about keeping the region's homes reasonably warm and well lighted. But unless energetic steps are taken, there is reason to be pessimistic about the long-run situation.

Everywhere in the United States power plants are strained to get their generating limits, with little or no reserve capacity for emergencies. There is much talk about voluntary rationing of oil and gas. Coal production for domestic uses and for foreign aid is outstripping war levels with not too comfortable margin between production and consumption; stocks on hand are low.

Nationally, and to a large measure, regionally, this shortage of energy is due to the enormous expansion of energy consumption far beyond war peaks in the homes and factories of the United States, and shortages of production equipment such as turbo-generators, waterwheels and generators, refineries, tank cars, transformers, and the like. The sudden release of pent-up consumer demands for modern electrical equipment and modern heating devices, as well as industry's increased energy consumption for more production, have catapulted total energy requirements upward far ahead of the capabilities of the energy equipment manufacturing plants of the Nation.

The Pacific Northwest situation, although it finds close national counterpart, has unique aspects. In many respects, it could become the most critical shortage spot of the Nation. With the exception of its hydroelectric potential—well over 40 percent of the national total—it is an energy-poor region. Its coal reserves, although large and potentially important, have made slight contributions to the Northwest's total energy consumption. The region imports all of its petroleum and has never developed important and sustained sources of natural gas. On the other hand, it has been a very heavy consumer of wood for the heating of its homes and the operations of many of its industries.

Somewhat traditional patterns of use are exemplified in the following table. This table, prepared by Roscoe A. Day, of the Bonneville Power Administration, shows the percentage distribution of various forms of energy in the region, as compared with the United States.

Sources of energy consumed in the United States and the Pacific Northwest for 1944

Energy source	United States	Pacific Northwest
	Percent	*Percent*
Oil and gas	42	44
Coal	54	10
Wood	(1)	16
Water power	4	30
Total	100	100

[1] Negligible.

It is evident from these percentages that the Pacific Northwest differs from the rest of the Nation in that it is a much greater consumer of hydro and wood, and a much smaller consumer of coal. However, this picture is changing. Wood, as a primary source of energy, is beginning to slip in importance. The deficiency caused by its tight supply and rising prices is being taken up by oil and hydro. Coal is stationary in its contribution. What is happening to these various sources of energy in the Northwest? We must remember that as the region continues its population growth its consumption of energy will increase in proportion.

Wood as a source of energy supply for Pacific Northwest homes and industry cannot be expected to bear its past share. The lumber industry is increasing its full use of each tree. Less waste is sold as fuel—more of the tree is manufactured into lumber and pulp. The depletion of easily accessible stands of timber is forcing loggers and sawmill operators further and further away from our large cities, making it more expensive to transport waste wood to markets in Portland and Seattle and other communities. Moreover, waste wood is becoming far too valuable for new uses, such as for plastics and chemicals.

The petroleum situation in the region reflects the national problem. The petroleum needs of the Northwest must be met by imports. However, inasmuch as California oil fields are no longer bountiful, foreign oil will be required. The rumors of pipe lines from Rocky Mountain fields are discounted by oil industry officials. Although effort must continue for local exploration of oil and natural gas, there are no prospects of major discoveries and sustained major production in the region.

In the meantime, the price structure of oil is rising and there are no facts to anticipate a reversal of trends. The future role of petroleum as a principal source of energy in the Northwest is cloaked with some uncertainty as to expanding supply. It is definitely under the restraining shadow of increasing prices per unit.

If the sources of about 60 percent of the region's past energy consumption have a downward trend, what can local coal and local hydroelectric power do toward meeting the rising energy demands? What about natural gas from the Alberta, Canada, fields?

The history of coal utilization—coal found in the Puget Sound area, in western central Washington and in some coastal areas of Oregon—is a history of the impact of competition from petroleum products. The discovery of petroleum in California was a blow to a reasonably flourishing coal industry of the Northwest. Recurrent attempts to build up this industry have been made by businessmen, but even those have been faced with a "lost art," a somewhat disdainful market, and heavy competition from higher grade coal mined in Utah. The pressures which are now at work offer opportunity for a revival of coal production in the Pacific Northwest, but not without effort.

The reserves of coal of the Northwest are great. Washington, with the greatest percentage of the total, probably has 63,000,000 tons. Oregon's deposits, although considerably smaller, are not unimportant in terms of local consumption. However, major technical and economic problems in the large-scale utilization of this coal dim the immediate possibility of their taking up much of the lost ground.

However, by the development of suitable processes, a more aggressive attitude on the part of producers and merchandisers, and a rising consumer acceptance, the potentials of Northwest coal reserves should not be ruled out. There are undoubted opportunities in the application of advanced techniques which provide acceptable types of smokeless or almost smokeless fuel. This would require the investment of several million dollars for treatment plants and the expenditure of large sums for market development. Similarly, there are as yet unrevealed potentials in the underground gasification of certain local deposits. This involves the controlled burning of underground coal seams; with recovery of gas and tarry substances.

These potentials have barely been explored.

The conclusion on coal is that it will not provide the major assistance required to meet the energy requirements of the region.

Recent news accounts of a proposed pipe line from the gas fields in Alberta, Canada, raise some hopes. If it becomes possible to bring in 200,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas to the Pacific Northwest, and if the price of the gas is low, the results will be most stimulating. Any region which can offer cheap hydroelectric power, pure water in large quantities, and cheap natural gas has an unbeatable combination for industrial development.

Although hydroelectric power doesn't provide all the answers, assuredly it is the brightest potential spot in the energy picture. Only 1,500,000 kilowatts have been developed so far on the Columbia River, with its potential fifteen to twenty million kilowatts. There is room for expansion. But will it come into production fast enough? Can this potential be brought over the regional power network soon enough to service all the new population and the new industries? What are the prospects for new power plants to nip the current power shortages?

That the region needs more and more hydroelectric capacity was recognized early in 1947 by both private and public utilities at a meeting in Tacoma. It was the judgment of these utilities that an additional 2,628,000 kilowatts of Federal generating facilities be added by 1953 to the region's present production capacity of about 3,500,000 kilowatts. This amount of additional power capacity is almost twice the present installations at Bonneville and Grand Coulee dams. Furthermore, recent studies made by the Department of the Interior indicate a need for at least 8,000,000 kilowatts of Federal capacity by 1960.

These astronomical figures cannot be discounted as mere phantasy or the wishes of an ambitious region. To be sure, the 600,000 or more new people estimated to swell the Northwest's population by 1960 will add to the regional consumption. Actually, these tremendous reserves of hydro are needed nationally to supply electro-process industries.

The location of an entirely new segment of industry in the Pacific Northwest has not been without reason. Industries for the production of aluminum, ferro-alloys, and numerous chemicals require electricity in huge quantities as a raw material. These industries have been growing rapidly, and their power requirements correspondingly so. From 1939 through 1943, the total yearly power requirements of national manufactures doubled. For the same period of time, major electro-process industries quadrupled their annual power consumption. The trend is continuing upward at an accelerated rate because our industrial economy demands increasing amounts of the high-purity products of the electric furnace and the electrolytic cell.

In addition, shortages of iron and steel, partially reflecting growing depletion of high-purity iron ores, are creating heavy demands for light metals—only capable of production by electrical methods. Small wonder that the engineers of prominent industrial firms are combing the United States for large quantities of steady power at low costs. And they must eventually look to the Pacific Northwest, because there is no other section which can ultimately supply their specialized needs. Because of this, advance estimates indicate a possible ninefold expansion of potential electro-process industry power requirements in the Pacific Northwest by 1956.

Although the future for Northwest hydro is replete with potential kilowatts, the immediate outlook is one of continued tightness in supply. Not much before all Grand Coulee generators have been installed and McNary Dam comes into substantial production will the region's capacity to produce begin to match its capacity to consume. Last year it was hoped that 1952 would mark the time when a shift from deficit to sufficiency might occur. However, delays in construction due to insufficient congressional appropriations have pushed the date of plentiful power into the future.

The same applies to Hungry Horse, Hells Canyon, Albeni Falls, and many other dams.

Fuel Oil Conservation by Federal Government

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD to include therein a letter from Hon. John R. Steelman to myself and a copy of the letter from Maj. Gen. Philip D. Fleming to Mr. Steelman. Unfortunately, I mislaid that correspondence, but have obtained copies today and am including them for the particular use of the entire New England delegation in the House, although the steps being taken will undoubtedly be of interest to other Members of Congress representing areas now seriously affected by the fuel oil shortage.

JANUARY 29, 1948.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HESELTON: This is in further reference to our past correspondence regarding the possible conversion from oil to coal in Government buildings.

Enclosed herewith is a copy of the report of January 27, 1948, on this subject from General Fleming, Federal Works Administrator.

It would appear from this report that there are some Government buildings in which conversion from oil to coal could be made at an early date and with relatively small expense; and General Fleming has been asked to arrange with the several departments and agencies concerned for corrective action in this respect where such action is feasible and will produce results during the present heating season.

As you doubtless know, the President's order of January 17, 1948, for conservation of fuel oil, gasoline, and gas (copy attached) contains the following paragraph with respect to future installations of fuel oil or gas-burning equipment:

"4. No equipment shall be installed for burning fuel oil or gas or liquefied petroleum gas, and no permanent building or establishment shall be converted to these fuels, without the prior approval of the Bureau of Mines, except where firm commitments for such installations or conversions have already been made."

Sincerely,

JOHN R. STEELMAN.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, January 27, 1948.

Hon. JOHN R. STEELMAN,
Assistant to the President,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. STEELMAN: Further references is made to your letter of December 19 requesting that an investigation be made as to the practicability of converting Government buildings from the use of oil to the use of coal. As you were advised, a meeting was held in this office on December 30 and those present were requested to have final data in our hands by January 2 on which to base a complete report to you.

We have now received a mass of information from the majority of those who were present at the meeting, included in which are figures to show the buildings which cannot be changed over for various reasons, as well as those which are susceptible of being changed and under what conditions. Briefly the information developed consists of the following:

1. Before the date of our meeting, some of the agencies had already issued to their field offices instructions to suspend any further conversions from coal to oil.

2. The Justice Department reported the partial conversion of one plant using 400,000 gallons of fuel oil per year to the use of coal; Public Health Service reported the recent conversion of one small plant burning 15,000 gallons of oil per year to the use of other fuel; and Public Buildings Administration reported the partial cancellation of a contract which had been entered into for converting a building to the use of oil. The contract had been partially completed and would have produced a plant which would burn 370,000 gallons per year.

3. The agencies reporting that conversion from oil to coal is practicable stated that to accomplish this would require the expenditure of a substantial sum, which funds had not been included in the budget estimates and that it would therefore be necessary for them to obtain the additional funds before proceeding with the work. They also reported that the oil-burning plants that are now in operation are in many cases automatically controlled. If converted to the use of coal, it would be necessary to employ firemen to operate them, requiring the necessity of additional funds. I am enclosing two of the reports that were received as samples so that you may see the care that was exercised by the agencies in gathering the desired information. It will be noted that the Department of Agriculture report shows a possible saving of 888,690 gallons of oil per year but that the cost of making the necessary changes would amount to $129,539 and that there would be an increase in operating costs of $70,065 per year. An analysis of the report of the Public Buildings Administration shows that it is considered practicable to convert 35 of the buildings but that this work would cost $414,220. This figure does not include the cost of any additional employees who might be required as firemen.

4. Apparently the situation existing in the Navy Department, which was reported in our letter of January 16, is the only one reflecting a major saving at this time. They can immediately begin the use of coal in certain of their plants previously operated by oil and thereby save at the rate of 1,420,000 barrels of oil per year.

Since the Executive order calling for conservation of fuel oil was issued January 17, 1948, which covers all phases of conservation and also regulates the installation of additional oil-burning equipment, it is doubtful if much more can be done in the interest of saving oil at the present time. It would seem that since the agencies are now acquainted with the existing situation and know that the prospects for the next few years are but little brighter, they will cooperate in every way possible, including the conversion of equipment where practicable, in order to ease the effects of the present fuel-oil shortage.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Major General, United States Army,
Administrator.

The American Marine Engineer Says: "Oleomargarine Taxes Should Be Repealed"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the American Marine Engineer magazine for January 1948:

American families for many years have been paying a scandalous tribute to the dairy lobby through the tax on oleomargarine.

Regardless of efforts made in the States and the Federal legislature, the dairy lobby is still in control of the situation. Here's how it shapes up:

You have to pay a hidden tax on every pound of uncolored margarine of one-fourth of a cent.

You have to pay a tax of 10 cents per pound to get margarine already colored.

Your grocer has to pay $6 a year to sell uncolored margarine and $48 a year to sell colored margarine.

The wholesaler pays $200 a year to sell uncolored margarine but $480 a year to sell colored margarine and the manufacturer must pay a stiff tax of some $600 on the manufacture of margarine.

There are variations, but these general impositions indicate the situation with regard to the discrimination against margarine. In addition to the financial restrictions in the form of taxes, many State have laws which prevent public institutions such as schools or hospitals from using butter substitutes. With butter around the dollar a pound mark, some institutions are hard pressed to include any butter at all on the menu.

If there were ever any health reasons for condemning oleo, they have disappeared and the only remaining argument against margarine has disappeared. Noting the rise in prices on foods, the American Public Health Association, in a resolution said: "The American Public Health Association condemns specific taxes on oleomargarine and respectfully petitions the Congress and the various State legislatures to repeal these taxes."

Rent Control and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following statement:

RENT ADVISORY BOARD HEARING ON DECONTROL
DECEMBER 29, 1947

The purpose of the hearing is to get some facts and suggestions concerning the problem of rent control and housing.

It is apparent to all that the rental housing situation is continually getting worse. Rent control and present practices are not providing any relief for those who seek rental accommodations. Those who are frozen into rental housing have a special preference, so long as they are subsidized by their landlords, but those who are forced to vacate and join the other rental demands find no relief under the present system.

The situation may be put this way: Rent control issued special ration cards to tenants in possession, in complete disregard of value, freedom of contract, and mutual harmony. As to mass housing, such as apartment houses, large volume of rentals, the situation is one merely dealing with tradespeople, but in many cases of small rentals, two flats and houses, we have a relation of constant personal dealing and where each feels the restraints and regulations we have a situation that brings about hostile and conflicting relations detrimental to the welfare of all concerned.

Those with ration cards for the preferred rentals are given a benefit that others cannot secure. They have from the rent director a special privilege contrary to all our plan of equal and fair treatment. And let it be recognized that those holding these ration cards or privileged positions are in many instances not the workingman, the widow and children that proponents of rent control drag out to play upon our sentiments, but in the majority of instances are tenants who have very substantial incomes, generally in excess of the income of their landlord. State Representative Paul Arnold, cited the example of a business executive, with a substantial income, holding a ration card on a 6-room brick dwelling, built in 1943, at monthly rental of $50 while a returning veteran, rent fixed by OPA and FHA regulations, for a lesser dwelling had to pay $70 a month. Currently, with rental control applying to old tenants and new buildings decontrolled, there are many instances of high-income individuals holding these privileges because of rent freeze, while the widows and children, and almost all veterans must bid for the new homes and pay the high rent that can be secured because there are so few of such places on the rental market and the demand for them is so great. The proofs present a situation where rent control is making the situation bad for the widows and orphans and the veterans, and so long as rent control continues the situation will be made even worse; and if we are going to sob for these people we must sob because rent control mistreats them.

Senator Arthur E. Wood presented the proof that many eviction cases are brought by those who have had to buy housing accommodations, because they hold no ration card for accommodations at the frozen level or at any level. They have been compelled to buy, at current prices—I do not think that the charge, generally made as to excessive price is justified. The prices paid for new and old houses is very little if any out of line with the general economy. Cost of living is said to be about 66 percent to 70 percent up from 1940. This cost of living has the unreasonably low item of rent, which is said to be up only about 10 percent. As rent is generally 25 percent of the cost of living, we could see that the cost of living, if rent had been allowed to follow the general trend, would be up some 90 percent and upward. General cost of housing accommodations is not very generally up 90 percent from the 1940 prices. In addition these factors should be considered—that it has cost much more to build new homes because of excessive delays, material shortages, black-market prices, labor troubles, and increase in costs of material and labor. Recent estimates published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD give lumber costs as nearly three times that of 1940. I do not think we gain anything by damning the sellers of housing accommodations. They are only part of the general economy and when they sell in turn must buy or rent on the high market. The real issue is in the short rental market that is created by the buying of homes.

As Mr. Wood indicated, the buyers want the accommodations for their own use because they cannot rent—they have no ration card, or as they are doing, someone took their ration card by purchasing their accommodations. If we consider that prior to rent control, some 75 percent of our population were tenants, we will see the squeeze rent control is putting on tenants. Now, less than 50 percent of housing accommodations are available for renting, 75 percent trying to use 50 percent of the accommodations. Every time a tenant must purchase, generally at considerable difficulty to himself and contrary to his wish, if it is an old accommodation, a tenant must be removed, his ration card taken from him and he cannot get another. As the accommodations become less and less for rental because more become owners, the 75 percent wishing to rent find their lot worse and worse. The answer is not in the fact that it is desirable to have a greater percentage of home owners for we are dealing with problems of providing accommodations not for those who wish to buy but for those who either cannot buy or do not wish to buy, it is the rental housing that is in short supply—there is no shortage of housing for sale. The tenants demanding rent control are not the ones out of possession, but the ones who hold the privileged ration cards—they have secured in illigimate advantage and they want to hold it—tenants out of possession, no matter how deserving or how much in distress, cannot get housing on the same terms. There is no housing available and the proofs are convincing that none was added under rent control and practically none is being added now, though new housing is exempted from control, with the continued agitation, emphasized by Walter Reuther for more stringent control that will include new and decontrolled accommodations, builders are not encouraged to provide rental accommodations.

It should be noted that all advocates of rent control carefully avoided meeting the issue as to whether any substantial new rental units were being provided. They are not concerned about out-of-home or needy people or with justice and welfare in the community, but with their own selfish advantage which has been secured at the expense of others, including many suffering tenants and would-be tenants. All studies cover lean and prosperous periods and consider both the tenant and the landlord and what each should have in return under the existing economy. Now we have thrown out the window all the lessons of past experience and have fixed rentals at an isolated, arbitrary, and oppressive standard, no matter what the tenant income, no matter what the cost of operation, no matter what the other economy does, rents must have no relation to anything else. Then those who have the privileges, the unconscionable advantage, cry to high heaven that there is not enough of rental accommodations, but offer no cure for the problem except the medicine that has made and is making the patient sicker. When asked whether any substantial new housing is provided to meet the rental demand, they shrug it off and say it is not what concerns them, they want rent control that is protecting their privileges, not a remedy for others. They care not what relation rents bear to income, cost of operation, taxes, or rising prices.

The fact is conclusively established that housing for rental was not produced under rent control to keep pace with the demand, practically none. The fact is further established that with rent conrol off new construction, there has been no sufficient housing added to relieve the rental demand, in fact a worse situation continues to develop because rental housing is being taken off the market, both by withholding accommodations from the rental market and offering same for sale and by purchasers taking homes off the rental market. Congressman RALPH A. GAMBLE, chairman of Joint Congressional Committee on Housing, in a statement to New York real estate audience disclosed that more new homes were started this year than in any prior year of our history. Taking off rent control has been instrumental in some degree, but the threat of new controls and the control of old housing has restrained construction for rental. While some 900,000 units are being constructed for 1947, only about 10 percent are for rental, and these are practically all in apartment units. It should be noted that only after rent control was removed from new units that there was any appreciable construction of units for rental, only about 3 percent of construction was for rental prior to July 1947, including construction in areas not under control.

We could not get anyone to give us the ratio of construction for rental as against for sale in Detroit. I think all those advocating control were careful to avoid this issue, for it would show that the result in Detroit is worse than Congressman GAMBLE presents for the whole country. Everywhere we see hundreds of vacant homes for sale, but none for rent. My experience shows that houses are permitted to stand vacant for months so that immediate possession can be given to the buyer. Mr. John Scoville stated that there are currently 30 inches of newspaper ads of houses for sale as against 1 inch for rent. Normally the ratio is in favor of for rent. It should be noted that many for sale ads offer immediate possession.

The situation in Detroit can be appraised somewhat by reference to statistics on housing and population increases in Detroit. Bureau of Government Statistics in September 1947 stated that the basic fact is that 1940 to 1947 more housing was added than population. Population increased 18 percent and housing increased 24 percent. The importance of such decimal change can be shown by the fact that with the same occupancy ratio as in 1940, we would today have a surplus of 50,000 dwelling units. The fact that there is no actual housing shortage poses the question why there is the shortage for rental or why any rent control should be continued. It is obvious that scarcity of housing is not the problem, but that hoarding of housing or withholding from the rental market, is the cause of the housing distress. As Mr. Scoville aptly stated, if some law controlling prices of ham, fixed the price at 10 cents a pound there would be an excessive demand for ham at 10 cents and if ham could not be produced at 10 cents there would be a scarcity, and because of the low price everyone would be trying to get it, and if any was produced many would pay black-market prices and keep it off the legitimate market.

So it is with rent. What supply of rental units is available is hoarded or held by those who have been able to get the ration cards—new units for rental cannot be produced at the low ceiling and are not produced. In normal economy, with 18 percent population increase—more than 70 percent of the increase would be in the tenant class—in a normal economy 70 percent of the added housing would have been for rental. Rent control has disupted normal economy, so that instead of 70 percent of the 24 percent increase in dwelling units, probably less than 1 percent was available for rental, so that practically no new rental housing was added

to take care of the 70 percent of the 18 percent increase in population. Rent control therefore does not, has not, and never will relieve the housing distress, until we have a depression, when it will not be needed to keep down rents. There is no housing shortage, but a housing distress for those who prefer to rent or who cannot afford to buy.

The evidence is conclusive that rent control will not bring relief and that is making the distress of tenants greater. The fact we may have a healthier society by reason of a greater number becoming owners of their homes, or the fact that buyers of homes are taken off the rental demand, does not offer any relief for the problem advocates of rent control say they want to relieve. One must be either blind or allow his prejudices to warp his judgment (we do not believe they are stupid) to contend that continuing rent control will produce any relief to the tenants and would-be tenants who cannot find accommodations. Those who say control must be continued until the distress—and it must not be called housing shortage for the figures are conclusive proof there is not a housing shortage in terms of normal use—is relieved must know that such control would have to be continued forever unless there is a serious depression.

And this must be added. Every industry must be able to build up a reserve. Dun's Review for December, gives us the fact that substantially 20 percent is required to provide for the needed for what is called capital formation, 20 percent of each dollar of goods and service produced. Rent income can be rated as service produced, and of that the normal 20 percent is required to maintain a normal relation in producing new units and providing for expanding demands. Under rent ceilings, where rental income is frozen at a low level of economy—normal growth cannot be had, for all other items of economy have taken a higher level, at least in dollar and cents figuring. We can see that rent control must of necessity operate to increase the distress and can never operate to bring about the relief that advocates of rental-control demand before ending it. The goal they say we must reach is forever getting more and more distant, for there is a constant increase in the ratio of units demanded to the units made available. Today there are less units available for rent than there were in 1940 or any time since. In addition, those providing rental units have not been able to build up a reserve to carry them over the inevitable lean period. Our industry would soon collapse if it did not have provision for reserve.

Much has been said about rent income and that because of full occupancy. Generally, a false assumption is taken. The costs of supervision, expenses of conflicts, ultimate excessive repairs, and often litigation are not included in computing net. The terrible conditions of battle-array relations cannot be compensated by any fuller occupancy, and many owners would gladly have more vacancy than put up with the abuse from tenants. But taking the figures at the best for the claim of great occupancy, without allowing any deductions, there is still only a showing of a possible 10 to 15 percent increase in dollars income, with those who have secured a 15-percent increase in rates, at best there is about 30 percent increase in dollars. But in purchasing power there is a shrinkage of approximately 70 percent, so that the income, giving it the best face advocates of rent control present, the income is still approximately 40 percent under the correct economy and 40 percent less than the average income in comparison. The proof is conclusive that those who insist that rent income has not suffered deliberately close their eyes to the fact they see in relation to their own costs and, while they loudly cry their dollars have lost purchasing power, try to rate the rent dollar at the old level. Certain advocates of rent control are at least intellectually dishonest, if not intentionally trying to deceive and present false comparisons.

There is this other phase. Do we believe in our Constitution and in the Declaration of Independence? We are hypocrites if we say we do and accept rent control in peacetime. There is nothing in the Constitution that authorizes such controls. None of us have the right to speak weasel words in paying respect to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and we are using them if we advocate rent control in peacetime.

The proofs are as conclusive as proofs can be made, that rent control is definitely wrong in principle and contrary to all our ideals: That rent control is not, never will with ceilings, produce rental housing to relieve the housing distress of the tenant segment of our population; that rent control is oppressive and unfair to both landlord and such part of the tenant segment as is not given special privileges or ration cards that are not available to others; that unfriendly and unhealthy social relations are created by the operation of the rent control and unnecessary conflicts and welfare is maintained between people who might otherwise be friendly and cooperative; that so long as rent control continues the distress of those seeking rental accommodations will continue to increase and that the greatest sufferers will be the widows and orphans and the low-income segment of tenant population; that under rent control those seeking housing must purchase and in purchasing must evict tenants in possession and these in turn are compelled to purchase in turn evict others, and that this creates conflicts and is detrimental to the peaceful and harmonious relations we should have.

GREATER DETROIT PROPERTY OWNERS, INC.,
EDWARD B. BENSCOE, *President*.
DETROIT, MICH.

The Viewpoint of a Thoughtful Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while there comes to my desk a letter which is so thoughtful and so indicative of the thinking of the people that I feel it should be in the RECORD. The letter which I am putting in the RECORD at this time outlines 11 points, with most of which it is hard to disagree. I hope many of my colleagues will take the time to read it.

JANUARY 25, 1948.

Congressman WILLIAM MILLER,
Connecticut District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: For quite some time I have been intending to write to you to say that we back home are well pleased with the way you are progressing in your work. No doubt, your task is tremendous, the hours long, and your work very hard. I guess many people do not realize what a Member of Congress goes through in these trying times. I for one wish you the best and somehow in the final analysis things will brighten up.

Here it is Sunday afternoon at home and I have just finished reading the newspapers which are all featuring our worldly troubles such as compulsory military training, taxes, the Marshall plan, Russian aggression, and so forth. Over the radio we hear the same sort of goings on. This commentator is in favor of one thing, another analyst has the opposite view.

After we hear and read all about our various troubles for 7 days a week, month in and month out and we see no faint ray of this chaos becoming unraveled only getting worse and worse, the multitude of the people are now so confused, so bewildered and uncertain that their confidence in good government has been greatly shaken.

No doubt, Mr. MILLER, you and other Members of Congress are better aware of these uncertainties than we back home. We hear of congressional investigations on this and that. Our State Department suddenly releases a secret Russian-German treaty pact. Only this afternoon Bill Cunningham, news commentator from Boston, said that early in April 1945, Stalin sent a note to former President Roosevelt saying that he, Stalin, would not adhere to Yalta and Potsdam agreements. It is definitely not fair to we the people to have to wait nearly 3 years for this secret stuff to come out. So long as it concerns the people, we demand that this secret stuff be made known Nation-wide immediately.

Multiply these few above-mentioned troubles by any additional number and we have a rough idea of what a mess we are in. So far nothing concrete and emphatic in the way of even a partial cure has been offered. The people are getting awfully tired, confused, and disgusted with all this talk, meetings, United Nations this and that, so many billions for this and so many billions for that. How long can people stand up under this sort of bombardment? I'm afraid not too long.

All this has no reflection on you personally, Mr. MILLER. It is simply brought out to convey the feeling of the people. They feel lost, sort of empty, with no real leader to look up to. Too much confusion and the future looks awfully dark.

Applying ordinary horse sense to this huge problem, it should go something like this. Let's take all the fancy double talk out of this thing and get down to a plan which is constructive or a plan of action. Make it a must with no alternatives, make it either or else and be emphatic. The first one to come out with a real plan to lick this thing in these uncertain times will do a great service to the people.

1. Elect a real leader for President who will work with the Congress.

2. Call the cards which Russia holds. Don't waste time trying to talk, reason, or appease Russia. Her mind is made up. Let here know emphatically where we stand and stick to it. If it means that we must push her back by force, let's do it before we spend billions over there possibly in vain. The people are not sold on the idea of parting with their hard-earned money on anything so uncertain as hoping it will make Russia behave and go home. There is a good chance that it will not work and a miracle if it does.

3. If Russia should back down after getting hit on the head, then, and only then, send money over to help out, but only for a short trial period subject to a check-up to see if the unfortunates are really helping themselves or still playing possum.

4. Invoke military training. Chances are we will need it all of a sudden with little or no warning of trouble. Make this a must by conscription if necessary.

5. Reduce taxes for the people here. A real reduction is in order, not one of the $40 a head things. Some of this loss in revenue can be easily made up by cleaning house in Washington, meaning Government pay rolls, duplications, and overlapping.

Really clean up the place down there and get rid of these hangers-on. This move alone will save millions.

6. We must have a big modern Air Force and Navy. Spend some money on this. It is the best protection for peace known to man regardless of any opposition or who it

comes from. Carry a big stick is still the best idea. This is a must.

7. Have us keep on making A bombs by the thousands. Keep those factories going day and night. One day we might need them but quickly. Spread them out after their made. Cuts time down getting there. Sounds like a warmonger? Not at all. Just mighty handy, just in case.

8. Send no more foodstuff over to the other side than we can stand without endangering our own needs at home. This goes for coal, fuel oil, kerosene also. Enforce this. People are not too happy about doing without at home with no guaranty that their sacrifice is doing much good. Whole thing is too uncertain.

9. Let them all know over in Europe that we are taking over as a sort of helping out period until they can stand on their own feet. If any other outfit gets in our way, show them our big stick and use it if necessary.

10. Allow no more of these secret meetings between our Government officials and other countries without letting the whole world know immediately what was said. This fallacy is now coming to light as a result from the last war. It shakes confidence on the part of the people in their government to have these things backfire.

11. One way or another get some more houses built here at home to ease the housing shortage. Consult private lending institutions and banks. They will be glad to help. No subsidizing. In fact take all subsidies off on everything. Robbing Peter to pay Paul is not good economics.

MR. MILLER, I again want to thank you for reading my letter and hope you can get something constructive from it. At least it lets you know how the people feel about the whole affair and should convey the importance of getting a definite plan into action quickly.

Very truly yours.

Increase of Pay of Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal of January 20, 1948:

RAISE POSTAL PAY

The cost of living has gone up 26.9 percent and food prices have risen 43.4 percent in the 2 years since postal workers received their last pay raise.

Pending before Congress are bills to increase post-office salaries and to liberalize the pension plan which was barely adequate 20 years ago, when a dollar went twice as far as it goes today.

Both of these things should be done, if not because justice requires them, because it is essential that the postal service remain attractive to able young men.

The most zealous budget cutter in Congress cannot accuse the Post Office Department of extravagance. It uses trucks that belong in a museum and pays salaries that a private employer would be ashamed to offer. Even if the tax cut planned by Congress must be modified a little, postal workers and their retired brothers should be given more money.

Increase in Subsistence Payments of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGIA L. LUSK
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

[From American Council on Education through University of Minnesota News Service, January 15, 1948]

(This is the first of a series of articles describing the results of a survey of college veterans based on the responses received from interviews with a scientifically selected sample of veterans attending all types of colleges located throughout the country. The study was planned by a national committee appointed by the American Council on Education and was made possible by a grant of funds from the Disabled American Veterans. Dean E. G. Williamson of the University of Minnesota acted as chairman of the committee. Ralph J. Strom, formerly of the Veterans' Administration, was director of the project and conducted the survey.)

MINNEAPOLIS.—One of the important problems facing the present Congress is the matter of proposed increases in subsistence payments to veterans attending educational institutions under the GI bill of rights and the Rehabilitation Act.

Veterans all over the country have been requesting increases in the $65 monthly allotment for single students and the $90 per month for married veterans so that they may remain in school despite skyrocketing living costs.

A portion of a survey on veterans' education recently completed by the American Council on Education and financed by the Disabled American Veterans, was devoted to an investigation of the cost of living of a scientifically selected and representative cross-section of veterans attending colleges and universities throughout continental United States.

To determine how much of a differential exists between the $65 and $90 monthly subsistence payments, and their actual living expenses, each veteran contacted in the Nation-wide poll was asked to make a careful estimate of his average total monthly expenses while attending school.

Results of the poll indicate that the average total monthly expenses of single veterans in college is $106.13, while the average for married veteran college students is $175.38. This means that single students spent $106.13 monthly but received only $65, a difference of $41.13. Married students spent $175.28 but received only $90 from the Veterans' Administration, a difference of $85.38.

Board and room costs of the large number of single veteran students who reported paying for their room and board in one lump sum were found to have an average of $55.19 monthly. However, in the case of single veterans who said they found it necessary to eat at places other than where they roomed the average cost of their meals alone was found to be $51.08 monthly. This amount, in addition to the average sum of $21.48 which veterans in this group pay for room rent brings the monthly cost of room and board to $72.56.

Married veteran students, according to the poll, spend an average amount of $38.96 for rent monthly, while their average outlay for food was found to be $67.71, adding up to a total of $106.67 for rent and food. ($16.67 more than the total subsistence allowance).

In order to make ends meet, many veterans work during school terms, and the wives of a great number of married veterans hold jobs on either a full-time or part-time basis. Summer vacation jobs are helpful to a large percentage seeking to augment their income.

Results of the Nation-wide study indicated that 36 percent of college student veterans work for additional income, 12 percent up to 10 hours during the week; 14 percent from 11 to 20 hours; and the remaining 10 percent more than 20 hours a week.

Despite physical disabilities, one out of four unmarried disabled student veterans was found to be working to supplement his income from the Government; one out of three married disabled veterans is working, while almost one-half of the married non-disabled veterans are employed.

Of the more than one-third of the college veterans employed, the survey showed that 46 percent earn $10 or less, 33 percent earn from $11 to $20 and 13 percent earn from $21 to $30. Earnings of the remaining 8 percent range from $31 to $105.

Wives of 56 percent of the married student veterans are working to supplement their husbands' incomes, the survey disclosed, 43 percent on a full-time basis, 9 percent part time, and 4 percent intermittently.

To help pay their living expenses and in an effort to set aside additional funds for supplemental financing of their educational costs during the current school year, 6 out of 10 veterans worked to some extent during the last summer months, according to the poll.

Despite the fact that many veterans did outside work last summer, many were unable to set aside any funds for their scholastic expenses. This was found to be particularly true of the married veterans, many of whom were unable to retain any of their summer earnings for school costs after paying their summer living expenses.

Of the 6 out of 10 married veterans who worked last summer, 62 percent said they were unable to accumulate any savings, 21 percent reported they were able to lay aside up to $250, and 17 percent more than $250.

Many single veterans who worked last summer were in a better position financially when school opened since 40 percent were able to save up to $250, while another fourth set aside more than $250. Only one-third of the single veterans who worked during the summer said they were unable to save any of their earnings.

In an effort to determine the financial cushion which student veterans are able to maintain, they were queried in the poll as to their total personal savings now available for financing their educations.

More than one-third reported in the survey that they have no reserve savings whatever upon which they can draw to help pay their way through school.

The savings of married student veterans are decidedly less than those of all student veterans, according to the poll, 40 percent of this group having no savings whatsoever. In the case of married disabled veterans attending college, one-half have no financial reserves to supplement their income.

America Must Not Give Away Her Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the issue of Newsweek, dated December 29, 1947, a highly interesting and informative article entitled "Merchant Marine: How America Seeks To Stay in the Oceans While Its Rivals in Trade Are Building Ships Pell-mell." The article shows that ships of 100 gross tons, and over, under construction as of September 30, 1947, were as follows:

Great Britain 483, of 2,112,669 gross tons; Sweden 72, of 294,345 gross tons; Holland 112, of 260,781 gross tons; France 92, of 257,046 gross tons; Italy, 76, of 222,037 gross tons; British Dominions 86, of 189,905 gross tons; United States 55, of 177,669 gross tons.

This article is worth reading at this time particularly in view of the suggestion coming from the State Department that the United States shall sell to European nations some 200 oceangoing steamships and in addition transfer to them on a temporary basis up to 300 more bulk-cargo ships under bare-boat charter.

I fully agree with the statement of Representative BRADLEY, of California, a very able and distinguished member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in his comprehensive, accurate, and unanswerable speech delivered on the floor on January 13, 1948. Mr. BRADLEY said:

Mr. Speaker, the funeral of an adequate American merchant marine has been arranged by the State Department. The pallbearers may well be some 16 foreigners. The mourners will all be Americans. The Outline of a European Recovery Program, prepared under the direction of the State Department, aims a near mortal blow at our present merchant marine. It may be that this Congress can save the patient's life and disappoint those who hopefully anticipate the reading of the last will and testament.

If we follow the course recommended by the State Department we shall disregard completely the recommendation of the Harriman committee when it said:

The United States needs an active merchant marine for national defense and we must not create conditions in which that merchant marine cannot survive.

It is interesting to note that reliable information exists to the effect that a proposal to defer foreign shipbuilding has been advanced by the United States and definitely rejected. In the meantime, while others build, we are asked to give away our ships. I am definitely opposed to that.

I have been a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries since April 18, 1921. I know Representative BRADLEY and the Harriman committee state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The article in Newsweek is as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE: HOW AMERICA SEEKS TO STAY IN THE OCEANS WHILE ITS RIVALS IN TRADE ARE BUILDING SHIPS PELL-MELL

(How big a merchant marine can the United States maintain in this postwar world? What is happening to the huge wartime fleet? How many new ships should be built and of what type? How much subsidy should be paid to keep the flag at sea? These questions are once again on the Government's agenda and the whole problem will be laid before the next regular session of Congress. Newsweek's special projects editor, Harold Isaacs, here summarizes the American maritime problem.)

This week the steamship *President Cleveland* sails on its maiden voyage from San Francisco to the Orient. It is an event calling for fanfare, large advertisements in the press, and official congratulatory messages. Yet the *Cleveland* is only a modest ship of 16,600 gross tons. What makes its debut a major event is that the *Cleveland* and its upcoming sister ship, the *President Wilson*, are the two largest American passenger ships built since 1939. No other passenger ships of any size are being built and all new shipbuilding plans are being held up until there is assurance that adequate Government subsidies will be forthcoming.

To merchant mariners this seems to be the place where the American merchant marine came in. Once again shipbuilders and operators and the Government are vexed by the same dilemma that has followed the flag to sea since the Civil War. High American costs, standards, and wages have made a large merchant marine an economic liability. But as two wartime experiences have shown, it has to be regarded as a national necessity. The problem is now repeated on a new level, with the United States the possessor of far and away the world's largest merchant fleet. But in essence it is the same: How large a fleet should the United States maintain, and how much money is the Government willing to spend to maintain it?

BUILDING PROGRAM

Only last month a Presidential committee of businessmen headed by K. T. Keller, president of the Chrysler Corp., recommended that subsidies of a full 50 percent of construction costs be paid for the building of 46 passenger ships, including two 50,000-ton express liners, at a total cost of $600,000,000, plus an unspecified number of dry-cargo freighters and tankers as first replacements for wartime ships already obsolescent.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 authorized shipbuilding subsidies of up to 50 percent depending on the cost of shipbuilding in competitive foreign yards. Maritime Commission sources indicated last week that spot investigations in Europe revealed the present differential between European and American costs to be closer to 40 percent. Authorization for any larger subsidy to American builders would have to be voted by Congress.

If, in any case, no adequately supported shipbuilding program is undertaken, the American shipbuilding industry will find itself almost out of business 6 months from now. At its wartime peak only 4 years ago, the industry had 1,722,000 workers hammering out five ships a day in 72 yards. It has dropped now to 105,700 workers, the bulk of them in 10 yards. Only 33,000 of these are building ships. The rest are engaged in repair and reconversion. In 1946 and 1947, the yards received only 41 new contracts, of which 22 were for foreign buyers willing to pay higher American costs in return for speedy delivery. Shipyards are currently working on 37 commercial vessels of more than 1,000 gross tons and nine ships of various sizes for the Navy. With the exception of one Army dredge and one cruiser, all this construction will be completed by August 1948. Only one new naval contract, for a submarine, has been let.

Reconversion, repair, and maintenance work in the repair yards will keep only a part of the present working staff at their jobs. As in the aircraft industry, the problem is not merely the fate of a major business but the dispersal of engineering and working skills that cannot easily be reassembled. The Keller 46-ship program, it is argued, will, if acted upon, keep at least the nucleus of the industry in being.

OPERATORS' SUBSIDIES

From the standpoint of the ship operators, equally crucial decisions are also pending. An example was the statement by George Killion, president of the American President Lines, on December 10, calling for guarantees of long-term Government aid before his line could go ahead with the purchase of five new ships for which bids have already been made. Such aid, he stressed, would have to include the 50-percent construction subsidy and assured long-term operating subsidies. The latter, also provided for in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, were suspended during the war. The Maritime Commission's power to resume them on more than an annual basis is now the subject of a dispute with the Bureau of the Budget. This, too, is an issue that will have to be resolved before the immediate future of the American merchant marine can be shaped.

This is a twice-told chapter in the story of America's merchant fleet, already filled with ironies and international cross-purposes. It makes a strange and convulsive pattern marked by long declines, spurts of wartime building, the creation of huge fleets, and the passage of these fleets into limbo. The fabulous shipbuilding of the war years gave the United States a fleet of 6,300 ships, totaling about 57,000,000 tons. Echoes of the financial aspect of that program will probably be heard for a long time to come in congressional committee chambers, but the result was in any case a complete reshuffling of the international maritime line-up.

UPS AND DOWNS

The American merchant fleet entered the war half the size of Britain's. It ended the war three times larger. Before the war American ships accounted for about one-sixth of the world's total tonnage. After the war the proportion was four-sixths. But most of this tonnage, especially the 2,700 lumbering Liberty ships, was expendable, like crates built for aircraft engines. No one ever dreamed that such a fleet could be maintained in peacetime. The question was how much to pare down and how to convert the remainder into an effective and balanced fleet.

According to latest available figures, the paring down that has already occurred can be summarized as follows: 743 ships lost in the war, 1,090 sold to foreign buyers, 554 sold to American buyers, 1,316 moored in reserve, and 171 scrapped. Still active—privately owned, under Government charter, or general agency agreements, or for the armed services—are about 2,500 ships, totaling some 25,000,000 tons. This still leaves the United States with 45 percent of the world's active tonnage and more than twice the fleet that anybody seriously believes can be maintained in peacetime. The continuing activity of such a large fleet is due only to the current extraordinary need for shipping that is part of postwar reconstruction. This need will gradually taper off and within 2 or 3 years will return to more normal proportions.

Sheer size, however, is not the only criterion. Much of the war-built tonnage was designed for wartime and does not serve peacetime needs. One example is the present serious lack of ships suitable for intercoastal and coastal routes in the domestic trade. Another example, cited by the Keller report as the most important, is the lack of passenger ships. Before the war the United States had 127 passenger or passenger-cargo ships, with a capacity of 38,357 persons. Today it has 36 in service or in prospect, with a total capacity of 8,333. In passenger-carrying capacity, the United States has already yielded leadership to Great Britain and is lagging behind other countries which are feverishly rebuilding to regain their prewar positions.

In addition to being ill-balanced, the American fleet suffers from having been built virtually all at the same time. These ships, with an average effective life of 20 years, will deteriorate or grow obsolete at the same rate. New construction would be indicated over the coming years in all types of needed vessels in order to maintain economy of operation and to take advantage of new developments in ship design. Ideally, construction over the coming years would gradually bring the fleet into a balance not only of types but of relative ages, with replacements coming out of the Nation's shipyards in an orderly manner.

FUTURE FLEET

The average of many recent estimates of the size of a feasible American merchant fleet comes down to a few more than 1,000 ships totaling 11,500,000 tons. This is only slightly larger in tonnage than America's prewar fleet, but the old ships have been almost wholly replaced by new and faster ships. The projected fleet would be at least 30 percent more efficient than the old one. In addition, there would be a reserve of anywhere up to 3,000 ships kept in good repair. One postwar study made for the Maritime Commission concluded that such a fleet could be maintained at a subsidy cost of only $50,000,000 a year. The Keller report recommendations for a building program between now and 1951 would in construction subsidies alone, however, amount to a total of $300,000,000. By comparison, between 1929 and 1939 mail subsidies ran to about $17,000,000 a year, and between 1937 and 1945 construction and operating subsidies cost about $25,000,000 a year. Of the operating subsidy payments, the Government has subsequently recaptured the larger share.

In the final analysis, the size and position of an American merchant marine depends on the state of world trade, which in turn depends on general world prosperity. All estimates for a large American fleet have to be based upon the assumption of a large enough increase in the total volume of world trade and American trade and travel to enable American ships to carry a larger proportion of American cargoes without damage to the vital shipping interests of other trading nations. They also have to be based on the assumption that all maritime nations would get together and work out their problems amicably and equitably.

These have already proved to be rather dangerous assumptions to make. In tabulating their contributions to the Marshall plan, the 16 participating European nations last summer included provisions for their own shipping to an extent which brought hot challenges from American shipping interests. This issue will figure in the ultimate decisions of Congress on the long-range European Recovery Program.

FOREIGN BUILDING

Meanwhile, since the end of the war all foreign maritime nations have gone all out in shipbuilding. As the accompanying chart shows, the United Kingdom's is the largest program. As of last September, it included 483 vessels totaling 2,112,669 tons, including the recently launched passenger liner, the 34,000-ton *Caronia*. Holland was building 112 ships totaling 260,781 tons. France was building 92, the British Dominions 86, Italy 76, and Sweden 72. In this tabulation of ships of more than 100 gross tons, the United States had dropped to seventh place.

There are no reports available on Russian ship construction. The Russian merchant fleet, however, has been augmented by 936,000 tons of American lend-lease shipping which is still technically American-owned, but which no one ever expects to see back in American hands. With this tonnage included, Russia has advanced from eleventh to fourth place in the list of world fleets.

The postwar maritime picture shows other notable changes. Japan, which so strongly challenged the maritime leadership of the western nations, has dropped from third to eighth place and Germany from fifth to eleventh place. Neither Germany nor Japan will, of course, for a long time to come regain their previous high rank in maritime trade. Canada, Brazil, and Argentina have all increased their fleets, and in Latin America as a whole prewar tonnage has been upped 30 percent.

OUTLOOK

The problem of effective interntional cooperation in shipping is at the moment a largely untouched item on the crowded agenda of world affairs. The wartime United Nations shipping pool disappeared and so did the short-lived United Maritime Authority that succeeded it. Today an obscure UN subcommittee handles world shipping problems. If the pell-mell building drive of other nations means anything at all, it presages another era of sharp competition. American wages and standards being what they are, foreign operators can invariably undercut American costs and rates. This is not serious when, as now, there are more goods to move than there are ships available. But come a tomorrow when the pinch of depression may again be felt, the absence of any international meeting of minds on shipping will result in unbridled maritime competition with ruinous results for all. If a cooperative pattern could still be established in world trade, the various maritime nations would each receive proper and adequate shares of the world's cargoes. This would depend, however, on the resolution of issues much larger than shipping.

Detroit Natural Gas Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter written jointly by August Scholle, president, and Barney Hopkins, secretary-treasurer of the Michigan Congress of Industrial Organizations. This letter was addressed to the Honorable Eugene Van Antwerp, mayor of the city of Detroit, on January 26, 1948, and contains much valuable information in regard to the natural gas situation in the Detroit area.

The letter is as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1948.

Hon. EUGENE VAN ANTWERP,
Mayor of the City of Detroit,
Detroit City Hall,
Detroit, Mich.

HON. MAYOR VAN ANTWERP: This letter is written in commendation of the position taken by the common council of the city of Detroit with respect to the natural-gas situation, and the demand by your honorable body that the consuming public shall continue to receive all such natural gas as is now being delivered to the Detroit area by the Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co., and to receive all such additional gas as that company may be able to pipe to Detroit at a competitive price, at future times.

However, these additional measures to protect the public interest are urged for your consideration:

First, that the common council obtain the assistance of Members of Congress from Detroit and Wayne County to the end that an investigation into the Detroit natural-gas shortage may be undertaken by some duly constituted committee of the House or Senate; this may be advisable in view of a possible need for additional legislation.

Second, that the common council inaugurate inquiries into the exact causes of industrial plant shut-down in the Detroit area which are allegedly occasioned by curtailments of natural-gas supplies. It is our opinion that the city of Detroit and the public generally are being deceived as to these circumstances. Further, we believe that the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. management may be penalizing industrial workers through such shut-downs, whereas the cause of curtailments may, in fact, be due to the gas utility's repeated failures to negotiate for additional gas supplies in prior periods, and to construct facilities for storing surplus gas during recent years.

In connection with this latter request, we submit the following information, based on newspaper reports and our own investigation:

Only 1 week ago, on Monday, January 19, 1948, the Detroit Free Press quoted Mr. Lawrence K. Ritchey, operations manager for Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., as stating: "There is no immediate danger that Michigan Consolidated will have to curtail deliveries to our customers." Today, approximately 200,000 workers are laid off due to such curtailment as Mr. Ritchey pledged would not occur. The Free Press article further credited Mr. Ritchey as stating that "oil shipments by rail were providing Michigan Consolidated with a supplemental supply of gas," which, ostensibly, would prevent recurrence of the experience when "During a cold spell last winter, gas supplies were shut off from February 7 to February 11 to 60 major industrial concerns." Was Mr. Ritchey speaking correctly on January 19, and has his own management, for its own reasons, imposed the present gas curtailment, causing the industrial shut-downs? The people of Detroit have a right to ask your honorable body to learn the facts.

The Detroit Times of Friday, January 23, 1948, carried this headline: "Factory Gas Off—500,000 Idle Here," and said in part:

"Henry Fink, president of the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., said that supplies had been sharply curtailed by the Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co., which pumps the gas to Detroit from Texas fields.

"'The industrial shut-down is necessary to protect the gas supply to domestic customers,' Fink said. 'No home need suffer from this temporary shortage.'

"Although Fink said that gas for industrial use might be available Tuesday, he added:

"'How much longer the industrial shut-down continuous depends entirely on Panhandle's ability to give us the natural gas to which we are entitled under our contract.'"

In connection with Mr. Fink's claims, set forth above, we beg to inform your honorable body that we have checked into the curtailment of deliveries to Michigan Consolidated by the Panhandle Eastern during the current cold spell and we learn the following:

The maximum obligation on Panhandle under its existing contract is 125,000,000 cubic feet per day. Its recent deliveries were—

For 24 hours ending 8 a. m., Thursday, January 22, 1948, 125,037,000 cubic feet.

For 24 hours ending 8 a. m., Friday, January 23, 1948, 123,485,000 cubic feet.

For 24 hours ending 8 a. m., Saturday, January 24, 1948, 121,656,000 cubic feet.

For 24 hours ending 8 a. m., Sunday, January 25, 1948, 121,586,000 cubic feet:

For 24 hours ending 8 a. m., Monday, January 26, 1948, 121,713,000 cubic feet.

This tabulation reveals a deficiency, due to curtailment by Panhandle Eastern as ordered by the Federal Power Commission, totaling less than 12,000,000 cubic feet. Are we now to believe Mr. Fink's statement that "sharp curtailments" by Panhandle are responsible for laying off 200,000 workers? Or is the lay-off due to the inexcusable failure of Michigan Consolidated to negotiate, in advance, for an adequate gas delivery, and to store underground the summer surplus of gas available to it, for winter use?

We request early consideration by your honorable body of the above request.

Sincerely yours,

AUGUST SCHOLLE,
President.
BARNEY HOPKINS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Oil Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following radio broadcast made by me from Stations WBAB, Atlantic City, and WSNJ, of Bridgeton, N. J. The broadcast follows:

In the midst of the debate on the tax bill, the result of which is a foregone conclusion, the undercurrent in the House this week is a belated anxiety concerning the continued exports of oil.

Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, introduced a bill for a 1-year embargo on all shipments overseas, except to American military forces, and the House Committee on Commerce under the leadership of our friend and neighbor, Congressman CHARLES WOLVERTON of Camden, recommended an immediate end to the export of petroleum products.

The New York Times headlined all of these activities as "strong move started in Congress to embargo foreign oil shipments"—so it may be that we are finally going to get somewhere.

To those of us who were working on this problem in June 1947, when the weather was warm and very few were thinking of their winter heaters, it is a little ironic that the strong move of others had to await a bitter winter and a very real shortage of fuel before making this move. Our best efforts to forestall the emergency failed to warn Congress in time.

I welcome the support now being offered, and I suppose it is a case of better late than never; but if anything is done now, the present heating season will be over by the time good effects can be felt.

In June 1947 the Merchant Marine Committee initiated hearings on oil supplies in this country. Our original concern was the use of American-owned tankers to transport gasoline and oil to Russia, but the hearings immediately developed a fear in our minds that there would be a general petroleum shortage in the United States during the winter of 1947-48. Hearings continued throughout June and July. Many witnesses were notoriously evasive, and I recall particularly questioning them closely on the effect of exporting millions of barrels of oil. The administration was, and is, so wrapped up in its European programs that any suggestion that exports be curtailed has met with howls of "isolationist." Nevertheless, the committee finally concluded that the continued high rate of exporting petroleum would have a serious effect on the oil supply this winter, not only on the civilian population, but on military supplies. On July 21, our committee reported H. R. 4042, which prohibited the export of gasoline and fuel oil to any foreign country, unless the Secretary of Commerce could certify in writing that such export would not impair the national defense or security, and the civilian use of gasoline and fuel oil. The bill also required monthly reports so that the Congress could keep close watch on the situation.

Our bill passed the House, but was not passed by the Senate prior to summer recess.

Our committee and many other Members of Congress continued to be concerned about this situation, but all attempts to modify exports were strongly opposed by the administration, and President Truman himself warned Congress to be very careful before taking any action on prohibiting shipments of oil abroad.

I know, of course, that exporting is not the only reason for the present oil shortage, but I also know that every million barrels of oil exported is a million barrels less in our national supply, and that the use of tankers and tank cars in the export program is a substantial factor in contributing to our transportation tie-up.

On December 8 and 9, while Congress was considering the $600,000,000 so-called stopgap aid to France and other European countries, I fought to amend that bill by including the same provision against exports of petroleum that I have just referred to. My amendment lost by only seven votes, after strong administration opposition, and opposition by those who, I am afraid, put foreign relief above the safety and health of the American people.

You see, this situation was forseen and every attempt was made to provide for it, but it has taken a very real shortage, a succession of snowstorms, and weeks of bitter weather before its real gravity is finally appreciated.

Last July was the time to act. It is now too late to help this winter, but perhaps we will have the wisdom to guard against a repetition of present hardships in another season.

Foreign rehabilitation, no matter what its merit, goes too far when it exports the fuel oil needed for the health and safety of America, to France which still has, after all, the unrationed use of automobiles. In the same way, we are talking about rationing meats in this country while exporting meat to Greece, where it is unrationed.

If this makes sense, I fail to see it.

Good night.

Postage on Parcels Sent to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. ELSAESSER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. ELSAESSER. Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress should not delay action on one of the many resolutions pending before it which would reduce or even eliminate postage on all parcels sent to Europe.

The reasons for the need therefor are many. First, we are engaged in an effort to relieve want and distress among the destitute peoples of Europe. We have appropriated billions of dollars for this purpose, and many billions more will be needed. These dollars are used to purchase goods in the American markets and to ship these commodities overseas.

Many American families have relatives or dear friends abroad. Despite the high postal rates prevailing at this time, they are shipping packages of food and clothing, and so forth, to these relatives and friends. If the postage were eliminated, or reduced substantially, many more such parcels would be sent overseas. Such voluntary gifts of essential items would alleviate some of the need which our tax dollar has been trying to accomplish.

Voluntary gifts of this nature reach the needy exclusively. There is no handling charge, no opportunity for favoritism, no blundering. Therefore we could dispense with some of the manpower now employed to administer relief programs.

Direct contact between the donors in America and the recipients throughout Europe and Asia must, and will, lead to the creation of international good will. The recipients generally acknowledge these gifts of food and clothing with considerable gratitude. It removes the possibility of political manipulation by foreign nations, such as removing shipping tags on crates, boxes, and so forth, and replacing them with labels of other nations as occurred during the UNRRA administration. This will result in giving credit where credit is due—to the generosity of our people and the wisdom of their Government which made it possible by absorbing the cost of shipping via parcel post.

The gifts, voluntarily contributed by our citizens, will demonstrate to the world the true spirit of America. No ulterior motive can be cited when millions of our people are ready and willing to share what they possess with others less fortunate. Such cooperation and combined effort cannot fail to restore faith and combat suffering abroad.

The shipment of canned foods today is almost prohibitive. In addition to the high cost of canned products, the excessive postage rates deter all but the wealthy from making such purchases and shipping them overseas. Elimination of the excessive postage would allow greater shipments of canned and processed foods.

The cost of this proposal could not exceed the cost of the present method. If anything, it would be less costly. Our taxpayers foot the bills for merchandise bought by our Government for shipment abroad, and for the costs of crating, handling, and distributing it, which include salaries of purchasing agents, technical experts, clerks, supervisors, and so forth. We hope that part of our money will eventually arrive at the homes of the needy in the form of food and clothing. Direct shipments of voluntary gift packages will guarantee the arrival of merchandise where the need is known to the American shipper.

Furthermore, in addition to aiding the needy, we will create a greater degree of good will that is so desperately needed.

I am, therefore, convinced that our Government should lower overseas postal rates substantially or completely eliminate postage, to increase shipments by individuals. This would be a great boon in reviving hope among our fellow men in Europe and Asia, and aid in broadcasting the spirit of America in a way that defies contradiction.

Preservation of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a group of more than 50 members of the junior and senior classes of North Side High School, Fort Wayne, Ind., visited Washington and were my guests at a session of the House of Representatives.

Before returning to Indiana, these young people left with me a petition urging that certain actions be taken to strengthen the United Nations and insure world peace. The interest of these young citizens in world problems is to be commended, and I herewith present their resolution for the consideration of the entire Congress:

Since we, juniors and seniors of North Side High School, will have to bear our share of the burden of any policy undertaken by our Government, we wish to voice our opinion in the only way open to us.

Whereas we are the people who will be the future soldiers, sailors, and taxpayers who must pay for all the policies and possible conflicts with our services, money, and even our lives; whereas the United Nations has proven ineffective to enforce a world peace, since this United Nations has no means of enforcing its policies.

Whereas the entire world is endangered through the use of atomic weapons; and whereas the present use of the veto is such that it hinders progress toward future peace.

We thereby have resolved to advocate the adoption of the quota-force plan for the reform of the United Nations; we advocate that an effective tyranny proof world police force should be established; we advocate that as rapidly as possible a control over atomic energy and limitations on all other important weapons should be established; we advocate that the present veto should be abolished in the matters of aggression.

We, the undersigned, do endorse in full the above policy.

(Signatures omitted.)

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous lot of articulation these days about friendship trains, CARE, ERP, and what have you, to feed and rehabilitate striking Germans, rebellious Italians, egotistical British, arrogant Yugoslavs, treacherous Albanians, and the Red army.

All this talk and hullabaloo is made with a grandiose play on our sentiments; and we, the poor, gullible Americans are right now in the act of selling our birthright and our offspring's solvency to feed, clothe and provide industry for this motley mob, too busy at fomenting strife and organizing revolutions to get down to work, other than reproduction—11,000,000 more population in Europe than on VE-day.

We have already spent about sixteen billions, and are about to obligate ourselves to the expenditure of sixteen more billions in the vain, oft-disproven theory that the recipients of this largesse will love us and fight for us. But why kid ourselves, we will only be called shylocks when we begin to talk about closing the spigots.

You just cannot disprove history nor the old adage, "You can't keep a friend by loaning him money." We tried it after World War I, and had to spend $300,000,000,000 and a million sons to kill those we had coddled with milk and diapers after we got through making the world safe for democracy. Oh, yes, we accepted token payments from Finland, who got about 3 percent of our European gifts in the early twenties.

Now let us call a spade a spade and see what this present gift to a bunch of decadent tribes—perhaps our future enemies—would do for us if we used just a little cold, calculating, common horse sense. It would build 50,000 brand new modern school buildings and pay teachers and operators for each school twice their present salary for 2 years, plus building maintenance costs. It would build 40 four-lane divided highways across the United States with no cross-traffic intersections or grade crossings. It would build a fleet of 80,000 of the most modern bombers obtainable, and train one pilot for each bomber. It would build 2,000 of the most modern airports possible, or 1,500 fully equipped military airfields. It would put a Buick sedan in 8,000,000 private garages, or feed the entire population of this country for 2½ years.

Just look around a bit, friend and neighbor, and see what else it would do for this country. Go visit the school where your kids attend—I did. See the plaster falling off the walls; see the kids drinking warm water out of the spigot; see the antiquated heating and lighting systems; the fire traps; see the kids put on their overcoats, mufflers, and rubbers to go from their classrooms, or to the lunchroom, because of hallways open to the weather. See the worn out jalopies they ride in—40 kids on a bus with seats for 24. Ask the teacher what her salary is for the year, and how much she has left after paying approximately 50 percent of it back in taxes—income, sales, and hidden taxes.

Check the condition of your 8-year-old automobile, then check your budget to see when you can afford to buy a new one. Think of the death trap our highway system has turned into, and calculate the chance you take every time you drive 100 miles—about 200,000 deaths and 800,000 injuries each year.

Think of the superb air force that could be created and maintained—a force that could smile with confidence at the least sign of a threat from these mobs; we are about to set up on a war-making basis again. Think of these diapered European darlings that our school kids are going to have to kill off when they are in the flower of their manhood and get killed in the killing.

Let us keep our strength at home instead of squandering our children's and grandchildren's lives, happiness, and belongings to no good end. Let us tell our Congressmen we are opposed—bitterly opposed—to a repetition of such an enormous sapping of national energy. Some one of these days we are going to wake up in a cold sweat, realizing that the harmless little fuzzy kitten that we fed and nurtured at the expense of our own strength, has grown into a lion—tasted blood—and is licking its chops with an attack squint in its eye—reach for the lunge that will mean—what?

Let us just stop for a minute or two and think soberly—history repeats itself in spite of our idealisms.

Veterans' Temporary Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I have sent to the Honorable William O'Dwyer, mayor of New York City, and to Mr. Thomas F. Farrell, chairman of the New York City Housing Authority:

VETERANS' TEMPORARY HOUSING

A special veterans' committee, whose chairman is Mr. Francis L. Fortune, 25-31 Seventy-fifth Street, Jackson Heights, has protested to me about the extreme conditions of hardship under which veterans are living in the temporary veterans' housing projects. They are unable to obtain adequate fuel oil for heating and are experiencing financial hardship because rents are excessive when the cost of heating is added. They are asking a modification of rent schedules, to include the supplying of fuel by the New York City Housing Authority. I understand this matter has been brought to your attention.

Upon investigation I found that rentals charged were approximately $8.50 a room, or $34 per month for a four-room unit. Each family is required to purchase its own fuel for heating which, at today's prices, costs from $20 to $25 per month. The total rental cost for four tiny rooms, including cost of all utilities, averages from $54 to $59 per month.

I believe the contract of agreement which the New York City Housing Authority has with the Public Housing Administration stipulates that in the event the rental charged, including heat and all other utilities, is more than one-fourth of the income of the tenant, then an adjustment may be made whereby the rental is one-fifth of the income of the tenant in some cases and less in others. I am certain a survey will prove that nearly all of the veterans living in these projects earn less than $250 per month and that the great majority earn less than $200 per month. In view of this, the necessity of an adjustment of rent schedules is obvious. This $54-$59 cost is also in excess of the average rental charged for comparable housing units in similar veterans' temporary housing projects in other metropolitan cities.

I believe that the regulations of the Public Housing Administration further stipulate that the basis for establishing rent schedules for these projects shall be rentals charged for comparable housing accommodations in the same area. The type of dwelling unit these temporary houses provide is not at all comparable to any other type of housing in the New York City area, either private or public housing. The houses are just what they are called—they are temporary structures, loosely constructed. They are not fully weather stripped, nor are they completely screened. Electric-power lines are inadequate. There are times when houses are without electric power for hours. There are no recreational or playground facilities in most projects. Transportation is poor. Schools and shopping areas are inadequate and inconvenient to reach. On the basis of rentals charged for comparable housing units, it is evident an adjustment of rent schedules is in order.

In view of these facts I urge you in fairness to these veterans to see that immediate steps be taken to have the New York City Housing Authority supply within adjusted, but fair and reasonable, rent schedules the fuel necessary to heat the houses in these projects. I feel confident the Public Housing Administration will approve, and agree to, your recommendations. I am sure it was not the intent of Congress when making these temporary houses available to municipalities that veterans should be charged excessive and burdensome rents. These veterans are entitled to have heat furnished at a fair rental commensurate with the type of house in which they find it necessary to live. They are not living in this kind of housing from choice. They certainly should not be charged excessive rents. The New York City Housing Authority has the responsibility of renting and maintaining these projects, and it would seem to me that it is incumbent upon the Authority to see that fuel for heating is provided.

ROBERT TRIPP ROSS.

JANUARY 29, 1948.

Marshall Plan Implements Military Alliance in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the cat is out of the bag. All doubts as to the motives behind the European recovery plan are now revealed. Prime Minister Bevin, 1 week ago, announced the formation of a military alliance against Russia. Yesterday, President Truman at his press conference delivered an ultimatum to Congress that it was all of the Marshall plan or nothing. This morning we read that some kind of secret deal has been made between our Government and the British—in effect a military alliance. Obviously we are again caught in the middle of international power politics and the administration must have the Marshall plan to support this nefarious business. As we financed and fought the last war we are again asked to finance and fight the next one.

Mr. Speaker, as one Republican I do not propose to follow this kind of leadership. If this is bipartisan policy let the Republicans beware; I want no part of it. No more blank checks for war-making purposes. I have had enough, have not you?

As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I offer the January 28 issue of Human Events, a challenging and timely article by Mr. Felix Morley:

A SAMPLE OF SECRET DIPLOMACY

(By Felix Morley)

The Department of State's compilation on Nazi-Soviet Relations reveals a sordid record of deceit and double-dealing on both sides of the thin border between national socialist and Communist ethics.

This story of pot and kettle indicts Stalin and Molotov of war criminality as black as that of any of their former Nazi buddies executed (with Soviet cooperation) at Nuremberg. To give that impression was presumably not the idea in making these captured German documents public at this particular time. But there is a good deal in this record which will eventually boomerang. There are likely to be consequences which the administration has not foreseen.

These consequences are indicated, ironically enough, in one of the messages selected for this collection. It is a telegram, dated September 6, 1939, from Count von der Schulenburg, German Ambassador in Moscow, to his foreign office. The Nazi diplomat describes the somersaults forced upon Russian public opinion when Hitler and Stalin made their alliance. "The sudden alteration in the policy of the Soviet Government," says the Ambassador, "is still not very well understood by the population." However:

"The Soviet Government has always previously been able in a masterly fashion to influence the attitude of the population in the direction which it has desired, and it is not being sparing this time either of the necessary propaganda."

For the past 10 years, at least, the American Government has also been extremely adroit in manipulating public opinion in this country. And it is certainly not "sparing the necessary propaganda" with respect to Russia, defined in the Charter of the United Nations as a "peace-loving state." Nevertheless, there is some reason to think that the American people are not fooled quite as completely as were the miserable Russians. At least there is still a little time for them to examine the road down which they are being led.

The latest, and one of the longest, downward steps on that road is being taken in the follow-up to the British Foreign Minister's speech in the House of Commons on January 22.

Mr. Bevin then announced the decision of the British Socialist Government to form a military alliance of the western European nations against Soviet Russia. Mr. Bevin made clear that "we are not now proposing a form of political union," which many Americans would welcome as the only rational solution for western Europe. What is in prospect and what Winston Churchill warmly approves, is a good old-fashioned fighting bloc. The nucleus is to be Great Britain, France, and the Benelux countries—Belgium, Netherlands, Luxemburg. But around this core it is hoped to group all of the 16 "Marshall plan" nations, and as much of Germany as can be salvaged.

II

With almost indecent haste, the Truman administration rushed in to acclaim the project of an anti-Soviet alliance. Less than 24 hours after Mr. Bevin spoke, the Department of State, issued a proclamation saying that "the United States 'heartily welcomes' the portentous step taken by the British labor government." The Department was, as often, speaking out of turn. It is extremely doubtful that the United States as a whole really does "welcome" a development all too likely to lead to war with our recent ally. But, since Roosevelt, it has become customary for the administration to regard itself as "the United States."

The celerity with which the Department of State "heartily welcomed" the British demarche was informative in another respect. It strongly indicated that the Truman administration had been consulted in advance about this alliance, and had approved it before Mr. Bevin spoke. Indeed, one must doubt whether this ambitious program would have been attempted by the British Government without assurances of American backing as to which the American people are uninformed.

The Department of State endorsed the Bevin announcement the day after it was made. The day before, this announcement was chosen by the Department for publication of German documents relating to the Nazi-Soviet alliance. Those published to date are limited to the period from April 17, 1939, to June 22, 1941. The documents relating to the effort for a negotiated German-Russian peace are being held in reserve.

But the sample of secret diplomacy already disclosed is sufficient for the present purpose. That purpose is to support, at first with money and supplies alone, the formation of an anti-Russian bastion in western Europe. For that purpose the Nazi documents so far made public are undeniably useful. They show beyond a shadow of doubt that Soviet Russia has objectives which are not yet satisfied, and they show further that the present rulers of Russia are absolutely without conscience or scruple about attaining their objectives.

Honest American thinking, however, cannot stop at that convenient point. It is too painfully apparent that the United States is now about to turn on Russia in fashion which in Moscow may seem reminiscent of that followed by Hitler. In his announcement of the new anti-Comintern pact, Mr. Bevin regretted that the compromise reached at Yalta has not worked. It is something of a shock to notice that identical words were used by the Nazi Foreign Minister as the German armies invaded Russia. Von Ribbentrop, too, regreted that "the policy of compromise between the two countries has been unsuccessful."

III

A rude awakening as to the character and conduct of our own foreign policy is now inevitable. The American people will have to realize not merely that we are deeply embroiled in the type of power politics which inevitably leads to war, but also that we are playing power politics ineptly. Illustrations of this ineptitude abound. Here we shall only mention the single case of Spain.

The nation to which General Franco dictates will obviously have to be included in inevitable. The American people will have the anti-Russian alliance which Great Britain has begun to build, with State Department blessing and support. Spain is essential to this alliance, for its resources, its manpower, and as a strategically important base. For some months our Government propaganda agencies have been careful to say nothing offensive about Franco. But we had previously denounced him so roundly as a Fascist beast that it's going to be awkward to get in the same bed with the Caudillo now.

It is worth while to recall that on March 4, 1946, the Department of State released to the press a first, carefully selected, installment of those same German documents now made more completely available. The purpose of the selection made 2 years ago was not to excite the American people against Russia, but against Spain.

Therefore, the only documents published then were those which put Franco in the worst possible light. They included letters from Hitler and Mussolini to the Caudillo, urging him to get on the Nazi bandwagon. Naturally this careful selection gave the reader the impression that Spain was virtually an ally of the Axis.

But in the larger assortment of documents now made public there are several which show that the Nazis never really expected

any important assistance from Franco. There is, for instance, a letter from Hitler to Mussolini, dated June 21, 1941, in which the Fuehrer says: "Spain is irresolute and—I am afraid—will take sides only when the outcome of the war is decided."

In common decency that letter should also have been published 2 years ago, along with the material then selected for the sole purpose of smearing Franco. But that would not have suited our weathercock foreign policy, as it was then veering.

IV

Some of the mess which our Government has made of its international relations results from the plain stupidity of ungifted amateurs. But some of it is the result of demonstrable deception, and should be exposed as such. In particular, the new aspect of the so-called European recovery program must be appreciated, while the issue is still pending before the representatives of the people, in Congress.

With the decision to build a western European military alliance against Russia, ERP ceases to be primarily a program for economic recovery. At least in part, it becomes a method of financing this alliance, but without honorable admission of this purpose.

It is not difficult to substantiate this assertion. ERP is based on the report of the sixteen-nation Committee of European Economic cooperation, made public on September 23, 1947. Even to the amount of the initial appropriation asked, ERP closely follows that report.

But the report freely admits (section 119) that: "A substantial and steady resumption of eastern European food, feeding stuffs, and timber supplies is assumed in this report." And it says further:

"Even on favorable assumptions about the availability of supplies in the East, progress is bound to be slow and the abnormal dependence upon the American Continent will remain."

In other words, without Russian cooperation ERP holds little promise of being more than stop-gap aid. And even before the program is approved, the Administration heartily welcomes a political move which can only intensify the Russian opposition.

Seemingly it is the military significance of ERP which makes the Administration press for unsupervised control over its operation.

As the diplomatic picture is developing, it is absolutely vital that this blank check should not be turned over to the Department of State. But more is needed than the essential precaution of removing the oversight of ERP from the hands of those who are in position to plunge the country into war. If the Administration's foreign policy is not made the biggest issue of the coming Presidential campaign, then the American people will show themselves unable to recognize an issue which affects their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

American Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a speech which was made recently at the Men's Club of Temple Sholom in Chicago by Gov. Dwight H. Green, of the State of Illinois. This speech was forwarded to me by Col. Julius Klein, commander of the Jewish War Veterans:

It is indeed a privilege to come here tonight as a guest of the Men's Club of the Temple Sholom. Certainly there could not be a more fitting place for a discussion of our precious liberties as American citizens and their preservation in these troubled days. For 80 years this congregation has provided, not only a temple of worship for its members, but an active center for the advancement of every worthy, cultural, and civic interest of this community. The full protection of the civil liberties of all citizens always has been a major concern of the congregation and of this club.

In coming here tonight I also feel that I am visiting old neighbors. As most of you know, I lived for many years within a block of this temple. Moreover, throughout my life the Jewish synagogue has been a familiar and friendly landmark, for it was my good fortune to be born and reared in Ligonier, Ind., a small city which became, in pioneer days, a center of Jewish settlement in the Middle West. Residents of Ligonier of all faiths have been proudly asserting for more than half a century that their city had the largest percentage of Jewish population of any city in America. Long before any national organization was formed to promote the cooperation of Christians and Jews, the people of Ligonier had achieved that cooperation, so completely, that we had to get away from home to discover there was anything unusual about it.

It seems to me, however, that there is something particularly significant in the period of 80 years covered by the history of this congregation. That 80 years covers a little more than half of the period in which the Bill of Rights has been a part of the Constitution of the United States and the fundamental law of our land. It goes back beyond the date of the adoption of the Constitution of the State of Illinois, May 13, 1870. That Constitution also contains a bill of rights, which guarantees to every citizen of Illinois the fullest measure of liberty to be found anywhere in the world. Most of us are familiar with the language of the Federal Bill of Rights. All of us should be equally familiar with the splendid phraseology of the guaranties of our liberty contained in our State constitution. Let me quote paragraph 3 of article 2, which guarantees religious freedom in Illinois:

"The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever be guaranteed; and no person shall be denied any civil or political right, privilege, or capacity on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the State. No person shall be required to attend or support any ministry or place of worship against his consent, nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship."

The guaranties of freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly, and the essential rights of trial by jury, due process, and protection against unreasonable searches and seizures, are set forth in language equally forthright and inclusive. (They are all worth reading and rereading.) But it seems to me that every citizen of Illinois should be particularly familiar with the last paragraph of the bill of rights in their State constitution. Let me quote paragraph 20 of the same article:

"A frequent recurrence to the fundamental principles of civil government is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty."

I do not know that consideration prompted the signers of our State constitution to write this admonition to future generations in Illinois, into their statement of the basic rights of men. I do know that that admonition is particularly timely today, when freedom seems in full retreat in many sections of the world, and is subject to insidious attack even in this land of liberty. With half the world ruled by Godless philosophies which exalt the State above the individual; and with some timid souls among us willing to trade the sacred rights of the individual for the false security of paternalism, it behooves us all to make "frequent recurrence to the fundamental principles of civil government," as we have always understood them in America.

If there is one lesson which the events of the last decade should have taught all Americans, it is that the battle for liberty is never ended. We had to be taught that lesson. Some Americans have not yet learned it. The men and women of my generation felt in our youth that the liberties of the Bill of Rights were something that had been established for all time for all Americans. We honored the founders of the Republic with a feeling that their blood had insured the blessings of liberty to us forever. Even the First World War did not jar us out of our complacency. While we talked about saving the world for democracy we did not consider our own liberties in danger. Today we know that each generation must win its own salvation.

In today's world of concentration camps, purges, economic and political absorption of small nations, and of scentific development of terrible weapons of destruction, liberty becomes a more precious—and less certain—thing. The Bill of Rights becomes a concern of all Americans, and not just of those minority groups who frequently must turn to it for protection against abuses founded upon prejudice. For today the people who are free, are but a small minority in a world of hate and fear and slavery.

We are constantly reminded that America emerged from World War II the richest and most powerful Nation on earth. No one will wish to dispute that record. Yet 140,000,000 Americans are indeed a minority in a world whose population is over 2,000,000,000. Our very riches and strength breed, first, envy, and then hate, among less fortunate peoples. Although the men and women of America who achieved our victory in the recent war, fought in the spirit of a glorious crusade for the rights of all mankind, they are not so regarded today by either their recent enemies or their recent allies. Certainly today most of the peoples of the world look upon us with jealousy and suspicion, and even with groundless fear or bitter hate. Surely every Jew must understand that that is the almost inevitable lot of any prosperous minority group. He is familiar with the pattern by which those who covet our possessions seek to inflame other peoples against us to destroy our liberties. Every true American knows that we must meet these attacks with eternal vigilance and courage, which puts the supreme trust in ourselves.

America, as a minority in today's world, wants to live in peace and harmony with all nations. We have joined a world organization dedicated to the highest principles of justice and liberty. We have sat down at the conference table in a spirit of give and take; but we have found ourselves faced by men who believed that we should give and they should take. We have come home disillusioned from one conference after another. We have not given up in our quest for peace, but most of us have come reluctantly to the conclusion that whatever security we have in the world today, springs from the fact that we are currently the strongest nation on earth.

For our own preservation, and for the advancement of the ideals which we hold for the world, we must preserve the full strength of America—our national resources, our military power, and, above all, the unity of our people. In the cold war of ideologies which is being forced upon us, we shall need the strength of every man and woman of every race and creed, just as sorely as we need them in the heat of battle. We shall need the best that is in every American, and we shall need the inspiration that comes from our country's steadfast devotion to liberty and equality.

We are not the first Nation in history to be called the greatest on earth. There have been many in the pages of history which have flourished for a time and slowly crumbled into insignificance or oblivion. The record will show us that no nation has ever yielded to the forces of bigotry and intolerance, and survived as a major power. The Roman Empire flourished when it respected the temples of all religions, so long as its subjects rendered to Caesar the things which were Caesar's, but it collapsed in the era of the persecutions of Christian martyrs. The Spain which prospered by giving opportunity to all, crumbled after the persecutions of the Inquisition. The Germany which achieved a golden age of culture and scientific progress in a period of tolerance, disintegrated under Hitler. The British Empire, whose tragic decline we are witnessing today, was built up, not only by sea power, but by the personal force of Englishmen, Scotsmen, Welshmen, and Irishmen, who were inspired by a greater degree of freedom and opportunity than was known elsewhere in the Old World. Its decline began when it failed to extend the same freedom and opportunity to its subjects beyond the seas.

America stands today at the threshold of a new era of world leadership. That leadership does not result from any imperialist ambitions of the American people; it has been thrust upon us by circumstances, mainly the collapse of other leaderships which failed. This leadership brings to our Republic new opportunities to serve others. It also brings new dangers to ourselves. The greatest danger is that in our hour of destiny we may neglect the ideals of justice and liberty which have guided our glorious history for two centuries.

The enemies of America and our American system know this. The disciples of totalitarianism are doing their utmost—and will continue to do their utmost—to divide us. The hatred and bigotry and bestial cruelty which has flourished in Europe for a generation, spreads like a pestilence. The enemies of the American system are trying to plant its germs in our American life. We must combat the perils of those germs by actions and policies which will serve as a tonic to the lifeblood of our freedom.

Those who are conducting the cold war against America would strike at all our liberties, particularly our economic opportunities. The first object of their attack is our freedom of religion. They know that it is the force of religion, the free conscience of God-fearing men, which has inspired each succeeding generation of Americans to build a greater culture and opportunity for the next generation, and to cherish and defend the free institutions which have been dictated by the fundamental moral concepts to which good Christians and good Jews both are dedicated. They know that our devotion to the flag is inspired by our devotion to God. As the Americans of 48 States are loyal to one flag, which stands for justice and liberty, so the Americans of many creeds and faiths are loyal to one God—a God of justice, mercy, and human dignity.

We must preserve the religious fervor and the religious unity of the American people. The great strides which have been made in promoting amity and understanding between Christians and Jews, and among all factions and sects of each, represent a tremendous contribution to the forces of America. That noble work must be accelerated and expanded. But that is not enough. America needs not only less religious differences in our lives; it needs more religion in our hearts. Amity and understanding and effective cooperation between Christians and Jews will be best established when there are more good Christians and more good Jews—Jews and Christians who will live by the laws of the faith they profess.

We shall never correct the evils which result from religious differences by fostering indifference to religion. Equality, regardless of race, creed, or color, is our American goal. Every man or woman has a race and a color; it is equally desirable that each man and woman have a creed, and live by it. As an American citizen, I do not care what is the religion of any man, but I hope he is a religious man. Indeed, our American society is founded, and I think any world society must be founded on one man's confidence that his neighbor will respect his rights so long as he respects his neighbor's. That golden rule is the law of the prophets as well as the law of Jesus; it is the law of many other faiths. It springs from our common belief in God. With godless men we cannot with confidence cooperate or negotiate. That is why the world's efforts to negotiate with Hitler failed. That is, I believe, the basic reason for the impasse we have reached in our dealing with the Communists of eastern Europe.

The preservation of our American liberties and our hope of extending them to other peoples of the world rests, more than anything else, on a renaissance of the religious zeal, and the godliness, of the men and women who founded and built America.

Ours is indeed a society of Pilgrims—not only the Pilgrims who landed on a stern and rock-bound coast in Massachusetts—but all the pilgrims, the Catholic pilgrims, the Protestant pilgrims, and the Jewish pilgrims, who, for four centuries, from every land have turned their eyes and their feet to the west, and have sought to find in America, freedom to worship God and to live according to His commandments.

We Americans must preserve that freedom. We must continue to worship Him and to live by His commandments. We must guard well every American institution, every precious liberty which has been established here. We must protect ourselves from every attack from without, and from every temptation from within, which would sacrifice the least iota of our American birthright.

Therefore, it is indeed fitting that here tonight, we rededicate ourselves to the preservation of our sacred freedoms as Americans—our religious, political, and economic liberties. As our state constitution so wisely points out, a frequent recurrence to those fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty.

As we do so, it is well that we remember the sage wisdom of Benjamin Franklin when he said, "They that can give up essential liberty, to obtain a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty or safety."

Office of International Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to enclose herewith a significant communication with reference to the Office of International Trade. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

JANUARY 14, 1948.

Mr. THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, Jr.,
Director, Office of International Trade, United States Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLAISDELL: The World Trade Association of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, in regular meeting held at the Fairmont Hotel Monday noon, January 12, 1948, considered the probable effect upon all export merchants of the United States of the new licensing procedure outlined in Current Export Bulletins 431 and 432. More than 150 persons were in attendance.

It was the consensus of opinion expressed by the membership that the objectives outlined in paragraph A of Bulletin 431 are in line with the current export situation and domestic conditions.

With respect to paragraph B, however, there was general disagreement with the methods outlined in paragraphs B–1 (c), (d), and (e). Referring to paragraph B–1–c, which also considers paragraphs B–1–a (1), (2), and B–1–b, foreign governments exercise rigid import controls and checks on use of dollar exchange, the end use of materials and conditions of delivery, before import licenses are issued. Little justification is seen for the OIT to consider consumption of dollar exchange in the foreign country or to judge between various brands or manufacturers of goods or conditions of delivery, this being a matter of competition inherent in private trade, which we approve and which is outlined under the broad policies of paragraph A of the subject bulletin.

The further requirement that total price be shown is ambiguous. It ignores the fact that the price may change between time of application and issuance of license and that many commodities are not quoted on commodity markets as mentioned in the bulletin. Prices are also subject to increase as quantities decrease from car load to less car load quantities when licenses are cut down.

The added requirement of a firm commitment of supply, mentioned in 432, also implies the acceptance of a document which must be given with reservations expressed or implied. A manufacturer may expect to have the merchandise available for a specific shipment at the time of application, but can scarcely be expected to earmark merchandise unless the export merchant has likewise made a firm commitment at that time. Unless the exporter has some reasonable assurance of an alternative use for such merchandise, he can scarcely make such commitment. Most exporters are not speculators.

With reference to paragraph B–1–d, it was pointed out that the requirement of showing the possession of an accepted firm order is completely unrealistic. While an order in hand has been a requirement at all times for filing an application, this has been until recently interpreted to accord with actual conditions, we believe. A careful buyer will scarcely give an irrevocable commitment for merchandise at a date of shipment which can only be determined if and when the license has been issued, of a quantity which also depends upon the license granted. A careful seller will not accept the firm order because of the same uncertainties and in addition will not commit himself to a price which at a later date may be less than his then cost. It can scarcely be unknown to OIT that the majority of export merchants operate to a considerable extent upon simultaneous purchase and sale. He does not own or buy the merchandise covered by the accepted firm order until he knows that he has a license for export.

Although paragraph A of Bulletin 431 and A–1 of Bulletin 432 state that the historical pattern has been abandoned, in the press conference of December 30, the following question was raised: "Assuming that two

identical applications were submitted and assuming that the prices were equal, would the applicant with the historical background be given preference over the nontraditional exporter?" Mr. Blaisdell stated, "It means the historical position will also be taken into account."

Referring to paragraph B-1-e of Bulletin 431, many buyers of commodities order at one time a quantity of a given product for a substantial number of essential end uses, and applications are accordingly apt to be vague. Enforcement of end use requirements has in the past apparently given an advantage to the applicant who could present his case personally.

Strong objection was voiced to the new procedures outlined in 431 and 432, for the reason that they seem to discriminate against the merchant exporters, in favor of the manufacturing exporters, and, in addition, seem to open the door for practices which would require an impracticable amount of enforced compliance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the price criteria be abandoned as unworkable in accomplishing the competitive situation outlined in Bulletin 431.

Competition in the foreign markets takes care of price limitation as no other method can. It is recognized that a license for a scarce commodity does, in effect, give the exporter a semimonopoly position, but it is believed that limiting the volume of export business which an export house can expect to do under an expanding positive list, should not also bring the prospect of bankruptcy by reducing the margin of profit to such a point as seems to be contemplated, and it is felt that more concern is being shown for the foreign buyer than for the exporters, whose place in the American economy has had, and can continue to have, a beneficial place.

If the price criterion cannot be completely abandoned under the new authorization for extension of export control, our membership urges that consideration be given to allowing the export houses a fair percentage of the quotas and that OIT indicate in its quota announcements the percentages of each licenseable item which will be set aside for each category of exporter, namely: (1) Government-to-government sales, (2) producer-exporter, (3) merchant-exporter; and that the OIT should further indicate what formula it follows in setting up these allotments.

If prices are to be compared in a group of applications, a definite basis of price should be specified, f. o. b. factory, f. a. s., or c. i. f., and rigidly adhered to for all applicants.

The members of this association are anxious to cooperate with a workable system of export controls recognizing the necessity of continuing these and probably of an expanding list of commodities. It is urgently recommended, however, that when changes of this important nature are contemplated, that because of the time element, due consideration be given to regional representation and ample notice of such contemplated meetings be provided.

Very truly yours,

W. J. GILSTRAP,
President.

More Whisky—Less Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in 1936 negotiators for our State Department, operating under the Trade Agreements Act, cut the duty on whisky from $5 to $2.50 a gallon. Imports more than doubled in the next year. On January 1, 1948, the duty was again reduced from $2.50 a gallon to $1.50 a gallon. The trend of imports at the present time is in the same direction as when the cuts were made in 1936. Last year imports of liquors amounted to about 10,000,000 gallons. If we are to judge by what happened in the past, liquor imports in 1948 will be limited only by the amount of precious grain the foreign distillers can take out of the very insufficient stocks. The American duty will be no limiting factor in any degree. Our President has, by proclamation, invited foreign makers to send us every drop they can spare.

Whisky is made from grain, and it takes a bushel of grain to make 4½ gallons of whisky. Wheat is the staff of life; rye makes good bread; barley makes good cereal; corn is scarce and precious. Every trumped-up argument to the contrary, the unchallenged fact remains that in 1947 foreign countries will use at least 3,000,000 bushels of grain to make liquors for export to the United States and millions of bushels more will be used in the foreign production of liquors for home consumption.

One of the very State Department officials that was influential in making the drastic reduction in liquor duties and encouraged its importation made the following statement:

> Europe today is a land of very low standards of living. Millions of families are having a hard time scraping enough together simply to exist, to find shelter, to cover their bodies, and to prevent disease and starvation. So much effort is spent in obtaining the bare necessities that they are unable to do a good days work, thus impairing production and retarding recovery.

Now, I want to make it clear that I understand the need for food in Europe. I agree wholeheartedly with the statement that the situation in some areas is acute. I have no objection to the sending of food to these starving people. I am as charitable as the next person, but I cannot countenance the effort of our President to feed them liquor or to increase the consumption of liquor in this country and abroad, and I make the statement after considerable investigation and serious thought. Our negotiators in the trade agreements made at Geneva, in their blinded efforts to keep pumping exports abroad and imports into the United States, deliberately planned a campaign to increase the consumption of liquor in this country. They did so knowing that thousands of people in Europe would go without bread and cereals so that we might have more and cheaper liquor.

President Roosevelt, and his successor in the White House, as well as numerous State Department representatives have said repeatedly that the great increase in imports resulting from drastic tariff cuts was not intended to replace domestic production. Increased consumption was the goal. By exporting more and doing away with our tariffs we would be able to import and consume more butter and cheese, walnuts and fruits, jewelry, and perfume. The fact that they have cut the rates of duty on whisky a full 70 percent is proof in itself that it was their intention to increase the consumption of liquor.

The foolish argument that rye and barley are used more for cattle feed than for human consumption is entirely without point. It takes as much acreage and labor and machinery to produce rye as it does to produce wheat. The argument that grains exported from the United States are to be used only in the production of food is just as foolish. The unchallenged fact remains that foreign countries who are literally begging for food are producing millions of gallons of liquors every month, and they are making it out of millions of bushels of grain. We have ordered our distilleries to greatly reduce their production so that we might export grain abroad and, at the same time, we reduce the duties on imports of liquor to an insignificant point. President Truman carefully gropes for votes with one hand and hides what he is doing with the other. He wants our whisky producers limited to a few millions of bushels of precious grains per month—but he beams benignly on foreign manufacturers and says, "Welcome to our market. We will take all the whisky you can produce."

And millions of people in the war-torn countries beg for bread. They do not even get a stone—they get liquor. A pound of wheat will make more than a pound of bread, but it puts more money in somebody's pocket if it can be used in the making of whisky, and, to too many people, dollars are more important than starving men and women and children.

Little wonder that labor and capital and the farmers themselves have lost faith in the administration. One of the basic weaknesses of the whole European recovery program is the loud talk of its proponents about "all or none," while at the same time they promote the sale of liquor which they know down in their hearts cuts the delivery of food. They question your patriotism if you do not save your slice of bread per day—but they ask you to consume more of the whisky made abroad from the grain you so patriotically did not eat.

We may drink our society into complete ruin—a very, very high price to pay for an increase in the dollar volume of our imports. Not many Americans will be fooled by the propaganda that we can drink the world into prosperity—or the Europeans into a condition of bounteous plenty. The trade agreements program so ardently pushed by Mr. Truman not only embodies foolish economics, it contains some vicious features which must and will be called to the attention of the people of this country.

Backs, Bellies, and Shelter Are Nonpartisan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in opposing the gag rule to provide for consideration of the Knutson-National Manufacturers Association tax bill—a type of rule which heretofore has only been granted in the consideration of highly complicated and technical revenue and tariff bills—I endeavored to point out the iniquities of that bill, and went on record as favoring the President's recommendations to give a flat income-tax reduction of $160 a year to those taxpayers in the lower-income brackets who are married and have two dependents and the same reduction be given those in the higher-income brackets or the wealthy class. I also urged the readoption of an excess-profits-tax law.

Today I received a letter from the People's Lobby, which reassures me on the stand which I have taken. I feel that their contention is worthy of real consideration and in the hope that it will be given serious study by the membership, under the leave given me, I insert it in the RECORD. It is as follows:

THE PEOPLE'S LOBBY,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1948.

SUFFERING CANNOT BE HELPED BY EVASIONS

To Members of the Congress:

Every Member of the Congress knows that the reduction in prices that is practical, if profits of big landed farmers, and major manufacturers, developers of natural resources, wholesalers and retailers, and transporters were reasonable, would mean much more, to at least two-thirds of American consumers, than the reduction of taxes proposed by any tax reduction bill pending.

Every Member of Congress knows that a 10 percent reduction of the $118,000,000,000 paid retailers last year could mean about three times more to all people in the lower-income brackets than any tax reduction they will get, and five times as much to many.

The President's recent Economic Report to Congress lists 11,000,000 persons living on relatively fixed incomes as follows:

Veterans living on pensions, 3,000,000.

Survivors and social security beneficiaries, 2,000,000.

Veterans living on educational allowances without other jobs, 2,000,000.

It did not mention the more than 1,000,000 preachers and teachers similarly handicapped.

The A. F. of L. admitted last December: "The 11 percent gain in average hourly rates and average weekly wages scored since October 1946 has meant nothing to the 13,000,000 production workers."

Unless Congress at once:

1. Restores at least half of the repealed excess-profits taxes.

2. Restores rent control and major price fixing and rationing as Canada plans to do.

3. Retains present personal income-tax rates above $5,000 or $6,000.

4. Taxes land values and repeals excise taxes.

5. Adopts most of the anti-inflationary measures urged by Chairman Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board.

Congress will stand convicted of the stupidity of trying to help suffering, without ending the causes of suffering.

Backs, bellies, and shelter are nonpartisan.

Yours sincerely,

BENJAMIN C. MARSH,
Executive Secretary.

The world judges our foreign policies by our domestic.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the January 29 issue of the New York Herald Tribune in regard to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway:

UNTIMELY AND UNPROVED

President Truman remarks that for 25 years Presidents have supported, as he is now doing, the St. Lawrence seaway project. The fact is that in the 25 years technological developments have increased the magnitude of the undertaking and lessened the justifications for it. The original proposal has been revised from a 25-foot to a 27-foot channel depth to accommodate vessels plying between the Atlantic and the Great Lakes. But the modern shipping trend is still toward greater depth. And there is no port on the Great Lakes, no approach channel to accommodate a 27-foot draft, let alone the 35 feet many authorities now deem essential.

Similarly, technological developments in warfare have outdistanced earlier arguments for the seaway as a defense resource. The locks would be particularly vulnerable to air attack, their own defense would be costly. The final justification, power development, does not depend upon completion of the navigation project.

Present plans call for tolls on shipping in an effort to make the project self-liquidating. The agreement between Canada and the United States, which Congress is now asked to approve, limits the charges that can be levied. Moreover, the St. Lawrence is open only 7 or 8 months of the year, so that the seaway could never operate to more than, say, 60 percent of capacity. Consequently, there is little likelihood that the seaway can ever be anywhere near self-liquidating.

Estimated costs, based on the inadequate 27-foot channel, range from $300,000,000 to $1,000,000,000. If Congressional legislators can forget the election, they will recognize that an inflationary period is the worst possible time for any major public work which draws heavily upon scarce materials and sends prices still higher. They will recognize that the necessity for financing the European recovery program and for channeling materials and productive efforts into essential restoration of economic stability at home and abroad rules out unnecessary Government expenditures and commitments. This is definitely not the time for Congress to embark upon a vast project, the cost of which cannot be accurately calculated, the national benefits of which are yet to be proved.

Juvenile Delinquency and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a thoughtful address by J. Pope Dyer, prominent educator of Central High School, Chattanooga, Tenn. Mr. Dyer has made a lifetime study of juvenile delinquents, and I invite your attention to his address which was delivered over radio station WAPO on November 17, 1947:

Juvenile delinquency is not a new term to the people of our Nation. Any student of criminology will recall that practically all the exceedingly notorious criminals in the early history of our Nation, as well as the noted criminals of the past decade or two, were first dangerous and desperate juvenile delinquents. This was the case with the Barker brothers, Karpis, Floyd, and a list too long to be recounted here.

I repeat, juvenile delinquency is not a new problem suddenly arising for solution. The causes broadly are the same from generation to generation. Poor home training, naturally by incompetent parents. Excessive alcoholism, feeble-mindedness, insufficient recreational facilities, bad housing, poverty, truancy, and a multitude of other causes could be listed. Basically, the incompetent parent, who is weak, cannot be expected by society to rear a strong, obedient, responsible, God-fearing child—that is expecting too much of either. As Helen Bailey said a few days ago, "There is no magic formula by which we can solve this problem." I have often said the time to reduce crime and juvenile delinquency is in the high chair and not the electric chair. Judge Tatum, of Nashville, has said many times that in the past few years, as juvenile judge, he has tried approximately 7,000 cases of juvenile delinquents and the number of children who are regular in attendance at Sunday school and church is less than a dozen and the same condition prevails at their homes. Fundamentally, we must recognize that juvenile delinquency exists when the home breaks down in any of its moral or spiritual obligations. We may expect more juvenile delinquency unless parents are willing to take more time for rearing children than any other thing in the world. This problem is serious and great men like Hon. J. Edgar Hoover are alarmed. I quote him, "Parents must awaken to the realization that the family is the first great training school in behavior or misbehavior. Children develop a sense of right and wrong—they are not born with it. Our Nation is sadly in need of a rebirth of the simple life—a return to the days when God was a part of each household, when families arose in the morning with a prayer on their lips and ended the day by placing themselves in His care."

Some of my students have recently received some tremendously enlightening letters relative to juvenile delinquency. Vernon Willingham, of my class, received one from Mr. James F. Wilson, of the Maryland Reformatory for Boys. Mr. Wilson said, in part, I quote, "Why are the boys here? First of all they were selfish. They were disobedient toward God, parents, lawful authority." I quote from another letter from the splendid Superintendent Fain C. Potter, of our own Tennessee State Industrial School. He said, "Most juveniles that are delinquents overestimate their own abilities and feel that they are a little superior to the average boy. Juvenile delinquents are not problem boys—they are boys with problems out of harmony with society. A large percent of them are boys who have not learned to say 'No.' They, as a rule, are a group of overstimulated youth that have very little of that virtue of patience to wait and work for accomplishments."

The schools certainly have a responsibility to cooperate with all agencies to reduce juvenile delinquency. The greatest studies of the careers of delinquents and crime reveal three things:

1. Criminal careers have their roots largely in childhood.

2. The marks of delinquency are in great measure evident during school years, and

3. The families of delinquents are as a rule unable to participate constructively in the training, supervision, and treatment of young offenders without expert guidance.

It is not guesswork to say failure of the home is the chief cause of delinquency. The experts, Father Flanagan, J. Edgar Hoover, Dr. Sheldon Glueck, and others are in absolute agreement at this point.

The school program must recognize the symptoms of delinquency and a program of discipline, instruction, recreation, and understanding must be constructed to meet the needs of these potential offenders. A course of study, specially designed for their needs must supplant the typical curriculum. The best teachers must be used so that these problem children may be saved. A sympathetic, firm, understanding teacher can do much to inspire a potential delinquent to do a great service. The excessive energy of the mischievous boy must be channeled so that it will not mature into downright meanness and destructiveness. It is much cheaper to spend more money now to prevent delinquency than to pay several times as much to incarcerate the youth at a later date. I feel that the school attendance law should be rigidly enforced.

It is time we got serious about this problem—parents, teachers, officials, and all citizens. We can't eliminate juvenile delinquency. We can reduce it. Miss Betty Dawson summarized the problem of juvenile delinquency this morning as follows: "One of the major causes of juvenile delinquency is the lack of religious training in the home. If a child is properly taught, when he is old he will not depart from it. Juvenile delinquency could be cured if parents would take their children to church."

I would add, the school must augment the work of the home and church. They must all be united in this common cause. No one force can neglect to do its share.

Oil and Steel Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN REGAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, much is being published in the press and considerable discussion is being heard daily with respect to the great shortages of oil and steel.

Many independent oil operators of west Texas, and I feel confident that the condition is not limited to west Texas but is a general condition throughout the United States, have felt for the past several years that a shortage of oil was bound to follow the shortage of pipe or well casing that has been an acute condition in the oil industry for the past several years.

This shortage of steel continues to hamper, prevent, and delay the drilling of wells that would, in all probability, relieve, if not entirely prevent the shortage in oil and its products if an adequate supply of well casings could be made available.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, we are told that there are tremendous quantities of scrap steel in Europe and Africa.

Mr. Speaker, we are shipping boatload after boatload of various supplies and commodities to Europe; the boats are returning empty.

Is it not high time, Mr. Speaker, that these United States start practicing some economies at home and do something that will be a direct benefit to all our people?

I have here an editorial by Mr. Ray L. Dudley, of Houston, Tex., as published in this month's issue of the magazine World Oil, that was forwarded to me by my good friend, H. E. Williams, a prominent independent oil producer of Houston, that I feel would be of great interest to every Member of this Congress and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD:

HOW TO GET MORE PIPE

Last month we discussed the steel situation and said (after talking with steel men in the East) that one sure way to get more steel to make more pipe to drill more wells is to get more scrap steel to the steel mills of the United States. We suggested that great quantities of scrap steel are available in Europe and north Africa and that the practical is to bring this steel back to the United States.

It is possible to increase steel capacity in the United States without the tremendous expense necessary to build new mills, the product of which necessarily would have to sell at a price considerably above present steel prices. But in any consideration of the problem of increasing steel production, the scrap question is well at the top of the list. You recall the efforts to get in the scrap during the war, of how the oil industry organized its efforts to bring in scrap and the large amounts of scrap thus recovered and delivered to the mills. That effort, of course, did not bring in all of the scrap—but it cleaned out the junk pile on many a lease.

There is, however, this big source of scrap abroad, everyone who has visited Europe has noticed it. So far as is publicly known, no effort is being made to bring this scrap to the United States but, on the contrary European nations have requested, under the Marshall plan, large quantities of scrap to be sent from the United States.

We shall shortly be sending these countries aid in the form not only of food but of manufactured articles. They want dollar credits through exports. Why in the name of common sense can't we get this scrap back? Our ships will be going over loaded and coming back in ballast. Why not bring the scrap back instead of ballast?

It will take congresisonal action to bring this about.

Speaking of the desirability of congresisonal activity along these lines, Alex Walker, president of National Supply Co., in a letter to Secretary of Commerce Harriman, recently wrote:

"This is a far more intelligent way to secure the additional five- or ten-million tons of ingots so badly needed, than to build new steel-producing capacity costing $2,000,000,000 to produce 10,000,000 tons of ingots per year, requiring 2 or maybe 3 years to build, and withdrawing 1,500,000 tons of steel from consumption in other channels.

"I am sure you understand that such action will gradually reduce the price of scrap in America; also the cost of steel; and eliminate the gray market.

"It is my understanding that only the Federal Government can bring foreign scrap back to this country in large quantities, because the amount owned by private industry, who has the right to sell it, is limited; most of the scrap scattered over this world is owned either by the Army, the Navy, or the nation in which it is now located.

"I know of nothing more that you can do to hasten business stability in America, than to build up the scrap supply and break the gray market which is made possible by the present shortage of scrap and finished steel."

Here, in our opinion, is how you • • • and by you we mean every person who reads this, whether owner, executive, or employee of an oil company • • • can help to increase the steel supply in the United States and thereby increase the amount of pipe needed by our industry:

Write your Congressman and Senators and say:

"Why don't you do something about bringing scrap steel back from Europe to the United States? This country needs the steel it will make. Only our Federal Government can do something about it and you are my representative in this matter."

Write the letters today.

RAY L. DUDLEY,
News Analysis Section.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of Erie County regarding the St. Lawrence seaway:

Whereas on various occasions and over a period of years this Board has gone on record, in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway; and

Whereas said proposed seaway presents a present threat to the economy of New York State and especially to the Niagara frontier as great as at any time since its inception; and

Whereas the people of the State of New York have contributed millions of dollars to provide water transportation from Lake Erie to the port of New York; and

Whereas New York State, because of its great percentage of national wealth, would be required to contribute a great part of the total cost of the proposed seaway and at the same time create a transportation system in direct competition with its own system; and

Whereas the diversion of transportation to cheap foreign shipping and the opening of our inland markets to alien tramp steamers would be detrimental to American labor, the American farmer, and American industry and so lower the whole standard of American living; and

Whereas the entire navigation and seaway project would be built largely at the expense of American taxpayers while a net loss of some $42,000,000 would be sustained by industry and commerce, along with individual taxpayers; and

Whereas such a seaway is unwarranted and unnecessary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Board renew its opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway, that it petition our Representatives in the Congress of the United States to oppose any and all legislation proposing such a project; and be it further

Resolved, That this Board join with and urge all organizations, public, semipublic, and private, in the Niagara frontier to create a united force to the end that all opposition possible may be brought against this unsound and undesirable project.

1948 Schedule for State Primary Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread interest in the approaching national election and since we do not have a uniform date for selection of candidates for Representatives in Congress, United States Senate, and governors, I am submitting a schedule of State primaries for 1948. Instances of presidential primaries are also noted. The schedule follows:

Alabama, May 4.[1]
Arizona, September 7.
Arkansas, August 10.[2]
California, June 1.[3]
Colorado, September 14.
Florida, May 4.[1 3]
Georgia, September 8.
Idaho, August 10.
Illinois, April 13.[3]
Indiana, May 4.[3]
Iowa, June 7.
Kansas, August 3.
Kentucky, August 7.
Louisiana (State officials only January 20).
Louisiana, September 14.
Maine, June 21.
Maryland, May 3.[3]
Massachusetts, September 14.[4]
Michigan, September 14.
Minnesota, September 14.
Mississippi, August 24.[1]
Missouri, August 3.
Montana, July 20.
Nebraska, April 13.[3]
Nevada, September 7.
New Hampshire, September 14.[4]
New Jersey, June 1.[3 5]
New Mexico, June 8.
New York, September 14.[3 6]
North Carolina, May 29.
North Dakota, June 29.
Ohio, May 4.[3]
Oklahoma, July 6.
Oregon, May 21.[3]
Pennsylvania, April 27.[3]
Rhode Island, September 14 or 24.[7]
South Carolina, August 10.
South Dakota, June 1.[3]
Tennessee, August 5.
Texas, July 24.
Utah, September 7.
Vermont, September 14.
Virginia, August 3.
Washington, September 14.
West Virginia, May 11.[3]
Wisconsin, September 21.[8]
Wyoming, August 17.

[1] First primary; if run-off necessary, second primary held about 3 weeks later.

[2] Presidential primary also held on this date.

[3] For Representatives in Congress only; Senators and State officials nominated in convention.

[4] Presidential primary held April 27.

[5] Presidential primary held March 9.

[6] Presidential preference primary is held on April 6.

[7] Under new law, party which first files request with Secretary of State has choice of dates; the primary of the other party is held on the alternate date.

[8] For State officials; July 27 for United States Senators and Representatives in Congress.

[9] New Jersey will probably change date to April 20 or May 4.

NOTE.—Connecticut and Delaware do not hold primaries for national or State officials.

The Plain Issue: Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to submit for the benefit of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Daily World, in the issue of January 22, 1948, entitled "The Plain Issue: Taxes":

THE PLAIN ISSUE: TAXES

Proponents of a $5,600,000,000 cut in the budget submitted by the President have practically defined the principal feature of the 1948 campaign. The bold move of the Republican majority leadership puts the President on the defensive. He will be in the position of defending high taxes and unremitting expenditures.

The cut proposed is explicit. It relates to income taxes. It carries the requirement that Federal expenditures be cut to fit the reduction in income. President Truman is commonly understood to stand for the present tax rate, and, inferentially, against any reduction of outgo. This situation makes the whole matter fairly plain.

The size of the cut would, if carried through, make it imperative that one or both of these things must be done. The aid to Europe must be reduced; the vast Federal establishment must be tamed.

There are two major probabilities: The budget will be trimmed and President Truman will veto the tax reduction bill. Apparently, the Republican leaders would not yield to the suggestion that they could gain Democratic support for a possible overriding of a third tax bill veto by cutting the cut somewhat. It was decided, probably wisely, to stand on the big reduction as a starter.

Mr. Truman's budget message was so palpably political that it created a challenge and largely disgusted the country. He submitted a budget of nearly $40,000,000,000. He has acquired some sort of support of his position that the expenditures cannot be cut now and that not even the desirable reduction of taxes upon small incomes can be voted.

Indications now are that the third veto will be fatal—to Mr. Truman. It is regrettable that the whole matter has become political—but here it is, a political issue.

It is apparent the President's plan is not for reduction of spending here or in Europe. The Republicans have not yet met the issue head-on; that is, they have not gone into cutting off bureaus and sections; they apparently rely upon the theory that if revenues are cut expenses will be cut. There is no action precedent, no deliberate marking of bureaus and sections for extinction. The cutting should begin at the source, not at the ultimate. But the action of the House majority is valuable; it puts the President purely upon the defensive. He is for continued spending and unlimited cost in Europe.

It should be made plain in Washington and over the country that there is basically no conflict between requisite aid for Europe and tax reduction. If we must pour out money for Europe, we must quit pouring out unlimited money at home. The looseness of European aid may mean shortening of rations for political bureaus at home. The whole business is interlocked, and the appearances are that President Truman is firmly tied to the idea of grotesquely large expenditures and the theory of the impossibility of betterment of the home Government.

The Meat Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the American National Livestock Association and resolutions of the Colorado Stock Growers and Feeders Association:

A MEMORIAL TO THE CONGRESS ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION AT ITS FIFTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION IN BOISE, IDAHO, JANUARY 14, 1948

Because of widespread misunderstanding of facts underlying the present meat situation, with respect both to supplies and prices, we present the following facts:

1. CAUSE OF INFLATION

All prices are high. We are in a period of inflation which is the direct result of the currency expansion of the war period. This currency expansion was inevitable once our Government had established a policy of financing the war primarily by borrowing from banks instead of by direct taxation and by sale of bonds to the investing public. This increased the supply of money out of all proportion to the available supply of goods and services. High prices are clearly the result of governmental policy adopted during the war and cannot be charged to any group or class of our citizens.

2. HIGH AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION COSTS

Farm production costs, which may be taken as representative also of ranching costs, are explained by the Department of Agriculture as follows: "Farm costs are at an unprecedented high level. Since 1939 farmers' out-of-pocket operating expenses have risen from 9 to 25 percent a year. Some further increase is expected in 1948."

Government figures also show that costs in farm production in 1946 exceeded gross farm income in 1941.

3. INCOME-MEAT PRICE RELATIONSHIP STABLE

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics reports that from 1920 to the present time, save only the war years of controlled economy, consumers have spent practically the same portion of their income each year for meat. In other words, meat prices are a true reflection of national income.

4. CONSUMER DOLLAR HIGH COMPARATIVELY

How does the consumer dollar spent for cost of living compare with other dollars spent? The National Industrial Conference Board shows, with Government figures, what has happened since 1935–39. By August 1947 the value of the 1935–39 dollar spent for living costs had been reduced to about 66 cents; that spent for construction of all types had shrunk to 53 cents; that spent for raw materials at wholesale to 45 cents. The value of the same dollar paid to labor in manufacturing industries had dropped to 49 cents.

5. CATTLE PRICES

What about beef cattle at 40 cents per pound? Such prices appear in the press occasionally for a single load or a part load of long-fed prime cattle; but the market page will also show that on the same day all other cattle sold for substantially lower prices. Top cattle have no significance for the average consumer. The meat from such animals does not go to the butcher shop but is a specialty item for hotels and night clubs.

6. THE CONSUMER FIXES THE PRICE

Consumer demand and available supply fix the price of food. Today it is a universal

high demand, created by high income, that has made prices rise. This broad demand, in a period of peak production, is distributing food more widely than at any time in our history.

7. PRESIDENT TRUMAN OPPOSED PRICE CONTROL

What President Truman said about price controls in 1946: "The general control over prices and wages is justified only so long as it is an effective instrument against inflation. I am convinced that the time has come when these controls can serve no useful purpose. I am indeed convinced that their further continuance would do our Nation's economy more harm than good. * * * The Price Administrator has advised me that with so much of the economy freed from price controls, clinging to the rest would, in his judgment, lead to distortions in production and diversion of goods to an extent far outweighing any benefit that could be achieved."

This is in direct conflict with his request now for selective controls.

8. MEAT PRODUCTION LARGE

Production of meat remains close to the record wartime level, but, relieved of war demands, the amount available for civilian use is substantially above even the peak year 1944.

Total meat production in 1944 was approximately 25,200,000,000 pounds. The amount of this available for civilian use in 1944 was approximately 19,200,000,000 pounds. Total meat production in 1947 is estimated to be well in excess of 23,000,000,000 pounds, practically all of it available for civilian use.

9. PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION HIGH

In 1947 each person ate on an average 156 pounds of meat. That is the largest per capita consumption in 38 years. In 1948 the supply will approximate 145 pounds per capita, but this will still be about 15 percent above the amount of meat consumed per capita in 1935-39.

10. BETTER LIVING

Under inflation, food prices have risen, even though the supply of food has been at record levels. More people in this country are living better today, eating more than at any time in our history. It is their demand, their ability to pay, that sets the price of food, whether that price be high or low.

11. RATIONING AND BLACK MARKETS

What would happen if we rationed meat? The present demand would inevitably create black markets and the black marketeer would be the beneficiary. The consumer with an average income would be the loser. That is what happened under OPA.

12. REMEDY FOR INFLATION

Maximum production coupled with a sound fiscal and monetary policy on the part of the Government will provide the most effective remedy for inflation. This would insure the consumer a maximum supply of meat at equitable prices. It can be accomplished only under an economy free from rationing, price controls, or other arbitrary restrictions. Maximum production cannot be realized, however, and reflected in lower prices so long as costs of producing and fattening livestock are dominated by the export to Europe of close to half a billion bushels of grain yearly, and of tremendous amounts of equipment and supplies that are important factors in production costs.

In view of all the above, we respectfully urge the Congress not to reimpose price controls or rationing or the authority therefor.

Resolution 4

Price Controls and Rationing

(NOTE.—On June 21, 1946, at our seventy-ninth annual convention in Canon City, the Colorado Stockgrowers and Feeders Association unanimously adopted resolution A urging Congress to remove OPA price controls, because OPA controls and regulations of livestock and meat products have proved unenforceable and impractical and black market operations fostered by such unenforceable regulations are causing irreparable damage to the economic structure of the industry.)

Whereas President Truman has requested that Congress grant him authority to reinstitute price and rationing controls on food and other products as he deems necessary to regulate prices and consumption; and

Whereas the American public accepted such controls and rationing only as a war measure justified by the danger to our Nation; and

Whereas no such emergency can now be claimed to exist to justify such regimentation and the sacrifice of individual rights and responsibilities, particularly when experience proves that the controls are foredoomed to failure: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we again point out that production and efficient utilization provide the most effective controls upon prices and distribution and we express our opposition to price and rationing controls as proposed.

Resolution 15

(Resolution supporting a memorial to the Congress adopted by the American National Livestock Association at its fifty-first annual convention in Boise, Idaho, January 13-14-15, 1948)

Whereas the American National Livestock Association, in annual convention at Boise, Idaho, January 13, 14, and 15, wrote a memorial to the Congress setting forth 12 facts regarding the present meat situation, both with respect to supplies and prices, and urged the Congress not to reimpose price controls or rationing or the authority therefor: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we heartily endorse their action and offer the support of the Colorado Stockgrowers and Feeders Association in opposing price and rationing controls.

NOTE: We believe that if meat were again controlled by rationing as suggested by President Truman and Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, such a Federal order would immediately create black markets for meat, forcing prices to go higher. We know from experience the results would be bad for all concerned and the consumer with an average income would be the loser—and that is exactly what happened under OPA restrictions.

European Recovery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is about time, before it is too late, for the taxpayers of our country to realize and to resist the raid on their pockets by foreign countries made possible by the American internationalists cooperating in the foreign raid. There can be reduction in expenditures to warrant much greater tax reduction than is provided for in H. R. 4790 if the people instruct their Representatives in Congress to oppose this foreign boondoggling program, which will eventually, if not stopped, make taxpaying slaves of our American citizens.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Henry J. Taylor delivered over Station WOR, New York, January 12, 1948:

Exactly who gets the money in the latest European recovery plan? Seventeen billion dollars. I've just found out for sure. I think you'll be very surprised to know.

Our money doesn't grow on trees. It's hard for most any of us to get along at best. Before we're challenged further by the idea that the $17,000,000,000 new European plan must be all or nothing and start paying the bill in our homes and work places and the high cost of living, we need some facts that are contrary to public impression and which were withheld in the original presentation of the plan itself.

Fact number one is who gets the money. It's hard to imagine that fact was left out but it was, and I think we have a right to know. We've already spent $22,000,000,000 abroad since the end of the war. And now we're expected to spend $17,000,000,000 more. Yet, in the mountains of words and figures, this fact was of itself an amazing omission. Actually, the plan, to be truly revealing, should never have been given to Congress and to the public without this fundamental information—who gets the money.

After all, who is more entitled to know where his money goes than the man who pays the bill, which means us all? But the State Department in Washington could not reveal and still feature the anti-Communist angle, my friends, on an over-all $17,000,000,000 basis, on an all or nothing basis. So in order to be factual and exact in discussing on the air this latest project, so important in your land and mine, so heavily involved in our inflation, high prices, taxes, the cost of living that is bearing down on us all and on our future, I've been making for weeks in Washington every possible attempt I could make to get official information regarding what countries in terms of percentages were to get our new $17,000,000,000.

So at long last here are the facts to plug that loophole, the official figures obtainable only yesterday. They indicate much we've not been permitted to know.

First you will find that in percentage of dollars, a full third of our seventeen-billion-dollar plan is primarily another aid to England project. The lion's share of the funds goes to the British Isles, one-third of the entire amount, $5,348,000,000 of the seventeen million—billion to be exact. Now, certainly, that part hasn't anything to do with buying off Communist popularity there, and to this large extent the Marshall plan should not have been presented to us as an anti-Communist measure, any more than the last $3,750,000,000 we gave England in 1945.

Maybe they need it, I don't know. But they certainly don't need it to stop communism in England. No one has even had the nerve to suggest that the British are on the verge of voting Communist. Had the fact that a third of the money we sent—or are to send—was to go there been made public, and early, it would have been impossible to present the powerful appeal for the over-all seventeen-billion fund on an anti-Communist basis, all or nothing basis, in the official support for the outlay, at least to the extent of one-third of the entire proposition.

Now, next with England, seven additional countries are ruled out in the same way, where there is, by common consent, no more idea of the population voting Communist than there is in England—this plan or no plan, I refer to Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Denmark, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, and little Iceland. So let's see what they'll get. Some of the figures are unbelievable, my friends, but they are correct and official and at last come from our State Department itself.

Do you know how much all of us are to be taxed for the Dutch? Holland is to get 2,436,000,000 American dollars. Fantastic as it may seem, the plan gives Holland, a little country with fewer people than live in New York city $2,436,000,000. And if that's a calculated risk against communism in Holland it's quite a calculation, yet imaginable. The plan is nevertheless presented as "take the whole plan or nothing, all or nothing." Why, the figure for Holland alone means a charge on us for $308 for every man, woman, and child who lives on the shores of the Zuyder Zee.

Denmark is supposed to get over a half billion dollars, $582,000,000 to be exact. For this one little country alone, with a population less than Chicago, that's as much as all the stop-gap aid for which the special session of Congress so dramatically called last November. Denmark, a half billion dollars.

Now Ireland: Ireland was not in the war. Ireland is an island. The Communists would have to swim to get there and if there's a Communist there now not an Irishman knows it. But Ireland is to get a half billion dollars, $407,000,000 to Ireland to be exact. So, my friends, three and a half billion dollars out of the 17 billions go to Holland, Denmark, and Ireland.

For good measure, even Iceland. Apparently there must be quite a Communist threat in Iceland and a lot of western civilization tottering on the brink there besides, for Iceland comes into the Marshall plan, and for $38,000,000. Fewer people live on that island than live in Trenton, N. J. And Iceland is just about as much in the throes of chaos, just about as much tottering on the brink of giving up western civilization as Trenton, N. J., except that there isn't much western civilization in Iceland anyway. But they're to get $38,000,000 from us, all or nothing, just the same.

Then there's Norway, where the Communist vote is about 7 percent. But Norway is in for $234,000,000 from us. The plan gives $234,000,000 to Norway.

Next comes Portugal in deciding whether or not the propaganda for the plan is padded in its over-all anti-Communist appeal to our public. Now, in Portugal, the Communist vote happens to be nonexistent. For 20 years the country has been and remains in the hands of a Fascist dictator, Dr. Salazar. Portugal did not fight in the war. Portugal profited immensely in the war by Portuguese standards. Yet, Portugal gets our money just the same. Portugal gets 100,000,000 American dollars in the Marshall plan. All or nothing. Can the seventeen billion be cut? Can the first installment now asked for, $6,800,000,000, be cut? Well, I should say so, and now.

The anti-Communist angle is valid to a degree in some places where the money is to go, like Italy. But, my friends, the simple truth is, now that we get the figures, so belatedly published and in a most confusing way, only yesterday, the truth is that over ten billion of the seventeen billion is going to countries—I visited every one of them myself—that are by common consent no more on the verge of voting Communist than the State of Indiana, which I visited last week, and which hardly looks on the verge of voting Communist to me.

Or take another angle. The appeal is made to us that we are aiding the victims of war-torn countries in gratitude for their losses in the war. Now, there are other appeals that are sound and very much better. That isn't a very good one. How many billions are ruled out on that one? Of the 16 countries in the Marshall plan over $6,000,000,000 out of the seventeen billions are to go to enemy countries, Germany, Italy, and Austria, for which there are other reasons to help, not gratitude. Seven hundred million goes to countries that stayed neutral, did not fight in the war, and, in fact, got richer than they've ever been in their lives during the war, largely at American expense. They might well be giving something back to us—as if anything like that could ever happen. Sweden and Switzerland, however, have asked us for nothing, praises be.

Now, my friends, all summer long in one European country after another, in England, France, Italy, Greece, Switzerland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Holland, Germany, and in broadcasting in Paris, where the 16 nations were meeting to put in their requests for additional American funds in substance now being decided I tried to say on the air as factually as I could, right there on the scene and repeatedly, from London, Rome, Athens, Zurich, Berlin, Brussels, Paris, and a dozen other places and since I've been home, that the objectives of the Marshall plan are good—heaven knows, there's no question about that—but that the gigantic amounts asked for were overstated, inflated, padded, padded, and padded, and shockingly weak in respect to how the money should be administered to get the results on which we pin our American hopes.

In short, I think we should be for the objectives of the Marshall plan. But the plan is no longer just an idea, you know. It's now a tangible piece of proposed legislation, ready to be enacted into law and to absorb billions in our American people's money and goods. It shouldn't be approved as written. I'm convinced it will not be. Once we get the air pumped out of the claims and make the necessary changes suitable to the real problem over there, which is a production problem and needs realistic, production-minded American handlers to whip it, we can stop sailing in the pattern of the 22,000,000,000 that has already gone with the wind since the end of the war and really get some place, really serve ourselves and Europe and the cause of lasting peace by the changes that must be made in the plan and save ourselves billions and billions besides, that would have been wasted had we allowed our judgment to be blitzed.

Freedom Point Raised on United States Education Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in these days when so much is being said about education being directed from Washington, in one form or another, I am delighted to give my colleagues the benefit of one of the most rational presentations on this that I have ever read. It is an article which appeared in the Washington Star of January 25, 1948, by our esteemed colleague, Representative RALPH W. GWINN of the Twenty-seventh District of New York. Representative GWINN is in a position to know whereof he speaks. He is a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and chairman of one of its most important subcommittees. He has conducted many hearings and is qualified to present a rational view on this subject. He addresses himself to the topic Freedom Point Raised on United States Education Plan, which it will be well for all to read. Representative GWINN's article follows:

FREEDOM POINT RAISED ON UNITED STATES EDUCATION PLAN—HOUSE COMMITTEE MEMBER FROM NEW YORK QUESTIONS ADVISABILITY OF GOVERNMENT INTERFERING IN SCHOOLS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Representative GWINN, of New York, is a member of the House Education Committee and chairman of one of its subcommittees. He is vice president of the International Council of Religious Education, a trustee of De Pauw University and former president of the board of education in his home town of Bronxville, N. Y. In the following he takes issue with the subject matter of a recent article carried by the Sunday Star and serviced through the Associated Press, written by Dr. John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education.)

(By Representative RALPH W. GWINN, Twenty-seventh District of New York)

The United States Office of Education is embarking upon a propaganda campaign for the promotion of zeal for American democracy in schools and colleges. What is the purpose of this campaign? Is it necessary? Why should the Federal Government interfere and propagandize? What are the implications and dangers of this enterprise?

John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, has been conducting a vigorous campaign to stimulate better education for democracy in our public schools. Until recently, the United States Office of Education has refrained, however, from any concerted plan or propaganda action in this respect. Taking advantage of the intense interest in the problems of democracy and its survival, now manifesting itself in our schools and colleges, Dr. Studebaker boldly announces that his office will enter into the propaganda picture.

We are now about to witness that a Federal office will issue an official statement to all our schools of the essential principles of democracy. We thought that was well taken care of in our magnificent Bill of Rights. Is there any reason to hope that a Federal office in present-day confused Washington can tell our American youth better than the Bill of Rights what true democracy really is?

DR. STUDEBAKER OVERZEALOUS

Dr. Studebaker goes on to announce that the United States Office of Education is ready to suggest certain criteria by which our educators may judge the effectiveness of our schools in the teaching and practice of democracy. In his zeal for democracy Dr. Studebaker becomes overzealous to such a degree that he wants the Federal office to lay down the rules for judging how democratic our schools are.

That Dr. Studebaker's program suffers from a basic self-contradiction becomes obvious, however, when he announces that the office will proceed to provide suggestions of resource material to help the schools fight what is called antitheistical beliefs and practices. Now, if the strange word "antitheistical" in plain English means "Godless," it follows that the Office of Education now will embark on a campaign against Godless beliefs and practices.

The triple purpose of this Federal propaganda campaign in our schools, then, is to have Federal authorities define the basic principles of democracy (over and above the United States Constitution), to furnish official criteria for the effectiveness of democracy in our schools, and to help the schools fight Godless theories and practices.

No citizen will deny that, in themselves, these are lofty and necessary purposes, even though groups of antitheistical citizens may object that the Government has no constitutional right to use money for propagandizing for religion and against citizens who do not believe in God and His commandments.

This whole new Federal program as suggested by the Office of Education is harmful and has most dangerous implications for our freedom of education. It is an unwarranted and unwanted interference in a domain which must remain free of Federal advice, Federal propaganda and Federal missionary effort.

YEARS PARTY INFLUENCE

Political prudence leads us to fear that any teaching of political ideas, directed and

financed by the central Government, will be determined in the end by the philosophy of the party or faction, or even person in power, rather than by precepts of the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution with its Bill of Rights. The practice and teaching of these ideas is strictly the business of the local community.

The idea of liberty happens to be in fashion at the moment, so for the time being there would appear to be no visible conflict. But if the doctrine of the all-powerful, all-fostering Government dominates the executive branch again, as it has been known to do, how long will a bureau in such an administration continue to teach that that Nation is best governed which is governed least? Or that economy in government is a moral virtue? Or that the only way to preserve liberty is to accept no favors from the State? How long will it take before propaganda seeps in saying that the American system "was" a good system, but now we have "new" problems? How long before such a bureau would redefine "representative government" to mean that the Executive should have control of our economic life, leaving Congress with a veto power or even making Congress over into a rubber-stamp institution?

BREEDS FACTIONALISM

Suppose the Office of Education, even in the future, should be led by men of higher intelligence and real integrity. What would happen, however, to such Federal officials, if the President and his chief advisers believed in concentrating powers in the hands of the executive of the planned state? Suppose the head of the United States Office of Education refused to conform to these new ideas of a so-called social democracy, this New Deal for America?

How long would it be before one of his ambitious subordinates would reach the President with a plan for "better" political education? Or some disgruntled State official or "expert" whom he had once opposed, would suggest a new bureau with a new title, to do the political "education" which the administration needed?

Once the central government undertook to spread its own kind of political philosophy, opponents of that philosophy would have no choice but to take over the Government itself, instead of reasoning together in a local community with neighbors on how to teach their notions of liberty. We should soon be deep in factional fights at election time, just as continental European countries now are, because whoever controlled the government controlled the means of indoctrinating the people. Since the party in power is always desperately maneuvering to keep in power, the control of the people's ideas is its first concern, through propaganda and education.

The modern state is everywhere narrowing the sphere of citizens' freedom and civil and economic liberties. When the devil-state has done its job, complete and cruel tyranny comes, as it did to Germany, Italy, and Soviet Russia.

In the twilight of freedom around us, the United States and its great people must lift the torch of liberty. We need a crusade against statism and for liberty in the very grassroots of our democracy.

We must urge more and more free education, spontaneously supported by the thousands of local communities, as the only possible source from which we can teach God and freedom and combat paganism and statism. The turn toward paganism and statism has come about because educators cannot or do not teach about God and self-government under religious disciplines.

Does it not follow that we must reverse our present trend, instead of accelerating it?

Address of Morgan L. Fitch Before National Association of Real Estate Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address which was made by Mr. Morgan L. Fitch on January 21, 1948, upon his retirement from the presidency of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. Mr. Fitch has been a neighbor and friend of mine for many years. His record as president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards has been an enviable one and has brought forth many constructive ideas for the development of the real-estate business and suggestions to alleviate the housing shortage.

The address follows:

My fellow officers of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, distinguished Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen, it seems to me that the only thing about this little party which would classify it as a banquet is the distinction of our guests gathered here from every corner of the United States, and the price of the ticket.

Some of us from the areas where inflation has not yet come to such full flower, who are accustomed to eating blue-plate specials at 45 cents and who have traveled the return trip on the overland trail to view and to marvel at the majestic processes of Government, have found that travel to Washington not only broadens the viewpoint but likewise flattens the purse.

We start out with no menu, no toastmaster, no speaker of the evening, no juggler, no singer from the civic opera company. We are simply a group of friends gathered together for the purpose of getting better acquainted in a better understanding that we may serve better the wholesome housing needs of the Nation.

I recall that just a year ago I stood in this room with many of you who are here tonight. I told you on that occasion that it was not for me to promise or predict that which might occur as the year unfolded. I said then that we would let the record speak for itself.

Now that record has been made. No word of mine can alter it by jot nor tittle. Certainly if I did not look upon it with pride I could not speak of it. Certainly if I did view the record with pride I would dare not boast, for indeed, as recorded in Proverbs of the Good Book, "When pride cometh then comes shame."

Yet, it is a simple fact that the membership of this national association has grown to 41,000—a gain of 15 percent in the past year. The organization has lived well within its income and is today in full stride of vigorous activity. But more significant is the fact that our members hold high their heads as standard bearers in the cause of freedom for the common man, in the cause of better housing for all men, in the cause of social and national welfare. We have made progress in the spirit as well as in the flesh.

A year ago the housing business was in a sorry mess. It remained then as a prisoner of war fenced in by a stockade of rules, restrictions, limitations, ceilings, and abuses. All the while little people danced around the enclosure shouting in sadistic delight as they tossed in crumbs of subsidy, grant, and loan, to a great industrial giant that was famished only for freedom.

Now, a year later, with only one great barrier remaining, we find supply of housing creeping into balance with demand. Since July 1 we have been creating houses at a rate of almost a million a year. All over the country vacant houses are offered for sale. In some places vacant rental units are offered for rent. The Government tells us that 93 percent of the homes in our cities are in good condition. Fifty-five percent of them are owner-occupied; half of all the rented dwellings rent for $29.33 per month or less.

What an answer to those men of little vision and meager understanding who proclaim in wishful glee that 50 percent of our children are born in slums!

If forces of Government would lift the heavy hand of bureaucracy and devote themselves to freeing the production of goods and labor in a competitive market the housing shortage would be only a memory in 6 months' time.

Indeed our business has had far more than its share of the burden of public interference. We have zoning laws to restrain the use of land, building codes to limit construction, restrictions on the productivity of the man on the job, monopoly in the marketing of building materials, competition from Government at all levels, strangulation by arbitrary and unreasoning enforcement of rent control.

Yet we carry on planning, building, creating, in the firm belief that our system of competitive enterprise has never been rivaled in Russia, France, Italy, or England, and that some day that system will be reestablished in full vigor in America.

I am pleased to recognize in this audience more than 100 Members of the Congress of the United States. I welcome them, not in their official capacities, but as fellow citizens. I have met the gentlemen of Congress all over the Nation and found them to be interested, not just in election—why should not a Congressman be interested in elections? After all a Congressman who is not elected is no longer a Congressman. I have found Congressmen interested, too, in the sound welfare of the Nation, interested in preserving those freedoms guaranteed in the American tradition; interested in building out of today a better tomorrow.

We would have these Congressmen know that people of real estate are likewise average citizens of America who, by their training and talent have a specialized knowledge of real estate. Look at that man who sits opposite you. Look intently. Does he look to you to be anything other than a plain ordinary American who works with his hands and his wits to make a living selling housing? Yet he has been called subversive, vicious, selfish, un-American, greedy, at times by persons in very high places, for he is one of the small parts of the real-estate lobby. He is one of the people who has made so bold as to ask that his business, too, be no longer a prisoner of war.

And come what will, he expects to carry on in spite of abuse, attack, political intrigue, or court prosecution, firm in the maintenance of his honest conviction as one of a hundred million little people in America. That attitude on the part of Realtors of America is the brightest jewel in the legacy I leave as I retire as president of this great association.

Cost of Experimental Unit of Universal Military Training at Fort Knox, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I think all are aware that an experimental program of universal military training is being conducted at Fort Knox, Ky. Various opinions have been voiced as to the cost of the training which has been envisioned and advocated by President Truman. The Department of the Army has set up a model universal military unit at Fort Knox, Ky., and I have had several inquiries as to the cost of this experimental unit. On December 8, 1947, I asked for the figures, and I am happy to give my colleagues the benefit of the information which I received.

The following is a copy of a letter addressed to me under date of January 21, 1948, by Maj. Gen. George J. Richards, the Army Comptroller, Department of the Army, which I think needs no explanation, but speaks for itself and gives us the information on the cost of the experimental unit of universal military training at Fort Knox, Ky.:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE ARMY COMPTROLLER,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: Reference your letter of December 4, 1947, relative to the operating cost of the universal military training unit at Fort Knox, Ky., and my interim reply of December 8, 1947, I now have additional information in this regard to transmit to you.

On January 16, 1948, Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, sent a letter to the chairmen of the Armed Forces Committees concerning the cost of the Fort Knox Universal Military Training Unit. Mr. Royall's letter covers the question you asked in such a comprehensive manner I feel you would be interested in its entire contents. I am therefore quoting to you the Secretary's letter in its entirety:

"I have been asked for certain specific information regarding the universal military training experimental unit at Fort Knox. As similar inquiries have reached me from other sources, or have been addressed severally to various Army addresses, I am including in this letter all of the information presently available with respect to the size and cost of the project.

"The UMT experimental unit was organized for two purposes:

"1. To obtain experience of value in a universal military training system covering a special age group, on a national scale, if authorized by Congress as recommended by the President, the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, and the armed services.

2. To obtain experience of value to the armed services in revising and modernizing their own training programs in the light of the Doolittle committee's recommendations.

In pursuance of these purposes, a new training formula has been introduced at the Experimental Unit, with greater emphasis on education, moral controls, broader concepts of discipline, and close supervision of off-duty as well as on-duty activities of trainees.

In computing the cost of the UMT Experimental Unit, no attempt has been made to separate the cost of training the 646 enlisted men in the experimental training battalion from the total cost of the unit, nor is such a separation possible. The figures which follow therefore represent a break-down of the over-all cost of an experiment undertaken for the purposes indicated. The figure given as the cost per trainee is likewise the pro rata cost of the unit as a whole, as applied to the men in the UMT training battalion, and not the cost of training these men alone.

SIZE OF UMT EXPERIMENTAL UNIT

Two cycles of training were completed by the Army Ground Force Experimental Unit on December 20, 1947. The first cycle extended from January 1947 to July 1947, the second from July 1947 to December 1947, inclusive. During this time the following personnel were involved:

(a) Average number of trainees (privates, Regular Army battalion strength), per cycle, 646. For two cycles, approximately 1,292.

(b) Average constant training cadre (military personnel):

Number of officer-instructors	77
Number of enlisted personnel	495
Total	572

(c) Approximately 21 civilians were employed during the two cycles as members of the training staff, all but four on a part-time basis. For the second cycle an estimated 17 part-time instructors were required in teaching auto mechanics, radio, typewriting, Spanish, and bookkeeping. Of the 4 full-time civilian employees, 1 was an educational counselor, 1 an assistant educational counselor, and 2 were stenographers for the Educational Center.

Cost of universal military training experimental unit, second cycle, July–December 1947, inclusive

1. DIRECT COSTS

Pay and allowances of trainees (Army pay rate)	$383,167
Pay and allowances of trainers (officers and enlisted men)	472,098
Costs of subsistence (enlisted men)	196,975
Costs of clothing (enlisted men)	73,311
Costs of transportation	52,320
Equipment replacement	171,182
Total	1,349,053

2. INDIRECT COSTS

Transportation	873,080
Repairs and utilities	24,705
Medical care	70,340
Supplies	230,532
Equipment maintenance	43,866
Administrative overhead and supervisory personnel	60,733
Total	503,256

3. ADDITIONAL INDIRECT COSTS NOT PROPERLY CHARGEABLE TO UNIVERSAL MILITARY EXPERIMENTAL UNIT

Appropriated funds for rehabilitation of post facilities for universal military training experimental unit, but not included in universal military training costs because available for other purposes later	300,000
Grand total, universal military training costs, second cycle (1 and 2 above)	**1,852,309**

Average over-all cost per 6 months enlisted trainee (at Army pay rate and including all other unit costs), $1,852,309 divided by 646 equals $2,867.

COST FACTORS IN UMT EXPERIMENTAL UNIT

Because of the nature of the experiment, and the fact that cadre training and orientation courses for officers and enlisted men of the several branches of the Regular Army, not connected with the experimental UMT unit, have been conducted contemporaneously with the training of the experimental battalion of 18-year-old recruits, the administrative and instructor personnel of the unit were larger than would be required for training either an ordinary tactical unit or a prospective UMT unit.

The ratio of trainees to trainers in the larger system, for example, would be more than double that indicated in the figures for the experimental unit. At Fort Knox the military personnel necessarily included all elements of a division staff, although only a single battalion of men were being trained for 6 months by the experimental UMT formula. In the first training cycle all arms and technical services were represented. Each training company had to be organized differently. The Information and Education and Special Services staffs were organized on approximately a regimental level. There were two chaplains. The personnel of the unit, in short, was organized to perform a multiple function, and not simply to train 646 enlisted men assigned to it for this purpose. As with any experiment, whether conducted by the military services or in industry, the cost of the pilot model is always higher than the cost of the subsequent product.

Since the trainees were all enlisted men of the Regular Army, and receiving an average of approximately $100 a month in pay and allowances, the cost also reflects this pay rate rather than the $25 a month recommended by the Compton Commission or the $30 a month provided for in H. R. 4278 for the pay of UMT trainees in the proposed national system. The pay differential alone represents an added cost per trainee of at least $70 a month, or $420 for the 6-month training period, while the other factors add substantially to the total cost of the unit.

For these reasons the cost figures given cannot be considered as in any sense a criterion of the per capita cost of training large numbers of men at a very much lower pay rate under a national plan. The Army estimates the cost of training 618,000 men by the UMT formula on a national basis, once the program is standardized to eliminate the added expense of current experimentation, at approximately $1,000,000,000 annually.

AUTHORITY AND COST OF BRINGING VISITORS TO FORT KNOX

It has been asked by what authority visitors were flown to Fort Knox, and the amount and source of funds used for this purpose.

The few groups representing the press and national organizations, invited by the former Secretary of War as a matter of broad public interest to visit the UMT experimental unit at Fort Knox, were transported by Army aircraft pursuant to authority contained in paragraph 1C (1), Army Regulations 95–90, published on April 28, 1947, which provides: "Upon approval by the Commanding General, Army Air Forces * * * personnel of the following categories may be permitted to ride as passengers in aircraft * * *

"(1) Any individual, without reimbursement, when the flight is on matters of concern to the armed forces."

Acting under authority of section 5 of the National Defense Act (10 U. S. C. 34), making it the specific responsibility of the War Department to plan for the national defense, and appropriate Army regulations with reference to the maintenance of public relations, the Department of the Army as a matter of broad public interest continuously attempts to inform the Nation of planning

developments relating to universal military training as well as all other Army operations.

In inviting individuals and groups to visit the UMT experimental unit we hoped to obtain and did obtain helpful suggestions from outside sources. We cannot obtain public reaction to our programs unless we take the people into our confidence.

TRAINING PROGRAM OF UMT EXPERIMENTAL UNIT

All trainees in the UMT experimental unit are enlisted men in the Regular Army. Every Regular Army enlistee is given 13 weeks of basic training. The additional training given in the experimental unit, and which is contemplated in the national plan, if authorized by Congress, is intended to qualify the trainee as a specialist in some arm of the service. It will be obvious that no matter whether the soldier receives the training in the experimental unit or in a tactical unit, it must be accomplished in any case. While not a characteristic training unit of the Army as now constituted, the UMT experimental unit by no means involves expenditures incurred for other than normal service requirements.

In addition to training the experimental battalion of 646 men (average constant enrollment), the UMT training cadre is currently required to instruct 480 potentional UMT training cadre personnel each month. This instruction covers all the positions from platoon sergeant to division commander, and results in a peak load of 200. For the period August 11, 1947, to December 20, 1947, approximately 2,563 students were given such cadre instruction.

It is estimated for planning purposes that of the 1,200,000 men annually reaching the age of 18 years, a total of 850,000, or approximately 70 percent of this figure would be found physically fit and inducted for training under a universal military training system. Of the latter number, an estimated 618,000 would be trained by the Army and Air Force and the remainder by the Navy, under the plan currently recommended by the three services. By carrying on this cadre training now, we shall have made a substantial start in building the organization that would be necessary to train the larger load of trainees later should the universal training program be authorized by Congress.

ARMY PROFITEERING FROM UMT EXPERIMENT

Regardless of the final action on the proposed national universal military training program, all of this instruction and indoctrination at Fort Knox is of great benefit to the Army and already is being translated into training doctrine for the Regular Establishment. It is finding its way into replacement training centers, and has been adopted as the training formula for the Third Armored Division at Fort Knox on a division level.

The modification of disciplinary training through the adoption of a special code of conduct for this special age group, built around a demerit and trainee-court system, is only one of the new methods whose usefulness has been demonstrated in the experimental program. Sound discipline is the first principle of military effectiveness, since without it any military organization would be little more than a mob. It is believed that under the UMT formula, subject to further testing, discipline can be improved, rather than weakened, by giving the trainee and in fact, all elements of the Army, a better understanding of its meaning and importance.

Thus the UMT experimental unit has served and is serving as a laboratory test of training methods and doctrines which will prove of increasing value to the military service as time goes on. It has permitted close study of the problems inherent in training men of the 18-year or minimum-age group not previously explored in any prior training. In fact, I know of no other single experiment in this field which has been so richly productive of constructive results.

I feel sure Secretary Royall's letter will give you the information you desire. However, if you need additional information, I will be glad to obtain it for you.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. RICHARDS,
Major General, the Army Comptroller.

We Must Take Our Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a logical, well-written, and forceful editorial in support of the European recovery program which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of December 23. I commend it to your attention. The editorial reads as follows:

WE MUST TAKE OUR STAND

The European recovery program, the issue of issues, is now before the people. Secretary Marshall made it plain Friday night that the Russian masters won't make peace now, but will keep on waging chaos in Europe, expecting us soon to pull out of that continent. The President's message to Congress has formally launched the Marshall plan, with the administration's full weight officially behind it. Senator TAFT immediately proclaimed his opposition, contending that the 52-month, $17,000,000,000 project would break our economy wide open. Senator VANDENBERG is wise in calling for immediate full-dress debate on American recovery for Europe. Time presses, and we must take our stand on ERP before it is too late.

It may seem strange that the upside-down situation of the world today forces us to reverse the usual order of things after a great war—first, peace and then, recovery—and to launch an all-out program for the economic recovery of Western Europe, to enable the continent to grow strong enough to permit the right sort of a peace to be made and consolidated there. Nonetheless, such is the situation that stares us in the face and commands our decision.

The European recovery program offers the key not only to the rehabilitation of that continent's economy, but also the key to peace itself. The News accepts the point of view Henry L. Stimson expressed recently in Foreign Affairs: "We Americans today face a challenging opportunity, perhaps the greatest ever offered to a single nation. It is nothing less than a chance to use our full strength for the peace and freedom of the world."

The pity of it is that this challenge, this opportunity comes to us when many of us are confused and unready. It is as though we were in a smoke-filled room, knew we must make our way to the door, but were so fearful of obstacles in the path that we feared to make any move. It is to be hoped that the Marshall plan debate will blow enough smoke from the room for the masses of the people to see the situation that today confronts the most powerful nation the world has ever known. Only by knowing the truth, and heeding it, can the American people give our Government the understanding support without which our hopes will fail to earth.

Whether we like it or not, the United States can never again become an isolated island in the world community, nor even a limited partner. We are a wholly committed member of the world community. We are forced to act in the world as it is.

The ERP decision requires the consent of the people as well as the action of Congress. Foreign policy is no longer simply a function of government, but is becoming a function of people. If the Marshall plan is to succeed, the American people must understand the purposes it seeks, the means by which its architects expect to attain these ends, the productions required on the home front, the austerities we must undertake to strengthen the non-Communist world.

The plan that emerges from the congressional crucible must be strong enough to convince the 16 cooperating European countries that we mean business, and aren't trying to fob them off with a lick and a promise. We can't afford to say that we'll give you enough for today, but don't know whether tomorrow we'll carry on any longer.

Secretary Marshall urged, the President presented an over-all recovery program. The European countries are at the least entitled to feel that if they meet the tests we put them to, we won't turn back in the middle of the stream. It is our right and duty to see that they toe the line in respect of the promises they make to us. In return, we would be under clear moral obligation to finish the job. This is the decision Congress has to make next session. America, Europe, and the world will anxiously await the sort of decision it makes.

Defense of Private Enterprise in Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert a paper delivered by Dr. C. S. Duncan, economist, Association of American Railroads, before the annual meeting of the Railway Treasury Officers at Swampscott, Mass., on October 8–10, 1947. I hope every Member of the Congress will read Dr. Duncan's informative and timely address:

DEFENSE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN TRANSPORTATION

You have just seen a brief glimpse of the main line of transportation in this country, which with its bands of steel binds the Nation together into an economic unit. It has developed our resources. It has built up our markets, local, national, and international, for the mining industry, the great agricultural industry, the manufacturing industry and the trade organizations that have made this country powerful, a leader in the world, the support for desolated lands and impoverished people—the very bulwark of civilization as we know it today.

We have had in this country a supply of private capital willing to support the development of these private undertakings so that it has been possible to increase production and decrease working hours. Task after task has been mechanized and the back-breaking jobs have been transferred to machines. Our people have had more leisure time and more opportunity for travel and recreation. The main line plays a vital role here also. It carries our people not only to summer and winter resorts but also has specials for the "big game" of the year and has especially equipped trains for the ski fans.

Of very great interest it is to note that over the main line of transport the history-making Freedom Train has already started on its 30,000 mile journey throughout the land.

This main line was built in a democracy as a private enterprise, by free men, with free play of individual initiative, who were willing to face all the risks and willing to bear the full responsibility to investors, to employees, to the public and to the Government. The achivement has been a marvelous thing. All those connected with its development and its operation may well be proud of its record.

The service performed by the main line is a basic function in our society. If it is not provided by private enterprise, then it will be provided by Government. If it is not provided out of private funds, then it will be provided out of tax funds.

Transportation service is not performed solely, of course, by railroads. There are other agencies that do essentially useful work. Among them the pipe lines alone, with their highly specialized services, stand economically upon their own feet. But of them all the railroads are the basic agency for the great bulk of mass transportation required for the support and advancement of our economy, as the record demonstrates. They are likewise the bulwark of private enterprise in transportation. If they fail, all will fail.

Despite their record of achievement, the railroads are actually on the defensive as a private enterprise. We only hide our heads in the sand if we deny this fact. In the recent great debate in Parliament it was possible for the proponents of the British nationalization of transport to point out that they were following a world-wide trend. In Europe and in Asia there is government ownership of railroads. Even in the British Empire, where private enterprise had been a shibboleth for a hundred years, it was cited that 95 percent of the railroads in Australia and New Zealand was government owned, 81 percent in South Africa, 55 percent in Canada. Throughout the world government ownership represented 45 percent of the total mileage.

Now that Great Britain has gone over to nationalization, the United States, with its great mileage, stands out steadfast as private enterprise. It stood steadfast throughout the war and performed marvelously. The heavy pressure brought to bear for the Government to take over the railroads in those parlous days, even though every advantage was taken of the doubts and fears generated by a world conflict, could not prevail. The achievements of the railroads under private management during that conflict were acclaimed by all responsible men.

If the railroads of the United States were able to withstand the pressure for Government control in the dangerous days of war, it would seem that the forces at work to bring about Government ownership in time of peace would be less. They are, but they are nevertheless consistently at work. We must be on our guard against them at all times. The price of private enterprise is eternal vigilance against those influences that tend to undermine it.

In presenting my ideas on this important subject I propose to ask the following questions and to give my answers to them. Why did the British people, who for so long have been stanch individualists, holding their personal liberties and freedom of action as a precious heritage, yield to the idea of government extending its power over their great industry of transportation? Are the same influences at work here in the United States? If so, what can we do about it?

When the great debate on bill No. 12, the nationalization bill, opened in the British Parliament, Prime Minister Attlee said that he did not expect any disagreement in principle on the nationalization program because it was only carrying forward the trend that had long been evident. He added, significantly, that in his opinion, it was not possible to deal with railways alone, for the various forms must be complementary and not competitive. That, I think, will always be true.

What the Prime Minister meant, it seems to me, by reference to the trend that had long been evident was the groundwork that had been laid in previous years. Its beginnings may no doubt be found in the influences let loose in the early days of Lloyd George when he first came to power and began impressing his ideas upon the people that the Government should be doing more for its citizens, that the Government should take on greater and greater responsibility, that Government activity should be widely extended. As these ideas received acceptance, the inevitable consequence was greater and greater need for Government revenues, and the source of Government revenues obviously was private enterprise. Thus, capital that might have been used for the improvement of the machines and tools of private industry, the advancement and progress of science as applied to industry, and the expansion and modernization of plants was drained off into the Public Treasury. There was less risk capital available for private enterprise, and without risk capital it languishes.

As you will recall, when the British railways were returned to private management following the First World War and they were forcibly consolidated into four great systems, legislation was passed providing for a standard revenue to the railroads based upon the earnings of 1913. The entire rate system was to be revised and rates were to be established by 1928 so that the four large systems might be able to earn the standard revenue which was considered by the British Government as a fair return.

Meanwhile, however, the Government expended large sums of money out of its treasury for the building of a highway system duplicating and paralleling the railroad system, thus providing a roadway for busses and trucks so that they could enter the field of transportation wholly unregulated, free to select the tonnage they desired to handle, while leaving the rest for the railroads to carry, and with full knowledge of the published rates by railroads, placed in a position to cut under them and draw away the cream of the traffic. No fair-return rate system was ever put into effect. Consequently, the railroads were never able to realize the standard revenue or fair return which was to be provided for them.

There was thus set up a vicious cycle. The railroads failed to earn a fair return. Without adequate revenues their credit was limited. Without adequate credit, funds available for improvements and betterments, for providing new machinery and better ways of operation, were restricted. Here was the basis for complaint by the public that the railroads were not progressive. Nor did the shippers or the industrialists of the country understand or appreciate the trend or, if they did, their policy was of a short-time and not a long-time view, seeking immediate advantage without regard to consequences.

Came the Second World War and Government again took over the transport facilities in Great Britain. When the time arrived to consider their return to private management, the long-time trend noted by the Prime Minister was manifest.

It may be seen, I think, that underlying all this movement and possibly the basis of the preparation for it was a persistent undermining of confidence in the public mind of private management.

In the propaganda for nationalization of the railroads in Great Britain, the proponents brought a number of charges against the private management of railroads. Private industry had failed, it was claimed, as shown by the substandard of facilities, rolling stock, both cars and locomotives, dingy, outmoded, old-fashioned stations, unrepaired roadways.

They said that the railways were overcapitalized; that dividends were paid instead of plowing back capital; that shares were held by a few rich men; that railways had never been able to attract new capital; that Government was subsidizing them; that the railway physical plant was "a poor bag of assets"; that the railways were operated inefficiently and their directors were selected more for their social standing than for their ability; that there was no progress either in speed, electrification of the lines, or in the exploitation of the advantages of automatic train control; that trans were underloaded, resulting in car shortages; that service generally was inadequate; that technical improvements had been neglected; that employees were required to work long hours at low pay in order that dividends might be paid; that railroads were a monopoly; and that coordination of railroad with railroad and railroad with other agencies had been made impossible.

These items have not been stated clearly if they do not have a familiar ring.

Every one of them management answered item by item, and attached to many of them the words "wantonly untrue." This, however, did not prevent their repetition. It appears to be a general human trait to believe and remember criticisms rather than praise. The railroads were placed on the defensive in a critical period of time when money and men and materials were not to be had for rehabilitation.

Nor was the criticism limited to private management in transportation. It was extended to bankers and industrialists. I think it will always be true that the discrediting of private management in an essential industry like transportation will be extended to other business management.

The process of the long-time trend is simple—discredit, penalize, destroy.

It was not the businessmen, the shippers, the users of transportation who favored nationalization, but the Trade Union Congress of Great Britain. It does seem clear, however, that private management in other industries held aloof, assuming the attitude that it was not their direct responsibility, and never exerted themselves as actively or as persistently as the proponents of nationalization. To one party it was a bad time for a fellow executive; to the other it was an idea with a rallying slogan. Only when the crisis was upon them did other private managements realize their vital interests were involved. It was then too late.

The downfall of private enterprise in transportation, therefore, only awaited the strategic moment. That time came following the war when improvements and betterments were not immediately to be had, when money and materials and men were unavailable, when the finger of scorn could be pointed at the roofless stations, the inadequate maintenance, the lack of new cars and locomotives.

The fact is that private enterprise in transportation, or elsewhere in fact, cannot long survive when its opponents are continuously active in undermining it but its fellow private enterprisers are indifferent or mildly sympathetic. It takes an idea to master an idea. Those who support private enterprise must work as energetically and persistently as those who support nationalization.

I cannot forecast the future of nationalization in Great Britain. That it is a disturbing factor is already evident. That the individual loses his personal liberties as government expands is inevitable. The government, as Mr. Churchill said, has "thrust the

clumsy butter-fingers of the state into all this intricate apparatus," for good or ill. Of the five-man commission empowered to determine, under the Minister of Transport, what the government policy shall be in the planning and operation of the transport facilities of Great Britain, two are gentlemen of experience and judgment and three are apparently political appointees, rewarded for their persistent and successful efforts. Some 750,000 employees will be added to the government pay roll. Fifty-six thousand miles of line belonging to the four principal systems and 56 local companies constitute the railroads involved. In addition, there will be some 40,000 trucks and the canals with their barges, docks with their equipment and hotels to accommodate rail travelers. Government already is in charge of airways.

The opponents have said that it is "a monopoly which will be cumbrous and top-heavy, whose structural defects are as manifest as its powers are unlimited." They say "this bill gives an unexampled opportunity for political patronage and jobbery." They say that it will do a great injustice and injury to the British people at the very time when all should work shoulder to shoulder for increased production. We can already see that there has been no increased production in coal. Nevertheless, for good or ill, for better or worse, British railways and all other transport facilities, except for private truck operations circumscribed by a 25-mile radius, will follow banking, power, and coal into the hands of the government. The iron and steel industry is next on the list.

You doubtless will already have identified those matters which have an analog in this country. The pattern is taking shape—discredit, penalize, destroy; step by step—discredit, penalize, destroy.

Is it not true that the discrediting of private management is already in evidence, reaching even into Government circles? Is it not true that heavier and punishing burdens are piled up like Ossa on Pelion as, for example, pay-roll taxes, increased wages, and material prices without corresponding increases in rates? Has not the Government built up competing agencies by highway, waterway, and in the air? We have not mentioned private ownership and operation as one of our goals even in our national transporation policy.

I do not know of a widespread, organized movement to nationalize our transport. There are groups, like the Socialist and allied groups, who talk it up from time to time. But my desire is to point out to you the signs of the trend, the discredit of private management and the penalty burdens. Thus went England. The strategic day came. The vote favoring nationalization in Parliament was 362 ayes and 205 nays.

You cannot have failed to hear much to the discredit of railroad management and certainly you in the railroad field have resented the unfairness, bitterly and rightfully. You know the punishment of increased wages, taxes, and material prices without adequate increases in revenues. You are all too familiar with the profit-and-loss account and its effect upon credit standing.

Railroad credit is affected. I need not tell you about the vital significance that profit-and-loss item in a private-enterprise industry. An imaginative writer could make a thrilling story of that account upon which industry pivots, its very guidance and control for expansion or retraction by management, its importance in the money market, its unerring indication of trends toward success or failure. As to this account it may well be said: "The moving finger writes, and having writ, moves on; nor all your piety nor wit can lure it back to cancel half a line, nor all your tears wash out a word of it."

Well, what to do? Railroads must be saved to private enterprise in order to preserve our American way of life. To be saved, they must be supported. They must be supported by all those who believe in our free private enterprise system. It is not a matter of mild interest, as a hard-luck story of a fellow executive. I tell you that to drift is dangerous. If an idea is required to master an idea, then realize this, that free enterprise is as much an idea as nationalization. We must, therefore, first believe in the cause.

To divide and conquer has always been a clever device. When thieves fall out they get caught. When honest men fall out, the thief has his day. We in the railroad field must stand together shoulder to shoulder, steadfastly and courageously. Furthermore, we must have the support of others, our competitors, the users of transportation, the bankers, and all good men and true who believe in the cause of free private enterprise.

You know what private management has achieved in the field of transportation. You know what it could do with adequate funds in transforming the vicious cycle of less income, higher costs, failing credit, and restricted improvement into a rising cycle of new facilities, lower unit costs, better credit, and improved service. It is amazing what can be done, what management stands ready to do with adequate funds in the way of improvements, better service, greater volume, lower unit costs, an increased satisfaction to users and the public.

Private management everywhere, not only in transportation, must be awakened to the danger of our policy of drift today. How can they know, really know, unless they are told? In Great Britain there was no association or organization of traders or businessmen, of users of transportation that came forward to support bill No. 12. While this is true, it is also true that those users of transportation were so negligent in the support of private enterprise that they let the pattern develop which ended in nationalization. Why? Because they thought that they might realize some immediate or temporary advantage.

It can happen here. The same trend is already in evidence and there is the same indifference for the same reasons from the users of transportation. Rates, like taxes, are sought to be escaped or transferred to someone else. Everyone has his own troubles and the Devil take the hindmost. It is then that socialism comes like a thief in the night and often under a pleasant guise. It offers blandishments and roseate pictures of a smooth road ahead, a better way. I ask you to beware when expenditures are made out of the Government Treasury on the basis of benefits rather than charges on the basis of use. The true test of usefulness of transport facilities should be the willingness on the part of the shipper to pay their full costs. The main line in transportation is a product of private enterprise.

Benefits are the Socialists' dividends. Expansion of government, no matter how benevolent, is a fencing in more and more of personal freedom, political liberty, and individual opportunity.

We are not free from socialism even in our American business, and certainly not in transportation. All the costs of our waterways and their improvement and maintenance for transport purposes are provided out of the Federal Treasury on the basis of benefits. There is no identity of interest between the one who pays the cost and the one who receives the benefit. Benefits accrue to the few who are able to use the facilities and the costs are spread out to the general taxpayer. Highway expenditures are distributed on the benefit theory. This is true of airways. All of this is socialistic. Unfortunately, it receives much popular support even from private management of industry.

It may readily be admitted that there are some facilities which can only be provided by the Government. This is socialistic. It can get along with private enterprise in the same economic and competitive field only by obeying the rules of private enterprise wherein costs are matched against revenues instead of benefits, wherein users pay on the basis of use, and wherein the user payments are sufficient to meet construction and operating costs, interest on investment, and a proper sum toward the support of government. In this way alone socialism can be made to harmonize with our American way.

What is it that nationalization has to offer in transportation that cannot be provided by private enterprise? Not better service, not lower cost, not a greater incentive to economic effort. While in theory it is substituting its service to the public for private profit motive as an incentive to economic endeavor, there has been no evidence anywhere or by anyone that the nature of business is changed or that money, power, and prestige by those who love them are not still the impelling force, or that the incentive to economic effort, which those who desire nationalization call public service, has in any way displaced the same old, even if baser, motives, either in those who control and expend tax funds or in those who benefit from them. There is perhaps even greater opportunity in a national enterprise for well-organized pressure groups to gain special advantages for themselves.

We must recognize that business under private enterprise fails or is successful on the basis of earning sufficient revenues from its charges for commodities or services to cover the cost of capital, operation, maintenance, and taxes for the support of government. A nationalized enterprise depends upon the expenditure of tax funds and the expenditure of these funds is directed not on a basis of economic factors so much as by political considerations and government planning. So under private enterprise business problems are determined on a basis of factors of economics, while in a nationalized business problems are determined on a basis of political persuasion and government planning. We do not want that.

We have in this country an organization that is dedicated to private ownership of all forms of transportation. For a number of years it has worked steadily and consistently toward an awakening of all those who believe in free private enterprise, to the risks and dangers of a slow and steady drift toward nationalization. I refer to the Transportation Association of America.

This organization has been asked by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House to analyze the transportation problem and to submit to the committee the methods and means by which there may be realized an equal opportunity among all forms of transportation so that the Nation as a whole may be well served by an efficiently operated and thoroughly coordinated system of transport under private management and operation. I hope that if you are not already acquainted with this organization, you will become so. I hope also that you will have the desire and find the opportunity to support and take some part in this organized movement to retain for ourselves, against the world trend, free private enterprise in the transportation industry.

Cooperation, the Key to Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a brief address made at the annual convention of the Nebraska Reclamation Association at Kearney, Nebr., January 15, by Goodrich W. Lineweaver, director of the Branch of Operation and Maintenance of the Bureau of Reclamation. Reports of this convention show that Nebraska is water conscious and is taking its proper place among the 17 western reclamation States. The attendance at the Kearney convention demonstrated the widespread interest throughout Nebraska in the reclamation program.

Mr. Lineweaver's address was on Cooperation, the Key to Reclamation. He mentioned how the cooperative efforts of the people of the Republican River Valley in Colorado, Nebraska, and Kansas had laid the ground work for the program which is bringing that important stream under control. This cooperation by the people, as well as between the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, deserves the highest commendation. It must be perpetuated. Mr. Lineweaver's address is as follows:

Today we hear a lot of talk about cooperation. Much of this talk is lip service, or sometimes it is like the complaints about the weather: Everybody talks about it but nobody does anything about it.

But in the reclamation book we not only talk cooperation but we seek it and practice it for it is the key to western development and is the only way by which the reclamation program can move forward as you want it to move and as we have it programed.

And that means cooperation on both sides of the street, beginning with the present and prospective water users on a reclamation project. Let me cite an example right here in Nebraska that stimulated the Missouri Basin plan that was of itself developed by the coordinated efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, and was written into the Flood Control Act of 1944 by the concerted leadership and support of western Senators and Representatives—Democrats and Republicans alike.

You know how the Republican Valley Conservation Association, under the leadership of Harry D. Strunk, of McCook, had cemented the support of farm and town interests from eastern Colorado through the tip of Kansas into southern Nebraska and again into Kansas. Nowhere in the West or elsewhere has there ever been a more effective pooling of mutual interest and endeavor. The association knew what it wanted and presented a united front. It got results, as you can see from the fact that the Congress has made appropriations for five irrigation and flood-control dams that are now or will soon be under construction—one by the Corps of Engineers and four by the Bureau of Reclamation.

All this was not mere happenstance. It came about through wise and far-seeing leadership in the Republican Valley, in your State reclamation association, among your able Senators and Representatives in Congress.

And here is a good place to record again a high degree of cooperation at the grass roots, which made possible the start of construction on Enders Dam in the Republican Valley, the first of the reclamation structures to get under way as a part of the Frenchman-Cambridge unit. The repayment obligation of the water users had been estimated based on the cost of the unit at 1940 construction prices. You are aware of the rising costs due to the war and the warnings of the Congress that increased costs must be reflected in the repayment obligations of the water users if favorable consideration was to be given to reclamation appropriations.

When advised of this situation—it wasn't exactly an ultimatum—the board of the Frenchman-Cambridge district voted to increase their repayable obligation by 50 percent. The Bureau of Reclamation cooperated by recommending that the repayment period be extended nearly 20 years. This recommendation was accepted by the Secretary of the Interior, and the Frenchman-Cambridge example has been heralded as evidence of the good faith of the water users of Nebraska.

Last September it was my good fortune to travel over a substantial part of the Republican River Valley with your Senator WHERRY, who occupies a strategic position in Washington as chairman of the Interior Department Appropriations Committee. At McCook were gathered representatives of some 20 counties and towns that make up the Republican Valley Conservation Association to give the Senator demonstrable evidence of the teamwork that seems characteristic of Nebraskans for in Washington your State delegation meets for breakfast one day each week under the leadership of your senior Senator HUGH BUTLER, who originally hailed from down Cambridge way in the Republican Valley. Occasions of that kind are perhaps one reason that Nebraska, by giving tangible evidence of cooperation, is in the forefront of reclamation today, with the Nebraska Members of the House of Representatives equally concerned with your Senators in advancing the reclamation program. CARL CURTIS, whose district includes the Republican River Valley, was in the forefront in advancing the cooperation to support the Republican River program. Dr. Miller, as a member of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the House Public Lands Committee, represents the important area where our North Platte project is now operating and is also concerned with further Platte River developments. KARL STEFAN, as a member of the Deficiency Appropriations Committee, had an important place in securing the supplemental flood-control project appropriations for Nebraska and is also an important factor in the Loup River development. HOWARD BUFFETT represents the Omaha district which has shown increasing recognition of the importance of water development in Nebraska for that great gateway city of the State.

The Bureau of Reclamation seeks and needs cooperation on all sides. We are seeking to bring to bear on reclamation the full resources of every State and Federal agency that can make a contribution to the planning, construction, and settlement and operation of reclamation projects.

To that end, in November we joined with the State experiment station directors of the Missouri Valley States in a statement of principles relating to cooperative irrigated agricultural research on the Missouri Basin program. This statement, which has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, was formulated by representatives of four Department of Agriculture research agencies and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The major point in the statement is that the State experiment stations, as the focal points for agricultural research, should be the coordinating agency within the State for research programs relating to Reclamation projects. Through this approach we hope to enlist the full support of the State agricultural colleges in the West and all agencies of the Department of Agriculture for the Reclamation program through their advice, counsel, and actual participation in our activities. The goal goes much farther than the research work of the experiment stations and the cooperating Department of Agriculture agencies, such as the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soil Conservation Service, and Bureau of Agricultural Economics. That goal will also bring into the program the Extension Services of the State colleges and Department of Agriculture through their county agents, the water facilities activities of the Soil Conservation Service, Soil Conservation districts, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Farmers Home Administration. We need their assistance and cooperation, and we seek both.

At the Phoenix convention of the National Reclamation Association in October, one of the resolutions adopted carried the following clause:

"*Be it resolved*, That the Bureau of Reclamation seek the cooperation of the United States Department of Agriculture, the State agricultural colleges, and associated State agencies in the study, planning, construction, and settlement of irrigation projects."

The Bureau of Reclamation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is placing responsibility on its regional directors in the field to develop and cement this cooperation. Regional Director Avery Batson, who is well acquainted with your State agencies, will be found ready to take the lead in cooperation in Nebraska. We believe that this cooperation of Federal and State agencies can best be achieved at the grass roots just as has been shown in Reclamation activities in the Republican Valley, and in this endeavor the Nebraska Reclamation Association can give us a hand.

Canyon Dam Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last Friday three members of the Texas delegation appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee on the War Department civil functions appropriations bill in behalf of planning funds to permit work to continue on the plans and specifications for the Canyon Dam project on the Guadalupe project in Texas.

The benefits which will result from the construction of this dam are tremendous. Tragic floods will be prevented. The power shortage will be lessened. Navigation improvements will lead to lower freight rates. Additional badly needed fresh water will be made available to the entire southeast Texas area. Pleasure will come to hundreds of thousands through the recreational facilities which will be developed.

I hope the funds requested by the Army engineers will be approved so construction of Canyon Dam can commence during fiscal year 1950. The following are the statements made by Congressmen JOHN E. LYLE, CLARK THOMPSON, and myself, as well as a communication to the committee from Hon. Edward M. Cape, general counsel of the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN LYNDON B. JOHNSON

I am interested in this bill because of the item of $100,000 earmarked in the budget for advance planning in respect to the Canyon Dam on the Guadalupe River in Texas. While this project is not located in my district, nevertheless, it is the key structure in the development of the watershed of that river, a large part of which is in my district.

The amount asked for is not large. It is necessary that it be made available in this bill, however, in order that the planning

may proceed. A State authority, known as the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority has been created by the Legislature of Texas to function under the constitution of Texas for the purpose of conserving the water and soil of that watershed. The authority proposes to fit its program in with the Canyon Dam project in such manner that the one will benefit from the other—the program of the authority will be beneficial to and reduce the costs of the Federal project, provided the plans of both are coordinated. If this be done the benefits resulting from the Canyon project will be manyfold greater than if the plans are otherwise developed. Such matters as the necessity of the construction of this dam and the benefits which will result in the way of flood control and aid to navigation have been described in the preliminary reports of the Corps of Engineers and no doubt will be discussed by other witnesses appearing before your committee. In the interest of time, therefore, I simply want to again stress the one point that time is of the essence if we are to take advantage of the opportunity of joint planning to avoid possible waste and confusion in the event that our planning is delayed.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. LYLE

The budget submitted in connection with this bill contains an item of $100,000 for advance planning of the Canyon Dam project on the Guadalupe River in Texas, which project is located in my district. The mere location of the project in my district and the true benefits to the district from its construction are comparatively minor when the picture is viewed as a whole.

The Guadalupe River is one of the principal streams of Texas. Like other streams in that area, it is subject to periods of drought and low flow, followed by excessive and devastating floods. The flood damage below the site of this project has been as high as one million and a half dollars from one flood and many lives have been lost. By controlling the flood waters, we will not only prevent this loss of property and lives, but will conserve the water for irrigation and render much more secure the navigation project on the lower river upon which the Government has expended and is expending many hundreds of thousands of dollars. Further, it will provide water for the irrigation of lands needing irrigation and for which water is not now available.

In order that you may have a more definite description of the project, I might say that Canyon Reservoir, Guadalupe River, Tex., was authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act approved March 2, 1945, in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in House Document No. 247, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session. The project consists of a gravity type dam, located on the Guadalupe River, about 7 miles upstream from New Braunfels, Tex.

This is a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir project for flood control, navigation, and power. The latest approved estimate of cost of this project is $25,952,600 as of September 1947; $260,600 has been made available to date for planning in connection with the preparation of the definite project report for this reservoir. The definite project report is approximately 70 percent complete. With the addition of the $100,000 included in the 1949 budget for preparation of plans and specifications the detailed construction plans should be approximately 40 percent complete by the end of fiscal year 1949. With this progress on construction planning in fiscal 1949, it will be possible to start construction of dam in fiscal year 1950.

STATEMENT OF HON. CLARK THOMPSON

I desire to be heard in support of the bill because of the item of the Canyon Reservoir which is included in the budget submitted in connection therewith. While the project is located a considerable distance out of my district, yet the people of my district and a great area in Texas will benefit directly and indirectly from the project.

A portion of my district suffers from the ravaging and destructive floods which at present go uncontrolled down the main stream of the Guadalupe. This will be prevented by the construction of the Canyon Dam. In other portions of the district, landowners are pleading for water to irrigate their lands. This water is not now available in dependable quantities because the floodwaters which should be stored in the hills are allowed to waste themselves into the bay. The stretch of the Texas coast from Galveston to Corpus Christi is a fast developing industrial section. Chemical and plastic industries are attracted to that section because of the availability of raw materials, including natural gas, as well as the accessibility to deep water. Such industries require enormous quantities of fresh and wholesome water. Even now some of those industries are seeking a supply of fresh water from surface streams, and this water can be made available in dependable quantities only by impounding and conserving the floodwater of our rivers and streams.

Without taking further time, I can say that the reports of the Corps of Engineers revealed in graphic fashion the fact that the Canyon project on the Guadalupe River is feasible from every standpoint and is necessary to accomplish those results so necessary to the safety, well-being, and progress of the region.

GUADALUPE-BLANCO RIVER AUTHORITY,
New Braunfels, Tex., January 28, 1948.
To the Honorable Chairman and Members of the Appropriations Committee, War Department Civil Functions Bill, House of Representatives of the United States.

GENTLEMEN: The Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority is a conservation and reclamation district and a governmental agency and body politic and corporate (art. XVI, sec. 59, Constitution of Texas; ch. 410, Acts of 1st called sess., 44th legislature). The act declares the creation of the authority essential to the control, storing, preservation, and distribution of the waters of the Guadalupe River and its tributaries.

An active phase of the program of the authority includes facilities for the control of flood waters of the river (it has, at this time, no such facilities); a broad program of conservation and reclamation practices; and the development of hydroelectric power. Flood control is now of paramount importance, by virtue of recent large increases in population of the area and large capital investment in the sections subject to overflow.

Navigation to river mile 52 and construction of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir in the interest of river regulation and flood control have been authorize ' by the Congress (79th Cong., 1st sess., S. 35, Rept. No. 63).

The President's budget message includes $100,000 for use by the Chief of Engineers toward completion of plans for construction of the Canyon Dam, which will eliminate floods in an area heretofore suffering 90 percent of the total losses from that source. Losses from floods on the river average $1,000,000 annually. Existing circumstances create an emergency, and we respectfully request that the suggestion of the President for the appropriation of such funds be adopted.

The authority has cooperated with the Corps of Engineers in a study of the problems since July 7, 1948. It desires to assist in sponsoring the Canyon Reservoir project.

If desired by you, representatives of the authority will be glad to appear before your committee with all information and data available to the authority.

Respectfully submitted.

E. M. CAFE,
General Manager and General Counsel.

District Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under the authority granted me to extend my remarks and include the report of the poll on the home-rule and reorganization plan for the District of Columbia taken by the Washington Post, I wish to express the gratitude of the Subcommittee of the House District Committee for this informative and useful piece of work. The questions asked in the poll were penetrating and to the point, and the article by Edward F. Ryan, in collaboration with Jane A. Shepherd, is excellent and well written.

The results of this poll are most heartening to the subcommittee, which has worked hard on this matter, and it is most gratifying to know that 70 percent of the residents in the District are in favor of home rule. However, it is not surprising that the people of Washington want to be like other Americans and have a voice in the management of their city. The expressions of opinion about various details of the plan will be very helpful to the subcommittees of the House and Senate which are now holding hearings on H. R. 4902 and S. 1968, and again may I pay tribute to the Washington Post for a job well done.

SEVEN IN TEN HERE WANT DISTRICT HOME RULE

(By Edward F. Ryan, Post reporter, in collaboration with Jane A. Shepherd, director of the Washington Post poll)

Seven out of ten Washingtonians want home rule.

This is shown by new findings of the Washington Post poll that 70 percent of Washington residents favor home rule, 23 percent oppose it, and 7 percent are undecided.

Congressional hearings on a home-rule plan for Washington will begin at 10 a. m. tomorrow in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building. The plan calls for an elected city council and appointed manager to run the District, subject to veto by either House of Congress and the President on major local legislation.

The new poll results show the same percentage of District citizens favoring home rule as was disclosed by the 1946 plebiscite. The big development since 1946 is that District leaders at the Capitol have taken over leadership in the drive for home rule.

NATIVES ARE ENTHUSIASTS

Washington's general sentiments on home rule showed up in answers to two poll questions.

The first question was:

"As you know, people who live in the District do not have the right to vote for city officials. How do you feel about this situation?"

The percentage results:

	Total	White	Negro
For home rule	70	65	83
Against home rule	23	30	4
Undecided	7	5	13

There is little difference between home owners and renters in attitudes toward home rule. Sixty-seven percent of home owners favor it, as compared with 72 percent of renters.

Native Washingtonians are as enthusiastic as those who have moved here from other States. Seventy-two percent of native Washingtonians favor home rule.

Strongest opposition comes from those who are not natives but have lived in the District more than 10 years. Of this group, 28 percent is opposed to home rule.

The second question:

"If the District had home rule, do you think the city would be better run, or worse run? In what ways?

	Length of residence				
	All groups	Under 5 years	5 to 9.9 years	10 years and over	Native
	Per-cent	*Per-cent*	*Per-cent*	*Per-cent*	*Per-cent*
Would be run better	54	65	53	48	60
Would be run worse	14	7	16	16	15
Depends on type of government, elected officials, etc.	7	8	6		
Would be the same	3	2	5	2	2
Undecided	22	18	20	26	20

People who have moved into Washington since the beginning of World War II are most convinced the city government would be improved by home rule. Native Washingtonians are also somewhat more convinced of this. Most skeptical are those who are not natives but have lived here many years.

DEMOCRACY AND TAXATION

The poll went into the specific reasons why citizens like and do not like home rule.

The poll showed 46 percent of all residents believed home rule would be more democratic. Individuals in this group said things like, "Every citizen should have the right to vote; people in other places have the right to vote and it should be the same here; it's undemocratic now."

Others said they want home rule because they pay taxes but receive none of the benefits of democratic representation in their own city government. This group represented 10 percent of the total.

Another 9 percent felt that home rule would promote citizen interest in civic affairs and make officials more responsive to public opinion.

In the line-up against home rule, 13 percent of all those questioned and 19 percent of the white persons questioned said they were fearful of Negro domination under a home-rule system. (Latest estimates show about 30 percent of Washington residents are Negroes.) Two percent opposed home rule because they felt there were too many transients, too many outsiders, too many Government employees, or too many undesirables here.

Five percent oppose home rule because they prefer the present District government. They said things like, "The city has been doing all right. I'm satisfied with the way it's running now. Washington has the finest form of municipal government in the United States. We have fine public service, the lowest per capita cost and no undue scandal. We're better off because most cities are corruptly run in the United States."

ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTS

Some who are opposed to home rule think the city would be better run if it had the vote, while others of this group are uncertain. Of those opposed, 8 percent think the city would be better run; 54 percent think it would be worse run; 10 percent say it would depend on the form of government, or on the elected officials; 7 percent say it would be the same as now; 21 percent are undecided.

Home owners do not differ significantly from renters on this question. Fifty-three percent of owners say the District would be run better under home rule, as compared with 55 percent of renters.

Of those who feel the District would be run better under home rule: 24 percent express a faith in the effectiveness of democratic process; 21 percent say elected officials would be more responsive to the needs and desires of the people they represent; 20 percent believe that city services and administration would be improved; 18 percent say District residents would take more interest in and responsibility for their city government; 2 percent say any change would be for the better—things are so bad now; 12 percent mention other ways in which District government would be improved; 12 percent give no way in which it would be improved.

(Adds to more than 100 percent because more than one answer was possible.)

Of those who feel the District would be run worse under home rule: 44 percent say it would give Negroes too much voice in District government: 18 percent say politics would enter in if the District had the vote; 18 percent say they like it the way it is now and feel the present form of government is satisfactory; 14 percent mention other reasons; 9 percent give no reason.

(Adds to more than 100 percent because more than one answer was possible.)

ONLY THIRD CAN VOTE

Besides gauging the over-all sentiment on home rule, the poll checked into the home rule views of local citizens who have had the experience of voting elsewhere. The poll found that 60 percent of Washington residents have never voted—22 percent because they were native Washingtonians—and 40 percent have voted at least once in their lives. The poll also showed that only 34 percent of District residents have a legal right to vote elsewhere—hitting hard at the theory that Washingtonians do not need a vote because they vote elsewhere.

Then this question was asked:

"On the whole, would you favor or oppose home rule for the District?"

Here are the percentage results:

	Have voted before	Have never voted before	Native of Washington
For home rule	64	73	72
Against home rule	29	15	21
Qualified opinion	1	1	
Don't know	6	11	7

Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS (Republican, New Jersey), first sponsor of the home-rule bill, was told about the poll results. He declared the showing of 70 percent of Washington residents in favor of home rule "is most encouraging to us."

"I'd like to say," he added, "that the Washington Post has done an extraordinarily helpful thing in conducting this poll and preparing the detailed information obtained. It clearly shows that the people who live in the District approve the efforts made by those of us who have studied the organization of the District government and have drafted the home-rule bill.

"We recognize the bill isn't perfect. Our minds are open to constructive criticism and amendments. We feel that once the home-rule plan is in operation, constructive changes can be made."

"DISPLACED" WILL OBJECT

As the poll makes clear, the hearings can be expected to produce sharp conflicts on the merits of the bill.

Strongest opposition is slated to come from District and Federal agency officials whose operations would be widely affected by the bill. For example, the District Commissioners will probably endorse some of the reorganization features in the bill while questioning the home-rule feature. Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant 3d, chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, wants the District run by an appointed governor, with power to veto acts of the city council. Powers of his agency to buy public lands in the District would be shifted to the city government.

Washington's appointed, unpaid school board opposes the idea of having an elected board of education, whose members would be paid, which would take over control of public libraries. Washington's library and recreation boards are expected to oppose the provisions of home rule that would put them out of business.

Strongest pressure for the bill will result from the allied interests of Washington groups which want home rule and congressional groups which want to get out of the business of handling the District's petty legislative chores.

Wilbur S. Finch, head of the Central Suffrage Conference and chairman of the suffrage committee of the Federation of Citizens Associations, has called on all supporters of home rule to turn out for the hearings.

The hearings will be held by a joint committee headed by AUCHINCLOSS and Senator JOSEPH H. BALL (Republican, Minnesota). They are chairmen of the House and Senate subcommittees on District reorganization and home rule.

VETO IS NECESSARY

On one point the residents of Washington show a desire for more self-determination than the Auchincloss-Ball bill can constitutionally express. The bill gives each House of Congress and the President veto power over legislation proposed by the city council. The reason for this requirement goes back to the Constitution, which gives Congress exclusive legislative jurisdiction over the District. Framers of the home-rule bill wanted to give District residents the initiative in writing the laws under which they live, but the Constitution keeps Congress from giving District residents final power to write their laws.

The veto provision was placed in the bill to make it constitutional. As things are now, a District law comes into being when each House of Congress has passed it and the President has signed it. The home-rule program would put the present machinery into reverse, by saying that legislation proposed by the city council could become law only if neither House of Congress nor the President disapproved it.

Another strong reason for the veto feature is the belief of sponsors that without it home rule would never pass Congress.

Whatever the reason for the veto, 50 percent of Washington residents are shown to be against it in the poll. The veto feature was approved by 30 percent, and 20 percent had no opinion.

Here is how individuals voiced their dislike of the veto: "If we're going to have home rule we should have the final say; the council should be capable of making its own decisions." Those who favored the veto did so in these terms: "The Nation's Capital is Congress' responsibility."

COMPENSATORY FEATURES

Because a limit must be placed on the number of questions in a poll, the survey did not bring out two features of the home-rule plan which offset the veto.

One is that the city council would be given all the ordinance-making powers now held by the District government. Such ordinances would become law without having to clear through Congress. The second is that the council would have final power to write the annual city budget. While the budget

would be sent to the proposed Joint Congressional District Committee for review, that group could only recommend, not make, changes.

The types of legislation that would have to clear through Congress under home rule include major changes in laws, revenue and taxation measures, changes in the charter, and proposed bond issues for public works.

Responses of Washington residents varied on other features of the Auchincloss-Ball bill:

The voting requirements were approved generally, but by a slimmer margin than the general home rule proposition. The bill would let District residents who have lived here a year or more vote in the local elections. The bill also says they can vote here without losing their right to vote on national affairs in a State.

This question was asked first on the election plan:

"I'd like to ask your opinion of some of the points in the plan. First, all people who have lived in the District a year would be eligible to vote for District officials. Do you approve or disapprove of this?"

The results:

	Have lived in District less than—			
	All groups	5 years	5 to 9 years	10 years or more
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Approved	89	88	70	88
Would approve if they were going to stay, etc.	4	2	4	4
Disapprove	82	30	20	82
Don't know	5	3	6	6

This question followed:

"District residents who have kept their right to vote in other places could still vote there in national and State elections. Do you think they should be allowed to vote here also for District officials?"

The results:

	All groups	These who have voting residence elsewhere	These who have no voting residence elsewhere
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes, should be allowed to vote here	39	49	35
Yes, if they plan to live here, etc.	6	7	5
No, should not be allowed to vote here	43	35	46
Don't know	12	9	14

Chief reason for opposing the double voting privilege is a misunderstanding about what it would mean in any one election. Twenty-nine percent say a person should have only one vote, shouldn't vote twice in the same election. A few say that people who have maintained voting residence are not so interested in District affairs (4 percent); that these people should vote for local officials where they come from (3 percent); that they are out-and-out opposed to home rule (2 percent).

ELECTED BOARD CARRIES

The proposal for an elected school board was backed by 62 percent of those polled. AUCHINCLOSS said "that is most encouraging, because we have been getting a large number of letters on the school-board plan." Opposition to electing school-board members was voiced by 22 percent, and 16 percent had no opinion.

The vote was closer on the question whether Washington's chief executive under home rule should be a manager appointed by the city council, or a mayor elected by the people. (In the home-rule bill the top administrator would be a council-appointed manager. There would also be a mayor, but he would be a member of the council, elected by it to serve as presiding officer and to represent the city in ceremonies.)

This was the question on manager versus mayor:

According to the plan, people would vote for members of a city council. The city council would then hire someone trained in city government to carry out the District laws. Do you think it is a good idea to hire someone trained in city government for this job, or would you rather have an elected mayor?

The results:

	Percent
Good idea	43
Rather have a mayor	39
Qualified	1
Don't know	17

In a final question, the poll showed strong support for the plan in the home-rule bill to make District elections strictly nonpartisan. Here is the question:

People running for office in the District would not run as members of any political party, like Republicans or Democrats, but as individuals. Do you think this would be a good idea?

The results:

	Percent
Yes	59
No	22
Don't know	19

The Washington Post poll made its home-rule survey late in December. All interviews were held in the home. The residents questioned were selected to give proportionate representation to all groups living in the District. Interviews were held in all parts of the city, and the calls were made in both daytime and evening to insure representation of working people.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Maryland Gazette of January 29, 1948:

KNUTSON TAX PLAN

The Congress should pass the so-called Knutson Federal tax-reduction measure, now before it, and not be deterred in any way by rumors that President Truman will exercise the right of veto if it is enacted.

President Truman has already vetoed two tax-reduction bills and has shown his opposition to any plan that tends to reduce the scope of Federal spending. The Congress should pass the Knutson bill and put the matter of saving some of the taxpayers' funds squarely before him. Let him, for the third time, exercise his right of veto if he sees fit, and then if the measure dies, let him face the people in the coming election as the President who three times in succession acted to prevent them from getting relief from the high burden of taxation.

The Presidential proposal of giving every taxpayer and his or her dependents a $40 income-tax credit and making up for this by additional taxes on corporations should be consigned to the wastebasket. On its face it is a mere political gesture, the only result of which, if enacted into law, would be to bring about price increases. It would not reduce the cost of government in any way, but would simply curtail corporations from expanding their productive facilities.

The Knutson bill, the product of the thorough consideration of the House Ways and Means Committee which has held hearings and sounded out popular sentiment in drafting two previous tax-reduction bills, is a real reduction measure.

As a matter of fact, it is more advantageous to the majority of workers and income-tax payers than the Truman suggestion. Both start equally by exempting all net incomes of $600. At the $800 income level Truman's flat credit of $40 would leave a taxpayer owing $17, while KNUTSON'S would cost him $27. After that the Knutson bill has the edge. At the $1,200 income stage the Knutson bill would levy a tax of $80 and the Truman measure $93. The Knutson plan holds this advantage throughout.

The tax reduction can be brought about by paring the $39,700,000,000 budget which President Truman has submitted to the Congress. This is the second largest peacetime outlay in the Nation's history and the sixth, including the war years. It calls for the third largest tax levy, $44,400,000,000, in the Nation's history, including the war years. So, it is obvious that President Truman, unless forced by Congressional action, will not, of himself, curtail Federal spending.

During the last Congress the President's 1948 budget and other sought appropriations were trimmed by $7,181,005,249. These reductions included a cut of $2,361,889,749 from the 12 major budget estimates, a cut of $402,041,986 in four supplemental estimates, a cut of $268,935,548 in six deficiency estimates and joint resolutions; a cut of $40,000,000 in permanent appropriations; a cut of $90,805,020 in supplemental and deficiency estimates, submitted but not considered, and a cut of $4,017,332,946 as a result of rescissions during the present Congress. Total reductions for all items, exclusive of rescissions amounted to $3,163,672,303. The total reduction for all items, including rescissions, was $7,181,005,249 and this did not include a total of $830,380,811 impairment of capital in the Commodity Credit Corporation which was not replaced by appropriations.

As a result of Congressional economy measures, and in the interest of efficiency in government, 15 boards, agencies or units of the Federal Government have been abolished since January 1, 1947, and remaining functions have been absorbed elsewhere.

Federal employees have decreased by 61,724,489 since the war peak, but substantially all of this has been in the War and Navy Departments, and the Government is still more than twice as large as it was in 1939. This indicates that further reductions can be made without curtailment of needed activities. Since the war peak up to October 1947, a total of 1,792,775 employees were dropped by the War and Navy Departments, but in all other agencies, there was an increase of 68,286 employees making the net decrease of 1,724,489.

Since 1933 the Federal administration has pursued a policy of an increasingly paternalistic government which, in itself, necessitated larger expenditures as its functions increased in number and scope. During this time Federal personnel multiplied from 563,000 to 2,013,407 and annual Federal expenditures rose from less than $5,000,000,000 to $42,500,000,000, while the national debt increased from $22,000,000,000 to $258,000,000,000. The number of Government bureaus rose to 1,039 while the number of offices increased to 46,865. Many functions previously administered by the States or local units, or by private enterprise, were taken over by the National Government.

Much of this was caused, at least in part, by depression and war, but much was brought about by the administration's philosophy that the lives of its citizens could be better administered by the National Government than by State, local, or private organizations. Between 1934 and 1946 Federal grants-in-aid to States cost the taxpayers $29,000,000,000, Federal subsidies totaled over $13,000,000,000 and Federal lending ran over $40,000,000,000.

There is plenty of room in this vast Federal financing and bureaucracy to save enough to finance a tax-reduction measure, and reserve adequate surplus for debt reduction. But funds cut from budget estimates would not have been used for debt reduction—they would have been spent. The taxpayers of the Nation might just as well spend the total saved, and passed on to them by tax reduction, as have the Federal bureaus spend it.

Tax reduction at this time, by curtailing the money taken from pay checks and envelopes in the form of withholding taxes, would act as a pay raise to thousands of workers, and thus tend to stave off demands for third-round increases, with the threatening inflation spiral. It also would provide risk capital for investment in the Nation's industry, now strained to its productive capacity, and in need of expansion. President Truman himself has pointed out how necessary it is for business to expand its productive facilities.

Veterans' Subsistence Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN D. JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased and gratified when Mr. ALLEN, of the Rules Committee, announced last week that at long last the veterans' subsistence bills, H. R. 4212 and S. 1394, would be brought up for consideration tomorrow.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee I voted to report this bill out of our committee in June of last year. While I think we should have voted on it last session, maybe the phrase, "Better late than never," will apply in this instance.

To show the need for this legislation and the widespread demand for it I quote from a telegram I received last Saturday from Preston Moore, commander of the Thomas C. Reynold American Legion Post at the University of Oklahoma in Norman. Mr. Moore's telegram in part read:

I am sending air mail, petition signed by 1,000 veterans thanking you for your sincere cooperation on veteran subsistence bill.

I will not burden the RECORD by inserting the list of names on the petition which I received in my office this morning, but they were the signatures of over 1,000 of the veteran students attending Oklahoma University. I call the fact to your attention to show the keen interest the veterans attending school under the GI bill attach to this pending legislation.

As further evidence of the interest of student veterans in the subsistence bill I quote in part from a telegram I received this morning from the veterans' committee of the East Central State Teachers College at Edmond, Okla., which stated:

We appreciate your support of H. R. 4212. It will be a great help to veterans on this campus.

I sincerely trust that on the morrow this House will keep faith with our veterans by speedily passing the veterans' subsistence bill.

Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, labor, management, and the public are endeavoring to cooperate in the Eighteenth Congressional District of California in the way that Americans should conduct their mutual relationships in business and civic affairs.

This cooperation is so excellent in the over-all picture that it does not make even the inside pages of the press. It is, however, one of the reasons why this particular southern California area has advanced so rapidly in its industrial capacity and output during recent years.

I am pleased to insert herewith a statement by Mr. George E. Roberts, district representative, United Rubber Workers of America, as published in the South Gate Press-Hollydale Press, of South Gate, Calif., of January 22, 1948:

LABOR LEADER PRAISES FRIENDLY RELATIONS EXISTING BETWEEN WORKERS AND MANAGEMENT IN MANY PLANTS

(By George B. Roberts, district representative, United Rubber Workers of America)

As a representative of organized labor and a resident here, I would like to extend greetings to the citizens of South Gate on the twenty-fifth anniversary of our city.

We are happy to take part in the festivities and celebration during the silver jubilee week.

Many might think that organized labor is interested only in hours, wages, and working conditions. Basically that is true, because with standard hours, fair wages, and working conditions it makes for better conditions in the home and, in turn, in the community in which we live.

In the past 10 years we in the CIO have established fine relationships with many employers in southern California. Year after year improvements have been made upon the working agreements and labor relations in these plants.

Unfortunately the public seldom hears or reads about plants or factories in which management and labor are working together in a harmonious manner—that just doesn't make news.

We, of the CIO, have come to realize we have other responsibilities besides taking up day-to-day grievances in our respective plants. We recognize that we have an obligation to our community.

We want to work with the many progressive-minded citizens and organizations, in helping to make our city one in which we can be proud to reside and rear our children.

We are interested and want to take part in our civic affairs. We feel that to be a really true American we must register and vote and take part in city, State, and National affairs. Only we, as citizens, can enslave ourselves by our failure to exercise our right at the pools on election day.

We, in the labor movement, are deeply interested in broader educational and recreational facilities for children and adults.

We are proud of our city park and we are anxious to see it expand, to include such as a swimming pool and public auditorium where many interesting events can and will be held. We have many sports committees in our local unions which are ready to cooperate with other groups in our city to furnish clean fun to young and old alike. I dare say we have members in South Gate who attend practically every denomination of church represented in this city.

We are interested in every phase of our community life and pledge that in the coming years we shall take even more interest in civic affairs and will try to conduct ourselves in such a manner that we will be worthy of the respect and cooperation of the many citizens, business and professional people of South Gate.

Jack Beall's Radio Report on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a radio address made over the American Broadcasting Co. network at 6:45 on December 27, 1947, by Jack Beall. It is interesting to note that Mr. Beall touched on the situation in the Panama Canal Zone and the UPWA's communistic influence, as pointed out by me in my remarks before the House on January 12 and again on January 19 of this year.

The address follows:

Good evening. The United States has sustained one of its sharpest diplomatic defeats. And partly, at least, it can be attributed to Communist influence. I refer to the action of the Panama Assembly, which voted down the proposed treaty with the United States for the maintenance of 14 bases in the Republic of Panama—chiefly radar stations—for the defense of the Canal. We are now pulling out of those bases. It may be a permanent set-back. Without these bases, in fact, our defense against air attack on a vulnerable set of locks, is almost impossible. The Canal, itself, may become untenable in time of war. The free passage of our fleet from one ocean to another, the transport of our goods from coast-to-coast through a Canal that cuts off 8,000 miles of distance around the Horn, may be stopped. The safety of the Nation is involved, no less.

Let's look at this thing from historic perspective. For sheer ingratitude, the action of the Panama Government is pretty shameful. We practically set the Panama Government up, when we first decided to have a go at building the Canal. We gave recognition 5 days after it declared its independence of Colombia. We protected it from the counterattack of Colombia. We stabilized its currency by making a payment of $10,000,000 in cash and agreed to pay a quarter of a million dollars every year in rent

for the Canal Zone. We dug the Canal, bringing great prosperity to the people of Panama. The point I make is that the Republic of Panama had greatly benefited from all its relations with the United States. We had not acted in a high-handed, and certainly not in an imperialistic way with her. Colombia might complain of us, but certainly not Panama.

And yet, there were administrative details, which caused friction. There was a distinct Jim Crow problem down there which was seized upon by the Communist Party in trying to get a foothold. The Communist Party of Panama supported an underground press in 1931; headway was made among the intellectuals, the professors and the students of the universities, by propaganda which depicted the United States as the avaricious "Colossus of the North" bent on "Yanqui imperialismo." The equally familiar Jim Crow argument was used on the general public. Congress scented some growing trouble a few years ago and passed a law saying that only Americans or citizens of Panama could work on the Canal, or hold jobs in the one great industry down there. But it became scandalous how easily almost anybody, at a cost of about $2, could get Panama citizenship.

In later years a great influx of Cubans in the Canal Zone took place where they became citizens overnight and got jobs. Habana is now the central clearing house of the Soviet Union in its work on South and Central American countries. A powerful radio broadcasting station beams Communist propaganda and slanted news to all countries to the south of us.

Many Cuban Communists were sent into Panama deliberately for purposes of infiltration. A handsome, two-color magazine, 76 pages at times, began to appear with pictures of Stalin, Lenin, and Molotov, praising the Soviet Union as the defenders of the people against Yankee imperialism. The Soviet Union, it maintained, is not imperialistic because it is a "socialistic state and therefore has no need to exploit weak countries." I suggest Belgrade, Bucharest, and Prague papers please copy.

For weeks, a tremendous propaganda drive has been going on in Panama, against the ratifying of the treaty on bases. It had been signed by the two countries and was thought sure to pass the assembly; but street demonstrations, with picket signs and cloth banners, following the familiar Soviet model, took place. There had been clashes with police. A foreign minister resigned. The uproar became louder and louder. Finally, on the night of the vote, a mob of 10,000 people whirled about the assembly hall. They were screaming the old, old slogans against Yanqui imperialism. All reports from there said that Communists had a leading part in all the demonstrations. A State Department spokesman here confirmed it. According to Time magazine, only President Jiminez dared to defend the treaty. When votes were cast, instead of having a few votes margin for the treaty, as had been originally expected, every single, solitary deputy voted against it. What was the explanation? Assembly President Arosemena supplied it: "Nobody," he said "will vote for the bases when they can look out the window and see 10,000 boys sharpening their knives." When he said "boys" he was referring to the radical student element, which traditionally makes Latin-American revolutions.

So we sustained a first-class defeat in our own back yard. One can mark up a major success for the Soviets against us, the strong country of the west—at almost the same time when France and Italy, those weak countries, were chalking up successes against the Soviets. France and Italy turned back the tide last week. We didn't even know we had been hit until we were down and the State Department told the War Department to begin getting its troops out of those bases.

And here let me bring in a thing which comparatively few people in this country know about, but which may be the most serious thing of all in the Panama situation. It is the penetration of an extreme left-wing union, called the United Public Workers of America, into all the activities of the Canal Zone, from engineers opening and closing the locks to waiters in mess halls. It controls the labor of 17,000 people down there. There is a peculiarity about its stand on getting American troops out of military bases that ought to be aired, right in this connection.

The United Public Workers of America was formed from two other left-wing organizations—the United Federal Workers and the State, County, and Municipal Workers. Abram Flaxer is the president of the new international. As president of the State, County, and Municipal Workers he had seen his organization follow a faithful Communist Party line before and after the Stalin-Hitler pact, and before and after the Hitler attack on the Soviet Union. "Flaxer," according to a report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, "has been active in the affairs of the Communist Party as far back as 1936.

"Although he has never publicly avowed membership in the Communist Party, his allegiance is indisputably established by his presence at closed meetings of the party, by the statements of those who have been closely associated with him in the labor movement, by his complete loyalty to the party line, throughout its various changes, by his defense of Communists and Communist fronts and by the standing established by his union as a Communist-controlled organization."

The secretary-treasurer of the UPWA is Eleanor Nelson, who had been head of the United Federal Workers before the merger. The House Committee on Un-American Activities has this to say about Eleanor Nelson: "She has been eulogized by the Daily Worker, official Communist organ—a mark of distinction reserved for those who possess the confidence of the Communist Party. The union headed by Miss Nelson followed the Communist Party line cautiously, but faithfully."

When these two organizations, with such a record and with such leaders, merged at a convention, held in Atlantic City the latter part of April 1946, the convention records show that it passed resolutions in a most peculiar way for a union of Federal Government workers. Its resolutions attacked the foreign policies of the United States. They praised the actions of the Soviet Union. UPWA charged that demobilization of American troops throughout the world was being deliberately delayed to further the imperialistic ambitions of the United States and Great Britain and to isolate Russia. And here is the nub of the thing—as it affects bases—it called for the immediate withdrawal of American and British troops from all friendly countries. Not a word was said about calling for the immediate withdrawal of Russian troops from the half dozen friendly countries which its armies had overrun. When this was called to the attention of the convention by one Peter Demas, he was shouted down and the convention went on record as favoring only British and American withdrawal from bases. Now I think this has some pertinence about Panama when you think of what happened next. About a week after the Atlantic City convention there was a May day parade in Panama City. Three thousand people marched with signs demanding the establishment of diplomatic relations between Panama and the Soviet Government. They carried banners calling upon the masses to break the chains of capitalism and denouncing Anglo-American imperialism.

On the very next day, May 2, Operation Panama, as it was called in the Communist press, was launched. The newly launched United Public Workers of America—just 8 days old—began organizing the Government workers of the Panama Canal Zone. By September they claimed to have 17,000 on their rolls. Such an organization, headed by such people, is now in control of the one big union in Panama, recognized as the bargaining agent for upward of 17,000 employees in all conditions of labor and positions of trust down there. I would like to see it officially and authoritatively denied that any of these seventeen thousands were among the demonstrators agitating against bases for the United States, or surrounding and cowing the assembly on the night when the United States-Panama treaty got no votes. In a way it is unthinkable that United States employees would be among those who agitated against the United States; demanding that its armed forces withdraw from airfields and radar installations, designed to protect the Panama Canal. And yet, when you think back to the main foreign-policy resolution of the very union that organized these people, you find that it favored getting the United States out of bases all over the world, while saying nothing about Russia withdrawing its soldiers.

I ought to tell you the sequel to the Atlantic City Convention. A storm broke over the heads of the UPWA, not only on account of the foreign policy resolution, but also on account of the attitude which had been taken about strikes against the Government. Flaxer, before the merger, had stoutly maintained the right of Government employees to strike. It was in the constitution of the UPWA that it was against UPWA's policy to strike, but, at another place in the constitution, it set up the procedures for strikes to be called.

This was a bit too thick for the administration. President Truman denounced it as intolerable. The Government couldn't exist under such circumstances, he said. Bills and riders were passed by Congress to make every employee swear that he would not strike against the Government and would join no organization that asserts such a right to strike.

This would just about have blown the UPWA out of the water, if some action had not been taken. The international board was hastily called together and it passed a resolution that it did not and never had asserted the right to strike against the Government. It adopted what it called a law that there should not be a strike against the Government of the United States. Of course, there was a loophole here. The original strike procedures were imbedded in the union constitution. They were not cut out or changed, they were negatived later by a mere resolution of the board. And, plainly, the union could still strike against local and State governments.

Also, there was much pressure from within the union against its pro-Russian policy and finally the UPWA substituted the standard CIO foreign policy declaration for its own.

It was partly because of the concern in Government circles over the United Public Workers of America and whether such a union, under such sponsorship, could be allowed to go along unmolested, which caused the President to set up a loyalty board, to purge the Federal payrolls of subversive or disloyal elements.

When you think of what has just happened in Panama, you ought to think of the far larger question: "Is the hand of Josef Stalin reaching into the Canal Zone to paralyze the possibility of defense in time of war of the most vital link of our naval operations and our Marine commerce?" It is something to ponder about before it is too late.

This is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

Address of Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, at the annual banquet of the American Road Builders' Association at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., Tuesday evening, January 27, 1948, the Honorable PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Republican Representative from Iowa, in introducing the speaker of the evening, paid merited tribute to the distinguished Speaker of the House, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., who then delivered an interesting and informative address on the importance of roads in keeping pace with the tremendous strides of the automotive industry.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the introduction and the speech in the RECORD:

INTRODUCTION BY HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and members of the American Roadbuilders Association, it is generally believed that all positions of authority and prominence in the Congress of the United States are the result of seniority and length of service. This is not true in all cases. The Speakership of the House of Representatives is the most outstanding example. A Member is, and always has been, elevated to the Speakership by merit and merit alone. The selection is made by his colleagues of the party in power and is based upon ability for the office and not length of service alone.

In January of 1947, the present incumbent, Mr. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., was the unanimous choice of his colleagues of his own party. In fact, this choice was so unanimous that no one even thought of running against JOE and no one considered urging anyone else to run against him. The retiring Speaker, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, whom we all love, at the installation of JOE MARTIN, said that "If we have to have a Republican Speaker, I would rather it would be JOE MARTIN than anyone else," and I am satisfied he was speaking the convictions of his colleagues of the minority party.

However, JOE MARTIN was not elected a year ago this month, but only the votes were counted on that date. He was elected during his years of service for his honesty, industry, and fairness. To us he is more than just the Speaker. He is our dearly beloved and much-respected JOE MARTIN. He is second in command of the Government of the United States today. In fact, he is the Vice President and for aught we know, come next November, he may be President in his own right.

Ladies and gentlemen of the conference, it is my great privilege and signal honor to give you the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

ADDRESS BY SPEAKER JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Road builders are among those who substantially contribute to the progress of our Nation. Our economic and cultural progress has been made possible largely through the improvement of the highway and "its other half" the motor vehicle, of which there are now 37,000,000 engaged in the transportation of goods and people. We can realize the tremendous contribution good roads have made to this Nation when we consider the expansion of road use by our population from 55,000,000 vehicle miles in 1921 to 361,000,000,000 vehicle miles in 1947.

Our highways are not mere ribbons of paved surfaces radiating out across the Nation; they are a part of the production lines of our factories. They stretch out to our farms and to the sources of raw materials. Every ton of agricultural products starts to the market over the highways. More than 25,000 communities in the United States depend entirely on highways for land transportation of goods. In my home community of North Attleboro, Mass., we are touched by a railroad. But our principal transportation is over the highways. We enjoy all the comforts of modern civilization.

Roads and ease of communication enable the farmer to reach his markets. They provide an indispensable service to industry. They develop community welfare. They provide access to places of religious worship. They bring modern district schools closer to rural homes. More than 80,000 school busses extend educational opportunities to 4,700,000 American youth in rural areas. And, not the least important, good highways are essential to our national defense system.

The benefits of government are brought closer to the home by good roads. Police and fire protection are made more quickly available. Rural mail service is extended daily to more than 29,000,000 persons. In the cities, motor trucks transport the bulk of the mail between post offices, collect it at corner boxes and deliver it to homes and offices.

I am informed that motor transport employs over 8,000,000 people, or about 1 in every 7 jobholders in the Nation. Commercial truck driving is today one of our largest single occupational classes outside of agriculture. Truck drivers outnumber all other transportation workers three to one. Farmers continue as the largest class of truck users. They now own 2,000,000, or double the number they had in 1940.

The construction of arterial routes for the free movement of through traffic around cities help that traffic, and keep city streets free for business.

One of the most important functions of our whole highway system is to relieve the centers of congestion in the cities of America. We realize the beneficial effects of urban life. People who can have a chance to own their own modest homes in uncrowded sections have a chance to be out of doors. They and their children can live closer to nature. They not only have pure air but they can have a few chickens, and the children can have pets.

In other words, our highways make possible a more wholesome life for those who want to get away from the congestion and the distractions of crowded places. No one questions what a tremendous advantage this is, made possible, as it is through better highways.

Adjusted to current values, I am informed the Nation's highways represent more than a $30,000,000,000 asset. At the end of 1945, there were 1,430,000 miles of surfaced rural highways and 220,000 miles of surfaced urban streets, providing a practically continuous network for the movement of traffic. These highways are of the greatest importance in our national life. They are essential to almost every form of business and social life. We cannot be content to let them remain in their present inadequate condition while traffic and congestion continue to grow.

This fact was recognized by Congress when it enacted the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, which authorized an appropriation of $500,000,000 in each of the first three postwar years to assist the States in developing a long-term program of highway improvement. It is interesting to note the Federal Government collected, in the calendar year 1946, motor-vehicle excise taxes amounting to $882,000,000.

In addition to an annual appropriation of $225,000,000 over a 3-year period for improvements on the regular Federal-aid system, the 1944 act also made available an annual appropriation of $150,000,000 for secondary roads and $125,000,000 in each of three fiscal years for work on sections of the Federal-aid system in urban areas. The program differs from many types of Federal-aid public works programs in that it is a cooperative enterprise. It requires implementing legislation on the part of the Federal Government and many of the States, and also calls for coordinated activity on the part of the Public Roads Administration and State highway departments in planning and developing the program.

The Federal-aid program administered by the Public Roads Administration is a necessary and very useful instrument of government to promote proper integration of our highway developments with the public needs. There are 48 State highway departments, over 3,000 counties, 3,000 cities of population over 5,000, and special highway authorities of one sort or another. There must be some mechanism for the integration of their activities in the public interest.

Another phase of the road-improvement program in which the Congress has provided assistance is in the extension of rural road improvements to reach more farm gates. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 includes provision for a more comprehensive rural road program through cooperation between the State Highway Department, the county, or other appropriate local road officials, and the Public Roads Administration, in the selection and improvement of a system of principal secondary or feeder roads. I understand this program is proceeding successfully. Specific improvement projects have now been included in the program to absorb 73 percent of the funds made available for the fiscal years 1946, 1947, and 1948.

This Federal-aid secondary program was authorized to meet growing demands of farmers who needed improved roads to and from market centers. It was conceived as the beginning of a long-range continuing program based upon the sound principles and experience of more than a quarter of a century of substantial Federal assistance in road-improvement work.

Early in the history of Federal-State cooperation in the development of our primary road system it became clear a system of roads must be established as a long-range goal if highway funds over a period were to be spent in the most effective way to serve transportation requirements and to assist in raising the economic level of our country. Routes were included in this system which were of topmost importance in the transportation pattern. Without the prior establishment of this system, annual programs would have been developed with a scattering of projects. We would have had haphazard, scattered improvements. There would have been no careful coordination and integration of the various projects all aimed toward a goal of completing a system of supreme importance to each State and to the Nation. In the extension of Federal-aid to secondary and feeder routes as provided for in the 1944 legislation, the benefits of this experience were all recognized by the Congress. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 provided for a similar approach through the requirement that Federal-aid secondary systems be established. The experience of the last couple of years shows determination on the part of the counties, the States, and the Public Roads Administration to make this program a success. Systems which have been established are based upon sound transportation concepts. These systems in the United States as a whole include approximately 370,000 miles of roads of greatest importance in rural areas. In combination with the 230,000-mile Federal-aid primary system, they include mileage equal to one-fifth of the total rural road mileage in the United States. My information is that 20

percent of the total rural mileage passes or comes within two-tenths of a mile of approximately 40 percent of all rural dwellings. People living on the other four-fifths of rural roads more remote from market areas travel the routes of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary system in traveling from farm to market and return.

The current program providing for $900,000,000 of Federal, State, or county matching funds during a 3-year period is providing for improvement of some 50,000 miles of roads. This accomplishment is visible evidence of cooperative county, State, and Federal efforts to provide a basis for a permanent solution to the secondary road problem. These efforts warrant continuation of the program.

A wonderful future lies ahead for both motor cars and our national highways system. Unquestionably the product of the automotive industry has been and will continue to be a marvel of design and engineering. Admittedly, highway construction in the past has not kept up with the tremendous strides in the development of the motor car. But in the future as the highway builders overtake and keep up with strides of the automobile industry—after we have unraveled the national traffic tangle, provided for a free flow of traffic on modern highways, solved our parking problems, and other major details, the Nation will realize the full potential of that great team—the automobile and the highway of tomorrow.

Fertilizer Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JANUARY 27, 1948.

Hon. OTTO PASSMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Being weather-bound I have been reading the papers a little more closely than usual, and ran across the attached article in the Shreveport Journal, and I feel it my duty to send it to you, and tell you that a great many of your people are beginning to feel this way about things, perhaps not as forceful in some ways as this man, but they are sick of everything being sent out of this country at our expense. Now, take my situation: I have a nice oat acreage, raised at great expense (paid $3.50 a bushel for seed, plus cost of cultivation, to say nothing of the use of the land), and I have the stock to feed most of a normal crop to, both milk cows and beef. I believe you to be a common-sense businessman, as well as a Congressman, or I voted wrong, and I think you will say that both are necessary to our present economy. Now I am told by my fertilizer manufacturer that has supplied me for years that he has been trying to get some ammonium nitrate for months for these oats, and he cannot get a sack, because the Department of Commerce is sending the whole output out of this country, have been doing it for months, and have ordered it continued through the next few months; and, if I don't get this ammonium nitrate, I probably will not get any oat crop, not even the seed back. It is necessary to the growing of the crop—absolutely necessary. Then what will be the situation when cotton-planting time comes around? How can the fertilizer folks make their fertilizer without nitrogen, I ask you?

I think you and the other north Louisiana Representatives and our Senators should look into this situation, and bear in mind what this man says over here in Shreveport; it reflects what they are also saying at home. I can tell you if you ignore it now at election time many you are counting on will secede again. That is when they talk.

A FRIEND, VOTER, GROWER, AND DISSATISFIED CONSTITUENT.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Reston, from the New York Times:

WASHINGTON SEES BIG NEED FOR A POLITICAL ERP—BELIEF GROWS THAT IT IS NECESSARY IF WE ARE TO SUCCEED IN EUROPE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 31.—There are two sets of Marshall-plan worriers in the State Department—the short-range worriers, who are concerned mainly about getting the plan through Congress, and the long-range worriers, who are concerned about what will happen when the bill does get through.

Both are in a state of melancholy decline this week end. The short-range worriers are alarmed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's clear indication that it intends to lop at least a billion dollars off the administration's request for $6,800,000,000 for the first 15 months of the program.

The long-range worriers, a more philosophic lot, are nevertheless uneasy about the growing suspicion that an economic-recovery program for Europe without an effective political-recovery program for Europe may not succeed.

Although the great hullabaloo in the Capital is over the size of the appropriation and the administration of the aid, the long-range political problem is in many ways more fundamental, and may be defined as follows:

Europe cannot really become a modern, self-sufficient economic unit, unless it really does get together in something very much like the union of states proposed by Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin.

Coordination of western Europe's economy is absolutely fundamental to the political stability of Europe. The coordination of Europe's industry and agriculture is so tied up with Europe's security, however, that the European states will never combine together or coordinate their security industries without a political and military commitment from the United States to defend them if they are attacked.

ECONOMIC STABILITY FIRST

The two basic ideas behind the Marshall plan—as defined by Secretary of State Marshall—were that economic stability in Europe must precede political stability, and that economic recovery depended, not only on aid from the United States, but on a change of the old atomized European economy into a coordinated, efficient, self-sustaining production and trading economy.

From these two ideas, the outlines of an experiment in intercontinental partnership emerged: the United States was to supply the available raw materials of recovery; these raw materials were to strengthen the economies of the Marshall-plan countries, and these countries, in turn, were to coordinate their national recovery programs and their economies so that the 16 countries and western Germany would gradually develop into a large, productive, unified international trading area.

The order of business, as the administration saw it, therefore, was, first, economic aid from the United States and economic reorganization and coordination in western Europe; and second, through these economic measures, political stability leading to security.

What the long-range planners are beginning to see more clearly now is that it is not so easy to separate the political and strategic problems of Europe from the economic problems.

In terms of economic reconstruction in Europe, bold and emphatic measures should be taken to revive the industry of Germany, unify the electric-power system and the rail and road systems of the Marshall-plan countries, standardize certain industrial machinery, eliminate uneconomic competitive industries and build up interdependent industrial and agricultural systems in which each country concentrated on the products it could produce the best.

In terms of politics and strategy, however, intelligent economic recovery programs of this sort are not always possible. The revival of the industrial Ruhr and Rhineland makes sense economically, but the French, who have been invaded by the Germans three times in 75 years, oppose for security reasons its being effected, without assurance against a revived arsenal for Germany.

ROADS AND POWER

The European road system should be improved, for economic and commercial reasons, and the Europeans admit it. Right now, however, good roads in western Europe often stop 20 or 30 miles from the frontier for a very simple reason—a road that can take a truck from one capital to another can also carry a tank or an invading army, so in the present state of political tension, governments still hesitate about promoting international highways.

The same goes for unification of power systems. The amount of power in Europe could be greatly increased by building hydroelectric systems capable of serving parts of various countries; but what are they to do, the Europeans ask, if there is war? Then, what is good economically may be disastrous strategically.

In terms of finance and commerce similar problems arise.

Europe very much needs large capital expenditure to be self-sufficient in a modern world, and Europe still has, hidden away by private individuals, considerable capital; so long as there is political instability and uncertainty about peace, the capital will not come out of hiding to assist in economic reconstruction.

In that small and select company of Washington officials who have time to think, the theme that is being developed, therefore, is this:

The Marshall plan needs a political and strategic counterpart. We have our troops in Germany and Trieste; we have our warships in the Mediterranean, we have reopened a large air base in Libya, we are trying to meet our responsibilities in the United Nations, and we are planning the economic reconstruction of western Europe.

Our policy in Europe, however, is almost as uncoordinated and uncertain as the economy of Europe itself. We are moving boldly on a number of fronts, but by uncoordinated fits and starts.

While we are taking great chances, we have not defined our political and strategic moves clearly; and neither our own people nor the Europeans have the requisite confidence in the objectives or continuity of our political policy.

FEAR AND INSECURITY

Above all, this thesis continues, we have not dealt with the problem of fear and insecurity in Europe that threatens the attainment of our Marshall-plan objectives. Now, as in the days before the First and Second World Wars, neither our friends nor our potential enemies know whether we intend to use our power against any aggressor in the future or whether we still hope to stabilize and withdraw.

The specific suggestion that is beginning to be heard, therefore, is that our policy should have been reversed, that the 40-year treaty of alliance offered to Britain, Russia, and France against the Germans should have been a simple treaty of alliance with the British, open to other states as they chose, to stand together against any aggressor in Europe.

Once that had been pledged, Europe would have known where we stood, national economic programs could really have been planned in a way to produce an effective self-sufficient continental system, and the Combined Chiefs of Staff could have planned in a rational way.

As it is now, responsible observers here feel, we are getting the worst of every compromise we make. Money is voted for a recovery program, but the measures necessary to recovery on the other side are not taken. An air base is opened in Libya. Marines are sent to the Mediterranean, but again they are enough to disturb Moscow without reassuring Rome, Paris, or London.

All this will provide some idea why the long-range worriers at the State Department think they have more to worry about over the recovery of Europe than the short-range worriers. Both are concerned about a cut in the Marshall-plan appropriation, but for different reasons.

To those who are just trying to get the bill through, the figure of $6,800,000,000 has taken on a magic significance. To the long-range planners, who have never thought the figure was high enough to deal with the problem, the figure is important mainly as a test of whether the executive and legislative branches can really get together on a steady foreign policy.

The conversation of well-informed people in Washington is on the side of the long-range worriers. There is little that can be done now about the precise figure that comes out of the Foreign Relations Committee; Senator VANDENBERG has evidently made up his mind that a cut can be made without hurting the objectives of the program. And such is the dependence of the administration on his support that once he goes against them there is very little they can do.

STEADY POLICY WANTED

In the embassies of Washington however, the problem of getting the Europeans to combine their economies, and if possible, their strategy, is seen as probably the decisive long-range issue. As one very high official of the State Department has admitted, even $5,000,000,000 with effective political and economic cooperation in western Europe would be far better than $6,800,000,000 without that cooperation.

What the long-range worriers are aiming at is something more than the matter of a billion dollars. They want a policy that is steady and comprehensive.

They want a Europe that is really an entity in something more than name.

They want a Defense Department and State Department team that really works together effectively on strategy, defense serving the policies of state. They want dependable allies in key positions. They want a political recovery program and an economic recovery program, together.

They are not afraid that we are going to pull out of Europe. In fact they think we are going to stay there and defend the purposes and principles of the United Nations, regardless of what happens.

The point they are making is that it would be better for everybody if Moscow and London, Paris and Rome, Prague and Warsaw, all thought so too.

A Program of Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the resolutions adopted by the forty-fifth annual meeting of the American Automobile Association relating to subjects of national importance. These statements of policy represent the views of the large portion of the motoring public, for they were voted on by over 500 delegates from all parts of the United States, representing 2,250,000 association members.

PROGRAM OF ACTION FOR 1948

HIGHWAYS AND HIGHWAY TAXATION

Federal aid should be confined to general-purpose roads of national significance and based on transportation needs for those roads. All such roads should constitute an integrated Federal-aid system, clearly defined and very strictly limited as to mileage. The newly designated interstate highway network should be the backbone of such a Federal-aid highway system and should be expeditiously completed.

In order to assure priority of attention to this network, Congress should direct the Public Roads Administration to make a study of methods of financing it and to submit a proposed plan including recommendations as to Federal, State, and local responsibilities. Because of the national importance of the interstate highway network, Congress should earmark a very substantial proportion of Federal-aid highway funds for use exclusively on the interstate network, requiring that an appropriate proportion of these earmarked funds be expended in urban areas.

AMOUNT OF FEDERAL AID

The amount of Federal aid for highways should be determined by the Congress on the basis of the vital interests of the Federal Government in the Federal-aid highway system.

FEDERAL EXCISE TAXES

Federal aid for highways is a charge against general taxes. The Federal-excise taxes on motor vehicles, parts and accessories, tires and tubes, motor fuel and lubricating oils should be repealed.

ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL AID

Federal aid should be administered by one agency—the Public Roads Administration—at the national level, and one agency—the State highway department—at the State level.

FEDERAL SHARE OF COST

Federal-aid highway funds should be made available for projects within the States on a basis of not to exceed 50 percent of the construction cost, said cost to include the cost of acquisition of rights-of-way, but not to include any maintenance costs.

An exception to this general rule which the American Automobile Association urges for the consideration of Congress relates to the interstate-highway network on which, because of its national importance, the Federal Government would be justified in assuming a larger percentage of such construction costs.

NATIONAL PARK AND FOREST ROADS

In the apportionment of Federal aid among the States, special financial provisions should be made, as heretofore, for the public-land States and for the construction and maintenance of highways in national parks and within national forests, including roads whose major function is that of providing access to national parks or forests.

NATIONAL PARKS

The American Automobile Association urges that the Congress hold a hearing on the entire subject of revenues and facilities of the National Park Service. Congress should determine the extent of services to be rendered, the fees to be charged, developments to be made in the parks, policies governing concessions, and related subjects. Among the conditions necessitating such a hearing by Congress are:

1. Accommodations in the national parks are wholly inadequate, in a bad state of disrepair, and urgently in need of replacement and modernization.

2. Roads in the national parks have deteriorated badly and are in need of immediate and extensive repair.

3. There is need for revision of present policies governing entrance fees to the parks. The present system of singling out motorists for paying entrance fees is discriminatory and unjustifiable and has never been specifically authorized by Congress. Congress should establish major entrance fee policies, including limitation of amounts to be charged. Entrance fees should apply to individuals rather than to vehicles, so all users of the parks would contribute a fair share regardless of the method of transportation used in entering the parks. Provision for a season ticket should be made for the benefit of people living in the neighborhood of a park area.

RUBBER

The temporary legislation under which the use of natural and synthetic rubbers is controlled expires on March 31, 1948. The American Automobile Association strongly recommends that Congress proceed speedily with the development of a long-range rubber policy for the United States. The association reiterates its belief that it is of the most vital importance to national security that a synthetic rubber industry be maintained in continuous operation. It recommends that a minimum amount of synthetic rubber be produced and used from year to year; and that in addition to the plants in active operation, sufficient stand-by facilities be retained to permit large-scale expansion of synthetic rubber in the event of an emergency. It further recommends that government and industry sponsor programs for continuing improvements of man-made rubber.

In the allocation of synthetic rubber for end uses under a long-range policy, the American Automobile Association herewith declares that the motorists must be placed on an equal footing with other users as to the price and quality of tires and tubes and other rubber products incident to the use of the automobile.

GASOLINE

The demand for petroleum products of all kinds is at an all-time high. The balance between supply and demand is now so close that it could be easily upset. Serious product shortages could develop, including a

shortage of gasoline. The American Automobile Association views this situation with real concern. It strongly urges that steel and other materials be made available in sufficient quantities to speed up the programs now under way for oil-well drilling, new refineries, and petroleum pipe lines. It is urged that the United States Maritime Commission speed up withdrawal of additional tank ships from Government laid-up fleets to take care of domestic needs; and that tank-car building programs be accelerated.

It should be the policy of Government and industry to meet oil commitments for aid to Europe from oil areas outside the United States, and it should be the policy to balance product or crude exports with imports. Our domestic needs must at all times have first call on America's petroleum resources.

TRAVEL

International

A. The United States is urged to take leadership in bringing before the United Nations the problems of international travel regarding both individuals and automobiles. To that end, steps should be taken for the adoption of a standard, world-wide system for the issuance and recognition of passports, registration and driving licenses, and customs documents, assuring freedom of travel for all bona fide tourists.

B. The United States Congress is urged to extend the life of a passport from 4 to 6 years, through establishment of a second 2-year renewal period.

C. Since 1897, United States law has permitted travelers a duty-free exemption of only $100 on personal property purchased abroad. Despite the rise in prices and standards during the past 50 years, this country still retains the same low ceiling. This discourages American travelers from spending and from making their full contribution to world trade. The AAA urges Congress to raise the exemption limit to $500 on personal property brought in by returning tourists.

D. The American Automobile Association urges the immediate elimination of the 15-percent Federal tax on foreign and domestic transportation. This step would benefit millions of American travelers, as well as the important transportation industry.

E. No one agency of the United States Government has complete responsibility in the field of international travel. The Commerce Department is responsible for promoting travel and maintaining statistics; on leaving our shores our nationals deal with the State Department and, if they are naturalized citizens, with the Immigration Service; on returning they must contact the United States Public Health Service, customs officials of the Treasury Department, and the Immigration Service. A foreign visitor would have contact with all these agencies. Integration and correlation of the work of these agencies is urgent and imperative if we are to make full use of the potential of foreign travel. The AAA proposes, therefore, the establishment by congressional authority of a Federal interdepartmental committee on foreign travel.

F. An increasing proportion of people going abroad are anxious to enjoy the comfort and mobility afforded by using their own automobiles on overseas vacations. The international travel department of the AAA will process some 2,500 American cars for European travel during 1947. The association urges United States ratification of the international driving convention of 1926, which provides facilities for the movement of automobiles across national boundaries without the necessity of obtaining a driver's license and registration document in each and every country visited.

Inter-American

A. It is strongly recommended that all nations of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States, adopt a standard inter-American travel card permitting citizens of other nations of the hemisphere to enter as a tourist or business visitor for a 3-month period without being forced to obtain passports, visas, and other documents that now hamper travel in the New World.

B. All nations of the Americas are urged to adopt and ratify, at the earliest possible moment, the convention on the regulation of inter-American automotive traffic, to the end that private passenger cars may circulate with maximum freedom throughout the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

C. The American Automobile Association reiterates its strong support for the earliest possible completion of the all-American highway system linking the nations of the Western Hemisphere. To this end it urges that as promptly as possible restrictions on travel over the Alaskan Highway be removed, and that the Governments of the United States and Canada work out arrangements for the continued maintenance of the highway. It also urges that the United States cooperate with other American nations in bringing about construction that will link together completed segments of the Pan-American Highway.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, about all that can be said about the tax bill that the House passed today is that it is a political bill, drafted with an eye on the 1948 election. When we consider the colossal cost of our Government and the finances we are pouring into the European recovery program the fact stares us in the face that this is no time to reduce revenues. Many of our friends on the other side who voted in November to appropriate over half a billion dollars for foreign relief cast their votes today to reduce revenues below the danger line. Somehow I am reminded of the philosophy of the old-time stateman who made it a practice to vote for every appropriation and against every tax bill. From the standpoint of Government finances the bill the House passed today is thoroughly unsound. The bill offered by the minority as a substitute was not an ideal measure but it had the merit of offering relief to small wage earners and white collar workers without diminishing revenues.

A good way to justify a reduction of taxes would be to eliminate thousands of excess employees from the Government service. Years ago when I was a freshman Congressman, full of zeal, I sent out a letter to constituents inviting them to tell me their troubles, in order that I might try to help them. One man replied in a melancholy vein that he was bothered with an uncontrollable right foot and he posed the question, "What can you do with an uncontrollable right foot?"

At long last I think I have found the answer to his question. The thing to do is to use it in removing from office bureaucrats whose main purpose is to strengthen their hold on the pay roll and to glorify the particular branch of the service with which they happen to be connected.

Tensas Basin Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, first, I would like to thank the committee for hearing me at this time. I have the honor of representing in Congress the Fifth Louisiana District. My constituents requested that I express to the chairman and members of the committee their sincere appreciation for the consideration given to the several projects in my district last year.

Mr. Chairman, I am vitally interested in the Tensas Basin project. The several projects in the Tensas Basin area by name are the Boeuf and Tensas River projects, the Bayou Macon and Bayou Lafourche projects. Certainly, I am interested in all of these projects, but more especially the Tensas-Cocodrie sector of the Red River backwater area.

At this time I should like to direct your attention to what is known as the Tensas-Cocodrie sector of the Red River backwater area. This project is a worthy one. In fact it is an essential project if the people who live in that area are going to continue to live there and exist and produce the necessities of life. I pointed out last year that these people are very tolerant and broad-minded. But I repeat, if they are to continue to exist, whether they be farmers or small town residents, the subject project must have preferred consideration. The preferred consideration should be given because the area that will be protected from backwater after the completion of the Tensas-Cocodrie backwater project, has been inundated almost every year for the past 8 or 9 years. Such is not an act of nature, but has been brought about by an unavoidable result of what has been done in the general over-all flood-control improvements elsewhere. The Tensas-Cocodrie backwater project, when completed, will conserve approximately 287,000 acres of as rich land as can be found in the world. I would like to point out that on account of the rich farm land in this area the Government would soon be repaid directly and indirectly from the increase in farm production and in taxes.

I should like to request that the committee consider revising upward the amount recommended in the budget so that the amount this year would equal the amount appropriated by the Congress last year.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that 12 of the 14 parishes that I have the honor of representing have voted bond issues making available large sums of money to be expended on the Boeuf and Tensas River projects, the Bayou Macon and Bayou Lafourche projects, and if in the wisdom of the committee the amount recommended in the budget could be revised upward, then it would justify the several parishes in starting their drainage projects which will tie in with the Federal and State plans. All of the projects in the Tensas Basin can be completed at a very substantial saving if the Federal Government makes an adequate appropriation to justify the parishes in getting their part of the program underway. I repeat, that on account of the many hundreds of thousands of acres of rich farm land in the Tensas Basin, after completion of the several projects in question, the Government will be repaid in the way of increased production and direct and indirect taxes.

I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, for hearing me and I sincerely hope that the committee will see fit to provide adequate funds for the continuation of the several projects in my district now underway.

Bipartisan European Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of January 31, 1948:

BIPARTISAN EUROPEAN AID

One of the major disputes about the Marshall plan continues to be over the question of who shall have charge of it.

This is an issue which the public finds hard to understand. From the citizens' point of view, it would appear that, if the program is a proper one, and if its general scope were defined by Congress, then it doesn't make too much difference which manager is assigned to supervise it.

The issue goes much deeper than that.

As a matter of fact, the issue may be said to have been raised by General Marshall himself. He has virtually refused to have anything to do with the program that bears his name unless he is put personally in charge of it. He is willing to accept any sort of front, in the way of an advisory board—so long as he doesn't have to take their advice, and can do as he pleases; but he has refused to consider any arrangement which places part of the final authority elsewhere.

This is a stubborn attitude, and his mere mulish refusal to argue the matter has caused a good deal of trouble in Congress. Moreover, Congress has not been satisfied with this explanation for his attitude, which is that since a part of the program bears on our diplomatic problems, he as head of the diplomats should administer all of it.

Many have challenged this position; Senator TAFT is among them. He has urged that some way be found to give Congress a voice in the administration—at least, that some of the power be lodged beyond the control of the State Department. There is a scheme called the Herter plan, after the Congressman (Massachusetts) who proposed it, which would set up a board of Government officials and citizens to run the plan through a director. Ex-President Hoover has vigorously condemned any effort to operate the plan through the State Department.

On the other hand, Senator VANDENBERG, who until recently was the undisputed leader of the Republican Senators in foreign policy matters and is the one who dragged them a year ago into the so-called bipartisan approach on these matters, has appeared to feel that it ought to be possible to work out a bipartisan solution to this problem.

Recently supporters of Secretary Marshall, including such persons as Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, and William L. Clayton, advisor to the Secretary of State, have taken up this tag phrase, and are urging that Marshall be given (in effect) a bipartisan vote to run the program any way he wants to.

A deadlock has thus arisen in which it seems perfectly obvious that someone is going to have to back down.

Either Secretary Marshall is going to be told, as Hoover recommends, that he is to have no control over the program; or the various critics of Marshall's one-man control are going to have to contend with some sham of bipartnership in which a handful of other persons will have high-sounding titles, but Secretary Marshall will have the power.

If face saving is to be the question, a solution should be easy. But the real test is going to be a very simple question—when all the laws are passed and signed, is or is not Marshall going to have final authority over the program?

There are two reasons why any program which includes Marshall as one of the apparent partners in a cooperative nonpartisan system of operating the Marshall plan will never be truly bipartisan.

One has to do with the personality of Secretary Marshall. He is a very stubborn man. He is determined to have his own way in this matter. He makes no bones about it—no one could have made more clear to Congress that he proposes to run the Marshall plan the way he wants it run, regardless of whomever else Congress puts in the picture.

The other is that Secretary Marshall is neither bipartisan, nonpartisan, nor impartial.

On the contrary, he is very much in the coming race for President—not, of course, for himself but as a sort of unofficial campaign manager for President Truman.

As a matter of fact, General Marshall has been running interference for New Deal Presidents for several years.

He personally, by helping suppress the Army report on Pearl Harbor until long after the 1944 election, and by compelling Roosevelt's opponent, Governor Dewey, to keep quiet about that report in his campaign speeches, probably did more than any other one man in the Nation to reelect President Roosevelt for his fourth term.

Secretary Marshall moved in as political adviser and strong man for President Truman about a year ago, and has carefully built him up to the point where many believe the President has a better than even chance of being reelected.

It would be unfair to say that the Marshall plan was invented only because of its political value to President Truman while running for reelection. On the other hand, it would be childish to assume that the inventors of the plan were blind to the tremendous assistance which the program, with its vast expenditures and vaster economic powers, would be for the Truman candidacy.

Why should we kid ourselves?

In Secretary Marshall's hands, the Marshall plan will be neither bipartisan nor nonpolitical.

Like a coin, the plan has two faces. One is aid to Europe. The other is aid to President Truman in a desperate, all-out struggle to stay in the White House.

Radio Address to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on January 31, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, to you scores of real patriotic Americans who are writing to assure me of your continued faith and confidence in your Congressman, I give thanks.

I am grateful to you for the support you offer. These are difficult times, and I need your friendship and counsel to help solve the tough problems this Congress is face to face with.

I need your help also in making swift answers to falsehoods spread by irresponsible out-of-towners, who push their way into your circles and by aggressive action, proceed to lambast men you elect to office.

The next time you hear one of these wiseacres spinning a yarn, walk right up to him, and find out where he hails from. Chances are he's from some place south of here.

He will probably be standing in the center of a group of honest working people. He may perch on a soap box and utter vicious un-American insinuations from his flannel-red mouth.

Of course, he will concentrate his vitriol on the Congress. He will be specific in naming and blaming me for all the ills the country now labors under.

Eye this man closely. Your conclusion will be that he is subversive, that he is not American. You feel a sense of nausea coming over you as you hear him belittle the Stars and Stripes, the Constitution, and the United States Congress.

After a while, this gets annoying. The sick feeling leaves you and anger takes its place. You ask what right this individual has to smear the institutions you hold dear, and take vulgar potshots at the one you elected to represent you?

Outside of his few evil followers, this agitator carries very little weight. But he bears watching because his hysterical rantings sometimes fall on unsuspecting ears.

Segregation is my remedy for such a fellow. He is obviously not sold on America. He doesn't like anything American. He is vociferously and violently against the Congressman you want to vote for.

Fortunately, the FBI usually catches up with this type. They know he's a bad actor and you know you don't like him.

However, there are too many of these political perverts still at large. There are too many like him well on the wrong road. The problem is to keep these monkeys from multiplying.

But I repeat, segregation is the real answer. Why allow any flannel mouth to roam the streets at large under the guise of free speech to sing hymns of hate and preach the gospel of intolerance to your friends and mine? Why irritate them with such viciousness, especially when the difficulties of making a living weigh so heavily upon all of us?

I say, let's round up these Red agents and throw them out. Let's treat them all alike, whether they're Commies or Nazis or Fascists.

I say they have no right smelling the free air of this grand country if they don't want to keep it free. They should be shown up for what they are and treated accordingly.

These agents advocate the violent overthrow of our Government. They make no bones about that. They are dedicated to such an objective.

Are we going to let them get away with it? I'm not. I'm sure the American Legion, the VFW, the DAV, and all the other veterans' groups won't either.

Next week, the House is going to vote to reduce your income taxes. And I believe you'll get a reduction, too, if the Senate will go along. Even a veto from the President will be overriden, so they say.

Well, you can count on my going right down the line for a tax cut. I'm sick of hearing a few say we've got to keep these high taxes. I'm tired of seeing the American people soaked to pay other people's taxes.

Aren't they doing just that? Haven't we poured billions into the British Empire and other points west?

What have American tax dollars done for them? You and I know that England, Australia, and several other nations of the Old World have just cut income taxes.

Are you willing to keep our tax rate high so the rest can get a reduction? I know you're good-hearted and generous, but I don't think you're that soft.

So you can realize why I'm so anxious to see the tax cut go through. I'm not arguing about the amount of exemptions. The lower-income groups never get enough to suit me. I'd raise those exemptions a little if I had my way.

But I'm generally satisfied. If we can't get a whole loaf, the best way out is to accept a half or three-quarters.

Give the American people the relief they need and you will release billions of dollars in this country to purchase the necessities we all must have. The United States will be nearer prosperity than she has been since the war ended.

Thank you.

Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Atlanta Constitution:

TAX RELIEF INDICATED

The amazing lethargy of lawmakers toward the fundamental problems of inflation is almost perfectly illustrated by the treatment of oleomargarine.

Margarine is an effective substitute for butter. It is fully as good and in some respects better than butter itself. Long since has it ceased its role as the poor man's butter. Today it is the only butter known by the millions who cannot afford to pay a dollar a pound and up for the dairy product.

And while the price of butter spirals higher and higher, the people of Georgia are taking to margarine as never before. This is aptly illustrated in figures released by Marion Allen, collector of internal revenue, which show that more than half again as much taxes have been collected on margarine since last July 1 than were collected during the entire 1947 fiscal year.

Up through January 22 Mr. Allen's figures showed Georgians paid taxes of $197,658.46 on margarine. Total taxes collected during the 1947 fiscal year were $125,801.91. These figures indicate that margarine will more than double in popularity this year.

But the figures reveal more. They show the extent to which Georgia housewives, attempting to beat inflation, are being penalized by a vicious tax imposed upon oleomargarine at the instance of the dairy lobby in order to attempt to eliminate competition.

Margarine is the most heavily taxed of all food commodities. It is the only food product under control of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. On every pound of margarine the housewife buys she must pay a Federal tax of 10 cents. So prohibitive is the Federal license for selling colored margarine that only 364 retail dealers in Georgia are able to afford it while nearly 7,000 sell the uncolored product, and there are only 14 wholesalers in the State who handle colored margarine.

The dairy lobby has gone to such lengths to fight margarine's popularity, and with such success, that sale of the butter substitute is circumscribed by all sorts of phony regulations, the breach of which makes the violator liable to fine and imprisonment.

For instance, if a private family has a paying guest, it is liable for the manufacturer's tax if margarine is colored in the home. Hospitals and charitable institutions which use margarine also must pay the manufacturers' tax.

Congressmen spend much time composing grandiose schemes to defeat inflation. They much better could serve the public by spending a little time repealing the taxes on margarine, reducing its selling price to the consumer and, because of the added competition thus created, eventually resulting in lower butter prices, too.

Mikolajczyk Describes How Roosevelt Appeased Stalin at Tehran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two additional installments of articles published in the Milwaukee Sentinel which describe that while words of high-sounding statesmanship were proclaimed at the Tehran Conference, nevertheless the men of Tehran carved up Poland, not represented at the conference, without any regard for the rights of the Polish people. Until statesmen begin to act like they talk there cannot be permanent peace.

Following are Mikolajczyk's two additional installments:

MIKOLAJCZYK REVEALS CHURCHILL, F. D. R. SCUTTLED POLAND AT TEHRAN PARLEY

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment XII)

The death of Prime Minister Sikorski was mourned throughout the Allied world, with the exception of Russia. While Roosevelt and Churchill joined in world-wide expressions of regret at the passing of a great democratic leader, their colleague, Stalin, remained ominously silent.

In that atmosphere of broken Soviet-Polish relations I was named Prime Minister of our Government in Exile on July 14, 1943, after we had sought and obtained the consent of our Polish underground Parliament by means of our radio contacts from London.

My immediate task was to reassure Polish patriots everywhere that the will of General Sikorski would be carried out. As fast as the German invaders of Poland tore down our underground's posters pertaining to Sikorski and the continuing fight, we pasted up new ones. Polish fliers, who formed so great a part of the RAF, were included in our assurances.

But conditions in our undeground were of great concern, too. The Reds were dropping parachutists into Poland, not to render us the military aid we so sorely needed but to prepare the way for the coming political domination of our country by the Kremlin.

That propaganda usually took the form of violent blasts against German rule, or an occasional grenade thrown into a house or meeting at which both Germans and Poles were present.

It was never coordinated with our underground's well-reasoned attacks, and it produced only additional woe for the Poles. When one Communist grenade would be thrown—perhaps killing a couple of Germans who were of no great concern to the Poles—the Germans would line up 100 Poles as hostages and shoot them.

On the other hand, our organized underground forces were systematically blowing key bridges, wrecking German troop trains, and making other well-planned attacks.

Before his death, Sikorski had sent Stalin a plan for collaborating these Communists assaults with the larger operations of a Polish underground, which was composed of members of all Polish political parties except the Communists. Stalin ignored the plea.

Nevertheless, we attempted to aid the Russian parachutists. When we hid them the Germans killed all those instrumental in the protection of the chutists and many others who were completely innocent. When we were successful in spiriting them out of Poland, the Germans burned down entire villages in reprisal.

I pledged my word to Poles everywhere that as Prime Minister I would do my utmost to reestablish friendly relations with the U. S. S. R. As a first step, I appointed Tadeusz Romer Foreign Minister. He had served our government in Moscow and was known for his direct approach when speaking of Stalin, Molotov, Vishinsky, and other Russians.

BLAST AT DICTATORSHIPS

On July 27, 1943, I made my first public statement as Prime Minister. I recalled the spirited declaration of Sikorski for a free Poland and added, "There is not and will not be in the future Poland any room for any totalitarian government, whatever its shade or kind."

On the Russian question, I pledged a "maximum of good will and faith," and asserted, with all the strength at my command, that Poland wanted only friendly relations with the U. S. S. R.

There was no reply from Moscow, and the growing chilliness of Britain toward the Polish-Russian split was becoming noticeable. Before his departure for the Moscow conference, Anthony Eden privately told me there was little possibility that Russia would renew relations with the Polish Government unless we agreed to give the Reds that huge portion of Poland which the Red Army invaded in 1939 as an ally of Hitler.

RECALLS 1941 NOTE

I reminded him that he himself, in a formal note of July 30, 1941, had stated that Great Britain would not recognize any territorial gains taken by force, and that Churchill had said the same thing in the House of Commons in a memorable speech on August 5, 1940.

"If we give up this territory—which, actually, we are not empowered to yield—it will be only the beginning of Russian demands," I told Eden. But it was useless.

To freshen his memory, I gave Eden a number of solemly agreed to Polish-Soviet pacts before he started for the Moscow conference with Molotov and Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

I learned at the time of the Moscow conference that it was simply a prelude to the long-awaited first meeting of Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill—to take place in Tehran a few weeks later. We had heard from Washington that Roosevelt was content that as soon as he sat down with Stalin he could straighten out the Polish-Russian problem.

SNUBBED BY F. D. R.

But I wanted to see him, to warn him of Stalin's tactics. I asked for an appointment in Washington or anywhere else along the way to Tehran, but the White House said the best that Roosevelt could do was to see me the following January.

I was also unable to see Churchill, who likewise believed he could do business with Stalin, though I did learn from the British that the reason for not seeing me at just this time was a fear that it might antagonize Stalin and prompt him to snub the meeting—as he had snubbed the Quebec conference.

The world never has been told what occurred at Tehran. There was, of course, the short, lofty statement of December 6, 1943, containing such phrases as "Our nations shall work together in war and in the peace that will follow" • • • "we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences."

COLD-BLOODED BUTCHERY

But behind these classic words lay one of the most infamous injustices of history. Poland, first to fight Hitler, indomitably opposed to establishment of even the slightest kind of Quisling cooperation with the Nazi invader, had been cold-bloodedly divided by Stalin. Stalin easily forced Roosevelt and Churchill into appeasement.

I used the splendid wording of their Tehran announcement as a basis for my own statement of the same day, lauded them for upholding the quest of peoples for freedom, promised that liberated Poland would follow the precepts of democracy and warned that territorial grabs would rupture the agreement.

TALKS WITH CHURCHILL

I saw Churchill February 6, 1944, and he came right to the point.

"You know, there will be no restoration of Polish-Soviet relations unless you agree to territorial changes," he said. "As a matter of fact, the Russians are demanding political changes in your government, but we can overcome those objections, we believe, if you consent to the territorial changes. They're more important."

"But I'm not empowered to give away half of my country," I protested.

Churchill turned away, rather unhappily. "I'll have a public statement about this matter in the near future," he said.

The statement came February 22, 1944, 5 days after we had offered to permit eastern Poland to be ruled—until the peace treaties—by an Allied commission, if Poland remained a complete sovereignty throughout its western section. We called it the demarcation line.

Churchill submitted this concession to Stalin and received what he later called a "very crude answer," and so on February 22 he spoke in Commons on the Polish question and revealed officially some of the unspoken aspects of Tehran.

AGREES TO CURZON LINE

Churchill, all of a sudden, had embraced the old Curzon line as a fitting boundary between Russia and Poland, though the British had discarded that line and ratified the Riga Treaty line, which was the U. S. S. R.-Polish boundary from 1921 until the Red Army invaded it as Hitler's ally in 1939.

He said Germany had used Poland twice in his lifetime as a road of attack on Russia, but neglected to state that in the first instance—in 1914—Poland was then divided among Germany, Russia, and Austria. He neglected also to add that Russia invaded us in 1939 before the break in Fascist-Communist relations.

I had no positive confirmation of what crimes had been committed against Poland by our big-power allies, however, until a meeting I attended in Moscow on October 13, 1944, with Churchill, Eden, Averell Harriman, and Molotov.

TEHRAN TREATY TOLD

At that meeting I brought up the question of Polish boundaries by protesting against the illegality of the Curzon line as a frontier. Molotov stopped me, and, turning from Churchill to Harriman with a surprised expression, he said:

"But all this was settled at Tehran! We were all there. I want to remind you, if you have forgotten. Mr. Roosevelt said he entirely agreed about the Curzon line—that it was a just frontier—but he added that that was not a good time to announce the matter publicly.

"The Soviet Government is therefore entitled to conclude that the Curzon line was, and continues to be, acceptable to all three big powers. There is no need now for Mikolajcyk's objections."

I looked at Churchill and Harriman, praying that they would object.

They looked down and remained silent.

The British and the American leaders had made a complete about-face under Stalin's pressure. They had gone into the war filled with a determination that there must be no territorial changes brought about by force. Now they condoned just that.

ROOSEVELT PLEDGED POLAND WOULD COME OUT OF WAR WHOLE

(Installment XIII)

When it became increasingly apparent that half of Allied Poland had been appropriated by Stalin at the Tehran Conference, with the consent of Churchill and Roosevelt, the Polish Government in London attempted to resign in protest.

It was only on the advice of the underground that we agreed to carry on. With that in mind, I decided to go through with my meeting with Roosevelt and I left for Washington with a heart made heavy by the fact that I could expect little except expressions of sympathy.

D-day was approaching, so before leaving London I recorded a speech to be broadcast to the Polish underground in France and Poles impounded into military or other service by the Germans, and urged them to facilitate the entry of United States and British forces into the continent.

I arrived in Washington June 5, 1944, and saw Under Secretary Stettinius on the first day. One of our first points of discussion centered around the tone of OWI broadcasts to Poland. They were consistently following the Communist line, which made our own job more onerous, so I said to Stettinius:

"It is unwise to adopt this approach to the Polish people. If you continue to call Russia a democracy you may eventually regret that statement, and your people will condemn you.

"Your Government once called Poland the inspiration of nations, but now the OWI calls the Communist forces just that. Please don't think we have not tried to make friends with Russia, for we have. Poland just does not want to become another Red satellite."

Stettinius took a lot of notes to be sent to President Roosevelt, and when I saw the President on June 7 I found him well prepared, though strikingly older and more exhausted than when I had met him with General Sikorski in 1941.

He had only a few months before agreed, we later learned for certain, to turn over to Stalin the huge section of Poland which the Red Army had invaded while an Axis partner, but his manner was one of great courtesy.

"Poland must be free and independent," he said.

"What about Stalin?" I asked him.

"Stalin is a realist," Mr. Roosevelt replied, lighting a cigaret. "And we mustn't forget—when we judge Russian actions—that the Soviet regime has had only 2 years of experience in international relations.

"Of one thing I am certain," he added. "Stalin is not an imperialist."

I thought to myself, "Here is the perfect idealist, but his faith in what Stalin is saying, and what Stalin is doing, is sadly misplaced."

PLEDGES SETTLEMENT

Roosevelt continued cheerfully. He said that personally he and Stalin had gotten along famously at their Tehran meeting; gotten along better, he added with a laugh, than did Roosevelt and Churchill.

He had personally brought up the matter of the Curzon line at Tehran, Roosevelt told me.

"Stalin wasn't eager to talk about it," he added. "I want you to know that I am still opposed to dividing Poland with this line, and that eventually I will act as a moderator in this problem and effect a settlement."

Roosevelt then explained to me what a "moderator" was and used, as an example, the role of a moderator in certain United States labor disputes.

"I understand, Mr. President," I said. "But in the case of domestic problems you are dealing with your citizens. You can settle matters by a bill or decree. But this would hardly apply to the current Polish problem."

POLAND'S WORRY, TOO

Roosevelt paused before he went on.

"I haven't acted in this matter because this is an election year. You, as a Democrat, understand such things." He laughed suddenly. "You know, I mentioned the matter of the forthcoming American elections to Stalin and he just could not comprehend what I was talking about. I guess he'll never become accustomed to understanding that there is a device known as free elections—by which political matters within one's country may be changed."

That was my worry, too, and I told the President just that. He was more thoughtful when he answered.

"In all our dealings with Stalin we must keep our fingers crossed," he said.

Then his mood changed again.

"You Poles must find an understanding with Russia," he said. "On your own you'd have no chance to beat Russia, and the British and Americans have no intention of fighting Russia.

"But don't worry," he added. "Stalin doesn't intend to take freedom from Poland. He wouldn't dare do that because he knows that the United States Government stands solidly behind you."

OFFERS GERMAN AREAS

The President looked at me seriously.

"I will see to it that Poland does not come out of this war injured.

"I'm sure I will be able to manage an agreement in which Poland will get Silesia, East Prussia, Koenigsberg, Lwow, the oil region of Tarnopol, and the oil and potash area of Drohobycz. • • • But I don't believe I can secure the city of Vilna for you."

I was tempted to repeat that what he was offering was land in exchange for sovereign Polish areas; that Russia had no more right to half our country than it had to that portion of the United States from the Atlantic to the Mississippi, and that more than 4,000,000 Poles had by that time died in the actual or spiritual defense of the land.

But the talk was turned to other things geographical, including his memories of bicycle trips through Europe as a young man.

MORE HELP OFFERED

In the end, Roosevelt asked me to see Stalin. I agreed instantly because I still hoped to achieve better relations. Roosevelt then messaged Stalin, asking him to

receive me. He gave me a nice send-off and urged Stalin's cooperation with Poland.

Before I left Washington Roosevelt generously offered to increase the scope of American aid to the Polish underground, a notable act, and I had made a short speech—in my halting English—at a White House dinner.

In the speech I said that my dream for the future Poland was to see it become a country whose people possessed that most priceless gift showered on the American people by their own hard work and honesty—freedom.

"As human beings we are essentially the same as Americans," I said. "We could be happy with only a tiny portion of your physican possessions. We could endure a much lower standard of living * * * if we could secure the freedom for which we fight.

"I should not limit this wish to Poland," I finished. "It is my hope that the United States precept of freedom will some day rule all European peoples."

Roosevelt might possibly have been surprised at Stalin's reply to his telegram concerning Poland, in view of the fact that he was sure of his role as moderator. Stalin wired:

"Thank you very much for informing me about your meeting with Mr. Mikolajczyk.

"It is to bear in mind that the establishment of cooperation between the Red Army and the Polish underground is undoubtedly now an essential matter. The solution of the problem of Polish-Soviet relations has a great bearing in this matter.

"You are familiar with the point of view of the Soviet Government and its endeavor to see Poland strong, independent, and democratic and the Polish-Soviet relations good neighborly and based upon durable friendship.

"The Soviet Government sees the most important promises of this in the reorganization of the emigre Polish Government which would provide the participation in it of Polish statesmen in England, as well as Polish statesmen in the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and especially Polish democratic statesmen in Poland itself, and also in the recognition by the Polish Government of the Curzon line as the new border between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Poland.

"It is necessary to say, however, that from the statement of Mr. Mikolajczyk in Washington it is not seen that he makes in this matter any step forward. That is why it is difficult for me, at the present moment, to offer any opinion about Mr. Mikolajczyk's trip to Moscow.

"STALIN."

Flow of Venture Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on January 29 the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] spoke in Philadelphia, at the forum of the Investors' League, Inc., and upon the request of several Philadelphians I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The assigned question is, How can we resume the flow of venture capital?

I suggest that the over-all answer is to be found in a completed decision of the American people for the restoration of the free-enterprise system.

Politically speaking, at the present time we stand half in and half out of the system.

The Congress, elected by the people in 1946, is working for the system while the President, succeeding a President also elected by the people in the preceding election of 1944, sends messages to the Congress which are valentines to the Wallacites and commemorative bouquets to the centennial celebration of the manifesto of Karl Marx.

This is the year for clarification and for redemption.

By his State of the Union message to Congress, the President spread out for public consumption, most all of the moldy and rejected political dishes of the last 15 years.

To the credit of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, it should be said that never in our history has a Presidential message been received with such noisy silence.

The President's notion of postwar income-tax relief is to give each income-tax payer and each of his dependents a $40 a year tax bonus credit.

Even though the President's specific plan is inadequate and badly conceived, we may take some pleasure in his belated and reluctant conversion to the policy of Congress in this session and twice affirmed last year and twice vetoed, to give especially favorable consideration to our citizens in the lower income brackets.

To determine whether this proposal soundly and fairly protects the interests of all of our citizens who support the Government by payment of income taxes, let us take a look at the present burdens on those in the middle and upper brackets, take a look at the increase in those burdens since 1939, and the extent to which they would be lightened if the proposal were adopted—which it will not be.

When I refer to income, it is net income before exemption and credit for dependents. It is assured that the taxpayer is married and has two dependents. For the purpose of my point, this puts the figures in the worst possible light.

In 1939, the taxpayer with income of $10,000 paid $343 for Federal income taxes and under present rates he pays $1,862. The President would relieve his burden $160.

The taxpayer with income of $15,000 paid $631 in 1939 and under present rates pays $3,636.50. The President would relieve his burden $160.

The taxpayer with income of $20,000 paid $1,469 in 1939 and under present rates pays $5,890. The President would relieve his burden $160.

The taxpayer with income of $50,000 paid $8,621 in 1939 and under present rates pays $24,111. The President would relieve his burden $160.

The taxpayer with income f $100,000 paid $31,997 in 1939 and under present rates pays $62,301. The President would relieve his burden by $160.

The taxpayer with income of $100,000 paid $303,568 in 1939 and under present rates pays $406,600. The President would relieve his burden $160.

The taxpayer with income of $1,000,000 paid $678,436 in 1939 and under present rates he pays $838,850. The President would relieve his burden $160.

It is now apparent, I believe, that the income taxes in the middle and upper brackets in 1939 were already heavily punitive, and that sharp increases have been added since that time.

And now it can be readily seen that under the President's tax reduction philosophy whereby increases in taxes are to be shared under sharply progressive rates and decreases are to be shared by the grant of a flat, across the board, equal per capita credit, all income taxpayers, other than those in the lowest brackets, might as well resign themselves to their oars in the galley. For those taxpayers it is "Heads, I win, tails, you lose."

And this is precisely what the left-wing politicians, drooling for the opportunity to destroy the free enterprise system and to bring everyone to equalized poverty, have been working and praying for.

It is indeed lamentable that a President of the United States, supposed to represent all of the people and to protect their welfare, would turn his back on his sounder advisers and go for that kind of destructive error.

There are fair ways to eliminate and lighten the income-tax burdens of those in the lower brackets.

For example, out of $4,100,000,000 of income-tax reduction provided in H. R. 3950, which was the second tax-reduction bill passed by the Congress last year and vetoed by the President, $2,572,000,000, or 63 percent, would have gone to taxpayers with incomes of less than $5,000 per year.

Last year those facts so crippling to demagogic argument, were studiously obscured or brazenly denied by those who were opposing our efforts to reduce income taxes.

In my opinion, our next income-tax-reduction bill which will be passed during the present session of Congress, will remove entirely from the rolls several million taxpayers in the lower income brackets, will provide for relief to all income taxpayers all the way along the line including the right to married persons to split their incomes and again will assure that the greatest percentage reduction and the greatest amount of money reduction shall go to those in the lower brackets.

But the President made two low bows to the extreme leftists. He proposed to recoup the loss of revenue which would result from his flat, all the way across-the-board $40 tax credit out of the profits of our corporate employers.

Thus was touched off the official 1948 election-year rebirth of the "hate profits" and "hate your employer" themes which brought this country to economic dead center in the thirties and which, if sanctioned by the people, will ultimately destroy the free-enterprise system and the Government itself.

Also, there is a second barrel to this proposal. By reducing the revenues by one method and equalizing the loss by another, it is intended to be sure that there will be no net tax reduction at all and that the high spending by the President's agencies shall continue without the slightest restraint.

The people observed, and I believe they will remember, the frightful results of the hate campaigns of the thirties.

Their effect was to discourage the pay-roll makers, to dry up investment, to prolong massive unemployment, to force mendicancy on decent citizens, to make the Government the grand almoner, to pile up debt, to introduce class hatred, and to afflict our economic system with a wasting anemia which for the first time since the 1860's halted the previous and fabulous rise in the American standard of living.

The war compelled a halt to those divisive and destructive hate campaigns. The results afforded a startling contrast to, and condemnation of, what had been going on in the thirties.

The executive department of the Federal Government, after fumbling around and getting nowhere with its own pet "long hairs," was forced to call in the Nation's industrial and business leaders who had been trained in the free-enterprise system.

They found Uncle Sam flat on his back, bound hand and foot with the red tape which had been wound around him by a crawling horde of Lilliputian bureaucrats.

With the cooperation of patriotic workers they cut him loose, got him on his feet, and got him going. Unshackled Uncle Sam, again lean, sinewy, clear-eyed, and star-spangled, came through with the mightiest production effort of all history.

From a standing start, he armored his fighting sons with food, clothing, medical care, and fighting tools far superior to anything ever known in wartime.

We sent armadas of goods to our allies, which in a happier day were acknowledged by them as having turned the tide. While bearing the burden of war production, we maintained a higher standard of living here at home than ever before.

Then the free enterprise system received another test. The transition period was approaching. The leftist planners simply could not tolerate the thought that the productive exuberance of private enterprise would be equal to the task. We were to go back to the stagnating economy of the thirties and the depressed standards of living then prevailing and we were to like it.

To chill the marrow of our bones and to condition us into acceptance of their "crutch, cushion, and planned interference" nostrums, the planners conjured out of thin air the grim picture of 8,000,000 unemployed promptly following VJ-day, the same as in the thirties.

In Congress we were confronted with legislative proposals which in operation would certainly have assured that result. But, thank goodness, the Congress did not give them their laws.

Once more, the free enterprise system went to work, and for this dreaded transition period came up with production levels surpassing what had been thought to be the unsurpassable levels of the war years.

Once more we have not only taken care of our own with the highest living standards in all history but at the same time have fed the world's starving, have sent billions of dollars' worth of goods and credit all over the world to aid the economic rehabilitation of stricken and devastated countries. And I believe that we shall continue to do more of the same thing but on a more efficient basis.

And where do the enemies of this system go for their inspiration? To the Old World countries which are operating under the very philosophies which they would fasten upon us and which must now come to the free enterprise system of the United States for their salvation from complete collapse.

One of these days we are going to have a President in the White House who will recognize and give due weight to the fact of enormous significance that about 40,000,000 of our 60,000,000 workers have many thousands of corporate employers.

With a full and fair recognition of this fact, that President will align his influence against "hate your employer" and "destroy profits" campaigns. He will make it clear to those who are misled that if profits are hobbled, pay rolls are hobbled; that ceilings on wages must follow ceilings on profits.

He will make clear the need for incentive investment, necessarily resting on the expectation of profits commensurate with risk, in providing ever more and better tools to ease the labors and increase the output of the worker.

He will explain this self-evident fact—and if a sincere man he will be believed—that the interests of the worker, the investor, and the corporate or individual employer are all tied together.

He will bring home the fact that if any of these inter-reacting interests are hurt, all of them are hurt; that if any of them are to be protected, all of them must be protected.

He will explain that competition, unpunitive taxation, and the jailhouse will take care of the hogs and the crooks and that labor itself has the federally protected power to take care of the oppressor.

When this occurs, and it becomes clear that the enormous prestige of the Presidency is not available to the divisionists we will again have a united people in these United States.

When this is done, there will be no question about how to stimulate the formation of investment capital. Such stimulation will follow automatically and there will be a new release of hope, energy, good will, and new advances in our standards of living greater than anything that has ever happened or has been contemplated in the past.

The economics of this Presidential proposal for limits on profits in peacetime standing by themselves, are plenty bad enough. But this proposal, in combination with the President's notion for the granting of an across-the-board $40 tax bonus, presents us with an incredibly fantastic nonsequitur. With one hand the President would distribute his $40 across-the-board tax bonus with the idea of increasing purchasing power, and with the other hand he would grab a source of funds needed for expansion of production to supply the increased demand which he wants to create.

True, such a tax will catch some monopoly profits, and some profits which are the result of gouging the consumer in a market characterized by unusual and temporary scarcities.

But it is certain to be discriminatory in its impact, penalizing the new and developing business upon which economic progress so largely depends.

We should always remember, I suggest, that high profits are not necessarily excess profits. High profits may be the reward of unusual enterprise or a payment for the assumption of a great risk. In these cases, high profits are a necessary payment from the social and economic point of view. They must be paid in order to get the job done.

Because even a well-drafted excess-profits tax law cannot distinguish adequately between high profits which are necessary in this sense, and those which are not, the excess-profits tax has long been regarded as inappropriate for peacetime.

Republican and Democratic Secretaries of the Treasury alike have condemned excess-profits taxes in peacetime. No more vigorous expression of it can be found than in the statements of the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court when, as Secretary of the Treasury in the Cabinet of President Truman, he appeared before the Senate Committee on Finance in 1945, to recommend the repeal of the wartime excess-profits tax.

Among other statements, Mr. Vinson made the following:

"Repealing the excess-profits tax means getting out of the tax system a tax which certainly in its present form has no place in the peacetime system. The case against the excess-profits tax for 1946 goes beyond the facts that it is primarily a wartime control and that it is erratic and inequitable. It is also an obstacle to that reconversion and expansion of business which is so necessary for a high level of employment and income."

And again Mr. Vinson said:

"The over-all impact which this tax is likely to have on business planning as well as business profits constitutes a serious threat to our postwar employment objectives. The testimony of businessmen is that they are unable to take the risk of full peacetime business expansion until this tax has been removed. That testimony comes not only from corporations subject to the excess-profits tax; indeed, it comes primarily from businessmen contemplating organization and expansion in competition with established corporations."

The accuracy of Mr. Vinson's judgment that the removal of the excess-profits tax would be a stimulus to business expansion is borne out by the statistical record.

Between January 1946 and November 1947 the personal income of the individuals in this country climbed from $169,000,000,000 to $205,000,000,000. In the same period the Federal Reserve industrial production index climbed from 160 to 192. Construction contracts awarded, as reported by the F. W. Dodge Corp., have increased from $358,000,000 in the month of January 1946 to $715,000,000 in the month of November 1947. The removal of the wartime excess-profits tax made funds available without which such business expansion could not have occurred.

The excess-profits tax proposed by the President would set a precedent for the peacetime use of a form of taxation which has a strong repressive effect upon the incentives motivating the American economic system.

True, we are told that it is a temporary measure, to be repealed when the inflation subsides or when budgetary requirements permit.

However, as has been pointed out, the tax frustrates the tempdrary merit claimed for it in connection with inflation, and I am suspicious of the claim that we can get rid of it when inflation subsides.

It is now routine for one executive emergency to pant on the shoulder of the next one to come. We might as well be practical and adjust ourselves to the fact that under our present executive department "emergency" and "normality" are synonymous terms.

A tax which has become entrenched is extremely difficult to dislodge. Proposals for its repeal or reform are invariably met by the objection that the revenues cannot be spared. We should avoid establishing this peacetime precedent for a tax which on an emergency or long-term basis fails to meet the tests of equity and sound economics.

As is well known, the major normal source of venture capital in the free-enterprise system is in the savings of those in the middle and upper income brackets. The income of the managers of our economy is in those brackets and they must find their rewards and incentives in what is left after the tax collector gets through with them. The President's tax program is either oblivious or indifferent to this fact and to its enormous importance.

Today we face a situation in which the flow of goods and services is inadequate to meet demands, a situation characterized by rising prices, sharp increases in the cost of living, and all the inequities and hardships which these changes produce.

We should attack the problem on a wide front. But among the remedies that of rapidly increasing production is the one best fitted to the free-enterprise system for the simple reason that it does not arbitrarily reduce demand to fit the output of a reduced and less-efficient economy.

Today and tomorrow the continued advance of the standard of life of this country will depend primarily upon increased production. This calls for the continuing investment of very large sums in new plants and equipment.

It is not just a problem of replacing the equipment which is wearing out, with something that is just as good. New and better equipment must be built and financed.

It is not just a matter of going on expanding the production of the same articles and services which we now consume. New and better products and services must be developed, and this process involves the assumption of very substantial business risks.

We cannot progress if we merely continue the existing patterns of management. New techniques must be developed and applied. Such changes in technique require not only the assumption of unusual business risks,

but also unusually hard work on the part of those who plan the new techniques and put them into operation.

This is why the incentives which we offer to the men who can perform the work and assume the risks of new and developing business are of critical importance to the future of this country.

This is why I suggest that the effect of our taxes upon incentives is among the most important of the tests which our tax system must face. Unfortunately the application of this test to our present Federal tax system yields rather discouraging results.

Observe, please, the repressive effect on incentive of the levy on individual net incomes. This tax alone produced nearly 54 percent of the total Federal tax revenues in the fiscal year 1947. The Treasury estimates that this tax alone will produce about 55 percent of the total in 1948 and 1949.

It is a tax which falls heavily upon the great bulk of managerial rewards and of distributed business earnings.

As has already been noted, one of the most obvious characteristics of the individual income tax is the extreme progression of its rate schedule. We all have a general idea that this is so, but most of us are not really sharply aware of its extent or significance.

I believe the best way to present the situation to you is to invite your attention to the so-called marginal rates, that is, the amount of tax collected on additional dollars of income received by persons in different income brackets.

These marginal rates are the ones that are critical from the point of view of incentives because they show how much of the extra reward for extra effort the individual taxpayer will be allowed to keep.

Most of us are aware that the rates range from 19 percent at the bottom of the scale to a maximum of 86.5 percent. But do we appreciate the fact that an individual receiving a surtax net income of $10,000, who obtains additional net income of $1,000, must pay 36 percent of it to the Federal Government alone?

Are we aware that a person whose surtax net income is $25,000, and who earns an additional $1,000, must turn over 56 percent of the increase to the Federal Government? Do we realize that a person whose surtax net income is $50,000, and who earns an extra $1,000 must pay 71.3 percent of this $1,000 to the collector?

The effect of rates like these upon the willingness of individuals to work, to save, and to assume business risks is all too obvious.

I believe that the current stock market, among other things, reflects the unfavorable effects of these rates upon the willingness of investors to assume business risks. The market is sluggish and shows a marked preference for securities with a low degree of risk. State and municipal issues sold in 1947 were $2,200,000,000 as compared with $1,000,000,000 in 1946. Corporate bonds and notes sold during 1947 totaled $3,300,000,000 as compared with $2,000,000,000 the previous year. On these two items, which represent securities with a comparatively low degree of risk, the 1947 financing was over two and one-half times that carried out in the previous year. On the other hand, the sale of equities dropped from $1,500,000,000 in 1946 to $1,200,000,000 in 1947.

The average yield on new securities has been increasing for some time, and the spread between the rates paid on issues involving a greater degree of risk and those of the gilt-edged variety is now substantially larger than it was a year or so ago.

All this is evidence that the business community is having difficulty obtaining risk capital, and in my opinion this situation is attributable in no small degree to the severe marginal rates now imposed under the tax on individual net incomes.

If as a result of tax penalties of this size, the managers and owners of our business enterprises relax and fail to put forth their best efforts, our attack upon the current problem of scarcities will fail.

If because of these tax penalties the investors of our society are unwilling to assume the risks of starting new enterprises and bringing new products into the market, the tempo of business is certain to decline, and the rate of progress of our economy will slow down to the detriment of all the persons who make up our society.

Appreciating these facts and their impelling urgency for action, I believe the Congress will give priority to income-tax reduction.

I would not have you think, however, that the Congress is insensitive to other defects in our tax structure.

In our search for tax influences which impede the flow of capital and incentive for new plants, new tools, new techniques and new venturesome approaches without which we cannot go forward, we do not look exclusively to the field of income taxes.

Our excise-tax system, for example, is loaded with a hodge-podge of regressive levies and inequities.

Included among the suspects are double taxation of dividends, loss carry-over periods which may be illiberal, discriminating notch provisions, insufficient tax incentive to small business, too much inflexibility in allowance of depreciation charges, uncertainty over the application of tax on excessive accumulation of surplus.

These and many other matters are under study in the House Ways and Means Committee, aided by an expert advisory group.

We look forward to surpluses which will warrant reductions and corrections in addition to those involved in the first step of income-tax reduction.

Taxes are now so high and the evils of this are so manifest that the situation calls for truly massive reductions. But we will be unable to enter all of the gardens of this heaven in one jump.

First, reasonable debt reduction accompanied by income-tax reduction, and then as soon as possible relief in other fields, as surplus after reasonable debt reduction again becomes available through elimination of waste and useless functions.

The expenditure side of the budget obviously is of equal importance with the revenue side. Thus zeal for tax reduction must be matched by zeal for a less expensive Federal Government.

Finally, when this world gets itself durably postured for peace and our budget is thus freed of the terrific costs of interim watchfulness and foreign-help programs, we should be able to complete the job of reducing taxes to a point where they no longer menace the free-enterprise system.

This, of course, assumes that the people later this year will provide their completed decision referred to at the outset of my talk for the continuance of this system.

Challenges to Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Challenges to Democracy, delivered by me on Friday, January 30, 1948, at the annual meeting of the Danville, Va., Chamber of Commerce. In these remarks I undertook to discuss the Marshall plan and inflation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great privilege and a high honor to address the leading business and professional men of an old and historic Virginia city, whose origin was a small village on the banks of the Dan in pre-Revolutionary days when tobacco was not only the cash crop of the section, but was used for currency, and when the only market for that tobacco was the mother country.

In order that the local tobacco might be inspected and graded for market at a point closer than Richmond or Petersburg, the Virginia Legislature in 1793 authorized an inspection station to be located at Wynne's Falls on the Dan River, the site of the present city of Danville.

My earliest participation in politics was in support of that brilliant son of Pittsylvania County, Claude Augustus Swanson, when his seat in the United States Senate was being contested by my equally illustrious predecessor, Carter Glass. When Claude Swanson, who with great distinction had served his State and Nation as a Member of the House of Representatives, as Governor, and as United States Senator, died, as Secretary of the Navy, the flag of the United States went to half-mast all over the world. His spectacular rise from obscurity to national and international fame can appropriately be explained by only one word "genius."

Because of the leadership furnished in State, national, and foreign affairs by men like Swanson, Rorer James, and other distinguished sons of Danville and Pittsylvania, I have been privileged to know for the past 40 years, I have decided to discuss with you tonight the two major problems now confronting our Nation—international cooperation, to preserve the future peace of the World, and inflation control, to preserve the soundness of our economic system.

THE MARSHALL PLAN

At a high price in blood and treasure we won World War II but we have not won the peace for which those sacrifices were made. At the San Francisco Conference in 1945 we helped to frame a blueprint for international cooperation which was intended to be our major reliance for winning the peace. It has disappointed us. The veto power of the permanent members of the Security Council of United Nations to which we not only agreed but upon which we insisted was intended by us and Great Britain to be power in our hands to veto future war. It has been utilized by Russia to veto peace. We are now convinced that as long as Russia continues to hold that type of veto power there is no hope for the successful functioning of United Nations, a situation which could have been anticipated in the fall of 1945 because between August 17 and October 3 Russia indicated on six different occasions that she had no cooperative spirit.

Nations can drift into war but they cannot drift into peace. The relations between Russia and the democracies of the world are becoming more and more strained. In spite of the one world contemplated by the Charter of United Nations, the world is now very definitely divided into two parts with a major portion controlled by the democracies which prefer peace and the remainder by the Communists, who are bent upon expanding their sphere of influence. Two costly world wars could have been prevented if the democracies of the world had united in taking a firm stand at the proper time and proper place, against German and Japanese aggression.

When our friendly overtures to Russia to cooperate for the establishment of one world dedicated to peace were rejected, when Russia on 22 different occasions used her veto power in violation of the spirit of United Nations for peaceful cooperation, and when Russia deliberately violated the provisions of the Atlantic Charter, to which she was a party, with respect to the recognition of the integrity of smaller nations and violated her agreements at Yalta and Potsdam with respect to boundaries and free elections, we became convinced that the only practical means of checking trends that would ultimately lead to another conflict would be the economic rehabilitation of the countries of Europe who preferred peace to war and individual freedom to state tyranny. As a basis for cooperation Secretary Marshall proposed in his now famous speech at Harvard on June 5, 1947, that all nations of Europe who shared our ideals for peace and were willing to cooperate to that end should unite in formulating a program for their own postwar recovery and then indicate to us what aid they would need from us and the nations of the Western Hemisphere in implementing such a program.

In spite of determined efforts by Russia and her satellite nations to sabotage that program, 16 nations met in Paris and formulated a program along the lines indicated by our Secretary of State. When that program was received by our State Department, committees of the ablest business and industrial leaders of the Nation were formed to analyze the request for aid from the standpoint of need, from the standpoint of self-help which we were entitled to seek, and from the standpoint of our ability in terms of goods as well as of dollars to finance a European recovery program. As a result of the work of those committees the request submitted to us by the 16 nations in question was materially scaled down and our ability to finance a reduced program of that character was carefully appraised.

A conclusion was then reached that we could finance over a period of years an adequate aid program the cost of which for the first 15 months of a contemplated 4-year period would not be in excess of $6,800,000,000.

No one, of course, in estimating needs which run into billions—a sum beyond the actual comprehension of the human mind—can say with any degree of certainty whether the figure agreed upon is so many million dollars too much or so many million dollars too little. We merely know that those responsible for analyzing this program have given it as their deliberate and best opinion that the sum of $6,800,000,000 is the minimum. It may well be that some millions and perhaps some hundreds of millions could be trimmed from that program, but the burden of proof is upon those who claim that it could be reduced by one billion, by two billion, or by $2,800,000,000, to substantiate their position. An aid program which is inadequate will be money wasted.

Personally, I favor aid that will be both adequate and timely because in this emergency time is of the essence. The reason I favor such aid is that I think now is the time for us to take a firm stand on the subject of Russian expansion in western Europe. Russia within a period of 5 years will have not only the secret of the atomic bomb but a supply of those bombs, and in the hands of an aggressor that will be a weapon more terrifying than anything Hitler had. Our possession of the bomb does not disturb Russia. She knows we will never use it for purposes of aggression. What she does not know and what she now needs to be told in no uncertain terms is where we stand with respect to future aggression in western Europe. That is a message that mere words will not convey to the Russian mind and the Russian understanding.

However unpleasant the choice may be the alternative rests between rehabilitation of the 16 nations in Europe on the one hand and the development of a military establishment with which Russia would hesitate to contest on the other. Either plan involves a calculated risk; both plans cost money and involve sacrifices. Of the two plans I feel that aid to European recovery will be less expensive than a military establishment, the maintenance alone of which by 1952 is now estimated to cost in that year and each succeeding year the total of the proposed Marshall plan. And regardless of what military establishment we may succeed in building, I am convinced that it would merely postpone and not prevent World War III, and that should World War III come there will be no victor.

But in giving my support to the Marshall plan I associate myself with those who believe that we should control exports and not ship abroad food or other scarce items in a manner that would unduly contribute to an inflation that would be calculated to end in a disastrous depression. A maximum of our supplies should be tools with which Europeans can help themselves and a minimum should be consumer goods—a destroyer of production incentive. For instance, the 32.4 percent of the total proposed aid for the 4-year period to be spent for food needs to be reexamined. Of the 16 nations Great Britain is the only one which over a period of years has been dependent upon food imports. The nations of western Europe did not stop eating in 1932 when we exported to them only 20,000,000 bushels of wheat. Last winter the weather in Europe was the worst in 50 years. Last winter the black market in Europe was the worst in 100 years. Last winter currency inflation in Europe was the worst in all history—but this year crop prospects in Europe are excellent and in asking our aid the 16 nations promised currency reform and the elimination of black markets.

I also think that organizations should be set up both here and abroad to so administer and supervise the aid program as to give it the best possible chance of accomplishing the desired result. In Europe such an organization would be comparable to the organization which formulated the aid request at Paris with emphasis upon the inclusion of the leading business and industrial experts of the countries in question. And in the event of the creation of such a foreign administrative body, it would be the part of wisdom for us to create a similar administrative body in this country to the end that priority be given to sound business principles and likewise for the purpose of counteracting the Russian propaganda that the program in question is a purely political program on our part inspired by a spirit of imperialism and administered for the purpose of making dependents and satellites instead of coequal partners of the respective nations.

I am likewise of the opinion that if we go into this undertaking at all we should do so for the same purpose and with the same spirit in which we fought World War II in which most of these nations were our friends and allies. It was our war as well as theirs. They were fighting for survival and we were doing the same thing. Russia now threatens their future freedom in the same way that Hitler did, and by the same token threatens ours. I have yet to see a well-informed man who did not believe that if Russia dominated the skills and productive capacity of the 270,000,000 people of western Europe that she would then be a greater threat to our future security than the Axis powers ever were. If the proposed aid to Europe is not in keeping with our enlightened self-interest it has no validity other than food donations from a humanitarian standpoint. But if the program is to promote the cause of peace and thereby our security as well as that of western Europe, and clearly it is, we should treat the nations of western Europe as partners in a joint enterprise and not ask them to accept humiliating restrictions upon our aid or attempt to make them crawl to us in a spirit of humble supplication.

The essential characteristic of democracy is self-government. The democracy of the nations asking our aid is changed in degree but not in kind from that of ours. In supporting their form of democracy we are likewise supporting our own. Possibly less than 10 percent of the people of any of the countries in question would prefer to exchange their democracy for communism. Nothing short of economic disaster in the midst of which men are willing to trade ballots for bread would cause the majority of the countries in question to vote to give up self-government for totalitarian government. And the people of western Europe recognize even more clearly than we that they can vote on that issue only once, because once a totalitarian government is established it maintains itself in office by force. Of course, if any recipient of our aid abandons the right of its people to self-government, it would be a proper justification for the withdrawal of our aid.

I am likewise of the opinion that a union of the countries of Europe, as proposed last week by Mr. Bevin and Mr. Churchill, will be essential to the success of the Marshall plan. I seriously doubt if there can be any sustained prosperity in western Europe without currency reforms and a break-down of trade barriers, racial prejudices, and extreme nationalism among a group of European countries that are too small to be a successful economic unit.

In fact, conditions have so changed in world affairs that I do not believe any nation in the postwar world will be large enough, strong enough, and with sufficient natural resources to be a self-contained unit, and that applies to Russia as well as the United States.

Free trade between 48 States in this country has made us the best market in the world for our own products as well as those of other nations. The 16 nations of the Marshall plan group in prewar days controlled about 50 percent of the world's trade and were the major market for our exports. Trade among those nations which will stabilize their economy and promote their prosperity will likewise make of those nations better customers for our goods and not harmful competitors.

I do not have to sell that idea to our tobacco farmers, but it does have to be sold to some of our manufacturers.

INFLATION

Second only in importance to our foreign policy to win the peace is the domestic problem of controlling inflation. In fact, the two are closely related because the higher prices go, the higher the cost of aid to Europe and the higher prices go, the greater the danger of a period of deflation in which we could render no aid to anyone and perhaps would face a major struggle to preserve our own democracy.

I am convinced that Russian leaders are acting under two misapprehensions in a refusal to cooperate in postwar rehabilitation which is hurting the standard of living in Russia as well as in all parts of the world.

The first misapprehension relates to the loyalty to this country of organized labor. The Russians think that Communists can control the labor unions of our country. That is a false and malicious slander upon the American workingman who in World War II surpassed all production records the world has ever known and who would be equally loyal and patriotic should our liberty again be challenged.

The second misapprehension is that we are headed for an inevitable depression which will wreck our economy. My personal opinion is that certain price readjustments are

now overdue and inevitable. Some think that they will occur before the end of 1948. Many think that they will come some time during 1949.

A good harbinger of what is in store for the general economy is the trend of farm prices, which are the last to feel the effects of inflation and the first to feel the effects of deflation. For many years the total national income has ranged from six to seven times that of the farm income, although those in the farm group comprise approximately one-fifth of our population. In 1947, when the cash farm income of $30,300,000,000 was the highest in history, the total national income was approximately six and one-half times as great. In 1947 the unparalleled increase in the price of grain, beef, and hogs accounted for the increase of total farm income. In 1948 there will be fewer cattle marketed and normal crops of wheat and corn will send the price of those food grains much below current levels.

Recent studies disclose that in 1947 the indebtedness of Virginia farmers, including mortgage debt, short-term unsecured debt, and consumer credit, increased, meaning, of course, that Virginia farmers spent all they earned and then some more. And that is generally true throughout the years of the American farm group and is the reason loss of purchasing power of the farm group is so quickly reflected in the prosperity picture. If the cash income of farmers in '48 should fall by as much as $2,000,000,000, we may look for a drop in the total national income of approximately $14,000,000,000, and that will signal the end of the boom. From then on our major undertaking will be to stabilize prices at a level which will permit us to carry our war debt and to finance a Federal budget approximately 80 percent of which will be for past wars and future defense. If we lose that stabilization fight we will slide into a depression and sliding down hill is sometimes a faster process than pulling up hill in good times.

The readjustments I have just mentioned have already occurred with respect to such farm products as fresh fruits and vegetables, dried fruits, canned goods, tobacco, and other items in lesser degree.

An acute shortage in the 1947 corn crop, plus unusual exports of wheat limiting that grain as a feeding substitute has caused a temporary rise in food products produced from grain such as milk and its products, eggs and meat. We still have more food of every kind than we had before the war and if the alleged acute shortage of beef should occur in the coming spring months we will still have a per-capita supply of beef of 20 pounds greater than in 1939.

For the past 3 weeks I have closely followed the hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee, listening to the testimony of witnesses pro and con on the subject of preventing a further rise in prices and perhaps of reducing them. I am firmly convinced that the occasion for the price rise in certain farm products when the prices of other farm products are so rapidly falling is so fundamental that the situation cannot be reached and cured except in a fundamental way, namely, through increased production or a voluntary curtailment of effective demand. I recognize how burdensome the high cost of living has become to a large segment of our people. I am keenly and acutely conscious of that problem. If I knew any legislative fiat by which a fair and stable economy could be substituted for inflation, I would not hesitate to support it. But I believe in intellectual honesty and, with all due deference to those who view the problem differently, when my study of proposed solutions leads me to believe that what is to be offered to the people is a stone, I cannot call it bread.

The testimony presented to our committee convinces me that rationing by itself would be utterly futile and that complete rationing coupled with complete price control all the way from the producer to the consumer level would be futile without a larger army of regulators and enforcement agents than we had in the postwar days of the OPA. In spite of the best efforts of OPA to hold the line in September and October of 1946, it is now admitted that during that period 60 percent of the meat sold in this country moved through black-market channels. Edmund Burke said that nations do not learn by experience, but that experience is so recent and so vivid in the minds of all of us that I can't believe that the American people would care to risk a repetition of it. We now have in currency and bank-check money three times as much money as we had before the war. After eliminating what goes into savings and the fact that the white-collar group has less purchasing power now than it had before the war, it is generally agreed that as a whole there are approximately $2 of purchasing power in the market places for each dollar of goods and services, and as a result the present dollar ranges in value from less than 50 cents to approximately 66 cents of the prewar dollar. In many realms of service the present dollar, as compared with the prewar dollar, buys less than 50 cents worth of services. In the construction field the present dollar buys approximately 55 cents of construction. But when spent for food and clothing and the other items that enter into the cost of living, the present dollar buys 66 cents' worth as compared with the prewar dollar. It necessarily follows that the problem of price inflation cannot be solved merely by an attack on food.

Those not familiar with the extent to which farm costs have increased may be surprised to learn that while the cash income of our farmers in 1946 was then at a peak never previously reached their cost of production in that year exceeded their total cash income in the last prewar years. It now takes 55 cents worth of corn to add 1 pound of meat to the corn-fed steer. Yet most cattlemen in Virginia received last fall about 22 cents per pound for finished steers from grass, and are now getting from 25 cents to 26 cents a pound for corn-fed steers. In 1920 Virginia farmers paid 18 cents a pound for feeder steers and carried them for a year on high-priced feed and sold them in the fall of 1921 for 9 cents a pound. When Ezekiel was called to leadership over Israel he said: "For seven days I sat where they sat." Those in our cities who would like to take those hazards are welcome to try their hand at producing cheaper meat.

We want our farmers to increase the food supply for the Nation. But how can we control farm prices without stifling production unless at the same time we control all the costs of production—labor, machinery, fertilizer and transportation? But you couldn't end your controls there because the farmer gets only about one-half of the consumer's food dollar.

We have built the strongest Nation in the world under a system of free enterprise and under that system we have out-produced the world. But that is a system under which the fundamental laws of supply and demand are not unduly interfered with. It follows that to select a few items now in short supply for rationing or price-fixing or both ignores the intimate relationship between cost of production on the one hand and effective demand on the other in an economic system which is highly integrated. Not even the totalitarian power of Russia could make rationing and price-fixing work in the presence of an excess amount of purchasing power, so Russia, exercising the powers of a dictatorship, tackled one of the fundamental causes (too much money) by means of a capital levy—a process which would be unthinkable in a democracy.

The answer to inflation is clearly increased production and pending that production a spirit of patience, of unselfishness and, if need be, a patriotic self-denial. That is an undertaking in which all must share. What communism has done to Russia and what it is now attempting to do to Europe should be a warning to us. We must preserve our system of private enterprise. It is the love of God that sharpens the tools of justice; it is the love of freedom of action that sharpens our incentive to produce.

Prayer by Ministers Representing the National Fraternal Council of Negro Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, at the request of Rev. W. H. Jernagin, the national prayer, prayed by the ministers representing the National Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, on the steps of the Capitol of the United States on January 7, 1948.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our Father, the Father of all mankind: We come to this place today in Thy Holy Name. We come in sacred memory and deep gratitude for Thy goodness and mercy to us as a Nation. Thou has protected, and exalted this Nation, and permitted it to grow and prosper and sit in high places among all the nations of the world. We pray for all the peoples of Thine earth; for those who are consumed in mutual hatred and bitterness; for those who oppress; for those who groan under cruelty and subjection; for those who are hungry, cold, and shelterless the world over. We beseech Thy blessings for the outcast tribes, the ignorant, the wretched and the enslaved of all races and nations.

Thou God who has made of one, all nations to dwell upon the earth; and who, by Thy Son Jesus Christ, has broken down the walls of partition between Jew and gentile, slave and free, Greek and barbarian; break down, we pray Thee, all that divides Thy peoples one from another; shame our jealousies, lay low our pride; cast out all race prejudice, that the peoples of the world may be united in the bond of fellowship and mutual service, so that black and white, Jew and gentile, may live in peace together, in honor preferring one another to the glory of thy great name.

Help this Christian Nation to glorify the things of Thy spirit. Help us not to depend on material things for power. We need Thy protection and Thy guidance. We pray for the leadership of faith; for prophetic vision and the light of the moral mind, lest we lose our way and wander in darkness and despair, war and bloodshed. Send us men endowed with the grace of insight, the gift of interpretation and the accent of command, to guide the affairs of state.

Bless we pray Thee those who bear the rule and responsibility of our Government; the Executive head, his Cabinet, the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, the governors and legislators of the several States that make up our Nation. May they feel keenly their obligations in making and enforcing laws for the protection of the life and rights of all the peoples that make up this great Nation. Deliver them from narrow-mindedness, give them clear vision and understanding of their duties and the courage to perform them.

Help our Congress, now assembling, to consider grave and far-reaching questions, not to become a house divided against itself on questions that make for justice, progress, and peace. Help them to find a way to outlaw mob murder. Help them to enact laws that shall give to every man, woman, and child in this nation equal opportunity for education, work, and protection under the law.

Teach us all, Kind Father, how to live together in peace, no man exploiting the weak, no man hating the strong, each race working out its own destiny unfettered, self-respecting, and fearless before Thee as Father of all, unto the coming of Thy kingdom in righteousness and peace upon this earth.

In Jesus' name, we ask these blessings, and the forgiveness of our sins of commission and omission.

Amen.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. OVERTON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of an address recently delivered before the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association, in St. Louis, Mo., by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers.

Section 2 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 for the first time gave a Federal agency jurisdiction over drainage, which is of vital importance to a great section of the Nation, particularly in the eastern portion of the country, where millions of acres of land otherwise tillable and rich in fertility are in disuse because of the lack of drainage facilities. General Wheeler's address contains a discussion of this relatively new phase of our national resources development program, and it is that portion of his remarks to which I particularly desire to bring attention.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

In the course of public service it is incumbent upon a Government agency, or an association such as this, to keep the people informed. In carrying out this responsibility, particularly in the light of the President's recent message on the state of the Union and his Budget message to this Congress, both advocating the continued conservation and development of our natural resources, I should like to discuss in some detail an important phase of our flood-control work which pertains directly to land resources, namely, drainage. Improved drainage is the natural complement of flood-control improvement—so much so, in fact, that flood control is not complete unless improved drainage of fertile lowlands is provided.

The war put a tremendous strain on our agricultural production and inevitably caused depletion of our land and soil resources. It was generally assumed that with the end of hostilities, agriculture, along with many other activities, would revert to normalcy and there would be a chance for land to rest and recover itself. Such has not been the case. Moreover, we now know that expanded agricultural production and intensive use of all cultivable land will continue for a long time, if not indefinitely. Not only must we supply food for export, but our own industries are becoming dependent more and more upon agriculture for basic raw materials. This situation contributes to prosperity in this country, but it also is a sober warning that we must make better use of available land and also bring into production marginal land that can be made usable through drainage. We cannot always wring ever greater crops from the same farm lands, no matter how well they are managed. But in the same agricultural areas of the United States where farming has been the long-established occupation and the facilities for handling farm production are available, there are hundreds of thousands of acres of fertile soil that can be brought into production by economically sound major drainage improvements.

This phase of flood control is not new. The Congress has long recognized this situation and in section 3 of the Flood Control Act of December 2, 1944, it specifically placed major drainage under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers by providing "That the words 'flood control' as used in section 1 of the act of June 22, 1936, should be construed to include channel and major drainage improvements." Accordingly, major drainage improvements are eligible for authorization as Federal undertakings. "If the benefits to whomsoever they may accrue are in excess of the estimated cost." Our district and division engineers are fully cognizant of the importance of major drainage and are giving this subject careful consideration in their examinations and surveys.

This work, just like all of our flood-control work, is fully coordinated with the functions of the Department of Agriculture in the field of drainage and land conservation. Whereas our jurisdiction covers major drainage and channel improvements with large direct Federal interest, the Department of Agriculture has jurisdiction of Federal aid for extending drains directly to individual tracts of land. The two departments have established procedures to insure that the work of each complements the other without conflict or duplication.

In addition to the numerous authorized flood-control projects that involve incidental drainage improvements, the Corps of Engineers now has under way a number of projects designed primarily for major drainage improvements. Examples of these include projects located in Minnesota, Missouri, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Louisiana having a total estimated cost of many millions of dollars. Our program of investigations and examinations authorized by the Congress embraces many reports on major drainage improvements in other areas, as well as review studies with a view to supplementing the flood-control and drainage projects that have been completed or are now under way. Favorable reports for additional work of this character in western Tennessee and southeastern Arkansas are now before Congress. An investigation of this problem in eastern Texas is being prosecuted vigorously. The flood- and water-control problems of the flat regions of southeastern Florida are the subject of a report recently completed by our Jacksonville district. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors considered this Florida report at its January meeting and at the request of the Florida people will hold hearings in Florida early in February. Still other investigations are under way in the States of Washington and Oregon.

I have no doubt that time will show that practically every State in the Union has potential improvements of the character authorized by the wisdom of Congress in formulating the Flood Control Act of 1944. And before leaving this subject I want to point out that the examinations, surveys, reports, and final recommendations to the Congress for major drainage improvements will be prosecuted by the Corps of Engineers in the same democratic procedure followed in the authorization of flood control and river and harbor improvements—a procedure well known to you and thoroughly proven to be advantageous both to the people and to the Federal Government.

Disloyalty to American Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by me from Benjamin C. Marsh, executive secretary of the People's Lobby, Inc., together with the enclosure.

There being no objection, the letter, with its enclosure, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE'S LOBBY,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1948.

THIS CONGRESS MUST END DISLOYALTY TO AMERICAN CONSUMERS

To Members of Congress:

The cost of living will be the universal issue in 1948.

The release of atomic energy has determined the speed with which we must make necessary economic changes.

America must choose between a democratically controlled planned economy, and uncontrolled chaos.

The United Mine Workers Journal, July 15, 1946, stated:

"The only way to take the poison out of inflation caused by increased Government debt, is to levy capital taxes that will wipe out all or part of the debt. Otherwise it will really be boom and bust—OPA or no OPA."

John L. Lewis is correct that some form of capital levy, including much heavier taxation of land values, is inescapable, unless the national debt is to be repudiated, but that is not enough.

Establishing "parity" between farm and industrial prices, and providing unemployment insurance for a large part of workers, makes Government planning of the national economy, with public, cooperative, and private ownership, inevitable, if we are to escape chaos here, while we seek to end it abroad.

Democratic processes cannot survive chaos now, any more than they did in March 1933, when snap bills and substituting bond issues for ending economic bondage, started a course which made war and present postwar problems inevitable.

In the enclosed brief we point out:

1. Farm policies have failed.
2. Labor policies have failed.
3. So-called "private enterprise" has failed.
4. Fiscal policies have failed.

The bleakest reactionary knows we are headed for a bust—which can be averted by intelligent policies, including drastic taxation of swollen profits, personal incomes, and land values.

It is incumbent upon this Congress to enact legislation insuring production, but not through consumer's credit.

Basic reconstruction in America is a prerequisite to the European reconstruction to

which we are committed, because it is the only way to make peace possible.

Yours sincerely,

BENJAMIN C. MARSH,
Executive Secretary.

THIS CONGRESS MUST END DISLOYALTY TO AMERICAN CONSUMERS

On domestic policies, Congress has followed much of the pattern which brought Fascist controls in several European countries.

There is no reason to think America can prevent such controls here, if these practices are continued much longer.

America has two alternatives—a controlled economy, or uncontrolled chaos.

Government must adopt, and operate efficiently, policies which will insure reasonably full employment and production and a fair living standard for all, out of current income, without subsidies, regardless of pressure-group clamor.

1. FARM PROGRAM HAS FAILED

Secretary Clinton P. Anderson recently told the House Committee on Agriculture, studying a long-range policy for agriculture:

"We never used, nor are we using now, systems of soil and forest management that will sustain permanent, high-level productivity in the Nation."

The preliminary report of this committee states: "Since about 1920 the United States has had no clearly defined agricultural policy. Because of this, agricultural programs and activities have lacked an over-all guiding purpose and have been undertaken in haphazard fashion, one at a time, to meet each specific agricultural problem as it arose."

Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, discussing the three lines of defense of farming, told the Senate Committee on Agriculture:

"The first line would be to develop our marketing efficiency. We believe that this can be done so effectively that 80 or 90 percent of our trouble can be cured without calling on the Government for supports or other governmental aids."

On conservation, Mr. Goss told the Grange annual meeting in November:

"We must recognize that a system which pays cash bonuses to farmers for doing what good farmers ought to do anyway, and which does not reach the landowners who persist in allowing their soils to wash away, can hardly be considered the basis for a sound, permanent program."

The Department of Agriculture's Post War Policies Committee, recommended in January 1944:

"The agricultural production of the United States should be adjusted to national requirements with due regard for export demand and desirable imports.

"We believe that private property is a public trust, and that wherever public and private interests in land use conflict, the public interest should prevail."

In 1947, Government conservation payments to farmers were about $240,000,000; Government paid about $370,000,000 for wool, eggs, potatoes, and other farm products to keep up prices, and Government is loaning over $500,000,000 on wheat and cotton, to maintain prices, and paying high prices for farm products for foreign relief. About half of all farmers get 80 to 85 percent of total farm income, and of the increase in the selling price of farm lands, while agriculture's net income in 1946 was $18,089,000,000 and about as much in 1947. During 7 war years:

1. The selling price of farm lands increased nearly $25,000,000,000.

2. Farmers' financial assets increased over fourfold, to $22,077,000,000.

3. Cash receipts from farm marketings increased nearly threefold (193 percent) and were in 1946, $28,519,000,000.

2. LABOR POLICIES HAVE FAILED

The American Federation of Labor in its Weekly News Service (December 2, 1947) says average weekly earnings of factory workers during October was $50.97, but, "the 11-percent gain in average hourly rates and average weekly wages scored since October 1946, has meant nothing to the Nation's 13,000,000 production workers."

The United States Department of Commerce in its Supplement to Survey of Current Business (July 1947) reports that in 1946 personal income was 7.4 percent more than in 1944, but wage and salary receipts were 4.9 percent less, while proprietors' and rental income was 21.7 percent more in 1946 than in 1944.

In 1946 and before the war, wages and salaries were about 65.5 percent of total personal income, but they are now only about 63 percent.

Dividend payments conceal the relative income from ownership or control of property since, despite the requirement on distribution of profits, so much profits have been retained that surplus and undivided profits of corporations alone, are now close to $50,000,000,000, of which part is postponed income, payable at the discretion of directors or the insistence of stockholders.

Wage and salary earners, as such, do not have this cushion.

Wage and salary earners, in Government and non-Government employment, know that merely increasing rates of pay to increase the take-home pay is futile, as a method of increasing their purchasing power, without fiscal policies and economic controls to make increases last.

3. SO-CALLED PRIVATE ENTERPRISE HAS FAILED

It is not accurate to speak of "private enterprise" as long as we have private monopoly of land and other natural resources and of credit, our present patent and tariff laws, privilege fomented and maintained private monopolies, and trade associations designed to obtain for small and allegedly competitive enterprises the benefits of monopoly with immunity from antitrust and price-fixing laws.

There is now an illusion of prosperity based upon temporary conditions:

1. Depletion or near exhaustion of irreplaceable natural resources.

2. Mining the soil. The Secretary of the Interior states that every year about 600,000,000 tons of top soil are washed into the Gulf of Mexico.

3. Business inventories at the end of October were about $41,000,000,000.

4. People on small incomes have within the past 15 months used about $10,000,000,000 of their savings, chiefly to meet high living costs.

4. Consumer credit has increased to about $11,500,000,000.

6. Our exports have been running at the rate of $11,000,000,000 to $13,000,000,000 a year above imports, which cannot be kept up indefinitely.

7. Bank loans and investments were on November 1, $135,200,000,000.

The costly advertising campaign financed by industry on the "American way" shows industry knows the insecurity of that way, also markets will soon be falling off.

4. FISCAL POLICIES HAVE FAILED

Corporate profits after taxes, for the first half of 1947 were at an annual rate of about $17,000,000,000 or two-thirds more than the peak war year 1943, while surpluses and undivided profits of corporations are close to $50,000,000,000.

The United Mine Workers Journal, July 15, 1946, states editorially:

"Sooner or later thinking leaders of labor are going to awaken to the fact that, regardless of what has happened in America before, a capital levy tax is the only way out of the financial mess in which the country finds itself."

The "financial mess" is much worse now than when John L. Lewis made this statement:

Interest on the national debt is now over $5,000,000,000 a year, or about twice as much as spent on public education in the Nation.

Congress should recognize that the repeal of the excess-profits tax was in the same category as scuttling OPA. In the year after that betrayal, consumers paid $10,000,000,000 more for food and other goods than under OPA price ceilings.

The Mine Workers' Journal editorial also states:

"The only way to take the poison out of inflation caused by increased Government debt is to levy capital taxes that will wipe out all or part of the debt. Otherwise it will really be boom or bust—OPA or no OPA."

In times of genuine prosperity, or "fool's gold" inflationary prosperity, the national debt should be reduced every year at least two or three times as much as the interest on that debt; by $10,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000 a year.

That would save $225,000,000 to $337,500,000 in interest every year.

A SEVERE DEPRESSION MAY BRING POLICE STATE OR SOCIALIZED ECONOMY

United States News, December 26, states:

"Today, Government activity is the most powerful single force in the Nation's economy. Washington decisions affect the daily life of nearly everybody in the country."

It lists the number of aids and controls as follows: Business—aids, 11; controls, 16. Agriculture—aids, 10; controls, 3. Finance—aids, 6; controls, 6. Individuals—aids, 5; controls, 3.

Instead of free enterprise we have a policing state with a modified balance between aids and controls—Government subsidies to profit-making agencies and land speculators, and subsidies to the victims of exploitation.

A serious depression would make maintaining the present policing state precarious.

The alternatives then, as now, would be:

1. A police state with the police superseding both legislative bodies and courts.

2. A socialized economy with an over-all plan for all production, with due regard for desirable imports and necessary exports.

Unless plans are made now for such a socialized economy, a police state may result by default.

A planned socialized economy would include:

(a) Public ownership of natural resources; natural monopolies, such as the banking and credit system and transportation; and basic industries, such as steel, motors, much food processing and distributing, textiles, and manufacturing of building materials.

(b) Cooperative ownership of much distributive and some extractive and manufacturing agencies.

(c) A large segment of private ownership, including most farms.

(d) Allocation of materials and credit to essential uses.

(e) Taxing land values, big incomes and profits, instead of consumption.

The ERP Tobacco Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, in an address to a meeting of tobacco growers at Danville, Va., last week, I reminded them of the fact that in the past approximately 40 percent of our tobacco crop has been exported, and emphasized the importance to them of the European recovery program, under which it is proposed to export nearly 2,000,000,000 pounds of tobacco over the 4-year period.

To further emphasize the part which tobacco is scheduled to play in the recovery program, both in preventing surpluses disastrous to our farmers and in providing the type of incentive needed to spur production in western Europe, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "ERP Tobacco Program Linked to World Trade."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERP TOBACCO PROGRAM LINKED TO WORLD TRADE

WASHINGTON.—The administration's European program calls for the shipment of American tobacco to Europe in considerable volume.

There have been reports that Europe would prefer to have more food and other goods, than to receive quantities of tobacco. There also have been rumors that American tobacco interests were pressing their product on the European recovery program to establish themselves on the European market.

The following information drawn from official sources may shed some light on the situation.

According to the State Department's commodity study, the amounts of tobacco scheduled to be sent to Europe under ERP are as follows: 50,000 metric tons during April-July 1948; 190,000 metric tons during fiscal year, 1948-49; 212,000 metric tons during fiscal year 1949-50; 202,000 metric tons during fiscal year 1951-52; 663,000 metric tons during 3¼ years of ERP.

MARSHALL STATEMENT

Secretary of State George C. Marshall, speaking at Atlanta, Ga., on January 22, said: "Tobacco is another staple that will be shipped to Europe in considerable volume. It is not as essential as food and clothing, of course, but even under austere living conditions and rationing it is found advisable to make some concessions to human nature. * * * Incidentally, I don't smoke. I did, but now I don't."

The 16 European nations in drawing up their original report on recovery needs listed tobacco as a necessary import. "Though not a food," it said, "it plays an important part in the international trade and in the balance of payments of a number of countries * * * the participating countries as a whole are big importers of tobacco from overseas sources, mainly the United States. Over the next 4 years an increase in European production of 30 percent as compared with prewar production is envisaged * * * total consumption is expected to grow and is reflected in estimated larger imports both from certain participating countries and from overseas."

The 16 countries that met at Paris estimated that their average prewar imports of tobacco reached 215,000 metric tons a year. According to Washington estimates the United States supplied 133,000 metric tons of this, on the average. This fiscal year, though, the United States is supplying these European powers with 162,000 metric tons of tobacco.

FOUR-YEAR PERIOD

While the 16 European countries did not outline where their tobacco needs should come from, they did estimate their individual and collective needs over the 4-year period as follows: 237,000 metric tons during 1947-48; 247,000 metric tons during 1948-49; 258,000 metric tons during 1949-50; 257,000 metric tons during 1950-51; 999,000 metric tons during 4 years.

The United States in its ERP report, however, has estimated their total import requirements (not only from the United States but globally) as follows: 278,000 metric tons during 1947-48; 328,000 metric tons during 1948; 326,000 metric tons during 1948-49; 343,000 metric tons during 1949-50; 344,000 metric tons during 1950-51; 1,621,000 metric tons during the same 4-year period.

The commodity report on tobacco that was submitted to Congress (along with the rest of the Administration's proposed program) has this to say about tobacco's place in Europe's recovery:

"Western European countries customarily import large quantities of tobacco, and the per capita consumption is relatively high, with a pronounced upward trend when sufficient tobacco is available. * * * All countries participating in the ERP program, with the exception of Greece, Italy, and Turkey must import either all or a large percentage of their tobacco requirements."

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

"CEEC recognized the importance of tobacco in the European recovery program, for its part in international trade, and in the balance of payments of a number of countries.

"The import requirements set out in the CEEC report appear reasonable with the exception of the zero requirement listed for western Germany, and no report for France and Switzerland. Included in the suggested revision of total import requirements is an allotment of 17,000 metric tons for western Germany for 1947-48 and increasing to 45,000 metric tons for 1950-51.

"The remaining amount of the increase in the CEEC import figures is accounted for almost entirely by an estimate of about 30,000 tons of imports for France and 10,000 tons for Switzerland, inasmuch as no figure was included in the CEEC total for these countries."

ADJUSTED PROGRAM

"The adjusted program based largely on CEEC information, where it was available, represents a consistent and conservative set of estimates. There is also every evidence that tobacco will be available to the full extent of requirements. The program from the standpoint of the United States is of vital importance in order that customary market outlets may be maintained.

"World trade in tobacco will also make a contribution toward general economic stability, and a reasonable supply of tobacco in European countries presumably will stamp out illegal traffic with tobacco as a medium of exchange."

According to this explanation and the comments of the Secretary:

The difference between Paris and Washington estimates are largely accounted for by the latter including estimates for France and Switzerland that were omitted in the former.

The United States anticipates a greater postwar preference for American blended cigarettes than has been Europe's custom.

From the United States standpoint ERP imports of American tobacco are "of vital importance" if the United States is to "maintain" its customary outlets.

By making tobacco or cigarettes more available in Europe, the cigarette standard which covers much of Europe's black market may be eliminated.

Keeping Guard on Our Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Keeping Guard on Our Fisheries," from the Seattle Post Intelligencer of January 16. This subject is of real importance and interest to every Member of the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEPING GUARD ON OUR FISHERIES

Encouraging progress is reported by Congressman HOMER R. JONES in his efforts to bring about the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of State charged with representing the interests of the American people in ocean fishery matters of international character.

This is of vital importance—not only because of the benefits which would be derived by the fishing industry from such a step, but because of its effect on the welfare and security of the whole Nation.

The Pacific Fisheries Conference, held in San Francisco last September, did not overstate the case in its "Policy for Fisheries—a Policy for Peace" when it declared:

"War or peace may hang upon the fishery clauses written into the peace treaty granted to Japan. Controversies over fisheries have led to war in the past. This danger is doubled today when nations compete for food in order to survive.

"Alone among industries, ocean fisheries are international affairs. In the fisheries alone, Americans compete in physical contact with men of other nations in areas where only international law applies—and few holds are barred * * *.

"Other nations recognize the international importance of fisheries, and the need for a firm voice in their behalf. They have ministers; we have subordinates. In our State Department there is no official of rank who can meet with the fishery ministers of other maritime nations on a basis of equality. Now, when we are granting a treaty of peace to Japan—the foremost fishery nation of the world—there is among our diplomats no authority competent to represent American fisheries."

The Seattle Chamber of Commerce has gone on record in support of the Pacific Fisheries Conference demand, and only this week laid the matter before the Western States Council as part of its program for the development of Alaska. Council approval would bring the concerted backing of all the chambers of commerce in the 11 Western States.

Meanwhile Congressman JONES has been enlisting the support of Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, chairman of the Republican policy committee.

Senator VANDENBERG has promised to urge the State Department to give urgent consideration to the matter, and Senator TAFT expressed deep interest in the subject when he visited Seattle last autumn.

Thus we have reason to be optimistic, but we must not be complacent. We must keep up the fight until it is won.

The urgency of the situation was well expressed by Miller Freeman, chairman of the Pacific Fisheries Conference, in his keynote address.

"Almost alone," he said, "America liberated the Pacific, but we do not ask that it be made an American lake. We seek only equal opportunity for our fishermen on this greatest of oceans, but an equality measured in realism which recognizes:

"1. Difference in standards of living.

"2. The iniquity of employing debased currency and debased labor as weapons of international competition.

"3. The rights of Americans in the markets of America.

"4. The preferential position which a record of conservation and protection confers in fisheries.

"Finally, that the young men of the Pacific, who redeemed the Pacific, will not be driven from the sea."

As Mr. Freeman observed so eloquently, we must see that "the things America bought with blood are not given away by visionaries," and an adequate fisheries secretariat is essential for that purpose.

Whisky or Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Whisky or Bread?" from the Christian Science Monitor of January 31 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHISKY OR BREAD?

The House Banking and Currency Committee has thrown out a Senate bill to extend another month the President's authority to restrict distillers in the use of grain. Mr. Truman has countered with a vigorous message urging a further grant of powers.

Distillers have already tried to make their case in advance. They assert they use less than one-thousandth of 1 percent of the total wheat, and that their use of corn "does not deprive America or the world of a single slice of bread." This is deceptive part-truth.

The great bulk of grain is used on the farm. Percentages mean something only if they refer to grain which reaches the market. This is the grain that sets the price. This is what is available for European relief. Of the domestic commercial consumption, distillers have been using 17 percent of the corn, barley, rye, and sorghum.

The feed supply is so tight that whatever grains the distillers may bid up and buy risks that much wheat being fed to livestock instead of to people. In this situation any grain saved equals wheat saved.

The distillers say they should not be curtailed to save grain while European distilleries go right on using grain. Here they are half-justified, but only half.

When grain is desperately needed for starving people there is no logic or humanity in arguing that all distilleries should run full blast because some are not limited. We would urge that all the liquor makers in all the countries involved in the relief program should be curtailed alike, and that this proviso be made one of the conditions of American aid.

When the distillers cry that all this grain-saving talk is nothing more than a foot-in-the-door for prohibition they drag in a pretty stale red herring. There is no imminent likelihood of reviving prohibition—yet. But if the distillers want to give dry sentiment a real boost, they have only to brazenly mock the aroused humanitarianism of a people. For taking account of all shades of American attitudes, the most that can be conceded the liquor industry is that it is a tolerated business.

The Drift to World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Can We Stop the Dangerous Drift to World War III?" by Dr. Clarence Poe, a reprint from the Progressive Farmer of January 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW CAN WE STOP THE DANGEROUS DRIFT TO WORLD WAR III?

(By Clarence Poe, president and editor)

Someone has recently written a book calling our present period The Age of Anxiety, and that seems to be correct. Our scientists and inventors and captains of industry have made inventions and discoveries that should make this the greatest era of both peace and prosperity humanity has ever known. We have the marvelous machines, the giant factories, the scientific knowledge, the quick transportation, the highly trained workers. And yet we do not have peace * * * only a small part of the world (our part) has reasonable prosperity * * * and a great part of the human race lives under the dread that our military and political leaders, while professing (and probably sincerely wanting) to promote peace are nevertheless pursuing policies that somehow seem to bring us ever nearer to war.

I

And what causes war? Two things—hate and fear. Perhaps we might say three things: 1, Hate; 2, fear; 3, military preparations to wage war. If another man and I increasingly hate each other, and increasingly fear each other, and increasingly arm ourselves with deadly weapons, there is danger of death between us. And so it is between nations. Christianity teaches love instead of hate, calmness instead of fear, and says of warlike preparations, "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword." The reckless radio commentators, daily columnists, militarists, and newspaper publishers who seem to thrive and prosper by promoting hate and fear—they, in my opinion, are more likely to bring on war than anything else. The same sort of cantankerous hotheads in the North and in the South drove our two sections into the war of the sixties—to the everlasting hurt of both sections. We must not let hotheads now drive us into war again. The last words ever written by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt should be read—re-read and memorized by every young person old enough to understand English:

"Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together in the same world, at peace."

Let's readily admit that the Russians have been bad-tempered, unfair, threatening. Instead of answering with more bad temper, threats, and fist-shaking, what would Christianity suggest? Would not real Christianity suggest that more of our leaders say to the Russian people, "The mothers and fathers of America do not wish to have our sons kill your sons. We can never forget that in World War II your heroic 21,000,000 who were killed and wounded in stopping Hitler's legions at Stalingrad and on a hundred other battlefields kept America from having only 1,000,000 casualties. We want no war with a people who sacrified as much as you did for our safety and world safety. The warmongers among us do not represent the real spirit of America."

II

At this point I should like to present not merely my own opinion, but the opinion of some of America's foremost thinkers and writers as to the need for a less combative and more Christian attitude on the part of American leadership. Walter Lippmann has just written after his return from Europe: "Our own greatest danger is that we shall accept a false estimate of the European situation, and of the real alinement of forces, and that as a result we shall be frightened and violent when in fact we should be confident, constructive, and magnanimous. For our real problem is * * * to push toward a settlement which permits the recovery of Europe and of the world, and to relax the tension, to subdue the anxiety, and to end the panic."

Brooks Atkinson who lived for years in Moscow as the able representative of the New York Times sums up the present situation by saying: "We are afraid of Soviet Russia which is afraid of us * * * two powerful nations shaking in their boots at each other and competing with each other in a tempest of rancor * * * Russia is a large country populated by admirable people with infinite potentialities, but led by a handful of fanatical doctrinaires who are scared * * * Russia cannot fight an aggressive war now, nor can she risk provoking war, for she has hardly begun to recover from the appalling losses of the last."

As Pearl Buck, who has lived long in Asia and understands the orientals better than almost any other writer, wrote recently in Look magazine:

"Nothing else but the fear of a new aggression, accompanied this time by a frightful weapon, can stir Russia's people to fresh efforts. What shall we do? Common sense answers very simply, 'Anything except to threaten war.' We should do all we can to work against Communists, first of all by not talking about fighting Russia. Every time an American talks about fighting Russia, he hands a gun to the Communists. They run shouting with it to their people, 'See? I told you the Americans want to fight us!' I do not believe in appeasement. But certainly I do not believe in helping the Communists by doing what they want us to do, and by saying what they hope we will say."

As David Lawrence, one of the ablest and most patriotic American writers, wrote recently in his extremely informing and level-headed publication, the United States News:

"We must be ready to 'debunk' our own course whenever it is palpably wrong. Thus, for example, we deplore Russia's intervention in the Balkans, but we do not consider our own intervention in Greece as violative of the basic principle of nonintervention. We accuse Russia of trying to control the composition of Balkan governments and influence elections, yet we ourselves endeavored to influence the course of the Argentine people when Peron was a candidate. We blame Russia for helping the Communists in China but we help the National Government there—the side which the Russians call 'Fascist.'"

As Mr. Lawrence continued: "Our Secretary of State went all the way to Moscow last spring and was there 6 weeks and never called on Stalin, the head of the Russian Government, until after the conference had failed and was in process of adjournment. Why?" And Drew Pearson recently quoted ex-Secretary James F. Byrnes as laying down this formula for peace:

"Get people who believe deeply that we can find a basis for working with the Russians. Then support these people to the limit. When they start getting discouraged and cynical, replace them with others who are confident that a solution can be found."

III

We believe Christianity is the only way to save humanity from World War III. In our opinion, Christianity has not been tried by Congress or our President or our State Department. We believe it ought to be tried. Jesus Christ said, "Blessed are the peacemakers"—but all too many Americans now denounce every would-be peacemaker as an appeaser. Jesus Christ said, "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword"—but our militarists want us to shoot first and risk the consequences. Jesus Christ said we should try to conquer our enemies by showing a nobler, friendlier, more patient, and more forgiving spirit than they show—but too many Americans, as Pearl Buck says, play squarely into the hands of the most violent element in Russia by trying to outdo Vishinsky in violence and fist-shaking, proclaiming that we hate Russia and are ready to make war.

Participation of Garfield's Mother in His Inauguration as President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by a very distinguished writer of my State, Mr. E. E. Patton, commenting on Mrs. Garfield being the first woman to see her son sworn in as President of the United States. I believe it will be extremely interesting to those of us who are fond of United States history.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELIZA GARFIELD FIRST WOMAN TO SEE SON SWORN IN AS PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES

(By E. E. Patton)

Mary Ball Washington, born in 1707 in Fredericksburg, Va., became the second wife of Augustine Washington who had been a widower 2 years. It is said that he was literally thrown at her feet because of a carriage wreck in London. They were married March 6, 1731, but there is no record to show whether they were married in London or in America. Her son, George, was born February 22, 1732. He always addressed her very formally as "honored madam" and signed himself "Your humble servant." Her farm overseer said: "When I meet the blue lightning of Madame Washington's eyes I feel exactly as if I had been knocked down." Lafayette visited her before going back to France at the close of the Revolution and she was very simply dressed in a house frock.

She attended a big ball in honor of George after Yorktown. On April 16, 1789, George stopped in Fredericksburg to see her while on his way to New York to be sworn in as first President; he seemed to sense that he would never see her again and he did not, as she died in September of that year. Just to show the difference between then and now, it might be mentioned that Washington did not get the news of his mother's death until 2 weeks after she died.

There is a small monument in Fredericksburg on the side of which are carved these words: "Mary, mother of Washington." When the people of this country fail to understand fully these words, there will be no necessity to take thought about the safety of the country, for it will be gone.

Nellie Conway Madison was born at Port Conway, Va., September 29, 1749; married James Madison in 1766, at the age of 17. She belonged to the Episcopal Church, but attended the Presbyterian; she did not formally join the Episcopal Church until she was past 80. We find this in the minutes of the church: "Among the goodly number confirmed by the bishop was the aged mother of the President. She became a communicant at 20 and now at the age of fourscore and four, she came forward to ratify her early baptismal vows." James Madison was the eldest of 12 children. His mother died in 1847, at the age of 98.

Jane Knox, the daughter of a Revolutionary soldier, who was one of the first members of the Order of the Cincinnati, was born in Sugar Creek, N. C. She married Samuel Polk, a man of considerable property for that time. James Knox Polk was her first child, and it is said that one of her neighbors came to see her; looked at the child and said: "Your child is all right, and some day he will be President of the United States." Perhaps we might take that with a grain of salt—perhaps, two grains.

When James Knox Polk was 11, his father moved to Columbia, Tenn., and it was there that young Polk opened a law office and entered political life. Samuel Polk died in 1827 and 2 years later his widow married a man by the name of Edens. She died in 1852, at the age of 76.

Hannah Simpson was born November 3, 1798, in Pennsylvania; moved to Ohio in 1818; married Jesse Root Grant in 1821. They lived in Point Pleasant, Georgetown, and Bethel, Ohio, but in 1854 they moved to Covington, Ky., and remained there until the death of Jesse Grant in 1874.

While her son was in the White House she did her own housework and was never in Washington during his 8 years in the Presidency. Her husband and her daughter went to Washington for the first inauguration in 1869 and Jesse Grant saw his son inaugurated the second time in 1873, the only man in our history to witness two inaugurations of his son. One history says that when Jesse Grant visited his son while he was President that he stayed in a modest hotel; but I have seen it stated that he was a guest in the White House, and I think the latter is correct.

Jesse Grant died in 1874, and his widow went to New Jersey to live with one of her daughters, but she did not go to the White House while on her journey to her last home. She died in 1883, at the age of 85. The New York Herald mentioned her death in a 3-inch obituary column. It might be of interest to the people of Knoxville to know that Judge Hugh Simpson is related to U. S. Grant's mother.

Eliza Bailou Garfield was born in New Hampshire in 1801; moved to Ohio in 1810. It is said that her husband's wedding gift to her was a three-legged iron kettle. Her husband's name was Abram and her youngest child was named James Abram Garfield.

When young Garfield was about 3 years old his father died after an illness of 2 or 3 days. The neighbors came in, made a coffin, and prepared him for burial. While they were waiting for the funeral hour this innocent youngster was calling for his father. The neighbors shook their heads and said they didn't believe that "Mrs. Garfield will ever raise her three children. She'll just have to bind 'em out."

But she lived to see her son sworn in as President of the United States, the first woman ever to have that experience. Other women were living when their sons became President, but they did not see the ceremony. When he had taken the oath he stooped down and kissed his mother.

Nancy Allison McKinley was born in Ohio in 1811. She was less than 5 feet tall, but what she lacked in physical stature she made up in energy and determination. She was a loyal Methodist and it is said that she did everything about her church except the preaching; that the janitor work was often done by her. She wanted one of her sons to be a bishop, but this never happened.

Once when she was on her way to Columbus, Ohio, to see her son when he was Governor a stranger asked her if she knew anyone in Columbus. She said, "Yes; I have a son who lives there," but she did not disclose her identity. When she was a guest of her son when he first went to the White House she is reported to have asked the President if he kept a cow. He replied, "Mother, I have not been here long enough to find out."

I Belong Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the January 17 issue of Information Service, which is published by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, there appeared the account of an address recently delivered by Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, delivered before the ninth constitutional convention of the CIO. It is such a remarkable address, and so full of newness of thought and real inspiration on the relations between man and man and between man and God, that I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The CIO has published in pamphlet form under the caption, "I belong here" the address of the Catholic archbishop of Boston, Richard J. Cushing, delivered in that city on October 13, 1947, before the ninth constitutional convention of the CIO. A letter signed by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the organization, commends the address to the attention of ministers as one of the most remarkable expressions of sound social views ever uttered by a churchmen. Excerpts from the address follow:

"I am glad to come this morning because Mr. Murray invited me. But I am also glad to come because I belong here. I am a priest, an archbishop. As such, I am by office and should be by my every personal action the representative of One whom 20 centuries have hailed as their High Priest. To the eyes of other men, the Saviour appeared as a tradesman—a worker—and all those who share His priestly office should be found

present wherever men are gathered who share in the labor which was the earthly vocation of Jesus Christ.

"For this reason, priests have always belonged close to the ranks of labor, whether organized or not. In the Old World, as the late pope once remarked, the tragedy of both religion and of labor for several generations has been that too many factors and forces came between some of the priests and many of the working people. • • •

"Here in this country, in the New World, there has never been the cleavage between the working classes and the clergy against which Cardinal Manning raised his voice. Not long ago the present pope, speaking to a large gathering of Italian workers, said: 'Visit countries where the church can live and act freely, even if its members are only a minority, as for instance in the United States of America. Penetrate there in the huge organizations of industrial life. You will not find any trace of conflict between the church and working world.'

"How could there be? In this country it has been working people who have built the seminaries in which our priests are trained. Our institutions have no princely patrons; they are monuments to human labor and to the generosity of hard-working men and women. Workingmen not merely built and paid for our seminaries, they sent to them some of their best sons. I have said this before, but it is important to repeat it here: In all the American hierarchy, resident in the United States, there is not known to me one bishop, archbishop, or cardinal whose father or mother was a college graduate. Every one of our bishops and archbishops is the son of a workingman and a workingman's wife. That is one further reason why I belong here this morning. • • •

"The aims of the CIO are those of the trade-union movement and of organized labor generally. These are chiefly three: (1) the organization of the working men and women of America, without reference to race, creed, color, or nationality, for mutual aid and protection; (2) the establishment of sound collective bargaining and wage agreements; (3) the promotion of legislation to safeguard economic security and social welfare, and to extend democratic institutions, civil rights, and liberties.

"For my own part, I cannot see how any man in his right mind, certainly how any American with the slightest comprehension of Christianity, can complain about those objectives. • • • The trade-union movement has long since established its reputation for Americanism and its right to be heard. Whatever mistakes it may have made—and they are no more than those of other groups—to whatever excesses it may have gone—and these are easily balanced by those of its critics—the trade-union movement is now a permanent part of the American picture. Labor is organized and it is organized to stay • • •

"I know the criticisms which are made of organized labor and I know, as do most people, the lines currently used in the campaign against unionism. You know them even better than I do. Some of the current criticisms may have some foundation in fact. If they do, you are in a far better position than your critics to know what these facts are and how to remedy them yourselves. Many of the criticisms of organized labor, its power, its proposals, its principles, come from men who would stop at nothing to bring back days to them dear but to the rest of mankind happily dead.

"In any case, there are no problems arising out of American organized labor, no problems internal to the labor movement or external to it in its relations with the rest of the community, which American labor cannot solve in an American way within the framework of American law and in the best interest of the American people. • • •

"When I hear the excited talk about this, that, or the other problem allegedly created by organized labor, I remember a famous report Cardinal Gibbons filed with regard to one of the earliest efforts at labor organization in the United States. You know, in his day an effort was made to discredit labor organizations and even to bring about religious condemnation of certain aspects of the labor movement. Men, professing to be the friends of law and order, when really they were the foes of both so far as working people were concerned, attempted to aline the church against the new labor organizations and the labor movement identified with them. The enemies of labor were powerful; they brought their case all the way to Rome. They knew then, as they would know now, that the great masses of American labor are loyal to their religious leaders and are inclined to hear with respect the voice of religion.

"The Roman authorities asked Cardinal Gibbons what he thought of the dangers said to be present in the labor movement as of that time; the alleged danger that the wrong people might take over, the possibility of top-heavy power, the menace of political abuse, and all the rest of it. The cardinal was a calm man. He knew America and he knew Americans. He took a long-range view of all questions involving the conflicts or competitions of the various groups which make up America and when that conflict was at its hottest he would point out that the lasting concord in a Nation like ours can only come out of conflict fairly faced and honorably settled. So when they asked him whether the labor movement should be condemned because a lot of people had become upset about certain aspects of it, the cardinal replied: 'The American people behold with perfect composure and confidence the progress of our social contest, and have not the least fear of not being able to protect themselves against any excesses or dangers that may occasionally arise.' • • •

"I have read with interest some of the deliberations of both management and labor concerning the so-called guaranteed annual wage. I know labor's position on this proposal. The worry of the workingman has traditionally been this: Jobs today—but what will happen tomorrow? Up to now many millions of Americans have been unable to answer that question for themselves. As a consequence they live in a fear which God never intended should be theirs. A wage earner must have steady work and pay this week, next week, and all the year round if he is to have security. Only an annual wage is an adequate wage. So runs the labor argument and it is a hard argument to answer. • • •

"The other positive point toward which I would direct your attention is concerned with certain questions of foreign policy on which organized labor has already shown a willingness to declare itself. Unfortunately at the moment, attitudes toward foreign policy are complicated by what are called 'conflicting ideologies.' Now I do not know what an 'ideology' is. I suspect the word of being a catch phrase, a 'phoney' word which can't be defined and which is therefore used to describe something not worth defining. Nowadays we hear a lot about fighting 'ideologies,' and, here too, I am not sure how you go about fighting an 'ideology.' But I know what hunger is—and I know how to fight that. You fight it with food. I know what poverty is. You fight that with money. I know what winter is. You fight that with coal and clothing. I know what discouragement is. You fight that with friendship and friendly deeds. I know what fear is and defeatism. You fight them with faith."

Our Monetary and Credit Problems Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Our Monetary and Credit Problems Today," by M. S. Szymczak, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, on January 22 last, at the annual stockholders' meeting of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the address is estimated to make 3½ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $248.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHANGED SITUATION IN OUR MONETARY AND CREDIT PROBLEMS TODAY

Since the days when I was active in the operations of building and loan associations, many changes have taken place—changes in the number and size and activities of building and loan associations, and changes in the operation of our economy and the organization of our society. The problems which confront the central banking authorities with which I have been associated are also reflected in the problems with which you have to cope.

In 1914 the United States was a debtor Nation; a substantial part of national development had been and was being financed abroad. We were in the process of shifting from a predominantly agricultural Nation to a predominantly industrial and urban Nation. Our conventional patterns of finance drew no distinction between the fiscal position of Government and that of individuals and businesses.

There were about 6,600 organizations of the type we think of as building and loan or savings and loan associations, as compared with about 6,000 today. These associations, through the thrift and saving of their members, had accumulated total assets of $1,360,000, as compared with about $11,000,000,000 today. At the same time, there were about 26,000 commercial banks with total deposits of about $17,000,000,000, compared with about 14,000 banks today with deposits of $140,000,000,000. The Federal debt was only $1,000,000,000. Today it is two hundred and fifty-four billion.

Our pre-World War I economy was a composite of regional economies. Perhaps the heart of our central banking problem at that stage of the country's development was to reconcile the monetary and credit needs of major regions and to maintain a balance between these needs. It was largely with this end in view that the Federal Reserve System was established. At that time there did not seem to be any necessity for separate provision to balance special needs of the various regions for mortgage credit.

When the Federal Reserve Act was revised substantially two decades later, between 1933 and 1935, the Nation had become a great creditor country internationally and a great industrial economy domestically. Our monetary and credit problem had changed from the problem of distributing funds among regions—which had been solved fairly well—to the problem of controlling the total supply of money and equating this supply to various national uses. In addition, the economy had gone through a great war, two great "booms", and two great "busts." The war, the booms, and the busts were national in ramification. While regional differences in economic organization still existed, the reality of regional interdependence was a more fully demonstrated fact than ever before in our history. During these two decades there were indications that traditional methods of mortgage financing were not completely adequate. We had the notable experiment with various kinds of mortgage bonds, mortgage participations, and "guaranteed" mortgages, and we had the notable failure of traditional mortgage financing methods in the Florida "boom" and crash.

Our great "bust" in 1929 had been particularly severe and its aftermath was widespread bankruptcy, unemployment, and poverty. The economy's critical problem of that period was idle men, idle machines, idle money. It was determined to solve the problem on a national basis. Fiscal policy and central banking policy became, more directly than formerly, the instruments of national economic policy. Many new agencies, among them the Federal Home Loan Bank System, were created to complement these two major instruments of national policy.

Once more we find ourselves in a new period. We have again gone through a great and devastating war. The war has changed our position in international affairs, and we find ourselves overwhelmingly a creditor.

The balance of power between capital and labor is different from what it was in 1914 and 1935, and is still changing. The relationship between creditor and debtor has also changed, in important part because better financial arrangements and techniques have been worked out. Banks make one kind of arrangement with farmers for the repayment of loans and a different kind of arrangement with manufacturing concerns, each arrangement calculated to fit the operations of the borrowers. Relatively little mortgage credit is extended today for the short periods of 1, 3, or 5 years which used to be conventional. Most mortgage lenders have adopted the practice of writing long-term amortized loans which building and loan associations were pioneering in 1914.

The Government is no longer merely another borrower in the market. It is by far the largest borrower. The Federal debt accounts for nearly three-fifths of the entire indebtedness of the country, and interest on the debt is a major item in the Federal budget, amounting to more than $5,000,000,000 a year. In this situation, special arrangements have had to be made for selling and managing the public debt. The Treasury and the Federal Reserve work closely together in issuing, retiring, and refunding the debt. This greatly increased importance of the public debt is one of the major factors in the present inflation.

Why has this increase in the public debt contributed so strongly to inflation? If we understand this point, we shall understand why some of the problems of the Federal Reserve System are so difficult to handle.

During the war, the Government spent more than twice as much as it collected in taxes, making up the difference by borrowing. Producers—workers, farmers, and business organizations—were paid for all the production of the economy, but the taxes they paid were less than half the money spent by the Government for the goods and services needed to win the war. Producers, as consumers, therefore, were left with more money to spend or save than the value of the goods and services they could buy. To some extent, they used these excess funds to bid up prices, but because we were at war, and because some goods, such as automobiles and many others, ware not available, controls were effective in spreading the supply of goods and services and restraining price increases. People, therefore, saved. Some of the savings were in currency, some in bank deposits, and some in other liquid assets, particularly Government securities.

The country's aggregate money supply, as measured by currency in circulation and privately held demand, time, and savings deposits, is two and a half times as large as at the beginning of the defense program, about $168,000,000,000, compared with sixty-six billion in June 1940. In addition, the general public, outside of banks, insurance companies, and Government agencies, increased its holdings of Government securities to $105,000,000,000, or nearly seven times as much as in June of 1940. These Government securities in the hands of the public are practically the equivalent of money because they are readily convertible into cash. In sum total, this stock of purchasing power available to buy the current output of goods and services amounts to almost $273,000,000,000, compared with a stock of about eighty-two billion in 1940.

Most of this expansion in the money supply and liquid assets in the hands of the public occurred during the World War II period. However, further expansion has taken place over the postwar period, and in recent months the expansion has shown marked signs of acceleration. This recent acceleration of expansion largely resulted from very active bank lending to businesses and individuals.

Since the war the economy has been operating very close to capacity, and the general public has shown a pronounced disposition to enjoy all the things that were in short supply during the war, from shirts and socks to automobiles and houses. People have been willing to spend their current incomes and dip into some of their accumulated savings. They have also supplemented these funds by borrowing from banks and other lenders, and by buying on installment credit. As a result of these strong demands for goods and services—demands in excess of supplies—prices have risen, and we have had inflation. As long as the volume of goods and services available, valued at current prices, remains less than the amount of money being spent inflation will persist. This condition, in fact, is the essence of inflation.

Two other factors are adding to inflationary forces. First, the addition of productive facilities to the economy is going on at a rapid pace. Second, our large export surplus. On the first, producers are paid now for turning out machinery and building warehouses, factories, and houses, and, on the second, producers are paid now for making the goods which are being shipped abroad. But goods and services to match these incomes will be turned out by the machinery and buildings only over a period of years, and it will also take some years for us to receive goods and services from abroad in payment for our exports financed through loans.

Both expansion of productive capacity and the export surplus have resulted in additions to the money supply through the creation of credit, and by the use of funds previously held idle. An additional source of increased money supply has been payment in gold for some of our exports of goods.

This brings me to the problem which confronts the banking authorities and about which the Federal Reserve Board is deeply concerned, for it shows clearly the changes which have taken place in the tasks of the Federal Reserve System.

Here it is.

Taken as a whole, the commercial banking system is fundamentally a mechanism for creating money—for allowing borrowers to spend money which no one has saved. This is in contrast to other types of lending—lending such as your institutions, or savings banks, or insurance companies, or individuals do—which is a matter of transferring savings from those who have them but do not wish to spend them to those who do wish to spend them.

It is true that limits are set to the amount of credit banks can create by the legal requirement that they must hold cash reserves to the extent of some proportion of their deposits—which deposits are themselves largely the result of loans and investments. Banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System, which hold 85 percent of all commercial-bank deposits in this country, must hold their reserves as deposits with the Federal Reserve banks, and no income is derived from these reserves. On the average, required reserves amount to about one-sixth of commercial-bank deposits. For every dollar of reserves, credit can expand six times.

Reserves are the heart of commercial banking, and control over commercial bank credit has traditionally been exercised by control of these reserves. Three techniques have been used to exercise this control: (1) Varying the rediscount rate, or the rate of interest at which member commercial banks may borrow from the Reserve banks; (2) open-market operations, or the buying and selling of Government securities by the Reserve System; and (3) varying the level of reserve requirements, that is, the amounts which member banks deposit with Federal Reserve banks as legally required reserves.

Two of these techniques for controlling bank reserves—discount rates and open-market operations—are not so effective as they once were, while the third—varying the level of reserve requirements—was exhausted under present law as a restraining weapon early in the recent war, except for a relatively small percentage in central-reserve cities—New York and Chicago. The present limited effectiveness of available credit-control technique is due almost entirely to the size and wide distribution of the public debt largely inherited from the war. Commercial banks now hold $70,000,000,000 of Government securities, an amount equal to about 50 percent of their total demand and time deposits, which they can sell in order to obtain additional reserves without borrowing from the Reserve banks.

The traditional open-market operation to reduce excess bank reserves is for the Federal Reserve System to sell Government securities, thus drawing down private deposits at commercial banks. In turn, this draws down the reserves of commercial banks by reducing their deposits with the Federal Reserve banks.

Here, however, we come up against the problem of management of our huge public debt of $254,000,000,000. If the Reserve System were to sell enough Government securities to reduce bank reserves and curb credit expansion, it would involve great dangers for the entire economy. To make possible this volume of sales, the prices of Government securities would have to be permitted to decline. With a marketable public debt held by investors other than the Federal Reserve banks amounting to $149,000,000,000, no one can say how great this decline in prices would have to be. As prices declined because of Federal Reserve sales, investors would suffer capital losses and in turn would be encouraged to sell their holdings while their losses were still small, and these sales would further drive prices downward. In brief, Federal Reserve open-market operation to reduce bank reserves might lead to a disruptive decline in Government-security prices, which might spread to the prices of other securities. This is a risk too serious to contemplate.

Traditional open-market policy would also have serious consequences for the Treasury. As prices of bonds decline, their yield, or effective interest rate, rises, and, if Government securities were to fall seriously, all future Treasury financing would have to be done at higher interest rates, thus raising the

cost of servicing the Government debt. Also, in such a market, the price at which the Treasury and other borrowers could sell securities would be altogether uncertain, and this uncertainty would interfere with the orderly management of the public debt as well as the orderly financing of private corporate investment programs.

On the other hand, the Federal Reserve System through its open market and discount policy in close cooperation with the Treasury, has already recognized that interest rates have undergone an upward readjustment, probably in response to temporary forces. It has recognized this, first, by lowering the support price (increasing the yield) on short-term Government securities, and second, by lowering the support price on long-term obligations (with assurance, however, that support of the lowered levels would be aggressive and continued for the foreseeable future), and third, by the increase in discount rates from 1 to 1¼ percent. It seems much better to us to permit interest-rate changes in this manner than to leave the economy's marketable debt to find its own interest level in a free market, dominated by Government securities.

It should be apparent from what I have said that the most important change in the problem facing the central banking authorities is the greatly increased influence of the public debt in our monetary and fiscal affairs. After the First World War the public debt ($26,000,000,000) could be looked on as merely another set of obligations—to be allowed to find their own price level in a completely free market. This policy, which was in line with traditional attitudes, resulted in large losses to many individuals and businesses, but these consequences were not nearly as serious as those which would result from a similar policy now. The public debt today is a factor to be reckoned with in all public and private decisions. Both its size and its wide distribution have given it great leverage in monetary policy and economic conditions. Moreover, the fact that the Treasury, unlike other borrowers, must constantly refinance its debt makes stability of the market for the public debt particularly crucial.

The increased importance of the public debt is also a factor in another situation which has received relatively less attention in public discussion. This is the shift which has taken place from the hands of the banking and fiscal authorities of a significant part of the control over the supply of money. I have already mentioned the primary difference between bank credit and credit extended by other lenders—namely, that nonbank lenders lend only saving, which have been accumulated by savers, while banks also make available to borrowers funds created by the 6 to 1 expansion of deposits to which I have referred above.

It has been customary and, in the main, correct, to say that loans made by nonbank lenders add nothing to the money supply. Today this is no longer true. Before we can say whether a loan by, for example, an insurance company or a savings bank or a savings and loan association adds to the money supply or not we must know where these funds were obtained.

Take an insurance company for example. In the first place, of course, the insurance company obtained the funds from its policyholders in the form of insurance reserves on policies; that is, policyholders' savings. In this sense the funds were saved by the policyholders. But this is not the full answer. For if the insurance company had these funds invested in Government securities, and, in order to make a loan, it sold these securities indirectly to the Federal Reserve banks, it added to the money supply, or at least to the potential money supply. Such an addition to the money supply results because when a nonbank investor sells Government securities, their prices tend to fall, and if prices threaten to fall too far, the Reserve System buys in order to preserve a relatively stable and orderly market for these issues. This increases private deposits at commercial banks, and the deposits of commercial banks at the Federal Reserve banks, thus increasing bank reserves, and the capacity of the banks to lend. The effect, in other words, may be just as inflationary as if commercial banks had sold the securities. The insurance companies, the savings banks, and the savings and loan associations are apostles of thrift and foes of inflation and yet by selling Government securities to add to their currently available funds for investment they are contributing to inflationary pressures.

In the light of all these considerations, the Federal Reserve Board has recommended to Congress the adoption of a plan which we feel would restore some of the powers over the money supply which have been lost because of the great increase in the public debt. Very simply, this plan involves a temporary increase in reserves which all banks would be required to hold, except that instead of being legally required to add to their cash reserves, banks would be permitted to hold certain income-producing assets, namely short-term Government obligations.

We could, of course, ask Congress to raise the limits to which required cash reserves may be increased, but it now appears to the Board that to increase required cash reserves by this means far enough to be relatively certain of restricting bank credit by an amount that may be required, would mean reducing the earnings of banks below expenses and a reasonable return on capital. This, however, in my opinion, may become an alternative to the special reserve plan proposed by the Board.

We recognize that the Board's proposal is no cure-all and that it would only deal with a part of the inflationary problem. But the proposed measure would constitute an important, available restraint, which is now lacking, on bank-credit expansion in the present inflationary situation.

There is likely to be little need for the suggested special reserve during the next 3 months because of the large amount of Treasury surplus funds, taken from the market through taxes, which will be available to retire bank-held public debt. This will temporarily exert pressure against bank-credit expansion. If inflationary bank-credit expansion continues after this period, however, and if further Treasury surpluses are foregone in favor of tax reduction, the need for restraining pressure will be urgent. It is better to have power to deal with the situation when it develops rather than to have it provided, if at all, too late to be used.

The urgency for the Federal Reserve Board's proposal, or some other proposal to curb credit expansion, will be especially great if we relax our current fiscal policy while inflationary dangers exist. Fiscal policy is by far the most effective way to deal with the demand side of inflation just as production and particularly more production per man-hour is the most effective way to deal with it on the supply side. This means rigid Government economy and deferment of all deferable expenditures. It also means as large a surplue of tax receipts as possible so that dollars are removed from the spending stream and used to retire public debt held by the Federal Reserve System. This takes dollars out of the money supply by an equivalent amount and is a reversal of the wartime process by which the money supply was expanded. The classical precept of sound finance that debt should be paid off in boom times has peculiar virture in the case of a public debt the size of ours, so much of which is held by the banking system.

There is still another side to the credit picture.

As you know, curbing of inflationary pressures cannot be accomplished by monetary and fiscal policy alone. Among other necessary measures are appropriate private decisions. You, for example, must ask yourselves whether, as a group, you are extending mortgage credit on a sound basis—credit which will stand up in whatever storms are ahead of us. In this connection, I commend to your attention, as well as to the attention of all bankers, the program formulated several weeks ago by the American Bankers Association and the joint statement on "Bank Credit Policy During the Inflation," issued November 24, 1947, by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Executive Committee of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks.

As you can see, I have so far spoken almost entirely about a fairly technical side of the inflation problem which confronts the monetary and fiscal authorities, that is, about how the supply of money is being increased. Another, and just as important, problem is how this large and increasing supply of money is being used. Here, again, developments have removed a substantial measure of control over bank lending from the hands of the banking authorities.

Banking authorities have always exercised some measure of influence over the kind of loans and investments made by banks as well as over the total volume of their credit. Such influence has been exercised by way of statutory prohibitions of limitations, by way of varied privileges of access to Federal Reserve credit, and by way of bank supervision. Statutory prohibitions and limitations have generally been quite inflexible. Federal Reserve influence on the kind of lending done by member banks has usually been accomplished, therefore, by keeping informed as to the credit policies followed by member banks and limiting the access to Reserve bank credit of those member banks found to be following unsound policies. Bank examination policy is also adapted, in cooperation with other supervisory authorities, to changing conditions.

Developments over the past 15 years, particularly in Government programs, have modified the effectiveness of the powers of the central banking authorities. This modification is particularly marked in the case of real-estate loans. It would be rather difficult, for example, for the Federal Reserve Board to say that banks with large mortgage loan portfolios shall be denied the right to borrow at the Reserve banks—even if rediscounting had any significance today—when a large part of bank real-estate loans are guaranteed by the Federal Government, either in whole or in part. Similarly, in these conditions, a bank examiner might have some difficulty in persuading bankers to reduce the volume of their guaranteed real-estate loans or to establish additional reserves against them.

It is probably not correct to say that restraint or encouragement of credit expansion through central bank credit and supervisory policies ever exercised a decisive influence on the lending activities of nonbank lenders. It would be equally incorrect, however, so say that such policies in the past exercised no influence. Central banking policy gradually came to exert a broad influence over national credit conditions and the prudent nonbank lender took these conditions carefully into account in shaping his own lending program. But since the middle thirties, financial developments, particularly those of wartime, have tended to reduce the influence of central banking policy. In addition, the link between important sectors of the credit market has been weakened at several points.

In the case of mortgage credit, for example, where this change is most pronounced, programs and practices instituted since 1932 have resulted in almost complete separation of this field of lending from general credit policy. Even mortgage lending by commercial banks has been largely sheltered from the influence of general credit conditions. Loans underwritten by the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration are obviously difficult to discourage by ordinary techniques of bank credit control when they are being encouraged on social grounds by other agencies.

Your own organizations, the savings and loan associations, are adding to the problems of restraining inflationary credit developments, again largely because of Federal programs developed since the passage of the original Federal Home Loan Bank Act in 1932. Let me say here that I would not argue for one moment in favor of returning the savings and loan business to the conditions that existed before that date. Then, there were no effective restraints on savings and loan lending except the volume of capital available to associations, and you suffered severely as a consequence. There was no effective means for transferring funds from areas of oversupply to areas of scarcity, and developments in real estate were uneven as a result. There was not sufficient protection for shareholders against either mismanagement or unfavorable economic conditions—and many investors lost heavily through no fault of their own.

The savings and loan system has been strengthened to perform its functions, and that is a good thing. We must face the fact, however, that this very strengthening of the system has made it independent of national credit policy, in a way it never was before. Funds are attracted to a savings and loan association as much by the insurance of share accounts as by an association's reputation for being a sound, well-managed institution. The right of borrowing from the home-loan banks makes it possible for associations to make more real estate loans in a community than there are savings in the community available for real estate lending. The capacity of the home-loan bank system to borrow in the general money market makes it possible to channel the funds available for investment in institutions sponsored by the Federal Government into the particular field of real estate. All of these conditions, among others, have given savings and loan lending a degree of independence it never had in the days when the only resources of an association were the investments of its shareholders and depositors and loans from commercial banks.

Let me emphasize that the present condition is much sounder than the earlier condition. Home-mortgage credit, accounting as it does for almost a fifth of all private debt, is important enough in the economy to warrant special facilities operating under special legislation. Just because it is so important, however, its general policies need to be related to and integrated with broad national policy in the credit and fiscal areas. Mortgage credit can and does add to inflationary pressures at a time like the present. I know you realize that credit is needed to finance the construction of houses and you are making more and more of your loans for this purpose. You are also aware that credit extended for the construction of more houses than can be built with the materials and labor available drives prices upward and I am sure you are limiting your lending in such a way as to minimize these price pressures. As experienced businessmen you know not to lend money to Tom Jones just so that he can pay more for a house than Harry Smith can afford, because that is the way bad loans are made and bad loans seem to have a way of staying on the books longer than good loans.

And now let me summarize and conclude my remarks on this occasion.

Important changes have taken place in the structure of our economy and in the organization of our society. As a result central banking and fiscal policies have lost a large part of the influence they once exerted over the supply of money. The credit and monetary control thus lost has not been placed in other hands but has been diffused throughout all financial sectors. At the same time, national influence over the use to which the money supply is put—never as strong as control of the supply itself—has been weakened, partly by these same forces, partly also by the independence which particular credit programs have had because they are specially sanctioned and encouraged by the Government for social reasons.

The Reserve Board has recommended adoption of a special reserve plan which it believes would restore a desirable degree of control over the money supply. I suggest that the reconstruction and strengthening of policy controls over the use to which the credit supply is put also requires careful and conscientious study. I do not suggest that we keep reaching out for more power and more controls, but I am aware of the fact that in honestly and sincerely seeking to promote economic stability at a high level, new effective techniques may have to be devised to meet the changing situation. For many years the Board has been able to control the flow of bank credit into the securities market, and during the war it was given the task of regulating consumer credit. The Board has recently asked Congress to renew this power, at least so far as installment credit is concerned.

It is possible that central banking policy will find the instruments necessary to perform its tasks under the new conditions which we face in a combination of traditional controls over the supply of money and selective controls over the use to which credit is put. If this be so, cooperation will be necessary between the central banking authorities and other agencies. For example, the mortgage credit field may be one in which such coopertation will be fruitful. At any rate, this is a question that you and we should be studying at this time, both separately and jointly.

The problems which monetary and credit policy must face today are different from those of a few years ago. On our success in finding ways to deal with these problems will depend in no small measure our success in reaching the goal of sustained prosperity.

Coal Production in the Ruhr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Time magazine carries a statement by Gen. Lucius Clay that the tonnage of coal in the Ruhr district is about 254,000 tons daily. I do not know why the General is boasting, for he has no reason to do so. In fact, it should be embarrassing to him, or to anyone else with authority over there, to mention it at all. To realize this, all one needs to know is that this tonnage is only one-third of the normal, prewar production of that area. Even after the peace was signed and our troops were in control of the area under General Eisenhower, the production of coal stood at about 400,000 tons a day.

The new bizonal arrangement, whereby we share responsibility with the British for production of coal in the Ruhr, does not seem to be working out so well, as many of us suspected. Last summer, just before the transition from British to dual control, the production was about 230,000 tons a day. Some spokesmen for the War Department here in Washington said then it would be up to 300,000 tons by the end of 1947, which was a laughing matter to those who knew something about the situation.

This condition would not be so serious or be the subject of comment if it were not that coal production is so important to the recovery of western Europe. There can be no recovery or success of the Marshall plan without full production of coal in the Ruhr district. That is indisputable, for coal is basic and this is the area from which it must come.

I do not know where lies the responsibility for failure to bring about greater coal production in the Ruhr and failure to repair the chemical plants, especially for the production of nitrogen or fertilizer. Fertilizer plants have been lying idle or have been dismantled. The production of nitrogen was in the neighborhood of 700,000 tons a year before the war, and now it is about 150,000. In the meantime the shortage must be made up by shipments from the United States, where it is also badly needed. This would be unnecessary if there were ample coal production in the Ruhr and by rehabilitation of the byproduct coke plants.

Let us do away with this short-sighted policy and get rid of people who cannot see beyond their noses in this. Last summer, on returning from Europe, I said, and also told the President, that the quickest way to get production in the Ruhr district was for us to assume responsibility for the operation of those mines and coke plants and put our own technicians, engineers, and managers in charge. I am satisfied that we could do the job as it should be done, instead of having people over there sitting around playing tiddlywinks with coal production while the taxpayers of this country pay for their indifference.

Until recently, and perhaps now, we had no one on our staff in Germany who knew anything about coal production, no competent engineers, no experienced managers.

Building Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a

report on the book, Building Citizenship. This report was rendered by a Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Recreation of the District of Columbia. I commend the reading of the report to my colleagues.

REPORT ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE TEXT-BOOK ENTITLED "BUILDING CITIZENSHIP"

The Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Recreation of the District of Columbia Committee held executive hearings on December 4 and 6, 1947, and January 15, 1948, on the book, Building Citizenship. At these meetings the Veterans of Foreign Wars, represented by Charles F. Sullivan, Jr., the American Veterans Committee, represented by Maynard B. DeWitt; the author of the book, Dr. Ray O. Hughes; and Dr. Hobart M. Corning, Superintendent of the District Schools, were heard.

The subcommittee finds that the book Building Citizenship is now used in several States and a number of jurisdictions. The subcommittee realizes that dealing with school textbooks and suggesting how and what to teach the growing child is a delicate and complex problem. The results obtained from any instruction depend a great deal upon how the teacher presents the subject. The teacher surely directs and molds the thinking of the students.

Our free public schools are distinctly an American institution. Under this system every child is entitled to an equal opportunity for a sound education. The American taxpayers support our educational system, and they have the right to demand that our schools be really American in viewpoint and influence. Our educational system is the bulwark of our freedom and generally enjoys the confidence of our people. It can only enjoy this confidence if it is kept free from politics and propaganda.

The Board of Education, Superintendent of Schools, and the teachers of the District of Columbia are legally and morally charged with the responsibility of education in the District of Columbia. In that respect they are more than individuals. Textbook writers guide the thinking of classes using textbooks. They are in a powerful position to mold the plastic minds and the attitudes about our American way of life. The subcommittee feels that all educators should aim to educate the children and influence their faith and belief in the basic principles upon which our liberties are founded. They should allow no subversive ideologies to be taught to our children.

The subcommittee feels that the book Building Citizenship needs revisions because there has been an overemphasis on the unfavorable aspects of our American way of life and history, with an underemphasis on the favorable aspects or an omission of their mention entirely. There has been too much said about poverty, depression, unemployment, and other ills, but not enough mention of the tremendous economic and social progress made by our people.

The subcommittee likewise is of the opinion and recommends that now and in the future those responsible for the selection of textbooks and the textbook committee of the Board of Education carefully review year by year all social studies and teaching materials that are used in the District of Columbia, taking into consideration the rapidly changing events of the world.

The book in question, Building Citizenship, consists of some 760 pages and is used in the District schools as a basic book of instruction, starting with the ninth grade. It attempts to cover the entire field of history, civics, government, and related subjects.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars appeared before the subcommittee condemning certain sections of the book as not teaching good Americanism. They make a particular reference to the quotation from the immigrant who said, "America—a place like heaven for the rich and like hell for foreign worker." The subcommittee feels that this statement is not properly counterbalanced by statements from immigrants, and there are millions of them, who praise our country. The quotation serves no useful purpose if, as the author stated, it was included to teach consideration for immigrants. The statement or similar reference should be more comprehensive or omitted.

The subcommittee feels that the reference to the teaching concerning the respective religions and the life hereafter, criticized by the Veterans of Foreign Wars which appears at the bottom of page 181, are objectionable and should be deleted in any future editions of the book. The author has agreed to make the necessary changes.

The subcommittee feels that in many instances the conditions in Russia and its type of government have been inaccurately reported. It should be remembered that this book is being used by youngsters in the ninth grade who are approximately 14 years of age. Their minds are receptive and pliable and great emphasis should be placed upon the glorious position our Nation holds in the hearts of our citizens.

In many instances the book seems to select the minute imperfections in our system of government and to magnify them without giving credit to the thousands of good things under our system of government. In the light of information available the book does not paint a true picture of the real life in Russia under communism. The students should be taught the truth about communism and the book should state clearly that communism, as we understand it, seeks to destroy free enterprise, religious institutions, and to completely regiment the individual under the control of a dictator.

Students must know the truth and they cannot know the truth unless taught the evils of communism. The subcommittee feels there is no necessity for the book to carry a picture of Stalin and hold him up as a hero. If the book places favorable emphasis on Russia and her system of government and then places our own American institutions in an unfavorable position, it is not in proper balance. In some instances it seems to do so.

Our present form of government is based upon the existence of two strong political parties. The book states:

"Sometimes we wish we could get along without political parties, but we have not learned how to do so. If we must have them how can they be used for good rather than harm."

In this quotation the student is impressed with the thought that political parties do harm rather than good. Such teaching is contrary to the concept of good Americanism and the achievements attained and the opportunities available to each individual under our two-party system.

The author of the book, R. O. Hughes, when he appeared before the subcommittee on January 16, 1948, pointed out certain revisions which he is making in the book. The subcommittee feels that these revisions will help remove some of the objections to the text which appeared in previous editions.

The subcommittee feels that the books written by Louis Adamic, Harold Rugg, and Louise Krueger, and others cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities have no place in the school system of the District of Columbia. They should promptly be removed, both from the schools and the library and be given no further recognition. This is the more important because the Walt Whitman School, of which Louise Krueger is a director, has been cited by the Department of Justice as subversive and disloyal to the United States Government.

The subcommittee recommends:

(1) A revision of the book to delete all of the unfounded favorable comments on Russia.

(2) The school authorities and the teachers should continue with renewed vigor to teach the evils of communism and its destruction of individual liberty and freedom because:

(a) It seeks to overthrow our form of government.

(b) It is opposed to private enterprise.

(c) It is opposed to morality and freedom of religion.

(d) It is opposed to freedom of speech.

(e) It is opposed to freedom of the ballot.

(f) It fosters slave labor and concentration camps.

(g) It permits no freedom of collective bargaining.

The subcommittee cannot emphasize too strongly the fact that the schools, citizens' groups, and all of us must be eternally vigilant and insist that only the highest quality of Americanism, integrity, morality, and good citizenship be taught in our schools.

The subcommittee was impressed with the fact that the school authorities appearing before the subcommittee had a common objective, that of teaching good citizenship and keeping America strong. We commend the VFW and the citizens of Washington who have written and shown a keen interest in the District schools. We hope they will have a continuing constructive interest in our schools and in our Government. The subcommittee believes that the salvation of our Nation is in the watchfulness of its citizens.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting as a part of my remarks on taxation a radio address delivered by a very distinguished tax expert in my district, Mr. Samuel J. Lasser, of Jamestown, N. Y. Mr. Lasser delivered the following address on the Town Hall program in New York City on January 27, 1948. I am sure that those interested in taxation will be very glad of this contribution to the subject.

SHOULD THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PLAN BE ADOPTED?

By implication Mr. Denny has made an expert of me, and I want to put a quick disclaimer. When I was 20 I thought I knew all the answers, but I am over 40 now and I'm not quite so sure. This evening my colleagues are all in official positions in public life, while I come from the "grass roots," a small but energetic industrial city in western New York—Jamestown.

Back in reconstruction days northern carpetbaggers offered each of our colored brethren the bait of 40 acres and a mule. This time the offer to all of us is $40, and no mule. A good many people, who have no ax to grind, feel that Mr. Truman's proposal is merely political hocus pocus. I wouldn't know about that. I'll just treat it as a tax proposal, not politics, and in the time allotted to me try to make a few points clear as my reasons for not favoring it.

The President's own circle is not sold on the plan. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder has admitted that he wasn't even consulted about it. And in Congress the high-ranking member of the President's party wouldn't introduce the bill for it. The President's plan is not a tax-reducing plan. It proposes to collect in taxes just as much as before. Don't forget that the tax rates now on individuals

are near the dizziest heights that ever existed in the country's history. Those rates were justified when we were at war and our annual expenditures were $100,000,000,000. They cannot be justified when we are at peace and our annual expenditures are, at most $40,000,000,000. Any plan that does not involve a substantial reduction in our taxes is indefensible. No amount of talk or fancy economics or bugaboos can overcome that simple fact.

The proposal is based on an estimate of this year's surplus. Judging by the past, Mr. Truman doesn't know what that surplus will be. For example, a year ago in his budget message he estimated a surplus of less than two billions. Actually, it was almost five billions. Now he is guessing that it will be seven and a half billions this year, and almost five billions for 1949. It might well be more for both those years; after all this is quite a country.

The tax collectors will take about twenty-three billions from individual income-tax payers as well as about seven billions in excise taxes this year, a bigger amount than in any previous year of peace or war. And admittedly there will probably be a bigger surplus than ever before. Well, how much of a surplus must we have to justify a tax cut? And if a tax cut, on what basis? Why $40 across the board? It's just a figure; maybe it should be $29.98 or $49.50. We are each to get a $40 credit, for ourselves and our dependents, but some wool-pulling goes with this. It is proposed to take this credit back quickly through an increased tax on corporations. As for the raised corporation tax, this is the old excess-profits tax again, and if Secretary Vinson backed its repeal in 1945 because it was a roadblock to reconversion and the expansion of business, why on earth would it be a good thing now? The answer is that it wouldn't.

Who are the corporations, anyway? You and I. When a corporation pays anything, it comes out of the pockets of the people who own the corporation. The corporations are owned by the mass of people. American Telephone and Telegraph, for example, has several hundred thousand stockholders. We little fellows are interested in the corporation, not only through direct purchase of stock, but also through our bank deposits or insurance policies, since the banks and insurance companies lend our money to the corporations or invest in the corporations. If corporate taxes are raised, it will reduce net earnings and therefore dividends. The Government will lose, because there will be less dividend income to tax. So the people get a second bite taken out of them, one, the higher corporate tax which will cut their income, and, two, their own personal income tax. To lop off individual taxes and take it right back from corporate taxes is like the story of the fellow who says that in order to save express charges he cut all the buttons off the suit, and then he says, "P. S.—You will find the buttons in one of the pockets of the suit."

And individuals had better realize this. Increased taxes on corporations almost always lead to higher prices. That is especially true in a sellers' market which we have at present. And so again we consumers pay through the nose.

The economists agree that the way to get prices down is through increased production. More production can be stimulated by lower taxes—never by higher taxes.

The President's plan is for 1948 only, and leaves real tax revision for some future Congress to take up. It is a mere temporary and arbitrary makeshift. It proposes to apply the entire surplus to reduction of the public debt. That is not sound. The debt should be taken care of by a scientific plan, not by hit and miss. We should agree now to a plan to systematically pay off the debt over a period of 50 or 75 years. This would not only create immediate and sustained confidence in Government bonds, but also release billions right now for tax reduction. Such a plan combining tax reduction and debt reduction would pep up our whole economy, stimulate production, and lend confidence to the future.

Our present tax structure is called a structure only by courtesy. It is put together with hay wire, old nails, and string. The President proposes to rearrange a few of the planks. It doesn't even deal with the proposal to permit husbands and wives to split their income in computing their taxes. Though endorsed by the Treasury, the President simply passed it up, leaving people in 36 states to carry a load put upon them because those in 12 other States and Hawaii get a special advantage.

The give-it-to-the-people with one hand, and take-it-away-with-the-other proposal now before us is inequitable, unfair, and improves nothing. It merely sounds good to the people who don't understand taxes. I might add "Who wants to understand taxes anyway? We just want them reduced"; and Mr. Denny, that the President's proposal does not do.

Aspects of the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks and include therein a series of five articles on "Aspects of the Marshall Plan" by E. F. Tompkins, editor of the New York Journal-American, I hereby present the first such article entitled "A Fundamental Error." The article follows:

ASPECTS OF THE MARSHALL PLAN

(By E. F. Tompkins)

I. A FUNDAMENTAL ERROR

If our $3,750,000,000 postwar loan to Socialist Britain has taught us anything, it should be that the $17,000,000,000 long-range Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of Europe has been so devised as to be a failure.

This is true, not because of niggardliness in the dollar values involved, but because of the political character of the two unprecedented transactions.

In both instances, the amounts of our disbursements were determined in advance computations of the supposed foreign needs, supported by ample statistics.

In mere arithmetic, the estimates considered the borrower more than the donor and were substantially presented, in the case of the Marshall plan, in the form of a joint capital levy by 16 associated nations upon our national means.

Quantitatively, therefore, the first doubt with respect to the Marshall plan is not whether Europe has demanded enough, but whether America can meet the requisition on its production without incurring disruptive inflation, a consequent economic crisis, and thereafter a debilitating impairment of our industrial efficiency—inflicting chronic unemployment—due to severe depletions of our resources.

These adversities could radically alter for the worse our social, economic, and political institutions.

In similar though less severe circumstances—less severe because we did not then have the burdens of World War II to sustain—New Deal socialism intruded itself into many segments of our national life.

But even if we can afford the Marshall plan, as its official advocates assert that we can, the plan itself requires the most careful diagnosis.

The proclaimed strategic function of the Marshall plan is to hinder or to avert Communist encroachments.

It is fails to work as projected, exactly the opposite effect is likely to ensue; and meanwhile we may have sacrificed our own capacity to resist communism effectively at home as well as abroad.

For the express purpose of compelling such an outcome, Soviet Russia has openly declared war upon the Marshall plan, and Soviet Russia may be calculating better than we.

Here is a risk affecting our security—and the welfare of mankind—to such a degree that the risk ought not to be taken unless the Marshall plan contains within itself the assurances of success.

And these assurances are not to be found anywhere in its valuminous documentation.

On the contrary, the very conditions of failure have been written into the arrangements.

For as it stands, the Marshall plan is—like the British loan—a scheme for financing European socialism at the expense of American free enterprise.

But this central fact has been deceptively glossed over, although it is both explicit and implicit in the Paris report of the Committee of European Cooperation, outlining Europe's requisition, and in the complementary report of President Truman's Committee on Foreign Aid, headed by Secretary of Commerce Harriman.

And thus—as has become usual in our devious diplomatic relations—the citizens of the United States are being allured into an ill-conceived foreign venture by humanitarian appeals.

It is axiomatic, in all presentations of the Marshall plan, that Europe's primary necessity is to get its people back to work in order to revive its agriculture, its industries, and its trade.

This country has accordingly been called upon by its Government to provide, in addition to $5,000,000,000 in emergency winter relief supplies, capital investment aggregating four or five times that sum during the next 4 or 5 years.

The people of this country have, and should have, no motive for doing so unless the people of Europe are to be the beneficiaries in improving standards of living, in stable political liberties, and in useful opportunities to own and operate business enterprises.

We know—from our own development in a century and a half, from Europe's history in its greatest era of social progress, and from the current slavish examples of the Marxist states, that the desired objectives cannot be even approached under regimes or systems of confiscation, repression and regimentation.

It is not the aspiration of the American people—and it is certainly not the mission of the American Government—to finance Socialism—or any other type of collectivism—anywhere at any time.

We can indeed, by pursuing a purblind course in Europe, inter the still surviving elements of free enterprise which are the seeds of reconstruction in the war-ravaged continent.

In doing that, we will destroy all individual incentive and deprive Europe of the creative services of its entrepreneur class.

And here, at the very core of it, the Marshall plan in its present guise is fatally defective.

Congress will be wasting our money, and promoting Soviet Russia's aims, unless it judges and amends the Marshall plan accordingly.

We Don't Understand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered at a banquet in the Wardman Park Hotel constituting the National Small Business Men's Association's observance of Small Business Day in Washington, January 14, 1948:

WE DON'T UNDERSTAND

(By DeWitt Emery, president, National Small Business Men's Association)

It's an honor, a privilege and a pleasure for me to speak at this meeting. I say that particularly because the more than 350 of our members who are present, coming from 34 States, have as their guests more than 150 Members of Congress.

This meeting marks an important milestone in the progress of the National Small Business Men's Association and is certainly a far cry from our early days in 1937 when we had nothing except an idea and a lot of determination.

The original stated purpose of our association was to give small businessmen a voice in national affairs and to preserve freedom of competitive enterprise. That is still our basic purpose.

I am not going to bore you with a long detailed list of claims concerning what we have accomplished. I do, however, want to stress one fact, which is that, directly or indirectly, the National Small Business Men's Association is responsible for the vast amount of consideration small business is now receiving and has received during the past 10 years. I say this because prior to the founding of our association in 1937, no one in or out of public life ever gave small businessmen as a group any consideration whatsoever. We started the small business movement and have been, and are, the principal factor in keeping it going at an ever-increasing rate of effectiveness.

I think one of the principal reasons we have been able to do what we have done is that we have never advocated nor supported class legislation of any kind and have vigorously opposed this type of legislation when it was proposed by others.

Also, we have been fortunate in that our membership has grown steadily year after year, and for the past 5 years our renewal rate each year has been above 94 percent.

Speaking at the New York Herald Tribune forum in New York on October 26, 1938, among other things, I said:

"We seek no special consideration or privileges of any kind. We do not want any one, the Government least of all, to hold an umbrella over us. All we want is a 50–50 break. Given this, we'll take care of ourselves and at the same time make a major contribution to the happiness and prosperity of every American citizen."

That is just as true today as it was then. Small business does not need or want any special privileges or consideration.

Our visit to Washington today is undoubtedly unique in the history of such visits. When the farmers go to Washington, they want something special for farmers; when labor goes to Washington, the idea is to get something exclusively for labor and frequently whatever it is labor wants is presented on an or else basis; when the veteran group goes to Washington, it wants something for veterans; and so on and on throughout an almost endless list. We, on the other hand, are not here to demand special privileges for small business. We have no desire to threaten or coerce anyone. We are here primarily to get better acquainted with our representatives in Congress and to give them an opportunity to get better acquainted with us. We are here also to say to these representatives of ours, "Forget groups, blocs, classes and cliques and do the best job you can for the country as a whole. We'll back you to the hilt on such a program."

Yes, as part of our visit, we are making some recommendations on legislation and if these recommendations are followed, the benefits therefrom will flow to all business, to farmers, labor and to every American citizen.

I'd like to go over these recommendations one by one, but that would take more time than is available this evening. Also, we will undoubtedly, in the near future, discuss these recommendations in detail at one or more Congressional hearings. So, let's go on from this phase of our discussion to a consideration of certain aspects of the national picture.

Personally, I'd like to jump right into the middle of a discussion of international affairs and the United States foreign policy. But that's out as our association has always confined its activities to domestic affairs and we have never had an expression from our membership on any phase of the international situation.

However, passing up foreign affairs is not going to handicap us in any way as there is plenty to talk about right here at home. There are an awful lot of things concerning our domestic picture which we do not understand.

We don't understand, for example, why the budget for fiscal '49 was not reduced far more than it was, and we are hoping that the drastic curtailment in appropriations for the executive department, which we feel should have been made in '48, will be made for fiscal '49.

As we understand it, the Constitution says Congress shall have control of the purse strings. If this is true, then it seems to us that if any department, branch, bureau, or agency of the Government is spending more than it should, the remedy is for Congress to decrease its appropriations. Certainly if the money isn't appropriated, it cannot be spent.

We know something about the tremendous pressure that was brought to bear on Congress not to cut this, that, or the other appropriation when the '48 budget was being considered. We know further that most, if not all, of this pressure was inspired and actively promoted by the bureaucrats. This brings up what we think is a mighty important question; namely, is Congress going to control the bureaucrats or are the bureaucrats going to control Congress?

There was a time, not long ago, when the "brass hats" of organized labor thought—at least that's what their actions implied—that they were big enough and strong enough to dictate to Congress. This situation was handled by Congress in passing the Taft-Hartley Act over the President's veto. This act does not take anything away from organized labor which rightly belonged to it. It does very effectively, however, clip much of the dictatorial power over union members that a handful of labor leaders had built up under the Wagner Act.

In our judgment, the growth in number, influence, and power of the bureaucrats, which has been going on steadily for many years, has now reached a point where it seriously threatens our republican form of government.

We can't stand for that. Therefore, the bureaucrats must be cut down to size, pronto. We believe that the best way to do this is to decrease appropriations to the point where at least a million of them will have to go back home and get jobs in industry and commerce where they will become tax producers instead of tax eaters.

In this connection, I believe you will be interested in a pamphlet which was recently called to my attention. The title of this pamphlet is "Common Human Needs," by Charlotte Towle. It was published by the Federal Security Agency as an interpretation for staff in public assistance agencies. Miss Towle states that "social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure."

How do you like that? I've known for several years that the ultimate aim of the public assistance and social security boys was national socialism—the Government owning and controlling everything and everybody—but this is the first instance which has come to my attention where one of the insiders admitted this objective in so many words. Yes; the bureacrats must be cut down to size pronto. Personally, I have every confidence that the Eightieth Congress will handle the bureaucratic challenge in a most satisfactory manner.

We further do not understand why the 40-hour week, which was adopted to spread work at a time when jobs were scarce and there was much unemployment, should be kept in force now that everyone who wants to work has a job and there are still many thousands of jobs to be filled, also an unprecedented shortage of goods.

There is much talk about combating inflation, but most of it concerns doctoring symptoms rather than treating the basic disease, which is an oversupply of money and an undersupply of goods. Abolishing the 40-hour week, so our productive facilities could be operated at straight time on a 44- or 48-hour workweek, would help tremendously in increasing the supply of goods which would most effectively combat inflation.

Still further, we don't understand, if the press reports are true, that we have practically no army, a third-rate air force, and a navy that is operating on a skeleton basis, what is being done with all of the many billions of dollars appropriated for national defense. Where is all this money going? How is it being spent and why are we getting so little in return for vastly increased expenditures over any other peacetime year? It doesn't add up.

I might continue 'the "we don't understands" almost indefinitely, but since I do not have all night, I'm going to move on to a couple of other things which I think are important.

One thing that bothers a lot of people, including a great many businessmen and some of the Members of Congress I have talked with, is why the United States is as far down the road to the left as it is?

The answer most frequently given is that the New Deal, with its strange, unorthodox fiscal and economic policies and its philosophy of scarcity-something-for-nothing, is to blame. Maybe that's the answer, but I don't think it is and I certainly cannot be accused of carrying a torch for the New Deal.

In fact, if the New Deal, something-for-nothing' idea, were carried to its ultimate conclusion, it could only mean that, after awhile, everyone would have everything for producing nothing, and that, of course, is about as cockeyed as it's possible for anything to be. In my book, the New Deal is, or was, if you prefer, an effect rather than a cause.

I can give you what I am sure is the answer to this country being where it is on the road to the left in one word. That word is "ignorance." Not nearly enough of the American people know and understand the basic facts of life concerning our free enterprise economy.

Whose fault is this? Is Congress to blame? No; Congress is not to blame. The blame, in my judgment, rests right squarely on the shoulders of the businessmen of the country, large, medium-sized, and small.

Every businessman knows what freedom of enterprise means to him, but how many have seen to it that those on their pay rolls know what freedom of enterprise means to them? Not very many, notwithstanding the fact that it's just as important, if not more important, to sell the system which makes possible the production and distribution of goods and services than it is to sell the goods and services themselves. We've thrown the baby out with the bath water and, quite naturally, most of us place the blame on everything and everybody except ourselves—the real culprits.

Every Member of Congress knows that his judgment on a given piece of legislation is no better than his information concerning that legislation. Also, every businessman knows that his judgment is no better than his information. But altogether too many of us have entirely overlooked the fact that exactly the same thing is true of a factory worker, a truck driver, or a machinist. If his information is wrong, his judgment cannot possibly be right. As someone said, "Give the folks the facts and our country will be saved."

Fortunately, this condition can, and to some extent is, being remedied. More and more companies are publishing and distributing simplified financial statements to their employees. More and more companies are devoting part of their magazine and newspaper advertising to an explanation of what makes our economy tick. This is all helpful, but the effort will have to be expanded at least one hundredfold in order to do a comprehensive job.

Our own effort on this is being carried out by a special organization—the Small Business Economic Foundation—set up for that purpose. The foundation is entirely educational—its one and only purpose is to make the largest possible contribution toward getting the man in the street to understand what freedom of enterprise means to him.

I mention the need for getting accurate information on fundamental, basic economics to the American people, because if you feel that this is important—we think it's as important as it's possible for anything to be—you Members of Congress, through your contacts with constituents and others, can help tremendously on getting the job done.

I mentioned the Small Business Economic Foundation because the foundation has a great quantity of educational material, most of it in pamphlet form and all of it written in simple, down-to-earth, easy-to-understand language, all or any part of which is available to you any time you want it.

And now, as Lady Godiva said as she neared the end of her ride, "I am drawing close to my clothes." I want to close by giving you my definition of our American way of life.

I searched diligently to find what I considered an adequate and satisfactory definition of our American way of life and when I had no luck in finding it, I asked some of my writer friends, Channing Pollock, Samuel Crowther, John T. Flynn, Lawrence Sullivan, to write one for me. They all promised to do so, but none of them did. So, since I've always been the sort of person who had more sand than sense, I rushed in and wrote my own. Here it is:

"Our American way of life is made up of many things, bathtubs, and automobiles; big cities and small towns; farms and victory gardens; mammoth steel mills and village machine shops; colossal educational institutions and the little red school beside the road; churches and hospitals; railroads and air lines; chewing gum and ice cream; department stores and crossroad general stores; specialty shops and beauty parlors; pool rooms and race tracks; Hollywood, Broadway, and the high-school play; laughter and sorrow; eagerness and despair and people—millions of all kinds of people—gathered together from all over the world, drawn by the magnet of freedom, opportunity, and justice.

"Our American way of life provides each individual an opportunity to go as far and climb as high as his willingness to work, his skill, ingenuity and integrity will carry him.

"Our American way of life recognizes that the individual has the right to work when and where he wishes, the right to worship as he pleases, to speak his mind on any subject, to meet with his fellow men for any peaceful purpose, to be secure in his possessions, and to have his day in a free court. It also recognizes that the individual is superior to the State, that our public officials are servants of the people and that they derive their just powers from the consent of the people.

"These things taken together created an atmosphere of freedom and an economic climate which made possible in the United States the greatest production and diffusion of wealth in the history of the world, and the establishment, for even the lowest paid worker, of the highest standard of living the world has ever known.

"Why? Because for more than 150 years, free men in a free country have been working together to provide this better way of life. Let us hold what they have given us and go forward in the sure faith that the American way of life is the greatest blessing known to mankind any place on the face of God's earth."

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein two communications regarding the Palestine question from leading constituents of mine.

The first one of these petitions comes from Morris Long, vice president of the Worcester Zionist district, who resides in my home town of Clinton, Mass., and who is an old and valued friend and long a zealous worker in behalf of a homeland and free commonwealth for the Jews in Palestine and charitable and fraternal activities of his people.

The second petition is from the ladies auxiliary of the Milford, Mass., Hebrew Association of B'nai B'rith, an organization composed of leading and representative Jewish women of that community.

My interest in the Palestine question is so well known that I scarcely need reemphasize my views. I have recently spoken at considerable length about this matter before an outstanding chapter of the B'nai B'rith of Fitchburg, Mass., in my district. At that time, I stressed the importance to our Nation of recognizing the principle of self-determination and the independence and autonomy of all nations. I declared that the age-old aspirations of the Jewish people for a homeland of their own, long recognized by democratic-minded nations the world over, should be fulfilled. It is not only a question of according freedom and self-determination to a people but also of providing at the same time a haven and refuge for victims of oppression and persecution within the boundaries of a free nation of their own.

In an effort to settle this great humanitarian question once for all, the United Nations has voted to recognize the Jewish homeland and the members thereof should be prepared to implement this decision. It is not enough that we should render lip service to this cause. Within the framework of the United Nations and in the exercise of our sovereignty, mindful of the early struggles of our own country, mindful of the sacrifices made by our own and other peoples for liberty and justice, let us implement this far-reaching epochal decision of the United Nations. It is to be hoped that peaceful means may be found of resolving the conflicting claims and ameliorating the bitterness and contention that exists between the parties to the dispute in Palestine. But in any event, we must make our position clear that we stand squarely behind the decision of the United Nations. Neither the Executive nor the Congress can afford to evade this burning issue. Let us render encouragement and support to deliverance from persecution and the establishment of free government for the Jewish people.

LONG'S CLOTHIERS,
Clinton, Mass., January 29, 1948.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We respectfully urge that the United States, which played the leading role in securing passage of the partition plan for Palestine in the UN General Assembly, act in a manner which would indicate that our Government sincerely desires the effectuation of that UN decision. American Jews are disappointed that the United States has taken no step forward in the direction of implementing this UN decision.

On the other hand, by placing an immediate embargo on the shipment of arms to the Jews of Palestine who are desperately fighting to defend their lives and the perpetuation of the UN decision, our Government has retreated from the position of high-principled trust which motivated it during the recent session of the United Nations on Palestine.

The inclusive and vacillating policy maintained by our Government since November 29 has given the enemies of the UN decision obvious encouragement for their nefarious insurrection against the verdict of the world's highest tribunal.

We demand that in this moment of crisis our Government give access of its surplus arms and munitions to the only force now materially backing up the United Nations in Palestine—the Haganah.

The United Nations' resolution on Palestine envisaged the creation of a Jewish militia. Haganah is now carrying on the duties of that militia. It must be armed as the first step toward implementing the policy which our Government championed so ardently and which the United Nations adopted.

Respectfully yours,

MORRIS LONG,
Vice President, Worcester Zionist District.

MILFORD, MASS.,
January 30, 1948.

Representative PHILIP PHILBIN,
House Office Building:

We respectfully urge that the United States, which played the leading role in securing passage of the partition plan for Palestine in the UN General Assembly, act in a manner which would indicate that our Government sincerely desires effectuation of that UN decision. American Jews are disappointed that the United States has taken no step forward in the direction of implementing this UN decision. On the other hand, by placing an immediate embargo on the shipment of arms to the Jews of Palestine who are desperately fighting to defend their lives and the perpetuation of the UN decision, our Government has retreated from the position of high-principled trust which motivated it during the recent session of the United Nations on Palestine. The inconclusive and vacillating policy maintained by our Government since November 29 has given the enemies of the UN decision obvious encouragement for their nefarious insurrections against the verdict of the world's highest tribunal. We sincerely hope that in this moment of crisis our Government give access of its surplus arms and munitions to the only force now materially backing up the United Nations in Palestine—the Haganah. The United Nations resolutions on Palestine envisaged the creation of a Jewish militia. Haganah is now carrying on the duties of that militia. It must be armed as the first step toward implementing the policy which our Government championed so ardently and which the United Nations adopted.

MILFORD HEBREW ASSOCIATION,
B'NAI B'RITH, LADIES AUXILIARY.

The Red Mogen Dovid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have so many years participated in and listened to seemingly endless discussions on controversial matters that, do believe me, it is like taking off a tight collar to be permitted the luxury to talk for a few moments about the Red Mogen Dovid. There are no issues of merit or demerit involved, no pro and con. There is no "on the other hand." The Red Mogen Dovid, the Red Shield of David, in its humanitarianism, dedicated to the task of healing and sustaining human life, has its reason for being in mercy only. The quality of mercy bestowed upon mankind is a precious gift. It draws us out of ourselves, making room for compassion and understanding and tolerance to enter our hearts. Mercy is the expression of the dignity and beauty and value of each human life. It has the same selfless passion of pure science; it neither condones nor judges. Mercy follows the need. It remembers only that there is a human being in pain.

When we recall the years of our lives and how many deeds of strife, hatred, confusion, vengence, and greed these years have witnessed, then is it not a thought to seize upon and cherish that man has grouped and continues to group together for acts of construction, for life-giving, not death-dealing, objectives? In the confusions and fears each day poured upon us by the press and the radio, in the uneasy knowledge of the horror of the past decade, in the gnawing anxiety of where man is heading toward, there is a very special urgency, almost a hunger within ourselves, to ally ourselves with deeds of conscience and humanity. For if there are no deeds of conscience and humanity, what difference does it make where the world is going? I say that every little triumph of mercy and justice, whether it be the act of your next door neighbor or the organized act of the Red Mogen Dovid, meets with another little triumph of mercy and justice until the accumulated weight changes the course of human destiny. It is a postulate that history has proven and reproven throughout time. This is not naïveté or wishful thinking; it is the realest of realistic thinking. I believe this passionately. That is why I am speaking today, joining in tribute to the work done in the past by the Red Mogen Dovid and grateful for the opportunity to share in the work before it.

From the year of its origin in 1930, the Red Mogen Dovid has served the humanitarian needs of the people of Palestine. Because Palestine was not a sovereign nation, it could not affiliate with the International Red Cross. The tasks that faced Palestine, colonization, industrialization, the development of the soil, the building of settlements and towns, the achieving of a workable economic and social pattern, the unfreezing of a culture, the political struggle for independence, the problem of immigration and so forth. It is truly full of wonder in face of these multifarious goals, Palestine with its amazing sensitivity to human needs, made room for, nurtured, and developed the Red Mogen Dovid. Today in Palestine, the Red Mogen Dovid has 28 first aid stations; approximately 200 secondary stations, blood transfusion centers, 46 ambulances, 20 of which were contributed by the American Red Mogen Dovid. It is nonsectarian, coming to the aid of the neglected Arab as well. It has a total of 600 volunteer doctors and nurses. It has educated 7,000 inhabitants in the principles of first aid. It cooperates closely with the International Red Cross.

Today the struggle in Palestine has been intensified by the defiance of the UN decision by a handful of Arab chieftains. There are episodes of violence and bloodshed. The day-to-day pursuits of the Red Mogen Dovid continue, but we, eating and talking in comfort here today, in making our calculations dare not forget the intensified struggle for national existence. Medical supplies, surgical instruments, ambulances, blood plasma are urgently needed in abundance. The new Jewish state needs us in every conceivable aspect to assist at its birth. If we are callous or indifferent to those needs, then I say unexpiable is our guilt. The refugees whose one hope lies in Palestine, the Jews in detention camps placed there by British colonial machinery, the citizens of Palestine who by sweat, blood, and tears rebuilt and reclaimed the Holy Land must not be allowed to think they are alone. Two thousand years is a long, long time to wait and the fulfillment of a vision alive for as many years must be shared by all of us who, only by the geographical accident, escaped being the needy and not the needed.

Permit me to leave just one more thought with you. During the period of the massacres of the Jews in the hundreds and hundreds of thousands, no Red Cross, no Red Mogen Dovid could reach them. The ministering organizations like the Red Cross could reach all prisoners of war except the Jews. Now that the doors are open, shall we not in whatever measure we can, both in memory of the dead and in hope for the living, translate our conscience into deeds?

Enemy Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, last November I urged that steps be taken by this Government to expedite the repatriation of our late Allies of enemy prisoners of war still held in lands foreign to their birth.

When the interim-aid bill was considered I introduced an amendment seeking to accomplish this result, which, unfortunately, was ruled out on a point of order.

The recent heroic rescue of Sgt. Angelo A. LaSalle, of Des Moines, Iowa, the sole survivor of a Flying Fortress which crashed in France Saturday, has thrilled the world. Sergeant LaSalle owes his life to Horst Kupski, a former German Air Force pilot, who is one of the enemy prisoners of war still held by French authorities.

I have today introduced a concurrent resolution, asking that the Secretary of State request the Government of France for the immediate repatriation to Germany of Horst Kupski as a gesture of good will, both toward the United States and toward our foreign enemies. Such acts of brotherhood transcend national lines and must be multiplied manyfold if we are to build a world which will know war no more.

Horst Kupski, who deserves special treatment for his good Samaritan deed, is, after all, primarily a symbol. He is one of millions now languishing in the dungarees of a prisoner of war, far from their homes and families. We cannot ever hope to build an enduring peace until this situation is corrected.

The resolution introduced today, therefore, goes further than to deal only with the case of Horst Kupski. It provides that this Congress request the Secretary of State again to draw the attention of our erstwhile allies to the fact that the repatriation of all war prisoners is long overdue and that the United States, as a signatory of the Geneva Convention and of the instruments of surrender of our former enemies, has a direct interest in the fate of all war prisoners, not alone those already returned to their homelands by us, but also those still held by the nations, at whose sides we were engaged in conflict.

The resolution recites that the European recovery program will be hindered rather than furthered by the continued employment of forced labor; and that the United States of America has a right to expect that its allies will abide by the very principles and ideals in whose defense American soldiers and sailors fought and died.

Proposed Amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of the speech I delivered in Minneapolis, Minn., on January 30, 1948, to the annual convention of the Minnesota Employers' Association:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, your committee has informed me that your association has never heard a talk on the Fair Labor Standards Act. I can well understand this because from my own personal experience and from our recent hearings on this law I have observed that the scope of this law and its importance has never been fully realized or understood by many. In other words, the provisions of the law did not receive sufficient attention by a great many employers and employees. They never really came to understand the effect of this law upon their business and work. This group who were uninformed on the law was composed practically entirely of small businessmen—the small machine shop—the small lumber yard operator—the small coal dealer—to name only a few. Of course, the United States Steel Corp., and the large manufacturers made extensive studies of the legislation and brought their practices into conformance at an early date, but the small businessman whose business is largely under his own personal direction and who had all he could do to run his own business and eke out an existence largely by constant effort of his own, was the man who generally failed to appreciate the impact of this legislation upon him and upon his business.

POLICY OF THE LAW

The Fair Labor Standards Act—better known as the wages and hours law—was enacted by Congress in June 1938 to:

1. Help spread the work so as to help alleviate the very substantial unemployment that was then existing and which had plagued the New Deal from its inception.
2. Classify substandard wages and excessive working hours as a form of unfair competition and make such practices illegal. The attempted proselyting of industry by our Southern States, using the bait of low wage standards and long hours, was the immediate evil which Congress sought to remedy by declaring this policy.
3. Restrict oppressive child labor practices.

THE SCHEME OF THE ACT

Generally the structure of the act may be divided into two main headings, i. e., those dealing with minimum wages and those dealing with maximum hours.

1. The minimum wage edict of the law makes it illegal to pay a minimum wage of less than 40 cents in covered employment.
2. The maximum hour edict requires 1½ times the regular rate of compensation be paid for all hours worked beyond 40 hours in any week.

PENALTIES

For unwillful violations of the minimum wage and overtime pay provisions the employer may be required to (a) pay the unpaid minimum wages and the unpaid overtime compensation, and (b) pay an additional amount of liquidated damages equal to the amount of unpaid wages or unpaid overtime compensation. Reasonable attorneys' fees and the cost of the action shall also be paid by the employer. This provision for attorneys' fees and costs is mandatory. Employees can sue to get this money themselves or they may appoint an agent to sue in their behalf.

For willful violations a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment up to 6 months may be imposed.

These are very substantial penalties both of a criminal and of a financial nature.

The money penalties have created very serious problems in instances where lawsuits have attempted to recover for retrospective liabilities that were no foreseen by the contracting parties when they entered into their wage contracts. You recall the portal-to-portal cases which are one example of a situation such as I describe. While the final court decision in these cases held that little or no money liability existed, it pointed up to Congress the very substantial amounts of money that might be involved where determination of the rights of the parties were delayed an unreasonable length of time. Congress replied to this situation by enacting the Portal to Portal Act of 1947 which was approved on May 14, and which is now the controlling law on the length of time that parties may go back into the past and seek to impose retrospective wage demands.

WHAT EMPLOYERS ARE COVERED

What employers are covered? I know this is a question that interests you all, but at the outset I should point out that the act does not apply to employers as such but rather to employees. This is an important distinction to note. The application of the act does not depend solely upon the character of the employers' business but rather upon the character, effect and results of the service rendered by the employee and in many cases when the products he produces are marketed. In the language of the act the minimum-wage and maximum-hours provisions are applicable to employees who are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. However, the scope of the act is not limited to the normal and ordinary meaning of those words but is extended to further situations by the process of defining certain words to have an abnormal meaning. I refer to the statutory definition accorded to the words "goods," "produced," and "engaged in the production of goods."

As defined by the statute:

"'Goods' means goods (including ships and marine equipment), wares, products, commodities, merchandise, or articles or subjects of commerce of any character, or any part or ingredient thereof, but does not include goods after their delivery into the actual physical possession of the ultimate consumer thereof other than a producer, manufacturer, or processor thereof.

"'Produced' means produced, manufactured, mined, or handled or in any other manner worked on in any State; and for the purposes of this act an employee shall be deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if such employee was employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, handling, transporting, or in any other manner working on such goods, or in any process or occupation necessary to the production thereof, in any State.

No person can read those definitions without observing the wide application of the law. He would also immediately visualize the tremendous number of difficult and borderline decisions that would be required to determine the extent of the application of the law to the millions of situations which arise out of the employment of millions of individual American workingmen.

EXEMPTIONS

A word is in order at this point concerning the specific exemptions provided by the act. Most of these are contained in section 13 which provides that the wage-and-hour provisions of the act shall not apply to: (1) "Executive, administrative, and professional" employees or those in a "local retail capacity" or acting as "outside salesmen." An important power with respect to this provision is the fact that the Administrator may define the terms by regulation; (2) to employees engaged in "retail" or "service establishments," the greater part of whose selling or service is within one State; (3) seamen; (4) airplane carriers; (5) employees in the sea-food industry; (6) agricultural employees; (7) learners, apprentices, and handicapped workers exempted by regulation of the Administrator; (8) employees of certain weekly or semiweekly newspapers; (9) employees of local carriers such as streetcars, busses, etc.; (10) employees engaged in preparing agricultural or horticultural commodities for market "when employed within the area of production"; (11) switchboard operators in certain small public telephone exchanges; (12) employees of interstate carriers.

ADMINISTRATION

One of the most important things in any law is the nature of the administration that is provided. With respect to this law, Congress chose to establish an administrator with certain somewhat restricted powers to supervise the functioning of the act. His powers are not absolute. A great many of the provisions of the law require court adjudications for their enforcement. There is, thus, a double-barreled administration under the present framework.

There you have the basic outline of the law. With the exception of three minor amendments the law was unchanged by legislative enactment from the date of its adoption in June 1938 until the passage of the portal-to-portal law in 1947.

You may have noted that I stated the act continued "unchanged by legislation action." These words were carefully chosen because I did not wish to indicate that the law had remained constant throughout that period. Far from it. In fact, the law was changed many times during that period, not by legislative action, but by administrative interpretation and judicial decision. This is no idle statement, for Congress, in the portal-to-portal law specifically declared in its findings that the Fair Labor Standards Act "had been interpreted judicially in disregard of long-established customs, practices, and contracts between employers and employees," and this brings us to the next point.

THE WORKING OF THE ACT

How has the act worked? To determine this the Wages and Hours Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee, of which I am a member, began a full-scale investigation. This was the first investigation ever undertaken by a congressional committee of the workings of this law. Our hearing was most complete. Every phase of the effect of the law was fully explored both from the standpoint of labor, government,

and business. As our investigation proceeded, we began to see that such investigation had been long overdue.

What did we find? While our subcommittee has not finished its findings in this respect, certain preliminary conclusions can be reached. First, as to administration; we found that while there had been many instances of arbitrary and officious action by a few field employees of the Wages and Hours Division, that the majority of field agents were extremely conscientious, reasonably well informed as to the workings of the law and in general closely followed the administrative orders and directions which emanated from higher authority. We found that many of the complaints that the businessman had against individual field investigators were in reality complaints against administrative interpretations, orders, and directions from Washington.

That brings us to the second phase of our investigation, the administration given the law by those top officials who were charged with this administration. In order to arrive at an unchallengeable decision on this point, we investigated specifically a great many individual acts and decisions of the top officials. In general, I would say it was our finding that in a great many instances the law had been interpreted administratively and judicially in disregard of long-established customs, practices, and contracts between employers and employees. This is practically verbatim, the same conclusion that Congress itself reached and embodied in a legislative finding in the preamble to the Portal to Portal Act. In other words, we found the same condition existing with respect to the law in general, insofar as administration and interpretation was concerned, as Congress found to have existed with respect to those portions of the law that were before Congress in the portal-to-portal matter. This is also the phase of the application of the law that comes in for most of the complaint from businessmen, particularly small businessmen. They complain primarily of those instances where the Administrator has given the act an unreasonable interpretation or a specious construction. Most of these interpretations are in one direction, that is, toward extending the coverage of the law. That hits the small businessman. Many of these constructions ignore the plain language of the statute. It is true that the Administrator has not been successful in all these attempts. Only recently he was quite sharply cut down by the United States Supreme Court in a case involving the construction to be given the motor carriers' exemption.

However, we are hoping that the present Administrator will do a better job of interpreting the act. He is a man with previous business experience and now that he is familiar with some of the objections to the acts of previous Administrators, I believe he will profit by their mistakes.

PENDING AMENDMENTS

As a result of our hearings a great many changes in the act have been proposed. In fact we have not had one single witness who appeared before the committee who expressed himself as satisfied with the act in its present form—that includes labor, management, and Government. They all propose substantial changes—some extreme in both directions. There are those who proposed the complete repeal of the act and there are those who proposed extending its provisions to every employed individual in the Nation. I do not consider that either of these extremes is a practical solution to our problem at this time, but the fact that no one is satisfied with the law in its present form indicates that some legislative changes are desirable.

I now propose to discuss with you the principal changes that have been suggested and which are presently under consideration by the committee. First and foremost is a change in the basic rate which is presently fixed at 40 cents an hour. This means an overtime rate of 60 cents an hour. Most proposals for a change in this provision suggest a new rate of from 55 to 75 cents an hour. Those in the South generally favor a lower rate, those in the North a more moderate rate, and the labor groups generally suggest a rate from 65 to 75 cents an hour for the straight-time rate which would be a $1.02½ to $1.12½ an hour on overtime work. The South is the big objector to fixing this rate at what you and I might think was reasonable, but I believe that it will be possible in this congressional session to bring this rate somewhere within the 60 to 75 cents range.

The second major change that has been suggested deals with the definition of the words "regular rate of pay" which form the basis for computing overtime compensation. In the act as presently worded "regular rate of pay" is not defined and a great many very difficult decisions have arisen. For example, whether bonus payments, profit-sharing plans, and other forms of extra compensation should be considered as being within the individual's regular rate of pay is most troublesome.

OVERTIME ON OVERTIME

It is also under this phrase that the famous overtime-on-overtime cases have arisen. At present these cases concern principally the longshore industry, which fixes a regular rate of pay and an overtime rate of pay by a collective-bargaining agreement. In some instances the overtime rate of pay is available to individuals who have not worked a full day. Because of this the longshore industry throughout the Nation is now being plagued with numerous suits, involving millions of dollars. These lawsuits are based on the contention that since a small number of workers might get this overtime pay without working the regular 8 hours, that it was thus not overtime pay, and hence to the extent that individuals performed work in the excess of 40 hours in any week that they were entitled to receive for their overtime work not the overtime rate fixed in their contract, but one and one-half times the money that they actually received. So here we see the situation where an industry has drawn up a collective-bargaining agreement that is more favorable to its employees than the Fair Labor Standards Act, and we now see a group attempting to use the mechanism of law to impose upon the employer a liability in excess of that contracted for. It should be said to the credit of the labor organization involved, which is the International Longshoremen's Association, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, that they have recognized the threat to free collective bargaining that is inherent in such claims, and they have appeared voluntarily before the United States Supreme Court in opposition to these wage claims of many of their members. In the brief they filed before the United States Supreme Court they stated:

"The danger to the longshoremen is real and immediate. The very foundations of free collective bargaining are threatened—and we cannot believe it was the purpose of Congress that the Fair Labor Standards Act should be construed so as to make it such a threat."

This case has been argued before the United States Supreme Court. Its decision will determine whether we face the possibility of another wave of litigation such as was involved in the portal-to-portal cases. Of additional interest in these cases is the fact that it is the United States Government that stands to eventually foot the bill for the millions involved because the work was performed during the war on Government contracts calling for Federal reimbursement of the costs involved.

THE EXECUTIVE, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND PROFESSIONAL EXEMPTION

One phase of the act that is sure to come up for consideration is some clarification of the definition of the exemption to "executive, administrative, and professional" employees. This has proved to be quite troublesome. The Administrator has present authority to define these words and his definition has not proved satisfactory. It would seem much better for Congress to specifically set forth its intent with respect to these words. The same can be said for clarification of the "local retailing" exemption. And akin to this exemption is a similar exemption to employees engaged in "retail" or "service" establishments, the greater part of whose selling or servicing is in intrastate commerce.

AREA OF PRODUCTION

Also up for consideration is a redefinition of the "area of production." This language furnishes the test for determining the coverage or noncoverage of individuals handling agricultural commodities for market. The Administrator is authorized by the act to define the "area of production." One of his definitions was annulled by the United States Supreme Court because it was predicated on factors not germane to the words defined. Even the present definition is somewhat open to the same objection. Clearly, this is another phase of the act where Congress should clearly express its intent rather than leave it to an administrator to legislate.

In summary of the changes that are proposed, you will note it to be my interpretation of the situation that we can look forward to Congress adopting some increase in the rate and providing greater clarity of some of the terms. I would be less than honest in my statements to you if I expressed myself as believing that further changes would be adopted. I also wish to point out that Congress will, I believe, be very leery of adopting new language which would only substitute a new problem for an old one. I am sure that a vigorous attempt will be made to clarify the details of the act but I have not observed any substantial support for those who propose to repeal or emasculate the Fair Labor Standards Act. I do not believe that Congress will gut the law. We are going to attempt to be fair and reasonable to both labor and management and to clarify the law so that a reasonable minimum rate will be fixed and so that a person of reasonable intelligence will be fairly apprised of the obligations he must meet.

In closing, I want you all to know that the knowledge that I have acquired on this legislation is available to you all regardless of where you come from in the State of Minnesota. That is true not only to you men who are employers but also to your employees.

If you or your employees have any problems arising out of the interpretation of this act, I will be most pleased to act for you or for them either directly or through the proper Congressman, regardless of where they come from in the State of Minnesota. I consider that I serve on this committee as a representative of the State, and I have conscientiously replied to all inquiries which affect the jurisdiction of this committee regardless of whether they come from my own district, the State of Minnesota, or from the Nation as a whole. Please remember this if you or your employees have any problems or suggestions. Thank you.

In Support of Increased Allowances for the Education and On-the-Job Training of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that one of the outstanding facts in the Nation's life at the present time is the drastic advance in the cost of living. This has appeared after every war. Opinions may differ about its immediate causes; opinions may differ as to whether the advance would have been less drastic if other policies had been pursued by the Congress or the Executive; opinions even differ as to the precise degree of this advance. As usual in these cases, statistics vary with the statisticians. But there is one general fact which no one can deny. It is that each item of necessity costs more, usually much more, than it did 5 years ago, or 3 years ago, or 1 year ago. Food to eat, clothes to wear, a roof over one's head and four walls within which to sleep, require more and more dollars and cents.

For many groups in our population, this increased cost of living has been compensated for in whole or in part. Wages are uniformly higher than they were; profits are higher than they were; the income-tax returns show that for the Nation as a whole the force of this increase in basic living costs has been cushioned by larger incomes.

There is at least one highly important group, however, a group for whom the Nation itself has accepted responsibility, a group to which the Nation owes a vast debt, for whose members the increase in living costs has not been cushioned. I call your attention to the way in which the advanced cost of living has affected our veterans who are studying in colleges and schools under the GI bill of rights.

In 1944, the Congress recognized that among our 15,000,000 service men and women there were many who had their education interrupted by the years they so willingly gave to serve the Nation in the war. They lost 1 year, 2, 3, 4, in some cases 5 years. Withdrawal from education meant for them delay or actual blighting of hopes for useful careers in line with their capacities. The Nation itself had much at stake, too. If the best possibilities of a whole college generation of the finest young men and women, with the best minds and highest ambitions, were to be lost to us, the harm to our democracy in the future, to our culture, to our science, to our spiritual life, even to our national properity, would be beyond all estimating.

Accordingly, Congress in 1944 opened up as part of a vast program of veteran benefits, the possibility of further school and college for these young men and women—all who could qualify and profit by it. Tuition and books to be paid for, and a subsistence allowance, which, although it would not cover all the student's expense, and was not expected to do so, would give such a boost that he could get along by working a few odd hours in time spared from his studies or by utilizing such other resources as might be available. The amount of subsistence was fixed in 1944 at $50 a month for single veterans, and $75 for those with dependents. In 1945 these allowances were increased to $65 and $90.

This response to this proffer of assistance in obtaining education has been amazing Although many believed that a period of military life at the crucial age of 18 to 20 would blunt the desire for education and that comparatively few would want to go on, just the reverse of this happened. Men who had not merely been in a training camp, but actually engaged in the brutalities of war for years, turned to academic pursuits in such numbers, once the opportunity opened, that they could hardly be provided for. The colleges have been bulging at every seam. In the fall of 1946 there were 1,080,000 veterans in college, which was more than half of the total college enrollment of the country, including the women's colleges. In the fall of 1947 there were 1,150,000 enrolled in colleges and universities, and 651,500 in schools below the collegiate level. Over 6,000 veterans are studying in 442 schools and colleges in 44 foreign countries as well.

Another surprise appeared when reports began to come in about the kind of academic work these veterans were doing when they went back to school. The same educators, and many others, too, had predicted that military life would not only dull the desire for education, but would dull the wits as well. This apprehension was groundless. Uniformly, all over the country, in colleges and schools of all sorts, the veterans began setting records as earnest and successful students. A characteristic comment, similar to expressions used by college educators everywhere, was that made last March by the acting president of Columbia University.

Academically—

He said—

the records of the veterans to date have been outstanding, almost invariably surpassing those of nonveterans. Their seriousness and fixity of purpose have won universal acclaim. The ease and completeness with which the ex-servicemen have fitted into the academic background has been remarkable.

He described them as "more mature not only in years and bearing, but also in judgment," and added:

They are vitally concerned with public affairs, with world problems, and with equipping themselves for citizenship.

These young men and the young women who are among them are one of the richest possessions of the United States—far more important than any material resources. They are our future statesmen, business leaders, clergymen, newspapermen, artists, and authors. In the years to come the affairs of the Nation will be turned over to them.

But the increased cost of living, with which I began, has hit them too. At a time when well-paying jobs in business and industry have not been hard to get, these veterans have been clinging with all their might to their educational aspirations while they lived on an everdwindling pittance. Many—no one knows how many—have had to give up the struggle and quit. More will have to do so, unless the subsistence allowance is put once more on the basis intended in the GI bill of rights in 1944. This can be done only by increasing the allowance to take account of the shrinking of the dollar.

Let us see how this $65 and $90 allowance has shrunk. The average for all cost-of-living items is put by the United States Department of Labor, in 1944, at the index number of 125.5. In 1945 it rose a little to 128.4. In 1946 it jumped to an average of 139.3 for the year, but at the end of the year, in December 1946, it was 153.3. In November 1947 it was 164.9. It is still going up. This means that roughly the cost of living has gone up 40 percent or more since 1944. The biggest advances of all are in food and clothing, and all students require food and clothes, even if their rent is low. The single veteran finds it increasingly difficult to manage on $65 a month and the veteran with one or more dependents finds it almost impossible to manage on $90 a month. Increasingly, time and effort and anxiety must be put in on outside work to the detriment of studies for those who have no independent income. Many are forced to give up the struggle.

A survey made by the regional office of the Veterans' Administration for the District of Columbia region, revealed that in one term, the following numbers of veterans stated financial difficulties as their reason for giving up their educational career:

George Washington University	22
Georgetown University	17
University of Maryland	53
Catholic University	64

Other frequently named causes for dropping out were job conflicts, entering employment, or the like, which in most cases probably means that these veterans found the financial struggle too much for them. The heading "Personal and other reasons" which also bulks largely in the reasons given for withdrawal in these colleges also probably includes many whose primary motive was weariness with the financial struggle.

The cost of veterans' education has indeed been very great—over a billion and a half out of the nearly $8,000,000,000 we spent in 1947 on veterans' benefits. Yet there is no part of our veterans' program which will bring back so much in returns to the country in future years. We must take care of the widow and the orphan and the disabled. We are right in doing all we can to readjust all veterans to civilian life. These are obligations. But this educational money is an investment. It will return to us in the future citizenship and leadership of America.

Such measures as have been proposed for increasing the subsistence allowance for veterans in schools and colleges are restricted to bringing that allowance nearer to the levels anticipated in the GI bill of rights. The bill that was passed by the Senate, S. 1394, on July 19, 1947, proposes $75 subsistence a month for veterans without dependents, $105 for veterans with one dependent, and $120 for veterans with more than one dependent. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House reported out on July 23, 1947, H. R. 4212, which is an identical bill to S. 1394. H. R. 4212 will come before the House on Tuesday, February 3, 1948, for 40 minutes of debate under suspension of the rules.

Of equal urgency is the passage of legislation which has been reported out favorably by the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House that would raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job. When Public Law No. 679 was passed on August 8, 1946, providing that "in no event shall the rate of such—veterans'—allowance plus the compensation received exceed $175 per month for a veteran without a dependent, or $200 per month if he has a dependent or dependents." I protested vigorously against this limitation because it did not carry out the intent of the majority of Congress to make it possible for the veterans to take full advantage of the educational and training programs that were provided under the GI bill of rights. The Kearney bill, H. R. 246, which was reported by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in February 1947, provided for the raising of this ceiling so that a veteran attending a course on a part-time basis, and a veteran receiving compensation for productive labor, whether performed as part of his apprentice or other training on the job at institutions, business, or other establishments, or otherwise, shall be entitled to receive subsistence, provided that the rate of such allowance, plus the compensation received, does not exceed $250 per month for a veteran without a dependent, or $325 for a veteran with one dependent, or $350 for a veteran with two or more dependents.

This bill, H. R. 246, providing for the raising of the ceiling of on-the-job-training allowances, will also come before the House on Tuesday, February 3, 1948, for 40 minutes of debate under suspension of the rules.

With the increased cost of living since the original legislation was passed providing for what was then considered by many to be adequate assistance to our veterans, it is urgent that favorable action be taken at once on the Meade bill, H. R. 4212, and the Kearney bill, H. R. 246, to make it possible for our veterans to pursue their educational studies. Many of these men are being forced to give up the struggle because they are finding it impossible to exist on the meager allowances they are presently receiving. It is up to us to provide them an opportunity to complete their education and help to make up for part of the time that they lost through their war service.

The high cost of living has affected burials, too. We have increased the burial allowance by 50 percent. Should we not increase the allowance for those who by living will serve and guide the country in the years of the future?

Congressman Celler Opposes Fabric-Design Bill—Care Worse Than Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2860 merits opposition because it seeks to protect that which in the practicable and economic sense is unprotectable, designs on textile fabric. Designs or patterns or markings have been devised from time out of mind since man first chiseled curves and lines on a stray stone. Through the ages these designs have come down, modified and remodified. Most designs are the result of variations here and there. The line between originality and modification in most instances, if not in all, would be so thin as to be indiscernible.

This bill is an attempt on the part of the large manufacturers of fabrics to obtain for themselves undue protection for their designs. While it is true that designs have been pirated and copied, it is also true that they will continue to be pirated despite this bill. Whatever may be accomplished by this bill will be far outweighed by the evil that will follow in its wake.

In my opinion this is an attempt on the part of the large manufacturers to develop monopolies and to impede the flow of commerce by the intimidation and coercion of retailers, the manufacturers of cloaks and units. These big manufacturers will copyright the design and because of the copyright demand a higher price for the product, though the design may be a modification of one already old as the hills. Protection, undue protection is being handed to these big manufacturers on a silver platter.

There are millions of designs. Many would be copyrighted under the bill. How could the users of the cloth determine the infringement. The retailers have not the means or the time to separate the chalk from the cheese. Manufacturers of suits and blouses, ribbons, brassieres, in fact, any item involving the use of textiles would be placed at a decided disadvantage. They could never feel safe or free of fear that they may be guilty of liability for infringement. This bill would place such manufacturers in tightening straps that must ultimately impede production. One thing is certain: the manufacturers of fabrics would have a field day in price upsurge. This would be most reprehensible in view of the rising cost of living. With the exception of the copyright owner, no one would dare buy any fabrics without risking a lawsuit.

Moreover, this bill is discriminatory. It applies only to fabrics. It does not apply to, say, glassware, metalware, furniture, plastics, felt, leather, and so forth. What about the manufacturers of pocketbooks, women's hats, travel bags, breakfronts, jewelry, kitchen equipment and utensils, paper doilies and the like? Practically everything of utility value can be treated with design. With this bill we are forced to admit that the textile manufacturers are powerfully well organized and have been able to propagandize us in the direction they wish to move. There is no question that the manufacturers of items mentioned above will soon beseige us with their own definitions of originality. We will have a pretty kettle of protected designs then.

It is passing strange as one reads through the hearings on this bill that no retailer appeared. Were retailers invited to testify? Were any organizations representing the general public invited to testify? Certainly the consumer should have something to say about this subject. He has to pay.

If there is anything that requires protection, our present patent laws give ample coverage.

The bill provides:

Upon receipt of an application for the registration of a textile design, the Register of Copyrights shall cause the application to be examined and a search to be made and, if he finds the application to be in proper form and the textile design to be original and novel and not substantially to resemble in appearance a prior textile design, shall, within 7 days from the date of application, issue a certificate of registration under seal to the applicant.

What is novel or original? What satisfactory definition or measurement can be applied with reference to textiles?

As I stated before, not only did none of the retailers appear, and they are the greatest number involved, but there was nobody from the cloak and suit industry, none of the jobbers or wholesalers, none of the manufacturers of suits, brassieres, blouses, scarves, and so forth. And they are legion.

This hearing, to say the least, was lopsided. Only those who agreed in whole or in part with the bill testified.

Consider for a moment the long line of users of textile fabrics. First, we have the manufacturer of the yarn as in the case of rayon or nylon. Then we have the weaver of the fabrics, the weaver sells to the wholesalers or jobbers who in turn sell to the manufacturer of men's and women's cloaks and suits, shawls, scarves, and so forth. Then in turn there are the wholesalers and jobbers of these manufacturers. Finally there come the retailers, not to speak of the general public who is caught between the links of this chain. Within this long line are the factors, warehousemen and distributors. Anyone in this long chain of handlers could be made guilty of a violation of this act. There are no genuine safeguards for them. The implied warranty of copyright protection follows, like a nondetachable ghost, everyone concerned in the selling and handling of the product. Is each design to be checked by each of these, search to be made by each of these? It all adds up to an absurdity.

The committee is involving itself in recommendation of a bill that can kill in its attempt to cure. The industries involved therein are left to flounder in a sea of trouble, and the big manufacturers of textiles may find themselves all twisted up in their own cloth.

Imagine the plight of a retailer in a small town who has purchased a lot of gingham aprons. A representative of a competitor of the retailer's vendor or distributor arrives and tells him that if he sells the gingham aprons he is in violation of the law. The retailer, however, sells. Under section 9 of the act, he is subject to suit for infringement of copyright in the United States courts having jurisdiction of suits under the copyright laws. In many instances the United States district courts are 300 and 400 miles away. Despite the alleged safeguards in the act, this will be the effect of the operation of the act.

There will be coercion and intimidation by competitors. There will be plenty of litigation. There will be a field day for lawyers.

That Oil Shortage Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of fuel oil in certain areas in the East and Midwest has caused grave concern with the people in those areas. The increasing demand for fuel oil and other petroleum products far beyond any expectations has caused the question as to the availability of crude-oil reserves. Various committees and many Members of Congress, personally, as well as editorials, news articles, and magazines have been giving attention to this question. Our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has jurisdiction generally over petroleum, has been going into this problem and making every effort to help alleviate the immediate and critical shortages.

A preliminary report was issued which I commend to the attention of all Members. This report was dated January 26. In addition to presenting the problem recommendations were made, some of which have been carried out. Much has been said through the press and otherwise about the committee recommending an outright embargo on exports of petroleum products. This is a misrepresentation. The committee recommended the immediate cessation of the exploration and the deferment of making any foreign commitments involving the supply of petroleum and petroleum products until a complete review is made regarding imports and foreign reserves and the effect of our exports on our national economy and welfare. We said:

It appears that the situation is now so grave that exports should be stopped completely until it can be determined whether further exports are damaging to the economy of this country, and until such review is made, it appears most unwise for the country to make any foreign commitments involving supply of petroleum and petroleum products.

Such a review, Mr. Speaker, has been under way continuously and will continue. It is a problem we can meet. We must be diligent at all times toward maintaining a healthy industry. Our national welfare demands it. We must not, however, lose our sense of proportion by coming to a hasty conclusion that our domestic reserves are not adequate to meet our own needs. We must encourage and, above all, pursue, such policy that will permit the continued development of our domestic reserves. In that way, we will continue to increase as we have in the past our own reserves. In this connection, I include with my remarks an editorial on the subject entitled "That Oil Shortage Again," from the Arkansas Gazette in a recent issue:

THAT OIL SHORTAGE AGAIN

The old scarecrow of a national oil shortage, decked out in a somewhat new dress, flaps in the national economic winds. Congress has been asked by Secretary of the Interior Krug to appropriate $9,000,000 for research on extracting oil from coal and shale. Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, not to be outdone, wants funds to make synthetic oil from Iowa corncobs. The House Interstate Commerce Committee is in favor of prohibiting exports of petroleum and gasoline, and Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, has introduced a bill to that effect.

New England and some other areas are suffering. But the shortage is local, as Secretary Krug recognized several months back when he asked the National Petroleum Council to suggest ways to increase availability of oil. He said, according to The Lamp, a Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey publication, that such localized shortages as may occur "will result not from deficiency of domestic and foreign resources, nor from exports, but principally from shortages of oil-country tubular steel goods and inadequate transportation capacity."

Nothing has happened since to alter that picture. There is a great national steel shortage, and the oil industry suffers from it just as the automobile industry does. A large percentage of the refineries are located in the market areas, and the fact that their production has declined does not reflect a lack of oil resources, but a lack of the rigging, pipe, and tank cars used to obtain and transport crude.

Certainly we need to continue the investigation of extraction and distillation methods for the production of synthetic oil. But we should weigh them against the facilities already at hand. The petroleum industry has impressive new exploration techniques, and there is an excellent chance that important new fields may be brought in at any time. Moreover, new methods applied to existing fields may enormously increase production. Some experts believe, for instance, that just one of the old or "settled" fields in Arkansas, under proper repressuring, might yield more additional oil in a single month than all the corncobs in Iowa over a period of years.

This localized oil shortage is bad, and the excitement of the New Englanders who are primarily affected is understandable. But it does not provide a logical basis for the sort of panic that seems to be leading some Congressmen to turn against the Marshall plan on the ground that our oil situation is so desperate we can't afford exports. An industry that met the demands of a mechanized global war isn't like to founder in the face of a rehabilitation program for western Europe.

To Bring Hope to Children Without Hope—A Report on Europe's Children as the United Nations Appeal Opens Its World-Wide Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, while many are talking about the Marshall plan, and are interested only in European recovery and relief on the basis of politics—and they know full well that not one dollar of this money will go to the people and the nations that suffered the most from the devastations of war—it is like a breath of fresh air to read this article written by Chester Bowles that appeared in the magazine section of the New York Times last Sunday, February 1, where a plea is made on a humane and Christian basis to help all of those children of Europe who are the innocent victims of this terrible war and have no conception of international politics, and sincerely look to the United States for food, clothing, and sustenance. It would take only a small portion of the Marshall plan funds to do a job that would meet with the approval of every American, and would win for us the everlasting gratitude and friendship of the future citizens of Europe, who are today these same little hungry, undernourished, frightened, and hopeless children that Mr. Bowles refers to.

Billions of dollars are being wasted upon armaments and preparation for war. Billions of dollars are being given to countries who were our enemies and to other countries who were not our allies and did not participate in the war. For Germany, it is proposed to give $2,000,000,000 in 1948, $1,000,000,000 from the War Department appropriations and $1,000,000,000 under the Marshall plan, but to the orphans and the destitute children in the war-ravaged countries not even a kind thought or word any more. The big Christian American hearts have not become chilled and calloused to the cries of orphaned, hungry, and destitute children of Europe. Of that I am sure. It is the political and big international business interests of America who have corrupted and messed up our foreign-relief program, so that the average American does not know what our policy is or where it will lead us. There are many established charitable and religious organizations who were willing, and could have undertaken a program of relief and assistance for Europe's children. Why do we not appropriate the money for this job? Why do we not pass the bill that I introduced, which would allow gift packages to be sent postage free to all European countries devastated by war? Here are two programs which would cost so little, and would be the best insurance for peace and friendship, but I suppose that the big boys could not make any money out of these two programs, and that is why

they will not give these two humane programs their support.

Chester Bowles, as Chairman of the International Advisory Committee for the United Nations Appeal for Children, has just completed a survey trip to Europe where he assisted in the formation of committees in various countries, to conduct drives for the relief of children. Before his departure for Europe he helped to establish the United States committee for the appeal, and this committee—the American Overseas Aid-United Nations Appeal for Children—is making a drive for funds this month. The article follows:

LONDON.—Like all Americans I have had some impression of the vast difficulties of postwar reconstruction in Europe; of what Europeans are doing to help themselves, and of what help they are getting from beyond their borders. Since my last trip to Europe a year ago, I have had to depend on newspaper stories, statistical reports, and the accounts given by returning travelers.

All these left me totally unprepared for many of the things I found. Words and figures cannot convey adequately the devastation in Warsaw; the sorrow of the Czech people for the murdered men of Lidice; the tragic spread of tuberculosis among the children of France and Hungary; the tight-lipped patience of the English.

Above everything else, however, I was impressed with the courage and intensity with which all these people are attacking their problems and the hard work being put forth by men, women, and children, many of them weakened by malnutrition.

All the countries which I visited suffered appalling human losses and physical destruction in the war. This differed in degree and kind between the countries, but no American has seen such things in his own country. Let us hope he never will. All of them were slowly fighting their way back to economic recovery, primarily by their own hard work, but with major assistance from their neighbors from overseas and most of all from UNRRA.

The crops were comparatively good, wherever there were men and machinery enough to plant, cultivate, and harvest them. Livestock destroyed by the Germans was slowly being replaced. Prisoners of war had come home and were making up for lost time in the restoration of industry and commerce.

In 1947 these countries were all hit together by a new disaster—what was, perhaps, the greatest drought Europe has ever suffered. The oldest records are those of France, going back to 1816. Since that time there has been no dry spell so destructive as that of 1947.

The drought brought new tragedies expressed in reduced nutrition and reduced energy for the workers; sharply increased infant mortality, and greater incidence of tuberculosis and other diseases among children.

The force of the blow differed from country to country but the pattern was the same. Everywhere the drop in grain production brought sharp cuts in the ration of bread—the fundamental food—and milk, the absolutely essential food for infants and growing children.

There was a tragic competition between bread and milk. To feed dairy cattle meant that the people as a whole would be further weakened and their recovery imperiled or delayed. Not to feed the dairy cattle meant that there would be even less milk—and there was already far too little.

It is not possible here to give statistical details for all countries, but France provides an example which is typical in most respects. The crop failure struck the French people with stunning force. Before the war France had raised an average of 300,000,000 bushels of grain per year. She had been accustomed to virtual self-sufficiency in food, as had Poland and Hungary, which produced for export. Last year the drought cut French production by nearly two-thirds—to only 130,000,000 bushels.

In 1946 average consumption of food in France had risen from wartime levels to 2,600 calories daily—about two-thirds of the American diet but enough to give strength to the workers and hope to the country. One year later hope turned to desperation.

The grain shortage sharply reduced the supply of bread—an essential staple in every Frenchman's diet.

Barren pastures and lack of fodder led to a further slaughtering of a dairy herd already reduced by nearly one-third during the war. The remaining milch cows gave less milk, about 2 to 4 quarts daily compared with an average of 10 for cows in the United States. The milk was of lower quality with only 2 percent of butterfat, compared with 3.8 percent for American milk.

It is a particularly cruel irony that France which gave Louis Pasteur to the world is also critically short of equipment for pasteurizing and refrigerating to protect the purity of her milk. The effect on adults has been severe. The basic ration already had been cut to 2,300 calories, and it must be cut to 2,000 in the near future. On children the effect was worse and more painful to think about. At present in France 69 infants in every 1,000 die within a year of birth. This represents a reduction from 120 during the Nazi occupation, but it is double the rate in the United States. It is now increasing.

The French people have reacted with an almost universal will to work and sacrifice to save their children. In the last 2 months milk has not been available even to invalids in hospitals. All but a tiny trickle is going to children under the age of 4.

The tiny trickle is divided between children over the age of 4 and, through the dwindling black market, to wealthy foreign visitors who live in the finest hotels and go home to report that there is "plenty of food" in France.

Malnutrition came as a shock to France, for it has been a new and terrifying thing.

In Italy the murderous combination of war and drought struck hard at the people who already were very poor. The average Italian ration is an enfeebling 1,800 calories per day, but even this average is misleadingly high—for I have talked with Italian families who had eaten nothing during the previous 24 hours. The average also includes gluttony for the wealthy minority. For Italy has made less progress than France in suppressing black markets.

The great new thing that is in evidence in Italy is the determination of so many people—against the heartbreaking odds of poor soil, war-damaged industry and years of oppression—not only to recover but to break new ground for social advances. Except for details the story of need is the same in all countries. In Czechoslovakia industry is relatively booming, but her people are still forced to subsist on an average diet of less than 2,000 calories—the average American diet is 3,300. Fortunately, the Czechoslovak people, like the British, have an efficient rationing system through which meager supplies are efficiently and fairly distributed.

In Hungary—normally a food-exporting country—there is more grain. But there are critical shortages of fats, proteins, and vitamins—contributing to an infant mortality of 120 in every thousand births. Hungary, with some of the greatest physicians in the world, is powerless to cope with the high incidence of malaria and tuberculosis because of a tragic lack of medical supplies and hospital space.

It has been a mercifully mild winter in Europe. Four children in a single family have only clothing enough for one to wear at a time. It is common for fathers to make shoes for their children out of old fur, leather, or felt hats.

Poland, which suffered severely from drought, had lost 65 percent of her dairy herd and 70 percent of her farm horses during the war. It is estimated that she cannot become self-sufficient in milk for at least 8 years.

In 1944 Warsaw was the scene of one of the greatest mass tragedies in recorded history during and after an uprising of her people against the Nazis. More than 200,000 people in the city were killed, after which the Nazis went to work with dynamite to punish those who still survived. Block after block for miles were blasted until Warsaw was a prairie of rubble. The city was 92 percent destroyed.

Despite her tragedies and her weakness, for there are no bulldozers or steam shovels, and despite an average diet of from 1,700 to 2,000 calories, the people of Poland are rebuilding their nation almost with their bare hands. The 600,000 who still live in Warsaw of her prewar population of 1,400,000 are huddled in cavelike rooms amid the wreckage, but they are working with passionate intensity to make a new and better life for themselves and their children.

This yearning for a better life and determination to have it are universal. I have seen this in each country I have visited.

Yearning and even determination are not enough, however, for every one of these countries desperately needs help. They need to help each other and they are helping each other with a steadily growing trade. With even an average crop next year Hungarian wheat may add again to the bread supply of Czechoslovakia and to the spaghetti supply of Italy; Italian olive oil may alleviate some of the desperate fat shortage in Hungary and France.

But most of all they need help from richer and more powerful countries.

After the United Nations won the war the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was established to repair some of the damage and heal some of the wounds. Every nation gave 1 percent of its national income to UNRRA, and $5,000,000,000 was raised—spent, most of it, I am convinced, with great care, economy, and wisdom. UNRRA was terminated, but the special needs of children and adolescents, of nursing and pregnant mothers, were still recognized by the United Nations, which established the International Children's Emergency Fund and the United Nations Appeal for Children.

A plan was projected whereby the Children's Fund would give aid to 20,000,000 children for a full year, with food, clothing, and medical care. To finance this program the governments of the United Nations were expected to contribute $400,000,000. In 2 or 3 years it was thought that the gravest phase of the emergency would be over, and that the war-ravaged countries would be well on their way toward self-sufficiency again.

But the governments provided only a bare dribble of funds. Something vital in human awareness had disappeared with UNRRA and less than one-tenth of the needed sum was collected after months of effort. A series of tragic choices had to be made. Only 4,000,000 children could be cared for out of the tens of millions who badly needed help. The 1-year program had to be cut to 6 months. Clothing and medicine had to be virtually eliminated from the program.

The 6-month lease on life for a relatively small number of needy children in 12 countries has already started. A small, hard-working staff of the Children's Fund is seeing to it that every pound of lard, horse meat, cod-liver oil, and every ounce of powdered milk—the major supply item—goes directly to children and infants. Supervised group feedings guarantee that none of the supply can enter black market channels. The United Nations appeal for children seeks to extend that 6-month lease on life and to reach more children by asking individual men and women all over the world to fill in the gap left by their governments—to give 1 day in earnings or effort.

The way the people of Europe are working for reconstruction has been inspiring. Equally inspiring has been their reception of the United Nations appeal for children—even in countries which have themselves suffered terribly. For the people of Europe the appeal means more than food alone. It means peace and a chance for the peoples to cooperate directly in an international undertaking. In this I think they are in advance of their governments.

At present it appears that national committees of the United Nations appeal for children in at least 14 European countries will participate in the campaign for funds. I have met with several of these committees, and I have been enormously impressed both with their enthusiasm and their ingenuity. The Danes already have given great quantities of antituberculär serum to other countries, and more will probably be given through the appeal. This serves to highlight how much can be done with only a little help—for all the children in Europe can be protected for less than the cost of a few heavy bombers, for instance.

From the people of Norway have come cod-liver oil and offers of more. The Czechs, Hungarians, and Poles, with little to offer but their tireless labor, talk in terms of labor.

Words and figures are truly not adequate to convey some of the impressions which have been burned into my mind on this brief trip. All I can do is to pass on the facts about some of the things I can never forget.

In an industrial town near Paris, in a windowless 1-room shack, an 11-year-old girl was caring for three smaller children—and for her father, whose legs have been amputated, and who will have to wait for several more weeks for artificial legs. Her mother was at work at a $10-a-week job, trying to earn enough to keep the family alive—and together. The little shack was neat. The children were clean. Most surprising of all, the 11-year-old was singing.

There were many more 1-room shacks on the outskirts of Rome. In one of them a war widow lived with five children. Whenever there is hard rain the family and their neighbors have to leave their homes and go out on the hillside.

A few hundred yards away a big housing development being erected for the people at the bottom of the hill. I was told that the Costello family will not be able to move in because the mother's $3 monthly widow's pension will not give her enough to swing it. The cost is $1 per month. That is the current black-market price in Rome for a package of American cigarettes.

Near Budapest there are other shacks that I shall not soon forget. In one the father has five children, and tuberculosis. There is no hospital bed available for him, and there is not enough antituberculär serum for his children. His wife is striving to keep the family alive by growing a few vegetables and selling them.

In Warsaw there was a 10-by-14-foot corner of the cellar of a blasted house. In it lived what was left of the Marshy family, a boy of 7, his sister aged 10, and their grandmother. The father, mother, and a baby boy and a girl, who should be 15 now, were killed in the Warsaw uprising of 1944.

The grandmother found the children wandering in the streets and moved them into the cellar. To support them she earns a few cents an hour, removing rubble by hand. In addition, she receives $2 monthly from the Welfare Department. The children take turns going to school because there are not enough clothes for both.

They are among the fortunate few who get a little bread given by the government, spread with lard and washed down with milk contributed by the United Nations Children's Fund.

There are millions of children living like this in the countries which I have visited. But I shall remember not only the misery, hunger, and squalor. I shall remember the neatly tied ribbons in the little girls' hair in the Warsaw and Budapest orphanges, the pathetic decorations in the peasant huts in Italy and Czechoslovakia, the cheerful nursery group in the devastated Polish schools; the grateful appreciation of Hungarian and French doctors for new hospital equipment just received from the Swiss; and the calm, quiet, cheerful determination of teachers and social workers, nurses and physicians in every country as with meager resources they attack the problems of a new generation born in war.

The children of Europe and Asia are living in a world of misery created by our generation. It is our responsibility that they shall have an opportunity to build a new world infinitely better than the one they know today. The United Nations appeal for children is a challenge to every parent, every worker, farmer, and businessman who seeks to build a world of peace and understanding.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

FACTS TO CONSIDER

Did the war reduce Europe's population? No, it has more people. In the past 10 years, according to the Population Reference Bureau, Europe has increased in population by 14,000,000.

What has this to do with the Marshall plan? A lot. A number of the 16 nations in the Marshall plan are giving bonuses for babies. We are called upon to feed them. Can we, and for how long?

In 1946, these 16 countries had 4,396,000 babies who survived to age one. Using wheat as a yardstick of food, it would take 920,000 acres of land to grow the minimum food for 1 year's lot of new Europeans. That equals the total crop land in New Jersey.

If in the next 4 years, the European crop of cannon fodder continues to increase at the same rate, it would take 18,200,000 acres to adequately feed these children from 1 to 4 years old. That is as much cropland as there is in California, our second largest State. This is for children alone. It does not count Europe's grown-ups and old people.

Meantime, our population has been increasing at about the same rate. Add the expected European children to our own children and you see trouble ahead. Wheat is, in fact, a minimum yardstick to measure calories. Small children can't eat wheat gruel all the time. They need milk, and cows make greater demands on acreage than wheat—both summer pasture and hay and grain in winter.

Dr. Hugh Bennett, chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service, told Congress we did not have enough good land left in the country for ourselves. That was 8 years ago. That was before the war, and before Marshall. Recently, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson has warned: "We continue to drain our soil fertility. * * * We are plowing land in the plains that is sure to be blown away in dust storms."

The Marshall plan will not send dollars abroad. It will send top-soil and our resources of phosphate, potash, iron, coal, petroleum, timber, etc. What about them? With reference to minerals, the Secretary of the Interior reported in 1945: "We have a meager supply * * * We are relatively weak now." Dr. Elmer Peterson of the Bureau of Mines says: "It follows that the faster we grow in industrial strength and military power * * * the faster we liquidate the basis of our power."

We are already living on our "capital" of natural resources. In 1943, our timber cut was 50 percent more than new growth. Lumber is short now. So is paper. We are in sight of the end of our good iron ore and other metals. Fuel oil rationing is also in sight.

In the light of these facts, President Truman's assertion that the Marshall plan will take only 5 percent of our total production is misleading. India, with her 388,000,000 hungry people—hungrier than Europeans—is already asking to come in under the Marshall plan. Why not? Then China, with her 470,000,000 hungry people, is next. Congress in fact, wants China to start sharing now.

If these countries threaten to go Communist unless we feed them, what do we do? Save Europe (if it can be saved) and let Stalin take over Asia?

We have 6,000,000 farms, and a farm population of 30,000,000. Are these 30,000,000 people to feed themselves and our 110,000,000 nonfarm Americans, and furnish a large part of the groceries to the 219,000,000 in the 16 Marshall plan European countries, plus 858,000,000 in India and China?

These are hard facts. They must be faced. If we let all these nations on our bandwagon, when do they get off? And where do we come out?

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by George Weller, Boston, Mass., foreign correspondent for the Chicago Daily News and Pulitzer Prize winner, before the Economic Club of Detroit, Detroit, Mich., January 5, 1948:

Mr. JOHN S. COLEMAN. * * * I have heard a top newspaper executive call our speaker of the evening, Mr. Weller, "One of the best, if not the best, foreign correspondent of our day." I am told that Mr. Weller has an objective viewpoint concerning the Marshall plan. I am hopeful that his talk will further clarify my thinking as to the possible success of what is called the Marshall plan in Europe, and the impact it will have on our living here.

Gentlemen, I am happy to introduce to you Mr. George Weller, foreign correspondent for the Chicago Daily News. Mr. Weller.

Mr. GEORGE WELLER. Thank you very much, Mr. Coleman.

It is customary for the visiting preacher to a new congregation to announce his text. My text, which may seem to you at first a little dry, is taken from the book of numbers. Let me read:

Albania, $40,000,000; Austria, $63,000,000; Australia, $54,000,000; Belgium, $494,000,000; Brazil, $70,000,000; Burma, $11,000,000; Canada, $138,000,000; Chile, $42,000,000; China, $1,482,000,000; Costa Rica, $1,500,000; Czechoslovakia, $31,000,000, plus about $400,000,000 UNRRA; $40,000,000 to Denmark; $1,000,000 to Ecuador; Egypt, $11,000,000; Ethiopia; $4,000,000; Finland, $92,000,000; France, $1,950,000,000; Great Britain, $4,400,000,000; Greece, 790,000,000; Hungary, $15,000,000; Ireland, $65,000; India $50,000,000; Italy, $538,000,000; Iran, $30,000,000; Korea, $62,000,000; Liberia, $20,000,000; Mexico, $87,000,000; Netherlands, $377,000,000; New Zealand, $5,000,000; Nicaragua, $2,000,000; Norway, $56,000,000; Peru, $3,000,000; the Philippines, $695,000,000; Poland, $90,000,000, plus another approximate $400,000,000 in UNRRA; the Soviet Union, $250,000,000; Turkey, $270,000,000; Yemen, $1,000,000; Yugoslavia, another approximate $400,000,000 in UNRRA.

I have been reading to you the postwar—not midwar, but postwar—aid that the United States has given to the world.

Today, stepping off from this background, we look at a new American plan to help the world. We want to know: what does the Marshall plan mean to Europe? and what does it mean to us? The motives, the aims, of the Marshall plan were stated after Mr. Marshall's overture at Harvard June 5, ably described to you by Mr. Coleman. Marshall's bid was taken up by the conference of ministers in Paris, where I was at that time, this summer. The objectives as taken up by those ministers with the exception of Mr Molotoff were four:

Rerevive production in Europe.

To restore its financial stability.

To work for greater economic cooperation between the nations.

To correct the dollar deficit of these nations with regard to their imports from the United States.

Who can quarrel with these purposes? Certainly none. Who should examine them? Certainly whoever is asked to finance them or who offers to finance them.

Now, it is important before we examine a plan like this in detail that we try to find out what in general it means. The Marshall plan as a whole is, I am convinced, beyond the comprehension of even those people who try to work closest to it. But we have to content ourselves with its impression on the people whom it helps, and the people who pay for it. First, then, the people who pay for it—ourselves.

We are told that the Marshall plan has as its purpose to save Europe from hunger, from communism, and from chaos. These are all fright words.

The backers of the Marshall plan argue that hunger is a living and real danger in Europe today, along with communism, and that chaos actually threatens. No other solution is proposed than money. Money and goods.

There is no problem of power to those who propose the Marshall plan. There is no give-and-take of power politics. No. This experiment has to be carried out in a pure vacuum where economic laws alone prevail. So it appears to us, and so it is offered to us.

Now, to Europe, this plan seems a little less impeccable than it does to us. It is welcomed, of course, by the minority of governments who find themselves facing terrible dilemmas, who find themselves faced with the obligation of making reforms and adjustments, and who see here in this plan a sort of remittance, a sort of postponement of, their necessity to wrestle directly with these problems.

There are others who cannot yet speak out their favor for the Marshall plan. I mean the government officials in the Communist satellite countries. It offers another out for them. If the United States can be induced to pour without security millions upon millions more of dollars into western Europe a profitable trade can be awakened, profitable for the eastern countries under the iron yoke and behind the iron curtain. Naturally these two minorities of officials, the Communist governments and the unreformed, semi-Socialist governments of the West, principally the governments of the East, silently welcome the Marshall plan.

But the majority of the European peoples are puzzled by the Marshall plan. They cannot understand why a country which has already given so generously to Europe should continue to wish to do so. The Europeans are in general critical and aleptical of mind. They want to know where the joker is in this generosity. They cannot believe that Americans can actually dispose of these sums seriously without asking recompense. And when they look at the list of the countries they are even more puzzled.

I am sure anyone who has been in Ireland, where I started out my tour this summer of Europe, would be puzzled indeed to know why Ireland was among the countries interested in a commercial gain through the Marshall plan; Ireland which remained neutral through the war; Ireland which provided me, as I took a bus across from Shannon to Dublin, with the biggest helping of roast beef and potatoes that I had anywhere, including the United States, for a very modest sum. Why does Ireland need any commercial boost? anyone would ask who has been in Ireland.

Why Scandinavia, whose industry is booming, and whose markets lack for nothing? Why Belgium, which has many items on its markets that we cannot, except at greater price, obtain here? Why is Switzerland to gain a trading lift, Switzerland where there is no housing problem such as we have, and where there is normal employment and a stable economy running along very smoothly, after a history, as far as the war is concerned, of being completely without injury?

Why, even somebody may ask, France, which as long ago as last May, 8 months ago, had already elevated itself to 93 percent of her former industrial capacity?

This is a genuine puzzle a d amazing, and the people have no answer for it, other than our open foreign explanation of rebuilding Europe at our expense. But there are those who are ready to give them more sinister explanations of self-interest.

The Communist Party in all these countries is ready to say that the purpose of America is imperialism. Well, now, "imperialism." What do we mean by that? Imperialism is perhaps the most abused word in all our confusion of semantics. Communists don't say what they mean by American imperialism. They don't say what the Americans want to get in return, because the Americans themselves don't say it. But it is easy for them to say that the Americans will eventually claim a price, because it is so irrational to any European to think that they will not.

Any European observer, looking today at the shift of weight of power in Europe so powerfully on the side of the Soviets and so much against us in the postwar changes, must believe that this is only the first step, the first overture, toward an eventual recovery of our loss in the balance of power which existed at the end of the war.

Can we expect gratitude? I dislike, because Americans are emotionally so susceptible on these points, to try to discuss and weigh so intangible a substance as gratitude. Gratitude can be found in some quarters in Europe. But I cannot say honestly that it is loudly, warmly, regularly, or spontaneously expressed.

We have had a thank-you note or two from some British town to a like-named town in the United States, where there was direct aid given from the foster town to the parent. We have some of that sort of personal gratitude. But altogether the Marshall plan is too far above the heads of all to feel any direct responsibility or any direct gratitude.

There is a rationalization of this indifference at hand. Europe has an idea that America is inexhaustible. America's difficulties, our declining land resources, are never discussed in the European press. They treat our aid as something natural, something due them, and something that comes from the less-harmed country to them, more by right than by generosity.

Now, if there were a Marshall plan for European recovery common to all the nations of the western world, this image would quite drastically change; if there were a broad front, a general front similar to the United Nations of accepted responsibility. But that is not the case.

A challenge of Mr. Marshall's remarks at Harvard has been picked up in its entirety and completely, and without any reference on the part of the European nations to a general sharing, when needed, by Mr. Marshall himself. That is why when Italy is portrayed to us in the darkest terms as needing immediate assistance of very large nature, nobody pays much attention to Italy's dealings with other countries.

If they did they would know that about 6 weeks ago Italy concluded an agreement to acquire beef and wheat from the Argentine to the tune of $175,000,000. Is this a gift, like America's of wheat and coal? No, it is not. Is is largess from the rich to the poor? No, it is not. The Argentine Government alro dislikes communism. But are they giving away their hard-raised cattle and their wheat for it? No, they are not. Are they making this credit without interest to Italy? No, they are not. The credit charge or interest rate is 2½ to 3½ percent.

Europeans just don't understand these contradictions.

So we see that the Marshall plan is two different things to the giver and the receiver. It isn't what it appears to be to us to the Europeans who are to receive it.

Now let's pick the Marshall plan up by one tendril. Let's pick it up by the question of imperialism. What is America going to get out of this?

The Marxists are usually pretty realistic about these things. They are trained in the school where you don't give anything away for nothing. Let's say that it is actually true that we are doing this in order to stop communism. Well, this is indeed the basis upon which the Marshall plan is increasingly being sold to the American people.

Why stop communism? Because communism, as we perceive, as it breaks surface now in the postwar period, we see a gigantic network of power concentrated in the Kremlin. We see it pushing forth outward and upward from the ground in all directions. We see its acts, and they threaten us.

Now, how did we get to this position? Two great nations emerged from this war; one nation, the European one, had lost most of its industry and many of its people. It conserved, however, a birth rate, a breeding rate, far higher than its competitor on the other side of the ocean. Its vitality was intact. Its national pride, quite rightfully so, high. Its resources, most important, were intact.

The other nation on the other side of the water came out of the war with much less losses in manpower, but still with a far lower birth rate. It emerged with its surface industry unharmed in any way, but with its resources greatly sapped by an attempt to supply all the lacks of its allies.

Here are two powers more equal than we sometimes think of them. Which will win? We are not here interested in which these nations God smiles upon, but which is likely to endure. We are asking ourselves which will win, not which one morally deserves to.

One of these nations fought on a single front; took heavy losses; traded space for time. Space and lives. The other jumped space across two great oceans and fought on two fronts.

The first nation was prodigal in valor and prodigal in casualties. The second nation was equally prodigal in valor and prodigal with its resources and securities.

Then victory came. And here again, by an odd reversal of techniques, the nation which in the beginning had traded space for time, which had retreated, when the victory came, and great part by itself, now raced on not only back to the lines where it had been before, but far beyond them. It discovered a new political weapon in the partisan forces. It used the partisans to establish new governments satellite to itself. It concentrated all its attention on building up it own strength at home.

And the other nation that had been so bold in action when it jumped the ocean with its armies, and had promised to put back democracy everywhere in the world? What did it do? This nation retreated. It drew back its forces across the oceans. It considered the war over, because the shooting war was over, and it said, "Let's play at peace."

One army remained tommy-gun at the ready, at its positions. Even today, 2 years later, this army occupies several more countries than the army that crossed the oceans. It occupies not only Austria and Germany. It maintains by right of treaty signed by all the other parties in the war, troops of communication—so-called in Hungary and Rumania. Its own advantage is very great, even through its own army, even exclusive of the powerful allies that it has created, and the satellite armies it controls and arms.

What of the other nation? The other nation, with a politically illiterate army, clamored to bring the boys home. It has left behind a mere weak, token force incapable—except at the single point of Trieste—of putting up any kind of military show or resistance.

The first nation had a social program, oh, yes. Its program was to seize and hold all enterprise, and hold it for itself, and to lodge all that could not be seized for itself in the hands of a friendly government, a puppet government, and to ask for as much more as possible afterward.

And what was the policy of the other nation, the nation from across the seas? To send of its own substance to support not only its own forces, not only the civilian populations, but even the armies of its allies, to prop up their political bargaining power. Did it increase its number of troops? It did not. What about the postwar policies? No more than had peace begun, immediately the nation from across the seas began immediately to read from the book of numbers.

But the other nation began to bargain. It did not bargain only with those whom it feared in western Europe. It bargained heartily with its own allies, and profited from them.

I have just read of the recent agreement between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia—Czechoslovakia, to whom we have given about $400,000,000 through UNRRA. Czechoslovakia has just received $23,000,000 of credit from Russia. A credit; not a gift. The credit will be paid for by barter in 1949 and 1950.

Notice the significant characteristics of this relationship. It is for a small sum. It is for a short term. And it is for real goods to come back in return for the credit. Contrast these terms with the loose American way of dealing: big amounts, long terms, small return.

Of these two rival nations one has a philosophy that calls upon all nations to join it. It invites them all, adaptable to their policies wherever they are. It has sown its seed in small, well integrated units, as I have seen in Indochina and Indonesia, and the Philippines.

The other nation says the thing to do is to turn the native peoples completely free, as was done in the case of the Philippines; to pay for their new freedom and to pay for their friendships; to disregard all strategy; to disregard all security.

As for those places in Asia where there is colonial war going on, the great power of Europe says the thing to do is support the masses, to encourage the struggling peoples. The other, the American Nation, supports by loans, and indirect or direct help, these colonial wars of France and Holland. While mentioning nothing of supporting these wars in its Marshall plan, it continues loaning more money to make them possible.

I think if you compare these two techniques you will have very little doubt, quite dispassionately speaking, as to which one of the two rivals is likely to be in the lead.

One of them—let's go just a bit further in this examination—boasts a conspiratorial party of internationally organized, devoted, idealistic fanatics. It has two wings in every country, aboveground and underground, prepared to go underground or to emerge, prepared to exploit the weaknesses of every situation.

We understand how this works when we see the first clamor on the part of the American troops to get home, which came in many cases from Communists in our own forces. Some later identified themselves, such as the Daily Worker correspondent who was on Stars and Stripes, who was the author of the Let's Go Home editorials in the Stars and Stripes in Japan.

But the nation which crossed the seas has no mass or conspirational organization whatever. It depends on an endless coal chute of money. When anything is needed anywhere it lifts the chute and lets down some more dollars.

The first nation has a systematic pattern of conquest. Its make-up is a partisan army, the rigging of elections, the essential partisans of the Soviet Army during the critical period seize all key posts in the cabinet, and finally the eradication of the opposition of all other parties systematically through trials. All this technique is clearly laid down in their own writer in Lenin, who says precisely how to do this. His instructions they follow faithfully and successfully.

And the other nation, to answer this, either withdraws their funds or ships in another great big bale of American dollars to answer it. Dollars, dollars. Anything can be cured with dollars.

How did we get to this vulnerable, humiliating position: We got to it through Teheran and Yalta. We got to it through conceding eastern Europe at Teheran to the division of two powers, only one of which was capable of exercising its strength there.

And the other great defeat was in the Far East. There we made critical concessions at Yalta. We gave the Chinese Communists a great base in Manchuria.

I don't like to sound tragic about this. But I think it is safe to say American blood will sometime flow for these terrible defeats.

Now we are in the process of waking up. We have slowly found out, a few of us actually realize that we lost the war. We did not win the war. We won it strategically, but we lost it politically. We lost it to that rival nation, first politically, and now strategically.

When today our Chief Executive compares, as he did in the case of Greece, the cost of a $400,000,000 loan to Greece and Turkey, to the cost of the entire war, he is comparing a tiny little front, only one of the fronts upon which we face defeat. The cost of the war will be not $400,000,000,000, but it will be nearer—when we have paid if off—$700,000,000,000.

Now, what do we want to do? We seem to want to buy back a buffer state in Europe. We want to buy back with dollars a western European buffer state. Now, this may sound rather crass to you, a rather crass analysis. There are humanitarian motives that we all feel. These exist. But they are so mixed up with this terrible military dilemma that they cannot be extracted, one element from another. So we have proponents of the Marshall plan jumping back and forth; from compassion to fear of communism and back to compassion again. It is confusing. Perhaps it is meant to be confusing.

If I might look backward I dare to say that these things, these humanitarian acts abroad, were better done when we handed them over to genuinely dedicated people like the Quakers who were selflessly devoted to humanity and were capable and efficient administrators of the humanitarian method of aid. Today it is especially desirable that we achieve this separation, first of all, between humanitarian sympathy and military reality.

Now, how did communism come into the countries with which we are mostly concerned?

We are worried about communism arising in western Europe, and we are worried because the wave of seizure has moved westward. Let's look very rapidly and briefly at this advance.

About 3 months ago I was in Bulgaria covering the Petkov trial, where a man who had been for all of his life a struggler for the rights of the peasants, a struggler for the small farmer, faced a rigged trial, and was eventually hanged. It was the last act of a straight Leninist drama.

But how was Bulgaria taken by the Communist Party? Bulgaria, which had played with the Nazis throughout the war; Bulgaria, on whom the Soviet Union declared war only after she was beaten and had made peace overtures to the rest of the Allies. It was done by the tardy creation of a Bulgarian partisan force of occupation by the Soviet Army. Then followed the placing of the partisan leaders in key Government positions, the gradual eradication of the other parties through terrorist measures, and suppression of the press, and so to the final drama of Petkov's death.

Look at Yugoslavia; the same thing obtains. Here is a more stellar record of resistance to the Germans, it is true, but nevertheless with the same pattern by a partisan corps; a leader trained in the Spanish Civil War becoming a leader of the country, with the Soviet Army to insure his predominance. In Albania, the same thing. Again a leader trained in Communist technique taking over the country.

Albania is an interesting example, because in reading to you from the book of numbers you remember I led off with $40,000,000 from us for Albania. Albania is one of the countries where America is today, in spite of the $40,000,000, unable even to maintain a diplomatic mission.

Go northward a little in Hungary. Again we have this phenomenon of the axis country taking over—the Soviet army on the scene; the adroit gradual pressure. Don't think that the Soviet commander goes around with a tommy gun and walks into the headquarters of the opposition parties and personally cleans it out. He does nothing of the kind. He simply terrorizes indirectly, by carefully managed methods, all opposition.

Northward to Czechoslovakia, where we see one of the last stages of transition of power to the Communists. We see a cabinet so completely dominated by the Communists that even the Catholic priest, who is the minister of communications, flipflops against the Marshall plan at Soviet command like all the

other members. Twenty-four hours ago they are unanimously pro the Marshall plan, and 24 hours later they are against it.

Poland. Again we have the pattern of the pressure government of Lublin; the delegates going to Moscow being arrested, and the gradual taking over, all the same steps.

Today you are told that communism arises itself out of hunger. You are told that it is a manifestation of the unrest of hungry people. Was there any hunger in those countries I named? No. The American people paid to assuage their hunger. Were there any riots? Were there mass organizations? No. Not in any of them. That idea is the sheerest rubbish and the sheerest play upon American fear.

Under the Marshall plan we are being blackmailed, blackmailed by the fear of communism.

Yes, we have lost the war in eastern Europe, as we lost it in Manchuria. But it was lost from the top, not by any mass movement, not by any idealistic economist's test under the bell glass. It was lost from the top by well-planned capably carried out resolutions. And we even paid for some of them.

Today we have a sort of a fear, an odd sort of fear, arising among us Americans. Some timid souls are fearful of opposing the Marshall plan because of being called pro-Communist.

Why do the Communists oppose the Marshall plan anyway? Well, they do it for tactical reasons, not for reasons of grand strategy, but for tactical reasons.

You see, the Marshall plan which is now proposed to us as an answer to communism, wasn't anti-Communist when Mr. Marshall proposed it at Harvard. Far from it. He proposed, if you remember, a general plan of aid to all European nations, specifically including—he was interrogated on it afterward—Russia. So that which is being sold to you now as anti-Communist plan was not such in the beginning. It became anti-Communist only after the Soviet Union, Mr. Molotov, in Paris refused to participate in it. Then it acquired its first anti-Communist line, and then the Communist International drove the southern Balkan states into line. It was after the Soviet Union compelled Poland and Czechoslovakia to do a flipflop that the Marshall plan became in our imagination anti-Communist.

But is it any weapon against communism? Is this afterthought worth so many billion dollars? Naturally, the Soviet Union has its own plan for a closed economy in eastern Europe and does not want the Marshall plan. But the Marshall plan is not a real threat in any sense to the Communists, and they are not worried about it. They are unable to find any arguments against it because actually it helps eastern Europe.

The only thing that they fear is the possibility that America might wake up and find out that she has been licked strategically in both Balkans and Far East and might do something about it.

The Marshall plan was probably invented to take the sting out of the Truman plan. The Truman doctrine looked too realistic. We tossed out the Marshall plan and turned it into a general over-all help, which was enlarged upon at Paris. Later, as you know, it was vastly expanded into this colossal amount: originally twenty-eight or twenty-nine million dollar plan, now seventeen-billion plan.

The real prize then has nothing to do with the economies of western Europe. The real prize that we are trying for is the economies of this solid block of satellite states that have been taken over by the Soviet Union. But promoting their trade with our gift-dollars, is not going to shake their governments very much, is it?

Now, it is an interesting experience for commercially minded men to go to countries like Poland, Yugoslavia, or Czechoslovakia and see there an economy functioning where the people know nothing about what is going on. Here is the way this trade-pact business works in those countries. A trade-pact is announced with, let us say, Bulgaria or Hungary. Well, two-thirds of the essential statistics are there, but not the other third that gives the meaning. We are going to sell $34,000,000 worth of hides and paper for $34,000,000 worth of clocks and hatchets, but nobody says how many we are going to get; nobody says what they cost; nobody says what or how it is going to be handled. The whole thing is a complete mystery. It is a mystery to those of us who are observers. We are supposed to tell what it means. But we cannot. Why? Because the essential figures are always omitted. You always either get the quantity and you don't get the value; or you get both; you don't get the price per item; or you don't get the time of the credit or you don't get the interest rate. Something is always left out. Talk about the corporations dropping a curtain in front of their economies. They've got nothing on the collectivist economists as I have seen them.

Russia is jumping this year her share in the Czech economy, from 4½ to 18 percent. And the Czechs, who are trying to play the game both ways, have pleaded for more American aid, if you please, in the face of having turned down the Marshall plan. Yet they are trying to get control of about 40 percent of their trade and hold it inside the economies of eastern Europe.

East and western Europe have made some 70 treaties of trade. They are not significant. So the question of autarchy remains.

Now, what are we going to do? Are we going to create a new autarchical system in western Europe? Is this the Marshall plan? The Russians say it is.

But, according to Mr. Harriman's interpretation, the Marshall plan is to help the countries of eastern Europe as well as the west, in other words, we are to help further with dollars the people whom the Russians already control.

Now, the Marshall plan has been likened to lend-lease. In lend-lease, you remember, we gave aid short of war to countries whose defeat we excluded, in the sense that we intended to continue to give it to them until they won, or we came in and they won through our coming in. But it is a false analogy to compare the Marshall plan with lend-lease, because under the Marshall plan we are helping both sides.

Now, there are lots of other places in the world where we are paying for both sides. Let's take, for example, at random, Palestine. The Zionists hope to collect here this year $258,000,000 to help the armed Jewish forces in Palestine, discountable from income tax as charity. The Arabs count for their particular aid on the steady flow of dollars through the sale of oil to the United States. So it is nothing new for the Americans to be paying both ways. In the case of the Arabs we are getting something back for it: oil. In the case of the Zionists, the Zionists of America are getting back in satisfaction helping people whom they sympathize with.

But have we reached a point where we want to promote the trade of Russia's satellites even more than we have already done?

The danger in plunging in this way, one of the dangers, is that which is so well illustrated by Greece today. We think of Greece as more under our control than any country in east or western Europe. Yet in Greece you will find a good example of the decadence of this dollar approach, this woefully unstrategic dollar approach.

We have today a Greek army of 150,000 men. They have been struggling for about a year with an army one-tenth their size—15,000 men. The rebels have possession of no city. Yet indirect support to the nationalists already has cost us through the nose. We are spending $300,000,000—about half of it, it is true, to aid the Greek economy—and already the Greeks want more.

Let's consider what is going to happen when we have once defeated this paltry little guerrilla army of less than a division.

I do not wish to present this case in an unsympathetic way to the Greek cause. I was with the Greek Army in northern Thrace only 3 months ago, and saw the difficulties they are there confronted with. Incidentally you may be interested to know that I had some partisan guerrilla pamphlets in my hand, which were explaining that the Americans were planning to give Thrace. Thrace is that northeast corner of Greece, which is one of the most fertile sections of Greece. The Americans were supposed to be planning to give Thrace to Turkey as a prize, and so the Thracians were called to fight on the side of the guerrillas.

Now, what is going to happen when you have to find places in the Greek economy for these 150,000 soldiers we have built up? Would it not have been better to have gone into Greece immediately, to have established strong American bases there, to have met this tremendous challenge of 90,000,000 Slav peoples outside Russia and under Slav, under Russian domination, to have met it directly ourselves, instead of to have to do as we have done? The Greeks can never counterbalance alone this great monolith hanging over them. Now, all these Greeks must spend their energies and our money chasing down 15,000 guerrillas. We distort the economy in a military sense while trying to build it up economically.

It seems to me that the long-range strategic responsibilities have been left too far aside in our plans. And the Marshall plan is part of this dreamy, merely economic approach.

Now, I have some diffidence about criticizing the public presentation of the Marshall plan. Why? Because I have uncovered in my study of how the European difficulty is being treated publicly some rather embarrassing information.

There is a well-known magazine of American medical science. About a year and a half ago a very important expert on nutrition, one of the leading dieticians of the country, was returning from Army service in Europe. Learning that he had prepared a report on hunger in Europe, the magazine asked for it for publication. The article came in. The magazine accepted it, and set the article up in type. The article said that there was no starvation in Europe anywhere, except briefly in Holland. It said that there was some undernourishment, but that there was no danger of epidemic disease or political unrest due to hunger.

This article if published at that time would have been picked up by the newspapers in general and would have caused a strong counter-reaction in the United States. It was not published. Why? Because upon learning of the article an important Government department wrote to the magazine and asked that it be suppressed. The article was suppressed, and is still suppressed.

Important figures get subordinated because they do not fit the general alarmist picture of hunger, chaos, and communism in western Europe.

I take these liberties because I am a newspaper man myself, and one of our greatest sports is self-criticism. The other day I saw, in Raymond Daniell's New York Times report from Berlin, that 62 percent of the German farmers have falsified their food accounts 62 percent. They have to turn in their quotas, and 62 percent were crooked. Might that be why we have to feed Germany?

Another story that I see much subordinated is the fact that the countries whom we propose to aid under the Marshall plan—these countries alone—have $13,000,000,000 in holdings in the United States.

In all the treatment of the Marshall plan I very rarely see it pointed out that there will be charges beginning July 1 of a billion dollars in aid to Europe outside the Marshall plan.

Why does the Government want to take this gamble? Well, I don't know. How can they call so coolly for such a gigantic experiment? It happens that I just came from New York. I spent 2 days in a hotel without any heat. The hotel had no oil. I have been living at Harvard University, studying and resting. I find around me there many young men who want to get married, want to raise future Americans, and are at the age when they should be establishing families, and cannot get a place to live. Suppose they marry. They can get one room or two rooms. They cannot raise a family. Don't they need a Marshall plan?

I look at our soil situation. I learn from the agronomists that our top soil is rapidly decreasing and it will pass the depletion point to feed this entire Nation.

I look at the words of a friend—Wallace Deuel—a news correspondent in Washington. He says that the Bureau of Mines says the United States has almost used up 21 out of 33 essential minerals. We have already used up 97 percent of our mercury; 68 percent of our lead and silver; 80 percent of chromium; 70 percent of tungsten, manganese, and bauxite; 65 percent of zinc. We will be all out of gold, the thing we are shoveling to Europe, in 14 years, but we will be all out of lead in 12; silver in 11; bauxite in 9; vanadium in 7; tungsten, antimony, and platinum in 4; asbestos and mercury in 3. We have 2 years' supply left of manganese.

It seems to me that under this situation the best thing for us to do is to do what should have been done long ago; that is, to drop this Marshall plan—which is European made anyhow—and begin all over again.

What does beginning all over again mean? Well, it means that on the aid side we will accept the principle already introduced by the leader of one of the Government missions that went to Europe, CHRISTIAN HERTER, who says that a 4-year plan is unnecessary, and that a 15-month plan is the maximum that should be undertaken.

I think that an early thing that we must take care of is the minimum hunger needs in Europe. But first there must be as well an American military plan.

And this revision must not be carried out as though it were an interesting economic experiment at the cost of the American people, even though Mr. Marshall calls it himself at best a calculated risk.

Our whole method has been upside down. Europe is being taken by military force and an applied political onslaught, not by hunger. If there is uncertainty or fear, it is our weakness that has created it, nor has our generosity checked it.

What are we gambling with in the Marshall plan? We are gambling with something more serious than the seventeen or the six billion dollars. What we are gambling with is the idealism of the American people. We know that they are being hard pressed at this moment even to feed themselves adequately. We know that prices are going up. We know that nobody is telling our people, or almost nobody, that the real struggle in Europe today is the struggling power of armies, of weapons, not of economies or moneys.

And if it should be that there be a depression, or a recession, as there is almost sure to be, when we reach the end of our present market, if this should happen and should coincide as it well may be with a new American wave of isolationism, you will find the last barriers going down in Europe, with no military means over there to halt them.

The thing we must do is to begin to plan a new plan, not the Marshall plan, a new plan, calling for permanent American bases overseas, with enough counterweight in power to match the counterweight of the eastern nations, where we have lost the political war to the Soviet Union. Using military reality as a background we can then begin to aid on a self-liquidating basis those countries who are ready to accept our aid. Then having pushed their great military fear out of the equation we can begin to see clearly.

Today we have this dilemma of giving our money, unconditionally and thus throwing it away, or giving our money with strings and not losing it earning the resentment of the Europeans. We can resolve it if we grapple first with the military crisis, maintain aid and strengthen our force in Europe, and stop this barren policy of retreat and pay.

We have two armies out against us: the army of the Soviet Union spread half across Europe, and the army of the Communist Party spread most of the rest of the way. You cannot halt either with dollars any more than you can hold a donkey with a fence made of hay.

As it stands now the Marshall plan is not only taking money on false pretenses. It is giving it away under false pretenses.

Let's get something better.

Observance of Boy Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article that appeared in the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., February 1, 1948, entitled "Observance of Boy Scout Week Time for United States To Consider Great Importance of Scouthood," by Bill Collins, Jr.:

OBSERVANCE OF BOY SCOUT WEEK TIME FOR UNITED STATES TO CONSIDER GREAT IMPORTANCE OF SCOUTHOOD—MANY WORTHY PROGRAMS ON BOY SCOUT CALENDAR

(By Bill Collins, Jr.)

(Boy Scout week opens next Friday and runs through February 12; time for people to recognize vital good being done by scouting in giving boys with growing bodies and growing minds fine ideals to live by.)

Not so long ago, a man known to almost everyone in Greater Lawrence called this writer's attention to an article then appearing in a national magazine. The prominent citizen was rightly angered at the ridicule and half-hearted humor contained in the magazine story. It had to do with Boy Scouts and was inanely titled "Rub Two Boy Scouts Together."

MAN PERTURBED

I read the piece, as requested, and found it be nothing more, apparently, than the remarks of a man who was perturbed because some Boy Scouts threw stones in a lake when he was fishing. The fact that almost every youngster, when walking through woodlands, finds the urge to skim rocks on water irresistible was not considered. The article, which pointed in somewhat sniggering manner to various aspects of Scouting, did not offer any solutions to the faults supposedly discovered. It was much like a man grumbling about a leak in a roof but doing nothing about fixing the roof.

BOY SCOUT WEEK

Today, with Boy Scout Week about to begin next Friday and run through February 12, we would all do well to give pause and consider how important Scouting is to our youngsters. And such consideration, in a time when juvenile delinquency is a threat and the way of life of a people trying to return from a wartime basis to a peacetime security is still somewhat muddled, should be done in seriousness, without any jibe tossing.

IMPORTANT TO UNITED STATES

There are more than 2,120,000 United States members of the Boy Scout organization which was founded 38 years ago. When that many American boys band together in one outfit and enjoy it and what it has to offer, it certainly must be doing some good. When over 2,000,000 youngsters find pleasure in gathering together in troop meetings, Cub Pack meetings, and other activities, the threat of juvenile delinquency is dealt a powerful blow. Such a contribution—by the boys themselves—toward victory in the Nation's fight to keep its youngsters from wrong influences and in a state of mind where they find enjoyment in clean, healthy recreational functions, should not be underestimated. It means a great deal to our country.

TRUTH

Perhaps it is being trite to say that the youth of today are the America of tomorrow—but it is the truth. And it is truth, as well, to say that the Boy Scouts of America is an organization for which we, as Americans, should be thankful.

OVER 2,000,000 BOYS

Over 2,000,000 boys—growing minds—are united. This year the theme of their anniversary is: The Scout citizen at work in his home, in his community, in his Nation, in his world. They are engaged in programs which may mean much to the world, but which already mean much to themselves and the country to which they belong. A Boy Scout is not "just a kid looking for a good deed to do"—he is America's future and the promise of a proud nation.

BIG PROGRAM

Today, the Boy Scouts are engaged in a program of saving and producing food to alleviate the world's food shortages. Each Boy Scout this year is expected to save a bushel, grow a bushel, share a bushel of food. The report of their progress will be made to the President of the United States, to Congress and to the United Nations.

Could you live up to that program or make such a report?

OTHER POINTS

In addition to conserving food and natural resources, the Boy Scouts will emphasize safety and fire prevention, home repairs and personal health. Through their world friendship fund of voluntary gifts they have sent more than 3,000 tons of supplies to help Scout organizations overseas to rebuild. This aid will be continued, for Scouting is having a rebirth in many war-ravaged countries. The Boy Scouts International Bureau in London reports a world membership of 4,409,780 boys and leaders in 42 nations.

WORLD PEACE

Another objective of Scouting is world peace and mutual understanding. Through world Scout Jamborees and the resultant expanding interest in friendships, understanding and personal relationship through correspondence these aims are increasingly being met. Last summer, the sixth world jamboree brought 30,000 Boy Scouts and leaders together in France from 38 nations.

DEMOCRACY AT WORK

At special Boy Scout week meetings, fathers, mothers, and friends will see that the Scout unit is an example of democracy at work. Scouts and parents alike will enjoy an evening given to Scout games, stunts,

campfire songs, and skits. At these meetings each unit will make public part of the report to the Nation, listing the community services it rendered in 1947 and its plans for this year. Scout delegations will also call upon the local government to report on what Scout citizens have done in community service and the scope of the work to be undertaken for the community in the months ahead.

BOY SCOUT SUNDAY

February 8 the actual anniversary date of the original incorporation of the movement in Washington, D. C., will be marked in countless churches of all denominations as Boy Scout Sunday. Scouts and leaders will attend church services in uniform. Those of Jewish faith will hold their observances in synagogues and temples on Friday and Saturday evenings of this week.

IMPORTANT OUTFIT

Since 1910 more than 14,000,000 American boys and men have been identified with the Boy Scouts of America. These are statistics. They are not to be passed over and forgotten—for they are evidence of what an important, vital organization the Boy Scouts of America is.

A BOY SCOUT

A Boy Scout is not just a kid looking for a good deed to do—he is the hope of America's future—the promise of a proud nation.

Thoughts at 70

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID M. POTTS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Frank S. Hackett is the founder and headmaster of Riverdale Country School, an American world school situated in the Riverdale section at the northwest part of New York City. In accordance with unanimous consent given to me for the purpose, I submit herewith for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD his Thoughts at 70, which I am sure will make very interesting reading not only to the Members of Congress but to all people interested in education as a means of settling conditions in a troubled world:

THOUGHTS AT 70

(By the founder-headmaster of Riverdale, Frank S. Hackett, Litt. D.)

The prayer of dominant desire in this atomic age is universal—to help further conditions essential to a just and lasting peace.

There has been found no one way. The accumulative effect of many diverse efforts, however, makes each single worthy enterprise a matter of importance.

"Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defense of peace must be constructed" (UNESCO).

Though minds of men must be enlightened in groups, at all ages, by all means, the hope of the world lies in the development of better individuals.

When in the heart of one, there rises determination to attack a given problem, a start is made. If he has sufficient equipment of character and intelligence to enlist cooperation, he adds to progress.

Movements such as UNESCO, designed to affect masses of people in every conceivable way, are fundamental.

Ultimately, however, they must depend upon the small unit which reaches the individual—the village church, the "freshwater" college, the little school, and other centers of sustained personal influence.

Forty years for Riverdale, relatively a little school (though grown from 12 students to almost 600, and from one unit to four), confirm the conviction that in this one small educational enterprise, there are possibilities of world-wide influence.

A completely new and unexpected circumstance, New York, the political capital of the world, the home of UN, focuses upon our city, attention of people everywhere. There is now no more influential center of culture, commerce, industry, or communication. Whatever forward steps are taken here, are likely to spread more favorably than those elsewhere.

Through higher education, Columbia and our other great universities affect the world. A school here which exemplifies a vital emphasis in education, transcends the local and the provincial, and as a beacon extends its light to the ends of the earth.

Who can prove that one stage of education is more important than another; that a favorable start affects life more or less than an advanced degree?

The "set" usually comes before college. What a student accomplishes there, depends chiefly upon the ideals and the equipment with which he enters.

A school at the capital of the world, committed to training American youths and their fellows from ther lands for world citizenship, surely is of relative importance to an institution of higher learning.

Necessarily small, that the influence may be personal, such a school may nourish notable lives.

What a difference if several members of UN committees, or even of the Security Council, were schoolmates. Or if representatives of business, the professions, or government in various parts of the world had in youth formed life-long friendships. Or if any, or all, had carried into their relationships the commitments of their school to further the brotherhood of man.

During 40 years, Riverdale has thriven through scholarly, friendly teaching of individuals—classes limited to 15 each.

In the First World War, refugees were welcomed, and ever since, youths from abroad have formed warm friendships with our American students. During World War II, refugees came from all except six European countries, and from Asia Minor and Australia. Today, 21 nations on every continent except Australia, are represented by 50 students—one in six.

For our preponderance of American youth, this is broadening.

They learn that the hearts of their fellows from other lands, beat just as high as their own for progress toward the conditions of peace. They see that they are just as good students, sportsmen, and citizens.

They gain understanding and respect for difference in background.

They develop friends from everywhere. When they visit abroad, they enjoy the homes of those fellows who have been their guests.

Youths from abroad preparing for college here catch the spirit both of our country and of UN.

They take home not just book learning, but understanding.

They realize our best, our less than best, and our worst, and they return determined to emulate the one, and avoid the other.

Perhaps in no other American college preparatory school is there a student body of greater potential world influence. For this high purpose, certainly no other is now better located.

These facts present a responsibility and an opportunity which, at seventy, are challenging. All that has gone before seems preparatory to the improvement and the extension of Riverdale as an American world school.

A year prior to the statesmanship and generosity of the Rockefeller family, through which our city became the capital of the world, we had by many small gifts acquired for the development of Riverdale as an American world school, an additional site of 28 acres in Riverdale. This plateau of virgin land, a quarter mile in length and in breadth, is 255 feet above the river, 10 feet higher than Fort Tryon Park at the north end of Manhattan Island, where stands the Cloisters. Views are even more magnificent.

The story is interesting:

Toward the close of the war, old Riverdale boys in service had used long vigils on Pacific islands or in Europe to consider why the tragic folly of war persists, and to grope for a better future. Their conclusion was unanimous—that we must cause education to do a better job; to produce better men; men who will transcend their national interests with a sense of humanity.

This thought predominates with serious men and women who have experienced wars. It has now spread everywhere. It is in the air. People constantly discuss it, and educators seek for ways to make it effective.

"What is our Riverdale doing about this?" was the challenging cry of our graduates.

We looked at ourselves, and we recognized that our little school is, indeed, a little world.

"Let us develop the American world school we already have," was our answer. "Let us make it better, and enlarge it, so that, continuing our friendly, scholarly teaching in small groups, we may train together for world citizenship more Americans and more fellows from other lands."

Men are made on playing fields as well as in classrooms. Our present site of 12 acres has for years been fully used. There is no room to expand.

Training for world citizenship is, moreover, a continuous process from the beginning of school. Since at Riverdale a boy or a girl can be under the same educational influence until college, it was clear that the development of the whole school in the direction of world understanding must be our effort. For the improvement of every unit of Riverdale, the need for an additional site was apparent.

From the bloody conquest of Okinawa, a Riverdale graduate had just returned safe and sound. A timely visit with his father unfolded the plan to develop Riverdale as an American world school. At once, he welcomed the idea as an expression of thanksgiving and as a means of bettering his own world-wide profession. He volunteered to give 7 acres of this wonderful property, provided the other 21 acres could be secured.

It is a pity that this far-seeing father insists upon anonymity. His generous gift started an unbounded influence.

A number of small owners of the remaining acres were glad to sell their holdings. Through gifts of over a hundred other parents, the school secured title to this whole superb site, from which views over the Hudson to the Palisades and hills of New Jersey and over Van Cortland Park to hills of Westchester, give a sense of remoteness. It seems unbelievable that the home of UN in the center of New York is but a half-hour distant.

In the brief period since the initial gift, careful faculty studies as to the best conditions for the teaching of the future have furnished a basis for preliminary plans by architects—Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill. They have prepared a model of a school community specifically designed to foster world friendship among 600 youths of high-school age, and their teachers. In addition to spacious playing fields, schoolhouse, chapel, gymnasium, auditorium, school of music and of art, there will be 10 residences, each for 30 boys, chosen about equally from other parts of this country and of the world, and from the metropolitan area. Apartment houses for families of teachers and of the maintenance staff of the whole school will constitute perhaps the first school coramunity of this kind.

Thoughts at Seventy concentrate upon this means of broadening school training. Improve and extend here at the capital of the world what Riverdale has long been doing as an American World School, and you will influence schools everywhere to welcome students of other lands, and to train them together for world citizenship, for furtherance of the brotherhood of man.

We Americans, moreover, by sharing with youth of other countries the best we can learn, will make our land "a praise in the earth."

At 70, what is needed is not alone conviction, but the power to convince.

What has thus far been done is heartening.

In but a little more than 2 years, the idea has taken form, become clarified, and appreciably spread.

The great site, which must otherwise have been snapped up for apartment development, has been saved for education. (This site, by the way, is just a little larger than that of Columbia University on Morningside Heights.) Faculty studies in the direction of specific training for world citizenship have already caused the introduction of two new courses, self-examination as to all our procedures, and definite plans for the immediate future, and for the new site.

What remains to be done, however, necessitates the attainment of fresh powers.

First, the school of today, children, boys, girls, parents, teachers, helpers, must catch the vision—feel themselves partners in extending the brotherhood of man through the development of their own Riverdale as an American world school.

Next, this same spirit must be caught by the 3,500 other families whom Riverdale has served in 40 years—the Riverdale family. Knowing what Riverdale has contributed to themselves and to the cause of broadening education, they have reason to become crusaders for the further development of Riverdale as an American world school.

Through the Riverdale family, and those to whom they explain and interpret this concrete effort toward better understanding between peoples, there must be reached that extensive company of men and women to whose vision and support the progress of American education is largely due. They know that education is the key to permanent peace.

They must be made to realize that school is just as important an instrument as college or university.

They will readily see that the scholarly friendly teaching of the individual in small units, is the surest means of personal influence.

They will appreciate that a school committed to training for citizenship of country and of world, located at the seat of UN may well nourish leaders for progress toward peace.

They can be made to see that a great school at the capital of the world may become relatively just as important an influence as a great university.

This is the job that must be done. At 70, to be entrusted with it, begets humility—you measure what you are by what you must be; and you know you need the strength of ten!

Such a responsibility leads into fresh fields and pastures new.

It emphasizes that Riverdale is far more an opportunity than an achievement.

It means growth and development—mountains of "doubt, hesitation, and pain" for faith to remove.

It commands full use of the best you have ever learned, and can learn.

It makes "Thoughts at 70" a misnomer. There is but one thought, one "prayer or dominant desire"—that through the development of the American World School which Riverdale has long been, there may be furthered the supreme essential of peace—the Brotherhood of Man.

It makes vivid the truth that "every morning, life begins."

"It is not the things done which challenge enthusiasm, but the things to be done—the long vista, and the yet unfolded close."

The Port of Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an interesting article on the port of Boston, written by Frank S. Davis, manager of the Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, showing the advantages of Boston as a port, and also the improvements being made in the port of Boston:

BOSTON'S WATER FRONT DUE FOR A REAL "FACE LIFTING"

(By Frank S. Davis, manager, Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce)

Nineteen forty-eight promises to be a big year for the port of Boston, at least with respect to the physical improvement of the water front and the port's facilities for the handling of water-borne commerce.

Already since the end of the war 16 additional deep-water berths have been made available for ocean-going vessels by the turning over to the Port of Boston Authority for commercial operation of the Government's Castle Island Terminal and the leasing of the Army Base Wharf and pier sheds to private operators for commercial operation. Castle Island has seven berths and the Army Base nine berths, capable of handling the largest type freighters.

If and when the comprehensive port program of the port of authority is carried out, and it should be given unqualified public and official support, the port's waterfront is due for a real "face lifting" operation during the next year or two.

Already the authority has started work on a $3,000,000 Hoosac Pier equipped with modern facilities including improvement of the present obsolete million-bushel capacity Hoosac grain elevator. Thus the present pile of rubbish, which has been useless for more than 2 years, will be replaced by a port facility that will match anything along the seaboard for the expeditious turn-around of steamers loading or discharging cargo, especially bulk grain, for the economical handling of which the port has long lagged behind other Atlantic ports.

The port authority's $7,000,000 program for reconstructing Mystic Piers at the mouth of the Mystic River, in Charlestown, has likewise progressed to the point where actual construction work will undoubtedly be well under way during the coming year.

Congress has already authorized extension to the new Mystic Piers of the 40-foot inner harbor channel from a point abreast Commonwealth Pier No. 1, in East Boston, where it now ends. This dredging project will be started soon as funds are made available and work on the new Mystic Piers begins.

Completion of these Hoosac and Mystic Piers is important because an analysis shows that more than 50 percent of the port's water-borne commerce originates at or is destined to the busy industrial communities north of Boston.

MODERNIZED PIER

At East Boston the port authority's comprehensive plan includes reconstruction of Commonwealth Pier No. 1 and the acquisition and replacement of the adjoining pier of the Boston & Albany Railroad by a thoroughly up-to-date pier structure.

An outstanding recent addition to the port's facilities is the enlarged and modernized pier of the Boston & Albany Railroad at Jeffries Point in East Boston.

This pier is now equipped with twin giant Gantry cranes capable of handling heaviest lifts—something the port has lacked in the past. Other important developments along the East Boston waterfront include the Hazelton plant at Central Square, and the shipbuilding yard of the General Ship and Engine Works, where modern oceangoing vessels are now being constructed on the site of the old Donald McKay Clipper Shipyard.

Of course, the fifty-million International Logan Airport is rapidly approaching completion and this great project has already proven its national as well as local value, and has provided the port of Boston with a facility that cannot be matched by any seaport in the country.

What Atlantic port has an airport that can be reached in 15 minutes from the business and financial center of the city? The Commonwealth and indeed all New England, may well be proud of this great New England enterprise.

Perhaps the project that will prove to be one of the port's most useful and widely publicized port improvements the coming year will be the $20,000,000 high-level Mystic River Bridge between Charlestown and Chelsea.

The efficient and vigorous Mystic River Bridge Authority has already issued its bonds, completed engineering plans, and awarded some construction contracts.

PLANS FOR NEW BRIDGE

This bridge, when completed, will eliminate the harbor's worst bottleneck and most serious obstruction to navigation.

Likewise, the city of Boston has completed plans and will shortly advertise specifications for a new Meridian Street Bridge over Chelsea River, between East Boston and Chelsea.

So much for the improvement of the water front. But what about increased commerce? Well, here the prospects are good in some respects and not so good with respect to other phases.

Foreign imports and foreign exports show a healthy growth since the war ended, and are rapidly reaching prewar volume. In fact, exports have substantially increased, now running about double the prewar volume. This is due largely to active solicitation of field agencies of the Port of Boston Authority, and also the congested conditions of New York which has caused heavy financial loss to New England industries in the form of delays and extra charges assessed against their exports and imports routed through New York during the past year.

It is difficult to understand why many of our New England industries persist in routing their water-borne traffic through New York when the costly delays could be avoided by utilizing the facilities of their own port of Boston.

Steamship operators may well be subject to the same criticism. A steamer, for instance, from a foreign port, will call at Boston, discharge a few hundred tons of cargo here, and then proceed to New York to discharge thousands of tons, much of it destined to Midwest communities; whereas if discharged at Boston, for forwarding to the interior destinations, much extra expense and delay would be avoided, the goods delivered

much more promptly, and the vessels' turnaround expedited.

NAVIGATION PROJECTS

Prospects with respect to domestic waterborne commerce the coming year are not so promising.

A fine dependable weekly or more frequent service is being maintained by the Intercoastal Lines operating between Boston and Pacific coast points via the Panama Canal. Indications are that this excellent service will be expanded as the volume of cargo warrants.

The UN on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial taken from the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., of January 27, 1948, entitled, "The United Nations on Trial":

THE UN ON TRIAL

The United Nations is at a critical point in its development today, and the United States and Britain seem to have turned their backs on it. This is the situation resulting from the failure of the UN thus far to enforce its decision on the partition of Palestine. If the Arabs, in their open defiance of the two-thirds majority vote, succeed in preventing the establishment of a Jewish state, then there seems no alternative but to say a requiem over another world-peace organization. The UN will be done. It cannot surrender in its first clear decree and endure as anything more than an international discussion group.

But in this crucial test the two powers that should be most concerned in maintaining the UN's prestige and authority have averted their gaze. By a flagrant "neutrality" they are implicitly encouraging the Arabs to nullify the partition decision.

The United States is doing this first by invoking the embargo provisions of the Neutrality Act to deprive the Jews of arms, and by failing to take the leadership in setting up some sort of UN police force to enable the Palestine Commission to do its job. Palestine is surrounded by land with Arab states, from which arms can readily be obtained by the former Grand Mufti's guerrilla bands. The Jews must look farther for arms, and especially to us. When we refuse arms to both Jews and Arabs, we are really unneutral, for it is the Jews who feel the effect of the embargo. We are refusing support to the UN decision for which we worked.

We are spending millions to defend Greece against guerrilla bands from adjoining countries, and there the UN issue is less clear than in Palestine. Yet in the Holy Land we facilitate the incursions of guerrillas from Transjordan, Syria, and Egypt.

Within the UN, we have sat back since the adoption of the partition plan, as if we expected it to become a reality without further effort. We are calmly watching the deliberate sabotage of a UN verdict, as if the fate of the thing were no concern of ours.

As for the British, they have dismally failed to keep order in Palestine. They have refused to evacuate a port for Jewish immigration by February 1, as recommended in the partition plan. They have supplied arms to Arab states, where attacks on Palestine are being organized, while denying arms to the Jews. All this Britain has done with a pretext of exercising neutrality. As if this were a time for neutrality when international outlaws were defying the single body of law and order recognized by the greater part of the world!

It is true that the one group able, with arms, to defend immediately the UN's decision is the Jewish Haganah, which has gone beyond defensive policing to engage in reprisals, such as the attack on the Semiramis Hotel. It would be better if it had not, or if the UN had its own constabulary, or if the British could or would keep order.

But the Arabs were indisputably the aggressors, indisputably the ones to institute bloody warfare on civilians. When we deny arms to the Haganah we are offering up scores of little Jewish settlements to the cruel vindictiveness of the ex-Mufti's barbarians.

It takes more than pious words to maintain the United Nations. Now is the time for that something more.

The Climate of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, most of us read the newspapers every day. Many of us read books and articles on matters of domestic and world importance. The more we read, the more confused the situation becomes, it seems.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a series of very simply phrased articles in the form of advertisements which appeared during the month of January in several of the outstanding publications of the country such as Newsweek, Time, Nation's Business, and several New York newspapers.

The author put his finger directly on the factors that make America different than any other country in the world. Because these articles have made such a fundamental point, I feel that they would be interesting and beneficial to the Members of Congress and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The articles follow:

THE CLIMATE OF FREEDOM

America has more passenger cars than the rest of the world put together—far more bathtubs and many more radios. It's that way with clothes or food or almost any comfort, convenience, or necessity you can mention.

Other countries have as much metal and enough manpower. There are no atom secrets in a four-door sedan. Modern bathtubs are hardly confidential. And the mysteries of the light bulb are "old hat."

What other countries don't have is "the climate of freedom," the economic and political freedom of enterprise that lets a man or a company pick its own destiny and labor toward it.

Burlington Mills has 75 plants, operating in this climate of freedom where the greatest good for the greatest number is the ultimate yardstick.

This climate of freedom is a precious thing to Burlington Mills, whose plants have prospered under its influence.

From these mills in constantly greater volume come Bur-Mil women's suitings, men's suitings, women's dress fabrics, ribbons, shirtings, and fabrics that go into umbrellas, millinery, comforters, blanket bindings, and an endless list of other items.

The climate of freedom is not exclusively ours, but favors all who produce for a better way of life for America. In our own case the better way means better rayon fabrics at prices low enough to please the millions.

ARE AMERICANS WISER THAN CHINESE?

Are Americans wiser than the Chinese? Of course not. The Chinese have more thousands of years of wisdom behind them than we have.

Then why do Americans have more food than the Chinese?

Is the average American a better man than the average Pole? Of course not. There are countless American citizens whose ancestry is Polish.

Nevertheless take any civilization in recorded history and see if you can find a land or a people so blessed with the things that make life good and worth the living.

Why is this? After all, Americans are just like the peoples they sprang from in other lands.

No supermen built this country. It was the climate of freedom that made the American businessman prosper where, in other lands, his work was partially nullified by unfavorable political systems of one kind or another.

We at Burlington Mills consider ourselves fortunate that we were able to work in this climate of freedom and build perhaps the greatest textile organization of its kind in the world—prodded on by the competition of other mills also free to seek the favor and patronage of the American people.

Thus, unwittingly, because Bur-Mil fabrics are worn by millions and used to adorn millions of homes, Burlington is "woven into the life of America."

CLOTHES MAKE THE COUNTRY

During the war, our soldiers were the best fed and best clothed in the world. In peace, too, Americans eat better and dress better than do other people. Some call it the American way—as if it happened just because Americans want it.

Italians want it, too. So do Germans, Russians, and Portuguese. But they don't have it—even though they have land, resources, manpower.

They have a scarcity of one commodity, however, that is plentiful in America—freedom—freedom of enterprise.

It has made America great. It has made its people better clothed, better housed, and better fed than any other people in recorded history. Because men were free to make things—and because people were free to accept or reject those things—men vied for public acceptance by making their products better and lower priced.

That's how we got a higher standard of living—how business grew great—how the American way came about.

And that's how Burlington Mills became one of the world's greatest producers of textiles. Today, millions are clothed in suits, dresses, shirts, slacks, and hosiery which are Bur-Mil products.

Millions of homes are decorated with drapes, spreads, furniture upholstery made of Burlington fabrics.

Only by making better rayons at lower prices could Burlington have won this preference from these millions.

Only in America could Burlington have been free to seek this preference—a preference that will continue as long as Burlington quality can merit it.

The Battleship "Oregon"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Oregonian for January 25, 1948:

BARNACLED HULK OF BATTLESHIP "OREGON" LIES FORGOTTEN, NEGLECTED OFF GUAM

The barnacle-crusted hulk of the battleship *Oregon* lies neglected and forgotten at anchor off the south coast of Guam, an indignant ex-Portlander reported last week in a letter to his father.

Lawrence M. DeLong, civilian engineer with the island public works on Guam and son of Merton DeLong, 3291 Southwest Fairmount Boulevard, recently visited the historic warship and made photographs of it. Writing to his father about what he saw and inclosing the pictures, he urged the elder DeLong to head a movement to return the *Oregon* as a monument, museum, and activity center at her old berth by the seawall.

Brought to Portland after being decommissioned by the Navy after World War I, the *Oregon* was a familiar sight in the harbor for many years. Among the organizations which met regularly aboard the vessel was the sea scout ship *Dana*, to which Lawrence DeLong belonged as a youth.

The Navy reclaimed the ship during World War II, removed her engines and superstructure and towed the hulk to the South Pacific with a load of explosives.

DeLong said the *Oregon* now is moored fore and aft in 40 feet of water between Merizo beach and the island of Cocos.

Anxious to get aboard the vessel on which he spent many happy hours as a sea scout, DeLong applied for permission to Rear Adm. C. A. Pownall, commander of the Marianas and Governor of Guam. The Portlander was taken to the *Oregon* on a small patrol boat and allowed to go aboard for an inspection and picture-making tour.

The old ship is empty except for a heavy load of gravel ballast aft which causes her to lie about 6 feet down by the stern and with a slight list to port, DeLong said. Before abandoning the ship the Navy built a cover over a hole cut in the deck for removal of machinery. There is little water in the bilges and the hull and decks are in good condition except for rotten wood planking on the main deck, he reported.

A graduate of Oregon State College in 1938, DeLong worked in the Albina Engine and Machine Works engineering department here during the war, and moved to Tucson, Ariz., later before going to Guam 3 months ago.

Minnesota Potatoes Take on Glamour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a well-known columnist and radio commentator, Cedric Adams, of Minneapolis, Minn., writing about a product of the famed Red River Valley area, which partly comprises the Ninth District of Minnesota, which I have the honor to represent, had the following to say:

The lowly spud, of all things, has slid over into the glamour department. Most of us think of a potato as a grubby little product that comes out of the ground, sprouts in the spring if you don't watch it, and goes very well with pan gravy. Members of the Red River Valley Potato Growers Association want to change all that and are well on their way. This year the association members sent out boxes of spuds—gift wrapped, if you please. The message that went with the potatoes read: 'You have just opened a gift box of fine potatoes raised in this most fertile region in the Nation. Our potatoes are famous for their wonderful flavor and fine cooking quality. They are stored from digging time to market time in nature's own cold storage plants and are, therefore, available from September to May."

The association also wants you to know that its spuds were grown within sight of the Northern Lights. There's no explanation of what effect that condition has on the spuds, but the statement is on the letterhead anyway. The Red River Valley produces 31,878,000 bushels of potatoes annually. Each spud was individually wrapped, too, like an orange or an apple. Progress, that's what it is. Progress.

This Red River Valley is truly a great inland agricultural empire. It is about 100 miles wide and extends more than 200 miles through eastern North Dakota and South Dakota and western Minnesota into Canada. Through its length runs the famed Red River of the North.

It is an immense area of rich, black loam and rightfully has been named the "Bread basket of the world." The United States Department of Agriculture recognizes the valley as an expansive tract of the Nation's most fertile soil. For several months each year winter locks up that fertility and saves it, hence, with proper farming methods, the valley will retain its high productivity indefinitely.

The total annual agricultural income in the valley exceeds $500,000,000. Major crops produced in 1945 were: wheat, 45,213,940 bushels; oats, 44,766,800 bushels; barley, 28,400,500 bushels; flax 5,201,400 bushels; sugar beets, 305,000 tons; livestock, $70,108,350; potatoes, 31,878,000 bushels.

The above statistics were included in the letter quoted by Cedric Adams. The Red River Valley Potato Growers Association concluded the communication with the following boast:

We want you to try our potatoes and compare them with those from any other region. Baked, boiled, mashed, or fried, you'll find them above par. Residents of the valley take pride in sending you this gift box, and strongly urge you to visit our great Red River Valley empire and inspect its many products.

What has been accomplished in the Red River Valley during the past few years demonstrates vividly the effectiveness of free enterprise in a free republic.

Some Views of a Thoughtful Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while there comes to my desk a letter which is thoughtful and indicative of the thinking of some of the people. The following is such a letter, and I hope many of my colleagues will take the time to read it. Mr. James, the writer, is an outstanding attorney of Des Moines, Iowa:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *January 26, 1948.*

Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR PAUL: Washington must, indeed, be an interesting place to be in these days; the most important city in the world; for decisions made there, right or wrong, affect the entire world; and the results are inescapable. Never has it been more important to be right; never so tragic to be wrong.

It seems to me to be our inescapable responsibility to go through with the Marshall plan. We cannot, for our own safety, allow western Europe to become vassal to Communist Russia. There is no happy choice, between peace and war. We are going to have to take "the least bad" course, in many instances. And while it is hard to have to throw billions more into Europe, it is certain that unless we do, we shall have to eventually pay far more, in both blood and money to save ourselves.

I had hoped that the United Nations might be created with the essential power to preserve peace, and bring the world together as a unit to preserve law and order. But it is evident that Stalin is no better than, and no different from Hitler. They, too, want "one world," by conquest, or intimidation, over which they propose to rule as the masters. Opposed thereto, however, we have created, and we insisted upon it, an international debating society, powerless to use any force to preserve order, powerless to make any laws or any rules, and hamstrung at every turn by a Russian veto.

It is clear if the United Nations is to be saved, and civilization saved from an atomic war, that a convention must be called to amend the charter, to give us a United Nations with the power to meet these problems; and, if Russia refuses to go along, let her go, keeping the door open for a voluntary return, but bring the peace-loving nations into accord, and cooperation in an effective and powerful international organization. Otherwise, we will continue to find ourselves operating unilaterally, and losing the friendship and support of those whom we are protecting.

I am also concerned about the tax problem. The present rates are such that no ordinary mortal, like me, can hope to become self-sustaining at or upon retirement. How many can ever hope to accumulate as much as $100,000, with present rates of income tax? And, if they did so, with interest at 2½ percent they could hope for an income of $2,500 per year, and be safe. A professional man in these times cannot see his way clear to independence, ever. He finds that he has been and is paying income taxes beyond anything he can save for his old age.

Have been thinking that it would be good policy, and help on the inflation problem, if

every taxpayer was granted an exemption up to a certain percentage of his income, for all sums invested by him annually in Government bonds. This would encourage people to save for their own old age; it would soak up excess funds, and retard inflation; it would bolster and sustain the bond market; it would provide extra billions for Government purposes; and it would reward men and women to some small extent for prudence and concern for their own old age.

Most of us, I am sure, would prefer to care for ourselves in old age, and the thought of dependence upon anyone else, including Government hand-outs is anathema. Having educated three children to university degrees, and having a son with six more years of college and university ahead of him, and with Uncle Sam my principal "dependent," to whom I have been contributing more than I have to any member of my family, myself, or possible saving for old age, I am concerned. This sort of a situation is general, I am sure. And it isn't good for morale. All of us need, and must have, reasonable hope for the future, reasonable assurance that we can make it to a reasonable degree of modest independence. That is denied us under the present rate of taxation; and the present, and probable future return (interest) on what little we can save.

None of us want to shirk. We all want to do our fair share, even sacrifice for the common good. This whole problem is very personal for every taxpayer.

It does seem to me that the suggestion I have made has merit; and that later, we would build up an abundance of private capital (savings) with which our free enterprise system can be given the necessary support to keep on building. Capital comes only from savings. If we continue to make saving impossible, or hopeless in achievement of any worth-while ultimate reward, we shall have no private capital, and we shall find ourselves confronted, as was Britain, in going socialist, and turning to state ownership, and state financing, because the citizens do not have the capital to support essential development of necessary industry.

The Government is either going to have to recognize the importance and necessity of sustaining individual accumulation of capital savings, and incentive to individual independence in old age; or the Government is going to have to provide the ways and means of supporting substantially all of its people at retirement age, and likewise providing the essential industrial capital to support and sustain production.

A reasonable exemption for personal savings would, in my opinion be a most salutary provision in the new law; and, in my judgment, bring the Treasury billions of dollars at a low rate of interest, and build up a fund of private capital for later investment, that will undoubtedly be badly needed, and will save the free enterprise system from grave danger, if not collapse.

Kindest regards.

Yours,

PAUL G. JAMES.

American Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, according to an Associated Press story of January 29, Air Force Secretary Stuart Symington ranks the United States third among the major powers in air strength. He cited previously printed reports that Russia is building planes at a rate of 75,000 to 100,000 per year, most of them being front-line ships.

According to the story, Secretary Symington stated that even with the proposed 70-group Air Force in the United States, we would still have only a one-shot proposition in the event of attack.

Mr. Speaker, these figures and assertions on the part of Secretary Symington are alarming and should tend to awaken the American people to the realization of the complete inadequacy of our present military machine, and more particularly our Air Force.

While Congress ponders whether or not to gamble $19,000,000,000 in an attempt to purchase the good will and political ideologies of Europe, Russia is building and equipping the mightiest peacetime air armada in history.

To me, Mr. Speaker, it would appear to be pure folly for us to appropriate $19,000,000,000 during the next 4 years with which to carry on our cold war against Soviet Russia, and at the same time fail or refuse to back up that effort with a first-class fighting potential. Whether we pass the Marshall plan or not, we must strengthen our air defenses to the point where this country would be able to defend itself with action as well as words.

It has been shown in the past that totalitarian dictators speak only the language of force in their dealings with their neighbors. Stalin is no exception to this rule, and we must, if we are to survive as a nation, arm ourselves to such a degree that we would, if necessary, be able to implement our words with military action.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the information contained in the previously mentioned news item of such major importance that I wish to include it herewith as part of my remarks. It follows:

AIR CHIEF RANKS WORLD AIR POWER: RUSSIA, FIRST; GREAT BRITAIN, SECOND; UNITED STATES, THIRD

WASHINGTON, January 29.—Air Force Secretary Symington believes that the United States ranks behind Russia and England in air power.

He fears that a force of the presently planned size would be wiped out early in any new air war, unless it got huge reinforcements fast.

He figures it would get a large part of that beating in trying to help evacuate American forces from Europe and avoid a new and magnified Bataan.

Symington expressed his views in an article written for American magazine, in which he gave this formula for the Nation's security:

"An impregnable air curtain—a curtain sufficiently strong so that no fleet of hostile planes or waves of guided missiles can reach the mainland of this country."

"No longer are we the leading air power of the world," Symington said. "In quantity we have slipped behind the Soviet Union, and qualitatively, both Russia and England have numerous developments that exceed our own efforts. England, despite her severe economic strain as a result of the war, is devoting a greater portion of her defense budget to an air force than we are."

He repeated previously printed reports that Russia is building planes at a rate of 75,000 to 100,000 a year, and is turning out copies of the B-29 superfortress in fairly sizable numbers.

Symington said the 70-group Air Force now planned would be "strictly a one-shot proposition." Without tremendous, quick replacement, he figured it too little for these jobs:

"1. To support our own industries.

"2. To support the evacuation, if possible, of our pitifully out-numbered occupation troops in Europe, where there is the ever-present danger of Bataan being repeated on a large scale, plus protection of the advanced bases from which our own air offensive must strike.

"3. To launch and sustain a full-scale air offensive and destroy the enemy's industry and economy with atomic bombs and the latest weapons."

JET PLANE LAG

Symington asserted that this country is still behind the British and Russians in jet planes, although we are catching up in this field.

He said that the British have a jet fighter more advanced than curs and that the Russians had 100 new jet planes in one show last August, and exhibited at least eight different types of jet planes including a four-engine jet bomber.

"One of their fighters is a swept-back wing type," the Secretary said.

"At time of this writing the United States has produced only one experimental model of this type. It indicates that the Soviet air force is preparing to hurdle the trans-sonic speed barrier. We haven't done that yet."

(An Air Force research plane with straight wings has exceeded the speed of sound, although the Air Force declines to say so publicly, and much more advanced research planes are being built. The Air Force has a swept-back wing fighter, the XP-86, in production, and swept-back wing six-engine jet bomber flying. It has an eight-engine jet bomber, two four-engine jet bombers, a four-engine jet all-weather fighter, and numerous jet fighter types flying or ready to fly. This country has built nearly 2,000 jet planes.)

HUGE RED OUTPUT

Symington said that the Russian massing of 100 jet planes indicated the Soviet must have at least 300 to 500 such planes in existence and an indicated monthly output of at least 2,000.

Symington said this country must have a 70-group Air Force, backed by an industry able to expand that force with "extraordinary rapidity to at least 180 groups and perhaps as high as 350 groups if the war should last 3 years."

He said the Air Force would have to spend $8,100,000,000 annually for a 70-group force.

The President's Air Policy Commission has accepted the Air Force's long-standing recommendation putting the cost at $4,229,000,000 for this calendar year and $4,539,000,000 for 1949.

Asserting that from its position as the world's mightiest air power, the United States has "demoralized as well as demobilized," Symington said, "If we had kept strong, there might not even have been a threat of World War III today."

"If we hurry and catch up, the threat may recede. But the very nature of air preparedness demands that we waste not another single day."

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Symington has sounded a warning that must not be ignored.

Admiral Richard E. Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I append the following copy of the speech made by the junior Senator of Virginia, the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, at the Statler Hotel, on January 29, 1948, on the occasion of the presentation of a gold medal of achievement to Rear Adm. Richard Evelyn Byrd:

It gives me pleasure to present on behalf of the Society of Virginia its gold medal of achievement to one of Virginia's most distinguished sons. He was born in the historic city of Winchester, just 1 year after I was born in the neighboring city of Martinsburg and spent a boyhood in the company of heroes of the Confederate Army who were followers of Lee and Jackson and some of whom participated in the 49 battles in which Winchester was either won or lost during the War Between the States.

It is not surprising that one reared in that atmosphere should have selected Jackson's school in Lexington—the Virginia Military Institute—as his first college after leaving a preparatory school that gave military training, the Shenandoah Valley Military Academy. After taking literary courses at the University of Virginia he entered the United States Naval Academy, where he was graduated in 1912.

It has been truthfully said that the three major factors influencing a man's destiny are his heredity, his environment, and his will power. Admiral Byrd inherited the spirit as well as the blood of the Englishmen who started with four little islands that could have been placed in the State of Texas where his father was born with an area the size of Virginia left over and developed them into an empire on which the sun never set. His environment was that which produced Daniel Morgan of the Long Rifles, in the Revolutionary period, leaders in the War Between the States, and leaders in the subsequent business, political, and religious life of the Old Dominion, which frankly makes all of us proud to say that we are Virginians.

But over and above all else, the destiny of Dick Byrd was shaped by his will power, which overcame the physical handicap which he incurred from a naval injury and which caused him in many an emergency to meet danger unafraid because he had faith in God and faith in himself.

When he had been out of the Naval Academy for less than 7 years, he had received 17 governmental citations, 4 of which were for bravery in World War I.

Ten years later he was promoted to the rank of rear admiral, being the youngest officer up to that time to hold that rank in the Navy.

In two world wars he served in an outstanding way. The lack of publicity concerning his service in World War II is thus explained by the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Nimitz, who recently said:

"From the many questions asked about Admiral Byrd, I know that there is a very widespread interest in this country as to what has become of him after he vanished from the news columns 6 years ago after his last expedition ended in 1940. Now it can be told.

"He disappeared from view in 1941, first, because his work has been largely of a very secret nature, and, secondly, because he chose and insisted upon completely subordinating himself in teamwork as good naval officers believe in doing.

"I am happy to tell you that Dick Byrd did the splendid job in the war that his fellow citizens would expect of him. This is his fourth citation for war work. He was overseas four times, having been at both fronts in connection with aviation and other matters. He has not been frozen in at the South Pole during all these years, but has been serving his country."

In between those two wars Admiral Byrd was a member of the crew of the ZR-2, which blew up in England over the Humber River and killed 42 out of the 46 men aboard, he commanded the aviation unit of the Navy-MacMillan Polar Expedition in 1925, he flew over the North Pole in 1926, he made a nonstop flight to France in 1927. He led a 2-year expedition to the South Pole in 1928 and a second expedition to the South Pole in 1933, and the Government expedition to the South Pole in 1939. For his war services and for his contribution to science Admiral Byrd has received 70 medals. Of the 25 citations that he has received from the United States Government 10 mention courage, including 2 mentions of extraordinary heroism.

The greatest, noblest, and most important to human society of all of his explorations is the one in which he is now engaged, namely, to plumb the depths of the human heart to find the way by which men can live together in peace and unity, and civilization as we know it can be protected from an atomic war which undoubtedly would fulfill the prediction of H. G. Wells, who said:

"Civilization, which commenced in a cave and behind a windbreak, will end in the disease-soaked ruins of a slum."

With all the accumulated evidence in the 2,000 years of recorded history which recounts the futility of mankind to permanently settle international differences by means of armed conflict, Dick Byrd will need, more than he ever needed when he faced the killing power of enemy batteries, his faith in God. But Dick Byrd believes that peace begins in a man's heart when he demonstrates his faith. In his own life he has found that peace. His present supreme mission in life is to take that message to others. He realizes that the conflict that is shaping up in the world is between those who profess faith in God and those who deny that faith. He realizes that those who profess faith in God far outnumber those who deny it, but that they lack the zeal and willingness to sacrifice of the smaller group. He realizes that no material measure—no political change, no economic reform, no international organization—will of itself establish peace, and that peace has escaped the chancelleries mainly because it has found no home in the hearts of men. While he wants us to continue to work through international cooperation for the economic welfare of the masses and a system of law throughout the world based upon equality and justice, he also wants us to recognize the fundamental fact that progress is first mental and spiritual. Therefore, he is working to help us find peace at home by overcoming hate, greed, and fear, and by our works to prove our faith in the Golden Rule.

I am happy to associate myself with him in the belief that if we do so we will find that there is a power stronger than the atomic bomb to rend the iron curtain behind which 180,000,000 misinformed people regard us as enemies bent upon their destruction.

In voting to award Admiral Byrd its first Gold Medal of Achievement the Society of Virginia likewise desired for that award to be accompanied with the following citation:

"The citation for the Gold Medal of Achievement of the Society of Virginia, awarded Rear Adm. Richard Evelyn Byrd, January 29, 1948.

"Taking counsel of his own courage, spurred on by an irresistible desire and an indomitable will to explore the flaming walls of the world, steeled by a quiet determination to obtain for his country and for science first-hand knowledge of the unknown lands in the icy embrace of the two poles, Richard Evelyn Byrd, in a series of precarious and daring adventures by land, sea, and air, extending over a period of 20 years, in constant and unceasing jeopardy of his own life and carrying the fearful responsibility of the lives of others, explored, chartered, and added to the geography of the world for all time the seas, lands, and mountain ranges of the vast regions of the Poles.

"He is the first man to fly over the North Pole, the first man to fly over the South Pole, and the only man to fly over both. He has looked down upon more square miles of unknown area than any human being in all history. He has added to the knowledge of mankind scientific data of incalculable value, geographical, geological, meteorological, and geodetic. He has carried the American flag over both poles and planted it at the farthest points north and south that have ever beheld its shining folds.

"He is the only living American who has added one square mile of territory to his country's empire and the only American since Lewis and Clark who has extended the American domain by exploration and discovery. With the antique courage of an Achilles, the dogged perseverance of a Ulysses and the skill and daring worthy of his long line of Virginian forebears, he has made himself a scientist notable in an age of science, a patriot outstanding in an age of patriotism, and an explorer high in the rank of all time and second to none in the world today. Sic Igitur ad Astra."

Admiral Byrd, warrior, scientist, and Christian leader, I salute you; the sons and daughters of your native State salute you; the whole world will applaud my action in now presenting to you this Gold Medal of Achievement.

Bill To Call in and Exchange All United States Currency, To Strengthen the National Defense, and To Make European Aid More Effective, Introduced in Congress Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill directing the Secretary of the Treasury to call in all United States currency and give new currency equal in exchange therefor.

If enacted into law, the effect of my bill would be to—

First. Greatly strengthen financially the governments of those nations to which we are sending dollars in aid.

Second. Increase confidence in these strengthened governments, thereby enabling them more effectively to resist

communism and help to avert a third world war.

Third. Determine with greater accuracy the ability of these governments to help themselves.

Fourth. Save the United States Government a huge sum which would otherwise be required for European relief.

Fifth. Lighten the financial burden necessary for us to maintain our isolated national defense by utilizing the military strength of rehabilitated governments in Europe and Asia.

Sixth. Improve gold cover for our currencies through relating gold cover to the amount of our currencies actually in existence and outstanding.

As of September 1947, $28,567,000,000 in United States currency was in circulation. No one knows how much of this amount is hoarded abroad by persons and private foreign-business interests. Estimates are based partly on prewar American properties; military expenditures by our Government and by our overseas military personnel in World War II; current tourist expenditures, and international exchange manipulations. Competent authorities believe that this amount will run into billions of dollars.

Europeans and Asiatics always have hoarded American dollars, both while in their native land and after arrival here, should they enter the United States. There is not a European or Asiatic government today which commands the unreserved confidence of its own nationals. My plan would rob no hoarder, but it would require that, within a certain time limit, these hoardings be turned into the central government, which would turn them over to our Government and receive new currency, dollar for dollar, in exchange therefor.

There are many other advantages for my plan, including destruction of black markets, and closer control of tax evaders and counterfeiters.

A Cost-of-Living Pay Increase for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, when this Congress passed H. R. 3035, the postal salary reclassification bill of 1945, most of the inequalities and injustices that had existed in the postal service for many years were corrected. That bill provided a permanent annual basic pay increase of $400 for all postal employees; it increased the opportunities for promotion and advancement in the postal service; and it introduced the principle of longevity pay into many branches of the postal service. H. R. 3035 also provided for time and one-half for overtime work, 10 percent extra on the hourly day rates for night work; and it gave all postal employees 15 days leave of absence and 10 days sick leave with pay each year. That bill was a comprehensive postal-salary-increase bill, carefully worked out, a bill that provided the long-overdue revamping of the postal service pay schedule, and a long-overdue reward for the loyal efficient service of the postal employees.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman Thomas Burch, of Virginia, chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, was the author of H. R. 3035, and he is entitled to most of the credit for its preparation and passage. H. R. 3035 was passed 3 years ago. That bill could be classified as a good job well done. Almost everyone connected with the postal service felt that the long-deferred justice for the forgotten postal employee had finally been brought about, and the postal employees had finally been given proper recognition for their loyal, faithful service.

However, Mr. Speaker, that was 3 years ago. What has happened since then? We all know that the cost of living has skyrocketed during the last 3 years. A postal pay increase that was adequate and fair in 1945 does not mean that the postal employee's pay today is adequate when we consider the present inflated cost of living. And so the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has before it for consideration today Congressman BUTLER'S bill, H. R. 4640, and various other bills, all providing for a cost-of-living pay increase for postal employees to tide them over this period of price inflation.

Mr. Speaker, under present living conditions is a cost-of-living pay increase for postal employees a fair request? I believe it is, and I believe it should be granted. As a Member of this Congress, who served 10 years on the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, and as a result of that service learned something about the postal service and its needs, I stand ready to vote for a fair, equitable, cost-of-living pay raise for the employees of the postal service; and I urge that favorable action be taken by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee upon such a pay raise bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I insert the following excellent statement entitled "Dollars or Sense" which gives a clear-cut analysis of the situation confronting the postal service today. It was prepared by Leo E. George, president of the National Foundation of Post Office Clerks, and was carried in the January 1948 issue of the Union Postal Clerk, the official organ of that organization:

DOLLARS OR SENSE

Again is heard the cry that the postal service is in the red. The Committee on Appropriations is considering the items to be included in various bills to be presented to the second session of the Eightieth Congress for the expense of operating the United States Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

There will be millions, lots of millions of dollars for the executive departments, the judiciary, and the Congress, and numerous independent offices and agencies.

SERVICES ESSENTIAL TO NATION

They are all agencies of the United States Government that have been established by the Congress to perform specific functions that are essential to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. They are all essential services and in the interest of the welfare of the people and of the Nation.

The post office, the function of which is to collect, transport, and deliver more than 35 billions of pieces of mail annually and to render millions of special-service transactions, serving every one of the country's 140 million people, individually as well as collectively, is the only Government agency that incurs a deficit.

Although postal service is an essential to nearly every individual and to every business, as well as to the social and cultural life of the community, it is singled out, among all public services, to be the whipping boy when appropriations are considered.

CLOSEST TO THE PEOPLE

The anomaly of the position of the Post Office Department is that it is charged with performing a universal service that comes closest to most of the people and that is, to most people, the most essential service rendered by the Government. However, its appropriations, as well as its charges for service, and most of its rates of expenditures, are determined by the Congress or by some other Government agency.

Postage rates are fixed by Congress. In the determination of postal rates, due consideration is given to the public welfare and in many cases are deliberately set far below the cost of performance in the interest of unrestricted dissemination of news and knowledge or to encourage the exchange of commodities.

Rates of compensation to the railroads and to the air service companies for carrying the mail are set by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, respectively, and in their determination first consideration is given to the welfare of the carrying companies.

Yet, when expenditures exceed revenues, the Post Office Department is tabbed the Government's "venture in big business" and the meager salaries paid to postal employees cited as the cause for a so-called deficit. A comparison of salaries paid in the Postal Service with those in any Government department or comparable private business or industry will yield some startling and enlightening facts. From the Postmaster General down to the lowest paid custodial laborer, no business worthy of the name would expect efficient service at wages or salaries paid in the Postal Service for comparable service and required qualifications.

MUST HAVE MODERN EQUIPMENT

Also, if the postal service is considered primarily as a business instead of a public service, good business practice would prompt immediate expenditures for modern buildings and equipment that would be investments in efficiency and economy rather than merely expenditures.

The making of bricks without straw was simple compared to rendering efficient and economical service in buildings, that are inadequate, dirty, dingy, and without ordinary sanitation and safety standards that would be required in other business structures, or with equipment that is obsolete or obsolescent, or without modern equipment of any kind. These are conditions that exist, not figures of speech.

RIGHT TO ADEQUATE SALARIES

Postal employees are rendering efficient service. It can be made better. They want to make it better. They have pride in their service and want it to be without flaw. Postal employees are also human beings and, as American citizens, have responsibilites and problems and duties to family, church, and State in the same measure as other citizens.

They do not expect nor do they ask for the unreasonable. They do ask, and have a right to expect, adequate salaries and conditions of work commensurate with American standards.

Sabotaging the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian for January 29, 1948:

SABOTAGING THE NORTHWEST

The Rockwell reclamation bill, as amended and passed by the House of Representatives, 232 to 120, last week, is the most dangerous threat yet made against the industrial and agricultural development of the Pacific Northwest. It is also a loaded gun aimed at the head of the Republican Presidential nominee and Republican Members of Congress, because if the Senate approves it in its present form President Truman doubtless will veto it. The President will make votes and the Republican Party will lose them in the Northwest.

Powerful interests of the East, the South, and California have at last a vehicle to realize their long-time hope of stifling industrial growth in the Northwest by forcing upward the basic rates for electricity from the Columbia River system.

Senator CORDON'S office reports that Interior Department experts have found no alternative to a drastic increase in the $17.50 per kilowatt year wholesale rate for Columbia River power from the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system if the bill survives. One group tentatively estimates that a rate of $19.50 would be necessary; another group thinks the increase may have to be to $22 or more. Studies have not been completed.

The Rockwell bill, H. R. 2873, was sponsored by the national reclamation association last session as an answer to criticism that the repayment of power features of western reclamation projects was not required by law to include interest, and that interest when paid voluntarily or by interagency agreement (as for Grand Coulee, at 3 percent) might be applied by the Reclamation Bureau on new projects rather than being turned into the Treasury.

The House Committee on Public Lands reported a compromise bill requiring 2½-percent interest on power repayments and limiting the repayment period on power facilities to 78 years. That portion of power revenues assigned to the repayment of irrigation costs would have been paid, without interest, within a "reasonable period of years" not exceeding the useful life of the irrigation features.

The amendments proposed from the floor by Representative ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, of California, and adopted by the House with an overwhelming vote of eastern and southern Members limited the repayment period on both features to 50 years.

Present law does not fix a definite amortization period. By agreement, the Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation provided a power-repayment schedule based on fixed supply and revenues for the Columbia Basin project. When the agreement was made rising costs already had added $74,561,820 to the projected total. The continued advance in costs now has raised that figure to nearly $100,000,000. These were to be amortized by extension of the amortization period. The schedule, based on 1940 costs, would have been completed, with applied power revenues totaling $665,044,190, in the year 2017. Fourteen or fifteen years would have been added to take care of the cost increase due to higher prices for materials, wages, etc.

The amended Rockwell bill demands that commercial power revenues applicable to the Columbia Basin project be paid by the year 2002, cutting 29 or 30 years off the amortization period. The minimum estimate is that this would add $3,000,000 annually to BPA's payments, or $2,000,000 more than can be obtained under the present $17.50 rate from scheduled availability of Grand Coulee power. BPA cannot incur a deficit. Hence, higher power rates.

But that may be only the beginning. New Reclamation Bureau projects will not have the favorable earning capacity from power installation that Grand Coulee has. Still higher rates would have to be figured for them, if the 50-year amortization is upheld.

No one yet has devised a method of identifying kilowatts from Grand Coulee from those of Bonneville or elsewhere when turned into the same system. The obvious result would be a system-wide increase in rates, readjustment of long-term power contracts, and deadly discouragement of new industries which are expected to pay the bill.

The amended Rockwell bill is political dynamite for the Republican Party. But it is also sabotage of the Northwest's future, which intimately is linked with low-cost power. The Senate should bury it beyond hope of revival.

Farmers Home Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I have received from Hon. Dillard B. Lassiter, Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, together with an excerpt from the Budget of the United States, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1948.

Hon. O. C. FISHER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FISHER: We appreciate your interest in the program of the Farmers Home Administration as evidenced by your letter of January 19, and we are glad to furnish you the information requested.

I believe the enclosed excerpt from the Budget of the United States—1949—will provide a good general picture of the background and operations of this agency and its predecessors, and the enclosed publications which describe our farm purchases and our operating loans will probably furnish the general information you desire regarding the way the program operates at the county level and the types of farm families who are eligible.

The proposed budget for the fiscal year 1949 calls for an increase of $15,000,000 in the funds for production and subsistence loans, while the proposed amounts for land purchase and water-facilities loans remain the same as the amounts provided this year. This increased budget recommendation was believed necessary despite the substantial increase in farm production and income because the most recent census reports show that more than half of our farmers received gross incomes of less than $1,500 per year and one-fourth had gross incomes under $600.

The need is also indicated clearly by the number of applications received in our county offices. In Texas, for example, applications for production and subsistence loans on hand at the end of 1947 totaled 3,174, of which 1,597 are veterans; 112 applications wanted credit for installing water facilities; and there were 6,615 applications, 3,981 of them from veterans, for farm-purchase loans. In addition, there were 6,379 persons, 3,473 of them veterans, who did not file for loans because they learned when calling at the county office that funds were already exhausted.

Actual distribution of the 1948 fiscal-year appropriation to the various States allowed Texas $2,222,600 for new applicants who desired annual or adjustment-type operating loans, and by the end of 1947, $1,238,395 of this had already been obligated. Most of the less-than-a-million dollars remaining would be required for processing loans already approved by county committees, and few of the 3,174 applications now on hand can be considered before new appropriations are provided.

Apparently a similar story must be told of the 6,379 persons who have applications on file for farm-ownership loans. Of the $15,000,000 appropriated nationally, Texas has already used $613,408 in processing the 58 farm-purchase loans made in that State. There are more applications on file in the State of Texas alone than could actually have been made with the entire appropriation received for the Nation for this fiscal year.

The records being made by the borrowers who were able to obtain loan funds is so outstanding in Texas that they deserve special mention. In the farm-ownership program to date, 5,008 families have been helped to buy farms of their own, and of these 1,263 have already repaid in full, 30 or more years ahead of schedule. Of those remaining, not a single borrower has been dropped from the program for failure to repay, and only two have been changed over to collection-only status because they have left the farm owing the Government a balance on their indebtedness.

Collections throughout the program have been excellent. A total of $114,470,470 has been repaid on real-estate and rehabilitation loans in Texas, while the remaining outstanding indebtedness as of the end of 1947 was only $49,473,991. Most of this money is owed by the 15,886 active operating loan borrowers or the 3,743 active real estate loan borrowers whose indebtedness has not yet matured, and who may have, in the case of the farm-ownership families, up to 40 years remaining of their scheduled amortization period. Of the additional $54,000,000 loaned under the emergency crop and feed loan program, over $46,000,000 has been collected to date.

These unusual collection records have been made possible because the Farmers' Home borrowers receive more than credit when they participate in the agency program. Before a loan is actually processed, the applicant and the county supervisor sit down together and draw up a realistic farm and home plan which will fit the applicant's ability, can be performed by the family without outside labor, and will work on the farm which the applicant will operate. Then

they figure out the funds necessary to make the plan work, and the application is for this amount. Following this planning session a committee of three local farmers studies the plan, discusses it with the supervisor, and frequently calls in the applicant for questioning. If the loan is to purchase a farm, this committee also appraises the farm to be purchased.

If the committee approves the loan, we provide the needed credit, but do not end our services with the delivery of a check. We follow up the loan making by on-the-farm guidance in sound farm and home management methods, farm record keeping, and technical information. And the committee, too, follows up each case through annual analyses of the records made by the borrower. This committee may recommend that the family be graduated to private credit sources because they are considered as qualified for it, or that we make a further loan to give the borrower an opportunity to expand or to operate more efficiently, or may recommend that the borrower be dropped from the program for failure to repay on schedule or to follow his plan of sound operations.

I hope that we have given you the information you desire, but if you need more specific information or other types of information, we will be more than glad to hear from you and to be of any further help that we can.

Sincerely yours,

DILLARD B. LASSETER, *Administrator.*

[Excerpt from the Budget of the United States—1949, p. 264]

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The Farmers Home Administration is authorized to (1) make farm-ownership loans up to the normal value of a farm and necessary improvements at 3.5 percent interest, loans to be amortized over 40-year periods; (2) to insure 40-year farm-ownership loans by private lenders up to 90 percent of the normal value of the farm; (3) make production and subsistence loans up to $3,500 for 1 to 5 years at 5 percent for buying livestock, seed, farm equipment, and other farm needs. Water facility loans also are made by the Administration in the 17 Western States under authority of the Water Facilities Act of 1937. From the beginning of the farm-ownership program in fiscal year 1938 through fiscal year 1947, a total of 47,104 families had received loans amounting to $224,000,000 for the purchase and development of family-type farms. Since inception of the program, over $104,000,000 of principal and over $28,000,000 of interest have been repaid, and 11,233 borrowers have paid their loans in full. About 25,000 active borrowers are ahead of schedule on their payments, aggregating nearly $22,000,000. Liquidations since inception of the program have resulted in a net loss to the Government of $50,830, or one-fiftieth of 1 percent of the total loans made. The insured mortgage program is just being initiated during the current fiscal year.

From 1935 through October 31, 1946, loans aggregating $1,000,000,000 of the rural rehabilitation type were made by the predecessors of FHA to over 1,000,000 families for livestock, equipment, and other farm needs. Farm supervisors helped these families plan their farming and put the plans into practice. Principal repayments on these loans have amounted to approximately 90 percent of maturities. Annual emergency crop and feed loans made by the Farm Credit Administration and predecessor agencies from 1918 through October 31, 1946, amounted to $576,000,000, of which approximately 80 percent has been repaid. These annual and rural rehabilitation loans were replaced by the production and subsistence loans under the new FHA act which became effective November 1, 1946.

While farm production and farm income have increased substantially in recent years, the 1945 census shows that half the Nation's farmers received gross farm incomes under $1,500 in 1944, and one-fourth of the farms produced agricultural products valued at less than $600. It is estimated that nearly 1.5 million farms are failing to provide an adequate family living because of inadequate working capital. To help alleviate this situation, an increase in loan funds from $60,000,000 to $75,000,000 is proposed for 1949. Also recommended is an increase of $2,000,000 for administering the program.

Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure and pride that I insert in the RECORD one of the winning 5-minute talks of the recent I Speak for Democracy contest sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Radio Manufacturers Association, and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

A resident of my district, Miss Janet Geister, 16, of the Cuyahoga Falls High School, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, was one of the four national winners. With the other three national winners, she took a $500 cash prize, a wrist watch, and a certificate of recognition signed by Commissioner of Education John W. Studebaker, from more than 20,000 contestants in more than 500 communities in 39 States and Alaska.

The contest was planned to encourage young people to think about the democratic form of government and to express its philosophy in spoken words, no limit except that of time being placed on their work.

It was inspiring to me to witness the presentation of the awards by Attorney General Tom Clark. I am also glad to learn that the United States Office of Education is making transcriptions of Miss Geister's talk and the other winning talks in this year's contest available to schools throughout the country, and that the contest is scheduled to be continued next year.

Miss Geister's talk follows:

TALK BY JANET GEISTER, OF CUYAHOGA FALLS, OHIO

When I was given the opportunity to enter this contest, "I Speak for Democracy," the first thing I did was to look up the word "democracy" in the dictionary.

Mr. Webster defined it as "government by the people, government in which the supreme power is retained by the people and exercised by representation."

There is a vast meaning in those words—a meaning bigger than Mr. Noah Webster's conception or George Washington's, or Abraham Lincoln's, or yours or mine.

But perhaps you'll listen a few moments to one person's idea of democracy.

I am 16 years of age and attend a public high school in a comparatively small town in Ohio. Of course, like most people, I have ideas on certain subjects. Some of these are good, some bad, some right, and some wrong. Perhaps as I grow older my ideas will change, but I know my idea of democracy will not. Because it is more than an idea, it is an ideal.

To me, democracy means a way of life. As I grow older, it means I will be able to help choose the representatives in the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the President himself. This means that I will have a real voice in my Government. And it also means that I will undertake a great responsibility. And I will accept this responsibility gratefully, even eagerly, knowing that only in a democracy could a citizen have such an opportunity.

As I grow older, I will also realize more fully what is meant by "freedom": Freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom to rise as far in any field as a person's hard work and ability can take him, regardless of his race or creed.

I wonder how many children in other parts of the world can look forward to such a future of freedom.

But right now democracy means to me the everyday things in life, the things which we accept and enjoy without full appreciation of their meaning and often take so much for granted; the things that give us pleasure, the things that give us happiness: Drinking a soda at the corner drugstore, attending high school, outside activities such as the concert course we attend every month, which gives such a grown-up feeling, clubs at school, the fun we have participating in the community plays, football games on Friday night, the idea that an opportunity is given to persons my age to enter a contest like this and give an opinion on an important subject such as democracy.

For democracy is important. To the people in other countries of the world where other forms of government exist, the United States and democracy are the one shining light and hope in an otherwise dark world. If democracy fails, what next?

Oh, not that democracy is perfect, not that it doesn't have its faults. But when 130,000,000 people believe in the same principle and are working toward that principle—well, it just has to be a success. That's the only way.

Democracy is on trial. The United States and other members of the United Nations are the deciding factors in the difference between the success and the failure, not of the peace, but of the world. As our forefathers fought and died to leave us this proud heritage of freedom, so must we strive to preserve that freedom for future generations—strive to eliminate racial discrimination, and strive to preserve the principles of free enterprise that have made our country the leading power that it is today.

Our responsibility to the world is great. We must not fail to live up to this responsibility. Yes, I do speak for democracy. I speak wholeheartedly, knowing that here in America people enjoy a way of life which is only hoped for by people of other countries.

Civil Aeronautics Board Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming every day increasingly evident that the present administration has become more and more under the influence of military men. With the peace machinery of this country in the hands of military trained men in such posts as our principal ambassadorships and the Secretary of State office, the President has now started to extend this military influence into our domestic life. The statement which I am inserting was written by one of the most independent and fearless men in American today, Harold L. Ickes:

MAN TO MAN

(By Harold L. Ickes)

I think it was Benjamin Franklin who observed that little boats should stay close to the shore. It is doubtful whether President Truman considered, if it occurred to him at all, that he was sailing out into deep and dangerous waters when he rudely dismissed, without benefit of clergy, one of the ablest of his keymen, James M. Landis, former dean of the Harvard Law School and chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and reached into the military, a continuing bad habit, for Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter to replace him.

General Kuter is 42. He is said to be one of the ablest of the younger air officers. Something of an infant prodigy when he entered West Point at the age of 15, he served in Europe, in the Pacific and in Air Force planning in Washington. On the basis of his record, I do not question either his qualifications as a soldier or his ability as a pilot. I am even willing to assume that he has the particular executive and other abilities that the chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board must have to give a successful administration and to solve wisely questions that pertain not only to domestic, but to international aviation.

But even admitting that General Kuter has all of the necessary qualifications, it was a bad appointment. Mr. Truman has sent to Congress a hurry-up request for special legislation that will permit the general to take the post while still holding his rank and position in the Army. The bill would exempt him from military supervision, but would continue his military pay and perquisites, with the Civil Aeronautics Board reimbursing the Air Force. This would make it a rather nice deal for the Air Force, too, because it could advance someone else to the Kuter job. But if the bill should become law, General Kuter's fellow members of the CAB would be discriminated against because their salaries are fixed by statute at $10,000, while General Kuter's Air Force pay is reported to be $15,200.

He has, besides, the privilege of free medical care for himself and his immediate family, he can eat at the low-cost officers' mess, and buy as he likes from the service stores. Altogether, pay, allowances, and privileges would probably amount to the equivalent of something close to $20,000 a year.

What the President proposes to do is not only unfair to the other members of the board, it would throw out of joint the whole Federal pay structure. Moreover, by this neat little trick Mr. Truman would be raising indirectly a salary that the Congress has declined to raise, and if he does it in this instance, why not in others? Why not an entire CAB composed of generals and admirals with Army and Navy pay and emoluments? And what would prevent extending the same principle to the Supreme Court? If the President should again yield to his propensity to fire a good man, as Landis undoubtedly was, why not fill the resulting vacancy by borrowing a Supreme Court Justice, with salary attached?

Moreover, this typical Truman blunder is flying in the face of a deep-rooted American tradition. Mr. Truman does not seem to know it, but there is an American predisposition against turning civilian affairs over to the military. It is also a sad commentary on Mr. Truman's lack of qualities of leadership that he could find no civilian willing to fill the brutally created Landis vacancy. Mr. Truman has made it clear again to all of the world that a job in his administration, especially if the holder thereof is competent and regards the public interest as paramount, is extra hazardous.

If General Kuter drove a good bargain, Mr. Truman drove a bad one. For one thing, he has shaken the morale of faithful Democrats in Congress. It will be recalled that it was through House Democratic Leader SAM RAYBURN that Mr. Truman sent to Landis assurance of reappointment. It was when Mr. RAYBURN was far away in Texas that Dr. Landis was called to the White House, 48 hours before his term expired, to be told roughly that he was through.

It is also reported that Senator BARKLEY, Democratic leader of the Senate, heard of the Truman intention when he was in Paris. He cabled Mr. Truman asking for a chance to talk with him before taking final action. How Mr. Truman reacted to that request is history. How Senator BARKLEY treated the palpable snub is not yet history, but it can quite readily be imagined. It is said that Mr. Truman got more than a whiff of a rising storm when the Senator shortly thereafter reached the White House.

Another and heavier penalty that Mr. Truman will pay for his too-ready compliance with Secretary of Commerce Harriman's demand for Dr. Landis' head lies in the fact that by his own willful and deliberate act he has given occasion for a spreading public alarm over the increasing influence of the military in American civil life. Henry A. Wallace will make the most of it. So, in all likelihood, will Senator TAFT, and others. It is not often in a Presidential year that the man in the White House forgets to wear his suspenders.

Rehabilitation of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, being from the Pacific coast I am much interested in the progress of rehabilitation in Japan. I have found this address by the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco on January 8, 1948, to be very informative on this subject and under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

To many American citizens—including myself—the most surprising development—and one of the most disappointing aspects of our victory over Germany and Japan has been the responsibility and cost which have been placed upon us in the matter of occupation. There were few who originally recognized the extent of this burden. And today every citizen of our country is justified in asking the "what" and the "why" of our occupation policies.

On this occasion I will speak specifically of Japan. Immediately after the surrender, the objectives of our policy were stated to be, first, "To insure that Japan will not again become a menace to the peace and security of the world," and, second, "to bring about the earliest possible establishment of a democratic and peaceful government which will carry out its international responsibilities, respect the rights of other states, and support the objectives of the United Nations."

The underlying idea was the prevention of future Japanese aggression—direct prevention by disarmament, and indirect prevention by creating a type of government unlikely to develop again the spirit of aggressive war. The real well-being of Japan—or her strength as a nation—was decidedly a secondary consideration—secondary to protection of ourselves against Japan, and secondary to payment of reparations to the victorious Allies for the damages inflicted upon them.

This attitude is clearly shown by the emphasis in the original directive, which stated in part: "Japan shall be permitted" (not encouraged but permitted) "to maintain such industries as will sustain her economy and permit the exaction of reparations * * * but not * * * enable her to rearm. * * * Access to, as distinguished from control of, raw materials should be permitted. Eventual Japanese participation in world trade * * * will be permitted."

It is clearly understandable—and it was fully in accord with the then feelings and opinions of our people—that in 1945 the main purpose of occupation should be protection against an enemy which had viciously attacked us and which had committed brutal atrocities against our troops and our private citizens.

Since then new conditions have arisen—in world politics and economics, in problems of national defense, and in humanitarian considerations. These changes must now be fully taken into account in determining our future course, but it should be remembered that these developments arose in large part after the original policies were set.

These original policies were promptly carried out. Within a few months after the end of hostilities, all Japanese tactical units had been dissolved and all implements of war destroyed or insulated. The top Japanese military organizations, as well as the infamous secret and terroristic societies, were abolished. Those who formulated the Japanese policies of conquest and aggression were removed from important political and economic positions.

War-making industries were marked for removal and reparation. This included arsenals, private munitions plants, aircraft factories, military research laboratories, synthetic-rubber and oil plants, shipbuilding installations, and certain chemical, machine-tool, precision-bearing, thermo-electric, and metal factories, nonferrous and others. Commitments were made to other nations for payment of reparations with those plants.

Other steps followed, including those leading to the dissolution of concentrations of property ownership and economic power. At the end of the war—and for a long period before the war—land ownership had been in the hands of a comparatively small part of the population. The system was analogous to the feudal system of past centuries, and in Japan the land barons used their power to encourage war.

"In the business field, the Zaibatsu, or money cliques, dominated completely and ruthlessly the Japanese economy—through holding companies and monopolies. A dozen families controlled over 75 percent of the country's commerce, industry, and finance.

The influence over the Japanese Government of these and other monopolies was almost unbounded, and they were linked inseparably with the militarists. This joint group over a course of years—and particularly in the year and a half before Pearl Harbor—encouraged Japan toward war and destruction.

Steps were taken to break both types of concentrations. Under a directive issued by the Supreme Allied Commander, the Japanese Diet enacted in the fall of 1946 a land reform law under which, through local land commissions, the 5,500,000 Japanese farm families could acquire land from the present owners

at a reasonable price and pay for its over a period of years. This program will be completed by the end of 1948. Just as in America the small landowner is symbolically and factually democracy in practice, so we expect that in time the strength of Japanese democracy will find roots in similar soil.

Action against the Zaibatsu has proceeded vigorously, and its control has now been virtually abolished. Sixty-seven holding companies, with 4,000 subsidiaries and affiliates, have been marked for liquidation. The two largest holding companies—Mitsubishi and Mitsui—have been closed. Others of the larger ones have been almost wholly liquidated.

The Japanese Government has been directed to prepare legislation prohibiting international cartels. Stringent antitrust and deconcentration legislaiton has been prepared and passed in part. A Holding Company Liquidation Commission has been established and is functioning in the supervision of the entire program.

While these various steps were being taken, new developments were arising, and old factors were changing in importance. Japan had never been able to provide all of its own food—nor to produce enough of many other necessities of life. Seventy-eight million Japanese occupy an area smaller than California and of that area only 16 percent is capable of cultivation.

The population is still growing at an enormous rate. It is expected to reach 84,000,000 by 1951. The current troubled condition in Asia leaves practically no food available for import into Japan, even if the currency and Japanese export situation would make food purchases possible—which they would not.

And yet without food and other necessities, Japan would be faced with widespread starvation and disease—would seethe with unrest and disorder and hopelessness. Even aside from the simple principles of humanity, we could not, under such conditions, accomplish our original objective of a peaceful Japanese Government. Nor could we hope that Japan would be other than susceptible to totalitarian demagogues from within and without. Without help the country would become a prey to nondemocratic ideologies of aggression.

To meet this situation America has supplied Japan with food and other necessities. This assistance has given the country a base upon which to build, and it has been possible to supplant totalitarianism and Shintoism with democracy, to begin to replace educational regimentation with academic freedom, and to build the foundations for a peace-loving government of the people.

For this and other achievements in Japan, great credit must be given to General MacArthur and his staff. America was indeed fortunate that for this vital task, it had an outstanding leader who could bring the Japanese to a complete realization of their defeat and at the same time obtain their full cooperation in forming a free and stable government.

But the Department of the Army and the Department of State—which shares the policy responsibility of occupation—both Departments realize that for political stability to continue and for free government to succeed in the future, there must be a sound and self-supporting economy, and General MacArthur in command of the occupation can be depended upon to implement these policies.

We also realize that the United States cannot forever continue to pour hundreds of millions of dollars annually into relief funds for occupied areas, and that such contributions can end without disaster only when the occupied countries can pay for their own necessities with their own production and exports.

These factors have resulted in efforts to improve in many fields the economic situation in Japan. And with this increasing economic approach there has arisen an inevitable area of conflict between the original concept of broad demilitarization and the new purpose of building a self-supporting nation.

In the case of agriculture the two purposes do happen to run practically parallel. The breaking down of feudal holdings has ended a war-making influence. At the same time the wider division of lands tends to produce incentive on the part of the larger number of landowners and thereby to increase over-all production.

But it is a different situation with manufacturing. The destruction of synthetic rubber or shipbuilding or chemical or nonferrous metal plants will certainly destroy the war potential of Japan, but such destruction may also adversely affect the peace potential.

The dissolution of the Zaibatsu may present in itself no serious economic problem, but at some stage extreme deconcentration of industry, while further impairing the ability to make war, may at the same time impair manufacturing efficiency and reduce the over-all production and the exportable surplus of Japanese industry—may, therefore, postpone the day when Japan can become self-supporting.

Such is our dilemma. It is clear that Japan cannot support itself as a nation of shopkeepers and craftsmen and small artisans any more than it can exist as a purely agricultural nation. We can expect a continuing economic deficit in Japan unless there is at least some degree of mass industrial production.

Another borderline situation between demilitarization and economic recovery is presented in the case of personnel. The men who were the most active in building up and running Japan's war machine—militarily and industrially—were often the ablest and most successful business leaders of that country, and their services would in many instances contribute to the economic recovery of Japan.

What should we do about them now? We cannot afford to leave the Japanese war system intact nor forget that there is danger in retaining in power leaders whose philosophy helped bring on World War II. On the other hand we cannot afford to sterilize the business ability of Japan.

Nor can we believe without qualification individual Japanese protestations of war innocence or of peacetime reformation. One Senator said to me in Germany shortly after VE-day, "I have inquired everywhere, and I have not yet found a single Nazi in Germany," to which could perhaps now be added, "nor a war lord in Japan."

All these matters present questions of degree, and the decisions are matters of judgment. These decisions are not difficult as a cocktail party or from an easy chair or on a rostrum, if made by those who have no responsibility for the decisions or their results. It is somewhat different when you must live and suffer with any errors that you might make.

The Departments of State and Army are trying to draw the lines in the right place. And in doing so they are giving—and will give—full weight to the changes in political and military and economic considerations which have occurred since the initial days of occupation.

We realize that deconcentration must stop short of the point where it unduly interferes with the efficiency of Japanese industry. Earlier programs are being reexamined—as, for example, the details of the program stated in the paper submitted some months ago to the Far Eastern Commission, and recently given wide publicity as FEC-230.

We are not averse to modifying programs in the interests of our broad objectives. A bill recently submitted to the Japanese Diet setting up procedures for deconcentration of excessive economic power was changed before its final enactment—changed with a view of giving added weight to the economic needs of Japan.

In the case of plant dismantling and reparations—in addition to the matter of disarmament—we are bound by certain agreements with other nations—agreements which must be carried out unless breached by those others or altered by consent. However, since last summer we have had a competent group of industrial engineers in the Pacific selecting the specific plants which, consistent with our obligations, can be dismantled with the minimum of detriment to Japanese economic recovery. The report and recommendations of this committee should reach the Department of the Army during this month.

I would not leave the impression that questions of demilitarization or reparation or deconcentration or disqualification of personnel are the most immediate obstacles to Japanese recovery. The principal difficulties arise from the destruction which war brought to Japan and to the chaotic condition which has existed in the Far East since VJ-day.

The flimsy nature of Japanese construction and the concentrated population centers made these islands most vulnerable targets for our incendiary and other missiles. Even aside from the effects on Hiroshima and Nagasaki of the atomic bombs, many Japanese cities were largely destroyed. I believe that on a percentage basis greater Tokyo—with about 7,000,000 people as of 1940—was as badly damaged as any enemy city in the entire world.

Japan has long been dependent on the rest of Asia not only for foodstuffs but for raw materials needed in their manufacturing and business life, and it has relied largely on general commerce with China and other neighbors. With the war and its aftermath these sources of import and export are largely nonexistent.

Many affirmative steps have been and are being taken to meet these and other difficulties—and to promote recovery and thereby hasten the day when Japan will cease to be a financial burden to the United States. I wish that time permitted me to discuss in detail our activities in many fields, including those of finance and credit and foreign trade.

Some results of our efforts are apparent. Over-all Japanese industrial production has risen from 18 percent of the 1930-34 level in January 1946, to 40 percent in August 1947. In the case of coal—basically needed for business recovery—the present production is 80 percent of the 1930-34 level. Fertilizer has increased fourfold during occupation. One-fourth of the war-destroyed houses in Tokyo and vicinity have been replaced. Six hundred thousand acres of land have been reclaimed for cultivation, and a million more should be added by 1950.

In this whole picture of Japan do not forget that we are supervising an entire Government—and one disorganized by an unsuccessful war. We have all the many normal policy and operating problems of a stable and successful government plus the added ones produced by the unusual and distressing conditions peculiar to present-day Japan.

The differences from our own country are such that we cannot expect to impose on the Japanese people an exact reproduction of American democracy. It follows that often there is no precise precedent for our problems, and the departments must do as our forefathers did in the early days of our own Government, reach the best results we can by trial and error.

The lines to be drawn are, of course, not always easy to draw, and as in the case of all decisions of importance one cannot be too dogmatic. There can be—and are likely to be—differences of opinion among sincere and informed people. Nor do I have any illusion that everything we do will be perfect.

But I can assure you that our decisions will be made with realism and with a firm determination of doing all possible to prevent Japan from again waging unprovoked and aggressive and cruel war against any other nation. We hold to an equally definite purpose of building in Japan a self-sufficient democracy, strong enough and stable enough to support itself and at the same time to serve as a deterrent against any other totalitarian war threats which might hereafter arise in the Far East.

Republicans Kill 4-Percent GI Real Estate Mortgage Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter that I have written to one of my constituents, Mr. Charles M. Taylor, a veteran and post commander of AMVETS Post, No. 8, Detroit, Mich. I believe that it is the duty and responsibility of the Government to extend long-term loans at low interest rates and small down payments to our veterans. Every veteran should have an opportunity to own his own home. This opportunity should not be stifled by demanding $3,000 and $4,000 as a down payment, and making him meet monthly payments and interest rates so high that he cannot meet them on the wages or salary that he receives.

A home ownership plan for the veterans is desirable and meets with the approval of all of our citizens, I am sure. It is up to the veterans' organizations to inform this Republican Congress that they want this program carried out.

MR. CHARLES M. TAYLOR,
Post Commander, AMVETS Post, No. 8,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. TAYLOR: With further reference to your letter requesting my support of legislation in Congress authorizing the RFC to purchase GI loans without recourse, I wish to submit the following information:

Senate Joint Resolution 146 was a resolution for the extension of succession and powers of the RFC. This resolution was passed without amendment by the Senate on June 23, 1947 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7881). The House Banking and Currency Committee, under the chairmanship of Jesse P. Wolcott, refused to consider Senate Joint Resolution 146, and instead, took up their own bill, H. R. 3016.

This House bill did not continue the authority of the RFC to purchase veterans' loans. On the House floor an amendment was offered to reestablish and extend the powers of the RFC as a secondary market for these veterans' loans. I voted for this amendment, but it was rejected (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 24, 1947, pp. 7631-7634). Later a motion was made to recommit the House bill, with the recommendation that it be reported back with the provision extending the RFC authority included. I voted for this motion to recommit, but by a vote of 154 to 192, the motion to recommit was rejected (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 24, 1947, p. 7634). The conferees agreed substantially with the House language of the bill and it became Public Law 132, thus terminating the authority of the RFC to purchase veterans' loans.

Subsequently, the Senate passed S. 1543, the Sparkman bill, the purpose of which was to give the RFC this continuing power to purchase GI housing loans. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Banking and Currency on July 25, 1947. No further action has been taken by the House committee.

At the time that the RFC was put out of business as a secondary market for these GI mortgage loans I strongly opposed this action, and I stated at that time that the bankers would boycott the purchase of these 4-percent loans to the GI's, and that there would be no outlet for these loans whatsoever, once the bankers succeeded in putting the RFC out of business. This is exactly what has happened.

In the Detroit area a GI must now comply under the FHA in order to obtain a mortgage loan. He has to pay 5 percent interest instead of 4 percent. He will not get a 100-percent commitment on a long-term basis. He must have three or four thousand dollars as a down payment, and his monthly payments on the mortgage loan are nearly doubled.

At the time that the legislation was up for consideration for extending the authority of the RFC, and all of the might and power of the banking interests were mobilized to kill this authority, I must state with regret that the newspapers and radio commentators were all hush-hush when this great slaughter of the GI veterans' loans was being committed in Congress. It is not surprising that it wasn't until months later than the veterans woke up to find out what the Republicans had done to them in Congress. Now, that is not all. Just recently I have been informed by a reputable mortgage man that in the Detroit area it is difficult to even sell 5-percent FHA mortgages. It would appear that the big bankers' plans have materialized. They have put the RFC out of the real-estate mortgage business, and now they have the field all to themselves. It will not be long before they will drive up the interest rates on real-estate mortgages to 6 or 7 percent again, as it used to be in the "good old Republican days" before President Roosevelt was elected and messed up their most lucrative and profitable racket.

I wish that you would bring this letter to the attention of your veterans' organizations.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
Member of Congress.

Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Daily Tribune, a newspaper published in my home city, Royal Oak, Mich. This editorial on politicians ought to be of interest to every Member of Congress. It presents a common-sense approach and is a complete answer to the criticism which all Members receive. The editor is to be commended for his intelligent analysis of this subject.

PERSONALLY SPEAKING
(By Floyd J. Miller)
THOSE LOUSY POLITICIANS

Everybody is all the time making cracks about politicians, and it isn't right.

When I say everybody, I mean just that. Why, I have even known myself to make disparaging remarks concerning these gents. Only when I did so I actually had in mind only a small fraction of the men engaged in public service—or politics.

But politics is just like any other occupation. It gets sneered at and jeered at and lambasted because of the unsatisfactory performance of only part of those engaged in it.

In the same way we refer critically to "damned capitalists" or "lousy labor leaders"; or even to "dump teachers" and "cheating ministers." It is not that we would condemn any one of these groups, or even a large proportion of it. No; we just get fed up with the stupidity or greed or incompetence of a few and proceed to cuss out the whole class.

Perhaps politicians are assailed more frequently and more violently than any other group because so much of their activity is out where we can see it. A man has to express his opinions where all the world can hear them, as repeated by the press. He is obliged to vote "yes" or "no" on questions that affect closely the welfare and well-being of his fellow citizens.

He has to stick his neck out. And, brother, do the rest of us like to take a whack at it.

When we get down to cases, though, we realize that only through politicians can our democratic form of government be carried on.

Politicians are the men engaged in politics. And politics is carrying on the business and promoting the welfare of the state. The state, that's us—we, the people.

If politics often stinks—and it does—we the citizens are responsible. We can clean it up any time we make up our minds to do so.

Unfortunately, in spite of the critical necessity for the best possible men in public office, the average American is still too busy or too lazy to pay great attention to the matter.

He will kick about what the politician does or fails to do, but forget that he himself failed to vote at the last election. Or if he did vote, it was after a whole 5 minutes discussion of the candidates and issues with some pal who really didn't know much about them himself.

So we get some pretty Sad Sacks in public office. Their ability or lack of it is generally a pretty good reflection of our own individual unwillingness to do anything about it.

The vast majority of men in public office though, are trying to do a good job and are reasonably well equipped to do so. Very few get anywhere near the pay we want them to be worth. Other reasons impel them to vie for whatever honors, prominence, and criticism they receive.

Quite a number like the prominence and publicity. Definitely, too, many seek the jobs so they may promote the interests of particular groups, business, industry, labor, agriculture.

But over and above all such selfish motives there is, I am convinced after many years of close observation, a genuine desire to serve. There is an appreciation of the fact that the American Republic can continue to exist only as long as individuals will contribute something to the good of all.

Or perhaps you prefer to consider the problem from the hard-boiled or realistic angle. Then it becomes just a matter of intelligent protection of your own interests, considered from a long-range view.

In either case, you perceive that the "pressure groups" which exert too great an influence, can make or break our Nation. But perhaps that is getting into too controversial a topic in the space available here. Most of us are members of organizations that can properly be labeled "pressure groups." It depends whose toes are stepped on.

These self-interests, no matter how justifiable they appear to each of us, must be watched carefully. We must avoid getting

tied in with any group whose leaders contend it is always right and never wrong.

The way in which we individually answer all these complicated conundrums will determine what kind of politics we have.

Meanwhile our politicians will be just as good as our politics—and no better.

The Worker and the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Worker and the Marshall Plan," by the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. John T. Kmetz, at a dinner meeting by the Wanamaker Post of the American Legion, at Philadelphia, Pa., on Tuesday, December 2, 1947. His analysis of the Marshall plan from the standpoint of the American worker is, I believe, well worth the attention of Members of Congress.

Mr. Kmetz makes a very interesting analogy in describing the wartime devastation of those nations of Europe which we plan to assist back to economic recovery through the Marshall plan. After outlining the destruction of industrial capacity in France, Italy, Greece, England, the loss of manpower through wartime deaths and injuries, the neglect of agriculture, the long history of undernourishment and overwork during the war, and the climax to all of this suffering in the form of floods, Mr. Kmetz says:

Is it any wonder that men despaired as in their own misery they witnessed the suffering of their wives, their children, their parents? Picture, if you can, similar conditions in our country. Suppose that it was in Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, and New York that factories with their production lines had been transformed into twisted girders of steel and a mass of concrete rubble. And suppose that as we started to remove the debris the rains came down in torrents and the Lehigh, the Ohio, the Schuylkill, the Delaware, the Susquehanna, and the Mohawk Rivers rose over their banks, drowning the growing crops and the last hopes of men for relief by their own efforts.

Well, gentlemen, that is what happened to Europe during the cruelest war in the history of mankind, and in the years that have intervened since American boys crossed the Rhine.

Those are Mr. Kmetz's words, and I should like to have the entire article inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to be with you tonight, and I wish I could address you as fellow Legionnaires. I envy you that great privilege of telling your grandchildren about your deeds at Chateau Thierry, at Soissons, at Belleau Wood, and I know that among your members there are enough veterans of World War II to keep your stories close to the truth.

It was not so with the grandfather of a friend of mine out in the mountains of western Pennsylvania. His grandfather was a private in the siege and capture of Petersburg, Va., during the Civil War. For several years he told of his part in that battle with becoming modesty. But as the years wore on, his imagination painted the lily. Later he remembered that he had been a sergeant and had assumed command of his company when his captain was killed in action. As time went on he remembered that he was the captain, and that it was his colonel who had been killed, and his battle command had been that of a regiment. The last time he told his grandson the story it was about General Grant and I.

The trade to which I was apprenticed 40 years ago made it impossible for me to wear this country's uniform in World War I. As many of you know, I am a coal miner.

I don't want to compare the war service of you men who faced sudden death or permanent injury and those of us who helped produce the munitions that made victory possible. Rather, I want to talk to you about that great thing American warriors and workers have in common. That is the love we bear our country, the pride we take in our way of life, and our determination that these things shall not disappear from the earth.

When, almost 30 years ago, you took off your uniforms, you had every right to feel proud. You had fought the good fight for democracy. To me your victory was a particular source of pride and thankfulness, because one of the new democracies which your victory made possible was started in Czechoslovakia.

It was the home of my ancestors and the place of my birth.

Maybe because of this fact I have thought more about how wonderful it is to be an American than those of you who always have enjoyed freedom. America, to me, has been more than a land of opportunity. Here I have been allowed to think as I like. I belong to, and work for, my union. I go wherever I please. I read whatever appeals to me, and I speak my thoughts. My children go to school and play without fear. I vote for the person who I think is best for the job. I pick the work I want to do, and I go to it every morning free in mind and spirit, knowing that a miner's pay for his work enables him to enjoy a higher standard of living in America than any coal miner in any other country of the world.

Such things were not possible in many parts of Europe when my father brought me as a child to America. My own people—the Slovaks—were under the rule of the Austro-Hungarian Emperor. They lived under the ever-present fear of the tyrant emperor and later under the dictator tyrant, who imposed their harsh will and inflicted their cruelties in spite of the heroic bravery and sacrifices of the people of Czechoslovakia.

In some respects the people of Czechoslovakia were more fortunate in the condition of their country than other European nations. I do not speak of Lidice, nor of the suffering they underwent in every part of the nation. I refer to the physical condition of their industrial plants. The workers, when they came home from the war, possessed skills; and they knew how to use them in these plants spared much of the destruction visited on the munition plants in other parts of Europe. They went to work. They were not as active in defeating Communist propaganda and infiltration into their unions as we, for instance, have been. That I regret. I do not fear, however, that they will fall victim to the false ideology of Moscow. Despite their predicament I am convinced that the overwhelming sentiment of the people for democracy will prevail.

But the destruction which was spared many industrial plants in Czechoslovakia does not apply to other parts of Europe. In France, in Italy, in Greece, and in England, to mention only a few, many of the factories had been destroyed. Millions of their young men had been killed or maimed. Much of the land which in years past had produced ample foodstuffs had gone to waste through neglect, lack of manpower, and machinery, fertilizer, and transportation. The people had been underfed and overworked through the years of the war. And so it was that from poverty they descended to despair. And then another catastrophe was added to their burden. Last winter was the coldest in western Europe in the memory of many now living. The mines did not produce enough coal to keep the people from the danger line of freezing. Transportation was disrupted. Mills and factories lay idle because there was no fuel. And as they recovered from this blow, floods came which destroyed young crops and delayed the planting of others.

Is it any wonder that men despair as in their own misery they witnessed the suffering of their wives, their children, their parents? Picture, if you can, similar conditions in our country. Suppose that it was in Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, and New York that factories with their production lines had been transformed into twisted girders of steel and a mass of concrete rubble. And suppose that as we started to remove the debris the rains came down in torrents and the Lehigh, the Ohio, the Schuylkill, the Delaware, the Susquehanna, and the Mohawk Rivers rose over their banks, drowning the growing crops and the last hopes of men for relief by their own efforts.

Well, gentlemen, that is what happened to Europe during the cruelest war in the history of mankind, and in the years that have intervened since American boys crossed the Rhine.

What are we going to do about it?

Shall we allow millions of people in Europe to starve? Shall we withhold the food, the fuel, the machinery which will sustain life until they can again take their places among the nations of the world? Shall we, by indifference to their suffering, permit the destruction of those ideals of liberty and freedom upon which our own America was founded and on which it grew to greatness? Shall we ignore reality and permit this to happen, with the inevitable loss of our European markets along with the destruction of our own ideals?

President Truman has answered that question. And leaders of the Republican Party such as Senator VANDENBERG have affirmed his answer. It has been called the Marshall plan. It is part and parcel of the American tradition of generosity to those less fortunate than ourselves. It also might be called enlightened self-interest. For make no mistake about it, if we do not help the nations of Europe to save themselves, then all the things we have, all the things we are or hope to be, are perilously endangered. Today's newspapers verify that fact.

I am not an economist nor a diplomat, so what I have to say about the Marshall plan concerns the way it affects you and me, as men who have lived and worked, and who hope that our sons shall continue to have that privilege under the American way of life. As a coal miner I know that my family would starve if there were no railroads to haul and no factories to consume the products of my pick and shovel. There would be no locomotives to transport our food and clothing and knickknacks, or hairpins and safety razors for all of us if the coal I dig failed to reach the steel mill. Nor would there be refrigerators, radios, textiles, kitchen utensils, or any of the thousands of other things we find in department stores if our basic industries were idle for lack of coal, or transportation, or for any other reason.

There are none of these things in the homes of European workers. Of course, they want them, as do you and I. But they are more concerned with where and with what they will obtain the meager rations which nowhere are sufficient to sustain healthy life.

On next Tuesday a group of State labor officials and representatives of labor and employers meet in Washington for the Secretary of Labor's annual conference on legislation. The committee drawing plans for the conference discussed what kind of banquet should be held during the course of the conference. Someone suggested, in the light of the President's program for the conservation of food, that they be served a meal typical of that now served at similar functions in England. So they called the British Embassy and asked for a typical menu. When they learned that the simplest meal that could be served in Washington would equal in calories an English ration for a week, the idea was abandoned.

It is because of insufficient food, a hopeless outlook, and the sight of their families ill and weakened from malnutrition that the workers of Italy and France and Greece have listened, in their despair, to the siren call of communism. The danger of this false ideology will fade and disappear when the workers know that the proceeds of their labor will provide food, clothing, and shelter for themselves and their families.

The Marshall plan started when our distinguished Secretary of State spoke at Harvard College last June 5. It wasn't really a plan. All he said was that the United States was willing to assist in a workable program for European recovery. Europe, he added, would have to start the ball rolling by drawing up a program. The program, he continued, would receive assistance from the United States only if the European nations affected would cooperate individually and collectively to make it work.

Well, 16 nations grabbed the life-saving rope flung out by Secretary Marshall in that speech. There were some others who wanted to meet with them in Paris when they sat down in July to talk cases. But they recalled their acceptances of the invitation after their government leaders were called suddenly to Moscow.

But the Paris Conference went on without them, even while they looked hungrily in from the outside. A preliminary draft of what is needed was prepared and submitted to the United States Government. The final decision on that, as is entirely proper, will be made by the Congress of the United States. Estimates of the cost to America range from less than twenty to twenty-five billion dollars, to be provided over a period of 4 years.

Now, what are the major elements in a European recovery program?

First, each of the countries that sits in on the deal will have to demonstrate its sincerity. They will have to do that by making a genuine, strong, and determined effort to start production of goods that can be exported; that is, exchanged with other countries for the things they need most.

Each country will have to stop the printing presses which have been turning out paper money by the ton. Each must inaugurate sound money and fiscal policies.

Every nation involved will have to demonstrate a maximum willingness to cooperate with all other nations in the pool.

Each of the countries that is involved in the plan will have to schedule some of its production toward exportable products that will cut down the deficit in the exchange of goods with America. In other words, as in the past, they'll make some of the things Americans want and need. These will be things which they can produce better than we can, because of raw materials, supplies, special skills in workmanship, or because some things grow in their climates that don't grow in ours. Like lead, copper, and zinc, Italian and French wines, or Swiss watches, or Norwegian sardines.

Finally, each nation to which we extend our help must lay down its programs so that they will be making their own way by 1951, on a reasonable standard of living.

The next question is, will it work?

Frankly, success of the program cannot be guaranteed. There are real risks that in at least some of the countries it won't work. But Professor Einstein wasted a lot of paper, and Mr. Edison a lot of sleepless nights, before their ideas began to pay off.

So, in proposing the plan, Secretary Marshall saw that some of the American goods that will go to Europe under the plan, will be gifts. These things are mainly such items as foods, fertilizer, and fuel, and some machinery essential to get the means of production going. In most cases machinery and raw materials will be paid for, however.

The idea behind the plan is to provide the minimum help that will put each of these countries on a self-supporting basis. If that means grants, or gifts, of some goods, why, "we'll cast our bread upon the waters," confident that "it will return after many days."

Secretary Marshall's plan calls for an agreement between the United States and each of the countries which is given assistance. Those agreements will, of course, vary in form, because the problems are not exactly alike in many of them. But there is one provision that is basic to all of them. That is that each country will adopt monetary and fiscal policies which will maintain stability in price and cost structures. The agreements will obligate them to set, and do their dead level best to attain targets of production, particularly, of coal and basic foods. Also each agreement will provide that the country to which it applies will cooperate in reducing barriers to international trade and promote an increasing interchange of goods and services with other countries.

While the first assistance that goes to these European countries will be from the United States Government, private business and finance is not going to be barred from participation. Secretary Marshall told two congressional committee on last November 10: "Every encouragement should be given to early initiation of private financing, so as to eliminate as far as possible the necessity of direct assistance from the United States Government." What this means is that when any of the countries begin to display signs of recovery that will attract private capital, then Uncle Sam will step aside.

A lot of people have asked if the Marshall plan will weaken our own industry, business, and commerce. Well, the so-called committee of 19, headed by Secretary of Commerce W. Averell Harriman, and including leaders of industry, commerce, and labor say it won't. At the present time, for instance, we send about 10 percent of our production out of the country. If Europe were to collapse—that is, if there was no Marshall plan—the biggest part of this market would be lost. But if, on the other hand, Europe gets a good start up again, they'll want more of the goods we produce. It would have a direct effect, for instance, in taking for cash—not as grants, as gifts—the American farm surplus of cotton, tobacco, wheat, flour, corn, hogs, fruit, canned milk, and other farm products. The people of Europe also want more of our automobiles, refrigerators, radios, electrical equipment, and a thousand other things. In return, the United States would benefit by being able, through imports, to obtain the things we need, particularly such things as copper, lead, and zinc, as well as manufactured products.

From what I've said you may have gathered the idea that up to now the people over there have done nothing to spark plug their own recovery. The fact is Europe already has worked hard for its recovery. It is remarkable that so much has been accomplished. Let's look at the record. We'll take production in the year 1937 as equal to 100. Well, Belgium is now approximately at 81 percent of what level. Denmark is at 102, France at 94, Italy approximately 70, The Netherlands 95, Norway 120, and Sweden 109.

Great Britain also has made substantial strides toward recovery. Over-all production is 110 percent of 1938 levels. Using that year as equal to 100, Britain's agricultural production figures show cereals to be 150 percent, potatoes 222, sugar beets 128, vegetables 130, and milk 120. In industrial production in Britain, coal is at 82 percent of 1938, electricity 167, gas 145, steel (ingots and castings) 126, merchant shipbuilding 180, trucks, 175, cotton yarn 55, rayon yarn 55, and merchandise freight traffic 130.

That brings up the question of whether or not the United States program for European recovery means that we will finance socialist governments. Assistant Secretary of State Saltzman answered that when he said:

"We are satisfied that our form of government, for us at least, is best. Whether or not this form of government is best for other nations is not for us to say. Because we have prospered, we hope that a large majority of other peoples of the world will profit by our experience in choosing a democratic form of government. However, it is not our intention to impose our way of life on other nations. That in itself would be undemocratic. Our only purpose is, insofar as possible, to give other nations an opportunity to decide these matters for themselves, free from coercion."

The attitude of President Truman, Secretary Marshall, and just about all of the people in the country is different when we speak of any form of government—Communist or otherwise—which tries to prolong or profit from hunger, disease, and insecurity. The American Government has stated that it will give sympathetic consideration to the needs of any European government which wishes to participate wholeheartedly in a program for the good of all. We shall not help any country which fails to do its part or maneuvers to block the recovery of other countries. Furthermore, should we encounter governments, political parties, or groups which attempt to prolong human misery for political profit they will receive our unqualified opposition.

What I have said concerns the long-range program for the economic rehabilitation of Europe. The $597,000,000 emergency relief program, which President Truman requested, and which now is before Congress, is preliminary in nature, and a gift to France, Italy, and Austria. It will prevent acute suffering from cold and hunger through the winter months and thereby hold off the radicals who would surrender the governments of those countries to communism. The European recovery program, however, includes permanent, long-range help to those countries to permanently remove that danger.

These programs—that for temporary relief and that for long-range economic assistance—are American programs and stem from our traditional willingness to help others in distress, particularly when they are anxious to help themselves. In each of them the aspirations of every individual American are expressed.

What is immediate, important, and urgent is the manner in which each of us carries out our part of the program, by saving food, by supporting our Government, by demonstrating that we accept our responsibilities as citizens of the greatest nation in the history of mankind. Thus will American ideals remain the beacon of human liberty and freedom to all men everywhere.

What the American People Expect of Business and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, on January 24, 1948, Mr. Frank W. Abrams, chairman of the board of directors of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, addressed the graduating class of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, at Troy, N. Y., and received an honorary degree in engineering from that institution.

Mr. Abrams' career in the Standard Oil Co. is one of the finest examples of our American system at work that has ever come to my attention. Over 40 years ago, upon graduating from Syracuse University, Mr. Abrams started his business career with the New Jersey company at less than $30 a month. By hard work and intelligent application of his talents, he has risen to the position of chairman of the board of directors of the company in which he made an humble beginning.

Mr. President, a career like this is only possible in America. In these days, when the American free competitive enterprise system is being subjected to so many pressures, and so many substitutes in the form of an easier way of life are being offered, it would be well for all of us to pause and consider whether or not this great Nation of ours can remain the leader of the world if we stifle the rewards for accomplishment which are inherent in our system.

Mr. President, Mr. Abrams' address at Troy, N. Y., entitled "What the American People Expect of Business and Industry," while directed to a group of young people on the threshold of their business and professional careers, is worthy of the attention of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Forty-one years ago I was looking forward to a 4-year visit to RPI and an engineering degree from this institution.

It is strange how the courses of our lives are changed by small incidents. At that time, while I was deep in a fascinating study of the RPI catalog of 1907, I received an invitation to spend a week end at a fraternity house at Syracuse. Partly to please one of my high-school teachers, who had helped me to prepare for my entrance requirements at RPI, I accepted the invitation for a pleasant week end on a neighboring campus.

When I arrived at the Syracuse depot I was met—much to my surprise—by the captain of the football team. My high school football record at Rockville Center, Long Island, did not warrant this attention—nor did my 135 pounds of bone and gristle. Vanity, however, has a great capacity for explaining situations of this kind. I came to the conclusion that I had more social charm than I supposed. Anyway, I went to Syracuse.

I hope this will explain to you why it has taken me 41 years to get a degree from RPI.

An invitation to address a graduating class develops mixed feelings. Honesty asks: "What can you tell these young men that they don't know already?" It is a fair question.

It so happens, however, that there are one or two things which I would like to discuss with you.

It is no idle compliment to say that you will be the leaders of tomorrow. It is just a simple statement of fact.

More specifically, many of you will be part of the leadership of American business and industry—especially of industries like my own which must draw heavily on the supply of technically trained men like the alumni of RPI.

It is very much in the interests of our country and of business and industry that your leadership be sound and good.

I know that you have had technical training of the finest kind. And that is very important in our modern, complex civilization. However, it is only a base on which you will build. Perhaps it would help you if I told you what I think you will need to build on that technical base.

It is quite evident today that the magnificent progress which we in this country have made in developing machinery and mass production techniques has sometimes left out of consideration the effect of what we were doing on the people who were going to run the machines. Today we are bumping our noses hard against the fact that the machine and machine techniques are only part of the equation. They are methods of increasing man's capacity to produce for his own comfort, happiness, and progress—but the most important element in the industrial equation is man himself.

In the past decade or two we have been scrambling to make up for lost time. During the past 35 years—while I have been working in industry—the time which managements have been devoting to problems that have to do with human relations has vastly increased until today the manager is apt to spend more hours on such problems than on any others.

Furthermore, I think that today we are far more conscious in this country of the force of public opinion. Mass production was only one of the great developments of the past 50 or more years which have made our country the strongest nation in the world. We have also had mass education and mass communication—which have made us the most thoroughly informed nation in the world.

There is no doubt that in a democracy like ours the people rule. That doesn't mean that legislation is immediately responsive to changing public attitudes, but there is no question that sooner or later the American people get what they want.

It is for this reason that I think the first thing you ought to examine is what might be called the Climate of Public Opinion in which you will grow to positions of leadership.

I think you cannot begin better than by asking what the American people expect of business and industry.

Let me try to answer that question partly for you—but I would like to urge you to explore it further in your own minds.

My first suggestion would be this: The American people want modern corporations to be good citizens.

Understand that I am not referring here to the private lives of people in corporations, but to our business and industrial companies themselves. They want our corporations to be efficient, productive enterprises—but they want them to be more than that. They want them to be aware of the social problems of our country and of the world, and to take the time and trouble a good citizen should take to help deal with them.

This is an interesting and I think a very sound development of public opinion. The modern corporation "enables men to engage in undertakings too weighty for an individual." It came into being because our expanding society needed some means for organizing the complex operations that were increasing our productivity and raising our standard of living. However, great arguments took place early in the century over the nature of corporations. Was the corporation a kind of legal person or not?

It is my opinion that the American people have now fully accepted the idea that the corporation is in a sense a person. But, with infinite wisdom, they have added the notion that a person—corporate or otherwise—should have not only rights but responsibilities, not only privileges but duties, not only a head but a heart. They have said, in effect: "Go ahead and be a person and enjoy the rights given to free men, but remember, that this means you must also accept the duties of a citizen."

In my opinion, this is a conclusion worthy of Solomon and typical of the long-range decisions made by free people.

And now a related observation: The American people look to the large enterprises of our country especially for examples of good citizenship.

There is a feeling among many men in business and industry that the American people look upon bigness as a bad thing. I dont believe that at all. The American people admire bigness in many forms. They see bigness in business and industry leading to large-scale production and low costs—and they are aware that low costs are the greatest share-the-wealth scheme man has yet devised.

Bigness is often the most efficient way of creating national wealth and providing jobs. But the American people are also aware that bigness has strength and they say: "Strength must have a special sense of responsibility."

They want strength for useful purposes, but they will destroy it if they feel it menaces something more precious than wealth and earnings—namely, individual liberty. They will police bigness if they must—but they would rather see the problem solved by the big enterprises themselves.

Oddly enough, and in spite of all the clamor by free-wheeling critics, the large enterprises of today may seem to the historians of the future to have made a highly important contribution to the morality and ethics of our times. The very fact that they are very much in the public eye makes them especially conscious of public opinion and of their responsibilities.

You may ask: "What exactly do you mean by good citizenship? What problems of our times should American industry and business try to help solve?"

Every business and industry has its own special areas of interest where it can make a special contribution as a citizen. But there is one field of great importance—it seems to me—to all of us: American industry could not exist today in the form which we know if it were not for our educational system.

The wealth and productive capacity of America today do not reside only in its natural resources but in our people. There are many countries which have larger stores of many basic resources than we have. But we have a free, ambitious, educated people. Our wealth and high standard of living have come from the use they have made of their opportunities.

Industry today is a major beneficiary of our educational system. We draw on our educated population for personnel and leadership. Furthermore, a highly educated population such as ours is a better market than any other.

And there are other beneficiaries of education. By increasing his earning power the individual makes himself more valuable to his fellow citizens. The better trained man is more productive—worth more not only to himself and to industry, but to society.

Industry has a tremendous stake in American education, and I believe that this will be increasingly recognized in the years ahead. I believe you will find business more and more extending its contribution to the support and advancement of education.

Certainly we have not reached the ceiling of capacity of the American people—and certainly education must play a major role in the advance still to be made.

We cannot overlook another factor. Educated men are less extreme in their views, more tolerant. There is a close correlation between education—information—and moderate views. In the world of the future—which must increasingly find roads in human understanding and peace—this is a factor of the greatest importance.

Enlightened industry has long played an important role in supplementing the education of our people by on-the-job training and executive schools. Many modern labor unions have expanded the educational work within industry. Both of these developments are important. But we must keep in mind that a foundation of our success as a Nation is our universal educational system. We have an obligation as citizens to help it to grow in usefulness.

I think my next observation would be this: The American people expect business to solve its own human problems.

It is quite clear, I think, that the American people do not like industrial strife. The average American is not favorably impressed by either management or labor when strikes occur. He gives both sides demerits. He considers strikes an example of bad management on both sides.

This, I think, may be an era in which you fellows can be most constructive and helpful.

I think we are not approaching our human problems often enough in the spirit of the engineer. Agreements and understandings are not engineered often enough—they are often jerry-built structures of compromise that an engineer in any other field would be ashamed to acknowledge.

Perhaps the time which our engineering schools give to studying the stresses and strains of human relations should be greatly increased. Certainly the perfect engineering solution to a construction or a production problem is meaningless unless the human factor was represented in the original equation.

While it is true that we as human beings are extremely complex machines and often give the appearance of being highly unpredictable, we are far more predictable than some of us like to admit. The psychologists are successfully plotting many of our curves.

This field of human relations is one in which you can find great opportunities—especially if you get to know men and what makes them tick. The best way to do this is to work with them on the job. Young engineers who have spent their summers working with men should be especially well equipped.

I believe there is another problem which the American people want American industry and business to tackle. And here again, it seems to me, the hard training of the engineer can be useful: The American people want us to make progress toward steady employment.

You are familiar with this search for security: However, I think the politically minded have twisted the wish of the American people in this regard. I don't, for example, believe that it is well expressed in the phrase, "Guaranteed annual wage." I don't believe that the American people think that a guaranty is any better than the ability of a company to pay while meeting all of its many other obligations.

But I believe the people of this country do think that progress can be made toward security, especially in certain industries and under certain conditions. The company I work for has actually reached the stage where 90 percent of its domestic employees have been continuously employed since they came to work with us. This achievement is partly due to the relative stability of our industry and our company—but it is not due only to relative stability. A great part of our success in this direction is due to an intention to achieve such security for our employees.

So, study this challenge as you move into industry and business and begin to advance up the ladder. Keep your eyes open, and one of these days you may make a major contribution to the development of an answer to this problem.

My last observation is a very simple one: The American people want American business and industry to make a profit.

Perhaps there is no doubt in your own mind about this question, and you may wonder why I speak of it at all. The reason is that a great many businessmen have become browbeaten into thinking that profit is something like original sin, and that a profitable enterprise should be slightly ashamed of itself. Some of the businessmen I know have reached the point where they are trying to think of some new name for profit.

In my opinion, such timidity is based upon a mistaken notion that the American people do not understand capitalism, democracy, freedom of enterprise and opportunity. It is akin to the notion that the American people need to be sold—or resold—the American system.

I don't believe that at all. The American people have a profound faith in freedom, individual initiative, and the kind of people's capitalism that we have in this country.

The simple fact is that a company which does not make a profit is not living within its income. It is eating itself out of house and home. It isn't accumulating savings. It can't provide security for the people who work for it. It can't grow. If it borrows money to expand, it can't pay off its debts.

A man who spends less than he earns and puts something by for a rainy day is considered an admirable character. He is a good and valuable citizen. The same thing is true of an organization of people such as a corporation. My point is that the American people know that.

As a matter of fact, public opinion surveys show that they believe the average corporation should make 10 percent profit. This is generous because all corporations in this country combined never earned as much as 6 percent in the 15 years 1926 to 1940. Latest estimates indicate they earned about 5.8 percent on gross income in the first half of 1947. In the recent past they haven't been able to retain and reinvest the funds necessary to keep their productive plant in step with the growing needs of the Nation.

So American corporations do not make as much as the American people believe they are entitled to make. It is a little like the story of the farmer who saw a sign on a bridge, "Speed limit 15 miles an hour." Whipping his horse to a gallop, he muttered: "I don't know whether we can go that fast or not."

Perhaps, as you think about these questions, you will make important additions to my basic list. I hope you do. The most important thing is that you study the problems of leadership.

Now, let me summarize very briefly what I have wanted to say to you today:

1. Have great faith in the American people. They are sound. They are wise. Especially give the horse laugh to anyone who talks of the American people in terms of "the masses." We are a Nation of 140,000,000 individuals.

2. Look upon the field of human relations as an area of great importance. Bring your scientific training to the problems in this area. A great deal can be done to measure the stresses and strains of human relations and to plot the curves of human reactions.

3. As you grow in capacity and responsibility, bring to your job a realization that the American people are not soft-headed theorists. They expect you to operate in the black. But they are counting on you to do better than that. They want the enterprises you run to be good citizens—contributing to the social progress of our times.

The world is full of problems and the future is always uncertain, but there is great work to be done and with your help we will keep on moving toward a finer, sounder, better America as the keystone of a better world.

Special Session of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made in Fort Worth, Tex., on November 10, 1947, relating to the special session of Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At last the political advisers in Washington, who sit back behind the scenes and run the executive department of Government, have decided that the psychological time has arrived for them to get Congress back in Washington in order that they may regain some of the power which they lost when the people went to the polls in November 1946 and turned out a bunch of New Deal Democrats and substituted for them Republicans.

Now, of course, there is one thing the people ought to understand and that is, the Congress of the United States, in the House and in the Senate, is no longer divided between Democrats and Republicans; in fact, the division is between Democratic and Republican New Dealers, and the very few anti-New Dealers who are still living; it is between left-wingers and right-wingers. But these communistically inclined New Deal Democrats who for the past 10 or 15 years have hovered around the Capitol in Washington together with their more recently recruited New Deal Republican fellow travelers believe they see an opening that will allow them to get the American people by the throat again with price control and rationing and allocation of materials.

The President has called Congress to come back to Washington on the 17th of November. I don't think anyone who heard the President thought that he was actually expressing his own sentiment when he was on the radio. I think most folks realized he was simply delivering the speech he was told to deliver, and in this speech he spent much time trying to put all the blame on the businessmen of this Nation for the fact that prices have gone up. He spent a great deal

of time quoting a lot of percentages to show how much prices had gone up since OPA control went off.

Well, of course, the truth of the business is that the figures he quoted did not mean anything whatever because the OPA price ceilings long before they were taken off did not mean a thing in the world because there was only one place you could buy many of the scarce articles and that was in the black market and in comparison with black-market prices, prices have actually gone down and not up since OPA controls were lifted.

Now, of course, these political wizards in Washington are not going to be dumb enough to ask Congress to reestablish the OPA; they will give it a new name. It will be some kind of a fancy name designed to mislead the people, because there is one thing you can be certain of—we have in Washington now a government that specializes in misleading the people rather than in telling the people the truth.

You, of course, noticed that in the call for this special session it was announced that one of the purposes was to get Congress to authorize the sending of some money to Europe. Now the joke about this situation is that two weeks before this call was made the President had announced very definitely that a means had been found whereby they could get the money without having a session of Congress. The truth of the whole business is that the political ringmasters decided they had a good chance to play up to this left-wing gang of Communists and radicals by calling a special session of Congress and making it appear the Democratic Party was a great representative of the mass of the people and that the Democratic Party was fighting the battle of the common man to hold prices down—and that, my friends, is the reason why this special session of Congress was called.

Now, of course, the truth of the business is that either by purpose and design or through sheer dumbness the leadership of the Democratic Party has been responsible for starting the spiral of high prices right after the war was over. This came about when they got all their big guns together and laid down a barrage against business which virtually ordered business to increase everybody's wages 30 percent and not increase prices.

Now it did not take this long to wear itself out and the wave of price increases started, and my opinion is that it won't be long until there will be another wave of wage increases and then another wave of price increases. The thing that is doing more than anything else to inflate prices in this country is something that this bunch of New Deal politicians in Washington completely ignore. Prices are high because of the fact that the demand for goods is very great and the production is low. We have high wages and low production, which means we have high purchasing power with a shortage of the things we want to purchase. This, of course, always results in increased prices and that is what it has resulted in at this time.

There is another thing they completely ignore, and that is the fact that whenever you undertake to finance a world-wide WPA in Europe and whenever you undertake to satisfy everybody on the other side of the Atlantic, of course you are going to run the prices of those commodities up here at home—that is just common ordinary horse sense.

Here is another matter that is a big factor in promoting inflation in this country and that is the policy which is being followed by the Government to continue spending on almost a wartime basis. There has been no serious attempt on the part of the administration in Washington to cut down Government expense. They want to keep all the bureaucrats and all the stooges on the pay roll because they are going to need their votes in 1948. And in doing this, they certainly are doing something that leads to inflation. This vast horde of civil Federal employees are consumers, and are not producers, consequently the millions of dollars they receive as wages goes into purchasing scarce goods and services, and thus runs prices up.

The whole trouble with the situation of our Government in Washington is that we are long on politics, but short on integrity. We have a government in Washington that is run and controlled by organized minorities and the most influential organized minority in Washington is, of course, that of the fellow travelers, because they have been there longest and they are on the inside. Now we have another organized minority in Washington and in that minority we have a fair sprinkling of big businessmen, men who are perfectly willing to run with the Reds, accept their philosophy, and play their game if in their opinion they themselves can declare a dividend on what they are doing.

You know all throughout the days of the New Deal, and I see it is continuing, the strategy of the New Dealers was always if they had a piece of dirty work they wanted done, to appoint on the committee to do the job two or three men who would work full time and see that the proper left-wing conclusion was reached and then they would put on these committees for decoration only, some big businessmen and usually they got some big businessmen on these committees who had some favors they wanted out of the Government so the New Dealers always figured they could in the final analysis make a trade with them—and I see that policy is still being continued under the Truman administration.

I guess everybody who is listening to me read the newspaper account of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. This report was a great document. The only thing is that the title of the report should have been "A report designed to stir up strife and hatred and trouble throughout the South." That would have been an accurate title for it because the whole report was directed toward the South.

To begin with the suggestions which they try to cover in what they call a fair employment bill are all subjects that Congress has no business whatever legislating on. Now there is another thing about it, this committee said that we ought to have a permanent fair employment law and this law ought to prevent any employer from using his judgment in selecting his employees.

I don't think anybody who knows me believes that I have now or have ever had in my mind any prejudice whatever against the Negroes here in Texas or anywhere else. I have always believed that they should be treated fair and right. I think most people believe that. But if a man wants to employ a stenographer, I say to you that if he has one white stenographer and he doesn't want to employ a Negro stenographer to work with her, that it becomes his business and it is not the proper task of government nor of any of the New Deal left-wingers to attempt to tell him how to select the people that will work for him.

Now, if Mr. Truman and his left-wing committee want to spend their efforts along the line indicated, directed solely toward employment by the Federal Government, that is another matter. But I say to you that it is none of their business how the employers down here in Texas select their employees, and if we down in this section of the country believe that the whites and the Negroes will both get along better if there is segregation in their employment, it certainly is a matter that employers in this section should determine for themselves and they don't need this left-wing committee of Brother Truman and they don't need any big businessmen who might have been on that committee who are trying to curry special governmental favors, to advise them. You know it is strange to me how every now and then some big businessman who heads some organization that is noted for doing everything it can to operate as a trust and put all competitors out of business, it is always interesting to me to watch them sometimes as they snuggle up to these left-wingers who hold Government jobs and begin to agree with them 100 percent. The next question that comes to me always when I see that is, I wonder what he is after?

Now, there is another thing they had in this famous report which the President's committee turned out and that is they want to get a Federal law passed that will authorize the Federal Government to step in and stop brutality when exercised by city police. My friends, that is really a good one. Think about that gang of Communists and fellow travelers up in Washington, picking out a nice board of investigators to send down here to some town in Texas to start investigating the police force to see whether or not perchance some policeman who arrested a drunk handled him just as he should have been handled.

Of course, the "colored chile in the wood pile" in this recommendation is that they want to be certain they get Federal control over the police so that when these reds come down to Texas and start labor trouble and the police obey the law and undertake to stop them, the Federal Government can come in and investigate the police force to see if they cannot reach agreement with them that they won't hit any of these reds with anything except powder puffs.

Now, folks, as I discuss this these things may sound unreasonable to you, but they are in the report. You read it in the newspapers. Now the only reason that self-respecting folks turn out a report like that is they are just campaigning for some more Red votes with the hope of maintaining the New Deal in power in Washington.

But I have yet to tell you all about this report. You know they recommended that this was going to be the method by which they were going to enforce their social standards on the South. They proposed in their report that the law provide that if any city or town adopted any segregation whatever of the races that this city or town would not be eligible for any Federal aid on any project. Of course, they would continue to tax us to raise the money, but if we had any segregation then we would not be eligible to receive any of the money in return.

But that is not all. They wanted it applied to the schools, as the Federal Government has been granting aid to the public schools to furnish lunches. Now, if you let this gang of Reds have their way, the only way the schools down here in Texas could get any part of that money would be, when lunch time came around, have all the Negro children and all the white children eat from the same table because if they had any segregation, then the school would not get any aid.

Well, of course, you know that under the Smith-Lever Act, A. and M. College, and under the Smith-Hughes Act, other colleges in Texas receive Federal aid. If the report of this committee were carried out, it would mean that you would have to open the door of A. and M. College to the Negroes or give up Federal aid for the operation of this and all other land-grant colleges.

Now I want to make this very positive statement. I have never thought much of the New Deal gang in Washington. I have never thought much of the political stooges that hang around the throne in Washington. I have never thought much of some of these big businessmen who will crawl around with these Reds in order to curry some Government favor they want further down the line. But I brand this present set-up in Washington as the low low when viewed from every standpoint by which you can judge any public institution. If the people of Texas are not disgusted with that bunch now, I wonder what it will take to get them to wake up.

There is another matter I want to call to your attention and it is this—the only hope in the world for the Democratic Party to get back in power in 1948 is for them to carry this Red vote in the big cities and they know it, and the whole gang in Washington right now are joining together in an effort to try to ration and control the prices of agricultural commodities throughout the country in order that they can bring the price of food down low enough to satisfy these Reds whose votes they must have in these big cities. The rest of this Nation is being literally filled with stories telling what a vast sum of money the farmers and ranchmen have made and are making. They are filling the country with a regular barrage of literature designed to portray the farmer as a great profiteer. They are ready to reestablish rationing, price control, subsidies, allocation of material, and everything else if they can just choke the farmer to death and satisfy the Red votes in the big cities that they must have to win the next election.

Under present prices, according to the Department of Agriculture, the income of the average man working on the farm in the United States has increased until he is now making on the average only about half as much as those employed in manufacturing plants in our cities. Well, these New Deal politicians say that is too much. They want to take part of that away from them and give it to their good Red brethren and put him back in his place where the average farmer will have an income of about one-fourth of the income of the man who is employed in our manufacturing industries in our cities.

I am wondering if you people noticed in the press the account of the meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Democratic Party. If you did, I am sure you were impressed with the fact, just as I was, that the South not only did not get anything out of that meeting, but the committee was so thoroughly under the control of the Reds and the left-wingers that our representatives down here in the South were even afraid to ask for anything. The time was, of course, before the days of the New Deal, when it took a two-third majority to nominate a man for President of the United States on the Democratic ticket. Under that rule the South had the veto power, the South had some standing in the convention, but under the regime of the New Deal they got rid of that rule and now the nomination is made by a mere majority. So they don't need the votes of the South any more. They know the people down here in the South are going to vote the Democratic ticket regardless of who is on the ticket, so they feel free to give the boys down here in the South a kick in the pants whenever they get ready.

Discrimination Against Egg Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the willful discrimination against the poultry and egg producers of this country by the Department of Agriculture and this administration is indeed cause for righteous indignation.

Our colleague, Mr. MURRAY, of my State, has repeatedly called this situation to the attention of the Department of Agriculture, and still this deliberate neglect continues. Mr. Speaker, why does one of the departments of this Government deliberately refuse to implement the law?

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following copy of a letter from one of my constituents:

RIO, WIS., *January 22, 1948.*

Hon. GLENN R. DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In behalf of my neighbors, friends, enemies, and myself, I am writing you in regard to the marketing situation here at home. As you know, we in the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin represent one of the best egg- and poultry-producing areas in the United States. Our problems are many and varied—you are our mouthpiece and we expect you to help us, if possible.

To state our difficulties would require pages and pages of correspondence we know you can't take time out to read. Therefore, briefly I will try to outline our problems:

Today egg prices are steadily declining; feed prices are steadily advancing. We ask: How come?

The consumer in Madison, Milwaukee, and neighboring towns is paying from 30 to 45 cents per dozen above the price paid to the producer. Feed prices are at a standard level throughout this district. Therefore, we, as producers feel that you, our Representative in Congress, could bring some pressure to bear on the proper committees to give us some help in this problem. We don't need help in producing any more—we need help in selling our products at a profit. You know as well as I do: Take away the farmer's profit and you take away 55 percent of the Nation's spending power.

Today, our Government is stressing more production; we know the world needs it, but must we produce at a loss?

Producers here are on the verge of selling producing livestock, due to low price of eggs and high cost of feed. We have no quarrel with anyone; we want cost of production plus a fair profit, namely, 10 percent on our investment. Can the United States of America deny us that and cast a wayward eye at the people dealing in the products we produce?

Will you, as our Representative, give this your immediate attention? Our need is imperative; our request, just. Help us if possible.

Respectfully,

CHAUNCEY M. DEFUY.

Salary Increase for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the postal employees are entitled to a substantial salary increase. I know from the increase in my own living expenses that the dollar today will not buy anything like as much as it did 12 months ago.

It is my considered judgment that we should pass legislation at once granting cost-of-living increases to not only postal employees but to all Federal employees.

I have received a number of excellent letters attesting to the serious need for such legislation and I have selected some of the best of these for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., *January 28, 1948.*

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Enclosed is a comparative cost of living between June 1946 and the present time. Almost all of the prices shown for June 1946 are taken from the advertisements of the leading merchants of Austin as they appeared in the Austin American.

We hope that this will aid you in giving your support to a salary increase for postal employees.

Sincerely yours,

H. J. DAHLSTROM, Jr.

	June 1946		January 1948	
Cereal (box)	$0.12		$0.17	
Crackers (7½-ounce box)	.10		.17	
Coffee (1 pound)	.81		.88	
Sugar (5 pounds)	.43		.45	
Flour (5 pounds)	.29		.53	
Bacon (pound)	.45		.75	
Canned meat (Spam or Prem)	.22		.52	
Weiners (pound)	.35		.49	
Ground meat (pound)	.29		.39	
Lunch meats (pound)	.35		.59	
Shoulder roast (pound)	.28		.59	
Toilet soap (Lux or Camay)	(3)	.20	(2)	.19
Washing powder soap (Rinso, Lux, Ivory) (box)		.23		.35
Bread (1½-pound loaf)		.13		.20
Shortening (Crisco) (pound)		.24		.48
Tomato puree (can)	(3)	.10	(ea.)	.06
Austex tamales (can)		.13		.21
Milk (quart)		.15		.22
Newspaper (per month)		1.00		1.25
Haircuts		.50		.75
Gasoline (gallon)		.18		.23½
Bus fare		.06		.08
Union dues (per month)		.55		.75

AUSTIN, TEX., *January 23, 1948.*

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a clerk in the post office at Austin, I am writing to ask your support of legislation granting postal employees a salary increase.

The rapidly rising cost of living is putting an ever-increasing strain upon our salary check. Speaking from the standpoint of my own family, we are feeling the pinch much worse now than at any time since prewar days.

I wish to assure you that any effort on your part toward securing passage of this legislation will be sincerely appreciated by me and my family.

Respectfully yours,

O. W. PROFFITT.

UNITED NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Austin, Tex., January 23, 1948.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: During our last labor-management meeting of the Austin post office, Mr. R. L. Phinney passed on to us your request for some data concerning the comparative cost of living between 1945 and the present time.

At our organizational monthly meeting, January 15, it was suggested that two or three

of our number should compile a list of items showing the cost of the commodity in January or July of 1946, and alongside with it, the cost today.

Enclosed is the compiliation of Mr. and Mrs. L. B. Council. You will receive a comparative list also, from Mr. and Mrs. H. L. McClintock, and Mr. and Mrs. H. J. Dahlstrom.

We trust that this will be of some benefit to you in giving your support to a wage adjustment or salary increase. There is a difference in a statistical report from the Department of Agriculture relative to the country as a whole, and an itemized actual cost per item as reflected in the Austin, Tex., stores.

Sincerely yours,

RODNEY MONTAGUE,
President.

Comparison of living costs for 1946 and 1947, submitted by Mr. and Mrs. L. B. Council

	July 1946	December 1947
Cheese	$0.35	$0.60
Lunch meat	.45	.85
Sugar (10 pounds)	.69	.95
Cereals	.11	.15
Apples (pound)	.10	.15
Oleo	.30	.45
Butter	.65	.90
Flour (5 pounds)	.39	.53
Shortening (3 pounds)	.90	1.27
Coffee	.43	.53
Lima beans	.25	.35
Bacon	.65	.85
Bread	.15	.20
Milk	.13	.22
Eggs	.41	.75
Car insurance	26.00	37.00
Bus transportation	.06	.08½
Newspaper	1.00	1.25
Haircut	.50	.75
Union dues	.55	.75

UNIVERSITY STATION,
Austin, Tex., January 26, 1948.

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
Representative, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We of the University Station post office of Austin, Tex., urge you to give faithful consideration to a salary increase bill for the postal personnel.

Some instances of increased cost of living during the past 18 months are: gasoline increased 4 cents per gallon, motor oils increased 5 cents per quart, coffee increased 20 cents per pound, potatoes increased 2 cents per pound, dry beans increased 8 cents per pound, flour increased $1 per 25-pound sack, steaks increased 25 cents per pound, corn meal increased 9 cents per pound, butter increased 35 cents per pound, eggs increased 40 cents per dozen, fresh milk increased 7 cents per quart, sugar increased 3 cents per pound, haircuts increased 40 cents, men's dress shirts increased 100 percent, men's suits increased 50 percent, daily newspaper rates increased 25 percent, rents increased 15 percent, as well as higher taxes and many other everyday necessities.

Your favorable consideration will be appreciated.

Respectfully,

A. H. BENNET, H. E. GRUMBLES, T. W. NABORS, E. L. DAVIS, JR., GEORGE D. TAYLOR, H. L. MCCLINTOCK, ALFRED CRIDER, E. H. PESCHKA.

AUSTIN, TEX., *January 20, 1948.*

Congressman LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I have been asked to submit a list of the items which have increased our cost of living since our last pay raise which you requested from our local branch United National Association of Post Office Clerks. In response to that request I respectively submit the following which I have compiled mostly from the Austin American from January 1946 and January 1948.

	1946	1948
Food:		
Canned corn	$0.13	$0.19
Coffee	.31	.51
Flour (25 pounds)	1.29	2.15
Potatoes (5 pounds)	.21	1.61
Round steak	.40	.67
Pinto beans (2 pounds)	.20	.36
Soap flakes	.23	.29
Canned milk	.09	.12
Clorox (quart)	.14	.21
Corn meal	.09	.18
Bread	.10	.20
Toilet soap (3 bars)	.20	[1].29
Onions (2 pounds)	.15	.29
Butter	.68	.85
Eggs	.45	.70
Fresh milk	.16	.22
Dry cereals	.13	.16
Sugar (5 pounds)	.31	.44
Miscellaneous items:		
Regular gasoline	.19	.23½
Haircut	.50	1.00
Hydro rat	.10	.15
City taxes (revalued)		(3)
Newspaper	1.00	1.25
Cigarettes (carton)	1.39	1.60
Ladies' shoes	4.95	[4]7.95
Men's dress shirts	2.50	4.95
Ice (50 pounds)	.25	.50
Man's business suit	40.00	[5]60.00
Rent (in some cases)		(6)

[1] 10 pounds. [2] 2 bars. [3] 25 percent. [4] Same shoe. [5] Same suit. [6] 15 percent.

Of course this is only a small list and almost all living expenses have raised accordingly. Incidentally, my wife spent $23.30 for groceries last Saturday, January 17, for a family of four for 1 week, and she is a very conservative buyer. I would like to urge that you support the pay raise that we so badly need at this time.

Yours for a better postal service.

Sincerely,

HERBERT L. MCCLINTOCK.

AUSTIN, TEX., *December 27, 1947.*

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Congressman From Texas,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Senators CHAVEZ and WILLIAM LANGER have introduced a bill (S. 1849) in the Senate which would provide a thousand dollar per annum salary increase for all employees in the port office field service.

I solicit your support of this bill as introduced to be effective January 1, 1948.

As you probably already know, Government statistics show that our buying power has decreased one-half since 1939 due to the high cost of living. Our salaries have increased from $2,100 per annum to $3,100 per annum (for top grade clerks); this is not twice the salary in 1939. Following this line of reasoning, a top grade clerk should be paid $4,200 per annum to maintain the same standard of living he was afforded in 1939.

Now let's look at the new clerk just entering the service. He gets only $2,100 a year as entrance salary on which he can scarcely exist and support a family.

The situation is acute. Clerks are getting deeper and deeper in debt, striving to provide for their families. Several have been forced to leave for they have been unable to get along on the salary they are receiving at the post office.

I do not feel that a $1,000 increase would be out of line at all. I, as well as thousands of others, will appreciate your support when the opportunity comes.

I certainly have felt the departure of Mr. Ray E. Lee here, and feel happy for him in getting something bigger and better. His friendship meant a great deal to me, and we here at the Austin post office have been very fortunate in having him here as long as we did. We really miss him. In your selection for replacement of Mr. Lee, in Mr. Bob Phinney, in my opinion could not have been better. I have known Mr. Phinney a number of years and already we have begun to love him as our postmaster. But as I have always said, leave it to Mr. JOHNSON, he always does it right and at the right time.

Yours truly,

GLYNN W. HOPKINS.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop:

LET'S FACE IT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

One of the most expensive and cruel frauds ever put over on the American people has at last been admitted officially in Congress.

That fraud was the pretense of the one worlders, the scientists and the New Dealers that in a short time the atom bomb would be converted to peacetime uses—operating power plants, enriching agriculture, and enlarging medical knowledge.

It was all a fake, all the time. There never was any basis for making any such claims. No evidence supported it. No scientists dared offer any specific proofs.

But many millions of good United States taxpayers' dollars were milked out of the Treasury from 1945 through 1947 to support scientific boondoggles that were supposed to convert atomic energy to peacetime uses.

Now comes the official announcement of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy declaring that the production of bombs rather than work on peacetime applications are the first order of business for the Atomic Energy Commission.

It has taken two expensive and important years to get that through the heads of the men who snatched the bomb away from the United States Army and put it in the hands of David Lilienthal and his claque of promisers on the Atomic Energy Commission.

Two years that rightfully belonged to the security and national defense of the American people have been wasted on the vanities and delusions of grandeur that afflict scientists and politicians at least as much as any other class of people.

Two years that some day may turn out to have been the two crucial lost years of United States history.

Who are some of the men who helped waste those years? First and foremost, Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, Democrat, of Connecticut. He was chairman of the congressional committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress that wrote the first Atomic Energy Act.

Senator MCMAHON's oratory promising that civilian hands would guide the atom from war to international control and peaceful plenty is all embalmed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD now where it can't be denied.

Have a look at it and see what he promised. See how he roared against the brass hats and the military minds. Yet now, after two of his kind of years, here we find that his judgment is reversed by events.

The next of the misguided to recall is Senator EOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, the present chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Where Senator MCMAHON left off he began with more of the same.

Then there is David Lilienthal, Chairman of the AEC. And, just for comedy, let's remember Harold Stassen, the mighty thinker from Minnesota.

Stassen's great contribution, announced in a full page of text in the New York Herald Tribune, was a plan for international ownership of the bomb. Remember it? He was for an international air force made up of fliers from five nations, commanded by an international headquarters located somewhere.

Flyers from each of the five nations would be spotted strategically around the globe so that if one bombed another's country, the retaliations could set in at once.

Goofy? Yes, of course. Hard to believe now in the hard light of full day that anybody could be so silly in that so-called dawn of the atomic era. Yet, there it was. Stassen wanted to give the bomb not only to Russia but to all the others hungry for our national wealth.

In those days the main idea was that at any cost the United States Army must be forced to wait outside like everybody else for word from the Atomic Energy Commission as to what the great minds of science were learning about the atom.

The very crucial heart and center of the Atomic Energy Act master-minded by MCMAHON was its clause which forbid the Army to have even a single seat on the inside where decisions were to be made.

It was not to know anything until voluntarily told by the Commission which Lilienthal heads. It could not originate any research. It could not check up. It could only accept whatever was given it. And all the emphasis was turned to peacetime applications.

How many millions went into those? What came of them?

It's time some truth were told the taxpayers about those things, especially considering all the implications behind the joint committee's declaration of Friday that:

"Until such time as an effective, enforceable and reliable program for the international control of atomic energy is in successful operation, the most vital business of the Atomic Energy Commission must be the meeting of the atomic requirements of national defense."

Well, of course, that's the hard and obvious truth. But why all of a sudden, after all this time? What has happened to knock that much sense into the heads of the men who had been aiming the opposite direction?

In a few days you will see. Already the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has been given some facts in confidence to explain why the fighting arms want a $20,000,000,000 budget.

Tomorrow and for several days thereafter news about that will come out. The sum of it all is that the nitwit ideas of "international control" are at last admitted to be as dead in theory as they always were in fact.

We have got to get ready for atomic war. Two years late. Congress owes the country a fuller explanation than just a mere announcement by the joint committee. Let's see if it can be extracted.

Is the Army Budget Irreducible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, is the Army budget irreducible? The following was taken from the monthly information letter issued for January 1948 entitled "Know Your Navy":

ARE NAVAL OFFICERS HEALTHIER?

Congressional committees investigating disability pensions being paid to retired military officers have found that a much higher proportion of retired Army officers have applied for and are receiving disability pensions than have Navy officers of comparable rank. Data collected for the Secretary of Defense reveals that 87.4 percent of Army officers holding rank of major and above who were discharged since 1940 are receiving disability pensions whereas only 63.4 percent of naval officers of comparable rank who were retired during about the same period claimed disability. The difference was much more marked in the lower grades. Only 75 percent of Navy commanders are receiving disability pensions whereas 99 percent of Army majors are so listed. Are Navy officers just healthier?

Reception to Senator Baldwin, of Connecticut, and to Mayor Rokach, of Tel Aviv

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, on January 15, 1948, it was my pleasure to give a luncheon in the family dining room of the Senate restaurant to Col. Julius Klein, of Chicago, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, who had as his guests of honor the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and Mayor and Mrs. Israel Rokach, of Tel Aviv, Palestine.

This luncheon was attended by several Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, officials of the executive branch of the Government, high-ranking officers of our armed services, and other distinguished guests—in all, a group of about 80 people.

The purpose of the luncheon was the presentation to the Senator from Connecticut, by members of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, of that organization's Award of Merit.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America was founded in 1896 by Civil War veterans of the Jewish faith. With the exception of the Grand Army of the Republic, it is the oldest active veterans' organization in the country. Its present membership is in excess of 100,000. Its organization consists of 610 posts in 40 States, and it has a ladies auxiliary, the membership of which exceeds 40,000.

I am advised that the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America maintains a veterans' service program, staffed by professional counselors and guidance specialists, and that the organization is accredited by the Veterans' Administration to represent veterans and veterans' dependents of all faiths and races in dealings with Federal agencies.

The luncheon was a most pleasurable and interesting experience for me. In addition to Mayor Rokach, the group was addressed by the President pro tempore, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and Colonel Klein, and the presentation of the Award of Merit resolution to the Senator from Connecticut was made by Mr. Albert Reich, of Hartford, Conn., past national vice commander of the Jewish War Veterans.

Since the General Assembly of the United Nations cast its historic vote on November 29, 1947, establishing Jewish Palestine, the eyes of the world have been directed to this tiny spot on our globe, for it exists as a symbol of hope for all, regardless of race, creed, or color, who seek greater understanding for humanity's sake.

Mr. President, I believe that Members of the Senate will be interested in the remarks of the several speakers at this luncheon, and I ask unanimous consent that a stenographic transcript of the luncheon proceedings be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have consulted the Government Printing Office, and it is estimated the matter will make four and one-half pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $319.50.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the transcripts printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LUNCHEON PROCEEDINGS

Senator HAWKES (introducing Senator VANDENBERG). I am going to interrupt this luncheon at this moment, even though some of our guests have not finished dessert. Senator VANDENBERG must leave us very shortly; he has official duties to which he must attend. This meeting would not be complete without my presenting to you the man in the Senate who serves as President pro tempore and who is chairman of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee. He has done, in my opinion, as much, if not more, than any one man in the world for the United Nations and for the peoples of the world. I introduce to you Senator VANDENBERG, President of the Senate, and ask if he would say a few words to you before he goes.

Senator VANDENBERG. Senator HAWKES, ladies and gentlemen, I always dislike being introduced as President pro "temporary" of the Senate. I am the only officer, out of several million, who has pro "temporary" attached to his title. All the others have jobs as pro "temporary" as mine, only they aren't constantly reminded of it. Perhaps it would be better for the country if they were. I am very happy to be here, and delighted to pay my respects to the Mayor and Mrs. Rokach, to the Jewish War Veterans' organization, and to their national commander, Col. Julius Klein. Organized some 50 years ago by Civil War veterans of the Jewish faith, they have added more than 100,000 members from the ranks of their 900,000 compatriots who fought with valor in each of our wars since—alongside of Americans of all faiths and races. They typify, perhaps, as no other single organization of the land, the cosmopolitan character of our population and the patriotism in America. Not only on the basis of their contribution but on the basis of the fundamental freedoms to which the United Nations is dedicating its efforts, we are now going forward, at long last with the substantial hope for the establishment of the long-promised Jewish state in Palestine, so richly deserved by these citizens

who have given their time, money, and services to this cause.

I am particularly glad to be here to honor my dear friend from Connecticut. No man of finer character, finer public spirit, and of finer potentiality for future public service has come before my view than my friend Senator BALDWIN of Connecticut. I regret the necessity of my leaving at this time

Senator HAWKES. Ladies and gentlemen, time is always of the essence in the Capitol, and I know it is with you. I am honored to express my very deep satisfaction in having the mayor of Tel Aviv and his fine wife here on this occasion of honoring Senator BALDWIN, of Connecticut. I want to introduce to you now a man who does not need introduction in the Senate, who has represented for 7 years the State in which I was born. When I first came to the Senate, I asked this distinguished gentleman for a photograph—he gave it to me and wrote thereon that he was proud to represent the State where I was born and worked for a number of years. Senator BROOKS is a rugged American, who believes much as I believe. I would like to say that the greatest impression I get from the United States Senate, even though living a long life before I came here, is that we do not all agree nor do we all have the same opinions. If we did not have a difference of opinion in this world we would not need government at all, nor law-enforcement agencies. The important thing in our Nation is to have faith in our representatives, to guard those things in which we believe and to encourage in the other fellow ideals—and not expect everyone to be perfect or to agree on all subjects. I always think of a Senator and a Congressman much as I regarded my children when I sent them to school. I did not expect them to get 100 percent, nor 90 percent, I felt that if they frequently got an average of 80 percent they were doing a good job. If you condemn me, or anyone else for irregularity—if you do not rally and support your representatives—then we will not have the fine functioning Nation we all want to have.

I have the honor to introduce Senator BROOKS of Illinois and to ask if he will be kind enough to introduce to you the commander of the Jewish War Veterans, Mr. Julius Klein. Colonel Klein has proved himself a fighting American and a fighting Jew in the two World Wars. In the one recently concluded, he saw active service in the South Pacific and in the Philippines where he won many decorations. At war's end, he was called to Washington to do special work under Secretary of War Patterson. A further tribute has come to him in his election as national commander of the Jewish War Veterans, an organization made up of American patriots of the Jewish faith.

Senator BROOKS. Senator HAWKES, our distinguished guests, Senator BALDWIN, His Honor the Mayor of Tel Aviv, his gracious lady, my colleagues and friends:

It is indeed a rare privilege and honor to be a participant in this unusual and most significant meeting. It is a high honor for any man to be privileged to represent his State in the Senate of the United States. This in turn affords me additional pleasant experiences, especially when one is privileged to participate in a meeting as significant as this one is today.

First, it is a great honor to welcome the mayor from Tel Aviv and his gracious lady. It is equally a great honor to participate when the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America officially award the plaque for unusual and outstanding humanitarian achievements to our colleague, Senator RAYMOND BALDWIN, of Connecticut. There is still another honor that I proudly enjoy today.

It is the fact that this splendid organization of veterans has chosen from the State I have the honor to represent Col. Julius Klein as its national commander. I have known Colonel Klein for many years. He has a distinguished record in two world wars. He has in his personal possession testimonials unusual in character from the Secretary of War and General MacArthur, as well as many other awards and expressions of high esteem for his service. Colonel Klein has never lost his interest in civic affairs, but in addition he has always been a devoted member of the National Guard, in which he commands today a regiment of Illinois citizens.

It is a rare privilege to extend our greetings to our visiting guests from Tel Aviv and a great honor to present to you my personal friend, Col. Julius Klein, of Chicago.

Col. JULIUS KLEIN. My good friend, Senator HAWKES, distinguished Members of our Senate and Congress, our guests, Mayor and Mrs. Rokach, I am delighted and honored to be here today representing the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. I appreciate the gracious kindness of Senator HAWKES, acting as host to our organization and to me personally and enabling us to pay tribute to a great Senator, Mr. BALDWIN, of Connecticut, and to the mayor of Tel Aviv and his gracious lady.

I am deeply moved that my old friend, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. BROOKS, has been selected by the chairman of this splendid gathering to introduce me to you. I did not dream 25 years ago when I was a cub reporter in Chicago, covering the news of a courageous young prosecutor in the old Chicago Criminal Court Building, that one day we would meet in the United States Senate—he as the Senator from my State and I as the national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. Many things have happened since those days in Illinois. My thoughts of Senator BROOKS are always very pleasant—"Curly" as we call him will always be one of the old gang. He is not only a strong supporter of and champion for all veterans, but has always fought in the old American tradition for the rights of so-called minority groups. At all times he has given a true demonstration of real Americanism. Illinois, and especially we veterans, are very proud of our buddy—the fighting marine—"Curly" BROOKS.

Today we are going to honor Senator BALDWIN, but before we continue with our brief program I would like to take this opportunity to express to you my appreciation for your presence here today. I am especially delighted to see General Vaughn, aide to the President, here. Our people feel a deep gratitude to President Truman for the part he played in the important decision in the United Nations on the question of the partition of Palestine. The names of many Senators and other friends will never be forgotten by our people.

We all realize that the struggle has just started—and we are a long way off from the final goal of a free republic of Palestine—but the present stage would never have been reached if we did not have loyal, true, and courageous men in the Senate. During those historical days, it was my privilege to serve as a sentry here in Washington. I therefore feel that I speak from personal knowledge and experience when I state we will never forget the debt we owe these Members of Congress who stood loyally by us for a just cause. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator VANDENBERG, who sits on my left, deserves all the praise and gratitude of our people. We will always remember the champions of our cause in the Halls of Congress headed by Senators like our friend in need, ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio; the ever-watchful Senator from Maine, Mr. OWEN D. BREWSTER; the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. J. HOWARD MCGRATH; his colleagues, Senator BIEN MCMAHON, from Connecticut, who hails from the State of our guest of honor; our distinguished host, Senator HAWKES; Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming; Senator THOMAS of Utah; Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky; and so many others too numerous to mention here.

I do want to express at this time the views of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States on the Palestine issue, prompted by the stirring brief words of Senator VANDENBERG a few minutes ago.

We are not a Zionist organization. In our ranks are Zionists, non-Zionists, and even anti-Zionists. But since we are, before anything else, an organization of American veterans of the Jewish faith, we unite all these elements on the basic principle of obtaining just treatment for the legitimate aspirations of those of the Jewish faith who desire to establish a home in Palestine. To this cause—because our basic purposes are those of an American veterans' organization—we have been able to give great help because our fundamental motives are crystal clear in the area in which we function; the area populated by our 18,000,000 fellow veterans of all faiths and racial and ethnic origins. It is, therefore, of the first significance that the initial response to our open letter to the Secretary of State came from non-Jewish veterans. The first two, of Catholic faith, wrote that they were appalled by the British treatment of Jews in Palestine. They thought our proposal temperate and practical and they said that if our country and the United Nations should see fit to adopt it, they would volunteer for the international police force we suggested. The third was from a former department commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. His letter contained a copy of a note he had sent to his successor in office, commending our proposal and suggesting that the department introduce it as a resolution at a forthcoming regional meeting of the VFW. These instances emphasize the unique role JWV plays in the total effort to attain a just settlement for Jewry in Palestine, just as we have been and must be unique in our approach to every other problem of concern to Jewry as a whole.

The JWV at its fifty-second annual encampment, last October, fully endorsed the recommendation for an international constabulary and urged that, pending the establishment of peace machinery, the Jewish Agency for Palestine be recognized as an interim governing body for the Jewish state during the period of formation of partitioned areas.

On December 1, 1947, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], one of the original champions of our cause, in dealing with the problem of Palestine, said, and I quote: "The United Nations has not only given birth to a new nation, but must see to it that this infant shall be properly nursed and developed." He added, "We also remind ourselves that the United States Government, as one of the chief sponsoring powers, has assumed a considerable measure of responsibility."

Senator BREWSTER'S reminder was almost prophetic. This new nation in Palestine is being threatened today with an outburst of passion which may destroy it by means of organized massacre. It is obvious to any student of the situation that the Arabs have an abundance of arms with which to attack this young nation. At the same time all access to weapons with which the Hebrews have a right to defend themselves has been cut off.

A little more than a century and a half ago another nation came into being, one which grew into the torchbearer of freedom—the United States. As we in 1776 required tender nursing, so will this nation, which has just been born on the shores of Galilee, require tender care until it, too, shall develop into a self-reliant and responsible member of the family of nations.

The new state in Palestine asks only for that consideration to which it has a justifiable claim and expects no unusual privileges. It does, however, consider it mankind's duty to give it a fair chance of survival, to achieve a historical place, and to assume those duties under the protection of its sister nations until that day when security shall be guaranteed by reason. This is one responsibility which must be assumed by the most enlightened and most powerful Nation on earth, the United States.

In the words of Winston Churchill, when Great Britain, too, felt the impact of insecurity, Palestine asks only of its neighbors in the family of nations: "Give us the tools and we will do the job." When they say, "Give us the tools and we will do the job alone, we are ready to do the job alone," the people of Palestine, the descendants of Maccabi, mean just that.

I do not speak for any organization in America when I voice this plea, but I do feel if the Jewish people of the Holy Land could speak right here and now, they would make this plea.

We would not like to see—and now I speak for our organization—American troops called and sent to Palestine—we do not want to see this country involved in an armed struggle for Palestine—there is no need for that. All we seek from the United Nations and Great Britain is that they keep their promises to the people of Palestine and to the nations of the world—a promise that has not been kept thus far.

The JWV in the United States is an organization which for five decades has played an important part in the American scene. As American veterans we have contributed and will continue to do our share to help make this country great. We are honored to be an inseparable part of this great American country. And now a few personal remarks.

I am pleased to see my old wartime Gen. Nick Ruffner in the audience. I could not let this moment pass without saluting General Ruffner. We both had the honor to serve in the Pacific under the great General MacArthur and General Richardson.

I am pleased and honored to greet the mayor and his lady from Tel Aviv.

We, JWV, of the United States stand ready to do our share for good government. That is one of the reasons why the Senator from Connecticut has been selected—he ranks along with Bernard Baruch—among America's great—who were so honored by us.

(Colonel Klein turned to Senator HAWKES.)

Senator HAWKES. Will General Vaughn, aide to the President, please stand up and take a bow.

My distinguished guests, time is short, but I am going to take a moment to say a few words to the mayor of Tel Aviv. I have told him that the day after VE-day I flew across the ocean and that when we had gone through England, France, Germany, and Austria, we headed for Palestine and landed in Tel Aviv, so I have a picture in my mind, as good a one as one of these Americans seeing the world in 24 hours ever can get in his mind, of a great city. What has been done there, the development of the land, the progress, is amazing. It is an amazing city reported to have 250,000 people. Is that correct, mayor? (The mayor named the figure 300,000.) That means that since I was there you have had 50,000 more people added. It shows very clearly what the Jewish people can do when they are given an opportunity and freedom from restriction.

I would like to say that my attitude toward the Jewish people has always been the same as I have tried to have toward each and every group making up the United States of America and the world. None of us comes into this world by consent or request, nor have we to say where we come into it. The only test amounting to anything in this world is: What has a man, or woman, done with what God gave him and has he played his part in society right and fairly. I have always taken the position that equity is not a one-way street, but a two-way street. Equity and justice cannot exist if they flow one way; they must flow out as well as in.

Guests and friends, it is my pleasure to present to you the Honorable Israel Rokach, the mayor of the all-Jewish city of Tel Aviv, one of the most outstanding personalities of Jewish Palestine today.

A lot of people today are asking, "Will it work"—the new Jewish state? The fact that the United Nations has established this state seems to me that it must be made to work. Unless we mean to keep our agreements there is no hope of establishing harmony and peace in this world. Those who only keep agreements when they work favorably, and violate them when they do not, are not making any contribution to humanity. This state must be made to work. It is one of the first great tests of the United Nations.

I think we are most fortunate to have the mayor and his wife here. I am going to ask Mrs. Rokach to stand up for a bow. [Greetings and applause.] We are particularly fortunate that they happen to be here today when we are honoring the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BALDWIN, for whom I have a great respect.

I understand the mayor has recently had his fiftieth birthday. I congratulate him. You will be interested to know that his arrest by the British administration in the beginning of August 1947 and his retention in the Latrun concentration camp for several months evoked world-wide interest and protest. His retention at Latrun, where he refused to be interrogated by British officials until formal charges were brought against him, ended abruptly.

When he and the mayor of Ramath Gan were released on September 14, 1947—coinciding with the eve of Rosh Hashana, the Jewish New Year—the event was widely acclaimed in Palestine and throughout the world.

Israel Rokach is the scion of a pioneer family which settled in Palestine more than 100 years ago. He was born December 31, 1896, at Neveh Zedek, then a suburb of Jaffa, now a part of Greater Tel Aviv, over which he presides as mayor. Mayor Rokach is an electrical engineer by education.

During the 25 years of Mayor Rokach's service to and leadership of the Municipal Government of Tel Aviv, the all-Jewish city became the most outstanding urban center in the Middle East—a center of industry, commerce, communication, education, culture, order, and security.

Its population now comprises more than 300,000 and its annual budget amounts to over £3,000,000. In a true sense, Mayor Rokach's administration of Tel Aviv has served as a concrete example of Jewish self-government and has created a pattern for the Jewish state, for the establishment of which the General Assembly of the United Nations cast its historic vote on November 29, 1947.

His great achievements in the field of developing Jewish municipal government in Palestine were acknowledged and widely acclaimed on the recent celebration of his fiftieth birthday.

Mayor Rokach, who came to the United States at the invitation of the Jewish National Fund of America, is entrusted with the task of presenting to American Jewry the land acquisition program for the implementation of the United Nations' decision to establish the Jewish state in 1948.

I am proud to present to you this man who has made such a distinguished record in the interest of his people and humanity throughout the world.

Mayor ISRAEL ROKACH. Senator HAWKES, ladies, and gentlemen, I regret that I cannot address you in the old Hebrew language because, while you would not understand me very well, I would be able in that language, which is my mother tongue, to express better my feelings and how grateful I am for this gathering and just what I feel toward the United States as a Nation. Unfortunately, I understand it will be of no use; that time is short, too short to talk to you in Hebrew and have it translated. We are all busy. I shall try to be short.

When I came to the United States by plane, a few days ago, LaGuardia Field was banned to me by snow. I understand you fear snow here. I was told I would be flown to either Philadelphia or Washington where the runways were clear. We were all very interested to have a chance to see Washington, but finally word came that we would land in Philadelphia. My first impression when we flew over New York and came down close to the Statue of Liberty which everyone who thinks of liberty—all civilization has heard of it—the Palestinians have heard of this famous Statue of Liberty in the harbor of New York, it was a very fine day and clear in the air (even though Mayor O'Dwyer was having troubles down below in the streets) the far view of the city, its beautiful buildings, recalled to my mind the dream of Pharaoh—I am looking for a Joseph to interpret my own dream which I have day and night since I came here.

There is just one thing that has me worried, and perhaps a bit jealous—everywhere, everyone we meet speaks of my wife, is so gracious to her, tells me what a fine lady she is—they never say "this fine man."

Senator HAWKES. But, my friend, we called you the distinguished gentleman.

Mayor ROKACH. We want to thank the Jewish War Veterans' Association, Col. Klein, and the American Army. The Army came to Palestine, established headquarters almost overnight—the American way, very quickly—the boys used to come to Tel Aviv, to the Hotel Palatine, and everyone did their best to make them feel at home. We could not do much, but we did our best. A few days ago I had a thrilling experience. I was talking to a gentleman in New York, an American in civilian clothes greeted me and asked how I was and recalled to me that he had been a colonel in the Army and had been in Palestine. He was visiting from the West and had not forgotten my name, although it was 5 years since he had seen me. Mine is not a simple name and I was amazed. The brother of the "fine lady," my wife, was a student here in New York and volunteered and was in the American Army. He is now honorably discharged, but we did see him in his American uniform. That is one of the reasons why so many are in love with her.

We know that the Americans have been donors of blood to save the world. In the First World War you gave freely of the blood of your youth to help the cause of freedom. In World War II you gave so much. We all hope these wars will bring liberty to all peoples of the world. I am not complimenting—in Tel Aviv I am not the complimenting type; I have the reputation of being a hard worker—but you have found it to be your duty to be the donor of blood for the liberty of the world.

What I am dreaming of is that once we are established we shall send our people here to learn from you. I have sent many here, boys, girls, nurses, doctors, educational and engineering methods, not to have our men and women learn the sciences, they are universal and are everywhere, but it is the spirit of the Americans that cannot be found anywhere in the world. We want to send our people here to be injected with that spirit and to learn about freedom as it can only be learned in America.

I am not going to go into politics, that would be unfair since I am your guest—but I want to refer only to the United States.

It is as your host, Senator HAWKES, said—Tel Aviv is a foundation stone, it was founded only about 38 years ago, built up with our own skilled labor, hard labor.

You will see this new State, Palestine, a little place smaller than most of your own States—but I hope you will not regret the help you will extend to us—for we will create a focus in the Near East where we will be teaching and living in liberty as you know it here in the United States. All eyes are turned (not only Jewish but others) to Palestine (not to be compared in size with Great Britain or the United States) which gave birth to the morality of humanity—against the immorality of paganism and bad tradition

I think we can build up in this new Jewish state the spirit of the prophets, equality, freedom of thought and speech. If we do this I think we will have done a good thing. We crave only the small support of your great Nation, as you have given it in the past—not only the Senate in proposing to accept the partition, establishing this Jewish state—but all along in history—we had protectors in the United States of America. President Taft's action when Russia was not ready to accept them—I do not know whether you know that—from then on between the Congress and Senate we have had the protection of your Nation. We hope to be able to start a new life of peace, equality, and justice.

It is a great day for me to be received in this hall of the famous Senate of the United States of which we hear so much. We know many names and there are many men of the Congress who are popular, regardless of which party they belong to, also your fine Presidents. You do not say "Left" or "Right" here, but sit together, Republicans and Democrats. When it comes to freedom, justice, and equality we can all unite.

Accept the prayers of my town and nation for the welfare and happiness of this great Nation—the United States of America.

Colonel KLEIN. I want to express my appreciation of the inspiring remarks of Mayor Rokach. I am grateful to Senator HAWKES for his invitation to the Mayor and Mrs. Mayor. I am grateful you are so patient and I know we are all enriched by this inspiring message.

I want to introduce Mr. Albert Reich, of Hartford, past national vice commander of the Jewish War Veterans, and an old friend of Senator BALDWIN. He will read the Award of Merit voted by the Jewish War Veterans.

Mr. ALBERT A. REICH. It is a privilege to be here today, representing the forty-sixth—in size—State. We of Connecticut are proud of RAYMOND BALDWIN, our Senator—we love and honor him and I feel honored to be here paying my respect and the respect of our State to him.

I am privileged to read to you on behalf of the national organization of the Jewish War Veterans the citation of the Award of Merit of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America:

"Whereas the public service of the Honorable RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, Senator of the State of Connecticut, has been consistently marked by human endeavors in furtherance of the civil and economic rights of all elements of the American population; and

"Whereas in the employment of his public office as an instrumentality for the advancement of understanding and cooperation among citizens of all racial, religious, social, and economic strata of American life, he has contributed materially to the structure of our Nation's security: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, through the unanimous recommendation of its national executive committee, as approved wholeheartedly by its total membership,* That the Award of Merit of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America be conferred on the Honorable RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, Senator of the State of Connecticut."

I present to Col. Julius Klein, the national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, the plaque which is the Award of Merit—he will make the presentation on behalf of our organization. Colonel Klein.

Colonel KLEIN. I am confident that the Members of the Senate present will appreciate that this veterans' organization is not dedicated solely to Jewish problems. On the contrary, Jewish problems, while important and dear to us, are only among the many with which we concern ourselves. Our chief aim is and has been to represent and build true Americanism. We are marching side by side with the other veteran organizations to assure enactment of sound local, national, and foreign policy legislation to insure a free and strong America for the coming generation so that the sacrifices of those who served, fought, bled, and died shall not have been in vain.

We urge support of universal military training, and a program which will assure a strong Army, Navy, and Air Corps. We need the strongest kind of defense organization. It goes without saying that we demand fair treatment for veterans. Senator BALDWIN is only one of the strong champions for these programs in the Senate and in the Government. Many messages have reached us congratulating our organization on having selected Senator BALDWIN for this honor. Governor Green, of Illinois, telegraphed Senator HAWKES saying how happy he is to hear the Senator is receiving the award.

We are grateful to Senator HAWKES for the meeting today enabling us to present this award in the name of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. As spokesman for 850,000 Jewish War Veterans of the United States, I am honored to present this plaque to you, Senator BALDWIN. You have well deserved it. Congratulations to you from all of us and may our Nation continue to have the benefit of your great service.

(Colonel Klein hands award-memorial to Senator BALDWIN.)

Senator BALDWIN. Colonel Klein, Senator Hawkes, His Honor the Mayor of Tel Aviv and his gracious lady, colleagues, and friends, to you, Colonel Klein, and the members of your great veterans' organization I extend my heartfelt thanks for this award. This award is one of the finest things that has ever come to me in my lifetime, and I am grateful beyond the power of words to adequately express that gratitude.

One may wonder why he should be rewarded for doing the things which his own heart and conscience dictate as the right and true things to do. The fact that you recognize them in this manner is most generous, kind, and thoughtful, and fills me with the most sincere feeling of thankfulness.

I have long known of the Jewish War Veterans. We have in our own State of Connecticut an excellent department of your great national organization. Many of the men who have led it through the years have been my warm personal friends. Your great veterans' organization, organized primarily in the interest of those in the Jewish faith who are bound together by a common faith and by a common experience in the war years, has been a great protagonist for all veterans whether of Jewish faith or not. Your organization has made a great contribution to the public welfare. It is known for its high spirit of patriotism and public service in advancing the cause of our country.

I am particularly happy and proud, Colonel Klein, that you have acted in behalf of the Jewish War Veterans in presenting this award to me. I have known you for many years now as a courageous, forthright American—a great soldier and great citizen, and I am proud indeed to have your friendship for you are widely known as a leader among Americans.

We are a Nation of minority groups. Some of our enemies think of this as a weakness. As a matter of fact, it is one of the sources of our great strength for everyone in this country belongs to one minority group or another. No single one has predominance. This fact is everlastingly true. All of these groups are bound together with the common love of freedom and an earnest and heartfelt desire to advance that cause of human freedom and justice in our own country and throughout the world. That common love and respect makes us one people. That common love and respect will continue to crown our efforts with outstanding success.

I am thankful to you, Senator HAWKES, as our host at this luncheon. This is a generous and kindly thing for you to do for a colleague. You have long known of my high regard and deep admiration for you as a friend and a citizen.

It is a happy thing for me to have the honor of the presence of the mayor of Tel Aviv and his gracious lady at this gathering. This day would have been memorable for me in any event. Their presence makes it even more so. The mayor said one thing which I would like to comment upon for a moment because I think it is of great importance. It is something that we do not often think about, all of us as Americans. He said that his country—Palestine—had been a great contributor to the morality of mankind. That is strikingly true. No other nation down through the centuries has made the contributions to the thinking of man on his own welfare, his moral worth, the quality of his soul, that have been made by the prophets and teachers of your little country. Jews and Christians alike read a Bible which records the thoughts and teachings of great leaders of the Jewish faith. And Christians accept as their Prophet and Savior a man of Palestine. We can say, very sincerely and truthfully, that out of your land in the Middle East, so well and ably represented here today by these two fine citizens of the world, have come the greatest contributions to human welfare that the world has ever known.

I think, sir [turning to the mayor of Tel Aviv], that it is a remarkable thing, and surely an extremely happy omen, that, when your plane could not land in New York, it came to Philadelphia. In the then little city of Philadelphia, more than 150 years ago, was born the United States of America. And here you are today representing a newly born state, on your first journey to this land of America, and fate lands you in the city which was the birthplace of the United States. I believe that the world will say, and, of course, we Americans believe sincerely, that we have made a fair degree of success as a nation and have endeavored to make generous contributions to all mankind, not only of our material wealth, but of our spirit of enterprise and our love of freedom and justice. May your forced landing in Philadelphia be an omen that your plans for your country will succeed and that your new nation born in the Middle East may likewise continue to make great contributions to man's happiness and welfare the world around.

We, as Americans, cherish the traditions of liberty, freedom, and justice. We remember also that in our own history success did not come by our single efforts alone. And so this new nation of yours must have friends. Your leaders speak with remarkable courage and conviction when they say that they can win and will win "on their own." That is a splendid spirit. But they will need help—our help, not only with encouragement and example, but in material things as well. We Americans, who cherish liberty and freedom, know well the feelings and great hopes of mankind that this spirit of liberty and freedom and justice be spread around the world in order that every man may have a fair opportunity in life, may live in health and security and reasonable comfort—may have an opportunity to advance his own ideas and his own cause.

We Americans have been richly blessed. Because of our favored position we must take a leadership in seeing to it that good, and not evil, possesses the world. It is of great significance that the United Nations has by its own action and with our support created this new state. But it is not the work of the United Nations alone nor our support that has brought it about. It is the toil and sacrifice of many men and women down through the years, men and women of the Jewish faith who have labored and died for this great cause. Your people will continue to need help. I am sure, believing as we do, and living as we strive to live, we will give that help in the manner and form best calculated to support this new nation and to advance the welfare of the people who live there now and who may come to live there in the future.

Again, Colonel Klein—Commander Klein, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for this generous recognition of your organization. I shall treasure it so long as life lasts.

Senator HAWKES [turning to Senator BALDWIN]. I have here a telegram from the Governor of Illinois which congratulates you and says that you are deserving of this honor. Governor Green's telegram says:

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *January 14, 1948.*

Hon. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Have just been advised by our mutual friend, Col. Julius Klein, that you are to be the recipient tomorrow of an award of merit from the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. Permit me to extend my hearty congratulations upon this well-deserved honor. Kindest personal regards.

DWIGHT H. GREEN, *Governor.*

In closing I would like the mayor and this gathering to hear this.

It does not make any difference, or much difference, what your faith is. Your faith is a thing that, to a certain extent, comes to you—comes to you in early infancy—from your parents, family, or perhaps from the place in which you were born—but it does made a tremendous difference whether you keep faith with your faith, if you have a belief in your heart and mind and soul. All may not agree with it, or like it, but if each of you keep faith with his own faith you will respect yourself and no one in the world will be justified in criticizing you for it—if you keep faith with what you believe—and in your God.

I would like to recite a piece I love:

"When you get what you want in your struggle for self
And the world makes you king for a day,
Just go to a mirror and look at yourself,
And see what that man has to say.

"For it isn't your father or mother or wife,
Whose judgment upon you must pass,
The fellow whose verdict counts most in your life
Is the one staring back from the glass.

"You may be like Jack Horner and chisel a plum
And think you're a wonderful guy,
But the man in the glass says you're only a bum
If you can't look him straight in the eye.

"He's the fellow to please—never mind all the rest,
For he's with you clear to the end,
And you've passed your most dangerous, difficult test
If the man in the glass is your friend.

"You may feel the whole world down the pathway of years
And get pats on the back as you pass,
But your final reward will be heartache and tears
If you've cheated the man in the glass."

Guests at the luncheon were the following:

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, Democrat, of Connecticut.
Senator OWEN BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine.
Senator HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, Republican, of South Dakota.
Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Colorado.
Senator CHAN GURNEY, Republican, of South Dakota.
Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire.
Senator CARL A. HATCH, Democrat, of New Mexico.
Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama.
Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, Republican, of Utah.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin.
Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Republican, of Michigan.
Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH, Democrat, of Rhode Island.
Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS, Democrat, of Illinois.
Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming.
Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, of California.
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat, of New Mexico.
Representative HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr., Republican, of Connecticut.
Representative JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Republican, of Connecticut.
Representative THOMAS L. OWENS, Republican, of Illinois.
Representative WILLIAM G. STRATTON, Republican, of Illinois.
Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York.
Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York.
Representative ROBERT J. TWYMAN, Republican, of Illinois.

Other guests were:

Mr. Gerard A. Robichaud, Chicago Sun.
Mr. Paul Leach, Chicago News.
Mr. Bob Burns, Hartford Courant.
Mr. Ben Connor, Associated Press.
Mr. Jack Steele, New York Herald Tribune.
Mr. David Block, chief of staff to Colonel Klein.
Capt. Sanford H. Winston, Infantry Journal.
Col. Charles I. Schottland, national executive director of Jewish War Veterans, New York.
Mr. Omar Ketchum, Veterans of Foreign Wars.
Mr. Charles E. Foster, assistant national director of the Disabled American Veterans.
Mr. Jack Morris, New York Times.
Mr. Ray Sawyer, Director of AMVETS.
Capt. Lyle O. Armel, Navy Department.
Capt. Winston Falk, Navy Department.
Mr. Newman Wright, Passaic Herald News.
Mr. Burt Kemmerer, Camden Courier.
Mr. George Donaldson, Newark Star.
A representative of Life magazine.
A representative of Time magazine.
Mr. Bernard Weitzer, Jewish War Veterans.
Mr. Philip Davis.
Mr. Bernard S. Bercovici.
Mr. Joseph Cherner.
Mr. Hyman Goldman, Standard Cigar & Tobacco Co.
Mr. Carl Loeffler, Secretary of the Senate.
Mr. Leslie L. Biffle, secretary to the minority.
Mr. Sam Rose, Veterans' Administration.
Lt. Col. Elliott Niles, War Department.
Mr. Joseph Deare, Jersey Journal.
Mr. Joseph Barr, Veterans' Administration.
Gen. Bonner Fellers, former military secretary to General MacArthur.
Gen. Clark L. Ruffner, War Department.
Mr. Tyrell Krum, Times-Herald.
Mr. Roger Doolan, representing Mr. Sam Pryor, of Connecticut.
General Kramer, National Guard.
Gen. Wilton B. Persons, War Department.
Mr. Paul Richman, director, Antidefamation League of the B'nai B'rith.
Mr. Abraham Kaplan, B'nai B'rith.
Gen. Harry Vaughan, aide to President Truman.
Mr. Oscar Brown, judge of the probate court of Philadelphia.

Congress Should Adopt the VFW Uniform Pension Plan for Veterans of World War I and World War II

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1948, I introduced H. R. 5213 to establish, as a matter of national policy, a system of uniform service pensions.

The immediate objective of this bill is to extend to veterans of World War I the traditional service pension which this Nation, in the past, has accorded its aging and disabled veterans. The operation of this traditional service pension has provided benefits in their declining years to veterans of the Revolutionary War, War of 1812, Mexican War, Civil War, Indian wars, Spanish-American War, and lesser campaigns and expeditions. These pensions have covered the period from 1818 to the present time and range in payment from $6 monthly to $120, now being paid to a Spanish-American veteran in need of an attendant.

It is an historical fact that George Washington, as President of the United States and speaking for a grateful Nation, launched the traditional policy of recognizing one's service to his country in time of war as a duty above and beyond that of ordinary citizenship. Our first President laid the foundation for the traditional pension policy for this Nation when he provided bounties in the form of parcels of land for his victorious soldiers. Subsequently, the Congress of the United States, in the furtherance of this principle, and as an expression of gratitude of the Republic they served so well, provided monetary pensions in the declining years of these soldiers of the Revolution.

The Congress then decreed, as it subsequently did after wars that followed, that as a matter of national policy, men, who in their youth fought to defend the United States from its enemies on world battlefields, ought never to live out their remaining years in want and privation. In my opinion, it is one of the glorious

chapters in our history that today every living veteran of the Indian wars, Civil War, and Spanish-American War is facing the twilight of life with the knowledge that the Nation he served so faithfully has provided for his security in the form of a service pension.

It is highly significant, and a significance which this Congress must recognize, that all the service pensions previously granted to veterans of past wars have occurred approximately 25 years after the termination of each of these wars.

For example, the first service-pension law for veterans of the Revolutionary War was enacted in 1818; the Civil War in 1890; the Indian wars of 1892; and the Spanish-American War in 1920. Now, almost 30 years after the termination of World War I, the veterans of that war stand out as the only living group of veterans who have been denied participation in this traditional policy of service pensions based on age and non-service-connected disabilities.

Here are some pertinent facts concerning World War I veterans. According to the Veterans' Administration, of the 4,750,000 men who served in World War I, 3,700,000 are alive today. Their average age is 54 years and they are dying at the rate of 60,000 annually. While the average age of the World War I veteran is 54 years, it is interesting to learn that in 1948, 76,324 of them will reach the age of 65.

The Congress, in past years, has attempted a half-way approach in applying the service pension policy to World War I veterans. The approach limits pensions only to those who are permanently and totally disabled. As a result, thousands of World War I veterans who are unemployable due to permanent disabilities less than total, are languishing on the human scrap pile without even the means of acquiring minimum security in their late years.

Under the provisions of H. R. 5213, a World War I veteran who reaches the age of 62 will be given a pension of $43.20, and, upon reaching the age of 65, he will be presumed to be permanently and totally disabled and will receive a pension of $90 monthly, which, incidentally, is the pension payable to Spanish-American War veterans who have attained the age of 65.

For those partially disabled veterans of World War I who have not reached the age of 62 and who are not permanently and totally disabled, the following pension plan is provided for varying degrees of disability regardless of age:

25 percent disability	$32
50 percent disability	50
75 percent disability	72
100 percent disability	90

Veterans who are totally disabled and who require regular aid and attendance shall be paid a pension of $120 monthly.

In setting forth the schedule of benefits under H. R. 5213, I want to point out that any pension benefits now received by a veteran of World War I will not be jeopardized in any way. Should the veteran be eligible for benefits under H. R. 5213, and at the same time eligible for benefits under any other law, he may elect to accept the larger of the two amounts.

One of the real purposes of this legislation is that for the first time in the history of veterans benefits it establishes a uniform system of service pensions. The hodgepodge and piece-meal efforts that Congress has followed in the past will be eliminated. New demands for better veteran benefits will be unnecessary since the provisions of H. R. 5213 will be applicable to World War II veterans when they establish eligibility through age or disability. Should our country become involved in another war, Congress will not be called upon to experience the difficulty that has followed past wars in meeting the needs of the veteran population for pension benefits. This legislation will simplify the problem of administering the affairs of the veteran and reduce the cost of processing veterans' claims.

Today, there are alive about 3,700,000 veterans of World War I. It cannot be said that every one of these veterans will receive benefits under this bill. I mentioned that the average age of the World War I veteran is 54 years and that they are dying at the rate of 60,000 annually. By comparison, it is interesting to observe that, according to the Veterans' Administration, there were 2,213,000 persons who served in the Civil War; yet the greatest number ever to receive pensions was in 1908 when 478,941 were on the pension rolls. In the case of the Spanish-American War veteran, of the 392,000 who served, the greatest number to receive benefits was 196,382 in 1932.

In 1959 the Veterans' Administration estimates that 2,900,000 veterans of World War I will be alive with an average age of 65 years. Considering the experience of the Veterans' Administration with the Spanish-American War veterans, of whom approximately only half are receiving pension benefits, a similar experience in regard to World War I veterans is possible. This would mean that it is possible that only half of those eligible will be on the pension rolls at that time.

While we are considering the possible cost of this bill, let us remember that we have sent billions of dollars to foreign countries and are still being asked to continue these international hand-outs, conscious of the fact that not a single dime will ever be repaid. Our foreign-aid program has been sold to us on the basis that we should rehabilitate foreign nations and bring peace and contentment to the citizens of these foreign countries.

In our frenzy to aid every foreign nation, we should pause a moment to consider that American lives, blood, and dollars have made possible the continued existence of these countries after the most devastating war in history.

Let us remember that the benefactors of H. R. 5213 will be the American men and women who in their youth fought wars on the soil of the very countries we are now aiding with money, material, and foodstuffs. While it is true that these wars were fought to protect this Nation from its enemies, we entered World War I and World War II, playing the role as world savior. We all recall the wartime slogans, "save the world for democracy," "to fight a war to end all wars." What greater expression of gratitude can this Nation offer to its defenders than that of providing an adequate and uniform service pension for its aging and disabled veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have introduced this legislation at the request of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and at this point, I want to quote from a letter received from Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director, National Legislative Service of that organization:

> I want you to know that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States strongly favors a uniform pension system and we will be pleased to endorse and support such a bill if you decide to introduce it. Such a proposal is completely in accord with the program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars approved by the national encampment and the national legislative committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that H. R. 5213 will receive immediate consideration by the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, and that it will be reported favorably to Congress at the earliest possible date.

An Appropriate GOP Slogan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Appropriate GOP Slogan," from the Anniston (Ala.) Star of January 11, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPROPRIATE GOP SLOGAN

According to a dispatch from Washington, the high command of the Republican Party, which had as its slogan in 1946 the two words, "Had Enough," has decided to wage the 1948 campaign under the rallying cry, "Save What's Left," and according to our humble opinion nothing could be more appropriately applied to the Grand Old Party.

The first objective of the Democrats in the campaign now under way should be to save what is left of the Bill of Rights. Because if we give the GOP undisputed control of the Government again, the Thomas committee may abolish freedom of speech, the right of assembly, and the American jury system. And some people fear we will even be told from Washington just how we will be able to worship our God.

Let's also try to save what's left of the Clayton Antitrust Act. For if we have a return to McKinleyism, as is indicated now under the rule of Taft, the railroads will be exempt from public control and the sky will be the limit as to what we can be charged to ride the trains and ship our goods to market.

We also shall need to save what's left of the Federal Trade Commission, because the Thomases have become so absorbed with the idea of investigating our personal lives that free enterprise is about to pass from the American scene under the resurgence of monopoly, which increases the cost of living of every American citizen.

The private utility lobbies also are on the march again and we are having to struggle to save what's left of the TVA and other public power projects, with floods wreaking damage that runs into millions of dollars every year while a do-nothing Republican Congress sits idly by in blissful unconcern.

Roosevelt's soil conservation projects also have been pauperized, with dust bowls hovering ominously in the background once more; and in spite of the recurrent pleas of Mr. Truman for continued aid to agriculture, we had the fight of our lives in the last Congress to save what was left of the farmers' gains.

We also remember how we all told the soldier boys when they went off to war that nothing would be too good for them when they returned. But now those soldiers, turned veterans, are having the fight of their lives to save what is left of the leaky roofs over their heads, and a GOP Congress turns deaf ears to their cries.

The GOP back in McKinley and Mark Hanna days used to hold out the promise of a full dinner pail to the men and women who toiled in our mines and factories; but labor now is wearing a GOP strait-jacket, and with economic controls removed under the leadership of TAFT the workman's pail gets emptier and emptier every day as food prices rise higher and higher.

Moreover, with the greatest peril we have ever faced being posed against us by a relentless foreign power, our Army has been converted into a mere caricature of its former self, due to penurious appropriations, our Navy is disintegrating and little is left of what was yesterday's greatest air force any nation ever assembled. And we shall have to struggle to save what is left of that also.

Americans everywhere are struggling to save what is left of a once proud public-school system, with our teachers being lured away from the schools by higher pay in industry and commerce; but while the GOP has millions to hand out in tax relief and other special favors to the coupon clippers that pay the campaign expenses, they have nothing for the one institution upon which the future of democracy itself depends.

Hence, we now are willing to adopt the 1946 GOP slogan. We have had enough of special privilege—a system that makes the rich richer and the poor poorer, and are everlastingly tired of the attempt to save what's left of the great America that Wilson and Roosevelt handed down to us from the wrecking crews of Republican ineptitude. We hope to return, therefore, to the party of our fathers come next November—and our name is legion.

The St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Waterway Fight On," from the Plain Speaker, of Hazleton, Pa., an editorial in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway," from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, in which this paper, although advocating the seaway, states that its construction should be postponed and the whole subject postponed at this time.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker of January 27, 1948]

WATERWAY FIGHT ON

The fight for the St. Lawrence waterway is on in the United States Senate.

President Truman, who has been an advocate of it, yesterday sent a letter to Senator VANDENBERG, presiding officer of the Senate, and Speaker MARTIN, of the House, urging passage of the pending bill that would authorize the project.

The President comes from the West and it is there where sentiment seems to be the strongest for the plan, which would involve the expenditure of a vast sum of money that the country can ill afford just now.

When the proposal first came to public attention during the early days of the Roosevelt administration it didn't get very far because of the pressure of many other matters. It had the full support of the late President Roosevelt. The same reasons he advanced in favor of it are among those cited by Mr. Truman.

The President, no doubt, is sincere in his attitude but we believe he is mistaken. The waterway is intended to help shipping from the Great Lakes area to the Atlantic but it must be remembered that the Lakes and the St. Lawrence are not navigable for about 4 months or more during the year.

Opening of this waterway to deep-sea shipping would not be of great help to the section it is supposed to benefit. It is claimed it would be useful for defense in case of war. Exactly the opposite is true. Instead of an asset it would be a great liability. Several heavy bombings could put it out of business and bottle up whatever ships were in the channel.

The waterway would be a practical death blow to the harbors of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore. Why destroy the commerce of these ports for the sake of so-called aid for the Great Lakes States?

They are the center of a vast industrial empire which needs no outside support.

Establishment of a giant power plant in the State of New York is contemplated under the plan. Why should the United States Government spend millions for this when New York itself can handle it if need is established for its construction?

The railroads and the unions which operate them are against the scheme. The mine workers of the hard and soft coal fields are opposed to it. The railroads would be bankrupted through its creation and thousands of workers would be thrown out of jobs.

Why not let good enough alone, especially at a time like the present when billions are to be appropriated for the recovery of Europe?

It is hoped that members of Congress from the Pennsylvania coal fields and our two United States Senators will not go along with the proposition.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate has turned its attention to that hardy perennial topic, the St. Lawrence seaway. For more than 40 years the Governments of this country and Canada have been talking about it, and in recent times two Presidents, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman, have strongly urged its construction.

The project would be of immense value to this Nation, both in the increased trade and commerce it would foster and in the huge supply of electrical power it would add to our natural resources. Through the St. Lawrence seaway, the industrial and agricultural products of some 60,000,000 Americans would find cheap outlet to the world. Likewise, through the seaway could come the raw materials and goods which America needs. Pittsburgh especially, which depends so on a fast-dwindling supply of ore in Minnesota, would benefit by this ready access to the untapped mineral wealth of Labrador.

Of course, many narrow interests in the country are against the proposal and can be counted on to do their utmost to kill it now or at any time in the future.

Knowing the partisan motives of most of those who oppose the seaway and having no sympathy with men who would sell out the national good for their own immediate gain, it is difficult for the Post-Gazette not to call for congressional approval of the project at once. And yet, questions arise as to whether the Nation should not delay the undertaking.

In the first place, is the expenditure justified at this time? When measure is taken of all the vital commitments this Congress should meet—and especially of an effective European recovery program—this answer, we think, is no. When current inflated building costs and the effect which a public work of well over half a billion dollars would have on our present economy are reckoned, the answer is even more emphatically "no."

Further, a question of priority comes up—not only as regards foreign aid but other public construction programs. For example, is the seaway of more pressing importance now—or even in the future—than a sea-level canal at Panama or Nicaragua? Or than a Missouri Valley Authority? Certainly we cannot do all of these things at the same time, and it's the administration's duty to list some order of importance for considering them.

As matters stand, however, prudence counsels delay. Much as Pittsburgh and the rest of the country need it, Congress should now postpone the St. Lawrence seaway, but with a firm intent to take it up when Europe's recovery is a certainty.

The St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Project," appearing in the Rutland Herald of February 2.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

The St. Lawrence seaway, long a controversial project, is now one of the hottest issues before Congress and the American people. Senator AIKEN told the Senate that the action taken on this proposal by the Senate might conceivably determine the outcome of the Presidential election.

The foes of the seaway, like its supporters, are marshalling all their arguments in an effort to sway public opinion and influence Congress. The seaway has been debated and discussed at Vermont forums; it is a lively subject in many cities throughout the Nation. Boston seethed with opposition and

New York City's Mayor O'Dwyer declared the project would be a defense "burden" and would damage east-coast industries.

Some interesting comments on the program were made in a letter from Herbert S. Myers, Ogdensburg, N. Y., to the Wall Street Journal. That paper had printed an editorial on the seaway and Myers took issue with the views expressed and some of the arguments advanced.

"Russia considered one of her first moves would be to rebuild the Dneiper Dam," Myers wrote. "Just think, during our last war, what a saving there would have been on coal, railroad box cars, fuel oil, etc., if we had only had this 2,150,000 horsepower from water without making it with coal or fuel oil.

"Now, about the river being blacked out 6 months in the year on account of ice and fog. I also disagree with that statement. I was born along the banks of the St. Lawrence and have lived here all my life. Canals open officially each year about April 15, and stay open until December 8. Quite a few ferryboats run longer. Our local St. Lawrence ferryboat runs every hour on the hour every day in the year, even through this ice and so-called fog. If you are acquainted with this vicinity, you know, of course, that we have very little fog."

Myers said he had stood and watched large freight boats enter and leave the present canal system many times and that he had been informed that they average one an hour for the full navigation season. He added: "Check on the barge canal, the Mississippi River, and the Panama Canal on freight and you will have a surprise when you compare these to the present poor system we have on the St. Lawrence which we are trying to improve."

One of the weakest arguments offered by seaway opponents is that the waterway would be closed several months of the year, because of snow, ice, and fog. The Great Lakes system is also closed for several winter months, but during navigation season it is one of the Nation's busiest waterways, making possible shipment of millions of tons of goods and raw materials.

The importance of letters like the one written by Myers was brought out recently by Senator AIKEN. He told of organized opposition to the project on the part of one city, although a poll of business firms in that municipality indicated that 72 percent of them favored the seaway.

"The only way you can get around such misrepresentation," said AIKEN, "is for the people themselves to write and wire and speak to their Congressmen and Senators. Otherwise, minority interests will try to give a wrong impression of public opinion."

A good many people, whether for or against the seaway, agree with AIKEN and are speaking their minds.

Effect of India and Palestine Problems on the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "India and Palestine Have Put Our Faith in the United Nations to Test," written by Lowell Mellett, and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 3, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE OTHER HAND—INDIA AND PALESTINE HAVE PUT OUR FAITH IN UNITED NATIONS TO TEST

(By Lowell Mellett)

The western world, stunned by the murder of great-souled Gandhi, appears to stand helpless in the face of the carnage and chaos it expects to follow. It knows of no way in which it can intervene effectively between the rival hatreds of the Hindus and the Moslems. In all the new machinery of civilization there has been developed no force for peace equal to the spiritual power of this one man. Or, so it seems.

Need this be so? Not if we truly understand the basis of the Mahatma's power. On what did it rest? It rested on the utter completeness of his belief. So complete was his belief that he was willing always to put it to the test, as he did again, again, and again, offering his life in forfeit each time. Had he ever wavered India would not now be free.

The power of belief served the western world when it set itself against a return to the law of the jungle, as represented by German, Italian, and Japanese fascism. It has begun to serve again through the creation of a new world organization, dedicated to the democratic rights of all people. How well it will serve depends on how deeply the men undertaking this great advance in human relations believe in their own mission. These are the men who have set up the structure of the United Nations and have accepted the responsibility for its functioning—or failing.

MUST BE MADE TO WORK

The United Nations Organization must be made to work. The power given into its hands by the people of the world must be used to enforce peace in India. If this is not done faith in the United Nations will die and all hope of avoiding the great and final war, the war between the east and west, will likewise die and that final war will come.

As a quick warning to India of its purpose and ability to act, the United Nations Organization should enforce its decision concerning Palestine. Abetted by the British, the Arab countries are making clear their intention to flout the will of the rest of the world, as represented by the United Nations.

There is one member of the United Nations that can bring the British and the Arabs into line and that Nation is the United States.

But the United States, as represented by our Government, shows no determination to act. Instead, every excuse for not acting is given. As the Arab troops, bearing arms sold them by the British, move implacably in on the beleaguered Jewish community from all sides, our Government wrings its hands and closes its eyes to the horrors soon to be enacted. Americans, caught within the fighting zone, are forbidden to aid the Jews. American firms may not sell the new nation the arms and material with which to defend itself.

UN-AMERICAN POLICY

There should be a quick reversal of this un-American policy. Our Government should insist on the dispatch by the Security Council of an international fighting force to Palestine. This could be done. The one nation that has been charged—and in most instances fairly charged—with preventing effective action by the Security Council in the past, has given every indication of a readiness to cooperate. The nation, of course, is Russia.

But our Government has more fear, apparently, of the consequences of allowing Russia to help prevent the massacre of the Jewish nation, than it has of the consequences of the massacre itself. The military minds in Washington whisper that if Russian troops go in along with ours and others representing the United Nations, they will not come out again. These policy makers seem to feel that by forestalling Russian participation in the enforcement of peace, they somehow outmaneuver the Russians.

The answer to this thinking was given by former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles a few days ago when he said, "If large-scale hostilities break out in the eastern Mediterranean, which enable the Kremlin legitimately to claim that Russia must take armed action to safeguard her vital interests by restoring peace in a region adjacent to her frontiers, is it likely that our policy will be successful?"

The Arab nations, although taken into membership, frankly do not believe in the United Nations. We either do believe in it or we do not. If we do, the time has come to put our belief to the test.

Can We Afford a Decent World?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article which I have written entitled "Can We Afford a Decent World?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE AFFORD A DECENT WORLD?

(By Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania, written for the 1947 Labor Day edition of the Trade Union Courier)

More and more often in the months ahead we are going to be asking ourselves whether we can "afford" some of the programs we recognize to be important to, perhaps necessary to, the establishment of a decent world, a world in which a free America can survive.

There will be many voices to tell us we cannot afford to do our part. Their arguments are rather compelling: that we have a huge national debt; that our own citizens are still deprived of many of the comforts of life; that taxes are onerous; that we may have a recession or even a depression and will need all of our resources for ourselves and will have nothing to share with others; that we have already done much for other peoples and for the cause of world peace and that we can't go on forever "carrying the rest of the world on our shoulders."

There is a certain amount of truth in all these arguments. They are not new arguments, nor is the truth in them some sudden revelation brought about by recent events. By and large, to the extent they are still true, they were also true in 1939 and 1940, in 1944 and 1945 and last year, and they will be true to the same extent next year and for some years thereafter.

But insistent as these voices are, compelling as they are with their arguments that we cannot "afford" the commitments we have made or are making in world affairs, the fact remains that we do not have much choice in the matter.

A mother with a sick infant does not reckon, before taking her child to the doctor, whether she could buy herself a fur neckpiece or a new dress with the money the doctor will cost. Similarly, the efforts to set a budget, put a ceiling price, on the cost of our foreign policy, ignores the realities of crisis diplomacy in an atomic era.

The big question, the one question, which America and all Americans must answer is not how much it will cost or whether we can "afford" the cost of achieving a real peace, but rather: What must we do to achieve it?

I don't think there is much argument over the need for making peace an enduring reality. Even though our country physically was unscathed in the past war, every American knows now, either through personal experience and observation or through the medium of the newspapers, magazines, and motion pictures, what hell modern war has been even before the birth of atomic destruction.

Though some may doubt we can "afford" the cost of achieving an enduring peace, no one can dispute that we cannot "afford" another war. Our country, the richest and most powerful in the world, cannot "afford" a war like the last one, and if we cannot "afford" it, then no country, not even the whole world, can "afford" it.

So all our thinking must come back to the one essential point: What must we do to prevent war and achieve a firm and lasting peace?

The problem, as I see it, resolves itself into two parts, the immediate and the long range. There is some overlapping and a great deal of interrelationship of our obligation in both phases, and, as a result, there has been a certain amount of confusion and perhaps even of contradiction in our approaches to them.

The immediate needs, being visible and somewhat dramatic, are fairly easy to assay, and reviving isolationism among some elements in this country has made little headway in blocking our course in meeting some of these needs, although, in the last session of Congress, we received several temporary set-backs and a number of uncomfortable scares. By and large, however, America stood united on these issues and isolationist-minded Congressmen who teamed up with the "ultra economizers" in Congress in a joint attempt to undermine America's foreign policy failed in their effort.

The immediate needs, the ones which we are not only convinced of the necessity of our Nation to meet but on which we have made some good progress, are, as I said, somewhat dramatic and easily visible.

They include problems of feeding the hungry and the starving, of clothing the destitute, of finding haven and shelter for the homeless and the stateless victims of Nazi and Fascist aggression. They include the problems of stabilizing economies in friendly nations which are on the brink of disaster—stabilizing them at least sufficiently so that chaos on a mass scale can be averted. They include the problems of restoring enemy and occupied nations to the point where they can be least begin to meet some of their own requirements. They include political problems, such as stamping out the vestiges of nazism and fascism in those lands. They include the problems of protecting smaller nations from lusts and greeds still widespread in the world and in giving the peoples of those nations, insofar as we are able to, a measure of security in working out their own destinies.

The Truman doctrine for the aid of Greece and Turkey comes under several of these categories. So does the post-UNRRA relief phase of our foreign policy. So, too, do our programs for occupation of enemy nations and for care of displaced persons. These are the programs on which we are spending a major share of our foreign-policy budget. These programs successfully got through Congress this year without substantial hindrance because, despite a variety of opposition, there was no alternative to them. These are the immediate problems, problems which we can see and evaluate easily.

Much more difficult to translate into easily visible terms are our long-range problems of making the peace endure. Being long range and not susceptible to immediate alleviation, they are not as dramatic as a picture of a starving child whose misery can be relieved with food. Once having fed the child and restored his health, however, we will find the vacant stare, or the apparent misery, still showing in that child's face, unless we can breathe into him some hope in his future, some sense of security against a repetition of the disaster which struck him and millions like him into conditions scarcely above animal level.

Since we all know, in an atomic era, that no nation—not even rich and powerful and heavily armed America—can be safe from atomic destruction unless all nations are safe, our primary long-range job is to make the United Nations equal to the task of confronting the atomic menace.

We all know, too, that in this era of rapid communication and of the resultant acute proximity of nations and of clashing political and economic theories, we cannot have any one nation—even rich and powerful America—living for long in its own self-sufficient luxury while all other nations exist precariously on the brink of misery and bankruptcy. That does not mean that America must sink to the economic level of these less-fortunate nations in order to dispel the jealousies and the hatreds arising from glaring contrasts in well-being, but rather that America, as the richest and most fortunate Nation, must take the lead in helping to raise the economic levels in other countries to bring them more in line with our own. This is the substance of the Marshall plan, and it is also the keystone of the United Nations social and economic program. Here, again, the cooperation of that one other nation necessary to make these programs effective—the Soviet Union—has not been forthcoming.

The apparent unwillingness of the Soviet Union to join with us and with other nations in the United Nations in finding common ground on which to meet and solve these vital long-range issues involved in the restoration of a decent world of free peoples has been one of the greatest aids to the isolationist cause in America. We are being told by these strident voices which seek to lure America back to isolationism that since our noble dreams of 2 years ago of a world of nations cooperating through the United Nations for enduring world peace have, in many cases, been dissipated by the practical realities of power politics and nationalist incentives, we should give up our efforts and retreat, that we should rush back to the mental comforts of isolationism and let the world find its own salvation.

What the world would find under those circumstances, far from salvation, would be chaos on a scale so vast as to suck us, in a few short years, into the very same abyss from which we have just emerged at a cost of hundreds of thousands of lives, more than a million casualties, more than two hundred billions of dollars, and untold suffering, dislocation and anguish for millions of our people.

When we total up these costs, can we ever again say we cannot afford the efforts and the expense of making this present, nervous, indecisive peace secure?

America's obligations in that direction involve much more than merely money sent abroad. They include the urgent necessity for America herself to prove to the world that this economy of ours, which other nations consider the bedrock of world stability, remains, in fact, stable. That means that just as we cannot afford wars, we can no less afford depressions. Their domestic effects, as we have known them, are, in themselves, tragic, but at this stage in world affairs, an American depression would be an international disaster from which free enterprise anywhere in the world would be hard put to emerge.

The past to which reaction would beckon us is a lost past which America can never recover. It is a past we should have no desire to regain. We have our chance now, despite many significant obstacles, to achieve a better world, a decent world.

Do we dare fail?

The United Nations Edict on Partition of Palestine Must Be Implemented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is now more than 2 months since the UN in a historic decision climaxing 2,000 years of injustice, on November 29 voted for the partition of Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states. For the record, it should be said clearly that rarely has any international decision had more heart searching, more exhaustive study of the problem, and more sustained analysis of possible repercussions. Partition was voted upon the majority recommendation of an 11-man international committee which studied the problem in Palestine, in the Arab states, and the DP camps of Europe. This committee was the twentieth to examine this question over the course of the last 25 years. It had before it everything that had been written on the subject, and the voluminous data, the charges and countercharges that had been produced in the course of a quarter of a century.

The decision was made, and no one would dare say that the decision was not made with a sense of responsibility and a very lively understanding of the situation. In this decision the United States took a major role, as befitted the most powerful nation in the UN. For this I am proud. By the part it played the United States not only strengthened the position of the UN, but placed our country clearly again in the main stream of traditional American foreign policy in support of independence for small peoples.

But what has taken place since November 29? The situation in Palestine has shamefully deteriorated. Arabs, apparently with the tacit approval of many British officials—or at least without their active disapproval—attack and kill Jews. Jewish forces seek to retaliate. Their arms are seized by the British, and they are rendered helpless. This extraordinary policy the British try to pass under the name of neutrality. What is even more shameful is the fact that no voice has been raised against this outrageous state of affairs. I turn to my own Government: What role is the United States playing in this miserable conspiracy of silence? What has happened? Why

has not the United States, who was active and eloquent in championing partition because it was after all the majority recommendation of a neutral UN Commission, why has not the United States used her tremendous moral authority to cry "Stop!" Why has she not conveyed to Great Britain the tremendous indignation the people of the United States feel toward this flouting of a UN decision? Why has she not lifted her voice to warn the Arab States, who are themselves members of the UN, that the world will not stand aside while a small group of willful men deliberately sabotage the first great decision of the UN?

The UN is only as strong as its members are strong. It carries with it only as much authority as its members carry.

If the UN decision on Palestine can be voided by violence, then the UN is doomed by default.

I, for one, cannot remain silent. We face a situation which far eclipses either the Jews or the Arabs. The UN itself is at stake. Our Government is committed to the implementation of partition. That is part of American foreign policy. It is part of UN policy.

I warn this administration that if it does not whole-heartedly uphold the UN in this decision, it will be too late to back up the UN in other decisions to come.

The UN is the last hope of the world for peace. If the UN in these next weeks and months expires, then the only other methods remaining to solve international problems are the methods which the Arab States now invoke before our very eyes: murder, massacre, war.

I include an article by Lowell Mellett:

ON THE OTHER HAND—INDIA AND PALESTINE HAVE PUT OUR FAITH IN UNITED NATIONS TO TEST

(By Lowell Mellett)

The western world, stunned by the murder of great-souled Gandhi, appears to stand helpless in the face of the carnage and chaos it expects to follow. It knows of no way in which it can interrene effectively between the rival hatreds of the Hindus and the Moslems. In all the new machinery of civilization there has been developed no force for peace equal to the spiritual power of this one man. Or, so it seems.

Need this be so? Not if we truly understand the basis of the Mahatma's power. On what did it rest? It rested on the utter completeness of his belief. So complete was his belief that he was willing always to put it to the test, as he did again, again, and again, offering his life in forfeit each time. Had he ever wavered, India would not now be free.

The power of belief served the western world when it set itself against a return to the law of the jungle, as represented by German, Italian, and Japanese fascism. It has begun to serve again through the creation of a new world organization, dedicated to the democratic rights of all people. How well it will serve depends on how deeply the men undertaking this great advance in human relations believe in their own mission. These are the men who have set up the structure of the United Nations and have accepted the responsibility for its functioning—or failing.

MUST BE MADE TO WORK

The United Nations Organization must be made to work. The power given into its hands by the people of the world must be used to enforce peace in India. If this is not done, faith in the United Nations will die and all hope of avoiding the great and final war, the war between the east and the west, will likewise die and that final war will come.

As a quick warning to India of its purpose and ability to act, the United Nations Organization should enforce its decision concerning Palestine. Abetted by the British, the Arab countries are making clear their intention to flout the will of the rest of the world, as represented by the United Nations.

There is one member of the United Nations that can bring the British and the Arabs into line, and that nation is the United States.

But the United States, as represented by our Government, shows no determination to act. Instead, every excuse for not acting is given. As the Arab troops, bearing arms sold them by the British, move implacably in on the beleaguered Jewish community from all sides, our Government wrings its hands and closes its eyes to the horrors soon to be enacted. Americans, caught within the fighting zone, are forbidden to aid the Jews. American firms may not sell the new nation the arms and matériel with which to defend itself.

UN-AMERICAN POLICY

There should be a quick reversal of this un-American policy. Our Government should insist on the dispatch by the Security Council of an international fighting force to Palestine. This could be done. The one nation that has been charged—and in most instances fairly charged—with preventing effective action by the Security Council in the past has given every indication of a readiness to cooperate. The nation, of course, is Russia.

But our Government has more fear, apparently, of the consequences of allowing Russia to help prevent the massacre of the Jewish nation than it has of the consequences of the massacre itself. The military minds in Washington whisper that if Russian troops go in along with ours and others representing the United Nations, they will not come out again. These policy-makers seem to feel that by forestalling Russian participation in the enforcement of peace, they somehow outmaneuver the Russians.

The answer to this thinking was given by former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles a few days ago, when he said: "If large-scale hostilities break out in the eastern Mediterranean, which enable the Kremlin legitimately to claim that Russia must take armed action to safeguard her vital interests by restoring peace in a region adjacent to her frontiers, is it likely that our policy will be successful?"

The Arab nations, although taken into membership, frankly do not believe in the United Nations. We either do believe in it or we do not. If we do, the time has come to put our belief to the test.

Repeal the Margarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., on Monday, February 2, 1948.

REPEAL THE MARGARINE TAX

It is seldom that the effect of a tax is felt primarily in the kitchen and on the dinner table. Most governments are reluctant to tax food. The United States Government tax on colored margarine is an exception, and one that weighs heavily on family budgets in these days of high food costs.

The collections from the margarine excise for 1946 were just under $5,000,000—not a major item in a $39,000,000,000 budget but a consequential one in many household allowances.

Several bills are pending in Congress to repeal this discriminatory tax. Some are sure to be pressed strongly.

Even favorable action by Congress would not assure housewives of free access to colored margarine in their stores in all States of the Union. In fact, the laws of 23 States still require margarine to be bleached white.

Legislatures of four of the States which bar colored margarine now are in session. In Massachusetts proposals are pending to repeal this prohibition. It is likely that similar bills will be considered in the other three—New York, New Jersey, and California.

There is another Federal margarine tax which could well be overhauled. This is the annual license fee for manufacturers (so-called) of margarine, which has been so construed that any hotel, restaurant, boarding house, private hospital, orphanage, or old folks' home that mixes color into margarine for its tables must pay $600 a year.

Even Federal legislation cannot remove all the discriminations which deny consumers an unhampered choice between margarine and butter. But repeal of the Federal tax on colored margarine would be a long step in the right direction and an encouraging example to the States.

GI Subsistence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, as an ardent advocate of increasing GI subsistence allowance, I believe that the Lewiston Evening Journal editorial of January 22 makes good common sense as it urges concentration of such help for those who are seriously studying practical pursuits and the avoidance of indiscriminating assistance for merely hobby education.

GI SUBSISTENCE

The GI bill of rights was passed by Congress in the heat of gratitude for the men and women in the armed forces who won the fighting war. Among the educational provision was monthly subsistence allowances for GI's taking training or going to college—$65 for single veterans and $90 for married. This figure was arrived at in terms of the cost of living 3 years ago. Since the bill became a law, prices have risen to the point that the original allowances are inadequate.

The educational opportunities offered in the bill were all to the good and for the good of the count y. It was little enough to offer to a veteran whose youth was interrupted, education delayed, and whose normal development was shut off. If it was a good thing then it is now—but allowances should be increased to meet the higher costs. The married veteran, many of whom are fathers, is hard put to stay in college or continue training, especially if there are children. Many veterans' wives are working to eke out the living costs.

Bills of veteran benefits should be trimmed in favor of assisting those who are fitting themselves for life work. The scholastic record of the veteran is in the high upper levels. Such projects as flight-training, dancing, and others in the hobby category should be eliminated and the funds diverted to increase allowances of those preparing for life careers.

This can only be done by an act of Congress. Congress should act quickly.

Tax Relief for the Wealthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against H. R. 4790—this tax-reduction bill which is designed to shift a greater percentage of the tax burden from the wealthy income groups to the small taxpayer. Its effect is to break down the progressive nature of our existing tax structure, which is based on the ability to pay, in order to grant huge tax hand-outs to those who have been making enormous incomes during this period of inflation.

This bill makes four important changes in the present tax laws. The first major change in the increase in personal and dependency exemptions from $500 to $600 per person. The second is the provision which permits married couples to split their incomes in making tax returns. A third change is the reduction in the rate of taxation by 30 percent on the very smallest incomes, by 20 percent for the incomes below $4,000, and by 10 percent on the larger incomes. The fourth major change is the reduction in estate and gift taxes by 50 percent.

FOR THE GREEDY, NOT THE NEEDY

This measure has been cleverly drafted by the majority party tax planners to deceive the people, and to mislead them into believing that real tax relief is being given. But its effect is just the opposite. The people who need tax relief—the low-income groups—will get only a token reduction. The wealthy person will, on the other hand, be given a bonanza. Those provisions which provide for a $100 increase in per capita exemptions, and the 30 percent cut in the smallest incomes, will not give the substantial tax relief that the small taxpayer needs for protection of his living standard. These features are only the sugar-coating which have been added to make this "rich man's" tax bill more savory to the public, and to detract attention from the gross inequities of the bill.

A careful examination of this measure will reveal its inequities, and prove it to be a masterful piece of Republican duplicity. The 30–20–10 percent tax reduction provision is most unfair to the average citizen. For example, a married man with two children receiving an annual income of $3,000 would get only $110 in tax reduction. On the other hand, a family of four with $100,000 per year income would obtain an $18,000 tax cut. The tax cut on a $500,000 income would be $63,000, and would amount to $106,000 on a $1,000,000 income.

The provisions which allow for income-splitting are also deceptive and unfair, as the bill is written this feature will benefit only the wealthy. It has been estimated that 97 percent of the benefits under the income-splitting provision will go to those with incomes above $5,000. The 50-percent reduction in the gift and estate taxes will also benefit only the families of great wealth.

The facts which I have mentioned relating to the effects of this bill permit only one conclusion. This measure will reduce Federal revenues by $7,100,000,000, and most of that amount will go into the bank accounts of the upper income groups.

It is difficult to understand why the upper income groups are in need of such generous tax reductions. Statistics from the Federal Reserve Board show that accumulated savings in this country at the end of 1948 amounted to $140,000,000,000. These savings include bank deposits, Government bonds, and cash. But to whom do these enormous reserves belong?

WHOSE SAVINGS?

An examination of the savings picture will reveal that most of the reserves are in the hands of the wealthy—the people to whom my Republican colleagues now want to give tax relief. According to the TNEC report, the wealthiest 10 percent of our population is responsible for 86 percent of total savings; the next wealthiest 10 percent accounts for another 12 percent of all savings; and the remaining 80 percent of our people acquire only 2 percent of total savings. In other words, most of the $140,000,000,000 in savings are concentrated in the hands of 10 percent of the people who have the highest incomes.

Now, we are discussing a tax measure which will make these same people the chief beneficiaries. The Knutson tax-reduction bill would give over one-third of the total tax reduction of $7,100,000,000 to 7 percent of the taxpayers in the upper-income group. The remaining 60 percent of the tax relief would go to the other 93 percent of the taxpayers, with a bulk of it going to the higher brackets of this group. Little real relief will be given to the majority of the people—the people who make less than $2,300 per year, and who need tax reduction most.

Such an arrangement may appear fair and equitable to my Republican colleagues, but to any reasonable person it seems to be a sell-out of the millions of wage earners and salaried people in favor of the wealthy taxpayer. It represents a repudiation of the universally accepted principle that simple tax justice requires that the tax burden should be so distributed as to bear most heavily on those who are best able to pay.

CONTRIBUTES TO DEPRESSION

I object to this measure not only because it violates the principle of ability to pay but also because it is by its very nature a depression-breeding policy. Business prosperity and full employment depend upon the maintenance of adequate purchasing power in the hands of the great majority of consumers. Yet, as the President's Economic Report shows, the inflationary rise in the cost of living is steadily depleting mass-purchasing power, and is forcing consumers to resort to credit buying and the use of savings to purchase the necessities of life. This economic situation is serious, and contains the seeds of depression.

An intelligent tax policy would contribute toward the reversal of this trend by granting substantial tax relief to low-income groups, and thus increasing their spendable income for consumer purchases. But this tax bill does just the opposite. It ignores the need for maintaining the purchasing power of the low-income brackets as a bulwark against depression—only the wealthy will benefit from its provisions. Such a short-sighted policy will increase the chances of economic collapse in the near future.

REAL TAX RELIEF NECESSARY

Mr. Speaker, there is a real need for tax relief, but this relief should be given to those who can least afford to pay taxes. This could be accomplished by retaining the present income-tax rate, while raising the per capital exemptions. Another approach would be to adopt the Dingell bill which would grant a $40 cost-of-living tax credit to each taxpayer. I regret that the House Ways and Means Committee has not seen fit to report out such a measure for debate. I have always favored real tax relief for the people, and have stood ready to give my support to any measure which would grant such relief.

However, I must go on record as being opposed to the unsound and inequitable Knutson tax bill. It is a rich man's tax measure which will favor the wealthy at the expense of the average taxpayer. It fails to recognize the need to conserve the people's purchasing power, and is therefore a depression-causing proposal. I have no choice but to vote against it.

Warning to Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news letter of Samuel Pettengill:

WARNING TO WOMEN

Ladies, take notice! If you go to Florida this winter, don't give your mother, sister, or daughter a hair-do, shampoo, or manicure. You have got to have such work done in a registered beauty shop. It makes no difference if you shampoo mama for free. There is a law "again" making people pretty at home. The fine is $500 and/or 6 months in the hoosegow. This is on the authority

of a newspaper dispatch in the Tallahassee News-Democrat of December 7.

The professional beautiicians of Florida are alarmed at the damage you might do to a dear one through love and ignorance. So, with no thought for self, these noble souls have lobbied a bill through the legislature to protect your mother from you, and you from her.

When I think of the sacrifice of time and effort these splendid uplifters made in your behalf, I am lost in admiration. It's hard work buttonholing legislators in the vast corridors of some State capitol.

It is apparently still legal in Florida to clip your own hangnails, or wash your own hair. But think of the greater danger when you do these chores on yourself. The law will no doubt be strengthened to prohibit self-beautification and send you to Ye Beauty Shoppe at so much per.

Why, this opens a whole new field for public service. Think of taking a bath alone. And stepping on the soap without a beautiful beautician and public cleaner to grab you and save you from yourself. More people fall in bathtubs than in battle. I know. I cracked three ribs once in a Texas bathtub. No one should be allowed to take a bath in his own home. It's too risky. The only place to take a bath is in a licensed, registered, and inspected Cleanie Bathee operated by licensed, registered, and inspected professional public cleaners. We should go to the cleaners.

And shaving! When I count the times I have cut myself with safety razors, I marvel I'm alive. Think of my hair-breadth escapes from barbers' itch and sudden death. I should never have trusted me to I. I demand protection. I shall write my Congressman. We've got to have a Bureau of Bristles in the Department of the Exterior.

And then think of the terrible risks young husbands take with Honey Bun's biscuits. The broken teeth, the ruined stomachs, the awful language! No; we must save husbands from their wives. Too long have we neglected our plain duty to these helpless ones. We need a secretary of biscuits and salaratus with a salaried staff of inspectors of young wives—one for every kitchen.

And when I see the figures on divorce, it is plain that love-making is extremely dangerous. No job for amateurs. As Harry Lauder said, "Love is a disease." It's very contagious, too. The public needs protection. No one should be allowed to make love until he has passed a civil-service examination on Ye Art of Love, the Right Phase of Ye Moon, and How to Choose a Wife. Why, we have had bureaus of animal inspection for years. Will you be so bold as to tell me that prospective brides need less inspection than animals? We must have registered, licensed, and inspected inspectors of love's young dreamers. We've got to pass a law. Florida, lead the way.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

The Jewish State Is in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of the United Nations voted on November 29, 1947, to create an independent Jewish state in Palestine. Today, that decision is being nullified by armed Arab bands who are carrying on open warfare against the unarmed Jewish population. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Conspiracy Against Partition" by Lillie Shultz which appeared in the January 31 issue of the Nation, and one which will throw considerable light upon the issues in Palestine:

CONSPIRACY AGAINST PARTITION
(By Lillie Shultz)

No more cynical veto was ever applied by a major power to a United Nations decision than Great Britain's refusal to comply with the recommendation of the General Assembly on November 29 that "an area situated in the territory of the Jewish state, including a seaport and hinterland adequate to provide facilities for substantial immigration, shall be evacuated at the earliest possible date and in any event not later than February 1, 1948."

The reason given by Sir Alexander Cadogan for this refusal was that his government was unwilling to jeopardize an already delicate situation and create new troubles for its security forces in the Holy Land. Sir Alexander repeated on January 21 what had become the standard British response to all inquiries about cooperation during the UN deliberations—namely, that so long as the mandatory regime is maintained it must retain undivided control over the whole of Palestine. He added: "For this reason it is not possible for my government to comply with the recommendations concerning evacuation of a Jewish port and hinterland so long as the mandate continues." Sir Alexander had apparently forgotten that Britain had also undertaken to maintain peace and security in the Holy Land until its withdrawal.

With British troops numbering 80,000 to 100,000 in Palestine, a modern army with modern equipment, it is nonetheless a fact that since November 30, 1947, there has been raging in that small country fierce warfare, initiated by the Mufti and the Arab Higher Committee, carried out in the first instance by Arabs of Palestine, and supported by the surrounding Arab states and bands infiltrating from these states. Is this a war of such proportions that it could not have been nipped in the bud by the mandatory power? And if it is, why has it not been brought to the Security Council?

When partition was voted, several facts encouraged the belief there would be a minimum of violence, at least until the independence of the two states was established: (1) The presence of large British forces and the declared intention of the mandatory power to maintain security; (2) the existence of the Haganah, and its ability to keep order provided it were recognized—as the UN clearly intended it should be—as the armed militia of the Jewish state and promptly supplied with arms; (3) the absence of any important Arab military force inside Palestine and the inability of the Arabs to wage an armed struggle unless supplied and directed from the outside; (4) the assumption that open flouting of a UN decision would evoke prompt action.

But neither the presence of the British military forces, nor a police department responsible to them, nor 165 emergency-defense regulations—which before partition were applied almost exclusively to the Jews—prevented Arab excesses. In many instances British troops have been passive spectators of attacks on the Jews, and in some, accessories. The British authorities have permitted a band of the Mufti's henchmen, calling itself the Arab National Guard, to besiege the old city of Jerusalem while holding 1,700 Jews as hostages, and have even concluded an agreement with this band permitting British troops to enter the old city to distribute food and other necessary supplies. Though the Mufti's organization, the Arab Higher Committee, is directing the whole operation, not one of its leaders has been arrested. In fact, the Palestine Government itself is distributing rifles to Arabs in the villages, ostensibly to enable them to defend themselves. Members of the Haganah, on the other hand, are being systematically disarmed. Recently the British withdrew from Jaffa and Tel Aviv, leaving their protection to Jews and Arabs under British command. The Arabs were armed by the British; the Jews were not, on the excuse that they had stores of arms.

Regular incursions into Palestine of Arabs from Syria and Lebanon and other Arab states for the purpose of attacking Jews are openly tolerated.

Far from permitting the Haganah to act as a militia to help maintain order and carry out the UN directive, British authorities are treating it as a terrorist agency. Meanwhile the Arab Legion operates in the key Jewish sections of Palestine, and Palestine Arabs are equipped with arms sent in by the Arab states or turned over to them by Arab members of the British police.

Without doubt this reign of terror could be ended without great loss of life and without additional military force. Its continuance is to be attributed directly to British policy, which has countenanced the war in Palestine as a form of political blackmail whose immediate objective is to defeat the partition plan and consolidate the British position in the Middle East. The long-range objective of this policy is to pave the way for the extension of the Truman doctrine to the whole Middle East. To that extent at least, our State Department is implicated.

Why are the British conspiring with the Arabs to carry out their armed revolt against the Jews? The reasons are simple:

1. Bevin and some of his Foreign Office colleagues are not averse to a little bloodletting—particularly of Jewish blood.

2. Britain intends to remain in Palestine. It is therefore ready to help along a situation which will prove the partition plan to be unworkable and open the way for some form of the Bevin federation plan as a substitute. As the mandatory power with large forces on the spot, Britain could then be persuaded to handle the carrying out the scheme as agent of the United Nations.

3. Should this fail, the British have another plan. At the appropriate moment, if nothing disturbs the stage as it is now being set, they will permit Emir Abdullah, of Transjordan, to overrun the whole of Palestine with troops of the Arab Legion—British trained, officered, and equipped. As a result (a) Abdullah will give up his ambition to annex Syria and Lebanon; (b) the British will be assured of the Negev, bordering on Egypt, of Haifa with its pipe-line terminus and port facilities, and of the port of Aqaba, giving access to the Red Sea; (c) the states of the Arab League will be rid of the Mufti and his rabble-rousing potential which the governing hierarchy in each state fears; (d) the Jews will be herded into a kind of ghetto in a restricted area with limited autonomy, and Britain, in the role of protector, will endeavor to reconcile them to this fate. Thus the primary aim of the Arab revolt—an Arab Palestine—will have been achieved. And Britain will have won.

This is no pipe dream. It is the reserve plan, approved in London and worked out by Brigadier Clayton, British military expert in Egypt, with leaders of the Arab League. And the Arab League is still the creature of the British, with Brigadier Clayton the only non-Moslem regularly permitted to attend its meetings. Key officials in the United States Defense and State Departments are familiar with the plan.

The prime object of Bevin's foreign policy is to assure the continuance of old concessions or their extension—military, political, and economic—in order, on the one hand, to protect Britain's oil empire and, on the other, to advance the plans of the Anglo-American alliance for containing the Soviet Union. For this purpose bases are needed on both sides of the Mediterranean. These the Arabs could well afford to give in return for being allowed to carry through their revolt.

The first results of this British strategy became evident on January 15 with the signing of the new Anglo-Iraqi military treaty. This was a renewal of the 1932 treaty whereby Britain obtained air bases, facilities for moving troops and equipment, the right to supply military and civilian advisers and technicians, joint control of the British-built railways and the port of Basra, and the right to move in troops if war threatened.

To be sure, under the new treaty Iraq is granted complete territorial independence and with it the air bases of Habbaniya and Shaibah. But Britain retains the right to use these bases until peace treaties have entered into force with all former enemy countries. Britain also continues to sell arms to Iraq. And an annex to the treaty states: "In the event of either high contracting party becoming involved in war or a menace of hostilities, His Majesty the King of Iraq will invite His Britannic Majesty to bring immediately to Iraq the necessary forces of all arms and will furnish to His Britannic Majesty on Iraqi territory all the facilities and assistance in his power." This prize may yet escape the British. Iraqi nationalists are protesting against the terms of the treaty, but this may turn out to be only a maneuver to gain further concessions.

Another treaty which has just come up for renewal is that with Transjordan. Under the present treaty Transjordan is nothing but a British base. The British are not only authorized to station, maintain, and transfer troops and ammunition to Transjordan, but also to train such armed forces as the Emir is assumed to require, with the British undertaking to defray all costs.

Other negotiations are under way with Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and both Syria and Lebanon.

The stakes for which the British are playing in Iran, Iraq, and Kuwait include an oil reserve of something over 15,000,000,000 barrels. The exclusive rights to the oil deposits of Iran and Kuwait are held by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. The British Government owns 50 percent of the shares of that company.

British and American oil interests mesh throughout the Middle East, and with them military interests as well. The Gulf Oil Co. of the United States owns 50 percent of the Kuwait concession. Socony-Vacuum and Standard Oil of New Jersey own approximately 25 percent of the Iraq Petroleum Co. and all its interests. The largest oil concession—that in Saudi Arabi—is owned exclusively by American interests. It has a reserve of 5,000,000,000 barrels, will run until the year 2005, and last year paid $17,000,000 in royalties to King Ibn Saud.

If Britain has bases in Iraq and Transjordan, the United States now has a base in Dhahran, where our Air Force operates a field built during the war. A deep-water port is being constructed near Damman, 11 miles from Dhahran. A pipe line being laid through Transjordan and Syria to Port Sidon in the Lebanon is expected to be completed in 1950. It will be capable of delivering 300,000 barrels of oil daily at the Mediterranean port. Last week the United States announced the reopening of a wartime airport at Mellaha near Tripoli in Libya, where the British still maintain control. This, coupled with Britain's announcement that it plans to use Cyprus as a military base and with the Greek vote against partition at the UN, gives a clear indication of Anglo-American plans and illuminates some of the reasons why the State Department seems to be conniving at the defeat of the United Nations plan for Palestine.

Since the disorders began, the United States has given no indication that it intends to take action to implement partition, either by helping to bring about British compliance with the UN decision or by securing the protection of the UN commission and the Jews of Palestine through an international police force. All signs point in the opposite direction.

According to the decision of the General Assembly, the commission is responsible to the Security Council. When the report of the Assembly's action was brought to the Security Council, the Arab attacks had already started. But the United States took the position that there should be no discussion of the question then.

The representatives of the United States, it should be underscored, take their instructions directly from the State Department and not from the President. When some weeks ago Secretary-General Trygve Lie sent out a questionnaire to the Big Five and other important states, asking about their attitude toward an international police force in view of the occurrences in Palestine, the United States failed to make any reply. Earlier the United States had favored a volunteer force.

But the positive acts of the United States are even more disturbing. At the General Assembly, when the protection of the Jewish community was discussed, the American representatives in closed meetings and press conferences and in personal conversations among members of the delegation and the press, took the position that the Haganah would be recognized, without question, as the Jewish militia and would speedily be provided with sufficient arms to carry out its functions.

On December 6, just a week after partition was voted by the Assembly, the State Department announced an embargo on arms to the Middle Eastern countries.

What is the effect of this unilateral act? First, obviously, it prevents the arming of the Haganah. Second, the seven Arab states are in a position to buy arms from all other member states and turn them over to the Mufti and his cohorts. That is precisely what is happening. Britain has announced that it will not impose an embargo and will honor its commitments to send military supplies to the Arab state. This means that the United States is accessory to a maneuver by which the Jews of Palestine are being exposed to annihilation, for it is impossible for the Jewish Agency to purchase arms in the legal market as long as the Jewish state is not recognized. It means further that American lend-lease and surplus military supplies in many countries are being used to defeat partition and wipe out the Jews of Palestine.

Before the crucial vote in the UN was taken, Loy Henderson and his colleagues in the division of near eastern and African affairs told President Truman that any further pressure on the Arabs would jeopardize the defense program. After the vote Herschel Johnson, United States representative on the Palestine committee, was reprimanded by Loy Henderson for carrying out too energetically the President's order to support the resolution. More recently the State Department has told the President we have done more than was necessary, and that our role now should be to wait and listen.

Apparently the Arab states are not afraid of UN reprisals, for the Governments of Syria and Lebanon are openly flouting the partition plan while Syria sits as a member of the Security Council. The Premiers and the Defense Ministers of both countries are responsible for the collection of funds, the registration and training of volunteers, and the assembling of arms to be sent into Palestine. This was reported to the Lebanese Parliament on January 15 by the Minister of Defense.

On January 14 the Arab paper Al Masri quoted the Syrian Defense Minister as saying that the training and arming of volunteers in Syria was progressing satisfactorily and an all-out attack against the Jewish community of Palestine could be expected within a month.

At Secretary Marshall's press conference on January 21 a representative of the Nation asked whether in his belief the invasion of Palestine by Syrian troops constituted a threat to peace and security which the United States might take up with the Security Council. Secretary Marshal brushed the question aside with the comment, "I don't want to talk about it at this time."

From another source the Nation has learned that the United States has no intention of sending American troops to Palestine or of initiating any action leading to an international police force in which Americans would participate. Secretary of Defense Forrestal has privately threatened to resign and denounce the administration should it contribute American troops to an international force or give impetus to the formation of such a force. Nor do we intend to lift the arms embargo.

The United Nations Commission on Palestine will by February 1 make its first report to the Security Council. The report must, of course, cover (1) the refusal of the British to comply with the terms of the resolution; (2) a description of the disorder in Palestine and its sources. A special report will deal with the desire of the Commission itself to be protected in Palestine by armed force as well as the United Nations flag.

Which country will take the initiative in suggesting action to restore order becomes the crucial question. Were the Russians to do so, they would play directly into the hands of the British, who would like nothing better than proof of the Soviet desire to gain a foothold in the Middle East. France, beset by its internal difficulties and the special problems of its Moroccan empire, can be counted out. So can China, now in the midst of the most delicate negotiations with the State Department. The two countries which remain are Great Britain and the United States. What will the United States do? Will President Truman be bullied by the State and Defense Departments into believing that further action by the United States would jeopardize the defense program? Or will he refuse to be swayed by the spurious arguments of Loy Henderson, Secretary Forrestal, and Admiral Leahy?

The United States could do a number of things which in no way involve American troop movements or our so-called defense program. We can face the issue of British recalcitrance and insist that it be ended. We can tell the Arab states that we recognize their complicity and will not tolerate it, and we can back that statement by the following specific acts:

1. Expose the Mufti as a war criminal through the publication of the secret files which were seized by the American occupation forces in Germany.

2. Insist upon the arrest, indictment, and trial of the Mufti as a war criminal.

3. Demand the extradition and trial of Kauwkji, now in Syria, the actual field commander of the Arab forces being siphoned into Palestine.

4. Take the initiative in demanding that all members of the United Nations place an embargo on arms shipments to the Arab League states.

5. Demand the immediate recognition of the Haganah as the defense force of the Jewish people of Palestine and its proper equipment for defense purposes by member nations of the UN.

6. Urge the establishment of an international police force with all possible speed—this force to comprise contingents of small powers to maintain internal order, but to be assured of big-power support in the event of external aggression.

The Arab world is incapable of a sustained revolt without the active support of the western nations, including moral encouragement, military supplies, and the training of troops.

As I have shown, the present disturbances can be laid to British connivance. As long as the United States fails to take appropriate action, the inference must be that the State Department, in agreement with the British, is deliberately undermining the pledges of the President of the United States. For this reason, if for no other, Mr. Truman himself should investigate the efforts to defeat his directive on Palestine. What is involved here is not simply the honor of the United States. Peace and security are at stake. Only the naive will believe that alliance with Arab feudal overlords, most of whom were yesterday in the camp of the enemy, constitutes a first line of defense in any war, cold or hot.

Will United States Government Uphold Monopoly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to note that Alaska has a good friend in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. We need friends in these days, when the imminence of statehood has made almost frantic those absentee interests who have so long controlled the Territory and who now seek to make their position forever secure before the people of Alaska create a State government. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch hit the nail on the head in an editorial which appeared January 7:

What is the mission of the examiners for the Maritime Commission in the investigation of Alaskan freight rates? Are they disinterested searchers for the facts or are they apologists for the shipping monopolies?

Two months ago the case against the monopolies of Gilbert W. Skinner of Seattle was fully documented at a Federal hearing. It was shown that his shipping companies are authorized to charge rates twice those to Honolulu although the distance from Seattle to Honolulu and from Seattle to Nome are the same.

Governor Gruening, of Alaska, put it this way:

Alaska is handicapped by excessive maritime transportation rates—the highest in the world in fact, imposed by what has become virtually a one-man-owned absentee shipping monopoly, a monopoly fostered by unseen men in distant Federal agencies.

In the face of facts and statements such as these, the Federal examiners have again called on the Maritime Commission to uphold the rates of the Skinner monopolies. No wonder Philip Eden, CIO economist, says that Skinner has more influence than 90,000 residents of Alaska.

The Maritime Commission should reject the recommendation of its examiners. If necessary, it should conduct its own investigation. When other applicants are asking the opportunity to engage in shipping at lower rates, the Commission cannot justify the preservation of the Skinner monopolies at excessive rates.

Here is another argument for statehood for Alaska. So long as Alaska is a Territory, without Senators and Representatives to look out for its interests, greedy men will seek to victimize the helpless residents.

Our Final Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article entitled "Our Final Choice," by W. T. Holliday, president, Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), which appeared in the Reader's Digest, January 1948 issue:

OUR FINAL CHOICE

(By W. T. Holliday, president, Standard Oil Co. (Ohio))

I am one of those terrible people, a munitions-maker. As chief executive of an oil company, my business is just as essential to war as tanks or planes. So I am supposed to welcome war as a fine thing for my business.

But the next war will not be a fine thing for my business—nor for any business. It will simply be the dead end of all our business—and of a good many other things as well. Man, at long last, has developed the instruments with which he can destroy his world—and will destroy it, unless the power to do so is taken from him.

So I put this to your common sense: If you know that down cellar in your house there is a hundred pounds of dynamite, with a fuse of a certain length attached and lit, is it your main job to see that the beds are made and the cupboard is filled?

Let us wake up. The first job of all of us today is to secure world peace. Our only alternative is World War III. The horror behind those cool words is beyond imagination. Already the scientists, in the merest babyhood of atomic power, are talking about bombs a hundred times more powerful than the Hiroshima type, which could blast New York off the earth and kill 6,000,000 people. Just as appalling, the scientists tell us, are developments in warfare by deadly bacteria.

Whenever a civilization is faced with a new and fundamental challenge, there is only one thing that can save it from decline and fall: Its men and women must change their habits of thought to meet the challenge. Either they meet their new world with new thinking, or they go under.

Do all of us realize that our present and normal state of world affairs is nothing but raw anarchy? We are living under a world condition of lawless chaos that we could not tolerate for an instant in our immediate lives.

Scholars talk about international law, but the plain truth is that there is no such thing. Law means enforced law. To enforce law, it takes a government. And where is their international government?

Well, you say, Don't we have the United Nations?

We do—for what it is. But at present the United Nations is not constructed to do the job that needs doing; let us recognize its shortcomings and try to correct them while there is still time.

The United Nations cannot maintain world peace for the simple reason that the United Nations is not a government. It has no world laws and no power to enforce them if they existed. The United Nations is nothing but a league, a many-sided treaty signed by 57 separate nations—each of which keeps all its independent power of deciding at any moment whether it will make war.

History is full of such agreements, from the leagues of ancient Greece down to the League of Nations. Every one has proposed to abolish war and every one has ended in war. If the league theory were all that history had to tell us about maintaining peace, the human race might as well shut up shop.

Under our noses, however, is a different fact of history that is equally well proved; it constitutes the only hope by which imperfect men in an imperfect world can live in peace together.

THE PROMISE OF FEDERATION

What is the real meaning behind the symbol of the policeman? If you look closely at the public peace in your city, you will be reminded that you and your fellow townsmen would be completely incapable of maintaining the peace by yourselves as individuals. The policeman represents public force, wished-for order and agreed-upon laws. Most important, he represents the unseen fact that you and your fellow citizens have given up your primitive, independent right to settle your own dispute with your own force, and have assigned him the power to handle something which you are individually powerless to handle. In a word, you and your fellow citizens have federated.

The essentials of federalism are all within the policeman. He does not tell you when to get up in the morning or what to eat for supper—his powers are his assigned powers, and no more. But when you have trouble within the scope of his duties and powers, he takes charge. And it works.

It is one thing to say that a federal world government would have supreme jurisdiction in maintaining the peace. But how would it enforce this peace? Right here is where you and I must change our habits of thought. It is hard for us to think of armies and navies not belonging to separate nations but to the world as a whole. Yet it is a condition of world government that all the great weapons of mass destruction must be given up by the nations and handed over to the world government. Theoretically, the world government would have the power to make overwhelming war upon any nation that threatened world peace.

I say theoretically because the real nub of enforcing world peace would be something quite different. Otherwise we are back at the impossible paradox of making war upon a nation for the sake of preventing war. How do we get around that contradiction?

The writers of our Constitution were puzzled by exactly the same point. They wanted the Federal laws to be obeyed in the States. But they knew the Union could not merely ask the States to enforce Federal laws. And they knew that for the Union to proceed by force against a State as a whole, for the sake of punishing a few lawbreakers, would be like burning down the barn to get rid of the rats.

They solved the problem by giving the Federal Government the power to go straight to the individual citizen, within any State, and punish him for his violation of Federal law.

And that is how Federal world government would enforce world peace. Just as you and I, whether we live in Oregon or Ohio, are punished if we break the Federal laws against counterfeiting, any national citizen under world government would be punished if he broke world laws against fomenting international war. If this seems an extreme break with our old habits of nationalistic thought, the fact is that the world is already moving in this direction. The principle of individual guilt for fomenting war is simply setting up Nuremberg trials before the event.

The shape of this world government is clear in outline. At the top is a world constitution. Under this, world government is embodied in a world legislature for enacting the laws to maintain peace, world courts to interpret those laws and decide disputes, a world executive body to execute the laws, and a world police to enforce them.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST WORLD GOVERNMENT

The objections to world government are numerous, but I have never once seen the statement disputed that it is the only final answer to world war. In sum the critics more or less tacitly concede world government to be necessary—and loudly declare it to be impossible. They list a variety of obstacles.

I was invited not long ago to take the side of world federation in a debate against a well-known commentator. I replied that I would be happy to debate with him, provided he would really take the other side. He must do more than point out the problems and difficulties on my side—he must argue against world federation itself as a solution for war. The gentleman declined. He said there wasn't any debate.

Some declare, for example, that national sovereignty prevents world federation, because no nation would diminish its sovereignty enough to join. Let us see what this can mean.

Outside a nation's own borders, there is no such thing as national sovereignty—meaning inherent supremacy. Within its borders, the Nation is of course supreme among its subdivisions and citizens. The only touching of this aspect of sovereignty by limited world government is its power to punish national citizens for fomenting international war. In this matter, world government has the supremacy. Yet I hardly see how this takes any supremacy away from the Nation, because so far as I know, in the matter of fomenting international war, no nation now exercises any rule at all over its citizens. If the nations really want war prevented under world federation, the sole sovereignty they would have to renounce would be the power of the nation itself to decide to wage war.

Others argue against a world government to prevent war on the grounds that it would be a negative and repressive government, a mere police state. To go a little deeper is to see that the only repression is of disorder, and that the law and order upheld by government is the necessary foundation for everything positive in social living.

Again, it is widely asserted that the world is not yet ready for world government, even of a limited sort. The critics on this score tell us we must first have long practice in international cooperation through such agencies as a world bank, a world food authority, and so forth. We need such agencies. But they would be no more capable of upholding the peace than the Universal Postal Union, a thoroughly successful example of world-wide cooperation, has been able to uphold the peace since it was founded in 1878. You cannot maintain the peace with a postman, banker, or grocer. It takes a policeman.

Last are the critics who declare that human nature itself is not spiritually ready, has not yet reached the state of perfection necessary for world federation. I am inclined to agree. Yet was human nature any nearer perfection in 1787, when our Constitution was written; will it be any nearer in 1987? The atomic bomb is not waiting for us to perfect human nature!

PROGRAM FOR ORGANIZATION

With all its shortcomings, the United Nations provides the framework for the working world federation we need. Let us see how the job could be done.

The first step is for some nation to introduce in the General Assembly a motion that the United Nations shall call a world convention to draft a world constitution. Article 109 of the charter provides that "a general conference of the members for reviewing the present Charter" can be called by two-thirds of the General Assembly and 7 out of 11 of the Security Council. That "conference" would be the constitutional convention—and no single nation can veto it.

At that conference "any alteration of the present Charter" can be recommended by two-thirds of the nations represented. That alteration would be a federal constitution for the world—and no single nation can veto a line of it.

Now comes the rub. The next step is to submit that constitution to the nations themselves for ratification. Again under article 109, the alteration shall take effect when it has been ratified by two-thirds of the nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council. In other words, one nation can stop the rest from having constitutional government.

Now that is neither reasonable nor tolerable. It is a curious fact of history that our Thirteen Original States, as they approached federation, were restrained by exactly the same rule of all or none. The Articles of Confederation, under which the Constitutional Convention of 1787 was called, said that any amendment adopted must be ratified by all 13 States. How did our infant Constitution manage to come into effect under conditions so stringent?

It didn't. By a bold and wise stroke the drafters of our Constitution ignored the Articles of Confederation and wrote the provision into the new instrument that it should be established among the ratifying States when 9 out of 13 had ratified.

The delegates to a world constitutional convention would be just as bold, and just as wise, if they ignored the Charter of the United Nations and provided in the new instrument for its own ratification on more moderate terms. If two-thirds of the nations can write a constitution, it would seem reasonable that two-thirds of the nations could establish it among themselves.

Once this federation is established among a reasonable proportion of the world's nations, it forms an open and easily expansible system. For any nation that did not want to come in at first, there would always be a vacant chair.

FACING THE FACTS

Which brings us to today's constant question: What about Russia?

But that isn't the real question. The first question we must answer is this: What about the people of the United States?

We ourselves are the crux of the problem. Do we want world federation? Will we work for it? Will we lead the way? We had better know for sure what we will do, before we try guessing what somebody else will do.

The Russians are realists. And the only way to deal with realists is to give them something real to chew on. This world has no chance of abiding peace until we Americans see to it that our Government takes the lead in establishing a world order of greater and deeper realism than anything the Russians have to offer.

The Russians too are seeking an enlarging order, perhaps a world order. They call it liberation, but the order they apparently want is an order of sheer Russian rule. In one word: empire. But an empire of force is no longer genuinely workable, as the Russians themselves prove by the suppressive measures they find necessary to take among every people they have "liberated."

Federalism is not empire. Under a world federation the rule would be world rule, the law world law, arrived at by the voluntary cooperation of all the member nations. Which is exactly the reason for the much greater and more lasting workability—and hence superior realism—of federalism over empire.

We Americans must lead the way to federalism. If our Government spoke up firmly and clearly for an immediate world federation limited to the prevention of war, I am convinced that a huge majority of the world's nations would join us at once, and gladly.

I myself believe Russia would join. You may believe differently. Should Russia delay in joining, it is entirely possible to create a working and all-but-world-wide federation out of the United Nations without her help.

No one pretends that this would be an adequate solution. It would, for one thing, mean two worlds. Yet I wonder if two plainly defined worlds might not be preferable to the multiple, chaotic world we have today. At least the issue would be out in the open. And it would be a clear issue, instead of the myriad of small, sordid issues the world now finds insoluble without that clarity. And the issue would no longer lie between Russia and America, on a plane of dog-eat-dog rivalry, but between Russia with only nine percent of the world's people on one side and a federation of most, or very possibly all, the rest.

If we Americans really want an enduring peace for the world, we must make this effort toward the only true source of public peace that has ever existed: justice under law and government. We must speak up for it so that our representatives will hear and will act. One by one, whoever and wherever we are, we must stand up and be counted.

The alternative is the catastrophic destruction of our civilization.

It is better to stand up and be counted than be counted while laid out in rows.

New York State Liberal Party Supports European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, support for the European recovery program is widespread, from political, economic, professional, and religious groups. These join in the conviction that it offers "the only reasonable hope of avoiding war and of saving millions of lives from misery and despair." Typical of this position is the following statement in support of the European recovery program, of the Liberal Party of the State of New York, which joined in nominating me in the last congressional election:

STATEMENT OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF NEW YORK ON THE ENACTMENT OF LEGISLATION TO MAKE EFFECTIVE THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The State committee of the Liberal Party believes it is the duty of every patriotic American to demand that the Congress promptly pass the bill proposed by Secretary Marshall which will make effective the ERP. We are convinced that such action offers the only reasonable hope of avoiding war and of saving millions of lives from misery and despair.

In these circumstances, it is irresponsible folly to try to cripple the ERP legislation with amendments, or to cut down the size of the indicated appropriation. The job of European reconstruction cannot be half done. It is all or none. We recognize the inevitable element of risk and we are quite aware of the sacrifices involved in the full measure of the ERP. But we believe that the risks and sacrifices are less if the plan is fully adopted

and vigorously carried out than if we drift further towards chaos. Even were this not so, adoption of the ERP is a moral imperative. It is accordingly

Resolved, That the Liberal Party communicate with all Congressmen and Senators insisting that they support the full measure of the ERP legislation, opposing all crippling amendments, and voting against any attempts to cut down the measure of the program proposed by President Truman and Secretary Marshall.

Reserve Components of Our Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much interest expressed in behalf of our Reserve components of the armed services by Members of Congress in an effort to obtain a better Reserve training program. I believe it will be of interest to our Reserve components to know of the action being taken to provide legislation which will encourage more active participation in the program.

Two bills are now pending in Congress which deserve favorable consideration. H. R. 2744 provides for nondisability retirement pay for our Reserve components and H. R. 3227 provides for inactive-duty pay for the Reserves. The benefits of this legislation, together with a better training program provided by the armed services, will result in a large, well-trained Reserve force.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter written to the Secretary of National Defense, Mr. James Forrestal, and the replies received by me from Mr. Forrestal and General Spaatz, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force:

DECEMBER 17, 1947.

Hon. JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of National Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY FORRESTAL: I have been a Reserve officer since 1932 and have been interested in Reserve work. During the war I was an infantry battalion commander in the Seventy-ninth Division, and it is my belief that one of the primary missions of the Departments of the Army and the Air Force in peacetime is the training of the Reserves.

During trips into my district in Texas last summer, I heard severe criticism of the Army and Air Force Reserve program. This caused me to wonder if this were true generally throughout the United States, or if this situation existed only in Texas. In order to obtain this information, I wrote to the department presidents of the Reserve Officers Association in each of the States of the United States and found that the situation was general. Letters received from these State departments of ROA are on file in this office, if you care to use them.

Those parts of the Reserve program that require corrective action, as revealed by these replies, are as follows:

1. Seventy-one percent of the departments emphasized the need for the passage of legislation allowing the Army and Air Force Reserves to receive inactive duty training pay. A bill covering this subject was introduced in both the House and the Senate during the first session of the Eightieth Congress. The Senate bill (S. 1174) was passed. The House bill (H. R. 3227) was reported out favorably by the House Armed Services Committee but did not reach a vote in the first session.

2. Forty-one percent of the departments stressed the fact that universal military training was a necessity. Hearings on the UMT bill in the House (H. R. 4278) were held during the first session of the Eightieth Congress and the bill was favorably reported out by the Armed Services Committee. Hearings have not been held in the Senate on UMT.

3. Thirty-eight percent of the departments gave priority to legislation covering the retirement for civilian component officers and men. Bills were introduced in the first session of the Eightieth Congress covering this subject. In the House (H. R. 2744), the bill was reported out favorably by the House Armed Services Committee but went over without prejudice on the Consent Calendar. The companion bill in the Senate (S. 1958) has not yet been heard.

4. Twenty-six percent of the departments claimed that the principal need was adequate appropriations for Reserve training.

5. Ninety-one percent of the departments claimed that the difficulty with the Organized Reserve Corps of the Army and Air services involved either a poorly conceived and executed Reserve program; insufficient Reserve units, both as to number and as to type; lack of proper facilities; or inadequate training equipment.

Of the 91 percent of the departments claiming that the failure of the Reserve program was due to these causes, their comments were further broken down as follows: 65 percent stated that the difficulty was due to a poorly conceived and executed program; 38 percent stated that there had not been authorized a sufficient number of table of organization units and that therefore there were not enough vacancies to which officers might be assigned, or that composite-type units had been created and officers have been assigned to these unsatisfactory organizations without regard to branch of service; 29 percent stated that the trouble consisted of lack of proper training, meeting, and storage facilities; 29 percent claimed that there was inadequate training equipment.

6. Thirty-five percent of the departments indicated that one of the troubles was the continued failure of the Department of the Army and Department of the Air Force for a period of 2½ years following VJ-day to indicate the requirements for Reserve officers to maintain their commissions and also what was necessary for them to do to qualify for promotion.

7. Eighteen percent of the departments indicated that there was a failure on the part of the Army and Air Force to include the Reserve enlisted men in the program.

Mr. Secretary, it is my opinion that the Congress of the United States, the Department of the Army, and the Department of Air have failed in our responsibility to our Reserve officers. It is apparent from the above summary that the Reserve officers of this Nation believe that there has been a complete failure of the Army and Air Reserve program. Likewise it appears that there is the need for definite remedial legislation.

In these times of international unrest the national security should be one of paramount consideration by the Congress of the United States. The civilian components composed 98 percent of our armed forces in time of war and the maintenance and training of these forces is imperative in time of peace if we are to have them ready for another emergency.

If there is any way that I can be of service to you in strengthening the national defense of this great country of ours, please call upon me.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman, Sixth Texas District.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, December 18, 1947.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: You letter of December 17, relative to the problems of the civilian components of the armed services, has been received.

As you undoubtedly are aware, I have recently appointed a committee consisting of the Honorable Gordon Gray, Assistant Secretary of the Army, as senior member, and representatives from the Navy and the Air Force as additional members, to go into the whole problem of civilian components of the armed services.

This committee will make a detailed study of all the problems pertaining to the civilian reserve components and will include in their recommendations to me their opinions and recommendations as to the pay, training, facilities, promotions, equipment, etc., which they consider necessary to support vigorous civilian Reserve components for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and their recommendations as to the legislation necessary to put these recommendations into effect.

I note that you have given a great deal of time and effort in compiling the information contained in your letter, and in order that Mr. Gray's committee may have the benefit of the work that you have done, I am forwarding your letter to him for his information and with the suggestion that he contact you for such additional thoughts that you may have on these important problems.

Your courtesy in writing to me about this matter and your continuing interest in the civilian Reserve components of the armed services is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1948.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Thank you for your letter of December 20, 1947, attaching a copy of your letter of December 17, 1947, to Mr. Forrestal. We fully concur with your statement that some phases of the Air Reserve program require changes, and my staff is constantly reviewing and studying the present Air Force Reserve program with a view to continuous improvement within United States Air Force capabilities.

The extent to which Air Reserve training can be conducted is determined first by the requirement for augmentation of the Regular establishment and secondly by the fiscal support made available to the program. Since initiation of the Air Force Reserve program we have been limited by both appropriations and personnel allocations in the accomplishment of the mission. In addition, considerable difficulty has been encountered in inducing nonrated officer personnel and enlisted Air Reservists to participate in inactive-duty training. In this connection, Mr. Symington has written to Mr. W. G. Andrews, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, to the effect that bills to provide for inactive-duty pay (S. 1174 and H. R. 3227), retirement pay for civilian components (H. R. 2744) and for universal military training (H. R. 4278) are considered by the United States Air Force as urgent pending legislation. It is believed that through the enactment of this legislation sufficient inducement will result to assure active participation in training by adequate numbers of Air Reservists.

The Air Staff now has under consideration an Air Reserve promotion policy which will establish requirements for retention of commissions and a credit system upon which promotion will be based. It is believed that this policy will be published in the near future.

Your most thorough coverage of the Reserve training program and your kindness in submitting this study to us is greatly appreciated. A copy of your letter together with this reply will be forwarded to Mr. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force.

Sincerely yours,

CARL SPAATZ,
Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

Impasse in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 1, 1948, entitled "Impasse in Palestine":

IMPASSE IN PALESTINE

The British program for withdrawal from Palestine, as explicitly stated by Sir Alexander Cadogan, is calculated to permit Britain to abandon her costly and troublesome mandate with a minimum of risk. But in the process it will turn the United Nations plan for partition of the Holy Land into a tragic farce, unless the UN is able and willing to send adequate forces into Palestine on a split-second schedule, timed to the British abandonment of sovereignty.

The moral weakness in the UN's position is that it has never faced up to the problem of implementing its decrees, but has counted on the active or passive assistance of Great Britain, despite that country's plain warning that it would not enforce a settlement which had not been agreed upon by Jews and Arabs. That the British position was unrealistic, except in the narrowest sense, does not obscure the fact that the UN supporters of partition have thus far been equally unwilling to face the responsibilities which the hard facts of the situation impose upon them.

As matters now stand, the British refuse to guarantee protection to the United Nations Palestine Commission in the Holy Land for more than 2 weeks before the surrender of the mandate—which means, of course, that whatever moral authority the Commission might be able to invoke to limit the present clashes is largely wasted. It also means that the complicated business of drawing boundaries, organizing governments, and so on will be carried on under a tremendous handicap.

What is even more important, the British refuse to permit the open organization of armed militias in Palestine, although in practice they appear to have been making use of illegal organizations along these lines in the maintenance of such order as prevails in their mandate. The worst sufferers from this policy are the Jews, since the Arab strength will be largely supplied by formations from the countries bordering on Palestine. Here bands can be freely trained and equipped for the task of preventing partition, while the Jews have to depend on their own strength and the underground organizations they have developed. Unless this barrier to the creation of a trained and well-equipped Jewish defense force is raised, the UN will have to be prepared to send immediate armed relief to the Jewish state on the withdrawal of British troops or find its solemn decisions go up in the flames of a general conflagration.

It is still possible for the Security Council to propose some plan for United Nations action in Palestine which will fill the vacuum caused by the British departure. To be sure, the British will have the power to veto such a plan, but if it is fair and if it does not require them to assume, singlehandedly, the onus of enforcing decisions repugnant to the Arab world, the British would not be likely to defy majority opinion. In any case, the Security Council could lay an international foundation for action in defense of the Assembly's decision at the earliest possible moment. And such action must be taken or there will be a tragedy in Palestine that will form an irreparable blow to UN's prestige and a scandal to humanity.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues would be horrified if someone had the audacity to introduce a bill disbanding the police force of the District of Columbia. Anyone so rash would at once become a fit subject for psychiatric examination.

There is no place in this world that attempts to enforce law and order without a well-trained and fully armed police force.

Yet we now behold the spectacle of the creation of a new state, accompanied by a warning that the present police force thereof will be withdrawn very shortly and, instead of those who claim to be desirous of setting up this new state, giving it the wherewithal to enforce law and order, we find the greatest country in the world, on the one hand, preventing the establishment of such a police force by an embargo against arms, while, on the other hand, sitting complacently by and watching another great power supply arms and encouragement to the brigands who would pillage and ravage the new state even before it is created.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WIRT COURTNEY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include certain resolutions recently passed by a very active post of the American Legion at Dickson, Tenn., Post, No. 115, on the subject of universal military training:

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas it is prevalent that there is unrest among many of the nations of the world and that war among some of the far eastern group now looms as inevitable and necessarily could threaten our own Nation; and

Whereas the United States of America has a past history in wars gone before of its undue lack of preparedness in meeting the challenge flung at it by aggressor nations; and

Whereas there has been devised a suggested plan of universal military training as an instrument, if put into force, to assure the United States a stronger foundation for preparedness in case of attack and to establish a firmer bulwark toward the world peace which we are striving for, realizing that preparedness is our strongest weapon for permanent peace: Therefore be it

Resolved by American Legion Post 115, Dickson, Tenn., in regular stated meeting assembled on this the 22d day of January 1948, That it go on record as wholeheartedly favoring the measure now before Congress that, if enacted into law, would establish a program of universal military training in the United States, and that the Post's more than 600 members urge the enactment of this legislation into law at this session of Congress and hereby petition our United States Senators and Congressmen to lend their wholehearted support to the measure from its formal introduction until the bill's final disposition; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be entered in the Post's minutes and a copy forwarded to each of our United States Senators and Congressmen from Tennessee.

GEORGE O. HOOPER,
Chairman.
DORRIS HARRIS,
W. A. MCINTIRE,
Resolution Committee.

Approved this, the 22d day of January 1948.

ROBERT L. NICKS, *Commander.*

The Fight Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following account of the remarks I made before the Fraternal Order of Eagles at Gardner, Mass., January 25, 1948:

Addressing the Eagles at an initiation class at Gardner yesterday, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN lauded the part played by that organization in developing a wholesome spirit of patriotism and civic loyalty which he said was a significant force in counteracting radical movements and stabilizing social and economic conditions. The Congressman called upon Government, labor, and management to make a real determined effort to solve inflation and high prices which he declared was our most critical domestic problem.

His remarks follow in part: "Citizens of Gardner best know the splendid contributions of this organization to the well-being and civic integrity of the community. It is obvious that great fraternal organizations like the Eagles, which are based on sound fundamental American doctrines and which teach patriotic ideals and religious precepts, are an effective deterrent to radical movements of the present day. There is no communism in this organization because its members are true to the principles of the American Constitution and their respective religious faiths which they know communism aims to destroy.

"Unquestionably Communist agitations intensified during the war and postwar period have been responsible for a great deal of the social unrest that exists throughout the

world. The international situation presents the gravest of problems. Our domestic economy is also beset by trying difficulties. The inflationary spiral in our own country has raised prices in the case of many commodities to an unprecedented level and the ordinary family is extremely pressed to purchase food, clothing, and other necessities of life. With such prices it is difficult indeed for the ordinary workingman and his family to make both ends meet. This is a very serious condition and cannot further be tolerated. No action to check inflation can be effective in the long run that does not deal with and recognize basic economic law. It is clear that one of the strongest weapons available to us in the fight against inflation is the productive energy and capacity of the unexcelled American economic system—our workers and managers. To be sure, the Government must take the leadership in the fight to check inflation, but if private enterprise and freedom of the individual are to be upheld, labor and management also must move to the solution of this most serious problem. If agreements could be reached between our faithful workers and our progressive managers on a voluntary basis which would permit of greater production and output of all kinds of goods and commodities a decisive blow would be struck at the enemy of inflation, and the Nation would be in a stronger position to meet its obligations at home and abroad.

"But the situation admittedly does not lend itself to easy solution. America must not only produce for its own people but in view of the conditions confronting us abroad must produce to some extent at least, for other democratic nations not only to alleviate hunger and distress, but to strengthen the democracies in the conflict against communism.

"To what extent we can continue to produce for other nations without wrecking our own industrial and productive system is a question which the Congress will have to determine. It is clear, above all, that we must not permit anything to impair the fundamental integrity of our own social, economic, and political institutions which have been and will be the greatest guarantee of future stability and happiness for all our people, and perhaps for the whole democratic world."

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. McGARVEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of January 27, 1948:

SEAWAY THROAT CUTTING

Senator WILEY, at the opening of debate on the St. Lawrence seaway, accused opponents of the measure of seeking to cut the economic throat of the Midwest. It apparently is all right in Senator WILEY's book for him and other proponents of the seaway to cut the economic throat of the East, including the Atlantic ports, the anthracite industry, and the railroads. The Senator is inconsistent.

The gentleman from Wisconsin attacked, among others, John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America. Mr. Lewis naturally wants no part of the seaway because it would injure the coal industry and jeopardize the jobs of members of his union. Apparently, Mr. Lewis should not look after the interests of the men whose spokesman he is, but it is perfectly proper for Senator WILEY to look after the interests of his constituents. Consistency is no jewel obviously in the State of Wisconsin.

As for designs on the Midwest throat, it seems to us that section of the country has been doing unusually well for itself under the present set-up. We wish all parts of the United States were as prosperous as this area which Senator WILEY indicates is so downtrodden because of the wicked easterners.

On the other hand, if the St. Lawrence seaway should be authorized by Congress, there is no question about what the effect will be on New York and other seaports, on the coal industry, and on the railroads. They not only will suffer, but they face ruin with attendant loss of jobs by workers, capital by investors and income by the Government. Why should this be when the present arrangement works no hardship and is so well balanced?

This, of course, is only one of many arguments against the seaway. The whole project is a fraud on the American people. It not only is unsound, but it has been misrepresented.

Only yesterday President Truman advocated the seaway on the ground it is necessary to the Nation's peacetime economy and to its security in time of war. Nothing could be further from the truth. Actually, it will injure America's peacetime economy, and it will not be of any help in the event of emergency. Mr. Truman's predecessor tried the same strategy during the recent conflict, but he failed to convince his countrymen. And we did a pretty fair job of licking the Germans and the Japs without the seaway, although to date we have not won the peace.

The St. Lawrence seaway will do more harm than good. It will add to the burden of United States taxpayers at a time when they are staggering under the weight of other obligations. The bill should be defeated, interred, and forgotten.

Oil Shortage To Worsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, we in the Midwest are very much concerned about the oil shortage. This problem will be with us for some time to come. It is a basic problem, and must be solved on a national basis. Involved in that solution is the adoption of the proper national policy toward oil.

A sane and sound analysis of the oil problem nationally is presented in an article recently written by Gustaf A. Nordin, the Washington representative for the St. Paul Pioneer Press. This article appeared in that newspaper on Sunday, February 1. I include it as part of my remarks:

OIL SHORTAGE TO WORSEN; STEEL BLAMED

(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—The oil crisis which is very real in the Midwest and along the New England coast at this moment is nothing in comparison to the trouble just ahead.

The full impact of the serious fuel-oil shortage has not struck home, except in communities where the supply has dwindled to a dangerously low level, threatening to leave many American homes without the vital fuel.

A thousand rumors have sprung up as a result, stretching from Washington to the oil fields of Texas to the consumers in the North country and in the East. Some blame the oil companies. Some cuss the Government for shortsightedness. Some accuse the industry of creating artificial shortages to raise prices and profiteer. Some say it is because this country is exporting too much fuel oil.

But the answer cannot be found in any of the rumors.

Experts in the business who know, say that the trouble begins with steel and ends with steel. If steel could be made available in sufficient quantity it would mean more well-drilling equipment, it would help provide new refineries, tank cars and tankers, and it would make it possible to lay new pipe lines into the Middle West.

The industry is not at fault unless it is lack of foresight and oversalesmanship. The Government is not at fault unless it again can be attributed to the inability of Government experts to peer into the future to see danger signs ahead. What then is the matter? Why are we in this serious situation?

It must first be realized that the shortage of oil is world-wide. It is not a United States headache alone. This country actually imports a good deal more crude oil than we export in oil products. So exports cannot be blamed and it would be dangerous to cut off exports as has been proposed. The result would simply be a greater demand for oil outside the United States—in places where this country now buys a large amount of crude oil.

The refineries in the United States are running beyond their original capacity. So the industry cannot be charged with creating artificial shortages. Oilmen are so desperate to cling to their trade and weather the crisis that they have resorted to the transportation of oil by rail from west Texas. That is expensive and is one reason why the price of oil has increased.

If the United States oil industry had been able to function on a normal basis since 1941—barring a war and the postwar restrictions—it would have sunk 70,000 new wells in this country. The lack of those wells today, coupled with too great a demand for fuel oil which once was just a byproduct of the gasoline industry, reduces the amount of oil which can flow into the homes and factories of the Nation.

Economists and accountants for both the Federal Government and the oil industry last spring miscalculated demand badly. Because the demand this winter had been misjudged, the industry held off buying tankers from the Maritime Commission and the Government didn't slap on export controls until June 30. At that time exports were a factor.

It is debatable whether the shipment of oil well drilling equipment to Russia and other countries would have changed the picture if it had been kept in this country. It would have developed more wells here and consequently more oil, but it would have reduced production in other countries—and oil today flows on a world pool basis.

The trouble ahead, however, is more to be worried about unless means can be found to voluntarily curb the use of oil, gasoline, and all other fuels. Men in the know believe these things will happen:

1. Crude and lubricating oils soon will go under strict controls.

2. When 1,000,000 farm tractors swing into action, they will receive a priority for gasoline and oil. The same priority will go to the fishing industry, chiefly because this country will need fish to substitute for meat.

3. Because so much emphasis has been placed on manufacturing fuel oil, the gasoline supplies will be less during the coming months. Some type of gasoline rationing this summer is seen. (Much more gasoline would be extracted from the crude oil if the remainder was not to be used as a fuel.)

4. The squeeze on fuel oil will continue next winter, even if transportation facilities improve, because it takes 18 months to build a new refinery and because of shortages of such materials as steel.

5. It looks like the rationing of fuel oil next winter is a good possibility.

6. Reconversion from coal to oil will slow down until the industry can catch up with demand.

Cost of the Marshall Plan to Each Resident of a Typical County in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in including an editorial from the Bowling Green Times, Bowling Green, Mo., an independent Democratic newspaper published in the home town of our former Speaker of the House, Champ Clark:

Senator JAMES P. KEM, the junior Senator from Missouri in an address upon the floor of the United States Senate has released figures which may be startling to a number of our citizens who are prone to let George do their thinking for them.

The figures are concerned with the cost of foreign aid since VJ-day or since the shooting war actually stopped.

Senator KEM, stating his figures were gathered from authentic sources, asserted that from July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1947, the United States Government had disbursed in loans, credits, relief grants, etc., to foreign countries, the sum of $73,092,058,013.

He also stated funds appropriated prior to July 1, 1945, were considered to be war expenditures, but since VJ-day more than $24,000,000,000 have been provided for foreign aid.

These figures are almost beyond human comprehension because we have gotten so used to speaking in billions of dollars that we rarely stop to realize their significance any more but $24,000,000,000 is a lot of money. So large, in fact, that a statistician, not one of Senator KEM's, has figured out if 24 men started counting this many silver dollars at the birth of Christ, they would still be counting, if alive, and their job would not be completed.

But Senator KEM has brought the idea a little closer home by giving figures which pertain to residents of Pike County alone with these statistics:

"The residents of Pike County, since VJ-day, have paid a total of $3,353,641 for foreign aid; the Marshall plan will cost them $2,675,742 more. The total county tax bill for 1 year amounts to $231,052.68.

"In other words, since the end of the war, foreign aid has cost each resident of Pike County more money than they have paid in county taxes for the last 14 years. The Marshall plan will cost them as much as their county taxes for the next 11 years."

Of course, these are Republican figures and in a Democratic community, no doubt many will desire to ignore them, but we publish them in this column because we believe our readers have a right to consider both sides of questions which are of vital concern to us all.

One thing of which we are all sure is that the cost of government is, and has been, out of all proportion to the benefits which we have received and that pay day is just about to befall us in the months ahead.

As we have stated in this column upon numerous occasions, we need more statesmen in our Government and fewer politicians, but so long as we refuse to think for ourselves, we will be misled by those political officeholders who are influenced more by votes than by concern for the best interests of this Nation and we, ourselves, are to blame because we refuse to support those who speak plainly and truthfully, and these are few.

Thus Senator KEM's figures may be assailed by his political opponents as inaccurate, yet if they are in error by as much as 50 percent, the reveal an excessively large levy by a Government upon a county of 18,327 people by any terms in which they are figured.

China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article, I beg to submit an article obtained by the Scripps-Howard newspapers from former Maj. Gen. C. L. Chennault, of Louisiana, and published in the Washington Daily News, Washington, D. C., on February 2, 1948, as follows:

UNITED STATES CAN STAMP OUT THE THREAT OF WAR

(When the first of Staff Writer Clyde Farnsworth's Mukden dispatches on the Battle of Manchuria was received last week, the Scripps-Howard newspapers, by cable to Shanghai, invited Gen. Claire L. Chennault to give his size-up of that conflict and of the American diplomatic and strategic interests involved. General Chennault, now head of the Chinese Relief Administration Air Transport Service, made his great reputation in China in his spectacular leadership of the famous Flying Tigers, a group of volunteer American airmen who were fighting the Japanese over China long before Pearl Harbor.)

(By Maj. Gen. C. L. Chennault (retired))

SHANGHAI, February 2.—The time fuse of world war III is burning now in Manchuria.

The United States owes it to China and to herself to stamp out this evil threat if possible. I believe it is possible.

If the United States does not help China and herself in this way we shall have facilitated—nay, assured—triumph in Manchuria of Russian-inspired, Russian-armed, Russian-manipulated rebellion within and against a nation friendly to us. We shall have abandoned the initiative we now possess for keeping what remains of world peace.

Something must be done because the only conceivable strategic motivation for this cat's-paw game, which Russia is playing in Manchuria, is to insure her eastern flank for freedom of action in the west—that is, Europe.

Russia will not take the big plunge in the west until she is secure in the east. That security is what she is seeking now—at China's expense.

Much of the dreaded pattern of Japan's first move for conquest of Asia is being repeated now in Manchuria. World War II dated from, and in great measure stemmed from, Japan's unchecked aggression there beginning in 1931.

While Russia's present maneuvers are perforce not as open as were Japan's, they are nonetheless clear in their implications. The aggressive motivation is essentially the same, and if unchecked will bring the same result.

Through creation of a Soviet sphere of influence, for which the United States was the careless or unwitting sponsor at Yalta, the Soviet Union intends not only to supplant Japan in Manchuria and Korea. It also seeks to enlarge that sphere into domination of Chinese borderlands from the Yellow Sea to the innermost recesses of Asia—a sweep of more than 2,000 miles.

Manchuria, with Korea, is the eastern anchor of that vast belt of strategic territory which Russia must control in Asia before she can act with a free hand in Europe, with her eastern flank secure from retaliatory assault.

To prevent consolidation of that eastern bulwark of communism is the cheapest and easiest insurance we can have against World War III.

Russia will not dare attack in the west until she is reasonably assured that her industrial regions and vital communications east of the Urals are secure from assault by air from bases within effective range—bases within northern and northwestern borderlands of China.

That is the broad strategic frame within which the present conflict in China, especially in Manchuria, bulks so large. But this strategic position is only the primary Russian objective. Manchuria is a rich prize in natural resources. It is so rich that China cannot achieve full stature as a nation without Manchuria, which even Russia recognizes—on paper—as under Chinese sovereignty.

A communized Manchuria probably would entail eventual disappearance of China, as well as other Asiatic countries, from the community of free nations. Communism cannot stand still for long and survive. It will not stop at international frontiers unless it is opposed.

We cannot afford, therefore, to let Manchuria go under unless we are prepared to surrender the world, ourselves included, to totalitarian authority.

If Manchuria is to be saved and the present deadly train of events averted, the United States must act decisively. That means soon. We can still act within the latitude of unwarlike cooperation with our former ally, whose sovereignty is recognized not only by the United States but also, ostensibly, by Russia.

If our cooperation with China is to be construed by Russia as war provocation we may be sadly assured thereby that Russia's inclination toward war was inexorable in any event. Actually, however, there is every reason to believe that firm aid to the Chinese Government would serve as a warning that the United States is fully committed to the support of China against communism, and that communism will not be permitted to encircle China with its iron curtain.

As urgently required as it is, American intervention on China's invitation in Manchuria need not be of a combatant nature. China does not need American soldiers or airmen directly in combat against Communist rebellion. China already has resources of manpower needed for victory.

Her only shortcoming—and this is a very great one—lies in her inability to train, arm, and supply that manpower, and bring it to bear to best advantage upon the inferior numbers of armed rebels. She has failed in this in the past for a variety of causes, for which the United States is not entirely blameless.

The most important of these causes was American capitulation to Russia at the Yalta conference. There, in the mistaken belief that Soviet intervention was necessary for the defeat of Japan, the United States virtually invited the Soviet Union to move into the Japanese sphere on the Asiatic continent. Russia was invited to invade Manchuria.

This invitation was extended on advice of our military experts who could not foresee the inevitable collapse of Japan 90 days before it actually happened. Some of these experts are still directing our China policy today, and are just as blind to the actual situation and its dangerous implications as they were to Japan's true situation in May 1945.

Russia used her invasion of Manchuria to lay the foundations of a Communist regime where no Communists had been before. During the period when the United States, still misguided, futilely sought to enforce a coalition between the Chinese Government and Chinese Communists, the Reds massed in Manchuria and were armed by Russia with weapons surrendered by the Japanese Kwantung army.

Russia's manipulation of the Chinese Communists and her strategic motivation, requires no further proof than this. Without loss of a single soldier she would thus attain the vital objective of securing her continental eastern flank.

By her action in Manchuria, Russia tipped the scales against China in such a way as to prevent reassertion of Chinese sovereignty there. Russia put that sovereignty to the test of bitter civil war—Chinese against Chinese.

Already disorganized and weakened by 8 years of war and 6 years of almost untested Japanese aggression prior to that, China needed and deserved American assistance from the very outset for recovery of Manchuria after Japan's defeat.

This was forthcoming. On the contrary China was obstructed by the United States through one-sided enforcement of a 1-year truce, sadly calculated to bring about coalition between a constituted government and rebels against it.

The Communist used this heaven-sent or was it made in America—respite to organize and train tens of thousands of new troops in Manchuria. During that period, when conceivably China might have overpowered communism there, the United States was withholding arms from China lest our "peace negotiations" be embarrassed.

Thus, it seems to me, our obligation to help China now is clear. Morally, it is something we ought to do. It is something which we, in realistic appreciation of the danger to our world, must do. There should be no difficulty in making these decisions. There remains only the question of what we can do.

Time is short and the need is great. But it is neither too late nor too great a task for American ingenuity to perform.

China's most crying need in Manchuria, the principal zone of decision, is for American military advice and such direction as she can accept without sacrifice of national sovereignty. Concurrently with this advice and direction, which must be rendered on an emergency basis, the United States must set in motion vast replenishment of Chinese arms and military supplies.

We must strike a proportion between land power and air power in China so that the latter, the only weapon missing from the Communist arsenal now, may be exploited properly and to full measure for swift victory.

No emergency measure within our power could serve China more than assignment, at China's invitation, of such a man as General Wedemeyer to a position such as he held in 1945 under Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. For prosecution of aerial warfare the United States should furnish, again at China's invitation, the best available American tactician.

Both of these men should be supported with increments of hand-picked specialists and technicians sufficient in number so that this partnership of advice and direction would be carried down as far as company organizations in the Chinese Army and flight organizations of the Chinese Air Force.

If this can be done quickly I believe it will assure victory in Manchuria. Victory in Manchuria will assure victory in China, and consolidation and recovery of a great nation which could be the eastern bastion of the only kind of world we want to live in.

Decentralization of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which I have prepared on the subject of decentralization. The article appears in the February 1948 issue of the magazine, the Reserve Officer, and discusses a matter which I regard as of crucial importance to the Nation, and on which I have submitted suggestions since my coming to the Senate 9 years ago.

I respectfully submit that this article is particularly appropriate in view of National Security Week, February 12 through 22. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST DECENTRALIZE

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and member of the Foreign Relations Committee)

"Comrade Americans, attention! This is the first broadcast by the liberating air armies which have freed you from the yoke of capitalist bondage. One hour ago, the treaty of unconditional surrender of the United States was signed by a brigadier general, your ranking military commander, who had directed the only few divisions and squadrons that were able to offer even the feebiest resistance to our victorious legions. The lightning war which commenced yesterday afternoon and which had been precipitated by years and years of capitalist provocation and plans of aggression, thus came to a decisive end.

"Guerrilla tactics are futile and will be speedily suppressed by mass executions and/or by atomic leveling of towns. Political commissars have now taken charge of each of the 48 States and of your National Government, which has been temporarily relocated in Kansas. This relocation is necessary because of the atomic radiation which still prevails in your former Capital, which now lies in dust, its inhabitants exterminated.

"We regret the necessity of destruction of your National Capital, of most of your State capitals, and your principal cities. It has been estimated that your dead may number, unfortunately, as high as 30,000,000. We are endeavoring to insure adequate medical care for your wounded, poisoned, and diseased populace. Our own liberating country is fortunately unscathed. All of your principal rocket-launching sites had been demolished and/or sabotaged by our friends within minutes after our initial atomic attack on your 50 principal centers of population.

"You will await further orders from us. Your Department of National Defense, Reserve Corps, ROTC, and all other branches of service have been dissolved. Your capitalist Constitution has been abrogated—your courts, your legislatures, etc. Your police forces and Federal Bureau of Investigation are now under direct control of our own secret police. The next broadcast will come to you 30 minutes from now."

Does the fictitious broadcast of a foreign military commissar sound too fantastic, too Buck Rogerish? Does it sound like an article in one of the Amazing Science pulp magazines or like the sort of fantastic things that you have read now and then in the press or heard in weird programs over the radio?

Probably it does not to the Reserve officers who read these lines. To them, it may seem, and I believe it will seem, like a grim possibility. To our general public, it may, however, seem like the most idle fantasy.

PREDICTIONS OF FUTURE WAR

Recently, nevertheless, the leading military and scientific authorities of the United States have spoken again and again along these lines. The points on which they agree with virtually absolute unanimity are these:

1. The next war could last a matter of minutes or hours.

2. It could feature all of the atomic and bacteriological weapons that the twisted scientific genius of man can produce.

3. The principal targets of attack would be Washington, D. C., and our other leading centers of population and industry.

4. America is almost completely unprepared against such an attack.

The purpose of this article is to alert the American people to the awful danger of such attack, and particularly to the danger of an attack on the Nation's Capital. One atomic bomb on Washington, D. C., could, in effect, end the war because it would wipe out the coordinating center of American offense and defense. All the principal military and civilian officers of the United States, the most important military and industrial records could be blasted into rubble. One atomic bomb could wipe out the one-quarter million of Government workers in the Nation's Capital. In one building alone, the Pentagon in Arlington, Va., there could be destroyed the very nerve center of American military leadership. The jam-packed center of Washington, D. C., would be a death trap not only to approximately a million people but a death trap for American liberty—for our constitutional republic of checks and balances, for every freedom for which Americans have fought since Valley Forge.

We must take steps against that possibility. We must decentralize or risk a destiny of national extinction.

TODAY'S FOOL'S PARADISE

We are now living in a fool's paradise of apathy and inertia, as well as in a crazily suicidal over-centralized condition.

If we see a picture in the paper of a single new jet-propelled plane or a new rocket missile or a report of a new scientific discovery

of use for war, we sometimes automatically think that we have sufficient supplies of each of these items when, as a matter of fact, we may only have one experimental model. In addition, our military leadership gives disturbing evidence of the fact that it may be preparing for the last war—not the next war—that it may be building Maginot lines for the future—mass armies trained in "squads right" tactics.

I do not mean to imply that we have not made any progress whatsoever along the line of adequate security plans for our country. We know, for example, of the formation of the powerful National Security Resources Board under the Armed Services Unification Act. We know of studies for decentralization and for underground factory operations; we have evidences of intensified atomic and bacteriological research; we have evidences of advanced thinking by certain officials for intercontinental air striking forces. But what evidences do we have of the plans for decentralization without which we will be ripe for a solar plexus blow by an aggressor?

We realize, of course, that our military officials cannot tip their hands by revealing all of their plans, and we would not for one moment want to breach security regulations. But decentralization cannot be achieved under wraps. It is a long, arduous process. And when have you personally read or heard about actual plans for it? The answer is: Very little, if anything. On the contrary, pick up any Washington newspaper any day, and you will read reports of more and more formerly decentralized agencies streaming back into town.

WASHINGTON VULNERABILITY

According to the 1940 census, Washington ranked eleventh in city population. The population density of the Washington metropolitan district on April 1, 1940 was 1,745.8 persons per square mile. The corresponding figure for the entire group of 124 metropolitan areas in the United States was 1,411 persons per square mile. In 1940, there were 10 metropolitan areas in the United States of 1,000,000 population or more, containing a total of 32,644,000 people. Washington has been growing faster than the average of these areas. It has become an ever bigger possible death trap.

NEED FOR REALISM

This is a time for straight talk rather than double talk, for hard and fast steps rather than pussyfooting. There is one and only one important potential menace to the United States in the world today, and that obviously is the Soviet Union. They know it and we know it. There is one relatively short channel of attack from Russia to the United States and vice versa, and that is via the Polar Cap. There is one principal type of warfare calculated to insure speedy success, if war came (and God forbid that it does) rather than a long stalemate, and that is through a lightninglike attack on the enemy's principal centers. Yet the Russians are decentralized to a far greater degree than is the United States. The Soviet Union is sprawled over one-sixth of the earth's surface, although, of a necessity, because she is a dictatorship, she is somewhat centralized. Still, it is evident that her military arm is being decentralized just as her industry has been throughout Siberia.

Let me, however, make it clear at the start that I do not believe that conflict with Russia is inevitable or that it is imminent, and I certainly don't believe that it is desirable. The possibility of a Third World War is almost too horrible to contemplate, the prospective loss in human life too staggering, the possible net constructive results so few, that it seems sheer folly to even turn our minds to this subject. Yet we have learned that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." We dare not, therefore, forget this possibility and turn our backs to it simply because it is so gruesome.

COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA

I believe that we must and should and will cooperate with the Russians to the maximum possible extent through the United Nations. I believe that we have made substantial progress in working out reasonable cooperation with the Russians. I believe that we can make still more progress, particularly if we show the Russians that we are aware of the very danger that they present. A Government based on violence and force such as theirs respects only the threat of violence or force. Weakness invites contempt and aggression. I do not believe in swaggering around with a chip on our shoulders, but I do believe in keeping our powder dry and letting the Russians know that our powder is dry.

America wants peace; she has always wanted peace; she has always hated war. The Russian leaders know this, even though they may have blinded the Russian peoples about these facts.

America does not like alarmists or so-called war mongers, but she hates Pollyannas even more—people who look through rose-colored glasses. Our veterans' hospitals are jammed full of the victims of pollyannaism and of our rose-colored-glass leadership. The cemeteries abroad and at home have hundreds of thousands of white crosses because we committed the errors of weakness and lack of realism and preparation. George Washington's words "To be prepared for war is the best means of safe-guarding the peace," are truer today than ever before.

POINTS TO CONSIDER

Please don't misunderstand me on any of the following points:

1. The fact that I am recommending decentralization does not indicate any lack of appreciation of the Capital of the United States. On the contrary, I will never cease being inspired by the beauties and traditions of this great city on the Potomac. Recently I have been in correspondence with the Washington Board of Trade on the matter of stimulating visits to the Capital by school youngsters from all over the country. I want them to be able to see the White House, the Capitol, the Supreme Court, Lincoln's and Jefferson's Memorials, the Washington Monument, and so on. We are not, however, going to move these great edifices from here but simply make provision so that in the event that all of these magnificent institutions are one day unfortunately blasted into rubble, the Nation can go on in its vital work. There is no reason why the Capital of the Nation has to be a swarming metropolis with its arteries of communication choked with traffic and vulnerable on a dozen other counts because too many vital functions are centralized here.

2. Decentralization will not of itself assure completely adequate American offense and defense. Obviously, it will not be an active element in offense but it will be a vital element in defense. It would be folly to decentralize and at the same time lack sufficient air power, ground power and sea power of the most modern sort with which to carry on the possible warfare of the future.

3. This proposal for decentralization should be considered on a nonpartisan basis. Party politics mean absolutely nothing when the security and the very life of our Nation are in danger.

Although my main objective in encouraging decentralization is national security, there are other important, albeit, lesser objectives which may be simultaneously served, such as (a) social values by ending over-concentration and congestion in swarming cities (like Washington) with all the attendant evils; (b) bringing the Government closer to the people by having Government offices located in the grass roots rather than in Washington, D. C.; and (c) enriching the economic bloodstream of countless smaller communities by new industrial and Federal pay rolls, if only to a small extent. But security ranks first.

4. Decentralization can't be done overnight. It takes intelligent administration, close cooperation by Federal agencies and with State government and localities. Yes; it takes money, too, but that is no reason why we shouldn't do it, and, in fact, why we shouldn't have started years ago. Decentralization requires retraining of personnel, with vastly new procedures and delegations of authority. But it can and it must be done.

Decentralization is a relative thing, of course. It has been variously defined as the dispersion of a given function to the smallest possible level at which that function can adequately be done. Decentralizing a blast furnace may mean a far different thing than decentralizing activities within the Pentagon Building, in Arlington, Va.

5. I do not presume to pose as a military expert. The Reserve officers who are kind enough to read this article possess far more insight into the military aspects of the problem than I do, I am sure. As a civilian, however, I do believe that the proposition of decentralization is sound and imperative, and that is why I presume to respectfully urge military authorities to take the necessary action.

If I may be permitted a further personal reference, in February 1941, I asked publicly in the Senate if our naval and air arms at Pearl Harbor were in the same position as the Russian Fleet was at Port Arthur in 1905, that is, if they were laying themselves up open to a blitz attack. My question went unanswered. I asked the Secretary of State to report to the full Senate in executive session on the conditions of far-eastern defense. My bill was pigeonholed, and my request went unfulfilled.

The months from February to December slipped by and on the 7th day of the 12th month of that year, we suffered the horrible losses at Pearl Harbor that might have been prevented so easily. I recommended stock piling of zinc and hemp, mass building of corvette boats to safeguard against the submarine menace, but these suggestions too went unheeded. I am not trying to prove any particular personal prescience. Actually, many other authorities, if not in the Senate, had indicated the possibility of a catastrophe similar to Pearl Harbor and had urged defense measures. It matters not one bit who made the predictions then or who is making the predictions now, so long as the individual has or had fair qualities of competence. What does matter and what did matter is that these predictions which are and were soundly based, are being and have been given a brush-off, with the result that our dear land is endangered.

6. I don't believe that our military leaders should be condemned or abused simply because they are high brass. I have the deepest respect for our present military leaders as I did for those who commanded our forces during the war. I do, however, believe that even military geniuses can and do make mistakes, and the record confirms this again and again. As a United States Senator and as an individual citizen, I believe that I have the right, as does every one of my readers, to submit suggestions and to ask that those suggestions be given the most careful consideration, and then be enacted, if found sound.

FOES OF DECENTRALIZATION

What are the arguments against decentralization? Some say it will "cost too much money." But I ask who can evaluate the cost to the Nation if we lose the next war, which we certainly might if Washington were smashed by an atom bomb.

Some say it can't be done because it is too "complex" a job. That is not an argument but an admission of incompetence. We

might remember the words of Napoleon: The word "impossible," he said, is not in the French dictionary. Nor for that matter, is it in the United States dictionary, as you men of Iwo Jima, of Normandy, of Anzio, of the Argonne Forest, of Chateau Thierry, know so well. The word American still ends in "I can."

There are those who say that the trend toward centralization will automatically check itself and has already done so because of transportation difficulties in the big cities, parking problems, high rental rates, taxes, and so forth. But were we to simply allow the natural process to take effect, is there any telling how long we would have to wait before there was any substantial improvement over present over-centralized conditions? And whoever heard of preparing against the possibility of war by hoping and waiting for long term trends to take effect?

Some say why decentralize in view of the fact that the next war will be a bacteriological war as well as an atomic war, meaning that entire regions of our country will be simply obliterated with all life erased by toxic agents in the air, in water, in crops, in livestock. If you carry that argument to its logical conclusion, you might just as well say "why build any war plants, any tanks, or any war implements because after all, everyone is going to be killed by germ warfare or atomic radiation?"

Then there is the related argument that since there is no defense against the atomic bomb or germ warfare, only some such stratagem as world government and the complete outlawry of war will work. There are any number of answers to that argument, but perhaps the best one is: "Tell it to the Russians." Obviously, neither the Russians nor a good many other peoples have indicated the slightest willingness to get even within yelling distance of world government. As a matter of fact, even if they were, would the simple declaration of a world government erase from the Russian mind the centuries of fear and hatred of the outside world? Would a simple declaration change the Marxist philosophy of conflict between capitalism and communism? Would it change Communist plotting substantially and do anything but make it easier? Would it, for that matter, change anything in the world and result in anything but a mere mechanical shell, a bare international skeleton of interest only to ivy-towered professors and hopeless idealists, but absolutely meaningless in terms of international political dynamics? If we can't, at this stage, make the United Nations entirely succeed, how could we make world government a success?

The world is still groping its way from a dreadful war. The peoples of the world still live at different levels—economically, politically, socially, religiously—some literally in the Dark Ages, others more enlightened, some respecting spoken or written pledges or contracts, others considering a pact (Kellogg-Briand, League of Nations, United Nations, or what have you) merely as a temporary expedient to be broken at one nation's convenience. These are not accusations; these are merely harsh, blunt facts.

MUCH TALK—LITTLE ACTION

The big trouble about this issue as with so many other issues is that we have had a superabundance of talk on it with little, if any, action. I personally have sought to secure the necessary action although I can't claim any notable success, nor am I satisfied with my own efforts along this line. Let me, however, cite these items:

1. I have written to Secretary of Defense Forrestal, urging him to influence his colleagues in the Cabinet to make the necessary plans for decentralization for purposes of national security. Secretary Forrestal responded by stating: "I heartily agree with you that decentralization of Federal activities is advantageous from the viewpoint of national defense." He added that he has given considerable thought to this question and has discussed it on numerous occasions with various advisers. He then went on to say that: "For the past 15 months the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been studying the dispersion and protection of military facilities and other national agencies, contributing to our national defense in the light of new developments in weapons and operational techniques." Secretary Forrestal stated further that he has appointed Secretary of the Air Force Symington as chairman of a small committee to work with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with the National Security Resources Board on the broader aspects of the problem. The Secretary went on to add that he was forwarding copies of my letter to various interested officials, particularly to the National Resources Board, which he indicated had final responsibility for the broader phases of this subject.

I might note in this connection that I had previously written to Director Webb, of the Bureau of the Budget, along this line. His reply was, however, confined particularly to the administrative difficulties involved in the process of decentralizing.

2. In 1947, the Presidential succession bill, making the Speaker of the House next in line to the Presidency after the Vice President, was up for consideration. At that time I introduced an amendment to the effect that if the entire specified line of succession was exhausted because an atomic bomb might erase all of the principal civilian officers mentioned in the bill, the highest ranking military officer in the United States would assume the duties of the Presidency until such time as a civilian officer for this post could be elected by the Congress. My amendment was defeated on a voice vote.

3. Obviously, if there were an atomic attack on the United States, the people of Wisconsin and the people of any other State in the Union could not possibly assemble to hold an election lest they invite their mass extermination. Suppose, then, there were vacancies in Congress to fill because a bomb had obliterated Washington and most Members of Congress? The State Law Section of the Library of Congress has reported to me that Wisconsin is the only State in the Union which does not have at present provision in its laws for filling a vacancy in the Senate by interim appointment by the Governor pending the holding of a general election. I have, accordingly, written to Governor Rennebohm, respectfully asking his consideration of initiating a change in our Wisconsin statutes.

4. I have introduced an amendment to the Constitution providing that the executive authority of each State shall issue writs of election to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives providing (and this is the new proposal) that the legislature of any State "may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct." At present, article 1, section (2), of the Constitution provides only for an election in the event of vacancies in the House of Representatives, and grants no power to the legislatures to delegate the power of temporary appointments or even mentions such a power.

5. I have contacted business leaders throughout the Nation for the purpose of encouraging them to decentralize their industrial operations to the maximum extent possible.

Government decentralization without industrial decentralization would be meaningless.

Enlightened business leaders have found that industrial decentralization pays off in countless ways—in better employee relations, for instance. At the same time, the question of whether or not it may be economical to decentralize a given function must be examined not only against the economic interests of a given industry, but against the over-all public interest. The public welfare is at stake—the welfare of 144,000,000 American people and of future generations.

6. I have written to the Director of the Federal Works Agency, General Fleming, asking for a thorough review of the entire transportation network from and to Washington. I mentioned specifically that I believed we should have a link with the Pennsylvania Turnpike directly to the Capital both for peacetime and wartime use. I have not, as yet, heard from General Fleming.

I will continue my efforts along these lines.

WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

The big question, the only question right now is, What are we going to do about all this? Are we going to "beat the winds" with a lot more talk and no action? Are we going to confer at round tables for the next 10 years, so that perhaps in 1960 we may have achieved a fair degree of decentralization? Or are we going to set the wheels rolling right now on a prompt military-type schedule? Are we going to act as if we were in a military crisis (as we are), as if we were faced with the possibility of invasion (as we are), as if we did not have time for a lot of foolish jawing (as we do not have time)?

I believe that every one of my readers in their own spheres can think decentralization, talk decentralization, and urge decentralization among their friends, their associates, their elected representatives, and the executive branch of the Government.

I believe that:

1. There should be immediately constituted a Government council on decentralization to consist of representatives of the principal departments and agencies of Government and whose primary unit would be a military committee on decentralization. This committee should formulate the basic plans and schedule and then should consult with the over-all council on speedy decentralization so that within a relatively short time, Washington, for example, would have no more than, let us say, one-third the present number of her Government workers.

When I say that the Federal Government must decentralize, I do not only mean that it must disperse its offices to smaller communities. I mean that it should get rid of some functions altogether. This, however, does not mean that it must give to the States or the localities vital defense functions or other functions which it alone can handle. At the same time, Uncle Sam must seek the active cooperation of the States and localities to take over a lot of the workload that should not be a Federal responsibility and that can best be handled at the State and local levels anyway.

2. I believe that the President's Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch, headed by our distinguished former President, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, should in the course of its work, consider this problem and coordinate its work with the Council on Decentralization.

3. I believe that every committee of the Congress should work with the representatives of the Government department and agency within its jurisdiction, e. g. the Interstate and Foreign Commerce with the Commerce Department, to help lay plans, i. e. budgetary allocations, etc. to speed decentralization.

4. I believe that the Congress should take the lead in planning for decentralization of the legislative branch of the Government. A joint committee of the Senate and House should plan to decentralize the legislative process, that is, to make plans, for example, for legislation by television so that, for instance, Senators and Congressmen from 30 or 40 points in the country might be able through the medium of television, to pass the necessary laws in the event of attack. This example of the Congress should be duplicated, I believe, by the Supreme Court.

We must have checks and balances available in this country against the possibility of dictatorship and ready to operate instantaneously in the event of attack. That is why, for example, I suggest that the Congress get busy pronto to decentralize itself so that it will continue as a vital force rather than as a pile of rubble.

5. I believe that such organizations as the Council of State Governments, the Association of County Officials, and so on, should be invited to submit their plans and to provide their cooperation in decentralization of the Government.

6. Simultaneously, the United States should consider all of the other necessary military items, e. g. appropriations, etc., for a United States offensive establishment second to none.

7. I believe that every citizen should be spiritually vigilant for the preservation of our Republic from attack from without and/or from attack from within.

CONCLUSION

Once there was a Wisconsin man named Billy Mitchell, who broke his heart and gave his life trying to awaken his countrymen to the danger they faced from the Pacific; the danger in the air; the danger to Alaska. May the warnings of our present danger meet with speedier response than did his warnings of the danger of the past.

America prays for peace, hopes for peace, strives for peace. She hates militarism; she wants to produce for peace; for an ever higher standard of living for her own people and all the peoples of the world. But she has no alternative but to prepare adequately against whatever the future may bring.

We have not since the War of 1812 fought a war with a foreign enemy on our own soil. The next war, if it comes, may be fought and will be fought in your city and mine; in Milwaukee, Madison, New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, San Francisco, St. Louis, Baltimore, Cleveland, and yes, principally in Washington, D. C.

What are we going to do about it?

Share Croppers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most successful cotton growers in the South is my neighbor, Mr. Oscar F. Bledsoe, III, of Greenwood, Miss., who operates a plantation that has been in cultivation for 98 years. He has just completed his fiftieth crop. The following statement by Mr. Bledsoe was carried in the January 1948 Staple Cotton Cooperative Review, published by the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association at Greenwood, Miss. The accuracy of his statements will do much to dispel the prejudice, ignorance and misunderstanding growing out of the share cropper system in the Cotton Belt.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the said statement as follows:

STRICTLY PERSONAL

(By Oscar F. Bledsoe III)

There is so much misinformation about the share cropper that I had my auditor give me a simple financial statement of my tenants' income and expenses.

My plantation is 98 years old, and this is my fiftieth crop. There are some grandchildren and great-grandchildren of my father's slaves included in this statement.

The cotton crop this year is below the average yield, but the prices are above parity which will make a fair offset.

The tenant's income per acre was $101.70. His account (living expenses and doctor's bill) was $57.45 per acre, which left a savings of $44.25 per acre, or 43 percent of his earnings. Does the city white-collar worker save this much out of his earnings? Outside of his own crop, the tenant worked in plantation crops and earned approximately $10 per tenant cotton acre.

In 1849 my grandfather paid 25 cents per acre for this woodland. After the Civil War, my father paid from $5 to $10 per acre for partly cleared land, and, at the beginning of World War I, I paid $40 per acre for nearly all cleared land. All land purchases were made during low-priced cotton, and bought for cash.

This year the tenants cleared above all living expenses considerably more than the highest price I paid for the land. There are very few Negro landowners in the Delta, yet if their race were thrifty they would easily own the Delta. Based on the amount of money I have paid them above their living expenses during the last 50 years, they could have bought the plantation nearly five times, based on the value of land at the time of the earnings. This period covers cotton prices from 5 cents to 86 cents per pound. Nevertheless, the Negro is the happiest, most carefree, and has the best disposition of any race in the world.

For the younger folks, this is a historical record that I hope will be of some benefit to them, especially during this period of inflation.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Millville Daily Republican. This is an intelligent examination of the European program, which I submit for the information of the House:

If the United States is to do all of the things for others it is expected to do, it will be necessary to send out an emergency call for several miracle men. Walter Winchell contends that the reason vaudeville has been discontinued in the theaters of the Nation is because theater managers realize that they cannot compete with the comedy in Washington. Daily it becomes more evident that Mr. Winchell is not kidding.

America, it would seem, is expected to feed the entire world. Yet this Nation produces only 12 percent of the world's food supply. There are 140,000,000 mouths to feed in the United States. There are three hundred and fifty million in Europe and four hundred and fifty million in China. The answer is obvious. Efforts on the part of this Nation to feed Europe and China mean shortages here, and shortages here mean only one thing—increased prices.

The average American is a generous soul. He will share his last loaf of bread with a needy neighbor, providing the neighbor is making an effort to help himself. The average American is, at the same time, an industrious and energetic individual. He is a go-getter and anything less than an honest effort by the fellow next door is usually viewed with disapproval.

We know Europe is hungry and most of us are willing to extend the hand of fellowship. But we expect our hand to be grasped by one that is calloused and streaked with the honest grime of labor.

Restoration of production in Europe is being hamstrung on every side. The Russians are looting, farms are being broken up, and excessive controls are being imposed by governments. Money, no matter in what quantity, will not correct this. Food is an excellent idea providing it reaches those who need it most. Aid sent to Greece is still standing idle in storage, according to reliable reports from that country.

Using Yugoslavia as an example, there are those who insist that unless food is sent to the Yugoslav Government its people will starve. Yet Yugoslavia conscripts an enormous standing army from men who would otherwise work on farms. The result is that Yugoslavia's food problem is solved by outside gifts while its manpower and financial resources are used to maintain a strong military.

The following statement was made nearly 30 years ago, in 1919 to be exact, but it is just as opportune today:

"The United States is disinclined to entangle herself further (after recent experiences) in the affairs of Europe. There is no guarantee that Europe will put financial assistance to proper use, or that she will not squander it and be in just as bad a case 2 or 3 years hence as she is now. In short, America would have postponed her own capital development and raised her own cost of living in order that Europe might continue for another year or two the practices, the policy, and the men of the past 9 months.

"If I had influence at the United States Treasury, I would not lend a penny to a single one of the present governments of Europe."

The above is not the statement of an American isolationist. It is that of the most influential British economist of the last generation—John Maynard Keynes.

Should We Outlaw the Communist Party?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of this week the Subcommittee on Legislation of the House Un-American Activities Committee will begin public hearings on various bills which have been introduced in the House and are designed to curb or outlaw the Communist Party in the United States. The subcommittee consists of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], and myself as chairman. I should like to discuss some of the problems which

the subcommittee faces in considering this proposed legislation.

It is the function of our subcommittee to conduct hearings on this subject, to make a thorough study of all the issues involved, and then to determine what, if any, legislative proposals should be reported to the full membership of the House for consideration. In making a decision we believe it is necessary to seek the answers to three basic questions: First, do American Communists constitute a real and present danger to our constitutional Government? Second, are our present laws adequate to cope with that danger, and if not, what new laws are needed which would meet the danger? And third, in enacting laws to curb communism, do we run too great a risk of weakening our own constitutional guarantees of freedom?

Our committee believes that the first question has already been conclusively answered. Last year the Committee on Un-American Activities, after a thorough investigation of the extent and character of Communist Party activities in the United States, filed a unanimous report in which we declared that, based upon the evidence, the Communist Party in the United States is the agent of a foreign government. The Communists of the United States owe their first and last loyalty to the Soviet Union. Their every act and every line is dictated by Moscow.

Today practically the whole world is engaged in a great epochal struggle between two systems of life, government, and economics—a struggle between our free democratic system and the system of totalitarian communism. As a member of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, last year I traveled through France, Italy, Greece, Germany, and other countries. There I observed first-hand the action of the Communist Party in those countries. I talked with the Communist leaders and their spoken words and actions, just like those of the Communists in the United States, reflect a puppetlike obedience to the string-pulling from Moscow. They have gained power in eastern European countries and seek to gain it in other countries by any means. If the expedient calls for violence, sabotage, guerrilla warfare, or whatever is necessary, they will resort to it if it will aid their cause. Democratic methods are employed by the Communists only when it serves them best.

To coconspirator of world-wide communism in America operates under the alias of the Communist Party of the United States. Unfortunately, a lot of confusion comes from the fact that we call it a party. Many people think that the Communist Party is a political party like the Republican or Democratic Party, but in fact it is not a party at all and has no resemblance to a political party. It is, indeed, a revolutionary conspiracy, Moscow-inspired and Moscow-directed. It is conspiring with the Communist parties of every country in the world to overthrow the Government of the United States, the Government of France, the Government of Italy or, indeed, any government which is not already communistic.

We must keep in mind that the Communist Party of the United States is no different from the Communist Party of Greece or France, and if the time ever arrives when they feel reasonably certain of success, they will resort to the same tactics here that they are now resorting to in those countries. Of course, it would be ridiculous for the Communists to attempt at this time to start a guerrilla war in the United States or to engage in open sabotage, but they have maintained and kept intact for 26 years in this country what J. Edgar Hoover has described as the most highly organized and disciplined fifth column in America, a fifth column which would be ready to go to work against us in the event of conflict with the Soviet Union. During these 26 years they have not stood as an isolated group to be pointed up for what they are—foreign agents and conspirators—but they have very cleverly integrated themselves into the political and industrial scene and today exert influence far beyond their mere numerical strength. They operate secretly and deviously. They camouflage their activites. They exploit our traditional American freedoms—freedoms which were intended to protect the citizens of this country, but not to shield the subverter. Recently, you have heard them speak a lot about freedom of speech. Freedom of speech is one thing and freedom of revolution is another. Freedom of speech to the Communists means freedom to destroy the freedom of others.

I think that we can say then that the Communists do constitute a real and present danger to our constitutional government. While no one would contend that they have the power to overthrow our Government at this time, we must remember that in the event of conflict with Communist Russia, American Communists will be enemies in our midst. They are right now doing everything possible to disrupt our economy, to create hatred and ill-will among our people, and to sabotage our foreign policy whenever it conflicts with that of Soviet Russia. At a time when Americans are making sacrifices to feed the hungry people of Europe the Communists in our midst are calling our aid program a Wall Street plot to dominate the world. They are doing this because they know that communism thrives and feeds on the misery, hunger, and desperation of the people, and that their only chance for success in enslaving the still free countries of Europe is to create and maintain confusion and chaos.

Going now to the second question: Are our present laws adequate to cope with the Communist danger, and if not, what new laws should be adopted?

There are a substantial number of people of unquestioned patriotism who believe that our present laws are adequate and that no laws directed against Communists, as such, should be adopted because of the possible threat to constitutional liberties involved in any legislation of this type. The committee will hear from witnesses who support that point of view, including, for example, Mr. Arthur Garfield Hayes, chief counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union.

There are, on the other hand, others who believe our present laws are not adequate. The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other organizations have long advocated outlawing the Communist Party. A recent Gallup poll reports that over 70 percent of the American people are in favor of such action. Yet we have had the testimony of experts, including that of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, who feel that this would be legislation which would do more harm than good, in that it would drive the Communist Party underground. Others say that the Communists are already underground and have been for years.

In considering the effectiveness of legislation which would outlaw the Communist Party, it is significant to note that when the Communist Party with only 300,000 members seized control of the Russian Government in 1917, it was a completely illegal party in Russia. In fact, those countries like Russia and Yugoslavia in which communism was once most ruthlessly suppressed are now the very countries in which the Communists have set up their strongest totalitarian governments. This would seem to indicate that outlawing the party is not the complete answer to the Communist question. The actual mechanics of outlawing a party is a very difficult one and the effectiveness of such legislation is considered very doubtful by many competent authorities on this question.

Another objection which has been raised to this approach to the problem is that we enhance their power by making martyrs of them if we outlaw the party. Still another objection is that if we follow this course we will be guilty of the same fault for which we criticize the Communist government of Russia. In other words, it is contended we cannot criticize Russia for not allowing democratic opposition parties to exist in their country if we will not allow the Communist Party to exist in our own.

I mention these arguments against outlawing the party, not because the subcommittee is committed in advance against such a program, but because I believe it is essential for the American people to realize that the problem is not as simple as it would appear on the surface, and that just passing a law against Communists may not be the complete answer to the question.

A second approach to the problem is contained in a bill which has been introduced in the House by our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota, KARL MUNDT, a member of the Un-American Activities Committee. This bill would require Communists to register as agents of a foreign principal.

Before and during the war, American Nazis were prosecuted under the McCormick Registration Act of 1938 which required registration of all agents of foreign governments. For some reason Communists have enjoyed immunity from the provisions of this act. Certainly if an American Nazi was an agent of a foreign government, an American Communist should be so classified. Congressman MUNDT's bill specifically designates Communists as agents of a foreign government, and requires all of them to register with the Department of Justice. If they do not, they are subject to a penalty of fine and imprisonment. The purpose behind this approach to the problem is to expose the Communists for what they are—to get them and their front organizations out in the open, label them as Communists, and let the good sense of our people take care of them. The fact that Communists act under aliases and object to disclosing that they are members of the party when questioned, for example, by congressional committees, indicates that secrecy and conspiracy is essential to their success. By denying them this cloak of protection we might be able to combat them more effectively than by outlawing the party.

In this connection, it is well to note that the Communists have gained their greatest power through their so-called front organizations. A front organization is one which to outward appearances is not Communist-controlled and which pretends to serve some worthy humanitarian purpose. Actually, the organization is controlled by the Communist Party, was originally financed by it, consistently follows the Communist Party line and does the party's work. Through such front organizations the Communists have been able to enlist the support of thousands of Americans who would not think of supporting an organization if they knew that it was controlled by the Communits Party. By exposing these front organizations for what they are through requiring their Communist leaders to register as agents of a foreign government, we might be able to cut away from the party the support of thousands of people who are now doing the party's work unknowingly. It can be seen, therefore, that exposure by the procedure set forth in the Mundt bill or in some other manner might prove to be an effective curb on Communists in the United States.

The final question we must consider is as important as the other two. Do we run the risk in adopting legislation against the Communists of impairing our constitutional guaranties of freedom? By removing the diseased fungus, communism, from the tree of democracy we must not permanently injure the tree itself. We cannot run the risk of destroying the rights and liberties we hold fundamental in America. By the same token, however, we must realize that the democratic governments of the world must act and act now if they are to avoid the tragedy of Communist domination which has engulfed so many European countries. Certainly it is a recognized fact in political philosophy that a government has the right to defend itself against revolution and it does not have to wait until the last minute to do so. It is wise to take precautionary measures, and therefore, I think that we here in the United States with the fresh memory of what has occurred in Europe the past 2 years, are justified in giving serious consideration to ways and means of fortifying ourselves against the world-wide conspiracy of communism. Whatever we do we want to strike at the very heart of this menace, but we want it to be in the democratic tradition, we want it to be clear-cut, and we want it to be effective.

In order that the subcommittee may consider these questions carefully and judiciously, we have invited some of the outstanding legal authorities in the country to advise us and to make recommendations as to what action should be taken. For example, Tom Clark, the Attorney General of the United States, will be the first witness and will testify particularly concerning the adequacy of our present laws to combat communism.

Among the other prominent lawyers who will appear are Robert R. Milan, the chairman of the Committee on the Bill of Rights of the American Bar Association; Donald Richberg; Louis Waldman; Morris Ernst; and Dr. Charles Collier, professor of constitutional law at George Washington University. These and other witnesses will appear before the committee to give us the benefit of their considered judgment as to the constitutional aspects of the specific legislation before us, as well as their opinion on the effectiveness of such legislative proposals in the event that they become law.

In order to explore every aspect of this question, we have also invited such prominent diplomats and political observers as Admiral William H. Standley, our former Ambassador to Russia; Adolph Berle, former Assistant Secretary of State; Raymond Moley; Dorothy Thompson; James Burnham; and Dr. William Elliott, professor at Harvard University and special consultant to the Select Committee on Foreign Aid. Representatives of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Federation of Labor will also appear and present their views. Ferenc Nagy, the former Premier of Hungary, will give the committee a first-hand picture of how communism engulfed his own country and will indicate what steps he thinks might have been taken to avoid that catastrophe.

From the foregoing discussion I think that it is clear that our committee intends to go to the root of the Communist problem in the United States from a legislative standpoint. We are going to hear witnesses who are for legislation of various types and those who are opposed to any legislation. We intend to make a calm, judicial determination of the issues involved because we realize that we are confronted by an unscrupulous, insidious enemy against whom ordinary measures will prove ineffective. While realizing that the danger is serious, we also recognize that it is a danger which must be met within the framework of our free democratic system of government. We know that the Communists would like nothing better than to be able to claim that legislation directed against them impaired the rights of innocent non-Communists.

I should like to emphasize that the committee will welcome an expression from any of the Members as to your views on this issue. This is a problem which affects our very security as a Nation and its solution must represent the best thinking of all our people.

The Late Archibald Johnston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

ARCHIBALD JOHNSTON: SYMBOL OF A GROWING CITY

In the death of Archibald Johnston, Bethlehem loses a man whose life was woven deep into the industrial and civic fabric of the community. For Archibald Johnston helped build the city's greatest industry, helped build the corporate city itself, and helped give the community a blueprint for the expanding future.

Archibald Johnston, in many ways, was a symbol of growing Bethlehem, just as he was a symbol of the best in the American free-enterprise system.

He worked his way to the top in a tough, demanding industry, in a day when hours were long and mechanical and electrical aids few. Muscle and sweat were the main ingredients in refining steel from ores and other materials when Archibald Johnston made iron and steel his life's work. He saw the old Bethlehem Iron Co. become the giant Bethlehem Steel Co. and help win two modern wars.

With it all, he was a warm, interested friend, a friend of rich and poor, high and low, throughout the wide sweep of his acquaintanceship. In his latter years, he liked few things more than a visit from old friends. He was partial to those men of an earlier generation who worked with him and for him in building an industry.

An impression of him will linger long. It was the warm gleam which lighted his eyes as a gnarled, bent workman of an earlier day passed him on main street several years ago. "Hi, Tom," said Mr. Johnston. "Hi, Arch," came the response. Then a hearty handclasp and 5 minutes of eager conversation.

It was on the same occasion that Mr. Johnston had a short obituary item from the newspaper pinned to one of his vest pockets. Pinned there, we are sure, so that he wouldn't forget to send flowers or other expression of his loss at the passing of an acquaintance or friend.

As the first mayor of the newly incorporated city just 30 years ago, Archibald Johnston made a great contribution. Until that time, he had been primarily concerned with production and jobs for the people who lived here. Now he became concerned with living conditions and services for the people, through their infant municipality.

He envisioned a beautiful, safe, healthful, and happy community. He wanted Bethlehem to be a better city in which to live and work.

In his inaugural address in January 1918, after his election had been prompted by petition of the people, he set forth his dreams: a system of parks, a good water supply, a sewage disposal plant, improved streets, health measures, and others. He wanted efficiency in government, too, and good men in office. And he served 4 years as mayor, without salary.

Mr. Johnston was energetic, hard-working, a man of action. He lived to see some of his dreams for Bethlehem come true. He lived to see the old Bethlehem Iron Co. become the hub of America's second largest steel producer. He lived to see the city become a better place in which to live and work. He

was a warm friend; a generous benefactor in a quiet, unostentatious way; a keenly interested citizen of the city and the world; and a symbol of his times.

Bethlehem will miss Arch Johnston.

Congressional Action on Displaced Persons Must Not Be Delayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, since the report of the Special Committee on the International Refugee Organization and Displaced Persons of the House Foreign Affairs Committee there has been a crystallization of sentiment in the country in favor of emergency legislation to admit a fair share of the DP's outside the nationality quotas. Much tragedy is being caused by our delay in enacting a measure of elementary justice. Endorsement by the A. F. of L., CIO and American Legion has now invalidated the arguments about jobs and housing made against legislation to admit DP's. The Stratton bill, although extensive hearings have been held on it, has not been reported out. A piece of evidence showing the urgency of action is the following story from the Washington Post, of February 1, 1948:

THE RED TAPE MURDER OF A DP'S SOUL
(By Fred Hechinger)

PLAINVIEW, TEX., January 31.—This is a report of one single European tragedy, but the reader may multiply it many thousand times.

What makes this case so poignant and close to the home of American consciences is that it happened way out here in Texas—and in Munich, Germany. It involves the murder of a hopeful boy, and the killer is red tape.

It is a particularly horrid murder because the victim is still alive and may remain alive for a long time (or perhaps just a few days), but his soul and his hope are dead.

Here are the records of the case.

The first witness is William Marshall, president of Wayland College at Plainview. Last year he authorized the selection of a talented displaced person of college age to be brought to Wayland for free education at the Baptist school.

The second witness reported a few weeks ago. He is Capt. Jack Moses, Baptist chaplain of the American air base at Munich. He picked young Visvaldis Paukulis, parentless and displaced native of Latvia, for the scholarship. The consulate promised to proceed without delay.

Visvaldis went to the Munich immigration center, stayed for several weeks, completed his processing for travel. The American boys at the air base responded with typical generosity, collected the money for his passage. Everything was set.

VANISHED HOMELAND

Then young Visvaldis was called to the United States consulate. He was informed that he would not be able to go, "because all who went to the States as students must have a country to return to." This boy has lost his country. It is now part of Russia. One of the witnesses asked whether Visvaldis' (and all the others') passport some 30 years from now would list "displaced" as his nationality.

The Air Force boys "appealed." They took the case to the Military Government, but received the same answer. The best they could get was the promise that the case would be reopened in 6 months. It was hoped that the policy regarding DP's might have changed by that time. "Policy" is a cruel word.

This correspondent regrets to add to the testimony that the same office which first assured Visvaldis that he could go to the United States finally turned down his application. There is no malice in this report, for it is obvious that a kind and reasonable official heart has reluctantly been conquered by the rule book.

A RARE OBITUARY

This case is peculiar in that the victim issued a statement after his soul was killed. It is in a letter of December 3, 1947, from Paukulis in Munich to President Marshall. It is a rare document and should be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"My joy and happiness was undescribable," the boy wrote. "The letters were to open the door to my future; satisfy my longings for knowledge and education; bring me out of this war-torn Europe, where famine, disease, and death have made themselves the rulers; give me home and chance to live.

"But look what happened! Very seldom was I so near the fulfilment of my dreams. I didn't know and couldn't even imagine that someone is already waiting there to say just a plain 'No.'

"At the first moment I didn't believe my own ears, but when the explanation followed I felt like a man being pushed down from the cliff into the sea. Fifteen minutes later I was in the street again, disappointed, confused, and hardly able to stop the tears into my eyes. * * * Why? Just because there was a law. A law just as cold as it could be killing. * * * Because I happened to be a displaced person without a home or place to live. Because I am unfortunately a Latvian nationality. * * * This law doesn't know grace. It ties the hands of those people who would sincerely like to help me. It doesn't feel."

COMFORTING BARRICADE

"Man made this law with purpose to feel comfortable and undisturbed behind its walls and I feel sorry for myself that it took me such a long time to realize the existence and thickness of these unbreakable strongholds. * * *

"There would be a reason and a goal. Now I am sitting alone at the seashore giving the last farewells to those who were luckier than I. Two years I waited. Two of my best years for education have gone into salvage. Time which will never return * * *

"My heart has to be brought into the country of freedom and liberty. As long as I physically shall exist, the fight will never cease, for I know the sun is there! It may take me years and years to break the clouds. * * *

"I owe you much gratitude for your kind letter and interest you showed in my case. I am very thankful, too, to our chaplain, Jack Moses, who is doing his best to help me to get to the States and preparing me for the studies in your college. Let us hope that Congress will improve the immigration law in this session and fulfil the dreams of many young ambitious men, who'd like to become valuable citizens of the United States of America."

EIGHTY THOUSAND SIGNATURES

The letter is signed "V. Paukulis"; but there are some 80,000 invisible signatures below. They belong to "unaccompanied, displaced children." They implore; they hope; they wait; and they die—spiritually and morally. In time many will really be dead.

The case of Paukulis versus The Rule is neither new nor unique. But it shows one single victim, and the specific instance has more meaning than the plight of anonymous masses.

Visvaldis Paukulis is a distinct person, although "displaced" and of no country. He is not a statistic. Perhaps I know him. He may be one of thousands whom I recently visited in their hopeless asylums in Germany. He may be one of those who have been haunting me.

I release his letter, his case, his file, his legal murder—to haunt Congress.

Must We Have Fuel Oil and Gasoline Shortages?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, last summer the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the Interior had knowledge of the impending shortage of fuel oil this winter. Director Max W. Ball has recently testified that the American people may expect like fuel oil shortages during the next four or five winters. What did Secretary Krug or Director Ball do to prevent the present shortage? What are they going to do about those they prophecy for the next 4 years? We know what they did not do. They did not prevent the sale of 80 or more government-owned tankers to foreign interests last summer. If 10 of them had been available for use on the Atlantic Seaboard since early December, much of the present trouble caused by lack of transportation would have been overcome. Congress authorized by law the sale of these tankers but had every right to expect that any sales would be made subject to the needs of our people. The Maritime Commission was ordered by the administration to sell them against their better judgment. I would suggest that the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Oil and Gas Division check periodically on the availability of fuel oil transportation in order that this phase of the present oil shortage will not plague us next winter.

We are told that control of the oil industry in the United States is concentrated in 17 major oil companies, and that these companies have entered into a voluntary agreement to act jointly in providing fuel oil and kerosene for individual hardship cases and for independent dealers whose sources of supply have dried up. This agreement was unlawful until at the recent special session of the Eightieth Congress we passed a law which permits such voluntary agreements with the approval of the President. Until Congress provided this means of granting relief in the oil shortage, the companies were barred from concerted action because of the Sherman Antitrust Act and kindred laws. If Secretary Krug believes such an agreement would be helpful next winter, he might bring the matter to the attention of the oil companies now.

A committee of Congress has also suggested that exports of petroleum products from the United States be restricted to such an extent that our own people shall not face a scarcity for domestic consumption. A law has been on the statute books for some time giving such control through issue of export permits. Perhaps the proper and judicious exercise of its lawful control over permits for oil exports by the Department of Commerce would have prevented our shortage of fuel oil this winter and the threatened shortage of gasoline next summer. If the Secretary of Commerce fails to protect the American people after all the hardship he has helped to cause this winter, the present administration cannot avoid responsibility for such a shortage. Canada recently has cut its oil requirements from the United States voluntarily—some evidence that such large exports should not have been permitted. The American people now know too well about the causes contributing to shortages.

Today we find the major oil companies rearranging the percentage of oil products from the crude oil which they refine in order to obtain more fuel oil and less gasoline. If this step had been taken by all of them when the shortage became apparent, perhaps we would have had no fuel-oil shortage at all. They are rushing ahead with such a program today and doing a good job of it—for which President Rathbone of Standard Oil of New Jersey deserves full credit. But the major oil companies knew, not only what commitments each of them must meet to supply their fuel-oil customers this winter, but that they were the real source of supply for all fuel-oil users in the United States, including those who receive their household supplies from independent retailers. Unless independent dealers are to be forced out of business, the major oil companies must provide for their needs the next four winters. If the companies need help in determining how much oil will be needed, Director Ball or some other Government official should furnish the statistics and other information. Each company plans to make money for its operations, but when a great segment of the national economy is controlled by only 17 companies—not only the oil industry, but the automobile industry and the house-heating industry, to cite two examples—it is up to those 17 companies to provide properly for the needs of all consumers of oil products. The 17 companies must not concentrate on the best paying products. Each company must carry its share of the less profitable oil products. If the companies cannot figure out a system which will prevent shortages, the American people may ask for some further supervision from Congress.

The oil companies need steel to expand. I think the steel companies should provide the amount to which they are entitled after considering the demands of others. We hope to have atomic power and heat in 20 years, not during the next four winters. Secretary Krug has suggested the investment of $9,000,000,000 for making oil products from shales and coal. That suggestion may be sound, but it is not going to furnish an alibi either for this year's shortage or those of the next 4 years. Let us have a proper, fair, and efficient management of our present oil industry and see if these present and future oil product shortages cannot be eliminated.

And while we are about it let us check on the prices of oil products. With capacity business, no sales resistance to overcome, even in a period of inflation, are the recent price increases for fuel oil and gasoline justified? Why are the prices of so many companies always the same? Is there need for a price-fixing body?

I think the American people who support this great industry are entitled to answers to the above questions from the Government and oil company officials who have permitted the present fuel-oil shortage to occur. Let us have an accounting now and not after the next and the next and the next shortage.

May I add that Americans are thoroughly aroused over the present crisis and are raising some interesting questions. The following editorial is from the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of January 28, 1948:

PLENTY OF GAS, LITTLE OIL

Just so long as officials of the major oil companies remain silent and conceal the real reasons why a fuel-oil shortage has been foisted upon New England and many other sections of the country this winter there is nothing left for the public to do but conjecture—and that is just what they are doing.

If the oil men should start talking, they will have a difficult time trying to reconcile the plentiful supplies of gasoline with diminishing supplies of fuel and range oil, as retail dealers struggle to keep their customers satisfied—and warm.

A householder who has gone modern by installing an oil-heating unit in his basement or a burner in his kitchen range is finding it next to impossible to obtain the quantity of oil he needs in order to keep his home comfortably warm. He has been told that he must curtail his usual consumption by at least 15 percent because the supplies are 15 percent below normal.

It is reasonable to assume that virtually every householder who has oil heat also owns an automobile. Does he have trouble getting his gasoline tank refilled when he is in need of fuel to keep his car in operation? Of course not! He can drive up to any filling station in the city, or in the area, whether he is a regular customer or not, and get as much gasoline pumped into his fuel tank as he wants and is able to pay for. He isn't asked to cut down his consumption of motor fuel. In other words, he finds that in petroleum circles there isn't even the remotest suggestion of a gasoline shortage. Why, then, must he shiver at home, he wants to know, when he can drive his car as much as he pleases and whenever he desires for pleasure purposes. It doesn't make sense.

He also knows that most of the gasoline filling stations are owned or controlled, or operated indirectly, by the major oil companies. He wonders, too, why they keep their filling stations brightly illuminated, many of them until midnight, when brown-out conditions should prevail, if the fuel conservation program is to be effective.

It apparently simmers down to a question of plenty of gasoline for pleasure driving, but a lack of fuel oil for heating purposes. Why? The obvious answer is that the margin of profit from manufacture and sale of gasoline is greater than from fuel oil, and the oilmen apparently are more interested in profits than they are in the welfare and comfort of their customers.

It is highly encouraging to note, in dispatches from Washington, that an immediate ban on all exports of petroleum products has been recommended to the House Interstate Commerce Committee, and that Secretary of the Interior Krug has asked Congress to set machinery in operation to build an American synthetic-oil industry so that ultimately it will not be necessary for the country to be placed at the mercy of the monopolistic oil interests.

The trouble is, however, that the Federal Government is a little tardy in initiating these moves. As a result, little, if any, relief can be expected this winter when fuel oil is badly needed to keep homes properly heated. Foresight on the part of our leaders could have prevented the present mess.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith remarks made on the Marshall plan in a radio broadcast over Mutual Station WOL, Washington, D. C., on Friday morning, January 30, 1948, by George E. Reedy, a distinguished news commentator.

Mr. Reedy's remarks follow:

President Truman has laid it on the line in no unmistakable terms. He has made it clear that he will accept no compromise on the Marshall plan. He wants all or nothing, and is not interested in splitting the difference.

In a sense it is well that the President has stuck his chin out in this manner. For whatever may be said about his attitude, it will at least clarify the issues. They are issues that badly need clarification.

The Marshall plan involves drastic changes in American policy—changes even more basic than those proposed by the late President Roosevelt with his Lend-Lease Act. The measure, if approved, will set America firmly in a path it has never trod before.

We have lost sight of that fact in the type of debate that is now waging around the proposal. Instead of fighting over the basic issues of the plan, we have talked only about the amount of money that will be appropriated.

The President has asked for $6,800,000,000 for a 15-month period. The opponents seem to have agreed to a figure of around $4,000,000,000 for a shorter period. Most of the arguments revolve around the nearly $3,000,000,000 difference.

Ordinarily, that is a sensible approach to legislation. The usual pattern is for the administration to ask for more than it actually wants. Congress usually counters by proposing less than it is prepared to give.

After a prolonged period of public debate a compromise is reached. As a rule it is not a bad compromise. It maintains legislative integrity and, by and large, reflects the real wishes of the people.

In the case of the Marshall plan, however, the administration is talking about one kind of a bill and Congress another. The figures, instead of reflecting different ideas of how much is necessary, reflect opposing ideas toward the legislation.

The administration wants the authority to intervene in Europe to try and buttress its governments against communism. In other

words, it is asking for final and complete abandonment of traditional American isolationism.

That is a project that will take money, and plenty of it. If it is worth doing at all, it is worth doing thoroughly. There is no conceivable way of cutting down the expense. It will require the mobilization of all American resources.

Those who are proposing a $4,000,000,000 measure are talking about something else altogether. Their project is designed to prevent starvation in Europe. Therefore, a searching scrutiny to hold expenses to the bone is possible.

The two groups involved in this debate have no common meeting ground, and should say so, once and for all. Anything less than that would be a fraud upon the public. It cannot help but have unhappy consequences.

There are two possible dangers inherent in the situation. One is that the administration would pass the Marshall plan under the label of a relief bill. The other is that the opponents would pass a relief bill under the label of the Marshall plan.

President Truman has rejected the first course. It is now up to the opponents to reject the second. On an issue so basic there should be no false labels. The Nation is entitled to a clear-cut "Yes" or "No" stand on the Marshall plan.

Price Control and Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, recently much publicity was given the testimony of a soup factory worker and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Cyrus J. Waud of Camden, N. J., who appeared before the Banking Committee of the Senate at a hearing on the return of price control and rationing, representing the CIO in its plea for the return of these controls. Mr. and Mrs. Cyrus Waud told of the hardship of the average factory worker in attempting to get along on $2,500 a year. In this morning's mail I received a letter from a typical above-average farm family, Mr. and Mrs. Forest L. Clough, Rural Route No. 1, Marshall, Mo., in opposition to price control and rationing, telling their story of the limitations and deprivations of the farmer and their fear of the return of controls with its uncertainty and impossibility of planning for the future. I quote:

MARSHALL, MO., *January 28, 1948.*

DEAR SIR: I noticed that a Cyrus J. Waud and family testified before the Senate Banking Committee on the high cost of living. Naturally, they will be high as long as the unions continue to demand and receive increased prices.

Poor Mr. Waud stated that he hadn't had a new suit in 4 years. Oh, dear. My husband has had only two new suits in the 20 years we have been married, a summer suit in 1932 and a winter suit in 1941, and one new overcoat—all that he has bought since 1928. Our son is 15 years old and he has never had a suit. Our two daughters wear made-overs, hand-me-downs, and sometimes we strike a sale and can buy them something. And I sometimes manage a new dress during the year. Cost—about $5. I wear my dresses for years, and love them. Right now I am wearing one that is over 15 years old.

But we do not want rationing. At least, we can save and buy an article of food, and during rationing the counters were bare.

We are farmers doing about as well as most of them, which is not so well financially, for our expenses are terrific. Everything we need is out of price because of the unions and strikes and wages. For instance:

1. Our machinery is old. We and most of our neighbors need new machinery, but it is out of price, if available and hasn't been sent overseas.

2. We are trying to save our land by soil-conservation methods, which are terribly expensive. Fertilizer, lime, etc, are expensive.

3. Our house is old and needs many repairs, but the price of lumber and everything needed, including labor, is out of price. Unions have put the price up.

4. Our youngest daughter has to fight off TB. We need a better heating system than two coal stoves, which halfway heat our house for over $150 a year. Price of coal? Unions demand and get more money.

5. We have three children to put through college—and education is going out of sight, but America needs educated people. How can they afford it?

6. We are still paying on the home we bought in 1924.

7. We have insurance policies to keep up, our car is 7 years old, our truck of 1929 vintage, our tractor 1936, etc. Expenses face us every way we turn.

Personal note: We won the balanced farming award in the county given by the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce in 1946. My husband was president of the county farm bureau of 1944-45. I have been president of the county council PTA units for the past 2 years. My husband and I have college degrees.

Oh, yes; like the Waud family, we don't drink, smoke, and rarely get to the movies. Our milk, too, is terribly high, for our cows cost money to buy and to feed and care for. We do usually have meat once a day—meat that could be sold. Right now oranges are 2 dozen for 39 cents, nice ones, but why not feed Lois Waud home-canned tomato juice, it has the same vitamins. Canned orange juice isn't so expensive; the 46-ounce cans (23 cents quoted this week).

No; we don't want rationing. Just let wages come down and everything else will automatically adjust themselves. Farm prices are always the first to come down or be hit, and the last to go up.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA N. CLOUGH.
(Mrs. Forest L. Clough.)

Mutual Understanding Essential to Success of UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of January 20, 1948:

HOW THEY GET THAT WAY

In a recent letter to this paper, Representative MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, stated that the important thing among people and nations is not to agree but to understand. For whereas it is utopian to hope for complete agreement, there is no reason why we cannot and should not learn more about what our world neighbors are thinking and why they are thinking that way, thus providing the climate for peace.

This is so elementary a truth that it is almost platitudinous, yet so infrequent a practice that it is almost revolutionary.

There are 57 members of the United Nations today, and that too often means 57 varieties of thinking based on the supposed primary interests of 57 nation-states. Yet the real primary interest of all of them is peace. Secretary General Trygve Lie has declared forcefully that the individual can help to attain this goal through his understanding not only of the world organization but of the other member nations.

With this simple fact in mind, and without waiting for one's neighbor to do the same, the individual can make a conscious, determined, unremitting effort to learn how his world neighbors get that way—and how, for that matter, he gets that way himself.

Wanted: A Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert M. Grannis, which appeared in the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Eagle of February 1, 1948, entitled "We Need a Leader With Gandhi's Courage":

WE NEED A LEADER WITH GANDHI'S COURAGE—HE HAS TO BE BIGGER THAN HIS PARTY AND RISK BEING A MAGNIFICENT FAILURE

(By Robert M. Grannis)

Gandhi was unconventional, unafraid. He had the courage of his convictions to such an extent that he refused to be moved from his selected path in life by the great possibility that one day he might be listed as one of the world's colossal failures.

We could use a few men like Gandhi in the United States. But, unfortunately, by our so-called civilized and ultramodern standards here anyone in public life who conducted himself like Gandhi would be considered a fool and a crackpot.

Our system—our lack of the spiritual approach to issues that confront us—does not encourage the development of leaders who hew to a line come what may. As a result, the era of great men in America is on the decline and our Nation is less strong in a moral sense than it should be.

The modern leader in political life in the United States believes that in order to survive he must travel in many directions at the same time. Sometimes his dashes down side roads become so frantic he makes himself ridiculous. Gandhi was never frantic or ridiculous. He cloaked himself in the dignity of his beliefs and looked all men in the face.

We haven't had a man like that since Lincoln. If there is another on the horizon, he is as yet invisible. I think that if Gandhi had lived and worked in the United States, we would have seen only that he was an eccentric, that he wore a strange garb, and that perhaps there was something wrong with him mentally. Quite probably he would have been investigated by Congress, because he

was against so many things that make for chaos in a man's life.

Today the world's top help-wanted advertisement calls for a man who will dare to be a magnificent failure. The job appropriately should fall to an American, because Europe and Asia are much more tired and bewildered than we are. The man to fill the bill has got to be bigger than the party behind him and he's got to be strong enough to act today for the benefit of the people of the future.

The job is a killing one. He won't get much help at first because he, too, will be considered a fanatic, perhaps a dreamer. Facing him is a United Nations just born and almost ready for the grave because there is no one with enough courage to say that it can and must be made to live and work.

It is so much easier and so much more in keeping with the times to fall back on the obvious—unilateral force, which in world history is the nearest thing to perpetual motion man has ever discovered.

The United States was instrumental in setting up the United Nations. It came into being at a time when people were so war weary that it was easy to sell despite the dismal failure of the last attempt which was called the League of Nations.

But somewhere along the way leaders became appalled by their own idealism and reached the conclusion that the world wasn't ready for anything so moral as permanent peace plans participated in and upheld by all nations. They let the veto power stand and stood idly by while UN degenerated into a brawl more fitting to the back room of an old-time saloon.

UN is just a name now for lack of a fighter who won't give ground. This man we need doesn't have to forego the common-sense necessity of keeping America strong for the battle against communism. He doesn't have to give away anything we should keep for ourselves.

But he has got to risk being a colossal failure in the belief that nations can line up for peace as well as for war. Is there such a man in America?

Mr. Speaker, this is but one more well-reasoned warning that the Charter of the United Nations must be strengthened and implemented if it is to become a world-wide force for peace.

Surely, somewhere in this great land of ours there must be someone who can rally popular opinion to this cause.

The Wright Brothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission of the House, I insert in the RECORD a brief reference to the late Orville Wright. He, with his brother, Wilbur, spent boyhood days on a farm in Henry County, Ind.

The recent death of Orville Wright, co-inventor of the airplane, stirs poignant memories for many an older resident of Henry County, Ind. It was there, on a farm near New Castle, that Wilbur Wright was born, and with his late brother spent several years of childhood. It was there, too, that as youngsters they conceived the dream of building a flying machine for men—a dream kindled by the gift of a propelled toy from their father. Not until a later day, when the Wright family had moved to Dayton, Ohio, were the brothers in position to demonstrate their inventive daring in a practical way, but to the lasting credit of Henry County, it was there that their idea was born, and it is there today that a modest monument stands in loving memory of their great contribution to the progress of civilization.

Problems of the Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement pertaining to an address made by me to the American Legion, Clinton, Mass., January 24, 1948:

Speaking at the past commanders dinner of the American Legion in Clinton last night Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN deplored conditions in the Veterans' Administration which are hampering efficient attention to the problems of the veteran. PHILBIN also touched upon and praised the Legion's aggressive campaign against communism and subversive activities. Demanding a strong impregnable national defense the Clinton Congressman declared that we should not adopt a defeatist attitude toward the achievement of an enduring peace which he stated the Nation should be prepared to work for unceasingly in spite of current discouragements.

PHILBIN said in part:

"It is fitting that we should pay our tribute to all the past commanders of Clinton Post, American Legion for the faithful, effective service which they rendered to the great American causes for which the Legion has stood throughout the years and at present. It is gratifying to note that their good work is being ably and forcefully continued by the present commander. I am proud to extend my congratulations, felicitations and best wishes for the future.

"Traditionally the Legion has been the staunch friend of all the veterans and the protector of their rights. That is why we must view with hearty approval the most recent efforts of the State Department in conjunction with other service groups to adjust the affairs of the Boston offices of the Veterans' Administration. We all readily agree that there is no more sacred trust that any of us have than the proper and adequate care of our disabled and wounded heroes. Hospitalization and skillful medical and nursing care must be provided to these veterans with a minimum of delay and without governmental red tape. There is no valid reason why all matters affecting the rights, benefits, and privileges of our veterans should not be handled with efficiency, because the Federal Government provides billions of dollars annually for these purposes. Petty differences and contention between Government officials should not and must not be permitted to interfere with the prompt handling of veterans' claims on a humane and generous basis. I pledge my continued cooperation and efforts to the adjustment of the present difficulties which have impeded prompt consideration, adjudication, settlement, and payment of veterans' claims. We must have effective administration of all these matters.

"Let me allude briefly to the Legion's campaign against communism. Nothing is more important to the country at present than that all Americans interested in the preservation of our institutions should join with the Legion, other service organizations, and groups to break the influence of Communists in our governmental and civilian life, and banish this cancerous plague from our land.

"If we keep our Nation strong and impregnable, if we are prepared to meet any contingencies that arise abroad which may threaten our own security, we will command the respect of all nations in world councils, and we can move to check communism at home and abroad with greater confidence.

"While the world situation is steadily growing less favorable, because of the activities of organized communism, we cannot afford to be defeatists about the prospects for ultimate peace. Despite difficulties, obstacles, and set-backs, let us move with determination and persistence toward the goal of the enduring peace. Neither world communism nor any other force can be allowed to destroy the aspirations and ideals of peace, democracy, and freedom hallowed by the great sacrifices of your comrades."

Tax Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following account of the remarks I made at the National Association of Letter Carriers banquet at Fitchburg, Mass., on January 31, 1948:

Speaking before the National Association of Letter Carriers, Branch No. 16, in Fitchburg last night, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN praised the employees of the Federal postal service and stated that they are an outstanding group of Government workers devoted to serving the public in an important role which touches directly practically every person in the country.

Congressman PHILBIN, who returned from Washington over the week end especially for the carriers banquet, referred to the current debate on the tax bill which is taking place in the House of Representatives. He expressed the hope, for the sake of the people, that a satisfactory tax bill would be passed and signed by the President.

"I think it was former Chief Justice Holmes of the United States Supreme Court who said that 'taxes were the price of civilization.' That is undoubtedly true in a sense, but we must not forget that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Taxes alone do not make a civilization. The spirit and genius of the people and sound progressive leadership are necessary factors. It is utterly impossible to justify high wartime taxation of American working men and women and businessmen in time of peace. Our tax structure is based on the principle of ability to pay but in these days of high prices, I need not remind you that there are a great many of our humble citizens who do not possess the ability to pay such substantial sums out of their weekly pay envelope to the Federal Government without feeling a real pinch. These people, most of whom have families to support, are entitled to prompt relief.

"Our business groups are also entitled to consideration. Present tax rates are so high that many businesses after taxes do not have adequate funds for reconstruction, repair, renovation, or expansion. These burdens fall especially heavily on small growing business. Because of the vitality of American business in general and because of the fact that the Government financed so much industrial construction during the war, this burden and handicap has not as yet been too manifest. But unless we unshackle private enterprise, which in the last analysis is responsible for most of the high-paid, high-standard employment in this country, from oppressive wartime taxation and other unreasonable un-American restrictions and permit it to grow and develop along sound American lines the time will come when incentive will be discouraged, business activity will be stifled, and employment will be greatly curtailed.

"Our economy must expand and develop as a dynamic progressive organism. If we stand still we are in fact slipping back and that we cannot tolerate because the path of America is forward. If we but observe what is transpiring in many foreign nations where initiative has been destroyed, we will recognize the vital importance of keeping open the doors of opportunity to all who aspire to seek advancement in any sphere of American life. I hope that the House will be able after careful deliberation to produce a tax bill which will be satisfactory to the general public and which will be signed by the Executive. Millions of humble Americans are crying out for tax relief and they are entitled to have it."

Congressman PHILBIN assured the postal workers that he would continue to give his most sympathetic attention and support to legislation in which they are interested looking toward equitable adjustment of their pay scales, betterment of the conditions of work and improvement of their retirement system, which, he declared, was a vital part of the national social-security program.

PHILBIN urged his listeners to apply calm, considered judgments to current domestic and international situations. "Let us not lose our sense of balance," he said. "We have worked out great problems before and if we cling to fundamental principles of our Government and way of life, remain vigilant against subversive groups and intent upon keeping the Nation strong against enemies within our gates as well as those which may threaten us from abroad, we will be able to solve the problems of the present and future in a way that will assure to our Nation and all our people the continuance of full employment, high living standards, sound prosperity, and the preservation of cherished civil liberties and freedoms which mean so much to the average American."

Who Is Un-American Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the American Journal of Public Health for December 1947:

WHO IS UN-AMERICAN NOW?

On July 2 last "The Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments Authorized To Investigate Publicity and Propaganda of Federal Officials in Formation and Operation of Health Workshops" made a report to the Committee of the Whole House.[1] This report has somewhat serious implications—although these implications may be somewhat different from those which the subcommittee itself had in mind. The fact that the Journal of the American Medical Association has editorially summarized the report in question [2] warrants a study of its content.

There are essentially two sets of facts brought out in this report and used by its framers as the basis for an attack on:

1. The United States Public Health Service.
2. The Children's Bureau.
3. The Office of Education.
4. The United States Employment Service.
5. The Department of Agriculture.
6. The Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Board.

The first of these facts was that Surgeon General Parran on December 10, 1945, transmitted to all officers of the Public Health Service a copy of House Document No. 380 which was President Truman's message to Congress on a national health program. He said in comment, "Every officer of the Public Health Service will wish to familiarize himself with the President's message and will be guided by its provisions when making any public statement likely to be interpreted as representing the official views of the Public Health Service." Since June of that year (1945) all officers of the Service had been by Executive Order 9575, covered into the armed forces with full military rights and obligations. Even under civilian conditions, however, such a warning as that issued in December 1945 would have been entirely proper. The United States Public Health Service is a branch of the Federal Government, and it would be most unfortunate for any subordinate officer of that Service to make statements likely to be interpreted as representing the official views of the Public Health Service if those views were in opposition to those of the head of the Government, whether acting as Commander in Chief of the Army or in his normal civil capacity.

The official views of the Service on any technical matter must be formulated by the Surgeon General himself. If his views differ from those of his official political superiors, he can only resign. We infer from certain earlier writings of Dr. Parran that he did not feel the President's speech called for any such action. He might have taken much more vigorous steps. It would have been quite within his rights to point out that the need for some form of compulsory prepayment of medical costs is as important for the health of the American people as is the need for vaccination against smallpox. He did not follow any such course; he merely acted to protect the Service against the danger of possible criticism, by members of the Federal family, of the policies advocated by the Chief of State.

The second mare's nest uncovered by the subcommittee is the fact that between November 1945 and November 1946 a series of 26 workshops were held in various parts of the country, under the auspices of the Service, for the discussion of problems relating to medical care. We deplore the word "workshop"; but it has become a routine part of educational lingo. In any case, groups of citizens and experts in various areas of the field were convened and Federal employees participated in the discussion of methods by which the important issues concerned could be brought before interested groups, so as to stimulate thought. The subcommittee concludes that these discussions were planned subtly to generate public sentiment in behalf of what certain witnesses and authors of propaganda refer to as socialized medicine. By and by, the subcommittee is very fond of this phrase that certain witnesses and authors of propaganda refer to as socialized medicine, repeating it half a dozen times. It puzzles us a bit. In the language of bodies like this subcommittee, propaganda usually means the other fellow's argument; and no person well informed enough to discuss health insurance intelligently ever uses this phrase "socialized medicine" which has no intellectual content and is used only to stimulate the endocrines. There seems no valid reason why technical experts in the Government service should not meet with groups of interested persons to discuss pressing public-health problems. It is an important part of their duty to do so. No convincing evidence is adduced of the subtle generation of public sentiment; and whether we like the word or not, the workshop is about as good a medium for democratic discussion as has yet been devised.

All this is pretty small potatoes for the activity of a group of representatives of the American people, convened in a Congress which faces the gravest world problems which have ever confronted the Nation.

Even more serious, however, is the last paragraph of the subcommittee report. "Suffice it at this time for your committee to report its firm conclusion, on the basic evidence at hand, that American communism holds this program as a cardinal point in its objectives; and that, in some instances, known Communists and fellow-travelers within the Federal agencies are at work diligently with Federal funds in furtherance of the Moscow party line in this regard."

As to the Moscow party line, the members of the subcommittee will perhaps be interested to learn that the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. are the only two leading countries of the world which do not have some system of compulsory health insurance. They do not have it in the Soviet Union because they have a system of state medicine (which is radically different). For the United States to adopt such a plan would be to follow London, Paris, and the capitals of Holland and Sweden and Norway and Denmark—in direct opposition to Moscow.

As to the business of fellow-travelers, the actual evidence which the subcommittee has been able to collect is as follows. If it had any better evidence it would, no doubt have welcomed it. The facts submitted were as follows:

(a) An obscure member of the staff of the Social Security Board has been documented by the House Committee on Un-American Activities for almost uninterrupted association, since 1939, with various Communist and fellow-traveler organizations in the United States according to the subcommittee. How far such documentation may be justified we have no means of knowing. There is no evidence that he was ever condemned by any court; and it is easy to accuse.

(b) It was once suggested in an office memorandum of the Security Board that this individual might be sent to New Zealand to study its health-insurance program.

(c) The Social Security Board maintains close contact with movements for compulsory health insurance in other countries.

(d) Another employee of the Social Security Board once assisted Senator WAGNER in drawing up a health-insurance bill.

(e) Therefore, the Social Security Board is a Communist-front organization.

(f) Much of the literature used in the workshops was prepared by the Social Security Board. (This could scarcely help being the case since the studies made by this Board furnish the most authoritative statistical data we have, with respect to medical economics.) Unfortunately for the clarity of the subcommittee's conclusions, neither the suspected Communist nor the head of research and statistics participated in the workshops.

But (g) since the workshops used literature prepared by the Social Security Board (which had a humble employee accused of being a fellow-traveller) the United States Public Health Service which sponsors the workshops must be tainted.

And, finally, (h) since employees of the Children's Bureau, the Office of Education, the United States Employment Service, and the Department of Agriculture sent representatives to the workshops they are probably fellow-travelers, too.

On this house that Jack built (or shall we say that Jerry built?) the subcommittee bases its conclusion that "Known Communists and fellow-travelers with the Federal agencies are at work diligently with Federal funds in furtherance of the Moscow party line." Six bureaus of the Federal Government are pilloried because one employee of one of them has been charged with being a fellow-traveler, and the Attorney General has been officially asked to prosecute offending employees for taking part in workshops mentioned. The true motivation of the subcommittee is, probably, a quite different one. It appears to assume throughout that advocacy of health insurance is ipso facto an evidence of communism. If this be the case, President Truman should be impeached for his message of 1945; and, since the Seventy-ninth Congress did not condemn his address as emanating from Moscow, all its Members must be considered as fellow-travelers. Indeed, the Eightieth Congress might deserve the same designation, since its Members sit in the same Chambers with many who supported the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill and who must be ipso facto Communists.

The final paragraph of the report of the subcommittee is the text for a shocking circular sent out to all physicians and dentists by the National Physicians Committee. It makes those who respect and love the medical profession somewhat heartsick to see the names of 13 physicians (most of them of outstanding position in the American Medical Association) at the head of this broadside.

We have no sympathy with communism as a political movement. We believe that it is necessary to protect the United States against the influence of such citizens of our country as may hold secret allegiance to any foreign power. The spirit of totalitarianism is, however, even more dangerous than its puny human emissaries. If we adopt the methods of totalitarian ideology we are surrendering to the very worst element which is common to both communism and fascism. That is what is happening when we demand absolute conformity with the social program of one group which happens for the moment to be in power; stifle discussion, call everyone who differs a Communist and everyone who has ever been associated with any organization in which there was ever a Communist member, a fellow-traveler. Such an attitude abandons reason for ideology, and philosophy for perverted semantics. It overwhelms empirical evidence in a flood of catch-words. It enthrones emotion above reason, by discovering un-American art and un-American music and un-American science.

The writer of this editorial has behind him ten generations of New England stock. He learned that the American tradition meant freedom of thought and of speech (up to the limit of legally prosecuted action); that it meant open-mindedness and readiness to try experiments; that it meant initiative in the working out of the problems of society; that it meant experimentation and progress.

The other road—that of rigid conformity with the theory of a temporarily powerful group—of defining not only what a man must do but what he must think and feel—and with whom he may be acquainted—is the road to what is truly un-American. This was the technique of the Hitler regime in Germany and is the technique of the Communist leaders in Russia. Pray God, it may never become the prevailing mood of America.

[1] H. Rept. No. 786, 80th Cong., 1st sess., July 2, 1947.

[2] Journal of the American Medical Association 134, 15:1240 (Aug. 9), 1947.

The Pomona Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, many plans have been suggested to alleviate world-wide starvation. One of the most unique and constructive plans yet offered is the Pomona plan. This plan has been promulgated by the citizens of Pomona, Calif., and offers a new approach to this great problem.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a summary of the Pomona plan:

THE POMONA PLAN

This is a plan that will solve the world food shortage and avoid starvation in European countries, both this summer and also next winter.

Because the world food problem is one of the gravest problems facing the world today, and because the whole world is looking to the United States to help, and because the United States has had plans for the people of the United States to eat less and to observe such days as meatless Tuesday and eggless and poultryless Thursday, which are all of a negative nature and therefore of very questionable success, we have this plan to offer to completely alleviate the critical situation:

The people must eat more—more fruits and vegetables.

The people must raise more fruits and vegetables by planting freedom gardens here in America.

The people must have freedom gardens in Europe, also; and they can have them very easily if we will just send them the seed, fertilizer, and a hand cultivator.

Help them to help themselves—that is different than just doling it out to them. What we save in cereals and meats here by eating and growing our own fruits and vegetables in our own gardens we can send to Europe and supplement their fruits and vegetables that they can grow with the cultivators, seeds, and fertilizers we will send them. Then everyone can have enough to eat and still Americans will not have to do without things on Tuesdays or Thursdays.

So the Pomona plan advocates—

1. Eat more fruits and vegetables.
2. Plant freedom gardens in America.
3. See that the people in Europe have the cultivators, seeds, and fertilizer to plant freedom gardens in Europe.

Resolution on the Pomona Plan

Whereas sufficient food to prevent starvation of millions of people and substandard diets for nearly everyone is one of the gravest problems facing the world today; and

Whereas all eyes are turned to the United States of America to supply food and to prevent starvation and to lead the way back to plenty; and

Whereas plans and ideas have been suggested and put into effect such as the plan for the people of the United States to eat less and to observe such days as meatless Tuesday and eggless and poultryless Thursday; and

Whereas all such plans are of a negative nature and of questionable success; and

Whereas the function and purpose of all such plans are to reduce the consumption of cereals in the United States in order that they may be exported to feed the starving people of the various countries of the world; and

Whereas the members of the Pomona Junior Chamber of Commerce and the people of the City of Pomona, Calif., know that people are best served by helping them to help themselves to help and rehabilitate themselves; and

Whereas it is the desire of the members of the Pomona Junior Chamber of Commerce and of the citizens of the city of Pomona, Calif. to help alleviate world-wide starvation; and

Whereas the Pomona Junior Chamber of Commerce and the city of Pomona, Calif., have developed and organized the Pomona plan, which is a three-point program to induce the citizens of the United States to eat more fruits and vegetables, to plant and grow freedom gardens, and to aid the people in all of the needy countries of the world to plant and grow freedom gardens:

Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That in order to help alleviate world-wide starvation and in order to decrease the consumption of cereals in the United States and increase the exportation of cereals from the United States to the starving countries of the world, and in order to increase the available food supply both within the United States and within all of the needy countries of the world, that a national campaign, known as the Pomona plan, be started and conducted throughout the United States to increase the consumption of fruits and vegetables; that, in order to successfully carry out said campaign, the people of the United States be encouraged to plant and grow freedom gardens; and that in order to aid and encourage the needy peoples of the various countries of the world to plant and grow freedom gardens, the people of the United States prepare and ship to the people of the needy countries unit packages containing desirable vegetable garden seeds and garden cultivators and tools; and be it further

Resolved, That Armistice Day, November 11, 1947, be declared Pomona-plan day and that on said day 25 unit packages containing garden seeds and garden cultivators and tools be shipped to 25 needy cities of Europe; be it further

Resolved, That the citizens of Pomona urge the President of the United States and Congress to seriously consider the Pomona plan for a solution to the food shortage both in the United States and in Europe.

The Place of the United States in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on The Place of the United States in World Affairs, by H. R. Cullen, one of the most distinguished citizens of Texas, the address being delivered at a dinner given Mr. and Mrs. Cullen on January 22, 1948, by the Methodists of the city of Houston, Tex.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When Bill Blanton, Walter Colston, and Hines Baker told me that the Methodists of the city of Houston would like to honor the

Cullens with a dinner on January 22, they told me that I was expected to respond, after being introduced by Bishop Smith.

The first thought that came to my mind was that I wouldn't have to plead with our citizens to help save our present form of government and system of free enterprise, which I have been doing for the past 15 years. I came to this conclusion because not only the voters of the United States have shown that they were turning strongly to the right, but those of England, France, and Italy also have shown they were turning away from radicalism. I decided, therefore, that I would confine my remarks to the early life of Mrs. Cullen and me, which might be of interest.

But something of compelling force has caused me to change my plans and, for the time being, I must forget my memory lane.

Sunday morning, January 4, found us at our ranch. As is the custom, our caretaker on the ranch brought us the Sunday issue of the Houston Post, and I was not only surprised, but startled, to read an article by Marguerite Johnston, entitled "Texas' World Federalists Convene." I say I was startled, for the article gave the names of some of our leading citizens, whom I honor. I could not understand how they could be in sympathy with a movement, which would, beyond doubt, move the control of our country to some place in Europe or Asia.

Naturally, I was very much interested to learn who started the World Federalists, and as luck would have it, I found the answer in the Houston Post of January 21. It stated that Cord Meyer, Jr., of New York City, was president of United World Federalists, and that he was the author of a book entitled "Peace or Anarchy." I learned from his book that he served as aide to Commander Stassen at the convention that formed the United Nations Charter in San Francisco. He being formerly associated with Stassen brought to mind a letter that I wrote to President Truman in 1945, protesting the appointment of Harold E. Stassen as a member of the United Nations Conference, due to his philosophy. Let me read parts of this letter to you, which should convince you that Stassen and this young Cord Meyer have the same philosophy, and are political bedfellows:

"DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMAN: Harold E. Stassen, an appointee of the late President Roosevelt to the San Francisco United Nations Conference, has certainly destroyed his usefulness there by an article he wrote entitled, "The Cost of Lasting Peace", in Collier's Weekly of April 21, 1945.

"The following are excerpts from the abovementioned article:

"'As I stated in my March 7, 1945, address at the University of Minnesota, I believe one of the seven cardinal points of America's world policy should be: "That we do not subscribe to the extreme view of nationalistic sovereignty; that we realize that neither this Nation nor any other nation can be a law unto itself in the modern world; that we are willing to delegate a limited portion of our national sovereignty to our United Nations Organization, so that it may be effective in the tasks we expect it to accomplish. That we hold that true sovereignty rests in the people, and that there is and must be a law of humanity above and beyond the narrow rule of nationalistic absolute sovereignty. That man is in truth and in fact endowed, not by his nation, but by his Creator with certain inalienable rights.'"

"In the above quotation, Stassen says we should be willing to delegate a limited portion of our sovereignty to some world organization, and he contradicts this statement later by saying that we should all be ruled as subjects of the Creator.

"'So each nation must so limit its action that it does not injure its neighbors, and must respect and assist in developing laws and courts that are above the nation and draw their power from the people.'

"Even stumbling Henry Wallace, with his fantastic dreams, would not place our welfare in the hands of a foreign court, for it would be a foreign court, because of the fact that we would have less than 5 percent of the vote in such a court, if such vote were based upon the population of the world.

"'Let me also make it clear that I propose that the agency set up in this particular field will have world-wide jurisdiction, and that no nation shall be permitted to fly a commercial plane in international flight except under the jurisdiction of this agency.'

"If this would be effected, then we would not be permitted to fly a plane to Canada or Mexico without permission of the foreign court.

"'This approach will also require that we discontinue the notion that our country or any other country can, in a futile attempt to give false prosperity to a particular group within a country, suddenly jump up its tariffs, or devaluate its currency, or install embargoes upon any certain group of products, and thus bring suffering and depressions to other parts of the world.'

"Stassen, in this statement, offers to give the foreign court not only the right to levy all tariffs, but the right to control the monetary system of this country.

"'We must also recognize our responsibility to furnish a part of the police power of the world and to back up the United Nations organization in a system of justice and law that will be gradually developed.

"'I believe it would be very desirable if a small portion of our forces were actually assigned to the direct control of the military staff committee of the United Nations. Joining with similar small forces from other major nations, they would constitute a very effective deterrent to the small disorders that break out in the world. These small breaches of world peace are often the forerunners of major wars and do so much to break down the whole moral tone and code of world behavior.

"'We all recognize that the speed with which one or two squad cars can arrive at the scene of trouble is a greater deterrent to crime than the fact that a large citizens' posse can be organized after considerable delay. So, I believe we should definitely contemplate consigning small, fast, hard-hitting peace forces to the control of the United Nations organization, so that they can be used quickly and decisively for policing action in accordance with general policies which our Congress and our President establish in advance.'

"In this statement, Stassen is willing to create a world police force, resulting, naturally, in a horrible gestapo, subject to the dictation of the foreign court, but this he contradicts later by stating that our participation in such a police force would be in accordance with the general policies which our Congress and our President established in advance. This world police force would have the power to enter the United States at any time and put a stop to strikes, race troubles, or other disturbances subject to police action.

"I have emphasized the words 'foreign court,' for the reason that the foreign court will be created by a majority of the vote of the peoples of this earth, or by a majority of all the nations on the face of this earth, and in either event, the United States is a very small minority, not exceeding 5 percent, so if the 'crackpots', of whom we have so many in public life now, should have their way and create such a foreign court, it is natural to suppose they would demand and receive the greater part of the wealth of this country and if we should refuse their demands, we would naturally have to fight the balance of the world."

Since Stassen is running for nomination for President of the Republican Party, it looks to me like a concerted action on the part of these two men to further Stassen's interests in his political venture.

I will now quote one paragraph from the article about the Texas World Federalists, as appeared in the Post of January 4, spoken of before:

"Their common purpose is to achieve a sound, functioning peace by uniting the nations of the world under a single president and a single republican form of government."

Now since Stassen and Meyer and his United World Federalists are in favor of a world republic form of government, it naturally follows that the people of this earth should have a vote in electing officers to run the world government.

Let us digest this most important matter and try to ascertain what kind of president we would have:

Figures show the total population of the earth to be about 2,300,000,000. Figures also show that this country has a population of about 137,000,000, or only about 5 percent of the total population of the world, so that, naturally, on the first vote we would lose control of our Nation. There is no question but what the Asiatics would govern us, for they have a large majority of the population of the world, and the kind of Asiatics that Wendell Willkie spoke of in his book, One World. He said:

"Finally, everywhere I went in the Middle East, I found a kind of technological backwardness along with poverty and squalor.

"The reason was that they were in truth returning to Biblical times, where little has changed in 2,000 years."

What are these people in the Middle East, who have not changed any in 2,000 years, doing now? In China, atheism—in the name of communism—is fighting a death battle with the ancient religions. In India, the Moslems and Hindus are fighting a religious war. In Palestine, the Jews and the Arabs are also fighting a religious war. In other words, half the people of this world today are fighting each other due to religious superstition.

Now, I ask in all frankness, would you want these Asiatics, that I have just spoken of, as fellow citizens with an equal voice in your Government?

If the time ever arrives when the people of this earth decide to elect a world president, you can rest assured that Joe Stalin, or one of his kind, would be elected, for even if every voter in Italy, France, England, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Canada, and all the South and Central American republics would vote with the voters of this country, then we would have only 18 percent of the world vote.

Joe Stalin has so outmaneuvered our New Deal representatives in foreign countries, that I am sure the great majority of the Asiatics are sold on the idea that Joe Stalin is a friend of the poor man. In my opinion, if he is still alive, he would be the first president elected by the World Federalists.

Now I again quote from the article by Miss Johnston, who said:

"By these resolutions, the United Nations would be empowered to enact, to interpret, and to enforce world law."

Now what does this mean? It calls for an army strong enough to defeat any nation, or group of nations, and you may rest assured there would never be any American boys permitted to join this army.

If the time ever arises when we have a world president and a world court, and a world army, the first important business before this court would be the question, "Who owns the wealth of the world?" Well, you may rest assured that the court would order the division of all wealth, including the gold now buried in the mountains of Kentucky. It would assess us millions of bushels of grain, and millions of bales of cotton, in fact, it would finally reduce us to the level of those people in Asia of whom we spoke before.

For the past 16 years the philosophy of the New Dealers has taught and convinced

our good people that it is their duty to attend to everybody else's business, whether they like it or not; that our Nation should meddle and attend to the business of other nations, whether they like it or not, so now, if anyone believes in America and the Monroe Doctrine, as we have always done in the past, we are condemned as isolationists.

It has come to pass that the politicians of many nations of Europe and Asia, regardless of the wishes of the people, have decided to return their countries to the Dark Ages, and no nation or group of nations can stop this tragedy.

I hope no one will accuse me of being selfish, but it is my sincere opinion that sending billions of dollars to Europe or Asia is a great mistake and will do no good—it will only make weaklings of them. The $3,750,000,000 we sent England is now dissipated and apparently drove that Nation deeper into socialism. To substantiate this statement I will read from a letter from Sir Sydney Parkes, a most brilliant Englishman, ex-president of Lloyds Bank of London, now chairman of the board of the Bank of New Zealand, and chairman of the board of Crosse & Blackwell, Ltd., with a factory in Baltimore, Md., who writes me as follows:

"As you know, we are fast getting through our dollar loan and it looks as if we shall have to tighten our belts still further, because this country does not want gifts, nor further loans, which would increase our indebtedness and increase the amount of exports for which we get no imports in return."

Every banker and businessman of this Nation, who has taken time to investigate, will tell you that as long as this country has an indebtedness of some $258,000,000,000, it is not in a secure position, and that the $6,000,000,000 that are now contemplated sending to Europe this year should either go to retiring the Government bonds of this country, or else be put into atomic bombs and long-range airplanes to protect this country.

The course which we are following today is very pleasing to Stalin, for we are proposing to build up the countries in Europe—which Stalin expects to take over—by depleting our own national wealth and resources, which will place us inevitably in the situation of England of today. The time is overripe when the people of the United States should look to and protect in every way the interests of their own country.

I am very sincere in saying that the only hope for this world is for each nation to work out its own salvation, and for this country to withdraw our boys from overseas, develop the atomic weapons, and build airplanes that can carry them to any part of this earth; to return to the principles of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, and, then, with the help of God, with bravery, honesty, and loyalty, we shall be a shining beacon for all the world.

Embargo on Shipment of Arms to Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, several days ago I wrote the State Department a letter pertaining to the very important question of the embargo on arms to Palestine, and I have today received an answer from the counselor of the State Department. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the State Department and the letter from the State Department to me may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is written on a matter of the greatest urgency regarding which the State Department has, I believe, the power to effect swift remedial action.

At the present time approximately one hundred casualties are occurring daily in Palestine, and the death toll—Hebrew, Arab and English—has been averaging about 20 lives daily since the United Nations decision on Palestine. The situation evidently is rapidly deteriorating and may continue until chaos consumes the Holy Land.

Evidence also that this fighting was premeditated to prevent the realization of a Hebrew Palestine—even in its minimum form—is a matter of public record. I am referring to the threats of invasion and bloodshed by official representatives of the Arab League States uttered at Lake Success last fall, and the sanction accorded to this attitude by some British officials.

In view of "the current disorders in the Middle East," the State Department on December 5, 1947, placed an embargo on shipments of arms and ammunition "to the troubled areas" and discontinued the transfer of surplus military equipment outside the United States to designated states. This action applied to seven countries in the Middle East, including Palestine.

Inclusion of Palestine in this embargo was most unfortunate in the light of the actual situation. Regrettably, it appears that since VE-day the United States has transferred over $37,000,000 worth of surplus United States war property to Arab League States, prior to the December 5 embargo. Since that date the British Foreign Secretary has announced that British arms will continue to go to the Arab League States, and on January 12, British diplomatic sources in London confirmed that large military stores, reliably estimated as worth $25,000,000, are being supplied to three states capable of aggression against Palestine—Egypt, Iraq, and the unrecognized state of Trans-Jordan.

Hence it would appear self-evident that the present embargo is unilateral in effect, since it leaves potential victims unarmed and helpless against any carefully prepared and fully armed attack. Additionally, it implies that we will remain inert in the face of intensified attacks against the defenseless men, women, and children of Palestine. Such a stand will only serve to spur the aggressors in their incendiary course.

American public sentiment overwhelmingly favors the Hebrew cause in Palestine, not only for reasons of sympathy and humanity, but also because of the importance to the world of this initial test of a United Nations decision. Certain well intentioned Americans have sought to assist the embattled Hebrews by supplying munitions covertly. Similar sub rosa efforts undoubtedly will continue, unless the Government remedies the situation officially, because American citizens are drawn by tradition to every struggle for freedom and justice.

The Hebrews of Palestine have emphasized that they do not want United States troops or foreign volunteers; that they are quite capable of defending themselves if they are permitted the most elementary rights of self defense and are not cut off from all sources of supply in the face of full-scale military encirclement.

As one who has always advocated the strongest United States support of the United Nations as the proper instrument for settling international disputes, it would seem to me that our country's policy toward the Hebrews of Palestine marks a serious departure from this policy in the first instance where a United Nations decision requires support and cooperation. And for that very reason it appears to be improper for us to continue to enforce a cruel and arbitrary embargo on those who are in grave peril as a direct consequence of a United Nations decision which our Government approved.

I urge that the State Department raise the embargo as applied to the licensing of shipments of arms and the transfer and sale of United States surplus arms and ammunition to the Hebrews of Palestine; through the licensing authority the State Department could insure that only types and quantity commensurate with defense purposes were made available. Delay in taking such action may be measured in human life.

May I again express my deepest esteem for your magnificent statemanship and urge that you give this matter your attention.

Sincerely,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 26, 1948.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Acknowledgment is made of the receipt of your letter of January 16, 1948, regarding current developments in Palestine.

Under authority contained in the Neutrality Act of 1939 and the Export Control Act of 1940, the Department decided early last November to refrain from licensing arms shipment to Palestine and neighboring countries. This step was taken because the United States Government believed it judicious to prevent any action likely to increase bloodshed or to make a peaceful settlement more difficult. No change is now contemplated in that policy.

It may be recalled that the General Assembly of the United Nations made detailed recommendations on November 29, 1947, with respect to the future government of Palestine. The United Nations Commission has already commenced its deliberations and it is understood that the general problem of the maintenance of internal law and order in the various areas of Palestine will be one of the first subjects under consideration.

As one of the members of the United Nations the United States Government is following these deliberations as well as current developments in Palestine with close attention and with the hope that the peoples of Palestine will cooperate in the peaceful implementation of the General Assembly's resolution.

For your information there is attached a copy of a statement relating to the general policy of the United States Government regarding Palestine, as well as two official releases on the shipment and transfer of arms to the troubled areas of the Near East.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor
(For the Secretary of State).

America's Obligations in the Partition of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted

in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the subject America's Obligations to the United Nations as a Result of the Action Taken in Regard to the Partition of Palestine, written by me and appearing in the New York Post on January 31, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America once more finds herself against herself. This land which has built its talking foreign policy upon the sanctity of treaties and the sacredness of the pledged word now finds her acting policy again turned to thoughtless expediency.

When it was pointed out in the mid-1930's that our Neutrality Act, with its arms embargo provisions, would aid the aggressor and hurt the victim of aggression, we decided to stay with the logic of impartial neutrality instead of with the real facts behind the act.

I introduced amendments making it possible for the United States Government to remove the arms embargo when it acted to the disadvantage of a victim of aggression. The amendment was rejected and Mussolini was not stopped because he could get what arms he wished from the rest of the world but his victim could get none from us.

The American people know that if we are to sustain international law, deliberation before action and respect for promises made and covenants entered into, they must sustain the action of any institution set up to operate in accordance with the theories of a peaceful process.

The final analysis of a peaceful process always results in a compromise on the theory that compromise is better than the alternative. This still leaves room for future struggle for right and change. But to let opportunity after opportunity go by, to make strong the deliberative action, is a mistake.

The United Nations has acted in regard to the Palestinian question. Their action was, of course, a compromise. Neither side had its absolute way. But it did afford a new start for peaceful institutional building and the age-old striving for a national home for the Jews again saw the light. All of the forces the United States has should now be used to unite with all of the nations that supported it in the United Nations' decision to maintain that decision for the sake of a future world organization.

It is not a question any longer of a national home for the Jews. It is a question of respect for the pledged word of the majority of the nationals represented in the United Nations.

A Jewish national state is an insignificant thing, indeed, compared to the proper functioning of a world organization. To go back on the Jewish national state merely retards for the time being the inevitable. But to turn our backs on world-wide action and the pledged word of the nations of the earth in formal deliberation may destroy all the progress we have made toward world organization and the peaceful settlement of disputes for generations. If man loses faith, now, in nations' ability to cooperate with each other to make decisions and to stand by those decisions, when will we have a chance again to move forward toward what has been the desire not only of nations but the prayer of the people of the world since the concept of progress dawned on man?

America must marshal those nations which voted to support the United Nations decisions. There is no retreating from that stand. We cannot afford in this generation a Corfu affair which destroyed the hopes of the last generation.

We hear echoed on all sides that if we do not give aid to Europe democracy is at stake. I say, if America and the nations of the world do not stand by their pledged word, world organization is at stake. And without world organization democracy ultimately may fail because democracy rests upon the peaceful process and so does world organization.

Spiritual Surgery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, Monday the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Peter Marshall, addressed an audience of more than 3,500 people in the Mosque at Richmond, Va. In the gathering were many of the leading business and professional men of Richmond, who went to hear the message of one of the great spiritual leaders and teachers of our day and time. A summary of what Dr. Marshall said to that group was published yesterday afternoon in the Richmond News-Leader. The address contains some truths which are so fundamental and so vital to us in the present crisis that I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the Richmond News-Leader printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in the hope that every Member of the Congress will find time to read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"ALTERED IDEAS NEEDED," SAYS DR. MARSHALL—"SPIRITUAL SURGERY" ASKED AT MISSION

"Spiritual surgery" to cut out stubborn pride and give a new life under God's management was recommended by Dr. Peter Marshall, of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, last night at the preaching mission in the mosque.

"Goodness lies not in keeping laws but in character and disposition," Dr. Marshall declared. "It is the fruit of a new spirit, a new birth, a complete change in life under new management.

"Christ can do little for us save as we let him change us inside."

Speaking to a crowd estimated at approximately 3,500 persons, Dr. Marshall added:

GOD A THEORY

"Many of us need to have our ideas of God changed. God for most of us is just a theory—a colossal ideal—not a friend, not a reality.

"Take alcohol, as so many of you do," he added. "It's not much to ask Christ to help you when the craving remains. Only Christ can remove the craving and set you free. To do that you must surrender to Him.

"Secretly we all want to be dictators and bullies. There are many embryo dictators in Washington, and I doubt not you have yours here. Christ can remove that spirit.

"We get worked up over the world situation and forget that slums exist because slums are in us.

"Many slums are owned by 'big shots' in the church. The world outside is merely a reflection of the world inside you and me."

HAS TO CHANGE HEARTS

"Perhaps we want power," he added. Think of spiritual power, like electricity. God does not grant such power indiscriminately.

"God has to change our hearts, and when we get them changed we won't want to use the power for our own ends.

"We've got to get a new concept, a new spirit, and a new attitude," he told the audience. "Only God can do that. He changes our spiritual gears. Not until that happens can you even see the kingdom of God."

Clinton's Famous Composers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an excellent article recently appearing in the celebrated publication, the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item, containing a very interesting account of the records and achievements of two famous popular musical composers who come from my home town of Clinton.

The article relates to Bill Heagney and John Redmond, both well-known and highly regarded popular composers. Both these famous men were born and raised in Clinton and spent their early years in that community. Both have attained very high rank in their chosen profession. Both are magnetic figures who are beloved by innumerable friends and followers throughout the country.

I have not had the pleasure of personally meeting Bill Heagney for some time past but hope to have the opportunity before long. He is greatly esteemed and particularly well regarded by the people of his home town who, like myself, would like to see him in Clinton more often.

John Redmond, whose real name is John Redmond Lynsky, and whose father was the great and dynamic Irish patriot, Peter Lynsky, is a very close personal friend of mine. I see him frequently. He is one of the ablest, most engaging and talented young men I know. He is held in highest esteem and regard by all his friends. His reputation as one of the most promising young song writers in the country today is rapidly advancing him to a distinguished and prominent place as one of America's best-liked composers. He is growing in stature every day and we may expect still greater things of him.

Clinton proudly hails these famous talented sons and I am happy to greet them and extend my heartiest wishes for their future health, well-being, and success.

CLINTON COMPOSERS RATE HIGH IN NEW BOOK—NOTABLE PROWESS IN THE MUSICAL WORLD OF WILLIAM H. HEAGNEY AND JOHN REDMOND CITED IN VOLUME PUBLISHED BY THE COLONIAL PRESS, INC.

Clintonians will note, with genuine pleasure, that the Colonial Press, Inc., has just issued an attractive volume of 483 pages entitled "The ASCAP Biographical Dictionary of Composers, Authors, and Publishers," carrying 2,173 sketches dealing with contributions to the musical life of the Nation and the world that have been made by virtually every important American composer, lyric writer, and music publisher of the current generation.

The volume is of great interest to residents of this town as it includes the biographies of two native sons whose offerings to the musical world have been many and notable and whose future works will serve to add to their Nation-wide fame.

It is most appropriate that the book should be printed and bound in a publishing plant in their home town, to which they have brought great renown.

BILL HEAGNEY

July 11, 1882, William H. Heagney was born in Clinton, and today there are hundreds of men and women still residing here who recall, with a thrill, dancing to the lilting music of Heagney's orchestra when it was recognized as an instrumental organization so talented that it soon became a leading dance-hall attraction throughout New England, filling engagements in all the larger cities and towns at events sponsored by prominent organizations which, at that period, conducted annual balls, always the social events of the winter seasons and at summer resorts where large dance halls catered to the lovers of terpsichore.

Mr. Heagney attended the local public schools and in his early years devoted much of his time to music, in which he self-educated himself.

While still a schoolboy he organized a local fife and drum corps whose services were constantly in demand at local parades and public entertainments.

He early realized that his talents were such that he would meet with success if he extended them beyond the limited range afforded in Clinton and he removed to New York City where he speedily gained renown as a staff composer in several music publishing houses of the metropolis and where he became the musical director, for several seasons, of light opera companies.

His exceptional prowess, as a pianist, later resulted in his becoming the accompanist of several two-men vaudeville acts and he toured the United States with these groups appearing in all the leading theaters.

When the movies invaded the entertainment field and vaudeville declined, Mr. Heagney accepted important professional posts in New York City music publishing houses and later authored two successful musical revenues, produced on the legitimate stage under the titles of "Dilly Daily" and "There You Are."

Every few months he turned out songs that met with wide sales including such lasting favorites as Roll Along, Kentucky Moon; Ev'ry Little While; Belle of Hawaii; Close to Your Heart; Tipperary Rose; The Belle of the Blue Ridge; Shadows in the Cane Brake; Moon Over London; I Envy the Rose; Just an Old Birthday Present, and many others.

In 1926, Mr. Heagney was elected to membership in the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, the Who's Who of the musical world and an organization that has contributed much to the leading place now held by the United States in the musical life of the world.

He resides at Bellaire, Long Island, New York State.

JOHN REDMOND

Twenty-four years after the birth of Bill Heagney there arrived in Clinton, February 25, 1906, an infant christened Patrick Henry Lynsky, destined to carry on, with his local contemporary, a career which has placed him in the front rank of composers, authors, publishers and soloists and whose talents were recognized by the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, just 30 years later when the organization elected him to membership under his pen name of John Redmond.

Following his graduation from Clinton High School he studied voice under famous teachers in Worcester, Boston, and New York City, and frequently contributed his talents to local and vicinity musical programs and became a singer on many radio programs and during World War II at many entertainments staged in Army and Navy centers and later entered the music publishing business, in New York City in which he has gained a prominent place and which he still carries on.

Of his many compositions which have gained world fame are: Sweetheart of Mine, I Let a Song Go Out of My Heart, The Man With the Mandolin, When Paddy McGinty Plays the Harp, Crosstown, Gaucho Serenade, Big Apple, You're a Sap Mister Jap, You're Breaking My Heart All Over Again, American Booties on a Musical Cruise, an album of songs; You'll Never Be Blue in a Blue Uniform; The Tune of Luna Park; Dream, Dream, Dream; and Give, Give, Give, which became the official song of the 1947 March of Dimes drive.

Frequently Mr. Redmond visits the scenes of his early years, in Clinton, where members of his family reside and is always welcomed by an army of friends who invariably insist upon his singing many of his favorite compositions.

Hundreds of his disks fill Clinton homes and are daily enjoyed by his admirers.

In his early forties, Mr. Redmond still has before him many years of continued fame in the musical world and is destined to become one of the Nation's leading composers.

He makes his home at 911 Wilson Street, Hackensack, N. J.

To be linked in a volume which includes the names of such prominent living persons as Deems Taylor, Leopold Stokowski, Oscar Levant, Ray Harris, Irving Berlin, Fritz Kreisler, and Duke Ellington, and with the estates of authors and composers whose works are still, in copyright, including Victor Herbert, Edward MacDowell, Gustav Mahler, Henry Hadley, James Whitcomb Riley, George Gershwin, Fats Waller, and scores of others, is, indeed, pleasing to hosts of Clinton friends of Messrs. Heagney and Redmond and a tribute to the town of Clinton where both first saw the light of day.

Wages and Allowances of Veterans Undergoing On-the-Job Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the bill now under consideration, H. R. 246, a bill to "raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and for other purposes," is being considered by the House under suspension of the rules. This procedure which limits debate to 20 minutes on each side and prevents the offering of any amendments seems to me unfortunate.

This bill increases the ceiling on wages and allowances payable to veterans from the present allowance of $200 a month to as high as $350 for a veteran with two dependents. If this bill were considered under a usual rule with ample debate and the opportunity to suggest amendments, I believe that we could amend the GI act in such a way that some of the abuses that have developed under this program could be eliminated.

We could prevent tuition being paid to fly-by-night schools that have been established for no other purpose than to train veterans under the GI program. The other day, for example, I received an advertisement from a flying school in Florida. This school offered prospective GI trainees round-trip transportation, wonderful housing facilities in Florida, including a swimming pool, golf, and so forth. It sounded more like the advertisement of a country club than an aviation school.

If activities of that kind could be eliminated, the funds saved would go a long way toward paying the increased cost of this bill. It was with considerable reluctance that I finally decided to oppose this legislation.

I have frequently assured my constituents that I would do everything possible to reduce the cost of government. I intend to vote against any unnecessary appropriation. If the present GI Training Act was causing undue hardship on any veterans I would be in favor of amending it, even though it meant additional appropriations. I am not, however, aware of any such undue hardships.

Yesterday more than two-thirds of the Members of the House voted to reduce Federal taxes by approximately $7,000,000,000. We were told that if we passed this tax-reduction bill and everything worked out as anticipated, we would have a balance of $500,000,000 at the end of the next fiscal year. Today we are asked to pass this bill and another one which will follow that involve an expenditure of slightly over $500,000,000. Thus, in the passage of these two bills with such limited debate, we wipe out the anticipated surplus referred to in the tax debate.

It is well to bear in mind that the President's $40,000,000,000 budget does not include funds for either of these measures. Instead of reducing the President's budget, as I am pledged to do, this legislation will make a substantial increase in the budget. It is my understanding that immediately after the passage of these two measures we will take up the independent offices appropriation bill. A subcommittee of our Committee on Appropriations has spent weeks and weeks trying to reduce wherever possible the independent offices appropriation. They will recommend a reduction of $59,000,000 below the sum requested by the Budget Bureau. After their weeks of effort it must be discouraging to members of the Appropriations Committee to see their whole saving wiped out several times over.

I cannot agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], former

chairman of the Committee on World War II Veterans' Affairs, that veterans' bills should be considered under suspension of the rules. He apparently feels that if legislation of this kind was considered under the usual rule, our sympathies would so run away with us that unreasonable amendments would be adopted. I have more confidence in the good judgment of my colleagues than to believe that.

The greatest contribution this Congress can make to the veterans of World Wars I and II is to maintain a sound dollar and a solvent Nation. No group in this country will suffer more from uncontrolled inflation than will the veterans. Most of them are very young. They are just getting started in life. I, for one, do not want to do anything that will make the future any more difficult for them than we know it is bound to be.

The second bill that we will consider this afternoon, H. R. 4212, is a bill "to provide increased subsistence allowances to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes." This bill proposes to increase the subsistence allowances paid to veterans who are attending school under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, or the GI bill as it is better known, from $65 per month if without dependents to $75 per month, and for a veteran with one dependent the subsistence allowance will be increased from $90 to $105 per month. If the veteran has more than one dependent, the subsistence is increased from $90 to $120 per month.

The same reasoning that compels me to vote against the passage of H. R. 246 is equally persuasive when we consider H. R. 4212. The beneficiaries of this second bill in most cases are in college. I am sure that the education they have thus far acquired will lead them to agree with me that the cost of Government must be reduced.

In my opinion it was never the intention of Congress to provide every veteran who desired to go to college a complete college education, including the social life that goes with it, without any effort on their part at all. It was my thought that this bill was passed to give those whose education had been interrupted or delayed by the war an opportunity to complete their education. Very few veterans who receive full tuition, supplies, and a subsistence allowance of $65 a month and who really desire a college education, will leave school if this subsistence is not increased.

I cannot think of anything that could be done by this Congress that would convince the American people that we mean what we say when we tell them we are going to reduce the cost of Government than our refusal to pass these two bills. The defeat of this legislation would be but another step along the painful road to economy and we must travel that road unless we intend to drift into uncontrolled inflation which means ruin and suffering for every citizen.

Clarification of Public Law 270

REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I have today called upon the assistant clerk of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House to take up with the chairman, Mrs. ROGERS, one phase of Public Law 270 which passed the first session of the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 3961 and for which I was pleased to vote.

In my opinion clarification of this law is indicated. For instance, the laws referred to in section 1 of the act pertaining to the Spanish-American War are public laws so that there can be no question as to the intent of the committee. However, section 2 reads as follows:

That all monthly rates of pension payable to veterans of the Civil War and dependents of such veterans which are payable under any laws administered by the Veterans' Administration are hereby increased by 20 percent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, any laws certainly means "any laws" and not necessarily public laws. Under this provision it is quite evident that any veteran of the Civil War or dependents thereof are entitled to this 20-percent increase even though they are receiving their pension under private law.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the language "any laws administered by the Veterans' Administration" has been used in the appropriation and other acts as meaning all laws, both public and private. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in favorably reporting H. R. 3961, stated in their report:

The bill proposes • • • to increase by 20 percent service pensions to veterans of the Civil War and the widows and children of such veterans, which are payable under any public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, the discrepancy between this report and the law as actually written. The law as written says "any laws administered, and so forth," while their report adds the word "public."

Now I maintain that a report should in no way supersede the law as it actually appears on the statute books and I also maintain that if and until this law is amended that Civil War veterans and their dependents who are presently receiving a pension under any law, private or public, are definitely entitled to and should receive the 20-percent increase. It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that the Veterans' Affairs Committee should bring in legislation having as its purpose the amending of the present law to insert the word "public" if that is their intention, so that it can be debated on the floor of Congress in an effort to determine whether or not the full membership will accept that interpretation.

I cannot for the life of me understand why a handicapped recipient of aid as a dependent of a Civil War veteran is not entitled to this 20-percent increase in order to help them meet increased living costs, simply because he or she is receiving their aid under a private bill and not under public law.

I realize that it is customary under generally accepted rules of statutory construction, if the language is not entirely clear to seek recourse in the legislative history. I am in agreement with that procedure, Mr. Speaker, wherein clarification as to the intent of Congress is sought, but in this specific case or in any other similar case I do not believe that this interpretation should be broad enough as for the administrator of a particular law to assume that words may be added to the statute.

I sincerely trust that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will take some action at the earliest possible moment looking toward a clarification of this section, and that the entire membership of the House will be given an opportunity to vote on this subject.

Subsistence Allowance to Veterans Pursuing Certain Courses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, as one who labored long and hard for the educational provisions in the GI bill of rights I have followed with deep gratification the successful development of this largest educational program in history. From the beginning I contended that vocational or college or professional education ought to be made available to all veterans who qualified and desired it, not so much as a reward, but as an investment in the Nation's future—an investment that will pay higher dividends each year for decades to come.

It is clear that the subsistence allowances ought to be increased so as to provide the veterans with substantially the same purchasing power now as the existing allowances represented when originally established. I therefore favor this bill.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a careful study on the living expenses of veterans now in training in colleges and universities. The study was prepared by Mr. Ralph J. Strom, of the American Council on Education, with funds made available to the council by the Disabled American Veterans.

A REPORT ON THE LIVING EXPENSES OF VETERANS NOW IN TRAINING IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

(Prepared by Ralph J. Strom, American Council on Education)

INTRODUCTION

This report is but one section of a much larger report of the results of a Nation-wide survey of veterans now in training in colleges and universities.

It is based on the responses received from interviews with a scientifically selected sample of veterans attending all types of colleges located in all sections of the country.

This report presents only those phases of the total survey which are concerned with the extent and manner in which veterans in colleges and universities are able to finance their education.

This study, as was the major study from which these data were drawn, was planned by a national advisory committee appointed by the American Council on Education. The membership of this advisory committee is as follows:

Dean E. G. Williamson, chairman, University of Minnesota.
Mr. Curtis Avery, University of Oregon.
President William S. Carlson, University of Delaware.
Dr. John G. Darley, University of Minnesota.
Dean Mitchell Dreese, George Washington University.
Dean D. D. Feder, University of Denver.
Dr. Clements C. Fry, Yale University.
Dean D. H. Gardner, University of Akron.
Dr. Walter C. Hess, Georgetown University.
Dr. Fred McKinney, University of Missouri.
Dr. Carroll L. Shartle, Ohio State University.
Dean Katherine E. Towle, University of California.
Dean Fred H. Turner, University of Illinois.
Mr. John Golob, ex officio, national commander, Disabled American Veterans.
Dean A. J. Brumbaugh, ex officio, American Council on Education.
Consultants: Mr. K. Vernon Banta, United States Employment Service; Mr. Donald Dabelstein, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation; Dr. Ira D. Scott, Veterans' Administration.
Director of study: Mr. Ralph J. Strom, 800 Washington Avenue SE., Minneapolis, Minn.

These studies were made possible by a grant of funds from the Disabled American Veterans to the American Council on Education.

PROCEDURE

Method of selection of veterans to be interviewed: In order to insure the representativeness of the results presented in this report, the following criteria were taken into consideration in the selection of the sample of the veterans to be interviewed:

1. Geographical: The schools at which the veterans were to be interviewed were selected so as to permit representation of the following geographical areas: (a) New England States; (b) Middle Atlantic States; (c) North Central States; (d) Southern States; (e) Northwest States.

2. Type of institution: In each geographical area, an attempt was made to have each of the following types of schools represented: (a) State, universities; (b) private men's schools; (c) municipal universities; (d) liberal-arts colleges; (e) junior colleges; (f) teachers' colleges.

3. Type of veterans to be interviewed: Within each institution at which the interviewing was to be done, careful instructions were issued to the interviewer in order that the following types of veterans would be included among those to be interviewed:

(a) Both single and married veterans.
(b) Both disabled and nondisabled veterans.
(c) All levels of scholastic rank (i. e., fresh, soph, junior, senior, etc.).
(d) Within the universities, veterans in the different colleges (Institute of Technology, Business, Agriculture, etc.).

FINDINGS

On the basis of the interviewing of this group of veterans, carried out in the manner outlined on the previous page, the following results were obtained:

TABLE I.—*Monthly expenses of single college veterans*

[This table is based on the responses to a question in which the unmarried veteran was asked to make a careful estimate of his monthly expenses]

Expenses:	Percent
Under $50	2
$50–$59	2
$60–$69	7
$70–$79	7
$80–$89	10
$90–$99	11
$100–$109	18
$110–$119	9
$120–$129	14
$130–$139	4
$140–$149	2
$150–$159	6
$160–$179	4
$180–$199	1
$200 and over	3
Total	100

Median expenses of single veterans interviewed, $106.13

TABLE II.—*Monthly expenses of married college veterans*

[This table is based on the response to a question in which the married veteran was asked to make a careful estimate of his monthly expenses.]

MARRIED—NO CHILDREN

Expenses:	Percent
Under $100	4
$100–$119	5
$120–$139	13
$140–$159	20
$160–$179	11
$180–$199	8
$200–$219	19
$220–$239	8
$240–$259	8
$260–$279	1
$280 and over	3

Median expense, $170.43.

MARRIED—1 CHILD

Expenses:	Percent
Under $100	1
$100–$119	4
$120–$139	15
$140–$159	25
$160–$179	14
$180–$199	8
$200–$219	15
$220–$239	6
$240–259	7
$260–$279	1
$280 and over	1

Median expense, $169.50.

NOTE.—See table III for explanation of reason for lesser expenses of married veteran with one child as compared to living expenses of married veteran without children.

TABLE III.—*Extent of employment of wives of married veterans*

Marital status	Extent of employment			
	Full time	Regular part time	Intermittent	Not employed
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Married, no children	61.8	11.6	5.8	22.8
Married, 1 child	9.8	7.7	5.5	77.0

TABLE IV.—*Extent to which veterans work to supplement income*

[These tables are based on the responsesto a question in which the veteran was asked to give the number of hours which he worked the preceding week in order to supplement his income and the amount of money he earned in such employment]

Hour worked	Married veterans	Single veterans
	Percen	Percen
Under 6	4	
6 to 10	7	8
11 to 15	6	6
16 to 20	11	6
21 to 25	6	
26 to 30	6	1
31 to 35	1	
36 to 40	2	1
Over 40	1	1
None	17	70

TABLE IVA.—*Amount of weekly earnings of veterans (see preceding table)*

Amount earned	Married veterans	Single veterans
	Percent	Percen
$5 or less	14	25
$10	20	30
$15	12	14
$20	26	15
$25	9	7
$30	6	4
$35	2	2
$40	3	1
$45	1	
$50 and over	5	2

TABLE V.—*Extent of summer employment of veterans in college*

These tables are based on the responses to a question in which the veteran was asked to state whether or not he had worked last summer and, if so the extent to which he was able to save any of his earnings]

"Did you work last summer?"	Married	Single
	Percent	Percen
Yes	62	59
No	38	41

TABLE VA.—*Amount of savings of college veterans who worked last summer*

Amount of savings	Married	Single
	Percent	Percent
Nothing	62	37
Under $100	5	6
$100 to $199	9	19
$200 to $299	10	17
$300 to $399	5	11
$400 to $499	3	5
$500 and over	6	5

TABLE VI.—*Total savings available for education*

[This table is based on the responses to a question in which the veteran was asked to state the amount of savings he had available at that time, November 1947 to help pay his way through college]

Total savings available	Married students	Single students
	Percent	Percen
Nothing	42	33
Under $250	9	13
$250 to $499	8	10
$500 to $999	15	16
$1,000 to $1,499	9	11
$1,500 to $1,999	5	6
$2,000 to $2,499	6	6
$2,500 to $2,999	1	2
$3,000 to $3,499	2	1
$3,500 to $3,999	3	3
Total	100	100

To Raise the Ceilings and Allowances Payable to Veterans Undergoing Training on the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that H. R. 246 and S. 1374 will soon become the law of the land. These bills amend, in effect, the original GI bill of rights by making it easier for the veteran to obtain desired education. To my mind, this is one of the most important features of the GI bill of rights, and the beneficent effects of this provision of the bill of rights is now being felt in every section of this country. It is most timely that we seek by these two bills to add to the aid which we are giving our veterans.

I have had occasion to visit many schools in which veteran student training is being carried on. I have seen how earnestly and conscientiously these people are trying to obtain the training and education which they feel is necessary for the future. They are to be commended for their ambition in desiring education and training. Especially should our commendations be loud and long for these whose educations, because of the war service, has been disrupted and delayed until they are past the customary school age. It seems that the age and the experience which they acquired during the trying days of war have whetted their appetite for learning and has increased their industry in obtaining it.

But, Mr. Speaker, these veterans have been working under most unfortunate circumstances. The subsistence pay which a grateful Government said it would provide has been entirely inadequate. The sum of $65 per month for a single man and $90 per month for a married man is miserable pay to give these people who work, both in the schools and in training, long hours each day. Senate bill 1394 will go far to relieve this injustice. It will cost for the year 1948 the sum of $207,000,000; but it will raise the allowance to the single veteran from $65 to $75; and it will raise the married veteran from $90 to $105 per month. Then, too, this new bill will provide an extra $15 per month for those having children.

H. R. 246 will raise the amount of money which a veteran in occupational training may earn without being denied the subsistence allowance. Since the original bill was written, the cost of living has mounted until I have felt for some time that the present action is most appropriate. I am glad that these two measures will pass the House of Representatives and I hope they both soon become the law of the land.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have felt that this Congress should have taken action on these two bills months ago. The delay of this body in taking action has caused many veterans and their families to suffer. The delay has caused some of them to become despondent and drop out of their schools and out of their occupational training. It has been a delay that we cannot well justify. Even now, when action is about to be taken, the increased amounts are small. Neither a single veterans nor a married one can hope to pay their expenses through school or through training, relying entirely upon the subsistence allowances. They must obtain funds from other sources. During my own early school days, I felt the pinch of poverty. I know what it means to be compelled to work to provide funds from outside sources to obtain "this day our daily bread." I do not think we should work out our laws in such a way that men and women who have fought for this Nation, undergoing the trial and hardships of battle and of war, should need another lesson in courage or in deprivation. Let us pay these veterans a proper amount to help them finish their schooling.

B'nai B'rith Commemoration of the One Hundred and Sixtieth Anniversary of the Formation of the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of September 4, 1947, the B'nai B'rith lodges of Alameda County, Calif., commemorated the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States, at a dinner in Oakland. The three lodges sponsoring this dinner were those of Berkeley, Eden, and Oakland.

At this dinner citations of merit were awarded to three distinguished Americans for outstanding work in the field of group cooperation. They were Gen. Mark Wayne Clark, United States Army; Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California; and Chief Justice Phil Sheridan Gibson, of the Supreme Court of the State of California.

Civic leaders, officials of government, educators, and men active in the field of human relations throughout the east bay region were honored to attend this dinner dedicated to the Constitution of our country. They came, too, to pay tribute to the great leaders who B'nai B'rith saw fit to honor.

That the interesting program arranged for this occasion may be preserved that future students of history may have a record of it, I insert in the RECORD extracts from the proceedings on that occasion:

B'NAI B'RITH SUPREME LODGE, FOUNDED 1843

Supreme lodge officers: Frank Goldman, president, Lowell, Mass.; Alfred M. Cohen, honorary president, Cincinnati, Ohio; Benjamin Samuels, vice president, Chicago, Ill.; William Gerber, vice president, Philadelphia, Pa.; Sol Fass, vice president, Portsmouth, Va.; Sidney G. Kusworm, treasurer, Dayton, Ohio; Maurice Bisgyer, secretary, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(Officers as above)

Horace R. Cohen, Montreal, Canada; Benjamin D. Reisman, Buffalo, N. Y.; I. W. Garek, Columbus, Ohio; Judge Samuel A. Weiss, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Harry K. Wolff, San Francisco, Calif.; David Blumberg, Los Angeles, Calif.; Edward Rosenblum, Washington, D. C.; Philip M. Klutznick, Chicago, Ill.; A. B. Freyer, Shreveport, La.; Leo Bearman, Memphis, Tenn.; the presidents of all American districts.

B'NAI B'RITH DISTRICT GRAND LODGE, NO. 4

(Comprising the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and the Province of British Columbia)

Officers: Dr. H. M. Ginsburg, president, Fresno, Calif.; Dr. N. M. Zipperman, first vice president, Los Angeles, Calif.; Hy Samuels, second vice president, Portland, Oreg.; Jefferson E. Peyser, past grand president, treasurer, San Francisco, Calif.; Edward A. Zeisler, past grand president, secretary, San Francisco, Calif.

Executive board: I. B. Benjamin, Los Angeles, Calif.; E. A. Brashem, Seattle, Wash.; Louis L. Brounstein, San Francisco, Calif.; D. A. Chertkow, Vancouver, British Columbia; David Goldman, Pasadena, Calif.; Samuel H. Faverman, San Mateo, Calif.; Aaron Gordon, Huntington Park, Calif.; Michael Gordon, Berkeley, Calif.; Herbert A. Leland, San Francisco, Calif.; Eli Levinson, San Diego, Calif.; Sigmund O. Meyer, Butte, Mont.; Elliott Nankin, Oakland, Calif.; J. A. Robinson, San Pedro, Calif.; Edward Schwartz, Los Angeles, Calif.; Dal Siegel, Salt Lake City, Utah; Bernard Silverstein, Oakland, Calif.; Saul Tannenbaum, Los Angeles, Calif.; Arthur Wolpe, Los Angeles, Calif.

Past grand presidents: David Blumberg, Los Angeles, Calif.; David Coleman, Los Angeles, Calif.; Howard H. Desky, Oakland, Calif.; Albert Elkus, Sacramento, Calif.; M. J. Finkenstein, Los Angeles, Calif.; Monroe Friedman, Oakland, Calif.; David Goldman, Oakland, Calif.; Edgar C. Levey, San Francisco, Calif.; Herman Lewkowitz, Phoenix, Ariz.; Jacob J. Lieberman, Los Angeles, Calif.; Rabbi Edgar F. Magnin, Los Angeles, Calif.; Oscar A. Mathews, Sacramento, Calif.; Milton Meyer, San Francisco, Calif.; Maurice L. Rapheld, San Francisco, Calif.; William Meyer, Butte, Mont.; P. Allen Rickles, Seattle, Wash.; David Robinson, Portland, Oreg.; Z. Swett, Portland, Oreg.; Henry Weinberger, San Diego, Calif.; James L. White, Salt Lake City, Utah; Harry K. Wolff, San Francisco, Calif.

B'NAI B'RITH LODGES OF ALAMEDA COUNTY—BERKELEY-EDEN-OAKLAND

General committee: Monroe Friedman, past grand president, chairman; Morris Henderson, secretary.

Edward Brosler, president; Howard H. Desky, past grand president; Arnold Fassler, president; Herman W. Mintz, president; Isidore Schonwald, past president; Rafael Silver, past president.

Reception committee: Abraham Kofman, past president, chairman; Robert G. Gaines, Henry R. Gall, Leonard Landan, Dr. Julius Levine, Rubin LeWon, Isaac Schechmeister, Harold L. Strom, Alexander Teplow.

Hosts: Irving Aikus, past president; Lionel B. Beuas, past president; Phillip R. Berger, past president; Jack J. Block, past president; Dr. Nat Brodke; Morris K. Cohen; Ike Dresner; Harold Edelstein; R. Robert Fischer; Mendel H. Friedman, past president; Rabbi Joseph Gitin, past president; A. W. Glickman, past president; Kalman Gluck; David Goldman, past grand president; Michael Gordon, past president; Phillip Grant; Richard Grodin; Max Jaffe, past president; Fred Kahn, Jr.; Irving Kahn; Joseph Kay; Nathan Kessler, past president; Charles Kushins; Jacob Lesser; Prof. Alex Levens; Nat Levy, past president, Leonard Lustig; Irving Malnick; Dr. Henry Mankin, past president; Leonard J. Meitzer, past president; Louis Milenbach; Elliott Nankin, past president; Harry Polse; Jack Posner; Carl R. Riegelman, past president; Col. David Rosen, past president; Dr. Herbert Samuels, past president; Harry Sapper, past president; Louis Scheeline; Max Silver; Bernard Silverstein, past president; Sydney Silverstein, past president; Jesse Smith; Louis Spencer; Dr. Alfred Stern, past president; Rabbi William M. Stern, past president; Lionel Wachs, past president; Matt Wahrhaftig, past president; George J. Weiser, past president; Rabbi John Zucker.

PROGRAM

The Star-Spangled Banner.
Invocation.
Musical selections.
Introduction of distinguished guests by Monroe Friedman, past grand president, toastmaster.
Presentation of citation to Gen. Mark Wayne Clark, United States Army, by Col. David V. Rosen, past president.
Response by General Clark.
Messages from the President of the United States and from the Governor of California.
Presentation of citation to Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California, by Edgar C. Levey, past grand president.
Response by Dr. Sproul.
Presentation of citation to Chief Justice Phil Sheridan Gibson, Supreme Court of California, by Howard H. Desky, past grand president.
Response by Chief Justice Gibson.
Address by Dr. Monroe E. Deutsch, former vice president and provost, University of California.
God Bless America.
Benediction.

Mr. MONROE FRIEDMAN (the toastmaster). Gentlemen, the Star-Spangled Banner. [All present arose and sang the national anthem.] Please remain standing for the invocation, which will be given by Rabbi William Stern of Temple Sinai.

Rabbi WILLIAM STERN. God of the Universe: With deep gratitude do we offer to Thee words of thanksgiving and praise. We are gathered here this evening in an exalted mood. One hundred and sixty years ago, men of vision and courage affixed their signatures to an immortal document—the Constitution of the United States. We have come here tonight to commemorate this event, to recall the great principles proclaimed therein, and to dedicate ourselves anew to the furtherance of its purposes and ideals. For this consecration, O God, we ask Thy blessing and Thy guidance. We pray that Thou will give us the same insight, wisdom, and understanding that filled the minds and hearts of our founding fathers. Remove from us all selfishness and all meanness that would destroy that which has been builded. Give us that love of country that makes for good citizenship, devotion to democratic ideals, loyalty to our institutions, and trust in our leadership. Bless those we honor tonight, who symbolize for us those virtues that have made our country great. And may this land, that has given freedom and security to all who live within its boundaries, continue to be in the forefront of that great crusade that seeks to bring a peace of justice and righteousness to all mankind. Amen.

(Dinner was served.)

Mr. FRIEDMAN. Now that we have finished our dinner, we will have the pleasure of listening to a group of songs by Mr. Oliver Jones, of the San Francisco Opera Company, accompanied by Mr. Henry Gideon. Mr. Jones will announce his selections. [Mr. Jones sang several songs, which were favorably received.]

B'nai B'rith is very glad to welcome all our guests this evening. I will now present our distinguished guests, but those who will participate in the program will be introduced later. I shall take one table at a time. As your name is called, would you please rise and remain standing until all the guests at your table have been introduced. Please do no applaud until after all the guests at any one table are introduced.

Head table: Mr. Edward Brosler, president, Berkeley Lodge, B'nai B'rith; Mr. Max Jaffe, grand lodge officer, B'nai B'rith; Mr. Elliott Nankin, grand lodge officer, B'nai B'rith; Mr. Arnold Fassler, president, Eden Lodge, B'nai B'rith; Mr. Michael Gordon, grand lodge officer, B'nai B'rith; Mr. Herman Mintz, president, Oakland Lodge, B'nai B'rith; Dr. J. Raymond Cope, minister, First Unitarian Church; Rabbi William Stern, of Temple Sinai; Rt. Rev. Richard H. Hammond, of St. Anthony's Church; Mr. Ingraham Read, publisher of the Post-Enquirer; Mr. Ralph T. Fisher, of the American Trust Co.; Mr. Bruno Forsterer, general manager of the Oakland Tribune and holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor; Hon. Homer R. Spence, associate justice of the Supreme Court of California.

Table No. 1: Dr. Alfred E. Baker, principal of the Castlemont High School; Rev. Calvin Barkow, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church; Mr. Thomas Caldecott, of the board of supervisors of the county of Alemeda; Mr. William S. Briscoe, commander, Oakland Post, American Legion; Mr. Fed Cox, president, Hayward Area Chamber of Commerce.

Table No. 2: Mr. George C. Bliss, principal of the San Leandro High School; Rev. Howard C. Busching; Hon. Arthur W. Carlson, chairman of the Republican State Central Committee of the State of California; Hon. Laurence L. Cross, mayor of the city of Berkeley; Hon. Ezra W. Decoto, judge of the superior court.

Table No. 3: Mr. Paul C. Bryan, superintendent of schools of the city of Albany; Mr. Charles Crouch, president of Lucky Stores; Mr. Herbert W. Erskine, who is said to be the only living Democrat in Piedmont; Mr. Erskine, shake hands with Mr. Carlson at table 2. (The two gentlemen shook hands.) Dr. W. F. Fraser, wise master, Rose Croix, Scottish Rite; Mr. Robert H. Fouke, potentate, Aahmes Temple, Ancient Arabic Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine; Mr. Charles Wade Snook, chairman of the Republican Party of Alameda County; Hon. James G. Quinn, judge of the superior court.

Table No. 4: Hon. O. D. Hamlin, Jr, judge of the superior court; Mr. Harry L. Kingman; Hon. Thomas O. Knick, mayor of the city of San Leandro; Mr. J. Longwell, general manager, East Bay Utilities; Mr. O. B. Paulsen, superintendent of the Hayward Union High School; Mr. Floyd Sparks, publisher of the Hayward Review.

Table No. 9: Mr. Will W. Green, principal of the Technical High School; Mr. J. D. Holstrom, chief of police of the city of Berkeley; Mr. James B. Kaney, of the California State Council of the Knights of Columbus; Hon. Harold Jacoby, judge of the superior court of the county of Contra Costa.

Table No. 10: Hon. Ralph Hoyt, district attorney of the county of Alameda; Mr. Elwin LeTendre, principal of the Berkeley High School; Joseph A. Moore, Jr., president of the Moore Drydock Co.; Mr. G. C. Pettygrove, director of the Berkeley Community Chest; Mr. Clay Meinheit, fire chief of the city of Berkeley.

Table No. 11: Hon. Benjamin C. Jones, judge of the Superior Court of Lake County, now sitting in the county of Alameda; Mr. E. D. Moody, superintendent of the Southern Pacific Co.; Mr. Thomas L. Nelson, superintendent of schools of the city of Berkeley; Mr. Robert R. Porter, of the Berkeley Community Chest; Mr. Sidney Snow, director of the Alameda County Zoological Gardens; Mr. Harold Johnson, principal of the Emeryville High School; Mr. Jim Ritch, publisher of the Hayward Journal.

Table No. 12: Col. A. Hubbard Moffitt, Jr.; Mr. Theo J. Norby, superintendent of schools of the city of San Leandro; Mr. W. H. Park, division manager of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.; Mr. Herman A. Spindt, director of admissions, University of California; Mr. F. L. Van Fleet, venerable master of the Oakland Scottish Rite; Judge Harry W. Pulciter.

Table No. 13: Mr. William R. Odell, superintendent of schools of the city of Oakland; Mr. J. Munroe Warner, director of the East Bay Fellowship; Hon. S. Victor Wagler, judge of the Superior Court; Capt. S. J. Michael, United States Navy, Commanding Officer of the Naval Air Station, Alameda; Col. J. Clayton Orr; Hon. Francis Dunn, Jr., a member of the California Legislature.

Table No. 14: Mr. John Soelberg, principal of the McClymonds High School; Mr. C. W. Mangum, of the Western Pacific Railroad Co.; Hon. George P. Miller, Congressman from the Sixth California Congressional District; Mr. Bernard Witkin, reporter of decisions for the California Supreme Court; Mr. William J. McGuinness, president of the Catholic Social Service; Mr. Walter Gordon, of the State Adult Authority; Mr. Lewis Drucker, of the State Adult Authority and past president of Glendale Lodge, B'nai B'rith.

Table No. 16: Col. Raymond R. Ribal, president, East Bay Chapter, Reserve Officers Association of the United States; Mr. H. E. Stone, dean of students, University of California; Mr. Ralph T. Wattenburger, superintendent of the Livermore Union High School District; Col. Stanley Grogan, United States Army, Deputy Chief of Staff, Sixth Army; Col. W. C. McMahon, United States Army, Deputy Chief of Staff, Sixth Army.

Table No. 17: Mr. Paul W. Pinckney, principal of the Oakland High School; Mr. Vernon L. Goodwin; Mr. J. M. Bryan, principal of the Alameda High School; Mr. Clarence Bulwinkle.

Table No. 18: Mr. Emmett Copeland, superintendent, Industrial Activities of the Blind for Northern California.

Mr. FRIEDMAN. Tonight B'nai B'rith is commemorating the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States. B'nai B'rith has been called the oldest and largest Jewish service organization in the United States. It is true that B'nai B'rith is 104 years old, but we are not really old, for what is 104 years to a people who have a recorded history of over 3,500 years? With a membership of over 325,000, B'nai B'rith has lodges and chapters in practically every city in the United States. But age and size are not the determining factors in the value of an organization.

B'nai B'rith has long recognized that the destiny of its people is one with those who seek to maintain human freedom. Jewish opposition to dictatorship long antedated Hitler and Mussolini. Centuries before language knew the terms "communism," "fascism," and "nazism," the Jewish people were historically the champions of human liberty. The Maccabees of old were the predecessors of Washington and Bolivar and of many of those great personalities who have produced the American tradition.

We Jews have been in this country a long time, nearly 300 years. You remember that the first organized group of Protestants came over in 1620 under William Bradford, and 14 years later George Calvert, Lord Baltimore, established the first Catholic colony in what is now the State of Maryland. Just a few years later, 1653, the first group of Jews landed on these shores, so that within the short space of one generation all of these various groups became part of our country.

During the next 300 years, wave after wave of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews from all parts of Europe came here and all of them assisted in the building up of our country and the maintaining of our American ideals. It is hardly necessary for me to mention that men of our faith have performed their share of the work. From Asser Levi, the sturdy leader of that first band of Jews in 1653, to Benjamin Cardozo, of the United States Supreme Court; from Haym Salomon, who gave his entire fortune that the cause of the American Revolution should succeed, to Oscar Straus, who was a member of Theodore Roosevelt's Cabinet; from Col. David Salsbury Franks, aide to General Washington, to Commodore Uriah P. Levy, who was instrumental in the abolition of flogging in the United States Navy, to Gen. Maurice Rose, the son of a Denver rabbi, who died in action in the recent World War, men of our faith have participated to the full measure in the life of our country. And what is just as significant is the fact that in every war of the United States, as privates in the ranks of the Army and as seamen on the decks of the Navy and in all branches of civil life as ordinary humble workers, there was always found their proportionate share, bearing their proportionate burden.

Our country means something to all of us. It means, among other things, that our Constitution is big enough and broad enough to protect every man in the right to his faith. If our country is to live—and it will live—then the fountain springs bearing the pure waters of liberty must not be defiled with the poison of hate, must not be covered with the slime of proscription, must not be polluted by any spirit of intolerance. [Applause.]

President's Message of February 2, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

FEBRUARY 4, 1948.

Hon. J. H. DAVIS,
Governor, State of Louisiana,
Baton Rouge, La.:

The President's message to Congress on February 2 was a shock to every true southerner. It is now time for every true southerner to stand up and be counted and to take whatever steps necessary to defend and protect our southern heritage. The legislation that the President advocates is fast materializing in the South. It is beyond the conversation stage. It is becoming a reality. The southern leaders have been asleep too long. It is now time to wake up and let the President and the Democratic Party know that we southerners have principles that we will not sacrifice nor will we tolerate any further encroachment upon our sacred southern heritage and rights. The point in his message asking for an FEPC law is equally as vicious as the several other points. It would be more honorable for me to resign and forfeit my seat in Congress than to remain dormant on this vital issue and all of us who have been trusted and elected to public office by the people of our respective districts and States should be willing to make any sacrifice necessary to head off what will be a catastrophe never before equaled or surpassed in the South should the President succeed in getting his proposed legislation enacted into law. Won't you get busy, Governor Davis, and lend your best efforts in this great struggle to protect our sacred southern rights and heritage.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Member of Congress.

Admission of Displaced Persons to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BOSTON, *January 24, 1948.*

DEAR MR. CHELF: I wonder if you still remember me. I was the physician of the Latvian Displaced Persons Camp "Insula," Berchtesgaden, Germany, which you inspected last fall. As you so kindly suggested that I should write to you in case I came to U. S. A., I am taking the liberty to write you now.

I had some hopes then to enter U. S. A. because my parents-in-law were already there, but I had no idea that I would come so soon. I came over last December together with my daughter and my wife who is a physician too. Knowing that Boston is a great university center we decided to come here. We understand that we have to pass the State board examination before we will become physicians here. That is our aim. But meanwhile we are working in a line which needs great help—we are domestic helpers in a family in Boston. We are saving money for the future and working hard on our English.

We are so grateful to America who gave us new hopes, future and hopes. Now we understand why everybody in America is so happy, proud of his country, and contented. After these years of persecution, desperate and hunger, we realize how nice it is to live in a free and rich country.

My sister-in-law, Mrs. Austra Kondrats, who came over 7 months before, is in Boston also. She is a dental surgeon, but to become a dental surgeon here she has to go to dental college for 2 more years, as it is requested by law for all foreign dentists. She is working in a family near Boston, saving money and hoping to enter Tuft's College Dental School next fall. Her husband, Ganis Kondrats, is still waiting for his quota number in the same camp we were in Berchtesgaden and is employed by IRO as a medical assistant. As Austra got her quota number first she had to come over alone for she did not want to lose the opportunity to enter America as soon as possible. Austra is very anxious to have her husband soon with her, but it seems that she will have to wait a long while if the Latvian quota number will not be enlarged.

As Ganis Kondrats is waiting for the possibility to enter U. S. A., so are waiting many thousands of people who are looking toward U. S. A. with big hopes and prayers. They are live people in darkness who are waiting for the sunshine. They have only one prayer, God, do not let the big nations forget that we are people who have only one desire—to live, to work, to fulfill our mission as human beings.

Without any hope, without seeing any future for them, these intelligent people will be lost to mankind. They are waiting with trembling hearts for the Congress session about them. Pray help them.

Yours truly,

BORIS KLASONS.

Segregation of Races in Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I herewith include a copy of a resolution passed by a distinguished ladies' organization of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, which takes issue with the outrageous recommendations of the President's obviously prejudiced Civil Rights Committee:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE IMMEDIATE ABROGATION OF SEGREGATION OF WHITES AND NEGROES IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

INTRODUCTION

A careful study of that portion of the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, pertaining to the District of Columbia, made by the Department of Legislation of the DCFWC revealed a number of misleading and inaccurate statements, which on the whole give a distorted picture of racial conditions in the District of Columbia.

Samples of these are as follows:

1. In the second paragraph of the Chapter on the District of Columbia, the report states that Washington, D. C., "is the point at which all public transportation into the South becomes 'Jim Crow'." The inference is, by use of the word "becomes" that the city of Washington practices Jim Crowism, whereas the report should state that Washington City is the last station, going from North to South, which does not practice segregation in transportation. (P. 89.)

2. The report states that the Capital Transit Co., during the war would not employ qualified Negroes as operators. Whereas, the truth is that it was the union member employees who refused to train Negro applicants for jobs in the streetcars. (P. 93.)

3. The report states that "Negro schools are inferior to white schools in almost every respect." This is not true. Qualifications and salary scales for teachers are identical; all new construction and equipment are identical in quality; such inadequacies as exist from time to time in plant facilities are common to both white and Negro areas. (P. 90.)

Negro children have increased to 47 percent of the school population since 1940, hence Negro schools are more crowded because the city has been unable to secure the necessary materials for school construction. But recently five white schools have been transferred for the use of Negro children temporarily until new schools can be erected.

4. The report states that "Negroes are increasingly being forced into a few overcrowded slums." This is not true. In fact there is today a larger area of the District of Columbia available to Negroes for housing than ever before. Since 1940 more new housing has been built for Negroes than for whites, in proportion to their respective population. (P. 91.)

In the last 20 years, moreover, the Negro population has been moving into white areas and have taken over a large portion of the central residential area of the city, such as Logan Circle, Lincoln Park, Bloomingdale, Columbia Heights and the Kalorama area. None of these areas could be classified as slums, when taken over. But the neighborhoods have deteriorated already, since occupied by Negroes, because a low economic level means low maintenance, and overcrowding by large families leads to destruction.

5. The report states that the Negro "is refused service in downtown restaurants, he may not attend a downtown movie or play and he had to go into the poorer section of the city to find a night's lodging." Negroes can find restaurants and movie theaters all along U Street NW., from Eighteenth to Seventh, and down Seventh from U to K Streets. The "downtown" part of the city referred to by the report is made up of white merchants, who naturally cater to white customers and who do so because they must secure a return on their investments. There are moreover several Negro hotels operated by Negroes for Negroes. There is neither law nor private covenant to prevent the establishment of any legal business enterprise on a nonsegregated basis anywhere in the commercial areas of the city. The only thing which prevents such establishments is lack of initiative and lack of the possibility of success. (P. 95.)

6. Under health services the report states among other things that "4 of the 12 private hospitals in the city do not admit Negro in-patients," which of course implies that 8 of the 12 hospitals operated by and for whites, at private expense, do maintain accommodation for Negroes. Thus Negroes practically monopolize all public-hospital facilities and also share private facilities maintained at white expense. (P. 93.)

The following resolution was therefore submitted by the Department of Legislation of the DCFWC, for the consideration of its Executive Board, pointing out the discrepancies, and opposing the immediate abolition of segregation of the whites and Negroes in the District of Columbia.

The resolution was duly seconded and carried as amended to provide that a copy be sent to every Member of Congress.

"Whereas most of the criticism, ascribed to the District of Columbia, by the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, is laid at the door of segregation:

"Whereas we feel that the report gives an unfair and misleading picture of conditions in the District of Columbia;

"Whereas we oppose the immediate abrogation of segregation of the races in the District of Columbia, as proposed in the report, as unwise. Radical social changes cannot be forced in this way. Such changes come either by revolution or by evolution. The latter is the American way. In the last 80 years since the Negro race was freed from slavery in this country it has made marvelous progress, under the principle of segregation;

"Whereas we feel that such a radical change in the District of Columbia should not be forced upon the citizens here unless national representation, as recommended in the report, and as endorsed by the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs for 20 years, is granted, and the people of the Nation's Capital has elected representatives in the House and Senate to speak for them when legislation affecting their most vital interests is being discussed: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs deeply resents the many misleading and inaccurate statements made in the report and opposes the upsetting of established customs and practices of the District of Columbia, which would be brought about by the immediate abrogation of segregation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs and to the President of the United States and that a copy be sent to every Member of Congress."

Respectfully submitted by Anna Kelton Wiley (Mrs. Harvey Wiley), chairman, department of legislation, District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs.

Work Stoppages Under Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Manufacturers, the godfather of the Taft-Hartley Act, is continuing its sponsorship of misleading propaganda regarding the effectiveness of the Taft-Hartley Act. Numerous pamphlets and endless newspaper and radio propaganda is being sent out in an effort to resell this anti-wage-earner law to the American people.

I have read and listened to a great deal of this misinformation recently and at no time has the NAM informed the public that 85 percent of the major employers in the Nation stampeded to sign new contracts immediately before the Taft-Hartley law went into effect August 22, 1947. When they are reviewing the effectiveness of the Taft-Hartley Act, they must exclude these millions of employees whose unions are already under contract and will not come in contact with this law until their contracts terminate 6 months hence. The Public Affairs Institute—founded by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen—published some interesting information on work stoppages involving noncontract unions during the months since the Taft-Hartley law went into effect. I am hereby submitting this report for the information of the Members of Congress.

WORK STOPPAGES UNDER TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Between August 22, 1947, the date on which the Taft-Hartley Act became effective, and December 31, there were 645 work stoppages reported to the Department of Labor. In the 8 months preceding August 22, the number of work stoppages totaled 2,955.

Since Taft-Hartley there have thus been 161 work stoppages per month as compared with 369 work stoppages per month in 1947 before Taft-Hartley.

Presto, the arguments of Senators TAFT and BALL in pressing passage of the labor bill were right. Apparently, the Taft-Hartley law reduces the number of work stoppages, thereby proving a great benefit to workers themselves who lose less pay; to consumers who get their output without interruption; to management who have smoother production operations, and to owners who reap bigger profits.

Everybody gains from having the Taft-Hartley Act on the books. But do they? Let's take a good look at the facts and their meaning.

The last 4 months of the year are traditionally a period of fewer work stoppages. With the exception of 1940, this has been true of every year since 1927. That this trend was even more apparent in the year 1947, is due to factors other than Taft-Hartley.

Many unions and employers, fearful that the Taft-Hartley Act would upset satisfactory arrangements which were the results of years of building up mutually good contract conditions, hastened to get contracts signed before the act became effective. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers, for example, entered into a long-term 5-year contract just prior to the passage of the act.

SOME TREAD WATER WARILY

Many other unions and employers are treading water warily watching developments in the early administration of the Taft-Hartley law. This cautiousness is not to be interpreted as a newly achieved high level of labor-management harmony. Rather, it is a feeling-out stage when each side is becoming familiar with the meaning of the act while its administrators lay down the rules under which it will be enforced. During such a period risks are not taken; hence the work-stoppage figures are low.

What the number of stoppages will be after Taft-Hartley has been in operation a longer time no one knows now.

The present period may well be the calm before the storm. For the continued high cost of living has reduced the purchasing power of workers to the point that a new round of wage-increases demands is generally expected when contracts come up for consideration this spring. Then may come the test for Taft-Hartley and its effect on work stoppages.

On the other hand, if industry continues to make tremendous profits, this will probably tend to discourage it from precipitating any conflict. Nor must the effect of this year's Presidential election on the strike picture be overlooked.

It is apparent to any competent observer of labor-management relations that the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act represents an important stage in the continued fight by antiunion employers to liquidate labor's gain of the past quarter century.

A PARALLEL, THE AMERICAN PLAN

A noticeable parallel in the post-World War I period is worth recalling in this connection. In 1920, employers throughout the Nation were actively sponsoring the so-called American plan. This plan under the cloak of abolishing the closed shop had as its real purpose, as did previous open-shop crusades, the destruction of unionism. The American Bankers' Association piously proclaimed the right of every man "to work out his salvation and not be bound by the shackles of organization to his own detriment."

A similar strategy was used by the NAM and other antiunion groups in pressing the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act after World War II. In place of the American plan, wage earners now are provided with a bill of rights specially designed for them as set forth in section 7 of the Taft-Hartley Act guaranteeing their right to refrain from any or all union activities.

The drive to disorganize labor continues unabated. As in the past it operates under the guise of benefiting the worker. And the proof offered is such figures as those showing the reduction in work stoppages cited above. It is important, therefore, to be alert to read between the lines when presented with so-called evidence of benefits under Taft-Hartley.

Low strike figures by themselves are no indication of successful labor-mangement relations. There were extremely low strike figures in Hitler Germany; there are equally low strike figures in Stalin Russia.

Even in free America, it is hoped by its supporters that such measures as the Taft-Hartley Act may so weaken unions by their restrictive conditions and the numerous

costly lawsuits which they involve that they may not be able to resort to work stoppages when that last weapon of a free labor movement should be used to obtain rightful demands.

A decline in the number of strikes is a good sign only when it reflects a situation where conditions permit labor and management to sit down as equals at the bargaining table, there to resolve their differences on terms acceptable to both.

Transfer of Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by joint maritime committee against ship transfers and Marshall plan, presented to Members of the Senate and the House on Tuesday, February 3, by members of the National Maritime Union, CIO, National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO, and the Marine Firemen's Union—MFOWW—unaffiliated:

American seamen, backed by the entire labor movement, are unalterably opposed to the transfer of 500 ships to foreign countries under the Marshall plan.. Not only will the Marshall plan wipe out 25,000 jobs for unlicensed personnel through these ship transfers but it would create widespread dissension throughout the world by direct interference in the affairs of other countries and thus open wide the road to world war III.

American seamen, together with their brothers in the armed forces, did not fight in the last war to prepare for the destruction of jobs and security and to set the stage for an even more catastrophic war.

The national council of the National Maritime Union adopted a resolution at its last meeting which correctly asserted that "the Truman and Marshall plans are to the unsettled and war-weary peoples of Europe what the Taft-Hartly Act is to the American people." M. C. & S. and M. F. O. W. W. took similar action.

We know that the Taft-Hartley Act is designed to cripple and ultimately destroy organized labor in America.

The bipartisan Marshall plan is designed to Taft-Hartleyize the world.

In the words of the NMU national council, "Food has become a weapon for forcing the hungry people of the world into line with the aims of Wall Street—a la Herbert Hoover."

We agree with Henry Wallace that "Those whom we buy politically with our food will soon desert us; they will pay us in the base coin of gratitude and then turn to hate us because our policies are destroying their freedom."

We are witnessing today in Greece, where the reactionary government has decreed the death sentence for workers who strike for better conditions, the full and shocking meaning of the Marshall plan. This plan ties a lot of political strings around the urgent food and relief needs of our former allies. And in so doing it is bypassing the United Nations and setting up a bloc of western powers that will do the reactionary bidding of American big business.

American seamen will be the first to be hit by the Marshall plan through the transfer of 500 ships. Representative WILLIS R. BRADLEY last month condemned the plan as being "the funeral of an adequate merchant marine." If Congress approves the transfer of these 500 vessels, it will mean the destruction of the American merchant marine. It will mean that the democratic people of Europe will be enslaved in an imperialist yoke in which their democratic rights and aspirations will be ruthlessly crushed.

To date, more than 1,000 ships involving 50,000 jobs have been transferred to foreign flags. The 16 European nations which will participate under the Marshall plan have a greater tonnage of cargo vessels today than before the war. The transfer of an additional 500 vessels would further increase their present tonnage over prewar levels. In effect, the Marshall plan will reduce America to a fifth rate maritime power.

We oppose the sacrifice of our merchant marine on the altar of American imperialism. We favor full relief to the hungry people of Europe without political strings and with relief cargoes carried in American bottoms.

We favor the Wallace plan of a world relief program administered by the United Nations on the basis of human need and not on political considerations.

We demand the elimination of all policies that will lead to war, including the Marshall plan, and the building of greater unity among the United Nations to assure world peace.

Rationing and Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation last week reaffirmed its position on rationing and price control and adopted a resolution which I desire to bring to the attention of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the resolution which sets forth the position of the board of directors of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation:

We, the members of the board of directors of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, reaffirm our position and that of the voting delegate body of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation in regard to rationing and price control.

There has been agitation by certain segments of our society, some Members of Congress, and the administration for price control and rationing of meats and other foods.

The American people partially accepted price control and rationing during wartime as an emergency but rejected it as a peacetime measure as evidenced in the period following the close of the war. Therefore, with the present consumer demand and buying power, the general public will not comply with a peacetime rationing program.

Rationing and price control will disrupt the livestock and food economy, making less meat available over a period of time. It destroys the incentive to produce and causes meat to be channeled through black markets, making it less available through legitimate trade.

It is generally agreed that rationing of any or all essential commodities will not effectively control inflation without adequate controls of credit, wages, and prices in general. Therefore, the attempt to solve our economic problem by the rationing of one commodity, such as meat, is preposterous.

We object to the livestock industry being used as a political football in this election year. The uninterrupted production of food is of prime importance.

A Talk to American Citizens—New and Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid talk given recently by the Honorable Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., of the United States district court in Boston, Mass., to 80 newly naturalized citizens that he recently admitted into citizenship:

A TALK TO AMERICAN CITIZENS (NEW AND OLD)

The COURT. Fellow Americans, by virtue of the authority vested in me under Article III of the United States Constitution and under the Nationality Act of 1940, I hereby declare that each of you who has taken the oath of allegiance has become a citizen of the United States of America.

There is no prouder title in the world than to be a full partner in this great democracy, and I congratulate each one of you on what is one of the most important days in your lives, and an important day for this country.

This country has always known that it owed a great debt to persons born abroad who voluntarily came to the United States and became citizens. Many years ago, in 1789, this country adopted as its motto three Latin words which, when you leave the courtroom, you will find on every coin in your pocket, whether it be a penny, a nickel, a dime, it does not matter. Those three Latin words are E pluribus unum, which translated into English mean "From many one." Originally, the motto stood for the idea that from many separate colonies one American Union was made. But the motto has a deeper meaning today. From many different lands, from people of many different religious faiths and people of many different colors, one American people has been made. And you are now a part of that people.

Did you come from France? Then you may think with pride of Lafayette and Rochambeau, and the host of Frenchmen who helped to make this country free.

Did you come from England? Then you may think with pride that the ancestors of Washington and of Jefferson and of Lincoln came from England.

Did you come from one of the British Dominions or Colonies? Then you may think with pride that the first great Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, Alexander Hamilton, was born in a British colony and came to this land.

Did you come from Switzerland? Then you may think with pride that another great Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin, was born in Switzerland and came to the United States.

Do you come from Scandinavia? Then you may think with pride that the inventor of the ironclad battleship, John Ericsson, came from Scandinavia, and here invented the instrument which made it possible for the North to prevail and preserve the Union in the great War Between the States from 1861 to 1865.

Do you come from Ireland? Then you may think with pride of John Barry, who came from Ireland in the eighteenth century and who is called the Father of the American Navy.

Did you come from Italy? Then you may think with pride that the man who was for three terms mayor of the largest city in this country, and head of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Mayor LaGuardia, came of a father whose home was Italy and a mother whose home had been the Balkans.

Do you come from Poland? Then you may think with pride of General Pulaski, the great hero in whose honor the bridge between New York and New Jersey has been named.

Do you come from Germany? Then you may think with pride of the senior Senator of the State of New York, Senator Wagner, born in Germany and author of some of the most progressive legislation in this country.

Are you a person of the black race? Then you may think with pride of Booker T. Washington, and Frederick Douglass, and George Washington Carver, three men of the black race who stand high on the roll of American educators.

Are you a Jewish refugee from oppression? Then you may think with pride of Albert Einstein, who, like yourself, was naturalized in a United States district court after coming here as refugee from oppression.

It makes no difference from what land you came, nor what church you go to, nor what is the color of your skin; people of your background have helped to make America what it is today. Your neighbor may have come from a different land, and may go to a different church, and may have a different color skin. But remember, people of his background have also helped to make America what it is today. And your first duty as American citizens is to be understanding, and neighborly, and tolerant.

But you have other duties, now that you are American citizens. You will soon have the opportunity to vote in local and State and in national elections. As a judge, it is none of my business for whom you vote, and I am not trying to advise you directly or indirectly for whom you should vote. But I am deeply concerned that when you do go to the polls to vote, you shall know who the candidates are and on what platforms they stand. It is your business to cast an intelligent vote. For remember, you are citizens; your vote is just as important as anyone else's. You are truly a part of a society in which the Government is not only of the people, but by the people and for the people, and you are part of the people by whom this country is now to be governed. You will have a chance not only to vote, but perhaps even to hold office. And even if you do not, perhaps your children and other members of your family will hold office.

Whenever I speak in this particular courtroom at a naturalization session, I am mindful of the board behind me, and the list of names which are on that board. They probably are unfamiliar names to you, but they are a list of the persons who have served on the Supreme Court of the United States and who at the time of their appointment were living in the first circuit, in New England.

The names start with Cushing and Story, on my right, your left, and go all the way down to Holmes and Moody and Brandeis. And yet, the list is not quite complete, for since the time that list was erected, another man living in New England at the time of his appointment was put upon the Supreme Court of the United States. And that appointee is a man who came from Austria when he was a little boy, and when he was 12 years of age his parents were naturalized, just as you have been naturalized, in a United States courtroom. He stands as the symbol of opportunity which opens up before you and your children.

Of course, a democracy is not only a place where one has an opportunity to vote and an opportunity for office. In a democracy the people in their day-to-day efforts contribute to the morale of the country. Upon you rests a great responsibility. Never has it been better phrased than by an ancient Greek, Pericles, speaking more than 2,000 years ago, who said at the conclusion of the first year of the war between ancient Athens and ancient Sparta:

"The secret of happiness is liberty.
And the secret of liberty is courage."

May you have in the day to day affairs of this country the courage which will preserve the liberties which we regard as the secret of our happiness.

Message to Residents of Kassel, Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, Judge Joseph J. Moriarty recently made an extensive trip into Germany and during the course of his visit made a speech at Kassel, Germany, which has received consideration both in the German and American press. His explanation of our American principles of government was undoubtedly an inspiration to those in the troubled country of Germany, who I am sure are also grateful for the message of hope which Judge Moriarty has so capably expressed.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Judge Moriarty's speech and newspaper comment in the Shakopee Valley News, Shakopee, Minn.:

HAIL JUDGE'S KASSEL TALK JANUARY 10—MORIARTY'S SPEECH WIDELY REPRINTED IN GERMAN NEWSPAPERS

A speech given to the citizens of Kassel, Germany, by Judge Joseph J. Moriarty was widely reprinted in the German press, it was learned this week.

Judge Moriarty, traveling in Germany at the present time, addressed a representative group in Kassel on January 10, shortly after his arrival in that country. The complete text of the speech is reprinted on another page of the Valley News.

His words were hailed as giving new courage to the German people as they are faced with the huge rebuilding task in that country.

During his stay in Germany the Shakopee judge has been visiting children's hospitals, boys' clubs, displaced persons camps, and has also addressed many civic and industrial groups.

He was scheduled this week to confer with the head of a German university, which in prewar days was considered one of the largest and most distinguished in Germany.

While in Europe he is visiting his son, Sgt. Pat Moriarty, presently on duty with the military government headquarters there. Judge Moriarty, while traveling as a private citizen with the full sanction of the American Government, is the guest of Gen. Lucius Clay, military governor of Germany.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY JUDGE JOSEPH J. MORIARTY TO THE CITIZENS OF GERMANY AT KASSEL, JANUARY 10, 1948

Acting as one free to act in a free country, I concluded to travel thousands of miles to visit my fellow men in this part of the world, and I assure you that I am pleased to be here so that I may be able to appreciate first-hand your problems. I came from the United States of America with full sanction of my Government for no other purpose than to convey to all the people of Germany, both young and old, the good will of the people at home and to visit my son, Sergeant Pat, on military duty here, and bring to him and all associated with him in the German youth movement the thanks and gratitude of the American people for their most commendable and worthy efforts in behalf of the well-being of the boys and girls of Germany.

I came in the name of liberty and justice, and I bring you nothing more than the earnest prayer of the people of my homeland for your future happiness and prosperity and for strength and courage and divine guidance to enable you and direct you, as a people, to lay wisely the foundations of a new and greater Germany, dedicated to liberty, justice, and the equality of men before law.

Men are born free, and men in every part of the world have an inherent and natural right to be free. Liberty comes from no man and no government. It is God-given. Freemen have a right to form a free nation, and nations have a right to be free. Take from the individual his liberty and rob him of his human dignity, and you reduce him to the station of a slave. Take from a nation its right of independence and freedom, and you reduce it to a vassal state, and you bind its people as the tyrant would bind his slaves.

From the beginning, the liberty for which men fought and died was liberty of thought—liberty of speech—liberty of conscience—liberty of action—liberty of all the human faculties, and from the beginning all reasonable men regarded the security of human freedom and the protection of the rights of men against the wrongs of others as the first concern of organized government.

Human liberty is the precious property of the individual. It is a property which is inalienable. It is a right which no man has the privilege to surrender to any power on earth. Without it, man is reduced to the state of a slave. His talents are useless. His urge to advance into a better and fuller life without hope. He lives, labors, and dies and his life work is simply the gain of his oppressor.

To protect man in the enjoyment of his liberty and to secure to him a proper station in the order of things and to enable him to fulfill the purpose for which he was created, society forms organized government which derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, ever controlled by the will and the dictates of the conscience of the people directly involved. The sole purpose of such a government is the general welfare of all the people and the full security of each. The society acting in such a process is not a select few or an ambitious and cruel leader but the whole collection of men. In such a government, the individual is safe in the full enjoyment of his liberty and the full enjoyment of life and has an equal chance with all other persons to advance to that state of prosperity, happiness, and peace of mind, which is the common birthright of men.

Man was not created to be ruled by the whims and fancies of another man, nor to serve the selfish interests of another individual, nor to be bound by the spoken words of a dictator. Man was created with a free will and a conscience to guide and direct that will, and man has a natural right to have his conscience and will play its proper part in shaping the course of the government which prescribes the standards of his civil conduct. Therefore, one of the functions of government is to carry into practice the dictates of the conscience and will of all the people who compose it, and such form of government is known to the world as a democracy. This is the form of government which I am a part of in America, and this is the form of government which I am ready to defend and protect to the end of my life. This is the form

of government which has the sanction of the conscience of the people of the world, and this form of government is in keeping with the planning of God for the regulation of the lives of men.

I will be among you for some short period of time during which I will visit life in this country as it battles with all the roughness of every environment in every section. I assure you I am an old and tired warrior in this sphere of human experience, for my trail so far in life led over the rocky road of adversity and hard knocks. I chose to travel this course because I found in it the true stimulus to the highest ideals of civilization.

I come from my own country as a messenger of good will and this I now impart to each and all of you with the fervent hope that in the light of this good will the Old and the New Worlds shall find a common ground for an ever-enduring peace.

Peacetime Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an editorial from the January 30, 1948, issue of the Pilot, published in Boston, Mass., in the interest of the Catholic Church in the archdiocese.

The editorial follows:

PEACETIME MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

The sponsors of the bill to draft 18-year-old boys for compulsory military service are greatly assisted by American suspicion of Soviet Russia's plans. Soviet Russia, palpably, has already inaugurated a cold war against the United States.

To some minds the conclusion from this is obvious—let us prepare! Remember Pearl Harbor? Well, let's not let that happen again! Let's conscript our youngsters; give them 6 months in an Army camp; then 6 months more in the National Guard, the Organized Reserve, or the Regular Army. Then see if the Russians won't behave more politely.

However, it is a point of those who oppose compulsory military service that the Russians will not be impressed. No one disputes that the value of mass concentration has lessened or disappeared. The emphasis, in the minds of the scientists who know most about the atomic bomb, should be on deconcentration. Better even than that, we should strive earnestly and prayerfully to prevent the possibility of turning either New York or Moscow into another Hiroshima. But, following through with the initial point, would 6 months of squads-right in an Army camp really entitle us to call the country prepared?

The opponents of compulsory military service want to play fair with the argument of those who favor the proposal. A man who knows even a little about the mechanism of the automobile he is driving has an advantage over the driver who knows nothing. It could be granted that compulsory military service would be worth something from the viewpoint of preparedness. But, how much? Enough to justify a revolution in our way of living? Enough to balance the other enormous debits?

Our philosophy as a people is dead against the "theirs-not-to-reason-why" mentality of the soldier. Demanding unity, but not uniformity, we have preserved and enhanced a genius of initiative. In this country, we believe in, to quote from General Eisenhower's magnificent statement, "the subordination of the military to civil power." Having viewed police states ancient and modern, our people feel no urge to copy their systems. And when military mores dominate a country's thinking and practices, emergency becomes permanent, marshal law becomes the routine code and in the name of "efficiency" democracy, even though its trappings and nomenclature have been preserved, becomes a body struck to the heart.

Many of our citizens retain vivid memories of their experience in the late war. They will not be impressed by the preachment that the camp will make a man of your boy. That's not the purpose of the training. The purpose is to produce an efficient killing machine. Traditionally the general really doesn't give a snap of his finger for other values. His job is to win wars, not to build character. Ask the ex-chaplains what they think of the argument that military service will make a man of your boy.

We who oppose peacetime military conscription find ourselves supported by distasteful allies. Our Communist friends are very ardently anticonscription.

But the paradox is simply explained. They see peacetime military conscription as a fist brandished against their first loyalty, Soviet Russia.

But there are enlightened, thoroughly American reasons for refusing Communists a chance to preempt a right position—which they espouse for the wrong reasons. Peacetime military conscription is an expensive, cumbersome method of achieving a purpose which could be better implemented by other methods. It represents an encroachment on our civilian liberties more radical than any attempted since the founding of the Republic—and, as such, is fraught with the menace of other encroachments. Lastly, peacetime military conscription exposes the adolescence of this country to moral hazards which are peculiar to the atmosphere of the camp.

Veterans' Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Brighton Blade of January 26, 1948:

MANY VETERANS TAKE TRAINING—ONE VETERAN IN FOUR NOW ENROLLED IN PROGRAM

The number of veterans in institutional and on-the-job training in the VA branch 13 area reached an all-time high at the end of last December, VA reports.

Figures released this week show a total of 61,978 ex-GI's in New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah receiving instructions or training under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (GI bill) and Public Law 16. This number represents 23.7 percent of the estimated War II veteran population of 261,000 in the four-State area, or nearly one veteran in every four.

MOST IN COLLEGE

Most of these veterans are enrolled in colleges and universities, while others are attending business, trade, and commercial schools. In addition, nearly 14,000 are learning a trade or profession in State-approved establishments or receiving practical training on the farm.

For the entire Nation, 19.1 percent of the War II veteran population of 14,625,000, VA said, are receiving educational or training benefits administered by the VA.

TWENTY-SIX AND FOUR-TENTHS PERCENT IN COLORADO

The number of veterans in training on December 31, 1947, by States and the percentage of the estimated War II veteran population for that State follow: Colorado, 31,195 or 26.4 percent; Utah, 17,263 or 25.8 percent; New Mexico, 9,746 to 19.5 percent, and Wyoming, 3,772 or 14.5 percent.

Statement of L. Douglas Meredith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me, I am including in the RECORD the testimony of L. Douglas Meredith, executive vice president of the National Life Insurance Co., Montpelier, Vt., before the Joint Committee on Housing on January 15:

STATEMENT OF L. DOUGLAS MEREDITH, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, AND CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE CO., MONTPELIER, VT.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meredith, it is nice of you to make this trip down here. We are very grateful to you, and I know we are going to absorb a lot from your statement, because we have found in going about that you are quite an authority on this subject.

Mr. MEREDITH. My name is L. Douglas Meredith.

I hold the office, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, of executive vice president, and chairman of the committee on finance, of the National Life Insurance Co., Montpelier, Vt., and I am most appreciative of the invitation to appear here to discuss this matter with you.

While the National Life Insurance Co. is not a large company, we have made over a quarter of a billion of FHA loans and also about 10,600 GI loans of all kinds.

I am also chairman of the subcommittee on postwar housing of the investment research committee, which is a joint committee of the Life Insurance Association of America, and the America Life Convention.

I believe I have close enough contact with the other companies to have a fair consensus of their views on some of these points.

These organizations have a combined United States membership of over 209 companies, with resources approximately $49,000,000,000, held in the interest of 75,000,000 policyholders and their beneficiaries. A recent survey made by the Federal Reserve Board shows that 74 percent of all families with incomes between $2,000 and $3,000 own life insurance. The life-insurance companies, consequently, have a primary interest in the same broad mass of people in which your committee is interested.

The subject your committee is considering has many phases, ranging from the financial to the technical, and because of the limitations of time, much of the emphasis of this presentation will be on the financial aspects.

The legal reserve life insurance companies at the end of 1947 had $8,500,000,000 invested in mortgage loans. In 1947 alone, mortgage loans owned by these companies increased $1,300,000,000, the major portion of which

was for residential purposes, largely for veterans. The life-insurance companies hold $800,000,000 of GI loans and $1,400,000,000 of FHA loans. Some companies have constructed or are constructing large-scale rental housing projects, investment in which on December 31, together with outstanding commitments, was over $300,000,000, providing approximately 40,000 family units. That would house a city about the size of Albany.

These figures should leave no doubt in anyone's mind as to the extent of the interest of the life-insurance companies in housing.

Solution of today's housing problem must begin with analysis of the fundamentals of high prices and the factors which have caused them. The problem of inordinately high prices is one of a scarce supply of goods and services in relation to a strong demand on the part of the general public. This demand is backed by a tremendous volume of purchasing power which, if put into effect, could further increase prices.

The Federal Government has been pursuing a "soft," or "easy," money policy, and this has resulted in a tremendous increase in the country's money supply. Demand deposits and currency in circulation increased more than two and one-half times during the period of war financing.

With your permission, I would like to point to this graph. That is taking into account solely demand deposits and currency in circulation which increased almost three times from 1940 to 1947.

We have plotted on here the Federal Reserve Board industrial production curve, and the spread between those is the inflationary gap which is causing basically high prices.

This money supply increased from less than $40,000,000,000—you will notice that that is a percentage chart and this shows a percentage charge but dollar-wise the increase was from less than $40,000,000,000 in June 1940 to $106,000,000,000 at the end of June 1946.

Savings deposits which in June 1940 were $27,000,000,000 almost doubled in the same period. In addition, the general public, exclusive of financial institutions and Government agencies, accumulated holdings of Government securities in the amount of $100,000,000,000, or nearly seven times as much as the holdings in June 1940. These Government securities in the hands of the public, and particularly the E, F, and G bonds, are about the equivalent of money because they are so readily convertible into cash.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System estimated that at the end of 1946, individuals and business concerns held about $223,000,000,000 in the form of currency, demand and savings bank deposits, and Government securities, or more than three times the prewar total.

This chart is made the same as the other. This is the percentage scale, and this shows the years 1940 through 1946. This green line shows the liquid assets of individuals and businesses.

That includes only currency, demand, and savings deposits and Government securities.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. All Government securities?

Mr. MEREDITH. All Government securities, all types which individuals might hold.

That does not take into account individual holdings of shares in savings and loan associations, listed securities, stocks, or bonds, and a great many things of that kind.

If you will take this curve you will see the percentage figures there—they were three times the prewar total, a total of $223,000,000,000.

If we take the Federal Reserve Board curve of industrial production again, here is the spread between this large sum of liquid assets held by the public and the goods being produced.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. You were talking about the E, F, and G bonds which are practically the same as cash.

Mr. MEREDITH. Yes.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Isn't it almost a reality that the Government is allowing these people to invest their funds in call money at better than call-money rates?

Mr. MEREDITH. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. And it is an inflationary pressure that could be exerted at almost anytime?

Mr. MEREDITH. That is what we are trying to demonstrate with these two charts.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. When the Government is saying it is going to start a further campaign to sell those bonds through pay-roll deductions, isn't it doing something which will increase the inflationary pressure sometime in the future?

Mr. MEREDITH. That is the point.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. If they were sold as bonds to be held until maturity, I can see where they would be deflationary, but when they are allowing them to be turned in at anytime, it seems to me like they are inflationary.

Mr. MEREDITH. They are tantamount to cash in the hands of any of us.

The figure probably rose slightly in 1947. In addition, current national income is at a record level, running at a rate of $200,000,000,000 per year, or 2½ times the 1940 figure.

In the face of the demand growing out of this enormous supply of money, production is at a point beyond which further growth will necessarily be slow. Commissioner Ewan Clague, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, stated recently that American industry as a whole is producing at about the maximum level and a longer workweek. According to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, the physical volume of construction of all kinds, including residential building, is close to any previous peak, and further expansion is now being retarded by shortages of essential labor and materials.

The facts just stated are the basic causes of the price rise which this country has experienced.

You understand that I might spend much time on that.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. And I might say it is the primary cause for our whole inflation, not only housing.

Mr. MEREDITH. Oh, yes, sir. I repeat that the facts just stated are the basic causes of the price rise which this country has just experienced.

One of the most important facts which emerges is that excessively easy mortgage credit now serves only to accelerate the rise of prices and has been a significant factor in the rise of 25 to 35 percent in the prices of houses during the past 2 years. It is widely agreed that easy mortgage credit, with the resultant rise in housing costs, has aggravated the general spiral of inflation.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Even though the FHA may have increased production in some cases yet has also added to the inflationary cost?

Mr. MEREDITH. Oh, yes, sir; whether FHA or any type, an uninsured loan, easy credit, has aggravated inflation.

The amount of home-mortgage debt has increased during the past 2 years by more than $9,000,000,000 and the rate of current mortgage lending has risen from about $550,000,000 per month to about $1,000,000,000 per month. Terms of lending have been substantially easier, as compared with the prewar. A large proportion of recent loans has been made on an installment basis at 4-percent interest for periods from 20 to 25 years. The bulk of these loans has been made for a very high percentage of current sale price. As Mr. Marriner Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, pointed out in a statement on November 25 before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report—

"Since more than half of the current unprecedented volume of mortgage lending is sponsored by the Federal Government under legislation enacted by Congress, the Government must assume much of the responsibility for any harmful effects of this type of lending."

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Is it your belief then that the FHA, although it serves a good purpose, should be given very careful consideration as to perhaps making their requirements a little more stringent, for instance, as to the length of the loan, the interest rate, or from the point of view of the down payment?

Mr. MEREDITH. I would say, sir, that at this time all types of mortgage lending might well give thought to the length of the term of the loan, the interest rate, and to the down payment.

And may I say that I think no one is more enthusiastic about FHA as I am. Insofar as some of the loans now being insured by FHA, and we have a lot of them in our portfolio, they have been made on a current cost basis, and I believe, if we could get back near to the basis on which they were insured under title II without doing any harm, it would do a lot of good to the general situation.

Mr. Eccles also stated:

"Easy credit has greatly increased the effective demand for both old and new housing far beyond the supply, and this has greatly inflated prices."

To continue quoting:

"If the easy-credit situation were producing a substantial additional volume of housing at supportable values in the long run, it would be justified, but because of the limitations of labor and materials, it produces, instead, a dangerously inflated market which cannot be sustained for both new and old houses. I believe that by curtailment of credit for housing in closer relationship to the supply of labor and materials the price trend would be reversed and a market for houses assured over a long period of years."

This argument by Mr. Eccles, and his recommendation for tighter housing credit, has been supported by Senator TAFT, the Federal Reserve Advisory Council, the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, and others. It has been one of the most generally accepted arguments made in the current congressional discussion of anti-inflationary measures. I believe it merits very serious consideration by your committee.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Is it your opinion that if credit restrictions are made a little more severe that will stop, perhaps, the acute demand for new houses, and therefore might be instrumental in bringing the price down?

Mr. MEREDITH. I think it can help, yes, sir. At the same time, we must keep in mind the tremendous inflationary potential.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Which is the primary cause of our inflation?

Mr. MEREDITH. Yes, sir.

With your permission, I would like to say just a few words about interest rates and their relation to this whole problem.

The operation of natural forces or the action of Federal fiscal and monetary authorities, or a combination of both, have resulted in the past 6 months in a sharp up-turn in interest rates. At first glance, coming in the wake of the lowest interest rates in history, this circumstance may seem somewhat alarming. But in reality it means that a brake upon inflation is taking effect. If the monetary authorities continue their recent steps in the direction of contracting the supply of money, or at least preventing further expansion, there is strong reason to believe that the policy will operate to curtail inflation. Similar policies have proved effective in the past. As a matter of fact, a rise in interest rates at the present time has a salutary effect—the point just mentioned—in that it tends to make prospective borrowers more thoughtful about assuming an obligation, particularly one that extends over a long period of years.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Is it true the rise in interest rates has been practically negligible to date? It has been more a psychological

effect that shows we have turned the corner rather than an actual rise in rates to date?

Mr. MEREDITH. I would say we have had a significant rise in interest rates to date.

Government bonds which sold on a 2½ basis are now selling at 248 or 249. And other bonds have come about in proportion into balance.

In the second place, a higher interest rate will tend to bring forth a larger amount of savings which is very desirable under present inflationary conditions.

The rate of interest is significant only when it is applied to the amount of money borrowed. The fiscal policies of the past decade which produced the lowest money rates in history, also have produced higher real-estate prices. It frequently is necessary for a home purchaser to borrow much more money than he would have been obliged to borrow 5 or 6 years ago to buy the same house. Under circumstances of this kind, the borrower would be far better off to pay 5 percent or higher interest on the sum of money required 5 years ago to buy the same house. Under circumstances of this kind, the borrower would be far better off to pay 5 percent or higher interest on the sum of money required 5 years ago, than to be obliged to pay 4 percent or 4½ percent on the money he now will be obliged to borrow. As pointed out in Housing Costs, a study made by the National Housing Agency, a 20-percent reduction in the cost of a house and lot is more than three times as effective in reducing monthly costs than a 20-percent reduction in the rate of interest charged for a loan.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Depending, of course, on how the features of the loan are.

Mr. MEREDITH. Oh, yes, the same type of loan.

Mortgage-interest rates may seem high to the uninitiated, but we must bear in mind that the net rate of return to a lender is not the contract rate as stipulated.

Out of this return, the investor must deduct his own expenses of buying and handling the loans, must write off any premium paid, pay the expenses of servicing, and must make some allowance for losses which are likely to result no matter how carefully loans may be selected.

At the 1945 meeting of the American Life Convention, representatives of four life-insurance companies presented figures to show the estimated net return on mortgage loans their companies owned.

These estimates showed that, assuming a 4½-percent interest rate on FHA loans, the net return averaged 3.04 percent after deducting the expenses just cited.

We must never forget that interest, while an expense to borrowers, is income to savers.

Our Nation was spending money so rapidly during the war, and it was necessary, of course, so much of this money was borrowed, that emphasis was soley on the cost side, with little thought for the people to whom interest is income.

The life-insurance companies of the country, with approximately 75,000,000 policy holders, afford an excellent illustration of savers who have been severely penalized by the low-interest-rate policy of the Federal Government.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Meredith, on that point, I believe I asked a previous witness if he does not feel that interest rates were about as low as they could be for financing loans. How do you feel about it?

Mr. MEREDITH. Very definitely so, sir.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. How do we answer many of the people of this country who have not had much experience with loans and mortgages who seem to think that when they get a mortgage on a 20- or 25- or 30-year period, and when they pay interest that, therefore, they are paying three times as much for interest as they are for the house.

Mr. MEREDITH. Well, unfortunately, of course, that condition does prevail, and I think the lending institutions are aware of it, and we try to explain to them, as I wish to emphasize, if I may, in a moment here, that interest has two sides, one is the cost to the borrower, and the other is income to the saver.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I am in agreement with you, and I am glad you are going to bring that point out.

Mr. MEREDITH. Mr. Lewis W. Douglas, then president of the Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York and now Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, appeared before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in December 1945 in opposition to the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

Mr. Douglas vigorously emphasized this point, and called attention to the sharp decline in the net earning rate of life-insurance companies from 1930 to 1945, a rate which has declined from 5 percent in 1930 to just over 3 percent in 1945, largely because of the decline in interest rates during this period, and in 1945 the net rate of earnings declined to 2.9 percent.

In 1921, 11 insurance companies, with approximately $10,000,000,000 of insurance and $2,200,000,000 in assets, earned $40,000,000 over and above the minimum amount required to maintain reserves.

This amount is known as excess interest, and with gains from other sources constitutes the sum which may be paid to policyholders in the form of dividends.

In 1944, with about double the volume of insurance in force, and assets over three and a half times as large, the companies had only about $21,000,000 above their requirement, compared with $40,000,000 in 1930.

Low interest rates, when created and maintained by artificial devices employed by the Federal Government, impose a severe hidden tax upon the savers of the Nation, including not only life-insurance policyholders but depositors in savings banks, savings and loan associations, pensioners and annuitants, endowed institutions, and others.

The inflationary situation has obscured the great progress being made in the direction of solution of the housing problem, with several aspects which deserve special mention.

The Bureau of the Census estimates that the number of families in the United States, including those doubled up as well as those living in separate quarters, increased 4,900,000 from the beginning of 1940 to the early part of 1947.

In the same period there was a net increase in the number of dwelling units of 4,400,000 in farm and nonfarm areas, with about 3,500,000 units newly constructed and approximately 1,000,000 added by conversions of existing nonfarm houses or on farms.

In other words, in spite of the war the increase in supply of housing units has very nearly kept pace with the increase in families.

Furthermore, as the census figures indicate, existing houses have, during these years, been brought into more efficient use by major repairs and installation of plumbing equipment.

We have through these means and in the face of very trying conditions, not only been able to augment the supply of housing roughly to correspond with the increase in the number of families, but we have also made substantial betterments in previously existing housing.

Along with this accomplishment and contrary to the general impression, there has occurred a slight reduction in the crowding of houses as is indicated by a decrease in the census estimate of persons per nonfarm dwelling unit from almost 3.2 in 1940 to 3.1 in 1947. That is a slight reduction, but it does indicate a downward trend contrary to the general belief.

The strides thus made both during and after the war are much greater than is frequently recognized. This is even more apparent when the recovery of house building after World War II is compared with World War I.

New housing construction in 1947, the second postwar year, was 120 percent of the volume in 1941, while that of 1920 was only 62 percent of 1918 and 67 percent of 1914.

The postwar housing record also compares favorably with passenger-car production, for example, which in 1947 was only 94 percent of 1941, compared with the housing figure of 120 percent.

It should be plain that a creditable job thus far has been done, in spite of all the difficulties of converting from wartime to peacetime production.

There remains, of course, a great deal yet to be done, and it is, perhaps, fortunate for our general economic welfare that this is so.

If it were possible to produce new houses for everybody who wanted one, and if we were to accomplish this miracle in 1948, we would probably have occasion to regret it later, even though improved housing may be desirable.

Directly and indirectly, residential construction provides a large amount of employment, and it is highly desirable that we should spread this construction over several years.

An excessively large concentration of building in the next year or two will mean a slump later on, in all likelihood, with unemployment for the building trades and suppliers and with a serious danger of dispossessing veterans and other homeowners.

Furthermore, such excessive stimulation of building would add greatly to the inflationary pressures, which we have been talking about earlier, and specifically would cause higher real-estate prices and increase the financial burden on home ownership.

If the present problems of an inflated economy can be satisfactorily overcome, we can look forward to a period of high building activity, accelerated removal of obsolete structures, and constantly improving housing conditions.

We are all impatient to speed up this process. We should all like to see everyone housed to his taste right now.

On the other hand, if we are to bear in mind not only problems of immediate need, but those as well of the long-range stability of our economic system, we must realize that our justifiable impatience requires some tempering.

The problem of housing today is precisely the same as it is in the case of clothing, automobiles, and other goods, namely, how to increase the volume of production, and at the same time, to reduce prices, or at least to hold the line on prices.

It is unlikely that any dramatic method can be found to accomplish this objective.

I should like to consider at this point some of the specific proposals which have been made to increase the supply of housing.

One, a number of steps can be taken to increase productive efficiency in the residential construction industry. Hearings earlier this week have revealed the efforts that builders and materials manufacturers have been making in introducing simplified building methods, in improving building codes, in assisting in apprentice training, and in industry-wide research.

And I hope before your hearings have been completed that you will hear about the engineered housing program, which is a very significant step.

The CHAIRMAN. We had that scheduled for last Monday, sir, and we had so many witnesses that we had to postpone it until next week, next Monday.

Mr. MEREDITH. I believe you will find it very interesting.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the one with slides, and so forth?

Mr. MEREDITH. The engineered house is the one which uses a standard module of measurement.

The CHAIRMAN. Modular.

Mr. MEREDITH. Yes, modular, 4 inches, 4 feet.

The CHAIRMAN. We are going to have an hour on that.

Mr. MEREDITH. I am glad to hear that, sir.

The Federal Government should aid industry in its cost-reduction program through assistance to technical research, building code improvement, and apprentice training.

Efforts should be made to increase productivity in the building industry, for this is the fundamental way to more and better housing, without incurring inflationary consequences.

2. Consideration might be given to encouragement of construction of rental housing through modification of the corporate income tax, particularly by steps that would permit a more rapid amortization of the investment.

Modification of the corporate income tax would make the construction of housing for rental and investment more attractive than construction of houses for sale.

This would also encourage, in a period of high prices, a greater proportion of equity investment instead of encouraging borrowing as has been the case with many of the measures previously taken by the Government. A program of this kind, of course, also must be considered from the point of view of the over-all tax program.

3. One of the plans designed to increase the supply of housing is the provision for yield insurance, as set forth, for example, in Title V of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

This plan, which was intended to be especially attractive to life insurance companies, would have the Government guarantee a minimum return to companies making direct investment of their funds in rental projects.

As we have pointed out, some companies are already engaged in this latter form of activity, and plans for its expansion are extensive.

The drawback is not the need for Government protection, but cost, and some companies seem reluctant to proceed under cost conditions that make reliance on the guaranty almost a certainty. There is nothing in the yield insurance plan that can reduce cost.

To my knowledge, no company or group of companies has asked for this type of special protection and, in my opinion, few, if indeed any, of them would use it.

It may be noted that the Dominion of Canada has had in force since 1944, a yield insurance plan much more liberal than any proposed in this country, and as I understand it, without having produced anything but one project of eight-family units thus far.

If a project is sound, it is likely to be undertaken on its own merits, and yield insurance would not be needed; if it is not sound, it is hard to believe that yield insurance would make it so.

4. Various plans involving further direct use of Government funds to provide housing have been put forward. These range from a resumption of the prewar program of public housing under the United States Housing Act, to various plans providing for subsidy payments directly to builders, investors, or purchasers to overcome present costs.

It should be remembered that any subsidy is a cost to the Nation's taxpayers, and a burden on the economy.

Notwithstanding the possible merits of some form of subsidy for the benefit of low-income families as part of a long-range housing program, the effects today would be harmful in some respects.

No matter what form in which it was offered, the subsidy under present inflationary conditions would, by the increased pressure of demand in the housing field, be quickly translated into higher cost. The experience in England after World War I is a spectacular demonstration of this fact.

In the short run, therefore, any form of public housing would serve to promote inflation. If public housing should be undertaken after inflationary pressures subside, there are certain stipulations it should meet.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. What you are saying today is that with such a demand for materials and labor and all the things that go into a house, that Government participation would only add to the demand.

Mr. MEREDITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. And you do not believe that they could do it as efficiently perhaps as private enterprise is doing the job.

Mr. MEREDITH. That is right, sir.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Secondly, are you intimating that really what is going to make it sound, whether it is the Federal or private or individual funds going into a project, what is really going to make it sound or unsound is the probable original costs.

Mr. MEREDITH. Yes, costs and, of course, the prospect of return, reasonable return, over a long period of time on that cost.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. So, what you are saying is that if the Government is going to do these big projects, and they may have to do some percentage, and there may be some room for Government some time in the future, but you certainly think it ought to be postponed at the present.

Mr. MEREDITH. Yes, sir. In the short run, if public housing should be undertaken after inflationary pressures subside, there are certain stipulations it should meet:

One, the temporary stopgap nature of the program should be clearly stated in whatever legislation was enacted for the purpose.

Two, the housing built should be available only to families of the lowest-income group, who are living in slum conditions.

Three, the housing should provide minimum decent accommodations.

Four, the Government should dispose of the housing at the end of the amortization period, the period over which it is written off.

Five, the housing should be financed to a greater extent than hitherto by local participation.

Six, any subsidy should be readily discernible so that the taxpayers will know the cost.

In summary, there are two cardinal facts in the housing situation in 1948 that should influence our policy for this year.

The first is that the Nation is now involved in a struggle to control inflation. This struggle must be won before we can hope fully to meet our housing objective.

Certainly, such measures as easier mortgage terms, subsidies for housing, restricted interest rates, and similar proposals will not accomplish little toward this end. Except through technological advances, such as are now under way, it is not possible immediately to stimulate production to greater heights, without increasing the inflationary risk.

The second major fact is that we are making marked progress toward the lessening of our housing difficulties. A large volume of residential construction is going forward, and the outlook is favorable for the future, providing costs do not increase sharply.

Ample financing at reasonable rates is available. With a continued high level of national income, and a continued high rate of building along with improvement in productivity, the condition of our housing supply, as a whole, will be steadily bettered.

But we are confronted with a serious choice, lying between more inflation and dramatic attempts to solve quickly the housing problem, or, on the other hand, less inflation and a sober, rational attack upon housing.

As custodians of trust funds owned by a large majority of the American people, the insurance companies, naturally would prefer the second course, and we sincerely commend its merits to the attention of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir; that is a very able document which the gentleman has presented to us, and it is worthy of much study.

Senator FLANDERS. Mr. Meredith, I was sorry that I could not get here earlier. As I was coming in, I heard you say some things that are unorthodox, so far as other testimony and intimation is concerned. I heard you using, if I understood it, some very large figures, as to the production of dwelling units during the war and since.

Would you mind turning back to that, if you can find the spot?

Mr. MEREDITH. Very easily, Senator. Would you like me to read that paragraph?

Senator FLANDERS. Yes; you just might read that paragraph.

Mr. MEREDITH. The inflationary situation has obscured the great progress being made in the direction of solution of the housing problem. If I may say, Senator, I began the case by demonstrating the inflationary gap.

Senator FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. MEREDITH. And its effect on the prices of houses and prices generally.

Senator FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. MEREDITH. The inflationary situation has obscured the great progress being made in the direction of solution of the housing problem, several aspects of which deserve special mention.

The Bureau of the Census estimates that the number of families in the United States, including those doubled up as well as those living in separate quarters, increased 4,900,000 from the beginning of 1940 to the early part of 1947.

In the same period there was a net increase in the number of dwelling units of 4,400,000 in farm and nonfarm areas.

Senator FLANDERS. The other was four million how many?

Mr. MEREDITH. Nine hundred.

Senator FLANDERS. And this is four million four.

Mr. MEREDITH. Yes, sir.

In farms and nonfarm areas, with about three and one-half million units newly constructed, and approximately one million added by conversions of existing nonfarm houses or on farms.

Senator FLANDERS. Now, does that include temporary housing?

Mr. MEREDITH. Yes, sir; I believe it does.

Senator FLANDERS. Does it go still further, and include such trailer housing as we had up in our town there in Vermont?

Mr. MEREDITH. I believe it does.

Senator FLANDERS. Yes. So that it is not a net gain; the gain is not necessarily a net, a permanent gain.

Mr. MEREDITH. I have some statisticians with me, and I would like to ask them if they would confirm my opinion. That does include temporary; it includes temporary, but not trailers.

Senator FLANDERS. I was not thinking of the trailer that a man buys or builds, but these somewhat elaborate trailers which were furnished by some branch of the Department of Agriculture; I forget what they called them.

Mr. MEREDITH. I understand not, and if your committee is interested, Senator, in more details, I would be very happy to prepare a memorandum and file it for the record, if you like.

Senator FLANDERS. You see those total figures are a bit astonishing when we think of this past year's effort that is being a very creditable undertaking. What was the number of completions and the number of starts?

Mr. MEREDITH. About 850,000.

Senator FLANDERS. About 850,000, but the average on this basis you have just given is

something like that for the whole period, is it not?

Mr. MEREDITH. No, sir; if we take 4,400,000 from 1940 into part of 1947, that is almost 8 years.

Senator FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. MEREDITH. And, of course, that includes 1940, which was not a war year, and a reasonably prosperous year, and the war years are in there.

Senator FLANDERS. That would indicate, except for the fact the temporary housing is included, that there was a deficiency over that period of about 500,000 homes.

Mr. MEREDITH. Yes, sir.

Senator FLANDERS. And those 500,000 homes were some net loss, probably of buildings going out of use from decay or whatever.

Mr. MEREDITH. One of my associates has some information here, and with your permission——

Senator FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. MEREDITH. Yes; these gentlemen tell me that there are 300,000 temporary units approximately in that total.

Senator FLANDERS. Yes. That would seem to indicate that if the new construction is in the right spot, that we would be catching up on the relationship between dwelling units and families coming in.

Mr. MEREDITH. That is the point, Senator, we are making tremendous progress, excellent progress, we believe.

Senator FLANDERS. Even with that 300,000, the chances would seem to be good.

Mr. MEREDITH. It would seem to be excellent; yes, sir.

Senator FLANDERS. Is the rate of production of new families keeping up with the high level of the past 2 or 3 years?

Mr. MEREDITH. I believe and suspect that they are falling off.

Senator FLANDERS. Well, that is extremely interesting, Mr. Meredith, and I thank you for bringing it here, because I believe we are getting from this a bit more optimistic picture than we have been getting previously.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Gamble, I know we have other witnesses and I do not want to take too much time, but I was very interested in the statement of Mr. Meredith that the insurance companies had considerable amounts invested in real-estate loans.

Mr. MEREDITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I assume they still have more money available for that purpose?

Mr. MEREDITH. I believe they have, sir.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Do you think the supply is going to be adequate to meet the demands?

Mr. MEREDITH. I was very much interested in listening to the testimony of the previous witness.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. MEREDITH. When the VA program was first inaugurated it was estimated that at that time there would be about $40,000,000,000 loaned to veterans over the life of that program. To date, there have been roughly about $5,000,000,000 of GI loans made.

I should hesitate at this time to say that there will not be sufficient funds available to take care of that program. Now, what conditions may be like 3 years from now, or 5 years from now, I do not think we can tell.

As you know, that program is spread over a 10-year period, and these loans, many of them are being paid off quite rapidly, so that I should hate to say now that there will not be sufficient funds to take care of them.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Have you or has your company ever thought of the possibility of Government participation in housing injuring the value of the investments of your company in real-estate mortgages?

Mr. MEREDITH. That is obviously a very difficult question to answer because it would depend on the extent of the participation.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. All I said was, Have you ever considered that possibility, talking about you as an individual or your directors.

Mr. MEREDITH. When you are studying housing problems, you cannot help but give thought to that. It is quite obvious, to go to another extreme, that the Government could put the insurance companies right out of the lending field almost overnight, and if you were to have a tremendous building program, with enormous subsidies back of it, the Government absorbing the loss and operations, why, the value of our underlying securities could be adversely affected.

I will not say at the moment—I know of no one who is worried about it.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meredith, you were speaking of the progress in 1947 when we had starts of 86,000 homes, and during those last few months that was running at the rate of a million dollars a year.

Mr. MEREDITH. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And should run into a million in 1948, according to the figures that we have received. Does that coincide with your thoughts on the matter?

Mr. MEREDITH. We have heard all kinds of estimates, we believe, running as high as a million and a quarter. Some of us think that probably between eight and nine hundred thousand units for the year will be a very creditable job.

The CHAIRMAN. We get very fantastic figures. Somebody testified about a million nine hundred thousand. There is not enough material and labor in the country to construct so there is no use talking about it. I think there are an awful lot of people who did not realize what the present rate is, particularly the CIO.

You have one of the thoughts that we have, that is, if we do not look out, housing is going to price itself out of the field.

Senator FLANDERS. I would like to inquire whether you see any evidence as to whether or not the new construction is taking place in the areas in which there is the greatest need for it.

Mr. MEREDITH. Well, off-hand, my answer to that, Senator, would be that it is, because that is where the prices are being paid, and where the demand is expressing itself.

Senator FLANDERS. Would you feel, for instance, that New York City might be an area in which families were more doubled up than they just might be elsewhere, and that possibly construction was not taking care of that situation as rapidly as it might elsewhere?

Mr. MEREDITH. I am not intimately aware of the New York situation because our company has made very few loans in that area, but I have heard comments much along the lines of which you suggest.

Senator FLANDERS. I know in rent hearings that seemed to be a problem area, very much more serious than in any other part of the country.

Mr. MEREDITH. That impression, general impression, is prevalent, although I am not intimately acquainted with it.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Do you have any more questions?

Senator FLANDERS. No.

Mr. MEREDITH. Thank you, sir.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Thank you, Mr. Meredith; we were glad to hear from you.

The Papal Prophecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I am inserting a sonnet entitled "The Papal Prophecy," by Glen Levin Swiggett, as follows:

THE PAPAL PROPHECY

"The sinister light of a new conflict
On the horizon flashes already,"
On Christmas Day Pope Pius urgently
Did to an anxious troubled world predict,
That nations recreant and derelict,
Ere 'tis too late, may haste forthwith to see
Their willful, wayward course and errancy,
And to the ways of peace themselves addict.
But if such nations in their eagerness
For war cannot be won for peace through power
Of prayer, the warning of His Holiness
We must at last all heed, and seek with our
United strength to smite aggressiveness
That is preventing world peace at this hour.

Tariff-Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, American sovereignty in the collection of tariff revenue has now been delegated very largely to 17 foreign nations and among these 17 foreign nations are debtors of the United States. The 17 nations have held a number of meetings, the principal ones being at Geneva and Havana. At Geneva they drew up a document which they called a charter, the effect of which transfers tariff-making from the Congress to this body of debtor nations.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that this question is one for serious consideration on the part of the Congress of the United States at the present time. For the past 15 years there has been a tendency to circumvent Congress on the part of the administration, particularly the State Department. It is time we call a halt.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include here an article written by George E. Sokolsky taken from the Washington Times-Herald of January 30, 1948:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Since the day of Alexander Hamilton the tariff has been a sovereign activity of the United States, the Congress determining what it should be and in what manner it is to be collected. This phase of American sovereignty has now been delegated to 17 nations, including debtors to the United States.

Apart from the United States, these countries are Great Britain, Canada, India, Australia, Union of South Africa, New Zealand, Belgium-Luxembourg-Netherlands (known as Benelux), Brazil, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Norway, Lebanon, Soviet Russia declined to join.

The 17 nations have held a number of meetings, the principal ones being at Geneva and Havana. At Geneva they drew up a document which they call a charter, the effect of which transfers tariff-making from the Congress of the United States to this body of debtor nations.

Of course, that would be unconstitutional, so the device used is the Trade Agreement Act of 1934, since extended up to June 12, 1948, conferring upon the President the right to reduce the tariff under certain specific conditions.

The President can proclaim certain tariff changes as though they originated with him. Actually, they are a result of the conferences among these 17 nations and are part of a general agreement reached by the International Trade Organization (ITO) of the United Nations.

The decisions of ITO thus become the law of the land. Congress has thus abrogated an important part of American sovereignty.

The Geneva agreement affects about 3,600 tariff rates. A partial list shows that the following American commodities will be affected:

Shoes, glass, pottery, printing, engraving, stereotyping and electrotyping, bookbinding, cigar making, hats, painting, decorating and paperhanging, carpenters and joiners, breweries, meat cutters and butchers, garment industry, brick and clay, bricklaying, masonry and plastering, marble, slate and stone, wood carving, coopers, paper making, pulp sulphite and paper mills, metal polishers, buffers, platers, lithography, leather, wallpaper, wire weaving, aluminum, cement, lace, distillery products, watches, agricultural products generally, wool, mutton, chemicals, pigments and dry colors, salt, glassware, tile, chinaware, optical instruments, dental and surgical instruments, cutlery, scissors and shears, hardware, tools, saws, etc., electrical appliances, agricultural implements, metal abrasives, cast-iron pipe, firearms and ammunition, wire cloth, textile, shoe, etc., machinery, zinc, lead, copper and brass, nuts, figs, dates, and other specialty crops, textiles: cotton, woolens, and worsteds, papermakers' felts, laces and embroideries, threads, twines and cordage, rayons, velvets, and velveteens, elastic fabrics, wool felt hat bodies, linoleum and felt-base floor coverings, carpets and rugs, leather goods, pencils and pens, toys, bicycles.

The gist of the matter is that a tariff policy is being fixed for the United States by its debtors at a time when no one can correctly determine what the economic situation of the world will be a month hence.

We have just witnessed France's revaluation of her currency by unilateral action.

It so happens that what France did suits the United States, but it upsets Great Britain's economy, which this country has underwritten to the tune of $3,750,000,000, if anybody still remembers.

Who can say what Great Britain will be forced to do? In a word, we fix our tariff at a moment of universal flux.

Clair Wilcox, Director of the Office of International Trade Policy of the State Department, makes this point in a defense of ITO:

"* * * Political cooperation among nations remains in jeopardy so long as individual nations feel free to wage economic warfare with weapons of their own choosing and rules of their own making."

But that does not explain why the creditor country should be so completely at the mercy of its debtors. It is particularly difficult to understand why the United States should have to make all the sacrifices. The other countries made it clear that they could not go along with the ITO program unless we cut our tariff—so we cut our tariff.

Unquestionably the State Department bypassed Congress. The entire subject requires detailed investigation by Congress.

Certainly the trade agreement law, which expires on June 12, 1948, ought not and probably will not be renewed.

Meanwhile, business and labor, which face wild competition from socialized and low-waged countries, ought to consider their interests.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Evangelist, of Albany, N. Y., issue of January 16, 1948:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING SEEN AS HAZARD TO MORALITY

Voicing vigorous opposition to the need of universal peacetime conscription, the Reverend Joseph T. Ryan, former Marine Corps chaplain, appeals to parents to barrage Congress with petitions and letters asking legislation to defeat this un-American scheme.

Father Ryan holds two citations for extraordinary valor during combat duty. A native of Albany, he is a graduate of the Christian Brothers Academy. He is the son of Mrs. Agnes Ryan, of 2 Kent Street, Albany. Since his release from service in June 1946 he has served as assistant pastor at St. Mary's, Hudson.

Father Ryan flirted with death with frontline Marines on Peleliu and Okinawa. He was the recipient of commendations in both operations. He served for 20 months in the south Pacific. Father Ryan's experiences convince him that the dangers to which peacetime conscription would expose American youth actually would jeopardize the security of the Nation.

Father Ryan says:

"It may come as a surprise to some advocates of the universal-military-training plan to know that there are highly trained, intelligent military men in all branches of the service who definitely oppose peacetime training on military grounds. In my opinion the arguments against it far outweigh the arguments for it. This is not merely my own opinion, but the considered opinion of thousands who have not resorted to the high-pressure tactics of some groups of Americans who are for it.

"For these military experts morality does not enter into the discussion. Their interest is primarily a military one. But there is a moral side to the question and there are many who feel that such a program will in the not too distant future bring about a complete break-down of morality in the United States. In my own mind I am convinced that if this legislation goes through and is carried on for two or three generations we shall see (those who are alive) a break-down in morality so complete that our glorious Nation will become, because of rampant immorality, not only one of the lesser world powers, but a beaten subjugated people.

"Who is there, in service in the last war, who does not remember the shock of the first sex hygiene lecture in boot camp? What decent young man now in his middle 20's can forget that to many, new vistas of unlawful pleasures were opened by these pictures and lectures. Their purpose supposedly was to instruct in necessary things about sex. They were instructive all right—instructive as to how to enjoy unlicensed carnal pleasures without disease.

"The tenor of the movies and lectures always was this: Every man must and will have these promiscuous pleasures; there is nothing evil in incontinence—just be careful that you don't get a disease.

"Who could forget the foul language in a barracks or in a tent or in a ship's compartment? The constant drumming of it on the ears, day after day, night after night, made it seem to the decent men as if all sense of purity in thinking and speaking would be lost forever, and lewed and lascivious manner of speech and thought would become a very part of them.

"Who is there, in the service in the last war, who will not admit that the popular belief on any Army post, naval, Coast Guard, or Marine base, on any ship, in any regiment, was: Take anything you could get; clothing, food, supplies of any kind, if you wanted them, take them from any other fellow, or the Quartermaster or ship's stores—they only belonged to the Government and therefore they were yours? And the insidious thing was that for most men there was no feeling of guilt about taking something that did not belong to them."

Father Ryan, who served for 36 months as chaplain in the Marine Corps, says:

"All of you veterans, the fathers of the coming generation, know what the moral dangers of military life are. Recall your own time in the service—recall the instructions you had to read daily on the lavatory walls, recall the nightly topics of conversation in the barracks, the suggestive recordings played before the movies, the remarks during the movies, the teen-agers after the beer issues, some of the USO shows, and the number of other proximate occasions of sin in which you found yourself in your daily life—then ask yourselves, decent, mature men:

"Do I want a son of mine placed in the midst of these temptations, at the age of 18, when our national security can be insured in other ways than by universal military training?

"The plan of training in the bill now before Congress wants to take youths at the most impressionable time in life, take them away from the safeguards of family life, and place them in an atmosphere where incontinence is the order of the day, foul and filthy language ordinary conversation, and stealing considered a sort of dangerous game with the stakes high for those who are clever at it.

"That the future of our country depends upon preparedness is certain, but there are ways of bringing about and remaining in a state of preparedness other than by universal military training. The future of our country also depends upon a generation of men who will know that they were made in the image and likeness of God and who will be imbued with the realization that they must never defile that image. Life in the peacetime service, during a certain part of their formative years, will never inculcate in young boys the lofty ideals of love of God and neighbor on which our Christian way of living and our very civilization is built.

"You veterans of the last war can realize the moral dangers of peacetime training better than any others and as God-fearing men who are or will be the fathers of future 18-year-olds I am sure that you want to protect your sons from these dangers. Your voices should be raised in protest against the plan of peacetime conscription and you should see to it that the bill now before Congress is defeated."

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING CITED INADEQUATE FOR DEFENSE

An ex-Army chaplain, twice wounded in action in Sicily and Germany, drawing on his experiences during 3 years of service with the armed forces in training camps in the United States and in combat zones in Europe, condemns the proposed peacetime conscription from the angles of inadequacy for defense and as an unwarranted hazard to the morality of the Nation. The Rev. Anthony Sidoti, assistant pastor at St. Mary's Church, Frankfort, says: "I am unalterably opposed to the plan for peacetime conscription as it now stands. Considering it from a military point of view, it is highly improbable that a

young man of 18 or 19 can be taught all that he should know (in the allotted time) about the new type of warfare which could and would be conducted with such instruments of destruction as the atomic bomb, bacteriological weapons, and radioactive gas. Six months of training would provide only a rudimentary knowledge and with progression of science that knowledge would soon be antiquated.

"I feel that a suitable course (similar to the ROTC) could and should be set-up in all of our high schools and colleges. There are many phases of military life which can be and are excellent character builders, e. g., discipline, subjection to properly constituted authority, obedience, self-reliance, perseverance, etc. The various types of weapons and warfare could be properly and thoroughly studied over a period of 4 or 8 years. At the same time the students would be under parental and, in many cases, home influence. Eventually we would have troops with a practical, working knowledge of atomic and advanced scientific methods of warfare."

Father Sidoti was discharged from service in December 1945, with the rank of a major. He served with distinction with the First and Ninetieth Divisions of the Infantry. He is 1 of 11 in the United States Chaplains Corps who have been decorated with the Silver Star with cluster. He also holds the Purple Heart with cluster and a Presidential citation for valor under fire.

Speaking of his experiences during 3 years of service with the armed forces, he says: "During the months of actual combat the average GI was in pretty good spiritual condition. With the cessation of hostilities, and I feel that all chaplains will agree with me, there was a general let-down concerning religious obligations and moral life.

"Peacetime conscription will present a greater moral danger to our young men than that to which they were exposed in training centers during the war. God knows those dangers were enough.

"Statistics prove that in villages, towns or cities proximate to any type of service posts or camps, crime, and vice ran rampant. Why then should we expose our young men, the cream of our manhood to unnecessary dangers to their moral life? We should not! Let the Government assure us that it will not assault the sense of moral decency which has been built up in our young men by their parents and religious teachers. Let the Government assure us of adequate protection of the morals of these youths; let it assure us that they will be, at least, no worse off morally at the end of their period of training than they were when entering it. Certainly it can be said of the rank and file of our young men that they have a true sense of morality and decency. They and we all have the right to expect that when the period of their training has ended they can return unspoiled to their homes."

EXCERPTS FROM A PAMPHLET, CONSCRIPTION IS NOT THE AMERICAN WAY, WHICH EMBODIES THE CONCLUSIONS OF A GROUP OF 11 MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY OF JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY

This law, passed by the French National Convention on August 23, 1793, meant the beginning of the era of the nation in arms. For the first time an entire nation was mobilizing every human being and every last resource in a national cause. Total war was to be the contribution of the French Revolution to modern times.

The mass army raised by universal conscription was intended by the French to be a defense for the Republic against its enemies. Napoleon, however, had other plans. While he protested that his rule of France meant peace for Europe, he developed the army to a point where Colignet, one of his officers, could say: "The army was now so numerous and so beautiful that it would have liked to fight all Europe." That was precisely what happened. Drawing upon such masses of men, Napoleon became more and more aggressive and, when war broke out again, he boasted to Metternich: "You cannot beat me; I spend 30,000 men a month."

And what was the effect of this new military policy of France upon that of other countries? Prussia was the state which understood most clearly the implications of the mass army. Gneisenau in 1807 remarked that "the (French) Revolution has mobilized the whole national strength of the French people * * * the rest of the states * * * ought to open up and make use of the same resources." "Get us a national army," begged Blucher of those working out military reforms in Prussia from 1807 to 1813. "It is not as difficult as one thinks," he continued, "the foot rule must be abandoned; no one in the world must be exempt, and it must become a shame not to have served except in the case of infirmities." Not until 1818, however, was it possible for Prussia to make conscription the law of the land. The cadre system, with a reserve mobilized in time of war and a long-term professional army, was borrowed from Austria and combined with a militia system. By this method reserves, when their training was completed, passed into a kind of local militia under elected officers.

Thus while other countries abandoned universal service after the Napoleonic Wars, Prussia laid the foundations of her future military efficiency upon the cornerstone of universal service and the organization of a fixed number of army corps regularly stationed in the territories from which they drew their reserves. The entire system was coordinated by an efficient general staff. This development, begun by Scharnhorst and perfected by Moltke, paid dividends in the attack upon Austria in 1866. Austria, determined not to be caught again, passed a universal service act in 1868. Defeated by Prussia in 1871, France followed Austria's lead in imitating the Prussian system by passing a universal service act. Again, the idea was not to be caught a second time. Russia acted in like manner in 1874, and Italy in 1875. The race was on. Commenting upon these developments, Bismarck, in a letter to the Russian diplomat, Prince Orlov, in 1879, said: "The great powers of our time are like travelers in a carriage. They watch each other and when one of them puts his hand into his pocket, his neighbor gets ready his own revolver in order to be able to fire the first shot."

As a result of Russia's success, the army was no longer to be considered as a police force to maintain order within the state. It had become the final arbiter in international disputes. The foundations of the "armed peace" had been laid. So convinced have the nations of the world been that a defense system founded upon the principle of universal military service would insure them against attack that, in spite of the experience of the First World War, 36 of 45 have adopted this method of security. Great Britain and the United States alone of the larger powers have refused thus far to follow suit. What everyone has overlooked is that each country's defense had reached a point where it was an offense to its neighbors. Security was always to be determined by the ability to equal or surpass the number of effective troops of the potential enemy.

After 1871 each international crisis resulted in greater absorption by the various countries in preparation for war. It was always done, however, in the name of peace. Such measures as increasing the term of service of the conscripts or changes in army organization in turn led to diplomatic crises, thus completing the vicious circle. The war scare of 1875 is a good case in point. More and more stress was laid upon the training and equipment of troops. Increased attention was given to the drafting of campaign plans "just in case." Rapidity of mobilization became a prime factor. Military plans of all countries came under the influence of the theories of the Prussian General Karl von Clausewitz, who had seen service during the Napoleonic wars. For him war was merely the continuation of state policy. The cost of victory did not matter, for he said that "he who uses forces unsparingly, without reference to the bloodshed involved, must obtain superiority if his adversary uses less vigor in its application." What can happen when two opponents apply equal vigor the modern world can judge.

Is it any wonder that mutual jealousy and suspicion engendered by such thinking should have culminated in the First World War? Nor is it surprising that the alliance system designed by Bismarck to maintain peace after 1871 degenerated into the state of affairs graphically described by Viscount Morely when he said: "Grey has more than once congratulated Europe on the existence of two great confederacies, Triple Alliance and Triple Entente, as healthfully preserving the balance of power. Balance! What a beautiful euphemism for the picture of two giant groups armed to the teeth, each in mortal terror of the other, both of them passing year after year in an incurable fever of jealousy and suspicion."

The prophetic utterance of Taine, the French scholar who wrote in 1891 that conscription "has propagated itself like a contagious disease * * *; it has mastered all Continental Europe and reigns there * * * with what promises of massacre and bankruptcy for the twentieth century, with what exasperation of international ill will and distrust, with what loss of wholesome effort * * * we know all too well," was indeed true. If history has any lessons for us, one of them certainly is that the adoption of universal service by the United States would be merely the signal for other countries to shape their policies accordingly. It would be no deterrent to others; rather it would be a goal to aim at.

Letter From American Relief for Poland, Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I have received from the secretary of the American Relief for Poland, of Lynn, Mass.:

AMERICAN RELIEF FOR POLAND,
Lynn, Mass., February 2, 1948.

Hon. Congressman THOMAS LANE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please use your influence, if possible, to stop the International Bank from loaning $60,000,000 to the Moscow-imposed Polish Government. It only means America will help to crucify the Polish people. Haven't we done enough? It is a sorry shame, that we who have suffered ourselves for our democracy had any part in the present conditions existing in Poland. American history, when written in the coming generation, will certainly have a black page. What is the matter with our American diplomats? They seem to ignore the right.

I have been in Poland this summer. I know what people say and feel. I know they are afraid to breathe deeply for fear they will be whisked away. They talk in whispers. I have talked with all types of people, religious, uniformed, educated, and peasants. All in one voice, say "we do not want aid through the Polish Government."

True, there is intense poverty and need, but that can only function fairly through the various humanitarian organizations who are having a very hard time functioning without funds and food and medicine supplies.

May I also add, we are against the Marshall plan unless it is 100 percent handled by Americans, and before our American aid is given any country the wealth of the country should be used first.

We hope your influence in these measures will prove advantageous.

Respectfully,
PELAGIA LUKASZEWSKA,
Secretary.

The German Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News under date of February 4, 1948:

THE GERMAN DANGER

Yesterday's strike of about a million and a half German workers in British-American occupied Bizonia is just one more proof that the situation there is bad, and in some ways getting worse. Some of the highest German officials are guilty of noncooperation with Allied authorities that amounts almost to political and economic sabotage. The democratization program in German hands has become a dangerous joke, with even religious leaders like Pastor Niemoeller openly advocating defiance of the denazification laws.

Here in America there is a temptation to attribute most if not all of these troubles to Russia and Red plots. There is some justification. Russia, defying the Potsdam pact for unification of Germany, has in effect partitioned the country in such way as to increase chaos. The Communist minority works night and day to multiply strikes and unrest, and to undermine British-American authority.

With Russia plotting to absorb Germany as the biggest prize of all her puppet States, and with Bizonia coal and steel production the key to western European recovery and Marshall plan success, continued Soviet sabotage can be taken for granted.

Nevertheless, the major factors in west Germany for almost 3 years have not been Russian but British-American on one side and German on the other. The failures in large part are either British-American or German.

On the Anglo-American side there has been internal wrangling and indecision, especially on key policy issues such as deindustrialization and socialization. There has been too much delay in recognizing the Soviet split and in setting up Bizonia with the goal of self-support instead of more American subsidies. This has perpetuated economic collapse and encouraged political irresponsibility. Even the belated new Bizonia quasi-government is a timid reform, and continued failure to provide a new currency is inexcusable.

But with full allowance for British-American blunders in a difficult situation made vastly more difficult by Russia, the fact remains that chiefly what is wrong with Germany today is the Germans. The same spirit which welcomed Hitler as its idol, and which now blames him for losing the war but not for starting it, is again dominant. Except for a small minority, the democratic Germans are either dead or too weak to stand against the current revival of the old spirit variously called Prussian or Nazi or totalitarian.

The average German in Bizonia today shows no sense of responsibility for the war or for his own suffering—much less for the suffering in neighboring Allied lands. He curses us for most of his troubles.

In our proper concern about Russia let us not forget we still have a big German problem on our hands. And the biggest problem of all is that the Russian danger and the German danger may some day merge again as they merged in 1939.

Margarine-Tax Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the most costly items of food at the present time is butter. At its present high price, butter is beyond the reach of the average family.

Margarine is a staple article of food in the daily diet of millions of people throughout the United States. It carries an unjust tax—a tax which was imposed at a time when butter was selling at a price in the neighborhood of margarine prices. The tax was imposed for the purpose of bringing the retail price of margarine above the retail price of butter.

Butter has long ago raised itself out of the price class of margarine. The tax has long since ceased to perform the function for which it was imposed, and it now remains simply as a burden upon the consumer, and one more item to add to the high cost of living. As was so truthfully said in the editorial printed herein below:

The tax serves but one purpose—to raise the price of a nutritious product to those unable to afford butter.

There is now pending a bill to remove these unfair taxes on oleomargarine. It is House bill H. R. 2245. This bill ought to have prompt action. There is no good reason why it should not be promptly brought to the floor of the House and passed. There is a petition on the Clerk's desk—petition No. 12—to bring this bill promptly before the House. I have signed it myself, and I earnestly hope that all Members of the House who are interested in taking every reasonable measure to reduce the high cost of living will sign this petition to bring House bill H. R. 2245 on the floor for action. It is true this bill will affect only one item of food. However, it is a staple item, and removal of this tax will mean a substantial reduction in the price of this item.

In the Atlanta Constitution of Friday, January 30, 1948, Doris Lockerman, woman's news editor, wrote an interesting article concerning the margarine tax, which I insert herewith under leave previously granted. Immediately following Mrs. Lockerman's article, I insert, under leave previously granted, a very logical editorial which appeared in the Atlanta Journal, February 2:

[From the Atlanta Constitution of January 30, 1948]

MARGARINE TAX REDUCTION ASKED

(By Doris Lockerman)

How many women would stand still and smile pleasantly if some stranger pushed ahead of them in their grocery line today and swept up a handful of their change with the expanation:

"For the butter people, you know."

It's done every day.

One of the basic foods, margarine, is heavily taxed to shield the dairy interests, and to be sure that a bloc of voters in Washington will be in line on other important issues.

Tariffs and taxes may be protective, but it is a good idea to know whom they protect, and at whose expense.

A bill is pending in Washington asking reduction of the 10-cent tax on colored margarine, reduction of the Federal license fee from $480 to $200 (now paid annually by wholesalers to handle yellow margarine), and from $48 to $6 (now paid by retail grocers). The lower license fees are those now paid by wholesalers and retailers who sell the uncolored product.

The immediate effect of the bill, if passed, will be that all margarine manufacturers (except in States where there are local restrictions) can color margarine when they make it, selling it at the same price now paid for the white, uncolored product.

Margarine is here to stay. More than four out of five families in America use it in their homes, and many city children, 6 years old or younger, have never tasted butter. They like margarine and they thrive on it.

This would be a time for fan mail to your Congressman. The consuming public should make a pretty strong lobby if Congress only thought of it that way.

[From the Atlanta Journal of February 2, 1948]

PRESSURE FOR REPEAL OF MARGARINE TAXES GAINS

The House Agriculture Committee and its chairman, Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, face today a special obligation to the American people. For upon that committee depends to a great extent the face of pending bills to end the Federal taxes and license fees which discriminate against margarine. Similar bills in past years have failed of passage. Congress must not lose the present opportunity to end its special-interest protection for butterfat and its denial of a free market for vegetable oils.

The price of butter has risen sharply, carrying it beyond the economic reach of millions of people. Today it is selling for about two and one-half times the price of oleomargarine. Yet, Congress has continued to restrict an essential low-cost food fat importantly needed in the diets of low-income consumers, and it has done so, incredibly, on the theory that this lower cost food might compete with another food two and one-half times as high. This is a flagrant example of artificial interference, of special-privilege interference, with the economy of a balanced production and consumption.

These discriminatory, and even vicious, margarine tax laws have been guarded for many years by the powerful lobby. Bills designed to remove the discrimination have failed to get past the first—and most important—hurdle, the House Agriculture Committee. Yet, in the face of this opposition to repeal unfair taxes, figures clearly

indicate that the dairy industry is producing far less butter than is needed for an adequate diet for the Nation. Butter is not only too high, it is also scarce. The truth of the matter seems to be that the importance of the butter market to the dairy farmers has been considerably exaggerated. Government figures show that for 1946, the dairy farmers' total cash income from the sale of all their dairy products amounted to $3,716,374,000, and only $548,674,999—or 14.7 percent of the total—came from the sale of butterfat and farm butter. Butter production in that same year was sufficient to give only 40,900,000 consumers the 35 pounds each recommended by the Bureau of Home Economics for an "adequate diet at moderate cost."

Demands for removal of the discriminatory taxes probably will be greater this year than at any time in the history of the 60-year-old antimargarine laws. And one of the principal reasons is that so many consumers are not able to pay the current high prices for butter. The tax serves but one purpose—to raise the price of a nutritious product to those unable to afford butter.

There is no excuse for these unreasonable taxes and fees on margarine. They are not only unfair but they are also vicious in principle. While affording special privilege for one group of farmers, they have become a penalty on another group, the producers of cottonseed oil and soybeans.

Proposals for repeal of the taxes deserve a fair hearing before the House Agriculture Committee and they deserve a chance for consideration by the House itself. The people demand it.

Aspects of the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks and include therein a series of five articles on aspects of the Marshall plan, by E. F. Tompkins, editor of the New York Journal-American, I wish to present the second of the series entitled "Financing Socialism." The article follows:

ASPECTS OF THE MARSHALL PLAN
II. FINANCING SOCIALISM
(By E. F. Tompkins)

There are two ways—and only two—in which the United States can provide for the reconstruction of Europe.

One is for Europe to permit and promote the use of private capital in plant investment and commercial loans.

This is the free-enterprise way, which is anathema in socialist Europe.

The other way is for the United States Government to extend grants or loans; and these can be made only to other governments.

The second method is the Marshall plan process that has been presented to Congress.

The essential difference between the two is that the first is liberal and constructive in its operation, supporting genuinely productive elements, seeking out sound business undertakings, insisting upon competent management, and requiring reasonable security as to the safety of investments or the fulfillment of obligations, while the second is political, conferring few of the benefits and entailing none of the guaranties of the first.

Money or credit advanced under the Marshall plan, in other words, will not be utilized by experienced enterprises, but will be dispensed by partisan officeholders.

And, in the prevalent condition of Europe, it will be applied in the service of socialism.

The phenomenon of governmental loans to governments for purposes of this kind is something new in the world.

In previous times, solvent governments—and occasionally insolvent—were financed by private capital, and governmental issues were prime purchases for thrifty individuals and financial institutions.

But the sanctity of governmental credit no longer exists.

It ceased in Europe when Communist Russia introduced the repudiation of public debts and when the currencies were debauched by printing-press inflation; it was vitiated in this country, and its revival was made difficult elsewhere, when the New Deal took the American dollar off the domestic gold standard.

Today, bankers do not lend to governments, except under compulsion to their own; so the United States Government is sending the people's money where bank money will not go.

Obviously, a risk that is hopeless for bankers is no better for the United States Treasury.

And, of course, Marshall plan "loans" to Socialist Europe will not be repaid.

Some international benefit might accrue if Federal donations for the revitalization of foreign economies were to be successful—and if one loan to each country were to be the limit.

But the British loan was neither successful nor sufficient; and the expenditure pattern of the Marshall plan is precisely the same, only on a magnified scale.

Furthermore, the dismal record of the $3,750,000,000 British loan itself makes private capital—the only fluid capital equal to world requirements—unavailable not only to Socialist governments but also to private enterprises in the Socialist countries.

At the very time when the British loan became available, the Labor government was nationalizing the banks and industries of Great Britain.

The pillaging policy continued, and meanwhile the loan was dissipated as a dole to subsidize the Socialist 35-hour week demanded by the Labor politicians' followers.

Now the money is about gone; and the doctrinaire Labor government is back, seeking more money, in a much greater sum, under the Marshall plan.

Thus, not only has it been demonstrated that Marshall-style lending will not reconstitute the economy under a Socialist government, in addition, an effective boycott has been laid against all private financing.

For what free investor would place his savings, or what responsible banker would hazard those of his clients in any business which, next year or the year after, may be confiscated as the coal mines of England or the insurance companies and utilities in France have been?

One remedy, among others, for the plight of the Socialist countries—if they are not to drift the rest of the way into communism—is for them to deliver themselves from socialism.

But the Congress of the United States has been notified that they will not do so, and the administration has acquiesced, so that they are to borrow our money on their terms.

The Committee of European Economic Cooperation said, in its application for Marshall plan grants:

"The various countries handle their economic affairs by diverse means; some work to a long-range plan, others follow relatively unrestricted private enterprise.

"The means of carrying out this program will therefore vary from country to country."

The governments seeking the most aid are the very governments that are most in thrall to long-term socialistic planning, which they plainly assert will continue.

And the United States Government is, in the matter of the Marshall plan, being governed by them in its dispensation of the American people's money.

The report of the Harriman committee has plainly said:

"While this committee firmly believes that the American system of free enterprise is the best method of obtaining high productivity, it does not believe that any foreign-aid program should be used as a means of requiring other countries to adopt it."

In going into the strange business of financing socialism in bankrupt countries, the administration puts America in a ridiculous position—we are going into a business which we know must fail because otherwise European governments may not accept our money.

An international banker who ventured into so chimerical a scheme would inevitably go broke along with his debtors.

So will the United States if we commit ourselves to the Marshall plan as it stands.

But the Harriman committee evidently believes that it is our duty to get rid of our money rather than to make Europe self-supporting.

Jacob Gralla—a Roosevelt Democrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep appreciation of the worth of my valued secretary for 20 years, and leader of the Democratic Party of my district, the Twenty-third Assembly District, Kings County, New York City, the Honorable Jacob Gralla.

A loyal follower of the precepts of Jefferson and Wilson, he ardently fought the good fight for the common man under the leadership of our late beloved leader of democracy, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and is continuing that fight under President Truman.

When the question of racial discrimination and unfair employment practices came before the House, he ardently and vigorously advocated the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee as recommended by President Roosevelt. In my work for this salutary legislation, Jack Gralla was at my side, rendering invaluable aid. Throughout my local district, he heralded this bill and encouraged a healthy public opinion for it.

When the infamous labor-baiting measure, the Taft-Hartley bill, was before us, he led the fight against it in our district. Jack Gralla has always aided the laboring man. I hope labor will come to his support in his forthcoming leadership fight. I need not dwell upon my prolabor record, but I stress that whatever good I have done for labor, in a measure, is due to the encouragement and painstaking efforts of my secretary, Jack Gralla. No Congressman can accomplish much without a good political secretary, either at home in the district or in Washington. Jack Gralla in attending necessary political chores in the district has made it possible for me to render a genuine service to labor and labor interests.

I hope and ask that the men and women who toil and who are registered Democrats will not forget the devoted services to the cause of labor offered by Jack Gralla.

Certain benighted ones back home aspire to the honor that is Jack Gralla's. They seek to wrest from him the Democratic leadership in the district. I personally ask that Jack Gralla's adversaries be soundly beaten in the Democratic primaries soon to be. I am a candidate as principal delegate to the Democratic National Convention in that same primary. I have no doubts as to the outcome. Both he and I shall be chosen. Select him as you would select me—upon our merits. His case is no more, no less, meritorious than mine. We rise or fall together.

I clasp his hand in a friendship of a quarter of a century. For all these years his loyalty and affection for me has been deep and abiding and they are reciprocated. I would be derelict if I did not ask you, the Democrats of the Twenty-third Assembly District, Brooklyn, to vote for Jack Gralla as leader of the Democratic Party in the district.

I ask his reelection not only because he is my friend, my leader, my secretary, but because he truly represents the Democrats of the district.

Whenever help for the displaced persons of Europe was urged, Jack Gralla was on the job and assisted me in facilitating the immigration of hundreds into our free land. Such a record should not be forgotten nor go unrewarded.

When partition of Palestine and the creation of a free Jewish state was yet a dream, Jacob Gralla conducted mass meetings and memorialized the Congress and our President in its behalf.

I have worked arduously for a Jewish state in Palestine. I have toiled in season and out for this desired end. But throughout I had the assistance and ministrations of Jack Gralla. He was always at my side with words of cheer, with acts of encouragement.

Much work remains to be done before the Jewish state is fully set up. The work did not end with the partition decision of the United Nations. Both the Arabs and the British seek to sabotage this decision. The enemies of the idea of a Jewish state are strong. But they must be worsted. I with Jack Gralla shall fight them tooth and nail. In this struggle Jack Gralla has been and will continue to be my right hand and shield.

Palestine may seem a far cry from Brownsville and the fight for Democratic leadership in the district. It is not. Those who would oust Jack Gralla would oust me. Therefore, if my work for Palestine is worthy of your commendation—and I think it is—I ask you to remember the work of my aide, Jack Gralla, on behalf of the aims and aspirations of the Jews in the Holy Land and his work and my work for the Yishuv. We are inseparable in the campaign to implement the UN partition judgment.

Jack Gralla has gathered around himself a group of strong, loyal, unfailing, stalwart Democrats. Through them he reaches into the four corners of the district and makes democracy living and vibrant there.

A poor family is threatened with eviction, a veteran seeks his due under the GI bill of rights, a husband wants to bring over his wife from Poland, a landlord unjustly refuses heat and services to his tenants, a postal employee seeks a transfer, a Federal employee has unfounded and unfair charges brought against his loyalty, a mother afflicted on a bed of pain and nigh unto death wants to see her soldier son, perhaps for the last time, and he must be brought back from the Pacific, the Red Mogen Dovid seeks to ship blood plasma to Palestine—in all these vital errands of either economic or moral necessity or mercy, Jack Gralla is ever present and helpful. His work is manifold as it is patient and effective. These indicated tasks are performed by him and me together. It is like the reverse and obverse sides of a coin. Despite different sides, the coin is one. He and I are one.

He has agitated for the renewal of the rent-control bill when it expires. He knows it would be unthinkable to have no controls over rents and rental conditions. He is in favor of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill and I have offered a companion bill in the House to set up a decent program of national housing. One of the musts of Congress is to provide homes for the homeless. Jack Gralla is a veritable leaders in the movement to enact into legislation the Wagner-Ellender-Taft-Celler bill.

Withal, a kindly group of his constituents help immeasurably in the good Jack Gralla and I bring to the district. They are men like Hon. Albert Martin Cohen, former assemblyman and outstanding lawyer, citizen, and community worker; Harold L. Fisher, chairman of the board of directors of the American Federation of Polish Jews; Assistant District Attorney Samuel Y. Gitlin; Assistant District Attorney Louis Ernst; Benjamin H. Schor, attorney for thousands of tenants, without fee; Arthur Dunaif, deputy commissioner of markets; and Abe Stark, prominent merchant.

Jack Gralla has set up a free legal bureau not only to help the tenants of his district but also to assist all persons in his district who cannot afford legal advice, regardless of race, color, creed, or political persuasion.

He has the warm friendship and admiration of the great mayor of New York City, the Honorable William O'Dwyer, and the beloved borough president of Brooklyn, the Honorable John Cashmore.

Jacob Gralla is a member of and active supporter of every charitable and civic movement in his community, including the Jewish Federation of Philanthropies, United Jewish Appeal, Boy Scouts, Red Cross, Infantile Paralysis Fund, Cancer Fund, Beth El Hospital, Brownsville Boys' Club, Conqueror Lodge, Knights of Pythias, and numerous other worthwhile endeavors. He has assisted organizations representing varying religious and racial groups without exception or favor. His own clubhouse is used as a meeting place for the Sea Scouts and other youth organizations in the battle against juvenile delinquency.

It is therefore just and proper that I should applaud this man's worth and urge that he be continued in office as Democratic leader of the twenty-third assembly district, Kings County. With all the fervor at my command I ask the enrolled and enlightened Democrats of my district to vote for him on primary day, Tuesday, April 6, 1948.

An International Conference a Snare and a Delusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda machine has been operating overtime to explain the cause of the break-down of the International Conference at London. Why should it evoke any surprise? Even Mr. Walter Lippmann, in the New York Herald Tribune of December 16, 1947, commenting on the set-up and its weakness, had this to say:

> Thus, the Council of Foreign Ministers, which had been a subordinate body, became, as Mr. Byrnes puts it, charged with the responsibility of preparing peace treaties. It has never been equal to the responsibility. For ministers are only ministers, bound by their instructions, uncertain of their tenure, unsure of their authority, and representing in practice not their governments but a department of their governments.
>
> To make matters worse, the Council has had to operate in full public view with every suggestion, remark, and inter-nation broadcast magnified immediately. No diplomat in history could have succeeded under these conditions. As it happened, none of the members of the Council—certainly none of the westerners—had had any previous diplomatic experience. Yet the making of this peace was as difficult a task as diplomats ever had to engage in.

I say that when the United Nations Organization was created it was doomed to failure. It served the purpose of its authors which was to furnish a forum for them to strut and to speak to a world audience. The character of the tirades emanating from the United Nations forum to the world has created more deep-seated hatred and distrust among nations than did the recent World War. The people of the United States are now hated by the people of the nations to which our billions of dollars have been sent.

The present New Deal administration, however, is moving heaven and earth to create in the public mind a war psychology to divert public attention from the major domestic problems, some of which are oppressive taxation and the high cost of living caused by inflation, from which the American people are acutely

suffering. Emergencies have been created, fear has been aroused, wars and rumors of wars are bellowed over the air night and day by the New Deal administration to justify wild and reckless expenditures here and abroad.

When, prior to World War I, has a nation fought a major war and then paid reparations to rehabilitate the defeated enemy? We did that following World War I, and as a consequence had to fight the same enemy again a quarter of a century later. This may be a pleasant diversion for the military and for those groups which profit by war, but for those who pay the cost in lives and in treasure, the result is a national tragedy.

The London Conference which has so completely failed is typical of all conferences used to divert attention from the failures of our administration on the home front. Unfortunately such conferences breed hate and distrust among countries and often make dangerous commitments so far as our experience with international conferences has been.

I recall what happened after World War I. Here is what Frank H. Simonds, an able observer and careful student of international affairs, has to say of these smoke-screen conferences and their unhappy results:

The futility of international conferences has long been recognized, except by those who use them to divert attention from failures in the economic field at home.

The explanation is invariably the same. For presidents and prime ministers alike, there is always a double temptation in the matter of an international conference. Such meetings distract domestic attention from troubles at home. Similarly, they insure a temporary rally of public opinion to the support of an administration actively engaged in foreign negotiations.

Even the most unpopular of governments can calculate upon a truce in parochial political abuse for the duration of a foreign assembly, since it can always appeal for unity at home to promote success abroad. But that appeal is obviously foolish, in itself, because all other governments are making it simultaneously.

There is always, too, the much subtler temptation inherent in the opportunity provided by an international conference for a public man to address a world audience, to play a conspicuous role upon a larger stage, to appear, if only for a brief moment, as the spokesman of a world seeking peace.

Thus international conferences have ended by creating an appetite for publicity, which no postwar statesman * * * has been able completely to resist. Finally, public men always hope that, even if their conferences fail, they may still be praised for their effort, while the blame can be shifted to the representatives of another nation.

Yet it requires no profound examination of the conferences since 1919 to indicate how incalculable has been the harm resulting from the disclosure of international rivalries at a time when the whole world was suffering both materially and psychologically from economic depression and political dispute. Conferences rashly summoned have led only to the exacerbation of national passions and international resentments. This fact explains the Geneva axiom that one disarmament conference is more disastrous for world peace than three battles in actual war. The same thought was disclosed in the prayer of a London clergyman after the Naval Conference: "Give to us peace on our time, O Lord, peace without conference."

Nor is any detail of contemporary conferences more striking than the unfailing attempts of statesmen to conceal from their publics the truth concerning a meeting actually in progress. Their prestige being engaged, because they have prepared these publics for achievement, they are condemned to sustain the illusion of progress, to continue to hold out the promise of success and, in the end, in the face of failure always inevitable, to claim a triumph which is promptly disclosed to have been lacking. Thus that secrecy and inveracity, which were the worst features of an old-fashioned diplomacy, have been adopted and even exaggerated by the new.

There is always, therefore, an element of basic untruth about international conferences. Publics perceive this promptly and have the uneasy feeling of being deceived by their own governments, as they are invariably suspicious of the superior skill of the representatives of other nations. Thus, as a consequence of successive failures they became cynical as to the possibility of an international understanding. As a means of attaining peace, accordingly, conferences have proved no more successful than were the methods of old-fashioned diplomacy in preventing war. And this failure results from the fact that they have been employed almost exclusively to help the political fortunes of administrations on the home front or to promote purely national policies abroad.

The Margarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, one of my friends has forwarded me several well-written editorials appearing in different issues of the Shreveport Times, a metropolitan newspaper published in the city of Shreveport, La. The editor of this paper appears to have made a careful study of the equities underlying the excise tax on oleomargarine. I think all of our Members will be interested in these editorials, and I reproduce them for careful consideration. In these times of extremely high food prices, it is difficult indeed to justify heavy excise taxes on any food products. They follow:

[From the Shreveport Times of December 10, 1947]

REPEAL THE MARGARINE TAX

Some time ago the Times called attention to the fact that newspapers in various parts of the Nation now are taking up the fight for repeal of the Federal tax on margarine—a tax put through Congress by the butter lobby as a means of both protecting high butter prices and stifling competition. Originally margarine was produced chiefly in the South, but now many of the big dairy States also are big margarine producers—or would be if they were not strangled by discriminatory Federal taxation, and in some cases by similar State taxation also.

The Des Moines Register and the New York City Daily News, both nationally known newspapers published in big dairy States, have been demanding repeal of the Federal margarine tax for some time. Now the Washington Post seems to be of the same mind, as indicated in the cartoon from that newspaper reprinted on this page today. And the New York World Telegram, chief link in the Scripps-Howard chain, has this to say editorially under the heading, "One abuse that should end":

"We don't know what measures for controlling the cost of living will be proposed by President Truman or enacted by the special session of Congress.

"But we know one simple measure, long overdue, that woud help materially.

"Repeal of the Federal taxes on margarine. We recently urged repeal of the unjustified State tax on margarine.

"There is no respectable reason for these taxes. Their sole purpose is to protect the butter business—to make margarine cost consumers more than it should and to make its use needlessly inconvenient.

"Many bills to take them off have been introduced in recent sessions of Congress, but blocked by the influence of the butter lobby. The special session offers a grand opportunity to get rid of them."

With support of this type steadily increasing in other parts of the Nation, it should not be difficult for the southern congressional bloc to get action on the obviously needed repeal of the Federal margarine tax.

[From the Shreveport Times of December 11, 1947]

ANOTHER BLOW AT MARGARINE TAX

Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, in a statement released in Washington a few days ago, joined the fight to bring about repeal of the discriminatory 10 cents a pound Federal tax on colored margarine and the Commercial Appeal of Memphis has joined the fight by editorially calling for full support of Senator FULBRIGHT'S efforts by all southern interests, political or business. The Times, of course, already has made such an appeal, on several occasions, and repeats it now.

Senator FULBRIGHT pointed out in his statement that the first margarine tax (Federal) was imposed in 1886 and that the effect of it simply has been to stifle expansion of margarine production and to add to the cost of living troubles of those of low income brackets. Revenue for the Federal Government has been insignificant. He also brought out the important fact that while most margarine originally was made from fats, 47 percent now is made from cottonseed and 43 percent from soybeans, and soybeans, especially for oil, are grown in many parts of the Nation, not merely in the South. Consequently, removal of the tax would benefit farmers almost everywhere in the Nation, and not merely in one section. In fact, a vast majority of southern soybean production is for green fertilizer and not for bean production.

The Commercial Appeal endorsement of Senator FULBRIGHT'S efforts, in which this newspaper joins, says, in part:

"It has been years since the taxes on oleo owned even the semblance of excuse. In the current era of soaring prices, the imposition of these taxes means entirely unjustified and unnecessary hardship on people in the low income groups. Senator FULBRIGHT'S move is well timed as well as in the public interest.

"It should be understood, however, that Senator FULBRIGHT will need the active backing of those who agree with him in principle. The present state of affairs means economic handicaps for the South's producers that ought to be removed, and can be if the people of this section rally behind their leadership."

[From the Shreveport Times of January 9, 1948]

FACTS ON THE MARGARINE TAX

The Times several times recently has pointed to the need for congressional repeal of Federal taxes on margarine—and State taxes, too—and has emphasized that these taxes were discriminatory not only against the margarine industry but against the food consumers in the lower-income brackets.

The Federal taxes were imposed originally years ago at the behest of dairy interests which sought thus to strangle competition.

All efforts thus far to repeal the taxes have been blocked by the dairy lobby. Now, however, influential newspapers in such big dairy States as Iowa, New York, and Minnesota have taken up the cudgels in behalf of repeal, and if a powerful attack is made from all sectors Congress may act.

Because of these things, the Times believes that the following background data, prepared by Editorial Research Reports, a fact-finding organization in Washington, will be of especial interest in this area where margarine production could become a major industry:

With the retail price of butter a dollar a pound in many places, bills to repeal or reduce the existing Federal taxes on oleomargarine may get more attention in the 1948 session of Congress than in previous sessions. Five such bills were introduced in 1947. They were interred in the House and Senate Agricultural Committees.

As butter prices have risen, more and more margarine has been used. In 1939, only 13 percent as much margarine as butter was consumed in the United States. In 1947 (preliminary estimates) margarine consumption was 40 percent of butter consumption. From 1939 to 1947, the per capita domestic consumption of margarine doubled, that of butter fell by one-third. The retail price of margarine, uncolored, is apt to be less than one-half that of butter.

Thus threatened by margarine competition even under the present taxes on margarine, the dairy industry will fight harder than ever against repealing those taxes. As far back as 1941, the Dairy Record editorialized:

"The dairy industry must set as its goal the complete extermination of oleomargarine. It must never rest until the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine have been outlawed."

At first oleomargarine was called bull butter, because it was made from animal fats. In 1886 Congress passed the first Federal margarine tax (2 cents per pound on manufacturers) and imposed fees on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers. Margarine makers claimed that Congress was using its taxing powers to destroy their industry, but in 1897 the Supreme Court held that on its face the law was an act for levying taxes, and, therefore, its primary purpose must be assumed to be the raising of revenue.

In 1902 the Federal law was amended to distinguish between artificially colored margarine (tax, 10 cents per pound) and the uncolored product (tax, one-half cent per pound). White margarine was practically unknown at that time. Margarine makers then developed use of naturally yellow oils; cottonseed and coconut.

In 1931 the Federal law was amended again. Margarine containing yellow or yellow-red shades or tints of more than 1.6 degrees was taxed at the 10-cents-per-pound rate. Naturally yellow cottonseed and soybean oils, which together compose almost 90 percent of all margarine oils, today are bleached to escape that tax.

Butter producers assert that coloring of margarine at its point of origin must be restricted to prevent fraudulent substitution of an inferior product. Margarine makers retort that, fortified by 15,000 units of vitamin A, margarine is an equally nutritious food product, and that butter itself is artificially colored for some 8 months a year, although not so labeled. Federal taxes on margarine are:

	Colored	Uncolored
Excise taxes (per pound)	10 cents	¼ cent.
Manufacturers' license fees (per year).	$600	$600.
Wholesalers' license fees (per year).	$480	$200.
Retailers' license fees (per year).	$48	$6.

Even if the Federal taxes should be modified or repealed, not all housewives would be relieved from the bother of adding yellow dye to white margarine; half the States prohibit the sale of colored margarine, and some others levy high taxes of their own on the sale or use of it. Thus, State as well as Federal action is needed.

Aspects of the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks and include therein a series of five articles on aspects of the Marshall plan, by E. F. Tompkins, editor of the New York Journal and American, I wish to present the third of the series entitled "Controls and Supercontrols." The article follows:

ASPECTS OF THE MARSHALL PLAN
(By E. F. Tompkins)

III. CONTROLS AND SUPERCONTROLS

Informed predictions have been made that one effect of the Marshal plan for Federal grants and loans to European governments will be the permanent emplacement of state trading in international commerce.

It would be idle for anyone to dispute the forecast.

State trading is a system by which a government conducts, or rigidly controls, the export and import business of its country.

Soviet Russia is a complete example of the system.

In the postwar nationalization of industries by the Socialist countries—including the free world cotton market at Liverpool, taken over by the British Labor Government—and in their manipulations of export and import quotas and licenses, the trend toward state trading in western Europe has been ominously evident.

By preventing or limiting international transactions among individuals, the system is in every way inimical to free enterprise and tends to depress standards of living.

Since the Socialist governments have announced that they will not modify or abandon their state socialism in order to participate in the Marshall plan, it necessarily follows that Marshall plan grants or loans will subsidize state trading—in competition with American trade.

Moreover, the Marshall plan will contribute greatly to a socialistic international super-government within which state trading will operate—with politicians instead of merchants making or dominating the deals.

The structure for such a super-government already exists in the United Nations, and has been written into the Marshall plan by the report of the Committee of European Economic Co-Operation.

The European committee pledges its 16 governments to make their currencies convertible in international commerce under the International Monetary Fund, and to adjust their commerce to the decisions of the International Trade Organization.

The joker with regard to money is that the socialist countries are all controlled-currency countries, and that the International Monetary Fund is an elaborate device, financed mainly by the United States, for international control of these controlled currencies.

Under this arrangement, currencies will have no stable or stabilizing values, as they had under the gold standard.

The values are to be fixed from time to time by decrees, making all the currencies mere fiat money.

And fiat money—or controlled currency—is necessary, in Socialist theory, for economic planning—in this country, the New Deal's deficit financing, which was the basic cause of our inflation, became possible only when the domestic gold standard was discarded.

Its use in international state trading against free enterprise is exemplified by the decision of the French Cabinet, on December 31 last, to create an export franc with a fiat exchange rate of 240 to 280 to the dollar.

"The new franc," said a copyrighted dispatch to the New York Herald Tribune, "will enable French exporters to compete more favorably with other exporters in foreign markets, especially the United States."

That kind of export trade is subsidized trade—state trading—in competition with American producers for the American market.

The International Trade Organization has been represented as a plan to eliminate such practices.

But here we lose again; for, under its Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and within the International Trade Organization, the New Deal has compacted virtually to abrogate the last few remaining fragments of our historic protective tariff.

It would seem apparent that if the United States is to foster state trading abroad through the Marshall plan, and at the same time open the home market to foreign producers, we will find ourselves compelled to adopt state trading; and indeed a long start has been made in that direction by import-export controls, plus huge Government purchases of meat and wheat for distribution overseas, with severe inflationary impacts upon our own costs of living.

Moreover, as a part of the Marshall plan the New Deal proposes to surrender to foreign flags 500 of our cargo-carrying vessels; and this at a time when the European maritime nations—through their energetic shipbuilding and previous American acquisitions will soon have merchant fleets exceeding their prewar totals.

The National Federation of American shipping has warned that the impending transfer of our 500 ships will deprive 25,000 American seamen of jobs; will again scuttle our merchant marine; will constrict our overseas traffic to the exactions of alien interests; and will deprive our armed forces of the indispensable auxiliaries and transports which we must have in event of a war emergency in the uncertain next 5 years.

All these are disturbing facts for Congress to ponder.

The hidden costs of the Marshall plan may include not only a demoralizing impairment of the American system of free enterprise, but also a wanton sacrifice of our national security.

The Kearney Bill—H. R. 246

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, Tuesday, February 3, 1948, I made an explanation of my inability to vote on a bill which had just passed the House. In my comments of yesterday, I said that due to unfortunate circumstances I was not present to vote on the bill just

passed. At least that is what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that I said. However, I had reference to H. R. 246—the Kearney bill—a bill to raise the ceiling of wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job.

I should like to have the RECORD definitely show that had I been present I would have voted in favor of the passage of this bill.

Our Foreign Policy Has Been and Is a Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Chicago Tribune of February 3, 1948, and, permit me to call attention to the fact that the Tribune is a Republican paper, comes some good advice. It reads as follows:

WHAT'S THE REPUBLICAN PARTY FOR?

During its wanderings in the wilderness the Republican Party has been kept alive by its control of various State and local offices. Even in its darkest hour, the party had a few Governors, and now it has the majority of them. It has controlled legislatures, and it has elected Congressmen and Senators Above all, it has controlled the courthouses of a vast number of counties in every State outside the solid South. A year ago the Republicans took control of both Houses of Congress after 16 years of Democratic domination.

The Republican Party was not formed to elect sheriffs. It does not fulfill its function unless it offers the Nation leadership on national questions. It cannot hope for national success through its control of local offices, valuable as they may be to political organization. The congressional victory in 1946 was won on national issues of domestic and foreign policy.

In the national election of 1948 the Republicans if they are to win must offer the voters an alternative to the policies of the incumbent Executive. Republican candidates have demonstrated this twice in defeat. Wendell Willkie and Governor Dewey, in successive campaigns, embraced the New Deal, and particularly its foreign policy. All they could offer was a promise to run it better. Not unnaturally, the voters picked the original New Dealer.

If they repeat these tactics this year, the Republicans may be able to go on electing sheriffs for a few years more. They cannot, however, endure as a national party. There will be no reason why they should.

After the Mexican War, the Democratic Party became the party of the extension of slavery. The Whigs tried to compromise on that issue, for fear of losing their southern members. They continued to elect governors and sheriffs, but they became impotent nationally. Lincoln had been a Whig. He had former Whigs in his Cabinet, and in Congress, but they were elected as Republicans. The Whig Party died because it tried to remain half slave and half free. The Republicans are courting the same fate.

The Republican Party cannot endure if it allows renegade Republicans to use it in support of the policy of human slavery in Europe and Asia. It cannot endure if it allows renegade Republicans to range it on the side of the tyranny of rationing and Government controls. It cannot endure if it tolerates "me-too" Republicans such as Dewey and Stassen, who would tax the American people into ruin to enrich further the billionaires who are trying to buy the Republican convention.

The Republican Party can win, and endure as the political mainstay of the Nation, if it says that the Truman-Marshall foreign policy is the bungled folly that the record proves it to be; if it denounces the economic controls and the vote buying by which the New Deal bureaucrats keep themselves in power; if it pledges itself to remove the crushing load of Truman taxes, and to dismiss the wasters of those taxes, military as well as civilian; if it tells the world that American foreign policy will be on the side of freedom and honest workers everywhere, and against slavers and socialist beggars everywhere.

It can win, if it says and does these things, and then chooses a candidate whose honesty is a pledge that he will do what he promises.

Effective Oregon Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial of recent date from the Capital Journal, of Salem, Oreg. I call particular attention to the tribute paid therein to Fred H. Kiser who was for many years the leading photographer of our beautiful Pacific Northwest scenery. This tribute is particularly interesting in view of the fact that the Board of Geographic Names has before it for consideration the renaming of one of our mountain glaciers after him.

The editorial follows:

EFFECTIVE OREGON ADVERTISING

The State highway commission, through its travel information department, has prepared a collection of the colored photograph advertisements of Oregon's scenic marvels and recreational areas it has been publishing the past year in the Saturday Evening Post, the National Geographic magazine, and other periodicals of national circulation along with a report presenting statistics revealing the steady increase of traveling interest in the great Northwest country.

These and other advertisements in newspapers and periodicals, supplemented with pamphlets printed in color, such as "Oregon, cool, green vacation land," "Oregon beach resorts and scenery," Oregon State parks and wilderness and mountain attractions, industrial lures, etc., along with highway and tourist maps, reveal what a good job the highway travel information bureau is doing. The illustrations are superb, the informative reading matter condensed and to the point, and as a whole the advertising campaign is the best ever launched in the Northwest.

Many years ago, when the Portland Ad Club was organized, Fred H. Kiser, then the leading outdoor photographer, called attention to Oregon's neglected scenic attractions, remarking:

"Some of us will see the day when the Oregon country will be referred to as the hub of attraction for tourists. This because of its varied and fascinating scenery and its glorious summer climate. Colored reproductions of our natural resources, in magazines and newspapers, will be largely responsible for turning thousands upon thousands of travelers in our direction each summer until the Northwest in general and Oregon in particular becomes known as the most desirable summer playground in the world."

Color photography had not then been invented but Kiser made up by artistic hand painting with oil or water colors the scenery photographed. His colored pictures of Crater Lake were largely responsible for its development as a national park and are still among the best ever made.

Kiser has lived to see his prediction come true after many years. Oregon was then still young and wild and little of its natural beauty had been discovered. There was then little interest in conservation work of any kind and when very little, if any, thought was given to Ruskin's motto: "Color is God's greatest gift to man."

Selling Forestry to the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach herewith the following article which appeared in the January issue of American Forests entitled "Selling Forestry to the Farmer," which I think would be of interest to the Members of Congress:

SELLING FORESTRY TO THE FARMER
(By Chapin Collins)

Down in Alabama something is going on, forest-wise, that may turn out the answers to a lot of questions, which might be summarized in this manner: Are farmers and other landowners interested in good woods management? If not, why not? If they are, why don't they do more about it?

Back of this activity is the Alabama Forestry Council. And the project—"More Trees for Alabama" it is called—is attracting attention, not only on its own account, but because it provides a pattern for similar activities in other States.

The small woodland is now recognized as a primary problem in American forestry. This is so because small woodlands; in total, make up the bulk of all commercial forest lands. This is true, also, because the average small owner is doing less to improve his woodlands, to manage them for continuous production, than any other class of owner.

This being the case, the first query to make is, "Why?" Other types of forest owners have been doing an increasingly better job, and the reason why they have is because they find forest management pays.

Many tracts, booklets, pamphlets, and untold reams of mimeographed bulletins have been produced to tell the farmer and other small owners what they should do about their woodland. Because little has happened, some have concluded that the education al process has failed. Actually, it seems more reasonable to conclude that the methods or types of education have failed.

Take the farmer. His primary business is raising yearly crops from plowed fields or pastures. Usually, he has a woodland, but his energies and interests have been centered on other things. Behind him has been a tradition that the forest was an obstacle, something to be cleared away. And in many parts of the country this idea isn't merely

tradition, but a very present fact of today. His woods, then, have been incidental, whereas, with the large industrial operator, the woods have been paramount.

It would seem that, taking all factors into consideration, many attempts to reach the small owner have omitted an all-important first step—arouse his interest, tell him why and then, how.

After all, this is the basic problem of advertising and merchandising, and the problem of selling good forest practices is no different. You have to make a customer want to buy your product; you never try to cram it down an unwilling throat.

That, at least, has been the reasoning of the Alabama Forestry Council in developing the "More Trees for Alabama" project. And members of the council know the problem if anyone does. Represented in it are the conservation department of the State of Alabama, the Agricultural Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the United States Forest Service, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the State department of education, the State agricultural experiment station, the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce, as well as farmers, landowners, woodusing industries, and others. The American Forest Products Industries, sponsors of the "Trees for America" project, as well as the "tree farm" and "keep green" movements, is sharing in this project.

As these organizations have approved it, the project seeks, first, to ask and answer the question: "Why should I bother with my woods?" Then, and only then, it seeks to answer, 'How?"

So, "More trees for Alabama" falls into two natural divisions. The first phase is promotion—the second, instruction and demonstration.

While the opening guns in this operation will not be fired until January, there first came a long period of preparation, as essential in a program like this as it is in a military campaign.

It was last July that State Forester J. M. Stauffer assigned W. R. Sizemore to direct this project. Bill Sizemore took counsel with his advisory committee, which consists of Mr. Stauffer, John P. Ward (manager of the Alabama State chamber), and Paul A. Swarthout, forest supervisor of the United States Forest Service, and the work began.

The biggest job was one of organization, but when it was done it reached every county in the State. More than 1,000 persons are serving on 67 county committees. These are committees of the public, not restricted to foresters or forest industries. One county chairman is president of a large textile mill, another the head of a coal company, another a county superintendent of education, another a farmer. Several chairmen are judges. There is a bank president, a county sheriff, a number of merchants.

Then came organization of cooperating agencies, particularly with the view of obtaining enough foresters to help with the second phase of the project. So far, 73 foresters have agreed to serve. Twenty-five have been provided by State agencies, 13 by Federal agencies, 17 by the pulp and paper industry, 10 by the lumber industry, and 8 by other industries.

Nearly a thousand Alabama veterans are to receive special training in basic forestry. They are landowners themselves and are expected to become focal points in their many communities for spreading the gospel of better woodland management.

The first short course in woodland management was held in the Little River State Forest from December 7 to 13. The vocational agriculture division of the State department of education, the Alabama agricultural extension service, and forest industries cooperated with the "more trees for Alabama" organization in arranging the week's program. It covered tree and log scaling, fire-control methods, planting, selective cutting practices, timber sales, and other subjects of practical interest to owners of farm woods.

The first on-the-land demonstrations will start in January. Locations for these forest shows are being selected so that ultimately one will be held within 10 miles of the home of every farmer in the State. They will feature selective marking and volume estimation.

Even before the campaign started, more than 125 spontaneous editorials, commenting on the project, appeared in Alabama newspapers. A mass meeting of interested farmers was held in one county. In Choctaw County one man issued a public statement to the effect that he was making more money from his farm woods than from 17 oil wells.

The project itself is starting with a paid advertising program in 140 Alabama newspapers, chiefly those reaching the rural field. These advertisements feature a specially prepared booklet, Cash Crops From Alabama Woodlands, of which 175,000 copies will be distributed by county agents, forest rangers, and others. A 2-minute movie short, also featuring this booklet, is running in most of the theaters of the State. Several hundred prints of a new film strip, with an illustrated manual, are being exhibited to granges, schools, and other organizations.

The first approach to landowners is best expressed in the booklet itself, which says:

"This book has suggested some ways of adding to your income by taking better care of your woods. It has not told the whole story, by any means. Its chief purpose is not to tell how, but to point out why.

"Woods management is no road to quick riches. But, in return for reasonable work and reasonable skill, it pays well. Your woodland is part of your farm. Don't forget it. It should be a profitable part of your farm. There are ways to find out how your own woods can make more money. Help is available, both by way of advice and of actual service. They are provided by your State and Federal Governments and by private industry."

The project will not be perfect, but it has the merit of being a sincere, noncontroversial approach to the woodland owner who is urged to do something for his own benefit.

While it is too early to chronicle results—and the ultimate results may be felt for years to come—this much can be said: Here is an instance in which the pulp and paper industry, the lumber and other forest industries, virtually every State and Federal agency concerned with trees, and many others, too, have joined hands to do a job. Who can doubt that the job will be done?

The Volunteer Fireman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Alton (Ill.) Evening Telegraph on January 30, 1948:

THE VOLUNTEER FIREMAN

A volunteer fire department gets its praise the hard way.

A community's volunteers, pledged to safeguard the city in time of fire, seldom come in for any recognition for just having had a meeting. The boys have to go into action before anyone acts as though he knew the firemen are alive.

There are occasional remarks by nonmembers about how nice it must be to run off "upstate somewhere" to a firemen's convention, and there's usually a party-crasher or two on hand to criticize when the firemen throw one of their infrequent "feeds."

But even these cutsiders are ready with their praise as they watch the firemen battle a blaze, in subzero or midsummer weather. Called from their beds, or off their jobs, the volunteers are always ready to respond to the call for aid. Theirs is a humanitarian endeavor.

There is seldom any worth-while compensation involved. The volunteer department chief's job is more or less an honorary position, though there is some pay for his added duties.

Lumbermen, plumber, refinery worker, florist, and grocer, all find a common purpose and understanding in banding together to protect and rescue their community from fire.

The volunteer fireman is an unappreciated man—until you've had your home saved by his efforts.

Water for California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, in asking permission to insert this editorial taken from the Los Angeles Daily News of January 27, 1948, I want to call attention to one significant statement made therein. It refers to what will be the determining factors in the adjudication of water rights for the future in the West.

We have before this Congress bills introduced by the California and Nevada Senators as well as their Representatives requesting the Attorney General to start legal action before the Supreme Court to effectuate final determination of the water rights for the Lower Colorado River Basin. Even on the assumption of our belief that our riparian rights are more authentic than those of Arizona, we have in addition this new concept as very ably brought out in this editorial. It follows:

WATER FOR CALIFORNIA

This State is going through one of its driest periods. If there is any truth in the cycle theory (and there seems to be) we may be in for another year of insufficient rainfall.

Mark Twain once said, in effect, that the weather is something everyone talks about but no one does anything about. There are a few things we can do and which our State and Federal Governments are hereby urged to do.

The first and most obvious duty is to settle, once and for all, what the policy is to be with reference to the service of water by the United States Bureau of Reclamation in the Central Valley and other regions. This is not the time and place to go into this highly controversial question on its merits. It is time to insist, however, that our State and Federal Government, through their proper agencies, confer and establish for all times and for all to know on what basis California's thirsty valleys are to get water.

The next step suggested is that we proceed to implement to the fullest extent our flood-control policies as translated into law and, again, in full consultation and cooperation with the United States Army engineers and such other agencies as may be authorized to deal with it.

Flood control means more than taking care of surplus waters during flood periods, important as that is. It means impounding surplus waters in reservoirs for future use. Los Angeles must recognize that its water supply from the Owens Valley and from the Colorado River is limited and it should utilize every other available source of supply. That is particularly true when the State and the Government both recognize our need and evince willingness to aid us to the fullest extent.

California must likewise move expeditiously toward a settlement of its Colorado River water controversy with Arizona. If this means suits in the United States courts then we should prepare and file those suits at the earliest possible dates. This should be done in the most friendly possible fashion in order that our normal relationships with our neighboring State may not be impaired.

Water supply in the West is more than a matter of law and engineering. It is a matter of major public policy, which involves both and determines the economic existence of a vast and growing area. Riparian rights in years gone by, in times and places where water was abundant and it was more of an academic matter than anything else, may have involved nice questions of property right· face, precedent, and numerous other elements.

Today in the semi-arid West, two factors determine water rights. One is the population and its needs and the other is how much diligence has been used to put water to beneficial use for that population. It is not what people would like to do with water or what they say they will do with it, but their needs and what they are actually doing to meet those needs that form the basic considerations as far as courts are concerned.

The city of Los Angeles alone has a greater population than the entire State of Arizona probably ever will have. That is half the battle. The other half is to assert that right by action.

There are two other items of less importance but which properly influence the whole situation. One is the need of readjusting our water treaty with Mexico in congressional action and with the aid of the State Department. This treaty should constantly be an object of the closest scrutiny.

The other item is attention to any possible changes in crop cultures that may be indicated by weather cycles. The State, fortunately, is aware of this and disposed to be helpful.

L. E. C.

The Late Orville Wright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union of February 2, 1948, entitled "Orville Wright."

ORVILLE WRIGHT

Orville Wright, codeveloper of sustained flight by heavier-than-air "flying machines," outlived Wilbur by a generation. He died of typhoid fever in 1912. Only 9 years before he and his older brother had made their first feeble flights at Kitty Hawk, N. C., where four sustained hops aloft were made, the longest of 59 seconds' duration and a 30-mile-an-hour speed.

But progress—sensational in that period of development—came quickly. The first military plane in the world, built by the Wrights for the United States Government, maintained in 1908 a continuous flight of 1 hour, and not only that, carried a passenger on a second hop. The performance, according to contemporary news accounts, "made a profound impression."

The Wrights did not foresee the use of the airplane in war. Wilbur never did realize its potentialities, but Orville saw its evolution as a war-hawk in two world conflicts. In the first, the airplane was merely trying its wings; in the second, it had found them; and the Allied victory is due in great degree to our air supremacy. Orville also was to know of what the future holds for aeronautics as a force of destruction in war—and as a contribution to progress in peace.

In 1943, in honor of the 40th anniversary of the first flight, President Roosevelt declared that "Orville and Wilbur Wright did not labor and toil to create an instrument of war. Knowing them as I do, their inspiration was not a destructive weapon."

That is so, but these are the most critical times in this Nation's history. We must maintain our military air strength, for air preparedness will either secure the peace or destroy our enemies. Then, again, as was Orville Wright's wish, the airplane will be one of man's most outstanding contributions to the progress of men.

Radio Networks Use Their Monopoly Power in Irresponsible Fashion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the judgment of the American people can be no better than the information available to them. Consequently there is nothing of greater importance than the necessity for getting full information to the people on vital issues. In a casual inquiry of the broadcasting industry in this connection I have made an alarming and almost terrifying discovery.

The four great radio networks of the Nation—NBC, ABC, Mutual, and Columbia—are reported to control about 95 percent of the night-time broadcasting power in America. This broadcasting power represents almost a practical monopoly of the most powerful avenue of information and propaganda known in the modern world.

Because of the propaganda power possessed by these networks, plus the fact that this power is a quasi monopoly, it becomes vital to our existence as a free nation that this power be used to present fairly both sides of every important issue.

The four networks on the basis of their own evidence have utterly failed to fulfill this responsibility on the so-called Marshall plan.

Without exception, the networks have given an overwhelming preponderance of radio time to the promoters of the Marshall plan. They seem not to have made even the attempt to preserve a semblance of a two-sided presentation. For eight long months since Marshall made his speech inaugurating this handout scheme, the radio networks have drenched the Nation with ballyhoo and propaganda favoring it.

A discussion of the irresponsible misuse of power is outlined in the February 2 front page article from the Chicago Tribune which I am including with these remarks.

The consequences of this failure and abuse of power by the radio network are impossible to calculate. It is my intention to report my findings to the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the hope that his committee will investigate this situation promptly and move to deal constructively with this situation.

The article referred to follows:

RADIO DRIPS WITH ALIEN AID PLEAS—6-TO-1 BIAS BARED BY SURVEY

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, February 1.—The four major radio networks of the Nation have saturated the air waves for 7 months with propaganda in support of the $17,000,000,000 European spending program, Representative SCHWABE (Republican, Missouri) declared in making public the results of a survey.

SCHWABE accused the radio chains of failing in their duty to furnish a "fair and equitable presentation of facts and arguments both for and against the Marshall plan."

The Missourian disclosed that he had received data from three networks in answer to letters requesting that they detail the amount of radio time given to speakers favoring and opposing the vast spending scheme. The fourth network, the National Broadcasting Co., wrote that it could not furnish the information at present.

SIX-TO-ONE RATIO

"The results were amazing," SCHWABE said. "Taking the networks' own figures, the ratio of radio arguments for the plan, compared with opposing views, since State Secretary Marshall first proposed it last June, has been six to one.

"All the networks claim that they furnish a balanced presentation on subjects of great public interest. The fact is that the people depending upon radio news reporters, commentators, and programs for information on the Marshall plan have been given a sadly distorted and one-sided picture."

SCHWABE said he began his inquiry after he noted the discrepancy between radio views on the Marshall plan and the sentiment of the people in his district. A poll of his constituents, in which 5,000 replies were received, showed three to one against the proposal, he said, and six to one against if it involved price controls and rationing.

ONSLAUGHT OF PROPAGANDA

He said he became convinced that the American public was being deceived through a nightly onslaught of radio propaganda which attempted to make it appear that opposition to European spending was practically voiceless.

SCHWABE addressed letters on January 12 to the heads of the Columbia Broadcasting System, the National Broadcasting Co., the Mutual Broadcasting System, and the American Broadcasting Co.

"The Marshall plan is a far-reaching issue," he wrote. "In my post, I conceive it to be of paramount importance that the American people fully understand this proposal.

"I recognize that much of the people's information about this plan comes to them from radio news reporters and commentators. I would like to be informed on your procedures for balancing your presentations on this specific issue, together with data evidencing this balance."

ASKED TO GIVE DATA

"In replying, please state what methods and techniques your network has used to see that your listeners have received a fair and equitable presentation of facts and arguments both for and against the Marshall plan. Furnish data on the allocation of time since the plan was advanced last June."

Replies were submitted within 2 weeks by CBS, MBS, and ABC. Niles Trammel, president of NBC, after 9 days, replied that the information requested was "so voluminous and will require so much research that it is not possible to supply actual data very quickly."

"How a network can achieve a balanced presentation of information on a subject without regularly compiling such relevant data is a mystery to me," commented SCHWABE.

ONE HUNDRED SPEAKERS LISTED

The other three networks gave SCHWABE a listing of programs, forums, and debates affecting the Marshall plan. Approximately 145 speakers had been given radio time between July 1, 1947 and late January 1948, to discuss the Marshall plan. Of these, 120 had urged its adoption. President Truman, Secretary Marshall, and other Cabinet officers, and numerous representatives of organizations created to support the program, had appeared time and again on the air.

In contrast, less than 20 persons had been permitted to air their views on the networks in opposition to the plan. Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, who has demanded a large reduction in foreign spending, was granted time on all three networks on separate occasions. Senator BROOKS, Republican, of Illinois, another opponent of unreserved expenditures, appeared on an ABC program in which the issue was debated by speakers of opposing views.

THOMAS LISTED AS OPPONENT

Some of those listed as opposed to the Marshall plan actually supported it. CBS listed Norman Thomas, Socialist Party leader, as an opponent given radio time. Thomas favors the plan because it will promote socialism in Europe and appeared on an ABC program with his speech labeled "Why I favor the Marshall plan."

"The conclusion is inescapable," SCHWABE commented, "that the American people have been permitted to hear only one side of the proposal during most of the time they are listening to the radio."

Communism in Europe, in America—Malignant There, Benign Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President and his advisers tell us that, if we do not give his administration billions of dollars and millions of tons of supplies to aid him in fighting communism in Europe, we should prepare to fight a third world war, draft American youth for compulsory military training, conscript our young men for armed service abroad.

He and his advisers are telling us that, unless we submit to price control, rationing, and regimentation here at home, in short, surrender our constitutional form of government, give him the powers of a dictator, the Communists backed by Russia will sweep over Europe down to the Atlantic seaboard, roll across the Atlantic and, like a tidal wave, engulf and destroy us.

Summed up, the story is that communism is a malignant, incurable cancer, about to destroy our Nation.

But does he fight communism here at home in the Nation's Capital? Does he use the surgeon's knife to cut out and destroy the cancerous growth of communism as it exists in his own administration, in his own front and back yards here in Washington?

Here in Washington, members of local 471, UCRW, an affiliate of UPWA-CIO, employed in some 42 cafeterias serving Federal employees, went out on strike. The administration closed the cafeterias in the Labor Department and in the Supreme Court Building, thus aiding the strikers.

The employer refuses to bargain with the unions because the officers of both the local union and the parent international organization, having been charged with being Communists, the unions accused of being dominated by Communists, refuse to sign an affidavit that they are not members of or do not support any organization which believes in and teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

No one contends that the employer in this case may not, if it wishes, bargain with Communists, with thieves, or with known criminals, nor does anyone contend that it can legally be forced to bargain with either.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Congress has by law provided an orderly, effective way of collective bargaining, the President, knowing that the Congress has provided an effective way to use collective bargaining; that it has provided a conciliation service designed to avoid strikes and lock-outs; knowing that the Congress, for the protection of our country, desires to freeze Communists out of the labor movement, nevertheless calls in Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach, who has no legal standing in the dispute, and requests him to call upon the employer to sit down and bargain with these gentlemen who have been charged with being Communists and who think so little of public opinion that they refuse under oath to deny that they are the enemies of our country. Some of them have been dodging the subpenas of a House subcommittee.

The people of this country have excused the President of the United States in a good many instances for doing many things, but, in my humble judgment, they'll never excuse him for calling upon the people's representatives to fight communism abroad to the extent that we may weaken our own ability to defend ourselves, while at the same time following a program which aids the Communists here in America.

Harry S. Truman is following a course in connection with this strike which, if he wants the respect and the confidence of the American people, he should at once abandon. He cannot expect loyal Americans to believe that he is sincere in his fight against communism in Europe while he coddles and encourages them in the Nation's Capital.

Russia's Secret Pacts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol Courier of Wednesday, January 28:

RUSSIA'S SECRET PACTS

The secret German records, long suppressed by our Department of State and released a few days ago with a great fanfare of publicity, are fascinating to read—but they prove none of the case which the proponents of the Marshall plan seek to make against Russia.

They were given out as part of our cold war against the Russians, and were represented to the public as proving that Russia is treacherous, secretly hostile to the United States, greedy, and unreliable.

Moreover, their release was carefully timed to take the newspaper and reader attention away from the Hoover report, which was a document of monumental importance. They were used, not to encourage understanding abroad but to further confuse it at home.

What do these secret Nazi memoranda, pacts, and protocols, seized nearly 3 years ago and suppressed until recently, really prove?

Virtually nothing.

The broad facts of the matter are well known—they are familiar to every school child that reads his history books, perfectly well known to every American who reads the newspapers.

Back before the start of the Second World War, Hitler "bought" off Russia from her threatened anti-Nazi alliance with England by promising Russia half of helpless Poland. Stalin took the bribe, and broke his promises to England, France, and several other countries.

After the despicable bargain, Hitler attacked Russia, which promptly fled back to those she had destroyed, and they—principally with the munitions supplied by Uncle Sam—rescued Russia from the Nazis. Stalin thereupon demanded from his rescuers, the Allies (principally Churchill and Roosevelt) the very things which Hitler had been unwilling to give, and at Tehran and Yalta, by secret deals just as reprehensible as those covered by the recently released papers, he was granted all he asked, and probably much more than he ever expected. That was in line with the late President Roosevelt's "great experiment" of Russian appeasement, which now has so seriously backfired.

Naturally, every step of the negotiations between Germany and Russia which led to the rape of Poland was covered by memoranda, reports, private agreements, and the like.

But since it is a known fact that diplomats—even our own—rarely say just what

they mean, all of these records are in a sort of involved double talk with the significance all between the lines.

The secret papers reveal that the bargaining between Hitler and Stalin was carried on in the most fantastic spirit of duplicity, suspicion, fraud, and treachery.

As one commentator observed, the whole transaction was "a cynical marriage of convenience." Hitler himself later called it a hypocritical performance.

Stalin welshed on his part of the bargain before the ink was dry, and forced Hitler to add further lands to the bribe—most of Lithuania, which Hitler had planned to keep, and new territory in the southeast. Hitler himself later made it clear that he intended all the time to do what he eventually did—invade Russia.

Trying to prove now, on the strength of documents written in such an atmosphere, that any statement of either of the parties throws any light on their real purposes is absurd. For the State Department to pretend that these "secret" papers give any new information on foreign affairs is a piece of demagoguery just as offensive as were the propaganda machinations of Hitler and Stalin during the period in question—when the German envoy was able to write, as he did, that: "The (Russian) press is as though it had been transformed," and to comment on the ability of the Russian Government "in a masterly fashion to influence the attitude of the population."

How secret were these papers?

That is an interesting question. The whole attitude of the State Department has been one of pious indignation over a scandal recently come to its attention. But if that is true, and this information only lately come to the knowledge of our leaders, then it is the worst possible indictment of the capacity of our State Department.

As for the German-Russian treaty which partitioned Poland, the documents prove that Count Ciano knew all about the negotiations and the terms of the proposed agreement at least a week before it was signed. If he, not a party to the negotiations, could learn about it in Italy, why should it have been a secret from our own diplomatic staff?

As a matter of fact, the documents would do their greatest value if they could be used as a horrible example to the public of the very type of diplomacy which we ought most strenuously to avoid—but which unhappily we have been fumbling with disastrously since long before the Second World War.

That is secret diplomacy, condemned by patriotic Presidents from Washington's warning against entangling alliances down to President Wilson's demand for open covenants openly arrived at.

It would be most interesting to know how carefully the papers were edited and censored before being released, and how many similar documents are still being suppressed—why? Because they would tip the American people off, if released, to the extent to which our own State Department used the same type of duplicity and double dealing and misdirection in the days preceding Pearl Harbor.

There is a whole missing chapter of the reports made to Hitler by his observers during the days when our National Government was, technically neutral—but pulling every wire to get us into the war. These, and the diplomatic papers circulated among the Axis Powers on these matters, would make most interesting reading now for the American people—who were hoodwinked while this was going on.

But the great significance of these papers lies not in their bearing on current problems so much as their bearing on the foreign policy of President Truman during the time when he had it in his power to have corrected the evils that now appear to force us directly toward a third world war.

That period was, roughly, from the time of President Roosevelt's death up to and shortly after the Potsdam agreement.

Assuming (for all its doubtfulness) the State Department's intimation that President Roosevelt never knew of the hostility toward this Nation which Russia expressed in the German-Russian documents, and that he died thinking Russia was "trustworthy" and appeasement a sound policy, these papers should have disillusioned President Truman at once.

They were seized the same month that President Roosevelt died. They were in American hands when the San Francisco conference was held, and they were in American possession during the Potsdam conference.

Yet at San Francisco the agents of President Truman ratified the horrible deals previously made at Yalta and froze the destructive "veto clause" into the United Nations program. And at Potsdam President Truman signed an agreement authorizing Russia to loot crushed Germany to the extent which has now paralyzed Europe; he authorized the reparations program which is now the great bone of contention between the United States and Russia; and he accepted the scheme for dividing Germany into zones that has proven advantageous only to Russia.

If these papers prove, as the State Department seems to expect the public to believe, that Russia is not a reliable partner in trying to work for peace in coming years—then why didn't they prove the same to President Truman in time for him to have done something about it before all the harm resulted?

Reflections on Gandhi—French Advice Ignored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include the following articles to be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington Post of February 3, 1948]

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
REFLECTIONS ON GANDHI

In the life and death of Mahatma Gandhi we have seen reenacted in our time the supreme drama of humanity. Gandhi was a political leader and he was a seer, and perhaps never before on so grand a scale has anyone sought to shape the course of events in the world as it is by the example of a spirit which was not of the world as it is.

Gandhi was, as St. Paul said, transformed in the renewing of his mind; he was not "conformed to this world." Yet he sought to govern turbulent masses of men who were still very much conformed to this world, and have not been transformed. He died by violence as he was staking his life in order to set the example of nonviolence.

Thus he posed again the perennial question of how the insight of the seers and saints is related to the work of legislators, rulers, and statesmen. That they are in conflict is only too plain, and yet it is impossible to admit, as Gandhi refused to admit, that the conflict can never be resolved. For it is necessary to govern mankind and it is necessary to transform men.

Perhaps we may say that the insight of the governors of men is, as it were, horizontal; they act in the present, with men as they are, with the knowledge they possess, with what they can now understand, with the mixture of their passions, and desires, and instincts. They must work with concrete and with the plainly and generally intelligible things.

The insight of the seers, on the contrary, is vertical; they deal, however wide their appeal, with each person potentially, as he might be transformed, renewed, and regenerated. And because they appeal to experience which men have not yet had, with things that are not at hand and are out of their immediate reach, with the invisible and the unattained, they speak and act, as Gandhi did, obscurely, appealing to the imagination by symbolic evocation and subtle example.

The ideals of human life which the seers teach—nonresistance, humility, and poverty and chastity—have never been and can never be the laws of a secular society. Chastity, consistently and habitually observed, would annihilate it. Poverty, if universally pursued, would plunge it into misery and disease. Humility and nonresistance, if they were the rule, would mean the triumph of predatory force.

Is it possible that the greatest seers and teachers did not know this, and that what they enjoined upon men was a kind of suicide and self-annihilation? Obviously not. Their wisdom was not naive, and it can be understood if we approach it not as rules of conduct but as an insight into the economy and the order and the quality of the passions.

At the summit of their wisdom what they teach is, I think, not how in the practical issues of daily life men in society can and should behave but to what ultimate values they should give their allegiance. Thus the injunction to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's is not a definite political principle which can be applied to define the relation of church and state. It is an injunction as to where men shall have their ultimate obligations, that in rendering to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, they should not give to Caesar their ultimate loyalty, but should reserve it.

In the same manner to have humility is to have, in the last reaches of conviction, a saving doubt. To embrace poverty is to be without possessiveness and a total attachment to things and to honors. To be nonresistant is to be at last noncompetitive.

What the seer points toward is best described in the language of St. Paul as the creation of the new man. "And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." What is this new man? He is the man who has been renewed and is "no longer under a schoolmaster," whose passions have been altered, as Gandhi sought to alter the passions of his countrymen, so that they need no discipline from without because they have been transformed from within. Such regenerated men can, as Confucius said, follow what their hearts desire without transgressing what is right. They are "led of the spirit" in the Pauline language, and therefore they "are not under the law."

It is not for such men as them that governments are instituted and laws enacted and enforced. These are for the old Adam. It is for the aggressive, possessive, carnal appetites of the old Adam that there are punishments and rewards, and for his violence a superior force.

It is only for the regenerate man, whose passions have been transformed, that the discipline of the law and of power are no longer needed, nor any incentive or reward beyond the exquisite and exhilarating wholesomeness and unity and freedom of his own passions.

[From the Washington Post of February 3, 1948]

FIASCO IN GERMANY
(By Sumner Welles)
FRENCH ADVICE IGNORED

The lessons of the two world wars are unmistakable. The Germans must be taught that they cannot succeed in any new aggression. Germany cannot safely be permitted to be a politically centralized state. Until there is proof that the German people have experienced a moral conversion, Germany must be kept under international control so that her manpower and her resources cannot again be used for war. If all of this is accomplished, the major powers must cooperate in carrying out a joint policy.

The Allies disregarded these lessons in the 1920's. The Second World War was the inevitable result.

In our own policy toward Germany since 1945 these lessons have again been ignored.

It is true that Russia's effort to use Germans for her own ends has so far blocked any agreement upon a United Nations policy. But we have been occupying a zone of western Germany for 2½ years. We have had ample time to launch a program of reeducation that could teach the Germans what democratic liberties mean. We have had every opportunity to lay the foundations for a political and economic system which could help to build up a peaceful Europe. We have had the chance of showing the Germans that Britain, France, and the United States can maintain a common front.

What is our record?

Denazification in the American zone has been a tragic farce. After endless bungling, its control has now been handed over to the Germans themselves. What kind of denazification will we get when the average German still believes that nazism's one defect was that it lost the war?

The press, the universities, the schools, adult education, the moving pictures and the theater were the obvious means through which German mass reeducation could be carried on. It is in this field where we might have been expected to be most successful, that our failure has been the most abject. The surveys conducted by the American Military Government show that the Germans are even more totalitarian than they were 2 years ago.

The American occupation has stressed relief. It has done little to stimulate German self-help. Until the individual German realizes that it is by work and not by strikes that he will get food and clothing there will be no productive and self-supporting western Germany. But our cockeyed occupation policies have often made it impossible for many Germans to find the chance to obtain work and have impeded the distribution of German-produced food. The distinguishing features of our economic program are widespread corruption, the black market, and primitive barter.

The continuation of the concentration camps for displaced persons, and the frequent use by our military authorities of notorious collaborators in screening the inmates of these camps are a further blot upon our record. They are partly responsible for the continued strength of anti-Semitism in western Germany.

We have persistently ignored France in shaping our German policy. The French Government had no knowledge of our recent proposals for a new form of administration in western Germany until after these had been offered to a number of German political leaders at Frankfurt on January 6.

The French contend that if the militarists and nationalists are to be prevented from regimenting the German people in the future, any central German Government must be a federal agency of the several German states and must not be elected by the German people as a whole. They insist that the solution of the German problem can only be found through the integration of Germany within united Europe, and that this can never be accomplished if Germany is permitted once more to become a unified, superindustrialized, and highly centralized state.

The past 30 years have shown conclusively that the French are justified in this belief. Only if Germany becomes a federation, in which each state retains sufficient political and economic autonomy to enable it to cooperate with its non-German neighbors, can the German people be expected to become a peaceful and constructive force in the European body politic. Yet the proposals the United States offered the Germans at Frankfurt would tend to bring about precisely the contrary result.

It was announced in Washington last week that by July 1 our administration in Germany would be in civilian hands. This change should have been made 2 years ago.

The whole set-up in Germany should be transformed from top to bottom. The military should be an instrument to enforce policy and not the policy maker. Policy should not only be made in Washington rather than in Germany, but it should never be decided upon until after full consultation with France and with Germany's other western neighbors.

France has had her sons slaughtered and her lands devastated by the Germans three times within the past 80 years. Her survival today depends upon the adoption of a policy toward Germany that spells security. Her advice in 1919 was spurned, yet experience has shown she was right. Is it too much to expect of the administration in Washington that it recognize that the French are as good judges of what the policy toward Germany should be as we ourselves?

Postal Workers Deserve Increase in Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach herewith the following editorial which appeared in the Gadsden Times, Gadsden, Ala., entitled "Postal Workers Deserve Increase in Pay," which I commend to the attention of the Members of Congress:

POSTAL WORKERS DESERVE INCREASE IN PAY

None among the workers who have been caught in the squeeze between rising prices and fixed salaries have been more severely handicapped than those in the postal service.

During the current battle between climbing prices and pay adjustments the postal workers have been unable to get the attention from Congress that their cause merits. And it is only from Congress that they can get increased pay.

The clerks, carriers, and others in the postal service are members of unions, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

But these unions operate under restrictions that prevent them from the kind of bargaining and pressure that are available to other labor organizations.

The economic fate of the postal workers is in the hands of Congress and the people. Unless they get wider support from the public for their requested pay increases they may continue to be ignored in Washington.

Despite the handicaps, the postal workers continue to efficiently and faithfully discharge their duties. This service is a constant and vital national necessity. It requires well trained and loyal personnel.

The postman has a home to maintain, bills to meet, children to educate, and the many other financial responsibilities of modern life. All his expenses have skyrocketed.

But pay increases have been small and infrequent. While other workers went on strike or brought about wage raises through organized effort, the postman continued on his job.

It is time that the public reminded Congress that this loyal and efficient service should be rewarded with an urgently needed and deserved salary adjustment.

Absurd on Its Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, section 3, of article II of the Constitution, provides that the President "shall from time to time give to the Congress information on the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

Each succeeding President of the United States has followed the constitutional directive, and on the convening of each session of Congress sent to it a message purporting to give his views on the state of the Union, carrying his suggestions as to needed legislation.

Complying with the constitutional provisions and following the long-established custom, the President, on Wednesday, January 7, personally delivered his message. Whether that message accurately described the state of the Union or recommended legislation that would be expedient is a matter of opinion. From a President of the United States one would naturally expect recommendations which would meet the test of sound judgment, logic, and consistency.

To illustrate what the Congress actually received from the President, permit a typical excerpt from his message. Said the President:

At least $50,000,000,000 should be invested by industry to improve and expand our productive facilities over the next few years. But this is only the beginning.

Then the President recommended:

A cost-of-living tax credit be extended to our people consisting of a credit of $40 to each individual taxpayer and an additional credit of $40 for each dependent. * * * It is estimated that such a tax credit would reduce the Federal revenue by $3,200,000,000.

Then he told us that to get back that loss of revenue, we should increase the taxes on corporation profits—which are now taxed 38 percent of their income, though we know money to improve and expand industry's productive facilities must come out of original investment or corporate profits.

Naturally, human nature being what it is, we are all for any program which

would save us $40 plus an additional $40 for each dependent. But is it good sense, is it logical, is it consistent to say in one breath that industry, and, of course, that means the larger corporations, which create jobs, should spend $50,000,000,000 to improve and expand its facilities, and at the same time ask it each year to pay an additional $3,200,000,000 in taxes?

To some it seems to be nonsensical to ask industry, over the next few years, to spend $50,000,000,000 in expanding its plants, and at the same time pay an additional tax of $3,200,000,000 when we know that corporations are now taxed 38 percent of their income. The President did not tell us where industry is to get the $50,000,000,000 if he takes it from it by additional taxes.

If we assume that corporate taxes continue for the next 3 years at the $17,000,000,000 level reached in 1947, the President's plan would take the entire net profit of all corporations after payment of taxes at the present rate for that period. How many people would put their money into corporations, into the building of plants, if they knew that for 3 years there was no possibility of getting a profit on their investments?

Nor is the President's proposed $40 tax reduction just what it seems, for he also recommended increasing the social-security tax by 1 percent. If a worker earned $3,000 per year and the social-security tax was increased as recommended by the President, there would be taken from him thirty additional dollars and $30 from $40 leaves $10, the actual tax reduction some would get.

I am afraid the President was talking through his hat and with the 1948 campaign in mind, rather than having his eyes on, his words directed toward, the state of the Union and the recommendation of sound, remedial legislation.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., Monday, February 2, 1948:

ANOTHER JOB FOR UNCLE SAM

There have been two appeals in the last few days for the United Nations to set up an international police force that can stop the fighting in Palestine before it flares into major war. One came from Harold Stassen, in the course of a political speech. The other was made by Mrs. Golda Meyerson, of the Jewish Agency on her arrival at UN headquarters from Palestine.

It is a wonder that there have not been more appeals. It is a greater wonder that the UN has not done something long since to carry out its order of partition. For the organization stands to lose the prestige it gained in the Soviet-American agreement on Palestine by its inaction since then.

The UN was clearly warned of trouble ahead. On the very day that partition was voted representatives of the Arab states told the General Assembly that their governments would not abide by the decision. It was evident that opposition would take the form of concerted international action. And that is just what is happening.

The Jews have been guilty of some needlessly bloody reprisals in Palestine. The British have been guilty of a half-hearted effort to keep the peace. But it was the Arabs who started the fighting.

Some have said that new nations are born slowly and in pain. They point to our own long revolution, and to the bloodshed from which many other governments of today have emerged. But this does not mean that history must go on repeating itself. The UN was created to change the pattern of history, to put an end to wars, declared and undeclared, and to preserve peace.

Efforts have been made by the UN in India and Indonesia to stop the fighting there and settle disputes. They have had some success. But the trouble in Palestine—trouble born within the assembly chamber—is ignored.

Partition was unpopular with the Arabs and their supporters, and the Security Council knew it.

Yet the Security Council has not acted. The UN Commission on Palestine has not acted. The British Government refuses to cooperate with the UN decision. And the Arab states are assembling an invasion army to crush the embryo Jewish state which the decision decreed.

If the invasion is not halted or broken up by international action, unilateral action by a UN member will not be surprising. Britain obviously is neither willing nor able to take that action. And what other nation is near enough and strong enough to step in? None but Russia, of course.

Some people with an understandable suspicion of Soviet policy think that Russia's agreement on partition was made with just such an outcome in view. If a major invasion of Palestine should come about, the future of the Jewish state and its people would be seriously threatened.

It is not easy to predict where the Red Army would be sent and how long it would stay, once it was in Palestine. But the possibilities cannot bring much joy to Washington or to London. Evidently London is going to do nothing about it. So, for the sake of justice and self-interest, it looks as if it is up to Uncle Sam to break the silence and stir the Security Council to action.

England Does Not Intend To Give Up Its Rule Over Palestine!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, only a few Members remained last night to hear several of us who spoke about the present tense situation in Palestine and the defiance of the United Nations by the Arab states and by Great Britain.

In this morning's mail I received a poignant letter from the American-Hungarian Jewish Federation, a religious relief society which has done valiant work in aiding the tragic victims of Nazi aggression in Europe, and in aiding the migration of Jews to Palestine.

I am inserting the letter in the RECORD under consent because it expresses so clearly the fears entertained by the world Jewish community at the present time, and points up what was said here yesterday.

AMERICAN HUNGARIAN JEWISH FEDERATION,
New York, N. Y., February 3, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is abundantly clear by now that England is determined to use all the tricks in its rich arsenal of imperialistic rule, in order to sabotage the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

The refusal by the British to open up a port for large-scale Jewish immigration, their continuous disarming of the Jews, while conniving with the Arabs in their attacks, their refusal to allow the organizing and arming of a Jewish militia under the auspices of the United Nations, their unwillingness to admit the United Nations Palestine Commission into Palestine before May 1, etc., etc., could only mean one thing, namely: That England does not intend to give up its rule over Palestine and is ready to achieve this aim by drowning the Jewish population in a sea of blood. Unfortunately, Bevin's policy of sabotaging the creation of a Jewish state seems to have some strong supporters in influential government circles in our own capital. This probably explains why till now nothing has been done by the United States Government to stop the bloodshed in Palestine and to help carry out the decision of the Assembly of the United Nations. On the contrary the clamping down of the embargo on arms to the Jews of Palestine strengthens and encourages the Arabs to go on with their attacks and helps England in its nefarious aims.

In the light of this alarming and dangerous situation, we appeal to you, dear Congressman, to do all in your power to urge our Government to live up to its obligations both to the United Nations and to its own citizens, by taking energetic steps through the Security Council, aimed at stopping the present Anglo-Arab conspiracy against the creation of a Jewish state. Arming the Haganah and organizing an international police force would be, to our mind, the first proper steps in that direction. A stern warning to the Arab States to stop their aggression is also long overdue.

In conclusion, we wish to express our shuddering at the thought that by our Government's disinterestedness and hands-off policy, new large-scale massacres of the Jews of Palestine are being prepared.

If during the war, certain democratic powers have resorted to the excuse of war expediency for their not interfering in Hitler's extermination of millions of Jews, then there is no war now and our Government's hands are not tied. It can and should act at once. England, which was saved from bankruptcy by the billions of dollars of our citizens and which is and will continue to be fed by us, can be made to fulfill its obligations to the United Nations, provided our Government wills it!

On the basis of your fine record and achievements till now, we feel that we can count on you to bring all your power and good offices to bear in defense of our great and noble cause at this crucial juncture.

Wishing you a great deal of luck and success in your humanitarian efforts, we are,

Yours with Torah and Zion greetings,
AMERICAN HUNGARIAN JEWISH FEDERATION,
Rabbi JACOB HOFFMAN,
Rabbi EMANUEL POLLAK,
Presidium.
M. WOBOLSKI,
Executive Secretary.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a letter written by Mayor Rollin A. Newton of Massena, N. Y., to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune replying to the metropolitan newspaper's Sunday morning editorial of January 18, 1948, against the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Mayor Newton has studied this project for years. His thinking is sound on this matter and I wholeheartedly agree with his arguments. I hope the Members of the House will read his letter carefully.

The text of the letter follows:

JANUARY 20, 1948.

EDITOR,
New York Herald Tribune,
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have been a reader of your paper for the past 20 years or more. I always figured you had a very liberal mind from your editorials, but after your comments on the St. Lawrence seaway project on Sunday I find that your liberality is concerned mostly with the city of New York.

We of the north country feel that we are entitled to a little consideration, knowing that the great city of New York has been given hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal funds spent on the port, on airports and on Federal buildings.

We feel we should not be penalized because New York City has been so shortsighted politically as to allow a large deficit from operation of its subways to color its political views, and because the city is in no financial position to develop its airports.

Your argument that the St. Lawrence seaway should be delayed is not very well taken. I am sure that you are liberal-minded enough to realize that America must wake up to the importance of conserving her natural resources.

We have helped finance two World Wars and have contributed a great deal of lumber, iron, and coal to help win these wars. Some competent authorities today doubt whether our natural resources will stand another world war.

I suppose that Mayor O'Dwyer would make the assumption that the seaway would take a lot of business away from the port of New York. I doubt if he can substantiate that argument as true

Your former mayor, the late F. H. LaGuardia, stated on a great many occasions that it would not affect the port of New York because of the fact that the seaway would be closed 4 to 4½ months each year.

At the present time the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence canals are carrying shipping equal to the load of the Panama and Suez Canals combined. I doubt very much that operation of the international section of the river from Ogdensburg to Montreal would materially increase the shipping. The only thing it might do is to facilitate that shipping. The 6-mile canal around the Long Sault rapids will have two locks, and the 2-mile canal, 5 miles above Waddington, to get around the control dam, will have one lock. These three locks will take the place of 25 or 30 now used in obsolete canals on the Canadian side.

One of the Congressmen that visited the site of the seaway in August was from one of the large coal-producing States. He told me at that time that the only thing John L. Lewis and the coal operators were agreed on was to defeat the seaway and power project. But he remarked that he thought it was time to conserve natural resources.

A necessary measure is to develop all hydroelectric power, not only in the State of New York, but in all areas where such development is needed. At the conclusion of World War II one of the first Russian moves was to rebuild the Dnieper Dam.

The development of power in the St. Lawrence, which is supplied by the Great Lakes, will produce a continuous supply of 2,200,000 horsepower. This power is greatly needed in this area, since the Federal Government built a $20,000,000 aluminum plant in Massena during the war. The plant was operated by electric power produced by coal in New York City. This power's cost, delivered to the Massena plant, was seven to seven and a half mills per kilowatt-hour.

The plant is now closed because there is no power cheap enough to operate it. Water power developed in Massena resulted in its growth from a population of 1,000 in 1901 to 15,000 today. The Aluminum Co. of America built a large plant up here. They have kept expanding, but the power was not sufficient for their needs, so they had to import some from Canada. The Federal Government has built hydroelectric plants in the South, Southwest, and on the Pacific Coast. In the last-mentioned area the cost is reported as 2 mills per kilowatt-hour.

As a result, the Aluminum Co. is building plants on the Pacific coast, which might otherwise have been built in the State of New York and added to the employment of local labor.

I wish to bring to your attention these facts to show the relative cost of producing energy from coal as compared with hydroelectric power.

Engineers have estimated that power could be developed here for about 1½ mills per kilowatt-hour.

A friend recently called to my attention the fact that the United States was one of the most wasteful nations in the world. I am not in a position to prove this, but it is about time that we gave some consideration to the matter.

The interests opposed to the seaway are those who have products to sell in competition. Their principal interest is the almighty dollar, regardless of the welfare of the American people.

R. A. NEWTON,
Mayor of Massena.

Power and the Rockwell Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal for January 28, 1948:

POWER AND THE ROCKWELL BILL

It will cost power users $1,000,000 more a year in increased rates if the Rockwell reclamation bill, as amended and passed by the House, finally passes, says Representative JACKSON of Washington. However accurate may be his estimate, some Members of the House, not to mention the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration, were very unhappy over last-minute revisions. No wonder.

The floor amendments, jammed through over vigorous protests, kicked the stuffing out of the compromise bill painstakingly worked out by Representative ROCKWELL, chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the House Public Lands Committee.

This compromise measure, which had the hard-won approval of both the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Reclamation Association, would have cut interest rates on funds appropriated for power units from 3 to not more than 2½ percent, would have extended the time for repayment of costs from 50 to 75 years, and would have settled the hot interest component controversy by providing that four-fifths of the interest on commercial power should be paid into the United States Treasury, rather than being utilized at the discretion of the Secretary of Interior to subsidize irrigation costs.

As amended and sent to the Senate, the bill would limit the repayment period for reclamation-project power-unit costs to 50 years and would require congressional approval of each and every reclamation project instead of permitting the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with self-liquidating reclamation projects which his engineering studies show are feasible—subject, of course, to congressional appropriations.

Reclamation Bureau and Bonneville Power Administration officials have already expressed their disapproval of these amendments. They see one favorable factor only, that is, a clause which would permit the Secretary of the Interior to allocate a portion of the costs of any multiple-purpose project to silt control, salinity control, recreation, and wildlife conservation. Otherwise, they fear the 50-year limit on repayment of power costs, without increasing costs to irrigators, will spell higher power rates.

This fear of higher power rates is shared by the Journal which questioned the original 1947 version of the Rockwell bill and urged the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Reclamation Association to get together on a compromise measure, before irreparable damage was done to western reclamation, power projects, and appropriations. It was shared by the National and the Oregon Granges which roundly criticized the reclamation association for supporting the original Rockwell bill.

It is doubly regrettable, therefore, that the compromise measure has been scuttled on the floor of the House. The Senate can still save it, however, and it is to be hoped that it will do so.

Veterans in College Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD certain news releases, including a release on the living costs of veterans in college training, which have been prepared by the American Council on Education, released through the University of Minnesota. In introducing that material into the RECORD, I want to say that I am very happy that the House of Representatives in recent days has passed the two bills in regard to veterans' legislation for which I have fought so hard for many

months past, which bills were passed by the Senate last July. I want to commend, because I have been critical heretofore, Mr. President, and I happen to be one who can commend as well as criticize when commendation is deserved, I want to commend the Republican leadership of the House for, at long last, bringing the bills out in legislative form. I am sure that under the leadership of the Senator from Ohio, who is chairman of the Senate conference committee on one of those bills, we shall have no difficulty in reaching a reasonable and fair settlement with the House conferees on the job training and ceiling bill. I am very pleased to be able to call the attention of the veterans of the country at this time to the fact that the other bill, namely, the bill for subsistence allowance for veterans in college, is now where I have wanted it to be for a long while, at the White House, awaiting signature.

There being no objection, the releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVING COSTS OF VETERANS IN COLLEGE TRAINING

(This is the first of a series of articles describing the results of a survey of college veterans based on the responses received from interviews with a scientifically selected sample of veterans attending all types of colleges located throughout the country. The study was planned by a national committee appointed by the American Council on Education and was made possible by a grant of funds from the Disabled American Veterans, Dean E. G. Williamson, of the University of Minnesota, acted as chairman of the committee. Ralph J. Strom, formerly of the Veterans' Administration, was director of the project and conducted the survey.)

MINNEAPOLIS, January.—One of the important problems facing the present Congress is the matter of proposed increases in subsistence payments to veterans attending educational institutions under the GI bill of rights and the Rehabilitation Act.

Veterans all over the country have been requesting increases in the $65 monthly allotment for single students and the $90 per month for married veterans so that they may remain in school despite skyrocketing living costs.

A portion of a survey on veterans' education recently completed by the American Council on Education and financed by the Disabled American Veterans, was devoted to an investigation of the cost of living of a scientifically selected and representative cross section of veterans attending colleges and universities throughout continental United States.

To determine how much of a differential exists between the $65 and $90 monthly subsistence payments, and their actual living expenses, each veteran contacted in the Nation-wide poll was asked to make a careful estimate of his average total monthly expenses while attending school.

Results of the poll indicate that the average total monthly expenses of single veterans in college is $106.13, while the average for married veteran college students is $175.38. This means that single students spent $106.13 monthly but received only $65, a difference of $41.13. Married students spent $175.38 but received only $90 from the Veterans' Administration, a difference of $85.38.

Board and room costs of the large number of single veteran students who reported paying for their room and board in one lump sum were found to have an average of $55.19 monthly. However, in the case of single veterans who said they found it necessary to eat at places other than where they roomed the average cost of their meals alone was found to be $51.08 monthly. This amount, in addition to the average sum of $21.48 which veterans in this group pay for room rent brings the monthly cost of room and board to $72.56.

Married veteran students, according to the poll, spend an average amount of $38.96 for rent monthly, while their average outlay for food was found to be $61.71, adding up to a total of $106.67 for rent and food ($16.67 more than the total subsistence allowance).

In order to make ends meet, many veterans work during school terms, and the wives of a great number of married veterans hold jobs on either a full-time or part-time basis. Summer vacation jobs are helpful to a large percentage seeking to augment their income.

Results of the Nation-wide study indicated that 36 percent of college student veterans work for additional income, 12 percent up to 10 hours during the week, 14 percent from 11 to 20 hours, and the remaining 10 percent more than 20 hours a week.

Despite physical disabilities, one out of four unmarried disabled student veterans was found to be working to supplement his income from the Government; one out of three married disabled veterans are working, while almost one-half of the married nondisabled veterans are employed.

Of the more than one-third of the college veterans employed, the survey showed that 46 percent earn $10 or less, 33 percent earn from $11 to $20, and 13 percent earn from $21 to $30 Earnings of the remaining 8 percent range from $31 to $105.

Wives of 56 percent of the married student veterans are working to supplement their husbands' incomes, the survey disclosed, 43 percent on a full-time basis, 9 percent part-time, and 4 percent intermittently.

To help pay their living expenses and in an effort to set aside additional funds for supplemental financing of their educational costs during the current school year, 6 out of 10 veterans worked to some extent during the last summer months, according to the poll.

Despite the fact that many veterans did outside work last summer, many were unable to set aside any funds for their scholastic expenses. This was found to be particularly true of the married veterans, many of whom were unable to retain any of their summer earnings for school costs after paying their summer living expenses.

Of the 6 out of 10 married veterans who worked last summer, 62 percent said they were unable to accumulate any savings, 21 percent reported they were able to lay aside up to $250, and 17 percent more than $250.

Many single veterans who worked last summer were in a better position financially when school opened since 40 percent were able to save up to $250, while another fourth set aside more than $250. Only one-third of the single veterans who worked during the summer said they were unable to save any of their earnings.

In an effort to determine the financial cushion which student veterans are able to maintain, they were queried in the poll as to their total personal savings now available for financing their educations.

More than one-third reported in the survey that they have no reserve savings whatever upon which they can draw to help pay their way through school.

The savings of married student veterans are decidedly less than those of all student veterans, according to the poll, 40 percent of this group having no savings whatsoever. In the case of married disabled veterans attending college, one-half have no financial reserves to supplement their income.

ATTITUDE OF THE COLLEGE VETERAN TOWARD HIS INSTRUCTION AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

(This is the second of a series of articles describing the results of a survey of college veterans based on the responses received from interviews with a scientifically selected sample of veterans attending all types of colleges located throughout the country. The study was planned by a national committee appointed by the American Council on Education and was made possible by a grant of funds from the Disabled American Veterans, Dean E. G. Williamson, of the University of Minnesota, acted as chairman of the committee. Ralph J. Strom, formerly of the Veterans' Administration, was director of the project and conducted the survey.)

MINNEAPOLIS, January.—The tremendous growth of colleges and universities in this country since the end of the war through the enrollment of one and one-quarter million veterans has raised numerous questions as to the adequacy of the instruction given to our ex-servicemen.

The answers to what the veterans themselves think of the instruction or teaching to which they have been subjected were learned in the Nation-wide poll of student veterans just completed by a committee of the American Council on Education and financed by the Disabled American Veterans.

Quality of college instruction was rated "average" to "very good" by 89 percent of the veterans polled, while 7 percent said they considered their instruction as "inferior" and only 1 percent branded college teaching as "very poor." In the survey, 3 percent had no opinion.

Of the 89 percent evidently satisfied with the instruction they are getting, 33 percent described it as "average," 35 percent as "good," and 21 percent as "very good."

Asked whether they felt that the present day greatly increased enrollments had lowered or raised the educational standards of their institutions, only 24 percent of the student veterans replied that standards had been lowered. No appreciable change in standards was reported by 26 percent, and 43 percent stated they felt that educational standards in their institutions actually had been raised as a result of the enrollment increase.

Of those who thought that the standards had been lowered, 31 percent said that it was because of crowded classes, and 29 percent expressed the opinion that the large enrollments resulted in less individual attention. Another 17 percent asserted that their professors and instructors were not sufficiently qualified to teach, while 7 percent saw a lowering of standards because of lack of teaching facilities such as laboratory materials, books, etc.

Increased competition among students for grades was cited as the reason primarily responsible for the increase in standards by 37 percent of the group which felt that large enrollments had resulted in such an increase. Greater maturity of students was the reason advanced by a fifth of this group, while another fifth attributed the higher standards to current higher college entrance requirements and to raised graduation and class requirements in grades. Other factors cited by this group as causes included: "More and better professors," 6 percent; "tougher courses," 4 percent; "school tries to get rid of the less fit," 3 percent; and "larger selection of new courses," 3 percent.

Six out of every 10 veterans in college, according to the Nation-wide poll, feel that their present-day attitude toward their education is different from that of nonveterans. Twenty-eight percent said they believe their attitude to be essentially the same as those students who had not been in service, while 12 percent had formed no opinion.

When asked why they felt that their attitude is different, 46 percent of the responding group stated they believed the difference to be due to the fact that veterans are more serious than nonveteran students about their work. Twenty percent said they thought veterans were more mature in their approach to college studies, 19 percent said they had more practical and definite goals than the nonveteran, and another 17 percent contended that veterans realized more fully the value of the educational program which they are now undertaking.

Considerable variation was found when the responses of married and single, disabled, and nondisabled veterans on the question of attitude toward education were compared.

Of the married disabled veterans, more than 72 percent replied that their attitude differs from that of the nonveteran student, while 65 percent of the married nondisabled veterans answered in this manner. That their attitude toward education differs from that of nonveterans was the opinion of 62 percent of the single disabled veterans and 57 percent of the single nondisabled veterans.

Fifty-seven percent of the married disabled veterans who stated that their attitude differs from the nonveteran student said it is because they are more serious about getting an education. Half of the unmarried disabled veterans in this group agreed with this statement as did 49 percent of the married nondisabled veterans and 42 percent of the single nondisabled veterans in this group.

Of all of the married veterans who reported a difference in attitude, 23 percent credited the difference to their own increased maturity, while 18 percent of the single veterans in this category offered the same explanation.

Veterans in college, the survey shows, are for the most part pretty well satisfied with college life, 93 percent reporting either that they are well satisfied or that they have "just a few gripes." Only 6 percent said they are "fed up."

Of those who reported having "a few gripes" or being "fed up," 43 percent complained of the inadequacy of courses and instructors, 21 percent said that their subsistence pay has been delayed or is too low or complained of a general lack of finances, 10 percent reported that classes are too large, 7 percent cited bad food and poor facilities, 8 percent contended that tuition and living costs are too high, while 5 percent complained of poor housing facilities.

EFFECT OF WAR EXPERIENCES ON THE VOCATIONAL GOALS OF COLLEGE VETERANS

(This is the third of a series of articles describing the results of a survey of college veterans based on the responses received from interviews with a scientifically selected sample of veterans attending all types of colleges located throughout the country. The study was planned by a national committee appointed by the American Council on Education and was made possible by a grant of funds from the Disabled American Veterans. Dean E. G. Williamson, of the University of Minnesota acted as chairman of the committee. Ralph J. Strom, formerly of the Veterans' Administration, was director of the project and conducted the survey.)

MINNEAPOLIS, January.—The general belief that war experiences have altered the vocational plans and ambitions of the great majority of American veterans is discounted by the Nation-wide survey on veterans' education made by the American Council on Education with the financial backing of Disabled American Veterans.

Results of the study indicate that more than half (51 percent) of the veterans now enrolled in the Nation's colleges and universities are preparing for the same vocations they planned to enter before they went into the armed services.

Only 35 percent, the survey shows, have changed their vocational plans made before entering military service, while 11 percent had not chosen vocations prior to donning uniforms.

The greatest change in vocational aims was found among the disabled veteran students, with 46 percent of the married students in this group and 43 percent of the single students enrolled in programs leading to occupational goals different from those they had prior to the war.

Principal reason advanced for changing vocational choice was "change of interest." Of the 35 percent who have changed their plans, one-fourth gave this reason. Other explanations advanced for change of vocational plans included "more opportunity in second choice," 17 percent of this group; "more aptitude for second choice," 13 percent; "is better paying," 4 percent; and "too long to prepare for first choice," 4 percent.

One-tenth of the student veterans who changed their plans stated that they had tried the vocation of their original choice, did not like it and had switched to another. Only 1 percent of those who changed said they found preparing for the first choice "too tough."

Once having embarked upon training for a vocation under the GI bill of rights or the rehabilitation program, most student veterans have remained "on course." The study shows that 86 percent have made no change in vocational plans since starting training under Government benefits. Some 12 percent reported having switched vocational plans once since starting training, while only between 1 and 2 percent said they had changed vocations two or more times.

Most student veterans feel that the majority of courses they are now taking are directly related to the vocations for which they are preparing. According to the survey, only 20 percent do not consider their present college courses directly related to their chosen vocations.

All but a few veterans in college are satisfied with the progress they are making toward their chosen vocations, the study indicates, with 72 percent considering their progress as average, 21 percent as excellent, and only 5 percent as unsatisfactory. Two percent said they did not know whether or not their progress is satisfactory.

ATTITUDE OF THE COLLEGE VETERAN TOWARD THE VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE HE HAS RECEIVED

(This is the fourth of a series of articles describing the results of a survey of college veterans based on the responses received from interviews with a scientifically selected sample of veterans attending all types of colleges located throughout the country. The study was planned by a national committee appointed by the American Council on Education and was made possible by a grant of funds from the Disabled American Veterans. Dean E. G. Williamson, of the University of Minnesota, acted as chairman of the committee. Ralph J. Strom, formerly of the Veterans' Administration, was director of the project and conducted the survey.)

MINNEAPOLIS, January.—With the Nation's colleges and universities staggering under the impact of one and one-quarter million veterans added to their enrollments since the close of the war and with $2,000,000,000 being expended for the training of veterans for the last fiscal year alone, increased emphasis is placed on the need for the proper selection of the course of training and the vocational objective of the student veteran.

What the student veteran thinks of the vocational guidance which he received from the Veterans' Administration and from his college or university was revealed by a Nation-wide poll taken by the American Council on Education, financed by the Disabled American Veterans, results of which have just been released.

Present veterans' legislation requires that all disabled veterans must select their vocational objective with counseling assistance of the extensive advisement facilities of the Veterans' Administration. Nondisabled veterans, those attending school under the provisions of the GI bill of rights, are offered the assistance of these facilities but are not required to make use of them. Nondisabled veterans are permitted to select any vocational objective they wish.

The Nation-wide survey of veterans in college indicates that only about 4 out of every 10 are availing themselves of the Veterans' Administration vocational guidance facilities and that of those who are making use of VA guidance, three out of four feel that the guidance they have received has been adequate, while one in four disagrees.

Another phase of vocational guidance is that which student veterans receive from their colleges and institutions. One-third of the veterans polled said that they had received adequate vocational guidance from official college counselors sources at their schools, and 16 percent stated they had not received adequate guidance from such sources. One-half of the student veterans included in the survey said they had not consulted any sources at their institutions.

The colleges and the Veterans' Administration were not the only sources of vocational guidance for these veterans, however. Of those queried, 37 percent had received additional help from other sources in the selection of their vocations.

In this latter group, 30 percent stated that they had received help from members of their family, while 39 percent obtained aid from individuals already in the vocational fields for which they were preparing. Eighteen percent received help from friends, while 11 percent had received help from members of their high-school faculty.

Further investigation showed that of those who had received help from these outside sources, 10 percent thought that this aid was less valuable than that received from the college or the VA, 23 percent thought it was equally as valuable, while 30 percent felt that this assistance was more valuable. Thirty-two percent of those receiving help from these other sources did not make use of the counseling facilities of either the Veterans' Administration or the college or university which they were attending.

The disabled veterans, who are required to receive Veterans' Administration vocational counseling, were asked whether the VA had given fair consideration to their own wishes in the selection of a vocational objective. Eighty-five percent indicated satisfaction in this respect, 4 percent were dissatisfied, while the remainder had no opinion.

Of this group of disabled veterans, 16 percent stated that their disability prevented them from entering vocations which they would have liked to enter, while 3 out of every 4 said that their disability had not affected their choice of vocational objectives. The remainder had no opinion.

EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION OF COLLEGE VETERANS IN EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

(This is the fifth of a series of articles describing the results of a survey of college veterans based on the responses received from interviews with a scientifically selected sample of veterans attending all types of colleges located throughout the country. The study was planned by a national committee appointed by the American Council on Education and was made possible by a grant of funds from the Disabled American Veterans. Dean E. G. Williamson, of the University of Minnesota, acted as chairman of the committee. Ralph J. Strom, formerly of the Veterans' Administration, was director of the project and conducted the survey.)

MINNEAPOLIS, January.—More than one-half of the veterans of World War II now attending colleges and universities take little part in organized student organizations and activities outside the classroom, according to the results of a Nation-wide poll of veterans in college conducted by the American Council on Education, and financed by the Disabled American Veterans.

An additional one-third of the veterans queried in the survey said they participate in

extracurricular campus activities to an average extent, and only 7 percent answered that they take a large part in such activities as veterans' clubs, student government, professional clubs, and like organizations.

When those veterans who take but little part in extracurricular activities were asked why, 63 percent advanced the reason that they do not have sufficient time, 20 percent said they are not interested in such activities, and 7 percent reported that part-time employment prevents their participation.

Further analysis of the results of the Nation-wide poll indicates that 73 percent of the disabled married veterans now enrolled in college work do not take part in such affairs because of lack of time, while 13 percent expressed lack of interest.

In the married nondisabled group, 68 percent said they lack the time and 13 percent are not interested. Among all the single veterans contacted in the poll, 58 percent gave lack of time as their explanation, while 24 percent said they are not interested.

Of the relatively small proportion of student veterans who stated that they take a large part in organized extracurricular activities on the campus, 27 percent said they find such activities of great interest, 18 percent cited social reasons, 14 percent stated that they like to be active, and 11 percent said they consider such activities a part of college life. Only 3 percent of this group said they thought such activities would be of help when it comes to getting a job, and 1 percent said they participated on a large scale in order to make personal contacts for use later on in life.

Informal social and recreational activities as differentiated from organized student activities attract a much greater participation by veterans in college, according to the survey.

Asked the extent to which they take part in these informal activities, 59 percent of the student veterans said they participate to an average extent, 21 percent to a very little extent, and 19 percent replied that they take part in a big way.

As in the case of organized activities, the married student veterans, both disabled and nondisabled, are much more restricted in participation in informal social and recreational pastimes than are the single students. Minimum participation in such informal enjoyments was reported by 34 percent of the married veterans and 16 percent of the single veterans. Participation in a big way was reported by 11 percent of the married veterans and 21 percent of the single veterans.

Dr. S. H. Scott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter I have just received from Mr. A. C. Croft, publisher of the Educator's Dispatch, which calls attention to the splendid record made by Dr. S. H. Scott during his 54 years of service as a member of the board of directors of the Coatesville, Pa., school district. In addition to being a great physician, Dr. Scott has by this outstanding civic service shown himself to be a great citizen as well as a great humanitarian. I know that his many friends and admirers in the Ninth Congressional District are joined with me in congratulating him on this splendid record.

Mr. Croft's letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 4, 1948.*
Hon. PAUL B. DAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAGUE: An unusual record of public service has just been completed by a citizen of Coatesville, Pa., and we believe that such a record should receive recognition through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Dr. Scott's tenure covers the era of greatest growth and development in the Coatesville schools. When he was first elected to the school board in 1893 only two pupils were in the high-school graduating class. Today the number of graduates averages more than 300. In 1893, there was one building of only six rooms and six teachers for the entire city. Now the city boasts of four elementary schools, two junior high schools, and one of the finest senior high-school plants in America.

As an impartial observer, I believe that Dr. Scott's record should be commended nationally.

Sincerely yours,

A. C. CROFT,
Publisher.

Rationing and Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, unquestionably the one national problem which is most generally discussed is that relating to the present high cost of living. A considerable portion of our citizens have urged the reinstatement of rationing and price control with the necessary subsidy out of the Public Treasury to support a reduction in current consumer costs.

Recently, I have received a letter from C. N. Silcox, official of the Cooperative Grange League Federation Exchange, of Ithaca, N. Y., giving some very interesting and pertinent data with respect to the relationship between market prices of foodstuffs under governmental subsidized control and free market. These figures clearly indicate that some very strong factor has developed since removal of price controls which has caused current prices to rise so substantially. Anyone who considers this problem without bias must recognize that this factor stems primarily from the tremendous drain of foreign shipments upon our domestic production.

The letter follows:

COOPERATIVE G. L. F. EXCHANGE, INC.,
Ithaca, N. Y., January 30, 1948.
Hon. W. STERLING COLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLE: During recent weeks many people, particularly in Washington, have been making statements which when interpreted mean that this country made a serious mistake in removing price controls at the time it did. The charges are based on the fact that highly desirable foods like meat, milk, and eggs have advanced materially because controls were removed.

I happened to be looking over some prices which I found very interesting and which do not bear out the fact that the removal of price controls allowed advances which would have not otherwise occurred.

Since the price of meat, milk, and eggs is influenced to a large degree by the price of the four main grains, it is proper to look at their price levels in trying to determine what really caused the present high price of meat and other animal products.

Price ceilings on corn, oats, wheat, and barley expired June 30, 1946. The following table is interesting. All prices are Buffalo basis.

	Price ceiling expired June 30, 1946	Market price January-February 1947 (6 to 7 months later)	Price as of Jan. 5, 1948
Corn	$1.65 per bushel	$1.48½	$2.86
Oats	$1.05 per bushel	.91	1.47
Wheat	$2.24 per bushel	2.39	3.22
Barley	$1.33 per bushel	1.29	2.16

The ceiling on feed ingredients was removed for the last time October 17, 1946. The relation of prices in January and February 1947 to the ceiling prices is shown in the following table:

	Price ceiling expired Oct. 17, 1946	Market price, January-February 1947	Price as of Jan. 5, 1948
Bran	$53.60	$41.50	$82.00
D. D. grains	41.60	41.60	93.00
Gluten feed	64.30	44.10	110.00
Soybean meal	68.40	63.60	107.00
Meat scrap	97.50	74.80	132.70
Dried whey	184.10	160.00	140.00

It is obvious by comparing the prices of January and February 1947 with the last ceiling prices, that the removal of ceilings did not result in material advances in feedgrain prices, which are the basis of food costs. Something else was responsible for the price level which now prevails.

Of course, any experienced student or observer of the market knows that the advances were due to the failure of the 1947 corn crop and the policy of this Government in shipping vast quantities of food grains abroad at a time when we were in short supply ourselves due to the corn-crop failure.

The talk of rationing only certain items when and if needed brings to mind that saying: "Oh, what a tangled web we weave when first we practice to deceive." Personally I think we are deceiving ourselves if we think that limited rationing will work, and this Nation will never stand for a return to a complete program of rationing and price controls.

What is your position on food rationing?

Cordially yours,

C. N. SILCOX.

Greece—Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article, I wish to include a report by the CDN of date December 15, 1947, which was published in the Washington Evening Star of same date, and which I think should be of much interest, and especially interesting to the Members of Congress, in view of the situation described in the article, and the further fact that the Congress will undoubtedly be called upon for further appropriations by the State Department in the near future.

The article is as follows:

TWO-THIRDS OF GREECE REPORTED IN CONTROL OF RED GUERRILLAS

ATHENS, December 15.—Despite the American aid program, two-thirds of the Greek mainland today is subject to temporary control by Communist guerrillas.

Except for the Peloponnesian Peninsula and Attica Province, of which Athens is the capital, the guerrillas dominate all the mountainous areas of Greece.

The Greek Army is able to protect only the more important centers of population, which are located in the plains and valleys.

But all land communications between them are liable to immediate rupture by the Communists.

If their Gen. Markos Vlfiades so desired, he could isolate almost any town except Athens and Salonika and keep it isolated for several days, until the army assembled sufficient reinforcements to drive his forces out. He could even isolate the entire province of Thrace, if he wanted, and he may yet do so, if and when it serves the Kremlin's purposes.

STRATEGY OUTLINED

So far General Vlfiades' guerrilla bands have not attempted to remain in control of any populous area. Their strategy is not to occupy territory, but to harass those who must defend it—in the hope of eventually exhausting Greece's powers of resistance.

The Communist tactics in Greece are identical to the tactics of the Bedouins of the Arabian desert during the first World War.

Inspired, paid and equipped by Col. T. E. Lawrence and other British agents, bands of Arabs no more numerous than the Communist bands in Greece succeeded in separating Arabia from the Ottoman Empire.

They succeeded partly because Turkey found itself on the losing side of an international war. But they succeeded also because of the faulty tactics of the Turkish Army—the same defensive tactics that the Greek Army is using today.

BOOK IS RECALLED

Passages of Mr. Lawrence's book, The Seven Pillars of Wisdom, might have been taken from a Soviet military manual issued for the instruction of General Vlfiades' guerrillas, or vice versa.

So long as they are able to receive aid from Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, and move back and forth at will across an undefended Greek frontier, the guerrillas will never be defeated.

They will be defeated only after the frontier is forcibly sealed and the Greek Army embarks on a serious offensive, lasting many months, to exterminate all guerrillas cut off from their bases outside Greece.

To that end the American military mission has authorized the formation of a national defense corps to relieve the army of the need for defending the towns and cities and lines of communication between them.

The Greek Government is hoping that the American military mission ultimately will increase the defense corps' strength to 50,000 men, but perhaps present plans call for supplying British arms and equipment for only 20,000.

BRITISH SUPPLIES NEEDED

British rather than American supplies are necessary in order to conform with the standard British equipment of the Greek Army. To reequip the Greek Army with American supplies would be a waste of time and money, although there are many Greek officers who would like to have us do so, since they consider our equipment superior.

If all goes well, and the strength of the defense corps is brought up to 50,000 men, it may be possible for the Greek Army next spring to begin in earnest the long, hard task of liberating Greece.

But nobody of any consequence here—Greek, British, or American—is so wildly optimistic as to believe that the job can be completed before the American aid program expires on June 30, 1948. Indeed, most observers doubt that it will be completed until the United States has set up permanent air and naval bases here and deployed two or three divisions of American soldiers or Marines along the Greek frontier.

Our Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., January 26, 1948:

My friends of the Mississippi Valley Association, I am honored and flattered that you should ask me to speak here today, because I have followed over a period of years the splendid work of the Mississippi Valley Association, and I sincerely believe that no small part of the credit for the magnificent development of the Valley area of our country is due directly to the vision and foresight of the members of this association. I feel that I can make this observation without fear of contradiction, because I live in the great port of New Orleans, and there have seen with my own eyes the fruit of your work.

I am glad, too, to come here today and talk about the American merchant marine. I may be accused of self-interest, because I represent an area which is so dependent upon an American merchant fleet, and because our port is the lifeblood of my home community. Should the charge be made, however, I would deny it, as the problems of the merchant marine transcend all local considerations, as they are directly related to our national well-being and security. The fact that I live in a great port means only that I have had a little more opportunity to witness first hand the significance of a strong American fleet.

It is difficult to understand why anyone should have to dwell upon the importance of the American merchant marine. To me it seems so very elementary. It would be almost ridiculous for a speaker to come before you in this day and age with the announced intention of convincing you of the importance of the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force. You know how important they are. And it would be presuming upon your intelligence to even argue the point. I am convinced that this audience likewise recognizes the vital importance of the American merchant marine, because this audience knows that no adequate defense program can be undertaken without fast, modern, dry cargo ships and tankers to move the men and supplies needed for the other branches of the services.

Yet, there seem to be many who do not quite understand this vital connection between our merchant ships and our national security. These people remind me of the isolationists who are still in our midst. The isolationist saw his theory exploded in 1917, and yet, because of the national disillusionment which followed World War I, he went right back to that type of thinking, and again the Nation had to fight a World War because of it. Nevertheless, there are many who are still unconvinced. May I take a moment of your time to cite a few of our great national leaders on the vital importance of the merchant marine:

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower: "When final victory is ours there is no organization that will share its credit more deservedly than the merchant marine."

Adm. Chester W. Nimitz: "Without the ships which have been wholly devoted to winning the war by the American maritime industry, our substantial progress would not have been possible. * * * This war has fully confirmed the necessity for a strong and sound merchant marine to be maintained in time of peace so that it may be employed as an auxiliary of the Army and Navy in time of war. The convincing way in which this fundamental fact has been demonstrated in the Pacific is a tribute to the ability and patriotism of the American merchant marine and augurs well for its future."

W. Averell Harriman: "A healthy American postwar merchant marine must be fostered. I feel we should aim at a fleet of the most modern ships—most efficient for each trade from our various ports to carry about a half on an over-all basis of our foreign trade. To accomplish this our Government should stimulate constant new construction on an annual replacement basis. This will give us a healthy shipbuilding industry as well, so sadly neglected after the last war."

Harry S. Truman: "As an aftermath of the war, the United States faces critical problems in connection with construction, modernization, and maintenance of an adequate fleet of passenger and freight vessels. With no new passenger liners and few cargo vessels scheduled to be built in the immediate future, the Nation is not assured of the existence of a balanced and modern merchant fleet. This is a matter that concerns not only our commerce and trade, but our national security as well. I feel that the whole problem should be carefully studied in all its phases. * * *"

Prior to World War I Woodrow Wilson said this: "It is necessary for many reasons of national efficiency and development that we should have a great merchant marine. The great merchant fleet we once used to make us rich, that great body of sturdy sailors who used to carry our flag into every sea, and who were the pride and often the bulwark of the Nation, we have almost driven out of existence by inexcusable neglect and indifference and by a hopelessly blind and provincial policy of so-called economic protection. Moreover, we can develop no true or effective American policy without ships of our own—not ships of war, but ships of peace, carrying goods and carrying much more; creating friendships and rendering indispensable services to all interests."

Prior to World War II Franklin D. Roosevelt said this: "I present to the Congress the question of whether or not the United States should have an adequate merchant marine. To me there are three reasons for answering this question in the affirmative. The first is that in time of peace, subsidies granted by other nations, shipping combines, and other restrictive or rebating methods may well be used to the detriment of American shippers. The maintenance of fair competition alone calls for American-flag ships of sufficient tonnage to carry a reasonable portion of our foreign commerce. Second, in the event of a major war in which the United States is not involved, our commerce, in the absence

of an adequate American merchant marine, might find itself seriously crippled because of its inability to secure bottoms for neutral peaceful foreign trade. Third, in the event of a war in which the United States itself might be engaged, American-flag ships are obviously needed, not only for naval auxiliaries, but also for the maintenance of reasonable and necessary commercial intercourse with other nations. We should remember lessons learned in the last war."

The maintenance of an American fleet has always been a difficult job. It might be well to briefly review our maritime history:

The fortunes of our merchant marine have surged and subsided as those of no other country.

Stories of the clipper ships of the early years of the nineteenth century, which carried as much as 90 percent of our foreign trade, appeal to the imagination and are familiar to everyone. Following the days of the clipper ships and the advent of the steamship, the American merchant marine reached its early peak, in number and tonnage of vessels, in 1860 with 1,440,000 gross tons engaged in foreign trade. Then came the Civil War, followed by a period of intensive internal development of the country and an extreme lack of interest in foreign trade and the merchant marine until in 1910 we had approximately one-half the tonnage of 1860 and carried only slightly more than 9 percent of our foreign commerce and our merchant marine reached the lowest efficiency in history. During this period all other maritime nations had been increasing their merchant fleets.

At this time there were no American-flag ships operating overseas from the ports of the Gulf of Mexico and there were no dependable services by foreign ships to many markets. Foreign ships which brought coffee from Brazil to New Orleans did not offer a return service but loaded cotton, grain, and other products for Europe and then carried manufactured goods from Europe to the east coast of South America, making what was termed "triangular voyages." Naturally the owners of those ships were interested in developing commerce between their own countries and South America. Sailings to European ports and to the Orient were seasonal and dependent upon the movement of cotton or grain. Because of their infrequency and uncertainty they were of no value to the exporter of manufactured products.

Then came World War I, finding us dependent upon the ships of other nations for the transport of nearly all of our foreign commerce. When these foreign ships were suddenly withdrawn for war service, there was stagnation of our foreign trade and ocean freight rates advanced to fantastic heights. We had goods for export for which the world was crying but no means of transporting them. This loss of trade cost our country a vast sum of money even before we entered the war.

When we finally became participants in World War I, we were forced into a frenzied era of ship construction costing more than $3,000,000,000 for vessels that could have been built for less than one-third this sum during the preceding years of peace. As few of these ships became available until after the war, the ships of our allies had to transport our men and supplies to the scenes of hostility.

While in 1910, our merchant fleet engaged in foreign trade amounting to only 782,000 gross tons, after World War I, as the result of the mightiest shipbuilding program in history up to that time, we found ourselves in possession of a fleet of more than 10,000,000 gross tons. A substantial number of these vessels were good ships, but many of them were of insufficient commercial or military value to warrant their preservation.

Under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 the Shipping Board selected the most suitable vessels from the emergency built fleet, and through private operating agencies undertook to establish steamship services to meet the immediate needs of our foreign commerce. About 4,700,000 deadweight tons, unsuited for commercial use, were sold for scrapping. Not one of these vessels was sold to foreign countries for competition with American shipping.

Efforts were made to induce private citizens to purchase and operate the various services developed by the Board, but finally it was concluded that private capital could not be attracted to shipping without the payment of a subsidy to equalize the lower costs of shipbuilding and operation enjoyed by foreign competitors. During the period 1922–28 there was not a single keel for a ship laid in the United States for service in foreign trade. Our ships, with a life expectancy of 20 years, were becoming old, and there were no plans for replacing them.

Further legislation was passed in 1928 which attempted to improve this situation by awarding mail contracts to the operators of American-flag vessels, which proved of some help and resulted in the construction of 31 combination freight and passenger vessels of high types which were launched between 1929 and 1932, representing an investment of $142,000,000. However, a total of $176,000,000 to overcome operating handicaps were paid out on the various mail contracts between 1929 and 1937 under the provisions of the act of 1928.

"Mail contract" was a misnomer. Subsidies were paid upon a mileage performance without regard to the amount of mail carried. This led to criticism by many who were more interested in finding fault with the administration than in building our merchant marine.

When it became clear that the act of 1928 had failed to achieve its principal objective—the development of an orderly replacement program—for the war-built vessels (only 13,265 gross tons were under construction on December 31, 1933), and that obsolescence was rapidly overcoming our fleet, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was passed and marked the real beginning of the rehabilitation of our merchant fleet under private ownership. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 expressed the policy of our Government in the following language:

"It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine:

"(a) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States, and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times;

"(b) capable of service as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency;

"(c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable; and

"(d) composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel.

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

Many fine vessels equal to any afloat have been built by American citizens, at a cost of more than $500,000,000, since the passage of this act. These vessels were available to serve our foreign trade on essential trade routes before we entered World War II and then in some measure, to meet our early military requirements; however, our fleet was far short of the requirements of expanding military operations and a second intensive emergency building program costing billions of dollars was necessary.

The end of World War II left us with close to 50,000,000 tons of ocean vessels. Such of these vessels as were left of those which had been requisitioned from private companies for war purposes were progressively turned back to their owners and under the provisions of the Ships Sales Act most of the better type of vessels suitable for commercial operation were sold to American companies. Others of the slower and least desirable type were chartered to those companies or sold or chartered to foreigners. The remaining tonnage was placed in laid-up reserves to be available for any future national emergency.

With vessels available to meet their requirements American shipowners began service on thirty-odd trade routes declared by the Maritime Commission to be essential to our foreign trade. These services reached all parts of the world and as of March 31, 1947, employed hundreds of privately owned dry cargo and combination ships, together with over 1,200 Government-owned dry cargo vessels under bare-boat charter to American-operating companies, as compared with 217 such vessels in 1937. The increased size and speed of the ships comprising the present fleet, moreover, results in an even greater capacity than is indicated by the increased number of ships alone.

It looked like the American merchant marine, after the interruptions of war, was again on its way.

But now there comes a new threat. This time there is being advocated in high places a policy directly contrary to that enunciated in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; a policy that might very well undo all that has been done and again scuttle the American merchant marine.

This new threat comes in the guise of an essential part of the Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of Europe. The President, in his message to Congress on December 19, 1947, said the following:

"The interest of the United States will be served best by permitting the sale or temporary transfer of some of our war-built merchant ships to the European countries. Because of world steel shortages, the sale or temporary transfer of ships should be linked with a reduction or deferment of the projected shipbuilding schedules of the participating countries. These arrangements should be consistent with their long-range merchant-marine requirements. They should also be consistent with our long-range objectives of maintaining an adequate merchant marine and shipbuilding industry for the United States.

"Making these vessels available to the European countries will materially reduce the cost of the United States aid both by lowering shipping costs and by reducing the use of scarce materials for new-ship construction overseas."

It is unfortunate that someone has so misinformed the President and the State Department, because a recommendation such as this merely gives ammunition to those who are already opposed to the Marshall plan and who are looking for excuses to sabotage it.

For my own part, I want it distinctly understood that I am supporting the Marshall plan in principle. I am not supporting it from humanitarian motives, as compelling as they are. Nor am I supporting it because of economic advantages which may accrue to our Nation, but for the same reason that I plead with you today to maintain a strong American merchant marine; that is, from the selfish, unaltruistic motive of our own national security.

It is inconceivable to me that we can maintain the free enterprise system in our Nation if all of Europe should become totalitarian. The mere cost of maintaining our national defense and of preventing attacks from within and without would soon seriously jeopardize our own system. The Marshall plan may fail. It is a gigantic gamble. But it is a gamble that we cannot afford not to take. Therefore, it is unfortunate—most unfortunate—that some so-called economic advisers should have the President endorse a program which may very well wreck the American merchant marine and which gives aid and comfort to the enemies of the Marshall plan.

The transportation features of the Marshall plan as recommended by the President propose that America shall turn over to the 16 nations receiving aid, 500 vessels from our reserve merchant fleet owned by the United States. Under the proposal, 200 of these vessels are to be sold outright, and 300 are to be chartered for bare-boat operation, operated under foreign flags and manned by foreign crews.

The evils inherent in these proposals are very clear. Since the conclusion of the war, 950 American vessels have already been transferred to foreign nations. The additional transfer of 500 more ships will make the number of ships under foreign operation greater than in 1929, when this Nation carried less than 30 percent of its exports and imports on American-flag ships, and it must be remembered that this competition is particularly bad because no foreign ship is required to maintain the labor and safety standards of American vessels.

It is now estimated that under existing schedules, the Marshall nations will soon have merchant fleets of 10,000,000 tons more than prewar, when their competition with the American fleet was destructive. Under the proposed plan, this amount will be increased by 500 vessels.

These 500 vessels represent more than half of our presently operating merchant fleet under private ownership.

At the present time American shipping companies are carrying ocean-borne foreign commerce in hundreds of vessels either privately owned or owned by the United States and bare-boat chartered to the private companies. These chartered ships fly the American flag and are manned by American seamen. If these ships were to transfer their flags, between twenty to twenty-five thousand officers and seamen, many of whom have been trained by the United States Government, will be thrown out of employment.

Admitting all of these facts, it might still be possible to justify the proposal if the economy argument—that is, that it will cost less to deliver relief supplies in foreign vessels than in American vessels, thus leaving additional dollars to be used for the purchase of relief commodities—was a sound one. But it is not. With equal logic we could argue that the sensible way of obtaining our raw materials would be by importing cheap foreign labor to man our farms, to mine the coal, to operate our railroads, and to run our industries. Of course, we won't do this. But, in effect, if we carry out the so-called transfer of American vessels we will be abandoning the American merchant marine when it is as vital to the security of our Nation as any phase of business or industry.

It is well to bear in mind, as I pointed out a few minutes ago that the Marshall plan is a gigantic gamble. I hope and pray that it will work and that it will succeed, and, as I said, I am supporting it because I can see no alternate; but we face a determined opposition. We face a government motivated by a philosophy so contrary to ours that it employs any means to justify its end of world domination. With Europe suffering as it is, we might not succeed. Do you think for one moment that these vessels would be returned if we failed? And would we not be providing ready-made a great merchant fleet that might conceivably be used against us?

Let us revert to the economy argument for a moment. Reliable computations indicate that over the full period of the Marshall plan the transfer of 500 American ships to foreign flags may result in a dollar freight saving of approximately $200,000,000, without crediting recapture of charter earnings and income taxes which would have been paid to the United States if the vessels were operated under the American flag. The bare-boat charters under which American companies are presently operating merchant vessels owned by the United States provide for the recapture by the United States of 90 percent of all profits made by the American charterer. The 10-percent profit retained by the charterer is, of course, subject to income tax. If allowances are made for these factors, it is safe to assume that the saving will be reduced to a small percentage of the estimated $200,000,000.

The President's Committee on Foreign Aid recognized this in its own report when it said:

"It is argued that this dollar cost could be still further reduced if the United States would transfer additional vessels abroad for foreign-flag operation in the bulk trades. * * * The limited financial savings are not sufficient to justify the drain on the United States resources for national defense which such transfers would involve."

And again:

"The United States needs an active merchant marine for national defense, and we must not create conditions in which that merchant marine cannot survive."

The President's own Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine, after a study of more than 11 years of peacetime and wartime operation under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, reached the conclusion, in its report made public in November 1947, that the act is fundamentally sound and should be retained, and that the payment of construction and operating differential rubsidies is absolutely essential to the maintenance of an American merchant marine of a size commensurate with national needs.

The Committee recognized the absolute necessity of the American merchant marine in the following conclusion:

"The Committee is convinced that a modern, efficient merchant fleet and an effective and progressive shipbuilding industry are necessary economic adjuncts to the peacetime economy of the United States, despite the unavoidable present necessity of Government financial aid to maintain them.

"Even if this were not true, the Committee faced the inevitable conclusion that such a merchant fleet and shipbuilding industry are indispensable to national security and would have to be maintained even should there be no other benefits accruing."

In conclusion, it is, indeed, difficult to understand how the recommendations of the President and the State Department could be seriously proposed in the face of current world conditions. They would be grossly unfair if they affected a so-called nonessential industry, but when they threaten the very existence of an industry not only vital to the economy of the Nation but positively essential to its national defense, they must be rejected.

It is my intention to vigorously oppose this proposal before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House and, if necessary, in the public debate on the measure when it reaches the floor of the House. In this endeavor, I am confident that I will have the support of all of you gentlemen, because many of you, if not the vast majority of you, have devoted many years of your life to the development of our great system of inland waterways, to the development of the commerce and trade of the Mississippi Valley, and the Gulf coast area, and this proposal, in my humble opinion, is directly threatening all that you have done, and all that you contemplate doing.

Thank you.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT ANNUAL MEETING OF MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, JANUARY 27, 1948

MERCHANT MARINE

The American merchant marine engaged in foreign trade now offers a service to shippers second to none in the world. We urge that American vessels should be patronized whenever possible by the public and by Government agencies.

However, the lack of suitable passenger ships and other special types, and the danger of loss of our shipbuilding facilities and skilled personnel is deplorable. We believe that the Government should create conditions which will induce private capital, under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to build the passenger and other special-type vessels necessary to keep the merchant fleet modern and a leader on the high seas.

Great uncertainty exists as to whether the United States Maritime Commission can make operating differential subsidy contracts for more than 1 year, as an annual appropriation by Congress has recently been made necessary to carry out the subsidy provisions of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act. Such uncertainty will seriously interfere with the financing of urgently needed new construction because ship owners require definite assurance of the long term Government operating aid provided by the above act as a condition for investments in vessels for operation under the American flag.

Therefore, we urge that the intent of Congress, as expressed in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, be made perfectly clear in the annual appropriations act so as to authorize operating subsidy contracts over a sufficiently long period to induce prudent businessmen to invest the capital necessary to build the ships now so urgently needed and those necessary for future replacement.

With special reference to the proposal of the State Department to transfer 500 ships to foreign nations, which we strongly oppose, the association further urges that neither by national nor by international action should foreign shipping be elevated above its prewar competitive position at the expense and deterioration of the American Merchant Marine, and that no action be taken by Congress or any Government policy be adopted which would result in the use of foreign ships for the transportation of more than 50 percent of the movement of cargoes under the Marshall plan for foreign relief should it be adopted.

We also urge that whatever is necessary be done to immediately reestablish our domestic coastwise water carrier services.

The association pledges its continued active support to the promotion and maintenance of a strong, privately owned and operated merchant marine sufficient for our national security, and for our economic needs.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Owen Brewster, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of the address I delivered last night at the Lincoln Day banquet at the Knights of Columbus Hall in Detroit, Mich.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1949

In 3 years we have had two Presidents and three Secretaries of State. Fortunately we have had one Senator VANDENBERG. Whatever continuity—I might almost say coherence—we have had in foreign policy has been largely dependent upon Senator VANDENBERG as Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Assurance of the continuance of Senator VANDENBERG at the helm of our foreign policy for the next few years is the best guarantee that America may begin to command some measure of respect in international affairs by reason of consistency and continuity.

To continue Senator VANDENBERG as the pilot of the American ship of state in the stormy seas that lie ahead it is imperative that Michigan return Senator FERGUSON for another term in the Senate of the United States.

There are many reasons for the reelection of Senator FERGUSON, but the supreme significance of keeping Senator VANDENBERG at the helm of foreign policy overshadows them all.

Emphasizing the leading role of Senator VANDENBERG in the evolution of American foreign policy in one of the great dramas of history by no means minimizes the outstanding service of Senator FERGUSON as an investigator with few, if any, peers, as a legislator with an eye single to the welfare of his country and his world, and as a Senator in the highest tradition of a State that has contributed so preeminently to the enrichment of our American public life and to the development of a nation that now stands in the forefront of human destiny.

Michigan, indeed, has reason to be proud of its two great sons and the country is grateful to Michigan for continuing in the Senate two men who contribute so greatly to keeping America as a leader of world civilization in these most trying times.

Let us always bear in mind in our preoccupation with Europe and its affairs that there are many problems and many millions of people outside Europe that are of concern to the people of the United States.

Our century-old interest in our neighbors to the south must continue as a cornerstone of our foreign policy.

Senator VANDENBERG pointed out a year ago at Cleveland that his counsel had not been sought to any extent outside the important but still limited fields of the United Nations and European policy.

Meanwhile, with Argentina, we had a Braden policy in Washington and a Messersmith policy in Buenos Aires and never the twain could meet. Under the pressure of a public suggestion from Senator VANDENBERG, we finally, though belatedly, moved to call the Rio Conference and released both Braden and Messersmith—the latter having simply carried out his instructions with all the skill of a quarter century in our diplomatic service.

In place of Messersmith to the most important diplomatic point in the Western Hemisphere from our standpoint we sent Mr. James Bruce, a dairyman instead of a diplomat, and left poor Mr. Peron to figure out the implications so far as our foreign policy was concerned.

In China there was a similar schizophrenia. Having sent Marshall to argue Chiang into a union with the Communists we pronounced a ban on Communists everywhere else in the world and abandoned China to the tender mercies of the Soviet.

Our unilateral action in Greece and Turkey in bypassing the United Nations was only saved from complete disaster by the prompt action of Senator VANDENBERG in clearing the procedure through the United Nations. The precedent may still give us very serious trouble in the Middle East or elsewhere.

Meanwhile at the eleventh hour we championed the partition of Palestine in the United Nations and immediately abandoned the Middle East to inevitable chaos.

All this adds up to the continuance of Senator VANDENBERG in his present, if not a greater, position of influence on our foreign policy.

In the rapidly changing panorama of Washington Senator VANDENBERG at least remembers yesterday and also that tomorrow is just around the corner.

Let us make sure Senator VANDENBERG is continued on the job.

TAXES

In fiscal 1949 as we call it—meaning the year beginning July 1, 1948, and running to June 30, 1949—there will be a tax reduction of at least $4,000,000,000—the objections of the President notwithstanding. There will be debt reduction of at least $4,000,000,000. There will be a reduction in the Presidential budget of close to $4,000,000,000.

Here also in the financial field we see the same divided and deviating counsel. Two years ago with corporations swollen with war profits President Truman signed a bill submitted by a Democratic Congress cutting corporate taxes by more than $3,000,000,000.

Now with the corporate refund provisions running out the same President seeks to restore the very tax he repealed and offers a $40 rebate to every taxpayer in a form that the Democratic minority in the House found so unworkable, unacceptable, or inequitable that the Democratic leadership would not even allow it to come to a vote in an almost unprecedented repudiation of White House counsel.

Perhaps the reason is found in the failure sufficiently to consult the responsible authorities in the administration or in the Congress concerned with fiscal affairs, since it seems clear that the President's proposal was out of Hollywood by Congresswoman HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS. The only question seriously debated in the smoke-filled room was whether the proopsal should be $25 favored by the President, $50 urged by the moderates, or $100 insisted on by the left. The result was chalked like a jury at $40 but found no takers among the responsible Democratic leadership in either House or Senate.

In labor relations also the same conflict of viewpoint appears within the Presidential mind.

Faced with a strike in transportation President Truman proposed drafting the strikers into the Army although the war was long since over. This proposal although limited in time would have established a precedent that would have been the envy of Adolf Hitler or Joseph Stalin. This was work or fight. This was work or else.

That proposal received overwhelming approval in 1 hour by a Democratic House and was through a Senate Committee and ready for final action in the Senate inside of 3 hours when it was stopped by the courageous action of a single Republican Senator. Over the week end with some chagrin some Senators paused to read the bill and it never again saw the light of day.

What assurance has anyone that such a proposal—perhaps the most un-American in all American history—will not recur?

If it was considered good policy in 1946 by the dominant advisers in the White House why may it not bob up again if expediency should seem to argue for its desirability? Has there ever been a public confession of error?

Americans may well consider where the greatest security lies—in the shifting winds of political expedience or on the bedrock of fundamental American principles.

I have predicted a reduced budget, a reduced debt, and a reduced tax bill for 1949. Let me also predict with equal assurance a Republican President. Who will it be? There are 50 eligibles among the governors, past and present, Congressmen, and Senators, who are competent to guide America out of the wilderness of doubt in which we are wandering. Perhaps a Speaker of the House. Perhaps a President pro tempore of the Senate. Men of a character and competence that presents only a problem of selection to determine who will be captain of a team that is equal to any challenge at home or abroad.

America is entering the fourth great period of its expansion under the guidance of the same principles that have carried us so successfully and so far since the Pilgrim Fathers launched this great experiment 3 centuries ago at Plymouth Rock.

Award to Postmaster Albert Goldman, of New York, by the Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the postmaster of the city of New York, the Honorable Albert Goldman, was recently honored for his patriotic devotion to duty during the war. At the eleventh annual meeting of the General Theodorus Bailey Post, No. 104, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, on January 31, 1948, that organization presented to Postmaster Goldman its Americanism Medal.

Too often we fail to pay honor to faithful public servants. Because of the unusual devotion of Postmaster Goldman to his duties, and because of the outstanding nature of the citation recently awarded him by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the citation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General Theodorus Bailey Post, No. 104, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, presents to the Honorable Albert Goldman, postmaster, New York, N. Y., on the occasion of the eleventh annual entertainment and dance at Manhattan Center, New York City, the Veterans of Foreign Wars Americanism Medal for outstanding service to our country during the Second World War and to veterans of all wars; and

Whereas Postmaster Goldman by his alert initiative and executive ability quickly organized the New York Post Office to do a superhuman task in speeding forward those anxious letters and parcels to our armed forces all over the world, and

Whereas it was always his intent and purpose to keep the morale of our armed forces and their homefolk at a high level by his constant, diligent, and conscientious leadership, and

Whereas he has shown a sincere and humane understanding of veterans, and their problems whenever they have sought employment in the New York Post Office and at any time they sought his counsel and advice, and

Whereas he was ever ready and willing to aid, assist, and advise disabled veterans and gave unstintingly of his time and money to their cause: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Theodorus Bailey Post, No. 104, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, present to the Honorable Albert Goldman, the Veterans of Foreign Wars Americanism Medal for his untiring efforts in contributing to the victory on the home front and for his willing and wholehearted efforts to bring cheer and good will to all our military personnel both at home and abroad during four hard years of war.

Duly approved at a regular meeting of the General Theodorus Bailey Post, No. 104, and in witness thereof we have placed our signatures and the seal of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, this 31st day of January 1948.

[SEAL] DAVID L. EDSALL,
Commander.
GEORGE NATHAN,
Adjutant.

The Republican Party's Contribution To Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Hon. Alf M. Landon before the Republican club at Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans., on Wednesday, February 4, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America has swung from a lurid, terrific, and unreal honeymoon with Russia to the opposite extreme of increasing casual acceptance of the imminence of war with her. Neither state of public mind is a credit to a great people.

In the final analysis I don't believe war is inevitable.

The price we have to pay for peace is: First, keep stronger than Russia; second, let her know that while we fear no one, we stand ready to make a lasting peace.

Therefore, I strongly believe that—

1. We must proceed at once to make ourselves as nearly invulnerable as possible in this atomic age.

That includes a more economical and efficient administration than we now have. National credit is as important as national arms.

The mighest armies, Navy and Air Fleets—will in the end be unavailing with the kind of wasteful and incoherent leadership of President Truman.

We just cannot afford that kind of leadership.

It will destroy us—if long continued—no matter what defenses and other safeguards we erect.

2. Go right ahead with a sound and coherent foreign-aid program. That includes a drastic reversal of our German policy.

3. Make it perfectly plain that we stand ready to come to an understanding with Russia.

I urge again that the President of the United States take, without delay, the initiative in bringing together the nations of the world in a peace conference.

If the Soviet and her puppets refuse to participate it would only be facing realities.

A basis for peace and the termination of World War II must be created either with or without the Soviet.

We are stressing No. 2—foreign aid—more than we are Nos. 1 and 3.

I believe that one, two, and three should all be equally stressed as part of a sound, constructive, and coherent policy for peace and progress—that will permit the fullest development of atomic energy for peaceful uses.

Despite the emphasis that has been placed on the Marshall plan, I am sorry to see it is losing ground with the American public.

Firm doubts about the wisdom of the plan are being created in the public minds by misinformation and lack of information. President Truman's refusal to explain his policies forthrightly to the American people is really a great and sinister failing of his national leadership. It has always been and always will be my contention that the American people not only want, but also deserve, to be told the plain unvarnished truth.

The isolationism this country is suffering from is isolationism from reality. For 15 years we have been settling one tremendous policy after another—that affect civilization to the end of time—by emotional appeals and sentiment rather than reason and necessity—by appeals to the passions rather than the mind.

Every thinking person realizes that we are the No. 1 world nation today. Our thinking and our actions must be compatible with that position. To lead us in that role we need not only a head man—but a man with a head.

Who is being fooled by President Truman's contention that the Government's food-buying program is not causing soaring food prices and rising cost of living when that is admitted by the administration's own dramatic appeals for ERP. The Marshall plan may be only one phase of a foreign spending program that will continue to boost the cost of living still higher.

I think the emphasis should be shifted away from food and placed where it belongs, on plant rehabilitation of Europe and restoration of normal world trade. But, of course, we are not going to accomplish that with the Marshall plan alone. It must be fitted into other major policies such as the restoration of Germany economically. That means another complete reversal of Mr. Truman's foreign policies.

Although I am well aware that public interest today is focused on the price of a good place to sleep—the high cost of food, fuel, clothes, caused by mistakes in economic planning by President Truman, we are faced with even a greater issue—war or peace. This drift toward war between the Soviet and western civilization seems to be becoming stronger with the passage of time. We know that the Russian people and the American people, or any other people in the world do not desire conflict and will do anything in their power to avoid another terrible bloody and perhaps totally devastating war.

The responsibility rests plainly on the men at the head of the countries to stop this drift to war before it is too late. It is their responsibility to lead, to have a planned course of action, and to strive night and day for policies which will create lasting peace. I restate that thousands of words appealing to the emotions will not solve this problem.

A battle commander just doesn't say forward charge—there is the enemy—go get them. To effect a victory he has spent hours of investigation, summarizing intelligence reports, planning. He knows his resources and to what extent they may be used without impairing his reserve, and he is able to inform his troops of the exact time and place where the attack will be made with a surety of success. What is the President's target today? No one can be sure from the vague and haphazard policies which have been put forth by his administration.

If we are headed toward war there is a lack of coordination of our preparedness program. If it is peace, which I pray that it is, there is a definite nonpartisan agreement that our foreign policies are not well thought out, and that no integrated peace program has yet been formulated.

With fanatical and constant reiteration by the Soviet leaders of their basic principle of dominating the world by force—with the Soviet eliminating opposition wherever it may crop up—by the concentration camp—by starvation—by the sword—with the Kremlin issuing daily propaganda against America's participation in world affairs—by the talk in America that another war is inevitable—that we have already lost another peace—and the provocative talk of military security by the administration in presenting its arguments for congressional appropriation for the Marshall plan—a poisonous and perhaps final devil's brew is being prepared.

Obviously only the most skillful handling of our foreign affairs at home and abroad in the next few years will enable us to avoid war with honor. On this one point I agree with Henry Wallace that the present administration is not capable of such skillful handling. But neither is Mr. Wallace. It is a case of the pot calling the kettle black.

On March 12, 1947, President Truman's message to the Congress on aid for Turkey and Greece—which I promptly supported—was uniformly considered as our answer to communism's constant attack on the foundations for reconstructing a prosperous and peaceful world.

That marked one of the most complete reversals in foreign policy in the history of any nation. Prior to March 12, 1947, the administration's policies had been to help Russia and communism entrench in the world. President Truman put an end to that—on paper—last March. Since then communism has lost several important engagements. But the President still refuses to adopt certain reforms in the administration's policy essential to the success of the Truman doctrine such as completely and finally reversing the horrible Morgenthau plan for Germany.

We announced, in more or less direct terms, that we had called a halt on the Soviet strong arm moves—that we had reached our limit in giving in to her outrageous proceedings.

As a result of promptings by Secretary of State Marshall, 16 freedom-loving countries and the United States are in the midst of developing a wide economic plan to help western civilization reconstruction.

On Thursday, January 22, 1947, Great Britain returned to her historical policies of undeclared hostility toward Russia. On that day Foreign Secretary Bevin admitted the labor party's policy of friendship for the Soviet was a failure. Also, completely ignoring the existence of the United Nations, Secretary Bevin proposes to return to Britain's age old balance of power policy on the European Continent built not on her former dominant position in world affairs, but on Secretary Marshall's European recovery program.

Republican cooperation for the sake of the Nation with the President is hampered by the President's incapability of steering the ship of state in the turbulent and dangerous waters we are now in.

We have a long, hilly, and rough road ahead of us. It is a road that only the uncommon American people can successfully travel. But even as great a people as we must have accurate road maps and information.

The education of the American people regarding road conditions should be forthright and continuous. But it is not.

We need to clear our minds of the myths that our foreign policies have been farsighted when the record shows they were

and are ridiculously bum-sighted—cross-eyed in fact.

The latest illustration of the confused thinking in the administration is the Secretary of the Army's statements before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that we had to have the complete administration program for European aid or peacetime military conscription at home.

Yet, the President has said we must have both. Is the country to understand now that if aid abroad is voted that we will not have conscription at home. Here is a highly important point that requires clarification by the President.

Thus we repeatedly are left dizzy by the conflicting statements of the administration on major policies.

The present world situation is proof either of the fool decisions made at Yalta and Potsdam or their mismanagement.

Under the inept handling of our foreign affairs, our relations with the great nations to the south of us and with France have been muddied. President Truman's ultimatum to the Congress, "All or nothing," does not fit cooperation for the sake of the Nation.

We energetically write notes and sternly call the cops. But there are no cops.

It is a pure fraud to talk about referring the policing of Palestine to the United Nations, unless Russia and the United States can patch up their differences first.

The United Nations is neither constituted nor equipped to deal with a crucial situation of that kind.

So we are in a situation for which the administration is partially responsible—where a fumbled match can start a prairie fire.

And what is the administration doing about that?

It has plans for spending fifteen to twenty-five billion dollars annually for the next few years for a huge armament program. It is asking the Congress for a total of seventeen billions for its European-aid program.

On top of all this, it is asking the Congress to appropriate forty billion for its regular budget.

Where money is coming from for this stupendous peacetime expenditure does not worry this administration. In fact, where money comes from has never worried any Democratic administration.

We badly need an administration that realizes that Uncle Sam can go broke—that realizes that an economically sound nation at home is as essential to our security and to a durable peace as a strong nation militarily.

Most serious of all is the lack of coordination of our preparedness program—just as in our foreign policies.

I believe that in military strength lies not only national security but peace. Now the plans for fifteen to twenty-five billions for military services are not complete.

"But they are definite enough to prove what the President's Air Policy Commission confirmed—that there is not now and has not been any integrated and coordinated postwar plan of defense, and that individual plans and policies, largely uncorrelated, have, like Topsy, just 'growed.'"

Those words are not mine. They are written by no partisan. They are the words of one of the recognized top military experts—Hanson W. Baldwin—of the New York Times.

Therefore, the country is imperiled by any lack of coordination in its foreign policy and its military-defense program. And the Republican Party is handicapped in its effort at cooperation with the administration for the sake of the Nation.

The administration chants over and over again—the Marshall plan and universal training. The President was not even courageous enough to use the word "military" in his message to the Congress. If it is really nothing but universal training we can get that simply and easily through our high schools and colleges.

But there is more involved in our national security and welfare than simply the Marshall plan and universal military training.

There is danger of them becoming an American Maginot line.

Many of the younger generals and admirals believe that masses of trained men in the field are obsolete under modern conditions of warfare.

The younger military professionals are more concerned about guided missiles, jet planes, radar, bacteriological warfare, aircraft carriers, submarines, and, of course, the atom bombs. Bases in the Arctic are more important to them than bases in Europe.

Unquestionably there is need for a reservoir of trained men to meet any massed panic of sudden attack. But that can be obtained through the National Guard.

The Republican Members of the Congress have equipped a Democrat President with a big stick. They voted him almost a third of the 1947 budget for national defense. They will give him at least what he asked for in his last budget message—about the same.

Furthermore, the Republican Party, as necessary, will give a Democrat President additional billions under the Marshall plan for his use in economic negotiations with foreign countries.

However, I don't believe we can buy peace by the simple appropriation by the Congress of these billions.

I believe there is still the biggest job of statesmanship left. That job is to build a bridge of cooperation for peace between the masses of the Russian people and the masses of the rest of the world.

That is almost a superhuman job. But, as I study history, I cannot escape the conviction that better and wiser statesmanship could have avoided most wars. Few wars have been deliberately planned. They largely result from blockheaded statesmen who, seeking immediate political advantage, link their initial steps with ultimate disaster.

If we stand firmly upon the principle that the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness apply to the peoples of all nations, then it will be extremely difficult for any nation to remain immovably bullheaded in opposing progress toward the realization of that principle.

We must never forget that the peace of the world in the last analysis depends upon the recognition of those inalienable rights.

Our role is the promotion of international cooperation rather than the development of old-fashioned international alliances, which, after all, usually turn out to be shotgun marriages.

To the Republican Party comes the great opportunity and the heavy responsibility of effecting policies that will offer a sound base for peace.

The nations today are in a state of great change in life and power.

Our leadership in this inevitable world evolution should be directed toward paths of development without world violence and with consent of the governed.

We cannot merely attempt with fine words to sit on the lid of the explosive forces now working in the world as did the Holy Alliance of Vienna.

I yield to no one in advocating a strong military program. But I also believe equally strongly that the sword should never dominate our thinking. We must always make it plain for all people—without relaxing our opposition to world domination by communism—that we are willing to offer our hand in peace and good will.

I want the American people to think about the details of our national defense program. But I also want them to give more thought to the roads to peace.

Let us prepare for national defense without emotional appeals to hatred, and strive for peace without ceasing.

The Republican Party's foreign policies, as expressed by the majority of its Members in the Congress, are neither appeasement, warmongering, isolationist nor hallelujah international give-away.

Republican statesmen are concentrating on a long-run constructive rather than destructive program.

It is a great job that confronts America, and the Republicans in the Congress are approaching it with a vision of social justice and humanitarianism and generous self-interest, tempered with the realization that there is a bottom to the barrel.

The conclusion cannot be denied that the Republican Party today occupies a middle ground between the haphazard saber rattling of President Truman, and the disarmament-appeasement program of Mr. Wallace. I believe the Republican position is solid ground for the country.

Award to Robert I. Queen by Delta Sigma Lambda Fraternity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD a notice from the New York City News of January 27, 1948. The article describes the recent honor paid to Robert I. Queen, past county commander of the Bronx County Disabled American Veterans, by the Delta Sigma Lambda Fraternity. Mr. Queen recently received an annual silver medallion award of that fraternity. I commend the public-spirited activities of Mr. Queen in the field of veterans' affairs and in the national campaign for the prevention of infantile paralysis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

R. I. QUEEN GETS FRATERNITY AWARD

Robert I. Queen, past county commander of the Bronx County Disabled American Veterans, has received the annual silver medallion award from the Delta Sigma Lambda Fraternity.

Mr. Queen, a former student at City College and New York University, was active while at school with student publications and handled public relations for the fraternity, first locally then nationally. He also was associated with the forty-third and forty-fifth precincts' public relations staffs for civilian defense, and served with other civic groups in similar capacities. He served with the United States Army in an infantry unit.

Subsequent to his discharge Mr. Queen became associated with the Bronx County DAV and the American Legion, in various posts of legislative chairman, civil service and public relations chairman, county adjutant, and finally county commander of the Bronx County DAV, becoming the youngest leader to attain that post. He at the time was employed with the United States Veterans' Administration in the capacity as a registration officer.

He was appointed to the Greater New York City Council and Department of New York DAV in public relations capacities, and to the New York County Rehabilitation Committee of the American Legion. He was cofounder of the Bronx County Coordinating Veterans Council and is now serving as public relations director of the group. Another recent appointment by the chairman of the Bronx County March of Dimes Committee put him on the Bronx Executive Committee for this polio campaign.

Willamette Valley Project—Resolution of the Portland Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Hillman Lueddemann, president of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, together with a resolution adopted by the Portland Chamber of Commerce at a recent meeting, in regard to the Willamette Valley project.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Portland, Oreg., January 21, 1948.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The entire meeting of our board last Friday was devoted to the Willamette Valley project, with Col. O. E. Walsh, of the Corps of Engineers, discussing the review report, and Valley communities being represented.

The following motion was passed at that meeting:

"That the board of directors of the Portland Chamber of Commerce go on record vigorously supporting the Willamette Valley project; that the resolution of the agricultural and Willamette Valley project committees be adopted and copies sent to Oregon delegation in Congress and to the Governor of the State of Oregon, said resolution to carry the names of all the members of the board of directors."

We are pleased to enclose a copy of that resolution.

Yours sincerely,

H. LUEDDEMANN,
President.

Whereas the economic position, social conditions, and cultural attainments of the people of Oregon depend largely upon the maintenance and further development of the productive capacity of its lands; and

Whereas within the immediate future there is little opportunity to greatly increase cropland acreage or otherwise increase production, except through flood control, drainage, and irrigation, and improved land management practices; and

Whereas the average annual flood damage in the Willamette Valley, based on 1947 values, is $7,413,710, with an estimated annual loss in excess of $10,000,000 by 1970, unless flood waters are adequately controlled; and

Whereas the review report of investigations of the Willamette River and its tributaries, recently completed by the Corps of Engineers, presents modifications of the presently authorized Willamette Valley project, necessary to met changing conditions; and

Whereas this integrated plan for resource development will effectively stop recurring floods resulting in millions of dollars in property damage and loss of valuable top soil that can never be replaced; provide urgently needed hydroelectric power; enable the installation of major land drainage facilities and subsequent irrigation, thereby providing new opportunities and greatly expanded production; provide navigation locks at Oregon City and channel improvement for waterborne commerce to up-river points; and provide for improved fish facilities along with pollution abatement and recreational facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Portland Chamber of Commerce, in the interest of conservation and development of our land and water resources, continue to give full cooperation to the Willamette Valley project and pursue strong measures to secure approval of the review report by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Oregon congressional delegation in Washington and to the Governor of the State of Oregon.

Proposed to the board of directors of the Portland Chamber of Commerce by the Willamette Valley project committee and agricultural committee of the chamber of commerce, January 15, 1948.

Approved by the board of directors of the Portland Chamber of Commerce in meeting, January 16, 1948.

Officers, Portland Chamber of Commerce: President, Hillman Lueddemann; First Vice President, Albert Bauer; Second Vice President, Charles H. Stewart; Secretary, Clark Burgard; Treasurer, E. V. Burns; Chairman of Board, Sid Woodbury; Directors: Leith Abbott, Neil T. Again, John Albright, Frank Belgrano, Jr., J. H. Branlund, Roland Davis, H. J. Detloff, Anthony J. Dwyer, Jr., Robert L. Eaton, S. Mason Ehrman, K. C. Eldridge, M. J. Frey, George Hailing, Ben Hazen, George Henderson, Dean Ireland, Philip L. Jackson, Carvel Linden, Gerald R. Martin, Frank E. McCaslin, Paul B. McKee, Orville Miller, Ralph Montag, Fred Meyer, Chester A. Moores, Harry Morrow, Frank Nau, F. C. Nelson, Dr. Morgan Odell, Roy Owen, E. F. Pearson, James H. Polhemus, O. C. Roehr, E. Don Ross, Lynn P. Sabin, E. C. Sammons, David B. Simpson, P. D. Tellwright, Preston Smith, E. B. Stanton, Manley Treece, Max Tucker, Roy A. Ward, Albert H. Wey, W. L. Williams, Thomas C. Young, Lee Stidd, Jr.

Saudi Arabian Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to receive a recent report on the progress of the Saudi Arabian agricultural program which is being conducted there by several Texans who had previously rendered great service to American farmers while employed by the Extension Service. These men are now teaching the farmers of Saudi Arabia the more advanced agricultural methods of the United States. This is a great contribution being made by America whereby our trained agriculturists encourage, inspire, and teach the farmers of this foreign land to do for themselves.

Mr. K. J. Edwards has been in charge of our agricultural mission there since January 1947. He is a graduate of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas and has had considerable experience in the extension service in Texas. It is a pleasure to have this report on the accomplishments of a close friend.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a progress report on the Saudi Arabian agricultural program:

SAUDI ARABIAN AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

About 1938 King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia became interested in developing an agricultural program for the benefit of his people. The Crown Prince, Amir Saud, has felt the same way about an agricultural and livestock development program and has rendered great service to this work. Shaikh Abdulla Sulaiman, Minister of Finance, has assisted the King and Crown Prince in every way possible and has handled many of the details of the work during the intervening years.

Actual work on this program was started at Al Kharj, about 60 miles from Riyadh, the capitol of Saudi Arabia. This project includes about 3,000 acres of irrigated land. Most of the crops which do well under irrigation in Arizona and California have done well at Al Kharj. These crops include wheat, alfalfa, maize, tomatoes, onions, carrots, eggplant, watermelons, cantaloupes, honeydew melons, Persian melons, and all kinds of pumpkins and squash, as well as many others.

Water for irrigation is pumped from two gigantic ains, which are in reality natural surface reservoirs of approximately 100 to 150 feet in diameter and several hundred feet deep. The Arabian-American Oil Co. was called upon to install pumps to lift the water from the ains into the irrigation systems and to construct the main ditches at Al Kharj. The work of the company has proven to be very efficient and the company pumping and irrigation systems have functioned successfully since their installation. In the years immediately following 1938, numerous groups from Middle Eastern and European countries assisted in the development of the project. In December 1944 a group of American agriculturalists, headed by David Rogers, of Arizona, arrived there. They stayed at Al Kharj until June 1946. This group was sponsored by FEA of the State Department. After the departure of this group, King Ibn Saud called on the Arabian-American Oil Co. to assist him in finding American agriculturalists to carry on the program at Al Kharj. Complying with the King's wishes, the Arabian-American Oil Co. brought a group of Texas agricultural men to Arabia and they started operations at Al Kharj in January 1947. This group was headed by K. J. Edwards, ably assisted by Sam Logan, Sonora; Bennie Gray, Canton; R. E. Nolan, Livingston; Joe Smith, Floydada, and John Gaudill, Rio Grande Valley. Edwards, Logan, Gray, and Nolan are all graduates of the Texas A. and M. College and have had extensive Extension Service experience. Joe Smith is a graduate of Texas Technological College at Lubbock and John Caudill received his degree from the Texas College of Arts and Industries at Kingsville.

The program of Al Kharj has been organized on the basis of research, demonstrations, and an educational program similar to

the work done by county agricultural agencies in the United States. At the same time, special effort has been made to make the project produce the maximum amount of crops at all times. All produce from the farm is sent to Riyadh.

Although operations at Al Kharj have been in progress under the direction of the Texas group for about a year only, King Ibn Saud, the crown prince and Shaikh Abdulla Sulaiman are so well pleased that the king has requested that four more agricultural centers be set up as soon as possible. These new centers will be organized just like Al Kharj on the basis of research, demonstrations, and an educational program reaching individual Arab farmers and livestock producers. They will be located at Hofuf, Qatif, Taif, and near Jeddah. Sites for the farms have already been selected at Hofuf and Qatif. Before the selection of these sites was made, the program was explained in detail to Amir Bin Jaluwi, the governor of the Al Hasa Province in which Hofuf and Qatif are located. The Amir was highly in favor of the program and appointed committees of Arab farmers at each place to work with the Al Kharj personnel in the selection of the sites for the agricultural centers.

The members of these committees were found to be highly intelligent and very much interested and enthusiastic about the program. They were extremely anxious that it be set up in such a way that it would be of equal service to everyone. The committees made some very valuable suggestions about the operations and services to be performed by the program. It is anticipated that these committees will continue to be used in advisory and policy-making capacities.

In the beginning work at the centers will concern various types of field crops and vegetables and will include all phases of the soil-improvement program. Work with livestock and poultry will be done as soon as the crop operations are well under way. With the entire approval of the Arab farmer committees, special emphasis will be given to setting up a phase of the work similar to the 4-H Club program for boys in the United States.

Experimentation and demonstration in crops will include the use of better seeds, fertilizers, insecticides, and fungicides. Extensive introduction of new crops of all kinds will be made. Improvement of soil fertility will receive major attention, and drainage in the Hofuf and Qatif areas will be of great importance. Within due time it is hoped that these centers will become the sources of supplies of good seeds for all the farmers, as well as the distributing point for improved livestock. Tractor and rice- and wheat-threshing services will be provided to a certain extent. It may be necessary that Government programs supplying fertilizers and insecticides and other farm supplies to the farmers at reasonable cost be instituted for awhile until the farmers can handle the purchase of these supplies themselves.

The Arabian American Oil Co. has rendered every possible bit of assistance to the operation of this program. In fact, there would be no agricultural program in Arabia if it were not for the oil company. The executives of the company feel that it is their obligation to encourage the institution and subsequent operations of an agricultural program which will furnish the people with more food to eat, raise their standard of living and do away with the necessity of importing huge amounts of foodstuffs as has been the system in the past. Saudi Arabia is the show window for this new program of American assistance in the Middle East. It is believed that successful methods employed in developing the Saudi Arabian agricultural program will be instituted in other middle eastern countries within due time.

King Ibn Saud has proven himself a great leader in this agricultural development work. He aims to develop a permanent program in agriculture, which within due time will be of tremendous benefit to the Arabian farmers and livestock producers. His Majesty is a very friendly, generous, and loyal person and has always been ready to listen to all problems arising out of agricultural operations. He has given his unstinted backing at all times. The same applies to the Crown Prince, Amir Saud, and Shaikh Abdulla Sulaiman and all Americans connected with the program in Arabia are looking forward to great improvement in the agricultural situation in the country and feel that the opportunity of being of service to the King and to the people of Arabia is extremely great. Perhaps within due time this agricultural program in Sauda Arabia will be an effective demonstration to all other countries in the Middle East, and even in Europe where agriculture needs to be rehabilitated.

President Truman is extremely interested in this program and made some very valuable suggestions about its operation during a recent 30-minute conference with him on this subject. Radio stations and newspapers have been anxious to carry significant programs and articles about the work. Harvard and Cornell Universities have invited K. J. Edwards to explain the program to its officials and students. The Department of Agriculture, through its Extension Service and FAR, is providing every possible amount of effective help, cooperation, and encouragement.

E. S. Shattuck Rips Military Training Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Los Angeles Daily News of January 20, 1948, entitled "E. S. Shattuck Rips Military Training Plan."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

E. S. SHATTUCK RIPS MILITARY TRAINING PLAN

Universal military training is the opening wedge to government control of the people, Edward S. Shattuck, former general counsel of Selective Service, said yesterday.

Shattuck, vice chairman of the Republican State Central Committee and former State commander of AMVETS, attacked the proposed bill at a town-hall luncheon in the Biltmore Hotel.

"There is no security for free Americans in such a step," said Shattuck. "We must not let this proposal become an American Maginot line, offering us a false security and lulling us into a fatal sleep."

"The only real hope of national security," he said, "lies in the early establishment of international law, international courts of justice, and international armed forces."

"There is no single step which will guarantee our security," he continued, pointing out that proponents of the plan claim the training of 18-year-olds for 6 months will make this country safe from attack.

Shattuck blasted universal military training on what he said was its only ground of justification—that it is essential to meet the manpower needs of our armed forces now and in the future.

Instead of building a single fighting force, trained in modern weapons, and made up of Regulars, the program would divert 185,000 Regulars from other duties to make it work, he charged.

"I have a deep conviction this Nation can solve the problem better and do it by traditional volunteer methods," he said.

"We must consider very carefully a course of action which might lead us away from our concepts of individual liberty and into an irrevocable step toward totalitarianism in America," he warned.

"Before we take such a step," he said, "we must certainly should convince ourselves beyond all doubt that it is absolutely and immediately necessary and that in no other way can we enlist sufficient military manpower to accomplish our objective."

Our Immigration Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert herewith a speech delivered in New York City, January 30, 1948, to a meeting of members of the American Legion, by National Commander James F. O'Neil:

The most important single occurrence on this earth during the past 25 years has been the emergence of the United States of America as a world leader. In the wake of two World Wars, a crippling economic depression, and a series of crises which have altered the character of almost every other major government, the United States exists today not only with its original form of government intact but as the most prosperous, most powerful, and most influential of all the world's nations.

It stands to reason that our national thinking and doing must be adjusted to fit this new role. In some fields, the appropriate adjustment already has been made.

Where once we permitted a naive policy of appeasement toward Soviet Russia, there is now a concerted effort to overcome the Russian threat to world peace. The American Legion, as one of the first and consistent opponents of Communist totalitarianism, applauds this change.

Where once there was reliance on England and France as protectors of American sovereignty abroad, we now realize we must steer our own course, strengthening friendly nations as we go. This recognition of the need for international cooperation of democratic countries the American Legion also welcomes.

The traditional American apathy toward national preparedness has given way to a great and growing public awareness of the need for universal military training, a powerful air force, greater scientific research, and other vital components of an adequate preparedness structure. The American Legion hails this trend toward realism.

These are a few of the realistic adjustments made in recent years by Americans whose Nation has come of age.

Unfortunately, this kind of fact-facing has not carried through all phases of our national affairs.

I want to talk to you today about a field of great importance to our national stature at home and abroad in which the necessary transition has not been made. I want to discuss immigration and America in 1948.

The immigration system now in effect in the United States is a conglomeration of legislative relics and antique regulations. This is not a random opinion. It is a measured statement of fact.

For 150 years, immigration has been treated as a stepchild of Government. Successive Congresses and administrations have heaped laws and regulations one on the other. Responsibility for executing the program has been bucked by four different Government departments. As a result, what goes by the name of United States immigration and nationality policy today is a massive pyramid of conflicting and complex directives which defy understanding, much less efficient administration.

Let me cite an example. In order to determine the classes of aliens excluded from admission to this country, it is necessary to consult 22 different sections of 13 different laws. To strike up even a passing acquaintance with the over-all subject of immigration, it is necessary to read almost 2,000 pages of printed laws and regulations.

I do not hesitate to say that officials of the Justice Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Service charged with administering the program find it difficult to comprehend all of its ramifications.

The national-origins provision of the Immigration Act of 1924 forms the basis for our present immigration policy. At the time of its adoption, this plan represented our pioneer effort to establish a numerically restrictive and automatically selective system.

Has this system worked? Your guess is as good as mine. The fact of the matter is that no one knows, for the simple reason that there has been no comprehensive analysis made of the character of immigrants received or any factual data established as to the degree of their assimilation. Patchwork legislation resulting from hit-and-miss attempts to modify the quota plan has further beclouded the issue.

The American Legion believes that what is best for America must be the paramount consideration in any modification of the quota system.

For this reason, I urge that the Congress appoint an appropriate commission to make a detailed analysis into all phases of our immigration laws, of the character of immigrants received under the present policy, and their effect upon our national economy. I further believe that this commission should be empowered to recommend to the Congress such revision and codification of the immigration laws as their study may determine.

The American Legion has dealt realistically and energetically with the problem of displaced persons in Europe. As a result of intensive consideration of this matter, including personal investigation of displaced persons camps in Europe, our organization has taken a firm and positive stand on the issue.

We believe that this matter must be divorced from the general subject of immigration and treated specifically for what it is—an emergency question involving vital humanitarian obligations. We further believe that the displaced-persons problem belongs and must be kept above partisan or selfish interests, and that the welfare of our Nation and our responsibility in relieving friends in distress must be the paramount and only considerations in its solution.

Accordingly, the American Legion recommends that the United States permit the emergency immigration to this country of displaced persons who were officially designated as such on January 1, 1947, less those who have since found haven, in numbers proportionate to our obligation as a member of the International Refugee Organization.

In recognition of the bond uniting men and women the world over who have fought in war for a common cause, we urge that special consideration be accorded war veterans and their families among the displaced-persons group.

We further recommend that all displaced persons who desire to settle in Palestine be permitted and assisted in doing so.

At present, there is a woeful lack of understanding as to the total number of displaced persons requiring relocation. Estimates range from several hundred thousand to the million mark. As an elementary prerequisite to any practical solution of the DP problem, the American Legion affirms that a count be made, that the exact maximum of persons to enter this country be fixed, and that we adhere strictly to that figure.

Our organization has always been interested in the betterment of relations between our country and foreign nations. At this hour of international tension, when the success of the United Nations and the best hope for peace everywhere depends on reciprocal good will among men, that is an objective especially to be cultivated.

At the same time, it is absolutely essential that we accord a firm first priority to our own national security and welfare. The American Legion believes that American residence and American citizenship are privileges which should be accompanied by the acceptance of certain obligations. Applicants for these privileges must measure up to the minimum personal standards of loyalty and industry on which our cherished institutions have been built. Common sense argues that the immigrant must conform to America, not America to the immigrant.

We want to make dead sure that immigrants will contribute to and not detract from the economic, cultural, and spiritual heritage of America. We are not obliged to burden our national structure with the malcontents and cast-offs and ne'er-do-wells of foreign societies. We do have a very definite obligation to exclude these elements from the American scene.

During the past two decades our immigration laws have been misinterpreted, misused, and even perverted to the lasting disadvantage of America. In spite of the fact that the law specifically excludes anyone who proposes the overthrow of our Government by force, we learned through congressional investigations that prominent Communists have paraded in and out of the country almost at will. Seemingly, one of these Reds obtained the necessary password from the White House itself. Certain influential persons in and out of Government apparently have made a hobby of smuggling aliens through lawful immigration barriers.

The American Legion vigorously protests this practice. As presently constituted, our immigration laws pose an almost insurmountable administrative problem. It is neither good sense nor good citizenship to magnify this problem by subjecting proper authorities to pressures which encourage evasion of the law.

Whether these attempts are made in ignorance or otherwise does not reduce by one iota their potential damage to our national welfare. A Communist smuggled into America under any other name is still a Communist, dedicated to the destruction of American institutions and possessed of the will, knowledge, and tools with which to advance that purpose.

In hundreds of deportation proceedings, brought during the past few years on the ground of Communist membership, scarcely any of the persons charged have admitted Communist membership. In most cases, the Government has been unable to prove such membership to the satisfaction of the courts.

The reason for this condition, of course, is that Communists are past masters at deception and secrecy. Almost all Communists assume fake names, and the Communist Party classifies its membership lists as top secret.

How many Russian fifth columnists have infiltrated American borders is anybody's guess. On the basis of the number of Communist aliens turned up recently, it's safe to say a small army of their brother and sister agents is still at large.

Chairman THOMAS of the House of Representatives Un-American Activities Committee announced several weeks ago that his group will investigate the illegal entry of aliens into this country. Public hearings on Communist aliens illegally in the United States are scheduled to begin March 1. This is a field in which the Congress should leave no stone unturned. The American Legion is pleased that the House committee will investigate the matter. We sincerely hope that the committee will recommend prompt and decisive congressional action to plug the loopholes in our immigration system.

To paraphrase an old saying, an ounce of exclusion is worth a pound of explusion. For once these blockade runners are in the United States, it is a near-impossible job under existing procedure to get them out.

I will mention just one case in point.

Gerhart Eisler, a German Communist, made use of a forged passport to enter this country in 1933. During the next 10 years he became a leader of the Communist Party in the United States, meanwhile enjoying several round trips abroad with the help of additional forgery. In 1943, his status was changed from that of an alien in transit to an alien for pleasure. As such, he had the complete run of the country. This, mind you, while many other aliens visiting America legitimately were having their visas revoked for such violations as failure to advise of changes of address.

Gerhart Eisler was brought to bay 14 years late, tried and convicted of lawbreaking—and released on bail pending appeal of his sentence. What is he doing today?

This agent of Soviet Russia, identified by the Department of Justice as a leader of the Communist Party of the United States, convicted and sentenced for contempt of the Congress of the United States, arrested and convicted for violation of the Passport Act, a known enemy of the Constitution of the United States, is even now preaching the Communist gospel before audiences in America.

If existing laws render this Government powerless to expel Gerhart Eisler and his kind from the United States, then by all means let's revise the laws. It is inconceivable to me that we should jeopardize all that our constitutional government has achieved in the past and promises for the future, out of reluctance to mend inadequate statutes. If there is license in our laws for the operations of Gerhart Eisler, then there is precious little protection in those laws for 140,000,000 loyal American citizens and the institutions they believe in.

More recently, an alien wanted as a war criminal in Hungary was discovered in the United States. His admission ticket to this country was a forged passport. He helped himself to a Spanish diplomat's title and got away with that ruse, for a while at least.

Then there is the case of the titled Englishwoman who overstayed the time limitation of her visitor's permit by 6 months, and was detected only after a bad check she had cashed called attention to this fact.

When the Canadian espionage trials of 1946 disclosed evidence of Soviet spy-ring operations in the United States, the Federal Bureau of Investigation followed the conventional trail of forged passports to locate a key suspect. He was posing as a student in the social sciences at the University of Southern California. He turned up missing one day and nothing more has been reported publicly on the case to this hour.

These are instances of immigration violations spotlighted by publicity. How many more are there that we don't know about?

The American Legion applauds the recent order by Attorney General Clark which will place drastic restrictions on the activities and travel of alien visitors in this country. We trust that the Department of Justice will pursue this policy relentlessly. Properly administered, it will go a long way toward eliminating many of the pretenses and ruses with which the evil minority of our alien guests have bewitched our immigration authorities in the past.

There are other "soft spots" in our immigration structure that require immediate attention.

Under existing law, visitors who qualify as "official representatives" of their government are accorded immunity from our legal processes. They cannot be bonded or detained by our law-enforcement officers. Inasmuch as industry and all else in Soviet Russia and company are under state control, all representatives of these nations qualify for the "official representative" classification. While learning from American experts the lessons of American technological and industrial skills, these Red missionaries are in a perfect position to scan the entire American scene for the benefit of the Kremlin. The American Legion advises that this policy, whose counterpart is unknown beyond the iron curtain, be terminated.

Another current regulation in sorry need of amendment permits the waiver of deportation proceedings in the case of an illegal entrant provided he avoids detection for 7 years and does not commit major offenses during that period. This is judicial double talk of the worst kind. It not only encourages law violators to go into hiding, thereby making evasion of punishment a substitute for punishment, but it also promises the violator an easy avenue to legal residence after he gives himself up. All the violator need do after he 7 years' leisure is cross the Canadian border, apply for and obtain a number under the appropriate immigration quota, and return to the United States as a bona fide immigrant.

Several months ago, upon receipt of certain information, I confirmed and made public the fact that the notorious "Tokyo Rose" of Japanese radio fame had applied for a preentry passport to this country. This native-born American who tormented and attempted to demoralize fighting GIs in the Pacific area, wanted to resume residence in the country she had betrayed. Of course, I immediately registered the American Legion's objection to this proposal. So far as I know the matter rests pending further investigation by the State and Justice Departments.

But the point I want to make is this: When members of my Washington staff queried the State Department for information, they were told by an official of that Federal branch that the "Tokyo Rose" files were supersecret, and my assistants received a hint to abandon their inquiry. The same Federal servant volunteered the contention that "Tokyo Rose" had committed no serious wrong. I sincerely hope that this pathetic and preposterous attitude is not indicative of the over-all State Department position.

The American Legion deplores the secret treatment accorded such matters. We believe that information of this nature should be made a matter of public knowledge and subjected to public scrutiny.

We further recommend publication of the names of all persons who request visas for admission to the United States. This would be good for them and good for us. They want to join our national family to work and live with us. It is only right that we, as members of that family, should have the opportunity to know in advance who our brothers and sisters will be.

I daresay that this policy, had it been in effect during the past 20 years, would have resulted in a drastic reduction of illegal entries into this country. There would be fewer and fewer cases of the hook-or-crook immigration to America which has become so popular of late.

These are steps which the American Legion believes we must take in order to realize the potential advantages and eradicate the potential dangers inherent in our current immigration system. They are the products of long and meticulous appraisal of the entire immigration field by veterans of two world wars who hope and work for the establishment of a world society in which national security and international harmony will be coequal and sustaining factors.

Conservation: America's Most Basic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK A. MUHLENBERG
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday February 5, 1948

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Public Works Committee of the House and therefore automatically interested in the subject of conservation of natural resources, I have read with great interest a speech by my colleague, Mr. FRANKLIN H. LICHTENWALTER, Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, former speaker of the house in Pennsylvania, at the meeting of the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River in Philadelphia on January 15. Believing the importance of the speech warrants its inclusion in the RECORD, I quote it below:

It is an honor to have this opportunity to speak with you about a subject so profound and fundamental as conservation. I am happy indeed to accept a part in your program, for I sincerely believe that conservation is America's most basic problem. In fact, I am willing to reach out farther. In my judgment, the salvation of the world depends upon the success in which we handle the job of conservation in this country. Conservation is not only an all-important domestic consideration; it is also a matter of vital international significance. General Marshall put the finger on that fact when, a short time ago, he stated: "Our foreign policy has entered the American home and taken a seat at the family table."

The world is sick today—very sick. It has reached the most critical point in all history. One only needs to read the headlines in any newspaper or listen to the radio to come to that conclusion. Hunger, poverty, strife, despair, human misery, and death are rampant. Although no longer at war, there certainly is no peace in the world.

Most of the globe's ills can be traced to one major cause—man's inhumanity to man and his arrogant disrespect of the simplest of the laws of nature. From time immeasurable, regardless of racial background or religious doctrine, humans have known that their existence and welfare are derived from the natural resources with which they have been surrounded. And yet, until most recently, nations have never seen fit to use the treasures of life which nature bestowed upon them in a prudent manner. At the peak of power and prime of life they always seem to change from plodding good samaritans to gluttonous, irresponsible monsters.

Only a brief consideration of history is required to confirm that assertion.

Consider first the plight of Greece, where an American mission of aid at present is striving valiantly to save that country from oblivion. At one time, Greece was a world power with an extensive domain. But, it squandered its resources, entered upon an era of intemperate living, and now lies weak and exhausted, a prey to the vultures who would devour it.

I need not refer to other examples of cultures which have recklessly wasted their resources and now lie dead and buried under their own debris. Suffice it to say that man has left a terrible path of ruin across the pages of history, in Europe, Asia Minor, North Africa, and China.

Now, let us take a look at the United States.

Today, it is the youngest major nation in the world. In its 172 years of existence—which, in terms of the span of life of man, is but 7 generations and, when measured by the age of the world, only a fleeting moment—America has become the most progressive, prosperous, and powerful country on the globe. Its rise to this pinnacle of supremacy can be attributed to two major factors: First, the abundance and diversification of its natural resources; and second, the excellence of its system of constitutional government. This combination of God-given assets and a Government designed to afford a free and full opportunity to its people for self-improvement has made it possible for the United States to become the beacon for all humanity.

The dominant question that confronts us now is: How long can America continue to maintain its enviable position of superiority? The answer hinges, more than anything else, upon how effectively the United States utilizes its natural resources from this point on, and upon how tenaciously it clings to the principles of government which has served it so well through the years.

Having stated this hypothesis, it is up to me to analyze and prove it.

As to our natural resources, aside from the air we breathe, the most important are soil, water, and minerals. Upon these three essentials hang the lives and livelihood of all human beings. It makes no difference where you live, what your occupation is, who your forefathers were, or who your children's children will be, you cannot sustain life and attain physical growth without the products of these three resources. Make no mistake about that!

At the beginning of our national history we were a republic of approximately 4,000,000 people. At that time we were in possession, in what is now continental United States, of 822,000,000 acres of virgin forests and approximately 460,000,000 acres of potential arable land with a cover averaging 9 inches of rich, fertile soil. Our streams sparkled with pristine purity and were alive with fish. Our tremendous store of mineral resources—coal, oil, iron ore, and uranium—had not yet been unearthed.

The passage of time has altered this picture materially. The amazing progress of this country, to which I have alluded, was made only at terrific cost. The price paid for industrial supremacy, for winning of wars, for our efforts to establish a lasting peace, has been stupendous. Over the years sight was virtually lost of the importance of our resources. So abundant were they that they were looked upon as being inexhaustible or forever permanent. As a result—a few times by necessity, more often through sheer indifference and thoughtlessness—we have permitted vast forests, fertile soils, clean waters, and valuable minerals to be wantonly wasted, ruthlessly ruined and selfishly exploited.

Today, in contrast to the 4,000,000 of yesteryear, we have 145,000,000 people in our own country to feed and sustain, and for whom to provide a livelihood—more than

35 times as many mouths to feed and much less to do it with. And in addition we are being asked through the Marshall plan to help feed, clothe, keep alive, and rehabilitate 270,000,000 additional people in 16 nations in western Europe during the next 4 years. And that is not the end to the prayers for succor from this country.

Can we carry this present load and shoulder our responsibility to future generations? The answer is an emphatic "No," if we continue our riotous extravagance and utter neglect of plain duty. Now, instead of 822,000,000 acres of productive forests we have less than 100,000,000 acres. While the area of our arable land has not shrunken, it has lost much of its richness. At least one-third of its topsoil has gone forever because of our failure to protect it properly from the ravages of wind and rain and the greed of men. Our streams not only have become open sewers and cesspools, but have been exposed to violent fluctuation of flow ranging from destructive floods to breathless dryness because of man's laceration of the forests and the lands from which they are fed.

Most of our mineral resources have been dangerously depleted.

In less than 200 years we have undone what it took nature thousands and thousands of years to accomplish.

On the basis of this record of denuded forests, scarred and eroded soils, polluted and desilted streams, reckless mining of minerals, and exploitation of gas and oil fields, destiny has written the condemnation: "Thou has been weighed in the balance and found wanting."

What shall we do in the face of this condemnation? Shall we maintain fierce and stubborn pride and deny the allegation? Or shall we acknowledge the fault and find a remedy?

Shall we, in ignorance and selfishness, continue to permit unnecessary waste and destruction of our natural resources? Or shall we admit our obligations and honor them?

Fate has flung the mantle of world leadership upon our shoulders. How shall we wear it?

We will only be able to fulfill our responsibilities to ourselves and posterity by making adequate provision now to embark upon an immediate and aggressive program of conservation. In no other way can this Nation continue to grow and prosper and, in the meantime, help tide over the destinies of others.

We are now living upon the products grown on about 390 of the total 460,000,000 acres of arable land which can be developed in this country. This production is sufficient only to provide the necessities of life in the form of food, fiber, clothing, shelter, and basic requirements of industry for a very little more than our present population.

Similarly, we are scraping the bottom of the barrel in respect to most of our irreplaceable mineral resources which, today, are the source of a substantial portion of all things that man uses. Curiously, however, we are witnessing the beginnings of a new era in the development of substitutes for many critical minerals and metals. Innumerable chemists in many laboratories are engaged in the synthesis of plastics and the adaptation of artificial resins for manufactured devices of all kinds. Spurred by the rapid depletion of nonreplaceable metals, science is developing usable substitutes from forests, plant life, and physical resources which can be reproduced, provided that we have the good sense to husband them properly.

Our population is increasing at the rate of one to two million persons a year. Western Europe is expecting us to supply her with $20,000,000,000 for the purchase of tremendous quantities of critical materials. Included in the list to be obtained from the United States in the first 15 months of the 4-year plan are 9,000,000 tons of grain, 1,000,000 tons of cotton, 43,000,000 tons of coal, 4,000,000 tons of steel, and 8500,000,000 worth of manufactured machinery and equipment. The plastic age soon will place tremendous additional demands upon the products of our soil, forests, and waters.

If we are to meet these requirements we must make the most of our natural resources. It is imperative that we immediately adopt a program of action. Such a program, among other possible items, must include the following steps:

1. We must put our total area of 460,000,000 acres of arable land in first-class shape as speedily as possible.

2. We must stop soil erosion in the shortest feasible time. At our present rate of correction, putting an end to such waste will consume another 100 years. That is not fast enough. If we don't at least double the tempo we will soon experience the tragic results of another too-little-too-late proposition.

3. We must stop the needless slashing of our forests. Right now we are cutting annually 17,000,000,000 board feet more than nature produces. It will take us 600 years to replenish the 75,000,000 acres which we have irresponsibly laid waste. In the last 10 years we have lost by fire, disease, and waste enough lumber to build homes for 10,000,000 GI's.

4. We must redeem our streams and navigable waters.

5. We must conserve and replenish our underground water supplies.

6. We must mine our coal and mineral resources more judiciously and use them more wisely.

7. We must find further productive uses for oat hulls, sugarcane fibers, corn stalks and cobs, wheat straw, sawdust, and other lumber wastes, peanut shells, pulp and peel of citrus fruits, and all other materials which find their way into rubbish dumps and incinerators.

8. We must stop waste of all types.

If we do not do these things and do them quickly, the United States will go into a decline when its population reaches about 180,000,000. At the present rate of growth that is not more than two generations in the future.

Conservation is indeed America's most basic problem.

Russia is the only other self-contained nation on earth which has a quantity and quality of natural resources and a number of people comparable to the United States. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the two countries are competing frantically to curry world favor.

America must win that race. Otherwise, freedom may vanish from the face of the earth. And America will win. Not because of superiority of its resources, nor because of any advantage in population numbers. The United States will stay on top solely and simply because, under its system of free government, it offers its citizens a positive, spurring inducement to develop ways and means to make the most of themselves and of the resources which nature has placed in their hands.

America's future, the world's future, depends upon us here in this country today and upon the way we view and treat the problem of conservation.

Incodel is to be highly complimented for the example which it has set in advocating that the problem shall be solved by continuing the application of the long established and well-proved American principle of government of the people, for the people, and by the people; and for demonstrating that this procedure still works successfully.

The Tax-Reduction Bill, H. R. 479

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill to reduce individual income-tax payments and for other purposes, has been carefully considered by the Ways and Means Committee and the Members of the House. It is not a perfect tax bill by any means but it embraces a clear-cut definite plan for immediate tax reduction.

There are few things indeed more desirable at the present time in this country than to lighten the tax burdens upon our people and our businessmen. The public debt stands at a staggering figure. The cost of running the National Government has risen to a truly unbelievable level. It must be obvious to any student of public finance and economics that the country cannot afford and our economic system cannot indefinitely maintain such gigantic expenditures by the Federal Government. These expenditures for the current year are about 10 times the cost of running the Federal Government in normal prewar years.

The cost of State and municipal government has also risen proportionately and onerous exactions are levied upon our citizens of every class and station in life. Income taxes, excise taxes, nuisance taxes, estate and gift taxes, taxes on some so-called luxuries which in America have become necessaries, taxes on automobiles, taxes on real estate, personal property, exactions of innumerable kinds from the cradle to the grave are burdening down the American business structure and the American people and threatening free enterprise, full-time employment and the deterioration of our industrial and financial institutions.

We are, in truth, a tax-ridden people and in this respect we are following precisely the way of all great democracies of the past which have fallen into ultimate ruin and disintegration because they taxed away the substance of their people, discouraged initiative and incentive and struck at the very mainsprings of economic activity upon which an abundant life depends. If this Nation is to preserve its vigor, strengths, and prosperity, this disturbing trend must be checked and checked now and in the months immediately ahead. No partisanism should intervene.

Our capitalistic economic system has tremendous vitality. That fact was demonstrated throughout the depression and particularly throughout the war and postwar period. It has successfully withstood the great burdens of government and war placed upon it and has emerged in sound, workable condition. It exemplifies our free way of life. We have learned the hard way that in this Nation enterprise cannot be put into a harness, that our people cannot be put

in strait-jackets. Undue restraints cannot be placed upon the operations of business or undemocratic restrictions fastened upon our people. We know now that we cannot compromise with proposals leaning toward the police state as fashioned after the principles of Karl Marx, or after the principles of the diverse socialistic philosophers, theorists, and politicians who have destroyed private initiative in certain European countries with such tragic results.

The war was a gigantic and tremendous venture costing us billions of dollars, and the American people will pay its heavy exactions for many years and generations to come. But we have left it behind and must reshape and strengthen our fiscal structure and industry for peace.

I am genuinely interested in extending relief to the millions of American taxpayers who are feeling the pinch of oppressive taxation at every level and who are also burdened at this time with excessive prices for ordinary necessaries of life. In the first instance we must have in mind the urgent needs of the average workingman and his family during this inflationary period. If we reduce the levies in the lower and middle-class income groups by a substantial margin and at the same time extend some relief to American business so as to provide for the accumulation and reinvestment of capital, the expansion of capacity, the extension of present facilities and by those means the increase of employment, we will be moving in the right direction.

I appreciate the fact that it is also desirable to insure the Nation against the resumption of deficit spending, to balance the Federal budget, and to provide sound fiscal conditions in the Treasury. I am also conscious of the fact that it is very difficult to reduce certain large items in the budget such as the appropriations for national defense, veterans' affairs, debt service, tax refunds, and other major items. But we must strive our best to effect economy, to promote efficiency, to strip Government of all unessential, wasteful expenditures, and to get down to the rock bottom of prudent management and careful budgeting. This can be done in my opinion without sacrificing any essential service, which is the only basis on which it should be done.

The formulation of a tax bill is one of the most difficult, complicated tasks assigned to the Congress. Under the Constitution the House has primary responsibility for revenue measures. It is not feasible to write a tax bill on the floor, and such measures must therefore be drawn and largely perfected in committee. This work demands the most expert, scientific, and laborious attention. We are fortunate to have a Ways and Means Committee comprised of some of the very ablest and experienced Members of this body. Under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], this committee has exhibited industry, patience, and ability in outstanding degree and quality in formulating the pending bill.

I do not agree with all its provisions. I should like to see more emphasis placed upon relief for the lower- and middle-income groups, more relief for handicapped groups, a broader social approach. I should like to see higher personal exemptions for individuals and a repeal of many of the onerous wartime nuisance taxes which are unfair and oppressive. I hope this additional relief may come later. I should like to see a more equitable balance in apportioning the tax burdens on the principle of ability to pay so that the working people, the white-collar classes, professional, and small-business groups would be given greater consideration and larger reductions.

But it is not possible, however desirable, to avoid the current financial demands of the Federal Government. There is a point below which we cannot safely reduce the budget without impairing essential services or without risking a deficit for the fiscal year of 1949, and we must have this fact in mind if we would truly serve. On the other hand, as we cut the lower taxes sharply by 30 percent—and I think it should be more—if we fail to give adequate relief to those in the upper brackets, we may well be inviting disaster to the whole economic structure. Because in that event we will not only be effectually barring the reinvestment of necessary capital funds, but we will be also striking a severe and shocking blow to the spirit of incentive and enterprise which is indeed the main pulsating spring of our productive economy.

One fact stands out inexorably before us as we consider this measure and that is that this Nation cannot and should not continue to tax its citizens and businessmen on a wartime basis. This is untenable, unsound, and unwise on any theory save that of the regimented collective state which the American people unqualifiedly repudiate. If we continue these extremely heavy and onerous wartime tax burdens much longer, which at some levels are virtually a capital levy, at all levels a hardship, we are bound to inflict perhaps an irreparable damage upon almost every class and group, and in the end dry up the wells of private business activity so essential for the maintenance of our high, unapproached, and beneficent American wage and living standards which underlie the security and prosperity of our people. Increased productivity is the way to insure lower prices and higher standards. More production and less spending is the great need of the hour.

It is entirely appropriate that we should cling to the principle of ability to pay which in the main is equitable and just if prudently and honestly applied by the Congress and our taxing authorities. We should make sure so far as we can that all taxes levied can be paid with relative certainty and convenience. We should endeavor to provide that taxes levied are not repressive in their effect so as to produce diminishing returns or cause discouragement to ambitious individuals, legitimate business ventures, and vital risk capital. Let us take notice of the fact now that in these days of inflation many of our humble citizens do not possess the ability to pay such substantial sums out of their weekly pay envelope to the Federal Government without facing a real pinch, that these people have families to support and are entitled to prompt relief from their Representatives in Congress and the Executive.

Let us take notice of the fact that our business groups are also entitled to consideration in order that they may continue to expand and develop their enterprises along sound, healthy, and progressive American lines, so that incentive will not be discouraged, so that business activity will not be curtailed, so that full employment will not be reduced.

Our tax system must provide the basis for an economy which can expand and develop as a dynamic progressive organism. If we stand still industrially, economically, socially, we are in fact slipping back and that we cannot tolerate, because the path of America is forward. The example of certain foreign nations where initiative has been checked or destroyed is before us and we can therefore recognize the vital importance of keeping open the doors of opportunity to all who aspire to seek advancement in any sphere of American life. These are factors we must weigh and evaluate as we frame a tax bill.

I am prepared to vote for any motion to recommit the pending bill which, in my opinion, contains carefully considered, constructive, and nondilatory proposals to render the measure more equitable to the rank and file of American citizens, our workers, our artisans, our farmers, our white-collar and professional classes, our small businessmen, and all others who fall into the category of hard-working, earnest, and humble Americans who neither receive, seek, or expect special privileges from their Government, but whose every desire is to sustain and strengthen it by their labors and devotion. But the substitute, I regret to say, in my humble opinion does not conform to this standard. To be sure there is virtual unanimity of opinion here concerning the tax-splitting, community-property features of the bill which readjust an inequitable situation imposing disproportionate burdens upon taxpayers in many States. Naturally, I favor that proposal, and as I stated, I also favor raising the personal exemptions on individual taxpayers. But I cannot subscribe to a tax revision affecting the American people which imposes many billions of dollars of tax liability upon every class in the Nation which has not been carefully considered by the Ways and Means Committee.

If you are lifting tax burdens, this may well be done without hearing and without lengthy deliberation, though it should always be scrupulously and carefully done. But when you are imposing new taxes affecting many persons and business groups it is only fair that you should give the persons affected a chance to be heard. The proposed substitute levies an entirely new tax upon 22,000 corporations out of some 360,000 in the country, and I do not believe that this is either fair or just to those concerned. It does not make either for orderly procedure or a just comprehensive bill.

Let us remember that the excess-profits tax is a war measure. It is part of a system which embraces price controls, rationing, allocation of materials, and other restrictions necessary to carry on a great war. It aims to make it impossible for anyone to make excessive profits out of war. I have always thought that, if we could take profits out of war and apply the practice to the world scale, that this would be an excellent way of preventing wars in the future.

Another point: We have had enough experience with high taxes to know that all too often they are simply passed along to the consumer in the form of higher prices and to the worker in the form of reduced real wages. Of course, it is not possible to justify legally, morally, or practically the selection of 22,000 corporations out of all the corporations in the country for the imposition of a special excess-profits tax. The corporations affected are new corporations. They are not the large corporations, the trusts, combines, and monopolies with huge invested capital and high base period earnings.

They are new corporations which were formed during the war or since and many of them are undoubtedly owned, controlled, operated, and directed, in whole or part, by the very class of young men in this country which this Congress should be most interested in helping, namely, our returned war veterans. To tax this one group is not only discrimination but unfair competition, because it places taxes on one class of business and leaves the others tax-free.

Excess-profits taxes in peacetime are not defensible and if long continued will debilitate and disintegrate our American economy. Every great fiscal expert since World War I has recognized this fact. In 1945 we repealed the excess-profits tax at the urgent request of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury because it was deemed necessary to provide incentive, stimulation to business, to provide for expansion and recovery during the reconversion period. There is no justice whatever in reimposing this law long after the war is over and at a time when our current tax laws are producing sufficient revenue to balance the budget and provide a surplus. The fact that this proposal did not emanate from the committee but rather from a small group and, what has been alleged on the floor to be a 1 hour's conference, serves to clinch my view that such a proposal was hastily conceived, not carefully prepared, violative of cardinal tax rules and principles, and would bring destructive results to the American economy.

The pending bill offers real relief, though not all to be desired, and for that reason I will support it. I wish amendments could be offered to raise the individual exemptions, because I would also support them. Under the legislative situation confronting us under the rules of the House, however, that is not possible. The bill provides for a substantial rise in the exemptions, substantial reductions in taxes for most of our people, laudable community-property features, special consideration for the blind, and on the whole moves toward the most desirable aim of eliminating wartime taxation and bringing the country back to a position where we can balance the budget, make some payment to reduce the national debt, meet all our essential current obligations and commitments, and assist our common people by reducing their taxes at a time when such relief will be most welcome. For the foregoing reasons, and because I believe that it is the best tax bill that can be achieved at this time, I will support this measure.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Shaw Plan," which appeared in the Greater Nebraskan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHAW PLAN

"We should be careful that our benevolence does not exceed our means." (Cicero.)

We have boasted that this is a free America. (It was up to 1933, the advent of the New Deal.) Secretary of State Marshall has a legal right to his so-called plan. We still claim an equal right to present our plan. We ask only for a patient consideration. You, Mr. and Mrs. America, must act as both judge and jury—the momentous decision is yours. (Mark M. Shaw, editor.)

Charity is a primal virtue and characteristic of man, enjoined by Scripture, and nowhere in the world is it more exemplified than in the United States of America. We are, and always have been, cheerful lenders and givers to other nations; in fact, our Uncle Sam has become a veritable Santa Claus—although some ungrateful recipients of our bounty have dubbed him Shylock.

The majority of the people of America are willing to aid friendly nations to recover from the ravages of war and to forestall the further spread of communism, but the extent of such aid must be consistent with our means, and we are definitely opposed to giving the vast amounts proposed by the so-called Marshall plan.

It is said, "There comes a time when patience ceases to be a virtue," and many of our people are beginning to feel that such a time has come with respect to all the spending; lending, and giving which has been imposed upon us during the past 15 years by the most improvident, lavish, and prodigal administrations that have ever scourged this fair land—and, boy, do we fervently hope that there will soon be an end to the present administration and all the vagrant train of New Dealers and spenders and lenders and givers of our hardened shekels.

Altruism is commendable, but it should not be carried to the extent of self-sacrifice on the part of the altruist. In other words, think of and do for others, but, at all times, have due regard for your own interests and ability, if you would satisfy both giver and recipient to the greatest extent practicable.

For the past 15 years our administration has spent and lent and given away our money, our food products, machinery, and what-not, without any regard for our own interests and our own needs, until we are head over heels in debt, short on food products, oil, machinery, equipment, etc., and now comes along the so-called Marshall plan proposing further aid to foreign nations to the extent of approximately $15,000,000,000 over a 4-year period.

We are unalterably opposed to the Marshall plan, or any other plan, of giving vast sums of money to foreign nations. We would favorably consider contributing a reasonable amount of food or money to any friendly nation in need of food for sustenance of life or health, and money for economic and industrial rehabilitation. We would do this for benevolent reasons as well as a good-will gesture with a view to hindering the further spread of communism. In determining the extent of such contributions, however, we should be mindful of the fact that we are in dire need of our precious dollars and of our oil, equipment, foodstuffs, and other necessaries of life; that we have an inflation menace to combat; the problem of high prices to solve; and an excessive national debt which cannot seem to be wiped off with just a stroke of the pen, as our former President said it could be done—(you know who). Jefferson had an altogether different notion about the national debt. He said: "The principle of spending money to be paid by posterity, under the name of funding, is but swindling futurity on a large scale"; while another famous Democrat, Woodrow Wilson, remarked: "The way to stop financial joy-riding is to arrest the chauffeur, not the automobile."

And then there are those infernal taxes which are bleeding people white, and from which we can expect no relief as far as the present administration is concerned, while every taxpayer feels there should be an immediate revision and simplification of the Federal tax structure, the reduction of income-tax rates, and the elimination of some of the other vicious forms of taxation, to the end that taxation be confined solely to the purpose of raising revenue for payment of the legitimate expenses of government.

Grover Cleveland "hit the nail on the head" when he said:

"When more of the people's sustenance is exacted through the form of taxation than is necessary to meet the just obligations of government and expenses of its economical administration, such exaction becomes ruthless extortion and a violation of the fundamental principles of a free government."

Some of those billions of dollars proposed to be given away under the Marshall plan could be used to good advantage right here at home for so many things that we need. For example:

The widening and improvement of our highways, particularly in the Midwestern area where so many serious accidents have occurred recently;

For soil and water conservation in our river valleys;

The establishment of adequate manual and business training schools for the benefit of our youth, many of whom become loafers and juvenile delinquents, mainly because they have no such training;

The elimination of dangerous railroad and highway crossings;

Payment to the American Indians of our long-delayed debt to them, many of whom are not only starving but lack hospital and medical care as well as adequate educational facilities for their children; and

In every large city in our land there are thousands of our own people who are homeless, ill-clad, and ill-fed. Surely they are entitled to consideration and relief before we send such vast amounts of money and other things to foreign countries.

All in all, we sincerely believe that it is the part of wisdom and common sense to first satisfy our own wants—take care of our

interests—before being so lavish with our money and effects to others; and we feel confident that Congress will not be bulldozed into appropriating any such amount as contemplated by the Marshall plan.

The foregoing suggestions are submitted in the sincere belief that they are more in harmony with the ideas of the average American citizen and taxpayer than is the grandiose Marshall plan.

Get this straight in your mind: The Marshall plan is the Communist-inspired scheme to make American citizens slaves in order to free Europeans and the semi-insane scheme to bankrupt America that France, Great Britain, and other European nations may become rich through the efforts of 170 years of toil of millions of American citizens. The most brazen scheme in all history—the robbery of the thrifty and industrious for the benefit of the shiftless and improvident.

MARK M. SHAW, *Editor.*

The Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing recently, entitled "The Taft-Hartley Act, What It Does Do, What It Does Not Do," by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT, WHAT IT DOES DO, WHAT IT DOES NOT DO

(By ROBERT A. TAFT, U. S. Senator)

One of the most outstanding accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress was the passage over the President's veto of the new Labor Management Relations Act of 1947. Probably no piece of legislation has ever been so carefully studied and worked out in such detail, both in House and Senate, and in conference. It was not the work of any one or two men, but represents the consensus of opinion of scores of legislators after prolonged debate.

The law was enacted in response to a general public demand, arising out of the tremendous injustices from the action of certain irresponsible unions and the prolonged strikes which interfered so seriously with recovery.

Union leaders have subjected the new act to bitter attack and misrepresentation. Without presenting any material specific criticism, they have tried to smear the act as a whole, its authors, and the Congress. They have threatened to purge from public life every man who voted for the act. President Truman weakly yielded to their pressure, but Congress did not. The majority, even of the Democrats in the House of Representatives, voted to override the veto, and the Democrats in the Senate were almost equally divided. If this veto had been sustained, union leaders might properly have boasted that their power would always prevail over the desires of a majority of the American people.

The truth is that, while the unions have succeeded in stirring up some opposition to the act as a whole, its major provisions meet the approval not only of the people at large but of the majority of union members themselves.

The difficulties in the labor field arose, for the most part, from existing statutes—the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the Wagner Act. Originally, the employer undoubtedly had a great advantage over his employees in such bargaining as took place. These acts were passed to correct that situation, and they did so. But taken together with the various regulations made by administrative boards and decisions of the courts, the results went far beyond the real intent of Congress and gave the labor leaders not only an arbitrary control over their members but a great advantage in dealing with employers, except the largest companies in the country. The little businessman was practically at the mercy of the big union. The theory of the new law, even more than of the old laws, is to base all labor relations on free collective bargaining between employer and union, but to give some assurance that that bargaining shall be on a basis of equality. It does not prevent any reasonable union activity. It requires union recognition and strengthens the principles of collective bargaining rather than weakening them.

The second purpose of the act was to remedy abuses which have become apparent, particularly where they have arisen from the provisions of existing law. In correcting these abuses, the act endeavors to protect the individual union member against arbitrary or unjust action by his own union, to protect the employer against unfair and one-sided rulings, and to protect innocent third parties not involved in a labor dispute against the arbitrary action of employers and union.

In the third place, the act recognizes the power which labor unions have acquired and should necessarily restrain, and imposes responsibilities on these unions commensurate with their power.

In view of the uproar made by some labor-union leaders, it is well to point out what the act does not do. It does not permit any employer to refuse recognition to a union representing his employees. It does not in any way interfere with the right to strike if the purpose of the strike is to secure better wages, shorter hours, or better working conditions. It does not make any man work against his will, or impose any compulsory arbitration or government fixing of wages. It does not restore in any way power of the individual employer to secure court injunction, free from the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. It does not interfere with Nation-wide collective bargaining, even if such bargaining amounts to a monopoly, except that where national safety or health is threatened strikes may be enjoined for 80 days while mediation procedures are attempted and elections held.

The contract between the United Mine Workers and the coal operators makes those who declaimed about a slave-labor bill look very silly indeed. Of course the act never intended to pass on, or let the Government pass on, the rate of wages to be paid. It never intended to interfere with the right of employer and employee to enter into whatever contract they wished to make so long as it did not interfere with the individual rights of labor-union members. The act does require that both parties enter into collective bargaining in good faith, and complete it by a written contract. Therefore, it would be an unfair labor practice for a union after negotiating terms to refuse to sign a contract, or to sign a contract which releases the union from all liability for its performance. Just as the unions compelled the employers to put their collective bargaining agreements into writing, so can an employer compel a union to sign a valid contract. But if the employer does not choose to file an unfair labor charge, there is nothing illegal in the failure to sign a binding contract. The Lewis coal contract does not relieve the labor union from liability for its performance. I can see no legitimate objection to a limitation of liability by unions for acts of others which it cannot restrain.

IMPORTANT PROVISIONS OF ACT

Public-opinion polls show that while a majority of employees are opposed to the act as a whole, they generally approve its specific provisions when they are acquainted with them. Some of the most important provisions of the act are as follows:

Freedom of speech is guaranteed for employer and employee alike. The desirability of doing this was recognized before our committee, even by Mr. William Green, A. F. of L. president.

Secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes are made unfair labor practices and subject the union conducting them to monetary damages. Testimony before our committees was almost universal as to the serious injustices brought about by secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes, particularly to those third parties who were in no way involved in the dispute. No witness defended this kind of strike. There was some suggestion that certain kinds of secondary boycotts might be justifiable, but no one could ever define what they might be. If they can be found, they can still be exempted from the provisions of the act.

Unions are required to file financial reports with their members and other information with the Secretary of Labor. Most unions admit that their members are entitled to this information, and there is no subject on which the public and the union members themselves are so united. Eighty-five percent of union members favor it. Corporations have had to make these reports for years.

The closed shop, which gives the union a veto power over all employment, is made illegal, but the union shop, under which persons employed must join the union within 30 days, is permitted if approved by the vote of a majority of the employees. However, even in this case, the union is not permitted to force a man's dismissal if that man is willing to join the union and pay union dues. In other words, a union may arbitrarily refuse to admit a man or fire him, but if that refusal or firing results from some cause other than nonpayment of dues, then the union cannot force the employer to dismiss that man. The Board is given the power to prevent excessive or discriminatory dues.

We had many cases where a union has fired a man because they did not like his political opinions, or the way he testified in court, or his opposition to the union leadership, and where, because of a union-shop agreement, the employee was dismissed from his job. Nothing could be more opposed to fundamental principles of American freedom or justice than such power or its abuse. Undoubtedly the union leaders wish to retain this power over their men, but we could not continue the present law if workmen are to have any real freedom at all. Some 77 percent of union members apparently approve this provision.

The abolition of the closed shop resulted from abuses shown to exist, particularly in the maritime industries and their hiring halls, in which union control of employment in many cases had absolutely destroyed discipline and efficient operation.

Unions are made liable on their contracts as if they were corporations and are required to bargain collectively in good faith with their employer, just as employers have been required for years to bargain in good faith with their union leaders. Unions today are theoretically liable on their contracts, but the difficulties of enforcing union liability has been so great in many States as to be impracticable. Furthermore, judgments against unions have been enforceable in some States against individual members of unions. The act provides that they are now enforceable only against the union itself and its funds. For years the unions have insisted upon the importance of collective bargaining agreements, and have boasted of their desire to abide by them. Those union leaders who now object to liability for breaking contracts show only their own unreasonableness, prejudice, and bad faith. Unions today are big business. There can be no logical argument for exempting them from liability on their contracts. Even union members approve such liability by a large majority.

The law requires all union officers to file affidavits that they are not Communists, or members of any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. There is a penalty on any such officer who flies a false affidavit. This would seem an effective way of getting rid of Communist officers in American unions. A desire to get rid of these officers has been often expressed by union leaders, and is certainly shared by an overwhelming majority of union members. The opposition of union leaders to the filing of such affidavits raises a serious question in the good faith of their protests against Communist-controlled unions.

WAGNER ACT REWRITTEN

The Wagner Act is rewritten to eliminate injustices, and made the act a two-way street. Up to now it has been entirely a weapon against the employer. The new act prescribes unfair labor practices on the part of unions, but without modifying in any way the existing restrictions on employers. Thus, it is provided that a union cannot coerce an individual employee into joining a union or staying away from his job. Unions are required to bargain collectively. Secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes are made unfair labor practices. So, also, the forcing of an employer to discharge a man without cause.

The one-sided nature of the Wagner Act has long been recognized. There is no reason why it should not operate against improper activities by unions as well as by employers. The principal beneficiaries, incidentally, will be the individual union members who are protected against the arbitrary acts of their officers.

The act is also amended by separating the prosecuting and judicial functions of the National Labor Relations Board. In the hearings in 1939 I was impressed by the complete injustice of any procedure where the same man or men initiate the prosecution, conduct the trial, and pass judgment on its results. The new act gives the general counsel charge of initiating and pressing prosecution for unfair labor practices and confines the Board to judicial action. Furthermore, in reviewing that judicial action, the Federal courts are given a wider power than they have today. The Supreme Court has held that almost no action of the Board could be reversed under existing law. The new act, while it gives preponderant weight to the Board's decision, permits the courts to examine the entire record to see whether it offers substantial evidence to support the Board. No man with an impartial mind and a respect for justice could criticize the action that has been taken.

UNION POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The act continues the present provision which prohibits unions from contributing to political campaigns when Federal offices are involved, and adopts the provision that unions shall not make expenditures for such political campaigns. A tremendous furore has been stirred up on the ground that this interferes with freedom of speech. Of course, there is nothing whatever in the act which prevents union officials from taking part in political campaigns and expressing their opinions of candidates as violently as the laws of libel will permit. The law has long prohibited corporations from making contributions, and it was always supposed that this also prevented the expenditure of corporate funds directly in elections through the publication of advertisements or pamphlets. The law simply subjects unions to exactly the same limitation as corporations. Unions are formed for certain specific purposes, and one of them is not to support or oppose candidates for office when there is almost certainly a difference of opinion among the union's own members. Dues paid by union members are paid for union purposes by members of all parties and friends of all candidates, and they are not paid for the purpose of promoting the interests of those candidates whom the union officers happen to favor.

It is suggested that the publication of a union newspaper might itself be a violation of the new act. The legislative history in Congress shows that this was not the intention. If the act is in any way ambiguous in this regard, I should favor an amendment making it clear that the act did not intend to affect any bona fide newspaper, even if the subscriptions are paid for out of union dues. But the act certainly is intended to prevent funds contributed for union purposes from being used to defeat or elect Members of Congress. It does not prohibit the setting up of political organizations sponsored by unions, such as the CIO-PAC, but their funds must come from those who believe in their political principles, and must not be coerced from every union member.

The act sets up a new impartial mediation service with a national labor-management panel of 12 men. More responsibility is given to this service to prevent strikes before they occur. A 60-day waiting period is prescribed, but if negotiations are opened 60 days before the end of the contract, the waiting period need not extend beyond the expiration of the contract.

Strikes by Government employees are forbidden. This is no change in the existing law. It is considered that men who choose to work for the Government give up their right to strike.

Limitations are placed on the check-off and the creation of welfare funds. Contracts providing for the check-off or for welfare-fund payments divert from the individual employee the money which his labor has earned, and places these funds in the hands of the union leaders. Consequently, admitting the desirability of these practices, there should be some regulation to limit the practice and prevent abuse by union leaders. The act simply requires that welfare funds created by direct payments from the employer to the union be trust funds for the benefit of, and enforceable by, each individual employee, and that his rights be definitely stated in the agreement. It also requires employer participation in the management, and independent audits of the fund. The provision is, in effect a stopgap provision until a more complete study can be made of the whole subject of welfare funds in particular industries and their relation to the national social-security system. In the meantime, we do not desire to give union officers huge sums to be dispensed at their discretion for anything they may choose to call welfare, or permit them to favor some employees or classes more than others. The check-off provision merely requires that check-offs be authorized in writing, which is the usual provision today. Seventy-four percent of union members favor such a limitation.

The act contains a provision to deal temporarily with strikes or lock-outs affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof which imperil the national health or safety. It permits the President to appoint a board of inquiry, and then obtain an injunction effective for 80 days. During that period, the mediation service attempts to settle the dispute and finally holds an election on the best offer made by the employer.

It is quite true that this proposal limits the right to strike contrary to the general principles in which I believe. It was felt, however, that where the national health or safety were threatened, it was not unreasonable to ask employers and employees to continue the status quo for 80 days until every possible effort for settlement had been made.

The public generally demands a much more extensive prohibition against the right to conduct national strikes. I don't believe they realize how much the freedom to strike is necessary to a free economy. If the right to strike is taken away, something must be substituted for it, compulsory arbitration or Government fixing of wages. Once the Government undertakes to fix some wages, it will probably go on to fix all wages. Once it fixes wages, it must fix prices, and we move rapidly toward a totalitarian state in which there is no longer a free competitive economy.

But it is said, what will happen if a national strike paralyzes our economic system? My answer is, in the first place, that it has not done so yet, and that voluntary methods in the end have succeeded and probably will succeed in preventing such strikes or ending them before serious damage occurs. If we do have something in the nature of a general strike or a strike in a particular industry which threatens the existence of the people, then we have what amounts to revolution. As the very last resort, I would support a special emergency act dealing only with the particular emergency, giving the Government power to seize facilities and operate them, call for volunteers, seize union offices and funds, and take every other effective measure necessary to preserve the people and the Government. But such a law is no proper part of a Labor Relations Act.

The act has not been written for the benefit of employers, except as they have suffered from the abuses of existing law. It has been written to abolish injustice, and to protect alike the employer, and the employee, and the public.

Russia and Certain Works of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article from the New York Times and the United States News evidencing the sacking of European countries by Russia not only of priceless works of art but also billions of dollars worth of goods, materials, and equipment which we have furnished for the rehabilitation of war-stricken nations.

It is truly incomprehensible to me, if these reports are true, that our Government officials should be willing to pour in such stupendous quantities of goods and supplies of every character when Russia is draining off as reparations or loot everything within reach. We are talking about a program to build up Europe against communism, but according to these reports our Nation has actually strengthened and is materially aiding communism and nations within its orbit and control.

Our people are not seeking war. We do not wish to be involved in another conflict. We want no supermilitarism or warmongering. We propose to work for peace and we propose to give our best efforts to the building up of the United Nations as an effective instrumentality to preserve the peace. But we must not let this attitude be interpreted by Russia or other nations as a sign of weakness. Let us lay the cards on the table. There can be no appeasement of communism and no appeasement of illegal and unwarranted territorial expansion by force or subterfuge. Our Nation cannot possibly acquiesce in the enslavement of free peoples, exploitation of small nations or helpless individuals, or denial of God-given human rights.

The Russian people are not in a position to choose or determine the form of government under which they live. That is done for them by Marxist dictators, commissars, and bureaucrats. But we should not permit this latter class to dictate to the United Nations or to this Nation with respect to territories, governmental rights and ideals, propaganda, infiltration, or other Communist techniques which are directed against democracy, against the fulfillment of our war aims, against the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," against the opinions of the democratic-minded peoples of the world.

We need not invite war to make our position known. We need not invite war to impress upon the Russians that we do not propose to stand by while they sack and dominate part of the world and seek through infiltration and propaganda to rule over the rest of it, including our own country. If ordinary diplomacy cannot impress upon the Russians that we mean business when we protest against these outrages, then we should not hesitate to break off diplomatic relations. We can break off economic relations and make endeavors to prevail upon other democratic nations of similar traditions, background, and attitude to join us in insulating the Christian democratic world against further encroachments by militant, arrogant, anti-religious, and anti-Christian forces which are ruthlessly spreading their domination and influence into many lands in violation of the fundamental principles upon which our own Nation is based and for which we have just waged the bitterest and most costly war in history. Whether it relates to Russia or any other nation, there is no excuse or justification as long as necessaries of life are in short supply or prohibitive cost in this country, for sending these vital commodities to Russia or elsewhere.

The fundamental approach to the rehabilitation of Europe should be predicated on the distribution abroad of our own surpluses. We should not give away to others that we need for the welfare, well-being, and health of our own people or for the stability and efficiency of our own economy. That doctrine is so plain and logical that it requires no argument. But in any event it is appropriate now, even at this late time, to serve unmistakable definite notice upon Russia and her satellites that we do not propose to be used as a pawn to strengthen communism and that we do not propose to tolerate further outrages against democracy and against the plain intendments of our war and postwar agreements, against the rights of democratic-minded peoples and against the interests of our own country.

[From the New York Times]

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY MILLION DOLLARS IN ART TAKEN FROM DRESDEN BY RUSSIANS

(By Edward A. Morrow)

DRESDEN, GERMANY, January 20.—The Soviet Army has removed art treasures valued at more than $170,000,000, including Raphael's Sistine Madonna, from the famous Twinger Museum in this city, it was learned today.

A catalog of the famous paintings formerly housed in this museum showed that 1,695 of the museum's best-known works had been taken to Russia. Left behind are 1,231 lesser known and minor works.

While the Soviet officers conducting eight American correspondents through the Soviet zone were eager to show the amount of restoration of cultural works that they were encouraging, they were unable to explain the disappearance of these art treasures or what would be done to fill the gaps in the galleries when the Zwinger Museum is restored.

According to Hubert Semesch, museum architect who is in charge of rebuilding the museum, which was heavily damaged during the war, the art works were sent to Moscow soon after the Russians took this city. He declared that an all-Russian trophy commission had given the paintings to Russia as a gift.

The catalog listings disclose among missing paintings Correggio's famous "Holy Night" as well as Raphael's Sistine Madonna, whose value on the open market could not even be estimated. To support the statement that $170,000,000 was a conservative figure for the value of the treasures taken, well-informed sources said that the following also had been removed to Russia:

Twenty-four original Van Dycks, 6 Palma Vecchios, 17 first class Rembrandts, and an equal number of Rubens; 7 of Poussin's works.

Other masters represented by several paintings were Tintoretto, Murillo, Jan Ruisdaels, Velasquez, Vermeer, and Veronese.

Represented among modern masters were Degas, Van Gogh, Manet, and Renoir.

One authority who declined to be quoted asserted:

"The selection was an excellent one. Without exception, not a work of international renown or of special artistic or scientific value remains. The twelve hundred left behind are either purely German in origin or utterly worthless. Only two important paintings by Paolo Veronese remain and these are here because of the difficulties that would be encountered in handling them because of their size."

[Two hundred and two famous paintings taken out of Germany by Americans and now in Washington are considered German property and American assurances have been given that they will be returned.]

The architect preferred to talk about the work that was going on in reconstructing the museum. It was built in 1709 by August the Strong and was almost completely destroyed in 1945. He estimated that the job would take 20 years if the materials were available.

[From the United States News of January 30, 1948]

BUILDING UP THE SOVIET BLOC

(Reported from Washington, London, and Berlin)

(A new Russian empire is growing fast in eastern Europe. The Molotov plan, which is jumping ahead of United States Marshall plan, is to tie nations closely to Russia, exploit their wealth. Russia's take to date: $12,000,000,000. United States on its side has poured out $15,000,000,000, part of it to Russian areas. United States method is to give aid, Russia's to exploit gains.)

Russia's Molotov plan for eastern Europe is pushing ahead of the United States Marshall plan for western Europe and is gaining momentum. The Russians are moving faster to tighten their hold on the area along their western border.

The Molotov plan, in practice, is described by United States officials as streamlined imperialism. Using it, Russia is drawing off reparations from former enemy countries. She is organizing companies to exploit the industries and resources of those countries. She is arranging trade deals that bind all the nations in eastern Europe more closely to her. She is completing a series of treaties that not only assure her dominance in the area, but are designed to tie the various nations to one another.

Countries in the network include Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Albania. Dovetailed with them are the Russian zones of Germany and Austria. Thus, the area in which the Russians now hold sway consists of a solid land mass that adjoins Russia and extends all the way from the Baltic to the Black Sea.

Gains made by Russia since the war, as the chart on page 20 shows, are in the form of goods as well as in power and territory. Estimates are that she has taken a total of $12,600,000,000 worth of goods from the former enemy countries. These have consisted of removals, reparations, and payment of occupation costs. Of the total, nearly $9,000,000,000 is estimated to have been taken out of Germany. Big quantities of machinery, livestock, and materials have been removed from Germany by the Russians to cover part of the damage the Germans inflicted on Russia during the war.

Russia's policy of extracting goods from her sphere is in sharp contrast to the policy followed there and in the rest of the world by the United States. This country has advanced more than $15,000,000,000 in nonmilitary loans and gifts since the end of the war. Part of these have gone to areas under Russian control. Now, under the Marshall plan, the United States is proposing to advance additional billions in western Europe, largely by gift.

Scope of the Molotov plan, however, includes much more than reparations. Official reports show that what Russia is trying to do is to create an eastern European bloc that, in effect, will be part of a new Russian empire.

A "Danubian federation" is expected to be announced at some later date. When and if it comes, this will merely give outward form to a structure that already is taking shape. Details now available for the first time show that this structure is being buttressed by agreements of three kinds—military, cultural, and economic.

Military alliances, known as "treaties of friendship and mutual assistance," form the foundation of the structure. At least 18 of these already are in effect and more are pending. First, Russia herself entered into an alliance with each of the satellite nations. Then Yugoslavia concluded a similar treaty with each of the others.

The remainder of the network now is in process of completion. Bulgaria has treaties with Albania and Rumania and is negotiating one with Czechoslovakia. Poland has treaties with Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Rumania has a treaty with Hungary. But Czechoslovakia and Hungary still are at odds, and other links in the net—ork have not yet been forged.

Backing up the treaties is a system by which arms are standardized and armed forces are organized on the Russian model.

Cultural treaties go along with the military alliances. These provide for exchange of professors and students and for setting up cultural societies in the respective countries.

For example, there is a Yugoslav-Bulgarian society, with headquarters in Belgrade, the capital of Yugoslavia. Its opposite number, a Bulgarian-Yugoslav society, has its headquarters in Sofia, the capital of Bulgaria. The ostensible purpose of these societies is to promote cultural and scientific cooperation. Actually, according to United States officials, they are being used by the Russians to spread Communist doctrine through youth groups and other agencies.

Economic treaties, however, give Russia the strongest hold on her bloc. Some of these provide for barter of definite quantities of goods. They are short-range and do not run for more than 6 months or a year. Others provide for long-range development of resources, with Russia supplying part of the capital and having a dominant voice in the control. Joint companies have been created in the former enemy countries for this purpose, the stock and the profits being divided equally between Russia and the government of the nation involved. In Rumania, companies of this type have monopolies on shipping, banking, and lumber production. In Hungary, similar firms control aviation, Danube shipping, and the mining of bauxite.

A series of agreements between members of the bloc also is being completed. One, between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, lays the basis for an eventual merging of the two countries. They already have a customs union. Joint hydroelectric projects are planned. Yugoslavia is to produce Diesel tractors for Bulgaria, and Bulgaria is to build up a canning industry for Yugoslavia's fruit. The two nations will act as a single unit in any trade treaties with the west.

Russia's leverage over the former enemy nations results largely from the goods she has been able to seize in their territory. In the joint companies, she usually pays for her share of the stock with goods she has received as reparations or with German assets she has acquired. She can set high values on the assets she puts up, and low values on the assets contributed by her partners. She tries to collect on any debts owed to the Germans, but can repudiate any debts Germany owed.

A study by the economic staff of United States News-World Report shows that, of the total of $8,850,000,000 worth of goods Russia has taken from Germany, about $1,620,000,000 worth was removed from Berlin alone, immediately after the fighting stopped. The chemical, machine-tool, electrical, rubber, optical, automobile, textile, and plywood industries of eastern Germany were largely stripped. In addition, reparations from Germany's current production have totaled $1,250,000,000. Occupation costs paid by the Germans total another $3,100,000,000.

Rumania has yielded Russia goods worth $1,235,000,000, including the bulk of her oil and timber. Bulgaria has provided $320,000,000; Hungary, $520,000,000; and Austria, $570,000,000. The remainder of the goods Russia has taken from former enemy territory has come from Finland and Manchuria.

Most of the goods acquired have gone to Russia. But some have been allowed to remain in the countries that have provided them and are being used to consolidate Russia's position there. One of Russia's main aims now is to make going businesses out of the satellite economies.

Russia's problems, in consolidating her eastern European bloc, are complex.

Resistance of the people forces her to go slowly with communistic measures in many localities. Individualism is especially strong in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Also, in areas where farms have long been of family size, collective farming is opposed. However, where big estates are broken up and given to farm laborers, as in Poland, and the new farm units prove too small, these laborers then offer little resistance to collective farming.

National jealousies also complicate the picture. Hungary, for example, refuses to sign a treaty with Czechoslovakia because of the way peasants of Hungarian origin have been treated by the Slovaks. And the Czechs, for their part, do not want to be in a military bloc that has Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito as overlord. They prefer to deal directly with Moscow instead.

Lack of goods to send to the satellite countries prevents Russia from bringing those countries completely within her orbit. They are badly in need of machinery and other equipment, which Russia is unable to supply. Therefore, with Russia's approval, they are resuming their prewar trade with western Europe as rapidly as they can.

Lack of currency that can serve as a common medium of exchange handicaps trade within the Russian bloc. In the absence of such currency, most of the trading between nations consists of barter deals. There are rumors, however, that Russia is preparing to make the ruble an international currency, and to set up a ruble area in eastern Europe, similar to the sterling and dollar areas elsewhere. In that event, the ruble for the first time in many years will have a definite value in international exchange.

Political opposition to Russia and the Communists still is powerful in some countries. The Russians, taking no chances on losing their hold, are gradually wearing this opposition down. In their maneuvering, they are using the trials of political leaders and the activities of secret police. Also, the presence of the Russian army not far away speaks louder than words. Nevertheless, even where open opposition disappears, much hostility to Russia remains beneath the surface.

Russia's ultimate aim, United States officials suspect, may be to absorb the entire area of eastern Europe that she now controls. That would add more than 100,000,000 to her population and boost the total to around 300,000,000. In any event, Russia makes it clear that, through her Molotov plan, she is determined to keep her influence in the area supreme.

A vital question facing the United States is this: What is the chance that the eastern European nations can or will get out from under Russia's dominance in the future? The men guiding United States policy believe the chance is good. Therefore, they are combating Russia's influence among those nations in every way they can.

This country's plans assume no final split of Europe, but the restoration of a big volume of trade through the iron curtain. Russia now is not trying to prevent that trade. If she does prevent it in the future, the whole basis of the Marshall plan will have to be changed.

While the United States is challenging Russia's hold on eastern Europe, Russia is challenging United States influence in western Europe. The result is a test of strength, with the Molotov plan on one side pitted against the Marshall plan on the other. The Molotov plan already is being applied, whereas the Marshall plan still must run the gauntlet of Congress. That puts the Molotov plan several jumps ahead.

Statement by Hon. Robert F. Wagner, of New York, Made in Connection With Broadcasts on Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Senator WAGNER dealing with a series of broadcasts on the housing problem produced by station WNBC in New York City, as well as one of the broadcasts.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. WAGNER. The critical housing shortage merits the continuous and searching attention of the people of this country. There is no national problem which weighs more heavily on the welfare of our families and our children than the shortage of housing and the continued existence of the slums which have disgraced American cities for generations. Nevertheless, notwithstanding the vital importance of attaining a solution of the housing problem, the efforts to acquaint our citizens with the real issues and to provide them with the information they need in order to determine upon the proper solutions are too few and far between.

For this reason, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a series of four broadcasts entitled "Housing, 1947," which were produced by radio station WNBC in New York City during the fall of 1947. In these broadcasts, all the issues and all the points of view on housing were presented to the public in dramatic, incisive, and accurate form. Authoritative spokesmen for industry, labor, and the public made their own observations on the housing problem and the best manner of curing it. I believe this series of broadcasts represents a noteworthy example of public service in informing the public on an issue of major national importance and I believe station WNBC should be strongly commended for undertaking it.

While all the broadcasts were of deep interest, I believe the Senate will be particularly interested in the following excerpts of a discussion on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill (S. 866) by a number of housing authorities who participated in the broadcast of September 25, 1947:

MR. GRAUER. I remember you said last week that tonight's subject is on a highly controversial issue.

TED. It certainly is. The people we hear from tonight are going to give their views on Government entry into the housing picture.

MR. GRAUER. Government. That would bring in politics, wouldn't it, Ted?

TED. Exactly.

MR. GRAUER. How do you feel about political implications in this housing shortage, Ted?

TED. Well, for that answer I went to Robert Armstrong, editor in chief of the Real Estate Appraised Journal and vice president of the New York Building Congress. I asked him if he thought there were political implications in the housing shortage. He said:

MR. ARMSTRONG. I think that the political implications amount to no more and no less than canned dynamite. Of course, most Americans want to see private industry do the required work. They want to see private industry erect all of America's homes, but if this does not occur, if it cannot occur in the next year or two, I am quite certain that we are likely to see the Government engage in a public-housing program that will make both the past and present advocacy of public housing seem as ripples when compared to the oncoming tide. No matter what party wins the election in the fall of 1948, it most certainly will receive a mandate whereby it will be obligatory upon the Federal Government to construct perhaps as many as a million and a half homes a year until the shortage is alleviated.

TED. And now for another of Government's role in housing, I want you to hear from Commissioner Herman Stitchman, of the New York State Division of Housing.

Mr. STITCHMAN. Decent housing is a necessity, and I think the Government at all stages—municipal, State, and Federal—the Government, I say, has got an interest in seeing to it that every citizen has a decent house at a rent or a price which he can afford to pay.

TED. At a price which he can afford to pay. Commissioner Stitchman was talking about me then, and a lot of you listening in, I know. Whenever I did find a place available, it was just way out of the range of my pocketbook. And here's what Mr. Stanley Isaacs, of the city council, had to say in that regard:

Mr. ISAACS. Housing produced by private builders at the present time costs so much that it is far beyond the range of most of the people who need decent housing and need new housing.

TED. I asked many people if they thought Government should step in and help the emergency. Mr. Charles Abrams, housing adviser to the New York Post, had some very interesting statements to make.

Mr. ABRAMS. We've got to adopt a theory that we had during the war, and that is that there is no housing at all or very little housing being produced, and, therefore, it becomes the function of Government to produce that housing.

We have local housing authorities, 800 of them, in 41 States of the Union, and if these local authorities were to build houses for all of whom private enterprise doesn't provide, for the lowest-income as well as for the middle-income group and the veteran, then I believe that we can produce housing in quantity. We can standardize specifications, we can buy cheaply by contracting for the whole output of factories. In that way we can produce houses on a mass-production basis and get them down to a low cost. In addition to that, the Government can borrow at low interest rates, the Government agency can build large communities that create their own environment and that resist the inroad of blight that affects private housing. We can replan our cities. We're given the opportunity for a real frontier in housing, and we should take advantage of it, if possible.

TED. Mr. James Kunens, of the Citizens Housing Council, was another man who had some definite opinions on how the emergency should be met.

Mr. KUNENS. Naturally, the primary responsibility is that of private enterprise. In New York City, which is predominantly a rental area, the emphasis has to be on large-scale rental projects. From this point of view it's necessary that we have more of the large-scale developments built by insurance companies, savings banks, and other large-scale builders. But at today's costs these groups can only take care of part of the demand, and we believe it is the responsibility of Government to take care of the basic housing needs of people whom private enterprise cannot serve. For this reason we've consistently urged action on all three levels of Government—Federal, State, and local—to supplement private activity.

On the Federal level we think that passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is an absolute necessity.

TED. Now I'd been hearing a lot about the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill from the people I talked with, so I decided to find out exactly what its provisions were.

Mr. GRAUER. I'd like to know a few more of the details of that bill myself, Ted.

TED. Well, of course, Mr. Grauer, we don't have the time for a complete study of the T-E-W bill. But here are the main things it would provide.

MAN 1. It gives aid to private enterprise in building.

MAN 2. It aids rental and mutual housing projects through insurance protection, with low interest rates and repayments lasting as long as 40 years.

WOMAN 1. It guarantees annual returns to investors, and in that way would attract large amounts of private capital into the housing field.

MAN 1. It helps people to buy moderate-priced homes with smaller down payments and installments extended for 30 years.

MAN 2. It will help clear slums.

WOMAN 1. It will aid the building of 500,000 units of community-owned low-rent housing projects for families which private enterprise cannot serve.

MAN 1. It will help private enterprise build 250,000 rural homes.

MAN 2. It will provide money for research in the housing field. Research in the use of new materials and new methods.

Now an interesting thing, which probably a lot of you know, is that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has never reached the floor of Congress for discussion. Some people feel that there is a definite group responsible for the lack of action on the bill. Mr. Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., national housing chairman of the American Veteran's Committee, made this comment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would say that remembering Mr. Wilson Wyatt's veteran emergency program which the Government undertook in the spring of '46, remembering that program, remembering its initial success and remembering that it was sabotaged largely through the efforts of the National Association of Real Estate Boards in Washington, the real estate lobby in short; and also remembering that the one national long-range over-all national program, which is the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, that its defeat is largely due to the opposition of the real-estate lobby in Washington and, I might add, that the American Legion has joined in with them on that, I would say that on that record, that the real-estate lobby is primarily responsible today for the housing shortage both for veterans and the country as a whole.

TED. Now, you remember, Mr. Roosevelt mentioned that the American Legion had voted against the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. So I went to see Mr. Arthur Benline, department housing chairman for the American Legion of New York. I asked Mr. Benline why the Legion had voted against the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Mr. BENLINE. Because the national housing committee of the American Legion feels that the Wagner bill, although it has many good and desirable points, primarily is a bill to provide housing and slum clearance and not necessarily a veterans' housing bill. At the convention there was a considerable difference of opinion among the delegates and particularly among the housing chairmen who attended the meeting of the housing committee. As you have probably read in the newspapers, many of the delegates came to New York instructed to vote for the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, or as it was rewritten, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. However, the prevailing opinion of the National Housing Committee prevailed in the final determination of the convention.

TED. Well, right here I think we should do a little studying of the Wilson Wyatt program. Even though it was abandoned last year, it's important to explain how it fits into the picture right now. Like the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill it was a Government move to relieve the housing shortage. It differed, however, in that it was much more of an emergency measure and was designed to get a lot of houses up for veterans in a hurry.

Mr. GRAUER. In other words, Ted, the people who were opposed to the Wyatt program are generally the same ones who now oppose the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill?

TED. Yes, Mr. Grauer, because both involve Government participation in housing. And some people are opposed to it. Like Mr. Douglas Whitlock, chairman of the Building Products Institute, an organization supported by the producers of building materials.

Mr. WHITLOCK. Well, we have experienced in the past several years the heavy hand of Government on the construction industry. We've found it in the OPA where it prevented us from producing the types of products that ought to have been available for low-cost housing. We have seen the fiasco of the Wyatt program where a group of Government bureaucrats plan the course of the housing industry in such a way that it couldn't get started at a time when it was sorely needed. We believe that if the Government will stop interfering with the construction industry, that it will produce the houses that are needed for the American people and will take care of the housing demand that exists at the present time.

TED. The next person I talked with was even more against public housing than Mr. Whitlock. This man is chairman of the Washington committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards—whom Mr. Roosevelt mentioned earlier. His name is Alexander Summer, the head of a real estate and mortgage concern in Teaneck, N. J.

Mr. SUMMER. Well, I think the general adaptation of a public housing building program means the end of this country, this life as we have known it. Trace back the history of every country that's gone communistic or socialistic, and it all started with public housing. Just a little bit of public housing to relieve the present emergency means a little bit more public housing. It's socialism pure and simple. I know there are a few people who are honest and sincere and conscientious advocates, but by and large most of those who advocate public housing do it for their own selfish interests and I think it's the greatest threat to the backbone of this country, private ownership of your own home.

TED. In view of Mr. Summer's statements I went back to some of the people who advocate public housing and asked them if they felt that public housing is a threat to private enterprise. Mr. Roosevelt said.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, public housing has never been a threat to private enterprise for the simple reason that private enterprise has always admitted that it cannot provide adequate housing for the lowest income groups and is a fact most private enterprise builders today will admit, that they cannot provide decent housing for the so-called no man's land which is the lower, not the lowest, but the lower income groups. Such acts as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill have been called socialistic. I'd like to point out that Senator TAFT, who in my opinion, is far from a Socialist, is one of the sponsors of the bill and that the Catholic Church, which has certainly never endorsed any socialistic legislation, the Catholic Church is behind the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

TED. And Commissioner Stitchman of the New York State Housing Department said.

Mr. STITCHMAN. Public housing properly run won't hurt private housing in the slightest, as a matter of fact it's the only salvation for our cities today in my opinion.

TED. I saw New York City Councilman ISAACS again and I asked him "Do you think public housing would hurt private enterprise?"

Mr. ISAACS. Not in the faintest degree. Private enterprise can build and should build to the fullest possible extent today but it can't produce homes at present costs, and this has been proved over and over again, that can rent for less than $23 or possibly $25 per month per room. There's no competition with private enterprise when you provide homes for those that can't pay more than 60 percent of this figure, $15 per month per room at the outside. Those people have to be provided for and private enterprise can't provide for them. When you provide for them through public aid you don't compete with private enterprise.

TED. Another interesting aspect of how public housing could be managed was given by Mr. Charles Abrams, the housing adviser we heard from earlier.

Mr. ABRAMS. What the Government ought to do is build housing for those who want to own housing and use all of the private mechanisms including even the speculative contractor who can become a contractor instead of an owner. In other words we should have a program to build housing for sale as well as for rent.

TED. Mr. James Felt, who is in the real-estate business and acts as a housing consultant, brought up the same point which Mr. Abrams just mentioned.

Mr. FELT. Under the circumstances, I think it would be a fine idea if public housing went ahead in these jobs, developed housing even on the outskirts, so that we could have dwelling units for our families as quickly as possible, but at the same time make arrangements whereby at the expiration of a certain number of years, when the emergency was over, that that housing would be turned over to private enterprise and operated by private enterprise.

TED. Mr. Felt's idea that housing built by the Government could be turned over to private enterprise when the emergency ends interested me very much. And many of the other people I saw made the same suggestion. You see, those in favor of public housing say that private enterprise cannot afford to build for families in the lower income groups and therefore Government building would be no threat to the private builders. However, the people who represent private enterprise say that in perhaps 5 or 10 years, when prices are not so high, they will be able to build for these lower income groups and then the public housing will be a definite threat to private business. But it seems to me that if provisions were made to turn the public housing over to private enterprise at the end of the shortage, as Mr. Felt suggested, the threat of Government competing with private interests would be eliminated.

Now, the next person I saw was Mr. Kalman Klien, president of the Long Island Home Builders' Institute. When I asked Mr. Klien who was going to build a home for the man who makes, say, $45 a week, he said:

Mr. KLIEN. I'll admit, though, that under the present framework we're not providing houses for the veteran making $40 a week because the average house is about $8,000. Unless you want to go out into communities which are far from transportation and take an awful lot out of the house, give them a very small house, for example, where you can produce a house for a little less than $8,000 or $7,000, but even a $7,000 house doesn't answer the problem of a $40-a-week income group. However, the Government could do something about the veteran making $40 a week, and I don't think the answer is in rentals either. The answer could very well be in the purchase of a home, and they can do possibly three things: On the national level, of course, the Government could subsidize part of his interest rate. I think instead of 4 percent, if the Government would subsidize some part of that, that would bring the carrying charges down. Coupled with that, instead of a 25-year mortgage, if a 35-year mortgage pattern would be initiated that again would bring the carrying charges down so the price of the house isn't so important as the monthly carrying charges, and then on the local level the various municipalities could do something for the veteran by reducing the assessed valuation on the house, by giving them some tax exemption. It could be within the limits of three to five thousand dollars, that, too, would help bring the monthly carrying charges down. The sum total of those three items alone makes a tremendous difference in carrying charges. By doing that I think we could satisfy a great many veterans and they don't have to live in rental projects. They can own their own home and have room for expansion and enjoy a different way of life. It makes a big difference, living in a private house as against living in an apartment.

TED. Mr. Grauer, you remember Mr. William Levitt, whom we heard from on last week's program?

Mr. GRAUER. I certainly do, Ted. He's the builder in Manhasset, Long Island, who's constructing 3,000 houses this year.

TED. That's right. And the houses sell for approximately $7,500 each. Mr. Levitt is outstanding because he has the production-line system of building which we talked about earlier. Well, I asked Mr. Levitt what he thought of public housing, and he said

* * *.

Mr. LEVITT. I think there's a very definite need for public housing, or its equivalent.

TED. Frankly, I was surprised that Mr. Levitt, being a builder, would make such a statement. And I told him I thought it was a little unusual.

Mr. LEVITT. I know, I've spoken to a lot of builders and practically none of them will ever say that public housing is needed, but at the same time somebody has got to house the $30-a-week fellow and I know that my company builds as cheaply as anybody in the business but I don't know how to do it.

TED. Well, now I want you to hear the answers I got to a series of questions I asked Mr. Maxwell Tretter. He was executive director of the New York City Housing Authority from January 1938 to July 1947 and now practices law and acts as a housing consultant. The first thing I asked him was, "Mr. Tretter, what are your suggestions for meeting the housing emergency?"

Mr. TRETTER. I'm glad you used the word "emergency" because we must use emergency methods in order to improve housing conditions today. Of course we must encourage private enterprise to the fullest extent but to provide housing now we must have a large public housing program.

TED. Then do you feel that public housing should be only an emergency measure?

Mr. TRETTER. No, I don't. It has been our experience over the years that private enterprise has not been able to take care of families in the lowest income group and therefore it will be necessary to have public housing with cash subsidies for families in the lowest income group. Nothing has occurred in the building industry which leads us to believe that private enterprise can build for the lowest income group now and in the near future. And in addition, in this emergency there must be an expansion of the public housing program so that Government will provide homes for families in the next income group. By that I mean public housing without cash subsidy.

TED. Mr. Tretter, I understand that public housing with cash subsidy means that the Government would make up the difference between what an apartment or house cost and what a family is able to pay. And I understand that this cash subsidy would be for the benefit of those in the lowest income bracket. But I wonder if you would explain a little more fully just what public housing without cash subsidy is?

Mr. TRETTER. That is housing built by public agencies like housing authorities throughout the country with the aid of the Federal, State, or local governments and it is housing provided for families in New York City who cannot afford to pay more than about $50 a month for an apartment. In contrast, public housing with cash subsidy in the past has been provided for families which can afford to pay about $7 or $8 a room per month.

TED. Well, Mr. Tretter, there's one thing I'd like to get straight in my mind. Just how can the Government build without losing money and rent at a price that is less than that private enterprise must charge?

Mr. TRETTER. Well, I agree that Government can't perform any miracles, but Government has certain instruments available to it which private enterprise does not have. For instance, in Government housing there is no profit involved; secondly, Government can borrow at much lower interest rates than private enterprise, which results in a substantial saving in overhead costs; thirdly, Government can afford to build these projects on a very large scale, which also results in reduction in construction costs and management costs.

TED. Do you think that Government building without cash subsidy is a threat to private enterprise?

Mr. TRETTER. Every fair-minded person who knows anything about the building industry will have to admit that there is still a tremendous gap between the 12- or 13-dollar per room per month rental to be charged in public housing without cash subsidy and what private enterprise can build for today. My answer is that we can now provide and at the end of the emergency these public-housing projects that are being built without cash subsidy should be sold to private enterprise and put back on the full tax rolls.

TED. Do you think that public housing will mean socialism?

Mr. TRETTER. Well, I certainly wouldn't like to see socialism in this country, but I am convinced that public housing is not the back door to socialism. All of us hate to see Government intrude into traditionally private fields, but it has also been the established practice in this country to ask Government to provide a service which is required by the public and which cannot be provided by private enterprise. If we maintain that principle and are certain that public housing will serve that market in the low-income group which private enterprise cannot serve then we will not have any socialism.

Union Leader Opposes British Labor Government's Palestine Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from a trades-union leader, Mr. Charles Zimmerman, secretary-manager of the Dressmakers Union, Local 22, one of the great components of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL, shows the trouble and perplexity even of those who are deeply sympathetic to the British Labor Government in view of its Palestine policy. This policy, if it may be called that, is alienating British labor's long-standing friends:

COPY OF LETTER SENT TO ERNEST BEVIN AND CLEMENT R. ATTLEE

DRESSMAKERS UNION, LOCAL 22,
New York, N. Y., January 16, 1948.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: I am addressing this letter to you as a labor leader who is responsible for the government of Great Britain. * * * We in the labor movement of America have always felt very close to British labor and have been accustomed to look to it for inspiration and guidance. We were naturally elated when labor swept the last general elections and took control of the Government. * * * A new spirit of far-sighted humanity and justice, we particularly hoped, would be brought into British foreign policy. It is with deep regret that we have to confess that in one respect at least—in the British treatment of the Jews in Palestine—we have been cruelly disappointed.

It is, of course, no secret to you that we have sharply disagreed with you in your Palestinian policy in recent times, and I do not intend to rehearse our criticism or engage in political argument. I want to appeal to you as an American labor man addressing his British colleagues on a level beyond politics or political controversy. You know as well as we do what has been the fate of the Jews in the past two decades. In Europe, the rise and triumph of the Nazi movement meant the launching of a deliberate, carefully-planned program to enslave, torture, and exterminate the millions of Jews on the Continent. This dreadful crusade was accompanied in Palestine by savage Arab attacks on the Jewish settlements with the obvious purpose of terrorizing the Jews and making impossible the development of a Jewish homeland in that country, although that had been guaranteed in more than one solemn declaration of the British Government holding the mandatory power. The net result of 15 years of horror has been tabulated in cold figures: Six million Jews murdered on the European continent. The handful of survivors uprooted, displaced, and homeless, are now—2½ years after the end of the war—still languishing in DP camps without chance or opportunity of reconstructing their lives on a normal human basis.

Here was a situation in which we, American labor men, certainly had a right to expect a great deal from you, the British Labor Government. But what have you done? Not only have you done nothing to bring relief to these shattered victims of Nazi savagery, not only have you shut the doors of Palestine in their face; what is worse, you have not shown the least sign of human sympathy or understanding of their dreadful plight—or at least no such sign of understanding or sympathy has ever been manifested publicly in any significant way. We looked, and looked in hope, for that new spirit that was supposed to animate British policy. We found it in the courageous British resistance to totalitarian expansion in Europe, we found it in India—but in relation to the Jews, in relation to Palestine, not a trace!

Finally the question of Palestine came before the United Nations. After long investigation and deliberation, a decision was reached—partition and the establishment of a separate Arab and Jewish state. The decision of the United Nations immediately became the signal for the mobilization of the Arab forces against the United Nations and the launching of furious attacks against the Jews. Violence and chaos began to ravage the Holy Land. No one questions that the Arabs were the aggressors and that the Jews were placed in a position where they either had to defend themselves or submit to extermination. We do not condone terrorism and we have in the past more than once condemned the small terrorist groups among the Jews in Palestine. But that the violence that has followed the UN decision has been provoked by Arab aggression and that the Jewish community and its security forces have been entirely on the defensive, no one who is not blinded by prejudice can deny.

But what has been the attitude of the British Government, of the British Labor Government, led by you? You have apparently not found one word to say in condemnation of the Arab terror, directed not only against the Jews but against the United Nations. But when the Jews, compelled to action in self-defense, strike back at the Arab terrorists, your spokesmen in Palestine are quick to denounce the dastardly action. I do not even mention the reports that British police in Palestine have protected or given actual aid to Arab aggressors, nor do I make a point of the action of the British authorities in disarming the Jews and thus leaving them helpless against their enemies. I merely ask: Why is it that the British Government finds its voice only for condemning the Jews when they engage in self-defense, and has nothing whatever to say about the Arab terror, about the wanton Arab defiance of the United Nations? This is something that we simply cannot understand.

I am not talking of politics, I am talking of the most elementary claim of humanity. Here is some sort of solution for the aggravated Palestine problem; here is a glimmering of hope for some of the wretched, forlorn remnant in the DP camps. Why is there not a single sign of sympathy, a single gesture of help, forthcoming from you and the Government which you head? Have sympathy, humanity, and compassion no part in the program of British labor? Does British socialism mean nothing more than the nationalization of the Bank of England and the reconstruction of British industry? But what is socialism without justice and humanity?

Despite everything, we have not lost our faith in Britain or in British labor. We can never forget Britain's services to the cause of human freedom through the centuries. We still remember that it was Britain that held the fort against Hitler when the world was at its darkest. * * * But why—why, we ask—should it be so different in your treatment of the Jews in Palestine and the DP camps? Why must the Jews be made an exception? Why is there no understanding or sympathy for them, why only cold unconcern and ill-disguised hostility?

We are perplexed, disturbed, deeply troubled.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,

CHAS. S. ZIMMERMAN,
Secretary-Manager.

Oregon Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Earl T. Newbry from the Oregon Journal:

OREGON COMMON SENSE

(By Earl T. Newbry, secretary of state)

Since long before statehood the women of Oregon have played an equal part with men in the molding of a community based upon common sense and fairness to all citizens.

It is natural to look upon early-day explorers as men. Yet many pages of our early Oregon history are filled with the accomplishments of women. It was a woman, the Indian Princess Sacajawea, who did so much to smooth the path of the Lewis and Clark party.

The names Walker, Spalding, Whitman, Jason Lee, Smith, Wells, and many others are famous as those of the early-day missionaries. Each of these names, however, was borne by a team—a team of a man and a woman striving to do a common job.

Long before women paraded in front of the White House demanding the right to vote, the women of Oregon were going to the polls and expressing their political preferences.

Mrs. Abigail Scott Duniway is generally credited with the victory that gave Oregon women the right to cast a vote.

Women of Oregon are an integral part of our political system, holding officers in political parties, being elected to the legislative assembly, and generally wielding much power for good.

Because of the influence of Oregon women, this State has made outstanding political contributions to the Nation.

Oregon was the first State to abolish the convention system of nominating candidates for public office when it adopted the direct primary. The secret ballot was another forward step by Oregon. It was the first to adopt the Australian ballot—as it was called in those days. The secret ballot—something that still is a mystery to many nations—enables a voter to enter a booth and mark his choice of candidates without any other person on earth supervising his selections.

Oregon was the first State to place in the hands of the people the privilege of electing United States Senators. Today it is a common practice, but when Oregon spear-pointed the innovation it startled the other States. Oregon also was the first State to adopt a preferential Presidential primary. It was the first State to introduce the initiative and referendum. Thirty-six years ago, Oregon enacted a law that 8 hours was to be the limit of a day's work on all public instruction.

We have the wages-and-hours law for women workers which set a pattern for other States to imitate. This was used as a model law in the finally successful fight against sweat shops in New York.

To assure the purity of our elections, for 40 years we have had the Corrupt Practices Act.

Oregon enacted a law to eliminate free passes on railroads for public officials. This spread across the Nation, and today the President must pay his own way when he travels.

Oregon provided for the removal of elective officers when their acts outraged public opinion by adopting the recall.

This is a brief picture of Oregon common sense. You are familiar with all of this. I have simply sought to refresh your memories.

Men or women elected to State office in Oregon have a pattern of conduct already mapped out for them. It is a pattern drawn by the voters themselves over a period of years of free elections.

As a businessman I have been favorably impressed by the character of our State government. In our Statehouse it is common to find the employee treating the public dollar with as great care as he does his own.

In the helter-skelter of some types of politics, Oregon is sometimes referred to as a reactionary State. The thing overlooked by these accusers is simply that Oregon moves forward rapidly and without a lot of noise. Oregon has grown up as an orderly State. Our people do not have to be driven to necessary reforms—they initiate them.

The business of our State government has grown at a tremendous rate. This has not been brought about by the creation of new bureaus and departments. It is simply the effect of a great population growth.

As a result, plans are now under way for a sizable expansion of State office accommodations. Work has already been started to increase the capacity of our State institutions. In other words, we are keeping pace with progress.

If we are to continue to keep pace with progress, or, as we have in the past, lead progress, Oregon women must continue to take an active part in State leadership.

Oregon, I believe, has been built upon hope, faith, and a lot of hard work.

Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday February 5, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a complimentary but well-merited editorial from the Chicago Sunday Sun and Times on the work of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER

We can't prove it, but we have a hunch that when most young cave men grew strong enough to swing their own axes they grumbled about the way their elders were running tribal affairs.

Down through history, the discontent of young men and women has played a large part in changing the ways of men.

Young men played a dominant part in America's own war for independence. They played a big part more recently in Theodore Roosevelt's "square deal," and Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal.

Within the last few days we have had an opportunity to watch two distinctly different groups of young men and women in their approach to problems of 1948.

Young men and women appeared to be in the majority at the meeting of the Progressive Citizens of America, which met here to indorse Henry Wallace for President. This group believes the operation of our present free enterprise system is promoting economic injustices. It demands, for example, public ownership of the steel industry, coal mines, public utilities, and railroads.

A few days later the Chicago Junior Association of Commerce and Industry held its annual banquet to honor young men who have distinguished themselves in civic affairs. These young men believe that "economic justice can best be won by free men through free enterprise."

Members of this group, who call themselves Jaycees, show their discontent with present day conditions in another fashion. They spend their spare time activity working on constructive projects which will make their community a better place in which to live. They work for the success of such projects as the Community Fund, Chicago Boys Clubs, Red Cross, Boy Scouts, etc. Politically, they are interested in making democracy work better by staging get-out-the-vote activities on election day.

Thus, the Jaycees carry out through action their belief that young people can best help improve city, national, and international conditions by participation. While the young PCA'ers concern themselves with resolutions against the Taft-Hartley law and the Truman loyalty order, the Jaycees plan action against rheumatic fever, traffic accidents, and destruction of school property.

This distinction between the two groups extends all the way up to their international attitudes. The Wallace-PCA group is against the Marshall plan. The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce is in favor of it.

The PCA'ers passed a resolution saying funds for Europe should not be used to interfere with the national sovereignty of the beneficiary nations. The PCA believes the Marshall plan contemplates forcing America's ideas of government upon other nations against their will.

We believe America's attitude is better expressed by John Ben Shepperd, president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce:

"The scream of the eagle must be heard around the world. We must adopt a positive program of selling our way of life to the whole world. When we help the less fortunate in Europe under the Marshall plan, we should accompany it with the old-fashioned gospel of democracy—pointing out that only under our system of free opportunity and enterprise has a people been able to work and produce enough to relieve the chaos of a troubled world."

As President Cleveland put it, we are today confronted with a condition, not a theory. Many agree with Irving Dilliard, who writes in the current Survey Graphic: "Communism is changing from a challenge to democracy to a threat."

There are some who believe the way to combat communism is by force. They're wrong. Ideas can't be stopped by force.

There are others who believe communism should be allowed to run its course in Europe. They're wrong. Communism might some day recede. But in the meantime great damage to the world would result.

And then there are those who believe the best defense—or offense—against communism is to show the world that democracy works better than communism.

Wallace and his group of eager young men in PCA believe that the way to make democracy work better is to create a new political party. Even if this could be done, it would take several years. Meantime, pressing problems cannot wait.

We need men of action such as the Jaycees to go after the problems of the day. And we hope that as they grow older they will not change their belief that "service to humanity is the best work in life." When men or governments forget that, they foment conditions which cause young men to grumble about the way their elders are running the tribal affairs, just as the PCA'ers are doing today.

Admission of Members of the Polish Army in Exile to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, as you know, H. R. 3620, which I introduced to permit members of the Polish Army in exile to immigrate to the United States, is presently being considered by the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. I urge this subcommittee at this time to give the most thoughtful consideration to this measure, and under leave to extend my remarks, include a letter this day received from Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish American Congress, and excerpts from the statement he made on June 13, 1947, when he appeared before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, Committee on the Judiciary, United States House of Representatives:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., February 3, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE MACKINNON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am acquainted with your H. R. 3620 bill and I was very pleased when you introduced it last May.

Six million Americans of Polish descent were at that time elated, too. The Polish soldiers whom your bill favors took heart and they are still hopeful that the gates of the United States will be opened to them.

While we backed Representative STRATTON'S earlier bill, H. R. 2910, we asked that section 5 be amended so that it would also embrace the members of the Polish Army in exile—our gallant fighting allies. Your bill is the answer to their hopes and our plea in their behalf.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of what I said in this matter before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization. Committee on the Judiciary, United States House of Representatives, on H. R. 2910, on June 13, 1947.

You may use it in toto or excerpts from it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if you want to.

Appreciating your intercession for the loyal Polish-soldiers, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President.

DISPLACED POLISH SOLDIERS

(Excerpt from statement of Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president, Polish American Congress, before House Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, June 13, 1947)

While we back Representative STRATTON'S bill, we do not endorse it entirely in its present form. We ask that section 5 be amended so that it would also embrace the members of the Polish Army in exile—our gallant fighting allies.

When Britain's fate hung in the balance, they performed daring deeds of bravery over the skies of England. They fought at Narvik, at the Maginot Line and in Tobruk. On the slopes of Monte Cassino alone, 3,600 of them laid down their lives, thus saving the lives of our American boys in General Mark W. Clark's Fifth Army and British lives in the Eighth Army of General Alexander.

These heroes of the biggest battles of the last war, many of whom were decorated with America's highest honors for bravery, are now disarmed and deprived of their military status, placed in camps of the so-called Polish Resettlement Corps.

Is this the reward for the Polish soldiers, who with our American boys fought for the cause of freedom, and who were the first to fight Germany and the last to cease fire? Is this the reward for the men who put their faith in the spoken and written pledges of the United Kingdom and the United States of America? Marked by the Soviet police, slated for labor camps in Siberia, prisons or gallows, if they return—170,000 healthy, young, heroic, and determined human beings are to languish in humid Quonset huts of British camps.

These Polish soldiers in Great Britain, Germany, or in the Middle East are entitled to come to the United States if only as a reward for the invaluable services they rendered America as our allies. It would in some measure repay them for their fighting and for their services. Their hearts bleed at the thought that they can't return to the kind of Poland for which they had fought. A great many of them come from eastern Poland, which at Yalta, without the consent of the Polish people, was turned over to Soviet Russia as an outright reward for aggression. And in what is left of Poland, there is a Communist government, which owes its allegiance to Moscow. Try to visualize, if you can, our own American boys in the same plight—unable to return home—because a ruthless foreign power in the guise of a liberator had occupied their country.

These gallant Polish heroes represent the highest human material from the point of view of any sensible immigration policy.

They, like their countrymen in concentration camps, love liberty. Most of them come from sturdy Polish peasant stock, psychologically akin to the American pioneer stock. Our vast areas of the West, the Southwest, northern Maine, or Alaska should be opened to them for the benefit of our country and our economy. Many of them are highly skilled and seasoned soldiers and it is safe to assume that they would enlist voluntarily in our Army, thus swelling its depleted ranks.

I would urgently suggest that this subcommittee avail itself of the presence of Gen. Mark W. Clark in this country and request his testimony on behalf of the Polish soldiers who fought under his command. Most of them are young people and single. They would certainly find wives in this country, build up families, raise new generations of Americans.

The displaced Polish soldiers and civilians are of the same blood and stock as the 6,000,000 loyal Americans of Polish descent. We cherish the fact that prior to the enactment of the draft law in 1940, over 17 percent of the entire United States Marine Corps, all volunteers, was composed of boys of Polish descent. Our casualty lists are replete with Polish names. We are proud of our record of achievement on the battle and home fronts. Unlike our native Communists who owe their allegiance to a foreign power, we Americans of Polish descent owe our allegiance to only one flag—the glorious Stars and Stripes of the United States of America.

AN INVESTMENT IN JUSTICE

The displaced civilians and soldiers are an American responsibility. Their plight is attributable directly to the Yalta agreement, to which America was a party. In depriving them of the protection of a legal government, of an independent country, of freedom, of their homes, and of their beloved ones, we are coresponsible for their wretched fate. Theirs is a heartbreaking story. No one can measure the depth of their grief and despair.

The Polish American Congress, the voice of 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, pleads not only for the cause of Polish displaced civilians and soldiers, but also for all displaced persons of every nationality, race, and creed who fear returning to homelands now transformed into Soviet lands of slavery.

To insure justice and fair play to all groups, we ask that the admission of homeless displaced persons and soldiers should be on a prorata basis in direct proportion to the numbers of nationalistic groups.

Aside from purely humanitarian considerations, there are economic reasons that should prompt Congress to allow displaced persons of good character to enter our country.

While doing our share in lightening the burden of their sorrow and in calming their fears, we will at the same time be alleviating the heavy financial burden now borne by the American taxpayer in maintaining them in their present state of idleness and misery.

The United States cannot carry on forever the burden of feeding DP's. A speedy solution to this grave problem is imperative. To permit those who typify the highest moral standards to enter the United States would be the quickest and cheapest solution. Their love of freedom would be the best investment in the future security of America. Because they would be sponsored by responsible individuals and organizations, there need be no fear that they would become public charges.

Our moral duty is to save these people. Let America set a shining example to other countries by throwing wide open its doors to a fair share of these unfortunates. The number who would come in under a revised H. R. 2910, which would also include displaced Polish soldiers, would still be far below the number of immigrants who would have entered the United States had there been no war.

In providing a haven to these homeless civilians and soldiers, God would bless America and the Congress of the United States would receive the gratitude and approval of the judgment of time.

Increase in Subsistence Allowances for Veterans Pursuing Courses of Institutional Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON C. JONES
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a bill, known as the Meade bill, to increase subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, was passed by the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives during the first session of the Eightieth Congress and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union on July 23, 1947.

Before passing same, the Veterans' Affairs Committee considered the bill very carefully, and we think reasonably, after hearing representatives of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Veterans of World War II, regulator veterans' organizations, Members of Congress, and the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

It was not until this session of the Eightieth Congress that the House considered this bill. On Tuesday, February 3, 1948, the bill was considered by the House and passed practically unanimously with 370 for and 6 against.

This bill is an excellent one and meets a need which has been very real to the veterans who are pursuing institutional training. The increase is not a large one but it has been for some time greatly needed by the veterans who are enrolled in courses of institutional training under this act.

The increases are as follows: Single veteran, from $65 to $75 per month; veteran with a dependent, from $90 to $105 per month; and veteran with more than one dependent, from $90 to $120. These increases do not seem large in casual observation, but they are certainly large to those young veterans who are taking these courses of training in the various institutions under this act.

Personally, I know of a number of worthy veteran students who are doing splendid work in the college and university courses and who are having a most difficult time making ends meet. This increase, although not large, will be a godsend to them and enable them to pursue further a course of training when otherwise they might have to drop out of the institution in which they are taking the course of training.

It is a source of satisfaction to the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House which has not been in the least dilatory in this matter to see this much-needed legislation enacted into law. I know it will be welcome and good news to the many veterans and their families pursuing courses of training in the various institutions pursuant to this act to learn that they have been granted this increase which has become so vital to their decision as to whether they can continue their institutional courses of training in preparation for pursuing chosen avocations in life.

The People, the Atom, and the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, American leadership in the field of atomic energy is just as dependent upon a well-informed public as it is upon the actions of the Members of Congress who are members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the few who have been selected to direct the United States Atomic Energy Commission. In order to have a well-informed public, however, it is necessary that there be a full disclosure of all permissible knowledge on the subject. The nature of the problem and the need for security in many phases of atomic energy administration places a tremendous responsibility on the United States Atomic Energy Commission and, to a lesser degree, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It bars disclosure of much information, even by members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to other Members of Congress. Such a prohibition is inherent in the subject, but there is much which can, and should, be made available to the American people.

A step forward in this direction has been taken recently by the United States Atomic Energy Commission. An office of public and technical information service has been established by the Commission to release factual news to the people through the usual channels such as press and radio. The Commission, under the leadership of David E. Lilienthal, is to be complimented for this action. It is creditable, too, that the organization's releases have not been colored by statements of opinion, but have been strictly unbiased and factual.

Information on advances in nuclear research is vital to the farmer, the industrialist, the doctor, and the general public. It is only with such knowledge that the 130,000,000 Americans can make intelligent decisions which will guarantee to the world that our use of atomic energy will be for peaceful purposes alone.

Recently, Mr. David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, made an admirable discussion of this aspect of the atomic-energy problem before the New York State Publishers Association, which merits the consideration of the public generally:

THE PEOPLE, THE ATOM, AND THE PRESS

(An address by David E. Lilienthal, Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, before the annual convention of New York State Publishers Association (meeting with New York Associated Dailies and New York State Society of Newspaper Editors) DeWitt Clinton Hotel, Albany, N. Y., Monday, January 19, 1948)

Will the United States be able to maintain, and even to increase its world leadership, in the development of atomic energy? This is a question on the minds and in the hearts of a good many people these days.

Upon the answer to this question a great deal depends, a very great deal indeed.

The people of the United States have a right to expect and to receive from the Atomic Energy Commission as candid and forthright an answer to this question as, in the present state of this troubled world, it is possible to give publicly.

For by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, the McMahon Act, the people, through the Congress, have placed the responsibility for solid and swift progress in all aspects of atomic energy squarely upon this Commission.

It is appropriate that I should state my views on this question before an organization of men engaged in the newspaper business; not a gathering of scientists or engineers or military men or industrialists, but newspaper men, publishers, and editors. For the press has a large, and it may be a conclusive role to play, in determining where American atomic energy development will be 3 or 5 years hence, in relation to its present condition and in relation to efforts elsewhere in the world.

In my opinion the answer to the fateful question: What are the prospects of continued American preeminence in atomic energy development—including atomic weapons—depends largely, indeed chiefly upon American public opinion. It depends upon how important atomic energy progress seems to the American people as a whole, and to the natural leaders of opinion within the thousands of communities of this country.

The state of American public opinion will be decisive. That opinion depends largely upon how well the people know what is at stake for them and for their children, in this race—this race for more and more knowledge of this new land of the atom. Giving the people help in learning what is at stake, what is the fundamental nature of atomic forces—here is a high function of the press. Providing the people with information, knowledge, and an interpretation of facts and events—all ingredients in the formation of realistic public opinion—is part of the trusteeship vested in our newspapers.

What has American public opinion got to do with the health and vigor of an intricate scientific, engineering business—and national defense—undertaking? Let me try to make this clear.

Bear in mind that this enterprise—from the raw ore through production and including the design and production of weapons and most research and development—this undertaking is wholly owned by the public, by the Government of the United States. It is a monopoly, by explicit provisions of law; a law so reasonable under the circumstances that it passed the Senate of the United States without a single dissenting vote. The reason atomic energy is at present a Government undertaking is an obvious one: its close interrelation to national defense and security.

The public, then, is the owner and the boss. Contrast this situation with that during the war. During the war the American people knew nothing of the atomic project; indeed, public money was spent to see to it that they did not know. Over $2,000,000,000 were spent without public knowledge or a chance by Congress to stipulate or even examine the manner of spending.

But that was in wartime. It was not the normal situation of a Federal enterprise.

The fact is, and we must face it, that it has yet to be demonstrated that in peacetime the cumbersome and time-consuming normal process of our Federal Government can make a success or insure leadership, world leadership, of such a complex scientific and technical undertaking as this.

But our difficulty today goes even deeper than this. If America is to remain in a position of world preeminence in atomic energy and atomic weapons, we simply must have at work in this pioneering field the most creative brains of science and the finest talents of industry and management. Such men, it goes without saying, are in the greatest demand in private life. It has yet to be demonstrated, however, that the United States Government in peacetime will be prepared to provide for such men the kind of opportunity and conditions without which men of this rare capacity will be repelled rather than attracted and held in the service of atomic-energy development. Here is the very crux of the matter, for it takes a high order of human energy to produce atomic energy.

Huge sums of appropriated money, alone, will not keep us ahead; the conditions of public service must be such as to encourage and stimulate scientific engineering and managerial effort in one of the most intricate and exacting enterprises of our time.

The members of the Atomic Energy Commission realize fully these difficulties. We realize that to overcome them will be an accomplishment without precedent. We feel certain that the job can be done if the American people are constantly aware of how vital it is for our country and our future that it shall be done.

There is in this country the scientific talents required to continue and lengthen our leadership in atomic energy developments. We have the engineering and industrial and administrative skills to keep our lead and to increase it.

But if the American people are not acutely aware of the vital importance of this development to them, to their future, to their security, there is a real hazard that in a brief time neither scientific talents, nor engineering or administrative skills or huge sums of money will avail us. Red tape, bureaucratic frustrations, petty politics, dull unimaginative direction will move in and change the whole atmosphere from one of pioneering to dull routine. Drive and intensity, initiative, a sense of urgency cannot be sustained in such an atmosphere. Top scientists will turn to other lines of inquiry; good administrators will have nothing to do with such an enterprise. It will become a fine nesting place for industrious mediocrity. And America's head-start and her position of preeminence will be lost, lost in less time than I care to think about.

What are some of the things about atomic energy that it seems important that the public should know, and that newspapermen should know so they may, in turn, aid in public education? Obviously it is not necessary that newspapermen or the general public become atomic scientists. Nor are the fundamental facts about this new field of knowledge too complex or technical for general lay comprehension. The notion that these are things that are "over the heads" of the general nonscientific public is bunk, in my opinion.

Let me, by way of illustration, refer to a few of the considerations that seem to me important for general public understanding.

Atomic science is not confined to weapons, but opens a new world of knowledge. This new realm of knowledge deals with the forces contained within every particle on the earth and in the sea and in the very air we breathe. These atomic forces are within our bodies, within every living thing on the farms of your home county, within every object you touch or eat or wear. Atomic forces are fundamental, as are electrical forces, and the forces of gravity and of magnetism. We are not dealing here merely with a new explosive, with "just another bomb," however powerful. You and I are witnesses, here in our time, of the unfolding of new knowledge that goes to the very heart of all things physical.

The first large-scale demonstration of this energy was the detonation of a bomb, a weapon that in a single blast destroyed an entire Japanese city. The dramatic way in which word of the release of atomic energy first reached us, with this news of the first atom bomb, naturally enough created the impression that this was only a military weapon. Quite overshadowed was its importance as the opening of a door to a whole new world.

Atomic energy is far more than weapons. But let no man underestimate its destructive power. However fantastic atomic weapons may seem, they are real, as those of us who live with them well know, they are very real indeed.

Atomic energy is a military force of vast power. Its further development is, by express provision of law, a paramount obligation of your United States Atomic Energy Commission. In the laboratories and plants of the Commission this is a high duty that we seek to discharge with vigor and determination. One evidence of the importance we give to weapons is supplied by the Commission's recent announcement that we have presently under construction proving grounds in the Marshall Islands of the Pacific (7,000 miles from our place of meeting today) for routine experiments and tests of atomic weapons. The design, improvement, and production of atomic weapons goes on in the Commission's laboratory at Los Alamos, on top of a mesa in the mountains of New Mexico. This constitutes a scientific and engineering undertaking calling for the highest order of skills. No effort is being spared to keep this part of our responsibility to you and to all Americans on a high level of superior competence and vigilance. In this we have the cooperation of universities, industries, and the National Military Establishment.

This country for 2 years, since November 15, 1945, has made and continues to make efforts to place the destructive aspects of atomic energy under effective workable international controls. For we are and always have been a peace-loving nation. But until such controls are effective throughout the world we must act on a realization that here are weapons that have shaken previous military and international concepts as has no event in centuries, if ever. This fact is just as important to you and your neighbors in up State and central New York as it is to those who sit at the council tables of Washington or London or Paris or Moscow.

My purpose in seeking to dispel the notion that atomic science and atomic weapons are synonymous is not to deprecate the position of this force as a weapon. It is rather to warn that this mischievous myth (that the two are one and the same) is a major fallacy, a fallacy that will make it more difficult to eliminate atomic energy as a weapon of war, a fallacy that may keep up from an understanding of this great force and deprive you and yours of the peaceful fruits of this discovery.

You and I have been vouchsafed the great privilege of living in that moment of time when we can dimly see ahead a whole new world of knowledge about nature. But the

door to this new understanding is but barely opened, just far enough for us to realize that beyond its portals lie vast new continents to explore and develop. Even the most talented men of science insist that they are profoundly ignorant about the nucleus, the dense core of the atom, and about the forces that hold that nucleus together with energies that are almost unbelievable.

As to these energies, let me illustrate rather simply. Suppose this small black cylinder I hold in my hand were a lump of coal. If you were to burn this amount of coal, the coal's energy thereby released in the form of heat would be negligible. But this black cylinder is not coal. This is uranium. It is uranium of very great purity. Six years ago no man had ever seen even this small amount of uranium of this purity and quality. It had never been a substance of any particular importance. Tonight, as we meet here this black metal, this inanimate object is a central figure at the council tables of the peoples of the world. This cylinder is made up of three million billion billion atoms of uranium, and each of these atoms has a nucleus. If the energy within the atoms of this cylinder were released not by burning, as in the case of coal, but by the splitting of the nucleus, by what is called fission, the energy from the heat that would be created would be equivalent to that produced by the burning of 2,500 tons of coal. That is about the amount of coal required to supply electricity for the city of Albany for 3 to 4 days. Atom for atom, the energy released by the burning of this amount of coal compared with that released by the splitting of the fissionable atoms in this cylinder of uranium bears the ratio of one for coal to tens of millions for atom splitting.

These forces within the nucleus are so fundamental that it is of the utmost importance that they should be understood—in their essentials—by all of us. Here are two facts of the greatest importance to every living being the world over.

First. Mankind has probably learned more in the past 30 years about atomic forces than in all the preceding centuries.

Second. Within the next few years, a decade perhaps, if the people of this country make it plain that they are determined that this Nation shall lead the world in pressing forward in this field—we should be in a position to unlock new knowledge about life and matter and growth and disease and suffering so that wholly new concepts of human life will follow in the wake of this new knowledge.

New knowledge is the very lifeblood of progress in a country such as ours; new knowledge is the foundation of our military strength.

A major part of this search for new knowledge that may yield majestic benefits for man is going on here in the State of New York.

Under contract with the Atomic Energy Commission, the University of Rochester is carrying on a research program in medicine and biochemistry so extensive that the Commission has just undertaken to construct at the university a 6-floor building to house this work. This will include the training of doctors in how to use atomic energy as a new instrument for diagnosis and treatment of disease. At Rochester, medical science is seeking ways of preventing and treating radiation harm to human beings, a matter of vital concern in a world that must consider the possibility of some day being involved in atomic warfare. At Rochester they are using radioactive substances produced in the Commission's nuclear energy furnace at Oak Ridge to trace the causes of many diseases, including cancer, and to progress toward the hope for cure of this dread disease.

In Schenectady, the General Electric Co., under contract with the Commission, is developing the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory. There nuclear scientists and engineers will tackle the long series of problems that have to be solved before we shall be able to produce electricity from atomic energy.

Cornell at Ithaca is a leader in using radioactive and stable isotopes from the atomic furnaces at Oak Ridge to seek out new knowledge of plant growth, so that plants may be helped to produce more food, at less cost, from each acre of land and each hour of labor. This work is not part of any Atomic Energy Commission project. It is made possible, however, by the fact that the radioactive isotopes—the tagged atoms—used in these new lines of research can be produced in such variety and quantity and so inexpensively in the Commission's nuclear reactors at Oak Ridge.

In short, at Rochester, Schenectady, and Ithaca there is leadership in the scientific and technical drive of this Nation to claim for its people and the world's people three great possible benefits of the atomic age: (1) New knowledge that will aid in diagnosing and treating diseases that shorten and burden man's days; (2) new knowledge and new know-how that will bring to the service of men more mechanical power to lift his load of drudgery and free him to develop further the things of the mind and the spirit; (3) new knowledge that will help to increase the annual yield from the soil of the earth and the toil of the farmers, and thus to overcome one of the greatest threats of this century—the fact that world population is now increasing faster than world food production.

Underpinning all of these applications of science to the service of man is the research into the basic nature of the nucleus of the atom and its behavior under different conditions. Here, too, New York State is the site of research work of the utmost importance. At Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island—old Camp Upton—nine of the great universities of this country (including Cornell, Columbia, and Rochester) have joined together and under contract with the Commission are operating a large segment of the entire basic research program of the Nation in this field.

I have referred by way of illustration to some of the kinds of information the American public must have, through the press and otherwise, if it is to make informed decisions on the issues of atomic-energy development. There is another side to this coin. Congress has forbidden public issuance of a considerable range of information. In the law this is called "restricted data"; information that might be altogether too interesting to individuals and nations who are potential enemies of the United States.

Congress has placed severe penalties on revelation of restricted data. But it is not so much the risk of incurring penalties that deter reporters, editors, broadcasters, and speakers from the use of restricted data; rather it is their genuine desire to avoid harm to the Nation's defense and security.

The first problem of the press and other media is to know what is restricted data—the information that the Congress has directed, in general terms, should not be published.[1]

The press here is in an impossible situation unless it has some guidance from the Commission that under the law has been made responsible for determining from time to time just what is secret and what is not. No one can put a piece of copy or a picture or an article alongside the brief definition of restricted data in the act and say with certainty whether it does or does not contain restricted data. Even the scientists and engineers working in the atomic-energy projects cannot decide this for themselves. Therefore the Commission maintains a declassification system, originated uner the Manhattan district. Working in this system, passing judgment on all copy submitted from inside or outside the project, are more than 120 high-ranking scientists, engineers, and technicians, each expert in one line of subject matter, each familiar with his phase of our Declassification Guide, a secret document developed by a group of the Nation's top scientists saying what may be published and what must be withheld. This system is complicated, but it is rather well administered and it works more rapidly than you would expect.

So there is a way, a fairly precise way, for determining whether any piece of copy or picture or anything else for publication originating inside or outside the atomic energy projects contains or does not contain restricted data. The Commission will put this machinery at the disposal of any newspaper, periodical, radio broadcaster, lecturer, or picture service man who wishes to have copy examined. A division called the Public and Technical Information Service will handle the copy, and give the person asking for the service the judgment of our scientific reviewers on whether it contains restricted data.

To manage both the security guidance and the positive information service for all media of public communication, the Commission maintains a small public information staff—four in Washington, one at each of the five managerial offices elsewhere in the United States. This staff, to the limits of its capacity, will help your Washington bureaus, and your home staffs, if they request help, in all possible ways.

I have emphasized somewhat this matter of security guidance because it is a new thing under the American journalistic sun. Now let me turn to the equally important function of accounting to the public through the press and other media on that part of the costly and important national atomic energy program that can and should be freely and fully reported.

Let me assure you first that there is no scarcity of information free and open to the technical community, and, if it wants it, to the press and other media. Quite the contrary. In the past year, our reviewers declassified more than 1,200 technical dissertations averaging 20 pages each. The Commission has under way the publication of a National Nuclear Energy Series of technical data that will run to more than 100 500-page volumes, 21 of which already are prepared up to the point of readiness for the press.[2] So that there is a great volume of material open already to technical and scientific men, and to the press, if it desires to use it. I have here a book 2 inches thick which contains the abstracts of the declassified literature in this field issued in the past 2 years. This book and the papers which it lists can be consulted any time by any newsman through our Public and Technical Information Service.

The Commission does not intend to undertake the popularization, for the press and other media of this material. We are proceeding on the assumption—and correctly, I believe—that the American press wants to do its own analyzing and interpreting and reporting of public data. The Commission wants to confine itself to making the information available, and to count upon the existing informational and educational system of this Nation—notably the press and radio, and the schools and universities—to do the actual reporting and teaching and interpreting.

To repeat: The Atomic Energy Commission does have a duty to provide guidance regarding security. But most of the information—and I cannot emphasize this too strongly—most of the information necessary for an understanding of the fundamentals of atomic energy and the formulation of public policy has long since been public, and some of it since before the war.

The Commission does have an information responsibility, but it is a limited one—and it should be kept limited. That is our firm intention. We are opposed to building up a large information staff for the dissemination and interpretation of information about atomic energy or about the work of the Commission. There is a strong and wise tradition in this country against anything in a Government information operation that smacks of propaganda; or of promotion for the prestige of particular Government agencies or the men who temporarily are directing them. It is of the utmost importance that under no pretext, excuse, or justification of "national security" should the Atomic Energy Commission or any other agency create information or public-relations staffs beyond (1) the minimum actually required for security service to those writers or speakers who desire it, and (2) that staff required to provide such positive information service as the press and other members of the public explicitly require and request. Last week a special Committee on Atomic Energy appointed from its membership by the President of the American Society of Newspaper Editors began an independent inquiry for the society into the Commission's information problems and how they can best meet the needs of the press. This is a step we welcome.[3]

Congress recognized the central importance of public information in developing American policy in this new and often bewildering field. In the Atomic Energy Act there is a remarkable declaration of policy, one that is without precedent so far as I know. Here is the language of the law:

"The effect of the use of atomic energy for civilian purposes upon the social, economic, and political structures of today cannot now be determined. It is a field in which unknown factors are involved. Therefore any legislation will necessarily be subject to revision from time to time." The paragraph then concludes: "It is reasonable to anticipate, however, that tapping this new source of energy will cause profound changes in our present way of life."

Congress then proceeded to design special legislative machinery to make this declaration effective. The Commission does, of course, report regularly to the whole Congress but these reports, made semiannually, contain only nonsecret information. To insure, therefore, that as far as possible your representatives, the representatives of the whole people, are kept currently informed, that they have the facts including secret data, Congress established a permanent Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of nine Senators and nine Representatives. To this committee, which is thus in a position to consider in an informed way the public views and those of their colleagues in the Congress, and those of the executive branch, the Congress looks for guidance on broad policy decisions.

The present membership of this 18-man permanent committee is an indication of the importance Congress itself assigns to it in charting the difficult policy course ahead. Its chairman is Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, a former governor of that State, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, an experienced administrator as well as legislator. Its vice chairman is Representative W. STERLING COLE, of Ithaca, in this State, who, as you know, is among the most respected and influential Members of the House, with long experience in matters of national security. The committee includes the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY, of Michigan and Texas; it includes Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, who as chairman of the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy in the Seventy-ninth Congress, sponsored the Atomic Energy Act and who follows with keen interest the international situation on atomic energy control; it includes Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado, chairman of the Finance Committee. On the roster of the committee are other men of both chambers most of whose names and reputations are familiar to you. In all, the committee is unusually broadly representative of the country, both geographically and in its group interests.

The setting up of this permanent high-level joint committee, aided by a staff under the direction of Mr. Fred B. Rhodes, is an example of the political inventiveness which has characterized American history from the founding of the Republic. Increasingly as time goes on the people of this country will come to look to this committee as a principal means whereby the broad policy decisions that atomic energy will require may be studied, weighed, and recommendations reported to the Congress as a whole, and to the people. The very fact of the existence of the joint congressional committee is security against the exercise of arbitrary power by the Commission, while we on the Commission, vested with a kind of quite terrible responsibility, find in it a great reassurance.

This joint committee mechanism, functioning in the objectives and earnest spirit which has motivated it, seems to me one of the most important facts in the atomic energy picture, and among those that needs to be better and more widely known and understood by newsmen and the general public.

Among the most important decisions in our history as a Nation will be those made concerning the course and direction of atomic energy development, and the uses to which this new force is put. These decisions will affect our most cherished institutions. They will have—they have already had—a deep and pervasive effect upon our relations with other nations and peoples of the world, and perhaps upon the very preservation of freedom in the world. These will not be scientific nor technical decisions. They will be human decisions, decisions about human organization, about our way of life, about the relations of science to well-being, about the issues of peace, or of war, war of a destructiveness beyond our imagination.

Those decisions will be made with wide understanding by the people of the facts, of the consequences of the decisions, that is to say, in accordance with the democratic process, or these decisions will be made without understanding, made in the darkness, made under the compulsions of hysteria and fear, not of reason and judgment.

It will be your job, in my opinion, not only to disseminate the underlying facts, within the limits of security, but to interpret and give meaning to those facts. It will be your task to see that your public servants, legislative and executive, are held to the highest standards of performance, to see to it that atomic energy shall never become the victim of petty politics or narrow partisanship. It will be your job not simply to increase public knowledge but what is equally important, to make that knowledge effective in determining the course of the Republic. It is for such a historic and fateful function as this that through more than 150 years this Nation has never wavered in its determination that the schools, the churches, and the press shall remain vigorous, independent, and free.

[1] Sec. 10 (b) (1) of the Atomic Energy Act provides: "The term 'restricted data' as used in this section means all data concerning the manufacture or utilization of atomic weapons, the production of fissionable material, or the use of fissionable material in the production of power, but shall not include any data which the Commission from time to time determines may be published without adversely affecting the common defense and security."

[2] Sec. 10 (a) (2) of the Atomic Energy Act provides the following as a policy to guide Commission action: "That the dissemination of scientific and technical information relating to atomic energy should be permitted and encouraged so as to provide that free interchange of ideas and criticisms which is essential to scientific progress."

[3] The membership of this Committee of the ASNE is as follows: Gideon Seymour, executive editor, Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune, chairman; W. S. Gilmore, editor in chief, Detroit News; B. M. McKelway, editor, Washington Star; C. G. Wellington, managing editor, Kansas City Star; Laurence L. Winship, managing editor, Boston Globe; Paul C. Smith, editor-manager, San Francisco Chronicle.

Increase in Veterans' On-the-Job Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON C. JONES
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a bill to increase the monthly maximum allowed to veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education or on-the-job training, known as the Kearney bill, was referred to our committee, as you know, on January 3, 1947, and was referred to the Rules Committee on February 26, 1947. Between the period of January 3, 1947, and February 26, 1947, the committee considered this bill very carefully and we think reasonably after hearing representatives of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Veterans of World War II, regular veterans' organizations, Member of Congress, and the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. All have expressed their views or the subject.

The change is not a great one from the old ceiling of $175 and $200 per month, but it takes in a group of veterans who are not making more than these amounts and gives them the necessary help to really live on a decent scale. It is admitted to be true that many of these boys do not have jobs that would earn for them more than $175 to $200 per month and with the old ceiling they were getting no help from the Government whatsoever and were not making enough to really live decently. The change from $175 and $200 to $250 for a veteran with dependents; $325 for a veteran with one dependent and $350 for a veteran with two or more dependents is not a great one, but it is one that is very helpful to many deserving veterans who need help in getting launched in their life work after being interrupted by serving in the armed forces of our country.

Under the old bill, a single veteran got $175 and the married veteran got $200. They would get no assistance whatsoever, but with a veteran earning $185 a month, he would get $65 per month, if single, totaling $250. If married and thereby having one dependent and if he were earning $210 per month, he would then have a $90 supplement which would give him $300 per month. Of course if he had two or more dependents, which

would entitle him to the full ceiling, and earns $260, with his subsistence allowance of $90, he would receive $350. These rises are not excessive as the committee views it and we felt that the House would approve them.

Under the old regime, there was an apparent hardship and rather a restraint on ambition and tended to keep veterans from entering on-the-job training courses because they could not live on the amount as fixed by the old ceilings. So, as I have previously stated, these figures were not arbitrarily selected but agreed to after very careful hearings and consideration by the committee which voted unanimously to include them in the bill.

We feel that the ceilings are not at all excessive, but are fixed in the recognition of the ever-increasing cost of living and helping the veteran who is trying to learn a trade and at the same time maintain a decent standard of living. The additional amount required to increase these ceilings is not very much. It is well justified, as the stimulus it would give to so many veterans to get started in a trade in the right manner and at the same time have a decent living while in training.

I would like to call to the attention of the House that the Veterans' Affairs Committee has not been dilatory in passing this bill, as this was done on February 26, 1947. We acted early in the previous session on this important matter, so we feel the bill should be passed at once.

I was in my district, and particularly in the city of Charlotte during the recess, and I found many of the veterans anxious to know just what the increase of ceilings was going to be so that they could make their plans accordingly. It is natural for them to want to know whether or not they would have a decent living while training on the job, and they are anxiously awaiting the action of the House in this important matter.

I might say that there were 21,000 men in the armed forces from Charlotte and Mecklenburg County, N. C., and about an equal amount in the other counties of the Tenth Congressional District. These veterans are all anxious to have this matter definitely settled and the slight increases made in the ceilings, for on-the-job training would help them.

"Thou Shalt Not Succeed"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the United States News of February 6, 1948:

"THOU SHALT NOT SUCCEED"
(By David Lawrence)

(Program for breaking up profit-and-loss system set forth in study of oil industry. Large companies held to be monopolies merely because of size. Antitrust action invited when business becomes successful and efficient.)

Radicalism is always difficult to combat when it skulks behind a tree.

Radicalism, however, in America has finally come out into the open. It seeks to demolish the profit-and-loss system and to substitute a system of state socialism or state capitalism.

The main purpose, of course, is to break up industry, disintegrate its efficient units, demoralize the whole economic system and make it impossible for businesses to get capital from frightened investors and thus introduce Government capital and Government control under the guise of emergency.

The plain implications of the radical viewpoint were set forth by a group of five Yale University professors in a book published last week by the Yale University Press at New Haven, Conn.

The book is entitled "A National Policy for the Oil Industry," but it applies as well to all other industries and might better have been entitled "A National Policy for Breaking up Large and Efficient Units of American Business."

The project is described on the title page as one of a series designed to present the result of studies made in the course of an interdepartmental program of research in national policy, organized at Yale University in 1946, by members of the department of economics and political science, and the school of law.

Funds for the project were furnished by the Carnegie Corp. which, it is stated, is supporting the Yale program of research in national policy, and by the Ganson Goodyear Depew Memorial Fund.

It is ironical that the funds for the propagation of a doctrine of destruction of our economic system should have come down from men who earned their surplus in life through the system of private initiative.

TECHNIQUES OF DESTRUCTION

But the study is to be welcomed. It tells frankly the technique whereby the American system can be broken into small pieces. The book will challenge the interest of the American people as the first comprehensive outline of the weapons of law and pseudo-constitutionalism which the radicals would like to use to bring on state capitalism.

Nowhere in the book is there, of course, any precise advocacy of such an ultimate course. It isn't necessary. Anyone may see the formula plainly.

Thus the book glorifies the Sherman antitrust law as an instrument of progress. With an enthusiasm that amounts almost to exultation, the authors point to the Supreme Court decision last year in the tobacco cases as affording an opportunity at last to break down large businesses.

THE CRIME OF SUCCESS

It isn't necessary any more, say the Yale professors, to prove conspiracy to fix prices or to prove the existence of any so-called evil practices. All that's necessary is to show that businesses are big and that whenever they want to act together, they can do so. Eugene V. Rostow, professor of law and a member of the graduate faculty of economics at Yale, is the principal author. He states the case quite bluntly, if not naively, as follows:

"Painstaking search for scraps of evidence with a conspiratorial atmosphere are no longer necessary. There need be no parade of small businessmen as witnesses to testify that they have been driven from the trade, and their lives ruined, by the ruthless squeeze of monopolistic pressure. Under the tobacco case, the economic fact of monopoly is very close to being the legal proof of monopoly. The decisive elements are the power to assert a degree of control over price and output in the market as a whole; and the power to deter or discourage potential competition."

There it is at last in plain view—the mere economic fact of large size and efficiency is proof of monopoly. Success is the crime.

The Yale professors' study raises and answers some possible objections to its own conclusions.

First of all, there's the little matter of efficiency. Yes; it says, large units are efficient but efficiency can be obtained in other ways, such as the elimination of large expenditures for selling.

Then there is the question of getting working capital. Yes; it says, large companies do raise money more cheaply because of their record of success while smaller companies have difficulty. But, after all, reasons Mr. Rostow, why should a little thing like a defect in the capital markets or its ways and customs interfere with the steps necessary to reorganize an industry.

Presumably if the capital markets rebel at furnishing capital to broken-up units of the oil industry, the Government can step in. And, of course, Government capital under a system of State socialism sets up its own restrictions of control and selects its own executives and builds up its own political bureaucracy.

The study anticipates the argument that reorganization of the oil industry would disturb the market value of outstanding securities and shake the faith of investors in all industry.

To this, the Yale professors answer that to consider any such contingency would make the Sherman law "nugatory."

It is admitted in the Yale study that to line up as many as 20 oil companies as defendants because they control a total of 80 percent of the volume of business in the industry, might be novel but the Department of Justice is nevertheless pointedly invited to try it.

What this study centers on, to be sure, is the claim that identity of price as between competitors, known in business as the natural or stabilized price, is unlawful under the Sherman law. What is sought evidently is to force instability of prices, if not of profits, and substitute for the natural appraisals by management of sales and costs a factor of artificiality or perhaps a public-utility regulating process.

The corner grocer sells his sugar at the same price as the competitor across the street. He must now put his price 1 cent lower or 1 cent higher to avoid identical price making. He may lose money on the former and lose his market on the latter, but apparently if a competitor preempts a particular price level, he must choose another price.

GOOSE STEPPING TO EFFICIENCY

Certainly there would be an elimination of expenses in many an oil company if half the filling stations in the country were abolished. Lots of ways could be found to reduce expenses if the Government controlled everything. Indeed, half of the restaurants or eating places could be abolished if the American people would only agree to a staggered system for lunch and dinner. If a certain number would eat lunch at 11, 11:30, 12, 12:30, 1, 1:30, 2, and 2:30, it would eliminate a lot of waiters and waitresses. It would reduce expenses, and we would all goose step to meals as prescribed by government.

But who wants that? Isn't it a citizen's privilege to eat when he pleases or to motor along the highway and fill his gas tank when he pleases?

What is involved in the Yale study may be found in nearly all blueprints for governmental control of the economic system—a theoretical justification for the elimination of waste and a theoretical claim that large-sized operations do not mean efficiency or low prices.

THE RIGHT TO SUCCEED

The contrary can be proved by fair examination of the facts. What American businesses furnish the American people is a service unparalleled anywhere in the world. Quantity production has given us cheap transportation, cheap tires, cheap gasoline, cheap appliances for the household under a standard of living higher than that of any other people, including socialistic England and communistic Russia.

Large businesses nowadays are not owned by a few individuals as in yesteryears. Today stockholders are numbered in the tens of thousands in almost all large companies. The public which has saved its money invests in these large companies with the hope of getting the fruit of long days of labor.

The Yale book is important because it reflects to no small extent the views of the "trust-busting" school of thought in the Department of Justice, where antitrust suits are filed by the dozens with funds supplied by a none too vigilant Congress.

"Thou Shalt Not Succeed" is the new commandment from the radical dictatorship.

The right to succeed is, however, the real incentive to American progress. It is a prime requisite if the American people are to enjoy the "privileges and immunities" set forth in a Constitution designed to safeguard the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Boom-Bust Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marquis Childs, from the Washington Post of Thursday, February 5, 1948:

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)

BOOM-BUST TAX CUT

Now that the Republicans in the House have had their fun with an old-fashioned boom-and-bust tax-cut bill, the Senate will get down to the serious business of drafting a measure that can be passed over the President's veto. The cut finally approved is likely to be less than half of the $6,500,000,000 which Representative Harold Knutson, in the role of heedless Santa Claus, dangled before the voters.

In the Senate more cautious Republicans are discussing a cut of two and a half or three billions. This is a frank recognition that most of the big talk about slashing the Truman budget is just political talk in a political year.

There seems little doubt but that a measure will be framed which can be passed over the President's veto. One thing it will contain for certain is the community-property provision enabling husbands and wives to divide one income and thereby pay at a lower tax rate. Since 12 States now have laws permitting such a division of income, it is only fair that the same provision should apply to all married taxpayers.

The final bill will also contain increased exemptions for individual taxpayers and some relief for corporations. In short, it will be a political compromise aimed at appeasing the largest number of voters while doing the minimum of damage insofar as national and international responsibilities are concerned.

This is the intention, at any rate, of those Republicans who are acutely aware of the spectacle in the House. Such blithe spirits as KNUTSON may feel that six and one-half billions is a good vote catcher. But even this is doubtful.

The other day, Speaker JOE MARTIN made a speech that didn't sound like the shrewd, able politician from Massachusetts. He solemnly warned of a plot to sabotage Congress and undermine the faith of the people in representative government.

Obviously Speaker MARTIN failed to realize how close to home he was hitting. The real saboteurs are the irresponsibles in Congress. Faith is destroyed by those who indulge in nose-thumbing political gestures, willing to take a chance that someone will save them from the full consequences of their irresponsibility.

KNUTSON is an interesting example. Giving his home as a summer resort in Minnesota and vacationing each year in Florida, he may just possibly be a little out of touch with the problems of ordinary citizens in this period of inflation.

From a reader comes a comment on President Truman's proposal to increase the personal exemption of each individual by $40. This has been laughed at as a cheap bait of the Knutson variety. But the following grass roots point of view is different:

"I would like to take exception to your expressed viewpoint that a tax cut would be inflationary. At least in my own case I do not see how it could contribute to inflation.

"If the tax cut were confined to those suffering from malnutrition because they can't buy enough foodstuffs to allow them a proper diet, in a case of this nature how could it contribute to inflation? In our case we get enough to eat, even though it has reached the point where we are having to draw on our small savings that we were able to make during the war years. These savings were made possible by long hours, but not at the prevailing high wartime wages.

"I made 80 cents per hour during part of the war and 94 cents per hour the latter part of the war. I get $1.12 now, which for 45 hours and 20 minutes per week, gives me a net take-home amount of $51.96 to support myself, wife, and two children.

"If we were given the benefit of Mr. Truman's plan of $40 per person off, I don't see how we could buy any more and thus add to the scarcity problem. But his relief plan would, I believe, make it possible for us to get by on what I am earning and thus stop the drain on our savings, which we desire to hold as a buffer against emergencies, medical expenses, hospital bills, and so forth."

Chairman KNUTSON, now on his Florida vacation, might be surprised at how many families these days are having to dip into their savings. It is a fairly common experience of those who are trying to maintain something like the standards of the past. But whether the Knutson across-the-board tax cut would give them any real relief is quite another matter. It would inject another $6,500,000,000 into the already swollen money stream.

Untimely Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star:

UNTIMELY TAX CUT

The temper of Congress—and presumably of the people—being what it is, any protest against a tax cut this year probably is futile. Nevertheless, the protest should be made, for this is not the time to be cutting taxes.

With a margin of more than enough votes to override a veto, the House again has called for tax reduction. This latest measure would take 6,000,000 people off the tax rolls and reduce revenues by $6,800,000,000. This is accomplished principally by increased exemptions, a sliding-scale percentage cut in the tax rate, and by adoption of the community-property principle.

In normal times this would be a good tax-reduction program. But these times are not normal.

One of the reasons for the present inflation is that the supply of dollars in the hands of consumers is greater than the supply of goods. The effect of this is to force prices up and the addition of $6,500,000,000 to the volume of purchasing power is almost certain to drive prices still higher. The national debt stands at $256,000,000,000. It is imperative that this debt be reduced, and a maximum reduction ought to be made when the national income is high, as it is now. The Republicans hope that they can provide for tax reduction and still reduce the debt this year by $2,600,000,000. That is an optimistic estimate, but even if it should prove valid, the fact remains that at this rate it would take 99 years to pay the debt, and this is without any allowance for the lean years that are bound to come.

Finally there is the fact, largely ignored when taxes are under discussion in a campaign year, that this country is more at war than at peace. With international conditions as they are, we cannot afford to take the chances that might be taken in a tranquil world. If we have any margin of revenue over and above a proper debt reduction, that margin should be used to strengthen our defenses and to finance the countermoves we are making in the face of Russian expansion. This is a field in which there can be no certain cost figures, but we would be wiser to plan on spending more rather than less than the current estimates.

These considerations point to one conclusion. Any tax reduction now is inimical to the best interests of the Nation. But if, for reasons of domestic politics, some tax reduction is inevitable this year, then the cut should be held to the lowest figure possible. There are members of the Senate, where the bill now goes, who share this view, and they should be given every support.

Border War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of Tuesday, January 27, 1948:

BORDER WAR
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

While you are worrying about the possibility of meat rationing, you might as well do some thinking about what to do if there's no meat to ration. And if you can't imagine such a thing, then here are some facts:

Sometime in 1946 some bulls were imported into Mexico from Brazil.

On December 26, 1946, a major catastrophe was announced in Mexico.

Cattle were found to be dying of an infection called hoof-and-mouth disease. This is one of the world's great scourges, as mysterious and deadly among animals as influenza among people.

Humans do not ordinarily contract the disease, but if they so much as walk on the ground in an infected area they can track the germs into fresh territory with disaster to cattle and hogs.

People who do not know much about the hoof and mouth disease take it lightly. Such are the ones who are always screeching that the cattle barons of the United States of America are playing dirty in opposing the importation of Argentine beef here.

The cattle barons were long-headed enough some years ago to support a treaty between the United States of America, Canada, and Mexico under the terms of which none of the three ccuntries would import cattle or meat products from infected countries.

The people who screeched, said:

"It's all for monopoly. Look at the Argentine. They have plenty of beef down there. Other countries buy Argentine beef. Hoof and mouth disease is highly over-rated as a menace."

The screechers ignored the lesson of Holland which imported uncontrolled items in the cattle line and was swept by hoof-and-mouth disease with absolutely disastrous results. They ignored the fact that Argentina's vast open ranges, as compared to our highly developed cattle country, are the last in the world that can find room for both infected and healthy animals in any numbers.

But the case of Mexico is so near to home that now the screechers, perhaps too late, are suddenly silent. The great Henry Luce, who sees all, knows all, and tells all, was one of the loud thumpers against the cattle control policy for years.

But what has happened to Mexico has even shut him up and that is a monumental achievement, though expensive, for he and the other meddlers were encouraging Mexico in its violation of the non-importation treaty.

What has happened to Mexico is this:

Since 1946, hoof-and-mouth disease has swept the whole central belt of the Mexican peninsula. The government of Mexico, admitting its inability to do anything, has called on the United States of America, for rescue.

Our Department of Agriculture has several hundred experts down there buying up, shooting, and burning animals in the infected areas. The United States taxpayers, of course, are footing the bill and it runs into many millions.

The Mexican farmers are squawking. What good is money, they say, when they lose cattle for reproduction and get no replacement animals?

Of course, there is no help for that. They lose from the disease anyhow, but they are ignorant people and don't think it that far through. They are resisting the quarantine and that is tragic, because the quarantine can barely hope to succeed even with full cooperation.

It is not succeeding, now. The quarantine line is slowly but surely retreating northward.

The Agriculture Department says it has a new vaccine that hasn't been tried cut in Mexico yet but is supposed to immunize animals for 6 to 8 months. Not good enough.

Only complete immunization will make the meat supply of the United States of America safe.

The United States is loafing on its job. The Mexican project is nothing like strong enough. A more stringent quarantine and a really full-scale vaccine effort are absolutely essential.

To quote the world's ablest cattleman, Robert J. Kleberg, head of the King ranch in Texas:

"The hour is late. Much valuable time has been lost. The job can be done only with the full cooperation of all departments of Government both here and in Mexico."

Our Government is a huge and many sided bureaucratic organization. It is slow to move on anything, no matter how important.

If you are looking for something about which to write in to Congress and the President, needle them all to get going against hoof-and-mouth disease.

Otherwise you may wake up one bright day and find no meat to eat around here and we'll be down on our knees to Peron, of the Argentine, for some scraps of his leftovers.

Our Contradictory Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, you can imagine the bewilderment of the average American today in regard to our so-called foreign policy, when even the experts are puzzled by the various contradictory moves that are being made by those who are in power in the executive branch of our Government, or one of its adjuncts.

Not long ago, you will recall, President Truman was asked if he did not consider it contradictory that we were shipping locomotives and freight cars to Poland, a nation that is definitely inside the iron curtain and most positively in the Russian economic orbit.

Believe it or not, the President blandly replied that there was no contradiction between shipping freight cars and locomotives to Poland, while at the same time shipping materials to western European nations in an effort to stop totalitarianism.

Now we have the news that the World Bank, which is financed almost wholly with American tax money, has decided to grant Poland's request for a loan of $60,000,000, ostensibly to allow Poland to modernize its coal mines.

This news comes on the threshold of the time we here in the House of Representatives will be asked to appropriate from five to fifteen billion dollars for western Europe to stop communism. Stripped of its bare essentials, that is exactly what the so-called Marshall plan is, and everybody knows it, a proposal to stop communism. It is a WPA way of trying to win friends and influence people. Now, apparently, we are trying to play WPA to our enemies as well as to the folks we hope to make our friends.

A most pertinent article concerning this World Bank loan to Poland has been written by the well-known foreign correspondent, Constantine Brown, and published in the Evening Star for February 3, 1948. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article.

I, for one, cannot understand how any man, however benighted or however cynical, can defend this loan and our other shipments of goods to Russia and at the same time urge the enactment of the so-called Marshall plan to build up a bulwark against communism in western Europe. The actions are contradictory, two timing, anomalous, and just downright stupid. One set of actions may be defended logically by itself, but playing both ends against the middle—the middle in this case being the American taxpayer—is not only ridiculous, it is inexcusably stupid.

THIS CHANGING WORLD—WORLD BANK APPROVAL OF POLISH LOAN SEEN AS LATEST OF DIPLOMATIC PUZZLES

(By Constantine Brown)

The World Bank has decided to grant Poland's request for a loan of $60,000,000, earmarked, according to bank officials, for the purchase of equipment to modernize the Polish coal mines.

This loan is being made in spite of the fact that Poland is spending many millions of dollars for military training of all her citizens between the ages of 16 and 21, and in spite of the fact that Hilary Minc, Polish Minister of National Economy, has just returned from Moscow with a new Russian trade agreement in his pocket.

The loan has been under discussion for about 18 months since Poland applied for a $600,000,000 credit, but the amount was too large to be floated in this country under the guaranty of the World Bank.

FOUND POOR RISK

Last summer a commission representing the bank, under the chairmanship of John J. McCloy, went to Warsaw to study the question on the spot. Mr. McCloy returned to Washington with the conclusion that Poland was a poor risk for a big loan, but a limited sum—about 10 percent of that asked by Warsaw—could be made available from funds still available in the bank.

The chairman was of the belief that purchase of new tools for the Polish mining industry would increase its output substantially and thus would help the Marshall plan. Poland's leaders had intimated that the increased production would be shipped to western Europe to relieve shortages of coal.

Although the heads of the World Bank pointed out that only economic considerations were taken into account in granting loans, it was admitted off the record that political solvency together with the applicant's leanings in the present international set-up had to be taken occasionally into consideration, particularly since the vast majority of the bank's funds came from American taxpayers.

Last fall the bank considered Poland a poor risk. A congressional group which visited Poland last September came to the same conclusion. The congressional group, headed by Senator SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, and Representative MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, at the end of their visit received from our Embassy in Warsaw a confidential outline of Poland's economic and political situation. This contained the conclusion that "every dollar given Poland under the present set-up is a dollar given to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Ever since the Polish Government was recognized by other powers, it has showed itself to be nothing but an obedient stooge of Moscow. The men at its head were carefully hand-picked by the Politbureau and blindly obeyed orders from Moscow. On orders from their superiors, they went out of their way in their effort to side-step agreements with the United States and to humiliate the citizens and official representatives of this country on every possible occasion.

NOT A FREE AGENT

The Chairman and other directors of the World Bank were obliged to take cognizance of these facts. Moreover, they had been told that existing treaties between Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were so tight that Poland had ceased to be a free agent and was in no position to live up to its international commitments.

The bank was warned that whether Polish coal would be sent to western Europe depended entirely on Russia's mood. Economic treaties between Moscow and Warsaw are so worded that the former can give them any interpretation it desires.

The study by World Bank experts was completed last fall but no action was taken because, in the words of some responsible bank officials, the results of the Big Three Conference in London had to be seen.

The conference failed and the policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics toward the Western World became more aggressive. Yet high officials of the State and Commerce Departments indicated to the bank's American Chairman last month that they no longer opposed the $60,000,000 loan to Poland, in view of the increasing deterioration in relations between the United States and the nations behind the iron curtain.

What has persuaded the State and Commerce Departments to approve the idea is one of those diplomatic puzzles which have harassed the American people since the end of the war.

Address of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by the distinguished Speaker of the House to the conference of small-business organizations on February 3, 1948:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

It is a pleasure to address a group of small businessmen. I, too, am a small businessman. Therefore, I feel quite at home in this gathering. I can appreciate and sympathize with your problems. I have had to meet problems of a similar nature. I know the headaches incidental to running a little business—material shortages, labor shortages, customers' complaints, high taxes, governmental interferences. I am also familiar with its rewards. They are rich and good. Not in a monetary sense, but in a spiritual sense.

We small-business people find ourselves important cogs in our home communities. Our customers are our friends and neighbors. We share their smiles and their heartaches. We watch their babies grow into awkward boys and giggling girls, and later become men and women of substance. We often help in that transformation. Our part in the life of America may be unsung, but it is indelibly imprinted on our times.

The small businessman is the backbone of business, just as the small farmer is the backbone of agriculture. The small-business venture is home owned, home operated, and staffed by home labor. It is the mainstay of thousands of communities. In the fiscal year 1947 small business employed 45 percent of all persons employed. His employees are not only employees—they are his friends. This Nation grew great because small business and the small farmer started us on the road to greatness. And they are today helping us stay great. That is why we must give them a chance to live and prosper.

In the past 15 years the tremendous contribution of small business has gone largely unappreciated. Queer policies prevailed and a strange assortment of theorists thought they knew more about business than the business people did. They were advocates of governmental controls. To be a businessman was almost discreditable. To be a successful businessman was, to the theorist, disgraceful. To provide good jobs for people was to be branded an oppressor of the workers and a reactionary. Consequently, the little businessman found himself in a squeeze play between big business, big taxes, and big demagogs.

During the last 15 or 16 years the small businessmen have had few friends in Washington bureaucratic circles. He was the real forgotten man. He could not make frequent expensive trips to Washington, or hire high-priced agents to protect his interests. During that time he was harassed almost beyond endurance. Bureaucrats hounded him from morning until night. He was compelled to report to Washington over and over again a chronological list of his activities. In his nightmares he saw countless Government forms to be filled out—more than 76,000 administrative regulations, wrapped up in 93,000,000 words, regulations having the force of law, beset and bedeviled him. In many instances he was summarily denied recourse to the courts. Bureaucratic arrogance was in the saddle. Bureaucratic theorists tried to tell him how to run his business. They told him what he could sell, what he could buy. They told the farmers to take the horse's shoes off at night to save metal. They ordered slaughterhouses not to butcher any more "female steers". They tried to tell women what to wear, and men what not to wear. Never before was there such a carnival of dunce-witted government by decree. The fuss-budgets had a great time. Spenders and wasters were in the saddle driving hellbent for ruin.

Small businessmen and farmers found Washington had a passion for regulation, but no talent for it. If a businessman made an honest mistake or inadvertently overcharged a customer, he was often hailed into court to pay a fine.

Pressure from Washington became so great, finally, that many small businessmen could stand no more. They closed the doors of their establishments, many of which had been in operation for years. We here can understand and sympathize with their bitter disillusionment. They had literally been hounded out of business by their own Government. As far back as 1939 it was my privilege to appoint the first Small Business Study Committee. This led to the creation of official committees and helped to give the little businessman a break.

Many of you in this very audience, no doubt, can recall trips made to Washington in war days. Many of you can recall fruitless and frustrating visits to the War and Navy Departments, the War Production Board, and other wartime agencies of the Government. You pleaded with the bureaucrats to be permitted to use your facilities to speed production of war necessities. If anybody ever got the merry run around, you did. You were made to feel that instead of trying to help, you were actually in the way. After days of humiliation, of futile assaults on the citadel of official red tape, you returned to your own community sadder, madder, but wiser men.

Under the continuous urging of the Congress, the small businessman was reluctantly permitted to make a greater contribution to the war effort. This contribution aided in bringing the conflict to a more speedy end, thus saving the lives of countless American boys.

In England the value of widely dispersed small business was clearly shown during the war. Had it not been for small business, England would have perished. Under continuous aerial attack, production in her large plants was constantly disrupted if not completely stopped. Her small business production was decentralized and that saved the day. In another war—and pray God there never is another—small business may be the mainstay of America.

Military planners are assuming air assault is inevitable. They are thinking in terms of decentralized industry. They are well aware this Nation must depend on small business to provide much of our war material. Passing are the days when the small businessman must cool his heels in the outer offices of bureaucrats when he wants to contribute to America's production.

The place of small business in a peacetime economy is vitally important. The world today is divided into two ideological spheres—freedom and communism. Our free economic system is under constant attack from within and from without. Moscow tells the world through its controlled press and radio our American system has failed. The out-and-out Communists within our own borders echo this propaganda. Their fellow travelers give them aid and comfort, using our own Constitution and our own institutions to protect them as they preach their poisonous doctrines. When we seek to curb their seditious activities they screech to high heaven their constitutional rights are being violated. They invoke the very instrument they seek to destroy.

Congress is the target of their special hatred because Congress is their major obstacle. It is the branch of our Government which has met and must continue to meet this challenge to America's well-being. Congress has summarily hailed Communist leaders and their cohorts before its committees. It has uncovered their dangerous practices so all real Americans can see the wicked undercover attempts to destroy our American way of life. Congress has prodded the administration to purge its ranks of those Reds and sympathizers who infiltrated into high places on the Government pay rolls. Congress has served unmistakable notice it will not tolerate traitors in our Government establishments and agencies any longer.

For its courageous and patriotic stand, Congress has been constantly vilified. Though Communists have spearheaded this vicious attack, respectable citizens have unwittingly joined in. It has become too common a practice to belittle the legislative branch of our Government. We see flagrant instances of it in the press and movies. Leftish radio commentators and writers offer further proof of this insidious campaign. The Communists are out to destroy the Congress before the Congress destroys their plans to overthrow our American way of life. Their attacks will not for a moment swerve the Senate and House of Representatives from what they consider to be their patriotic duty. Your legislators will persevere until we have on the statute books adequate laws to deal effectively with traitors. We intend to bring to justice those who are serving the interests of a foreign nation—the only nation

with which there is danger of war. Your Senators and Congressmen will not cease their insistence that the Communists be dismissed from the service of your Government. We shall not let them disrupt the economic life of this country.

Small businessmen will be on the alert not to lend their aid to these un-American elements. The methods Communists use are clever and deceptive. In many cases they mask their activities under respectable cloaks. Citizens must be careful not to become the unwitting tool of the Communists. We must be vigilant against their subtle propaganda. Expose this propaganda and their activities whenever you can.

Today the small businessman is concerned over high prices, high taxes, the high cost of foreign aid, and the threat of more Government regulation. The President, in his state of the Union message to Congress, made it quite clear no tax relief is coming from the administration. He has presented a trick tax proposal which many members of his own party have privately dubbed impractical, and quite obviously political in purpose. It got very little support. We Republicans, after extensive and continuous study, determined to give the overburdened taxpayer real relief.

We do not believe it is necessary to increase the already heavy tax load on business. This would be disastrous to business. It would deprive business of the necessary funds to provide more jobs, increase production, and the lowering of prices. We believe business along with the rest of the taxpayers is entitled to honest tax relief.

It is a curious twist of thinking that the administration should want to load more taxes onto business, while at the same time, in the very same message demanding that business spend $50,000,000,000 for expansion.

We can achieve this objective by effecting long-needed economies in Government operations, economies which will not only permit tax relief, but also a substantial reduction in the huge national debt. Need I add these economies will in nowise impair the efficient functioning of the Government service. They will not be made at the expense of the national defense. We are all aware of the necessity of maintaining a national defense fully adequate to meet any contingency. The administration has clearly indicated it favors a restoration of Government controls. It seems to have inherited some of the views of the previous administration that a free economy is bad. I am indeed sorry there seems to be so little faith in the American system of free enterprise. Respecting the request for stand-by authority to reimpose controls, I have this to say: The special session of the Eightieth Congress gave ample power to deal with the situation as it exists today. This power was in addition to authority already possessed, and which has never been used. They tell us the measure we passed is inadequate before they even try it. No measure can work well if there isn't a will to make it work.

It has been a real pleasure to be with you tonight. In parting I would like to leave this thought with you. The small businessman can do much for good government; he can successfully help mold public thinking along American lines; he can contribute so much toward the elimination of economic evils.

He can help America prove to the world our American system works. Your forefathers believed in America, and they toiled to make it the land we know today. The blood of their courage, their love of liberty, their devotion to American principles, runs through your veins. Major problems confront us and you can help toward their solution by American methods. We need your courage, your independence, your initiative, your inherent honesty. I am sure you will give of it to the utmost.

Today's Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a speech given by the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., at Springfield, Mo., on January 10, 1948:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. In the history of our country and of the world the year 1948 will be one of great challenge, of great responsibility, and of great decision.

Our challenge is to win the peace and to lay the foundations for a cooperating friendly and peaceful world based on the preservation and security of our peoples. Our responsibility is to set the example and to accept the leadership in the struggle to help all nations and all peoples to be spiritually and economically free from domination either by their own state or by another. As a nation, we will meet this challenge and accept our responsibility only if by our decisions in the Congress and at the polls in November we have brought prices under control and have firmly embarked on the European recovery program as set forth in the Marshall plan.

No thinking person can deny that science has made us one interdependent world. During the recent war I learned the terrible effect of the weapons of destruction which were then available. Today, one atom bomb dropped in New York Harbor with a south wind blowing will in 30 minutes destroy 2,000,000 people. Our great problem is a social and political one for we now must learn as human beings to live together with understanding and mutual respect, sincerely dedicated to building for the general welfare instead of the destruction of us all.

This is a great question today: Must we accept the tragic inevitability of inflation, of depression, of a third world war, of the end of freedom in our world? I know that you will agree with me that the Democratic Party, under the able guidance of President Truman, has and will continue to answer with a sober but resounding "No," supplying the leadership for our people at home and faith and hope to the free peoples abroad.

The traditions of our party are grounded in the American progressive liberalism of Jefferson, of Jackson, of Cleveland, Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt. We Democrats will continue to hold high the standard of these great Americans and to move forward with liberal and progressive answers to the desperate problems which confront us.

Liberalism in the traditional sense of the Democratic Party is not bogged down by a set of fixed dogmas, but within the framework of a free society adapts itself to the new problems of a changing world and provides new answers. As liberals and as free men, we are prepared to set the example for all the world to see. To do this we must first eliminate discrimination against and segregation of our minorities, economically, socially, and politically, for only when men feel free can they accept their full responsibilities as citizens.

Second, we must not curtail, as the Republicans would have us do, but instead we must expand our reclamation and soil-conservation programs.

Third, we must harness the great Missouri River as we did the Tennessee, not only to relieve our present shortage of electrical power but to make cheap power available to more Americans.

Fourth, we must expand educational facilities and opportunities through Federal aid for our citizens of tomorrow.

Fifth, we must put an end to the oppression of the rights of free labor as under the Taft-Hartley Act. We must raise minimum-wage levels to 75 cents an hour. We must expand and strengthen social security. And we must encourage in free labor a sense of responsibility for the welfare of the community as a whole.

Sixth, we must stand firm against the attempts of such men as Representative KNUTSON to soak the poor—luxuriate the rich.

Seventh, until all nations have placed their security in a superior military force of the United Nations, and until we are safe from the attacks of any expanding dictatorial ideology, we must dedicate ourselves to the security of our country through the enactment of the universal military training program.

Eighth, we must pass a long-range, national-housing program such as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill so that millions of our veterans and, in fact one-third of our Nation, can live decently and raise their children in a respectable, clean, and healthy environment.

Ninth, we must provide adequate health service for millions of our citizens through the enactment of a national-health program such as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

Tenth, we must continue to improve the living standards of our farm families by strengthening and extending the benefits of our crop-insurance program, by going forward with the rural-electrification program, by modernizing the price-support program.

However, the two greatest issues which face us in American today are, first, how can we assist Europe to help itself to rebuild and to remain free, and, second, how can we put an end to the desperate NAM-Republican-Taft inflation? These two issues are a clear example of how domestic and foreign policy are interrelated. For, if we have a runaway inflation, followed by a bust, the Marshall plan cannot work, the Russian prediction will have come true, and western Europe will have lost all hope and may perhaps go communistic. The implications of such events are too obvious to contemplate.

Let us first look at the Marshall plan. It is a great and stirring example of true liberalism, for it is a new answer to a new problem. I am convinced that we cannot step backward with Senator TAFT, whose new isolationism of giving a little and too late is based on the belief that America can remain strong while the rest of the world slips into chaos, misery, and slavery. It is ironical that the Kremlin and Senator TAFT should see eye to eye in their opposition to the Marshall plan. The Kremlin is against it because it sees it as a means of helping western Europe to remain independent and free from Russia's crushing domination. Senator TAFT is against it because he is still a Victorian and has not learned the lesson of our atomic age, that all nations, that all peoples are today inevitably interdependent.

Senator TAFT tells us that the Marshall plan will increase our domestic inflation. He is correct only if we as a people are unwilling to sacrifice to secure total peace. Senator TAFT obviously does not know the facts. During the war we exported 32 percent of our total production and we consumed in America 58 percent. During this period of tremendous export our prices rose in 4 years only 6 percent and in the 2 years since the war we have exported 11 percent, not 32 percent, of our total production, and have consumed at home 89 percent, and yet our prices under the Taft-NAM uncontrolled inflation have risen 46 percent. To win the war we spent almost $300,000,000,000 and hundreds of thousands of American lives. The winning of the war will have gone for naught and we will have lost the peace and laid the foundations for a third and more terrible war if we fail to make Europe independent and free through the Marshall plan. I cannot believe that we Americans, if we know the facts, are unwilling to spend $17,000,000,000 in the next 4 years, or 3 percent of our annual production, in order to thus lay the foundations for a permanent and lasting peace. However, there is one fact which we cannot escape. If we permit our present inflation to continue, the Marshall plan can never work. Already some prices are increasing at the rate of 100 percent a year. This trend may easily accelerate. This means that the $6,800,000,000 which the President is now seeking for the first 15 months of the Marshall plan operation will at the end of that time buy little more than one-half of what was estimated and needed. If our runaway inflation is allowed to be followed by the inevitable bust, we will be unable to help anyone, perhaps even ourselves.

As one of our great Democrats, Alfred E. Smith, used to say, "Let's look at the record."

A year ago the NAM-GOP-Taft combination gutted the stabilization program which for 4 years had held down the cost of living and protected the living standards of the American people. This they did in the name of freedom. In the name of freedom they set free the forces of greed that sound policy had kept under control. In the name of liberty they liberated the forces of inflation.

I well remember the full-page ads which the NAM placed in every paper across the land which proclaimed that the destruction of price controls would set industry free, that production would skyrocket and then prices would come down. Senator TAFT and Senator WHERRY were in the spring of 1946 vying with each other to get the credit for the destruction of the stabilization and price-control program. But, already, a year and a half later, Senator TAFT has recognized his blunder, has recognized that we do have an inflation as a result of his blunder and has introduced his own anti-inflation program which the Congress passed in December and which President Truman called weak and inadequate.

Governor Stassen has said that the premature termination of price controls was the greatest economic blunder of our generation. Recently, it was reported that Mrs. Taft, who often speaks out in behalf of her senatorial husband, proclaimed to a women's club that her good husband was not responsible for the end of price controls in 1946. I am appalled at such blatant attempts to twist the facts. Again, let's look at the record. It certainly was not President Truman. Time after time after time he called upon the Congress to continue the stabilization program without crippling amendments. His first appeal was made in the state of the Union message in January 1946, 6 months before the stabilization statutes were due to expire. As the months passed, the appeals made by the President grew ever more urgent. What response did he get from the Republicans. The NAM and its full-page ads took care of the propaganda campaign to confuse the American people, and Senator TAFT and Senator WHERRY and Representatives MARTIN, HALLECK, and BROWN saw to it that a cynical bill without teeth, impossible to administer, and without honesty was finally sent to the President for his reluctant signature. Yes, the NAM-GOP and the leadership of Senator TAFT stand convicted today of having willfully gambled with our cost of living and of having squandered our best chance to make an orderly transition from war to peace. In short, the record shows them to be responsible for our present skyrocketing prices.

As the Republicans in the months ahead try to avoid their responsibility for their tragic blunder, I urge you to apply this simple test of the sincerity of their professions of innocence.

In the face of a sharp and continuing rise in the cost of living, a rise that has already badly hurt millions of American families, in the face of a feed and meat shortage worse than any we knew during the war, the President on November 17 staked out a 10-point anti-inflation program and called upon the Congress for immediate action. If the Republican leaders were not the real wreckers of price control, would they not have responded at once. Indeed, had they been innocent would it not have been they who took the initiative, and the President who would have been reluctant? There can be only one answer. There is only one guilty party. The NAM-GOP-Taft cabal.

In the face of the damning record of their party, some Republicans try to absolve themselves by blaming the whole American people—for spending too much, eating too much. This group of Republicans has a characteristic remedy for inflation: All we have to do to bring prices back in line is to practice voluntary self-control over our family budget. You may be sure that the millions of American families who have been squeezed out of the meat market, whose children have cut down on milk and stopped drinking orange juice, treat this advice with all the contempt it deserves.

Another favorite scapegoat for the Republican blunder is labor. These hosts of working men and women, the Republicans allege, have greedily sought higher wages and so must bear responsibility for the inflation. I can think of no charge more dishonest and more unjust than this. The plain truth is that wages have fallen further and further behind the cost of living. The average pay envelope today buys 10 percent less than it did at the end of the war. Labor has been a victim, not the cause of inflation.

Equally false is the charge made by some Republicans that inflation is the fault of the farmer. The farmer is not responsible for inflation. He sells at prices determined in the open market.

Nor can businessmen be justly blamed—apart from the National Association of Manufacturers which, hand in hand with the GOP, destroyed price control.

Business too takes what it can get in the market. And that is the way it should be under normal circumstances, when competition can be relied upon to establish prices that bear a reasonable relationship to costs.

The trouble lies wholly in the fact that controls were destroyed and prices left to the free market before normal conditions had been restored.

Responsibility for this destruction which brought on inflation lies squarely upon our old friends the NAM, the GOP, the Taft leadership.

Here are a few plain economic facts that the Republicans refuse to face. Because of the bad corn crop and the shortage of other feed concentrates, the Nation's meat supply next spring will run 20 to 25 percent below the present per capita level. Meat will be scarcer than it was at any time during most of the war. Unless meat is rationed and put back under price control, meat prices next spring will be a third or more higher than they are today. And as you well know, meat prices today are appalling. As the price of the short feed supply goes through the roof, we can expect the prices of milk, butter, and eggs to tag along. Not immediately, of course, because spring is the flush season for such products. But next summer they will go up nearly as much as meat.

This dark forecast of the coming food situation is by no means a secret. The Secretary of Agriculture spelled this out for congressional committees all over Capitol Hill. But the NAM, the GOP, and the T-A-F-T still refuse to act.

According to the Department of Labor, feed prices by the end of 1947 were up 58 percent over June 1946, the last month of effective price controls. Industrial prices were up 34 percent. There is no evidence that we have reached the peak, and there is plenty of evidence that prices will continue to spiral. In the weekly wholesale price reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, you can find dozens of key items moving up week after week and in any single week jumping 2, 4, and 5 percent. A price rise of 2 percent in a week may not sound serious to some people, but unless this rate is checked it would double the price level in less than a year.

Contributing to our price difficulties are the serious bottlenecks in steel and steel plate, nonferrous metals, and other basic materials for which demand far outruns supply. Our continuing failure to break these bottlenecks is a standing invitation for industrial users of the materials to bid their prices higher and higher, with producers only too willing to charge accordingly. The same Republican soothsayers, the NAM, the GOP, and the T-A-F-T, who think they can make inflation disappear by chanting the magic formula, "Production, production, and still more production," are blind to the basic bottlenecks, which are the greatest obstacle to production and one of the greatest hazards to continued prosperity.

The refusal of the steel industry to undertake a constructive expansion program after the war is typical of several other industries whose products are in short supply. Unfortunately, although business is not primarily responsible for inflation, its current attitude is a strong contributing factor in the continuation of the upward spiral. Most businessmen today are convinced that a depression is inevitable; therefore they do not wish to take on an expansion program which might leave them in an overcapitalized position. Convinced of the coming bust, they are putting their excessive profits into a nest egg to tide them over the rainy days. Through expansion of production, these businessmen have the power to counteract inflation, but, instead, they have shown themselves to be lacking in the fundamental faith in the future prosperity and stability of their country.

It is because the administration has for some time been aware of the danger of an economic smash-up that President Truman summoned back the Congress on November 17 and submitted, along with the estimates of interim aid for Europe, a 10-point program to win the battle against inflation. But what happened to it? Once again, with the country on the threshold of disaster and only a fighting chance to stave it off, the Republican bigwigs turned to their friends in the National Association of Manufacturers and turned their backs on the people of the United States.

Running true to form, Senator TAFT came up with a characteristic Taft statement that rationing is totalitarian, apparently forgetting that thanks to his efforts we already have the cruelest kind of rationing—the kind that allocates butter exclusively to those families that can afford to pay $1 a pound, and eggs only to those families that can pay $1 a dozen.

When the President reluctantly signed the Taft voluntary anti-inflation bill, he aptly described it as a "feeble" and "pitifully inadequate weapon against the high cost of living." He once again urged Congress to enact a workable and positive program. Our job is to rally the country behind the realistic leadership of President Truman. I am convinced that if the people of the United States know the facts, know of our impending disaster and know of the need for European assistance and recovery, they will willingly sacrifice together to achieve the necessary objectives.

The Democratic Party has an unprecedented opportunity and responsibility as our

Nation, in this fateful year of 1948, approaches the crossroads of our destiny. Under the leadership of President Truman, we can, we must, achieve economic stability and security at home, and restore prosperity and faith to the free peoples of the world.

"Sail on,
O Ship of State,
Sail on, O Union strong and great;
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate."

Honesty Essential in Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on January 26 an article appeared in the Washington Post by Joseph and Stewart Alsop entitled "Honesty Is the Only Policy." I commend it to every Member of this House, for it states a truth and an objective which must be attained if our foreign policy is to have the confidence of the people of this country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article in question:

HONESTY IS THE ONLY POLICY
(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

In the higher ranks of the administration, a debate of the most far-reaching import is now in quiet progress. Will the real facts of the world situation at last be placed before the country and the Congress, with all the almost irresistible weight of Secretary Marshall's authority? Or will the opposition to the European recovery program be allowed to have its way, for sheer lack of understanding of the consequence? These are the alternative courses now being discussed.

This debate was precipitated by rather belated preliminary checks, which disclosed a distinctly bleak congressional situation. There is not the slightest sense of urgency on Capitol Hill today. As of today, action on ERP is likely to be greatly delayed; the program will probably be festooned with unworkable restrictions, and the amount appropriated is expected to be cut to somewhere near the $4,000,000,000 level advocated by former President Hoover.

A final survey is now being made, so that the most dependable data on the outlook in Congress may be laid before Secretary Marshall on his return from the South. But the results of this survey are not likely to give new cause for optimism. Therefore, the American policy makers are discussing the choice outlined above. There is only one way to rescue ERP from the effects of congressional indifference. That way is to arouse an adequate sense of urgency in Congress and the country. Equally, there is only one way to arouse this sense of urgency. Secretary Marshall must at last tell Congress and the country what are the real motives of American policy.

Here there appears a strange anomaly, which the American policy makers are free to confess. In the great American decisions, from the British loan down to ERP, moral, humanitarian, and, of course, economic motives have been given due weight. But the really impelling motives for every one of these decisions have been motives of pure political and strategic self-interest.

"We did all these things," one of the wisest men in the Government remarked the other day, "because if we hadn't done them, or had done even a little less, the Soviets would have been able to carry out their program of expansion and domination. If the Soviets ever carry out their program, we shall face a Europe and Asia in Soviet hands, and we shall have no choice but to fight or to surrender." As anyone familiar with the practical workings of Congress must realize, self-interest is the great congressional persuader.

Yet these real motives of American self-interest, which would quickly convince Congress, have never been publicly confessed or explained by President Truman, or Secretary Byrnes, or Secretary Marshall, or anyone else in authority. They have been hinted at, or suggested by shadowy generalities. But mere hints and suggestions do not pose big issues. In fact, the underlying issues of American policy have never been debated in the Congress, because each great American policy decision has always been put forward in elaborate moral, humanitarian, or economic fancy dress, with the real motives for it largely suppressed.

There are no exceptions to this rule. The strong language of the so-called Truman doctrine no doubt passed the Greek-Turkish aid bill but President Truman's rather grandiloquent defiance of the advance of totalitarianism contained no mention of realistic American interests.

When Secretary Marshall insisted upon Greek-Turkish aid, he had in mind only that Greece and Turkey were the keys of the Middle East, and that control of the Midle East would give the Soviets unchallenged domination of Europe and Asia. These hard facts were rather pointedly not stated by the President. A calmer statement, containing the fact, would have been more effective than the Truman doctrine.

Again, the British loan was presented as a great free-trade gesture until the last moment, when Secretary Byrnes had to make the House of Representatives' flesh creep with Soviet horror tales. The device worked. The loan passed in a mood of hysteria. But if it had been presented in sober honesty at the start, the loan could have passed in a mood of clear understanding of American interests.

In short, what is now proposed is not to "cry wolf" as is rather loftily asserted by the opponents of plain speaking. What is proposed is simply for Secretary Marshall to make a full, clear, plain statement of facts, which will only be alarming because the facts of the world situation are intensely alarming.

Those who advocate this course admit that it has not been the previous practice of American diplomacy. But they point out that although Parliament is much more responsive than Congress, Ernest Bevin's recent magnificent speech to Parliament was as strong and straightforward as could be wished. And they argue finally that it is undemocratic to ask Congress for great decisions without explaining the reasons for those decisions. Events seem likely to confront Secretary Marshall with a choice between adoption of this theory or acceptance of a gutted ERP.

Aspects of the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks and include therein a series of five articles on aspects of the Marshall plan, by E. F. Tompkins, editor of the New York Journal-American, I wish to present the fourth of the series entitled "The Basis of European Recovery." The article follows:

ASPECTS OF THE MARSHALL PLAN
(By E. F. Tompkins)
IV. THE BASIS OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY

To recognize that drastic relief measures had become necessary last fall in some parts of Europe is not to concede that the Marshall plan must be approved by Congress on European terms.

The crop failures and fuel shortages in western Europe, caused by the cruel winter of 1946–47 and prolonged droughts in the following seasons, came close to being catastrophic.

That emergency was met by the congressional donations to Austria, France, and Italy and by the appropriations for Germany through our army of occupation east of the Rhine.

And the Marshall plan is not offered as a relief measure.

Its express purpose is to make western Europe self-supporting by revitalizing its agriculture and industries and expanding both (1) to equal the needs of a population of 270,000,000 and (2) to provide exportable surpluses to be exchanged for essential imports, including supplementary foodstuffs.

The European problem is not difficult to under; it is simply one of procuring production.

The Marshall plan should therefore be constructed and construed to this single end.

It will fail, and be doomed to fail, if it emerges as an instrument for building socialism, at American expense, as the left-wing Pied Pipers intend it to be.

And western Europe has within itself the basic means of production sufficient for its needs.

In fact, the task of self-rehabilitation through production after World War II—though hampered and obstructed by socialistic attitudes in politics and labor—was well advanced when the food and fuel crisis intervened as a temporary set-back.

The report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation, in its own discussion of the Marshall plan, said:

"The scale of destruction and disruption of European economic life was far greater than that which Europe had experienced in the First World War. * * *

"The devastated countries had to start again almost from the beginning.

"Nevertheless recovery proceeded well—indeed, much faster than after the end of the First World War. * * *

"This was made possible by the efforts of the European countries themselves, with generous assistance from the United States and from UNRRA.

"So successful were these efforts that by the end of 1946 industrial production in Belgium, France, and the Netherlands had recovered to 85–95 percent of the prewar level.

"In the United Kingdom the process of demobilization of the war economy had been accomplished smoothly and the prewar level of national output had been fully restored."

At this point, however, the European committee appeals to the food and fuel crisis as its major plea for a Marshall plan according to its own ideas.

But the committee also gives the game away.

Congress, it has already been noted, was donating more than $5,000,000,000 for relief.

And the European committee asks for something else.

It submits a capital development prospectus calling for a production expansion by 1951 which will be similar in general scale to that achieved by the United States in the mobilization years of 1940 to 1944.

Then, interpreting Secretary of State Marshall's invitation in his Harvard speech, the committee computes Europe's financial ability to meet its own prospectus and requests the United States Government to underwrite a deficit amounting, in its own estimate, to some $22,000,000,000.

Subsequently, the total was scaled down to about seventeen billions.

No American should object to a European design of large production.

Yet there are questions which a prudent and capable businessman would ask before venturing his substance on such a prospectus:

1. What about management?

America's industrial war effort, which western Europe would emulate, was an accomplishment of our free enterprise system.

The European program is socialistic, first, because it is predicated upon governmental loans and governmental spending; and second, because the socialistic governments have declared themselves socialistically as recipients in the Marshall plan.

2. What about labor?

Respecting its own recovery program the European committee says:

"It calls for unprecedented peacetime effort of work by the whole population of the participating countries."

But in Great Britain millions of tons of coal production have been sacrificed by strikes and, until lately, by the socialistic 35-hour week.

In France and Italy the general confederations of labor are controlled by the Communists.

As evidence of what they can do, the communistic strikes in France in December 1947 cost the nation 2,000,000 tons of coal, 4,500,000 tons of steel, and a general equivalent of 6 months' production in manufactures.

3. What about confiscations and economic controls?

The French Cabinet is now imposing a forced loan or capital levy on large incomes, while the British Labor Government has just nationalized the railroads.

In most of the countries price controls and rationing, as well as wage fixing, seem to have become habitual and perpetual.

"The application of such a policy," the European committee notes, "presents increasing difficulties over a long period and may tend to react unfavorably on production."

An $80,000,000 Rat Hole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by Samuel B. Pettengill, a former distinguished Member of this House.

In this well-written article Mr. Pettengill makes reference to the outstanding work that is being done by the subcommittee headed by our able colleague, the Honorable FOREST A. HARNESS.

Mr. Pettengill's article follows:

AN $80,000,000 RAT HOLE

Congressman FOREST A. HARNESS, of Indiana, is a member of a special subcommittee of Congress investigating publicity and propaganda in executive agencies. He states that the chief interest of this subcommittee has been "the means by which Federal bureaucrats perpetuate themselves in office, generate pressures on Congress for more and bigger appropriations, and sponsor socialistic enterprises in the name of national emergency or an artificially stimulated public demand."

In the fiscal year 1946, some of the principal Federal agencies propagandizing themselves spent $80,573,678 of the taxpayers' money. Most of this was actually appropriated for other purposes. It took this committee six solid weeks to ferret out a project known as the health work shops of the United States Public Health Service, the Social Security Board, the Children's Bureau, and other health and welfare program agencies.

The reason it took so long is the spirit of defiance encountered by the committee investigators.

"We discovered that practically every argument, every pamphlet, every radio broadcast, and every statistical table advocating socialized medicine originated primarily in the Social Security Board. Here is the world-wide nerve center of the movement for socialized medicine."

Mr. HARNESS says that these advocates of socialized medicine have sent missions to every country in the world—missions often staffed by men identified with fellow-traveler outfits avowedly sponsoring the Moscow party line in the United States. They have gone to Europe, to South America, to Japan, to New Zealand. They return and write reports which are scattered throughout this country by the millions—and costing millions.

The ramifications of Federal propaganda in behalf of socialized medicine astonished the committee.

This is done, Congressman HARNESS says, in violation of a law which makes it illegal for an executive agency to use public money to put pressure on Congress. But no one is prosecuted.

"I am sure," he says, "that the United States has not yet reached the point where it must be submissive to the dictates of a bureaucracy in Washington".

We all know that the bureaucratic power feeds upon the rights and privileges and liberties of the people. Government propaganda is the method of dictators.

"Public opinion must be maintained in its free and virile state—in full harmony with the great American tradition of liberty. If we do that by stamping out Government propaganda at its roots, then we shall have rendered a great service, not only to medicine, but to the whole cause of liberty and freedom the world around.

"Our purpose will be to uproot and destroy Government propaganda wherever we may find it."

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Something New About Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, 1947, there were opened and exhibited to the public certain private papers of Abraham Lincoln. They had been delivered to and deposited with the Library of Congress here in Washington by Robert Todd Lincoln, sole surviving son of President Lincoln, with the proviso that they should not be opened to public inspection until 21 years after his death. Robert Lincoln died on July 26, 1926.

This is a voluminous collection of 18,350 items. Included are many letters written to the President during the Civil War and some items before the war. It is interesting to note the manner in which Lincoln reacted to some of the communications which he received. On the back of some of them he made cryptic endorsements, and it is to such endorsements that I desire to call special attention. A few of them are herewith presented and made public for the first time.

Every Member of Congress receives many letters. I wonder whether we react or dispose of some of them in a manner very much different than Lincoln, more than 80 years ago. There were no typewriters, telephones, radios, television, or other methods of speedy communication in his day.

We are indebted to Mr. Percy Powell, of the Library of Congress, who cataloged the Lincoln collection, and now has supervision over that Lincoln treasure house. He prepared the rare items that follow, upon my request, for "something new about Lincoln":

SOME INTERESTING AND CHARACTERISTIC ENDORSEMENTS OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN RECORDED ON DOCUMENTS IN THE ROBERT TODD LINCOLN COLLECTION OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S PAPERS

In October of 1864, Elihu B. Washburne, Senator from Illinois and long a personal and political friend of Lincoln, the sole person to welcome him to Washington on February 23, 1861, became alarmed over the prospects of Lincoln's reelection in Illinois. He doubted if Lincoln could win without the soldier vote. So, on October 17, he wrote to Lincoln as follows: "Everything is at sixes and sevens and no head or tail to anything. Please consult with Stanton and have the soldiers started home at once. If you would save our State from the most appalling calamity, pray do not neglect what I suggest about getting the soldiers home."

Lincoln read the letter and endorsed it with one word, "Stampeded."

James R. Webster wrote President Lincoln on December 24, 1864, from New York and signed himself "Your affectionate friend." He was an old Illinois acquaintance and went as a delegate to the convention in Springfield, Ill., that nominated Lincoln for Senator. He asked the President for a job.

Lincoln made the following endorsement on the letter: "James R. Webster for something."

One William Kellogg was a delegate to the State convention in Bloomington in 1856, when the Republican Party of Illinois was organized. He served as a Presidential elector on the Lincoln ticket. In March 1861, Lincoln named him chief justice of Nebraska Territory. This is the same William P. Kellogg who went through the troublesome reconstruction times as Senator and Governor of Louisiana. In 1863, however, he wanted Lincoln to give him a big diplomatic assignment. He was offered the post of consul to Valparaiso. This irked him, and while in an angry mood he wrote to President Lincoln, on April 8, 1863, refusing the honor. The White House secretary briefed the letter and marked it unpleasant.

When the letter came to Mr. Lincoln's attention he endorsed it as follows: "I understand my friend Kellogg is ill-natured; therefore, I do not read his letter."

Abraham Lincoln's habit of making cryptic endorsements on his mail seems to have developed before his White House days. A New

York publishing house sent him a circular under date of May 21, 1859, announcing the forthcoming Livingston's United States Law Register and Handbook of Information Useful to Every Lawyer—"Published by subscription; will not be peddled through the country by agents." The circular listed some of the contents of the volume and suggested many possible uses for it.

Apparently the President didn't spend too much time reading the notice, for he made the following endorsement: "Too deep for me."

On April 26, 1863, Mr. Francis L. Capen wrote to Lincoln as follows: "Please refer me favorably to the War Department and I will guarantee to furnish meteorological information that will save many a serious sacrifice."

Evidently the President had interviewed Mr. Capen a few days earlier for he endorsed the request as follows: "It seems to me Mr. Capen knows nothing about the weather in advance. He told me 3 days ago that it would not rain again till the 30th of April or the 1st of May. It is raining now and has been for 10 hours. I cannot spare any more time to Mr. Capen."

It is known that Secretary of War Stanton could not always find places for the persons who expected to be appointed by the President. Colonel Hicks asked Mr. Lincoln to make him aide-de-camp to General Wool. Mr. Lincoln sent him to Secretary Stanton who refused to issue the commission. The colonel wrote the President on May 23, 1862, to the effect that the Government was run by the Secretary of War.

Mr. Lincoln made the following endorsement of the letter: "This note, as Colonel Hicks did orally yesterday, attempts to excite me against the Secretary of War and therein is offensive to me. My order as he is pleased to call it, is plainly no order at all."

During April and May 1863 President Lincoln received a number of letters from his political friends in Missouri telling him of the growth of factional feeling. Samuel T. Glover wrote that Secretaries Stanton and Chase were using their patronage power to build up a party opposed to the administration. Congressman J. W. McClurg wrote his objections to Governor Gamble and Senator Henderson. Congressman Henry T. Blow wrote about the quarrel, but stated that he was not in it.

President Lincoln endorsed Congressman McClurg's letter as "one side of the quarrel." He endorsed Glover's letter as "other side of the quarrel," and the letter of Mr. Blow as "more about the quarrel."

Secretary Chase wrote President Lincoln on November 8, 1862, that Mr. Masten, a New York patronage appointee of Congressman Steele, had been removed on the belief that he had contributed to the defeat of the Republican nominee for Congress and on the belief that the President agreed to the removal.

When Lincoln read the letter he turned it over and endorsed it as follows: "This note confounds me utterly. I am sure I have never been conscious that I was superseding Mr. Steele's man."

Henry Villard, the journalist (later railway promoter and financier), who reported the Lincoln-Douglas debates, became acquainted with Lincoln and collected Lincoln stories. He covered the Republican Convention at Chicago in 1860 and after the election went to Springfield, Ill., as correspondent for the New York Herald. He wrote to President Lincoln on August 14, 1861, asking for a letter of introduction to Gen. Winfield Scott, and adding that "you will doubtless remember me as a newspaper correspondent last winter in Springfield."

Lincoln made this characteristic endorsement on the letter: "I have only a slight acquaintance with Mr. Villard as a gentlemanly newspaper correspondent; and as such I commend him to others."

Rev. Samuel B. McPheeters, pastor of the Vine Street Church in St. Louis, Mo., refused to declare himself for the Union. He even went so far as to baptize a baby with the name of the Confederate General Sterling Price. A provost marshal arrested McPheeters and took control of the church property. Some 6 months later a petition signed by several elders of the church came to the President's desk. He made the following endorsement on it: "The assumptions of this paper, so far as I know or believe, are entirely false. I have never deprived Dr. McPheeters of any ecclesiastical rights. If, after all, the doctor is kept out by the majority of his own parishoners, and my official power is sought to force him in over their heads, I decline that also."

Senators S. C. Pomeroy and J. H. Lane of Kansas wrote President Lincoln on March 14, 1862, and asked that George McGlouflin be removed as Forage Master at Fort Leavenworth and the job given to Mike Grulish, a valuable Irish Republican.

President Lincoln transferred the matter to the Secretary of War with the precautionary "unless" clause, in the following manner: "Let the removal and appointment within requested by Senators Pomeroy and Lane be made, unless there be some reason to the contrary unknown to me".

Divisions Within Democratic Party Should Not Be Taken Too Seriously by the G. O. P.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following transcript of a radio commentary by George L. Reedy over Station WOL this morning:

The current revolt of southern Democrats will make a serious crack in party solidarity. But it's not very likely to result in any real attempt to set up a new political organization—at least not this year.

That is the opinion of the inner-circle Democrats who are trying to direct their party to victory in the coming elections. They believe that the dissatisfaction of their southern colleagues can be ignored for the moment.

The real significance of the movement, however, is that it affords a dramatic example of basic divisions inside the Democratic Party. They have been there for years, but it is only recently that they have cropped out violently.

The Democratic Party is the oldest in our country. And yet, over the years, it has failed to bring all of its followers together under one program. Today it is a combination of at least three conflicting groups.

They are the southern democratic, the New Dealers, and the old-line, practical machine politicians of the big cities. They can get together on individual issues, but in the long run they are bound to turn upon each other.

The current scrap is over the President's so-called civil-rights program. It was absolutely necessary for him to advance it if he wanted to keep the northern vote. It was equally necessary for the southern Democrats to protest vigorously.

In this particular case the argument will probably be smoothed over. Nobody expects the President's program to be enacted by Congress. As a last resort, it would be filibustered to death in the Senate.

At the same time the southern Democrats realize the advantages of staying in the party. By themselves they would find it impossible to capture Congress, and they certainly could not look for a permanent alliance with the Republicans.

Consequently, both sides will probably back down from their extreme positions. At least they will stop talking about it and quit embarrassing each other. In an election year anything else would be suicide.

The southern Democrats have some pressures short of a bolt from the party. These they will certainly apply. Just as an example, there is the interesting suggestion—already applied in South Carolina—that they withhold the funds from the Jackson Day banquets.

These are an important source of income to the Democratic Party. The leaders would think twice before letting them go by the board. They need that money, and they need it badly.

On the other hand, the administration has a few pressures it can apply in retaliation. Not the least is its power to appoint people to certain Federal jobs. Furthermore, the southerners are doomed to remain a minority unless they cooperate with their northern brethren.

It all adds up to peace within the party. But it is a peace with a difference. Some dirty linen has been washed in public, and it isn't very likely that the public will forget. This is especially important in an election year.

It's a good spot for the Republicans. They have to do nothing except sit back and let events take their course. Sooner or later on this kind of a proposition the odds are bound to be in their favor.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt the most discussed subject today is inflation, because it affects every one of us. We all receive over our desks an almost unlimited number of articles on this subject. Many of them I have tried to read and digest. To date, the editorial which I am asking to insert in the RECORD contains what I think is one of the most condensed, common-sense, and logical analyses that I have read on this very controversial subject. It is written by Mr. Manchester Boddy, publisher and editor of one of the influential newspapers of California.

(By Manchester Boddy)

At long last nearly everyone knows that "inflation" means "too much money chasing too few things."

Inflation exists in every part of the civilized and semicivilized world. Relatively there is less inflation in the United States than elsewhere for reasons that will be explained shortly.

Sound money is based on real wealth.

War destroyed real wealth; therefore, the only way to restore sound money is to replace the wealth that war destroyed. There is no other way. Millions of words have been written about measures finance ministers in London, Paris, Moscow, Warsaw, Tokyo, Vienna, Nanking, Brussels, Stockholm and Washington are taking to prevent, cure or end inflation in their respective domains, but the hard truth remains. No amount of juggling, no political soft-soaping, no "monetary reform," however ingenious, can take the place of real wealth. A nation's money is valuable only when it represents wealth.

A classical example of inflation in the making is contained in a recent United Press dispatch from Peiping, China, which says the Communists have shelled the Nationalist stronghold of Mukden, Manchuria, knocking out a huge hydroelectric plant on the city's outskirts.

It is a foregone conclusion that if and when the Communists capture the area, the Nationalists will then feel free—indeed, obliged—to give the power plant and other industrial installations a further blasting to prevent them from being used by the Communists.

That is inflation in the making.

Of course neither side really wins. Whichever side is "victorious," a sizable chunk of wealth will have been destroyed, which will have to be replaced by hard work on somebody's part if it is to bear its former function as a foundation for sound money.

Except for the premeditated, managed, policy inflation that swept Germany in 1922–23, Europe had sound money before the advent of World War II. That is because it had real wealth.

It now has unsound, inflated currency, because its wealth was so largely destroyed. In Germany, the plan for reparations approved as reasonable and desirable the pegging of Germany's industry at one-half its prewar capacity. Besides the terrific destruction by bombing, England suffered a tremendous loss in wealth through the worst kind of attrition—the overworking of her productive facilities without repairs or improvements. Everyone is familiar with the vast destruction of wealth in France, including major ports and virtually all her livestock. And in Russia, the value of the wealth destroyed has been estimated by reliable authorities at approximately $600,000,000,000.

Regardless of Russia's protestations to the contrary, such destruction must, under any system, produce inflation. In the realm of food supply alone, one of the most vital kinds of wealth, the war cost Russia something like 26,000,000 cattle, 32,000,000 hogs, and 200,000,000 chickens. Among other losses were a third of her tractors and combines, and 8,500,000 horses.

Fertile soil plus available manpower is wealth. So is a plant that produces electricity; a mill that makes steel; a refinery that turns out gasoline; factories that produce tractors, automobiles, washing machines, and other useful, wanted things.

During the war each side cheered when its armies scorched the enemy's earth; blasted his dams; destroyed his factories, his power plants, his railroads, and killed his men. That destruction, so essential to winning a war, destroyed the only possible basis for sound currencies.

To win a war, something more than destruction is needed. Mass man must be told that the victory for which he is fighting means peace and prosperity.

The postwar politician, therefore, is faced with the problem of presiding over ruins while he strives to deliver peace and prosperity to the people who elected him.

Since money is regarded as wealth, his first desperate move is to dish out currency. This temporarily satisfies the people and gives him time for maneuvering. Liberalism, with all its virtues, usually is administered by practical politicians in terms of short hours of work and long piles of money. This leads to the mess we now see in England, France, Italy, and other desperately ill countries all across the face of Europe.

The United States has more available real wealth and more current production today than it had before the war. Therefore, it has a firm, solid foundation for a sound monetary system. But even in this country, the volume of money has increased faster than wealth has been produced. Consequently, the problem is either to drain off this excess money, or to increase real wealth through more production.

If we drain off our production through huge shipments to Europe and Asia, while at the same time increasing our supply of money, we, too, will have inflation of the disastrous kind.

President Truman's program calls for $18,800,000,000 over the next 4 years. It is, therefore, an inflationary measure. And it cannot be offset by price control, rationing or any other arbitrary measure. The only answer is enough production remaining in the United States to sustain our money in circulation.

DECEMBER 29, 1947.

Church and Professional Groups Support European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, following are resolutions of the Forum of Men's Class of Riverside Church and New York State Bar Association, strongly endorsing the European recovery program. It is further confirmation of the support from diverse and important organizations of our citizens, of this program of self-help and mutual cooperation with the support of the United States:

THE FORUM OF THE MEN'S CLASS OF RIVERSIDE CHURCH,
New York, N. Y., January 13, 1948.

The Forum of the Men's Class of the Riverside Church on January 13, 1948, voted unanimously their support of the Marshall plan as presented by Secretary Marshall on January 8 before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

We believe that the Marshall plan, if administered with good will, discretion, and wisdom, can be of inestimable value in improving friendly human relations among all the peoples involved and in promoting the cause of world peace.

We further believe that time is of the essence, in order to preserve human lives as well as American prestige.

Therefore we, the members of the Forum of the Men's Class of Riverside Church, do earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to put the Marshall plan, together with administrative details as presented by Secretary Marshall, in operation by April 1.

JACOB F. FOSTER,
Chairman of the Forum.

"The New York State Bar Association recommends that Congress enact legislation in furtherance of the program for European recovery set forth in section 2 (b) of the draft bill that accompanied the President's message of December 19, 1947, to the Congress on this subject."

CERTIFICATE

I, Chester Wood, secretary of the New York State Bar Association, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the original resolution which was duly adopted by the association on the recommendation of its committee on international law, William Roy Vallance, chairman, at a regular session of the association held during its annual meeting on January 23, 1948, at the house of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said association, this 30th day of January 1948.

[SEAL] CHESTER WOOD,
Secretary.

NOTE.—The section 2 (b) referred to in the resolution was quoted in the printed report of the committee of the association, as follows:

"SEC. 2. (b) Purposes of act: It is the purpose of this act to effecturte the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section by furnishing material and financial assistance to the participating countries in such a manner as to aid them, through their own individual and concerted efforts, to become independent of abnormal outside economic assistance within the period of operations under this act, by—

"(1) Promoting industrial and agricultural production in the participating countries;

"(2) Furthering the restoration or maintenance of the soundness of European currencies, budgets, and finances;

"(3) Facilitating and stimulating the growth of international trade of participating countries with one another and with other countries by appropriate measures, including reduction of barriers which may hamper such trade."

State Sovereignty Over Minerals Beneath Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] before the Colorado Mining Association at Denver, Colo., on February 7.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, I start off that way because you are my good friends, most of you; old friends, many of you.

My friends, this is an anniversary year.

A century ago the world awoke to the glorious recognition that there was gold in the hills of California, and new industry arose to shape our destinies.

This year is the centennial of that discovery, a discovery which brought both realization and utilization of mineral values previously unknown and ignored.

A century from now, we may well celebrate the centennial of the discovery and realization of a bonanza which has lain quietly beneath the waters of our inland lakes and our navigable streams, and which in those 100

years may have proved to be the natural stock pile of a wealth almost immeasurable in this world of rapidly depleting natural resources.

We who claim to represent the great mining industry are today aware that the picks of progress have struck into new ledges, filled not with gold and silver, but with new kinds of wealth unrealized in its undeveloped state. And not only do we have new kinds of mineral wealth to search for and develop; some of us have some new ideas about where to seek some of the old kinds of mineral wealth.

But I wonder if we do not lack the old-time spirit of the seeker.

A century ago they called them pioneers, and there was a gold rush. Men struggled and died to get there, and many fought and died to protect their interests when they found some color in the pan. Today we might be said to lack the energy, or horse sense, of the pioneers of '48. We aren't doing much to keep the mineral resources underlying our rivers, lakes, and ocean fronts open to the endeavors of those who might develop them. And we face a threat to the security of our mineral rights without fighting back, almost without realizing it is a threat.

Today we look back and praise the sturdy, rugged men who found the gold in 1848.

A century from now, I trust the remnants of what was once a great mining industry may not look back 100 years and condemn us who live today for having become too soft, or too slovenly in thought, to hold our rights and protect the future of our industry.

Let's take a look at what we're up against.

Last June the United States Supreme Court handed down one of the most far-reaching decisions in its history—a decision which, if allowed to stand, will change and unbalance the entire constitutional relationship between the States and the Federal Government and which will seriously confuse, if not obliterate, the legal distinction between governmental powers on the one hand and the property rights of the States and their citizens on the other.

This decision was handed down in the case of *United States* v. *California* (330 U. S. —, decided June 23, 1947), but the effect of the decision is not confined to the State of California and its implications are so far reaching that all States and their citizens are vitally concerned.

The prospective loss to legitimate and innocent lease and title holders, resulting directly from this abrupt and arbitrary reversal of title law, may be very great. The indirect results may include incalculable confusion in land titles—particularly titles to mineral land—and inevitable and grievous waste of the Nation's natural wealth.

Legally unassailable real-estate titles are the foundation of a sound national economy, just as protection of mineral rights and mining claims is vital to the mining industry. In every real-estate transfer the greatest of care is taken in removing all possible clouds to real-estate titles by careful record searches. Certainly in real-estate title law is absolutely essential, for any change in basic legal rules can have disastrous tendencies. It is decidedly anomalous for a decision of the United States Supreme Court to make such a change.

Because of the effect of this decision on minerals under water, not only in the coastal States but in the inland States as well, and because of its impact upon the mining industry and its importance to all concerned in that industry, a few words at this point, as to the background of this controversy, seem justified.

Since the formation of the Union the various States, or those who hold title as grantees of the States or under State laws and decisions, have always exercised full powers of ownership and control over all lands and resources beneath navigable waters within their respective boundaries. In the California case it was recognized by the Court that the 3-mile belt, or marginal sea, as it was called, is wholly within California's constitutionally established boundaries. The ownership and control of such lands and resources was always deemed to be a concomitant of State sovereignty. This principle was always applied both as to inland lakes and rivers and as to the 3-mile belt along the coasts.

Pursuant to this long established rule of property ownership, enormous expenditures have been made by both States and political subdivisions and their grantees for the improvement of ports and harbors and in filling and reclaiming submerged lands. On the same basis minerals, including, of course, oil, along the seacoasts, and iron, coal, brines, and other minerals beneath inland waters have been developed.

The lands beneath navigable waters are not to be confused with the public lands of the United States, which in most Western States were reserved to the Federal Government by the Acts of Admission to Statehood. These public lands and the minerals contained in them, being already fully owned by the Federal Government, are in no way involved in the present controversy. It has always been held that lands beneath navigable water do not come within the category of Federal public lands subject to the land laws of the United States. The Supreme Court's decision in the California case does not appear to change that rule.

The power of the Federal Government to regulate commerce and prevent obstructions to navigation in navigable waters within the States is not involved in this controversy. This Federal power has always been recognized by the States and is not challenged. But this power to regulate and control commerce and navigation has never, prior to the Supreme Court's decision in the California case, been considered as carrying with it the right or power in the Federal Government to appropriate lands or mineral resources underlying these waters.

For a period of 161 years, from 1776 to 1937, all State and all Federal officials had held that title to these lands was in the several States, and more than 50 decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States confirmed this holding. In 1937, Secretary of the Interior Ickes commenced agitation to reverse and upset all these precedents. To use his own words, Mr. Ickes changed his mind, repudiating an opinion which he had signed in 1933, and asserted a belief that these lands might belong to the Federal Government.

Prior to 1937 all Secretaries of the Interior, including Mr. Ickes, had uniformly ruled that title to the tidal and submerged lands belonged to the States. For example, on December 22, 1933, Mr. Ickes wrote a letter to an applicant for a lease on some submerged lands, in which he quoted from a case (*Hardin* v. *Jordan* (140 U. S. 371)), where the Supreme Court said:

"With regard to grants of the Government for lands bordering on tidewater, it has been distinctly settled that they only extend to high-water marks, and that the title to the shore and lands under water in front of lands so granted inures to the State within which they are situated, if a State has been organized and established there. Such title to the shore and lands under water is regarded as incidental to the sovereignty of the State—a portion of the royalties belonging thereto and held in trust for the public purposes of navigation and fishery—and cannot be retained or granted out to individuals by the United States."

Mr. Ickes quoted that. Then Mr. Ickes wrote:

"The foregoing is a statement of the settled law, and therefore no rights can be granted to you, either under the Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), or under any other public land law, to the bed of the Pacific Ocean either within or without the 3-mile limit. Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State. A permit would be necessary to be obtained from the War Department as a prerequisite to the maintenance of structures in the navigable waters of the United States, but such a permit would not confer any rights to the ocean bed.

"I find no authority of law under which any right can be granted to you to establish your proposed structures in the ocean outside the 3-mile limit of the jurisdiction of the State of California, nor am I advised that any other branch of the Federal Government has such authority.

"Sincerely yours,

"HAROLD L. ICKES,
"Secretary of the Interior."

But when he appeared to testify before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. Ickes said:

"Until 1937 these applications were denied by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and, in those cases where appeals were taken to the Department, his decisions were affirmed * * *, but applicants and their lawyers continued to insist that the United States does own the land and the oil, and that the Department does have the power to grant them oil and gas leases. So we began to have doubts * * *. Consequently, since 1937 action on all of these applications, of which there are about 200, has been suspended pending a judicial determination" (p. 4, hearings, Senate Judiciary Committee, 79th Cong., on S. J. Res. 48 and H. J. Res. 225).

There, in his own words, is the history of Mr. Ickes' change of mind. Applicants for oil leases "and their lawyers" caused Mr. Ickes to decide that the "settled law" of 1933 had changed by 1937.

In other words, the controversy started as a conflict of interests between individuals holding oil leases from the State of California and other individuals who wanted the Federal Government to grant them leases of the same property. There were some 30 decisions of the Interior Department holding that the Federal Government had no authority to grant Federal leases under navigable waters because such lands belonged to the States. Nevertheless, Mr. Ickes did change his policy and assert Federal ownership.

It was to settle this controversy and to quiet the titles of the States and those holding under them that identical joint resolutions were introduced in the two Houses of Congress in 1945. Hearings on these resolutions were held before the House and Senate Judiciary Committees. More than 50 prominent State officials from all parts of the country appeared and testified in support of the resolution. The resolution sponsored in the House by the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and in the Senate by the senior Senator from Nevada passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority. Shortly after its passage, the Attorney General was persuaded by Mr. Ickes to file the suit against the State of California. It was obvious that this suit was filed for the express purpose of blocking the legislation, which was then pending in the Senate.

Exhaustive hearings were again held, before the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which I was then chairman. In all this time the only opposition to the measure was that of Secretary Ickes and a few individuals who had made application for Federal leases of California lands. The committee approved the resolution which had already passed the House. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee I sponsored that resolution on the Senate floor. When the resolution came up for consideration the question was raised whether Congress should act while the suit was pending in the Court. I took the position then that Congress is an independent branch of the Government and

should act on the legislation pending before it, especially where, as in this case, the legislation involved a matter of national policy vitally affecting State and Federal relations. I pointed out that if Congress must cease to act whenever a Federal official starts a lawsuit, Congress could be rendered impotent at any time. The Senate upheld my view and passed the bill by a substantial majority.

After the bill was passed it was vetoed by the President, the main ground of the veto being that the issue of the ownership of these lands was pending in the Supreme Court and Congress should await the decision of the Court. Following the veto the action in the Supreme Court continued, and the decision was handed down last June.

The fundamental theory of dual sovereignties, and States' rights, is endangered by this claim of superior Federal powers over State lands and resources.

The title and control of each State over its submerged lands are as old as the American Republic or the State itself, and never were successfully contested, or even seriously questioned, until Mr. Ickes came along with his Marxian dream of centralized power.

In a report filed April 26, 1946, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary stated:

"The title to all classes of lands underlying navigable waters has been confirmed to the States by the Supreme Court, and any modification of these decisions would constitute a change in a rule of property which has existed since the founding of the Nation" (S. Rept. No. 1260, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 3).

The Supreme Court of the United States has seen fit to make such a change; and has then sought to minimize the tremendous and far-reaching effects of its decision by the pious statement that "we cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its power in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission" (*United States* v. *State of California*, (330 U. S. —)).

You will be told that the Supreme Court decision in the case of the *United States* v. *California* can have no possible effect upon inland waters or even upon bays and harbors. You will be told that the decision is so phrased that it does not apply to anything except the strip of marginal sea between low-tide mark and the 3-mile limit. Technically, it is true that the decree in this case does not by its terms affect anything except a 3-mile strip of marginal sea offshore from the State of California. But the principle enunciated by the Court in its decision is of much wider application. And the Supreme Court itself has said, in another case (*Illinois Central Railroad* v. *Illinois*, 146 U. S. 387, p. 435), that "there is no reason or principle for the assertion of dominion and sovereignty over an ownership by the State of lands covered by tidewaters that is not equally applicable to its ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by the fresh waters of these lakes."

In the same report from which I have already quoted, the judiciary committee also said:

"If the Supreme Court of the United States should reverse itself, unending litigation would result for probably half a century, for it would mean that the boundary of every parcel of land fronting on navigable waters in the whole Nation would necessarily require judicial determination" (p. 5). That statement is as true today as it was when made; only now it is no longer a prediction, but an accomplished fact. Furthermore, the principle upon which the Supreme Court based its decision is so broad that there is no certainty at all but what it is equally as applicable to dry land as to land under water; and the result has been to cast a cloud upon the title to any land in this Nation which is underlaid with mineral deposits which either are, or may be in the future, necessary or desirable for use by the Government in connection with waging war or in its dealings with foreign nations.

This decision of the Supreme Court is based on a theory heretofore unknown in American constitutional law; a theory that in the exercise of its constitutional powers the United States may appropriate to its own use, and without paying for them, natural resources, existing within land wholly within the boundaries of a State, and not the property of the United States. This doctrine, if carried to its logical conclusion, might permit the Federal Government to appropriate, without compensation, minerals, forests, and other natural resources in State or private ownership, anywhere, which it deems essential to the performance of its constitutional functions.

In the suit against California, the United States alleged that it had either title in fee simple or paramount rights over the lands and minerals underlying the 3-mile belt off the coast of California and outside inland waters. Thus, no claim was made as to inland waters in that case, but there is nothing to prevent the United States in the future from making exactly the same claims as to inland waters and the lands and resources beneath such waters.

Some Federal officials have attempted to quiet the fears of the inland States by saying that it is not their intention to claim lands or minerals beneath inland waters.

Obviously, such assurances are of no value. Mr. Ickes was very positive, for a number of years, that the Federal Government had no rights in submerged lands. But under adequate stimulus he changed his mind in a hurry.

The mere statement of one Federal official that he has no intention of making such a claim is meaningless and without legal force and is not even binding on the person who makes it. A Federal official can change his mind after making such a statement, just as Mr. Ickes changed his in 1937.

The people of the inland States must look to the decision of the Supreme Court, examine the grounds upon which the Court based its decision, and see for themselves whether or not the doctrines upon which the decision is based could be extended to inland waters. If they could, then the inland States are definitely in jeopardy and will be subject to attack whenever Federal officials determine that such an attack should be made.

As a matter of fact, Department of Justice officials have stated to representatives of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary that the Department interprets the decision of the Supreme Court as probably being applicable to all the marginal seas of all the States having ocean frontage, regardless of any peculiar conditions under which such States came into the Union. Because of this interpretation, these officials say, they believe it is incumbent upon the Department to proceed with the filing of suits against all of the remaining tidewater States within the near future. The reason this policy has not yet been carried into effect is, presumably, that the Congress is again considering legislation with respect to these submerged lands, and the Department has been notified that hearings will begin on February 23, and has been asked to present its recommendations at that time.

In order that we may be in a position to form our own opinion on this point, let us examine the Court's decision in the California case to see precisely what the Court held and the precise grounds upon which it based that holding.

The Court specifically held that the Federal Government, rather than the States, has paramount rights in and power over the 3-mile belt, and that included within this power is the right to appropriate all the natural resources of the soil under the water, including oil.

The Court also held that California was not the owner of these lands and resources.

The Court did not directly hold that the United States was the owner of or had title to these lands and resources. It did not say in so many words who was the owner. This fact thas led many lawyers to the view that so far as ownership is concerned, the decision, instead of settling the question, completely unsettled it; that the only inference which can be drawn from the decision is that the land has no owner at all. However, this is completely at variance with one of the basic principles of the law of real property; namely, that real property must always have an owner. In the United States, any lands within the boundaries of a State which have no other owner must of necessity belong to the State.

I think it must be concluded that the language of the Supreme Court's decree, that "The United States of America is * * * possessed of * * * full dominion * * * over the lands," is sufficient to affirm ownership in the Federal Government, and was intended as such an affirmance. It is obvious, of course, that the Court's language is confusing, as well as something less than forthright.

The apparent reason why the question of ownership was left in this confusion was that the Court did not base its decision on chain of title or any ordinary attribute of ownership but rather on this paramount, overriding governmental power which the Court said transcends the rights of a mere property owner.

One of the most disturbing points in the Supreme Court's decision is this statement:

"The Government, which holds its interests here as elsewhere in trust for all the people, is not to be deprived of those interests by the ordinary court rules designed particularly for private disputes over individually owned pieces of property." That statement is more than striking; it is shocking.

That could be construed as one way of saying that when the Government asserts an interest, private property rights will not be protected. The people of a free democracy never could assent to such a doctrine as that, and it is hard to believe that is what the Supreme Court meant.

Reduced to nonlegal language, what the Court seems to have said was that the Federal Government can appropriate for its own use, or can determine who shall appropriate, minerals, and other natural resources in the submerged lands within the 3-mile belt, without any regard to the question of who owns the soil and without making compensation to anyone.

This announces a wholly new and previously unheard-of doctrine in American law which obliterate the basic legal distinction between governmental powers on the one hand and property rights on the other. Never before in this country has it been held that governmental power extended to the taking of minerals or other resources from the soil wholly without regard to lease or fee ownership.

If that is the law, we have come a long way downhill from the Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights.

This holding of overriding governmental power which transcends title was not based on any previous decision or upon any hitherto recognized doctrine of constitutional law. In fact, the Court cited no authority whatever in support of its decision. The sole basis for the decision was the Court's own declaration that it is necessary for the Federal Government to have this overriding paramount power in order to perform its constitutional duties and responsibilities in relation to national defense and international relations. In other words, the Court said that if the Federal Government needed

oil or minerals for national defense, then such need alone, and without regard to title or ownership, would give the Federal Government the everriding paramount power to appropriate such minerals or other property. That is the rationale of the decision.

No wonder the Court was divided in its optnion.

It is not adequate to say that the Supreme Court, in the case of the *United States* v. *California*, has decided the question with respect to submerged lands. What actually happened is that the Court has reversed the rule which was uniformly upheld for more than 100 years, and has thus in effect confiscated State property, and private property derived from State titles; and has laid the foundation for further confiscation of mineral land wherever and whenever the Federal Government sees fit to declare or assert a "paramount interest" stemming from its responsibility to protect the country against dangers, or its responsibility for conducting United States relations with other nations.

The responsibility of the Federal Government for national defense clearly extends to all navigable waters, whether inland or otherwise, and, for that matter, extends to all the lands of the Nation. The Supreme Court's new theory of control of natural resources could, therefore, be extended equally as far.

California's coast line is approximately 1,060 miles in length. Not more than 15 miles of this contain any oil wells. The off-shore oil wells of California all are grouped in the vicinities of Santa Barbara, Long Beach, and Huntington Beach. The United States did not merely claim the oil rights, nor even limit its claim to that section of the submerged lands in which there was oil; it claimed the entire area of California's marginal sea. In sustaining that claim, the Supreme Court has certainly extended an invitation to the Federal Government to make similar claims elsewhere.

Officials of the Department of Justice, speaking unofficially, but in discussions with representatives of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and presumably weighing their words, have expressed the opinion that if the Federal Government should find that the land lying under inland waters was necessary to the national defense, or to the conduct of the Government's negotiations with other nations, the paramount Federal power might be asserted with the same force and effect as it has been asserted with respect to the California marginal sea.

In reading the opinion of the Court in *United States* v. *California*, one cannot help but be struck by the fact that there is nothing in it that is peculiar to California. The Court finds nothing in California history and no peculiar circumstances relating to California which call for a special rule which would apply only to that State. On the contrary, the entire decision is taken up with a consideration of the rights and powers of the Federal Government in the marginal sea generally—and the conclusions are based on the "constitutional responsibilities" of the Federal Government—responsibilities which are obviously no different as to California than as to Colorado, Wyoming, or any other State.

To grasp the potentialities of the decision as it may affect other States, we have only to look at the dissenting opinions of Justices Frankfurter and Reed.

Mr. Justice Reed in his dissent points out that the power of the United States is plenary over these undersea lands precisely as it is "over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation." The constitutional power is the same everywhere. The Federal Government has the same duty to defend inland States from attack that it has to defend the coastal States. If, in the exercise of this power of national defense, the United States can appropriate oil under the marginal sea within California's boundaries, the same power would extend to minerals under the waters of inland lakes and rivers.

If California oil can be confiscated, Texas and Louisiana oil is not safe. If the Federal Government is entitled to take the oil produced in Texas, Louisiana, and California, by virtue of "paramount right," then the Federal Government can assert "paramount right" to the oysters from the bed of Chesapeake Bay, the gas from under Lake Erie, the iron ore from beneath the Minnesota lakes, the coal from under the rivers of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, and perhaps even the pay-dirt from the beds of our gold-producing streams.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his dissent points out that the contention that oil deposits in the marginal sea may be vital to national security is no more relevant to the question of ownership or of control than is the existence of uranium deposits wherever they may be. In other words, if this national power can justify the taking of oil, it could also justify the taking of uranium deposits even in private property, and if oil and uranium can be taken, why not iron, manganese, copper, coal, gold, and silver, or any other natural resources?

Reluctantly but inescapably, we are forced to the conclusion that the decision in *United States* v. *California* is an assertion by the Supreme Court of Federal rights and powers not declared in the Constitution and never asserted in the past by Congress or any other Federal agency; and that the decision is therefore a threat to property rights everywhere.

To realize the seriousness of this threat we must remember that the Court tells us that it is the needs of the Federal Government for national purposes which justify the existence of this paramount overriding power that transcends property rights. But who will determine these needs? Eventually the determination will fall into the hands of some Federal bureau. A bureau in Washington will decide when the Federal Government needs to appropriate your national resources, forests, mines, and fisheries. The Supreme Court's decision thus becomes a factor in the steady weakening of State and local government and the increased centralization of power in Washington, which if not checked can only result in the ultimate break-down of the constitutional balance between State and Federal governments.

Three days after the Supreme Court entered its decree in the case of the *United States* v. *California*, the Attorney General of the United States wrote a letter to the President advising him of the action taken by the Court.

The second paragraph of that letter starts with the following sentence:

"The signing of the decree brings to a successful termination the first phase of efforts being made to establish the rights of the United States in areas which, up to this time, had been claimed by the State."

I do not mean to attribute to the Attorney General any deep or hidden meaning, in his use of those words. But I say to you, his words were prophetic, in perhaps a broader sense than he intended them.

This decree of the Supreme Court does bring to an end only the first phase of the struggle. Efforts are being made to establish the rights of the United States in areas which up to this time have been claimed by the States.

In my opinion, such efforts are continuing and will continue; and there is no telling when or where they will stop, if the Congress does not stop them. This is not the plan or plot of any one man or group of men; it is a part of the pattern of centralized bureaucracy, which is at once a formula, a method, and a manner of thinking; and which is the natural and implacable enemy of States' rights.

Concluding his letter to the President, the Attorney General used this final sentence:

"What has been recovered may prove, in the coming years, to be but an insignificant fraction of the undeveloped and as yet unknown resources in the remaining area."

I think those words have deep significance, however the Attorney General may have intended them. Certainly, if the bureaucrats subsequently assert, and the Supreme Court upholds, a claim by the Federal Government to paramount power and dominion over lands beneath inland waters, and the mineral resources of such lands, what has been recovered already may indeed prove to be but an insignificant fraction of what might then be involved.

All sections of the country are affected alike by the threat implicit in this Supreme Court decision. Prospective losses of mineral rights and other natural resources may differ in degree among different States, as their natural resources differ, but the nature of the threat is the same; and there are no prospective benefits for any State, or group of States.

It is wrong to say that the reclamation States, or the reclamation fund, can profit in any way from Federal ownership of the submerged lands. These lands do not come within the provisions of the Public Lands Mineral Leasing Act, which appropriates 52½ percent of revenues from production to the reclamation fund. That act applies only to the public lands, and does not cover any submerged lands or marginal seas. The Attorney General of the United States has confirmed this, in a decision dated August 29, 1947. As a matter of fact, the briefs and stipulations filed by the Government in the case of the *United States* v. *California* made it very clear that the submerged lands cannot even be leased unless Congress passes some new act granting authority for the leasing.

The public domain was established in 1787 when Virginia ceded the Northwest Territory to the United States. Following this all of the other original States ceded their western lands to the Federal Government. These lands became the public domain; but this cession did not include lands beneath the coastal sea, nor lands beneath inland navigable waters, which were always reserved to the States.

Public lands are vacant and unappropriated uplands, subject to the land laws of the United States, and which have been surveyed by the United States under the public survey. The public survey has never been extended to cover the lands under navigable waters, either inland or along the coast, as such lands always have been considered the properties of the States.

If the decision of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *California* was a good thing for the reclamation States, the National Reclamation Association would not be lined up against the decision, and the National Reclamation Association has by resolution directed its board of directors and officers to cooperate with and assist the governors and attorneys general of the States in their continued Nation-wide organization and campaign for suitable congressional action to undo the unsettling effects of this decision.

By petition, the National Reclamation Association has asked Congress to take immediate action declaring the law to be substantially as follows: First, that the exercise of the Federal Government's paramount powers in national defense, international affairs, and commerce shall not of itself be interpreted as vesting any proprietary interest in the land or resources so defended or dealt with; and, second, that, except as to those lands which the Government has previously acquired by purchase, condemnation, or donation, the respective States own the title to all lands beneath the navigable water within their boundaries, which as to coastal States includes the marginal shelf, subject to such regulatory powers in the Federal Government as may be necessary in exercising its constitutional powers of and in national defense, commerce, and international affairs.

Anyone who will say that since the Supreme Court has now decided this matter, the Congress should not take any action, demonstrates his own complete failure to comprehend the problem. Congress not only should act; Congress must act. If we assume that the Supreme Court's decision settles the question that the Federal Government has complete sovereignty and dominion over the marginal seas within the 3-mile limit, then there are, literally, a score or more of questions which must be settled. These questions, of course, would not require separate and special handling if the Congress should dispose of the whole problem by disavowing Federal ownership of these lands. But if Congress does not take that course, then Congress must either itself take up, one by one, the many other questions which will then present themselves, or provide that they be taken up, and settled, in some other way.

Among these questions are the following:

Is the low-water mark, as it existed when the State came into the Union, to be accepted for purposes of a decree, or is the low-water mark as it existed at the date of the decision to be accepted?

What is to be done with artificially-made land projecting into the 3-mile area?

What are to be the limits upon the police jurisdiction within the 3-mile area, for law enforcement purposes, or for the abatement of nuisances, or the granting of fishing licenses, or the exercise of other police powers?

How are inland bays and waters to be distinguished from the low-water mark on the ocean shore line?

Are channels and inlets lying between islands within the 3-mile limit, or between an island and the mainland, to be treated as inland waters, or as a part of the area within the Federal jurisdiction, thus bringing the surface of such islands within the dominion and sovereignty of the Federal Government?

What is to be the disposition of public and private docks, loading terminals, and other harbor installations, including jetties and causeways extending into the 3-mile limit?

What are the rights of present tenants holding under grants or leases from the States?

What is the liability of the States to the Federal Government with respect to royalties and other revenues they have received from lessees, grantees, and licensees for the occupation and use of off-shore areas?

That list of questions is by no means comprehensive; but it will serve to give some idea of the complexity of the problem.

If Congress will not settle this problem at one stroke, then Congress must at the very least give its assent to negotiations for settlement, between the Federal Government and the States, looking toward a compact, or compacts, which shall be mutually binding, and which shall resolve the issues presented and give adequate protection to the rights of States and individuals. I have given considerable study to the question of compacts as a possible method of attacking the problem, and I shall give it more study, for I am inclined to think it might work.

It is my opinion now, however, as it was when I sponsored House Joint Resolution 225 in the Senate, that this is a question of national policy which should be determined by the Congress, if the Congress will act and if the President does not again nullify its action. The overwhelming sentiment of the people in favor of continuing State ownership and control was demonstrated in the passage of House Joint Resolution 225. The indications are clear that the Supreme Court decision has only strengthened that sentiment.

The only way in which this threatened invasion of State powers and rights can be prevented is by congressional action of some nature. To bring about such action I have recently joined with 19 other Senators in introducing Senate bill 1988, to restore ownership and control of all lands and resources beneath navigable waters to the States and those holding under them. This bill is a nonpartisan measure sponsored by 10 Democrats and 10 Republicans. Its basic aim is to preserve, as between the States and Central Government, the true constitutional balance of power which is essential to the preservation of our Federal system and upon which the strength and vitality of this Republic depend. I do not believe it is by any means perfect. In fact, I think it can be improved in language. But its purpose is sound.

I present this subject to this convention with a deep sense of responsibility. This great meeting, that has now become an annual conclave of historic significance, can well afford to give serious thought to the conditions that have arisen by reason of the decision recentl, rendered.

This Government would never have come into existence—in other words, the Constitution of the United States would never have been adopted by the original States—had it not been for the fact that in the organic law itself, it was declared, as it is now declared, that those rights not specifically granted to the Federal Government should be reserved to the States and to the people.

I know of no gathering that assembles in all the West to which this subject can be more appropriately addressed. The West is today, and we hope will always remain, the respository and frontier of individual human liberties; the guardian of the rights that belong to the States and the people thereof.

That being true, this conclave, assembled in the very heart of the West, can well afford to pronounce against what appears to be constant encroachment of bureaucratic centralized government.

As a last expression, let me express the thought that there is no form of totalitarian government that can be more ruthless in its dealings with the individual than that form of administrative hierarchy which we know as bureaucracy. A true dictator, being a one-man government, might change his mind, might yield to his heart or his conscience; but the bureau has no heart, and it has but an assembled conscience. A monarch, however bound by tradition, has a mind of his own, and may think. The bureau never thinks; it follows the formula. The individual cannot always pass the buck and escape responsibility, but the bureau can always resort to that method.

If your State, and my State, remain quiet and inarticulate on the subject that I have discussed here—if the people of the great open country of the West remain silent—we cannot tell what rights we may be letting go by default, or how soon they may go. But the generation coming on will hold us responsible for remaining silent, when the rights of the States, and the rights of the people, as individuals, are being progressively taken away, despite the apparently express guaranties of our organic law.

Others may remain silent, but I shall not; and I have sought today to present this subject as clearly as was within my power to one of the most important groups in western America, with the hope that you may be aroused, and so that you may at least be warned.

The American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the subject The American Farmer, prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUIT CRITICIZING THE AMERICAN FARMER

The great work of American agriculture during the First and Second World Wars in helping to achieve victory is so well known that it certainly doesn't require repeating. So, too, the amazing job that American farmers have done after both wars in sending needed relief supplies to feed the hungry abroad is also an epic that has been told and retold.

It is amazing, therefore, that in spite of the magnificent record of American agriculture and its 29,000,000 people, there should be such widespread and unjustified criticism of the American farmer these days.

"The farmer is living off the fat of the land," "the farmer is profiteering," "the farmer is having life easy and is bleeding the American consumer." These are some of the examples of the synthetic, loose thinking which you and I hear in so many quarters today.

FARMERS MUST NOT BE MADE SCAPEGOAT

This talk is completely uncalled for, as I am going to show in this statement. The reason that I take the time to answer this talk is because I don't want to see American agriculture or any other fine segment of American society made the scapegoat for unfortunate inflationary conditions—for the fact that we have a 50-cent dollar today—which is, in large part, due to bureaucratic bungling anyway. I don't want to see American farmers crucified or persecuted any more than I want to see American labor or American management unjustly attacked.

WISCONSIN'S AMAZING FARMING RECORD

It is only natural that, representing as I do the great dairy State of Wisconsin, I should be keenly interested in Badger and all American agriculture. All of Wisconsin, with its almost two and a half million milk cows, with its annual production of over seven and a quarter billion quarts, with its butter production of 83,000,000 pounds, its 370,000,000 pounds of whole-milk cheese, its over 19,000,000 gallons of ice cream produced, is deeply affected by the progress of American agriculture. You and I know that Wisconsin is not only famed for its dairy production, but for its outstanding production of canning items—cucumbers, cabbage, peas; that it ranks first in the Nation in production of tame hay, clover and timothy hay, in hemp acreage, second in alfalfa acreage, in cranberry production, fourth in production of oats and honey. Wisconsin's over 177,000 farms form a vital component of American agriculture and of our entire American economy.

FARMER DESERVES RESPECT

Loose criticism of the Wisconsin and all American farmers must come to an end. The farmer deserves the respect and esteem of the American people because he is confronted today with a tremendous job which he cannot possibly do unless he receives the

full support and encouragement not only of Government but of all segments of American life.

ANSWERING CHARGE THAT FARM INCOME ROSE DISPROPORTIONATELY

Now let's answer the synthetic thinking point by point.

1. In the first place, there is a lot of misinterpretation of the fact that the farmer's income has increased in some cases more than the city laborer's income has gone up. While it is true that farm income has risen somewhat more than that of American workers, we mustn't forget the fact that the average income of the American farmer is still way below that of the American city dweller including the worker. Sure, farm income has risen, but it rose above such low levels—such an incredibly low income—that it doesn't represent a great advance in farm prosperity.

MEMORIES OF FARM DEPRESSION

You and I know that in the last two decades, American agriculture has lost folks through migration at the rate of 600,000 per year.

You and I well recall the day when farms were being foreclosed wholesale, when farmers were being turned out of homes which they and their fathers had occupied for generations, because they couldn't eke out a few dollars to pay the mortgage. One of the first acts that I did when I came down to the Senate in 1939 was to introduce a bill for a moratorium on farm foreclosures.

I reported then that in Barron County where my father before me and I have had a dairy farm of over 300 acres, some of the finest farms were being foreclosed because the farmers couldn't make ends meet. Farmers were selling milk, as I was, at 90 cents to $1.15 per hundred that cost $1.80 to produce. I don't want to see conditions like that return any more than does any other sensible, thinking American. If American agriculture prospers, all America prospers. If American farmers suffer, all other parts of the American economy which depend upon the farmer not only to buy items but to sell items, will suffer.

FARMERS GET FRACTION OF CONSUMER'S DOLLAR

2. Next, let us note the fact that the farmer still only gets a fraction of the total price paid by the American consumer. The wool suit on your back, the food items that you eat, all have shot up in price, but not because the farmer is profiteering. His share of the consumer dollar is still only a small part of the increased price that consumers are paying.

HIGH TAXES RAISE PRICES

The middlemen whose costs have increased, too, have sought higher prices to meet the problem of higher taxes and have passed those prices along to the consumer. Let's not allow the smearing of the middlemen any more than the farmer should be smeared. We all know how processors and distributors have been hit by high taxes and high labor costs. Their dollar, like our dollar, is worth only 50 cents or so in purchasing power today.

If taxes were reduced, as I have consistently suggested and voted, the pressure to make ends meet might be taken off the middlemen, so that they would be able to decrease prices. Reduced taxes means, too, added revenue to Uncle Sam, as was proven after the First World War because with taxes low, production is stimulated and increased.

But on the farmer specifically let us note the fact that according to the Department of Agriculture, between the years 1935 and 1939 the farmers only received 50 percent of the retail price of dairy products which the consumer paid; today, his share of the retail price has risen to 59 percent. When you think, however, of his tremendously increased costs in maintaining his farm animals, his buildings, his machinery, in buying his own goods, this comparatively small increase in the farmer's share is understandable.

When you think of the sunup to sundown hours that the farmer spends on producing his food items, the long years of investment that he has to put in, you can further understand his problems. In canned fruits and vegetables the farmer's share of the retail price is only around 26 percent today as against 14 percent back in prewar days. In poultry and eggs, the farmer gets only 54 percent of the retail price today as against 40 percent in years past. In fresh fruits and vegetables, the farmer gets 40 percent of the dollar we pay whereas he received only 35 percent in years past.

FARMER'S INCREASED COSTS AND SHORTAGES

3. Next, let's consider the fact that the farmer's own cost of living items have tremendously increased in price, thus sapping his purchasing power. It has been proven that the cost of items that the farmer buys have risen higher than the cost of items that the city dweller buys. In addition, it has been proven that in times of relative prosperity costs to the farmer rise sharply, but in times of relative depression those costs tend to drop only slightly and not as fast as do the farmer's prices for his own produced items.

SHORTAGES FARMER FACES

4. Any time anyone starts to think that the farmer is leading an easy life, let him go out and work a month or so on the farm. Let him tackle the tremendous problem of the shortage of labor and the shortage of farm machinery. I have been working with officials of the United States Employment Service, trying to assure an adequate supply of hands for Wisconsin fruit and vegetable crops. Moreover, I have been trying to help forestall the grave gasoline shortage which is going to hit American farmers during next spring and summer. The word "shortage" is all too familiar to the American farmer these days. The farmer is short on everything except needless criticism which he receives.

PROBLEMS ABOUT OUR FARM POLICY

5. It is assumed by some folks that America's farm policy is all squared away. Actually, there is tremendous need for wholesale reconsideration and revision of our entire agricultural program which is still operating on a makeshift basis and which needs overhauling in the light of modern prices. The whole parity price formula, according to statements from every qualified witness, like the President of the American Farm Bureau Federation, requires overhauling to assure justice and equity for America's farmers.

EFFICIENT USE OF FEDERAL FARM FUNDS

6. We know, too, that although we have been appropriating vast sums each year for the Agriculture Department, much of our funds never reach the American farmer but go into bureaucratic overhead. I well recall that back in 1939 we were spending a billion dollars or so a year for the Department of Agriculture, but so far as the farmer in Barron or Chippewa Counties was concerned, he wasn't seeing or getting nary a dollar of it to help him when he needed help in the way that he needed it.

Farmers are tremendously interested in getting a streamlined, efficient Government set-up to assist them. Right now, there is duplication, overlapping and conflicts in administration of several areas of the farm program. In the interests of economy and efficiency, it is time that we streamline the farm agency set-up.

DECENTRALIZE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

7. Streamlining also means decentralization. I have introduced Senate Resolution 136, providing for a study by the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee of ways and means of decentralizing the vast Agriculture Department. There is no reason why this department should be concentrated principally in Washington, D. C., and a few other major cities. The time is long overdue to disperse this Department to the grassroots of America, to send the Dairy Division close to the dairy heart of America, the Cotton Division, the Wheat Division and so on down the line, close to the farmers who know their own problems best.

8. Still another need of the American farmer is an adequate program for research and education for increased consumption of farm commodities. If we are to maintain a high level of farm production once Europe's immediate food needs are met, we must make sure that we don't run into the problem of farm surpluses.

We don't want to ever see recur the day when farmers must spill their milk because they can't sell it at a fair price. It is important that we accelerate therefore our studies of using byproducts of agricultural commodities, that may be in surplus, of channeling surpluses in the school lunch program and in improved nutrition and health programs. We must encourage American consumers to eat greater quantities of wholesome, nutritious foods like cheese. As I have often said, if the American consumer was to consume cheese in as large a degree as do many European consumers in normal times, then we would probably never again see a recurrence of the problem of cheese surpluses and falling cheese prices.

CONCLUSION

These, then, are but a few of the many problems which face the American farmer. You and I know that we could go on at length discussing the problem of soil conservation—the problem of adequate electrification of farms—the need for adequate farm credit, and farm health programs, accident prevention, rural education, and a dozen other issues which the farmer confronts.

In any case, our study of this problem boils down to this—quit criticizing the American farmer and start helping him and encouraging him in the tremendous job he had done, he is doing, and he still has to do.

Advantages of Export to the Middlesex County Manufacturer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Alexander S. Keller at the annual meeting of the Middlesex County Manufacturers' Association. I have consulted the Government Printing Office, and it is estimated that the matter will make two and one-quarter pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $159.75. I believe that the address is worth much more than that.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When your secretary, Mr. Hippler, did me the honor of inviting me to address you this evening, he suggested as the subject "Advantages of Export to the Middlesex County Manufacturer". I greatly appreciated the compliment of his invitation and accepted

the subject without an argument. It seemed like one which any export manager could handle with a great deal of ease. It certainly has been thoroughly explored and you will find a very general agreement that export is a good thing. I have heard it said by Republicans and Democrats, farmers and businessmen, labor leaders and industrialists. Mr. Henry Wallace discovered that export was necessary to support his 60,000,000 jobs. Now we've got the 60,000,000 and whether or not Mr. Wallace's prescription for reaching that point was the correct one, there is no doubt that our export figures for this year will exceed all previous records and play a vital part in supporting our present level of general activity.

To me, the advantages of export are about as obvious as the desirability of selling your products in New Jersey and California. Exports add to volume, employ labor, and help make the fullest use of plant and equipment.

There is, of course, one point about exports that must be emphasized and that is the advantage of export trade to those who are not exporters. I am, of course, particularly familiar with the machine tool industry which over a period of a good many years has shipped some 25 percent of its volume to foreign destinations. Now a gray iron foundry or an electric power company may not be greatly concerned with the problems of export but if they are selling castings or electric energy to a machine tool plant, you can just put it down that 25 percent of their sales to that machine tool builder are moving into export. Among the manufacturers of Middlesex County, there are many who are experienced exporters and understand the problems as well, or better, than I, but even if your product is a consumer article sold entirely within the United States, it can still find its largest possible distribution only during a period of general good employment and prosperity. Our economic history shows that every such period was marked by a very substantial export trade.

Conversely, the present indication that our foreign shipments have reached and passed their peak is one of the very important factors on which those who foresee a business recession are basing their predictions.

Let's take a look at the figures. The Department of Commerce tells us that we exported $12,000,000,000 worth of goods in 1946. In the first 6 months of this year that figure reached $8,300,000,000. In May alone we shipped over $1,400,000,000, which was almost as much in dollar value as we shipped abroad in the year 1932. Predictions were current that the total for this year would reach $17,000,000,000 or $18,000,000,000. It is now evident that May was the high point, June was off .12 percent, July another 7 percent, and August about the same as July.

Every exporter is familiar with the problems which have begun to arise. The so-called dollar shortage has been so widely publicized that there is very little reason for me to go into it in much detail. The fact is that almost every country in the world is now carefully limiting its imports by some system of control, and many of them are engaged in the most desperate efforts to become economically self-sufficient and reduce their needs for supplies from outside sources. This is not because they don't want the goods but because they haven't the means to pay for them.

Now, how about the other side of the picture? While we were exporting $12,000,000,000 worth of goods in 1946, we were importing $5,250,000,000 and the $8,300,000,000 in 6 months of this year were partially offset by $3,000,000,000 worth of imports. Those figures are records too, but they are a long way from balancing the terrific needs of our foreign customers.

The figures on exports and imports which I have just quoted are the most important considerations in our foreign-trade picture but they do not tell the whole story in the total balance of international payments. To get the entire picture, we must also take into consideration such items as services, including ocean freight, insurance, etc., interest on foreign investments here and abroad, the movement of long-term capital and the expenses of people traveling in foreign countries. Then there is a figure which is pleasantly termed "unilateral transfers" in the Department of Commerce reports. This is what we used to call immigrant remittances but in the last few years it has reached some enormous totals, including public and private relief remittances, lend-lease and UNRRA expenditures.

Now, gentlemen, with all due respect to the subject suggested by your Secretary, I feel that it is a little too easy. To me, the important question is not what are the advantages of export but how are we going to protect, maintain, and, if possible, expand our export position so that we are going to be able to continue and enlarge those advantages in the days to come. Obviously, there is no sense in taxing ourselves, borrowing from ourselves, and inflating our own economy to support our export on a relief basis. We want to use our resources, our manpower, and our plant to the greatest extent possible, but unless we can see some return over the years we would simply be wasting our assets and our efforts. As an exporter, this is a problem which concerns me very greatly, as it must concern every thinking citizen interested in our peace and prosperity. I am going to venture to recommend a program which may help somewhat in solving it.

1. The Marshall plan should be approved and put into effect as promptly as possible so that we will continue to have a world in which our type of economy can flourish.

2. We must develop political and economic conditions under which private American capital can be prudently invested in foreign countries on an increasing scale.

3. We should develop foreign travel by our own citizens and encourage their purchases while abroad.

4. We should support the International Trade Organization and the reciprocal trade agreements resulting from the recent conferences at Geneva.

5. We must reverse our traditional attitude toward imports by recognizing them as a vital and beneficial portion of our national economy.

The Marshall plan has already had so much attention, and you will hear so much more about it, that I certainly do not propose to take up much of your time by going into details. I simply want to call to your attention the fact that we are still far from having passed out of the emergency stage to a position where we can safely rely upon normal trade and prudent investment to carry us out of our difficulties. We must preserve our friends and our prospective friends in Europe so that at least a substantial proportion of the economically advanced part of the world will continue to be available for the kind of business relations which are typical of our system of free enterprise.

I myself have said a little earlier this evening that we must find a way of supporting our foreign trade on something other than a relief basis. Many of those who are beginning to voice some opposition to the Marshall plan are pointing out that our investments abroad should be made on a sound economic basis which promise a reasonable return. To me the necessities of the Marshall plan are like the necessities for the use of public funds for relief or for the education of children in our own country. We don't spend our tax money for those things with the expectation that there will be direct repayment, but we are enlightened enough to know that our own future and that of our families is not safe if we permit an exaggerated condition of economic distress or of ignorance to prevail in our midst. Similarly, on an international scale, we cannot avoid present sacrifices to maintain a world in which there is a prospect of future safety for our own way of life.

The Marshall plan, however, is, and must be viewed as, an extraordinary effort under extraordinary conditions. It has a definite job to accomplish over the next 5 years, but it is not a program for the indefinite future, and that brings me to the second point which I have recommended to you.

A large part of the development of our industry and transportation during the nineteenth century was based upon the investment of foreign capital in this country at a time when capital and savings here were too inadequate to do the job. Today there are enormous opportunities for the profitable use of surplus American capital in undeveloped territories all over the world and in the further sound rehabilitation of countries which have suffered during the war.

It is true that the investment of capital abroad is faced with many adverse conditions which did not prevail here a century ago. There are large areas in which the investment of private capital is unwelcome and there are more areas in which there is so much doubt as to the economic and political future that prudent investment is impossible. In the period immediately following the last war we made substantial foreign investments, many of which were lost. Today there is a tendency toward nationalistic economic thinking which causes many countries, even though they welcome foreign investment, to hedge it about with restrictions and discriminations which are certainly discouraging. It must be admitted that some of this attitude is the result of the special privileges which foreign capital has often demanded in the past.

In spite of these conceded difficulties, however, there is no question but that private investment, dollar for dollar, can do a far more effective job than Government investment. It is particularly important that the direct investment by American business in foreign subsidiaries and affiliates carries with it a share in management and the export of American "know how" which will be enormously valuable in advancing world recovery. And the movement of American capital into the foreign field can provide a very substantial item in the international balance of trade which will help to support our exports for a good many years to come.

The third point which I made had to do with the development of foreign travel and particularly with the encouragement of travelers' purchases abroad. Expenditures of our travelers in normal times have been a very important item in the balance of international payments. Our present position of economic and political leadership gives every promise that our foreign travel will automatically expand if peace and general prosperity are maintained.

Our government is already making efforts to eliminate some of the vexing problems of visas, which have been so burdensome to foreign travelers in recent years. Our foreign friends should cooperate in making the visitor's path as pleasant as possible, for their own direct benefit.

A further point, not too frequently recognized, is the effect of our own customs regulations. Undoubtedly many of you have traveled abroad and I am sure that the pleasure of your trip has been definitely limited by the thought of that customs inspector, whom you are sure to meet when you come back to the United States. Our present regulations, which permit an American traveler to bring back only $100 worth of foreign purchases duty-free seem to me to be ridiculous, out of date, and completely useless from any point of view. I can see absolutely no reason why an American traveling abroad should not be entitled to bring

home with him anything that he wants for his own use or for gifts to his family and friends. We have the resources in foreign exchange to permit it and it is impossible to see that any conceivable amount of purchases by travelers abroad would impinge so severely on any American industry that it would endanger its position.

The additional purchases that would be made by American citizens abroad would have a very beneficial and entirely harmless effect on the balance of international payments; and the freedom from constant consideration of that customs inspector would in itself encourage foreign travel and add to its enjoyment for a large number of our citizens. It is my recommendation that there should be no limit whatever to the value of goods which a traveler can bring back with him, that he should be required only to sign an affidavit that his purchases were entirely for his own use or for gifts and not for resale. The administration of customs should be directed altogether to insuring compliance with this simple regulation.

As my fourth point, I have suggested the support of the International Trade Organization and the reciprocal trade agreements developed at the Geneva Conference. The proposed charter of the ITO has now been published and it has come amazingly close to the ideals of American private enterprise which our Government attempted to establish as an international policy through this new organization. The desired effect is the ultimate elimination of many of the international barriers to foreign trade. Considering the amount of economic nationalism which is prevalent today (and in this we cannot help including the enormous barriers which have been set up by our own country) the substantial agreement arrived at in the draft charter is a truly monumental achievement.

Our negotiators didn't have an easy time. They were, of course, perfectly consistent in their desire to remove discrimination for or against particular countries or groups. But they couldn't deny the barriers which are inherent in our whole tariff structure. The reciprocal trade agreements which were negotiated at Geneva must go hand in hand with the ITO charter as an indication that we are willing to match the acceptance of our own principles by the rest of the world with a disposition to let them trade with us.

The most important point that I can make is the fifth, which is the reversal of our attitude toward imports. I said before that everybody is in favor of exports, or at least renders them lip service; but we've always had our share of economic isolationists who are against foreign trade, and particularly they live in fear of imports.

That, I submit, is a view that is obsolete and antiquated for two very good reasons.

First, we have learned at bitter cost in two wars that we cannot live in political or economic isolation. We are too big to stay out of the troubles, even when they are created by conditions far from our own country. Since we always get into them ultimately, it would certainly make better sense to prevent them, if possible, and to have good and strong friends in any case. Far from having no responsibility for World War II, there is powerful evidence that our high tariff policy was a contributory cause.

Secondly, it just doesn't make sense to live in fear of imports. Your children and mine know better than that. The part of their weekly allowance that goes into the box at Sunday school may be good for their souls, but it's that weekly importation of bubble gum that puts the glint into junior's eyes. No workman in our factories is content to exert his best efforts just for the sake of seeing the products roll out of the shipping room door. His interest is the pay check—and what it will buy. And, on an international scale, the fruits of our efforts in foreign trade are the goods and services which our people can buy and enjoy.

At an earlier stage in our economic history there was real validity to the argument that we must protect our industry and agriculture against the older, better financed, more efficient competition from abroad. Today that simply doesn't make sense in the light of the ever increasing world-wide demand for our products.

Equally obsolete is the argument that we must protect our standard of living against foreign labor on starvation wages. We know now that no labor is more efficient, dollar for dollar, than our own, with its background of the finest and most effective plant and equipment that the world has ever seen. Those products that we shall bring in at lower cost will actually improve, and not lower our standard of living.

A more recent argument against any change in our tariff policy is that there is no use trying to encourage imports because the rest of the world is so flat on its back that they have not anything to send us. It is certainly true that many of the European countries at least are suffering from a serious lack of productivity with serious effects, both on their own internal economy and on their ability to accumulate a surplus for export. This lack of productivity results from a variety of causes, some of which, like shortage of raw materials and fuel, are beyond their control. There are also other causes inherent in the current political and economic theories which have attracted too many of the countries of western Europe. The emphasis has been on socialization and security, while individual initiative and incentive have suffered. A vast amount of hard work on both sides of the Atlantic is going to be necessary to insure the recovery which we all need. It is the problem of the countries overseas to reestablish the amount of individual incentive necessary to restore their productivity. By encouraging imports we can provide a further incentive to them, at the same time as we assure a continuing market for our own exports.

We can do a great deal to restore a decent political atmosphere through the Marshall plan. We can accomplish much through the encouragement of private investment in foreign countries, but in the very long run this whole matter of the balance of international payment boils down to whether we really want to avail ourselves of the things that other countries can produce and send for our nourishment and enjoyment. Capital will not go overseas, and should not, unless it can be quite sure that interest payments will be made and principal ultimately repaid, and it seems to me to be the most primitive form of economic thinking, and the soundest, that tells us that if we are going to work, produce, save and invest, and export, we want more for our pains than gold at Fort Knox and another round of bankruptcies.

The reciprocal-trade-agreement program represents a magnificent advance in the history of our economic thinking. As you know, these agreements have always been based upon our making concessions in our tariff rates against concessions of equal value made by other countries. The use of the word concession has always amused me a little. Of course, it is very good when you are working out a deal to persuade the other fellow that you are giving him something and, of course, we were. But these concessions were very carefully considered to avoid any damage to our own industry and insofar as they succeeded in this, they also succeeded in bringing in more products at lower cost for our use and enjoyment; so while they were concessions to the other countries, they were benefits to ourselves.

Our tariff structure is enormous and complicated. To wipe it out all at once would be dangerous and might cause as many new injustices as were caused by its erection, but we should clearly favor its continued modification through the Reciprocal Trade Agreement route and perhaps through carefully considered legislation when necessary.

But the whole spirit of the administration of our tariff laws requires immediate attention. It has always been our policy to administer the law so as to put the greatest possible burden on the importer. If there was any doubt as to the classification of a commodity, it was put into the group carrying the highest possible tariff. Any difference of opinion was resolved by the customs officials against the importer and the delays in securing a judgment or appeal to the courts have been so great as to tie capital and merchandise up for years before some of the cases have been settled. Consequently an importer wishing to bring in a new product, concerning which there is any doubt whatever as to classification (and I assure you that our definitions give rise to a great deal of doubt), has in most instances given up the idea rather than to attempt to seek a decision which he feels sure will be adverse and which he knows will cause interminable delays. Occasionally an importer can find a good way of circumventing an unreasonable tariff schedule. I have always liked the story of the Canadian producer of mineral water who faced a prohibitive tariff here and then discovered that by freezing the water he could bring it into the United States as ice. That procedure is not available to many and the result has rather been a freezing of our entire foreign trade situation on the import side.

Regardless of the view that our present tariff barriers are excessive, the fact is that we have them, and we must use care in avoiding drastic readjustments in industries that have grown up behind them in all good faith. But I am absolutely sure that we could do ourselves and the rest of the world the greatest possible benefit by viewing the importer as a businessman who is performing an essential economic service. So let us engage in a process of gradual evolution of reorienting our tariff policy so that foreign goods are welcomed here and are only kept out when their admission would seriously endanger the structure of an existing industry or when an uneconomical industry must be maintained for reasons of national defense. Above all let us change, by law, the entire administration of our customs so that foreign importations are treated as the great economic benefit which they truly are.

Unfortunately this whole battle has thus far been carried by the importers who were presumed to have a special interest in this situation, as indeed they have; but even more important is the effect of our tariff structure on exports and on our entire economic and political well-being. From that point of view, it is the job of every one of us to take an interest in this situation.

It is ordinarily only the people whose direct interests are clearly affected who take the trouble to fight our most important battles. More and more generally exporters have come to realize that their own existence depends upon fighting the battle for imports. By the same token every citizen of our country has a stake in the battle for foreign trade.

Fears Rise in Italy of Red Revolt—Adriatic Arms Smugglers Hunted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of Thursday, February 5, 1948:

FEARS RISE IN ITALY OF RED REVOLT—ADRIATIC ARMS SMUGGLERS HUNTED—MORE MUNITIONS CACHES DISCOVERED—POLICE TO ADD 20,000—CABINET ACTION DUE ON COMMUNISTS' EXPANDING PRIVATE ARMY

(By Arnaldo Cortesi)

ROME, February 4.—Fears that the Communists were organizing an armed insurrection to start if the Left Wing was defeated in the next general election increased today when it became known that the Government had ordered intensified surveillance of the Adriatic coast to prevent the smuggling of arms into Italy from Yugoslavia and Greece.

The navy was instructed to cooperate with customs guards to intercept several vessels believed to be about to sail for Italy with cargoes of arms, ammunition and explosives.

It is known that there has been considerable arms traffic across the Adriatic in the past and that many foreigners, mostly Yugoslavs with false identification papers, have been engaged in receiving and distributing the smuggled munitions.

Rome meanwhile is receiving additional reports of the discovery by the police of arms caches in various parts of Italy. An arsenal that included machine guns, other automatic weapons, ammunition and explosives was found on a farm outside Crevalcore, near Bologna.

Another cache was discovered in a cemetery at Parma. This one consisted of four machine guns, several submachine guns, 46 rifles, several thousand rounds of ammunition, four antitank mines, 196 hand grenades and 55 pounds of explosives. A Communist municipal councilor in Parma is reported to be the chief suspect.

TOGLIATTI STAND RECALLED

Large quantities of high explosives and gas masks were found in the attic of the home of a Communist stone mason in Prato.

All these facts, coupled with the Communist drive to recruit a large private army, appear to conform to official suspicions that the Communists may be preparing to take Italy over by force if the election scheduled for April 18 should go against them and their allies.

Palmiro Togliatti, the Communist leader, speaking at his party's congress in Milan last month, made it clear that the Communists expected to conquer power by democratic means but that they did not propose to abide by an adverse electoral verdict by the Italian people.

Although the threat of revolution does not appear to be imminent, the independent press, with the Tempo in the lead, urges the Government to act before it is too late.

Perhaps partly in reply to such proddings, the Official Gazette today published a decree authorizing the Government to increase the police force by 20,000 men, with recruiting to start immediately. This step follows the recall into service of many members of the Carabinieri from the class of 1905 onward.

The problem of what to do about a Communist private army should be taken up by the Cabinet Council tomorrow. The Government has been hampered hitherto by a lack of any specific legislation against private military and semimilitary organizations. Article XVIII of the new Italian Constitution, which came into force on January 1, forbids all secret associations and all those that even indirectly pursue political ends by means of organizations having a military character.

The Constituent Assembly, however, has not yet voted any law implementing this article. It is thought that the Government will outlaw all private military organizations by decree, but enforcing of the decree may prove difficult.

The tempo, which has been carrying on to call attention to the threat represented by a Communist private army, today published further revelations on the subject. They were believed to have been supplied by Government quarters and had every appearance of being authentic.

According to the Tempo, the Communists, after their Milan congress, decided to create permanent military formations for use "not only at home but also abroad." They were said to be called Garibaldi brigades in Italy and Maquis brigades in France.

In Italy, the newspaper says, these forces are recruited through the National Association of Italian Partisans and the Youth Front, both of which are dominated by Communists. The Tempo adds that such formations existed in Milan even before last month and had their own transport, commissariat, and arms.

They effected a trial mobilization last November when they occupied the prefecture and center of the city, the newspaper added. These Communist "troops" are to be used in forthcoming street demonstrations, especially against the police, it was said.

ZONAL SET-UP REPORTED

The Tempo stated that Communist armed forces in northern Italy were at the orders of the branch office of the Communist information bureau that recently was established in Milan expressly to organize an armed insurrection. Its headquarters are secret and frequently changed from one place to another so as to escape detection, the newspaper added.

For operational purposes, the Tempo said, Italy is divided into "zones," each of which has its own "commander." The Tyrrhenian zone, which stretches along Italy's western coast from Genoa to Grosseto, has been entrusted to one of the Pajetta brothers, the newspaper said. There are two brothers, Giancarlo and Giuliano, both Communist deputies.

The Tempo said that arms were manufactured for the Communists by a factory near Genoa until the plant was discovered. It added that the Communists were seizing every possible occasion to test the efficiency of their organization by ordering partial mobilizations; some were called on such strange pretexts as a congress against illiteracy.

"There is no doubt that the Communists intend in the more or less distant future to plunge Italy into a frightful civil war," the Tempo concluded.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to submit the text of a broadcast by Henry J. Taylor, in which he discusses the Marshall plan:

Exactly who gets the money in the latest European-recovery plan? Seventeen billion dollars. I've just found out for sure. I think you'll be very surprised to know.

Our money doesn't grow on trees. It's hard for most any of us to get along at best. Before we're challenged further by the idea that the $17,000,000,000 new European plan must be all or nothing and start paying the bill in our homes and work places and the high cost of living, we need some facts that are contrary to public impression and which were withheld in the original presentation of the plan itself.

Fact No. 1 is who gets the money. It's hard to imagine that fact was left out but it was, and I think we have a right to know. We've already spent $22,000,000,000 abroad since the end of the war. And now we're expected to spend seventeen billion more. Yet, in the mountains of words and figures, this fact was of itself an amazing omission. Actually, the plan, to be truly revealing, should never have been given to Congress and to the public without this fundamental information—who gets the money?

After all, who is more entitled to know where his money goes than the man who pays the bill, which means us all? But the State Department in Washington could not reveal and still feature the anti-Communist angle, my friends, on an over-all $17,000,000,000 basis, on an all-or-nothing basis. So in order to be factual and exact in discussing on the air this latest project, so important in your land and mine, so heavily involved in our inflation, high prices, taxes, the cost of living that is bearing down on us all and on our future, I've been making for weeks in Washington every possible attempt I could make to get official information regarding what countries in terms of percentage were to get our new seventeen billions.

So at long last here are the facts to plug that loophole, the official figures obtainable only yesterday. They indicate much we've not been permitted to know.

First you will find that in percentage of dollars, a full third of our $17,000,000,000-plan is primarily another aid-to-England project. The lion's share of the funds goes to the British Isles, one-third of the entire amount, $5,348,000,000 of the seventeen million—billion, to be exact. Now, certainly, that part hasn't anything to do with buying off Communist popularity there and to this large extent the Marshall plan should not have been presented to us an an anti-Communist measure, any more than the last $3,-750,000,000 we gave England in 1945.

Maybe they need it, I don't know. But they certainly don't need it to stop communism in England. No one has even had the nerve to suggest that the British are on the verge of voting Communist. Had the fact that a third of the money we sent—or are to send—was to go there been made public, and early, it would have been impossible to present the powerful appeal for the overall seventeen-billion fund on an anti-Communist basis, all-or-nothing basis, in the official support for the outlay, at least to the extent of one-third of the entire proposition.

Now, next with England, seven additional countries are ruled out in the same way, where there is, by common consent, no more ideas of the population voting Communist than there is in England—this plan or no plan. I refer to Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Denmark, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, and little Iceland. So let's see what they'll get. Some of the figures are unbelievable, my friends, but they are correct and official and at last come from our State Department itself.

Do you know how much all of us are to be taxed for the Dutch? Holland is to get 2,436,000,000 American dollars. Fantastic as it may seem, the plan gives Holland, a little country with fewer people than live in New York City $2,436,000,000. And if that's a calculated risk against communism in Holland it's quite a calculation, yet imaginable. The plan is nevertheless presented as "take the whole plan or nothing, all or nothing." Why, the figure for Holland alone means a charge on us for $308 for every man, woman, and child who lives on the shores of the Zuider Zee.

Denmark is supposed to get over a half billon dollars, $582,000,000 to be exact. For this one little country alone, with a population less than Chicago, that's as much as all the stop-gap aid for which the special session of Congress was so dramatically called

last November. Denmark, a half billion dollars.

Now Ireland: Ireland was not in the war. Ireland is an island. The Communists would have to swim to get there and if there's a Communist there now not an Irishman knows it. But Ireland is to get a half billion dollars, $497,000,000 to Ireland to be exact. So, my friends, three and a half billion dollars out of the seventeen billion go to Holland, Denmark, and Ireland.

For good measure, even Iceland. Apparently there must be quite a Communist threat in Iceland and a lot of western civilization tottering on the brink there besides, for Iceland comes into the Marshall plan and for $38,000,000. Fewer people live on that island than live in Trenton N. J. And Iceland is just about as much in the throes of chaos, just about as much tottering on the brink of giving up western civilization as Trenton, N. J., except that there isn't much western civilization in Iceland anyway. But they're to get $38,000,000 from us, all or nothing, just the same.

Then there's Norway, where the Communist vote is about 7 percent. But Norway is in for $234,000,000 from us. The plan gives $234,000,000 to Norway.

Next comes Portugal in deciding whether or not the propaganda for the plan is padded in its over-all anti-Communist appeal to our public. Now, in Portugal, the Communist vote happens to be nonexistent. For 20 years the country has been and remains in the hands of a Fascist dictator, Dr. Salazar. Portugal did not fight in the war. Portugal profited immensely in the war by Portuguese standards. Yet Portugal gets our money just the same. Portugal gets 150,000,000 American dollars in the Marshall plan. All or nothing. Can the seventeen billion be cut? Can the first installment now asked for, 6,000,000,000, be cut? Well, I should say so, and now.

The anti-Communist angle is valid to a degree in some places where the money is to go, like Italy. But, my friends, the simple truth is, now that we get the figures, so belatedly published and in a most confusing way, only yesterday, the truth is that over ten billion of the seventeen billion is going to countries I visited every one of them myself—that are by common consent no more on the verge of voting Communist than the State of Indiana, which I visited last week and which hardly looks on the verge of voting Communist to me.

Or take another angle. The appeal is made to us that we are aiding the victims of war-torn countries in gratitude for their losses in the war. Now, there are other appeals that are sound and very much better. That isn't a very good one. How many billions are rolled out on that one? All the 16 countries in the Marshall plan over 60—and beyond—out of the seventeen billion are to go to enemy countries, Germany, Italy, and Austria, for which there are other reasons to help, not gratitude. Seven hundred million goes to countries that stayed neutral, did not fight in the war, and, in fact, got richer than they've ever been in their lives during the war, largely at American expense. They might well be giving something back to us—as if anything like that could ever happen. Sweden and Switzerland, however, have asked us for nothing, praises be.

Now, my friends, all summer long in one European country after another, in England, France, Italy, Greece, Switzerland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Holland, Germany, and in broadcasting in Paris, where the 16 nations were meeting to put in their requests for additional American funds in substance now being decided, I tried to say on the air as factually as I could, right there on the scene and repeatedly, from London, Rome, Athens, Zurich, Berlin, Brussels, Paris, and a dozen other places, and since I've been home, that the objectives of the Marshall plan are good—heaven knows, there's no question about that—but that the gigantic amounts asked for were overstated, inflated, padded, padded, and padded, and shockingly weak in respect to how the money should be administered to get the results on which we pin our American hopes.

In short, I think we should be for the objectives of the Marshall plan. But the plan is no longer just an idea, you know. It's now a tangible piece of proposed legislation, ready to be enacted into law and to absorb billions in our American people's money and goods. It shouldn't be approved as written. I'm convinced it will not be. Once we get the air pumped out of the claims and make the necessary changes suitable to the real problem over there, which is a production problem, and needs realistic, production-minded American handlers to whip it, we can stop sailing in the pattern of the $22,000,000,000 that has already gone with the wind since the end of the war and really get some place, really serve ourselves and Europe and the cause of lasting peace by the changes that must be made in the plan, and save ourselves billions and billions besides, that would have been wasted had we allowed our judgment to be blitzed.

High Cost of Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 8, 1948, an article entitled "Price Control in Politics" with special emphasis on the cost of meat. Hepburn, the author, has made a very accurate analysis of the causes responsible for present inflationary prices of meat.

PRICE CONTROL IN POLITICS
(By Hepburn)

SOME INFLATIONARY FACTORS, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE COST OF MEAT

A friend of mine recently showed me a letter from one of the best-known Democratic Members of Congress on the subject of price inflation. It was long-winded and violent in tone. The author was either astonishingly ignorant of all the various forces at work to push prices up and their origins, or he chose to appear so. It was a tirade against the Republicans for killing off the Office of Price Administration. A reader of that letter in another land would be led to believe that no Democrat in Congress or in the administration had had anything to do with lifting price controls (or wage controls); that the rising cost of living was traceable to nothing else, and that it could be checked and set back by a few strokes of a bureaucratic pen if the Republicans in this Eightieth Congress would only give President Truman the authority to reestablish wartime checks.

Now this is the line that nearly every labor publication in the country has been following for months. The Republicans are held responsible for the passage of the Taft-Hartley law and must be punished for it this coming November. But labor leadership is not sure that this consideration is going to move a sufficient number of the rank and file to vote the Democratic ticket this fall. So the Republicans must also be convicted of the crime of lifting price controls, so that big business could indulge in an orgy of profiteering. It appears that this is going to be the Truman campaign line as well, which the tame economists of the Political Action Committee and of the Democratic National Committee will support with a great outpouring of figures, graphs, and charts.

Now, it is as easy these days to hire an economist to make the most of your case in the court of public opinion as it is to hire a lawyer who will take care of your interest in a law court, and the war cries of the embattled doctors of philosophy are very confusing. But one doesn't have to be a professor of the inexact sciences to understand that releasing the controls on the cost of living is no more the cause of inflation than releasing the brake on a car is what makes it go.

Step hard enough on the gas, and the car will go in spite of the brakes. Put enough pressure behind inflation, and no control will stop it. If a fellow is determined to keep his foot on the accelerator, he will only ruin the brakes by keeping them on; and the war was scarcely over when the American people made a display of their determination to step on the gas. They wanted everything they had done without during the war years—done without because there was a war to win; they had the money to pay for whatever they wanted, and they went into the market flourishing their wallets. And when the shelves were empty they went into the black market and paid whatever was asked. We have short memories if we have already forgotten how the brakes were smoking when they were released.

Those persons in the low-income groups upon whom inflation is now visiting real hardship are, of course, most concerned about the price of food. Rents are under control; clothes can be made to do a little longer; minor luxuries and amusements can be crossed off the list, and the doctor and dentist will usually wait; but one must eat every day, and Americans are not accustomed to adjusting their appetites to a bread-and-cabbage diet. They want the meat, fish, eggs, butter, and milk to which they are accustomed; and when high prices force them to reduce their allowances of such foods they are just as miserable as the oriental coolie who cannot afford a little bean curd and some greens with his bowl of rice.

So the correct answer to the head of a family on a small fixed income—the man who delivers the mail, let's say—when he comments angrily on the price of meat and curses the Republican-dominated Congress for refusing to reimpose price control, is not to tell him to "eat less." You have to explain to him why meat is high, why he wouldn't now be getting as much as he wanted at prices within his reach if controls had remained in force, and why an adequate supply wouldn't be brought within his reach if controls were reimposed.

The interplay of costs being what it is, the price of meat should not be considered apart from prices and costs in all other industries. The price of steel affects the cost of the production of meat. The price of meat affects the cost of producing steel. No domestic enterprise is so independent of all others that a readjustment of its budget does not have its effect on all other budgets. An increase of labor costs in a lipstick factory sends an imperceptible inflationary ripple across the whole economic pool. But, since the meat prices are of such immediate interest to all citizens and are of crucial interest to many, let us try to see why meat is high.

In the briefest possible outline, the answer to the question is that, despite more than 2 years of lively postwar spending, there are still so many persons in this country with so much money that they can afford to buy all the meat they want at present prices, and that, collectively, they want more than the American people ever did before, and are eating meat faster than it is being produced.

It must first be considered that the supply of money has increased enormously in the last 14 years. In 1934 we had roughly $5,500,000,000 of currency in circulation. When we entered the war we had about $11,000,000,000. In September 1947, the figure was about $28,500,000,000. That increase, mostly in paper, was due in part to New Deal deficit financing, in larger part to wartime deficit financing. However, it came about—and it came about under Democratic auspices—human experience through 30 centuries has shown that it is impossible to multiply the supply of money in the hands of the people without cheapening it—as impossible as it would be to multiply the amount of corn on the open market without bringing it down in price. Human experience has also shown that, once too much money has resulted in a reduction of its buying power, nothing will restore it but the redemption (out of taxes) and destruction of great wads of it, or the repudiation of it. With all its police power over the economy of the nation, Soviet Russia recently had to repudiate a high percentage of its paper (largely represented by peasant savings) to relieve its regimented economy of the inflationary pressure of its currency flotation.

Throughout the war our money was cheapening as the supply of it grew; but the inflationary pressure of it was held in check by rationing and price controls which kept it out of competitive buying to a great extent because patriotism reconciled the people to the necessity of it. They put their money into bonds and savings banks. The dam that held the destructive inflationary power of this rising flood of currency in check was psychological. The paper power of the OPA simply implemented the popular stale of mind. There were small holes in the dam at all times, of course, which showed what would happen to the paper structure when its psychological support was withdrawn. I live near a poultry territory, in which I have some farmer friends. That territory was invaded early in the war by black-market agents. They weren't numerous and the farmers who dealt with them weren't numerous; but the farmers who did accept their high premiums had sufficiently high prices for local supplies of feed to put quite a few honest folks, sticking to OPA prices, out of business. After the war they all sold to the black market and they all bid against one another for feed. Where the pressure of a vast amount of expandable currency squirted through small holes in the psychological dam during the war, it began to tear great holes in the OPA's paper dam immediately after it. During the war years, when the sugar ration was so low, country people let their fruit and berries rot because they couldn't preserve them. One heard little of black-market sugar. But during the first postwar summer the sugar racketeers were everywhere, and home canning boomed with the help of sugar at 25 cents a pound.

Then, as for meat: try to remember what happened. Everybody with a roll, which included every homing soldier and sailor for a time, was determined to beat the ration system and gorge on meat. It wasn't long before the black marketeers and the producers who supplied them, under the patronage of a public as contemptuous of OPA as were the rum runners' patrons of prohibition enforcement, had a big part of the country's meat supply running through filthy underground channels, and before long legitimate dealers were exhibiting empty shelves to plain citizens. The poor, who are now priced out of the meat market, say that present prices are higher than black-market prices were under price control.

That may be true; but, in the first place, the black-market gentry were just getting their system organized when the abolition of controls brought meat back into legitimate channels; and, in the second place, new inflationary forces have gone to work while the pressure of ready money, ready to meet any price, has not yet eased up.

Among other inflationary pressures on the price of meat (to leave other costs to the producer entirely out of account) is the higher price of grain. Speculation and hoarding play their part in these price increases. But the speculator and the hoarder are influenced by the corn shortage and by present and prospective Government wheat buying for export. But, in the last analysis, it is the free-spending, meat-hungry citizen who is himself the guilty party, and his name is legion. If I remember rightly, the Department of Agriculture reports that we are eating 156 pounds of meat per capita a year, as against 125 pounds before the war. Now multiply 31 pounds by the last population figure, translate that into grain if you know how (as I don't), consider that the money for this is still readily forthcoming from the average gainfully employed citizen—rolling into the market as fast as he outeats the production of meat—and can you still wonder why meat is high?

And who is now simple enough to imagine that the reestablishment of price controls, the re-creation of a paper dam, would do anything but discourage production and create a scarcity which the racketeers would at once exploit, to the total exclusion of the poor from the meat market? The American Government that could now make price control work to the advantage of the poor would have to have Soviet Russia's power to police the farmer and rancher and a hundred thousand secret agents. Then how much meat would you get? This talk of restoring price controls may be good demagogic politics, but as an appeal to the distracted citizen it is a cruel swindle.

The President's Civil Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Evening Star of today contains a statement made yesterday by Dr. E. H. Pruden, pastor of the First Baptist Church, of Washington, which I should like to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN HEARS PRAISE FROM PASTOR FOR HIS CIVIL-RIGHTS STAND

President Truman yesterday heard praise from the pulpit for his civil-rights program which has been so bitterly attacked by southern Democrats.

Attending the First Baptist Church, the President listened attentively as Dr. E. H. Pruden, the pastor, asserted there is nothing in the civil-rights plan which cannot find support either in Scripture or the Federal Constitution.

Drawing an analogy between the furor created by the President and the storm encountered by Jesus' disciples as they crossed a lake in obedience to His command, the minister declared that those who pioneer in the social realm will always encounter contrary winds.

TRUMAN ARRIVES UNANNOUNCED

And Dr. Pruden commented that we sometimes meet severest opposition when we are doing what we believe to be the will of God.

Mr. Truman arrived unannounced, accompanied only by a secret-service guard, and took a seat always reserved for him in the middle of the church.

Dr. Pruden's sermon topic was "In the Night Christ Came Walking," and referred to His appearance among men in the midst of history's darkest hour.

In those days, the pastor said, social conditions were characterized by slavery and the dignity of man was not generally recognized. He observed that humanity had made little progress in reaching Christ's ideal for human relationships.

PRESIDENT GREETS PASTOR

Mr. Truman's civil-rights message last Monday called on Congress to see that guaranties of individual liberties and protection are not abridged in the United States. Part of these proposals were assailed as unduly raising racial issues involving segregation.

At the close of the service, President Truman greeted the pastor and asked "How is your mother? Give her my kindest regards."

The pastor's mother is Mrs. J. R. Pruden, of Chase City, Va. She is 71. Mr. Truman met her about 2 years ago.

Are We Crazy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop:

ARE WE CRAZY?
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

What fools we Americans are to think we can run the world. What idiots vanity must look at these facts of life from a State Department bulletin, Oct. 26, 1947, published in 1947:

"In spite of recent natural and man-made catastrophes, about 17,000,000 inhabitants (of the world) were added each year during the past decade."

Think of it.

We have been obsessed with news of death for so long that little or no public attention has been given to news of life.

The slaughters of war all over the globe have been the headlines of the past 10 years; Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, Tojo, and all the other buzzards circling over the battlefields have held our attention.

But, as so often, we have been looking in the wrong direction. We should have been looking at the maternity records. The wars have hardly dented the rising curve of life.

There are now more than 2,000,000,000 people in the world. In 25 years, the merest clocktick of history, there will be half a billion more. How can the Marshall plan cope with that?

We are all very proud of our modest administration of Japan. What is the effect? The population is increasing at the rate of a million a year under our beneficent rule.

Puerto Rico is another sinkhole of humanity into which the United States taxpayers have poured millions of dollars for public health, until now there are 2,000,000 hungry beings swarming in an area that could hardly support a third as many in its natural state.

What is the result of our interference? In 10 years there will be 3,000,000 Puerto Ricans.

The faster we run, the farther we slide back.

Every spot in the world that we touch with our temporary and inevitably limited relief reacts with a burst of new life. People are born faster than they die off. The net effect upon the living standards of the survivors is something that has to be thought about. But more from the State Department survey:

"The world's present rate of population growth (about 0.9 percent) is probably the highest in history. If the present rate of growth is maintained, the twenty-first century will see the world with a total population about half again as large as it is.

"However, prospects for the immediate future suggest even larger annual population increments. The estimates developed in the present study, for example, indicate a world population total at the end of 1955 of some 2,438,000,000 people, an annual increment of almost 21,000,000 from now until then."

That means 21,000,000 more people at the end of each year than there were at the same year's beginning.

Can we honestly promise to underpin a standard of living for a mass of people growing at such a rate?

True, we have the world's greatest factory system and the world's most productive agriculture. True we once had one of the world's richest stores of minerals and timber.

But the depreciation of our minerals is now so serious that the secretary of the armed forces wants to obligate the taxpayers for $9,000,000,000 to find a substitute for natural oil, a liquid mineral that we have squirted away.

The problem is how to shift over from liquid oil to oil squeezed out of coal and other hard minerals. It is a big problem, it will cost a lot, and when we get it solved the world's population will still have continued to grow by 21,000,000 people a year.

Are we supposed to make this switch in oil, just for one, in an attempt to supply all those people whenever they cry to us for help?

Our factories can be worn out producing goods for the world, and still never make a real showing against that rising tide, if we produce for political rather than economic purposes.

Our soil can be worn out and washed and blown away in vain attempts at political rather than economic farming. Millions upon millions of tons of invaluable topsoil have already been wrecked that way. And the result? You see how we are headed in 1948.

It's all like the famous British loan of 1946. We were all told that just one little boost and our British cousins would be back on their feet. Were we told the truth?

The world's problems are many and difficult. They always have been. They always will be. Anybody who goes looking for other people's problems to solve will always have plenty to do.

But will he ever get any one problem solved?

You know from personal experience the answer to that one. You can waste your life trying to do too many things at once. Or you can concentrate on one thing at a time and maybe end up a little further up on the scale of human usefulness than you had expected.

The United States of America has been through a terrible war that cost us heavily in human and material wealth, far heavier than the politicians dare admit.

We have plenty of repair work to do right here at home to recover our own prewar living standard.

We can't honestly pretend we are able to be nursemaid to the Greeks, Japs, Chinese, French, British, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Italians—the list is as long as the world is wide.

Let's do our homework before we try to do the world's.

Reduced Number of Strikes Since Enactment of Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial from the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen relating to the reduced number of strikes occurring since the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act. This tends to prove the contentions of the supporters of this measure that it would benefit labor, management, and the public, and all groups are constantly realizing its good effects.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEN AND NOW

Last year there were 3,600 strikes involving 2,200,000 strikers and costing 35,000,000 mandays of working time. In 1946 there were 4,985 strikes involving 4,600,000 workers and costing 116,000,000 man-days.

These are figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, released in review of labor relations during 1947. In view of the continuing agitation over the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, we think that they are significant. That highly controverted law went into full effect last August 22. In the first 3 months afterward, the strike situation compared as follows with that in the similar period of 1946:

	1947	1946
Work stoppages	525	1,359
Workers involved	180,000	1,098,000
Man-days idle	4,580,000	16,080,000

What all of this proves is perhaps open to dispute. The plain facts show, however, that strikes decreased in 1947, a year which coincided with the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act and the establishment of a new, independent Conciliation Service. Too, the Conciliation Service averted one Nation-wide strike, that of the Western Union telegraph operators.

The Taft-Hartley Act may be a fiendish device to destroy the labor movement or it may be a monument to industrial statesmanship. We are not attempting to pass judgment. But we do wish to recall the long-winded yet pertinent declaration of policy under section 1 of this measure:

"It is the purpose and policy of this act, in order to promote the full flow of commerce, to prescribe the legitimate rights of both employees and employers in their relations affecting commerce, to provide orderly and peaceful procedures for preventing the interference by either with the legitimate rights of the other * * * and to protect the rights of the public in connection with labor disputes affecting commerce."

It was the plain intent of Congress and of the act to curb unnecessary strikes. That, evidently, is what has been done.

Kansas State Board of Agriculture Resolutions on Agricultural Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted at the seventy-seventh annual meeting of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, on January 16, 1948.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE SEVENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, JANUARY 16, 1948

As the official delegates from local units of organized agriculture representing more than 100,000 Kansas farmers and stockmen, we present the following beliefs and recommendations on problems of vital importance to the people of Kansas and of the Nation.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

We reaffirm our pledge of full support to the United Nations and reiterate our desire that this Nation exert every possible effort and influence to help establish genuine agreement, understanding, and confidence among the nations of the world.

CONSERVATION OF FEED AND FOOD

As producers of food in one of the major agricultural States of the greatest food-producing nation, we pledge our cooperation in the program of conserving feed and food as one means of saving lives of people in other lands. We pledge most serious consideration of efficient feeding and farming methods, so that feeds and seeds may be used in such a manner as to produce the most human nutrition.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL PRICE POLICY

Our chief concern in regard to agricultural prices is not that of endeavoring to maintain prices at present extreme levels, but, rather, that of initiating practices and legislation which will stabilize the farm-price situation on a par with other industries. We feel the aim should be to insure farm incomes adequate for a reasonably good standard of living on American farms, and adequate, also, to allow farmers to take whatever measures are necessary for the conservation of our soil, the basis of all life, wealth, and civilization.

PRICE SUPPORTS

We look upon price supports not as a means of maintaining high agricultural prices, but, rather, as a means of preventing a recurrence of demoralizing agricultural prices such as those which followed World War I. Experiences of the past indicate that in times of economic recession, agricultural prices decline first and more drastically than those of any other industry, and that all other industries eventually suffer from an agricultural price collapse. We therefore urge that the Congress of the United States seriously study the agricultural price situation with respect to possible need for continuing supports of the Steagall amendment beyond the period provided for in the present law.

PARITY

We join with other agricultural organizations and groups throughout the Nation in endorsing the principle of parity prices, to give equality of purchasing power between the respective segments of the American economic structure. We urge that the Congress of the United States study the parity formula carefully and modernize it to meet present world conditions. We feel that labor should be included in the parity formula, and especially request a careful study of this point in considering the subject of parity.

SUBSIDIES

We favor agricultural subsidies only as extreme emergency measures, and we urge that farm income be maintained at proper levels, insofar as possible, through fair prices for agricultural products rather than by payment of subsidies.

COST OF FOOD

We respectfully call attention to the fact that, although present living costs are extremely high, the American farmer is giving full value for the portion of the consumer's dollar which he receives. This is evidenced by the fact that latest figures on consumer expenditures for food indicate that the percentage of national income spent by consumers for food is no greater than in the prewar period of 1935 to 1939. For this same percentage of national income the consumers are actually obtaining and eating more and better food. Meat consumption, for instance, is 24 percent higher than in the prewar years of 1935–39. The consumers of this country are eating 27 percent more eggs, 31 percent more chicken, 58 percent more turkey, 31 percent more cheese, 19 percent more fluid milk and cream, 27 percent more citrus fruits, 38 percent more canned fruit, and 50 percent more canned vegetables, with many other staple food products showing similar increases in per capita consumption. The Nation's consumption of frozen fruits and vegetables is four and one-half to five and one-half times greater than in the immediate prewar years. We feel pride in the record of more and better food for the same percentage of national income. It proves that American agriculture has increased its efficiency and service to the Nation, even under inflationary economic conditions such as those now being experienced.

AGRICULTURAL SUPPLIES

We, the farmers of Kansas, join with the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture, in urging that Congress provide for the carrying of adequate reserves to level off production cycles which vary with weather conditions. Thirty-five percent of 1 year's normal production of each basic crop is considered adequate. This should help insure abundance of food without the accompanying scourge of reduced farm prices because of alleged oversupplies.

EXPANSION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETS

We commend Secretary Anderson and the United States Department of Agriculture for their efforts toward a long-time program of finding foreign and other new markets for agricultural products produced in overabundance by American farmers. We ask that this program be continued as a safeguard against economic shock to this Nation's agriculture if and when domestic and foreign demand for food is drastically lowered.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

We commend those responsible for continuing the expansion of electrical services to rural areas of Kansas. We again point to rural electrification as one of the richest blessings ever to come to farm people, and we urge that the program for further expansion of rural electrification be encouraged in every way possible, by Congress, by the State legislature, and by all others concerned.

SOIL CONSERVATION

We take serious cognizance of the fact that all wealth and life springs from the soil and that the welfare of all classes of people is directly dependent on our soil resources. For this reason, the importance of soil conservation is a prime responsibility of this generation and merits universal interest and support of every citizen. In this connection we encourage the farmers and landowners of Kansas to give serious thought to the program of balanced farming advanced by Kansas State College for a more practical and more efficient agriculture. We especially recommend widespread encouragement of grassland farming with livestock and use of other practices which maintain and replenish the soil, coincident with production of food.

FLANNAGAN-HOPE ACT

We believe in the principles which led to enactment of the Flannagan-Hope Research and Marketing Act, and we are pleased that Kansas is to participate in both the research and the marketing phases of this work, with some constructive projects of material benefit to the State's agricultural industry.

SOCIAL SECURITY

This group is aware of the movement to extend Federal social security to cover many groups of people not now covered. We see considerable merit in the social-security program, but we feel that security for farmers can best be provided by parity prices in a long-range program that will assure the American farmer his just share of the national income.

AGRICULTURAL OFFICES

We agree with the National Grange that it would be highly desirable for all agricultural agencies in each count, to be housed at the same place, and for the United States Department of Agriculture to integrate its activities wherever possible.

COMMENDATION

We commend Gov. Frank Carlson and members of the 1947 Kansas Legislature for their part in enacting constructive legislation of benefit to Kansas agriculture, particularly the legislation on agricultural marketing, weights and measures, agricultural statistics, agricultural chemicals, and coyote control.

COOPERATIVES

We call attention to the fact that farm cooperative organizations are serving vital functions in many communities throughout the State of Kansas. Their services are valuable to the agricultural interests of Kansas and we, therefore, vigorously oppose legislation, either State or Federal, which is designed to cripple or destroy farm cooperatives.

LEGISLATIVE COMPENSATION

We join with the Kansas Farm Bureau and with other organizations and individuals in urging a change in the Kansas constitution to provide for adequate compensation to members of the Kansas legislature.

WILDLIFE PRESERVATION

We pledge wholehearted cooperation to those who are endeavoring to protect and preserve the State's beneficial wildlife. In like manner we call on all other citizens of Kansas to support this cause, and we respectfully suggest to the legislature of the State of Kansas that legislation be enacted to provide the following:

1. Provisions to strengthen present requirements that hunters obtain permission from farmers to hunt on their premises, and that the law shall provide a specific penalty for hunting on any premises without such permission.

2. That the farmer shall have authority to check the game taken from his farm by hunters, as regards to bag limits and other provisions of the law.

3. That consideration be given to the possibility of raising the price of hunting and fishing licenses to give the State fish and game department sufficient funds for adequate propagation, protection, and law enforcement.

UNIFORM DAIRY LAWS

As Kansas farmers and dairymen, we feel that satisfaction for producers and consumers alike is dependent upon uniform dairy regulations among the States. We urge, therefore, that every effort be made toward uniform regulations and that dual inspection on milk, cream and other dairy products be eliminated, and the authority for this inspection be vested with the State boards of agriculture of the various States, who are thoroughly familiar with agricultural conditions, so there will be no unnecessary barriers to hinder the movement of high quality dairy products from one State to another.

BUTTER SUBSTITUTES

Scientific research shows that butter contains essential nutritional properties superior to those of substitute products which are sometimes colored to resemble genuine butter. Because of this, we feel that the consuming public is fully entitled to protection from imitations which tend to undermine the natural market for butter and thus threaten the stability of this Nation's essential dairy industry. We urge, therefore, that our lawmakers stand firmly against any attempt to weaken present laws dealing with the coloring and sale of butter substitutes.

SCHOOL REORGANIZATION

As representatives of the rural areas of Kansas, we are intensely interested in all aspects of the program of school reorganization for this State.

Be it resolved, That we favor:

1. Retention of local control of school districts.

2. Such consolidation of rural districts as is necessary to meet educational standards.

3. Consolidation in accordance with the expressed will of the people residing within the districts affected.

Be it further resolved, That we oppose the county unit plan of school reorganization, because such plan contemplates the elimination of all existing rural grade and high school districts in the State of Kansas.

HIGHWAYS AND RURAL ROADS

In order to make living in the country more desirable and make available to rural dwellers one of the advantages enjoyed by all urban dwellers of Kansas, we urge that Kansas really be "taken out of the mud" by the surfacing of all of the mail and school bus routes in the State. We also urge the improvement of the State's primary highway system by an increase in the construction of concrete highways. We reaffirm the traditional Kansas policy of more than 20 years that "he who uses the roads and highways shall build and maintain them." As rural users of the primary highway system, we declare our willingness to pay our fair share of the costs of building, maintaining, and improving this system by taxes on highway motor fuel and fees. We strongly wish to reaffirm our opposition to the taxation of nonhighway motor fuel for highway purposes. We believe that local roads should be under local control and be financed, in the main, by local taxes. Good rural schools are impossible without good rural roads. We realize that a full development of rural mail and school bus routes will cost a lot of money, but we also realize that we pay for good rural roads whether we get them or not. Therefore, we declare our willingness to pay the increased local taxes necessary to build and maintain these roads.

To reimburse local road funds for the proportion of nonrural use we urge the maintenance of the State-county-township road fund. We further recommend that the fund be changed from its present fixed amount to a fair proportion of the State highway tax collections. We urge full cooperation among

all farmers in protecting the exemption to taxation of nonhighway motor fuel by rigid compliance with the State law covering such exemptions.

RESEARCH IN WEED CHEMICALS

We recommend increased financial support for agricultural education, research, and extension. Because of the rapid expansion in the fields of agricultural chemicals—fertilizers, growth-regulating substances, herbicides, and insecticides—we recommend a marked increase in the State appropriations for research in weed control, fertilizer use, insect control, and the place of growth regulating substances in Kansas agriculture.

UNITED STATES WEED OFFICE

We reaffirm our interest in the establishment of a weed office by the United States Department of Agriculture, for conducting research and education on weed control in cooperation with the various States. We reiterate, also, our feeling that Congress should enact suitable legislation to regulate the interstate transportation and sale of weed infested seed material, and to prohibit the importation of weed-infested materials from foreign countries.

4–H CLUB CAMP

This group feels that the State 4–H Club camp, now in its early stages of development, is a great forward movement for building of good Kansas citizenship. We call upon the people of Kansas to encourage and support this project.

TRIBUTE

We realize that the high position of Kansas agriculture in the Nation's economic structure is made possible not only through the wealth of Kansas agricultural resources and sturdy, progressive farmers, but also by progressive farm leadership in this State. We pay tribute, therefore, to Kansas State College, to the farm organizations of Kansas, to the Soil Conservation Service, and to vocational agriculture, 4–H Clubs and other youth activities. Our wholehearted cooperation is pledged to these groups.

PUBLICITY

Knowing that Kansas is a leading producer of many products of the soil and that the State is of much interest to tourists from every section of the United States, we desire to take every measure possible to increase the interest and enjoyment of those traveling the highways of the State. To this end, we wish to recommend that the newspapers of the State of Kansas cooperate in recommending and encouraging every city and town, large or small to erect a suitable signboard on each highway leading into that town; this signboard to state the name of the town, its population and its altitude. We deplore the fact that in many towns in Kansas the name can only be secured by asking.

MEAT CONTROL

Whereas all former efforts on the part of Government to control allocations of meat supplies through rationing and price ceilings have proven unworkable and altogether unsatisfactory; and

Whereas such attempts at control have diverted meats from retail stores and markets, established market centers, and agencies, into black-market channels where price is no consideration; and

Whereas present threats of rationing meats tend only to further reduce supplies, by creating uneasiness and hesitancy among producers with consequent reductions in meat-animal numbers; and

Whereas full production is the only known remedy for scarcity and for establishing equitable price levels: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That for the best interests of all concerned (producers, processors, marketing agencies, and consumers of meat animals and meat products), Government officials and agencies be urged to forget rationing of meats and refrain from further threats of rationing and price control, and allow the livestock industry to operate and produce in a normal manner so we may soon have abundant supplies of meat for our domestic needs and for assistance to the hungry people of other nations.

BRAND LAWS

We recommend that our present brand laws be strengthened in the enforcement phases and inspection increased as rapidly as possible.

LIVESTOCK SANITATION

Be it resolved, That the State board of agriculture urge and promote uniform national and State sanitary regulations in the interstate movement of livestock.

SEED LABORATORY

The facilities of the State seed laboratory are inadequate to take care of the demand for services expected by the citizens of the State of Kansas. We, therefore, recommend that the legislature take steps to improve this important service in order to meet the demand of the people of the State.

AGRICULTURAL HALL

We urge the legislature to appropriate funds for the completion of the agricultural hall at Kansas State College. The present facilities are inadequate to house the existing agricultural work at the college. The classrooms and laboratories are crowded and the extension service is housed in Army barracks.

STATE FAIR

Be it resolved, That the action of the Board of State Fair Managers in eliminating all gambling devices from the fairgrounds, be commended by this body.

APPRECIATION

An expression of gratitude is extended to those who have contributed to the success of this meeting. We thank the press and radio for their careful coverage, the city and State officials for their courtesies, the speakers for their excellent contributions, and Secretary Mohler and his staff for efficient planning and management of details.

SOCIAL WELFARE

Due to the fact that the social welfare load in some counties appears to be unduly high, considering the present era of prosperity in general, we do hereby urge the Congress to change the regulations in order that publication can be made of welfare clients and the amount of payments made to them.

United States Information Services in Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to me, dated January 9, 1948, from the Honorable John G. Erhardt, our American Minister in Vienna, Austria.

This letter has to do with the pick-up and expansion in the work of the United States Information Services in Austria, due to the visit of the joint congressional committees to Vienna last summer. It gives some indication of the possibilities of the new program which we have recently given legislative authorization for by the passage of the Smith-Mundt bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIENNA, AUSTRIA,
January 9, 1948.

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I was delighted to receive your letter of December 2, 1947, and send hereby sincerest thanks, in which my staff joins me, for the kind observations you made regarding the Legation's part in activities connected with your visit to this country on your recent trip through Europe.

It was a very stimulating and valuable experience for us to have you in Vienna, and there is no doubt that the effect of the visit of your committee was to lift the morale of all United States agencies here. For instance, it became apparent through your visit that Congress was eager to study the work being done by the Information Services Branch of the United States Forces in Austria—not only its newspaper and radio activity—but its longer-range information center, and its lecture and book-publishing programs. The visit brought home most effectively the realization that Americans, whether working in Washington or in Vienna, were all members of the same team. It was reassuring to hear this thought expressed by you in an interview with the press in Vienna.

Col. Sidney S. Eberle, Chief of ISB, has informed me that the visit specifically resulted in bringing to a conclusion the plan to purchase newsprint in the amount of $300,000 to supplement the indigenous allocation, thereby enabling the official United States paper in Vienna, the Wiener Kurier, to appear again in an eight-page edition, instead of the inadequate four-page edition. The criticism sometimes leveled at the Wiener Kurier that it was merely a propaganda sheet will thus no longer be valid. The Information Services Branch will also no longer be working under the disadvantage of competing with an eight-page Red Army pape , as was the case with a four-page edition.

The Red-White-Red radio network received greatly increased interest as a result of the attention given it, especially its "Voice of America" program, by the committee. It can now be considered as on a par with the Wiener Kurier both as regards influence and prestige.

Colonel Eberle advises us that the approbation given by your committee to the work being done in the information centers has led to an increase in the number of activities carried on by the staff. During the last 3 months the demands of 132,734 Austrians who visited the centers were handled. To cite one more example, 33 lectures in English and German on a wide range of subjects dealing with American life, customs, and institutions were delivered to enthusiastic Austrian audiences.

Many other effects not yet materially in evidence are confidently expected as the result of the demonstration of congressional support for the information program in Austria.

Again thanking you for your letter, I am,
Cordially yours,

JOHN G. ERHARDT,
American Minister.

Jewish Refugees en Route to Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by I. F. Stone, appearing in the New York newspaper PM on February 2, 1948, be printed in the RECORD.

The article presents some interesting information with regard to the origin of certain news reports appearing lately which have tended to discredit the character of groups of Jewish refugees attempting to enter Palestine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—If the New York Times had published a story about an individual like the story it published yesterday under a headline, "London insists Communists were bound for Palestine," it would be subject to suit for libel.

And if that story were unsupported by facts as yesterday's below-the-belt blow from London at a group of Jewish refugees, the New York Times would lose that suit and be subject to punitive damages.

I want to analyze the New York Times' story in the light of its own assertions.

The dispatch, by Herbert L. Matthews of the Times' London Bureau, said the Jewish immigrant ships *Pan York* and *Pan Crescent* "were carrying many Communist agents, according to official British sources."

"These statements," Matthews wrote, "are bound to cause dismay now that they are being made for the first time with authoritative backing."

I don't want to spread dismay in the London Bureau of the Times and among its New York editors but just 1 month ago, on January 1, on page 1 of the New York Times, under a two-column headline like yesterday's, there appeared a similar "special" dispatch to the New York Times from London making the same "authoritative," but unsupported charge.

The refugees, according to an Associated Press dispatch from Haifa on January 1, were captured that same day by the British on the high seas and taken to Cyprus, where they were searched, interrogated, and interned.

In the intervening month, the British had ample opportunity to bring forward proof of the original red smear by that "authoritative" source in London, if the allegation had any substance.

Instead the British significantly found it necessary to tone down their charges.

A month ago, the "authoritative source" in London told the New York Times correspondent that the refugees were mostly handpicked Communists or fellow travelers, with links to the Stern gang.

But yesterday's story lowered the Red ante. It said, in case of the *Pan York* and the *Pan Crescent*, the Russian conditions are believed to have been that the ships would be released only if 1,000 Jewish Communists were included among the immigrants.

The January 1 story said there were 12,000 on the two boats. Yesterday's story gives the figures as 15,000. But instead of being mostly hand-picked Communists, we are now told that it is believed that the Russians insisted that 1,000 be hand-picked Communists.

What proof is given of this assertion?

NO EVIDENCE, BUT BRITISH ARE CONVINCED

We come to the most amazing statement of all in yesterday's Times dispatch, a statement which would have led any small-town editor to throw a local story of this kind into the wastebasket.

"The security precautions taken in advance by and on behalf of the immigrants of the *Pan York* and the *Pan Crescent*," said the dispatch, "were so thorough that British officials found it impossible to get direct positive evidence that any Russian-sponsored subversive elements were among the immigrants."

This is hardly cricket, as our British friends like to say. It is as if one were to accuse a man without proof of beating his wife, and then to give out a story saying that he must have beaten her very cleverly because "no direct positive evidence" could be found of any bruises.

"Nevertheless," the dispatch said, after this reference to lack of evidence, "the British have convinced themselves that large-scale Jewish immigration, far from being discouraged or prevented by Soviet satellite governments, has been deliberately encouraged by them."

But even if the British "have convinced themselves" that Soviet satellites are encouraging Jewish immigration to Palestine that is a long way from proof that these refugees are "mostly hand-picked Communists," or that 1,000 of them are.

While the dispatch says at the beginning "no direct positive evidence" was found, it declares later on that the British discovered among the effects of the refugees "membership cards of the Communist Youth in Rumania, the Rumanian Communist Party, the Lenin United Communist Association, the Union of Female Anti-Fascists, and the Universal Democratic Front." "All these bodies," it is asserted, "are militant Communist organizations. Moreover, a number of Communist handbooks were found."

This is puzzling. If advance precautions were as "thorough" as the dispatch says, why were membership cards in "militant Communist organizations" and "Communist handbooks" not destroyed?

Secret agents don't carry identification cards. Why don't the British give the number of cards and the number of persons who had them? Why don't they supply photostats to the correspondents in Cyprus?

There is something fishy about those cards.

The British seem to be so hard up for concrete allegations that they make much of the fact, according to the Times dispatch yesterday, that 1,000 of the 15,000 immigrants aboard spoke Russian. • • • Some may have been non-Jews and some had documents showing that they had served in Soviet forces during World War II, these sources say.

The fact that 1,000 of these refugees spoke Russian is not surprising.

These refugees were almost all Romanian Jews, most of them from Bucovina and Bessarabia, both taken over by the Russians before the Nazi-Soviet war begun.

Most Bessarabians, Jewish or non-Jewish, speak Russian; the province was Russian until the end of the First World War. Able-bodied Jewish refugees from areas taken over by the Russians during the war, Jewish partisans from that area before the Nazi-Soviet war began, and Jews lucky enough to flee from German territory into the U. S. S. R. did serve in the Red Army against the Nazis and many East European refugees are veterans of the Red Army and of the Polish Army.

While Arabs who served under Hitler are permitted to organize warfare in Palestine against the Jews, are the gates of Palestine to be barred against Jewish refugees who served in the Allied armies against Hitler?

ALL PIONEERS OR CHILDREN UNDER 12

The New York Times is guilty of unfair journalism, and British Government of malicious slander.

Early in December a full report on the refugees of the *Pan York* and the *Pan Crescent* was made by the Jewish Agency for Palestine to the State Department.

Except for 1,400 of those on board, all were chalutzim, trained Zionist pioneers, chosen by a board of selection representing all different parties of the Zionist movement.

The other 1,400 were hand-picked, but not for communism, as the British well know, for they interned them in Cyprus.

The 1,400 are children under 12, mostly orphan survivors of those Rumanian Jewish families who were driven by the Nazis in the winter of 1942–43 across the Dniester into Transnistria, where 200,000 died of hunger and cold.

I. F. STONE.

POSTSCRIPT—SOME FACTS

Some pertinent facts:

Jewish illegal immigration has been forced away from French and Italian ports by pressure on Paris and Rome exerted from the British Foreign Office and by Foreign Secretary Bevin personally.

The British in at least one case known to this correspondent (negotiations concerning compensation for British-owned mines taken over by the Yugoslav government) have offered actual financial concessions to Soviet satellite countries if they would take a hostile attitude toward Jewish immigration.

The new governments of eastern Europe and the military commanders of the Red Army (except in one case in Budapest under pressure from the American military attaché in Hungary) have refused to add to the unhappiness of these unhappy refugees seeking the new home promised them in Palestine by Britain's own Balfour declaration.

London and Washington would be gleefully ready to smear Moscow as anti-Semitic if any such steps were taken.

I. F. S.

Loans to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, we in New Jersey are extremely proud of the job that is being done by the Division of Veterans' Services of the Department of Economic Development, which Division is under the directorship of Col. Warren S. Hood.

In the field of economic rehabilitation of the veterans of New Jersey, the results of the operation, as an instance, of the Bureau of Loans of the Division of Veterans' Services can be no better set forth than by quoting from the report to the Governor of the State of New Jersey showing the situation as of November 24,

1947, and I hereby set forth that quotation:

DIVISION OF VETERANS' SERVICES, BUREAU OF LOANS (OPERATING THE NEW JERSEY VETERANS' LOAN AUTHORITY)

The bureau of loans performed normal functions during the month.

	Number	Amount
BUSINESS LOANS		
Total loans approved to date	13,563	$31,092,647.02
Total loans withdrawn to date	1,288	2,830,184.90
Approved loans outstanding	12,275	28,262,462.12
Total loans disapproved to date	1,369	3,087,684.49
Total loans processed to date	14,932	34,180,331.51
Total defaulted notes purchased	317	537,458.75
Total loans repaid in full	1,186	2,348,788.00
HOUSEHOLD LOANS		
Total loans approved to date	3,825	2,280,350.00
Total loans withdrawn to date	151	93,000.00
Approved loans outstanding	3,674	2,187,350.00
Total loans disapproved to date	291	177,440.00
Total loans processed to date	4,106	2,462,790.00
Total defaulted notes purchased	5	1,990.24
Total loans repaid in full	69	36,320.00

There is a steady, though slight, decline in business loans and a sharp rise in household loans. The number of defaulted loans is increasing and is now about 2½ percent.

The number of loans being paid in full before maturity is increasing each month.

We may be a bit optimistic but from our experience so far it looks as though we will salvage about 60 percent of our defaulted notes.

Stand by Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the Oregon Democrat appears an interesting article written by Mr. Richard L. Neuberger. I particularly call the attention of every Democrat to the last sentence of the article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The title of the article is "Stand by Mr. Truman."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAND BY MR. TRUMAN
(By Richard L. Neuberger)

The next President of the United States, unless death or illness should intervene, will be either Harry S. Truman or the 1948 nominee of the Republican Party. Henry Wallace has absolutely no chance to be elected; he himself admitted as much in the speech which announced his candidacy.

There can be only one net result of Mr. Wallace participating in the Presidential race. He might take enough labor votes from Mr. Truman to insure the election of the Republican candidate. What would that mean—inflation and higher prices, no veterans' housing program, restrictive laws against labor, reduction of power and reclamation projects in the far West, tax reduction for the upper income brackets.

This is what Mr. Wallace will be hastening if he goes onto the ballot. The great liberal Pulitzer daily, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, stated editorially a few weeks ago: "Mr. Wallace should know that, in becoming a third-party candidate without any real possibility of winning the election, he is giving aid to those who have been his enemies all his life. He is drawing away support from those who represent whatever is left of the New Deal."

I listened to Mr. Wallace's speech of announcement. It was an able speech. Many of his criticisms of the Truman administration were valid. Yet I was struck by two points: (1) that Mr. Wallace offered no particular remedies for the shortcomings he assailed, and (2) that by running for President he actually will help those who, by implication, he criticized the most.

Mr. Wallace made much of the dreadful inflation which is sapping the buying power of so many people. He assailed the lifting of controls. But who lifted controls? Was it not TAFT, WHERRY, TABER, and the other Republican leaders? And by running for President, does not Mr. Wallace advance the opportunity of these men to take over the executive branch of Government?

It is easy to criticize. Mr. Wallace made a convincing case against Harry Truman. Yet I wonder whether a case could not be made against any American President, be he named Jefferson or Franklin Roosevelt. Political institutions are not perfect and neither are the human beings who create them. Any election is a choice between alternatives, and no alternative is beyond criticism.

But Harry Truman has been a good President. He fought to retain the controls which might have kept down prices. He vetoed the Taft-Hartley bill. He vetoed the Knutson save-the-rich tax bills, and twice made the veto stick. He appointed a commission which brought out the finest report on minority rights ever issued by the United States Government. He named David Lilienthal Chairman of the Atomic Commission, and he stood by the appointment.

Would you trade this for Senator TAFT? That is what you will be doing if you vote for Henry Wallace. Wallace has no chance of election. He can only take votes from the Democratic candidate, President Truman. Each vote taken from President Truman will in effect, be a vote for the Republicans. I can understand the desire of Communists to see the Republicans elected. There were probably more Communists in the United States in 1932 than at any time in history, for despair and unemployment breeds communism.

But liberals can have no stake in a Wallace party, for a Wallace party makes extremely possible a Republican victory nationally. At this critical period in world history, America cannot stand 4 years of Republican reaction. Raymond Gram Swing has pointed this out most succinctly. Although I do not agree with Harry S. Truman on every issue, I shall support him to the fullest of my capacity in this year of 1948, for I believe his continuance in office can best serve the welfare of mankind.

Experience of Tennessee Proves That Oleomargarine Taxes Do Not Help the Dairy Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in 1931 the State of Tennessee adopted certain laws imposing heavy restrictions on sales of oleomargarine. Nine years later Mr. Oscar Johnston, president of the National Cotton Council, made a survey of the results of this effort to favor the dairy industries and products, showing an interesting comparison of conditions in the neighboring State of Kentucky. The States of Tennessee and Kentucky have similar conditions. They have about the same area, the same population, with approximately the same percentage differences between urban and rural populations. It was shown by Mr. Johnston that over a period of 9 years following adoption of the law, the Tennessee farmers producing butterfat for creameries did not receive a better price for their butterfat than the dairy farmers of Kentucky, nor was there any tendency for Tennessee conditions to improve relative to those of Kentucky. The following figures represent prices in cents per pound received by farmers for butterfat, as of January 15 of the indicated years:

	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
Tennessee	21	18	14	27	31	31	23	23	28
Kentucky	20	19	12	28	30	30	31	22	29

Manifestly Tennessee secured no price improvement greater than that received by its sister State which maintained no barriers against margarine. The Tennessee margarine taxes brought no assistance to the dairy farmers whom they were supposed to benefit.

Mr. Johnston also developed the fact that manufacturers of creamery butter have not benefited substantially by reason of the tax. This is evidenced by the fact that the per capita consumption of creamery or manufactured butter did not vary materially during the 9-year period following the enactment of the law as between the States of Tennessee and Kentucky.

The existence of the laws did not benefit the consumer of creamery butter. This is evidenced by the fact that there was no substantial or appreciable change during the 9-year period between the price charged the consumer in Tennessee for creamery butter and the price charged the consumer in Kentucky for creamery butter.

I have recently secured the figures for subsequent years, and the results indicate that Mr. Johnston's observations apply with equal force to this period, as shown by the following figures:

	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946
Tennessee	30	36	46	48	46	47
Kentucky	27	31	44	47	47	47

American Merchant Marine—"Don't Give Up the Ship"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, Congress has recently received a bill (H. R. 4840)

designed to assist the recovery and rehabilitation of the nations of Europe. The basic purpose to be served by that legislation is laudatory. But in the bill are two sections which, if permitted to become law, would completely reverse our long range congressional policy relating to the American merchant marine. Enactment of those provisions would seriously weaken the defenses of our Nation at a time when world conditions are upset and the prospects of permanent peace apparently remote. Therefore, I urge that the shipping sections of the European recovery program, which authorize the transfer of 500 vessels to foreign nations, be eliminated. Congress must not be a party to the scuttling of our American merchant navy.

For over 20 years the Congress has developed a long-range policy for the maintenance of the American merchant marine. That policy has been based upon the self-evident fact that our merchant fleet is a vital adjunct to our Nation's defense. Therefore, Congress has over many years legislated certain benefits designed to protect and assist American ships to remain on the seas despite low-cost foreign competition. We have appropriated and spent hundreds of millions of dollars to this end. The wisdom of our long-range policy and the importance of our merchant marine to our national defense were forcibly proven during the recent war. In the acid test of actual combat, it was our ability to supply our forces abroad through the use of our merchant marine that made victory possible. Experience in these years showed that our shipping was the vital link in the chain between our production of war material and the utilization of our potential power on the battlefields in the far corners of the globe. As Secretary of War Patterson recently testified: "It can truthfully be said that shipping was the key to the war effort." I believe that if the United States had possessed an adequate merchant marine in 1914 and 1939, both World War I and II would have been avoided.

Conditions in the world today are such that we must continue to maintain our defense forces at an adequate level. Through the foreign-relief program we are attempting to bring about a peaceful solution to the present unsettled world conditions. But while we in good faith make this attempt, it would be foolhardy for us to lower our guard or to throw away our defense weapons. Congress would not vote at this time to advocate scrapping our Navy or our Army. Yet today the Congress is asked to approve a proposal to reduce our merchant marine to a size and potency far too small to fulfill its necessary functions as a part of our defense forces. Without being informed as to the inevitable result of the ship-disposal sections of the foreign-aid bill, Congress is now being asked to weaken one of the most vital links in our chain of defense to a point where, should war again arise, our entire efforts would be limited to the strength of that weak link. For that reason I urge that the proposals submitted in the European recovery program for the sale and charter of vessels to foreign nations be overwhelmingly defeated.

With the present unsettled condition of the world, we must maintain an adequate active American merchant marine ready and able to bear the impact should another war occur. Newspaper accounts have predicted that the future will see push-button warfare. Publicity given to air operations during the last war have given the false impression that through air power alone can our Nation be defended and our objectives won. But the recent Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, has pointed out that, while these ideas have a superficial appeal, the defense of the United States would require the early and rapid movement of millions of men and millions of tons of equipment and supplies across the oceans. As Mr. Patterson stated, this can only be accomplished by ships. Despite the developments in air warfare, both Army and Navy representatives have recently emphasized that the requirements for shipping in any future major war would far exceed in volume the ship requirements of World War II. We know how difficult it was to get ready.

The proposals submitted by the State Department and presently contained in H. R. 4840, section 7 of that bill would authorize the administrator of the European recovery program to charter to foreign nations any merchant vessels owned by the United States which are in excess of the Maritime Commission's current requirements. That section further provides that vessels so chartered to a foreign country shall be considered during the charter period as though they were foreign vessels, surrendering their American documents. In addition to this charter program, section 8 of the bill would authorize the administrator to require the sale of American Government-owned vessels to foreign interests. The full scope and danger of these proposals appears not in the bill itself, but in the transmittal documents from the Secretary of State which accompanied it. In those documents, it is stated that it is intended to sell 200 vessels and to charter 300 to foreign nations should the proposed legislation be approved. Under the procedure suggested by the State Department, the Maritime Commission, consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, and the findings required by the Ship Sales Act as to the desirability of transferring a vessel to foreign control would be completely bypassed.

What would be the result if these procedures suggested by the State Department were to be approved by the Congress? It would be that for every one of the ships transferred to a foreign nation, an American ship, employing American seamen, and paying American wages and American taxes would be forced to suspend operations and go into the laid-up fleet. By the workings of the ordinary laws of supply and demand, that result is not only probable, but inevitable.

Operating expenses for American ships are far higher than those of similar type vessels sailing under foreign flags. Our seamen are paid a basic wage rate of $192 a month, which compares with the present basic wage of $96 a month paid aboard British ships and the smaller amounts paid by our other major competitors. When you figure the estimated total pay of seamen during the year 1947, we find an average of $290 a month aboard American vessels as compared to $103 a month paid by the British. In addition to these higher wages, American vessels must pay higher maintenance and repair costs, greater insurance expenses, and larger subsistence costs for the feeding of our seamen. Because of these high costs of operation as compared with foreign ships, American vessels have always been at a tremendous competitive disadvantage. As a result of their comparatively high operating costs, our American vessels are the marginal ships. As freight rates drop or as demand for shipping becomes less, these costs require their withdrawal from service prior to the ships of any other nation.

Today there is no shortage of dry-cargo ships; there is an ample number of these vessels to handle the needs of the European recovery program. But if we transfer one vessel to a foreign nation for use under this plan, we immediately must prepare for the withdrawal from operation of an American vessel. In recent months the number of American-flag vessels sailing the seas has been substantially reduced; 372 American-flag vessels previously in operation were withdrawn and placed in laid-up status during the last 6 months of 1947. If Congress were to approve the transfer of the 500 additional vessels, as suggested by the State Department's program, an identical number of American ships would be required to cease operation.

As justification for their program, the State Department offers the thought that certain dollar savings may be made if foreign ships and crews are used to handle relief supplies. They further advance the theory that we should build up the fleets of the recipient nations as a means of implementing their incomes. I favor economy and the rehabilitation of western Europe. But, looking at these arguments closely, I am convinced that neither will result from the enactment of the proposals of the State Department dealing with our American merchant marine. I am convinced that this program would, in the long range, cost the United States many, many millions of dollars more than the State Department's estimated savings.

According to the estimates which have been submitted by the President's Committee on Foreign Aid—the Harriman committee—which studied the possible transfer of ships to foreign nations, approximately $300,000,000 of the cost of the long-range European recovery program might be saved by transferring vessels to foreign-flag operation. But what the State Department and other proponents have failed to note is that, while there may conceivably be savings in the expenditures under the program itself, the over-all result to our Treasury and the American taxpayers will be a substantial loss rather than a saving.

Let us keep in mind that if these 500 ships are not transferred to foreigners they will be operated by American companies and will be required to employ American citizens. Both the companies, their owners, and their seamen will be required to pay taxes. Transfer these ships to foreign flag and these taxes will

not be paid. Remember further that in past years we have been required to spend millions to subsidize and build up our American merchant marine in order to keep it on the seas. Transfer these 500 ships to foreign flags and we would not only have to write off our past expenditures, but we would be required in years to come to spend untold amounts to rebuild an American merchant marine up to our defense needs. Transfer these 500 vessels and our country would be placed in the negative position of having to subsidize our own merchant fleet in the coming years to a greater extent than ever because of the tremendous subsidy which these transfers would give to our foreign competitors. Think also of the huge amounts which we have spent to train our seafaring personnel. Transfer these ships to foreigners, throw American seamen out of work, and write off as a complete loss the amounts which have been expended in their training. If these vessels are chartered to Americans, our Government receives both charter hire and a large share of such profits as eventuate. Transfer them to foreign nations and all we receive for the vessels is money, which we give them, for their purchase and charter. To give you concrete losses in terms of actual dollars and cents which would result from these transfers is impossible. But it is obvious that the loss in taxes and charter revenues, plus the increased expenditures which will be required in the future to maintain our merchant marine, will be infinitely greater than any possible savings of the moment through transfer of vessels to foreign ownership and control.

Not only will the ultimate cost be greater, but the damage to our national defense will be incalculable. We have spent and will spend in the coming years billions of dollars to maintain our defense installations and weapons. Should these ships be transferred we will be faced with either a ruinous weakening of our defenses or we will be required to heal the resultant breach by building up other armaments to compensate for the loss of our merchant marine. I think that the question of cost and ostensible savings to be accomplished by the foreign transfers was excellently summarized by the President's Committee on Foreign Aid which, in discussing the alleged savings in dollars, stated that—

> The limited financial savings are not sufficient to justify the drain on United States resources for national defense which such transfers would involve.

We must not, in my opinion, give way to a philosophy of opportunism. We must not attempt to save money which, over a period of time, must be paid for many times over. It is necessary that we look at the long term and not at the moment. And when we look at the long term, the economic justification advanced for the transfer of these ships to foreign flag becomes both an illusion and a delusion. We must not here be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The only additional justification other than supposed savings of dollars for the transfer of these ships to foreign nations is that such transfers may assist in rebuilding the economies of the 16 nations to be aided under the proposed program. True it is that obtaining these vessels will assist them. But it will assist them only at the expense of the United States, its defenses, its merchant marine, and the thousands of merchant marine personnel who will be thrown out of work. We are interested in building up the economy of these nations and reviving their industry. But I do not feel that we owe them an obligation to build up their industries above their prewar status. While their steel, coal, and other industries may be far below their prewar status, the merchant marines of the European nations are in an extremely healthy condition. At the end of 1938 total fleets of the 16 countries involved aggregated 48,300,000 deadweight tons. As of the end of 1947, that combined fleet was estimated at 44,400,000, or less than 10 percent below its prewar capacity. Under the plans formulated for the development of the merchant marine of these nations during the next few years, it is estimated that by the end of 1951 they will total 55,400,000 deadweight tons, or an increase of 7,100,000 tons over their prewar status. This amount is in addition to another almost 4,000,000 tons of ships which the European nations may or may not retire. Having these figures in mind, it seems to me difficult to justify the transfer of 5,000,000 tons of merchant ships to these 16 nations. Where is the justification for rebuilding the merchant marines of these nations above their prewar level, when such rebuilding inevitably must result in a contraction of the American merchant marine by an equal amount?

Yet we are asked to vote this transfer of 500 vessels. No mention is made of the fact that as of June 30, 1947, we had already transferred 670 vessels of 6,900,000 dead-weight tons to the 16 nations to receive aid under the Marshall plan. No mention is made that since that date, when the recipient nations themselves stated that their shipping needs amounted to but an additional 4,000,000 tons of shipping, we have transferred to them over 2,000,000 more tons of ships. The State Department now asks us to transfer an additional 5,000,000 tons, or two and one-half times the remaining amount of tonnage that the recipient nations themselves have stated they require to meet their needs, despite the fact that 372 American ships have been forced from operation during the last 6 months. In short, the State Department, in its overwhelming generosity with our merchant marine, has asked that we retire 500 more American ships in order to give 500 similar vessels to Europeans for operation by low-cost foreign labor in competition with our American vessels and American seamen.

Nowhere can it be found that there is a shortage of dry-cargo ships. Nowhere will it be found that the 500 ships proposed for sale and charter to foreigners are required to carry Marshall plan goods. Quite the contrary, these transfers are not for the purpose of doing a needed job, but rather for the purpose of assisting the European merchant marines to compete with our own. An examination of the present use of ships now owned by the recipient nations show that they maintain a large number of their vessels in routes other than those which will carry relief supplies. In other words, they are maintaining their competitive position in these routes, rather than divert any of their shipping to the actual carriage of relief cargoes. Put another way, the State Department's proposed transfer of vessels would merely permit European countries to maintain vessel services on nonrelief routes and still carry relief cargoes from this and other Western Hemisphere countries to their destinations in Europe.

While I favor aid to Europe, I do urge most strongly that the Congress not support such aid as will serve no function for the recipient European nations except to enable them to drive the American merchant marine to the wall. I have labored too long for the maintenance of an adequate American merchant marine to see this happen. I have seen too recently how necessary it is for us to maintain an American merchant marine if we are to maintain an adequate defense force for me to vote for any scheme which would crucify American shipping and America's defense for the sole purpose of assisting European nations to build up their competitive shipping position.

There are certain other aspects of the State Department's shipping proposals which I find to be highly objectionable. First and foremost is that by giving foreign operators merchant ships without cost, they place the American operator who must pay for and amortize his vessels at an even greater competitive disadvantage than under normal operating conditions. While a purchase price for these vessels might be met, in actual fact the money used by the foreign interests to procure them will be money given by this country under the Marshall plan. If charter hire is paid for their use, that too will be money granted by Uncle Sam. And that, too, will constitute unfair competition with American ships.

In the Harriman committee and other reports dealing with the transfer of ships to foreign flag, it has been emphasized that such transfers should be permitted only as a condition to the foreign nations cutting down the ship-construction programs which they have presently undertaken. The reasoning behind that suggestion is that it is ridiculous to transfer American ships and at the same time permit the foreigners to complete additional vessels requiring additional American steel in amounts up to 5 percent of the total steel to be supplied under the relief program. To permit such foreign shipbuilding to continue and to supply the steel for this purpose means that we are doubly assisting foreign merchant fleets. Yet in spite of the recommendations of the Harriman committee that transfers be permitted only on condition that foreign shipping building programs be curtailed, the State Department's program mentions nothing of this. As far as I can see, the State Department contemplates giving these ships without any restrictions on their shipbuilding programs. The result can only be that not only will these transferred ships eliminate 500 American vessels, but that additional American vessels will be put out of service as new foreign ships come out of their yards.

The estimates of savings which would result from transferring these vessels foreign are based, as I understand it, on the Marshall plan being carried out in accordance with the original recommendations. Now it appears probable that these estimates will be substantially curtailed. If this is the fact, the amount of dollar savings will be less. But in addition, if the aid to be furnished under the pending bill is reduced, the amount of cargoes available will be far less. Under these circumstances the transfer of these 500 vessels to foreign flag will be an even more severe blow to the American merchant marine. For in addition to having to lay off 500 American ships because of the transfer of an equal number to foreign nations, American operators will be forced to lay up an additional large number of vessels because of the shortage of cargo. In considering proposals of the kind here suggested by the State Department, Members of Congress must constantly keep in mind that because of the marginal nature of the high-operating-cost American ships every drop in available cargo means an American ship must be taken from the seas. Unfortunately the foreign-flag vessels can continue merrily on their way.

The suggestion that vessels be transferred to foreign nations is not a new one. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries considered the question during 18 months of hearings on the bills which ultimately became the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946. That act permits vessels to be transferred to foreign nations but establishes very definite safeguards which must be met as a condition precedent to such transfers. Under that act we have already transferred almost 9,000,000 dead-weight tons of war-built ships to the nations covered under the pending relief bill. In committee we considered the entire question of charters to foreign nations; after most deliberate consideration it was determined that permitting such charter would be detrimental to the best interests of our merchant marine and of our Nation. Yet today this same proposal is being made again by the State Department as an incident to a broader purpose. Members of the Congress must not permit themselves to follow this misguided effort to revive a procedure long considered and found wanting in merit.

Let me emphasize one further point. That is that the transfer of these 500 ships as proposed by the State Department would throw out of work over 30,000 additional trained Americans now employed to service American merchant ships. During the last 6 months of 1947, 16,000 American seamen were thrown out of work by the withdrawal from operation of 372 American flag vessels. With the withdrawal of the additional 500 American flag vessels which would inevitably result from the transfer of this number of ships to foreign flags, approximately 22,700 officers and seamen, almost all American citizens, will be placed upon the beach. Over 10,000 Americans engaged in ship-repair work and other shoreside maritime industries will similarly lose their means of livelihood. America will lose the services of this large number of trained personnel. And America will lose the benefits of having an active fleet, rather than a laid-up fleet, as a part of its national defense.

Not only would this program take away the livelihood of over 30,000 Americans and their families, but it would take from the Government both the benefit of their training, the value of the taxes they pay, and the cost of their training during recent years. All this on the theory that, for the moment, a few dollars will be saved. All this on the theory that Europe's recovery should be aided. All this because the State Department has in its recommendations on shipping closed its eyes to the needs of America, seeing only the needs of Europe. All this because of the State Department's attempt to establish a world merchant-marine policy without consideration for the American merchant marine.

For many years I have known that my interests and those of my colleagues here in the Congress have primarily been to advance the welfare of our Nation. To advance that welfare and to insure its defense, we in the Congress have consistently voted a policy for the maintenance of an American merchant marine and the development of a trained force of American seamen. Our efforts have been to obtain the maximum result at a minimum cost. Today I see all of our efforts toward this end likely to come to nought because of what I believe to be a misguided and uninforced policy conceived by certain members of our State Department.

Let me invite the attention of this Congress to a determination made by the Congress of a few years ago after many months of study, hearings, and debate. Twelve years ago, the Congress made a determination which has been the keystone of American merchant marine policy and which has been set forth as the preamble to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. In that preamble the Congress stated:

> It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine.

Let us not forget that policy. Let us not change that policy merely to save for the moment a sum of money which we will be required in the future to pay for many times over. Let us not forget the needs of America, the American merchant marine, and the American seamen merely to assist in the rehabilitation of Europe. In short, I urge the Members of Congress, and particularly the membership of the Committees on Foreign Affairs of the House and Foreign Relations of the Senate, overwhelmingly to defeat the present proposals relating to shipping contained in H. R. 4840.

Supplementing what I have said here, I ask careful reading of the speeches appearing in the RECORD made by Representative BRADLEY, of California, under the following dates, January 13, 1948, and January 20, 1948, and an extension of my own on January 30, 1948, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Congress Treading on Dangerous Ground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, Congress is treading on dangerous ground if it ever flouts the will of the great masses of the church people in the United States and, at the same time, helps to increase schism between the Negroes and the whites of the United States. Yet, we as a party will be doing both of these things if we pass the so-called universal military training legislation now in the Committee on Rules, where it should stay until it is recommitted to the Committee on the Armed Services for further hearings and study.

As we all know, the church people of the United States are almost unanimously opposed to the legislation, as it is now offered in H. R. 4278, the so-called Towe bill. No opportunity was given for these groups, composing the finest of our American culture, to be heard. Likewise as we know, the bill would authorize by statute the War Department to segregate the various soldiers who would be inducted under the provisions of the proposed legislation. This, to me, is a notable and important failure of the bill, and, if the bill were to be passed in such a form as it was reported out by the Committee on the Armed Services, the Republican Party would be blamed by millions of voters throughout the North.

In this connection, I have received a letter from an important Negro leader of New York State. I submit it for inclusion in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, and I hope that my colleagues will give it the study and consideration it deserves:

> I write this letter, not as national chairman of the Emergency Committee Against Jim Crow in Military Service and Training—comprised of over 200 top Negro leaders. Rather, I write as a Republican.
>
> Briefly, I do not wish to see our party commit political suicide among Negroes in 1948 by enacting a permanent Jim Crow military draft. That is exactly what H. R. 4278 in its present form boils down to.
>
> In a recent conference Chairman Walter G. Andrews told A. Philip Randolph and me that the War Department plans segregated white and Negro battalions under any UMT

legislation that Congress may pass. Next November, and thereafter, every Negro of voting age would hold the Republican Congress, not the Truman administration, responsible for any such permanent compulsory segregation.

A prominent Negro New Dealer on the Federal pay roll once said: "I was a Negro before I was a Democrat." That is my position within the Republican Party. Neither I, nor any other Negro Republican, next fall could possibly explain away a Jim Crow draft for every 18-year-old Negro youth.

May I therefore urge:

1. Recommittal of H. R. 4278 to the House Armed Services Committee. Full opportunity for Negro veterans to testify before the House committee.

2. Insertion while the bill is in committee of unequivocal antisegregation amendments.

Prologue to a Political Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article contributed to the January 1948 issue of Survey Graphic by Mr. Irving Dilliard, an outstanding member of the editorial staff of the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch.

Mr. Dilliard's article follows:

PROLOGUE TO A POLITICAL YEAR
(By Irving Dilliard)

Are the American people and their two-party system of self-government equal to the test which lies ahead in this Presidential campaign year of 1948?

Here is a question not simply to be asked rhetorically or pondered by a few who teach or study government. It is a practical question of the first magnitude which demands to be answered by the entire Nation in one way only—with the clearest, most earnest, most determined yes.

There is no guarantee at all that we shall answer it in this way. But the answer, whatever it is, will have to be written in acts. Words count for zero. What we think in our hearts or what we tell others will not make the slightest difference unless confirmed by what we do.

Solemn talk, you say. But, in fact, all of us may gain from a reminder that this is not to be called merely a year of stress. This is a world crisis, and using any one of half a dozen issues now facing Congress as a partisan plaything is simply playing with dynamite, or as the saying goes in 1948—atoms.

Never in the 160 years since the founding fathers compromised their differences to produce the Constitution has it been more true that, in Cleveland's stanch phrase, it is a condition which confronts us—not a theory.

What is the condition?

What is the test?

What can we do to meet it?

First, an estimate of the situation. The initial fact is that the calendar has brought us around again, as every 4 years under our pattern of fixed elections, to a period in which we all divide into Republicans and Democrats, and single-mindedly undertake to hold or capture for our party the highest office in the land.

Traditionally we go to any lengths for our side. We become extremely careless with the truth even if we do not ignore it altogether. We say things we would never think of saying under other circumstances. We make promises we cannot keep or else have no intention of keeping. We engage in trades and deals which we know are beneath us. We blind ourselves to clear facts which at other times we should recognize as compelling.

All this we do to one paramount end—to get votes for our candidates, to possess the political prizes in State and Nation.

This year we have not only the general fact of a Presidential election and all that goes with that. We have it set in the most adverse circumstances, politically. And we have the coincidence of some of our toughest questions of policy coming up for decision immediately, not to be postponed beyond the election—with frightening consequences for muffing them.

With the present term completed, the Democratic Party will have been in control of the executive branch of the Government for 16 years. This is twice as long as the party, as we know it today, has ever before held control at one stretch. Indeed, it is a span which equals the total of its previous years of control since the Civil War—8 years of Wilson and 8 years of Cleveland.

Power held so long gets to be a habit. Those in control are so accustomed to authority and patronage that they shrink all the more from the idea of change. At the same time, those out of power grow the hungrier for influence and advantage.

Looking back, we see that there has not been, in these 16 years, a single Presidential campaign which produced a real contest. For his fourth term, Franklin D. Roosevelt overwhelmed Gov. Thomas E. Dewey in the electoral count, 432 votes against 99, and no other Republican had done so well against him. The last four Presidential elections were runaways for the Democrats.

Then something happened in the midterm congressional election of 1946. Roosevelt, tired and spent, had died. In his place was Harry S. Truman, a relatively little-known product of the Pendergast machine in which tenure and patronage, personalities and friendships counted for more than public issues.

Although there were creditable entries in his senatorial record, this new President was lacking in progressive conviction and prestige. He had the country's sympathy and good will but little of its respect.

In short, Harry Truman was an almost nondescript, pretty much bewildered man, lifted suddenly to a post beyond his powers. The country remembered his great predecessor as warm and appealing, optimistic, imaginative, resourceful, and boundlessly energetic. The contrast, to many, was appalling.

Moreover, formal hostilities had ended in both Europe and the Pacific and postwar disillusionment had set in. With the defeat of Germany and Japan, differences long held in check began to come out. Large ones made their appearance at conferences of the victorious Allies. Lesser ones took shape at home. When the congressional elections came around, a thousand and one discontents and grievances went to the polls and the Republicans, out of power since Hoover's midterm, not only swept the House but surprised themselves by taking the Senate as well.

How crushing this defeat was still is not realized. Here is one way to measure it: From Pennsylvania straight west all the way to Colorado, there is now only one Democratic Senator—SCOTT W. LUCAS, of Illinois. Every other administration Senator in this agricultural-industrial heart of the country was turned out. Even Missouri, the President's usually Democratic home State, now for the first time in its history has two Republican Senators.

This overturn suggested at once that an important law of American politics was again at work, namely: the party which takes control of Congress in midterm will win the Presidency 2 years later. That has been true over more than half a century. Switches in House control in 1894, 1910, 1918, and 1930 anticipated party changes in control of the Presidency in 1896, 1912, 1920, and 1932.

This precedent is not unbreakable. It can be broken just as was the anti-third-term tradition. But as the University of Oklahoma political scientist, Cortez A. M. Ewing, writes in his highly informative study, "Congressional Elections: 1896–1944," this law, until it is broken, remains "a fairly reliable criterion for the interpretation of American politics."

And so for several months after the 1946 election, the Republican victories appeared as the handwriting on the wall for 1948. The message read, or at least seemed to say, that the GOP would have an easy time in the Presidential election, pretty much regardless of its nominee.

But in came the new Congress with the Republicans in control. It is unnecessary here to review the struggles over governmental expenditures, tax reduction, labor policy, and other issues; the record of special messages, independent action and no action, vetoes and the overriding of vetoes. That is fresh in the memories of us all. Notwithstanding constructive agreements in the field of foreign policy, we have seen that fears of a stalemate in a politically divided government are fully justified.

All the while the cost of living mounted in the inflationary spiral of higher wages, higher prices, then higher wages and again higher prices. Enthusiasm for the Republicans has cooled. In 1947, special elections to fill vacancies in the House were held in five districts which the Republicans carried in 1946. In each, the Republican majority was lowered, and in one the GOP margin was down 12 percentage points.

This countertrend was confirmed by the municipal elections in November in politically sensitive Indiana—a State with a Republican governor and two Republican Senators. The Democrats won mayoralties right and left and ousted Republicans in several of the larger cities.

The upshot of all this is a Presidential horse race. That is what 1948 opens on, 10 months in advance of election day. The prospect is for the tightest contest since Wilson edged out Charles Evans Hughes 32 years ago in a battle whose outcome was not determined until the final delayed returns came in from rural California.

The normal course the first 6 months of this presidential horse race is through the halls of Congress. Election year after election year it has been this way. Each party has sought to use the Congress to embarrass the other, as a means to rival political ends. In such a situation, the politicians, cautious men by profession, commit themselves as little as possible. At best the public welfare marks time.

When one party has held the presidency in presidential years and the other controlled Congress, the resulting deadlock has shunted the needs of the rank and file of people out at the little end of the horn. Such an instance followed the Democratic defeat in 1918. Senators William E. Borah and Hiram W. Johnson set about to even their score with Wilson. Abetted by Henry Cabot Lodge they blocked the peace treaty, kept the United States out of the League of Nations and out of its rightful role in world affairs. A strong case could be made for the proposition that a direct consequence of this was Hitler and nazism and the new war they waged.

The high cost of living was an issue in the 1920 session of Congress, preceding the Harding-Cox campaign. Wilson asked for legislation to combat the price spiral. Looking to the election, the Republican Congress gave the Executive little aid. The leaders preferred to blame living costs on the administration's expenditures and its insistence on keeping taxes high—identical complaints today.

The sessions which followed the 1910 and 1932 midterm overturns for the most part also were given over to political jockeying, to pulling and hauling intended to discredit the other side.

Left to its own devices, the second session of the Eightieth Congress, now assembling, would be no better—probably worse. As the basis for such a forecast, we have the recriminations and frustrations of the first session and of the special session last month.

But in 1948 "no better" will be not nearly good enough. The elected representatives of the American people along with the President, have got to find the way to something better. For there is a fact of graver moment in 1948 than the prize of the presidency, and that is the state of the world. We cannot gear ourselves blandly to the lesser concern when our fate is tied to the larger. This is the crux of the meaning of 1948 for the United States of America.

Congress in the new session faces a whole series of issues, any one of them a heavy burden for any preceding session.

European relief is the basic factor today in the lives of more than 200,000,000 persons abroad, and the foundation of a sound foreign policy for us. It represents the ultimate in renunication of isolation—yet many Members of Congress still would vote isolationist if they thought the times would give popular support to their stand.

Communism is changing from a challenge to democracy to a threat and relations between the United States and Russia, as a consequence, have deteriorated from month to month. Yet unless we accept a counsel of despair we must continue to work for an understanding which can be the basis for peace.

The United Nations has not measured up to our hopes; yet we have no choice, actually, but to strive even harder to make it the instrument for good will and harmony which we had envisioned it would be.

Then there is the problem of revenue to pay for vast and unavoidable Government activities. In a time of high national income and of unprecedented national debt, there is the clearest indication of high taxes in order to reduce that debt—with the anomaly of a serious drive to cut taxes. Tied to this is the threat of inflation and the need to control it.

More than 2½ years after VE-day, our gates are still closed to the displaced of Europe, hundreds of thousands of whom are even now huddled in cheerless, frustrating camps, yet Congress here continues to shirk a duty which could not be plainer.

The list of waiting decisions could be long extended: loosening the tariff bonds on world trade without which there can be no world recovery; long overdue housing for veterans and their families; protection and extension of civil rights for all citizens; provision of personnel adequate to discharge our obligations and meet our opportunities in Germany, Japan, and Korea; enlargement and perfection of the Voice of America broadcasts and the Government information service as an encouragement to friends behind the "iron curtains"; aid for education without infringing the fundamental separation of church and state; provision for enforcement of mine safety inspections; planning to meet an always possible curtailment in employment or a break in our none-too-healthy prosperity—these and many other issues are serious and could become critical.

Such issues deserve handling on their merits. They also command attention now as the very substance of representative self-government at work in a world which is hearing, from a vast propaganda machine day after day, that democracy is weak and fumbling and incompetent. When, for example, Congress fails to pass the Stratton bill to admit 100,000 carefully screened DP's each year for 4 years, the loss is much more than the bill and the worthy cause which it embraces. The whole practice of democracy is weakened by that much.

This is the condition. Here is the test. What can we do to improve our prospects?

This is no time to talk of long-range changes such as constitutional amendments to lengthen the term of House Members, to establish the parliamentary system with the Cabinet sitting in Congress, to prevent the President from succeeding himself as a check on his political activity. These proposals have no relevance now. What we do must be done in the weeks that are rushing at us in 1948.

The times are too urgent for inaction. The stakes are too great for a round of political charges and countercharges—and do-nothingism. How can we sufficiently impress these self-evident truths on the men we have sent to Washington? That is the question.

The first requirement—being severely practical—is for the American people to resolve that this session shall not fall to the level of those others degraded into curtain raisers to presidential campaigns. This resolution is absolutely necessary. Without it we merely relive the past and stumble into well-known pits.

Not every last one among our 140,000,000 people need to resolve. That ideal, of course, is utterly beyond attainment. But throughout the country, east and west, north to south, in every State and every congressional district, there must be men and women aroused and determined that the old frustrations shall not be repeated in this crisis year of 1948.

The second requirement is that this resolution be promptly and effectively translated into action, impressive to both President and Congress. The action is equally necessary; the resolution is a joke without the action.

We have the machinery for this at hand in the highly organized condition of the American society. Parts of this machinery have been used many times by special interests to impress White House and Capitol Hill. It can be used now as never before to impress the larger view, not that of special interests, but the interest, if not the lift itself, of our country in relation to the peace of the world.

This mobilized public opinion, this means to action, needs to stand above even the appearance of partisanship.

What can be read as Republican criticism of the Democrats will only cancel out what is, or appears to be Democratic criticism of the Republicans. The one way to lift this public opinion above partisanship is to participate in organizing opinion that is fair, balanced, evenhanded—and positive.

The chamber of commerce or the professional association which condemns a presidential pardon for a convicted mail fraud crook like Boss Curley must also hold Congress to account for a tax reduction bill, advocated not because Congress believes in reduction at a time of inflation and tremendous debt, but because Congress thinks a cut will make votes.

The trade-union or the voters' league which checks it up to the majority leader of the Senate when he charges "bad faith" in a presidential attack on the spiral of high prices can show its balance by checking it up to the executive who would wangle a high appointive post for an untrustworthy crony. After all, an administration that insistently included in its official family a "profiteer in human misery" should not be considered immune to being carefully watched in the future.

The thousands upon thousands of service luncheon and supper clubs which meet every week in communities ranging from the largest cities down to small towns and villages can profitably make this resolution and this action a prior order of business. The many thousands of veterans' posts, fraternal orders, women's clubs, medical and bar associations, engineering societies, and other organizations can do the same thing.

Letters and telegrams and formal statements should pour in upon the President and the Senators and Representatives. The word should go in longhand on penny postcards written on kitchen tables after a day's work; from secretaries who hasten to wire the declared conviction of large organizations; by word of mouth; by the newspapers and on the radio.

The message to send is not that politics is adjourned, but that politics this year must be on a high and responsible plane. The word is that political discussion and education are as much in order as ever, but that political trickery, misrepresentation, and deceit are ruled out. It should serve notice that the people have taken charge. It should be as quick to applaud the good as to oppose the bad.

Let this happen and the United States of America will have its new awakening. Democracy will be in fact a vital, vibrant, shining way of life, one which we are proud to display before the world, which will give new heart to distant friends risking their lives to plead the cause of liberty where oppressors rule.

This is not impossible. It is not more than we can do. We elected this Congress and we can turn it out of office in November. In the months ahead we can require it to serve us.

We sent Harry Truman to the executive branch. Ten months from now we shall say whether we want him to continue. In the interval we can require him to serve us.

This year 1948 is no time to blame our ills on the President—or on Congress. The occupant of the White House is all the President we have until he is replaced. This Congress is our latest screening of the American people to produce the most representative body on earth. If we discredit the President and Congress we discredit ourselves. That we do at our own peril.

It is up to the vast rank and file of citizens. It is in their hands—our hands. They—we—can make all the difference.

The alternative is to waste six precious months next ahead of us in a game of political tag in which everyone, including innocent onlookers growing weaker day by day on starvation diets, will lose. The alternative is to fumble in what may well be one of the greatest lost chances in history.

Now is the time.

The place is everywhere—Maine, Indiana, Texas, New York, Illinois, Wyoming, Virginia, Missouri, Oregon, Kentucky, California—everywhere throughout the length and breadth of our country.

This is asking a great deal—of the American people, of Congress and the President, of the individual citizen, of me the writer and you the readers of this article. It is asking that we break for once with the settled habit of taking a fling every 4 years. It is asking that we accept the role of positive responsibility for our political behavior. It means foregoing a great deal of election-year fun, taking on a great burden of serious concern. Such an idea requires justification, and it is in this case the simple alternative which leads to the edge of disaster—for the world, and ourselves, too.

Is the Almighty Dollar an Honest Dollar?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, on a number of previous occasions I have called

the attention of the Members of this House to the fact that we cannot hope to achieve stabilization of the economy of either Europe or our own Nation if we do not first return to a policy of fiscal sanity in our national and international finance operations.

At this time I should like to introduce into the RECORD a discussion of the United States monetary situation by Mr. Frank Lilly, a prominent mining research authority of Spokane, Wash.:

IS THE ALMIGHTY DOLLAR AN HONEST DOLLAR?

(Address to the Mining Bureau of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce by Frank Lilly, February 2, 1948)

With the monetary systems of the world crashing all around it is logical to ask, Could this happen here? It goes without saying that we do not want this to happen here; and the best way to prevent such a happening here is to look facts in the face and take such preventive action as the situation seems to require.

Is our almighty dollar an honest dollar in the truest sense of the word? In other words, does it have a true unvarying permanent value and is it safe? Let us look the facts in the face.

In the first place, we will find that we have several kinds of dollars to consider. They are as follows: (1) The silver dollar; (2) silver-certificate dollar; (3) United-States-note dollar; (4) national-bank-currency dollar; (5) Federal-Reserve-note dollar; (6) bank-check dollar.

The silver dollar: The silver dollar, of which there are now only 337,000,000 in the United States Treasury, where they are backing silver certificates, and 154,000,000 in circulation, is the only hard money we have, except subsidiary coins that conform to the provision in the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have power to coin money." There is nothing in the Constitution about paper currency, possibly because the founding forefathers had learned from practical experience with the continental currency that only coins should be recognized and used as money.

The silver dollar was an honest dollar containing as much or more than a dollar's worth of silver until in 1873 silver was demonetized at the behest of British international bankers. Its position in the monetary system was restored in 1934, but Congress failed to make it an honest dollar with a dollar's worth of silver in it. As matters stand today with the Treasury price of silver at 90.5 cents an ounce, there is only about 70 cents worth of silver in the dollar. Thus, through no fault of its own, the silver dollar falls short of being an honest dollar in the full sense of the word, although it is the only dollar we now have that is acceptable anywhere in the world.

The silver certificate dollar: Instead of coining all silver in accordance with the obviously expressed intention of the Constitution, Congress provided for the issuance of silver certificates against bullion silver acquired under and through the Silver Purchase Act and silver dollars in the Treasury.

These silver certificates fall short of being 100 percent honest dollars because they are issued against silver on the basis of $1.29 an ounce, when as a matter of fact, the Treasury price for silver is only 90.5 cents an ounce. Not only do they fall short in this respect, but at least one-fourth of the 1,850,000,000 ounces (approximately) of silver against which silver certificates have been issued has been lend-leased to foreign countries and is not, therefore, available on demand. All of this may be returned eventually, but no less a person than United States Senator PAT MCCARRAN told me that he doubted if any of it will ever get back in the Treasury.

United States note dollar: The United States note constitutes a comparatively small amount of our currency, totaling only $322,000,000. These Government notes were first authorized in February 1862 during the Civil War as a war measure and were at that time called greenbacks. They bear no interest and have no hard money or other collateral backing. Despite the fact that they were a promise of the United States Government, United States greenback notes sold as low as 36 cents on the dollar in gold and/or silver specie during the reconstruction period after the Civil War. Nevertheless, I consider the present United States note the most nearly 100 percent honest money this country now has, because being a non-interest-bearing Government issue it does not indirectly filch a private profit from the unsuspecting citizen as is the case with national currency and the Federal Reserve note.

The national bank currency dollar: This dollar originated as a result of legislation passed by Congress in 1863 that provided for the issuance of a so-called national currency by national banks against Government bonds owned by these banks, which, although called national banks, were and are actually privately owned. Subsequently, these banks were permitted to issue currency against other public indebtedness and even in certain instances, private indebtedness. This currency is now being retired and at the present time there are only about $100,000,000 of such notes outstanding. As notes they were and are no better and no worse than a promise to pay, and while not intentionally dishonest they do not measure up to the requirements that would make them fully 100 percent safe and honest.

Federal Reserve note dollar: In December 1913 Congress passed legislation creating the Federal Reserve bank system out of a group of privately owned national banks and provided for the issuing of currency by these banks on about the same basis as it had been issued by national banks, except that the Federal Reserve note was required to have a 40 percent gold backing.

The Federal Reserve System, by the way, was created because gold was not at that time being produced at a rate sufficient to provide the money this coutnry needed to maintain a smooth-working economic system. These notes of the Federal Reserve bank were originally in the form of national currency, but were later issued as notes redeemable in gold on demand until the gold standard was abandoned in 1934. However, the 40 percent gold reserve backing provision was retained until 1945 when it was reduced to 25 percent.

Thus the gold which is not actually owned by the Government, although theoretically under its control, is not in fact money in the truest sense of the word. Incidentally, the commercial bank that owns the gold can use it to create $245 of new money for each ounce of gold it obtains at $35 an ounce.

The Federal Reserve note, being a note based upon a promise-to-pay credit, and with no more than a small and wholly theoretical gold backing, cannot logically be considered as being 100 percent safe and "honest." If, for example, a critical debt-credit situation should arise such as did come about during the depression of the early thirties when the Federal Reserve banks were operating, it is entirely possible that much of the "promise to pay" against which the Federal Reserve has issued its notes could crumble into mere promises and no pay.

Bank check dollar: The modern bank check dollar is the dollar with which most of the business of the United States is done. It is convenient but it is not money in the real sense of the word. One money dollar deposited in a bank is in the process of banking and customer checking converted into many check dollars, and everybody is happy until, through a combination of circumstances over which neither the bank nor the depositor has control, the bank cannot pay money dollars. Remember the so-called "bank holiday."

It is only fair to point out that the bank-check dollar is safer today than ever before because of the Government guarantee covering deposits up to $5,000, but, although this type of dollar expedites business and is in many respects essential, it lacks the safety factor essential in an "honest" dollar.

The total supply of all the foregoing kinds of dollars is estimated at $111,000,000,000, or about three times the prewar volume. Of this total only the silver dollar, silver certificates, and United States notes amounting in all to about $2,500,000,000 are not more or less based upon interest-bearing debt with the profits accruing to non-Government powers who create the currency under the powers and with the privileges delegated to them by Congress.

Thus, we have stumbled step by step into a muddled debt-based monetary situation in which the real nature and purpose of the dollar has been lost sight of. To serve merely as a medium of exchange and as a measure of value is not enough—the dollar should be a safe, unvarying, and permanent storage of value which an interest-bearing debt-based money cannot provide.

This can be achieved by basing our monetary system on a gold and/or silver hard money foundation. The dollars of such a system could neither be inflated or deflated, and, incidentally, no country has ever gone "busted" because it had too much gold and/or silver.

The United States now has nearly $23,000,000,000 of gold on the basis of $35 an ounce, and approximately $3,500,000,000 of silver, including minor coins, or a total of $26,500,000,000. If this dollar total along with our check dollar, on which the bankers can get along very well without the added profit on Federal Reserve notes, does not provide sufficient money value to meet the needs of our economic system the value of gold and/or silver can be regulated as the Constitution clearly indicates is the duty of Congress.

Congress should act immediately in this matter, because in the well-chosen words of John McBride: "An unsound monetary system is more fruitful of human misery than war, pestilence, and famine, and has brought more injustice than all the bad laws ever enacted. Until a sound monetary situation is adopted by the United States all the present frenzied efforts for permanent peace, recovery, full employment, full production, and a balanced budget are just so much sound and fury signifying nothing."

Most insistent among the suggestions made in this connection is restoration of the former gold coin standard and the right of a citizen to own gold and to buy or sell same in a free market. In this connection it is pointed out that it is not in the pockets of citizens, but only in the hands of banks that values based on gold can be inflated. Opposition to silver in the monetary set-up is far less than at any time in recent years and the chance of teaming silver with gold to provide a money system with truly honest dollars is promising. Hasten the day.

The Worthington Plan—A Proposal by Which People Everywhere Can Do Something Practical for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I desire to call attention to the unique plan for peace originating in Worthington, Minn. The following radio address which I prepared for use on the radio in Worthington, Minn., gives a brief description of the Worthington plan. Those desiring further information should write Mr. Charles Cashel, of Worthington, Minn., or the editor of the paper in Worthington.

Good friends of Worthington, Minn., about 20 years ago, when I was a student in Columbia University working on an advanced degree in education and serving as superintendent of schools of a small South Dakota community, we had an instructor who was a firm believer in the opportunities of life and education in America's smaller towns and cities. Almost every day he used to encourage us by repeating this impressive and very truthful slogan: "You don't have to live in a big town to do big things in education."

In this broadcast of greeting and congratulations to the people of the Worthington community who are really just good neighbors of mine, since Worthington, Minn., and Madison, S. Dak., are not very far apart, it seems to me that a paraphrasing of that old educational slogan might be highly appropriate.

Certainly, Worthington, Minn., better than any other community in the whole United States, has proved with definite finality the axiomatic accuracy of this statement: "You don't have to live in a big town to do big things in the promotion of a permanent peace."

Worthington, Minn., has today become a phrase which is literally known around the world. In Washington, in New York, in Ohio, and in Europe I have heard people talking about the Worthington plan with almost as much familiarity as they demonstrate in talking about the Marshall plan.

Truly, your Worthington plan of establishing people-to-people contacts and friendly associations with the residents of a city in a former enemy country through the unique procedure of adopting that foreign city as a sort of political ward of yours is both unique and contagious. Many other communities in America, and some in England, are now in process of following your example. They have seen the vision in the sky reflected from the working mechanism you have established in Worthington for substituting the helping hand of friendship for the clenched fist of conflict. They have learned from your example that a wise and successful victor seeks not to perpetuate the bitterness of war but to build for the future through creating areas of understanding and good will to replace the fox holes of hatred which form a part of any war. Since permanent peace is the goal of military victory, the Worthington plan if extended to 500 foreign communities by 500 inspired American cities adopting political and economic municipal wards in every region of the earth could well do more to create and maintain a permanent peace than all the armies and international organizations and formal Marshall plans that the mind of man could possibly conceive or the great purse of America could finance.

While I was in Germany last September and October I took special pains to inquire about the reaction of foreigners to your municipal Worthington ward of Crailsheim, in the western part of Bavaria, Germany, located just 40 miles southwest of the seat of the Nuremburg trials. Crailsheim, I found, to be a new symbol of hope and of peace not only in Bavaria and in Germany but throughout much of Europe as well. The Worthington plan and the reaction of the people of Crailsheim was widely publicized in an article I saw in the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune. Another article publicized your program all over in Europe through the European edition of the Stars and Stripes. It was written up in Rome American, an English language newspaper published by some ex-GI's in Italy. The little ripples of freedom and friendship which you Worthington folks have originated by your assistance and counsel to the people of Crailsheim are sweeping over Europe with ever-increasing strength and in a steadily expanding circle of good will.

I found our American occupation authorities in Berlin not only interested but actually enthusiastic about the potentialities of the Worthington plan, and they expressed the sincere hope you would make it at least a 5-year program with a steadily expanding interchange of correspondence, of products, of pictures, and eventually of students, teachers, city officials, and visitors between Worthington, Minn.—the parent of freedom—and its political and economic ward, Crailsheim, Germany, which hopes to become an oasis of democracy in what was formerly a hopeless desert of Nazi tyranny and belligerent nationalism.

About 2 weeks ago, when Gen. Lucius B. Clay and Ambassador Robert Murphy were in Washington, having just flown in from Germany to testify before our House Foreign Affairs Committee on conditions overseas, I took the occasion to ask General Clay, as the commander in chief of our occupation forces in Germany, some questions about the success and significance of the Worthington plan of substituting assistance for animosity.

Let me read you now some of the official testimony as it appears in our congressional hearings:

"Mr. MUNDT. General Clay, both you and Ambassador Murphy, I am sure, are familiar with the so-called Worthington plan which I discussed with you in Berlin last fall. Worthington has adopted a little German city. Other American communities are getting interested in that kind of thing. Because I was identified with the Worthington plan from the start and helped select the location in Germany through the State Department and a member of your staff, I get a lot of correspondence on the plan. Should we discourage or encourage other communities from entering into that kind of experiment.

"General CLAY. No, sir; I think it has been a very helpful thing. That type of thing and the contribution of the individual which reaches Germany makes the German feel that he has not been completely forgotten in this world, and it has, I think, more effect in molding him to our way of thinking and to a belief in democratic processes than almost anything that we can do. The more of it that can happen the better.

"Mr. MUNDT. You will be happy then to cooperate and further such cases?

"General CLAY. Very much so indeed."

That, good people of Worthington, is the testimony of General Clay in tribute to the patriotic and far-sighted program in which you are now engaged for building the precepts of enduring peace in an area which has so often served as the cradle for war. It is a tribute which you Worthington "peace pioneers" richly deserve and one which I am mighty happy to convey to you.

Inasmuch as I was once the district governor of the Minnesota-Dakotas district of Kiwanis and the Worthington Kiwanis Club was for a time under my jurisdiction, I am especially glad that the Kiwanis Club of Worthington is one of the groups now sponsoring the supporting of the Worthington plan. Many other organizations have joined together, I am sure, in this great cooperative and constructive enterprise and I salute and congratulate them all as well as the progressive community which they serve.

Since it was my old friend Charles Cashel who first enlisted my interest and assistance on the Worthington plan I want to extend a special word of commendation to him, since I am sure he must have been one of the idea men behind this new world-famous project. You will be glad to know that the State Department thinks so highly of the Worthington plan that under the provisions of my so-called Voice of America bill which was recently signed by the President, a special office is being set up for the purpose of bringing other communities together and for facilitating the exchanges of personnel and products which it is anticipated will develop from such international contacts and associations.

In conclusion may I extend the personal hope that the Worthington plan will continue not only for the 5-year period originally expected of it but that it will eventuate in a permanent series of contacts between Crailsheim, Germany, and Worthington, Minn. I also hope that some individual or committee in Worthington will prepare a little pamphlet discussing the origin, the development, and the hopes of the Worthington plan, since many in America would like to know more about it. In fact, one of the editors of Pathfinder magazine, published here in Washington, was in to see me today to get some information on your project. You have a grand idea which is off to a good start, and by describing it in an attractive booklet you can add new laurels to your crown as well as help other communities to follow in your footsteps.

As I told Charley Cashel when he first solicited my cooperation in what has come to be known as the Worthington plan, I hope you will extend its functions far beyond the contribution of supplies to the needy of Crailsheim and the interchange of letters, pictures, and literature between the students and adults of your two communities.

Men and women of Worthington, you have started a snowball of peace which has far greater potentialities than that. I hope you will be able to raise funds through cooperative efforts like home talent plays or community suppers, or tag days, or what have you, so that eventually you can finance the trip of your mayor, or your superintendent of schools, or your chief of police, or some other prominent citizen or group of citizens to visit Crailsheim and do on-the-spot guidance to help that far-off German city learn better the methods of democracy, the values of free universal education, and the functions of freedom. I hope you can also finance in time—and the sooner the better—a visit to Worthington on the part of the burgomaster of Crailsheim, or its superintendent of schools, or somebody selected in that city to get the valuable first-hand impressions of our American way of life which could be so simply demonstrated in a month's visit to Worthington, Minn. I hope, too, you can arrange for one of your good school teachers to spend a year in the schools of Crailsheim teaching the school children there to speak the English language and to understand American history and our American economic and political system. Likewise I hope you can arrange to exchange such a Worthington teacher for a year for a German instructor who will teach children in Worthington courses in German or chemistry, or physics, or music, so that through increased mutual understandings the inspiration of freedom as it functions in America can help create a solid beachhead of democracy on the European Continent.

The State Department stands ready now to help facilitate all such exchanges of personnel and products. The American occupation forces in Germany are eager to cooperate fully in developing the Worthington plan to its optimum and maximum possibilities. Whatever more help I can personally provide will be yours for the asking. You are perhaps building better and greater than you realize, but the eyes of the world are upon Worthington and everywhere the wish is that you will not stumble, or falter, or grow weary with your efforts. Your success will light a torch of freedom and set in action a chain of peace-preserving reactions which can help mightily to put an end to future war. In closing I salute you as one who is proud to be a neighbor of the city of Worthington.

United States and Great Britain Plan Military Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is now revealed under a London date line of February 7, that the United States and Great Britain have laid broad plans for linking defenses of the Marshall-plan nations. Only too few people in the United States have understood the implications involved in the Marshall plan, but now they stand revealed to everyone. Is this the first step in imperialism? Time will tell. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article which appeared in the Washington Post as of Sunday, February 8, 1948:

UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN PLAN UNIFORM DEFENSES FOR MARSHALL NATIONS

(By Arthur L. Gavshon)

LONDON, February 7.—Qualified British military informants say broad plans are nearing completion for linking defenses of the Marshall-plan nations.

Anglo-American chiefs of staffs, according to these informants and diplomatic sources, will submit to 15 European countries proposals to standardize a wide range of military equipment and training as the basis for a program of military self-help. Standardization will be on the basis of American and British patterns and methods.

These sources emphasized that the plans are to be regarded neither as part of the Marshall program nor as excluding states outside its focus. They are primarily intended to establish military cooperation among nations which some day may have to fight as allies.

Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin broadly hinted such measures are contemplated in his address to Commons on international policy. Bevin said Britain's military alliances, as well as her political ties, with the countries of western Europe are to be tightened.

The informants expressed confidence that the standardization principle would be accepted readily in western Europe, since most of the countries already depend almost exclusively on the United States and Britain for military requirements.

Asked to confirm these assertions, spokesmen of the British Foreign and War Offices gave cautious "no comments." The War Office spokesman, however, disclosed that Gen. G. M. J. Revers, chief of the French General Staff, has visited British military establishments and has been in consultation on technical and training matters with the Imperial General Staff.

Every care will be taken to avoid the impression that the Anglo-American arms and strategic program involves "ganging up militarily" on Red Europe, diplomatic and military informants insisted.

MERE PROJECTION

Disclosure of the plan came as the United States swung into a detailed study of the report of the Paris Conference which answered Secretary Marshall's call for a European recovery program.

The Paris report specifically stressed the desirability of streamlining continental economic recovery by standardizing basic items of industrial equipment.

The sources—who ranged from British military planners to Ambassadors of western European countries—pointed out that a program of arms standardization is just one stage removed from the principle of industrial standardization.

Most of the 16 states sooner or later must face the question of whether their armies are to be equipped with weapons forged in the west or in the east, they declared.

The standardization program was generally seen to be essentially gradual, to be put into effect over a period of at least 10 years, barring emergencies. Many of the Marshall-aid countries already are in close military liaison, the informants added.

War Office sources said that at least 11 Marshall-aid states have sent officers and men to Britain for training in the last year. The exceptions are Austria, Switzerland, Iceland, and Sweden.

Sweden recently placed the second of two large orders for an unspecified number of Vampire jet fighter planes with the DeHavilland Co., an official statement announced. Technicians of the Swedish air force are expected to come here for jet propulsion training at the DeHavilland factory.

British training missions have gone to most western European states to train and reorganize their war-battered armies on the spot. The Italian Army, said an Italian diplomat, has been reorganized from top to bottom on the British model since 1943, when Mussolini fell. He said Italy had five British equipped and trained divisions in the field when the war ended.

UNITED STATES DIVIDING SURPLUS

Similarly the United States has large missions in Greece and Turkey, training, reorganizing, and equipping their armies. Surplus American military stores and equipment are being disposed of in several other countries, including France, Italy, Austria, and the Low Countries.

Britain has supplied France, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Italy, Greece, Portugal, Turkey, Eire, and Iceland with radar equipment, aircraft—including jet-propelled machines—and armaments since the war ended. Troops of several of those countries wear British uniforms.

Turkish technicians were instructed in jet propulsion at the DeHavilland works. The French and Belgian chiefs of staff have visited British battle schools.

France last year purchased guns, aircraft, transport, and all the other material necessary to equip a full air-borne division 16,000 strong. She has purchased many naval vessels since.

Meanwhile the sources saw significance in Lord McGowan's visit to Portugal and Spain late last year. The chairman of Imperial Chemical Industries—largest industrial concern and arms works in Britain—called on Portuguese and Spanish political and banking chiefs, although he did not see Generalissimo Franco.

British officials stressed that there is no direct intention of strengthening the armies and defensive resources of the countries taking part in the Marshall plan. But one source who is in a position to know how Foreign Secretary Bevin's mind works said Britain "views with understanding" an already expressed American desire to promote military self-help among the 16 states.

He was referring to United States Defense Secretary Forrestal's statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee that he hopes his Department will be given the job of integrating the armed forces of the Marshall-aid countries.

LIKE LATIN PLAN

American peacetime plans for building a unified defense of western European states—common arms, air bases with equipment and techniques known to all the partners, and training which would allow military units of one country to be blended with those of another—were seen to follow a pattern already set for the Western Hemisphere.

That program was laid before Congress in the closing days of the 1947 session, tagged with a "must" label by Marshall, Army Chief of Staff Eisenhower, and ranking War and Navy Department officials.

Under its terms the United States would help other Western Hemisphere countries develop military, naval, and air bases for their common defense if attacked.

High British officials ruled out the possibility of any full-scale merger of Anglo-American armed forces in the foreseeable future. But they said they are aware of—and back—the United States desire to standardize the arms of several foreign countries to prepare herself for any emergency that might emerge from east-west rivalries.

The year-old Anglo-American agreement for the exchange of 100 officers between the RAF and AAF for training is working out "most successfully," an Air Ministry spokesman said. He remained tight-lipped when asked whether RAF officers in the United States are being instructed in the technique of atom-bomb warfare.

Other authoritative sources said, however, that this and several additional aspects of up-to-the-minute scientific developments are included in their training as a matter of course.

British officials said they expect that the United States and British Governments will maintain at least indefinitely, if not permanently the Washington-based, wartime-created Combined Chiefs of Staff Board. Both countries continue to exchange information on military equipment, weapon and munition developments. American observers regularly attend conferences of British Commonwealth army specialists and planners.

It is unlikely that plans to coordinate the forces of the western European countries will be accompanied immediately by a full exchange of top-secret information.

SMALL-ARMS CHANGES

The new standardization plan means that Britain, France, and other Marshall-aid countries will be able to order most of their military requirements from the United States in future emergencies, the officials said. It does not mean that the countries of western Europe will give up arms production themselves.

Precise details of what weapons would come under the standardization program could not be learned at once. However, informants said that the British .303-inch rifle would be redesigned to the United States .30-caliber, that other small arms will be changed to the United States pattern and that cartridges will be grooved instead of rimmed.

Some continental countries already are using the same designs as the Americans in their weapons. The French artillery, for example, uses 75, 105, and 155 mm. rifles (guns). So does the United States Army.

Kirwan Named

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to include an article from the Washington Post of February 8, 1948, written as a part of the column Gallery Glimpses by Robert C. Albright.

The article follows:

Amid all the dark talk of a Dixie rebellion, congressfonal Democrats for the first time in history have chosen a liberal Yankee to lead their fight to recapture the House.

Southern Democrats, who heretofore have always put one of their own in the key campaign spot, surprisingly went along with the choice, Georgia's EUGENE COX even seconded the nomination.

The new chairman of the Congressional Democratic Campaign Committee, whose job it is to put Democrats in Republican seats, is 61year-old MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN.

KIRWAN is a Youngstown, Ohio, Irishman, with a brogue as thick as Washington weather. He has worked at every job from driving mules in a mine to braking on a train. In World War I he was a machine gunner. Before he came to Congress he was a member of the Youngstown City Council.

SUCCEEDS VIRGINIAN

But the most surprising thing about KIRWAN, and his election-year choice by a split party, is this: "He's a 99.4-percent Roosevelt Democrat, of the vanishing New Deal variety. How he gets along with Southern Democrats is his own secret, but it has something to do with that brogue.

KIRWAN succeeds the late Patrick H. Drewry, of Virginia, who knew how to clock elections but frankly had his doubts about the New Deal. Before Drewry there was Tennessee's Joe Byrnes, Arkansas' William Oldfield, and Virginia's Hal Flood. By some sort of unwritten rule, the chairmanship always stayed in the South.

House Democrats went North this time for a very practical reason. Southern seats are sure. Outside the deep South, Democrats must pick up at least 31 Republican seats in order to control the next House.

KIRWAN thinks he knows how to do it. In 12 years he has transformed his own traditional Republican district into undisputed Democratic territory. Two Republican Presidents—Garfield and McKinley—once represented his district in Congress. Until KIRWAN came to Congress, it had never elected a Democrat.

A WALLACE RIVAL

Another explanation: Henry Wallace will enter third-party candidates in many a northern congressional district. KIRWAN can appeal to the liberals, has a Roosevelt record that even Wallace can't challenge.

The Youngstown Democrat plans a few variations on the usual direct-the-fight-from-headquarters congressional campaign.

Accompanied by Victor Hunt Harding, committee secretary, who generally does all of the cruising, KIRWAN will enter each State, from Massachusetts west, as soon as party nominees are chosen.

He's already made up his mind about issues.

Listen:

"They're going to be peace and food—the two biggest things in life."

By peace KIRWAN means the No. 1 Democratic issue is going to be the Marshall plan, its contribution to world peace and what the Republicans do to it and other international measures in Congress.

He also plans to light into the Republican record on national defense—charge the GOP with failure to support a military establishment adequate to preserve peace, from the Guam fortification test down. Only two Ohio Congressmen voted to fortify Guam. KIRWAN was one of them.

POCKET OR PAUNCH

Like peace, KIRWAN'S second issue—food—covers a lot of territory. He uses the word interchangeably with "stomachs," "bankroll," and "savings." And what he means all the time is that inflation is driving prices out of the average man's reach, cutting into his savings and making him take in his belt.

"When you touch a man's bankroll, you've made an enemy," says KIRWAN. "During the war nearly everybody saved money. Now, in peacetime, they've used up their savings and can't make their salaries stretch. Who's to blame?"

For Democrats and Republicans alike, that's the jackpot question. The answer will determine the political complexion not only of the next national administration but probably of the next House and Senate.

KIRWAN insists the country has already made up its mind.

"It's just the reverse of 1946," he says. "They don't blame the President any more. They blame the Republican Congress."

"Wise Subordination of the Military to Civil Power"—Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower stepped out as Chief of Staff, United States Army, to begin a new career, and his successor was sworn in. A few days earlier, January 26, General Eisenhower issued a statement which stirred the Nation. It was a statement in keeping with the finest in American history on the "wise subordination of the military to the civil power." The thought was akin in principle to what I tried to say only the week before on the growing tendency to use military career men in the executive branch of the Government. General Eisenhower's statement should be not only preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but widely disseminated and frequently read. Under permission heretofore given, I place it in the RECORD at this time:

The text of General Eisenhower's letter to Leonard V. Finder, New Hampshire newspaper publisher, regarding the Republican Presidential nomination follows:

DEAR MR. FINDER: Your letter and editorial have been on my desk for more than a week while I pondered the reply merited by your obvious concern for the Nation's welfare, and from a personal standpoint, by the honor you had done me. Months ago I thought that unqualified denial of political ambition would eliminate me from consideration in the coming campaign for the presidency, because that office has, since the days of Washington, historically and properly fallen only to aspirants.

That some few would misinterpret or look for hidden meanings in my past expressions was expected and discounted, but my failure to convince thoughtful and earnest men such as yourself, proves that I must make some amplification. This will necessarily partake of the laborious, due to the complexity of the factors that have influenced me to say no more than I have, but which dictate my decision that I am not available for and could not accept nomination to high political office.

I have heretofore refrained from making the bald statement that I would not accept nomination, although this has been my intention since the subject was first mentioned to me.

This omission seems to have been a mistake, since it has inadvertently misled sincere and disinterested Americans. But my reticence stemmed from cogent reasons. The first was that such an expression would smack of effrontery. I had and I have no desire to appear either as assuming that significant numbers of our peoples would actively interest themselves in me as a possible candidate, or to appear as lacking in respect and regard for the highest honor American citizens can confer upon one of their own body.

A second and even deeper reason was a persistent doubt that I could phrase a flat refusal without appearing to violate that concept of duty to country which calls upon every good citizen to place no limitations upon his readiness to serve in any designated capacity. On this point it is my conviction that, unless an individual feels some inner compulsion and special qualifications to enter the political arena, which I do not, a refusal to do so involves no violation of the highest standards of devotion to duty.

It was only the possible misinterpretation of my attitude that caused me concern and so long as I could believe that mere denial of political ambition would prevent serious misunderstanding and misdirected effort, I was reluctant to say more. It would seem almost superfluous for me to add that as long as I live I shall hold myself in instant readiness to respond to any call by the Government to military duty.

In full awareness, then, and not in violation of my own sense of duty, I have developed the following conclusions which are responsible for my negative decision.

It is my conviction that the necessary and wise subordination of the military to civil power will be best sustained, and our people will have greater confidence that it is so sustained when lifelong professional soldiers in the absence of some obvious and over-riding reasons, abstain from seeking high political office. This truth has a possible inverse application. I would regard it as unalloyed tragedy for our country if ever should come the day when military commanders might be selected with an eye to their future potentialities in the political field rather than exclusively upon judgment as to their military abilities.

Politics is a profession—a serious, complicated, and in its true sense, a noble one.

In the American scene I see no dearth of men fitted by training, talent, and integrity for national leadership. On the other hand, nothing in the international or domestic situation especially qualifies for the most important office in the world a man whose adult years have been spent in the country's military forces. At least this is true in my case.

I am deeply regretful if a too simple faith in the effectiveness of a plain denial has misled any considerable number concerning my intentions and so allowed them to spend time and effort under erroneous impressions. At the risk of appearing pompous, I must say that the honor paid me cannot fail to spur me in future years to work the more diligently for America, her youth, her veterans, and all her citizens, and for the continuance of peace.

I trust that this rather lengthy explanation will convince you that my conclusions are not only sound but have been arrived at objectively and have not been unduly influenced by my own desires and convenience. In any event, my decision to remove myself completely from the political scene is definite and positive. I know you will not object to my making this letter public to inform all interested persons that I could not accept nomination even under the remote circumstances that it were tendered me.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

United States Interests in East Endangered by Conflict in Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am calling attention to two important articles dealing with the present situation in Palestine which appeared in the Washington Star on Sunday, February 8, 1948. One article is by Mr. Leigh White from Tel-Aviv, Palestine, and the other is by Phillips Talbot, both writers for the Chicago Daily News. These men have been in Palestine and frankly set forth herein their observations and views.

Mr. Speaker, no situation is quite so acute as this one. Immediate steps should be taken by President Truman to compromise the difficulties between the Arabs and the Jews. If he fails in this respect, war is bound to result.

UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN EAST ENDANGERED BY POLICIES—RUSSIA ALONE STANDS TO GAIN AS ARAB NATIONS FEEL BETRAYED; ASIATIC PEOPLES LIKEWISE LOSING FAITH

(By Leigh White)

TEL AVIV, PALESTINE.—Much to the delight of Russia, the whole structure of American foreign policy is beginning to crumble in the Middle East.

By taking a leading part, against the wishes of the Arab League, in pushing the partition of Palestine through the United Nations, the United States has aroused the suspicion—and thereby the potential enmity—of every Arab leader of whatever political complexion.

The United Nations' action, in which Russia sided with the United States, sets up a Jewish state in the Holy Land.

Every educated Arab with whom I have spoken in Iraq, Palestine, and Egypt feels that his people have been betrayed in the interests of a Jewish minority in the United States.

Arab spokesmen maintain that the persecution of the Jews is a purely western problem that has nothing to do with the Middle East. Westerners have no right, they say, to force easterners to suffer the consequences of the westerner's refusal to make room for Jewish refugees.

ONLY MILLION NATIVES

They insist that only native Jews have a right to concentrate in Palestine and that foreign Jews have no more right to do so than Italians had a right to occupy Albania or Ethiopia.

Even if all of the world's 10,000,000 surviving Jews were supporters of Zionism—which is not the case—not more than 1,000,000 Jews are natives of the Middle East.

No Arab ever will be convinced that a decision in favor of 1,000,000, or even 10,000,000, Jews against the wishes of 70,000,000 Arabs has anything to do with the principles of justice which the United States says it is defending.

And it is important for Americans to remember that Palestine, to the Arabs, is an integral part of the Arab nations. It is to the Arab world roughly what Delaware is to the United States.

To the Arabs, the forcible establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine is equivalent to an armed invasion of the Arab world. Anyone supporting such an armed invasion will sooner or later be treated as an enemy.

MILITARY AID SOUGHT

Americans may not know it, but officials of the Jewish agency are counting on the United States to provide them with the weapons needed to enforce the Palestine decision. In other words, the United States now is involved in a military adventure.

The Arabs in turn, by resorting to force, have made impossible the peaceful achievement of the Jewish agency's maximum aims. If those aims ever are to be achieved, they now will only be achieved by force.

The only hope of a peaceful settlement—and it is waning as the violence in Palestine increases—is a compromise based on minimum rather than maximum Jewish aims.

Arab leaders with whom I have spoken hint that an autonomous Jewish republic inside a greater Palestine will be acceptable, even with increased immigration, provided a quota is imposed to insure that the proportion of Jews to Arabs is not increased beyond 30 or 35 percent.

Unless there is a compromise, American observers feel, there will almost certainly be a holy war, against Americans as well as Jews—a holy war that only the Soviet Union can win.

WE LOSE GOOD WILL

American policy in the Middle East has long been based on the assumption that we could win, and hold, the respect of the Arab world.

We are losing that respect and friendship today because of our stand on Palestine in the United Nations.

The forcible creation of a new Judea, in the opinion of our best-informed observers, probably will make it necessary for the United States to send troops to many Arab countries in order to protect our stake in the oil production of the Middle East.

Our position would then be that of an invading power, and the Arabs would become more and more susceptible to the offers of Soviet assistance that would promptly be forthcoming. The holy war against Zionism would gradually be converted into a holy war against Anglo-American imperialism.

Any benefits accruing from the Marshall plan in Europe would thus be more than offset by the resulting turbulence throughout the Middle East. Greek, Turkish, and Iranian resistance to the Soviet war of nerves would be gravely weakened in consequence, and the Moslem leaders of Pakistan, already tempted, would be more than ever likely to make common cause against us with the Moslem republics of the U. S. S. R.

These are the reasons why American representatives throughout the Middle East are almost unanimous in regarding our Government's action in Palestine as folly. They are hoping against hope that it will be corrected before it is too late.

(By Phillips Talbot)

While the United States concentrates on saving Europe, its prestige in Asia is skidding dangerously.

Asians think Americans do not realize that the big eastern continent is growing up fast. They resent appearances that United States policy in southern colonial Asia is dictated by our interests in the European mother countries.

Yet take a look at the record, they argue:

1. The Arab countries were released from Ottoman rule in the First World War, then fell mostly under British and French influence. Now all are independent except Palestine, whose case is on the anvil.

2. India (with Pakistan) finally gained freedom after generation-long campaign sparked by Mohandas K. Gandhi and, among the Moslems, by M. A. Jinnah.

COLONIALISM COLLAPSING

3. Southeast Asia was politically asleep a generation ago. Now Siam, the Philippines, and Burma have become independent, while Ceylon is almost self-governing, Malaya and Singapore have new constitutions in sight, and struggles for self-rule are going on in Indonesia and Viet Nam.

Asiatic colonialism, in short, is collapsing far faster than feudalism broke up in western Europe earlier.

New states, new forces, new ambitions are appearing from the Mediterranean to the Pacific.

This eruption has not been peaceful. But these disturbances also underline the necessity of a realistic United States policy in southern Asia—one that counts the new forces and thinks in terms of the millions of humans who live in that zone.

Recently an American consul general was stationed in Java. One of his main tasks was to report on relations between the Dutch and the Indonesians.

He was extremely popular with the Dutch. He even contributed a foreword to a Dutch propaganda pamphlet published last July.

But the Indonesians interpreted that officer's presence in Java as evidence that the United States was interested in Holland but not in the Far East.

The Indochina American foreign service officers were reluctant to associate with Viet Nam nationalists.

By indirect evidence, also the newly emerging forces in Asia think that the United States is against them. Dutch troops in Java and Sumatra and French troops in Indochina both sport American military equipment in their campaigns against nationalists.

UNITED STATES POLICY CONFUSING

"It is difficult for us to understand America," a Southeast Asian nationalist said to me last fall. "We want her friendship and need her help as much as the European countries do.

"But we believe that her interests as well as ours make it important that the United States should no longer consider us just as possessions of European countries.

"Political peace in Southeast Asia means more rubber and other tropical products available quickly for the world, and the United States is one of the biggest buyers."

This country must be ever vigilant to balance the new forces with the old ones in making foreign policy.

Cashing In on Foreign Trade Zones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following article which appeared in the December 30, 1947, issue of the bulletin of the Research Institute of America:

CASHING IN ON FOREIGN TRADE ZONES

Foreign trade zones—those United States port areas where goods can be stored and processed completely free of customs regulations—will offer new opportunities for profits and savings in 1948.

New zones on the west coast are likely to be added to the two areas already established in the East and South. Recent policy changes will expand the zones' general use. As a result, it's more important than ever for foreign traders to look into the possible advantages.

HOW THE ZONES WORK

Congress authorized foreign trade zones in 1934. Rules and policies governing their operation are set by a Foreign Trade Zones Board, composed of the Secretaries of the Treasury, War, and Commerce. The zones are administered by corporations authorized by the Board.

The zones are run on a straight profit-and-loss basis; the managing corporations' income is based on dockage, storage, and service charges paid by companies using the facilities.

There is no limit to the number of zones which may be established, but the Board has so far been leery of handing out authorizations except where there seemed a real economic need. Using this yardstick, zones have been set up successfully in New York and New Orleans; one failed to work out in Mobile, and one in San Francisco is now awaiting final approval.

Four key rules govern use of the zones:

Any goods may be stored in the zones indefinitely, without bond and free from payment of all customs duties.

While stored in the zones, goods may be cleaned, graded, repacked, reconditioned, and otherwise manipulated, without Government intervention or control.

Goods may not be exhibited for sale, but bona fide buyers are allowed to examine the merchandise under customary trade conditions normally employed for showing the specific commodity.

No goods may be manufactured within the zones.

Recent rulings by the Foreign Trade Zones Board have greatly increased the trade possibilities of the zones. The phrase "manipulate" has been broadened to include many activities formerly banned as "manufacturing."

Illustration: Contrary to previous interpretations, it is now held that the assembling of watch movements into cases and the attaching of wrist bands to watches do not constitute manufacturing. Similarly, the screwing of bulbs into flashlights, the blending of olive with vegetable oils, and the mixing of sugar and flour to make a prepared baking mix no longer fall under manufacturing.

More such rulings are expected. For instance, the dyeing of piece goods will probably be made permissible.

SEVEN WAYS TO BENEFIT

Check on whether the zone set-up can help you hold down operating costs when importing goods:

1. You can avoid paying duty on shrinkage by storing merchandise subject to evaporation or seepage in foreign trade zones until ready for marketing. This can mean big savings to importers of tobacco, liquor, nuts and other commodities subject to weight loss in inventory.

2. It is often possible to process goods into a class subject to a lower rate of duty. For example, certain fruit juices may be combined with domestic flavoring while in the zone, and then brought into the country at a lower duty than if imported in the original form. Similarly, foreign rugs can be imported at lower duty rates by removing excess fringe while in the zone.

3. You can also avoid duty losses by using the zones to sort out materials which fail to meet United States market standards. Often such substandard material can be reexported to countries where market requirements are lower. Use of the zone for this purpose means minimum United States customs expense and red tape.

4. Operating expenses, and particularly the cost of maintaining inventories, can be whittled down by storing goods in foreign trade zones. No duties or excise taxes need be paid as long as the goods are held there.

Moreover, the importer can borrow against warehouse receipts issued for goods stored in the zones, without posting any bond. (Where receipts are issued for goods stored in a bonded warehouse, there is the extra expense of arranging for a bond equal to twice the amount of duty.)

5. Insurance costs are lower. Where goods are entered through customs and then stored, insurance must be carried on their duty-paid value, plus any other taxes that may have been applied. Where goods are stored in a foreign trade zone, the charge will only be on the value of the goods.

6. You can save handling and office expenses. There's a minimum of customs red tape, and goods are always under the owner's control. (In a bonded warehouse, of course, you may be hamstrung by the requirement of customs supervision over any handling—at your expense.)

7. The zones are usually more convenient for storage purposes. You can keep goods there indefinitely, and in any sized package, while goods may be withdrawn from a bonded warehouse only in an entire bale, cask, or box, and only in the original package unless repacking is necessary for the goods' protection.

EXPORTERS GAIN, TOO

Foreign trade zones offer important advantages to exporters—especially in the case of reexporting. Customs formalities are held to a minimum. Since no duty is paid as long as the goods are in the free zone, you have no problem of draw-backs. Also, like the importer, the exporter may clean, recondition, repackage (with his own brand name), assemble, mix with domestic goods and ship—all with a minimum of paper work.

In some cases savings are even possible on straight exports. For instance, where domestic flour is packed in imported bags and exported, you get a draw-back on duty paid if the packing is done within a foreign trade zone.

Recommendation: Think about cashing in on a foreign trade zone now. Few businesses are sufficiently aware of the potentialities. If you believe your line is one where use of a zone might mean greater savings, you should contact the New York zone by addressing inquiries as follows: New York Foreign Trade Zone Operators, Inc., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y. For the New Orleans zone, address queries to Foreign Trade Zone No. 2, New Orleans 15, La.

Increased Subsistence Allowance for Veterans Pursuing Educational Work Under Servicemen's Readjustment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN C. SNYDER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I favor the passage of H. R. 4212, providing for increased subsistence allowance for veterans pursuing educational work under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

During the past summer, I availed myself of the opportunity of visiting some of the colleges in West Virginia and made particular inquiry about the GI students, how they were getting along from an academic standpoint and whether or not their subsistence allowance was sufficient to meet current necessary living expenses. I know you will receive satisfaction in learning that the report on the GI's academic work was very favorable. This seems to be true not only in West Virginia, but from all information it is universally true throughout the United States.

On inquiring as to whether or not the subsistence allowance was sufficient, the replies were unanimous by all school officials that they were not, in view of the high cost of living.

Recently I noted where a survey had been made by a committee of the American Council on Education, financed by the Disabled American Veterans, on the sufficiency of subsistence payments. The committee found that the average total monthly expense of single veterans in college is $106.13, or $43.13 more than the $65 allotment. Married students spent $175.38, but received only $90, making a difference of $85.38.

To make ends meet, the committee reported that many veterans worked during school terms or summer vacation. Of the more than one-third employed, 92 percent earned from $10 or less to $30 in a term. Earnings of the remaining 8 percent range from $31 to $105. Wives of 56 percent of the married students worked to supplement their husband's incomes.

Many of the schools in which the 1,250,000 veterans are enrolled are located in small towns where it is impossible for the veteran to get employment to supplement his Government allowance. Consequently, the veteran is in a position of either living on his allowance or withdrawing from school. Unfortunately, in many instances, the veteran has had to give up his school work.

The provisions of this bill, while inadequate to take care of the entire expense, in many instances, will give substantial relief.

The Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of interest has been manifested in the Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act, which is being sponsored in the Senate and House by a bipartisan group including such distinguished Senators and Members of Congress as Senators BRIDGES, BARKLEY, FERGUSON, FULBRIGHT, HAWKES, and HILL; and in the House by Representatives WOLCOTT, SPENCE, ROGERS of Massachusetts, and KEARNEY. The bill which I have filed in the House is H. R. 521.

One of the real concerns of the Nation today is giving veterans and small businessmen a better economic opportunity. That is the purpose of this bill. It establishes a corporation similar to the RFC to furnish technological assistance and funds where they are not available from private sources to veterans and

small businessmen who wish to establish sound and profitable businesses of their own.

Recent reports indicate that $3,000,000,000 has already been paid out in readjustment allowances to veterans. About 500,000 veterans have already exhausted their allowances, and about 700,000 are drawing their readjustment allowances at this time. It is in the interest of economy, as well as to the benefit of veterans and small businessmen to assist them in getting started in their own businesses, where they have a sound proposal that would succeed.

Many veterans groups are supporting this legislation on the basis that a chance to have their own business is the great desire of members of their organizations.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter to me from Ray H. Brannaman, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1948

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEFAUVER: It was a particular honor to have you attend our luncheon Saturday in Washington given for distinguished Members of Congress, for ambassadors and for representatives of nations under the Marshall plan, of China, of the Philippines and representatives of the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans and the American Veterans of World War II.

In The Veterans Plan To Win the Peace, that I announced over the NBC national network and at the luncheon, your "Tennessee plan" can serve to implement plans in the other 47 States. We wish to compliment you on your plan as it will help the people of the communities, including veterans, by bringing new industries to the communities, expanding present businesses, modernizing agriculture and by creating new industrial uses for agricultural products.

We find that experts from other nations are interested in developing programs similar to the "Tennessee plan" to enable their people to prosper and to hold the line against communism and war. It is not an overstatement to say that if applied here at home and abroad, such a plan would help win a bloodless World War III before the shooting starts.

Your championship in Congress of small business in the United States and the establishment of veterans in businesses and profitable careers has our support. The bill that you introduced in Congress, on January 6, 1947, H. R. 521, entitled "The Veterans Economic Development Corporation Act," will enable millions of veterans to catch up with the economic parade at home and abroad. Your bill will interest the taxpayers particularly as no appropriation of taxpayers' money is contemplated. In addition, it is estimated that it will reduce taxes as it will save a billion dollars a year of the present cost of government.

The bipartisan support of your bill and its early passage is indicated by the companion bills introduced in the House by EDITH ROGERS, of Massachusetts, chairman of the important Veterans' Committee, WOLCOTT, of Michigan, an authority on finance and chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and past Chairman SPENCE, of Kentucky, by Congressmen KEARNEY, of New York, and VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, both former commanders in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and members of the American Legion. The unusual support of your bill in the Senate is shown by the introduction on July 17 of companion bill, S. 1652, by Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman of the important Appropriations Committee on his behalf and on behalf of Senators BARKLEY, of Kentucky, BUTLER, of Nebraska, chairman of the Public Lands Committee, REVERCOMB, of West Virginia, chairman of the Public Works Committee, FLANDERS, of Vermont, of the Committee for Economic Development, MORSE, of Oregon, chairman of the Veterans' Committee of the Committee on Labor and Welfare, and Senators CAIN, of Washington, CAPEHART, of Indiana, DWORSHAK, of Idaho, FERGUSON, of Michigan, HAWKES of New Jersey, KNOWLAND of California, JENNER of Indiana, MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, JOHNSON of Colorado, FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, EASTLAND, of Mississippi, MAYBANK, of South Carolina, and HILL, of Alabama. In addition to the approval of your bill given by President Truman, it is significant also that small business associations and others are enthusiastic about the prospects of your bill's helping to enrich the people in the communities.

As our veterans economic development corporation bill helps others as well as veterans, it should implement your Tennessee plan as a new milestone in the illustrious history of Tennessee and of the Nation. More power to you and we veterans are behind you.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

RAY H. BRANNAMAN,
Commander in Chief.

In his letter, Commander in Chief Brannaman refers to the Tennessee plan. It is the desire of the sponsors of the legislation to utilize the information and assistance of local groups in every possible way. State and local planning commissions would be called upon to render assistance in resource uses and in giving counsel as to the types of enterprises in the various communities which would succeed. In areas where the Tennessee Valley Authority operates the information secured by the TVA as to the economic opportunities would be of benefit.

Col. Richmond Harris, a native Tennessean, who is serving as technical consultant in connection with this legislation, together with other experts, has prepared tentative State plans for a number of States, including New Hampshire, Delaware, Maryland, Idaho, and Tennessee. The tentative proposal for Tennessee as prepared by him is as follows:

TENNESSEE PLAN

The Tennessee plan is designed to develop the resources of the State to promote the prosperity, welfare, and health of all its people. Career opportunities for veterans as well as continued full employment for others would be fostered through the development of needed new businesses, the modernized productivity of agriculture, the utilization of unused natural resources and the implementation of needed self-liquidating public projects.

Planning activities would be on a State, county, regional, or community level. The State planning board, with the assistance of a know-how committee composed of technical experts, would plan for the physical development of the State, cooperating with other State agencies in the preparation of programs. It would also assist regional and county committees (which would plan for county and regional projects) and community planning boards, giving technical advice and assisting in the coordination of State, county, and community plans. It would further extend technical assistance to individuals, new businesses, and projects.

Since the Tennessee plan is essentially a grass-roots plan—designed to serve small business and industry and agriculture in the community—emphasis on planning would be on a community level. Thus, while the State planning board and know-how committee would engage in planning on a State-wide basis, their primary function would be to serve the interests of the communities and to bring to bear the cooperation of the Federal Government on local projects whenever advisable and necessary.

Because of this emphasis on local planning, the following outline on State and community planning will list specific opportunities for development and expansion under the section on community planning.

COMMUNITY PLANNING

1. Local planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups.

2. Planning board sets up a know-how committee.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State planning commission or State know-how committee:

a. Inventory to determine present and future economic needs, including preparation of town and agricultural maps on the following:

(1) Population distribution and trends
(2) Property tax surveys.
(3) Land use.
(4) Zoning ordinances.
(5) Traffic studies.
(6) Recreational facility requirements.
(7) Health and welfare survey.
(8) Community center redevelopments.
(9) Highway maintenance.
(10) Fire protection.
(11) Water supply.
(12) Housing.
(13) School system.
(14) Farming.
(15) Utility services.
(16) Transportation service—airport, etc.

(a) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and regional agencies for fact finding and making projective studies.

4. Opportunities for development and expansion:

a. Local industries:
(1) Needed expansion of existing industries.
(2) Needed new industries:
(a) Research for new products.
(b) Use of captured enemy patents and new processes.
(c) Use of natural resources.
(d) New industrial uses for agricultural products.
(3) Processing plants for local products.
(4) Assembling plants for local markets.
(5) Service industries.
(6) Retail trade.

b. Land use:
(1) Land conservation:
(a) Irrigation—surface and underground water resources.
(b) Reforestation.
(c) Erosion control.
(d) Soil treatment.
(e) Fertilizers.
(2) Water-power development:
(a) Utilities.
(b) Industrial uses.
(c) Agricultural purposes.
(d) Home.
(3) Agricultural practices:
(a) New methods of farming and livestock improvement.
(b) New crops and expansion of present acreage.

c. Commerce:
(1) Sales development—new market centers in growing communities.
(2) Farm cooperatives.
(3) Export development opportunities.
(4) Shipping:
(a) Assembly, processing, and warehousing facilities.
(b) Harbor improvements; feeder lines.
(c) Inland and ocean-going ports.
(5) Air transport.
(6) Trucking.
(7) Freight.

d. Mining:
(1) Geological surveys.
(2) Development of mineral products.

e. Tourist and recreational areas:
(1) Beaches and artificial ponds and lakes.
(2) Wood trails and roads, camping areas.
(3) Sports, fish and game stocking.
(4) Restoration of historical areas, scenic improvement.
(5) Hotels, cabins, and restaurants.
(6) Stream and pond pollution control.
(7) Handicrafts.

f. Public service (self-liquidating):
(1) Utilities and power development.
(2) Transportation of passengers:
(a) Bus.
(b) Streetcar.
(c) Train.
(d) Air travel.
(e) Boat.

g. Public health and welfare (self-liquidating):
(1) Medical clinics.
(2) Fire prevention.
(3) Sanitation.
(a) Stream pollution abatement.
(b) Sewage disposal.
(c) Garbage disposal.
(4) Hospital (improvement and/or expansion).

h. Public works and public improvements (self-liquidating):
(1) Housing:
(a) Multiple low rental units.
(b) Prefabricated and industrial housing.
(2) Toll roads and toll bridges.
(3) Parking areas and buildings.
(4) Municipal projects.

i. Education (self-liquidating):
(1) Colleges, professional and trade schools (improvement and/or expansion).
(2) Housing to accommodate veteran students.
(3) Community recreation centers.
(4) Vocational and social guidance.
(5) Rural school program, consolidation, and transportation.

STATE AND REGIONAL PLANNING

1. State planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups:

a. Supplements and implements work of existing State planning agencies.

b. Cooperates with and serves community planning boards.

2. Planning board sets up a State know-how committee composed of technical experts in various fields:

a. Know-how committee gives technical advice to planning board, to community know-how committees, to county or regional committees, to individuals, to new businesses and projects.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State know-how committee or State planning commission:

a. Takes inventory to determine present and future economic needs of State and geographical area, preparing State, regional and county maps and statistical studies:

(1) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and regional departments and agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.

4. Planning board relates county, community and intrastate regional plans to one another, thereby eliminating overlapping, confusion, and unprofitable enterprises and projects.

5. Planning board cooperates with other States on regional projects in same geographic area, such as power developments, land conservation, etc.

(Specific opportunities for development and expansion outlined in detail in section on community planning.)

With our diversity of industry and agriculture in Tennessee, plus the benefits and information already available through the TVA and the State planning commission, ours is a strategic State to show how this act can be made to operate for the benefit of every business and agricultural community in the State.

For example, there are the new scientific processes, trade secrets, and patents that our veterans have captured from enemy countries, which can be of commercial profit to small new industries in our communities. John Webster, of the Department of Commerce, who was sent to Germany to evaluate and codify this material, informs me that its value to American businessmen is estimated to be as high as $20,000,000,000. Much of the goods that people of our communities buy from other States and other countries can be produced by themselves to bring and keep more wealth in the communities of Tennessee.

In an area of such potential wealth, there are many factories still to be built, many new jobs to be had from developing Tennessee's dormant resources. There are great areas of land to be restored to full productivity through soil treatment and modernized agricultural methods. There are houses, roads, schools, hospitals, and parks to build, utilities to install, oil and gas exploration and developments to be made, mineral resources such as limestone and phosphate and coal to be developed, our output of lumber to increase.

This program is designed to enable our veterans and other people to participate in the tremendous economic possibilities which lie in the field of peacetime uses of atomic energy. These will include the design, development, and manufacture of many special types of equipment, structural materials, and instruments. The expansion of uses of radio isotopes in medicine, agriculture, and in industry will also bring demands for special types of equipment and instruments and will itself be an important field of technical activity. The future development of useful power from nuclear fuels will create a demand for entirely new types of equipment and will open a new field of engineering.

Much of the work can be immediately accomplished under the executive order by the President or by amendment of existing legislation. In teamwork with technical experts and community leaders, veterans, and others can benefit from this plan, which will be implemented also under the provisions of the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act, which we have introduced in the Eightieth Congress.

Our Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial which appeared in the Daily Mirror, New York City on Monday, January 12, 1948, entitled "Our Congress":

OUR CONGRESS

O for the good old days when Congress delivered grandiloquent addresses on the tariff and similar simple matters!

Nowadays each Senator and Congressman must be an expert on the state of some 30 countries.

He must know the policies and purposes of Ibn Saud and Tito, of Pauker and Hoxha, of Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Tse-tung. He must know the geography of Pakistan and Turkestan, of Iran and Iraq, of France and Greece.

He must be a walking State Department and he needs to be able to discover when an employee of the Government of the United States is practicing diplomacy on him—diplomacy being the gentle art of lying about trivialities and fabricating about major issues.

He must be a super FBI to discover the wiles of the hired hands who pad the payrolls and other Government expenses.

He must know that the teeth of the children of Georgia require dentistry and that hoof-and-mouth disease threatens our food supply. He must know the value of a super air fortress over a submarine.

And so the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives no longer come to Washington for a few weeks each year. They have an all-year-round job.

Those who take their committee appointments seriously never finish their work. It goes on and on.

And when smart alecks talk about congressional junkets to Europe or Asia or South America, they give the impression that these representatives of the American people vote themselves fancy vacations.

It is precisely the opposite.

This year more than 100 Members of Congress traveled in Europe and out of it came, for one thing, the work of the Herter committee—the most solid study of the so-called Marshall plan.

It is no longer possible for the little fellows in the State Department to bluff the Congress by hiding reports and not knowing how to answer questions. Plenty of Members of Congress are better informed than plenty of so-called experts.

An excellent example of that was on the Town Meeting of the Air a few days ago. William C. Bullitt and Congressman WALTER H. JUDD were debating Owen Lattimore and Richard Lauterbach on the subject of China.

Lattimore is one of the smart experts close to the White House in Roosevelt's day; now director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University.

What Congressman Judd did to Lattimore in this debate should not happen even to one who is not an expert.

Judd knew. Lattimer opinionated.

Judd hurled facts at Lattimore which he and Lauterbach dodged. And when Bullitt hit an intellectual solar plexus, you could hear it all the way between New York and Nanking.

The American people are to be congratulated on their Congress. No harder working men exist anywhere. And they are truly representative of the varieties of Americans.

Maybe, some New Yorkers do not like some Congressmen who come from the South and West—and it is certain that lots of folks in the South and West dislike some New York Congressmen. But that is the kind of people we are and the Congress mirrors the nature and character of our people.

Maybe, the good old times were easier or even better—but for what we face today, it is sound to put your trust in Congress.

Decentralize for Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a recent important book which, in my opinion, should be studied by every Member of Congress, and, indeed, by every thinking person in the country. Decentralize for Liberty, by Thomas Hewes. Everywhere throughout the country business leaders themselves are growing more and more concerned over the great concentrations of power which have come to dominate our economic world. For many years it was only the college professors, commonly called crackpots, who constantly warned us of the dangerous growth of monopoly. But now we find that business leaders are seeing the handwriting on the wall. Within the past few years a number of books have appeared, written by businessmen or lawyers for prominent business firms, in which drastic and immediate action is urged to reverse the trend toward monopoly. The book by Mr. Hewes, senior partner of the well-known law firm of Hewes & Awalt, belongs in this group and is, to my way of thinking, one of the best works ever to appear on this whole subject.

Backed by 35 years of active experience in practicing law, Mr. Hewes has arrived at his conclusions, not from the books of abstract theoreticians, but from actual first-hand experience. Although one may have some reservations concerning some of the details of his program, his description of the broad outlines of the problem and his recommendations as to the general direction in which public policy must move are, to my way of thinking, beyond criticism.

Mr. Hewes' work forcibly points to the moral, which has constantly been urged on its business readers by no less an authority than Fortune magazine, that every true conservative should be a zealous supporter of the antitrust laws and a stanch opponent of monopoly and centralism. That they are not so, may probably, more than anything else, be the cause of their own undoing.

Because of the timeliness and the importance of Mr. Hewes' work, particularly in regard to many of the legislative proposals facing the Congress today, I would like to add part of a review of the book written by Mr. Joseph Lalley, the distinguished critic of the Washington Post, which appeared in Human Events in October 1947:

DECENTRALIZE FOR LIBERTY, BY THOMAS HEWES

The great social dilemma of our time might, I believe, be logically stated thus: (a) In an industrial society the mass of mankind cannot have both economic security and liberty; therefore (b) if we choose security, we must sacrifice liberty; or (c) if we choose liberty, we must accept insecurity. Is it possible to escape this dilemma? I think it is a rule of logic that dilemmas cannot be evaded, that the only hope of the disputant who finds himself trapped in one is to demolish the major premise from which the horns, or unhappy alternatives, have been projected; in other words by proving that it is not a real or valid dilemma. This in effect is what Mr. Hewes has attempted; he wishes to show that liberty and security (as we use the term today) are not necessarily irreconcilable and that we are not obliged to choose between democracy and wage-slavery on the one side and socialism and State slavery on the other. He offers a third choice the nature of which is sufficiently indicated by the title of his book.

Still, it might be well to rehearse the argument whereby the major premise of our dilemma has been established. Under the conditions created by the industrial revolution and by the mechanisms of finance capitalism the inevitable tendency of unregulated competition is toward monopolies which are themselves destructible of free industry and free competition. That is to say power machinery and the new division of labor enabled the factory owner to eliminate the individual producer, the large industry to absorb the small one, the powerful industry to extend its operations into other fields. As the scale of these operations enlarges the domination of industry passes to a few bankers and financiers. This process whereby ownership and economic power are concentrated into progressively fewer hands is necessarily accompanied by the multiplication of a class which, possessing no capital, has nothing to sell but its labor, in short a proletariat.

The cumulative psychological and moral wreckage of this process, which is destructive of all tradition, engenders a revolutionary spirit. The workers, aware of their individual impotence against the monopolists, seek power in collective action. But here again the monopolistic tendency asserts itself. The trade unions follow the same pattern of expansion and unification, and presently the control of striking and bargaining power passes to a handful of individuals. The control of a vast and powerful union may even lead in the end to the virtual control of a basic industry by a single individual. Meanwhile, the increasing insecurity of existence for an increasing proportion of the population gives rise to a demand for Government intervention and for amelioration in such forms as social insurance and guaranteed employment; but it is soon evident that these require a planned economy and that a planned economy means rigidly controlled economy.

Such is the dilemma Mr. Hewes has here undertaken to demolish. He presents a plan of action, applicable under American conditions, which will preserve capitalism while eliminating the social maladies to which it has given rise.

Veterans Speak Up on Army Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1948, I spoke on the floor of the House on Army waste.

I am including in these remarks excerpts from a few of the many letters I received since then. I presume that the Army will as usual investigate itself and find itself not guilty by applying as usual a liberal supply of whitewash.

By coincidence the first letter I quote is from the same captain who conferred with me at Karachi, India, during the inspection trip of my committee. He was the one who stated, as I explained in my recent speech, that the Army had promised the men at Karachi that they would have opportunity to talk with my committee, that the officers and enlisted men would each be allotted an hour with my committee. He got me aside complaining we were being rushed along so the interview could not take place. Thanks to this captain I insisted the men be heard. After reading an account in a newspaper of my recent speech, this man, Morris H. Dresner, 19367 Cherrylawn, Detroit, now enjoying the freedom of the American civilian, writes me as follows:

I was the captain in Karachi, India, who induced you to stay over and listen to first the officers' complaints and then the enlisted men's complaints.

I read your charges and I am happy to say that I hope you stick with it until you make them crawl for cover. After you left Karachi I had inspectors general from Washington, New Delhi, and Calcutta in to take my testimony. I was definitely persona non grata after that, but I didn't care. Make your charges stick.

Here are excerpts from a handful of the hundreds of other letters I received, mostly from ex-service people, in response to my speech, all telling the same story:

From Brooklyn, N. Y.:

On Guam, which is in the Tropics, came loads of winter underwear. Was it returned as a mistake or sent to needy people? No; it was put in the dumps—a most useful place for everyone to look for what they needed. The underwear was used for greasing and cleaning planes and machinery. Also when someone wanted a refrigerator, one could be found at the dump. Many cans of food were dropped by the wayside over the rough roads, never to be retrieved. But the natives knew where to look and sort out these cans, always near a rough spot in the road. Persons who worked there on the clerical staff were shocked at American waste (being from Australia and New Zealand, where there was such a lack of things that "went over the cliff").

From a former pilot in the China-Burma-India area:

As a hump pilot who was stationed in Assam for a year and flew a full share of unnecessary trips to China, I was glad to see some of this information made a public record. Flying Louisiana rice to China seemed a little like carrying coal to Newcastle at the time. However, we're taking coal to Newcastle now and it may be that those hump boys were just a little ahead of time. I could talk for hours about flying useless cargo to China, but I think you have a good start. I hope that some of the news services picked it up so that some of the other hump boys can have the same satisfaction I enjoyed.

From San Francisco, Calif.:

Some billions of dollars worth of guns, vehicles, machinery and utensils of all kinds were shipped into this area, San Francisco, from eastern points for reshipment to the armed forces in the Pacific theater of war. This material was incased or crated with high-class lumber and came into depots for transshipment, by ocean carrier, to destined points. When it arrived at the depot it was uncased and uncrated "for inspection" and then recrated and reincased for the ocean transports. All well and proper. The lumber from these crates and cases could have been sold for some millions of dollars. Lumber was scarce. It was rationed and almost impossible to get. It was burned on the shore of the bay, in a perpetual fire, always under a military armed guard. No sale was ever permitted and none of the lumber was used for recrating of the war implements. There might have been a reason for this waste but the military guard could offer no explanation, it was just "orders."

From San Carlos, Calif.:

Andrew J. Rogers of Grass Valley called on me one evening and showed me data he had gathered. He is a carpenter and worked in army camps here in California. He told me about lumber that would be hauled in and crews would work, pulling out the nails, then the lumber would be hauled to piles and burned.

From Jackson, Mich.:

My nephew, who served in the armed services and lived near here, reports that in a southern camp large numbers of brand new radios were smashed and covered over by tractors. On his way home by ship, he and a number of others were ordered to throw overboard many barrels of best-grade machine oil as well as a large consignment of new radios. All this went overboard before the ship reached the New York harbor. Names, dates, and places can be furnished you if desired.

From Allred, Tex.:

One man who was stationed at Dutch Harbor, Alaska, came home on furlough during the time tires were the scarcest for civilians and stated that one could walk for 25 miles on new tires that had never been unwrapped but that were floating along the shore.

From Port Orchard, Wash.:

I was employed by the Army in Alaska on a tug boat. It's just one big holiday to be a member of these crews. While Army parkas and clothing, as well as machine guns and equipment were being destroyed, coke bottles were being transported back to the mainland.

From a former ATC pilot now residing at San Mateo, Calif.:

I have some 20 to 30 very clear pictures of both Army and Navy dumps in Guam which include close-ups of material which, after it had been allowed to deteriorate in the weather, was burned or hauled out to sea and dumped. Much material was readily convertible to civilian use as, for example, Prestone, which is still hard to obtain, wool-lined leather flying jackets, boots, trousers and gloves. Also boxes upon boxes of hardware such as bench vices, drills, etc. There were uncountable tons of new aircraft parts and equipment of every description, including new Pratt & Whitney motors whose protective plastic bags had been cut open, the dehydrating plugs unscrewed from the cylinder heads and dropped in the mud and the motors allowed to ruin in the weather.

Much of this was, of course, unavoidable due to the stress of war but after the war was over I was horrified to see material, literally by the acre, hauled out of the warehouses and dumped in the open. And this at the very time that the United States taxpayers were sending millions in relief to China, the ships passing almost within hailing distance of Guam where perfectly good, warm clothing, sleeping bags, etc., were being dumped and burned. Obviously something is wrong with the Army system of handling a surplus. And the Navy is just as bad.

B'nai B'rith Commemoration of the One Hundred and Sixtieth Anniversary of the Formation of the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the portion of a program held under the auspices of the B'nai B'rith Lodges of Berkeley, Eden, and Oakland, Alameda County, Calif., commemorating the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States.

At this dinner Gen. Mark Wayne Clark, United States Army; Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California; and Chief Justice Phil Sheridan Gibson, of the Supreme Court of the State of California, were given citations in recognition of their work in the field of group cooperation.

Mr. Monroe Friedman, past grand president of B'nai B'rith and distinguished member of the bar, Oakland, Calif., acted as master of ceremonies.

A part of the program follows:

Mr. FRIEDMAN. General Clark, Dr. Sproul, Mr. Chief Justice Gibson, Dr. Deutsch, distinguished guests, members of B'nai B'rith, and friends: In May of this year, in Washington, D. C., were given awards by B'nai B'rith to three great Americans—General George C. Marshall, Secretary of State; Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson, of the United States Supreme Court; and the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War.

Tonight, citations for merit for outstanding work in group cooperation are being awarded to three great Americans—General Mark Wayne Clark, United States Army; to Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California; and to Chief Justice Phil Sheridan Gibson, of the Supreme Court of the State of California.

That General Clark is a great military commander is well known to all of us; but that is not why B'nai B'rith humbly desires to pay tribute to him. His record for over 30 years shows a deep appreciation of the American principles of fair play and justice. Far beyond the official reports, we have learned of his conduct and attitude toward the very large number of different peoples, races, and religions in Italy, both in his capacity as military commander and as an administrator. Far beyond the official reports, we have learned of his administration with respect to displaced persons of all religious faiths in Austria.

The presentation of the B'nai B'rith Citation of Merit to General Clark will be made by a past president of B'nai B'rith, who was an officer on General Clark's staff in Europe during the recent World War. It is with great pleasure that I now present to you Col. David V. Rosen. [Applause.]

Col. DAVID V. ROSEN. I consider it a great personal privilege to be permitted the honor of presenting this citation, which reads as follows:

"B'nai B'rith Citation for Merit to Gen. Mark Wayne Clark, United States Army."

[General Clark arose and stood at attention.]

"One of the great military commanders of history; in his command, there fought side by side units of many countries, races, and religions; large forces of Americans, white, black, and yellow; Christian, Jew, and Moslem; British, Indian, Polish, Brazilian, Canadian, Australian, New Zealand, South African, Italian, Palestinian, and French—all served in harmony under the distinguished leadership of General Clark.

"An able administrator in occupied territories, including Italy and Austria, he supervised the repatriation and maintenance of hundreds of thousands of displaced persons with integrity-forwardness, deep understanding of the problems of humanity, and abiding faith in democracy.

"General Clark's Army record and his many decorations indicate the greatness of his career, but it is not for those things alone that we offer this citation. We pay tribute to a splendid American, Mark Clark, one who has walked among the great, yet retains the common touch.

"B'nai B'rith therefore presents this citation to Gen. Mark Wayne Clark, United States Army, for his historic contribution to the advancement of unity among peoples, world justice and humanity."

(The assembly rose and applauded vigorously as General Clark received the scroll containing the citation.)

Gen. MARK WAYNE CLARK. Mr. Chairman, members and friends of B'nai B'rith: I deeply appreciate the distinguished award which you have just bestowed upon me. It is a pleasure, indeed, to be honored by an order whose traditions and ideals of humanitarian service are known throughout the world. I humbly accept this award, not for myself alone, but for the American men and women and those of our allies who formed the Fifth Army and the Fifteenth Army Group in Italy and United States forces in Austria and who defeated the Nazi and wiped out nazism within their sphere of activity. I have previously stated, and I again repeat, that I hope the United States of America will do its part in bringing displaced persons out of the misery of Europe and into the sunshine of democracy. No one here tonight forgets the martyrs of Dachau and Belsen, men and women, and children who suffered torture and death, rather than to compromise with the principles of human freedom.

Having been victorious in a world-wide war against arrogant tyranny and discrimination, it was reasonable to expect that mankind might enjoy the peace for which we all so desperately fought. We had hoped and prayed that in the new democratic world dictatorships would be a thing of the past. Unfortunately, today, in spite of our hopes, the insidious forces of another totalitarian dictatorship are increasingly active. I refer to the forces of communism, acting in some cases openly and with the sanction of foreign governments; acting in other cases in the clandestine and secretive manner which all of us have come to recognize only too well.

That war has been won, but the victory will be a hollow one indeed unless a true and lasting peace is made. The gains which have been secured at such a tremendous expenditure of life must be consolidated. They must be consolidated now—now, while we still have the united determination and material resources to defend our way of life against any aggressor who would profit by our show of timidity.

So again, permit me the privilege on behalf of these fine American men and women and those of our allies that I commanded in Italy and in Austria to thank B'nai B'rith for its recognition of the American contribution to world justice and to humanity as exemplified in the Army of the United States that won the war in Italy, with the aid of its

Allies, and that has acted in Austria in such a manner as to truly represent our democratic Nation. (The assembly rose and applauded unanimously.)

Mr. FRIEDMAN. I will now read a letter which was written in May of this year by the President of the United States addressed to Mr. Frank Goldman, the supreme president of B'nai B'rith:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

MY DEAR MR. GOLDMAN: Please convey my greetings to B'nai B'rith upon the occasion of its triennial convention. I am confident that the deliberation of the delegates will be fruitful of results fully in accord with the high standards of community service your order has rendered in the 104 years of its existence.

In common with your wide membership, I share a sense of regret over the passing of your distinguished president, Henry Monsky, whom it was my pleasure to meet a little more than a year ago to discuss veterans' welfare.

His long efforts in behalf of humanitarian causes should be a stimulation to continued vigor of B'nai B'rith broad program of benefactions, youth-character building, Americanism, and the promotion of mutual understanding among all religions and racial groups.

The patriotic and public-service character of such organizations as B'nai B'rith contribute much to the maintenance of that freedom and democracy which are the salvation of our Nation.

You have my best wishes for the success of your convention.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

[Applause.]

I will now read a letter from the Governor of the State of California.

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, *Sacramento.*

To the Members of B'nai B'rith and Their Distinguished Guests:

I regret very much that because of prior commitments I am unable to join tonight in the ceremonies commemorating the birthday of our National Constitution.

I am happy to know that you are paying honor to this great document outlining a form of government which, because of its outstanding guaranties of freedom for the individual, remains unique in the world today. It is particularly important that at this time we should rededicate ourselves to the philosophy of the way of life upon which our Constitution is based. The spiritual strength and inspiration which we gain by doing so will fortify us to meet the problems of a changing world as squarely as our founding fathers met them 160 years ago.

With best wishes for a successful meeting, I am

Sincerely,

EARL WARREN, *Governor.*

[Applause.]

The B'nai B'rith Citation for Merit for outstanding work in group cooperation will be presented to Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California, by a past grand president of B'nai B'rith, a graduate and a former regent of the University of California, Hon. Edgar C. Levey. [Applause.]

Mr. EDGAR C. LEVEY. A great institution of learning looks out to the west, facing the Golden Gate, through which pioneers of the past streamed in the years gone by to seek fortunes and to build a mighty empire on the shores of the Pacific. Outstanding among their accomplishments was the founding of the University of California, destined to become the world's largest university and one of its greatest fountains of education.

One of its products was a young man of keen ability, high scholarship, and profound devotion to youth and its endeavors. Following his graduation he became associated with the business administration of his alma mater. It was my pleasure to first meet him in the capitol at Sacramento, where, as speaker of the assembly of our legislature, I had frequent contact with him, for he came there as the university's sponsor of legislation which through his efforts received favorable consideration and made possible the wonderful expansion which now distinguishes his college and mine. A vacancy occurring several years ago in the presidency of the University of California, the board of regents, of which I was then a member, chose Robert Gordon Sproul to be its executive head. The wisdom of the regents' choice needs no comment from me. Dr. Sproul has brought to himself and the institution which he heads great honor and great acclaim. Men talk long and well of his sagacity, his kindliness, his ease of approach, his joviality, and above all, his efforts on behalf of all humanity. To more concretely express the appreciation of good will of his neighbors and fellow citizens, the East Bay Lodges of B'nai B'rith, sponsor of the Hillel Foundations at 176 universities, presents to Dr. Sproul this Citation for Merit, which I am now privileged to read.

"B'nai B'rith Citation for Merit to Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president, University of California:

"A rare spirit, a scholar of renown, a nationally recognized educator, a sturdy servant of public service as an ideal; Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president of one of the largest institutions of learning in the world, has demonstrated full well his belief in a living, dynamic democracy. Loyal, fair, independent, wise, scholarly, courageous, indefatigable in righting wrongs and, above all, infinitely kind.

"He has never paid mere lip service to the American ideal that all persons, regardless of religion, racial origin, or antecedents, are entitled to equal consideration; his actions show a constant reaffirmation of faith in fundamental human rights; his valiance has taught us all a lesson in persistence and fortitude; his great ability is enhanced by his personal charm, his devotion to processes of reason, and his understanding of people, so that all who know him come to regard him as a personal friend.

"We, who are the People of the Book, honor him as a great educator, but more than that, we pay tribute to Robert Sproul, a chivalrous and gallant American gentleman."

(The assembly rose with loud applause, as Dr. Sproul received the scroll containing the citation.)

Dr. ROBERT GORDON SPROUL. Mr. Chairman, members of B'nai B'rith, and friends: I have an intuition that I should be deeply appreciative of the honor which B'nai B'rith has so generously conferred upon Robert Gordon Sproul. The name is my own, of course, but I have a feeling that it is a namesake rather than myself that has been characterized. I think, on the whole, I would like to know this namesake better, for I might, perhaps, be briefly stirred to emulate the virtues imputed to him, even though to do so would require days of toil and nights filled with sober reflection throughout the rest of my life. It is a stimulating experience for youth, and a solace for maturity, to feel a kinship with the great or near great around us, to recognize traits in them to which we, too, may lay modest claim. I feel that way about the Sproul whom you have described, but any resemblance between him and me, is, I fear, purely coincidental, and as tenuous as that between a man and the shadow he casts when the limelight is upon him. Given the proper lighting angle, such a shadow can appear truly imposing. Nevertheless, I am conscious of a sincere gratitude to B'nai B'rith for the glimpse it has given me of myself as some others see me. For the man who must perforce, live much in the distortion of the limelight comes inevitably to be heartened by the kindly judgment of his public, and inspired thereby to continue in the arduous task of converting, Pygmalion-like, his dreams and aspirations into reality.

To my mind the spiritual uplift, which has tonight been accorded me, epitomizes B'nai B'rith's great purpose and its many accomplishments in the past 104 years. My knowledge of B'nai B'rith's labors has been gained most intimately through Hillel Foundation at the University of California, which is, of course, but one of a multitude of activities in which it is interested. That one activity, however, has been enough to convince me that B'nai B'rith is, beyond question, one of the great fraternal organizations of the modern world. Conceived in a transcendent spirit, it has continued to maintain itself on an exceptionally high plane, kept scrupuously free from politics and religious dogma. It exists that men may better live, men of every race, in every clime, and every nation.

Modern civilization is too full of precepts of conduct and too empty of their performance. Between the ideals that we praise in the abstract, and the men whom we reward in the concrete, there lies normally the void of a great disparity. The strongest man, if he tries to stand alone against the world may well weaken in his highest resolves and conform his code of conduct to fit the expediencies of the moment. Such a one may even lose the clarity of his concept of God. And should he possess the strength of character to retain his convictions, he can scarcely escape a deep sense of futility as he struggles against man's inhumanity to man, and contemplates the long, hard road toward the ideal which faltering mankind has yet to traverse. It is only by banding together with men of like mind and spirit that each of us can sustain his own faith in the eventual triumph of justice over injustice, of tolerance over prejudice, and of decency over bestiality. The churches provide one rallying point, regardless of their faith or sect. But to many in these times, the churches do not suffice. For them, the answer to our ethical and moral problems must be found in well established secular judgments, human not divine. Herein lies the great contribution that B'nai B'rith makes, not only to people of Jewish faith, but to the people of the world. It provides a secular standard to which men of conscience may repair. Its humanitarian activities, great and numerous though they are, represent merely the outward expression of its inner purpose, which concerns an attitude toward life. It is in preserving that life attitude within the hearts of men that B'nai B'rith makes its highest and most lasting contribution.

The term "indoctrination" has come into bad repute during recent years. We have had all too convincing demonstrations of its effectiveness for evil in all too many countries of the world. We have learned that men will come not only to believe in, but also to fight and die for, the most perverted of philosophies if they have had that philosophy drilled into them by never ceasing propaganda. We recoil from these tragedies and consequently revolt against the indoctrination and propaganda that would seem to be their cause. Yet the processes of indoctrination and propaganda, if we but think about it, cannot be either inherently bad or inherently good; but, rather, the good or evil lies in the uses to which they are put. Human beings cannot live in vacuum devoid of all moral, ethical and spiritual content. Men must have choices of belief; they must be given definite objectives among which they may choose, if they are to recognize any purpose in life above eating, sleeping and procreating their kind. It is not enough to

see that gasoline is kept out of the fire buckets. They must be filled with something else, for they are of no use empty. Even so, it is with the hearts and minds of men. Not only are they of no use empty—they will not remain empty. Men will fill them from one source or another, even though it be from the mouth of Hell. To speak of avoiding indoctrination is merely to bandy words. Man was given almost from his very beginning the power of choice between good and evil. Consciously or unconsciously, the founders of B'nai B'rith must have recognized that truth. They were wise men, and they gave wisdom to the world. I salute them, and I salute those who have carried on the torch that they kindled. It is a privilege to be here, and a greater honor than I can express, to receive the citation which you have so generously worded. May your good work continue and increase in power and stature with each passing year.

(Prolonged applause as the entire assembly rose.)

Mr. FRIEDMAN. The B'nai B'rith citation for merit for outstanding work in group cooperation to Chief Justice Phil Sheridan Gibson, of the Supreme Court of California will be presented by a past grand president of B'nai B'rith and a member of the profession from which Mr. Justice Gibson came—Mr. Howard H. Desky. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD H. DESKY. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, friends of B'nai B'rith, the Order of B'nai B'rith has become generally recognized throughout the civilized world as dedicated to the service of democracy, humanity, liberty, human rights, and the American way of life. This is the America of all of the people, coming from many lands, holding many faiths, speaking many tongues, descendants of Plymouth Rock and of Ellis Island, alike sharing the rights and duties of our democracy and freedom. This is the America of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States with its Bill of Rights. Only he is a true American who believes in freedom for all and who defends the sacred right of every human being. That is the America of the eminent Phil Sheridan Gibson, chief justice of the Supreme Court of California, who has courageously and with fortitude demonstrated by his conduct, his actions, and his judicial decisions that he believes in the constitutional safeguards and freedoms expressed in our fundamental law.

To Phil Sheridan Gibson, our Constitution contains plain and simple truths, and guarantees to everyone fundamental natural rights—the right to work and to earn; to have and to keep the fruits of one's toil; to learn and to teach; to think and to speak; to write and to publish; to create art, music, poetry and song; to heal the sick; to speak for justice in the courts; as priests, ministers, and rabbis, to lead in prayer in church and synagogue; in short, the sum total of the human right to live and to be, regardless of origin, race, or creed. Mr. Chief Justice, B'nai B'rith recognizing your fighting spirit in defense of these rights and that your life and deeds are expressions of these noble attributes, presents to you this citation for merit, which reads as follows:

"B'nai B'rith citation for merit to Phil Sheridan Gibson, chief justice, Supreme Court of California:

"A loyal citizen, a courageous man with sincere convictions, a distinguished jurist; Phil Sheridan Gibson, chief justice of the Supreme Court of California, has never violated, either in letter or in spirit, the equal rule of law, which is the basis of our society. He has always reconciled liberty with equality, and both of them with order. He has always harmonized the claims of stability with those of progress. He has always respected the rights of the individual, but he has not pressed them to the point at which they threaten the welfare or the security of the many. His deeds shout that law shall be made true to its ideal of justice; that the American rule for the equality of all citizens, of all groups, of all religions, shall not be violated.

"A kindly man, not coldly intellectual, but most human, with the precious gift of humor. We respect him for his work as the head of the judicial system of the State of California, but it is not for this alone that we offer this citation. We pay tribute to Phil Gibson, a champion of the right of all people to live in human decency."

(The entire assembly rose and applauded unanimously.)

Chief Justice PHIL SHERIDAN GIBSON. I am deeply sensible of the honor you have conferred upon me, and I am most grateful for the generous tribute contained in the testimonial certificate. The citation is the more impressive since it comes from this hundred-year-old organization, which has played such an important role in the history of American Jewry, and which is now valiantly engaged in fighting the peacetime war for freedom, tolerance, and humanity. Any American who has kept his eyes open in recent years knows that freedom and tolerance, even in this country, cannot be taken for granted, and he must welcome, as I do, the opportunity to stand up and be counted among those who are defending our country's heritage with all their physical and spiritual strength. In responding to your invitation, and in accepting this honor, I feel that I am here not as an individual but rather as a member of the judicial branch of our government. It cannot be too strongly emphasized how important is the function of the judiciary in safeguarding the civil liberties of our people. When the recent history of this Nation is recorded, it will disclose an admirable and remarkable picture of sanity and balance, of progressive thinking, and of liberal statesmanship, on the part of our judges during these crucial years. By and large, the bills of right in the Federal and State constitutions, and the elementary rules of fairness in judicial and administrative proceedings, stood up well throughout the war and postwar period. Excesses, whether of military or civil officials, or of lawless individuals, received no sanction in judicial decisions of the higher courts.

There were times when we might have benefited from the wise leadership and counsel of Holmes and Brandeis and Cardozo, but these men did not, in passing, take their principles with them, and the lessons taught by them remain a source of strength and inspiration for those charged with the duty and responsibility of protecting the civil rights guaranteed by our Constitution. When economic crises occur in modern democratic countries, there is a tendency to think in terms of "strong leadership," of uniform beliefs, and of the suppression of dissenting ideas and practices. There are those self-styled patriotic organizations which appear out of nowhere to demand the punishment, the isolation or the exclusion of every group which fails to conform to their ideas or specifications. We hear strange things about some of our fellow Americans; they are characterized as being racially undesirable, or incapable of assimilation, or of alien extraction and beliefs. These are notions which the freedom-loving, freedom-seeking founders of this Nation would never have countenanced. There are not, and there cannot be, racially or nationally undesirable groups in this country. Racial and national origins are not a bar to assimilation. Israel Zangwill truly described America as a melting pot, a country ceaselessly engaged in blending the characteristics and characters of many peoples from every part of the globe. These groups may exhibit minor differences of speech and manner, and habits of eating and dress, and may differ also in intellectual processes, or even in political and economic views; but these matters are as nothing when compared with the all important thing upon which everyone should agree: That freedom and justice can be attained and preserved for all under a democratic state.

In a struggle against intolerance and hatred, and for the rights of minorities, it is no surprise to find Jews and Jewish organizations in the front lines. They have been the victims of persecution in countless places and unnumbered ages, and they know that you cannot either achieve or preserve freedom without fighting for it. But it is surprising, and indeed shocking, to find how many people think that this is the Jews' own battle—people so ignorant of history as to think that the Jews have been the sole victims of the torture and misery which strong groups of men are able to inflict on weaker groups. They should read the story of the past and discover how every civilization has developed its oppressors, and every era has had its iniquitous record of persecuted minorities.

This country was founded by people who fled from injustice, and there is scarcely a section of America today in which there is not a group whose ancestors were hounded and tortured in some part of the world. This truth becomes vitally important when we recall the events of the past decade. I say "recall," for no one here needs any recital of the facts so fresh and painful in our minds. But though we may grow tired of reciting those monstrous facts, let us take care never to grow tired of reflecting on their significance. The Nazi and Fascist dictatorships, along with the Japanese feudal empire, have fallen; the concentration camps have been closed, the gas chambers and the fiendish instruments of torture have been destroyed; and a handful of the more vicious of the criminals have been punished. This is good; and we must not be cynical or indifferent to the great victory, gained at such a colossal cost. But is dictatorship dead? Are the people of small nations now completely safe to follow, if they will, the pattern of political democracy? Are minority groups—racial, religious, social, national—certain of the protection of their civil rights throughout the world? Is freedom of speech and of the press an accepted fact everywhere? If the answer is "no" to these questions, then it follows that we are not through fighting; we have won a battle, but not the war.

Where in this picture is there comfort for those who think that the great cause of social justice is only a Jewish problem? The evil forces of hatred and oppression, on the march today as always, do not spend themselves on one object; there are always fresh fields in which the poison may work, new groups to be singled out and persecuted because of their wealth, or their intelligence, or their religious beliefs, or the color of their skin or hair, or their language or manner of speech, or their peaceful disposition, or their civilized habits. No; this is not a battle for Jews alone, nor for any other minority group. It is a struggle in which all civilized peoples must stand together to protect their common ideals and interests. The Jews are not the first, nor will they be the last, racial, religious, national, or social group to be the victims of persecution. And nature has a habit of turning yesterday's majorities into today's minorities. If our consciences do not sufficiently spur us on, we may well be urged on by the necessity of self-preservation. In this great struggle we shall all have a common object: To achieve a world order in which special testimonials of the kind conferred tonight will be unnecessary and unknown—a world in which the invisible badge of tolerance will be worn by all.

[Enthusiastic applause as assembly rose.]

Rules on Disclosure of Information by Civil Service Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks heretofore granted, I place in the RECORD, for the general information, a letter from the United States Civil Service Commission, setting forth the rules and regulations which the Commission has adopted with respect to disclosure of information:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1947.
Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: Reference is made to your communication of November 28, 1947, transmitting clipping from the Washington Post regarding the payment of annuities to Members of Congress.

There is no provision of law mandatorily prohibiting the disclosure of information regarding the retirement or annuity status of Members of Congress. However, Congress has delegated to the Commission the authority to make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary and proper in the administration of the retirement law. Any such regulation made under authority of the statute necessarily has the force and effect of law.

The Commission's regulations with respect to disclosure of information are quoted below. These regulations are applicable to all members of the system and no exception is made as regards Members of Congress.

"11. (a) Files, records, reports, and other papers and documents pertaining to any claim filed with the Civil Service Commission, whether pending or adjudicated, will be deemed confidential and privileged, and no disclosure thereof will be made except as provided herein.

"(b) Disclosure of information from the files, records, reports, and other papers and documents shall be made to a claimant or to his duly authorized representative in matters concerning himself alone when such disclosure would not be injurious to the physical or mental health of the claimant or be regarded as a breach of confidence.

"Determination as to when disclosure of information would be injurious to the physical or mental welfare of a claimant will be made by the Medical Division.

"(c) By 'a duly authorized representative of a claimant' is meant any person who has satisfied the Commission of his authority to act.

"(d) The name or address of a beneficiary designated by an employee or annuitant will, during the life of the employee or annuitant, be furnished only to the designator when request therefor is made in writing over the signature of the designator.

"(e) Such information as may properly be disclosed to a claimant personally shall, in the event of his death, be disclosed upon proper request to the duly appointed representative of his estate, or to such person as may be designated by such representative, or to a duly designated beneficiary. Where no representative of the claimant's estate has been appointed, the claimant's next of kin shall be recognized as the representative of his estate.

"(f) Where copies of documents or other records are desired by or in behalf of parties to a suit, whether in a court of the United States or in any other court, such copies shall be furnished to the court only, and on an order of the court of subpoena duces tecum, addressed to the President, United States Civil Service Commission, requesting the same.

"(g) Where a process of a United States court or other court requires the production of documents or records contained in the retirement files of a claimant, such documents will be produced in the court out of which the process has issued. Where original records are produced, they must remain at all times in the custody of a representative of the Civil Service Commission, and if offered or received in evidence, permission should be obtained to substitute a copy so that the original record may remain intact in the file.

"(h) The address of a claimant as shown by the Civil Service Commission records may be furnished to duly constituted police or court officials upon proper request or the submission of a certified copy either of the indictment returned against the claimant or of the warrant for his arrest.

"(i) Disclosure of the amount of annuity or refund to any claimant may be made to any National, State, county, municipal, or other publicly recognized charitable or social-security administrative agency.

"(j) Subject to the limitation contained in paragraph (d) hereof, all records or documents officially required by any department or other agency of the United States Government shall be furnished in response to a proper request, and Senators and Representatives of the United States in their capacity as Members of Congress of the United States shall be furnished for their official use with such records, documents, or other information as may be requested for such use.

"(k) Copies of papers, records, etc., the furnishing of which would be prejudicial to the interest of the Government; copies of reports of examining surgeons; reports from the War Department; or copies of records of other departments and other confidential matters, will not be furnished."

The Commission receives on numerous occasions requests for lists of annuitants and other similar information which information is desired for solicitation purposes or to satisfy idle curiosity. It is obvious that such information should not be disclosed generally and the Commission has consistently refused to comply with such requests.

With the exception of the name of the beneficiary designated by the employee or the annuitant, the Commission's regulations do not prohibit furnishing Members of Congress for their official use information otherwise considered confidential.

Statistical information of public interest regarding the operation of the retirement system is at all times available and will be furnished generally by the Commission upon request.

Sincerely yours,
WM. C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

Abraham Lincoln, 1809-1865

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I place in the RECORD for this anniversary week of the Great Emancipator's birth, a tribute written by O. E. Harper, of Hot Springs, S. Dak. Mr. Harper is a veteran of the Spanish-American War who spent many years in Government service and is an ardent student of United States history.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, 1809–1865

Child of poverty, and son of want:
Destined to play a mighty part in the making
of a nation's history,
Yet ill prepared for that great task. A few
short months in school;
Just able to read, to write, to cipher.
To read: ah, that was difficult indeed; to
you, each word
Was rymbol of a thought, each thought part
of a human soul.
And so you studied hard to understand aright
the words of those
Who suffered, sacrificed, yea, even died to
give a nation birth.
At last their meaning came to you, clear as
the noonday sun:
Freedom; union; justice.
Freedom to worship God as you saw fit, to
speak your thoughts,
To praise or criticize; to work, to save, to
care for you and yours.
Union for strength, for safety, for defense;
For though the several States would have
problems of their own,
Yet each was interested in the other's welfare
As members of one family.
Justice for all, without regard to race or
creed,
To wealth or poverty, and yet to be administered with sympathy
And understanding of man's weakness.
And when you understood these things, you
did what every citizen
Should do, resolved to do all within your
power to preserve this
Precious heritage, to pass it on untarnished
To generations yet to come.
Your youthful years soon passed and you
assumed the duties of a man,
And like your neighbors, toiled to earn your
daily bread.
Sometimes dame fortune smiled on you,
sometimes she frowned.
You loved and lost and loved again.
Yet all the while your eyes could see the
gathering
Clouds of coming storm. Therefore you traveled up and down the land,
Spoke to your fellow men, did all you could
to avert impending danger:
But all in vain, for fate had otherwise decreed.
Soon the storm broke, the lightning struck,
and in the Nation's
Darkest hour she turned to you for guidance.
Humbly, but sustained by faith, you took
upon your shoulders
That massive burden. For two long years it
seemed that all was lost;
Then came the faint light of coming dawn,
and Gettysburg,
And there, in simple words, you bared the
Nation's soul.
Slowly the sun arose and at last came victory
and peace,
But with the close of strife you too were laid
a last
Great sacrifice upon the Nation's altar.
And I said you were ill prepared. I had forgot that you were taught
In nature's school, the school of bitter struggle to obtain
The bare necessities of life. The school of
rolling fields
And quiet woods, and there you learned your
first great lesson,
That all of life, whether bird, or beast, or
man, was created
By the same Almighty God, each entitled to
his chance in life
As he had been given talent. And in that
school there was taken
From your heart all thought of malice,
hatred, envy,
And in their stead were placed the precious
jewels of
Friendship, brotherhood, sympathy.
Dear God: if only man-made schools might
teach as much.
Many years have passed, your body has long
since returned
To mother earth from whence it sprang, and
in your memory men have
Built great buildings; erected many monuments; yea, your rugged face
Has e'en been carved in granite on a mountain top.
It is well that this is so, and yet in countless
centuries to come
These all shall be destroyed by nature's
elements,
Shall slowly crumble into dust and make
their bed with thee.
Yet rest in peace, kind soul:
Your true monument can never be destroyed.
Your memory will live forever within the
hearts of men.

Pay Increases for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and article from the Newark Evening News of January 26, 1948:

NEW JERSEY AFFILIATED
POSTAL EMPLOYEES,
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
East Orange, N. J., February 4, 1948.
Hon. FRED A. HARTLEY,
Chairman, House Labor Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing to you in the name of 10,000 postal employees in New Jersey which the above legislative committee represents on the question of pay increase for all postal employees. In their behalf I strongly urge you to do all you can in the House to have early hearings by the House Post Office Committee and that this committee reports a bill at an early date to adjust the pay of postal workers.

As the present Chairman of the House Labor Committee and as former member of the House Post Office Committee for many years, you are fully aware of the high cost of living in this present day and the meager wages of the postal employees. You have always been our champion in the House committee to alleviate these conditions. We in New Jersey look to you to come to our assistance in these days of skyrocketing prices of foods, fuel, and clothing.

I am enclosing a clipping from the January 26, 1948, Newark Evening News which shows the steady increase in the cost of living in New Jersey. This article quotes the New Jersey Department of Agriculture stating that the purchasing value of the consumer dollar is now 57.4 cents compared to a full dollar in June 1939.

We look to you to help us and hope for early and favorable action by the House on the question of pay increases for all postal employees.

Sincerely,
THOS. F. FLANAGAN,
Publicity Director.

[From the Newark (N. J.) Evening News, of January 26, 1948]

JERSEY RECORD SET ON COST OF LIVING—BUYING POWER OF CONSUMER'S DOLLAR REPORTED AT 57.4 CENTS

TRENTON.—The cost of living soared to an all-time high in New Jersey last month, reducing the purchasing value of the consumer dollar to 57.4 cents, compared with June 1939, the State agriculture department said today.

Federal income taxes, which absorb between 8 and 10 percent of the average family's gross earnings, are excluded from the cost-of-living studies of the department, which are made on a bimonthly basis.

The average cost of goods and services, such as food, clothing, housing, fuel, light, furniture, house furnishings, and miscellaneous items during December was 2.1 percent higher than during the previous pricing study in October, the department said. Those items cost 10.2 percent more than in December 1946 and 74.3 percent more than in June 1939.

DROP OF 5.6 CENTS

The purchasing value of the consumer dollar was 63 cents in December 1946, or 5.6 cents more than last month.

The advance in the cost of housing paced all other items in December. The survey showed housing cost 5 percent more on the average than in October. Average December price for houses without heat was 23.9 percent above the June 1939 rentals.

The department said that new rent units, not subject to governmental regulation, are being leased at higher rents than others under control, forcing up the average. The 15 percent maximum increase allowed by law for older housing is becoming more prevalent.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from John C. Tulloch, Esq., of Ogdensburg, N. Y., who is the secretary of the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce. The Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce is a fine organization. They have worked long and hard for the St. Lawrence seaway on the basis that it is a good thing for the country. I heartily agree with them.

THE NORTHERN FEDERATION
OF CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE,
Ogdensburg, N. Y., February 6, 1948.
Hon. CLARENCE KILBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am secretary of the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce and this federation has been striving to help in every conceivable way with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. We have sent men to Washington recently and know about what the situation is, but there is one particular thing to which I desire to call your attention and that is the argument on the diversion of traffic. We all know that the Welland Canal is now a seaway canal with its 27 feet over the sills.

I secured from the superintendent of transportation of the Welland Canal upon request, a statement as follows:

Total ships locked through one way in 24 hours, 28 (you must remember that these 28 have to be locked back, so that is 56 per day. This figure occupies every minute of the 24 hours. This is physically impossible and always has been, but granted they can lock through 28 one way per day and they were all 4,000-ton boats, it would be 112,000 tons per day, or 3,360,000 tons per month, and for 7 months 23,520,000 tons. Because this is an international canal, Canada is entitled to one-half, or 11,760,000 tons). That is the utmost that the seaway can carry because that is the greatest amount that can be locked through the Welland Canal which is a seaway canal now. They are carrying about 8,000,000 tons at the present time, so where does the argument on diversion land?

This seems to me to be one of the most convincing arguments that we have and should be made use of and published widely.

Very respectfully yours,
JOHN C. TULLOCH, *Secretary.*

International Monetary Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday February 9, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Melchior Palyi, from the Toronto Northern Miner:

MUST REVAMP FUND OR SCRAP IT—IF MONETARY SANITY IS TO BE RESTORED TO WORLD—ITS PRINCIPLES GONE WITH THE WIND

(By Melchior Palyi, Chicago)

During and after the war, up to a year ago, the instrumentalities of official propaganda have been trumpeting that the Bretton Woods institutions are all that is needed (plus a few little things like the British loan, UNRRA, etc.) to provide freedom from want everywhere. Showing such bad judgment disqualifies its authors intellectually, but they should be disqualified morally as well, if for a different reason.

The International Monetary Fund was put up for the avowed purpose of bringing about stable exchange rates, and especially to eliminate multiple currencies. Its statutes abound with assurances, as did the propaganda line which accompanied the Bretton Woods program, to the effect that the very purpose is to prohibit arbitrary exchange manipulations and to nip in the bud such vicious multiple monetary systems as had been perpetrated by the Nazis. Multiple currencies are to be outlawed so far as the members of the Fund are concerned. Whether it is the French franc, the Argentinian peso or the Greek drachma, no member's currency was supposed to consist of more than one kind of money in terms of exchange rates. The idea was that the Nazi technique of having one kind of exchange rate for exports and another for imports, and a third, a fourth, and a tenth, each for some other purpose, should not happen again.

MULTIPLICITY OF VALUES

In reality, the policies of the Fund have not only permitted but even fostered the maintenance of old, and the creation of new currency chaos. Directly or indirectly, it has greatly contributed to the spread of monetary delinquency and condoned it. Officially, each country's currency can have only one value against gold and foreign currencies. Actually, the majority of the members have developed and retain a multiplicity of foreign exchange values for their respective currency units, and do so in many cases quite openly. Most Latin-American countries have different official prices for exports and imports. In the Argentine, as an example, the exporter gets one price in pesos for the dollar proceeds of his sales to the United States, while the domestic importer has to pay quite another price for dollars he needs to buy goods in this country. Often there is an upper and lower price for each, the export

and the import currency, and special prices on top of that. These clear violations of the Fund statutes—of its very purpose—are accepted without as much as a verbal spanking of the culprits. The Fund maintains a sanctimonious attitude by insisting on its principle while at the same time hypocritically tolerating its violations. But multiple currencies are practiced also in countries which deny their existence. Canada has two kinds of dollars. Officially, there is only one price for the pound, the par ($4.03 to the pound sterling). However, there is an unofficial market in pounds, too, which is recognized by the Bank of England in a left-handed manner For example, you are permitted to take with you a certain number of pounds if you go to Britain as a tourist even though you bought them outside the official market and at a price some 10 to 15 percent below par. Similarly, if you buy British Government bonds, the Bank of England will permit you to pay in pounds acquired at the gray market rate, and may not even ask whether you bought them on a black market where the price runs as low as $2.50 to the pound.

FRANCE ACTS CONTRARY TO RULES

France is one of those countries that lives against the rules of the Fund without losing its membership rights, as it should according to the statutes. Officially, there was only one par value for the franc in terms of the dollar or gold, but the French Government tolerated and quietly recognized unofficial prices, especially for gold. It even publishes "black market" quotations. Now, France has acted to devalue its currency—raised the gold price—for the fourth time since the last war began, and to introduce on this occasion three kinds of francs. Characteristically, the Fund management did not quite know what to do about it.

Why this weakness, this inability to follow a clear-cut line of policy that was to be imposed upon the members? From the outset, the Fund has accepted the rule that for a transitional period of 5 years the members could retain their wartime foreign exchange restrictions and even introduce new ones; later on, they can do so with the consent of the Fund. Since the majority of the members practice exchange restrictions, the decisive vote in the Fund management is bound to be always in favor of permitting those practices. But foreign exchange restrictions necessarily create multiple currencies, a fact ignored by the international planners who drew up the Bretton Woods plans. Once a government is given the power to manipulate its money by permitting one kind of foreign transaction and forbidding another kind, the market reacts by attaching different values to each portion according to the greater or lesser ease with which it can be used. And once such market values are established they are bound to become part and parcel of the system. Sooner or later they must be recognized by the government itself. Exchange restrictions lead to multiple currencies, and it is nonsensical to forbid the latter if the former are permitted. To restore monetary sanity in the world we will have to revamp the International Fund, body and soul—or to scrap it altogether.

Government Should Set Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette:

GOVERNMENT SHOULD SET EXAMPLE

The Government in Washington has had quite a bit to say about cutting prices.

All of us would like to see lower prices, because we do not enjoy paying high ones and we do not like inflation.

But the Government would be performing a public service if it would take the lead and reduce the cost of its own operations. That would be a good example for the entire country.

The Federal budget and Federal taxes ought to be cut. Business and the individual are entitled to relief.

Everybody agrees that there are a lot of frills to Government today and they all cost money. But frills are not essential and they can be trimmed away without really hurting anyone.

The spending habit got pretty strong in Washington during the war. We were not counting the cost then. Everybody's first thought was of winning regardless of expense.

Now the war is over and we cannot afford waste, so the word "economy" will have to be brought into use again.

Cut the budget, see that the waste is eliminated, and the country will gain, not suffer, in the process, if good judgment is used in the pruning.

Brand Reports on War Crimes Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a brief report on the work of the military tribunal at Nuremberg by James T. Bland, associate justice of the Supreme Court of Oregon, which appeared in the Oregon State Bar Bulletin for January 1948.

Judge Bland is an eminent jurist of the State of Oregon and served as a presiding judge of the military tribunal constituted for the trial of major war criminals of the European Axis. He was appointed by the President of the United States and assigned to his post by General Clay.

The report follows:

BRAND REPORTS ON WAR CRIMES TRIAL

(By James T. Brand, associate justice, Supreme Court of Oregon)

The request of the editor of the Bar Bulletin for a report on the work of the military tribunal at Nuremberg comes as a call of duty. While on leave of absence from the supreme court, I have served as the presiding judge of a military tribunal constituted for the trial of major war criminals of the European Axis. Having been loaned by the authority of the State legislature for this purpose, I acknowledge the duty to the bar and to the people of Oregon to report upon the results.

The judges of the Nuremberg Tribunal were appointed by the President of the United States and assigned to their respective positions by General Clay. To Tribunal III was assigned the duty of conducting the trial of the members of the Ministry of Justice and of certain judges of the "Terror Courts" under the Nazi system. Fifteen defendants were tried before a tribunal consisting of three judges. The actual trial was commenced on March 5, 1947, and was concluded on December 5. In addition to a transcript of more than 10,000 pages, 2,000 exhibits were received. The entire record of the case comprising 10 bound volumes is en route somewhere between Nuremberg and Salem, Oreg.

To boil down such a record in a few short pages is, of course, impossible. I shall venture only the briefest outline of the law and procedure which governed this and the other Nuremberg trials. A reasoned discussion of the great issues involved must await fuller opportunity. Among those issues which were peculiar to the trial of the Justice case, lawyers will identify questions of judicial immunity for acts performed pursuant to local law, the defense of superior orders, the bearing of the doctrine of national sovereignty, questions of constitutionality, the nature and content of international law and its relation to domestic law, the applicability of the ex post facto principle in international law and many other issues that stagger the mind and yet demanded an answer.

The acts creating and defining the jurisdiction of the tribunal were (1) the London Agreement of August 8, 1945, with the Charter of the International Military Tribunal annexed thereto; and (2) Control Council Law No. 10 enacted by the representatives of the United States, England, France, and the Soviet Union. The indictment was drawn pursuant to the provisions of Control Council Law 10 which is similar but not identical to the Charter. Thus it will be seen at the outset that the Nuremberg tribunals were based upon international authority. Although the judges on Tribunal III all came from the United States, Russian, English, or French judges could, under the law, have been appointed on this tribunal.

Control Council Law 10 defines acts in general terms, each of which is recognized as a crime, namely, (a) crimes against the peace (the waging of aggressive war), (b) war crimes, (c) crimes against humanity, and (d) membership in criminal organizations. The indictment in the Justice case charged the commission of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and membership in organizations declared criminal by the decision of the military tribunal in the case against Goering et al. There was no charge of waging aggressive war.

Most of the defendants were charged with war crimes, i. e., violations of the laws and customs of war. In substance, the statute adopted and incorporated the rules of international law as the rules by which war crimes were to be identified. This legislative practice is not unknown in the United States. See *Ex parte Quirin*, 317 U. S. 1. For a determination of the issues upon this count of the indictment, the tribunal was required to seek the guidance of textbooks, treaties, the decisions of international tribunals and, above all, the Hague Convention by which limitations were imposed upon the conduct of belligerents while in occupation of hostile territory. The wording of Control Council Law 10 (too long for quotation here) disclosed that the term "war crimes" was employed to cover acts in violation of the laws and customs of war committed against non-Germans and did not include atrocities committed by Germans upon their own nationals. The Charter referred to acts against civilian population of or in occupied territory.

Typical of this type of crime were the atrocities committed under the infamous "nacht and nebel" decree whereby upon Hitler's order thousands of persons accused of resistance to German authority were spirited away in night and fog out of France, Belgium and Holland, never to be heard of again. They were taken to Germany, secretly tried before German courts in a language strange to them, sometimes without counsel and often without witnesses for their defense. Frequently they learned at the trial for the first time the nature of the charges against them. The results of the trial were unimportant to the defendants. Some were executed, others sentenced to brief terms of imprisonment, others acquitted; but, with few insignificant exceptions, none ever returned to their homes. If acquitted or if their terms of imprisonment expired, they were sent to concentration camps, a punishment worse than death. The declared purpose of the night and fog decree was to spread terror in the hearts of the people in the occupied countries by reason of the disappearance of their loved ones and neighbors. Several of the defendants in the Justice case were found guilty of participation in this criminal program.

Other violations of international law occurred in connection with the extension of German law into occupied territory contrary to the provisions of the Hague Convention which requires the occupant "to insure, as far as possible, public order and safety while respecting, unless absolutely prevented, the law enforced in the country."

Among other cases of war crimes which were held violative of international law, mention should be made of prosecutions conducted by Germany against Poles, who, before the war, had caused the prosecution in Poland of Polish nationals who were racial Germans. After the invasion, the Polish prosecutors were apprehended and charged with treason against racial Germans although there was no law covering such a case. Other Poles were tried and executed on the charge of treason because they attempted to flee into Switzerland and thus escape from forced labor in Germany, "thereby malevolently leaving his important agricultural job." It was claimed that these Poles intended to join a Polish legion in Switzerland. The legion had been interned by Swiss authorities, but the Germans considered this circumstance immaterial because the interned Poles might be used on the side of the enemy in the event of German troops invading Switzerland. Other Poles were accused of "separating from the Reich, territory belonging to the Reich." The territory in question constituted portions of Poland which Germany had attempted illegally to annex. On such trumped-up charges, Poles were convicted of high treason and executed.

The third count of the indictment involved questions of profound difficulty. The charges were based upon the provisions of control council law 10 which defined as criminal "atrocities and offenses, including but not limited to murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, imprisonment, torture, rape, or other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds whether or not in violation of the domestic laws of the country where perpetrated."

The clear purpose of this section was to include within its condemnation acts which did not constitute violations of the laws and customs of war or of the Hague Convention. As distinguished from war crimes committed against the civilian population from occupied territories, this section provided for the punishment of atrocities against any civilian population and declared in substance that compliance with German law should be no defense. Thus it was that German officials were tried and convicted because they participated in the persecution of German nationals on political, racial or religious grounds.

It is literally true that, pursuant to German laws and decrees, millions of Poles and Jews were exterminated. The story of this, the greatest crime of the ages, cannot be told here. Several of the defendants in the "Justice Case" were convicted for participation in the international crime of genocide, a governmentally organized program for the extermination of racial minorities. In support of our conclusion on this issue, we cite the recent resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations which—

"Affirms that genocide is a crime under international law which the civilized world condemns, and for the commission of which principals and accomplices—whether private individuals, public officials or statesmen, and whether the crime is committed on religious, racial, political or any other grounds—are punishable."

The evidence of atrocities by the officials and judges of the ministry of Justice in the name of law was overwhelming and devastating. It raised the gravest questions as to the essential character of a people who could develop or even tolerate so cruel a system.

The trials were conducted in two languages with simultaneous translation of every word spoken, from English to German and German to English. Through his earphones, each listener in the court room heard the testimony in the language which he understood. Every possible assistance was given to the battery of German lawyers who put up a capable and exhaustive defense collectively and separately. The tribunals did not apply Anglo-American rules of evidence with which the German lawyers were unfamiliar. The only test imposed by the governing statute was that of the probative value of evidence offered. More than 850 people in the Palace of Justice alone were employed in support of the work of the tribunal. The evidence consisted chiefly of captured German documents, the authenticity of which was admitted. The defendants enjoyed the benefit of the presumption of innocence and were convicted only if found guilty by proof beyond reasonable doubt. The Nuremberg trials must be distinguished from the "Who Done It Cases," which were prosecuted at Dachau and elsewhere for the conviction of the human butchers who, under Himmler, operated the camps for mass extermination of Jews, Poles, and political opponents of the Nazi system.

The twelve cases which were assigned for trial at Nuremberg were selected for that purpose because they involved the establishment of legal precedents for the future, and because, in the trial of those cases, the facts concerning the Nazi tyranny could be judicially established and recorded for history. The "Justice Case" was in truth a trial of the Nazi judicial system. The evidence conclusively demonstrated the perversion of the judicial system, the destruction of judicial independence and the consequent loss of personal liberty, freedom of speech and every right dear to the heart of a free people. This evidence constitutes the strongest argument ever made for the separation of powers, judicial independence and a government of laws and not dictators.

If this skeleton outline of the bare issues involved has stimulated an interest in the minds of the lawyers of Oregon, it will have accomplished its full purpose.

Travel Allowance of Railway Postal Clerks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to increase the travel allowance for railway postal clerks assigned to road duty. No increases have been granted to these worthy employees since July 1, 1945, although everyone is well aware of the fact that the high costs of hotel rooms and meals in restaurants and other traveling expenses have increased a great deal since that time.

Railway postal clerks assigned to road duty are allowed not to exceed $4 per day for expenses during the time they are away from their initial terminals, on duty, and while at their outer terminals. This bill will raise this allowance to not to exceed $6 per day, and I trust it will receive the favorable consideration of the committee and of the House.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over station WHBF on February 7, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, today I received a pouch full of -lapel buttons which read, "Dewey for President."

They were sent to me by my good friend, Dr. Charles A. Earl, mayor of the city of Oneida, which as you know is in our district.

I am distributing these buttons among my fellow Members of the House, urging that they be displayed.

My thanks go to my staunch supporters of many years, the good ladies of the Broome County Women's Republican Club. I also wish to acknowledge their message assuring me of their desire that my legislative program in Congress for 1948 will be carried out.

I have written to Mrs. Marjorie Brownfield, their secretary, who sent me this welcome testimonial, expressing my appreciation for such valued assistance.

To you veterans, whose participation in on-the-job training and higher education under the GI bill of rights make this subject interesting, I wish to read the speech I made in the House this week as I voted to increase your allowances:

"Mr. Speaker, the bills we pass here today which provide increases for veterans' allowances and compensation embody the proposals I made at the beginning of this Congress over a year ago.

"At that time, I introduced H. R. 866, a bill entitled 'to increase the monthly maximum allowed to veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education.'

"Everybody knows veterans have been crying for these increases for over 2 years. In my opinion, action is long overdue, and I think our leadership is wise indeed to allow the passage of these remedial measures now.

"From now on the average veteran taking on-the-job training will be able to meet more easily the high cost of living. His preparation for a better job will not be impeded. Employers of such veterans will likewise benefit, because such training will remain attractive.

"From the standpoint of education under the GI bill, students who are veterans have found it well nigh impossible to live on subsistence allowances. I remember talking to a group of veterans attending one of the several colleges in my district a few months ago.

"One and all, these young veterans had the burning desire to regain their lost years by taking advantage of the higher learning offered them. But, tragically enough, they

were up against rising food costs and other mounting expenses. They asked me when Congress would wake up to their dire circumstances and give them a helping hand. They said frankly many of them would find it necessary to leave school unless we come to their rescue.

"As one who proposed universal college education of the GI several months prior to its inclusion in the original GI bill, I am anxious to see veterans' opportunities in the field of higher learning increased, not decreased. Perhaps there are some who mockingly refer to this as a noble experiment. But the experiment is working and working well.

"I believe the time will come when Government will assume the responsibility of opening the avenue to college and university training for all our citizens just as today it guarantees our children primary and secondary education.

"Certainly, a poor boy or girl who meets the scholastic qualifications of a university ought to have the same chance of improving the mind a person who is more fortunate financially has.

"At any rate, the GI bill has opened a burning question, puts it on a working basis, and proves that all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color, can be treated equally when it comes to opportunity to go to college.

"Therefore lest this educational feature of the GI bill be scuttled and countless veterans be compelled to leave important studies they are now pursuing, I strongly urge the House to vote these increases of subsistence allowances to veterans immediately.

"I likewise recommend that we improve the on-the-job training program by raising the ceilings, now too low, so that the private initiative of each veteran manifests itself more forcefully."

Thank you.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I extended my remarks on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway. I tried to point out how very undesirable this project would be from the standpoint of the best interests of the citizens of the United States. I have noted with interest the debate that has progressed from day to day in the other body. Certain phases of the debate have attracted my attention particularly and I desire to comment upon them.

"Changing conditions" require "changes in methods."

One very distinguished member of the other body, and a man for whom I have the highest respect, points out that new and changing conditions demand that we give serious and favorable consideration to the seaway. He very aptly says that new conditions cause an adjustment in our economy and uses as an analogy the "buggy-whip industry." He says, and very correctly, that there was a time when the buggy-whip industry was an important and very useful industry in the United States. He states further, and also very correctly that a subsidy for the rehabilitation of that industry today would be very poor economics. He infers that progress in the fields of science and industrial development, with the new and improved methods, and so forth, challenge us to make adjustments to keep pace with the advance along these lines. Up to this point, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in full agreement with my distinguished friend. However, he goes on from there and applies this reasoning as an argument for the seaway development. He points out that railroads are fast becoming obsolete. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I do feel that my friend has gotten switched on the wrong track. In my opinion, waterways, particularly inland waterways, antedate railroads. They are one of the oldest forms of transportation. They are also perhaps the slowest and most nearly obsolete of all forms of existing transportation. When compared to railroads, the railroads are modern and the waterways are obsolete, even as passé as the very buggy-whip industry to which my friend refers. It was the railroad that speeded up our transportation and made the waterway outdated. The very argument used so ably by my distinguished friend, appears to my mind to strongly support our claims that the seaway development would be a step, but a step in the wrong direction. Instead of being forward, it would be decidedly backward. It would be adjusting ourselves to a change, Mr. Speaker, but it would be the same kind of a change if we would propose that our modern garages should be declared obsolete and we would proceed to reestablish the blacksmith shop. Our young men, engineers and mechanics, would be challenged to leave the splendidly equipped garages and return to the "village smithy 'neath the spreading chestnut tree." No, Mr. Speaker, we cannot discard our 60-mile fast overland freight because it is obsolete and expend our billions to develop a 12-mile-per-hour waterway, and call it progress.

THE SEAWAY IS A POWER PROJECT

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the St. Lawrence River would lend itself well to power development. But if we want additional power developed with Government funds, why do we select a river in some other country? Why not an American river? There are plenty of them in our own country, Mr. Speaker. Rivers going right through our own American States, rolling listlessly out to sea, thousands of miles of them. They are undeveloped and our own citizens would be most happy to see power projects for American use, employing American workers, and benefiting American business. There is plenty of opportunity for development on the Penobscot, the Connecticut, the Delaware, the Mohawk, the Hudson, the Susquehanna, the Potomac, the Niagara, the Ohio, the Mississippi, the Missouri, and countless others. All of these are in America. The power problem is not necessarily dependent on the St. Lawrence seaway. I fear it is being used merely as an argument for a project that the advocates of realize is not worthy to stand on its own merit. I fail to see that our need for power development justifies the seaway any more than it would be feasible for us to scrap our fine railroad transportation in behalf of the establishment of a ship canal.

In conclusion, I should like to pose this further question with regard to power development in the United States. Is there a lack of capital within reach of our American power companies to develop additional facilities to meet any sound requirements of our people? A glance at their financial statements will perhaps answer that question. If a power project is sufficiently needed to justify the investment, is it not reasonable to suppose that the companies themselves would be only too glad to provide it? Should it be too costly for them, then, when that is discovered, it would be well for the Federal Government to consider a grant of aid to them, thus confining our appropriations to a point where it is just the amount necessary to make the development possible. This procedure, it seems to me, is much more prudent than for the Federal Government to further aggravate our inflated condition by pouring hundreds of millions into a gigantic power development to merely create further competition with private industry. Such an effort would also further aggravate inflation, further weaken the already weak dollar, increase the already too large national debt, and load still heavier the overburdened American taxpayer. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

Federal Bureau of Asylums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the whole subject of the commitment of deranged citizens to mental hospitals and their treatment therein is one of deep concern not only to the Federal Government but to the governments of the various States of the Union. The United States Government and State officials and members of the Federal Congress and of State legislatures for many years have been aroused over the many cases of illegal commitment of the alleged mentally deranged and the inhumane treatment accorded to them and other patients in some of the hospitals maintained for their care and treatment.

While the problem is usually one coming under State jurisdiction, the Federal Government also has certain responsibilities with reference to it. I feel that the investigation of this serious problem should not longer be delayed but should be put on the agenda for early action both by the Federal and State Governments.

I am today in receipt of a copy of a letter written by Samuel Friedman, director of the American Equity Association, addressed to the President of the United States, calling attention to the seriousness of the problem and including

a newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star under date of November 14, 1947, in which certain alleged inhumane treatment of mental patients is discussed. I have no personal knowledge as to the truth or falsity of the statements but do feel that the whole subject should not be lightly brushed aside but the Nation-wide problem should be given consideration with the view to make certain that these unfortunate citizens are not deprived of their legal rights nor subjected to treatment which is out of keeping with the high standards of a free democracy. The letter follows:

AMERICAN EQUITY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In Attorney General Clark's recent speech he is quoted as apologizing for "burdening his listeners with details (pertaining to lynchings) because he wanted to bring home the horrors that result when mob violence takes over, when lynch law replaces due process of law, and when irresponsible persons set themselves up as the judge, the jury, the prosecutor and the executioner."

We understand the Attorney General's activity was due to your ordering the investigation of mass killings. While we are in sympathy and accord with this humanitarian gesture may we call attention to the fact that deaths by lynching are few in comparison to the deaths from violence and neglect that occur in the mental hospitals of this Nation.

When attention of hospital heads and State Governors is called to mental hospital filth and brutality, many times before the exposé breaks into print, there is always a rubber-stamp denial that anything was or could be irregular or wrong. Illinois and California papers are carrying accounts of shocking conditions in mental hospitals; recently articles have appeared in Life, Reader's Digest, Cleveland Press, New York PM, and various others, which you may not have read; therefore we wish to draw your attention to an Associated Press article in which a spokesman for the panel not only speaks for Maryland but honestly voices conditions of all mental hospitals of this Nation. "We are Tearing Patients Down Before We Can Build Them Up." * * * "Said conditions result from a division between the board of mental hygiene and individual hospital boards."

Mr. President, may we again bring to your attention the need for a Federal Bureau of Asylums with well-trained inspectors who shall be free from medical or political censorship to go into these institutions, day or night, unannounced, and find out just why an atmosphere of the concentration camp is allowed to prevail, just why many sane individuals are railroaded (without due process of law) and held incommunicado—certainly a violation of the fourteenth amendment, forced to work without pay, a violation of the thirteenth amendment, many needlessly tortured and brutally murdered, a violation of the eighth amendment, and all under the sole control of an irresponsible group who have set themselves up as judge, jury, prosecutor, and executioner.

Trusting you will give the above your serious consideration, I am,

Respectfully yours,
SAMUEL FRIEDMAN,
Director.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately many of our hospitals for the mentally ill fail to provide for the rehabilitation of mentally deficient patients. The Congress, realizing the importance of rehabilitation passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress Public Law 487 which provides for the expansion of psychiatric facilities for the treatment of mental patients to further a program of rehabilitation. I include the following interesting and helpful discussion of this subject by M. R. Rittle:

REHABILITATION OF MENTALLY DEFICIENT PERSONS

(By Counselor M. R. Little, Waycross)

(Excerpts from paper read at district conference in Savannah)

Prior to 1943 the rehabilitation of mental cases was ignored almost completely. Public Law 113, the Barden-LaFollette Act, recognized the needs of this group and the economic feasibility of restoring such individuals to employability.

No claim should be made that all, or even most, mental cases can be rehabilitated with present knowledge, but cases can be selected who are both eligible and feasible for service.

Through the years there have been marked changes in people's attitude toward mental illness. No longer do we feel that a person is possessed of the devil or controlled by some evil influence. The mentally sick are not turned out and isolated, nor are they now punished for being "witches." Relatives of the mentally sick still are inclined to feel that occurrence of such an illness is a blot on the family record. They hesitate to mention such illnesses openly and attempt to keep such information from being public knowledge. They are fearful that they themselves may become mentally ill. * * *

There are no reliable statistics to show the complete incidence of mental diseases but it is known that slightly more than one-half of the 500,000 hospital beds in the United States are occupied by mentally ill patients.

Approximately 12 percent of men between the ages of 18 and 37 years were rejected by Selective Service for mental and personality disorders, not including mental deficiency or neurological defects.

Most physicians will admit that at least one-half of the patients whom they are treating are suffering partially or primarily from some emotional disorder.

Psychiatric cases must be selected carefully for rehabilitation in order to achieve the success necessary to justify the confidence of legislators and administrators who have made the present program possible and to avoid the discouragement which failure will bring to the rehabilitation worker and the client.

In other words, we look at the emotionally disabled individual as a human being not greatly different from other human beings, except for his disability. * * *

Every person has a threshold of tolerance for stress but if he faces stress beyond this point he tends to show disturbances of emotion.

The late Ernie Pyle expressed his feeling when he left the European theater of war in this way:

"I am leaving for only one reason—because I have just got to stop. 'I've had it,' as they say in the Army. I've have all I can take for a while. * * * I've been immersed in it too long. My spirit is wobbly and my mind confused. The hurt has finally become too great. All of a sudden it seemed to me that if I heard one more shot or saw one more dead man, I would go off my nut, and if I had to write one more column, I'd collapse."

* * * During his life every individual meets difficult situations producing anxiety, irritability, or frustration. * * *

Vocational rehabilitation aims at making the individual employable.

Psychiatrists as a rule are concerned with treating all phases of a patient's disability.

The law requires that hospital treatment be limited to 90 days. In most cases vocational training and placement may be carried out sometime during the course of psychiatric treatment, before treatment is actually terminated. * * *

The first question to be answered is: "Is there a vocational handicap?" Emotional disturbances are perhaps the most common cause for employment difficulties. * * *

The most difficult decision to reach in the consideration of feasibility is the question as to whether or not the condition will respond to treatment within a reasonable period of time. In general, the outlook for response to treatment is better in the psychoneuroses and the depression states. However, no hard-and-fast rules can be made.

Feasibility of treatment also will depend to a large degree on facilities available. Under the provisions of the Mental Health Act recently passed by Congress, and signed by the President, there will be a gradual expansion of psychiatric facilities throughout the country. However, it has been estimated that it will be 50 years before there are enough trained psychiatrists in the country.

A person who is feeble-minded cannot be made intelligent. However, many such individuals can be placed in more suitable work and assisted to a vocational adjustment in spite of the handicap.

The problem of placing workers in the right kinds of jobs is not new in industry. It is estimated that approximately 50 percent of workers in the United States are not well placed vocationally and are somewhat unhappy and inefficient on this account. Some veterans who have never found themselves vocationally, and who are still suffering from some minor nervous ailment when they seek employment, will be floundering and will have no clear idea as to what they want to do or for what they are fitted.

In addition to the medical history and report of psychiatrists, constructive advice will take into consideration, whenever possible, the person's mental age, his scores in aptitude tests, his personality, his high school or work history, and his social background and conflicts.

The attitude of the employer and the state of the individual himself must be considered. Many employers have shown reluctance in accepting employees who have been given psychiatric diagnosis. One employee inadequately placed will do more to increase the employer's resistance to accepting such cases than productively employed clients could do to decrease this resistance.

The vocational rehabilitation counselor must not feel that the rehabilitation process is complete when the client has been placed in employment. A careful follow-up must be made to see that the client is self-sufficient, independent, and able to travel "under his own steam."

Some workers such as the "Schizoid" type can work more effectively only in places where they are sheltered from distractions and particularly from contact with large groups of people.

The more intelligent clients are apt to do well in a research job or other position where they are dealing with facts and chemical or mechanical processes, rather than with people.

The slow learner or mentally deficient type should be placed in jobs that do not require much complex thinking. Some need a fixed routine and simple situations.

It has been said that there are more jobs for the feebleminded than there are feebleminded persons to fill them.

In actual practice it has been demonstrated that persons with mental ages as low as 5 or 6 years may be taught to do simple jobs with supervision.

Over 100 gainful occupations for men and women with IQ's between 25 and 75 have been listed. * * *

The Federal Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, in a recent report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, showed (cases) persons with mental or nervous diseases "closed as

employed" in such occupations as guards, watchmen, janitors, farmers; in skilled trades as jewelers, carpenters, electricians; semiskilled trades as in machine shop occupations, routemen, chauffeurs, auto repairmen, retail managers, clerical work, sales and kindred occupations, service occupations such as housekeepers, maids, waitresses, barbers; professional occupations such as accountants, authors, chemists, teachers; semiprofessional occupations such as aviators, dancers, photographers, radio operators; managerial occupations such as hotel and restaurants; unskilled occupations such as laborers and stevedores. • • •

The R. H. Macy Co., a department store which employs 13,000 persons, established a full clinic consisting of psychiatrist, psychologist, and psychiatric social worker. In a 4-year period these professional teams were able to adjust more than half of the "problem" employees studied while they continued to work.

Cost of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN C. SNYDER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the cost of government has a direct effect on the cost of living. This is a basic and fundamental fact, which the President and his advisors deliberately ignore.

The Congress has been asked to appropriate approximately $40,000,000,000 for current expenses during the next fiscal year. Debt reduction is not included in that figure.

The facts are that better than 20 percent of the cost of food and goods is represented by taxes. That is why it is so essential to reduce the cost of government and to reduce taxes.

One of the main reasons that living costs bear so heavily upon the workers of the country, is because of high taxes. High taxes are reflected in the cost of every loaf of bread, pound of meat, pair of shoes, or any other item one might mention. The most effective way to give relief from the high cost of living is to cut down taxes, so that the worker will have a larger take-home pay to meet the high prices of today. For the worker, this is just as effective as a pay increase, and it will be much better because it will bring lower prices through the stimulation of production.

I call attention to two editorials, one appearing in the Philippi Republican, Philippi, W. Va., under date of Tuesday, January 27, 1948, entitled "Why Not Look After the Cost of Government, as Well as the Cost of Food?" The other editorial appeared in the Preston County Journal, Kingwood, W. Va., on Thursday, January 29, 1948, entitled "The Cost to Each of Us."

The cost of government can be substantially reduced when all agencies of the Government give to the taxpayer a dollar's worth of service for a dollar of tax money.

[From the Philippi (W. Va.) Republican of January 27, 1948]

WHY NOT LOOK AFTER THE COST OF GOVERNMENT AS WELL AS THE COST OF FOOD?

President Truman is campaigning to bring down the cost of food, but up to the present time he has said nothing about bringing down the cost of Government. Note his $40,000,000,000 budget.

Since 1939, the cost of food has gone up 100 percent, while the cost of Government has gone up 377 percent. Government now costs more than food. Few people see that a greater danger to their jobs, savings, and living standards comes from Washington, D. C., than from the corner grocery, and why? It is because the Government is getting so far away from us that we don't understand it. We can understand a pound of butter, but most of us can't understand a Government bureau.

A former Governor of Texas said, "We are moving the county courthouse and the city hall to Washington." Of course, that is not literally true, but it is true in every sense that counts. We must bring Government back home where we can see and control it.

[From the Preston County (W. Va.) Journal and Preston Republican of January 29, 1948]

THE COST TO EACH OF US

President Truman's budget message seems to most of us to be dealing in astronomical figures. Forty billions is merely a row of figures. The fact that Government expenditures now are more than twice what they were under Roosevelt's New Deal before the war started is merely comparative.

To bring it nearer home one might realize that the 1949 budget as set by President Truman would cost every man, woman, and child in the country $270. To a family of four the cost is more than a thousand dollars. Add to this $270 the average cost of your State and local governments and you will begin to see just how much Government is costing you these days.

Since the New Deal took over back in 1933 the national debt has increased $235,000,000,000. This means that each family in the country now owes as its share of the national debt $6,000 more than it owed back in pre-New Deal days. Then add on any State, local, or personal debts and see where you stand.

Yet in spite of all the expenditure, President Truman has drafted new and expensive plans for repairing the state of the Union. After 15 years of New Deal rule we seem to be farther from the end of the rainbow than ever.

Put Teeth in Mine-Inspection Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, failure of Congress to expedite consideration of several proposals offered in both the House and the Senate to put teeth into the Federal mine-inspection law by providing enforcement features amounts to gambling with human lives. Because I feel that Congress should recognize its responsibility to grant protection to the thousands of men engaged in this hazardous, and most essential industry, I have urged the proper committee in the House of Representatives to take this legislation from its pigeon hole and report it to the House for consideration.

The seriousness of the present state of mine safety enforcement—or, I should say, lack of enforcement was forcibly brought to the attention of the Nation on March 25, 1947 in the terrible disaster at Centralia Coal Co., mine No. 5 when 111 miners lost their lives. The country was shocked not solely because of the tragedy but also at the political events which led up to it.

Congress was aroused. For awhile it appeared that the Centralia disaster would result in prompt action on legislation to give Federal authorities the power, not only to make recommendations in the interest of mine safety but to enforce such recommendations. A Federal mine inspection law had been passed by Congress back in 1940. In its original form this was the legislation needed to cope with the problem of mine safety. But somewhere along the line in its evolution from a bill to its final enactment into a law it lost its teeth. So we have in our statutes an inspection law that leaves the Federal Government with no power to enforce its recommendations.

I want Congress to restore the teeth which were pulled from the original bill. The series of mine disasters which have occurred since the passage of the inspection law should be evidence enough that Congress was in error when it neglected to provide enforcement power for the Bureau of Mines inspectors.

The question of States' rights was the chief argument used to pull the teeth from the law enacted by the Seventy-seventh Congress. Mining, however, transcends State boundaries. It is one of the most important of our national industries. Coal is a natural resource. Miners should be the special concern of our Nation.

State enforcement of mine safety regulations has been very lax. The Centralia disaster merely exposed a condition that had existed for many, many years. The miners were made the pawns of political chicanery. Illinois is not the only guilty State but the events of last year within its State mine inspection system were such that they attracted the attention of the entire Nation.

I have asked the chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor to act quickly on pending bills to restore teeth to the Federal mine-inspection law as the only answer to the problem of mine safety. Only in this way can we remove mine safety from the influence of corrupt political machines. Too many men have already given their lives while men high in State offices played politics with the inspection system.

At the time the Centralia miners were appealing to Governor Green and State officials to compel the mine owners to comply with safety recommendations which had been made by competent inspectors of the Federal Government and by a State inspector, Mr. Driscoll Scanlon, who was subsequently rewarded for his honesty in public service by being removed from his position, these State officials were more interested in a

mayoralty election in Chicago. A few weeks before the tragedy it had been publicly disclosed that the mine operators were being solicited for political contributions by representatives of Governor Green's State administration.

Four months after the Centralia disaster 27 miners were killed in an explosion at the Old Ben Mine at West Frankfort. Shortly after three miners were killed in an explosion at Orient Mine No. 2 at West Frankfort.

In every case, at Centralia, at Old Ben, and at Orient, the mine management had been warned in advance of danger. But they took chances a rigid Federal enforcement law would not permit them to take and in 5 months 141 Illinois coal miners were killed.

A United Press dispatch from Benton, Ill., dated February 2, 1948, indicates that in the face of such tragedies a lesson has not been learned. The story relates that an Illinois State mine inspector was under indictment on a charge of malfeasance and failure to take necessary precautions for the safety of miners at Old Ben Mine 11. The representatives of the State inspection system it is charged in the indictment, attempted to intimidate the representatives of the miners on safety and tried to prevent them from requiring from the mine operators the necessary safety measures.

It is long past time for Federal action. It is shameful the way the mine-inspection systems in many States have been used for political advantage and politics should be removed from enforcement of mine safety by Federal law. Mining is too hazardous an industry to permit delay in action on danger warnings. It is the responsibility of Congress to make absolutely certain that the safety regulations of the Bureau of Mines are observed to the letter.

Legislation for Widows and Dependents of War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE J. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD a resolution passed by Captain Lester S. Wass Post, No. 3, American Legion, Gloucester, Mass., and endorsed by the Disabled American Veterans, Chapter 74, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Post 1624, the AMVETS, and the newly formed National Guard Veterans' Organization, all of Gloucester, Mass., and urging the enactment of legislation benefitting widows and other dependents of war veterans:

Be it resolved in regular meeting assembled, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to amend all present laws and regulations pertaining to widows and other dependents of veterans of any war participated in by the armed forces of the United States to allow (authorize) the previously mentioned widows and other dependents to draw the existing pensions regardless of any other income which they may be receiving from any source whatsoever: Also be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to make all income received by any widows or other dependents of any veteran exempt from all taxation by the Federal Government.

The foregoing resolution was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

European Recovery Plan Weakened by Near East Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me by the House, I include in my remarks a news article appearing in the Wall Street Journal, under date of February 7, 1948. The article, written by W. C. Bryant, sets forth the critical situation in the Near East and its effect upon the European recovery plan with respect to its commitment to supply petroleum during the intervening years between this and 1952. The subject matter is one that should have the careful and serious consideration of every Member of Congress. The article to which I have referred reads as follows:

OIL FOR EUROPE—CONGRESSMEN SEE LACK OF PETROLEUM AS WEAK LINK IN MARSHALL PLAN—CAN'T COUNT ON VITAL MIDWEST SUPPLIES; ARABS ANNOYED ABOUT PALESTINE—16-NATION NEEDS TRIMMED

(By W. C. Bryant)

WASHINGTON.—In public hearings and in secret sessions on Capitol Hill the past week Congressmen have spotted the weakest link in the whole plan for rebuilding European industry. That link is petroleum.

No matter how well drawn the State Department's program for a Marshall plan, the machinery would be badly affected if oil supplies ran out. Secretary Marshall's aides are trying their best to soft-pedal the obstacles facing their $17,000,000,000 European recovery program, but they have been forced to the tacit admission that the plan as now proposed may be tripped by lack of enough oil.

Middle eastern oil is the key.

To carry out the 4-year Marshall plan, as now envisaged, will take 1,667,100,000 barrels of oil. The State Department has made that estimate after careful study. The 16 European nations to be assisted will draw heavily on this supply as they build up their industries with American help. The United States already is pressed for fuel oil and gasoline, so the plan calls for a big increase in oil production in the Arabian Middle East.

NO ASSURANCE FROM ARAB COUNTRIES

Now, the State Department admits it has no assurance that the Arab countries, incensed over the partition of Palestine, will supply all that precious oil regarded as necessary for the program.

The State Department has just released a special commodity report on the petroleum needed for ERP. The report begins significantly "petroleum is essential for the recovery of Europe." It proceeds to relate how the Department pared Europe's requests for petroleum—2,290,000,000 barrels—down to what it considers a feasible figure.

This supply of oil is predicated on expansion of oil production in the Middle East. "It is believed that the necessary quantities of crude oil and petroleum products to satisfy the requirements of the participating countries as estimated by the executive branch should in general be available provided that the projects for the expansion of the world's oil production and refining, especially in the Eastern Hemisphere are completed on schedule." If this Eastern Hemisphere supply is increased, the report says, the Middle East will contribute 60 percent of Europe's petroleum needs in 1951, compared with only 23 percent in 1946.

LEWIS DOUGLAS TESTIFIES

At a hearing yesterday, United States Ambassador to Britain Lewis Douglas told the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committe that, if this increased Arabian oil supply does not materialize, the whole Marshall plan will have to be revised. He differed sharply, in this respect, with Interior Secretary Krug, who suggested recently that, if Arabian oil is not forthcoming, the United States might make up the difference by rationing its own consumers.

What degree of confidence do you have in your ability to get more oil for Europe from the Middle East? the committee asked the State Department. The answer, not made public, was given at a secret meeting Thursday night. Present were State Department experts and Ambassador Ali Jawdat from oil-important Iraq.

Their answer, in brief, was that they can have no confidence at all, while Palestine is in turmoil.

The congressional committee wants the State Department to come up with some allocation plans for carrying out ERP without extra oil. This committee does not have any control over the drafting of Marshall plan legislation, which is being handled by the House and Senate Committees on Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations, respectively. But the question mark it has raised will not be missed when this bill gets on the House floor and when the appropriations committees study the plan for possible economies.

INCREASE USE OF OIL

The State Department claims to have cut Europe's oil requests pretty drastically, but the program still allows for increased use of Diesel engines in road and rail transportation, agriculture, shipping, and industry. It also considers requirements caused by conversion from coal to oil.

This raises eyebrows among the House committee members who have taken a hand in the Interior Department's program for voluntary conservation of oil in the United States. That program discourages United States homeowners from installing oil burners and encourages United States industry to change back from oil to coal.

Europe's growing dislike for coal is based on two factors—high costs and labor and machinery bottlenecks. British coal costs $10.50 per ton at the mine head, the Commerce Committee was told. Anyhow, the State Department's plan already calls for a big increase in coal production, as big as the experts think possible.

Europe's reconstructed industry is estimated to need energy in 1951 on the order of what could be produced by burning 699,700,000 metric tons of hard coal. That compares with 540,300,000 in 1947. Energy derived from petroleum would be boosted about 32 percent to help meet this goal.

LOOK TO MIDDLE EAST

To fill the increasing demand for oil, the European nations, under the Marshall plan as now drawn, would look to the Middle East, where British and American companies have

been laying pipe lines, building refineries, and dickering with local potentates for concessions at a furious pace since the war's end.

Assuming plans proceed on schedule, the European countries would get 335,000,000 barrels of petroleum products from the Middle East in 1951, compared with 124,000,000 barrels this year. The United States is scheduled to give Europe a little less oil in the first year of the Marshall plan than it did in 1947. The State Department anticipates first-year exports of 36,000,000 barrels. Exports from other parts of the Western Hemisphere, chiefly Venezuela, would also decrease as middle eastern supplies increased. This Latin-American oil would then become available to meet increased demands in the United States.

Even so, the House Commerce Committee staff figures the United States may be 1,000,000 barrels of oil per day short of meeting its own domestic requirements in 1952.

MODIFY PIPE-LINE PLANS

Already, some United States companies have modified their plans for constructing pipe lines and refineries in the Middle East as a result of trouble in Palestine. Construction on the Haifa end of the trans-Arabian pipe line has been stopped and construction crews have been shifted to the Persian Gulf end of this important project. Unless this important link between the Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean can be completed, the oil companies, already short of tankers, will need an extra 56 of these vessels to transport the desired supply of middle eastern oil.

In addition, Defense Secretary Forrestal has warned that pipe lines in the Persian Gulf area are insecure.

Middle East oil output was about 850,000 barrels a day at the end of last year. United States companies reportedly draw about 315,000 barrels daily of which the armed forces take about 60,000 to reduce their drain on scarce United States fuel oil and gasoline.

In December, Arabian-American Oil Co., organized by Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co., predicted that projects then undertaken by all companies in the area would double output within a few years. These projects include, besides the trans-Arabian pipe line, two pipe lines from Kirkuk in Iraq to Haifa in Palestine, new or bigger refineries in Iran, Iraq, and Kuwait, and extensive exploration and drilling.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a memorial to Abraham Lincoln written by the Honorable Homer Hoch, former Representative from Kansas. This world famous memorial was recently referred to me by the Honorable Phil E. Zimmerman, past national patriotic instructor of the United Spanish War Veterans:

LINCOLN

There is no new thing to be said of Lincoln. Nor is there a new thing to be said of the mountains or the sea or the stars. The mountains ever tower in solemn majesty above the drifting clouds, the mysterious sea ever sobs upon the shore, and the silent stars ever keep holy vigil above a tired world—but to mountain and sea and stars men turn forever in unwearied homage. And thus was Lincoln. For he was mountain in grandeur of soul, he was sea in deep under-voice of sadness and mystery, he was star in steadfast purity of purpose and of service. And he abides. With the name of Lincoln tears are called from old men's eyes, and with the name of Lincoln childhood learns to lisp a patriot's devotion. And there is no new thing to be said of him—what need, for such as he! But while the republic stands on whose altar he laid his great mind and heart, while liberty is cherished, while civic virtue and service and sacrifice are honored in the earth, the name of Lincoln will be spoken in undying love by the sons of men.

HOMER HOCH.

Statement of Rochester Inter-Faith Goodwill Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, never in all history have the forces of righteousness faced a greater challenge. Godless scoffers at spiritual values occupy the seats of the mighty in sister nations. In our own country their sympathizers and agents, in idolatrous worship of unrefined materialism, seek to subvert our institutions and inoculate our people, particularly our youth, with their poisonous serum. On top of that, greed, want, racial intolerance, hatred, oppression assail us on every side. These elements are our true enemies. Only by unity of Catholic priest, Protestant minister, and Jewish rabbi, together with all those of every denomination who make their common supplication on bended knee, can the forces of right and justice prevail. Only under God, can this free Nation prosper, indeed survive.

With intense civic pride, therefore, which my colleagues may be kind enough to forgive, I set forth below, under leave to extend my remarks, the text of a recent statement issued by the Rochester Inter-Faith Goodwill Committee formed in 1934, in the city which I have the honor to represent, consisting of prominent Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish members of the clergy and laity.

Stressing the basic beliefs, principles, and ethics which unite, rather than doctrines or dogma which divide, our citizens of various faiths, this committee has performed a service of inestimable value.

TEXT OF PLEA BY INTER-FAITH GOODWILL UNIT

(Following is the text of the statement issued yesterday by the Rochester Inter-Faith Goodwill Committee:)

The Rochester Inter-Faith Goodwill Committee was formed in order to strengthen the bonds of community life. To meet the national and international problems before us, those bonds must now be made stronger than ever. As a contribution to this end the committee invites the attention of the community to its statement of purpose adopted February 23, 1934:

"The Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish communions in this city, through official representatives, have organized a permanent body known as the Inter-Faith Goodwill Committee to express their sense of comradeship and to consider such issues as may arise which are of common concern.

"The confusion of the time offers to the members of these communions an opportunity to achieve a deeper understanding and appreciation of one another. It also challenges them to emphasize in their moral and religious outlook the great common principles which they believe to be the basis of our civilization.

"The members of these communions, for instance, share the belief in the spiritual nature of man and in man's supreme responsibility to God. They are also united in the desire to maintain the rights of men, civil and religious, which are the foundation pillars of the Republic, and which are guaranteed to our citizens by the Constitution.

"The purpose of the Inter-Faith Goodwill Committee will be to express this belief and desire, shared alike by Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, and to engage in such activities as will remove prejudice and bigotry and make for an increasing fellowship in the service of the common good."

CHARTER REAFFIRMED

At this time the undersigned members of the Inter-Faith Committee would reaffirm the charter which has been the guide for its activities during the last 14 years. We believe that the great majority of the citizens of Rochester stand with us on these fundamental principles. In our meetings we have been enabled to secure a better understanding of the ideals of our people, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish. We have directed questions at each other and have secured accurate and timely declarations of the beliefs and practices of each group. In these interchanges we have recognized always the loyalty of each group to our American Constitution, to our American principles of civil and religious liberty, and to our American doctrine of equality for all before the law.

We welcome the public discussion of every question of common concern. We recognize that there are times when the public discussion of religious as well as political differences may be a necessity if our democracy is to function in a healthy way. We believe, however, that such discussion should be carried on without impugning the loyalty of the great body of our people, Catholic, Protestant and Jewish, to the foundation principles of the Republic. Unless we recognize this common loyalty, fraternal relations become difficult and the mutual confidence essential to our working together in community enterprise becomes imperiled.

CONFIDENCE NECESSARY

Such mutual confidence is more than ever necessary in these times when we face tasks upon the successful accomplishment of which the fate of civilization itself depends. We still have to make peace and avert another world war. We have to organize our economy to provide for the needs of all without sacrificing our liberties to the tyranny of a police state. We have to find types of education that will make man, as a spiritual being, master of the science and technology that, uncontrolled, will destroy him. We have to fight racial discrimination and a deadening secularism that denies the religious basis of life.

These are the primary tasks that confront us. They are the common responsibility of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. And the men and women who will contribute most to their achievement will come from all the communions.

The differences in outlook that separate us are important. It is essential that we acknowledge and study them. But it would be tragic if in considering these differences we should drift into attitudes of hopeless antagonism toward one another. The religious

and racial conflicts of the old world with their bitter consequences warn us against this danger. Along with the emphasis on differences, let there be also a common quest for a deeper understanding of the spiritual objectives of these great religious groups and their ways of life. From such understanding may come a new spiritual climate in which the work of all the communions may be more fruitful.

LOCAL HERITAGE

Rochester has a heritage of good will that has characterized the relations of the members of the various communions with one another since the founding of the city. We are proud of that heritage. We are concerned that it be perpetuated.

Inspired by great common convictions and the vision of great common tasks, we pledge our continued effort to the achievement of civic unity. We count upon the cooperation of the members of all our communions, for we believe they are prompted both by patriotism and religious faith to defend our precious American tradition of human freedom.

Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein; Rev. Hugh Chamberlin Burr, D. D.; James P. B. Duffy; Rev. Patrick Flynn; Harry D. Goldman; Joseph Goldstein; Rt. Rev. Msgr. William M. Hart; Very Rev. Msgr. Gerald C. Lambert; William A. Lang; Elmer Louis; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward M. Lyons; Martin J. Moll; William MacFarlane; Rev. Harold E. Nicely, D. D.; Rev. Justin Wroe Nixon, D. D.; William T. Nolan; Rabbi Stuart Rosenberg; E. Reed Shutt; Joseph E. Silvertein; William H. Stackel; Rabbi Leon Stitskin; Rev. Fred M. Winnie.

Slovakia's Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter from Mr. John C. Sedlacek, a prominent citizen of East St. Louis, Ill., who serves as vice president of Assembly 501, National Slovak Society. I found Mr. Sedlacek's letter of great interest and I insert it in the RECORD because I believe many other Members of Congress will be interested in Mr. Sedlacek's treatment of a subject which is of world-wide interest.

Mr. Sedlacek's letter follows:

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In the past decade, the history of Slovakia has become known to millions of our fellow citizens. Of course, their knowledge of the land of the Slovaks is indeed meager, but at least they learned from the newspaper headlines of the spring of 1939 that the Slovaks, 3,000,000 in number, lived in the heart of Europe on the Danube; that they have inhabited this area as their homeland for 15 centuries, that they had their own kingdom in the ninth century, and at last, after more than a thousand years of foreign rule, these long-suffering people, who had survived as a national group, had proclaimed their independence and had assumed their rightful place in the family of European nations.

In World War I the Slovaks fought side by side with their Czech cousins and helped to break up the domination of the Austro-Magyar dynasty after a thousand years' rule. But their fight for national freedom was unfortunately misused by the Czechs who used the Slovaks for their own purposes to establish a hybrid Czechoslovak undemocratic state. The plot to enslave the Slovaks under Czech hegemony was foiled, however, by the great Andrew Hlinka, who led his People's Party in Slovakia to victory over the evil designs of the Czechoslovak planners in Prague.

Out of the chaos that preceded the outbreak of World War II, the Slovaks emerged as a free nation by formally proclaiming their national independence, and by immediately establishing the Slovak Republic on March 14, 1939, in Bratislava. The newly created Slovak state was truly in accord with the will of the overwhelming majority of the people; and its institutions, the framework of its national constitution, the spirit and organization of its new government followed democratic lines. Moreover, its constitutions was based on Christian and democratic principles as inspired by the Papal encyclicals and the American Constitution. The governing officials of the new republic, who were elected in a free, nation-wide democratic election prior to World War II, served Slovakia efficiently, humanely, and justly during the entire war.

Let's look at the Slovak record during World War II. The Slovak Republic, which was established by the unanimous assent of its national parliament on March 14, 1939, in Bratislava, Slovakia, compiled the following historic and amazing list of achievements:

1. England, France, Russia, Germany, Spain, Italy, all the countries of Europe, recognized the Slovak state and established diplomatic relations with its Government before World War II.

2. The Slovak Republic, even when unjustly dispossessed of its southern fertile lands by Magyar aggression and annexation (condoned by the German Reich's Von Ribbentrop in Vienna), successfully managed to build a sound national economy.

3. The Slovak people enjoyed the greatest era of prosperity in their 1,500-year-old history during the short but glorious 6 years of Monsignor Tiso's regime (1939–45).

4. Slovakian railroads and highways reached a new high in development during the democratic regime of President Tiso.

5. The number of books, magazines, and periodicals during the existence of the Slovak Republic exceeded by far the total edited in the entire 20-year period of the first Czechoslovak regime.

6. Not one person was sentenced to death by Tiso's government in its 6 years of rule. This fact testifies more eloquently than any other accomplishment to what extent the Slovak nation and its government cooperated in the spirit of Monsignor Tiso's motto: "True to ourselves—let us march forward together."

7. Nazi-pursued Polish and Jewish refugees found safe refuge and sanctuary in the Slovak Republic. Altogether more than 100,000 lives were saved through the intervention of the Slovak Government, and well-known Slovak Communists were spared the death penalty even though Slovakia was strongly anti-Communistic and was waging war against Soviet Russia. What a contrast to the bloody record compiled by the present Soviet-dominated regime in Slovakia in the course of 2 years since the Russian liberation.

8. The Slovak Revolt (August 1944–October 1944) engineered by Soviet parachutists and a few disloyal Slovak Communists, far from being a demonstration of discontent of the mass of the Slovak people, turned out to be a fiasco when it was discovered that the rumor of Tiso's arrest was false. It had been rumored that the Nazis had taken the Slovak president into custody, and for that reason a few thousand Slovak peasants in the north country joined the partisans.

9. President Tiso frequently walked the streets of Bratislava unattended and unprotected. This shows that the Slovak president was loved by the populace. Few rulers can afford this personal luxury.

10. Father Tiso's execution by the Czech Communist regime on April 19, 1947, was mourned by the whole Slovak nation. His death by hanging was a crime against the Slovak people and against humanity.

11. The Slovak Republic did not declare war against the United States of America.

12. Despite communistic pressure and the menace of Soviet power, the Slovaks voted a 3-to-1 democratic majority in the elections of May 1946.

What of the future of Slovakia? At the present moment Gottwald, Stalin's personal chief in Czechoslovakia, has assumed control of the government in Bratislava after dismissing the representatives of the Slovak Democratic Party in the Slovak capital. This further increases the danger of Soviet domination of Central Europe, thanks to the machinations of Benes and Masaryk, who have been collaborating closely with the Soviet policies of the Kremlin, and who share the guilt with their Communist chief, Stalin, for the death of hundreds of Slovak patriots and the imprisonment of thousands of innocent Slovaks. Yet in spite of these tragic developments in Slovakia, the press of America consistently adheres to the view that the Catholic-minded Slovak state, with its government and people, was a Nazi-inspired satellite state of Germany, while the second Czechoslovak republic of Benes and company, is hailed as an island of democracy in the Soviet sea of Central Europe. But even this view is rapidly changing every day because of the steady retreat of the Czech collaborators with Stalin toward Moscow. At long last the Prague politicians have been unmasked, and their champions in America very shamefacedly have had to admit that Benes and Masaryk have let them down in the crisis. Reluctantly they have come to the conclusion, accepted in regard to Hitler, that you simply cannot do business with dictators except on their own terms. And those terms have been tyranny, persecution, violence, revolution, and death. So far we have acted as if we subscribe to these terms, and thousands have had to pay with their lives for our shortsightedness. There is coming a day of reckoning; and America, the world's most powerful democracy, must not be caught asleep. Already the front lines of democracy on the Danube are shattered. We must be ready to meet the challenge to our freedom at our very door.

As you had stated in your letters of last year, your memorial address before your colleagues in the House in honor of Monsignor Joseph Tiso and the Slovak republic. It could be given on their national independence day, March 14, which also will be their ninth anniversary. The Slovak republic was established in Bratislava in 1939, or on the day that Father Tiso's execution was carried out by the Czech-Communist regime 1 year ago on April 19.

It is with much pleasure that I send you my hearty congratulations and good wishes for a successful nomination as Congressman of the Twenty-fifth District in the Democratic primary election held on the 13th day of April. Your activities and the progress of the district will be watched with interest all over the State and country.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. SEDLACEK,
Vice President, National Slovak Society, Assembly 501.

Employment of Navajos Off the Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker. the Congress passed, in the recent special session, an emergency measure for the relief and rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians in my State of Arizona and in the State of New Mexico. In the closing hours of the special session $600,000 was appropriated for relief this winter and for the start of an off-reservation employment program. I anticipate that estimates covering the remainder of the $2,000,000 authorized for the emergency program will be received shortly by the Congress.

In addition, legislation and appropriations for the long-range rehabilitation program that is essential are being considered actively by the Public Lands Committee Indian Affairs Subcommittee in the House, and by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on Indians Affairs in the Senate, as well as by the Indian Bureau and the Department of the Interior. I hope that we can proceed unremittingly to the enactment of a suitable long-range rehabilitation program, which is even more important than the action already taken for them.

I believe that the Congress and the country should be informed of the progress that has been made on one phase of the emergency program—the off-reservation employment. I have a preliminary report from Assistant Secretary William E. Warne, of the Interior Department, in the form of a letter, which I include as a part of my remarks. It follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1948.

Hon. JOHN R. MURDOCK,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MURDOCK: Gratifying reports have been received of the conference held January 30 in Phoenix at the Westward Ho Hotel regarding off-reservation labor opportunities for Navajo and Hopi Indians. District Director William H. Zeh, who conducted the conference, says:

"The attendance far exceeded our expectations. It was a representative group. * * * A keen interest was maintained throughout the meeting which was participated in by the Indians, present and prospective employers of Indian labor in industry and in agriculture, religious groups, and others interested in the welfare of Indians. It was significant that throughout the entire meeting this interest was both specific and practical. * * *

"The facts developed during this meeting are briefly summarized as follows:

"1. The Navajo Indian under certain conditions is willing to leave his reservation to seek off-reservation employment.

"2. The Navajo has been found to be a desirable employee.

"3. Methods need to be developed to stabilize the Navajo labor supply.

"4. The primary need was to develop stable communities off the reservation in areas where work will be available. The undesirable type of temporary migratory labor, with its attendant social problems, should be avoided.

"5. The pioneering work carried on by vegetable growers in the Salt River Valley and others in connection with the hiring of Navajo labor definitely indicates that a stable Indian labor supply can be developed with the right treatment, training in the work to be done, and by the development of satisfactory housing as well as school facilities.

"6. Problems created by language, tribal customs, etc., can be solved by a sympathetic understanding and education of both the Indian employee and the white employer.

"7. There is ample evidence to show that there are real possibilities for the development of skilled labor among the Navajos. A positive training program should be instigated, in which the Veterans' Bureau can play a major part.

"8. There are numerous agencies, both in the Government and State, as well as among private concerns, who are very interested in developing off-reservation employment of Navajos and are willing and able to help the Indian Service."

I know that you will be glad to know that this phase of our Navajo program has been well started. There will be no let-up in our attention to the details that need to be worked out. The Indian office, through the district office at Phoenix and through Mr. James M. Stewart, superintendent of the Navajo agency at Window Rock, is bending every effort to make this a continuing and successful program.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM E. WARNE,
Assistant Secretary.

A Word About Meat; No Rationing, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Joseph's News-Press:

A WORD ABOUT MEAT; NO RATIONING, PLEASE

About 17,000,000 people—or at least their spokesmen—this week told Congress that meat should be rationed, and one lobbyist said FLANDERS' bill wasn't strong enough. Well, a Senate banking subcommittee yesterday voted 3 to 2 against the bill. But there may be other attempts at setting up meat rationing machinery under the theory that we are facing a serious meat shortage.

From the heights at Washington the meat situation looks bad; consumers agree that the price of red meat is too high, and fear that if and when the shortage comes, the price will go still higher. Now, let's look at the figures on which this anticipated shortage is based.

On January 1 there were 12 percent fewer cattle on feed than a year ago. The drop in sheep and lambs, over the same period, was 19 percent. There are no comparable figures for hogs, but here is an indication: Last fall's pig crop was 3 percent higher than a year ago, but the anticipated 1948 spring pig crop will be 11 percent smaller, which would result in a 9 percent drop in marketing of spring pigs next fall. That'a the story of what is ahead as far as the 1948 meat supply is concerned. It's not a pretty picture, but it's not famine, either. You are just going to eat about 5 percent less meat this year.

Now about this price business. Most folks don't mean price control when they say price control; they mean price reduction, the fixing of a ceiling at a lower price in order that their dollars will buy more meat. Well, let's have a look at meat profits. Accurate figures are available on a steer that was purchased by a feeder January 1, 1947, and sold at $1 a pound for steaks last September.

This steer, weighing 600 pounds, costs the feeder $22 a hundred, making the feeder's initial investment $132. If he had corn on hand at the time he bought the steer, it had cost him $1.50 a bushel. In 8 months' feeding the steer was fed 50 bushels of corn, worth $75, $20 worth of supplement, and $10 worth of hay. When the steer was sent to market, the trucking charges were $3.50, yardage, 60 cents, and the commission company that sold him charged 80 cents for its service.

With the cost of the feeder animal, the feed, and marketing makes the feeder's investment $241.90. It is difficult to determine labor costs in farm operations, but observers say that labor, death loss, interest on investment, and incidental expenses incurred in feeding a steer would run about $35. That makes his investment $276.90.

The steer, weighing 1,000 pounds after 8 months of feeding, sold for $32.50 a hundred on the market, so the feeder received $325 for the animal. His profit was $48.10. (If he had fed the steer through the last 8 months he would have paid $3 to $4 more a hundred for the 600-pound animal, and would have fed it $2.75 corn.)

So the packer bought the 1,000-pound steer for $325. Labor and other plant expense in slaughtering the animal were $11.31. (We have the exact plant costs on packer operations.) But the by-products from the steer, including hide and glands, were worth $28.42 last August 27, so the steer actually cost the packer $307.89. The steer dressed out 625 pounds of marketable meat, an excellent dressing average, so the meat that the packer had to sell had cost him $49.50 a hundred. The meat weight shrunk 4 pounds in shipping it to New York, and the shipping expense was $14.64. (We are sending this meat to New York, for the industrial Northeast eats a big share of the Nation's meat.) Laid down in New York the meat had cost the packer $51.90 a hundred.

The meat from this steer sold to a large meat market for $52 a hundred. (That was the actual price for that grade of meat on September 10, last year.) The packer made 10 cents a hundred on the steer he slaughtered. If this profit seems small, it might be interesting to know that last year Swift & Co. made only a quarter a cent a pound on all the meat it handled.

Now the meat dealer had the carcass; he lost 93 pounds in unsalable bone, sinew, and shrinkage during cutting, bringing the cost to $60.50 a hundred, before labor. The work of cutting up the carcass sent the dealer's cost to 73 cents a pound. Since some cuts of beef sold for much less than 73 cents a pound last September, even in New York, the better steaks from this steer retailed for $1 a pound.

Now let's bring this price thing up to date. The feeder, paying $25 a hundred for the 600-pound steer, and $2.75 a bushel for the corn, is shaving his profit pretty close, for he's still getting about $32.50 a hundred for his 1,000-pound finished steer. The trucker, the stockyards company, and the commission firm are still getting about what they received from handling last year's steer. The live animal is costing the packer about the same, and the retailer is getting about the same for the steaks and roasts and boiling meat. Labor in all of these categories costs a little more than it did last year.

Now, if the cost of the meat you buy is going to be pushed back and made stationary, where is the price reduction going to be put in effect? On the feeder, the packer, or the retailer? And if all of them are included in the cut, will they be given assurance that labor and other costs they have in handling the product will not show further increases?

One thing is certain. Whenever meat prices are rolled back somebody along the line between the producer of the feeder steer and the consumer is going to get hurt. The price fluctuations on the day that the rollback comes will determine which agency will get the blow.

Petroleum and the European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, an essential part of the European recovery program is a greatly expanded petroleum supply and the steel to make it possible. What we will be able to do in helping Europe's recovery largely depends on conditions in the Middle East. It also depends on what we do in supplying steel for constructing additional facilities required to develop Middle East oil production.

For some time the committee has been examining intensively into the current fuel situation, especially regarding petroleum. We have been considering present and future domestic and world petroleum demand and supply in an effort to determine just where we are and where we may be going in this highly significant area. Many witnesses already have been heard and preliminary and progress reports have been issued.

We have just concluded 2 days of testimony on petroleum requirements of the European recovery program and on the situation in the Middle East, given by Lewis Douglas, Ambassador to Great Britain; George Wadsworth, Ambassador to Iraq; Loy Henderson, Director, Office of Near East and African Affairs; and other State Department officials.

It is apparent that petroleum is one of the key commodities in the European recovery program. It has been presumed the petroleum largely could be supplied from expansion of Middle East fields. It is not at all clear, however, that very great reliance on this source justifiably can be placed in view of political unrest in these areas.

Even were there complete confidence that this source were available and could be developed, the proposed increased use of petroleum products in reviving the European economy depends upon tremendous immediate expansion in refinery and transportation facilities to process and carry such oil. Steel is required for wells, for refineries, for tankers, for pipe lines, and even for oil burning and consuming equipment. We do not yet know how far we can supply this, nor the effect on our own economy.

On January 26, this committee issued a preliminary report covering certain specific aspects of the domestic and world fuel situation. The committee then stated that, until a thorough review had been undertaken, it appeared most unwise to make—and the committee specifically recommended the deferment of making—any foreign commitment covering the supply of petroleum and petroleum products.

From our survey these past few days we are not yet in position to know what can be done.

Last summer the committee, in the exercise of its continual watch over the petroleum situation, was assured by both industry and Government representatives that there was no question about there being adequate basic supplies of oil. By December it was evident to us that this assurance was incorrect. By last week, Government witnesses testified that neither they nor industry any longer took the position that available supplies now, or even for the next few years, would be forthcoming in volume adequate to meet the tremendously increasing domestic demand.

While it appears that the State Department has made some revision downward in Europe's requirements as estimated last summer in Paris by the participating nations, it is far from clear whether the Department's estimates have given effect to the serious situation just now being developed as confronting us. Indeed, such comparisons as can be made between the program as advanced at the time of the special session last fall and as presented this week to the committee, indicate only a minor downward change of some 5 percent. This seems unrealistic in view of current and anticipated conditions.

The State Department should carefully and energetically review its estimates of Europe's petroleum requirements. It further should review the feasibility of the entire recovery program in the light of present precarious supplies and the possibility of developing alternate energy from other sources. This should be done before the Congress is asked to vote on the recovery program, not after.

The evidence presented to the committee indicates that whereas the world in 1946 used just under 8,000,000 barrels of petroleum a day, in 1951 it is expected to consume well over 10,000,000 barrels a day. The United States consumes over two-thirds of the world's production, and is estimated last year to have used some 1,970,000,000 barrels. By 1951 United States demand is estimated to increase nearly 1,000,000 barrels a day. The additional 2,000,000 barrels a day to meet this United States increased demand and the increased demand of the rest of the world must come from both hemispheres.

European requirements, as presented to us, contemplate an increase in consumption of the participating nations from 255,000,000 barrels in 1946 to 442,000,000 barrels in fiscal 1952. Whereas the Western Hemisphere in 1946 supplied 75.4 percent and the Middle East supplied 24.6 percent of Europe's needs, the executive-branch program assumes that by 1951 these proportions can be practically reversed. This means of the 408,000,000 barrels demanded that year, the Western Hemisphere will need to supply only 18 percent, and the Middle East will supply the remaining 82 percent or 335,000,000 barrels. To do this, production in the Middle East must more than double its present 850,000 barrels a day.

This means that this country can meet its increasing needs, and Europe be supplied in larger quantities, only if Europe is primarily supplied from expanded production in the Middle East.

Reliance on the Middle East as a source of supply is entirely problematical. Whether the supply can be developed at the rates and times proposed to meet these Europan requirements already seems doubtful. The committee has been informed of changes in facilities construction already occasioned by difficulties over the partition of Palestine. Europe's proposed reliance on oil as source of fuel and energy for its commendable but ambitious program to reinvigorate its industry, calls for the closest scrutiny.

While the State Department has detailed its estimates of Europe's requirements for petroleum, however, well founded they may be, so far we have not been apprised of what we are expected to furnish in the way of steel and equipment, other than a suggestion that they are large in amount. Nor do we know when and where these are wanted, nor what will be their impact on our own domestic needs.

Regardless of the fact that oil can be made available from the Middle East source, the stepped-up European requirements necessitate substantial refinery expansion. This it will take time to accomplish. In the meantime, it is stated, Europe's requirements would have to be satisfied in appreciable measure by imports of finished products from the Western Hemisphere, as well as from the Middle East.

This is significant, for 67 percent of the stated 1949–52 requirements are in our now critical categories of kerosene, gas, Diesel, and fuel oils. Although it is stated that the executive branch estimates of requirements take into account the particularly tight situation in heavy oils, it is proposed that the apparent shortage in residual fuel oil, may be reduced somewhat by increase in refinery yield at the expense of lighter fuel products. This procedure is exactly opposite to the trend today in our own operations, for greater amounts of gasoline and home-heating fuel oils have been obtained at the expense of cracking into the industrially used residual fuel oils.

The executive-branch report on the program's requirements states that the increase in European demand for kerosene and lubricating oil is moderate, but gas and Diesel oil, and especially fuel-oil, consumption show a large expansion, resulting in part from the greatly increased use of Diesel engines in road and railroad transportation, agriculture, shipping, and industry, but mainly caused by the conversion from coal to oil in industry and shipping between 1945 and 1947.

It is far from apparent the extent to which the State Department has screened the uses of not only all petroleum products but particularly of these oils; nor how far there are imposed the same restrictions on use of, or conversions to, oil for these industrial and other purposes equal to the restrictions assumed will apply on use of gasoline for motor fuel. This is of especial moment in view of the current demands being made here at home, not only for cessation of conversions but even for reconversion back to coal in uses of this character.

Some testimony has been offered to the effect that the European conversion to oil is the result of the high price of coal, now reaching $10.50 a ton at pit mouth; and that without reduction in costs in industries which are large users of power, the European countries cannot produce goods at costs low enough to compete in world trade. To the extent this is true, it would appear the remedy may well lie in effectuating a change in mining costs of an energy source locally available in these countries, rather than through imports of energy fuel oils from here.

The increased Middle East production and European use further represents substantial expansion of transportation facilities, including ocean tankers and initiation of and completion of several large pipe-line projects to the Mediterranean. Quite apart from political considerations regarding the completion of these pipe lines, is the matter of steel involved. Pipe has been and continues to be in short supply here at home for imperative drilling of wells, for transportation of petroleum, and for transportation of natural gas and the alleviation of an exceedingly critical situation.

Alternatives to pipe line construction in the Middle East involve an even larger tanker construction program than any yet contemplated. It has been stated that in the case of one line of 300,000-barrel capacity the alternative is 59 tankers which of themselves would require 357,000 tons of steel. So far no specific estimate of the steel requirements from this country for transportation expansion to meet Europe's increased oil requirements has been forthcoming.

The committee and the Congress, before voting on the Marshall plan, should be better informed of just what is involved in the petroleum aspect of this recovery program, comprising the amount and source of oil requirements, the uses to which the oil products are to be put, the steel involved in expanding collateral facilities, and the alternatives to reliance hitherto placed on the Middle East as a source of supply. Therefore, I have requested the State Department to furnish a statement covering the following:

First. Petroleum requirements under the European recovery program:

(a) Total requirements estimated by CEEC and by State Department.

(b) Such requirements by types of products by years, by countries; comparison with current and prewar years.

(c) Such requirements by source of supply—that is, United States domestic, United States foreign, other foreign—by chief supply areas, by years; comparison with current and prewar years.

(d) Such supply itemized not only as to crude source but area of refining, and amounts from these areas.

(e) Total requirements under the plan for investment in crude production, refining, transportation, and distribution facilities; itemized to show crude or refinery capacities involved, dollars or other source of investment, areas and ownership of expansion, and steel or other critical material involved, together with source of such material, with amounts.

(f) Uses by participating countries of products involved; that is, maintenance of existing demand, increased demand, conversion from other energy sources.

(g) Investment required to meet any expansion in oil-burning facilities, especially as it relates to supply from the United States, under the plan, of such equipment, together with indication of amount of such equipment, with dates.

Second. Contemplated supplying such requirements from the Middle East:

(a) Full discussion of the "degree of confidence which we justifiably may have in imports and foreign reserves, under changing political situations, especially in view of the reliance which hitherto has been placed on greatly expanded production in the Middle East"—committee report, January 26, 1948, page 17.

(b) Full discussion of whether it is proposed to meet all or any portion of the requirements from the United States which are now contemplated will come from the Middle East in the event such Middle East supply is not forthcoming in the estimated amounts; together with discussion of the consideration which may have been given, in such circumstance, to the effect upon the meeting of the domestic United States growing demand.

(c) Alternative plans for meeting European energy and fuel requirements in the event it is not proposed to meet any deficiencies as outlined in (b); that is, additional European coal production, United States exports of coal, additional European hydroelectric power; and in the latter event, the amount and kinds of equipment planned on export from the United States.

(d) The basis upon which the plan's contemplated development of Middle East production is predicated, that is, the determination regarding amount of expansion by United States companies and by foreign companies, whether on some historical pattern or otherwise, and the effect upon competitive positions in this area of United States and foreign companies.

Oleo and Butter Held Equal in Nutrition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLLA C. McMILLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of February 7, 1948:

OLEO, BUTTER HELD EQUAL IN NUTRITION—2-YEAR ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY SURVEY REPORTS NO DIFFERENCE IN EFFECTS ON HEALTH, GROWTH

CHICAGO, February 6.—Butter and fortified margarine have equal nutritional value, according to a survey reported in the Journal of the American Medical Association today.

The survey was made over a 2-year period by Dr. Anton J. Carlson, Dr. Harry Leichenger, and Dr. George Eisenberg of the University of Illinois College of Medicine.

The doctors studied two groups of children, one of which ate butter and the other standard brands of margarine, and concluded that there was no apparent nutritional difference when the source of supplementary table fat was vegetable (margarine) rather than animal (butter).

The margarine group consisted of 160 children, from 3 to 16 years of age, who were orphans or children from broken homes. They received margarine on bread, in vegetables, in pastry and fried foods.

The butter group included 107 children of about the same age group in another institution.

"The diet in each institution was carefully supervised by trained dietitians and so regulated that 25 to 30 percent of the total calories were supplied by fat," the experimenters said. "The margarine constituted approximately 65 to 70 percent of the total fat calories."

All of the children in both groups were weighed and measured each month under medical supervision. Routine red blood cell counts and hemoglobin determinations were made on each child after the study was started and again one year later.

"Growth of the group fed margarine, as determined by increases in height and weight, was comparable to that of the children fed butter and to standard height and weight values for the same age group," the doctors reported.

They added, moreover, that no increase in the amount of illness was noted in the margarine group and blood studies showed no significant difference between the two groups.

"The children in the margarine group experienced a high degree of good health during the study, and in comparing their health to that of the butter group it appears to have been much higher," the investigators said.

The doctors emphasized, however, that they were not making claims that the margarine group was healthier because their diet contained margarine, asserting that "other variables are more likely to account for their better health."

Radio Broadcast by Jack Beall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall over the American Broadcasting Co., January 24, 1948:

Good evening. This week, there has been a startling and important disclosure by the State Department, of the actual secret documents of Nazi-Communist collaboration leading up to the Second World War.

As you'll recall from reading the accounts in the newspapers and listening to your radio

this week, the State Department has released official documents of the Hitler government, which were captured and which had never expected to see the light of day. They lay bare in clinical detail the development of a Fascist-Communist working arrangement to divide and dominate the world between them; to define the spheres of influence of each and to take the concerted steps which started the most disastrous war the world has ever known. This captured correspondence shows definitely that they were seeking to negotiate a settlement by which the Soviet Union would come in, openly on the side of the Rome-Berlin-Tokio axis and be a full partner of Hitler in the war. It records the overgreediness of Stalin and Molotov—their asking too high a price of Hitler—a proceeding which led to a cooling off in their relations and eventually the attack of Hitler on Russia, in June of 1941.

Without the Stalin-Hitler pact, there could have been no war, because Hitler would not have dared to go to war with Poland, with a possibility that England and France would come to the aid of their ally. Germany's eastern flank had to be made secure by a treaty.

One of the important points that the disclosure clears up very plainly is the excuse which the Communists all make for the hideous betrayal of the rest of the world. They claim that Stalin was merely seeking to gain time, to build up his own strength against the attack that he knew was inevitably coming from Hitler Germany. Well, the documents show that not only was Stalin supplying Hitler with large amounts of war materials, but that he was actually straining Russia's own economy and reducing its own war potential to do it. On the other hand, aid from Germany was slight and lagged far behind Hitler's promises. But Stalin kept right on sending material to Hitler's war machine, at the cost of his own. One of the documents is a note from the German Government thanking Stalin for his valuable assistance.

All of this certainly doesn't look like a man gaining time to build up his own resources, against a future German attack, but more like a man intent on collaboration for the gains that would accrue to Soviet Russia from that collaboration. The first fruits thereof were the Soviet seizure of the Baltic States and the division of Poland between the Soviet Union and the German Reich.

In passing, I would like to point out that the first overtures for the Stalin-Hitler pact came—not from Hitler—but from Stalin. The date was April 17, 1939. That shows the perfidy of a system which claimed to be the ruthless enemy of nazism and fascism. When it found it to its material advantage, for the sake of the spoils of war, in the hope of looting the rest of the world—it embraced the Nazi system, freely, and took the first step toward collaboration.

All of this material was sought to be placed in the records at the Nuremburg trial, by Goering, Von Ribbentrop, and other Nazis, but it was excluded on the insistence of the Russians. Goering and Von Ribbentrop thought that if they were to be adjudged war criminals and sentenced to be hanged then Stalin and Molotov were equally guilty as men who helped start the war. I leave it to you to judge whether you think the Russian side, which actually initiated the talks, made territorial agreements for the carving up of Europe; gave assistance to the Germans; actually invaded Poland from the east while the Germans were coming in from the west, protected Germany's flank; gave Germany political carte blanche to go ahead with the war; assisted in that war with supplies and even a submarine base at Murmansk; and was even negotiating to join the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis—and probably would have joined if Hitler had not thought their price was too high—I leave it to you to decide if you consider the Soviet rulers were any the less guilty than the Nazi rulers for starting that terrible holocaust—World War II.

In the days of the Stalin-Hitler pact, the representatives of the two governments toasted their mutual successes. They united in agreeing that their ideological differences were slight in contrast to their joint enmity toward the capitalist western democracies. Molotov then reviled American imperialism in just the terms that the Cominform does now. It was in this period that Molotov made his remarks * * * that the difference between nazism and communism, ideologically, was just a matter of taste.

Communists would now prefer to forget all about that period. They consider it provocative "war mongering" that the documents are now brought up and published by this Government. But they should never be allowed to forget that they were once the collaborators of Hitler in bringing war to the world—the Second World War—that cost more than 22,000,000 lives, the wounding of more than 34,000,000 others, and a money cost of more than $1,000,000,000,000.

In the time I have left I would like to pursue the point that there is little to choose between fascism and communism—that they are bloody brothers under the skin.

Both fascism and communism stem from the philosophy that the state is everything—the people nothing, save instruments of the state.

Both represent revolts against western liberal civilization. Both derided and despised democracy, but the Nazis and Fascists were much more frank about it. The Communists have sought to cover themselves with the mantle of democracy, to claim that they are the true democrats. In the same way, the Communists make claim to the title of "progressive" and "liberals," while they berate the western democracies as being "reactionary." They don't consider the fact that they have gone back to the most reactionary form of government on earth—that they are copying the methods that are as old as tyranny itself—that they are going back a thousand years to the despotic rule of one man.

The struggle of democracy, up through the ages, has been to put limits on the power of one man—the king, the tyrant, the despot, the absolute ruler. Only in the most backward of countries do you still find the absolute ruler—the man who has life-and-death power over his subjects. But the Communists have raised up the infallible leader, with all the old attributes—almost of god-head. And they call it "progressive," and "modern." Stalin, for example, is publicly adulated almost to the point where he is a god on earth. No criticism of him is tolerated. The chief instrument of his rule is a single party—the Communist Party. No opposition is allowed to this party. The same things were true in Hitler's Germany. How would you distinguish this from the oriental despotism of Genghis Khan? Was Genghis Khan "progressive" by present-day standards?

Hitler once ruled, as Stalin now rules, by methods of terror and of propaganda. They both used all the arts of indoctrination and discipline to get their people to accept their rule, without question. The Communist Party—just like the Nazi Party—controlled the press, the radio, the theater, the movies, the schools—all the outlets and media of expression. If propaganda should fail them and people should still try to think for themselves there was the whip, the castor-oil treatment, the torture chamber, the death furnace, the firing squad, and the exile to Siberia to coerce people back into line. All these are methods of terror, upon which the rule of these modern despots rested. The instrument of their terror had different names. It was called the Gestapo in Germany, the Ovra in Italy, and in Russia it has had a succession of names. It's latest name is the MVD. But it does its work in the old, old way of terrorizing people. The knock on the door in the middle of the night, while peope inside cower, and silently and tearfully kiss each other goodbye—for none knows which will be taken off to prison and to torture. I might say here that if Torquemada was "progressive" so is the MVD of Stalin—so was the Gestapo of Hitler. Neither permitted habeas corpus or the right of speedy trial by jury. Both could keep a man in prison, incommunicado, until he rotted, if they liked. If Louis the Fourteenth with his letters de cachet was progressive so was the Gestapo of Hitler—so is the MVD of Stalin.

While the Soviets have done away with the death penalty, they have hit upon another penalty far worse to the victim and far more practical for the State—it proceeds to work him to death in slave camps in the Arctic North, where the turn-over is 12 percent a year. In other words, where the life expectancy is no more than 8 years. Hitler, too, had his slave-labor camps and his death factories which were almost merciful by comparison in the sense of getting the torture over quickly. If, in bringing back to this modern world the age-old institution of human slavery, Stalin and Hitler were progressive, then so were the Pharaohs of Egypt, so were the Babylonians, so were the Chaldeans, so were the Incas.

The chief distinction, I believe, of the modern slaveholders and slavedrivers is that they do it on a scale unimagined in the past and they do it to their own people—not just the enemy taken in battle.

Both Hitler's Gestapo and Stalin's MVD carried on espionage against the entire population. I am told that about the only persons who aren't listed in the secret police files of Russia are Stalin himself, and Beria, the boss of the MVD. Maybe I am going too far in making these exceptions.

Of course, with the wiping out of all political parties, both the Fascist and the Communist systems either wiped out the trade unions or reduced them to the status of company unions. In both states, the right to assign people, arbitrarily, to their labors was asserted.

With the suppression of freedom of the press, went freedom of speech and freedom of public assemblage and the rights of petition for redress of grievances. The freedom of religion was originally knocked out entirely in Soviet Russia but, in more recent years, it reached the approximate status of religion under Hitler—it had to serve the state or be under very limited toleration. Both sought to substitute state-worship or leader-worship for God-worship.

And how did the two forms of the totalitarian state face the world at large?

Both had an aggressive idea of their messianic mission to spread themselves over the earth. "Germany today—tomorrow the world" was the slogan in Hitler Germany. "We have a world to gain" is the Marxian slogan.

The organization of fifth columns in foreign countries—by branches of the Communist Party and by the bunds—was common to both. The effort to keep foreign ideas from infiltrating the minds of their own people caused both countries to set up rigorous censorships and travel restrictions. However, the iron curtain of Russia is much harder to pierce than anything der fuehrer was able to construct.

Both beat the drums of war and called for the martial spirit in training their youth. Both have cultivated the same type of suspicion of anything foreign.

Both kept huge armies and exemplified the idea of guns before butter. Both grabbed whatever territory they could, adjacent to them which they thought they could grab without causing war to break out. Both adopt a hectoring, bullying attitude in their foreign relations. A speech by Hitler before

the war could only be surpassed in vilification and abuse of supposedly friendly nations, by Molotov or Vishinsky. Both seek to make friends and influence people with a club.

There are so many points of similarity that, when you come to sum up you can do no better than use the words of William Henry Chamberlain, who says "Communism is the heir of the aggressive methods and designs of fascism. Stalin and Molotov have taken up where Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese militarists have left off."

Our New Friends, the Japanese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABE McGREGOR GOFF
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, in the February 1948 issue of the Nation's Business, an article appeared by Gen. Bonner Fellers, former military secretary to General MacArthur and Secretary General to the Allied Council for Japan. It was my privilege to serve with General Fellers both in Africa and Japan. I commend the article as an excellent statement on the occupation of Japan with sound recommendations for the future treatment of that country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article, as follows:

OUR NEW FRIENDS, THE JAPANESE
(By Bonner Fellers)

Japan's war record is so black that reasonable people understandably wonder:

Are the Japanese worth saving? When occupational forces withdraw, will Japan return to militarism? Can the Japanese nation again be trusted? Can we do business with Japan?

While in Tokyo as military secretary to General MacArthur, I struggled to find answers to these questions.

I reached these findings:

The new Japan, provided we don't blunder, will eventually emerge as a Christian democracy, and a stanch friend of the United States. The new Japan will help bridge the gap between the east and west. A democratic Japan will aid the billion Asiatics who seek freedom, will stalemate Russia, and help lift some of the burden from the American taxpayers.

The unspeakable cruelty which the Japanese military forces inflicted on prisoners of war and on civilians in occupied areas has marked Japan, but an examination of some of the probable causes of this cruelty is revealing.

In the first place, human life in the greater part of the Orient is the most plentiful and cheapest known commodity. It is cheaper than horses or wagons or machines or food. Human impoverishment breeds human cruelty.

The Japanese have no God. Their indigenous faith, the Shinto cult, teaches neither compassion nor brotherly love. It does not hold individuals personally responsible for their morality. So long as a man is loyal to his chief, he can commit any act of injustice or cruelty on his fellow man without the slightest moral responsibility.

Japanese education is superficial, the written language is cumbersome. Most of the elementary education must be devoted to memorizing characters. Thus, that essential part of early education which teaches reasoning processes has been neglected. The militarists took advantage of this. As part of the universal military training, the militarists taught their own moral code. They called it moral training and its basis was cruelty.

If a soldier had as much as 2 weeks' service in the army, it entitled him—in fact it was his duty—to beat up any newcomer. Violators of rules were officially given corporal punishment. A saying came from soldiers of particular regiment—the Forty-seventh—"When you join the Forty-seventh, the contour of your face changes."

Soldiers hated this brutality but they were forbidden to discuss it. Their parents resented it, but there was no recourse since the militarists ruled Japan by force.

Lectures by army officers in all schools and to troops rounded out the picture. Japanese were a superior race; blind loyalty to one's chief was a virtue; the Emperor was divine and to die for him was a rare privilege. All foreigners were crooks. The white man, cruel, merciless, determined to dominate the Orient, was the eternal enemy of the Japanese people. Racial prejudice was taught deliberately. Japanese youth was taught to hate, and Japanese youth had not the mentality to reason himself out of this false indoctrination.

CRUELTY IS INBRED

With this background it requires no great imagination to understand how, if the Japanese were physically cruel to themselves, in extreme adversity, they would commit atrocities on an enemy whom they had been taught to hate.

Lack of moral responsibility led the militarists deliberately to deceive the people. They lied about the progress of the war. Reports from the front presented a false picture to the high command in Tokyo. Japanese soldiers captured off New Guinea believed they were on islands off the California coast. Filipino guerrillas reported that the Japanese kept order-of-battle maps showing their flag planted in California.

The militarists indoctrinated the home population, first with tales of great victory. Then, after Tokyo was bombed, they claimed the Americans intended—when they invaded—to destroy all Japanese males and to enslave all women. Girls were instructed to wear a potion of poison about their necks and to commit suicide rather than submit to American atrocities. The Emperor himself, the militarists preached, would be numbered among the invasion casualties.

When the first Americans arrived at the end of August 1945, streets in the Yokohama-Tokyo area were deserted. The first Japanese girl I saw held her parasol so that I could not see her face.

But the moral tone of the occupation must have amazed those who had believed the militarists. It was a firm but dignified occupation. There was no cruelty nor was there horseplay. The dreaded GI, though tough, turned out to be a man with a sense of humor and a friend of the weak.

In a crowded Tokyo street car two GI's moved a Japanese man from his seat to permit a pregnant woman to sit.

The posting of GI guards at Japan's sacred shrines to prevent their being desecrated made a profoundly favorable impression. News of such incidents, small in themselves, spread rapidly. Gradually, the population welcomed the foreign army. The mayor of Kobe, a devout Christian, called on General MacArthur and, with tears in his eyes, thanked him for the decency of the occupation.

During the past 2 years Japan has emerged from feudalism. She has adopted a new constitution in which sovereignty rests in the people. War as a sovereign right is renounced. Women have been given equal rights with men. Freedom of speech, of assembly, and of religion are accomplished facts.

Possibly more than 200,000 civil officials who were tainted with militarism, or whose past assignments were in ultranationalistic categories, have been purged by their own government and replaced by carefully screened personnel. The Emperor has been stripped of power but remains the symbol of the Japanese. The cost of the occupation has been borne largely by Japan. There have been no unfortunate incidents. In spirit and to the letter the Japanese Government has carried out instructions of the Supreme Commander, Allied Powers.

Today one can see signs of change. School children are happier and young people enjoy more freedom than ever before. Everyone comments on the much kindlier attitude of policemen. This is not a superficial change. Rather it is a basic shift in values. The liberal trend is likely to be permanent.

The Japanese are a proud, sensitive race. Under military domination they were plunged into a futile war. They saw their country destroyed by air strikes. The torture which the militarists claimed would come with the occupation failed to materialize. These events stunned 80,000,000 Japanese into the realization that the militarists had duped them. What was even worse, the militarists had lied to their Emperor and humiliated him.

Today Japan's militarists are dead, or in jail, or living in obscurity and disrepute. Militarism is gone. Moreover, defeat separated Japan from the means to make war. She has not the resources within her borders to create new military might.

Into the moral and social vacuum left by the pangs of hunger and the humiliation of total defeat came our Christian forces of occupation. Gradually, the realization that Shintoism had failed to sustain them swept over the Japanese people. Shintoism, which demanded loyalty, worked in time of victory, but it offered no solace in adversity. Consequently, the people began to grope for new spiritual values.

The Japanese have always respected a winner. The victorious American forces and the decency of their conduct appealed to them. There were already enough Christian Japanese—an estimated 500,000—to provide the leaven for a strong Christian upsurge. Dr. Kagawa and Miss Michi Kawai, both devout Christians, led the movement. Kagawa received word from the palace that he was to raise the moral level of the Japanese people.

The Empress dowager remarked: "What this country needs now is Christianity."

An American Quakeress came to teach the Crown Prince English and ideas of democracy. Christian churches in Tokyo suddenly filled to overflowing. One held services daily, and it, too, was crowded. Many Japanese held Sunday services in their homes. Curious, homesick GI's wandered by, heard the singing, entered and joined in the service. Most striking of all, the Diet elected Tetsu Katayama as Prime Minister of Japan—the first Christian Prime Minister in Japan's history. The Emperor, astonishingly, fits into this new Japan, far better than into the old feudalistic Japan of the militarists.

The position which the Emperor occupies in the minds of the people is not generally understood. He is a living symbol of the race and in him lie the virtues of the people's ancestors. He is the incarnation of national spirit; loyalty to him is absolute. Although no one fears him, all still hold him in almost reverential awe. Most Japanese people even now would not touch him, look into his face, address him, step on his shadow. This abject homage is sustained by a religious patriotism, the depth of which Westerners find it difficult to understand.

The poor people are especially devoted to Hirohito. They feel that his addressing them personally over the radio at the most critical period in their history makes him unprecedentedly close. His rescript opposing the militarists and demanding peace filled them with joy. Hirohito enjoys more personal popularity among the people than has any other emperor of modern times. His renunciation of alleged divinity and Japan's adoption of the new constitution actually released him from the false position in which he had been placed by militarist domination. These changes merely enhanced his position in the eyes of his people.

Japan's swing toward western ideology is natural. A number of leaders explained to me that in 1870 Japan wholeheartedly adopted western materialism, but flatly rejected our spiritual values. With western materialism she rose to a world power—only to fall by the very power which made her great. Now, the Japanese feel, they must take the other hand which the West has to offer and assimilate western ideology.

This Japan is doing rapidly, for there is no one in the Orient to whom she can turn. In the Philippines and China hatred engendered by the war is still justifiably rampant. Moreover, China is suffering from an economic and political turbulence without parallel. Japan dares not turn to Russia because she fears her.

This is not a new fear. It is a fear which has progressively been intensified since the Red revolution. Russian conduct during the occupation has given the Japanese a taste of what they might expect if they were to fall under Red domination.

During the time I was secretary-general to the Allied Council for Japan, I learned that the bitter Japanese resentment of Russia traces back to these points:

1. Soviet stalling on Japan's request for mediation with the Allies, while simultaneously preparing to launch a belated attack;

2. Alleged slaughter of Japanese troops in Manchuria after Japan had surrendered;

3. Russian reluctance to repatriate nearly 1,000,000 Japanese prisoners of war;

4. Russian endeavor to stalemate reparations;

5. The stand that Japan cannot be "democratized" so long as the emperor system exists;

6. Opposition to measures which would bolster Japanese economy;

7. Efforts of Russian Communists to instigate strikes, to disregard property rights, and to incite chaos.

Fear of Russia and the mounting tide of Christianity are strong assurances against Communist domination, despite the fact that Japan today is a vast poorhouse, and that the Russians are doing all in their power to win the country.

It has been General MacArthur's conviction that the best way to prevent Japan from going communistic is to give the Russians and their Japanese fellow travelers, of whom there are some 25,000, an absolutely free rein. Consequently, Communists have had complete political freedom. They have been given transportation and permitted to travel. No restrictions have been placed on the size and activities of the Russian staff in Tokyo. Yet, in spite of this freedom of maneuver, the Communist movement has been a fizzle.

In the first free election, only 6 Communists were elected to a Diet of 466 members. Before the war, under military restrictions, the Communists boasted 7 members of the Diet. In the second election, out of 716 members elected to the House of Representatives and the House of Counselors—Japan's new Congress—precisely 8 were Communists. In short, Japan shows far less trend to the left than some supposedly democratic states of the West.

REDS RETAIN HOPE

Despite this signal failure, Communists still hope to win their ideological battle. Their trump card is to create economic chaos. And time and stalling are on their side. These two conceivably could counteract all our gains of the past 2 years.

Japan is cursed with a lack of resources. Only 15 percent of her land is tillable. Iron ore, oil, mercury, manganese, nickel, tin, tungsten—sinews of modern industry—appear only in negligible quantities. Only in coal, timber, and ocean fisheries can Japan hope to meet her own needs.

Every effort is being made to increase food production. Japan's feudalistic land problem is being resolved. Nearly half of the population are farmers. The average farm family tills 2.7 acres of land. Before the war, some 80 percent of this land was owned by the landlords. The tenant gave his landlord one-half the crop, did all the work, provided the seed, the implements, and the fertilizer. Naturally, farmers were impoverished. Today it is possible for a tenant to buy the land he tills. The Government is subsidizing land sales so that the landlord is not stripped of his wealth without fair reimbursement.

But, even with land reform and her fisheries back to prewar standards, Japan can never raise enough to feed her population. She must always import at least 20 percent of her food. But, to import, her economy must be set up so that she can export manufactured goods. To export, Japan's peacetime industry must be reestablished.

If, however, reparations strip Japan of her remaining industrial assets, we shall have to continue to feed her at a cost of some $300,000,000 annually. Thus high reparations—and $54,000,000,000 have been claimed by our allies—really mean that the United States in the long run will foot the bill. Moreover, it is to the best interests of American business that Japan be permitted to stabilize her economy.

Then the frugality of her people and their eternal willingness to work can be trusted to build a sound economy.

On the other hand, if her economy is permitted to collapse, Japan will be compelled to turn unwillingly to communism and be forced to help mold the Orient into a vast group of slave states under Moscow domination.

Only decisive action in the form of a peace treaty with Japan can avert disaster.

As soon as a peace is effected, our occupation forces should be withdrawn. No matter how enlightened the program may be, armies of occupation are repugnant to any self-respecting people.

The Spanish occupied the Philippines for more than 300 years. Their troops intermarried and gradually lost military effectiveness as they became a part of the population. The Japanese occupied the Philippines only 3 years, but their brutality was such that the Filipinos will hate them forever.

It is imperative that our American forces shall not fall into either of these categories. From now on the continued presence of occupational forces will encourage rather than discourage communism. General MacArthur has stated that the present government is now strong enough to hold down a general strike or any other Communist maneuver if the American Army is withdrawn. But it is not strong enough—even to survive—unless a peace is signed to provide the economic stability any government must have to endure.

It is possible, if our leadership is able, that Russia would join in a peace treaty with Japan. Certainly she would have much to gain by remaining a member of the United Nations. But the problem of whether or not Russia joins in the treaty, or if she joins would comply, is inherent in the peace now or at any future time. In the opinion of experts, including former President Hoover, a decision to make a treaty without Russia would not lead to war. But in any event, the treaty should be attempted now.

Doubtless an allied commission created to operate under the United Nations would supervise Japan's compliance with the terms of the treaty. Whether or not the United Nations would guarantee the Japanese security from aggression is something to be worked out over the peace table. It would indeed be a strange quirk of fate if Japan, which fought the cruelest war in history, became the only nation which had renounced war as a sovereign right.

In the years since 1941, we have spent much blood and treasure in defeating Japan and in bringing her universal suffrage, free speech, free press, and the decencies and responsibilities of democracy. Certainly, it is high time that America faces the fact that we must choose between a Russian-dominated Japan or a free Japan. We can do business with a free Japan. And what happens there will have a profound effect on our other world interests.

1947: A Year of Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Torrance Herald, Torrance, Calif., under date of January 8, 1948:

1947: A YEAR OF RESULTS—VISION: FULFILLED

Each year at the beginning of the New Year the Torrance Herald devotes one of its seldom written editorials to a review of the progress of the community during the past year and to an outline of the needs of the city.

We would be most happy if we had the space to print each of the three editorials, one published on January 11, 1945, entitled, "Torrance Needs Men of Vision"; the second published January 3, 1946, entitled, "Vision: Fulfilled?"; and the third published January 2, 1947, entitled, "Happy New Year, Vision: Fulfilled."

Space limitations do not permit such republication, but in order to present the continuity of the program suggested by the Torrance Herald in its original editorial of January 11, 1945, we shall present it briefly, as follows:

1. Torrance, the fourth largest incorporated city in total area in Los Angeles County, is exceeded in size only by Los Angeles, Pasadena, and Long Beach; in per capita wealth, Torrance is the third richest city in the county; in total assessed valuation, Torrance is the tenth largest city in the county; Torrance has nearly 60 basic industries within its boundaries and a factory pay roll which (if all employees should reside in Torrance) would require twice as many housing units as now exist in Torrance; Torrance has room for nearly a half million residents; and Torrance needs to grow into its long pants.

2. The editorial cited need for vision in the city hall; the need for water; the need for ambitious planning; the need for homes; for recreation facilities; the need for locally controlled schools; the need for adequate bus transportation; the need for highways and streets—the need for "men of vision who can sit in the city hall and see the boundary at the bluffs of Hollywood Riviera; who can see the boundary of Torrance at Redondo Beach Boulevard; who can encourage the growth of this community to its fullest to fill to its boundaries this vast area with homes, factories, and stores."

The first year saw the launching of the first of two important water districts; the start of plans for the second district; the offer of a good recreation program; the birth of the successful program to take over the schools from Los Angeles; the initial expansion of local bus lines; the start of an ambitious street improvement program; a tremendous interest shown in the city affairs by the people.

The end of the first year witnessed the accomplishment of many of the outlined needs, but in the second annual editorial, the important objectives were outlined as: Sewers for districts not served; commercial parking facilities; "shop-in-Torrance" campaigns; cultural and athletic programs, indoors and out, during appropriate seasons; adequate highway-direction signs; all telephone service through the Torrance exchange; unification of mail service through the Torrance office, encouragement of home-building programs on mass scale.

We predicted 1946 will be a year of action. True, it was a year of action, for it saw the people vote to assume control of its schools by adoption of a city charter; it saw the formation of the two municipal water districts covering a great area of the city of Torrance; it saw new factories launch programs here, and paved the way for the accomplishments of the year 1947 which we consider an outstanding period for Torrance.

The following year, on January 2, 1947, the Torrance Herald predicted that 1947 will be a year of results, reiterating certain needs, and in a review of its program, we are proud to present the following:

1. The city charter was ratified and the new city school district formed and in operation.

2. The new junior college was located at Alondra Park as urged by this newspaper in a vigorous campaign. Torrance joined the district.

3. The city engineer's office reorganization was accomplished.

4. The first definite step toward the city-manager form of government was made with the appointment of George W. Stevens as administrator and city engineer.

5. Unification of the school districts, under one Torrance City Board of Education, was launched.

6. Busses were purchased to enable the establishment of municipal lines to North Torrance, Southwest Torrance, Hawthorne, and Long Beach.

7. Nearly 1,000 new homes were started in Torrance, with 2,000 more planned.

8. Progress toward the unification of the mails was made, with the establishment of a new rural route through North Torrance and city delivery through Southwest Torrance (Seaside Ranchos).

9. The former Army airport was acquired through right of entry and interim permit, by the city of Torrance.

10. New industrial development was undertaken here, the largest being by American Radiator-Standard Sanitary Corp.

11. New off-street parking lots were provided through the cooperation of members of the chamber of commerce with the City Council of Torrance.

12. Water districts covering most of Torrance had been formed, and new sewer districts planned.

13. A community concert association was formed to bring fine artists to the equally fine Torrance High School auditorium.

There were many other accomplishments, such as bringing about a thorough understanding between the city council and the chamber of commerce from which nothing but progress and sound civic development could result.

All of this has been accompanied by a population growth such as Torrance never has experienced in a similar period.

The average population gain for each new home in Torrance is 3.6 persons. Thus, with 1,000 new homes being completed, the gain can be readily estimated at 3,600 new residents.

This year, according to plans on file by single family and multiple-unit dwelling projects, 2,000 more homes will be built, and Torrance will enter the year 1949, we predict, with a population of more than 20,000 persons.

More than 1,000 new jobs will open up in Torrance during this year, largely due to three big industrial plants.

For the year 1948, may the following, among other things, be accomplished.

1. Establishment by charter amendment of the city-manager form of government.

2. Creation of a sound and thorough supervised recreation program participated in on a joint basis by the city school district and the city recreation department, keeping school grounds open after school and on Saturdays, and making what athletic and cultural facilities as exist in Torrance available to general use.

3. Solution of the telephone problem, which can be accomplished now that materials are available; institution of the dial system; extension of facilities for better service; unification of number systems and service so that all of Torrance may be reached through one exchange.

4. New schools to house the children of the increased population.

5. Unification of the school system under one Torrance Board of Education.

6. Further expansion of the municipal transportation system to serve all sections of the city and the new home districts.

7. Completion of the program to unify all Torrance mail under the Torrance post office.

8. Completion of the pipe-line systems of the new Torrance municipal water districts.

9. Creation of necessary sewer districts to care for expanded population.

May the people of Torrance raise their sights to view the great opportunities awaiting them; may the city hall be staffed with men of vision who can do something about it when the opportunity presents itself.

May the year 1948 exceed the year 1947 in community progress.

F. S. S.

The Bomb Secret Is Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor of the University of Chicago, from the December 1947 issue of the American magazine:

THE BOMB SECRET IS OUT

(By Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor of the University of Chicago)

On the afternoon of July 16, 1945, a group of nuclear scientists met around a conference table in a small, hushed room in the metallurgy building of the University of Chicago. They were meeting in an effort to save tens of thousands of civilian lives, if not, indeed, all humanity.

At 5:30 that morning, on the desert in New Mexico, the first atomic bomb had been successfully detonated. These men who had helped construct the bomb had now dedicated themselves to suppressing it.

Their purpose was not exclusively humanitarian. They knew that if an atomic bomb were dropped over Japan, all hope of preserving the atomic secret for the United States and other traditionally peace-loving nations would be lost forever.

These men knew that once the bomb was dropped, once the world learned that fission chain reaction could be accomplished, atomic bombs could be produced by any reasonably advanced nation on earth, and that the end result could be annihilation of all life on this planet.

Before the hot dark closed down on Chicago that day, a solemn letter had been drafted to the President of the United States and signed by 65 members of the university's scientific staff. It petitioned the President to prevent the dropping of the bomb.

Receipt of the letter was never acknowledged.

Five days later, two members of the group were delegated to fly to Washington and appeal personally to James R. Byrnes, then chairman of the President's Committee on Atomic Research. This appeal likewise was ineffectual. The bomb was dropped over Hiroshima on August 6, the next over Nagasaki.

Then and there, our opportunity to control atomic energy vanished.

We still had one small factor in our favor—time. Under normal circumstances, it might have taken other nations a few years to discover precisely how to put a bomb together. But this chance was destroyed a few days later when the H. D. Smyth report on atomic energy for military purposes was made public.

Mr. Smyth, in his excellent job, obligingly pointed out four specific ways in which atomic fission could be accomplished. The only problem then remaining to any nation which might desire to harness atomic energy, or to produce atomic bombs, was to decide which of Mr. Smyth's comprehensive blueprints was best and most convenient in its particular circumstances, and follow Mr. Smyth's instructions.

From that instant all talk of secrecy in connection with the atomic principle has been completely asinine, and public utterances which would have us believe we own an atomic secret are rooted either in ignorance or in deceit.

Any realistic appraisal of the status of atomic energy today, militarily speaking, must be predicated on two simple propositions:

1. There is no secret.
2. There is no defense.

To understand why there is no secret, let's go back 400 years before Christ. An atomic theory was propounded in that remote time by Democritus, a Greek philosopher. A Roman, Lucretius, wrote a classic poem about atoms before Jesus was born. The theory that all chemical elements are composed of atoms was corroborated 145 years ago. The structure of the atom was determined and its energy known before World War I.

The fact that atoms of certain substances, specifically uranium—a metal—could be split, and that this splitting, or fission, was accompanied by the release of enormous quantities of energy was demonstrated before World War II. This was not an American secret; it was known by scientists in many countries. The only problem since that time has been to capture and control the atomic energy thus released, and discovery of methods for doing this has been only a question of time.

Much as it may discomfit some of our professional patriots, the fact is that a very great part of this preliminary work, as well as practically all the subsequent work, was done by foreigners. Of 10 scientists (Einstein, Hahn, Bohr, Strassmann, Meitner, Frisch, Joliot, Chadwick, Fermi, Wheeler) who pioneered atomic fission in 1939, 5 were German, 1 was French, 1 Danish, 1 Italian, 1 English, and only 1 American. The Germans were far ahead of us at the outbreak of the recent war.

Many foreign scientists who had recently come from Europe were employed when our Army Engineer Corps established the Manhattan District for the production of atomic bombs in August 1942. They contributed notably—so notably, in fact, that every single basic idea in atomic fission came from a European mind. Very few basic contributions were made by Americans. The American contribution consisted of applying these ideas and producing the atomic bomb.

All of these foreign scientists are entirely familiar with the processes involved in producing the atomic bomb. Today, they are scattered throughout the world—in at least four European countries, to my personal knowledge—and each of them knows all there is to be known about atomic energy and atomic bombs.

So there is no secret.

No fewer than 5,000 individuals knew we were making an atomic bomb, and many of them knew the essential steps that were taken. An effort was made to compartmentalize the work, certainly, but this in itself would have been ridiculous if carried out according to directives. Compartmental regulations were violated every day. If they had not been, production of the atomic bomb might have been delayed for several years.

As a matter of simple truth, no harm would have been done had the whole enterprise been published in the newspapers, for at that time we were the only Nation on earth able to carry on such a monumental enterprise. The Germans had no facilities and the Japanese wouldn't even have known where to start. We could have given them all our plans and still they could not have duplicated our work, merely because they lacked the physical resources.

That is not the case today with Russia. When we speculate on what may be going on behind the iron curtain, we must concede at the outset that the production of atomic bombs now is only a matter of mobilization of physical resources—materials, machines, manpower.

Can Russia make them? Of course. If we told the Russians all we know at this moment—and we know a great deal more than we knew in 1945—this knowledge would not shorten their work by more than 6 months.

Is Russia making them? We would be foolish to assume that she is not. An able scientist prophesied after reading the Smyth report that Russia would complete her first atomic bomb within 3 years and thereafter would produce them more rapidly than we could. That prediction was made more than 2 years ago.

There are no less than 27 first-class nuclear physicists in Russia and no fewer than 700 universities. Assuming that each university has a fairly competent nuclear scientist on its staff, Russia has an excellent scientific corps.

Through our gratuitous contributions to her knowledge, she is able to bypass the heartbreaking succession of blind alleys and dead ends we had to explore between 1940 and 1942, when we set off the first self-maintaining nuclear chain reaction—the principle of the bomb—under a grandstand on the campus of the University of Chicago. Russia today is able to drive full tilt along a line, broad, clearly marked avenue of general knowledge. For, today, the production of atomic bombs is merely a manufacturing process. There is no secret.

But why is there no defense?

All theory of defense against aerial weapons—and the atomic bomb is essentially an aerial weapon to be transported by aircraft or controlled missiles such as rockets—is based upon absorptions, the amount of punishment a target can absorb before it capitulates or is destroyed.

With the atomic bomb there can be no question of absorption. No known target can absorb the punishment the bomb can administer. When one medium-sized bomb can wipe out of existence a target of the size of Indianapolis, what can be left to absorb any further punishment? Moreover, the problem of attempting to destroy an atomic bomb on its way to a target when carried by a high-speed missile is as difficult as attempting to destroy an artillery shell in flight.

It is theoretically possible to make atomic bombs 1,000 times more powerful than any thus far demonstrated. Let us assume that an enemy nation has only two bombs of that gigantic size. With these two bombs, by taking advantage of location of detonation and direction of prevailing winds (central California and northern Oregon, for example, when steady winds were blowing toward the east) this enemy would have a fair chance of making the United States uninhabitable.

Why? Because areas not destroyed outright through concussion, heat, and fire would be contaminated as the winds swept the highly radioactive air over the face of the land. This was conclusively demonstrated when rays from the test explosion at Bikini reached the United States in detectable strength in 1 week. And it is much farther from Bikini to Los Angeles than it is from Los Angeles to New York.

What refuge can there be from a lethal element which permeates the very air upon which we depend for life? Could we go underground? Well, even assuming it would be possible to dig caverns enormous enough to hold such industrial behemoths as Pittsburgh and Detroit, and others large enough to shelter all the people in the United States, what would we do for fresh air? Subbasements might shelter us from concussion and fire, but eventually we would have to draw outside air into them. A thoughtful soldier once remarked that the only defense against the atomic bomb is not to be there when it goes off, but even distance is no guaranty of safety if the air is contaminated for thousands of miles.

England found no defense against the V-2; her only defense was to win the war. If the war heads of the V-2 had been atomic bombs instead of TNT, England would not be here today; for 16 ounces of U-235, the critical element in the atomic bomb, is capable of as much destruction as 8,000 tons of TNT, and it is not even possible to make a bomb with as little as 16 ounces of U-235.

Added to the annihilating force of aerial detonation is the possibility of sabotage. An atomic bomb of average size detonated under the surface of New York Harbor when the wind was right would cover all of Greater New York with a deadly atomic spray. So it is reasonable to conclude that there is no known defense against the atomic bomb.

Could any nation win an atomic war against another nation which also had atomic bombs? Probably not, although this is slight consolation, indeed. Let us imagine that Nation A has 1,000 atomic bombs and feels dominant and secure because Nation B has only 150 atomic bombs. Nation A starts the war by firing its 1,000 bombs at all known targets. The targets are destroyed and so, to all practical purposes, is Nation B.

But somewhere, in some secret place, Nation B still has its 150 bombs and the means to transport them, and it has enough rugged men left alive—although burned and contaminated and doomed to slow death—to explode those bombs over Nation A. One hundred and fifty atomic bombs will ruin any nation on earth.

The result, of course, is that the nations destroy each other. Some individuals in remote places will escape, and by incredible struggles against contaminated soil, crops, and water they will temporarily survive. But disease, plague, and famine will overtake them since all surviving creatures and facilities upon which they depend for existence will be weakened and doomed to destruction, and so all life must eventually disappear.

That is the extremely unpleasant but completely realistic prospect facing mankind if atomic energy is unleased for war.

Is there a solution? I think so.

Many of us who have thought the situation through have concluded that our only salvation lies in establishment of international morality, a mutual acceptance of the futility of further warfare and a mutual avowal to keep the peace. Three years ago I would have considered such a thought absurd, human nature being what it is. Today I believe it is the only chance for the survival of humankind. Unfortunately, this conviction seems not to be shared by the rulers of nations.

I believe that all the nations must sit down together and agree to be good. It is no longer possible to say, as we seem to be saying: Let's be powerful so we can force everyone else to be good. Force can never again be a national monopoly. No nation can be dominant militarily for more than a moment in the dawning atomic era.

Nor is it enough for one nation to decide to be good. If we were to decide to be good, and another nation were to decide to be bad, the result doubtless would be most uncomfortable for us.

No, if we are to preserve ourselves, we must acknowledge that a world crisis exists—not next week nor tomorrow, but now, today, for there is very little time remaining. Instead of glowering at one another, nations must understand that we are inevitably destined to have one world or none at all. Rather than wave atomic bombs at one another, we must recognize that here in our hands is a method to produce cheaper and better goods, cure all ills, give us leisure beyond all our dreams; that there in our hands lies the most important means of improving the well-being of mankind that has appeared on the earth in 4,000 years.

Perhaps the practical solution is the establishment of a world government. Such a blueprint is now being formulated for presentation to all nations. I would have said before the accomplishment of the atomic fission that we might have a world government within the next 500 years. Today I

am convinced that we must try to attain it within the next 5 years. That's about all the time we have left.

What can we gain by attaining it? What could life be like in a peaceful atomic age?

Once more we must start with a correlated group of basic truths:

1. Atomic energy is here, now. It is an accomplished fact.

2. It is the most important discovery to mankind since the discovery of fire.

3. Medically, it provides the most important tool since the invention of the microscope.

4. Economically, which means industrially and commercially, it is the most important discovery since the discovery of the wheel.

The astounding difference between atomic energy and the energy with which we are familiar is the enormous amount of atomic energy which can be produced from a very small quantity of atomic fuel. I cannot imagine how many millions of tons of falling water, how many millions of tons of coal, how many millions of barrels of petroleum are required to produce all the electricity consumed in the United States in an average month.

But I know that less than 15 pounds of atomic fuel, no more than a small child can carry in a basket, will produce enough electricity to meet all the demands of the United States for 1 year, with a comfortable excess in reserve. One boxcar of atomic fuel will produce enough energy to heat every building, illuminate every electric bulb, and operate every machine in the entire world for 1,000 years.

Two types of atomic power plants are presently projected. One type will be a large land-based installation from which power will be transmitted to distant points by the usual methods—conduits, tubes, wires. The second type will be a large installation on an ocean liner or a battleship. Both types must be large and heavy because of the enormous quantities of insulating materials necessary to protect workers from dangerous rays inherent in their operation. That is why you cannot expect an atomic engine in your automobile or airplane for a long time to come. But you will ride in streetcars powered by energy from atomic plants, and quite likely in atomic-powered trains, in the foreseeable future.

The size and weight of atomic power plants will be reduced, for the process of producing atomic energy will be better understood as we go along, just as the processes of making steel or fabrics improved as they developed. Millions of dollars must continue to be spent in research to broaden our knowledge and improve our methods. And someone—whether it be the Government with a view toward Federal monopoly of this colossal force, or whether it be private industry with a view toward perpetuating our traditional economic system—must spend it.

The principal predictable benefit from this improved knowledge will be that atomic energy will be produced more cheaply than is now possible. Yet, even now, the cost of producing atomic energy is far less than it was 2 years ago. In a short time it should be the cheapest energy the world has ever known, just as today the atomic bomb is far cheaper than TNT in terms of destructive power.

The cyclotron, for example, was until very recently believed to be the best, if not the only, method by which radioactive isotopes could be produced for medical and industrial purposes. To produce 1 millecurie, an infinitely small amount, of these substances with the cyclotron costs about $1,000,000 and takes 3 years. Today, through a simplified process called an atomic pile—the machine, or furnace, which was developed at the University of Chicago and which made the atomic bomb possible—the same quantity can be produced overnight for less than $50.

No serious scientific or engineering problems remain to be solved aside from those of normal evolution. Atomic power is no longer a dream. It is a present-day reality.

Atomic energy makes all our conceptions of daily living obsolete, eradicates virtually all our limitations, cures all our maladies, and opens the door to a way of life as uncomplicated as that of a South Seas native basking in the sun and plucking his food from the breadfruit tree. Our paramount problem, our chief hazard in the atomic age will be what to do with our spare time.

Assuming that world government is accomplished and world peace established, and that we shall have a future at all, it is not impossible to draw a reasonably accurate blueprint of the atomic city of tomorrow. Such a conception necessarily hinges upon a thousand and one developments which are now only gleams in the scientific eye. Basically, however, the atomic city will be built along scientifically functional lines to provide maximum comfort and convenience to its inhabitants. Streets will be hundreds of feet wide. Buildings will be far apart.

The only smoke will come from fireplaces used for pleasure. They will not be needed for heat. Heat will be so plentiful that it will even be used to melt snow as it falls. Fireplace wood will be cheap and plentiful because wood will not be needed for construction.

Lawns and gardens will be luxuriant, for atomic energy promises fertilizers and soil balances more powerful than any known today. There will be flowers such as we do not have at present, for the atomic principle has the power to alter forms of plant life, just as it alters the atomic structure of minerals.

Parks, playgrounds, and other places of recreation will abound, for leisure will be almost unlimited. A very few individuals working a few hours a day at very easy tasks in the central atomic power plant will provide all the heat, light, and power required by the community and all its surrounding areas, and these utilities will be so cheap that their cost can hardly be reckoned.

There will be factories, of course, but because atomic energy is so much more potent than the forms of energy employed today, factories will operate only a comparatively few hours a week to produce more goods than can be used. They will produce, among other things, new metals, new types of self-insulating building materials, new fabrics, foods, furnishings, communication devices which will eliminate time and space, and vehicles which will run for a year on 2 ounces or less of atomic fuel.

The atomic city will have a central diagnostic laboratory but only a small hospital, if any at all, for most human ailments will be cured as rapidly as they are diagnosed.

If this seems too fanciful, consider how incredible, how utterly impossible even a small modern town would have seemed to a Dawn Man squatting on his haunches before a blaze he started, dimly conceiving that here in his hands lay a tremendous new power, a new force—fire. Today, we are the Dawn People of the atomic age.

How far are we along the road to this Utopia?

Farther than you think.

Medically, atomic energy is already at work all over the world. To understand how it is being used, and what its implications are, we must realize that the human body is like a chemistry laboratory a bull has just charged through. All the pieces are there, but they're all mixed up.

The medical scientist, with his microscope and X-ray and test tube, is able to follow and understand certain processes which take place in the body and thus correct many maladies. But beyond these are many more processes he cannot follow, does not understand, and at which he can only guess. Thus people continue to die of cancer, tuberculosis, hypertension, and other bodily malfunctions which the physician can relieve temporarily and to a degree, but which he cannot cure.

Today, through application of atomically produced substances called radioactive isotopes, the human body becomes as transparent as a pane of glass.

A radioactive isotope is a speck of material—carbon-14, a species of carbon, is the commonest now used—which has been made radioactive through subjection to atomic radiation, much as a needle is magnetized by proximity to a magnet. The immediate result is that it throws off rays which are detectable through flesh and blood with a simple instrument called a Geiger counter. Rays thrown off by the isotope make a clicking sound in the Geiger counter.

Radioactive isotopes, or tracers, are introduced into the body through the mouth, a vein, or in other ordinary ways. As they begin their wanderings through the jumbled chemical laboratory of the body, they can be followed with the Geiger counter. The medical scientist is able to determine exactly what is taking place, as surely as though he were looking through a window.

There is every reason to believe that we shall know almost at once what causes the calcification of joints in one form of arthritis and the disintegration of tissue in another. And it is axiomatic that medical science can cure or prevent what it clearly understands.

With cancer, the major problem is not what will cure it, but what causes it, why the cells go wild. Since cancer is fundamentally growth, although abnormal and uncontrolled, the problem of cancer is allied with the whole mysterious question of growth. Why do things grow?

As a kindergarten example, medical science knows that phosphorus introduced into the body becomes an element of bone, making bone grow. It does not know why or how this happens. But with radioactive isotopes as tracers it becomes possible to follow the precise events that make up this phenomenon, and when it is understood we shall know something, at least, about the mystery of growth.

The procedure is essentially the same with cancer. When we find out why a cancer grows we shall be in a position to determine how to prevent it from growing, or to kill it altogether. Here the same elements which acted as the means of diagnosis may be found to be the means of cure.

Radium has been widely used in the treatment of cancer because it emits rays. Radium treatment has been impossible for the vast majority of cancer sufferers because there is not enough radium to go around. All the radium now available for medical use would fit into a small cigar box. But through the atomic principle it is possible to give many substances the power to emit rays—in other words, to make them radioactive. These substances are the isotopes, and they are already being ground out cheaply, quickly, and in enormous quantities.

The next and fairly simple step will be to find a method to shoot a stream of radioactive rays unerringly into cancerous growth, much as bullets are fired from a machine gun, and kill the cancer without serious injury to adjacent tissue.

I am convinced that we shall understand the mystery of cancerous growth within 7 years.

Thyroid disorders, reasonably prevalent and not too well understood, are already being conquered by radioactive iodine. Blood disorders of rare but fatal types are succumbing to radioactive phosphorus. The end of all human suffering is in sight. If we are permitted to live at all, there is no reason we cannot expect to live as long as Methuselah.

The principles of diagnosis and cure apply likewise to all animals and most plants. Diseases of plants, now only dimly understood by a very few specialists, will become clear and methods of eradication will follow.

These are not dreams. These are not visions of the distant future. These are realities of today and the immediate tomorrow.

Industrially and commercially, the world was revolutionized by discovery of the wheel. The harnessing of atomic energy launches another era of equally tremendous economic progress. In the field of metals especially, this progression is already well under way.

There are many things wrong with metals. Nearly all of them—steel, particularly—should be 10 times as strong as they actually are. Aluminum, magnesium, copper, all have faults. For example, wire reduced to very low temperatures loses virtually all its resistance to electricity. Why? We shall find the answer, and when we do the cost of electricity under existing production systems will be reduced sharply.

We have found it necessary to develop several entirely new metals, unlike any hitherto known on earth, for the sheer purpose of producing atomic energy. Ordinary metals cannot resist the enormous heat generated by atomic fission. So we have used atomic energy to produce new metals, so they can be used to produce still greater quantities of atomic energy.

But the net result, to industry, is the appearance on earth of metals of such incredible strength that they must inevitably revise all our standards of stress and strain and replace many of the metals now in common use.

Alchemists dreamed for centuries of transmuting mercury into gold. This has not yet been accomplished through atomic energy, but I have no doubt it will be, perhaps before these words can be printed. We have already transmuted gold into mercury.

Even more dramatic is the impact of atomic energy upon the petroleum industry.

The fundamental problem of the petroleum industry is locating new and untapped stores of oil in the ground. Oilmen have accomplished this with all sorts of devices and sciences ranging from doodlebugs to meteorology, but none have been infallible.

Today, the same sort of radioactive isotopes used in medicine are being employed to locate subterranean oil pools, and not only to locate them but to measure their extent and volume. Through the employment of radioactive isotopes, the very earth itself becomes transparent, and the greatest gamble in the petroleum industry is eliminated.

At first glance it might appear that this would present a grave danger—the exhaustion of all natural supplies of oil. This is extremely improbable, since we already have known reserves of oil for hundreds of years. But even if we were to find, tap, and pump out all the oil in the world and pour it into the sea, we could still produce, with the aid of atomic energy, more oil than we could possibly utilize.

This is possible because of substances called catalysts. Catalysts are guiding and accelerating agents employed in refining crude oil into gasoline and other common petroleum products. During the recent war, the Germans used catalysts to produce oil from coal. Today, through employment of radioactive isotopes, the entire field of catalysts is revolutionized, immeasurably improved. If we find it necessary or desirable to make oil from coal, the means are in our hands. The process is simple and relatively inexpensive. And we have enough coal in the United States alone to meet all the demands of the world, both for coal and for oil, for the next 3,000 years.

These are not dreams. These are simple truths.

So today we stand at the fork of the road.

To the right lies peace, productivity beyond all our imagination, ease of living beyond our brightest dreams.

To the left lies war and the eventual end of all life on earth.

For the first time since creation, we truly hold in our hands the power to shape our own destiny, to choose our own fate.

We must make our choice within 5 years.

Allowances for Flight Training of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MITCHELL JENKINS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE KLISCH FLYING SCHOOLS,
WILKES-BARRE WYOMING VALLEY AIRPORT,
Forty Fort, Pa., January 14, 1948.

Congressman MITCHELL JENKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reading over the President's message to Congress of Monday, January 12, with reference to budget allowances for the year of 1948, we feel that an injury has been done to the aviation industry and we should like to enter our protests for the record.

Mr. Truman, during the course of his speech, spoke of cutting down allowances to the Veterans' Administration for the rehabilitation of veterans for avocational lines, and, in doing so, specified flying together with dancing—evidently placing them in the same category. We, of the aviation industry, feel this a direct insult to one of the major industries of the Nation, and, while in many ways flight training may not seem to be effective as a rehabilitation program for veterans, we feel that Mr. Truman is overlooking many angles in which the aviation industry and flight training may bring a larger benefit to the Nation as a whole than any trade or artistic training might afford.

Much has been said about allowing large sums for national defense; in fact, Mr. Truman spoke of that in the same speech. If you will recall, one of the first steps in national defense was to send millions of young men to flight schools, no different than the one I represent, for the initial nomenclature, orientation, and primary flight. How better can we prepare for national defense than to have the thousands of young men now enrolled in flight training under the Veterans' Administration to acquire the same knowledge and skill that, in case of another threat of war, will cost the budget millions of dollars and millions of hours of precious time to obtain at a moment when time is at a premium. It seems that aviation is even more important in thinking of future national defense than it was during World War II.

Second to the above reason, aviation as a means of transportation is becoming more and more prominent. The light plane industry is growing rapidly, and light aircraft will become in the near future as widely used as automobiles are at the moment.

How then can the preparation for inevitable future events be classified in the same category as the artistic talents of dancing or of the drama or of music or of art, which are also studied under the GI bill of rights, although not mentioned by Mr. Truman as avocational and pleasure training.

I believe I can speak as a representative of the aviation industry (since I have been in the aviation business for some 20 years) in saying that Mr. Truman has grossly insulted one of the largest and fastest growing industries in the Nation which he leads; and, I believe, that in his contemplation of removing flight training from the curricula of the Veterans' Administration, he is being very short-sighted in both business and national preparedness.

Very truly yours,

ROLAND KLISCH.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] before the annual Republican Lincoln dinner of Washington, D. C., Statler Hotel, February 5, 1948, over the Mutual Broadcasting System:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

We meet to remember a common man who became great. He was a common man with common attributes raised to the highest power and implemented by character and self education.

As we meet in this annual fellowship to pay tribute to Abraham Lincoln, the same questions arise which have addressed themselves to every generation since his passing.

What manner of man was he that so eminent a historian as H. G. Wells should catalogue him as one of the six greatest characters of all mankind and place him beside Christ, Confucius, and Buddha?

Why should we continue to return to his wisdom and inspiration for guidance after the elapse of fourscore and 3 years since his passing?

What was the grand designs of his life which somehow enthralls each generation and enhances his place in history?

If we could experience the miracle of looking through his eyes and from his heart, what course would we as a Nation pursue both at home and abroad?

He was a common man whose words and deeds made such lasting impression upon mankind that he belongs not to one Nation or generation but to all nations and all generations, and is worthy of our deepest devotion.

What manner of man was Abraham Lincoln? Some years ago I saw a little girl, perhaps 6 years of age, look upon his marble likeness in the Memorial. As she gazed, a chubby hand found the reassuring hand of her mother. There was awe and reverence

in that childish voice as she spoke. "Mother, there is Mr. Lincoln." It was as simple as that—as simple as the wide, round eyes of a child. "Yes, dear, that is Abraham Lincoln." There were no questions. There was no recital of his achievements or of biographical data. It was unnecessary. To a child it was Mr. Lincoln and there was no other Mr. Lincoln.

In a single year nearly 2,000,000 Americans have looked upon that sitting figure in the memorial, where sadness and concern were captured in marble. Why this mass tribute? What mystic magic makes him tower even greater in the esteem of his fellow countrymen and mankind as the years go by? It is neither mystic nor magic. It is but the tribute which grows from year to year to a common man in whom was gathered up an honest heart, a noble soul, a love of humanity, a wisdom which springs from compassion for and an understanding of men, a matchless humility and an unyielding will in the cause of freedom.

How candid he was and how refreshing that candor would be in an age that is marked by so much egotism and double talk. Less than a year before his nomination to the Presidency when he was already 50 years of age, he wrote a brief biographical note to an old friend in Bloomington, Ill., in which he said:

"When I came of age I did not know very much."

In this day and time how many individuals after 50 years of life had gone by would admit in writing where all mankind might see that at age twenty-one they did not know very much. But such was the manner of this great common man.

His moral integrity shines as a light down the corridor of the years. As never before we need that same virtue in the social, economic, and political life of our country. In his note to the chairman of the Republican National Convention in 1860, in which he accepted the nomination, Abraham Lincoln stated so briefly and so simply that:

"The declaration of principles and sentiments which accompanies your letter meets my approval; it shall be my care not to violate it or disregard it in any part."

How often the planks in a party platform are designed as mere lures for various groups of voters and not especially intended for subsequent action. Yet here is the first Republican President in the history of the Nation stating in a letter that all might see and know that it would be his care not to violate or disregard the declaration of principles and sentiments in any part. This was the manner of this common man.

How modest he was. Standing in the chill November air of 1863 before that group which had assembled at Gettysburg to do honor to the men who had fallen in the cause of this great Union, Lincoln said:

"The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here."

But the world did note, and the world did remember. The few words which he uttered there comprise one of the few speeches in the history of the spoken word which were graven in stone as a masterpiece of diction, and it will be remembered as long as the English language is spoken on the earth. Such was the manner of this common man.

What rare compassion graced his spirit. It can be found in a thousand places. But nowhere is it better exemplified than in those words which he addressed particularly to the members of his own party at Cooper Union Institute less than 3 months before the national convention was scheduled to meet in Chicago. He was pleading for peace and harmony for the Nation, and in the course of that plea he said:

"Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion or ill temper. Even though the Southern people will not so much as listen to us, let us calmly consider their demand and yield to them, if in deliberate view of our duty we possibly can."

Such was the compassion and the forbearance in this heart which could hold no malice. Are the problems of today any greater in importance and magnitude than those which confronted him? It might, therefore, well be asked what good healing and confidence in this difficult hour would spring from an exercise of that forbearance, understanding, and compassion which he so richly exemplified toward all groups and all sections of the country. Such was the manner of this common man.

A rare kind of moral courage marked his life and his course where principle was involved. In his day, no less than in ours, the art of political appeasement and political compromise was a well-known and practiced art. He knew full well that it existed, and so dealt with it openly and fearlessly. In that portion of the Cooper Union address which he devoted to the arrest of the spread of slavery in the Territories and free States, he went boldly to the heart of the matter when he said:

"Let us be diverted by none of these sophistical contrivances wherewith we are industriously plied and belabored—contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong."

For him there could be no middle ground where the simple morals of right and wrong were involved. And there can be no middle ground today. So many of our problems are no less moral than they were 4 score and 9 years ago. As the past looks down upon us and the future beckons, may we be no less wanting in that moral courage which marked his course. Such was the manner of this common man.

What a liberal he was. Unlike some of the self-styled liberals of today, Abraham Lincoln was a true and classical liberal. It can be safely said that he was the most discerning liberal in the history of this Nation, and so he could with propriety express his confidence in the ultimate justice of the people. He did not use the types of meaningless expressions which are in such common usage today to identify his liberalism. He stated it very simply so that all might understand.

"When one starts poor, as most do in the race of life, free society is such that he knows he can better his condition; he knows there is no fixed condition of labor for his whole life."

In recent years we have witnessed the development of a kind of fixed condition of labor which did pursue the common man for his whole life. This condition sprang in part from the intrusions of government and in part from the vast power which was built up in private organizations and in the leaders of those organizations. It was a strange combination of public and private power which was designed to keep the common man common, and it became necessary to emancipate him from this condition and restore his freedom. That is true liberalism, and such was the manner of this great common man known to history as Abraham Lincoln.

Perhaps his rarest and most endearing virtue was patience. Perhaps that is not so strange, after all, for patience is the companion of true wisdom. How else could he have saved the country in an hour when hate ran high, when bitterness was in the hearts of so many, and when both sides to the conflict needed that kindly counsel which comes from a patient spirit which is so hungry for peace and union?

It was only 3 days before his death and while he was appealing to the serenaders at the White House for the support of the new State government of Louisiana as a first step in reconstruction that he expressed that patience in a single homely phrase which all can understand. On that occasion his heart was so glad. Richmond had been evacuated and Lee had surrendered. A new vista of life had been suddenly opened to him. Naturally he was not unaware of the sharp differences of opinion among people in the North as to the mode and manner and means of reconstruction. Knowing all this and having made his argument for the proposal which he envisioned as the first step toward restoring the harmony of the Union, he said so very simply:

"We shall sooner have the fowl by hatching the egg than smashing it."

He knew the tumult in the human breast and the need for patience. This homely expression which he used was like Paul's admonition to the Thessalonians when he wrote: "Be patient toward all men."

Such was the manner of this common man called Abraham Lincoln.

There was greatness in his simplicity. In this day and time how complicated life has become. The administration of government itself has become so complex with its myriad functions and its millions of people intruding themselves more and more into the lives and liberties of the people of the country. Despite the stories and anecdotes which we best remember about Abraham Lincoln and which somehow make it appear that he gave over a vast amount of time to details, he was, in fact, forever backing life into a corner and reducing it to its lowest terms. There is something so rich and revealing in the incident of the Confederate envoys who came to sue for peace before the war had ended. Having patiently heard their proposals, it is said that Lincoln wrote two propositions on a sheet of paper and then informed them that they could fill in any other terms which they deemed proper and that he would sign it, so long as his proposals remained a part of the terms. It is said that they examined what he had written and then quickly departed. He had, in fact, written but nine words: "The Union must be preserved. Slavery must be abolished."

How simple and fundamental it was. All else was mere detail. Somehow in the very midst of war's turmoil he could reduce the future to such simple essentials. In this brave new world of ours so full of seeming complications both abroad and at home, how much easier the problems of government and the tasks of mankind would be if simplicity was a more practiced art. But such was the manner of this great common man.

This then was the manner of this great common man whom we honor today. This is the manner of this man whose soul is everywhere; this man who could find time to pencil a note to a mother who lost five sons in battle; this man who before the crucial battle of Gettysburg could promise God that if He would stand by the troops, he, Abraham Lincoln, would stand by God; this man who could arise from his bed late at night to listen to the plea of a New York Congressman to save a young military offender from execution, and who could so quickly cut through all admisintrative complexities and save a young life; that man who could express regret for the 110 horses lost at the Battle of Fairfax but not for the captured brigadier generals, because he said he could make a general in 5 minutes. This was Abraham Lincoln, a common man grown great, who is the embodiment of the spirit and the purpose of America.

To a cynical person it may seem the mark of weakness to return over and over again to Abraham Lincoln for inspiration and guidance, but it is neither weak nor sentimental. Somehow close communion with him can furnish an answer to the ills and frustrations of today.

He is such an essential part of what we call the American tradition. How often that word "tradition" is used and how threadbare and nebulous it seems. Perhaps we have not examined into it quite enough.

What then, is this American tradition about which we hear so much? In brief, it is that whole body of customs and practices, of principles and events, of personalities and achievements which are handed down from one generation to another and which constitute the very substance of our greatness. It is, in fact, the lineage of the Republic.

This Nation is not some vague and rootless thing without background which springs anew with each generation. It is like a family which has continuity and extends back from son to father and to grandfather and to great-grandfather. And like the family, it has its spiritual heirlooms, its romance, its glory, its achievements, its splendor, its causes and its purposes. Something of this sort must have been in the mind of that very wise apostle Paul when he wrote to the Thessalonians: "Hold to the traditions which ye have been taught."

What then do we find in this tradition of America, which is so glorious and exciting and gives it continuity and a cohesive bond?

There are those hundred and two original adventurous refugees known as the Pilgram Fathers, who took 63 days to cross the Atlantic to find freedom and to lay the foundation for the greatest republic that ever existed on earth. It is said that 4 days after their arrival they ate their first Christmas dinner aboard the vessel which brought them, and first thanked God for his blessings. It is said that in the following spring when the Mayflower was ready to return and more than one-half of the pilgrims had died, yet not one of those who remained went back to England. What a vital and compelling faith they had. They are a part of the American tradition.

Every sacrifice at Valley Forge where Washington's soldiers froze and hungered while nearby barns were stocked with food and fuel is a part of the American tradition.

Thomas Jefferson, who not only wanted to be remembered for the establishment of religious freedom and the Declaration of Independence but also for his contribution to American agriculture by sending olive plants to Charleston and bringing a new strain of rice from Africa, is a part of that tradition.

The vigor and common sense of Thomas Paine, whose trenchant pen had much to do in stirring the sluggish emotions of the Colonists and who was certain that but for America the candles of liberty would have gone out through the universe, is a part of that tradition.

The unselfish Washington who had everything to lose and nothing to gain by assuming command of the forces of independence is a part of that tradition.

Lexington and Concord, the Bill of Rights, free schools, Harper's Ferry, the Monroe Doctrine, Uncle Tom's Cabin, the Emancipation Proclamation, the exploits of millions of soldiers in every generation that freedom might carry on, and the tears of unnumbered widows and orphans—all these are a part of that tradition.

Stephen Decatur and John Marshall, Daniel Webster and Elijah Lovejoy, William Lloyd Garrison and Susan Anthony, Roger Williams and John Brown, Daniel Boone and William Penn, Ann Rutledge and Florence Nightingale—what a glorious cavalcade of personalities it really is, and all are a part of that tradition.

Towering large in that tradition and in that glorious dream is Abraham Lincoln. What he said and did, what he stood for, and what he achieved, what he accomplished for all mankind and what he did for humble people is an iridescent pattern in the whole design of America, and so as we pay tribute to him, so we honor the traditions of this Republic.

But traditions become rootless unless they are kept vital and fresh and alive by those who come after. If then, through frustration and defeatism, through confusion and cynicism, through emotional instability and softness, those traditions become dim or meaningless, what is there to tie to? What shall succeeding generations use for moral and spiritual anchorage, and who will deny that in this feverish period cynicism and defeatism are among the more common of our mass emotional diseases?

It is indeed no accident that as faith in and contact with the American dreams and the American tradition becomes dim and slender, so defeatism and escapism multiply. At a time when the world is beset with spurious ideologies and transient creeds which are inimical to the holy cause of freedom and the divinity of human personality, it is so necessary to rediscover and to reglorify the tradition of which that great common man, Abraham Lincoln, is so large a part. It can be done by reasserting the very virtues and causes whereby this became a great land.

We need as never before a generous dose of old-fashioned patriotism. To be sure, it is an old-fashioned remedy, but the moral weaknesses from which we suffer are equally old-fashioned.

At a time when true freedom is under attack in virtually every quarter of the globe and is being so subtly and gradually impaired at home it is imperative that we manfully make the sacrifices that are required for its preservation even as sacrifices were made in the generations which have gone before.

It is high time to meet the threat of defeatism with a new kind of pageantry which reasserts the glory, the greatness, and the romance of our own past. Can anyone imagine that self-educated man known as Abraham Lincoln, speaking of the bankruptcy of the Republic and indulging in those gloomy prophecies that come so readily from the lips of men with faltering hearts and a feeble faith. The true capacity of this Republic which was bequeathed to us through his zeal and devotion, has not even been scratched.

It is time to stop lamenting the lack of opportunity in America when it offers so much to so many. One need but call the roll of American business, agriculture, labor, and government to find emblazoned there the names of men and women from humble beginnings who found opportunity in every generation even as it was found by Abraham Lincoln.

Despite every dour and gloomy prediction of the last two decades, the grass is not yet growing in the streets and grows only on the streets of defeatist thinking which cannot envision a rosy and dazzling future for this blessed land. It is when we rediscover the dream and the tradition which is America, of which that great common man, Abraham Lincoln was such a noble part, that a rooted faith will return and frustration cease. Over and over and over again we must reassert it. It is because we must recapture the very purpose of America that we should return to the wisdom and guidance of this common man whose faith never faltered. As he once observed, if the dream of America ever comes to an end it will come not by conquest but by suicide.

In every purposeful life there is a grand design, and so there was in his. It was the freedom and the happiness of the individual, as distinguished from that strange collectivist philosophy which is sweeping so many parts of the earth and reducing the individual to a kind of serfdom in the interest of the collective good.

While Abraham Lincoln may not have been the originator of the movement for the freedom of the Negro race, he was the author and finisher of the final destruction of this ghastly form of tyranny in our own land.

As a flatboatman on the Mississippi, he vowed in his heart to crush the institution which enthralled human beings because of their color. It was the sense of justice which spoke within him, and from that time forward there was an unquenchable fire in his soul. One can see it everywhere in the grand design of his life.

It was manifest in Lincoln, the lawyer, while practicing law in Springfield, Ill.; in Lincoln, the State legislator, in Lincoln, the Congressman, in Lincoln, the antagonist of Douglas in that celebrated series of debates which are so rich a part of the American tradition; in Lincoln, the defeated candidate for the Senate; in Lincoln, the Republican nominee for the Presidency; in Lincoln, the Republican President of the United States. To that very hour when the assassin's bullet found its mark, freedom's fire burned brightly within him.

At Gettysburg the design of his life found such sublime expression. There he said that this was a Nation conceived in liberty. There he asked whether a nation so conceived could long endure. There he hoped and prayed for a new birth of freedom. That was the soul speaking.

Here then is a revelation of his insight and wisdom. How well he seemed to know that there could be no secure freedom for any man, anywhere, anytime while any other man was a slave. He knew that the divided house could not long endure.

Nor was his interest in the whole question of freedom limited merely to striking the physical shackles from the Negro race. Over and over he reaffirmed the principle of freedom and individual liberty in all our domestic affairs as well. When he spoke of a free society as the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all men to better their condition, he at the same time added a warning against the surrender of the political power of freedom. His words are as fresh and as vital and as timely as if they had been uttered today.

"Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess and which if surrendered will surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them, till all of liberty shall be lost."

This then was the grand design of his life—the design of freedom—in all things both at home and abroad.

More than 11 months before he had affixed his signature to that great document whereby this dreadful and awful vestige of human tyranny which remained as one of the unsolved problems of the Constitution, came to an end. What a document the Emancipation Proclamation is and what a delightful sound it carries. Its language is worth recalling.

"By virtue of the power and the purpose aforesaid, I, Abraham Lincoln, do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within such States are and henceforward shall be free, and upon this act, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God."

To his own generation and to posterity he was saying that human beings are and should

forever be free. He was asking God and mankind to look with favor upon this act. It was indeed one of the most compassionate events in the whole history of mankind. Such was the purpose of this common man.

But this recital to his devotion to the cause of freedom would not be complete without adding two other observations. They are indeed so timely now.

The first of these was contained in his message to the Congress on December 1, 1862. On that occasion he said: "In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free."

If we could experience the miracle of seeing through his eyes and from the heart of Abraham Lincoln, the problems of today, what courses would we be impelled to follow to serve humanity best and earn for ourselves the acclaim of our fellow men and the gratitude of posterity? What should we do to enrich the tradition of America? Somehow in moments of stress and anxiety, we like to call upon the wisdom and guidance of those who have gone before. It was this very natural inclination which impelled the poet Wordsworth, in a critical moment in the history of England, to cry out from his very soul: "Milton, thou should be living at this hour!" In that same spirit when frustration besets us and the current scene is not too peaceful, we too might utter such an entreaty and say, "Lincoln thou shouldst be living at this hour!"

And why not? His wisdom and inspiration is not denied to us. He still speaks. Even as Paul in speaking of the sacrifices of Abel to gain righteousness reminds us that "Abel being dead, yet speaketh," so this great common man yet speaketh to every generation which shall come after him.

Surely in any personal communion with him we would at once be challenged with a question which might take the very form of the words he used in his first speech at Springfield, Ill., in the campaign of 1858: "Do we know where we are? Do we know whither we are going? Can we know what we must do until we get our true bearings and a sense of direction? If a nation cannot endure half slave and half free, can an integrated world in which time and space have been annihilated endure half slave and half free? And what is the state of freedom in the world?"

Out of this provocative and challenging question there would quite naturally ensue so many things which we already know.

Let us refresh ourselves on the events of the last few years. It is but 30 months ago that mankind's costliest war for freedom came to an end. It was a moral war. It was the age-old conflict of right and wrong, the right of humble people to be free, the wrong of iron dictatorship that would despoil that freedom. At every turn the conflict was sparked by the battle cry of freedom. The pronouncements of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms were reasserted over and over again. They were reasserted in Washington and in Moscow, in Tehran and in Yalta, and from it all the world looked for so much.

It was a costly struggle. Millions of men, women, and children died. Other millions were uprooted. Other hundreds of millions were saddled with burdensome taxes. For other hundreds of millions the whole economic, social, and political design of their lives was destroyed.

And not the least of the cost was the complete destruction of hope for so large a segment of mankind.

This awful cost of freedom seems so quickly forgotten. One is reminded of the soldiers of King David, who with great danger to themselves went to Bethlehem's well to bring water for their King, and when it was brought David suddenly became conscious of its worth and would not drink. It was then that he said: "With the jeopardy of their lives they brought it." And we must ever remember that it was with the jeopardy of their lives—millions of lives—that we earnestly hoped that the water of freedom would again be brought to humanity.

And now that this chimerical dream of blood and despair has for the moment vanished, what is the state of freedom in the world? With that ancient prophet, Haggai, we can in truth cry out today and say: "Lo! Ye looked for much and it came to little."

Since the drone of planes and the roar of artillery was stifled to mark the end of World War II, more freedom has been liquidated than was won upon European battlefields. One by one the candles of freedom are again being extinguished.

One need but lift his eyes and assess the state of freedom behind the "iron curtain" from Finland to the Aegean. One need but appraise the fears of Austria and Czechoslovakia. One need but examine the fever and unrest in Italy and France. The liquidation of freedom has been accomplished by fear, brutality, and by the complete and subtle distortion of the concept of real democracy. Somehow the Atlantic Charter with all its affirmations has been forgotten in many places. One may well wonder what dead and bruised GI's might say about all this. Freedom—that kind of freedom for which Lincoln crusaded—the freedom for which millions died—the freedom which is the very purpose of this Republic—that freedom began to vanish from the earth before the cannon of World War II was cold.

Its gradual extinction has brought a strange overtone of anxiety and misgiving upon the whole world and upon us. We cannot plan for the future of our country and ourselves. Everything we say and do is calculated in terms of what communism may do. Never as a Republic have we entertained such a strange anxiety, and what do we propose to do about it?

We must finish the business of freedom. Abraham Lincoln finished his task. The words of the proclamation come down to us with ringing force. "The slaves are and henceforth shall be free," but he went even further. He said also that if the people should make it an executive duty to reenslave such persons, another and not he must be the instrument to perform it. He did not utter the plaintive cry of Haggai that "ye looked for much and it came to little." He finished the work he was in.

But we have not finished the work which we are in. The menacing force of communism daily grows bolder and bolder. Its plans for the complete engulfment of Europe must be reasonably clear to all men. Communism knows what it believes and where it wants to go. It entertains no doubts about its objectives. It is moving like an engulfing shadow.

Now we are confronted with requests for aid from the people in those countries where freedom's light, though feeble, still burns, and it is for us to determine whether our rendezvous with freedom shall be kept.

Will we be deterred by softness and political timidity from doing our full duty? Will we haggle and delay while the time for action is here? Do we fall back upon threadbare cliches to avoid our duty? Will selfishness deter us from action? Will we permit the isolationist ghost to rise again?

Perhaps we forget that communism is as much a religion as it is a system of government and economics. It is a struggle for the souls as well as for the minds of men, and already in the last three decades it has brought more than 20 percent of the world's habitable land under its control. There are some who believe that the gap between enslaving collectivism and individual freedom can be bridged, and that these systems, as opposite as day and night, can dwell together in this earth in concord and understanding. They can dwell together only if we are ready to let freedom perish from the earth.

To save freedom abroad and at home and arrest the spread of this evil force will cost money. But in Lincoln's day it was also a costly business to achieve freedom at home. To provide necessary aid to meet the challenge to freedom may to some degree feed the fires of inflation, but as Lincoln pursued with an amazing singleness of purpose and devotion the end which he had in view, there was also inflation in the land. It will require sacrifice of the most heroic kind to meet this challenge, but it also required great sacrifice in his day no less than in ours. In fact, so burdensome was the sacrifice that even the great Greeley permited it to sway his trenchant pen.

In fact, as Lincoln stood at Gettysburg in those dark hours while desertions ran high, blood and tears were everywhere, and the credit of the Union was shakey, there was still no deviation from the course which this great common man pursued.

Would we be honoring his memory tonight if he had forsaken the struggle for union and freedom because blood, inflated prices, heavy expenditures from the public treasury, and grim sacrifices by all people were required. Had he yielded to these, we would rather remember him with contumely and shame.

Conscience rides herd upon our generation. We looked for much and thus far it has come to little. Shall we now meanly forsake the struggle for freedom because it involves other and costly sacrifices?

If so, what shall we do when the political and economic and spiritual slavery of Communism moving as a cloud over the earth, weaponed by the unlimited manpower of the east and the resources of Europe, should at long last direct its attention to us as the last remaining citadel of freedom. It is then that we shall know the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln. He was so emphatic in his conviction that the Nation could not endure half slave and half free. One or the other must triumph. And in this highly integrated world in which time and space have been annihilated, and it is no further from Washington to Berlin than it was in his day from Washington to Atlanta, who will contend that such a world can endure half enslaved and half free. We are but on the threshold of this contest. Even as the world worked long and hard during the war to devastate and destroy, so it must work longer, harder, and more sacrificially than ever before to rebuild what was destroyed, including, faith, hope, and ideals.

Abraham Lincoln kept his rendezvous with freedom. Do we keep ours?

There is another facet to the problem of today, and that is freedom at home. Here again his wisdom would be equally clear and persuasive.

I can picture him before a large crowd in the city of Peoria, Ill., more than four score years ago. These were his people—the kind of people whom he represented during his only term in Congress. Here again he devoted himself to the fabric of freedom, and his observations were such that they justify careful quotation:

"My faith in the proposition that each man should do precisely as he pleases with all that is exclusively his own lies at the foundation of the sense of justice that is in me. I extend the principle to communities of men as well as individuals. I so extend it because it is politically wise as well as naturally just; politically wise in saving us from broils about matters which do not concern us."

This was the doctrine of that great common man. Yet there are those today who would in peacetime impose unwanted restrictions upon the people's liberty and action. It is the incredible approach of meeting the problem of inflation and scarcity by division instead of multiplication. It is a

testimony to our softness, to the ease with which we grow accustomed to restrictions on liberty, and to the escapist view of finding the easiest way out of our dilemma.

In time of war we were only too glad to swap butter for guns that the victory might be the sooner won in the world contest for freedom. But what about swapping butter for the weapons of freedom to win the unwon peace? Without freedom there can be no peace, and without peace there can be no freedom.

One need not be an alarmist to say that this is a time of crisis for mankind. It is a moral crisis, for defeatism exists both in and out of government. A measure of our faith has been leached away and replaced by confusion and timidity. What better can we do as we honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln than in truth and in fact to fall back upon the standard which he raised for his party as its first President. Sorely do we need his faith, his simplicity, his patience, and his singleness of purpose. We need his guidance to marshal a return to the American tradition and so stop the dangerous drift which is upon the land. We need to take his design of freedom if we would serve humanity. We need to look through his eyes to rediscover the greatness of America. We need to make this exalted common man our patron saint in something more than name.

Let me add this brief epilogue to my story. In the year 1832 when Lincoln was a volunteer captain in the Black Hawk War in northern Illinois, a young man but a few years out of Harvard who was to distinguish himself as a minister of the gospel, had composed the words to a song. His name was Samuel Francis Smith. There had come to the attention of Samuel Smith a rather solid melody which was more than 100 years old. The words of the song did not impress him and so in a moment of inspiration he wrote within the space of half an hour, five stanzas to this melody which suited him better. One stanza was subsequently dropped. But so was born a song which has risen from the lips of millions upon millions of Americans from the day it was written. In childhood we commit it to memory, and it never leaves us:

"My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing.
Land where my fathers died,
Land of the Pilgrims' pride;
From every mountain side,
Let freedom ring!"

I do not know when or in what degree this song of freedom may have come to the attention of Abraham Lincoln. Often have I puzzled over this song, especially the last line, "From every mountain side let freedom ring." Abraham Lincoln, common man of the ages, did something more than let freedom ring.

He made it ring. In this generation, when the world is so beset with the challenge to liberty, there is upon us the sacred duty to make freedom ring.

True American Wants Opportunity—Not Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is inserted herewith a letter received from a resident of the district which I have the honor to represent:

SOUTH HAVEN, MICH., *January 10, 1948.*
CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: Perhaps this won't interest you, but as a mother of three children and trying to bring them up healthy and happy, and with pride in America, I have to "pop off" to someone and express my views (and many of my friends) on helping Europe with billions of American dollars.

Constantly we are being asked via radio, newspapers, and other publications to help the children in Europe. No one wants to see them hungry or mistreated, but neither do we like to see our own do without.

When they speak of sending all this money to Europe, do any of them stop to consider the families in this country in my position, and believe me we are in the majority, who wonder from day to day how they are going to get through the expenses of the next day?

Here are a few points of comparison for them to look at and think about:

In 1942, 3 years after my husband had passed away, I was still able to pay my grocery bill in full, drive a car, keep my house as warm as I wished and buy my children, not luxuries, but the necessities of life. Also to instill in them that this was a mighty fine country with everyone having the right to pick their own vocation and, if they had enough initiative, to make a spot for themselves. All this was done on the insurance my husband had been foresighted enough to provide.

It is now 1948, and I have been working 3 years. I couldn't work before because my youngest child was born 3 months after my husband died and I was unable to leave him alone and help was unobtainable. I am head over heels in debt (and not a great deal of hope for the future in clearing it up). I lose my appetite, and I mean literally, when I think of ordering groceries because of the price and knowing that my children need the right kind of foods. I can't even promise them they will be warm this winter because I run from day to day with the threat of having no oil. I am not a home owner that converted recently to oil, either. I had a complete unit installed in my home in 1939. When I get oil I now pay as much for 100 gallons as I formerly paid for 200. All this when I am still getting insurance payments and a salary. Incidentally I haven't owned a car either in 5 years. I sold it because I thought someone engaged in war work would receive greater benefit from it than I.

Ask Mr. Marshall and some of these others that are all for doling out our money—after all you can't deny, that in our small way, we of the so-called middle class are going to pay it eventually—if they have ever wondered on December 23 and even the morning of December 24, if they were going to be able to place anything under the tree for three youngsters for Christmas morning? Maybe if they thought of a few of those things they might know why the people of the United States have failed to follow through with a great cooperation on meatless Tuesday, eggless Thursday and some of the other brilliant ideas. I'll grant you they have some excellent ideas at times, but the times have been too few.

I don't want anyone to pay my bills for me or any part of social aid; all I'm asking is an opportunity to take care of my own obligations and feel that when I have concluded a day's work that I have made a small step forward in the security of my children until such time as they can provide for themselves.

I am not a radical, Mr. HOFFMAN. I was brought up in a good Republican atmosphere, where we were taught that we should work for what we wanted. There was opportunity for all, and there still is if some of those lame-brains would concentrate on the problems of our own people before taking on the world.

I know many families in South Haven, and, believe me, they feel just as I do, and they are all in the same position as I.

As you can gather from the above, I am seething with anger over the futility of working day to day and going backward instead of forward.

You are the recipient of this as you are the only one from Washington that I have ever met (though I wouldn't expect you to remember one out of thousands) who, I feel, might read this and realize my sentiments for what they are.

At least I have the feeling that someone in Washington will know what we are up against.

Sincerely yours,
OLIVE S. CAIN.

Poem by W. D. Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert herewith a poem received from a resident of my district, Mr. W. D. Thomas:

Hillbilly Harry, the man from the hills,
Is now down in Washington and does as he wills.
Bighearted Harry must feed the whole world,
If the people at home into starvation be hurled.
When Harry became master of the big chair,
He said to the King: "Your troubles I share.
"We will feed you and clothe you regardless of cost,
"For the royal family must never be lost.
"What care I if we starve and freeze,
"If the royal family can live in ease.
"We will dish out the cash and millions of men,
"To see that your troubles all come to an end.
"And now, dear King, on my bended knee,
"I make you a present of our Treasury's key."

Margarine and the Growth of Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Margarine and the Growth of Children," by Dr. Harry Leichenger, Dr. George Eisenberg, and Dr. Anton J. Carlson, which appeared in the American Medical Association Journal for February 7, 1948. I have been informed by the Public Printer that the article will make 2¼ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $159.75.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARGARINE AND THE GROWTH OF CHILDREN [1]

(By Harry Leichenger, M. D., George Eisenberg, M. D., and Anton J. Carlson, Ph. D., M. D., Chicago [2])

This study was undertaken to determine whether there is any nutritional difference, as shown by increases in height and weight in significantly large groups of children, when the source of supplementary table fat in their diets is vegetable (margarine) rather than animal (butter).

For a number of years there has been some controversy among nutritionists and other workers in the field of fat nutrition regarding the relative merits of animal and vegetable fats in the human diet. A great deal of experimentation has been carried out, the laboratory rat being used, in the main, as the experimental animal.

Little experimental work has been done in fat nutrition, however, among human subjects. For that reason, the present study was decided on. To insure valid results, examinations of the 267 children (white) included in this study were made for a period of 2 years.

As early as 1925 Holmes,[3] in studies carried out on human sujects, found that margarine was from 93 to 97 percent digestible. Bunker,[4] in 1927, stated:

"Beef fat excreted in the milk of the cow is no different in its origin from beef fat which is retained within the animal, although the chemistry of butter fat and oil differ somewhat. Each is a suitable food. The vegetable oils, also, such as olive oil, palm oil, coconut oil, peanut oil, cottonseed oil, and others are all suitable foodstuffs. The digestibility of the various animal and vegetable fats is high."

Some years later Carlson [5] stated:

"All the scientific data on the digestibility, flavor, and color of the dietary fats show clearly that there is no significant difference in digestibility between animal and vegetable fats and that the acceptability of those fats in regard to color and flavor is a matter of past conditioning of the individual and of no other significance in nutrition."

Boutwell [6] and others, after experimental studies on rats, concluded:

"1. With lactose as the sole carbohydrate * * * rats showed superior growth when fed butter or lard as compared to corn oil, coconut oil, cottonseed oil, soybean oil, peanut oil, olive oil, and hydrogenated cottonseed oil.

"2. With a mixture of carbohydrates composed of sucrose, starch, dextrose, dextrin, and lactose in the diet, the average growth response of the animals fed vegetable oils was equal to that of the animals fed butter and lard. The growth rate on this ration was more rapid than when all the carbohydrate was present as lactose.

"3. Properly fortified oleomargarine fats gave growth equal to butterfat over a period of 6 weeks when the above mixture of carbohydrates was incorporated in the rations."

Deuel,[7] on the other hand, found no difference in the growth of weanling rats at any time over a 12-week period whether they were fed mineralized skimmed milk powder, vitamin supplements and butter, or corn, cottonseed, peanut or soybean oils, or margarine. The extent of growth was confirmed at 3 and 6 weeks by roentgen determinations of length of the tibia. Also, the efficiencies of conversion of these various fats to body tissue were identical. These experiments refute the idea that butterfat possesses certain fatty acids not present in other fats, which are essential to growth.

The Council on Foods and Nutrition of the American Medical Association [8] stated:

"It is therefore possible to conclude that at present there is no scientific evidence to show that the use of fortified margarine in an average adult diet would lead to nutritional difficulties. A similar statement is probably justified in the case of growing children, but preliminary reports from animal experiments indicate that more work is necessary before any specific conclusions can be made."

Graves [9] stated:

"When pure, all fats are equally available for the energy needs of the body * * * the shortening powers and keeping qualities of both butter and margarine are about the same and they are equally assimilable."

Again, Bloor [10] pointed out:

"Very little need be said about the relative nutritional value of fats and hence of availability and distribution for the reason that most of the ordinary food fats of both plant and animal origin consist mainly of the same few fatty acids—oleic, palmitic, and stearic—in varying proportions, and it is to be expected that they would not differ much in digestibility or in metabolic usefulness."

Recently Deuel [11] reaffirmed the fact that vitamin-fortified margarine has a nutritional value substantially equivalent to that of butter. This belief is supported by the conclusions of an entirely unprejudiced group, the Committee on Public Health Relations of the New York Acsdemy of Medicine, which recommended in its report of February 1, 1943, that wide publicity, both lay and professional, be given to the fact that margarine fortified with vitamin A is nutritionally equal to butter. A similar conclusion was reached by the food and nutrition board of the National Research Council in its reprint and circular series No. 118, released in August 1943.

Cowgill [12] concluded:

"Edible fats, the melting points of which are not too high to prevent liquefaction in the alimentary tract, are digested and absorbed to about the same degree. Such differences as have been found are of no practical nutritional significance. * * * Natural fats differ with respect to their content of the essential unsaturated fatty acids, but the amounts needed by the organism are so small that these are probably of no practical nutritional significance. Natural fats have not been found to differ appreciably in their effect on the body's needs for other dietary essentials. * * * In a diet otherwise nutritionally satisfactory, a vegetable fat such as that contained in a margarine can serve adequately in place of butter fat for growth and reproduction, as shown by experiments with eight and more successive generations of rats."

Boer and colleagues [13] recently reported on the presence of vaccenic acid in summer butter. They stated that vaccenic acid has growth-promoting properties in rats. Euler and associates,[14] however, reported inability to demonstrate any growth-promoting factor peculiar to butter. Moreover, the same authors [15] in later studies "to characterize the physiological influence on the rat's organism of different fats * * * compared the growth, the fertility, and the longevity of rats, which were reared on a fat nutrition, consisting either of butter or of margarine (fat mixture MW)." They concluded "that the nutritional and physiological value of the slightly varying fat mixtures, which we employed under the designation of MW and which correspond to the margarines manufactured in Sweden during the period from October 1943 to November 1946, is in no way inferior to the value of butter."

Deuel and associates,[7] meanwhile, found vegetable fats and margarine equal to or better than butter in supporting augmented growth in two series of tests with rats, based on administration of growth hormone from the anterior lobe of the pituitary body.

PLAN OF STUDY

Two groups of children were included in the study, which covered a period of 2 years. One group received only margarine as the table fat in the diet. It was used on bread and vegetables, as well as in the making of pastry and in frying. Fortified margarine was supplied by a number of the various companies now manufacturing the product and was the same as that sold to the public. The margarine used was all derived from vegetable fats and contained no fat from animal sources. The second group of children used only butter for the same purposes.

The margarine group lived in an institution housing 130 children ranging in age from 3 to 16 years. The children were half-orphans, for the most part, from broken homes. They attended the neighborhood schools and returned to the institution for lunch. Samplings also indicated that the children were served margarine on their occasional visits to families outside the institution.

[1] From the Department of Pediatrics, University of Illinois College of Medicine.

[2] Aided by a grant from the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. Terms of the grant provided that findings from the study could be published, regardless of results.

[3] Holmes, A. D.: Digestibility of Oleomargarine. Boston M. & S. J. 192: 1210 (June 18) 1925.

[4] Bunker, J. W. M.: Evidence Concerning the Reputed Health Values of Fats: A Review of the Literature, Am. J. Pub. Health 17: 997 (October) 1927.

[5] Carlson, A. J.: Facts and Fancies About Food Fats, Am. J. Pub. Health, 31: 1161 (November) 1941.

[6] Boutwell, R. K.; Geyer, R. P.; Elvehjem, C. A., and Hart, E. B.: Further Studies on Comparative Value of Butter Fat, Vegetable Oils and Oleomargarines, J. Nutrition 26: 601 (December) 1943.

[7] Deuel, H. J., Jr.; Movitt, E.; Hallman, L. F., and Mattson, F.: Studies of the Comparative Nutritive Value of Fats: I. Growth Rate and Efficiency of Conversion of Various Diets to Tissue, J. Nutrition 27: 107 (January) 1944.

[8] The Comparative Nutritional Value of Butter and Oleomargarine, report of Council on Foods and Nutrition, J. A. M. A. 119: 1425 (August 22) 1942.

[9] Graves, L.: Fats in Our Daily Fare, Mod. Hosp. 60: 90 (March) 1943.

[10] Bloor, W. R.: Role of Fat in the Diet, J. A. M. A. 119: 1018 (July 25) 1942.

[11] Deuel, H. J., Jr.: The Butter-Margarine Controversy, Science 103: 183 (February 15) 1946.

[12] Cowgill, G. R.: Relative Nutritive Values of Animal and Vegetable Fats, Physiol. Rev. 25: 664 (October) 1945.

[13] Boer, J.; Jansen, B. C. P., and Kentie, A.: On the Growth-Promoting Factor for Fats Present in Summer Butter, J. Nutrition 33: 339 (March) 1947. Boer, J.; Jansen, B. C. P.; Kentie, A., and Knol, H. W.: The Growth-Promoting Action of Vaccenic Acid, ibid. 33: 359 (March) 1947.

[14] von Euler, B.; von Euler, H., and Saberg, I.: Zur Kenntnis des Nahrwertes verschiedener Fette, Die Ernährung 7: 65, 1942; Versuche über die Nahrungsfaktoren der Butter, ibid. 8: 257, 1943.

[15] von Euler, B., and von Euler, H.: Biological Facts on Vaccenic Acid, Ark. f. kemi, minero. o. geol., June 1947, vol. 25B, No. 2.

[16] Deuel, H. J., Jr.; Hendrick, C., and Crockett, M. E.: Studies on the Comparative Nutritive Values of Fats: VII. Growth Rate With Restricted Calories and on Injection of the Growth Hormone, J. Nutrition 31: 737 (June) 1946.

The butter group was in another institution some 10 miles (16 kilometers) away. It included 125 children, ranging in age from 6 to 17 years, who were mostly orphans.

The diet in each institution was carefully supervised by trained dietitians and so regulated that 25 to 30 percent of the total calories were supplied by fat. The margarine constituted approximately 65 to 70 percent of the total fat calories.

All of the children in both groups were weighed and measured each month under medical supervision. A careful check was made from time to time to be sure that weights and measurements were accurately determined. Routine red-blood-cell counts and hemoglobin determinations were made on each child after the study was started and again 1 year later. Specialists in pediatrics supervised the medical care of all the children. A record was kept of the character and duration of all illnesses contracted by the children.

RESULTS

At the close of the study more than 200 records were available for analysis in the margarine group. Because of the turn-over in the institution, the period of study was not uniform and ranged from about a month to a maximum of 24 months. In the butter group there were about 150 records available, ranging up to 24 months' observation time on weight, height, red-blood count, hemoglobin, and illnesses.

It was found that those children who stayed a very short time had extreme irregularities in weight gains. Since it would serve no useful purpose and only increase the margin of error in the computations, all those records of children who were studied less than 6 months were discarded. About 40 in each group were so eliminated, leaving 160 records in the margarine group and 107 in the butter group.

Blood studies

There were 65 children in the margarine group and 85 in the butter group from whose records differences in erythrocyte count and hemoglobin could be computed. At the beginning of the study there was an average red-cell count of 4,284,000 in the margarine group, the lowest being 3,710,000 and the highest 4,870,000. One year later the average was 4,198,000; the low, 3,440,000; and the high, 5,560,000. Comparable figures for the butter group were as follows: At the beginning, the average red-blood-cell count was 4,629,000; low, 3,940,000; high, 5,640,000; 1 year later the average was 4,640,000; low, 3,920,000; and high, 5,560,000.

In the margarine group the average hemoglobin was 13.7 Gm. per hundred cubic centimeters, with a low of 11.3 and a high of 16.6. One year later the figures were 13.4, 10.5, and 18.6, respectively. For the butter group, at the beginning of the study the hemoglobin figures were: Average, 15.4 Gm.; low 13.8; and high, 17.9. One year later the findings were: Average, 15.3; low, 12.4; and high, 17.5.

All these figures are within normal limits in our clinical experience. Moreover, according to Osgood and Baker,[17] there is an average of 12 gm. of hemoglobin, ranging from 10 to 14 gm., in the blood of normal children from 4 to 13 years of age. Griffith and Mitchell [18] stated that the red blood cell count remains at about 4,500,000 to 5,000,000 throughout childhood. Hence it would appear that the blood cell counts in both institutions were in line with counts found in similar groups of children. Furthermore, any variations which occurred were well within the usual errors in making hemoglobin and red blood cell determinations.

Height and weight

All the records contained data on weight in pounds and ounces and height in inches. Gains in weight and height are partly a function of time, so a further adjustment had to be made to facilitate valid comparison. The basis of exactly 1 year was used for standardization. The period of the greatest majority of the cases was over a year. Since this means that the majority had to be reduced in value to be standardized, chance errors tend to be reduced as well.

An analysis of the total cases in each group is shown in tables 1 and 2. Average annual weight and height gains for boys and girls are shown. For additional comparison, the average gains from standard height-weight tables are included under the column headed "Standard."

Since changes in weight and height are also a function of age, only groups of like age are compared.

The standard error is appended to each value in the margarine group, and comparable value in the butter group. For a test of statistical significance at the 5-percent level, the difference between two comparable entries in the margarine and standard columns must be greater than twice the standard error. For instance, on the first line in table 1, under "Boys," in the column headed "Margarine," the average yearly gain in weight was 6.7 pounds (3,039 gm.) with a standard error of 0.6 pound (272.2 gm.). Twice 0.6 is 1.2, which added to 6.7 gives 7.9 pounds (3,583.4 gm.). The average gain in the standard column is 7.2 pounds (3,265.9 gm.), well within the range of the standard error, and the difference is, therefore, not statistically significant.

TABLE 1.—*Average yearly gain in weight (in pounds) for children observed at least 6 months*

Age, years	Boys			Girls		
	Margarine	Butter	Standard	Margarine	Butter	Standard
All (2 to 15)	6.7±0.6		7.2	7.4±0.6		6.9
All (6 to 17)		7.0	7.9		8.9	7.1
6 to 13	7.2±0.7	8.8±0.9	7.5	8.9±0.7	7.2±1.0	8.0
2 to 5	4.2±0.3		5.2	3.9±0.4		4.6
6 to 9	5.3±0.5	7.1±2.2	5.5	7.5±0.5	8.3±1.7	6.2
10 to 13	12.3±1.7	9.4±1.0	9.5	10.6±1.3	7.1±1.1	9.7
14 to 17		6.6	8.7		3.4	5.2

TABLE 2.—*Average yearly gain in height (in inches) for children observed at least 6 months*

Age, years	Boys			Girls		
	Margarine	Butter	Standard	Margarine	Butter	Standard
All (2 to 15)	2.2±0.1		2.3	2.1±0.1		2.2
All (6 to 17)		1.5	1.8		1.0	1.7
6 to 13	2.0±0.1	2.1±0.1	2.1	2.0±0.1	1.2±0.1	2.1
2 to 5	2.5±0.1		3.0	2.3±0.1		2.7
6 to 9	1.9±0.2	1.9±0.2	2.0	2.1±0.1	1.5±0.3	2.2
10 to 13	2.2±0.2	2.2±0.2	2.2	2.0±0.1	1.2±0.1	2.0
14 to 17		0.7	1.2		0.4	1.0

For a test of significance between a margarine and butter value the formula

$$\sigma_{\bar{x}_1-\bar{x}_2}=\sqrt{\sigma^2_{\bar{x}_1}+\sigma^2_{\bar{x}_2}}$$

is used. In only three cases does it seem necessary to perform this test. This is in table 1, under boys, ages 6–13 and ages 6–9, and table 3, under boys, 6–9 years of age. In none of these cases was the difference found significant.

In both table 1 and table 2 all average gains in the margarine group were at least as great (including the standard error) as the gain in either the butter group or a standard group, with two exceptions. These exceptions were in the 2- to 5-year age groups. This is due to the fact that the average age in this particular group in the margarine study was greater than the midvalue of the group. In fact, there were only one boy and one girl 2 years old included in the study.

It is believed that the adjustment of all the values to an annual basis is accurate. However, to eliminate doubt as to the validity of the method, comparisons were made using only those subjects who were observed for the maximum time. There were 51 children in the margarine group who were studied the maximum time of 24 months. In the butter group there were 53 under observation for the maximum 24 months.

Again the values were reduced to an annual average gain, going far to reduce chance errors, since all values were practically halved. Tables 3 and 4 exhibit the data:

TABLE 3.—*Average yearly gain in weight (in pounds) in children observed 24 months*

Age, years	Boys			Girls		
	Margarine	Butter	Standard	Margarine	Butter	Standard
All (2 to 15)	6.7±0.9		7.2	8.2±1.0		6.9
All (6 to 17)		8.1	7.9		6.3	7.1
6 to 13	7.4±1.2	8.7±1.2	7.5	9.5±1.1	5.3±1.2	8.0
2 to 5	4.6±0.5		5.2	4.0±0.4		4.6
6 to 9	5.1±0.6	6.7±2.3	5.5	8.3±1.1		6.2
10 to 13	12.2±2.4	9.4±1.3	9.5	11.0±1.7	8.3±1.2	9.7
14 to 17		7.0	8.7		6.7	5.2

[17] Osgood, E. E., and Baker, R. L.: Erythrocyte, Hemoglobin, Cell Volume and Color, Volume and Saturation Index Standards for Normal Children of School Age, Am. J. Dis. Child. 50: 343 (August) 1935.

[18] Griffith, J. P. C., and Mitchell, A. G.: The Diseases of Infants and Children, ed. 2, Philadelphia, W. B. Saunders Co., 1937, p. 38.

In only one case, the 2- to 5-year-age group in the boys, is the comparison unfavorable. In all other combinations margarine shows up as at least as efficient a source of fat for growth as butter in the normal diet.

COMMENT

It is evident from the tables that growth of the group fed margarine, as determined by increases in height and weight, was comparable to that of the children fed butter and to standard height and weight values for the same age group.

Furthermore, it was noted that in the margarine group there was no increase in the amount of illness. Illnesses in general had been on the decline in the margarine group for the last 4 or 5 years, and this decrease in the incidence of illness continued during the period of the study. This compares with conditions present in the community for the last 5 years.

It was interesting to observe how the children accepted margarine. When it first made its appearance on the table—in its white form—and the study was explained to the children, the younger children promptly accepted it. The children in the older age group did not take to it too kindly. Very shortly thereafter, however, a shipment of colored margarine came in. This was cut up into the usual pats and all the children then ate it readily and liberally. Thereafter it was always served cut in pats and colored.

At no time during the period of the study was it considered that vitamin A played any definite role in the results of the study. The reason, of course, is that all the margarine used contained 15,000 units of vitamin A per pound—which is equal to or greater than the amount present in average butter.

Blood studies showed that there were no significant differences between the margarine or butter groups.

The children in the margarine group experienced a high degree of good health during the study, and in comparing their health to that of the butter group it appears to have been much better.

TABLE 4.—*Average yearly gain in height (in inches) in children observed 24 months*

Age, years	Boys			Girls		
	Margarine	Butter	Standard	Margarine	Butter	Standard
All (2 to 15)	2.2±0.2		2.3	2.2±0.2		2.2
All (6 to 17)		1.6	1.8		0.9	1.7
6 to 13	2.1±0.3	2.2±0.2	2.1	2.2±0.2	1.2±0.2	2.1
2 to 5	2.5±0.1		3.0	2.5±0.1		2.7
6 to 9	2.0±0.4	2.6±0.1	2.0	2.4±0.2		2.2
10 to 13	2.3±0.3	2.2±0.2	2.2	2.0±0.2	1.2±0.2	2.0
14 to 17		0.7	1.2		0.1	1.0

When infirmary records are compared it is readily seen that the margarine group fared much better than the butter group. We are not making any claims that the margarine group were healthier simply because their diet contained margarine. Other variables are more likely to account for their better health.

At no time during the course of the study did either institution experience any type of epidemic, and no doubt this may in part be due to the fact that both institutions practiced accepted preventive measures on all their children.

CONCLUSIONS

Growing children experience normal growth in height and weight when their diets contain only fortified margarine as table fat, as shown by comparison with children fed on similar diets with butter as the source of table fat and by comparison with standard height and weight tables.

TABLE 5.—*Group total and average yearly gains in weight (pounds) and height (inches); children observed at least 6 months*

Age, years	Margarine group			Butter group		
	Number of children	Weight	Height	Number of children	Weight	Height
2 to 5	45	182.389	106.784			
6 to 9	71	429.586	139.446	13	66.872	23.332
10 to 13	41	462.020	86.432	28	440.173	90.510
14 to 15	3	43.121	6.878			
14 to 17				41	223.328	25.209
Total	160	1,127.498	339.540	107	760.373	139.141
Average		7.047	2.122		7.100	1.300

TABLE 6.—*Group total and average yearly gains, by sex, in weight (pounds) and height (inches); children observed at least 6 months*

Age, years	Boys			Girls		
	Number of children	Weight	Height	Number of children	Weight	Height
	Margarine group					
2 to 5	24	101.080	59.171	21	81.311	47.614
6 to 9	41	213.701	77.800	30	224.667	61.647
10 to 13	16	197.327	35.600	25	265.290	50.833
14 to 15	2	42.273	6.878	1	.848	
Total	83	556.381	179.449	77	571.116	160.094
Average		6.703	2.162		7.417	2.079
	Butter group					
6 to 9	9	63.793	17.294	4	33.079	6.038
10 to 13	28	263.559	60.935	25	176.614	29.576
14 to 17	26	172.504	18.800	15	50.824	6.499
Total	63	499.856	97.029	44	260.517	42.113
Average		7.934	1.540		5.921	.957

Whether the greater part of the fat of the diet is derived from vegetable or animal sources has no effect on growth and health as shown by changes in height and weight and health records of children observed over a 2-year period.

During a 2-year period the health of 267 children was uniformly good so far as serious illness is concerned, regardless of whether margarine or butter was the source of the greater part of the fat in the diet.

If there is a growth factor present in butter which is not present in margarine, there is no evidence in the present study that such a factor plays any important part in the growth of children as determined by increases in height and weight.

Margarine is a good source of table fat in growing children, as determined by a 2-year study. Children readily accept margarine as a table spread when it is colored and served in pats.

Archibald Roane—Correspondence Between Jefferson Davis and Caleb Cushing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an historically interesting narrative written by Mr. E. E. Patton, which appeared in a recent issue of the Knoxville Journal, a daily paper published at Knoxville.

Mr. Patton is a very prominent businessman, historian, outstanding citizen, and statesman, who lives in Knoxville, Tenn. He has served as mayor of that splendid city and in his research, which is a kind of side line or hobby with him, he frequently comes up with a story of human interest.

The story I speak of today concerns a letter written by Caleb Cushing on the 20th of March, 1861, to Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States. This story relates how this letter appeared to haunt Cushing in later years, actually preventing him from being nominated by President Grant as Chief Justice of the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO JEFFERSON DAVIS SPELLED DOOM FOR CALEB CUSHING'S CAREER

(By E. E. Patton)

Horace Maynard was a scholar, a lawyer, a statesman, a politician, a teacher, a diplomat; he represented the Second Tennessee District in Congress; he was minister of Turkey; was Postmaster General. He said it is better to ride 20 miles on horseback and talk with a man rather than write him if it is on a delicate matter. My advice to all young people is, never write a letter when you are mad. In this article I shall endeavor to show how a man was destroyed by a letter he wrote.

Caleb Cushing was a native of Massachusetts; was educated at Harvard; spent 2 or 3 years in Europe learning the modern languages and taking extensive courses in international law. He held various offices, including several terms in the House of Representatives. He was Attorney General in the Cabinet of Franklin Pierce from 1853 to 1857. Incidentally, Pierce is the only President who kept his Cabinet intact for 4 years.

In that Cabinet was Jefferson Davis, Secretary of War, and a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point. He had also seen service in the Mexican War under his first father-in-law, Zachary Taylor. He had also seen service in the Black Hawk War, having been the commanding officer of the division in which Abraham Lincoln served as a captain of volunteers. Davis was President of the Southern Confederacy and on March 20, 1861, Cushing wrote Davis the following letter:

WASHINGTON, *March 20, 1861.*

Hon. JEFFERSON DAVIS,
President, the Confederate States.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Archibald Roane, for the last 6 or 7 years a clerk in the Attorney General's office, desires from me a letter of introduction to you, and he desires it not in the view of anticipating administrative favors, but that he may have the honor of your personal intercourse. Of this I take pleasure in assuring you he is eminently worthy. A Southern man by birth, family, and affection, he has carefully studied and ably discussed, in Mr. DeBow's Review and other Southern works, the lamentable events which have at length overthrown the American Union. Whilst a practical man, he is also a ripe and accomplished scholar, with, indeed, predominant literary tastes and habits. In the discharge of his official duties he has combined in a singular degree the purest integrity, enlightened intelligence, with modest contention of his lot, having more than once declined offices of more conspicuous employment in the public service. He now resigns his present office from sentiments of devotion to that which alone he can feel to be his country, namely the Confederate States, from one of which (Texas) he was appointed.

I most heartily commend him as a gentleman and a man to your confidence and esteem. And I am, with the highest consideration, your obedient servant.

C. CUSHING.

By way of explanation, it is said that this Archibald Roane was a son of Archibald Roane, second Governor of Tennessee, and whose remains lie in a cemetery about one-half mile from Farragut High School in Knox County.

This Archibald Roane, whom Cushing recommended so highly to Davis, had a patent rifle which he desired to call to the attention of the "President of the Southern Confederacy."

In 1873 President Grant appointed Cushing to the high office of Chief Justice of the United States, and this nomination went, in its usual course, to the United States Senate for confirmation or rejection. It seems that in his younger days, Cushing treated a young man in his city with somewhat hauteur and contempt; in fact, he insulted this young man by the name of Aaron A. Sargent. Sargent went to California and in 1873 was a Senator from that far-western State. He was told about this letter. He got the letter in his possession and got the Committee on the Judiciary called together. He then proceeded to read the letter and show the members of the committee that it was in the handwriting of Caleb Cushing. He asked for a show-down, but there was not a man on that committee who was willing to risk his political life by voting to confirm Cushing for that high office, a man who had written a letter to Jefferson Davis when that man was in open rebellion against the power and authority of the Nation.

No doubt there are those who would like to know how Sargent found out about this letter and further, how it happened to be preserved. When it was known that Richmond could not hold out much longer, a clerk in one of the offices of the Confederacy decided it was time to take the records of the Confederacy to a place of safety. So he had them crated and hauled out some distance from Richmond and stored.

He later went to Washington and offered to sell them to Secretary of the Treasury, but he was not very much impressed; he could see no reason why he should put out good money for a large lot of "Rebel" records. But some of his subordinates suggested that since every claimant for damages to his property had to prove his loyalty to the Union Government, he would likely find thousands of letters from Southern sympathizers attesting their loyalty to the Confederate Government; that by purchasing these letters and other records, he could save the government untold millions of dollars in damages. So he bought the letters and other records and it is said that he paid out 90,000 good dollars for them.

Evidently some one in the Department who knew Caleb Cushing, decided it might be well to preserve it; this was done. A clerk in the Department knew of Sargent's hatred toward Cushing and lost no time in getting the information to him.

Status of the Aircraft Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article written by me entitled "Status of the Aircraft Industry." This appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union of February 5, 1948, and in the Manchester Evening Leader of February 5, 1948. Both papers are published in Manchester, N. H.

STATUS OF THE AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

IMPORTANCE OF THE AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

Every American should be deeply interested and vitally concerned in the trends and the conditions of the aircraft industry. It is of utmost importance for the United States to have in being an aircraft industry continually designing, developing, and producing the latest types of aircraft and aerial missiles for immediate use should an emergency arise. It is essential that the industry be capable of rapid expansion.

It is perfectly obvious that air power will play the major role in our future national security. It is certainly clear that in the event of future war the United States will be attacked from the air by missiles, conventional bombers, and atomic weapons. If our national security is to be guaranteed, we must have the facilities to replace the exceedingly heavy losses which the Air Force will sustain in the first weeks of an emergency. The decisive factor in any war of the future will be the ability to produce aerial missiles and aircraft in the first weeks of the struggle.

Planes become obsolescent with great rapidity. At the present time, obsolescence is one of the outstanding characteristics of the equipment in use by the Army and Navy air forces. We must have a vigorous, healthy aircraft industry to make replacements so that the Air Force will be modern and up to date.

The President's Air Policy Commission in its report dated January 1, 1948, entitled "Survival in the Air Age" devotes the second section to the aircraft manufacturing industry. The chairman of the Commission was Mr. Thomas K. Finletter. The report has already become a famous document on national security. In this report emphasis is placed on a strong aircraft industry as a vital element in the achievement of United States air power. The Commission holds an air establishment is useless unless it is backed by an industry which possesses skill in technological application, is high in production efficiency, is capable of great expansion, and has a strong financial basis.

OBSOLESCENCE

The task of replacing the equipment in the Air Force, most of which has now become obsolete, is huge in consideration of the present low-production level. The armed forces estimated in statements to the President's Air Policy Commission that they should have in their striking arms and in their reserves some 26,000 planes. It is conceded that air equipment for military purposes should be replaced every 5 years because of attrition and obsolescence. The current rate of production is about 1,500 military aircraft a year. At this rate the equipment of the air-striking arm and the reserves could be placed not every 5 years, but once in 15 years. This situation is so startling that we should be gravely concerned.

THE TIME FACTOR

The time required to construct an airplane from the drawing-board stage to the date when it rolls off the assembly line emphasizes the importance of having an aircraft industry in readiness. From 5 to 7 years are necessary to plan and produce an airplane. All the plans for the planes used in World War II were on the drawing boards before the outbreak of hostilities. In the event of another conflict entirely new planes will be employed and the industry must be capable of producing them in mass quantities.

Even under ideal conditions a long time is required to expand the rate of production of aircraft. In World War II when all the resources of the United States could be mobilized in a leisurely fashion, when there was never at any time a question of attack or of interruption by sabotage, 5 years elapsed before the industry reached adequate production. We were exceedingly fortunate to have Allies standing between us and the enemy. This situation which prevailed in World War II, also in World War I, will never be repeated again and in a future conflict there will be no one to hold back the enemy while we proceed to expand the aircraft industry.

THE REPORT OF THE AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE

About 2 years ago the official Air Coordinating Committee made a study of the amount of aircraft production that should be maintained for the purpose of national security. The committee reached the conclusion that, as maintenance of world peace is well assured and a substantial degree of disarmament has taken place, the minimum production of military aircraft should be about 3,000 units a year. However, if there is need for a substantial striking force ready at all times to cooperate in the maintenance of world peace, the report came to the conclusion that the production of military aircraft ought to be 5,780 units a year. We certainly need a substantial striking force to guarantee the peace.

In view of the 3,000-unit level recommended after the maintenance of peace is assured and the 5,780 units if a substantial striking force is required, it is most alarming to realize that the production of military aircraft in 1946 was only 1,330 units and that production of aircraft in 1947 was approximately 1,500 units.

REQUIREMENTS

In his recent statement before the Air Policy Commission the Secretary of the Navy held that the program for naval aviation alone requires an annual production of 2,500

to 3,000 aircraft a year. A similar statement presented to the Air Policy Commission by Secretary of the Air Symington places the Air Force needs at an annual production of 3,200 planes a year.

Current production then is less than one-third of the minimum estimated requirements of the two air services. This is a perilously wide margin of failure to supply our air-striking arm with the new equipment they need to maintain operating air forces trained with modern equipment.

PAST AND PRESENT STATUS OF PRODUCTION

In 1946 production of military aircraft was 1,330 units. In 1947 it was about 1,500 combat units plus a few liaison and personal aircraft. The production ran around 1,500 a year for the 2 years, compared with the wartime peak of 96,000 units in 1944. In 1940, the aircraft industries produced 6,019 planes; in 1941, 19,433; in 1942, 47,836; in 1943, 85,898; in 1944, 96,318; and in 1945, 47,714

EMPLOYMENT

In the airframe and engine industries employment has declined to 175,000. This is about 30,000 fewer employees than were on the pay rolls at the end of 1946. At the height of production, late in 1943, and early in 1944, the total employment reached was 1,300,000 in the airframe and engine plants.

The above figures on the contraction of employment in the aircraft industries illustrates how rapid has been the dissipation of production and engineering teams built up during the war. Any further decline in employment threatens the complete dissipation of the nucleus of the teams of management, production, and engineering forces required to maintain an industry capable of producing the equipment we require in undertaking the expansion necessary in case of an emergency.

FINANCIAL STATUS

During 1946 and 1947, the American industrial economy experienced its greatest boom. Yet in this period when our industries were experiencing unprecedented activity, the aircraft manufacturers operated at a loss which menaces the survival of the industry. In 1946 most of the larger units in the aircraft industry responsible for the astounding production of the wartime years operated at a heavy loss. For 15 of the largest companies in the airframe and engine field, the operating loss before application of tax carrybacks and postwar reserves in 1946 amounted to $81,591,000. Even after making fullest utilization of tax carry-back provisions the net loss experienced by these companies in 1946 amounted to $11,684,000.

The picture for 1947 is even gloomier. Based on the latest information the Aircraft Industry Association estimated the operating loss of the 15 companies in 1947 as exceeding $100,000,000. After the application of the tax carry-back credits, and additional reserves accumulated during the war years, the net loss of these 15 companies for 1947 is expected to be at least double the $11,000,000 loss they experienced in 1946. Thus, for two consecutive years the aircraft industry has been operating in the red. Survival has been assured by tax carry-backs which will not be available after 1947. This grave and serious condition has not invited the confidence of investors or prospective employees particularly the employees equipped with the necessary scientific and engineering talents.

LAG IN AIR PREPAREDNESS

Secretary Symington of the Air Force in an article written for the American Magazine states that the United States is no longer the leading air power of the world. In quantity we have slipped behind the Soviet Union and qualitatively both Russia and England have numerous developments that exceed our own efforts. England, despite her severe economic strain as a result of the war, is devoting a greater portion of her defense budget to an air force than we are.

Guy W. Vaughn who is president of the Curtis-Wright Corp. asserted only recently that Russia is more powerful in the air at the present time than the United States was in World War II. He stated that Great Britain and Russia are ahead of the United States in research because of the very liberal appropriations of their governments. These warnings should make us determine to appropriate the funds required to prevent us from hopelessly lagging in the air race.

IN CONCLUSION

This alarming summary of the status of the aircraft industry emphasizes how imperative it is that we increase our plane orders sufficiently to make it possible for companies to remain organized. This is necessary for expansion sufficient to ensure production of the aircraft required in case of an emergency. The aircraft companies cannot be expected to maintain their financial positions and to retain their organization of high technically trained personnel in order to manufacture planes in the event of a conflict unless they receive financial aid through orders given by the Government. There isn't the demand for planes outside of the Government to keep the companies functioning.

Air supremacy cannot be achieved and maintained without the aircraft industry. A well-organized aircraft industry capable of expanding and a well-staffed organization of employees possessing the skill to build airplanes is prerequisite to achieving control of the air which is necessary for our national security. Even a cursory inspection of the industry causes us to pause, and we have every reason to be deeply concerned over the deplorable condition in which the companies capable of manufacturing military aircraft find themselves.

The acquiring of air supremacy is the most important issue before the country. One of the most important factors in gaining air supremacy is the maintenance of a healthy aircraft industry. Without the industry we cannot manufacture the planes and without the planes we cannot hope to achieve or maintain air supremacy; and without air supremacy we have no guarantee of security, and without air security the United States cannot survive.

The Daughters of the American Revolution and the Future of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and timely editorial taken from last week's issue of the Knoxville Labor News, published at Knoxville, Tenn.

This editorial is entitled "The Daughters of the American Revolution and the Future of America," and is one which pays high and worthy tribute to this splendid organization. After complimenting the DAR, the editorial proceeds to say we must see to it that our liberty and freedom are handed down unimpaired to future generations of Americans. It suggests that this can best be done through our public schools by constantly teaching students the too-often-taken-for-granted basic rights and guaranties of their liberties, and by contrasting them with the lack of such rights in other countries like Russia.

I commend the Knoxville Labor News and its editor, Hon. John L. Essary, for this thoughtful editorial, and for the patriotic suggestions he makes, as well as the splendid tribute he pays to that fine, patriotic women's organization, the DAR.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AND THE FUTURE OF AMERICA

The National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution is composed of women whose ancestors fought in the Revolutionary War to gain our liberty, freedom, and independence. Their main objective is to collect all history pertaining to the Revolution; mark historic spots; and foster certain worthy and worth-while schools in America.

There could be nothing nobler or finer in sentiment than this agenda. But there is a companion obligation imposed on this great society: that is to see to it that our liberty and freedom are handed down unimpaired to future generations of Americans. This can best be done through the medium of our public schools. The English language should be used in every public school. By that we do not mean to outlaw teaching other tongues.

In every schoolroom there should be constant reference made to our Declaration of Independence, to our Constitution, to our rights to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" in drastic contrast to the lack of those basic rights in such countries as Russia and all of her satellite countries which are forced to do obeisance to Stalin and his gang.

No student should be permitted to leave high school without a full and complete knowledge of our fundamental laws; the value of our rights, freedoms, and liberties. He should be required to read A Man Without a Country.

Recently there appeared in the Knoxville Journal an article on the mothers of Presidents and in this was included:

"There is a small monument in Fredericksburg, Va., on the side of which are carved these words: 'Mary, mother of Washington.' When the people of this country fail to understand fully these words, there will be no necessity to take thought about the safety of the country, for it will be gone."

Lord Macaulay tells us in his immortal poem that Horatius said to himself:

"And how can man die better
Than facing fearful odds;
For the ashes of his fathers
And the temples of his gods?"

If the Romans could die for that cruel country, how much nobler is it for Americans to die, or to live for this country. The DAR, in their State convention, should pass resolutions favoring the teaching of these basic governmental subjects in every school in Tennessee and they should also ask the National DAR Convention to take similar action.

Prohibition Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of February 5, 1948:

PROHIBITION NEXT?

The liquor industry is getting much the better of its argument with President Truman and other powerful opponents. The President and other crack-the-liquor-industry salesmen are peddling the idea that the industry's grain supplies must be cut in order to help Europe.

They cannot prove that Europe is to obtain much more than another kernel of grain through the medium of slashing the liquor industry's grain tonnage.

They cannot deny:

That the industry uses less than 1 percent of the Nation's grain output.

That the industry employs more than 2,000,000 well-paid workers.

That cutting the industry's grain supply in half literally would make ghost towns of Lawrenceburg, Ind., a clean, thriving community of 5,000 persons, and 60 other liquor-producing towns similar to Lawrenceburg.

That the industry pays to the Government billions of dollars in tax revenue each year, more than enough to pay half the cost of the Marshall plan.

That British and Canadian distilleries are running at capacity, are selling whisky in the United States.

That the welfare of an American liquor worker must be as important to the Government of the United States as the welfare of a European.

That, of the less than 1 percent of the Nation's grain used by the industry, more than 45 percent becomes pork chops, steaks, milk, butter, eggs, because distilling produces a residue chock full of vitamins and proteins, a byproduct used by farmers to feed animals and poultry.

Since the industry's opponents cannot deny that the Nation's economy is damaged irreparably when the liquor industry is handicapped, their reasoning is suspect. The suspicion is that they want the return of prohibition upon the United States. With prohibition came the gin mills, the slaughter of persons killed by bootleg whisky, the gangsters operating the bootleg traffic.

Prohibition didn't stop a single drinker. It merely robbed the Nation of revenue, permitted teen agers to drink because irresponsible gangsters were operating the liquor traffic.

Because the use of corn for distilling doesn't deprive anybody of a slice of bread, because the distilling industry uses less than a thousandth of 1 percent of the total wheat supply, it is good that we now have a responsible liquor industry.

It is far better to have Lawrenceburgs than gin mills. An American's appetite for food or liquor cannot be removed by legislation.

Nomination of Edward Allen Tamm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the President of the United States has recently forwarded the nomination of Edward Allen Tamm to be an associate justice of the United States District Court of the District of Columbia. This is an ideal selection. Mr. Tamm has earned distinction as one of the directing heads of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This fact indicates clearly the type of individual we have the privilege of confirming, because this important agency, so closely identified with activities of the Department of Justice, is composed of men of unquestionable integrity and devotion to the public service.

If proven competence, sterling attributes, and conscientious public service are tests by which judicial nominees can be gaged—as unquestionably they are—then Edward Allen Tamm measures up in every respect to the qualifications of the judiciary. He will grace the bench, and, based upon his record of faithful and efficient performance of duty, he will make a creditable addition to the district court.

Recently the Washington Star published an editorial in which reference was made to Mr. Tamm, and I ask unanimous consent to have these excerpts printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Some criticism of the appointment of Mr. Tamm can be expected. A native of Minnesota, he entered the FBI in 1930 as a special agent at the age of 23. And since FBI agents do not operate in the spotlight, he is relatively little known in Washington. He has not had the kind of legal experience that one ordinarily expects to find in the record of an appointee to the Federal bench, and his appointment was announced without waiting for any recommendations from the local bar.

Generally speaking, this would provide ground for opposition to the appointment. The Star does not believe, however, that this holds good in the case of Mr. Tamm. For his record at the FBI and his attitude toward law enforcement are such as to lead to the conclusion that he will make an excellent judge.

There will be, naturally, considerable speculation as to the reasons for the selection of Mr. Tamm. The best guess seems to be that it was a personal choice on the part of the Attorney General, and it may also be that the President desired to indicate his confidence in the FBI in the face of some criticism which has been leveled at this agency. But the particular reasons for the selection of Mr. Tamm are not of first importance. What is important is that these three appointments tend to strengthen our courts, where political appointments would have weakened them. It would have been easy, especially in an election year, for the President to have treated these vacancies as political plums. That he did not do so indicates that he has a proper regard for that political independence which ought to be the first attribute of the Federal judiciary.

Decentralize or Perish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have noted in the February 4, 1948, edition of the Wheeling Intelligencer, published in Wheeling, W. Va., an editorial entitled "Decentralize or Perish."

This newspaper, of which Mr. Herman Everett Gieske is editor, has called attention in the editorial to the suggestions made by me on behalf of Federal decentralization. I believe that an editorial on so important a subject deserves wide reading, and I am, accordingly, asking unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECENTRALIZE OR PERISH

Item:

"New York's land and buildings, regarded as the richest segment of real estate in the world, have risen in value to $17,684,240,921 on the city's tax books for the coming fiscal year."

Item:

"Writing in the Reserve Officer, United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, said atomic war with Russia could turn this Capital (Washington) into a 'death trap' for American liberty. We are now living in a fool's paradise of apathy and inertia. We must decentralize or risk a destiny of national extinction."

The above two news items may not seem to be related, but they are. Something has got to be done about the big cities of the United States, as Senator WILEY suggests, we risk national extinction.

If some foe, from without or within, were to wipe out overnight such great cities as New York, Washington, Philadelphia, Chicago, San Francisco, and St. Louis, to mention only a few, our national economic and government system would fall.

Those living in smaller cities can well feel a sense of security against such a doom. But they, too, are vitally affected. Should the National Government fall from such an atomic blow, the dwellers in the hinterlands would find it difficult not only to retain their freedom but merely to subsist.

Senator WILEY is a thousand times right. Our biggest cities must be decentralized and scattered and converted into smaller cities of, we would suggest, not more than 500,000 population.

The difficulties are staggering. New York City's taxable value of over $17,000,000,000 stands in the way of that, because when population goes, realty values would shrink, and the smaller cities would be the gainers.

In the atomic age, the agglomeration of huge masses of people in immense hives, with population running into the millions, is fully as fantastic as atomic energy itself.

Right now we should be building an alternative or "summer" capital of the United States somewhere near the geographical center of the North American Continent, equipped with bomb-proof subterranean chasms wherein our Government, including the Senate and the House, could function unmolested when atomic war comes.

We realize this smacks something of the Maginot-line psychology, but this need not be so. We could at the same time have atomic bombs poised to paralyze a foe in his homeland and still not be without protection and organization at home, should worse come to worse and we awaken some morning to find New York City and Chicago had vanished overnight.

Doubtless Senator WILEY at present is as a voice crying in the wilderness. But we trust he will not remain so. We commend him for his vigilance and foresight. With reguard to atomic energy, we are in much the same predicament as we were when the Wright brothers' flimsy crate first flew; when the first flickering movies were viewed; when the first weak wireless call went out into the air; and when the first balky horseless carriage trundled its way along. It was not

clear then that these forces would change the world socially and economically

Nor are the full implications of atomic energy at all clear at the present time. But is it not better to be safe than sorry?

Memorial Services for Mohandas K. Gandhi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday February 2), 1948

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I am delivering this afternoon at memorial services for the late Mohandas K. Gandhi. The services will be held at the Department of Labor Auditorium.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the passing of the great disciple, Mohandas K. Gandhi, our common manhood has lost a kinsman. Probably no man since Christ has more devotedly and literally followed and lived out the teachings of the Master of Men than he whose memory we honor today, and I am grateful for the privilege of lifting up my voice with others to pay a tribute of the esteem and regard in which he was held throughout the civilized world. Conscious of the greatness of his mission, he sacrificed himself for others, imposing on himself rigid restrictions, abstaining from fleshly lusts which war against the soul. He truly walked with God.

In a world torn with dissensions, tossed about by madly swirling currents of greed and lust for power, with many great powers reverting to the law of the jungle, seeking to impose their will on others by the destruction of life and property, this man of God turned to the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God. He became the leader of teeming millions of people. Striving to bring about his ideals for the benefit of his fellowmen, not through resort to guns and armaments but in glorious contrast, he followed the formula given by our Lord and Master: "Not by might nor by power, but by My spirit, saith the Lord."

So mote it be that as we face the future, seeking to bring order out of the chaos which threatens the peace of the world, that America and the nations of the Old World might put their trust, not in reeking tube and iron shard, but in obedience to the divine command to "Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself."

In so doing we would speed the day when the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ.

The press states that Gandhi is dead. This is true only in a mortal sense, for he spoke truly who wrote:

"A good man never dies, in worthy deed and prayer,
And helpful hands and honest eyes,
If smiles and tears be there.
Who lives for you and me,
Lives for the world he tries to help.
He lives eternally.
A good man never dies."

Such a man was Mohandas Gandhi. India and all peoples are better because he lived.

"So valiant, for truth, passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side."

But Gandhi, being dead, yet speaketh.

Tolls and the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tolls and the Seaway," which appeared in the February 8, 1948, issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOLLS AND THE SEAWAY

In 1934 Army engineers predicted that a St. Lawrence seaway would carry a maximum annual tonnage of 27,000,000. The St. Lawrence survey report arrived at the closely similar result of 25,000,000. Last year the National St. Lawrence Association raised these figures to 37,000,000. The discrepancies indicate that no one knows what the potentialities of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway are. Secretary Harriman has testified that the Department of Commerce has not yet made a detailed analysis of potential traffic on the seaway. Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler furnished the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Eightieth Congress with Army estimates of expected traffic—estimates which have been used to prove that the seaway can be made to pay for itself by levying tolls—but declines to be bound by them in the absence of a thorough study of all prospective traffic, the character and amount of tonnage that would actually move under a toll system * * * and the actual net income from those tolls as compared with the assessed navigation costs. In other words, all estimates of potential seaway traffic are little better than romantic hopes.

Proponents and opponents of the seaway split on the issue of self-liquidation. Last year's Senate joint resolution fixed a maximum toll of $1.25 a short ton of laden cargo that would pass through the deep-water navigation works, with exemptions in the case of local or way or Government traffic. Probably $1 would be the average cargo-ton toll. A study made by the Port of New York Authority indicates that the annual cost of maintaining and operating a channel 27 feet deep, exclusive of power facilities, would be $20,000,000 annually to American taxpayers. There are not more than five and a half million tons of toll-paying traffic in sight, so that on the basis of a $1-a-ton average (Secretary Harriman thinks that 50 cents a ton should be the maximum for grain, coal, petroleum, wood pulp, and ores), a belief in the possibility of self-liquidation seems mere daydreaming.

Costs, too, have risen since the St. Lawrence seaway was first seriously discussed in 1921. Last year the Chief of Army Engineers estimated the total cost of the work still to be done on the whole navigation and power project from Duluth to Montreal at $674,707,000, of which $491,609,000 would be borne by the United States—an estimate that allows nothing for deepening channels of lake ports and providing adequate harbor basins. Every one of our great engineering projects outran the estimates. The Welland Canal was to have been built for $70,000,000, but cost three times as much; the Chicago drainage canal cost not the estimated $16,000,000 but $53,000,000; and the New York State barge canal cost $176,000,000 instead of the expected $53,000,000. If the seaway should be constructed, it would probably cost American taxpayers annually far more than $20,000,000 for fixed, operating, and maintenance charges, so that the prospect of self-liquidation becomes more and more dubious.

Congress would be well advised to proceed with caution. We need a more thoroughgoing study of engineering costs and potential traffic than has been made before it can be asserted with confidence that a seaway can be made self-liquidating by levying tolls that shippers will pay.

Inconsistent Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the moment, let us forget the muddling foreign policy, which did not keep us out of war, and confine our present observations to what has happened since the fighting ended.

We have spent, since that time, billions of dollars in foreign lands and we have given away tons upon tons of farm and industrial machinery; of fertilizer; of oil—fuel, lubricating oil and gasoline; almost everything we were asked to give. Secretary General Marshall now admits that policy will call for sacrifice on the part of all of our people, but, more particularly, upon the part of farmers who just cannot produce food for us or anyone else without tools and fertilizer.

Now, no one objects to making sacrifices in order to help the unfortunate, but, as Herbert Hoover said just a few days ago, and as I have been trying to say for more than a year, it is idiotic to weaken one's self so much that one can neither care for himself nor help others.

Every farm girl and boy knows that you must adequately feed the cow, the hen, the pig, or you will not get milk, eggs, or ham. The city boy knows he cannot run dad's auto without gas. But that which to us seems a truism, our great intellectuals, who are so dissatisfied with our way of doing things, who wish to adopt some foreign ideology, just refuse to accept.

Our international policy has been not only inconsistent, but absurd. It would be funny if it were not so tragic in its results. Here we are, the strongest Nation in the world, frightened half to death by the propaganda which tells us that unless, in the 15 months after April 15, we give to foreign nations $6,800,000,000; unless we spend eleven additional billions on our armed forces; unless we grab each boy in the country who has reached 18 years of age and, for a period ranging from 6 months to a year and a half, turn him over to the military authorities for compulsory military training, someone is going to lick heck out of us. Communism is going to sweep this country.

Then these propagandists of fear, who try so hard to convince us that some unnamed potential enemy is about to destroy us if we do not accept without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," their program to keep us out of war, face

in the other direction and do the very things which history tells us create war. They stick our nose into every quarrel, whatever the issue, wherever it may be. They send our marines to Greece; they send our officers to lead the armies which are fighting in the powder keg of Europe—for centuries the place where wars have been conceived—they insist that we meddle in Palestine and are now talking about sending your boys to make Palestine safe for either the Jews or the Arabs. And, to top it off, they even still make it possible for Russia, through the use of our money and materials, to gird for war. They spend billions to stop communism from Russia; they give billions to Britain which enters into a trade agreement with Russia which strengthens Russia and communism.

Billions to stop communism 3,000 miles away, but coddling it here. This week, right here in Washington, there is a strike in Government cafeterias which feed 80,000 Federal employees. The union, whose members work in these semigovernmental cafeterias operated in Federal buildings, refuses to sign the anti-Communist affidavit required by law. The President of the United States did not protest when his Secretary of Labor and the marshal of the United States Supreme Court ordered two cafeterias closed, thus depriving the women and men who wanted to work there of the opportunity to work, making it impossible for some 10,000 Federal employees and others to eat there, furthering the program of a union whose officials refuse to comply with the law requiring them to sign an affidavit stating they are not Communists.

Spending billions to fight communism abroad, nursing it here at home, does not make sense.

Spending billions to create opposition to communism in Europe, giving other billions in dollars and material to communistic-dominated countries in Europe which aid communism, patting Communists on the back here at home, is ridiculous.

Our foreign policy for the last 15 years has been ruinous. It is time this administration and the present State Department are kicked out and a policy that will protect our own welfare and interests adopted.

The Present Status of the Alaska Highway and the Defense of Alaska, Our West Coast, and the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when we became involved in World War II, we established far outposts of defense to our security. Even though we then had strong allies, we deemed it necessary to take effective measures to ward off possible attack at points many hundreds of miles from shore.

We looked forward to the successful end of the war and we assumed that thereafter we could with safety relax our defensive outposts. Within the past 2½ years we have acted upon that assumption.

We have unlimbered for a voyage on what we thought would be a sea of peace, and now dark-red flashes of the tempest appear on the horizon. Our forecast of general postwar calm was in error. The hurricane of aggression is still in the winds. We must prepare ourselves to ride out that fury until it spends itself in oblivion.

We must reassume a posture of active defense. We must reestablish those outposts of protection that are necessary to the present threatening circumstances.

Among the most strategic points of dynamic defense is our Territory of Alaska. As an air and sea base, it commands the northern Pacific and is an outpost of protection to our entire west coast and the Western Hemisphere.

In a very recent study of Alaska entitled "Alaska Study Mission" made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is a quotation from a report previously made by the permanent Joint Board of Defense for the United States and Canada, as follows:

The Board reported that the effective defense of Alaska was considered of paramount importance to the defense of the continent against attack in the Pacific, because Alaska is one of the areas most exposed to any attack by an enemy wishing to establish a foothold in North America.

Senate Report No. 548 of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, on the Alaska Highway, reads, in part, as follows:

Failure to adequately defend it (Alaska) would result in the establishment of enemy air and naval bases for operation against the western part of the United States and against Pacific shipping. Defense of Alaska and the Aleutians was supplied almost entirely by the Pacific water route then being attacked by enemy submarines. * * * Military strategy dictated that the air route to Alaska be conditioned for the movement of whatever number of planes might be required in operations in the northwestern Pacific area and for providing Alaska with the essential supplies, should the water route become too hazardous. This has required grading and surfacing a connecting highway and building airport facilities.

The need was immediate and urgent, and while the situation is now materially improved, the necessity remains for both a highway and air route suitable for large operations as part of the permanent Alaskan defense. It was evident that the highway to Alaska would have a variety of peacetime uses and would contribute to the development of both Canada and Alaska, but the decision to build the highway was based solely on military considerations.

The building of the Alaska Highway will remain a saga of World War II. On February 16, 1942, a declaration of military necessity concerning the highway was made by the Secretary of War to the Secretary of State with the view of securing rights-of-way through Canadian territory. Shortly thereafter commenced the greatest single highway construction job ever undertaken. Seven regiments of United States engineers equipped with Diesel tractors, bulldozers, dump trucks, gasoline shovels, carryalls, graders, portable sawmills, and pile drivers, together with 12,000 civil workers, built the 1,500-mile highway into the Arctic to connect the United States with Alaska, between the spring of 1942 and November 1943. The cost of the highway was about $130,000,000, paid completely by the United States. The highway was built along the route that follows the general line of airports, Fort St. John, Fort Nelson, Watson Lake, Whitehorse, Boundary, Big Delta. It was built to serve as a military highway for transport and was in support of the line of air fields between the United States and Alaska. It is a vital link in the protection of the Northwest.

One of the sentences from Senate Report 548, quoted above, is worth repeating:

The necessity now remains for both a highway and an air route suitable for large operations as a part of the permanent Alaska defenses.

It therefore becomes important to determine the present status of the Alaska Highway as a highway and an air route in connection with permanent Alaska defenses.

Mr. Speaker, the United States presently has no legal basis for the use of the Alaska Highway for military purposes should the necessity therefor arise. This highway was built by the United States during the late war as a military highway and to provide a ground supply route for a chain of military airfields in northwest Canada and Alaska. However, that portion of the highway lying in Canada—1,257 miles of it—was, under the basic construction agreement, completely turned over to Canada on April 1, 1946, "to become an integral part of the Canadian highway system subject to the understanding that there shall at no time be imposed any discriminatory conditions in relation to the use of the road as between Canada and United States civilian traffic." In other words, the only purpose for which we may now use the highway is for civilian traffic and that only to the extent that a Canadian citizen may use it on the basis of nondiscrimination.

The Alaska Highway was built by us for the military defense of Alaska and now we may use it only for civilian purposes.

If the necessity for the defense of our west coast suddenly arose, Alaska would immediately assume major significance. We would then have to begin negotiating with Canada for military use of the Alaska Highway for military surface traffic and for its use as ground-supply route for a chain of military airfields for northwestern Canada and Alaska. On February 12, 1947, a joint announcement was made by our Government and by Canada based upon discussions within the Joint Board of Defense, as to extension of continuation of wartime cooperation between the armed forces of the two countries during the postwar period. This announcement is the last word, so

far as I know, of the status of joint defense arrangements between the two countries. It reads, in part, as follows:

The collaboration will necessarily be limited and will be based on the following principles:

* * * * *

4. Mutual and reciprocal availability of military, naval, and air facilities in each country; this principle to be applied as may be agreed in specific instances. Reciprocally, each country will continue to provide with a minimum of formality for the transit through its territory and its territorial waters of military aircraft and public vessels of the other country.

* * * * *

No treaty, executive agreement, or contractual obligations has been entered into. Each country will determine the extent of its practical collaboration in respect to each and all of the foregoing principles. Each country may at any time discontinue collaboration on any or all of them.

This is the basic document underlying present joint defense arrangements of our two countries. It probably contemplates the possible future making of an agreement respecting our military use of the Alaska Highway. But until such agreement is made, we have no legal right to such use. Furthermore, under the provisions of the February 1947 joint statement Canada "may at any time discontinue collaboration" with regard to our military use of the highway.

This is not a sound international arrangement for the defense of Alaska. However, there are some that say if the military use of the highway became necessary we would not hesitate to use it. Others will say that it would embarrass the Canadian Government and its citizens to ask such an agreement at this time. But these are not attitudes of frankness and honor. We need much more of these qualities in international relations today. We have had far too much Atlantic Charter talk and Yalta action. I do not know what kind of diplomacy is going to be necessary for the atomic age. But I do know that polite evasion and duplicity are going to prove hopelessly inadequate. I have a suspicion that a strong and entirely new kind of technique will have to be employed by the diplomats—the technique of truth telling and dealing in honesty. The very terms of the February 1947 joint statement contemplates further agreement as to the defensive use of the Alaska Highway by the United States. Why does not the Joint Defense Board arrange it now?

Must we wait for another situation to develop such as the one in Panama? The Panamanian Government has told the United States "to get out" of certain strategic defensive positions in their protection of the Panama Canal. Our State Department certainly did not look too good in failing to have arranged agreements for the maintenance of those positions. What kind of American diplomacy is it that fails to take proper and honorable steps to guarantee the defensive use of an outpost such as the Panama Canal. Both Alaska and the Canal are necessary for the protection of the Western Hemisphere. Neither of them is intended in any respect for any kind of interference with the internal affairs of any other country in the Western Hemisphere.

It is true that the international relations between the United States and Canada are probably the most exemplary in the world. But if I were Canada at a time when it became necessary for the United States to defend Alaska, I would much rather have an executed agreement between the two countries assuring the United States the military use of the highway. If I were Canada at such a time confronted as it would be with the opposing attitudes of the United States and its enemy, I would be embarrassed—to say the least—in granting the military use of the highway to the United States under pressure of crisis of war. It most comports with international honor and realistic understanding of world tensions today for Canada and the United States to enter into an agreement granting the use now rather than to put the United States in the position at a later time of a nation that would have to thrust its way across another country to defend its outposts.

Another sound reason why we should immediately have a permanent agreement for the plenary use of the highway is that the important Territory of Alaska will, in the not distant future, attain the position of statehood. When that time comes, we should certainly have to have an assurance of the military use of the highway. A tentative understanding such as is contained in the February 1947 statement would be entirely insufficient. When Alaska is a State we certainly should have full use of the highway connecting her with the United States. This is in no way detrimental to Canada. In fact, it comports with the best interests of Canada. A strong Alaska is a guaranty to Canada as well as the United States against the designs of any enemy of the Western Hemisphere coming from the Orient.

I believe it is the feeling of some members of the Joint Defense Board that it is not necessary at this time to enter into such an agreement with a nebulous arrangement based on previous expressions of good will between the United States and Canada. A definite agreement such as I have proposed is not inconsistent with the best of good will. The New York Central Railroad maintains a right-of-way across Canada from Detroit to Buffalo. It does not rest content with the international goodfellowship between the United States and Canada as a basis for its right-of-way. This right-of-way is protected by a 999-year lease entered into in August of 1903. When the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific Railroad used a right-of-way across the upper part of the State of Maine, they did not rest content with international friendship as a basis for the use of a rail highway across an American State. They obtained from the State of Maine the enactment of a law in 1868 incorporating an international railway company and assuring the use of the railway in Maine to the Canadian companies. If private corporations can obtain definite agreements for the use of right-of-way in a foreign nation, should the Government of the United States hestitate to formulate an agreement with Canada for use of the Alaska Highway, built by the United States, built as a military highway and built for the military protection of the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere?

Mr. Speaker, I urge the early consideration and adoption of the resolution I am introducing today to facilitate the making of an agreement between the United States and Canada whereby the United States is definitely assured the military and civilian use of the Alaska Highway both as an overland and an air route. The world has not arrived at the pacific state whereby we can afford to relax those outposts of defense that seemed so vital to us even in World War II. Alaska is a bridge to the Orient. We cannot permit an invasion to come across that bridge and penetrate into the heart of the American Continent.

It Is a Tax on Happiness and Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the war is over, and I think it is about time that we eliminate some of the excessive taxes that hit the average citizen whose income is in the middle and lower brackets.

Almost everyone goes to the movies—the theater. Some families go at least once a week, and others two or three times a week. Attending the movies is something the whole family can do together, and for two happy hours they escape from the troubles of their everyday life and achieve a relaxation hardly possible under other circumstances.

Dr. M. M. Hargraves, who is associated with the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., points out that recreation is an essential to good health, and urges people to make recreation a must on their list of activities.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 5011, which will abolish the wartime tax on theater and other amusements. My bill does not eliminate all taxes on admissions, but merely that extra tax that was legislated as a war emergency.

As Members of Congress, we surely do not want to penalize the vast majority of people whose chief recreation is a night at the movies.

I urge your support of my bill. The text of it follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) in the case of the tax imposed by section 1700 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on admissions) the rate of tax applicable with respect to any period after June 30, 1948, shall be determined without regard to the war tax rate of 1 cent for each 5 cents or major fraction thereof specified in section 1650 of such code (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes).

(b) In the case of the tax imposed by section 1700 (b) of such code (tax on permanent use or lease of boxes or seats), and of the tax imposed by section 1700 (c) of such code (tax on sales outside box office) the rate of tax applicable with respect to any period after June 30, 1948, shall be determined without regard to the war tax rate of 20 percent specified in section 1650 of such code (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes).

(c) In the case of the tax imposed by section 1700 (e) of such code (tax on cabarets, roof gardens, etc.), the rate of tax applicable with respect to any period beginning on or after 10 a. m. on July 1, 1948, shall be determined without regard to the war tax rate of 20 percent specified in section 1650 of such code (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes).

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, at my request the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared figures showing the cost of our foreign-aid program to each of the counties in the State of Connecticut and to the towns and cities in Hartford County.

I insert these figures not as an argument for or against the European recovery program or, as it is better known, the Marshall plan, but simply to give the residents of the First Congressional District of Connecticut an idea of what the Marshall plan will cost and just what the European relief program has cost the taxpayers of the same district since the end of the war:

Cost of foreign aid to counties in Connecticut and towns in Hartford County

	Population	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, (population × $183.02) based on $24,099,211,087	Foreign aid proposed by Marshall plan, 1948–52 (population × $129.11), based on $17,000,000,000	Total foreign aid provided and proposed, 1945–47, 1948–52 (columns 2 and 3) based on $41,099,211,087	Property taxes collected in 12 months ended Mar. 31, 1945
Counties:					
Fairfield	418,384	$76,575,987	$54,017,558	$130,593,545	$22,293,740
Hartford	450,189	82,397,192	58,123,102	140,521,094	23,170,841
Litchfield	87,041	15,930,940	11,237,864	27,168,804	3,262,241
Middlesex	55,999	10,249,385	7,230,031	17,479,416	1,548,044
New Haven	484,316	88,643,389	62,530,039	151,173,428	23,338,343
New London	125,224	22,919,498	16,167,671	39,087,169	4,149,498
Tolland	31,866	5,832,370	4,114,219	9,946,589	733,421
Windham	56,223	10,290,383	7,258,952	17,549,335	1,328,194
Total for counties	1,709,242	312,839,144	220,680,236	533,519,380	82,124,322
Towns in Hartford County:					
Avon	2,258	413,277	291,530	704,807	66,007
Berlin	5,230	957,236	675,245	1,632,481	149,661
Bloomfield	4,309	788,668	556,335	1,345,003	197,585
Bristol	30,167	5,521,466	3,894,861	9,416,267	1,732,137
Burlington	1,246	228,053	160,871	388,924	27,054
Canton	2,769	506,895	357,506	864,311	75,103
East Granby	1,225	$224,209	$158,160	$382,369	$32,282
East Hartford	18,015	3,407,096	2,403,383	5,810,449	1,214,212
East Windsor	3,967	726,072	512,179	1,238,241	112,210
Enfield	13,561	2,482,043	1,750,861	4,232,904	595,549
Farmington	5,313	972,428	685,961	1,658,389	195,190
Glastonbury	6,632	1,213,842	856,258	2,070,100	262,259
Granby	1,544	282,595	199,346	481,941	61,217
Hartford	166,267	30,431,516	21,466,732	51,898,248	11,946,404
Hartland	300	54,908	38,733	93,641	11,678
Manchester	23,769	4,350,883	3,072,689	7,428,572	913,367
Marlborough	476	87,121	61,456	148,577	11,420
New Britain	68,685	12,571,278	8,867,920	21,439,198	3,282,029
Newington	5,449	997,320	703,520	1,700,840	234,143
Plainville	6,935	1,269,299	895,378	2,164,677	276,211
Rocky Hill	2,679	490,332	345,886	836,218	119,964
Simsbury	3,941	721,313	508,823	1,230,136	140,752
Southington	9,649	1,766,037	1,245,782	3,011,819	375,893
South Windsor	2,883	524,009	369,642	893,651	113,302
Suffield	4,475	819,050	577,767	1,396,817	187,965
West Hartford	33,776	6,181,954	4,360,819	10,542,773	1,877,146
Wethersfield	9,644	1,765,122	1,245,137	3,010,259	456,544
Windsor	10,068	1,842,726	1,299,379	3,142,105	377,403
Windsor Locks	4,347	795,623	561,241	1,356,864	136,158
Total	450,189	82,397,191	58,123,000	140,521,091	25,170,845

Sources: Population figures, Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Population, vol. II, pt. I, pp. 836-37, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce. Information Relative to the Assessment and Collection of Taxes, 1945, State of Connecticut, Public Doc. No. 48, pp. 106-22.

NOTE.—1940 population figures for the continental United States are used because later figures are not available for every local unit. Population of the Nation (excluding armed forces overseas) has grown from 131,669,275 in 1940 to 143,382,000 (estimated) by July 1, 1947. If the latter figure is used, the per capita cost of foreign aid between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947, is $168.08 rather than $183.03. It should also be noted that the foreign-aid figures cover a period of over 6 years while the county tax receipts cover only 1 year. The county tax receipts reflect the income of only 1 unit of government and not all local and State receipts and expenditures.

The Dismantling of German Factories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a splendid editorial entitled "The Dismantling of German Factories," which appears in the February 5 edition of the Wanderer, a national Catholic weekly newspaper published in St. Paul, Minn. The editorial discusses the pamphlet Destruction at Our Expense and urges a more Christian approach to the great question of rebuilding Germany. The editorial follows:

THE DISMANTLING OF GERMAN FACTORIES

At a time when the world is crying, and even dying, from lack of industrial production, writes former President Herbert Hoover in his foreword to the pamphlet Destruction at Our Expense, we seem to pursue, nevertheless, the policy of destruction of the gigantic productive equipment in the western zones of Germany. This policy, Mr. Hoover thinks, of dismantling and shipping abroad hundreds of German factories of all kinds, "means less essential goods for all Europe, greater delay in recovery of the world, and larger drain on the American taxpayer * * * as we vainly spend a billion a year to keep alive these millions of (forcibly made) idle Germans."

The afore-mentioned pamphlet, edited and endorsed by a special committee (Common Cause, Inc., 137 East Seventeenth Street, New York), contains valuable information and pertinent suggestions relative to the currently employed economic policies of the Western Powers in occupied Germany. Specifically, the pamphlet takes issue with the plan, long operative in bankrupt Germany, of dismantling thousands of factories which otherwise might be put to vitally needed, peacetime productive use. Its criticism focuses on two main points: First, that many of the German plants have been allocated for shipment to the Soviets; and, second, that in all three zones in Germany from which the factories are being removed, there is at present a huge economic deficit which must largely be met, either directly or indirectly, by the American taxpayer.

After pointing out that the arguments used by proponents of this plan have been proven false by outstanding American economists and political leaders who point to the enormous production vacuum which has thus been created in Germany, the pamphlet refers significantly to some of the chief dangers being courted by the dismantling program. The "discouraging effect," it points out, of the dismantlings on German labor and on other democratic elements, on which we must rely to build democracy and resist communism in Germany, are only too obvious. The German people must not only have bread, but hope. And yet, if they are asked to continue what must seem an insane process of destruction amid the desolate ruins which surround them, realizing that in too many instances they are destroying the factories on which their very livelihoods and jobs must depend, they can hardly be blamed if they resent such a program and,

if the program continues, gradually come to despair.

The desire to remove German industry now, the pamphlet asserts, as a means of preventing future German aggression, can to a certain extent be explain d psychologically. But it is unwise and unnecessary. For the period of the present crisis, and for as long as the Allies occupy western Germany, it is utterly irrelevant. "As for the future, there are other and better means of preventing aggression, such as disarmament and disarmament inspection; treaties to provide joint action against aggression from Germany or elsewhere; the building of a democratic Germany, and, above all, the building real international organization with its own police force."

We heartily concur, if not with everything as set forth in this pamphlet, then at least with the basic idea of finding a more Christian approach to this question, an approach which respects the justified claims for security and hope for the future on the part of the millions of dispossessed victims of Nazi aggression. (W. L. M.)

Irving Martin, Grand Old Man of California Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, next April 8 will be the fifty-third birthday of the Stockton Record. The founder of this paper is Irving Martin. Today, at the age of 82, he is the active head of the Stockton Record Publishing Co.

Mr. Martin has had an interesting and useful career. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the publication entitled "Editor and Publisher," under date of January 10, 1948, which just came to my attention.

From long personal knowledge, I know how active the Record and Mr. Martin have been in helping foster sound and beneficial public projects. His son, Irving Martin, Jr., prior to his death, wrote a daily column on the editorial page of the Record entitled "As the Sun Sets." That column gave impetus to many important public efforts. One was to try to develop the Stockton Symphony Orchestra, organized in the city of Stockton. By publicity and encouragement, he helped make the orchestra a distinct success and asset to the city. Every holiday season Irving Martin, Jr., collected through his Sunset column thousands of dollars for the parent-teachers' association for the purpose of providing lunches for underprivileged children. In every way the Stockton Record has been a wholesome influence on Stockton and the surrounding area.

To describe Mr. Martin is a difficult thing, but I believe his two outstanding characteristics are his tolerance and his kindness. He has supported many important men, including our present Governor, Earl Warren. These public men have themselves differed violently on public questions, but Mr. Martin has nevertheless maintained his friendship with them and also his convictions.

The article referred to reads as follows:

MARTIN SAYS PUBLIC WANTS HONEST OPINION

(By Campbell Watson)

STOCKTON, CALIF.—The youth who would be publisher in a city known as a "graveyard of newspapers" is silver-haired now, a veteran of 52 years at the head of one newspaper—the Stockton Record.

The same courage which brought success in publishing caused him to switch his traditional political stand in four Presidential elections, and on one of these occasions his paper's influence was a vital factor in swaying a close election and changing the course of history.

He built a successful newspaper where others failed, though once he defied a community's wrath and an advertising boycott for the stand he believed just.

HONEST OPINION A DUTY

These factors lend real significance this national election year to the views of Irving Martin, Sr., when he speaks on the value of a newspaper's editorials.

Mr. Martin asserts firmly that honest expression of opinion is a duty of the newspaper which its readers expect the publisher to assert. He does not think such editorial opinions should be for influence alone, holding that the prime purpose is to perform a public service.

Likewise outspoken on labor conditions, Mr. Martin does not believe the Chicago system of photoengraving is the real answer to the existing dispute between printers and publishers.

"It seems to me that men can get together. We must get together here in this country if we are to succeed in solving world problems," he declared.

THREE ITEMS IN HIS CODE

As a daily newspaper publisher since he founded the Record April 8, 1895, Mr. Martin lists the three principal duties of a newspaper in this fashion:

"First, to get and publish as much news as you can.

"Second, to interpret that news and make it plain.

"Third, to provide descriptive comment and opinion.

"This last," he hastened to add, "does not necessarily mean that the readers are going to follow you and be influenced by you. They want your opinion as a mark to shoot at and will follow you only to a certain extent.

"But it does not make much difference whether the readers agree with you. It does matter that they are stimulated by it and thereby find and learn their own opinion. An editorial viewpoint is offered not only as an influence. It is given primarily as a public service."

This is especially true, Mr. Martin explained, in advice given on the long series of propositions which regularly face the California voters at each election. The Record always offers yes-and-no lists, and has been gratified at the number of newspaper clippings appearing in the hands of voters going to the polls.

"This is a most effective way of giving effective thought to the community," he explained.

"The Record has facilities to investigate each ballot proposition and determine its merits. We are happy to provide this service."

STILL ACTIVE AT 82

Alert and vigorous at 82, Irving Martin summed up his views of editorial responsibilities by stating:

"It is not important whether readers agree with you or not. If you express your honest convictions, few readers will quarrel with you."

A reputation for printing the news the community has a right to expect is essential in building repute for editorial forthrightness, Mr. Martin hastened to explain. The Record always refused to suppress news. There were big tests when a community figure absconded with a huge sum of money and when civic officials were arrested in an early morning gambling raid, yet these proved the Record could be relied on to tell the story—also, that the public cannot be fooled, Martin stated.

STARTED AS A PRINTER

Fifty-three years come next April is a lengthy span of publishing for any man, but even before that Irving Martin was coowner of a weekly, the Stockton Commercial Record. Before that he was a Stockton Independent reporter, and he began newspapering by learning the printing trade at the age of 17.

Martin entered the daily field here, despite the failure of four others who attempted to publish dailies. In the course of events he absorbed the Stockton Mail, which has hailed his venture with a cartoon showing the "gravestones" of his predecessors. But he did not succeed hands down. He subsequently confessed his debts at one time reached $165,000.

The Mail held Stockton as a stronghold when the Record began to publish, and Martin gained his foothold by courting the nearby communities and the countryside. His policy was to build up circulation, render service to the community, and improve his plant as he went along.

SUPPORTED WILSON

In 1912 Martin stuck out his jaw all the way and endorsed Woodrow Wilson for President, despite warnings that this interpretation of "independent Republican" policy would ruin him. Martin remained in business and struck out for Wilson again in 1916. Chief Justice Hughes was hailed the election winner as vote counting continued in California's hinterlands, and then came the tally which returned Wilson to office.

"I do not say that the Record decided the election," Martin stated. "But it is interesting to note that California went Democratic by a margin of 3,600 votes, and the State then was nominally regarded as well within Republican ranks, so the Record's stand was important."

Martin also supported Cox against Harding and backed Franklin D. Roosevelt over Landon in Presidential contests, but he was always regarded as a progressive Republican. His stanch stands and his integrity of character resulted in a series of State laurels. He was water commissioner, railroad commissioner, chief of finance of the board of control, chairman of the California Tax Commission, and a member of the group which revised the constitution.

PUBLISHED DURING QUAKE

The Record moved along. It had just installed a new rotary press in 1906 when San Francisco was hit by earthquake and fire. The Record kept its new press rolling for almost 24 hours, printing extra after extra and building a reputation for progress. Rivals were unequipped to meet such production.

Then, in 1914, the community was rent by a dispute over unionization. Refusal of merchants to recognize a clerks' union was the spark which flared over the entire community. A group of store owners suggested the Record endorse the open-shop move, but Martin refused on the grounds his first responsibility was to publish a paper as he saw fit. The merchants debated cancellation of advertising contracts in a secret session, and Martin immediately returned all contracts.

"I had to rely on the countryside, which fortunately I had cultivated, to stay in business. It was bitter strife. It divided churches, lodges, and even families. I am glad to say that I was able to do some work which helped effect an eventual compromise."

Throughout his half century as a publisher, Martin's ideal was to link the newspaper and the community so the paper would lead and reflect the area's progress. Among many contributions to this was a long fight which created a deep-water port at inland Stockton.

GRANDSON IN TRAINING

Greatest loss in Martin's long career was the death of his son, Irving Martin, Jr., then vice president of the Record Publishing Co. This happened during wartime, when a grandson was in military service with the Army Transport Command.

The grandson, Irving Martin III, is now in the Record news room, training for future responsibilities as publisher. He worked in the advertising department, evenings and vacations, when in high school, and later in the circulation department. Irving III likes the news room best.

"He now has a knowledge of the concordance of a newspaper's departments which I believe essential," the publisher explained. Martin is especially sold on that unity of departments. He has a common plant entrance for all employees, designed his newspaper building so no one would be away from others, and annually has all workers as guests at a great Christmas party.

Nearby Lenten Services Available to Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the staffs and the Members of the Congress to a community religious enterprise here on Capitol Hill which began on Wednesday of this week.

A service of worship and meditation will be held in the Church of the Reformation, at 212 East Capitol Street, just opposite the Folger Shakespeare Library and within a block and a half of the Capitol, each weekday noon until Easter from 12:10 to 12:30 o'clock.

Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder, of the Church of the Reformation, emphasized that these would be general Protestant services, to which everyone is invited. Ministers and representatives of the various denominations will speak.

The purpose of these services is to deepen our moral and spiritual thinking, especially during these Lenten days and at a time when all of us need to refresh our minds on the basic principles of the Christian religion, which has meant so much to the life of America and all mankind. I hope many Members of the Congress and their staffs may find it possible to attend these 20-minute services each weekday.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway Would Strengthen Our National Defense

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while our moon-gazing internationalists are plunging this country toward another war, they seem to imitate Nero of old, who fiddled while Rome burned, by their refusal to build an adequate air force, and to coordinate it with our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge on the Tennessee River.

Everybody with any intelligence knows that the atomic bomb is the most powerful and destructive weapon the world has ever known. It would be more effective in a war today than all the navies in the world, or than untold millions of individual ground soldiers without adequate means of transportation—and without the atomic bomb.

Our main plant for the construction of this powerful weapon, on which we must depend for our future defense, is at Oak Ridge on the Tennessee River. Two years ago we authorized the construction of a new inland waterway along the Tombigbee to connect the Tennessee River with the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile, Ala., which would shorten the water distance from Mobile, Ala., to Oak Ridge by more than 800 miles; and would reduce the cost of transporting strategic materials from Mobile, Ala., to the Tennessee River from $2.79 a ton to 62 cents a ton, or to less than one-fourth; and on a barge load of 14,000 tons would save $30,380 on its fuel bill alone.

One of the greatest oil fields in the world is just west of Demopolis, Ala., in Mississippi. All water transportation coming out of Birmingham, Ala., where many strategic materials for war purposes are provided, has to come through Demopolis. This new route would shorten the water distance from Demopolis, Ala., to this Oak Ridge plant by 1,246 miles, a reduction of 82.7 percent.

This project would reduce the cost of transportation from Demopolis to the Tennessee River from $3.08 a ton to 34 cents a ton, or to less than one-ninth of the present cost, and on a 14,000-ton barge load would save $38,360 on its fuel bill alone.

In testifying before the Senate committee in 1944, General Robins, Assistant Chief of Army Engineers, said:

If that waterway were in operation today it would be of tremendous value for national defense, but you cannot put a money value on it any more than you can put a value on winning the war.

Yet, while the Dnieprostroy Dam in Russia is being rebuilt with American money, and while some of these internationalists are arguing that we proceed to build dams on the Jordan River at the expense of the American people, we are having tremendous difficulty getting an appropriation with which to start work on this great inland waterway, which in addition to giving us a slack-water route to all points on the Ohio River up to Pittsburgh, Pa., as well as what amounts to a slack-water route into the Great Lakes at Chicago, and to Minneapolis and St. Paul on the Mississippi River, would be the greatest contribution to our national defense of any inland waterways project ever proposed in providing this cheap slack-water route to and from Oak Ridge, the site of our greatest national defense project.

I am appealing to the Committee on Appropriations, and to the other Members of Congress from every State in the Union, to join us in this effort to strengthen our national defense, and to make it possible to more easily protect our country against all comers at all times.

Here is the table worked out by the Army engineers, showing in distances this project would provide:

Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway

WATERWAY DISTANCES TO GULF PORTS

From—	To Gulf at New Orleans via Mississippi River	To Gulf at Mobile via Tennessee-Tombigbee	Savings	
			Miles	Percent
Minneapolis-St. Paul	1,718	1,610	108	6
Chicago	1,398	1,290	108	7¾
St. Louis	1,043	935	108	10
Cairo	880	772	108	12.5
Hickman	824	788	36	4
Pittsburgh	1,841	1,641	200	11
Cincinnati	1,379	1,179	200	14.5
Louisville	1,226	1,030	200	16
Paducah	900	706	200	22
Chattanooga	1,370	740	630	46
Wilson Dam	1,165	535	630	54
Junction of Tennessee River and Tombigbee Canal	1,121	491	630	56.2

DISTANCES VIA TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY VERSUS EXISTING WATER ROUTES

From—	To—	Distance via present waterways	Distance via Tennessee-Tombigbee	Savings in miles via Tennessee-Tombigbee	
		Miles	*Miles*	*Miles*	*Percent*
Junction of Tennessee River and Tombigbee Canal.	Fulton, Miss	1,711	57	1,654	96.7
Do	Aberdeen, Miss	1,673	95	1,578	94.3
Do	Columbus, Miss	1,685	183	1,502	91.9
Do	Demopolis, Ala	1,507	261	1,246	82.7
Do	Birmingham, Ala	1,687	441	1,246	73.9

And here is one showing the savings in the cost of transportation:

From—	To—	Via Mississippi per ton	Via Mississippi per tow of 3,500 tons	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee per ton	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per ton	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
Houston, Tex.	Cairo	$2.34	$8,190	$1.94	$6,790	$0.40	$1,400	$5,600
	Paducah	2.42	8,470	1.88	6,580	.54	1,890	7,560
	Tombigbee-Tennessee Junction	2.74	9,590	1.40	5,030	1.34	4,690	18,900
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	2.02	7,070	1.32	4,620	.70	2,450	9,800
	Paducah	2.10	7,350	1.26	4,410	.84	2,940	11,760
	Tombigbee-Tennessee Junction	2.42	8,470	.99	3,465	1.43	5,005	20,020
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	2.39	8,365	.95	3,325	1.44	5,040	20,160
	Paducah	2.47	8,645	.89	3,115	1.58	5,530	22,160
	Tombigbee-Tennessee Junction	2.79	9,765	.62	2,170	2.17	7,595	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	2.66	9,310	.95	3,325	1.71	5,985	23,940
	Paducah	2.64	10,640	.89	3,115	2.15	7,525	30,100
	Tombigbee-Tennessee Junction	3.36	11,760	.62	2,170	2.74	9,590	38,360
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	2.60	9,100	.67	2,345	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	2.78	9,730	.61	2,135	2.17	7,595	30,380
	Tombigbee-Tennessee Junction	3.38	10,780	.54	1,890	2.74	9,590	38,360
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	2.84	9,905	.81	2,765	2.32	8,120	32,480
	Paducah	2.91	10,185	.65	1,875	2.46	8,610	34,440
	Tombigbee-Tennessee Junction	3.23	11,305	.17	595	3.06	10,710	42,840
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	2.88	10,080	.46	1,610	2.42	8,470	33,880
	Paducah	2.96	10,360	.40	1,400	2.56	8,960	35,840
	Tombigbee-Tennessee Junction	3.23	11,305	.13	455	3.10	11,025	44,100
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	2.80	10,255	.41	1,435	2.57	8,820	35,280
	Paducah	3.01	10,535	.35	1,225	2.66	9,310	37,240
	Tombigbee-Tennessee Junction	3.33	11,655	.08	280	3.25	11,375	45,500

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution memorializing Congress to enact a sound and effective European recovery program

Whereas there is great need of aid by the United States to certain countries of Europe in order to protect the inhabitants of such countries from privation and starvation to assist them in their own efforts to restore their shattered economies and to prevent the spread of communism and to preserve the democratic form of life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact as speedily as may be consonant with careful consideration a sound and effective European recovery program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In Senate, adopted January 29, 1948.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

[SEAL] F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Walter Anderson—Man of the Year in Florida Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and appreciation that I note the designation by the Progressive Farmer of Walter Anderson, of Greenwood, Jackson County, Fla., as man of the year for agriculture in Florida. I can think of no finer selection. Walter Anderson is a good farmer, a good citizen, and a good American.

The Progressive Farmer, a noted farm publication, has for many years selected outstanding men throughout the South for its man-of-the-year awards in recognition for their services to agriculture. Here is what was said about Walter Anderson:

FOR FLORIDA: WALTER ANDERSON

Walter Bryan Anderson is one good farmer who is not without honor in his own country. Now farming in the same community in Jackson County, where he was born 48 years ago, he has led the way in soil improvement and in use of new and better crops and has served well his community, his State, and the Southeast.

The oldest of five boys, he left college after a year and a half at the University of Florida to begin farming on his father's place. At first he raised mostly hogs, cotton, corn, and peanuts. Always, however, he had a high appreciation for good soil and early learned the things that deplete soils and some of those which build up fertility. During World War II he took over an old run-down plantation, had it producing twice as much an acre within 2 years.

He was one of the first farmers in Jackson County—early in the 1920's—to plant Austrian peas. He continued to grow them until blue lupine came along. He got 100 pounds of blue lupine seed from the Florida Experiment Station in 1939, planted them too deep, and had a near failure. Undiscouraged, he increased his acreage rapidly the next few years and has been a principal source of seed in his county.

He was the first farmer to plant Dixie Runner peanuts, agreeing to work with the Florida Experiment Station before the field value of this new variety was known. Since 1942 he has produced hundreds of tons of Dixie Runner seed, as well as GFA Spanish seed.

He is also planting Dixie crimson clover, kudzu, and other legumes. For 15 years he has been producing good Hereford beef cattle.

He was chosen a community AAA committeeman in 1933 when the plow-up campaign was begun, a county committeeman in 1934, and a State committeeman in 1936. He has served continuously for 11 years.

He became a director of the GFA Peanut Association when it was organized in 1937. He is now first vice president. It has a membership of 51,000, with assets over $400,000.

In Re Continued Contributions to Europe and Lack of Cohesion in the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter which ought to be of interest to those internationalists who are determined to give this country away:

JANUARY 16, 1948.

IN RE CONTINUED CONTRIBUTIONS TO EUROPE AND LACK OF COHESION IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Because I love my country and, notwithstanding the downhill path which it has traveled for the last 15 years, think it is still the best country in the world in which to live and still offers more promise to its citizens than any other nation, I have endeavored to reduce to writing the views which I have expressed to you in our several recent conversations on the foregoing subject and the position which I think the Republican Party should take with respect to continued contributions to Europe and our present internal difficulties.

What troubles me most at present is the lack of cohesion in the Republican Party (of which you and I always have been members) upon both of these two important subjects, to-wit, (1) contributions to Europe, and (2) the domestic situation, coupled with the demand of the President for further regimentation and continued high taxes.

I intend to discuss these subjects, if I can, both from the historical and philosophical point of view, and also from the economic point of view.

THE FOREIGN SITUATION

The difficulty which I find with contributions to Europe, which, of course, includes the so-called Marshall plan (which must have had the Presidents approval or it would not have been promulgated), is that it grows out of a fundamental misconception of the philosophy of war, especially all-out war, and its necessary economic results.

An all out war, in its ultimate analysis, necessarily means the economic and national destruction of the defeated party. It was not until recent years that there has grown up a theory that there was some duty on the part of the victors to reestablish the defeated, notwithstanding the fact that the victors themselves paid an enormous price for their victory.

I do not recall that after the Napoleonic wars there was any philosophy or eleemosynary conception of duty which required the victors to add to the price of their victory the duty of supporting the vanquished. Certainly, Great Britain and its allied victors were not concerned with the imposition of taxes upon their own citizens to support those whom they had destroyed. There was no philosophy in that period which required it.

I don't suppose that there is a country in Europe which was more savagely and ruthlessly destroyed in the late war than were the Southern States by the northern armies in our own Civil War.

At that time Great Britain was the secret ally of the Southern States—almost its affirmative and overt ally—but I do not recall that Great Britain, then at the zenith of its strength, felt any moral obligation to tax its citizens to reconstruct or enable the citizens of the South to reconstruct themselves. Neither do I recall that the Northern States, which, through their victorious armies, had destroyed and ravished the Southern States, felt any moral obligation to tax the citizens of the Northern States to rebuild and reconstruct what they had destroyed in the South. On the contrary, the duty of reconstructing themselves was left just where it was—on the survivors. They had to dig themselves out by work, production, and suffering and it took them more than half a century to even begin to do it. They haven't arrived yet.

Now, suddenly, there has been thrust upon the citizens of the United States a conception that in some way it is their duty to still further destroy themselves by taxation for the purposes of restoring the civilization which was destroyed in Europe.

We did not begin this war. It was thrust upon us. The nations which began it knew that if they were defeated they must pay a terrible price. The very philosophy of war requires that they be left to dig themselves out.

However, it is said by some Republicans that somehow or other the duty is now imposed upon us to destroy ourselves in order to help the other countries who destroyed or are destroying themselves. It is said that some or all of these countries will go communistic if we don't destroy ourselves by further taxing our citizens, and thus adding to the price of victory the policy of self-destruction. It goes without saying, that as long as we can be blackmailed, foreign countries will continue to blackmail us by the threat of communism.

A few days ago there was a royal marriage in London. It must have been a gorgeous pageant. It must have been enormously expensive to the citizens of Great Britain. Such expenditures were made at the very time when American taxpayers had been contributing to the destitute taxpayers of England. We are asked to further contribute, at our expense, to relieve their destitution. Yet everyone who thinks must know that this is only a "hangover" or an extension of the New Deal—an application to foreign countries of the magic formula which was invented by the late President by which the underprivileged could remain underprivileged without work or want, without destroying initiative and without impairing accumulated wealth. But everyone knows that destitution in England could be quickly relieved if the destitute workers of England would go to work, produce as much as they can, and dig themselves out of their difficulties, which are no greater than those which confronted our ancestors who landed at Plymouth Rock and Jamestown and who, surrounded by countless dangers, were required to work overtime in order to support themselves and to lay the foundation for the great prosperity which this country later experienced.

Parenthetically, I might observe that it might be a good thing for this country if instead of supporting workmen who won't work to the utmost in England, we let the Socialist experiment which is now going on there demonstate its utter incapacity to succeed.

Those, however, who favor continued taxation here to support Socialist England and western Europe say that it must be done in order to prevent Russia, with its communistic theories, from overrunning western Europe.

Communism, as it exists in Europe today, is either a faith or an economic status which the absolute political control by Stalin makes it impossible for the slaves, in what is equivalent to a slave state, to throw off.

If it is the latter, it is quite possible that Russia may break down internally.

If it is the former, a faith and not a political condition, people who believe in it will fight for it just as the Mohammedans did centuries ago when they tried to impose Mohammedanism on western Europe by military force and failed.

Further, if it is a faith, there isn't any doubt that if we are going to be able to successfully defend our theory of free enterprise, we have got to make ourselves strong enough to be able to fight when we have to fight, and to give our citizens an incentive to work by enabling them to keep what they earn and not to destroy them by devastating taxation.

Nations are very much like boys. Every boy who has ever grown up outside of a large city learned by personal experience that the only way to defend himself against the town bully was to make himself ready, willing, and able to fight. The town bully always left that type of boy alone. The same thing is true of nations.

At present we are weakening ourselves playing right into the hands of the international bully. We allow ourselves to be insulted without resentment. The representatives of the United States Senate are refused admission to its own embassy in Moscow and no political notice is taken of it. Instead of letting the international bully know that we won't be bullied, we continue to let him know that we are perfectly willing to be bullied and show no national resentment.

My thought is that this Nation should save its energies to build up its strength. Communism as a faith and free enterprise as a faith can't exist side by side. Sooner or later there will be a clash of arms and the more able and willing we are to accept the challenge, the less apt we are to be challenged.

These are my views on the foreign situation, on foreign relief, on the continued oppression of American taxpayers, and the continued weakening of our own resources. I know they are shared by numbers of our people. The Republican Party owes it not only to itself, but to the Nation to refuse to continue the blackmailing financial contributions to Europe and to make itself and the Nation strong.

THE DOMESTIC ISSUES

The domestic issues are confused largely by the President himelf. Everyone who reads the news intelligently has reason to believe that he places his demand for enlarged regimentation and for continued contributions to Europe upon the alleged fact that charity requires it, whereas, as a matter of fact, self-protection requires us to do the very reverse.

As to the President's demand for increased regimentation: It never occurs to anyone—at least I never see it in print—that the instant Government attempts to regiment anything, other regimentation is necessary in order to offset the economic evil resulting from the first. It never seems to occur to anyone that the real way to get rid of the economic evils which have been thrust upon us is to abandon all regimentation and allow these economic evils to be settled by the free play of the law of supply and demand.

Of course, such a course would result in temporary suffering here, there, and yonder, but I submit that suffering is the price which we must pay to restore manpower lost during the war, the destruction of wealth caused by the war, and the reestablishment of free enterprise.

It is an economic and as well a physical law that any individual or nation which has indulged in a long drunken debauch or a long economic debauch must suffer before either of them can recover. The sooner this Nation undergoes that suffering and emerges from it, the better off we will be. However, we can't "feather bed" recovery along by hopeful wishing (including regimentation) and restore the prosperity which existed before the war. It can only be restored by the abandonment of all control, and we must all suffer severally and jointly until economic balance has been restored.

The President says that he thinks it can be restored by regimentation. He is giving an unsound excuse for it and is doing the very thing which will prolong suffering and ultimately result in self-destruction.

The Republican Party is in control of both Houses of Congress. It can refuse to adopt the President's policy and refuse to go along with increased regimentation of American citizens in time of peace, the enlargement of Government bureaus, the continuance of discouraging and exhausting taxation, both income and estate taxes. The latter should be definitely lower, as well as the former.

If it is defeated in such a program, I would rather see it defeated than to see it victorious by the adoption of a policy which goes a long, long step toward socialism and the destruction of the right of free citizens.

Personally, I have been a member of the Republican Party all my life, have been for years a member of the Republican Citizens Finance Committee of Illinois and a contributor thereto. I have also contributed during the last three Presidential elections as much to the Republican National Committee as any one citizen, under the law, can do. But I think I might as well plan to discontinue such contributions if the Republican Party goes even half way along with the President's demands. We must be a party in real opposition and not a party of part imitation. If we aren't, we might as well stand aside and let our party help the President ruin the country.

* * * * * *

I have written at great length and very seriously. There are other things which our party might do to help restore freedom and sanity in this country, but I have already written at far too great length. I hope that you won't be bored with this very long letter.

RALPH M. SHAW.

CHICAGO, ILL.

American Civilian Victims of Japanese Maltreatment During the War—A Suggestion for a More Speedy Relief Is Made by Lawyer-Economist Vicente Villamin, of Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I wish to include the following article written by Attorney-Economist Vicente Villamin for the Manila Bulletin, Manila, Philippines.

The article discusses the relief of American civilian victims of the war in the Pacific, numbering about 6,000. The House, on January 26, 1948, passed H. R. 4044, providing for their monetary relief. It provides for a commission to investigate claims, then report them to Congress before January 3, 1949, with recommendations for further legislation, including the creation of a second commission which will actually consider claims and pay them. On the face of it, delay in the payment of the claims is evident, and the intent of Congress to help the American war victims would be frustrated.

Mr. Villamin suggests that the example of the Philippine War Damage Commission, which was created by Congress by the act of April 30, 1946, be followed and only one commission be created with the full and final power to approve claims and pay them. There is great merit in that suggestion. It should be studied for possible adoption.

Mr. Villamin's article follows:

DELAY IN AMERICAN WAR VICTIMS' RELIEF

(By Vicente Villamin)

If the Americans who were interned by the Japanese during the war expect to receive monetary relief under H. R. 4044, which passed the House and is now in a Senate committee, before at least 2 years from now, the bill will have to be modified with respect to the provision of title II regarding the War Relief Commission to be created. The relief is approved by all departments and agencies of the Federal Government and not a single Member of the House had opposed it. The only question is how to give the relief so it will actually relieve the pressing necessities of the prospective beneficiaries.

Under the bill, about $50,000,000 will be paid to some 6,000 American civilians who were interned, disabled, or killed by the Japanese during the war in Wake, Midway, Guam, and the Philippines. The amount will be debited against the former enemy assets, estimated at approximately $250,000,000, now under the control of the Alien Property Custodian.

The first bill on this subject matter was introduced more than 2 years ago, but delays and more delays overcame its consideration. Further delay may be expected under an amendment adopted by the House when it passed the bill on January 26 last to the effect that the War Relief Commission shall make the required report to Congress, not before March 31, 1948, as originally provided in the bill, but before January 3, 1949, or 9 months later. The bill's author himself, Representative CARL HINSHAW, introduced the amendment.

The idea of the Commission was the center of the debate in the House. Fear was expressed on all sides that it might cause such a delay in paying the internees that it would defeat the immediate intent of the bill. But no alternative was presented during the debate, except an amendment by Representative GEARHART, which was voted down. The amendment would do away with the Commission altogether and lodge the power to consider and approve claims in the United States district court wherein the claimant is resident, thereby greatly expediting their disposal.

Under the bill as passed by the House, the duty of the Commission is to receive claims, study and classify them, and then report to Congress with recommendations for new legislation to carry out the intent of title III of the bill. So, if there is no postponement of date, sometime after January 3, 1949, the Eighty-first Congress, which is not bound in the matter by the present Eightieth Congress, might take it up and pass a bill incorporating the recommendations and creating a new commission charged with the actual approval of claims after its own investigation, and the payment thereof. Judging by the speed of the average Federal commissions, the first payment may be expected not before 1950, that is, if the preliminaries went along according to schedule.

Representative GEARHART dramatized the foreseeable situation when he said during the debate in the House: "If you reject my amendment, it will merely mean that you have set up one more commission whose members will draw $12,000 a year, three men who will learn to like their jobs very, very much. At the end of the year, they will come in and say that they have not been able to complete their work and, therefore, will ask Congress to extend their time, and they will keep on asking for extensions. Then they will recommend the setting up of another commission to adjudicate claims in accordance with the recommendations of the first commission * * * and then perhaps the grandchildren of the internees will get the claims paid at last."

The hope is in the Senate. The question is what plan could be advanced to forestall the delay inherent in the two commissions contemplated in the House bill. The Gearhart amendment, while well intended, would complicate matters because there will be no standard for the treatment of claims by the courts unless such standard, which at best is subject to different interpretations by different courts, is specifically set forth in the enabling act. Besides that, judicial processes are usually slow and court dockets are full and the claimants will have to spend money as in other court cases both in the first instance and on appeal. The determination of a commission is uniform, final, and not appealable, and thus more satisfactory, efficient, and economical. The present case is clearly for a special commission to administer.

The author believes that the case of the Philippine War Damage Commission offers a possible solution. That Commission has more claims to consider than the proposed War Claims Commission—over 1,000,000 as against 6,000. And it has more money to disburse, $520,000,000 as compared to $50,000,000. Its work is more complex and involved, but it is working satisfactorily and, as far as commissions are concerned, speedily.

The Philippine War Damage Act was enacted by the United States Congress on April 30, 1946. On April 18, 1947, a year after, it made its first payment. Considering the magnitude of the work of this commission, including the recruiting of its staff in the United States and installing them in Manila and informing the whole Filipino people of its work, the proposed War Claims Commission under H. R. 4044 should be able to make the first payment in 2 or 3 months after the bill becomes law. Specifically, if the bill is enacted into law in April, the first payment to claimant should be made before July—July 1948 and not in 1950 or thereabouts.

The vital point is that in the case of the Philippine War Damage Commission the Congress empowered it to receive and approve claims and pay them. There will be only one commission with the power of final and unappealable adjudication of claims. Why cannot this formula be adopted in the case of the American internees' relief? The two cases are roughly similar and parallel. During the debate in the House, no Member mentioned the Philippine War Damage Commission despite the fact that it was an illuminating precedent. If it had been brought up, it would have appealed to many Members of Congress as the solution of the problem of delay involved in having two commissions. The only explanation for the omission is that no one remembered or knew it, and if a Member had read the commission's second semiannual report to Congress he was not on the floor during the debate to call it to the attention of the House. This omission must not be repeated in the Senate.

Again, let it be emphasized that there is unanimity in Washington in favor of extending monetary relief to American civilian victims of the war, and the only question outstanding is how to extend that relief without unnecessary delay. It is obvious that the bill that passed the House (H. R. 4044) with all its good and generous intentions, does not meet that situation satisfactorily. A new solution must be found and the suggestion above mentioned is submitted for consideration. The war victims must be aided in time. Justice must be done them. And oftimes delayed justice is denied justice.

Nailing an International Lie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, more than once I have risen on this floor, and so have scores of other Members, animated wholly by a sense of devotion to the high ideals and immense power and prestige of our country, to call attention to the propaganda activities of the Arab Office, a quasi-diplomatic agency representing the intransigent feudal states which comprise the Arab League.

It now appears that we should have included in our warning the British Foreign Office and its spokesmen.

In the past weeks a sudden flood of insinuation, innuendo, libel, and false and distorted charges have been widely published in this country. I have said sudden; but what is sudden about it is the new vast volume of the output, and the fact that it now appears to be emanating from high places in both the United States and the United Kingdom, yet clearly following the Fascist-Arab line.

The intent, and possibly the effect, of this river of words is to subvert the stated foreign policy of the United States as enunciated by the President and the Secretary of State in regard to the Middle East.

There appears to be a serious effort to portray these medieval Arab states, with their masses of poverty-stricken illiterate, unhappy peasantry, as progressive citadels of democracy, threatened in their native lands by an inundation of fanatic Jews tainted with the dread disease of communism.

FANTASTICALLY UNTRUE

That such a portrait is fantastically untrue goes without saying.

Every objective authority who has studied Palestine and the Middle East agrees that the nomadic tribes of the backward Arab States, living by the sword, legalizing rape and plunder and destruction, have reduced the land of milk and honey to a desert waste in centuries of misgovernment and mismanagement.

Only the Jews indigenous to the area or settled there in immigration from Europe have been able to keep alive the tradition of culture and industry and fruitful agrarian husbandry. In only a few decades the colonies of newcomers—who entered Palestine, be it noted, under specific treaties—have made vast steps toward reclaiming the fertile land from the hungry desert.

If the United Nations decision is carried out expeditiously and determinedly, they will continue to develop the natural resources of the country.

MOST CRUEL OF ALL

Most cruel of all recent propaganda is the absurd allegation that the desperate Jews on the two refugee ships, *Pan York* and *Pan Crescent*, are parts of a Communist fifth column.

I am glad to find in the New York Post a remarkable news story by Hal Lehrman "debunking" the fraud, and an important and decisive editorial dissecting and nailing the whole international lie.

Lehrman's findings square with private information I have had pointing to a new wave of anti-Semitic hysteria in all Europe under Russian domination. I cannot judge the authenticity of my information except by the earnestness with which it has been presented, except in Rumania and in Poland, where both official and unofficial sources have agreed on the virulence and the great proportions of anti-Semitism.

Under leave, I am inserting at this point both Lehrman's article and the editorial from the New York Post of Friday, February 6, 1948:

JEWS QUIT SOVIET SPHERE IN PANIC—NOT AS RED SPIES

(By Hal Lehrman)

Economic misery, fear of pogroms, and Communist suppression of liberty are goading eastern Europe's Jews into a desperate search for escape—by any road—from the lands of Soviet domination.

After a year and a half as correspondent in the satellite states of Russia's Europe, this writer can testify that the mass Jewish exodus from the Balkans is no sinister plot engineered by the Kremlin to spirit Communists into Palestine.

On the contrary, it is an irresistible urge among hundreds of thousands of survivors of Hitlerite extermination to get away from Soviet "liberated" countries where they have no tolerable present and no secure future.

These self-made "displaced persons" who head for Palestine, who pack the DP camps of Austria and Germany, will go anywhere that will offer them a safe refuge.

When the remnants of Balkan Jewry struggled back from Nazi crematories, or the forests where they had hidden, many were indiscriminately taken as "enemy aliens" by the Red Army and shipped to labor camps in the Soviet Union.

Those who reached home found high-sounding decrees of the new Communist-run regimes abolishing racial discrimination, but failing to restore the property grabbed from the Jews by wartime Fascist governments.

I know a Yugoslav Jewish industrialist whose factory had been confiscated by the Germans after he fled. When he returned, Tito jailed him and confiscated the factory again on charges of "collaboration."

In Hungary and Rumania thousands of Jews were unable to redeem their homes from pro-Nazis.

One Jewish woman of Budapest who was raped and tortured by Hungarian Fascists of the Arrow Cross, was compelled after "liberation" to share her small apartment with an ex-Arrow Cross family who had joined the Communist Party.

It was the exception for Jews to get back their shops, factories or homes. The Communist Party newspaper in Hungary even denounced such Jewish claims as a clamor for special privileges.

Despite millions of dollars spent by the American Joint Distribution Committee and other relief agencies, the Jews of Russia's Europe, have been permanently made a depressed class by Communist legislation against private enterprise.

Congenitally anti-Semitic, the masses—resentful under Communist rule—are turning to the Jews for their usual scapegoat, although only an infinitesimally few are active in the new Communist regimes, and those are not friendly to the Jews. In fact, thousands of ex-Nazis have been forgiven and enrolled into Communist parties, while Zionists have been persecuted.

In Rumania, the Jewish desire to get out is currently at fever pitch, which renders absurd the recent British allegations that Palestine-bound emigrants are cloak-and-dagger Communist agents.

The latest major Jewish exodus from Rumania began last summer, when famine swept large areas of Rumania. Communist "stabilization" this fall reduced the value of Rumanian money 20,000 times and the last paltry Jewish savings were wiped out.

Badgering private enterprises into quitting made the few remaining Jewish merchants willing to exchange for an exit visa.

Dr. William Fildermann, who had saved many Jews by defying the Nazis, was persecuted by the Communists to force him to bring his union of Rumanian Jews into the fold.

The net result was to make the Jews want to get out, rather than accept communism.

The camps in Rumania which London sources now describe as Red-supported training centers for Communist agents to Palestine were really Hachsharoth—where youthful applicants for emigration, supported exclusively by Zionist and western funds, lived and awaited departure for Palestine. The closest they came to military training was to study the Hebrew language and take a few lessons in farming.

Of the Jews aboard the *Pan York* and *Pan Crescent*, which the British pulled into Cyprus and described as packed with Communist provocators, 4,000 were Halutzim (pioneers) from those Zionist camps.

Fifteen hundred more of the "subversive" emigrants were less than 2 years old. Another 4,000 were between 2 and 11 years of age.

All the rest were special distress cases: widows of the Nazi pogroms and refugees from Bessarabia and northern Bukovina—provinces annexed by the Soviets.

I saw some of the rigid screening which applicants for Palestine visas had to undergo by their own Jewish leaders. Quotas were apportioned severely among the different Zionist groups and only the neediest, most legitimate cases were approved.

If there had been room aboard the ships, not for a few thousands, but for 150,000, there would still not have been enough for all the passionately non-Communist Jews who want to shake the dust of the new "democratic" Rumania from their weary feet.

The editorial follows:

NAILING AN INTERNATIONAL LIE

It began last December, this particular smear campaign; almost immediately after the United Nations, backed by Russia and the United States, decided in favor of finally creating the Palestine state promised the Jews in 1919 under the Balfour Declaration.

Some 12,000 carefully screened, desperately tried Jews managed to assemble at Balkan ports, to sail on two ships, the *Pan Crescent* and *Pan York*, for Palestine.

The Jewish Agency screened them with meticulous care; they were trained Zionist pioneers chosen by members of the various Zionist organizations, except for 1,490 who were not selected.

These 1,490 consisted entirely of very little children.

The British Government, as alert to prevent any more Jews reaching Palestine as they have been to provide the Arabian states with weapons to kill those who are already there, intercepted the two vessels and interned the passengers in concentration camps in Cyprus.

They—those who are still alive—are still in concentration camps.

On January 1 a New York Times correspondent cabled his newspaper from London that he had learned from authoritative and official sources that the British had intercepted 12,000 Jew Communists on their way to take over Palestine.

Later modifications of the same authoritative reports began to weaken the figure somewhat, but ever since, when things were dull in London or in other anti-Palestine centers, a new version of the same canard would be solemnly filed, or as solemnly commented upon.

The New York Times has printed several variations on the original theme. Latest version was that 1,000 Communists had been definitely identified among the 12,000.

On February 3 a New York Post columnist, Marquis Childs, writing out of Washington, wrote that he thought it would be an excellent idea if some provable facts were substituted for the innuendo, the anonymous charges, and the flat denials that were becoming an increasing topic of undercover conversation among Washington residents, official and otherwise.

The same day under officers of the State Department placed on Secretary of State Marshall's desk a memo saying that the Department "had been informed" that there were 150 or 200 Communists among the 12,000 or so refugee Jews intercepted by the British and interned in Cyprus.

The Secretary informed the reporters, and this time the press of the entire Nation was treated to the "Jew-Communist" plot with which had been associated the dignified name of Secretary Marshall. Still without any facts, or any disclosed responsible source.

At the same time an intelligent reporter, seeking some facts, questioned the British commander, Sir Godfrey Collins, commissioner in charge of the refugees at Cyprus.

Sir Godfrey is evidently an honest man, and his reply proved so disconcerting to certain British officials in London that it may be said for certain that Sir Godfrey has hardly heard the last of it. What he said was, however, that there was no indication whatsoever that any Communist agents were among the immigrants. He also denied reports that any Communist literature or identity papers had been found on the immigrant ships *Pan York* and *Pan Crescent*.

This was the lie nailed—almost. But not quite.

In London there was consternation.

The British Foreign Office, finally smoked from cover as the heretofore "anonymous" but "authoritative" source of the story, admitted it.

The New York Times correspondent cabled from London that the Foreign Office had finally consented to reveal its identity as the source of the original and subsequent libels—only, of course, the Foreign Office didn't admit they were libels.

The Foreign Office wasn't sure how many Communists it claimed were among the detained refugees, but indicated there were a good many.

Questioned about the statement of Sir Godfrey, who certainly should be in a position to know, the Foreign Office retorted

angrily that he wouldn't have acted that way if he had been a Foreign Office man, but that alas, he was a Colonial Office man.

"The immigrants were questioned by the Foreign Office, not the Colonial Office," says the dispatch from London darkly.

The Foreign Office denial was followed by a Colonial Office statement in behalf of Sir Godfrey that he had not said there were not any Communists among the refugees; he said merely that, if there were any, he didn't know it. Besides, he was speaking for himself and not for the Colonial Office.

Today, in the New York Post, an Overseas News Agency correspondent presents the palpable truth about the refugees.

They were, it seems, almost as anxious to escape from the anti-Semitism still rampant in certain Balkan countries, notably Rumania, as they were to enter Palestine.

His story makes interesting—and factual—reading.

But, of course, the end is not yet in sight; and the refugees are still not in Palestine, but in British concentration camps; the Allied refinement on Hitler's Dachau.

And there are, indeed, a few Communists in Palestine, as there are some in every country in the world, including the United States; there their political impact to date has been perhaps somewhat less, but no matter.

The resourceful British and their American and Arabian allies will continue to pour out half truth and innuendo in carrying on the campaign to finally make partition appear to be another Soviet plot against the Western World.

Watch for those dispatches, statements, etc.—and read them with care. They contain a secret substance more destructive than the atom bomb—secret intrigue against international honor, justice, and decency.

Concurrent Resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith on behalf of the entire Mississippi delegation in the House of Representatives the following concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi:

House Concurrent Resolution 22

Concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi memorializing the Congress of the United States of the grave apprehension and vigorous opposition of the people of this State to the recommendations of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights and urging opposition to any congressional enactment of said recommendations

Whereas President Harry S. Truman, by Executive order, on December 5, 1946, did establish the President's Committee on Civil Rights; and

Whereas this committee did function and submit its report to the Nation in the form of a public document; and

Whereas the report did recommend, among other things, the enactment by the Congress of an Antilynching Act, an Anti-Poll-Tax Act, a Fair Employment Practices Act, an act forbidding segregation, and other acts of this same character and devious purpose, which acts are obviously directed against certain geographical sections of the Nation, more particularly the Southern States, and which acts are aimed at nothing less than the subjugation of the sovereignty of the 48 States of this Union in favor of a gigantic and compelling Federal system of appointive boards with powers equal to those of the State or the judiciary; the subjugation of the majority to the demands of various minority groups and, not least among these recommendations, certain ones whose effect would be to deprive the States of their rights with regard to suffrage and election laws, and passing this power to the Federal Government for their dictates; and

Whereas the recommendations of this committee constitute an assault on the fundamental principles of division of powers between the Federal and State governments; and

Whereas the recommendations of this committee constitute an attempt by a group of persons not qualified by training or experience to recommend basic changes in a social and economic system arrived at after centuries of adjustments and changes accompanied by progress and enlightenment; and

Whereas the recommendations of this committee constitute nothing less than an attempt to inflict on the States by Federal legislation a social, economic, and political framework totally in derrogation of the sovereignty of States guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized of the grave apprehension with which the people of this State view these proposals, and be further memorialized of the vigorous, indignant, justifiable, and considered condemnation of and opposition to these said recommendations, and that the Congress be urged to defeat any and all of these recommendations; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these joint resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Mississippi delegation in Congress, with the request that said delegation continue their steadfast, determined, and courageous defense of the traditions, customs, and ideals of the State of Mississippi and the South.

Adopted by the house of representatives, January 29, 1948.

WALTER SILLERS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate, January 30, 1948.

SAM E. LAMPKIN,
President of the Senate.

In the Name of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the House to a splendid letter from President Harry S. Truman to Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans on the subject of participation in the Nation-wide observance of National Security Week by the Reserve Officers Association. The letter was published in the February issue of the Reserve Officer:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 7, 1948.

Brig. Gen. E. A. EVANS,
Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL EVANS: I am glad to know that the Reserve Officers Association is planning a Nation-wide observance of National Security Week during the period between February 12-22. You have my indorsement of this program.

In these times the inclusion of all of our people in the study of the things which must be done to guarantee our national security is very important. I hope the ROA can bring into this program every State and community. National security is the obligation of every citizen. Its responsibilities know no social, economic, religious, or partisan lines.

Our National Security Week observance in 1948 will end almost exactly 30 months after VJ-day. We, as a Nation, gave everything we had to win the victory over the Axis Powers and Japan. We must continue to give everything that is needed to win the peace. The price of victory was lives, dollars, and materials. The price of peace calls for application of our minds, hearts, and our resources, just as we applied them in war. I believe that the people of our Nation have the character to go ahead with the tasks which are before us.

Among the many fortunes which the American people enjoy is the leadership of her citizen defenders, the men and women who have won our victories and who are the trained bulwark against aggression. I feel sure that national preparedness means preparedness for peace and not for war.

Therefore, in the name of peace, I commend National Security Week to all the people of these United States.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Chairman Andrews' Interpretation of National Security Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the period of February 12 to 22 has been designated as National Security Week. I know of no more qualified person to interpret the meaning of national security than Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS, chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives. Congressman ANDREWS started his Reserve service prior to the incident which called American troops to the Mexican border in 1916. He served in the Twenty-seventh Division of the National Guard of the State of New York in World War I. He was a company commander in the rugged fighting which that division participated in on the western front. For gallantry in action over and above the call of duty he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. He continued his interest in national security following the termination of the war and the demobilization of his division. He

entered Congress on March 4, 1931, and became a member of the Military Affairs Committee. Today he is the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. As chairman of that committee, following the reorganization of the committee structure of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] had a complicated and difficult job. He performed that job in the most excellent manner to the satisfaction and admiration of the members of that committee. No man in the entire Congress, in my humble opinion, has a better grasp on the security problems of the United States than Chairman ANDREWS. His interpretation of what National Security Week means should be read with interest and profit by every Member of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his statement, which was published in the February issue of the Reserve Officer, a magazine owned and operated by the Reserve Officers' Association. It reads as follows:

National Security Week, as sponsored by the Reserve Officers' Association, invites the attention of every American citizen to a simple and compelling truth which has never lost its validity in the 172-year history of the United States; namely, that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and that vigilance must be combined with an adequate military posture, in order to assure the respect of the world and to deter the ambitions of potential aggressors.

This truth was never more applicable than it is today when our continued existence as a free people literally depends upon our determination to prevent military weakness on our part inviting a war.

I am thus in full accord with the purpose of National Security Week and urge every citizen to ponder carefully its meaning.

WALTER G. ANDREWS,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives.

The United Nations and Palestine

REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of this House to the activities of a Christian gentleman in connection with the outrages now current in Palestine and which threaten to increase unless brought to an immediate halt. On February 5, 1948, the Honorable John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn, sent the following telegram to the President of the United States:

FEBRUARY 5, 1948.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.:

I am deeply disturbed by the turn of events in Palestine. The defiance of the edict of the United Nations by the Arab higher committee is reprehensible. The bloodshed and sabotage must stop. I urge you to use all your influence to see that law and order are reestablished in Palestine and that the authority of the United Nations is observed and respected there. To achieve this result it is necessary to lift our embargo against the shipment of arms to those who are trying to uphold the power and dignity of the United Nations. It is also necessary for the United Nations to establish an international constabulary to keep order in the Holy Land. Unless such immediate action is taken, the United Nations is doomed to the fate of the League of Nations, and Palestine and Israel will serve as a new Manchuria and a new Ethiopia.

JOHN CASHMORE,
President of the Borough of Brooklyn.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time Mr. Cashmore has spoken out in the same matter. Nor did his efforts cease with the sending of the telegram.

I know, not only from him, but from other sources that, without fanfare and without publicity, he has been working ardently and long to bring about the desired result as demanded in his telegram to the President of the United States.

I am glad to note that others, too, have learned of Mr. Cashmore's efforts in this connection.

Following is a copy of a telegram sent to me by the President of the Brooklyn Jewish Community Council, the original of which was sent on February 10, 1948, to Mr. Cashmore:

FEBRUARY 10, 1948.

Hon. JOHN CASHMORE,
President, Borough of Brooklyn,
Borough Hall, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

As president of the Brooklyn Jewish Community Council embracing 850 constituent organizations, speaking in behalf of 1,000,000 Americans of Jewish faith in Brooklyn, I bespeak their eternal gratitude to you for the part played by you in molding public and official opinion prior to the historic decision of the United Nations establishing a Jewish homeland. Your quiet but forceful efforts had much to do in bringing about the decision which Jews for 2,000 years had prayed for. And now when the UN decision is imperiled you have come forward again and taken effective action to safeguard the hard-won decision. What you have done openly as well as what you have done quietly at the highest official level will ever be remembered.

MAXIMILIAN MOSS,
President, Brooklyn Jewish Community Council.

Mr. Speaker, my hat is off to a real leader, a true Christian gentleman. Would that others talked out and acted as promptly and as vigorously.

Observations From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from a Minatare farmer, who is now a lieutenant in the Army and stationed with the American Army of Occupation in Germany. It seems to me that his observations should be of interest to the country.

Another soldier writes me that he wonders who is being occupied—Germany or the Army of Occupation. He states that his observations are to the effect that the State Department cannot possibly handle the intricate problems of Germany—that the Germans only understand force and power. He feels that the continued dismantling of German factories which are needed to produce the things the Germans needed is wrong. American money is being poured into Germany to build new factories similar to those which are being dismantled.

These observations come from two fine Nebraska soldiers who are stationed in Germany. I commend their observations to you for your reading:

MUNICH, GERMANY, *February 1, 1948.*

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A blind Minatare farmer may not be a competent observer, still he may be a good listener. Some of the ideas gained by listening since coming here may be of interest to you.

Europeans appear to believe that aggressive warfare is a legitimate function in national existence. Reparations and annexations is the immediate goal and that the possibility of winning them is justification for war. The smaller nations that are used to being plundered or have often been innocent bystanders accept the devastations as unavoidable and set to work in an earnest attempt to rebuild. They are succeeding. Germans are not yet able to believe that they did lose the war and appear to think that the benevolence of Britain and the United States will save them from the consequences. They know that Russia will deal with them just as they dealt when they occupied parts of Russia.

Democracy does not mean a wide range of personal liberty in thought and action here as it does in the United States but rather a very limited choice in very restricted fields. For example, a nation of motorists voluntarily drive with care through school zones cannot be imagined. But if policemen were stationed closely enough so it was "drive carefully or go to jail," they would understand and consider the choice democratic. The thought that Justice is right cannot compete with the idea that might is right. Germans lived 100 years on the master-race creed. That creed collapsed in 1945 and now the Germans are desperately trying to rebuild it or to find a substitute. In rebuilding Europe most of these countries are putting first things second. They are bending their effort to produce export goods rather than food, clothing, and fuel. Even so the smaller countries are achieving some balance in their efforts. The notion that hunger breeds dictators can be only partly true since dictators have flourished when food was both plentiful as well as when scarce. Then you will recall that a few years of our WPA system we taught a large segment of our folks that the Government owed them a living. Large percentages of the population of these countries have had similar lessons over much longer periods. This is probably one reason why luxury export goods are being made instead of exerting the extra effort required to produce the necessities.

In Nebraska if our neighbor has a broken leg in the spring we go in and plant his crop, but we do not agree to cultivate, irrigate, and harvest it or to pay his bills. I think the European recovery plan should operate in about the same way. It seems to me that factional strife in each of these governments is likely to make it most difficult to make ERP effective. The Russian plan is simpler. In it the opposition is liquidated either by killing or by economic pressure. All these people understand their method and they don't understand altruism in either economics or politics.

My guess is the Russian deflation was effected for these reasons. To drain off surplus buying power so that demand would be limited to the meager supply of consumer goods. To dispel any postwar unrest that surplus money would tend to prolong. To have her economic house in order to profit when the depression comes. The news I have concerning her recent trade pacts with her neighbors all seem to be based on the principle that Russia buys goods that are in current production and pays for them later with seasonable goods. The late war was largely financed by such methods. Hitler used the method for several years. It is doubtful if it works so well or so long under the new management.

I think we should put ERP to work. To be effective it will have to foster a change in the thought as well as the economy of these people. The amount of financial help and method of using it as well as the method of reeducating these people should be determined by experts for the Department of State and Congress. I think great stress should be on local production for home consumption. A passion for personal liberty would check communism and I have no idea how to instill such a passion. Trade pacts having long-deferred payment clauses with a country that is not too strict about honoring its pledges might be checkmated by pacts with current exchange of goods.

Yours truly.

A LIEUTENANT IN THE AMERICAN ARMY OF OCCUPATION STATIONED IN GERMANY.

The Truth Will Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a copy of a newspaper article published in the Washington Times-Herald, of date February 11, 1948, by columnist Willard Edwards, entitled "Britain Plans Diverting United States Aid to Empire" which article I think would be of interest at this time.

The article follows:

BRITAIN PLANS DIVERTING UNITED STATES AID TO EMPIRE—SENATOR MALONE REVEALS ADMISSION BY CRIPPS

(By Willard Edwards)

Great Britain has secret plans to divert American billions received under the Marshall plan to a program of empire reconstruction in Africa, Senator MALONE (Republican), of Nevada, revealed yesterday.

MALONE related a conversation with Sir Stafford Cripps, British Minister of Economic Affairs, in London last November in which Cripps stated Great Britain could take care of its own industrial recovery.

HOW IT WILL BE SPENT

"We will use American aid for rehabilitation in south and central Africa," Cripps was quoted as saying. "It will be spent on railroads, mines, and development of resources. Great Britain has enough money of its own to invest in British industry."

MALONE was visiting Europe as chairman of the Senate National Resources Economic Committee. In an effort to determine Europe's actual needs he explored coal mines, steel mills, and industrial establishments in the United Kingdom and other European countries.

The Nevadan said he was flabbergasted by Cripps' statement. He noted that State Secretary Marshall has outlined a prospective share of $5,000,000,000 for Great Britain. This was supposedly for investment in plants, machinery, ships, and vehicles within the island of Britain. Marshall said this American aid was absolutely essential to the recovery of western Europe.

AND EXPECTS NO RETURN

MALONE said he had planned to save his startling disclosure for a Senate floor speech attacking the Marshall plan after debate starts March 1.

"Cripps made it very clear," he said, "that Great Britain wants American funds for British Empire, not British industrial recovery. Its own production, including agriculture, is now above prewar levels.

"I talked to another high British official, Ben Smith, who controls coal production. He said very bluntly that we had better extend our aid in the form of lend-lease and expect no return. Otherwise, he threatened, Great Britain controls three-fourths of the world's raw materials and, if necessary, could clamp down on us."

This Matter of Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARTER MANASCO
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Alabama Baptist of February 5, 1948:

NOTED JURIST DISCUSSES THIS MATTER OF SEGREGATION—IS SEGREGATION UNCHRISTIAN?

(By Judge Horace C. Wilkinson)

The efforts of the secular press, supported by some churchmen, to make it appear that segregation is unchristian, and your reference in the Alabama Baptist of January 8, 1948, to the growing tension between the white and colored people of the South because of segregation, and your report that the Negroes refused to have part in the city-wide Protestant meeting at Legion Field for reaffirmation of the principles which sprang from the Reformation, should challenge the attention of every Baptist in Alabama.

It is my conviction that the Christian religion does not call for or demand social and political equality of the Negro in the United States, and churchmen who advocate the contrary are threatening the destruction of one of the most priceless gifts of God to man.

Is segregation unchristian?

Let's answer the question with another. Is racial purity un-Christian?

Purity of race is a gift of God. Man can destroy that gift just as he can and does destroy other gifts. But when man destroys his racial purity it can never be redeemed.

"And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth, after his kind: and it was so." (Genesis 1: 24.)

Thus was the law of racial purity established in the beginning by divine command that every living thing reproduce "after his kind." As long as that law is obeyed the color line cannot be lawfully crossed.

God saw fit to segregate and separate the different races by placing each in different lands. He divided them by color lines as well as by territorial lines so that each race could maintain its racial integrity. God did his part to prevent intermingling. What God has done churchmen may succeed in undoing, but that which some churchmen seek to do God cannot undo.

"And Isaac called Jacob, and blessed him, and charged him, and said unto him, Thou shalt not take a wife of the daughters of Canaan." (Genesis 28: 1.)

The prophet Jeremiah propounded this interrogation:

"Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?" (Jeremiah 13: 23.)

The advocate of social equality who would have the white man lost in the intermingling process of bleaching the Negro might well ponder the words of the prophet.

In Deuteronomy 23: 2 we read:

"A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to his tenth generation shall he not enter the congregation of the Lord."

It might be well to point out that the real Negro seldom agitates for the abolition of segregation; it is the mulatto—the bastard element in the Negro race that agitates against segregation. This element is sometimes aided and abetted by some people who claim to be white, but I think those with light skins who advocate abolition of segregation fall into one of three classes: (1) They are misguided, or, (2) they are motivated by political considerations, or (3) they have a Negro strain in them.

There are many reasons why segregation is desirable but the main reason is that we know beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty that social association and political intimacies between people of different races inevitably brings about and leads to intermarriage. We also know that intermarriage destroys racial purity. The destruction of racial purity is the destruction of one of God's priceless gifts to man.

Can a course of conduct that leads to the destruction of that gift be morally right, Christian, or even socially expedient?

If God gave the Negro the inalienable right to social equality and intermarriage with whites then it must necessarily follow that God gave them the right to destroy the white race. I wonder if any of our misguided churchmen would sponsor a charge of that kind against God Almighty?

If the Negro has the inalienable right to social equality and intermarriage with the whites, and if social equality leads to intermarriage, and intermarriage is destructive of racial purity and the loss of racial purity is catastrophic, how are we to escape the conclusion that God endowed the Negro with the right to destroy the race through which God has revealed Himself to men?

The destruction of any race is not in accordance with the divine plan of God. Miscegenation and amalgamation is in direct defiance of the will of God. A gospel of equality of the races cannot but end in free miscegenation of the races.

Which is better—a mongrel race whose origin is sin and which represents the worst of all races, or a race, whatever its limitations, yet true to its own racial peculiarities and striving to attain, intact, the best and highest of which it is capable.

Those who seek a mongrel America often quote from Paul's sermon on Mars Hill where, in speaking to the Greeks, he said:

"God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands;

"Neither is worshiped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things;

"And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation;

"That they should seek the Lord (God), if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us:

"For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring." (Acts, 17: 24–28.)

In emphasizing the statement: "Hath made of one blood all nations of men," those who seek a mongrel America overlook the fact that we live in many worlds; they ignore the implication of the remainder of the verses quoted. There is a physical kingdom and a spiritual kingdom. Laws for the regulation of the physical kingdom are not necessarily appropriate to the regulation of the spiritual kingdom and vice versa.

Jesus never sought to bring about the social or any absolute equality among men on earth. He distinctly said: "My Kingdom is not of this world." His Kingdom is a spiritual kingdom, not a physical kingdom.

The statement by the Apostle Paul that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men" is just as much spiritual as the other statement that He "dwelleth not in temples made with hands." It is as spiritual as the further statement that "we are His offspring," because in Him "we live and move and have our being."

We do not physically live in God; we do not physically move in Him; we do not physically have our being in Him. The apostle was talking about the spiritual kingdom, every citizen of which is made of one blood, the blood of the Lamb. But that passage does not even purport to deal with the physical kingdom or to teach that all men physically are made of one blood. The passage referred to also states that God "hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation."

The Master said:

"In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you;" (John 14: 2).

All of which, in my judgment, clearly demonstrates that the subject dealt with on Mars Hill was spiritual as distinguished from physical.

The surest way to destroy the white race through which God revealed Himself to men; the surest way to destroy the white race that has spread the gospel of Christ over the face of the earth; the surest way to destroy the white race that is now supporting the great missionary movement; the surest way to destroy the Christian church is to mongrelize the race that has fought for, defended, and advanced the cause of Christianity. Mongrelization is an inevitable result of the destruction of segregation. One follows the other, as does night the day.

There is nothing un-American and un-Christian in racial segregation. God expects us to preserve the color line. It is high time we Baptists concern ourselves about His business in that respect.

National Security Week, February 12–22, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to note the constant support given by the Reserve Officers' Association to adequate measures for our national security. The Reserve Officers' Association is sponsoring the twenty-sixth annual observance of National Security Week which has the unqualified endorsement of the Department of the Army.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the endorsement of the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Kenneth C. Royall, which appeared in the Reserve Officers' magazine in observance of National Security Week, February 12–22, 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Observance of National Security Week, under auspices of the Reserve Officers' Association, gives me the opportunity to commend to the attention of all citizens the serious problems currently confronting the Nation and the world.

Peace was not won automatically with the cessation of hostilities 2 years ago. The dislocations caused by war in the economies and in the political and social interests of the various nations can be adjusted but slowly. Until these adjustments are complete, danger of further dislocations is ever present. This danger makes it imperative that we be prepared and alert, that we may, by example and by wise guidance, lead the community of nations along paths of democracy to that peaceful future for which a most bitter and costly war was fought.

A strong peacetime defense establishment, deriving its strength from our traditional democratic citizen army, must be our insurance against any eventuality. A strong, well-trained Organized Reserve Corps must be a very important element in our solution of the problem of national security. The role of the Reserve Officer is fully as important in peace as it was when Reservists materially expedited our victory in war.

I congratulate the Reserve Officers for taking the lead in support of our program of National Security by sponsoring National Security Week and I urge every citizen, during this week, to consider his personal share of the responsibility for national defense.

KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army.

Price Drop Should Reduce Marshall Plan Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles F. Brannan, Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, in his recent testimony before the Senate Committee on Grain Allocations, brought out the fact that weather conditions over western Europe, because of plenty of snow and moisture, were most favorable for heavy wheat and bread grain crops, in that entire area for 1948.

Estimates at the present time, in view of the favorable weather throughout the United States, indicate a much larger wheat crop than was anticipated a few months ago. In fact, world conditions generally are most promising for bumper world wheat and bread grain crops.

These recent reports have had their influence in breaking the grain market and turning the price spiral downward. This downward trend will most likely continue and prices will be stabilized at probably lower levels than at present.

The Members of the House and Senate should take into consideration the possibility of still lower grain prices, and they should scale down the $6,800,000,000 request for the Marshall plan to offset the drop in prices.

Mr. Speaker, the number of bushels requested in this first 15 months of the Marshall plan will cost millions of dollars less, and more important in reducing this cost to the American taxpayers is the fact that because of favorable weather conditions European countries will produce many millions more bushels of wheat and bread grains over last year, which should greatly reduce the number of bushels the United States will be called upon to supply.

Mr. Speaker, lower prices for wheat should mean lower appropriations to the Marshall plan. More wheat produced in Europe should mean less wheat that will be needed from the United States. Here is the chance for the Members of the House and Senate to save many millions of dollars.

Out of the billions for various articles of manufactured products, raw material, and so forth, provided for in the Marshall plan, including cotton, tobacco, and textiles, it should be possible to save other millions, because as grain prices seek lower levels further wage raises will not be necessary, which will reduce costs generally of all articles requested under the Marshall plan. Here is a chance for a saving of many more millions.

The Congress must take these facts into consideration in the interest of the American people.

Statement Before House Un-American Activities Committee in Support of McDonough Bill, H. R. 4581, To Define Communism and Make Its Active Practice Treasonable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to underestimate the necessity for adequate legislation at this time to halt the activities of Communists and the spread of communistic doctrines and propaganda in the United States.

I know that the members of the Un-American Activities Committee are fully informed concerning the methods used by Communists in this Nation in their consistent efforts to undermine the foundations of our free democratic government. I am sure the committee has the whole record of communistic infiltration into unions, agitation within the armed forces even during war, and propaganda within our schools and universities. You also have the record of the insidious efforts of the Communists to gain a foothold in the motion-picture industry, where they hoped to find an

outlet for their propaganda which would carry it to every corner of the Nation.

The fact that we have been able to hold the malignant growth of communism in America in check by exposing it has not destroyed the threat of communism to our national security. We need legislation which specifically defines communism and makes it illegal to spread Communist doctrines or engage in other treasonable activities for the Communist movement.

There is need for a clear understanding of the term "Communist" as it is applied to an accused individual. Today it is a term loosely used as an epithet to be hurled against persons who may be communistic or may merely be extremely liberal in their opinions. It is used to smear the innocent, as well as to brand the guilty, and even the courts of the Nation have failed to agree on the meaning of the term, though it has been established in court that the use of the term "Communist" when directed against an individual damages his character and reputation.

Until a clear definition of communism is established by legal procedure—a definition from which the actions of a man may be determined to stamp him as a Communist or clear him of the charge—there is no basis whereby effective action can be taken by our security agencies to protect the Nation from the insidious sabotage of the real Communists in America.

Communists are not merely members of a political party, though they may use such a party in an attempt to legalize their assault on democracy.

Communism actually is the long arm of an international conspiracy; it is not a political party. Outlawing of the Communist Party alone will not halt communistic activities or destroy Communist-front organizations.

Communism is an atheistic and anti-religious ideology which would destroy freedom of religion in America.

It is a conspiracy which advocates and practices deceit, confusion, subversion, revolution, and the complete subordination of man to the state.

Communism has for its purpose and intent the overthrow of this or any other democratic or non-Communist form of government by force and violence, if necessary.

The position that passage of a bill to define and combat communism would drive the Communists underground is, in my opinion, a defeatist attitude toward legislation, especially since the Communists are apparently underground already.

During the last war we saw the development of a new technique of warfare, the fifth column with its infiltration, propaganda, and prepared quislings. We saw governments fall to the enemy without a single overt act of treasonable violence. We cannot afford to take the "can't happen here" attitude. We must enact legislation which will permit our law enforcement agencies to investigate activities which are un-American and treasonable and bring persons guilty of such activities within the jurisdiction of the law.

I introduced H. R. 4581 for the purpose of clearly defining communism and making the active practice of communism a treasonable act in the United States. My bill would not attempt any form of thought control. Only persons actively practicing communism would be exposed and treated as treasonable enemies of the United States, persons who actually owe allegiance to an international conspiracy whose ultimate aim is the overthrow of established democratic government and destruction of individual liberty and freedom.

The response to my introduction of H. R. 4581 was tremendously in favor of such legislation, and I have received letters not only from those in my own district but from persons in every part of the Nation. I am submitting excerpts from these letters for your consideration.

In my opinion effective legislation is necessary to halt communism in America. I firmly believe that passage of H. R. 4581 will meet the Communist threat in America, and I urge the members of this committee to report H. R. 4581 favorably to the House.

The excerpts referred to follow:

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS RECEIVED BY CONGRESSMAN GORDON L. M'DONOUGH ON H. R. 4581

Jacksonville, Fla.: "Your proposed legislation to make it treasonable to belong to the Communist Party is the most important news item in our paper today, but, unfortunately, it was not given front-page position as it so rightly deserved."

Beverly Hills, Calif.: "Your fine work in promoting the anti-Communist measure is one of the worthiest pieces of legislation of the present time. You deserve and have the gratitude of the vast majority of United States citizens and it is most opportune to advance this patriotic work in the stressful and difficult period in our history."

Los Angeles, Calif.: "We would like to compliment you on your past efforts in formulating and promoting good legislation, especially regarding the anti-Communist bill, and we hope you will continue to do your utmost to push this bill through the Congress."

Cavalier, N. Dak.: "Please keep up your work and make communism so unpopular that it will fade entirely from the picture. I hope you get real support for your efforts. Your 'guts' may save our country more than anyone can realize."

Los Angeles, Calif.: "I am heartily in favor of your bill, H. R. 4581. It is high time we are fighting un-American activities in our country. More power to you."

San Antonio, Tex.: "On November 26, 1947, the San Antonio Express carried a brief item to the effect that you planned to introduce legislation in the House to make it a treasonable act to belong to the Communist Party, or to practice communism, and that violation of the proposed act would be prosecuted under the treason laws. May I take this occasion to salute you, and to congratulate you on your proposed course of action. It is high time that American leadership was aggressively developed to perpetuate the institutions which our forefathers struggled so hard to secure."

Los Angeles, Calif.: "We are in favor of your bill, H. R. 4581, which you presented to the first session of our Eightieth Congress, and are of the opinion that they should pass it as it is with as little delay as possible."

Los Angeles, Calif: "I want to thank you personally for your fight against communism, for the bill which you introduced will clarify the issue and bring the fight out into the open. Today it is a life-and-death struggle; it is our way of life or communism."

Washington, D. C.: "I have just read with a great deal of satisfaction the report in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the introduction of your bill to define communism and make the practice of communism a treasonable act in the United States. To me, it seems just as urgent that we take action to forestall the spread of communism at home as it is that we do so abroad. I hope your suggestion will receive the consideration it merits and that the adoption of it or an equally effective method of destroying this threat to the United States may result."

South Wales, British Isles: "Seeing that you have introduced legislation to reveal and cope with the fact that communistic activities are actual treason, my daughter and I feel we must send you our thanks and every wish that you may succeed as you certainly would if enough people understood the trend of affairs clearly enough to realize the appalling menace to civilization of allowing these spies and agitators to be at large, paid by a foreign power to sow seeds of confusion and disorder people—your plan is the only one to get rid of them all—it's them or us. There is no time or room now for any middle way."

San Antonio, Tex.: "It gives me great pleasure to congratulate you on your anti-Communist bill. I hope you make the fight of your life to get that bill through Congress at this session."

Lincoln, Nebr.: "I note by the press a bill was introduced by you to get legislation to make it a treasonable act to belong to the Communist Party or to practice communism. I have this date discussed with a number of men the proposed legislation above referred to. The men are of different political parties and different lines of business. Without a single exception they are in favor of such legislation. They agreed generally that communism is an ideology for world revolution, against free press and free speech and for the overthrow of representative government. Many join me in wishing you success in having enacted into law the proposed legislation along lines above outlined."

Tacoma, Wash.: "I am greatly in favor of your bill presented, making active practice of communism in America as treason, as reported in today's press."

Philadelphia, Pa.: "Your bill to outlaw communism is most appropriate and I hope you will get enough votes to put it through."

Kansas City, Mo.: "Reading your proposal to outlaw communism in the Kansas City Star this morning prompts me, a life-long Missourian, to say: It's the best answer yet to the terrible threat of communism."

Proctorville, Ohio: "I want to congratulate you on your stand against traitors. I hope that you find enough friends of the same opinion to outlaw the Communist Party for the safety of these United States. This must be done."

Philadelphia, Pa.: "In a tiny dispatch on an inside page of the paper recently, I read of your introduction of a bill to outlaw communism. Your bill will no doubt have a rough time of it—even supposing it ever sees the light of day. To me the most stultifying sort of opposition will come from those snide sentimentalists who must perforce bend over backward to see that the other guy gets his chance, when the only chance he's looking for is one to stab you in the back. Communism should be outlawed just as murder and treason are outlawed, and for much the same reason."

Cleveland, Ohio: "As an American World War veteran I want to thank you for your militant actions and alertness of the menace of communism within the gates of our Republic. Indeed, I am wholeheartedly in favor of legislation making it a treasonable offense for any person or group to circulate untruths, thus undermining our constitutional form of government. The majority Members of both Houses of the United States Congress are sound Americans today. That is why I am appealing to you today to enact drastic legislation, with teeth in it to prevent Communists and their fellow travelers from overthrowing our Government by force, violence, etc."

Los Angeles, Calif.: "Was glad to see in Los Angeles Times your bill for outlawing the Communist Party. Better get our own country free of them."

Indianapolis, Ind.: "Communism is secretly eating into the very heart of many local unions and international unions in and around New York City and elsewhere. They work night and days because in many instances with them it is their only religion. In other words, they are fanatics and in other instances, it is my personal judgment, they are under the supervision and direction of the Soviet Government and in such cases a certain amount of fear exists on those idolaters of the Soviet regime. The trouble with our Government is we are too much afraid of offending a foreign power that has no hesitancy in endeavoring to undermine our Government. * * * I favor very much your bill to define communism and to make the practice of communism a treasonable act in the United States. You may not be successful, but at least it is worth trying."

Los Angeles, Calif.: "Communism must be overcome everywhere, even in our own country."

Tucson, Ariz.: "We were deeply gratified to learn of your bill to define communism and to provide adequate sanctions for so-called Americans who are Communists."

Seattle, Wash.: "Attached hereto is a clipping taken out of the Seattle Post Intelligencer, Wednesday, November 26. (Clipping relative to H. R. 4581.) It is the most impressive piece of reading I have seen in a long time. I sincerely hope that you will get the support of both the House and Senate on this much-needed piece of legislation. As for me, if this is not accomplished, this good country of ours is going to h— in a hurry."

Los Angeles, Calif.: "Since the Communist Party in the United States is a representative of a foreign power, dedicated to the overthrow of our lawful Government by violence and bloodshed, I urge you to vote for legislation outlawing the Communist Party in the United States."

Erie, Pa.: "God bless us for men like you are and make your constituents vote communism as treason."

Stetlersville, Pa.: "Please be advised that I received a copy of your H. R. 4581. I think you are right in having the term 'communism' properly defined. It is about time we know exactly what it is."

Madison, Wis.: "I am particularly interested in your H. R. 4581, to define communism and to make it a treasonable act in the United States. For many years past it has been my judgment that this is the one most certain, most reasonable manner in which to handle the Communist problem in the United States."

New York, N. Y.: "Your letter of December 9 is very much appreciated and I am in fullest sympathy with the bill you introduced in Congress, H. R. 4581."

Los Angeles, Calif.: "I am with you on your bill to outlaw communism as a party and I hope it will be your measure that will win out. Do not compromise with the idea that to do so would drive the enemy underground for we all know that is where they have always been and where they are today."

A recent poll conducted by the Republican open forums compiled from participants in 33 States showed:

	Percent
Those who believe American Communists follow the dictates of the Russian Communists	82
Those who believe American Communists are attempting to overthrow the governmental, economic, and social system of this country	84

A recent poll conducted by the American Association of Small Business among 20,000 members throughout the Nation showed:

	Percent
For H. R. 4581	82
Against H. R. 4581	10
No vote on H. R. 4581	8

Should Rent Controls Be Continued?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sunday Oregonian of February 1, 1948:

SHOULD RENT CONTROLS BE CONTINUED?—YES—WOMEN VOTERS POINT TO FOOD COSTS RISE IN OPPOSING CHANGE

(By Mrs. Blair Stewart, president, League of Women Voters of Oregon)

"Should Rent Controls Be Continued?" will be the subject of lively debate in and out of Congress from now until February 29 when the present Rent Control Act is due to expire. Great public pressure has been built up by organized property-owner groups for decontrol in spite of the fact that it would almost certainly impose an intolerable burden upon millions of American families. The League of Women Voters believes that, in view of the present highly inflationary situation, we should not only maintain and extend existing restraints upon the rising cost of living but also reinstate some additional ones. The league will support extension of rent control beyond February 29, and oppose any across-the-board increase in rents.

The League of Women Voters' position is not one hastily or recently arrived at, but is rather the result of 6 years of activity in relation to inflation control and an interest in, and knowledge of, the Nation's housing needs that go back to the early thirties.

When the United States entered World War II the League of Women Voters realized that one of the most serious problems that could confront any nation at war was inflation. Accordingly, it adopted for support a many-sided program designed to minimize the inflationary pressures made inevitable by the rapid conversion from production for peace to production for war. An important part of that program was price and rent control. When hostilities and pressures for decontrol mounted the League of Women Voters supported an extension of controls at least through the reconversion period and until production could begin to catch up with the Nation's pent-up demand.

In June 1946 most price controls ceased to exist and almost every American family has learned the bitter meaning of inflation—learned it the hard way through rising costs of food, clothing, services, and other living essentials. The only important control still in existence is that of rents and even under control the President of the United States recently estimated that rents for the country as a whole are rising at the rate of 12 percent a year—a rate which he called too high.

HOUSING: ACUTE SHORTAGE AFFECTS RENTALS

Many of the rent advisory boards, citizen groups created by the present Rent Control Act, in major cities across the country, have recommended that rent controls be extended until the housing shortage becomes less acute and the danger of mounting inflation lessened. Portland's rent advisory board was one of those. In view of the alarming rise in food prices, a rise from June 1946, the last month of effective price control, until October 1947, of 116.9 percent, a majority of the local rent advisory board believed that a similar rise in rents would almost certainly follow if controls were lifted.

At the same time the board did not fail to take into account the economic difficulties facing some landlords or the weaknesses in the law that make adjustments difficult. Accordingly it recommended that the Congress strengthen the law and appropriate enough money to permit its effective administration. It is true that landlords represent that last important segment of our economy to remain under wartime restrictions but we now recognize that many of the other controls were prematurely relaxed.

Any discussion of rent controls must inevitably take into account the Nation's acute housing shortage which has accumulated over a period of 25 years. Principal reasons for the shortage are the depression of the thirties and the recent war, when home building virtually ceased.

In 1925–26, the Nation's largest building year, about 975,000 houses were built. By 1933 the number had dropped to 100,000. After the depression there was a gradual increase until 1941 when approximately 750,000 were built; then the war halted all but the most essential building.

The estimated national need based upon the 1940 census is for at least 1,300,000 dwelling units per year for 10 years in addition to the demand for farm dwellings and repairs to existing houses. In 1940, before current pressures developed, it was estimated that 37 percent of the population lived in houses in need of major repairs or lacking sanitary facilities. Add the fact that over 400,000 new families are created each year and the further fact that at least 200,000 houses fall into obsolesence or disuse each year, and the magnitude of the need becomes apparent.

The housing needs of Oregon differ only in degree from those of other parts of the Nation. Dr. Bayard O. Wheeler, housing economist of Seattle, Wash., writing in the November 1947 issue of Oregon Business Review, published by the bureau of business research, School of Business Administration of the University of Oregon, estimated the population increase in Oregon between 1940 and 1946 at 33.3 percent with a corresponding increase in the number of new families created. Analysis of figures of various agencies indicate an increase in Portland of at least 30 percent. At the same time the bureau of census, "Current Population Report—Housing," dated August 13, 1947, dealing with the Portland metropolitan area, indicates an actual decrease in rental units in 1947 from 1940. Dr. Wheeler estimates that merely to attain the same ratio of dwellings to families as existed in 1940 Oregon immediately needs 108,996 new dwelling units.

One of the groups most seriously affected by the housing shortage and excessive costs is the veteran group. While the shortage has forced doubling up of many families, the percentage of veterans having to live under such conditions is over four times as great as in the case of nonveterans. Two percent of nonveterans live so, while 9 percent of veterans' families live with relatives or friends.

VETERANS PRICED OUT OF MARKET IN TRYING TO BUY HOME

The Oregon Department of Veterans' Affairs recently submitted a housing questionnaire to veterans throughout the State. The results, as report on December 27 by Director of Veterans' Affairs W. F. Gaarenstroom, reemphasize the housing shortage and reflect general dissatisfaction with rental housing. Complaints include high rents, cramped

quarters, inadequate facilities, and undesirable locations.

Some report a desire to move to other cities within the State where employment is available but are unable to do so because it is impossible to find housing.

Also stressed is the fact that most veterans even if they wish to purchase new homes find themselves priced out of the market.

Another important point emphasized by Director Gsarenstroom is that his office finds in administering the veterans' farm and home loan act that "the asking price of older houses is generally considerably higher than the appraised value." Hence most veterans cannot afford either new or old houses.

REPORT URGES ACCEPTANCE OF LOWER STANDARDS

Another recent report of more than passing interest is one made by a committee of the Oregon Building Congress on low-cost housing in relation particularly to veterans of World War II in the Portland area. It clearly defines the problem and deals with the housing deficit, the paying ability of workers, the kind of housing desired, the cost of construction, and other items. However, all of the facts set forth add up to some surprising conclusions in the minds of the committee. The first is that lower standards of housing must be accepted. Of course, the committee refers to standards in new housing but it is little comfort to the veteran living doubled up with relatives or in one of the 45,944 substandard houses in Portland to be told that he must lower his sights as far as a home is concerned.

Government-subsidized low-income group housing is dismissed as an unacceptable solution because the controls that would be exercised over all phases of building and marketing of such houses are unsavory to a free people. The committee recommends the starter house that would provide about 700 feet of living space to be increased to about 1,050 square feet as the owner's prosperity increased. However, the cost of the starter house is estimated at $4,500 exclusive of site, and most veterans have reported that they cannot afford to put over $5,000 into a house, including ground.

It is apparent that the only real solution is building, but building at prices which the average family can afford. Even under the liberal terms of the Federal housing administration, many builders are hesitant to enter upon any large-scale building operation because of the shortage of materials as well as the high prices.

Two solutions then present themselves for consideration. One, the long-term solution, must inevitably be governmental aid to local communities in meeting the housing needs of the lowest-income group. The other, the immediate solution, a Government program of controls and allocations on the most essential building materials, with continued rent controls.

In the long-run picture, it has been demonstrated through the years that private enterprise has never been able to build profitably for the low-income families. Much has been said about building new homes for those who can afford something better, thus making their old homes available to others. However, while that would make a few homes available it could never wipe out the accumulated deficit of 25 years, especially since the country as a whole has never produced more than 1,000,000 homes in any year.

Organized real-estate interests have consistently opposed governmental expansion in the housing field, and were successful in blocking passage of the general housing bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress. However, the bill, known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, was reintroduced during the first regular session of the present Congress, and extensive public hearings have been held on it by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. Much public misunderstanding has been created by the opponents, who call public housing "socialization of the building industry."

Actually, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill provides, as does the United States housing act, that such housing can be built only after the local community makes a formal decision that it is needed and that it cannot be provided at a profit by private builders. The construction job is undertaken by the local housing authority through private contractors. Local labor is employed at the going wage rates and the land is bought through local real-estate dealers. As a nonprofit public agency, the local housing authority owns and operates the projects, establishes rent scales, selects eligible families, and takes care of repairs, maintenance, and other management functions. The only function of the Federal Government is to provide the annual subsidy to cover the difference between aggregate rents paid and an economic return on the investments. In 1945 cost to the Government in existing housing projects was $6.03 per family per month.

The Nation's greatest housing shortage, however, is in the middle-income field and the pending housing legislation would provide many aids to independent business in meeting that need.

RECORD OF RAPID BUILDING IN WARTIME CITED

The Federal Public Housing Administration, a wartime agency, given responsibility for all emergency housing, had, by war's end, provided shelter for 9,000,000 persons including 4,000,000 workers in defense areas In addition, all of the facilities for community living were provided, schools, streets, cafeterias, recreation centers, sewers, and utilities. Existing housing took care of about one-half but the rest had to be new construction. Private capital, working with and aided by Government, provided more than half of the additional 1,900,000 units required and it was done during a period of unprecedented shortages of time, labor, and materials.

Much of this temporary housing is still in use and will need to continue in use until permanent houses can be provided for its present occupants.

If Government and private industry could create such a record during the war, why can it not do a similar job now when the need is daily becoming more acute?

It is a curious paradox that the organized real-estate interests that spearhead the fight against extension of rent control are the very same interests that most vigorously oppose Government aid in alleviating the housing shortage which makes rent control necessary.

In view of the highly inflationary situation, the League of Women Voters is advocating not only continued rent control but extension and renewal of other controls plus maintenance of present tax rates. The league advocates these steps in the interest of a solvent United States, able to meet its responsibility of world leadership.

Should Rent Controls Be Continued?—No!—Landlords Complain Fixed Income Unfair on Mounting Market

(By E. L. Wilson, president, Oregon Apartment House Association)

On the 29th of February 1948 the rent-control law will expire—unless the Congress sees fit to renew it. Now that the law is about to expire, there are voices being heard to say it should be renewed.

If rent controls are to be continued, the Nation as a whole must be the main beneficiary. If the national welfare demands that the owner of rental housing forego his constitutional right to be treated on a parity with all other businessmen, it must be on the basis that an emergency has arisen which can be circumvented in no other manner. To take the rights from one class of our citizens and bestow benefits on another class is not within the letter or spirit of our Constitution as written by the founders. This is the manner in which a Fascist state operates.

The only justification for the continuance of rent control is that an impasse has been reached in our housing situation that will disrupt our economy unless the Government by edict takes from one and gives it to another. To justify rent control, it must be assumed that our economy has broken down and there is no other way of solving our housing problem.

Let us examine some of the facts that lead up to this so-called housing shortage. In 1940, according to the Bureau of the Census, the United States had 34,855,000 occupied homes and dwellings. In November 1945 it had 37,600,000, according to the same Government report. This is an increase of 7.9 percent in housing. Meanwhile, between the same periods, the population increased from 131,669,000 to 140,200,000, or an increase of 6.5 percent. It will be seen that the increase in housing is greater than the increase in population.

POPULATION INCREASES MORE SLOWLY THAN HOUSING FACILITIES

In April 1940 there were 264.5 occupied dwellings per 1,000 persons in the United States. In 1946, there were 259 occupied dwellings per 1,000 persons. It will thus be seen that between 1940 and 1946 housing increased faster than population increased.

The same census report tells us that the number of houses and apartments occupied by only one person rose from 2,677,000 in 1940 to 3,481,000 in 1945, an increase of 30 percent in 5 years. The number housing only two persons rose from 8,630,000 to 10,529,000, an increase of 22 percent in 5 years. Meanwhile the number of dwellings occupied by six or more persons dropped from 5,414,000 to 4,208,000, a decrease of 22 percent. The number of rooms per person has increased from 1.45 to 1.58, an increase of 9 percent.

It will thus be seen that during this period when rents have been controlled renters have found housing one of the cheapest commodities on the market. As wages and incomes went up the renter found it very easy to afford additional housing space. Where a man and wife in 1940 were struggling along in an apartment for two, paying say $40 per month, which was 20 percent of his salary, by the time 1946 arrived he finds his salary has doubled. By adding a few dollars to the $40 he now finds he can rent an apartment that was designed for three or four persons, and his budget still calls for less than 20 percent which is the usual amount set aside for rent with the average earner.

In Portland, there are hundreds of large apartments occupied by only one person, thus preventing owners from renting to families because of rent controls.

CONTROLS KEEP RENTALS TIED UP, FORCE VETERANS TO BUY

This spreading out of families into larger and more commodious housing units is only natural when their incomes go up and they look about and see that housing prices have been frozen. When thousands and thousands of families all over the country do this a shortage in housing is the result. If all housing was permitted to command the rental commensurate with the incomes of the renters, there would be a bidding for each unit that would readjust the whole rent structure shortly. Families would give up the extra room or rooms that they had been getting for a few dollars. These rooms would house thousands and thousands of people. Before we knew it we would find our population housed again.

As it works out now the returned veteran seldom gets a chance to rent one of the frozen units. It is so cheap that the occupant would not think of giving it up. He knows he is getting $60 worth of housing for perhaps $40. He knows that if he were to duplicate it by building that his housing would probably cost him more than $60. So the returned veteran, being unable to rent, must go out and buy a home, at an exorbitant price.

Assuming that controls were necessary during the war, the time has now come to get back to the form of economy that has made these United States click. These very controls have created the so-called housing shortage in large part. To continue them is only to complicate the situation still more.

Not many people know that France adopted rent controls during the First World War. Thirty-three years have now elapsed and they still have the controls in France. Each year they declare that the situation is an emergency and they continue them for another term. Today France has probably the worst housing shortage of any of the western nations.

FRANCE: EXAMPLE OF CONTROLS GETTING OUT OF HAND

Worst of all the housing in France has deteriorated until there is scarcely a roof that does not leak or a wall that is not cracked. The price of rents there have been controlled, but other commodities such as materials and labor have been allowed to rise until no landlord can afford to pay for repair. General commodities and labor have risen 65 times. Rents have been allowed to rise only 5 times.

No new housing has been built in France. The controls have so discouraged private industry that it can no longer be induced to function. In France the Government has spent all its money and has borrowed its limit and has nothing to subsidize with. If the United States continues to borrow it will soon be in the same situation. Then, if it has driven private industry from the field, we will be in the same dilemma in this country.

Again we want to state that the only justification for continued rent control is that such an emergency exists that without it the Nation will be rocked to its very foundation. The advocates of rent control would have us believe that the Congress is all-seeing enough and wise enough to set up machinery that will work more efficiently than the law of supply and demand. One control only calls for another with the situation becoming more and more involved. While the experiment in Government control goes on we get farther and farther away from the rugged individualism that built this Nation.

Far too much of the thought back of controls is to protect one person from taking advantage, and another from being taken advantage of. If this same thought was given to making our economy free again, there would be profit and opportunity for all. Most advocates of controls seem to think that they should be extended to guaranteeing to every family a subsidy to put it on a parity with every other family. Just the fact that a man is born in this country in their minds entitles him to all the gadgets that go to make up the American way of living, regardless of whether he is industrious, resourceful, and appreciative.

In France they have reached the point long ago where there is insufficient net income from housing to permit the landlord to maintain the housing out of net income. This situation is now developing in this country. Many owners of rental property themselves have not come to realize that their buildings are wearing out and they do not have a sufficient margin of profit to keep them in repair. During the war period materials have not been available and they have not priced the materials and labor to bring their buildings up to first-class condition again.

There is a fallacy being propagated by the advocates of rent control to the effect that the landlord is making more now than he ever did. They state that due to full occupancy, now he is getting 20 or 25 percent more income than in 1942 when the rents were frozen. This is far from the fact. In 1942 the post office department made a survey and they found that there was only a 2½-percent vacancy. So a 2½-percent increase in rental is all that the landlord has been able to enjoy.

TAXES CONTINUE UPWARD AS DO EXPENSES

In the meantime our tax-levying bodies have met year after year between 1942 and the present and raised the mileage, all of which has resulted in an increase of taxes year after year. The last year alone most housing units were raised from 20 to 30 percent.

Anyone in the housing business in a substantial way scarcely ever finds that a day has passed when someone does not notify him some of the services he has been supplying will be raised the following month. Sometimes there are several raises in the same month. Thos who have planned the rent controls make no effort to modify these controls to take into consideration these increases.

Most of the larger housing units are heated with oil these days. We have no alternative but to continue to use oil even if it takes the last penny of net income there is. In 1942 the oil was sold to us at $1.17 per barrel. Raise after raise has resulted in this price being boosted to $2.90 per barrel. We are paying roughly two and one-half times as much for oil now as we did in 1942. This has had to come out of the income because there has been no way for the landlord to pass it on to the renter. If it was costing $1,000 in 1942 to heat a building, it is now costing $2,500. Controls have taken $1,500 from one class and given it to another class.

RENTS FROZEN IN 1942 WERE ON DEPRESSION LEVEL

This increase in the price of services has extended to everything that enters into the housing picture, because there are no controls on anything nowadays except rents. Plumbers, carpenters, painters, electricians, and the materials are all two or three times what they used to be.

It must be borne in mind that the rents the landlord was charging in 1942 were really the depression rents. Not one landlord in twenty in 1942 realized that the depression was over and had raised his rents to a point that paid him a return on the money he had invested in his property. It was about the time of the freeze on rents that the city fathers of Portland made a special appeal to landlords not to raise their rents. While he was being a patriotic citizen the machinery in Washington was turning to freeze everything as of March 1, 1942.

In conclusion, we want to state that continued rent controls, without the control of every other commodity, including labor, is a tacit admission that politically we are going over into a Fascist state where those in power arbitrarily take from one and give to another to perpetuate themselves in office. It is highly discriminatory and unfair to hold one class of citizens under restrictions when all other segments of our economy are operating free from controls. However, the retention of controls on everything is an admission that our democracy is not working. A return to the system that in 150 years has made the United States the most prosperous nation in the world is what is needed. There can be no compromise between free enterprise and a planned economy.

The Cattle Situation and Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been very interested in the welfare of our farmers and ranchers who have contributed a great deal to the wealth and greatness of our country. I feel sure it will be of interest to them to have the considered opinion of one of the country's most qualified agricultural economists as to the present cattle situation and outlook.

In a recent issue of the Country Gentleman magazine, an editorial has this to say:

Charles A. Burmeister, of the United States Department of Agriculture, and regarded by many as the ablest analyst of the livestock industry, figures 1951 as the nearest date to look for an increase in cattle number. The facts of the situation—our increasing population, the demand for meat, higher labor income, the lack of import competition, the sound financial condition of the range—all add up to one of the most favorable prospects cattle raisers ever had. In fact, livestock generally looks like the No. 1 best risk in agriculture.

Mr. Charles Burmeister is a graduate of the Agriculture and Mechanical College of Texas and has been rendering a great service to the Department of Agriculture and to the country as an agricultural economist in the Livestock Branch, Production and Marketing Administration. I am very glad to learn of his many accomplishments and the recognition he has gained.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address made by Mr. Burmeister before a meeting of the Mississippi Cattlemen's Association at Jackson, Miss., on January 16, 1948:

THE CATTLE SITUATION AND OUTLOOK

Developments during and since the war have brought about many changes in our economic life and there is much uncertainty as to how the country will finally adjust to the new conditions and what the adjustments will be. The beginning of this new year is a good time for stockmen to review the situation and consider prospects for the future, so as to determine if changes in their plans seem desirable.

Fifteen months have elapsed since most of the wartime price controls were discontinued. During that period prices have been free to find their natural level as determined by supply and demand operating without restrictions, as they did prior to the war. Demand, backed by consumer incomes more than double those of prewar years, has caused prices of many products to rise to new all-time highs. The average of all commodity prices is now about at the peak reached in 1920 after the First World War. Naturally there is great concern as to this situation and as to whether prices will continue to rise. For those who have to look far ahead in planning operations, it is even more important to consider the possibilities of a sharp decline in prices and how far it might go, once it gets under way.

Last year was generally favorable for livestock producers, despite a rise in production costs, particularly costs of feed. Demand for meat was sustained by the highest level of consumer income on record. Disposable income of consumers averaged more than $1,200 per person, compared with an average of slightly over $500 in the 5 years prior to the war. Livestock prices rose to new peaks, even though cattle marketings exceeded all previous records and meat supplies generally were very large. Meat consumption per person was the largest since 1909. Slaughter of cattle and calves totaled about 36,000,000 head, or 12 percent more than in the previous year and 50 percent more than the average of the 5 years preceding the war. Slaughter

of hogs, totaling about 76,000,000 head, was about the same as in 1946, but because of heavier weights the output of pork was greater. Slaughter of sheep and lambs decreased about 15 percent. This decrease reflected the sharp drop in sheep numbers that has been under way since 1942 when numbers were at an all-time peak.

After price controls were discontinued in mid-October 1946—15 months ago—prices of livestock rose sharply as unrestricted demand quickly came into balance with offerings. Seasonal increases in supplies caused prices to decline during the winter, but this was followed by a rise in the spring and prices of most classes and grades advanced to new highs. During the second half of the year, cattle prices were well maintained, even during the period of the seasonal increase in grass cattle when prices of the lower grades normally decline. Near the end of the year marked strength developed, cattle prices reached new peaks, and hog prices started their seasonal rise in November—somewhat earlier than usual.

The year ended with prices up 7 percent over the previous December on hogs, 13 percent on lambs, 18 percent on cattle, and 30 percent on calves. Except on calves these increases were only about enough to offset the rise of 14.5 percent in prices of the goods farmers buy. The purchasing power of lambs decreased 1 percent and that of hogs 6 percent. Purchasing power of dairy products and poultry declined even more. Prices of cattle, hogs, and lambs are now up about 50 percent above their parity prices. They were even further above parity in September. Compared with their purchasing power in 1941, cattle are up 25 percent, lambs 22 percent, and hogs 54 percent. In 1941, hogs were 5 percent below parity and cattle and lambs about 21 percent above.

Because of the unusually high prices now received for livestock, one would expect to find livestock production expanding. On the contrary, the trend is downward. During the next 2 years at least we may expect to see fewer cattle, hogs, and sheep for slaughter. This means less meat for the consumers regardless of their buying power and the prices they are willing to pay. The reasons for the decrease in production are different for each kind of livestock.

Sheep numbers have been decreasing since 1942, primarily because during the war period production costs increased in relation to returns and sheep raisers found alternative enterprises more attractive. Stock sheep numbers at the beginning of last year were down 17,000,000 head, or 34 percent from the all-time peak reached 5 years earlier. It appears that numbers now are about a million less than a year ago, and the present total is the smallest since the Civil War. This year's lamb crop will probably be the smallest in the last 50 years. This means fewer lambs for slaughter, and if next summer and fall sheepmen are inclined to start holding back ewe lambs to rebuild their flocks slaughter supplies will be even smaller. The rebuilding of flocks appears almost certain to get underway either this year or in 1949. But it can be accomplished only by holding back more than the usual proportion of ewe lambs from slaughter; hence smaller supplies of lamb and mutton are in prospect for the next few years.

It seems unlikely that sheep numbers will again increase to the peak level reached in 1942, when we had more than 49,000,000 stock sheep. The sheep industry in this country has always been primarily a frontier industry, operating largely in mountain areas and regions of limited rainfall where sheepmen could compete more advantageously with other agricultural producers. Expansion in sheep raising will have to be based primarily on the prospective demand for lamb, rather than wool, since wool prices will be determined largely by supply and demand conditions for wool in other parts of the world. The strong demand for beef and dairy products will tend to hold down sheep production in the farm flock States. In the Western States, excluding Texas, expansion will depend on the availability and cost of herders, and the extent to which weather conditions in the next few years might tend to restrict cattle production in those States. Sheep numbers have been reduced less in Texas than elsewhere, and there is some uncertainty as to whether sheep numbers there will or can expand greatly in the next few years.

The trend in hog production is now downward because of the reduction in supplies of feed grains, primarily corn, which resulted because of the unfavorable crop weather last year. Corn prices have risen relatively more than hog prices, and this is causing hog producers to market hogs at lighter weights and to breed fewer sows. Instead of an increase of 9 percent in the number of sows farrowed last fall, as was indicated in the intentions report of last June, the increase realized, as reported in December, was only 4 percent. The December survey shows that producers are now planning a reduction of 11 percent from last year in the number of sows to farrow this coming spring. We are glad to note that here in the South little or no decrease is contemplated. In the Corn Belt States, the indicated decrease is 14 percent. With average size litters, the 1948 spring pig crop will total about 48,000,000 head, or nearly 5,000,000 less than last year. These pigs will come to market next fall and winter.

The short corn crop of last year not only has caused farmers to produce fewer pigs but it also caused them to market last spring's pig crop earlier than usual. Slaughter during the period October to December exceeded that of a year earlier by more than 2,000,000 head, although the 1947 spring pig crop was less than a million greater than the 1946 crop. The supply of hogs now on farms for market during the next 4 months appears to be about 2,000,000 less than a year ago.

The supply of hogs for slaughter from May to September will come largely from the pig crop produced last fall and from the sows farrowing pigs this spring. These hogs will provide the sows and gilts that will farrow next fall's pig crop. If prospects for the corn crop are favorable in June and July the hog-corn price ratio at that time is likely to be sufficiently favorable to encourage farmers to increase fall farrowings, and this would thus reduce the supply of hogs for the summer market. An increase of 10 percent in sows and gilts held for farrowing next fall would reduce the summer market supply of hogs by a half million head. These indications as to probable supplies point to a possible reduction of about 4 percent in the number of hogs for slaughter during the next 9 months. Since market weights will be less than in 1947 when they were considerably above average, the reduction in pork output will be relatively greater than the decrease in numbers.

If more sows are bred to farrow next fall as a result of favorable prospects for the corn crop next summer, the increase in pigs raised will not be reflected in increased pork supplies until the spring and summer of 1949. Beginning at that time we may see an upward trend in pork production under way which might continue for 2 or more years, depending on the availability of plentiful supplies of corn to maintain increased production.

In contrast to the factors causing the downward trend in hog and sheep production, the supply of cattle and calves is being reduced because of the high level of cattle prices and the uncertainty as to how long these prices will continue. Cattlemen are in much the same position as the owner of a house who has an opportunity to sell it at a price far above what he paid for it, and who thinks he might be able later to buy another house equally as good for considerably less. They are inclined, therefore, to sell cattle more closely than ever before—thus reducing their breeding herd and replacement stock—and hoping that later when prices decline to lower levels they can rebuild their herds by buying breeding stock from those who did not sell. While this is generally considered to be a wise practice in most lines of business, it results in reducing cattle numbers and making fewer cattle available when the seller desires to restock.

The slaughter of 36,000,000 cattle and calves last year indicates that cattle numbers now total around seventy-six to seventy-seven million head, or about 4,500,000 less than a year earlier. Cattle numbers reached their peak 3 years ago when the total was estimated at 85,600,000. They were reduced by 4,500,000 head in 1945 and 1946, and apparently by about the same number last year. Present cattle numbers, therefore, are indicated to be about 9,000,000 less than the peak of 3 years ago—which is a decrease of a little more than 10 percent.

The official estimates of livestock numbers will be released late next month, and not until then will we know for certain which classes of cattle have been reduced most. During the first half of last year an unusually large proportion of the available supply of steers and heifers was slaughtered. During the second half the slaughter of cows was very large in relation to cow numbers. Calf slaughter during the year was near a record proportion of the calf crop produced, being equivalent to nearly 40 percent of the crop.

The indications on cow and heifer slaughter in 1947 point to a probable reduction of about two and one-half million head in the total number of all cows and heifers 2 years old and over, but it is not certain as to how the indicated decrease is divided as between beef cows and milk cows. The sharp drop in the ratio of prices of milk and butter to feed prices last year probably caused dairymen to cull their herds more closely than normal, especially during the fall months, and this may account for much of the large increase in cow slaughter at that time.

Because of the large reduction in cattle numbers last year and the reduced supplies of feed grain now available, we can expect fewer cattle for slaughter this year. The number of cattle on feed January 1 was 12 percent less than a year earlier, and the smallest since 1940. In the Corn Belt the decrease in number on feed was 19 percent. Outside the Corn Belt the total on feed is 12 percent greater than last year and the largest on record. Most of this increase is in California and Colorado. Supplies of hay, roughage, and byproducts of sugar beets used for cattle feeding are somewhat more abundant this year in the Western States, and demand for all classes of livestock for slaughter is unusually strong on the Pacific coast because of the great increase in population there since prewar years.

It is somewhat uncertain as to how large the decrease in slaughter of cattle and calves this year will be, but it probably will be relatively less than the decrease in number of cattle fed. The goal for combined slaughter of cattle and calves is 32,000,000 head. Stopping the decline in cattle numbers this year would necessitate reducing total slaughter to about thirty million, or about 17 percent below that of last year. With demand for meat as great as it now is, a reduction this large in slaughter is not to be expected. A reasonable expectation would be around 10 percent.

In years of short feed supplies, the general practice is to market fed cattle early and to produce relatively few long-fed or highly finished cattle for the summer and early fall markets. This pattern of feeding and marketing is likely to be followed this year, as is indicated by the kinds and weights of cattle taken out for feeding last fall. Shipments of stocker and feeder calves from the four larger markets in the last half of 1947 were 36 percent less than a year earlier. This indicates a large reduction in supplies of fed cattle in the late summer and fall. Feeder shipments of cows, heifers, and bulls were reduced by 38 percent, which means a much smaller supply of these kinds for slaughter during the winter and spring than a year earlier when they were unusually large. Total shipments of feeder steers from the four markets were 19 percent less than in the last half of 1946, and all the decrease was in steers weighing under 900 pounds. From these indications as to numbers and kinds of stocker and feeder cattle bought last fall, and as to supplies, we can expect the reduction in beef supplies this year to be relatively greatest after June, and be most marked in the better grades.

Meat production in 1947 totaled slightly more than 23,000,000,000 pounds. Output this year is expected to be down about 2,000,000,000 pounds, or nearly 10 percent. The reduction will be relatively greatest in the second half of the year. Fewer fed cattle will be available during the summer and fall, and hog marketings in the last quarter will be down sharply from the previous year.

There is little prospect of increased imports of livestock or meat from Mexico and Canada, our main sources of such imports. Imports of live cattle from Mexico, formerly an important supplier of stocker and feeder cattle, are now barred from entry here because of foot-and-mouth disease in that country, and will continue to be barred until it has been determined that the disease no longer exists anywhere in Mexico. For several years we imported about a half million cattle yearly from Mexico—mostly calves and yearlings for grazing on pastures in the Southwest before going to feed lots or to slaughter. With these cattle no longer available, Western stockmen and packers will have to look to you cattlemen here for some of their needed supplies.

Imports of cattle and meats from Canada are only nominal now because of an embargo imposed by the Canadian Government so as to enable it to carry out commitments to furnish beef for export to Great Britain. These commitments extend into 1950. Since cattle prices in Canada are only about half as high as in this country, the removal of this embargo so as to permit the entry of Canadian cattle here would cause meat prices to rise sharply in Canada and bring marked complaints from consumers there.

Although the proposed plans for aiding economic recovery in Europe provide for shipments of large quantities of food products abroad, it is unlikely that any meat other than horsemeat will be included in these shipments—at least for the first 2 years the program is in effect.

Looking beyond 1948 into 1949 and the early fifties, the indications point to continued decreasing supplies of lamb and mutton and beef and veal, but probably an upturn in pork output beginning in the late spring or fall of 1949. The increase in pork production will depend on the outcome of the corn crop this year and next, but it is doubtful if the increase obtained will be sufficient to offset the probable reduction in the output of other meats.

How much longer cattle numbers will decrease is somewhat uncertain. The downward trend will end when producers have more confidence in future price stability and when they find it necessary to retain cattle to obtain the maximum net return from their pastures and crops. A good stand of grass is a great incentive to own cattle. Pastures without cattle are like a house for rent without a tenant. You can never recoup for the time not used.

When cattlemen start holding heifers and cows to increase numbers, this will further reduce the supply of cattle for slaughter for at least 2 or 3 years after this action is taken. Assuming that the present downward trend in cattle numbers is not likely to end before 1950, there is reason to expect that supplies of cattle and calves for slaughter will probably continue to decrease until 1952 or 1953. During the low years the yearly total probably will be less than 30,000,000 head. Because of increasing population—now expanding at the rate of nearly 2,000,000 a year—the supply of meat per person will decrease at a faster rate than the total supply, and will probably drop close to the levels of the decade of the thirties when per capita consumption for the period averaged about 130 pounds. Last year it was about 155 pounds and this year it is expected to be about 143 pounds.

The most uncertain factor in the immediate and long-time outlook for the livestock industry is the probable demand for meats. Those engaged in analyzing business trends and the factors determining the incomes received by consumers are forecasting a continuation of the present high level of business during the first half of 1948, with some possibility of a slight decline in the second half. In the latter period, production of some items now in short supply is expected to catch up with demand. For years beyond 1948, demand prospects are much less certain, but producers should keep in mind that this country is in a much different position than other countries, and much different from what it was before the war. Its population and standards of living have increased, and the requirements of its people are much greater. Meat is one of the foods most greatly desired. Supplying that desire is an obligation of livestock producers and also a challenge. By meeting the challenge you not only will increase your contribution to society, but over the long period you stand to increase your profits.

In my judgment the long-time prospects indicate a need for greater livestock production to take care of future demands. The possibilities of increasing cattle production appear to be greater here in the South than in most other areas, and now is the time when action should be taken to get the increase that will be needed.

1948—The Outlook for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on a subject of grave concern to our country and the world, delivered by a distinguished citizen of my home town of Paris, Ill. The speaker was Allen D. Albert, D. Sc., early president of Rotary International and widely known scholar in the allied fields of government and world affairs. The occasion was his annual address to the Paris Rotary Club. Because it presents a comprehensive survey of world conditions and a scholarly analysis of hopes for peace, I commend it for study by every Member of the Congress:

1948—THE OUTLOOK FOR PEACE

The greater the war the greater the turmoil left behind.

World War II was in every way the greatest war of history.

The turmoil left behind for us to allay was and is the most widespread, the most intricate, the most nearly hopeless of all the afflictions that have come upon mankind.

Yet the men and women who look into world progress most analytically, the social and political scientists, look upon that coil of difficulties without panic. They perceive in it, I am confident, a hope that contradicts our current headlines of "The Third World War." They take it to be altogether probable, I am confident—

1. That in 1948 humanity will grind along nearer and nearer to what is called world peace, meaning the cessation of armed hostilities.

2. That with or without the atomic bomb Russia can be counted upon not to undertake a major war within a generation.

3. That the United Nations is doing more than fairly well the work for which it was designed.

AMERICANS COULD WELL STOP TO THINK

We are to try today to see the present confusion of the world as these specialists see it and we may well begin with a momentary look at ourselves. Norman Makin, Australian Ambassador to our country, afforded such a glimpse lately by quoting an American industrialist as saying:

"It is strange that so many of us were once upon a time deluded into believing that such a devastating hurricane would suddenly blow away and disclose a brave new world with all of our dreams come true.

"For 6 years our human society was in a terrible convulsion. It took the greater part of those 6 years for America to reach a high peak of efficiency in destructive war. We are now but 2 years away from convulsive destruction. How much of that destruction did we expect to remedy in 2 years?"

Another misjudgment is suggested by Ralph Sockman, president of the Church Peace Union:

"Too often we think that the will to peace is found only in America. We are wrong. For the will to peace is present everywhere in the world, among men and women of good will who want to make this world both neighborhood and brotherhood."

Again, we people of America in particular have come to live by headlines. We must have a new headline every 24 hours. Any of us who can wedge a moment of thoughtfulness in between the news summaries on the air will realize that any important influence upon human living should be the subject of a thought now, a meditation later on, through a week, or a month, or a year.

GOOD AND BAD AFTER THE WAR

Suppose in that fashion we look into the turmoil brought upon us by World War II.

Storm, drouth, flood, earthquake, fire, disasters of the air and sea and land have come to the four corners of the earth in 1947.

Organized labor, conscious of a new political weight, and organized management, fearful of further constraint, have so contended with each other that in the richest country of the earth employment and prices are continuously threatened with instability.

Science has entered all our calculations—

With new possibilities of unlimited good, as in the treatment of disease, the increase of health, the prolongation of human life, the devising of new instruments of navigation, the release through atomic fission of unlimited resources of industrial power.

With new possibilities of unlimited evil, as in the use of disease germs in war, as in the future use of atomic bombs capable, we are told, of destroying our very civilization.

Not less than 850,000,000 human beings have been under the shadow of war since the surrenders—not frays, or melees, or guerrilla engagements—wars of religion, wars between races, as in India; wars of contest for rule, as in China; wars of strategy in statecraft of capitals hundreds of miles distant,

as in Greece; wars of desperate need for living space, as in Palestine.

Half the people of the earth have for years lived on insufficient food. Today nine-tenths of them are doing so. The entire population of Europe, the Continent that gave name to our civilization, lack for food enough to maintain physical effectiveness. And more than 400,000,000 children are enfeebled for want of food to eat and warmth in their homes.

So low a living scale has slowed down all the decent labors of the unfortunate communities. While our American schools and colleges are disturbed by the crowding into their doorways of unprecedented numbers, the classrooms of Britain, France, and the countries east of them are partially or wholly empty for need of coal to heat them.

A MAGNIFICENT CREDIT FOR AMERICA

Jolted out of the complacent self-assurance we felt after the First World War, we Americans after the Second have led in the establishment of a second association of nations. It has served us and the rest of the nations for 2 years.

Herein is one of the magnificent credits of our life as a nation. We have supported it out of our larger loyalty to the good of mankind, disregarding our lesser loyalty to political party.

In the 2 years United Nations has wrought enormous gains. The Netherland East Indies, Burma, Siam, Palestine, all have turned to it as none of them would have dared hope to do 20 years ago. In economics, education, public health, the cultural studies, United Nations has outstripped the League of Nations.

Yet the will of the majority has been blocked, frustrated 24 times by one power employing a device which could hardly have been written into the San Francisco Charter unless our America had been as afraid as Russia to trust the majority.

Here at home, as in all other countries, license, fostered by world-wide war, has marked 1948 for its own. Sex stalks through the novels we read, unashamed, uncloaked. A world makes the American cocktail party its one means of formal entertainment. In America, rather more than anywhere else, juvenile delinquency multiplies arrests and judicial hearings.

The democracies resound with protests against bigotry and intolerance. Other races are by law assured relief from old discriminations. Yet we have taken to trying American citizens for their political opinions, trying them without confronting them with their accusers, sometimes without so much as letting them know of what they are accused.

Tardily, to be sure, but yet unmistakably, the American people, reverent, generous, sound of heart, are making felt their sense that the postwar era is losing godliness. A quickening is discernible in our houses of worship. A readier and more practical charity is obscuring the old, old lines of rigid prejudice between denominations. America is awakening to the realization that there can never be a godless happiness, never a godless peace.

COLD WAR CENTERS ON MARSHALL PLAN

These are lights and shadows playing upon the international scene of 1948. What do they presage as to world peace in 1948?

The question lifts high above all other considerations the relations, the attitudes, the present diplomatic maneuverings of Russia and the United States of America.

Both Governments look far into the future. For the present, however, they are battling in what is termed "a cold war" over the rehabilitation of Europe.

Russia believes that as the people of Europe suffer they will incline more and more to support her economic system of communism.

America believes that as the people of Europe make their way back to self-support under political systems chosen by them in all freedom they will safeguard the cause of democracy.

I think we should be forewarned that, whatever may develop, the "cold war" will not be ended in this year. Indeed, it appears to me to be clear that it may not end for a full generation of 30 years.

If the leadership of the democracies does not fail, I believe we may count upon a steady and productive improvement in normal living, normal trade, normal international atmosphere after the second year or thereabouts. After about 5 years it may be American aid and help can become secondary.

This is a contest which is not to be won save by an America and her democratic allies, strong in the ideals of democracy, strong financially, strong in military organization, strong above all else in purpose.

COMMUNISM NOT THE RUSSIAN CHIEF CONCERN

The ground for that caution is that the foe is of an ancient stubbornness. Communism is not the chief motive of Russia. The chief concern of that other one of the two powers is Russia. Communism is one of its dearest objectives. But for communism the present government, and every Russian Government for generations to come, could wait without any sinking of the heart if that were needed to advance Russia to further greatness.

A distinguished social scientist is Louis Gottschalk of the University of Chicago. He believes "the Communists are not idealists so much as pro-Russians. We must expect deliberate aggression from them. They look to see the capitalistic world collapse. We of America have no choice but to do all we can to prove they are mistaken."

In his mind, as he spoke the other day over the air, was the plan for self-help in western Europe put forward by the American Secretary of State. That plan has come to be the prize, the stake of the "cold war." If it succeeds, Russia must then make concessions. If it fails, the democracies must draw in their belts and return to the arena as Britain returned to the fighting after Dunkirk.

PURSUING AN OLD AIM

A sharp, clear light is thrown upon Russia under Stalin by that extraordinary find of German diplomatic correspondence from which our Department of State quoted in a recent bulletin. As the Voice of America said:

"The documents tell a tale of secret intrigue and rival skulduggery, of naked conquest, and cynical disregard for world opinion and the rights of other nations, in which Russia was not only a participant but a driving force. * * *

"They provide evidence that Russian expansion of today is nothing new in itself but only a rigid pursuit of the same aims on which Stalin embarked before the last war, and which he sought to realize first with Hitler, then against Hitler, then with the Western Allies, and now against them:

"At their very beginning with the Nazis, the Russians made it plain that ideology had little to do with Russian foreign policy. * * * To the very moment when Hitler turned on his partner, Moscow continued to applaud German conquests in Scandinavia, Holland, Belgium, and France, backing up Russian words of cheer with massive shipments of grain and a naval base on the Murmah coast."

GIVEN THE RUN-AROUND

It was an uneasy and mistrustful partnership. Russia demanded German withdrawal from Finland, a free hand in Bulgaria, bases within reach of the Dardanelles, if necessary war between the partners and Turkey, a penetration into Iran, and the coal and oil of southern Sakhalin.

Only 8 months were required to reveal to Hitler that he had a bear by the tail. One of the memoranda of Count von der Schulenburg, dated April 11, 1940, reports:

"For some time we have observed in the Soviet Government a distinct shift which was unfavorable to us. In all fields we suddenly came up against obstacles which were, in many cases, completely unnecessary; even in little things like visas they started to create difficulties.

"The release of Germans imprisoned by the Poles could not be achieved. The deportation of the German citizens long imprisoned in Soviet jails suddenly stopped. The Soviet Government suddenly withdrew its promises already given with regard to the north base.

"These obstacles, which were apparent everywhere, reached their climax in the suspension of petroleum and grain shipments."

Americans, whom the Hitlerbund regarded as so naive, can read that memorandum with a broad smile. There is something wickedly enjoyable in seeing brutal sophisticates get the run-around. Let us enjoy it while we can.

For in the 8 months following San Francisco the Russians gave the rest of the world the same kind of run-around. They annexed outright 240,000 square miles. Stopped by the meeting of the General Assembly in London, they entered upon a typically Hitlerian proceeding in setting up puppet governments in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, and began the infiltration of Greece.

BLOCKING UNITED NATIONS

That which the Third Reich had to endure took the form of confusion in United Nations sessions. Prof. Harold Laski, of the University of London, writing in the hope that America might, even so, cajole the good will of Russia by investments in its future, has provided us with a catalog of Russian obstructions. It is too long to quote in entirety; it is enough for us to know that he cites:

"She has never given an adequate reason for rejecting the Lilienthal plan for the control of atomic energy. She has not joined any of the UN food and agricultural organizations. She has not supported the International Monetary Fund.

"Her Iranian adventure is beyond defense. She has stripped Manchuria. The part of her agents in the inter-Allied control of Germany and Austria has been often perverse, sometimes wanton, even brutal.

"In the United Nations her delegates have driven honest men to fury, clinging to the letter of the Charter. Twenty-four times she has blocked the majority with vetoes. Wherever there is a group of Communists in other nations, no matter how small, she has kept them posted and active."

RUSSIA AFRAID OF WAR

You will be interested to hear that Professor Laski accounts for all this on the ground that Russia is afraid of war.

"Stalin now realizes," says this chairman of the British Labor Executive, "that for her own protection Russia must be kept aroused to passionate nationalism and therefore he paints every possible enemy action in far blacker color than it warrants."

Laski says, as well he may, that it is an old Russian tradition to bargain hard. Her leaders feel that by our policies after the Bolshevik rebellion she has become a pariah nation. She suffers a critical shortage of men who are competent to look ahead reliably. There are no younger men available with the knowledge and acumen of Litvinov and Maisky.

This is the foe with whom America must grapple for the cause of democracy. Between these two giant nations gapes an impassible difference. The logical fruitage of Russian communism is the welfare of the mass of men as determined by a small committee of superiors. The logical fruitage of American democracy is the upbuilding of human personality, subject to all the errors of judgment and mean motives of which humans are everywhere capable.

DEMOCRACY ON TRIAL

Is it not astonishing that such a contest should have come when resort to armed hostilities is quite improbable, if not impossible?

So long as one of them does not possess the secret trigger to atomic explosion, so long as it cannot construct the huge paraphernalia requisite to the fission of the atom, so long as it looks upon the ruins of 1,600 cities and large towns to be reconstructed, so long as its people bend and mutter at the mere suggestion of another war, in short, until a new generation has come to adult development knowing nothing of World War II the other power has only to keep so strong as not to invite an insanely reckless assault.

What all this imports for America is well understood by you in its right proportions, I am confident. Democracy, particularly democracy in the United States and Canada, is on trial before the afflicted countries of Europe.

By our charity, by sympathetic cooperation, by harmony in our own councils—even in the year of a Presidential campaign—by steadiness, by determination not to yield to bad temper, by patience, patience, patience, we of the greatest democracy can command peace through 1948 and years after.

That is the outlook for world peace in 1948.

Proposed Southern Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herewith an editorial which appeared in the McComb (Miss.) Enterprise-Journal, on Thursday, February 5, 1948:

OUR SOLIDITY MUST BE FREE FROM SENILITY

(By Oliver Emmerich)

The South should push the current plans for a Southern Democratic Convention to its brutal completion.

There are those who say that nothing permanent can be accomplished. Well, what's wrong with this plan:

First, hold our own southern convention and there reach an agreement upon what the South will demand. Second, go to the national convention with the South's 127 electoral votes all wrapped up in one package, sealed by definite commitments that cannot be broken. Thus far this idea has not been discussed in the press. Thus far only talk of a southern convention with a southern candidate has been ventured. But the second step should be pursued. Go to that national convention with the South's vote solid—but this time solid for the South, not solid for the East and North to use at their will.

But let us have no more of those courageous stands to be followed by a cowardly fall.

Four years ago we took a stand in Mississippi, a courageous, noble stand. Then the National Democratic Party put the heat on Mississippi. That heat was put upon the Mississippi Legislature—and the State wilted, wilted shamefully. With the choice of southern traditions and pork-barrel politics before us, Mississippi turned down southern traditions and accepted cheap pork-barrel promises. Thus, the "pink lady" ballot was enacted by a legislature that went one more shameful step. It not only turned its back upon southern traditions but upon the State constitution as well. This time we must have the character to stand hitched.

But the Nation should know this: That southern political rebellion was the force that blocked Henry Wallace for Vice President. Harry Truman is President today because of that southern rebellion—and he knows it. And this editor was one of the delegates to that convention and can personally testify to this truth.

For many years the political solidarity of the South has reflected the political stupidity of the South. In the last national Democratic convention—and the one before that—the big city bosses of the North and East used this solidarity at will. Thus, the CIO, which had so much to say in the convention, actually used the South's solidarity to its advantage. The party big-wigs recognized that southern solidity meant southern senility. It was when the South was snubbed, rebuked to the point of disgrace, that Mississippi delegates saw that Henry Wallace needed a small handful of votes to get him over the majority hump, and then joined with Virginia delegates and gained sufficient other southern votes to break up the Vice-Presidential playhouse of the CIO and Henry Wallace. The coalition defeated Wallace.

So let's go through with the southern Democratic convention, and this time let's make it stick. The Nation reads about the "solid South" and laughs. It should be painful laughter to all who live in Dixie. And remember one thing more: The challenge of State rights is not the only need for solidity that is free from senility. Many issues are at stake. The remedy depends upon whether the South will be spinelessly solid or solidly secure.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

CITY OF BUFFALO,
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
February 7, 1948.

Hon. JOHN C. BUTLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to directions of the common council, I enclose to you herewith copy of resolution adopted by that body on February 3, 1948, in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Very truly yours,
Dr. J. J. TRONOLONE,
City Clerk.

It is the sense of the Common Council of the city of Buffalo that the proposed agreement between the United States of America and Canada for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway will be most inimicable to the welfare of Buffalo and will destroy industrial values, create widespread unemployment and compel the removal of much of the grain elevating and flour and feed milling industry to seaport areas.

The city of Buffalo has been and continues to be unalterably opposed to this extravagant waste of public funds.

Commerce of the Great Lakes, which now has its eastern terminus at Buffalo and which has made Buffalo the greatest inland port in the world, will be diverted through the Welland Canal at a point approximately 30 miles before reaching the entrance of Buffalo Harbor.

No benefits from ocean cargoes through the seaway to the Port of Buffalo are considered probable and the Port of Buffalo cannot be used for ocean ships without deepening the harbor, Buffalo River and the city ship canal, at an expense of not less than $20,000,000.

The claimed benefits of the St. Lawrence seaway for military purposes have not been established and the limited period of time during which the seaway would be open discounts any real benefit of the seaway as an element of national defense.

The city of Buffalo protests against the sacrifice of its port, its facilities, and its industry to a scheme of untold cost and conjectural benefits.

The following resolution is therefore presented for adoption:

"GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

"*Resolved*, That this Common Council of the City of Buffalo, of the State of New York:

"1. Reaffirms its opposition to Senate Joint Resolution No. 111 now being considered by the Senate of the United States, and to House Joint Resolution No. 192, hearings upon which are scheduled before the House of Representatives, Committee on Public Works, or any other similar legislation which, if passed, would authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project.

"2. Directs that copies of this resolution be sent to the Governor of the State of New York; to all assemblymen and senators from western New York; to the United States Senate; to the two New York State Senators; to the chairman and each member of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives; and to each Member of the House from the western New York area.

"3. Hereby authorizes and directs the corporation counsel of the city of Buffalo to prepare a brief presenting the case of the city of Buffalo in opposition to this unwarranted expenditure of public funds for a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

"4. That members of this council as may be designated by the council president, the commissioner of public works, and the corporation counsel be authorized and directed to appear before the appropriate House committee hearing to oppose the St. Lawrence seaway and power project on behalf of the city of Buffalo."

Mr. Rybka moved that the foregoing resolution be amended by adding thereto the following:

"5. That the city clerk be directed to wire the Members of the United States Senate, Washington, D. C., and the majority and minority leaders of the State senate and assembly of the passage by this council of a resolution in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway."

Needed: A National Policy on Communism in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the time has come to declare and define a national policy with regard to communism in America. In the following radio address, which I am attaching as a part of these remarks, I have outlined some of the reasons why I believe my proposed legislation, H. R. 4422, will serve our national interest at this time:

My fellow Americans, congressional hearings are now under way before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which have as their purpose the establishment of a legislative basis for doing something definite to curtail the menace of communism in the United States.

As the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I want to talk with you tonight about the reasons why many of us in Congress feel that the time has come to circumvent the treacherous activities of Communists here at home. In an attempt to limit communism abroad to its present conquests and to protect friendly countries against Communist aggression, the Congress and the country are now contemplating the expenditure of many billions of dollars under the so-called Marshall plan. The purpose of the Marshall plan stated in three short words is simply to stop communism abroad. Our State Department and our Department of National Defense tell us that unless we can stop communism abroad, our security is in danger and war will become inevitable. If their position is correct and there is convincing evidence to support it, then, my fellow Americans, we would be penny-wise and pound-foolish indeed if we did not at this time take effective steps to stop communism at home. Uncontrolled communism abroad may well invite war with all of its disastrous consequences. Uncontrolled communism at home is certain to invite chaos and disaster with a dictatorial government resulting as its consequence.

Most Americans abominate communism, either at home or abroad. Most Americans are God-fearing and religious people and denounce the atheistic materialism which is part of the Communist concept. Most Americans love freedom and value our private-enterprise system, so they abhor the tyranny of communism and the economic idiocy of collectivism either at home or abroad. But most Americans, unfortunately, have limited their dislike and distrust of communism to condemning it with unkind adjectives, or to denouncing it from the press or from the platform, or to voting billions of dollars for the purpose of stopping it in some foreign country or on some distant continent. Very few Americans—indeed surprisingly and disappointingly few, in fact, since so vast a majority of our citizens oppose communism—very few Americans indeed have done anything definite or positive to curtail the menace of communism here at home. Perhaps this is because Americans generally have been waiting for Congress to declare a national policy with regard to the Communists in this country. In all events, I am one of those who believes that the time has come when Congress should speak out definitely, clearly, emphatically, and effectively, on this matter of communism. We can no longer afford to ignore the vipers attempting to poison our body politic within its own citadel of freedom.

Consequently, our Committee on Un-American Activities is now conducting hearings on a bill which I introduced in Congress a few months ago. This bill, H. R. 4422, spells out in specific language the three definite positive steps which I believe we should take at this time to circumvent the secret plots and plans of the American Communists.

In the first place, my bill includes the following language: "The Communist Party, any organization carrying out the principles and policies of the Communist Party, regardless of what name or title it assumes, or any organization, association, or other combination of individuals which is dominated, directed, or controlled by the Communist Party or whose origin can be traced to the Communist Party shall be required to register with the Department of Justice as an agent of a foreign principle." Not only does H. R. 4422 provide for this registration, but it requires as a part of such registration that there must be included the correct names and the last known addresses of the officers and the members of the organization, be it the Communist Party itself or one of the many front organizations engaged in advancing the Communist Party line in this country.

The second provision of my bill would require that all printed matter distributed by such organizations or any members thereof through interstate commerce must be clearly labeled in bold face type with the following identification label: "This is published in compliance with the laws of the United States governing the activities of agents of foreign principals."

The third provision of my bill establishes a penalty of not less than $1,000 and a prison sentence of not less than 12 months in one of the Federal penitentiaries operated by the United States Government.

In other words, the legislation I propose would strip the dark mantle of secrecy from the Communist Party in this country and compel it to operate in the open, under its own name and using its own label precisely as in the case of the Republican and Democratic parties of the United States. It would disclose to full view the officers and the objectives of the Communist organizations; it would disclose their source of income; it would make public their membership lists just as Republicans and Democrats have their party references registered in the auditor's offices of many American court houses and city halls. In short, it would deprive the Communists in America of the unique privilege which they now enjoy and which they seek to perpetuate in this country whereby they alone of the political organizations—if they can be dignified by being called a political organization, which I doubt because communism is in fact an international conspiracy rather than a political party—but in all events, my legislation would deprive Communists of their existing unique privilege of operating under cover and in secret and without registering or reporting their membership lists and financial statements for public inspection.

Many of you have written to our Committee on Un-American Activities to inquire why we do not write legislation to outlaw the Communist Party, since it is so obviously an un-American enterprise. Frankly, friends, we on the committee feel that outlawing the Communist Party would not achieve the desired results. Outlawing the party would simply serve to drive further underground activities which are already shrouded in secrecy. Outlawing the party would also snap shut or obscure certain open activities which now serve as important leads to the FBI and to the investigators of our Committee on Un-American Activities. Outlawing the party would also be to adopt a tactic of the Communists themselves, since wherever communism controls a government, it immediately suppresses and outlaws and persecutes all parties of opposition. The American method is not to suppress opposition but rather to strip from it the secrecy and deceptive covering under which it operates. Outlawing communism was tried in Russia before 1917, and communism took over the country while it was an outlaw party, just as the outlawed Nazi party seized control of Germany and the Fascists usurped power in Italy. What we need in America is legislation which will drive out of the ground and into the open the purposes, the personalities, and the pagan affiliation of the Communist Party.

So long as the Communist Party can remain all things to all men and hide its identity and program from public inspection, it is certain to make inroads among Americans who are either duped or deceived or distracted into working with it. While appealing to the Negroes of America for support of the Communist Party, these would-be tyrants of a new dictatorial regime hide the ugly fact wherever communism has gained control, not only Negroes but men of every other race, as well are reduced to political and economic slavery. While trying to appeal to the Jews in America on the basis of racial arguments, the Communists camouflage the fact that anti-Semitism is a handmaiden of communism in many areas of the world. While appealing to American laboring classes for cooperation with the Communists, they conceal the fact that the best paid laborers of the Communist countries enjoy less prosperity, lower standards of living, and less freedom than the most poorly paid laborers in America. While trying to weasel their way into American farm organizations, these Communist comrades of catastrophe carefully hide the fact that in Communist lands the farmer is chained to the soil and becomes the unhappy creature of the state, which treats him with the cold commercial unconcern that it shows to its cattle and its swine. Only by denying the truth and by functioning through fiction are the Communists able to deceive or dragoon Americans of any race or color or line of occupation into following these false prophets of despair. Only then, by disguising the fact that American Communists are in fact the selfish, self-serving agents of the Soviet Government are these Communists and their fellow travelers and fellow wanderers able to fatten their purses and advance their cause through luring gullible Americans into their Red spider web of potential tyranny.

The evidence to support my legislative proposal to require Communists to register with the Department of Justice as agents of a foreign power is volumes high and monotonously long. As far back as 1924 Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, at that time Secretary of State, forwarded to the then Senator Borah a 530-page document which stated in conclusion: "The subversive and pernicious activities of the American Communist Party and the Workers' Party and their subordinate and allied organs in the United States are activities resulting from and flowing out of the program elaborated for them by the Moscow group."

That finding was made in 1924. From that day until this the Communist Party in the United States has been the willing creature of the men of Moscow. In 1947 William C. Bullitt, our former American Ambassador to Russia, said in sworn testimony before our committee: "Here our Communist Party, like all other Communist Parties, is subject to orders from Moscow. It follows the party line laid down in Moscow with extreme care."

The research staff of our Committee on Un-American Activities has found conclusive evidence that the party line laid down by Pravda and Izvestia in Moscow is followed by Political Affairs, the Daily Worker, and other Communist publications in America. During last December, for example, the Daily Worker in the United States carried 115 articles attacking American foreign policy along precisely the same lines as the Soviet attacks of Vyshinsky and Molotov. During the same month the Daily Worker carried 76 articles defending or supporting Communist activities in countries outside of the Soviet Union; it carried 43 articles supporting outright the attacks of the Soviet Union on American policies and purposes. On such items as the following the Communist command in Russia and their captive creatures in America see eye to eye: They comment as though in unison on the Marshall plan—on our American position in China—on Henry A. Wallace—on General MacArthur—on our American defense program—on Greece and Turkey, and on at least a dozen other American personalities or policies.

If further proof were needed that the Communist Party in America is in fact and in function the agent of the Russian Communists, it can be found in the sworn testimony of Louis F. Budenz, former editor of the Daily Worker itself, when he said on November 22, 1946. "The Communist Party is as much a Quisling organization under the heel of the Kremlin as the Nazi bund was the agent of Hitler's Germany."

Fellow Americans, since the evidence shows the Communists Party in this country to be the agent of a foreign power, my legislation proposes to require it to register as such together with the names of all its members. Once that is done I have confidence enough in the capacity and determination of patriotic Americans everywhere to curtail the activities of communism—and to defeat its seditious plots to destroy our American way of life. If you agree with me that the time has come to declare and define a national policy on communism, I suggest you write to your own Congressman urging his active and articulate support of my bill to require Communists to register with the Department of Justice as the agents of a foreign principal and to identify their propaganda and their so-called literature as being in the interests of a foreign government.

Girl Scouting in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, in cooperation with the movement sponsored by the national executive committee of the Girl Scouts of America and with a desire to honor a great and glorious Georgian, who was born in my district in the city of Savannah, Ga., I have today introduced a joint resolution in the House of Representatives authorizing and directing the Postmaster General to issue a series of 3-cent stamps commemorating Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America. Juliette Low was born in 1860 in a typical southern city, Savannah, Ga. She had a very early and intimate acquaintance with war and privation. During Sherman's occupation of the city of Savannah he called at the home of Juliette Low's mother, with whom he was acquainted, and while there held Juliette Low, who was then a very small child, on his lap. Juliette Low was able to recall her reaction to seeing the Yankee soldiers invade and occupy the city of Savannah.

Leaving with her mother during the occupation of the city of Savannah, she went to the home of her maternal grandparents in Chicago and remained there until it was considered safe to return to Georgia.

After receiving her education in a boarding school in Virginia and a finishing school in New York, she met and married an Englishman, Mr. William Low, and moved to Warwickshire, England, where she traveled extensively throughout the British Empire and into the Far East with her husband.

It was while living in England that she met Lord Robert Badden-Powell, who was the founder of the Girl Guides in England. Through intimate association with this altruistic nobleman she caught a spark of his enthusiasm and conceived the idea of creating a similar organization in America.

She then returned to Savannah, low in funds but high in enthusiasm, and firm in the faith that a girls' organization similar to the Girl Guides of England could prove to be a great force for moral and social uplift in America. The first troop was organized in Savannah, Ga., in 1912, and in 1913, Juliette Low bravely came to Washington, D. C., where she opened national headquarters for this newly born organization. In 1915 she incorporated her project, and from this point on the organization grew by leaps and bounds.

Mrs. Low has been honored on many occasions for her altruistic service to American society. Her interest never waned in this organization which completely occupied her life after returning to America. Until the very last she maintained great enthusiasm and active interest in its growth and development.

And with it all there was an underlying sweetness of character which showed itself in constant helpfulness to the less fortunate. Her kindness went out to the sick and underprivileged, and many daily visitations were made which no one knew about, but which brought health and cheer to the unfortunate and unhappy.

Although intensely interested in the growth of the Girl Scouts and extremely proud of her part in it, she was big enough to sink her own personality and turn the work over to others when she found it was going beyond her own capacity to manage. No suffering could turn her, no faintness make her falter, no obstacle daunt her.

She knew and understood girls. She loved and trusted them in every problem. She had an extraordinary intuition. Whatever she believed correct or incorrect she believed it vehemently and maintained it vigorously. Her character and personality was the nucleus around which this great organization was built.

It is fitting and proper that the Congress pass the joint resolution which I have offered commemorating this great American. Few women have left their names so indelibly stamped upon the social structure of our country as has Juliette Low.

Great philatelic interest has been exhibited in this movement to issue a commemorative stamp, and in my opinion it will prove to be one of the most popular issues made in recent years.

Not only will it be an honor to the sacred memory of Juliette Low and to the great organization she fostered, but it will be a distinct tribute to the city of her nativity, Savannah, Ga. This coastal city, which I have the honor to represent, can truly claim a large portion of the early American colonial history. It will likewise be a tribute to the sovereign State of Georgia, and lastly, it will be an act in keeping with that great American custom to pay greater tribute to those Americans who have contributed to the moral, social, and spiritual development of our Nation by unselfish sacrifice.

It's Your Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, those who have more money than they can use, who have all their bills paid, including taxes, who are not afraid of inflation and the high cost of living, and who have no interest in the debt-bondage future of their children and grandchildren, will not be interested in the following report and comments.

But in fairness to all of my constituents, who are folks that have to worry about where their money is coming from, I have had prepared some facts which may give them a better understanding as to what their share will be in financing the Marshall plan and the Truman administration's estimated budget for the fiscal year of 1948–49, if passed.

From July 1, 1940, to July 1, 1945, according to the Library of Congress Legislative Reference and other sources, the United States advanced the huge sum of $73,092,058,013—billions, not millions—to foreign governments. Since some might say this should all be charged to World War II, let's see the picture since VJ-day.

From the end of the war through June 30, 1947, the United States has assisted foreign countries to the tremendous amount of $24,099,211,087, which, according to the last official census, would

amount to $183.03 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Now it is proposed that we give to foreign countries, under the Marshall plan, an additional $17,000,000,000. To add to the sorry picture, President Truman has proposed a Federal budget for the coming fiscal year of nearly $40,000,000,000—to be exact, $39,669,000,000, as compared to nine billion spent by the Federal Government in 1940, which was the largest sum ever spent by the Government in peacetime.

I got to wondering just what effect this huge outlay would have on my people at home. To assist me, I have had the figures broken down so as to show just what it would mean in the four counties and their county seats in Utah's Second Congressional District. This is the sad news:

Cost of foreign aid (1945–47, 1948–52) and Federal expenditures (1949) to the Second Congressional District of Utah, by counties and county seats

Counties and county seats	Population, 1940	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947 (population multiplied by $183.03), based on $24,099,211,087	Foreign aid proposed by Marshall plan, 1948–52 (population multiplied by $129.11), based on $17,000,000,000	Total foreign aid provided and proposed, 1945–47, 1948–52 (column II plus column III), based on $41,099,211,087	Estimated Federal expenditures for fiscal year ending June 30, 1949 (population multiplied by $301.28), based on $39,669,000,000
Davis County	15,784	$2,888,946	$2,037,872	$4,926,818	$4,755,404
Farmington City	1,211	221,649	156,352	378,001	364,850
Salt Lake County	211,623	38,733,328	27,322,646	66,056,004	63,737,777
Salt Lake City	149,934	27,442,420	19,357,979	46,800,399	45,172,116
Tooele County	9,133	1,671,613	1,179,162	2,850,775	2,751,590
Tooele City	5,001	915,333	645,679	1,561,012	1,506,701
Utah County	57,382	10,502,627	7,408,590	17,911,217	17,288,049
Provo City	18,071	3,307,535	2,333,147	5,640,682	5,444,431
Total for counties	293,922	53,796,544	37,948,270	91,744,814	88,532,820

It should be noted that these population figures are based on our 1940 census. With our present increased population in Utah's Second District the picture is even worse.

On the basis of the average United States family of four persons, the Truman budget for this year alone would be $1,205.12 for each American household.

Taxes and expenditures are inevitably tied together. Over 30 percent of our national income is eaten up in local, State, and Federal taxes. The average American works 3 days out of 10 for the Government. Taxes are an important factor in every family budget. They are reflected not only in the individual's income-tax return, but they are reflected in the price of everything we buy. Here again is another factor that has caused the recent price rises.

Some may say corporations will bear the bulk of these taxes, but never forget—corporations do not pay taxes—they collect them. John Q. Public is the man who pays. The high cost of living and high taxes go hand in hand. If we are to curb inflation and prevent suffering among our own people we must reduce these costs and do it now.

In the last 14 years the Federal Government has expanded from 521 agencies and bureaus to 1,141, and the number of employees has increased from 582,000 to 2,000,000. The administration insists on keeping these 2,000,000 employees on the pay roll. Now is the time to trim down this expanding bureaucracy and examine with the utmost caution further gifts to foreign lands.

Our people are demanding that by courageous, honest, statesmanlike, and careful action we trim these expenses both at home and abroad, all to the accomplishment of our full strength and security, our peace, happiness, and prosperity, and the preservation of our cherished way of life.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1948.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to call to your attention remarks which I have received in a letter from Mr. Alex Lowenthal, chairman of the Pittsburgh Zionist Emergency Council, said council consisting of about 11,000 adult members of the Jewish families in the city of Pittsburgh, wherein he has written to me, calling again to my attention the serious situation existing in Palestine today, and the deterioration of Palestine.

Mr. Lowenthal states this deterioration has been due mainly to the uncooperation and obstruction of the British Government to the UN decision; also, it is believed the policy of the United States has encouraged both the Arabs in Palestine and the Arab states surrounding Palestine to violate and disobey the UN decision, even though our Government took a strong position in bringing about the UN decision, although its actions since then have tended to undermine the decision.

He further states that (1) the embargo on the shipment of arms to Palestine, (2) failure to warn Arab states about the consequences of their interference in Palestine, (3) statements of high officials of our Government questioning the soundness of the American policy in advocating partition, (4) failure to take any action within the UN toward the establishment of an international police force, (5) permitting a general atmosphere of alarm which may have disastrous effects on American public opinion, which in turn may undermine the entire structure and effectiveness of the UN.

May I have an expression from you regarding this situation so I might inform Mr. Lowenthal and the other members of the Zionists organization accordingly?

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

FRANK BUCHANAN,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 9, 1948.

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCHANAN: I appreciated your letter of the 4th in regard to Palestine.

Palestine has been a matter of considerable disturbance to me ever since the Japanese surrender, and I've been endeavoring to get the matter worked out. It's now in the hands of the United Nations, and this Government is backing the United Nations in the settlement they have suggested.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "A Point of View," from the January 1948 issue of the Michigan Teacher:

A POINT OF VIEW

Citizens should have a clear understanding of the essential difference in the tax adjustment proposals outlined in President Truman's message as contrasted with the tax reduction features embodied in the Knutson-sponsored H. R. 4790 tax cut measure.

The Knutson proposals would establish a number of precedents which appear to be dangerous. In the first place, they suggest over-all tax cuts of approximately $6,000,000,000 in a period of prosperity when economists generally are agreed that every effort should be made to keep Federal revenue at the highest possible level.

General tax reduction of the nature proposed by Representative KNUTSON could not operate otherwise than to feed inflationary forces at a time when our interests at home and abroad emphasize the need for controlling prices and using scarce materials and commodities to the best possible advantage.

Moreover, even though a general tax reduction were justified, the Knutson plan is not equitable. Concentration of the tax cuts in the income-tax field under the Knutson proposal is certainly to be criticized. Excise taxes adopted as emergency measures were scheduled for elimination 6 months after the end of the war; Representative KNUTSON'S failure to make any provision for some cut in these taxes as part of a general reduction such as he is proposing is inexcusable.

The several Knutson proposals if adopted would operate together to give the low-income taxpayer insufficient relief, but would give thousands of taxpayers in the $5,000 to $30,000 groups reductions ranging from 25 to 39 percent in their tax bills.

The Truman proposals, on the other hand, would not establish precedents as the Knutson bill does, but are frankly emergency proposals. The President's suggestion that a $40 cost-of-living tax rebate allowed for all taxpayers would be very simple to administer. Moreover, it would give the low-income taxpayer more relief than he would receive under the Knutson plan, yet would not feed inflation by giving upper-bracket taxpayers the large reduction proposed by Representative KNUTSON.

Under the President's plan, the further proposal to offset personal income-tax revenue losses by a temporary increase in taxes on corporate profits appears to be in accord with current need for checking inflation.

The Knutson proposals appear to be premature and would tend to establish a tax pattern in a period of uncertainty which might have unfortunate economic consequences. The President's proposals are sounder because designed as emergency measures to meet an emergency situation. The Truman plan has the merit of concentrating the tax cuts where they are most needed, without the possibility that they will contribute either to loss of Federal revenue or to feeding current inflationary forces that might be anticipated through the adoption of the Knutson proposals.

Transfer of American Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the past I have brought to the attention of the House the fact that the proposed European recovery program indicates the transfer of some 500 American-flag vessels to foreign nations either through sale or charter. I have stated emphatically that I do not believe that such a transfer of American ships is either necessary or advisable. In view of this, I am very much pleased to insert here an article by Mr. George Horne, maritime editor of the New York Times and one of the outstanding maritime authorities of the Nation, in which he discusses this proposed ship transfer at length. I recommend the reading of this article by all who are interested in shipping matters:

REDUCTION IS SEEN IN SHIP AID FIGURE—BELIEF SPREADS THAT MARITIME PHASE OF MARSHALL PLAN HAS BEEN OVERESTIMATED

(By George Horne)

A conviction that the ship transfer features of the European recovery program, or Marshall plan, have been grossly overestimated is spreading among private shipping operators and Government authorities concerned with the aid program.

Shipping executives in New York freely predict that the State Department, the outstanding advocate of the transfer by sale and charter of 500 American vessels to the 16 Marshall plan nations, is re-examining the proposal and may withdraw or amend it. Indications are that this view is based on much more than mere hope on the part of shipping companies who have vigorously opposed the sales and charters as inimical to American maritime interests.

An independent study of the Harriman report on aid, and of figures that were a part of the original European request, made by the so-called Paris committee, shows that the need for American tonnage of this character has been exaggerated.

Experts on the program say it is questionable whether more than a few specialized types of vessels will be needed by the participating nations beyond the tonnage they already have received.

SALE OF 200 SHIPS SOUGHT

Under the proposed transfer plan, 200 of the carriers would be sold to foreign interests, and the additional 300 would be ticketed for temporary charters, which American companies describe as a permanent give away. The State Department has maintained that the savings in transport costs under the rehabilitation plan, by making it possible for aided nations to carry home their own goods, would aggregate $650,000,000.

The National Federation of American Shipping, representing the opposition, used its own figures in scaling the potential saving of $200,000,000. Its spokesman say this relatively small economy will not justify removing from the active American fleet a body of 500 ships—the equivalent of one-fourth of the national reserve tonnage.

Public expressions of concern over the transfer phase of the aid plan consistently have failed to point out that by the time the program gets under way the need for transfers will have been well dissipated.

The Paris committee estimated the needs from the United States at 3,000,000 deadweight tons. Confusion on the actual need was admitted at the time, and the Harriman committee of experts, in its report, suggested plainly that the figure was a shot in the dark and not a firm or reliable estimate.

The figure was based on existing applications by the 16 nations to the Maritime Commission for vessel purchases. And it is well known that the applications were inflated; that the prospective buyers applied for more ships than they expected to get. The inflation amounted in some cases to 4 to 1.

NORWEGIANS QUESTION FIGURES

Shipping men here say it is apparent to them that the State Department accepted the 3,000,000 figure. Later calculations by no means support it, and reports from shipping interests abroad indicate that those who would benefit from the plan believe the original estimate could be and should be substantially reduced.

In fact, practical shipping men in Norway, one of the principal maritime nations among the 16, have questioned the necessity of wholesale ship transfers, and other foreigners have expressed doubt privately.

Regardless of the fair figure at the time of the Paris meeting, tanker needs were included, and the recipient nations already have received more than a million tons of vessels in this category. They also have obtained surplus American Liberty and Victory vessels and a few freighters of higher quality, not to mention numerous smaller craft that would not be engaged in the relief-carrying trade and would not enter into the transfer calculations.

In comparing the different approaches of the State Department and the Harriman committee, it appears that the Department took the 3,000,000-ton figure at its face value, subtracted the 1,000,000 tanker-tons and then formulated the 200-ship-sale request. The Harriman committee did not take the Paris estimates seriously and made its own study of ship needs.

HARRIMAN REPORT CUTS ESTIMATE

The report of the Harriman experts on this phase of the shipping program said:

"In the original Paris report the program of United States war-built vessel purchases for delivery subsequent to June 30, 1947, was placed at 3,000,000 dead-weight tons. After a series of adjustments in Washington this figure was finally expanded to 4,000,000 dead-weight tons, but, for various practical reasons, we have adhered to the original estimate.

"In relating either of these figures to the foreign sales policy of the Maritime Commission it is important to note that purchase applications have already been approved on many of the vessels included in the forward purchase program. Consequently, additional Maritime Commission approvals on the sale of 100 to 200 ships would probably be sufficient to enable the 16 nations to accomplish their entire vessel-purchase targets. A narrower range of estimate is impossible at this time in view of the confusion in the European vessel purchase plans as related to us."

In general, the transfers already accomplished, particularly the tankers, have been made since that report was compiled.

The other group slated for transfer, the 300 under charter, would be bulk or tramp vessels. The Paris nations asked for $585,000,000 in United States tramp shipping for the whole Marshall-plan period, with most of it during 1948. Thereafter, a tapering-off schedule called for $167,000,000 in 1949, $89,000,000 in 1950 and none in 1951.

TRANSFERS WOULD TAKE TIME

Shipping authorities who now reason that transfers in quantity will not be needed, point out that a good part of 1948 will have slipped into history before the aid program can get moving. Meanwhile, interim aid continues, with grain and coal moving, much of it in American bottoms. If the Marshall plan is approved by midyear, it would take some months to transfer the American tonnage from its current operators.

The talk is of laid-up ships, but it is generally accepted that the vessels, if ordered transferred, will come from the active fleet; American crews will simply walk off and foreign crews walk on.

Other factors deflating the ship needs would be the steady increase of new tonnage available to recipient nations from their own yards, and the anticipated rise in the availability of coal from the United Kingdom, Poland, and the Ruhr.

The 16 nations have a 15,700,000-ton shipbuilding program for the 4-year period and are building 4,500,000 tons now. These bottoms will come along as coal imports from European nations increase, as interim aid from the United States continues, and as the period of usefulness of American transfer tonnage declines.

Sam Hardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, the fortieth anniversary of an employee of the Ways and Means Committee, I had an opportunity to pay tribute only briefly to that man, Sam Hardy. Our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], long

associated with that committee, and who has known Sam for many years, expressed his admiration and true affection for Sam—admiration and affection shared by many of us.

My predecessor, Hon. Allen T. Treadway, and long a member of the Ways and Means Committee, knew Sam as did Mr. REED. He appreciated his fine character and intense loyalty. Sam was devoted to Mr. Treadway, and their close friendship continued even after Congressman Treadway retired. Sam was a frequent caller at the Treadway home on Tracy Place, always faithful and anxious to be of service. He has those excellent qualities of character—trustworthiness, friendliness, and loyalty—which we all so much admire.

This day, Lincoln's Birthday, would seem to be a fitting day to pay tribute to this gentleman, of whom we in the House are so justly proud.

Time for Action on Mine Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

DEATH ON CONGRESS' CONSCIENCE

"Should there be another horrible loss of life in a coal mine, a large share of the guilt would come down squarely on this Congress." (Post-Dispatch editorial, February 7.).

These words had hardly been printed before eight men were killed in a mine explosion near Greenwood, Ark., Sunday afternoon. A check of the last report on the mine by a Federal mine inspector shows that there were more than 30 violations of the Federal mine safety code. This report said that while many previous violations had been corrected, many other violations were allowed to continue.

For example, explosives were fired by cap and fuse instead of by electical detonators. Weekly tests for methane and other hazards were not made. Air measurements were not made. Rock dust was not kept to within 80 feet of working face. Safety posts were not used close to the face. The entry roof was not adequately timbered. The hoist was not equipped with safety controls. Escapeway from active workings to escape shaft was blocked. Explosives were transported in a manner not permissible. Blower fans were not of permissible type.

And so on through a list of many more breaches in the Federal safety regulations. The trouble is that the Federal inspector can do no more than say what is wrong. That is all the law permits him to do. He cannot close an unsafe mine. And that is why it is so urgent that Congress pass the mine safety bills of Representative LANDIS and Senator KILGORE. For almost a year these bills have been tied up in committee.

This tragedy in their State should be enough to enlist the help of Senators FULBRIGHT and MCCLELLAN and all seven Arkansas Representatives to get these slumbering bills cut on the floor. If there is any honest opposition, let it declare itself in the open.

The Eightieth Congress was warned by the Centralia disaster. Is it as callous as the Green administration in Illinois? How many ghastly reminders does Congress require?

Margarine Versus Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pathfinder of February 11, 1948:

MARGARINE VERSUS BUTTER

On Tuesday afternoon, bald, sixtyish bovinephile Representative REID MURRAY asked permission to speak from the floor of the House. As he rose to orate he pulled from under his chair a 2-foot-long plaster-of-paris cow.

With the cow, Rebecca, under his arm, MURRAY proceeded to lecture Congress. When he finished, not a Congressman present doubted that (1) butter is rich, creamy, and nourishing, or (2) the dairy industry will fight repeal of Federal oleomargarine taxes.

If MURRAY seemed alarmed, it was only because margarine makers have marked 1948 as the year to repeal 62-year-old laws restraining its free competition with butter.

Repeatedly, Congress has rebuffed margarine makers' pleas for equality with untaxed butter—partly because in 1886 it had good reason to crimp oleo's style. Then meat packers made oleomargarine from the original beef-fat recipe France's Napoleon III got from a nation-wide chemists' contest. Farmers feared for their butter business, saw little profit in byproduct beef fat. More alarming, dishonest peddlers passed off yellow-dyed oleo as butter. After the law was passed, honest manufacturers strove to compete with butter, switched from a beef-fat base to imported coconut oil. Then when home-grown vegetable oils became abundant—and the need for political allies grew desperate—they turned to soybean and cottonseed oils. Their product became tastier, their farmer friends more numerous.

With new margarine strength on Capitol Hill, the dairymen must wage their greatest fight to halt tax repeal. Certain to come out are these arguments:

MARGARINE ARGUMENTS

1. There's a $250,000,000 yearly business in margarine, a table spread made from cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and other farm products. It benefits farmers in 44 States.

2. Margarine costs less than half as much as butter. Yet it tastes like butter because it contains skim milk and often diacetyl, butter's flavor element. It has the same caloric content as butter. Margarine is fortified with 9,000 to 15,000 units of vitamins per pound to give it approximately butter's nourishment.

3. Margarine cannot compete freely with butter because of a 10-cents-a-pound coloring tax on the colored product.

4. Soybean oil gives margarine a naturally yellow color, without using chemical dyes. But to avoid the 10 cents coloring tax, this oil must be bleached.

5. If Congress repeals Federal penalty taxes, yellow margarine would cost the same as white.

BUTTER ARGUMENTS

1. There's about a $1,000,000,000-a-year butter business. Its sale is the balance wheel of the 5,000,000-farmer dairy industry.

2. Nobody has ever proved margarine is as nutritious as butter, it is only a cheap imitation.

3. If Congress repeals the tax on colored margarine, it would also steal butter's prized yellow hue.

4. Margarine makers use skim milk in their product, forget farmers would butcher the cows that produce it if the butter market fizzled.

5. Uncolored margarine carries a mere one-fourth cent per pound Federal tax. It is easy today to dye margarine at home.

6. Despite makers' vow that colored oleo would be sold as margarine, clerks and restaurants will try to pass it off as butter.

7. The 26 margarine firms could form a dangerous monopoly, hike the price of their product.

As opposing forces gird for the fight in Congress, both sides are wooing the housewife's support. Smack in the middle of the controversy, she must decide between 88-cents-a-pound butter and 39-cents-a-pound margarine.

Probably four out of five families have at least tried margarine. Whether they will pressure for tax repeal hangs on (1) how much they know about margarine restrictions, and (2) how much they care.

Few know that grocers must foot $48-a-year Federal licenses to sell margarine colored, $6 uncolored. In 23 States yellow margarine sale is banned. Idaho, North Dakota, Tennessee, and Utah tax it 10 cents a pound. In Wisconsin the purchase price of even white oleo includes a 15-cents-a-pound State tax and a share of $15–$500 dealer-license fees.

But if these facts are alarming, United States Patent No. 2347640—the oleo beanbag—soothes. Chicago inventor Leo Peters' brainchild, it lets the housewife dodge both coloring taxes and the home-coloring chore. The margarine and a dye capsule are packed in a bag of transparent, pliable plastic. Without opening it, she breaks the capsule, kneads it into the margarine. Already four firms have adopted the new package. As its use increases, say butter men, it should end all talk that the margarine color tax inconveniences the housewife.

The Oleo Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the oleo bills with all the implied benefits to consumers are entitled to factual consideration.

First. There is nothing in these oleo bills that will have an appreciable effect on the cost of living.

Second. The oleo bills will allow oleo to be sold in place of butter.

Third. The oleo bills are just an attempt to get the camel's head under the dairy tent. The next step will be to substitute vegetable oils for animal fat in evaporated milk, and claim it is as desirable as evaporated milk made from natural normal cow's milk. If a vegetable oil is equal to an animal fat as a substitute for butterfat in a pound of butter, will it not be claimed that the vegetable oil is equal to the animal fat not only in evaporated milk but also in bottled fluid milk? Do you know of any pseudo-scientist that wishes at this hour to state that 100 pounds of milk containing 96 pounds of skim milk and 4 percent vegetable oil is equal in food value to a 100 pounds of natural milk?

Fourth. The whole oleo industry has not an economic leg to stand on. Without the dairy cow oleo is not produced. Where are you going to obtain the oleo when the dairy cows are hanging in the coolers in packing houses?

Fifth. The experiments on the use of oleo and butter should recognize the fact that oleo cannot be made without dairy products. Oleo, then, itself depends on the dairy cow. Whether or not the 15.6 percent of the oleo, which is a dairy product, is a sufficient amount of dairy products to give good results in tests and experiments is another question.

Sixth. Animal fats are absorbed at lower temperatures than vegetable oils.

Seventh. Over 2,000,000 more milk cows would have been needed to have produced the oleo manufactured in 1947. Could the consumers not have efficiently used the veal and meat that would have been produced by these 2,000,000 cows?

Eighth. If the oleo bill is passed the dairyman might as well reduce the milk cow numbers of the United States another 2,000,000 head.

Ninth. Milk cow numbers have already been reduced over a million within the last year. The United States milk production in December 1947 was the lowest it has been since 1940, even though the population of the United States has increased by 11,000,000. Do you wish to encourage a further reduction in dairy cattle numbers?

Tenth. Stockyards located in sections like Chicago, St. Paul, Milwaukee, New York State, New England, and Pennsylvania have large calf and dairy-cow receipts. Do you want to see a 10-percent reduction in receipts of cattle in these yards? We must remember that 40 percent of the beef and veal of the Nation is derived from the dairy industry. Before the war there were more milk cattle in the United States than nonmilk cattle.

Eleventh. If these promoters of vegetable oils are to succeed, it will be necessary to develop a cow that produces nothing but skim milk. Or do you subscribe to a thesis of cream for a few and skim milk for the many?

Twelfth. The dairy cow on a given amount of feed will produce twice as much human food as any other farm animal and four times as much as some other farm animals will yield. We should be able to efficiently use the products of the dairy cow without any question whatsoever. The issue then is between vegetable oils and animal fats. Great damage can be done not only to the dairy industry but to the general welfare and public health of our Nation if vegetable oils are to be sold as animal fats. Some real experiments should be conducted comparing the two products. One never reads of that kind of an experiment. The ones we read about are where vegetable oils and dairy products are fed in comparison to dairy products. Let us have just one experiment, please, without dairy products added to bolster up the vegetable oil and see what happens.

Thirteenth. The oleo consumption is now about one-half the butter consumption. Any time the byproducts of butter are provided their proper legislative support in the dairy field butter interests will not be asked to carry the burden of showing up the falsity of the oleo propaganda.

Fourteenth. So, I repeat, let no one be misled about the true values of vegetable oils and animal fats until science really tells the story. No experiment yet wherever it was conducted has butterfat. Dried skim milk has 1 per-shown that a vegetable oil can replace cent butterfat in it. Where does this leave most of the oleo experiments? This 1 percent of butterfat may be enough of this "magic food" to give the results shown in the experiments. How about the calf experiment at Minnesota College when vegetable oil was compared with butterfat?

Fifteenth. The oleo people, I repeat, do not have an economic leg to stand on. They cannot make oleo acceptable to the public without using dairy products as a base. No milk, no oleo. No cows, no milk. Do you advocate a drink made of 96 percent skim milk and 4 percent vegetable oil and contend it is equal to natural milk? Even if you do, where are you going to get the skim milk?

Sixteenth. There are huge appropriations made in the name of public health. Why listen to groups that would relegate the greatest producer of protective foods to the coolers in the packing plants? Why talk about public health, oleo, and protective foods at the same time? There is no correlation in the consideration.

Seventeenth. Since the dairy cow—the foster mother of the human race—produces twice as much human food as any other farm animal and four times as much as some farm animals from a given amount of feed, steps must be taken not to allow cheap propaganda to decrease her numbers. Enough is being done to the dairy industry without adding this one.

Eighteenth. If anyone wants less dairy products, less dairy byproducts, less leather, less beef and veal, less soil fertility—get on the oleo band wagon.

Nineteenth. We have fewer milk cows in the United States on January 1, 1948, than we had on January 1, 1933, or 15 years ago.

Admiral Sellers Knows Retired Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the many comments published in the press concerning the retirement of officers of the armed forces, I take pleasure in inviting the attention of the House to the following remarks of Admiral David Foote Sellers, United States Navy, retired, president of the Retired Officers Association, who speaks after a lifetime of public service, during which he demonstrated his integrity and love of country time after time, both in war and peace:

In the wake of the disclosure that Major General Meyers had been retired from the Army for physical disability has come a deluge of criticism of the whole system of retirement of military personnel for physical disabilities. Coincidentally there have been initiated, both in the executive and legislative branches of the Government, inquiries as to the manner in which the system has been administered in individual cases and as to whether changes in the system as presently established should be made. Complete review of the cases of officers heretofore retired for physical disability appears to be in prospect—at least with reference to those who were retired for disabilities subsequent to World War II. Suggestions for basic changes in the whole system are being made.

Many of those who have heretofore been retired for physical disabilities—including some who were retired years prior to World War II—are now apprehensive lest, through administrative review or a change in the laws under which they were retired, their economic situations may now be readjusted with consequent hardships to their dependents and themselves. Some of them, although their original retirements were brought about as administrative determinations by competent and conscientious boards of medical officers, properly constituted under existing laws, later experienced a measure of physical rehabilitation through perseverence and medical care. They fear that their good fortune in this respect may now result in economic hardship through reduced income. They have molded their lives, as have their dependents, upon the reasonable expectation that they would be left undisturbed in the circumstances which premature retirement from service to their country has placed them.

While no clear cases of actual maladministration can be defended or condoned, and if such there be they should be corrected, it must be assumed that in the vast majority of cases, administrative determinations have been properly made in accordance with well-known and long-established standards, under laws enacted by the Congress—standards which were established for the purpose of eliminating the physically unfit from active military service to enhance its efficiency. These standards, originally applicable to career military personnel, have been made equally applicable to the reserve components with the mandate by Congress that they be equally and impartially applied.

Administrative determinations under those standards, if proper at the time they were made, should be left undisturbed even though in some cases there has been a measure of recovery from the physical disabilities upon which they were based.

Likewise, while a study of the present system may well, under changing concepts, suggest the necessity for the establishment of new standards, changes in the system should be for prospective application and not retroactive.

Over the years, to career military officers of the regular services, enforced retirement for physical disabilities has brought with it bitter disappointment. It has meant the sudden and premature termination of their ambition to serve their country. The standards of physical fitness for active military service are necessarily high. They are not comparable to the standards of physical fitness applicable in other fields.

Failure to meet the exacting standards of physical fitness throughout a military career, during which physical fitness is constantly under scrutiny, results in premature retirement after varying amounts of active service. In such cases, as a general rule, the greater the devotion to duty by the individual the less prepared he is to readjust his life to the totally different demands of civilian occupation in order to support his family and himself. Certainly it cannot be expected that he could make provision for that purpose by savings from his inadequate active-duty pay. The compensation, whether for active duty or

for inactive duty in retirement, never can be adequate due to the large numbers of military personnel necessary to a proper protection of the country in the interest of a preservation of peace.

Years of military service leave their mark upon those who perform it with a devotion to duty which must in large measure be its own reward. It is therefore not unreasonable to expect that the rigors of such service will inevitably result in a larger proportion of career personnel in the higher ranks being placed on the retired list for physical disabilities which have been incurred incident to military service, particularly at the close of a war during which physical strain was very great.

The essence of some of the criticism being voiced today of the system of disability retirements is that the retired pay of those so retired is exempt from Federal income tax. That is no new principle, nor is it confined to the military services. In my judgment it is a wise provision of law which might well be extended to military personnel who attain the statutory age of retirement for they are in effect retired for want of adequate physical condition to continue in active service.

Finally it must be emphasized that doubts which are being expressed in many ways today concerning the fairness of the application of the laws for retirement for physical disabilities should be resolved in favor of the individual, and basic changes should not be applied to those who have served under different rules. To change the rules in the middle of the game would create grave dangers to our national defense by undermining morale. Underpaid at best, and not undergoing preparation for business careers, it would inevitably create among those in the services a feeling of insecurity and result in their eyeing the outside as a more promising way of life rather than to keep their eye on the military ball. If it were now established as a precedent that expected emoluments of office might be at any time taken away or substantially reduced after the service has been embarked upon or performed, young men of high attainments could not reasonably be expected to choose an honorable career in the military service with a feeling that during the closing years of their lives they and their dependents might be reduced to penury.

Betrayal of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hope that every American citizen will read I Saw Poland Betrayed. Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane, the author of the book, has rendered a patriotic service to his countrymen. What he has disclosed ought to put the people on the alert as to the danger inherent in our present foreign policy. It is a foreign policy that, if continued, will pauperize our thrifty citizens, weaken our Republic, and endanger the very existence of our free institutions.

When existing undisclosed commitments are all made public, our humiliation as a nation will be complete. The word "honor" is apparently unknown to the New Deal administration.

As a part of my remarks, I am inserting an article by George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the Times-Herald Wednesday, February 11, 1948:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane has contributed immensely to the American people by publishing I Saw Poland Betrayed. It is a report to his fellow countrymen on his mission to Poland between 1944 and 1947.

I wonder whether the title should not be: I Saw America Betrayed? for when the officials of a country forsake its honor and lower its dignity for whatever expediency, do they not disclose that its spirit has been fouled, its national morality abandoned?

The tale really begins at Tehran when Great Britain, which went to war with Germany over Poland, abandoned principle upon demand of Stalin and at the instigation of Roosevelt. Lane says:

"The discussions at the conference at Tehran in December 1943 among Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin remained an official secret * * * even within the Department of State the truth of what happened at this momentous conference was probably not known, except perhaps to two or three.

"Some key officials, indeed, who had the responsibility of making important recommendations on matters dealing with the United Nations organization, in conversations with me shortly after President Roosevelt's death in April 1945, deplored the fact that no records of the Tehran meeting were available even to them. Perhaps none had been made."

For page after page, following this quotation, Lane records the deceptions pursued by President Roosevelt. He recounts in detail the relations between the President and Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress. Rozmarek wrote to Lane:

"President Roosevelt in his talk with me expressed distrust of Stalin, having been fooled by him, as he stated, on a number of occasions. He plainly indicated that he was fearful that Stalin might again collaborate with Hitler as he did in the initial stages of the war, and the President wanted at all costs to prevent such an alliance.

"He kept on repeating to me: 'Let us win the war with Germany first.' The President let it be understood that once Hitler was defeated, he would know how to handle Stalin."

Stalin actually got a better deal in Poland from Roosevelt and Churchill than he got out of Hitler by the Stalin-Hitler alliance. Apparently Roosevelt was so sure that he could outfox Stalin after the war that he complacently permitted Stalin to outfox him while the war was on.

Lane went to Poland as our Ambassador after the peace and after we had recognized that country's puppet government. Our mission to Poland was treated cavalierly. It was improperly and even humiliatingly housed.

Its diplomatic telegrams to its own Government were delayed or not sent at all. Members of the mission and other Americans were arrested. The Russians established the fact in the minds of the Polish people that the United States did not count.

Did we do anything about it? Of course, Ambassador Lane reports:

"Over my personal protest, Director General Herbert H. Lehman had appointed as director of the first UNRRA mission to Poland the Soviet member of the UNRRA council, Mr. Menshikov. * * * It was no surprise to me when in August the agreement concluded in Warsaw provided that the Polish Government, and not UNRRA, should have complete jurisdiction over the distribution of UNRRA supplies in Poland."

Also, we granted a $90,000,000 loan to the Polish government. Lane telegraphed the State Department:

"With the greatest earnestness of which I am capable I beg the department not to approve the extension of any credits at this time. When the terroristic activities of the security police come to an end, when freedom of the press is restored, and when American citizens are released from Polish prisons—not until then should United States public funds be used to assist the Polish provisional government of national unity."

He ends his chapter:

"In my opinion, these minor gains in no way compensated for the loss of prestige suffered by the United States when we granted credits to a government which had not kept its word to us and which seized on our leniency as warrant for proceeding to even greater attacks on the freedom of its own citizens—and of our citizens."

The book should be read by every American in humility and shame.

Brownie Boultinghouse Won First Place State Sons-Daughter Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published in the Osborne County Farmer-Journal of January 29, 1948:

BROWNIE BOULTINGHOUSE WON FIRST PLACE STATE SONS-DAUGHTER CONTEST

In a communication received Monday from Mrs. Frank Boyd, State chairman of the Native Sons and Daughters essay contest, the local high school was informed that Brownie Boultinghouze, one of the school's popular juniors, received first place in the State with her essay on Americanism. The essay not only won first place among the entries on the particular subject but also won the sweepstake award covering all the various subject divisions which this contest included.

Mrs. Boyd's letter to the local superintendent of schools stated, in part: "It is a real pleasure to notify you that one of your students, Brownie Boultinghouse, received first prize on her essay on Americanism and will received the $25 award from the Robinson Milling Co. of Salina. * * * In addition to the prize from the Robinson Co., she was awarded the sweepstake prize, being chosen first among the "firsts" in the various classifications. * * * You please notify Brownie that she is to get the free trip to Topeka given by the Native Sons and Daughters of Kansas, be their honor guest at the annual banquet meeting in Topeka, Wednesday 28. Your school will receive the $25 given by the State chamber of commerce."

In a telephone conversation on Tuesday Mrs. Boyd informed Brownie that both she and her instructor, Miss Florence Deeble, would be Mrs. Boyd's guests at the Jayhawk Hotel and that following the banquet on Wednesday evening they were invited to be among the guests at the Governor's reception.

This is the third time that Osborne High students have won this coveted award. Several years ago Elizabeth Bell brought this honor to Osborne. And in 1944 Dean Gregory was State sweepstake winner. The fact that Osborne has had two State winners within the past 4 years is a genuine tribute to the splendid services given by Miss Deeble, head of the English department in the high school. Moreover, it testifies to the fact that our high school youth are appreciative of basic values of life as expressed in their essay writing.

The entire community joins the school in congratulating Brownie Boultinghouse upon her splendid achievement.

"AMERICANISM

"(By Brownie Boultinghouse)

"Americanism was born as an ideal; an ideal which has developed and still continues to develop as an 'American way of life.' This ideal was first expressed to the world in the immortal words of Jefferson, 'that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights—and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' It was made clear that these rights are not granted to men by some benevolent government, but that they are rights with which all men are endowed by a Supreme Being, and which are sacred to the individual.

"Later, when the Constitution was drafted, the founding fathers, keeping the words of the Declaration in mind, decided that it was precisely to secure these rights that governments were made, in the first place. They believed that governments were instituted to do good, not evil; they were made to protect men, not to injure them.

"But early Americanism meant not only the Constitution and the Declaration. When we speak of early Americanism we also think of how the documents were written and of the great men that backed them; we think of men who could not have repeated them, but whose lives were the incarnation of these principles and whose spirit has breathed life into these immortal documents. It is because of the ideal of Americanism we had men who were willing to suffer, to die, to venture, to sacrifice. It was because of the spirit of Americanism that we have a country, and it is only by that spirit that we will ever be able to keep a country.

"The democratic ideals and the theories of Americanism took practical form with the development of the West. It was the spirit of Americanism that led the pioneers to the West and far West; it was the same spirit which in every part of our land has accounted for the development of democracy as 'a way of life.'

"Americanism has grown in the minds of men until it is ever greater than the ideas and hopes of the founding fathers who stood before us to teach us the meaning of Americanism. Today, these rights and benefits are not only very precious but also very rare. Nowhere else on the face of this earth are so many of the good things of life within reach of the common man, and nowhere else are the people so free to improve conditions; so free to engage in the effort to shape the future according to their heart's desires. The suffering and the hardships of two World Wars have taught us these things and many more about the true meaning of Americanism.

"But we must not take all of these for granted. Today America is challenged with many problems. Our appreciation should not be merely passive. We should actively determine to maintain the strength, the spirit, and the greatness of America. Today, the challenge of Americanism is to rise above selfishness and serve not only the people of our own community, but also those of other communities the world over, regardless of race, prejudice, or color, and I believe that Americanism is meeting this challenge.

"Today, the hearts of Americans have been touched as never before by the needs of those in distant lands. Americans have given generously to the Friendship Train and to the Freedom Train. They are giving generously to the many other worthy and efficient relief agencies which are doing so much to help the people of the war-torn areas. In other words, Americans are voluntarily extending the hand of friendship and freedom to all the peoples of the world.

"Americanism continues to grow in the minds of men. It will find a solution to the problems which stand in the way of world stability and a permanent peace."

Pricing Policies of Tire Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

George J. Burger, director of the Washington office of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., declared today that the action of the Federal Trade Commission calling on the big four tire manufacturers to supply the Commission with their pricing schedules "will no doubt unearth secret and special deals in violation of section 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act."

The FTC's action will reveal secret pricing policies extended by the big four tire manufacturers through direct selling to local and national fleets, through their own retail company-owned stores, and mass distributor purchasers, all of which tend to reduce independent retailers' position in the tire-distributing fields, Mr. Burger declared.

This action of the FTC may further disclose overriding commissions paid to major oil companies—a privilege denied to independent retailers—which in turn prevents them from securing business from independent filling stations. More important, it closes the door to small tire manufacturers in getting business from independent filling stations.

The House Small Business Committee, through its chairman, Representative WALTER C. PLOESER, Republican, of Missouri, instituted this action with the FTC early in 1947 and this action of the FTC, Mr. Burger said, represents "a long and major step to solve this problem of hidden price discounts given to the few and not to all of the customers of the big tire companies."

Mr. Burger has been an active member of the rubber-tire industry for nearly 40 years. He said independent tire dealers have the right to petition Congress for legislative action through the so-called rubber-tire bill that was sponsored by both the House and Senate Small Business Committees in the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses.

Mr. Burger further stated that Congress must approve such legislation unless Federal agencies can bring into line rubber manufacturers who, Burger declared, have figured the present Robinson-Patman law was just another eighteenth amendment insofar as they were concerned, and today's action of the FTC will dispel that thinking and planning in the minds of the big four tire manufacturers.

Small business of this Nation will welcome this news, and it is a major accomplishment for the present House Small Business Committee, Burger stated.

National Foundation Fund for Cancer Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding patriotic veterans' organizations of the United States, the Military Order of the Cootie, has just inaugurated a campaign to raise $25,000,000 for the establishment of a National Foundation Fund for Cancer Research.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud of the fact that the national headquarters of this foundation, dedicated to suffering humanity, is located in my congressional district at Akron, Ohio, and that one of my constituents, Paul R. Couch, of that city, is the chairman of the supreme cancer committee.

When the Military Order of the Cootie was first organized in Washington, D. C., on October 23, 1920, it was designated as the honor degree of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Twenty-eight years ago, Mr. Speaker, even as you and I, the members were much younger and emphasis was given to their social activities. However, with the passing of the years, sobered by the thinning ranks of their departed comrades, they have rededicated themselves to a life of service in behalf of their more unfortunate brothers in arms.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to this House that this endeavor on the part of this great veterans' organization is not only in behalf of veterans, no, not only in behalf of Americans, but in behalf of all suffering humanity.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress within reach of my voice and loved ones of their families are destined to die of the searing ravages of tortuous cancer.

As an honorary member of the supreme cancer committee, I suggest that this Congress, many Members of which voted billions of dollars to win the war through maiming and killing, appropriate the funds to match the $25,000,000 contribution being made by the Military Order of the Cootie.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION FUND FOR CANCER RESEARCH

MILITARY ORDER OF THE COOTIE,
Akron, Ohio, January 24, 1948.

Hon. WALTER B. HUBER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Because of your known sympathetic inclination toward the veterans of this Nation, as shown by your efforts to help enact beneficial legislation and further the ends of their welfare, this letter is addressed to you.

It is written with the hope that after you have read it and digested its contents, you will be imbued with the great desire to lend your influence and support to the great humanitarian project which is set forth herein.

In order to get a comprehensive picture of the events leading up to, and including, the ultimate plan, it will be necessary to give you some historical data.

There exists within the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, a subordinate organization known as The Military Order of the Cooties of the United States. This title has been generally shortened to the extent that it has become popular to refer to it as the Cooties.

When first organized in Washington, D. C., on October 23, 1920, the by-title was adopted as being, "the honor degree of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, because the members must be picked from members of the VFW."

At the beginning the honor degree was more social in character, and fun and pranks seemed to be predominant in the organization. But the years passed and left their mark upon the membership and the spirit of fun and frolic exhibited itself with diminishing intensity each and every year. As this condition became more and more pronounced there came a change-over toward the other extreme and many of the older members gradually came to wonder if the Cooties should not endeavor to stress the honor degree instead of the social degree. As a result of this change, the Cooties requested of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that they be allowed to take over the hospital-visitation program of that order. Permission was granted by the parent body and a new era opened for the Cooties.

A slogan was adopted, "Keep 'em Smiling in Beds of White" and with this as an ideal the Cooties have for the past 8 or 9 years made it their paramount ambition to make life a little more pleasant for their comrades and buddies in the various hospitals throughout this country and its outlying Territories and protectorates.

Many thousands of presents have been distributed, many hundreds of visits have been made, and thousands of dollars have been freely given in order that their unfortunate comrades might have a few hours of pleasure to help them to forget the other monotonous hours that they were compelled to spend in their "beds of white." The rewards have been great. A smile brought to the face of a boy or man who ordinarily is wracked with pain, is enough to reimburse the Cooties for all of the time, effort, and money spent throughout the time since this work was started. The feeling of something done which was worth while in making a comrade happy for a few hours is something that cannot be forgotten by a Cootie who has made a hospital visitation.

It also must not be forgotten or lightly passed over, that the Cooties made it possible to present to the VFW National Home at Eaton Rapids, Mich., an athletic field, for the recreation of the boys and girls who are residents of the home. Cootie Field is its name, and it stands as a fully equipped memorial to those who believe in making someone else happy.

At Christmas of each year the Cooties sponsor the Christmas party to the boys and girls of the National Home and every resident of the home becomes the recipient of presents galore, the yuletide greetings and bushels of joy and happiness. Cooties from all over the country journey to that Christmas party and take part in the festivities. Their only reward is to observe the unbounded joy and happiness that is radiated from the faces of those children.

Now, it so happens, that these same Cooties who have, over the years, done so much to alleviate the lonesomeness and suffering among their comrades, have also observed that in the hospitals that they have visited, both veterans and civilian, one of the most prevalent sources of hospitalization is the dreadful scourge of medical science—cancer.

So, with the idea that perhaps an opportunity lay within the scope of Cootie activities to not only do good amid the restricted area of veteranism but also to benefit humanity in general, the great idea has been fostered to take up the fight against cancer.

The purpose and aim is expressed in the title which has been adopted—"The National Foundation Fund for Cancer"—or at least help in the work of ascertaining its cause and cure.

Briefly, it is a campaign to acquaint every Cootie and the American public with the need of raising money to fight cancer. Every Cootie in the national organization will work and do his part and the results will show that for every Cootie member there will be $1 contributed to the cause. Not only will the Cooties contribute but they will endeavor to bring the program to the attention of the public and hope to acquire additional contributions from that source. It is the plan of our committee to make this program of national scope and the hope is that 1 week of each year may become known as the Cootie cancer-fund week. We hope to have the President's approval and cooperation.

The program was first initiated by the action of Pup Tent No. 3, of Akron, Ohio, and by that body was proposed to the meeting of the grand council of administration of Ohio on February 26, 1946. The plan was enthusiastically received and it was proposed that it be presented to the department at its convention of that year. The adoption of the plan was voted on favorably by the department of Ohio. Plans were then made to secure favorable action at the national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, held in Boston, Mass., in 1946. Again the plan was received with great enthusiasm and the "go ahead" sign was given to the Cooties by that national encampment.

A committee was appointed and began its work immediately upon the adjournment of the convention and for over a year the work of perfecting the program has gone on.

Mr. HUBER, can you not feel that such a noble and worthy cause should be brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States?

The Cooties have proved themselves capable of high esteem in the past and we hope to continue to merit that esteem in the future. May we count upon you to help?

Let us all adopt the slogan which is to be used in this undertaking and "get in on the kill." Cancer must be eliminated.

We hope you will do what you can to make the Cooties' national foundation fund for cancer research a byword in the minds of every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Respectfully yours,

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
PAUL R. COUCH, *Chairman.*
GERALD LYNCH, *Secretary.*

Dr. Horace G. Smithy, Jr., Saves Girl by Heart Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as revealed in the Evening Star of February 10, 1948, and through other newspapers throughout the country, young Dr. Horace G. Smithy, Jr., formerly of the District of Columbia, has performed a miraculous operation at the Medical College of South Carolina, in the city of Charleston.

As a tribute to the untiring efforts on the part of members of the medical profession, I take pleasure in calling attention to the outstanding service of Dr. Smithy.

We are proud of our State medical college, which has been in existence more than a hundred years. Great physicians have gone out from this institution to minister to suffering humanity.

As a part of my remarks, I include herewith the newspaper account of this great surgeon's work:

SURGEON SON OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REALTY MAN SAVES GIRL BY HEART OPERATION—KNIFE ON SLENDER ROD INSERTED TO OPEN CLOGGED VALVES

Dr. Horace G. Smithy, Jr., son of a well-known Washington real-estate man, has succeeded in inserting a blade in the tubes of the heart and cutting away tissue to relieve clogged valves, the frequent after effect of rheumatic fever, it was learned today.

Dr. Smithy is assistant professor of surgery at the Medical College of South Carolina. The operation was on an 18-year-old girl, a victim of rheumatic fever who had been given a year to live. The operation occurred in Charleston, S. C., 10 days ago, according to the Associated Press. The girl, Betty Lee Woolridge, of Canton, Ohio, is now up, walking around and apparently nearly well.

Dr. Smithy has been performing this delicate operation—in which the heart is held in the hand while a knife at the end of a slender rod trims away valve tissue within—for several months on animals. The Woolridge girl in Canton read a newspaper account of the work in September. She appealed to Dr. Smithy by mail to try the technique on her.

PARENTS KNEW OF WORK

The doctor's parents, who live at 2721 Thirty-first Place NW., knew from his letters about the work and that his first operation on a human being was imminent.

Dr. Smithy, who is 33, went to Friends School here and to Episcopal High School in Alexandria. His medical practice, since his graduation from the University of Virginia Medical School, has been in Charleston.

"The good Lord was with us," his mother said today in telling about this critical operation of his career.

The 85-pound girl was flown to Charleston on January 18. Dr. Smithy said her condition was such his first impulse was to send her home.

Scar tissue in the heart valve interfered with flow of blood from one main heart chamber to the other. She had to be propped on three pillows to breathe. Veins in her neck stood out like cords.

Dr. Smithy said the operation was performed by opening the chest, and baring the heart. He used a long instrument, a slender rod, in the end of which was a movable blade to be used in cutting the scarred valve. The cutting blade is manipulated by the surgeon through the handle of the rod.

HEART HELD IN DOCTOR'S HAND

First the surgeon made a purse-string suture, or sewing, on the heart muscle. This was so that when the rod was thrust through into the heart the string could be pulled to tighten the outer heart tissues all around the rod to minimize bleeding.

The heart was held in the surgeon's hand while this purse-string suture was put in place.

The valve-cutting instrument was designed by Dr. Smithy and associates. It was made by the college machinists. When the instrument was inserted into the heart Dr. Smithy worked it by feel, and by experience gained on animals' hearts, until the point was over in the valve.

Heart valves are openings fringed with flaps of tissue, called cusps. When the heart contracts these leaves come together, closing the valve. When the heart expands they separate, leaving an opening. The scarring fastens the edges of cusps together, so that they no longer open freely. Dr. Smithy's probe cut away these adhesions, or part of them.

Abraham Lincoln Favored Constructive Aid for the South in Its Recovery From War—His Principles Should Be Applied Today in the European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since coming to Congress to extend in the RECORD on the anniversary of Lincoln's birth a statement on his great service, particularly his interest in the South's recovery. The day belongs to our colleagues on the Republican side, so I shall not consume the time of the House in speechmaking. However, as a humble Democrat I wish to express some thoughts on Lincoln's efforts to hasten recovery from the effects of war.

Abraham Lincoln died in the hour of success, a week after the South laid down her arms. Victory in war is far easier to achieve than justice and tranquillity in peace; the goal is far simpler, the problems are more straightforward. But, although Lincoln did not survive to struggle with the complexities of peace, he has a right to be regarded as more than a victorious leader in war, for he has left evidence of the policy that he intended to pursue when the conflict was over.

In his annual message to Congress in December 1863 he offended many by advocating a moderate policy toward the South. In February of 1865 when the end of the war still did not seem to be in sight, he drafted a message to Congress calling for $400,000,000 as compensation for the loss of property caused by abolition of slavery; only the united opposition of his Cabinet led him to shelve the proposal for the time being. Nicolay tells us that aid to the stricken South was dear to Lincoln's heart and that he was very sad at the rebuff which his purpose met at the hands of his Cabinet. A month later in his second inaugural address—which he considered to be as great a speech as any he ever delivered—he spoke of "malice toward none," of "justice toward all," and of "binding up the Nation's wounds." His last speech, made 3 days before his death, was devoted to answering those who attacked him for overgreat leniency in his attitude toward the new government in Louisiana.

History is full of might-have-been and it is idle to speculate on exactly what might have happened if Abraham Lincoln had been spared to complete his second term as President. Yet we can hardly doubt that, had he survived to translate into action that mild and conciliatory attitude of which he had given such evidence, had he, with all the weight of his great reputation behind him, attempted the harmonious reconstruction of our national life, then the country as a whole would have been spared much of the bitterness that so long outlasted the war; we cannot doubt that the history of the United States would have been one of even greater progress and prosperity than it has been.

The thought of this possibility, the wistful regret that we must all feel that Lincoln perished at the very hour when his greatest opportunity lay before him, has a moral for today. As in 1865 the United States had been ravaged and impoverished by a great conflict, so today the world has been ravaged and impoverished. In the years after the War Between the States the word "reconstruction" acquired an unpleasant flavor. Today we are waiting to see if it can recover its hopeful sound, for today Europe is in the direst need of reconstruction. There are some who try to draw a strange lesson from the parallel circumstances. The South, they say, recovered from the War Between the States without any aid; why cannot Europe do the same? The contrast is inexact; the conclusion is wrong.

First, in the last century, the United States lay in no serious danger of attack. It could recover from its wounds unperturbed by the threat of war. That is not true of western Europe today. The weakness of her war-shattered economy is an immediate temptation to the forces of disorder to the east. The South may not have been aided in recovery but at all times it had the protection of the United States flag. Without aid western Europe is more than likely to fall victim to foreign aggression.

Second, the South was comparatively self-sufficient. It contained within its borders most of the staple necessities of life. Its wealth lay in its fields and not, as in western Europe today, in its factories. The South did not have to face the problem which confronts western Europe today; it did not have to restore an elaborate industrial economy and to recreate markets—in a world in which the entire framework of trade had been shattered by war—in order to pay for food enough to survive. The South was impoverished indeed by the war but it had an agricultural economy and it was left with long years of peace in which to rebuild; it was left in a stable world with open markets and low custom barriers.

Third, the parallel breaks down because, after the War Between the States, both North and South were left the poorer for their struggle. Today the United States has emerged from the war with her productive capacity 50 percent greater than when it began. All her allies have paid the price of victory with severe loss of capital wealth.

But even were the parallel between the unaided recovery of the South after 1865 and that of Europe in the coming years perfect, it would scarcely serve as an argument against aiding Europe. If Lincoln's policies had been followed, if reconstruction had been constructive, who can doubt that the South would have been more prosperous, both in the past and today? Who can doubt that much bitterness and much hardship could have been avoided? And who can doubt that in the long run the North giving the aid would have benefited from it almost as much as the South receiving it?

I am not unaware of the great private charities extended to the South by the people of Northern States, and these acts of benevolence were a major influence in "binding the Nation's wounds," but the Government itself failed to seize the great opportunity which Lincoln pictured.

Lincoln died, and the opportunity was missed. Today an even greater opportunity lies open. The one country whose prosperity has increased during the war can, with a limited outlay, do much to give her allies a chance to restore their own and world prosperity, prosperity without which peace cannot be assured. Lincoln strove for the unity of his country and for domestic tranquillity. We know that he planned to apply in peace principles of conciliation and mutual cooperation to foster the welfare of his fellow countrymen. Today there is a chance to follow Lincoln's ideals in fostering the unity, the tranquillity, and the welfare of all the world.

Abraham Lincoln Would Be Engaged in the Same Work as the Fraternal Order of Eagles, if He Were Alive Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is Lincoln's birthday and if Abraham Lincoln were living today I believe he would want to be a member of the Eagles. I believe that because the Eagles are so actively engaged in truly humanitarian and social work for those of our citizens who really need it. In the Look magazine for February 17, 1948, is an excellent article on the Eagles who are this year celebrating 50 years of service to our country. In connection with the article are a series of pictures all of which I am proud to say, were taken in my home town, Milwaukee, Wis., showing, in a concrete way, just how the Eagles in Milwaukee operate. They show one group of community leaders working out traffic problems; another shows the boys' boxing tournament, an activity to combat juvenile delinquency. Another shows how housing for young offenders is being given attention by Governor Rennebohm and John Kenny, probation head, under auspices of the Eagles; another shows the interest of the Eagles in the juvenile court, with Judge Walter Schinz presiding; next is sponsorship of a baby clinic. Then there is one showing Ray Markey and Bob Hansen taking food to a needy

family—one of the Eagles' oldest traditions.

I am very happy to include the article in Look, as follows:

THE EAGLES, NATION'S LARGEST BENEFIT FRATERNAL ORDER, CELEBRATES 50 YEARS OF SERVICE TO COUNTRY AND FUN FOR MEMBERS

The largest benefit fraternal organization in the world is the Fraternal Order of Eagles. It has 1,391,437 dues-paying "brothers" in 1,546 "aeries" or lodge homes. A benefit fraternal society is one which makes cash payments to its members for illness, death, or disability. Money for this comes from the dues, which, in the case of the Eagles, averages $13 a year. Among Eagles, no club is better known than the one in Milwaukee, Wis. There 16,528 members pay $16 per year and, as shown on these pages, work or play in a fine clubhouse that cost more than $1,000,000 to build in 1926.

The FOE was organized February 6, 1898. Six men who were in the theatrical business in Seattle during the gold-rush days decided at a lunch-hour gabfest to form a club and call it the Order of Good Things. They changed the name to Eagles at their next meeting. Because theatrical people travel widely, it was not long before other clubs were organized in cities across the country. Early Eagle members thus were predominantly theater folk. Their pay was uncertain at best. They knew the value of the helping hand. The Eagles have a deserved reputation for taking the workingman's part, and the late John Considine, one of the founders, explained it this way: "From the start we had sick and funeral benefits and provisions for a club physician to tend our ill. Being in the theatrical business, I had seen how stage hands used to chip in and hire a doctor. We took the idea into the Eagles."

The idea stuck. The Eagles, by working that theme to the utmost for the next 50 years have grown and prospered. They point with pride to their record. The first workmen's compensation law was passed in Wisconsin in 1908. It was an Eagle project. The bill was drafted by Dan Hoan, for many years mayor of Milwaukee and an active Eagle. Eagles were back of the first mother's pension law enacted in Missouri in 1911. Montana's old-age pension law in 1923, trail blazer among such laws, climaxed an Eagle crusade. Wisconsin's 1947 Youth Service act and similar legislation in California, Oregon, and Minnesota in the field of juvenile delinquency had Eagle sponsorship.

DUES ARE LOW

The order pays members $7 per week for illness. Death of a member brings a prompt $100 to his family. The prosperous Milwaukee club pays a $200 death benefit. The payments are low. But so are the dues. Benefits total about $2,000,000 yearly to the whole membership. The funeral payment has its roots in the organization's start. Many early members were immigrants working alone in the United States for enough money to pay passage here for the rest of the family. The $100 assured a decent burial if the member died with no relatives near to see to his funeral.

THEY ARE WAGE EARNERS

The Eagles direct their appeal to the wage earner, to give him a place where he can belong and feel important. "Get a man a job, watch out for his family, help him improve his community where he lives, make him feel secure and you've got an Eagle for life," one Eagle bigwig said.

The Eagles try to do this on a big scale. National Eagle conventions establish policies and programs and urge each local club to plug away at community-improvement projects, prevention of juvenile delinquency, stimulation of employment, aid for veterans, promotion of child health and the teaching of American democratic traditions to check communism.

THEY BACK SOCIAL SECURITY

On the national policy level, the Eagles are busily advocating more and more social-security legislation. This is their platform for the future:

1. Extension of social security to include all employed workers not now protected by a retirement plan.
2. Expansion of social security to include protection of wage earners from loss of earnings through illness and reimbursements for major medical expenses.
3. Passage of State youth service acts to make juvenile delinquency a State responsibility.
4. Encouragement of city, State, and Federal planning for full employment.
5. Guaranteed annual wage and profit sharing by industry.

Palestine Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations today must solve the problems and exercise the power which its member nations have bestowed upon it. Today a situation exists in Palestine that may lead to another World War. It is the duty of the United Nations to use its force to see that justice is meted out to the Jewish people who are today living in Palestine with the thought that they would receive the protection of the great nations who believe in justice.

Great Britain, America, and the United Nations are responsible for thousands of people immigrating and settling in this Jewish homeland. It is our inescapable obligation to protect these helpless pioneers who are now being subjected to torment and unjust attacks. The situation is doubly unthinkable because the helpless people of Palestine are prohibited from securing arms and weapons to defend themselves from unjust attacks.

The time for action on the part of the United Nations and our State Department is now.

I wish to incorporate in my remarks a resolution unanimously adopted by the Gary Jewish Welfare Federation, Inc.:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT MASS MEETING OF ALL JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS OF THE CITY OF GARY, IND.

To the HONORABLE HARRY S. TRUMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

SIR: Whereas Americans of Jewish faith are greatly alarmed and distressed at the reports of rioting, violence, death, and destruction in Palestine; and

Whereas our State Department has placed an embargo on the sale of arms in Palestine, and the British have openly supplied arms to the Arabs and confiscated the arms and defense weapons of the Jews, thus leaving them helpless before the attack of the Nazi-inspired mercenary Arabs brought in from beyond Palestine's borders; and

Whereas the United Nations Committee has been delayed and hampered in its effort to create an international police force to keep order in Palestine by the diplomatic maneuvers of opponents of the partition plan; and

Whereas the results of these policies have caused death and destruction and threaten the success of the United Nations policy and the peace of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we in mass meeting here assembled respectfully urge you to immediately lift the embargo on the sale of arms and munitions to Palestine, so that Jews can acquire weapons to protect themselves against aggression and violence; that our representatives at the United Nations conference be urged to seek at once establishment of an international police force to keep order in Palestine and protect its inhabitants against Arab aggression; that our Government take such steps as are possible to implement effectively the partition plan for Palestine without delay, all in order to defend the helpless victims of the Holy Land, rebuff the attack of the Arab Federation on the United Nations Organization and to preserve the peace of the world.

Respectfully submitted,
GARY JEWISH WELFARE ASSOCIATION,
CYRUS WECHSLER, *President*.
HERBERT ROSENBLOOM,
Chairman of Mass Meeting Committee.

Cut Government Expenses and Reduce Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, in 1947, the Republican leadership in the Congress with the aid of a number of good Democrats, passed a tax bill in this House and in the Senate which would have given the American taxpayers a reduction in taxes in the amount of $4,500,000,000.

President Truman opposed the passage of that bill with all the power at his command. Nevertheless, it passed the House and Senate by big majorities. He vetoed the bill, and inasmuch as it requires a two-thirds majority to pass a bill over the President's veto, he was able to deny the taxpayers any relief last year.

Mr. Speaker, we came back again this year in an effort to keep our pledge to the people to reduce taxes, presenting a bill to the House of Representatives that would give the people something over $6,000,000,000 in tax relief. Again, the President attempted with all the power at his command to defeat this bill. Notwithstanding his opposition, every Republican except one, voted for the bill and 63 Democrats joined with us Republicans passing the bill by over a 2-to-1 majority in the House. The bill has gone to the Senate. It is hoped it will soon be passed by the Senate so that the American taxpayer in the third year after the winning of the war may get some relief from the biggest tax load he has ever been compelled to carry.

Mr. Speaker, we can give the people a $6,000,000,000 tax reduction, balance the budget and have $3,000,000,000 left over to pay on the Nation's debt. If we can cut the $40,000,000,000 request the President is asking for the running expenses of the Government for the next year by $3,000,000,000, we can pay $6,000,000,000 on the national debt. If the President would cooperate with the Republican House and Senate instead of opposing us, we could reduce his budget by $5,000,000,000, making it possible to give a $6,000,000,000 tax reduction and pay more billions on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago when we attempted to cut the running expenses of the Government by $5,000,000,000 he and his entrenched administrative bureaucrats opposed every reduction we sought to make at that time.

He is opposed to any reduction in his $40,000,000,000 budget this time which is $2,000,000,000 more than it was last year. He insists on refusing the taxpayers of our country any tax relief by saying that it would be inflationary, and at the same time he insists on taking more than the $6,000,000,000 tax relief from our own people and giving it to European countries, or spending it for merchandise in this country to give to the people of western Europe. He takes the position that the American citizen and taxpayer shall not have tax relief and spend his own money for clothing, dental, and doctor bills or for payments for the repairs of his home, or for any other purpose because he says that would be inflationary.

On the other hand, he says if his administration takes the money away from them in taxes and spends it on other nations, or allows them to spend it here, that will not be inflationary.

No President in the history of this Nation has ever before sought to so penalize and call upon the American people to make such a sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, the $40,000,000,000 budget he requests to pay the running expenses of the Government for the coming year amounts to an average of $1,000 per family. There are 40,000,000 families in the United States. When he asked for a $40,000,000,000 budget, he asks to sell the average family a year's service of the Federal Government at a cost of $1,000. His $40,000,000,000 budget request is more than the total 1946 income of all individuals in all States west of the Mississippi River except Texas.

It is more than the amount invested in all of our railroads, street railways, oil pipe lines, and telegraph and telephone systems representing the investment of 100 years. You will see this is a terrible drain on the economy of our country. Such a constant drain out of the financial bloodstream will soon wreck the country. They now in the Nation are paying more for taxes than they are for food. Their food bill is less than their total tax bill, when State, county, city, and all taxes are totaled.

Think of it. It is more than the value of all assets of all life-insurance companies in 1943, which was the chief nest egg of 70,000,000 people. The President ought to be asking for less billions instead of $2,000,000,000 more than he asked for last year.

Mr. Speaker, while the people are demanding a reduction in the cost of government, the President insists on keeping 500,000 more people on the Federal pay rolls than are needed at an expense of over $1,000,000,000 a year. This Congress has done and will continue to do its best in the face of the opposition of the President and this administration to reduce the cost of government and to pass a tax bill over his veto if necessary.

WHAT THE TAX BILL DOES

Mr. Speaker, this bill we passed raises the exemption on every taxpayer and his dependents from the present exemption of $500 to $600. The man with a wife and two children will get an extra $100 exemption on each of the four. While this will benefit every taxpayer, over 90 percent of the benefit in this exemption raise will go to those whose net incomes are $5,000 or less.

The raising of these exemptions alone will free 6,000,000 small taxpayers from paying any taxes whatsoever.

The taxpayer who, after taking these exemptions, has a net of $1,000 or less on which he must pay taxes will then get a 30-percent tax reduction.

First. He gets a large percentage in relief by the $100 extra exemption and then he gets a 30-percent relief in the amount upon which he must pay. This will give probably a general 40-percent relief to the little taxpayers who pay on any amount up to $1,000. There are 25,000,000 taxpayers in this group in the low-income brackets who will get this big reduction in addition to over 7,000,000 in the lowest-income group who will pay no taxes whatsoever. This high percentage rate of reduction for those in the low-income bracket is an attempt to give them much greater relief because we realize that they need greater relief to help meet the present rise in the cost of living.

Second. The taxpayer, after exemptions, who pays on a net of from $1,000 to $1,396 will receive in addition to his added $100 exemption a reduction of 20 percent. There are 7,000,000 taxpayers in this group.

Third. Taxpayers who, after exemptions, pay in excess of $4,000 will receive a reduction of 20 percent on the first $4,000, and above that in earnings, only 10 percent.

This bill also gives great relief to those over 65 years of age, as follows: Those 65 years of age will get an added exemption of $600, making a total exemption of $1,200.

This should wipe out the tax on many of the school teachers of the Nation who are now paying either taxes on their salaries, or taxes on their annuities.

Mr. Speaker, it practically wipes out all tax against the blind of the Nation by raising exemptions higher for them than any others.

It provides for married people to divide their incomes and will give relief to a great many married couples.

Mr. Speaker, yet, when the figures prove that those in the lower brackets get 72 percent of the reduction, yet the President when he gets ready to veto this bill will most likely make the same charge that he made against a similar bill a year ago, that this bill benefits the rich and penalizes the low-income group. Of course, there was no truth in his statement a year ago, and will be none if he repeats it as to this bill.

Those in the highest brackets are allowed a 10-percent reduction because we Members of the Congress and everyone who has thought tax legislation through realizes that you cannot take 50 to 75 percent in taxes away from those who must replace worn-out machinery and keep their machinery repaired and in good condition year after year, without finally throwing millions of laboring men out of employment. They must have this encouragement now to renew equipment and expand plants if we are to keep 60,000,000 people employed.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a political tax bill like the $40-a-vote bill offered by the President, which is so worthless that neither the Democrat Members of the House nor Senate have attempted to substitute it for this bill. This is an American equity tax bill seeking to push the economy of the United States Government forward for continued employment and greater production. This is not an inflationary tax bill. It is a tax bill to combat inflation. Greater production is the only real cure for inflation. This bill will greatly increase production. And, as we greatly increase production, more wealth is made against which these lower tax rates will operate, and by the expansion and creation of greater production and greater wealth the passage of this tax bill will not likely cut $1,000,000,000 out of the revenue of the Government, while at the same time it will give $6,000,000,000 relief from these high wartime taxes to the taxpayers who are carrying this terrific load.

Mr. Speaker, after the last World War when the Republicans came into power they passed a tax-reduction bill each year for three successive years. Every time they reduced the tax levies business expanded so much that they collected more money, with the result that they balanced the budget and reduced the national debt by a billion dollars a year for 10 successive years. Sound policies written into this tax bill will not only give the people the relief they seek, but will continue employment at a high peak; the production of wealth at a high peak, will expand business and probably bring in more extra revenue at these lower rates than the $6,000,000,000 in relief we insist the American people shall have in 1948.

French Monetary Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a letter from Hon. A. N. Overby, United States Executive Director of the

International Monetary Fund, and certain releases and statements in connection with the change in the par value of the French franc:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1948.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am glad I had an opportunity to discuss with you on the phone this morning the recent changes in the French monetary system, regarding which there has been so much discussion in the public press and not a little confusion.

As I indicated to you, the International Monetary Fund heartily agreed with the French Government that a change in the par value of the French franc was necessary, and indicated that it was prepared to concur in a devaluation of the franc to a realistic rate. I think I can fairly say that officials of the International Monetary Fund, including myself, have for several months indicated to the French Government officials that a change in the value of the franc was necessary and desirable. We have all indicated for several months that this action should be preceded and accompanied by budgetary and fiscal measures directed at internal monetary stabilization, without which a devaluation of the franc would prove ineffective, if it did not actually contribute to further inflationary forces. In all of our discussions with the French authorities over the past several months we have urged them to take measures to balance their budget, to improve and strengthen their tax-collection measures, to control inflationary expansion of credit, to reduce wherever possible their capital-investment program, and to take all other measures necessary to bring under control and reduce inflationary factors at work in France. We have noted with satisfaction that the French authorities, despite the fact that such measures are often unpopular, at least temporarily, have in recent months taken budgetary and fiscal measures directed at internal monetary stabilization.

You will note that the attached press release by the International Monetary Fund emphasizes the foregoing considerations, and I should like to reemphasize that we were all prepared to concur in a devaluation of the franc to a realistic rate. This was not the point at issue.

I think I might elaborate somewhat on the description of the French monetary plan which is contained in the attached press release. The French proposed to reduce the official par value of the franc by 44.444 percent. This would result in a change of the rate from approximately 119 francs per United States dollar to approximately 214 francs per United States dollar, from 480 francs per pound sterling to 864 francs per pound sterling, etc. At the same time, the French proposed to introduce a so-called free market in which the United States dollar, the Portuguese escudo, and ultimately certain other currencies would be bought and sold in a market inside France at fluctuating rates which would differ considerably from the new official par value.

This new free market would not be a free market in the orthodox, classical sense, because it would be subject to the control of the French authorities in the granting of import licenses, in authorizing capital transfers, etc.

French exporters to the dollar area, for example, would be required to sell one-half of their export proceeds to the French monetary authorities at the new official par value of 214 francs to the dollar. They would be permitted to sell the other one-half of their export proceeds in the free market. Assuming this free market would be established in the neighborhood of recent quotations in the black market of, say, 340 francs to the dollar, the French exporter to the dollar area, selling one-half of his export proceeds at the official par value of 214 and one-half at the free rate of 340, would average 277 francs per dollar of export proceeds.

The French authorities proposed that so-called basic commodities, such as wheat, coal, fertilizer, and petroleum products, would enter France at the official par value of 214 francs to the dollar. These commodities are the basic commodities which are being supplied under the interim-aid program and would presumably continue to be supplied under the European recovery program. Importers of so-called nonbasic commodities would be required to purchase their dollar exchange in the free market at a rate of, say, 340 francs to the dollar.

The free market would also be used for various invisible transactions which would be authorized to take place in this market, including exchange transactions of tourists, capital transfers, and other noncommercial remittances. It was the hope of the French authorities that the free rate would encourage a substantial repatriation to FRANCE of French capital held abroad.

As I have said, the fund was more than prepared to agree to a change in the par value of the franc to a realistic rate, and the fund did its utmost, in view of the special circumstances prevailing in France, to go along with the French proposal. Despite certain misgivings regarding a system involving fluctuating rates, the fund was prepared to accept the fluctuating free market for invisible transactions and even for the import of nonbasic commodities from the dollar area.

The one point on which the fund was unable to approve the French proposal was the inclusion in a market with fluctuating rates of any part of the proceeds of exports, as in its judgment this entailed the risk of serious adverse effects on other members of the fund without being necessary to achieve the trade objectives sought by the French authorities. As stated in the press release, "The fund felt that there would be scope for competitive depreciation in the application by one country of a fluctuating rate on exports to one area while other rates remained stable and other countries maintained the parities agreed with the fund. Such a system, operating in an important trading country, would encourage trade distortions and might cast unwarranted doubt on the real strength of many currencies through the apparent discount applied to them in the French system. The fund feared that the widespread adoption of such a system would result in exchange uncertainty and instability and produce a disorderly exchange situation from which all members of the fund would suffer."

Granting permission to France to sell the proceeds of exports to certain areas (e. g., the dollar area) at a fluctuating premium with respect to the cross rates based on fund parities, which other members would be required to observe, would make it possible for the French to engage in competitive depreciation at the expense of other members of the fund and without control by the fund. One of the basic purposes of the fund is to prevent such competitive depreciation.

It was felt that if export proceeds were sold in this manner serious trade distortions might result, either from the price effects of the fluctuating exchange differentials or from the actual diversion of trade from its customary channels through commodity arbitrage. For example, French importers might purchase goods in the sterling area or in other currency areas which could then be reshipped to the dollar area and sold at a substantial profit, thus in effect, depriving the sterling and other areas of the dollar proceeds of the sales that they might otherwise normally make in the dollar area. Although the French indicated that they would use their best efforts to prevent this, question existed in the minds of the members of the fund as to whether they could in fact do so. Moreover, it was thought that even if the French authorities could control such commodity arbitrage, similar effects might follow directly from price distortions arising from the differential exchange rates.

The fund did not see how it could deny to other countries the right to institute fluctuating rate systems if France were allowed to do so. If the fund, under the French proposal, required other members to live up to their obligations under the fund agreement, we would be permitting a particular country to gain advantages from instituting a fluctuating rate system. If many members institute fluctuating rate systems, however, a wholly new situation is created in which the stability and order in exchange rates which are one of the objectives of the fund become difficult, if not impossible.

One of the results of the French proposal, if adopted on a widespread system, would be to promote bilateral deals and reduce world trade more and more to a barter basis, which is contrary to the objectives of the fund and of United States policy in the foreign economic field.

Although the introduction of the French system raises many difficulties and may have serious adverse consequences, we are all hopeful that the French Government and other governments, particularly the neighboring European countries, will do everything within their power to keep to a minimum the adverse consequences which may flow from the French action. In this connection I think you may be interested in the attached Anglo-French communiqué and in the French communiqué on this matter.

The fund, for its part, while regretting the French action, will continue to work with France in seeking a modification of its newly introduced exchange practices in order to meet French needs within the framework of the international monetary arrangements established by the fund agreement.

As our statement emphasizes, we have approached this problem in anything but a rigid and doctrinaire manner, and as you will see from my description of the extent to which we were willing to go, we certainly are not holding to any pet ideas or rigid concepts. The fund was established essentially to set up rules of fair practice in the international monetary field. We have no desire to be managers. Our efforts, on the contrary, are directed toward the role of a benevolent umpire, who is anxious to have the members of the fund adhere as closely as possible to the rules of fair play which it was sought to establish in the fund concept. The competitive exchange depreciation, exchange instability, and Schachtian economic warfare practices of the twenties and thirties were among the evils which it was hoped the fund would be effective in removing. We are still hopeful that, despite the present difficulties of the world, we can promote standards of fair exchange practices and gradually remove, rather than increase, exchange restrictions and competitive or discriminatory exchange arrangements. I know that the members of the fund board and the staff of the fund are devoting their full energies and best judgment to the success of this experiment in international cooperation, and that they will do their utmost to carry on despite temporary set-backs.

Please forgive me for having written at such length, but I wanted you to have an understanding of our point of view and of our objectives. If you have any questions, I shall do my best to answer them for you.

With all good wishes and the hope that I may have the pleasure of seeing you soon again, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. N. OVERBY,
United States Executive Director.

STATEMENT CONCERNING EXCHANGE ACTIONS TAKEN BY FRANCE

(Press Release No. 35, January 25, 1948)

Camille Gutt, chairman of the executive board of the International Monetary Fund, today made the following statement:

"The French Government has engaged in full and frank consultations with the International Monetary Fund regarding a plan for exchange adjustment, which would require the approval of the fund. The essential features of the plan were the following:

"The par value of the French franc would be reduced by 44.444 percent which would result in a change in the rate from approximately 119 francs per United States dollar to approximately 214.

"At the same time, a discriminatory multiple currency practice would be introduced whereby United States dollars and certain other currencies which can be readily sold for dollars would be bought and sold in a market inside France at fluctuating rates which would differ considerably from the new par value.

"French exporters would be permitted to sell in this market one-half of their export proceeds in the designated currencies, the other half being sold to the French monetary authorities at the official par value. French importers would be permitted to buy in this market the designated currencies needed to pay for nonbasic commodities. In addition various invisible transactions would be authorized to take place in this market, including exchange transactions of tourists, capital transfers, and other noncommercial remittances.

"The fund agreed with the French Government that a change in the par value of the franc was necessary, and indicated that it was prepared to concur in a devaluation of the franc to a realistic rate which would be applicable to transactions in the currencies of all members of the fund. In this connection, the fund has noted with satisfaction the budgetary and fiscal measures directed at internal-monetary stabilization which France has taken in recent months.

"The fund gave careful consideration to the proposal to establish a market in convertible currencies along the lines indicated above. The fund had no desire to be rigid or doctrinaire in its approach to this matter, particularly in view of the abnormalities of the present situation. Despite serious reservations regarding a system involving fluctuating rates, the fund explored various alternatives designed to meet insofar as possible the objectives of the French authorities. The fund was not, however, able to agree to the inclusion in a market with fluctuating rates of any part of the proceeds of exports, as in its judgment this entailed the risk of serious adverse effects on other members of the fund, without being necessary to achieve the trade objectives sought by the French authorities.

"The fund felt that there would be scope for competitive depreciation in the application by one country of a fluctuating rate on exports to one area while other rates remain stable and other countries maintain the parities agreed with the fund. Such a system, operating in an important trading country, would encourage trade distortions and might cast unwarranted doubt on the real strength of many currencies through the apparent discount applied to them in the French system.

"The fund feared that the widespread adoption of such a system would result in exchange uncertainty and instability and produce a disorderly exchange situation from which all members of the fund would suffer. While recognizing the difficulties of the French position, the fund felt that the solution must be found through cooperative efforts to place currencies on a sound and stable basis.

"The French Government found that it could not accept the modification of its proposal suggested by the fund and has now informed the fund that it has decided to go forward with its proposal notwithstanding the objections of the fund. The fund regrets this action by a country which collaborated so effectively in the fund's establishment and whose cooperation has been a valuable asset.

"The fund will continue to work with France in seeking a modification of these exchange practices in order to meet French needs within the framework of the international monetary arrangements established by the fund agreement."

TEXT OF THE COMMUNIQUÉ ISSUED JOINTLY BY THE FRENCH AND BRITISH GOVERNMENTS ON DEVALUATION OF THE FRANC

(Anglo-French statement of January 25, 1948)

Mr. Rene Mayer, Minister of Finance, exchanged views in London on the 16th and 17th of January with the Chancelor of the Exchequer about the monetary project of the French Government.

These conversations were continued in the course of the visit which Sir Stafford Cripps made to Paris on the 23d and 24th of January. Although the points of view of the two governments on the method to be adopted in this matter did not coincide, the conversations which took place both in London and Paris have made clear the frank and intimate character of relations existing between the two countries.

The French Government has presented their proposals to the International Monetary Fund at Washington.

They have explained that the solution chosen by them is the only one capable of meeting the exigencies of the economic situation. It does not constitute in its intention the permanent monetary system of France, but a step toward the stabilization of the currency on the basis of a single exchange rate, which is the object of the financial and economic policy of the Government.

BRITAIN SIDES WITH FUND

On the British side, objections of the same character as those put forward by the Chancelor of the Exchequer have been presented to the fund. The International Monetary Fund has today published a statement on this subject, of which the two governments have taken note.

The United Kingdom Government associated itself with the statement by the International Monetary Fund.

Whatever the differences between the French and British points of view in this matter, the two Governments wish to continue their close cooperation in order to insure that any measure which may be considered necessary in these new circumstances will have only a minimum repercussion on the commercial relation between the sterling and the franc areas.

The two Governments have the same objects in view. In this spirit of mutual comprehension, close cooperation between the technical services of the two countries has been decided upon and will begin at once.

TEXT OF THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT'S COMMUNIQUÉ OF JANUARY 25, 1948, ON THE FRANC DEVALUATION

The Government, at the time it took office, assigned itself the task of stabilizing the French economy. The result could be achieved only by putting into operation an over-all program consisting, in the domestic field, of combating inflation, and, in the foreign field, of provisions tending to adapt the value of the franc to international economic realities.

In having its fiscal and budgetary bills adopted by Parliament, the Government demonstrated its will to fulfill the first part of this program. It now remained to make the necessary arrangements in the foreign field.

In this regard, an adjustment of the exchange rates was manifestly necessary, to take account of the rise in French prices. The question was one of deciding whether it was better to proceed to a pure and simple devaluation of our currency, or, on the other hand, to have recourse to a more supple formula, better adapted to the circumstances.

TRANSITION PERIOD CALLED FOR

In the present state of French economy, it appeared impossible to the Government to define a new exchange rate satisfactory for all transactions abroad, commercial, or noncommercial.

In seeking prematurely to give such a definition of the franc it would have run the following risk: Either the devaluation would have been insufficient, and would not have achieved its purpose, or it would have been too great and would have inflicted an excessive rise in prices and impoverishment of the French economy.

It, therefore, is necessary to pass through a transition period during which at least part of the offers and bids of convertible assets can balance each other in a market where rates are established freely.

The Government's final aim, of course, is to return as quickly as possible to stability—but to a real and lasting stability, not to an artificially and purely apparent stability.

It knows that the policy it is following is the best means—considering the difficulties our economy is going through at the moment—of attaining this aim and, in consequence of aiding in the realization of the objectives adopted by the International Monetary Fund.

REGRETS FUND'S DISAPPROVAL

For arriving at these ends, the Government refers to the provisions that were inserted in the Bretton Woods agreements for the transitional postwar period on behalf of member states whose territories were occupied.

The Government knows, furthermore, that it is not compromising or hindering through its action the efforts that other countries may make in the same direction while employing different means suitable to their own circumstances.

It regrets that the International Monetary Fund, although approving certain important parts of the plan, did not consider itself able to accept it in entirety.

The Government stands ready, through the adoption of technical provisions and coordinated procedures of control, to take into consideration the concern that its measures might cause to countries with unconvertible currency, and more especially to our neighbors in Europe.

The Government is convinced that in taking the stand it is adopting today, and in thus preparing the stabilization of French economy, it is making the best possible contribution to the reconstruction of western Europe, in conformity with the report of the 16 nations.

NEW FRANC RATE DECREED

Such were the circumstances in which the following decisions have been decreed:

1. The rates at which the exchange stabilization fund buys or sells moneys against francs are increased by a bonus, starting January 26, 1948. The bonus applies to all transactions and is uniform for all moneys. Its amount is established at 80 percent of the rates practiced hitherto.

The new franc rates thereby come out to 214.392 for one dollar and 864 francs for one pound sterling.

The parities of the homeland franc (of continental France) with the other currencies of the franc zone are not modified except as regards the franc of the French territories of the Pacific as well as the French rupee. Their rate in relation to the dollar and the pound sterling remains unchanged.

2. There will be created immediately, besides the official market, a free market on which the United States dollar and the Portuguese escudo can be quoted.

FREE MARKET DESCRIBED

The features of the free market will be as follows:

(A) The market will be supplied:

By half of the proceeds of the exports, the other half being ceded to the Exchange Stabilization Fund on the basis of the latter's rates;

By all moneys having a different origin, notably moneys acquired from noncommercial payments, moneys corersponding to movements of capital into France from abroad, moneys paid by foreign tourists.

(B) The resources of the market will be employable:

To pay for imports of commodities, to the exclusion of some categories deemed essential, to pay for which the Exchange Stabilization Fund will continue to deliver currency at the rates it practices;

For all other payments or movements of capital from France abroad to the exclusion of certain payments by the State.

(C) The market thus defined will be a free market, in the sense that the currencies dealt with thereon will be established freely by the play of offer and demand.

The monetary authorities shall see to it only, first, that all currency that is to be turned over to them is indeed turned over; second, that no purchases be made except those conforming to the regulations authorized by the Exchange Office under the usual conditions—that is to say, as regards imports, only upon delivery of (French Government import) licenses.

The Journal Officiel will publish a notice on January 26 by the Exchange Office detailing the provisions of application of the new system.

Resolutions by Student Body of William Jewell College on the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an open letter from the student body of William Jewell College addressed to the Members of the Congress. Also a letter similarly addressed to the student bodies of all American colleges and universities.

William Jewell College is one of the oldest colleges west of the Mississippi River and numbers among its alumni and former students something like one-fourth of the Missouri delegation in the House of Representatives in the Eightieth Congress.

The accompanying letters represent the overwhelming sentiment of the student body of the college as expressed in a vote taken after exhaustive discussion of the subject in the open forum of an all-school convocation held January 27, 1948. The letter to the Congress is as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO ALL SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS

FEBRUARY 5, 1948.

GENTLEMEN: We want to take this opportunity and this means to inform you of the recent action of the student body of William Jewell College concerning the European recovery program, known as the Marshall plan.

At a convocation of the entire student body of 826, half of whom are veterans, held January 27, 1948, the salient features of this recovery program were presented in full. After this discussion the student body voted 777 to 49 to authorize the drafting and the sending of this letter to all the Members of Congress in order to express approval of a long-range program for European recovery and to notify all Members of Congress of the following conclusions:

First. Economic recovery of western Europe is contingent upon adequate aid given immediately by the United States.

Second. World peace and the economic stability of all other areas of the world are affected by the economic status of Europe.

Therefore, the student body of William Jewell College respectfully urges that the Congress take the following action:

1. Create an agency headed by one administrator responsible to the President of the United States to direct the European recovery program. We urge that Congress thus integrate a businesslike administration of the European recovery program with our foreign policy.

2. Make available to the agency adequate funds for the promotion of this program. If we are penny-wise and pound-foolish, the program will in effect become piecemeal aid and relief instead of recovery.

3. Implement the European recovery program by April 1, 1948, so that the program will be in action by that date. Delay would greatly diminish the possibility of success and thus would be throwing money down the drain.

The student body feels that the condition of the world demands that America face the situation with statesmanship. We are happy to believe that this also is the feeling of the Members of Congress.

Respectfully yours,
THE STUDENT BODY OF WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE,
By WILLIAM H. OVERTON, *President*.
THE MARSHALL PLAN COMMITTEE OF THE STUDENT BODY,
By REX BROWN and REX SCHAEFFER,
Cochairmen.

Mr. Speaker, I also include as a part of my remarks the letter authorized by the student body in convocation assembled and addressed to similar college bodies in the United States as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE STUDENT BODIES OF ALL AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

FEBRUARY 5, 1948.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE STUDENT BODY:

During the past few weeks the members of the student body of William Jewell College have been participating in open discussions relating to the salient features of the European recovery program, popularly known as the Marshall plan. These discussions culminated in an all-school convocation, January 27, 1948, devoted exclusively to the Marshall plan.

By a vote of 777 to 49, the student body authorized the drafting and the sending of a letter to each of the 531 Members of Congress. This letter urged that Congress implement the European recovery program with adequate funds and create an agency headed by one administrator responsible to the President of the United States to administer the program.

The student body also authorized its officers to send a letter to the presidents of the student bodies of the 900 colleges and universities of America, with the suggestion that something be done on each of the campuses about the European recovery program.

The youth of America have not as yet spoken about the Marshall plan. We are only suggesting that through your leadership the students of your campus have the opportunity to express themselves.

If we are penny-wise and pound-foolish, the European recovery program will in effect become piecemeal aid and relief instead of recovery. May we also suggest that it is expedient that you act at once.

The student body of William Jewell College feels that the condition of the world demands that the students of America as the leaders of tomorrow make known today their opinions on matters of vital interest.

Respectfully yours,
THE STUDENT BODY OF WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE,
By WILLIAM H. OVERTON, *President*.
THE MARSHALL PLAN COMMITTEE OF THE STUDENT BODY,
By REX BROWN and REX SCHAEFFER,
Cochairmen.

Mahatma Gandhi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the beloved Gandhi belongs to all of us now. True, he is India's son, but the truth and the beauty of his life lifted him out of the limitations of time and place.

The meaning of Gandhi's life cannot be weighed and measured like a pound of tea, but there is not one who will deny that the impact of this frail, slight body upon the course of history has made itself felt universally.

His grip on the pulse of his country did not require what so-called strong men in other lands demanded—there was no secret police behind him, no controlled army, no spy system. His enemies knew his strength, but they made the same mistake that men of ill will always make. The body of man is mortal, but not the spirit. A bullet cannot kill a gospel.

To the United States the magic name of Gandhi had a very special significance. It has become more than a bit tiresome to hear the word "materialist" thrown at us and the American way of life. We have had a good deal of difficulty in clarifying that concept to many foreign dignitaries. Because democracy is based on the dignity of the individual, the practical application of the democratic form has resulted in the widest distribution of goods and services any country has ever known. Withal, we have been conscious of our defects, knowing our own incompletions. We hold on to the American dream, working toward wider and ever wider application. The intellectual sneers directed at our stream of automobiles, cars, and refrigerators, and so forth, have reduced some of us to apologize for our so-called materialism. I may be appearing at this moment to be departing from the figure of Gandhi. But I am not, actually. To the people of the United States Gandhi was the embodiment, the clarification, the explanation of the stream of cars and refrigerators. Gandhi may have wanted to arrive at the dignity of the individual, freedom, peace, justice, and plenty in another way, by another route. But this quiet man's strength, his vision, his spiritual wealth, his practiced belief in human goodness symbolized and crystallized for the people of the United States the hopes, the never-ending struggle for the betterment of man. When Gandhi spoke the people of this land listened, and millions said to themselves, "Yes, that is right, that is good, that is true."

It has been given to few to wield so enormous an influence in the history of our time. He had none of the outward traditional trappings of leadership. He was armed, instead, with the clearest of vision and with tenacious faith. With all the strength of his soul he sought to efface oppression. Bloodshed and violence were not his answers. A good end could not be reached by evil means, he said. Hatred breeds hatred and blood draws blood.

To a people demoralized by centuries of misrule, he brought the healing graces.

It has been said that this is the age of violence and that ironic though it was for the man of nonviolence to meet his end by the hand of an assassin, it followed the pattern of our day. But that is not so. Every age has been an age of disturbance and destructiveness. But not entirely, no, never entirely, because now and then men, pure of heart, and clean, selfless and endowed with grace, have arisen to take with them on their journey through life followers in the path of peace. These are the men who when they shed their mortal lives leave behind them a world a little bit closer to the good and the true. Men like Moses, Buddha, St. Francis of Assisi, Lincoln, with this royalty Gandhi is forever joined.

Department of the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a statement by the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. W. Stuart Symington, published in the Reserve Officer in connection with National Security Week:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The Department of the Air Force is deeply gratified that the Reserve Officers Association is once more sponsoring the observance of National Security Week. The loyal support of Reserve officers in time of peace as in time of war has for many years given needed strength to our Military Establishment. In arousing public consciousness of the necessity for providing adequate national security, the Reserve Officers Association performs another service of inestimable value.

Today more than ever before it is essential that our citizens understand the problems of national defense. The activities of the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy are coordinated in the National Military Establishment, but that establishment must be supported by the coordinated activity of all our citizens. We have an increasing responsibility to defend and preserve our democratic liberties, and there is no more appropriate period in which we should be reminded of that responsibility than in the period that includes the birthdays of Lincoln and Washington.

I wish personally and on behalf of the Department of Air Force to thank the Reserve Officers Association for sponsoring an observance that can contribute so much to the national welfare.

W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Secretary of the Air Force.

Foreign Aid, the Budget, and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following findings and recommendations regarding foreign aid, the budget, and taxes, were adopted by the board of directors of the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, of Long Beach, Calif., on January 26, 1948.

I invite the attention of the Members of the House to these findings and recommendations as they represent, in a general way, the opinion of a cross-section of business activities in the area of Long Beach.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING FOREIGN AID, THE BUDGET, AND TAXES

The need of some relief to Europe in its present emergency is recognized, not only from a humanitarian and economic viewpoint, but largely for purposes of our national safety to combat Soviet Russia's avowed plans for subjugation of western Europe and the entire world.

However, the continued economic well-being of our country demands that any aid furnished be subject to the following conditions:

1. Preservation of all our natural resources inasmuch as they are essential to our continued ability to defend our Nation against future attack.

2. Other countries of the Western Hemisphere have just as great a stake in western Europe's economic recovery as has the United States; therefore instead of the United States buying relief items from other countries of the Western Hemisphere, those countries should be induced to export the needed items direct through establishment of necessary credit arrangements of their own with European nations. This would make possible a reduction in the amount of relief appropriations by about $3,333,333,333, and permit a corresponding reduction in taxes.

3. The granting of relief to the nations of western Europe should be conditioned upon the recipient country's agreement to encourage and foster the growth of free enterprise.

4. Any relief program adopted should be limited to not more than 15 months' duration and any subsequent aid should be contingent upon the result of a survey showing the then actual need, plus proof that the recipient nation has fostered and will continue to foster free enterprise.

5. The relief program should be administered in a businesslike manner by a bipartisan commission of private citizens and Federal officials as opposed to administration by one man or one department of our Government. Should relief for countries other than those of western Europe be decided upon it could logically be most economically administered by the same commission.

6. The total amount of aid furnished should be held to the absolute minimum in order that our own national solvency may not be endangered. A reduction in the amount of the national debt is of paramount importance; therefore, we favor adoption of a systematic plan by Congress to reduce such debt each year by a minimum retirement of a substantial agreed upon sum of $2,500,000,000 or more.

7. For every dollar of foreign relief voted by Congress, a dollar to be deducted from our domestic Federal expenditures. This result could be accomplished by pro rata reduction in the budgets of all Government departments excepting those essential to military defense of our Nation.

8. It is recommended that Congress repeal existing agricultural price-support legislation or at least drastically amend its application because the buying of commodities in large quantities requires vast expenditures and unduly raises commodity prices through purchases by Government agencies in competition with private enterprise. This contributes to the inflationary spiral and increases our taxes unduly.

Adopted by the board of directors, Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, January 26, 1948.

D. W. CAMPBELL,
General Manager.

Oleo Rears Its Head Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include excerpts of an editorial, I submit the following editorial from Pacific Rural Press, January 31, 1948:

OLEO REARS ITS HEAD AGAIN

You have noted the drumbeating to take the tax off margarine—stop inflation—give consumers relief in food costs.

Some of you may have noticed the stockyards papers suggesting that dairymen quit fighting oleo and start manufacturing it.

Others of you have heard farmers defend oleo because it is cheap—an excellent way for farmers to tear down their own house because chemists and exploiters can present synthetic substitutes for most farm products.

The oleo propaganda will win no distinguished service medals for intellectual honesty. For instance, the tax issue. Oleo pays very little tax—a Federal tax of one-fourth cent per pound—so small that if it were removed it would probably never give the consumer a penny's relief.

What the oleo propagandeers want is the privilege of coloring their substitute to look

like butter and not have to pay the 10-cent penalty for such act. They can sell it natural color without paying any such penalty, and do, and can artificially color it any hue except butter color without paying this penalty. But they want to make their product look like butter. That is one place where their pleas fail to adorn truth.

The plea to give the consumer price relief is also something less than a contribution to fundamental ethics. Probably the retail price of oleo, compared with the cost of the materials in it, is one of the lush things of this inflationary age. The price of oleo does not seem to be based on the cost of materials so much as on what the traffic will bear and still be cheaper than butter.

Russian Reds' Seizure of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ansel E. Talbert, in the New York Herald Tribune of January 25, 1948:

RUSSIAN REDS' SEIZURE OF POWER IN CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY RECALLED—COMMUNISTS DISPERSED DEMOCRATICALLY ELECTED DELEGATES, OF WHOM THEY WERE MINORITY, AT BAYONET POINT IN JANUARY 1918

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

Thirty years ago this month the century-old dream of Russian liberals who had been in the forefront of the fight against czarism was realized—and soon shattered. This was the convocation of the first democratically elected constituent assembly in Russian history.

Events surrounding the incident explain to a large degree the violent present-day Soviet distrust of elections in which more than one slate of candidates is allowed. For it was this event, almost forgotten today in the ebb and flow of more recent Russian history, which put the Communists in power in Russia. It was accomplished not by the democratic vote which was the aim of the assembly but by force. At bayonet point the Communists took over the assembly, overruling the voters who had a short time before rejected the Communist candidates by a substantial majority and chosen instead men from left wing but anti-Communist parties. Thenceforth the Communists controlled Russia.

On January 18, 1918, the new constituent assembly, composed of delegates elected by free and open elections throughout the nation, held its opening session in Moscow. Both its name and purpose were borrowed from the constituent assembly of the French revolution, which wrote a constitution for France and the declaration of the rights of man and then forced Louis XVI to give them his reluctant approval.

GOAL FOR A CENTURY

Such an assembly had long been sought by Russian liberals, beginning with the Decembrist rebel officers of the Imperial Guard and Navy, who massed their forces on December 14, 1825, in the Senate Square at St. Petersburg in an unsuccessful attempt to gain a constitution. This struggle by the liberals, punctuated by executions and exile to Siberia, continued throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century and into the next.

Elections for the Constituent Assembly finally were held on November 25, 1917, nearly 3 weeks after the Communist Party organization staged the revolt in Petrograd and Moscow which overthrew the provisional government of Alexander Kerensky.

One of the most constantly reiterated accusations of Communist leaders against the provisional government had been that the government was attempting to delay and sabotage the Constituent Assembly. Actually, in its first appeal to the Russian people in March 1917, 3 days after the abdication of Nicholas II, the provisional government stated that among its basic policies would be:

"To proceed forthwith to the preparation and convocation of a constituent assembly based on universal suffrage."

As late as October 25, 1917, after the election date had been set, Leon Trotsky introduced a resolution at the conference of northern councils of workmen's and soldiers' delegates warning the Russian people that the provisional government intended to prevent the assembly's convocation.

FAIR ELECTION PROMISED

Three days after the Communists seized power on November 7, 1917, Nicolai Lenin, as the new Premier and President of the Council of People's Commissars, promised specifically in a public declaration:

"The elections shall be held on November 25, the day set aside for this purpose. All electoral committees, all local organizations, the councils of workmen's, soldiers', and peasants' delegates, and the soldiers' organization at the front are to bend every effort toward safeguarding the freedom of the voters and fair play at the elections."

Other Russian political groups immediately issued manifestoes asserting that the Communist revolt had taken place because Lenin and Trotsky were aware that they could not win at the polls. In answer to this, the issue of Pravda appearing on November 11, 1917, stated editorially:

"It is clear to everybody that only an outright liar can, after this, say that the Bolshevik Government is attempting to kill the Constituent Assembly and does not want to call the election on the appointed date because it is afraid of it."

The elections were held on the appointed date, but in spite of the prestige and other obvious advantages of controlling the governmental machinery the Communist Party suffered a severe defeat. Only about one-third of the delegates elected were Communists or their supporters.

A majority of delegates were members of the Social Revolutionist Party, another left wing group which under czarism had fought constantly to end autocracy and also to distribute land among the peasants. While the Communists drew most of their strength from the industrial workers of the cities, the Social Revolutionists were supported strongly by the Russian peasants.

LENIN'S DESCRIPTION

In a Communist pamphlet issued during the summer of 1917 Lenin described the Social Revolutionist Party as wanting a bourgeoise parliamentary republic with reforms for the workingmen and peasants as contrasted with the Communist air of a republic of workmen's soldiers', and peasants' delegates opposed to all imperialist wars and to all bourgeoise governments which wage them.

Smaller blocs of delegates to the assembly were elected by the Social Democrats, the group favoring evolutionary socialism, and by the Constitutional Democrats or Cadets, a liberal monarchist group advocating parliamentary government on the British model. The right wing reactionary parties had almost no representation.

When the Constituent Assembly met in Moscow after 2 months of Communist dictatorship the delegates were not long in making it plain that they intended to carry out their mandate from the Russian people. The assembly's first act was to elect as its president, Victor M. Chernov, an old enemy of czarism and one of the founders of the Social Revolutionist Party. It also adopted a resolution at the opening session stating:

"In the name of the peoples who compose the Russian state, the All-Russian Constituent Assembly proclaims the Russian state to be the Russian Democratic Federated Republic" * * *

Communist disapproval of these actions was not long in forthcoming, either. When Chernov, as president, began his acceptance speech with the assertion that peasants must receive the land of large estates at once, Boris Shelesnink, a former sailor who was one of the Communist-elected delegates, leaped to the rostrum and shouted: "Enough!"

DELEGATES ROUTED WITH BAYONETS

At this signal Red guards with fixed bayonets poured into the meeting hall and directed the delegates to disperse. By the end of January a number had been arrested by Communist secret police and were imprisoned without trial, while many were in hiding.

The social revolutionists and social democrats almost immediately formed a union to fight by all possible means against the Communist suppression of the assembly. The Social Revolutionist Party held a conference at the end of May 1918 in Moscow, but after it adopted a demand for reconvening the Constituent Assembly the entire body was arrested.

Many of the social revolutionist leaders such as Chernov and Catherine Breshkovskaya, the little grandmother of the revolution, who had spent 35 years as a czarist exile in Siberia, managed to go underground and escape abroad. Others such as Maria Spiridonova, a young woman of considerable beauty as well as ability and intelligence who had passed 11 years in Siberian exile, were arrested, imprisoned and were never heard of again.

SOCIAL REVOLUTIONISTS' FIGHT FAILS

The social revolutionists attempted to fight the Communist dictatorship by reviving their underground fighting organization which, under czarism, had executed Von Plehve, Grand Duke Sergius, and other reactionary officials for anti-Semitic pogroms and other crimes against the people. The Communists responded with mass arrests and executions.

On one occasion during this period Lenin is reported to have answered a question regarding his views on parliamentary government by saying:

"I believe in multiparty government, provided the Communist Party is in power and the other parties are in jail."

Whether or not the anecdote is authentic, it summarizes accurately the state of parliamentary government in Soviet Russia from the date of the suppression of the Constituent Assembly to the present.

Production of Synthetic Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I voted to report this bill, H. R. 2161, out of our committee, and I am pleased that it has received favorable consideration from the House.

It has been estimated that our reserves of crude oil in this country are approximately 22,000,000,000 barrels. Our daily consumption of oil today is higher than it was during the peak of the war. We are consuming a little less than 2,000,000,000 barrels of oil each year, and, while it is not entirely certain, it is estimated that our crude oil may last but 15 years. A prudent man, therefore, would take no chances and provide for a synthetic oil industry in this country as early as possible.

Last summer I visited the shale oil experimental plant at Rifle, Colo., and I am sure that before long they will be able to produce oil in competition with petroleum. Most of the shale is located in the States of Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah. It is estimated that Wyoming has 600,000,000,000 tons of coal, and without a question of a doubt over 220,000,000,000 barrels of oil could be produced from this coal, although under present methods it would cost much more than oil produced from shale. We have more coal in Wyoming than all of Europe. Germany, by force and circumstances, was obliged to produce terrific quantities of synthetic oil.

I am hopeful that before long private industry will be able to take over not only further experimentation and research in this field but will also be able to establish commercial plants.

In the light of the condition confronting the country today, I am hopeful that there will be no effective opposition to this bill.

Brotherhood Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, on February 27, 1938, Mr. William Randolph Hearst wrote an editorial that was recently republished in the Oakland (Calif.) Post-Enquirer. This editorial is as pertinent today as it was a decade ago.

Knowing that many of the Members would like to reread this editorial, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD:

THE HEARST NEWSPAPERS CALL UPON ALL CHURCHES TO UNITE IN BROTHERHOOD

(From an editorial written by William Randolph Hearst, published in the Hearst newspapers, February 27, 1938)

"In union of the churches of God against atheism and paganism there is strength to succeed.

"In division there is almost certain defeat.

"It is not enough for the churches to wish and to say and to believe that moral and religious sentiment will triumph in the end.

"It is the preeminent duty of the churches to take the necessary measures to make sure that righteousness shall triumph and religion shall survive.

"There is a certain day in San Francisco when representatives of various religions, Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, get together and speak and plan in harmonious cooperation for the advancement of all religion.

"That day is called Brotherhood Day.

"Every day should be brotherhood day among the free churches of America.

"But to promote the happy condition of universal brotherhood of all antipagan religions let us begin by having throughout the Nation a series of brotherhood days like the one observed in San Francisco.

"There is a greater work to be done in the world in behalf of righteousness and religion, justice, and tolerance, than any one church can accomplish. Cannot all the churches unite in brotherhood to make its accomplishment absolutely sure?

"W. R. HEARST."

The last week in February has been proclaimed Brotherhood Week all across the Nation.

The Hearst newspapers are proud of the part they have played in helping to make this expression of tolerance and unity and mutual respect an American institution. They will continue to work for brotherhood among all religions and sects and creeds. For brotherhood is our surest defense against the forces of godlessness which are riding roughshod in other parts of the world.

Southern States Held Able To Force Election of President in House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star of February 9, 1948:

SOUTHERN STATES HELD ABLE TO FORCE ELECTION OF PRESIDENT IN HOUSE—ELECTORAL VOTE BLOC COULD BE WITHHELD IF THEY REJECT TRUMAN

(By David Lawrence)

The solid South can exert the balance of power in the coming Presidential election. Ten States with an electoral vote of 115 can compel the selection of a President by the House of Representatives if the general election is close. Because of that potentiality, the South can influence the attitude of the candidates and platforms of both political parties.

The device is sanctioned by the Constitution. It permits each State to choose its own electors and these electors can, if instructed by a State convention, vote as the people of that State may direct.

By withholding 115 votes from the Democratic candidate, for instance, the first ballot in the electoral college may show that no candidate has received the necessary majority of 266 votes. This automatically takes the election of a President out of the hands of the electoral college and, as provided in the Constitution, it transfers the election to the House of Representatives.

STATES VOTE AS UNIT

But in the House there are, for this purpose, only 48 votes because the Members from each State must decide by majority vote for whom the single ballot of that State shall be cast. It is necessary for a candidate to get 25 votes in order to win an election.

It requires a two-thirds vote to make a quorum when the election is placed in the hands of Congress but the actual decision is by majority. In the House it is a majority of the States when a President is chosen and in the Senate it is a majority of the Senators when a Vice President is chosen.

The mere fact that the electors from Southern States would go to the electoral college instructed to vote for an independent Democrat would have its immediate effect on the policies or programs of any man who was a candidate for the regular Democratic nomination.

This method of exercising influence in a national election has not been used heretofore because the South, especially since the War Between the States broke up political parties, has been able to wield a veto in the Democratic national nominating conventions. But in 1936, through the influence of the late President Roosevelt, the one-third veto possessed by the South was abolished. Instead of nominating by a two-thirds vote, the Democrats now choose a candidate by a majority vote.

HURT BY LOSS OF RULE

The abolition of the two-thirds rule deprived the South of much of its influence in the Democratic Party. Mr. Truman, by his civil-rights message, has merely taken advantage of the alleged helplessness of the South, for it has been taken for granted that the South could be pushed around and would still vote Democratic on election day.

There are many reasons why the Democratic Party in the South must necessarily remain as it is, especially because of the State primary machinery. There is, however, nothing to prevent the Democrats in the South from using the name Democrat and utilizing the State party machinery and still remain free to support whomever they please in the electrical college or in an election which is transferred to the House of Representatives.

The important point to be borne in mind is that electors pledged to a particular candidate cannot ethically change their minds after a State has voted. This makes it all the more essential that, if the balance of power is to be wielded legitimately, the people of each State be advised in advance so that they may vote for electors who are not pledged to the regular nominee. There is nothing to prevent the regular nominee, however, from having a set of electors chosen in his behalf so that the people can decide between the two sets.

CONTROVERSY MAY BLOW OVER

The whole civil rights controversy may blow over. It may have been merely a desperate gesture on President Truman's part to prevent Negro votes in the big northern cities which have been Democratic from going over to the Wallace banner. But sooner or later the coalition of northern Democrats and Republicans will be able to put through legislation on the Negro problem which will be at variance with the wishes of the South. Hence, political action through the use of a bloc of 115 electoral votes appears to be one way that the South can protect itself against steps which it does not favor.

In a close election, the 115 votes could do considerable damage to a regular Democratic nominee, but if another Democrat should achieve the popularity as a vote getter that Franklin Roosevelt attained, it would not make much difference how the 115 votes were cast.

The counterattack then might come from groups in the North by reviving the third-party idea in those States where the big-city vote is a deciding factor. The presence in the contest this year of a radical third-party candidate is, strangely enough, the circumstance that gives the South its minority power.

If a Republican won a majority of the electoral votes next time, the protest of the

South would be of no avail. If, however, a Democratic majority is elected in both Houses of Congress and then the South withholds its electoral vote from Mr. Truman and the Republicans do not poll a majority of the electoral votes, it would be possible for the 10 States of the South plus 15 Republican States in the North to bring about the election of a Republican. It would even be possible for the South's own independent candidate to be chosen President if the Republicans preferred him to the regular Democratic nominee. The Constitution is sufficiently flexible for minority groups to combine to make a majority of their own in the election of a President.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] last evening at the Lincoln Day banquet of the Young Men's Republican Club of King County, Wash., at Seattle.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I was invited here last spring by your Chairman Army Seljas, I spoke to your Senator HARRY CAIN. He told me—"That's a great crowd—they are up and coming. I hope you accept." That just made it for me. Harry is one of the hardest workers we have in the Senate. When he speaks, we listen, for we know he has something to say. Everybody likes him. You can be proud of his record as a public-spirited, conscientious officeholder in civilian life and in military life in time of war as a fearless, independent aviator who was repeatedly promoted in rank because his leaders had confidence in him. He will give you fine service in Washington. I am proud of my friendship with him.

Tonight we are celebrating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, the Nation's first Republican President, whose memory as a leader our citizens will forever cherish. He was a man who knew how to get things done. He was a man whose art of compromise for the country's welfare is unexcelled.

The parallel between the 1860's and the days until next November, when we choose our next President, is striking. When Lincoln was at the helm of our Government the crisis was the preservation of the Union. Today we are again living in a time of crisis, almost more explosive, and the stake this time is the preservation of individual freedom, not within our own borders alone but throughout the world. In 1948, truly a "year of decision," we are fervently working for world peace as the only way to win a lasting peace and real security for American citizens on American soil. Recently I expressed it this way: "Failure to meet this critical situation—and meet it head on—may well result in a radical change in what we mean by liberty, justice, and freedom. It's as simple as that."

In the crucial days of 1861, Abraham Lincoln put it to a Cleveland audience in these eloquent words: "If we do not make common cause to save the good old ship of the Union on this voyage, nobody will have a chance to pilot her on another voyage."

This could well be the theme of the thoughts I want to discuss with you tonight as we set our sights for a constructive, unified command in Washington. By this I mean, a Republican President working with a Republican Congress a year hence.

In terms of 1948, we should realize that we can save the ship only by integrating every segment of our domestic and foreign policies into one affirmative, well-balanced American program. The state of affairs demands that we calmly take stock—that we approach recovery abroad, national defense, the question of inflation, Government efficiency, social legislation, and reassertion of individual rights as one coordinated problem. I cannot emphasize this too strongly. Each of these seemingly independent issues must be considered in its proper relationship to our one over-all aim—to create a more secure and prosperous life for our children and their children. A determined Republican leadership can work out such a coordinated, truly national program, and give this country, this sick and limping world, the shot in the arm it needs.

Last month I listened to the President, who is expected to be the Democratic candidate to succeed himself, deliver his State of the Union message. This message carried a Santa Claus gift for everyone—absolutely everyone—to the tune, in some people's judgment, of over $10,000,000,000 in taxpayers' money. Certainly many of the goals President Truman outlined in his platform speech are agreed to by all. Who doesn't want a healthier Nation, more security, shorter working hours and higher wages? Achievement of all these goals at once, desirable as they may seem, will merely add to the already enormous expense of government and top-heavy Washington, bureaucracy, for which our citizens would ultimately pay.

Government, like any family, has a limited amount of money to spend during any given period. For this reason, sound government administration demands that we carefully weigh one desirable against another. It cannot accomplish every aim it would like to each year. It must establish a priority list, in terms of the most pressing needs before the country at the moment.

What you want to hear from me tonight is my idea of which issues should be given priority consideration if we are to remain within our financial limitations—unless, of course, deficit financing in peacetime does not phase you—and how we best can resolve them in a coordinated way to accomplish our goal of preserving the American philosophy of government.

Some of the tremendous decisions facing us affect our relations with other countries; others will affect only us here at home. But in this age of radar, atomic energy, and fast transportation we realize that many of the decisions made within our borders have a deep impact on peoples throughout the world.

One of these great issues is the European recovery program. Should we go ahead? My answer is "Yes." We must.

The ultimate aim of our foreign policy is to have a free, strong America. We cannot be free in a world at war, nor strong in a disrupted one. Neither can many parts of the world now have prosperity without the helping hand of a vigorous, purposeful United States.

Most people now recognize the importance of working for recovery in Europe rather than mere relief. The general aims of the plan, which Secretary Marshall first outlined at Harvard, my university, last June, have been widely accepted. Great strides have already been made toward this end under the brilliant leadership of Senator VANDENBERG. He is virtually the voice of foreign policy in the Senate.

Surely few people doubt that Europe needs a helping hand today. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I saw at first hand the poverty and hunger, bombed-out homes, and long bread lines on the Continent last autumn. But it is not for Europe's weakness alone that we should help her, but for her inherent strength. Potentially Europe is a production-center area second only to the United States. She has a heritage of rich culture and a tradition of personal freedom and parliamentary government which tie her to us in strong bonds of sympathy.

The European recovery program, in whatever form it finally takes, will be the principal channel of our foreign policy. We must, therefore, be sure that it is crystallized to represent the aims to which we are pledged. But, and this is a big "but," we have no intention of turning on the faucet of American aid and leaving it running. This time we intend to put in the stopper and make sure Europe's level of production rises.

Long-range aid to Europe is open to question on all sides. Such a tremendous undertaking involving the peace, prosperity, perhaps the lives of many of us, merits the intense study it is receiving everywhere. It is probably the most far-reaching plan of reorganization ever attempted. I intend to examine carefully each part of this over-all plan to determine whether it is really going to do its job.

One of the biggest issues is on the question of the administration of the plan. Shall it be run by an independent corporation or agency? Shall the Department of State have direct control or act only in an advisory capacity? What role shall American industry have in the administration? Every day some new plan is proposed to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. This is all to the good. I, personally, am confident that under Senator VANDENBERG's statesmanlike and patriotic guidance, his Committee on Foreign Relations will report out an administrative scheme as free from politics and as businesslike as possible. Whatever form the administration may ultimately take, a primary consideration should be to get American know-how across to European industry. We must accompany our dollars with our unparalleled knowledge of industrial and business techniques, for Europe needs more than just money. It needs practical advice as well. Industry-to-industry aid should be fostered wherever possible.

The crux of the European recovery program is European self-help. We cannot carry the whole load. Recipient nations must shoulder by far the major portion, and already we have seen some encouraging signs all along the line.

If effective self-help continues to become a reality and if we do give substantial assistance to the cooperating nations, all agree that we must make periodic checks to insure that they are meeting the goals promised. The recipient countries themselves recognize the need for supervision. We must find the hairline which defines the balance between too much and too little. Too little might mean all our efforts would go to naught—money disappearing into nonessentials or black markets, or simply wasted through inept business policies. Too much might mean bringing on our heads the accusation of trying to interfere with their internal affairs, and defeat our announced purpose.

How much aid is needed? How much money can we spare? What will ERP mean to us as individuals—in terms of high prices, shortages, and taxes? These are questions everyone is asking, and rightly so. Just as a housewife scrutinizes her budget before deciding how and in what amount she can help her neighbor in trouble, so must the United States assess its resources and economy before settling on an exact sum for aid to Europe. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I will be hearing much about this in the coming weeks. We certainly cannot ascertain exact figures until all evidence is heard. Some reports already have been made public. We know that Europe wants goods in short supply here, such as fuel, food, fertilizer. ERP will affect our goods in short supply. If it goes ahead substantially as planned, we will feel it in many little ways. It will take a little longer to get that refrigerator you want. The farmer may have to pay a slightly higher price for his new tractor. Put it another way: If the whole amount of $17,000,000,000 for 4 years is ultimately subscribed, it means about $29 a year for each person in the United States.

Long-range aid will mean sacrifices, but let's look at the odds. If ERP is successful, world trade will be immensely furthered. This in turn means more business for us. If western Europe is made self-supporting again, it means the end of relief and recovery programs. If the plan works, western Europe will be a strong, productive, democratic ally.

What is the alternative? If Europe is unable to struggle to her feet the chances are great that Soviet Russia will take a much more active interest in her. The world has grown too small for us to be able to ignore such a development. In this case, might we not have to spend much more on building up our military strength here at home?

Senator VANDENBERG recently summed up this alternative in these succinct words: "The Marshall idea involves long-range aid to implement self-help and self-sufficiency. If self-help and self-sufficiency can be made to work, this objective may well be a bargain. * * * In any event, we must take one of the two calculated risks. There is a calculated risk if we proceed. But let's be honest enough with American destiny not to ignore the calculated risk if we do not proceed."

On the other side of the world we have another ally, China. China's Government today is fighting for its very existence. The people of China have endured years of war. If we adopt the policy of economic recovery for Europe, can we afford to neglect China? When a plan is proposed by General Marshall, Congress must give it thoughtful and sympathetic consideration.

You rightly ask: Where does the United Nations fit into the picture?"

We must by all means continue to support vigorously the United Nations. Though only 2 years old and plagued by growing pains, the UN has already demonstrated its contribution to the cause of a just peace throughout the world. Again the words of Senator VANDENBERG are particularly apt: "So long as we are talking things out, no matter how angrily, we are not shooting things out. I ask those Americans who would dismiss the United Nations as a total loss to remember this. * * * If it does not save the peace, it will fix the crystal-clear responsibility for its loss. This moral verdict of mankind finally is the greatest power on earth. Has this been worth while? Can there be but one answer?"

At the moment the United Nations is not capable of handling such extensive programs. It has neither the administrative organization nor the funds to do the job. The fact remains that we are the only nation in the world able, at present, to undertake the task.

Finally, we must be absolutely sure that we do what is to the best interest of the individual American—that we will do that which in the last analysis will help him to retain his freedom in true American tradition. Our willingness and humanitarian instinct to help our real friends when they are in real trouble is another great American tradition.

Part and parcel of an affirmative, well-balanced American program, for which we Republicans must strive, is the positive assurance that we have totally adequate national defense. Our foreign policy can only be successful if it is supported by a military force always able to back up our word. We can no longer place our reliance for security on the width of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. As patriotic citizens we must give the proper maintenance of our armed forces a top priority this year. In any future war we would be the first ones hit, here at home and without warning. Large segments of our industries and untold numbers of our people would be obliterated. We must be sure that as Republicans we face the hard fact that more men are needed to man our regular armed forces and supply our reserves. The day of the minuteman is gone. The men who fought at Concord took their guns from the wall, kissed their wives goodbye and went out to fight a shooting war. The twentieth century, its inventions, and methods of waging war make this an impossibility. Today we know neither the Army, the Air Forces, nor the Navy is fully manned. We realize, too, that the National Guard, even after a strenuous recruiting campaign, is far under strength. We know that the reserves required for the logistics of our armed forces are woefully lacking. It is perfectly clear to me that the security of our country comes first. To insure it, we may have to take steps that we ordinarily would be against. If we are to be militarily ready then we must have sufficient men in our reserves, in our National Guard and in our regular forces, not only to keep our country secure but also to go out and take the offensive if we are attacked. We must make it clear to the other nations of the world that we have the strength to mean what we say and say what we mean.

Within our borders, the issue uppermost in people's minds today is the question of inflation. The Republican Party must attack it with statesmanship—in a forthright, decisive, and practical way. We must go after its causes and not satisfy ourselves by turning out just another temporary, politically appealing pill to deaden its effects. We Republicans want a real cure, not just another OPA aspirin. Again, we should look at inflation in relation to an over-all coordinated national program. Are we going to work out this question by reviving the wartime bureaus and go back to the OPA days? Or are we going to work it out without centralizing tremendous powers over our lives in our Government officials in Washington—without again permitting them to spread the evils of bureaucracies over every nook and corner of our great country?

Inflation, we know, is the result of too much money with too few things to buy. Increased production is, and always has been, the primary solution to lower prices. This is a slow process, so other helpful and practical steps should be given careful consideration.

Partisan considerations cannot stand in the way of the welfare of all citizens. Yet, our Republican majority in Congress has been criticized for allegedly trying to hold back the monster of inflation with a thread. I disagree. Today the present administration has legal authority and the administrative machinery to do much more than it has to cut back prices. There are a number of steps the Republican Congress has given to curb run-away inflation. Yet, these steps have not been followed up by the present administration.

Export controls can and should be more carefully administered. The wartime Export Control Act is still in effect. Yet, there is serious doubt that this power has been used to screen with sufficient care the export of scarce commodities. Has the President prevented our steel from going to South America when it was needed here? Has he prevented our grain from being shipped to those countries in South America which are not hungry? Take the question of wheat. Was it necessary for us to ship wheat from this country to 26 countries all over the world during the last year? I doubt it. Why is it not concentrated in the countries which are actually hungry?

Few people realize the very direct relationship between the high cost of government and the high cost of living. We can eliminate nonessential Government expenses. Yet last month President Truman presented to Congress the largest Federal budget in the peacetime history of our country. His budget for the fiscal year 1949 would authorize the expenditures of over $39,000,000,000. The Republican Party—dedicated to the principles of sound Government financing—feel that this figure can be safely reduced by a further whittling down of the still sprawling Washington bureaucracy, and thus meet one of the direct causes of the inflationary trend. At the moment roughly 990 executive department bureaus and agencies, manned by an army of over 2,000,000 civilian employees, make up our Federal Government. When the Republican majority took control of Congress a year ago it started the job of trimming some of these over-staffed bureaus. It will continue to do so. But it is perfectly clear to me that the only way to cut Federal bureaucracy back to size is to effect a thorough top-to-bottom reorganization of the executive branch. And it is equally clear to me that there is only one way it can be done effectively—by a Republican President working with a Republican Congress. The results of the 1946 election decisively indicated that our people wanted less government rather than more. I am certain they will be in the same mood next November.

Sound administration of regulations governing bank credit, particularly for nonproductive purposes, is another basic approach to the inflation problem which we must insist upon. The Federal Reserve banks, in their effort to peg the market for Government securities, have lost a good opportunity to reduce the supply of money. Yet we all fear the effects of a sharp drop in Government bonds. The protection of these Government savings is a continuing Government responsibility, but that does not demand that Government must indefinitely support these bonds, regardless of what happens. Such a continued Government policy will stifle the country's economic growth and will ultimately lead to complete Government control of our banking system. The proper handling of these basic and most complicated bank-credit regulations is vested in the executive branch. We must insist that they are wisely carried out in the interest of helping our people to overcome the enemy inflation.

A judicious reduction in income taxes for all is another helpful step. Tax relief will have two direct effects: It will give incentive to business expansion, thus creating increased production—the ultimate cure—and it will give relief to hard-pressed individuals and even give many the opportunity to put away some savings. Furthermore, how can we maintain individual initiative and freedom when Government taxes continue to take out of our pockets more than 33 cents of every dollar we earn? By tax reduction, we Republicans do not believe in taking the weight off one shoulder and putting it on the other shoulder, as President Truman suggests. I believe we can lighten the load on both shoulders by cutting back the expenses of government. The House already has passed a bill reducing individual taxes by $6,500,000,000. Before settling on a final figure for tax reduction, I want to be certain that we will have adequate funds for our own national defense, foreign aid, reduction in our huge national debt, the necessary and legitimate functions of government, and, above all, a balanced budget. But even after considering all these factors, I am

confident we still can have tax relief. We will insist upon a financially sound government as the greatest bulwark against inflation. But we will insist that that government be efficiently—not wastefully—run.

Still another decision in combating inflation is rent control. It seems perfectly clear to me that rent control, equitably adjusted, must be continued until production more closely catches up with demand.

The present administration approaches the problem of inflation from a different angle. It would reimpose price controls and rationing and all that these two devices connote. Rationing does not increase the supply of vital commodities. It will not produce one additional bushel of wheat or suit of clothes. On the contrary, even selective rationing cannot help but stifle production. In a word, the return to meat lines and ration coupons will mean not only more regulation over our lives but also no more goods and services. Rationing and price controls may even mean less production. As one who still remembers the decision of the people at the polls in 1946, my present answer to the OPA sedative is "No", though some small modification of this decision may become necessary if any essential commodity becomes too scarce. I, personally, want to give the anti-inflation bill which we passed in the special session—based on the American voluntary method rather than Government dictation—a completely fair trial.

The after effects of the recent war have emphasized and aggravated certain other acute needs of the individual citizen which our party must recognize if it is to put forward a well-balanced national program. By this I mean government's rightful concern for health, education, unemployment protection for the needy, equitable labor-management legislation, veterans' benefits, civil rights, and housing. I am certainly not in favor of any cradle-to-the-grave policy, but we in the Republican Party must never lose sight of the honest needs of our citizens. While our future depends upon our inventive genius, and upon giving everyone the opportunity to improve himself by hard work, it is axiomatic that people work better if they know they have some security when they get caught in the squeeze through no fault of their own, and it is equally axiomatic that government can go into this field of so-called social legislation only to the extent to which its taxpayers are willing to pay, for the key to this insurance for decent living lies in a solvent government.

One of the greatest contributions the Republican Party can make—and I sincerely hope it will—is to draft the proper compromise between Government help and self-help in its social legislation for our people's welfare. Too much Federal assistance, which cannot be divorced from Government dictation, will snuff out individual freedom of action. Too little means Government neglect of its true responsibility for the protection of its people.

As we commemorate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln tonight, we Republicans throughout the country are reflecting upon the great challenge facing us at home and abroad. We must give the American people unerring confidence in our ability to act in their behalf.

We will continue to work for a just peace throughout the world, thereby creating a more secure and happier future for our own people. These efforts to insure lasting peace will mean bold national action and may well entail certain personal sacrifices on the part of everyone of us. These efforts also demand military strength to give clear meaning to our word. The development of atomic energy, high-speed airplanes, and supersonic instruments have made the world too small for us to do otherwise.

From my experiences in Washington I am convinced that it is time for a change. The strength of our Government by checks and balances rests upon changes in administration. Shifts in party control are safeguards against government by bureaucracy. In these times when the world has gone ahead so fast and conditions have changed so rapidly, a change is way overdue. There is a tremendous need for new ideas, new methods, more efficiency, and less waste in nearly every department of our Federal Government after 16 years of New-Deal rule. That is just one simple reason why we should vote for a change—why we should vote for unity of purpose—why we should vote for a Republican President to work hand in hand with a Republican Congress.

Within our party today we are watching some fine and able men contending for the Republican nomination for President of the United States. That is all to the good, because it gives us a wider range of Republican viewpoints. It gives us a chance to hear these candidates debate their views openly and fearlessly. But in such a contest our leaders must not become party to statements of a derogatory or personal character which could well backfire to the detriment of our sole objective—the election of a Republican President. Let us as determined Republican workers pull together in harness from now until November election day.

The Republican philosophy of government stems from the love of individual freedom. Our party must combat the pressures which today are attempting to submerge this consciousness of the individual.

We Republicans today, like Lincoln in his day, clearly understand that human freedom is indivisible.

We Republicans must keep our thinking one jump ahead of events in this fast-moving world.

We Republicans must never permit partisan considerations to run rampant at the expense of human misery.

We Republicans know that the welfare of the people will best be served by a Republican President working with a Republican Congress.

Today we are in a scoring position. We will score on November 2, 1948.

Tribute to Mohandas K. Gandhi by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the address which I delivered at the memorial services in tribute to Mahatma Gandhi at the Departmental Auditorium, Washington, D. C., Wednesday, February 11, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In speaking of our two greatest Americans, Theodore Roosevelt said, "No two great men were as good as Washington and Lincoln, and no two good men were as great." In Gandhi there was no line between goodness and greatness. His goodness is what made him great. Thus he became one of the great universals among men. World citizen in ideals and in action, but when a cause was for his people, he, like Jefferson, our outstanding world citizen, could become a tense nationalist.

Gandhi dead will be a force in the world greater even than was his power in life, for Gandhi's leadership rested upon spirituality. Trained in western culture, he became that bridge between the east and the west which in goodness and spirituality show there was no difference.

He gained many of his ideals from reading an American philosopher, but he tempered those ideals with an eastern spirit. Thus he linked the cultures of the east and the west.

One of America's martyrs, President Garfield, is said to have soothed an angry crowd by putting forth his hand and saying, "There are times in the lives of all of us when the presence of the eternal spirit is so close that if we but put out our arm we can feel it." Gandhi's sign of forgiveness, displayed toward the man who had struck him down, proved how close are the great ones who live constantly in tune with the Infinite Goodness. His gesture of forgiveness brought pause to the thoughtful of the whole world.

Religion is a bond, which, when viewed in relation to time, ties those who live in the present with those who have gone before and those who come after. Gandhi without religion and without the spirit would not be Gandhi. Gandhi now belongs to the ages. The new India is arising to be an everlasting monument to his goodness, his greatness, and his spirit.

Income-Tax Deductions for Donations to Allegedly Subversive Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release by me for the Sunday papers of February 8 dealing with the charges recently made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] in connection with the Treasury Department approving income-tax deductions for donations to groups labeled subversive by the Attorney General.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, said today that he had thoroughly investigated the charges made by Senator BALL, Republican, of Minnesota, that the Treasury Department was approving income-tax deductions for donations to eight groups labeled subversive by the Attorney General.

Senator LUCAS further said that before the charge was made, two of the subversive organizations, namely, the International Workers Order and the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, had had their tax exemptions denied by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

"Also at the time the charge was made, the Department had under investigation Hollywood Writers Mobilization, The School of Jewish Studies, and the National Council of American Soviet Friendship.

"The Ohio School of Social Science, the Philadelphia School of Social Science, and the Samuel Adams School of Boston, named by Senator BALL, were not under investigation, but investigation promptly began, and it is my understanding that the Bureau has now completed the investigation of the last six named and their tax exemption has been revoked. Senator BALL is to be congratulated for bringing this to the attention of the Department, and the Department is to be congratulated for acting with such speed. However, a few more facts must be considered in relation to the charge.

"There are 28,000 organizations throughout the United States that have individually applied for and received favorable rulings that they are entitled to exemption under section 101 (6), of which approximately 7,500 fall within the educational group outside of the system of public education.

"The Bureau of Internal Revenue received reports from more than 100,000 organizations every year that claim tax exemption. It is estimated that there are some 300,000 organizations throughout the country that are exempt under section 101, exclusive of educational and religious organizations. There are 30 different types of organizations that receive tax exemption under the law.

"To handle this vast volume of reports and to make the determinations of tax-exempt status, there is a total of only 56 employees engaged in this work. There is no staff at all provided for field investigation of these cases, but such field investigations are turned over to revenue agents whose primary responsibility is the collection of taxes.

"It is ridiculous to expect such a small personnel without any assigned field force to give adequate supervision to the activities of the hundreds of thousands of tax-exempt organizations throughout the United States. Yet, in the face of such an inadequacy of personnel, the Congress last year reduced the appropriations for the Bureau of Internal Revenue to such an extent that 7,000 tax collectors, agents, and supervisors were dropped from the staff of the Bureau.

"The Treasury Department is the biggest financial operation on earth. The Bureau of Internal Revenue, with less than 50,000 employees, collects and keeps the records of $40,000,000,000 of taxes received from more than 50,000,000 people. Although not fully comparable in the character of service rendered, the biggest private business in America, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., requires 750,000 employees to do a business of approximately $2,000,000,000 per year. The cost to the Government of collecting and accounting for internal revenue taxes is one-half of 1 percent of the amount collected. The average collections per employee, including clerical force, maintenance crews, collectors, and supervisors, is $800,000 per person per year.

"The tragedy is that hundreds of millions of dollars of evaded taxes are escaping the Treasury as a result of an inadequate force of investigators. The marvel is that more than $2,000,000,000 a year is being brought in through the enforcement activities of a relatively small staff.

"It is clear to anyone that 50,000 employees cannot adequately supervise, investigate, audit, and collect from 50,000,000 taxpayers a total of $40,000,000,000 a year. It is estimated that no less than 20,000 additional personnel is required to give adequate enforcement to our revenue laws. It is also estimated that the revenue produced by the additional personnel would be several times more than the cost.

"Senator BALL stated that this was another case in this administration of the right hand not knowing what the left is doing. Is it any wonder that honest mistakes might be made when such a gigantic fiscal policy of the United States is being carried out with limited personnel? It seems to me that the 50,000 employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue deserve commendation for accomplishing a task that in size is beyond human comprehension. The Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate have an opportunity to render a real financail service to honest taxpayers of the country by giving to this Department additional help in order that the chiselers and the tax evaders of the Nation may be brought to justice. The niggardly attitude on the part of the Republican Appropriations Committees last year toward this Department was an open invitation for tax evaders to further their nefarious and criminal activities in escaping the payment of taxes due the Government."

Subsistence Allowances to Veterans in School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE M. REED
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. REED. Mr. President, one of my very good friends, Mr. J. E. Schaefer, vice president and general manager, Boeing Airplane Co., Wichita, Kans., has sent me an open letter to Congressmen, printed in the New York Sun of January 24, 1948.

This letter is so pertinent and so interesting that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESSMEN

One of the bills which you will consider deals with the increasing of subsistence allowances for veterans in school and on-job-training programs. The issue is unfortunately as political as it is humane, since more than 2,000,000 voters would receive direct financial benefits from the proposed legislation. Supposing, however, that the majority of you are sincerely interested in accomplishing the most good, my husband and I—as 2 of the 2,000,000—would like to present the case as we see it.

My husband is finishing college by virtue of the $90 provided by the GI bill of rights. We are very grateful for that $90 a month. Without it we couldn't be here. It would be very easy to sit quietly and let you gentlemen raise it to $105, as you probably will. But we do not believe in biting the hand that feeds us, so we want you to know that we can get along without that raise.

We actually live on our $90 a month. I use "live" deliberately. It feeds us, keeps us clean, and puts a roof over our heads. It doesn't provide our clothing, not in a general sense, but it does cover occasional replacements of small items. Here, in fact, is a chart of exactly what we've done with our $90 per month in 2 years' time:

Rent	$20.00
Food (milk, soap, everything that comes from the grocery store)	38.00
Laundry	.50
Cleaning	2.00
Insurance (my husband's)	6.60
Insurance (mine)	4.40
Haircuts	1.00
Church	9.00
Stamps and stationery	.50
Entertainment	1.00
Transportation	4.00
Clothing repairs	3.00
Total	90.00

The rent is delightfully low—because we live in a trailer. (Most colleges have reasonable accommodations once you get into them; they just don't have enough.) Nor is it a superaffair with hot and cold running water. In fact, it hasn't any running water at all except that which runs down the walls and under our bed in every heavy rain, or even a prolonged light one. We carry our water in in a bucket, and we carried it out also until my husband procured for $1 a funnel, 4 feet of hose, a roll of black tape, and made us a drain. Our particular trailer hasn't even an oven—merely a two-burner gas hot-plate, but with a pressure cooker and a little ingenuity we have good, healthful meals and plenty of food on about $9 a week.

We have four times as many meatless days as the average patriotic citizen, but we won't starve. My husband also catches fish in nearby streams, and so provides sport and food at the same time. (The fishing license comes out of the grocery money.)

Laundry days are 2 weeks apart and we do it together in a help-yourself establishment in 1 hour for 25 cents. Cleaning, we watch closely, removing minor spots ourselves. One of our extravagances is a steam iron, which has more than paid for itself in renewing clothes that are merely wrinkled.

Since my husband does a great deal of studying, we have little time for entertainment, but we occasionally attend 15-cent shows which are several years old, and often better than newer ones. We have friends over for dinner, and crack walnuts and make fudge, or just plain talk. I read a great deal, and crochet and sew. We go to most student activities and picnic in the woods. I mention all this to show that we don't really suffer from lack of entertainment funds. We have no money to gamble, drink, or smoke, and we don't.

As for clothing, we didn't have a lot to start with, and the "new look" hasn't exactly stormed our area. We grew up during the depression, and learned to use good judgment in what little we could buy. Fortunately, my husband was an Army officer, so he still has his pinks and greens for school clothes.

We have had no medical expenses, but the school furnishes a health service for students who need it.

That, I think, accounts for the $90. We find that our neighbors spend theirs in similar ways. Besides our Government allowance, we spend about $400 additional each year. These things are our luxuries and include our car, which costs us about $240 a year more than the monthly $4 we deem necessary transportation. We consider these our responsibility to provide if we want them.

This additional money must come from somewhere. My husband found before the war that too much work does not mix with the kind of grades he wants. He goes to school both semesters and to summer school. That leaves 6 weeks in August and September to pick up $350 to $400. He solved it one summer by hauling paving bricks, purchased from a condemned road, to contractors. Handling, individually, thousands of 8-pound bricks is work, but it paid well.

Last summer he hauled machinery on a short job for a ditch-digging concern. For two more weeks he flew in the activated Air Corps Reserve, and week ends he painted a house. The truck drivers' union in our town generously grants temporary permits for short jobs for a small payment, thereby saving us the large initiation fee. Some of the unions are very considerate in such situations.

We do have a little savings, and we intend to keep them. It is the basement of the house we intend to build some day, and we won't be afraid to build it with our own hands. Some of our friends have savings; some do not. Most of them do odd jobs. Some do janitor work at the school for $10 a week; some have jobs in town. A few of the wives have jobs, and many of us have

small gardens around our trailers. Those with children find the going tougher.

This just shows why we can do without an increase. There are also reasons why we positively do not want any more money in the form of an increased subsistence check:

1. The proposed raise for married students alone is $15 a month. Let us assume this to be an average, since single students get less and married students with children get more. According to the records of the Veterans' Administration for November 1947, 1,309,145 veterans are attending school. A $15-a-month raise will cost the Government $19,637,175 a month. Yet, it will not be the determining factor in causing many GI's to stay in school. In fact, the good it will do is negligible, and its harmful aspects have been completely overlooked.

2. Constant wage increases from every direction are a contributing factor toward inflation. The extra twenty million that students alone will spend each month will make items just that much scarcer and higher in price. If we earn the money before spending it, rather than having it given to us, we will also be producing $20,000,000 worth of labor and various goods.

3. The most important reason is for the sake of the veterans themselves. Most of those receiving these benefits are in their middle or late twenties. They have been fed, clothed, and provided for by the Government almost ever since their parents stopped doing it. If they are going to become useful citizens in a democracy where the individual is the important unit, a necessary part of their training is learning how to take care of themselves.

If you really want to help, do something constructive about prices and housing, and the rent controls that go off in February. That will benefit all of the people.

As I said before, we speak only for ourselves. We are acquainted only with conditions in the Middle West. We know that students attending universities in large cities have different problems than in small college towns. We have lived in both, and have inquired about many. We know that the boys who fought the battles have learned to think, and we suspect that some of them may even agree with us.

M. V. M. PIKE.

British Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "British Health Plan," from the Miami Herald, which should be of especial interest to the American public at this time, when we are considering a similar idea.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH HEALTH PLAN

Short views on the news:

The young men who are flooding our universities with applications for admittance to the many excellent schools of medicine and dentistry should take a look at the new British health policy.

Great Britain's Socialist government is about to inaugurate a huge program of free medical care for every man, woman, and child in the "tight little island."

Basically the idea is that the Government will pay everybody's doctor bills, including hospital treatment, ambulance hire, drugs, and medical supplies.

The cost, as now estimated, will exceed $600,000,000 a year, and is to be collected from the long-suffering British taxpayers.

British doctors are being asked to sign up with the Government's plan, although they are free to stay out if they so choose. All who do join the Government medical service will receive a basic salary of $1,200 a year, to be augmented by fees of $3 per patient.

Thus, if a doctor had the time and endurance to see 4,000 patients a year, he could reach a ceiling of $13,200 before taxes.

All Government doctors would have to serve in areas where the Government determined they were needed most. The Health Ministry will have authority to bar doctors from locations which it considers are oversupplied with physicians.

Included in the list of services to be provided by the state are home nursing, midwives, maternity and child-care clinics. The Health Ministry is also to be the final judge of a doctor's competency, thus removing the individual's right to appeal to the courts.

Needless to say, the Government's program is meeting with tremendous opposition from the British Medical Association. This group fears that eventually all doctors will be forced into state medicine, with over-all salaries to be fixed by the Government, regardless of individual merit or background.

They cite the experience of 1912, when the doctors temporarily boycotted a national health-insurance plan, but ultimately had to yield. It is no secret that the British Government believes it is only a question of time until all doctors must surrender to its latest experiment in socialism.

Then all medical care in the British Isles may gradually descend to the level of the least competent practitioner, and a doctor with years of the best possible training and experience will find himself on the same economic level with Great Britain's 2,000,000 other civil servants.

We commend what is happening in Britain to the attention of America's doctors embryo, because while it is easy to say, "It can't happen here," the fact is that bills have already been introduced in the United States Congress which would take us down the same socialistic road.

You can still write your Senators and Congressmen before it is too late.

Government and Industrial Decentralization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial endorsing my stand on Government and industrial decentralization, from the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of February 7, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOL'S PARADISE?

Some may think that Senator ALEXANDER WILEY is too wrought up over the danger of a single, knock-out blow by a foreign foe. In the Reserve Officer magazine he speaks of our "living in a fool's paradise of apathy and inertia." He warns that, in an atomic war with Russia, Washington could become "a death trap for American liberty." He believes that we must scatter our armed forces and Government offices, or run the risk of having them blotted out in a single moment.

Even a little thought, though, about what the split atom has done to our traditional means of defense, will free the Wisconsin Republican of the charge of hysteria. Already we have agreed that our factories must be strung out, or deployed, over vast reaches of inland America. That is the policy behind the Army-industry national meet just held in Dallas. The same idea must be spread promptly to cover both military forces and civil government.

Perhaps the soundest argument for quick passage of the universal military training bill is that it would give every part of the country sizable forces in the event of disaster. The 16,000,000 veterans of World War II should also be fitted into this plan of instant readiness. It is nothing more than the Swiss idea of a citizens' army that can spring into action almost at a whistle.

There must be, too, a directing command behind both factory and fighting forces. That in our land is the civil authority. It is clear, then, that regional authorities should be created, on paper at least, to take over full power in their own areas in the event of national calamity. The Senator is merely talking common sense. Elementary, it would seem, as Sherlock Holmes might say.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial recently issued by the National Cotton Council of America in the February 6 issue of its publication called Cotton's Week, containing a discussion of the effect on the cotton market of the uncertainty of the fate of the Marshall plan.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARSHALL PLAN

Uncertainty about fate of Marshall plan is credited with playing part in sharp break this week in stock and commodities market.

Supporters of plan admit there is apathy in Congress toward plan, arising primarily for two reasons:

1. Question as to whether Marshall plan will do the job.

2. Question as to whether Marshall plan will be possible without reimposing domestic controls.

As to first query, nobody knows. However, best informed opinion is that effort must be made unless Russia is to take over most of western Europe. Will Clayton, who probably knows as much about the European situation as any man in the country, said as much in a speech the other day, and if Russia takes western Europe, many informed persons believe it means eventual war with United States.

With regard to second question, feeling is growing that Marshall plan will be possible without reimposing price controls and rationing. Judicious use of export controls over scarce commodities, supporters of plan point out, should keep inflation in hand without clamping down in this country. Furthermore, plan supporters say that supply situation, particularly in grains, is better now than was anticipated when plan was first proposed.

In this connection, there have been reports that cotton purchasing for western European countries under plan would be done by Government agencies.

Cotton Council has investigated these reports thoroughly. All Government agencies, and particularly USDA, which probably would do actual buying under plan, have emphasized they feel that cotton should be handled by private trade as was done during interim aid period. Council plans to write State Department to get views officially stated. Apparently, rumors and fears that private enterprise might be supplanted in cotton as well as other commodities arise from general language of proposed legislation and testimony. Legislation permits government to purchase and transfer commodities but there have been repeated assurances that no such procedure is contemplated with regard to cotton.

Apathy toward plan and uncertainty about its fate have aroused concern on part of some Southern Congressmen. They are pointing out that demand in this country, Europe, and China for United States cotton is strong and apparently will continue so for several years. Question is whether Europe and China also can raise dollars to buy cotton, or to state it another way, matter is one of financing. If Marshall plan fails, surpluses are pretty certain to begin piling up within couple of years. This would bring back problems with which belt is all too familiar: price supports, production controls, and like.

And, still other supporters of plan, harking back to break in commodities this week, are contending that failure of Marshall plan and slump which might result could cost country many times proposed expenditures for European recovery.

The Southern Revolt and 127 Electoral Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I use the above caption to call attention to the fact that in 1879 the electors from the State of Louisiana cast the deciding votes to elect a Republican President of the United States, and 1928 should not be overlooked. I am also submitting below articles on the subject under discussion, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 13, 1948]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

DEMOCRATS ALIENATED BY TRUMAN

Anti-Truman resentment among the Democrats is now so deep that some are actually talking about trying to dump him.

What Truman has succeeded in doing is alienating both wings of the party—the southern Democrats and the northern liberals. This was something that Roosevelt, despite the kicking around he gave to some leaders, was careful never to do.

But now Truman has rubbed northern liberals the wrong way by ousting such Roosevelt appointees as Marriner Eccles, James Landis, and John Fahey. Simultaneously, he has made southern leaders boil over with indignation at his civil-rights message.

In fact, the only people Truman has pleased are the Republicans.

Result of all this is that some Democratic leaders are even talking among themselves about finding a new candidate. Admittedly, they don't think the chance is great, for it's almost impossible to block the renomination of a sitting President. However, some of them have been quietly discussing a boom for Justice William O. Douglas, while others talk about a draft-Eisenhower move for the Democratic ticket. After all, the first and only political speech Ike ever made was at a Jackson Day dinner at the age of 18.

Meanwhile, Henry Wallace has told friends that he would yank his third party out of the running if the Democrats nominate Eisenhower, Douglas, Judge Thurman Arnold, or any other Roosevelt Democrat.

NOTE.—What Democratic leaders fear most is that Wallace's third party will carry so much of the labor vote that it will be impossible for Truman to carry New York and Illinois.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 13, 1948]

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

SOUTHERN REVOLT

The convivial days of old, when Democratic Senators gathered in the inner sanctum of Leslie Biffle, staff director of the Democratic policy committee of the Senate, are no more. A brooding bitterness is too often the mood today, and even the best stories get hardly a chuckle.

The reason, of course, is the revolt of the southerners, touched off by President Truman's civil-rights message. The same kind of flare-up has occurred in the past, only to die down after a pyrotechnical display of southern oratory.

But this time party leaders are deeply pessimistic. They discount a lot of the southern talk about establishing a southern wing of the Democratic Party which would nominate its own candidate for President. They minimize the possibility that electors from the Southern States might refuse to cast their ballots, thereby throwing the election into the House of Representatives. They do not, however, discount the effect of all this on the voters throughout the country. It feeds the impression of divisiveness and incapacity. And this time the flare-up seems likely to mean more than just oratory, even though it stops short of an actual split.

The southerners are threatening to hold up nominations made by the President whenever they can. Their first target is likely to be the President's nomination of Thomas B. McCabe, of Philadelphia, to be chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. For a variety of reasons, McCabe's nomination was deeply resented.

To begin with, McCabe would fill the vacancy caused by the death of Ronald Ransom, of Georgia, who was the only southerner on the seven-man board. Failure to give proper representation to the South would in itself explain antagonism to the appointment. On top of this is the wide popularity in the Senate of Marriner Eccles, who is being demoted to vice chairman so that McCabe may have the chairmanship.

The McCabe appointment comes before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee next week. Four southerners—Senators FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, ROBERTSON of Virginia, MAYBANK, of South Carolina, and SPARKMAN, of Alabama—are on that committee. They could certainly delay action, and their votes might block it.

An even more practical threat which the southerners say they will carry out concerns the Democratic war chest in this campaign year. There is nothing to compel the Democratic State organizations in the South to contribute to the national committee as they have done in the past.

The Southern States have, in fact, been among the largest contributors. Because of the one-party system in the South, funds are not needed at home for a party battle. Consequently, almost everything that was collected went to Washington.

Even though their per capita wealth is much less than that of most Northern States, Texas, Florida, Arkansas, and North Carolina were among the first 10 contributors in both 1940 and 1944. Their contributions were exceeded only by New York and the District of Columbia, and they all outranked Pennsylvania. But not this year, say the southerners. If they hold to this determination, the Democratic National Committee will be hard pressed to find generous contributors to make up the difference.

The southerners even talk of blocking essential legislation. Whether they will go this far is doubtful. Nevertheless, here is another possibility of stalemate in an election year, when the machinery of government creaks along slowly at best.

The required number of votes to shut off debate and stop a filibuster are said to have been counted in advance in the Senate. With the flow of oratory thus dammed up, the frustration and the anger will grow.

The suggestion which got into print, that the President might modify his civil-rights stand by later repeating his request and carefully omitting reference to abolishing segregation on trains and busses, drew a stanch denial from the White House. Mr. Truman is prepared to stand behind every demand in his 10-point program, it was said.

The President's advisers are a little surprised at the violence of the southern reaction. The 1944 Democratic platform said: "We believe that racial and religious minorities have the right to live, develop, and vote equally with all citizens and share the rights that are guaranteed by our Constitution. Congress should exert its full constitutional powers to protect those rights." Mr. Truman in his message was merely translating that generality into specific demands, and he intends to back them up no matter what the cost.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 13, 1948]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

FOR SOUTHERN RIGHTS THEY ARE

The white-supremacy southerners in Congress are now talking among themselves about placing either Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, or Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, in nomination for the Presidency against Harry S. Truman. This underground discussion neatly balances the overt plan of the west-coast left-wingers to put forward Henry A. Wallace as a suitable Democratic nominee.

One thing is already clear, this year's Democratic convention is likely to resemble one of those awful children's parties at which large numbers of the dear little guests gang up to kick the stuffings out of the grave but tearful host. In his role as universal nursery maid to his party, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH, is going to have a pretty ghastly time preventing public mayhem. And this will be true even though the southerners do not carry out their threat to support a candidate of their own.

Overt southern support for a rival to Truman, even if limited to the convention, would

almost certainly be going further than the southerners desire. The Democrats have been in so long that the southern leaders have almost forgotten the hungry misery of dwellers in the political wilderness. But some faint recollection of this horrid state still lingers in their minds. They are still reluctant to destroy their party's chance at the election. This is what may be expected to nip the overt anti-Truman movement in the bud, although the plan may be expected to be watered with quantities of the same sort of northern money that used to finance Gene Talmadge.

On the other hand, the strategy which the southerners appear actually to be adopting will be almost as difficult for the White House to handle. As of today, it seems probable that the Southern States, including as a minimum South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, and Tennessee, will send uncommitted delegations to Philadelphia. The uncommitted delegations will be used to wrest from the platform committee a weasel declaration on the civil- and human-rights issue.

In the past few days there have been anxious negotiations between southern leaders and White House representatives. The southerners dropped hints that if the White House continued so scornful of the South, the more violent expedient of sending overt anti-Truman delegations to the convention would have to be resorted to.

The President may deny the intention of conciliation until he is black in the face. He may personally have no such intention, but his representatives respond to the hints of the southern leaders by hinting in return that the President would in the end approve a compromise on the platform's civil- and human-rights plan. The southerners intimated that if such a compromise were forthcoming, they would then content themselves with holding a post-convention rally, as they did after the Wallace nomination in 1940. At this rally they promised they would give free rein to their propensity for oratory, but would end by resolving that much as they detested Truman, they hated the Republicans even more.

In Congress this plan has found favor with many, even among the extreme white supremacy shouters like Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina. Meanwhile some southern governors like J. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, and M. E. Thompson, of Georgia, have also sent assurances of eventual support to the White House.

It is symptomatic of the state of the Democratic Party that in these dubious circumstances the White House political strategists are breathing audible sighs of relief. They are thankful for very little these days. The arrangements outlined above are very little to be thankful for because of two obvious draw-backs.

In the first place, any weasel words in the civil- and human-rights platform plank will enrage and alienate precisely the groups in the North at whom the President's civil-rights message was aimed. Yet if the weasel words are not spoken, the uncommitted southern delegates will still be able to put forward their own man. In the second place, the present arrangements may be upset even before convention time if the Fair Employment Practices Act becomes law at last.

House passage of FEPC is a foregone conclusion. So is Senate passage if cloture can be applied. Application of cloture turns upon four or five Republican votes, including Senators ROBERT A. TAFT, HARLAN BUSHFIELD, and ALBERT HAWKES. TAFT, it is known, will vote to approve cloture, although opposed to the FEPC bill. HAWKES is in a hard reelection fight in New Jersey, and the other waverers will be not uninfluenced by the fact that this is an election year. If FEPC passes, the southern fat will really be in the fire. In the ensuing bitterness and recrimination anything may happen, and quite probably will.

[From the Opelousas (La.) Daily World of February 10, 1948]

"GENUINE" DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

The EDITOR, THE WORLD.

DEAR SIR: The Truman intention to use Federal power and snoopers to abolish sensible race segregation and States rights could prove a calamity to the entire Nation, including the deluded Negroes whose votes are being bought by this Truman alliance with the creed of the CIO and the Communist Party.

Mr. Truman joins the ranks of those who, in the past 15 years, schemed and hatched the rotten system of control of the majority by the use and political manipulation of a self-seeking balance of power minority.

Mr. Truman knew when he joined the Democratic Party many years ago that Democrats were then as they are now—devoutly dedicated to the principle of a republic by a union of sovereign States. The Democratic Party has not changed. But, Mr. Truman and his fellow travelers at last march with Henry Wallace, out of and away from the time-honored, unchanged customs and beliefs of the Democratic Party.

It now becomes the duty of genuine Democrats to close ranks, rebuild and rededicate our party for honorable service to those people of the Nation who believe that our safe future depends upon a political party willing to work for the greatest good of the greatest number.

Thousands of stay-at-home eligible voters from border to border and coast to coast will at last have a reason for a return to the use of their ballots, if we southerners give them a real Democratic Party.

Mr. Truman may get the nomination of the Philadelphia mongrel convention. We of the South owe it to our country to call a genuine Democratic convention, and not in Philadelphia.

Cordially yours,

JOHN U. BARR.

The Causes of Industrial Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Causes of Industrial Peace," by Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp. It is an article which I think all those in industry in this country who think they can solve industrial problems by way of legislation should read with great care, because I think Mr. Francis in the article supplies an answer to a great many of the business industrialists who think we will solve our labor problems by restrictive legislation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 9, 1948]

THE CAUSES OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE

(By Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp.)

It is ironic that Americans—the most advanced people technically, mechanically, and industrially—should have waited until a comparatively recent period to inquire into the most promising single source of productivity, namely, the human will to work.

It is hopeful, on the other hand, that the search is now well under way. We are learning now that a cause of freedom from industrial strife is healthy human relations. Just as there are degrees of health, so there are degrees of industrial peace. The sort we seek is a vibrant, affirmative, productive peace. We know that it can exist because we have seen it exist. There have been few times within recent memory when we have lacked examples of this fact.

Yet, ignoring these signposts, we have lived amid the din of industrial disorder from the start. Our economic expansion has been marked by periodic disruptions from the days of the anthracite and rail strikes of the 1870's through the sit-downs of the 1930's right on down to the present.

Why has this been so? Basically, I think, it is because too many employers somehow fell into the grave initial error of treating labor as a commodity, because management and labor leaders became preoccupied with the rules of industrial warfare, because we concentrated on the vocabulary of difference—"demands," "grievances," "disputes," "prerogatives," "rights," and all the rest—and because, by implication, we accepted the notion that the interests of labor and management are basically opposed.

That's an irony, surely, since the interests of 60,000,000 Americans at work are served not by the cultivation of disunity and discord but by unity and cooperation. The tragedy is that millions of working Americans, whether organized or not, are suffering from the nonexistence of mutual endeavors to create smooth relationships.

To me, the ideal in industrial peace would be, not 15,000,000, not 30,000,000, but 60,000,000 Americans working together in well-planned and understood human relationship. Think what that would mean in terms of national unity, production, and prosperity.

I do not mean to discount the importance of labor legislation; but, conceding its importance, we must grant that it is but one of a number of trees in a very large forest.

In other words, you can legislate the conditions under which management and labor can quarrel.

You can legislate the conditions under which management and labor can maintain an armed truce.

You can even legislate the conditions under which management and labor can enjoy a negative sort of peace without fighting; at all.

But you cannot legislate harmony into the hearts of men.

You can buy a man's time.

You can buy a man's physical presence in a given place.

You can even buy a measured number of skilled muscular motions per hour or day.

But you cannot buy enthusiasm; you cannot buy initiative; you cannot buy loyalty; you cannot buy the devotion of hearts, minds, and souls.

You have to earn those things.

In today's complex industrial structure, the development of better understanding between management and labor can't be left to chance. When you want to get to know a man better, you don't begin by writing letters to his lawyer. You try to find some way of demonstrating your good will and communicating it to the man himself.

This is just as true of dealings between management and employees as it is of dealings between individuals outside working hours. Techniques and organization are needed—in small companies as well as big ones. And I am prepared to stand before you and say that, when the techniques, organization, and principles of good human relations are carefully applied, the end result is bound to be a greater measure of industrial peace.

Why are we in business, anyway? Are we simply in it to make money or do we acknowledge a stewardship toward employees, stockholders, and consumers?

Do we, above all, believe in the freedom and dignity of the individual in a free American economy?

Do we, then, believe that political and economic freedom are inseparable—and that they are equally the rights of employers and employees? I happen to be one of those who believes that you cannot put freedoms in separate compartments or maintain one kind of basic freedom without the other.

Do we want our employees to get a sense of dignity, achievement, satisfaction, and security through working harmonicusly with others in a well-organized, rational, productive industrial structure and at fair wages?

Above all, are we willing to work to create these conditions?

On the negative side we know that we simply cannot afford the consequences of industrial conflict. We cannot allow the terrible danger of class consciousness to weaken our internal structure. We cannot permit the collapse of the world economy. We dare not let hunger and poverty lead millions into communism.

All true. But, on the positive side, let us consider not what we have to lose but what we have to gain. Why should our policies be dominated by a negative dread of communism instead of a positive confidence in America? As Gardner Cowles said in a recent significant speech, "No one flees toward Russia." America is the symbol of an active reality which has already accomplished more for human betterment than any system on earth. (From an address to the Congress of American Industry.)

Article by George Sokolsky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky from the Washington Times-Herald of February 10, 1948:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The essence of the articles written by Henry Morgenthau on himself and appearing in the New York Post is that the State Department and the War Department had, as is their proper function, worked out plans for postwar Germany.

He had obtained a document prepared by the State Department which would have saved the world endless trouble and unbearable costs. Morgenthau was terribly angry. So he saw General Eisenhower in London and Eisenhower said to him:

"I want to say that I am not interested in the German economy and personally would not like to bolster it if that will make it easier for the Germans."

Now, how could it be that General Eisenhower or anybody else in so responsible a position could say that he is not interested in the German economy? For after all, Germany is the economic and geographic heart of Europe.

It may be that it is unfortunate for mankind that the particular people who inhabit that particular area of the earth's surface are those who are there.

But no intelligent man can say that he is not interested in German economy—for it is German economy that has already cost us two wars, and the huge cost of occupation and the British loan and the Marshall plan but so much else that has disturbed our generation.

How could General Eisenhower say that in 1944?

It was in 1944 that Henry Morgenthau was told by General Eisenhower, as Morgenthau reports, that Russia now (in 1944) had all that she could digest, and her present problems would keep her busy until long after we were dead.

That was before Yalta and Potsdam. It was before Soviet Russia took over Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, the Kurile Islands, Manchuria, and Korea.

It was before the Cominform was organized. It was before Togliatti attempted to force Italy, and Thorez, France, into the Soviet Federation. It was before Soviet Russia tried to take the atom bomb from us.

Certainly it is difficult to believe that Eisenhower was so badly informed, so inadequately oriented as Morgenthau makes him out to have been.

For the history and purposes of bolshevism, from 1907 to 1944, is a thoroughly documented story, widely known and discussed by intelligent students the world over.

It is not possible to believe that the man to whom the destiny of this country was entrusted could have been so superficial. Until Eisenhower speaks for himself, I, for one, decline to believe that he could possibly have expressed such views.

Of course, the confusion in thought and of policy in the Roosevelt administration are beyond belief. Morgenthau reports, for instance, that he discussed not Treasury but foreign problems with all sorts of people, although the country assumed that it was Cordell Hull who was Secretary of State.

Apparently the American people were wrong, because Hull seems not to have known what was going on.

For instance, Morgenthau discussed Tehran with Anthony Eden and then with Cordell Hull. Apparently minutes were kept at Tehran, but Cordell Hull was not permitted to see them, although, as Secretary of State, they should have been in his possession. According to Morgenthau, this is what Hull told him:

"I don't have a chance to do anything. I am not told what is going on. That's on a higher level. I am told that is a military affair. I have consultations with the War Department every day on the immediate objectives, but when they talk about the state of Germany I am not even consulted."

Why was he Secretary of State? The story is coming out, even earlier than had been expected. Maybe, in time, some of us who warned the American people that they were being fooled and their confidence abused will, unfortunately, be proved to have been right.

I, for one, would rather have been proved wrong.

The other day I remarked to a friend that it would have given me more comfort for the future of my children if the facts, as they are now disclosed, would show that I had been in error during the years of the Roosevelt confusion.

Foreign Policy Gone Haywire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a timely editorial which appeared in the Kenosha (Wis.) Evening News on Monday, February 2, 1948. The editor has called attention to inconsistencies in our foreign policy and to such an extent that the people at large are generally confused and bewildered.

GONE, BUT NOT FORGOTTEN

Every day there seems to be less sense in our relations with Soviet Russia.

The United States finances the United Nations and Russia uses it as a world platform from which to hurl abuse at us.

Undesirables from Russia, holding credentials to the UN, continue to pour into the country. Immigration laws keep out thousands of victims of Nazi and Soviet terror.

While Russian diplomats and Reds roam our Nation, United States diplomatic representatives in Moscow are under rigid supervision, practically limited to their quarters.

The nastiest of Russian spokesmen wander around at will in our best society.

Cargoes of scarce materials leave our ports for Russia. It's cash business, apparently, all very reminiscent of pre-Pearl Harbor days.

The Marshall plan for spending $17,000,000 of our wealth to stop communism in Europe is ballyhooed to the heavens. At the same time Moscow sets a course designed to increase the cost to us of such a program.

Britain is credited by many with having shrewder diplomats than we have, but the Lion is pursuing a course just as muddled as ours. Bevin is applauded for rapping Soviet policies, and in a different part of London a colleague wins praise for negotiating a deal whereby Russian grain is exchanged for British machinery.

It's no wonder the ordinary fellow in the United States busy with his own dollar survival problems, can't make sense out of the doings of the diplomats.

The mainspring has gone haywire. What we need more than anything is statesmen, but if any of that breed still exists they must be camping in caves hidden away in the Grand Canyon.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Fourth District, Fairfield County, Conn., to the Hartford Women's Republican Club, Hartford, Conn., on February 12, 1948:

Members of the Hartford Women's Republican Club, ladies and gentlemen.

The occasion which we commemorate today is of importance not only to the Republican Party but also to the Nation and to the world. Abraham Lincoln, the sixteenth President of the United States, was born 139 years ago today. Yet he is very much alive. His memory is truly enshrined in the hearts of his countrymen. In a very real sense he belongs to the ages—to our age. For in his 56 years of life he stamped an image of himself on the tapestry of history and made a lasting impression on the minds of men and women the world over. He was a pioneer. He pioneered in the lonely wastes of uncharted thought, in the unplumbed depths of the human soul, and in the field of action.

His memory has a very special meaning in this fateful year. It has a special meaning particularly for us Republicans who, while we bear much responsibility, have not yet received from the people the power completely to discharge it. It is not enough to talk like Abraham Lincoln—the Republican Party must act like Lincoln. We must translate into effective action the inarticulate aspirations of millions of Americans in order that we may meet the challenge of leadership which is presented to us. We must think of freedom not as a right to be used and sometimes abused, but as a privilege to be earned and passed on undiminished to those who come after us. We must be alert to defend and deserve that privilege. We must recognize that the concept of freedom is still the most modern, the most revolutionary idea which man has yet discovered as a basis for his spiritual, political, and economic life on this planet. We must be actively aware that freedom and responsibility are inseparable. We must so lead our individual lives as to vindicate the enormous sacrifices made in the cause of freedom by millions of people. We must fulfill our daily obligations to the society in which we live in order that when we have been gathered to our fathers we shall have made a lasting contribution to the cause of liberty. We must give more than lip service to the memory of the great man whose birth we are gathered here to celebrate.

The Republican Party was born in 1856 in the midst of the turmoil and terrible disagreements which preceded the Civil War. In this year of crisis—1948—the Republican Party must have a fresh, vital, and vigorous approach to national and international problems in order that a ravished and devastated world may have a "new birth of freedom."

Never before in the history of the party, never before since this Nation was founded, has any group had such a glorious opportunity for service and leadership as the Republican Party has today. If we fail to grasp that opportunity, our failure will be commensurate with the magnitude thereof.

The two-party system is the lifeblood of our Republic. If there were less than two parties there would be distatorship and our Constitution and Bill of Rights would be of no avail. More than two major parties often leads to confusion. It is important that the two major parties should bring before the American people the great issues of the day in order that differences of opinion should be thoroughly ventilated and exposed to public view. The greatest enemy of freedom is ignorance. The American people have a right to be continuously informed regarding the significant implications of the issues which face the Congress.

In approaching these issues the Republican Party should be guided by the principles which governed the actions of Abraham Lincoln throughout his notable public career and should bear in mind that the concept of freedom must be adapted to the needs of our day if it is to survive. It was Lincoln himself who said: "The dogmas of the past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise to the occasion. As our case is new so we must think anew and act anew."

The overwhelming majority of the American people worship freedom and revere Lincoln. They are deeply apprehensive regarding conditions abroad. They know that the struggle for freedom is not yet won. They are worried about conditions at home.

Now there are no pat answers to these difficult problems. There is no mumbo-jumbo by which we can suddenly dissolve the tyrannies which still threaten us and bask in the sunshine of a secure freedom. There is no panacea which can quickly dissipate our troubles, dispel our fears, and make out of a world recently torn by war a lotus land of peace. But there are certain principles which through the years have proved timeless in their validity; there are tenets in the faith of freedom which must be reaffirmed, which must be acted on. The Republican Party must stand for these principles if we are to meet the challenge of our time.

The great issues which confront us can be divided into two main categories:

1. Those which face us abroad; and
2. Those which face us at home.

The Republican Party has shown a commendable spirit of nonpartisanship with respect to foreign relations. Several of its members have made distinguished contributions to the development of an effective foreign policy. Indeed, it may be said that insofar as the Administration has abandoned the philosophy, appeasement or war, it is to a large extent the result of the effort made by certain Republicans. There is another choice. The Republicans have been instrumental in pointing it out. The European Recovery Program, about which you all have heard so much, illustrates the recent reorientation of the Administration's attitude toward foreign affairs. Though the principle on which this proposal is based is simple, the execution of such a vast undertaking is enormously complex.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, it has been my privilege to hear the testimony of many witnesses regarding this aspect of our foreign policy. While it is impossible within the brief compass of these remarks to penetrate deeply into the labyrinth of difficulties inherent in this program, I should like to say that in my opinion its success will hinge in large measure upon our ability to bring all the elements of our foreign policy in line with this proposal. For the Marshall plan is a strategical measure with relief characteristics. Strategy cannot be successfully prosecuted piecemeal. I have been very much disappointed by the failure of the administration to carry forward on a concurrent front the other vital segments of our foreign policy in order that the European Recovery Program should operate under the most advantageous conditions possible and in order to take every step to insure the huge investments which the American people may be called upon to make.

I should like to see the administration, as soon as possible, initiate action to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Call a meeting of the United Nations under section 109 of the Charter in order that the United Nations may be strengthened; with Russia if possible, without Russia if necessary. We who were the chief creators of the United Nations should take the lead in helping it to survive and grow and prosper.

2. Instruct our representatives to the International Monetary Fund, to which we make a huge contribution, to recommend that an international monetary conference be called for the purpose of effecting a planned devaluation of the currencies of the 16 nations participating in the European Recovery Program, in order that this may be accomplished with a minimum of economic dislocation and a maximum of benefit for western Europe and for the American taxpayer. The amount involved in the European recovery program is based on the balance of payments. Because the dollar has become the basic currency in the world today, the needs of the participating countries are estimated in terms of dollar deficits. Since these foreign currencies are artificially pegged, the Marshall plan constitutes to a considerable extent an attempt on our part to bridge the gap between the legal and the real value of these currencies. A devaluation of these currencies would make European commodities cheaper to buy. It should be expedited in order:

(a) That these countries may increase their exports and thereby reduce their dollar deficits; (b) by reducing their dollar deficits, reduce the load on the American taxpayer; and (c) increase American imports and thereby reduce the cost of living in America.

3. The President should decide on a policy with respect to export controls, and with particular reference to Soviet Russia and her satellites. Here we must recognize that a revival of trade between eastern and western Europe is important to European recovery. It is to be hoped that when we have helped the Marshall plan countries to create a capital goods surplus, the agricultural surpluses of eastern Europe will flow into western Europe, in spite of the iron curtain. On the other hand, it should be our policy and the policy of the nations receiving our aid not to help Russia to defeat the Marshall plan. This aspect of our foreign policy should not be allowed to drift from day to day on an improvised basis. It should be carefully considered, clarified, and synchronized with the European Recovery Program in order that it can help to implement its major intentions.

4. Call a meeting of the 17 nations now receiving reparations under the German Reparations Agreements in order that the questions of reparations and particularly the problem of dismantling of German plants may be reexamined in the light of the European Recovery Program. Our approach to the German problem should be revised in order that the German economy should play its part in the recovery of Europe. I do not share General Marshall's fears regarding a change in the dismantling policy, provided it is the result of conversations between the United States and those nations who are to receive reparations from Germany as well as aid from America. Separate and special agreements should be negotiated with those nations who are members of the German Reparations Agency, but who are not to receive American aid.

General Marshall's view is that a change in the dismantling policy would be regarded by the nations receiving reparations as a breach of faith by the United States. I do not propose a breach of faith. I propose a modernization of these agreements. I want to bring them up to date for the benefit of all. In any event there can be no harm in discussing their revision with the interested parties.

5. Instruct our representatives to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, to which we make a predominant contribution, to call a meeting of the members of the bank in order that the activities of this organization should be coordinated with the purposes of the European Recovery Program. For instance, I have been informed by Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former leader of the Polish Peasant Party, that every dollar we spend in Poland goes to Russia. Former Ambassador Lane's arresting book tends to bear this out. Yet it is rumored that the World Bank is about to make a loan of $40,000,000 to the Communist Government in Poland. If Mr. Mikolajczyk is right, and his opinion is certainly entitled to a great deal of weight, we would, in contributing to such a loan, be helping the Russians to defeat the Marshall plan.

6. The Foreign Ministers and high military officials of the United States and the participating nations should meet for the purpose of coordinating the activities of their respective military establishments in order—

(a) to avoid a duplication which is a burden on their economies and therefore a burden on the American taxpayer; (b) take such dispositions with respect to their armies, navies, and air forces as the tactical and strategical situation require; and (c) make those changes within their military establishments which seem desirable in view of the present stage of scientific development of the weapons of war. These results could be accomplished within the framework of the Western Union proposed by the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Ernest Bevin.

The above are but a few of the things which should be done as expeditiously as possible in order that western civilization may be made secure from the onslaught of Communist aggression. We know from bitter experience that appeasement leads to war. We must know by this time that the best way to avoid war is to be strong. We know that we are stronger if we have friends than if we are alone. We know that if these friends are strong, their strength will create a mighty compulsion to peace.

In other words, the European Recovery Program should not be an attempt to restore Europe as it was in 1939. It should not be an effort to put Humpty-Dumpty together again. It should be the beginning of a great movement to achieve an economic federation in Europe in order to spread freedom by extending the free-trade area. It should have as its ultimate goal what George Washington anticipated years ago—a United States of Europe. Such a concept involves politics as well as economics. American foreign policy must take the political factors into proper account if the economic program is to succeed. We know that a starving Europe cannot recover. We know that as long as Europe has not recovered it constitutes a hunting ground for purveyors of tyranny. Accordingly, we must face the challenge as it is presented to us—on all its fronts and in all its aspects.

I have given you these few suggestions also because it does not seem to me that a nonpartisan approach to foreign affairs demands that the Republican Party should sit supinely by and wait for the Administration to show the way. Had that been our attitude we would probably still be embarked on a policy of appeasement today. The right carries with it the responsibility—nay the duty—to participate in the formulation of an effective foreign policy.

When I returned from my investigation trip last November I hoped that our President would also see the challenge to America as a nonpartisan challenge. I confess that I have been deeply disappointed. In the first place, there has been an attitude on the part of the Administration that the Congress should accept the Marshall plan precisely as written in the legislation submitted by the State Department or the whole program would be compromised. While I have for some time enthusiastically favored the principle involved in the recovery program, it is my considered view, after weeks of study, that the Congress can improve the measure submitted to us and thereby add to its effectiveness and diminish the ultimate cost to the American people.

No one can deny that foreign and domestic affairs are closely related. They are to a large degree interdependent. What happens abroad has a very definite effect upon what happens at home, and what we do here with respect to our domestic problems will have world repercussions. To think otherwise is to be in fact an isolationist. There is no sharp line of cleavage between conditions in America and conditions outside America. We are involved in world affairs whether we like it or not.

I believe that the American people have a right to expect the Executive to rise above party in administering the vast enterprise which is the United States. I believe that the Administration must display the same degree of statemanship with respect to the needs of the American people as the Republican Party has displayed with respect to the needs of others. Yet the President has seen fit to treat questions of Tax Relief, Labor-Management Relations, the Fuel-Oil Shortage in New England, Public Housing, Federal Aid to Education, Social Security, and the Public Health, as well as other matters, as political footballs to be kicked around for the profit of the Democratic Party when they should be studied and acted on in the interests of all. The Republican Party has become infused with new blood. Out of differences of opinion within its ranks has grown a revitalized modern-minded party—a party which can withstand the pressures of the moment for the ultimate good of all—a party which is truly the party of the people. It is my belief that there are accommodations which the Government must make to modern needs which interfere in no way with the freedom of the people, but which instead help them to achieve a basic standard of living without which freedom becomes virtually meaningless. It is my belief that the Republican Party must be the party of youth, the party of new ideas within the framework of freedom, the party of insurgents, of young Turks, the party which will carry high the torch of individual liberty and thereby respond not only to the hopes and aspirations of millions of Americans, but to the longings of a prostrate world.

On the other hand, the Democratic Party is so distressed, divided, and distraught that it is hard to make out what they believe except that they believe that they should stay in office. Do they believe in anti-lynching and anti-poll-tax legislation in order to bring the concept of freedom to the fulfillment hoped for by Abraham Lincoln, or do they believe in white supremacy? Do they believe that Communism threatens freedom as Nazism did, or do they believe that they Communists should be accorded rights and privileges which will help them to destroy liberty? Do they believe in relieving the people of part of the enormous tax burden which adds tremendously to the cost of living, or do they believe that the cost of Government should go up every year as it has ever since the Democrats have been in power? Do they believe, as President Truman stated in his speech on the State of the Union, that $50,000,000,000 should be invested in American business in order to insure continuous employment and a rising standard of living, or do they believe in a system of taxation which will raise the cost of consumer goods and leave little for the start of new small businesses?

On the one hand the Democrats say that they believe that payments on the national debt should be made in order to combat inflation, and on the other hand they resist the cashing of terminal leave bonds by former enlisted men on the ground that such payments on the national debt are inflationary. They were opposed to price controls in 1946 and they favor price controls in 1948. They seem to think that the Government should stay in the red since the Reds stay in the Government.

The fact is that the Democratic Party is tired, torn, and tattered. It is desperately hanging on to power which it doesn't know how to use. It has lost contact with the people from whom that power comes.

This is a year of decision. It is a year in which men in public life should more than ever keep their eyes on the horizon in order that they may have vision to act in the best interests of the people and without regard to party advantage or their own political future. It has never seemed to me that public office is an endurance contest. It is a call to service. The American people are tired of empty promises—they want constructive action. At the time of Dunkerque, Winston Churchill promised the British people blood, sweat, and tears. That promise struck a cord of understanding and resolve which was felt throughout the Western world. Today we are engaged in a terrible conflict. It has been called a "cold war." Our promise for 1948 might well be sweat in order to avoid the blood and tears of another war.

If we are to avoid the "twin gulfs of immorality and inefficiency," if we are to meet the challenge of leadership in this troubled world, if we are to maintain America as a bastion of liberty, if we are to bestow the blessings of freedom on those millions who are languishing in chains, a revived, revitalized, rejuvenated Republican Party must take the helm and march forward to new vistas of achievement propelled by the mighty spirit of an enfranchised people and inspired by the simple greatness of Abraham Lincoln.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the following thought-provoking editorial by the editor of the Gilroy Dispatch:

JUST WATCH GOVERNMENT SPENDING NOW

The tendency of most citizens is to demand and expect more and more service from local, State, and Federal Governments. Furthermore most public officials are continually seeking to expand those services in order to increase their own authority. All of these services must be paid for by the taxpayer.

It is high time we take stock of what Government services are essential and which can be done without. Some public and school buildings must be constructed, and some services must be expanded, but the time has come to eliminate all unnecessary expenditures. The day is fast approaching when small businesses will run into difficulties. Many of them will fail—many already are folding up.

Credits must be watched more closely than ever before. As small business houses close many of their proprietors will be seeking jobs. Soon a surplus of labor will accumulate.

Events of the past week have proved that the commodity markets can tumble without warning. The drop may be halted artificially for a while, but as supply catches up with demand a big break can be expected. When that happens millions will be lost in stocks on hand by merchants and wholesalers.

This prospect is one of the principal reasons why Government should curtail its spending now in order to help hold down fixed overheads for business and protect workers from losing homes and small ranches. Taxes have increased tremendously during the past year and next year will show still further increases as more and more costs are piled onto city, county, and school district administrations.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate on January 27, 1948, by Bernard Weitzer, national legislative representative of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am happy to express to you as national legislative representative of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States the thanks of our organization for this opportunity to present its views on the European recovery program which you are considering.

Our membership is made up of veterans who have fought for America in one or more wars since and including the Spanish-American War. Our oldest surviving member until 2 years ago was a veteran of the Civil War. He died shortly after our fiftieth anniversary. In our membership today we have slightly more than 100,000 of the 850,000 veterans of the Jewish faith organized in 616 posts in 264 cities.

At our fifty-second national encampment in St. Paul, Minn., October 15–19, 1947, the more than 2,000 delegates representing all sections of the country unanimously approved the following resolution:

"Whereas the devastated countries of Europe are so weak economically that their very existence is threatened; and

"Whereas the people of the United States, through the Marshall plan, have proposed a system of aid which will rehabilitate these countries, save lives, and contribute to the peace and security of the world: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, in fifty-second annual convention assembled at St. Paul, Minn., October 15 to 19, 1947, record ourselves as favoring the Marshall plan and urging its adoption by Congress and its implementation in such manner as to make it most effective as soon as possible to make economic rehabilitation a fact."

In harmony with that mandate and by direction of our National Commander, Col. Julius Klein, I am appearing before you because he could not get here today.

As a veteran's organization I believe we have a special interest in the European recovery program. Colonel Klein emphasized to me that, as he looked back upon his experience in the Army in the South Pacific and the Philippines, it seemed to him that the men who fought the war fought for two main objectives. The first was to win the war. The second was to win the peace.

After victory veterans felt that they had played their full part in gaining the first objective. Civilians again, now they are ready to do what is necessary to gain the second objective and are relying upon this European recovery program to help make it possible. With the overwhelming mass of the American people, they want to get on with this job. They look to Congress to do this job and thereby make it possible to win the peace. Remembering the mud, blood, disease, and separation they experienced during the war, the veterans stand squarely behind Secretary Marshall in the conviction that "we must not fail to complete that which we commenced."

When veterans speak of peace, they usually envisage a peace which fulfills two conditions. One is prosperity, a degree of prosperity adequate to assure employment, a good living and a happy family life. The other is a peace which will last, not a mere truce before a third world war. I believe one thought was constantly in the minds of literally millions of our men overseas, the thought, "I'll do this and whatever else is necessary that my son may never have to go through this."

Western Europe, as we all know, is one of the world's two great workshops. Its 270,000,000 people normally account for more than half the world's international trade. Its present lack of purchasing power prevents recovery in South America, Asia and Africa. Unless this European workshop is enabled to produce, an economic blight will continue to rest upon the greater part of the earth. There can be no real enduring prosperity in the United States if economic break-down and chaos impoverish the surrounding world.

The peoples of western Europe, their men who fought and their women and children who suffered bombing, hunger, and enemy occupation, want the same things our veterans want—prosperity and a lasting peace. But they lack the means of making their workshop produce what it must, without assistance from us. Without the aid provided for in this program they might well lose hope in the future.

We cannot afford to consider this program only in material terms, for one of its most important consequences will be regeneration of hope and confidence. Once it has been adopted, the feeling will spread among people of western Europe that their recovery has already begun. Those who saw no way out will feel they are already on their way. Such an atmosphere of hope and confidence is an essential element in the continuance of private enterprise in the large areas of economic life where private enterprise is still dominant.

This program, furthermore, is indispensable to the attainment of a lasting peace. Without it, so serious a threat to peace would arise as to jeopardize not only the future security but also the future survival of the United States. This danger has been pointed out in previous testimony by Government officers and veterans' organizations. I do not need to repeat what they have said. The danger is obvious to any intelligent American who seeks to weigh the future consequences for the United States of an economic and social collapse in western Europe, of control of its great productive capacity by a totalitarian dictatorship, possessing unlimited ambitions, and of the probability that within a few years this dictatorship will have atomic bombs. We hope and believe that these consequences of a failure to carry out this program will be constantly kept in mind by every Senator and every Member of Congress.

A barometer of American security is provided by our appropriations for national defense. The Secretary of Defense has indicated that, if this program were not adopted, such appropriations would have to be raised to a yearly outlay equivalent at least to the total 4¼-year estimated cost of the program. Such would be the immediate measure of the increased danger of war and the increased danger to our national security. Americans are essentially a constructive people who like to get something of enduring value for large expenditures. Would we not rather spend this amount once for a 4¼-year program as constructive as any in history than spend it every year to guard against a threat which this program can preclude?

There are a number of other points I would like to make as briefly as possible.

We believe that the administration of this program must be businesslike. But we believe it is of the first importance to avoid conveying any impression that the State Department is not carrying out our foreign policy. Otherwise those countries we wish to help will be confused and the countries which are hoping for the failure of our plans will have material for the detraction of our foreign policies. A story is told of a prominent American banker who once said, "bring me lawyers who will tell me how to accomplish what I want to do." Veterans are looking to your committee to work out the means of doing what they want to do. That is to put into effect successfully this vital program for achieving the peace and prosperity for which they fought.

Much has been made of the exports this program requires. The American people have always considered that exports are beneficial and an important element in our national welfare. Although exports create a pressure just now against articles and commodities which are temporarily in short supply, they will continue to be important to our economic welfare in the future. Without this program, our future exports would rapidly wither away.

With this program, our export markets will be maintained for the years to come. In considering the immediate pressure which will be created, it is necessary to realize that the program will not increase our surplus of exports over imports this year beyond what it was last year. Thereafter our surplus of exports will progressively diminish as the aid we furnish Europe decreases and as European recovery enables our consumers to obtain many things they need or desire from abroad. At the price of a temporary pressure on a few sectors of our economy we shall gain permanent economic benefits of immeasurably greater importance to our people.

In adopting this program, we must at all costs avoid the failing of doing too little too late. These words, "too little and too late," have been written in blood on the history of many democratic peoples. We must insure now that they are not similarly engraved on the history of America.

Some prominent people have made general statements proposing that the program should be cut by or to various round sums. We have not been impressed by these statements because they are not supported by analyses and studies of the problem, of the needs of European recovery, and of the ability of the United States to fulfill them, at all comparable with the long, careful, comprehensive, and exhaustive analyses and studies from which this program resulted.

In state policy, as in business, action must be timely to succeed. If we delay the start of this program, we shall increase the risks and the cost, as the European will to recover and the plant essential for recovery deteriorate. Any reduction in the total $6,800,000,000, established with the greatest care as the minimum aid which will do the job for the first 15 months, will risk the success of the program and is likely to require its continuance for more than 4¼ years. Reduction of this amount might actually preclude the recovery which is our goal and make the program only a form of relief with no end in sight.

We believe that any American who opposes this program or urges that it should be reduced or delayed should realize the effect of his proposals. He should realize that their effect is to promote, to a degree proportionate to his influence, the Communist objective of increasing chaos in western Europe. He should realize that their effect is to promote, to a degree proportionate to his influence, the world policies of Stalin, Molotov, and Vishinsky at the expense of the world policies of the United States.

I feel that this is probably as important a problem as any that will come before the Congress in the lifetime of most of its Members. Our country's future—the future of the world—is involved vitally in the solution you gentlemen work out.

All of you who were in Congress in 1941 faced courageously the risks that were certain when you chose to have our country fight a war against totalitarianism as symbolized by Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo. Our whole country backed you up. It will support today this program which we believe will prevent the growth of a Communist totalitarianism to the point where a war for survival—World War III—will be necessary.

All the speed possible, sums adequate for the size of the first 15 months task, an administrative plan that will get the maximum all-over results are the urgent need we respectfully ask you to meet.

Thank you on behalf of the Jewish War Veterans and of myself personally for your hearing of our views.

So Arthur Bliss Lane Gives Poor Poland a Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, when Arthur Bliss Lane was Ambassador to Poland he saw the ruins and devastation in that country. He likewise must have seen the hunger, disease, and destitution among the Polish people.

What did he do for them? Did he try to assist them with loans and credits to rebuild the ruins and regain their strength? No. The contrary is true. He did his utmost to stop any loans or credits. He did his utmost to stop a meager supply of food and medicines for these unfortunate people, and he was successful in his efforts.

So, now he writes a book on Poland. To clear a guilty conscience? Or to make some easy money off of the gullible, as so many have done in the last 2 years? Maybe it is done for both reasons; but I have no patience with these so-called friends of Poland who shed tears over her because they do not like the Polish Government, and at the same time deny the Polish people food, clothing, medicines, relief supplies, credits and loans with which to rebuild their economy that was so completely destroyed by the Nazis. At least Hitler and the Nazis set out to destroy the Polish people and the Polish Nation openly and brazenly. They made no bones about their purpose and objectives.

But it burns me up to see these so-called friends of Poland destroying the Polish people and the Polish Nation just as deliberately as Hitler and the Nazis did, and then have the effrontery to write a book and make profit out of their destructive efforts.

Mr. Arthur Bliss Lane must know that slaughter, devastation, and oppression, even their century-long obliteration as a sovereign nation, have never weakened the Polish sense of national identity nor their patriotism.

Poland will regain her full freedom and become a potent instrument in the creation of a peaceful Europe. The signs of an unquenchable national vitality are unmistakable.

The real friends of the Polish people know this. They look with suspicion upon those who are continually carping about Polish politics, and do everything possible to deny loans and credits to the Polish people. These carping authors of books on Poland are actually driving the Polish people deeper under Russian influence. The Polish Nation last year spent all of its gold with the United States and Canada to buy wheat in order to give bread to their hungry and destitute. The Polish people are literally pulling themselves up by their own boot straps. Millions of dollars are made available for countries who did not suffer from the ravages of war, but Poland who took the full brunt of war's destruction and fury for six long years receives what? A book from the Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane.

After the war, from July 1945 up to September 1947, we gave in postwar assistance for foreign relief approximately $20,000,000,000.

Out of this sum only 8 percent or one billion six hundred million went to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, together with Ukraine and White Russia. The rest of the nations, including Germany and Italy, received eighteen billion.

Now, under the Marshall plan, seventeen billion more is going to Germany, Italy, England, and those nations that received the other eighteen billion, making a total of thirty-five billion.

Well, anyhow, we must admit that Poland and the other 11 nations of central and eastern Europe that took the heaviest punishment at the hands of the Nazis are making a splendid come-back on one billion six hundred million, and another new book by Arthur Bliss Lane.

Value of the Pound Sterling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal recently. In my opinion it is about time for Great Britain to become realistic in connection with the pegged value of the pound sterling.

The editorial follows:

THE PEGGED POUND

Pegging the pound sterling is proving costly for the British—and for us, too.

Sir Stafford Cripps, Britain's Chancelor of the Exchequer, has reported that the Empire is now down to a bare $2,000,000,000 of gold and dollar reserves. During the past year Britain lost more than $4,000,000,000 in dollar balances. The $3,700,000,000 United States credit virtually disappeared; only $100,000,000 remains and that will be gone by April. The large Canadian credit has also evaporated.

The popular explanation for Britain's loss of dollars is that she has to import more than she exports, that the cure is to achieve a balance of her trade. This, of course, is part of Britain's trouble. But it is not the whole answer.

An important factor is the weakness of the pound. Holders of sterling know it's not worth its official price in terms of dollars. At every opportunity they will exchange it for dollars; so eager are they to do so that they will pay premiums up to 50 percent. Even the Attlee government's export and currency controls, models of stringency, cannot stop it.

Britain's loss of dollars last year through her own foreign purchases amounted to about $2,500,000,000. Since her total dollar drain was in excess of $4,000,000,000, at least $1,500,000,000 of her dollar resources disappeared for other reasons. Sir Stafford Cripps mentions one, "We are bankers to the sterling area and finance the dollar requirements of all sterling-area countries." But the well-known activities of unofficial currency-exchange markets strongly suggests that liquid British capital has been fleeing the pound and that its owners consider dollars a safer form in which to hold their funds. Last summer when Britain, for a brief period, made pounds freely convertible into dollars, the Bank of England was swamped with customers eager to swap their pounds for dollars.

The root of Britain's fiscal trouble is her stubborn insistence that the pound is worth $4.03. In the few free markets left a pound will actually bring only about $2.60. The difference between the free-market price and the official price is a subsidy. We have paid a large part of this subsidy through loans to the British treasury. The British people pay the rest of it in loss of capital, loss of trade, and a lower standard of living.

Consider it this way: The trade value of a pound—that is, its purchasing value in world markets—is $2.60. If you had £100 you could buy $260 worth of goods. Now, suppose the Bank of England offered to exchange your pounds for $4.03 each. Would you rather have £100 or $403? That's what the holders of pounds sterling think, too. It's not surprising the Bank of England had a run on its dollars last summer.

Every time the Bank of England paid $4.03 in exchange for £1 it gave $1.23 more than the pound's free-market value. For a brief while it tried to meet the $1.33 loss on each pound transaction by drawing down on the United States loan. The only surprise in the result was that Britain kept it up so long.

Now, look at it the other way around: Suppose the trading value of the pound and its official value were both $2.60—that is, that Britain devalued. That would mean, of course, that Britain would pay more pounds sterling for what it bought in the United States. It would, however, use up only the same amount of United States dollars as before. But Britain's problem is a shortage of dollars, not a shortage of pounds. Vis-a-vis the United States dollar, Britain would be no worse off than before.

And it would get out of a lot of difficulties. In last summer's interlude of free convertibility no debacle would have ensued. For then instead of needing only £25 to get $100, a sterling holder would have required nearly £39 to get $100. Dollars wouldn't have looked like such an exciting bargain, and even the sterling holders who still wanted to sell could have bought fewer dollars with their pounds. The strain on the Bank of England would have been much less severe. More likely there would have been no strain at all.

If today the official price of the pound sterling, in terms of dollars, were equal to the pound's actual trading value, the two currencies could be made freely interchangeable with no difficulty. The flight of capital from the pound would dwindle as there would be no bargains to be had by switching.

Britain, of course, would still have a dollar drain to the extent that its exports fell below imports. But this drain would not be aggravated by the impetuosity of runaway capital.

Furthermore, the dollar drain from its export deficit would probably decrease. For to the American customer the price of British goods would decrease; the bargains would be on the other side.

Today the cheapest British car costs £325 delivered in New York. To the United States customer that's $1,300. For the same price he can get a heavier, more powerful American car. With the pound at, say, $3, the British car would cost an American only $975. The British automobile then becomes an attractive buy. The same situation applies to whisky, textiles, and a host of other goods which Britain is trying to sell in an American market that is getting more competitive and price-conscious every day.

Sir Stafford says he doesn't intend to change the price tag on the pound because if he did the British "would have to pay more for what we buy abroad." How he intends to prop up the pound, he made clear to the Commons on Tuesday. The dollar drain, he said, must be closed "by our own efforts supported by the Marshall plan."

Sir Stafford is compounding Britain's difficulties—and increasing the cost of our own foreign aid—by persisting in the delusion that there is profit in an overvalued pound. Somebody has to pay the subsidy and we have the fretful feeling that it may be us.

Poland Betrayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of February 11, 1948:

THESE DAYS
(By George E. Sokolsky)

Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane has contributed immensely to the American people by publishing I Saw Poland Betrayed. It is a report to his fellow countrymen on his mission to Poland between 1944 and 1947.

I wonder whether the title should not be "I Saw America Betrayed"? for when the officials of a country forsake its honor and lower its dignity for whatever expediency, do they not disclose that its spirit has been fouled, its national morality abandoned?

The tale really begins at Tehran when Great Britain, which went to war with Germany over Poland, abandoned principle upon demand of Stalin and at the instigation of Roosevelt. Lane says:

"The discussions at the conference at Tehran in December 1943 among Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin remained an official secret * * * even within the Department of State the truth of what happened at this momentous conference was probably not known, except perhaps to two or three.

"Some key officials, indeed, who had the responsibility of making important recommendations on matters dealing with the United Nations organization, in conversations with me shortly after President Roosevelt's death in April 1945, deplored the fact that no records of the Tehran meeting were available even to them. Perhaps none had been made."

For page after page, following this quotation, Lane records the deceptions pursued by President Roosevelt. He recounts in detail the relations between the President and Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress. Rozmarek wrote to Lane:

"President Roosevelt in his talk with me expressed distrust of Stalin, having been fooled by him, as he stated, on a number of occasions. He plainly indicated that he was fearful that Stalin might again collaborate with Hitler as he did in the initial stages of the war, and the President wanted at all costs to prevent such an alliance.

"He kept on repeating to me: 'Let us win the war with Germany first.' The President let it be understood that once Hitler was defeated, he would know how to handle Stalin."

Stalin actually got a better deal in Poland from Roosevelt and Churchill than he got out of Hitler by the Stalin-Hitler alliance. Apparently Roosevelt was so sure that he could outfox Stalin after the war that he complacently permitted Stalin to outfox him while the war was on.

Lane went to Poland as our Ambassador after the peace and after we had recognized that country's puppet government. Our mission to Poland was treated cavalierly. It was improperly and even humiliatingly housed.

Its diplomatic telegrams to its own government were delayed or not sent at all. Members of the mission and other Americans were arrested. The Russians established the fact in the minds of the Polish people that the United States did not count.

Did we do anything about it? Of course. Ambassador Lane reports:

"Over my personal protest, Director General Herbert H. Lehman had appointed as director of the first UNRRA mission to Poland the Soviet member of the UNRRA Council, Mr. Menshikov. * * It was no surprise to me when in August the agreement concluded in Warsaw provided that the Polish Government, and not UNRRA, should have complete jurisdiction over the distribution of UNRRA supplies in Poland."

Also we granted a $90,000,000 loan to the Polish Government. Lane telegraphed the State Department:

"With the greatest earnestness of which I am capable I beg the Department not to approve the extension of any credits at this time. When the terroristic activities of the security police come to an end, when freedom of the press is restored, and when American citizens are released from Polish prisons—not until then should United States public funds be used to assist the Polish provisional government of national unity."

He ends his chapter:

"In my opinion, these minor gains in no way compensated for the loss of prestige suffered by the United States when we granted credits to a government which had not kept its word to us and which seized on our leniency as warrant for proceeding to even greater attacks on the freedom of its own citizens—and of our citizens."

The book should be read by every American in humility and shame.

Are You for the Marshall Plan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following speech that I made over radio station WWJ in Detroit, Mich., on Monday, February 16, as follows:

One of the most important matters up for consideration before Congress at this moment is the Marshall plan, the European recovery program, or as it is sometimes referred to in its abbreviated form, ERP. This subject is of utmost importance because it involves politics and economics.

The program cannot be discussed in its entirety in the short space of 15 minutes. However, I do wish to touch on certain phases of our foreign-relief program, and in that connection, I wish, first, to refer to Senate Document No. 112 that was recently issued.

This amazing report shows that the total estimate of postwar assistance for foreign relief, rehabilitation, and so forth, has reached the staggering sum of nineteen to twenty billion dollars, exclusive of what may be contemplated under the Marshall plan proposals. This report covers the period from July 1945 to September 1947.

What is especially interesting to note is that Germany and Italy, two of the enemy nations, received $1,674,000,000, while Poland, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and the U. S. S. R., together with Ukraine and White Russia, received a total of $1,644,000,000. Germany and Italy, the enemy nations, received $30,000,000 more than these much devastated nations of eastern Europe.

England, France, and Greece received $7,288,000,000.

Maybe this past policy makes sense to some people, but I am sure that it will not be understood by the vast majority of our citizens, and that it does not have their approval. I am sure that our citizens expected a humane policy which would give fair and equal assistance to the nations devastated by war. I am sure that they do not desire to follow a relief or rehabilitation program based on politics.

Our original purpose was to work out a relief, rehabilitation, and recovery program for European nations in conjunction and in cooperation with the United Nations. This was the honest and proper way to pursue a world recovery program, but certain bankers and international cartellists, under the guise of a bipartisan program, wrecked the plan that the honest and decent American citizens were supporting. A world recovery program under the United Nations would have cost our taxpayers less than one-half of what this selfish and inequitable program is costing us, and it would have brought us the respect, gratitude, and love of the whole world, instead of envy, fear, suspicion, and hatred.

I believe that our political approach is likewise wrong. I believe that our support of the rightists, or of the prewar status quo, can only bring us the enmity and hatred of the European people. That is why our position is so bad in Greece today, and that is also why we have made a mess of it in China. The people of Europe do not want communism, but likewise they do not want a return to their old governments and to the misery, intrigue, war, and starvation that those governments have brought upon them.

I am not in sympathy with a program which will shower billions of dollars on some nations and some people and ignores the plight of other people who suffered so much at the hands of the Nazis. How do you feel when you read that two and a half million German children could eat American ice cream for Christmas and 1,000,000 Polish orphan children, who went through all kinds of hell for six long years, are ignored and forgotten?

It seems like our bipartisan, big-business, and international cartellist program will only bring us the hatred and enmity of all the people of the world. We appropriated $600,000,000 for German civilian relief on July 23, and then 2 weeks later canceled a miserable $15,000,000 relief fund for Poland. This is something that many citizens cannot understand.

We had originally embarked on a sound American program which would give aid and credits to all people and all nations. This was the right policy to pursue, as it was in the old American tradition that has made America strong and respected. The present policy has resulted in a lot of confusion and misunderstanding. For example, we have now three groups of people in America: Those who are sincerely supporting a program of genuine relief and assistance out of the charity of their big Christian American hearts. Then there is the second group that has always opposed old-age pensions, school lunch programs, aid to veterans, Federal aid to school teachers, aid to the incapacitated, the blind, and crippled. Yes; those who wouldn't give a bone to a starving dog we find strongly supporting the present and proposed program, because it is a policy of anticommunism and a restoration of the rightists and reactionaries in Europe. Thirdly, there is the group of big bankers and international cartellists and all of those speculators in petroleum products, grain, and commodities who see for themselves an opportunity to make big profits quickly out of these free dollars that are being given to certain countries. Their motives for supporting the program are not based on patriotism, on a sound foreign policy that would work for peace, or because of sympathy for the destitute and hungry, but they have only one purpose in mind, and that is greed, high prices, and big profits that they can realize quickly out of this program.

I would like to see a genuine relief program where the gifts from America would be distributed directly to the needy people by established charitable organizations, such as the Red Cross, the various religious relief organizations, and the many other societies that for years have been doing this kind of work, so that our gifts would not fall into the hands of the profiteers and black marketeers, or into the hands of political cliques, where the people must sell their souls to get bread, or are bled white by the profiteers. The present method of distribution has brought us the hatred and enmity of the destitute and hungry.

A genuine relief program should be supplemented further by the bill which I introduced, and the amendment that I offered to the recent relief bill, which provides for free postage on gift packages being sent from the citizens of the United States to the people of Europe. In the first 9 months of last year Americans spent $44,000,000 for postage alone to send these gift packages. They are sending old clothes, shoes, food, and those things that the people in Europe desperately need. These packages go directly to the needy and the recipients know that they come from the United States. These gift packages have brought us more good will than any other thing that we have done, and it is my firm conviction that this program should be encouraged, as it would bring the greatest benefits in goods to the needy and genuine appreciation to the American people who send these packages.

I believe that Congress should junk the present program. We should quit giving gifts and instead we should give loans and credits, without interest, to all nations and their people who have suffered from the ravages of war. We should not play favorites and try to rebuild one country as against another, and particularly, as we have been doing recently, where we ignore nations and people who have been our loyal friends for centuries, and who have been on our side in every struggle. It is said, "But they have a government that we do not like." And I say in reply, "So what? The people of that nation also may not like their government, but governments come and governments go, but nations and people remain forever."

These people stand in ghastly fear of our policy of rebuilding Germany. They know that Germany has sprung at their throats at every opportunity, and in some nations, such as Poland, there is hardly a family who has not suffered the loss of fathers, mothers, brothers, or sisters. Here's a nation that had 30,000 orphans in prewar days. Today it has 1,000,000 orphans as a result of German barbarism and beastiality. Two thousand tons of human ashes were found at one crematorium just outside of Warsaw. These people and these nations have a right to be alarmed about our present policy. They also have a right to ask, "Why don't you give us an equal opportunity to rehabilitate and reestablish ourselves?"

Now, let's turn to the recent London Conference at which Russia asked for $10,000,000,000 in reparations from Germany, and which we opposed so strongly. From my viewpoint this is not an unreasonable request. It is estimated that Poland suffered over $100,000,000,000 in property damage by the Nazis. Russia's damages in all probability are two or three hundred billion dollars. Now, why shouldn't the Germans work and pay for their sins? Certainly $10,000,000,000 is not a great amount of compensation for the damages they inflicted upon the Russian people. Since the war, the United States has already contributed twice that much for the relief of European nations, and the funny part of it is that we won the war. It will serve America no good to be identified as supporting the Fascists and anti-Democratic forces anywhere in the world. Certainly that is not the desire nor the program of the rank and file of the American people. We love our liberty and we have advanced steadily in our fight for better economic and living conditions. I am sure that the sympathies of the average American are with the down-trodden, and not with the kings, queens, dukes, and the big-landed aristocracy of Europe, or with the European cartellists and monopolists. The people of Europe desire liberty, freedom, democracy, and better living conditions, just as much as we do. I believe that they shall get them. I believe that neither the left nor right shall win in Europe. I only hope that when the clouds over Europe roll away that we shall not be hated and despised by everyone. I am sure that the United States will be respected, loved, and admired if we follow the program on relief that I suggested, and also the program on credits and loans to all nations, without interest, and so to give all of them an equal opportunity to rehabilitate themselves without playing favorites one way or another.

Now, just recently it has been revealed how the proposed $17,000,000,000 Marshall-plan money would be distributed. These facts have been withheld from the public for a long time. But I think the public has a right to know who gets the money. After all, who is more entitled to know where his money goes than the man who pays the bill?—which means all of us taxpayers. Here is the break-down as it has seeped out of the State Department and the supporters of the Marshall plan:

One-third of the total $17,000,000,000 primarily goes to England. That is a sum of $5,348,000,000 earmarked for England. This will be in addition to the $3,750,000,000 which we gave to England in 1945.

I voted to help the British in 1945, as I felt that they needed some assistance, and as we were informed that this money would put them on their feet. Now they came back for another $5,348,000,000.

Holland is to get $2,436,000,000. Holland has a population that is smaller than that of the city of New York. Yet we propose to give them $2,436,000,000. That means that we will give $308 for every man, woman, and child who lives in Holland.

Denmark is proposed to get $582,000,000, and Denmark has a total population that is smaller than that of the city of Chicago.

Ireland, also, gets some of the money. Ireland was not in the war, and, so far as I know, Ireland didn't do so badly during the war. But under the proposed plan Ireland is to get $497,000,000—nearly one-half billion dollars.

Then there is Iceland. Iceland is earmarked for $38,000,000. Iceland has a population equivalent to that of Highland Park and Hamtramck, Mich., combined. Now, what couldn't the municipalities of Highland Park and Hamtramck do with $38,000,000?

Then there is Norway, which country I believe should have some help, as she did suffer from devastation during the war. But Norway is earmarked for the huge sum of $234,000,000.

Next comes Portugal. Portugal was never in the war, and I know for a fact that they profited tremendously from the war. Portugal is to get 150,000,000 American dollars.

Now, $6,000,000,000 is earmarked to go to Germany, Italy, and Austria, the enemy countries. Now, in the face of all this information, the proponents for the Marshall plan will brazenly stand up and say that this is a program for aiding the victims of war-torn countries in gratitude for their losses in the war. Those countries who suffered the most receive none of this $17,000,000,000. Will they be our friends in the future? Is it any wonder that our neighbors, the South American countries, all have a platter, looking for a hand-out of these free and easy dollars?

Oh, yes; and the expenditures under the Marshall plan is not the end. Already we are informed that an additional billion dollars must be given to Greece and Turkey, and additional hundred of millions must be appropriated for China, Japan, the Philippines, and other spots in Asia.

Here at home we have a shortage of steel, of fuel oil, gas, grain, and so many other commodities. We have the problem of taking care of our veterans, of our disabled and incapacitated, of our teachers and school children, and of the aged and older persons who are living on miserly and beggarly pensions.

Is it not time to ask if those 12 countries in central and eastern Europe who were the most destroyed and devastated during the war can make a recovery on $1,600,000,000, why is it necessary to dump thirty-five to forty billion dollars into these other nations?

I think it behooves every American citizen to look into this foreign spending program deeply and thoroughly. Let's not permit ourselves to be blitzed into national bankruptcy. Let's insist that our foreign recovery program be placed on a sane and business-like basis.

Bon Voyage, Then, Red Frigate of Fortune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, here in this country no more distinctive recognition can come to an undertaking than to have it generally referred to as an American institution. Run over in your mind those so considered; you will find their number surprisingly small, and the chances are heavily odds-on that you will have included the famous big red book Who's Who in America.

Certainly when one among these few undertakings which our customs and our usages have combined to rate as an American institution, completes a half century it seems appropriate and fitting that proper notice be given it.

Therefore, I now so record the issuance of the fiftieth anniversary volume of Who's Who. Since James M. Cain has lent his genius to preface this golden anniversary edition, I use his introduction to express, far more effectively than I, what the occasion would seem to justify:

Institutions, if they be actual and not merely nominal, will be found, I think, to possess some element, some simple, pregnant aspect, easily comprehensible to the popular imagination, which sets them off from other members of their class and gives them special status. Harvard University, certainly regarded as a thing apart, is the oldest college we have, and thus arouses reverence in the average mind, which probably doesn't know that it is also the richest, and certainly doesn't care that it is possibly, as some think, the wackiest. The late Caruso, not greatly surpassing various contemporaries in style, repertoire, or beauty of voice, could nevertheless sing louder than anybody on earth, and so passed into legend, along with Dan Patch, Babe Ruth, and other living wonders. And Who's Who in America, though a gospel, a heresy, and a raging polemic in one, and thus potentially suspect, is at the same time a Dun, a Bradstreet, a social register, and a hall of fame, all merged into a grand consolidated national glory highway, and thus unique in the eyes of the American people—this in spite of its frantic denials that it is any such thing, and the ironic agreement of its critics that it certainly is not.

It didn't seek, and doesn't seek, this role, to that extent its asseverations are true; but this is merely one more instance of the difference between what is aimed at and what is hit. The original idea, as conceived by the late A. N. Marquis, who founded it in 1897, was simply that it be a source of exact information, to be supplied by the subjects themselves, for the use of schools, libraries, newspapers, and scholars, about people likely to be frequent objects of inquiry. For a title, it is well known, of course, that he adapted to his purposes the title of the English "Who's Who," which had been published since 1848. What is not so well known is that this book, except for its title, bore almost no resemblance to the book Mr. Marquis had in mind. Until then, the English Who's Who was simply a handbook of official dignitaries, bearing more than a passing resemblance to the Social Register, the Royal Blue Book, and parts of the Statesman's Year Book, with no attempt at biography at all. Indeed, for most of the people it listed, there was little of a biographical nature to tell except their clubs, recreations, and degree of consanguinity with some noble lord; for the main point about them was their position, whereas Mr. Marquis was concerned, and indeed the whole American social scheme forced him to be concerned, with achievement. It is interesting to note that when his innovation prompted the English publishers to have a whirl at biography too, the change gained scant praise, so little that the change was regarded as a failure, and the editor responsible for it lost his job. Once accepted, though, it couldn't be discarded and crept steadily into the policy of the English book until even what a man had done began to take precedence over what he had been borne to. Of course, Mr. Marquis tried to standardize achievement as well as he could, so as to dissociate it from his personal opinion. Above a certain rank, in various fields of endeavor, such as the judiciary, the military, the Government, the academic faculty, and the like, the subject was listed ex officio. If he was an Army officer of specified rank or higher it made no difference whether he was a hero or not, whether Grant had relieved him at Cold Harbor, whether McKinley liked him: If he was of that general rank he was included in, if not, out. Industry, the liberal arts, and the learned professions had to be considered on an individual basis, since they did not, and do not, make rank a systematic matter, but here eminence in the main was a guide, and since it was easily ascertainable, selections were not difficult.

And yet, back of all this, in spite of the impersonality which Mr. Marquis imposed on himself, judgments had been passed, comparisons made, critical standards raised. If he explained that all Federal judges were in, regardless of what law schools they had been graduated from or which Presidents had appointed them, there would be those to demand by what right a judge assumed to be of more importance than the owner of a 30,000-acre ranch, or why playwrights, as a class, apparently took precedence over wholesale grocers, or admirals over contractors. Without his knowing it, there lurked in this stubby, red-bound book, which presently came off the presses with some 8,000 biographies listed, the elements of a storm which goes on, though eased by sensible changes and prestige that time has conferred, quite briskly to this day.

However, there was little indication, from the reception accorded volume 1, of the controversies that would ensue later. It was reviewed, and in the main favorably, and the sales permitted Mr. Marquis to go ahead with volume 2, his plan being to bring out a new edition every 2 years; but it was not, so far as inspection of old newspaper files shows, very hot news. And it doesn't seem to have occurred to many people that anything unusual in the way of a reference book had made its appearance. For one thing, the county history, or book of sketches in which persons of prominence were written up for some trifling sum like $150, were what the country was accustomed to in the way of brief biography, and while Mr. Marquis said no sketch in his book could be paid for, many assumed that this needn't be taken too literally; such statements, indeed, were in no way unusual in that era, even in patent-medicine advertising, but it was usually found that a quid pro quo, a contribution to a worthy cause, could be discovered somewhere along the line, for a little looking. Little by little, however, through hearsay and repetition and personal testimony, it began to seep into popular consciousness that the Marquis statement was true: You couldn't in the case of this book buy in. Then a great many Americans began to ask: "If you can't buy in, but at the same time you are in, what is the answer?" It wasn't long before they had it: "You are a success." The next step, as soon as popular consciousness began to stir editorial consciousness, was that the book did become hot news, but of a peculiar kind. For, in addition to national and international aspects, it had city, State, and even county aspects; it became as Gen. W. S. Hancock said of the tariff, "a local issue," and for much the same reason: It touched, directly and separately, every community in the land, for there was hardly one of them who didn't have somebody in it, if only some lawyer who had got himself appointed to an official body which carried ex officio listing for its members. Thus, as each new volume appeared, all papers carried page 1 stories about it, with lists of local boys who had made good, and special attention to new boys in the freshman class. Then the editorial writers took over, airing countless opinions about it, some of them favorable, others not. Among those against was Mr. H. L. Mencken, and his biennial remarks on the subject, first, in the Smart Set and, later, in the American Mercury, were awaited by all, and by none more eagerly, it was said, than the staff of Who's Who in America themselves.

Opinion, as it appears in American newspapers, need not be taken too seriously, for lying back of it is the fact that an editor is always up against it for something to write about, and finds it easier as a rule, as well as more entertaining, to knock than to boost. Thus many complaints were captious and some were waggish. Yet in the early years there runs through these criticisms a fairly consistent vein; the book gave far too much space, it was said, to obscure clerics, do-gooders, and professors in small universities, and too little to hustlers, comedians, and similar celebrities, really in the news. It may be conceded, I think, that this complaint was more than slightly founded on fact. Mr. Marquis, though I never knew him, had the reputation of being a godly man; his picture, as I look at it now, suggests more a bishop of one of the Protestant faiths than a lay publisher of books. And he constantly proved, by the policies he adopted, that he was profoundly impressed by education and the deference due to educators. From the beginning, the advertisements of schools, colleges, and universities were the only ones he would accept, this rule being still in force, so that an American, when he opens the English Who's Who and finds all sorts of blurbs, notices, and appeals scattered through it, and even stamped in gold on the cover gets a bit of a jolt.

And it must be conceded he was almost incredibly indifferent to stage, screen, and the other lighted arts. It was the limited interest shown in these fields, I think, which really annoyed commentators most, as the omissions were glaring. And yet now, I think it can be argued that this very austerity, whether by luck or some profound sagacity that guided most things Mr. Marquis attempted, had much to do with the position the book occupies today. For it is almost impossible to picture such a work, dedicated to the cafe society of the early 1900's, as commanding the confidence of intellectuals, and this confidence it had to have if it was to win general acceptance. Later, when rock-ribbed repute had been attained, would be time enough for broadening in places that had been too narrow. As a matter of fact, this liberalizing of the book has long since taken place. Mr. Wheeler Sammons, when he bought out Mr. Marquis in 1926, did not, so far as I know, make any radical changes. But he is a man of somewhat different temperament, more hospitable to the sophistications of life, and given to more contacts, so that he is probably in wider contact with his country than was his predecessor. He is said to maintain an organization, a set of advisors scattered all over, which makes it unlikely that any important subject be left out, and almost impossible that some inappropriate subject get in. Inappropriate subjects, from all one hears, are perhaps his chief grief. They lay siege to him in droves, by wire, by mail, by personal visit, and by importunities of their friends, trying to get themselves listed. It is surprising, however, how few downright absurdities have been placed on the roll.

The Sammons innovations are in no way dramatic, but they should be pondered by all who edit reference books, for they are corrective of the special ills that afflict reference books. The first, apart from the changes already noted, is the indication, in a clear, simple way, of the pronunciation of names about which there can be any doubt. To those who have struggled through musical reviews which assume familiarity with the most obscure titles, historical treaties which allude to forgotten personages without explaining who they were, or Britannica articles which quote, without translation, long passages of Latin—to all who have been annoyed by such phony pretensions of contributors, this gesture toward common sense is most refreshing. Often, due for lunch with some visiting fireman, one looks into Who's Who in America for information about him, and it is indeed most helpful, if he has some trick way of pronouncing his name, to know this in advance. And anyway, since names are often so arbitrarily pronounced, it is pleasant to be sure.

The second is the listing, begun some 10 years ago, of the subject's children, in addition to his marriages. This, as the effects accrue year after year and find their way into Who Was Who, will prove of enormous help to the American scholar, and not only lighten his labors but improve his work. As things stand now, information as to the descendants of some character of history is often maddeningly difficult to get, simply because the editors of reference books did not think to instruct their contributors, most of whom have the data at their fingertips, to include it. Such categories, for example, as our military families are not commonly the subject of easily located studies; their members flare into prominence briefly, then are little heard of until the next war, and articles about them are more concerned with military exploits than with sons, daughters, or in-laws. Seeking the kin of some general, one would give almost anything for a book that would list them definitely and quickly. Yet most books do not. The English Who's Who, careless at best on the question of marriage, is a complete blank on the subject of children: "1 s., 3d." is its idea of treating the subject; that "s." and "d.'s" might have names is a possibility nobody apparently thinks of. The Dictionary of American Biography, to take an instance on our own side of the water, is a complete wash-out in this respect. The subjects' marriages it often mentions but rarely in such fashion that one can be sure the subject is fully covered. Children figure in such remarks as, "A daughter, Clara, has written a memoir, My Father and Reconstruction," but as to whether Clara was an only child or had brothers and sisters one is usually left in the dark. The Sammons contribution, if it goes no further than Who's Who in America, will do much to relieve this state of affairs; if it is imitated, as it should be, it could have a considerable effect on American biography.

Sharing Mr. Marquis' interest in education, and concerned over practical methods of promoting it, Mr. Sammons instituted, in 1938, Who's Who in America biennial citations for educational philanthropy. This, like the book itself, is something of a local issue too, for the terms of the award are so devised that it will not become the exclusive possession of a few rich men giving to a few rich colleges. For the amount of the award is considered in relation to the amount of endowment held by the college which gets it, so that small donors to small colleges are as likely to be recognized as large ones to larger places, and in point of fact many have been so recognized. Indeed, one can assume that such a citation, whose effect is likely to be considerable, can have the result of channeling money into places where it is really needed, rather than encouraging it to pile up in places where there is a great deal of it already.

In the course of an ordinary writing day, one consults the World Almanac at least once, the Brittanica three times, the Webster Unabridged Dictionary six, but Who's Who in America, in my own case anyway, is thumbed every hour on the hour. This addiction, this habit of settling endless things, from the spelling of a name to the title of a song, by a quick look-see at an appropriate entry, goes back to my childhood, when I made the acquaintance of volume 1 in the year 1901, in my father's study at Annapolis, during a summer when I was supposed to be boning square root as a preliminary to a special promotion in school, but actually spent most of my time with this fascinating book, which told all about Roosevelt and Sampson and Schley and Dewey and McKinley and Bryan and other worthies of the era, as well as George W. Cable and James Whitcomb Riley, Joel Chandler Harris, and others lying closer to my heart, and transformed them from fabulous newspaper figures into flesh-and-blood human beings. This early association, long known to Mr. Sammons, is the reason for his suggestion that I contribute a preface—that and the circumstance that I am one of a brief list of persons mentioned both in Who's Who in America and Who Was Who in America.

My education, thus derived in no small part from these pages, has been invariably my entertainment too. I know of no book so endlessly absorbing as this, so full of surprises, so suitable to sporadic peeping or hour-long poring; if you are a stranger to it, I congratulate you, for many pleasant hours lie ahead, an adventure in self-improvement, though one, I am afraid, which is habit forming. It seems odd, as I make ready to wish it well on its second half century, to reflect that I shall not be here to see it make port at the hundred-year mark, and that Mr. Sammons won't, and that most of those now associated with it won't. But so great is its usefulness, so great its vitality, so profound its hold on the country, that I think we are safe in assuming that it will dock, on schedule, with full cargo. Bon voyage, then, red frigate of fortune, and may the passengers of the future match the distinction of those of the past, and of now.

JAMES M. CAIN.

National Security and Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article and five editorials from Wisconsin newspapers:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette of January 28, 1948]

REPRESENTATIVE BYRNES HAS CHANGE OF MIND, NOW FAVORS UMT—CONGRESSMAN SAYS HE BELIEVES TRAINING ESSENTIAL TO SECURITY

Representative JOHN W. BYRNES has announced that in light of present-day requirements for the adequate defense of the United States, he has changed his previous stand on universal military training, and now is in favor of such a program as vitally necessary to our national security.

In a 2,000-word statement issued this week, the Eighth District Republican Congressman declared that he has not arrived at this conclusion lightly, not without a great deal of study and soul searching, and said he wanted to explain the reasons for his change of mind in detail.

"I approached this problem by attempting to find the answer to just one question only. I tried to throw sentiment, emotion, and prejudice aside and arrive at a clear-cut answer to this question: Will universal military training make our Nation more, or less, secure?"

He went on to explain that he had expressed his opposition to peacetime conscription on many occasions, and that to him, as to many Americans, "the idea of drafting young men into military training during a time of peace has been repugnant" and "has gone against everything that my schooling and my instincts have taught me to believe."

Representative BYRNES also stated that universal military training was only one phase of a general program he sees as imperative for the future defense of this country.

"In preparing for a war that may come in spite of all of our efforts to prevent it, the only course open to us is to arm ourselves so strongly that not only would other nations hesitate to attack us because of our ability to strike back powerfully and swiftly, but so strongly that if we were attacked we could smash the assault quickly and surely," he declared.

"I wish to make clear that I am not discussing the type of warfare that is referred to by sensation-seekers as 'push-button' warfare," he said, adding that he was discussing the type of warfare which is possible today or in the next few years.

Other points in an all-around national defense program outlined by BYRNES included a powerful air force and air-borne troops who could defend against an air-borne attack against the United States and meet the initial blow; a cooridinated and highly efficient intelligence service; continuous scientific research and development; industrial mobilization; and unified armed forces.

But getting back to UMT, Representative BYRNES explained that reasoning process by which he had arrived at the conclusion that it is a necessary part of any adequate national defense program.

The first phase of the type of warfare possible today would be an attack through the air without warning, he said. The attack would be primarily against the great cities and would cause great destruction both to physical structures and people. And then he asked, "in such a war, where such a devastating initial attack is possible, what kind of armed forces do we need?"

First it is absolutely essential to have a highly trained body of men equipped with the latest weapons to meet this attack and be prepared to strike back to seize either advance bases for future operations or to follow up our own bombing offensive in the homeland of the enemy, BYRNES continues. And then, to defend against air-borne invasion of America, the only possible defense is "well trained reserve units in every part of our own country ready and able to meet possible invasion." These Reserve units, he points out, would also be needed to handle problems of evacuation, medical care, fire fighting and repair of essential communications and transportation.

"This will require large numbers of trained men organized into Reserve units," BYRNES declares. "To maintain such a large number of men in reserve units, it is my opinion that universal military training, which will give the rudiments of training to our young men for 6 months, then require that they join one of our reserved armed force units and train with it for a certain period, is essential and necessary. Our reservoir of trained men left over from the last war will not last forever. It must be constantly refreshed."

"Thus, straight logic, based upon a review of what is possible in the future, has led me to believe that universal military training is vitally necessary, in this era of uneasy peace, for our national security."

The Representative goes on to point out that UMT will cost money, and so will the other five points in an adequate defense. But he declares that "if it will prevent a war, or make us relatively more secure against attack, it is money which must be spent."

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 27, 1948]

REPRESENTATIVE BYRNES NOW BACKS UMT

It takes Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, of Green Bay, some 2,000 words to explain to his constituents why he has changed his

mind about universal military training and is now supporting it. But the effort is worth the words.

Mr. BYRNES, quite unemotionally and searchingly, examines the probabilities for the years immediately ahead. He concludes that America must remain strong militarily. By his own analysis and reasoning he comes to the conviction that, for the time being a program of universal military training is one prime essential to national security for which there is no adequate substitute.

Mr. BYRNES deserves whatever credit is due any man, particularly a man in his position, who can be convinced by facts and plain probabilities, even perhaps against his will. In now changing his stand, he shows that he is not one who blindly follows his preconceived notions or closes his eyes to changing conditions.

In making a forthright statement of his change of mind and the reasons for it, Mr. BYRNES shows political courage and integrity. Many Members of Congress, just as fully convinced of the necessity for military training as Mr. BYRNES, consider it politically inexpedient to voice their views. They are avoiding rather than seeking opportunity to commit themselves. They are trying their best to keep the whole question hushed up and pigeonholed until after election.

It remains to be seen whether all other members of the Wisconsin delegation in Congress will be as objective and as honest in dealing with this vital question as Mr. BYRNES has been. The voters have a right to know where every Representative and each Senator stands on this question, and why.

[From the Manitowoc Herald-Times of January 28, 1948]

MR. BYRNES ASKS A QUESTION

"I believe universal military training, as outlined in bills presently before Congress, is vitally necessary to our national security," JOHN W. BYRNES, Representative to Congress from this district, stated Monday.

A lot of people besides Mr. BYRNES have believed the same thing and for a much longer time. What makes his arguments worthy of comment is not so much that he favors UMT or even that he is a Federal lawmaker but that by his own admission, he has expressed his "opposition to peacetime conscription on many occasions * * * the thought of drafting young men into military training during a time of peace has been repugnant."

The Congressman was convinced of the necessity of UMT by reasoning apparently so homely and straightforward as to require no exposition. He said he merely asked himself the question: "Will universal military training make our Nation more or less secure." This formula sounds easy and is easy and arrives unerringly, inevitably at the answer "Yes, it will." Mr. BYRNES, after devoting to it more thought and time than most people, could not escape the distasteful, uncompromising truth.

Enemies of UMT cannot, will not, see it in this light, of course, the only one that makes sense. Instead, they attempt to befog the issue with the old, familiar arguments: Compulsory military training will inspire militarism in the population, dictatorship in the high places, and transform our Nation into an aggressor; it will corrupt the morals and education of our youth; it is an outmoded system, useless for defense in the atomic age; and it will cost too much.

The very manner in which they sidestep the fundamental question as considered by Mr. BYRNES suggests that, consciously or instinctively, UMT opponents are aware of it, but through certain inexplicable cerebrations are virtually incapable of meeting it head-on Obviously, they derive more satisfaction from manipulation of their own overextended dialectics than from realization of their country's security.

Admittedly, there are dangers in any military system—real dangers. A few of those mentioned above are far from mere fantasy. Considerable effort must be expended to forestall their development or at least minimize it. But quavering before these secondary hazards is the direct cause of our failure to defend against the primary threat, the menace to our Nation from abroad.

Those persons and institutions now so bitterly opposed to UMT should make a strenuous attempt to catch up with the times. Their ideas are the ones which are outdated. Their witless disregard of the world's war potentialities would be absurd if it wasn't conducive to national obliteration. Time is getting short in which they must ask themselves the question: "Will universal military training make our Nation more or less secure?"

[From the Appleton Post-Crescent of February 3, 1948]

REPRESENTATIVE BYRNES ON UMT

Representative BYRNES gained stature by his frank statement that he has changed his mind about universal military training, and now considers it a necessary part of our national defense program. His analysis of national preparedness in the light of present-day military tactics and weapons is an enlightened one devoid of the emotions, prejudices, and bias which so often confuse this great issue.

Mr. BYRNES did not have to come forth publicly now and state his position on UMT. He could have ridden the issue side saddle until it came up for a vote in the House. For that reason it is more to his credit that he announced openly to his constituents that he had changed his opinion.

In his analysis of present-day military needs of the United States, Mr. BYRNES pointed out a fact all too often passed by—the very great need for numerous and well-trained Reserve units of all the armed forces in modern-day warfare. He argues that universal training is the obvious method for recruiting young men for those Reserve forces.

The United States has always depended upon a civilian army to fight its battles. In wars past there has been time to train these civilian forces to some extent. In a future war there will not be time. Universal military training is proposed mainly as a method to train this civilian army while there is time—during peacetime.

Mr. BYRNES also points out what a valuable part such a trained young citizenry would play in case the United States were ever attacked with modern weapons, bombing from the air followed by air-borne invasion. The only defense is well-trained reserve units scattered throughout the country. They mean order instead of tumult, organization instead of chaos.

The Reserve units of our armed forces are in a neglected state at the present time. This is particularly true of Army Reserves which are not even reimbursed for inactive-duty training. They are expected to give their time and effort and put themselves forward as sturdy volunteers for the first ranks in event of a national emergency without reimbursement. The result has been as expected, a few handfuls of men with enough patriotism to do just that. But largely a paper army with great potentials but little to work with at any given time.

Mr. BYRNES sees today what the country must come to see—that all we acquired through our last excursion to the sodden fields of crimson was the acute necessity of an alert readiness for any eventuality, for treachery is now free to roam the earth.

[From the Marinette Eagle-Star of February 5, 1948]

CONGRESSMAN BYRNES DARES TO STATE HIS CONVICTIONS

Congressman JOHN W. BYRNES has received the plaudits of several newspapers of the Eighth Congressional District in recent days because he has had the courage to take a stand on two issues, neither of which will meet with the approval of many of his constituents.

Foremost is his declaration in favor of a universal military training program, in which he explains:

"As your Representative, I have expressed my opposition to peacetime conscription on many occasions. To me, as it must to all Americans, the thought of drafting young men into military training during a time of peace has been repugnant. It has gone against everything that my schooling and my instincts have taught me to believe. Yet today, I am telling you that I believe military training, as outlined in bills presently before Congress, is vitally necessary to our national security. I have not arrived at this conclusion lightly, nor without a great deal of study and soul searching."

He has taken the pains to explain at length why he arrived at this conclusion. But he could have avoided taking a stand on this momentous question at this time. More than likely Congress will delay action on universal military training in this, an election year. Yet in declaring himself for universal military training he has incurred the opposition of many mothers and fathers in the district who, whether by emotion or clear reasoning, do not favor it.

Similarly, he has invited opposition from constituents of Manitowoc by taking the position that Manitowoc should not have a new post office at this time. On this question he informed Manitowoc constituents:

"I have been outspoken in Congress against Federal building at this time. I have opposed it in other parts of the country; to be consistent, I must oppose it within my own district until there is a radical change in our present national fiscal situation."

Mr. BYRNES could have informed Manitowoc that he had the matter under consideration and would give it further attention—the well-known run-around answer—but he chose to be forthright. And he is to be greatly commended for it. The country needs a lot more Congressmen with the courage of their convictions.

[From the Denmark Press of February 5, 1948]

WE MUST BE REALISTIC

Last week JOHN W. BYRNES, Representative of Wisconsin, announced in a prepared statement that he had abandoned his opposition to peacetime conscription and considered universal military training "vitally necessary to our national security." BYRNES probably reflected the switch that most Americans had effected in their opinions on universal military training. In the first days after war's end we remembered the cost of unpreparedness. We realized the necessity for a defensive force that would turn to the aggressive at the earliest possible moment. So we grudgingly conceded that universal military training seemed the only answer.

Mothers and dads looked at sons. Today it was grade school—vacation days, and school days and dreams for futures; college or John Brown & Son in business. Somebody threw a straw upon the waters. It was the United Nations organization. We grasped for it, hoping against hope. No one dared to say aloud, but mothers kept that forlorn hope locked down deep within their hearts—"The war to end wars?" They

had heard it before. So, the UMT idea cooled, then was shelved. We had a new hope for security.

But now a different pattern has become clear. war with the socialist republic of Russia looms as a deadly possibility, UN has been sabotaged by a "veto" and the same forces that have worked within the darkest corners of aggressive nations since the beginning of time. Today most broad-minded men are accepting the facts as they stand and thinking as BYRNES does.

Our Congressman said in a widely lauded statement:

"In preparing for war that may come in spite of all of our efforts to prevent it, the only course open to us is to arm ourselves so strongly that not only would other nations hesitate to attack us because of our ability to strike back powerfully and swiftly, but so strongly that, if we were attacked, we could smash the assault quickly and surely.

"Our only course, therefore, is to develop an air defense that can break up such a sustained attack and an air offense which would cause any nation contemplating such an attack to think twice before bringing a rain of destruction down upon themselves.

"Air power, an efficient intelligence service, scientific research, industrial mobilization, and unified armed forces are agreed upon by students of national security as basic requirements.

"The only persons who disagree are those who either believe that we should disarm entirely * * * and those whose sympathies lie closer to other nations than to their own country.

"We must be realistic. We must grant to our potential enemies an intelligence equal to our own. The bare fact is that in future wars it is entirely within the realm of possibility that we shall be invaded by airborne forces who will have the same objective as our own striking force—to make it impossible for us to attack their homeland. We must be ready to crush such an invasion."

However, knowing all this, we, the little people, are praying too that the UMT program will not be a permanent feature of our way of life. A goal was shown to us once, Peace in Our Day. It has been reached before in the world's history. Some men have been blessed with a lifetime without wars and bloodshed. Something similar to the UN, we think, will be the only answer. We believe that preparedness will help us win the next war, it may even prolong the wait, until some nation thinks they have matched our power—but we doubt if strong armies ever prevented wars. We say this remembering what Hemingway wrote, "An aggressive war is the great crime against everything good in the world. A defensive war, which must necessarily turn to aggressive at the earliest moment, is the great countercrime. But never think that war, no matter how necessary, nor how justified, is not a crime."

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, more bureaucratic bungling resulting in higher prices, as well as loss to the harassed taxpayer, is revealed in the accompanying article by Mr. Mark Sullivan in the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle.

The administration renders lip service to the cause of lower food prices, but the moment an item starts to drop, they either step in and start buying or announce a program of future buying.

The truth is, of course, that they are playing politics with the food on our tables. They want to maintain high prices, both to present a false front of prosperity and at the same time lay at the door of Congress the responsibility for these prices.

In fundamental soundness, their approach ranks with that of the official who suggested the other day that the way to lick inflation was to control the prices of what one buys, but take controls off what he sells.

Mr. Sullivan's revealing illustration follows:

OPERATION BEE (A HONEY)

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON.—This story is—pardon the pun—a honey. Only it isn't a story in the ordinary sense; it's an account of a Government operation. In official jargon, you might call it Operation Bee. Essentially it consists of buying honey at 10 cents a pound and selling it at 5 cents.

The beginning of the story was last fall, and has to do with flowers, bees, and the weather. Because the summer was prolonged, flowers bloomed longer; the bees, obsessed by their natural instinct for industry, worked longer. The bees gathered more honey.

Normally this would mean more honey for consumers, and a lower price for it. Housewives could enjoy a gleam of cheer in the gloom of rising cost of living. But as the consumer smiled, the Department of Agriculture frowned.

It carries out a policy of price support for practically all farm products, from wheat to peanuts and honey. To support the price of honey, the Department made a formal announcement January 28, saying that it "plans to purchase up to 12,000,000 pounds of * * * dark-color, strong-flavor honey, meeting grade A * * * from beekeepers, assemblers, processors, or their authorized agents." While the Department says that "purchases will be made on an offer and acceptance basis," it indicates that the price paid will be up to 10 cents a pound.

Having bought the honey, the Department faces the problem of getting rid of it. A frequent disposition is to sell abroad, and this is to be done in the case of honey. The Department will sell to the State Department for use in the European-aid program, and to the Army for use in various parts of the world. The selling price, arrived at by an intricate calculation of calorie equivalence between honey and wheat, will be less than half what the Department paid.

Bees are a sturdy folk, equipped to defend themselves against interference. Yet the Department of Agriculture ought not to endure frustration by bees. It has an admirable and abundantly equipped Bureau of Entomology. Somewhere in that abundance of talent could not the Department devise some means, perhaps a surgical operation or some sort of governmentally planned breeding whereby a sufficient number of worker bees could be turned into drones?

Fair Warning to Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of February 10, 1948:

FAIR WARNING

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Congress has a duty to give every Communist in the United States fair warning of what to expect in law as the consequence of becoming a Communist. The House Committee on Un-American Activities is just now in the process of analyzing just what kind of law will do that best.

Obviously, the right law will state plainly that nobody can be a Communist and a good citizen, and that every Communist must register with the State Department as an agent of a foreign power.

Every Communist, whether he realizes it or not, is such an agent in fact.

John Foster Dulles, member of the United States delegation to the United Nations, quibbled on that issue in his testimony to the committee, as follows:

"In part, it (the Communist Party) is a clearly subversive organization subject to what Stalin calls the iron discipline of the party with respect to policies which are largely formulated by the Soviet Communist Party in Moscow.

"On the other hand, the Communist Party in some countries, notably France, Italy, and, to a lesser extent, the United States, draws into its ranks many who in no sense seek the revolutionary overthrow of our institutions * * * but who look to the Communist Party as a method of reform that will cure evils."

The difficulty, he said, is how to separate the two and distinguish one kind of Communist from another. "That," he concluded, "is a difficulty that I do not see clearly how to solve."

Well, it isn't the Government's problem to solve the difficulty. The Government's problem is to make the rules so that everybody can understand them. Then it is the problem of the man about to become a Communist to decide what he wants to be.

This country is full of radicals who don't know why they are radicals or where their radicalism is leading them. College kids, factory workers, bored housewives, rich ignoramuses with too much idle time and too little sense.

There are thousands and thousands of such people in the Communist Party and flirting around its precincts as fellow travelers.

In the hands of genuinely treasonable and clever agents—such as Red college professors, Red union leaders, and Red political experts—these dupes are as dangerous as any other Communists.

Dulles ought to know that. If he doesn't, let him read the official transcript of the Canadian spy ring's performance, as issued by the Government of Canada.

There it was shown how dim-witted people of just the sort Dulles attempts to excuse were led step by step from "reform" to espionage. They joined the Communist Party out of a sense of grievance against the world as they found it.

They became spies, enemies of their own government. Their assignment? Oh, merely

to help steal the atom bomb, a nice playful little gesture.

Ignorance of the law is no excuse, as everybody knows. Likewise, ignorance of the Communist Party's true aim is no excuse, either, for having joined or having played around with it.

But just to make sure, be absolutely fair and give every possible warning in advance to mushheads and silly sentimentalists who find the lure of communism so powerful, the law ought to be explicit and clear.

It should say: Every Communist, by the mere act of becoming a Communist, is an agent of a foreign power in the eyes of the United States Government. If you want to be such an agent, do so at your peril. And register at the State Department under the alien agents' registration law now already on the books.

That's plain enough for anybody to understand. It will give the Government of the United States a point at which to begin breaking the power of communism in this country. Is that an important power that needs to be broken?

Well, consider this fact: There are more Communists in the United States today than there were in Russia in 1918 when the Communist Party there took over the government of one-sixth of the earth's surface.

And another thing, communism offers nobody an escape from the ills of the world. It's time people like Dulles started coupling that truth to their statements about why the simple-minded turn to communism. Just because the Reds use high-sounding promises as "sucker bait" is no reason to let their stuff go unchallenged.

The test is not in the promises but in the performance.

The performance of communism is hideous oppression. Why doesn't Dulles say that at every chance?

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on February 14, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, another Lincoln Birthday has come and gone and the Nation once more pauses to admire and to revere the name of our foremost American.

As a founder of the Republican Party, Lincoln was the first Republican President. He has always appeared to me as the greatest of all Republicans.

I am an Abraham Lincoln Republican. That means I am against all those who champion the things he opposed, namely, greed, selfishness, and corruption in government.

I wonder what Lincoln would say if he appeared upon the Washington scene today? I wonder what he would do to the little Caesars, the petty dictators, the arbitrary power grabbers we now find everywhere.

You and I know he would throw them off their high and mighty thrones. He would brand them for what they are, the enemies of the people.

It would be fun being a Member of Congress under a Lincoln administration. How easy one would find it to gain his ear in proposing bills that benefit the people. How sympathetic would Lincoln as President feel toward some measure your own Congressman has introduced that helps the veterans, the aged, the unfortunate, and the downtrodden.

Instead of finding oneself against a stone wall of opposition, the Chief would doubtless come up to Capitol Hill and demand that Congress take immediate action on those things.

Proposals like the Hall veterans' bonus bill and pensions for men of World War I would probably go through like a house afire.

Yes; Abraham Lincoln was a leader who wanted to see rank-and-file Americans represented in Congress. He even served in the House a couple of terms himself.

I am proud to say to you that I won the right to represent you folks in the same way Lincoln did, by your votes, not by the decree of a little group of scheming, calculating, designing men, who get their heads together in a smoke-filled room, reeking with tobacco and the suggestion of skullduggery.

Like Lincoln, I want no part of the activities of these wire-pullers. They have always tried to crucify me, and had they been able to lay hands on me, would have succeeded long ago.

Fortunately, the power you friends bring to bear defeats their infamous objectives and permits your Congressman to proceed with his work unmolested. Your votes sent in my direction strike terror to the hearts of these plotters.

Letters written by my chief of staff recently appealing for financial support are already being accorded wonderful response. His message contained a dire warning that John L. Lewis is sending his stooges into the Republican primary this year to endorse and finance my opponent. This, of course, is a matter of record, announced sometime ago, and you people know what to expect.

John L. Lewis is fully as popular in our locality as red ants at a picnic. But he could hide behind some smooth-faced front man, willing to sell his soul for a mess of pottage. His cronies plan to spend a lot of money to defeat the people's representative from this district.

Plans of some other labor bosses call for assessing each union member $1 apiece to throw in the kitty and spend it to assassinate my character. They are even going so far as to demand $5 minimum from businessmen they can scare.

This is the lowest form of extortion. To take a dollar from an honest, patriotic working man or woman, to force them to deprive their families of $1 worth of food in these days of high living costs, is the most outrageous act I have ever known.

They cannot control their members' votes. If they could, they would have licked me 10 years ago. Why, then, should they reach into their pockets and grab their food money, their rent money, their cash that could buy clothes?

The answer is, they'll have tough going to collect this blood money. Most of the people they're taking money from are my friends. They've voted for me before and will again. They're going to resent these babies taxing them to build a campaign fund to fight me.

Yes; they're on the wrong side of that issue. They'll get an awful kick-back from that one and it will be harder than the cash they extort. It will smack them right between the eyes and on the nose.

I'm willing to wager they can't get away with it. I'm betting folks value their dollar bills too much. They would rather spend the money on America. They'd rather see their dollars used to save the country, not wasted to sabotage it.

Thank you.

Hinshaw Proposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of February 16, 1948:

HINSHAW SEES SEVEN WAYS UNITED STATES MAY BE STRUCK

Representative HINSHAW, Republican, of California, vice chairman of the congressional Aviation Policy Board, sees seven ways in which America may be hit by an enemy. He suggested seven things to do now as national survival insurance.

His remarks may be a preview of the military section of the board's report, which is due March 1.

While the political war rages over the world, HINSHAW says these things might happen here: (1) Unrelenting subversive activities; (2) undeclared war; (3) destructive epidemics; (4) local disasters of doubtful origin; (5) radiation contamination of public utilities; (6) strikes and slowdowns in key industries; (7) direct assault.

This is what he proposes to insure that the United States will remain the bulwark of freedom, justice, and democracy:

1. Isolation of subversives, while devoting a wholehearted effort to teaching the true meaning of America to all citizens.

2. Establishment of a universal system of technical and scientific education from kindergarten through college graduate courses.

3. Establishment of a universal physical-training program through sports and outdoor activities.

4. Removal of the National Guard from Federal control and reformation of it as a defense in depth organization.

5. Assignment of policing duties now given the National Guard to State police forces.

6. Creation of a single reserve system having Army, Navy, and Air Force units.

7. Creation of a continental command with the job of defending the continental United States.

Picketing Political Meetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Calumet region in Indiana is probably the most industrialized section in our country. Gary, Ind., the youngest metropolitan city in the United States, is the center of a huge steel industry. All the industrial workers in this area who have studied and familiarized themselves with the hidden provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, are opposed to it and are clamoring for its repeal. A great deal of misleading propaganda is being circulated among members of organized labor in an effort to convince them that the restrictions set out in this bill against union organization, collective bargaining, local union elections, restrictions against exercising their right of free speech, and so forth, is a concession to union labor. However, when the obstinate employer starts taking advantage of the numerous restrictive provisions of this act, the public will soon realize that the progress of union labor has been set back a quarter of a century.

The number one sponsor of the Taft-Hartley and Republican candidate for President of the United States, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, visited Gary last week. The CIO leadership, including Philip Murray, Joseph Germano, district CIO director of the Chicago area, and Joseph Goin, subdistrict director of the CIO in Indiana, are to be congratulated on publicly requesting that the thousands of workers in the Calumet region refrain from picketing the distinguished Senator while a visitor in our community. Labor unions in Gary, the No. 1 industrial city of America, refused to follow the ill-advised actions of groups in other areas of the country picketing the chief sponsor of the Taft-Hartley bill when he has been a visitor to their various communities.

I herewith repeat excerpts from an editorial by H. B. Snyder, of the Gary Post-Tribune, of February 13, 1948:

Senator TAFT'S visit to Gary and Lake County was a happy one from every standpoint. Particularly fortunate was the absence of any of the picketing that had been promised by labor. Some of the TAFT supporters were somewhat disturbed at the lack of the promised demonstration which they expected to advantage TAFT and not the picketers. Something of this feeling was doubtless felt by higher-ups in the CIO and may have been responsible for the orders to drop the program. It was apparent to anyone who gave the matter a moment's consideration that the chief beneficiaries of the demonstrations would have been the Communists who were reported to be lurking on the fringes ready to take any and all credit.

The Cow Versus Oleo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the subject of civil rights brings threats of secession from some southern States, the mention of oleomargarine creates an equal uproar in States like Wisconsin where we not only make the finest butter in the world, but feel that the American people are entitled to eat butter without danger of having colored oleo slipped over on them as a disguised substitute. As the case of Cow versus Coconut comes before this Congress, I desire to plead as a friend of the cow.

When I first came to Washington, I was amazed to notice that in restaurants and hotels of the Capital City, most people pushed aside their tiny plates of butter and left it untouched. But I wasn't amazed very long, for upon tasting the oily substance served up as so-called butter, I realized it was oleomargarine. I know that if Washington served the kind of butter made in any of Wisconsin's 2,600 licensed dairy plants, there would be no pushing aside of this valuable food, but hurried calls to waiters for more of that delicious product of America's dairyland.

Back in 1931, Wisconsin farmers organized and marched en masse on the State capitol at Madison to demand that the State legislature take action to protect Wisconsin from oleo. That march on the capitol was led by Joe Beck, a State commissioner of agriculture, who in his zeal to safeguard butter, got himself fined $250 when he defied a court order. But the march had the desired result, and laws passed that day in Madison still remain on the statute books.

Farmers of Wisconsin are opposed to any repeal of the oleomargarine color-tax that would permit its unrestricted production in imitation of butter. Farmers have no objection to peanut butter, jellies, and jams—all used as spreads for bread—for they are not manufactured and colored to look exactly like butter, and so cannot be palmed off on the unsuspecting public as butter.

At the present time, oleo is cheaper than butter. But while butter can be made on any farm and is manufactured commercially in 18,000 American dairy plants so that its price is governed chiefly by demand, oleo is manufactured in only a small number of plants and a virtual monopoly exists, which could charge any price it wished if the public had no way of knowing by sight that it was being offered an inferior product that seemed to be butter.

Economically, the proposal to do away with butter and substitute oleo is unsound. At the present time, 40 percent of the beef and veal of the Nation is derived from the dairy industry. Even the oleo manufacturers cannot do without milk, and have to use it for 15.6 percent of their oleo or their entire efforts to imitate butter will fail. Our supply of leather—even the supply of fertilizer that every farmer needs on his acres—depends in great part on dairy herds.

First it was animal fat mixed with milk, water, and coal tar that Napoleon III tried to substitute as butter for his troops in the Franco-Prussian War. Then oleo was made from coconuts. Finally cottonseed oil and soybean oil are being used. But in all these operations it has been necessary to use milk, to get a product that anyone would eat. It is estimated that if no oleo had been manufactured last year, over 2,000,000 more cows would have been needed to produce the butter, and it goes without saying we could have used the meat and leather that would have resulted from that increase.

In conclusion, I would like to include an authoritative editorial on this subject from a recent issue of Hoard's Dairyman, Wisconsin's leading publication devoted to the dairy industry which is widely circulated throughout the Nation:

OLEO TAX ONE-FOURTH CENT

"Margarine TAX" is the title of an editorial which recently appeared in the Washington Post. In the main, the editorial condemns the tax imposed upon oleomargarine. It emphasizes when butter reaches a dollar a pound that it is necessary for people to use some substitute. The editorial says the revenue obtained from discriminatory excises is negligible. The reader is reminded that the public pays the taxes imposed upon margarine.

It is clearly evident the writer of this editorial is not a student of why a Federal tax is imposed upon oleomargarine. We have often stated that the Federal Government lacks police power; its taxing power is unlimited. Prior to the enactment of the Federal law, oleomargarine in many places was selling—and is yet—as butter and at near butter prices. The consumer has a right to know what he is purchasing and what he is eating.

The tax of 10 cents a pound on oleomargarine colored in semblance of yellow butter is to stop the sale of this product. The tax should be higher. Natural-colored oleomargarine is taxed but one-fourth of a cent a pound, not for the purpose of adding to its cost but to create enough revenue from this source to pay for suppressing the fraud committed when oleomargarine is sold as butter. A tax of one-fourth cent a pound is placed on renovated butter for the same reason. Adulterated butter is taxed 10 cents a pound, the idea being to stop its sale.

No complaint can be entered when only one-fourth of a cent a pound tax is levied on oleomargarine. This doesn't add a great deal to the cost of oleomargarine. Forcing it to sell on its own merits helps to reduce its price far more than the tax which the Federal Government has levied. We well remember when oleomargarine was sold as butter, even from stores. Today it is served in the color of yellow butter when customers at hotels and restaurants ask for butter.

It seems to us the dairy industry has a right to protect its products and to require all other products used in the place of any dairy product to sell upon their own merits and not masquerade as a milk product.

Further, butter at a dollar a pound is not relatively higher than wages which the farmers are paying. Any tradesman who comes to the farm today to work for the farmer wants $1.25 to $1.50 an hour; some will want $2 an hour. It requires about 1 hour's work to produce a pound of butter from the average herd in this Nation.

We realize, of course, what people want are high wages and cheap commodities. Well, there isn't any such animal.

Accomplishments of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following report from the Los Angeles Daily Journal of January 30, 1948, of an address by senior United States Circuit Judge Orie L. Phillips, of Denver, before the

Los Angeles Bar Association. Judge Phillips points out the accomplishments of the United Nations during the short time it has been functioning, and he warns against loss of faith in this organization because of impatience and failure to appraise its potentialities for accomplishment from a long-range viewpoint.

The common people of the world devoutly hope for peace but have lost faith in the United Nations as a vehicle for its achievement, senior United States Circuit Judge Orie L. Phillips of Denver told the January meeting of the Los Angeles Bar Association yesterday at the Biltmore.

The leading jurist of the Tenth Judicial Circuit urged that those who hope not lose their faith in the great world congregation of nations.

"It seems to me that those who lost faith in the effectiveness in the United Nations and those who regard it as impotent have been disappointed in its failure to accomplish more in a short time, have been blinded by impatience, and have failed to appraise from a long-range viewpoint its potentialities for accomplishment," he said.

The Federal jurist pointed out that he had told the annual meeting of the American Bar in 1944 that the goal of ordered justice under law among nations might require decades to accomplish.

"In attaining the objective of justice under law among nations," the speaker continued, "we must, of necessity, interpose international control by a body of international law with means to enforce it."

FORCE THE WRONG WAY

"In reaching that objective we must not move so fast as to provoke war. And, we must not move so slowly as to permit any aggressor to provoke war. Perhaps, we are compelled by the present world situation to take the risk of moving too rapidly in our effort to impose international control.

"Again, while I would strengthen the United Nations, we must not hope that the proper solution of all controversies can be compelled by force.

"We have not reached that stage as to every character of domestic dispute. For example, in labor disputes we have not deemed it wise to compel submission to adjudication, even where processes of negotiation, conciliation, or arbitration fail.

"In the early stages of a world community lacking in cohesiveness and unity and made up of many nations varying widely in their traditions and ideologies, their religions, and their governmental systems, we can only hope, by an evolutionary process, to bring about compulsory adjudication of every character of international controversy and compliance with such adjudication by force.

"Further, the moral suasion which will be engendered by a righteous opinion expressed by a great majority of the members of the General Assembly may be more compelling than military force."

TELLS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Judge Phillips declared he did not believe any nation, no matter how powerful, would long continue a course of conduct condemned by a majority of the General Assembly of the United Nations. No nation, he asserted, would likely take the risk of being placed in the role of a world outcast.

Much more has been accomplished in the 2 years since the Charter of the United Nations came into force than realized, Judge Phillips pointed out. Specifically, he referred to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance adopted by 19 American Republics at Rio de Janeiro on September 2, 1947, and which agreement supplemented the agreement of Chapultepec.

The signers represent more than one-third of the members of the United Nations and the agreement specifically outlaws war and aggression and defines aggression in clear-cut language.

"Thus, what shall constitute an act of aggression is not left to ex post facto debate on political levels," the speaker said, "as under the Charter, and action by the organ of consultation will remove threats of aggression, and is not subject to a minority veto, as is action by the Security Council under the Charter."

The speaker also cited the fact that the United Nations has begun organizing the field of international law. A committee created by the General Assembly is busy formulating definite plans for the development and the eventual statement of international law in a form suitable for the postwar world.

With World War III smoldering in many places throughout the world, the UN has taken specific action in many instances to combat impending trouble such as in Korea and in Greece, where a committee was sent to investigate guerrilla warfare charges.

He also pointed out that the General Assembly of the UN by unanimous vote adopted a resolution condemning any and all war propaganda. The Security Council also directed the partitioning of Palestine.

President Paul Fussell presided and Delvy T. Walton headed the program committee.

What the Government Knows About You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, with the increasingly complex nature of our present economic set-up, it has become customary for various Government departments, from time to time, to issue statements with regard to the apparent supply and demand of certain commodities. Such statements may or may not reflect the true facts in the degree that they can be traced to propaganda designed by pressure groups for their particular benefit.

It has occurred to me that reports and statements issued by the Government, which are of vital concern to the housewife, the merchant, and business generally, if submitted to the Bureau of the Census before being published, would be more likely to present actual conditions and be less likely to cause confusion in the buying and selling markets.

An article which appeared in the July 1946 issue of Nation's Business, by Junius B. Wood, entitled "What the Government Knows About You," bears out my contention, and I wish to include it here as an extension of my remarks:

WHAT THE GOVERNMENT KNOWS ABOUT YOU

(By Junius B. Wood)

You're no forgotten man. No, indeed, brother. Board chairman or bindle stiff, the bureau boys have your number. Your past may seem dreary, but it isn't dark.

This is the open season on the forgotten man. A national election is in the offing. The bleeding hearts and aching lungs of candidates rally the voters to the hustings to rescue the Homo Americanus which they label the forgotten man.

But don't worry, little man, you're not forgotten. Not even if you're only a tiny human atom in the big United States. Your only elbow-rubbing with the world of strangers may be while swaying on a strap in an overcrowded city bus or when buying a slab of bacon at a lonesome trading post, but Washington knows where you are and more about you than you imagine.

You're indexed and cross-indexed by a Government which never destroys a record. Even the knights of the road who cook their cinder-blown can of evening stew in a hobo's jungle, without worries over punctures or finding another $50 hotel room after 5 days, are not forgotten.

Government surveillance of the individual's finances is familiar to any citizen who can rattle two coins in his pocket and voice his right to gripe at public spending. Not so well known is our Government's diligence in cataloging every individual within its borders. A Government which counts the birds, fishes, and rats—123,000,000 of the latter by the last census—and keeps track of their summer and winter outings, should know about the human beings. You may think you're a forgotten man but the odds are 500,000 to 1 that your name and address and a wealth of personal information appears more than once in the interminable miles of Government filing cabinets.

If you've done any eating in the past 5 years—and that includes everybody in the United States—the Government has you indexed. Even those who did not reach the "da da" gurgling age got a ration book. Parents attended to that. The only ones who ate without benefit of a book, though their names were listed, were members of the armed forces and inmates of institutions. An individual who dined exclusively in restaurants could exist without one, but few neglected the opportunity to have such a useful article of legal tender.

In countries like the Soviet Union and former dictatorships, where police assiduously scrutinize every individual's domestic affairs, a card of identification is as necessary as wearing apparel. The ration book—rationing started with tires in January 1942—was the first break in American resistance to such state control of the individual. Americans accepted rationing as a wartime necessity to conserve and distribute food equitably. Others realized its possibilities for control of the individual but rationing ended, except for sugar, before that control reached the extreme of denying ration cards to the politically undesirable and leaving them to starve, as in some countries.

Being a Federal permit to purchase food, a ration book was valid in any part of the country. Its holder got it from the local ration board in the district where he resided on the date the series was issued. States and even merchants quickly realized its utility as a card of identification. The public had accepted regimentation as an obligation and officialdom followed with more burdens.

The OPA records each of the four issues of ration books as around 132,000,000, a total well over half a billion. While a book carried only the name and residence of its holder, the latter's age and sex also were recorded in OPA files. Millions of changes came with each series. The files showed the moves of every resident, citizen, or foreigner in the country.

In fact, the Census Bureau checked the records of the 1943 books to show a wartime population movement of 27,000,000 persons since 1940—the greatest mass migration movement in history in so few years, equal to the combined populations of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey and greater than the entire rural population of the Nation.

In addition to telling everybody how much they should eat, the Government fixed the temperature for their homes and offices, decided how far they could drive their cars and who should have a pair of shoes, rubber

boots, new or second-hand tire, stove, automobile, bicycle, or typewriter. OPA reports 28,000,000 on its lists for gasoline, 11,000,000 for fuel oil, 30,000,000 for tires, and the remainder of 100,000,000 for certificates for other commodities.

What OPA knew about holders of food ration books was primitive compared to its data on the past life and daily doings of anybody who received a certificate for other rationed goods. Much of it was immaterial and personal prying by a comparative few of the 100,000 volunteer and paid employees who relished their sip of dictatorship and tried to make things difficult for themselves and for the helpless citizen.

The dossiers in the filing cabinets of the Social Security Board are a close second to OPA. The information on each individual is much more detailed. SSB has the facts on 86,000,000 workers whose wages are posted. Of these, 75,000,000 are on what it designates as the active list. Its records are continuous from January 1, 1937.

Those who work for themselves or are casual, farm, domestic or government workers or under the Railroad Retirement Board, are not included. With these exceptions, SSB has a wealth of information on everyone, American citizen or not, who has earned $50 in 3 months by working in this country or on an ocean-going ship flying the American flag. A social-security card and number will be issued to an unemployed person if the personal information which the Board requires for its files is supplied.

Under a Fair Employment Practice Act, if New York State is taken as an example, a private employer is forbidden even to ask some of the questions for which the Social Security Board requires written answers.

Its complete list is: 1. Name used now. 2. Address. 3. Name at birth. 4. Age. 5. Date of birth. 6. State, county, and city where born. 7. Father's full name and whether dead or alive. 8. Mother's full name before marriage. 9. Sex. 10. Color, specifying whether white, black, or what other. 11. What name was used in any previous application for social security or railroad retirement. 12. Employer's name or whether unemployed. 13. Date. 14. Signature.

REPORTS ON CHANGED NAMES

Social security has a double record of every worker as both employer and employee report. Taxes for both are paid by the employer to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which also has its dual record. SSB will not disclose the earnings of an individual and says that the serial number and information collected are merely for identification. Employers are under no such obligation, however, and authorities often find a social-security number helpful in locating a missing person.

SSB insists that its solicitude over names, past and present, is not to aid sleuthing. The name tracing is for a more romantic purpose, namely: to protect the savings of absent-minded women who change their names by marriage or divorce, get a new card and number, and forget to notify SSB of the happy event.

Since it started keeping records in 1933, to the end of 1945, United States Employment Service has recorded the name, address, telephone number and other facts on 163,354,000 applicants for jobs. These are exclusive of 500,000 on the national roster of scientists and specialists which interested the late President Roosevelt. March of this year may be typical of 1 month's grist for USES with 1,163,000 applications of which 697,000 were veterans and 216,000 women, and 453 placed in jobs.

As the first object of USES is a quick turn-over, the names are not a dependable permanent record. Millions are duplications and temporary addresses. In addition to what each applicant writes down on occupation, education, and training, age, birthplace, race, marital status, and military service, there is an oral examination.

The figures portray current national labor conditions as each State depends on USES records for its unemployment and other benefit payments.

Most of the wage earners who are not listed by Social Security are registered in other official pension and retirement organizations. The largest group that is not cataloged by either OPA or SSB is in the armed services. However, those in service at present are not more than 5 percent of the 47,833,000 men registered by selective-service boards from 1940 to January 1946. As men up to 65 years of age were registered in 1942, this produces another Government agency with a file of the entire male population between the ages of 18 and 99 years.

DETAILS FOR THE DRAFT

Selective-service data on each individual is much more detailed than in any other registration. It specifies which of 419 occupations or trades, or 35 professions, he follows. It explains further whether he works for himself, his efficiency in his job, his education, including familiarity with foreign languages, and much more. All is put on individual cards, keyed to classifications.

Much of this remains in the Government files as out of 48,000,000 registered, only some 34,000,000, between the ages of 18 and 45, were notified to report. More data was added to their information sheets, until finally, allowing for occupational and physical deferments and rejections, some 13,000,000 were inducted into the service.

In addition to being indexed, numbered, tagged, and psycho'ed, the lads and lassies in military service also are among America's fingerprinted millions. The fingerprints of nearly half the population of the United States are in the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington.

Fingerprinting had difficulty living down its unsavory birth as a means of crime detection. Also, as the identification records are kept by the Nation's largest crime prevention agency, many associated fingerprinting with a suspicion of past crimes or future escapades.

Records of the FBI show, however, that by now the prints of sinners are a very small fraction of the total in its files. The Bureau has the prints—five fingertips of each hand—of 65,000,000 residents of the United States. About 6,000,000 of these have been furnished by police departments, of persons who have been arrested for some offense. Many of them were not convicted. About 15,000 are tough birds still on the wing who can be identified if they leave the trace of a single finger when making an uninvited call. Being the international exchange center, it also has a few thousands from 89 other countries and provinces.

The 6,000,000 have grown from 810,188 cards, which started the Bureau in 1924, mostly from Chicago and from the Federal prison in Leavenworth, Kans. The other 59,000,000—individuals with clean records—started from scratch. War speeded up the collection with compulsory fingerprinting of not only men and women in the armed forces but of Government employees, workers in defense plants, and close to 5,000,000 aliens in the country.

In addition to this permanent identification of half the population, various States and cities go in for it. When not all 10 fingers are on the uniform type of card, FBI rejects their offerings. Postal savings banks print the four fingers, exclusive of the thumb, on the right hand of each depositor. There are 4,100,000.

Some States and cities require two- or five-finger prints from taxi drivers, holders of gun permits, public employees, persons in the liquor business and other specified occupations.

FBI's records are purely for identification. They do not record occupations though a card does show where the individual was employed when the print was made. Such information would be given only to public law enforcement officers. An employer is not told whether a new employee has a record or has changed his name. But if the individual is wanted, though years have elapsed, the city or county will be notified. That often happens.

PRINTS HELP IDENTIFY

The individual who has a police record has a good reason for not being fingerprinted. There are some reasons why the other 59,000,000, even when not required for a job, put their loops and whorls on a card. In the armed forces, they identify casualties, discourage the old trick of fitting out a spy with a prisoner's uniform and dogtag, and prevent frauds. In civilian life, they can identify victims of amnesia, accidents, or sudden death and unmask imposters.

With all this finding out how the people use their time, and comparatively few need to be watched because they are misbehaving, the Government is even more thorough in keeping track of what they are doing financially. Telling anybody about taxes may be as useless as introducing a man to his grandfather. Everybody is his own expert, so it will be brief.

Income tax returns are filed by more than 50,000,000 individuals and firms each year. About one-fifth of these are tax exempt. In addition, the Bureau of Internal Revenue receives nearly 15,000,000 quarterly declarations every 3 months and 92,000,000 income-tax withholding receipts and about the same number of separate social-security reports in a year. All are cross-checked in its New York City office where each of the 50,000,000 names is indexed.

Of the income and excess profits total collected last year, 58 percent was paid by individuals, or four times what corporations contributed. That means a name for almost every household.

The Internal Revenue Code provides a year's imprisonment and $1,000 fine for unlawfully disclosing information from a tax return. Section 55 specifies: "Returns constitute public records, but, except as hereinafter provided in this section, they shall be open to inspection only upon order of the President and under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary (of Treasury) and approved by the President."

One of these rules is that each year, the Secretary publish a list of each person who received $75,000 or more in salary, bonuses, or commissions from a corporation. The Ways and Means Committee of the House, the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the Department of Justice may inspect any return. The 32 States which levy additional income taxes have the same privileges within State limitations. Also, any holder of 1 percent or more of a corporation's stock can inspect its return. All are subject to the same penalty for making the information public. Anybody can find out whether an individual or corporation has filed a return, but not the amount.

BUSINESS IS CATALOGED

While private snoopers cannot get information, the Government has the essential financial facts on every business in the country. The individual is no longer required to report securities which did not pay dividends or the names of corporations which did pay. However, the New York office can get the information by cross-checking from the corporation's report.

Any of 26,000,000 rural toilers, and on a farm everybody works, overlooked by the Internal Revenue Bureau does not escape the Census Bureau's tabulations for the Department of Agriculture and its Triple-A and other bureaus. The country has 6,000,000

farms, a decrease of 90,000 since 1940, embracing 1,140,000,000 acres of which 352,000,000 were in crops in 1944.

To encourage production, the Government guarantees that the six major crops—wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, tobacco, and cotton—will receive 90 percent of parity prices (cotton, 92½ percent) until 2 years after war officially ends. It also fixed marketing quotas, now ended except for tobacco.

This gigantic regimentation of agriculture is kept up to date by 3,000 County Agents who watch the buds and beasts on every farm. A chart of each farm is in Washington. Though many controls are removed, crops still are a concern of a Government which decides not only how much its people shall eat but how much and what food shall be grown.

DREAM OF STATISTICIANS

Finally comes the statistician's dream of heaven—the Bureau of the Census—with thousands of clerks poring over miles of tables, adding and sorting machines humming through the day, parading columns of nine figures across endless white pages until finally another report emerges on the prosaic or eccentric doings of the millions of human beings in the American ant hill.

Every time a year ends in zero, the Bureau gives the body politic a complete check-up. In interim years, it takes censuses of manufactures, agriculture, religions, vital statistics, automobile accidents, cities, and many special subjects.

In the big canvass, it lists the name and address of everybody, from the cradle to the grave, and 30 more facts of possible interest about each one, including race or color, wages or salary, and whether more than $50 came from other income. With straw poll technique, it has 15 supplementary questions for 5 percent of the inhabitants—parents' birthplace, mother tongue, military service, social security, trade or profession, and whether women have been married more than once, age at the first venture, and number of children.

In 1787, the founding fathers put a section in the Constitution requiring a census every 10 years to apportion Representatives and taxes for each State. That was all they foresaw, but Government, insatiable in making work, has added questions through the years until a national census indexes even the thoughts of the population.

In the last census, 1940, the army of enumerators put down close to 132,000,000 names. An unnamed 7,000,000 have been added since. Each name is transferred to a 45-column card in which holes are punched according to the data on the individual.

Tabulations are made at close to lightning speed by electrical contact through any selected hole in a card. As there are eight series of cards with the same names on several series, the 132,000,000 blossomed into more than half a billion cards.

CENSUS SHEETS ARE PRESERVED

Once the tabulations are completed, this pasteboard mountain is destroyed. The enumeration sheets, around 4,000,000 for the last census and each larger than a newspaper page, are preserved. These sheets for every census, from 1790 to 1870, with the name and data on everybody who could be found in the United States, are in the ornate National Archives palace in Washington.

Those for the seven later censuses are in the big concrete offices of the Bureau in Suitland, Md., and, astonishingly, are consulted daily. The Bureau searches these old records for the answers to an average of 200,000 requests a year for information which they alone can supply.

In most cases, it is needed to get a birth certificate, citizenship papers, an old-age pension or a passport or to prove the nationality of parents. The Bureau does not sort its millions of names alphabetically but keys its records by States, counties, townships, municipalities, wards, streets, and house numbers or rural locations. If an inquirer does not know his old address when the census was taken, and about half of them don't, the Bureau cannot supply the information.

After all this cataloging of Americans—OPA, 132,000,000 listed; Social Security, 86,000,000; USES, 168,000,000 listings; Selective Service, 48,000,000; FBI, 65,000,000; Postal Savings, 4,100,000; Internal Revenue, 50,000,000; AAA, 26,000,000; and Census, 139,000,000—old Diogenes would need a radar lantern to find a forgotten man in the United States.

Reece Calls on Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of February 16, 1948:

TWO-PARTY SYSTEM FOR SOUTH URGED BY GOP CHAIRMAN—REECE CALLS ON TRUMAN TO STAVE OFF DEMOCRATIC FILIBUSTER ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Chairman Reece, of the Republican National Committee, yesterday urged a two-party system in the South as one way of preventing what he called infringements upon civil liberties.

He also challenged President Truman to urge Democratic Senators from the South not to filibuster against antilynching, anti-poll-tax, and other administration-recommended civil-rights proposals when they come up for action.

GOP EFFORTS PRAISED

Southern governors and legislators have denounced the President's 10-point civil-rights program. It calls for no segregation in transportation and Federal guaranties against discrimination in employment because of race.

They are talking of withholding Dixie's electoral votes from the President as one means of retaliation.

Reece, in a letter to 20,000 Republican officials and party workers, credited the Republican Party with originating most measures in the Nation's history for promoting civil liberties.

He added that Democratic filibusters in recent years had blocked all Republican efforts to put through antilynch, anti-poll-tax, and fair-employment-practice measures.

"Just now," he said, "there are some rumblings from the deep South indicating a growing realization that the un-American, one-party system is injurious to everyone, including its presumed beneficiaries.

"It is to be hoped that eventually an enlightened self-interest will put an end to this anachronism in certain of our Southern States."

Reece is a former Congressman from the Republican First District of Tennessee. He said many of the President's recommendations "are duplicates of proposals which Republican Members of Congress have been seeking to enact into law for many years."

COMPARED WITH RUSSIA

He asserted that infringements upon civil liberties "are nearly always to be found where a one-party system prevails."

"Though there may be differences in degree," he went on, "that principle would apply, regardless of whether the party bears the Communist name, as in Russia, the Nazi label in Germany, the Fascist label in Italy, or the Democrat label in Mississippi."

The Dilemma of the East-West Trade in Europe: Will the Machine Products Sent From Western Europe in Exchange for Grain Too Dangerously Strengthen the Hand of Moscow Satellites?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the iron curtain has cut Europe politically in half. We also know that agriculturally the eastern part of Europe has traditionally been interdependent with the industrial west. Over 70 trade pacts have been entered into by the east and west since the end of the war. The west needs the food from the east: But when England, France, and the other nations of the west are shipping machinery to Poland, Bulgaria, and the other satellite countries, it should be done with the full knowledge that such shipments are intended by Moscow and its puppet governments to fit into the over-all Soviet plan; that plan is to strengthen the Communist-dominated governments further rivet them to the Politburo. The eyes of the west should be wide open to these deals. Following is an excellent article from the February 14, 1948, issue of America:

EAST-WEST TRADE AND EUROPEAN RECOVERY

(By Tibor Fayzs)

The European recovery program is based on the assumption that in the next 4 years eastern and western Europe will gradually resume a normal pattern of trade. This is a factor in the calculations of both the general report of the Committee on European Economic Cooperation, resulting from the Paris Conference of 16 European governments, and the message of President Truman to the United States Congress on the Marshall plan, December 19, 1947.

But Communists everywhere are inimical to the European recovery program. In September 1947 the Communist Parties of nine European countries held a conference in Warsaw which resulted in the announcement of the formation of the Communist Information Bureau, the Cominform. A manifesto was made public which stated: "The Truman-Marshall plan is only a farce, a European branch of the general world plan of political expansion being realized by the United States of America in all parts of the world."

Since the Cominform came into existence, a great deal has been done by Communists both beyond and behind the iron curtain to wreck European recovery and to hasten the advent of a Communist continent. Still, east-west trade in Europe, a basic assumption in the calculations for the ERP, has not stopped. In fact, it is on the increase. According to a dispatch of World Report, dated December 30, 1947, there are at present 71 bilateral trade agreements in force between east and west. At present, however, these represent, at a yearly rate of $1,400,000,000, only 30 percent of the volume of prewar trade. Curiously, there seems to be even more anxiety on the part of some eastern European countries, such as Poland and Czechoslovakia, than on the part of western Europe to maintain trade relations with the United States and Britain.

This would apparently indicate a Communist inconsistency between political and economic policy. But an analysis of the Communist strategy in Europe as it unfolds from recent events, both west and east of the iron curtain, might shed some light on the issue.

In the west, the French and Italian Communists—the only two western groups which were among the founders of the Cominform—have been on the offensive since the latter part of 1947. In France, however, the Communist attempt to tie up the national economy through strikes was unsuccessful. Many workers refused to answer the call for strike, and about 1,000,000 members of the Communist-dominated CGT (General Confederation of Labor) have set up a non-Communist organization, the Force Ouvrière, under the leadership of Léon Jouhaux. On the political side, the considerable support of General De Gaulle's RPF (Rally of the French People) in the municipal elections shows a waning of the French voters' enthusiasm for the Communists. (In the last two national elections the Communists received about 30 percent of the total vote.) In Italy, the Communists followed the familiar pattern of strikes, political agitation, and violence. But there are no Communist gains of consequence here, either. The goal of one Communist section for every church tower has not yet been reached, according to a recent announcement by Pietro Secchia, the chief of party organization. Communists, however, do not as a rule attain power through democratic majorities.

As to its continental strategy, there is little evidence that the Cominform was hoping for victory in France or in Italy before the end of 1947. Activities in these two western countries were more in the nature of preliminary skirmishes. Before a full attack can take place in the west, the eastern European hinterland must be solidified.

The Communists still feel the need for "mopping-up operations" in at least some of the countries of the region, both in domestic politics and in the national economies. In addition, they wish to consolidate the political and economic relations of the eastern European governments both with the Soviet Union and with each other. A further task is the regulation of trade relations with the rest of the world, particularly with the western European participants in the ERP.

Admittedly the countries of eastern Europe are Communist-controlled. Investigation into their domestic politics, however, shows that the claim that they are ruled by coalition or "National Front" governments may be granted some validity, proceeding from south to north in the region. Of course, Communists occupy everywhere the key positions. But while Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Rumania are, for all practical purposes, one-party States, Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia are not—as yet. The Peasant or Agrarian Parties, the Socialists, and other non-Communists in the governments are the left wings of those prewar parties. It has been a question of survival—often only a temporary survival—to follow the Communist lead. However, for some time these parties seem to have had a mollifying effect on Communist decisions. It should be noted that the last genuine Peasant leaders, in or out of the governments, such as Petkov of Bulgaria, Maniu of Rumania, Mikolajczyk of Poland, were eliminated only quite recently. More recently, even Alexander Obbov, a left-wing Peasant leader in Bulgaria who seemed to have been a docile Communist collaborator, was shoved into the background.

As to the Socialists, in Rumania the formation of a single Workers' Party of the Communists and Socialists is scheduled for early February. Socialists in Poland and Hungary, though left-wing Socialists, of course, have been able so far to resist the Communist "invitation" to fusion. In Hungary the two parties had separate election slates. The Czech Socialists remain relatively independent. Many large trade unions in these countries are still under socialist, and not Communist, leadership. The rank and file of trade unionists have opposed the attempts at fusion. Also proceeding in the south-north direction, one finds minor opposition parties still tolerated. Thus the Communist job in the domestic politics of eastern European countries is still not fully completed. Undoubtedly, however, the Communists are doing their best. They know that to carry out their plans they must accelerate their pace, for, in view of the recovery program, time is definitely against them.

In international politics, there is unqualified orientation toward the Soviet Union as the great power upon which alone the democratic countries of eastern Europe can rely. The United States is denounced as imperialist. And the British labor government is aiming at hiding the true face of imperialism behind the mask of democracy and Socialist phraseology. Another significant development is the rapidly expanding system of treaties for political, economic, and cultural cooperation among the governments of this region. This development also follows a south-north direction. It began with the closest collaboration, to the point of customs unions, between Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. It continued with the extension of the network of treaties to Hungary and Rumania. There are signs of further developments, involving Czechoslovakia and Poland. The ultimate plan for an Eastern European Confederation is not denied, but is rather termed the "music of the future" by no less a Communist than Premier Georgi Dmitrov of Bulgaria, the chief of the prewar Comintern. Such a confederation, if realized, would no doubt evolve in time into a Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of eastern Europe.

The economic pattern follows closely the political one in this area. There is planned economy everywhere: 2-, 3-, and 5-year plans are setting up economic goals. In domestic economy, nationalization, next to land reform, is the outstanding future. Constitutionally, there are three sectors of national economy: Nationalized, cooperative, and private. Basic industries and large financial establishments are nationalized. Cooperatives play an important role, particularly in food production. With some exceptions, private enterprise is permitted in medium and small industries so long as they remain within the bounds of the over-all state economic planning. Foreign trade and internal wholesale trade are either nationalized or controlled by government agencies. Some of the retail trade is taken over by the cooperatives from private hands. Rapid increase in the industrialization of Poland, Yugoslavia, and Hungary is planned, and a further shift in Czechoslovakia from light to heavy industry. In general, the similarity to the new economic policy of Lenin in 1921 is a striking one. But as the NEP was a temporary stage preceding full sovietization, so there is little doubt as to what is in store for eastern Europe if the Communist planners should manage to have their way.

In foreign trade, the Soviet Union emerges as the principal customer of the region. The various plans of the governments of eastern Europe are made subsidiary to the Stalin 5-year plan for the U. S. S. R. This has been brought about by bilateral trade agreements between Moscow and the capitals of eastern Europe and, in the case of Hungary and Rumania, former Axis satellites, through reparations and the Russian title to German assets under the terms of the Potsdam agreement. The latter has occasioned direct intervention by the Soviet Government in the management of some Hungarian and Rumanian corporations, and the joint Soviet-Hungarian and Soviet-Rumanian enterprises in bauxite, oil, and Danubian navigation.

But apart from the direct dominant role of the Soviet Union, there is another parallel between foreign trade and foreign politics in eastern Europe. The region is in the process of being forged into a large economic unit. To this end the rapid increase in industrialization envisaged in the different plans is a basic condition. According to the trade agreements among the governments of eastern Europe, raw materials and industrial products are to be exchanged in a fashion which will help to transform the noncomplementary economies of the countries into substantially complementary ones. Czechoslovakia is an example. Her engineering equipment will go to Poland to produce steel and improve the Upper Silesian coal industry, in exchange for coal, electric power, zinc, and food. Yugoslavia will receive Czech industrial equipment for aluminum, iron ore, lead, and chrome. Bulgaria will pay for Czech machinery with lead, tobacco, hides, maize, and pigs; Rumania pays for it with oil, timber, and agricultural products.

Czechoslovakian industry, as it is today, could only partially fulfill the demands upon it. At present, however, more than half of Czechoslovakia's trade is still with the west. While non-Communist elements in the Government might sincerely consider their east-west trade a contribution to European recovery, it is certain that Communists view this trade as a means to provide Czechoslovakia with western industrial equipment—that is, with the tools which will develop her into the machine shop of eastern Europe. Much the same applies to the coal which Poland is so anxious to trade for western machinery. In fact, east-west trade in general must be looked upon in this light.

Thus east-west trade is fostered by the Communist-controlled east: (1) Because temporarily it still needs western trade relations for a balanced economy; (2) because the industrial equipment it receives for export is necessary for the attainment of its goal, 5 years hence. This goal is the political, economic, and military self-sufficiency of a combined eastern Europe and Soviet Union, a veritable new imperial order.

These seem to be the reasons, then, why, in spite of the fact that it helps the ERP, the east is anxious to continue and increase east-west trade.

It is necessary that the west should realize the implications of this trade. Undoubtedly such trade will make the ERP cheaper to the American taxpayer. Moreover, while the United States can make her own economic policy, she cannot dictate the trade relations of the sovereign states of western Europe. But it should not be forgotten that, while east-west trade is helping the ERP, it simultaneously accelerates the Communist plan for eastern Europe and strengthens the Soviet hinterland for an aggressive hand in western Europe, the Far East, and elsewhere. It is doubtful that under these conditions any future normalcy in east-west trade relations in Europe, that is, the prewar flow of eastern food, fodder, timber, and coal, in exchange for western industrial products, will be reached or sustained beyond a period of 5 to 10 years.

Still, for complex reasons of international economy, east-west trade must be accepted while it lasts. But the west must consider that trade a calculated risk which must be taken with eyes fully open to its place in Communist world strategy as a whole.

We've Scuttled Our Air Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, entitled "We've Scuttled Our Air Defenses," which appeared in the February issue of the American Magazine:

WE'VE SCUTTLED OUR AIR DEFENSES

(By W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force)

The safety of the United States demands that we have an impregnable air curtain—a curtain sufficiently strong so that no fleets of hostile planes or waves of guided missiles can reach the mainland of this country. As part of that curtain we require adequate radar protection, which we now lack.

Dollars as a yardstick are misleading these days. But it has been estimated that to provide an air force able to guarantee the minimum safety margin of national security the bill would run as high as $8,000,000,000 annually.

The United States had, in its mighty air force of World War II, the greatest weapon imaginable to ensure a permanent peace and to keep us from fear of successful attack. After V-J day we scuttled it—just as surely as if it had been a rowboat and we had taken a double-edged ax to its bottom.

If we had kept strong, there might not even have been a threat of World War III today. If we hurry and catch up, the threat may recede. But the very nature of air preparedness demands that we waste not another single day.

To cite one bit of concrete evidence, a small but revealing example of how we are hamstrung in many ways by lack of funds, one of our valuable acquisitions as a result of victory in Germany was the capture of huge stores of German air force intelligence films. These showed industrial developments and terrain in a part of the globe where some day we may have to wage a war of self-defense. But we are so short of money and personnel that we are in danger of having some of this invaluable footage spoil before we can develop it.

Imagine what a potential enemy nation would do if it could lay its hands on similar films of our defenses and industrial centers.

No longer are we the leading air power of the world. In quantity we have slipped behind the Soviet Union, and qualitatively both Russia and England have numerous developments that exceed our own efforts. England, despite her severe economic strain as a result of the war, is devoting a greater portion of her defense budget to an air force than we are.

There is no doubt that Russia is going all-out for air power. The Russians are reported to be producing aircraft at the rate of 75,000 to 100,000 a year.

What kind of planes are these? In the last war the Russians were deficient in long-range heavy bombers. But this has been corrected. When Russia was our war ally several of our B-29 Superfortresses, at that time the mightiest bomber in the world, capable of operating at a 4,000-mile range, were forced down in Soviet territory after attacks in Japan.

We never saw them again, but now Russian-made copies of the B-29 have appeared in fairly sizable numbers. Manufacturing experts have estimated that Russia, with moderately aggressive production, could have at least 1,000 of this type of plane during the coming year. In December 1946 the Russians even tried to place orders for a number of sets of B-29 type tires, wheels, and brake assemblies right here in the United States. The orders were not accepted.

We are getting new bombers—the B-36, the B-50, and others—which far outstrip the B-29 in range and bomb-carrying power. Still, the B-29 is a very formidable long-range bomber.

Let's take a look at jet planes. We are catching up in this field, but we are still behind other nations. Britain has a jet fighter more advanced than ours. Russia, in her show of military strength last May Day, flew 100 jet planes en masse, and, on Red Air Force Day last August, exhibited at least eight different types of jet planes, including a four-engine jet bomber. One of their fighters is a swept-back-wing type. At time of this writing the United States has produced only one experimental model of this type. It indicates that the Soviet Air Force is preparing to hurdle the transsonic speed barrier. We haven't done that yet. Any aeronautical engineer can tell you that if an air force is able to fly 100 planes of a type at one time it must have at least 300 to 500 in existence. This, to an engineer, would indicate a monthly output of at least 200.

One of the brighter rays of hope in the otherwise gloomy picture is that the United States Air Force has finally achieved what it has been struggling for since the days of Billy Mitchell—coequal status with its brother services, the Army and the Navy. The recently enacted unification bill gave us that.

As the first Chief of Staff and the first Secretary of the newly created autonomous United States Air Force, Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, and I have pledged ourselves to strive to give the Air Force—and the Nation—the most for its dollars.

In World War II, under the brilliant leadership of Gen. "Hap" Arnold and Assistant War Secretary for Air Robert A. Lovett, and a score of inspired, resourceful fighting commanders in the field, the AAF became the world's mightiest air armada—more than 2,400,000 men and 80,000 planes. We were backed by an industry capable of producing 96,000 planes a year.

Then came VJ-day. Demobilization, of course, was necessary, but we demoralized as well as demobilized. Undoubtedly, it was the fair way, the American way, to carry out a system of demobilization that released our men in order, depending on their tenure of service, their combat records, and their family status. But, by doing it this way, we stripped ourselves of the very veterans whose skill and technical knowledge were absolutely indispensable to keep the remnant of our Air Force going. True, we had numbers of men and numbers of planes. But, as an air force, they could not fight, they hardly could fly, and there was barely a nucleus left to teach the green hands.

Now the Air Force has started on the road back. The road has been—and still is—painful, arduous, and fraught with frustrations and obstacles. Under the leadership of General Spaatz, Gen. "Hap" Arnold's leading field commander and now his successor, and a staff in which youth, inspiration, and ability abound, we are making progress. But even the greatest of leaders cannot continue to make bricks without straw, so the Air Force is facing a crisis.

An air force, I have heard General Spaatz say, is like a four-legged stool. One leg is the military air-force-in-being (this includes operations and training plus the backing of vigorous, unrelenting scientific research and development). The second leg is a strong air reserve and national guard. The third leg is industry—a healthy and adequate manufacturing network capable of rapid expansion in time of emergency. The fourth is an up-and-going air-transport industry to serve as the nucleus for military transport in event of war. Remove any of the legs and your four-legged stool of air preparedness collapses.

What are we doing about maintaining this four-legged stool so the country can rely on it?

As far an adequate military air force, we simply do not have it. When General Spaatz took over after the war, he put our best brains to work on determining the minimum number of air groups and supporting personnel we must have to maintain national security. Our planners came up with the rock-bottom conclusion, in which Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower concurred, that at least we could dare get by on was 70 combat groups augmented by 22 aquadrons, and backed up by 27 groups in the air national guard. To maintain these 70 groups and keep the other business of the Air Force going, we must have 401,000 men and officers.

In the event of war, the mission of such an air force would be (1) to protect our own industries; (2) to support the evacuation, if possible, of our pitifully outnumbered occupation troops in Europe, where there is the ever-present danger of Bataan being repeated on a large scale, plus protection of the advanced bases from which our own air offensive must strike; and (3) to launch and sustain a full-scale air offensive and destroy the enemy's industry and economy with atomic bombs and the latest weapons.

Now, a 70-group air force, unless it is backed by the capability for almost miraculous rapid expansion, would be strictly a one-shot proposition. It would be wiped out in another air war in a very short time. We must count on being able to expand with extraordinary rapidity to at least 180 groups—and I speak of groups which, in load-carrying capacity, are approximately 40-percent greater than those of World War II—and, if the war continues, to keep on climbing, perhaps as high as 350 groups if the war should last 3 years.

But we do not have these 70 groups. The money has not been available. Even recruiting has fallen down. As of a recent date, we had been able to climb to a total of 321,000 men. If we're lucky, we'll have 55—not 70—groups operating by the end of the year.

Painstaking surveys have indicated that, if we get the 70 groups, which we don't have now, we'll have to procure more than 5,800 planes and train 5,400 new pilots annually to keep the force operational and nonobsolete. That would mean the Air Force would have to spend $8,100,000,000 annually and employ 664,602 military and civilian personnel to keep such an establishment going. From the standpoint of absolute national security, anything less may be a step toward national suicide, any time any first-rate air power wishes to attack us.

To stress just one item: It is vital for this Nation to have an adequate radar network—the electronic eyes that will warn us if enemy air fleets near our boundaries—set up along the vulnerable approaches to the United States. Yet the necessary radar is just not available, so we do not have this network.

"Why spend money on old-fashioned types of planes and a large force of men to fly them when the next war will be a push-button affair?" This is an argument frequently raised by critics who may be well meaning but who certainly are poorly informed. Sure, we are going to have push-button warfare. There is not a scientific problem that will not yield to sufficiently intensive research, provided we put enough time and money into it.

But push-button warfare is, at best, 10 to 15 years off, and probably more. The era when the warrior scientists of enemy nations will sit in underground shelters 10,000 miles apart, and manipulate multibutton consoles that will aim atomic, radar-guided rockets at one another may be coming, but we at least have some breathing space before it arrives. So the next war, if it comes within the next 15 years, will be fought with improved versions of weapons now at hand.

We do plan to take the initiative in setting up underground plants for manufacture of highly critical items. In next year's budget we shall request $5,000,000 for construction of an experimental underground jet engine plant.

The soundest strategical concept of how the next war will come is that there will be no warning, not even a relatively short period in which America can get ready. There will be no allies this time to hold the fort until the American arsenal can catch up. If we survive the first shock—and we can do so only by the expensive process of keeping up our defenses—we then can win the war only by offensive action. Even America's vast resources would be exhausted by a protracted stalemate against a far-off power that cannot be blockaded. To end it, we would have to strike with powerful, devastating weapons to make the enemy cry quits. If we are hit, only a powerful air force in being can strike back hard enough and fast enough to prevent the destruction of the United States.

Georgia Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of Georgia's laws affecting veterans and their dependents, as compiled by my good friend, Paul Ginsberg, national junior vice commander of the Disabled American Veterans, 786 West Wesley Road, Atlanta, Ga., who, while a practicing attorney at law, has devoted a great deal of his time to veterans' affairs. At the present time he is also serving as commander of the largest DAV chapter in the State of Georgia.

Many of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them, under certain circumstances and, therefore, I am hopeful that this résumé of Georgia's veteran laws will come to their attention.

The outline is as follows:

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Evidence may be admitted of presumed death or absence.

Disability of minority is removed for qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

Protection is granted to persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

Fiduciary powers are suspended during war service.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Roster of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, when completed and certified by a majority of the Georgia Soldier Roster Commission, shall be prima facie evidence of the truth thereof. (Powers and duties of the roster commission have been transferred to the veterans' service office.)

The fee of clerks of superior courts for recording and indexing discharge certificates is limited to 25 cents.

It is the duty of the director of the veterans' service office to disseminate information to veterans of the war with Spain, the World Wars I and II, and any other war, military occupation, or expedition since 1897, their dependents and beneficiaries, as to their rights and benefits under Federal legislation or legislation of this or any other State and to assist such persons in the prosecution of claims.

The State department of veterans' service furnishes counsel and assistance to veterans.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

The State board of education is authorized to receive Federal funds to provide education of noncollege grade for persons above 18 years of age.

Certain requirements of graduates of the University of Georgia School of Medicine are suspended during military service in World War II.

The year of continuous experience required immediately prior to the issuance of a certificate as a public accountant is not broken by service in the armed forces.

Veterans of World War II may attend the common schools regardless of age. The State board of education may provide the facilities free of charge.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who were killed while serving in the armed forces during World Wars I or II, or who died as a result of such service. Amount: $300 per child per year with free tuition in State institutions of secondary or college grade.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Continuation of membership in the teachers' retirement system is provided while in the armed forces of the United States.

Equal civil-service preference is extended to war veterans.

Certificate of registration is granted without examination to certain persons whose practice as an architect was interrupted by World War service.

Leaves of absence are granted to employees of the department of public safety for service in the armed forces.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Confederate pension money is exempt from garnishment and all other legal processes.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications.

The appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran is provided, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Confederate veterans may be admitted to the Confederate soldiers' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS, ARTIFICIAL LIMBS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

The general assembly is authorized to levy taxes to supply artificial limbs to Confederate veterans.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

Residence requirement has been established for filing petition in action for divorce.

MEDALS

Medals are provided for service on the Mexican border and in the World War.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

A war memorial building commission has been created.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Credit is given for war service with reference to retirement and service medals.

PENSIONS

Pensions have been granted to Confederate veterans or their widows, integrated with old-age pensions.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

County aid is extended for food and clothing to Confederate veterans.

A veteran resettlement corporation has been created to make loans guaranteed by the Federal Government under the GI bill of rights.

TAX EXEMPTIONS: EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Parks and places where baseball, football, or any similar game is played, and race tracks where bicycle, horse, or other races of similar character are held, where admission fees are charged, are exempt from any special tax thereon, whenever the proprietor or owner is a maimed or disabled Confederate soldier.

Resident hunting and fishing privileges are extended to nonresident Army officers, troops, and soldiers, stationed and confined for training duties in various camps and cantonments throughout the State.

All back income taxes of members of the armed forces who die during service in World War II are canceled.

Income-tax exemption is granted to members of the armed forces during World War II and for 6 months thereafter. No return is required.

Reciprocal agreements may be made for the operation of automobiles owned by draftees and members of the United States Army and registered in other States.

Confederate veterans may act as life- and fire-insurance agents or solicitors without payment of license tax.

Disabled Confederate veterans may do business as photographic or similar artists without licenses.

Veterans may conduct any business not prohibited by law without the payment of a license tax.

Disabled veterans are exempt from payment of peddler's and business license taxes.

Members of the armed forces during World War II were exempt from poll tax.

Homestead exemption of $2,000 was extended persons in the armed forces during World War II.

TRANSPORTATION PRIVILEGES

Common carriers may sell tickets to Confederate veterans at half price.

Many of these laws have been enacted through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veterans' organizations.

At the present time the DAV has some 21 chapters scattered throughout the State of Georgia, most of which maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers to assist veterans with their problems in their own communities.

In addition to this service on a local level, the DAV maintains five full-time national service officers, under the direction of James A. Aldred, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Atlanta, Ga.

Those DAV experts extend all types of service to veterans and their dependents, free of charge, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for

various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled under existing Federal and State laws.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920, and chartered by the Congress in 1932, to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100—$50 if born before January 1, 1902—in cash, or by a down payment of $5 or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year—ending on June 30—after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing number are becoming DAV life members.

DAV SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 World War II handicapped veterans to become national service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, under the supervision of old-time, long experienced DAV service officers.

The members of the tenth and last class of such trainees received their diplomas in May 1947 and are now completing their job training in all parts of the country.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents, and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to set forth, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records and publishes the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, and VA Administrator, VA regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a badly wounded World War I veteran, an insurance agent in private life, who has had a broad background of 28 years of experience in various local, State, and National DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer, business manager of the organization, and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati, the Fifth Third Union Trust Co., has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and of its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has its office manager, John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

DAV SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The DAV has freely rendered technical help to thousands of disabled veterans each year in obtaining compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, pensions for dependents of deceased veterans, vocational training, civil service appointments, and last but really first in importance, suitable gainful employment.

During the past 18 years for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the DAV have extended service as indicated by the following brief resume:

Claims handled, 1,525,753.

Total monetary benefits, $132,512,111.87.

Additional compensation payments thus obtained for thousands of disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to procure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities into community assets.

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical résumé, to indicate the many different types of service extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which subsequently have proved of value to hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed from service reports.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

Most citizens agree with the DAV that the Federal Government should bear the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were incurred in or aggravated by his military service.

To prove service connection of a disability, however, is not an easy thing to do, except where official records show its inception in service. An equitable claim cannot necessarily be legally established.

Many different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service, even though actually service-incurred or aggravated.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployed. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must therefore supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice must be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation, its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran of World War I, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV, and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

H. R. 5052

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, most daily newspapers in cities like Austin, Tex., in my district, have three types of newspaper dealers—newsboy carriers, the boy who deliver the paper to your home; street vendors; and independent out-of-town dealers. All are independent contractors, who buy papers at a wholesale rate and resell them at the uniform retail rate. These dealers, for all practical purposes, actually own the papers after they receive them, since no refund is made for unsold copies. They operate under contract and are independent merchants—not employees. Comparatively little control is exercised over them by the newspaper officials.

These carrier boys deliver the papers they purchased throughout the city. Nearly all of them are under 18 years of age. The turn-over among them is rapid, with at least 10 percent changing each month. The average length of service of these boys is less than 1 year. Most street vendors are adults, but the turn-over among them is very rapid also.

The out-of-town dealers are more constant in length of service, since they operate their own street stands in their own communities. Again, all of these dealers buy papers at wholesale rates and sell them at retail. They are not on the pay roll of the newspaper publishers and their revenue fluctuates with the number of papers they buy and resell.

Recently the Bureau of Internal Revenue proposed to issue an order which would have had the effect of placing these contract merchants under the provisions of the Social Security Act. The Ways and Means Committee has very wisely reported legislation with the purpose of defining the employer-employee relationship, so as to exclude these people from social-security provisions.

If these contract vendors are classified as employees and made subject to the old-age benefits tax, as will be done unless H. R. 5052 is passed, it would be just as logical to tax the cigarette companies for the old-age benefits tax covering the cigarette girls who sell their products over the counters.

The amount of old-age benefits tax which each newspaper would have to pay would be negligible compared with the cost of keeping records on it and collecting the matching tax from the newsboys. On many boys who work a week and then quit, the Government would collect about 20 cents each—10 cents from the newspaper and 10 cents from the carrier. It would take a Philadelphia lawyer to interpret the regulations and bookkeepers and detectives to keep track of the accounts and personnel involved.

Mr. Speaker, I hope H. R. 5052 can be considered and passed at an early date.

Our National Cemetery Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Foreign Service, the national magazine of that great organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, recently carried a thought-provoking article entitled "Our National Cemetery Scandal." It is such a timely discussion that I believe it should be reprinted here. Incidentally, I want to point out the fact that at the forty-eighth national encampment of VFW in Cleveland a resolution was passed asking establishment of national cemeteries in every State and Territory of the Union. The resolution was sponsored by 26 State departments of the VFW.

The article follows:

OUR NATIONAL CEMETERY SCANDAL

(By Herbert L. Schon)

The Air Corps lieutenant from Boston who flew a million-dollar bomber over Germany and crashed to his death during the Schweinfurt raid has become the victim of governmental economy.

An infantry staff sergeant from Columbus, Ohio, who died on Okinawa after putting to good use training and equipment which cost thousands of dollars is being denied benefits which cost a fraction of that amount.

All of the flags at half staff and 21-gun salutes which will greet these fallen heroes and approximately 200,000 other World War II dead being returned for final burial during the next few years will not cover up the fact that this country has failed to provide a national cemetery for them in their native States. For the next-of-kin and other relatives of these men and women, the outward display of tribute and respect which will mark their homecoming must add up to something less than a heartfelt welcome from a grateful Nation.

Seemingly forgotten by Congress, 21 States whose World War II casualties total well over 122,000, and whose veteran population is more than 5,000,000, are without national cemeteries. Such populous areas as all of New England, Pennsylvania, and Ohio today cannot provide burial plots for veterans in resting places maintained by the Government. The condition in densely populated California and New Jersey, which have one such cemetery apiece, is not much better.

Figures reveal a striking story of callous indifference and neglect for the veteran's right to rest with his comrades in arms. They show that while there are over 18,000,000 veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II eligible for burial in national cemeteries, there are today only about 434,000 grave sites provided for them. Despite the fact that 21 States have no burial facilities maintained by the Federal Government for veterans, and that other areas of the country are inadequately provided for, not a single national cemetery has been established since the year 1939.

Any member of the armed forces who is killed in action, dies while on duty, or a veteran who has been honorably discharged, is entitled to burial in a national cemetery where space is available. This privilege is also extended to the veteran's wife, unmarried sons under 21 years of age, and unmarried daughters of any age. There is no cost attached to such burial.

Such liberal provisions look good on paper but to veterans and their families who live hundreds of miles from the nearest national cemeteries there is little comfort to be gained from them. Conditions make it impractical for these bereaved families to take advantage of a privilege they were intended to receive.

The mother of the Air Force lieutenant from Boston might want to have his remains interred in a national cemetery where he could once again be near men with whom he fought side by side. But since there is no cemetery of this type maintained in Massachusetts, she would be faced with the problem of whether or not to approve burial in the Long Island National Cemetery at Farmingdale, N. Y., over 300 miles distant and the nearest one to her home. Like most Gold Star mothers, she probably would refuse to consider interment of her son at a point which would prove inconvenient for relatives and friends to visit. Similarly, parents of the staff sergeant from Columbus, Ohio, would be reluctant to think of burial in the national cemetery located at New Albany, Ind., over 200 miles away, for their son.

Other very practical considerations are causing relatives of veterans to pass up the opportunity they have to apply for a carefully maintained grave site for their loved ones in national cemeteries. For the aged, traveling great distances in order to be present at interment services is a physical ordeal sometimes impossible to bear. Families in moderate circumstances find that the cost of railroad fare to these cemeteries is a burden which their budgets cannot stand. And since the Government allows only a limited amount for such expenses as transporting a veteran from the place of his death in this country to the national cemetery, many have found it wiser to seek out burial lots in private grounds near to their own communities.

Charged with maintaining an inadequate number of national cemeteries at the present time, the War Department is not unaware that something should be done, and soon, to correct a condition which is keeping thousands of veterans from taking advantage of regulations passed expressly for their benefit.

In 1946 the War Department supported congressional action which called for establishment of at least one national cemetery in every State and additional cemeteries in States with a population of over 500,000. The proposed bill was defeated.

During the first session of the Eightieth Congress, early in 1947, a bill was introduced which provided that surplus military reservations be used to expand cemetery facilities. While this measure would not have provided each State with a national cemetery, it would have given a more equitable distribution. Ultimately the bill was passed by the Senate, only to be amended in the House so that provision was made only for expansion of Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery in Missouri and the Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery at San Diego, Calif. Thus, once again the needs of veterans in 21 States without facilities were overlooked.

Without Congressional approval, the War Department stands powerless to take steps necessary for creating at least one new cemeterial shrine in every State. Each passing month will add to its dilemma in attempting to provide adequate service, for the death rate of former armed forces personnel is rising slowly but steadily.

Actuarial figures show that deaths of Spanish-American War veterans will reach a peak within the next few years. In 1968, it is estimated, deaths of World War I veterans will have attained their highest point. The greatest number of deaths of men and women who served during World War II will come in 1987.

While these dates seem distant, statistics furnished by actuaries give little encouragement or support to those who could adopt a do-nothing attitude. Studies show that veterans' deaths during the next decade will occur at the following rates: 1948—124,331; 1949—128,603; 1950—133,093; 1951—140,509; 1952—145,742; 1953—151,466; 1954—157,866; 1955—164 426; 1956—173,822; 1957—182,657; 1958—190,524.

Present lack of national cemeteries stems partly from the manner in which they were originally established by a well-meaning Congress.

Determined to preserve from desecration the graves of soldiers who fell in battle during the Civil War, Congress authorized the Secretary of War in 1866 to secure suitable burial places in which to inter the dead properly. The following year the War Department was granted the right to purchase grounds for national cemeteries, to enclose them with substantial fences, to mark each grave and to appoint a superintendent at each cemetery.

With casualties having occurred for the most part in the South, the largest number of cemeteries was established in that section. Since the majority of them were opened during or shortly after the Civil War, it was impossible to envision the vast expansion of the United States, the shifting centers of population, or the accessibility of the sites which were being established. And, besides, it seemed unlikely then that fighting of any great magnitude would ever again compel the entrance of United States troops into action.

For many years Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia, where the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of World War I is located, was believed by many to be the only Government-maintained land for veterans' burials. There was also a mistaken notion held by some that Arlington was given more extensive care than other national cemeteries. In recent years, however, with increasing veteran mortality, a growing number of families have found that there are other national cemeteries and that all of them are given the same careful attention by the War Department. Records show, too, that establishment of the new national cemeteries near large centers of population invariably results in the facilities being used to a progressively greater extent year after year by those for whom they were intended.

Today there are available grave sites for veterans in national cemeteries located in Alabama, Arkansas, California, the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. Those honorably discharged servicemen whose families live near these cemeteries, however, are in a minority compared to millions of veterans who do not live within a reasonable distance, or reside in States where there are no national cemeteries at all.

Forced to suffer along with a cemetery system created for the most part during the horse-and-buggy era, War Department officers today can offer slight solace to next-of-kin who may wonder why something isn't being done to remove inequities which are causing disappointment and sorrow. Thus far nobody holds out even a hope that something definite will be done in the near future.

Whatever excuses may be offered during coming months when relatives of veterans start asking questions about the lack of national cemetery facilities, it is unlikely the answers will lessen a growing suspicion that the dead soldiers and sailors of our world wars are fast becoming forgotten men.

Conditions in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have here a speech which Dr. H. H. Kung, former Premier and Finance Minister of China, delivered on January 8, of this year to the Far East-America Council of Commerce and Industry. I think it would be of interest to my colleagues before we consider the problems which face us in China to hear some extracts of this speech. Dr. Kung is internationally recognized as the most experienced and able finance minister his country has had in her modern history.

In the opinion of many, it was in no small measure due to Dr. Kung's successful management of China's finances during the last war that his country was able to face alone the tremendous difficulties which confronted her before the United States became her ally. The dangers which faced China then appears to many to have been even greater than the difficulties she faces today.

Dr. Kung in this speech said:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I feel greatly honored to be asked to meet with you this afternoon, and certainly it is a great pleasure to see so many familiar and friendly faces. I am afraid I do not deserve all the kind remarks made by our chairman. Anything I have done for China in my capacity as a servant to my country and any good will which I have tried to promote between the United States and China, I have considered as a privilege, and I am sure that many who are here have contributed as much, and perhaps more, both to their beloved countries as well as to the world.

As many of you know, we Chinese are a modest people. When you ask a Chinese about his home, he is likely to speak about his hovel; if you say that his wife is a beautiful lady, he is likely to say that she is an old hag. So when he speaks of his country, he deprecates—every country is more wonderful; every nation knows better; the statesmen and politicians of all countries are comparably pure and noble—they sprout angels' wings—they move about in a halo of glory; but of his own statesmen and politicians he speaks of them as if they were a useless lot.

I should like on this occasion to change the tune. I shall forget that I was born in China and shall only remember that I was educated in America, which I consider as my second home. As such, since we are good friends, let me tell you that there is much to say for China's heroism and fortitude against greater odds and over a more prolonged period than any country has faced in many generations.

Three years ago, when I was in the United States, I had the pleasure of addressing a similar gathering on the subject of postwar cooperation in the development of China. * * * It was then my hope—as it is now—that it should be possible for American capital to come and help us develop our country. It has always been my conviction that foreign investors should be given their just share of profits with sufficient security for them in any undertaking which they may have in China. A question was raised during the war in this country as to whether one preferred butter or bullets. Obviously, you could not have both, so you rationed butter until it almost disappeared from the market, but you made enough bullets to save the world from the forces of evil. Often in history a country has been faced by just such a sharp choice.

When in 1927 the Chinese National Government was established in Nanking under President Chiang Kai-shek, we were full of enthusiasm for our plans for the reconstruction of China. We were going to eliminate the Tuchun system, abolish civil war, modernize our civil and criminal codes, extend our educational system, build railroads, improve highways, airlines, we hoped that with the abolition of extraterritoriality, the establishment of excellent courts, the training of our judiciary and competent civil servants, trade and commerce would be expanded and vital industries would come into existence. As we hoped that the corruptions that had become a habit and a tradition under the Manchus and the Tuchuns would be corrected.

That was in 1927. Since then we have been engaged in constant war. We were attacked by the remaining Tuchuns. We faced the shifty politics of warlords who, while pretending to have reformed, played havoc with national interests. We faced the constant sabotage of national interest by the Chinese Communists. We faced the Communist armies. We faced the threat from Japan. From September 18, 1931, until VJ-day we faced the Japanese forces. They attacked us in Manchuria, in north central China, and everywhere. They concentrated their formidable forces against us until Pearl Harbor. We stood against all this completely alone from September 18, 1931, until December 7, 1941.

Whatever strength in manpower, in wealth, in resources, and in spiritual fortitude China has possessed has gone into this struggle to keep China free, to safeguard China from conquest by a foreign foe and from the Chinese agents of a foreign power. Luckily we have had a strong and great leader during our great trials. Under the leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek we stood firmly and unremittingly against our enemies, despite the fact that on more than one occasion very attractive peace offers were made to China by the Japanese in order to withdraw their forces from the Chinese theater to concentrate them against your and other countries.

Under these circumstances we could do little more than utilize our strength in the national defense. Our glorious plans for reconstruction have remained plans. Our wonderful ambitions have remained ambitions. Our hopes remain hopes. But we still stand an independent unconquered people. We also chose bullets instead of butter—we were willing to accept no other choice. We still must keep that program of reform and reconstruction before us. I, for one, deeply believe in Dr. Sun's principles of people's livelihood, and am intensely interested in economic reforms within the country and promotion of international trade without. To achieve this, I personally believe the following are urgent things that should be done:

As soon as possible, a currency reorganization should be instituted. This new currency must have full convertibility; it should be backed with sufficient reserve so as to insure complete confidence. Effective measures should be undertaken to increase the national production of all consumer goods and to meet the necessary needs of the common people, seeing to it at the same time that waste is eliminated as much as possible. We must combat the flight of capital and the unnecessary use of foreign resources. The unfavorable balance of trade should be countered by energetic and well-planned measures to encourage exports. At the same time, every effort must be made to develop and modernize our rural economy for the welfare of the farmers. Further methods should be devised to strengthen the national economy when the currency is being stabilized. This will again call for the balancing of the national budget, which had actually been achieved before our war with Japan. The honoring of Government loans and balancing of international payments, together with a reorganization of the system of taxation to insure a fair and equal distribution of the national burden, should be accomplished. The actual carrying out of the plans for the development and improvement of the existing communication systems to facilitate the revival of normal business and trade should be undertaken. At the same time, foreign capital should be encouraged and protected to participate in the general development of the natural and potential resources of China.

Against the background of inviting foreign capital to China, in my opinion, exists the enviable record of the National Government in regard to meeting payments on service of debts that they themselves incurred. For example, every loan made by the United States Government to my country was serviced by us, and even in our most dark days the payments were made as they fell due and although our exchequer might have been low.

Parenthetically, I might remark that every disbursement of every one of these loans to which I refer was checked and accounted for by my Government to the loan-controlling agency, whether it be the Export-Import Bank, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the Federal Reserve Bank here in New York.

In the present stage of world affairs, we realize that more emphasis is placed upon Europe than China. I must note here that I speak as a private person not delegated to discuss policy, but think that most Chinese will agree that we neither judge nor criticize your foreign policy nor its geographical emphasis. I only want to state realistically that we too are fighting the same menace which threatens the democracy and peace of the world, but our resources are being exhausted and that if unaided, we may suffer even greater reverses. We can no more stand alone than Great Britain or France could stand alone in their fearful days, or than Italy or Greece or Turkey can stand alone today.

Gentlemen, your country has formulated a very unselfish and comprehensive plan for the recovery of Europe which is necessary to prevent the spread of tyranny through that Continent. American policy toward China has still to decide whether timely and sufficient aid should be given to close the door to communism in that area to conform with her policy of containing that menace in Europe. It must not be forgotten that China's position geographically is believed by many to be more important than Europe for the strategical defense of this American stronghold, the heart of freedom. * * *

Because of devastation from without and within, we have no industries now to support the needs of the present civil war. Our industries such as exist on a minor scale are not the type that can supply our American trained and equipped armies. We, therefore, need American arms and munitions, airplanes and spare parts. If we do not get the help, we shall continue to fight for unification and liberty. Chinese do not fear failure. Dr. Sun failed many times before he succeeded. We shall not fail his memory.

But, with help, we can accomplish so much more and so much faster; we can put out the fire before it becomes a holocaust; we can more quickly alleviate the suffering of our masses and the threat of suffering to others in foreign lands.

* * * * *

From their manifesto, you know that the Chinese Communists can never be your allies or your friends. They are the far eastern phase of the iron curtain. When that curtain is lifted, the National Government shall, as always, be your friend; those behind the curtain can only be your enemies. If it were that the Chinese Communists merely wanted political rights, no one could argue with their claim to political freedom unto itself, but armed insurrection which aspires to regional political autonomy that impairs the integrity of the state in a military, economic, and social sense, must be resisted.

Friends, I believe you understand why I speak so candidly. I do not for a moment question the good will of your Government and your people. Your distinguished President and your wise and industrious Secretary of State are burdened with heavy problems, particularly as every country turns to the United States for aid which obviously is becoming wearying to a people, who have already done so much. I speak so candidly because since my youth at Oberlin and Yale, I have had such close ties with you that I feel at home among you, as one of you. I speak to you with such frankness because the air of America has fed my spirit, and my affection for this country has been less only than my affection for my own.

* * * * *

Gentlemen, remembering world history, you need no reminder that we are not the first nation against whom false charges have been made and our leaders castigated. I know we have shortcomings as well as our virtues, but we also know that much of the recent propaganda has been malicious and mere fabrications, and much built up from the proverbial molehill into a mountain. These charges and many others, my friends, were made against all nations and were even laid at the door of these United States in the dark days of Valley Forge and the threatening days of your own Civil War. They were also made against such great leaders and Presidential administrations as Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and many others. Every country has faced its tragic days. Every country has known its black hours, when every hope seemed lost. But, like you, our country in days of national tribulation still stands before the world a free people—battered, yes—hurt, yes—but fighting free.

Conditions in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANKLIN J. MALONEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the National Conference of American Zionist Emergency Council, Washington, D. C., February 15, 1948:

In the bosom of every true American beats a heart filled with love and loyalty for our great country, and this is true whether the American be Jew or Gentile, Protestant or Catholic, white or colored, Republican or Democrat. Right or wrong, either in internal or foreign policy, though our country may be, this war affection never diminishes. If she be wrong, then it is our right—nay, it is our duty—to exert every effort within our means to right that wrong; and if we hold public office, the means to right the wrong is enhanced and the duty proportionately greater.

Conscious of a wrong in the Palestinian situation, and likewise conscious of our duty, 30 Republican Members of the House of Representatives, including myself, within the last few days addressed a petition to Secretary of State Marshall. We requested information as to whether or not Great Britain was, directly or indirectly, shipping arms to the Arabs to be used against the Jews in Palestine; and if Great Britain was condoning such action in others, and what position was the United States going to take.

Under our Constitution, the executive branch, headed by the President, primarily is responsible for foreign policy. We in the House of Representatives have practically no authority in such affairs except in matters of appropriation, but we do have the authority to direct such a petition to the Secretary of State. This we could do. This we did do.

Further than this we can speak before the people and help to direct public opinion along the proper channel. With this purpose in mind I am addressing you tonight.

I need not dwell lengthily upon the history of the struggle of the Jews in Palestine, as you only too well are aware of these facts. What is happening there today is that a small, willful group of self-appointed, rather than democratically elected Arab leaders, has incited a number of their countrymen to deeds of horrible violence in an attempt to defy the recognized decision of the United Nations. To begin with, this violence was on a small scale and tentative in character. If the British authorities, which so proudly declared that they and they alone were going to maintain order and did not wish anyone to interfere with them, had taken the most elementary police precautions, these misdeeds would have remained a minor incident. But the British Government has chosen to assume an attitude of benevolent neutrality toward the rioters, thus encouraging them to ever greater misdeeds and thus persuading others, who have so far been peaceful, to join their ranks.

Essentially, therefore, the responsibility for what is going on in Palestine at the present time rests with Great Britain.

A second consequence of the British attitude is that the neighboring Arab states of Palestine were encouraged thereby to lend active support to the Arab rioters in the country. Their territories are now openly

used as bases for operations against Palestine; men are being trained and armed in those neighboring states for the fight in Palestine; soldiers and officers of their armies are being encouraged to take leave with pay to join the Arab rioters in Palestine along the well-known model of the German and Italian "volunteers" in Spain; arms from government stores and money from governmental treasuries are being given to those rioters; and several invasions of armed groups into Palestine have taken place from Syria, the Lebanon, and Transjordan. In two cases those invaders engaged in battles with the Jews as soon as they crossed the frontiers, and upon being repelled, withdrew with their arms into Syria and the Lebanon, there to prepare for their next act of aggression.

This is no longer disorder or a civil war within a country. This is international aggression. This is the very state of affairs to prevent which the United Nations has been created. But to this very day the United Nations has done nothing in order to call those states on the carpet. As for the British Government, it tolerates this state of affairs and it is believed even continues to supply those aggressor governments with armaments.

But there is no point in we citizens of the United States protesting either against the sins of commission of the Government of Great Britain or against the sins of omission of the United Nations. We must look to our own Government to do the right thing and not to tolerate the wrong thing. It is up to the American Government to take whatever steps are necessary in order to recall the British Government to the sense of its obligations and to the elementary decencies involved. Specifically it is up to the American Government to take up the matter in the United Nations, of which we are so leading and so active a member. It is up to the American Government to do everything in its own power to bring about the speedy implementation of the United Nations decision, and neither to do nor to tolerate anything that would run counter to the verdict of the United Nations.

This is the crux of the situation where we, citizens of the United States, are concerned. Unfortunately, the position assumed by our Government in many ways has been as shameful as, and in other ways more shameful than, that assumed by others. The British never supported the partition plan adopted by the United Nations. They were markedly cool to it from the start and made no secret of their dislike for it. The Arab Governments openly spoke against it. But our Government supported partition as the fairest compromise between the Jews and the Arabs, each of whom claimed Palestine as their own.

Having thus actively supported the plan, and having greatly contributed to its adoption by the United Nations, our Government has assumed in the last 2 months a most reprehensible attitude of coolness toward it; an attitude of straddling the issue. Nothing has been done by President Truman and his subordinate officials to smooth the way for the carrying out of the decision. But a lot has been done, mainly under cover, to put new obstacles in its way.

We might have signified to the Arab States our displeasure at their acts of aggression. We have not done so.

We might have used our friendly relations with Great Britain, with whose government we are so closely linked, to represent to it the need to conform with the United Nation's recommendations, to allow an increase of Jewish immigration into Palestine, to open the port of Tel-Aviv for the influx of immigrants, arms and civilian supplies. We have not done so.

We might have put the question of acts of aggression, now brazenly perpetrated in Palestine, before the Security Council of the United Nations, as we have put the questions on Greece, Iran, Korea, and other countries before the United Nations. We have not done so.

We might have relied on the long American tradition in permitting individual American citizens, who voluntarily feel like joining the fight for just causes, go abroad without hindrance and accompanied by the best hopes and wishes of the American people, as we had done in the cases of those who had gone from this country to help defend England, France, and Finland and many free countries in their hour of stress. We have not done so.

While thus carefully refraining from doing anything that might help transform the United Nation's decision into reality, Mr. Truman and his subordinate officials have done plenty in the other direction.

An embargo has been clamped on arms to the Middle East. No difference has been made between arms for the attackers and arms for the defenders; between arms for those who seek to defy the United Nations and arms for those who defend its verdict. Since the Arab rioters are kept fully supplied by the Arab Governments and it is believed—indirectly—by Great Britain, this means in practice that the embargo has been instituted in order to make it impossible for the Jews of Palestine to defend their lives and the newly proclaimed Jewish state.

Pressure has been exercised in respect to Jewish immigration. But this pressure was not applied to the British in an effort to get them to admit more Jews to Palestine. This pressure was applied to the Jews in an effort to get them to stop further immigration for the time being, thus nullifying the essential stand taken by our own Government for the last 3 years, according to which the immediate admission of large numbers of Jewish immigrants into Palestine was the most urgent of all tasks relating to that country.

Steps have been taken by our present administration to recall the passports of Americans fighting alongside the forces of law and order in Palestine. Press announcements have been issued by this administration and unfriendly comments have been inspired by officials of this administration, seeking to place these Jewish volunteers in a bad light before the public. Our country was founded by volunteers from abroad who helped defend a just cause. Lafayette and Kosciusko are names of honor in the history of America. From time to time, freedom-loving Americans returned the compliment and helped to fight for liberty and justice, even in those cases where our country was formally neutral. But disregarding these precedents, the administration has now chosen to take punitive measures in order to discourage those of us who are young enough and indignant enough to want to help a small people which fights alone for a cause sanctioned by the United Nations of the world.

A lot of arguments are being used to justify this attitude of the administration. Some of these arguments find their way into the newspapers, others are bandied around by word of mouth. It is alleged that the United States of America cannot afford to back its own policy and the United Nations policy; cannot afford to back it because of the international situation. What does that mean? We can rightly afford to stand up to Russia, the second greatest and strongest nation in the world, when we believe that justice demands it. And here it is said that we cannot afford to stand up to a few ambitious rulers and arrogant demagogs in the Middle East.

It is said that we dare not support the Palestine partition plan because Russia supports it. How do you like this way of double talk? As long as Russia's stand was undecided, we were told we could not support the Jews in Palestine because Russia would come out against them. Now that Russia has come out for them, we are told that we cannot support them because Russia has come out for them. Heads I win, tails you lose.

I do not believe that the present stand of the administration is necessary in the national interest, however narrowly you constr · that national interest. But I do believe that the present attitude of the administration is very much contrary to American national interest if you look at this national interest from a broader and higher point of view. I think the principal national interest of America is to assure respect for the United Nations, to show continuity and determination in backing that which is right, and to safeguard the reputation of America for integrity and honesty.

I feel that the present attitude of the administration is not calculated to advance any of these three objectives and I, therefore, oppose it.

I am not a member of the Democratic Party nor do I have its confidence regarding the internal relations within the administration. I do not know, therefore, neither do I wish to know, to what extent the present attitude is due to Mr. Henderson, to Mr. Lovett, to Mr. Forrestal, to Mr. Marshall, to Admiral Leahy, or to President Truman. Our Constitution does not make any such fine distinctions. Nor are the citizens of the United States called once every 2 or 4 years to make such fine distinctions. The executive branch of the American Government is one whole. It is headed by the President who instructs the members of his Cabinet, and who, in turn, issue directives to their subordinate officials. All I can do, all we can do, is to address our protest to the executive branch of our Government as a whole and, if necessary, to carry our protest, against this Executive policy, to the American people as a whole.

In this sense I join with you in this expression of indignant protest against the attitude assumed by the American Government on the question of Palestine and in the insistent demand that our Government should immediately take the only stand consistent with its dignity and integrity.

CAB Denies Delta Air Lines Application

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., on February 8, 1948, entitled "CAB Decision Ignores Needs of Big Mid-South Travel Area":

CAB DECISION IGNORES NEEDS OF BIG MID-SOUTH TRAVEL AREA

The decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board denying the application of Delta Air Lines for a new New Orleans-Washington-New York route that automatically would give one-carrier service to and from those cities for Shreveport and a huge mid-South travel area surrounding it is a shocking set-back to prospects for future air transport and economic development in this entire area.

The decision is shocking enough in its total disregard of the needs of the largest area in the United States, geographically and in population, not having one carrier service to and from the present-day world political capital, Washington, and the present-day world economic capital, New York—our local area. But, the decision is even more shocking in that its very wording reeks with crass sectional favoritism. It favors the Great Lakes-Midwest area with new air transport service while ignoring even greater needs of the big southwestern and mid-South area radiating from Shreveport. It favors air lines having eastern and northern financial backing, even though one of them—Pennsylvania-Central Airlines—is so wobbly that the banks are pressing it on loans, over an airline southern-backed and operated and sound in every way—Delta Air Lines.

The Times stated editorially on last December 23 that the CAB was giving our local area a brush-off through having delayed for 9 months a decision in this case, after its own examiner had recommended back in March 1947, that Delta be given the extensions that would establish the new New Orleans-New York route, and give this area its first one-carrier service to those cities. That brush-off, through delay, was bad enough, but if this decision stands we may find ourselves brushed completely off the national air map so far as major service to key eastern points of the Nation is concerned. And it begins to look as if that is exactly CAB's intention.

The Times casts no reflection on the individual integrity of any member of the CAB. We stated editorially not long ago that we had confidence in their integrity. But we very definitely now do question their judgment, and we even further question their self-stated reasons—in the decision—on which they formed their judgment.

The Fall in Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following article by Gould Lincoln which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 12, 1948:

TRUMAN WRONG AGAIN, FALL IN PRICES SHOWS—DROP MAY ELIMINATE ELECTION ISSUE—DEMOCRATS AT A LOSS

(By Gould Lincoln)

A week ago President Truman insisted he still wanted price-control legislation; that it was needed to check a drastic inflation which might run riot. He spoke at a press conference a day after the first break in the commodity markets. Succeeding days have shoved prices lower and lower, until the consumer is now paying less for his pork, his flour, his butter, and other necessary items. Unless there should be a tremendous reversal of form, prices will continue to fall.

The politics of the situation is obvious. Price control and rationing legislation is dead as a door nail. If prices of commodities continue to fall, high prices will not be an issue in the coming campaign. Demands for another widespread increase in wages either will not materialize or will fail.

What will all this do to Mr. Truman, seeking reelection? He will have been proved wrong again—as he was when he demanded $2,000,000,000 from Congress immediately after the war ended to offset an expected tremendous unemployment. The unemployment never materialized. He will have been wrong again as he was when he took a position that wages could be increased without increasing prices—a position into which he may have been drawn by his then Secretary of Commerce, Henry A. Wallace.

CRASH NOT YET IN SIGHT

Production—always the answer to high prices—has begun to catch up with demand. Crop reports in this country and around the world have indicated there will be ample supplies of grain—possibly a surplus. And gradually the production of manufactured goods is coming in sight of the supply necessary to meet all demands. There is no crash yet in sight—for the demand is still high, employment is full. But there is opportunity for a leveling-off process, with reasonable prices and the threat of inflation out of the window.

Now that prices are falling, screams are coming naturally from those who benefited by high prices—and from those who made money trading in commodities and stocks. To the great mass of Americans, however, a reduction in prices is a boon. That they are not beholden to Mr. Truman for a cut in their cost of living is something that will sink in.

Republicans generally view the price recession as favorable to their cause. However, there are those, particularly from the farm States of the West, who may be expected to join a clamor for Government support of commodity prices—despite the fact that producers, handlers and traders in these commodities have been making inordinate returns during the last 2 years. That, too, is politics.

MAY NEED OTHER ISSUE

The attitude of the Democrats toward the price reductions is still to be developed. They have been calling for price controls and price reductions for so long they seem at a loss for the moment. Secretary Anderson of the Department of Agriculture has been charged by Senator TAFT with seeking to bolster the falling grain market by offering to buy grain for the Government. This Mr. Anderson has flatly denied. But any huge purchases now by the Government, which might be calculated to halt the price drop, will be looked upon with suspicion. Obviously the administration cannot have t both ways—and if high prices was the issue upon which it hoped to win next fall's election—as charged by Republicans—it must find some other issue.

Already the Democrats have begun to say that the Republican tax reduction bill must not be put through—since prices are falling. They take the ground that with falling prices, revenue returns of the Government will diminish greatly, and that the present tax rates must be maintained, or there may be a deficit next year. That is not necessarily so. If Government expenditures can be curtailed by billions of dollars, the tax returns, if production and employment keep up, should be ample to permit of a reduction in the income tax—the same income tax, practically, that the people paid during the war.

Mikolajczyk Tells How Stalin Crushed the Real Polish Government and Set Up His Pattern for Puppet States in Warsaw—America and England Stood By—Some American Leaders and Newspapers Aided Stalin's Bloody Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, herewith are two additional installments of Mikolajczyk's story as contained in the Milwaukee Sentinel. Sad indeed is the story of Poland sacrificed on the altar of opportunism.

Well do I remember the sickening spectacle of certain leaders and newspapers in our own country that sided with Stalin in setting up the Lublin government in Poland, leaders and newspapers that thereby collaborated with the bloody plan of the Soviet leader to permit the extermination of the heroic Polish underground army of Warsaw while the Red army paused outside the city, American leaders and newspapers that ridiculed the London Polish Government in exile and favored the Communist Lublin clique. Those American leaders and newspapers not only aided and abetted the betrayal of the Polish people in the imposition upon them of the police state, but they actually aided and abetted Stalin in setting up the northern anchor of his iron curtain. Those American leaders and newspapers who were so ready to sacrifice principle then should have no great standing in the forum of American public opinion today. For while they could be moralistic, their eyes were blinded to moral principle. They could strain the gnat and swallow the camel. If they aided Stalin through ignorance, then their name is still ignorance. If they aided Stalin with knowledge of their acts, then their name is Pharisee or possibly even worse is the charge against them: treason to the principles of western civilization.

The articles from the Milwaukee Sentinel follow:

SOVIETS STOOD ASIDE AT WARSAW AS NAZIS ANNIHILATED POLES—STALIN ALSO ACTED TO HALT BRITISH AND UNITED STATES AID

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment XIV)

Stalin turned down Roosevelt's request that I be permitted to confer with the Red leader in Moscow, in the summer of 1944, but consented to see me after Churchill had presented the same request in somewhat stronger language.

I was prime minister of a country whose fight against the Germans, at overwhelming odds, had aroused the sympathy and admiration of the civilized world.

And, as such, I was going to Moscow to plead for support from a great ally who could help our cause—especially that of the embattled underground—with a minimum of effort.

The Red army has been doing an unbelievable thing as it advanced across Poland behind the retreating German Army. From London I had instructed our underground leaders throughout Poland to rise up and fight the Germans—our plan carried the code word "Tempest"—whenever the Red army appeared at the edges of a Polish city.

In accordance with this plan, the Polish underground had aided in the liberation of hundreds of towns and inhabited places, and in some places the delighted Red army commanders gratefully pinned medals on the chests of our heroes for their splendid valor and cooperation.

But then these very men, these Poles who had rendered such great aid to the advancing Red Army, were suddenly disarmed, arrested for "sabotage" and, in many cases, shipped into Russia at gun point.

Now, as I flew toward Moscow in the hope of appealing to Stalin's humanity, if he possessed such emotions, the Red army fought its way to the suburbs of Warsaw.

The nucleus of our extensive Polish underground was centered in Warsaw. There we had maintained the underground section of our parliament, the courts of justice which meted out positive punishment to German commanders for their hideous atrocities, our schools, welfare services, central communications departments, and other units, including 40,000 crack troops under the command of General Bor-Komorowski.

In the case of each uprising of Polish underground forces, as the Russians approached, I had left the final decision to those who were closest to the situation. In the case of Warsaw, which was to be the biggest of all the home army's operations, the invocation of Tempest rested with General Bor-Komorowski, Deputy Prime Minister Jankowski, and Speaker of the Underground Parliament Puzak.

Unknown to me, as I traveled from London to north Africa on the first leg of my journey to meet Stalin, the Warsaw underground, on July 29, 1944, had received the following radio message from the Moscow radio station which was called Kosciusko—used in Russian broadcasts to Poland:

"Poles, the time of liberation is at hand. Poles, to arms. Make every Polish home a stronghold in the fight against the invader. There is not a moment to lose."

RUSSIAN GUNS NEAR

The guns of the Red army could be heard in the center of the capital. Russian planes fought the Luftwaffe overhead. Red army tanks rumbled on the environs of Praga, the industrial suburb of Warsaw.

So, on August 1 at 5 p. m., the Warsaw home army came into the open against a sadistic foe that had butchered close to 6,000,000 of our people. It rose, 40,000 strong, to fight the heavily entrenched Germans and facilitate the entry of the Red army into the capital.

What followed remains one of the blacker marks on the record of Communist Russia. The Red army, acting on orders from Stalin, did not enter Warsaw until many months later.

General Bor-Komorowski's men and women, with ammunition and food enough for only 7 days, fought 63 days to utter annihilation—while countless divisions of the Red army remained in the suburbs.

And Stalin, beyond refusing to help, brought great pressure to bear on the British and Americans to refrain from attempting to help us.

IGNORANT OF PLOT

But as I traveled toward Moscow I knew nothing of the beginning of this fantastic doublecross, aimed at exterminating the remaining cream of Polish manhood so as to make easier the eventual reduction of Poland to a Russian police state.

My principal concern, after I reached Cairo on the way to the Kremlin, was the disquieting news there that Stalin had effected an agreement with the Polish stooges who called themselves the Polish Committee of Liberation, soon to become the Lublin government, and now recognized by all the United Nations.

My position was thus weakened, and for a time I considered giving up the thought of continuing on into Russia.

But at Tehran there were messages for me from Roosevelt and Churchill—copies of wires sent to Stalin imploring him to receive me and beseeching a change of his attitude toward Poland.

COLD RECEPTION

We arrived at Moscow on July 31. The reception was bleak. Pravda made no mention of our arrival, though it was rapturous over the impending arrival of a member of the Danish underground and news about the exchange of ambassadors between the U. S. S. R. and the Polish Committee of National Liberation.

I saw Molotov on July 31 at his office in the Kremlin.

"Why did you come here? What have you got to say?" he asked frigidly. I replied:

"I came here to see Stalin, and I ask your aid in helping me to get to him. I want to discuss with him the problems of our common fight against the Germans and the possibility of collaboration between the Red army and our underground.

"We can provide a wealth of information that will be of help to your forces. Beyond that pressing question, I'd like to talk to Stalin about Soviet-Polish relations."

MOLOTOV UNIMPRESSED

Molotov did not seem impressed. "We'll take Warsaw on the 5th or 6th of August," he said. "As for Stalin, he's very busy with military operations, but I'll try to make an appointment for you on the 2d or 3d of August."

Then he looked at me quite severely.

"But before you meet Stalin we want you to see the Poles from the Polish Committee of National Liberation."

I answered:

"I can see them, but that's an internal question concerning only Poles. I'm here as a representative of the Polish Government to see the Prime Minister of Soviet Russia."

That ended the meeting. I returned to the house that had been assigned to us in Moscow and underwent a nerve-wracking 2 days. I learned on August 1 that the Warsaw underground had risen and, through British Ambassador to Moscow Clark-Kerr, I received the first of a series of desperate messages appealing for aid in the terribly unequal fight.

On August 3, in the afternoon, I was informed Stalin would see me at 9:30 that night.

The man who wins "elections" by a 100-percent vote is nonetheless the most heavily guarded individual on earth today.

SCANNED CAREFULLY

On the night I saw him the first time, to plead the case of a depleted and desperate ally who was being treated more shabbily than such former enemies as Italy, my papers were carefully examined at the main gate of the Kremlin, NKVD men led me through the yard to the door of a certain building in the enclosure, more NKVD men took me to a waiting room, still more NKVD men scrutinized me for 5 minutes while I stood in that room, and finally I was admitted to the Red leader's large study.

With me were Professor Grabski, veteran speaker of the Polish Parliament-in-exile, and Polish Foreign Minister Romer.

Stalin was standing near a conference table that reached along the wall. With him was his translator Pavlov. Stalin wore his marshal's uniform, adorned by a single decoration.

On the wall above him, curiously enough, were big oil paintings of two old Czarist generals, Kutuzov and Suvorov. Relegated to an obscure spot near the door was a small photograph of Lenin.

"Won't you sit down?" Stalin asked.

He took a place near the end of the conference table, his back against the wall. I sat opposite him, with Pavlov in between. Stalin lighted a cigarette, exhaled the smoke, and made a gesture for me to sit.

(Installment XV)

Stalin looked across his conference table at me, on the night of August 3, 1944, while the Warsaw underground army was fighting for its life, and asked me why I wished to see him.

A few days earlier he had given an order to the Red Army to stop on the edges of Warsaw while the Polish home army, enticed by the Moscow radio to come out of hiding and fight the Germans, was cold bloodedly exterminated.

Simultaneously, Stalin had signed an "agreement" with a group of Communist-trained Poles who called themselves the Committee of the Liberation.

"I'm glad to be here in Moscow on the anniversary of the Stalin-Sikorski agreement of 1941," I began, reminding him of a pact of friendship and aid which he had broken with characteristic callousness whenever it served Russia's purposes.

"It is also nice to be here at a time when the Soviet Armies are defeating the Germans on Polish soil," I continued. "I'd like to discuss the Polish-Soviet relations, the collaboration to finish the fight against Germany, and I'd like to discuss the question of the future administration of Poland.

"But, above all, because the fight within Warsaw has started, I want to appeal to you to bring immediate help to our men in their pitifully unequal battles with the Germans."

Stalin looked back at me and answered:

"But you are not taking into consideration the agreement which has been reached between the Soviet Union and the Lublin Committee."

It was the last time I was to hear him use the word "committee" in connection with the Polish stooges who had been so carefully assembled to extend the influence of the Kremlin into Poland. Thereafter, Stalin referred to them as "the Polish Government," though, of course, I was the Prime Minister of the actual Polish Government, and so recognized by all the countries of the world except Russia.

"You are speaking of something that has been done since I left London for Moscow, as you know," I said.

Stalin went on:

"The trouble with the Polish underground army is that it does not want to fight the Germans."

"You've been misinformed," I almost shouted. "Our home army began fighting Germans in 1939 and has never stopped fighting them."

"TOO EARLY" FOR AID

I reminded him of Sikorski's efforts in 1942–43 to enlist his aid for that fighting, and of Stalin's reply that, while he was "sorry to see Polish blood shed," it was too early to give help to our fighters in the homeland.

I reminded him, also, that there was a clear-cut record of our years of sabotaging German troops and supply trains moving across Poland to the Russian front.

"Ah, yes, but what an army!" Stalin snorted. "It has neither tanks nor artillery."

CAN'T TRUST POLES

"But that's one of the reasons I'm here to see you," I said. "Can you supply our men with tanks and artillery? Your forces are in the very suburbs of Warsaw, and are near home army units in many other sections of Poland."

"I cannot trust the Poles," Stalin answered. "They suspect me of wanting to occupy Poland again. They're making a lot of trouble for me."

I asked him to name one example. Just one.

"Well," he pondered, "there was the case of the commandant of your home army forces in the Chelm area. As we neared that region, he mobilized all able-bodied men from 16 to 65 and joined in the fight."

I asked him what was wrong with that.

"He should not have done this," Stalin replied steadily. "We needed those men for the harvest. So I had to order the arrest of that commandant."

DIFFERENT PEOPLE

Startled at his reasoning, I launched into a defense of the patriotism and cooperation of the Polish people—in face of extreme hardships and danger—but he cut me short this time.

"The Poles are a different people today than when you left there in 1939," he said.

And he moved the talk along the touchy question of our frontiers.

"You must realize this," he said, "that nothing can be done for Poland or you if you do not recognize the Curzon line."

"For the loss of eastern Poland," Stalin continued, "you'll get the Oder line in the west, including Wroclaw, Stettin, and East Prussia. Koenigsberg (promised to Poland in Mikolajczyk's talks with Roosevelt) will remain with the Soviet Union, as will the area around it."

VIOLATES CHARTER

I protested that this was a violation of the Atlantic Charter and the several Polish-Soviet pacts, and after hearing me out Stalin shrugged and said:

"Maybe we can make some changes in the Curzon line that will be to the benefit of Poland. But first you've got to reach an agreement with the Lublin Poles. Hereafter I intend to deal with only one Polish Government, not two."

Then he reminisced about Warsaw, especially the picturesque old part of the capital, and said that the Germans were defending it more savagely than he had expected. There would be a small delay in capturing the city, Stalin said.

"I'm eager to help your home army there," he went on. "But how can I? I don't know how to communicate with your commanders. I'd like to drop two of my communications officers in there, to send me word about the situation."

I offered him every assistance and urged him to do this.

FRUITLESS MEETING

Above all, I felt as he talked, that he was determined that Polish resistance, as exemplified by the Polish underground then fighting the Germans in the streets of Warsaw, must perish. The Red army, and the Red army alone, would be the "liberators of Warsaw."

I met with the Lubin Poles, in the fruitless hope of appealing to whatever Polish blood was left in their veins and getting their support for the home army and the future democracy of our native land.

They were a motley bunch, but Molotov met them at the airport with a great show of ceremony. Pravda, which had not once mentioned our presence in Moscow, ran long articles in praise of them.

They were Osobka-Morawski, a former co-op clerk who had been set up as head of the new Communist-controlled Polish "Socialist" Party; Wanda Wasilewska, a Polish Communist who, after the 1939 invasion of Poland by Hitler and Stalin, wrote that Poland "would never rise again"; Andrze Witos, a distant relative of the venerable head of the Polish Peasant Party and a frightened little man since his release from a Soviet death house, and Gen. Michal Zymierski, who had been dishonorably discharged from the Polish Army before the war for accepting a bribe.

PLEADS FOR HELP

"I spoke to Stalin the other night, and he expressed a willingness to help our forces in Warsaw," I said. Turning to Zymierski, I added, "As commander in chief of the Kosciuszko Divisions, you have good contacts with Red army headquarters, and now it's your duty—as a Pole—to bring help as quickly as possible. Our men are in desperate straits."

Zymierski started to reply, but Wanda Wasilewska, a stern, horse-faced, sex-starved fanatic, silenced him.

"There is no fighting in Warsaw," she said, looking at me through narrowed eyes.

Anti-Semitism in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of February 15, 1948:

ANTI-SEMITISM SEEN MOUNTING IN RUSSIA—INTENSITY OF FEELING DECLARED SURPRISING IN LAND BOASTING OF LACK OF PREJUDICE—ARMY POWER QUESTIONED—FORCE IN 1948 IS DESCRIBED AS FINEST IN THE WORLD FOR WAR BASED ON 1945 TECHNIQUES

(By Drew Middleton)

(Mr. Middleton left his post as correspondent in Moscow in May of 1947 for a vacation. Not having been able to obtain a reentry permit, he has been assigned to another post. This series on Russia has been written in London from notes he brought with him when he left Moscow.)

The extent and intensity of anti-semitism in the Soviet Union is surprising in a country that boasts of its lack of racial prejudice.

It is met in the streets and is evident in Government departments. It flourishes in Moscow but also in Odessa and Kiev. Reports on minor court cases reveal evidence of flourishing anti-semitism in the poorer quarters of the capital.

The Jews are blamed for shortages of bread or potatoes. In Kiev widespread discontent over the inadequacy of rations assumed an anti-semitic aspect.

One Russian never passes the pictures of members of the Political Bureau, which are displayed on national holidays, without muttering:

"Dirty Jew dogs, you killed my father."

Two former colonels of infantry have reason to know about anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

TRANSFER TO INFERIOR POSTS

These two colonels are Jews. Before the war they lived in the same town and worked in the same factory. When they were demobilized and returned to their jobs they learned they were to be transferred to inferior positions in distant parts of the Soviet Union.

Wearing the medals they had won fighting against the Germans, the two men journeyed to Moscow. After their protest had been heard, they received jobs similar to their old ones in towns not far distant from their old home. But the two friends were no longer to work in the same factory.

Still mystified, they invited their former factory manager out for a drink on their return home.

In his cups he said, "So you're moving. A good thing, too. You're good workmen, but we decided on the committee (the local Soviet) there were too many of you Jews in this town and in the factory. So we made a routine complaint."

Anti-Semitism is not an announced Government policy, as it was in Germany. But it is difficult to believe that such widespread anti-Semitism could exist in so closely controlled a police state if the Government did not give its tacit approval.

Announced or not, it appears to be Government policy to reduce the number of Jews in positions of influence in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Moreover, Jews are barred from joining the ministry even in the most subsidiary positions.

Jews cannot now enter the principal military academies in Moscow. Their number is restricted in the medical and law schools in the university at Kiev and in Moscow University.

Jews trace the start of the present antagonism to the treason trials 12 years ago. Leon Trotsky, they point out, was a Jew and so were many of his followers.

Like much else in the Soviet Union, the armed forces of the Socialist state present an imposing and awe-inspiring front.

The Soviet Army—the adjective "Red" has been abandoned—is formidable from the point of view of manpower, tanks, and guns. In 1948 it is probably the finest army in the world for the warfare of 1945.

Behind this front are certain important weaknesses. Some reflect the deficiencies of the Soviet economy as a whole. Some are the result of a mental hangover arising from a deep draught of victory laced with propaganda.

Despite nearly 2 years of preparation after the signing of the Russo-German pact of 1939 it was nearly eliminated in the first 2 months of the German invasion.

The German commanders, especially Field Marshal Gen. Karl von Rundstedt, consistently outthought their Soviet opponents. Many elements of the vast multinational Soviet army were unreliable in battle; notably, according to a Russian staff officer, the Armenians, Kazakhs and Uzbeks. Matériel, weapons, and ammunition were deficient in quantity and quality.

The Soviet state is one built by and defended by land power. Today the Russian Navy, its history one of startling defeats and dubious victories, is subsidiary to the ground forces.

Soviet air power is considerable. But it is subordinated to the needs of the ground forces. Construction of a long-range, heavy-bombardment force was opposed by the ground commanders, during and after the war, and, as in the Wehrmacht of National Socialist Germany, their views prevailed.

ATOM BOMB A FACTOR

The present emphasis on the atom bomb shows that a section at least of the political hierarchy understands the importance of nuclear fission in war. But according to articles in the military journals and magazines and the conversations that several highly placed foreigners, including two of the most successful of western generals, have had with Russian general officers, there is a strong belief that what was god enough for 1945, or even earlier, will be good enough for 19—.

The weaknesses of Russia's industrial economy today are also the weaknesses of the war machine. For today industrial strength is the prerequisite of not only victory but survival and the manufacture of decisive weapons demands a larger, better-trained, more-experienced industrial population than ever before.

For centuries Russia's main defense against invading armies has been her enormous size. Invading armies were swallowed in the vast expanse of Russian earth as, with supply lines extended, they pursued the retreating Russian forces. Today when war moves in the air such a defense is outmoded.

The Soviet Union, with a totalitarian system that can direct all national effort in peacetime to one objective, probably has now succeeded in manufacturing at least one atom bomb. Whether it has solved the other problems that have arisen from the new conditions of warfare is another question.

Can Soviet industry in its present straitened circumstances begin large-scale manufacture of atom bombs?

Will the army's general staff continue to resist "interference" by scientists and technicians in organization and planning for war?

Are there enough technicians, scientists, and "managers" to meet the new requirements of atomic armament and simultaneously fulfill plans for industrial expansion under the 5-year plan and the demands of the established armed forces?

PINNACLE OF POWER

Today the Russian Army has reached the pinnacle of power.

Well-advertised demobilization has been balanced in part by continuous conscription. It is undoubtedly the largest army in the world, with at least 2,000,000 troops in eastern Siberia, the Maritime Provinces, and Manchuria, and over 2,750,000 in western Russia, the periphery or satellite states and the trans-Caucasian and Karelo-Finnish Republics.

Equipment in the last war's weapons is excellent. Tanks, guns, and mortars are bigger, combat soldiers more heavily armed and the sheer mass of matériel more impressive than anywhere else in the world.

Command, again measured by 1945 standards, is good.

The navy, except for submarine construction, has remained static since the close of the war.

Since the removal from high position of most of the senior officers who advocated long-range bombardment in the western style, the Soviet Air Force has concentrated on the support of the ground forces.

The production of jet-propelled fighters has gone on since the end of the war. On May 1, 1947, not fewer than 100 of them flew over the Kremlin. From what the writer saw on airfields in Minsk, Kiev, Odessa, Zaporozhe, Stalino, and Rostov, as well as in Moscow, the Soviet Air Force is also well off in light and medium bombers.

The only four-engined bombers evident are those produced for major military demonstrations.

One is struck by two thoughts after seeing such parts of the Russian war machine as are exposed to foreigners. The first is that the United States and Great Britain contributed far more to the victory over Germany than one would expect even after an extensive tour of the fronts of western Europe.

The second is that the Russian Army has reached the apex of its power about 10 years too late and at a time when the vast masses of machinelike soldiery, the ponderous tanks, the tremendous guns are but minor equipment for war.

Increase of Pay for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jerry Bakst, from PM for February 6, 1948:

POSTMEN RING FOR PAY RAISE
(By Jerry Bakst)

The Nation's 340,000 regular civil-service postal employees are asking Uncle Sam for a $1,000 a year salary increase to help them combat the soaring cost of living.

They are driving for passage of bills to grant them the raise now before Congress but the postmen fear that this year, as in the past, they will get much florid oratory and little or no cash.

The highest paid of these postal employees—railway-mail clerks—receive $3,300 a year, about $63.50 a week, after 10 years of regular experience. But their regular experience doesn't start until they have served time as substitutes at $1.14 an hour. Then they become permanent subs and get 5 cents an hour increases every year.

When vacancies occur and they are finally appointed as regular civil-service employees, their starting salary is $2,300 a year. They get $100 increases each year until they hit $3,300.

CARRIERS', CLERKS' TOP IS $3,100

They get another $100 the third year after they hit $3,300, another $100 in the eighth year, and still another $100 in the fifteenth year, so that the peak becomes $3,600 a year after at least a quarter of a century's work.

Income taxes, of course, are deducted, and so is 5 percent for pensions.

But the railway mail clerks, low as their pay is, are better off than other postal workers:

Letter carriers and post-office clerks get $2,100 to $3,100 a year.

Mail handlers who load and unload the mail pouches get $2,000 to $2,500. So do custodial employees such as guards, elevator operators and garagemen.

Special delivery messengers get $2,000 to $2,800.

NO RAISE IN 2 YEARS

The postal workers have been behind the economic eight-ball for a long time. From 1932 to 1942, they got no pay increase of any kind. In 1942, they got a $300 cost-of-living bonus and in 1945, another $100 was added and the $400 boost was made permanent.

But the base entering salary scales remained the same.

Under the Reclassification Act passed in 1945 and effective in January 1946, classification inequities were ironed out, increments were given certain crafts for long-time service, and all base pay scales were raised $400.

Since then, with living costs zooming up, the men who handle your letters haven't had a raise.

Postal employees, whose legislative arm in the New York City area is the Joint Council of Affiliated Postal Employees, also point out that pension deductions have jumped from 2½ percent of salaries in 1920 to 3½ percent in 1920 and again to 5 percent in 1942.

There were no benefit improvements, the postal workers point out.

ASK 40 PERCENT RAISE FOR SUBSTITUTES

The Joint Council, composed of 23 A. F. of L. postal union locals representing some 18,000 workers in six crafts, is pressing, along with other postal-employee organizations, for passage of the Langer-Chavez bill, S. 1849, and the Dingell bill, H. R. 4704, which incorporate the pay raise they seek.

They are also asking 40-percent pay raises for substitutes who, before they reach permanent substitute status get 99 cents, $1.04, or $1.14 an hour, depending on the craft they're in. Substitutes don't always work a full workweek but are always on call, which hampers them in getting outside work. During rush periods like Christmas, when they work overtime, they are paid straight-time rates for overtime work.

There are a lot of other angles to the postal workers' plight. Senior post-office clerks and railway mail clerks must be familiar with the postal "schemes" of as many as four States. They must know where each post office is located, what railroads serve the town or city it's in, and must be acquainted with railroad schedules so that mail will move with a minimum of delay.

RAILWAY CLERKS HAVE "HOME WORK"

When a railway-mail clerk is finished with his run—say from New York to Albany—the mail he has sorted must be bundled up and ready for the letter carrier who will deliver it to its final destination. All the letter carrier should have to do is sort the mail for the streets he serves in house-number order.

In addition to his own "schemes," the railway mail clerk must have enough knowledge of the rest of the country to be able properly to route mail picked up on his train run. Moreover, he is personally responsible for all registered mail he handles and if such mail is lost, he may be held liable.

When his run is through he has home work, just as he has home work before he starts out. Before he leaves he must prepare all his tags, labels, and forms. When he gets back, he must prepare a trip report. For this work at home, the railway mail clerk gets $200 a year extra, which is why his salary exceeds that of a post-office clerk by that amount.

En route, a railway-mail clerk may have to purchase additional mail space from the railroad if the load picked up on the run is more than has been anticipated. He is responsible for the purchase and must account for it when he makes out his trip report at the end of the run.

Should Butter and Oleo Be Treated Alike by Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include a radio address as prepared by Mr. E. W. Tiedeman, general manager, Central Grade A Cooperative, and executive chairman, National Dairy Council, Appleton, Wis.:

The topic for discussion "Should butter and oleo be treated alike by government?" really means: Should the present taxes and regulations be removed from oleo? My answer is "No."

Right at the start I want to make it perfectly clear that the dairy industry is not trying to deprive consumers of oleomargarine; we have no desire to bar, or to limit, or to interfere in any way with the legitimate sale of oleomargarine. We have no objection to the use of oleo just as long as oleomargarine is sold on its own merits, for what it is—a white vegetable compound.

Dairy farmers have no quarrel with oleomargarine in its legitimate field—no more than they have a quarrel with vegetable shortening, or lard, or salad oils.

But let me make this perfectly clear, also: dairy farmers have opposed and will continue to oppose all efforts of oleo to masquerade as butter. Oleo is not butter, no matter how well its oils are deodorized, no matter how well it is needled with vitamins A and D, no matter how well is is artificially flavored and colored, no matter how skillfully the distinctive butter carton is imitated, no matter how many signboards and advertisements appear, showing farm scenes with dairy cows up to their knees in clover, no matter how it runs the entire gamut of imitation—oleo is still not butter. Since it is not butter, dairy farmers insist that laws which are intended to prevent its being sold as butter, be kept on the books. This whole issue is just that simple—if the consumer wants oleo, she has a right to get it; if she wants butter, and most people do, she has the same right to be sure she is getting butter.

The present laws which curb unrestricted sale of colored oleo as butter are a safeguard to consumers. That is why these laws were enacted. They are, also, necessary for the protection of the dairy industry, because only law can help to counteract misrepresentation, fraud, and deception in the sale of oleomargarine.

Dairy farmers take the position that (1) oleo regulation is necessary to protect the consumer from intentional or unintentional fraud and deception and (2) oleo regulation is necessary to protect the dairy industry from free and unhindered sale of oleo in imitation of butter.

The history of oleo legislation briefly, is this: Oleomargarine was introduced into the United States in 1874. By 1883 its fraudulent sale as butter had become so widespread that Congress considered its control. In 1886 Congress passed the first Oleomargarine Control Act levying a tax of 2 cents per pound. This tax proved to be ineffective, and by 1902 some 30 States had passed anticolor laws, and Congress enacted the law which taxes oleo 10 cents per pound when it is colored in semblance of butter. That is the one that the oleo lobby is trying so hard to have repealed.

It is contended by those who are trying to get repeal of the oleo-color tax that present-day business ethics are in themselves a guaranty against deception in the sale of colored oleo as butter. Unfortunately, this is not true, as the annual reports of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue will attest.

I am not suggesting that manufacturers of oleo would be intentional parties to fraud. The opportunities of fraud would be manifold, however, after the colored tax-free oleo left the hands of the manufacturers.

Again let me emphasize that so far as consumers are concerned, the 10-cent color tax on oleo does not cost them anything, if all they want is a lower priced spread in its original form. They should not complain about paying a 10-cent tax for the privilege of coloring oleo yellow, since the yellow color adds nothing in the way of nutritional value. Yellow is the trade-mark of butter with which nature has endowed it. For thousands of years the natural yellow color of butter and its typical flavor have been universally recognized and accepted. The producer and the consumer know that butter is both a food and a flavor. To them color and flavor are the evidence of its identity. They believe that the consumer is entitled to buy either oleomargarine or butter, with the feeling of assurance that there will be no confusion, no uncertainty, no parading in false colors. There is only one reason why anyone wants to color oleo yellow and that is to make it look like something which it is not.

The oleo tax has been described by its opponents as a tribute to the dairy industry. It is not a tribute to the dairy industry—neither the farmers nor the dairy industry get the tax; it goes to the Government. The oleo tax is primarily a regulatory tax for consumer protection against unrestricted imitation of butter. It must be granted that when regulation is necessary, the product regulated should pay the cost of the regulation enforcement.

The cries of protest from oleo manufacturers have been mounting day by day. It has been said that the color tax is unjustified, and that oleo is the only food product which bears a tax. They neglect to mention that oleo itself is protected by an internal revenue tax of 15 cents per pound on all oleomargarine imported from foreign countries. They likewise forget to mention that oleo enjoys privileges under Federal regulation that are are not extended to butter.

Under the Federal food drug standards for oleomargarine, makers of oleo are permitted to add butter flavoring, preservative, and vitamins A and D.

On the other hand, if butter manufacturers wished to increase the natural vitamins A and D content of butter, by addition of vitamins A and D, or to add preservatives to guard against the improper refrigeration of butter, such practices would cause such butter to be subject to seizure and condemnation as an adulterated food product.

The contention that oleo is the only food product which is taxed is belied by the fact that other imitation butters are also taxed. There is a ¼-cent per pound tax on processed or renovated butter.

In the case of butter, it was unnecessary for Congress to impose any regulatory tax, because no question of fraud or deception is involved in its manufacture. Butter is a natural product, sold for what it is, and is not an imitation of any other product. Oleomargarine is an imitation of butter. Does anyone think if the natural color of butter were pink, that the oleo people would be crying to high heaven because they are taxed when they color their produce yellow?

To summarize: If the present Federal taxes regulating oleo were repealed, it would mean that—

1. Practically all oleo would be colored yellow—there would be little if any white oleo on the market to help hold down the price of colored oleo. There would be nothing to prevent manufacturers from boosting the price of yellow oleo. It is very likely that low-income people would be paying more rather than less for oleo.

2. Consumers would have no adequate protection against fraud, deception, and misrepresentation.

3. No control would be left to the Federal Government over intrastate production and sale of oleo because the Pure Food and Drug Act does not apply there.

4. The dairy industry would suffer tremendous losses because of the resulting increase in fraudulent sales of oleo as butter.

5. Finally, the whole issue boils down to this—if the consumer wants to get oleo she has the right to get it. She can get it. She does get it. If she wants butter, she has the same right to be sure she is getting butter. She can have this assurance only by keeping taxes regulating oleo on the statute books.

The Palestine Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the present critical situation in Palestine and the plight of the Jewish population there should receive the serious consideration and immediate attention of an aroused Congress.

I cannot conceive that our country, the outstanding champion of a peaceful and democratic solution to the Palestine question, will view with indifference the military offensive and atrocities now being carried out against these defenseless people.

Under the permission granted me I include in these remarks the following stirring address made by Mayor William O'Dwyer of the city of New York at a meeting in Manhattan Center, New York City, under the auspices of the Emergency Zionist Council a week ago Thursday evening, February 5, 1948:

I am here as an American citizen who loves his country, who believes in her institutions and who always wants to see that her strength is on the side of right, on the side of humanity.

I have seen the ravaged lands abroad where people and land have both been turned into rubble, and where the survivors lack the power to do what they think should be done. This tragedy of impotence has never come upon us here. We still have power to see things clearly, to choose spiritual values, to abide by principle.

The one great, real, and tangible victory that came out of the wholesale destruction of the last war has been the establishment of the United Nations. It came out of the hope and faith, in the hearts of the common people the world over, that such moral chaos as had plunged the world into war, twice in one generation, could be averted, and must be averted. It is our best hope of establishing a new order of decency, justice, and peace in world affairs. It was fathered by our own late great President Roosevelt. It was brought to birth on our shores in San Francisco, and, by common consent, this country was made its permanent home.

We in the United States have thus acknowledged our stake in the future of the United Nations. We here in New York have given a special pledge of our faith in its future. We have assured to it all the facilities and hospitality necessary for the accomplishment of its importaft work and great purposes.

One of the most important and urgent problems to face the Assembly of the United Nations was that of Palestine and the displaced Jews of Europe. The nations met and formulated a plan which was a compromise, but it was also a step forward.

During the General Assembly's deliberations, Arab leaders issued one threat after another, and proclaimed their determination to resist with arms any United Nations decision on partition.

The nations of the world and the United States Government heard these oft-repeated threats, took into account the attiude of the British Government, and, after deliberate and thorough discussion, voted to adopt the resolution to partition Palestine. It was not mere sentiment that dictated this American policy on Palesine. It was the realization that freedom and democracy in the world, justice in international relations, world peace and the legitimate interests of America would best be served by this solution of the problem of Jewish homelessness—a problem that has been a festering sore in international relations for such a long time.

When the decision was solemnly adopted in plenary session of the United Nations, it marked the first genuine victory of that tribunal. It marked the first instance of accord among nations, in which their rivalries were subordinated toward achieving some measure of justice. It was the first proof of the strength of the United Nations as a whole.

It seemed fantastic to suppose then that the seven Arab delegations which left the Assembly Hall defiantly vowing that they would set that decision at naught could make good their threat. It did not then seem possible that the most important expression of our modern new world organization could be turned into a mockery and into such a tragedy as it has become.

We are now witnessing the murder of hundreds of people in Palestine. We are now witnessing the frustration of the hope of a homeland, of a people who built that homeland with sweat and blood from desert earth. We are now witnessing the murder of the honor of the United Nations which

pledged them this homeland and the honor of the United States which played a leading role in supporting that pledge. What has happened and is happening in the Holy Land since the decision of the United Nations is a matter of daily newspaper headlines.

Ironically, the decision that was intended to help the stateless and homeless Jews has been so perverted that it may result in a carnage of Hitlerian proportions unless it is checked.

I believe that the heroic Jews in Palestine will not give their lives cheaply. They have already taught the world what to expect from them in courage and in military prowess. They will fight, with their bare hands if need be.

These people are no revolutionaries seeking the overthrow of a government. They are the legitimate recipients of a legal award, waiting peaceably for the day when the mandate is lifted and they may rightly take over. They are the people whose lives and homes are now being subjected to ruthless, sudden, and swift attack by foes who have sworn to exterminate them before the promised hour of liberation arrives.

The whole future of the United Nations is today pin pointed on the manner in which its decision on Palestine will be carried out. You cannot have international peace so long as you permit international murder. You cannot have peace here if you permit anarchy to flourish anywhere. The manner in which we deal with the Palestine decision may well decide whether the United Nations organization is to fulfill its purpose or whether it is doomed to nullity and failure. And that answer hinges, in a great measure, on the good faith and action of our own country.

We spoke for the conscience of the world when we threw our great prestige and moral force into that United Nations solution of the Palestine question. It meant, as I see it, that we voted in good faith and that we would back with deed our pledged word to the United Nations and to the people of Palestine. That is the kind of vote the world expected from us, and that is what the world has a right to expect from us. Our support was not intended to mean that we would merely register a vote on the record and then turn away from the inevitable consequences of implementing our vote.

We are the greatest, richest, most powerful Nation in the world, the one nation which has come through the war with moral, spiritual, and material values undestroyed, the leader that holds up to the world, as a beacon light, the shining values of democracy. We are a nation that must keep faith with ourselves and with the world.

Has anything happened since the United Nations adopted its decision, to warrant a revision of this American policy on Palestine—a policy that has been shaped over a period of many years, and endorsed time and again, not only by our Chief Executives, but by Congress, and by American public opinion? The answer should be "No." The answer is "No." The question that may be asked—the question that is being asked is, Have we been as energetic and as forthright in fulfilling our promise as we have been in making it? Are we using our power and our resources to implement that United Nations decision, for which we were so largely responsible, or are we allowing the situation to deteriorate? Are we merely standing by in the matter or are we doing something about it?

I am afraid that American inactivity is largely responsible for the growth of the crisis in Palestine and in the Middle East. We seem to be following a course inspired by anti-Jewish circles, who want to manipulate events in such a way as to be able to say: "The opposition to partition is so formidable, that the plan simply cannot be carried out. Give up the whole idea." That is precisely what they are saying, and they are saying it to the councils of our Government.

I am here to say that America and its people will not accept a reversal of the United Nations decision on Palestine—a decision in which the United States played so prominent a part. I am here to say that if we weaken in the support of that decision, it will have the most disastrous effect on the fortunes of the United Nations.

For even a child can understand that the issue before us now is much deeper and wider than Palestine or the Jewish people. It is the existence of the United Nations that is at stake. We live in an era of such fears as shrivel the mind and the heart. There is no answer to these fears except to strengthen the means of collective security. The hope and faith of too many of the common peoples the world over are centered in it. If we let down the United Nations on the question of Palestine, it will never recover. With the United Nations will go our hope for world peace. The death of the United Nations means the death of our civilization. And in this lies the tragedy for the world, for mankind, for each and every one of us.

Such tragic consequences must be prevented. They can be prevented. We dare not admit defeat or helplessness. But we must act, and act courageously and quickly.

Clearly, this problem cannot be solved overnight. We must separate the long-range problem of the Jewish State in Palestine from the immediate emergency now confronting us. The United States is in a position to take swift action in the immediate emergency and demonstrate to all the world that we stand in back of our commitments, and that promise means performance.

With our backing, it is still possible for the Security Council, under the Charter, to form a United Nations international police force or constabulary which can be sent to Palestine to prevent the breach of the peace that threatens. This force should be ready to move in when the British troops leave, or earlier, as requested.

With our backing, it is still possible to have the Security Council examine the question of using and invoking measures, short of military force, for the maintenance of peace and security. The resolution of the United Nations Assembly recommended such action. With our backing, the doors of Palestine may be immediately opened to the displaced Jews of Europe.

And we should, of course, lift or modify our own recent embargo on the shipment of arms to Palestine. The result of this embargo is incredibly unjust. It is tantamount to arming Arabs to attack the Jews and frustrate the United Nations decision, while preventing the Jews from receiving arms to defend themselves and thus sustain the decision of the United Nations.

We Americans understand the real implications of a one-sided embargo and we resent being told that the matter is so complicated and the considerations so involved that only a small group of professional diplomats can be entrusted in handling it.

The embargo must be modified. It is a cruel travesty to maintain it in the face of organized massacre and international lawlessness. By all means, let us deny arms to aggressors. By all means, let us deny arms to those who attack the Jews of Palestine and flout the judgment of the United Nations. But we are honor bound to make the decision of the United Nations effective by supplying arms to those who resist aggression and those who support the United Nations. Give arms to the Jews who are compelled to defend their lives and to preserve their freedom.

There are times in the unfolding of history when a great moral force must make itself felt or what has been achieved by generations of men, at infinite cost, can be swept away overnight. Bitterness and disillusionment cannot be underestimated as weapons of anarchy and destruction.

Now is such a time. The United States, moral leader of the world, must assume her role. She cannot remain remote; she cannot remain inactive.

Capt. Alden Partridge, Apostle of Preparedness and Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am extending my remarks and including a verbatim copy of the address I delivered at Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., on the twelfth day of February, it being National Defense Day, and the occasion of the observance of the one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of the birth of Capt. Alden Partridge, founder of Norwich University:

Mr. President, fellow citizens, we are met today to appropriately observe the one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of the birth of one of America's great men, Capt. Alden Partridge, Vermonter.

"The grand military defense of our favored country, both against external invasion and internal insurrection, is vested in the great mass of American citizens from 18 to 45 years of age. These constitute the grand military force of the Nation; a force whose feelings and interests are identified with those of the great body of the people, and which, while it forms an impregnable barrier around the Constitution and liberties of the country is in no respect dangerous to either. But in order that this constitutional force should answer the purpose for which it was originally instituted, it must be properly organized and duly instructed in the elements, at least, of military science and tactics. Hence arises the necessity in our country, of an extended system of military education, and of a general diffusion of military knowledge. If these so necessary requisites be not attended to, if the great body of American citizens do not feel that they are something more than merely nominal soldiers, our population will gradually degenerate, our militia, so emphatically styled the bulwark of our liberties and independence, will lose their military spirit, will decline and finally be destroyed; on their ruins will spring up the standing Army detached by feeling and by interest from the great mass of the people, and when this crisis arrives, it will not require the spirit of prophecy to predict our fate from that of the most celebrated Republic of antiquity.

"The liberties of Rome were safe while military information was generally diffused and every Roman citizen considered and felt himself a soldier. But, how fatal were the results when by the operations of a system organized by Caius Marius, the savior and scourge of Rome, and matured by Julius Caesar with a view doubtless to the accomplishment of his ultimate object, the final prostration of the liberties of the country; those noble and patriotic legions which had so often, in time of peril and danger, proved the shield of their country and the terror of its enemies, were transformed into mere mercenary bands, alienated from the country and identified in views and interests with their leaders alone.

"But Rome, though the most striking, is not the only instance in which similar causes have produced like effects. The republics of Greece furnish additional instances. Can you believe that if the Greeks in the age of Demosthenes had possessed the same spirit and organization which they did in the age of Themistocles and Aristides, or, if the soldiers who fought at Cheronea had been of the same stamp with those who fought at Marathon and Thermopylae, they would have so tamely submitted their necks to the yoke of the Macedonian conqueror? From an attentive consideration of these, as well as of many other similar instances which might be adduced, I am forced to the conclusion that in every republic the due cultivation of a proper military spirit amongst the great mass of the people and a general diffusion of military information are indispensably necessary for the preservation of liberty; and consequently that those republics which neglect these requisites, will eventually be driven to exchange their freedom for a form of government bordering at least on military despotism."

The foregoing is quoted from the announcement of Capt. Alden Partridge's Views on Education and Military Training, as published in the Windsor Journal, Windsor, Vt., in 1820. He did as much as any American to mold, to shape, to determine the educational policies of his time and of succeeding generations.

Today we honor ourselves by undertaking properly to observe the one-hundred-and-sixty-third anniversary of Alden Partridge's birth in the little town of Norwich, in Windsor County, Vt., February 12, 1785.

He was educated in the common schools, at Dartmouth College, and West Point, from which latter institution he graduated as first lieutenant of engineers. In 1806, at the age of 23, he was detailed to act as Superintendent, and continued to serve in that capacity, with brief intervals, to 1815, when he received a permanent appointment which he continued to hold until 1817.

In the early part of 1819, having resigned from the Army the year previous, he was employed as United States Government engineer in charge of the survey of our country's northeastern boundary under the Fifth Article of the Treaty of Ghent. I have seen the original correspondence involving his selection for that important task and have read the diary he kept as he made and completed the survey. In July of that year he resigned this position to carry into effect a plan of education that had occupied much of his attention since 1810.

Over and over again he expounded the doctrine that in every republic the due cultivation of proper military discipline among the great mass of the people and a general diffusion of military information are indispensably necessary for the maintenance of government and preservation of liberty.

He followed the thesis laid down by Milton, who said: "A complete and generous education is that which fits a man to perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously all the offices both public and private, of peace and war." History attests its correctness.

Revolutionary as was the educational system for which he stood sponsor, it was entitled to, and eventually it won, the respect of the leading educators of the land.

Someone has said that the true test of a great man is found in the fact of his having been in advance of his age. Alden Partridge qualifies under such a definition. He was a great man.

His advanced educational ideas, at first opposed by his contemporaries, have been appropriated one by one; they thereupon have been accepted and adopted almost universally. He was prominent, and a leader, not only as a military officer and an educator, but in the zealous discharge of his duties as a citizen.

The product of a hard land rich in many men, he was an exemplar of fearlessness, courage, depth, and breadth of thinking; an inheritor of that prescience which our New England forbears contributed and which their successors have continued to pour into the melting pot we call the United States of America.

Four times he represented his home town of Norwich in the Legislature of Vermont. In 1821 he was elected president of the University of Vermont, but declined to accept the honor. What was the loss of the University of Vermont was the gain of Norwich.

Three times he was an unsuccessful candidate of his party for Congress.

He had the courage of his convictions, nevertheless. I have seen a political campaign poster he had printed and widely distributed wherein he declared himself as a candidate for President. He took advantage of the attendant publicity to talk about the necessity for a trained citizen soldiery, as you might expect.

The towns of Strafford and Norwich adjoin. Substantiated tradition has it that Senator Justin S. Morrill's Land Grant College Act was inspired by Captain Partridge's lectures, discussions, pronouncements, and conferences had with him, and the necessity for some form of military training as a basis for citizenship, such as advocated and exemplified by his neighbor, the founder and then president of Norwich.

Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Clay, Calhoun, and Morrill were his friends; distinguished men of the time in which they lived, but no more distinguished, no more able, no more entitled to a high place on the honor roll of our country than this teacher, prophet, educator, and public servant—Alden Partridge.

In 1834, while a member of the Vermont Legislature, he obtained the charter for Norwich University, of which he was elected president in 1835, serving until he resigned on November 11, 1843.

When president of Norwich he called conventions of military officers and persons interested in the militia of the several States to discuss plans for the organization and discipline of the militia and for the wider dissemination of a knowledge of military science.

In 1839 he visited Portsmouth, Va., and at the request of similarly minded patriots, established an institution soon recognized by the State of Virginia as the Virginia Literary, Scientific, and Military Institute, which had an outstanding record as has Virginia Military Institute at Lexington.

From 1840 to 1853 he was as above stated very actively engaged, country-wide, delivering lectures, attending conventions along military lines, training and instructing officers and men. Among other institutions he established along academic-citizen-soldier-training lines were those at Bristol, Pa., in 1845, at Reading, Pa., in 1850, as well as one at Pembroke, N. H., that same year.

In 1853 he established another institution at Brandywine Springs near Wilmington, Del., for which institution with competent financial support he had great hopes, which were shattered by a fire in the fall of 1853, when the buildings were consumed by flames.

In the fall of that year he returned to Norwich, Vt., where his family still resided. It was there on the 17th of January 1854 that he died, and in the little old cemetery at Norwich, the body of one who had been so active and restless was laid to rest.

He was one of Vermont's great men; one of her most distinguished sons and citizens.

We do not fully appreciate the magnitude of the debt the people of the United States and the State of Vermont owe this hardy pioneer of broad, prophetic vision, with the courage, and the determination to make his dream come true. Together with his contemporaries he laid the everlasting foundation on which has been erected the superstructure of the greatest and best republic the world has ever known.

Americans today, as in the days of Alden Partridge, are opposed to war, or anything which looks like another war; but the average citizen today would be as bitterly opposed to anything and everything which looks like such a wilful lack of preparedness as that with which we were twice recently confronted when we ought to have been ready to have prevented or to have entered and to have then ended the war.

History and experience have taught, as Alden Partridge long ago insisted, that in a republic the due cultivation of proper military discipline among the great mass of the people, and a general diffusion of military information always have been, are now, and always will be indispensably necessary for the defense, protection, and preservation of this Government. Contradiction is idle.

As Secretary of State Marshall has well said:

"We are living today in a most difficult period. The problems are different, but no less vital to the national security than those during the days of active fighting. But the more serious aspect is the fact that we no longer display that intensity, that unity of purpose with which we concentrated upon the war task and achieved the victory.

"There is a natural tendency to relax and to return to business as usual, politics as usual, pleasure as usual. Many of our people have become indifferent to what I might term the longtime dangers to the Nation's security. It is natural and necessary that there should be a relaxation of wartime tensions.

"But I feel that we are seriously failing in our attitude toward the international problems whose solution will largely determine our future. The public appears generally in the attitude of a spectator—interested, yes, but whose serious thinking is directed to local, immediate matters. Spectators of life are not those who will retain their liberties, nor are they likely to contribute to their country's security.

"There are many who deplore, but few who are willing to act—to act directly or to influence political action. Action depends upon conviction, and conviction in turn depends upon understanding both of the past history of man on the globe and an understanding that action is a basic necessity of man's nature."

I am neither a militarist nor a pacifist. I am an American, and as such, with every rational and conscientious person the world over, I join in the wish and the hope that there may never be another war. I am not so foolish, however, as to believe my hopes will soon be realized, or my wishes speedily come true. There is no established peace, none which may be established by agreement, nor any to be won, but which must be defended.

All may dream of the day when wars shall cease. Every effort to bring about a realization of such a dream, so long as it does not strip us of our defenses, nor develop a condition of unpreparedness, nor lay us open to, nor invite attack, is commendable, and deserves our support; yet, I say to you while we dream, grim reality stares us in the face. If we are to have universal peace we must be prepared to initiate it, maintain it, and fight for it if need be.

America will cease to be a great nation, and the exemplar of republics whenever her young men and young women no longer possess adequate preparation, courage, energy, daring, training, endurance, determination, and the power to fight their Nation's foes or vigorously to maintain the principles on which our founders conceived, established, and defended this Nation of ours.

Capt. Alden Partridge was the prophet of preparedness. Military training for citizens

today, as in his day, is the essence of democracy. It recognizes the equal responsibility of all citizens for the safety of the country whose protection they claim. It is fair, it is just, it is right. It is an American plan.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting an article by Cecil B. Dickson, of the Gannett News Service, as follows:

MARSHALL PLAN CALLED "COVER-UP" FOR ERRORS OF ROOSEVELT, TRUMAN

(By Cecil B. Dickson)

WASHINGTON.—More and more the Marshall plan to aid busted Europe shows as a "cover-up" for the tragic mistakes the Roosevelt and Truman administrations made in dealing with the Soviets.

As debate over the Nation as well as in Congress develops, postwar mistakes made by our Government in Europe loom in greater magnitude

All the great and highly touted postwar plans, which have already cost American taxpayers $20,000,000,000 in cash and many more billions in inflated prices, have failed of effectiveness.

The evidence is in the Marshall plan itself, if the United Nations, UNRRA, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the $3,750,000,000 loan to the British, the administration by the Army of Germany and Austria and all the other financial and material aid contributed thus far had been successful, there would not have been any Marshall plan. It would not have been needed.

The Truman administration says we must have the Marshall plan, to restore Europe and to stop the sweep of communism westward in Europe.

Yet, it gives no assurance that the plan, to take $17,000,000,000 from American taxpayers and buy our scarce materials and food to send abroad at the risk of more inflation here, has any possibility of succeeding.

Even the author of the give-away plan, Secretary of State George C. Marshall, admits it is a calculated risk with doubt as to achievement.

Proposed administrator of the dubious project, Lewis W. Douglas, our Ambassador to England has admitted that even with the sharing of our wealth with western Europe, there is serious question as to whether it will accomplish the objective in 4 or even more years.

Looking backward a few years, I remember that on December 7, 1941, General George C. Marshall was horseback riding when the Japs bombed Pearl Harbor. The bombing took place while Secretary of State Cordell Hull was conferring with two treacherous Japanese at the State Department.

Looking farther backward, I recall that shortly after the Germans moved into Russia on June 22, 1941, General Marshall held a special secret press conference in which he predicted the Russians could not stand against the Germans 6 weeks. The idea was to boom lend-lease aid for the Soviets, whose strength he underestimated.

Again looking backward, I recall the luxury with which we fought this war, a more luxurious war than ever fought in history. Granted that the general did have the great concept of the requirements of the world wide conflict and that this Nation had the wealth in money, manpower and material strength to wage it on such a scale, I often wondered if so many tools had not been available whether the general would have ended the war with the title of hero, as he did.

Still recounting, I remember now when he could not get the Nationalist and Communistic governments in China to do as he wanted them to do, the then Ambassador Marshall recommended withdrawal of American assistance to Chiang Kai-shek's government.

It is almost a year ago that I was with Marshall in Moscow for the Big Four Conference, which resulted in another failure to deal with the Communists. There it was, after a strange but brief discussion with him at our Embassy that I decided that this man could not brook interference with his objectives.

It happened that after Marshall's Harvard foreign-aid speech, I wrote the first story in America giving some concept of the scope of the proposal.

At the time, I questioned the right of any one man, or any group of men, appointive in office, to commit the whole economy and all the people of our Nation to a project of such dangerous proportions, and even more dangerous potentials.

Now it is developing, despite the Marshallites' claim we have to spend along the lines of the Marshall plan or expand our Military Establishment, that we are going to have to do both if the Marshall plan is accepted.

Already there are proposals for bigger armaments, larger air forces, and compulsory military training to back up the Marshall plan.

To many worried and thinking people, the question arises as to whether the backers of the Marshall plan, who made so many mistakes in Europe and with Russia, are not now making another mistake.

If we are going to war with Russia, can we afford to give away wealth needed to fight? Will Europe help us fight if we help them more than we have?

I don't think so.

Address to Young Democrats of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address delivered by Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Senator from Alabama, before a convention of Young Democrats in North Carolina at Greensboro, N. C., February 7, 1948.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include, following the address by Senator SPARKMAN, an editorial entitled "Advice to Democrats," which appeared in the Greensboro Daily News under date of February 10, 1948:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN J. SPARKMAN, OF ALABAMA

It is a real pleasure to be with you at this meeting. One of my rich experiences has been the opportunity to meet with many groups of our citizens, groups of varied composition and seeking various goals. Of all these groups, there is none with whom I like to associate more than the Young Democrats. This is not only because of the warm personal friendship I enjoy with many of you, but primarily and fundamentally because of the importance of the task which you have undertaken.

This is a task of no small magnitude. It is no less than to awaken the young people of our country—both those now eligible to vote and those about to become so—to their role as citizens. You have set yourselves to recruit them into active participation in our political life. You have set yourselves to educate them to function with political intelligence, both as to issues and as to techniques. From among them you will select and groom promising candidates for public office. You continually pour fresh energy into the lifeblood of the party. You help to set the tone of party politics, providing new insights and ever-higher standards.

These are goals that will require a high degrees of citizen participation. They present opportunities so wide and so challenging that it is stimulating to meet with you and talk about them.

One fact that points to the importance of more active citizen participation is that in the 1946 elections only 35,000,000 voted out of 91,000,000 Americans 21 years of age or older. In the Presidential election of 1944, only 48,000,000 American citizens voted.

Comparisons made with other nations show that on a proportionate basis twice as many Englishmen voted in their last national election; and that from two to four times as many Frenchmen and Italians have consistently voted in their postwar elections. Moreover, our record is worse as to the number of eligible voters who cast their ballots than it was in the pioneer days when to vote was much more difficult than it is today. We are forfeiting a most precious privilege by not exercising it.

Another attitude which disturbs us is the position taken by many that "it is better to be a street sweeper than to be a politician." This stand is completely incompatible with the preservation of democracy. Responsibility toward and activity in the field of politics must be accepted as of equal importance with our responsibility to our business and our church. Of course, there are some dishonest office holders just as there are some dishonest businessmen and preachers. But we do not condemn these latter two segments of society as a whole just because of the occasional crook. In either case, it is the duty of the concerned citizenry to expose the culprits.

A general lack of esteem for people engaged in political work will tend to discourage those best qualified to seek office. And the slurring title of "bureaucrats" given those who enter Government service does not encourage our most competent young people to serve their Government as a career. This is already evident in many Federal positions of grave responsibility.

You have chosen to work within the ranks of the Democratic Party. Perhaps you have done this largely as a matter of tradition. Tonight I would like to discuss with you why as a matter of conviction, as well as tradition, the Democratic Party is the party to which you and the rest of the South should continue to give allegiance.

THE SOUTH CONSISTENTLY PROGRESSIVE

A question is sometimes raised as to how truly the Democratic Party today represents the thinking of the South. Such a question cannot be answered without careful analysis. In the first place, what do we mean by "the thinking of the South"? It is evident that the South today is like a rich and many-colored carpet, woven of many strands of thought. Some are highly conservative; others distinctly liberal; a few are even called radical. Many of us come from an agricultural background; but others reside in cities concerned largely with the problems

of industry. We come from a variety of economic levels. Yet, out of such a varied web, consistent patterns have emerged which have led us in the direction of one political party and its program—the Democratic Party.

We in the South are often criticized for being too conservative. In fact, reactionary is the term most often used to describe us. I have never felt that such criticism was either fair or borne out by the facts. At the outset, American liberalism was essentially agrarian, and had its origin in the South under America's first great liberal, Thomas Jefferson. The great majority of southerners cast their ballots for Jefferson in 1796, and in 1800 they were largely responsible for his election to the Presidency.

In the Jacksonian revolution of 1828, it was the South which gave Old Hickory his most solid support. From Jackson until the War Between the States, the Democratic Party was the majority party and generally carried most of the South in State and National elections.

Following the reconstruction period, there was an era of uncertainty and fear during which the southern masses were tied to the big planter, the manufacturer, and the railroad magnate. Conservatism was the order of the day. The rank and file was too busy struggling for the bare necessities of life and all groups were too occupied trying to regain control of the machinery of government to be interested in national progressive movements.

By the 1890's, however, the southern majority had recovered its political independent thinking. In some areas of the South populism spread like wildfire, and the Democratic Party soon took over many of the measures advocated by the Populists. Since the mid-nineties the majority of the people in the South have supported those National and State candidates recognized as liberals.

Historians generally agree that Bryan's first nomination in 1896 was made possible by Southern support. The South rallied to him in 1900 and again in 1908. His ascendancy within the Democratic Party would have been impossible without southern support.

And again the progressivism inside the Democratic Party made possible the nomination of Woodrow Wilson, and the resulting new freedom which characterized his administration. North Carolina was one of the Southern States that gave Wilson consistent support at the Baltimore Convention in 1912.

During the 1920's when conservatism ruled the day, progressivism inside the Democratic Party was kept alive by great and outstanding Democrats such as your own late and beloved Josephus Daniels.

It was this progressive wing of the party and the strong support of southern Democrats that determined the decisive nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt at Chicago in 1932. The eastern delegations had given Roosevelt little initial support. It was the South that made his nomination possible. We know of the overwhelming approval the South gave Roosevelt in 1936, 1940, and again in 1944, and I confidently predict the same wholehearted support in the nomination and election of Harry S. Truman in 1948.

It was the South that made possible the enactment of the great liberal program of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Almost every measure of the New Deal was sponsored by Southern leadership in both Houses of Congress. Go down the list and one by one you will find the names of southerners in the lead on all of these great liberal measures.

In my opinion, the South will continue to support liberal candidates and liberal legislation.

From this sketchy résumé it is conclusive that:

1. The South has by and large been in the forefront of progressive movements since the founding of the Democratic Party by Thomas Jefferson in 1801.

2. The belief that the South supports the Democratic Party today solely as a result of the reconstruction era is, to say the least, highly questionable.

3. The truth is that the Democratic Party has generally always been the party of progress and has always, even before the Civil War, normally received the support of southerners.

SOUTH MUST WORK WITHIN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

From time to time we have threats of revolt in our party. I suppose such is to be expected, particularly in the election years when controversial issues have a habit of coming to the front. This year is not the first time that we have heard rumblings. In fact, it happens just about every 4 years. It is only natural that there should be differences within a party as big as ours and made up of as many different groups from different parts of the country with greatly divergent views and interests. However, in the past we have pretty well succeeded each time in settling our differences within the party and I feel confident that this year will be no exception.

After all, the thought presents itself, what would the South have to gain in bolting the Democratic Party? Certainly we could expect little consideration from the Republicans. So far as that party is concerned, the South has hardly been a part of the Union. The South is a great and important part of this Nation and of the Democratic Party, and it need not be afraid of what may happen to it at the hands of its own party.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY THE PARTY OF PROGRESS

Contrary to the thinking of many people, the South supports the Democratic Party because it is the party of progress. It is the party that discovered and gave life to the welfare clause of the Constitution. It is the party that dared legislate under the general welfare clause.

Ever since the Democratic Party first came into power in 1801 it has stood for "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." It has followed the premise that governments are not the masters but the servants of the people governed and that to serve the public best, government must be responsive to the changing needs of the people.

The Democratic Party has followed the principle that property should be protected in all its legitimate rights, but that the rights of men come first. Our party has decreed that the minority is to be protected, but that the interest of the majority is not to be sacrificed to the greed of the minority.

It is significant that the scope of the objective of the Democratic Party has progressively widened in response to definite and new needs and problems.

The reforms which the party has initiated or supported since its founding are confirmation that it has not deviated in its support of legislation that would benefit all the people rather than a select group. A study of progressive legislation since the beginning of the nineteenth century shows that nearly all forward-looking measures were enacted under Democratic administrations—measures which for the most part were severely criticized and strongly opposed when first advocated, but which are accepted now as being essential to the welfare of our Nation.

Furthermore, the record shows that since 1860 the Democratic Party has never won a national election with a platform or a candidate considered to be conservative.

Let us take a look at some of the measures which have caused the Democratic Party to be labeled as the party of progress—the party that gets things done.

It was a Democratic administration through which the conservation of our natural resources of soil, forests, water, and minerals, was given the attention it deserves in our total economy.

During the last 15 years the dissipation of our soil and forests has been retarded, and millions of acres have been restored to productivity. Greater advantage has been taken of our water supply than ever before. Great dams have generated billions of kilowatt-hours that have been channeled into hundreds of new industries.

One cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of even expanding this program. If we want to make full use of our resources so as to have adequate protection against future emergencies, no part of our conservation needs can be neglected. One conservation need is dependent upon the other.

For example, we must have minerals to build machinery to cultivate the soil. We must rebuild our forests if we hope to have sufficient construction material for our homes, factories, farms, and mines. We must build hydroelectric plants to prevent the rapid depletion of our coal and oil reserves. Even today we are seriously feeling the pinch of an oil shortage. We must practice soil conservation for no country can exist indefinitely as a first-class power when its ability to produce food continues to decline.

In actively expanding its aid to these worth-while needs, the Democratic Party has taken the position that the wealth and wonders of our Nation should be protected for the welfare and pleasure of all.

If the policies adopted during the last 14 or 15 years are pursued, never again will a greedy few exploit the forests, the soil, and the minerals which rightfully belong to all our people. Private ownership of natural resources must be directed toward the interest of the people as a whole.

In its concern to conserve the Nation's human resources, the Democratic Party has shown itself to be a party of progress.

Along with the struggle for material prosperity there must go the fight for higher moral and spiritual values. From its birth the Democratic Party has worked for the welfare of those less able to help themselves. We remember the preachings of Jefferson on behalf of equal opportunity for all. We recall Jackson's fight for the interest of the average man. As a matter of fact, one can only recall one or two Presidents during the past century outside the Democratic Party that has shown much concern for social-welfare legislation.

The three Democratic Presidents since the turn of the twentieth century have supported legislation designed for the common good.

Wilson advocated and passed progressive measures which made his administration one of an unparalleled era from the middle of the nineteenth century to the time of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Just to name four or five, there were the rural credits law which made it easier for the farmers to borrow needed money; a law creating the Federal Trade Commission to prevent abuses in business; a law strengthening the antitrust provision; a child-labor law; and an 8-hour-day law.

Under Roosevelt the Democratic Party renewed the struggle for progressive measures in the field of human welfare. As a result, we have the rural-electrification program which has added more comfort to rural life than any other project.

This Federal program is self-liquidating and the REA co-ops are ahead in their payments, but more important is the effect upon the rural economy and rural well-being.

The REA loan program has enabled local groups of farmers and other rural people to provide themselves with an essential service they were unable to obtain in any other way.

Rural power lines financed with REA loans have brought greater prosperity and stability to our entire national economy.

Experience has shown that for every dollar spent on power lines rural consumers spend about $4.50 for wiring and new electrical equipment alone. This money, for the most

part, is spent locally. It goes to the small businessman—the neighborhood hardware merchant, the proprietor of the crossroads store, the local wiring contractor.

The program is a loan program. Local people are doing the job. The Government is helping them merely by providing the necessary financing. As the local people progress with the job they are paying back the Government loans with interest.

Altogether, a review of REA's balance sheet leads to the unavoidable conclusion that here is a case of public money well invested.

The Democrats inaugurated the school-lunch program, which has become so essential to the health and well-being of millions of our children.

Repeated studies show that a large proportion of our population is undernourished and does not enjoy the highest physical well-being. General Hershey pointed out that nutrition had something to do with at least half of those rejected for military service. The school-lunch program aims not only at helping the Nation's agricultural economy but at assuring that minimum nutritional requirements will be met in all States.

It was a Democratic administration that gave to the country its first long-term comprehensive program of economic security.

As a result, today millions of Americans enjoy social security. Assistance is given to the aged, the needy blind, and dependent children. Other millions are covered as workers. Insurance is provided against unemployment.

Social security has worked. We Democrats are justifiably proud of this program.

It was a Democratic administration that established true opportunity for the American worker.

More has been done in the last 12 years to nourish the inherent freedom and dignity of the laboring class than in any other administration in the Nation's history. The magnificent achievements of labor during the war made it possible for our soldiers to have the necessary weapons to whip the enemy. The just treatment his Government had given the laborer accounts for a great part of his willingness to increase his production during those crucial years.

After a dark and unhappy era, unionism came to be respected and is now regarded as an essential part of our economy.

We must continue to emphasize the human element in industry and strive toward increasingly wholehearted cooperation between labor and management.

It was a Democratic administration that sponsored the most generous program for returning veterans that this or any other country has ever offered.

Employment provisions, medical and hospital benefits, insurance, educational opportunities, readjustment allowance, terminal-leave pay, loans with which to establish businesses or buy homes, all combine to express appreciation of a grateful Nation to those who saved our country and its way of life.

One could name other progressive legislation which is intended to add happiness, health, and general well-being to the lives of our citizens.

For example, there is the hospital program which is just getting underway, and which is planned to provide more liberal and extended hospitalization to our people.

There is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which establishes confidence in our banks, and guarantees the holdings of the small depositors.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY THE PARTY OF BOLDNESS

The Democratic Party is not only the party of progress—but it is the party of boldness, of daring.

It is the party which has created precedents rather than followed them.

The Democratic Party led in the establishment of international trade agreements. These agreements have been of immeasurable help in providing outlets for our surplus products and in enabling us to secure the materials of which we are in short supply. The freer the trade among nations the greater the chances for world economic and political security.

The great dream of participation in an international organization through which nations could settle their differences at the conference table was envisioned by the Democratic Party.

It was that great Democrat, Woodrow Wilson, who dreamed of a League of Nations that might give us lasting peace.

It was that Great Democrat, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who dreamed of the United Nations, the one great hope for lasting peace.

One historian has described the 99-day session of Congress which ushered in the Roosevelt administration, after 12 years of Republican rule, as the period of the most daring leadership in American history. The social reforms—some of which I have already named—gave the people of America the chance for security and self-respect.

It was a Democratic administration that initiated the CCC program that not only resulted in the savings of forests, fields, and streams, but what is more important, rescued millions of youth from an endless life of waste.

We remember the bold leadership of our party which declared a national holiday of banks so as to prevent a certain collapse of our financial system.

It was the leadership of our party which inaugurated the programs of NRA, NYA, PWA, etc., that served their purpose of putting new lifeblood into a sick economy.

It was the Democratic Party that dared the bold program of lend-lease when the fate of democracy hung in the balance at the beginning of World War II.

And when this country was drawn into the war by the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor it was Democratic leadership that dared plan and put into effect a program that hastened the end of the greatest struggle ever known to mankind.

The production of hundreds of thousands of planes and thousands of ships, and the supplying of over 14,000,000 in the armed services with the materials of war are miracles of achievement which some timid leaders declared to be impossible.

And it is Democratic leadership which has originated the Marshall plan—a daring attempt to rehabilitate the war-torn democracies of Europe.

If the Marshall plan fails, we shall have lost democracy as we know it.

And thus it is that our party has met the challenges of the times. When faced with domestic or international disasters, Democratic leadership has been equal to the occasion and has enabled our Nation to weather the storms of adversity.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY THAT HAS HELPED THE SOUTH

Not only has the Democratic Party been the party of progress and the party of daring, but it is the party that has meant most to the South.

In this regard, because of lack of time, I shall confine my remarks largely to the last 15 years. During this period more has been done to develop the natural and human resources of the South than in any like period of our history.

Throughout the past hundred years volumes have been written on the potential riches of the Southern States. Our minerals, farms, forests, and waterways have been praised as a possible source of huge developments. Our people have been looked upon as a fountain of labor for possible industrial expansion.

It took a Democratic administration to convert empty phrases about these assets into positive action.

President Roosevelt recognized that it is not what a country has that makes it great but how it uses what it has. He recognized that if the South was treated as an equal partner with other regions of the country, the whole economy would profit—that the South was too rich in resources and people to be longer neglected.

Perhaps the greatest single project which has redounded to the welfare of our region is the TVA. The history of this project is too long and too rich to relate here. Suffice it to say that a great section of our Southland has literally been brought back to life. Serving a population of approximately 4,000,000 people living in the States of Alabama, George, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina, this monument of Democratic leadership serves as an internationally known laboratory for regional development.

It also serves as an example of how Federal funds can be put to use in a project that is too big an undertaking for State or local authorities. At the same time it proves the feasibility of coordinated participation of every level of the State and local governments, local business, agricultural and labor groups, and the individual citizen himself. This grass-root participation in the affairs of Government is an essential ingredient of a functioning democracy. It is the antidote to centralization and regimentation. Furthermore, the economic status of the people of the area served by TVA has shown an improvement of 50 percent in excess of that of the rest of the Nation. This decentralized administration of TVA and the improvement in the economic status of our people may well be a source of pride to your own two good Senators and Members of your House delegation who throughout the years have supported TVA.

TVA, of course, is not the only cause of increased industrial activity in the South, but as the single largest development in the area it must be given a large share of the credit. It is significant that from 1933 to 1946 employment opportunities in privately-operated manufacturing concerns located in the TVA area increased 161 percent. This compares with the national average of 131 percent.

During the war years many new industries were placed in the South. Some of them are staying and new ones are coming. According to Kiplinger magazine of July 1947, the 1946 construction awards in the South hit the $2,000,000,000 mark for an unprecedented high.

From 1939 to 1945 the South's food industry and related factories increased the value of their output almost $1,500,000,000.

From 1939 to 1946 the annual value of the South's exports has increased from $86,858,000 to $445,500,000.

The farm program of the last 15 years, under a Democratic administration, has likewise produced noted changes in southern economy.

No group can appreciate the farm program more than the tobacco farmers of your own State. There was established for the first time in history a proper balance between the production and consumption of tobacco by the adoption of the tobacco program.

The shackles of one-crop system have been broken and diversification has become the practice of the day.

The Farm-Tenant Loan Act has added dignity to the farmers' efforts to become farm owners.

Soil and forest conservation, which means more to the South than any other area, has received added stress.

Farm mortgages have been reduced from $800,000,000 in 1930 to about $120,000,000 now.

The school-lunch program has made for a healthier population.

Those of us who grew up on the farm can appreciate the comforts now extended to hundreds of thousands of southern farmers by the rural electrification program.

When this program got underway 13 years ago, only 1 southern farm in 20 had electricity. In your own State there were 9,672 farms that enjoyed this convenience—today there are 157,591.

We could continue to discuss what our party has meant to the South. We could point out, for example, that since 1929 our per capita income has risen from $371 to $801 (North Carolina to $817), and that southern wages and salaries have increased 156 percent, compared with a national increase of only 49 percent.

However, it is far too early for self-satisfaction. The South is still the most undeveloped region of our country—the South is still the Nation's low-income area.

And so we must continue to strive for progress. We must expand the programs which have shown that they more than pay for themselves in added income and personal comforts to our people.

Somehow we must give more encouragement to small business. This might be done by stricter enforcement of the antimonopoly laws, by promoting research and applying the findings to business enterprises, by opening large surplus war plants through such plan as multiple tenancy, and perhaps by extending loan insurance.

Effort must be continued to give an equal education to all our boys and girls regardless of the section of the country in which they live.

World and national conditions are changing, and so is the South. We want to solve problems peculiar to our region with no outside dictation. We want to make progress and at the same time preserve our customs and institutions that have proved their value through the years.

From our experience in the past and from the program, or lack of program, on the part of the Republicans today, we know that we cannot look to them for help in working out our greater destiny. The Democratic Party for us is the party of hope.

In closing, may I wish you continued success in the work you are doing, work that is hard, sometimes dull, but more often full of interest and at all times necessary to the perfection of our democracy. The Democratic Party relies on your enthusiasm and constant support. The year 1948 may well prove one of the most crucial in the history of our country. Let us all work together to make it a year of progress and victory.

[From the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News of February 10, 1948]

ADVICE TO DEMOCRATS

Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, gave guests at the Young Democratic dinner Saturday night at Sedgefield and southern Democrats generally something to think about when he warned against a bolt from the national party.

The Alabamian declared that if the Truman civil-rights program is a question of interfering with our principles in the South the Republicans have been equally guilty. In substantiation of this declaration, Senator SPARKMAN pointed to the Republican platform of 1944 as advocating the same set of reforms now considered offensive to southern Democrats. He contrasted the definite statement of the Republican platform on the controversial issues with the generalizations of the Democratic platform on the same subjects.

Warning against southern Democrats failing for Republican trickery with reference to the civil-rights issues, SPARKMAN challenged his audience to continue with the progressive policies of their party instead of giving aid and comfort to a party that has not considered the South a part of the Nation. In this connection he reviewed the progressive legislation enacted under the Democratic administrations in the last 15 years, emphasizing the benefits that had accrued therefrom to the South.

All this seems to make a lot of sense. For while it may be true that the northern and southern wings of the Democratic Party represent differing viewpoints the fact remains that this party has had a lot more to do with the development and progress of the South than the Republican Party has. It seems to us that the wiser course for southern Democrats is to work for greater voice and recognition in the affairs of their national organization. Certainly there is little reason to feel that the Republican Party, enhanced by revolting Democrats, is likely to be more considerate of the South than it has been in the past. The Republican Party largely speaks and acts for big business and entrenched interests centered mainly in the North and East. What consideration could the South with its own peculiar regionalism hope to have under such circumstances? Are southern Democrats to abandon the ideals and principles that have brought the South to its present condition and seek refuge where it has been ignored up to now? Southern Democrats have more to gain from a stiffened attitude toward their national party than from turncoat tactics.

Senator SPARKMAN expressed hope that Democratic Party differences can be resolved and that will be increasingly possible as the South continues to develop and assume larger stature in the Nation's life. This seems to be a good time for southern Democrats to let their national leaders know in positive fashion that they are tired of being ignored in the advocacy of such controversial matters as the civil-rights program. Their chances of achieving this will be greater if they have a saner and more workable plan as a substitute.

Shortage of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON H. CARSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by J. French Robinson, president of the East Ohio Gas Co., before the Senate Interstate Commerce Subcommittee regarding the shortage of natural gas.

There exists in the Northern and Mid-central States, and particularly in the State of Ohio, a critical shortage of natural gas. It is estimated that since January 14 more than 250,000 industrial workers have been idled because of this shortage.

We have heard through the papers, and otherwise, many reasons for the causes of this shortage. Mr. Robinson has spent his entire life in the gas industry and gives what, in my opinion, is a most fair and unbiased opinion regarding this shortage. In an effort to eliminate some of this shortage, the House passed a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act last year, but said bill failed to be reported out by the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. Hearings before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee were completed on February 12. In my opinion, the major portion of the shortages has been caused by conflicting opinions, both within the Federal Power Commission, and by the courts, and I commend Mr. Robinson's statement to each and every one of you in order to get a clear picture of this emergency. Regardless of the causes of this shortage, regardless of the factors involved, this situation calls for immediate action.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF J. FRENCH ROBINSON BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE ON H. R. 4051, A BILL TO AMEND THE NATURAL GAS ACT, APPROVED JUNE 21, 1938, AS AMENDED

My name is J. French Robinson. I live in Cleveland and am president of the East Ohio Gas Co., a gas-distributing company operating in Ohio. I am also a director of the Consolidated Natural Gas Co., of which my company is a wholly owned subsidiary. Consolidated's other subsidiaries are: The Peoples Natural Gas Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., a gas-distributing company which operates in Pennsylvania; Hope Natural Gas Co., Clarksburg, W. Va., a gas producing and transmission company which operates in West Virginia; New York State Natural Gas Corp., a gas-transmission company which operates in Pennsylvania and New York; the River Gas Co., a gas-distributing company which operates in and around Marietta, Ohio.

I am here now as a spokesman for the gas-distributing companies in the country.

The gas-distributing companies believe that H. R. 4051 will clarify the original intent of the Natural Gas Act, approved June 21, 1938. We think it is important that this be done. Here are our reasons:

CLARIFICATION OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT WILL MAKE MORE NATURAL GAS AVAILABLE FOR EACH COMMUNITY

Distributing companies have the job of taking gas from wells or transmission lines and making it available in each community to—

1. Domestic users—and these users take precedence over all others, not only because it is a legal requirement in most States but also because we are under a natural obligation to supply gas first to keep people warm, and enable them to cook their food and heat water for their cleaning needs.

2. Commercial users—such as restaurants, bakeries, churches, schools, etc.

3. Those industrial users who need an uninterrupted supply of gas to manufacture or process goods for the general public. However, this type of user must be and is curtailed in his supply of gas when the total supply in the area drops to a point where it jeopardizes the supply available for domestic users.

4. Those industrial users whose supply can be interrupted on very short notice.

There are more than 600 distributing companies supplying straight natural gas to 9,400,000 customers in 5,100 communities in the United States. About 30 companies supply mixed gas, consisting of natural and manufactured gas, to 2,500,000 customers in 560 communities. This means that these companies furnish gas to about 53,000,000 of the people in this country.

Domestic users of gas have a greater investment in the gas industry than the distributing companies

I spoke of the natural and legal obligations the distributing companies have to domestic

users. We also have a dollars-and-cents obligation. Let me use East Ohio as an example because it is the company I know best.

At East Ohio we have an investment in plant of about $104,000,000. What investment do our domestic users have? First of all each one has an investment in piping to use gas in his home. Then he has a gas range and a gas water heater. If he heats with gas, he has invested in a furnace or boiler or circulating heaters—some sort of space-heating equipment. He may have a gas refrigerator. If he rents he still has to pay for all this in his rent.

All told, we estimate that our domestic and small commercial customers have an investment of about $138,000,000 in equipment that can be used only with gas.

It is difficult to estimate the investment that our 900 industrial customers have in plant equipment designed expressly for the use of natural gas but it is my belief that if such an estimate were made, the amount would be as much as the investment of the domestic and commercial customers mentioned above.

Our customers—both domestic and industrial—have bought this equipment in good faith, in the considered belief that their gas company will continue indefinitely to supply them with the gas they need.

We, the gas-distributing companies, are obligated to fulfill the faith that our customers have had in our intentions and abilities to keep them supplied.

Why do we have gas emergencies in cold weather?

Since the middle of January extremely cold weather made drastic curtailment of industrial consumers necessary. Even so, severe domestic shortages occurred in many areas. As recently as January 30, 1948, the Associated Press reported that 250,000 men and women were unemployed due to shutdowns, attributed to the lack of natural gas. There was no shortage of gas in the major gas-producing areas. The entire shortage was in the amount of gas being delivered to and by the gas-distributing companies.

But the causes of it were elsewhere.

Certain areas of the United States are thickly populated. Our areas have the gas reserves. The first area served by natural gas was the Appalachian area, consisting of Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky, and western New York. Until recently the area produced as much or more gas than it used. Today it does not. The Appalachian area uses 26.8 percent of the natural gas consumed in the United States for domestic and commercial purposes; it has just about 2.8 percent of the Nation's total gas reserves.

Conversely, the producing States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Louisiana use 22.3 percent of the natural gas consumed in the United States for domestic and commercial purposes and have 82.9 percent of the Nation's total gas reserves.

That is why the Appalachian area has been importing gas through long distance transmission lines in large quantities since 1943. This is one instance of the need for interstate transmission of gas. There are many others like it.

The natural-gas industry since 1940 has spent $1,300,000,000 to improve the supply of gas to the people who use it. Still there is not enough gas coming through the pipe lines.

Confusion as to the extent of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission is one of the basic reasons.

The oil and gas fields of the Southwest are the only ones with sufficient gas reserves to supply the thickly populated areas. Much of the gas produced in these fields is produced as a byproduct of oil production. The oil producers are under no obligation whatsoever to sell this gas for transportation to out-of-State population areas. They can sell it as fuel within the State in which it is produced, or they can sell it for the manufacture of gasoline, carbon black, and such products. Four large plants, two of which will be finished this year, are planned to make gasoline from natural gas.

This means, first of all, that gas transmission companies must buy southwestern gas in competition with buyers who would use the gas locally for purposes other than fuel. They must pay the same price for it as anyone else—or get no gas. And if the price is inadequate producers who can do so will suspend production and development. You can understand how this works. You saw meat and other products disappear from the legitimate market when prices were controlled, and miraculously reappear when the law of supply and demand was allowed to set the price. With natural gas there is one difference. The producers have other legitimate markets to which they can sell if the Federal Power Commission sets too low a price.

Wherever the Commission has had an opportunity to set prices for produced gas, as in the case of the production departments of certain transmission companies, it has set a price which is so low that no one in his right mind would sell gas at that price if not under absolute legal compulsion to do so. For example, the Commission has allowed prices of 1.14 cents and 2.21 cents per million cubic feet for gas at the well mouth, as against a prevailing field price of 7 cents.

Naturally many large oil companies have refused to put their gas on the market under long-term contracts for fear they will be subject to such rulings of the Federal Power Commission and to the costly process of complying with the Commission's accounting and report orders. We are convinced that a great deal of gas is being withheld from the markets entirely because the Commission has construed the present act as giving it control of the gas before it actually reaches interstate transmission lines at any time it desires to exercise such control.

Many times we have said that another big reason for current gas emergencies is the lack of steel for building additional lines from producing areas. Big pipe lines are laid only to fields where a large volume of gas for transmission can be assured. Producers, as we have pointed out, are reluctant to commit themselves to long-term obligations because of their fear of coming under Federal Power Commission rate and other regulation theories. That reluctance caused the transmission companies to hesitate about making the huge investments necessary to build pipe lines. Their orders for steel were thereby delayed and the pipe-line companies lost all hope of favorable priorities from the mills.

CLARIFICATION OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT WILL PREVENT UNNECESSARY DUAL REGULATION OF GAS DISTRIBUTING COMPANIES

Many companies distributing natural and mixed gas operate solely within one State. All of their activities are regulated by State or municipal authorities who have jurisdiction over rates, depreciation, and depletion charges, financing, major extensions, rules, etc.

A few of these distributing companies produce all their own natural gas locally. Their production properties and facilities, as well as their so-called transmission facilities, are used to move all of the gas to points of local consumption.

Most of these distributing companies also take gas from interstate transmission lines, but all of their operations are within the State in which they take possession of the gas.

When the Natural Gas Act was passed in 1938, its purpose was clearly specified as one of filling in the gap between State and Federal regulations. The act itself stated that the production and gathering at one end, and the distribution at the other end were not to be subject to the act.

The Federal Power Commission has, however, consistently misconstrued the language of the act and has attempted to bring under its general jurisdiction everyone who handles natural gas from the time it leaves the bottom of the well until it reaches the burner tip. This means complete regulation from Washington of one of the major industries of the country. It means that millions of customers of distributing companies will have to pay as part of their cost of gas service not only what the present complete and effective State and municipal regulation costs, but also the cost of complying with the accounting, reporting, and procedural requirements of the Federal Power Commission.

Perhaps the most menacing aspect of this dual regulation is that the Federal Power Commission has been asserting views on what natural gas should be used for by ultimate consumers. It will never prove practical to have a body in Washington decide how and by whom natural gas shall be used in each of the thousands of cities in this country which are being and can be served by natural gas. That is a local problem which should be handled in the future as in the past, by local and State authorities.

Actually, the Natural Gas Act recognized this situation, but as we know, Federal administrative bodies have a tendency to expand their powers—a little bit here and a little bit there—until they are met with statutory language which no one can misconstrue. H. R. 4051 does just this and will prevent an enormous and expensive amount of Federal duplication of existing State regulation. And it will let the gas distributing companies and the municipalities and State commissions decide who in each community is to get natural gas and how much.

CLARIFICATION OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT WILL IMPROVE THE NATION'S GENERAL FUEL SITUATION

Earlier in this statement I brought out the fact that this amendment to the Natural Gas Act will make more natural gas available as fuel. I am repeating that statement now because I want to bring to your attention the fact that it was not only the gas industry that operated under emergency conditions this winter. All along the eastern seaboard there has been and still is a critical shortage of fuel oil. In some areas coal in its several forms has been scarce. Anything that can be done to improve the supply of any one fuel is a contribution toward licking the national shortage of available fuel.

If this amendment to the Natural Gas Act were passed and producers could be sure that they had nothing to fear in the way of regulation by the Federal Power Commission, I feel certain that many producers would be willing to enter into long-term agreements to supply natural gas for distribution as fuel instead of delivering their production to nonfuel users as they do now.

Such action would not only relieve the fuel situation in general; it would lop an enormous amount from the Nation's fuel bill. Using the city of Cleveland as an example, again, the cost of gas to the user allows him to save 25 percent of the money he would put out if he were using coal, and 50 percent of what he would pay if he were using oil.

CLARIFICATION OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT WOULD NOT NECESSARILY INCREASE THE PRICE OF GAS TO THE USER

Several things should be kept in mind in discussing gas prices to users, especially in times like these. Let's take them one by one.

States regulate gas prices and profits

Every State in which gas is distributed keeps close watch on both prices to users and gas utilities' profits. There has been some fear expressed by the newspapers that if the Federal Power Commission did not regulate producers, the gas distribution companies might be tempted to pay outlandish prices to producers and so force a rise in the cost of gas to the user. Well, frankly, any gas distributing company that went off the deep end in that respect would be foolish, to say the least. And any gas distributing company official who has ever taken part in a rate case before State authorities knows it. No expense is allowed by these authorities unless it is a reasonable one.

Selling price of gas reflects field price only to a minor extent

The following table shows some facts about gas production in the Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Kansas gas fields. It is based on these areas because they supply most of the Nation's gas today and have 83 percent of the known gas reserves in the United States. The last year for which data were available in the Bureau of Mines Minerals Yearbook was 1945:

History of Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Kansas gas production

	1907	1922	1940	1945
Production, 4 States (billions of cubic feet)	82	279	1,754	2,758
Percent of total United States production	20	37	66	70
Average field price, 4 States (cents per thousand cubic feet)	8.2	8.2	2.1	3.1
Average selling price, entire United States (cents per thousand cubic feet)	23.7	49.9	65.7	61.2

What this table shows, first of all, is that the gas industry is becoming more and more dependent upon these four States for its source of supply. The field price in these States will become more and more important as a factor in the price we distributing companies have to pay for gas.

The second thing this table shows is that there has always been competition to buy gas from these States, and that competitive buying has increased over this period without forcing the unregulated field price of gas to skyrocket. One reason for this, of course, has been that in the past 12 years, for example, the discoveries of new gas reserves have been over three times as great as the amount of gas used, even though the use of gas has been increasing.

The only conclusion that can be drawn is that the field price of gas has about as much relation to the selling price as the cost of electricity has to a trolley fare. When we take on the job of distributing gas and making it available to users we must provide for such operating expenses as labor and materials, taxes, and all the other costs that any business has. So our selling price is based on many costs, only one of which is the field cost of gas. Even though most of these costs have been increasing steadily, we have been able to offset them. This is because, until the Commission moved in with its loose interpretation of the act, there has been a free market for gas in the field, and our pipe-line suppliers by their diligent efforts have been able to get for us our share of this gas. Consequently, we have been able to increase our volume sold, thus creating a broader base to support our operating costs, and so reducing the proportionate share of these costs that each m. c. f. of delivered gas must bear.

Let us refer to East Ohio as an example. During the past 7 years the field cost of gas that East Ohio buys in Ohio has increased by 11 percent. Yet the price of East Ohio domestic gas today is 10 percent lower than it was in 1940. A fundamental reason for this is in the much larger volume of gas we have been handling.

Remember, it costs just as much to lay a 20-inch pipe line whether you are going to put 20,000,000 cubic feet of gas a day through it or 60,000,000 cubic feet. It costs just about as much to operate it. But there's an enormous difference in the cost per thousand cubic feet when you spread those more or less fixed costs over 20,000,000 cubic feet or 60,000,000 cubic feet.

One of the most important things about this amendment is that it will get more gas into the transmission lines and out into the distributing lines. That means savings for everyone—the transmission companies, the distributing companies, and the users of gas.

We don't have to worry about demand for the gas, once we get it into the lines. Let me use East Ohio as an example one more time. In 1940 we had 512,000 customers, of which 62,000 used gas for house heating. At the present time—7 years later—we have 564,000 customers, and 197,000 of them use gas for house heating. Of our house-heating customers, 46,000 were added in 1946 and 30,000 more were added in 1947 in spite of the restrictions that the Ohio Utilities Commission placed on this use of gas, and this has been happening in every section of the county where gas distribution is available.

Until 1940, East Ohio's largest day's sales were 228,000,000 cubic feet. On January 14 of this year, our sales exceeded 510,000,000 cubic feet.

In view of the current cheapness of gas in comparison with other fuels, and the convenience of installing and operating gas-heating equipment, it is very likely that we would have at least 200,000 more house-heating installations within the next 5 years—if we could get the gas to supply them. Each additional house-heating customer requires 2,000 cubic feet of gas on a peak day so that we will require an additional 400,000,000 cubic feet on a cold day to take care of these additional installations. As mentioned before, the greatest amount of gas that we were able to deliver on a single day for all of our consumer requirements has been 510,000,000 cubic feet.

For the past several minutes, I have been talking almost exclusively about East Ohio Gas Co. But this same growth in the demand for gas has been going on everywhere that there are distribution lines. Sales of domestic gas in the United States have increased from 542,000,000,000 cubic feet in 1940, to 789,000,000,000 cubic feet in 1946. Total sales of gas to all users have increased from 2,655,000,000,000 cubic feet in 1940, to 3,900,000,000,000 cubic feet in 1945. Increased field costs spread over these volumes will obviously have little effect on final rates to users.

The extra costs of regulation of distributing companies by the Federal Power Commission adds to rather than decreases the price of gas to the user

As an illustration of the added cost to domestic and other customers of regulation of distributing companies by the Federal Power Commission, I refer to the experience of my own company. We have no rates that can be regulated by the Commission, but it insists we should comply with its accounting and report requirements although we operate only in Ohio and already report fully to the Ohio commission.

The original cost and other studies necessary to this end would cost us between $1,500,000 and $2,000,000, all of which we would eventually have to get from our Ohio customers. We could have our suppliers buy a lot of gas for us to distribute to our customers at prevailing field prices in the Southwest—or at higher prices—for this amount of money.

Natural gas is a bargain; it will remain a bargain if it can be kept coming to market

During the past 8 years, the cost of living has increased greatly—70 percent in Cleveland, for example. Yet the tapping of the vast southwestern gas fields for eastern and midwestern consumption, and the resulting economies by distributing companies of handling increased volumes has resulted in no appreciable increase—and often a decrease—in the cost of natural gas to consumers in thousands of communities throughout the country.

The result in Cleveland is that to heat a home today with natural gas costs only 50 percent as much as it does with oil and only 75 percent as much as with coal.

If present gas volumes can be maintained and increased, it is apparent that natural gas will continue to be a great bargain even though substantially higher prices have to be paid to the producers. This is so because the well head price or gas in the Southwest—whatever it may be—is only a small fraction of the ultimate cost of transporting this gas for thousands of miles to thousands of communities and distributing it through city streets to consumers.

SUMMARY: THE GAS DISTRIBUTING COMPANIES BELIEVE THAT H. R. 4051 WILL PUT INTO EFFECT THE ORIGINAL INTENT OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT APPROVED JUNE 21, 1938. WE SUBMIT THAT THIS RESULT IS NECESSARY TO ASSURE ADEQUATE SUPPLIES OF NATURAL GAS TO COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE NATION

I do not need to stress the point that H. R. 4051 carries out the original intent of the Natural Gas Act—the Federal Power Commission is not to have jurisdiction over natural-gas production and gathering, or over gas distribution. That has been ably expressed by Report No. 800 of the House of Representatives Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted by the Honorable HENDERSON CARSON on July 7, 1947.

I do want to stress this—the interest of the distributing companies in this clarifying amendment is twofold: First, to get an ample supply of gas for the 53,000,000 people dependent on our service. We think that the amendment will have little or no effect on the selling price of gas to our customers. But that is not the fundamental issue. The fundamental issue is whether the Nation will go on having "gas emergencies" indefinitely, or whether the people who depend upon us to supply them will get as much natural gas as they want and need. Second, our interest is to avoid expensive and unnecessary duplicate regulation.

My statements today have been devoted entirely to the amendment of the Natural Gas Act as it relates to the distributors of natural gas to the ultimate individual users. The subject was covered in its broader aspects when I testified last spring before a House committee. This testimony is recorded in the printed proceedings entitled "Amendments to the Natural Gas Act; Hearings Before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; April 14 to 18 and May 28 and 29, 1947."

Merchant Marine—Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, on the 30th of January and 9th of February 1948, I stated my reasons for opposing the proposal to transfer, by gift or charter, 500 ships to foreign nations. I endeavored to show the extremely dangerous position in which such procedure would place our merchant marine. On page A687 of the Appendix of the RECORD and succeeding pages is a copy of a speech delivered by the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. HALE BOGGS, before the annual meeting of the

Mississippi Valley Association, at St. Louis, Mo., on the 26th day of January, 1948. I hope it will be read by every Member of the Congress.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] comes from the port of New Orleans, and knows, as few other men in Congress do, the problems of the American merchant marine—how they transcend all local considerations, and how essential they are to national well-being and security.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] quoted many of our national leaders on the vital importance of the merchant marine and aptly called attention to the situation which developed during World War I and immediately thereafter because we had neglected our merchant marine. He correctly described conditions before and in World War I. He said:

At this time there were no American-flag shipping overseas from the ports of the Gulf of Mexico and there were no dependable services by foreign ships to many markets. Foreign ships which brought coffee from Brazil to New Orleans did not offer a return service but loaded cotton, grain, and other products for Europe and then carried manufactured goods from Europe to the east coast of South America, making what was termed triangular voyages. Naturally, the owners of those ships were interested in developing commerce between their own countries and South America. Sailings to European ports and to the Orient were seasonal and dependent upon the movement of cotton or grain. Because of their infrequency and uncertainty they were of no value to the exporter of manufactured products.

Then came World War I, finding us dependent upon the ships of other nations for the transport of nearly all of our foreign commerce. When these foreign ships were suddenly withdrawn from war service, there was stagnation of our foreign trade and ocean freight rates advanced to fantastic heights. We had goods for export for which the world was crying but no means of transporting them. This loss of trade lost our country a vast sum of money even before we entered the war.

When we finally became participants in World War I we were forced into a frenzied era of ship construction, costing more than $3,000,000,000 for vessels that could have been built for less than one-third the sum during the preceding years of peace. As few of these ships became available until after the war, the ships of our allies had to transport our men and supplies to the scenes of hostility.

I became a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in April 1921, and continuously for almost 27 years I have fought for a restoration of the American merchant marine. I served during the chairmanship of Greene, of Massachusetts; Edmonds, of Pennsylvania, White—now Senator from Maine; Scott, of Michigan, and Davis, of Tennessee. I served on the subcommittee dealing with the merchant marine. Mr. BOGGS states the exact situation existing when the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 passed the House of Representatives.

I am confident that the proposed sale or temporary transfer of some of our war-built merchant vessels to European nations might very well undo all that has been done and again scuttle the American merchant marine.

I emphasize my support of the Marshall plan in principle, but my unequivocable opposition to the transfer of our ships by sale or charter to foreign countries. I said so in my remarks on January 30 and February 10, 1948.

Mr. BOGGS quoted from General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, Mr. Harriman, and President Truman and ex-Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt confirming the dangers emphasized by Mr. BOGGS.

Many of our Presidents have expressly recommended a reasonably adequate merchant marine. I quote some of them.

Calvin Coolidge:

The maintenance of a merchant marine is of the utmost importance. Our own vessels carry only about 40 percent of our foreign trade. We are dependent on our competitors to carry 60 percent of our trade to market. Of course, the result is that they help themselves and hamper us. Parity in merchant ships is only less important than parity in warships. We ought to make the necessary sacrifice to secure it.

Woodrow Wilson:

How are we to build up a great trade if we have not the certain and constant means of transportation upon which all profitable and useful commerce depends. And how are we to get the ships if we wait for the trade to develop without them? The Government must open these gates of trade, and open them wide; open them before it is altogether profitable to open them, or altogether reasonable to ask private capital to open them.

To speak plainly we have grossly erred in the way in which we have stunted and hindered the development of our merchant marine. It is necessary for many weighty reasons of national efficiency and development that we should have a great merchant marine. • • • It is high time we repaired our mistake and resumed our commercial independence on the sea.

Moreover, we can develop no true or effective American policy without ships of our own—not ships of war, but ships of peace, carrying goods and carrying much more; creating friendships and rendering indispensable services to all interests on this side of the water. They must move constantly back and forth between the Americas. They are the only shuttles that can weave the delicate fabric of sympathy, comprehension, confidence, and mutual dependence in which we wish to clothe our policy of America for Americans.

Theodore Roosevelt:

Ships work for their own countries, just as railroads work for their terminal points. From every standpoint, it is unwise for the United States to continue to rely upon the ships of competing nations for the distribution of our goods.

To the spread of our trade in peace and the defense of our flag in war, a great and prosperous merchant marine is indispensable. We should have ships of our own and seamen of our own to convey our goods to central markets, and in case of need to reinforce our battle line.

Ulysses S. Grant:

A nation of the vast and ever-increasing interior resources of the United States must one day possess its full share of the commerce of these oceans, no matter what the cost. Delay will only increase this cost and enhance the difficulty of attaining the result. • • • Building ships and navigating them utilizes vast capital at home; it employs thousands of workmen in their construction and manning; it creates a home market for the products of the farm and the shop; it diminishes the balance of trade against us precisely to the extent of freights and passenger money paid to American vessels, and gives us a supremacy upon the seas of inestimable value in case of foreign wars.

Thomas Jefferson:

The marketing of our productions will be at the mercy of any nation which has possessed itself exclusively of the means of carrying them; and our policy may be influenced by those who command our commerce.

For a navigating people to purchase its marine afloat would be a strange speculation, as the marine would always be dependent upon the merchants furnishing them. Placing as a reserve with a foreign nation, or in a foreign shipyard, the carpenters, blacksmiths, caulkers, sailmakers, and the vessels of a nation, would be a singular commercial combination. We must, therefore, build them for ourselves. • • •

To force shipbuilding is to establish shipyards; is to form magazines; to multiply useful hands; to produce artists and workmen of every kind who may be found at once for peaceful speculations of commerce and for the terrible wants of war.

It is as a source of defense that our navigation will admit neither neglect nor forbearance. The carriage of our commodities if once established in another channel, cannot be resumed in the moment we may desire.

George Washington:

We should not overlook the tendency of war to abridge the means and hereby at least enhance the price of transporting productions to their proper markets. I recommend it to your (Congress's) serious reflections how far and in what mode it may be expedient to guard against embarrassments from these contingencies by such encouragement to our own navigation as will render our commerce and agriculture less dependent on foreign bottoms which may fail us in the very moments most interesting to both these great objects. • • • There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure.

To the same effect were statements by President Hayes, President Arthur, and President Benjamin Harrison. President McKinley said:

Our national development will be one-sided and unsatisfactory so long as the remarkable growth of our inland industries remains unaccompanied by progress upon the seas. There is no lack of constitutional authority for legislation which shall give to this country maritime strength commensurate with its industrial achievements and with its rank among the nations of the earth. We must encourage our merchant marine. We must have more ships. They must be under the American flag and built and manned and owned by Americans. They will not only be profitable in a commercial sense; they will be messengers of peace and amity wherever they go.

Presidents Taft, Harding, and Hoover expressed themselves to the same effect, as quoted below:

President Taft:

All the great commercial nations pay heavy subsidies to their merchant marine, so that it is obvious that without some wise aid from Congress the United States must lag behind in the matter of a merchant marine.

President Harding:

Our shipping will strengthen American genius and determination, because carrying is second only to production in establishing and maintaining the flow of commerce to which we rightfully aspire.

I do not for one moment believe in Government ownership as a permanent policy, but I prefer that hazardous venture to the surrender of our hopes for a merchant marine.

So we mean to maintain the flag on the sea until such a future day as when Congress may rise above the obstructionist, when the reflective sentiment of all the country will sense the great necessity and compel the legislation required to turn to the national way of triumph on the seas.

President Hoover, in a message at the launching of the steamship *Santa Rosa* in 1932:

The efforts put forth in the rehabilitation of the American merchant marine have proved beneficial to the country at large. During the past 10 years, as compared with the prewar decade, the proportion of our foreign trade carried by ships under the American flag has substantially increased. It has notably grown in trades where no American-flag services previously were provided.

President Hoover, when Secretary of Commerce:

We must have ships if we would expand our exports on sound lines, and we must have them as auxiliaries to our national defense.

To secure export markets we must have some sound proportion of American-controlled shipping to assure us against combinations in rates which would prejudice our goods in competitive markets. Nor have our merchants been without experience in finding that the transport of our goods in foreign bottoms has been taken advantage of by our competitors to learn details of our trade connections.

It is just as important to the farmer to be guaranteed reasonable rates for sea transport as of land freight. The real security is an American-owned merchant marine.

It is simply a truism to say that we must have an American overseas merchant marine.

There is only one protection of our commerce from discrimination and from combinations which would impose onerous freight rates. That is to maintain upon these trade routes the regular operation of very substantial shipping under the American flag.

Other great statesmen of all parties have reached conclusions in accord with those expressed by the able patriotic men who have filled the Presidency, speaking under their responsibility to speak for the best interest of all the people of the United States rather than from the impulse to attain victory for the particular party with which they were affiliated and which had honored them. The unanimity of the views of Presidents of different faiths is convincing truth of the accuracy of their conclusions. James G. Blaine, of Maine, one of the greatest Americans whom our Nation has produced, Representative in Congress, and Secretary of State under President Benjamin Harrison, said in Twenty Years in Congress, written by him:

The principle of protecting the manufactures and encouraging the navigation of America had been distinctly proclaimed in the first law of the new Government and was thus made in a suggestion and emphatic sense the very cornerstone of the Republican edifice which the patriots of the Revolution were aiming to construct.

Secretary of State Elihu Root said in 1906:

We are living in a world not of natural competition, but of subsidized competition. State aid to steamship lines is as much a part of the commercial system of our day as state employment of consuls to promote business. It will be observed that both of these disadvantages under which the American shipowner labors are artificial; they are created by governmental action—one by our own Government in raising the standard of living and wages by the protection tariff; the other by foreign governments in paying subsidies to their ships for the promotion of their own trade. For the American shipowner it is not a contest of intelligence, skill, industry, and thrift against similar qualities in his competitor, it is a contest against his competitors and his competitors' government and his own government also. Plainly, these advantages created by governmental action can be neutralized only by governmental action, and should be neutralized by such action.

Senator Wesley L. Jones, from the State of Washington, in a speech in 1913, in the Senate of the United States said:

Since 1885, foreign ships have carried over $50,000,000,000 of our foreign commerce. Estimating the freight at 15 percent, we have paid them over $7,500,000,000 for getting our products to their markets and supplying our own. Of what benefit is a balance of trade in our favor if we pay most of it for freight?

Senator Jones was recognized as an authority on the subject on which he spoke.

On March 4, 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt presented to the Congress the issue of whether or not the United States should have an adequate merchant marine and answered the question affirmatively. He said:

To me there are three reasons for answering the question in the affirmative. The first is that in time of peace, subsidies granted by other nations, shipping combines, and other restrictive or rebating methods may well be used to the detriment of American shippers. The maintenance of fair competition alone calls for American-flag ships of sufficient tonnage to carry a reasonable portion of our foreign commerce.

Second, in the event of a major war, in which the United States is not involved, our commerce in the absence of an adequate merchant marine, might find itself seriously crippled because of its inability to secure bottoms for neutral, peaceful foreign trade.

Third, in the event of war in which the United States itself might be engaged, American-flag ships are obviously needed for naval auxiliaries, but also for the maintenance of reasonable and commercial intercourse with other nations. We should remember lessons learned in the last war (H. Doc. No. 118, 74th Cong., p. 1).

Under date of June 18, 1934, the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the President, appointed an interdepartmental committee to be known as the Committee on Shipping Policy, consisting of representative departments of the Government. This committee made a comprehensive study of the American merchant marine, and recommended a shipping policy to be pursued by the Government. The Secretary called for a comprehensive study of the policy to be followed by the administration in the development of an American merchant marine necessary for national defense and for the growth of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, including the question of subsidies, personnel, and unemployment.

That committee worked almost continuously for the next 6 months and submitted its report, which was attached to the President's message. The committee said:

The committee feels that it is necessary, for the purposes of both national defense and the development of foreign and domestic commerce of the United States that we have an American merchant marine. It is needless to call attention to the part that our merchant marine has played in the national defense of the country during various wars in which the United States has been engaged. We need only to recall the World War when we learned the result to us of allowing our merchant marine to approach the vanishing point. Between the outbreak of the war and our entry into it we found that the foreign shipping lines on which we had relied to carry our commerce had withdrawn their services to American trade in a large part, with the results, inter alia, that the ocean freight rates increased in some instances 1,000 percent and over. We found the products of farm, mine, and factory at the water terminals without sufficient transportation facilities to move them to their destination. After our entry into the war, it was necessary for the Government to embark upon a huge shipbuilding program resulting in the expenditure of about $3,000,000,000 to furnish merchant ships to carry supplies that were necessary for the support of our troops. We also had to train personnel to operate this new merchant fleet. It was further necessary to draw heavily upon the trained personnel of the Navy at a time when their services were needed for manning new combat vessels. This was in contrast with the experience of other maritime nations which were able to utilize their trained merchant marine personnel for operation of their naval vessels (H. Doc. No. 118, p. 21).

The President's message and the accompanying papers were referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce of the Senate. These committees studied the problems presented by the above message of the President and accompanying papers H. R. 7521 was introduced in the House, was studied for many months. Hearings consuming 1,243 printed pages, and held for 15 days, resulted in the committee reporting favorably H. R. 8555 on June 20, 1935, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, report No. 1277.

The report showed that the committee had carefully considered the message of the President and accompanying papers.

The bill provided means for the termination of ocean mail contracts which were the subjects of considerable controversy and gave the President agencies to assist him in his responsible duties but without abating or diminishing powers, and sought to give him the opportunity to work out substitution of contracts such as he might recommend for contracts which he might wish to cancel or modify and the committee sought to provide safeguards to prevent abuses in the future.

The committee said in its report:

The problem of an American merchant marine, its present condition and needs, the competition it must meet, the aids granted by other nations, and some of its outstanding difficulties are so complex that the committee summarizes them in this report that members may have before them the difficulties which have confronted this committee and also the Nation.

The committee disclosed the condition of our oceangoing merchant marine at

the time the report was submitted, discussed the needs for trade promotion and protection, and showed that the American merchant marine was in danger of destruction without new construction and replacement immediately.

A select committee on inquiry into the operations, policies, and affairs of the United States Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation, consisting of seven Members of the House of Representatives had been appointed under the authority of the Sixty-eighth Congress and had submitted its report in which it said:

In fact, had it not been for the American merchant marine at the close of the World War the United States would probably have paid out in increased ocean freight rates alone more than the total cost of the Government fleet. It was the Shipping Board which brought about, through control of its tonnage, constant reductions in ocean freight rates which inured to the benefit of American producers, industries, and shippers. This tremendously important fact cannot and should not be overlooked in estimating what the American merchant marine is worth to the people.

In addition to the enormous savings in freight rates, it must be remembered that the percentage of American commerce carried in American vessels has materially increased in volume over the prewar period and the freight money paid out by shippers for carriage in American vessels has remained in the United States. This sum constitutes a huge total.

Foreign ships are built abroad, their earnings are largely invested abroad, and they are manned almost entirely by foreigners who spend most of their money in other lands. It becomes apparent that the financial benefits to this country from foreign ship operations are meager. On the other hand, the earnings, wages, and purchases involved in the operations of ships are transactions which directly benefit the Government and people of the United States. An American merchant marine becomes, therefore, an effective instrument in the stimulation of domestic labor and industry.

The report of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries quoted from the Committee on Shipping Policy as follows:

In the opinion of the committee it is beyond question that this country should maintain a merchant marine, and this quite aside from the matter of national defense. In reaching this opinion, the committee is influenced by the following considerations:

1. The necessity of securing steamship service over routes essential to our commerce for which the steamship service of other countries might not provide.

2. The beneficial effect of the control of general shipping rates which the existence of an adequate national merchant marine assures.

3. The desirability of having available at all times a supply of tonnage to meet our urgent needs in the event of the withdrawal of foreign ships in a time of crisis or emergency abroad.

While there may be an occasion for differences of opinion as to the exact size which the merchant fleet should attain in order to meet these considerations adequately, the determination of what that size should be on an objective, impartial basis, giving due regard to the public interest as a whole, calls for close study and painstaking analysis of a very intricate and constantly shifting array of complex facts. Such a task can best be carried on under the direction of the unified authority on maritime affairs which is the subject of a later recommendation, and which can give full consideration to all aspects of a matter closely bound up with our foreign relations, the balance of our international payments, and the advancement of our agriculture, industry, and commerce in general.

The report pointed out that during the period from 1922 to 1928 no vessels were built in American yards for overseas foreign service and under the 1928 act 31 new vessels were built for ocean mail service and 42 reconditioned while in the preceding 5 years, in the construction of freighters, this country had built 4 while Great Britain was building 295, and for the 5 years previous when we were constructing 4 in American shipyards Great Britain built 558.

The report said:

During the postwar period from 1922 to 1933, about 16,500,000 tons of oceangoing ships of 2,000 gross tons and upward were constructed throughout the world of which the United States constructed less than 7 percent.

Obviously, something must be done quickly or our flag will disappear from the seas. We shall be reduced to our prewar position where we had 81 vessels of less than 50,000 tons operating on our regular services at which time we carried less than 10 percent of our commerce in American ships.

The tonnage under construction in the United States consists of two tankers aggregating 16,800 tons. The other tonnage consists of four vessels averaging 418 tons each. There is not one oceangoing vessel building in the United States for either domestic or foreign trade for the carriage of goods and passengers. Shipping serves every State in the Nation not only by supplying the transportation to carry its products to the markets of the world, but also by drawing upon every State for materials, supplies, and equipment for the construction of a ship. There is no other industry so diversified. The shipbuilding industry is a great consumer of raw materials. It buys from other industries not only the materials and equipment that are incorporated within the ship itself, but also the products that are consumed within the shipyard during the process of construction.

The evidence shows that from 80 to 85 percent of the cost of a ship goes to labor. This includes not only the labor within the shipyard itself, but also the labor performed on all the materials and equipment that are purchased by the shipyard and used in the construction of the vessel. When a shipyard buys material, as, for instance, a piece of machinery, the industry making this machinery performs labor upon it; and it, in turn, buys raw material, such as steel, copper, lumber, and other products, which, in turn use labor in their production. In tracing the production of any of these products it will be found that in producing ingot copper or steel, or lumber, that labor has been performed, so that finally everything is labor except the intrinsic value of the mines, fields, or forests of the country.

There is no industry in the United States where so much good could be done throughout the country and so many of the unemployed taken off the relief rolls as in the shipbuilding industry, with all of its ramifications. In this bill we have provided for the use of American products so far as practicable. The ships are needed, the American merchant marine has grown so old that it is in danger of destruction, men are on the relief rolls anxious to obtain employment, and the opportunity to grant relief is before us.

Ship operation is the most highly competitive business in the world. It is as true now as then that—

Failure to grant aid would open the door to monopolies in shipping and abandonment of the smaller ports. A few companies who could finance themselves would absorb all other lines, curtail operations, abandon ports, fail to develop smaller ports, operate from the now congested centers and destroy that equitable service to all ports of this country which has been the hope and dream of the interior portions of our country as well as of the ports that are to be served.

The study that was made by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries confirmed fully the President's message that aid was necessary for a reasonably adequate American merchant marine, and "that only by providing for American shipping Government aid to make up the differential between American and foreign shipping costs could a reasonably adequate merchant marine be maintained," and it concluded that it would well afford to call a subsidy by its right name.

Members of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries who still serve in the Congress of the United States are Edward J. Hart, of New Jersey; Richard J. Welch, who was second to Frederick R. Lehlbach, of New Jersey, who was ranking Republican on the committee; Ralph O. Brewster, of Maine, now junior Senator from that State; Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan; and Bland, of Virginia, who was chairman.

Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, who was a member of the committee, is now Comptroller General of the United States.

The committee studied exhaustively all questions involved in the subject and summarized in its report the subsidies that were paid by foreign countries.

I hope this review of the record may prove interesting and useful. Partisan politics have never entered into the deliberations of the committee handling this legislation. All members were impelled and guided solely by the best interest of America as they saw it.

I am convinced that the same motives and spirit have guided and actuated all of the members of the United States Maritime Commission from the dates of their first appointments in 1936 to the present time.

No men occupying any offices have tried more honestly and faithfully to serve America than the former Commissioners and those who now serve. To say that they have made mistakes is only to say that they are human, but I believe that an unbiased, comprehensive study of their work, their problems, and their difficulties will convince all who wish to do justice to say that they have done well.

One of the Commissioners who gave of himself without stint and unreservedly, Admiral Vickery, paid with his life for his devotion to the cause. He was as truly a victim of World War II as any soldier who fell on the battlefield. His duties were arduous. He, too, was one of those immortals who died that America might live. I feel that I would be untrue to his memory, and a perfect ingrate, if I should omit this tribute to his memory.

May his sleep be sweet and may all of us who survived him remember his services.

Lord God of hosts, be with us yet.
Lest we forget! Lest we forget!

Betrayal of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the perfidy of those who have sacrificed our national honor for their own advancement in the field of domestic and world power politics is gradually coming to light.

Just so long as the sovereign citizens of our Republic reward aspirants for public office because such candidates flatter and charm them, they will find themselves betrayed.

Under unanimous consent granted, I am inserting an article by Frank R. Kent, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 13, 1948:

LANE BOOK ON POLAND'S BETRAYAL DIFFICULT FOR ROOSEVELT DEFENDERS TO ANSWER

(By Frank R. Kent)

It is typical of the worshipers of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt that they should agree with practically everything in the impressive and significant book of Arthur Bliss Lane ("I Saw Poland Betrayed") except the single statement that at Yalta and Tehran Mr. Roosevelt, in his effort to charm Mr. Stalin, abandoned the principles of the Atlantic Charter and, in effect, cast aside his promises to Poland, opening wide the door for the savage and brutal domination of that suffering country by the Soviet forces.

That, of course, is an extremely serious charge—particularly when it is recalled that in 1944 hundreds of thousands of American Poles voted solidly for Mr. Roosevelt in the firm conviction that he was the vigilant and unshakable champion of Polish freedom and independence. But it is not a new charge. Others have asserted that at these Roosevelt-Stalin meetings Poland was blithely sold down the river, the former American President trustingly relying on the unsupported word of the Soviet dictator, utterly ignoring his long, black record for violation of treaties, agreements and pledges; incredibly permitting him to have a free hand in Poland.

Of all who have made this devastating accusation, Mr. Lane carries the most weight, presents the most convincing evidence and was in best position to know the facts. It no more can be claimed that he was inspired by a personal or political motive than it can be contended he did not fully appreciate the nature and implications of his statements. Here is no Roosevelt hater, no representative of reactionary forces, no economic royalist or ambitious seeker of office. Instead, here is an outstanding American with a distinguished career of diplomatic service covering more than 30 years in various parts of the world.

ROOSEVELT NOMINEE

Named Ambassador to Poland by Mr. Roosevelt himself, he was in London in 1944 when Poland was occupied by the enemy and her government was in London. He entered Warsaw immediately following the German surrender and remained there until last year, an eyewitness to every step of the Soviet seizure of Poland, with full understanding of the callousness of the pledge violation and of the humiliating failure of our Government to lift a hand to prevent or utter an effective word to protest what, beyond question, was one of the most dreadful and indefensible crimes against a free people in all world history.

Because of his official position and by reason of our Government's apathy, Ambassador Lane was personally impotent to halt the strangulation of Poland. When he talked with Mr. Roosevelt, after the latter's election in 1944, he urged the importance of insisting to the Soviet Government that the independence of Poland be maintained.

The Roosevelt reply was: "Do you want me to go to war with Russia?" When he returned to Warsaw he did what he could, but the Soviet representatives paid slight attention to him, and his own Government not only did not back him up but, over his earnest protest and with American citizens unjustly imprisoned, loaned the Polish puppet government $90,000,000.

The whole story as told by Mr. Lane is a sickening one of shameless treachery, broken promises, and unshackled brutality. It is interesting to note that the Lane report, both as to responsibility for this murderous assault upon the integrity of a great people and on the character of the occupation, coincides with that made in Jan Ciechanowski's book, published 2 years ago.

DEFENSE UNCONVINCING

Mr. Ciechanowski for many years was the distinguished Polish Ambassador to this country. By some it was unfairly argued that as a Pole he was prejudiced. But no prejudice can be charged against Mr. Lane. He is not a Pole; he is an American diplomat with no political connections, aspirations, or purposes. Early last year he resigned his post as Ambassador to Poland and, at the age of 52, closed his long diplomatic career solely to be able to tell the American people the truth of what happened to Poland—and why.

This he has done in his book and is doing in his lectures. It is a shocking story and few Americans can reflect upon their country's part in it without a feeling of shame. The defense of Mr. Roosevelt's role, at Yalta, Tehran, and after the seizure began, is not a convincing one.

Chiefly, it amounts to statements from his former intimates that while Mr. Lane has made a "valuable contribution," they personally know of Mr. Roosevelt's "deep concern" for Polish freedom and had often discussed with him his ideas for maintaining it. This clearly inadequate reply is supplemented by a transparently futile effort to shift the blame for what happened, first to former Secretary of State Stettinius and then to former Secretary of State Byrnes.

In other words, no reply worthy of the name has been made. Nor is it likely one will be. For the historians probably the kindest thing is to accept the explanation that Mr. Roosevelt was a sick man whose judgment was impaired. Certainly the notion, which so many agree Mr. Roosevelt cherished, that he, who spoke no word of Russian, could, through two interpreters, "charm" Mr. Stalin, who spoke no word of English, seems hard to reconcile with reason.

Life in Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, for 25 years the Communist Party leaders all around the world have stated time after time that the only safe place in the world for members of the Jewish religion is in Soviet Russia, as anti-Semitism was a crime under Soviet laws. In recent years the world has come to know that that is not true and that as a matter of fact anti-Semitism has become more and more flagrant under the direction of Joseph Stalin, a well known anti-Semite all of his life. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD an article in the New York Times of yesterday by C. L. Sulzberger, which discusses the regrettable status of the Province of Biro-Bidjan which was many years ago set aside as an all-Jewish state in Russia. It is in the far east of Siberia, so far north that life there is a burden, and it has been permitted to steadily deteriorate over the years as is so well described by Mr. Sulzberger's article.

I hope all of the Jews of the world will read this article and ponder on the honesty of the officials of Soviet Russia:

SOVIET JEWS' AREA REPORTED IN DECAY—OBSERVER SAYS ANTI-SEMITISM DRIVES SOME TO BIRO-BIDJAN, BUT DREAM OF HAVEN FADES

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, February 14.—In view of the Soviet Union's advocacy of the partition of Palestine into Jewish and Arab states and of the quiet anti-Semitism that still obtains in many areas of the Soviet Union, it is interesting to report on the Province of Biro-Bidjan.

This autonomous Jewish district was established in the early days of the Soviet Union on the Trans-Siberian Railway in the Far East. Jews were encouraged to migrate within the Soviet borders to establish their own seat of national culture. Russian and Yiddish are the official languages of Biro-Bidjan.

An observer recently spent considerable time there. He expressed the opinion that the Soviet government had lost interest in that area as "a project of importance" and that this haven for an oppressed people was being permitted to fall into decay. At best, he said, it is treated on a parity with other remote parts of the Soviet Union and no longer as a dream project.

Travelers are rarely permitted to inspect that distant province.

Although, because they feel uncomfortable in conditions in which the anti-Semitism engendered during the war has not died out, Jews, especially intellectuals from Russia proper, are still emigrating to Biro-Bidjan, they are likely to be disappointed by what they find, according to my informant.

He said that the oblast, or district, of Biro-Bidjan, which has a rugged climate, consisted of only a few villages in addition to the town of Biro-Bidjan, in which lived about 30,000 inhabitants, somewhat less than a third of the oblast's population.

The town, he added, is built entirely of wood except for fewer than a dozen brick buildings, and contains three cobbled streets, an Intourist hotel, and a few small factories. There are a brick factory, a sawmill, a textile factory, and wagon and pipe works. The town has no sewerage system or water supply, the observer remarked.

Although families are not so crowded as in Moscow, and often have more than three rooms, they live primitively, usually in two-story wood apartment houses for 10 to 20 families, according to the informant. The buildings, he said, are constructed around a courtyard in whose center are a lavatory pit and garbage dump.

BUILDING FOUNDATIONS SINK

Most of these buildings were erected within the last 15 years, but were said to be in a state of dilapidation. The town is built on swamps, and some foundations have sunk to a depth of 10 feet, the observer said.

As a result, he went on, the brick buildings have cracked and the wood ones warped, with many floors rotted by the unusual damp of the summer rainy season. Only a few trucks and old busses were said to make up the transportation system. To obtain water the inhabitants often have to travel 2 or 3 miles in communal trucks.

Most of the population subsists mainly on locally grown potatoes and vegetables, according to the traveler. These are produced in allotments worked after hours in the factories and state projects, he said. To support their families, many of the men have had to take two jobs, he added. One engineer was said to be feeding his wife and children by working 19 hours a day.

The local factories once received good material from western Russia, but a lack of repairs has induced what the observer described a "state of interrupted breakdown." Thus, although Biro-Bidjan has a pipe factory, it has no sewers, he remarked.

Despite the original dream of forming a Jewish state in Biro-Bidjan, its Jewish population is less than one-fourth the total; according to my informant, who said that the Jews nevertheless held many of the administrative positions, including the local party secretaryship.

The secret police has its outposts in Biro-Bidjan, the observer declared. One of its main functions was said to be to prevent disillusioned pioneers from departing.

In the Soviet Union in general it was learned that allegedly as a result of the gradual exclusion of Jews from public life (with a few notable exceptions such as Jacob Suritz, recently Ambassador to Brazil, and Vice Premier Lazar M. Kaganovich) certain Jewish leaders protested recently to Foreign Minister Molotov about anti-Semitic trends.

Mr. Molotov was said to have intimated that governmental action might be taken later when circumstances were more favorable.

Mr. Kaganovich, a member of the Politburo and a friend of Premier Stalin, was said to have made similar and firmer promises. Soviet Jews seemed to have hope that their situation might become more favorable since the death more than 2 years ago of A. S. Shcherbakov, a Politburo alternate who was reputed to be the most powerful anti-Semite in the Soviet Union.

Trends toward anti-Semitism appear to have brought about more group consciousness in Soviet Jews, and the membership of organizations such as the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee is growing.

Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union may have some bearing on recent British contentions that Communist Jews, many of whom spoke Russian, had migrated to Palestine.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Livingston Enterprise of February 6.

This editorial was sent me by Arnold F. Cayser, a civil engineer of Livingston, Mont., with the statement:

I am complying with a timely request which appeared as editorial in the Livingston Enterprise only last night.

The editorial follows:

WRITE A LETTER TO YOUR CONGRESSMAN

The congressional budget committee has proposed a reduction of $2,500,000,000 in the total of Federal spending proposed by President Truman.

That is not enough and every taxpayer should write to his Congressman and Senator and tell them so.

The Federal budget should be cut seven or eight billion, perhaps even $10,000,000,000 below President Truman's recommendation of $39,700,000,000.

President Truman and his bureaucrats have asked Congress for every cent of money which they hope to wring from a Republican Congress, and then they have added to it for good measure.

If the Government were forced to live as sparingly as its citizens are forced to under the present inflated prices it could get along with a great deal less than is asked.

Tell your Congressmen and Senators that taxes are sapping the lifeblood of the American economic system and that if there is no relief this Nation will be forced into socialism because there will be no source of capital to finance enterprise.

Tell your Congressman that Government spending is inflationary, because the Government enters the markets and bids up the prices of things that the people need.

Tell your Congressman that high taxes are inflationary because Federal tax is piled onto Federal tax in the price of every item which an individual buys.

Tell your Congressman that a reduction in individual taxes will not be inflationary but will be deflationary, because it will make unnecessary another round of wage increases, because it will reduce the cost of manufacturing and selling, and because it will take the Federal Government out of the market place to the extent of the reduction.

Tell your Congressman that Government spending is being poured directly into consumer-goods items in even greater proportion than is private spending.

Tell your Congressman that you are willing and even anxious to go without huge Federal-aid projects until they can be financed more cheaply. Tell him that you are opposed to adding any new costs to the budget, such as that for socialized medicine or for United States aid to education.

Tell your Congressman that Federal employees must pay everything they need for their subsistence in competition with you and I, while they produce nothing to fill channels of trade and commerce. Tell him that the Federal pay roll should be reduced so that these people could get jobs in private industry, where they are needed to help produce goods.

Tell him that you are in favor of tax reduction and budget reduction and that you think the proposal to slice only $2,500,000,000 from an inflated $39,700,000,000 budget is ridiculous.

Communism and Subversive Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following radio interview between myself and Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation:

Mr. FISHER. The people of the Nation have been anxious about our internal security since the early days of the war when Nazi Germany, aided by fifth columns, overran the many peaceful countries of Europe. Espionage and sabotage in those countries were uncontrolled. The fifth column had already done its work. In those days we, too, worried about what might happen in America. But our worries were never realized because our Nation throughout the war years experienced no enemy-directed acts of sabotage, and espionage was under complete control. One very good reason, and, indeed, the controlling reason, for this safety and security, which were ours is explained by the existence of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the G-men, as they are more properly known.

The man who heads that organization has made a profession out of security. For nearly 24 years Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has led the FBI to victory after victory and I am happy to have Mr. Hoover as my guest on this program today.

Mr. HOOVER. It is a pleasure for me, Congressman FISHER, to be with you on this program and to have this opportunity to speak to the citizens in your great State of Texas.

Mr. FISHER. I am sure, Mr. Hoover, that you feel very strongly, that the ending of the shooting war in Europe and in the Pacific did not end the necessity for vigilance here at home. You and I both know that if we have enemies to the American way of life we must know who they are before we can adequately defend ourselves, and I have the feeling that a potential threat again comes from a totalitarian force—this time the Communists. But am I being an alarmist, Mr. Hoover, when I say that communism is a menace to our democratic institutions?

Mr. HOOVER. I would say, Congressman FISHER, that you are being very realistic in your observations. The fact that there are less than 100,000 known members of the Communist Party of the United States of America in itself is not too serious. But they are only the duly constituted members of the party. The Communists themselves make the boast that for every party member there are 10 others ready, willing, and able to do the party's work. This includes Communist sympathizers, fellow travelers, and stooges who conceal their real identity with a cloak of pseudo respectability. Whether the menace of communism can be determined by the number of Communists on the party rolls is immaterial. There are some misguided and innocent persons who claim that we have nothing to fear. Unfortunately the good people of Germany and Italy learned that lesson, but only after it was too late. The Nazi Party only had 30 members when Hitler joined it in 1920, while the Italian Fascist movement in 1919 consisted of Mussolini and 150 of his friends, and when they marched on Rome they were outnumbered ten to one. But they were organized just as the 80,000 members of the Communist Party were when they overthrew the old Russian Government and seized power. In fact, in proportion to the population there are more Communist Party members in the United States today than there were in Russia in 1919. But yet we hear people in the United States saying that any denunciation of communism is likened unto the rise of national socialism in Germany where "The attacks on the rights of a very unpopular minority led to the attack on the rights of all the people."

Mr. FISHER. I know, Mr. Hoover, how deep-seated your contempt for anything that smacks of fascism is but don't the Communists always say that anyone who denounces the Communist way of life is a "Hitlerite," a "Fascist," or a "Reactionary."

Mr. HOOVER. That is right.

Mr. FISHER. Now Mr. Hoover, what evidence do we have that the Communists stand for the destruction of the American way of life? We have found the Communists are good at deceit and trickery—the first thing a Communist learns is to lie about being a Communist. They masquerade under a lot of false colors.

Mr. HOOVER. We need go no further than the words of the Communist leaders themselves. In recent years they have been very cautious about using such phrases as "force and violence," but in their schools and in party caucus their every plan is based upon the necessity of a world revolution to establish "the dictatorship of the proletariat." In their own words they plan "to raise these revolutionary forces to the surface and hurl them like a devastating avalanche upon the united forces of bourgeois reaction, frenzied at the presentment of their rapidly approaching doom." The phrase "united forces of bourgeois reaction," Congressman FISHER, necessarily includes every patriotic American who is convinced that our system of government and our way of life are the best the world has to offer.

Mr. FISHER. That is certainly a plain statement, Mr. Hoover, but is it not true that Communists deny any plan to overthrow our constitutional government by force and violence?

Mr. HOOVER. Certainly they do. But Communists do not mean what they say when they are speaking for public consumption. They feel no moral compunction when they state that lie. The great god of the American Communists, Comrade Lenin, urged the use of deceit and trickery. His writings, which are their "bible," declare "The strictest loyalty to the ideas of communism must be combined with the ability to make all necessary practical compromises, to maneuver, to make agreements, zig-zag, retreats, and so on, so as to accelerate the coming to power." The Communists cannot maneuver or zig-zag around the ruling of the Attorney General when he held that the Communist Party from the time of its inception in 1919 believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

Mr. FISHER. The Communist Party of the United States also denies any connection with any foreign political party or government, does it not?

Mr. HOOVER. That is true. American Communists naturally do not admit in public that their interests are identical with those of Soviet Russia. In reality, however, the one fundamental principle of the party line from which there can be no deviation is the duty to support Soviet Russia in all its dealings with other countries, including particularly the United States. Need anyone be reminded that "The Yanks are not coming" was the Communist chant during the Russian alliance with Hitler? The day before the Nazis marched into Russia, American Communists were voicing protests against our every defense effort. But less than a month later the same voices demanded all-out production and started the chant for a second front.

Mr. FISHER. You are convinced then, Mr. Hoover, that the American Communists constitute a fifth column with loyalty pledged to Soviet Russia.

Mr. HOOVER. I am, Congressman FISHER.

Mr. FISHER. Suppose, however, that actual war were to break out. In the event of that ultimate test of patriotism, where do you think the Communist Party of the United States would stand?

Mr. HOOVER. I believe few Communist statements, Congressman FISHER, but I take some of them at full face value. Here is one I freely accept. A top functionary of the Communist Party when asked the very question you have just asked me, said: "A war by the United States against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be an unjust war, which is why it must be fought against; but if it should come, the Communist Party of the United States would be with Russia, and make no mistake about that." This is not the feeling of just one Communist leader. It is part of the accepted catechism of all true Communists. In another section of the country a Communist leader made this statement: "I believe that everyone should know that we are for Russia and if need be we will die for the cause. I don't mean that war with Russia is coming soon; I hope not, so that Russia will be better prepared."

Mr. FISHER. Such statements leave no room for doubt, Mr. Hoover. The Communist's first and only loyalty is to a foreign nation and an ideology opposed in every sense to the American way of life.

Mr. HOOVER. Yes, Congressman FISHER, the Communist Party of the United States, the dupes and its fellow travelers, have been, still are, and always will be a menace to our liberty, our democratic ideals, and our freedom to live and to worship according to our conscience.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hoover, what can the individual citizen do to defeat the Communist attempt to impose a totalitarian dictatorship upon this Nation of ours? A single individual, no matter how strong his patriotism, cannot hope to stem the tide of Red fascism by his efforts alone.

Mr. HOOVER. True, Congressman FISHER. One individual or even one organization alone cannot defeat communism. But our Nation is made up of individuals and its historic tradition has made its watchword "United we stand." The Nation's strength is the sum of the strength of the individual citizens. If each does his part, the Nation has nothing to fear.

Mr. FISHER. It is evident that each citizen, then, should know communism for what it is and fight it by exposing its true nature to others.

Mr. HOOVER. Yes, Congressman FISHER, and I want to point out that the Congress of the United States has performed a signal service in publicly disclosing through its members the forces, both Communist and Fascist, which menace America.

Mr. FISHER. We all might do well, Mr. Hoover, to take a page from the book of the Communists themselves. The true Communist devotes himself to the interests of the party with an enthusiasm which amounts to fanaticism. If all our citizens support Americanism with this same kind of fervor, the battle is as good as won.

Mr. HOOVER. That is certainly true, Congressman FISHER. At the same time, we must not let our enthusiasm lead us to violate the very principles of democracy we seek to preserve. We must be certain the man we label as a Communist is truly dedicated to the Communist cause. Sincere liberals and progressives are communism's most deadly foes, yet the Communists seek the protective cloak of liberalism to do their dirty work. A favorite Communist technique is to shout loudly for better living conditions and protection of civil rights in order to enlist popular support. The sincere liberal also fights for such desirable objectives, but his motives should not be confused with those of the Communist. We must be careful, too, that law enforcement is left in the hands of duly constituted and well-trained officers. No one is justified in taking the law into his own hands. One lynching is worth a great deal to the Communist propaganda machine. Fascism is a danger no less than communism, if it is allowed to flourish. We must fight any evidence of its recurrence.

If we do these things: Expose communism wherever it exists, protect the civil rights and liberties of everyone and devote our energies enthusiastically to making our kind of democracy work—then the Communist infiltration will fail and the Constitution of the United States will triumph over the Communist manifesto.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hoover, in a statement before the House of Representatives' Committee on Un-American Activities, you summed up the best antidote to communism as vigorous, intelligent, old-fashioned Americanism with eternal vigilance. That prescription is one that each American citizen would do well to take to heart.

Mr. HOOVER. Thank you, Congressman FISHER, and thank you for this opportunity to express my views to your fellow Texans.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you, Mr. Hoover, on behalf of all our listeners.

Inequality in Income-Tax Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

THE SENATE, STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, February 13, 1948.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing herewith copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, introduced by Mr. Anderson, adopted in the senate on January 12, 1948, and concurred in by the assembly on February 2, 1948, memorializing Congress to amend the Federal income-tax law by eliminating the inequitable tax discrimination between residents of the so-called community-property States and the so-called common-law States.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 11

Whereas it is our belief that a fundamental American concept of government is the establishment and maintenance of equity and freedom from discrimination among citizens in their relation to government; and

Whereas it is further our belief that such equity and freedom from discrimination does not now exist in the matter of the imposition of Federal income taxes pursuant to article XVI of the Constitution of the United States and its implementing statutes, because of the inequality of the income tax-burdens upon the residents of a few States of the Union and those of the many other States resulting from the so-called community-property laws of said few States; and

Whereas it is our belief that such inequality is substantial and places an additional estimated tax of $170,000,000 annually upon a large segment of the residents of this State; and

Whereas it would be tremendously difficult for the so-called common-law States to uproot their rules of property in an effort to remove this discrimination; and

Whereas it is our belief that the best and most equitable means available for the removal of this tax discrimination lies within the legislative powers of the Congress and the

legislative approval powers of the Chief Executive: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the legislature of the State of New York respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to speedily correct the Federal income-tax law by eliminating the inequitable tax discrimination between residents of the so-called community-property States and the so-called common-law States, of which this State is one; and be it further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the legislature of the State of New York respectfully urge the President of these United States to speedily approve such corrective legislation when, as and if submitted to him for executive approval; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to each Member of Congress and to the Governor and legislative body of every common law State in the Union.

By order of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

In assembly February 2, 1948; concurred in without amendment.

By order of assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Stinnett, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE WORLEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an interesting newspaper article about the very friendly town of Stinnett, Tex., which I am happy to say is in my own congressional district:

ALWAYS A SPARE ROOM—"FRIENDLIEST TOWN" EVEN LENDS YOU CAR

(By William C. Barnard)

STINNETT, TEX., February 7.—A freezing mist stung the stranger's face when he got off the bus in this northern Panhandle town. He saw nothing that looked like a hotel—just a row of weatherbeaten business houses bordering the highway from Borger and Amarillo.

Constable Ben Foster, a small, lean, middle-aged man, walked up and stuck out a hand.

"What can I do for you, friend?"

"I have to spend the night and I'm looking for a room."

"I'll get you fixed up," Foster said, smiling. "If Ed hasn't got something maybe Curley will have, and if Curley's full up I'll put you up in the jury dormitory at the courthouse. We're not trying anybody right now."

Then he added reassuringly: "Don't worry about a room—Stinnett never turns anybody away."

Ed was clear out of rooms and so was Frantz (Curley) Ferguson. But Ferguson, owner of a hardware store and pool parlor, had an idea:

"My youngest can spend the night with his grandma. My wife and I will move into his room and this man can have the big bedroom with the desk."

The visitor protested, but Ferguson refused to listen.

"It's all settled," Curley said. "Now, here's my car keys—you probably have some running around to do while you're here and I don't want you getting wet and muddy."

CANOPY OF SMOKE

It was a typical incident here, and big city citizens who walk around the unconscious man on the sidewalk and never nod to the guy in the next apartment would be amazed.

Stinnett, with a population of 635, is the seat of Hutchinson County, which sits atop the world's greatest gas field. Thirteen miles south is Borger, carbon black center. Over most of the county the smoke hazes the atmosphere, softens the sunrise, colors the sunset, and sometimes gives the appearance of an impending blue norther.

Most men of Stinnett work in carbon black plants and in the gas field. The gas wells march right into town.

Outside Stinnett are fine ranches and wheat farms, and the ranchers and farmers are part of Stinnett's community life that centers in the two-story brick school. Everyone knows everybody. There are no doctors or dentists in town and Druggist Burt Downer does quite a business patching up scratches and swabbing throats.

It was at Stinnett that Frankie Groves, 103-pound, 16-year-old junior, last fall became the first girl ever to play in an interscholastic league football game.

Businessmen decided to present Frankie with some new clothes. Curley Ferguson went out for 30 minutes and got about $100. After that he just went back to his store and people began dropping in to contribute. Nobody gave less than $5.

"We sort of make it a point to help out," Ferguson says. "A while back a fellow here went over to Borger and a doctor told him he needed an operation and would be laid up in a hospital for 3 weeks. That was at noon, but the word got around. By 5 o'clock we had enough money to pay the doctor, the hospital, and to keep the man's wife and three children until he could get back to work."

EVERYBODY'S GAME

"This town goes in for athletics," says School Superintendent M. W. Graves. "Every eligible girl and boy plays basketball and every eligible boy, except three, went out for football. The three have after-school jobs. Boys and girls stay in training. I have never seen a high-school girl here smoke a cigarette."

Miss June Gibbs' home economics class took in $1,200 last year selling food at entertainments and hot dogs and coffee at football games. That's no easy trick, since there are no bleachers here and the crowd continually moves around.

When a fullback lights out on a 60-yard run, the fans run along the sidelines with him. Ed Fagg, 90, turned out for one game last fall and trotted up and down the sidelines, too, saying, "I'm going to see this game if it kills me."

Coach Truman Johnson, 220-pound Irish-Cherokee Indian from Oklahoma, teaches history and civics and drives one of the three school buses, making two 15-mile runs a day. The former Centenary football star and Chicago Cardinal professional sets out before sunrise and gets home after dark.

In his store, Ferguson runs things from an easy chair at the rear of the shop. A man came in, picked out a frying pan, rang up the sale on the cash register, got his change, waved to Curley and departed.

Curley's visitor was impressed by this easy self-service.

"Is it a good idea to let people get in your cash register?" he asked.

"Why not?" Curley shrugged. "If they get short-changed they have nobody to blame but themselves."

Union-Shop Elections—Building-Construction Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Robert N. Denham, general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, has just announced a program of union-shop elections in the building-construction industry. It is estimated that the program will involve a minimum of 14,000 separate elections and that 2,500,000 building-trade workers will vote. The election in this industry alone will probably cost the American taxpayer in excess of $1,000,000.

I have been engaged in the building-construction and material businesses since early manhood, and I am, therefore, familiar with all phases of the operations and problems of the building-construction industry, and I am of the opinion that this poll is unnecessary and will impose an unwieldy administration burden on the National Labor Relations Board.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I will include a report by the Public Affairs Institute which appeared in the weekly issue of the Trainman News of February 7, 1948, which is the official weekly publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

This very enlightening and able report of the Public Affairs Institue confirms many of the criticisms which were directed against the union-shop election proceedings provided in the Taft-Hartley Act.

The report is as follows:

UNION SHOP ELECTIONS UNDER T-H—UNWIELDY, UNBINDING, UNNECESSARY

(A report by the Public Affairs Institute)

A recent report released by the National Labor Relations Board reveals that 2,064 cases were filed with that agency for the month of December alone. This is the largest number of cases ever filed with the Board in any one month in the entire 12 years of its existence. Over half of these cases consisted of petitions for elections authorizing a union shop.

When this particular provision of the Taft-Hartley Act was debated, its supporters proclaimed that the rank and file workers must be protected from compulsory union membership. Therefore, union security could not be valid without a poll among all the employees of a given bargaining unit.

Critics of this provision, on the other hand, vainly pointed out that not only was such a poll unnecessary but that it would impose an unwieldly administrative burden upon the NLRB. The accuracy of this prediction is borne out by the fact that the Labor Board is now confronted with a steadily increasing back-log of cases. The latest available figures which deal with the month of December indicate an all-time high of 5,833 cases buried under "unfinished business."

Recently the board conducted a union security election among the employees of the American Woolen Co. This one election involved the polling of over 20,000 employees in 21 mills located in 14 different cities. Yet this task was comparatively simple in the light of the demands to be made upon the board in the near future. For example, the United Automobile Workers of the CIO has announced that it will seek an election not for 20,000 but for 250,000 employees.

ELECTION COST STAGGERING

What of the cost of conducting these mammoth elections? It is estimated that it costs the Government about 45 cents for each vote in a union shop election. Therefore, such an election among the 250,000 General Motors employees represented by the UAW would cost well over $100,000. Obviously, the over-all cost of these elections would be staggering.

Is it not strange that Congress can be so lavish in its use of Government funds for the restriction of organized labor, and so niggardly with its expenditures where public welfare could be improved? Millions of dollars for union shop elections, and not enough funds to conduct an effective Department of Labor.

An even more important factor is the effect of such unwieldly procedure on labor-management relations generally. The very nature of the field in which the labor board operates requires that matters before it be handled promptly. For instance, a union seeking to be certified as a bargaining representative cannot wait weeks and perhaps months for the board to consider its case without creating unrest among the employees and disturbing relations with the employers

A backlog of board cases means a backlog of injustices and dissension in the factories, shops, and offices throughout the country.

IS SUCH EXPENDITURE NECESSARY?

Is this expenditure of time, money, and good will necessary? The answer again is to be found in the figures for the months of December and November. Of the approximately 73,000 votes cast during that month, 93 percent were in favor of the authorization of union-shop provisions. Elections held during November showed 90 percent of the employees were in favor of the union shop.

Despite this overwhelming sentiment in favor of union security, the Taft-Hartley Act does not require an employer to enter into such an agreement even after an election has been held. For example, if as much as 100 percent, of the 250,000 GM employees were to vote in favor of a union-shop provision, the General Motors Corp., would not be required by law to agree to such a provision. It is illegal for a union to insist on a union shop without an election, but it is perfectly legal for an employer to ignore the preference of his employees as determined by a labor board election.

If the sponsors of the Taft-Hartley Act had really been interested in giving effect to the views of employees, they would have included in the act a provision compelling the employer to agree to a union-shop provision where a majority of the employees vote in its favor.

Why Materials Controls Are Unnecessary, Unworkable, and Obstructive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by John H. Middlekamp for the Automobile Manufacturers Association to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on January 30, 1948:

INTRODUCTION

My name is John H. Middlekamp. I am a vice president of the Mack International Motor Truck Corp., a producer of trucks and busses. Today, at the request and with the assistance of the fact-finding committee on Government controls of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, I am appearing to give you the views of the automobile industry on the materials controls embodied in legislation before your committee.

This is a subject on which I can speak with some knowledge, as during the war I helped administer the production controls imposed on the automobile industry. Shortly after Pearl Harbor I was called to Washington to expedite truck production for the Office of Production Management. I had been with the Brooklyn-Manhattan Transit Co. for 17 years, my prewar job being superintendent of its automotive equipment. Later, I was commissioned by the Army to head up a department to control truck production, and on January 1, 1944, at the request of WPB and the Army, I accepted the directorship of the Automotive Division of the War Production Board.

PURPOSE OF THIS STATEMENT

The automobile industry is thoroughly convinced, after exhaustive reviews of its experience both in peace and war, that:

1. No need has yet been shown for imposing materials controls upon the domestic economy at this time or at any foreseeable time of peace;

2. Partial controls—that is, regimenting some segments of the economy and leaving others free—are impossible for the Government to administer or for industry to operate under; and

3. Complete controls won't work in a free country. Even if workable, complete regimentation of the business and industry and agriculture of America would fail to create and in fact would prevent the stabilization of the economy which is the professed goal of the bills before the committee. More importantly, it would inevitably weaken and quite possibly destroy the capacity of the last free country in the world to maintain its own economy and help the rest of the nations of the world throw off the shackles of regimentation and the consequent economic paralysis which has caused them to look to us for assistance.

You will have noted that we are talking mainly about materials controls. In our industry, both wages and prices are competitive matters which are not discussed collectively. They are handled by individual companies on the basis of their individual problems and policies. In some instances, the specific as well as the broad economic arguments we will use to oppose the control of materials are applicable also to wage and price controls, but I want to stress that our presentation is based upon our knowledege and experience in the materials field.

From our experience with OPA controls of prices of materials during the reconversion period we know that items carrying unrealistically low prices disappeared from the market before the agency could—or would—correct the maladjustment. This compounded the problems of manufacturers, who were forced either to develop and use more expensive substitute but available materials or to reduce production. Thus price controls on basic materials instead of stabilizing prices actually increased costs and inflated prices.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY AND NATIONAL ECONOMY

The automobile industry, as you probably know, is not self-contained. We neither produce nor fabricate all the materials that go into our passenger cars, trucks, busses, and taxicabs. Instead we buy materials and parts from thousands of sources—thousands of small businesses.

To produce our vehicles, we use components which we make ourselves from basic materials bought from the steel, copper, lead, zinc, textile, lumber, plastics, and other materials companies. We also use complete or semifinished components or subassemblies bought from parts producers, most of which are "smaller businesses" by any definition.

The nonintegrated system of production stood us and the Nation in good stead during the war. Then the emphasis was on subcontracting, and this industry with the aid of its thousands of subcontractors (or vendors as we call them in peacetime) was able to produce—in trucks and tanks and guns and planes and hundreds of other lethal items—about 30 percent of the country's metal-based war production. For about half of our industry's important contribution to victory, smaller businesses can take credit. Subcontractors located in 1,375 cities and towns in 44 States accounted for 56 cents of every dollar's worth of automotive war production, and that pattern probably is not much different now.

You perhaps may know that the automobile industry is responsible for approximately one out of every seven paid jobs in America, with about 8,200,000 persons earning their living in the manufacture, distribution or use of its vehicles. Besides employing about 800,000 people in its own plants, it generates employment for nearly 7,500,000 people in 537,000 outside concerns, nearly all of which are classified as small business. Automotive sales and service accounts for one-fifth of all retail business, one-eighth of all wholesale business.

Normally the automobile industry is likewise responsible for a large proportion of the employment in other industries, using 15 percent of all steel, 80 percent of all rubber, 69 percent of all plate glass, 65 percent of all upholstery leather, 35 percent of all lead, 10 percent of all cotton, 9 percent of all tin, and a substantial share of nearly every other commodity sold in the United States.

These facts are cited to show the role of our industry in the over-all economy of our country and the role of small business in the automobile business. Any shortages of materials resulting from attempts to allocate them would diminish automobile production and employment, not only in the great industrial cities but in hundreds of smaller cities and towns in nearly every one of our Nation's 48 States. Thus, it would directly and adversely affect a considerable portion of the industry's total production and employment.

WHY MATERIALS CONTROL WON'T WORK

We are disturbed because in all of the official testimony offered to support measures to allocate or ration or control materials there has been no apparent realization of the fact that allocation of materials by Government, either through compulsion or through so-called voluntary agreements, means allocation of end products—the finished goods that customers buy. By allocation the Government tells each company or industry how big or small it can be.

Frankly, our industry does not believe that there exists or could be created in Washington in peacetime any group of men endowed with sufficient wisdom, judgment, objectivity, and knowledge of the future needs of the Nation to fairly and honestly allocate steel or other materials between competing products. That is, they'd decide that in 1948 there should be built so many passenger cars, so many trucks, so many airplanes, so many freight cars, so many buildings, so many bobby pins, so many of this, and so few of something else. This is exactly what the allocation of materials means, for you can't

provide more of a scarce material to one segment of the economy without taking it from another segment.

Even if it could be assumed that such a determination could be made with reasonable fairness and foresight, I don't believe that anyone would be able to imagine that the same official body or any other could fairly and efficiently allot materials to individual competing producers within a single industry. What standards would they use? If they used a historical base, taking a given year or period of years as the bench mark, they'd freeze the status quo. The smaller company could not grow, the new company could not even get started.

To circumvent this, any bureau in charge of materials controls would then attempt to use some basis other than historical for allotting materials to competitors. This inescapably would lead to discrimination and the use of personal-advantage considerations rather than broad economic factors as standards.

SCARCITY BREEDS INFLATION

More possessions of more people were destroyed in World War II than ever before. More farm tools, fertile fields, and factories were destroyed—and our own production facilities were worn nearer the end of their useful life than in any previous conflict.

Our first postwar problem was to rebuild worn facilities to produce the tools and basic materials from which we could build the commodities needed to fulfill the war-deferred demand.

This has been done. The pump is primed—the repaired and expanded facilities are producing at a steadily increasing rate and the market for some items is beginning to be satisfied. The job that American industry has done in converting its facilities to war production and reconverting them back to peace production probably will never be either understood or appreciated by people outside industrial areas, but you may take our word for it: In scope and speed it has no counterpart in industrial accomplishment any place in world history.

Unfortunately the acceleration of the production of commodities was seriously slowed down by prolonged strikes which delayed the current high rate of commodity production. One result was the loss of 18,000,000 tons of steel since VJ-day. Because of such production losses, too many commodities have been in short supply too long, inviting inflation and profiteering abuses.

Just as restricted production clearly adds to inflation, so increased production leads to stability. Greater production of scarce items is the only sure cure for inflation.

PARTIAL CONTROL IMPOSSIBLE

During World War II partial materials controls, by means of priority systems, failed despite the wholehearted efforts of Government and industry. These failures occurred under conditions ideally suited to partial control, if such control could ever be made to work, because there was practically only one customer—namely our Government. Also the variety of items bought by the Government during the war was small compared to the tremendous variety currently sold to millions of customers.

Partial control usually implies attempts to ration scarce items through a priority system, allowing the best priority for the commodities considered most essential. Lesser ratings are assigned to commodities considered of lesser importance. Essentially a priority is a license to buy if you can find a supplier with enough of the scarce item to reach down to your particular priority rating.

Partial control by priority failed during the war and certainly would fail in times of peace. Manufacturers with ratings less than the best cannot plan ahead because they can have no assurance that they can obtain all the materials they need to build their product when they have relatively low priorities for part of the materials required. The several partial-control systems attempted during the war seriously curtailed production and would drastically impede output now and thus increase costs and raise prices.

About the middle of 1941 the priority system was in the process of breaking down with the Priorities Division of the Office of Production Management unsuccessfully attempting to handle about 7,000 pieces of mail a day—a modest amount of mail compared with what was to follow. The production requirements plan, the next system of partial control, also failed. Please remember this because it is significant: These two systems covered only a relatively few specialized war commodities. The number of war products amounted to mere thousands of items while American industry now is producing hundreds of thousands of articles.

COMPLETE CONTROL ELIMINATES INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE

Complete controls of materials would be impractical, and ultimately disastrous, even if it is more possible to make them effective temporarily than such partial controls as priorities.

The Government's effort during World War II to completely control material distribution was called the controlled materials plan. CMP applied to all manufacturers but affected, for all practical purposes, only one customer—the Government—and a limited variety of war commodities. CMP was at best only partially successful despite the utmost cooperation between Government and industry to make it work. But it would have failed completely even under those conditions if the variety of products had been as numerous as in peacetime and the demand as variable and unpredictable.

The amount of paper work, as exemplified in one form which I will show you shortly, and the number of people required to make such a plan work in peacetime would by their sheer weight bog down any such plan. WPB required 18,000 people to control the materials for a relative handful of kinds of products, while the armed forces and industry had to take hundreds of thousands of people out of productive work to operate the bare paper work of such controls.

The war proved that a materials allocation plan cannot be even partially successful if the end products receiving allocations are not first broken down into components and the results compiled on the basis of the quantity of material required to produce each of the components of the finished product.

The allocation of the scarce material in the bill of material of the end-product establishes the number of end products which can be built. This is the result of any complete allocation of any scarce material.

Our industrial production is highly intricate, and the result of many years of intensive training of great numbers of men, each constantly making immediate important decisions in his own field and on his own initiative. Literally millions of conversations, letters, and telegrams between these production men in industry accurately time material deliveries throughout vast industrial organizations. Slight disturbances in any one plant can cause production losses in many distant plants.

The production and materials procurement relationship in our tremendous and intricate American industrial machine has been amazingly, efficiently, delicately balanced to maintain steady production with minimum inventories, despite the natural mechanical difficulties and other handicaps of converting from war to peace. Disturb it through central material control and you seriously slow it down, by reducing or eliminating the opportunity for individual initiative to find the answers to the countless production problems which the experience and imagination of the men of industry have qualified them to solve.

At this point we would like to offer for the record a brief summary of the continuous failure and confusion which accompanied progressively intensified attempts to control materials during the war. This summary is taken from the official history of the WPB and its predecessors and it is keyed to the page numbers of that publication.

MATERIALS CONTROL DANGER ILLUSTRATED

Here is a picture of a truck and the bill of material of the 14,426 parts of which the truck is made. Also, here is the wartime CMP form converting this truck to quantities of the basic materials required to produce the parts from which it is made. This is one of three basic trucks my own company made during the war—now we have 42 different models of trucks and busses.

This paper work which we had to do for each of the three trucks we built during the war had to be done, in relatively about the same volume and with the same loss of productive effort, by each of the nearly 300 vendors who made materials or parts for us. Now, in peacetime, because of the greater variety of models, my company buys from 4,200 vendors, which is fairly typical of the industry.

If any one part of this truck were not available in our factory on schedule, due to the failure of the Government to issue on time the proper priority for it after poring over the paper work required of us and all other producers of items using controlled materials, all the other material on hand and the man-hours ready to assemble the vehicle would be immobilized. Production would slow down or stop and costs would rise. This part I show you, a rocker arm, is typical. It demonstrates perfectly the logic of that old truism about the battle being lost for the want of a horseshoe nail. For the want of this setscrew the rocker arm assembly could not be built. For the want of the rocker arm, the engine could not be completed. For the want of an engine, the truck could not be built—all for the lack of this little piece, which maybe costs us 25 cents.

Yet, this is just one of the parts needed for just 1 of the 42 models of one manufacturer. In our own industry there are more than 50 producers of various types of motor vehicles. There are 94 other American industries which like the automobile industry produce various products in volume more or less by assembly-line methods. In these other industries and our own industry, there are 11,000 plants. The number of separate products, taking model differences into consideration, runs into the hundreds of thousands and the number of different kinds of parts required for their production runs into many millions.

The point is that the whole productive process in any of these plants can be halted by the lack of a single part, even such a simple part as the rocker-arm setscrew.

Yet, complete allocation would require definite action somewhere concerning each of these separate numberless bits and pieces. This would require a bureaucracy many times larger than the WPB. It would raise industry's production costs astronomically because of the magnitude of the number of men who would have to be taken from productive labor to handle the paper work. All this, mind you, is not intended to increase production—which is not the purpose or result of allocations—but is merely to distribute a shortage.

Any such attempt at material control, as our wartime experience proved, does require the detailed analysis and expensive paper work typified by the CMP form to be applied to each different product using a temporarily scarce material. And, usually, before there is time to develop a production program for each commodity, the supply of the scarce item has been sufficiently increased or industry has used its ingenuity to develop a substitute material which nullifies the original need for control.

WHY NOT POSITIVE INSTEAD OF NEGATIVE APPROACH?

Materials controls and their consequent expensive burden of paper work—and frustration—do not produce more. On the contrary, they do produce less and they do increase costs.

Developing incentive for our citizens to build and grow more of everything needed is the positive American way of beating shortages and consequent high costs and high prices. We are acutely and constantly aware of the perils of pricing people out of the market.

But wasting the time and energy of our citizens in an attempt to paper control a distribution of scarce items is certainly a negative and therefore un-American approach to the problem, which instead of curing the shortage only prolongs it and twists the inflation spiral a turn of two higher.

Our proposal is this: Given our free, competitive economy a fair chance to complete the already well-advanced job of bringing supply and demand into balance, by the fundamental processes of the market place. There is every evidence that we now are nearer to bringing scarce materials into supply-demand balance than at any time since before Pearl Harbor. Certainly, the production record of American industry in 1947, including that of our own industry, effectively challenges the factually unsupported claim that control is necessary in order to get higher production so as to stabilize our own economy and help the rest of the world.

Of all the myriad consumer goods made from steel, for instance, there are few which are still hard to get except automobiles. Immediate or near future delivery is available for some models of radios, electric stoves, refrigerators, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, and many other products. Even in the automotive industry, busses and heavy-duty trucks are becoming increasingly available. As the demand for more and more products levels off, more steel is becoming available for products in short supply. Sooner or later, and probably rather sooner than later, steel shipments to all industries will be on a normal delivery basis. That is, if we don't interfere with the function of the free market.

After all, it was not a regimented, or controlled, or Government spoon-fed economy that has permitted the people of the United States, with less than 6 percent of the world's land surface and 7 percent of the world's population to have and enjoy 80 percent of the world's automobiles, 60 percent of the life-insurance policies, 54 percent of the telephones, 48 percent of the radio sets, 46 percent of the electric-power capacity, 35 percent of the railway mileage, 30 percent of the improved highways, and 92 percent of the modern bathtubs.

These material signs of well-being, together with the social and economic blessings they have brought us, are all the fruits of our particularly individualistic competitive economy, possible only under our form of government. Thus it just doesn't make sense to us to regiment our free economy in order to free the economy of the rest of the world.

Let us permit our citizens to freely muster all their ingenuity to overcome the production bottlenecks rather than curtail overall production down to the level of a scarce item.

On March 4, 1944, in the annual report of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, then known as the Truman committee, the following statement was made on page 18:

"Any attempt to create for peacetime production a regimentation more complicated and more difficult than that which we have had during the war would be most unfortunate and contrary to the principles of democracy."

As an industry, we concur.

And as an industry, we ask you to consider carefully, as we know you will, the implications of fastening the burden of materials controls upon our peacetime production, which with its multiplicity of manufactured products, and customers, would require a system of industrial regimentation infinitely more complicated, more burdensome and more costly than anything we had during the war.

Lincoln Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Lincoln Day address delivered by me at Bangor, Maine, Friday, February 13, 1948:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Republicans, the warmth of your welcome belies the chilly reputation of Maine winter weather. The kind words of the gentleman who introduced me give rise to a feeling similar to that of the man who was given a flowery introduction and upon arising to address his audience said, "After that fine introduction I can hardly wait to hear what I have to say." In speaking of the warmth of your welcome, I cannot but recall the chill reception I received one Memorial Day in my own congressional district when called upon to address a crowd at a national cemetery. Soldiers were there with a firing squad to salute the colors. The chairman who introduced me said, "We will now have an address by Congressman MARION T. BENNETT. At the conclusion of his remarks the firing squad will shoot a volley over the dead."

I spoke last night at Portland, Maine, and am greatly enjoying my first visit to your State. I know pretty well what a fine place it was before I got here because for 6 years I have had to listen to FRANK FELLOWS and the other Members of your congressional delegation sing its praises. I must admit they had aroused my curiosity. Many people of America have been curious about both Maine and Vermont since that historic day you demonstrated that when it comes to voting you have better discrimination than all of the rest of the country put together. That judgment is also evident in the character of your representation in the National Legislature in Washington, in both House and Senate. Without meaning to discriminate among your Members, I must confess that FRANK FELLOWS is a particular buddy of mine and that it is pleasing to me that I have this opportunity, in his district, to assure you that all of his colleagues in Congress share my high estimate of his character and ability.

On these occasions, at this time of year, we pay homage to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, first President our party furnished to the Nation. I would assume that Maine, and especially Bangor, would have considerable personal interest in this custom because Bangor was the home of Hannibal Hamlin, father of the Republican Party in Maine and Vice President in the first administration of Abraham Lincoln.

History records the incident when once Bangor staged a giant parade in Hamlin's honor and offered him a carriage. He turned it down, saying: "I'll walk with the boys." As a member of the Maine Legislature, later a Congressman, Senator, Governor, Vice President, and Ambassador, this humility characterized him as it did Lincoln himself. It is a quality which must have appealed to Lincoln as it did to the voters of Maine. America was fortunate in Lincoln and Hamlin. It would be nice to have a Lincoln and Hamlin in Washington today, one at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and the other presiding over the Senate. But, Missouri reserves the distinction of furnishing the present tenant of the White House, whose lease expires in 1949.

It may interest you to know that my own congressional district is the one where High Tax Harry Truman was born, at Lamar, Mo. There he spent his youth and made his later acceptance address as nominee of the New Deal party for Vice President. Of course, he has never been able to carry the county or the district where he was born, for any office. We know Harry too well. In Missouri we know that he was never elected to any office by an honest vote, that he is a dues-paying member of the corrupt Pendergast machine, its defender on the Senate floor and in the White House, and he will not carry Missouri in November 1948. Republicans are on the march in Missouri. They have 9 of the 13 seats in the United States House of Representatives and both Senators today, for the first time since the Civil War.

It is just a little difficult to tell what the Democratic Party stands for today. If you vote for its candidates you can't be sure whether they represent the ultra-conservatism of the deep South or radicalism of the far left wing.

You can't know whether you are voting for the attitude toward labor that vetoes the Taft-Hartley bill or that which threatened to draft railroad workers into the Army at bayonet point.

In foreign affairs would it be expressing sympathy for Communist Russia or for a reactionary monarchy somewhere?

Would it be in support of controls and rationing or for a party which refers to such as the methods of a police state?

Would you be voting for anti-poll-tax and lynching laws or for a party that calls such practices viciously un-American and threatens to secede again from the party if not from the Union?

A party that looks for Communists under every bed or hides them under every bed?

A party which calls speculators in the grain market gamblers in human misery or one whose officials busy themselves in such activities?

A party that advocates "four freedoms" for all the world or participates in secret conferences where they are sold down the river?

A party which is for more production or which favors plowing it under and killing little pigs and throwing them in the river?

These are but a few of the puzzling questions which indicate the only sane and sensible answer for Americans in 1948, is to support the Republican Party which has a program and knows where it is headed. I gain, as a Republican, much satisfaction from the fact that when Tom Clark, the Attorney General, recently came forth with a list of Communist-front subversive organizations, and 23 names of Members of Congress appeared on their membership lists, no Republicans could be found among them.

In fact, it was not until a Republican Congress took office one short year ago last month, that any genuine effort was made to find this vermin which for 14 years had been permitted to worm its slimy way into the foundations of this Republic. We are trying to get the Reds out of the Government and the Government out of the red. That is the most important job facing America today. It is the key to our future prosperity and security. It will open the door to peace,

defeat of high prices, preservation of industrial peace, the building of homes, improving the Nation's health and education, broadening the protection of social security, protecting civil rights, reclaiming land for farming, increasing industrial production, lowering taxes and the high price of government, and protecting ourselves against infiltration of dangerous ideologies.

I cannot emphasize too strongly, in this connection, the need for us to become the party of youth. We need to do more than ask youth to join our columns. We need to demonstrate that we not only understand the problems of our youth but are anxious and willing that energetic youth help lead the direction of our party.

The youth of America is disillusioned by the moral and political corruption in high places in Washington under the present administration. It is easy to understand why this is so.

For years Kansas City, Mo., has been a cesspool of political corruption where public officials worked hand in glove with the rackets of vice, gambling, vote theft, and murder. Books have been written about it. Have you read Tom's Town? or Tom's Boy Harry? You would find it hard to believe that these books are not fiction except that they are documented. It was hard for Americans to believe that when Boss Tom Pendergast was on his way to prison, his errand boy in the United States Senate said, "I will not desert a sinking ship." It was unbelievable when, as Vice President, he took an Army airplane and flew to Kansas City to attend this man's funeral. It was shocking when last year he sent his check for dues to Jimmy Pendergast, the new boss, and Uncle Tom's nephew and political heir, in order that he might remain in good standing in the notorious Pendergast Jackson County Democratic Club.

When an honest district attorney at Kansas City prosecuted and won penitentiary sentences for 259 members of the machine, Harry Truman pardoned many of them when he became President. He fired the district attorney, Maurice Milligan, and appointed a man named Sam Wear, a gentleman I defeated for Congress the first term I was elected 6 years ago. Wear could find nobody to prosecute following the theft of a congressional election from Roger Slaughter but the Kansas City Star uncovered thousands of ghost votes. He is still in office but a special prosecutor has been assigned to do the job. He isn't getting anywhere because the courthouse vault holding the evidence, the fraudulent ballots, was blasted open one night and the evidence was stolen. Truman flew from Kansas City to Washington the next day. Eighty-one indictments against 71 individuals are thus left hanging in the air. When Congress demanded an investigation of the affair the Democrats filibustered for days, the clock around, to prevent it from coming to a vote—a confession of guilt.

Yet, there are some who say that Harry Truman never did profit from the crookedness of the Pendergast machine. But, consider how he was elected presiding judge of the county court which built a new courthouse in Kansas City with Pendergast ready-mix cement and paved every road and highway in Jackson County, Mo., and eventually those highways with the same materials. Consider how he got elected to the United States Senate twice by fewer votes than were later marked off registration lists as ghosts. Somehow he has made good. Harry himself, says, and I quote, "I have got ahead because I am a regular Democrat. That is how I became judge, Senator, and Vice President." His present position he owes both to this formula and intervention of divine providence which must have been hard pressed to choose between Truman and Henry Wallace. This is the same man who today rattles the saber at Russia but who vetoes a labor bill which requires labor unions to certify that no Communist is a union official, with power over the life stream of American commerce. It is under this administration, my friends, that we have reached the sad state where it is unfashionable and vetoable if one is called upon to raise his hand to his heart and say, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States and to the Republic for which it stands • • •."

I emphatically reject any belief that the present administration is either willing or competent to save this country from the dangers of inflation, bankruptcy, and totalitarianism. I charge it with aiding and abetting these forces through ignorance, cowardice, crookedness, and lust for political office. I contend that it is necessary to elect a Republican President who will cooperate with the Republican Congress which has tried but has been considerably thwarted in its efforts to save America.

Let me say, that as one who is not an isolationist, one who has voted for foreign aid, I am alarmed at the incompetent manner in which it has been administered by the executive department of our Federal Government. When I was in Athens last summer I saw it on the black market. I saw it on the black market in Italy, France, and 16 other countries. I thought of the evils which had arisen under the same men in Missouri affairs. I wondered whether they could ever be corrected now that their jurisdiction has been extended to the national and international field? I am convinced that they cannot be so corrected. I am further convinced that, as Republicans, we must insist that first things be put first.

We must first purge our Government of all Communists, New Dealers, Pendergast politicians and fellow travelers.

We must stop the nonsense which granted aid to Greece and Turkey to fight communism and within a week of extending aid to Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, and other Soviet satellites. We cannot and should not waste our strength helping both sides when it is our own security which is at stake.

We must repudiate the President who promulgates the Truman doctrine to fight communism by aiding free peoples to resist it, and at the same time says he sees no reason to stop exports of war materials to the Soviet Union, as he has the power to do.

President Harry Truman granted export licenses to Russia for $113,700,000 worth of automobiles, farm machinery, machine tools, freight cars, locomotives, and steel in 1947, along with over 8,000,000 barrels of oil and aviation gasoline since the war. Apparently, the administration has learned nothing from New Deal appeasement of Japanese totalitarianism with scrap iron and oil prior to World War II. Apparently, it is not concerned with this inconsistency with the Truman doctrine. Apparently, its muddled thinking and confusion of purpose thinks it is all right for the taxpayers of this country to shell out in straight Government gifts from this country to Russia since V-day, $177,847,782.04, with $16,000,000 of it handed out last year to add to $11,259,888,000 we gave Russia outright to help her win the war. All of this aid direct to Russia does not take into account the hundreds of millions of dollars we have given both during and since the war, especially since, to her 11 satellite countries.

We must stop subsidizing socialistic and communistic experiments and governments abroad. We must stop subsidizing foreign politicians and black markets. We must stop paying blackmail to those who threaten to turn Red if we don't feed them greenbacks. While we are for relief for starving and freezing people abroad we must get an administration which will be for some relief for the American taxpayer, for the old-age pensioners in the United States of America, for our own needy school teachers and other citizens who are being forced to the wall by inflation. Foreign aid distributed in an inefficient manner so that it helps neither recipient nor giver, hits you twice—in high prices and high taxes.

It is intensely interesting that the President and his paid propagandists advance the theory that Republicans are responsible for high prices because they do not restore rationing and price controls when we have given him the other powers to fight inflation that he asked for. Our experience conclusively demonstrated in 1945 and 1946 that such controls retard rather than promote production, which is the cure for inflation. Price controls and rationing deal with the effects and not the causes of inflation.

A simple rule of either medicine or economics is that in order to prevent a thing you must control its cause. In medicine you cannot prevent an illness by misreading the thermometer that is recording the patient's temperature, nor by fixing it so that it cannot rise, nor by throwing it in the river.

Likewise, in economics, you cannot prevent inflation that has already taken place by falsifying the evidence recorded in the market places where people do business, nor by attempting to fix prices, nor by closing markets and tampering with the free exchange of goods and services. Prices are the thermometer of the inflation patient, not the cause of the disease. To fool with the thermometer, and acclaim that it protects the health of the patient, is the lowest form of economic quackery and the foulest brand of political snake oil. Even if the quack loudly proclaims his love of the patient and concern about his welfare, it does not make his shenanigans any less futile. Curbing inflation requires the treatment of causes, not condemnation of effects. High prices are not the criminal. They are only his tracks and inflation is his name.

The New Deal wrecking crew in Washington has done all it can do to hamstring private enterprise in such a way as to build up a clamor for wartime controls in peacetime and to stimulate a boom-and-bust economy. It has thwarted Congress in its effort to cure the causes of inflation, which are many. About some of these causes, such as the drought and increased consumption, due to a larger population and national income, Government can do little, if anything. But it is pertinent at this point to remember that it was Harry Truman who vetoed in 1946 the OPA extension bill which called for an orderly end to wartime controls. He, and not Congress, abruptly decontrolled commodities following public repudiation of price control and rationing, with its shortages and black markets, in November 1946. It was Harry Truman who, on October 16, 1947, denounced rationing and price controls in a White House press conference as "methods of a police state." But this is an election year, and he is looking for an issue. He thinks your memories are short. He hopes you have forgotten that in June 1946, 79 percent of the communities in America were short of bread. In the same month 59,000 butcher shops closed because they had no meat to sell. In September a majority of city people ate fish and poultry because there was no other meat, and horse meat was replacing beef, even in hospitals. He has reversed himself again. He is back in bed with the CIO-PAC and those other left-wing forces which demand economic controls over the businesses, the farms, the housewives of America, as the price of election support. He cannot escape the responsibility for 16 years of power for his party by passing the buck to Republicans, who have had control only of the national legislature for a year's time. We did not get in this fix overnight.

Prices are breaking and within a month, at most, we should know if this is the "leveling off" or "recession" economists have been predicting as a result of consumer resistance to the high cost of living. When prices started to fall, the Secretary of Agriculture indicated it was time for Government to start buying heavier to keep them up. Which causes us to ask, "Is the administration trying to combat inflation and high prices or not?"

On the whole, I would say that the Administration favors high prices, on its record. From the beginning of the New Deal we recall the program of destroying crops and killing stock to promote scarcities and high prices. Truman has out-Wallaced Wallace on this score. The pig-killing program of Henry Wallace was interesting but here is Truman's record to the high cost of living.

1. He has permitted his appointees to speculate on the commodity market and enrich themselves while running up the price of commodities.

2. He has sent the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation into the market, as he did January 20, 1947, at Kansas City, when it bought $40,000,000 worth of wheat in 1 day. That was 19,000,000 bushels and it drove wheat up over a dollar a bushel. The Government has been buying over one-third of the wheat crop to give away to foreigners. That program is reflected in the price of groceries. For a long time, it has been the chief cause of food scarcities and high prices. The administration bought 1,600,000,000 pounds of sugar at $1 per hundred pounds above the market price, the same day controls were taken off, just to make sure prices would rise when controls went off.

3. The President has not used the powers he always has had to stop deficit spending and creation of printing press money printed to meet the costs of unproductive Government spending. The administration opposes any reduction in the high price of government. Its philosophy is: "You make it, we take it. You lend it, we spend it."

4. The President refused to permit income-tax reduction in 1947. Wartime taxes in peacetime have added to the cost of living, cut take-home pay, discouraged production and business expansion. Since 1948 is an election year, he has come out, as was forecast when he vetoed tax-reduction bills in 1947, with a plan of his own, seeking to increase taxes on business and distribute the loot among the people at $40 per head. Increased taxes on business mean higher prices.

5. The President has encouraged low productivity by labor with his administration of the wages and hours law, insistence that wage increases can be granted without increasing production costs and retail prices, keeping hundreds of thousands of people on the dole who should be made to get a job, and by condoning feather-bedding union practices, business, and labor monopolies.

6. The President has refused to restrict exports to friend or foe.

7. The President has drawn people from farm and factory to work in the political machine in Washington and branch offices throughout the Nation, when they ought to be in jobs producing goods and wealth. The cost of government has become so high that we pay more for it than we pay for food. Food costs have gone up 102 percent since 1939, which is bad, but cost of government has gone up 480 percent in the same time. The food bill was $300 per person in 1947. The bill for government, on a per capita basis, was $671, or $41 more per individual than the food bill. The New Deal has increased the national debt $268,000,000,000 in 15 years. The Republican Congress in 1947 was able to reduce that debt, balance the budget, and cut expenses $5,000,000,000, but could have done better with cooperation from the White House. At least, it reversed the trend.

8. The President has fostered and supported the OPA which reduced production, hamstrung business and agriculture, created scarcities, black markets, and stimulated inflation.

9. The President has encouraged labor policies which result in strikes and crippling of production and has opposed all legislation to cure the causes of industrial unrest.

10. The President has, from the beginning of his public service, adhered to the Henry Wallace, New Deal theory, that our Nation has reached the limit of industrial and economic development and nothing remains to be done except to divide the national wealth under an economy of scarcity. In this he has outdone Mr. Wallace by such programs as that initiated by "soft soap" Charlie Luckman, of soap-opera fame. This gentleman who struggles along on an annual salary of $500,000 was brought down to Washington to persuade Americans voluntarily to do without meat and eggs, which OPA had previously forced them to do without. He was financed by half a million dollars misappropriated from funds set aside by Congress for aid to Greece and Turkey. His zany program failed in its announced objectives but did help promote high prices and restricted production.

11. The Soviet system cured inflation by abolishing their currency and issuing new, worth 10 cents on their old dollar, which they call the ruble. Here it is being done by easy stages, cutting the value of the dollar, every savings account and insurance policy. Here it is called managed currency. It is printing-press money. The gold we are still buying at $35 per ounce from Russia is buried in the ground at Fort Knox, for what purpose no one has ever been able to figure out.

The New Deal has vetoed, blocked, and hamstrung with poor administration every congressional effort to bring order out of chaos. It has spent its time pardoning Kansas City election thieves and letting Mayor Curley, of Boston, out of the Federal pen in time to line up his mob for the next election. Truman's administration has witnessed unprecedented scandals in the Army of which he is Commander in Chief.

Undermining confidence in the dollar, in the Constitution, in the laws of the land, in the armed services, every attempt is being made to have us in the middle of the stream again on the eve of the next election. We had better get wise to this crisis or emergency technique which has been used so often to win elections since 1933. The road now marked the "Truman Trail" is actually the same old road we have followed into two world wars and depressions. Its toll is high in dollars as well as in what Churchill called "Blood, sweat, and tears." Are you ready to pay the price in dollars, goods, controls, restrictions and freedom, scarcities, high prices, eventually in lives? That question is one you must answer. There is another road. That road is to vote Republican and save what's left.

I find I have come to the end of my address and have hardly mentioned the name of Abraham Lincoln. Since I was a very small boy he has always been my hero. Next to the Galilean Carpenter I feel that he more perfectly reveals the attributes of providence than any other person told about in the annals of history. A strange light shone from his sad gray eyes. All the people of morning, noon, and night, all the mystery of dark forests and starry skies were in them. A strange dignity shone from his face, carved with lines of worry and suffering, cut deep with care and love for mankind. A boundless love, fathomless as the sea, illimitable as space. No monarch ever had greater power than he. None ever employed it so tenderly, so benevolently, so graciously. No power of pardon, except that of providence, ever was exercised so mercifully. No other human being ever dried so many tears, stopped so many heartaches, revived so many hopes. Do not think me sacrilegious when I say he was a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief. He was bruised for our iniquities, wounded for our transgressions, and the weight of the world was upon his shoulders. He saved others, himself he could not save. And, in the words of the poet:

"And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

But, I must confess, that there is no really new thing I can say about Abraham Lincoln, nor is there a new thing to be said of the mountains, of the stars, nor of the sea. The mountains ever tower in majesty above the shifting clouds, the quiet stars ever keep holy vigil above a tired world, the mysterious sea ever sobs on the shore. But to mountain, to star, and to sea man ever turns in reverent homage, and thus it was with Lincoln. He was mountain in the majesty of his thought, star in the steadfast purity of his purpose, sea in the deep undervoice of mystery and of sadness, so he abides.

My friends, I am an Abraham Lincoln Republican, and proud of it. Long live the Republican Party and may God bless America.

Regular Veterans Association Recommends a Practical Plan for Recruiting and Maintaining the Full Strength and Efficiency of Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, for sometime past, Mr. William M. Floyd, national commander and legislative representative of the Regular Veterans Association, has been in close touch with me in connection with the legislative program of his organization affecting the welfare of our country, its service men and women, and its armed forces. I have been glad to cooperate with him because of his clear thinking on these subjects.

Under the leadership of Commander Floyd and his national officers and committees, the Regular Veterans Association has succeeded in establishing an enviable record for promoting logical and reasonable legislation for the welfare of veterans and their dependents and for the security of the nation. Today it is one of the principal veterans' organizations and certainly one of the most active in carrying out its national program. Its aim is to serve all veterans who have honorable service whether it be in time of war or in time of peace.

It is my privilege to be well acquainted with Commander Floyd personally. I had the pleasure of meeting most of the national officers of the organization, as well as many of the State and post officers when I attended the national convention held at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in August of last year, and spoke before the assembled delegates and visitors. Sometime later, on a tour of investigation in the western part of the country, I became acquainted with a number of other national and State officers. I was glad to talk to these men about veterans' problems and about the effective work being

carried on by the Regular Veterans Association throughout the country.

In my own great State of Ohio, and in my district, the Regular Veterans Association is well represented. I am very proud of the high caliber of the men and women representing this organization in Ohio. Among the outstanding men who are carrying on a great work for the Regular Veterans Association in my State, are Mr. Neal C. Perkins, the department commander for Ohio, and a leader in rehabilitation work for disabled veterans. Closely associated with Commander Perkins are Edgar Norton, Springfield; James Gallagher, of Burton; Commander Ralph H. Grieves, of Springfield; Commander Joseph Pinter, of Burton; and Commander D. A. Pabon, Bethel, Ohio.

While at the national convention in Wilkes-Barre, I was privileged to visit and observe a number of the business sessions as well as the work of the national committees. I was much impressed with the businesslike conduct of the convention, with the strong and constructive program mandated by it. I was greatly impressed with the sincerity and the capability of the leadership of the Regular Veterans Association as demonstrated at that convention. I was so much impressed, as a matter of fact, that I then and there became a life member of the association and paid my dues in full.

I am proud of my membership in such a fine association of men and women, every one of whom has served his or her country in its armed forces and in almost every part of the world. The Regular Veterans Association itself is proud of the fact that it has such a national leader as Commander William M. Floyd. His value as a leader was fully recognized when the national convention unanimously drafted him for his fifth consecutive term as national commander of the organization.

Commander Floyd has the confidence of the membership of the Hill, for we have learned by our experience with him that he does not misrepresent any issue, he stands on his own two feet, and he is a man whose word is as good as his bond. I am pleased that we will continue to have his wise counsel at all hearings on veterans' legislation, and I shall welcome his recommendations and suggestions at all times, for Commander Floyd has the welfare of all veterans uppermost in his mind.

I wish to point out here the alertness of the Regular Veterans Association to the needs of national defense when problems present themselves.

More than a year ago, after demobilization of our wartime forces had been completed, the then authorized Regular forces dwindled seriously because of the lack of voluntary enlistments. Men were not interested in entering the Regular services. At the time, the Regular Veterans Association was the first of any organization to take a practical view of our armed forces and to recommend to the President, to the Congress, and to the War and Navy Departments, a 10-point program suggesting important measures that would make the armed services more attractive for enlisted men and thus induce reenlistments. Most of these recommendations were adopted by legislation where necessary and by War and Navy Department policy where legislation was not required. The services soon were recruited to full authorized strength.

Among the 10 points were recommendations for substantial increases in pay for enlisted men; increase in allowances for quarters and rations; 20-year retirement for disability; greater opportunities for enlisted men to secure commissions; and several other recommendations that helped make the service more attractive.

At the present time, the regular forces are nearly 150,000 short of their authorized enlisted strength. Some Federal officials are now advocating that a peacetime selective service system may become necessary. Commander Floyd and his organization do not agree with that thought. This organization believes that ample voluntary service can be secured if the services are made attractive to a degree comparable with civil life, and if a decent security can be assured enlisted men who decide to make a career in the armed forces.

Recently, astute National Commander Floyd conceived a plan he felt would stimulate voluntary enlistments without having to resort to peacetime selective service. He immediately called a joint meeting of his national committees on universal military training and national defense. The plan was discussed. The result of the conference produced a program which places the Regular Veterans Association in the envied position of again being first to recommend a practical plan for recruiting and maintaining the full strength and efficiency of our national defense forces.

The suggested program which has already been presented to President Truman and the Department of National Defense, proposes:

First. To authorize double time credits for retirement purposes to enlisted personnel who served in the armed forces between December 7, 1941, and March 1, 1946.

Second. To offer the same inducements to enlisted personnel of the women's services.

Third. To apply the authorized double time to longevity pay entitlement of enlisted personnel.

The committees, in their conference, made further recommendations for members who have served honorably in the peacetime establishment, to provide parity in disability compensation for all persons who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States at any time.

Distinguished members of the Regular Veterans Association who took part in the conference conducted by National Commander Floyd were Commander Patrick J. Foley, chairman of the national defense committee; Commander Claude E. Allen; Commander Leonard Hoffman; Senator John Sparkman, Alabama; Representative J. Harry McGregor, Member of Congress, Ohio; Representative John Phillips, Member of Congress, California; Commander William J. Chisholm; Victor E. Devereaux, national service officer; Past National Judge Advocate Pompei J. Orlando; Frank B. Gigliotti, chairman of the Americanism committee and past national senior vice commander; Harold S. Wanner, national quartermaster; and Master Sgt. Junior J. Spurrier, a member of the armed forces and holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

I was very happy to serve on the committee conference, for the members comprising them were all active life members of the Regular Veterans Association.

Included in the many constructive resolutions mandated by the Regular Veterans Association, are a number that I especially approve, and I feel that some of them should be set forth here as far as space permits. They form only a small part of the extensive and logical program of the association.

I believe, for instance, that disability compensation for peacetime veterans should be on a par with those of disability compensation for wartime veterans; that a World War I pension of $50 per month for all who served 90 days or more, should be paid to those veterans upon reaching the age of 55, with a $2 increase each year thereafter; adjusted pay for World War II veterans having 90 days of service on the basis of $4 per day for service rendered outside the continental limits of the United States, and $3 per day for service within the continental limits of the United States; that Congress should expedite reasonable legislation for the housing of veterans and their families; that the pay of the enlisted personnel of the armed forces should be increased; that the retired pay of all retired enlisted men should be exempt from taxes. I also agree with the Regular Veterans Association that the Department of Justice should take immediate steps to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States.

Of course, the national legislative program of the association embraces many other constructive resolutions. A considerable number of the bills so strongly advocated by the organization, were enacted during the last session of Congress, and Commander Floyd is exerting every effort to secure enactment of the bills which are now before the present session for consideration.

Trojan work has been performed by the association and thousands of deserving veterans are now receiving pensions or compensation because of its efforts. The work is being carried on intensively, and the achievements of this veterans' group are remarkable mainly because it is sincere in trying to secure reasonable legislation rather than place itself in the position of being an association of so-called Treasury raiders.

It is a pleasure for me to acquaint you with the splendid work and accomplishments of the Regular Veterans Association, especially under the able administration of National Commander William M. Floyd. I believe it to be a public duty and service to bring to the attention of my colleagues, and to the public, some of the outstanding achievements of such an organization of wartime and peacetime veterans as the Regular Veterans Association.

Britain's Economic Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of February 16, 1948:

BANKRUPTCY NEAR, SAYS LONDON PAPER—HARD WORK AND HARD LIVING SEEN ONLY SALVATION

Britain faces bankruptcy.

So says the London publication, the Economist, in the leading article of its February 14 issue. The article is entitled "On the Rocks."

By midsummer at present rate of expenditure, Britain will have exhausted its remaining reserves of about 600,000,000 pounds, the Economist says.

"After that, it will just be impossible to buy either the food or the raw materials which are necessary for Britain to eat and work," declares the Economist. "The aspect of starvation and mass unemployment is now alarmingly close."

BASED ON WHITE PAPER

The Economist bases its prediction on figures in the latest British white paper.

The publication declares the outlook is not encouraging even with Marshall plan aid.

Britain, it said, used previous loans to live and to spend on a scale which was quite out of accord with Britain's real economic position.

"And what guaranty is there that the Marshall plan may not be used in the same way?" it asks.

The Economist declares American and other loans have served to mask from the government and the people alike the country's true economic straits.

HARD WORK URGED

It advocates that Britain begin now to pursue the policy it would pursue if the Marshall plan were reduced to a half or a third and to use the surplus thus created to build up reserves, modernize industry, develop economic integration in western Europe and undertake now the program of hard living and hard working "in which in the long run salvation alone will lie."

Britain, the paper declares, has been cradled in illusions since 1945. If it had realized the situation then, as had Poland, it might have set to work as the Poles have done.

The reality is of a nation in its worst economic straits since the Napoleonic wars, the Economist declares.

Yet unions press for more wages for fewer hours while the well-to-do fight the controls and restrictions, it says.

WORLD WAS BLAMED

"Britain has been living like an improvident family which, failing to make both ends meet, first spends the accumulated capital of the past, then borrows from friends—and when their loans are exhausted, begins to pawn the furniture," the publication says.

The publication blames Britain's plight mostly on the fact it was the only Allied Power to fight both World Wars from first day to the last.

The solution to Britain's problem, the Economist says, is the same as that faced by any family facing bankruptcy—either it goes under to a life of perpetual makeshift and pauperism, or it restores its solvency by vigorous action—by buying less, by cutting down every kind of expense and by straining every nerve to sell more of its goods and services.

ECONOMIES PROPOSED

Bankruptcy is a family responsibility, the Economist declares, and no section of the community can avoid its hardships.

Longer hours and more output at the same wages, heavier taxes or limitation of profits, sterner rationing of coal, cuts in overseas spending, slashes in the armed forces, cutting down of Government employees by one-fourth, and cut-backs in capital spending for schools, hospitals, and housing are among the economies advocated by the Economist.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial by Mr. Allen Griffin, owner and publisher of the Monterey Peninsula Herald, Monterey, Calif., Thursday, February 5, 1948, on Universal Military Training. The article follows:

DO WE FOOL OURSELVES?—ONE OF THOSE THINGS—WHAT IT PROPOSES AND WHY WE STAND

If universal military training is a lost cause in this political year, it isn't the first lost cause advocated by this column. And we dare say there will be more.

One reason why the public generally may favor a measure such as this and yet permit its defeat is because of the overweening egotism of the American people and their sense of superiority over the foreigner.

There is the assumption, particularly by those who have had little or no combat experience, that the average American, once put into a uniform, is the best, gosh-durned soldier in the world.

Well, maybe he isn't. Some of us have had quite a lot of that kind of egotism knocked out of us, even with most of the artillery and air power on our side.

There is also the old hang-over from the optimism of that vastly ignorant but colorful patriot William Jennings Bryan, who swore that "a million Americans would jump to arms overnight" (more successfully, we suspect, to the arms of Venus).

There is the pert assininity that points to the last 2 wars and asserts that the record proves that the drafted armies always lost. There's an approach to a coincidence there, but not an argument. However, there is no use arguing this one except in the presence of a proponent; and in that case it is best first to wipe such a person behind the ears. But there are lots of them and some wear high stiff collars, too.

There is always the good democratic faith espoused by Micawber, that in an emergency "something will turn up." Something always has, particularly time, thanks to those that have given us time.

Yes, we're mighty egotistic—back home among the ice cream counters.

On the other hand, there is no reason for anyone to be enthusiastic over the thought of UMT or any other expensive and wasteful military preparation, all of them being expensive and wasteful because that's the very nature of this obsolete fetish that perpetuates itself to this day because international sanity is still a goal rather than a fact.

We see no sense in a military establishment for its own sake, because on such grounds it doesn't make sense. We find justification in it only because of necessity, and we hope as much as anyone that the necessity is temporary. It is a hideous thought to contemplate, that well over half of the Federal revenue must be devoted to the costs of past wars and preparation for the one that may not happen.

Nevertheless, supporting a military establishment on the surface of land and sea and in the air, sufficient to sustain this Nation's present and growing world responsibilities—obviously built on power—is still one of those things as necessary as going to work to support a family—and many of us don't like to work, either.

There is a job to do or to mess up or possibly to fail in the doing; and there is a definite adversary that doesn't shudder and retire at someone else's weakness.

What does universal military training mean?

It does not mean what universal military service means. The latter means that the inducted person belongs to the service and may be employed here or abroad at the will of the high command, under the law.

Under UMT the inducted youth is a student being trained in the business of soldiering, in order that a reserve of trained or partially trained men may be established, to be called into service only at the will of the Congress of the United States.

In general terms this period of training is divided into two phases.

The first phase is 6 months of basic training of the individual and of small units. It is to instruct young men how to live together, to obey commands, to learn the fundamentals of weapons, to harden their physiques, to act together in group teamwork, to respond to leadership, and to develop the capacity for leadership. It is also to permit an examination into their various capacities, so that their future training may be directed according to their abilities, intelligence, and education.

The second phase, largely based upon the knowledge derived by the soldier-student and about the soldier-student, leads to selection of his reserve capacity for which he has been oriented in an entirely democratic way.

In this phase the young man by his own volition, may elect to become a member of the National Guard, for instance. If he has discovered that he likes the service very well, he may join the Regular service for which he believes he is fitted. If he has the capacities for a technician and chooses to prepare to be a technician, he will simply carry on with his school work, taking on radar, electronics, motors, chemistry, radio, or whatever phase of specialized training prepares him to be a specialist or technician in the Organized Reserves.

In short, in the event of an emergency, instead of being called unprepared to the colors, he will respond in the branch of the service or the specialty for which he has had

some preparation. He will already know what the life of a soldier is like; he will already have been oriented to discipline in barracks and in the field; he will already have had preliminary training in his specialty.

The matter is particularly important. No matter how rapidly science advances and its gadgets change and improve, the hand and mind already accustomed to the proper approach and understanding of instruments of science have gained a great advantage in time and speed in further acquisition of skills. Time is of the essence. Time has caught up with America.

The program is first of all to create a reserve, secondly to interest young men in the professional service. But let us make it clear that under UMT the trainees would not belong to the Army, they could not be employed for anything but training; they could not be sent overseas. This is not conscription in any form that this or any other country has had.

We have favored UMT as probably the best compromise that could be worked out in a democratic way. It is a compromise because universal military service would be militarily more practical.

It is not a substitute for other military programs, such as the need for maintaining a constantly superior Air Force, a Navy capable of prompt action in any sea, and a Regular Army at the strength needed for any outpost duty required of it (Trieste today, Palestine tomorrow), for occupationary duties, for training obligations, and with efficient mobile forces each unit of which is at full authorized strength.

What is the good of it all at this terrific cost to the victor of the most recent war.

The good of it lies exclusively in national security, which itself gives the other democratic nations of the world a feeling of confidence in us and in their future, until such a time that a responsible and stable peace may be organized and this maddening waste sharply curtailed.

We have never yet presented a front that a competent adversary would consider it suicide to attack. We believe that such a front is our best bid for peace, together with our willingness to dismantle it in cooperation with other governments prepared to exercise good will and make of United Nations an effective organization.

We therefore line up with the scientists and educators that have recommended such an integrated program, of which UMT is an essential part.—A. G.

Columbia Ups Tuition, Rent of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I felt sure that the increase in the subsistence to GI's attending school, under the bill recently passed, would be nullified by the educational institutions now attended by the GI's. All that the bill has apparently accomplished is to furnish a subsidy to the educational institutions with no benefit whatever to the GI students.

Under leave to extend I am inserting an article which appeared in the veterans' edition of the Army Times of February 14, 1948:

COLUMBIA UPS TUITION, RENT OF VETERANS

NEW YORK.—Columbia University this week just about wiped out the small subsistence increase granted by Congress to GI bill students.

The university announced a 33 percent hike in tuition fees and a 17 percent boost in men's dormitory rents. Women's room rents were increased 7 percent. The new fees take effect next fall.

Columbia's 15,000 veteran students will be forced to pay the increased dormitory fees directly out of their own pockets.

The one-third increase in tuition will automatically shorten the period of each students' eligibility for GI bill study by faster consumption of the $500 yearly maximum tuition contribution of the Government.

A recent New York Times survey showed Columbia's present tuition rate of $450, which the increase would raise to $600. Men's dorm rent at present is $221; this would be hiked $37.57. The Congress-approved subsistence increase is $10 a month for students without dependents.

The Partition of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me to the National Conference of American Zionist Emergency Council, Washington, D. C., February 15, 1948:

Mr. Chairman (Dr. Neumann), Dr. Silver, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, my fellow Americans, I am one of the hundreds of Members of Congress, one of the many millions of Americans, who felt profound relief and gratification on November 29 of last year. I thought—as you all did—that the decision on Palestine taken by the United Nations on that day marked the end of one of the greatest tragedies in human history and the beginning of new life and new glory for Israel and the Land of Israel.

Henceforth, we said to ourselves with hope and pride, the Jews will not have to protest any longer; they will be busy building their new state, absorbing all the displaced and homeless Jews of Europe. The Jewish people will be a full-fledged member of the international family of nations, an equal among equals. And the friends of the Jews—all those Christians, among whom I am proud to count myself, whose minds and souls smarted at the shame of Jewish suffering—they, too, would have a respite from unending protests and indignation on behalf of the Jewish cause.

I thought so and you thought so, and God knows that it was not mere wishful thinking on our part. After the United Nations decision on Palestine, coming as it did as a result of a protracted and fierce debate between the advocates and the opponents of Palestine partition; after our great country agreed to support partition; we all had the right to feel optimistic. We knew how difficult it had been to bring about the international decision on Palestine, but after the decision was adopted, we had no doubts as to the future course of events.

Why then am I standing once more before this gathering which has assembled not to celebrate the new Jewish state, but—I am sorry to say—once again to voice indignation and bewilderment?

Only 2 months have passed since November 29, 1947, and great anxiety is once again upon us. There are strong indications, and even more than indications, to the effect that powerful opposing forces are actively at work to scuttle the United Nations decision on Palestine and to kill the Jewish state even before it is born.

A powerful antipartition alliance (most of which is anti-Jewish) is now engaged in a war, in part a declared war and in part an undeclared war, on the United Nations decision. It is a strange and unnatural alliance which is ready and willing to employ every means to block the United Nations decision.

Every partner in this alliance has a job of his own. The Arab potentates in the Middle East do their share by encouraging anti-Jewish riots and massacres in their lands, by supplying money, arms, and manpower for attacks on Jewish Palestine, and by threatening the United States with oil and other sanctions if the partition decision is implemented.

The British partner does his full share. In Lake Success, Great Britain temporizes and slows down the workings of the United Nations with regard to the implementation of the General Assembly's decision. In Jerusalem, the British Administration and armed forces prevent the effective functioning of the Jewish defense forces while apparently condoning Arab riots and attacks. In London, Mr. Bevin's government continues to supply arms and ammunition to the Arab states in the Middle East. In general, Britain continues to act as if no United Nations decision on Palestine had ever been adopted. Not one of the many positive recommendations of the General Assembly has been carried out by the British Government. A port has not been placed at the disposal of the Jews of Palestine; nor has the ban on immigration into Palestine been eased; nor has the British Government ever offered honest cooperation to the United Nations Commission of Implementation.

And here I come to that part of the alliance about which I cannot speak without a sense of deep shame and humiliation. I refer, of course, to the American members of this strange and unnatural alliance. Some of these Americans, it has been stated, fight for their vested interests, very tangible interests, translatable into the language of dollars and cents, or rather of millions of dollars, where cents hardly count, certain big oil interests in America. They are neither the first nor the last men in this world prepared to sacrifice peace and progress in order to make their profits secure, or to make more profits. They should realize what they are doing before it is too late, and withdraw from this strange and unnatural alliance.

There have been rumors in the press, and elsewhere, that the position of our Government has changed since the vote in the United Nations which provided for the partition of Palestine. Secretary Marshall and Secretary Forrestal have denied these rumors insofar as they apply to themselves or to their departments. Secretary Marshall's denial also applies to our governmental policy, as the State Department is the Department mainly responsible for our policy on foreign affairs. We are thankful to Secretary Marshall and to Secretary Forrestal for their recent statements which were most timely. We hope they will be made effective. Insofar as both Secretaries and their departments are concerned, if it has not already been done, they should see that any lesser officials in their departments act affirmatively in accordance with their recent statements and avowed policy of our Government in relation to Palestine.

When our representatives in the General Assembly voted for partition and our Government did everything it could to get the necessary two-thirds vote for its adoption, that action definitely committed our country to a policy of seeing that partition in Palestine became successful. For partition to be voted, as it has been, and then for partition to fail would result in a catastrophe that would stun the world, and would destroy the United Nations organization as an effective instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security in terms of the UN Charter. I have no knowledge of any, but if there are any of our officials, directly or indirectly linked with this strange and unnatural alliance, they should withdraw from it at once. It is their duty to do so. Their position is inconsistent with the definite and avowed policy of our country in relation to Palestine.

If the Arab nations, the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine, and the Arab League, or any group or groups of people can successfully defy the mandate of the United Nations, then all governments and all groups would be encouraged to do so. As I see it, unless proper action is taken to carry out the decision of the United Nations Assembly; unless partition is effected successfully, and it must be done at once, the United Nations organization will be destroyed. Like the League of Nations after World War I, when events transpired that were in violation of the League and its covenants, the League died. So will the failure to carry out the partition of Palestine result in the death of the United Nations.

President Truman and Secretary Marshall kept faith with the vital interests of our country when they provided American backing for the report of the United Nations committee and for the decision of the United Nations Assembly to partition Palestine into Jewish and Arab independent states. It was not mere sentiment that dictated this American policy on Palestine, but the realization that freedom and democracy in the world, justice in international relations, world peace, and the legitimate interests of America would best be served by the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine and by a solution of the problem of Jewish homelessness, which has been a festering sore in international relations for such a long time.

Nothing has happened since November 29, 1947, to warrant a revision of this American policy on Palestine, which has been endorsed time and again not only by our Chief Executive but also by the two Houses of Congress, by the two political parties, by the governors and legislatures of most of the States of the Union, and by American public opinion. Nothing has happened in these 2 months which could not have been foreseen with absolute certainty. Has any new element, any unforeseen element, appeared in the picture—any element of such significance as to change our entire attitude, shaped over a period of many years?

The only true answer to all these questions is an emphatic "No." On November 29, any man, even moderately acquainted with the Palestine situation, could have given us a blueprint of future events which would have corresponded with great precision to what has since actually happened. We all knew that the Jews would abide by the United Nations decision and do their utmost to bring about its speedy and orderly implementation. We all knew that the Arabs, especially the ruling cliques of Arabia, would do their utmost to oppose and sabotage the United Nations decision. The Jews and the Arabs have behaved in complete accordance with these expectations. During the General Assembly's deliberations on Palestine, the Arabs issued one threat after another, announcing that a United Nations decision on partition would be followed by armed Arab rebellion in Palestine; that Jews in Arab countries would be massacred; that the Arab states in the Middle East would place their forces at the disposal of the fight against the United Nations decision.

The United Nations and the United States Government heard these oft-repeated threats, and proceeded to adopt the decision to partition Palestine. The Arabs, on the other hand, proceeded to carry out their threats.

There is no justification for any revision by the United Nations or by our Government.

If any efforts are made to bring about a revision of our pledges and commitments on partition, we will make vigorous protest. For even a child can understand that the issue before us now is much deeper and wider than Palestine and the Jewish people. It is the existence of the United Nations that is at stake. If we let down the United Nations on the question of Palestine, it will never recover. The United Nations is our hope for world peace.

We are now faced by a most serious situation in Palestine in which those who are fighting for freedom and democracy are seriously handicapped by this strange and unnatural alliance.

Men and women are fighting for their lives in Palestine. Boys and girls are forced to bare their chests to Arab bullets because they do not have the armor to protect busses on the street; houses are raided, looted and burned to the ground because householders do not have the rifles they need to defend themselves against Arab gangsters.

The United Nations and our country have a great task before them. Our country has imposed an arms embargo on the Middle East. Under this embargo as it now stands we cannot send arms and ammunition to the States of the Middle East. But Great Britain is still disposing of excess war material in the Middle East—and a swift transmission belt makes certain that a dozen submachine guns, unloaded today in Alexandria or Port Said, tomorrow will be in Arab hands spitting their loads of death into Jewish buses and Jewish homes—murdering a little people whose only fault is that they do not wish to be exterminated, and who have signified their willingness to accept the decision of the United Nations.

The result of this embargo is decidedly unjust. It is tantamount to arming Arabs to attack Jews and the authority of the United Nations, while preventing the Jews from receiving arms to defend themselves and thus defend the United Nations.

The embargo in this form must go.

Those whom the United Nations Palestine Commission certifies as abiding by its verdict and needing arms for defense, should not be denied through the action of our country the power and right to arm and defend themselves.

This is the first step to be taken. In addition, our delegates in Lake Success should support, and if necessary, lead a demand that no member state be allowed to sabotage the international verdict. We should give our support to the speedy establishment of a militia for the Jewish state, and of an international police force for Jerusalem and the rest of Palestine.

Such an attitude on our part would immediately tend to quiet down the forces of disorder, just as vacillation on our part would serve to encourage those forces.

This change is necessary in the interest of Palestine. It is necessary in the interest of the United Nations. But—above all—it is necessary in order to vindicate the integrity and the good name of America. Any talk of compromise is out of the question.

In the first place, the partition of Palestine voted upon by the General Assembly and agreed to by the Jewish agency constitutes a compromise, and one on the part of the Jews. It must be remembered that western Galilee, and a substantial part of Negeb and Jerusalem, were large Jewish concessions made to the Assembly.

Furthermore, a compromise would only be made where both sides to a question claim more than they expect, or where both sides were aggressors. This is not so in this case.

In Palestine, the responsibility for bloodshed is not divided. It rests squarely on the shoulders of the Arab leaders and the Arabs. They are the aggressors.

The Arabs have rejected categorically the decision voted by more than a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the vote taking place on November 29, 1947.

The Jews have accepted the decision of the Assembly. The Arabs have not. The Arabs challenge this decision and have arrogantly stated they will resort to force and military power, if necessary, to prevent the partition agreed upon. To permit the Arabs to get away with that will result in the destruction of the United Nations, and it will constitute international anarchy.

The Arabs have used force and are threatening the use of military action to prevent the United Nations from carrying out the decision of the General Assembly.

So there is nothing to compromise.

As a matter of fact, the Arabs would not be satisfied with a complete reversal of the action of the General Assembly. They have demanded, in addition, that the international bases of the Jewish homeland in Palestine established by the Balfour declaration and the League of Nations mandate, be wiped out, leaving the Jews in Palestine a defenseless minority.

The Arabs should be informed in no unmistakable terms that by the United Nations organization and the powerful countries who are members of the United Nations the decision voted by the Assembly will be carried out.

Firmness means strength and success: Appeasement means trouble and defeat.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include therein copy of a resolution adopted by the fifth district of the American Legion in Iowa urging the immediate adoption of universal military training:

Be it resolved by the members of the American Legion in the old Fighting Fifth District of Iowa, That we unanimously favor the immediate adoption of universal military training, H. R. 4278, and request our United States Senators and Congressmen to vote for and aggressively support the passage of H. R. 4278 in the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

Unanimously passed by fifth district of American Legion, in convention assembled at Creston, Iowa, October 13, 1947.

L. J. RITCHELL,
Acting Adjutant.
ED POWERS,
Commander.

The Late Mohandas K. Gandhi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a recent tribute to the late Mohandas K. Gandhi by the noted columnist, Hon. Sam P. Pettengill, which I think is most excellent.

The article follows:

GANDHI

When a million people come to a man's funeral—more, perhaps, than ever before in history—you ask yourself, what was the secret of his power? Did he hold high political office? Was he a military hero? Had he purchased a cheap popularity by scattering billions to his retainers? Had he left a pyramid of skulls as proof of his might?

The man who died in India was none of these. He had "neither purse nor sword." He had only a breechcloth and a faith. Yet some think he was the greatest man of our times.

The fact that a million people gathered at his funeral pyre seems to prove that mankind is weary of bloodshed, the brutality of power politics, and the appeal to force.

Force! It is everywhere today. Goon squads at home, and armies abroad. Navies, air squadrons, the atom bomb, lethal dust rained from the sky, strategic bases, military conscription of the world's youth, bankrupt treasuries, hundreds of thousands of veterans in psychoneurotic hospitals, and after "winning" a war, more being spent in preparation for the next Armageddon than ever before.

Where are the Gandhis of the western world—the "Christian" part of the globe? Name me, if you can, someone in Washington, London, Paris, Berlin, Moscow, who even thinks as Gandhi did—or that other great man, also assassinated, Abraham Lincoln, who just before he died appealed for "malice toward none, charity for all."

In what dark stinking pit will the appeal to force exhaust itself?

A Catholic poet wrote in 1918:

"After 2,000 years of holy Mass
We've got as far as poison gas."

Having deserted God, has God deserted us? No, not so long as there are left even a few with the spirit of Gandhi. And there are those few. I refer to the Quakers who, year after year, against all odds, hold that killing is wrong. And here and there others are scattered. But why so few? One reason, I think, is that we have lost faith in the power of the individual. We say, "What can I do?" We say "We must organize—we must join some pressure group to get things done." Pressure. That fatal word.

Gandhi proved that one ugly little man, weighing 90 or 90 pounds, one among hundreds of millions, could light a fire upon the mountain where it could be seen from afar. Gandhi did not say, "Don't stick your neck out." He stuck his out. He spent a dozen years in jail. He stuck it out until he was killed.

He had faith "as a grain of mustard seed." Like Stephen, he was a "man full of faith." He "continued in the faith." He had the "mystery of faith." Strange mystery of faith. Strange in its strength. Strange to men.

It was said, "of old time" that one with faith and charity "could remove mountains." Gandhi, with faith and charity, moved men.

The men with purses and swords have died, and none visit their graves. Nations with purses and swords have been corrupted by their wealth and have perished by the sword. But the men of faith, the Christs, the Lincolns, and the Gandhis, live on. They are the only ones who do not die.

"King and queens are facile accidents of time and chance;
Chance set them on the heights, they climbed not there.
But he who from the darkling mass of men
Is on the wings of heavenly thought upborne
To higher ether, and becomes a voice for all the voiceless,
God annointed him. His grave shall be a shrine; his name a star."

Address by Hon. Katharine St. George, of New York, at St. Louis, Mo., February 7, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, on February 7, 1948, our distinguished, attractive, and very able colleague, the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York, delivered a most instructive and inspiring address before the Federation of Republican Women's Clubs of Missouri at the Jefferson Hotel in St. Louis.

For many years I have attended these annual gatherings, but this was perhaps the largest crowd, assembled from all over our great State, and no speaker was ever more cordially or enthusiastically received than was Mrs. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE. Her address was so timely, so sincere and logical, so full of hard, common sense that it literally lifted the vast audience of admiring and appreciative Missourians out of their seats. Not only Republicans, but many Democrats from all over the State were so impressed by her thrilling message that they requested a copy of her outstanding address.

Under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include her address which I hope to have reprinted, in order that I might send a copy of it to many of the thoughtful, patriotic citizens of our great State. My personal wish is that every voter in America might read it before he casts his ballot this coming November:

We are met again to celebrate the birthday of the first Republican President and one of the greatest Americans.

This is primarily a Republican celebration, and in this year of 1948, when we are preparing for a Republican victory, it is perhaps well to take stock once again of those things for which we stand and wherein we differ from other political parties.

It is the fashion among many so-called independent voters to say that there is really no difference between the two major parties in the United States and that they therefore vote for the best man, as they see him, and let it go at that.

Nothing could be more completely un-American than this reasoning. Our Government is a government of law and not of men, of principles and not personalities. It is unique in this and the more we depart from these two fundamentals the more likely are we to see our republican form of government collapse.

There is a fundamental difference between the two major parties today. We stand clearly as our name implies, for the Republic as opposed to a democracy. We stand for majority rule, with curbs furnished by the checks and balances as set up by the Constitution so that although the majority rules (as is its right), still the minorities' rights are protected and Government is for all the people.

Lincoln, in his great Gettysburg Address, asked a question that still remains unanswered: Whether a nation conceived in liberty can long endure. Today again that question must be answered in the affirmative, tomorrow may be too late.

We have seen during the past 16 years what happens under the democratic system of our opponents. First, the party was taken over by the radical wing known as the New Deal; they did not represent the majority of the party, but they did represent the well-oiled political organizations of the eight key cities of the country. The leader of the party once boasted: "Give me the eight key cities of the United States and you can do what you want with the rest of the country."

Another contrast is the tremendous stress laid on personalities. This, of course, was greatly helped by the moving pictures, radio, and television. A speaking voice became of paramount importance.

I have often wondered what Abraham Lincoln's voice was like. Maybe if we had stood on the field at Gettysburg and heard him deliver one of the greatest speeches in the English language, we, too, would not have been impressed just as the men and women on that field were not impressed—so much so that the President was slightly hurt and as he left the platform with the two thin pieces of paper in his hand, he started to tear them. His secretary, John Hay, took them from him saying: "I will keep the papers, Mr. President."

No, there were no mimeographed copies of that speech handed out to every newspaper in the country; there were no file copies, there were just two sheets of paper that didn't match, one having been taken from the White House and the other picked up on the train, and the words written in long-hand by the President. This Address would have perished if John Hay had not suddenly been prompted to take them from his hands.

Yes, that great Address may not have been delivered in a mellifluous voice, with faultless diction, but it will endure long after they are forgotten and it is also possible that many things that are written and said today will endure long after present day headlines makers have been forgotten.

We have seen how a majority was taken over by a militant and aggressive minority. This has been done in the democracies of the whole world sooner or later. Next, we have seen this minority taken over by a few brilliant and ambitious personalities. That has happened sooner or later in every democracy in the world. And now what is the next step? You know what has happened in every democracy in the world: out of these brilliant, ambitious personalities rises one leader, the man on horseback, the dictator. Look at the democracies of the world. It is always the same story and the same thing can and will happen here under democratic rule.

We have already lost many of our rights as individuals during the past 16 years. We have seen our Constitution flouted and set at naught by the party in power. We have seen our Chief Executive advocate the passage of legislation in spite of its being doubtful constitutionally. All these are dangerous signs, all these are black clouds on our country's horizon.

Another thing that has come into our country within the last 16 years, a thing that never belonged in America, is class hatred and the distrust and vilification of anyone who has or has earned property. It was Abraham Lincoln who said: "Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. Let him not who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built." That was and still should be America.

We Republicans are very much to blame for the serious conditions that have developed in the last 16 years, we cannot lay the blame at the door of the Democratic Party. Our trouble is also that we are led astray by the modern mania of attaching ourselves to a political leader because we like him personally and completely forgetting the great fundamentals of the Republican principle of government that is far greater and far more important than any individual that the party may nominate.

I have heard Republicans say: "Oh, if so and so is nominated, I would sooner vote for Truman." This is a shocking point of view, it is the point of view that has kept the Democrats in power for 16 years.

How can we counteract these distressing handicaps? Only in one way: by realizing that the words of Benjamin Franklin are as true today as the day they were uttered—"You will have a Republic if you can keep it."

We have fought two world wars to maintain freedom in the world and yet we must admit that National Socialism has won more ground than before we ever started to fight. So that a young Englishman, who spent 2 years of his life in a German prison camp, after returning home wrote: "For St. George has slain the dragon only to find that it is the dragon's features which confront him when he looks into the glass."

The fateful hour for keeping it is here. In fact, its integrity has already been seriously attacked. It seems that we, who are Republicans, must be the leaders in maintaining the Republican philosophy of government alive and progressive in the modern world.

We have allowed ourselves to be scared by a lot of noisy, incorrect propaganda. I had a young college girl in my office the other day who had been obviously very thoroughly indoctrinated with the New Deal version of the Republican Party. She was, therefore, politely shocked when I spoke of it as the party of progress. So I asked this question: What was the first reason for the founding of the present Republican Party? She told me she did not know. I said: "To eradicate human slavery from our country and the world." Surely that was progress.

Under what party were the laws curbing the excesses of big business passed? Under the Republican Party. When our party is true to its traditions and true to the Republic, it is and must be the party of progress and of reform. We have a great task of progress and reform ahead of us this year. First, we must reestablish the proper balance between the three branches of Government, we must restore government by law.

We hear a great deal these days about the importance of keeping the Democratic Party in power because if the administration changes it will be bad for and may change our foreign policy. I think, quite frankly, that our foreign policy needs a change. I believe our State Department needs a thorough overhauling. It is time our career diplomats were made to understand that their job is to represent the United States and her interests abroad and not represent the policies and interests of foreign nations to us at home.

I had a case brought to my attention recently of an American citizen who was arrested on a false charge in South America. He called his consul but the latter was too busy to do anything for him. He called the Embassy and was told that the Ambassador had only recently arrived and would have to familiarize himself with the work first. This American was kept for 14 days in a primitive jail up in the jungle, most of his clothes were taken from him, including his shoes. Wormy meat was thrown in to him through the bars once a day; he lost 35 pounds in 14 days before he finally was rescued.

This sort of thing is inexcusable. We should learn from the British diplomatic service how they care for their nationals. Even today a British subject is respected all over the world, and the Union Jack is a protection that no one violates save at his peril.

We can also say to these nations abroad: Yes, we know that your democracies have failed, that they have lapsed into weak Socialist governments or into dictatorships, but let us show you a system of free government that can and will succeed, the system that has made our country great, not democracy, but the Republic.

Our party has a great rendezvous with destiny this year because we are the party that is best fitted to strengthen and keep the republican form of Government at home and to teach and promote it abroad. We will have many recruits from the Democratic Party. After all, they know as well as we that Thomas Jefferson called himself a Republican and that he was one of the greatest and clearest exponents of that philosophy of government. It was Jefferson who said that the best government was that government that governs least. It was Jefferson who wrote, "I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude." He would indeed be amazed if he could look down today and see the party that claims him as their founder and patron, who give dinners annually at $100-and-more a plate to fill the political war chests, in his name, and who have now built up the biggest bureaucracy the world has ever known, where the executive branch alone has 2,008,485 employees and the people of this Nation, every one of them, are working one-third of his or her time for the state. No, it is doubtful if that was the ideal of government that Thomas Jefferson looked forward to for his country.

We are here determined to maintain this Republic, being very sure that only so we can weather and triumph over the waves of national socialism that have engulfed most of the world since World War II—knowing that our form of government, though imperfect as all human efforts must be, is the nearest thing to perfect government yet contrived by man.

But, to accomplish this great task and to achieve our country's destiny, we here as individuals must work hard and diligently. We must not rely on Henry Wallace or the ineptitude of our President, who has never been elected to his high office.

No, we must be positive of our facts. We must determine to carry out our great destiny. We must be able to say that we have kept the faith, that we have saved the Republic not only for ourselves but for future generations, not only here but everywhere in the world.

We are the salt of the earth, but if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out and to be trodden under foot of men.

We will be cast out and justly so, if we do not stand fast, inspired by those who labored so well and so faithfully to give us this most perfect instrument of government. And among them none was more true to those ideals, none put his country above individuals more than the man whose birthday we celebrate today. The man to whose shrine we must repair each year in awe and wonder that such simplicity could express so perfectly the aspirations of a people that such modesty was coupled with such courage, such tenderness with such strength.

In his name and in his honor let us resolve not only to keep this Republic but to make her greater and freer along this pattern that has been given to us, so that this great American hero, this martyr to the cause of a united free Republic, shall not have died in vain.

Estate Tax on GI Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communications on levying estate tax on GI insurance:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 10, 1948.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: We are the attorneys for the widow and children of a soldier who died in the war. The Treasury Department is contending that the face value of the GI insurance (national life insurance) payable in installments to the soldier's widow and children, are subject to estate tax because the Internal Revenue Code contains no specific exemption therefor.

We believe it is unconscionable for the Government of the United States to levy a tax upon the proceeds of GI insurance in the case of a soldier who gave his life in the war.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter which we have this day sent to the Honorable Colin F. Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. In this letter we have commended to his attention a recommendation that section 812 of the Code be amended so that this inequity in the law may be cured.

We hope you will agree that remedial legislation is required respecting this matter and that you will lend your support to an amendment which will exempt from estate tax any GI insurance payable in the case of a soldier who died in the war or from injuries incurred therein.

Respectfully,

AARON HOLMAN.

FEBRUARY 10, 1948.

Hon. COLIN F. STAM,
Counsel to Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STAM: We are the attorneys for the executrix of the estate of a soldier who died in the war. A problem has arisen in connection with the determination of the estate tax which, we believe, calls for some action on the part of Congress.

We are informed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue that the proceeds of a national life insurance policy payable to the widow and children of a soldier who died in the war are includible in his estate for tax purposes. Our attention has been directed by the Bureau to the case of *U. S. Trust Co.* v. *Helvering* (307 U. S. 57), which involved the question of the taxability of similar insurance proceeds payable upon the death of a soldier

who died in World War I. It was there held that since the statute did not specifically exempt such insurance from the tax, it was includible in the estate for tax purposes. The Bureau proposes to follow that case in view of the fact that the Internal Revenue Code contains no specific exemption.

Most Members of Congress to whose attention this matter has been brought have expressed great shock upon learning that the proceeds of GI insurance payable to the widow and children of a soldier who died during the past war, are taxable. Most members of the Bureau of Internal Revenue are likewise surprised to learn that there is no specific exemption therefor and that it is the intention of the Bureau to impose an estate tax on such proceeds.

We believe that the very thought of the Government imposing a tax upon the proceeds of GI insurance and depriving the widow and children of soldiers, who gave their lives in the war, of such funds will shock the sensibilities of most people. While some may urge that the $60,000 estate tax exemption is an adequate protection for the families of decedents, the argument loses sight of the fact that most soldiers who died in the war were young and the opportunity has been lost to them to increase the estates which they might otherwise have left to their families; also, that since the widows of deceased soldiers will in most cases lack the ability to manage effectively the estates which are left to them, the assets will usually be invested in securities paying a small fixed return, and the families of the soldiers will have to subsist on fixed incomes whose purchasing power has been materially reduced during this inflationary period.

It may also be urged that there is no need for remedial legislation since relatively few deceased GI's left estates which are subject to an estate tax. We respectfully submit that this also is a poor argument since the inequity of the law should not be permitted to affect the families of any soldiers who died in the war, no matter how few they are.

We respectfully submit that this matter should be brought to the attention of the joint committee and that an amendment should be proposed to section 812 of the Internal Revenue Code which will exempt from the estate tax any proceeds of national life insurance payable on the lives of soldiers who died during the past war or as the result of injuries incurred therein.

Respectfully,

AARON HOLMAN.

Distribution of American Research Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD portions of an article on the subject Distribution of American Research Funds, by Clarence A. Mills, of the University of Cincinnati, which appeared in the magazine Science for February 6, 1948.

Mr. President, this article proves the contention of many appearing as witnesses on subjects related to the science foundation bill, showing that funds given or appropriated are not uniformly or widely distributed. If we are to have a science foundation law, and if the Government is to use its funds for research, it must see to it that the funds are distributed for all of America, and not for a favored few. If scientists know only how to take care of themselves first, I wonder where in America we can get persons who can look after the general welfare first. There is real food for thought in this article.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN RESEARCH FUNDS

(By Clarence A. Mills, laboratory for experimental medicine, University of Cincinnati)

Equity and wisdom in the distribution of Federal research funds seem of paramount importance in the years ahead. * * *

There exists no evidence that native intelligence is better in one part of the United States than in another. * * *

In order that future funds may be distributed to the best advantage of the country as a whole, I have sought information from past distributional techniques in the field of medical research, with which I have been most closely in contact during the past 30 years. My findings bring out very disturbing inequalities in the granting of such funds—inequalities so pernicious in end results as to indicate the need for an entirely new basis of action with the large Federal outlays in future years.

* * * * * *

MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDS STUDIED; METHODS

Because of the long-term dominance exerted over medical research by the older institutions of the eastern seaboard (Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, Columbia, Pennsylvania), the following Northeastern States have been set off in a group by themselves: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia. Although this small corner of the United States contains less than 30 percent of the country's total population, it gets 50 to 80 percent of all research funds.

* * * * *

American Cancer Society

Of the $14,136,897 raised by this society during 1945 and 1946 by public subscription all over the country, only 35.9 percent was contributed by the Northeastern States listed above; but in the distribution of these funds for research purposes up to February of 1947, this same northeastern section received 66.7 percent of the total. The remainder of the country, which contained over 70 percent of the total population and contributed 60.5 percent of the funds, received only 33.3 percent of the research money distributed. Of the research fellowships supported by these funds during this period, 34 were for work at institutions in the northeastern section and only 14 for work in the remainder of the country.

Let us glance now at the membership of the committee on growth of the National Research Council, which handled the allocation of these research grants and fellowships. Before July 1, 1946, 10 of its members held posts in institutions of the northeastern section and only 2 elsewhere; since July 1, 1946, the proportions have been 16 and 3. Similar disproportion exists in its associated research panels set up for channeling requests for funds: 53 from the Northeast against 24 from other parts of the country up to July 1, 1946, and since then, 68 against 36. Four northeastern institutions with representation on the committee (Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Yale, and Columbia) received 29 percent of the total distribution and 21 percent of the research fellows, while the best any top four institution not so represented could do was only 11 percent and 10 percent, respectively. Over half of all research allocations and 63 percent of the research fellows went to institutions represented on the committee on growth (with its present 19 members).

National Research Council (1941–42 annual report)

Membership on the council in 1941–42 included 174 from the northeastern section and only 44 from the remainder of the United States. Its medical fellowship board in 1944 had 11 members from the Northeast and 10 otherwise, while its fellowship board in the biological sciences had 32 and 23, respectively, and the board in physics, chemistry, and mathematics, 28 and 13.

* * * * *

Rockefeller Foundation

In its appropriations of 1944, 1945, and 1946 for the support of medical teaching and research and for research in experimental biology, the foundation awarded 77 percent of the United States total to teaching and research institutions in the northeastern area.

John and Mary R. Markle Foundation

Of the payments made in 1944, 1945, and 1946 for medical-research grants in the United States, 58 percent were to institutions in the northeastern areas, 42 percent elsewhere.

Commonwealth Fund

Over the 5-year period, 1942–46, this fund granted 74 percent of its United States medical-research funds to institutions in the northeastern area and only 26 percent elsewhere.

International Cancer Research Foundation

The report of activities for 1943 indicates that 18 grants (69 percent of United States total) were made to workers in the northeastern area and 8 (31 percent) to workers elsewhere in the country. Of the 24 United States members of the advisory trustees, 22 (92 percent) are located in the northeastern area and 2 (8 percent) elsewhere.

Josiah Macy, Jr., Foundation

Of the grants for medical research in the United States during the 5-year period, 1937–41, 81 percent went to the northeastern area and only 19 percent elsewhere.

Ella Sachs Plotz Foundation

During the 5 years 1941, 1942, 1944, 1945, 1946, 48 grants (54 percent) were made to northeastern institutions or workers and 41 (46 percent) elsewhere in the United States.

Life Insurance Medical Research Fund

This recent addition to the medical research funds has a medical advisory committee of eight members—five located in the northeastern area and three elsewhere. Two committee members are from Harvard, two from Yale, and one each from Columbia, Vanderbilt, Minnesota, and Southern California Universities. Harvard received 16.5 percent of the funds distributed; Yale, 9.4 percent; and Columbia, 7 percent—a total of 33 percent thus going to these three institutions with top rating as recipients. Five institutions in the Northeast received a total of 43 percent of all funds distributed, while only 30 percent went to the luckiest five elsewhere. The Northeast received 51.3 percent of all funds—48.7 percent going to the remainder of the country.

Similar inequity occurred in the distribution of fellowships granted by this fund. Sixteen fellowships were granted to workers in the northeastern area, 22 to men elsewhere, but 22 spent their year working in northeastern institutions and only 16 in institutions elsewhere in the country—a net loss of 6 out of 22 young scientists from the West. Harvard received 16 percent of the fellows for their year's work; Yale, 11 percent; and Columbia, 5 percent—a total of 32 percent of all fellows thus going to work in these three institutions.

National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis

Annual Nation-wide money-raising campaigns provide funds for distribution by this foundation, and, for once, less than half of the funds (48.7 percent) went to the northeastern area with its 29.7 percent of the total United States population. In 1946 its general advisory committee consisted of 6 members from institutions in the northeastern area and 7 from institutions elsewhere in the United States; the committee on virus research, 3 and 5, respectively; and the committee on research for prevention and treatment of after effects, 4 and 13, respectively. Taking all the foundation's advisory committees for the whole 9-year period (1938–47), there were 21 members from the northeastern area and 28 from the remainder of the country. This represents the most equitable geographic distribution of membership thus far encountered in committees dictating the disbursement of research funds.

* * * * *

United States Public Health Service

The Service's report of roughly $2,000,000 in grants approved March 26, 1946, revealed fairly equitable geographical distribution of funds—only 38 percent to the northeastern area with 30 percent of the population. Membership on the National Advisory Health Council, which recommends the distribution of these funds, is composed of 14 members: 4 from the USPHS, 2 each from Harvard, Columbia, and the University of Illinois, and 1 each from the Universities of Wisconsin, Michigan, California, and Tulane University in New Orleans.

Here again, however, the evils of committee representation show up clearly. Seven institutions with committee representation were among the 13 highest on the recipient list, these 13 receiving 47 percent of all research funds distributed. The 6 highest on the list received 31 percent of the total. The 2 northeastern institutions with committee representation received 23 percent of all funds allocated to that section, while 22 percent of funds allocated to the remainder of the country went to the other 5 represented on the committee. Harvard, Columbia, and Johns Hopkins were, as usual, among the country's top 6 recipients.

DISCUSSION

"For unto everyone that hath shall be given and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath."

* * * * *

The author is well aware of the justification usually given for present distributional inequality—the larger research institutions receiving the lion's share of funds are best equipped for the prosecution of research. Such justification was very appropriate with the emergency needs for quick results during the war years. In peacetime, however, the basic need is not for quick results but rather for the broadest possible distribution of research opportunity to the country's whole population, especially where governmental funds or those collected from the whole country by popular subscription are concerned. There can be little real justification, for instance, for the New England and North Atlantic States with 30 percent of the country's population and contributing 39.5 percent of the cancer funds collected, receiving 66.7 percent of the research funds disbursed (by a committee on which they have a disproportionately large representation).

* * * * *

Corrective measures, however, must go beyond restoring a proper balance between East and West. The present tendency to benefit representation on disbursing committees must be broken. Scientists themselves have demonstrated a most unfortunate inability to act without bias in overseeing the distribution of funds in their own fields. No one believes that the politicians would themselves do any better, but theirs is the duty of so legislating that the proper end will be accomplished where public funds are concerned.

In the long run, the greatest good to the greatest number would probably be served by securing the distribution of Federal research funds—or those collected by public subscription—on a State-population basis. Perhaps the less wealthy States should even receive an added bonus to stimulate development, instead of being almost completely cut off as at present. Distribution within the State would present the next problem, for State committeemen would still be inclined to favor the institutions they know best—their own.

Pay and Retirement Benefits for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on Saturday, February 14, 1948, at the annual meeting of Eastern States Postal Employees' Councils, in Harrisburg, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I think I know something about your business. There is hardly a job in or around the post office that I haven't had some personal contact with or with which I was not made thoroughly familiar in the discussions around the dinner table in my father's home.

For, you see, I come from a postal family. My father was a career postal employee. On vacations and after school hours all through my early years I worked in the post office; I carried the mail; I sorted mail; I jumped on and off the package trucks. I have had sore feet and an aching back in my time in the same cause in which you fellows have had the same occupational diseases.

When legislation comes up in the Senate involving postal employees and the postal service I can therefore look at it, I think, in much the same way any of you would look at it. It's real to me. By association, it's mighty personal to me, too.

When your representatives go before the committees of the Congress as they have been doing recently in support of better treatment for the postal employee, better retirement features, or higher pay, I can think back quite easily to a period of inflation right after the First World War, when my family was dependent on my father's post-office salary while the cost of living was shooting out of sight. On this matter of more realistic retirement benefits, I only have to recall how my parents were expected to get along on a retirement benefit of not much more than about $25 per week in the years between the time my father retired and his death. This was his reward, this pension of about $25 per week, for about four decades of service in Uncle Sam's post-office system.

So when the postal employees of Pennsylvania began to bombard my office not so long ago with telegrams and letters urging better retirement benefits and a cost-of-living pay increase enabling them to a certain extent to run after, but never quite catch up to, the soaring cost of existence in this inflation, I did not need much urging in declaring my support.

You have that support and you will always have it. And perhaps what I have just said might explain to you why I have from time to time raised the roof down in Washington with supposedly intelligent persons who sometimes appear before our committees and make bland and casual know-it-all remarks about the lazy Federal pay-rollers, the bureaucrats, the loafers, gobbling the tax dollars out of the trough of Uncle Sam's pay roll and giving nothing for their pay but just sitting around throwing away the taxpayers' dollars and enjoying life at the taxpayers' expense.

Who do they mean? Do they mean the postal employees? Well, no, they don't actually mean the postal workers because they do see the postman out plodding around in the slush and the cold and the snow and in the heat and the hail and the rain; they know that their packages and business letters get through promptly; they concede, grudingly sometimes, that they guess they don't mean the postal employees.

Now I am very proud of the postal service just as you are all, I am sure, mighty proud of it too. But it strikes me that by and large—sure there are some exceptions, but by and large—the devotion to service of the postal worker is matched—mind you, not exceeded, but matched—by career employees in many of our Federal agencies and departments. I just do not like these blanket accusations and condemnations of the Federal employee because they are not justified; they are libelous and slanderous and unfair, dirty misrepresentations.

Does this mean that I think everyone who works for the Federal Government is a shining example of dedication to the public trust? Of course not. There are incompetents on the Federal pay roll too, just as perhaps there might be some in the Congress. I personally have raised all sorts of uproar with some of the bureaucrats myself over inefficiency and lack of imagination which are bound to be found in any organization.

I think the postal employees have succeeded more than any other group of Government employees in refuting these slanders on their efficiency and enterprise and initiative. I can tell you that you have sold yourselves as a group to all the people in the country and even, I might add, to a super-economy-minded Congress. Washington is full of lobbys and lobbyists but very few of them are as effective as the postman who carries the mail so faithfully, the clerks who handle it and the railway mail and motor vehiclemen who transport it all over the country. Your excellency of service and devotion to duty are the most effective lobbying activities in your behalf. When your representatives come before Congress, they find the good will has already been created for them by the rank and file back home in every post office and in the postal service.

That does not mean that you have always gotten from the Congress the things that you want and have a right to expect or gotten them promptly enough when you did get them. The delays in acting upon employee benefits of all government employees including the postal employees and sometimes particularly the postal employees have at times verged on the tragic side.

Right now we have this pay increase legislation under consideration in committee. Most of the bills recognize the horrible injustice to postal employees and to all government employees represented by their fixed preinflation wages and the shooting star level of living costs. Without doubt before the Eightieth Congress completes its work it will have acted on a pay raise bill, perhaps not the thousand dollar raise which I favor but at least some raise. I am hopeful and pretty sure we will also see the final

enactment of improved retirement legislation. These things will help the postal employee.

But every postal employee and every government employee and a lot of us in the Congress certainly recognize that the help that comes now is long overdue. The moment price control went out of the window the government employee and the postal employee along with every other American who lives on a rigidly fixed income started losing ground financially at an alarming rate. There is not yet any clear cut sign of an end to this over-all upward trend in prices although optimists the last few days have been reading all sorts of significance into the dip in the commodity and stock markets. These have been taken as signs that the peak has been reached and the downward turn begun. There are those who counsel us now that all our fears about inflation can be thrown aside because inflation is ended.

I am not an economist. I am not a soothsayer or a prophet or a fortuneteller, but as a member of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee which is supposed to be keeping close scrutiny on all of the economic facts of life as they affect our prosperity, and which has been given the advantage of all sorts of expert testimony from business leaders and labor leaders and economists and Government experts, I have seen nothing in this market dip and in the momentary flurry of price reductions of a few cents here or there in certain commodities to convince me that the upward inflationary trend has in fact come to an end.

There has been a great to do over the sudden drop of a few cents in livestock and meat prices. Meat has become something of a barometer to our over-all well-being. It is true that a tremendous sudden surge of livestock to market a few days ago following the drop in corn and wheat led to some dramatic drops in some cuts of meat. But it is significant that within a few days the volume of livestock marketings suddenly dropped. The meat which came to market at such a flood all of a sudden appears to have been livestock normally due to hit the market in the spring and summer. Much of it, I understand, was underfed livestock.

Now here is the alarming thing about it: We have known for some months that our meat animal population in this country has fallen off substantially as a result primarily of the bad corn crop and the very high corn prices. All of the responsible experts told us several months ago that we faced a severe shortage of meat this coming spring and summer. No one has denied this although some of the industry representatives have attempted to make it appear that the shortage will not be really severe in terms of per capita consumption—that the amount of meat per person will be reduced only a few pounds, say 10 pounds or so. This sounds mild until we remember that we have 140,000,000 people in the United States, most of whom like to eat meat and most of whom now feel that they have not been getting a fair share of meat because their budgets do not allow them to buy as much meat as they feel they need. We have had witnesses come before our committee in Congress and tell us frankly that they can afford meat for their families in some cases only as often as once in 3 weeks. These people are not relief clients, or charity cases. They are working people. In many cases they are making more money than ever. And now as a result of this drop in commodity prices a few days ago we had a sudden delivery to the stockyards of animals which normally would not have been marketed for several months. When the pinch really arrives in the spring and summer on meat supplies those animals prematurely marketed now will mean that many less animals coming to market then, thus aggravating tremendously the shortage that we had previously expected had the normal flow of livestock not been disrupted as it was a few days ago.

I therefore do not see how, in regard to meat anyway, we can expect any continuing decline and stability of prices. I seriously believe that meat prices, in the absence of any Government control, will not only shoot right back up to where they were but will just keep on climbing until one thing happens—the people have no money to buy it. It is one of the last items that our citizens will resist buying.

When prices start coming down only for the reason that people no longer have the money to pay them—I'm not referring now just to buyer resistance based on the belief that prices are too high, but rather on the pure and simple fact that the mass of our people don't have the money any more with which to maintain a decent standard of living—when prices, as I said, start coming down for that reason, then, my friends, we are really in for some tough and frightening experiences.

How close are we to that point no one seems genuinely able to say. The statistics show an alarming shrinkage not only in the purchasing power of our people as reflected by current wages and current prices but also an alarming shrinkage in the savings of our people—the backlogs. War bonds in the last few months have, as I recall, been cashed in at a higher rate than the rate in which they are being purchased. This never happened before except perhaps in the days immediately after the ending of the war, when a lot of people felt that they could not wait another minute to buy some of the things that for patriotic reasons they had put off purchasing during the war. But the lack of availability then of some of the most wanted items led to a reversal of that trend and savings in war bonds consistently increased over redemptions.

Those savings were what we had been counting on to help us to sustain indefinitely the tremendously high level of industrial activity we have been enjoying. As those savings shrink and become intermixed with current income and outgo and made a part of the daily budget and used for current living expenses and not for capital expenditures, the ability of our economy to sustain anything like the current level of production and employment becomes seriously threatened.

Every American has a tremendously vital stake in this issue. Rich or poor, every American will be seriously affected by any substantial drop in our economic level. We have many methods these days that we did not have in 1932 to ameliorate the hardships of unemployment and business stagnation, but, believe me, a depression, or even a recession, is no fun. It's no fun at all. A lot of people get hurt. Some get hurt badly. Our democracy begins to verge on thin ice in times of economic travail. Right now when just about the entire civilized world depends for its eventual recovery on the continuation of a prosperous America and a stable America and a free America, an America which can lend its tremendous weight toward the establishment of a decent world in which freedom can live, this country cannot afford economic upheaval. The world cannot afford to have it in America. Yet this inflation, if it is not halted, invites that upheaval.

The wage increases which you people expect and deserve may to a certain extent be considered inflationary in that it will put some additional purchasing power into your hands. If prices are allowed to continue to rise unchecked, then your increased purchasing power will be temporary and the net effect of your raise inflationary. That must not be allowed to happen. Your wages will be raised because the price rise has already driven many of you against the wall financially. You need the raise. But as much or more than you need this raise in pay, you and all Americans regardless of level in life absolutely must have a sane economy restored to our country. This must never be lost sight of.

I hope that I have not been a messenger of gloom here today. It is always a pleasure to meet with the postal employees because the postal service is so close and personal a thing to me. I just want to say in closing that I thought President Truman had performed one of the finest services possible for the whole postal service and for Government service as a whole in selecting as his Postmaster General a career postal employee. I heartily concur in that appointment.

United States Stand on the Palestine Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Stand on Palestine Viewed as Starting UN on League's Path," written by Sumner Welles and published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 17, together with a memorandum which I have had prepared dealing with the legal problems involved.

There being no objection, the article and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 17, 1948]

UNITED STATES STAND ON PALESTINE VIEWED AS STARTING UN ON LEAGUE'S PATH—SUMNER WELLES ATTACKS COUNSELORS OF CAUTION, SAYS HOLY LAND WAR WOULD REALIZE THEIR FEAR—SOVIET TROOPS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State)

It is hard to arouse a democracy to impending danger when the clouds on the horizon still seem no larger than a man's hand. Even Winston Churchill could not waken the British people to the menace in the rise of nazism. The peril to us in Japan's aggression against China and in Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia went largely unperceived. But even if the tragic lessons of the recent past are to be so easily forgotten, the clouds now looming are no longer on the horizon. They are hanging over us.

This Government has repeatedly announced that the United Nations is the foundation of American foreign policy. Yet because of the failure of the United States to adopt a consistent and courageous policy on Palestine, the United Nations is today faced with the gravest dilemma in its history.

Save for Britain in the days of Baldwin, it would be difficult to find a more sorry instance of a major power refusing to face facts.

The decision to partition Palestine was taken after full investigation and debate. It was in strict accordance with the provisions of the Charter. The United States was in great part responsible. This country played a leading role throughout the events that led up to that decision.

LACK OF ENFORCEMENT

The American Government failed, however, to insist that the United Nations must be enabled to enforce its decision, and to protect life and property in Palestine until

the independence of the two new states had been finally established.

For lack of any United Nations police force, the members of the Palestine Commission have now been told by the British that they will be assassinated if they set foot in Palestine. Major hostilities between Jews and Arabs are imminent. The United Nations cannot carry out its decision. Because the United States has during the last 2 months renounced every semblance of leadership, the smaller countries are increasingly reluctant to assume any responsibility.

The Palestine Commission has at length been compelled to ask the Security Council to determine that there is a threat to the peace and to take action under the Charter. And Washington still remains silent.

It is notorious that there is a sharp cleavage of opinion within the Government. The Army and Navy, supported by some officials of the State Department and of other departments, insist that the United States must take no action to back up its words. They allege that our growing controversy with Russia makes it unwise for us further to antagonize the Arab states or jeopardize this country's access to Middle Eastern oil.

SOVIET TROOPS?

Such arguments are wholly unconvincing. The British Government cannot prolong its mandate in Palestine. Once British forces withdraw, war will result unless the United Nations can send an international constabulary to Palestine. If hostilities break out, the Soviet Union will undoubtedly insist that its vital interests require it to send its own forces to maintain order in its neighborhood.

Should our service departments prevail upon the administration to refuse to exercise any leadership within the United Nations to maintain peace in Palestine, they will pave the way for what they fear most, namely, the extension of Soviet control over the Middle East.

The arguments on oil are just as unrealistic. If a new war breaks out, the middle eastern oil resources would certainly not be available to western Europe nor to the United States. Should peace be preserved, since the Arab governments depend upon the royalties from their oil concessions, they are hardly likely to oppose their exploitation.

But we are face to face with a far more fundamental issue.

Japan defied the League of Nations in 1932 and was permitted by the great powers to do so with impunity. The Italian aggression against Ethiopia, the civil war in Spain, and the rape by Hitler of Austria and of Czechoslovakia were the inevitable result.

The Arab states have now defied the United Nations.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET CONCURRENCE

The partition of Palestine is the one major question upon which the policies of the United States and of the Soviet Union have coincided. Yet this Government has so far failed to initiate any measures within the United Nations to guard against the Arab aggression which is under way, or even to protest the flagrant violation of their Charter commitments by the Arab states.

If the United Nations is, in fact, the foundation of American policy, the United States must support the United Nations, not only when that is convenient and easy, but quite as much so when such support implies effort, sacrifice and risk.

The League of Nations collapsed because the major powers then members of the League supported the League only when it suited their own ends. They failed to support the League when it seemed that their selfish interests might be prejudiced.

We are seeing exactly the same trend. The Palestine question is a test case. Should the United States persist in its present blind inaction it will be preparing the way for the failure of the new international organization. And if the United Nations fails, the one hope humanity today possesses for the rule of law rather than the rule of force, for the freedom and progress of mankind, and for the establishment of a peaceful world order will vanish with it.

FEBRUARY 17, 1948.

Memorandum for Senator BREWSTER.

Subject: Palestine—Embargo and restrictions on arms shipments.

House Joint Resolution 306 (the Neutrality Act) adopted November 4, 1939, establishes a National Munitions Control Board and authorizes the Secretary of State to administer that Board. Section 12 (d) of this statute provides:

"It shall be unlawful for any person to export or attempt to export, from the United States to any other state, any arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of subsection (1) of this section, or to import, or attempt to import, to the United States from any other state, any of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war listed in any such proclamation, without first having submitted to the Secretary of State the name of the purchaser and the terms of sale and having obtained a license therefor."

This statute is administered under regulations published by the State Department, which bear the following preamble:

"Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of State by section 12 of the joint resolution approved November 4, 1939 (54 Stat. 10; 22 U. S. C. 452), sections 1 and 2 of the joint resolution approved January 31, 1922 (42 Stat. 361; 22 U. S. C. 409, 410) and proclamations issued pursuant thereto the regulations governing the international traffic in arms, ammunition, and implements of war, heretofore promulgated by him, are hereby superseded by the following regulations."

Section 201.12 of these regulations provides:

"Export licenses: The Secretary of State will issue export licenses to appropriately registered applicants upon the presentation of applications for license, properly executed, unless the exportation of arms, ammunition, or implements of war for which a license is applied for would be in violation of a law of the United States or a treaty to which the United States is a party (see secs. 201.37–201.40 and pt. 204): *Provided, however*, That export licenses shall not be issued in any case when it shall have been determined under the authority of the President, in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714; 50 U. S. C., app. 701), that the proposed shipment would be contrary to the interest of the national defense."

Published with these regulations are copies of proclamations issued by the President forbidding shipment of arms to China, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Cuba. No such proclamation has been issued by the President precluding the shipment of arms to Palestine.

The State Department has published no order or regulation prohibiting the licensing of arms to Palestine. It published a news release on December 5, 1947, declaring that "in view of the current disorders in the Middle East, the United States is discontinuing for the present licensing of all shipments of arms to the troubled areas. The shipment of arms and ammunition licensed to the countries of the Middle East area affected during 1946 and the first 10 months of 1947 are as follows."

The table which follows in this release indicates that no shipments of arms or ammunition were made to Palestine.

I have quizzed the officials of the Munitions Division of the Department of State specifically and exhaustively on this point and they assure me that their directions to withhold license for shipments of arms to Palestine come to them by interoffice memorandum from the Secretary of State.

It will be noted that the Department's regulation provides that license will issue "unless the exportation of arms, etc., would be in violation of a law of the United States or of a treaty to which the United States is a party."

I have asked the Munitions Division to cite the law or the treaty which would be violated were shipments of arms permitted to Palestine.

Mr. E. T. Cummins, who is Chief of the Munitions Division of the Department of State, and Executive Secretary of the National Munitions Control Board, called my attention to the President's message of April 15, 1947 (H. Doc. 195), pursuant to which the Department of State is asking for a revision of statutes under which it derives its authority for munition controls. I find in this document the following very interesting language:

As long as section 12 of the Neutrality Act is in effect that requirement of impartiality is still the law, and the Secretary of State must treat aggressor and aggrieved, peacemaker and troublemaker equally by granting every application for a license for the exportation of any arms, ammunition, or implements of war unless such action would be in violation of a treaty. Such a provision of law is no longer consistent with this country's commitments and requirements. We have committed ourselves to international cooperation through the United Nations. If this participation is to be fully effective, this Government must have control over traffic in weapons which will permit us to act in accordance with our position in the United Nations and will be adaptable to changes in the international situation. Therefore there must be new legal provisions enabling the exercise of discretion in the granting or rejecting of applications for export or import licenses for arms, ammunition, and implements of war and related items."

You will note that this statement is an admission that the Department does not have the authority it needs to leny export licenses where no treaty would be violated. Mr. Cummins suggested to me that the agreements of the United Nations have the force of treaties.

The United Nations has not, however, by resolution or other action directed or requested its member nations to withhold shipments of arms to Palestine. I have checked this point thoroughly with the local office of the United Nations. Mr. Cummins was unable to cite any specific law or any treaty which would be violated by arms shipments to Palestine. He falls back upon the general authority to control exports contained in the act of July 2, 1940, the pertinent portion of which reads as follows:

"SEC. 6. Whenever the President determines that it is necessary in the interest of national defense to prohibit or curtail the exportation of any military equipment or munitions, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or materials, or supplies necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation thereof, he may by proclamation prohibit or curtail such exportation, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe. Any such proclamation shall describe the articles or materials included in the prohibition or curtailment contained therein. In case of the violation of any provision of any proclamation, or of any rule or regulation, issued hereunder, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment. The authority granted in this section shall terminate June 30, 1942, unless the Congress shall otherwise provide."

The proclamations issued by the President under this section merely describe the items to be treated as arms and ammunition. He has issued no proclamation under this authority to withhold shipments of arms to Palestine. The Department of State's action in denying export licenses for arms shipments to Palestine is therefore a high handed, arbitrary, and wholly unwarranted usurpation of legislative authority. The request made by the President in his message of April 15, 1947, transmitting a proposal for legislation to control the exportation and importation of arms, etc., admits that the Secretary of State must grant every application for a license for the exportation of arms unless such action would be in violation of a treaty. No action has been taken by the Congress to grant the authority asked for. Nonetheless this Department, presuming to know what is good for the world and this Nation far better than the Congress, proceeds to exercise that control without authority.

Recent precedents which may be cited to show that our State Department has not always stood on the side lines as an impartial observer are: (1) The assignment of 50 cruisers to Great Britain before our entry into the war, but after Great Britain had declared war on Germany; (2) the shipment of supplies of arms and ammunition to the Finns during their encounter with the Russians in 1939; and (3) the Flying Tiger episode in connection with which we supplied large number of airplanes equipped with machine guns and bomb racks, set up a factory for the manufacture of military aircraft for Chiang Kai-shek government and continued to supply this factory with the machinery and tools for the construction of military aircraft, all with full knowledge and consent of the Department.

American Principle Applied to a Joint European Recovery Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "American Principle Applied to a Joint European Recovery Program," which I delivered at Peoria, Ill., on Saturday, February 7.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN PRINCIPLE APPLIED TO A JOINT EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

(By HOMER E. CAPEHART, United States Senator from Indiana)

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

For 30 years our international efforts have failed to accomplish the purpose claimed for them.

The Marshall plan, as now proposed, faces the same result unless aid to Europe is divided into three phases:

1. Restoration of European economy on a business principle—private enterprise to private enterprise.

2. Direct relief to the needy peoples of Europe through government-to-government gifts.

3. Stabilization of European currency through the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

This report tends to deal only with phase 1 and the methods by which it should be applied. The success of phase 1, however, will have an indirect effect on the success of phase 2 and phase 3.

HOMER E. CAPEHART.

EXPLANATION OF HOW TO APPLY AMERICAN PRINCIPLES TO EUROPEAN RECOVERY

President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall said to the Congress: "Give all or nothing."

I say: "Do it right or don't do it at all."

Our failures

For 30 years the United States has experienced nothing but failures which have grown out of hasty, ill-advised action based on emergencies which found this Nation lacking in courageous leadership.

We fought World War I to save democracy. Then came the Versailles Treaty and the Disarmament Conference. The Kellogg-Briand Treaty was like the others—it never accomplished what it was designed to accomplish.

Then came the depression and that destructive philosophy of scarcity which is still with us today.

Prewar farces

War again threatened and we had the Neutrality Act, cash and carry, and finally lend-lease; we were only fooling ourselves. Then we gave 50 destroyers to England with the silly belief they would keep us out of the war.

Business as usual was being carried on with Japan while our diplomats were edging closer to war with that nation.

Here we go again

The war clouds engulfed us. American free enterprise went into high gear. American people fought for survival both abroad and at home.

In the meantime we signed the charter of the four freedoms which were to be the terms of an allied victory for the world.

The United Nations was born as the savior of world peace. Bretton Woods and the Export-Import Bank were proclaimed the harbingers of permanent international prosperity.

War's end came with the birth of the atom bomb and a new fear of what the future has in store for the restless world.

Scraps of paper

Four Freedoms, United Nations, Bretton Woods, Export-Import Bank; scraps of paper as we began getting the returns from Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

The Morgenthau plan and the division of Germany boomed into the faces of those hoping for a quick return to the peaceful ways of the world.

Russia began grabbing. We began fearing. Then came the Greek-Turkey loan to stop Russia's march to the Mediterranean oil pool.

Now the Marshall plan.

We face another problem

It is not controversial that Europe is in need of economic recovery.

The 16 nations which have indicated a desire to participate in the Marshall plan could, as healthy, prosperous nations, form a great obstacle to a future war.

But today the threat of international conflict grows from the clashing of two ideologies: government by the people and government by dictators.

The United States has become great on the principle of free government and free enterprise. We believe this system could and should be applied with equal success in the distressed European nations if they are to become prosperous.

It is the principle for which we fought in two great conflicts. It is the principle upon which we base our hope for a lasting peace. It is the principle which should guide us in any efforts to aid Europe.

Without this principle the Marshall plan, or any other plan, will fail and we will have weakened the very structure of our own system.

Are we to be consistent?

Under the Marshall plan it is proposed the things Europe needs to restore production and stability in economy will be procured by a representative agency of our Government.

That agency, directed by an administrator, will distribute the materials—and even money (reference: Senate Foreign Relations Committee report of December 19, 1947) into the hands of the governments of those nations with whom aid treaties are signed.

Those governments then will distribute the materials into the channels of their own choosing, effecting a form of state socialism bordering on that ideology of government with which we are clashing today.

Government to government

Under such a plan of government-to-government operation, we fail to inspire the individual effort which America has found to be the bulwark of prosperity and greatness.

Such a procedure shrinks the will of private capital to invest in the resources of its own country. If a nation is worthy of assistance by the United States it must be worthy of investment by its own nationals.

The very crux of any plan for relief of any European nation should be the worthiness of that nation for assistance. If its own people are wary of its worthiness, should not we be wary of its worthiness?

The dollars are there

We need have no concern over the ability of practically all of the 16 nations to avail themselves of monetary assistance in a recovery program.

In short- and long-term investments and bank balances in the United States alone these 16 nations have $13,000,000,000 in good credit dollars (reference: Senate Foreign Relations Committee report, December 19, 1947, and statement by the committee for the Marshall plan).

Authoritative information has been accepted by those studying the Marshall plan that other vast holdings by the 16 nations and/or nationals of those nations exist in South and Central America and Switzerland.

Then there is Bretton Woods

Each of the 16 nations can turn to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a loan to meet at least a share of the needs. That is what the bank was established for by the 44 participating nations in 1945.

The bank's capital was fixed at $10,000,000,000 of which the United States share was $4,175,000,000. The bank's power, under the treaty approved permits it to make direct loans and to guarantee loans of foreign countries or private foreign corporations sold to private investors.

At the same time, the International Monetary Fund of $8,800,000,000 was established to maintain orderly exchange rates and to eliminate arbitrary exchange restrictions and discriminations. The United States contributed $2,750,000,000 to this fund.

Hailed as the answer

President Roosevelt, in an address to the Seventy-ninth Congress on February 12, 1945, said of our membership in the International Monetary Fund:

"The United States should act promptly upon the plan for the International Bank, which will make or guarantee sound loans for the foreign currency requirements of important reconstruction and development projects in member countries."

He also said:

"This measure, with others I shall later suggest, should go far to take care of our part of the lending requirements of the post-war years. * * * As confidence returns, private investors will participate more and more in foreign lending and investment without any Government assistance."

It is important to note that Russia was not a member of the fund.

Here is business approach

We must, therefore, assume with all the right of one willing to help, that the 16 nations of CEEC can also help themselves to a goodly degree.

It is important to the success of their recovery that those nations and their nationals have a stake in the progress toward recovery. The risk is great. Mr. Marshall said on December 10: "The imponderables are many. The risks are real."

Are the American people to assume those risks alone? Or are the 16 governments and their wealth-holding nationals ($13,000,000,000 in United States) willing to take the risk with the Americans?

Common cause—common effort

If Americans are willing to invest $1 in the future freedom and prosperity of any one of those 16 nations, the peoples of that nation should be willing to invest another $1 toward the same end. This should be particularly true if Americans are willing to make an outright gift of huge proportions of sufficient necessities to relieve the physical hardships of the hungry and cold in those countries.

Americans were willing to take the same risk in their own country in 1932 when a Republican administration said that formation of a Reconstruction Finance Corporation would save American economy and the free-enterprise system.

Americans have that same confidence in the free-enterprise system succeeding in those nations where the people are confident the American way is best.

An international RFC

Let those nations where confidence prevails step forward with funds to help themselves; then Americans will step forward with an equal number of dollars to aid in the industrial recovery of that nation.

With these dollars will be formed a vast pool of dollar credit which can be loaned for the purpose of restoring the production of that country.

Money can be poured into private enterprise in the foreign nation through a credit allowance against the RFC in that nation. This will entitle applicant to an equal credit against the American RFC.

Armed with his purchasing credit, the businessman moves into the world market to procure the materials he needs to restore production so badly needed in his country.

Eliminates government buying

By this method we free the market from the destructive influence of over-all government purchases which tend to drive prices high and which prevents the orderly processes of free enterprise.

Elimination of Government buying also inspires the interest of private investment and restores the faith of people in foreign nations in the processes of a free-enterprise system.

If we are to make industry subservient to the government in each of the foreign nations we defeat the purpose and intent of our willingness to help.

Greater control over risk

With private capital and private gain involved in the movement to restore the economy of those nations we have greater control over the chances of success. This feature is the contended goal of the greatest minds which have been consulted in the matter.

Bernard Baruch told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the 16 nations should form an economic unit. Former President Herbert Hoover told the committee the Government's only concentration for spending at present should be toward direct relief. John Foster Dulles told the committee the United States should stipulate that the amount of aid from the United States should depend upon each nation's cooperation in attaining these goals.

Three top foreign-affairs advisers are interested in how much the foreign nations will help themselves and how we can more competently assure success of the venture.

Experience is best teacher

Since July 1, 1945, the United States has made available to the Marshall plan countries and western Germany (figures to November 1, 1947) a total of $11,014,000,000, of which $9,570,000,000 has been utilized. This is more than half of the total now sought for the Marshall plan in a 4-year period.

All of this aid has been on a government-to-government basis except in the case of UNRRA costs of $1,585,000,000, which was in part by direct distribution to the people by agents of our Government.

This 2-year direct expenditure for foreign recovery by the United States is more than half our total Federal debt in 1930 and is more than the entire cost of the United States Government in 1940. Yet the economy of those nations has gradually dipped to the point where it is now admittedly a great risk to additional investment.

(Sources: Report of Council of Economic Advisers to President, November 1947; Congressional Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures; Report of Committee of European Economic Cooperation, vol. 2; State Department Bulletin, May 18, 1947.)

We used plan during depression

Our experience in restoring our own industry and free-enterprise system at a critical time places us in the position of knowing best how to meet Europe's crisis. We used the Reconstruction Finance Corporation plan during the depression and are still using it.

We used the RFC to finance worth-while capital improvements necessary to a progressive production system at a time when private enterprise was pressed financially. We also used the RFC effectively to meet the great war-time production expansion.

In my judgment, the same system can be utilized to meet Europe's needs in the most businesslike manner to reduce the risk to the Americans who are being asked to invest in Europe's ability to restore its economy.

THIS IS THE AMERICAN WAY

We should create an international division in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Each European nation seeking to participate in the plan would likewise create a reconstruction finance corporation.

The American Congress should authorize the new RFC division to purchase not less than 50 percent of the stock in the RFC of any of the 16 countries which meets the participating requirements. At this point we should definitely include western Germany as a seventeenth nation of the CEEC, since sufficient German credit dollars are available outside Germany to permit compliance.

Each participating country would form a corporation in an amount of capital to be approved by the American RFC.

The stock purchased by the American RFC would consist of preferred stock and would have equal voting rights with the common stock which would be owned by the participating European country.

American RFC would have the right to sell its preferred stock at any time on the open market.

The preferred stock would be retired no later than 40 years from date.

Congress would appropriate $——— to the credit of the American RFC for use in purchasing stock in any participating European RFC.

PATTERN FOR EUROPEAN RFC

The corporate organization of each European RFC could be similar to that of the American RFC with the addition of preferred and common-stock provisions in their charters. The division of stock should be as recommended by the American RFC.

At all times each European RFC should issue common stock equal to the investment of either the participating government or its nationals.

WHAT EUROPEAN RFC WOULD DO

Equipped with the dollar credits of the American RFC and those made available through the collateral of the participating country or its nationals, each European RFC would be prepared to aid in the financing of agriculture, commerce, and industry, including the facilitating of exports of agriculture and other products.

It would be empowered to make loans or furnish credits to: (1) Individuals, firms, or corporations; (2) political subdivisions of the country; (3) banks, mortgage agencies, and insurance companies.

The board of directors of each European RFC would determine the conditions and terms of the loans which could extend from 60 days to 40 years. No loans would be made after 10 years from the time of organization of the RFC unless the preferred stock owned by the American RFC has been retired.

We can do more with less money under this plan because interest and principal payments can be used as a revolving fund to make additional loans.

Any European RFC should be prohibited from making any loans to political subdivisions of government for the purpose of financing the acquisition of any Government-operated industry or utility. This restriction, however, should not prevent the loaning of funds for the purpose of erecting a Government-owned public utility.

It should also be the duty of each European RFC to perform such other functions as will effectually carry out the purpose of promoting industrial and agricultural production in the participating country.

Each European RFC could employ engineers, technicians, secretarial help, advisers and legal counsel. It should establish and staff regional offices in the participating country.

Each European RFC should be governed by a board of directors of seven members, three of whom should be selected by the holders of the preferred stock (American RFC); the other four members by the holders of the common stock (participating country and/or its nationals). Upon retirement of the preferred stock the common stockholders should name the entire board.

Each European RFC should be required to submit a quarterly report to the American RFC.

BENEFITS OF THE AMERICAN WAY

By this plan, Americans call upon the Europeans to share in the risk of saving their country in a cooperative manner. It inspires the confidence needed to successfully preserve freedom and independence.

This plan is the answer of the free enterprise system to the ideology of government by dictators.

It preserves our principle. It preserves our pledge to protect Americans and American resources.

If we are right in our system in America, then our system is the greatest force with which to oppose communism.

CONCLUSION

We have not attempted in this report to deal with the merits or demerits of an outright gift to European nations to meet the needs of the hungry and cold peoples of those nations.

That is a separate phase of European relief and should be dealt with separately even

though the Marshall plan as proposed fails to do this.

We have not attempted to deal with the monetary stabilization phase of the over-all program other than to point specifically to the provisions contained in the Bretton Woods agreement and the International Monetary Fund.

It was felt that each phase of the complete problem should be dealt with separately since the requirements are so vastly different that to join them is only to confuse the issues involved in each.

By this plan to restore the economy of each nation we have not called for a weakening of the present monetary position of any nation, but we have sought to preserve those existing dollar assets for each nation.

The importance of a single feature of this plan to attain recovery through free enterprise rather than through Government dictation is best described in the words of the Committee for the Marshall Plan: "self-respecting peoples, who believe in a free, democratic process, will not accept foreign dictation."

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senator of Indiana.

Civic Problems, Civic Bodies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Jesse C. Suter in the Sunday Star of February 8, 1948, entitled "Civic Problems, Civil Bodies." It is such an able article that I feel it should be brought to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CIVIC PROBLEMS, CIVIC BODIES—KIND OF VOTE OUR PEOPLE NEED MOST; HOME RULE DISTRICT WANTS AND NEEDS

(By Jesse C. Suter)

WHAT KIND OF GOVERNMENT IS NEEDED BY THE DISTRICT?

Lord Bryce, in the American Commonwealth, says: "The people of the United States, owing allegiance to State and Nation, have two patriotisms, two loyalties." To this Theodore W. Noyes added: "We of the District of Columbia, owing allegiance only to the Nation, have only one patriotism, one loyalty. We are Americans and nothing else. Our allegiance is undivided. Our Americanism is the more intense for its concentration."

Continuing, Mr. Noyes said: "Since the Washingtonian is a national American and a national American only—an American in a peculiar and unique sense—he is surely entitled to all the rights and powers which belong to the national American, except those (if today there are any) which he should sacrifice to meet a national necessity or to protect the national safety." These quotations were taken from an address by Theodore W. Noyes at a dinner of the Society of Natives of the District of Columbia, April 17, 1922, held in celebration of the one hundred and thirty-first anniversary of the laying of the first cornerstone of the District of Columbia.

The Auchincloss-Ball bill, now pending before subcommittees of the Senate and House Committees on the District of Columbia, is entitled "A bill for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia." It overlooks completely in its text any recognition of the fundamental truths stated above.

The framers of this bill, H. R. 4902, and its Senate companion, S. 1968, explain that the omission to include any recognition for national representation for the District of Columbia is due to being entirely beyond the designated scope of the committee. However, advocates of representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President are unable to see any impediment to recognition that it would not be home rule without such representation.

Another reason for the omission of reference to such fundamental Americanism was that it would require an amendment to the Constitution which would be considered by an entirely different committee. However, it is still not too late for the committees to recognize that home rule without District voting participation in the controlling Congress would fall far short of anything deserving the name of home rule.

The point of beginning of District home rule

Senate Joint Resolution 6, introduced in the Senate on January 6, 1947, by Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, Republican, of Kansas, is the first cornerstone of genuine District of Columbia home rule. Upon this foundation may be erected a structure of true Americanism which may be extended broadly so far as it does not impair full protection of the interests of the United States. The full text of Senate Joint Resolution 6 follows:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia.

"Whereas in recognition of the fact that the District which is the seat of the Government of the United States is a populous and permanently separate political unit which, in keeping with its special purpose, is not and should not become a State or part of a State; and with intent that the effective rights of citizens resident in that District, including their participation in the Government of the United States, shall be as nearly similar to those of citizens resident in the several States as may be without impairing the supreme authority of the said Government over its Capital: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be proposed for ratification by the legislatures of the several States which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years of the date of its passage, shall be valid as a part of said Constitution, namely:

"'The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal.'"

Congress governs the District

Under the Constitution of the United States the Congress is given the power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the seat of the Government of the United States. No matter what form of local government has existed in the District of Columbia, it has operated under this overriding authority of the Congress.

The existence and exercise of such power would continue under the proposed reorganization plan of the Auchincloss-Ball bill or any other form of local government which the Congress might erect. It is therefore most important that these voteless and unrepresented people of the District of Columbia be given the right and privilege possessed by other Americans in the States of electing Senators and Representatives in the Congress and of participating in the selection of the President and Vice President.

The rule of the District by the Congress is, of course, through legislation, and the President is a most important factor in the legislative procedure. His approval makes legislation by Congress effective. To override the President's veto of legislation requires a two-thirds vote by each House of the Congress. Lacking such two-thirds vote, the veto is sustained. This has the effect of giving the President's veto a weight equivalent to at least one more than a third of the Members present and voting on a veto. If all Members of both Senate and House of Representatives were present and voting on a veto, the President would be wielding a power equivalent to 141 Representatives and 33 Senators.

Participation in ruling body essential

Participation by the Americans of the District, through their duly elected Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, would in no way lessen the control by the Congress over the seat of Government. It would only mean that each isolated American of the National Capital would have the same fractional part in such control by the Congress as is possessed by each American of the sovereign States.

Until these voteless and unrepresented people are accorded these fundamental American rights of voting representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President, they will not possess the influence and respect among their fellow Americans, in or out of Congress, which they justly deserve and require. They have the same vital interest in all legislation as well as in all policies of their Nation. They are Americans with no divided allegiance and entitled to all of the rights and powers possessed by other Americans.

Reorganization is due

The consensus appears to be that some type of a reorganization of the District of Columbia government is due. But such reorganization plan should be formulated by the people of the District and confirmed by a Congress in which the people of the District of Columbia are represented on an equal footing with other American citizens. Such procedure would parallel that which operates in the sovereign States, where charters become law through the action of the State legislature, in which the people of the affected community are fully represented.

In the consideration of this entire question there crops out frequently an expression of fear that under changes which have been suggested from time to time the interests of the United States may be endangered. Having in mind the history of the seat of Government and its relation to the Nation, it seems impossible to envision any manner in which the Federal interests may be endangered except through the neglect of the all-powerful Congress to safeguard properly the interests of the United States.

THE HOME RULE THE DISTRICT WANTS AND NEEDS

The question of home rule for the District of Columbia was discussed briefly in the 1928 hearing before the House Committee on the Judiciary by the late Henry H. Glassie, a prominent Washington lawyer. Mr. Glassie was a native Washingtonian, at one time a member of the United States Tariff Commission, and over a considerable period a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. In the course of his argument supporting a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant national representation to the people of the District of Columbia, he said:

"Now, the constitutional provision for exclusive legislation means the same to every man. It means one legislation, not a divided legislation; not a superior and a subordinate legislation; one single sovereignty, one law.

"You have it now. You will always have it. How will our having a voice in the making of that law—by having one or two Representatives or one or two Senators—change that obvious fact? In other words, the constitutional provision for exclusive power of legislation has nothing in the world to do with the composition of the legislative body.

"One other principal ground or suggestion in the way of opposition is that we are not quite open, and that we stultify these American principles by not claiming the right of local self-government; that we come into court, so to speak, weakened by not claiming that right.

"Now, if the gentlemen of the committee please, coming from words to facts, what was the claim of the Americans to full participation in the Government before the Revolution? Participation in local government? Not at all. They had that. It was participation in that sovereign imperial parliament which made the law.

"We have been reproached with the idea that we do not want local government and therefore do not want self-government. But mark the distinction. Local government may be a mere matter of municipal administration. But what self-government means is that the people who are to obey the laws shall have a share in the making of the laws. You make the law. Under the constitutional provision you will always make the law. Under the principle that the Federal Government shall be supreme, you must continue to make the law.

"Therefore, when we come to you humbly and say, 'Admit us to participation; admit us to your councils in the making of this law,' we are asking for local self-government.

"True it is that we do not ask that we shall appoint the dog catcher. True it is that we do not ask that we shall elect the school board. True it is that we do not ask at this time, coming as a united body, for any of those usual municipal functions as to which it is still a question, after 100 years of self-government, whether they are better done by a vote, or by a city manager, or by a commission.

"So I say to you gentlemen, with profound deference, that these two things, first from one side and then from the other, which are continually thrown against us, will hardly bear scrutiny. We do want self-government, and the essence of self-government is the right to send a man from your community into your legislative representative body which can send you to war, tax your property, do what it pleases with your will, control your domestic relations, your relations to your family, your wife, and children, and do all those things which make a government a government touching intimately the life, as the learned gentleman suggested—and I thank him for the suggestion—which touch intimately the life of the community. Those are the things that are dearest to you, and those are the things which, in your respective States, you insist upon having, and which you will never surrender." (House Judiciary Committee hearing, 1926, 70th Cong., on H. J. Res. 18, serial 22, pp. 71, 72.)

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway," from the Daytona Beach Evening News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Sometime late this month the United States Senate may vote its approval or disapproval of a vast shipping and power project that has been kicked around in Congress since 1909. This is the proposed St. Lawrence River seaway and power project, which must be approved by the Canadian Parliament as well as by the United States Government before it can begin to be a reality.

Several times the project has been defeated in the Senate; it may be defeated again this time. There are sectional and business reasons. Eastern interests centering in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston are opposed to the project because the seaway, when completed, would offer Midwest interests additional transportation facilities that would compete with those seaports. Railroads oppose it as they oppose all inland-waterway projects.

On the other hand, the Midwest and Canadian interests favor the project because it would enable them to ship their goods to the East and overseas at much less cost. And then, of course, there is the electric-power-production angle.

The St. Lawrence seaway would enable oceangoing vessels to navigate 2,347 miles from the mouth of the river on the Atlantic to Duluth, Minn., on the western tip of Lake Superior. This would be accomplished by digging a 27-foot channel through 119 miles of rapids from Montreal to Ogdensburg, N. Y. These rapids are the only part of the entire route through which big ships are unable to go now. To complete the deep-water channel there would have a revolutionary effect on midwestern agriculture and industry and would benefit Canada in the same way.

Then there is the power-production angle. Power facilities would be developed with a total generating capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower by harnessing the 119 miles of river water that drops 223 feet in level in three series of rapids between Montreal and Ogdensburg.

This new fund of electric power would be available in the USA within a radius of 300 miles from the dams, which means that it would be available in New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, northeastern Pennsylvania, and northern New Jersey. And in an emergency power could be transmitted as far as Chicago and Washington.

Total cost of the project based on last May's construction prices has been estimated at $884,000,000. But the United States has already spent $32,000,000 on parts of the plan and Canada has spent $133,000,000. Engineers estimated $720,000,000 in new money would be needed of which the United States would supply $492,000,000 and Canada $228,000,000. All this money would be paid off by collecting tolls from shipping interests and charges for electric power.

For these reasons the cost of the project is not being used as the grounds for opposing it. Opposition is based on one thing—fear of competition. Eastern interests fear it will hurt the business of the ports of New York, Baltimore, and Boston. Privately owned power companies within the radius that would be served by the new power dams are fighting it too. So the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is facing the same kind of opposition that the TVA had to face before that great project was completed in the early years of the New Deal. Fear of competition is contrary to the spirit and purpose of our system of free enterprise, but some of the loudest spokesmen of free enterprise fight competition the hardest when it comes their way.—F. B.

The Oil Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Oil Muddle," from the Exeter (N. H.) News-Letter of February 5, 1948. This editorial points up well the situation in New Hampshire and New England generally this winter as a result of an inadequate supply of fuel oil. It was just such situations as that to which the editorial refers that prompted me recently to introduce Senate bill 2073, by the terms of which exports of petroleum products, except for our armed forces abroad, would be halted, as an assistance to furnishing adequate petroleum supplies for the northeastern area of the country. The people of the New England States have been for several winters the victims of the Government's failure to adequately plan ahead, so far as gasoline and fuel-oil supplies for them are concerned.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OIL MUDDLE

When it is revealed that the flow of fuel oil to New England has ebbed to the point where it is necessary in some communities to issue edicts curtailing the temperature in public establishments and business places to 40 degrees, then it becomes time for some plain questions and answers about our fuel-oil supply.

It takes only common sense to know that normal work cannot be carried on at a temperature of 40 degrees when the mercury is flirting with zero outside. Nor can health and well-being be maintained for any length of time at 60 degrees in the home.

The rigors of New England winters are well known. For many years New Englanders have been encouraged to turn to oil as a more comfortable and efficient means of heat. Many were encouraged to join at great expense, the oil-heating ranks within the past year. In their turn the heating contractors were encouraged to sell and install new oil-burning heating units; oil dealers were not dissuaded from taking on new customers.

Why, if an oil shortage were foreseen, was this business allowed to continue? Many of these people lack the means of converting to other methods of heating at the present time. Why, if these conditions exist, must oil continue to be shipped abroad?

If a national emergency exists in the preservation of our oil supply (it is said that the United States has 33 percent of the world's proven crude-oil reserves at the present time) the New Englander will be found in the front rank in withstanding the hardship.

We can see no greater emergency, at present, then warming cold New England homes. We've had zero temperatures for over a month. Our hospitals are full.

So, let's have the oil.

Economic Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on February 12, 1948, at the annual banquet of the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors, in Philadelphia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate very much the opportunity to meet with you tonight, you as the representatives of more than 1,500 townships in Pennsylvania with a population today, I dare say, well above the figure of the last national census. A substantial portion of Pennsylvania's population continues to live under the township system where they are, perhaps, closer to the day by day municipal and civic issues facing them than are, perhaps, any other group of Pennsylvanians.

Our whole political system in America and in Pennsylvania grew out of the township system and it is indicative of the strength and the value of the township system that even with all the so-called improvements over it which have developed in the field of political organization, the township system itself continues largely unchanged and as virile as ever.

Frankly, it was a source of some surprise to me to find out the other day in preparing a few notes for this meeting, that the assessed valuation of our townships in Pennsylvania, as of the last figure I found, was substantially greater than the assessed valuation of the State's boroughs. The combined assessed valuation of townships in many of our counties exceeds, as a matter of fact, the total assessed value of all the property in some of our other counties, including township, borough, and city. It is, therefore, pretty obvious that although you gentlemen represent what are regarded as small political subdivisions, your responsibilities are anything but small.

I, on the other hand, as a Senator of the United States, represent one phase of the biggest business in the world today, a $40,000,000,000-a-year business, a business in which you and the people in your community, as citizens of the United States, have a very vital stake.

Sometimes it may seem to you that we in Washington are very far removed from your local communities, not much aware of what goes on in them, and perhaps not much concerned either. I know that is the popular conception. I read it in my mail all the time. There isn't a township representative here tonight, I am almost sure, to whom I could not go and say such and such a citizen or group of citizens in your community has written me in the last few weeks on this or that subject.

I might say parenthetically that from one standpoint—the amount of work it gives us in the Senate—the high degree of literacy in Pennsylvania is sometimes alarming. Every one of our ten million or more citizens seems to know how to write and at least one time or another in his lifetime—sometimes frequently—writes to me. You know, sometimes when we get up legislation having to do with Federal aid to education, it occurs to me we might be doing the Senators from some of the so-called backward States a great disservice by making it possible for more of their constituents to learn how to write.

Seriously, though, out of this flood of mail which literally pours in upon us every day, including Saturdays and Sundays and holidays, and days when the Senate is in session and days when it is not in session, I do manage to get a fairly good picture of what is bothering people all over the State. Usually people write to their Congressman or to their Senator only when something is bothering them. Many have the idea that when they send off an indignant letter or telegram to Washington it will be thrown into a heap with a lot of others on the same subject, weighed, and then thrown away—certainly not read by anybody, and positively not read by the Senator himself. Now they are all wrong on that, at least as regards letters sent to me, but even if they were right, even if the letters were thrown away unread, I detect in those letters—for you see we do read them—I detect an obvious inner glow of satisfaction on the part of the writer in getting the subject off his chest, whether anyone reads it or not.

Oftentimes the writer will say, "Of course, Senator, you will never get to read this letter, but if you do, this is what is eating me—" etc. The letters which really get me angry, however, are those which come in unsigned or with no return address. Many of these letters are frustrating because the writer may be urging me to support certain legislation or oppose certain legislation or to do something about some issue or other, completely ignorant of the fact that I may be beating my brains out doing exactly what the writer urges me to do, and there is no way that I can write him and tell him to relax in the knowledge that things are going to turn out all right. The more apoplectic in tone the letter may be, the more I worry about this poor fellow having a heart attack without ever finding out that I am on his side and anxious to see the issue resolved the way he wants it resolved.

This is all a somewhat roundabout way of saying that I do have a fairly good idea of the status of public opinion throughout Pennsylvania without benefit of the Gallup poll. Knowing the things which generally are bothering our citizens, I think I have a pretty good idea, also, of the problems facing their elected representatives, in the townships as well as in the cities and boroughs. I should say the biggest problem right now is money—as usual.

And yet, it shouldn't be usual, for the times are not usual. We are now experiencing the greatest level of economic activity in our history. More people are employed than ever before, doing more things and making more things than ever before, and receiving better wages and profits and incomes than ever before. One might think that this might make for greater happiness than ever before. Actually, however, the problems arising out of this high level of activity are becoming more and more difficult and happiness is a state of mind I seldom find reflected in the faces of our people.

I am not speaking only of the persons on fixed incomes, the pensioners and others who are still trying to get along on prewar incomes, or on incomes fixed and constant since the inflationary spiral really got under way a year or two ago. I am speaking also of the great bulk of our people whose incomes have, to a certain extent, followed prices upward and, in some cases, may have risen faster than prices. As a member of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee, which is assigned the formidable task of keeping our fingers on the Nation's economic pulse beat and proposing legislation to maintain this high level of employment and of industrial activity by heading off depressions before they start, I have heard voluminous testimony from all levels in our economy that we are today in a pretty dangerous situation which might blow up in our faces if something is not done to halt this upward spiral before it gets further out of hand.

It is not just as individuals that we have been feeling the pinch of inflation. Equally as seriously, and in many cases, perhaps more seriously, our political subdivisions have been feeling it, too. In your street repairs and your highway building program, Ir. your local services and in your public pay rolls, you have been finding that your tax dollars just do not stretch far enough. The solution which most frequently must present itself to you is that of raising taxes and of instituting new taxes. And yet, your citizens, and you yourselves, already burdened with high living costs and shrinking purchasing power, are hard put to find places where those increased taxes could come from.

Your problem is further aggravated by the fact that the expansion in population and in construction in your townships necessitates large-scale improvements which are of urgent nature. This work would have to be done at present inflated costs. The dilemma is very real.

I have no magic formula to offer you at this time, no trick solution. Federal aid is often a helpful remedy to a distressed community, but Federal aid by itself is no solution to this over-all problem of the steadily increasing cost of local government and the steadily decreasing purchasing power of local government tax dollars.

The Federal Government, as I said, is a $40,000,000,000 business this year. When the budget was announced last month, screams rent the air over the extravagance and the waste, so-called, of this allegedly bloated budget. But the screams were decidedly mild when compared to the uproar which greeted last year's $37,500,000,000 budget, a budget we were told could be cut and would be cut by $6,000,000,000. As it turned out, the Congress voted in total about $200,000,000 more in the fiscal year than the President's budget of thirty-seven and one-half billions, a budget which was supposed to have been cut by $6,000,000,000.

I mention this ancient history only to point out that it is very easy to make blanket statements about the extravagant cost of Government—including local government—but that when it gets down to the point, item by item, of exposing the extravagance and making reductions, the chances are our public budgets—local as well as national—seldom provide even a minimum of the things which we as Americans expect from our governments—local as well as national.

On the national scale we want and insist on adequate military establishment and that is costing us literally billions of dollars each year. In the hopes of one day achieving a goal which mankind has sought for at least 2,000 years—and that is real and enduring peace—we are spending other billions in support of the United Nations and on programs designed to restore some semblance of economic recovery to nations which, once they get back on their feet, can do a full share with us toward achieving peace and preventing war. These two items, national defense and foreign recovery, take a major, almost an overwhelming bite, out of our $40,000,000,000 budget. Depending upon how effective these outlays are, it is money either completely wasted or it is the best investment we could ever hope to make. We must never forget that the last war cost this Nation hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars—the figure is so stupendous it is just about incomprehensible.

Out of the remainder of our budget we are delivering the mail, collecting taxes, helping you build highways and airports, keeping an eye on the health of our people, keeping the railroads in operation, guarding our natural resources and helping to develop them, and doing hundreds and thousands of other things which all of us as citizens not only expect from our Government but insist on our Government doing.

And then, all by itself, is the simply huge outlay each year for our veterans, an obligation we certainly have no intention of repudiating.

That's our problem nationally. On a small scale, but along the same lines each township in Pennsylvania has a similar problem.

Not so long ago I made a speech here in Philadelphia before representatives of shipping interests in the Eastern States. One of their major problems, and one in which I had and still have a close association, has to do with boxcars. As you no doubt know, the terrific expansion of industrial activity since the end of the war led to a great crisis in railroad transportation. We were junking each month more boxcars than we were building. The railroads were working day and night at the job of moving this great flood of goods in interstate commerce; but the job was just too big in terms of available equipment. One of my committees in the Senate, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, assigned a subcommittee to the job of investigating this shortage and recommending remedies. I was appointed to that subcommittee.

Early in our investigation, more than a year ago, Senator REED, of Kansas, the chairman, and I came to the conclusion that although we could no doubt find many instances of inefficiency and delay in the use of available boxcars, the only solution, the only real and effective and enduring solution, was the production of a lot more boxcars than we had, of a lot more boxcars than we were junking. Therefore, instead of conducting the kind of Roman holiday which congressional investigations sometimes resemble and in which the main concern seems to be to find a villain or to make headlines, we set out to get more boxcars. In the absence of Government controls, which by then had lapsed, we had to depend on the voluntary cooperation of three industries—the railroads, to order the cars that they needed and to put their orders down in black and white; the steel companies, to provide the steel that was needed and to provide it in preference to other enterprises often offering all kinds of premiums for steel; and the boxcar builders themselves, to get down to work and turn out boxcars. Happily, we got agreement; we got a plan and a program and everyone went to work and boxcars have been rolling out of the mills at a rate which now exceeds for the first time in years the rate at which old boxcars are being junked.

The point I made in speaking to the shippers group here last month was that the big villain in the boxcar shortage situation, if you could call it a villain, was the unprecedented, simply amazing level of industrial activity in America, which made all of our facilities too small, inadequate. That villain is present in most of our bottleneck situations today. We are producing more than ever and it is not enough, and so we have shortages of one kind or another—shortages which will continue as long as demand continues at this simply terrific level.

When we reach the point where we have all the box cars on the sidings adequate to meet all the needs instantly and promptly without delay, when we have all the houses built that people are interested in buying or renting, when we have all the automobiles even a high level economy can sustain in operation, when there is enough oil for every need, and all the steel is being turned out so that no one has to wait on his order, then we are heading into a different kind of trouble, a different kind of shortage, a shortage of customers.

What we are going to need then, perhaps more than we have ever needed it, is real and genuine faith in the free enterprise system, enough faith to make us want to work hard at the job of making free enterprise work. It's easy to talk about free enterprise when the profits are rolling in and employment is at a peak and there are more orders for goods than there are factories to fill the orders. In a situation like this, some of the worst enemies of free enterprise have been found in free enterprise itself—in a lack of restraint, in greed, in the old theory of dog eat dog economics.

The result has been this inflation. The result has been a shrinkage of our purchasing power among the mass of our people, a shrinkage which is hurrying up the day when we may have more goods available than customers because the customers can't afford to buy. That will be a sorry day for free enterprise because it is under circumstances such as those that we find the workability of free enterprise increasingly subject to suspicion.

There is little that the officials of a Pennsylvania township can do to protect the purchasing power of the township's tax dollars during a period of inflation. You can cut expenses and you can cut services only so far. The only solution for you as elected officials and for the solvency of your communities is to help bring about on a national scale conditions and sentiment which will halt this inflation before it gets further out of hand, and bring prices down, and once again make your local tax dollar adequate to buy a dollar's worth of service for the people of your communities.

It has been a pleasure to be here with you. It will be a pleasure at any time to do anything I can to help your communities on any problems which may arise in which I may be of assistance. I want you to feel free to call on me. I want you to know that I share your concern over the problems of local government, problems which, although smaller in scope than our national and international issues, are, nevertheless, real and significant and important and very, very close to home in every community.

Statement of Ernest O. Thompson, Chairman, Railroad Commission of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the other day a great Texan appeared before the Oil Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. His remarks were so worth while that I want all the Members of Congress to have the benefit of them.

That man was Col. Ernest O. Thompson, chairman of the Railroad Commission of Texas. Colonel Thompson was a distinguished soldier, in both wars. He was the youngest lieutenant colonel in the AEF in the first war. He trained two regiments in the last war. He has either been chairman or a member of the Railroad Commission of Texas for about 15 years. He was one of the founders, and three times chairman, of the interstate oil compact. He was personally appointed by President Roosevelt to represent this country at the World Petroleum Congress in Paris in 1937. Former Secretary of War Patterson appointed him as his representative to make a study and inspection tour of Europe and the Middle East in 1945.

Since Colonel Thompson knows more about oil than just about anyone in the country, our committee benefited greatly by his advice and suggestions. I include a summary of his statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

STATEMENT OF ERNEST O. THOMPSON, CHAIRMAN, RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS, BEFORE THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE CONGRESS, FEBRUARY 5, 1948

1. That the oil policy of the United States should be one that will call for and do all possible to insure a vigorous, healthy domestic oil-producing industry.

2. Imports of oil should be allowed only to supplement the oil that can be produced by a vigorous, healthful, domestic oil-producing industry. A flood of foreign oil could ruin our oil-producing industry.

3. There should be free play of price; in other words, the price should be free to increase exploration and improve conservation. There should be a minimum of government interference with the maximum of information furnished on improvement in technique of production and technique in discoveries and explorations. Bulletins from Bureau of Mines on new techniques.

4. The Interstate Oil and Gas Compact should be given permanent congressional approval, because it has been useful in occupying that no-man's land between State and Federal jurisdiction. (It is now approved for 4 years only.)

5. The Federal Government should demonstrate its own idea of conservation on Federal public land; for example, it should stop flaring of gas from oil wells drilled on Government public land. I say this because the Federal people are always criticizing the States for flares and yet do nothing about flares on public lands.

6. The only truly dependable reserve of oil in wartimes is an active, producing reserve. Setting aside probable oil land is not a dependable reserve for war. The wells must be drilled and producing and should be where we can protect them.

7. Texas has always produced all of the oil that has been indicated as needed by the Bureau of Mines in its monthly certified estimate of crude needed for the current month, month by month. For example, the Bureau of Mines of the United States certified last month that the amount of crude Texas oil needed every day in the month of February 1948 was 2,360,000 barrels per day.

Texas is now producing 2,385,000 barrels per day, or 25,000 barrels daily in excess of market demand as indicated by the Bureau of Mines. During 1947 Texas discovered 161 new oil fields. Texas has always filled every demand for oil. We look forward hopefully to fulfilling all requirements for oil, provided the price is left free to react to the law of supply and demand and enough steel pipe is made available for drilling the necessary oil wells.

When more oil is discovered the price of oil and gasoline will drop down according to the old law of supply and demand. We do not want price control nor rationing.

Palestine Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, one of the difficult problems now before us has to do with the Palestine situation, and we are all indebted to anyone who throws light on it.

I am including a copy of an editorial from the January 13, 1948, edition of the Waterloo Daily Courier and also a letter from Rabbi S. H. Epstein, of Waterloo, Iowa.

Both the writer of the editorial and Rabbi Epstein have given considerable thought and study to the problem, and their views are worthy of great consideration.

The editorial and letter are as follows:

EXPLOSIVES FOR PALESTINE

The Jewish Agency for Palestine, a responsible group promoting the Jewish homeland, acknowledges that it has been purchasing explosives in the United States for shipment to the Near East. A spokesman said the agency believed that the purchases were legal, although shipment of arms and munitions to the Near East was banned by the State Department on December 5.

American public opinion generally is unfavorable to the export of munitions in the belief that it is more difficult for people to fight if they have difficulty obtaining the arms to fight with. But there are factors which make the Palestine case an exception.

As the spokesman for the Jewish agency pointed out, the United Nations in approving the partition plan for Palestine made no provision for an international police force or other protection for the present inhabitants. The British, with their empire resources strained to the limit, are in no position to offer that protection.

The Jews, therefore, are compelled to take steps to protect themselves. It is natural that they should attempt to purchase surplus munitions in the United States. While any attempt to evade State Department export restrictions cannot be condoned, the need for a change in United States policy is evident.

Arab groups are engaging in open warfare against the Jewish settlements in Palestine. The United States is irrevocably committed to the partition plan. Does it make sense to deny arms to the group which is attempting to carry out the principles of American policy?

It would obviously be better—in terms of long-time Arab-Jewish relationships—for the UN to do the policing of Palestine. But since no UN police force has been formed, it is only fair to allow private Jewish agencies to purchase surplus American arms.

ARMS FOR PALESTINE

WATERLOO, IOWA.

To the EDITOR:

I wish to commend you on your excellent editorial "Explosives for Palestine" in the Courier of January 13. The writer shows that he fully understands the issue involved in the Palestine problem. If the United Nations' decision on Palestine is not realized and made an actuality, the Charter of the UN is a dead letter and all the world's hopes for peace go a-glimmering. If the UN does not convert their first major decision into action and submit to the threat of force by the Arab feudal states, the world will have another debating society similar to the late League of Nations.

For the sake of peace and a better world, the United Nations must be supported by the United States to bring order out of chaos and abolish the rule of brute force.

May I touch upon another aspect of this problem of arms for Palestine. It is the indisputable fact that while the Jews are refused arms, the Arabs, who aggressively oppose the UN decision and launch a series of murderous attacks on the Jews, are supplied with arms and manpower by the Arab states bordering on Palestine.

These states have purchased $41,000,000 worth of weapons from United States Army surplus since the middle of 1945. Even now, while the United States has established an embargo on shipment of arms to the Middle East, the British continue to send arms to the members of the Arab league, the sponsor and instigator of violence in Palestine. Even now the Arab Legion, recruited in Transjordania, officered and armed by the British, have been brought into Palestine where they attack Jewish convoys and commit excesses against Jewish settlements, while the members of the Haganah, Jewish defense corps, are disarmed by the British.

Is this fair play? Is this in keeping with the principle of sportsmanship of giving a fighting chance?

Editorials and pronouncements of right thinking people will do much to rectify the wrong and give a tortured people a chance to live and develop. May I in conclusion thank you for your forthright stand and enlightened position.

RABBI S. H. EPSTEIN.

Dismantling of German Industrial Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial pertaining to the dismantling of German industrial plants, from the New Hampshire Morning Union of February 12. This editorial strongly supports the position which I have taken regarding the urgent need for halting indiscriminate dismantling in Germany.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGES IS RIGHT

Senator STYLES BRIDGES is fully justified in his demand for a full airing of the question of dismantling of German industry. Recently, Secretary Marshall has turned down the proposal that the United States stop dismantling German plants on the ground that it would jeopardize the unity of purpose and feeling essential to European recovery. He insists that the dismantling program will aid rather than hamper European reconstruction.

Marshall's stubborn insistence on this position in the face of the widespread protest against the dismantling program is annoying. The dismantling procedure was authorized by the Potsdam agreement which decreed that German reparations should be made by the removal of capital equipment from Germany rather than from current production. Under this process, reparations were to be paid to Russia and Soviet satellite states, as well as western Europe. BRIDGES points out that in 1947 90 percent of the machinery and facilities dismantled went to iron-curtain countries, with 85 percent to Russia.

Does this make sense today when the whole German situation has been changed by Russia's refusal to carry out the basic features of the Potsdam agreement, and when the dismantled industries might help provide the goods so essential to the reconstruction of western Europe? Today Germany is divided by Russian obstinacy, with the west cut off from the agricultural products of the east, and dependent on exports to provide the essentials of life. The United States is asked to provide goods that the Germans might produce themselves, which means that the dismantling process is carried on at the expense of the American taxpayer.

There is some justification in dismantling German industries geared to war purposes. But the facts show that out of 918 plants scheduled for dismantling, 600 cannot be classed as war plants in any way. Moreover, Secretary Marshall has himself admitted that there is a tremendous loss in efficiency in the removal of industrial plants from Germany.

Virtually every one of the Congressmen who visited Europe last summer came back outraged by the absurdity of the dismantling program, and demanded that it be stopped. Senator BRIDGES was one of these visitors, and he speaks not from hearsay, but from first-hand knowledge. If Secretary Marshall is determined to continue a program so widely pronounced absurd, simply for the reason that the United States should keep its word in the Potsdam agreement, which has already been shot to pieces by the Russians, the situation should be examined thoroughly.

This is not the first policy obstinately followed by the State Department in the face of reason and protest. Congress is asked to make heavy appropriations for the recovery of western Europe, to which western Germany belongs, and it should know whether it is asked to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to repair the damages of ill-designed administration policies. As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator BRIDGES has a right to know all the facts.

Report on Conditions in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, by Hon. Joseph J. Moriarty, a district judge of the State of Minnesota:

FRANKFURT, GERMANY,
January 26, 1948.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States of America, White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TRUMAN: On December 31, 1947, a military permit was issued to me to enter the United States zone of Germany to survey my son's activities with the Bremen Boys' Club and other like clubs organized and inspired by Army leadership in that area. By virtue of this authority, I entered the zone on the 9th day of January 1948 and with unceasing labor and effort conducted a survey and course of observations which led me

to many cities and places for conversation with not only the troops and officers of the Army and the department heads of the military government but also the courts, spiritual leaders, lawyers, doctors, educators, mechanics, laborers, farmers, and other people of Germany, with the result that I am in possession of definite facts and sound opinions gained from trusted persons in the military forces and outside of the military forces and some impressions and opinions of my own arising from what I saw and heard here and before I came here which you, as President of my country, should know, if you do not already know, to help you in leading our Nation toward the sanctuary of full security and world peace.

Every American who pays a visit to this area cannot but feel a high sense of pride in the morality, devotion to duty, and qualities of leadership displayed by the entire personnel of the military force of the United States assigned to this zone of occupation. The task which fell to their lot is a trying and difficult one, calling for patience and continuing sacrifice in aiding the people of this nation as it struggles with the problems of reconstruction and rehabilitation. They are entitled to every consideration of our country, and they are performing a service which should not be forgotten as they work out the problems of security for us and for the German people and spend their leisure time and money in missions of mercy among the sad and discouraged people of this land.

It was my privilege to confer with the various department heads of the military government, and here, too, I found men and women possessing outstanding qualifications to perform the work allotted to them, and to my great satisfaction, I reached the glorious conclusion that none of these department heads was as yet affected with that dreaded malady which at home we call bureau spasms, the symptom of which is a violent change of course and policy at every point.

In Mein Kampf, Hitler divided the German people into three classes—leaders, potential leaders, and idiots. It was the leaders and potential leaders who destroyed this great German country and attempted to destroy the rest of the world as well, and now the burden of running down these leaders and bringing them to their just due rests upon the group which Hitler branded as idiots but who, in reality, were the finest people of Germany and a valuable and essential factor in the things of the world which promote the best order of society.

Nowhere in Germany do I find any respect for the Nazi Party and nowhere have I found any picture, statue, or even the name of Hitler, save in proceedings to prosecute his followers and supporters. Of course, the spirit of democracy destroyed these things but such movement received the support of the better classes of Germany. It seems that the brutal crimes committed at Dachau and other places of death and suffering where innocent men, women, and children were brutally tortured and murdered, had so shocked the people of this country that nothing short of death or severe discipline awaits every single individual responsible for the ruthless extermination of those hundreds of thousands of persons of this area and other areas as well. These crimes also shocked the civilized world and the courts of the world, including the courts of our country, are still engaged working out justice in each and every case in keeping with the laws of nature and of God.

The denazification courts of Germany are daily in session identifying, trying, and passing sentence upon Nazi Party criminals and party members, and fixing by judgment, terms of segregation and discipline, and while it is a slow process and without doubt some guilty persons may escape just punishment, yet, from my observations the German people are to be commended for the way they administer this type of justice.

The courts of general jurisdiction are making a heroic struggle to reestablish a uniform system for the administration of justice and to change the letter of the law practice which prevailed under the Hitler administration and which gave effect to the precise word of a ruthless dictator to one where the principle of right and justice and the judicious conscience play a proper part in the deliberation and final judgment of the court. I find the judges to be men of learning and fairness, leaning toward a judicial reform in the direction of the judicial system of the United States of America.

While I find the antireligious orders, decrees, and regulations of Hitler had and still have a profound effect in leading the old and driving the young away from God and religion, yet everywhere churches and chapels are among the first buildings to be repaired and, under American regulations, receive priority in many instances, proving to me that the conscience of the German people is not dead, as one infidel said to me, but to the contrary, it is stimulated anew by the long persecution of a Godless state and is expressing itself in a positive manner in laying the foundations of a new and truly religious Germany.

The most gifted writer will fail miserably to convey by description the destruction which the war caused in almost every city of Germany. My survey led me to and through Frankfurt, Kassel, Berlin, Giessen, Munich, Regensburg, Nuremberg, and many other cities some 90 percent others 60 percent in total ruins. Thousands of bodies still buried in the heaps of broken, burned brick, stone and twisted beams of steel; trains of cars and locomotives, tanks, and military equipment, wrecked, burned, and driven into the ground by the force of bombs and the fury of war. Yet in the face of all of this the poorly clad, half-fed, and punch-drunk German workmen, with courage and hope and with a few simple tools, have begun the almost superhuman task of restoration—a sad fate not of the people's making but the fault of one Godless dictator whose name was Adolf Hitler.

The physical reconstruction of Germany, hard as it may seem, is light compared with the political, social, educational, and spiritual rebuilding of Germany, for the old curse of national socialism still lingers in hidden form in the souls of many people, awaiting the opportunity to spring forth like a demon and seize control of this country and again wreck and ruin this Nation and the world at large. The majority of the good German people recognize this danger and the danger of Nazi and Communist union under another dictator and take the position that Germany must pass through a long course of conditioning before safety for itself and for the world would allow her national sovereignty. In the meantime, Germany must work out its salvation by its own planning and industry under a political organization possessing all essential powers of democratic government but short of complete national sovereignty, and Germany looks to America, and America alone, for security, liberty, and protection from now until the day it meets qualifications for national sovereignty. As I survey the field of international complications, America has no other safe course to take except to stand firmly by this course of action.

A great fighting general advised me that America must remember and instantly realize that the prewar position of our country has entirely shifted. In 1930, we of America were the pivot upon which was balanced the Allied Powers on one end of the balance beam and Germany on the other end. The movement of America in any particular direction cast the balance for or against a particular side. Today America is on one end of the balance beam, Russia is on the other, and Germany occupies the pivot central position. The movements of Germany are and will be a determining factor in throwing the balance to one end or the other, and such shifting in all probability may determine the future fate of civilization. This position of America, which was not of our choosing but cast upon us by the force of a foreign government, which went all-out for destruction of democratic ideals in the whole world, is one which demands of America a fixed, positive, long-range policy for self-preservation and world peace.

This is the first time in my experience that I had the privilege to view my country from a position thousands of miles removed from the immediate security of my Government and at the same time study first hand the operation and work of foreign governments with the result that I now take a broader view of, and see more clearly, the things which in the end mean freedom or slavery for us at home.

After reaching here I visited the Russian sector of Berlin to consult with the burgomaster, Louisa Schroder, and there observed the Communist's contempt for citizens of my country and the same old Hitler political ritual in full sway, the same sullen and uncompromising attitude which characterized the Communist representatives at the various United Nations conferences, the complete absence of any kind of freedom and the fear-stricken attitude of the Germans and other peoples whose unhappy lot it is to live in complete isolation from the rest of the civilized world. This dark world of communism to the east, fortified by isolation of political thought, yet spearheaded by a determined will to rule the world by fire if necessary, is a direct challenge to America to meet and solve without delay, the problems which confront us here and at home.

Friends of America here view with alarm three dangerous factors forming weak points in the political armor of America; namely, isolation, inflation, and the happy old-soul policy in dealing with Communist forces behind and in front of what someone has properly called the iron curtain.

Any one of these weak points may at any time give rise to an emergency which would place the whole American people in jeopardy of the expanding greed of the forces of communistic Russia. It is the duty of our Government and people to proceed without delay to remedy these weak points. First, by some proper democratic method of sensible price control; second, by the adoption of a sound, definite, long-range policy which will meet the aggression of Russia in a positive manner in true American fashion. It is said here in many quarters that America has delayed this action already too long. It is said that America must understand that Russia did not appreciate receiving what it asked for during the war and what it received after the war. This constant aimless American giving has reached the stage where many here and multitudes at home consider it a weakness in our National Government.

This sound policy and a self-political reconditioning of European nations along democratic lines of thought, recognition of each other's problems and mutual effort and determination to carry Europe through this world crisis, must precede any large-scale American plan for financial aid to Europe. For example, why should America pour money into France and England while both of these countries in their respective zones are slashing down the German forests and transporting the timber to their respective countries, upon the ground that it constitutes a German war potential, while America is attempting to rebuild Germany and sorely needs this vast natural resource to accomplish its purpose. I have not the time or facilities to here enumerate the numerous measures inconsistent with America's plan of

relief, but to the ordinary rational American, many things were agreed to by America and are now permitted under our American policy which does not make sense.

It is fundamental that the future hope of Germany lies in the mental and social attitudes of the German youth. Through no fault of their own they were doped and led to form pagan attitudes of cruelty and taught by the Nazis to hate God and every Christian concept of morality in order to wean German thought away from democratic channels of thought. This generation of German youth deserves guidance and fair treatment from America. This guidance and fair treatment must come through religion, training, and teaching, and temporary relief from the hunger and starvation that threatens the health and life of the German youth. America has no right to teach religion, but America has a right to teach God. The American soldiers here of their own initiative launched a program to train the German youth and at their own individual expense and sacrifice of off-duty time, put in motion an institution known as the German Youth Activities.

This program in due time received military recognition and was later elevated to the dignity of a department of the military government. This department is recognized here and at home as one indispensable to the proper readjustment of the German way of life, and the only true foundation for a free and peaceful national order of things. Yet, I find that this movement has not received from the government at home the financial and moral support which it is entitled to. This institution must be established on a sound basis entirely under the Army or as a separate unit of the Department of State, with proper facilities for full-scale operation with trained and competent personnel and adequate financial support and without delay, or America will lose one of its greatest means to elevate Germany to a truly democratic nation.

America has a displaced person problem on its hands here, fed and quartered by the American taxpayers and by the German economy. Before I left home, I heard a speech by a very prominent advocate of the conservation of human resources, in which this social leader said, "Let us receive into our bosom the 600,000 displaced persons in our zone of Germany, so that they may have the American sanctuary of peace and an opportunity to work with the fullness of life." This good lady was totally ignorant of the character and origin of these people. She did not know: (1) that the other nations of the world have already picked and repicked this group on the basis of character and talent; the musicians, men of science, professional and tradesmen, were long ago in other countries, and what is left now consists principally of the nontalented class; (2) that these people are not refugees who reached the zone in flight from the pursuing persecutor, but principally people of all classes and types of character, caught in the shifting chances of a roving life; (3) that this group has among them many persons capable of adopting and living good and useful lives, but in the great majority are a collection of lazy, worthless persons, totally devoid of any notion to earn their way by honest industry or effort and resting from day to day on the assumption that the world owes them a living; (4) that many of these persons were people attracted to Germany by Hitler policies and who took part in the Hitler economy against their own countries, and now are afraid to return to the people whom they betrayed; (5) that many of these people live in elaborate quarters at American expense with German people as maids and attendants while anxiously awaiting the day to enter into America to engage in profit-making commercial manipulations; (6) that many of these people are in the black markets of Germany sucking the lifeblood out of the German economy and deliberately robbing the German people of whatever little means in their possession; (7) that many of these people are avowed Communists and Nazi adherents, and are daily being detected by the authorities; (8) that many of these people swarm on the streets like vultures to take advantage of the weak and the hungry for their own personal gain; (9) that many of these persons lack the moral fiber to adapt themselves to democratic ways of life; (10) that if America shall take into our country these people without a thorough process of screening, break-down and culling out, we at home will suffer, not for a while but always, from such a national mistake. If this good lady took time out to come here and investigate these facts, I am sure that she would keep these persons far away from the loving bosom of America.

The German people and the entire military forces of the United States, and all American civilians employed on behalf of our Government in Germany, are in one way or another the helpless victims of the black markets. These markets are owned and controlled by the racketeers who supply such markets by downright deception, open and aboveboard commercial oppression, and interception of American supplies as they pass through the channels of distribution in the German economy. The black-market system originated in the Hitler economy and its operators were the favored class of the dictator. It continued over into the present German economy. It has monopolized the food supply and controlled the distribution of the necessities of life, and fixes the prices of commodities. For example, the price of a pound of bacon is 300 marks and the average German workman receives 150 marks a month. The salary of a judge, whose jurisdiction and work is comparable to that of a district judge in America, is 1,294 marks, or 7 packages of cigarettes or 4 pounds of bacon, and so on through the entire list of the things which make up what we at home call, the necessities of life. These markets must disappear from the German economy and the procedure to effect this objective forms one of the most perplexing problems of the German people. It would be well for America to take notice of the German system of black markets so that, in the event that America should adopt a price-control system, ample provision and safeguards shall be enacted to prevent the invasion of a similar system of black markets into the American economy.

The food supply in this zone of Germany appears to be and is, as far as I can discover, entirely inadequate to serve the proper needs of the people. This problem must be solved now in order to preserve the health and life of the entire population. This aid must come from America. The burden of feeding the people may be to a large extent lifted from our shoulders if America now and before planting time supplies seed and fertilizer to the farms and gardens and gives Germany a chance to reap a crop in 1948. Connected with this problem of adequate food supply and a part of it is the control and total abolition of the black markets. This is one phase of the war against greed which America, so far, failed to win. The German courts, police force, and in fact the whole German economy is still too weak to cope with the power and wealth of the black markets. It rests with America to use the strong arm of the law to solve this problem, and a definite program for this purpose must be adopted.

This in part covers my investigation of the situation in the American zone of Germany. I have taken a deep interest in all the things that I saw and heard, because my family has paid a high price for peace thus far achieved in the world in the loss of our young Navy pilot, who gave his life to keep the skies clear over America against an invading enemy.

I have defrayed the expenses of my trip to Germany out of my own resources. I ask nothing from the Government in return for this expenditure. I will be available at all times to make good any statement which I have here made and I have desired, Mr. President, to call upon you at Washington and personally leave you this report and give its contents to the press of America, which I consider the great bulwark of democratic freedom and security so that the people at home may know something about what is transpiring in this unfortunate land.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH J. MORIARTY,
District Judge of the State of Minnesota, Shakopee, Minn.

How Much Does Government Cost?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press, Pontiac, Mich., of February 9, 1948.

In will shock some people to learn that the cost of the Federal Government in 1946 equaled the incomes of all the people in 19 States. In 1929, the cost of Federal Government was less than the total income of all the people of the State of California. In 1939, 9 years later, it had already increased to such an extent that it equaled the total incomes of all the people in 10 States.

If the appetite of the administration for spending money continues, it will soon total the incomes of half of the States in the Union, or until the utter collapse of our economic system stops this wild orgy of spending.

The Pontiac Daily Press is to be commended for pointing out to the people what is happening. I hope that every Member of Congress reads this editorial.

WHY WORRY ABOUT BUTTER?

Of course you know you're a victim of ruthless Federal taxation and have been for years.

This isn't a secret.

Washington can't hide it.

Just recently President Truman sounded a strident tocsin note heralding the need for reducing the price of food. We believe the President is serious.

We are, too.

We want food prices down.

But Mr. Truman blandly and grandly ignores governmental costs. He still itches to get your tax dollars—all that he can rake into Washington. Hasn't he vetoed one tax reduction bill already? And hasn't he threatened to do so again? We're still under the spell of a Federal Government that longs to rule mankind "from womb to tomb."

We are intrigued by a pamphlet that comes to our desk headed "Octopus on the Potomac." It uses a striking example of what the Federal Government is costing every taxpayer in this section and everywhere else.

In 1929 the cost of Federal Government was less than the total income of all the people of the State of California. In other words, if all the income of all the people of California had been sent to Washington, it would have supported the Federal Government, leaving all the rest of the income of all of the rest of the people for the people to use themselves.

This was back in 1929 when that extravagant Mr. Hoover was in office.

Remember?

Nine years later, in 1939 and before we were in the war, the New Deal dynasty had raised this Federal bite until it equaled all the incomes of all the people in California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana.

That's bad enough.

In fact, it's much too bad.

Tax strangulation was here.

But according to the Octopus we should examine the record for the year 1946. The war was over then, you know. In that year the cost of Federal Government in Washington had arisen so high that it equaled the incomes of all the people in California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas, Minnesota, and Iowa.

And you can add half of the State of Missouri.

This includes every State west of the Mississippi River except Arkansas and Louisiana.

To quote: "(the equivalent of) every dollar received in 1946 by every individual American citizen in this vast area has been taken by the Octopus on the Potomac."

That means Washington, D. C.

Yet Mr. Truman worries about butter.

Well, so do we.

But we are much more worried about wartime taxes when the war is long since ended. And, furthermore, we're worried about the excessive peacetime taxes the New Deal saddled on this country as the bands played The Star-Spangled Banner, and they slaughtered little pigs and paid huge sums for not raising crops.

They made you like it.

Are you worried about the price of butter?

So are we.

But let's worry more about an administration that gouges every living wage earner out of wartime taxes when the shooting's over, just because it is committed to a program of "spend, spend, spend."

British Views on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the American press for days has devoted much space to the tragic situation as it now exists in Palestine.

It should be of interest to Congress to note some of the British reactions in this important matter. The following is a critical statement of the British policy as it appeared in the New Statesman and Nation, commenting upon the violent overthrow of the pro-British cabinet in Iraq, indicating that it was exactly what was to be expected.

I quote from that newspaper:

The fact is that the appeasement of the Arab states has been no more effective in 1948 than it was in 1939. British abdication of responsibility in Palestine, though it may be calculated to assist the Arabs, does not impress them with our strength. It merely increases nationalist xenophobia directed not merely against the Zionists but against all westerners. This is still the motive force of the pan-Arab movement.

The following editorial from the issue of the Answer dated February 6, 1948, sheds light upon the situation in its quotations from the Observer, known as a Tory paper, and from the Tribune, known as a Laborite paper:

LONDON COMMENTARY—A LITTLE TRUTH LEAKS OUT

"When rogues fall out," an old saying tells us, "honest men come by their own." To judge by a number of little hints which have been dropped in official circles here during recent days, it would appear that there has been just the tiniest bit of "falling out" amongst the "rogues" engaged in implementing the Foreign Office Palestine and middle eastern policy. The system of all-in blackmailing, which is diplomacy in the Middle East, has produced some results not altogether pleasant for the British Raj. So the Foreign Office has revealed just the fraction of an inch of claw beneath its polite velvet glove, and has closed the tap of Arab violence in Palestine, a fraction—just for the moment.

Two highly revealing contributions in the British press, published, one in a Tory and the other in a Left Wing Laborite paper within a couple of days of one another, bear further witness to the latest moves in diplomatic rascality. In both of these articles for the first time a little truth about British Palestine policy has been allowed to leak out in the British press. In both cases, the leakage can be attributed to the falling out process to which I referred above.

The Tory article appeared in the Sunday Observer. It warned bluntly that the Middle East remained "Britain's most vital base outside the United Kingdom." And it told the Arabs with brutal frankness: "The presence of strong British forces to cover the eastern Mediterranean as well as the Arab countries and Persia are even more important since the British left India." After quite openly hinting at the British Foreign Office policy of supporting the Arab feudal system it reminded these Arab rulers (over one of whom, Ibn Saud, Anthony Eden has recently been slobbering with fulsome praise) that the alternative to indulgent British control is the "terrifying designs" and "ruthless domination" of Russia. The article is plainly playing up for continued British military domination of Palestine, and by way of mollifying British popular feelings, which are bent on British withdrawal, the article threatens that if disturbances continue in Palestine, the Marshall plan (which, in the eyes of the British people, secures Britain as Uncle Sam's remittance man) cannot succeed.

The article in the left-wing Laborite paper Tribune, in which the whole of the master plan of the Foreign Office to destroy the Hebrew nation in Palestine is brazenly admitted, owes its origin to a different falling out. These left-wingers of the British Government's Labor Party regard Bevin as in the pocket of Tory policy. The unbridgeable cleavage between trade unionism, which can get along quite consistently with Toryism, and the socialism of these left-wingers which cannot, is always threatening to smash the Labor Party as it did in 1931. The left-wingers were anticipating a triumph by Bevin and their other internal enemies by means of the foreign affairs debate and the Bolshevist scare—a success which in fact certainly sent up Bevin's stock. Hence, they decided to unmask the Foreign Office Palestine policy which Bevin champions, in all its revolting rascality. This is how they describe what they discreetly label as "thoughts among what might be called the entourage of Mr. Bevin's entourage:"

"Even if the Arab atteck does not overthrow the Palestine Jews entirely (so that they would have to ask for British support), it will force them so much onto the defensive on the coastal plain that there will be no prospect of any stable Jewish state. The United Nations Implementation Committee will soon see, after the last British have departed in August, that there will be no way of implementing the United Nations decision without a strong force—which it cannot have, for such a force would have to be Soviet-America, and this is out of the question.

"The Committee will therefore appeal either to the Assembly or to the Security Council for new instructions. By the time either body meets, the American elections will be over and pressure from the Arab interests in the State Department will be growing. Mr. Truman and Mr. Marshall will be able to 'do a munich' on the Zionists, and either something like the Morrison plan of Jewish and Arab cantons, without large-scale immigration, will be enforced, or a scheme of a much smaller Jewish enclave around Tel Aviv in a larger Arab state—either a Greater Syria or a Greater Transjordan—will be carried through. And southern Palestine—the Negeb—will, by way of incorporation into Transjordan, come back under British control."

There you have it, straight from the mouth of the Government's own party, published for the first time in the British press in a paper over which one of the ministers of the Crown is known to exercise predominant influence. It might interest Americans, considering the Marshall plan, to learn from this same article the belief that as much as a quarter of the last American loan to Britain was squandered on the Foreign Office's Palestine adventure.

This illuminating article concludes by pointing out that the British-organized Arab attacks on Palestine had, it was felt in official circles, gone a bit too far and too quickly. There was the risk of war, and the Security Council, and Russia. Hence the lull in the British-controlled disorders. I hope the honest men in your State Department and your Congress friends will ponder these astounding revelations and confirmations.

Two Hundred and Forty-second Anniversary of the Birth of Benjamin Franklin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on January 17, 1948, in connection with the ceremonies marking the two hundred and forty-second anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General Eisenhower, Governor Duff, Mayor Samuel, distinguished guests, members of the Poor Richard Club, men and women of Philadelphia who have assembled here to honor a great American of our time and to pay homage to the memory of a great American of the early days of our Republic who

became Philadelphia's most distinguished citizen.

It is most appropriate and fitting that we should choose ceremonies commemorating the birth of Benjamin Franklin as the occasion to honor a great soldier. For, although Franklin was not a military man, he was in the real sense of the word, a soldier—a soldier of democracy. Looking back over Franklin's attainments, one is struck by the fact that almost the only area of human activity in which he did not distinguish himself was as a military man. He achieved distinction as a statesman, scientist, philosopher, publisher, inventor, and philanthropist. There was, of course, a good reason for this. When the war for American independence broke out Franklin already was an elder statesman. After a lifetime of service to his fellow citizens, no one would have begrudged him a deserved rest.

He was 26 years older than Washington, 30 years older than Adams, and 37 years older than Jefferson. But, at great personal sacrifice and risk, he cast his lot with those hardy spirits who were determined that America would be free and tyranny could not be endured. He served his country on dangerous missions abroad. If he had been captured he would have been hanged.

Therefore I think it is most fitting that on the occasion of the two hundred and forty-second anniversary of his birth we should honor Franklin by honoring an American whose achievements in the great war as directing genius of the allied invasion of Europe will mark him as one of the great military commanders of all time.

Although Franklin did not wear a military uniform during the Revolutionary War, he was a soldier in the sense that Franklin Roosevelt was a soldier. He exhausted himself in the service of his country, he won powerful allies for the new American Nation and who shall say his contribution to final victory was not as great as Washington's. And as we review the wartime contributions of Benjamin Franklin and General Eisenhower at different periods of our history we are struck by their similarity.

Great as was General Eisenhower's contribution as a soldier I think it was overshadowed by his accomplishments as a diplomat and ambassador and able representative of the American people—a diplomat who with infinite patience and tact and persistence, welded together the forces of freedom composed of nations and peoples with different backgrounds and interests into the most formidable weapon for the preservation of liberty and the crushing of tyranny ever forged.

A century and a half earlier that was the essence of Franklin's wartime contribution as the representative of the young American Nation in the courts of Europe. How General Eisenhower must understand and sympathize with Franklin's efforts to get guns and ships and soldiers from allies of the struggling new Republic.

Franklin and Eisenhower have this in common. They both recognized at different periods of our history that America needed allies—that America needed friends. Both Franklin and Eisenhower understood this fact at critical stages of our history. It is a fact as true today when we are rich and powerful as it was when we were a struggling new nation with only an ideal and a devotion to freedom and democracy to hint at our future greatness.

Franklin and Eisenhower both realized also that to have the understanding and friendship and good will of the world it must be earned. It cannot be coerced or bought—it must be earned.

Franklin and Eisenhower both realized, too, that we can neither isolate or insulate ourselves from the rest of the world and if we are to live in peace we must demand the existence of a world in which freedom and decency can survive unchallenged.

That is the essence of the Marshall plan. It is designed to enable the freedom loving peoples of Europe to revive their economies and regain their economic health, so that they will be able to stand on their own feet and make their contribution to the prosperity and peace of the world.

I think the Poor Richard Club could not have made a more appropriate selection of the man to receive its gold medal of achievement than General Eisenhower. He and Franklin were kindred spirits, representing the best of the ideals and aspiration and character of the American people.

On behalf of the Federal Government I join in congratulating General Eisenhower on the addition of this award to the many he already has earned in the distinguished service of his country.

"We Must Achieve a Greater Responsibility in Government; We Must Drive Out Monopoly in All Its Forms; We Must Rid Our Country of the Plague of Price Fixing, for It Is Only in a Free Market That Democracy Can Attain Its Full Destiny"—Mr. Saul Cohn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, this great land of ours is now experiencing economic stresses that demand the soundest thinking and wisest action of which its citizens are capable. It is true that we have weathered other economic storms in our history but it is vitally important that the lessons of those experiences be not lost upon us during these days of crisis.

In extending my remarks in the RECORD, today, to include a speech recently delivered by Mr. Saul Cohn, president of City Stores Co., a famous retail outlet, I am making available to the Congress and the country the considered expressions of one of our country's greatest merchandisers, one whose judgment in economic matters is held in the highest esteem. Mr. Cohn has not only a sound but a refreshingly unusual approach to the problems he discusses. In analyzing the situation of the moment, he visualizes us as heading toward an economy based upon consumption, rather than production.

This well-known and highly respected business executive, an outstanding leader in his field, is strongly of the opinion that our salvation, that is, our ability to achieve economic stability in the future lies in the unshackling and the expanding of our distributive machine. According to his convictions, we have laid entirely too much emphasis upon production when, as he contends so convincingly, an efficient productive capacity means little in the absence of an equally efficient distributive system.

Mr. Speaker, I commend that which Mr. Cohn has written to the careful consideration of everyone whose eyes scan these columns. The text of his address, delivered initially at a luncheon meeting of the National Association of Retail Secretaries in New York on January 12, 1948, is the following:

PRICE MAKING IN A DEMOCRACY

The two big issues that confront us in 1948, and which have always been great undercurrents of influence in our lives, are peace and prices. And while the two are interwoven, I shall confine myself in the main to the matter of prices.

But price making today is more complex than ever. To see this clearly we must divide price making into its component parts.

Broadly speaking, every price contains two major elements—the tangible and the intangible. The tangible is the yard of cloth represented in raw material and labor, the value of which can be more or less measured because it is visible and subject to appraisal. The intangible comprises what cannot be seen or measured and makes up a considerable portion of the price. Among the intangibles are included the acts of government and the acts of producers. And it is these that we should think about today, for though viewed singly they indicate but little, seen in their totality they reveal the full and staggering impact upon prices.

ACTS OF GOVERNMENT

It would be futile today to list all the acts of government which find their way into the price structure, but a few are sufficient to indicate the powerful effect they have on prices:

A. The tax structure

Income taxes, State taxes, royalty taxes, sales taxes, license taxes, occupational taxes, and many hidden taxes.

In our kind of economy a tax structure must be judged by its effect upon consumption. When a tax bears down so heavily upon the price that consumption is arrested, with its subsequent effect upon production, that tax structure is a failure. Ours is a dynamic economy, based not only upon freedom of spirit but on a satisfaction of needs and desires. Taxes which arrest production are an interference with the dynamic flywheel of a democracy: an arrest of consumption is an arrest of production. For example, see the effect of one phase of the tax structure as it appeared when published by a leading New York newspaper on January 11, 1941:

Hidden taxes paid with purchases of goods

One hundred and twenty-six different taxes on a pair of shoes.

Seventy-eight different taxes on a quart of milk.

One hundred and forty-eight different taxes on overalls.

One hundred and ninety-one different taxes on a fence.

One hundred and forty-two different taxes on a plow.

One hundred and fifty-four different taxes on a cake of soap.

Two hundred and one different taxes on a gallon of gasoline.

It is needless to point out the cumulative effect of excise and consumption taxes, as well as taxes in general. These are purchase taxes which are all a part of prices, but in many instances they are not only this, but a foundation for profit on taxes. They seriously impair the national income and reduce the job opportunities available.

B. Subsidies

But if some of these taxes can be defended on the basis that they are a legitimate source of Government revenue, on what basis can be defended the artificial support given to prices through Government subsidies, such as tariffs, farm prices, and numerous others.

Our subsidies and sanctioned monopolies and exemptions make but a trapeze of our commercial system, on which the various lobbies engage in a good deal of acrobatics,

but with a balance that tips in their favor at the expense of the consumer. We, as retailers, have never fully understood the effect of these tactics upon the economy and have therefore neglected to make our influence properly felt, nor effectively joined our forces with the consumer in the safeguard of his interests.

C. Price-maintenance laws

And as if these were not enough, we have a long list of market legislation, such as the Miller-Tydings, Robinson-Patman, and numerous other State laws, which affect the free movement of goods into the market, producing a rigidity and inflexibility of price, notable among which are the price-maintenance laws.

ACTS OF PRODUCERS

Add to this the various methods in which cartels and monopolies have further managed to impose upon production administered prices and other kinds of contraptions, all calculated to increase the price of goods, and you begin to have some idea of how the freedom of the market is being destroyed.

As an example, only recently the head of one of our stores (a business which does over $20,000,000) was asked "how many items and lines in your store are controlled by the manufacturers, i. e., how many items are you required to sell at a price without your consent fixed by someone in the line of production?" The answer was "at least 30 percent of the items."

Producers who insist that the marketing of their products shall be done in a way which represents their requirements rather than what the retailer knows to be the consumers' requirements frequently result in enslaving the market.

COMPETITION

Competition is an easily mouthed word in this country. But is it competition to set specific retail price lines, so that an article which cost the retailer $10.75 must be sold for $16.75? And while the merchant may have some leeway over the price line for clearance or seasonal distress periods, if he attempted to be more freely competitive in price at other times it would be difficult for him to secure goods in a period in which there was an undersupply. Price fixing is a hurt to the economy.

Democracy means the right to choose, as well as the right to buy. It is for this reason that our economy is favorably contrasted with almost every other economy in the world; and for this reason it has had a turnover and an element of dynamics unequaled anywhere else. But this was achieved by a freer market, and to the extent that our market is free, to that extent will it continue to be achieved. Goods improperly restrained from coming into the market result in a deprivation of the economic liberty of the individual—and ths applies not only to consumer goods, but also to raw materials, to heavy goods, and to capital goods.

RENTALS AND LONG-TERM LEASES

There is the matter of rentals caused by competition for the limited number of desirable central locations and long-term leases which may, or may not, take into consideration the gradual decentralization of custom and trade. These have a serious impact on the retail dollar.

The percentage lease, which grew up during the depression, has served to inflate the price structure and returns to owners are too frequently disproportionate to the real value of their properties. The percentage lease does not merely give to the landowner a return on his investment—it more nearly constitutes a partnership with the merchant and an added burden on the buying power of the community.

While there is a natural opportunity inherent in the site of a store, sales volume depends upon the resourcefulness of the merchant and the capital he invests. Does the percentage lease encroach upon the merchant's power to raise wages or reduce prices?

Since we moved up to new economic plateaus because a worker takes so much more of the national product now as compared with prewar, would it be timely to inquire whether the percentage lease attacks a normal power of consumption?

COOPERATION

There is a vital need of greater cooperation between the makers of yardage and garments and the makers of sales. The lack of this is reflected in the effect on the price of fashion goods. There seems to be little faith on the part of the mill converters, the cutters or manufacturers, as well as the retailers. No one is willing to take a chance and order goods in time. The result is some goods are delivered too late, causing markdowns and losses which must be compensated for in the price of the goods arriving on time.

All of these problems can be dealt with in periodic discussions which may help to coordinate the activities of each group, at the same time working out economies in production, stemming from a better standardization of goods and from the removal of wastes which find their way into the price. In a world which needs production so badly, we must strive unceasingly from year to year to find ways and means to accomplish this.

ENGINEERED APPROACH TO CONSUMMATION OF TRANSACTION

Today's prices represent an inflated expense dollar. There must be greater production in the distributive fields which in this respect have not done as well as manufacturing.

There is also the need of management and personnel working together to simplify procedures so as to produce a better, more efficient and pleasant job; a job in which the employee shares with management the creative character of performance. This not only makes for efficiency, but like all good things reaps a good byproduct; and this is the dignified status of the employee, who achieves a sense of personal worth and pride of achievement, rather than the feeling that he is only a cog in the wheel.

1948

Nineteen forty-eight will be a fateful year, a year of great problems, but also a year of great opportunities. It will probably determine whether the whole of the twentieth century will be known as the century of fear and defeat, or as the century in which vital problems were met and successfully overcome.

At the moment we are beset by a snarl of prices, wages, and taxation problems, each with an interlacing effect upon the other. There is that segment of opinion, of course, which sees the answer in greater Government controls; in the prolongation of taxes; in the expansion of social security; in the raising of beneficial payments to the unemployed, and in the fiscal policy for deficit spending of Government-made work. The answer does not lie in any of these measures. The answer lies in some hard-headed ways of improving turn-over and buying power. But there is not enough bold statesmanship as to the price-making policy. We in retailing, must provide it or inspire it.

The most constructive thing we can do is bend our efforts toward the strengthening of our economy; make our Nation exemplary for those who have not yet worked the way of their own chaos, and prove to them that democracy can work. And a free market is the hub around which democracy revolves.

We must achieve a greater responsibility in government; we must drive out monopoly in all its forms; we must rid our country of the plague of price fixing, for it is only in a free market that democracy can attain its full destiny.

Since the retailer is in effect the buying agent of the consumer, since he most nearly knows what the consumer wants and the price level at which the consumer will take goods, he must assume a more aggressive role in the making of prices, and insist upon authority equal to his responsibilitiy. All these things must he do if we here in America are to survive as a free society with a free-enterprise system.

Palestine Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles A. Wells, writer, traveler, lecturer, and cartoonist, writing in his publication Between-the-Lines makes some pertinent observations on the Palestine problem. Mr. Wells has traveled extensively throughout the world and he should have some knowledge and insight to this problem. It is not necessary to agree with his point of view to recognize that he is presenting some irrefutable facts. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including his article which appeared in the February 9 issue of Between-the-Lines:

The Palestine question is not a problem of just Jews versus Arabs as the average American assumes. In the first place, powerful Jewish factions are opposing the Zionist movement to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine. They reject entirely the theory that the only hope of the Jew is in the establishment of a homeland in crowded Palestine. The non-Zionists believe that the Jewish destiny can best be achieved as the Jew becomes a valuable and honored citizen in the country where he resides. They believe that the true nature of zionism is spiritual and not nationalistic—that Israel should be bound together by the ties of their great religion and thus be a light to the world wherever they are.

But Zionists bitterly reject this interpretation of their destiny. They demand that the Jews must reestablish their national life, that they must have a country, a national capital, and an army and navy—and that this country must be Palestine and that the capital must be Jerusalem. Zionists have been increasingly accepting the philosophy of violence to achieve their aims. Many non-Jewish people who have been sympathetic with the Zionist aims have been shocked and their sympathy for zionism greatly shaken by the violent methods of Jewish Palestinian groups who have bombed, ambushed, and terrorized Arab communities * * * often in retaliation but with a savagery, desperation, and efficiency that far outstrips the usual medieval half-barbaric Arab thrust.

These violent Jewish factions, working with the devotion and fanaticism of the anti-Nazi underground of Europe, have recently been involved in attempts to ship large quantities of munitions from this country to Palestine. Working secretly in this country, they have raised large sums of money among American Jewish communities and have undertaken to arm the youth of Palestine for a military defense of the new Jewish national state.

British shipments of munitions have also been made to the Arab nation during the past months as is widely known in diplomatic circles. Why hasn't the American press, which gave big headlines to the discovery of the Jewish shipment of munitions

to Palestine, given any space to the news of British munitions going to the Arabs? Is it because the powerful American oil interests, endeavoring to hold the cooperation of the Arab states in matters of oil, in spite of the Washington endorsement of Zionism, have had a large hand in the British secret support of the Arabs? There are ample grounds for this assumption in view of the congressional investigations that revealed how these giant American oil corporations, endeavoring to hold their Near East oil concessions during the war, paid vast sums to the Arab states through secret arrangements with departments of the British Government (see Between-the-Lines, December 8, 1947). In spite of whatever policy the White House or the London Labor government might seek to maintain, there are always departments of both Governments that are under the control of these powerful commercial groups.

Another unfamiliar factor in the Palestine situation is the presence of Christian communities in the Holy Land that are made up of both Arab Christians and Jewish Christians—as well as other races—who are subject to persecution by both Arab Moslems and Jewish Zionists. These Palestine Christians and their rights are being ignored entirely in the war between the Jews and the Arabs. A recent report in the Christian Century by Robert Root gives considerable detail of this astonishing situation. The question is being raised among both Protestant and Catholic leaders in Europe and America as to what will become of the Christian shrines in Bethlehem, Jerusalem, and elsewhere in the Holy Land, long revered by the millions of Christendom, which are to come under the complete control of the Jewish Nationalists. UN commission reports on Palestine have already mentioned Zionist industrialization crowding ruthlessly on sacred Christian sites.

The British surrender their mandate this coming May. Then Palestine goes under the supervision and protection of the United Nations. It will no doubt be one of the most dramatic months in the history of this ageless cradle of the world's spiritual life.

The irony is that the larger portion of the Jews who have migrated to Palestine are actually nonreligious. There are few religious establishments of any kind in the new Jewish communities, rarely even a synagogue. Great numbers of the Jewish youth in Palestine are Communists—which explains somewhat Russia's unique relation to Palestine. Russia, though a Communist state, has a large Moslem population in some of the southern Soviet republics. That means that Russia is the only great world power with close ties to both the Jewish Communists which largely dominate Jewish Palestine and to the Arab Moslems of Palestine. And Russia is very close by. How long will the United States and Britain be able to hold the upper hand on Palestine when Russia begins to play fully upon these factors?

A Call to Congress To Lead, Not Follow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Mr. Jerry Voorhis, one of the most respected and outstanding men to ever serve in the House of Representatives.

In an article appearing in the New York Times, Mr. Voorhis has this to say about the obligation of Congress to lead and not to follow.

What he has to say should be of interest to the Members:

A CALL TO CONGRESS TO LEAD, NOT FOLLOW—AN EX-CONGRESSMAN DISPUTES THE VIEW CONGRESS SHOULD MERELY ECHO THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

(By Jerry Voorhis)

The United States Congress has a decisive role to play in this year of decision. How is it to act so that the best interests of the Nation will be served? On what should it base its decisions? As Representatives of the people, should Congressmen follow the people's will or lead it? This is a dilemma as old as democracy.

The danger is that Congress will take the time-worn course of following the Nation, as it does today, instead of setting such standards of courageous and farsighted leadership that all of us will be inspired to meet America's grave, new responsibilities. The danger is acute because unless Congress leads, the job America must do—at home and abroad—will not be done.

To a great many persons the phrase "representative government" means that Senators and Representatives are sent to Washington, not to use their own judgment and to be guided by their knowledge of the needs and problems of the Nation, but rather to reflect in their votes the opinion of a majority of the people in their districts. This is the dominant attitude of Congress itself, and it is worth while examining for a moment how majority opinion is arrived at and how the vote of the average Congressman is finally determined.

To begin with, public polls, newspaper and radio commentaries, and similar contemporary phenomena provide a fairly accurate picture of majority opinion; they can tell, at a given time on a given topic, what the people are thinking. But these are rather loose and general appraisals, with or without specific reference to a Congressman's own district. Reports from trusted lieutenants and the views of leading citizens in one's district get closer to home and are continually utilized. There are still other means.

The mail is a familiar voice from home which Congressmen listen to and they know how to "weigh" it. It is not hard to ignore the multigraphed postal cards or the identically worded telegrams that sometimes pour in. But it is a far different matter with the letter in longhand beginning "Dear Joe" or even "Dear Congressman" and appealing to you not to "let us down" on a certain bill. It is still more impressive if the letter represents the views of a local organization, which may even have sent an emissary, or lobbyist, to Washington.

It would seem that the Senator or Representative who heeds such appeals as these—so simple, so direct, the voice of the people back home—was performing his duties in the loftiest spirit of representative government. But what shall he do when all his knowledge and convictions on a significant issue lead him to one point of view and the apparent opinion of the majority in his district directs him to the other? This is the fundamental question with respect to representative government.

The easy answer, the safe one, is that the opinion of the district should prevail. This removes, for one thing, the necessity of thought. A still easier course is for the Congressman to make an early commitment as to how he will vote. From then on in legislative forum, he can argue rather than reason.

The philosophy behind such a policy—other than the view that representation means simply echoing what appears to be majority sentiment—lies in the realm of practical politics. After all, it is said, every Congressman was elected to office in the first place because his ideas corresponded most nearly to those of the majority in his district. If he is to remain in office to do as much as he can for the welfare of his constituency and the country at large, he must not lose sight of this basic political fact.

Is this, however, a proper standard of statesmanship? And is it the only way to endear one's self to the electorate?

To me, such a theory of representative government seems woefully inadequate and unrealistic. We are just beginning to realize that there are vast fields in which there is no real public opinion—even on crucial issues—because many voters do not have enough information about them.

To fill this vacuum a constituent may fall back on a prejudice or an old maxim. The bigger the problem is, and the more confused he becomes, the more likely he is to cling to the past; the more susceptible he is to the eloquence of special-interest pleading and the half-truths of propaganda. This is especially true when Members of Congress do not supply the leadership which most constituents need and many would welcome.

The Congress of the United States does not have to be a mere echo of what "inquiring reporters" and poll-takers say the people think. It is just as possible to lead and inform public opinion as to follow it. Surely there is an obligation binding on every Senator and Representative to make his views known to his constituents, to explain his reasons and appraise the issues honestly. Just as surely it is his duty to cast his vote in the best interests of the whole Nation, as he sees them. And this even though the majority opinion among his constituents may, at the moment, be on the other side.

The truly valid conception of representative government holds that the people elect their representatives because they expect from those representatives better, more farsighted action than the people as a whole, with their limited access to all the facts, can provide.

It holds that the representative is supposed not so much to reflect the opinions of his constituents as to serve (or represent) their best and highest long-run interests.

If Congress is to be nothing but a mirror one is almost tempted to conclude we could do without it. The people cannot pass judgments unless they have something to judge. Democracy cannot and does not work—particularly in times of crisis—unless the public opinion of the time is the result of the pull of concrete proposals by men daring to offer leadership to the people.

It can be done. Every successful politician worthy of that much-abused but perfectly good name knows that he owes his election, in part at least, to the organization of public opinion behind his candidacy. If this can be done to win elections it can be done to gain support for a statesmanlike course of action.

In every community in America there are men and women to whom others look for guidance on public questions. They possess qualities which have given them the opportunity to help mold the opinion of that locality. Most Senators and Congressmen know who these people are.

Direct communication with them, regardless of party affiliation, should lead them to rally behind the sound position of their representatives, or else the whole theory of democratic government is questionable. It is, as a matter of fact, at least as easy to mobilize public opinion behind true leadership as it is to attempt to gage the thinking of the people and then tag along behind it.

Members of Congress have access every day and every hour to information about both domestic and foreign affairs which, in the nature of the case, the average citizen cannot know. Unless, therefore, the Senators and Representatives act in the light of this information, the country is compelled to operate without any fully informed action (except of course, that taken by the President and his Cabinet). Even if there were no other arguments for Congress leading rather than following public opinion this one would be conclusive.

To this higher concept of representative government Congress can rise, if it will. Confronted by unquestioned responsibility for the future welfare of this Nation—and indeed in times like these, of the world—it is fervently to be hoped that the membership of the House and Senate will be lifted in vision and courage to the point of genuine leadership.

We have had such men in Congress. I have seen them take their political fate in their hands and vote in accordance with their mature conclusions even when they knew they were in effect telling the majority opinion in their district that it was, at the moment, mistaken. And I have seen such men—not all of them, but some—returned to office by people who, on second thought, saw that they were right.

Some of the brightest pages in the history of the Congress are those which record the career of George W. Norris, of Nebraska. First as a Member of the House, later as a Member of the Senate, Mr. Norris consistently led the people's thinking, instead of following it. He awakened national interest in constructive reformation of the rules of the House; he led the battle for the TVA, for rural electrification, for a one-house legislature in Nebraska, for a dozen other measures of lasting benefit to the Nation.

Norris challenged the voters of his State to follow him or to defeat him. By his forthright action he gave direction to the thinking of the people, and so won their confidence that he was reelected over and over again. At his death all America hailed him as a great man.

Less well remembered, perhaps, is the speech delivered in the Senate by Prentiss Brown, Senator from Michigan in the midwar debate on the OPA. For days Senators had been carrying to the Senate floor the opinions of well-knit special-interest groups each of which desired concessions in the bill.

Public opinion was, without much doubt, indifferent if not hostile to a continuance of price control. Admittedly mistakes had been made and poor judgment used in some cases. Yet every informed Member of the House and Senate knew how disastrous the results would be to the Nation if price control were rendered ineffective at that particular time. It remained for Senator Brown to cut through the fog of half-truth and challenge the Senate to act on the larger issue that lay before it. And the Senate did.

Afterward there were those who believed he had so offended certain powerful organizations in his State that he could not be reelected. Perhaps they were right. Brown never ran again, for he accepted the post as OPA Administrator and retired from the Senate. But the reelection of Senator Brown was for one golden hour at least—and probably for longer than that—of less importance to Prentiss Brown himself than safeguarding the economy of the United States. The press and the people of the United States understood this and appreciated it.

We do not yet know the ultimate fate of the Marshall plan for western European recovery. But we do know that specious isolationist arguments and opinion were dealt a heavy blow when Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, in defending the interim-aid bill a few weeks ago, gave his graphic illustration of throwing a 12-foot rope to a drowning man 15 feet from the pier. The Senator from Michigan had some of the most powerful figures in his own party against him. He spoke against every cliche that has hampered American foreign policy since this country came of age as a great power. But he gave public opinion a simple rallying point.

Perhaps most important of all for the future of mankind are those members of Congress, led by freshman Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut, who literally spent sleepless days and nights to inform the American people of the true scientific facts regarding atomic energy, to discredit the false promises of their vote-hungry opponents that America could keep "the secret" locked up somewhere in the Pentagon Building, and to pass the McMahon atomic energy control bill in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

There are men and women of this stature in Congress today. The question is, are there enough?

If there were enough to change the course of Congress from one of following Mr. Gallup et al. to one of offering leadership to the Nation based on the hard facts of the present world situation, it would spell the difference between confused forebodings and renewed hope.

The average American citizen has learned to expect a generous seasoning of partisan politics with every dish the present Congress serves to him. Suppose he learned from experience that Congress was no longer adulterating its legislative action in that way? Suppose he learned that there in Washington was a group of representatives of the people seeking with singleness of purpose to serve the long-run welfare of the Nation? Then both American citizens and the other people of the world at large would know that there was a new dynamic salutary force at work around which they could rally.

Rent-Ceiling Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Sylvia F. Porter, which appeared in the New York Post on February 13, 1948:

RENT-CEILING FIGHT

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

I know one way Congress can turn a mild shake-out into a full-dress depression. It just has to let rent controls die February 29. I know how Congress can break the financial backs of millions of us. It just has to force us to pay up to 50 percent more for our shelter. Before Congress falls for the tortuous argument that the commodity slump justifies the slaughtering of our rent-control law, let it decide exactly what it wants to achieve.

And let it be fully prepared for the consequences—not only next November but also in the years following.

Yesterday afternoon I had a visit from a group of real-estate men. We'd arranged the appointment 10 days ago—before the crack-up in the stock and commodity markets.

When their spokesman first phoned, he'd said:

"We think you're getting a one-sided picture of the rent-control situation. We think you don't understand the position of the landlord and home owner and builder."

I'd listened, agreed I could learn plenty from our meeting.

So we met and I learned plenty all right.

I learned that something new has been added to the arguments against extending rent ceilings—the new "thought" going like this:

Since the inflation peak has been passed, there's no longer any justification for punishing the Americans who own or rent houses.

Since the time for controls has passed, the best way to solve our housing shortage is to let free, free epterprise take over.

Since food and clothing will be cheaper soon, tenants will have enough money left to meet their bigger shelter bills.

That's the new argument. And, in addition, I was told that rent ceilings always have been inflationary because they've left people with more cash to buy other goods. (How do you like that.)

And I was informed that ceilings hurt the veterans because they permit people to rent larger places than they actually need and thus the veteran can't get the space.

And I was exposed to the idea that if the higher prices compelled more families to double up, that would be fine because the space thereby released would reduce the shortage.

As you may judge, it was a most educational afternoon.

It defies logic and common sense—this new argument that the recent commodity decline justifies the end of rent control.

For instance, we realize that a painful economic adjustment has become imperative because so many consumers have been priced out of the markets in recent months.

So how do we make the adjustment less painful?

By pricing more consumers out of the market.

We remember what happened to the price level after controls were eliminated in 1946.

So how do we benefit from that lesson in economic management?

By killing the last remaining control—and the one governing a fundamental item in our cost of living.

We understand that an ersatz control law is as bad as no control at all, for we had an experience with a phony law in 1946.

So how does Congress propose to avoid repeating that mistake?

By debating a rent-control bill that is so full of jokers that Senator WAGNER (Democrat, New York) can brand it as "appalling and dishonest."

The facts are these:

We are in grave economic trouble because we have permitted prices of essential commodities and products to get out of hand.

Each inflationary price increase has led to an inflationary wage increase—and the spiral has gone on and on. The result is an economy full of dangerous distortions, of unhealthy rigidities.

The one fairly stable living cost has been housing. But since last June 30, when the present law was passed, the Bureau of Labor Statistics index on rents has risen 6.2 points—from 109.2 to 115.4. (On this index, 1935–39 equals 100.)

The housing shortage remains critical. Secretary Harriman estimates 3,000,000 families are involuntarily "doubling up." Estimates of the shortage run into the many millions. The scarcity of rental housing is particularly serious. The prices of new houses are terribly inflated and out of the reach of countless needy families.

According to Housing Expediter Tighe Woods, rents would rise 50 percent if controls were removed. The experience in decontrolled areas shows plainly that rents jump immediately when the ceilings go off. Even the real estate interests admit there would be "some increases".

Rent control dies at the month-end unless the law is extended temporarily or a new and honest law is passed.

As a tenant, I must confess some prejudice. As a reporter who vividly recalls the forecasts of the dead OPA's enemies, I must confess considerable skepticism of all pretty pledges.

But I did listen yesterday. I did try to be objective.

But the net result is I'm more convinced than ever of the utter necessity for extension of rent control. If you are, too, let Congress know how you feel—in a hurry.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing is a fair picture of the situation as it exists not only in the city of New York, but in every urban community.

Expansion of Steel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, many Members of Congress, as well as many other Americans, have been critical of the steel industry in recent months and have been of the opinion that the shortage of steel has been primarily due to the industry's inability to expand its production facilities to meet the tremendous demand for that basic commodity. In view of that rather general belief I was happy to read in the Pittsburgh Press recently that there are four United States Steel projects to be finished in 1948. The newspaper article also lists eight other projects of the United States Steel outside the Pittsburgh area. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWELVE UNITED STATES STEEL PROJECTS TO BE FINISHED IN 1948—FOUR PROGRAMS UNDER WAY IN AREA

(By W. L. Russell)

Four projects in the United States Steel Corp.'s $500,000,000 construction program will be completed in the Pittsburgh district this year.

They are:

1. Increase in the cold-rolled strip and tinplate productive capacity at the Irvin works of Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corp., to be finished in the fourth quarter.

2. New coal washers at Robena mine of H. C. Frick Coke Co., to be completed in the third quarter.

3. New coke oven battery at Clairton works of Carnegie-Illinois to be in operation in fourth quarter.

4. Increased production of silicon steel at Vandergrift works of Carnegie-Illinois to be effective by second quarter.

Nine of the 12 new major facilities now under construction by Big Steel will begin operations this year.

The 12 are the principal undertakings in the $500,000,000 development program in which virtually all operations from the ore and coal mines to sales offices will share.

The following dates have been set for completion of the eight projects outside the Pittsburgh area:

1. Increase in cold-rolled strip and tinplate capacity at Gary, Ind., fourth quarter.

2. Conversion of hot-rolled mill to a cold-reduction mill at Birmingham, Ala., fourth quarter.

3. New research laboratory at Duluth and Trout Lake pilot plant at Coleraine, Minn., to handle lower-grade ores of the Mesabi Range, second quarter.

4. New cold-rolled strip mill at Pittsburg, Calif.

5. New cold-rolled strip mill at Los Angeles, fourth quarter.

6. Construction program at Lorain, Ohio, and additional tube-making facilities at Gary, Ind., fourth quarter.

7. Remodeling of 132-inch plate mill at Geneva, Utah, for manufacture of hot-strip coils, first quarter.

8. Two new modern blast furnaces at Chicago, second quarter.

In addition to the expansion program, the corporation is engaged in a broad program of replacements and improvements to its iron, coal, coke, and steel producing facilities.

Communism Expands Under Roosevelt and Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, "During 1945 and 1946 Russia achieved a territorial expansion greater than in any other comparable period in her history," says Ely Culbertson, in a feature article appearing in the New Leader, of February 14, 1948. He then points out that Russia emerged from the war as a giant Communist empire, from Korea to the Elbe, with vast industrial resources and nearly half a billion humans under one iron will. Said he, again, "In two short years, Communist Russia fulfilled the imperialistic dreams of generations of tzars."

Mr. Speaker, this comes as a shock to the average citizen. So that all may read and have the benefit of Mr. Culbertson's thinking, I am including the whole article, as part of my remarks:

THE STALINTERN AND THE ATOM BOMB—AFTER THE MARSHALL PLAN, WHAT?

(By Ely Culbertson)

During 1945 and 1946, Russia achieved a territorial expansion greater than in any other comparable period of her history. She emerged from the war as a giant Communist empire, from Korea to the Elbe, with vast industrial resources and nearly half a billion humans under one iron will. In two short years, Communist Russia fulfilled the imperialistic dreams of generations of tzars.

During 1947 Russia consolidated her victories of Tehran and Yalta in eastern Europe and laid the groundwork for new advances in China and the Middle East. The Communist tide has been contained, however, on the Greek and Turkish frontiers; it is receding, temporarily at least, in France, Italy, and America. But the Moscow rulers, by postponing practically every basic issue of the world settlement, are gaining precious time in which to advance their industrial rearmament and to make their strategic position in the heartland of Eurasia impregnable.

Meanwhile, the United States is still drifting confusedly toward the fateful hour, sometime after 1950, perhaps even sooner, when 150,000,000 Americans must fear annihilation by atomic blasts from skies or cellars.

Why have we failed?

One reason for the failures of our foreign policy lies in the structure inherent in any real democracy.

The only people who make decisions on war or peace in Russia are the 14 members of the Politburo. Russia's rulers can and do use force and the threat of war as an instrument of policy, and the only effective answer to power policies is counterforce.

But American leaders cannot give this answer—not if they wish to be reelected. The moms and pops of America do not understand the logic of power politics; they only know that they do not want their boys to go to war.

Thus, America finds herself in the greatest psychological trap in history: Our leaders, unable to answer military force with counterforce, must of necessity resort to broken weapons of persuasion, economic pressure, and half measures. Our foreign policy in 1945 and 1946 was one of appeasement, and in 1947 it stopped at half measures designed to "contain" Russia.

The Marshall plan, however worthy, is another such half measure—unless paralleled by effective action on the political front.

It is clear that the Democratic administration has developed the Marshall plan, not only as a new anchorage for United States foreign policy but also as a lever to swing the 1948 elections. From the internal political standpoint, the administration reasons that if the Republicans support the Marshall plan, then they will be placed, as in many times in the past, in a me-too position, which cannot gain votes, and if the Republicans unduly restrict or undermine the Marshall plan, then the economic logic and the popularity of the plan will lose votes for the Republicans. How much validity is there in this reasoning?

The Marshall plan has two points of strength and one basic weakness: First, it is a plan to feed, clothe, and shelter the impoverished peoples of western Europe; second, it is a plan to rebuild western Europe economically, so as to "contain" the Communist expansion into western Europe. These two points alone are enough to leave no alternative for the Republican Party except to support the Marshal plan, with proper safeguards.

But there exists a basic weakness in the Marshall plan, which we must guard against if the Marshall plan, like so many previous plans of the administration, is not to become a gambit for the Moscow rulers. The weakness lies in the deliberate propaganda of the administration that the Marshall plan is the cure-all for the ills of the world and in the consequent failure of the administration to advance additional and more effective measures against the militant Communist state.

On January 5, Charles E. Bohlen, counselor to the State Department, speaking in the place of the Secretary of State, declared that the Marshall plan "offers us the best chance for the eventual achievement of a stable and peaceful world. It is certainly the best chance, and it may be the last."

This kind of grossly exaggerated selling job, if successful, may well turn the Marshall plan into the Maginot line of the American nation. The truth is that the Marshall plan is strictly limited to the counteroffensive on the economic front, and therefore completely ignores the strategically more vital objectives of the counteroffensive on the political front. The Marshall plan fails to solve three fundamental threats to the United States and the world from the USSR.

First, the Marshall plan can do nothing about the atomic threat. Soviet Russia is now feverishly engaged in building atomic plants at the cost of billions of gold rubles and with the help of thousands of scientists from Germany and elsewhere. Leading scientists estimate that by 1950 Russia is virtually certain to have a few atomic bombs. By 1952, which is the terminal point of the Marshall plan, they will have enough atomic bombs to threaten to destroy, in case of conflict, a score or two of American cities.

Secondly, the Marshall plan can do nothing about the consolidation, leading to effective absorption, of Russia's gigantic zones of influence in eastern Germany, Poland, and the Balkans, and the Far East, not to count the incipient zone in the Middle East. In fact, it has been stated by the administration that the eventual success of the Marshall plan in western Europe is largely predicated on the cooperation of the agricultural states of eastern Europe. Unless the administration contemplates eventual appeasement of Russia, such an assumption is obviously fantastic.

Thirdly, the Marshall plan can do nothing about the gigantic rearmament program of Soviet Russia now going on, parallel with her intensified industrialization. Although it may partially rearm Germany and western Europe, it cannot possibly disarm Soviet Russia and her satellites, now engaged in a tremendous program of building new air fleets, new tank and rocket divisions, and new submarine fleets.

Assuming the fullest success of the Marshall plan, with the expenditure of all the amount asked, what will our situation be in the middle of 1952? Western Europe will be economically stronger and in a better position to resist communism from within. But from outside, Russia, recovered and with her strategic zones consolidated, will possess the most powerful war machine of all time, spearheaded very probably by squadrons of atomic bombers and backed by 500 divisions. Today, the American atomic monopoly is the principal deterrent to a sweep by Communist Russia over Europe and Asia. By 1952, Russia will be in a stronger position and America will have lost her atomic monopoly. Furthermore, as with Hitler, the fear of the overpowering war machine at their very doors, fortified by the atomic threat, will probably divide and keep paralyzed the nations of western Europe and Asia.

The Marshall plan may divert the attention of the American people from the fundamental issues between the United States of America and U. S. S. R.; but it will not avert the Third World War. In a world of power politics, America cannot buy world peace on the installment plan. The Marshall plan cannot therefore be the sole basis of United States foreign policy, as proposed by the administration. Something else, of a far more drastic and more effective nature, will be needed in addition to the Marshall plan.

That something else cannot be a preventative war to crush Russia now. In a democracy such as ours either political party is certain to be defeated if enough Americans become convinced that it is a war party.

Is there a way out, which is neither appeasement of Russia a la Wallace, nor half-measures a la the Marshall plan? Such a way exists. It is to anchor the United States foreign policy on the United Nations—not the present, impotent United Nations, but a revised United Nations strong enough to prevent any nation from rearming for aggression with impunity or attacking a divided world with chances of success. The American people are convinced that the hope of the world lies in the United Nations. But since the present UN Charter leaves that body too weak to defend the peace of the world against aggressors, it must be strengthened. We can make the United Nations work by:

Abolishing the veto, but only in specific matters of aggression;

Preventing rearmament for aggression, by world-wide control and inspection of atomic energy together with a quota limitation on the production of other important weapons;

Defending any member-state against aggression with a strong international contingent (police force) recruited from the smaller member-states, supported, if necessary, from the armed forces of the major states.

Should Russia choose to reject this revised United Nations plan (or quota force plan) in spite of its eminent fairness to her, the building of a strong United Nations would proceed without her, under article 51 of the UN Charter.

What are the chances of some such plan being adopted by either of the major political parties? The plan already has been fully approved by a number of national and local organizations from left to right, whose total membership numbers over 5,000,000. Remarkably enough Socialists and liberals like Norman Thomas, Roger Baldwin, and George S. Counts are united with former presidents of the NAM and leading officials of the American Legion in endorsing the revised United Nations plan. The adoption of this plan, therefore, by either political party would secure for that party the votes of millions of those independents to whom the cardinal issues are communism and the atomic bomb.

A question may arise: If this plan for reform of the UN is so good, then why has not the administration itself proposed it? Why is the State Department making great efforts to play down even a discussion of the veto question in the United Nations, as demonstrated by its inconsistent action first in creating the little assembly in a defiant blare of trumpets, only later to bury it shamefacedly as thought it were a still-born child? One reason is that the nostalgic hankering for the happy pro-Communist days is not completely eradicated in official circles. But the more important reason is the fact that a pro-Russian vote is deemed essential by the Democratic politicians in order to win the delicate 1948 elections; and that vote would be lost irretrievably if the revision of the United Nations without Russia were proposed.

With the Marshall plan there is always a hope eventually to reach a friendly understanding with Russia. In fact, if at some future time the Moscow tacticians decide to forgive and cooperate in the Marshall plan, we will have peace in our time—always good at election time. But the revised United Nations plan will finally slam the door to any appeasement of Russia, except on conditions of effective and guaranteed peace. And the present Moscow rulers won't like it at all. For if they agree to the reform of the United Nations not only will they have to abandon any aggressive designs, but they will lose their principal trump which they so assiduously cultivate with their own long-suffering people, which is the bugaboo of foreign imperialist aggression against Russia; and if they lose this trump communism may collapse in Russia. On the other hand, should they refuse to join in the revised United Nations they will be facing a word collective front of peaceful nations that will crush them if they choose aggression.

Thus, reason the Democratic politicians, whose problem is, as with all politicians, how to save the world and yet be reelected. Perforce they follow a tortuous line of being tough enough to satisfy the anti-Communists and yet avoid making the politburo really mad.

However, things have gone too far with Communist Russia for any semiappeasement, however cleverly disguised. Furthermore, the threat of Wallace's third party has been considerably reduced by the defection of all except the Communists and totalitarian liberals. If only the Democratic leaders had enough imagination to take a firm and constructive attitude for the reform of the United Nations, they would gain millions of extra votes.

The Republican Party is not suffering from Wallacitis, but it has other kinds of internal troubles. Fortunately, a healthy and powerful movement is developing within that party against a too slavish adherence to the zigzags of the administration. Many Republican leaders have finally realized that the "Me-Too" policy in foreign affairs cannot gain any votes, and that a bold and practical program for the effective revision of the United Nations, in addition to the Marshall plan, would liberate the Republican Party from the me-too chains which Roosevelt so cleverly put upon it.

Thus the logic of world events and the opposition of the American people to both appeasement and a preventive war against Russia leaves only one way out for both parties. And that way can only be via a revised United Nations. Whether the leaders of either party will have enough political imagination to seize this unique opportunity remains to be seen.

One thing is certain: The revised United Nations plan will be a death blow to the imperialist designs of the Moscow state. And yet the plan is so designed that it offers to a peaceful Russia exactly the same guarantees against aggression as to the United States and the rest of the world. The Third World War need not take place. For if the Moscow rulers choose to stay out they will be all dressed up with no place to go. And rather than risk a war at hopeless odds against the United States and most of the world under a revised United Nations they too will have to join.

Today the Politburo reasons well that American statesmen cannot force guns into the hands of the sons of American Moms and Pops in a cause of power politics. But this is only half the truth. The other half is that American Moms and Pops will support the putting of a gun into the hands of the revised United Nations—not against Russia but against any aggressor—under a higher law, a world judge, and a world policeman.

United States Jews and Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts of a letter addressed to the New York Herald Tribune by Mr. Lessing J. Rosenwald, president of the American Council for Judaism.

Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable confusion and some misstatement about the American Council for Judaism with reference to its present position on Palestine. I am very happy that Mr. Lessing J. Rosenwald, president of the American Council for Judaism, has seen fit, in a letter which he sent to the New York Herald Tribune, to set the record straight in that respect. In his letter Mr. Rosenwald, writing as president of the council, said, in part, as follows:

On November 20, 1947, the member states of the United Nations met in solemn conclave at Lake Success and reached a history-making decision to partition Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states. We accept this decision. We wish the new states the greatest possible success, and we hope that they will prosper and develop in peace and harmony.

We opposed the partition plan which was finally approved by the United Nations. Whatever our opposition of the past—time will tell whether or not we were right—we cannot, and do not, set ourselves against the

organized voice of the world society of nations. We have no foreign policy of our own, independent of that of our own government.

* * * * *

I am frequently shocked by the conception that loyalty and devotion to the United States are to be interpreted in terms of abiding by its laws. "I vote, I pay my taxes, I live honestly and decently." Fine! But is that all that is meant? No! National loyalty and national devotion are to be found in the depths of our being. A glowing love of our land and its people and its language. A warmth of heart about its landmarks, and its songs. A trust in its destiny. A pledge to dedicate life and posessions and all that is dear, to the fullest and finest evolution of its institutions. An awesome conviction that here—in the United States of America, and nowhere else in the world—I will live, here I will die, and so with my descendants.

For the last 150 years in all western lands we have striven to abide by the concepts of our religion as that of Judaism, our national loyalty as that of the countries of our choice.

* * * * *

In our national loyalty, attachments and interests, we are exclusively and totally Americans—as the only proper course for those privileged with citizenship of the United States of America. In our religious adherence—and in that alone—we are of the Jewish faith, striving to live by the spiritual, moral and ethical implications of the universal cry: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One."

We trust that these concepts will strike a sympathetic chord in the hearts of all Americans, regardless of their religious beliefs. May it also bring some measure of hope to all those thousands of distressed persons, of all faiths, who look to the United States as a haven and a heaven, where life can again be sweet and natural.

Mr. Speaker, I have always contended that the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine will not cause in the slightest degree any diminution of the patriotism and allegiance of American Jews to the United States of America. The foregoing excerpts are but one more demonstration of the truth of that statement. Regardless of the differences of opinion that may have existed as to the advisability or feasibility of establishing a Jewish state in Palestine, now that the United Nations has decreed it, the entire world is in duty bound to give it a fair chance to succeed. Every effort must be bent to preventing outside interference.

The next step in that direction must be a positive statement in no uncertain terms by the Secretary of State that any attempt to sabotage any decree of the United Nations will be considered an unfriendly act and a threat against the peace of the world.

Angry South Could Defeat Truman in Civil Rights Row

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herewith an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Tuesday, February 10, 1948:

ANGRY SOUTH COULD DEFEAT TRUMAN IN CIVIL RIGHTS ROW—WITHHOLDING OF 127 ELECTORAL VOTES WOULD MEAN GOP VICTORY

(By Gould Lincoln)

Unhappy Democrats of the South are trying to decide whether they stand to lose more by having a "carpetbag" Democrat or a Republican in the White House. They regard the program laid down by President Truman in his recent civil-rights message to Congress as bad or worse than the program of the radical Republicans in reconstruction days after the Civil War. The Truman program spells the doom of segregation of the white and colored people—which has been practiced in transportation, in schools and colleges, in hotels and theaters and, in many ways, in employment. The issue has become social, as well as governmental and economic.

These southern Democrats went along with the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt at election time, although Mr. Roosevelt at various times advocated practically all the things which Mr. Truman has now advanced. Mr. Roosevelt, however, never lumped them all in a special message to Congress, and threatened an army of FBI agents and a determined Department of Justice to compel the southerners to carry them into effect. They went along in order to keep a Democratic President in the White House—and to keep themselves in office, with jobs to parcel out to deserving followers. They did this although they were opposed to much of the New Deal program, and particularly to the Roosevelt attitude on the race question.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVEN ELECTORAL VOTES AT STAKE

Except Franklin Roosevelt, who carried every State in 1936, aside from Maine and Vermont, and Woodrow Wilson, who was elected overwhelmingly in 1912 because of the Bull Moose Party led by Theodore Roosevelt, no Democratic candidate for President has ever had a ghost of a show for election without the vote of the solid South. If that vote were taken from Mr. Truman in the coming election, he would be sunk without a trace—and even if he divided States of the North and West with his Republican opponent, and the election were tossed into the House of Representatives, he would stand no show.

So the most aroused southern Democrats are today threatening Mr. Truman with the loss of the 127 electoral votes of the 11 States of the South unless he eases off and fails to press for the enactment of this program. Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, for example, gives his own answer to the question, "What can the South do?" It can withhold her electoral votes and defeat any Democratic candidate, he points out. He further asserts that "no candidate would be nominated if it were known that he would not receive the South's electoral vote. The machines of the North which control the party are not crazy," he added.

Mr. EASTLAND presupposes that a Republican candidate for President could not win next fall when he suggests that the election would be thrown into the House if Mr. Truman does not receive the electoral votes of the South, yet Republican Presidents have repeatedly been elected, despite the fact that the South voted solidly for their Democratic opponents. So it is obvious that, while the South might prevent the election of Mr. Truman, it is not necessarily true that a Republican would fail of election without the issue going to the House. Southern Democrats figure, however, that it may well be better to go to the mat now on this race issue with the Democrats of the North and West than to postpone the issue. They hold a powerful weapon if they wish to use it.

MISSISSIPPI LEADS FIGHT

Mississippi, through its Governor Wright, has taken a lead in this fight with Mr. Truman—and unless Mr. Truman retreats on this issue and the Democrats of the North retreat along with him, Mr. Truman will not get the electoral vote of that State, no matter what the other Southern States do. The Southern governors, meeting in Florida, put through a resolution to study the matter for 40 days—during which, it is presumed, they will seek to get some kind of a compromise with Mr. Truman.

If Mr. Truman should yield, he will lose strength in the North and West and will be more vulnerable than ever to the raids made by Henry Wallace as a third party candidate. The position of the prospective Democratic nominee for President seems to be rapidly deteriorating.

Senator EASTLAND, who voices the sentiments of Governor Wright, says flatly: "Common sense demands that the electoral vote of the South be used to protect her people. The stark reality is, however, that our electoral vote is the basis of the movement to destroy our social institutions. Our electoral vote is now being used to promote such purposes. The politicians are expected to keep us in line in the name of party harmony while they stay in office through the dispensation of governmental favors."

The A B C of Inflation in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American citizens have seen their money squandered, depreciated, borrowed, and spent, and their future and that of their children mortgaged by a ruthless gang of New Dealers bent on a planned economy. They have seen higher and higher taxes, larger Government pay rolls, and they now know that the President is demanding controls and regimentation to further aggravate an inflation for which he and his predecessor and the New Deal legislation have been responsible.

I am inserting under unanimous consent, The A B C of Inflation in the United States, written by Roger Amory, chairman of the board of the National Rockland Bank of Boston.

THE A B C OF INFLATION IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Roger Amory, chairman of the board, the National Rockland Bank of Boston)

INTRODUCTION

Every great war has produced an inflation of commodity prices, and after each war the cost of living has rapidly increased. Each period of such inflation has been followed by a period of deflation, bringing financial distress to the borrower and unemployment to the wage earner.

The cause of these inflations has been the same. During the war, expenditures by the Government have exceeded receipts from taxes and from outright sales of bonds to the public. The difference is made up by the creation of new money in the hands of the public. On the termination of the war, bonuses are paid discharged soldiers, and individuals bring forth the savings they have accumulated from wartime wages or from earnings which under ordinary conditions would have gone into things not available during the war. Bureaucrats, whose numbers have been greatly augmented during the war, are not only slow to get back to civil life and the production of civilian goods, but have become accustomed to authority and lavish expenditures. Their demands on Congress are often arrogant and exorbitant and difficult to curb. The public goes on a buying spree for the things it has been denied during the war, and which, unfortunately, are still in short supply. People bid against each other and drive prices up. Commercial loans increase because of the increased business activity and because of the higher dollar value of those raw materials and finished goods which business must carry during those many months intervening between the time when raw materials come out of the ground and the time when the finished goods are paid for by the ultimate consumer. This increase in commercial loans further augments the money supply. An inflationary boom takes place.

However, the upward surge of prices and wages is not orderly, and as the inflation continues the buying power of an increasingly large section of the public is reduced. Finally demand for goods slows up and prices start falling. The buying spree is over. The future becomes uncertain. Economies are put into effect. Unemployment occurs. Loans are reduced or eliminated, and the supply of money is thereby reduced and its value correspondingly increased. Prices continue to fall, unemployment and stagnation of business set in, and the country is in a depression.

Money, as now defined since the gold coin standard within our country was legally abolished in 1933, is a medium of exchange, of no value in itself, but only of value to the extent that it can be exchanged for goods or services desired. Other things being equal, the larger the money supply, the less a single unit of it will buy, and the smaller the money supply, the more a single unit will buy. In the long run, if you increase the supply of money, prices go up; if you decrease the supply of money, prices go down.

Money is a measure of relative values. If a half a day's labor in a coal mine is equivalent to that labor necessary to produce food for the miner and his family for a day, it is immaterial whether the half day's labor in the coal mine and the supply of food produced by the equivalent labor is said to be worth $4 or $8. It is vitally important that they are represented by the same number of dollars. Whether it is $4 or $8 depends not on the quantity or quality of the labor in the coal mine, or on the quantity or quality of the food in question, but rather on the ratio of the supply of money to a combination of factors in the economy, perhaps best represented by "gross national income."

The spiral of increased wages, increased costs and increased prices is not due to "selfish labor leaders" or "selfish big business" but is a natural adjustment of our national economy to the inflated money supply.

The money supply of the people is composed of: (a) Currency, and (b) checking accounts in commercial banks. Currency, as here defined, consists of silver, nickel, and copper coins, bills representing the deposit of silver in the Treasury in Washington, and Federal Reserve notes. The latter are I O U's issued by the Federal Reserve banks largely against the deposit of Government bonds. It is not lawful money, but it is redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury or any Federal Reserve bank, but none of our lawful money in this country today is redeemable in gold. Only a very small portion of the checking accounts in commercial banks is the result of deposits of currency. These checking accounts are largely the result of credits, which have arisen from (1) loans to the public and (2) loans to the Government.

We have, therefore, the following conditions:

I. Prices are largely governed by the relation of the size of the money supply to "gross national income."

II. The size of the money supply is increased or decreased by:

(a) An increase or decrease in currency.

(b) An increase or decrease in loans of commercial banks to the public and to the Government, and

(c) An increase or decrease in holdings of Government securities, gold, and loans by the Federal Reserve banks.

III. "Gross national income" is directly related to the productivity of individual effort.

INFLATION AND WORLD WAR II

Those in charge of the debt structure of the country during the war were well advised as to inflations and deflations attributable to former wars and the causes leading up to them. They realized that a certain amount of inflation of money was necessary to carry on the war on the gigantic scale desirable. They also were aware of the dangers. Inflation of money through inflation of currency had resulted in the almost worthless "continentals" of the Revolution and in the "greenbacks" of depreciated value of the Civil War. They realized that the inflation of credit, which had resulted by having encouraged the purchase of Liberty bonds with borrowed money, was a contributing factor to the boom and bust following World War I. The Government did finance the recent war 46 percent by taxes, as compared with virtually none for the Revolution, 43 percent for the War of 1812, 23 percent for the Civil War, and 28 percent for World War I. However, the expense of World War II was more than that of any other war, and the effect on our economy far greater. We find that per capita debt in 1812 was $15; in 1864, it was $78; in 1918, it was $240; and, in 1945, it was $1,981. The national debt has reached the stupendous figure of $258,000,000,000, requiring annual interest charges of some $5,000,000,000. In spite of the effort to finance as large a part as possible of the expense not taken care of by taxes through the sale of bonds direct to the public, and in spite of the fact that the provisions of the bonds of smaller denominations were such as to prevent them from being used as collateral for loans from banks, a very great inflation of the money supply did take place.

The money supply, composed of currency and bank credits resulting from loans to the public and loans to the Government, increased 180 percent. In 1940, there was less than $8,000,000,000 of currency outstanding against over $28,000,000,000 in 1947. Checking deposits in commercial banks have increased from something under $30,000,000,000 in 1940 to something over $80,000,000,000 in 1947. The per capita money supply is around $770, as compared with $214 at the peak of 1929. This money supply is the result of private-business activity to the extent of 37½ percent and of Government activity to the extent of 62½ percent. In 1929, the large money supply was the result of private business to the extent of 90 percent and of Government activity to the extent of 10 percent only.

The estimated annual personal income in the United States, of which over 60 percent is wages was in September at its all time high of $210,000,000,000, having gone up from $76,000,000,000 in 1940, and having doubled from the peak of 1929. The amount being paid out in wages alone is 50 percent more than the total personal income of the whole United States in 1940.

It is not surprising that with such income and after the restraints and self-denials of the war, consumption of goods increased. It is the tremendous buying power more than a shortage of goods that causes the present situation. The per capita consumption of meat is 25 percent in excess of that before the war. Not only are we consuming more goods than in the past, but Europe is demanding more goods of us. She hopes for many times the amount of wheat that she took from us before the war.

With this tremendous buying power in the hands of the public, rationing of beef can have but little effect on the economy as a whole. If people cannot compete for beef, they will compete for lamb or pork or chicken, and we would soon find it necessary to ration everything. Black markets would abound. To put on price controls would be equally futile. Price controls are ineffective, if prices are unrealistic. They are like a little boy who only leads the circus parade while he runs in front of it. It would take a tremendous increase of the present vast bureaucratic organization to even prepare and distribute the forms. Enforcement in time of peace would be virtually impossible. Meatless Tuesdays and eggless Thursdays are nothing but gestures, which have a tendency to increase the consumption of meat and eggs the other 6 days of the week.

THE A B C OF INFLATION

The ways to curb inflation are:

A. Decrease consumer spending.

B. Increase production, and increase the supply of goods.

C. Reduce the money supply.

If it were not necessary to consider what was socially desirable and what was politically feasible, there would be many ways to: (A) decrease spending, (B) encourage production and increase the supply, and (C) reduce the money supply.

A. Ways to decrease spending might include:

1. Real, determined, and effective reduction in Government spending. This is the first and foremost essential.

2. Increase of consumer taxes so that other taxes may be decreased or Government debt reduced thereby.

3. Encouragement of saving by increasing the rewards of thrift.

B. Ways to encourage production and increase the supply might include:

1. Reduction of taxes on production.

2. Encouragement of the retention of earnings for the modernization and expansion of production facilities.

3. Encouragement of venture capital.

4. The elimination of rent and other Government controls

5. Restriction of the exportation of goods.

6. Encouragement of the importation of goods.

C. Ways to reduce the money supply might include:

1. The elimination of those Government aids to borrowing as have developed from the activities of the RFC and FHA and crop control.

2. Increase the sale of Government bonds to the public and retire Government bonds now in the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks.

3. Have the Federal Reserve use the ample powers at its command to control the present inflationary boom and insist that the Federal Reserve in its open-market operations not add to its already large holdings of Government securities and thereby increase the money supply and augment inflation.

Although the gradual reduction of the huge Government debt by excess tax receipts over expenditures is particularly desirable, it is by no means the only way nor necessarily the most effective way of controlling the money supply.

During the war our own Federal Reserve, along with the central banks of all major participating countries, came under the complete domination of the administration. This was natural under the circumstances as, in the financing of the war, tremendous

amounts of money had to be raised. However, to insure a sound financial future, it is essential that the Federal Reserve System regain its independence of action and not be dominated by the present or any other administration. The Federal Reserve System was organized by Congress in order that a central independent authority, through its power over bank deposits and interest rates, might keep an adequate but not excessive money supply available for the operation of a free economy. Under existing laws Congress clearly has placed this responsibility squarely on the Federal Reserve, but with the present size of the national debt the Treasury is naturally keenly interested in how Federal Reserve policy affects the markets for Government securities.

The greatest difficulty with which the Federal Reserve Board has been faced in controlling the money supply and the inflation is the danger of starting a sharp deflationary movement which would be temporarily upsetting to the security and commodity markets and would be politically embarrassing to the administration.

No one questions that the administration now has ample powers to control the supply of money and could check the inflation and stop the upward spiral of wages, costs, and prices. However ways to stop inflation are not pleasant to party leaders, party workers, and Federal employees, nor is it immediately pleasant to the electorate. Higher interest rates mean higher interest charges for the taxpayer to pay. The administration talks against inflation, searches for palliatives and painless cures, but is embarked on an overall program that regardless of its merits is highly inflationary. To influence the economy and politics of Europe with money and supplies is inflationary. To maintain the most expensive Military Establishment in all peacetime history is inflationary. To increase social benefits and advocate higher wages and shorter hours is all inflationary.

On the other hand, no one questions that Congress could refuse the necessary legislation and appropriations to carry out those policies of the administration which are inflationary. However Congress reflects directly the electorate and the electorate at times seems to be obsessed with an emotional curse of benevolence and fear which blinds it to all rules and effect. The people at the grass roots are still not yet interested seriously in putting through drastic Government economy and stopping inflation. When they are interested, Congress and the administration will be responsive. In the meantime, the Treasury itself, regardless of its own ideas, must raise the large sums appropriated by the Congress.

What the voters do not realize is that for a nation which has been moving along the road to further and further inflation, there are only two courses of action: to go on, or to turn back. To stand still will inevitably end in drifting toward further inflation. To go on inflating eventually means bankruptcy, and repudiation. To choose the alternative course of turning back means actually deflating. It is useless to deceive ourselves that such a change back to sober and sound economic policies can be accomplished without encountering for a time serious economic discomforts.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

This emphasizes the difficulty of a planned economy in an unregimented democracy. Once it has reached the stage of development where he willingly hires a police officer to arrest any and all, including himself, for violating the speed laws, but he has not reached the stage where he informs on himself when he fails to obey the law, nor does his heart go out to the officer who arrests him.

To achieve permanent success those operating a planned economy must at times put into effect restraints not immediately pleasant to the electorate. Men elected to office are loath to do this and prefer to call for more power to alleviate the pain. That is why planned economy is incompatible with democracy and why it results in continual requests by the central government for more and more authority until the only solution seems to be a police state with its stunted production and low standard of living.

Europe presents many examples of the result of the philosophy of attempted prosperity through planned economy, paper money, controlled money rates and deficit spending—a philosophy which, if followed, always has and always will lead the masses along a glittering path of inflation to a slough of misery and degradation.

ROGER AMORY.

DECEMBER 1, 1947.

Soviet-Nazi Cooperation in the Extermination of Freedom in Poland in August 1944, While They Were at War With One Another

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday February 17, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there recently was published by our State Department the documentation of the Nazi-Soviet relations from 1939 to June of 1941.

The attack by Hitler on Russia did not really end the relationship between Hitler and Stalin. They could fight with one another, these two aggressors, but when either one of them was confronted with freedom and liberty you will find them fighting side by side against freedom and liberty.

Such was the case from August to September 1944 when Stalin's legions were advancing against the Nazis in Poland. The Soviets broadcasted to the Polish underground to arise in Warsaw and assist in the assault on the Nazis. But the Soviets betrayed the heroic Polish underground. They paused in the suburbs of Warsaw and thus collaborated with the Nazis while the latter proceeded to decimate the civilian population and the underground army. History probably does not contain a much blacker page of villainy than that which can be written of the Soviet high command as engineered by Stalin. Of course, Stalin had a purpose in collaborating in the extermination of the Polish underground army, his purpose was this: He wanted to set up his own Soviet Poland. He has accomplished his purpose. We now have a Soviet Poland.

Following are two installments of Mikolajczyk's story as contained in the Milwaukee Sentinel:

GENERAL BOR'S ILL-FATED STAND SADISTIC RUSS COUP

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment XVI)

The horse-faced woman Communist, Wanda Wasilewska, had just looked at me in our Moscow meeting (it was August 6, 1944), and told me that there was no fighting going on in Warsaw between the Polish Home Army and the Germans—while the Red army lolled in the suburbs hoping for the extermination of the Polish patriots.

"You're talking nonsense," I said to her, and showed her some of the frantic and heart-breaking communications I had been receiving, through the British, from General Bor-Komorowski in Warsaw since the fight began a week before.

She read through them hurriedly.

"Well, if it's true," she finally said, "the help will soon come. We want to establish ourselves there as soon as possible."

I repeated that I had seen Stalin a few nights before at the Kremlin, and that in addition to showing an interest in the plight of the Warsaw Home Army (his interest, as a matter of fact, had been negligible) he had also spoken about the future boundaries between Russia and Poland.

"If we can get together, here and now, I believe we can gain some advantage for Poland by approaching him as a unit," I appealed to these either sinister or pathetic Communist stooges.

"The Curzon line is most just for Poland," Wanda answered coolly, yielding to Russia the huge territory which the Red army had invaded as an ally of Hitler in 1939.

Andrzej Witos, the frightened little man who had become a fellow-traveler after being spared from a Red purging, spoke up now.

"But Madam," he said to the woman who had hailed the downfall of Poland in 1939 and now was established by Stalin as one of its future rulers, "I think Mikolajczyk is right. Perhaps if we got to him as a body—with you refraining from speaking for us—we can."

That is as far as he got. Rather than reveal to me that there was a difference of opinion among this so-called Polish Committee of Liberation the meeting was abruptly terminated.

I was told again, however, that there was no fighting in Warsaw and that Boleslaw Bierut, destined to become President of Red-enslaved Poland, had been there on August 4, 1944, and had reported there was no fighting. He was not there, as a matter of fact, but a lie means nothing to a Communist.

BELIEVE GENERAL SHOT

After this first meeting with the Lublin Poles, I singled out one of them, Gen Michal Rymiewski, in charge of Polish units serving in the Red Army, and gave him a true picture of the military plight of General Bor-Komorowski's forces, which had been tricked into exposing themselves in open fight against the Germans in Warsaw—a sadistic Russian setup which eventually resulted in the deaths of almost 200,000 Warsaw patriots.

He assured me he would do something about this matter, and even promised to release a fine Polish Home Army soldier, General Filipowski, who was arrested by the Reds after helping them free Lwow. But I never saw Filipowski again * * * nor did anyone else, except perhaps his Russian executioners.

MAKES CYNICAL OFFER

On the next day, August 7, I met Bierut, an old-line Communist who had given up his Polish citizenship years before, and urged him to listen to whatever Polish blood was left in him and appeal to Stalin not to take half our country from us—an ally.

"Our relations with the U. S. S. R. are more important than frontiers," he told me.

Then he made me a remarkable cynical offer. If I would return to Warsaw after its liberation, as prime minister of a Communist-controlled Polish government, he would give minor cabinet posts in that government to three other independent party leaders. It would be an 18-member government, 14 of whose members would be Lublin Poles.

"I can't even discuss that with you," I told him. "First of all, I am already the prime minister of a legally formed government which, together with its underground, was fighting the Germans when you—as a Communist—were allied with Hitler.

"I'd return to Poland tonight if I knew that we could sit down with the underground parliament and reach an agreement that would be constitutional and in the best interests of the Polish people."

WARNING FROM BIERUT

Bierut looked me over, with hostility.

"If you want to go to Poland as a friend, in complete agreement with us, we will accept you," he said. "If you attempt to go as Prime Minister of the Polish Government, which is no longer recognized by the U. S. S. R., we'll arrest you."

I got up. "I have no business here."

NO TRUST IN RED POLES

I saw Molotov and Stalin once more before I left Moscow. Molotov apparently could not trust the Lublin Poles to tell him the truth, so he had me into his office—with them—to hear with his own ears my own feelings.

As for Stalin, he was less hospitable than before, presuming that is possible.

"Can you give me your word of honor," he asked, "that there is fighting going on in Warsaw? The Lublin Poles tell me there is no fight at all."

"I can give my word of honor that there is a fight there," I told him. "It is a desperate fight, and I beg of you—who is in a good strategic position for it—to give us aid."

I had heard from Washington and London that the Russians had asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff not to provide further aid for Warsaw—a request which the western allies rejected—but I still hoped I might reach Stalin's heart.

WE'LL LIBERATE IT

"I had two of my communications officers dropped into Warsaw after I saw you the other day," he said, smoking his pipe, "but the Germans killed both of them." I discovered a few days later that both men had reached the ground safely and had sent numerous dispatches back from underground headquarters.

But at the time I had no information and expressed my regret. Stalin sighed, "I'll still do my best to help Warsaw," he said. "The Germans there are more difficult than we expected. But we'll liberate it soon."

As history knows, he waited until the Germans had killed nearly a quarter of a million of our people in the capital, and then, after the fight ceased, burned and dynamited the city to extinction with a systematic thoroughness which was possible only because the Russians remained rooted in the suburbs and simply looked on.

LIKE SADDLE ON COW

Before I left Stalin, I could not resist telling him a story from our Warsaw underground. It concerned three captured Germans and their views of Germany's future. One of the captured men predicted confidently that postwar Germany would embrace communism so devoutly that it would soon become the foremost Communist state, and then go on to rule the world.

Stalin snorted indignantly.

"Communism on a German is like a saddle on a cow," he said. He added that the Soviet Union, the United States, Great Britain, and France must remain close friends for many years after the war because one can expect Germany to start a new war after about 25 years.

STALIN IGNORED PLEA OF AID TO WARSAW

(Installment XVII)

If Roosevelt and Churchill needed any additional confirmation of the fact that they could no longer do business with Stalin—they, of course, had never been able to do so—their efforts to supply the Warsaw underground by air in the summer of 1944 should have taught them.

I besought Anglo-American aid after my successive appeals to Stalin, presented to Soviet Ambassador Lebiedov in London, began to be returned to me unopened.

In Warsaw, our undaunted home army was suffering terrible losses at the hands of the Germans. We were fighting tiger tanks with little more than home-made petrol grenades. The civilians of Warsaw were being shipped by the hundreds of thousands into slavery in Germany. Stalin had promised me early in August 1944, that the Red army would take Warsaw within a matter of a few days thereafter. Yet the Russians remained planted just outside the city, never lifting a finger to aid a courageous ally.

Churchill was the first to act. Through his intercession, the RAF began running critically needed arms, food and medical supplies by air from Italian bases, with many Polish fliers involved in the missions.

The RAF losses were heavy. German night fighters took their toll. Heavy German antiaircraft emplacements in Warsaw, free to operate because the Red Army would not come in, brought down many other relief planes. Red Army guns sometimes joined in the attacks on the relief planes.

I told Churchill of the existence of Russian-held Polish airstrips only a few miles beyond Warsaw and suggested that he make arrangements with Stalin to permit the RAF planes to land there instead of trying to fly back over those interminable miles to Italy. Many were running out of gas on the long flight home.

STALIN IGNORED PLEAS

As far as I know, Stalin never answered the appeals.

In despair, I turned then to the United States and asked Roosevelt to run a special Eighth Air Force relief mission from the British bases then being used. But I pointed out that because of the distance involved this could not be done successfully unless the American planes could land on the Polish fields adjacent to Warsaw.

Negotiations between Washington and Moscow opened in mid-August of 1944, by which time General Bor-Komorowski's forces were in tremendous peril. They were being held together by the precious crumbs the RAF dropped, some of which landed so far off the mark—the RAF missions were at night—that the supplies had to be carted as many as 80 miles to the capital, at great risk.

The American planes, which flew by day, might have a better chance of hitting their targets with supplies. But there was the imposing obstacle of Stalin to surmount.

REPLIES TO NAME DATE

After ignoring a number of messages from Washington, the Russians consented during the first week of September to permit the American planes to run a shuttle mission.

But even after consenting, the Kremlin delayed in naming a specific date for the mission. The days grew shorter, and the prospects for relief dimmer.

In mid-September, word came from Moscow that the Eighth Air Force could come immediately. But almost as the planes warmed up for the take-off, laden with arms and other sorely needed supplies, the permission was withdrawn. "Technicalities" had arisen, Stalin said. There would have to be a delay of 3 or 4 days.

During that delay, the Red Air Force suddenly appeared over Warsaw on the night of September 13–14, after the forty-fourth day of the uprising, and dropped supplies.

AMMUNITION USELESS

The ammunition they dropped did not fit the guns they dropped. The food they brought—American lend-lease rations—was dropped with either defective chutes or no chutes at all. It smashed against the ruins of Warsaw and was wasted.

But Moscow, having beaten the Americans to the aid of Warsaw, crowed happily through its propaganda mills that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was the true friend of the Polish people, and that the Americans were long on promises and short on deliveries.

The Americans finally were permitted to come on September 18. They drummed over with 104 B–17's, escorted part of the way by 200 fighters. Two of the supply-laden bombers and two fighters were lost. The desperately grateful people of Warsaw came up from their ruins and sewers to cheer the Americans. They could fight the Germans a little longer.

Simultaneously I broadcast from London:

"Today you've seen the American forces bringing help to fighting Warsaw. This is a symbol of how the Allies are trying to help you in your desperate fight. * * * I hope this help will bring you some relief in your historic fight against the Germans * * * your fight for a really free and independent Poland."

The only land attack on Warsaw made by the nearby Red Army in support of our home army was turned in by one of General Berling's Polish Kosciusko divisions. There had been some Red Army artillery shelling of certain German positions in Warsaw, spotted by home army men. But as the Kosciusko Poles forged across the Vistula to help their blood brothers in the city, that artillery fire suddenly ceased.

With no cover, the advancing Poles were annihilated by the defending German forces. General Berling was promptly removed from his command and returned to Moscow for "further training."

MOSCOW ASSAILS BOR

In September the Moscow radio opened a vicious attack on General Bor-Komorowski. The Moscow radio itself had enticed the home army to rise against the Germans on July 29—to facilitate the entry of the Red Army. But now it accused the general, and myself, of ordering a "senseless uprising."

The Americans were not permitted to run another shuttle mission. The British, too, were forced to give up in despair. Beyond all human endurance, General Bor-Komorowski surrendered to the Germans on October 2, 1944, with one last heart-breaking message from the capital:

"This is the stark truth," a shaken voice said. "We were treated worse than Hitler's satellites, worse than Italy, Rumania, Finland. May God, who is just, pass judgment on the terrible injustice suffered by the Polish Nation, and may He punish accordingly all those who are guilty."

HAILS POLISH HEROES

"Your heroes are the soldiers whose only weapons against tanks, planes, and guns were their revolvers and bottles filled with petrol. Your heroes are the women who tended the wounded and carried messages under fire, who cooked in bombed and ruined cellars to feed children and adults, and who soothed and comforted the dying. Your heroes are the children who went on quietly playing among the smouldering ruins. These are the people of Warsaw.

"Immortal is the nation that can master such universal heroism. For those who have died have conquered, and those who live on will fight on, will conquer and again bear witness that Poland lives when the Poles live."

From London I broadcast:

"Heroes of Warsaw, the 63 days of fighting will not be in vain. Through your heroic resistance once again the world has come to know that Poles prefer to die rather than live in slavery.

"You are now oppressed from both sides. In addition to the Germans, there are now

those who try to make profit from attacks on your leaders.

"I take full responsibility. A fight against an enemy occupying your country could not be avoided. It was our duty. It was in our national interest.

"We have lost one more battle, but we have not lost the war. The fight against the Germans is going on, and the victory was never as near as it is today."

A million people were living in Warsaw, or existing there, when the insurrection against the Germans began. A quarter of a million human beings were killed, wounded, or were missing by late September. Some 350,000 were forcibly evacuated, mostly to Germany, during the fighting. When the Russians finally came in the following January, they found human life only in the Praga suburb—120,000 Poles who remained there while the retreating Germans systematically leveled the city.

"Traitors. They surrendered to the Germans," the Moscow radio said of the dead and deported. And the Red Army marched into the ghostly place, bringing in their wake the NKVD men and Polish stooges, who, protected by Red Army guns, claimed the streets made sacred with the blood of a free people.

Address of Hon. Joseph C. Grew, Former Ambassador to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit a copy of an address by Hon. Joseph C. Grew, former Ambassador to Japan, which was delivered today at a meeting at the Waldorf Astoria, New York, attended by more than 400 mayors, city officials, and others at the meeting of the United States conference of mayors.

The address of Mr. Grew follows:

On January 8, 1790, George Washington, in an address to the Congress, said: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." Please let that simple but profoundly significant statement sink in. It came over a century and a half ago from the fount of political wisdom. It is just as true today as it was then. It should be written in letters of gold all over our country. It should be broadcast in clarion tones throughout the length and breadth of our land, until our people, all our people, come to realize that peace in our time inevitably depends upon a strong America. Please allow me to repeat an observation that I made in a talk to some 3,000 people in New York about 10 days ago, that what we face today is not a world governed in orderly fashion by international law but a world governed by the law of the jungle. In the jungle it is the fittest and the readiest who survive.

Gentlemen, it is a very great privilege to address you today because you represent in your persons and offices an important cross section of the American people, and in your several capacities you have an inestimable opportunity for patriotic service by squarely and straightforwardly meeting the doubts that assail so many of our people, first, as to the necessity of military preparedness; second, as to the wisdom of military preparedness; and, third, as to the means of military preparedness.

I speak today in support of the plan for universal military training. That plan has many opponents, although I find that much of that opposition, apart from the antagonism that springs from subversive elments within our gates, arises simply from a lack of understanding as to just what universal military training is. The inaccurate, indeed the utterly false conceptions of the plan that come to me from many sources and that are widespread in our country are little short of appalling. Unless overcome those misconceptions may well prove disastrous. Let us remember that it is the Congress that is going to decide whether we shall have universal military training—indeed whether we shall have any kind of adequate military preparedness—and that the Congress is the interpreter of the people's wishes and cannot and will not move very far ahead of public opinion. It is therefore public opinion that must be brought to understand the facts and not remain hamstrung by imaginary bogeys of its own fabrication.

Thank heaven for our kind of democracy in which the people have the right and the freedom to know and understand the facts, all of the facts, not only about universal military training but about what is going on in the world around us. There have been times when our Government was reluctant to tell our people the whole story because it knew that the publication of all the facts would complicate the situation by antagonizing and provoking certain foreign countries. That is one of the best arguments for preparedness that I know. This subject is far too serious to lend itself to humor, but I can't help feeling that there's a good deal of sound philosophy in the story of the dying colored man. The parson, who was kneeling by the bed, said: "Rastus, does yo' believe in de Lo'd God Almighty?" "I sho' does, Pahson." "Does yo' renounce de debil and all his works?" "Now look a-here, Pahson, de way I'se feeling right now I don' want to antagonize nobody." In a strong America our Government can afford to publish the whole truth, whether by so doing we antagonize anybody or not.

Now, as to universal military training, I have no sympathy whatever with those who have made up and closed their minds against it without understanding just what it is. There are people within our borders who oppose universal military training simply because they don't want a strong America. Some of those people I would characterize as intellectually dishonest. Others I would class as outright disloyal. But there are in our country good, substantial Americans who, even though they support military preparedness, do not believe that universal military training is the best means of achieving it. Those people deserve accurate, intelligent, and comprehensive information to meet and, it is hoped, to relieve their honest doubts.

At this point we need a little history. Do not forget that on the Archives Building in Washington, Confucius' admonition, "Study the past," and Shakespeare's reminder that "What is past is prologue" are etched in stone. I commence with the flat assertion: Without preparedness, diplomacy, democracy's first line of national defense is bankrupt. Let me give you two illustrations to support that statement.

The scene is Berlin in the winter of 1914 a few months before the outbreak of the First World War.

Some celebration was being held at the mess of one of the Prussian guard regiments to which I had been invited by a German friend. Champagne and beer had flowed freely during the evening, and, finally, with a great clanking of steins on the wooden mess table, the officers solemnly proposed a toast and drank to "der tag"—the day of war. My host was in communicative mood. I said to him, "Your group reminds me of nothing so much as of a football team which is tired of constant practice and wants a game." "You have hit the nail on the head," he replied. "Of course, we shall have that game, and it will be with our old traditional enemy, France. The French Army is weak; we shall have no trouble there. We may have to go in through Belgium; but, of course, the Belgians won't fight; they will lie down at the very start. England is a decadent nation; her military and naval power is at low ebb, and even if she wanted to fight, she knows very well that with her labor and Irish troubles, she couldn't possibly do so. No; we can count Great Britain out. And as for you in the United States, you are a pacifist nation, anyway, and how in the world could you get a single soldier across the ocean? Of course, we would torpedo every transport before it got halfway across the Atlantic." I have put his remarks in quotation marks, but, as he spoke in German, this is merely a record, though a close record, of the substance of what he said that night. How clearly I remember it today. It seemed then as merely the usual arrogant braggadocio of the Prussian officer, but I remember it on July 31, 1914. That was the thinking in Germany.

My point is this. If during those pregnant years before 1914 England had followed the sage advice of Winston Churchill and had built up Britain's power on land and sea, and if, when war threatened, Sir Edward Grey had been in a position to say to Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg: "If Germany crosses the Belgian frontier, Great Britain will be in the war within an hour," might not history have run a different course? Would the Germans have dared attack with the certain knowledge that they would have had to fight not one but two powerful nations, one of them a naval nation? Alas, Sir Edward Grey was in no position to issue such a timely warning or to convince the Germans that he could back it up with adequate force if issued. There were 4 or 5 days of fumbling, and when finally Great Britain did enter the war on August 4 it was too late to arrest the tide. Diplomacy was bankrupt. So much for that phase of history. The lesson is there for all to mark.

We move to Japan in 1931. The Japanese military people also were tired of practice and wanted a game. They also wanted to emerge from the shadow in which they had been placed by the enlightened diplomacy of Shidehara, aiming primarily at international friendship and cooperation. So they invaded Manchuria. At first they looked anxiously over their shoulders as does the ganster emerging from a pilfered storehouse, wondering whether they were going to be allowed to get away with it. Notes of protest were written—lots of them—but action? No, neither the United States nor Great Britain was prepared for action—not even for the sort of demonstration in force which might have convinced the Japanese military that they could not get away with it, nipping in the bud the trends that ultimately led to war. Another foundation stone (the first was Mussolini's attack on Corfu) had been removed from the structure of international peace, and no effective step was taken to preserve that structure from eventually toppling.

After arriving in Japan in June 1932, some 8 months after the invasion of Manchuria, I spent the first 2 months sizing up the situation and Japanese psychology, and then I wrote on August 13 to Mr. Stimson, then Secretary of State, who had clearly recognized the danger:

"Such a national temper is always dangerous. The German military machine, supported by a carefully nurtured war psychology, took the bit in its teeth and overrode all restraining influences in 1914. The Japanese military machine is not dissimilar. It has been built for war, feels prepared for war, and would welcome war. It has never yet been beaten and possesses unlimited self-confidence. I am not an alarmist but I believe that we should have our eyes open to all possible future contingencies. The facts of history would render it criminal to close them."

That was 9 years before Pearl Harbor. If, in the light of that warning, continually repeated during my 10 years in Japan, our country had been willing properly to assess the lessons of history; if our Government and people had been able to read and correctly to interpret the handwriting on the wall which was there for all to see; if in those intervening 9 years before 1941 we had built up and strengthened our military force and had created a two-ocean navy—which was just plain common sense—and had been in a position to tell the Japanese in no uncertain terms that the carrying out of their expansionist plans through aggression would not be tolerated—since they threatened not only our vital interests in the Far East but the security of the Philippines and our other possessions as well—might not a very different story have developed in the Orient? Might not even the Japanese military extremists—and there were plenty of intelligent leaders among them—have realized that they could not possibly afford to risk war with the United States? Might not the Emperor and the peace-minded elements in the Japanese Government have been given the support they so dreadfully needed, in the face of continual political assassinations, to curb the expansionist ambitions of the hotheads? I believe that history when all the evidence is available, will unquestionably corroborate this view.

But during those critical years, whenever our Government or clear-visioned men and women among our people, publicly advocated preparedness, shouts of warmongers arose all over our country. Speeches and articles by our isolationists and pacifists were prominently displayed in the Japanese press, often in banner headlines, so that the Japanese people, and especially the Japanese military people, assumed that the United States would be stopped by its own people from ever building up a military and naval force capable of fighting total war. In such circumstances, how could diplomacy, still our first line of national defense, hope to obtain a respectful hearing? Assurances were given, plenty of them, but concessions by the military were made with tongue in cheek. They were simply biding their time. Diplomacy was bankrupt. The lesson is there for all to read. History is prologue.

Let us remember that bullies do not attack the strong; they attack the weak. Let us remember the boasts of Hitler and Goering and Ribbentrop that Germany would bring England to her knees in short order, because England had allowed her military strength to disintegrate. They simply miscalculated the bull-dog tenacity and moral staying power of the Anglo-Saxon race, but it was touch and go all the same. The Japanese boasted that the United States, being militarily weak, could never survive the knock-out blow that was to be given at Pearl Harbor. Again, Japan miscalculated our tremendous potential strength. If another war comes, potential strength and bull-dog tenacity and moral staying power may not mean very much. Unless we are militarily prepared to act immediately, the play may be over before the curtain is half up.

Now a few facts about universal military training in an effort to meet honestly some of the honest doubts that assail the opponents of the plan.

First of all, what is universal military training?

Last year the President appointed a commission of nine distinguished Americans who made an exhaustive study of the problem, hearing hundreds of witnesses over a period of 6 months, and finally recommended the adoption of a plan for universal military training with a clear, strong, and unanimous conviction as an urgent military necessity. This recommendation was embodied in what has become known as the Compton report, named after the chairman of the Commission, Dr. Karl Compton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It is available to all. That report is certainly required reading for every American citizen. It states the problem in clear, simple language, and answers many of the questions and doubts that have been raised. Briefly, the report calls for the establishment of a National Security Corps, whose personnel would undergo training in the various armed services, but who would not become members of the armed forces in time of peace. These trainees would not be soldiers. They would not be in the Army or part of the Army. They would be civilians under Army supervision for military training and under civilian guidance and counsel in nonmilitary matters.

Every young man on reaching his eighteenth birthday or, at the option of the individual, with parental approval, on his seventeenth birthday, would become a member of the National Security Corps and would receive 6 months of training in camp. Any youth who was still in high school or undergoing a similar course of study could be deferred until the completion of his studies or his twentieth birthday, whichever occurred first. Exemptions are provided for those physically unfit and in cases where induction would cause financial hardship. Upon completion of the 6 months' training in camp, the trainee would be required to participate in one of several alternative defense programs, to be chosen by himself so far as quotas might permit, the majority of which could be undertaken in connection with any course of study or occupation in which the trainee might be engaged in civil life. A civilian commission is to be set up to administer the program which would provide numerous safeguards for the moral and spiritual welfare of the trainee. The UMT experiment unit at Fort Knox has been widely publicized and is a living example of the plan in action.

A bill to establish universal military training is now before the Congress. It was introduced on July 18, 1947, and is known as H. R. 4278, sponsored by Representative TOWE, of New Jersey. Referred to the Armed Services Committee, it was favorably reported by the unanimous vote of 20 to 0. At the present time this bill is pigeonholed in the Rules Committee of the House and can be brought to the floor to be debated and voted on only by consent of a majority of the members of that committee.

By refusing to place universal military training on the agenda, the House Rules Committee is denying the representatives of the American people the right to vote on this vitally needed legislation. If they and the majority leaders from whom they presumably take their cue, persist in this high-handed and intransigent course, they may well become responsible for the downfall of a free nation.

Now, its cost.

It has been said that the cost of universal military training would be prohibitive. I have the figures here, officially issued by the War Department last year, giving the actual costs of World War II, as well as the costs of universal military training as estimated by the Compton Commission. Broken down, those figures indicate that the whole cost of universal military training for 1 year would be less than the cost of 7 days of war. Let that fact sink in. If universal military training, as we who support it earnestly believe, will prove to be a powerful deterrent to war, can we afford in such a case to be penny wise, pound foolish? Is a 2-percent premium—and that is what it would amount to—too much to pay for an insurance policy against war?

Would not another world war, in this age of science, be but a push-button affair in which trained manpower would be useless?

That hypothesis can be answered in a single, simple sentence. No country, short of surrender, can ever be conquered without physical occupation, and from what I know of the American spirit I don't believe that the United States is ever going to surrender to anybody. Our cities might be destroyed, our main industrial plants might be bombed out of existence, our protecting Navy might lie at the bottom of the ocean. But American soil would still remain, and when the enemy parachutists or the enemy marines or fifth columnists within our gates swarmed over that sacred soil, then, and only then, would come the show-down. With a great reserve of trained manpower ready to be thrown into the conflict, wherever and whenever it might occur, do you believe that push buttons—short of utterly annihilating our people—could possibly bring about the conquest of the United States? Or do you believe, with William Jennings Bryan, that when in case of war "a million men would spring to arms between sunrise and sunset," those untrained men could save our country? Alas, that comfortable philosophy no longer makes sense, if it ever did make sense. Experience has shown that the casualties among untrained men are appallingly greater. An untrained, undisciplined mob of thousands would be utterly helpless against a trained and disciplined force of a few hundred men.

Why should we not place our faith in the United Nations?

The answer to that question is equally obvious and simple. The United Nations is a body of tremendous potential power to guarantee world security and peace but, alas, as the political world is functioning today, that power has not yet been achieved nor is it likely to be achieved in the foreseeable future. Let us do everything that we properly and practically can do to help give the United Nations that power; the machinery is there; all that remains to be done is to make that machinery work effectively. But until the United Nations reaches a point of development where it can convince us all that it possesses the power, the ability and the determination to guarantee peace between nations it would, I submit, be the height of folly to let down our guard in the years ahead. Rather, let us strengthen that guard by every possible means if we expect to continue to survive as a Nation.

Why shouldn't the Regular Army take care of our defense?

The Regular Army can never be maintained in time of peace at sufficient strength to win a war. Voluntary enlistments will never be adequate, nor would our people stand for peacetime military conscription. UMT is not military conscription. The young men in training would not be soldiers. They would not be liable for any peacetime service in the armed forces. They would form a pool of trained men all over our country, available to protect our own communities in case of disaster at home, and available in the National Guard and the Organized Reserves if and when needed. Barring a national emergency declared by Congress, the whole project would be subject at all times to civilian control.

Would not UMT create the danger of militarism in our country?

Definitely, no. The character, ideals, and history of our people is the best answer to that question. In the aggressive-minded countries, militarily trained forces were built to implement prior plans for war as history has clearly revealed. In our country, no one wants war, least of all the 15,000,000 men who have served in the armed forces. The war veteran is our most sincere advocate of

peace for he knows the horrors of war about which the pacifist talks. He is the greatest proponent for universal military training because he knows that it is the best means of preserving peace. The major veterans' organizations are unanimously for it. A mercenary army can easily become the tool of a dictator. A people's army cannot be so used. Throughout the life of this Republic, we have had what is known as the militia in which every male citizen capable of bearing arms is charged with the responsibility of protecting his country in the hour of need. Let us not forget the minutemen of Lexington. Universal military training vitalizes and brings this doctrine up to date. Such training has not made militaristic states of Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Holland, France, or Switzerland. Our military leaders, such as Marshall, King, Arnold, Eisenhower, Nimitz, Bradley, Halsey, MacArthur, are not Junkers. They are Americans, believing in and practicing the American way of life. Military pomp has no appeal to these men nor to the American people. No general or admiral ever requested Congress to declare war, nor does the Army have the power to mobilize the Nation's Reserves. Only Congress can declare war or authorize the mobilization of military forces.

But is universal military training not still conscription, opposed to our way of life?

Our jurisprudence does not rest on a voluntary jury system. Our taxes are not based on a voluntary taxpaying system. Our educational system is compulsory. Universal military training would simply be compulsory education in self-defense and in the defense of home and country—a purpose much more significant in consequences than many other forms of compulsion. Men lie dead in Europe and the Pacific today because their fellow Americans were not trained in time or in sufficient numbers in peacetime to come to their assistance.

Interruption of education: Our GI's have answered part of that question. After long interruption of their academic education, they are back in schools and colleges with renewed determination to learn. Experience in the armed forces has whetted their desire for an education. They have seen the stern side of life. They are determined to face it courageously. They have responded with an earnestness and performance well above the peacetime average.

Time spent in military training is not lost. Anything that constructively employs the mind or body contributes to their development. In the business of military training, the field of leadership is wide open. The boy in training who shows leadership qualities soon becomes a corporal. He may have 10 men under him. He is responsible that they keep their living quarters in order, that they comply with sanitary measures. He leads them on the drill and training field. As a sergeant, he takes on additional responsibilities. There are few comparable opportunities in civil life for a youth of the same age to develop his latent leadership ability.

Not all men possess the qualities of leadership. But business, industry, and the professions and the armed forces are all crying for men who do. They are in great demand. They command high compensation in civilian life. Military training will not make a leader, but it will serve to develop one who has the basic qualities for leadership.

This training, too, would certainly contribute to civic consciousness. Civic irresponsibility is a major problem in our democratic way of life. Civic discipline is needed. The men trained under universal military training would supply it. In returning to school or college at the end of their period of training, they would make better students because of greater maturity and because of a greater incentive and eagerness to learn and to develop ability. This has been proven. Universal military training would make them better citizens with a better sense of responsibility and of the importance of teamwork in the community, and it would make them better men, physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually. Safeguards against moral looseness will be part and parcel of the plan, while religious opportunities will be amplified and emphasized. There are things to be gained in life over and above mere academic education.

Would universal military training cause international distrust?

The statesmen in whom this country has confided its representation in the United Nations and who have taken the lead in making that body an instrument of peace are unanimous in asserting that the very best guaranty of a successful United Nations is a strong United States. Demonstrated military weakness on our part now will definitely detract from the possibility of attaining permanent world peace through United Nations action.

Certainly the peaceful peoples of the world, especially the smaller, weaker nations, will feel much more secure if the United States remains strong militarily than if it does not. It requires little imagination to understand that.

We have repeatedly demonstrated our nonaggressive attitude and have proved our peaceful intentions. We have twice come to the rescue of victims of aggression by powerful nations, in our own interest as well as theirs. We have carried the banner of humanity in wars for civilization—the goal toward which we direct the progress of this Nation, asking nothing for ourselves but the right to live as we wish in a world of free and friendly neighbors. Who would come to our rescue if we were attacked and overrun?

No nation has cause to distrust our purposes, nor to believe that we want war or would provoke war. In the United States, universal military training would be a peace program, not a program for war.

Should we not devote to the building of planes and air power the money that would go for universal military training?

Planes and air power are absolutely essential in any program of defense. But air power alone cannot win a war or even guarantee the safety of our country from occupation by enemy forces. In the final show-down in any war, it will be trained manpower on foot that will either conquer or prevent conquest. Let there be no doubt whatever about that.

And, finally, the net result.

It is my considered view that universal military training, in conjunction with other elements in a comprehensive security program, may, even in the lifetime of many of us here today, mean the difference between the conquest and totalitarian enslavement of the United States on the one hand and, on the other, continued peace and a continuance of our democratic way of life.

All or Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hope that those people who are urging the spending of $17,000,000,000 under the Marshall plan for European recovery and to prevent communism will examine carefully the amounts allocated to each of the various countries under the plan.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following copy of a broadcast made by Henry J. Taylor on January 16, 1948:

ALL OR NOTHING

Is the latest European recovery plan—calling for over $17,000,000,000—primarily an anti-Communist measure, necessary because civilization is at stake? How many people know that a third of the money goes to England? Let's hear some facts that affect us all.

I've been traveling around our country a good deal. In the last couple of weeks alone I covered several thousand miles. There's a feeling of frustration across our land about sending new billions abroad, regardless of how good our objective may be. We want to help Europe. But we feel we are getting a hooking, like a fish, all the time we're doing it.

From the workingman's viewpoint I think the reason why we feel this way is because we don't know what we're doing. We are not told honestly.

We've already spent $22,000,000,000 abroad since the war. That represents a charge of $450 against every family in America. Yet do most of us know where that money went? We do not. Now, on the new $17,000,000,000, it's been a case of dig, dig, dig in the dark in the State Department, even to get the break-down of which countries get the money.

WE ARE ENTITLED TO KNOW

Yet who is more entitled to that information than the working people of our country, who pay the bill? We are at least entitled to know where the new billions go.

Let me give you a little background on this picture. When I was in Paris in September, while the 16 European nations were deciding among themselves what their shares would be, and were adding up the total under the direction of British Foreign Secretary Bevin, I had their figures showing what each country intended to get. But since I've come back to our country, the State Department has been insisting that it would be inaccurate to use those Paris figures in describing where the money would go, because the figures would be changed. They were not final. Wait and see, said the State Department, until the Marshall plan is finally and officially presented to Congress, and the appropriation is asked for. It sounded fair enough.

FIGURES UNDER WRAPS

But when the plan was officially presented on December 19, and the money asked for, even then the figures as to how much of our money the individual countries were to get were left out. I was unable to get these figures officially until last Saturday. Only then did the fact come out that a third of the whole $17,000,000,000 is slated to go to England—$5,438,000,000 to be exact. Only then was it revealed that $2,436,000,000 goes to little Holland.

Why were these figures kept under wraps? It's the same old story, I'm afraid, of thinking that the end justifies the means.

THE PROPAGANDA POLL

Here is what took place. When the State Department was getting ready to present its latest European recovery plan, the Department's publicity people took a private poll across our country to find out what the public's reaction would be. They quietly made a survey, for the Department's own propaganda guidance, on how best to present the plan to Congress and the people, in order to persuade us to take it and like it. What feature would have the biggest pull?

"STOP COMMUNISM" NOT SOLE MOTIVE

They discovered that the new $17,000,000,000 proposition would sell best if the whole thing were presented on an anti-Communist basis. It would be most successful if it was offered as a means of forestalling communism in places where communism would otherwise spread.

Perhaps a sound case for spending this amount of money could have been made out. I doubt it. But I'm not sure, because those questions are very complex. But in any event, they did not make out a sound case. They chose their propaganda line and stuck to it.

Yet the argument was valid only in certain places like Italy. It had no application, for example, to the half billion they proposed to give to Ireland—which is about as little on the verge of voting Communist as any place in the world, and where western civilization is no more crumbling than it is in Saginaw, Mich., which was still standing intact when I left there last night.

PROPAGANDA MISLEADING

Nevertheless, you'll notice that the whole build-up of the presentation was on that anti-Communist feature—and on an all or nothing basis. This presentation simply did not jibe with the country-by-country figures I obtained in Paris. But as I said, the State Department refused to let the cat out of the bag.

After a series of huddles, the planners decided it was absolutely impossible for them to reveal, even in the official presentation to Congress, what countries would get the money. These figures were fundamental in constructing the 131-page plan itself. But to avoid completely crossing themselves up on their own propaganda, they had to toss the whole thing out in a lump total for all 16 countries.

WHO GETS THE MONEY?

Now, nobody thinks England is on the verge of voting communistic. For reasons like this, the list simply could not pass inspection. The vital question is, "Who gets the money?" That's what I spoke about on my broadcast January 12.

After that broadcast, telephone calls and telegrams began to come in from Washington, and from all across the country, because the people—and many Senators and Congressmen, too—had been in the dark about the simple truth.

"I've been invited to appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee in Washington. I shall be very glad to do so.

AS NOW WRITTEN

Who gets our money under the plan as now written? In addition to what I have already said about certain items, let me give you the whole list tonight:

England, $5,348,000,000.
France, $3,701,000,000.
Italy, $2,913,000,000.
American and French zones of Germany, $2,499,000,000. (Now, that has a legitimate Communist angle.)
Holland, $2,436,000,000.
Belgium and Luxemburg, $1,419,000,000.
Austria, $713,000,000.
Denmark, $582,000,000.
Ireland, $497,000,000.
Greece (extra), $473,000,000.
Norway, $234,000,000.
Portugal, $150,000,000.
Iceland, $38,000,000.
Turkey, $18,000,000.

Sweden and Switzerland, praise be, asked us for nothing. They may, in fact, end up with a favorable balance, totaling $176,000,000.

Along with the International Bank's contribution, which is also, incidentally, 80 percent our money, that's where our hard-earned money is scheduled to go.

IMPROPERLY PRESENTED TO THE PEOPLE

Now, I ask you to look a little ahead. When the facts are fully exposed, I'm sure you will see that the State Department will switch away from the anti-Communist angle, as quickly as possible, and call in the military. We'll be told that the European recovery plan is cheaper and better than fighting another war—as if anything were not better than that, and as if $17,000,000,000 could save us from another war if Russia wants to have one. What an unfair and misleading choice for them to present to us.

The objectives of the Marshall plan are good. But there are great weaknesses in it as an actual proposal and commitment. Nor has it been properly presented to the American people. The air should be pumped out of it. The propaganda should be shelved.

I'm convinced that Congress, now getting the facts, and with more facts to come, will not pass the Marshall plan as presented. It will not approve the amount requested on an all or nothing basis. It will completely alter the proposed methods of administrating the undertaking—if it is undertaken at all.

We are all entitled to the facts. For all of us, every one of us, is called on to pay the bill in your land and mine.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

CAN INDUSTRY STABILIZE JOBS AND INCOMES?

Question. What can be done to help stabilize the jobs and incomes of workers in production industries?

Answer. With new products and processes constantly displacing old ones, things are changing awfully fast. The constant change in customers' tastes and demands also complicates the problem of stabilizing employment and income in many production industries. These problems are affected by consumer or supplier practices, or customer habits. We all live a much more seasonal life as buyers than we realize.

Stabilization of employment is further complicated by many conflicting governmental and trade-union practices. However, progress is never made in any field simply by saying that nothing can be done. Within the area of management, much can be done. A good deal is being done. Furthermore, the possible benefits are more than worth the effort.

To the extent that management makes progress in employment stabilization within its own operations, in its own community, progress will be made across our land.

But there are two legal complications in the development of forward-looking plans and programs to stabilize unemployment and income. First, present tax laws make it difficult to establish and operate plans that naturally require setting aside reserves. These laws do not recognize such reserves as an ordinary operating business expense at the time they may be set up. Again, rigid provisions of the wage-hour law, with respect to the payment of overtime, severely restrict the possibility for employment and income stabilization for many companies.

We want a progressive, forward-looking economy. We want the best security we can muster. To that end, these laws should be modified so that they will promote and stimulate, instead of restrict, constructive management efforts toward employment stabilization.

A PRIMER ON AMERICANISM

Question. Is there such a thing as a down-to-earth, simple, elementary primer on Americanism versus collectivism?

Answer. There are very few clear, concise, good books dealing with the fundamentals and the human advantages of our country's unique economic system, which gives us the highest standard of living in the world. However, I've been reading a new and important book that fills the bill and costs only $1. It's entitled "Mainspring," by Henry G. Weaver. It's published by the Talbot Books Co., Detroit. I found it fascinating reading.

Let me give you an idea of the author's approach. He says in the introduction, and I quote his words, "I realize that America is far from perfect, but in recent years the negative side has been so much overstressed that I make no apologies for concentrating on the doughnut instead of the hole."

I'm for that.

Address at Dinner of B'nai B'rith by Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me Monday, February 2, 1948, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., introducing Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, Chief of Naval Operations, at dinner of B'nai B'rith:

ADDRESS OF HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Goldman, Admiral Denfeld, Colonel Niles, members and distinguished guests of B'nai B'rith, it doesn't seem quite possible a year has passed since your last annual dinner when you invited me to be your guest of honor. That evening 1 year ago was a memorable occasion for me and one of the great events of my life. It was at this annual dinner 1 year ago that your late distinguished leader and president of B'nai B'rith, Mr. Henry Monsky, praised my work for the veterans of our country.

Since this time 1 year ago you have elected a new president, Mr. Frank Goldman, of Lowell, Mass., to take up and carry on the wonderful work of Mr. Monsky. I cannot tell you how delighted I am with your selection. Mr. Goldman has lived in my city and his city of Lowell all of his life. We have known each other many years. We have been interested in many of the same activities. We have worked together and have accomplished many benefits for our city and Commonwealth. Today Mr. Goldman is one of the outstanding lawyers in Massachusetts; is a highly respected citizen and an honorable gentleman. You may call it local pride if you wish, but I want you to know all of us are very proud of Mr. Goldman in Lowell. We know his ability. We know his accomplishments. We know his leadership. We know his honesty, integrity, fairness, and untiring efforts to always help when help is needed. Under the leadership of Mr. Goldman, B'nai B'rith will march ahead for he brings to your great organization wisdom, reasonableness, consideration, courage, honesty, and fairness. Thank you, Mr. Goldman, for your fine tribute to me in your introduction. In reply I can say I am delighted you have the honor to be the leader of this great and fine organization. Our city of Lowell is proud of you. So is our Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

I am delighted you invited me to introduce your guest of honor this evening. I know that in spite of many thrilling and memorable events in his life that he too will look upon this occasion as one of the finest in his life.

As many of you here this evening know, I have had the privilege for many years to serve our disabled veterans. I am devoted to these men and their problems—these men who have suffered for the glory of their country—these men who have felt the bite of enemy's steel. I shall strive to help them so long as I live. Regardless of the service I have given, however, I want you to believe

me, ladies and gentlemen, when I say to you, I wish there were no veterans of any war. I wish mankind could have avoided war. I wish that mankind had sheathed the sword, a long time ago. I hate war just as all of you do. As we turn our faces and thoughts toward the future, however, we know most certainly that regardless of our hatred for war we must be completely prepared to meet war if it should come. We know we must be ready with every modern weapon and technique to resist and successfully meet the challenge of any foolish enemy resorting to war.

In the past during World Wars I and II, our allies were sufficiently strong to hold the enemy until the United States could get ready. Regardless of American efficiency a long period of time was required for the United States to reach the peak of its war potential both in industry and training. This brings me to a very important point. It is this: When the next war begins there will be no time for America to prepare. Our country will be in jeopardy and the enemy will be attempting to strike our great industrial centers and our Capitol in an all-out effort to suddenly destroy our war-making potential and force us to our knees. We will not have any precious months in which to prepare. We will not be able to make our plans then. My point is this, ladies and gentlemen: We must make our plans now, we must prepare now, if we are to be able to prevent the enemy from destroying our country. These are the days—today, tomorrow, and the next—when we should be preparing. This is the time and the only time we will have. These are precious hours.

The question arises how can we accomplish this necessary preparedness. I believe it is the duty of the free people in this great country, to demand that Congress provide the funds for strong, adequate, military forces.

Tonight we are honoring a great naval officer, so I shall invite your attention to what naval preparedness means to the security of this country. Don't be fooled or misled by anyone for selfish reasons trying to make you believe the day of the great navy is over. On the contrary, it is just beginning. Such foolish statements, and I have seen quite a number of them lately, if intentionally and seriously made, are vitally interfering with the Nation's security and are on the level of sabotage. Persons making such statements should not be permitted the honor of serving our country.

The Navy today is the country's first line of offense. The development of huge modern carriers, which can withstand any kind of an attack or bombardment, give the Navy floating air bases from which its airplanes can strike the enemy at any time, anywhere in the world. The fact these carriers can move from one place to another—that any number can be concentrated in a certain place or dispersed to several different places—provides the Navy with the method of concentrating power where power is needed.

When war comes the airplanes of the Navy's huge mobile air bases, constituting a completely organized fighting system, will be the first to strike the enemy. They will carry the fight to the enemy instantly. They will not have to capture bases first before they can fight because in these carriers the Navy will possess a completely organized mobile air base that is practically indestructible.

In addition, the Navy of the future will possess subsurface fleets able to inflict great damage on the enemy. The modern submarine can travel very deep in the sea and shoot at its target without coming to the surface. The important point is that due to modern invention it will not miss the target.

These great ships and airplanes which mean so much to the security of the United States are of little value in the planning stage or on the drawing boards. We do not want phantom ships. They must be real. They must exist, fully equipped and completely manned. This is preparedness.

To be prepared, however, costs money. It is very unwise for the Congress to limit the necessary funds to provide adequate military strength because of politics or trumped-up duty elsewhere. We must first be certain of our own security. We must be able to protect our country and our freedom, or we will lose both. The Congress needs your support and the support of all patriotic citizens throughout the Nation. With such support, I believe that sense, rather than politics, will prevail.

The guest of honor tonight is a naval officer of vast experience. He has served on every type of naval ship. He has been in command of both surface ships and submarines. He has commanded destroyer divisions and battleship divisions. In the First World War, as a young naval officer, he was attached to a destroyer force operating in the North Atlantic. In World War II his flagship, the *Wisconsin*, operated in support of the Okinawa landings and participated in shore bombardments of Hokkaido and Honshu, of the Japanese home islands. In addition, he has held a number of top positions in the Navy Department, such as Chief of Naval Personnel and Deputy Chief of Naval Operations. He knows the sea and knows the problems of a fleet fighting at sea. Likewise, he knows the business of naval operations.

I have known the guest of honor and his charming wife for many years. His professional ability as a naval officer has been demonstrated in his excellent performance of duty in the most responsible assignments in the Navy. His complete fairness in dealing with complicated issues is outstanding, while his understanding of people with his ability to properly evaluate the human element involved in decisions is a remarkable quality. His consideration of everyone from seaman and office boy, to flag officers and the most distinguished individuals with whom he has personal contact, illustrates his friendliness and warm human quality. He shoulders a great responsibility, but he is equal to the job which must be accomplished.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have the high honor to present to you, a veteran of three wars, one of the most distinguished sailors in the history of the United States Navy—possessor of the Legion of Merit, the Distinguished Service Cross, and other decorations—the Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Louis E. Denfeld.

ADDRESS OF ADMIRAL LOUIS E. DENFELD, UNITED STATES NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

I am very much honored at being introduced by so charming and distinguished a lady as Mrs. ROGERS. It was my privilege last year to join you in tribute to her, and I welcome this opportunity to express once again my admiration of her outstanding accomplishments. I know of no one else who has the interest of millions of veterans more at heart, or who is working with greater vigor, determination, and wisdom to insure them the happiness they so richly deserve. I wish her every success in her continuing efforts to make the United States an even better place in which all of us may live.

I feel very strongly that it is the membership of B'nai B'rith, and not myself, who should receive the plaudits tonight. Few organizations contributed as much as yours during the war to the comfort and welfare of naval personnel. I wish everyone could hear of your Serve-a-Ship program. I wonder how many people know that the officers and men of over 800 naval vessels were beneficiaries of that program? The radios, games, musical instruments and dozens of other items you gave did more than fill up the idle moments of fighting men and make life at sea a little easier—they helped to win the war. The checker game that relaxed a man on the eve of battle enabled him to shoot down a suicide plane and save a ship. Multiply that instance a thousandfold and you will have an idea—but still only an idea—of the value of your contribution.

I am glad that Col. Eliot Niles is here tonight, for as originator and director of the Serve-a-Ship program, I want to thank him publicly for all he has done. I remember that while talking to him sometime ago about those 800 ships the B'nai B'rith helped to outfit, he remarked, "Admiral, if you fellows had let the war go on a little longer, we would have taken care of every ship in the Navy." Now that would have been a pretty large order because at the peak of our wartime strength we had over 7,000 ships in commission. But with all the vigor and determination Colonel Niles possesses, I'm not sure but what he would have made good his promise if we had given him half a chance.

It's difficult for me to talk of the Navy's welfare and recreational programs without mentioning the men whose time and energies are largely devoted to supervising and furthering them. I refer, of course, to the Navy Chaplain Corps. I doubt if there is an officer or man in the Navy or Marine Corps who cannot tell you of at least one instance in which a chaplain contributed directly to his mental, moral, or spiritual welfare. Our ministers, rabbis, and priests are as much a part of the Navy as a captain in command of a ship—and just as important. We want to strengthen our Chaplain Corps and bring it into even greater prominence, for the men and women who serve in the armed forces today are self-respecting, honorable, and proud, and they are entitled to the same spiritual guidance and comfort as other young Americans. Only with the help of chaplains in all branches of service, can they continue to be mentally, physically, and spiritually equipped to resist successfully any threat to this country's freedom.

I know all of you are interested these days in the general state of efficiency of the armed forces and their ability to defend the United States against attack. The world situation is far from what we would like it to be, and even though we continue to plan for peace we can't overlook the possibility that another emergency may arise. We hope we will never have to go to war again, but if we do we want to be prepared. We were caught short twice before, and suffered badly as a result. Today, with all the new weapons that science has invented, we can hardly afford to get ready after hostilities have commenced. We might lose the war before we were even ready to fight it.

The various branches of the armed forces are now down to their normal peacetime size. The Navy went from a force of over 3,000,000 officers and men down to one of approximately 42,000 officers and 350,000 men. As I said before, we had over 7,000 ships at our peak wartime strength. Today there are approximately 300 combatant types on active duty.

Fortunately, we are a little better off than these figures would indicate. For one thing, we have 2,400 vessels in the reserve fleet, berthed along the east and west coasts. For another, we have more than 900,000 officers and men in the Naval Reserve, and we hope to increase this figure in the near future to the full 1,150,000 authorized by Congress.

The ships and personnel we have in reserve constitute a safety factor which increases our strength considerably. If we could put them into action at the drop of a hat we wouldn't have much to worry about, but, unfortunately, this isn't possible. The ships have to be made ready for sea, trained crews have to be put together to man them, and aircraft and pilots have to be provided for our strong air arm. This could take from

3 to 9 months, depending upon circumstances.

Because of this anticipated delay in getting the reserve forces mobilized, our emphasis is placed upon keeping the active fleets ready to go. We have stripped our shore establishments of all the men they could spare, and put them aboard ships on active duty. This enables our fleets to operate at nearly full strength. We are also giving them priority in essential equipment. We want the forces available today to be ready to go, and without a moment's delay.

Those of us in the Navy fully realize that somewhere between considerations of national economy and national security a proper balance must be struck. We don't want to place an additional load upon a taxpayer who is already overburdened. At the same time, we share with the other armed forces a responsibility to protect this country against attack. The best way I know of to insure that neither security nor economy suffer at the expense of the other, is to give the public all the facts pertaining to both.

The Navy in its present size is a mobile force for taking care of our commitments in the Mediterranean, the Far East, and other parts of the world, and guarding our vital trade routes. But it is still a force capable of delivering powerful blows. We learned during World War II that the fast-carrier task force is one of the most effective ways of hitting an enemy hard and often, and our peacetime Navy is built largely around the carrier. We have two main fleets, one in the Atlantic and one in the Pacific, and each of these contains all the air, surface, submarine, amphibious, and supply units necessary to a balanced Navy.

I should like to stress the word "balanced" in talking of the Navy, because unbalanced naval forces are nearly as ineffective as none at all. It used to be that a Navy consisted of surface ships and nothing else. The submarine and airplane have changed all that. It was first thought that the submarine and then the airplane would do away with the need for surface ships, but to the surprise of everyone except Navy men, it turned out that they only helped the surface ship do even greater damage. Most of you probably remember the last few months of the war, when our battleships approached to within a few miles of the Japanese coast and dropped 16-inch shells into many vital targets. They wouldn't have been able to do that if carrier-based aircraft hadn't first swept the skies of enemy opposition, and destroyed planes on many fields in Japan. At the same time our submarines were lying just off the Japanese ports and sinking vessels loaded with imports essential to the enemy's war production. Seapower is no longer expressed by surface ships alone, but by aircraft, submarines, and surface ships all trained together and acting together to defeat the enemy in any part of the world.

Germany made a great mistake when she tried to win control of the Atlantic with submarines alone. Her Navy was a prize example of an unbalanced naval force. If she had had the surface ships and carrier-based aircraft to back up her submarines, she would have given us a bad time of it. As it was, her efforts were foredoomed to failure.

I can assure you that we are not going to make the same mistake. We have a well-balanced Navy today, and we intend to keep it that way.

The same principle of balance which is so important within the Navy, applies equally well to our entire defense establishment. The Navy is only one member of a team composed of the armed forces of the United States. No one member of the team can win a war by itself. Each must coordinate its efforts with those of the others. This becomes even more important as science devises newer and more effective weapons of warfare.

A much needed step to facilitate and further the coordination between the various branches of the armed forces was taken with the passage of the National Security Act of 1947. For the first time in our history we have a closely integrated defense organization, and we can't help but benefit by it. I had a chance to see unification work out in the Pacific, just before returning to Washington this time, and I was deeply impressed. At my headquarters at Pearl Harbor I met with representatives of the Army and Air Force at least once a week. During those discussions we talked over each others problems and decided how we could best act together to overcome them. We always knew each others viewpoint and there were no secrets kept from anyone. As a result, we were able to accomplish much more than we could have by acting independently. We not only obtained greater economy, but greater efficiency as well.

I am glad that as Chief of Naval Operations I will have the opportunity to do even more to further the spirit of unification. Only with closely knit and well-balanced fighting forces can we hope to safeguard our freedom.

The Navy is not just ships, planes, and submarines. It is a group of men—skilled, alert, and intelligent young men—who are trained in the ways of the sea and who use whatever tools are at hand to do their job. Yesterday they used machine guns, torpedoes, and shells to accomplish their mission. Tomorrow they may use rockets, jet-propulsion, and atomic energy. Whether or not they always have all the tools they need depends entirely upon you and other Americans. I said before that a well-informed public was our best guaranty that our national security would never be jeopardized. In line with this, I intend to see that as much information as possible about the Navy continues to reach the people of this country. There are certain things we can't talk about, but there is much that we can tell you. When you understand the job the Navy would have to do in the advent of another emergency, and realize how many men and how much equipment it would take to do that job, there will be no question in your minds about spending the money necessary for national defense.

I wish more people and more organizations would display the same interest in the Navy and its personnel that B'nai B'rith does. It would make our job a lot easier. I know I speak for every officer and man of the naval service in thanking you for all that you have done, and continue to do, for them. The type of public-spirited and patriotic action you demonstrate, be made our country the great Nation it is today. It is this same type of public-spirited and patriotic action that will enable the United States to remain always a great, free, and proud Nation.

End the Steel Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harold J. Ruttenberg, from Harper's magazine:

END THE STEEL FAMINE
(By Harold J. Ruttenberg)

(Harold J. Ruttenberg is probably the only man who has seen steel from three points of view: Management, union, and government. He was research director of the steel workers' union, then an Assistant Director of the WPB Steel Division, and now is vice president of the Portsmouth Steel Corp.)

The Marshall plan, now creeping slowly for lack of grain, will be stopped cold this year for lack of steel. While the politicians can temporarily get some people to eat less and get everybody to pay the same price for a smaller loaf of bread to launch the Marshall plan, they can't do that with steel. Workers won't vote themselves into unemployment and industrialists won't vote their companies into the red by shipping the steel abroad that they need at home to provide jobs and profits. An Emergency Food Committee can appeal to Americans' inherent humanity in 1947, but an Emergency Steel Committee in 1948 would only draw boos from the Nation's workers and a sit-down strike from the industrialists. And the politicians would support both—witness their present outcry against exporting steel pipe that their farmer and oil-company constituents are short of because there is not enough steel capacity in America or the world.

This persistent steel shortage has the big names of the large steel producers dizzy. For the past 2 years they have semiannually predicted the end of the steel shortage in 6 months, only to find it persisting at the end of each 6-month period since VJ-day. Now they give the steel shortage two more years of life. Is their new prediction any more trustworthy than their previously discredited ones?

Gen George C. Marshall saw his military plans delayed at the war's start for lack of steel. Is he also going to see his peace plans delayed for lack of steel? I say that he will. The American Iron and Steel Institute and its big names from its big-company members say, "No." Which counsel should the general and America heed?

But, you may ask, isn't the whole controversy about the adequacy of steel capacity settled anyway by the industry's announcement of a billion dollar expansion program? Unfortunately not, because, as I shall reveal later, this announcement carried in newspaper ads is a phony.

At times like these the record is always a valuable thing to examine. These prognosticators of the American Iron and Steel Institute, to be sure, are the same men who "out of 40 years of personal, practical experience in the steel industry" predicted that there was enough steel in 1941 to fight the war; who contended during the war that the new steel capacity under construction would not be finished in time to help win the war; and who prognosticated that building steel capacity to over 90,000,000 tons a year would result in ever so many idle steel plants in the postwar era. I shudder to ponder where our economy and the world would be today if we did not have the 10,000,000 tons of pig iron and 14,000,000 tons of steel capacity that were built during the war.

Why have these men of such great practical experience in steel been so wrong on steel capacity? Old Andrew Carnegie could tell them. One has to know more than the steel industry to know whether and when there is enough steel. This is a basic question of world-wide economics and international relations. The present steel crowd lack the insight of their greatest predecessor, the venerable Andy Carnegie. In fact many of them are quick to point how little old Andy knew about steel, and his knowledge of steel was limited. But his success grew out of his profound knowledge of the relationship of the iron and steel industry to the economy as a whole and to the world. It is here that the current-day leaders of steel are demonstrating their abysmal ignorance in public, and have been doing so since their Gano Dunn reports of early 1940 (which discounted the need for additional steel capacity)—reports so obviously shortsighted that even an insignificant research director of a steel labor

union knew they were dead wrong, and said so.

Two personal experiences are revealing. After I had had the benefit of a year as a top official of the steel division of the War Production Board, I freely said that the postwar world would use all of our steel capacity (so greatly expanded during the war) and still cry for more. The president of one of the largest steel producers warned me that I was going to look silly for making such loose statements. I replied, "Yes, but if I'm right, look how much more silly you are going to look."

"Not a chance, boy, not a chance," laughed this man, who said steel would be lucky to run at 70 percent of capacity after VJ-day.

After I became vice president of one of the country's integrated steel producers, I spent an afternoon in this president's office. "How do you like the steel business, Harold?" said he.

"Fine, just fine," I replied, "but what happened to your 70 percent forecast?"

"I was right about steel, but I didn't fully take into account all the outside factors," he answered. This steel firm head is beginning to understand what was old Andy's chief stock in trade.

Experience No. 2. The War Production Board Steel Division is trying to perpetuate itself, and so far has succeeded. At its second annual reunion in Pittsburgh last May I was eating lunch with a dozen of my WPB associates including two of its former directors who are steel company presidents. With us was an ex-college professor turned personnel man. He was talking about broader steel items than prices, the demand for stainless, and rails.

"What we need, and nobody has yet done," he said, "is a definitive statement of our industrial culture."

"What's that?" he was rudely interrupted. And another brilliant mind chirped, "How much does it sell for a ton?"

I did not join the belly-laughs, but looked at each tormentor of the ex-professor.

Too smooth over the wisecracks, a steel man of 40 years' experience asked "What do you mean by industrial culture?"

The tormented man went on and he sounded a little like Lewis Mumford, whose Technics and Civilization ought to be required reading before anyone is allowed to learn about steel, metallurgy.

"Very interesting. I never heard it called industrial culture before," replied the man with 40 years of steel experience.

But, fully 40 years before, old Andy had given speeches and written articles and books about (and even given money for) things that had to do with a culture that was being radically changed by the industries that these how-much-a-ton fellows manage.

The mere fact that a man has 40 years of practical steel experience behind him does not qualify him as the supreme judge of the adequacy of his industry's capacity. These men whose foreheads are wrinkled with years of steel experience were wrong in 1941 not because they didn't know steel, but because they lacked the imagination to envision the insatiable appetite for steel of a total war. Yet an historical knowledge of what the Civil War did for our then struggling iron industry, of how the Spanish-American War brought our budding steel industry to maturity, and of how short we were of steel in World War I led me to the obvious conclusion that there was not enough iron and steel capacity to wage a new world war that was to make a rehearsal of its predecessor. So I ventured the assertion that our 1940 steel capacity was inadequate, and campaigned through the CIO and the Truman committee to expand it before Pearl Harbor. Steel and iron facilities were not only expanded during the war, but enough of them were completed to help win the war.

I urge General Marshall, whose military plans were delayed by the well meaning but shortsighted leaders of the steel industry, not to be misled again by the same type of best-intentioned shortsightedness. There is just not enough steel capacity to carry through the general's peace plans and also operate our own economy adequately.

I would like to ask my fellow steel executives how many automobiles, tractors, and tin cans our economy would be producing today if our steel industry were without the iron and steel facilities built during the war. And also whether we would have over 60,000,000 jobs today if we could produce only 75,000,000 tons of steel ingots instead of the present 85,000,000 tons?

The 60,000,000 job debate just before war's end sheds light on the current steel-capacity debate. The 60,000,000 jobbers (I was one) said that (1) unless the Government did so and so, plus several other things, (2) 60,000,000 jobs could not be created in the postwar years. The opponents said that (1) no matter what is done by Government or anybody else, (2) 60,000,000 jobs were a pipe dream and could not be achieved in the immediate postwar years. Both were wrong. The program of action so essential to get 60,000,000 jobs was not adopted, yet the 60,000,000 jobs that could not be furnished are with us today.

Why? I don't pretend to know (for sure), but I suspect that the answer lies in the same factors that are causing the enduring postwar steel shortage which has every promise of persisting.

When I was in Washington I had access to reports and people who knew what was happening to the steel industry in other countries. They were unanimous: While the United States produced 43 percent of the world's steel in 1940, after the war she was going to have to produce well over 50 percent of it. This, combined with a little historical look at our own economy, led me to the forthright conclusion that after the war the steel industry would be in for a boom that would make the industry's heads dizzy. And they have been seen to appear dizzy in recent months.

I recently heard one of the more publicized large steel company heads ask, "But what will we do with the new capacity 2 years from now?" I remember hearing him ask during the war, "What will we do with all this new capacity after the war is over?"

II

A brief historical look at our domestic economy reveals that it has been starved for steel for almost 2 decades. In the thirties the railroads didn't rebuild and the people didn't buy the cars they could have operated if they had had the income to buy them. The economy was depressed. In the farmer's case, there was underconsumption of steel going back 10 more years as their depression, we all know, began in the twenties. When they were coming out of the depression in the early forties and industry began to recuperate at the same time, along came the war that kept them from buying the steel they then had the money to buy.

I recall the plaintive plea of a steelworker: "In the thirties I didn't have the money to buy a car; now in the war I have the money but I can't buy a car." I wonder if he is among the millions still waiting for his car to be delivered 2 years after the war's end.

What comfort does he get when he hears Henry Ford II say, "The steel industry does not have the capacity to make all the steel that many of us desperately need and want"? How does he feel when he hears his SOHIO broadcaster say that there will be a petroleum shortage because there is not enough steel pipe for transmission lines? Will his coldness or pocketbook be relieved any this winter when he will be idle or shy of dividend checks because manufacturing plants will be closed or curtailed for lack of gas caused by inadequate pipe lines that could not be enlarged for lack of steel pipe? An industry trade journal reports, "almost 6,000,000 tons of steel is needed in the next few years to make the 27,220 miles of pipe lines which are to be built."

Farm fence is even a more revealing example. In 1947 the steel industry shipped over 350,000 tons of fence to keep cattle, hogs, and chickens penned in before marketing. And the demand is getting farther and farther ahead of supply, because the farmers are fencing in the fields they couldn't afford to fence during the twenties and thirties and couldn't get the fence for during the war. Furthermore, as farming becomes more specialized, fields within fields are being fenced. It will be well into the fifties before the farmers' demand for fence drops to the level of supply.

Idle automobile plants—for lack of steel—are daily headlines, and these will persist. General Motors' head sees automobile demand holding at capacity for several years. Car production is not even replacing normal obsolescence, let alone filling the gap caused by 4 years of no automobile output. And I believe that America will be able to support 10,000,000 more vehicles on the road in 1950 than it had in 1940. There is just not enough steel capacity to fill such domestic needs.

The conclusion is overwhelming:

When you combine (1) a big industrial nation like ours that has been starved for steel for almost 20 years, with (2) a world whose steel industry has been decimated by a war, which (3) created an unprecedented postwar need for steel, a steel boom and shortage seems inevitable for the only country that suffered no physical damage in history's most destructive war.

"But where's the money coming from? Who is going to pay the bill for all these exports?" is the present plea of those practical industrialists who said their combined industries could not give jobs to 60,000,000 gainfully employed.

General Marshall has already answered this question. In the forepart of 1947 our exports were running around one and a quarter billion, against imports of around a half a billion. This is a $750,000,000 monthly deficit, and herein lies a basic contributing factor to America's current prosperity. Cut exports down to the level of imports, and there may be enough steel in due time, but there won't be 60,000,000 jobs. A steel surplus can be created quickly by severing America from the world, but America can no more live so severed than an amputated arm. The domestic economy is being primed (yes, this is pump priming) at the annual rate of $9,000,000,000—far more than the great F. D. R. ever dared do. And General Marshall has made it clear why America has no other defensible alternative.

Steel is making around 85,000,000 tons of ingots this year, which is about all its present facilities will do despite their theoretical capacity of a little over 91,000,000 tons. More than 10 percent is being exported as steel products, and half again as much in the form of cars, trucks, tractors, and other essentials made of steel that the world needs. This is over 12,000,000 tons of steel ingots a year—one "whale" of a lot of steel is being exported directly and in fabricated form even before the Marshall plan is started. And these exports can no more be stopped than can the exporting of wheat. Like it or not, the United States is the hub of one of the two worlds on our planet today, and she is going to have to keep her world going with steel and wheat and dollars and a lot of other things.

Last April I said in the pages of Life magazine that the United States cannot meet domestic and world steel needs with 91,000,000 tons of capacity and called for "a steel industry that can produce 100,000,000 ingot tons of steel a year • • • now, not in 1950 or 1955." I also advanced the idea that higher steel prices would make it profitable enough for the industry to finance this expansion out of its profit dollar after taxes. But United States Steel, the price leader, was afraid to raise prices enough even to cover cost increases, let alone enhance profits, and the public seems to approve high profits for other industries but feels that somehow steel profits are sinful. This is a dangerous attitude for a people who are living in the steel age.

Charley White, the lanky, tireless heir to Tom Girdler, in opposing steel expansion, argues that new facilities cost so much today that the steel produced in them would have to sell for $20 a ton—a cent a pound—above present levels. Instead of being a reason for not expanding steel capacity, this is a good reason for raising both steel prices and steel capacity. Are steel profits too high? Look at United States Steel. In 1937, no excessive profit year, United States Steel netted $95,000,000, since when the value of the industrial dollar has dropped at least 40 percent. To earn the same profits in 1937 dollars would take $158,000,000 in 1947. United States Steel netted around $130,000,000 last year. A cent-a-pound increase in steel is a small enough price to pay for 10,000,000 additional tons of capacity, and—with Phil Murray's CIO steelworkers' union hot in pursuit of a just share of corporate earnings—will not unduly raise steel profits.

The big names in my industry publicly disputed my pleas for steel expansion last spring, and my steel friends said I would be the laughingstock of the industry by Christmas. Now that Christmas 1947 has come and gone, the end of the steel shortage has been postponed not for another 6 months but for all of 2 years. And in 1949 it will be postponed still again—unless there is cyclical recession. It will take a real depression to bail the big names' prediction of sufficient steel capacity out of the bucket. My steel friends did not laugh at me this Christmas, and by the coming Christmas they be in the throes—for better or for worse—of another great iron and steel expansion.

III

But are they not already expanding steel capacity by $1,000,000,000? This belated expansion announcement is a phony, and I will tell you why. It provides for only 2,500,000 tons of ingot capacity, while 4,500,000 tons of capacity have been abandoned since VJ-day.

By far the largest part of the $1,000,000,000 is for finishing mills, not the much-needed raw steel and iron-producing facilities. The big sheet producers are greatly expanding cold rolled sheet mills, whose product is more profitable than hot-rolled sheets. Most of the steel for these new cold-rolled mills will come from hot-rolled sheets. This will give the country more cold-rolled sheets, but it won't provide any more steel over-all—just a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

When this $1,000,000,000-expansion program is completed the industry will be lucky to be able to make 90,000,000 tons of ingots a year. The domestic and world need is clearly for a hundred-million-ingot-ton American steel industry.

Lastly, virtually all of this billion-dollar program was under way last spring when the American Iron and Steel Institute was using its annual spring reunion as a sounding board for its big names to tell America and the world, that are short of steel, that our steel capacity is adequate. A few weeks later, on June 19, 1947, Wilfred Sykes, president of Inland Steel, the official institute spokesman, told a Senate committee, "I believe we are going to have real relief—from the steel shortage—by the end of this year."

The next scene was in mid-September before the same Senate committee. Then Mr. Sykes and his fellow big steel company presidents gave the steel shortage two more years of life. Whereupon the case for expanding steel capacity, underlined by the Marshall plan, could no longer be denied. That is when the institute announced the billion-dollar-expansion program, and backed it up with paid advertisements.

The program is a phony because (1) it is largely devoted to rounding out finishing facilities; (2) when complete it will still leave us close to 10,000 000 tons below the needed annual capacity of 100,000,000 ingot tons; and (3) it was all under way last spring when the institute argued publicly against steel expansion. True, the industry is spending a billion dollars, but it is primarily to round out its finishing facilities and not to expand its basic capacity.

It is the latter that is so urgently needed, and I have a practical suggestion to get this steel capacity debate off dead center and to start to build more blast furnaces, steel works, and the necessary raw-material facilities behind them.

Before getting into this suggestion, however, there is one alibi and one dumdum argument against expansion to be waylaid. The alibi: If it were not for the 18,050,000 tons of ingots lost in the past 2 years because of strikes, there would be few complaints about the steel shortage now. As long as the leaders of the American Iron and Steel Institute contended that the steel shortage would be over in 6 months, this point had some weight. But now that they give the shortage two more years to run, it loses its force. Eighteen million ingot tons is 10 weeks' production, and if we had this steel we would be 10 weeks closer to the end of the steel famine. Too bad that we lost this tonnage, but its loss is hardly reason sufficient to claim that the steel shortage would now be over if we had not lost the 18,000,000 tons (incidentally, an exaggerated figure).

During the war, the last straw which the anti-steel expansionists grabbed, ran something like this: It takes 1 ton of steel to build 4 tons of capacity, and since the new capacity won't come in for 18 to 24 months, this 1 ton should not be diverted from tanks and guns. I was one who had to contend with this argument during the war, and it did stop some expansion and delay most of the rest. The facts are accurate. Current steel consumption has to be sacrificed to get more steel tomorrow. In the war we wisely decided to slow down the armament program to get more steel later, and it paid off. Whether this should be done again in the current situation is clearly a matter of judgment. Mine is to repeat the wartime performance, and I believe any steel sacrificed today to get more steel tomorrow will pay off in large dividends to our domestic economy and foreign policy.

IV

If old Andy Carnegie were living today, he would go ahead and build a half dozen more blast furnaces and a score more open hearths, and he would make another fortune selling the products of these furnaces. But he would have to contend with taxes that did not hinder him in the last third of the past century. And these Federal taxes are a real hindrance.

So I have a practical proposal to make. Uncle Sam should give some assistance to us poor steel producers to help finance the expansion of iron and steel facilities. Out of every dollar in profit we make today, we have to pay Uncle Sam 38 cents. It costs millions to build iron- and steel-making furnaces, and especially now these facilities are costly to erect. Any money we spend on them must be capitalized, which means that Uncle Sam leaves us only 62 cents of each profit dollar for such purposes. I say that Uncle Sam should let us use the full profit dollar to finance expansion, and not just 62 cents of it.

Here is how the proposal would work. It should apply only to primary expansion, such as coke plants, iron ore and coal mines, blast furnaces that make pig iron, converters and open hearths that make steel, soaking pits that preheat steel for rolling, and basic rolling mills such as blooming, slabbing, and billet mills. These are the new facilities that cost so much and without which finishing facilities are of little value. The cost of all primary facilities enumerated above should be treated the same as operating expenses, but the cost of finishing facilities should be treated as capital expenditures, as is the present practice. This proposal should be effective with all primary expansions begun since VJ-day and continue for all others undertaken within 6 months after Uncle Sam gives the go sign.

I specifically exclude finishing facilities, for which most of the billion dollars is going, because they increase a company's earning power so quickly, and are now capable of rolling over 100,000,000 tons of ingots a year. The industry is already expanding these facilities still more. The trouble is that they are not being backed up with the necessary raw iron and steel. At the Portsmouth Steel Corp. we are spending around $2,000,000 on new finishing facilities to increase our earning position. The other companies are doing likewise, especially with cold-rolled sheet and strip mills. But we at Portsmouth hesitate to build another blast furnace which we could use, and to a large extent this is true of the other steel producers. A major reason is the high cost of new facilities, which can be overcome by Uncle Sam letting us write them off fast. Beware of the proposal to accelerate the depreciation of existing facilities as this would freeze out the new fellow. Only newly built facilities should receive accelerated depreciation treatment by the Federal tax people.

It may be sounder to finance basic primary iron and steel facilities out of new investment money. Some of it will be done that way, as in the case of Wheeling Steel's recent bond issue for coke- and iron-making facilities. But this is the exception. Uncle Sam needs to step into the breach and provide an incentive to expand these costly primary facilities.

I say that a new 3-year amortization plan will end the steel capacity debate and lay the foundations for a hundred-million-ingot-ton steel industry by 1949-50. Tom Girdler may doubt that there will be a need for this increased capacity in 2 years, but he was wrong about the new capacity built during the war, and he can be wrong again.

Up to mid-September the American Iron and Steel Institute stoutly rejected all thought of expansion. Then, as I have shown, it announced that a few companies were expanding basic steel facilities to the extent of 2,500,000 ingot tons.

This public reversal would seem to indicate that some of its leaders are getting mixed emotions about expanding. But they are full of fears; first, that new facilities cost too much; second, that there may be no demand for the steel once the new facilities are completed. Here is an opportunity for Uncle Sam to give the steel industry some tax encouragement, and tip the scales in favor of making America a hundred-million-ton steel country by 1950.

The Place of the Retired Officers in American Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the biennial convention of the Retired Officers Association, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 14, 1948:

Brother officers, today I have the rare privilege of talking to a group of Americans of which I am one from the triple viewpoint of a citizen, a retired officer of the Navy and a Member of Congress. It may be that will not agree with some of my observations but I assure you that they are sincere, friendly and intended to be helpful.

Let me commence by stressing the value of an association such as this. It is worthwhile from many angles. The individual retired officer is not likely to have much influence either in the righting of grievances or in moves for the betterment of retired officers as a whole. The saying "In union there is strength", is truthful not only in the operation of a ropewalk, wherein fibers of hemp or manila are brought together to form a hawser capable of towing a heavy ship, but also in almost every walk of life as we know it today. You may never use united strength to obtain additional benefits, but you may need it to protect some of the things you now enjoy—to protect them from sudden flurries of ill feeling caused by such an unfortunate instance as occurred recently in connection with retirement benefits for physical disability. Standing together—with a calm hand at the wheel—it is likely that you will weather the tempest without disaster. Standing alone—without an authorized spokesman to present your side of the picture—you might well be damaged so heavily that homes will be lost, children compelled to leave school, or other near-tragedies come upon you or your family.

You have built up a worthy and a worthwhile organization in the Retired Officers Association. Many of you have been in it from scratch—some 19 years ago—and you have reason to be proud of your handiwork; to be gratified by accomplishments of the past, and to be happy at the opportunities for service which are ahead. And here let me stress, my friends, that I use the word opportunities, in so far as the future is concerned, for much that you may accomplish will be due to conscientious efforts on the part of this association. We in America seldom give something for nothing. I wish I could say that we never give something for nothing, but that would not be true for there are times when a totally unexpected legacy from some unknown relative drops into the lap of a surprised heir. The retired officer, however, will be wise indeed if he expects nothing more than he has earned through service to his country.

There may be some who feel that you are supporting a lobby in Washington and that it is neither proper nor ethical to do so. Perhaps I can put your minds at rest on certain aspects of this situation since I deal with these so-called lobbies nearly every day.

We all realize that the officials of this association are retired officers of the armed forces and are bound by the usual regulations of those services. You cannot properly use this association to put pressure on the Congress, or on any other governmental body, in behalf of your members. You can, however, quite properly, utilize this association, and its officials, for the purpose of explaining the needs of retired officers to the Congress. You can, quite properly, endeavor to justify or oppose proposed legislation when it is in the formative stage of committee hearings. You can, quite properly, present requests of individual members to governmental bureaus or agencies, or else resolutions adopted by your board of directors as the reasoned conclusions of retired officers as a whole.

And here let me mention lobbying activities around the Congress as I see them. A private lobbyist, most correctly called a business representative or business agent, is a valuable man both to his own employers and to Members of Congress. An improper one is a nuisance and an obstruction to good legislation. I am glad to declare that, almost without exception, the business agents with whom I have come in contact have been gentleman well versed in their own lines of endeavor, polite, considerate, and interested chiefly in having an opportunity to present their views, without recrimination or bitterness. In plain fact, I have learned to appreciate these gentlemen so much that I call them far more often than they call on me.

A Member of Congress can't know all the details of thousands of laws—he can't have all kinds of statistics filed away in his head so they are on call at any moment.

So on my part, I turn largely to the business groups which have representatives in Washington when I want detailed information regarding their respective specialties, and not once has any of these agents given me incorrect information or attempted to mislead me. When I am stuck with a complicated question of pay for a retired enlisted man or a fleet reservist, I frequently refer the whole question to the Fleet Reserve Association. If the problem concerns a matter embedded deeply in the maze of officers' retirement laws, I send it to the Retired Officers Association and your legal counsel ponders and perspires over it until he has prepared the answer. If I am troubled about merchant-marine matters from the viewpoint of ownership or operation, I turn to the exceedingly competent staff of the National Federation of American Shipping or to the equally competent staff of the Maritime Commission—a Government agency with which I have the most pleasant relations. When the question involves seamen or other merchant marine sea-going personnel, my lines of communication run into the offices of the National Maritime Union where their well-trained research analyst soon produces the elusive facts or figures I am seeking. And so it goes right down the line as I utilize these private agencies in conjunction with the established governmental set-up.

I have given you this picture because I want to put your minds at ease, once and for all time, in regard to the status of your own officers here as they go about their work with the Congress and other branches of the National Government. There is nothing wrong about their efforts in your behalf. They deserve your wholehearted support.

Now for some of the aspects of retired officers of the Military Establishment. Why should such officers be retired? Are they of any value to the Government? Should they be utilized in other governmental positions to reduce the cost of the retired list or to make use of their experience?

First. Why should an officer be retired for age or physical disability? Fundamentally, as an act of justice after his service to the Nation. Practically, because every sound concept of national defense requires that officers of the armed forces be men of high character, ability, integrity, and education, and such men cannot be held in military service, during the best years of their lives, without the certainty of financial security. A military career offers almost no opportunity to build up a profession or a business which will take care of one in his old age or in the event of physical disability. Yet, the military profession requires all a man's adult years up to comparative old age, without regard to his personal desires as to time or place of residence, as to associates, as to working conditions, or even as to the presence of his family at the station of his employment. It may be said with truth, that the commissioned officer of the Regular Military Establishment actually gives his life to the Nation during his years of active service. You, my friends, such officers should and must be retired, for disability or for age, as a matter of common justice to the individuals and of safety to the state.

Perhaps you may be thinking of the question so frequently propounded by civil employees of the Government: Why should military personnel have retirement privileges without pay deductions when other Government employees must build up their old-age benefits through contributions to a retirement fund? The answer to this is simple indeed. The retirement privilege is given full consideration in arriving at pay scales of military forces. It is one of the inducements needed to persuade men to enter military service and to devote their lives to it. An increase in service pay would not be anything like as great an inducement as the privilege of retirement now is, because military men realize that money is quickly spent and that people such as they—people who are ordered hither and yon during all their years of active service—would have small likelihood of establishing a home and a competence for their old age.

Second. Are retired officers of value to the Government? The answer to this question is a decided yes. Every such officer is subject to recall to active duty in time of war or national emergency if physically fit. This reservoir of retired officers constitutes a tremendous reserve strength when the need for men especially trained in the profession of arms is greatest. It provides hundreds of inspectors, instructors, and administrators for both home and overseas posts. It provides men who are conversant with the details of procurement, with the building of ships, and with the assembling of munitions. It provides steady hands for civilian wartime community tasks, such as air-raid wardens, draft boards, and security patrols. It furnishes the know-how and the leaders for local bodies set up to cope with large-scale disasters in both peace and war. As I recall the figures, the Navy utilized approximately 86 percent of its retired officers for some sort of active duty during the recent World War. The contributions of these officers were a decided factor toward victory. They made it possible for our small Regular Naval Establishment to expand rapidly without great loss in efficiency.

In every modern war the retired officers of our armed forces have rushed forth to serve their country in its hour of need—they have kept faith with America.

And, third. Should retired officers be employed in other branches of the Government in time of peace to reduce the cost of the retired list or to utilize their experience? This is a debatable proposition, but my own answer is—only in specific positions where technical training makes their services necessary.

Regardless of what many of you gentlemen may believe, I have come to the conclusion that there is a distinct "military mind" or "military conception" on the part of most professional officers. This military mind differs materially from the civilian in its way of doing things, and it quickly builds up resentment and lack of cooperation on the part of the public. The American Government is a civilian Government—it wants no part or parcel of military management or military ways during time of peace. Civilians pay the taxes on which the whole Military Establishment depends for its existence. Civilians prefer possible sacrifice of efficiency to obedience to directives of a mind which has been indoctrinated in the art of command.

A retired officer could hardly be expected to perform civilian Government work unless he were paid a total sum equal to his active duty pay and allowances. In general, since he would be new in the job, this would put his earnings there that of a civilian in a comparable position and would cause discontent and demands for increases in pay in civil branches of the Government. It is likely that increases brought about by such demands would cancel savings to the Government due to the employment of retired officers in civil jobs.

Civilian office holders, in general, would soon come to look upon officers of the armed services as contenders for their jobs and we should thus build up such suspicion and distrust that the maintenance of adequate national defense might be impaired thereby.

These are only a few of the reasons why the military man should not be utilized to replace the civilian in time of peace. However, if you are a retired officer and you are able to establish yourself either in business or professional life on your own, rather than through assignment by the Government, you will find yourself welcomed into the world of civilian workers on an equal footing with your contemporaries. This is as it should be in America.

I am in receipt of hundreds of letters from retired personnel, of both the military and civilian components of the Government, in which demands for increases in pay are the dominant theme. I do not recall that I have ever received such a letter in which appreciation has been expressed for the benefits now being received as a reward for faithful service. It is not difficult to understand why one wants more pay. Practically all of us want more pay—feel that we earn more than we are getting—think that our pay should be increased materially. But not one in a hundred gives a moment's thought to the sum total of what even a small individual increase means in this day of vast armed forces. Probably not one in 500 gives serious thought as to how the money to finance additional pay scales is to be obtained. And so, let me say right here that there is only one source of income for the Government, and that is taxes of one sort or another. You can call them what you like, but they are still taxes and you, the people, pay them. It seems that each one who demands more pay figures that he'll get more than he'll lose in taxes. He has an idea that someone else will get nicked for the extra dollars and that he'll just ride along on the gravy train. Usually, he is merely fooling himself. The Nation's workers have found that to be the case during the last decade. A general boost in wages soon causes an advance in the cost of living such as to absorb the wage increase. Now, these workers are getting smart enough to declare they would prefer a reduction in cost of living, rather than an increase in earnings.

When some of us older people entered the service, the total number of commissioned officers was only a few thousand—probably less than 10,000 if we include every category in the whole national-defense establishment. An increase in pay or allowances didn't mean very much then to the National Treasury. Now, however, conditions are totally different. The number of active officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force must be at least 125,000. I haven't any idea of how many retired officers there are. Also, we have applied the laws for pay and retirement to the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service. The grand total of individuals who would be benefited by an increase in pay for commissioned officers is great, indeed. An addition across the board of $25 per month will likely mean an additional $50,000,000 of annual expenditures to the Treasury. And we must keep in mind that the Congress cannot increase pay for officers without extending the same sort of relief to the enlisted personnel. That is as it should be, for normally relief is needed in the lower-pay brackets much more than in the higher echelons.

I realize that officers in general have not had a worth-while pay increase for many years and that their standard of living (other than that of those who enjoy additional pay for aviation, submarine service, etc.) has deteriorated steadily when compared to that of civilians with whom they formerly enjoyed parity. I realize also that all important fact, which the civilian seldom understands, that allowances are all lost upon retirement. I am also aware of the fact that a new pay scale has been suggested by a committee of members of the armed services, but I understand that there is little likelihood of its being presented to the Congress during the current year due to further study in the Department of Defense.

In view of this, the prospects of an increase in pay or the inclusion of some part of allowances in retired pay are not such as to make one optimistic of any probability of favorable action during the current session of Congress.

The great burden of the most gigantic debt in history—the highest annual budgets known to man in years of peace—stare Members of Congress in the face and present the stark realities of reducing expenditures in these postwar years or bankruptcy of government by the people.

It will be well to discuss briefly charges that officers of the Regular services are favored over reserve and temporary officers in transfers to the retired lists. There are specific instances where such charges seem clearly proved, but in any great establishment, or groups of establishments, there are certain to be errors of judgment, cases of favoritism, etc., which are the exceptions to the rule. To claim otherwise would be to maintain that we are not subject to human frailties, a condition I, at least, do not want to maintain, for I have no desire to be superman and I like the attributes of a human being.

Basically there is a difference in the retirement of regulars and reserves; there should be, and I believe there always will be. This difference is fundamental to the character of service performed. The regular has embarked upon a lifetime of service to the Nation. He has a permanent commission and is entitled to retirement when he fulfills certain specific requirements as to length of service, age, or physical condition. Sometimes retirement is at his own request; generally it is forced upon him. Since experience has shown we must have reasonably young men in the middle ranks of the services, and since officers neither die, resign, become physically unfit, or retire voluntarily in sufficient numbers to keep up that healthy flow of promotion required to keep age limits down to a satisfactory maximum for proper performance of duty, the services have found it necessary to adopt measures for compulsory retirement or elimination, as it is generally called. Involuntary retirement is a difficult matter. It is accompanied by heartburnings, grief, and feelings of discrimination on the part of those so retired. For the best interest of the services, it should be avoided insofar as possible. Now when a Regular officer comes before a retiring board and that officer is in a grade where elimination is required by law, what more logical result can be expected than that the officer will be retired if he has any appreciable physical deficiency? Such action is only plain common sense. The officer would have to retire soon anyhow in accordance with existing laws, and normally it is to the advantage of the service and to the Government to eliminate him then and there, rather than having him go on to a higher pay bracket as well as having to force some physically fit officer off the active list to provide the minimum flow of promotion.

We have had an unusual condition at the end of the great conflict just terminated. We had many comparatively young men in high grades temporarily. These young men did not care to revert to their permanent grades—they did not like the idea of demotion—so they set about to obtain retirement in their temporary ranks. If they could ascertain some disability or ailment to the point where a retirement for physical disability could be obtained, they did so. That was to be expected. If they didn't obtain a physical retirement, some spent out their 30 years of service—at the discretion of the President.

Let us think of the Reserve or the temporary officer who comes up before a retiring board. If he has a decided physical disability—definitely service-connected—he should be given the same consideration as is accorded to a Regular under similar circumstances. I believe that such has been the case. Frequently, however, such an officer has been in active service only a short time and there is little to connect his disability to his military service. He complains of nervous disorder, stomach troubles, high blood pressure, and claims that his short military service has brought this about and has disabled him to the extent where he should be pensioned by the Government. Unlike the Regular, the Government has no obligation to him in the way of retirement except what may be due to service-connected disability. Could you maintain, for a moment, that a retiring board should be as liberal in its interpretation of disability in such a case as in that of a Regular officer whose eventual retirement is assured in any event, and whose retirement at the time might be of advantage to the Government? Undoubtedly there have been cases of injustice to temporary and Reserve officers seeking retirement for physical disability. But let's not confuse the issue. Let's have these reputed injustices stand on their own feet rather than to accentuate them by critical comparisons with the acts of retiring boards for Regular officers.

Gentlemen, I feel that every organization does better, and advances farther, when it has some mission of service beyond its own restricted circle. I suggest that you undertake something more than benefits for your own membership. You might, for example, consider a program of aid for service orphans in acquiring an education, or of gaining entrance to West Point or Annapolis. You might consider including in this program, however small it might be, a percentage of orphans of enlisted personnel. There are only thoughts—vague thoughts perhaps—but nevertheless, worth while. On my part, I find there is no deeper satisfaction than the knowledge that I have helped some deserving person—that I have advanced him on the road toward the goal he seeks. In helping others, you will help yourselves.

And, gentlemen, the goal of the physically-fit retired officer should not be achieved by a low golf score, a good bridge game, and a carefree life. It should include recognition of his obligation to his country, maximum service to his community, and an honest effort to help in providing for the needs of his own loved ones.

Gentlemen, your future is in your own hands, not, as some think, solely in the hands of the Congress. You must determine the issues in your own lives. You must present these issues to the proper authorities, after you have helped yourself to the limit of your respective abilities. You have, in this Retired Officers Association, an effective instrument for the furtherance of sound and adequate measures for retired military personnel—both officers and enlisted men. You should use it intelligently, and constructively.

I wish you the greatest measure of success in your efforts to be of service to America.

In My Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following radio address entitled "In My Opinion" delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System on February 16, 1948":

We can best guarantee national security by the rapid achievement and continued maintenance of full and adequate preparedness for defense, on the sea, on the land, and more especially in the air. All the funds required to keep us the strongest military nation on the planet should be unhesitatingly appropriated by the Congress, and then having done this the Congress should insist that the armed services efficiently and effectively move to an early and full realization of this proposed goal. A strong and powerful United States is the surest guaranty for the perpetuation of a society of free nations.

Air supremacy by the United States must for our own national security become an actuality at the earliest possible moment regardless of the cost, the effort, or the sacrifice involved. Air power is peace power. This should be so obvious to anyone who gives even the slightest thought to the present disastrous trend of world affairs as to eliminate without any further discussion any arguments against the proposition. We must achieve an air force equal to any air force or combination of air forces on earth. United States' air power is the key to the future well-being and happiness of the world.

On December 15, 1947, I introduced a bill providing for a supplemental appropriation of $500,000,000 to be expended on the Air Force before June 30, 1948. Beginning with the fiscal year 1949 the Congress should appropriate $6,000,000,000 annually for the Air Force to achieve the absolute irreducible minimum air protection. It should be emphasized and reemphasized that the suggested supplemental appropriation of $500,000,000 and the annual appropriation of $6,000,000,000 beginning with the next fiscal year will provide for this country only the barest minimum peacetime Air Force.

Even with the allotment of funds I have advocated it would be 1952 before the United States can achieve the 70-group program were we to start at once. This 70-group program, according to General Spaatz, comprises 6,969 aircraft, including training; 3,212 for the National Guard; and 2,360 for the Air Reserve. The total amounts to 12,441 airplanes. To keep this force modern and up to date, states the General, would require an annual procurement of 5,200 planes and a reserve of 8,100 planes.

When this 70-group program is a reality we will have only the basis on which air supremacy could be achieved. Were we to be attacked, this 70-group air force would be just sufficient to blunt the enemy's first offensive. We would not have air supremacy, and before we could attain it a period of 18 months would be required. To win a war we must have an Air Force of approximately 175 to 200 groups.

I cannot too strongly emphasize the fact that an appropriation of $500,000,000 for the current fiscal year and a $6,000,000,000 appropriation annually would be necessary to build the 70 groups in four years. Let me call your attention to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget has approved only $3,064,000,000 to be used by the Air Force for the fiscal year 1949. This is only half enough money to even start to realize the 70-group program.

In view of the fact that the Soviet Union is manufacturing bombers equal to or superior to the famed B-29 and is rapidly producing jet planes, the United States should at once move to achieve and maintain air supremacy. Complete control of the air would, in my opinion, be the greatest guaranty of national security.

The status of our air strength is appalling. We are not anywhere near the minimum air strength advised by the Air Force and by the naval air arm as necessary for the protection of this country were an emergency to arise. The United States aircraft industry is producing scarcely over 1,500 planes a year when it should be producing at least 6,000. The industry is sick and is rapidly losing money. The Government should place orders for many more planes.

The cost of constructing a gigantic air fleet will be great. To achieve air supermacy it will probably be necessary to spend $8,000,000,000 annually on the Army Air Force and the naval air arm. The expenditure is huge but if we refuse to pay this price as a penalty for our stupidity in scuttling the finest Air Force in history at the close of the last war, we will certainly have to pay in terms of destroyed cities; in terms of blood; in terms of millions dead; and in terms of the loss of freedom.

Air power—overwhelming is the only possible defense against the atomic bomb. Any nation contemplating an attack upon the United States will hesitate only if she knows that within a period of hours from the time the attack is made there will be delivered in reprisal a knock-out, devastating, retaliatory blow from the air. The United States can be immunized against attack from the air by building a completely unassailable and invincible Air Force.

Let no one imagine that an attack on the United States is not possible or perhaps imminent. The Soviet Union exceeds us in air strength, in the construction of guided missiles, and in submarines. Time is shorter than we think. A-day may not be January 1, 1953, as the Finletter report designates it. The hour of attack may be much nearer.

The Grain-Buying Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include an editorial in the Kansas City Star of February 9, concerning the effect of the Government's grain-buying operations in connection with the downward trend of the grain market:

THE GRAIN-BUYING RECORD

Whatever may be said about Senator TAFT's charge that the Administration is deliberately trying to keep prices up for political reasons, there is something to be said about the Administration's record in the buying of grain. It has been bad, almost the worst kind of management.

Of course each party has been trying to hold the other responsible for inflation and each had planned to make it a campaign issue. Now if by any chance the price trend should be definitely lower a decided shift in strategy would be necessary.

But aside from that Senator TAFT and others point to a bit of damaging evidence. It was the announcement of Secretary Anderson, after a sharp 2-day break in the grain market, that the Government planned soon to buy 50,000,000 bushels of wheat. This had all the appearances of an effort to bolster the market when a downward readjustment was strictly in order and when the Government could have profited thereby.

In fact, there was no need to announce then, or at any time, that the Government expected to buy a given amount of wheat. It could only be a market stimulus and cost the Government more when the actual buying took place. This is entirely different from buying that might be an advantage to the Government or from buying that might be justified in support of the market and in the interest of farmers.

Such bungling has marked the whole record of the Government's grain-buying operations. Over a period of months there appeared a series of conflicting announcements as to how much would be bought for relief abroad. The figures were put out by different Government agencies and the extremes varied by as much as 125,000,000 bushels. It might be a total of 570,000,000 bushels or 450,000,000 or less. It was hard to pin down responsibility and to discover what agency had the final word. The markets were kept in turmoil, usually soaring upward as the Government agents came in to buy and traders could see what was happening.

That suggests the record of it whether or not there was any deliberate planning to push prices up and try to hold them there. Under any conditions the foreign-aid program would have had its effect on prices not only of grain but on a wide range of commodities. It will still have that effect.

But responsible management could have aided in holding the inflation in check and could yet do it without the twaddle about restoring wartime controls. Otherwise a trimming of the aid program and the operation of natural economic forces will have to do the work.

Thirty Members Act on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1948, 30 Republican Members of the House of Representatives expressing their deep concern with the Palestine issue, sent a letter, set forth in full below, to the Secretary of State, to which the Secretary of State replied on February 12 by letter also set forth below. There is appended, too, for the information of the House an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of yesterday, February 16, on this exchange of letters. It is becoming clearer daily that the Palestine issue may well prove a turning point for the United Nations. It calls for study and an informed opinion on the part of every Member.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Following the decision of the United Nations General Assembly taken on November 29, 1947, we have been deeply concerned by the violence in Palestine between Arabs and Jews to which the surrounding Arab nations themselves threaten to become parties, and by the honest worry among many of our own citizens as to our Palestine policy. We are concerned lest the State Department's policy announced on December 5, 1947, "discontinuing for the present licensing of all shipments of arms" to the Arab countries and Palestine, while extensive sales of arms by Great Britain to the neighboring Arab nations are reported, may be misleading alike to those seeking to render inoperative the United Nations decision and to those seeking to sustain it, as to the intentions of the United States. We believe there is grave danger that if the United Nations Palestine decision is rendered inoperative, far more even that this decision may be jeopardized, and the United Nations itself may be made ineffective.

Under the circumstances referred to above, we consider it appropriate at this time to ask the following questions:

1. Is it true that Great Britain is permitting arms to continue to be shipped to the Arab nations, and if so, does the continuance of such shipments interfere with carrying out of the United Nations decision on Palestine?

2. Do the activities of the Arab nations with respect to support of the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine, and the Arab League, or otherwise in their announced violent resistance to the UN decision on Palestine, endanger the maintenance of international peace and security in the terms of the UN Charter?

3. What will be the instructions of the United States to its UN delegate on the questions referred by the UN Palestine Commission to the Security Council regarding the means for making effective the General Assembly's decision on Palestine?

4. What is the United States prepared to do to help in the implementation of the UN decision on Palestine?

On April 22 and July 15, we addressed certain questions to you on the issue of Palestine. We believe that these were helpful in crystalizing the position of the United States on this issue. As we have stated before when addressing you on this subject, we imply in this communication no criticism or direction, but ask only for ourselves and for the people, the necessary information so that the attitude of the United States may be made clear, and the influence of our attitude be utilized to the full for the preservation of peace and the enhancement of the prestige of the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. TWYMAN, Member of Congress, Ninth District, Illinois; WILLIAM G. STRATTON, Member of Congress, Representative at Large, Illinois; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Member of Congress, Tenth District, Massachusetts; JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Member of Congress, Third District, New Jersey; J. CALEB BOGGS, Member of Congress, Representative at Large, Delaware; KENNETH B. KEATING, Member of Congress, Fortieth District, New York; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Member of Congress, Sixth District, Washington; THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON, Member of Congress, Third District, Kentucky; EDWARD A. MITCHELL, Member of Congress, Eighth District, Indiana; HOWARD A. COFFIN, Member of Congress, Thirteenth District, Michigan; JOHN C. BRODHY, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Wisconsin; GEORGE H. BENDER, Member of Congress, Representative at Large, Ohio; HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD, Member of Congress, Fourteenth District, Michigan; EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, Member of Congress, Thirty-seventh District, New York; ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE, Member of Congress, Third District, Connecticut; MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Member of Congress, Second District, Maine; GEORGE MACKINNON, Member of Congress, Third District, Minnesota; RICHARD B. VAIL, Member of Congress, Second District, Illinois; W. HOWES MEADE, Member of Congress, Seventh District, Kentucky; WILLIAM J. CROW, Member of Congress, Twenty-third District, Pennsylvania; NORRIS POULSON, Member of Congress, Thirteenth District, California; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Member of Congress, Thirty-sixth District, New York; JACOB K. JAVITS, Member of Congress, Twenty-first District, New York; EDWARD J. DEVITT, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Minnesota; FRANCIS J. LOVE, Member of Congress, First District, West Virginia; DAVID M. POTTS, Member of Congress, Twenty-sixth District, New York; JAMES G. FULTON, Member of Congress, Thirty-first District, Pennsylvania; FREDERICK A. MUHLENBERG, Member of Congress, Thirteenth District, Pennsylvania; FRANKLIN J. MALONEY, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Pennsylvania; CLIFFORD P. CASE, Member of Congress, Sixth District, New Jersey.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 12, 1948.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: I have received a letter dated February 10, 1948, signed by you and 29 other Members of the House of Representatives. This letter expresses your joint concern over violence in Palestine between Arabs and Jews, your worry lest the announced policy of the Department of State of an arms embargo to the Arab countries and Palestine may be misleading as to the intentions of the United States, and your apprehension that if the United Nations Palestine decision is rendered inoperative the United Nations itself may be made ineffective. In reply to your specific questions, I desire to inform you that copies of this letter are being addressed separately to the other Congressmen who signed the communication of February 10.

Taking your questions seriatim, I quote the first:

"1. Is it true that Great Britain is permitting arms to continue to be shipped to the Arab nations, and if so, does the continuance of such shipments interfere with carrying out of the United Nations decision on Palestine?"

On February 4, 1948, the British Minister of Defense made an official reply in Parliament which largely covers your inquiry. He said, among other things:

"There is at present an embargo on the entry into Palestine both by sea and over the land frontiers of all warlike material. The Government of Palestine will enforce this embargo to the best of their ability until the mandate comes to an end on the 15th of May. It is also the policy of His Majesty's Government to refuse permission for the export of military material from Great Britain to any part of the Middle East except under existing contracts which have been undertaken as a result of our treaty obligations to certain Arab governments. His Majesty's Government have no reason to suppose that the material supplied by them under such contracts will be used in Palestine."

This Government has no information in its possessions indicating that to date the continuance of British treaty shipments has interfered with the carrying out of the recommendations of the General Asembly on Palestine embodied in its resolution of November 29, 1947.

"2. Do the activities of the Arab nations with respect to support of the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine, and the Arab League, or otherwise in their announced violent resistance to the UN decision on Palestine, endanger the maintenance of international peace and security in the terms of the UN Charter?"

While it is true that various Arab governments and organizations have announced their determined opposition to the General Assembly's recommendation on Palestine, there have thus far been no overt acts which, in the decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, have been determined to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security in the terms of the United Nations Charter. Meanwhile, the United Kingdom, as the mandatory power, is responsible for the preservation of peace and security in Palestine. The United States has consistently proclaimed its determination to see the provisions of the United Nations Charter complied with, and its representative in the General Assembly, in announcing this Government's policy regarding Palestine on October 11, 1947, said that we assumed there would be Charter observance.

"3. What will be the instructions of the United States to its UN delegate on the questions referred by the UN Palestine Commission to the Security Council regarding the means for making effective the General Assembly's decision on Palestine?"

The United Nations Palestine Commission has thus far submitted its first interim report to the Security Council but the Council has not yet taken action on the report. On February 10 the Council agreed to await the forthcoming special report of the Palestine Commission on the problems of security and enforcement before giving further consideration to the General Assembly's recommendation on Palestine. This report is due February 15. In absence of knowledge as to the contents of the Palestine Commission's next report it has been impossible to formulate instructions to the United States Representative on the Security Council.

"4. What is the United States prepared to do to help in the implementation of the UN decision on Palestine?"

I believe that much of this question is implicitly answered in my response to question 3. Until the Security Council has received and studied the report of the Palestine Commission on security and enforcement and has reached a decision it is not possible for this Government to determine in advance the steps which may be necessary to carry out such a decision. However, the United States has been active as a member of certain other principal organs of the United Nations which are dealing with the Palestine problem to implement the resolution of November 29. The United States Representative on the Trusteeship Council and his deputy have worked with other members of the Council in preparing a draft statute for the trusteeship of Jerusalem. The United States as a member of the Economic and Social Council will be concerned with those aspects of the resolution of November 29 which call for action by the Economic and Social Council. Practically every major organ of the United Nations is concerned under the terms of the Assembly's resolution.

I much appreciate your patriotic interest in this question and your concern for the success of the United Nations. As the President and I have on several occasions made clear, we regard the solution of this immensely difficult problem as a United Nations solution and our contribution to that end will be as a member and steadfast supporter of the United Nations.

Faithfully yours,

GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 16, 1948]

CORRECT BUT UNCONVINCING

The reply of the Secretary of State to questions raised by a group of Congressmen concerning America's Palestine policy is technically correct. He does not go beyond the British Government statement on arms shipment to Arab states; he accepts the inaction of the Security Council; he announces that instructions to the United States delegation at Lake Success must wait on the report of the United Nations Palestine Commission. In all of this he has the support of protocol. The matter is in the hands of the UN; there the State Department is satisfied to let it rest.

But no one knows better than Mr. Marshall that the UN is not a mechanical brain, which, if fed a sufficient amount of factual data, will automatically produce an impeccable solution. The UN is a human institution, which responds to human initiative and can be restrained by human doubts and fears. Moreover, it is dealing with a very human situation in Palestine, where passions are mounting, regardless of protocol—where lives are being lost and where every act or omission of statesmen, of soldiers, of fanatics, and of bewildered men and women who see their hopes and their homeland threatened by war contributes to the growing tension. The American responsibility in the premises may and should be shared with other members of the United Nations. But it cannot be simply loaded on the back of the international organization and dismissed. The United States, for a great number of reasons, has too intimate an interest in a Palestine solution to adopt a passive role now.

Therefore, the technical correctness of Mr. Marshall's Palestine statement is basically unconvincing. It does not correspond with the realities of the American position, which demand that the United States do everything which the UN Charter permits to bring an end to the terrible uncertainties which now prevail in the Middle East. It is not enough to sit by while the UN develops its policy; the United States, as is its right as a member of the UN and its duty as a nation which has in the past exerted a variety of official and unofficial pressures to affect the conditions under which Great Britain exercised her mandate, should be seeking actively to expedite and implement the work of UN. The course which Mr. Marshall has outlined is fundamentally a course of indecision, and such a course will neither avert a tragedy in Palestine nor enhance the prestige and authority of the United States.

Housing Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with the continued housing shortage problem, it does appear to me that useless red tape could be cut in many places. Last summer it was my privilege to view in detail a new housing project being constructed at Moline, Ill., of 510 housing units from one- to two- and three-bedroom houses, all thoroughly modern with radiant heat and with all conveniences and a beautiful lay-out with curved streets, which is being constructed by the Byrne Associates, with headquarters in Washington, D. C. These were houses selling from between $7,000 and $8,000 each.

When I viewed this last summer, I interviewed many on the project, not only the general superintendent, but also many of the individual workers and while this is a prefabricated project with the prefabrication being done entirely on the ground, there was absolutely no slowdowns because of labor. In fact, many of these union men are known personally to me, and their story was that it was a very happy set-up but it appears that slow-downs and the delays are being caused by agents of this Government according to an editorial in the Moline Dispatch of February 12, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include also this editorial:

THOUGHTS ON HOUSING

One of the ways to solve the housing situation would be for the Federal Government to get out of it bag and baggage, and stay out. To the extent that State governments are involved, they should retire, too. To complete the picture, let the cities get out partially, remaining interested only in the prevention of eyesores and unsafe construction and in the proper installation and maintenance of utilities, such as sewage, power, and water and gas mains.

The multitudinous restrictions on rents, financing, selling, and construction have made housing an unpleasant venture. Houses are in too many instances being built merely because it is imperative rather than because someone wishes to invest his money in them in the hope of making a profit on the expenditure. Competition has been wrecked, and where there is no competition people are apt to go without adequate shelter.

I. A. Bickelhaupt, vice president of the Byrne organization now erecting dwellings on the former Deere experimental farm, has something to say with regard to the possibility of selling houses to certain individuals owing to FHA regulations. In testimony before a congressional committee in Washington, January 14, Mr. Bickelhaupt recited the case of a man and wife who were both working, drawing a total of $3,100 a year, but were not accepted for one of the Byrne houses because only the income of the head of the family was recognized. Mr. Bickelhaupt asked: "Are we denying the right to own a home to those families with the ambition and energy to get together and all work to pay for it?"

Another quotation from Bickelhaupt's prepared statement: "There are many cases wherein a man wishes to buy a home who is the present owner of a home (which has a ready market sale). He makes application to purchase one of our homes but is turned down unless he has income to support both homes or until he sells his other house. We have six cases of this type in Moline, Ill., on record."

Another instance: "A disabled veteran with a permanent allowance from the United States Government of $1,400 a year and with a watchman's job with the ADT at $1,400 a year was refused approval because his income from the Government was not recognized which we think is the most stable income of the two."

Mr. Bickelhaupt in his testimony made reference to the rumored limitation of output by organized labor, he said: "Contrary to the general opinion, we have not encountered any limitation of output among organized labor. We have found an equal or greater loss of efficiency and lower production among the open shop crews or unorganized workers than we have found among the organized crafts—so much so that we have been for some time working out national agreements with the various crafts."

Mr. Bickelhaupt's prepared statement had some remarks on local building codes as encountered in various places where the Byrne organization is building houses. Some restrictions, as we all know, are imposed by FHA itself before the financing can be approved.

"In Moline, only," said Mr. Bickelhaupt, "we were further required to drill holes in the cement and install Rawl plugs whereas it has been standard practice to nail the bottom plate to the concrete with concrete nails."

As to front and rear entrance platforms, Mr. Bickelhaupt said "These platforms were of concrete and it was required in Moline that we form them in conjunction with the grade beam, doweling the steel into them to make a slab integral with the beam of such design as to disregard the support of the earth. This is, of course, excellent construction such as is used in a $50,000 house, but it is not necessary in low-cost housing."

Mr. Bickelhaupt further said: "Sidewalks have been required in Moline leading from the front steps around the house to the rear entrance. This is all in good practice but is it not possible that a man might prefer a walk from his drive to the rear entrance and is it not possible that a workman in the low-income bracket would prefer to save that cost and put in his own walk in his spare time?"

As to paving in the Byrne area in Moline, the witness said: "With houses ready to occupy, we have been delayed in Moline approximately 6 weeks with people begging for occupancy, because of a dispute between FHA and the city. The city requested that we install concrete curbs and gutters and lay a base of crushed rock topped with fines and shot with oil and left to settle for 2 years before the city's specifications will permit the roads to be topped. FHA insists that they will not give us final approval until the road has been completed with a gravel basis and an asphalt top. The difference in cost is immaterial to us but we believe the city's method the better and the city agrees to accept the streets and maintain them as all-weather roads. After a series of delays the question was finally settled."

The quotations given here, and much other information given in the Bickelhaupt statement indicate that a builder is not only confronted with endless unscientific restrictions and a hodgepodge of code variations that make genuine planning of low-cost housing difficult, but that FHA and local authorities do not always agree.

We suggest that the most houses, and the best houses, were built in this country when politicians kept out of the business.

Farmers and Falling Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter by Walter F. Renk, secretary-treasurer of William F. Renk & Sons, of Sun Prairie, Wis., the well-known hybrid seed corn growers of my district:

SUN PRAIRIE, WIS., *February 14, 1948.*
Hon. GLENN R. DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: The severe price breaks in commodity and livestock markets this week have cost the farmers of this country millions of dollars. Most of us farmers realize that prices were high and bound to recede, but felt such a recession would be orderly. Such a bust as has just occurred cannot help but bring panic to the country.

There has been too much loose talk in Washington from both political parties about the cost of living. The newspapers and radio too have contributed their share. The average housewife has been led to believe that farmers are almost 100 percent responsible for her food budget. Has anyone in a responsible position told the housewife that the wheat in a loaf of bread for which she has been paying 16 cents brought the farmer only 5½ cents? Or has anyone told the Chicago housewife that the quart of milk for which she is now paying 22 cents would still cost her 12½ cents if the bottle empty of milk were placed on her doorstep?

The livestock and grains that the farmers have on hand at the present time have been produced with high-priced labor, high-priced feed, and high-priced machinery. Do the farmers make all these prices high? One of the major reasons that feed has been almost prohibitive in price was the competitive buying for export by the Government. The farmer certainly has been caught in a squeeze. He has had to compete with his Government to buy his feed, helped to pay for this competition through taxes, and because prices were forced so high, has now suffered a terrific financial loss on the food he is producing for the world.

Have the other items affecting the cost of living taken a nose dive? What about fuel, clothes, furniture, doctor's fees, automobiles, building costs, and so forth? Have they dropped 20 percent in 1 week?

I am strongly urging you as a representative of a great agricultural State to use your influence to help correct much of the erroneous information that is being broadcast promiscuously about the cost of living. We farmers do not want a lag in the drop of prices in the things we buy for 8 years, like that following World War I. Our greatest concern now, as farmers, is that other segments of our economy come down with us.

Very truly yours,
WALTER F. RENK.

Quartermaster Corps Research Laboratory at Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 18 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I made this morning before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services considering Senate bill 286, to establish the Quartermaster Corps Research Laboratory at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

We in Pennsylvania have as fierce a civic pride as residents of Massachusetts, and I should say that for every argument which various gentlemen from New England, including some now or formerly high up in the Quartermaster Corps of the Army, advance to you regarding the merits of New England as a site for this laboratory can be countered with similar arguments in behalf of Pennsylvania and particularly Philadelphia.

During the course of my testimony I will, of course, go into some of these arguments pro and con. I do that primarily to keep the record straight. You know, we in Pennsylvania, and particularly in Philadelphia, just can't sit idly by and allow the record to be filled with dissertations on the glories of some other part of the country, assertions designed to show that Pennsylvania and Philadelphia lack similar virtues.

In fact, this argument between the two regional areas has gone on for such a long time in connection with this legislation and with previous attempts in the Seventy-ninth Congress by New Englanders to take this laboratory from its rightful home in Philadelphia, that the Philadelphia newspapers have become very sensitive. Our newspapers are so sensitive on this score that they resented bitterly last year the assertions made by some proponents of this legislation that Boston was a better location than Philadelphia because the Boston weather is so much worse than the Philadelphia weather, bad weather supposedly being a criterion in this contest. The Philadelphia Bulletin went so far as to make a study of its own into climatic conditions as far back as colonial times.

It reported that New England historians themselves were convinced that Philadelphia had worse weather than New England. The historians to which the Bulletin had referred were supposed to have concluded that some of the credit for William Penn's successful dealings with the Indians in Pennsylvania, in contrast to the stormy relations and the bloody encounters between Indians and colonists in New England, should be given to the severe weather in Pennsylvania which left the Indians too weak and anemic to fight whereas New England weather was much more healthy and made the Indians stronger.

I mention all this not as scientific evidence but rather as an amusing side light of the lengths to which this purely sectional argument can be carried.

Frankly, gentlemen, and seriously there is not that much difference in climate or in the availability of scientific talent or in any of the other purely technical aspects of this geographical squabble to make much of a difference in these deliberations. Any argument raised on behalf of the New England location from a geographical or a climatic standpoint can easily be matched or bettered with similar arguments for Pennsylvania and Philadelphia.

The issue, therefore, comes down to one very simple thing: Government expense.

Does the United States Government have 6 or 8 or 10 or perhaps $13,000,000 to spent at this time in gratifying some Army officers and civilian scientists in their preference of a neighborhood in which to work?

Can the Government of the United States afford to spend this kind of money so that those officers of the Quartermaster Corps in research and development who come from New England or who like Boston, or who miss the ivy-covered walls of Harvard or MIT and who want to go back there, can have their wish granted?

Do we have that kind of money available to spend merely to save an occasional civilian scientist from one or more of the New England colleges the extreme hardships of a railroad or plane journey to Philadelphia? As one who travels frequently, I know that the trains today are substantially more comfortable than the stagecoach or oxcart or horseback mode of travel, and that it really isn't fatal or even too inconvenient to ride a train. I think most of these scientists for whom the New England delegation evidences such concern in pressing for this legislation are in the main a hardy enough breed of men to survive such occasional travel.

Gentlemen, Benjamin Franklin managed to make that trip under much more adverse conditions. I might add that he was quite a scientist, too.

Philadelphia is really not very far by train or plane from any of the areas from which the laboratory attracts personnel and consultants. It is not in Hawaii; it is not in the Aleutians or the Canal Zone or Okinawa; it is right there on the east coast not far from New York and very accessible by any means of transportation. From some of the statements which have been made in connection with this proposed transfer to Boston or vicinity, one would think that we in Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, were stuck off somewhere at the very edge of civilization.

Now just what are the facts in connection with this legislation?

The facts are that long before the last war certain activities of the Quartermaster Corps in research were conducted at the old established Quartermaster Depot in Philadelphia. Some of these activities were carried on elsewhere. During the war there was some centralization of these activities at Philadelphia. After the war the Army came to the conclusion it would be nice to have them all centralized somewhere. The director of military planning of the Quartermaster Corps, a Harvard man, who is now, I understand, back at Harvard, decided, in his conviction that Harvard and the New England area are the fountainheads of scientific knowledge and the center of all of the worst weather possible to find in any one geographic location, that this laboratory belonged in Harvard's back yard. Some of the members of the New England congressional delegation, heartily concurred and the drive was on. The matter was taken quietly to the House Appropriations Committee during its closed hearings on the Army's appropriation bill back in 1946. The Quartermaster Corps had already worked out the plan to its own satisfaction and had engaged an architect-engineer to substantiate the planning director's own preference for Boston and had then turned over to the Corps of Engineers, which would do the building work for the Quartermaster Corps, the assignment of getting the money for it. The witnesses for the Corps of Engineers pointed out properly to the committee that they build where they are told to and that the selection of a location was the responsibility of the Quartermaster Corps. The testimony was to the effect that the Quartermaster Corps desires to have the facilities erected at or near Boston. Witnesses from the engineers testified that the kind of building desired by the Quartermaster Corps would cost about $5,700,000 with another several hundred thousand dollars necessary to purchase the land. Please bear in mind that these were rough guess of the Army engineers with no plans or specifications on which to base the estimates, nothing more than a square foot estimate of the space, and that these guesses were as of early in 1946 or late in 1945. This bill now before you provides for an expenditure of not to exceed $6,000,000. Presumably the figure is based on that estimate of the engineers which in turn was based on a guess which in turn was based on prevailing construction costs early in 1946 or late in 1945. Gentlemen, that guess would be so unrealistic today as to be ridiculous, absurd, impossible.

In any event, the reports on what was happening in the Army appropriation bill finally came to our attention and the Members of Congress from Philadelphia back in 1946 aided by many of the other Pennsylvania Congressmen obtained an opportunity to present our case before the committee and we succeeded in blocking a $6,000,000 appropriation for erection of this laboratory in Boston. The committee in its report sidestepped

any of the geographical or sectional phases of the controversy and based its action solely on the fact that it was convinced there was no legislative authority for such an appropriation.

Subsequently at the start of the Eightieth Congress in 1947 bills were introduced in the House and the Senate to authorize the construction of this laboratory in or near Boston.

Activities have either been removed from the Philadelphia depot to other locations in an effort to reduce the significance of the Philadelphia depot as a laboratory center or else attempts have been made to do that very thing. Furthermore, the word seems to have been passed down the line from "topside" that all military personnel in any way connected with research and development that Boston is "it" and every effort is to be made to fertilize the soil and condition the air for such a transfer.

One of the significant exhibits of the Quartermaster Corps in testimony before the House Committee on the Armed Services on the companion McCormack bill to this Senate bill was a digest of abstracts from letters from business concerns expressing their approval of the Boston site. It has been called to my attention that the letter from the Quartermaster General's office which inspired these letters of approval in reply did not ask for a preference between Boston and Philadelphia but merely asked if Boston were satisfactory. This is typical of what I have been informed are the strategies of the Quartermaster Corps in pressuring for a Boston location.

As I said, gentlemen, we are armed with masses of documentation and evidence to show that Philadelphia matches or exceeds any of the advantages of a New England site for this facility. But, in the face of a sectional, geographical contest here—and that is what this has developed into—the main issue comes back to one of Government expense.

Every Senator without exception believes, I think, in avoiding any unnecessary governmental expenditures, especially in view of our continuing need for huge military outlays, for vast appropriations for assistance to foreign nations in our efforts to achieve a decent world in which peace and freedom can endure, for terrific expenses for veterans which will no doubt increase as the years go by, for the protection and development of our natural resources, for flood control and reclamation, and for a great variety of other necessary Government needs. The chairman of this subcommittee, Senator BALDWIN, has already indicated his support, I believe, for increases in the wages of inflation-harried Government employees. Many, if not most, of us believe Federal assistance is warranted for our school systems. We are spending now $40,000,000,000 a year, and, although the budget is a source of much controversy, regardless of individual views on individual items in that budget, the fact remains that there is little responsible opinion that it can be cut very substantially. The recent legislative budget resolution drawn by the joint committee representing House and Senate taxation and appropriation committees indicates this.

And now comes this recommendation that we authorize millions of dollars unnecessarily for a new building in New England to do work which can be done and to a large extent has been done and is being done in the quartermaster depot in Philadelphia.

I might say parenthetically that numerous New Englanders, including residents of Boston, Cambridge, Dorchester Center, and elsewhere in Massachusetts have protested vigorously to me against the erection of this building on what appears to be the desired location of the Quartermaster Corps, on park land now providing about the only recreational space for thousands of children living in a congested area.

Far from opposing any expansion of the quartermaster depot in Philadelphia, on the other hand, all of our people in Philadelphia, who are proud of this present facility, wholeheartedly endorse any expansion of the depot which might be necessary to provide the space needed for this laboratory.

Actually, however, we believe that present facilities could be rearranged to provide for the laboratory, and that it could be done with a minimum of expense to the Government while providing a maximum of the desired centralization. It is my understanding that even if the labcratory proposed here were built in Boston or in New England, many research activities would of necessity continue in Philadelphia and you would have the very division of activities this bill purports to correct.

First of all, there is 154,490 square feet of Government-owned space adjacent to the Quartermaster depot in Philadelphia which, if a completely new building actually is needed, could be utilized at a saving of at least the $200,000 or so which the Corps of Engineers—back in 1945 or early 1946—estimated land for the laboratory building in New England would cost. This available Government-owned land in Philadelphia is new being used for a parking lot.

Secondly, Research and Development at Philadelphia is already utilizing about 148,941 square feet—these are inside building measurements—at the Philadelphia depot. Nearly a half million dollars has been spent, I understand, in the construction of these facilities. How much of this expense would be wasted were the research functions to be consolidated in Boston, rather than in Philadelphia, I do not know, but I suspect that much of the money spent during the war on facilities at Philadelphia would be written off in such a transfer.

Thirdly, although the argument has been advanced that space is not available in the Quartermaster depot because the Signal Corps was recently moved into quarters there, I necessarily must bring to your attention the fact that the Signal Corps has tremendous space of its own at Middle River, Md., where an entire bomber plant, as I recall, was taken over by this service. The Signal Corps has flatly stated its intention of consolidating most of the functions it now carries on in Philadelphia down at the Maryland facility it owns and since it is in Philadelphia now only temporarily and can be moved upon short notice, either on its own initiative or to make room for laboratory research, I maintain that it is a thoroughly misleading argument and an untrue one to say that the Philadelphia depot cannot accommodate the laboratory because of the Signal Corps tenancy.

These are dollar-and-cents aspects of the issue. There are more:

The plans for the new laboratory building at Boston provide, I understand, for the construction separately, at additional expense, of a cafeteria and recreation hall. Is there any estimate available on this cost? I ask, because there exists at Philadelphia at the depot an auditorium capable of seating 1,000 persons and there also exists one of the most modern cafeterias in America. These, I repeat, already exist at Philadelphia. This is another aspect of the dollar-and-cents importance of staying in Philadelphia and enlarging the Philadelphia facilities.

The Army speaks of the saving in travel and telephone expenses in consolidating in Boston. Of course it is obvious that with some of the work in research continuing in Philadelphia, there would still be extensive traveling and telephone expenses in communication between the two locations. But even more expensive an aspect of this transfer would be the terrific expense of moving the bulk of the present military and civilian employees of the Philadelphia laboratory to Boston. Expense aside, are there housing accommodations in Boston or vicinity for these reluctant pilgrims forced to journey by this proposal to the great Mecca of Harvard?

While we are on the subject of expense and expenditures—a very compelling subject usually to this Congress—I might point out right now that although the Budget Bureau has expressed no objection as such to the Army's submission to the House and Senate of a report urging authority to construct a laboratory in Boston, the Budget Bureau expressly stated that this was not to be construed as involving any commitment with respect to the early submission of estimates of appropriation for construction of the project.

In view of that, I submit that since the Army obviously has no authority, even if this bill should grant it, to seek construction funds for the project at any early date, it cannot ask for such funds without Budget Bureau approval even if the Congress passes legislation authorizing the project—that the Army therefore has time—it has plenty of time—to give another look at the extent of Philadelphia space available to it; it has time to determine the actual cost of enlarging Philadelphia facilities to be suitable for the consolidated laboratory; it has time to make a realistic survey of the realistic costs of building such a laboratory from the ground up in New England; it has an opportunity to revise this wholly absurd estimate of $6,000,000 specified in the legislation now before us. As a matter of fact, the Quartermaster Corps has had the opportunity ever since the failure of its original end-run attempt of 1946 to get the money from the House Appropriations Committee to make such realistic surveys and it hasn't seemed to have wanted to take advantage of the opportunity. Yet, in the recent House hearings last year, this magic figure of $6,000,000 still holds as the Army's estimate.

That raises the question, In late 1945 or early 1946, when this proposal was first made, was the Army estimating on the basis of 1949 costs? Did it know what they would be? No, of course not. Army engineer estimates on flood-control costs made at the very same time that these estimates were made for the proposed Quartermaster Research Laboratory in Boston, have since been found to be completely impossible in view of the outrageous rise in construction costs. I have a tremendously high regard for the Corps of Engineers, who have done magnificent work in my State on flood control, particularly, and I am inclined to accept their estimates as being pretty reliable. The Engineer Corps estimate on this building was made in late 1945 or early 1946—I repeat. It was no doubt a good estimate at that time. Yet, when the hearings on this measure were conducted in the House last June, all of the testimony on costs came not from the Corps of Engineers, but from Quartermaster Corps officials. I found no mention in the House hearings of any recent cost estimates from Army engineers. General Larkin of the Quartermaster Corps testified in these words:

"Our costs, from the estimate that we have prepared last year, is an estimated cost of $6,000,000."

Perhaps the Quartermaster Corps has little liaison with the Veterans' Administration, which is striving to build hospitals somewhere within buzz-bomb range of appropriations given it in 1946 and 1947, or the engineers who are trying to build flood-control projects under the same circumstances, and both finding it impossible in terms of present-day construction prices. If this liaison did exist and the Quartermaster Corps knows of some of the construction-cost problems of its sister branches of the Army, it would, I am sure, do some rapid revising on its figures.

Now, gentlemen, let's stop kidding ourselves or the public that this project could be built at Boston for anything resembling $6,000,000. Let's stop pretending that because a certain amount of the field work of the Quartermaster Corps' research work is done at Mount Washington or on the rocky coast of Maine or in the New England wet-cold occurring perhaps a month or two out of the year that the laboratory center must be in Boston. Actually, I understand, a great deal more of the field work is done in places like Attu or the jungles of the tropics. It would, therefore, be as logical to build this laboratory halfway between the Aleutians and New Guinea.

These field teams are mobile units which go where they find the appropriate conditions for the particular test. Regardless of where this laboratory were located, they would make such far-away field trips. And as for scientists and research men, I can promise that our universities and colleges in Pennsylvania and in nearby New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and other nearby States will make it their business to supply as many thoroughly qualified men as are needed in case Harvard and MIT men, for example, shrink in horror from an occasional train trip down to Philadelphia for some consultations or for extended periods of work with the Quartermaster Corps on projects of such great national importance.

It seems the Atomic Energy Commission still manages to attract scientists to the most isolated parts of the country without bringing the entire atomic-energy project to Harvard. If the work is important—and this is—the men will be found to do it.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Kansas City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 18 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] at Kansas City, Mo., February 13, at the Lincoln birthday dinner of the Missouri Republican Club, in conjunction with the Jackson County Republican Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am proud to have been invited here to join with you in commemorating the anniversary of the birth of one of the world's greatest men—Abraham Lincoln—first Republican President of the United States.

In your State there is so much which is in tune with the life of Lincoln. The romance of Missouri's progress to greatness is one of the most inspiring stories of our Republic. It is a story of rugged independence, self-reliance, patriotic love of country, and magnificent victory over struggle, hardship, and conflict.

Your proud reputation as the "show me" State is honored across the Nation as a challenge and an invitation.

Missouri stands foursquare to the world as a land of vast achievement. It is strong and progressive in industry, agriculture, and mining. It is far advanced in spiritual and cultural attainments. From your cities stem the railroad arteries which haul the Nation's freight and its people to all parts of the United States.

Your fertile farms produce the crops of both the North and the South and the fruit of your orchards has national fame. Your State leads the country in lead mining with an amazing history of development going back more than 200 years. You have rich deposits of coal, zinc, iron, and many other minerals.

But more important than all of these things is the sturdy character of your God-fearing people. Missouri Americanism represents an intermingling of the best traditions of the Old World with the hard work, the courage, and freedom of the New. Your State has produced a long line of famous men—statesmen, military leaders, educators, industrialists, writers, and editors. Their service has contributed so much to our Nation and to the world.

Speaking of Missouri's outstanding sons, let me take this occasion to express my deep appreciation of the honor and pleasure of my association with your two courageous, able, and distinguished United States Senators. I refer, of course, to FORREST DONNELL and JIM KEM. Let me assure you that they are among the hardest-working, most conscientious legislators in Washington. Missouri is indeed fortunate to be represented in the Senate by two Republicans of such exceptional ability, unquestioned integrity, and high character. Their fine legal attainments are serving the Nation well in the fight to restore constitutional government.

They, together with your Republican Representatives in the Lower House, live up to your State motto, "Let the welfare of the people be the supreme law."

Abraham Lincoln believed in that doctrine. He believed in good government, in honest government, as the only kind of government that truly serves the welfare of the people.

This is the way Lincoln felt about good government and the need for respect for the law. In an address at Springfield, Ill., he declared:

"Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well wisher to his posterity, swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate, in the least particular, the laws of our country, and never to tolerate their violation by others. Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the law be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap, let it be taught in the schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in the primers, spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice."

If I had my way, this quotation would hang framed in town halls, in city halls, in county buildings, and in the State capitols of our 48 States. It would be displayed in Washington in the legislative halls and most particularly in the office of every bureaucrat.

Lincoln's text is just as alive and as pertinent today as when he uttered it.

Lincoln knew that real freedom could be attained only by a law-abiding people under leaders whose whole careers had been dedicated to good government.

Unfortunately, there are still with us the racketeer in government, the racketeer in politics, the racketeer in business and in labor.

They have been flourishing in recent years. We have seen numerous cases recently. We have seen a powerful leader in the House of Representatives—a Democratic chairman of the Military Affairs Committee—engaged in quiet business deals and fixes, getting war contracts for the boys and plenty of undisclosed business for himself, under the table. The sordid story of Representative Andrew J. May was unfolded in our Federal courts.

More recently we have seen one of the highest Army officers—Maj. Gen. Bennett Myers—in charge of Air Force procurement—revealed as a man who set up a business on the side and influenced Army contracts into his plant. Not only was he making a secret and illegal profit by virtue of this racket—he was making an outrageous profit.

A Republican Senate committee brought out evidence that he had deliberately boosted the cost of the instruments he sold to far above an honest price.

These are just a few cases reflecting a dangerous break-down in morality. In the days ahead more examples will undoubtedly be brought to public light.

Across the Nation we have the corrupt city machines, dominated by unscrupulous men, serving their own selfish interests. These are powerful forces in the Democratic Party and they crush everything in their way. There is the insufferable Hague machine in Jersey City, Tammany Hall in New York, the Kenny-Nash machine still doing business at the old stand in Chicago, hand-in-glove with the underworld.

They have defiled the purity of the ballot.

They have become partners in operations which prey upon the earnings and savings of our citizens.

They have made a mockery of law enforcement by corrupting public officials. In some instances they have made justice a commodity to be bought and sold in the market place.

But here, in Kansas City, I need not tell you how a corrupt political machine operates. You Republicans, with the help of self-respecting Democrats, have fought courageously to defeat the Pendergast machine. You believe with Lincoln that reverence for the law is the charter of your own and your children's liberty.

Local governments are the foundation timbers upon which we have built the structure of our Republic. When political termites weaken that foundation, our whole system of free government is in danger of collapse. We must exterminate them before it is too late.

The examples I have mentioned, which could be multiplied many times, have shaken the confidence of the people in public officials. The word "politician" has become transformed; to many people it implies intrigue, graft, and dishonest dealing.

It is notable that Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, in his recent letter announcing that he was not a Presidential candidate, stated: "Politics is a profession—a serious, complicated, and, in its true sense, a noble one."

The dictionary definition of politician is: "One versed in the science of government." We must return the word again to that definition.

Lincoln was a politician, and he knew that politics must, as a matter of course, be part of any form of government other than dictatorship or anarchy. He knew that politics can be clean and honest and can help to provide good government for all the people. Lincoln knew, and proved by example, that a politician can be an incorruptible servant of the people. He knew, as we here all know, that the party and party regularity can be valuable weapons for good citizenship and for the defense of the Constitution.

It should be a matter of concern to all of us that so many of our citizens—leaders in business, education, and the church—have been so lax in their efforts and guidance toward good government. It is to be regretted that so many have taken the position that politics is beneath their dignity. They should understand that politics is the science of government. If we are to have clean, efficient, economical government, serving the best interests of all the people, we must have good citizenship. That means greater participation in politics and more widespread interest in the affairs of government.

We must join together as good citizens to fight corruption whether in the Democratic Party or in our own ranks.

We should not forget the advice Lincoln gave in an address before the Young Men's Lyceum of Springfield, Ill. The support and defense of our Republic, he declared, depends upon general intelligence, sound morality, and reverence for the Constitution and law.

We should encourage our young men to interest themselves in politics—not in the politics of the corrupt political machines but in politics in its true sense as exemplified by the greatest of all Republicans—Abraham Lincoln. The young men who are attracted by politics are among the greatest assets of our country. The future of the community, the State, and the Nation, is bound up in the course they take. They must realize that success in politics will grow out of what they put into it—not what they take out. They must learn that political work is for public service—not for private advantage; for the public good—not for personal gain. The qualities of highest importance are honesty, sincerity, willingness to work, and a deep sense of obligation to their fellow citizens.

For 15 long years our young people have been taught a philosophy contrary to those principles. They have been taught to depend upon the Government and not that the Government depends upon them. They have been taught to look to Washington, to the bureaucrats for the solution of all their problems. They have been taught the dependent way of life, not the independent way. This false philosophy, combined with the rising tide of corruption, spells danger to the people of our Nation. Unless we act vigorously to check these evil influences, we will be led down the road to destruction. We will lose the freedoms bought and paid for in sacrifice, sweat, blood, and tears in every generation.

I have been deeply concerned over the development of recent years in which men have turned to Washington as the source of all good things.

America's pioneers could build a house or conquer savage enemies with their hands. They were unafraid. The song of America's manifold opportunities was in their hearts. They had faith in God. They believed in themselves, and had confidence in their ability to build a Nation of freedom. That was Lincoln's kind of stock.

Abraham Lincoln was the great prophet of opportunity. His rise to immortal fame teaches that in this land, no matter where you start, there is plenty of room at the top for those who strive upward.

As never before in our history we need the example of Lincoln to teach this generation and those that follow the importance of keeping the avenues of opportunity free and open for every youth in America.

Much of the attitude of leaning upon Government to do for us what we should be doing for ourselves, comes from a feeling that the opportunities of the old days have gone.

There never was, there never will be, a falser premise. The opportunities are here. But the new philosophy of Government, with its tax roadblocks, its regimentation and socialistic paternalism, temporarily bars the way.

We will clear away these obstacles to opportunity. We will open the road once more. We will restore sound, economical, constitutional government by a smashing Republican victory in November.

Look about—opportunity is demonstrated on every side. In this very room are men of courage who came up the ladder the hard way. Today, as in Lincoln's day, you will find men who, literally, were born in humble log cabins and yet climbed to the stars.

Here in Missouri, you have men of pioneer stock, whose grandfathers and great grandfathers found opportunity, success and honor in the freedom of our soil. Others came to our shores in more recent years, finding for themselves and their sons the right to grow and prosper as good Americans. Some died on the battlefield, fighting under the stars and stripes. All contributed to building and safeguarding America.

No other land on earth offers such opportunities. Let us clean house. Let us get the course of Government back on the main track. Then America will offer the same opportunities to the brave in spirit as when it lifted Abraham Lincoln from an earthen cabin floor to a place among the immortals.

In planning for the future we can seek guidance in the lessons of the past. Have we been vigilant? Have we been true to our trust? What dangers do we face? What remedies can we apply?

First, we have placed too much emphasis upon our rights and too little on our obligations. As a people we have not taken enough interest in government. As a result, we have allowed much of our Government to be dominated by selfish men, grasping for power and wealth at the expense of their fellow citizens.

We have been led astray by political promisers who pretend they are giving something to the people, when, in fact, they are only promising to spend the taxpayers' money.

We have placed spendthrifts in high places—men who squander our substance without regard for financial stability or national solvency. Their way is the easy way—and leads to disaster. We have the pressure groups, large and small, who swarm about Washington serving special interests and selfish purposes. In seeking advantages for themselves they seem to forget that the rights of the whole people are parsmount to the rights of any group, organization, or section.

We have permitted the creation of a multiplicity of spending agencies with overlapping authority and duplication of services. Many of them perform functions which should be reduced or eliminated. Their wasteful and extravagant financial operations are so intricate and so intermixed that the most capable expert accountants cannot find their way through the maze of jumbled figures. No one knows where they stand or where the money has gone.

We have seen the creation of an army of bureaucrats, not to serve the public, but to perpetuate in power the kind of government that submits a budget of $40,000,000,000 for a single year.

This is the most tremendous peacetime budget in all history. And the end is not in sight. Next, I predict, based upon existing facts, that unless we defeat this administration, it will be asking the taxpayers for a budget in excess of $50,000,000,000 within 2 years. Such a course can lead only to higher taxes, more and more inflation and, in the end, national bankruptcy and a receivership in the form of a socialistic or totalitarian government.

That is not a pleasant prospect. We can stop it only by continuing and strengthening Republican control of Congress and by electing a Republican President in November. This we must and will do.

The most constructive proposal offered by the Republican Party is its pledge to put our country's financial house in order—to restore honesty and sanity to our Federal spending—to reduce taxes, to postpone unnecessary public improvements and to make a substantial start on paying off the Federal debt.

Since January 1947 the Republican Congress has been doing everything within its power to achieve those ends, but the stubborn short-sighted Truman administration has resisted every effort to restore sound fiscal policies.

The party of Lincoln is committed to these things—and will continue the fight—because we know that freedom depends upon a financially sound government structure. An insolvent nation cannot be a free nation. Economic bankruptcy is the open door to political disaster. History teaches that a debt-ridden nation always sells its freedom for a mess of pottage—and winds up with neither, but only with chains and distress.

In these troubled, confused and perplexing days we need more of the spirit that made Abraham Lincoln say:

"I am driven to my knees over and over again, because I have nowhere else to go."

This great man of ours, this great man who belongs to the whole world and to all history, was not too proud to go to his knees and pray for guidance and comfort.

There is comfort in prayer. There is guidance in prayer. There is wisdom in prayer. The men who made America carried the Bible over the mountains and into the wilderness.

Where have we gone off the right course? Have we turned to false gods? We have the churches, the cathedrals, the temples and synagogues. We have the men of good will and good spirit to lead us back to prayer. Let our church bells ring out across the land, let our people turn again to God for divine guidance in rebuilding and strengthening our spiritual courage and our moral fiber.

With the example of Abraham Lincoln to inspire us, let us go forward to an overwhelming victory in November.

Forward-Looking Republicanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 18 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Forward-Looking Republicanism, which I delivered in Charleston, W. Va., on February 12, before the Republican Clubs of West Virginia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are many reasons why I am glad to be speaking here in West Virginia tonight. To my mind first comes the thought of the pleasure at the opportunity which this occasion affords me of telling you of the fine standing in the United States Senate of your Senator, Honorable CHAPMAN REVERCOMB. I have served with him for many years. His sincerity, his earnestness, his careful study of public questions, his zeal for the people of West Virginia, and his sense of dedication to the United States gives him a high place in the Senate He is an able public servant and a fine American. I am proud to call him my friend.

Then on Lincoln's Birthday, it is somehow appropriate to be speaking in a State whose beginnings are so closely tied up with the Civil War in which the great Lincoln led this country to victory and without whose leadership we would not today be a nation to whom the whole world looks for liberty and salvation. It is fitting here in West Virginia, meeting as Republicans, to reflect on Lincoln's loving kindness for his fellowmen, his honesty, his passion to unify the people and finally what one great spiritual leader called his "freedom and radicalness."

Remember it is Lincoln who said: "This country with its institutions belongs to the people who inhabit it."

We cannot be timid or backward-looking and be worthy of Lincoln.

Remember the great words of thunder which come breaking out from the past from Lincoln's brain to help us today: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

"Think anew and act anew"—good words for Republicans, indeed for all Americans—to remember.

"Think anew and act anew"—thoughts which the people at the next election will certainly have uppermost in their minds.

We must think anew and act anew because we are meeting under such difficult conditions. In some ways more difficult than those which existed in time of war. At that time, to be sure, our young manhood was being wounded and killed. Thank heaven this is not happening now, but today we face conditions as a people which are of much greater complexity.

In time of war the problem can be simply stated: It is to defeat the enemy and win the war. Today, however, we must make decisions which compel us to look ahead not for 3 or 4 or 5 years but for a whole generation. The acts which the American people take in this year of 1948, either through their Representatives in Congress or by their own direct use at the election in November will in all honesty have a decisive effect for good or evil on the lives of you and me who are here today and also on the lives of those who come after us.

The problems are so full of contradictions that the right answer to one problem, if carried too far, can become the wrong answer. We are often limited merely to choosing between the lesser of evils. Take, for example, the question of helping Europe. There are powerful reasons for helping Europe. There is the reason that we do not want to let our brother starve and shiver with cold. There is the reason that we do not want to see the whole western world outside of the United States engulfed in that godless tide of violence, hatred, and treason known as communism.

There is the reason which comes to mind from the old saying that, in life, the people you meet going up, you also meet coming down.

There is the reason that, out of our aid and out of the ashes, a united and integrated Europe may arise which will give man some hope for a way out of his misery—in other words that we will not have merely resurrected the old firetrap which has involved America in two world wars.

Those are all powerful reasons.

But it is also powerfully important that this help be given in the right way.

In extending it we must avoid the errors of the past. We must not repeat all the mistakes of UNRRA and of the British loan and of the other ill-fated attempts to bring order out of chaos by the simple expenditure of American dollars. We must avoid the incredible errors of bureaucratic operations, whereby we send olives to Greece and coal to Newcastle.

We must provide help for essentials only. Let luxuries be obtained elsewhere and let them be obtained later and not at our expense.

Our help must be conditioned above all on the ability of European countries to help themselves. It would be a foolish and almost a criminal waste for us to send coal abroad, for example, to countries whose principal article of export is coal.

Then, we must get something back in return. If we are to send our machinery overseas, let there be a hard and fast agreement that we will get natural resources (or future rights to such resources) in return, such as bauxite, manganese, and iron ore, and many other things, which we do not have in sufficient amounts in this country. Such agreements enhance self-respect and minimize the chances of bad feeling.

We must be absolutely sure that all assets owned by foreigners are put into the service of this great cause, insofar as this can be done. If, as we are officially told, there are between two and three billion dollars worth of gold in France, this gold must be put to work. If there are wealthy people in Europe, they should be taxed. If there are $9,000,000,000 worth of foreign assets held in the United States, they should be pledged to the operation of the Marshall plan, because the poor here in America must not be made to support the rich overseas.

The Europeans must know that we are giving this help. We should set aside enough money and enough of an organization so that in spite of communistic propaganda they may know the truth about America and then they can take us or leave us. If they know the truth they will embrace the hope and the inspiration that is America and will do so with enthusiasm.

Let there never be a Marshall plan in reverse. That would be worse than no plan at all. What do I mean? I mean a condition in which our funds would be used to promote the separatism and suicidal nationalism of Europe. We should use our influence to achieve a voluntary integration and unity of Europe in which tariff barriers are removed, financial stability and a solid currency are assured and in which the whole European area is treated as a unit, thereby lifting the intolerable military and governmental burdens from the backs of the European people. That is the best hope for avoiding the recurrences of future European war.

We all know that the program which we are confronting makes sacrifice on our part inevitable and we also know that the American people can make sacrifices and have so done many times, but let us remember this: That whatever aid we send, we must never do violence to vital American needs. It must never be at the expense of the food and the heat and the clothing and the housing and the economic system whereby America lives and has its being. A strong America is not only essential to Americans; it is vitally necessary to the world.

If there is one thing which the masters of the Kremlin desire more than any other it is the collapse of the United States. They may even desire this more than they desire the prostration of Europe.

Consequently, if there is one thing which we must preserve above everything else, it is the strength and the vigor of our country.

And, so, no matter where you start in your discussion of public affairs—whether you start in China or Germany or any other remote part of the world—you always come back to the United States. Because a strong United States is not only essential to ourselves; it is fundamental to every foreign policy which we may desire to carry out.

And I tell you no secret when I say that at the present moment the strength of America is in danger of being impaired. What is a strong America? It is, of course, an America which has an adequate army, navy, and air force. That is one kind of strength.

And in that respect we are deficient. Our Army is 60 to 70 percent short of the minimum in combat troops and our Air Force is below the 70-air-group figure which our experts consider the rock-bottom amount. This is discouraging.

But there is another and more fundamental strength which comes from a people whose morale is high, who are having such a good life themselves and see so many prospects for their children that they are enthusiastic about what this country stands for. If, therefore, the standard of living of the American people falls below a certain point, and if the prospects for the American family become dim, you will have a falling off in enthusiasm for what America stands for and a serious weakening in what is, after all, the most important form of national strength.

You know as well as I that today this element of our strength is threatened by the tremendously high prices which everyone must pay for the necessities of life. Prices are high and every American family is being strained to make both ends meet. You also know what some of the reasons are for these high prices. There is the war, which, of course, creates tremendous scarcities and builds up tremendous demands which postwar production cannot meet. There is also the desire of certain groups for exorbitant gain which in turn leads to very high prices. There is the bad weather here and abroad. I mention these three factors in order to be perfectly frank. Yet another factor for high prices is the great added burden placed on our production of foodstuffs by the need for shipping food abroad. Let us be fair.

But it is also true that the party which has been in power since 1932 seems to have overlooked not one single opportunity to push prices as high as possible. Let us just make a list of what they have done since 1932.

1. They have increased the amount of money in circulation.

2. They have cheapened the value of the dollar.

3. They have vastly increased Government borrowing and spending.

4. They have increased taxes, which always leads to increased prices in order to make up the difference of the tax.

5. They have increased the amount of Federal obligations in the hands of the banks.

6. They have failed to curb speculation in commodity markets. In fact we are now reading the not very edifying story in the papers of speculators within the President's official family.

7. They have given price support to many essential commodities in order to keep the price up.

8. They have bought foodstuffs at the wrong time and in the wrong way without taking advantage of drops in the market.

These are not statements which I make out of my imagination. These are not statements which can simply be attributed to the fact that we are having a Republican meeting here tonight. These are statements of fact which are taken from the record and which no serious student of public affairs in either party seriously disputes. There may be members of the party in power who can give explanations of why these things are done. But no one can deny that they were done.

Nor can anyone who has observed the party in power during the last 10 years fail to see the deterioration which has taken place. Ten years ago it was not only possible, but easy, to disagree violently with them, but it was evident that there were many men in Washington of imagination, intellectual vigor, and broad human sympathy—a far cry from the smug hanger-on which, with some noteworthy exception, seems best to describe many of those in the seats of the mighty today.

But there is never much use in spending a great deal of time in fixing the blame. We prefer the constructive attitude of the man who says, "Here's a problem, what is the best way to solve it?" We believe that the Republican Party is the party which can and will meet these issues intelligently and effectively, always remembering that this country exists for the benefit of the people who live in it, and that the economic structure of all segments of the community must remain in balance with the rest. The Republican Party had its birth as the defender of the most underprivileged people that the world had ever seen. It is and must be the defender of the underprivileged today. What then can we expect as a Republican program?

First of all, we can stop the mistaken policies of those who have been in the seats of the mighty since 1932.

This means effective measures:

1. To curb speculation.

2. To call a halt to any extravagant price support of commodities essential to life.

3. To stop the extravagant administration of government. We have, in fact, taken great strides along this line during the very short time that we have been in control of Congress. The Republican Congress reduced expenditures and stopped and reversed the extravagant trend of the preceding years. Congress also passed a law, of which I was an author, setting up a very able Commission to reorganize the whole executive branch of the Government, to throw the light in all the dark places and to overhaul it from stem to stern. This Commission will report in January 1949, and it is my hope and belief that it will pay big dividends in increased economy and increased efficiency for the American people.

4. We can and must reduce taxes and do so in several different ways—by increasing the allowance for dependents under the personal income tax which will give relief to the place where it is most needed and will be most appreciated. We must revise the business-tax structure so as to give encouragement to investment in goods and machinery which will increase production. Serious study should be given to a proposition to give a tax rebate to firms which reduce the price of their product to the consumer. These tax-reduction measures should give some quick relief from high prices.

5. We should be able to make at least a $2,000,000,000 reduction in Federal expenditures, a $3,000,000,000 reduction in the Federal debt, and at the same time maintain an adequate national defense and give proper support to the Marshall plan.

6. You may say that this is a hard thing to do, but that is what statesmanship is for. If these things were easy, there would be no point in the community training men for their whole lifetime in order to cope with these questions. We have trained statesmen, thank Heaven.

7. There should be some assurance given to the people also that really effective measures will be taken to conserve our natural resources. Whether we like it or not, we are becoming a "have not" nation in many of the basic commodities in which we once had a surplus, and which helped materially to make us the strongest power on earth. Remember that our great national strength and productivity is due in part to the intelligence and industry of the American people, but it is also due in part to the great natural wealth which God in His wisdom put in the four square of the United States. We must conserve what we have left and we must seek means of stock piling and acquiring natural resources abroad to make up for the deficiencies which the war has caused.

8. There should be prompt action for setting up a real housing program. The utter impossibility of getting housing at a reasonable price is a blot on our traditional American ingenuity. If the production lines of our country can turn out radios, airplanes, and motor cars, they should also be able to turn out the basic units which go into housing. When volume production gets under way prices will go down. The demand is there. With construction at a sufficiently high level to assure year around work at a decent wage for labor, the restrictive working conditions which are reported in certain trades would disappear over night. The same is true of the collusive practices which we hear of among the suppliers of building materials. These would give way under competition. The Government of itself cannot provide the sole solution, but it can help to break the log jam. The most effective and quickest step toward this end is for the Government to provide part of the cost so that housing will be available to people at prices they can afford, and especially to the lowest income groups whose needs, even in normal times, have never been met by private enterprise. But most important of all is prompt action so that advantage may be taken of the building season which begins in March. We must not lose another year.

9. Our prime reliance for the well-being of the citizen must always rest on having a competitive economy. We believe he prospers better under such a system, and we know that without a competitive economy a political democracy is impossible. The two go hand in hand. Destroy private property by direct or indirect action and you destroy human freedom. But there are chinks which our competitive economy does not always reach, and there are certain things which it is more convenient for us to have government do—and government, we hope, will under Republican guidance become an efficient tool to do whatever the people want it to do. For example, there are useful steps which government can take in the field of public health without in any way bringing to the needy and sick the dangers of so-called socialized medicine. One such step is to make a free distribution to the needy sick of certain medicines, the value of which is proven and which are beyond the financial reach of many persons. Nor is it disputed that government has an obligation toward aged persons who come to the end of their lives without adequate means.

Another way in which the power of government may be used is in instituting a really efficient campaign for voluntary rationing together with adequate appropriations for the organization of statutory rationing, should this be demanded by the people. If rationing of meat, for example, is demanded by the people, it would be inexcusable if the Government were not ready to put it into effect, and did not have really well-thought-out plans. I realize that Congress makes the laws and the President administers them. And there is no way that we can pass laws which will give us efficient administration. If we have administrators of the type that we had before, it is doubtful whether the best laws would work. But at least Congress must be ready with the plans so that if the people decide to go on a certain course, we can do so as effectively as possible.

10. There are many reasons for believing that government funds should be used to facilitate scientific research, but not under conditions which impose governmental dominance of scientific thought.

To sum up:

There are two kinds of strength—military and economic. We are below strength in one because our armed forces are under the minimum. We are below strength in the other because of inflation.

While the war and other causes explain part of the current inflation, the party in power is responsible for eight definite measures which have given prices a big push to their present height. These measures are: Increasing amount of money in circulation, cheapening value of dollar, increasing Government borrowing and spending, increasing taxes (which increases prices), increasing amount of Federal obligation in banks, failure to curb speculation, excessive support of prices of necessaries of life, and buying foodstuffs at wrong time.

A Republican Party program is here presented to curb speculation, halt extravagant price support, cease lavish public spending, enact tax reduction, conserve natural resources, construct housing, promote public health and scientific research, and maintain adequate armed forces to support American foreign policy.

These are a few specific suggestions for constructive, forward-looking Republican action. But while, of course, we must have a Government program, more than that is properly demanded of us. While we must ever be efficient, effective, industrious, far-sighted, and incorruptible in our administration of public affairs, more than that is rightfully expected of us. Our viewpoint about our fellowmen is at the heart of the matter. There must be fervent belief in his value, his dignity, and his capacity for development. There must be that passion, as the Constitution so eloquently puts it, "to establish justice"; whatever we do must be done in an atmosphere of active, affirmative faith.

In such an atmosphere and animated by that faith, the Republican Party can lead our country and the world to a richer prosperity and a greater peace than it has ever known. What is more important, in such an atmosphere and spurred by such a faith, we will deserve to lead.

What Labor Expects of Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 18 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an important address by an outstanding leader of labor, Harvey W. Brown, president of the International Association of Machinists. This organization is made up of the toolmakers, machinists, and mechanics whose skills are the foundation of our machine-age civilization.

Mr. Brown's address entitled "What Labor Expects of Management," was delivered February 18, 1948, before the annual meeting of the American Management Association at Chicago, Ill. In these days when we are struggling to develop labor-management cooperation, Mr. Brown's forthright appraisal of management's responsibility is worthy of careful consideration by every Member of this body.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing this address. The estimated cost is $213.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been invited to speak to you on the subject of what labor expects of management. To be more specific, what should management do in handling individual grievances, in maintaining stability, consulting with unions in the establishment of welfare programs, and in adopting labor-management approaches to certain types of employment programs.

These are very familiar subjects. I have been talking about them for—well, for more years than I am going to admit. I have been talking about them with men of your standing in management; I have been talking about them with foremen and supervisors in discussing grievances. Perhaps I should be tired of it, but I am not. To me, they are vitally interesting and important subjects, and there is nothing I would rather talk about in ordinary times, but these are not ordinary times. Frankly, the question of what management and labor expect of each other in their daily contacts does not seem to me to be the important issue today. The important issue, the only issue, is: What do the times demand of management and labor?

This year America must make decisions which will shape the course of her future, and of the world's future, for many years to come. You are meeting here to discuss important phases of one of those decisions—how American management may operate our industrial machinery in such a way as to fill the material demands of a nation and of a world whose people want, and in some cases desperately need, the products of our farms and factories. I am here, in response to your friendly invitation, to stress the fact that not only must American industry meet these demands, but it must meet them without sacrificing the industrial democracy which we of organized labor have been building painfully for the past half a century. Indeed, if America is to meet the challenge fully the area of industrial democracy must be constantly expanded.

I appreciate deeply the opportunity you have given me to be with you today. I look upon your invitation as a compliment to the 650,000 working men and women I represent. More important, the invitation is, to me, a symbol of the friendship and of the cooperation which must be practiced by management and labor on every level of contact, if we are to meet fully our democratic challenge.

The tide of totalitarianism, which already has engulfed eastern Europe, and which beats relentlessly at the crumbling walls of freedom in the west, is testimony of the extent of that challenge and the urgency of our cooperation. If we are to maintain free competitive enterprise here at home, if we are to perpetuate our free way of life throughout the world, management and labor must accept that cooperation as a basic part of our pattern of democracy, and must practice it and defend it with the same intensity which marked the practice and defense of political freedom in the early history of the United States.

This is an auspicious time for our consideration of this problem. Next Sunday we celebrate the birthday of George Washington, who led our Nation in its successful fight for national independence and political liberty. Last Thursday we celebrated the birthday of another great American, Abraham Lincoln, who lived and died in a struggle to prove that democracy began, not ended, with the principles for which Washington led a revolution.

It is important that we remember these men, and their principles, as we discuss the question of industrial democracy in today's economy. I have no doubt that American management, which you represent, could meet almost any goal of physical production if it could exercise unbridled authority. You men are experts in your field. You know the techniques of translating raw materials into finished products; you know how to mold the theories of laboratory technicians into practical goods and services. You can do the job.

But just doing the job isn't going to be enough. The matter of how the job is done is just as important. Hitler forgot that; he molded a master management which could proceed unhindered by a consideration of the slaves who ran the machinery. Hitler is gone, but there are others today who place material accomplishment above all else—above humanity, above liberty, above life itself. They will fail, as he failed. And we, too, shall fail if we slip, however slightly, into the mistaken belief that we can sacrifice human rights for material goals, even when the accomplishment of those goals may feed and clothe those whose liberties are denied.

We shall fail if we try that road because the working people of America clothed in the traditions of Washington and Lincoln, manifest in their organized strength, will refuse to remove the garments of liberty when they enter their work place. A man cannot be taught to believe that he is half free and half slave. He cannot be placed upon a pedestal of political liberty, and then told to obey commands blindly when he takes his place at his bench or machine.

The truly rugged individualists of early American management did not recognize this fact. Their failure to recognize it gave birth to the American labor movement. That movement is the expression of the American wage earners' continuing struggle for liberty in every phase of their existence. To condemn organized labor as an institution, the opponents of organized labor criticize the actions of individual leaders and certain practices just as the foes of democracy try to discredit our political system by personal attacks and by petty criticism. But the concept of organized labor, like the concept of democracy, is not open to attack by anyone who believes sincerely in the dignity of man and in his natural right to attain that dignity.

Management must believe in this concept of democracy if it is to do its part in meeting America's challenge in the postwar world, and you, the management, must practice this belief in all of your many dealings with your employees. You must admit democracy to the workshop. If you do, you will find that the processes of industrial democracy, like those of political democracy, are a stepping stone to a better, more efficient, and more productive industrial society.

Some of you may doubt this. It is probably true that the majority of American industrial managers, including many with a record of fair and successful dealing with unions, are only lukewarm in their acceptance of organized labor's full rights. Perhaps at this stage of labor-management relationships, such limited acceptance is understandable. You of management do wear the mantles of men who looked upon organized labor as an unmitigated evil. And I agree that some instances of organized action by wage earners, even today, might seem to warrant that opinion. But perhaps those regrettable actions stem from the fact that many segments of organized labor still bear the marks of battle, inflicted by management which still clings to the brutal traditions of the past. My union will celebrate its sixtieth birthday next May, but within the past decade, and even within the last few months, we have had occasion to deal with managements as ruthless and as unwilling to admit labor's rights, as any with which the union dealt in its earlier years.

This is not the whole picture, and I am happy to say, in making that point, that we also enjoy most cordial and cooperative relations with management throughout the country. During 1947 we entered into or renewed collective-bargaining agreements with some 10,500 individual firms. Yet, in less than 1 percent were we obliged to resort to the strike as a bargaining weapon. This record, of course, reflects as much credit upon the 99 percent of management as it does upon our union.

In spite of parts of the record, on both sides of the fence, I maintain that organized labor is intrinsically sound and basically good, and that by accepting it as such, management will help accomplish its own aims more fully. Let's look at that contention from your viewpoint, and judge whether it will hold water.

First, let us dismiss any ideas that such problems as wages, hours, grievances, seniority, and the like exist because of unions. The contrary is true. These problems exist because of the very nature of modern industry, which operates to deny an individual worker his God-given liberty, and tends also to rob him of economic security. The unions actually were called into being by wage earners to provide machinery by which they could translate into reality their desires for personal dignity, for justice, and for economic security.

Some of you know all of this. Yet many of our citizens, including a large segment of American management, cling to the mistaken notion that labor unions are responsible for the friction in industrial relations, and there are some of these people who believe, even more mistakenly, that without unions this friction would not exist at all.

That, of course, is absolutely false, and the management which preaches that belief, or acts in accordance with it, is either acting in extreme ignorance, or is motivated by a malicious desire to reap some temporary advantage from union smashing, at the expense of its employees and at the risk of injuring the entire country.

As an example of just how untrue the charge that unions cause industrial unrest is, let us consider the 1946 strike record. That was the year of reconversion and produced the worst strike record in recent history. Unquestionably that wave of strikes did much to convince the uninformed that the so-called power of organized labor needed to be curbed. Those strikes also misled many individuals in and out of Congress into supporting the punitive legislation embodied in the Taft-Hartley law. There was considerable strike disturbance in 1946—there was much more in 1919. In that year (1919) more than 20 percent of the labor force was involved in strikes, as against 15 percent in 1946. Yet there were only 3,000,000 members of organized labor in 1919, compared with 15,000,000 in 1946. Plainly, then, unions are not the cause of industrial unrest and they are not the cause of the countless other labor problems which plague the minds and upset the schedules of managers of industry.

A union is, in essence, a line of communication by which employees may let management know what their work problems are, and what they want done about them. A union is also, of course, a means by which employees can translate their wants into demands, and in drastic cases attempt to enforce those demands by economic power. You may resent this economic power, but without it a union would be as useless to employees as is a lathe without a cutting tool, and when you consider the matter closely from your own viewpoint as managers, I think you will find that without potential economic force a union would be a useless tool in industrial relations.

Management, in its daily work, must contend with three different groups—the owners of the business, the customers, and the employees. Both the owners, because of their control of capital, and the customers, because of their control of purchasing power, exert direct economic pressure upon management. Unless the employees have some means of exerting pressure of their own, their wants and needs will be ignored. Management will be too busy responding to the groups which have power to enforce their demands. The fact that the employees' needs and grievances are ignored will not cause them to vanish. Rather it will cause them to fester—like a hidden infection—until they have poisoned the entire structure of employee-management relations.

All of us know the effects of repressed economic demands. They resemble in these days the same force that was represented by repressed political demands in the eighteenth century. In those days the cry of the revolutionary was "political freedom." The twentieth century revolutionary rallies his forces beneath the banner of industrial democracy.

This type of revolutionary preaches the false industrial democracy of Soviet Russia. He speaks of liberty and freedom, but when he has gained the allegiance of a repressed people, he strips from them the last vestige of those civil and political rights which we cherish as the bulwarks of a free society. He, and the nation whose philosophy he represents, are potent forces in the world today. They are challenging the proponents of true democracy for the aspirations and loyalties of men on every continent. And they thrive upon the denials of industrial

democracy even in countries like ours, where political liberty is firmly established.

It is important that America's leaders, both industrial and political, do not reach the false conclusion that because the totalitarian left has seized upon the cause of industrial democracy, that the cause itself is discredited. Remember, in the days of our political revolution, charlatans and dictators espoused the cause of political freedom for their own particular ends. They used that cause, as others are using the cause of industrial democracy today, only because it embodied the hopes and ambitions of a growing mass of the common people. Industrial democracy is the irresistible force of the twentieth century. Wise men, who know the lessons of history, will not seek to stand in its path.

I am not too deeply concerned with the probability that resistance by unwise men will lead to a violent political-economic upheaval in this country. We of organized labor do believe that some business and political leaders would like to misuse the powers of government to force the subservience of the common man to their own ends. But I believe that the majority of Americans, including a majority of industrial managers and investors, are too imbued with the spirit of democracy and too astute to strive for such an end.

I am, however, very deeply concerned with the attempt of management in many plants and industries to deny industrial democracy within their own domains. The path which they choose is rocky and it must end in failure. The employees of such management, deprived of the recourses of industrial democracy, will indulge in all sorts of practices designed to cripple operations. The only recourse of such employees is to be found in individual and small-group obstructionist tactics—the slow-down, make-work practices, even petty sabotage. These are not the tactics of an organized work force which have been accepted wholeheartedly by management.

These individual and small-group tactics will continue until the employees have organized, and until management has recognized and deals with their organization. Sooner or later the employees will organize. They will organize despite every effort of management against organization and, the greater management's opposition, the more liable are its employees to be driven into irresponsible activities. Irresponsibility in unions is a direct outgrowth of management obstruction. Management in many a plant today—honestly trying to practice sound industrial relations—is haunted by the ghost of an autocratic, antilabor policy which was buried years before. The modern manager who practices such a policy is storing up trouble for himself and his successors, and is cultivating the ground for subversive forces. He is the greatest ally of the Communist labor-front in America, and the Taft-Hartley law, with its non-Communist affidavits, can save neither him nor our economy from the tragic results of his folly.

This type of management, unfortunately, still exists, and exerts power, in our economy. There are plenty of signs all around us today that this type of management is deliberately moving forward with a program of destruction. A similar attempt was made by similar evil forces after the First World War. Many of us in this room can recall that program, brazenly called the American plan. It was an attempt to eliminate independent trade unions and to build in their place a spineless, servile creature known as the company union.

The aims of the plan were to push down wages, to lengthen hours, and to rob the American worker of the self-respect and independence which he had gained by his own struggles to build a free labor movement. The tools of the plan were the company spy, the private detective, the hired gun-man, the professional strikebreaker, the yellow-dog contract, and the labor injunction. The plan employed private armies, and even called upon and obtained the services of State and Federal troops to break the ranks of union workers.

By its ruthless use of these methods, the plan attained a measure of success. Organized labor was destroyed in many industrial areas. It was considerably weakened in others. Wage earners, robbed of their strength to ask, and to fight for, a fuller share in the industrial gains of the 1920's, had to be content, like Lazarus, with the crumbs from the master's table.

But what did this success profit industry? What was the harvest for the economy and for the welfare of the United States as a whole? The wages that industry chose to pay were not enough to provide the purchasing power necessary to consume the industrial output. Factories closed, unemployment rose, and hunger gnawed at the bodies and spirits of the citizens of this land of plenty. The depression of 1929 cast a blight over our entire civilization. The strong, powerful antiunion leaders of American industry, like Sampson, had pulled down the temple of our economy, and the rubble of that catastrophe was still in our streets when World War II caught us.

The question now is, Can we learn from history? Labor has learned. It has learned that management can practice collective bargaining and prosper as it never prospered before. More important, it has learned that through collective bargaining, labor receives a fairer share of the products of industry. Fifteen million working men and women organized into trade unions know that, and their ranks are reinforced by the conviction of many sections of the public not directly identified with labor, and among men of learning and men in high places.

The men and women of organized labor remember those other days. They remember that they, who were contented with the wages industry set in the years of its prosperity, were paid off in doles and breadlines in the years of its self-inflicted misery. They know the fruits of the American plan, and they know the fruits of industrial democracy.

They know that the Taft-Hartley law, for all its clever double-talk and empty promises, opens the door to the old methods. That law is one manifestation of a new American plan. That law will not succeed. Labor will not again be pushed down into the valley of want and darkness. We, too, are strong. We, too, are powerful. We have learned from history. We are the forces of the new and real American plan—industrial democracy.

Industrial democracy is the greatest challenge to American management in the postwar world. By wholehearted acceptance of this challenge, management will make it possible for American industry to meet its production goals more effectively and more fully. By accepting this challenge management will enable industry to meet its goals in such a way as to give the lie to the apostles of revolution, who preach that our industry can succeed only by denying to the worker his dignity and freedom. But, of more immediate importance to you men here, by accepting the challenge, management will go far in resolving many of its day-to-day employee-relations problems.

Omitting for the moment such items as wages and hours, what causes these day-to-day problems? The employees don't understand, they are suspicious, they feel that they have been injured. For example, management may introduce a new system of work methods. Perhaps every possible means has been taken to safeguard the welfare of the employees; the system was devised to make the job safer; a training program was developed to enable the employees to learn the new methods as quickly and as easily as possible; the average employee will earn as much or more than he earned under the old system. Management feels proud. The new system is announced. The employees rebel. They see in the system all sorts of evils—speed-up, stretch-out, reduction in earnings, greater accident hazards—everything that management had worked so hard to prevent. Management has two courses open. It may decide to scrap the new system, or at least postpone its introduction until some spadework has been done on cultivating better employee understanding. Or, it may try to make the system work, despite employee resistance, hoping to iron things out by education and training. The first decision is a set-back for more efficient production. The second may prove an invitation to serious labor trouble.

Management can avoid such difficulties only by dealing with a representative of its employees at every phase of the plan's development. If the representative is to be fully effective, two conditions are essential. First, he must truly reflect the desires and sentiments of the employees. Second, he must have their confidence.

To fulfill these conditions, the representative must be elected by the employees. Management cannot select someone for the job. However objective management may try to be, however capable the representative so selected, the very fact that management made the choice will undermine the employees' confidence in him.

The process by which the representative is elected must be one established and controlled by the employees, without management assistance or interference, and the employees must be voting for a representative to do the specific job required—negotiating with management. It is impossible to use the officers of a management-sponsored "employee welfare association" for the purpose. Such officers may serve well enough in planning social events and in operating an employee newspaper, but how can they achieve force and authority in negotiations with management? The association is not wholly a creature of its members. Management, which helped breathe life into the creature, may disavow it at any time.

There is no substitute for democracy. Consider the record in our political life. As our democracy has developed practically every technique devised to safeguard the common folk from the results of their own free will has fallen by the wayside. The electoral college, which used to select the President for the people, is now but a channel for the expression of the popular will. The Senators, who once were selected by State legislatures, are now elected directly by their constituents, and, with few exceptions, the nomination of candidates for office has passed from the party convention to the direct primary.

If people are to have a voice in their own affairs, there can be no half-way mark. Industrial management cannot seek the cooperation of its employees without eventually committing itself to the industrial democracy of free trade-unionism. There is no other way to know the employees' sentiments and wishes. There is no other way to gain their full-fledged cooperation in developing programs and procedures of mutual interest to employees and management. There is no other way of committing the employees as a group to definite responsibilities in agreed-upon programs. There can be no freedom of understanding—there can be no equality of responsibility—between master and servant. Understanding and responsibility can be achieved only between men or groups who stand upon a plane of equality. Employees can gain equality—and be fully capable of understanding and responsibility—only through the instrumentality of trade-unionism. The only final solution to the personnel problems of management is in industrial democracy, and industrial democracy in a private enterprise system can be attained by no other road than that of free trade-unionism.

If the attempt to change work methods, which I mentioned before, had been discussed and developed with the officials of a union of the employees' choosing—management would not have come suddenly upon the necessity for final decision. The union might have objected to the concept of the plan—that is true, but in so doing the union would only be reflecting the reaction of the employees—a reaction which management would have to face eventually. By facing it with employee representatives, while the change was still in the formative stage, management could have had the advantage of attempting to prove its sincerity and to educate its work force before the plan was announced as an accomplished fact. It would have been discussing the matter with a few persons, who had some degree of understanding of the problem, instead of with hundreds of individuals entirely devoid of technical understanding and motivated by suspicion and fear of change.

The same benefits of dealing with organized employees exists in every sphere of employee-management relations. Take the problem of grievances. So long as men seek to live and work together misunderstandings concerning rights and responsibilities will exist. As men develop socially and morally they seek three solutions to these misunderstandings: First, by furthering general understanding and good will, they seek to narrow the areas of mistrust and ignorance which give rise to fancied grievances; second, they attempt to define the rights and responsibilities of each man or group of men, in order better to define the areas of individual grievances as they arise; and, third, they establish definite routines by which those individual grievances may be considered and resolved in justice. Those three steps form the pattern of our modern society. They were evolved because men could find no other way in which to live together in justice and freedom. As surely as we adopted them in our political life—so shall we adopt them in our industrial life, and we shall not achieve them industrially until the wage earner has been accorded at the work place, the same degree of freedom which he possesses in his political life. There was no guaranty of justice while men were ruled by absolute political monarchs. The expectation of justice from such a source was scrapped in 1215 when the English barons forced King John to sign his name to the Magna Carta.

The final solution to the problem of grievances can be worked out only between a union and management. The effective functioning of any arrangement must, of course, rest finally upon mutual respect and good will. But even when these factors are present, the formal pattern of the contract should be introduced. The contract outlines the rights and responsibilities of both labor and management. It is, in effect, the body of law upon which industrial democracy rests. The grievance procedure, which is spelled out in the contract, provides a definite routine for the presentation and hearing of grievances. If it is a good procedure, it sets time limits on each step in the routine, and has a definite terminal point, such as arbitration, to dispose of those few grievances which cannot be ironed out by negotiation. Such a grievance procedure, just in its inception, complete in its provisions, and utilized in fairness by both parties, can effectively eliminate grievances as a major labor-management problem. No other method can.

There are numerous other spheres of employee-management interest, such as methods of hiring, promotions, lay-offs, and safety and health, to name a few. There is not time to consider each one individually, but the same general principles apply to each. Labor and management must approach such subjects together. The employees must be represented by a union. The method of dealing with each problem should be outlined in the contract. The rights and responsibilities of each party should be spelled out clearly and completely to avoid misunderstanding, and then some provision, either the general grievance procedure or a special procedure, should be made to take care of any disputes which may arise.

There is one other problem which we might mention in some detail—the problem of welfare funds. With the public attention riveted on the subject within the past 18 months some managers may consider it wise to venture into such activities for the purpose of stimulating better employee relations. The wise management may initiate discussions on this subject, but also make this subject a matter of discussion and negotiation with the union. Freemen do not relish having things done for them. They like to help do things for themselves. The management which tries to institute a welfare plan on its own lays itself open to the suspicion that it is trying to alienate its employees from their union. Such action in itself may well prove a cause of labor-management misunderstanding and make rocky the peaceful way of labor-management cooperation. Management cannot bypass the road of industrial democracy without jeopardizing its relations with labor.

We of labor know that the citizens of a democracy have their responsibilities as well as their rights. We realize that if we are to be worthy of the full industrial democracy which is our goal, we must in fact practice it. As management accepts labor and deals with us as partners in those phases of industry which bear directly upon our liberties and welfare, we must accord to management the respect and good will that such democracy implies. We are willing and anxious to demonstrate our worth.

We regret that, for the time being, we will not be able to apply our most constructive efforts to the work before us. Much of the time we might devote to the discharge of our main duties as citizens of an industrial democracy will be frittered away in complying with the restrictions which have been imposed upon us by the Taft-Hartley labor law. Much of our funds which we intended to devote to constructive uses will be consumed by legal costs which the application of this antilabor legislation imposes upon all unions that try conscientiously to comply with its complicated provisions. We must devote considerable effort to protecting the welfare of our members against the activities of those managements who would like to destroy much of what we have built up.

Some of you here, I am sure, look upon the law, as we do, as an impediment to the practice of sound labor-management relations. We know that you will bear with us until the burdens of this law have been removed. At the local level you, and we, can continue our joint efforts to improve collective bargaining, in spite of the law.

To those of you who do not recognize the evil of the Taft-Hartley law, we ask only this: Study the record of industrial democracy. Consult the records of your fellow managers who wholeheartedly accept collective bargaining and who have committed themselves to this twentieth-century extension of the struggle which George Washington suffered through a bleak and hopeless winter at Valley Forge and for which Abraham Lincoln laid down his life. Do not fall prey to the hopeless cynicism which betrayed Benedict Arnold into deserting a just cause, or to the blind vengeance which squeezed the trigger of a gun in the hands of John Wilkes Booth. Of you, who do not understand, we ask faith, not in labor leaders as individuals but in the righteousness of our cause, and patience, with the sometimes fumbling efforts of those who practice freedom after years of its denial.

Together, we of management and labor can meet America's challenge. Together we can produce the goods. Together we can perfect the pattern of industrial democracy to shine out as a beacon of hope in a dark and groping world where so many forces of evil are now at work, just as our pattern of political freedom shone forth in another time of crisis.

Yes, together we can do these things, and none but we can do them. If we fail we not only lose our present status as free men in industry and labor, but if we fail, then freedom, the very soul of this land of ours, will fail, too. Neither you of management, nor we of labor, nor our sons and daughters for years to come will know the outer warmth of plenty, nor the inner glow of freedom, until some future generation of serfs casts off the yoke and displaces the totalitarian state with a state that guarantees both political and industrial democracy.

Gentlemen, I may have disappointed some of you by straying from the details of the problems which face you in your day-to-day operations. If so, I am sorry. I may have overstressed, in your opinion, the principles of industrial democracy. If so, it is because until those principles are more widely accepted, and until management and labor fulfill their responsibilities under them, there can be no real solutions to your problems.

I could have cited cases from the records of the International Association of Machinists to illustrate examples of good and bad handling of specific problems, but when we had analyzed those cases, we would have found that the important factor was not the techniques applied but the spirit of the company and of the employees involved. Without exception, we would have found that the spirit which produced the good examples was the result of the wholehearted acceptance and sincere practice of the principles of industrial democracy.

If these were ordinary times, we could ignore the principles and experiment with techniques as a means of attaining those principles in practice, but these are unusual times. If the principles of industrial democracy were generally accepted, we could devote ourselves to improving their practice, but the principles of industrial democracy are not generally accepted.

If we take time today to devise techniques while we ignore principles, we shall not meet the challenge of the times. Relations between labor and management will hinder, not help, us in our job of physical production. The denial of industrial democracy will arm the common enemy in its war on our American way of life.

If we devote ourselves to principles, the techniques will evolve naturally. Labor and management, working together, will meet our goals of physical production and will prove to all the world that economic freedom can be achieved under our system of competitive private enterprise.

Humanitarian Work of Dr. J. W. Witten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 18 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the appendix of the RECORD an article that appeared in This Week by Mr. Ralph Bass in regard to the work of Dr. J. W. Witten, who is now a member of the House of

Delegates of Virginia. He lives in Tazewell, Va., and has the love and confidence of all who know him.

I am doing this in the hope that his example will be emulated by others elsewhere.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN WITH 150 SONS

(By Ralph Bass)

(One of the happiest families in the United States lives in an old brick house in Virginia. It all started 40 years ago when Doc Witten first opened his door to a homeless youngster.)

The two boys had been trudging the dusty, southwest Virginia road all day, and now night was falling. They hadn't eaten since morning. They were 10 years old—and a little scared. They came to a modest brick and stucco house across from the Tazewell railroad depot. It looked promising. They rang the bell and looked up silently at the middle-aged man who opened the door. He didn't seem surprised. "Come in," he said quietly. Ten minutes later two small stomachs were distended to the danger point—and Dr. Jack Walter Witten had two more permanent, nonpaying guests.

He's been doing that sort of thing for a long time. Forty years ago, this great-hearted physician flung open his door—and he's never closed it since. Through that door have walked 150 unhappy, bewildered boys, to leave years later as smiling, hopeful youths.

A white-haired, eye-glassed bachelor, stockily built, Witten at 66 is "dad" to men all over the country, and "granddad" to a growing number. He is much loved, because without thought of gain he shares his home with the most helpless of the homeless—the very young. So that they can have a roof, a friend, education and a chance in life, he gives what he has. And because boys' shoes wear out fast, his medical earnings rarely reach a bank.

But these are the least of Witten's gifts. He knows the "father-hunger" of homeless boys, the need for a male bulwark, a hero. Modestly, quietly, he gives a father's love and concern. Today he has 15 boys from the ages of 7 to 20 living with him in his 10-room house. Two of the 7-year-olds are twins, three of the older boys are brothers.

The spacious old-fashioned rooms are a little crowded with the boys and their gadgets, and the long rows of toothbrushes in the large twin-showered bathroom are almost comic in their number and variety.

When Dr. Witten met me at the station, he had three of his boys with him. One 10-year-old was bursting with news that could not wait. "I got my first whuppin' today," he proclaimed proudly. "I threw a 'tater 'crost the table this mawin'."

Witten winked at me. He knows that childhood, supposedly carefree, can be a bad time. He remembers, when he was a motherless 12-year-old, the feeling that he had reached bottom, that he could never be more miserable. He doesn't want other boys to go through that. If a paternal "whuppin'" makes them feel someone is interested, why, Witten will oblige.

"WHO SENT THAT?"

As we drew up in front of his house, a coal truck had just dumped its load on the sidewalk. "Who sent that?" asked Witten. "Can't say, Doc," replied the driver. Witten shrugged, "Someone thinks we're freezing to death, I reckon."

I didn't fully understand about the coal until next day when I was talking to a wealthily cattleman of the region. "If I hung a ham outside my door," he said, "somebody'd steal it. If Doc hung one out, someone would put another alongside it."

Later I learned that the cattleman had just sent a purebred bull calf to Witten's farm as a gift for the boys. But the doctor's neighbors have all shown what they think of him by sending him repeatedly to the Virginia Senate and to the House of Delegates. They know, too, that he lives for his patients and his boys—that without him the boys would be homeless wanderers or orphange inmates.

Witten sends his boys through school as far as their ability and ambition will take them. At present he has three boys in Virginia Military Institute and one each at West Point, the University of Virginia and Morristown College. All of them were raised from infancy when their parents died or could not maintain them.

A TOUCHY SUBJECT

One day while I was still in Tazewell, the University of Virginia boy sent Witten a football. It was a trophy. He had been voted the outstanding player by his teammates after their victory over Harvard. The football was given a place of honor atop the bookcase.

The same day this letter came from West Point: "At first I got off on the wrong foot, but I know how you dislike demerits. I got back into step. * * * This is a touchy subject, especially since you have so many boys going to so many schools, but I need $15 to clear me of debts * * *."

Also in the mail was a letter from VMI: "Harry, Bob, and I often get together and talk about the things we did at home. Some of the other boys here find it hard to believe everything that we tell them about you, the boys and the house. * * * It is something that is very hard to explain, and no one would fully understand without having lived in your house."

The boy added, "I guess I am still right much of a baby when it comes to staying away from home."

All the letters were signed, "Love, your son."

As Witten carefully scans the lines, you know that they are indeed his sons. In every room he has placed pictures of boys in military uniform. Twenty-four Witten boys served in the war, many with distinction. He won't talk about the dead and the wounded, but the only hatred I ever heard him express while I was with him was for men who want war.

Deeply proud of all his boys, Witten has a special glow for one. A Negro, brought up with the others, this boy is taking a college premed course and doing fine work. I mentioned the Negro lad to the other fellows and heard words of affection and respect—none of condescension. If he makes the grade he will be the second of the boys to become a doctor. The first, who has named a son after Witten, practices in Newton, N. J. A third prospective medic, once doomed to child labor, is doing brilliantly in school.

Some of the younger lads are pathetically fond of their natural parents, and Witten encourages the feeling. "I see my mother every Christmas," a 9-year-old told me importantly. One lad was expecting a visit from his mother. "I won't say she's coming Sunday," he added cautiously, "'cause she might not."

Witten gazed fondly at the two kids. "They were skinny little things when I got them 4 years ago," he said. "First thing, I had their tonsils out—fixed the boys so they'd grow right."

"I like gravy and 'taters and milk, and all kinds of stuff," gravely confided the 9-year-old. That he gets "all kinds of stuff" I know, because I saw Witten shopping for it with the crumpled dollar bills he had collected from his patients during the day.

Witten's boys are the kind you instinctively pat on the head. Eager and friendly, they have an outgoing quality that will stand them in good stead later on. Quaintly courteous, one 7-year-old embarrassed me by lugging my bag upstairs.

From their "dad" the boys get a rare sense of natural decency, for Witten has great respect for people. He recently administered a fierce rebuke to a rich farmer whose laborer's wife had no sheet on her bed when the doctor came to deliver her baby.

"Rich or poor, every mother having a child is a queen," says Witten. "Next time I see that fellow I'll jump on him again."

HE KEEPS TRACK OF THEM

Driving around town, Witten now and again points to neat frame houses where his old boys live. Some he built for them himself. I saw him pay $1,000 for a lot so that two of his newly married boys could build homes. He knows all about their jobs, and can reel off the names of their wives and children. As he stops to chat with a pleasant, smiling man, you see the kind of people his kids turn into.

This loyalty is not one-sided. Witten is a football fan, so most of his boys take to the gridiron. At a recent Tazewell High game a belligerent spectator ran out to argue with the referee. Witten, who was near by, advised the young fellow to return to his seat. Instead he turned viciously on the doctor and drew back his fist. In a flash one of the boys leaped from a spot a dozen feet away and, in the words of a witness, "hit the sorry fellow 10 times before he hit the ground."

Next day Witten's other huskies were out looking for the belligerent one, but luckily he had disappeared.

It was in 1907 that a young doctor of 26 stood at the bedside of a dying woman. A 10-year-old boy was on his knees, sobbing. The woman's eyes, fixed on the boy, held an awful question. Before she died Witten said something that brought a glad smile to her worn features.

"I had no one living with me," says Witten, "so I took him in. He stayed 8 years."

WHERE THEY COME FROM

Witten has been "stumbling over" homeless boys ever since. In a district where many men have died in the mines, leaving helpless widows, such boys are not rare. The mothers often roam away to find work, and Witten gets another son.

As his family grew, Witten adopted a strict routine. The boys get up at 6, make their beds and sweep up. Then the older ones help the youngsters to dress. They take turns in caring for the three cows, the hogs, turkeys, and rabbits.

Witten has a good cook and several housemaids who work hard but seem happy. Every meal is a gala occasion. The dining-room walls are ingeniously fitted with drop-leaf tables for "the little ones." The others eat with Witten at a long table. Sports, school, and table manners are the usual topics of conversation, but while I was there one 7-year-old was showing Witten how well he had learned to count. "Fifty-seven, fifty-eight, fifty-nine, forty," he cried triumphantly. Witten tactfully pointed out that the best authorities ended that particular sequence with "60."

The boys say "yes sir" and "no sir" to Witten, but there is no fear in the house—only laughter. As I got out of the line of fire of a four-boy imaginary gun duel, doing my best not to trip over three dogs, one of the 7-year-olds said, "Gosh, I bet you wish you were us, going to church and school, and having fun." At that moment the last vestige of my mistaken pity vanished.

NEVER CATCHES UP

Witten doesn't bring up sissies. Told a cow had kicked one of the boys that morning, he drawled, "Well, I reckon it waked him up, maybe." But when it comes to clean clothes, daily showers, and lots of milk at meals, he is hawk-eyed. Clothes are a big item, and Witten shops constantly without ever quite catching up. The weekly laundry bundle is always a two-man load.

Once a week the boys go to the movies, hoping for a cowboy-and-Indian picture. A recent discovery of 30 Indian skeletons in a nearby cave has had them all agog. Witten, too, is interested, since he comes from a pioneer Tazewell family. One ancestor settled there in 1771 and "cleared out the bears to make room for the people."

THE CLAN IS DYING OUT

Witten talks a little sadly about the days when the clan was numerous and active. "The family is dying out," he says, "and soon it will be forgotten." It never occurs to him that his name will live until the last "Witten boy" and his descendants are gone.

As I was leaving Witten seemed a little distraught. It developed that he had a letter from an anxious grandmother who wanted him to take in a problem boy of 12. "They say you are so good to young boys and make them mind, too," she wrote. The boy was coming that day, and Witten wanted to make sure everything was shipshape.

Saying good-by, I asked Witten why he had spent his life as he had. He looked at me for a moment and said, "Luke, eighteen-sixteen."

That night I opened a Bible and read the words that entered Jack Walter Witten's heart 40 years ago: "Suffer little children to come unto Me * * * for of such is the kingdom of God."

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 18 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able address delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Illinois Republican State Central Committee at Chicago, Ill., on Tuesday evening, February 10.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster and my fellow Americans, it is a real honor to be invited to address this Lincoln Day celebration. We Pennsylvanians take pride in the fact that the lineage of the great American we honor tonight reaches back to Berks County in my own State. We are proud that the forebears of the Great Emancipator lived in Pennsylvania.

When I was Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I became well acquainted with your distinguished Governor, Dwight H. Green. He is an outstanding soldier and executive, as well as a courageous American. He is a credit to your State and to our Nation.

Even before entering the United States Senate, I learned to admire and appreciate your Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS. His splendid military decorations are a tribute to his brilliant record as a soldier. He is one of the powerful leaders of the Senate.

Your Republican delegation in the House of Representatives is one of the most influential in the Union.

Hard work and self-reliance were Abraham Lincoln's way. He climbed from the humblest to the greatest place in America by back-breaking physical and mental toil. Hardship and work were his daily, lifelong companions. He showed they could be used as tools to fashion greatness.

His earliest years were a struggle just to live. He struggled to gain an elementary education. As he grew older he knew defeat—both financial and political. But he did not quit and he did not hustle off to Washington for a hand-out. He worked. He kept his sense of balance, his humility, his tolerance, his loyalty, and his love of God. And he won through to fame that will live forever.

Abraham Lincoln never forgot to practice tolerance and good will. He never thought of inciting class hatred, religious or racial prejudice, or sectional discord to gain political advantage. He believed in American ideals and he practiced them.

In reviewing the greatness of Abraham Lincoln we must remember his genius for politics. His statesmanship represented political action at its best, striving always for good government and to advance the welfare of his fellow Americans.

One of the founders of the Republican Party, he believed in party loyalty and party discipline. Those qualities spell victory on election day. If we practice them diligently we will have a great Republican victory in November. We will restore to the Nation Lincoln's concept of constitutional government by electing a Republican Congress and a Republican President.

We can still find guidance and inspiration in the things Lincoln said and wrote, and we can apply his sound common sense to the problems of today.

Because of its tremendous importance to every American and to the world I should like to discuss this evening the problem of European recovery and the New Deal program for the greatest peacetime expenditure in all history.

I should like to consider how much we can afford to spend—where the money is to go—and the most effective methods to block the spread of Soviet aggression.

The philosophy of Lincoln can help us in this discussion. I believe if Abraham Lincoln were alive today, he would offer a program something like this:

"We must help free people who need help, and are willing to help themselves. Strengthening their hand at this time will help preserve the Union. But we must not buy a pig in a poke. In our willingness to help others we must not sap our own strength. To do so would endanger the liberty of our Republic."

That, I am convinced, is what Abraham Lincoln would have recommended.

As we examine the Marshall plan we should remember it was Lincoln who said: "If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

Recent history has demonstrated beyond all doubt that in the modern world, Europe is our next-door neighbor. When the European house catches fire the flaming embers fall also upon our own roof. When nazism and communism blazed up in Europe the destructive flames spread across the United States.

I believe firmly that we should do all in our power to help the needy. That has been the traditional policy of the American people down through the years. We should aid, within the limit of our means, the economic recovery and rehabilitation of Europe.

But let me say—very bluntly—that we should not undertake a program that threatens to be so wasteful of our resources that we may become the authors and the finishers of our own destruction.

I do not agree that we should approve the Marshall plan without thorough study and full debate. I do not propose to accept without question this package wrapped up by the State Department and delivered to Congress labeled as a bipartisan policy.

I dislike being told that I must not question whether we can afford this package or whether it can achieve the desired result.

Our State Department's record does not warrant that kind of blind acceptance. This same State Department has been responsible for many fuzzy-brained decisions that poured out our people's money.

Recently we were told that the $3,750,000,000 loan to England would restore that country to economic stability. Now we know that it has all been spent—much of it wasted—and the people of England still face the same problems as when we made the loan.

No, the Marshall plan in its present form is not the answer. It proposes to prop up European nations which might be in danger of succumbing to communism.

We have been told that more than half of the Marshall plan money will go to such countries as Portugal, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Luxemburg, Iceland, Norway, and Ireland. I have heard nothing to indicate that any of those countries would go Communist if we did not finance them. I can hardly picture the folk of Eire and Portugal, for instance, embracing Marxism.

A very large share of the money, reportedly a third, would go to Great Britain. I don't believe there is any great danger of Joe Stalin taking over that country.

But then they say: "We want to use the money not only to combat the advance of communism—we want to help some of these nations to get on their feet.

And then we are told: "We must not attach conditions to our help. We must let them handle this money in their own way. We must not offend their national sovereignties."

And furthermore, Congress has received a virtual ultimatum from the President and the Secretary of State: "All the money or none; don't dare to cut a penny."

Since the early 1930's it has been the fashion for the New Deal to tell Congress nothing, to ask large chunks of money, and to spend it in ways that make a believer in the American Constitution shudder. It became the custom in that period for a rubber-stamp, spendthrift Congress to vote the money and ask no questions.

We have a Republican Congress now. The rubber stamp has been thrown into the scrap heap. Most of us in Congress want to know how the taxpayers' money is being spent.

In its best sense the Marshall plan may be described as follows: "The United States is ready to help those who help themselves."

That is fine. But I want to know some things that Congress has not been told up to now. I want to know that the beneficiary country is helping itself to the maximum of its ability and to the limit of its own resources. I want to be sure that the help given by the American taxpayer will be used solely to get the country back on its feet and to assure free, self-government for its people.

In the postwar period from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, America put more than $24,000,000,000 into European relief.

We are now told that the Marshall plan will cost $17,000,000,000.

In other words, postwar relief up to now, plus the Marshall plan, will cost the American people $41,000,000,000. That means it will cost the average American family about $1,248. Think of that.

Let me bring it a little closer to you. The people of Illinois spend a little under $475,000,000 a year for their State government. Money already spent, plus the Marshall plan, would make Illinois' share of foreign relief nearly two and one-half billion dollars, enough to operate your State government for 5 years.

Before we vote such burdens upon our people we must be sure we have a plan that will succeed.

I would like to know whether our money will be spent to perpetuate ideologies harmful to us. Do we want our money to solidify such undesirable groups in power? Or will we impose conditions that will ultimately assure the great masses of their people the rights and privileges of freemen?

I wonder, for instance, how much of our money will be used to foster socialism in Great Britain and to further nationalize industry in the socialistic pattern?

America has the highest regard for General Marshall, but little confidence in many in the State Department who have developed its policy in recent years.

I feel he was wrong in coming before Congress with that ultimatum—$17,000,000,000 or nothing.

I cannot understand how President Truman could make such a demand. When he was a Member of the Senate he said:

"Unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their perogatives in connection with the purse strings of the Government, much of the money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever."

That statement is still fundamental good sense. It is a pity Mr. Truman has drifted so far from his once safe and sound moorings.

There is something else that troubles me greatly. Over the years American diplomacy stood for honesty, fair play, and the right of every nation to foster freedom and liberty.

But today we must face the fact that our Government has departed from that tradition under New Deal leadership that sought only to perpetuate itself in power.

We have discovered that our Government has been digging deeper and deeper into the smelly barrel of the diplomatic school which calls for deals, double deals, and double-cross deals. I regret to say our Government has been led into dishonesty in international affairs.

You know the record. You know the unsavory concoctions we helped to brew at Potsdam and Yalta and elsewhere.

Our Government forgot the truth and frankness of Abraham Lincoln when it dealt treacherously with Poland. It betrayed the little Baltic nations by way of secret pacts. During the war and after, when the New Deal Presidents were making statements supporting a Jewish homeland in Palestine, the State Department was sending secret notes to the Arabs telling them that the public utterances were intended only for home consumption.

Are we now taking the same position with regard to the decision of the United Nations for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine? Are we abandoning the citizens of that country to murderous attack without supporting their right to arm in self-defense?

Is the money the administration wants to pour into England to be used to defeat the mandate of the United Nations? If so, the whole structure of the United Nations as the hope of the world for peace and freedom faces destruction.

These are the deals we now know about. But what about the secret deals that have not been revealed? I am not so gullible as to believe that all the cards are on the table, face up, today. Are you?

To what have we been committed? Why can't we be told the truth?

I want to repeat that I feel help must go to western Europe. I realize also that as we improve the lot of other nations, we build American stability.

I have tried to point out that we must be guided by certain fundamental principles. Briefly, I would suggest:

1. We should determine how much of American resources we can give without endangering the solvency of America.

2. We must bear in mind that we will be called upon to provide further funds to restore the health of China, Korea, and other sick nations.

3. If in helping Europe we weaken ourselves, there will be none in the world to help us defend human liberty against communistic tyranny and aggression.

4. Feeding the hungry and bringing relief to the suffering is a Christian obligation of our Nation. Such relief should be administered by an agency separate and distinct from the program for the industrial and economic rehabilitation of Europe.

5. The rehabilitation of Europe should be entrusted to the best business brains of America. This is a job for hard headed businessmen with the American "know how." It is not a job for bureaucrats who do not know the value of a dollar.

6. Full consideration should be given to the investment, as far as possible, of private capital in business and industrial enterprises of western Europe. That will help protect the social and economic freedom of the individual.

7. In return for taxpayers money given by our Government to European countries, we should receive, wherever possible, raw materials available to those countries but which are in short supply in the United States.

8. As a condition for our assistance, we must firmly establish standards of self help and achievement by each European country.

9. We must insist that the help we give Europe be so administered as to bring to its people a greater share of individual liberty—that they be safeguarded in those rights and freedoms that we in the United States regard as endowments from the Creator of all mankind.

The great light of American liberty was the hope and inspiration of freedom loving men and women in all the dark corners of the world. Its shining rays penetrated the densest iron curtain of Europe.

Unfortunately recent diplomacy has created suspicion, distrust, and even hatred of America. If we are to rehabilitate ourselves in the eyes of those who suspect our motives we must carry out the highest ideals of Americanism.

In his historic address at Gettysburg, on the soil of Pennsylvania, President Lincoln called upon all America for high resolve that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom.

The memory of the Great Emancipator calls upon us today for a new dedication to liberty so that men and women of good will in all the world shall share in the blessings of peace, with honor and justice.

Radio Networks as Tools of Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 18 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Radio Networks as Tools of Propaganda," from the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 9, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO NETWORKS AS TOOLS OF PROPAGANDA

Representative SCHWABE, a Missouri Republican, set out a few weeks ago to find out why the vast majority of radio speakers have been plugging the Marshall plan at a time when the majority of the radio listeners with whom he was acquainted were against it. He started his inquiry after a poll of voters in his district showed them 3 to 1 against the plan, or 6 to 1 if it inflicted rationing and price controls on Americans.

He went to the radio networks, officials of which assured him, as they always do in such matters, that they presented both sides of any controversial matter discussed on their chains. But when he set out to find how much of each side they were presenting, the lists of speakers which the chains themselves furnished him demonstrated the debate was loaded 6 to 1 in favor of the Marshall plan.

This is nothing new. It has been going on since the inception of the New Deal. Every radio station, because of the arbitrary power of the Federal Communications Commission to put it out of business, is subject to political pressure. The networks are most vulnerable to bureaucratic blackmail.

Granting permanent titles in wavelengths to individual stations, revocable only upon proof of abuse, would free the stations from intimidation designed to make them follow the line of the party in power. This would help correct the abuse uncovered by Mr. SCHWABE but would not wholly solve the problem.

If radio stations, themselves freed from FCC blackmail, were encouraged to originate a large share of their programs, and the networks were thus reduced to their proper status of service agencies for stations, instead of being dictators of the industry, both radio and the public would benefit. To allow four networks, all with headquarters in New York, to originate and dominate about 90 percent of all the radio discussions of political policy is a dangerous thing for the Nation.

Election Returns From New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 18 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the election returns from New York, as published this morning in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALLACE MAN WINS SWEEPING VICTORY IN BRONX ELECTION—ISACSON, ALP, DEFEATS PROPPER, FLYNN'S CANDIDATE, BY NEARLY 2 TO 1 IN CONGRESS RACE—REPUBLICAN, LIBERAL TRAIL—UPSET IN USUALLY DEMOCRATIC AREA VIEWED AS BLOW TO HOPE OF TRUMAN FORCES IN FALL

(By Warren Moscow)

LEO ISACSON, the candidate of Henry A. Wallace, was elected to Congress yesterday in a special election in the twenty-fourth congressional district in the Bronx. He scored a sweeping and surprising victory over Karl Propper, candidate of Edward J. Flynn's regular Democratic organization, in a four-man race in which Dean Alfange, Liberal Party nominee, finished third, and Joseph A. De Nigris, Republican, was last.

The vote from all the 159 election districts in the congressional district was:

Isacson	22,697
Propper	12,578
Alfange	3,840
De Nigris	1,482

FEWER THAN HALF ELIGIBLES VOTE

Total vote of 40,597 was light, considering that approximately 96,000 in the area were eligible to vote, and 89,000 did vote for Congress in the same district in 1946.

Mr. ISACSON received 55.8 percent of the vote, against 31 percent for Mr. Propper.

The result was an upset with definite national political connotations. In political circles, Mr. ISACSON never had been considered to have a chance to win, but the percentage of the vote given to the third party forces was to be regarded as an indication of the potential Wallace strength in November.

The result does not necessarily mean that Mr. Wallace will carry the district in the November election over Mr. Truman. Special elections do not forecast the percentages in November. But the result was regarded as certain to strike at Democratic hopes for Presidential victory, and to bring gloom to the Truman high command.

Mr. ISACSON ran on the American Labor party ticket, the group formed to support Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936, which has since passed into left-wing and Communist control. Mr. ISACSON was supported throughout the campaign by the Daily Worker. The Roosevelt policies, always popular in the area, were stressed as an Isacson asset, rather than a Democratic one.

Mr. ISACSON will take his seat at once in the Eightieth Congress, the second representative of the American Labor party to do so, the other being VITO MARCANTONIO. He will have to run for reelection in November, since the election yesterday was to fill a vacancy.

DEMOCRAT ELECTED TO ASSEMBLY

In a separate special election for the assembly, in the first Bronx district, Bernard McDonnell, Democrat, won easily, scoring 3,525 votes against 779 for Simeon H. F. Goldstein, Republican, and 394 for Jackson Goldman, Liberal Party nominee. The ALP named no candidate.

Mr. Propper conceded his defeat in a one-sentence telegram to Mr. ISACSON, sent at 9 p. m., reading:

"Congratulations on your election to Congress."

A statement by Mr. Flynn, leader and undisputed boss of the Bronx since 1922, issued through Louis Cohen, his right-hand man, said:

"The Communist menace in this country is much greater than most people thought. This election brings home forcibly that those who are opposed to communism do not exercise their franchise. This is a deplorable situation. Regimented Communists vote, while those opposed to communism do not take the trouble to do so. I hope this election will serve as a warning."

The election is regarded as likely to have international repercussions, since Russian official organs have been saying the Wallace forces were the forces of democratic liberalism in this country.

Throughout the campaign, Mr. ISACSON campaigned against the Marshall plan, declaring it to be a plan of the imperialists to cut off democratic forces abroad, while Mr. Propper gave the Marshall plan his full support. The same issue was presented when Mr. Wallace spoke for Mr. ISACSON and against the Marshall plan in the Bronx last Sunday, while Mayor O'Dwyer and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt took the opposite side at a rally last Thursday.

In analyzing the factors that led to the defeat of Mr. Propper, eminently respectable candidate presented by the Democratic organization, politicians and observers felt that the first of these was the effect on voters in a predominantly Jewish voting territory of the militantly pro-Palestine appeal made by Mr. ISACSON, Mr. Wallace, and other supporters.

While lifting the embargo on arms for Palestine was urged by Mr. Propper as well as by Mr. Alfange, the vote unquestionably reflected dissatisfaction with the present United States attitude on implementing the Palestine partition recommendation of the United Nations committee. This was in spite of the fact that the recommendation of Mr. Flynn to President Truman many months earlier was an important factor in the United States support of the Palestine partition move.

A second factor of importance was the light vote cast, which tended to show that the bulk of the Democratic voters in the territory—predominantly New Deal in its voting tendencies—was unimpressed by the Truman administration in general, and would not turn out to support it in a special election. That the Truman administration is weak in the urban centers has been recognized by political leaders for some time and has given the Republicans much confidence about winning with almost any nominee in the Presidential election this fall.

A third factor was that the Communists, out in full support of Mr. Wallace and Mr. ISACSON were able to mass their full worker strength from the entire city in one congressional district. Going from house to house and door to door, they pictured Mr. ISACSON as the real young progressive, favoring peace, prosperity, and Palestine, against a machine candidate whom they charged with being a lawyer for landlords in eviction cases.

In the canvass the left-wingers were able to put in more manpower than the Flynn machine, even though the latter is still the strongest organization of its kind in the city. The left-wingers also overcame the defection of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, who left the party over the Wallace third-party candidacy and who had normally been counted upon to furnish a substantial part of the American Labor Party vote.

The strength of the left-wingers in what is regarded as a Democratic stronghold is best emphasized by recalling the 1946 election figures when Benjamin J. Rabin, the Democratic incumbent, polled 39,316 votes, or 44.1 percent, while Roy Soden, ALP nominee, polled 24,249 votes, or 27 percent. The Liberal Party nominee in 1946, Bernice Benedick, polled 8,504 votes, or slightly less than 10 percent, and David Scher, Republican, got the votes of 16,931, or 19 percent.

Yesterday's balloting took place in what is normally strongly Democratic territory, with most of the election districts in the congressional district included in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh Bronx assembly districts, where the Democratic Party has ranked first, the American Labor Party second, and the Republican Party third. The newly formed Liberal Party ran fourth in the 1946 election.

The campaign began when a special election was ordered to fill the vacancy caused by the election to the supreme court of Benjamin J. Rabin, who then resigned from his congressional seat.

The American Labor Party forces supporting Mr. Wallace immediately announced their intention to run a separate candidate, who turned out to be Mr. ISACSON. When Mr. Flynn rejected an offer of support from the Liberal Party for his nominee, the Liberals countered by nominating Mr. Alfange, who was their candidate for Governor in 1942 when they controlled the Labor Party and who was thus their best-known vote-getter. The Republicans nominated Mr. Di Nigris, who made virtually no campaign, since he stood no chance of election.

When the ALP forces announced that Mr. Wallace would speak for their candidate, the Democrats brought Mayor O'Dwyer and Mrs. Roosevelt to the Bronx to counteract the effect of the Wallace appearance in what always has been New Deal political territory.

In the electioneering yesterday, while the polls were open, leaflets issued by ISACSON supporters charged Mr. Propper with being a lawyer whose office had represented landlords in at least 10 eviction cases pending in Bronx municipal court. The allegation was promptly denied by Mr. Propper, who said he had never represented a landlord in an eviction case.

Early in the day, Assistant Attorney General Nathan Ginsberg, assigned to tour the polling places, said he had received numerous complaints that ALP observers were wearing small blue ribbons as identification marks.

Mr. ISACSON said the ribbons were "just a method of identification used by the watchers," and that in all cases they discontinued their use when asked to do so.

Mr. Propper, 56 years old, has lived in the Bronx since 1898. He is a graduate of Columbia University and Columbia Law School, was admitted to the bar in 1915, and has practiced law ever since, except when he served overseas in World War I.

Mr. ISACSON, born in New York City 38 years ago, is a graduate of New York University and New York Law School and was admitted to the bar in 1934. He was elected to the State assembly on the ALP ticket with the help of a deal with the Republicans in 1944, but was not renominated by the Republicans in 1946. He then became legislative representative of the American Labor Party and has always been associated with what was its left wing and is now the controlling group in that party.

ISACSON BACKERS JUBILANT—CROWD JAMS HEADQUARTERS TO SHAKE HANDS WITH MARCANTONIO, QUILL

The victory of LEO ISACSON was reflected in the attitudes at the campaign headquarters of the two main candidates in the Bronx special congressional election last night. At the Pontiac Democratic Club, 801 Westchester Avenue, headquarters of Karl Propper, there was gloom as early as 8 p. m.

At the Isacson headquarters in the Hunts Point Palace, One Hundred and Sixty-third Street and Southern Boulevard, the news of the unexpected victory brought hundreds of left wingers to the hall. VITO MARCANTONIO and Michael J. Quill were jubilantly shaking hands with all comers, and the milling crowd soon filled the lower hall of the building, which accommodates more than 700.

Mr. ISACSON said in a formal statement that "this is a victory for Henry A. Wallace and the third party—the people's party." He declared also that it was a resounding repudiation of the policies of the Truman administration, which he declared was leading the Nation down the road to war.

"The people have also gone to the polls to say 'No' to the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan which plays politics with hunger and orders whole people and nations to vote the way Mr. Truman, Mr. Dulles, and Mr. Vandenberg, the chiefs of the Democratic-Republican coalition, instruct them," he continued.

"The people have shown that Wallace-endorsed progressive candidates for Congress in the coming national election can win and by their vote they have given the answer to the shaky liberals who have raised the false cry that third-party candidates cannot win. The people have spoken—for Henry A. Wallace, the trustee of the Roosevelt program."

C. B. Baldwin, campaign manager for the Wallace third party movement, said the vote was even more than "a clearcut people's repudiation of the subservient do-nothing policy of a President and of an administration which has blithely handed the American Government over to Wall Street and the military."

Capehart's World RFC Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 18 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star on Monday, February 9, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPEHART'S WORLD RFC PLAN

"Do it right or don't do it at all." That was Senator CAPEHART's answer to President Truman's demand for "all or nothing" on the Marshall plan. And he was ready with a constructive idea. The Capehart plan, as the Senator says, "injects the American principle of free enterprise into the European recovery program." It was presented Saturday night by Senator CAPEHART in an address to Illinois Bar Association members at Peoria.

Mr. CAPEHART, like many others, has seen the Government spend $11,014,000,000 since 1945 with little success in providing recovery. Plan after plan has failed to accomplish its purpose. And so, while Mr. CAPEHART believes in the purposes of the European recovery program, he does not believe in the method proposed to achieve that purpose.

This is what he proposes as an alternative. Send gifts of food, clothing, and fuel, as proposed by General Marshall, on a government-to-government basis. But beyond these relief goods, the entire approach of ERP should be changed from a government-to-government to a business-to-business basis. In addition, the 16 nations would be required to invest their own American dollars in their own recovery. And a free-enterprise method would replace a Government-control method.

Under Senator CAPEHART's plan the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would handle all loans for European recovery. Each of the 16 nations (with western Germany it would be 17) would set up its own RFC with Americans in the minority on each board. These European RFC's would lend money to individuals, businesses, government agencies, and industries, just as our RFC has been doing here since 1932. These businesses then would buy the goods they needed to expand or improve production anywhere they wished. They would not have to get government permission either to buy or sell.

These RFC's would get their money in two ways. Roughly one-half would be provided by European governments whose nationals have dollar investments in the United States. These investments, which total $13,000,000,000 now, would be turned over to their governments who would give the owners their nation's currency in return. Then, for every dollar these nations put up, the United States would put up a dollar.

The American taxpayer would be protected. The free-enterprise system would be encouraged and stimulated both abroad and at home. Foreign governments would have less American interference in their economic affairs, less imperialism and there is even a chance that they could end up with a profit from their RFC's after 10 or 20 years, as our RFC did in peacetime.

This is the best alternative to ERP that has yet been presented. It certainly will influence the whole debate in Congress; and it may provide a means of bringing together many Congressmen who formerly were opposed to foreign aid and getting a constructive, workable, adequate, aid plan through soon. Senator CAPEHART has done the country an outstanding service by presenting it.

Radio Address of Earl K. Long, Candidate for Governor of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] made the following statement in closing his futile attempt to toss aside the photostatic evidence which I had produced in support of my argument that he was in error when he said unqualifiedly that Earl K. Long, candidate for Governor of Louisiana, had been assessed in excess of $100,000, including a fraud penalty, and had agreed to pay a fraud penalty in connection with his income-tax returns in Louisiana involving the year 1937, 1938, and 1939.

I quote what the gentleman from Louisiana said:

I challenge the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] to produce not the amount of tax paid wherein the fraud lies, but the income figures even as admitted by Mr. Long.

I now offer, Mr. Speaker, the speech which Mr. Long made himself on a Statewide radio hook-up in Louisiana on Monday, February 16, which includes the figures which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] has requested. I hope this finally satisfies the gentleman from Louisiana, but if he wants any other documents I will get them for him also.

The New Orleans newspapers have been publishing a great deal lately about my not giving my income-tax figures for the years 1936 through the years when I was Lieutenant Governor and Governor, up to the present time.

The newspapers claim that Sam Jones answered my challenge and made a statement of his income for 11 years, from 1936 to 1947, including the 4 years when he was Governor, 1940–44, up to the present time.

Sam Jones and his candidates have been saying in their campaign speeches that although Sam Jones gave his income figures to the public, that I have not up to this time made a statement about my income during the years before I was Lieutenant Governor and Governor, up to the present time.

As a matter of fact, the people of the State know that as soon as Congressman JIMMIE DOMENGEAUX made his false charges on the floor of Congress against me, I followed up by filing a substantial suit for damages against Sam Houston Jones and Bob Ainsworth, for repeating his slanderous and false charges, and against the New Orleans newspapers, and Sam Houston Jones, for conspiring with JIMMIE DOMENGEAUX in having him make his false charges on the floor of Congress and for having published and repeated his false, slanderous, and libelous statements against me with regard to my income taxes and supposed overassessments and penalties.

Congressman JIMMIE DOMENGEAUX charged on the floor of Congress that I had received an income of over a quarter of a million dollars in 1938 and 1939 while I was Lieutenant Governor and Governor, and that the Bureau of Internal Revenue has assessed more than $100,000 tax liability, at the present time, against me, which I had agreed to pay, but that I had asked them to hold up until after the present gubernatorial election.

Those were the false, vicious charges made against me by Congressman JIMMIE DOMENGEAUX in the House of Congress.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX has been proven to be a falsifier on each and every count.

As you all know, I promptly filed a suit for a million dollars against the Times-Picayune Publishing Co., the Item Publishing Co., Congressman Domengeaux, Sam Houston Jones, and Bob Ainsworth, his campaign manager, and against Ralph Nicholson and Leonard Nicholson, publishers of the New Orleans newspapers, for their part in spreading those false, slanderous, and vicious statements against me in their effort to hurt me before the people of the State in my campaign for Governor.

The reason why I delayed giving the details of my income, year by year, to the people of the State was that I wanted the New Orleans newspapers and Jimmie Domengeaux, Sam Houston Jones, the Nicholsons, and Bob Ainsworth to file their answers to my suit for damages against them.

I wanted to see if any of them would dare set up that DOMENGEAUX's statements were true. Truth is the only defense to a damage suit for slander and libel against a man's good name and reputation.

I can now tell you that the New Orleans newspapers—all three of them, the Times-Picayune, States, and Item—and their two publishers, Leonard Nicholson and Ralph Nicholson, have filed their answer, but none of them has dared to plead truth of the Domengeaux false statement as a defense to my damage suit against them.

Bob Ainsworth, the Sam Jones campaign manager, went into court and asked for 15 days' delay after he was served with my suit for damages against him. He has not filed his answer up to now.

Sam Houston Jones has not filed his answer, nor has Congressman DOMENGEAUX.

I guarantee you, JIMMIE DOMENGEAUX will not and cannot plead truth as a defense for his false and slanderous charges which he made against me in the House of Congress. I hoped to have my suit against the New Orleans newspapers and Mr. Jones and his campaign manager tried before the second primary election on February 24, to further prove their false slanders against me. But this suit cannot be tried in court until all their answers are filed.

On today, Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, supported by photostatic copies from my income-tax records in the Revenue Office in Washington, disproved every false charge made by Congressman DOMENGEAUX in conspiracy with the New Orleans newspapers, Sam Huston Jones and his campaign manager. Congressman HÉBERT submitted to the House of Congress and filed in the RECORD for public inspection a full set of photostatic copies from my income-tax records in the Revenue Department in Washington.

My income-tax records show that I did not make anything like a quarter of a million dollars in 1938 and 1939, when I was Lieutenant Governor and Governor. These records from the Bureau of Internal Revenue proved that there was no tax liability or fraud penalty imposed against me in any amount, let alone $100,000 as Congressman DOMENGEAUX, the New Orleans newspapers, Sam Jones, and his campaign manager charged me with, and these records from the Department of Revenue further showed that I did not agree to pay any tax except what I had already paid.

Furthermore, an official letter from the Federal collector of revenue, Mr. Donnelly of New Orleans, showed that I had paid all of the taxes due by me from the years 1920 to 1946. Mr. Donnelly stated absolutely, and I quote:

"The records of this office disclose that all taxes certified to me for collection for all the years in which returns were filed by you have been paid in full and that no penalties were assessed against you in any of these years."

That letter was addressed to me by Mr. Donnelly, collector of internal revenue in New Orleans, on February 13, 1948, just 3 days ago.

Congressman HÉBERT was furnished with a copy of this letter from Mr. Donnelly, and filed it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not only for Congressman DOMENGEAUX's inspection, but for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that anybody and everybody who wants to can get a copy of it simply by writing his Congressman. That is the easiest way for anybody to get a copy of the facts regarding any income taxes for the past 26 years.

You have not seen Sam Jones give photostats of copies of his income-tax records to Congressman DOMENGEAUX to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that any of you good people in the State of Louisiana can write to your Congressman and get a free copy of them. No!

Mr. Jones made a statement over the radio about his net income and it is published far and wide in his sympathetic newspapers, but he does not give you any details about his income taxes, such as I gave to Congressman HÉBERT for him to use in answering Congressman DOMENGEAUX's false charges against me and to have them published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a public record, which anybody and everybody in the State can get by simply writing his Congressman for a copy.

Now, let's get down to the facts of my income before I was Lieutenant Governor and Governor up to now, and to Sam Jones' income before Sam Jones was Governor up to the present time.

Right after Congressman DOMENGEAUX made his false charges against me on the floor of the House of Congress, in a plain effort to hide behind his right of immunity as a Congressman, I not only filed my suit against them for substantial damages for libel and slander, but I also issued a challenge to Sam Houston Jones, as the candidate for Governor, to publish the facts about his income before he was Governor, while he was Governor, and after he was Governor, and I said that I would do the same thing, and that we both should give sworn statements of our income to our campaign managers at the same time for publication, so that the people of the State would have all of the facts.

Sam Houston Jones has not accepted my challenge, and he dare not for many, many reasons.

The New Orleans newspapers and Sam Jones and his candidates for State office are trying to fool the people into believing that Sam Jones has accepted my challenge and has given you all the facts, which he most certainly has not up to the present time.

Now, here is the challenge which I issued to Sam Houston Jones:

"I now challenge Sam Jones, as the candidate for Governor, to make and publish a sworn statement of his taxable income for the last 9 years, including the year 1938 to the present time, and to publish a sworn statement of the names of the persons, firms, or corporations who paid him fees, and how much, during any of those years, and how much they are now paying him.

"I am prepared to make such a sworn statement and let the people have all the facts regarding my income, whom I represented and from whom I took fees before and after my short term as acting Governor of Louisiana in 1939–40, up to the present time.

"I defy Sam Houston Jones to accept this challenge and to publish, under oath, how much his income was before, during and after the time he was Governor up to now, and particularly—

"How much the coal interests paid him to prevent the shipment of natural gas out of this State to compete with coal as fuel in the East.

"How much the City Service Refining Corp. paid him to repeal the 1 cent per barrel oil refining tax and put a sales tax on the people in its stead.

"How much the air lines paid him to remove the tax on airplane gasoline, while he left the gasoline tax on the fishermen and trappers' boats and the farmers' farm machinery, and

"How much the large shell corporation paid him for that big State shell reef near Lake Charles, which he leased to that corporation for 4 cents per yard when the State shells were worth $2.50 per yard—quite a difference.

"How much those big interests are still paying him for the favors he did for them while he was Governor in 1940–44.

"If Sam Jones will accept the challenge, let him give his sworn statement to his city campaign manager in New Orleans and I will furnish my sworn statement to my campaign manager, both to be published at the same time."

I leave it to you whether Sam Jones has accepted that challenge.

Did Sam Jones tell you, the people of the State, how much the coal interests paid him or his law firm to prevent the shipment of natural gas out of the State to compete with coal as fuel?

Sam Jones testified under oath before the Federal Power Commission that he was employed by the Kansas City Southern Railroad, the largest coal hauling railroad in the country, and by the big eastern coal interests to prevent the shipment of Louisiana gas out of the State to compete with their coal as a fuel.

Why doesn't Sam Jones tell you how much he got out of the coal interests and the Kansas City Southern Railroad, and how much he is still getting out of them to fight the gas interests of the State of Louisiana?

Did Sam Jones tell you good people how much the City Service Refining Corp. paid him to repeal the 1 cent per barrel oil refining tax? No, absolutely no.

You know, that Judge Bob Kennon and the Lake Charles Kennon campaign committee put that question to Sam Jones many times during the first primary, but Sam Jones has not answered yet. Why not? He can not.

Did Sam Jones tell you, the people of the State, how much the big air line companies paid him to take the tax off airplane gasoline by his order to his State revenue collector, although there is no law authorizing the exemption of airplane gasoline from the regular gasoline tax? No. He never will.

Did Sam Jones tell you, the people of the State, how much that big shell company paid him for thousands of acres of shell reefs near Lake Charles, which he leased to them for 4 cents a yard, when the State shells were worth $2.50 per yard? Had I done this, I doubt if I could have stayed in the bounds of the State of Louisiana. No; he did not tell you that either.

On the other hand, it is a matter of public record that Sam Jones represented that corporation before the Supreme Court and defended the very lease of State shell bottoms which he gave to that company for little or nothing. That was the same case that Judge Bob Kennon decided while he was on the supreme court and held that the Jones shell deal was malum in se, that is, morally and fundamentally wrong and against the best interest of the State of Louisiana.

Did Sam Houston Jones tell you good people how much he got on the cuff and off the record for helping to lobby the bill in the 1944 legislature to deprive the people of their right to hold local-option elections until 2 years after the war? Ask him, didn't he get $25,000 for that.

Did Sam Houston Jones tell you good people how much he got out of the deal when his big Lake Charles Corp. client sold those 13 acres of marshland for the Lake Charles Bridge project to the State highway department for $40,000 when the same land was assessed by his tax commission at only $7 an acre? No, Sam Houston Jones won't let you good people in on any of his secret deals at your expense.

Did Sam Houston Jones tell you, the people of the State, how much those big interests are still paying him for the favors which he did for them while he was Governor from 1940–44? No. He never will.

And I want to let you in on a little secret. Sam Jones won't tell you, the people of the State, how much he was paid for the favors he did for those big special interests while he was Governor, and how much he got for his political influence over the Davis administration from 1944 up to the present time. He has really been raking it in.

Now, I will give you a report of my income, and I don't mind giving it to you from the time I started work way down yonder in 1916, when I was 19 years old.

In my early manhood, from 1914 to 1928, I was a traveling salesman, college student and farmer. When I saved up enough money from work at odd jobs, as most young men did in those days who wanted to get a college education, I would go back to college, first to Louisiana Polytech, then to LSU, then to Tulane, and, finally, I finished law at Loyola in 1926 with a free scholarship.

From the years 1928 to 1932, while my brother, the late Huey Long, was Governor, I was attorney for the inheritance tax collector in New Orleans, and my fees from that work averaged from $10,000 to $12,000 a year. This is a matter of record in the Orleans civil district court.

In 1933 I practiced law and operated a small farm in Winnfield, from which my income was $5,368.72.

In 1934 I became special attorney for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, at a salary of $3,000 a year, and I practiced law and continued my farm work at odd times, which gave me an income of some $6,131.22.

In 1935 I practiced law, carried on some farm work, and was a candidate for lieutenant governor, and I was elected in 1936 and took office in May of that year. My income for 1935 was $5,999.72 and in 1936, $6,124.80 including my salary as lieutenant governor for 6 months of 1936.

My total net income for the 4 years, while I was lieutenant governor and governor are as follows:

For 1937, $14,185.38; for 1938, $14,975.22; for 1939, $14,010.17; for 1940, $7,134.

This includes the 3 years during which I was lieutenant governor to June 1939 and also includes the income from my farm and cattle business, law practice, and salary as lieutenant governor.

Under the law a lieutenant governor, who is a lawyer, has a right to practice law, which I did in a moderate way.

My income for 1939 and 1940 also includes the 11 months during which I was governor until May 1940.

You will notice, for instance, from my income of $7,131 in 1940, which included my salary as governor for about 4½ months that, I did not receive any fees from corporations or clients which could have been the result of favors performed by me for any special interest, while I was governor during those 11 months to May 1940.

My income for the year 1941 was $6,280.50; 1942, $5,203.50; 1943, $5,675.02; 1944, $8,653; 1945, $4,941.91; 1946, $7,552; and my estimated income for 1947 is $6,950.50.

I am sure no one, not even the New Orleans newspapers, can accuse me of collecting fees from any special interests in the years immediately following my 11 months as Governor of the State of Louisiana, and this income includes that of my wife too.

So you see, good people, I have nothing to fear, I have nothing to hide, and I am ready and willing to publish a sworn statement of the names of my clients who paid me fees for legal services, if Sam Houston Jones will accept my challenge, and I will guarantee you I did not get any fees from the coal interests, or the Kansas City Southern Railroad, or the City Service Refining Corp., nor from any shell company or oil company, or from anybody else for doing them special favors or using political influence for them, either while I was lieutenant governor or governor, or at any time since.

I wish to further assure you that I have never done anything in a public way in my life that I am ashamed of, and as long as my Maker gives me the intellect to fully realize and appreciate what I am doing, I never will.

I would rather be governor and pay those fine old needy folks that $50 old-age pension, open the charity hospitals in the State and build more tubercular hospitals to take care of the poor sick people, restore free-dental trailers and ambulances, build trade schools, restore free hot lunches, to help the children of the State get a better education and grow up to be fine men and women and healthy citizens, pay better salaries to school teachers and bus drivers, give the war veterans a just bonus, and save the road system of the State by repairing the neglected highways, build farm-to-market roads, blacktop and pave highways and widen our truck-line highways which are death traps at this time, to make them safe for people traveling over them throughout the State.

I would rather be governor and work to do all these things and get all of these benefits for the people of the State, than have all the gold in the hills of Fort Knox or the wealth of Wall Street, because when you leave this earth you can only take with you the good deeds that you have done for your fellow men right here on earth.

Statement of Harrington Wimberly, Vice Chairman, Federal Power Commission, on H. R. 4051

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call the attention of the House to a statement made by Mr. Harrington Wimberly, Vice Chairman, Federal Power Commission, on H. R. 4051, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, February 9, 1948:

I agree with the explanation made by Chairman Smith regarding the proposals to amend the Natural Gas Act which we have submitted.

We believe that the amendments which we have suggested are needed to clarify issues which cannot be ignored. I am convinced beyond doubt that these suggested amendments are required to guide the Commission in carrying out the purpose of Congress.

I also want the record to show that I continue in my opposition to the enactment of H. R. 4051. My own position has been stated clearly in the reports on the natural gas investigation which have been filed with your committee. These reports were prepared in the first instance by Mr. Bohling, Director of the Natural Gas Investigation, and I think they fairly and adequately deal with the issues and problems involved. They also give a fair characterization of the positions taken by all those who participated in the investigation.

My remarks will be confined generally to discussion of the basic issues rather than taking your time now in building up an elaborate case to support my views. I want to be as helpful as I can because the Congress has very important questions before it. For that reason I will point out in the best way I can some of the intellectual and philosophical tests which I have applied in arriving at my conclusions. I am not passing a tin cup for the natural-gas industry, but neither do I intend to promote a theory which produces weird results.

Brief mention of certain matters of record in the Natural Gas Investigation (Docket No. G-580), and in legislative reports to committees of Congress on proposals made last year, are appropriate at this time.

At the Houston hearing in the natural gas investigation in February 1946, an industry witness, Col. George A. Hill, made some rather intemperate accusations to the effect that the Federal Power Commission has grandiose plans for taking over under Federal jurisdiction all of the Nation's energy resources. I replied to him that I thought it should be stated for the record that his statements had not, to my knowledge at that time, any basis of fact and I did not think that his charges were appropriate.

He charged that the Federal Power Commission was seeking to take over powers which I would object to, and my answer was that I knew of no such proposals to be sponsored by this Commission.

In a short statement before this committee on April 29, 1947, I said, in part:

"As far as the exemptions under section 1 (b) as to production and gathering are concerned, I have always been one just to read the English language with care, but yet without attaching implications to it. I would not criticize either the lawyers or the courts, but I think that the language of section 1 (b) is certainly clear and definite. Much reference has been made to a dissenting opinion in the Columbian case, but I have never seen evidence, since I have been on the Commission, that the Commission was going to adopt the philosophy that was pronounced in [that] dissenting opinion."

That was my understanding when I made those statements. I am still of the opinion that the intent of the present act is clear in its limits of jurisdiction, but when there are widely different opinions about it I believe it is time for the Congress to do something to clarify it.

I became a member of the Federal Power Commission in October 1945. As a result of my thinking I do not subscribe to the application of the conventional net original cost rate base principle when applied to gas producing properties of interstate pipe lines, and it is not my understanding that the State commissions have used this depreciated original cost procedure as to gas production.

As to the exemption under the act of independent gas producers who deliver directly to the interstate pipe lines, the Federal Power Commission unanimously went on record last year as favoring amendment of the act to clarify such exemptions and spell them out in definite terms. I joined in those recommendations to the committees of the Congress and there was no question at that time but that the Federal Power Commission considered such legislation desirable.

Soon after the Supreme Court's opinion in the interstate case and immediately following adjournment of the first session of the Eightieth Congress last July, I joined a majority of the Commission in adopting R-106 on August 7, 1947, which was intended as no more than a statement of stop-gap policy. I would like to read one of the paragraphs of that rule, which is as follows:

"The rule herein has this specific purpose and is issued at this time because the Congress has not yet reaffirmed such exemption by amending the act. It is also our intention, in keeping with the position heretofore taken, to continue to recommend to the Congress that it take appropriate clarifying legislative action regarding this matter."

On last Thursday at this hearing Senator MCMAHON asked some questions about that rule, and it is my own opinion that it could be changed tomorrow and the Federal Power Commission could, if it so desired, seek to extend its jurisdiction to the full extent of congressional authority over interstate commerce. What the courts would say is another matter, but I bring up this subject to point out how unsettled the situation is at this time and how important it is that the Congress give guidance. I would not myself be so presumptuous as to tell the Congress—which after all is the final authority in resolving such far-reaching issues—to keep out of this and let us settle it.

I want to make it clear that I subscribe to the principle of a fair and reasonable return on net investment when applied to utility properties. This sound method of determining consumer rates should continue to be applied on utility operations. There is only one major point of controversy and that is whether gas wells, leases, and other production properties constitute a utility operation, and if not, what pricing principle is the most desirable in lieu of the rate base method on those production properties.

I first became aware of how serious these problems are after attending some of the first hearings in the Natural Gas Investigation, Docket No. G-580.

Following one of the hearings, I discussed within the Commission the problem of applying the cost doctrine to gas production properties. After going over the matter step by step, I still could not get over the hurdle that production operations, no matter how much or how little gas the pipe-line company came up with, were put in exactly the same category as the pipe lines, compressor stations, and other utility portions of the property.

The treatment that had been given the profits derived from extraction plants had been bothering me particularly, and I was seeking enlightenment on the methods applied. Under the cost formula, any profits above a utility return, which a pipe-line company or an affiliate derives from the sale of natural gasoline and other liquid fractions extracted from wet gas prior to its delivery into the transmission lines, are deducted from the cost of such gas. In other words, if such profits from extraction operations were sufficient to pay all costs connected with production and gathering of gas, including a return on the investment in leases, wells, etc., the result would be that the gas would enter the transmission lines as free gas at that point.

I carried it on further, and to the extreme, which to my thinking is the only way to fully test a principle. I posed the question as to what the result would be if the profits from extraction operations were sufficient to pay all costs of delivery by a pipe-line company to a point of consumption hundreds of miles away. Under those extreme but not impossible circumstances, the pipeline company would be delivering the gas to the distributing company absolutely free.

I think these are the necessary implications of the cost formula as applied by the Commission. If the principle is to be applied at all, it must govern in each and every situation no matter how fantastic the economic results might be.

With further reference to the assured return every pipe-line company receives that invests in leases, exploration, well drilling, and other necessary functions in the production of natural gas, I suggest consideration of the following illustration:

Company A and Company B each invests $10,000,000 in leases, drilling, etc. There is not necessarily any relation between the two as to what they get for their money. The owners and investors get the same rate of return, but Company A's reserves amount to 1,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas, while Company B gets for its $10,000,000 one-quarter of a trillion cubic feet of gas. The result is that the investors get the same return for their money but the rate payers served by Company B, which owned one-quarter of a trillion cubic feet of gas, pay four times as much as the rate payers of Company A who were fortunate enough to get 1,000,000,000,000 cubic feet.

Independent producers are in no such position as this, and they supply more than 80 percent of all the gas produced and more than 50 percent of all the gas going into interstate pipe lines, which handled about 28 percent of the total marketed production in 1945. These percentages show that most of the gas produced does not move through interstate pipe lines but goes for other purposes.

I am now going to refer very briefly to the Federal policy on the water resources of the Nation as expressed in the Federal Power Act and other statutes relating to the conservation and use of the waters of the United States. I think I can point out an essential difference in this situation as contrasted with natural-gas production.

I doubt if there is a person in this room who would try to convince you that there should be any vested rights in the waters of the navigable streams of the country. For many years I have had an interest in that subject, and I hold strongly the view that these waters are public property and that no one should be permitted to capitalize or profit from the use of the waters as such.

That important national policy was expressed with the passage of the Federal Water Power Act in 1920, and it has been reaffirmed from time to time. The Federal Water Power Act was passed partly to encourage the development by private owners of hydroelectric projects on our navigable rivers.

Under the Federal Power Act, a developer of water power under license from the Federal Power Commission may include in its rate base only the cost of those facilities which are necessary for the development of electric energy from the falling water and the delivery of that energy to certain points. What constitutes a water-power project is specifically defined in section 3 (11) of the Federal Power Act, and earnings are limited to a fair return on the depreciated cost of such project. Nothing is allowed, and properly so, for the most essential feature of a hydroelectric project, the falling water itself, because that is a resource that under national policy cannot be reduced to private ownership.

The question appropriately arises as to the point of comparison when it comes to rate making between a hydroelectric project and a natural-gas company. I am convinced that the situations are not analogous, but they have, nevertheless, been given the same treatment in rate making by the Commission.

The water belongs to the public, and no earnings are permitted on its use. Natural gas, also a natural resource, is generally recognized as one that can be reduced to private ownership, just as other minerals.

However, the rule that the production of natural gas shall give to the natural-gas company transporting and selling its own gas only a return on its actual investment for such purposes, it seems to me applies to natural-gas companies the same rule as that applied to licensees operating water-power projects under the Federal Power Act—namely, a limitation of earnings to a fair return on the original cost less accrued depreciation or depletion. The rule, in effect, places natural gas when produced, transported, and sold by a pipe-line company in the same category as the falling water that turns the wheels for the generation of electric energy. The gas itself is essential, but when such a rule is followed no recognition is given to any value it might have if utilized for other purposes.

If the comparison I have made is sound, the question of public policy before the Congress is this:

When natural-gas reserves are dedicated to public use, shall they be regarded as public resources and the natural-gas companies that capture, gather, and transport in interstate commerce such dedicated gas be permitted to earn only on the cost of the facilities necessary for such operations? Or should they be treated as other producers of natural gas?

I should like to pose these further questions that disturb me:

If the Congress does not clarify the act in regard to exemption of independent producers and gatherers, is the Commission free to make inroads in that direction?

If the Congress fails to give further guidance, is the Commission to accept that as indication of congressional approval of its method of price fixing as applied to natural gas produced by pipe-line companies?

I know you will weigh carefully all that is involved. The answer should come from the Congress, because I do not believe that any administrative agency should be permitted to make national policy on behalf of the Congress.

Award by Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce of Distinguished Service Citation to W. Brooks George

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 18 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce has named Mr. W. Brooks George, of Richmond, Va., as recipient of the distinguished service award as the State's outstanding young man of 1947.

It is my privilege to know Mr. George, and it is my opinion that this was a well-deserved tribute. He is a young man of outstanding ability, fine character, and splendid personality.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper release explanatory of this action by the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LYNCHBURG, February 15.—The Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce last night named W. Brooks George, of Richmond, to receive its distinguished service award as the State's outstanding young man of 1947 at a banquet in the Virginian Hotel. The award was made by Henry E. McWane, president of the Lynchburg Foundry Co.

During the past year Mr. George served as cochairman of the Richmond area Community Chest campaign in charge of the industrial division and was a member of its board of directors. He was also cochairman of the Richmond American Red Cross campaign in charge of the industrial division.

Mr. George is a member of the board of directors of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce. Last year he served as president of the Richmond Junior Chamber of Commerce and is a member of its board of directors. He is also a member of the board of directors of the Richmond Citizens Association, Virginia Manufacturers' Association, Salvation Army, and Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce. He is president of the Windsor Farms Citizens Association.

Mr. George is controller and assistant to the president of Larus & Bro. Co., Richmond. He is a graduate of the college of William and Mary and is a registered certified public accountant.

Judges for the award were Senator Harry Stuart, of Elk Garden; Dr. George Sadler, associate secretary of the Baptist Foreign Mission Board, Richmond; and Mr. McWane.

Speakers on the program were David E. Basten, president of the Lynchburg Junior Chamber of Commerce; Joseph H. Saunders, Jr., of Alexandria, president of the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce; John Pearsall, vice president of the Virginia Junior Chamber; George O. Baird, Jr., of Shreveport, La.; national vice president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce; Mr. George and Mr. McWane. Kenneth Lane, of Richmond, was chairman of arrangements.

The award is made annually to a young man whose participation, service, or contributions, in one or more fields of activity, with or without compensation, has been so outstanding as to bring honor to young men of the State.

Britain on the Rocks—Facing Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a revealing inside story just received by air mail from the authentic and outstanding financial paper of England, the Economist.

It furnishes us a vivid preview of America 4 or 5 years from now should we be so foolish as to adopt the ridiculous American economic Maginot line commonly known as the Marshall plan and if we fail to rid ourselves this coming November of the American socialistic New Deal.

Britain faces bankruptcy. That is the real significance of the Government's latest white paper. At last the British people now know where they stand. In the past 2 years they have as a community overspent their income to the extent of £1,000,000,000 and the rate of overspending was almost twice as large in 1947 as in the preceding year. At the present rate of expenditure (which has fallen since its peak last August, but now shows

signs of settling down at a monthly figure of some £40,000,000), the remaining reserves of about £600,000,000 in gold, dollars, and unexhausted credits may last Britain and the sterling area until midsummer. After that, it will just be impossible to buy either the food or the raw materials which are necessary for Britain to eat and work. The specter of starvation and mass unemployment is now alarmingly close.

To translate the tables and figures of the white paper into more homely terms, Britain has been living like an improvident family which, failing to make both ends meet, first spends the accumulated capital of the past, then borrows from friends—from American friends, from Canadian friends, from South African friends—and when their loans are exhausted, begins to pawn the furniture. How else can one describe the latest deal with Argentine in which the whole capital asset represented by the British-owned railways is bartered away for 18 months 'supply of meat? It is, of course, true that there is nothing discreditable in the events which led the British community to this desperate plight. Alone of the belligerents (except the German aggressors), Britain fought in two World Wars from the first day to the last. The income from overseas investments which nearly bridged the gap between imports and exports in 1938 disappeared in the struggle. Exceptional conditions of world demand created by war devastation added £300,000,000 to the cost of British imports in 1947. But in fact the reasons which have brought the British to beggary are less likely to be remembered than the fact that they are beggars. The old soldier showing his campaign medals at the street corner is an object of pity, not of respect.

When a family faces bankruptcy, either it goes under to a life of perpetual makeshift and pauperism, or it restores its solvency by vigorous action—by buying less, by cutting down every kind of expense and by straining every nerve to sell more of its goods and services. A nation is in no different case and the choice open to the British people is in reality precisely the same difficult choice between pauperism and gruelling recovery. The only question worth asking today when the crisis is, in Sir Stafford Cripps' words, not a matter of years, but of months and weeks, is what further steps the British people can take to consume less and produce more, to reduce their standard of living, and at the same do harder work. The subject is being debated in the Commons as the Economist goes to press, but clearly the Government's plea—it is not much more—that neither wages nor profits shall rise at this juncture is one small part of the much bigger effort that is needed to restore solvency to the British people.

Both wages and profits have to contribute their share. Bankruptcy is a family responsibility and no section of the community can avoid its hardships. The real need for workers and managers alike is longer hours and more output for the same income. In this way, more goods could be produced for export without new financial pressure being created to divert those goods to consumption at home. So drastic a departure from current industrial practice is too much to hope for, but at least the principle of no further wage increases save for cases where workers are genuinely below an adequate level of subsistence must be endorsed. Further, there is certainly a case for increasing the contribution to national solvency by those who, despite their reduced standards, can still afford it best. Heavier taxation or limitation of dividends and the control of expense accounts (upon which so much of the conspicuous waste in the big cities is based) will help politically, and to some extent economically. Even if such steps must wait upon the budget, their announcement would go far to relate the question of wages to the wider action needed to counter bankruptcy abroad and inflation at home.

But, although it will be necessary to temper the cuts by considerations of social justice, the brute fact remains that standards of consumption in Britain do not reflect the insolvency which may lie only a few months ahead. Can it be said that the rationing of domestic fuel has been drastic enough in view of the vital importance of coal as an export? Can Britain afford £200,000,000 for government expenditure overseas, or to feed a million mouths in the forces in return for no productive work? It is easy to make a case for keeping 2,000,000 government servants, but if 500,000 were returned to industry, would the gain in output not ease the burden of the controls? By what yardstick can the overseas expenditure of £50,000,000 on "tourism" in 1947 be justified? It is no longer a question of choosing whether or not to maintain certain amenities. The stark fact is that the means to provide them no longer exist.

In spite of the recent cuts in capital expenditure, it is clear that more has to be done. No one will criticize the Government for wishing to build better schools, new hospitals, and more and better-equipped houses. But this program has added to Britain's insolvency by diverting materials and manpower from the export industries; in that sense it is Americans, Canadians, and South Africans who have been paying for part of the British program of development at home. No one denies the desirability of these things, but it is not usual to add a bathroom to the house just as the receivers walk in.

The last items to cut back should obviously be productive assets, the renewal and modernization of plant. The reductions already announced in these items are severe—probably too severe—but in another field the figures suggest that outlay has been too heavy. The sum of £180,000,000 for new assets overseas, a large part of which must be represented by various schemes of colonial development, seems unduly high in relation to the time which must elapse before they begin to yield their fruits.

These are a few instances picked from a possible list of further cuts and reductions, but simply to set them down shows how painful their execution would be and what appalling stresses it would introduce into the national life. But bankruptcy is necessarily an ugly, painful, and distressing business. It tests the temper of the most united family. It requires not only fortitude and patience but considerable humility to weather it with dignity and success. Yet, bankruptcy is nevertheless the crisis through which this nation may be about to pass. What are its chances of surviving this latest test—a test with none of the glory and solidarity of a nation at war but perhaps more gruelling as a result?

It cannot be said that the outlook is encouraging. In the first place, the country so far has remained in ignorance of the facts. The government's powers of explanation have never been high, but its inability to convey to the public the significance of the gathering economic crisis is beyond all previous failures. And this is not simply a question of poor public relations. The failure goes deeper. It is not only that the government has not talked as though the crisis were serious. Until quite recently, it has not behaved as though it were. In 1946, before the catastrophic rise in American prices and the fierce winter, there was some excuse for believing that Britain could recapture its export trade, police Europe, rebuild its industries, create new social services, rehouse the people and provide cheap food all at the same time. But the writing on the wall was there for all to see after January or February 1947. The fatal flux of gold and dollars had begun. The gap between imports and exports was growing. Home production continued to lag, but the government went on its Micawberish way, waiting for something to turn up. Mr. Dalton was happy with his balanced budget, Mr. Morrison declared that no further sacrifices could be demanded of the people. Today, with the gap wide open and no prospect of filling it from British resources, even Sir Stafford Cripps' realism may be too late.

If the British had been made to realize in 1945 that in many ways the problems of reconstruction facing them were no less urgent than that which faced, say, Poland they might have set to and worked as the Poles have done; but cradled in illusions they have advanced in their crisis like somnambulists. It is the illusion either of infinite prosperity or of infinitely squeezable profits that makes it still possible for the trade unions to press for more wages for fewer hours. It is the illusion of wealth withheld by a spiteful government that has turned large sections of the more well-to-do against the controls and restrictions which they recognized as necessary during the war. Yet the reality is of a nation in greater economic straits than at any time since the Napoleonic wars. If the present attitude of the different classes in society cannot be mobilized into something more than the collective and disgruntled selfishness they show today, then the British will be obliged to face their supreme economic crisis without the only assets upon which they could still draw—their political balance, their deep natural unity, their phenomenal staying power.

This statement will no doubt be contested. Why speak of "Britain's only assets" when there is every chance that by midsummer the Marshall plan will have been passed by Congress and assistance will be assured for the next 18 months at the least? Even Sir Stafford Cripps has said that the only hope lies in American assistance, to give Britain the necessary time to bring about the restoration of normal conditions. But herein lies precisely the danger. Continual borrowing can have the same effect as continual drinking. The borrower's—like the drunkard's—sense of reality tends to fade. Britain has already had the American loan and the Canadian loan and will get the South African loan. All have been necessary, but all have helped to mask from Government and people alike the country's true economic straits. A standard of living has been maintained, reserves have been eaten up, expenditures undertaken on a scale which is quite out of accord with Britain's real economic position. And what guarantee is there that the Marshall plan may not be used in the same way? The only proper, the only long-sighted, the only courageous course would be for Britain to pursue now the policy it would pursue if the Marshall plan were reduced to a half or a third and to use the surplus thus created to build up reserves, modernize industry, develop economic integration in western Europe, and undertake now the program of hard living and hard working in which in the long run salvation alone will lie.

Democratic Education—University of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Minnesota Legislature from 1934 until I left to serve in World War II, I was privileged to represent my alma mater the University of Minnesota. This great educational institution was located in the legislative district I then represented and is also within the congressional district I presently serve. As the representative of this institution in two legislative bodies I have on many occasions had an opportunity to observe the excellence of its work in many fields. It is a truly democratic institution—and its fundamental aim is to serve the citizens of Minnesota. In this respect it has more than fulfilled its purpose and the people of Minnesota are grateful for the high caliber of the service rendered them. They have responded through their legislature by furnishing the university its primary support. They have also continued to adhere to a sound original program that was established many years ago. Where some other States have diffused their support for higher education, Minnesota has concentrated her efforts. The results of this sound policy are to be seen today in the great university that Minnesota has become.

The president of the University of Minnesota at this time is Mr. James L. Morrill and the educational leadership that he has already evidenced is in the same tradition as that demonstrated by his notable predecessors in this position.

Time has proved the wisdom of the choice of men that Minnesota has selected to head her university and of the course that Minnesota has followed in supporting higher education. For today the University of Minnesota ranks on a par with the finest colleges and universities of the world. It is thus entirely proper that a great national magazine should select this leading educational institution as the first in a series reporting on the outstanding universities of our Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Collie Small which appeared in the January 1948 issue of the Cosmopolitan magazine:

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

(By Collie Small)

The University of Minnesota is a colossal monument to mass education.

Recently it installed its own atom smasher, a bulky cylinder that thrusts its head up from the depths of the campus. An electrostatic generator, turning up 5,000,000 volts, it is the most powerful of its type in the world. Inside, the atom smasher is an ominous tangle of wires, tubes, dials, and switches, all bent to the service of science. Outside, it is dominated by the huge Minnesota football stadium.

And if the football stadium seems to contradict the atom smasher the arrangement is all the more reasonable. A university is many things to many men, and it thrives on contradictions.

Minnesota is no exception. A State university, it is committed to the public service. It is the highest seat of learning in the State. It is passionately devoted to the advancement of learning. Yet, it has suffered the contradiction of being forced to cater to more average students than superior ones, to more students wandering uncertainly through college in quest of automatic degrees than students earnestly seeking the most in higher education. The situation is not unusual. It is a tribute to Minnesota, however, that it has been able to shape itself to the needs of the average student without distorting itself as a university.

Minnesota is a great university. Even physically, it is overwhelming. In sheer numbers it is the largest university on a single campus in America. (California, with several different campus sites, is bigger.) Its red brick and gray limestone buildings, huddled together in scholarly communion on a bluff overlooking the Mississippi River in Minneapolis, shelter some 28,000 students. Future citizens come off its assembly line at the rate of five graduating classes a year. If the faculty and the janitors are included in the census, the university population swells to 36,000 persons, making it the fourth largest city in the State. Only Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth are bigger.

The university operates its own airport for fledgling fliers. And aeronautical-engineering students pick over the skeletons of the several planes owned by the university. There is a university radio station, KUOM, over which professors with microphones on their desks broadcast their classroom disquisitions. An alert student, by enrolling only in those courses which are broadcast, could conceivably win his degree without ever getting out of bed.

Like any community of 36,000 people, the university maintains a police force equipped with radio cars, a crime laboratory, a lie detector, and the right to pursue and arrest fugitives anywhere in Minnesota. Crimes against the campus are committed largely by irreverent outsiders, but there is a difficult traffic problem for the police to handle, and last year they conducted a devastating assault on gamblers at athletic contests.

As a member of the Big Nine, Minnesota has maintained a position of eminence in the conference and on the national sports scene. During the thirties her Golden Gophers consistently ranked the Nation's football teams; however, when the celebrated Bernie Bierman went into service her glory faded. But Minnesota is now building again. In the 1947 Little Brown Jug meeting with Michigan, her sophomores showed unexpected power. The highly touted Wolverines, slated to steam roller the Gophers, barely managed to win, 13 to 6.

The Little Brown Jug classic is one of the oldest, most colorful sports rivalries in the country. In 1903, after Minnesota and Michigan had fought each other to a 6-to-6 standstill, Michigan left on its bench a brown 10-gallon jug which has remained a coveted trophy ever since. In 30 games with the Wolverines, Minnesota has captured the jug 11 times.

The Minnesota Daily, the student newspaper, boasts the largest circulation of any college paper—34,450 at the last count. The university maintains its own student symphony, but defers to more exacting tastes by serving also as the home of the Minneapolis Symphony, conducted by Dmitri Mitropoulos. This year, the University Theater will experiment with such adventures in Thespia as Oedipus the King, Macbeth, and Lysistrata, having disposed early last season of Electra, Amphitryon, and The Skin of Our Teeth, among others.

All that, of course, is pretty much standard fare at any typical university. But if Minnesota intended to be no more than a typical university, it overreached itself grievously in 1940 when it built its $2,000,000 student center, the Coffman Memorial Union. There is nothing typical about the union. It is a magnificent temple dedicated to pleasure which exceeds by far any possible flight of the imagination.

There are, for example, 20 dining rooms, a post office with 18,000 boxes, an underground garage, 18 grand pianos, a soda fountain, a barber shop, and a bookstore which wisely stocks no textbooks in this frolicsome atmosphere. There are also billiard tables, complete with undergraduate pool sharks, a swimming pool, chess and checker tables, card tables, ping-pong tables, and 16 bowling alleys complete with pastel blue bowling balls. For the faculty, there is an Olympian retreat called the Campus Club, with its own dining rooms, lounges, recreation rooms, and even a "quiet room" of monumental sanctity where tired professors repair to sleep off the effects of difficult classes.

At any university so elaborately equipped, there is always the danger that the students will forget why they are there. Minnesota does not pretend to be teeming with eager young scholars searching desperately for the truth, but there is an enormous amount of studying done.

The curriculum is positively staggering. The university's graduate schools offer advanced study in every field except theology. There is a college of agriculture, forestry, and home economics in St. Paul, on the "farm" campus, which is a short trolley hop from the main campus in Minneapolis. There is a law school, a justly famous medical school partially endowed by the Mayo Clinic, an institute of technology, a college of science, literature and the arts, and a dozen other colleges. There are courses in anything and everything. You can even learn to play the trombone and get from two to four university credits a term for it.

The Minnesota philosophy of education has been described as "democratic" in contrast with the "aristocratic" type of classic education championed by the large private schools. The "aristocratic" school emphasizes the cultures of the past, offers the same courses for all students, largely ignores vocational subjects, and selects its students according to a rigid system that involves little or no consideration of individual needs.

The admission requirements at Minnesota are flexible; there are even a few students without high-school educations. For those with special needs there is University College, a division of the university that manufactures curricula to order. Not long ago a young lady about to inherit a stock farm was rescued from her dilemma of what to study by a course that somehow managed to combine business administration with animal breeding. Another student professed to be in urgent need of a course in "medical journalism," and though University College was baffled temporarily by the proposition, it rallied bravely and turned out a medical journalist, or at least what it assumes to be a medical journalist.

Of all the students who enter Minnesota as freshmen, nearly half have disappeared by the third year. The university does not delude itself that the sole cause of this high mortality rate is a stiff curriculum. Many students simply are not college material; others can afford only a year or two. For such students Minnesota has taken a long stride forward with its general college.

The general college course is for 2 years, and the curriculum places the emphasis on utility rather than on culture or highly specialized knowledge. Some courses in general college are strictly vocational; others have vocational applications and deal with broad, general principles which the college itself hopes will "enable the student to grasp the significance of an area of employment rather than the specific skills required by a particular job."

The university requires some students to enter General College directly, while others are shunted to it if they fail to show an aptitude for university work or if General College appears to be better suited to their needs. As was to be expected, in 1932, when General College was established, the university regulars developed the habit of referring to General College as "All Fools' College," and for a time succeeded in creating a rather bleak and distorted image of it.

The administration countered, however, by sending its top professors to General College, thus silencing the amateur critics.

With rare consideration for its graduates and others in need of occasional freshening, Minnesota also established a center for continuation study. Filled to capacity every term, it invites professional people to return to the campus to refresh themselves with special survey courses and to study new developments in any number of fields.

The faculty at Minnesota is not the elite faculty of a Harvard or Columbia. Nevertheless, it is impressive. Dr. Alfred O. C. Nier, who first separated uranium 235, is on the physics staff; he is currently carrying on experiments similar to those conducted at Oak Ridge. Dr. John J. Bittner, head of the department of cancer biology, operates a colony of 20,000 mice and is noted for his discovery of the milk agent in mammary cancer.

The Nation's insurance companies have been looking nervously at Minnesota's laboratory of physiological hygiene while that department conducts experiments calculated to prove a specific relationship between obesity and heart disease. These experiments involve weighing people under water. If the laborstory proves what it expects to prove, the life-insurance companies may have to change their actuarial tables.

Since it is sponsored by the State of Minnesota, the university is naturally sensitive to the peculiar problems of its benefactor. Dr. E. W. Davis, head of the mines experiment station, for example, is doing research on the processing of low-grade ores, hoping to bolster the diminishing supply of high-grade ores in Minnesota. The agricultural school has developed new fertilizers, a hybrid corn, and a superior strain of farm animal known simply and rather inelegantly as Minnesota No. 1. Minnesota No. 1 is a hog, noted for the lean, succulent flavor of its bacon, pork chops, and ham.

All this, of course, is big business. Last year, the cost of operating the university was roughly $20,000,000. Nearly $9,000,000 was spent on instruction and research alone. James L. Morsill, the former city editor of the Cleveland Press who serves as Minnesota's eighth president, balanced the books neatly, however, with income from the State, the Federal Government (which provided money for research, instruction and extension), and from various funds and fees.

Almost 85 percent of Minnesota's 28,000 students are residents of the State. The university, faced with the problem of educating its own family, does not encourage outsiders to apply for admission: to keep them away, it has established a tuition schedule that is higher for out-of-Staters than it is for residents. Last year, the demand for nonresident admissions was so great that the university had to lock the gates to some 13,000 applicants, enough to stock a new university elsewhere. This year, it was grimly prepared for 20,000 students, but the veterans did not appear as overwhelmingly as predicted, and the enrollment is a few hundred over the 28,000 mark.

Enrollment last year, however, showed an alarming jump of 60 percent over the previous peak year, and the university suddenly discovered that it didn't have any place to put its students, though it had built a village of Quonset huts and trailers to care for the overflow. Formerly, all students were housed within walking distance of the campus. Now, however, Minnesota is a trolley-car university, and it will accept rooms anywhere on the Twin Cities' street-car system for the duration of the emergency. Luckily, many students live at home, in Minneapolis and St. Paul, but this does not alleviate the crush on the campus, where, for example, 1,400 students are enrolled in the same economics class. They hold that one in an auditorium, and if it gets any bigger, they will probably have to move it to the stadium. The classroom shortage keeps lectures going well into the night.

Social life on the Minnesota campus is typical of the social life on almost any campus, but it is complicated by several factors. One of these is an interesting disparity in the ratio of males to females. There are three males to every female, representing either a superabundance of males or an acute shortage of females, depending on the viewpoint.

Immediately following the war years, there was a sharp decline in the tempo of social affairs, but gradually they are coming back. The Mardi Gras, for example, is an all-out party that compares favorably with the best campus celebration, and there is a great deal of interest shown annually in Snow Week, a midwinter expedition to Duluth. But the light snowfall of recent years has put a damper on that activity.

As on other campuses, and for some reason which has never been clearly explained, an astounding number of "queens" are enthroned each year. At Minnesota, the engineers and the foresters are particularly addicted to crowning queens, and the competition has been intense enough to bring out the cops.

The engine school men emerge on St. Patrick's Day bedecked in kelly-green hats and clay pipes; they spend most of the day either kissing the blarney stone or the young lady whom they have installed as queen. Not to be outdone, the woodsmen have a Forester's Day which is presided over by a duly elected "Uncle of Paul Bunyan," and a queen who is provided with four "assistant queens," thereby making her, in the opinion of the foresters, four times as queenly as the engine school sovereign.

Student fashions at Minnesota are dictated by simple standards of convenience and function. Saddle shoes and sweaters are still standard attire for the girls when the weather is good, and the men like lumberjack shirts and GI pants and jackets. In the winter, fashion is no problem at all. With the first hint of snow, the girls jump immediately into sheep-lined storm coats and fur-lined boots, and the men do the best they can with whatever is warmest.

The administration professes to find a certain amount of usefulness in fraternities and sororities, and, as a result, there is no particular pressure on them, as at some universities elsewhere. But the university does keep a restraining hand on rushing tactics. It is definitely against the rules to stampede confused freshmen into joining fraternities or sororities. They are introduced gradually into the mysteries and delights of Greek-letter organizations.

If there is a shortage of anything at Minnesota, it is of playboys. Some 60 percent of the students are working their way through school. It has been estimated that the minimum cost for a year at Minnesota is $850, and the average $1,000, exclusive of clothes and amusements. Unfortunately, most of the students at Minnesota are a long way from having even the $850 minimum, to say nothing of the $1,000 average. If the price seems high, the university points out sadly that even tuition and textbooks are victims of inflation.

University officials are frequently amazed at the lengths to which some students will go to get an education. Not long ago a desperate student approached the university with an offer to sell his body for medical research after his death in return for enough money to finance his way through school. Several years ago, the university discovered an undergraduate working as a street-car conductor in Minneapolis; for 2 years, he had been averaging something less than 5 hours of sleep a night.

Possibly the best student job in recent years went to a young man whose only duty was to close the doors of a fire station after the truck went out. Others worked as waiters, bakers, dishwashers, barbers, models, and chauffeurs. One youth supported himself by driving racing cars on the dirt tracks, and another—a house painter by avocation—hustled enough contracts from faculty members to insure four years at the university.

Most student employment is meted out by the university employment service, which has developed its own "civil service" system of job classification. Students are carefully graded for aptitude. Many veterans returned from war duty with special skills that they are now using to support themselves in college.

Total student earnings on the campus last year came to more than $2,000,000, and it is expected to be higher this year. Veterans, particularly, have shown a tendency to take on heavy work schedules to protect their savings, but they are gradually discovering that they can't work full time and study, too. The university itself recommends no more than 4 hours of work a day.

Before the war, Minnesota students borrowed between forty and fifty thousand dollars a year from the school to finance their educations. During the war, with the campus loaded with Army and Navy trainees, the figure dropped abruptly, but it is now rising again. A student is permitted to borrow only $250 in 1 year, and not more than $500 during his whole college career, except in the case of medical and dentistry students, whose fees and textbooks are higher and who may borrow $500 in any one year, and no more than $600 spread over the college years. A note is dated for 1 year, but as long as the student stays in school and does satisfactory work it is left open, and he pays only the interest until he graduates. Minnesota requires no security and no cosigners, nor does it require the permission of parents in the case of minors seeking loans. Despite the university's liberal attitude, the rate of number of repaid debts is high.

Many students, however, are still permitted to go down for the third time simply because they have exhausted the financial-aid possibilities. Scholarships would rescue them, but Minnesota, like most lowly endowed State universities, is weak in scholarships. One Minnesota official stated recently that no more than six scholarships were available for the whole freshman class, which normally numbers between seven and eight thousand students. Privately endowed universities are likely to subsidize half the freshman class. The situation at Minnesota and other State universities, it appears, will be corrected only by divine intervention or a more generous circle of friends.

It has been fashionable in recent years for university students to govern themselves, or at least to create the illusion of self-government. At Minnesota the "student bill of rights" has granted the students, according to the university handbook, "wide and general privileges which are similar to those enjoyed by responsible citizens in every community."

Actually it is doubtful if any of the student councils are responsible for anything very important. The All-University Council, for example, is the supreme body and is elected by the student body; yet it sets no policies and performs no perceptibly greater function than to designate 1 week each year as homecoming. The Associated Women Students is a large organization for women. Actually the strongest student voice is that of the Minnesota Daily.

Most of the students, like students anywhere, view campus politics with monumental apathy, and, as a result, the workings of student government, such as it is, are controlled by a few eager opportunists. There are, however, several campus political parties, and the skullduggery frequently reaches a high professional plane. Harold Stassen left behind an illuminating record as a campus politician when he graduated from Minnesota 18 or 20 years ago.

A small group of students, brandishing the spear of intellectual freedom, constitutes the core of the student thinkers. Henry Wallace was sponsored by a student group not long ago, and Senator BALL, of Minnesota, has also appeared on the campus. Senator BALL, unfortunately, was subjected to a barrage of heckling truly remarkable for sustained effort.

The students at Minnesota are not exceptionally concerned with the political state of the Union or with the political state of the world. The campus Republican club, for example, claims only 350 members. The United World Federalists, an organization devoted to world government, numbers some 200 at the outside.

The left-wingers on the campus concentrate their forces mostly in the Minnesota chapter of the American Youth for Democracy, a group which includes 87 of the university's 28,000 students. The University of Illinois banned the AYD from its campus last August, but Minnesota feels that the group exerts so little influence it is best to ignore it rather than call attention to it and thus incur the displeasure of a lot of students who, being traditionally idealistic, would be inclined to support an under dog. Minnesota further feels that a university is the one place that can afford to support a conflict in ideas, and, in this sense, at least, the AYD serves a definite purpose.

Since the war, Minnesota has experienced much less of the collegiate rah-rah and coonskin spirit generally associated with a university. The students appear to be more serious now, and the only real outburst last year came when a group of veterans buried the legendary Kilroy in front of the student union. It was an elaborate ceremony, and Kilroy lay in state on the campus for several days with an ROTC guard of honor.

Even the campus humor magazine, the Ski-U-Mah, has sobered, and is not carrying the usual quota of jokes. This will come as a distinct relief, incidentally, to old college-humor magazine readers who have suffered through an endless rotation of bad jokes for years. All good college men will remember: "Waiter, there's a fly in my ice cream." "Serves him right—let him freeze."

The returning veteran has had much to do with this new attitude. All students appear to be much more concerned with post-college security than ever before, and in the case of the veteran, the problem is particularly acute since, as often as not, he has married and has taken on new responsibilities. Age is overtaking him, and the ominous signs of a possible business recession are prodding him to greater effort. It is significant that, at Minnesota, at least, his grades have been appreciably higher than the grades of nonveterans.

As for the university itself, it hopes to endow its students with judgment, perspective, and the skills to make a living. Dr. Morrill has said that Minnesota is attempting to impart a strong commitment to public service and "an understanding loyalty to the kind of political, economic, and social order which made possible the opportunities students have had at Minnesota."

Dr. Benjamin Fine, an authority on education, recently paid the University of Minnesota the supreme compliment.

"In many ways," Dr. Fine wrote, "the University of Minnesota may serve as a typical model for the democratic college of the future."

Joe Martin in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil by Mr. A. M. Piper, editor, in connection with Speaker MARTIN'S visit to Des Moines, during which he addressed a large gathering of Iowa Republicans.

In this editorial Mr. Piper voices the sentiments of millions of Americans who know our Speaker best or have followed his services to the American people during his many years as a loyal public servant.

JOE MARTIN is held in the highest esteem by not only his own party members in Congress but also by those who sit across the aisle.

The editorial follows:

JOE MARTIN IN IOWA

Speaker JOE MARTIN came to Iowa Monday. Of course, we should refer to him as the Honorable JOSEPH WILLIAM MARTIN, JR., Representative from the Fourteenth Massachusetts District, and Speaker of the National House of Representatives.

But Joe doesn't care for titles. He prefers to be known as Joe. That is what all of his friends call him, and most of the hundreds of thousands of residents of his district.

JOE MARTIN is a man of the people, as common and friendly as they make them. He gets acquainted with everybody and visits with more people in the course of his travels than any other man we ever met. He is always accessible, always ready to listen to the other fellow's troubles and do what he can to get them straightened out. That's one of the reasons he has been elected to Congress every election since 1924, polling the full Republican vote every time and often receiving half or more of the Democratic votes in the district.

But there are many other reasons why Joe has been a Congressman for 24 years, why he was elected minority leader in the days when Republicanism was at a low ebb, why he was chosen Speaker without opposition, and why he ranks above many leading statesmen in the country.

He knows more about the workings of the Federal Government than most Members of Congress. He is a superb organizer. Nobody ever called him a boss, but the Republican Members of Congress follow his leadership, not only willingly but enthusiastically. The Democrats respect and admire him. He doesn't have an enemy in Washington, or anywhere else.

JOE MARTIN is a man of the highest integrity. He is a Republican first, last, and all the time, but not a narrow partisan. What is best for the country determines his course.

* * * * *

Joe delivered a rousing speech to Republican committeemen and party workers in Des Moines Monday. It was the best speech we ever heard him make. He certainly rang the bell in Iowa.

As Speaker of the House, MARTIN is next in line of succession if anything should happen to the President.

Everywhere he goes, and Iowa is no exception, you hear rumors that he may be in line for the Presidency, regardless. If the cards should fall that way, the Nation would have a Chief Executive with only one ambition—to do his best for his country.

The Knutson Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article written by H. H. Bookbinder which furnishes interesting information on the tax bill which passed the House a few days ago. The article follows:

THAT INCOME-TAX FARCE AGAIN

Here we go again! The Republican chiefs of Congress are trying again to reduce taxes. Last year they failed twice to get their tax reduction approved by the President.

The GOP has announced that the first order of business in the 1948 session of Congress will be a new version of their income-tax proposal. Representative KNUTSON, Minnesota, Republican, who fathered last year's bills, has announced that his new bill is veto-proof, because it meets all the serious objections to the earlier bill and provides more relief to low-income families.

Almost all the publicity so far does make it seem like the new bill is a major improvement over the old ones. It seems to meet the major argument presented by President Truman for vetoing the old Knutson proposals, namely, that they "reduce taxes in the high-income brackets to a grossly disproportionate extent as compared to the reduction in the low-income brackets."

As a matter of fact, however, the new bill is subject to the same criticism as was directed against the old ones.

Statistics are funny things—if you are not careful. Let's take a look at some of the statistics that have been given lots of publicity in order to give the impression that the new Knutson proposal will benefit the poor at the expense of the rich. In the following table, present taxes and those resulting from the proposed reduction are given for various income levels. "Net income" means yearly income, after normal deductions, but without personal exemptions, for a family of four.

Net income	Present taxes	Proposed taxes	Percent reduction
$2,400	$76		100
$3,000	190	80	58
$5,000	889	586	35
$10,000	1,862	1,210	35
$20,000	5,890	3,656	38
$50,000	24,000	15,986	34
$100,000	62,301	44,224	29
$500,000	408,600	343,940	15
$1,000,000	838,850	732,966	13

Now, this looks pretty good. What are we yelling about? The family with a $3,000 income, or about $60 a week, has its taxes reduced by 58 percent. This percentage goes down and down, until the man with a million-dollar income saves only 13 percent in taxes. Isn't that fair?

WHAT'S WRONG?

Well, here's the gimmick. The important thing to you is not the percentage by which your taxes are reduced but the percentage by which your take-home pay is increased.

Now, let's take the table above, and do some arithmetic with it. Instead of yearly income, let's consider weekly income. Then let's see what the take-home pay is now, based on today's tax rates. Let's compare that with the take-home pay resulting from the proposed bill.

Net income (weekly)	Present take-home pay	Proposed take-home pay	Percent increase
$48	$46.48	$48.00	3
[illegible]	56.20	58.48	4
$100	88.22	92.28	5
$200	163.00	177.00	9
$400	282.00	360.00	13
$1,000	518.00	680.00	31
$2,000	754.00	1,115.00	48
$10,000	1,868.00	3,121.00	67
$20,000	3,223.00	5,340.00	66

This table tells a different story, doesn't it? The average workingmen would have his take-home pay increased by 3 or 4 percent, but the poor suffering banker or industrialist, earning $10,000 a week—a week, not a year—would have his take-home pay increased by 67 percent. The worker has about $1.50 a week more to spend, while the $10,000-a-week man has about $1,200 a week more to spend.

Bad as it is, you might think that this latest Knutson monstrosity is at least an improvement over last year's bills. The bill is better in that it does give somewhat more relief to the lower brackets—by raising personal exemptions from $500 to $600. But it is worse in that it helps the rich even more than before. Here is the proof:

Comparing the present GOP bill with the GOP bill of 1947, we find that the tax reduction is $50 greater for the $3,000-a-year man, $300 greater for the $10,000-a-year man, $5,000 greater for the $100,000-a-year man, and $20,000 greater for the $1,000,000-a-year men.

In other words, KNUTSON has "improved" his bill over last year's by giving the average worker $50 more tax relief and the millionaire $20,000 more tax relief. Not bad—if you're a millionaire.

CIO POSITION

The CIO has taken the stand that if there is to be any tax reduction the entire tax relief must be given only to the lower brackets. The simplest and most effective means is to increase exemptions. By doubling present exemptions, a family of four with an income of $80 per week would not pay any taxes at all. Such a change in the tax laws would reduce total tax revenues by no more than the Knutson proposal, and would provide needed relief for those families that have been hardest hit by the rapid rise in the cost of living.

H. H. BOOKBINDER.

Brooklyn Adopts Breukelen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn, N. Y., has again shown the way. Some of its leading citizens of all races, creeds, and origins have organized under the name of "Brooklyn, New York, adopts Breukelen, Holland Project." Having discovered that its namesake in the Netherlands was in need, they decided to adopt it.

This is not a fund raising campaign. They are asking for things in kind. They have no paid staff. Every one is a volunteer, rendering services gratis.

Let me quote from a recent letter to me:

We need the help of everyone in Brooklyn. In cases where it is not practical to send goods, we're glad to receive a check. This is immediately used to buy at wholesale some item on our list. As we have no overhead every cent is spent for goods.

Can you think of a better way to foster foreign relations * * * * or a better piece of good publicity for Brooklyn? By the way, the people of Breukelen did not ask us for help. We asked them if they needed anything and this was done through the consul general in New York and the burgomaster in Breukelen. This is a one-time campaign only, and once we get them these goods they have a fine start to help themselves * * * which is what they really want to do.

Following is a circular giving more details about the project:

BROOKLYN ADOPTS BREUKELEN PROJECT

FACTS ABOUT BREUKELEN, THE NETHERLANDS

Breukelen has 5,100 inhabitants of whom approximately 3,400 are persons upwards of 18 years; and approximately 1,700 18 years and under.

Of these 3,000 are members of the Dutch Reformed Church; 600 of the Reformed Church; and 1,500 of the Roman Catholic Church. There are 4 churches in Breukelen. (1 Dutch Reformed; 2 Reformed; 1 Roman Catholic.)

Breukelen has a Boy Scouts and Sea Scouts organization; a rest home for the aged; two infant welfare centers and a Catholic welfare group.

BREUKELEN'S NEEDS

According to a letter received by Miss Marguerite A. Salomon from the burgomaster of Breukelen, the following is a list of the most urgently needed things * * * and to quote from the burgomaster's letter "In our opinion you can best help by sending materials. The women can make the clothes then themselves. In view of different cuts and especially different measures, this seems to us the best way."

Knitted underwear for children, men and women about 5,100 units; sizes: 2–6 years, 600; 7–12 years, 750; 13–18, 850; men's, 20 percent size 32; 20 percent size 34; 20 percent, size 36; 40 percent, size 38; women's 25 percent, size 36; 50 percent, size 38; 15 percent, size 40; 10 percent, size 42.

Sheets and pillow cases for maternity cases—approximately 300 of each.

Baby clothes for children (up to 2 years) about 250 pieces of each.

Outing flannel for babies; 3,000 diapers; 1,000 crib sheets; 3,000 safety pins.

Outing flannel for pyjamas (1 per family) approximately 10,000 yards.

Cotton material for women's clothes (1 per family) approximately 8,000 yards.

Cotton material for men's shirts (1 per family) approximately 5,000 yards.

Overalls (small, medium, large) about 200.

Work trousers for men (small, medium, large) about 200.

Knitting wool for sweaters and socks.

Men's suits—20 percent, size 38; 50 percent, size 40; 20 percent, size 42; 10 percent, size 44.

Bicycle tires and tubes, size 38x1½.

Notions: Cotton thread, darning cotton, rubber bands, pins, studs, buttons, snappers, arm-bands (for men's shirts), garters for men, haberdashery.

There are many items not mentioned by the burgomaster that would be most welcome.

To supplement the heavily starchy Dutch diet they would appreciate: meat spreads, peanut butter, cheese, jams, marmalade, luncheon meats, jellies; hard candies, sugar, jams, raisins, canned fruits; lard, cooking oils or shortenings; tea, coffee, cocoa, chocolate; canned and packaged foods of all varieties especially those which do not require prolonged preparation or addition of milk, sugar, or eggs; seasonings and flavorings, condensed milk, powdered milk and eggs.

Also girdles and corsets, sanitary napkins, rubbers; wash clothes, towels, soap, youth handicraft materials, youth sports equipment.

All shipments are handled free and duty free through the courtesy of the United Relief for Holland.

Mr. Speaker, the thought behind this project is an excellent one, and if it is adopted by other communities it will go a long way toward solving our world problems. I urge every Member of Congress to start a similar movement in his own community.

New York Teacher Offers School Finance Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, on Saturday, February 7, 1948:

NEW YORK TEACHER OFFERS SCHOOL FINANCE PLAN

(By John L. Blackman, Jr.)

Widespread interest in learning and teaching evoked by the reports of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education has drawn attention to an unusual plan for financing education put forth by a New York public-school teacher.

The plan for economic stability based upon the use of banking credits for education is presented by Mrs. Viola Lurch Cox, teacher in the Jamaica (N. Y.) Vocational High School, in a book, "Wealth Through Education," published by Stephen-Paul Publishers, New York. Believing that education is the true source of wealth not only for individuals but for nations, the author tells how she would increase the productive efficiency of individuals, and hence add to the wealth of nations, by making educational opportunities more widely available to all.

Mrs. Cox's plan, in essence a system designed to permit commercial banks to make personal loans to students under the guaranty of the Federal Government, had its origin in the long depression of the thirties.

In those years Mrs. Cox saw the education of many able students cut short by the necessity of supporting their families. She felt she must find a means of keeping the children in school.

CREDIT EXPLORED

Finally, with the cooperation of her husband, S. Ernest Cox, she began investigating the uses of credit in the history of many nations and became convinced that it not only facilitated material development, but had

encouraged in the borrowers more faith in themselves and a higher sense of responsibility and capacity.

She found that the means of obtaining credit have been extended greatly in the United States in recent years. The Federal Reserve System has facilitated the provision of reserves for the commercial banks. The Federal land banks and other agencies have increased the credit sources for farmers. The Home Loan Bank System has done the same for home owners. The Federal Housing Administration had inaugurated a new type of bank credit, insured by the Federal Government. But no comparable credit facilities have been made available for education, upon which the productive capacities of all workers depends.

It was in personal credit, then, that Mrs. Cox found what she believes to be the answer to her long inquiry. This answer she has now set forth in a volume entitled "Wealth Through Education." Dr. Willis A. Sutton, superintendent emeritus of public schools in Atlanta, Ga., and past president of the National Education Association, has given his endorsement in an introduction to the book.

EDUCATIONAL LOANS

Mrs. Cox's plan, which she terms "Wealth for All," has attracted the attention of many educators and Members of Congress. It is carefully described in the book, together with a detailed estimate of its probable effects on the national income, national debt, effective tax rates, price index, and production index during the first 20 years after its establishment. Its principal features may be summarized as follows:

1. All young people, from the age of 10 to 24, would be made eligible for Government-insured educational loans to be obtained locally from commercial banks, under rules to be established by State loan boards. (Although primarily designed for use in the United States, Mrs. Cox believes the plan could, with slight modifications, be adapted to most other countries.)

2. The State loan boards would determine the amount of money to be loaned to each age group and establish rules for its proper use. The boards would be selected from business, labor, and professional groups by State and local boards of public education.

3. Mrs. Cox has suggested the following tentative amounts for the annual loans:

Age group	Annual loan	Sum due after 20 years
10 to 14	$400	$600
15 to 18	800	1,200
19 to 24	1,200	1,800

Thus a young couple which had availed itself of the average benefit of the educational loans and took the usual length of time to complete elementary school, high school, and college, would accumulate a joint debt of about $30,000, according to Mrs. Cox's estimate. But the author is sure the students would be stimulated by the new sense of responsibility resulting from the loans to complete their schooling in less than the usual time and so would need loans totaling considerably less than $30,000.

TWENTY YEARS AFTER

4. The students would be charged a rate of 2½ percent simple "interest" (virtually a service charge), but neither principal nor "interest" on any of the annual loans would fall due until 20 years afterward, when both would become payable on the first of these loans in 12 monthly installments. Thus the earliest that any loan would be due would be at age 30 for a loan obtained at age 10 (with parents' endorsement in this age group). The other loans would become due on successive years.

5. Of the 2½ percent payments, 1 percent would go to the banks to meet the expenses of servicing the loans, and 1½ percent would go to the Federal Government. Neither bank nor Government, of course, would receive any payments during the first 20 years of the plan. The 1½ percent received by the Government would be used for three purposes: (1) to insure the student borrowers against certain contingencies, namely, to cancel the loans of students who passed on or were permanently disabled before their loans fell due (2) to insure the banks against loss if a loan was defaulted by the borrower and his five fellow-student endorsers (this feature is adapted from the FHA system of insuring mortgage loans); (3) to pay $300 a year to parents for each child in the age group of three to nine who attends school 10 months a year, or who, up to the age of five, is given competent nursery school training.

This, then, is a brief outline of the system of "dynamic dollars" which Mrs. Cox estimates would increase the school attendance of the United States from about 25,000,000 to about 37,000,000 in its first year of operation. The amount of loans required to do this she places roughly at $18,000,000,000. This sum would be bank-created credits, that is, new money added to the Nation's effective demand for goods. An additional $18,000,000,000 would be lent each succeeding year. Thus in the 20 years before the earliest loans fell due, approximately $400,000,000,000 of student credits would be created, according to Mrs. Cox's calculations. After the twentieth year, however, some loans would be paid off as fast as others were granted, hence the total credits outstanding would tend to stabilize around $400,000,000,000.

PROBABLE EFFECTS

The immediate impact of an increase of 12,000,000 in the school population of the country (roughly a 50-percent change) is fairly obvious. The need for new school and college buildings, for additional teachers, and for millions of textbooks would cause a boom in education that would put the present veteran-stimulated boom (at the college level only) in the shadow.

The effects on the national economy of the vastly increased spending by students and their parents would be complex as well as staggering in scope. The possibility of further serious inflation of prices, if the $18,000,000,000-a-year plan were put into effect at this time, is not ignored by Mrs. Cox. If the sums were business loans, some inflationary consequences might follow, she believes. But she maintains that loans to students will have the effect of increasing their personal capacities and character, and so will result at once in increased efficiency of production on farms and in factories. This increased output of goods and services will absorb the larger supply of money, raising the standard of living of the entire population.

This point, it should be emphasized, is the main thesis of the book—that personal student loans will bring greater national wealth by increasing the actual output of goods and services of a given number of workers. In different language, the productivity of each individual will increase. The two aspects of this most likely to receive attention in Congress, if the plan is presented to that body, are: (1) By how much will this productivity increase? (2) How soon?

INFLATION A DANGER

It would seem reasonable to expect a lag of at least a few years after the granting of the first loans before the initial beneficiaries could complete their education and obtain positions in which they could make $18,000,000,000 more goods a year than they would have made without the loans. In the meantime, it seems to this writer, if such a lag appeared, the students' spending of their loans would have an inflationary effect on prices—not only in the printing and construction industries but in food and clothing. If put into effect during a serious depression, however, the plan would tend to increase employment rather than prices.

Wealth Through Education is more, however, than the presentation of a plan for making education available to all. It is a thorough and careful study of two topics of fundamental interest: (1) The relation between education and a community's spiritual and material achievements, and (2) the value of credit in history and at the present day in the development of great nations. It is pervaded with a strong faith in democratic processes and in the dignity and inherent capacity of each individual man and woman. Its objective is equality of opportunity for every child in every nation. It is already fulfilling an important mission in focusing attention on this vital problem.

Joseph Scott, Eminent Advocate of the Irish Free State, Makes Vigorous Appeal to Senate Foreign Relations Committee for Freedom of Northern Ireland in Considering the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph Scott, eminent Los Angeles attorney and vigorous advocate of the Irish Free State from its inception, accompanied by a delegation of other prominent Irish-Americans, recently appealed to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee urging them to make certain that any of the funds provided by the United States to implement the Marshall plan would not be used by Great Britain to continue their oppression of the six counties in Northern Ireland that are not now part of the Irish Free State.

The following is the statement made by Mr. Joseph Scott:

THE CHAIRMAN. The first witness this morning is Mr. Joseph Scott, of Los Angeles, Calif. We are very glad to see you, Mr. Scott. Will you proceed in your own way?

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH SCOTT, ATTORNEY, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you very much.

First of all, I wish on behalf of the committee to extend our sincere appreciation for the privilege and the pleasure of presenting our views to this honorable body, and I will say very frankly that we come here as taxpayers looking to this committee to listen to our views and give them the consideration we feel confident you will accord them.

The delegation is from all sections of the country. I come from Los Angeles, Calif. There have been a lot of people coming from our city to present their views to the Senate and the House of Representatives, but there need be no question with regard to this committee of ours as to how we stand on the fundamental principles of the American way of life. We are uncompromisingly devoted to the principles of the founding fathers and we are all of Irish stock—not all of us born in Ireland. Some were born in the faith of St. Patrick, but some of the greatest patriots we have had in the Irish cause have been men of the Protestant faith.

Regarding the Irish Free State, so-called, composed of 26 counties in Ireland:

Its first President was an Irish non-Catholic, Dr. Douglas Hyde, a distinguished Gaelic scholar, and not previously identified with Irish politics.

Gentlemen of the committee, I hope I do not have to expatiate upon the anxiety we have as American taxpayers in regard to the fundamentals of the so-called Marshall plan and where the funds are going to go.

Our information is that it is proposed that a good portion of this money is to go to London, to Downing Street, and it will be siphoned out of that seat of the English Government over to Belfast, which is the stronghold of a little corner of northeast Ireland which was cut off arbitrarily by Lloyd George and men of his type from the rest of Ireland, where the principles of the American way of life are unknown or ignored, and where the ascendancy of the imperialistic powers of England are exercised to the nth degree.

We feel, coming from a race that suffered persecution through the centuries, not merely for religious principles but for fundamental political rights, that we should present to this committee our reasons for taking what may appear at first glance to be an arbitrary stand.

I came to this country myself after matriculating in London University. I was not born in Ireland, but my father and mother were married in the city of Wexford, a little corner of Ireland where John Barry, "the father of the American Navy," as we like to term him, was born.

When I left to come to this country, my little Irish mother threw her arms around me and told me to fear nothing that walked the earth or crawled under the earth, but to love God above all things and be true to the principles of Jefferson and Lincoln. It happened that she, as a little Irish girl, had had her boyhood friends come back from Gettysburg; and I learned, Mr. Chairman, from my Irish mother what Lincoln meant at Gettysburg—that right made might and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, with the help of God, should not perish from the earth. So I did not need to go to any American college or to any library of American literature. I got it from the womb of my mother.

That is the faith that has been fought for through the years. Every battlefield of the Republic, from Washington to the last great war, is marked with it. I have lived in California for 55 years. I have seen the little pueblo of Los Angeles grow from 60,000 people to nearly 2,500,000, and in our county now there are about 4,000,000 people. Our race was out in California before me. I can recall still Admiral O'Callaghan, with his flagship, the *San Francisco*, going down to his glorious death in the blue waters of the South Pacific. I can still recall Chaplain O'Callaghan, the Jesuit padre, who was designated by the skipper of his ship as the bravest man he had ever seen.

We feel, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that the Irish have been an asset to this country. We feel that the right to be free as nurtured in the Irish heart has been a welcome, appreciated virtue in the American way of life. My little Irish mother told me that we got it from St. Patrick; that he was a slave in the hills of Antrim from the time he was 14 until he was 18 years of age, and in his blood, in his veins as a youth, he detested slavery in any form after his bitter experience.

He impregnated the Irish with that same principle, and through the ages they have fought for liberty—not for economic security, merely, to have a slave mind, but to be free.

So men and women of the Irish race had a convention in New York a couple of months ago. I have been attending these reunions and conventions for over 50 years, and I can state, Mr. Chairman, that it was the most representative gathering we have ever had to perpetuate the ideals of the motherland of so many of us and to instill more deeply a fervent devotion to the principles of the founding fathers of our country.

There were all types of political beliefs there. I think, as a member of the buck privates of the Republican Party, I was very much in the minority, but somehow or other they insisted that I accept the job as chairman of the convention. I have never aspired to public life. My only experience in that respect has been as president of the city board of education of Los Angeles for several years. I followed the fortunes of Mr. Taft when he managed to take Vermont and Utah in 1910; I stayed with Hiram Johnson in Chicago when he fought a losing fight in 1920 in his efforts to secure the Republican nomination as President. And an old doughboy like myself had the privilege of nominating for President one of the greatest men the country has ever produced, my earnest personal friend, Herbert Hoover. So I have been around a little.

Senator BARKLEY. You wouldn't by any chance be for Wallace this year?

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir; and nobody in this delegation is for Wallace. And that is another reason why I want to impress upon you gentlemen this:

The Irish have wanted to own the soil of their own homes. I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that men like Wolfe Tone from Dublin was a Protestant. John Mitchel, in the days of '48, just 100 years ago, one of the rebels of Ireland, was likewise an outstanding Protestant. He managed to come to this country and threw in his fortunes with the Confederacy.

I want to say that I think it is Hilaire Belloc, a very outstanding English philosopher and writer, who said, "You have got to sustain the idea of private property, otherwise you must restore the institution of slavery," and therefore it has been one of the frantic, desperate hopes of the Irish to own their own homes. And therefore for that reason and utterly opposed to communism in all its shapes and forms. We do not mind telling you we think it is straight from "the hob of hell." It is diabolical in all its assets, if it has any.

Therefore, we Irish—thoroughbred Americans, if I do say it myself—are one of the best assets this Nation has got in its fight against communistic control; first, because the Irish believe in a living God. We make no pretense of any evasive attitude toward a belief in the living God. We welcome and see with reverence and appreciation and emotion the picture of George Washington on his knees at Valley Forge. They can understand what Jefferson meant when he said, "With a firm reliance upon divine providence, we pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor," and Lincoln said, "This Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom."

All the way through our history the Irish go along with our history because of our fervent belief in its religious principles. We have no truck with the agnostic, the pragmatist, the atheist, the infidel, and with those who scoff at religion.

So we feel, Mr. Chairman, when we come here, we come as men as humbly and fervently devoted to the principles of our Government as any of you splendid outstanding statesmen before me.

Now, why are we here? We have come as taxpayers. It may be a peculiar way to come, but we come as taxpayers. Some of us have made a little money. Our limited purse strings will be ripped wide open if the Marshall plan goes into full fruition. We feel we have a right to direct the attention of this committee that no funds whatever from the pocketbook of the American taxpayer shall be diverted or allowed or compromised to get to Belfast to maintain an imperialistic Tory ascendancy as reactionary as any there is in the whole world. It is the remnant of the Tory government, just as much hostile to the principles of our Government as when John Hancock—I want to remind the Senator from Massachusetts, the man who wrote his signature first upon that immortal document, who when he was writing said:

"There! I have written my name with spectacles, but I have written it so big that the King of England can read it without spectacles."

Our information—and we are speaking, we think, by proper authority, is that it is proposed that some of this money will be given as a grant to Belfast. We respectfully, urgently, and emphatically present to this committee that that would be a violation of the fundamental principles on which we exist as a nation and as a government. We think that if we are going to go anywhere at all, we must recognize and be, at least to some extent, consistent.

As we read the Good Book, we realize that Christ sat down and ate with prostitutes and publicans and had compassion on the sinner. "I came not to call the just but sinners to repentance." But there is one type of sinner he did not compromise with. The novelist Dickens has immortalized him in his English character of Mr. Fecksniff. Christ flayed such with scorn and drove him out of His temple, and that was the hypocrite, the two-faced man who professed to be superior to his fellows; the Pharisee, in other words. We resent the pretensions of Downing Street, London, or any other place who would have you do otherwise. We suggest to you gentlemen of the committee that any money from the Marshall plan going to Belfast would be wasted, a desecration of the purposes of the appeal now being made. Anyone who protests that it should go to Belfast and that it would do good there is either a liar, a knave, or an ignoramus.

We feel very strongly about it, gentlemen of the committee. We feel our people over there have suffered long enough. They had a dirty, abominable deal, if you will allow me to use a little Los Angeles language. Irishmen fought and died in the rebellion of 1916. Young fellows with their faces in the sun, full of celestial happiness for the glory of their cause, faced the firing squads of Lloyd George and went to their doom with as pure and undefiled souls as Nathan Hale had when they put the rope around his neck and he regretted he had only one life to give to his country. They were very brave kids; they were murdered and slaughtered.

Those young Irish people had the same idea, gentlemen of the committee, of life that you have: That to be free, to have liberty, was a God-given right that nobody should be deprived of, and these men died that way.

I have in my file here now an orderly, dispassionate statement made by a meeting held in Dublin recently by lawyers and men who believe in O'Connell, the great parliamentarian. O'Connell is dead now 100 years. Eighteen hundred and forty-eight was a terrible year for Ireland. My little Irish mother saw men and women and children dead upon the roadside from famine in those horrible days of 1848. They died of starvation, although there were enough foodstuffs exported from Ireland to feed the people. They died of starvation, and young men in 1848, ignoring O'Connell's idea of constitutional agitation, rose up and fought a hopeless rebellion—such as Meagher, Mitchel, and Gavan Duffy. Meagher became a great general under Lincoln in the Civil War. Some of you Democrats of the South may be interested to know that John Mitchel, to whom I have previously referred, threw in his fortunes with Robert E. Lee, and his grandson, John Purroy Mitchel, became mayor of New York. Gavan Duffy became Prime Minister of Australia—those three young men, released

from the yoke of English tyranny—see what they made of themselves.

Now, I am quoting here statements made quite recently at a public meeting on January 25, 1948, in Barry's Hotel, Dublin. Here are three extracts from a more conservative man than I am, because, as I speak, I am filled with emotion myself, because it is in my blood, and all these delegates here present behind me feel as I do. There are 30,000,000 people that can trace their line of descent and blood to the Irish. They fled to all the four corners of the world, but mostly here.

Here is a statement made by James McScorpan, King's counselor and Member of Parliament. This is what McScorpan said:

"Britain set up partition and could end it. The responsibility was thrown upon whatever government was formed in Eire to show that it was inexpedient for Britain to continue it. I have never advocated physical force, and I never will. But if it is not solved in the way I have suggested, then as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow another generation will arise and there will be more blood offered at the shrine of British imperialism. The only way to end it is to make it inexpedient for Britain to continue."

That is a terrible indictment to make of the so-called British Government that talks about freedom and liberty in a day that has seen Palestine ripped in two, that has seen India rise in its desolation and pain to produce a man like Gandhi—imprisoned time and time again. Your distinguished colleague—I knew his grandfather well—Senator LODGE, will recall, and every New England man will recall, the story of Emerson going to see Thoreau in prison and Emerson said to Thoreau "What are you doing in jail?" And Thoreau said to Emerson, "What are you doing out of jail?"

And so Gandhi was in jail time and time again, under the same power that put Belfast on the map as a government.

Now, look how Gandhi has been exalted in death. We find that Gandhi's philosophy, with all of his peculiarities of religion, were fundamentally the Sermon on the Mount:

"Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice, for they shall have their fill."

I have passed my eightieth milestone, gentlemen. I ought not be here. I think according to the Scriptual admonition threescore years and ten is the limit. But I am here. After threescore years and ten, a man is supposed to encumber the earth. I flew through the night to get here. Now let us return to this Dublin meeting of last month.

The next man who spoke said:

"While the Government in England, the Government in Whitehall shed crocodile tears over the welfare of minority groups in far-off India, the British Government carelessly ignores today the aspiration of 80 percent of the Irish people and insists on stifling the voice and ruthlessly suppressing the operations of the democratic processes in Ireland."

Another Senator from that same Parliament in Belfast, Senator J. G. Lennon, said:

"At the present time a friendly Ireland is essential to Britain. It was their duty to weld the Irish opinion throughout the world and in one voice to demand the ending of the partition."

The partition, gentlemen, was caused in this way: After Padraic Pearse and these other brave lads were shot to death, after the revolution was defeated, Eamon de Valera, the present Premier of Ireland, was in that rising and was made prisoner, and he was saved from execution because he happened to be an American, born in New York. Subsequently, in the effort of the English Government to secure a solution of the tragedy, Lloyd George, a wily, shrewd, clever, smart, nimble, agile mental giant, among that kind of people, told Griffith and Michael Collins, who at that time represented the Irish as an ultimatum:

"I have the steam up on the train leaving Euston station. You sign on the dotted line. If you don't, you take the consequences."

And with a gun to their heads, these desperate Irishmen signed on the dotted line. Thus this so-called partition became effective, cutting off the wholesome part of Ireland, this northeast corner dominated by racial animosity and religious bigotry.

Here is that corner of Ireland today, gerrymandered in disgraceful and contemptuous disregard for political rights of minorities, so that it would make an American city ward politician of today almost laugh in his sleeve at anything as coarse and ruthless as that if it was not for the tragedy of it.

They haven't a chance to be accorded a reasonable vote.

Now let us see what this group of 2,000 delegates meeting in New York wanted to do. They believed that we should put before this Senate committee on the Marshall plan this statement of our position, which with your permission we will file. That statement protests that we are opposed to having any American taxpayers' money diverted to maintain this imperialistic undemocratic form of government in northeast Ireland. We urgently request that you put it to them this way: "If you don't accept this program, you are not going to get any money at all from us."

My friend Will Rogers was a Democrat, like my friend Isidore Dockweiler. Out there I don't know how you fellows get along in your other sections, but we old timers get along very well in California. Isidore Dockweiler was a very old friend of mine. He is the godfather of my oldest boy, and I am the godfather of his boy, a lad who went over to Japan and to the South Seas and was captured and had a hell of a time for 3½ years. We people with different political views get along.

Will Rogers said to me:

"Joe, I don't know how it is, our kids can lick anything on top of the earth, under the water, on top of the water, in the air. But when our big boys sit down with those buzzards at the conference table we lose our shirts and they take us to the cleaners.

"I have sat in with groups on these very treaty conferences. I was in Paris with Wilson. I was at the Economic Conference in 1922 in London. I saw Harding and Charles Evans Hughes in action in the Naval Conference in Washington. Every time we sit down with those buzzards they outsmart us and outlick us and we go to the cleaners."

Now, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, I have been favored with a long life. I am grateful to God for the blood that is in my veins. I am the father of 7 living children and 17 grandchildren, and I tried to put into every one of those kids the philosophy of my little Irish mother, to love God above all things and to fear nothing that walks on earth, but to believe in the philosophy of Jefferson and Lincoln as fundamental to the American way of life.

Now, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that when you put this proposition up on the Marshall plan, you can put a program down to Downing Street, London, whereby it may be this, that, and the other, but no money whatever shall go to Belfast to sustain and perpetuate this horrible, graceless, and diabolical system of government. And I think, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is not outrageous or inconsistent or abominable to suggest that if they don't accept that way, they get no money at all. That is the position of our committee, anyway.

I have seen changes in the life of this Nation. When I was a young man, Senator LODGE, if you will pardon me a minute, I went up in 1889 to Boston, and I saw in the advertising sheets of the papers there, in the Boston Globe and the Boston Transcript, "Wanted, a carpenter. No Irish need apply." "Wanted, a cook. No Irish need apply." "Wanted, a nursemaid. No Catholic need apply." That was in Boston in 1889. Now Boston today is 75 percent Irish and Catholic, but the Irish in 1889 in Boston didn't lie on their bellies and let people make a doormat of their backbones. The blood of free men was in their veins, and they stood up as free men and look what it has got for them.

Gentlemen of the committee, you have had a lot of people come from California. Some of them have very misty views of their obligations as American citizens and their beliefs as to the American form of government. But these people I bring to you today, gentlemen of the committee, are 100-percent-plus fervent devotees of the American way of life, firmly and confidently believing the way of salvation is through the philosophy that Washington on his knees and Lincoln and Jefferson all fervently adhered to. And when you have that kind of support, gentlemen of the committee, we think we are on the right track.

I don't want to be too peremptory in this matter. But as I have said, Mr. Chairman, I have a very firm belief that this committee will give us sympathetic attention and consideration. Some of us here have presented in typewritten form an extension of these remarks and an epitome rather more adequate than I have put it here as their views on this matter, and I think, if I may be allowed, Mr. Chairman, I would like an opportunity to extend my remarks, and ask that these other gentlemen may be called upon to have the same privilege.

Germany and the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. Monteith Gilpin, secretary, Society for the Prevention of World War III, which appeared in the Washington Post of February 17, 1948:

GERMANY AND THE MARSHALL PLAN

The Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., has indorsed the basic principles of the European recovery program. We believe those principles will be supported by all Americans who cherish freedom and peace. On the other hand, the society believes that while the principles are wholly admirable and correspond to the real interests of the American people, their correct implementation is of fundamental importance.

The present policy pursued in western Germany, however, will not contribute to the realization of our European recovery program aims because, in essence, it is an attempt to reestablish the German economy on an autarchy basis. We must also bear in mind that the food shortages and the economic situation in Germany today are largely the result of deliberate acts of sabotage on the part of the Germans themselves:

During 1947, 6,319,000 head of German cattle had disappeared and were presumably sold on the black market. Several months ago the press reported that the government of Wuertemberg-Baden had underestimated the grain crop by 62 percent. Ruhr coal production is about 50 percent below prewar levels, and as Walter Lippmann recently pointed out, about 20 percent of the coal produced in the Ruhr disappears. The same situation holds true regarding American shipments of

cotton to Germany; thousands of bales of cotton disappeared before reaching the German factories for processing. Likewise, the German workers, aided and encouraged by their leaders, are actively engaged in sabotaging the reparations program which is so essential for the economic rehabilitation of Germany's victims.

In allocating $1,005,000,000 to Germany (as part of the $6,800,000,000 requested), plus over $1,000,000,000 a year for food and commodities to be sent to Germany, the share of Germany amounts to more than 28 percent of the total to be appropriated for the next 15 months for Europe. This places a heavy obligation on the American taxpayer for the rebuilding of an enemy country, which through strikes and sabotage of its coal and food production is jeopardizing its own revival.

Since Germany's threat to world peace lies not in her own capacity to wage an independent war within the next quarter of a century but in her value as a partner in any future world conflict, it is important that her bargaining power as such a partner be kept to a minimum.

To make the rehabilitation of Europe a success, our society submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the European recovery program be guided by the following principles:

(1) Our first consideration in the rehabilitation of Europe should be given to Germany's victims.

(2) American policy regarding European recovery should aim at reversing the economic and political trends of the past 25 years which have placed Germany in the key role of economic master of Europe.

(3) German heavy industries must be limited to peacetime needs as recommended in the final report of the United States Foreign Economic Administration.

(4) Democratic forces in western Europe must be helped in their quest for security from future German economic and military dominance because they are the only friends we have in Europe. The United States must help these countries develop their own industrial potential.

(5) Germany's coal production—the bloodstream of the European economy—should be maximized and sufficient coal delivered to her neighbors to enable them to meet the industrial level set at the Paris Conference.

(6) Prompt reparation deliveries should be made to the 18 claimant nations in the form of surplus capital goods—specifically the 9,000,000 tons of surplus steel capacity which exists in the western zones.

(7) All German cartels, trusts, and cartel-like devices must be forever eliminated.

(8) All German assets abroad must be unearthed, marshaled, and vested by the occupying powers for eventual allocation among Germany's victims.

(9) In helping to integrate the German economy with that of her neighbors, Germany should be given the opportunity to develop her own peaceful economy through the exploitation of her light industries and her agricultural resources and raw materials.

(10) The United States should cancel the $1,005,000,000 allocated for Germany as part of the $6,800,000,000. This would leave the military government, through $1,250,000,000 of appropriations for the next 15 months, in exclusive charge of aiding Germany to solve its food and industrial problems.

(11) In order to provide Europe with the means for maintaining a stable and prosperous economy which will eventually benefit the American economy and relieve the burden of our taxpayers, the resources of the Ruhr should be placed under international ownership and control.

C. MONTEITH GILPIN,
Secretary, Society for the Prevention of World War III.

NEW YORK.

Farley Blames World Ills on F. D. R.'s Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of February 18, 1948:

FARLEY BLAMES WORLD ILLS ON F. D. R.'S RULE—CALLS MANY TRACEABLE TO THIRD AND FOURTH TERMS

HAMILTON, N. Y., February 17.—James A. Farley, who helped put the late Franklin D. Roosevelt in the White House, said today that many of the world's ills could be traced to Roosevelt's third and fourth terms.

Farley spoke on the Human Side of Politics at the opening of Colgate University's 1948 series of lectures in human relations.

WEIGHT OF YEARS TOLD

"I sincerely believe that many of the ills which beset the world today may be traced to the third and fourth terms, which brought a great mind, but one worn by the weight of years and cares of state, to the all-important conferences at Tehran and Yalta," Farley said.

The former national chairman of the Democratic Party said that almost every world leader supported him in this belief. He said the Roosevelt at Tehran and Yalta was not the "vital resolute mind that gave a despairing Nation hope with the clarion call 'we have nothing to fear but fear itself.'"

"Instead," he said, "we had a worn Lear, dividing the world in a series of concessions embodied in secret agreements, which having arisen from the Pandora box of secret diplomacy, are plaguing the world's children with blood, death, and fears."

Farley said that reluctance to relinquish power, "particularly where the hand is feeble and the mind is tired," is fraught with danger to political parties and to the Nation. If younger men are not trained to take over leadership, he said, the party and Nation are weakened.

THIRD PARTY CONDEMNED

The former postmaster general lashed out at Henry A. Wallace's third party and said it was formed by one who "wouldn't play according to the rules." He said men and women should try to correct what they dislike in a political party from within the party.

"We have a third party today, formed by one who wouldn't play according to the rules in the Republican or the Democratic Parties," he declared. "I don't want a third party in this country. The two great political parties help our Nation by promoting unity. A third party can only promote minority rule and tend to leave the country the prey of demagogues and malcontents."

Abraham Lincoln and George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of these remarks brief articles by Carlos W. Huntington, a distinguished and public-spirited citizen in my congressional district, commemorative of the birthdays of Abraham Lincoln and George Washington:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN—1948

(Lincoln's Birthday, February 12)

Rail-splitter, clerk, postmaster, lawyer, member of the Illinois Legislature, Member of Congress, President, Abraham Lincoln was born in Kentucky, February 12, 1809, a staunch advocate of national unity and economy and efficiency in government.

What would he see in his America of today?

A national debt of unprecedented proportions, $256,000,000,000, almost $2,000 for every man, woman, and child, the highest tax rate in history; industry harassed by regimentation; bureaucracy and waste keynoting governmental operations; scare propaganda to aid in the imposing of a philosophy of scarcity, of governmental support from the cradle to the grave, of dependency on government for shelter, food, medicines, and security rather than individual effort and initiative; price support subsidies; governmental meddling in every phase of our lives; centralization of power in Washington and a breakdown of individual responsibility. He would also see a segment of our population espousing and abetting foreign ideologies that have as their goal a totalitarian government under the ultimate domination of Moscow; he would find do-gooders whose ambition is to give away our substance, both at home and abroad, they, of course, to be the mediums through whom the largesse is channeled, in order that they may reap the plaudits of the recipients, build up their power and control over the rest of the people and economy.

He would see Navajo Indians starving on their reservation while trainloads of food go to our former enemies across the water; he would see other Americans dependent upon charity for which "drives" are conducted, one after the other, to provide funds while our Government sends billions overseas; he would see our people shivering while coal and oil are exported to other lands; he would see hundreds of unnecessary Government bureaus staffed with hundreds of thousands of employees burdening the taxpayers; and he would find inefficiency and waste rampant in all branches of governmental activity.

On the brighter side, he would find an awakened national realization of the necessity of tax reduction, of greater efficiency in the Federal Government, of greater economies in operation and less restrictions upon free enterprise. He would find industry at an all-time high, despite governmental handicaps, increasing production, a determination to make the American system succeed, and an optimistic view of the future.

Yes; Lincoln would find that, despite all obstacles, America is still America, where government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

CARLOS W. HUNTINGTON.

GEORGE WASHINGTON—1948

(Washington's Birthday, February 22)

Surveyor, planter, soldier, Member Continental Congress, President, George Washington, Father of His Country, was born in Virginia, February 22, 1732, an ardent advocate of devotion to America and freedom from entangling alliances. What would he think of his country today, the state of the world, the outlook for the future?

He would see a nation of 140,000,000 recovering from two world wars and threatened with a third. He would see the results of appeasement of Hitler by Chamberlain—war; the appeasement of Stalin at Yalta and Tehran—nations overrun by communistic hordes—Americans saddled with $90 debt for every man, woman, and child for "lend-lost" grants to Russia alone; nations prostrate and reviling the United States while begging for our dollars, food, and materials.

He would see Stalin, Molotov, Vishinski, and their ilk, barbarians dressed in the habiliments of civilization, hiding behind an iron curtain, their minions enslaving, purging, starving, and mistreating millions of Europeans, while attempting to spread their fiendish communistic doctrines throughout America and the lands they have not yet conquered. He would see the shambles of massacre and hate in, of all places, Jerusalem, ancient cradle of Christianity. He would see his Nation trying to help bring order out of chaos, trying to stabilize the world economy, trying to insure peace, and daily getting into the depths of the international maelstrom. We think he would reiterate his admonition of no entangling alliances, no commitments that would enslave our people. True, he would aid the suffering, but he would always bear in mind that a government's obligation is to its own citizens first, that the welfare of its people is paramount, and that out of our abundance, after our own needs are met, we will give freely to those requiring aid.

George Washington, there are still some of us who believe in your sound philosophy and doctrines on this your two hundred and sixteenth birthday.

CARLOS W. HUNTINGTON.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Joseph News-Press:

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

There has been much in this newspaper about the Marshall plan. There has been much on this page and in this department for the Marshall plan. Yet there never was a great issue raised where there was not another side. This column today is devoted to a scrutiny of the Marshall plan. It will find a favorable reception in the Middle West, for all tests reveal that the Atlantic and the Pacific States are far more enthusiastic for the program outlined by Secretary of State George Marshall for the relief of Europe than is our own part of the country.

Frank Gannett, Rochester, N. Y., publisher of a string of good newspapers, brings forth the sound point that there are two phases of the European problem. One is the question of feeding the hungry and helping them produce more food. The other is to rebuild Europe with the hope of resisting the Soviet Russia power. Mr. Gannett favors saving the hungry, but not under European auspices. He would feed them through the American Red Cross, the Quakers, or some other great non-Government agency.

This eastern editor and publisher resents buying Europe away from Russia. He holds, and he has something, that rebuilding Europe involves so much international cooperation and so many safeguards against economic nonsense that the task is one for an international agency with hard-headed business sense. He favors the World Bank, whose capital has been subscribed by 46 nations, and which is authorized to lend up to $8,000,000,000.

It probably will not be questioned that if the United States does all the financing of rebuilding Europe we are going to have no tax reductions. We will have tax increases and we will have higher prices. There is a pretty large group of thinking men and women who are convinced that our own economic stability is in grave danger unless we think about this Old-World dilemma with practical common sense.

United States Senator JAMES P. KEM has prepared some startling data on what price America must pay for foreign aid. The junior Senator from Missouri questions whether America can afford to go all out as the President and the Secretary of State ask. Senator KEM has brought the matter home by showing what their foreign-aid plan has cost and will continue to cost the people of Missouri.

Senator KEM shows what foreign aid from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, has cost every county and city of any size in Missouri. The figures will amaze you. St. Joseph's (Mo.) share of foreign aid that 2-year period amounted to $13,855,113. The foreign aid asked by the Marshall plan, says Senator KEM, would cost St. Joseph, Mo., $11,053,806. Then he shows the figure for Buchanan County. For the 2-year period ending last June 30 it was $17,214,261 and under the Marshall plan would be an additional $13,733,782, or a total for Buchanan County of $30,948,043.

And mark well this: The annual tax receipts from Buchanan County from all sources are estimated by Senator KEM at less than $2,000,000.

This Department thought the junior Senator from Missouri had gone off on a tangent. Mathematicel figures are confusing to many of us and we just could not swallow those startling figures. But they are correct. The junior Senator gets his figures from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The costs of foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, are actual, nothing surmised, nothing estimated, nothing guessed. They comprise loans, property credits, advances, relief, rehabilitation grants, and other authorizations. The total for the United States this 2-year period is in excess of $24,000,000,000, that's billion, son, not million.

The rest is plain arithmetic. You will find it is $183 for every man, woman, and child in America on the basis of the last official census. It is $616 for every American family. Foreign aid has cost every American family $25 a month for each of the last 25 months.

We could give you the cost to other towns and other counties for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD records that speech of Senator KEM, January 16, last. But to give you only a few (the cost for the 1945–47 period) show Savannah, $385,764; Tarkio, $386,862; Cameron, $661,545; Plattsburg, $350,445; Gallatin, $300,000; Union Star, $75,000; Albany, $367,830; King City, $201,840; Stanberry, $346,419; Trenton, $1,289,418; Mound City, $293,898; Chillicothe, $1,466,752; Princeton, $289,872; Maryville, $1,043,100; Platte City, $123,143; Weston, $205,525, and Grant City, $221,247. Something to think about, isn't it? No wonder we have that damned-soul look in our eye when we pass Income Tax Collector Lee Herter on the street these days.

The Palestine Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast made by me on February 14, 1948:

Tonight I should like to discuss a subject that is close to the hearts of us all. We, the common people of the world, regardless of our race, nationality, or creed, earnestly desire that a lasting peace be established. Remember our rejoicing on VJ-day? I can easily recall how you and I expressed our great relief and joy on the streets of our city and gave thanks in the churches of our faith.

And to insure peace the anti-Axis Powers gathered at San Francisco and established an international organization known as the United Nations. With enthusiasm born of hope we faced the future and quietly said in our hearts "It shall be peace in our time."

Today, however, we view a strife-torn world—a world filled with petty prejudices, Godless greed and dwindling hope. In their drive for material gain, in their devotion to so-called scientific philosophies, the politicians of this day are turning their backs on the basic concept of our contemporary religions. They have lost sight of the fundamental truth that there is but one God and in his sight all men are equal. In my humble opinion the people of all lands must return to this fundamental truth if war is to be averted. A sincere devotion to the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is the only sound foundation for a lasting peace. Before we can have peace among nations it must be established in the hearts of men.

Today, 2 years and 9 months after the war, more battles are being waged, more lives are being lost, than was the case in 1939, prior to Germany's invasion of Poland. With the exception of our Western Hemisphere, no area in the world is free of situations which can easily explode into World War III. Communist agression in China, turmoil in India, colonial revolt in southeast Asia, Communist-inspired rebellions in Italy and France, foreign intervention in Greece—the list is almost endless. But the most danger-laden of these, is the crisis in Palestine, where seven small Arab nations threaten the peace of the world. Failure to solve the Palestine crisis may well herald the beginning of another world conflict.

As you will recall Britain has been administering this territory under a League of Nations mandate given to her in 1922. This followed a decision of the victorious Allied Powers in World War I taken at San Remo in 1920. This decision stated that the mandatory should put into effect the terms of the Balfour Declaration made by the British on November 2, 1917. According to this declaration, the British Government agreed to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. This agreement was also contained in a treaty between the Allied Powers and Turkey and finally in the Covenant of the League of Nations. Though not a member of the League of Nations the United States consented to this arrangement in the American-British-Palestine Mandate Convention of 1924. Britain has since administered this territory and was to have facilitated the establishment of a Jewish national home in accordance with provisions of the Balfour Declaration.

After World War II, however, Britain found herself in dire straits. She was caught in the greatest economic crisis of her history. She appealed, therefore, in 1947 to the United Nations General Assembly to recommend a solution which would enable Britain to withdraw completely from Palestine. The General Assembly of the United Nations was the twentieth committee to consider a solution for Palestine. After weeks of fact finding and free discussion the United Nations voted 33 to 13 in favor of partitioning Palestine into Arab and Jewish states with economic union under the United Nations.

Great Britain's Palestine mandate is to be ended not later than August 1, 1948, and the independent Jewish and Arab states are to come into existence not later than October 1, 1948. In the meantime two critically important events are to take place: First, a provisional council of state is to be designated and recognized for each of the Jewish and Arab states by the United Nations Palestine Commission; and, second, within the shortest possible time an armed militia composed of the residents of each state and sufficient in number to maintain internal order and to prevent frontier clashes is to be recognized by the United Nations Commission. Britain is required to vacate a port in Palestine by February 1, 1948, for the purpose of facilitating Jewish immigration.

The present situation finds the United Nations Commission just beginning its work; Arab guerrillas attacking the Jews to discredit partition, with widespread disorder and bloodshed in Palestine, and the Jews endeavoring to defend themselves; the British taking the position that all they need to do is see that none of their own troops get hurt before they can pull out; and the Arab states, member nations of the United Nations, almost openly supporting the guerrilla attacks on the Jews, persisting, to use their word, in defying the United Nations' decision and in the threat of an organized invasion of Palestine as soon as the British move out.

That is the present situation, plus one other very important factor—on December 5, 1947, there was announced by the United States a cessation of the licensing of arms shipments to the countries of the Middle East, including Palestine—in this way effectively cutting off the Haganah, the informal Jewish militia, from any arms, while leaving free the Arab guerrillas through the Arab countries, to obtain arms. The British confirm a report that they are continuing to sell and ship large quantities of arms, admittedly not less than $25,000,000, to Iraq, Egypt, and Transjordan.

The major argument made against the Palestine decision of the United Nations is that it is a threat to the peace. But is it not true that it will only result in extensive hostilities between Arabs and Jews, if the leading nations fail to show decisively that they will not tolerate it? Is it not true that widespread disorder and conflict in defiance of the United Nations is what will constitute a threat to the peace? Let us examine for a minute the Arab situation itself. It is the Mufti of Jerusalem, who is one of the most distinguished Nazi collaborators alive, and his guerrillas who are attacking the Jews in Palestine. Press reports show that many of the Palestine Arabs resent it, and they have enjoyed excellent relations with the Jews. And, indeed, they might, for Arab improvement in Palestine during the period of the greatest Jewish settlement, from 1930 on, has been enormous. The value of Arab land has gone up from $123 to $640 per acre. The Arab cattle population has increased by 60 percent. The Arab school population has risen from 20,000 to about 70,000, and the daily wages of Arab workmen in Palestine are generally five times what they are even in the more advanced Arab countries.

Arab nations who propose war on the United Nations muster armed forces of 120,000 men, 35,000 of whom are in Egypt, but have no adequate mechanized means with which to cross the Sinai Desert to Palestine. The most effective force, Transjordan's Army of 25,000, is British trained and under British command. If the Arab armies are to invade Palestine, it would be because, in the main, the British arm and lead them. Should that happen, it will be the most sardonic joke the world has ever seen.

Much can and must be done to bring higher standards of living, education, and health to Arab countries. They must be encouraged in democratic ideas. But the way to do this is not by exterminating the Jews for the Jews are the the principal source for improvement in the Middle East.

On February 10, 1948, I wrote Secretary of State George C. Marshall, asking what the United States is prepared to do to help in the implementation of the United Nations decision on Palestine. He replied on February 12 that the United States considered Palestine a United Nations problem and that the United States as a steadfast supporter of the United Nations would make her full contribution when called on to do so. And that is as it should be.

The Palestine crisis is not limited to trouble between Arabs and Jews. If the United Nations is ineffectual in enforcing its Palestine decision then it, like the League of Nations, is finished. This we cannot allow to happen. To make Palestine another Munich would be to make world war III inevitable. Seven small Arab nations must not be allowed to destroy the possibilities for peace. We must enforce the Palestine decision. We must support the United Nations all the way. This is our last chance to establish peace in our time.

Transylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR AMERICANISM,
Cleveland, Ohio, February 9, 1948.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is an appeal in the name of humanity to every loyal Member of Congress, in behalf of the tragic situation of a vanishing people.

FREEDOM AND LIBERTY IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY BY A HUNGARIAN KING VERSUS SLAVERY AND TORTURE IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY BY AN AMERICAN PRESIDENT FOR THE SAXON PEOPLE OF TRANSYLVANIA, RUMANIA

The Saxon people entered Transylvania on the invitation of King Géza II more than 800 years ago. This Hungarian king, who was searching for a trustworthy people to inhabit and protect the land on the border of Hungary against enemy invaders, found the Germans from the Rhine and Moselle regions had the qualifications to meet his aims. He offered them the right to have laws and rules of their own making in the new homeland. Because of this freedom offered by King Géza; the golden charter; and the Saxon bill of rights, granted to them later, they were able to develop their art and culture rapidly. According to history the Saxon people have lived up to their duty and responsibilities from generation to generation. They have answered the calls to protect home and country to such an extent that they can rightfully claim the ground on which they live has been paid with their own blood. They have been able to master their difficulties successfully, even at times when their very existence was at stake. They have enjoyed the respect of friend and foe, because of their great sense of justice and their intelligence.

Never in their history have they been destitute like they are at this time, and only so because of the deeds committed at Tehran and Yalta by an American President. Mr. Roosevelt favored the enslavement and cruel treatment of the Saxon people because of their German origin. We do not believe that Stalin would have taken by force men and women for slave work in the far steppes of Russia without the consent given him by Mr. Roosevelt.

As Christian Americans the members of this organization believe in the golden rule, therefore we expect our Government officials to be a shining example to us in this respect. If they had lived up to their, and our, American principles in foreign policy since the end of hostilities, the Saxon people would no doubt have a heavy burden of reparations to carry but they would not be destitute. We then would have no cause to bring this grievous situation to the attention of our Congress.

We appeal for immediate consideration in this serious matter before it is too late. We believe that Congress has enough qualified men to study, investigate, and to find a solution for the Saxon problem. We have confidence that we have such great men in Congress who will not overlook little people because of their minority. Today whoever is left of the Saxon people must endure great hardships. Many of them are facing starvation as displaced persons in the camps of Austria and Germany. Others are still somewhere in Russia. The most unfortunate are those who are being sent back from Russia into Germany sick, without clothes, and forbidden to go back to their families in Transylvania. It is ruthless and it is outrageous that such undeserved misery should be imposed on a people who, although small in number, have given their share toward civilization and humanity.

In closing we would like to quote one of our greatest men, Abraham Lincoln, who said: "To keep silent when we should protest makes cowards of men."

May the fate and destiny of the Saxon people of Transylvania be guided toward righteousness and justice by an act of the Congress of the United States of America.

Very truly yours,
MRS. ANNA WOLF,
President.
Miss RENATE DIETRICH,
Secretary.

Address of Congressman Joseph R. Bryson Delivered in Statuary Hall on Tuesday, February 17, 1948, Observing the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Passing of Frances Willard, Under the Auspices of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

President Coates, officers, members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and friends, on this, the fiftieth anniversary of the transition of Frances Willard, it is quite appropriate that we hold this observance here in Statuary Hall, this hallowed chamber of our Nation's Capitol, at the feet of the statue of one of history's most remarkable and influential women. As evidence of the unusual and outstanding character and service of Frances Willard, her statue is the only one representing our women in this chamber. All around us are impressive figures of stalwart sons, brave soldiers, great statesmen, leaders in industry, education, business, and politics. In their midst stands this frail little woman of imperishable granite. Since the dawn of history, women have contributed more than their share to the advancement of Christian civilization. Someone has said that God could not be everywhere all the time, so he gave us our saintly mothers.

We have just observed the birthday of President Lincoln who, like other great leaders, attributed his finer qualities to his mother. Mr. Lincoln said, "Whatever I am, I owe to my mother."

Frances Elizabeth Caroline Willard was the daughter of teacher parents. Education, next to religion, played the most important part in their ideals of life. Circumstances made it necessary for the Willard family to leave their native State of New York and journey westward through Ohio, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

Early in life Miss Willard displayed talents of leadership and for many years taught in schools and colleges. Her record as an educator is outstanding but is overshadowed by her work in the cause of temperance.

Although considered by some as an impractical dreamer, Miss Willard fought hard for political enfranchisement of women. She was a pioneer in the contention for equal opportunities, equal pay, equal rights, equal responsibilities in the home, in the professions, in industry, and affairs of state for women. She insisted upon provisions for vocational guidance for girls, upon education for citizenship, upon physical education and sports. She advocated the 8-hour day, a minimum-wage law, and many other ideals which in her day were considered the ravings of an impractical dreamer.

When those of us who still fight for temperance and decency become discouraged, we are heartened to learn of the untiring efforts for a better world in which to live as sought by Miss Willard.

She believed that intoxicating beverages were God's worst enemy and the devil's best friend. As we contemplate the example of this good woman, we shamefully confess the fact that so many still clamor for booze even if there is no bread. The selfish, greedy attitude of those who transform food into strong drink has so recently been revealed by their opposition to any restrictions in the use of grain for the distillation of liquor.

By reason of her devotion and zeal in the cause of temperance, our subject advanced from a subordinate position to that of president of the World Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

This guiding genius of the national temperance cause early recognized the importance of the printed page. She wrote six books and edited the Union Signal. She believed in temperance education, and promoted this cause for schools, colleges, and churches. She agitated for legislation, and participated in securing constitutional prohibition amendments in various States.

Not only was Miss Willard interested in the cause of temperance and justice in our own country, but her theater of operation covered the entire world.

A half century has gone since this saintly woman was called to her reward. In spite of the present chaotic plight of this troubled world and in spite of the destructive wars through which we have passed, her marvelous influence is still with us.

This is not the only statue or memorial to Frances Willard. Throughout the world there are hospitals, educational institutions, and other agencies of mercy and culture bespeaking the fine qualities of this good woman. In Willard Hall, at Northwestern University, on a marble bust of Miss Willard are chiseled these lines from the pen of the poet Whittier:

"She knew the power of banded ill,
But felt that love was stronger still,
And organized for doing good
The world's united womanhood."

Soon after the passing of Miss Willard the great State of Illinois placed this marble statue of her likeness here. The Congress paused that day to mark the eventful occasion. Many impressive eulogies were delivered. Inscribed on the pedestal of this statue here are these words from the lips of Miss Willard:

"Ah! It is our women who have given the costliest hostages to fortune. Out into the battle of life they have sent their best beloved with fearful odds against them. Oh, by the dangers they have dared, by the hours of patient watching over beds where helpless children lay, by the incense of 10,000 prayers wafted from their gentle lips to heaven, I charge you give them power to protect along life's treacherous highway those whom they have loved."

Our Nation, our churches, our people do well to remember the life and service of so noble, so self-giving, so loving a soul.

She was a brave true soldier, a great commander, and finally and best of all a kind and gentle woman who loved her fellow beings with such an unstinted devotion that she has been christened the "mother of all mothers."

When called by that Master with whom she walked so closely all through life, she answered with tones of utmost content: "How beautiful it is to be with God."

May the memory of this good woman, who did so much for the cause of humanity, be forever preserved, perpetuated, and transmitted to the generations yet unborn.

How Firm Is Your Foundation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "How Firm Is Your Foundation?" delivered to the Mercer Club of Buffalo, February 10, 1948, and to the Masonic Club of Buffalo, January 14, 1948, by Richard Bishop Mather:

This occasion, which precedes the celebration of the birthdays of two of our greatest Presidents, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, should inspire me to give one of the most dramatic and most eloquent orations of my career. I should thoroughly enjoy entertaining you and indulging myself in that fashion. But the present times seem to call instead for less impassioned speaking, for more sober thought, and still more intelligent action.

Rather than "orate" at you I should prefer to consider with you some fundamental issues which are of interest and deep personal concern to each one of us in this room, whether we believe them to be so or not, and whether we wish them to be so or not.

Had I begun my talk, not in this conventional manner, but by entering the room very quietly, tiptoeing across the floor, and then tapping each one of you gently on the shoulder saying to you, "Pardon me, but your foundation is slipping," you would have thought me either irrational or inordinately facetious. Yet there is nothing which I could do and nothing which I could say which would more accurately illustrate and more completely epitomize the message which I bring to you, than that.

We, in this country, have inherited a fabulously rich legacy of liberty, freedom, and opportunity. These rich privileges have come to us without effort on our part.

The liberty, freedom, and opportunity which we enjoy were firmly established for us by great men of past generations who conceived and brought this Nation of ours into being. It is well for us to recall the prevailing thoughts and words of their times.

George Washington is popularly referred to as the father of our country. He was the first President of the United States operating under our Constitution which fulfilled the promise of the Declaration of Independence, and which has preserved for us the heritage of liberty, freedom, and opportunity we enjoy.

The substance of the Constitution is given in the magnificently, precise, and clear preamble, which reads:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Since the day of George Washington several changes, in the form of amendments, have been made in our Constitution. It is proper that these changes, expressing the will of the citizens, should have been made. In more recent years, however, the fashion seems to have been to circumvent the Constitution and to substitute bureaucratic processes for democratic government. To that extent, I say, our foundation has been slipping.

Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, referred to as the preserver of our Union, had the good fortune or misfortune, whichever way you view his situation, to have been President when our Nation was torn by the great civil conflict. You all know his undying message, delivered with eloquent simplicity, on a former battlefield in Gettysburg. He said:

"Fourscore and 7 years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether this Nation, or any nation, so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure."

We all know the sequel to that immortal address. We know that, to outward appearances if not inwardly in fact, the wounds of our Nation have been healed.

Since the time of Abraham Lincoln, there has occurred the greatest development ever recorded in all history. This development however, has not, in a manner of speaking, been "all across the board." The development has been predominantly materialistic.

The great scientist and author, Lecompte du Novy, in his book, "Human Destiny," which he completed just a short time before his death, said that the rate of material developments since 1880 has been so rapid as to leave us gaping, wondering what new marvels each tomorrow would bring forth.

In his book he developed the thought that the increase in materialistic knowledge and scientific skill may have outrun our human capacity to understand and appreciate its significance. Material inventions and developments may have outdistanced our ability to use them constructively and beneficially. He draws a distinction between intelligence and wisdom, saying that wisdom lags far behind.

As we all know, we now find ourselves confronted with the shocking fact that, for the first time in all civilization, man possesses power for its complete destruction, even obliteration.

Last Saturday evening, I heard the brilliant young president of Dartmouth College, Dr. John Dickey, speak very calmly and dispassionately on this subject to an assembled group of Dartmouth alumni. He said that having access to information, as he does, it is by no means a sure thing that we shall be able, in the time allowed, to find ways and means of preventing the use of atomic power, and other known destructive agencies, from wiping out our civilization. He reminded us that time is exceedingly short and that the solution, if one is to be found, must come through our democratic processes.

He went on to say that he personally does not take a dim view of the future. He said it is entirely probable that our civilization, as we know it, may be destroyed. But, he said, he does not believe that the earth itself would vanish. He said history is a record of the successive failures of one civilization after another. It may well be that our civilization is about to go into a total eclipse to be an object lesson for some future civilizations two, or three, or five thousand years hence, if indeed any record or trace shall remain.

To paraphrase the words of Abraham Lincoln, we seem now to be engaged not merely in a great civil war, testing whether this Nation or any other nation so conceived and so dedicated shall long endure, but engaged in a great, cold war, testing whether this civilization or any other civilization so conceived and so dedicated shall long endure.

The need of the times is not for impassioned speeches; it is for more sober thought and still more intelligent action.

In the face of such a portentous future, most of us appear to be blithely unconcerned. Our thoughts seem to center upon our own personal affairs and the gratification of our individual desires. In this respect, we act not unlike the sons of the wealthy olive growers of ancient Roman times, who were sufficiently well to do that they did not need to and had no inclination to exert themselves. Their father, recognizing their shortcomings, called them to his side as he lay on his deathbed. He told them that there was a great treasure buried in the grove. Scarcely had the old man expired before the boys were out in the grove, digging feverishly. Of course, they did not find that treasure, as such, but while they were digging they were also tilling the soil. That year, when the harvest matured, they were rewarded with an abundant yield. The truth of what their father had spoken then became apparent to them.

This country of ours is like a vast grove of freedom and opportunity. We seem to have been perfectly content to pick the fruits of these magnificent trees, giving little, if any, thought to the protection, cultivation, or perpetuation of them. We now find that this grove, our country, is seriously threatened. It is time that we took action. The magnitude of the job to be done requires the best efforts of every intelligent and capable citizen. It is a job greater than elected and appointed officials alone can do for us.

There are two aspects of the problem, one on an international level and the other on a local level. We should do as much as we can on both.

On the international level, we should endeavor to keep ourselves informed of the needs of the situations and of the best possible remedies that have been advanced, so that we may offer constructive suggestions as well as personal encouragement to our elected and appointed officials in whose hands the execution of the programs rests.

On the local level there is even more that we can do. Our country is a going concern. Equality of opportunity and freedom of action, under laws designed for the greatest good of the greatest number have made ours the greatest, richest, most powerful and most desirable Nation in the world.

Strong as our Nation is, it is being insidiously attacked from within. It is up to us to keep our Nation so vital and so strong as to be immune to any such attack. Groups such as this here in this room have the ability and the influence to accomplish this objective. A recent article in Collier's magazine entitled "Clubs Are Trumps," told of the phenomenal growth service clubs, such as yours, such as Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions, Exchange, Gyro, and others, have had in recent years. The author estimates there are now approximately 1,000,000 members of these clubs. He says that in the aggregate the membership is now so great and so influential that it could control the destiny of our country. The author points out, reassuringly, that these clubs are all organized to render beneficial and constructive service.

It is good to know that we have such force as this in our country. There is need of it.

The need is strikingly brought to our attention by the fact that pitted against these 1,000,000 members of service clubs, organized for good purposes, there are an estimated 5,000,000 members of Communist and Communist-front organizations who seek the destruction and downfall of our way of life. The Communists and their sympathizers are, if anything, organized more completely. And, instead of working toward their objective occasionally, they are unceasingly at it. They are intelligent, skillful, highly trained, and zealous. They are dangerous.

A year ago last September, when there were only about one-fifth as many, J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the FBI, in an address which he delivered before the American Legion in San Francisco, said that he would not be concerned about the 100,000 Communists in this country were it not that for each one of them there are 10 more ready and willing to do the party's work. They place themselves in strategic positions where they influence or control the activities of tens, scores, hundreds, and even thousands of others.

In a country of some 140,000,000 people, even a group of 5,000,000 need not cause alarm, but the threat which they pose must be dealt with promptly. Our memory of what a small but powerfully organized minority accomplished in Italy, Germany, and is accomplishing in Russia is all too vivid and too much to the point.

To combat the efforts of Communists in our country, we need to consider how they operate. They have developed a technique of exploiting either real or imagined personal grievances and of offering to the aggrieved a chance to get even.

It is fantastic that anyone can come into this country with a "product" like communism, the worst product in the world, that has to be forced down the throats of oppressed people with the butt of a gun, and win any adherents to their cause. They cannot do it if we will all do our full part to keep this country of ours the land of freedom, equality, and opportunity which its firm foundation made it.

As individuals, we must do our part by action, by deed, and by word.

By action, I mean being the kind of citizen that exemplifies the best ideals of the American way of life.

By deed, I mean doing for others what you hope and expect will be done for you in this land of freedom, equality, and opportunity. Recognize the dignity of the individual. That is the root of democracy. Do not think of people impersonally as groups or classes or segments of society. Think of them and treat them as human beings.

In your dealings with your friends, your customers and especially your associates and employees, treat them as people. Do not think of workers in terms of so many man-hours of labor or so many units of output. Think of them as individuals. Let them know something of your plans. Take them into your confidence. Make them feel that they are, in effect, partners in the enterprise. Let them see the part which they play and how they contribute to the success of the whole. Recognize the individual and make it possible for him to express himself. You will thus increase his self-respect, his spirit, and his enthusiasm. You will strengthen him to the point that he will not fall prey to the insidious approach of communistic agitators.

By word I mean speaking up for our democratic way of life, not running it down. It is an all too human trait to agree with people when they knock, complain, or revile. Should you hear loose, insidious, destructive talk, speak up. But, to speak up and to do so effectively, you will need more than the mere desire to do it. You will need both knowledge and skill. And so, I say to you, let us steep ourselves in the rich tradition of this country, learning exactly why it is that our country has succeeded and how it will continue to succeed on the basis of equality of opportunity and freedom of action.

As a suggestion, I offer this recommendation. Do what any businessman, any experienced sales manager would do, were he marketing or promoting a product. Analyze your product and the competition.

We shall label our product democracy and the competition communism.

Take two large sheets of paper, one for each, and then under each heading, list the good features of each system of government and the benefits which accrue to the individuals in consequence of them. Then, list the risks which individuals run and the losses which they sustain under each.

If you will do this, considering the problem from various standpoints including political, economical, cultural, social, you will find that you have in your possession all of the sales ammunition that you will ever need. Once in possession of it, set about developing the skill to use it most effectively.

Just 3 weeks ago, I was the speaker at a banquet in this same room. My attention was caught by a quotation printed on the souvenir program which read, "Wisdom is knowing what to do next, skill is knowing how to do it, virtue is doing it."

Let us do our utmost to acquire the wisdom, develop the skill, and display the virtue which our times require of us.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to enter figures prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress showing the cost of our foreign-aid program to the 16 towns which compose the Third Congressional District of Connecticut. I do not make this entry to bolster arguments in favor of or against any European recovery program, but simply to provide information to my constituents as to just what the program has cost and what their towns have contributed since the end of the past war:

Cost of foreign aid to the Third Congressional District of Connecticut

	Population	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947 (population×$183.028), based on $24,099,211,087	Foreign aid proposed by Marshall plan 1948-52 (population×$129.11) based on $17,000,000,000	Total foreign aid provided and proposed 1945-47, 1948-52 (column II and column III) based on $41,099,211,087	Property taxes collected in 12 months ended Mar. 31, 1945
New Haven County[1]	484,316	$88,643,389	$62,530,039	$151,173,428	$23,338,343
Towns:					
Bethany	705	129,018	91,152	220,370	37,754
Branford	8,060	1,475,206	1,040,627	2,515,833	318,878
Cheshire	4,352	796,558	561,887	1,358,425	145,795
East Haven	9,094	1,664,457	1,174,126	2,838,283	382,871
Guilford	3,344	688,561	457,566	1,146,217	134,224
Hamden	23,373	4,277,913	3,017,688	7,295,601	1,157,871
Madison	2,345	410,899	289,852	700,751	135,541
Meriden	39,494	7,228,268	5,099,070	12,327,578	1,662,666
Milford	16,449	3,008,797	2,122,459	5,131,256	850,941
New Haven	160,605	29,385,212	20,735,712	50,130,924	8,686,134
North Branford	1,438	263,194	185,660	448,854	49,070
North Haven	5,323	974,807	687,640	1,662,447	296,478
Orange	2,069	367,703	279,582	627,085	71,101
Wallingford	14,788	2,705,618	1,909,279	4,615,897	440,241
West Haven	30,021	5,494,684	3,875,011	9,370,695	1,105,242
Woodbridge	2,262	414,069	292,047	706,056	103,521
Total of towns	323,756	59,256,414	41,800,138	101,056,552	15,575,328

[1] The Third Congressional District does not include all of New Haven County.

Source: Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940, Population, vol. I, p. 182. "Information Relative to the Assessment and Collection of Taxes, 1945," State of Connecticut, Public Document No. 48, pp. 108-109.

NOTE.—1940 population figures for the continental United States are used because later figures are not available for every local unit. Population of the Nation (excluding armed forces overseas) has grown from 131,669,275 in 1940 to 143,282,060 (estimated) by July 1, 1947. If the latter figure is used, the per capita cost of foreign aid between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947, is $168.08 rather than $183.03.

It should also be noted that the foreign-aid figures cover a period of over 6 years while the county tax receipts cover only 1 year. The county tax receipts reflect the income of only one unit of government and not all local and State receipts and expenditures.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to have the privilege and honor of inserting in the RECORD, one of the winning 5-minute talks of the recent "I speak for democracy" contest sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Radio Manufacturers, and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

A resident of my congressional district and my home town, Miss Alice Wade Tyree, a high-school student of the Lawton (Okla.) High School, Lawton, Okla., was one of the four co-equal national winners. She is the charming daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John W. Tyree of address Tossaconnic, Lawton, Okla. Mr. Tyree is a prominent lawyer actively engaged in the private practice of law there in Lawton.

Competing against more than 20,000 contestants in more than 500 communities, 39 States and Alaska, Miss Tyree together with the other three national co-equal winners, won a $500 cash prize, a wrist watch, and a certificate of recognition signed by the United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. John W. Studebaker. We know that this honor did not come to you, Alice Wade, except as a result of hard work on your part, good training, a proper attitude toward life, and, of course, outstanding ability. I know that I speak for all the citizens of our great State of Oklahoma when I say that we are proud of you as I know are the good citizens everywhere in our country.

This contest for high-school students was planned to encourage young people to think about the democratic form of government and to express its philosophy well, in spoken words, being limited only as to time of 5 minutes. The contest was intended also to further the use of radio broadcasting for such expression.

Miss Tyree was entered in the contest by the Oklahoma Junior Chamber of Commerce with the cooperation of Lawton's radio station, KSWO.

I had the honor of attending the award luncheon here in Washington, D. C., and it was inspiring to me to witness the presentation of the awards by Attorney General Tom Clark. I am also glad to learn that the United States Office of Education is making transcriptions of Miss Tyree's talk and the other winning talks available to schools throughout the country and that the contest is scheduled to be also conducted next year.

Miss Tyree's talk follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

One of the greatest things in a democracy is the importance of the individual. Only in a democratic environment does every man have the opportunity to develop to his greatest ability. This privilege has made it possible for any man to contribute his talent to America, thereby raising the standard of living for the whole people to a plane greater than has ever been known in the history of man. Even the poorer class of Americans have so much more, materially, in comparison with other countries, that we have been nicknamed "the rich Americans." While we know that all people in America are not millionaires, they are wealthy in opportunities and possibilities. The lowliest laborer is not cold and he is not hungry. And though he goes to work on foot, he has the same personal freedoms as the rich man who rides past him in a limousine. There is no class distinction to be broken down, no social or political caste system to hold him back. An American man is judged on his own ability.

Since its very inception, this country has been a nation of free enterprise, and no nation has ever, in the history of the world, attained its position scientifically, mechanically, or financially. On two different occasions, the United States of America has been called upon to save the world in battle, and thereafter, to save the world financially. This was possible because of the freedom of our inventive genius and our ability to produce commodities quickly and in large quantities. We are inspired to greater heights of productivity because of our individual freedom. No dictator decreed that we were to work certain hours, at certain times, and to have certain set goals. And because of this freedom of choice, because we Americans may work for ourselves and not for a stereotyped, mechanical, impersonal reason, we outstripped all previous records. A man working for personal gain will naturally work harder. This fact was proven when the first of the English colonies, which eventually became America, was established. In 1607, Virginia was settled, and though the pioneers worked diligently, the results were dismal. Capt. John Smith found the trouble. Those settlers were forced to work for a company, not themselves. When they were assured that the results of their work would belong to them, and not to a settling company, interest and hope revived them, and they shaped Virginia into a prosperous, proud settlement.

The human being is a sentimental animal. If he has an ideal to fight for, a principle to preserve, and a personal pride in the outcome of his struggle, then this principle is important and this ideal is real.

But an ideal is useful only as a guide by which to live. The democratic ideal is hollow until filled with democratic living. Democracy is just a word or a symbol until the individual realizes that only through his actions can it become a reality.

Johnny may stand up and sing God Bless America and feel very patriotic and privileged to be an American. But when he disregards common courtesy to one of his playmates or a little Negro boy, he is not being democratic.

Mr. Jones is proud of being able to cuss the Government without fear of imprisonment, which is all right, because this country encourages freedom of speech; since we are a country of individuals. But when he refuses cooperation by purposely forgetting about democratic ideals in order to make a shady business deal, he is abusing the privilege of a free citizen by being democratic only at his convenience.

Thus rights and privileges impose duties and responsibilities. With freedom, come restrictions and obligations. A chain is as strong as its weakest link. A nation is as strong as its weakest citizen. Our country needs to build a consciousness of morality in order that we may choose and act for the common good. We need statesmen, not politicians. In times of stress, our country has produced great leaders, because freedom was at stake. Freedom is not a gift. It is an inalienable right of man. In the very beginning, man was born free. Then came restrictions and laws, and freedom was limited to the strong. Gradually, as civilization has progressed, we have tried to regain freedom for everyone. In order to do this, we had to fight for it—and now we must live for it. We dare not wait until our freedom is threatened again. The job of keeping our peace is as worthy as that of winning it. We must not tolerate insipid politicians as substitutes for the proud, vigorous, leaders we need. We should demand men who

dividual above security. They transformed

These are the fellows with fine, florid pro-

would work for the glory of democracy and its enlightenment in the world. But, we also need inspired followers—men and women whose desire for freedom and peace and democracy is so strong and so sincere that every other desire is subservient.

I speak for democracy—the only possible government of individual freedom.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Sam O. Plunkett, a resident of my congressional district, is a member of the local rent advisory board of my area. Mr. Plunkett is one of our outstanding citizens and is exceptionally well versed in the problems with respect to rents, being secretary of the Oregon Apartment House Association. He was appointed as a member of the rent advisory board by the late Governor Snell, of Oregon.

I include as part of my remarks a portion of a statement recently made by him which appeared in the Oregon Apartment and Hotels Magazine for February 1948, which is worthy of consideration by all Members of the Congress while rent control legislation is under discussion. The statement follows:

BOARD GOVERNED BY RENT REGULATION

At rent board hearings all facts of the case are considered in the light of the rent board's authority under the law. Each member has an opportunity to express an opinion and to request from the rent office any information that may be pertinent to the individual application. Under the rent regulation a landlord is entitled to relief under hardship if he can show that his net income has substantially decreased under any one year of rent control compared to 2 years subsequent to 1939. The measure of adjustment would be the difference in the amount the landlord's net income had been reduced. Rent boards apparently do not have the right to bypass this provision which results in them being unable to correct an inequity. A recent case before the board involved a woman having shown a decrease in net income of $34.42 per year in a four-unit building. The total amount the rent office could increase the rent of each unit would be 72 cents per month. However, an increase of $1 per unit per month was granted the petitioner who filed an application for review with the rent board. Under the regulation the board could do nothing except refer it back to the petitioner to make application under another ground for adjustment. The rent in this case was $12 per month, so it is understandable that this lady was suffering an obvious hardship.

PREVAILING RENTS BAR TO INCREASE

In many instances in which appeals are made to the rent advisory board are cases in which the rent office denies a petition on grounds that the rents are not lower than the rents of similar accommodations on the maximum rent date. In these cases the rent office supports their position by submitting several comparable housing accommodations in which prevailing rents are shown to be the same or lower than the rents in question. Comparability of rents existing on the freeze date has been a bar to many rental owners in securing rent adjustments for the reason that most rents generally prevailing on March 1, 1942, were low. In fact, the freeze method of stabilizing rents was adopted under wartime conditions because of its immediate and simple application. It was never intended to become a perpetual yardstick for appraising rents.

FUTURE OF RENT BOARDS IN DOUBT

Under provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, the present regulation expires on February 29, 1948. This also terminates the status of local rent advisory boards unless the law is extended into the future.

As a member of the Portland board it was my hope that some immediate solution might be evolved that would relieve the present condition facing owners of rental housing. It is quite obvious to me that owners of rental housing have suffered immeasurably by having to conduct a business in which a rigid price level has been imposed on its income while at the same time it has been compelled to pay its operating expenses on a constantly increasing cost basis. The threat that rent controls will be unnecessarily prolonged to the point that increasing operating and replacement costs will be greater than net income should cause grave concern to rental-housing owners.

BOARD VOTES DOWN DECONTROL

Being the only member of the Portland Rent Advisory Board that voted for decontrol of the Portland area I made a statement in connection with my vote which I now repeat. "I intend to vote for decontrol on the principle that it is grossly unfair to single out one class of citizens to be held under price control while permitting all other segments of our business economy to be free from restrictions." In a recent speech before a congressional committee in which he asked for termination of rent control on February 29, 1948, when the present Rent Act expires, John E. Owen, president of the National Apartment Owners Association, stated: "The experience of the last several years has shown that rent control has not accomplished all the objectives that its proponents claim. Rent control has not prevented inflation nor retarded it. Simple proof of that statement is to point out that in the years we have had rent control we have also had our greatest inflation. Rent control has served only to conceal some of the effects of inflation by distorting some of the relative values of housing and other commodities. Holding down the rent of a family has made more of its money available to bid up prices of food, clothing, and other essential and nonessential commodites. Rent controls thus have removed some price pressures—only at the expense of others. Rent control has had the effect of increasing the incomes of some tenant families, but only at the expense of other families—those families which own the rental property—and those families seeking rental housing. It has not increased our national wealth one dime. In other words, the owners of rental property and the persons seeking housing have been required to subsidize not only the tenant in possession of living units, but other business enterprises patronized by these tenants."

CONGRESS DECLARES INTENTION

In conclusion, Congress itself declared its position on rent control in the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, when it stated: "Congress declares it is its purpose to terminate, at the earliest practicable date, all Federal restrictions on rents on housing accommodations. At the same time, Congress recognizes that an emergency exists and that for the prevention of inflation and for the achievement of a reasonable stability in the general level of rents during the transition period, it is necessary for a limited time, to impose certain restrictions on rents charged for rental housing accommodations in defense rental areas."

The limited time referred to expires on February 29, 1948, and Congress should not break faith with tenants who willingly signed leases in 1947 for the year 1948 under the assumption that Congress meant what it said, about terminating rent control. Neither should Congress extend the gross injustices against one class of citizens who happen to own rental property by making them, the sole victims of bureaucratic control, by failing to permit the present law to expire on February 29.

Write a Letter to Relatives and Friends in Europe Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution today requesting the President to designate the week ending March 28, 1948, as Write a Letter to Relatives and Friends in Europe Week.

Last month the Congress passed and the President signed the so-called Voice of America bill to enable the Government of the United States to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries. As set forth in the act, one of the means of achieving these objectives is the dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies.

Mr. Speaker, the most powerful voice for telling the people of Europe the truth about the United States is the voice of the plain people of the United States.

One of the most effective means of checking the spread of antireligious, antidemocratic doctrines in Europe is through the voice or pen of those living in the United States, of those who know and believe in liberty and freedom and in our democratic principles and institutions, who have faith in a government based on Christian principles.

The people of the nations of Europe have experienced severe physical and mental suffering. War and its aftermath have left a large segment of the people of the continent confused in their thinking, uncertain about the kind of government they want, and who, because of misinformation, do not understand the United States and what we are doing to preserve peace in the world. These people need friendly encouragement. They need to have their faith in their fellowmen restored. If every American would write their European relatives and friends in their own words the truth about the United States, much of the confusion and misunderstanding would be dispelled.

These letters would be a most potent force in combating the false propaganda being directed against the United States. They would build a bond of friendship and understanding which no amount of manufactured propaganda could dissolve.

I urge the House to give this resolution most earnest consideration. It follows:

Whereas every effort should be made to promote mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of the countries of Europe, which understanding is one of the essential foundations of peace; and

Whereas steps should be taken to correct misunderstandings about the United States now prevalent in the countries of Europe; and

Whereas encouragement should be given to the dissemination in such European countries of true information about the United States by American individuals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to designate the week ending March 28, 1948, as Write a Letter to Relatives and Friends in Europe Week, during which time private American individuals shall be urged and encouraged to write letters or messages to their relatives and friends in any of the countries of Europe, setting forth true information about the United States, its democratic principles and institutions, its prosperity, and its desire for mutual and honorable peace and understanding with all nations and peoples of the earth.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Lincoln Day Club of the Third District of Kansas held its annual meeting at my home town of Independence. Despite inclement weather that assumed the proportions of a small blizzard, there were more than a thousand stalwart Republicans in attendance, coming from all over the district and from various parts in the State to pay tribute to the memory of the first Republican Party President. The meeting was climaxed by a banquet with Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, as the main speaker. The address of this gallant soldier and distinguished statesman was so constructive and inspiring it should receive the widest dissemination possible. To that end, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address herewith and commend it to my colleagues and others as must reading. The address follows:

It is always a pleasure to come to the Sunflower State and to visit for a time with the fine, patriotic, progressive people of Kansas. It is a high honor to be invited to address this celebration of the birthday of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, first Republican President of the United States.

Here, in the heart of America, you proudly sustain the best traditions of Americanism. Patriotic inspiration springs from the romance of Kansas history. You have always believed in and practiced freedom.

Your magnificent achievements are a glorious chapter in American progress. It is the story of sturdy, hard working, courageous men and women who valued liberty of the individual above security. They transformed the rugged frontier of your pioneer days into a vast empire of agriculture and industry; education, culture, and religion.

Kansas is the great storehouse from which food pours out to supply the world's primary need for bread and meat. You also contribute to the welfare of the world from your vast deposits of oil, natural gas, zinc, lead, coal, and salt. These natural resources yield their riches only to men willing to work.

In the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II, military units from Kansas won undying fame and glory. My affection for Kansas goes back to when I was a mere lad, serving as buck private with the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteers in the Philippines. Our outfit was brigaded with your Twentieth Regiment of Volunteers, commanded by that brilliant and inspiring leader, Col. Frederick Funston.

In military work and in politics I have learned to know and admire so many of your famous men. I have been associated for many years in National Guard affairs with Gen. Milton R. McLean, your efficient adjutant general. While Governor of Pennsylvania I came into frequent contact with your former Governor, Andrew Schoeppel, whose service to his State and Nation deserved the highest praise. I have greatly admired Frank Carlson, your present Governor, who made an outstanding record in Congress.

In the United States Senate it has been my privilege to serve with your two Senators—ARTHUR CAPPER and CLYDE REED—both of whom hold distinguished places in that body. They are representative of your many newspaper publishers, who are active in public life, including your able and courageous Congressman, HUB MEYER, of this district.

Some of the great Kansans, I am proud to point out, have their roots deep in my own Pennsylvania. I refer particularly to Alf Landon, who was born there, and many of whose close relatives have been lifelong Pennsylvanians; to your great Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, whose father was a Pennsylvanian; and to your distinguished adopted son, Harry Colmery, past national commander of the American Legion, who was born in the Keystone State and who still returns to visit us now and then.

These are just a few, enough to show that the ties which bind us are not flimsy and that there is a little bit of Pennsylvania in many of the truest Kansans.

With pardonable pride let me remind you that the peerless American whose birthday we honor tonight also had the blood of Pennsylvania ancestors in his veins.

Of Abraham Lincoln, more than any other figure in history, it may be truthfully said "He was a man of the people."

The contacts that influenced his life were with the farmer, the man in the street, in the cross-roads store, in the post office, and in the courthouse.

The details of Lincoln's life story are too well known to all good Americans to require retelling here. But his principles and sound common sense can guide us in grappling with the critical problems of today.

One of the paramount issues before the American people is the solvency of our Nation. Warning against excessive Government expenditures, Lincoln wrote:

"It is a system not only ruinous while it lasts, but one that must soon fail and leave us destitute. As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next, no one left to borrow from, so must it be with a government." Those are Lincoln's words.

What this country needs today is more men in high public office who know the value of a dollar. We need more "No" men. We have too many "Yes" men, too many agreeable, complacent, charming people, willing to buy votes with your money.

These are the fellows with fine, florid programs. Sure; they have plenty to offer, plenty of benefits for everybody, plenty of good times for everybody, plenty of something for nothing for everybody. Of course, it is not their money they are spending. It is yours; it is everybody's.

I say we need men who can say "No" and oppose phony something-for-nothing programs.

If the wastrel demagogs are followed it must inevitably lead us down the road to destruction—to national bankruptcy and loss of individual freedom.

I'll give you a program. It may not be a popular program, but, in the years to come, it will pay dividends. It will guarantee that your pension and social-security programs will be sound and waiting for you; that your bank accounts will be safe; that you will continue to enjoy precious American freedoms and liberties.

This is my program. Say "No" to most of these flashy new spending proposals. Say "No" when men in high places offer to spend your money for you and assert they are giving you something for nothing.

Say "Yes" to proposals to cut the cost of government, to lower taxes, to reduce the national debt, and above all else, to keep our country solvent.

You will remember when the apostles of unlimited spending took over in March 1933, and the Nation had a public debt of twenty-two and one-half billion dollars. Today it is over two hundred and fifty-six billion.

At that time we had about 500,000 Federal employees. Today there are nearly 2,000,000 on the Federal pay roll.

Even in those early days it cost the taxpayers a little over $5,000,000,000 a year to run the Government. Today the President asks for a budget of forty billions, out of which about five and one-half billion represents interest on the national debt alone.

These figures are staggering but bear in mind that in addition, the Truman administration proposes to spend $17,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in Europe.

Now, we all recognize that there are good, sound reasons—humanitarian and economic—for us to go to the rescue of some European countries with a program properly and economically administered. But the great tragedy in the President's so-called State of the Union message was that he uttered not a single word on behalf of economy. He suggested no saving that would help provide the funds for this vast outpouring of American tax dollars.

The President has told us that it will require work, sweat, and sacrifices to achieve our aims in Europe. But he said nothing to indicate that the overgrown and arrogant bureaucracy in Washington will be called upon for any sweat or sacrifice.

Oh, no—they are so strongly entrenched behind the iron curtain of waste and extravagance that it will take high explosives to blast them out.

That points to the Republican program—beginning now—a great crusade to save America—to crush the spendthrift administration under an avalanche of Republican votes. You have a big job to do here in Kansas—and I know you will do your full share to return the United States to Lincoln's concept of constitutional government. Kansas will help elect a Republican Congress and a Republican President next November.

Let me tell you what a Democratic Senator reported just the other day. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, is a real American—an old-line Jeffersonian Democrat. He is chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. Reporting to Congress for that committee, he said:

"Reduction of Federal personnel in the executive agencies during the first 6 months of the current fiscal year was negligible."

He continued, "Increase—not decrease—in Federal personnel is to be expected the remainder of the year."

There is something to think about. Here we are in peacetime—fighting to cut Government expenses, to reduce taxes, to keep down inflation and the Truman administration has gone back to boondoggling. It is building up the pay rolls in advance of the national elections—not for the public benefit—but to buy votes with the taxpayers' money—just as it always has done.

It has been estimated conservatively that it costs $5,000 a year to maintain a Federal employee on the average. I mean his salary and office expenses.

If we can eliminate only half a million of those pay-rollers, it would mean a saving to the taxpayers of upward of $2,500,000,000 a year.

But first we must break down the stubborn refusal of the administration to cooperate with Congress in effecting these economies so necessary to relieve the American taxpayer of the backbreaking load of taxation. It is sometimes difficult for people away from Washington to comprehend the things that we see there every day.

Roadblocks are placed in the way of every effort to reduce pay rolls and other Federal expenses. Every department, bureau, board, and commission operates a little lobby of its own to pressure the Congress and to stir up protests around the country. Items are padded and faked in budgets so that even after slashes have been made pay-rollers can be paid through phoney items. Money is actually concealed in budgets and then brought out to maintain the army of drones.

Every shabby trick is resorted to in order that they may maintain this huge bureaucracy which saps the Nation's lifeblood. Every day an army of press agents, on the taxpayers' pay roll, grinds out propaganda to keep the wasters in power. No scheme is too costly—no promise too fantastic for their political philosophy.

I can hear, like an ever-recurring echo over the years, that Harry Hopkins' slogan—"We will tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect."

Oh, Abraham Lincoln!

How we need you today!

The Great Emancipator told the world that "A nation cannot survive half slave and half free."

That is as true today as when he uttered it and it applies not just to one kind of bondage but to all kinds. Let me remind you that when a government says to its free people, "Don't do it for yourself anymore; let the ruler do it for you. Don't think for yourself; let the ruler think for you"—then, that government is perpetrating a form of bondage.

And, for a period of more than 15 years, I charge, this process has been going on in the United States. It has been slow. It has been insidious. The velvet glove has always been worn. But its expression has been those slashing, brutal, bare-knuckled, terrifying words of Harry Hopkins:

"We will tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect."

Thank God we have not gone too far. We are not yet half slave. And we will not be so long as we use the ballot box for our shield this November as we did in November 1946.

One of the great dangers to America is big government. In 1854 Lincoln wrote:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

In recent years there has been a great increase in the number of individuals and subdivisions of government, organized as pressure groups, asking and demanding help from the government.

Lincoln's early struggles and the hardships he endured give emphasis to the words attributed to your former Governor, Henry J. Allen:

"Had Abraham Lincoln been living today the Rotary Club would supply him with a set of books. The Lions Club with a good reading lamp. The Cosmopolitan Club with writing equipment. The Kiwanis Club with a wooden floor for the cabin. He would have the protection of the child labor law and Government old-age assistance. A kindly philanthropist would send him to college with a scholarship. Incidentally, a case worker would see that his father received a monthly check from the county. The OPA would reduce his rent by 50 percent. He would receive a subsidy for rail splitting; another for raising some crop he was going to raise anyway; and another for not raising a crop he had no intention of raising.

"Result: There would have been no Abraham Lincoln."

Once we strained our muscles for liberty. Today we seem willing to surrender a share of freedom for a handout from Washington.

Lincoln, in his wisdom and vision, saw the great need for more government in the town hall, in the city hall, in the court house, in the State capitols, and less in Washington. The courthouse must again be the beacon light of liberty as it has been in the past. The closer the government is to the people the more efficiently and the more economically it is administered. The Federal Government is the furthest away and the most expensive. Let us keep a greater share of our government at home.

No right thinking American can fail to be alarmed over the confused, contradictory, and bewildered leadership of the present administration.

Back in 1848, when he was in Congress and long before he dreamed of achieving the White House, Lincoln spoke caustically of the then President, James K. Polk. On the floor of the House he said:

"The President is in nowise satisfied with his own positions. * * * His mind, taxed beyond its power, is running hither and thither, like some tortured creature on a burning surface, finding no position on which it can settle down and be at ease. * * * He is a bewildered, confounded, and miserably perplexed man."

It is hard to believe that quotation is not just a few days old but goes back a whole century.

I say this at the risk of appearing unkind to your neighbor from Missouri who often perplexes the Congress by actions similar to those described by Lincoln. Perhaps you remember a few.

You will recall that the President of the United States told his press conference that a return to rationing and price control in peacetime would be the act of a police state. And 30 days later he sent a message to Congress recommending these very controls and ordered his Cabinet into action to influence Congress on behalf of this program.

Do you remember also a President of the United States who told Congress and the Nation he was dead set against any tax reduction at this time. And then went before Congress, in person, to recommend a $40 reduction for every person in the Nation, with a phony soak-the-corporation proviso attached.

And a President who went before Congress to demand that strikers be drafted into the Army, and a little later was denouncing the fair and equitable Taft-Hartley bill as a slave law.

And a President who wrote to former Gov. George H. Earle, of Pennsylvania, ridiculing what he called the Communist bugaboo. Those were the President's words. Then 2 or 3 weeks later he issued a public order to his administration to combat communistic menace which existed in the Government itself.

Yes; there is danger from communism in our country. But no subversive element will gain a foothold in America so long as our people stand firm and united in patriotism, good will, tolerance, and love of God.

There is, however, a minority group that is a menace even greater than the Communists. They are the minority that is seeking the easy way—those who show disrespect for the law—the chiselers, the racketeers, and the something-for-nothing crowd. We have some of them in labor, in business and industry, in politics, and even in the Government.

Their ranks include the pressure groups, many of them well meaning but misguided, who swarm about Washington and flood the mails with demand after demand for spending that favors their own selfish interests. They don't seem to realize that the benefits they seek will be only temporary in nature and that when bankruptcy comes upon us the most precious of all our blessings—freedom—will be gone.

America is a great and powerful Nation. We have been given this land as a sacred heritage. Generation after generation has kept the fires of freedom burning.

All of our great progress has been based upon the philosophy of the sacredness of the individual and the sovereignty of God. It has brought us freedom of action, independence of thought, and tolerance in worship. We, in this generation, must not falter, stumble, or fall. If the sacred torch of liberty falls from our hands, it will be because of what we do to ourselves. It will be due to blunders at home, because we continue to tolerate administrations that weaken our independence, our inner strength and even squander our solvency blindly.

Abraham Lincoln, a man of vision and passionate desire to keep this Union strong and firm, saw it that way. He declared to a New York audience:

"At what point then is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

We have taken some of the steps toward the danger that Lincoln pointed out in that warning. There is still time to change our course.

We are in a critical period today because we have depended too much upon the power of government and too little upon ourselves. There has been too much strife and confusion; too much selfishness and not enough cooperation; and the failure to observe the Golden Rule in our relations with one another. We have forgotten the thrift, courage, humility and love of God possessed by the founding fathers and so well exemplified by Lincoln. So many of our so-called intellectuals have forgotten God. They talk of a planned economy which has failed every place it has been tried during the last 2,000 years.

We have talked too much about our rights and too little about our obligations. There has been too much clamor for higher wages and greater profits. We have talked so very little about giving in exchange greater efficiency, increased production, better service, and higher quality.

The time has come where the individual citizen must know his duties and assume a greater share of the responsibilities of citizenship. From the family and the church we must relearn the ancient lessons of honesty, thrift, tolerance, work, and obligation. These must not be merely Sunday virtues. They must be 7-day-a-week virtues, practiced in our daily lives.

In the eternal truths that live forever, in the teachings of the Holy Bible, there is guidance to preserve America as a land of high ideals and opportunity so that the humblest child may achieve the highest position in government, in the professions, or in business. That was Lincoln's thought when he spoke to the men during a review of a regiment during the Civil War:

"I happen temporarily to occupy this big White House," the President said. "I am a living witness that any one of your children may look to come here, as my father's child has. It is in order that each of you may have, through this free Government which we have enjoyed, an open field and a fair chance * * * that the struggle should be maintained, that we may not lose our birthright."

A big job confronts us. We must retain America in all its greatness and glory through the idealism of the individual citizen. That means Americans must obey the law. The Golden Rule must be put into business. That will be an example to the world in right living.

We can do our job if we keep faith and carry out the ideals of Lincoln—"with malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right"—and hold fast to government "of the people, by the people, for the people."

Tonight, the greatest tribute to Lincoln is a prayer from the 140,000,000 Americans that we may have an understanding of our mission in the world; that justice alone can bring peace to the world; that respect for authority and the rights of each other should be recognized. On the birthday of the Great Liberator our greatest need is a modern Lincoln, to lead us in our duty as Americans.

That will make us a strong and dynamic America. An America copied from the courage of Kansas so well expressed in your State motto, "To the Stars Through Difficulties."

Fuel-Oil Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of yesterday appeared the announcement that the Commerce Department halted the issuance of all export licenses for gasoline and fuel oil for 48 hours subsequent to 5 p. m. eastern standard time on Tuesday, February 17, 1948. It is understood that contacts have been made by the State Department with officials in several foreign countries with a view to a new cut in export quotas to be announced, probably on Friday. When the present embargo is lifted Friday morning, the east coast embargo will remain in force until March 31. Apparently the Commerce Department had considerable difficulty in determining whether or not to impose this absolute embargo of shipments from any port in the United States. First, the newspapers were advised that the embargo was on. Within a half hour they were notified that the suspension had been called off. A half hour later the Department officials announced the embargo was in force. I believe that this vacillating action on the part of the Commerce Department officials is typical of their handling of the fuel-oil shortage which has caused so much hardship and trouble for thousands of American citizens all over the country and particularly in New England.

The possibility of a shortage of fuel oil was known to Government officials last spring. Apparently, oil company officials persuaded them that the shortage would be of small account and of short duration. When they knew that they had guessed wrong, our Government officials failed to act promptly and decisively to end the shortage. Nine congressional committees have endeavored to bring order out of the departmental chaos and relief to the householders. It is through the efforts of these committees and of Members of Congress acting as individuals that pressure has been brought upon the various Government departments to release Federal oil to local municipalities, to prevent further conversion from coal-burning apparatus to oil-burning apparatus in Federal buildings, to provide additional Government-owned tankers for transportation, and to place embargoes on shipments of oil from the United States to foreign countries.

In its latter course, the Government has proceeded so slowly with partial embargoes, and finally a full embargo, that the relief which might have been granted to American citizens will come at a very late date in the winter; but it is better late than never. This relief is, however, due for the most part to Congress. Congressman HESELTON, of Massachusetts, has introduced a bill which would place a commission in charge of the oil industry. The problem is a difficult one but it must be solved. Government officials have stated that they have all the laws that they need to govern the oil industry in such a manner as to prevent shortages, yet they testify that we will be faced with fuel-oil shortages for the next four or five winters and with possible gasoline shortages in the summers. If they believe their own testimony, the cause of these future shortages will be the failure of the Government officials to make certain that the industry knows how much fuel oil and how much gasoline are needed to meet the requirements of the citizens of the United States and then to insist that the 21 major oil companies which now have a strangle hold on the oil industry and all other industries dependent upon it shall provide the American requirements for fuel oil and gasoline on time. There is a growing conviction among Members of Congress that this present fuel-oil shortage need not have occurred. It is unfortunate for the independent dealers in fuel oil and in fuel-oil-burning equipment that their industries and businesses are the only ones which the 21 major oil companies do not dominate at the present moment. It looks as if 21 companies control the future destinies of nearly 40,000 other corporations and individuals in the oil or allied businesses. If the 21 major companies do not recognize the rights of these independent dealers and if they do not further realize that the most important use of oil products—other than oil needed for national security—is fuel oil for the heating of American homes, then I trust that Congress will give full consideration to the Heselton bill with a view to establishing proper production and distribution of oil products in the United States.

I am pleased to include with my remarks the following editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of February 12, 1948:

OIL EXPORT BAN WORTHLESS

An interesting commentary on the action of the United States Department of Commerce in banning oil exports from Atlantic coast ports until March 31 as a means of relieving the acute shortage of heating oil in the East, particularly in New England, is that the ban, to all intents and purposes, is virtually worthless and insignificant in its scope. Department officials frankly acknowledge that there is nothing to prevent exporters from shipping their oil overseas through Great Lakes, Gulf of Mexico, and Pacific coast ports.

If oil exports to foreign countries can produce a profit to make it worth while, there is every likelihood that the ban on Atlantic coast shipments will have little, if any, effect on the question of keeping our oil supplies at home for domestic consumption between now and the end of March, when oil is gravely needed for heating purposes in areas where supplies are extremely meager and rapidly diminishing.

It is quite obvious, then, that the ban in its present form is practically meaningless and entirely without merit.

If the Department of Commerce wants to put teeth in the prohibition of oil exports, it will have to clamp the lid down on all exports for a period of at least 30 days. In this way, and in this way only, will the petroleum interests be thwarted in their attempts to sell oil in the foreign market, presumably at far greater profit than is obtainable in the domestic market.

Now that Congressmen CLASON and HESELTON have been successful in their efforts to effect a partial halting of oil exports, they ought to extend their demands and insist that the Department of Commerce officials go all the way and prohibit exports of oil from every United States port, at least until after the severe winter weather has passed and needy communities have been kept properly supplied during the emergency.

Youth Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, as a charter member and past president of the Logan, Ohio, Kiwanis Club, I naturally watch with interest Kiwanis activities.

One of the primary objectives of Kiwanis International is to aid underprivileged children. Untold thousands of physically handicapped children have been restored to health and happiness through the efforts of Kiwanis members.

There has just now come to my attention a type of youth training which, in my humble opinion, is one of the most noble objectives any service club could adopt. This is also the first time to my knowledge that any service club has ever undertaken an educational program of this type. I refer to the action now being taken by the Kiwanis Club at Circleville, Ohio. This club has started an

anti-Communist drive among the school children of all grades in the city of Circleville. On last Friday they distributed 1,600 pamphlets entitled "It's Fun To Live in America" to school children of all ages. According to the chairman of the committee, Mr. Verne Hawkes, "Distributions will be placed on a monthly basis." There is a definite need right now to present a true picture to children and grown-ups alike comparing living conditions in Russia with those in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that this Kiwanis Club is located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, and I want here and now to publicly congratulate the membership of the Circleville Club for adopting and promulgating this noble objective and to voice a hope that other clubs will follow their example. Hitler knew the value of enlisting the youth of Germany in his program. Every dictator nation follows the technique of instilling their false ideologies in the minds of their children. It is a known fact that subversive groups in America, through the formation of various youth movements with catch-phrase titles, are attempting to destroy American institutions by instilling false ideologies in the hearts and minds of American children. It is also a known fact that various instructors in the schools and colleges of America are disseminating propaganda directly opposite to the ideals which make America the envy as well as the hope of the world. If America is to be saved, it must be done through our youth, and I know of no better way to supplement the program of the churches and of the home than the one which the Circleville Kiwanis Club has undertaken. My best wishes are with them in their noble objective.

The Costs of Containment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post of February 12, 1948:

THE COSTS OF CONTAINMENT
(By Walter Lippmann)

President Truman's foreign policy is about to cost well over $20,000,000,000 a year in direct expenditures. The bill for foreign aid put in by the State Department is well over eight billions figured on a yearly basis, and there is besides the bill for many other activities in foreign relations. The bill for the armed forces is over ten billions, not counting the additional expenditures for the proposed strategic Air Force or anything more than a first small installment for universal military training.

The disturbing thing about these costs is not the burden they impose this year. It is that they support a foreign policy in which, as it is now conducted, this rate of expenditure will increase rather than diminish.

That is because we are operating a policy of global containment rather than one designed to induce and compel a settlement.

For a policy of holding the line all over the world requires more and more money, more and more armaments, merely to hold the line as the situation behind the line we are holding deteriorates.

During the past year it has been deteriorating in Germany, in Greece, in the whole Middle East, and in China. The deterioration is marked by the fact that as the Truman administration has increased its commitments its diplomatic influence on events has declined.

We have assumed the whole burden of the deficit of western Germany, but our control over the destiny of Germany is rapidly evaporating. We have assumed the whole burden in Greece, but the prospects of our being able to subdue the rebellion or to settle it are less favorable than when we rushed in a year ago.

The whole Middle East from Iran to Iraq to Palestine to Egypt is proving once more the old rule that when great powers intervene separately and competitively in a rich and backward region of the world the result is anarchy and violence. And in China we are about to increase our commitments at a time when our capacity to influence the course of events is approaching zero.

The common factor in all those places is that, thanks to the Truman doctrine, we are losing our freedom of action. Our clients are becoming our masters. The western Germans, the government party in Greece, the Iranian Government, the Zionists, the Arab League, and Gen. Chiang Kai-shek have been given such unqualified support so publicly that the Truman administration is constrained to follow them and cannot lead them. Once we declared that it was a vital interest of the United States to make western Germany solvent as a bulwark against communism, or to make Greece prosperous as a bulwark against communism, or the Middle East, or China, we deprived ourselves of diplomatic bargaining power.

We must support our clients, no matter what they do, because we have slammed and bolted the door behind us. They know that we cannot withdraw our support without eating our words, and suffering humiliation and a spectacular loss of prestige.

The policy of containment has thus become what it was bound to become—an ever-deeper entanglement in evermore insoluble difficulties. There is only one way out of it, and that is by concentrating our diplomatic effort upon a settlement at some critical point. That point may be Austria. It may be Greece. It could be the Middle East. But at some deliberately selected point the stalemate must be broken decisively by that combination of pressure and compromise which is the essence of diplomacy. The important thing is to break the stalemate somewhere, and thus to change the political currents of the world. An Austrian treaty, which resulted in the military evacuation of Austria, would do that. It might well mark the turn of the tide from another war to an eventual peace. Therefore, it would be worth a considerable price.

What has to be determined by diplomatic negotiation is whether the Russians mean to stay in Austria or to leave it—in other words, whether an Austrian peace treaty can be had for a price, whether Austria can be ransomed. If it can be, then the cost of the ransom will be small compared with the cost of not making peace, of maintaining the armies of occupation indefinitely, of never reaching the time when Austria is independent and no longer divided under alien rule.

The worst of the Truman foreign policy is that in order to justify the enormous and mounting costs, it has been necessary to argue ourselves into the assumption that nothing can be settled. From that it is a small step to the view that nothing ought to be settled since any settlement requires concessions and compromises—and thus to acquire the habit of not looking for, of not trying to think out, ways and means of breaking the stalemate.

This habit is easy to acquire and hard to throw off. Especially as is now the case in the State Department, the habit tends to become fixed because the few men at the top who would have to direct a policy of settlement are so busy with the complicated consequences of the policy of containment that they cannot pay serious attention to the remedy for it.

Address of Hon. Ellsworth B. Foote, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE, Member of Congress, Third District of Connecticut, before New London County Republican banquet, February 14, 1948, at New London, Conn.:

We meet this evening to pay tribute to the immortal Abraham Lincoln. From a purely political standpoint we do so because he was the first President from the Republican party and one of the noble men who brought our party into being and made it great. Long before we faced the crises of today he had become an American institution far removed from political divisions, however. He has become the symbol of all that is truly American. As Stanton said on that fateful night, "Now he belongs to the ages." True it is that he belongs not to one Nation, or one generation, but to all nations and all generations. But let us not forget in all pride that he belongs uniquely to the Republican Party. He shaped it in its early years. He believed in the party as the instrument of the public welfare. He brought to it his lifelong principles and those principles have been our beacon light. The historian H. G. Wells places him as one of the six greatest characters of all mankind.

Whenever our Republic has been threatened there has always arisen in our midst a man who seemed preordained to struggle with the task at hand. From out of the masses has come a champion of the people who has wrestled with the problem and won. When revolution came, it was Washington who stood forth to lead the people. When the new Government was formed it was Jefferson who acted as the guiding genius. When it came time for America to speak her mind for a hemisphere free from sea to sea, it was Monroe who proclaimed his doctrine. But no figure in history towers so above them all as does Abraham Lincoln.

He appeared on the scene in that historic moment when the very life of the country hung in the balance on the precarious scales of human destiny. He it was who understood better than anyone else that the Union must be preserved, and yet it could not be preserved half slave and half free. He came forth at the very moment when all the world watched the very death throes of the gigantic dream of an American Nation. He perceived the difference between right and wrong.

There was no middle course for him, but it took courage, foresight, and fortitude to shout the doctrine of "one nation indivisible," from the very housetops of a country then torn by domestic strife. He led the Nation into a war only when he knew it could not be avoided and he set his course with faith in God and the strength of his people. There were moments when he might have been swayed by the cunning compromisers. He might have been torn aside by the pleas of businessmen to whom war meant bankruptcy and ruin. He might have been deviated by the wails of mothers and fathers torn from their sons, by the agonizing thought of brother arrayed against brother, by the ghastly cascade of blood which flowed across the land, by the destruction of homes and cities, by the prisoners of war and the suspension of civil liberties, and the whole revolting picture of a nation torn from border to border. Yet, he did not swerve from his path. He did not for one moment lose sight of the goal. He saw ahead of him a nation reborn, bound together forever, one Government, one flag, one people. We would not be honoring his memory tonight if he had forsaken the struggle for union because of heavy expenditures and grim sacrifices of people that were required.

Life in the great city of Washington brings home to one the full realization of the sacrifices that have been made by men and women down through the years and the rich heritage that is ours. On every side one sees monuments testifying to the work which has been done toward building this Nation to the point where it has become the envy of all other nations of the world. One of the greatest testimonials is the Lincoln Memorial. This marble shrine in a setting of rich dark green below it, and the Washington Monument and the Capitol in line with it eastward, is a memorial to the nobility and idealism of Abraham Lincoln whose rugged figure, 19 feet high, is seated within. Seven years were required for its completion. In order to prevent the columns and walls from appearing wider at the top they are tilted slightly inward. Above the rows of the columns are printed the names of the 36 States of Lincoln's time. The present number is symbolized in 48 festoons around the attic parapet. It is estimated that 2,000,000 people annually look upon that seated figure in the memorial and read his second inaugural speech and the Gettysburg speech carved in the marble walls. When Lincoln stood in the chill November air of 1863 before the people at Gettysburg to do honor to the men who had fallen in the cause of this great Nation, he said: "The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here." But the world did not and cannot forget what he said there. These words engraved in marble will be remembered as long as the earth endures.

Lincoln was a true liberal. Unlike some of the self-styled liberals of today, he was a true and classical one. He did not use meaningless expressions to identify his liberalism, but stated them simply so that all could understand. While he was poor financially and his heart bled for the poor people, he did not condemn the man who through his own industry may have acquired considerable of earthly goods. He did not condemn the rich, nor penalize them, nor attempt to set class against class. In a speech in New York City in 1846, he said: "Property is the fruit of labor—is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise." Lincoln realized that capital and labor each had its own rights and duties and that only through a spirit of cooperation rather than antagonism could they and the country prosper and reach that high point of productivity so earnestly yearned for.

Lincoln was the greatest exponent of freedom that ever lived. He realized that a nation could not long endure half slave and half free. He realized also that a world could not long endure where any nation was half slave and half free. Surely as we face the problems of today, the words of Lincoln in his first speech at Springfield, Ill., in the campaign of 1858, are appropriate, when he said:

"Do we know where we are? Do we know whither we are going? Can we know what we must do until we get our true bearings and a sense of direction? If a nation cannot endure half slave and half free, can an integrated world in which time and space have been annihilated, endure half slave and half free, and what is the state of freedom in the world?"

These words, spoken 90 years ago, are truly applicable to the situation in this atomic age.

What is the state of freedom in the world today? It is a lamentable fact that notwithstanding two world wars were waged upon European battlefields for the cause of freedom that we are far from realizing the goal. Freedom is again being extinguished, all the way from behind the iron curtain—from Finland to the Aegean. On all hands are to be found the enemies of freedom and those who proclaim it. Two European statesmen, symbols of democracy and freedom, and who fought for it until it was necessary for life itself to leave their countries and seek refuge here, viz, former Premier of Hungary, Ferenc Nagy, and former Premier of Poland, Stanislaus Mickolyczyk, are today sounding the alarm to us as to what is going on in eastern Europe and the plan that is being made to engulf us here. It is a regrettable fact, as testified by former Premier Nagy before a congressional committee the other day, "that the worst possible sin in Hungary as well as in the other eastern European countries is sympathy toward the United States." He further states it almost appears as though every anti-Communist politician is persecuted, put on trial, compelled to run for his life, because he is sympathetic to America and eventually finds himself either in jail or the cemetery. He say that the Bulgarian Prime Minister stated that it would have been possible to save the life of Potkof if the United States had not intervened in his behalf.

What would the immortal Lincoln prescribe today? I think he would say that we should do all within our power, commensurate with our ability, to hold high the torch of freedom in the countries of the world. He would not stand, however, in my opinion for a repetition of UNRRA. He would make doubly sure also that the money sent to foreign countries did not fall into the hands and be used by the very forces of communism which it is sought to destroy. I believe he would advocate giving aid and assistance to those freedom-loving countries for their own advancement but would consider it also in the interest of our own national security. The massive force of communism grows bolder and bolder. Its plan for the complete domination of Europe is clear to all. To save freedom abroad and at home will cost money. In Lincoln's day it was a costly business to achieve freedom at home.

As Speaker of the House JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., in an address in Washington the other evening stated, "The world today is divided into two spheres—freedom and communism. Our free economic system is under attack from within and without. Moscow tells the world through its controlled press and radio that our American system has failed (notwithstanding that under it we have become the richest country in all the world and are financing the rest of it). The out-and-out Communists within our borders echo its propaganda. Their fellow travelers give them aid and comfort—using our own Constitution and our own institutions to protect them as they preach their poisonous doctrine. When we seek to curb their activities, they screech to high heaven their constitutional rights are being violated. They refuse to answer the question of whether or not they are Communists and invoke the first amendment to the Constitution—the very instrument they seek to destroy. Congress is their target because Congress is their major obstacle. It is the branch of our Government which has made and must continue to meet this challenge of America's well being. Congress has served unmistakable notice it will not tolerate traitors in our Government establishments and agencies any longer.

"The recent disclosure that Communists are employed right in our State Department, having possible access to documents and military secrets, is so distressing that it is nauseating. To think that those who owe allegiance to the only foreign country with whom war is possible are now in the employ of the department of our Government having jurisdiction over its foreign affairs. It is disclosure of conditions such as this that is the greatest deterrent to enthusiastic support of the so-called Marshall plan.

Lincoln has been described as both the saddest and most humorous of men. He was elected to Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois in 1846. His opponent was Peter Cartright, the famous Methodist circuit rider, and the campaign was waged not on national issues of the day by Cartright, but on personal, moral, and religious issues. Cartright and his supporters resorted to the "grapevine telegraph" in spreading reports of Lincoln's infidelity. The final rally of the campaign was held in Cartright's church, and it demonstrates humor which he displayed on so many proper occasions. Cartright had called Lincoln an infidel, an agnostic, and an unbeliever, and then turned to his audience and said, "All those who expect to go to heaven kindly stand up." All stood up except Mr. Lincoln. "Ha, ha," said Cartright, "see, I have proved my point. Now, where do you expect to go, Mr. Lincoln?" Whereupon Lincoln stood up and said, "I expect to go to Congress." And he did.

One need not to be an alarmist to say that this is a time of crisis for mankind. What better can we do as we honor the memory of Lincoln than in truth and in fact to fall upon the standard which he raised for his party and as its first President? Somehow we should like to call upon his wisdom and guidance. One could well say: "Lincoln thou should be living this hour." If Lincoln were in the White House today he would strive with every means in his power to smooth out and rub out the animosities and hatreds which now divide Americans—to convince labor and capital that their interests are the same—to reconcile or dampen down the racial, religious, and economic prejudices which have been so carefully fanned up and kept hot—to persuade every American once more of the eternal truth of Benjamin Franklin's historic remark that "We must all hang together or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

I can think of no more fitting manner of concluding my remarks then to reiterate the thought expressed by the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, in his address at the National Republican Lincoln day dinner in Washington, D. C., on February 5, 1948, wherein he called attention to the fact that in 1832 a song was written, the last stanza of which reads as follows:

"My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing.
Land where my fathers died,
Land of the pilgrims' pride,
From every mountainside let freedom ring."

And that it is not known to what degree this song of freedom may have come to the attention of Abraham Lincoln, but that Abraham Lincoln did something more than let freedom ring. He made it ring.

The state of freedom in the world is at a low ebb. Abraham Lincoln kept his rendezvous with freedom. Shall we keep ours?

Tomb of the Unknown Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a portion of a letter recently received from Mrs. William L. Dickson, of 43 North Pearl Street, Meriden, Conn., who comments upon the lack of respect shown the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington, Va.:

This summer my husband and I spent 3 months in England, Scotland, and France. While in London and Paris we visited the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. In both places people stood quiet as if in prayer, as it should be. We did not think much about it till after being home a month, we visited our own in Washington. We were ashamed to see good-sized children running and laughing about. Speaking of it later, I have had people tell me that they have seen grown-ups try to make the guard laugh and get in his way as he marches back and forth.

Can't you ask the boys that are on duty there what they think? Perhaps we need guards to teach our people how to act in such a sacred place.

Palestine Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sumner Welles which appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, February 17, 1948:

PALESTINE TEST
(By Sumner Welles)
PRICE OF PROCRASTINATION

It is hard to arouse a democracy to impending danger when the clouds on the horizon still seem no larger than a man's hand. Even Winston Churchill could not awaken the British people to the menace in the rise of nazism. The peril to us in Japan's aggression against China and in Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia went largely unperceived. But even if the tragic lessons of the recent past are to be so easily forgotten, the clouds now looming are no longer on the horizon. They are hanging over us.

This Government has repeatedly announced that the United Nations is the foundation of American foreign policy. Yet because of the failure of the United States to adopt a consistent and courageous policy on Palestine, the United Nations is today faced with the gravest dilemma in its history.

Save for Britain in the days of Baldwin it would be difficult to find a more sorry instance of a major power refusing to face facts.

The decision to partition Palestine was taken after full investigation and debate. It was in strict accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. The United States was in great part responsible. This country played a leading role throughout the events that led up to that decision.

The American Government failed, however, to insist that the United Nations must be enabled to enforce its decision, and to protect life and property in Palestine until the independence of the two new states had been finally established.

For lack of any United Nations police force, the members of the Palestine Commission have now been told by the British that they will be assassinated if they set foot in Palestine. Major hostilities between Jews and Arabs are imminent. The United Nations cannot carry out its decision. Because the United States has during the past two months renounced every semblance of leadership, the smaller countries are increasingly reluctant to assume any responsibility.

The Palestine Commission has at length been compelled to ask the Security Council to determine that there is a "threat to the peace" and to take action under the charter. And Washington still remains silent.

It is notorious that there is a sharp cleavage of opinion within the Government. The Army and Navy, supported by some officials of the State Department and of other departments, insist that the United States must take no action to back up its words. They allege that our growing controversy with Russia makes it unwise for us further to antagonize the Arab states or jeopardize this country's access to Near Eastern oil.

Such arguments are wholly unconvincing. The British Government cannot prolong its mandate in Palestine. Once British forces withdraw, war will result unless the United Nations can send an international constabulary to Palestine. If hostilities break out, the Soviet Union will undoubtedly insist that its vital interests require it to send its own forces to maintain order in its neighborhood.

Should our service departments prevail upon the Administration to refuse to exercise any leadership within the United Nations to maintain peace in Palestine, they will pave the way for what they fear most, namely, the extension of Soviet control over the Near East.

The arguments on oil are just as unrealistic. If a new war breaks out, the Near Eastern oil resources would certainly not be available to western Europe nor to the United States. Should peace be preserved, since the Arab governments depend upon the royalties from their oil concessions, they are hardly likely to oppose their exploitation.

But we are face to face with a far more fundamental issue.

Japan defied the League of Nations in 1932 and was permitted by the great powers to do so with impunity. The Italian aggression against Ethiopia, the civil war in Spain, and the rape by Hitler of Austria and of Czechoslovakia were the inevitable result.

The Arab states have now defied the United Nations.

The partition of Palestine is the one major question upon which the policies of the United States and of the Soviet Union have coincided. Yet this Government has so far failed to initiate any measures within the United Nations to guard against the Arab aggression which is under way, or even to protest the flagrant violation of their charter commitments by the Arab states.

If the United Nations is in fact the foundation of American policy, the United States must support the United Nations, not only when that is convenient and easy, but quite as much so when such support implies effort, sacrifice, and risk.

The League of Nations collapsed because the major powers then members of the League supported the League only when it suited their own ends. They failed to support the League when it seemed that their selfish interests might be prejudiced.

We are seeing exactly the same trend. The Palestine question is a test case. Should the United States persist in its present blind inaction, it will be preparing the way for the failure of the new international organization, and if the United Nations fails, the one hope humanity today posesses for the rule of law rather than the rule of force, for the freedom and progress of mankind, and for the establishment of a peaceful world order will vanish with it.

American Diplomats Criticized for Views on Prewar Dictators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by William L. Shirer that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, February 15, 1948. Mr. Shirer, as we all know, is without doubt one of the most learned journalists in America and one of the best informed men on Germany and European countries. Mr. Shirer has spent many years in Germany and in practically all of the countries of Europe. I was glad to read his comments on Arthur Bliss Lane, former Ambassador to Poland. Lane saw the misery, hunger, disease, and destruction among the Polish people and did absolutely nothing to help them. In my opinion Mr. Lane's attitude was heartless and inhuman. He exerted every effort to deny loans and credits to the Polish people. He even went out of his way to deny them a meager amount of relief supplies of food and medicines that were voted by Congress for the Polish people. He tries to cover up his inhumanity by saying that he did not like the Polish Government. After Hitler and the Nazis finished murdering and slaughtering some 7,000,000 people in Poland, Mr. Lane by his actions, would have permitted many millions more to die of starvation and for lack of medicines. Anyone who is sympathetic to the Polish people cannot regard Mr. Lane with respect.

Mr. Shirer's article follows:

AMERICAN DIPLOMATS CRITICIZED FOR VIEWS ON PREWAR DICTATORS—SHIRER, DISCUSSING LANE'S BOOK ABOUT POLAND, ASKS WHY ONLY RED BRUTALITY EVOKES IRE; SAYS ENVOYS ACCEPTED THE RIGHTISTS

(By William L. Shirer)

I have read Arthur Bliss Lane's somewhat hysterial but highly provocative and informative book, I Saw Poland Betrayed, with the greatest of interest, but I cannot help thinking that his case against the suppression of democracy in Poland by the Bolsheviks would have been much more effective had he shown more concern about democracy in eastern Europe in the years when he represented his country there and when the Communist ruffians had not yet taken over.

It is a criterion which one could apply to most of our American diplomats.

I have no illusions about Russia's hold over eastern Europe—a hold which is based, as Mr. Lane shows in regard to Poland, on fraud, terror, and force. But what sometimes baffles me about our State Department diplomats is that they seem to recognize tyranny only when its color is red. Why were their eyes closed and their hearts hardened to the tyrannies of almost all the little eastern European states they were accredited to during the years when those lands were completely uncontaminated by communism?

For a number of years between the wars eastern Europe was my beat, and though the people, including the intellectuals and artists were charming, and in most instances courageous, their governments, for the most part, were monstrous. These governments, which were dictatorships, did not permit democracy to function. They suppressed the human freedoms.

IS IT WORSE THAN BEFORE?

It may be, as PM's disillusioned former correspondent, Hal Lehrman, argues in his fascinating book, Russia's Europe, that there are degrees of tyranny and that the current Russian-Communist kind is several degrees worse than what it supplanted.

But the old variety was bad enough, and some of its excesses, its terror, its sadistic practices of torture used to rob me of my sleep when I learned of them in my tour of duty as an American reporter.

However—in those days—these excesses bored the readers back home, and, so far as I remember, they used to bore most of our American diplomats on the scene, who later would recoil at similar practices of the Red barbarians.

Perhaps it is my naiveté, but it is hard for me to distinguish between tyranny and terror, whether red or black. In those years between the wars I remember that our American diplomats took the suppression of democracy and human decency in eastern Europe in their stride. Their proudest boast—as anyone who has called at an American legation or embassy in east Europe will recall—was that they had gone "huntin'" with Dictator So-and-So and what a really good fellow he was when you got to know him.

And I cannot recall that a single American ambassador or minister resigned in a huff and came home to write an angry book about the suppression of democracy in the country to which he had been accredited.

Could it be that suppression of liberty and democracy is all right with an American diplomat so long as the Communists do not do the suppressing? Long assignments in Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and other countries now under the Soviet yoke have made me ponder the question.

EXAMPLE OF BALTIC STATES

I kept pondering it during the perusal of Ambassador Lane's book. He was, for instance, our Minister to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania during 1936 and 1937. How did he find democracy faring on the Baltic?

The facts were plain. In 1934 the Estonian Parliament had been dissolved, martial law proclaimed, and an authoritarian regime set up with Paets as dictator. It is true that after Mr. Lane left things got worse in Estonia. Indeed, by 1938 the local dictator presented the country with a corporative Fascist constitution and the country lived under martial law with suspension of civil rights.

Did we care much about that in America? Or did it depress our diplomatic mission to the Baltic States? Or did the State Department send ringing notes to demand that democracy be restored immediately?

Estonia, of course, was only one of the three Baltic States. There was, for instance, Latvia. Mr. Lane was also accredited to it. By the time he arrived, in 1936, Prime Minister Ulmanis had succeeded in suspending parliament and setting up an authoritarian dictatorship on what he called a "corporative"—that is, Fascist—basis. The country lived largely under martial law.

LITHUANIA THE SAME

Lithuania, the third Baltic State, had seen the dissolution of all opposition parties in 1935 and authority taken over by Smetona. And so on.

Mr. Lane next moved to our legation in Belgrade. Though he arrived there in 1937—that is, 3 years after the assassination of King Alexander had brought an end to a royal iron dictatorship—it can scarcely be said that democracy and a respect for liberty and human rights prevailed in Yugoslavia. The elections were rigged, and until near the very end Stoyadinovitch was pretty much of a dictator under the regency of Prince Paul, who had surrounded himself with White Russians who were not only pro-German but pro-Nazi. I cannot recall that our legation or the State Department lectured the undemocratic pro-Nazi Belgrade regime during this time.

In his book Mr. Lane recalls the unbridled enthusiasm he witnessed in Warsaw when the Polish Republic was born in 1919. He did not see diplomatic service in Poland again until he returned as Ambassador in 1945. But in his sketch of the background of his assignment he has not a word to say of what happened to democracy in Poland between the time he left and the time of the treacherous Nazi onslaught in September 1939.

I happened to spend a fair amount of time in Poland during that period, and I have been thinking what a significant book some retired American Ambassador could have written then with a title: "I Saw Democracy Betrayed in Poland." He could have told how Pilsudski, for whom Mr. Lane has some kind words, destroyed democracy in Poland, and how, after Pilsudski's death, the little band of stupid pro-Nazi colonels outlawed all parties but their own, and even annulled the democratic constitution of 1921 by illegal and fraudulent means.

None of this background excuses what the Russians have done to gain their ends in eastern Europe. But it does seem to me that our diplomats, like Lane, when they come to write their books, owe it to their American public to provide a little perspective. And their angry words about Russian-Communist tyranny would ring truer, I submit, had they been just a trifle angry at the reactionary tyranny which preceded it in eastern Europe.

Palestine: British Appeasement Did Not Secure Arab Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two recent articles on Palestine. The first is If America Scuttles Partition from the February 14 issue of the Nation, in which the editor, Freda Kirchwey, vigorously reviews developments in the Holy Land and rejects any possibility of appeasement of the feudal Arab tyrannies. The second is by Henry Wallace from the February 16 issue of the New Republic, and is included, not because of Mr. Wallace's role as a third party Presidential candidate, but because of his familiar and lifelong standing as a great humanitarian and an excellent reporter. They follow:

[From the Nation of February 14, 1948]

IF AMERICA SCUTTLES PARTITION

(By Freda Kirchwey)

While the United Nations Palestine Commission wrestles with its monstrous assignment, word spreads in Washington and Lake Success that the United States is looking for a way out of its commitment to partition. The opposition of certain State Department officials and of Secretary of Defense Forrestal was exposed in these pages 2 weeks ago by Lillie Shultz. Since then, Forrestal has said plainly that the protection of our oil reserves in the Middle East would require strong measures—including "some arrangement" which might bring upon the Government the charge of imperialism. And sources close to the State Department insist that strategic considerations have at last forced Secretary Marshall to abandon his support of partition.

If this is true, it leaves the President both isolated and vulnerable. From honest conviction as well as political interest, Mr. Truman favors the UN plan for Palestine. More than that, he recognizes the obligation our Government assumed when it voted for partition in the General Assembly. But it will take immense courage to resist the kind of pressure that can be brought to bear if his chief policy-makers decide partition would jeopardize American security in the eastern Mediterranean. Has Mr. Truman that kind of courage?

Without active American help, the Palestine Commission stands no chance on earth of winning the backing it requires in the Security Council. Only American insistence could overcome the obstacles set up by the British—their refusal to allow the creation of local militias in Palestine as recommended by the Assembly; their refusal to provide a port and hinterland from which the commission could operate; their unwillingness to receive the commission itself until just before they lay down the mandate, thus preventing the United Nations from making any adequate preparations for taking over the interim administration of the country. Above all, the British have permitted the Arab rebellion to develop to a point which guarantees in advance the failure of partition, unless the Security Council takes drastic measures to restore order.

To meet the problems facing it in Palestine, the Security Council, will have to develop a capacity for positive action of which it has never yet shown any signs. It will have to deal with acts and threats of aggression on the part of several member states of the United Nations, one of which—Syria—is represented on the Security Council. It will have to deal with Britain's failure to maintain peace and security, its explicit refusal to carry out recommendations of the Assembly—and Britain is a permanent Council member, possessed of the veto. It confronts the necessity of putting down rebellion. Obviously, none of these obligations will be met unless the United States puts the full weight of its authority behind the commission and the decision of the United Nations. If it fails to do so, Britain and the Arabs may wreck partition, but American prestige will go down in the general collapse.

This has not yet happened; perhaps it will not happen. But if it does, we should recoguize what it means in terms of American foreign policy. For the growing resistance to partition in the minds of our policy-makers is part of something much bigger. Put in a sentence, it indicates that the Truman doctrine is in process of being extended to embrace the whole Middle East and perhaps other areas as well; that the strategy

of employing as allies or tools whatever groups happen to be in power, provided only they are opposed to Russia and hostile to communism, will be applied to the Arab countries as it is now being applied to Greece and Turkey.

Just as the British tried to buy Arab support, or at least neutrality, by abandoning their commitments in Palestine when they saw war with Hitler in the offing, so they and we—if the opponents of partition have their way—are preparing similarly to buy Arab support in anticipation of war with Russia. The states of the Arab League, angered by the UN decision and fully aware of western doubts about implementing it, have put on a full-dress demonstration of their unending will to defeat the plan, if it costs the last poor Arab's life. The Jews persist in believing that, given arms, they can defend both partition and themselves; they have also asked for a United Nations police force to help maintain order and protect the commission. But some of our leaders in Washington are more impressed by Arab threats than by Jewish powers of resistance—or America's commitments in the UN. Several officials have expressed the belief that arming Haganah would only incur Arab vengeance, while an international force might in the end bring Soviet troops—along with ours—into the Levant. Better to "eat crow" on partition, they say, and make deals with the Arab rulers to protect the bases and pipe lines and oil reserves we shall need in that war with Russia. So the Arabs call the tune to which Americans will march in defense of our democratic Western civilization.

It takes temerity to differ with experts; but one gains courage from the fact that only a few months ago many of these same men had figured it out differently. They saw the strategic problem then in terms of a defense based in Africa—arguing that, in case of war with Russia, the Middle East could not be held unless armies were already massed there to prevent an invasion.

One gains courage, too, from recalling that British appeasement after 1939 did not secure Arab loyalty, but, on the contrary, was utilized by local leaders to prepare the Levant as an avenue of Nazi advance; and that the Mufti, now directing the rebellion in Palestine, was similarly engaged in Iraq at the most critical moment of the war. But if the loyalty of the Arabs cannot be bought, even with Jewish blood, the good will of the Jews can be thrown away. No official in London or Washington can hope that Jewish friendship will survive the scuttling of partition or that Palestine's Jews will quietly submit to Arab domination or existence in a "Vatican state" at Tel Aviv. Rather than accept the blasting of all their hopes, the Jews will fight, and this time they will not be held back by any concern for future good relations with Arabs or British—or Americans. They will fight as the Jews fought in the Warsaw ghetto. And every Jew will be an Irgunist, for the premises on which moderation still precariously rests will have been blasted away.

Will pipe lines and refineries be safer in these circumstances than under the plan laid down by the United Nations? Will a bloody struggle with the Jews of Palestine help secure the Middle East as a bulwark against Russian expansion? Will it create that solidarity in the West so essential to the successful "containment" of Russia? Would the United Nations itself survive the surrender of partition by America?

These are some of the questions the President should put to his chief advisers before he allows his Government to go back on its word. For once he accepts the logic of imperialism, the course will be set for war and the final defeat of democracy.

[From the New Republic of February 16, 1948]

HENRY WALLACE'S COLUMN

PALESTINE: CIVILIZATION ON TRIAL

We have the power to stop violent deaths in the Holy Land.

Day after day, as I read the stories of bloodshed in Palestine, my mind goes back to my visit there three short months ago. I saw the magnificent efforts of the Jewish settlers to build thriving communities which would set a pattern for the entire Middle East. I saw evidence on the village level that the Jew and the Arab get along very well, provided hatred and discord are not incited from outside. I saw the potentialities of this ancient land as they were dramatically presented by the Jewish people in their everyday work. I was confident that the Nation of Judea would, with the help of funds from the World Bank, join with King Abdullah of neighboring Trans-Jordan in developing the Jordan River for the lasting benefit of both Arab and Jew.

On November 29, when the General Assembly of the United Nations decided that the only practical and equitable way to put an end to the Palestine strife was through partition into Jewish and Arab states, those of us who have confidence in the practicability of international organization were inspired with hope.

Since November 29, the British Government, without American opposition, has done all in its power to obstruct the implementation of the partition plan.

It has waged undeclared war on the Jews, confiscating their weapons while they were under Arab attack. It has permitted Arab troops commanded by the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem from his exile in Egypt, to lay siege to the old city of Jerusalem, to erect road blocks on Palestine highways, to snipe at Jewish food-supply convoys.

The British Government bluntly told the UN that it will not permit the UN Commission to enter Palestine until May 1, 2 weeks before the scheduled termination of the British mandate and the surrender of civil authority. It told the UN it will not legalize present Jewish defense forces or permit the formation of a Jewish militia, despite a recommendation of the UN Commission that such a militia be organized.

When I read Bevin's speech about his Arab friends—the feudal lords of the Middle East—coupled with the day's stories of new bloodshed, I thought of the persecuted people I had seen building a new life in Palestine, and I shuddered to think that this man should ever speak, as he has so often done, in the name of western civilization.

Britain and the Arab states are waging civil war against the United Nations. They will succeed unless the United States speaks out forcefully and at once to give the UN courage.

When it was a question of bringing the Iranian problem before the UN, the United States didn't hesitate to act at once. When it was a question of furnishing arms to Greece and Turkey, the United States did not hesitate to act unilaterally. Of course, when it was a question of supporting the legitimate government in Spain with arms in 1936, the United States had refused to act. Is history to record that the United States acts in most instances to support feudalistic and vested interests?

Almost 2 years ago, on Army Day 1946, President Truman declared that, "No country, great or small, has legitimate interests in the Near and Middle East which cannot be reconciled with the interests of other nations through the United Nations. The United Nations has a right to insist that the sovereignty and integrity of the countries of the Near and Middle East must not be threatened by coercion or penetration."

Yet Truman ignored the UN in the case of aid to Turkey and is ignoring it today. American actions and inaction make us as responsible as the British for continued bloodshed in the Holy Land.

We are undercutting the whole peace-making power of the UN.

The United States, having cast the decisive vote for partition, must put its strength behind that decision. We must let the British know at once that they will receive no more money from the United States until they carry out the UN decision with regard to Palestine. We must insist that the British stop furnishing arms to the Arabs anywhere in the Middle East. I would like to see UN action to stop all shipments of arms to any nation anywhere in the world, but I condemn a system that prevents shipments to Jews and encourages shipments to Arabs.

The Arabs and the oil resources of their lands must not be pawns in a cold or hot Anglo-American war against Russia. The move to sabotage the UN decision for a Jewish state, to keep the Moslem peoples submissive, and to placate the kings and emirs and effendi is an outrage.

I have listened to and read a lot of propaganda, much of it no doubt British-inspired, to the effect that the Jews in Palestine are Communists or that recent immigration has been largely communistic. I am convinced that this is another utterly false "Red menace" manufactured with the hope of justifying murder.

The Jews of Palestine are not Communists. The economy of Palestine is mere genuinely a mixed economy than can be found in any country in the world. There is plenty of room for the free enterprise of the businessman and the individual farmer. Many of the recent immigrants have come from eastern Europe because they did not want to live in Communist lands, and they find a different spirit in the kibbutzim than in the Russian kolkhozes. The attempt to use the Red paintbrush to smear the Palestine picture is nothing short of criminal.

The strife in Palestine is a reflection of a foreign policy—our foreign policy—which is negative and defensive. The elements for peace exist in Palestine as they do throughout the world. There are people, masses of good people, Jews and Arabs, with common needs, destined to be neighbors, who can be helped to build new, useful and abundant lives if we will think positively and act forthrightly, without delay.

In addition to using its influence to stop the British government's sabotage of the UN decision, the United States must call on the Security Council to order the establishment of a Jewish defense militia, responsible to the UN commission for maintaining order in the Jewish state until an international constabulary can be provided. We must demand security council action to halt the shipment of arms to the Arab league states which are waging war against the United Nations. We must request the Security Council to urge immediate compliance by the British government with the General Assembly's recommendation to evacuate a port in Palestine for the reception of Jewish immigrants.

We have the power to stop violent deaths in the Holy Land. We must use it.

Labor and Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, decades hence students of labor relations digging into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of 1947 for subject material on which to write the labor history of our time will find many yellowed pages filled with charges and counter-charges as to what had transpired during the immediate past that resulted in the passage of legislation adverse to the cause of labor. They will find many unsupported statements but little factual material.

In order to supply some of that lacking factual material, I ask unanimous consent to include in these remarks an editorial published in the Richmond (Calif.) Independent on Saturday, January 17, 1948, that is entitled "Good Going."

This editorial is based on the results of a survey conducted by the Contra Costa County Development Association and released that week. The survey was among the leading industrial plants of Contra Costa County and covered a 7-year period from 1940 through 1947 as to the number of man-days of labor lost due to strikes.

The results of this survey are interesting and have earned their place in the history of Contra Costa County. Now Contra Costa County is one of the most rapidly growing counties in California and is predominantly industrial. It was in Richmond, Calif., the largest city in Contra Costa County, that records for shipbuilding during World War II were set. Here were located the largest shipyards of that master of production, Henry J. Kaiser.

Contra Costa County is a pleasant place to live. Its people are friendly, intelligent, tolerant, and understanding; and perhaps this is the secret of the fine labor relations that exist in this county.

Here labor and management have demonstrated that they can get along together and that they are interdependent.

I am, indeed, proud to represent a district in California of which Contra Costa County with its close to 300,000 people is a part.

I am proud of this record and I think the Contra Costa County Development Association supported by the county and the industrialists of the community is to be congratulated for making known the results of a factual survey that discloses that during the period 1940 through 1947 there were 10,167 days of work lost due to strikes out of a total of 42,538,893 man-days of work. This means about 1 day out of 425 was lost due to work stoppages arising out of labor-management disputes.

The editorial reads:

GOOD GOING

This week the Contra Costa County Development Association released results of a survey conducted among the leading industrial plants of the county and found that during a 7-year period only 10,167 man-days of work were lost due to strikes.

This is nothing short of miraculous in view of the fact that there were 42,538,893 man-days worked during the same period, 1940 through 1947.

The figures emphasize what has long been a contention of labor and management leaders in the county, that Contra Costa County labor-management relations are the best in the Nation.

Contra Costa County is predominately industrial. Its lifeblood is closely interwoven into huge oil refineries, the world's largest sugar refinery, powder plants, pottery plants, and other types of heavy industry. Normally, it would be considered the ideal breeding ground for industrial dispute.

The fact that there is such a low ratio of man-days lost because of strikes is a tribute to labor and management. They know how to get along. They see the other fellow's point of view and adjust their thinking and actions along those lines.

It is also a near miracle when one considers the fact that on the whole, labor and skilled crafts in the county are better paid, or as well paid, as employees in other sections of the State. In several categories the working man in Contra Costa County earns more on an hourly basis than in any other section of the State.

All of this contributes to well being for the worker, a full day's output for the employer, and a higher than usual standard of living.

Contra Costa County, second leading industrial county in the State and topped only by Los Angeles in the value of its products, might easily have been the scene of spirited, protracted, and costly labor disputes. But it was not, and down through the years the record shows that peaceful relations between employer and employee have been the rule rather than the exception.

There have been some disputes and there have been some work stoppages. But they have been quickly settled as the result of the sane thinking and action of the leaders involved.

Labor and management in Contra Costa County have demonstrated that they can get along, and that both sides can profit.

Many other areas in the State and the Nation would do well to emulate the Contra Costa County method of doing things.

Abraham Lincoln—1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article, Abraham Lincoln—1948, written by Carlos W. Huntington, which appeared in the Portland Homebildor under date of February 14, 1948:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN—1948

Rail-splitter, clerk, postmaster, lawyer, member of the Illinois Legislature, Member of Congress, President, Abraham Lincoln was born in Kentucky, February 12, 1809, a staunch advocate of economy and efficiency in government and national unity.

What would he see in his America of today?

A national debt of unprecedented proportions, $256,000,000,000, almost $2,000 for every man, woman, and child, the highest tax rate in history; industry harassed by regimentation; bureaucracy and waste keynoting governmental operations; scare propaganda to aid in the imposing of a philosophy of scarcity, of governmental support from the cradle to the grave, of dependency on Government for shelter, food, medicines, and security rather than individual effort and initiative; price-support subsidies, governmental meddling in every phase of our lives, centralization of power in Washington and a breakdown of individual responsibility. He would also see a segment of our population espousing and abetting foreign ideologies that have as their goal a totalitarian government under the ultimate domination of Moscow; he would find do-gooders whose ambition is to give away our substance, both at home and abroad, they, of course, to be the mediums through whom the largesse is channeled, in order that they may reap the plaudits of the recipients, build up their power and control over the rest of our people and economy.

He would see Navajo Indians starving on their reservation while trainloads of food go to our former enemies across the water, he would see other Americans dependent upon charity for which "drives" are conducted, one after the other, to provide funds, while our Government sends billions overseas. He would see our people shivering while coal and oil are exported to other lands. He would see hundreds of unnecessary Government bureaus staffed with hundreds of thousands of employees burdening the taxpayers and he would find inefficiency and waste rampant in all branches of governmental activity.

On the brighter side he would find an awakened national realization of the necessity of tax reduction, a greater efficiency in the Federal Government, greater economies in operation and less restrictions upon free enterprise. He would find industry at an all-time high, despite governmental handicaps, increasing production, a determination to make the American system succeed and an optimistic view of the future.

Yes, Lincoln would find that, despite all obstacles, America is still America, where government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

CARLOS W. HUNTINGTON.

Republican Speakers Eulogize Abraham Lincoln on His One Hundred and Thirty-ninth Birthday Anniversary; They Applaud National Rededication to Principles of Freedom and Equal Opportunity Advocated and Practiced by the Great Emancipator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to authorization of the House of Representatives, I am presenting herewith for the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an inspiring radio broadcast commemorating the one hundred and thirty-ninth birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln.

The addresses, citing everlasting accomplishments, precepts, and admonitions of the immortal Lincoln for application to problems currently confronting our Nation, were presented under auspices of the Republican National Committee over facilities of the American Broadcasting Co., February 12, 1948, Hon. Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee, speaking from Indianapolis, Ind., presided.

Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, Speaker of the House of Representatives, spoke from New York; Hon. Kenneth S. Wherry, United States Senator from Nebraska, spoke from Huntington, W. Va.; Hon. Dwight H. Green, Governor of Illinois, spoke from the executive mansion at Springfield, Ill.; and

Clare Booth Luce, former Republican Member of the Congress from Connecticut, participated in the broadcast from San Bernardino, Calif.

All cited Lincoln's way—the way of national unity in support of liberty and justice and equal rights and opportunities for all races, creeds, and colors—as the eternal American way and conqueror of alien ideologies that would make our Government master instead of servant of the people.

To these views, I am sure all patriotic Americans wholeheartedly subscribe. I thank the House of Representatives for this opportunity to have this Lincoln Day broadcast made a part of the permanent record of the Eightieth Congress.

Full text of the broadcast, beginning with the radio announcer's opening remarks, follows:

ANNOUNCER. Tonight the American Broadcasting Co. presents in the public interest a special tribute to Lincoln. The program is arranged and presented by the Republican National Committee. The next 30 minutes ABC microphone will take you to Springfield, Ill.; New York City; Huntington, W. Va.; San Bernardino, Calif.; and Indianapolis, Ind.

The chairman of the program will be Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee, who will introduce four other speakers in this Lincoln anniversary celebration. And now we take you to Carroll Reece in Indianapolis.

Chairman REECE. This is a year of decision for the American people. This year the people will decide whether to go forward as a free and powerful Nation, guided by the principles of Abraham Lincoln, or whether we will continue along the perilous course of the past 15 years. The Republican National Committee tonight is happy to be able to present to you some of the outstanding members of our party, persons who have rendered great service both to the party and to the Nation, both in public and in private life.

Eighty-eight years ago, in a time of crisis, this Republic turned to Abraham Lincoln and the Republican Party for guidance and protection. The result was the preservation of the representative Republic bequeathed to us by the founders of this Nation, and during the years which have passed since those dark days, so long as we have followed the precepts and the principles of Lincoln, we have grown in wealth and power. When we have turned from those precepts, as, unfortunately, we have on a few occasions, we have become involved in difficulties and controversies, both foreign and domestic.

There is little need to point out that we are involved in such difficulties today—after nearly 16 years under an administration which has sought to subvert or destroy the things for which Lincoln fought and for which he died.

It is said that history repeats itself and the situation in which we find ourselves today convinces me that such is the case, because basically the problem which we must solve today is the same one which confronted Lincoln—the problem of maintaining freedom and independence and integrity in a world in which powerful forces are arrayed on behalf of tyranny and disunion. The stage is larger today, the actors are different, but the basic principles involved are the same.

Lincoln had his roots in the great Middle West. Born in Kentucky he moved to Indiana in his youth, but most of his life before he was called to Washington, was spent in the great State of Illinois. I am speaking to you tonight from the capital of one of the States in which Lincoln lived, and now for a continuation of our program we take you to Springfield, Ill., to hear a great Republican and a great Governor of that State, the Honorable Dwight H. Green.

Governor GREEN. Thank you, Carroll Reece.

Four score and seven years ago yesterday, February 11, 1861, Abraham Lincoln left Springfield on a special train which carried him to Washington—to the Presidency, to death by assassination, and to eternal fame. From its platform he bade a tearful and prayerful farewell to his Springfield neighbors.

Springfield still feels the living force of Abraham Lincoln. I speak to you from the 90-year-old Executive Mansion. When it was new Lincoln was a frequent visitor here. Through the miracle of the radio, and the wise arrangements of the national committee, I am able to join with my fellow Republicans in their homes throughout America in this celebration of his birthday.

All Americans are united today in homage to the simple man from Illinois who made liberty more real for countless millions of men and women of every color, creed, and condition in life. Yet properly and inevitably he remains the patron saint of the party which gave him to the Nation and which he, in turn, made a dominant factor in America from 1860 to this day.

Properly in this campaign year when we believe that the preservation of the fundamental freedoms of America again depends on Republican victory, we scan the Lincoln record for counsel and inspiration to apply to our present task. The lesson I find in that record is this. The Republicans won in 1860 because they had a candidate who understood the American people and who stood uncompromisingly for what he believed to be just and right; and because the party conducted that campaign as a great moral crusade. I believe that that is the only formula which will achieve Republican victory in 1948.

In short, what our country and our party need today is Republicans who will work and live by the philosophy and the faith of Abraham Lincoln. Indeed, the whole world needs that faith and that philosophy.

This morning I participated in ceremonies as another special train left Springfield. It is the Lincoln friendship train, sponsored by church organizations throughout America. After joining other sections from other States, the train will deliver at the seaboard a cargo of food to be sent to starving men and women in Europe.

How wonderful it would be if that train could carry also faith and hope to the starving souls of the world. The train cannot do that, but the American Nation can send them. We can do that by scrapping the Morgenthau plan of vengeance and hate and replacing it with a Lincoln plan of justice and mercy for conquered Germany. We can repudiate the shameful compromises by which Presidents Roosevelt and Truman consented at Yalta and Potsdam to programs of mass slavery, mass exile, and mass oppression.

Our own experience should teach us that peace and prosperity must be founded on liberty, justice, and tolerance. Without liberty there is no peace but the submission enforced by the oppressors; no prosperity except for the exploiters of the oppressed. I am convinced that unless America is prepared to oppose a world half-slave and half-free, to stand for a Lincoln plan of justice and mercy, and to support it with firmness in the right, all the billions we may spend under the Marshall plan will be wasted. Similarly, the perplexing domestic problems which confront us will be solved not by new experiments in regimentation and socialism, but by a return to Lincoln's zeal for hard work and production, his faith in our system of free enterprise, his conviction that capital and labor in mutual respect can achieve a fuller and richer life for all.

Let us here rededicate ourselves to the goal for which Lincoln lived and died—a strong and free America.

Now to Indianapolis and Chairman Reece.

Chairman REECE. The next speaker on our program is one of the outstanding women of America. She has distinguished herself in the fields of literature, the theater, and public service. We go now to San Bernardino, Calif., to hear the former Congresswoman from Connecticut, the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce.

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE. It is over 80 years ago that Abraham Lincoln was slain. He was slain by a bigot who hated him because he had used his great mind and will "To give this Nation, under God, a new birth of freedom." So ever since we have rightly called him a martyr to liberty.

Liberty, do we have any clear idea what we mean by liberty? Don't we mean this: That a man has liberty when he is free to choose according to his own lights—between what seems good to him and what seems evil?

The idea that man is born with the right to choose freely is something called "the doctrine of natural rights." This doctrine is set forth in the Constitution and Declaration of Independence. It holds that each and every one of us—regardless of color, creed, or birth—holds these natural rights inalienable. And, as Abraham Lincoln knew so well, they are inalienable for one reason only: because they are the endowment of the Creator.

So God has endowed a man, at birth, with a free will, which can never be taken from him. But he can be stopped from exercising his free will in making choices. His free choices can be interfered with, or prohibited by other men. Bureaucrats and demagogues can cut them down by using legal stealth. They can pass laws which little by little will whittle away at his liberties. In the end he may not be able to call his house or business or savings or even his wages his own. His opportunities may be reduced to the point where he can't earn a living and must either starve or become a creature of a political boss or party. He may be handed over to be the victim of a powerful economic pressure group. If he is also a member of a weak minority, he will then become a slave in everything but name. He will have lost, as we say, all his civil liberties.

The American people enjoy a larger measure of civil liberties than any other people in the world. They do so, because they still have a representative form of government. They have voted themselves into these liberties.

But by no means do all our people enjoy all the civil liberties to which they are entitled—not only as children of God—but as ordinary United States of America citizens. I am speaking of the Negroes and the other racial minority groups.

The reason for this again is that we are a representative form of government. And our Government isn't perfect because we, the people, are the Government, and we aren't perfect by a long shot. So there are imperfect—that is to say, prejudiced and selfish people in our Government. Most of them got put there by selfish or indifferent voters, who urge their representatives to increase their own freedom of choice while denying it to minorities. The problem of government is simple to state, even if it isn't easy to solve: It is to increase the area of freedom of choice for the greatest number of people, while safeguarding all the liberties of the past that have proved fruitful and useful to our Nation.

Now it is just a plain ordinary everyday common-knowledge fact that the southern Democrats in our Congress do not want to increase the area of freedom for our Negroes and minority groups. There are a lot of things wrong with the Republican Party—just as there are a lot more things wrong with the Democrat Party. And you, exercising your freedom of choice, can do your own toting up of the score, come the next election.

But this is a matter of record: All the great initial advances made in our civil rights were made by Republicans. They freed the slaves. They passed the thirteenth amendment which prohibited slavery here forever. They put through the fourteenth amendment. That one protects us against having our life or property taken from us without due process of law. They brought about the fifteenth amendment. That keeps any citizen from being denied his right to vote by reason of his race, color, or previous condition of servitude. If you don't believe what a joke the Democrats in our House and Senate try to make of these amendments every chance they get—you should have sat, as I did, for 4 years in Congress. The tragedy was, they succeeded. And why not? They were in power.

They have been in power for 16 years.

Just now Mr. Truman is making quite a to-do about civil liberties. He named a committee to give us a report on civil rights. Here's something from that report:

"The most striking mass interference (it said) since slavery with the right of physical freedom was the evacuation of persons of Japanese descent from the west coast during the past war. The evacuation of 110,000 men, women, and children—two-thirds of whom were United States citizens—was made without a trial or hearing of any sort at a time when the courts were functioning."

"The most striking interference since slavery with physical freedom." Yes, that is what Mr. Truman is saying now about what Mr. Roosevelt did. But the funny part of the thing is that Mr. Truman was in the United States Senate at the time Mr. Roosevelt did it.

He was a big, important, Democratic Senator. And the sad thing is nobody heard Mr. Truman saying anything then against this interference with freedom.

No, human liberty isn't the thing the Democrat Party cares most about like Abraham Lincoln did. But maybe you do. Maybe you'd like to see the poll-tax abolished, and an antilynching bill passed. Maybe you'd like to see minorities in this country get a little better break? Well then, I expect you'll have to go for the party of Abraham Lincoln.

Now to Indianapolis, and Chairman Reece.

Chairman REECE. The period immediately following the War Between the States was one marked by the tremendous development of the territory which now includes the Western States. As a result of that development, made possible largely by the achievements of Lincoln, many new States were admitted to the Union, and among the first of those was the State of Nebraska. Nebraska has supplied many notable leaders of the Republican Party and of the Nation. One whom I am going to present tonight is now the acting majority leader of the United States Senate. Like most good Republicans, he too has been making a Lincoln Day speech tonight and he is in Huntington, W. Va. I now present the Honorable KENNETH S. WHERRY, United States Senator from Nebraska.

Senator WHERRY. Thank you, Carroll Reece.

My fellow Americans, throughout the land Abraham Lincoln has been honored today, in thousands of homes, in schoolrooms, and patriotic programs. Tonight at hundreds of meetings he has been paid the highest tributes. May I, as a Member of Congress, the Congress in which Abraham Lincoln once served, submit this thought to you?

As in Lincoln's time, so now, we need a united America. And America needs a leader in the White House who will stand four-square on the principles championed and accomplished by the immortal Lincoln. He was unmoved by the storms of controversy which raged about him because his soul was rooted in the finest traditions of liberty and faith in his fellow men, a faith in God, and an abiding confidence that only right is might.

For 15 years the strategy of New Deal administrations has been to divide and control, to pit one minority group against another, to incite conflict between capital and labor, and to reduce our country to a nation of contending classes. But Lincoln gave his full measure of devotion to save the Union, to bind its wounds, and to unite all people.

So the issue is, Shall there be a fifth term of New Dealism in the White House?

That is what President Truman and his radical advisers are conspiring to achieve. The master planners who are advising him have taken possession of the Democratic Party. They have nothing in common with the Jeffersonian Democrats or those of us who believe in the principles of Abraham Lincoln.

The American people will not stand for a fifth term of New Dealism. Next November they will elect a Republican President who will cooperate with a Republican Congress to unite our people. Then our country will move forward to complete the job so well advanced by the present Republican Congress.

In his time Lincoln emancipated the slaves. In our time the Republican Congress emancipated the workers. Lincoln advocated and believed in American free enterprise. President Truman has lost faith in our competitive system. He constantly appeals to the Congress for power and more power to control and regulate the lives of our people. The solid fact is President Truman has been wrong on the economic situation from the day hostilities in the war ended up to this very moment. He anticipated and geared his actions for 10,000,000 unemployed. He was wrong by 10,000,000. Last October the President said price control and rationing were police state methods. Two weeks later he asked Congress to give him power to establish a more colossal OPA than we had during the war.

He fanned the flames of inflation by almost daily predictions that prices were going higher and higher and higher.

The President has insisted that huge exports of grain and meats have had little or no effect upon our domestic prices. But Secretary of Agriculture Anderson testified that exports have had a terrific effect. Who was right and who was wrong?

Even as commodity prices began breaking last week the President was insisting again to newsmen at the White House that the Congress must vote him police state power to impose price controls. The same confusion and drift prevails in the administration's foreign policy. Twenty billion dollars has been spent in Europe since hostilities ended. Fundamental problems remain unsolved, the answers to which may have far-reaching consequences, because of the President's mistakes and delays. We are still searching for a lasting peace.

The administration tried to impose the Morgenthau plan upon Germany. It failed. And it was the Republican Party that forced abandonment of that stupid and costly policy. The people sense the Ship of State has lost its rudder and the captain does not know what course he follows.

As Abraham Lincoln spoke of another President:

"The President is in no wise satisfied with his own position. First he takes up one, and in attempting to argue us into it he argues himself out of it, then seizes another and goes through the same process, and then, confused at being able to think of nothing new, he snatches up the old again, which he has sometime before cast off. * * *

"He is a bewildered, confounded, and miserably perplexed man."

This kind of leadership the American people will no longer tolerate. The signs are unmistakably clear. There is an insistent yearning call for a leadership that will stand unflinchingly for the eternal truths lived by the great Lincoln.

Let us, all of us, all Americans, rededicate ourselves tonight to his precepts and principles, so that our beloved country, with God's help, again may enjoy the blessings of freedom and opportunity.

And now back to Carroll Reece, our national chairman, in Indianapolis.

Chairman REECE. When Lincoln was struggling to maintain the Union, one of the areas from which he drew most effective and loyal support was New England. Our next speaker on the program is a product of that area. He is a man who holds today the second highest official position in our Federal Government.

Tonight, he has been a speaker at the great Lincoln Day dinner in New York City. He will speak to you from there. I now present the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Speaker MARTIN. Tonight, the fate of civilization hangs in the balance. Everywhere in the world men, women, and little children, terrorized by the flames of war which have swept their homes away and which have left them miserable, hungry, confused and fearful turn their eyes to the United States and cry "Help us lest we perish." In that bygone day of Lincoln in our own Nation, the fate of the Union hung in the balance. Dark clouds of trouble hovered low over our own fair land. Today throughout the whole world including our own country, dark clouds of danger and threats of disaster hang low and everyone is afraid.

We in our generation must save civilization, even as Lincoln, in his generation, saved the Union. Little did the men and women of his day know the Union he preserved would become the hub upon which the fate of the whole world would turn. But so it has become. The people of the North, the South, the East, the West, patriotic Americans all, stand shoulder to shoulder in the struggle to make sure civilization shall have a new birth of freedom, and that free government and human progress onward and upward shall not perish from the earth.

In that struggle, we must go forward with Lincoln's unfaltering faith in God, and his deep trust in the people.

We must keep our own Government of the people safe, sound, strong, and solvent. This must be done for the sake of all those who love liberty everywhere in the world. Their great strength and hope lie in America. Their inspiration, too, is in Lincoln's wonderful example of faith, determination, and fortitude.

If our own Nation loses its free way under our American system, if liberty withers in Lincoln's America, the beacon of hope for all the rest of the world will become dim and flicker out; the torch by which the footsteps of mankind are being lighted onward and upward will lose its flame and men will become lost in the darkness of despotism and ignorance.

As we see freedom faltering in so many lands, we must give the world the great example of making liberty a practical chart of life in these United States. It would be unthinkable that the lives which have been offered up by men in their last great sacrifice upon the alter of their country should have been given in vain. It is unthinkable that the privations which our forebears have endured should come to naught. We in this Nation shall not meanly lose our liberties and allow the great handiwork of the founding fathers to fall in failure. We shall be true to Lincoln's faith in us. We shall be true to our faith in Omnipotent Providence. We shall be true to our faith and confidence

in curselves. We shall not permit political greed for power or wanton extravagance in government, reckless waste, or conniving schemes to defeat our great aim to maintain our own liberty under our American way, and to help lead the other peoples of the planet back to sanity and peace.

As a Nation we say to the world, in Lincoln's words:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in. * * *"

God bless Lincoln; God bless America.

I now return you to Indianapolis, and Chairman Reece.

Chairman REECE. On our program tonight four great Republicans, and four great Americans have addressed you from widely separated cities in the United States. They have sought to bring you the message of the Republican Party; the message, which I hope will assist you in making the right decision in this year of destiny. We believe that the destiny of this great Nation, and indeed the destiny of the world itself, depends upon adherence to the principles which have made this Nation great and which will make it even greater unless they are disregarded.

This is more than a Presidential election year. It is the year in which the American people have what may well be their last chance to make a free decision as to the future of our Nation. All of us, Republicans, Democrats, and those of no political affiliation, are in the same boat. If we go on the rocks, we will all sink together.

The Republican Party enters the Presidential campaign this year animated by a determination to save our way of life and our form of government, and a conviction that this can be accomplished only by the election of a Republican President who will be guided by the principles of Abraham Lincoln—the principles which saved this Nation once before and will save it again.

We appeal to all Americans to join us in this great endeavor. Let us not forget the admonition of Lincoln here in Indianapolis on February 11, 1861, while he was on his way to Washington to assume the Presidency. He said:

'I appeal to you to constantly bear in mind that not with politicians, not with Presidents, not with office seekers, but with you is the question: Shall the Union, and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generation?'

ANNOUNCER. During the past 30 minutes you have heard five leaders of the Republican Party in tribute to Abraham Lincoln. The chairman of the program was the Honorable Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee, who spoke from Indianapolis. The Honorable Dwight H. Green, Governor of Illinois, was heard from Springfield, Ill. The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Speaker of the House of Representatives, spoke from New York City. Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, acting majority leader of the United States Senate, was heard from Huntington, W. Va., and former Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce was heard from San Bernardino, Calif. This program was presented in the public interest. This is the American Broadcasting Co.

Ohio Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, many Ohio veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of Ohio. I am, therefore, pleased to present, for their information, an outline of such laws, as compiled by my good friend, Albert L. Daniels, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 111 Wyandotte Building, Columbus 15, Ohio, who will be happy to furnish more specific information on any such State law.

Mr. Daniels, incidentally, has been a member of the Ohio Legislature for 12 years, the last 8 of which have been spent in the State senate, and, at the present time is chairman of the senate committee on finance. He is an outstanding leader of the legislature, particularly on veteran questions.

Mr. Albert Croy is department commander. He is publisher and editor of two newspapers in Van Wert County, the Ohio City Progress at Ohio City and the Radar at Convoy. As a World War I veteran myself, I have been interested in the DAV for years, even though I was not wounded or disabled, because of their fine service in behalf of comrades who were less fortunate than I. The DAV is definitely in good hands in Ohio with an excellent history of constructive accomplishments on behalf of war disabled veterans and their dependents during the past 15 years.

This résumé of Ohio laws, affecting veterans, their dependents, and organizations, is as follows:

BONUS

A bonus is being paid to every honorably discharged veteran of World War II who served on active duty in the armed forces between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, both dates inclusive, and who, at the time of commencing such service, had been a resident of the State for at least 1 year and who served at least 90 days or who is still in such service. Amount—$10 for each month of domestic service and $15 for each month of foreign service with a maximum of $400. Survivors of eligible persons also have entitlement.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A maximum county allowance of $100 is provided for the burial of indigent veterans, their mothers, wives, or widows. Burial may not be in a potter's field. Privilege is granted for removal and reinterment of bodies in soldiers' plot.

Counties, townships, and municipalities may purchase and maintain burial plots for burial of deceased veterans.

Cemetery associations have been granted certain powers.

The county recorder is the custodian of records concerning the location of veterans' graves and upon request from a veterans' organization 30 days prior to Memorial Day, shall furnish such organization with a list of all veterans buried within the county.

It is the duty of the adjutant general to preserve a record of place of burial of veterans.

Cemeteries may not prohibit the erection of a headstone provided by the United States or by the State of Ohio for veterans' graves.

The county is required to furnish, on petition, markers for veterans' graves for the purpose of designating such graves for memorial purposes.

The county shall apply to the United States for a suitable headstone for the grave of a deceased veteran and have same set in place.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments and the administration of oaths.

Disability of minority is waived for a veteran or spouse to contract under the GI bill of rights.

Protection is granted to persons in the armed forces in case of civil actions arising during period of military service.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

Provisions for voting by inmates of soldiers' homes have been made.

CLAIMS—ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS—SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Representatives of recognized veterans' organizations are appointed as commissioners with power and authority to administer oaths and take acknowledgments in connection with instruments to be used in prosecuting claims before the Veterans' Administration.

The State commissioner of soldiers' claims administers oaths without charge.

Free copies of public records are provided for wards of the United States Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

County recorders issue, without charge, a certified copy or certified photostatic copy of discharge papers.

The Veterans' Administration or other United States Government agency may obtain from the director of health, without expense to the State, transcripts of, or information from, birth, stillbirth, and death certificates without payment of any fee.

It is the duty of the State commissioner of soldiers' claims to assist veterans, their heirs, or representatives with their claims against the United States.

The soldiers' relief commission in each county is empowered to employ a county veterans' service officer to advise and assist veterans, their wives, widows, children, parents, and dependents.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS—QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Training in the armed forces is accepted as active practice required of applicants for registration as professional engineer.

Tuition benefits are extended to veterans.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

At least 7 of the 11 members of the board of trustees of town, municipal, or county memorials to veterans shall be veterans. Preference shall be given to veterans in employment on the construction and maintenance of such memorial buildings.

Members of the school retirement system in the armed forces are considered as on an indefinite leave of absence if they return within 2 years after discharge, with all rights preserved.

Members of the soldiers' relief commission and service officers appointed by the commission in each county must be veterans.

Period of service with the armed forces is not counted in determining eligibility for appointment to position in the police or fire departments recreated within 3 years after its abolition.

Preference is given to veterans in employment as caretakers of county or township memorial buildings.

Preference is given to veterans under civil service in State and local units as to examination and appointment.

Preference is given to veterans, their wives, widows, and children in employment by the soldiers' relief commission, as investigators.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Employment Insurance Act.

Retirement rights of public employees, teachers, and school employees in military service are preserved.

Full credit is extended to police and firemen's relief and pension funds for time spent in the armed forces of those honorably discharged on or before September 30, 1948, and who shall have made application for reinstatement in their department within 90 days after discharge.

Classified State employees may be reinstated after termination of military service in World War II with preservation of civil-service rating.

Representatives of congressionally chartered veterans' organizations recognized by the Veterans' Administration may be appointed as State veterans' commissioners.

Retirement is provided under the State employees' retirement system (also public school or teachers' retirement system) where the cause of disability was the result of military service.

Unemployment compensation provisions are extended for those entering the armed forces.

GUARDIANSHIP

The superintendent of the Ohio Soldiers' and Sailors' Home is the guardian of the estate of all minors admitted to the home.

A uniform veterans' guardianship act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Veterans, their wives, widows, and mothers may be admitted to the Madison Home.

Veterans may be admitted to the Ohio Soldiers' and Sailors' Home.

Orphans of veterans may be admitted to the Ohio Soldiers' and Sailors' Orphans' Home at Xenia.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Counties, etc., are authorized to purchase land in cooperation with the United States public-works projects for building veterans' hospitals.

MARRIAGE

All marriages of soldiers performed in the State from the beginning of World War I up until February 28, 1919, under marriage licenses issued by their commanding officers or other military authority, have been declared valid and binding. Such marriages shall be recorded by the probate judge on payment of a fee of 50 cents.

For good cause a probate judge may waive the 5- to 30-day waiting period before issuing a marriage license.

Regardless of the requirement that marriage license be obtained in the county where the female resides, the probate judge of any county must issue the license to any soldier or sailor stationed in his county and to the prospective bride of any such soldier or sailor.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

Badges of honor have been provided for veterans who had service on the Mexican border, Spanish-American War, and World War I.

Provision has been made for a special State roll of honor to accord recognition to officers and enlisted men who received awards for gallantry.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIALS, ETC.

A memorial forest has been established in Hanover Township, Ashland County, in commemoration of those citizens who lost their lives in World War II. The Ohio Federation of Women's Clubs is erecting a memorial shrine building.

Suitable markers have been erected on all State and Federal highways at points crossed by Morgan's raiders in 1863.

The Greene Ville Treaty Memorial Park has been established at Greenville as a State memorial under the State Archaeological and Historical Society. A $20,000 canvas painting of the event hangs in the rotunda of the State capitol in Columbus.

The taxing authority of any township, municipality, or county may declare additional taxes necessary for the building of memorials to commemorate the services of all members and veterans of the armed forces.

To honor three of Ohio's famous fighting divisions, State Route No. 3 has been designated Thirty-seventh Division Memorial Highway; State Route No. 42 has been designated Forty-second "Rainbow" Division Memorial Highway; United States Highway No. 21 has been designated Eighty-third Division Memorial Highway.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Annual appropriations made by county, city, or town for Memorial Day observance are expended through veterans' organizations.

County commissioners provide Memorial Day markers for veterans' graves upon petition of any Memorial Day association or veterans' organization and pay the expense of placing such markers.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

The 700 extra copies of the Official Ohio Roster of the Soldiers of the American Revolution have been transferred to the Ohio Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

A war history commission has been established with biennial appropriations.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks, building and loan associations, and domestic life-insurance companies may make loans to qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

A postwar program commission has been established to study restoration of World War II veterans to private industry.

The county soldiers' relief commission extends relief to needy veterans, their wives, widows, children, and parents.

The board of trustees of town, municipal, or county memorials coordinate and assemble within a county one-stop information or service centers where all governmental agencies for the benefit of veterans operate. The centers are located in the memorials.

Where the proceeds of admissions are used for the benefit of needy veterans, such admissions are exempt from taxation.

TAX EXEMPTIONS, EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

No tax may be collected on admissions where the proceeds inure exclusively to benefit persons in the military or naval force, National Guard organizations, Reserve officers' associations or organizations, posts or organizations of war veterans, or auxiliary units or societies, provided no part of the net earnings go to a private stockholder or individual.

Residents of State institutions and military homes may fish without a license.

Persons in active military service are exempt from motor-vehicle license requirements during furlough and from examination after discharge.

A special license is issued for operation of a motor vehicle not to exceed 12 times a year for parade and exhibition purposes, with an annual fee of $2. Such licenses are issued only to the American Legion, VFW, and Forty and Eight.

Veterans are required to pay a nominal fee only for peddler's license.

A disabled or an unemployed veteran may do business as a vendor, as defined in the retail sales tax act, in more than one county under a single license.

Embalmer's or funeral director's license is renewed without cost during period of military or naval service.

Any trade or professional license is renewed without penalty or examination after discharge from the armed forces.

Monuments, monumental buildings, and funds set apart for building of monuments to veterans are exempt from property tax.

Real estate held or occupied by veterans' memorial associations, monumental building associations, etc., is exempt from property tax.

Time is extended for filing tax returns, reports, or information required by law to be furnished to the department of taxation of the State or to any county auditor of any county for members of the armed forces during World War II until 6 months after a discharge.

Funds raised and set apart for the purpose of building monuments to veterans of the State and monuments and memorial buildings are exempt from taxation.

The requirement that a club shall have been in existence for a period of 3 years in order to qualify for a D-4 liquor permit does not apply to units of organizations chartered by the Congress of the United States or a subsidiary unit of a national fraternal organization, provided, however, that the parent organization has been in existence for 3 years or more at the time of making application.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

State appropriations are made biennially to the following veterans' organizations: Grand Army of the Republic, United Spanish War Veterans, American Legion, Eighty-third Division of AEF Veterans' Association, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Ohio Rainbow Division, Thirty-seventh Division AEF Veterans' Association, Disabled American Veterans, American Legion Buckeye Boys' State, Army and Navy Union. The funds appropriated are used to render various types of service to veterans and their dependents.

Provision has been made for policies of group life insurance covering members of veterans' organizations.

The unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of certain veterans' organizations is punishable by a fine not to exceed $20 or imprisonment for not more than 30 days, or both.

County commissioners may permit use of county buildings by any society or association of soldiers, sailors, marines, and pioneers.

Certain counties may erect memorial structures with room suitable for a meeting place for the Grand Army of the Republic, Woman's Relief Corps, Sons of Union Veterans, or any other organization for the benefit of Civil War veterans or their descendants.

Certain veterans' organizations have rights with respect to the use of county memorial buildings.

Suitable rooms, including heat, light, and janitor service are provided in State armories for the following veterans' organizations unless a State, county, or municipal memorial has been provided: The Grand Army of the Republic, Woman's Relief Corps, Sons of Veterans, Sons of Veterans' Auxiliary, Daughters of Union Veterans, United Spanish War Veterans, United Spanish War Veterans' Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Union Veteran Legion, Army and Navy Union, American Legion, Disabled American Veterans.

The boards of trustees of town, municipal, or county memorials may provide, with or without cost, suitable county headquarters for nationally organized veterans' organizations chartered by Congress.

Township memorial buildings are to be open and free to and for the use of veterans and allied organizations as meeting places.

Counties, cities, and towns may make annual appropriations to veterans' organizations for Memorial Day observance.

Members of the Soldiers' Relief Commission and service officers and other employees appointed by the commission in each county must be veterans.

Members of veterans' organizations are exempt from prohibition as to wearing of uniforms.

Most of the above-mentioned laws have been enacted by the Ohio Legislature during the last 27 years through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veterans' organizations.

The people of the State of Ohio give evidence of their confidence in the service work of these veterans' organizations by making biennial appropriations to the DAV, as well as to the American Legion, VFW, USWV, etc.

Most of the 108 DAV chapters in the State, whose membership dues average about $5 annually, maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers.

In addition to such State-wide service, the DAV maintains 12 full-time national service officers, under the direction of Bernard Southard, at the Veterans' Administration regional office in Cincinnati, and four others, under the direction of John N. Nemeth, located at the Veterans' Administration regional office in Cleveland.

These DAV experts extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, tion, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmore particularly in the technical preparaernmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and factually eligible.

The DAV is primarily a one-purpose organization—to see to it that all war disabled veterans and their dependents receive their just entitlement to rights and benefits provided under many complicated laws, Federal and State.

To provide gainful employment for all such disabled veterans, the DAV has developed a Nation-wide man-job-matching method program.

During its more than 27 years of service activities, the Disabled American Veterans has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation, nationally and in each State.

Formed in 1920 and chartered by Congress in 1932, the DAV is composed solely of men and women who were wounded or disabled as a result of their service to the United States in time of war. My good friend, Gov. Thomas J. Herbert, is a life member of this organization.

National headquarters of the DAV is at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, under the direction of Vivian D. Corbly, national adjutant, together with Capt. Cicero F. Hogan, as assistant national adjutant.

Having specialized in the protection and promotion of the justifiable needs and welfare of America's disabled defenders, the DAV feels that it has been thereby rendering a great service to these veterans and to our country.

Address of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Before the National Republican Club's Lincoln Day Dinner in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have the privilege and honor of including, preceded by my brief introductory remarks, the very excellent and forceful address of the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., at the sixty-second annual Lincoln Day dinner of the National Republican Club in the grand ballroom of the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria in New York City last Thursday evening, February 12, 1948:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB

President Hoover and other unusually distinguished guests, members of the National Republican Club and their friends, and I have to thank our chairman of the evening for an all too generous introduction, the inspiration that comes from this gathering should in some measure compensate all those who have contributed to make it the magnificent occasion that it so obviously is.

To Dr. Wolfe for his erudite address, to Senator FERGUSON for his brilliant governmental discussion, our grateful thanks.

I bring, also, greetings to one and all from Governor Dewey, whose unprecedented administration has done so much for the people of our State of New York, which has consequently inured to the benefit of our Republican Party.

The Speaker of the House, the most powerful representative body in the world today, is by virtue of his office a dominating figure in our Government, made even more so by recently enacted legislation affecting Presidential succession. Yet, the present encumbent, by his forthright demeaner, his complete understanding of governmental processes, and his all-pervading kindly attitude and approachableness has so endeared himself to Representatives on both sides of the aisle that the influence of his personality goes far and beyond. No colleague of mine or his would be other than extremely proud to present, as I now do, Joe MARTIN.

ADDRESS OF SPEAKER MARTIN

Tonight as we are gathered here to honor the memory of one of the world's immortals, the martyred Abraham Lincoln, we in this hour of world confusion can feel something of the anxieties which weighed upon him. He was President when the fate of the Union was in the balance. We today must strive to have Lincoln's faith in providence and in the destiny of our country. We are again at the point of a fateful decision. Civilization must be saved. Our generation must save it.

We have just passed through a second world war to preserve liberty and perpetuate civilization everywhere. As the distinguished Michigan Senator, HOMER FERGUSON, has pointed out, we are now confronted with a desperate struggle to maintain liberty at home. We dare not assume freedom in our own Nation is assured. Eternal vigilance today, as always, is required.

Congress must maintain our free constitutional Government, free economy, and free society.

The administration whose party has been in power for 16 years is now demanding the greatest peacetime appropriations in our history; it demands a return to governmental controls, rationing, and price ceilings. What we need is more of the Spirit of '76, and less of the spirit of 76,000 bureaucratic regulations. To get that spirit we must have a Republican President and a Republican Congress. And that is what we will have next January.

Our freedom has been seriously whittled away in the last 15 years. The citizens' liberties have ceased to be secure. We are reaping the fruits of those reckless days of the New Deal. Bureaucrats still have the old scheme of operation which can be stated in two lines:

You make it; we take it;
You lend it; we spend it.

From the White House down, there is bitter resistance to efforts of the Congress to cut Government spending.

The $39,700,000,000 proposed expenditures for fiscal 1949 is more than four times the amount spent just before the war, in 1940. It is eight times the amount expended in 1933, when a New Deal President was first elected on a campaign promise to cut Government costs by 25 percent. Now they have the gall to tell us a $40,000,000,000 budget can't be cut a thin dime. But it is going to be cut, and this Republican Congress is going to do it.

Nobody in the administration seems to realize we cannot forever go on wildly spending more and more of the people's money laying an increasing burden of taxation upon them, and still keep the United States safe, sound, solvent, strong, and free.

Only a strong United States can possibly combat the threat of world communism.

The best we can do to achieve that is to help the other nations to help themselves. The Communists are at work to stop effective aid to Europe. They want to produce the confusion and chaos which will enable them to take over the governments, enslave the people, and rule. They conspire to destroy our American system.

We spilled rivers of blood and gave torrents of goods, machines, and services to fight for freedom abroad. We Republicans mean to keep freedom at home; we are making that fight now. We know we can count on the people's support.

Our domestic economy shall not be tilted off balance by excessive taxes nor forced into ruin by inflation. Our Nation can be kept strong, sound, solvent, and free. It cannot be done by giving the administration new powers of rationing, regulation, and coercion over the lives of our citizens. No man ever set himself free by putting on handcuffs. We became a great nation by following the highway of freedom. We are going to remain a great nation by staying on that highway.

The veterans of the wars and all the other young people want their chance to get ahead. They deserve that chance. They are going to get it.

We are confronted in this country by three fundamental conditions; any one of them could prove our ruin. None of them need prove our ruin if we will exercise common sense and good judgment.

I want to discuss those conditions.

The administration has squirmed and wiggledin every possible way to evade responsibility for inflation. The fact remains the seeds of high prices and inflation were planted by New Deal deficit spending. The currency was inflated by billions of dollars. Bank portfolios were inflated by more billions of Treasury paper. Still more billions were sold, after the war began, to the people in bonds. War activities were inflationary. The greater part of everything produced was destroyed in war. Wages and salaries remained at home. A great backlog of demand and purchasing power piled up. When those two forces operated in the markets, prices went up.

Then came this world-wide demand for aid to other peoples. Drafts on our production for that program constitute a further inflationary force. Goods, machines, and services are again going overseas, and the wages and salaries stay at home. The answer to high prices is production and more production—on the farm, in the field, in the factory, and in the mill. We must get that additional production, with lower prices and improved quality, without reducing wages or increasing working hours. Then, every man, woman, and child in the United States will actually realize an increase in real income. That production can come only through patriotic cooperation between labor, agriculture, management—every citizen who loves America and liberty.

To obtain that production we must consider taxes.

Taxation, Federal, State, and local, takes 31 cents out of every citizen's dollar. Of that amount, about 11 cents goes in direct income tax to the Government. The rest is collected in prices. The Government compels the retailer to become its tax collector, and grab 20 cents of every dollar the American housewife takes to the store, for governmental bureaucrats to spend. We passed a tax bill twice in the first session of the Eightieth Congress. Twice Mr. Truman said the people were not entitled to a reduction of taxes. Therefore, he vetoed our tax proposals.

We passed a tax-reduction bill in the House last week. This bill gives more than 71 percent of the tax relief to the people with incomes of less than $5,000; it frees 6,000,000 people from paying any tax; it gives special relief to the neediest of our people, the aged and the blind. It helps the American taxpayer to meet the high prices. It provides incentive for men and capital to work together for needed expansion and more jobs for the people. There is nothing wrong with a fair profit in business.

We Republicans believe lower taxes will spur production and bring lower prices for the people. We are going to see that the people get them. Our opponents claim tax reduction would be inflationary, because, they say, it would leave the people with too much money in their pockets. All you folks out there who think you have too much money please stand up.

Nobody can now say Government operation under compulsion is any good. Look at Russia. Communism is a threat to us as well as to the rest of the world. A lot of people who, for 15 years or more, played around with the Communists and the pinkos were given places of high power and influence in the Government. There is absolutely no question but what the New Deal administration knew full well the intentions of the Kremlin.

We Republicans warned of this menace of communism for 10 or 12 years. We told the Nation the Communists were sneaking into high Government places. Now it is going to take a Republican administration to clean out these fifth columnists, and traitors from the governmental structure. Those who insisted for years in keeping them there will never do the job.

Another problem is the proposal to spend billions of dollars for foreign aid.

The only proper yardstick by which to measure foreign-aid cost to our people in sweat and toil is its proportion to our total production. That is the only way we can get an intelligent concept of what we are undertaking to do. Of course, we intend to help Europe. But the people are entitled to know exactly what they are being asked to undertake; how much it will cost them; and how the whole program shall be administered.

This is going to put a great strain upon our own people. It cannot be tried a second time, if it fails the first. I propose the rule which shall guide the administration of European aid shall be: Economy, efficiency, commonsense, and cooperation. We are confronted by unusual expenses. We must face that.

We know we must maintain a national defense—especially in the air—fully adequate for any emergency. We cannot and will not neglect this national defense. The Congress has been accused of rendering our defense in the air an empty shell. The fact is the Eightieth Congress in its first session actually permitted the air services to spend, in fiscal 1948, $76,000,000 more than the President asked. I ask you—when did generosity ever starve anybody to death?

The total reduction in the expenditures in the armed forces was only 1.3 percent or $120,000,000. Now if a reduction of $120,000,000 destroyed our national defense, and made a hollow shell of our air services, in Heaven's name, what did the services do with the $9,400,000,000 they were granted?

That is a question the people are entitled to have answered, and should insist on having answered. I could cite many other instances wherein distortions of fact and rank misstatements have caused unjust criticism of the Congress. Caught between these crushing inflationary prices, the crushing burden of taxation, and the crushing loads of foreign aid, we need an administration which realizes the vital necessity of economy and efficiency in Government.

The New Deal has had 16 years in which to prove it knows how to achieve efficiency and economy. For 16 straight years it has failed. The Republican Congress achieved the first balanced budget in all that time. We have started to pay off the national debt. We have reached a point where we can no longer temporize with political trickery or subterfuge; nor can we tolerate waste and inefficiency anywhere in government. We must overcome inflation by increased production and lower prices.

We must lower taxes. We must do everything possible to make sure our heavy expenditures in foreign aid will succeed. The only way this Nation can get such assurance is to turn out the incompetents in Government. This will be done with the election of a Republican President and Republican Congress.

In this last great haven of liberty, we must as a united people, pull together to win the world back to peace; to put a stop to ruthless aggression; to make sure we can perpetuate religious and political liberty. It is a great challenge to the American people. They will not fail. Pray God we may bring Lincoln's courage and Lincoln's faith to the task.

We Have Failed Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, in the rich and storied lands of the Far East, off the mainland of Asia, the march of democracy is strong and heart warming. Exploitive colonialism is falling away into the limbo of forgotten crimes against humanity.

The United States has withdrawn from the Philippines and the new Philippine Republic has become a functioning reality.

Not too far away, as distances are measured in the vast sweeps of the Pacific, the new Indonesian Republic has emerged from the clouds of civil war, Japanese aggression, and lingering Dutch imperialism.

The analogy with American history is obvious and unmistakable. Just as our own American Revolution against British exploitation was preceded by meetings, discussions, and fervent planning, so in Indonesia the vast masses of people worked their slow way toward fitness for independence and self-rule through the processes of education and economic improvement.

The Indonesian Republic now is in the same stage of development as was our own beloved country in the decade which followed the Revolutionary War.

We are bound to the national aspirations of exploited people by an unseverable bond of sympathy and association. We have hailed the final reluctant step of the Imperial Dutch Government in recognizing the existence of the Indonesian Republic, and in disclaiming imperial designs on the islands.

In that connection I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from Labor, a weekly newspaper published here in Washington, and an article entitled "We Have Failed Indonesia," from the February 18 issue of the Christian Century. This article was written by Garland Evans Hopkins, who is an associate secretary of the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church, and who is well qualified for his authoritative position by his own first-hand investigations in Indonesia, and by his particular responsibility for liaison with government and business leaders.

The record of courage of the Indonesians in resisting Japanese aggression, and of willing and active and dangerous cooperation with allied forces of liberation, has been written with blood in the history of World War II in the Pacific theater.

Yet the United States is preparing to expel some natives of Indonesia from this country in accordance with our outmoded immigration and naturalization laws. Most of the victims of this legalistic and unfeeling move are residents of my congressional district. They are, or can be, good American citizens. Many of them are married to American citizens. Others fought in our army against tyranny.

Through the intervention of the Indonesia League of America, Inc., an organization devoted to the promotion of better understanding between our country and Indonesia, bills are being introduced in both Houses of Congress to enable these gallant allied people from the East to remain in the United States and to acquire citizenship through amendment of our archaic laws.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that all of us here will support these measures and will cooperate to the end that we may reach passage in this session; and I hope that the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization will use his widest discretion through benevolent deferment of any legal proceedings against these people.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Christian Century]

WE HAVE FAILED INDONESIA

(By Garland Evans Hopkins)

Several months ago in these columns I asked, "Will we fail Indonesia?" The answer can now be given. It is clear that we have failed Indonesia. Recall the sequence of events. It was on August 1, 1947, that the world thrilled to the forthright action of the Security Council in calling on the Netherlands and the Indonesian Republic to put an end to hostilities and settle their dispute by arbitration or other peaceful means. Cease-fire orders from both governments followed on August 4, but each party immediately charged the other with violations.

On August 14 the Indonesian statesman, Soetan Sjahrir, requested the Security Council to supervise the cease-fire order, to ask that the Netherlands troops be withdrawn to former positions and to provide an arbitration commission. He pledged that his government would abide by the decision of

the commission. The Netherlands delegate answered that the Council had no jurisdiction in the matter. He proposed mediation by an impartial third party functioning without relation to the Council. He also proposed that the career consuls in Batavia should jointly report the situation.

COLONIAL POWERS SUPPORTED

In all the discussion which followed these proposals, Herschel Johnson, the United States representative on the Security Council stood solidly behind the colonial powers. His original attitude of contempt toward Indonesia gave way to one of restrained courtesy, perhaps because of the numerous demands in support of the colonies made upon the State Department by leading Protestants. But it is doubtful that there was any fundamental change in his viewpoint. If more American churchmen had become vocal the situation might have been saved.

However, not all American churchmen were against colonialism. One leader wrote: "The economic life of Holland itself is at stake. * * * Americans should never forget this. Holland's continued existence depends upon the resources of the Indies." This kind of statement was grist for the mills of our Europe-minded State Department and UN delegation. Throughout the discussions Russia and Poland, from whatever motive, were saying the things a dynamically democratic United States should have said. There was a sharp rise in the numbers and prestige of the Communist Party in Indonesia.

On August 25 the Security Council passed a resolution which, among other things, requested the "governments members of the council who have career consular representatives in Batavia to instruct them to prepare jointly * * * reports on the situation." It tendered its good offices, expressing readiness, if requested, "to assist the settlement through a committee of the council consisting of three members of the council, each party selecting one, and the third to be designated by the two so selected." In other words the council, largely at the insistence of the United States, refused to undertake arbitration and accepted the procedure of "good offices," a device which had already twice failed.

The career consuls' report offered more hope of getting at the truth than previous devices had done, particularly in view of the fact that the strongly pro-Dutch American consul general, Walter Foote, had been relieved of his duties in Batavia. But then the United States Government clearly showed its hand: it requested Foote to remain and serve with the career consuls in making the survey. The resulting report presented two directly opposed positions as admissible interpretations. It was tendentious and of little value.

On October 1 Frank Porter Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, and a recognized liberal, was appointed as this country's representative on the Good Offices Committee (GOC). The move was welcomed by friends of Indonesia, though the battery of advisers provided by the State Department raised a question as to how far Graham would be free to exercise his own judgment. Reports from Indonesia soon showed that his chief task was to mediate between his fellow committeemen, R. C. Kirby, of Australia, and Paul Van Zeeland, of Belgium, whose differences to date have prevented the presentation of a report to the Security Council and may result in two or even three reports being submitted.

It will undoubtedly be years before the full story of the negotiations can be made public, but it is hardly hazardous to guess that Graham has been torn between his personal convictions and demands from the State Department to hew to its policy of subordinating all other considerations to the rehabilitation of Europe. Particularly unfortunate is it that the one man in the State Department who might have raised his voice in support of a more farsighted policy as regards Indonesia—Kenneth Landon, the former Presbyterian missionary who is Acting Chief of the Southeast Asia Division—has frequently been absent from his desk on sick leave. The fact that former Consul General Foote has been kept in Washington as consultant and adviser on Indonesia since his return is highly significant.

UNITED STATES TO BLAME

It is now evident that the GOC has failed. This is doubly tragic. Not only does it blast Indonesian hopes but it adds another to the failures of the United Nations at a time when that organization badly needs a success to its credit. Responsibility for the failure will properly be laid at our door, for if Graham had sided with Kirby, the Renville truce and subsequent statements signed on January 17 would not have been imposed upon the Indonesians. By attempting to steer a middle course between the principles of colonialism and those of democracy, the United States has laid itself open to blame for a document more ambiguous than the Linggadjati agreement. The Indonesians have been forced to yield on practically every point. Their one gain is provision for a plebiscite, but since the Dutch control the territory in which this is to be held, there is serious doubt as to the possibility of a genuine expression of sentiment. The Dutch, on the other hand, have received almost every concession they demanded, even maintenance of the Van Mook line.

Despite the manifest injustice of this situation, Prime Minister Sjarifoeddin was backed by President Soekarno when he stated, immediately after signing the truce: "The Republic is naturally disappointed that the truce finally agreed upon departs so far from what we hoped for * * * but the Republic has accepted the truce and will carry it out to the best of our ability." What else could the leaders of Indonesia do but sign in the face of their commitment to support GOC?

But the people (who are sometimes said to be powerless in the hands of their leaders) were not willing to accept the Renville agreements. The Cabinet members representing the Masjoemi Party—largest and most intensely nationalistic of Indonesian parties—resigned. The stop-gap Cabinet of the Batak Christian Sjarifoeddin fell and Mohammed Hatta, long-time leaders of the extremists, was asked to form a new cabinet.

This is an unfortunate move, so far as the west is concerned. Indonesian liberals like Sjahrir and Sjarifoeddin have long held before their people the hope of western cooperation in attaining freedom and economic stability. The loss of prestige resulting from the failure of every previous effort, and now of the GOC, relegates these men to the background. It is entirely possible that the Indonesian Government will become anti-western and transfer its hope of support to the Moslem nations. If this happens, it will be a serious blow to both the cause of democracy in the east and to the hope for peace in Indonesia. Responsibility for such a démarche would have to be placed squarely and almost equally upon the Netherlands and the United States.

COLONIAL WAR MADE IN AMERICA?

Until the end of 1945 Indonesians looked to the United States of America as the one power which stood for freedom and emancipation of colonial peoples. They have suffered slow disillusionment as proof piled upon proof that the Department of State was committed to buttressing Dutch power. The Indonesians felt that the Dutch would never have dared to launch their war in the colonies unless the United States had given them the green light. This conviction was strengthened by the fact that while the Hollanders' aggression was at its height the United States continued to lend them money.

Indonesians have been bombed by planes made in America, shot and shelled by tanks, artillery and rifles made in America, and burned by flame-throwers made in America. The death and devastation which have come upon the land were made possible by American money and American arms in the hands of the Dutch. To say that the United States had no concern or moral responsibility for the situation brought about by the use of these weapons is an argument which few Americans, let alone Indonesians, would be willing to accept.

MORE OF THE SAME POLICY

Now, following the truce, the United States has repeated its offer—first made in July 1947 on the very eve of the Dutch war—of $100,000,000 for the rehabilitation of Indonesia. This seems a friendly gesture. In light of the provisions of the truce, however, several questions arise. Who is to spend the money, the Dutch or the Indonesians? What say will the Indonesians have in accepting or refusing the loan, in the terms under which it will be accepted and in its expenditure? Will it be spent for the ultimate good of the Indonesian people? If the money is handed over to the Dutch or to a Dutch-sponsored colonial government, it will simply mean that the United States has made an additional loan to the Dutch with Indonesia as collateral. In the hands of the Dutch such a sum could become a more effective weapon against the Republic than all the arms we have supplied.

It is all too obvious that we have failed Indonesia. But it does not follow that we must continue to make the same mistake. The Dutch Government and the United States Department of State should face the realities. Independence for Indonesia is certain to come. It may be delayed; it cannot be defeated. An aroused public opinion in the United States should demand a complete reversal of our present policy toward Indonesia.

[From Labor]

THIS IS NOT A PLEASING PICTURE

IS THIS THE KIND OF DEMOCRACY OUR BOYS FOUGHT AND BLED TO ESTABLISH?

Aboard one of Uncle Sam's transports, anchored off Batavia, Java, a commission, representing the United Nations, has succeeded in inducing the representatives of the government of the Netherlands and of the Indonesian Republic to sign a truce. The Indonesians are promised a measure of liberty, but—and this is the most disturbing feature of the document—the Dutch retain control of all the natural resources of the territory affected.

Probably it is the best solution the United Nations commissioners can work out at this time, but it calls attention to some ugly facts. Why should the Netherlands, a little country in northern Europe, control the fabulous wealth of thickly populated islands thousands of miles from the Dutch homeland? Of course, the answer is that Dutch and British capitalists insist on retaining the source of their tremendous profits.

The Japs chased the Dutch out of Indonesia. Some of the natives welcomed the invaders because they hated their old masters.

Yankee soldiers and sailors drove out the Japs and the natives felt that at last a real deliverance had come. They were to be free to conduct their own government and to determine their own way of life.

However, the Dutch came back, armed with American and British weapons, and proceeded to slaughter the natives. The situation became so nasty that the United Nations had to intervene, and now we have the results of that intervention.

All through Asia the story will spread and hundreds of millions of yellow men will be convinced that the white man talks a democracy and liberty for all human beings, but mercilessly exploits those who can't stand up against his modern weapons. We ask again:

"Is this the kind of democracy our boys fought and bled to establish?"

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Kokomo, Ind., on February 12, 1948:

You know that Mr. Truman has demanded that Congress authorize a permanent program of compulsory military training for all American young men who, after 6 months of Army training, would join in a steadily growing pool of reserves. The Armed Services Committee of the House, in compliance with the President's demand, reported such a bill on July 26, just a few days before Congress adjourned last summer. The measure went to the Committee on Rules, where it has since rested.

The Rules Committee, of which I am a member, schedules all legislation in the House. In conjunction with the Steering Committee, it actually determines the legislative program.

Everyone who wants a universal military training program, therefore, has been directing urgent appeals to my committee to schedule this measure for House action. As one of the 12 members of the committee, I have been subjected to constant and intense pressure on this issue. In fact, the proponents have conducted a campaign to induce me to help force the bill out of the committee. Let me quote a portion of a letter sent to the posts in our district by the State commander of the American Legion as a part of this campaign:

"This is a personal appeal for some quick and definite action on your part. The national program * * * is in jeopardy because Congressman FOREST HARNESS is voting to hold in committee our UMT bill. We need a letter from yourself and every other member you can get to write at the earliest possible moment, urging Mr. HARNESS to vote to bring this bill out of committee. Our national representative * * * advises that a big majority of the House favors passage of this important defense bill, but they have been unable to get a chance to vote because it is held in a committee of which HARNESS is a member. The national commander has asked me to get our members of the Fifth District busy, and I have assured him that you would comply in a big way."

Not for a moment would I question the motives of my comrades in the Legion. Every man among them has proved his devotion to America, and I know each speaks from the heart in this issue. I do, however, doubt that my friends have examined the over-all problem of national security as they might.

Naturally, that sort of activity is causing a rather complete misunderstanding of the program and of my position. The fact that I have so far declined to commit myself one way or the other on this immediate proposal has been interpreted to mean that I am against the principle of universal and equal responsibility to serve our country in time of need; that I am opposed to adequate national defense; and even that I am playing politics with national security.

Fortunately, I believe my record in the matter of national security needs little defense, even before the most strident critics. The hard lessons I learned as a combat infantryman in the First World War have not been, and will not be, forgotten. I have always wanted to keep American defenses so strong that no aggressor, or combination of aggressors, would risk an attack upon us.

I have belonged to the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars from their inception, shortly after I laid aside my uniform in 1919. I have gone up and down our State, and I have repeatedly taken the stump elsewhere in the cause of preparedness. I think my ideas are, and have been, much the same as those of any sane man who has ever heard a shot fired, or a bomb dropped in anger: Avoid war if at all possible. But if war is inescapable be prepared to destroy the enemy quickly, and at the smallest possible cost in lives and treasure. It is also a part of my creed that American might is the strongest possible argument to deter an aggressor who will listen to no other.

Well, then, what about this immediate issue? Does our national security rest upon a foundation of compulsory peacetime military training, or doesn't it? Frankly, I confess that I do not surely know, even though I believe I have studied this question at least as carefully as most of those who insist, with Mr. Truman, that we must rush into a program of training all American youth. I see considerable merit in both views of the question. Enough merit, in fact, to convince me that we ought to examine and debate the issue much more thoroughly. Let me point out what I consider to be compelling reasons why we should not act hastily or hysterically.

Have we actually proved that universal military training is essential to our national security? Do we have convincing evidence that the benefits will be worth the actual cost of $3,000,000,000 per year? If so, are we sure that we will not place undue dependence upon a pool of half-trained reserves, at the expense of the several more important elements of national defense? Do we realize what a complete departure such a program will be from a national philosophy which has always rejected the concept of compulsory service to the state except in periods of dire emergency? Do we fully understand how staggering is the over-all cost of the security program, of which this would become a part? Are we sure that the economy can carry the burden indefinitely? Or, if an over-all budget, including this training program, is too heavy to carry safely, are we honestly willing and ready to cut other security functions just as far as necessary to provide for this program?

These are a few of the key questions which can still be asked open-mindedly and objectively; and which certainly ought to be answered just as honestly and thoughtfully as possible before we reach any final decision.

I frankly do not have the answers and I am convinced that the proponents of the program cannot answer them with positive assurance. The report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, headed by Dr. Carl T. Compton, frankly admits many doubts as to the wisdom of effectiveness of such a program. Let me give you just a few thought-provoking quotations as evidence that this distinguished group of men, after consultation with 200 military, diplomatic, industrial, and educational specialists, studiously avoid any dogmatic conclusions on the subject.

The Commission says, "We do not advocate universal military training as a panacea which of itself will give us security. We do no give it priority over any of the other elements we have set forth of an integrated national defense program." Now let us see how they define the other elements: "Our first requirement is a mobile striking force, relying heavily on air power, to stop the enemy's attack and hit back at him with all possible force. This force would have to consist of highly trained professional soldiers and fliers * * * We believe that a potential enemy's reluctance to start a war, and his handicap in prosecuting it successfully if started, will be in direct proportion to the power and readiness of our mobile striking force."

The Commission continues by pointing out that our second line of defense is comprised of Regular Army, Navy, Air Force and marines. In a word, our established, regular armed services—not a reservoir of partially trained men. Behind these first- and second-line elements, the Commission calls for a broad, continuous, and intensive program of scientific research and development; and a program of industrial mobilization and stock piling of critical materials which will keep the country fully prepared to meet any emergency.

The Commission says of this over-all program, in which universal military training appears only as a component of relatively minor importance: "All of them are necessary if we are to feel secure in this world. We cannot underscore this too strongly."

And the Commission could not possibly have emphasized more sharply a fatal error which might accompany universal military training than it did in these words:

"We realize that there may be danger if our country puts universal military training into effect, that it will therefore be lulled into a feeling of false security. There may be a tendency for this reason, coupled with a natural desire for economy and lower taxes, to seek to offset the expense of the universal military-training program by a curtailment of one or more of the other military elements of national security. * * * If the introduction of universal military training should have such indirect effect of weakening, rather than strengthening, the other elements of our national security, then our Commission is of the firm opinion that the adoption of universal military training would be a mistake and would diminish, rather than increase, our national security."

For my own part, I believe we have so far given all too little thought to date to the over-all cost of national security according to the plan of which universal military training is a part. Please understand that I have no thought of pinching pennies when it comes to national defense. Whatever it costs us to maintain our freedom as a Nation, the price will still be a comparative bargain. Nevertheless, we ought to know for sure that we can go on indefinitely carrying this load without damaging or destroying our free economy.

First of all, we must go on supporting our front-line forces. The budget for the armed services for the coming fiscal year is $12,000,000,000, in round numbers. Regardless of their views on universal military training, most thoughtful persons agree this is a wise and necessary investment.

But on top of that, we are expected to provide for a training program to cost upward of $3,000,000,000 per year; and to contribute well over $4,000,000,000 annually under the Marshall plan to the recovery of Europe.

Those items add up roughly to $20,000,000,000 per year which we in America are asked to advance for national security. That is just about 10 percent of our total national income. And even this program cannot be considered adequate. The armed services budget is by no means sufficient to provide the sort of research and development, the industrial mobilization, or the stock piling which the Compton commission recommends. And still another Presidential advisory group, the Air Policy Commission, says that present provisions for our Air Force are entirely inadequate; and that ever-increasing investments in air power will be necessary in the immediate future.

Listen again to the wise counsel of the Compton commission:

"In making our plans for national defense we must take realistic account of the financial ability of the country to support the measures that are considered necessary. We

must have protection without such prohibitive cost that it will bankrupt the Nation * * *. Universal military training should not be undertaken at all unless the citizens of this country understand that it has value only as a part of a program that will demand the expenditure of a much larger portion of our national income than we have ever allocated for national defense in peacetime. * * * It is perfectly apparent that the over-all cost of an adequate program is staggering."

When the President's own advisers speak in such strong terms, certainly every thoughtful person must pause and seriously ponder the grave implications.

And as we consider the staggering cost of adequate defense, let us remember that we are expected to carry other costs of government which are equally burdensome. If we adopt the Federal budget proposed for the coming fiscal year, the over-all load on the taxpayers will be $40,000,000,000 or roughly $1 in every five of our entire national income.

Obviously, this sort of spending must stop somewhere—and soon—if we do not intend deliberately to swamp and destroy our free economy. After all, there is a definite limit to the load that even this amazingly strong and productive economy of ours can carry. Many of our foremost economic, financial, and industrial leaders testify that we have already reached the limit of safety, if, indeed, we have not passed it.

But if we weaken or destroy our economic machine, we weaken and destroy the very foundation of national security. Since science has introduced us to total war we need no expert witnesses to convince us that our armed defenses can never be stronger than the economy which supports them. But it is most significant that the Compton Commission places at the very top of its list of essentials to security a strong national economy. Says the Commission report:

"A strong, united Nation is our number one security requirement. It is the bedrock on which all our military preparations depend. In particular, we must be concerned with * * * a healthy economy reflected in full production, full employment, industrial peace, and the avoidance of recurring economic crises or inflation."

Can we hope to keep our economy healthy and growing under such burdens as we are even now imposing upon it, to say nothing of the increased burdens we may be forced to impose to maintain defenses which will assure our national survival?

If the load is too heavy, how and at what points may we expect to reduce it? Will the American people, already chafing under a crushing tax burden, forego the tax cuts they have been promised and which they have a right to expect? We must not, of course, invite disaster by skimping on national defense, so we must seek savings in other portions of the budget. But are our people honestly willing and ready to cut every other function of Government to the bone? Will they support Congress in trimming away every nonessential or overly costly service? Will they even give up a portion of the many services they have come to think of as essential?

Every one of these is a question of the gravest and most imperative importance, and it is worse than idle, it is dangerous to attempt to reach any conclusions about UMT or any other phase of our national security problem until we have the most reliable answers that careful thought and study can provide.

I have quoted generously from the report of the President's Advisory Committee not alone because its authors are distinguished and respected men, but also because it seems particularly significant to me that these men who are perhaps most often quoted in favor of UMT actually render only a conditional endorsement, and very frankly express their own doubts at many points. There are, of course, other equally prominent authorities whose opinions ought to give the most ardent supporters of UMT food for further thought. Among these sources is the President's Air Policy Commission, which I mentioned a minute ago. To persons interested in objective study of our problems of national security I suggest a reading of both these reports.

I hope this brief review explains why I and other members of the Rules Committee have so far refused to be stampeded or coerced on this issue. But I want to emphasize the fact that I, as one lone member of 12, can hardly be expected to direct the committee's final action. After all, I do not own and boss the committee. And I assure you that I, as an individual member, or even the whole committee, can exercise only relatively small influence in the decision Congress makes on this issue.

The opinion was stated in the letter I quoted at the outset, that a majority of the House is eager to vote favorably for the current bill, but is deprived of the opportunity because my committee is blocking the measure.

But whenever a majority desires to take action on any bill, it can discharge the committee and bring the measure to the floor after seven legislative days. All it ever takes to get action is to secure the names of a simple majority—218—on a discharge petition.

Such a petition has been filed on the UMT bill, and has been available to the House membership at the Speaker's desk for some time. Does a majority of the House membership desire the immediate passage of this measure, as the quoted letter indicates? I took the trouble to check just before I left the Capitol yesterday, and I found that up to that time just 13 Members, out of a total of 435, had signed it.

So much for the status of this measure in the House. But that is still only half the story. No matter how the House may act, the Senate must also approve the measure if it is to become law.

Although that body has been entirely free to act, it has done nothing at all to dispose of the issue. Its Armed Services Committee has conducted no hearings; and I can see no evidence that the Senate expects to dispose of the issue any time in the early future.

Despite any reports to the contrary, therefore, a large majority in both Houses obviously share my own and my committee's view, that hasty action on this issue would be unwise. You can take it for granted that the Members of Congress are just as deeply concerned about American security as anyone, but our concern is not leading us to decide this issue until we know more surely the wise and safe course to follow.

Republican Ticket Only Avenue of Escape From New Dealism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of the Congress to an outstanding address made by my distinguished predecessor, the Honorable Jessie Sumner, of Illinois, before the Kansas Republican Women's convention in Topeka, Kans., on January 28, 1948. Miss Sumner's keen insight into the problems of our Government and her rare talent for clarity in thought and presentation are well known to those colleagues who served with her through 8 years in Congress. Her address at Topeka proves once again her courageous devotion to the cause she represented so ably while a Member of this House. It deserves the serious consideration of every Member of the present Congress.

ADDRESS OF HON. JESSIE SUMNER, OF ILLINOIS

The Republican ticket, November 1948, is your only avenue of escape from New Dealism, the form of totalitarianism that masquerades as Americanism.

To be sure, there are some philandering Republican leaders who, having themselves become New Deal camp followers, seem to want the rest of us to join the New Deal harem, too, and who even go so far as to try to tell you that nobody is giving our country away.

But that only goes to show that the primrose path of New Dealism is filled with irresistible temptations, such as:

Washington dinner parties serving lend-lease soup to nuts. Free trips to Europe and all around the world for statesmen who will see only what the New Deal wants them to see. Mixing with lords, dukes, kings, and commissars—with their hands out for handouts or—to put it more politely—who have the common touch. Campaign assistance at the expense of American taxpayers. Being lauded instead of lashed by the New Deal press and the rest of the New Deal disk jockeys. Being photographed for the history books at world peace conferences, pompously picking Uncle Sam's pockets, and diplomatically creating more rendezvous with destiny for America to fight. It isn't surprising, is it, that so many politicians are human enough to cut themselves in on the New Deal racket and thereby qualify as world humanitarians, too?

The New Deal has spared no effort—and no Government money—in its sedulous drive to annihilate all opposition. The President's annual budget is a disguised campaign fund, filled with appropriations calculated to buy the votes of minorities at the expense of the majority. They laughed when the present New Deal President "sat down at the piano." But now you know that every time he plays it costs you billions of dollars. Every note he hits is a bank note.

It is through such legalized vote buying that the New Deal has built up a Nation-wide political machine—which consists of so many self-styled nonpartisan organizations that any club, league, union, or trade association you join is likely to be a New Deal-front organization. It includes teachers and even preachers. Today, like the benighted citizens of Hitler's Reich, you can hardly look or listen without having New Deal half-truths and untruths preached at you as if it were the gospel. Their falsehoods echo and reecho throughout the land until they actually believe them themselves.

The New Deal should have been thrown out way back in 1938. It was already obvious then that this Nation was being led blindfolded into dictatorship, serious currency debasement, and another quixotic war to save the world, from which, as we told them at the time, nothing would come except corpses and communism and more wars to fight. In the sacred name of the United States, New Deal Government officials have delivered unto death and communistic slavery whole countries full of innocent men, women, and little children. They keep ranting and spending for "conservation purposes." But their spending for other purposes has already exhausted many of the vital natural resources

in which this country, as they admitted themselves, was rich at the time they came in. They have become so addicted to war that they don't even give you time enough between wars to raise up a new crop of young men to manhood. If left in control of the United States Government, these Don Quixotes will surely proceed to accomplish the complete degeneration, if not the destruction, of this generation of Americans.

It is sickening to hear over and over again the hypnotizing propaganda that the United States, though still the most powerful Nation in the world, can no longer stand nor prosper alone. What an excuse for paying blackmail to every gold-digging government on earth.

This Nation is the mighty Nation that was born of a high determination never to pay tribute to any foreign government. During the first century of this Republic, while the American people still had the protection of the Constitution and the eternal principles of good government instituted by our first President, George Washington—while we still had Presidents who were neither egotists nor weaklings—nobody dared to attack us but the British and they were soundly defeated. And nobody would dare to attack us now if we had a President who was man enough to follow the Constitution and the eternal principles of national self-preservation laid down by our first President—who was a loyal American President.

Within 8 years after the Revolutionary War, the most exhausting war in American history, freedom had already paid off. Adams and Jefferson, envoys to beggar-ridden Europe, were able to boast that you could not find a single beggar nor involuntary pauper in the whole United States—the land where today most every American is begging for steel and other American products because European beggars are systematically pilfering the American people, with the treacherous connivance of our own Government officials.

The dynamic citizens of the United States, before the Constitution was kicked out from under them, demonstrated continually and irrefutably for over a century, that freedom produces a steadily rising standard of living. As long as they are free to produce what they want and keep what they produce and earn, Americans will produce whatever is wanted at cheaper and cheaper prices. They will work, save, and invest, thereby creating a plentitude of rising opportunities for their fellow citizens to do the same. The formula never fails.

Thomas Jefferson, coauthor of the Constitution, said that the principal problem solved by the Constitution was that of enabling the American people to live free of the oppression common to every government in Europe, where, he said, people were robbed of the fruits of their toil by government politicians, whom he called wolves and thieves because they robbed the people through direct and indirect taxes. And also through the insidious age-old racket of making the people feel prosperous while robbing them of what they have through creating additional money for the rulers to spend after they have spent all that they dare to demand of the people in taxes. And these are the principal rackets by which the New Deal wolves and thieves are grinding the American people down into slavery.

If you can only succeed in selecting a Republican Congress and a Republican President—I mean real Republicans and not mere gigolos for the New Deal—you can be sure that they will curb those rackets. A real Republican victory in 1948 means up from slavery.

It is harrowing to hear the falsetto voice of the wolf in grandmother's nightgown saying that your Government must give what you have to the rest of the world in order that the rest of the world will have as much as you have so that you will have more. What do they think we are? Simpletons? Playing Lady Bountiful with your money has gone to their heads. Like Hitler, the paintslinger, they are infatuated with themselves in their new role of world humanitarians, world leaders, and world conquerers. Hell, the New Deal world order!

Why, the omnipotent Lord Himself did not try to take in any more territory. He gave a chosen few religion and left the rest of the world to work out its own salvation, from the example. Our Christian American forefathers, adhering to the Constitution, refused to give anything whatsoever to any foreign government except a successful example of self-government. But that shining example was enough to inspire the oppressed and impoverished peoples of Europe to seize sufficient freedom for themselves to prosper more than they had ever prospered before. All that the world needs from the United States today is the only thing that it is not getting—the example of good American government.

Today this Nation is being disgraced. Treason is the fashion. Our National Capital crawls with Benedict Arnolds whose hearts beat with adulterous love for foreign governments. Little world statesmen—busily trying to support the whole wide world at your expense, who would not know enough to support themselves if you dumped them off the Government pay roll. The cowardliest crew that ever manned the ship of state—spending everything you possess out of fear that they might lose an election. Paying to foreign governments more blackmail, more blackmail, more blackmail, more blackmail—until everybody in the world thinks that we, the fearless American people, are yellow too. At the rate at which they are throwing it overboard, this generation of Americans will live to see the day when the magnificent American heritage of natural resources is gone with the wind.

Through unscrupulous unrepaid gift-loans the British and other foreign shakedown artists have been calmly living off the American people ever since World War I. This ridiculous American munificence to the so-called mother country is enough to make us look as if we had a nation Oedipus complex. Though it is only because the politicians who rule us have an inferiority complex derived from being inferior.

Gift-loans have served to keep the world groaning under the anachronistic parasitical British Empire system which our ancestors left in disgust. The fact is that the British Empire system is almost as much of a spreader of communism as Russia, since exploited colonials become convinced that even communism could not be worse than what they have.

But now our Government is paying annually increasing billions to the British to keep in power British socialism—the British reproduction of communism. The fruitless British socialistic government is a hopeless dictatorship. In fact, every single foreign government that your Government is now subsidizing is a hopeless dictatorship. They all use Nazi-like price controls and communistic preventions of private enterprise.

All of the dictatorships that your Government is now subsidizing are so hopelessly misgoverned that they could not possibly keep out of the red, much less keep out the Reds. What else but hopeless dictatorships would you expect the New Deal to promote abroad, far from your watchful eyes? You certainly could not expect the New Deal to promote the traditional American brand of freedom abroad. Because the New Deal has always done its best to destroy American freedom here at home.

You know from experience that gift-loans plunge the United States into depression and war.

Depression? Yes; two depressions. As patriotic American financial analysts warned in advance, gift-loans to England and other alien governments immediately following World War I caused the inflation resulting in the 1921 crash. As the same experts warned in advance, gift-loans and currency manipulation by the Federal Reserve Bank to facilitate a loan to the Bank of England sparked the inflation and precipitated the 1929 crash. And now the same old reliable experts cry warnings that continued gift-loans can only strip this country and land us in a hungry economic paralysis which will be worse than a crash

War? Why certainly. In 1934 subsidies to both England and Russia, by means of the New Deal gold-buying program, revived the Russian Communist Government then dying on the vine and seething with counterrevolution. The revival of Russian communism furnished the excuse for the building up of Hitler who was called the "bulwark against communism." The resulting war to save from Hitler the nations which themselves had actively built up Hitler—England, France and Russia—furnished the excuse for the building up of Russian communism. And now repeated and increasing donations to Europe are used to rebuild Europe, including Germany, as a "bulwark against communism." Yes, gift-loans are the price we pay for depression and war.

Since VJ-day the New Deal Machiavellis have already squandered on foreign governments over $23,000,000,000 worth of what would otherwise belong to you. They told you at the time that it would save you from "world chaos and confusion." Remember? But common sense and plenty of Republicans protested that they would only use the money to buy the world chaos and communism which they now have the colossal effrontery to propose spending another $20,000,000,000 to rescue you from. You can see with your own eyes that they are only spending you into world bankruptcy and World War III.

Step by step they dragged you into World War II by first throwing American arms and ships into war through their Lend-Lease Act. And how surprised and grieved they acted when the Pearl Harbor attack—which they knew was going to happen and invited—caught us with our defenses in Europe. Step by step, exactly as they dragged you into World War II, they are now dragging you into World War III, by first throwing American arms and ships into war through bills which are exactly like the Lend-Lease Act.

They call those bills European recovery bills, but they might better be called Russian recovery bills, since the Russians will recover whatever we've sent to Europe if and when Russia decides to take over the rest of Europe—as New Dealers themselves have admitted that Russia can easily do any time that she wants to—and within 24 hours.

And how surprised and grieved they will act when the attack discloses that America is no better prepared than at Pearl Harbor. As General Arnold reports, "The cold truth is that at present we are almost as badly off, in a military sense, as before Pearl Harbor." All you have been getting out of the vast military expenditures meekly voted by Congress since VJ-day is a political army—evidently intended to fool you, since it does not fool any potential enemy. What America needs, so say the real experts, is scientific research, industrial-mobilization planning, and quantities of constantly improved planes. What the New Deal is putting over instead is a broomstick conscription army and a military dictatorship.

They tell you that their lend-lease bills which they now call European recovery bills are plans to keep war away from our shores.

But that's exactly what they told you about the Lend-lease Act which brought war to our shores. You already know from tragic experience that New Dealers are not above deceiving you again and again and again. To reelect the present administration would be to deserve the want and war you would surely get.

The spectacle of President Truman, General Marshall and other New Dealers posing as leaders of a crusade to save the world from communism is almost as comic as if Stalin, Molotov and other Communists were to pose as leaders of a crusade to save the world from communism. New Dealism and communism are like Siamese twins. The New Deal has always helped the Russian Communist Government stay in power and augment its power. The Communist fifth column in the United States has always helped the New Deal administration stay in power and augment its power.

The New Deal has always almost invariably followed the Communist Party line. The Communist Party has always almost invariably followed the New Deal party line. The New Deal has always done everything it could to discredit and destroy the Congressional Un-American Activities Committee which, under the New Deal, was the only agency of government trying to save the United States Government from overthrow by Communists. Under the New Deal, Communists have always littered the Government pay roll.

Evidently New Dealers themselves can't tell a Communist from a New Dealer. A few months ago the New Deal President even asked Congress for several million dollars with which to hire people to locate the Communists on the Government pay roll, presumably because there was nobody on the pay roll who could tell the Communists from the New Dealers. But, as usual, the money appears to have been largely wasted. The last I heard, when in Washington in December, there were still "Commies" roosting on the Government pay roll—even in the State Department—which thinks up and administers the plans to save the world from communism. Perhaps the theory is that it takes a Commie to catch a Commie.

They hope, with their noisy crusade to save the world from communism, to make you, the voters, forget that it was they, themselves, who gave the world to communism. It was the late New Deal President Roosevelt, who, at Tehran and Yalta, airily delivered unto Stalin the parts of Europe which enable Russia to dominate Europe and the parts of Asia that enable Russia to dominate Asia. It was the present New Deal President, Truman, who, while communing with Stalin at Potsdam, finished the job of giving Stalin all of the world that Stalin asked. It was the bemedaled godfather of the Marshall plan, General Marshall, himself, who, as American Ambassador to China, immediately after the war, tried to induce the Chinese Government to commit suicide by letting Communists share in the government of China.

Long before the murderous western front invasion of Europe, it was already obvious that the invasion would be a waste of American lives because the New Deal had already given Russia control of Europe and the difference between Stalin and Hitler was not worth the life of a single American boy. But those of us who said so—and I, for one, even filed a bill in Congress to postpone the invasion until Stalin should cough up the countries he had swallowed—were only wasting our breath. There is no use to expect real humanitarianism from phony Kelly-Nash, Tammany, Pendergast and other New Deal humanitarians. New Dealers were still trying to make you believe that Russia was a "freedom loving," "peace loving," "democracy" long after enslaved people from one end of the world to the other had found out from experience that the chief difference between communism, nazism, fascism, socialism and new dealism is only professional jealousy.

The same New Dealers who are now posing as anti-Communists kept on building up Russia and promoting communism in your name and with your money, long after they had begun to pretend that the reason they were shoveling your property into Europe was to save Europe from communism. In 1946, at the same time that the administration was pressuring through Congress the British gift-loan bill, with the excuse that it was necessary to save the British from communism, it was also putting through Congress a bill to donate another $250,000,000 to UNRRA—though knowing in advance that the UNRRA donation would surely be used to enslave anti-Communists and build up Communist armies exactly as previous grants to UNRRA had been used. They were even letting Russia coin unlimited amounts of American money, using United States Treasury plates. They called it "occupation" money, but it was freely exchangeable for good old American dollars.

And only last year, while, with one hand, the administration was hurling American arms and officers into the Greek war against communism, with the other hand it was still sending Russia lend-lease war materials and furnishing Russia export licenses with which to haul away shiploads of American oil and what have you—though today Americans are shivering in their homes for lack of fuel oil, and midwestern farmers are curtailing their production of next year's food crop for lack of oil with which to operate their bulldozers and tractors.

And only last month, while the New Deal was pushing through Congress the interim-aid bill, with the excuse that it was vital to save Europe from communism, it was giving the Russian puppet government of Poland $60,000,000 worth of locomotives and railroad equipment badly needed here at home and helpful to Russia in case of war. In short, they have not stopped subsidizing Russia. After all, this is the same New Deal administration which appointed as head of the Government agency manufacturing atom bombs a bureaucrat who had been officially advocating giving Russia our American atom-bomb secrets.

It is for a higher power to judge whether death-dealing New Dealers shall be thawed out in the hereafter. It is for you to vote the straight Republican ticket, the only way to avoid sharing their guilt.

The way to rescue Europe from Russia is to take Russia and the Russian puppet governments off our American supply lines. But you will never get either Russia or Communists off the American supply lines until you first dump the New Deal off the American supply lines.

In 1933 the New Deal jitterbugs came in talking that the Constitution was a one-horse shay. They hitched their jitter-buggy to a comet—the late New Deal President, now gone, but not forgotten—nor forgiven. Who cared that the New Deal was copying the hit programs which nazism was copying from communism? The industry controls, the labor regimentation, the propaganda methods, even the purges. To say nothing of the demagogic schemes for taking honest men's property away from them—though, unlike the Nazis, the New Dealers were smart enough not to pretend that they confiscated private property for religious reasons. Few noticed when OPA came—after the people escaped from NRA—that OPA, from which you managed to escape only because President Truman muffed his cards, was the exact duplicate of the key Nazi program for the subjugation of industry.

By throwing you a bone now and then—a project or a subsidy or a special privilege—so as to make you think that they were cutting you in on their racket, they have won every election—except the last one. The Republican Party is now crowded with refugees from this unconstitutional, un-American corruption and oppression.

The lion's share of the New Deal loot goes to—you've guessed it—the New Deal's old sparring partners—the economic royalists. I mean the big war profiteers who have held the Democratic Party by the nape of the neck ever since World War I, and more than once have given a Republican Party National Convention the bum's rush.

These New Deal Midases are always out with their tin cups whenever Government throws important money around, whether at home or abroad; but preferably abroad where you, the voters, can't see the size of their take.

For example, you should have been at the hearings when one of the New Deal's less retiring kept businessmen was going it for the New Deal's so-called veteran's housing bill in 1946. How he lauded OPA. Though incontrovertible evidence in the hearings showed that the reason that houses were not being built was because OPA had prevented the production of every single kind of material used in building houses.

All he wanted, he said, was to help the poor veterans by building prefabricated houses in mass production in his brand new industrial empire built from a shoe string during the war with your money. Why not? The bill was a Christmas tree, loaded with legalized graft for New Deal pets—materials priorities, guaranteed sales, subsidies, free factories, tax exemptions—in short, all the same legalized rackets by which some of the largest corporations during the recent war, multiplied their prewar assets several hundred percent—as shown by the records of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The suicidal New Deal foreign policy is made to order for the economic royalists—whom the New Deal has made rich with your tax money. Without it, the stiff competition from typical American businessmen might cut them down to size. But the New Deal foreign policy will lift them to the financial stratosphere to which they aspire.

Goods produced in their free plants here can be sold to foreigners and paid for with your money through gift-loans. Goods produced with slave labor in their free factories abroad will be shipped back to compete in the coveted American market on equal terms with goods produced by taxpaying Americans paying high wages. Moreover, your fine boys will be rotting around the world, policing their interests, which they chummily refer to as "American interests." And if their old pal, Stalin, persists in his stubborn and unanticipated refusal to play ball with them in Russia and the rich areas which the New Deal gave to Russia, presumably in order to induce him to play ball with them—you will surely see another Pearl Harbor somewhere.

The little lambs bleating passionately for the New Deal foreign policy and world government are simply asking to be fleeced. Thanks to the New Deal propaganda barrage which blankets this Nation, few seem to realize that world government is already your ruler, much of it already set up, some of it already operating—though it has not yet dared show its fangs.

Step by step, just as they dragged you into World War II, just as they are now dragging you into World War III, just as they always drag you into everything at which you would balk if you knew ahead of time where you were being dragged—in 1945 and 1946—before the Republicans were elected to control Congress—this Nation was surrendered to a group of world bureaucracies of which UNO is the part that squeaks. Together, those bureaucracies will have complete power to loot and oppress the American people.

The Bretton Woods banking bureaucracies, patriotic experts testified before Congress, have power enough to create out of thin air unlimited billions of American dollars to be given to foreign governments in exchange for their worthless I O U's. It means unlimited gift-loans for which your Government has already issued a blank check.

The UNO bureaucracy—except for the veto, which, under the New Deal, is no veto—will own the United States Army. The world trade bureaucracy—not yet set up, but for which our President has already signed up with the British—will have power to impose permanent rationing and permanent OPA. It will also have power to impose the death sentence on any business in which you are now engaged in order that some foreign country can produce what you are producing for the American market instead.

In Parliament, the Duke of Bedford called it "the most impudent attempt in history to set up a financial and economic dictatorship." Said he, "We are proposing to hand over the control of our economic life in a very large measure to a gang of Wall Street financiers who are responsible to no one and are above every government."

You have already felt the heel of bureaucratic, autocratic, plutocratic New Deal tyranny. But what you have so far endured is as nothing to the want and war you are sure to suffer when the world bureaucrats, appointed by foreign dictators who are used to killing and enslaving people, go into action, grinding you beneath their world juggernaut, destroying you with your own American weapons and armies if you dare to revolt.

Once this new world dictatorship is well under way, how would you propose to stop it? Through your union? That is a laugh. If and when you grow weary of working for a dictatorship which gives the fruits of your toil to parasites, the New Deal will again pass a slave labor conscription bill, like the one which President Roosevelt maneuvered through the lower House of Congress and the one which President Truman flim-flammed the lower House into passing—giving the Government power to force any American citizen to work anywhere at any wage or no wage. The first time it went through General Marshall testified in favor of it. And the CIO union did not lift a finger to oppose it.

Little they care, these New Deal world humanitarians, whether you die in war or starve in peace—so long as they get their mink coats, their faces in the papers, their free factories, their free trips abroad, their medals from kings and their weekends with lords. November 1948 may be your last chance to escape from the barbaric tyranny that New Dealism has already enthroned in a world supergovernment to rule over you and your government. Later may be too late.

We, the American people, are not yellow. We are not morons. All that makes us seem so is the corrupt exhibitionists in control of our Government who have betrayed us and are still betraying us. All that keeps the United States from being invincible and invulnerable is the lack of loyal, virile Americans in Government office who would obey the tried and true American principles of national self-preservation which would make us invincible and invulnerable.

If the American people are worthy of their ancestors—and I think they are—we will all jump into this election campaign and work as we have never worked before for the straight Republican ticket. And we will not stop weeding until every politician in the whole wide world knows that we mean business and intend to have good traditional American government of the American people, by the American people, for the American people, once more and forevermore.

Lincoln Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by United States Senator RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, of Connecticut, to a Lincoln Day banquet at Springfield, Mo., February 9, 1948. This was an affair sponsored jointly by the Sixth and Seventh Missouri Congressional Districts, represented by Hon. DEWEY SHORT and myself. Over 2,000 people were in attendance. The address of Senator BALDWIN was warmly received by the vast crowd present and by his radio audience. It is a splendid, thought-provoking statement of the great issues confronting the Congress and the country at this difficult time.

I sincerely appreciate your kind and generous invitation to join you here in commemorating the birthday of our first Republican President.

In Washington, we are so deeply involved in our daily legislative work that it is a great relief to come out here and exchange viewpoints with you.

Speaking of Congress on such a political occasion brings to mind the story of Lincoln's 1846 campaign. He was opposed by Peter Cartwright, a fiery circuit rider who was said to be able to freeze hell over with three sermons. During one of his meetings Lincoln strolled in. Cartwright reached the point where he was demanding of his congregation whether they were going to heaven or hell. When the standing count was called Lincoln remained seated. When Cartwright demanded where he was going, Lincoln replied, "To Congress." With a little congressional experience I feel sure he would have aligned himself with one of the standing groups.

Your State of Missouri, with its great cities, its industries, its farms, and its villages, has always seemed to me to be a kind of crossroads of America. It is here, if anywhere, that we can find the typical American. And it is from these Americans that the strength of our country comes. In the last year, I have had the opportunity of knowing and working with your very capable and respected Senators, JIM KEM and FORREST DONNELL, and also with several of your Congressmen. I might say that Missouri Republicans have chosen well their delegates to the Congress. I particularly want to thank Congressman BENNETT and your committee for their kind and generous hospitality which made me feel welcome here before I arrived.

Tonight I don't want to deliver a lecture on legislation before the Congress. I would like, rather, to talk with you about Abraham Lincoln and about our party—its problems, its hopes, and its future, and about this country of ours which has come to be the most powerful and wealthy nation in the world. We have reached position not because we sought power or wealth, and not by virtue of military conquest or political aggression. The reason we have come to that position is best explained by the fact that we meet here tonight to pay homage to the most loved of all Americans. An American who represents the beliefs and ideals and hopes we all have. What were those hopes, beliefs, and ideals? Humility, love of freedom, self-respect, hard work, equal opportunity, tolerance, and Godliness.

These are the beliefs and the virtues that put this Nation in a higher position than that ever gained by all the military conquerors in history. These are the beliefs and virtues that made us great and will make us greater. If we ever lose our humility, our love of freedom, our tolerance, or if we ever forget our God, we shall surely lose all that we cherish and all that we hope to pass on as a heritage to our children.

The world has become a small neighborhood of nations. We now have the electric light, the wide use of the telephone, the automobile, the radio, the airplane, and finally the atomic bomb. Distance has disappeared. The furthest part of the globe is today only a few hours from Springfield. Huge industries have grown up. Our population has doubled and redoubled.

All of that change around us has not changed the souls and the hearts of men. The basic rights and wrongs, and the hopes and prayers of our people are no different today in an atomic age than they were in a frontier age.

Our forefathers came to this Nation because they sought security and peace and the right to live as free men. Abraham Lincoln is the most revered of all Americans because he succeeded in preserving and furthering those ideals. Peace and security and the rights of free men are still today the answer to all our prayers.

It is harder to find peace in our world of today. It is harder to build security. It is harder to keep men free, but that only means that we must redouble our efforts as threats against our moral precepts crowd in upon us.

The Democratic Party (author of the strange experiments which have culminated today in conditions with which it is apparently unable to cope) has evolved some strange thinking.

The Democrats choose to call the Taft-Hartley bill a "slave labor" bill. Yet, polls indicate that the majority of labor itself approves the principal provisions of the bill. Statistics indicate that the strike record, since it has been in effect, is the best in years.

The Democratic Party criticizes the Republican tax-relief program on the ground that it "soaks the poor," completely ignoring the fact that it gives nearly three times as much relief to people of low incomes as it gives to people of high incomes; that it frees millions of people having low incomes from the tax rolls entirely; and establishes a proportionately higher tax on high incomes.

The Democratic Party chooses to object to the Republican Farty's demand for a sound, realistic attitude in our foreign policy, completely ignoring the fact that it was years of appeasement and years of wasted money that led us to the present difficult situation.

Not more than a few weeks ago a prominent apologist for this strange system said, right here in Springfield, that labor was not to blame for inflation; that the farmer was not to blame for inflation, and that business was not to blame for inflation. That would seem to cover about all the categories from which votes can be solicited. He then went on to say that the release of price controls was the cause. Now, we don't need controls unless we have something that needs controlling. Whatever needed controlling was certainly something brought about during the period when we Republicans, unfortunately, had little to say in matter of public policy. Beyond that, when these price controls (on which the Democratic Party depends so much) were removed, there was a Democratic Congress in Washington and it was the Democratic President who removed the controls by Executive order nearly 8 months before the law was due to expire.

hand. The present budget, estimated now

little consequence today. The Pied Piper of

destroyed the Union and made of America a

These devious Democrats now try to hide these sins by complaining that this Congress has not, in 1 year's time, developed what they call a workable program to create peace and prosperity and all good things, to replace their 15 years of chaos, confusion and emergencies. What have the Democratic Congresses and the Democratic Presidents of the last 15 years been doing about these workable programs for which they now plead so piously?

If it were not for our deep love of our country, we could be tempted to suggest that the Democratic Party work its own way out of the difficulties it has caused.

All of this reminds me of the sailor who went on an all-night spree; came in the next morning tired, broke, and discouraged, and then blamed a friend for allowing him to go out.

There are those among us who have pessimistically concluded that America has reached its pinnacle of success—that war is inevitable, and that it is for us nervously to enjoy our prosperity while we prepare for the inevitable conflict.

Through all of Abraham Lincoln's life, he met periods of despair and periods of disappointment, but we can well remember that in Abraham Lincoln there was always hope—and there is hope in America today.

We have not yet begun to develop the vast resources that God gave our people. We have not yet begun to enjoy the comforts that we can create. We have not yet begun to enjoy the best that we can build.

Peace, progress, and prosperity do not just happen. They are the result of sacrifice and work. It was the sacrifice and work of our forefathers that gave us the heritage we enjoy today. Abraham Lincoln did not go from the lowest place in life to the highest by idly accepting all that he found around him and concluding that no improvement could be made. Every great step of progress in this Nation has been the result of foresight, sacrifice, work, and progressive thinking. We can have peace in this world as surely as Americans 100 years ago could preserve our Union. But we cannot have peace if we turn away from the challenge that is before us.

In all that has been written about Abraham Lincoln, I cannot recall there being recorded any act or campaign he undertook to belittle, deny, or wreck the plans of others without full consideration, but I can recall a great deal of the positive programs he held up as hope for our people. Lincoln was a builder. Let our party, if it forsakes all else, remember that we, too, are builders.

Our purpose as a political party is to provide more progressive, more hopeful plans for the future. It is not the province of any party out of power to obstruct and reject every proposal of the party in power. We are not intended to serve as the anchor to hold our ship of state at rest until the wind blows in our favor. We are, rather, the keel of that ship of state which, while it does not turn at the captain's whim as does the rudder, can still help insure us against an erratic and risky course. A dragging anchor can be cut loose and dropped to the depths of oblivion so the ship can sail on. It would seem useless to say that our country has not progressed and advanced since last we were in control at the helm, but we have done so erratically by fits and starts. There has come about in these years some threats to our beliefs in a free republican system of government. A deeply divided party, made powerful by unprecedented budgets and glittering promises, has succeeded in steering us off the course that made this Nation the wealthiest and strongest and the freest of any in all world history.

Speaking of Government, Lincoln said: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, Government ought not to interefere." (That is a principle which we can well afford to examine.)

"I like the system which lets a man quit when he wants to and wish it might prevail everywhere. One of the reasons why I am opposed to slavery is just here. What is the true condition of the laborer? I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free, to acquire property as far as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in law to prevent a man from getting rich. It would do more harm than good. So while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else."

There have been two basic fallacies in the thinking of the administration of the past 15 years. The first is that capital and labor alike can work less and less and earn more and more. Wealth is usable goods, and can only be obtained through the production of usable goods. There is more wealth in one acre of Missouri farm land than in all the gold buried at Fort Knox. We can reach any degree of prosperity and any standard of living so long as the producer of wealth is encouraged to produce more by the buyer's willingness and ability to buy more. Labor, the farmer, and business, must come to realize that a bigger production means more income for the owner and the worker, and thus more purchasing power to buy the increased production of the workers.

The second weak premise upon which our plans of the last 15 years have been based is that of deficit spending. By irresponsibly charging off to the future the cost of expensive schemes, we can unquestionably offer the people added services and added securities—or at least furnish employment for many engaged in planning those goals. But like the charge account in the local grocery store, some day it must be paid. Emergency after emergency has led to the spending of vast sums for popular purposes and has led to the vast wastage of public moneys. In this a curious thinking has evolved. The late President said on many occasions that he favored a balanced budget and reduced public expenditures. The present administration likewise has put itself on the record foursquare for economy.

Lincoln had these same problems. He once said:

"For several years past the revenues of the Government have been unequal to its expenditures, and consequently loan after loan, sometimes direct and sometimes indirect in form, has been resorted to. The system of loans is but temporary in its nature, and must soon explode. It is a system not only ruinous while it lasts, but one that must soon fail and leave us destitute. As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next, no one left to borrow from, so must it be with a government."

The President in his recent message on the State of the Union offered the people the same kind of a bargain that Lincoln said the Yankee peddler offered when he put up for sale "a pair of pantaloons large enough for any man and small enough for any boy." We cannot oppose the fine principles exhibited in that address. We cannot put ourselves in the position of being opposed to morality, the Golden Rule, or in favor of sin, but we can wonder first what the cost of all this will be to the American people, and second, whether or not the administration can accomplish it. Our quarrel is not with the purpose but rather with methods which so rarely bring results.

For example, since ascendency to power 15 years ago, the Democratic party has consistently and regularly warned that there was, in this country, a serious housing shortage—and we do have a serious shortage. Today, after 15 years, we have 34 Government agencies concerned with the question of housing and the President tells us that the shortage is more severe than ever.

Fifteen years ago the administration consciously went about the job of creating inflation by cheapening the dollar, spending huge sums of Government money, increasing taxes, favoring any and all increases in wages and salaries, practicing inefficiency in the Government, and now—in 1948—the Administration seems surprised that we do have inflation. The President claims credit for the high wages and high purchasing power that inflation brought and yet is loathe to claim the high prices that come as part of the same inflation.

This strange Democratic Party has come to have in it some oddly contrasting figures. Today, in voting for that party on a national ticket, one can well wonder whether he is voting for the ultra-conservatism of the Democratic deep south or the radicalism of the far left wing. He can wonder whether he is voting for the kind of attitude toward labor that vetoes the Taft-Hartley bill, or the kind of attitude toward labor that threatened to draft railroad workers into the Army. He can well wonder whether he is voting for sympathy with Communist Russia, or for sympathy with a reactionary Greek King. He can well wonder whether he is voting for controls and rationing or whether he is voting for the party that refers to such action as being the methods of a police state. He can well wonder whether he is voting for an Administration that opposes any tax reduction consistently, or whether he is voting for an Administration that opposes tax reduction only in nonelection years. He can well wonder whether he is voting for a party that violently opposes the anti-poll-tax and antilynching legislation, or whether he is voting for a party that calls such practices viciously un-American. He can well wonder whether he is voting for a party that looks for Communists under every bed or whether he is voting for a party that hides them under every bed. He can well wonder whether he is voting for a party that believes that speculators in the grain market are "gamblers in human misery," or whether he is voting for a party that has in it officials who busy themselves in such activities. He can well wonder whether he is voting for a party that advocates the "four freedoms" in all parts of the world or whether he is voting for the party that sat idly by while those freedoms are "snuffed" out. He can wonder whether this party is, this year, in favor of plowing crops under or burning them or demanding the farmer produce more.

It is all very well to say that $5,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000 can be arbitrarily cut from that budget, but we are up against two difficulties: the opposition of the administration, and a budget which fills a book—I am sure as large as the Kansas City directory. More than that we cannot reduce commitments which our Government has already assumed. In this connection the President in his recent message to Congress tried to illustrate the economy of his administration by claiming that the budget had been reduced from a wartime level of $63,000,000,000 to $38,000,000,000, and that the number of Federal employees had been reduced from a wartime level of three and three-quarter million to two million. That is an obviously misleading and unwarranted claim. No one could, with any justification, compare the cost of—or the employees needed for—the conduct of Government in wartime with that of peacetime. The President did not choose to compare the number of employees in the last peacetime year or the budget of the last peacetime year—which budget incidentally was only about one-quarter of the present one.

In seeking to reduce the ever-increasing budgets, we do not have an entirely free hand. The present budget, estimated now at $39,700,000,000, includes $11,000,000,000 for defense, $7,000,000,000 for international commitments, $6,000,000,000 for veterans, $5,300,000,000 for interest on the debt, $2,000,000,000 for social security, and $2,000,000,000 for tax refunds. Of this a total of $22,500,000,000 is already committed. In addition, another $11,000,000,000 concerned with national defense can probably not be greatly reduced with safety. That leaves us only about $6,000,000,000 with which to deal. It is obvious that we cannot make a $20,000,000,000 cut in that.

I make those observations not because we, in the Congress, have any less interest in reducing these expenditures, for we must and we will reduce the budget and taxes. I illustrate these difficulties to point out the position in which we find ourselves. We feel somewhat as Lincoln must have felt when a friend told him it would do him good to get down to Washington. Lincoln answered: "I only wish I could have got there to lock the door before the horse was stolen. But when I get to the spot I can find his tracks."

We must, each of us, as a member of a great party, play a confident role in urging allegiance to our cause. We know what our problems are. In seeking solutions the authorship is of far lesser importance than the result. Let us apply that thinking to a careful review of ways and means of keeping the peace, defeating high prices, maintaining industrial peace, building houses, improving the Nation's health and education, broadening the protection of social security, protecting civil rights, reclaiming arable land for farming, increasing industrial production, increasing agricultural production by a realistic guaranty of a fair return, lowering taxes and Government cost, protecting ourselves against dangerous ideologies. These purposes must be more than idle words. We can accomplish these things effectively within the scope of our now threatened system of free and independent enterprise. To do that we must either propose specific programs of our own or espouse promising programs of others. We cannot continue to say "we're for it, but not that way" unless we have a better way. The test of our value to our American future is not the degree of success we might have in denying progress but the degree of success we have in making progress. We have the choice of becoming a bitter, critical minority or becoming confident progressive builders of our own great future.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for us to become the party of youth. We need to do more than ask youth to join our columns. We, as workers in our party, need to demonstrate the sound and working principles of our American beliefs. We need to demonstrate that we, not only understand the problems of our youth, but are willing and anxious that energetic youth help lead the direction of our party.

We need to demonstrate that we are capable of—and constantly are—putting the interests of our Nation above party consideration. We need to demonstrate that we can, and we will, provide for the needs of our people and listen to their hopes and demands instead of creating agencies to stumble over one another in the development of ineffectual theories.

We are again a growing party, not looking back hopelessly on failures of the past, nor looking back smugly on victories of other days. With Lincoln, we can, "hope to stand firm enough not to go backward and not go forward fast enough to wreck the country's cause." If we are to justify a victory in 1948, we must frankly review the reasons for our failure. We made errors, the principle of which was that we did not keep pace with our people—but what our platform was in 1932 or at any other time in our history, is of little consequence today. The Pied Piper of promises has led the parade long enough. Let us not sit disconsolately by while the parade wanders aimlessly through a labyrinth of back alleys. Let us join the parade—and lead it again back to the broad avenue our forefathers built.

The political philosophies of our people and our party are, as Lincoln said, "sweet and short like the old maid's dance." The true American is a man who believes in political freedom for himself and for all people. A man who believes that he shall have the right to live as he chooses so long as he does not interfere with the rights of his neighbor; a man who believes he can, like Lincoln, rise from poverty to the highest office of our land; a man who believes the world changes and that he can change with it; a man who is not held down by either the dead hand of defeat or the dead dogmas of the past; a man who believes in youth and progress—constructive, positive programs; a man who believes in America, and believes in the God that made America great.

Address of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House of Representatives, Before the Missouri Association of Republicans at the Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, on Saturday Evening, February 7, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, Missouri had the honor and pleasure of a return visit from our esteemed Speaker, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts. We have had the pleasure of having Mr. MARTIN in Missouri with us on several occasions. We Missouri Republicans take him to our heart as an adopted son.

On the occasion of the Lincoln Day celebration at the Jefferson Hotel in St. Louis, our Speaker delivered an outstanding address which was broadcast from coast-to-coast over NBC network.

It is my great pleasure to express thanks in behalf of Missouri Republicans and to extend the remarks of our most distinguished Member—the Speaker—into the RECORD:

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Missouri Asscciation of Republicans, fellow citizens, when I come to Missouri my mind reverts to other visits. I recall coming here in 1938 when you had only a single Republican Congressman, good old DEWEY SHORT, and a handful of members of the legislature.

Today you have two Republican United States Senators, nine Members of the House, and you have control of your legislature. You have made great progress for sound, sane government in these few years, and I am sure that next November you will complete the task by reelecting your Congressman, electing a Republican Governor, and casting your electoral votes for a Republican President.

We are gathered here to honor the memory of an immortal American who had a sublime faith in God, and a profound confidence in the American people. He carried this Nation through a crisis which might well have destroyed the Union and made of America a divided country. Happily the Union survived and went on to a high destiny in the world. Lincoln died a martyr to his country's welfare and his devotion to the public weal. His birth date is saddened this February by the death of a great apostle of peace in India to whom death came in the same way as to Lincoln.

One of the outstanding characteristics of Abraham Lincoln was his reluctance to use power. He had a high respect for the Congress, in which he had served before he became President.

I ask you, What kind of thinking do we have today when an administration says Government price controls and rationing are tools of a police state and then advocates just such police-state methods 2 weeks later? Either they don't know what they are talking about or else they are not talking about what they know. Obviously, such an administration is not the kind to be in charge of our Government in these critical times.

What kind of thinking is it when in one breath the administration asks business to spend $50,000,000,000 for expanded production, and in the next breath, suggests increased taxes upon business. These taxes proposed by the administration would, of course, actually be a sales tax. Otherwise business would be prevented from securing the necessary funds for expansion.

Lincoln was an apostle of candid government. He believed the people were entitled to know what their administrators were doing in their name. He was convinced the people should always be told to what they were being committed by their public officials. "Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people?" he asked. "Is there any better or equal hope in the world?"

The trouble with America in the last few years has been we have had a rash of manufactured emergencies, and a chronic case of counterfeit crises in peacetime for the sole purpose of the administration demanding from the Congress more and more power. That is why Congress now views with suspicion any cry of "Wolf."

One trouble with America today is we have too many people who were never elected to public office running the Government. The people are sick of them. The administration still has a bad case of "spendicitis." It has been stubbornly unwilling to cut the cost of Government, and reduce the stupendous pay rolls. But the Republican Congress is going to do a little surgery on that trouble; we are going to cut it out. The administration today is demanding more powers, not for war, mind you, but for peace. It is demanding more and more money, higher and higher budgets. Even a nation as resourceful as America cannot indefinitely support such budgets.

This 16-year Government of trial and error—mostly error—must be discarded; it must be replaced by time-tested principles, principles which are wholly American and which have always worked successfully before in critical periods of our history.

The New Deal has sought to array class against class. It has made the businessman and business generally the focal point of its insidious attack on our American system of free enterprise. In devious ways it has promoted a so-called socialistic plan to redistribute the wealth forgetting completely that socialism redistributes poverty, not wealth.

This administration would restore bureaucratic control over our economy in its lust for more power over the people. By shackling the economy the administration says it hopes to check inflationary forces. It is never wise to do evil hoping good may come of it.

America is at a turning point. We are fighting a battle to maintain our American system of constitutional government, free

gency of the future. We are all intent on

businessmen of the poorer States. The

ordinance was adopted in what later be-

economy, and free society. We stand against demands for Government controls which would be sure to grow and spread to the point of state socialism. In other parts of the world, we are fighting communism, so-called, which is slave government.

America is the spiritual leader of the forces of Godliness and liberty. We are the financiers of what must be the greatest cooperative movement for freedom ever tried in history. The fate of civilization depends upon the success of that movement.

For more than 14 years the Republicans have been warning the Nation against the creeping plague of Communists infiltrating into positions of power in the Government. They were protected as they sought to gain control of labor unions; and even as they stirred up strife and strikes during the war.

The New Dealers derided our warnings. They scoffed at our fears. They went merrily on placating the Communists, and praising their so-called liberalism. Now even the State Department has had to reveal the treacherous acts against civilization committed by communism while high American officials were praising the Kremlin. Those who thought it was politically smart and philosophically fashionable to go along with pink policies, now want to sing very low. But it has not been so long ago when the New Dealers, the semi-Socialists, the Socialists, the pinkos, and the outright Communists were all playing around together. Anybody who questioned either their wisdom or their integrity, their intentions or their actions, was a prince of privilege, or a ruthless reactionary.

Now, fellow citizens, whom do you want to clean these Communists out of places of power? Whom do you want to clean up the intricate network of bureaus of this Government? Whom do you want to ferret out, and throw out, these people who delight to spend and spend, and tax and tax, and waste and waste? Do you want those who a short time ago were in bed with the Communists, and the pinkos and the statists? Or do you want the Republicans who saw this danger from the very start; who have fought these saboteurs all the way down the years; who never conciliated them, or appeased them, or made traffic with them? That will be an easy one for the American people to answer come next November.

The truth about despotism is out. Dress it up in any kind of propaganda you will, it still enslaves the people, and creates a special privilege class of those who control the Government.

The facts are now so clear, nobody dares to argue that communism has any advantages over our American system, or any attraction for free people. It will be stopped at our shores by those who have never trafficked with it; who never associated with it; who never appeased it; but who, down the years, have fought it for the deadly menace to liberty it has always been. That is one strong reason why I am certain the people next November will elect a Republican President and a Republican Congress.

The sly front of governmental waste is confusion, and secrecy in administration.

The Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress achieved a balanced budget for the first time in 16 years. We have commenced to pay off the gigantic national debt. We passed a tax-relief bill twice in the first session. We gave the greatest relief to those in the lower-income brackets. We sought to relieve the elderly people, and those living on small fixed incomes of all taxes, so they might have a few of the comforts of life. The administration was determined the people should have no relief from crushing taxes. Mr. Truman vetoed the taxpayers. That is why you didn't get the tax reduction last year. We have just passed another tax-reduction bill in the House which grants relief similar to the first two bills which were vetoed. This bill gives 71.1 percent of the tax relief to the people with incomes of less than $5,000; it frees 6,000,000 people from paying any tax; it gives special relief to the neediest of our people, the aged and the blind. It helps the American taxpayer to meet the high prices. It provides incentive for men and capital to work together for needed expansion and more jobs for the people. Twenty cents of every dollar the housewife pays in prices goes to the tax collector, and doesn't buy a nickel's worth of food or service. Eleven cents more goes to the Government as income tax.

Now, fellow citizens, there is something else we have to do when we reduce taxes. We must cut governmental waste and spending. The only way to cut governmental waste and spending is to cut down the governmental bureaus which waste and spend. That is another strong reason why I am certain the people will elect a Republican President and a Republican Congress next November.

The bureaucrats have a long-established policy. It may be expressed in two lines:

You make it; we take it.
You lend it; we spend it.

A joint commission is now at work on the Government reduction problem. The joint commission will report next year to the Congress. We then, with a Republican President and a Republican Congress, will finish the job of cutting the Government back to peacetime size.

We must return to the State and local levels the functions which belong there, and return to private endeavor the functions which belong there.

Big Government always means big budgets. Big budgets always mean big taxes. High taxes are oppressive on the people and discouraging to business expansion and production.

Swollen government is always oppressive. The bigger and more concentrated government becomes, the further it gets away from the people and the more remote the bureaucratic mazes are from the taxpayer.

The only way to prevent that is to keep government well and safely in the hands of the people themselves.

What we need in government is more of the Spirit of '76 and less of the spirit of 76,000 administrative regulations.

The President says he intends to spend in fiscal 1949, $39,600,000,000. We may well be startled when we realize this amounts to $1,020 for every family of four in the United States. Ten years ago the Federal Government expenditures were $276.60 per family of four. Talk about inflation robbing the people.

The administration boldly says this budget cannot be cut. Well, I will tell you it must be cut and we are going to cut it. With cooperation from the executive department, it could be reduced very substantially. But even without that cooperation, we will do this necessary job for America. The people cannot be kept forever in a strait-jacket simply because the bureaucrats insist upon continuing their wartime spending ways.

We are assuming a new cost burden on a colossal scale.

It is proposed we spend billions of dollars in the European relief program. The administration is fighting to have its own people handle these billions. The Congress is looking very carefully into the sums which are to be spent, and into the methods to be employed in the spending. The burden of cost is too vast for this money to be wasted or misspent.

In considering the tough plight of our European neighbors we must not permit our natural sympathies to blot out realities. In attempting to lift our friends up we must be certain beyond doubt that failure will not plunge us to their level of poverty and despair. We must ever bear in mind that to prevent Communist world domination we must remain strong economically and militarily.

I have a rule which I now propose. I believe it should govern the administration of the European venture. It can be stated in four words: economy, efficiency, common sense, and cooperation. Lacking any one of these elements the whole venture could be an appalling waste of the American taxpayer's money.

Only a safe, sound, solvent, free America can help the rest of the world regain peace, progress, and happiness.

While we are helping Europe, we are reaping the bitter fruits of administration mistakes over the past 16 years. The American people are bedevilled by high prices. The citizens by now know pretty well the causes of high prices. They now know inflation was born in the deficit spending of other New Deal years. They know the war activities were inflationary. The goods and services went overseas, or to the bottom of the seas, while the unspent wages and the salaries stayed home. The people now know the drain on our production to aid the world operates as an inflationary force, because, again, as in war, the goods go overseas and the wages and salaries stay at home. The people remember that price control didn't stop inflation. Price control merely drove goods into the black market. The Kremlin has had absolute control over prices in Russia, but they had inflation just the same. Despotism and deficit spending are the twin promoters of inflation.

The administration would like to have us believe inflation, like Topsy, just growed. Scatter-brained economic theorists have been pumping it up ever since they descended upon Washington like 7-year locusts in 1933. Unlike 7-year locusts, unfortunately, they're stayed for 16 years. A powerful insecticide compounded of the American voters' wrath, and the people's desire for a return of good government, will be applied next November and put a stop to this plague.

The foggy-mindedness which this administration indulges in is demonstrated in their talk about high prices. What has been perfectly plain all along is just now being discovered by them. Someone has pointed out that the dollar has depreciated just as the share in a company depreciates when the capital of that company has been watered. The administration tries to blame the producers—the Republicans—everybody—for high prices. It is the New Deal Administration itself which has created the inflation. Producers are straining to provide goods. The remarkable thing is not that prices are high, because Government inflation made them that way. It is that our free American enterprise has so rapidly and effectively moved to counteract this inflation by enormous increases in production.

There is just one answer to inflation in America; that is sound, common sense production of farm and factory products under free economic conditions which will not generate unemployment. The essence of prosperity is jobs at wages high enough to buy the products of farm and factory.

The administration has already demonstrated that its only answer for the condition America finds itself in is more power, more controls, and more spending, and eventually more scarcity. The attack on inflation and waste will have to be made under a Republican President cooperating with a Republican Congress. The New Deal has had 16 years in which to demonstrate its capacity for sound, economical government. It has failed miserably. It took a Republican Congress to achieve the first balanced budget in 16 years.

Government is vastly more costly than it ever was before. We know our national defense is going to be very much more expensive than ever before in the history of this Nation. We know we must have a super air defense fully adequate to meet any emergency of the future. We are all intent on keeping our country strong. The Republicans are creating a special committee to study our air defense. If the cost of government is not to overwhelm the people—efficiency and economy in government must be made effective as never before.

Ours is a battle bigger than a party. It is a fight to save Americanism. Millions of honest, patriotic Democrats and Independents are ready to unite with us—give them a cordial welcome.

We have poured out rivers of precious blood, and inconceivable amounts of goods and services through two world wars. We don't intend to lose the liberties at home we fought for abroad. We are not going to let America go down in confusion and chaos. We shall keep Lincoln's America and our America sound, solvent, strong, and free. We shall lead the great world movement for godliness and liberty. Faith and freedom must be our watchwords. Honesty, efficiency, cooperation, and a people united to save civilization can save civilization and will save civilization.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1948.

Mr. J. V. DOWTIN,
Principal, Kenton High School,
Kenton, Tenn.

DEAR MR. DOWTIN: The 10 reasons for Federal aid to education which you recently submitted to the United States Office of Education have come to my attention.

Your statements in justification of Federal aid are pithy and to the point, and it is my belief that they are worthy of publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is suggested that you send them to your Congressman with the request that he have them inserted.

Your thoughtfulness in sharing with us your views on this important subject is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

RALL I. GRIGSBY,
Special Assistant to the Commissioner.

KENTON HIGH SCHOOL,
Kenton, Tenn., February 12, 1948.

TEN REASONS FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

1. Ours is a shifting population, a person educated in one State may live the rest of his life in another.

2. Each State has representatives and helps elect the president.

3. Fun is made of people of poorer States and they are told how to manage their affairs. Education would make them less amusing and more able to handle their affairs.

4. In the War Between the States the South was overrun, became in debt, and had her property destroyed. Then she was robbed. The thieves and robbers were protected by the United States Army. Nor have all the discriminations against the South been abolished.

5. The businessmen of the richer States gain in their business transactions with the businessmen of the poorer States. The former set the prices—buying price and selling price (the old colonial system).

6. Recently it was decided that all citizens of a State should have equal opportunities for education. Why not for the Nation?

7. Educated whites and educated blacks would go a long way in solving the race problem. When has there been a conflict in which all parties were educated?

8. Illiterates and others lost to the army because of poor education were a loss to the entire Nation—also the allies.

9. Criminals in the poorer States commit Federal offenses. Lack of education is a cause of crime.

10. By subsidies, tariffs, grants, special privileges, etc., big business has received Federal aid. In many ways labor has received Federal aid. Even the farmer has received some Federal aid—though not enough. Why shouldn't education, America's most important business, receive Federal aid? Teachers are dependent on others for their livelihood.

J. V. DOWTIN.

Proposal for Issuance of Commemorative Stamp To Honor Nation's Volunteer Firemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced into this House a joint resolution which I earnestly believe merits the interest and support of all the Members. This resolution provides for the early issuance of a commemorative stamp of the denomination of 3 cents as an expression of the Nation's gratitude to the thousands of volunteer firemen throughout America and to the thousands of women who comprise the auxiliaries of these volunteer fire companies.

Seldom has the value of the work of these volunteer firemen and the members of their respective auxiliaries been more apparent than in this present severe winter. At great risk of their own safety, and indeed their very lives, these unpaid fire fighters in rural and suburban areas throughout our country give evidence each day of their courage and devotion to duty. Day and night, by their willingness to accept great personal discomfort, they protect the lives and property of residents of our towns, villages, and rural areas.

In Delaware I have had the privilege of being closely associated with scores of these volunteer firemen who faithfully carry on their individual businesses and productive enterprises but are, nevertheless, always available when the safety of human lives and of real and personal property is endangered. Furthermore, I personally had an opportunity recently to witness, and to be grateful for, the speed and the efficiency by which these unpaid but highly trained firemen perform their tasks.

I have learned that it was exactly 300 years ago—in 1648—that the first fire ordinance was adopted in what later became the United States of America. It was as a result of that ordinance that a body of volunteers patrolled the streets of New York City each night to watch for the outbreak of any fires; and 30 years later the first organized volunteer fire company, as we think of it today, was established in Boston. It is now estimated that there are at least 14,000 volunteer fire departments in the United States. The number of members of these companies and of their women's auxiliaries has not been ascertained, but it must certainly consist of hundreds of thousands.

Although volunteer firemen have served America for 300 years, no commemorative stamp has ever been issued in their honor. I now propose, Mr. Speaker, that such an honor be extended to them by our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to point out, as anyone who has ever lived in a rural American community knows, that the value of volunteer fire companies and their auxiliaries extends far beyond their invaluable services in fighting actual fires. They have done—and they continue to do—much in promoting fire prevention. In the villages and towns of America the fire house is an integral part of community life and civic and social activities. It may truly be said that within the volunteer fire companies throughout the Nation may be found the firm roots and the very foundation of our form of government. In those town and village fire houses we have, indeed, a fulcrum of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, there is still another important point I wish to make. Only a few days ago Secretary for National Defense Forrestal announced that plans are being drafted to organize civilian-defense units throughout the United States which would be fully trained to act in the event of any national emergency, especially such an emergency and critical situation as would be caused by an atomic-bomb attack. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary for National Defense already has available to him, as a nucleus for such a civilian defense corps, the volunteer firemen of America.

George Washington: 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an article entitled "George Washington: 1948," written by Carlos W. Huntington, which appeared in the Portland Homebildor under date of February 14, 1948:

GEORGE WASHINGTON: 1948

Surveyor, planter, soldier, Member Continental Congress, President, George Washington, "Father of His Country," was born in Virginia, February 22, 1732, an ardent advocate of devotion to America and freedom

from entangling alliances. What would he think of his country today, the state of the world, the outlook for the future?

He would see a Nation of 140,000,000 recovering from two world wars and threatened with a third. He would see the results of appeasement of Hitler by Chamberlain—war; the appeasement of Stalin at Yalta and Teheran—nations overrun by communistic hordes—Americans saddled with $90 debt for every man, woman, and child for "lend-lost" grants to Russia alone, nations prostrate and reviling the United States while begging for our dollars, food, and materials.

He would see Stalin, Molotov, Vishinski, and their ilk, barbarians dressed in the habiliments of civilization, hiding behind an iron curtain, their minions enslaving, purging, starving, and mistreating millions of Europeans, while attempting to spread their fiendish communistic doctrines throughout America and the lands they have not yet conquered. He would see the shambles of massacre and hate it, of all places, Jerusalem, ancient cradle of Christianity. He would see his Nation trying to help bring order out of chaos, trying to stabilize the world economy, trying to insure peace, and daily getting into the depths of the international maelstrom. We think he would reiterate his admonition of no entangling alliances, no commitments that would enslave our people. True, he would aid the suffering but, he would always bear in mind that a government's obligation is to its own citizens first, that the welfare of its people is paramount and that, out of our abundance, after our own needs are met, we will give freely to those requiring aid.

George Washington, there are still some of us who believe in your sound philosophy and doctrines, on this your two hundred and sixteenth birthday.

CARLOS W. HUNTINGTON.

New York State Republican Clubs Support European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the mounting support for the European recovery program among thoughtful citizens deeply concerned with the public welfare is very gratifying to those who have been wrestling with the enormous problems of world peace and stability. A significant contribution is the following resolution adopted by the Association of New York Young Republican clubs at the January meeting of their board of governors:

ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK STATE
YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUBS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 11, 1948.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JAVITS: The attached resolution, with regard to the Marshall plan, was adopted by the Association of New York State Young Republican Clubs, Inc., at a meeting in January.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES S. HAMILTON, JR.

At a meeting in January of the board of governors and the executive committee of the Association of New York State Young Republican Clubs, Inc., the following resolution was adopted with regard to the Marshall plan:

"Whereas, World War II has so disrupted the economy of various European States, and so distorted international trade, that minimum requirements of food, fuel, fertilizer, and production tools can be obtained only through substantial, long-range loans and contributions from all unscarred countries having relative export surpluses; and

"Whereas permanent world peace cannot be achieved without the restoration of those European national economies which have been dislocated by World War II; and

"Whereas the economic position and self-interest of the United States require that it lead the way in the selection and administration of the necessary reconstruction program, seeking full participation of other nations able to help; and

"Whereas a realistic study of their own needs and stated anticipated performance has clearly outlined the goals of the 16 nations participating in the Paris Conference; and

"Whereas studies of the American economy indicate our ability to supply the necessary aid, now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Governors and Executive Council of the Association of New York State Young Republican Clubs, Inc., recommends the adoption by Congress of a European recovery program embodying the following principles:

"1. The shipment of foods, fuel, and fertilizer as an outright gift.

"2. The shipment of capital goods, the value of which should be liquidated over a long term by the import of materials in short supply in the United States and other contributing states.

"3. Insofar as practicable, the aid should be extended in kind rather than dollar credits.

"4. A complete program to achieve European recovery, based upon the production and standard of living goals set by the 16 participating nations, should be authorized as a whole.

"5. The sole condition to the extension and continuation of aid should be active protection by receiving nations of freedom of worship, assembly, speech, press, and elections.

"6. A nonpartisan European recovery agency should be set up and administered by American business leaders and technicians appointed by the President and approved by the Senate. Provision should be made for representation of other contributing nations. A semiannual progress report should be submitted to Congress, which report should include the agency's views as to possible modification of the program."

Lincoln and the People Everywhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the Robert Todd Lincoln collection of Lincoln papers was opened to the public on July 26, 1947, in the Library of Congress. At the ceremony to mark the public opening of this collection one of the principal addresses was delivered by Dr. Roy P. Basler, a former professor at the University of Arkansas. Dr. Basler is now editor of the Writings of Abraham Lincoln, sponsored by the Abraham Lincoln Association of Springfield, Ill. His notable work for the association in producing a new and more satisfactory edition of Mr. Lincoln's writings is recognized by students of Lincoln literature as a significant contribution.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following closing paragraph of Dr. Basler's elequent address at the Library of Congress ceremony:

In Lincoln's life and thought America has found a compelling symbol and statement of democracy. Lincoln instructs the very soul of mankind in the meaning of human dignity, in the efficacy of human striving for justice and right, and, above all, in the spirit of patient, ironic humor with which all absolutes must be tempered—whether of failure or success, falsehood or truth, wrong or right—if men of various talents, creeds, and colors are to seek equality under one law. By precept and by example, Lincoln continues to teach mankind the way of democracy in this so-called atomic age, even as he was himself taught, both boy and man, by the precepts and examples of Washington and Jefferson.

America has accepted Lincoln as a symbol of the best which man has thus far achieved through democracy. More than this, America has accepted with Lincoln an ideal which may yet be more nearly attained—the timeless and universal democracy of the Declaration of Independence, rather than the temporary and often expedient democracy of the timely, or sometimes untimely, laws of our land. What Jefferson conceived, Lincoln consecrated with renewed meaning. Those who know the minutiae of Lincoln's life and works recognize the abiding truth in this popular acceptance of Lincoln as America's finest symbol of democracy. It was Lincoln's own admission that he had "never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence." In an impromptu speech delivered to a German club in Cincinnati, while he was en route to Washington in 1861, Lincoln stated unequivocally: "I hold that while man exists, it is his duty to improve not only his own condition, but to assist in ameliorating mankind." If America knows and follows Lincoln we cannot fail in this, or any future era, to assist in the work of ameliorating the lot of all men everywhere.

I believe that America will continue to follow Lincoln's belief that the wealth and power which have accrued to the Nation in our quest for freedom and equality is not an end in itself, but is a byproduct, to be utilized as a means of furthering the quest. Our wealth and power cannot justify our democracy before the nations of the world, now or ever. But our democracy can justify our wealth and power, by utilizing it in the quest for a better world for all men everywhere. We shall have failed of the historic destiny which Lincoln saw for us unless we recognize with him, that "the struggle of today is not altogether for today—it is for a vast future also." How truly Lincoln answered one great question:

"What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts, the guns of our war steamers, or the strength of our gallant and disciplined Army. These are not our reliance against a resumption of tyranny in our fair land. All of them may be turned against our liberties, without making us stronger or weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere."

This, ladies and gentlemen, is Abraham Lincoln's belief, and I believe, fundamentally, America's belief. So long as Lincoln's life and works are studied, it will be difficult for Americans to hold any contrary belief. To the purpose of perpetuating the study of Lincoln, the Robert Todd Lincoln collection is dedicated. May we hope that the day will never dawn when Abraham Lincoln and the principle for which and by which he lived have lost their force in the hearts of "all men, in all lands, everywhere."

American Ideals Taught in Athens College, Athens, Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, while in Greece with the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee last October, I was impressed to find several people in each village who could speak very good English. After talking with these people for a while they would always proudly explain that they had attended an American college in Greece such as Athens College.

These colleges in Greece, which are about the junior college level here in the United States, are supported by donations from Americans. It is my opinion that the education we are able to furnish these young Greek students by teaching them the ideals of American democracy is one of the most important things we can do for them.

I was very much impressed with the accomplishments of Dr. Homer W. Davis who is founder and president of Athens College. Dr. Davis is formerly of Coram, Long Island, N. Y., and he and his staff of American and Greek instructors are training several hundred students each year the American way of life.

Our American Mission for Aid to Greece is assisting in the rehabilitation of Greece but it has not taken over any responsibility of providing funds for these American colleges. It is important that friends of these schools continue to support them financially.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a recent letter received from the president of Athens College, Dr. Homer W. Davis, together with a letter from the Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece, Mr. Dwight P. Griswold:

ATHENS COLLEGE,
Athens, Greece, February 7, 1948.

The Honorable OLIN TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Recalling your visit to the college and your suggestion that I should keep in touch with you, I am writing to claim your interest in America's contribution to education in Greece.

All of us, of course, watch with great interest the work of the American Mission for Aid to Greece and give it our full moral support. The privilege of educating and in fact the fate of all American institutions in Greece obviously depend on the success of American efforts here, for the alternative is the iron curtain.

In the meantime, while the struggle is going on, we feel that Athens College, like other American institutions in Greece, is a powerful support to the official American effort and that the disappearance or serious curtailment of the work of these institutions, because of lack of funds, would be interpreted by the anxious public as lack of interest on the part of the American public and in fact weakening of America's determination. Any sign of weakening would be fatal.

Those of us who have struggled since liberation to rebuild American institutions in Greece thought that the announcement of the Truman doctrine would be accepted by the American public as recognition that greater help for Greece was needed and that, therefore, our task would be less discouraging. Unfortunately, the result has been just the contrary and we have faced the danger of closing the doors of the college because so many of our former contributors have taken the attitude that Government help made voluntary contributions unnecessary. We have tried to counteract this unfortunate impression and the attached copy of a letter from Governor Griswold has proved effective in many quarters.

Our trustees in the United States are appealing to the American public and particularly to Americans of Greek blood, whose obligations and interest in the matter are closest.

Mr. Theocharis Stavrides, former assistant principal of the college, who was at my side for 15 years in building up this institution, is in the United States this year and is spending much of his time going about and addressing groups in behalf of our trustees. It would be a tremendous support of our cause if you would be willing to give him letters of introduction to influential or wealthy Phil-Hellenes in your States, particularly Greek-Americans. Your endorsement of the work of the college and your expressed interest in the efforts for its survival would mean a great deal to us and I believe it is not an exaggeration to say a real contribution to the success of American efforts in Greece.

I hope that Mr. Stavrides will find it possible to call on you. If not, he will write you. His address is Mr. Theocharis Stavrides, care of Near East College Association, 46 Cedar Street, room 1209, New York 5, N. Y.

I apologize for troubling you but I know that I can count on your interest in the work to which we are devoting ourselves here with all our strength and energy. We feel that we are on the front line here and it is a great satisfaction to know that we have the support of friends in Washington, who have been here and have seen for themselves what is at stake.

With the kindest regards, I am,
Very truly yours,
HOMER W. DAVIS,
President.

THE AMERICAN MISSION
FOR AID TO GREECE,
Athens, November 22, 1947.

DR. HOMER W. DAVIS,
President, Athens College,
Psychico.

MY DEAR DR. DAVIS: It has recently been brought to my attention that contributions from the United States to certain institutions here, particularly Athens College, have fallen off since the arrival of the American mission. I am told that this is due to the feeling in the United States that the American Aid Mission has taken over all responsibility here, including even the American educational institutions which have operated for so long and so efficiently in this part of the world. As you know, this is not the case and, for the present at least, our program is confined to the economic and security problems of Greece itself.

It is extremely unfortunate that these contributions are on a decline, and I am sure that if the facts are properly presented to the American public, they will respond. I, myself, have first-hand knowledge of the good work you are doing here. I have met and dealt with graduates of Athens College in many walks of Greek life in the short time I have been here. Your institution is performing a lasting service and is contributing not only to the welfare of Greece, but also to the prestige of the United States.

I wish you every success in this important work. With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
DWIGHT P. GRISWOLD,
Chief.

The Postman Deserves a Raise in Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the editorial that appeared in the Oakland Post-Enquirer of Friday, January 16, 1948, is pertinent to the times. Recently there have been a few flurries in the commodity market that some have been quick to hail as a break in the high level of food prices. This is wishful thinking. There has been no real reduction in prices.

Postal and other Federal employees are entitled to a raise in pay. This editorial pleads their case in a logical manner. I urge you to read it carefully.

Continued high prices have sapped the surplus earnings of Government employees. They have no cushion of savings left to tide them over in case of sickness or periods of distress. There is no chance for them to build a reserve—it takes all they make to buy the necessities of life.

There are very few pennies left in the pocketbooks of the faithful wives of our postal and public employees after a very few trips to the grocery store.

Let Government express its interest in its employees by adjusting their salaries upward to meet high-living costs—we must not be guilty of forcing down the living standards of faithful public servants.

THE POSTMAN DESERVES A RAISE IN PAY

During the present sequence of rising prices and salary adjustments, the plight of the Nation's post-office employees continues to be largely unknown to the public, and consistently ignored by Congress.

The National Federation of Post Office Clerks is a union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Apart from this identity, however, the post-office employees' union operates under limitations which prevent it from forms of bargaining and pressure invoked by other organized workers to better themselves economically.

Thus, they are prohibited from appealing to the Labor Relations Board and other facilities to compose salary grievances.

They must wait for Congress to consider their needs, and be bound by the decisions of Congress.

In spite of these handicaps, the post-office employees loyally and patiently go about their vitally essential work.

Their only recourse is to enlist public opinion, and hope that it will impress upon the Congress the now drastic need of better salaries.

In turn, Congress, not confronted with vigorous demands by highly organized and active pressure groups, finds it all too easy to ignore or delay the need and justice of the clerks' petitions.

This is not only unfair, but unintelligent.

Efficient and swift service of the mail is an unrelaxing and constant national necessity. It requires well-trained, loyal, and experienced men.

It merits a much higher rate of pay, and certainly does not deserve the small, few, and infrequent raises of the past.

The postman is a valuable and valued servant of the public.

He, too, has bills to meet, a home to support, children to educate and the maintenance of adequate savings.

This he cannot do on his present pay.

While other workers have kept their accounts even with rising prices, the postman has had to tighten his belt. While other workers went on strike, the postman went his rounds, with unexampled dependability.

Obviously, Congress must get busy and correct this injustice.

And quite as obviously, the public must also get busy and remind Congress that proper and prompt action on this matter is a matter that can no longer wait.

Excelsior, Minn., Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "How Lincoln Attacked a Problem," which appeared in the Minnetonka Record on Lincoln's Birthday, February 12, 1948. This newspaper, published by the "waters of the Minnetonka," is well known for its many thought-provoking editorials and able coverage of the news. I especially recommend the following editorial for the keen comparison it makes to our present-day situation:

HOW LINCOLN ATTACKED A PROBLEM

When we find our Nation involved in insoluble difficulties we are inclined to seek help from the experience of brave souls who faced like conditions and left records of their methods of action. We of America—literally our Congress and our President—have been floundering helplessly in an effort to attain peace years after the last enemy yielded up his weapon and surrendered. Years of confusion, frustration, energy-sapping uncertainty have been wasted, and peace seems more distant than it seemed on VJ-day. Can we—can our congressional leaders, our President—be helped by noting how a statesman of the past acted in a somewhat similar situation?

This is Lincoln's birthday. No harm can come—and possibly good may result—from considering how he attacked a problem that threatened the Nation. This was the problem of human slavery. It was in June of the ye.r 1858. Slavery, roughly an institution of the Democratic Party, though many individuals in that party abhorred it, was extending into territory formerly considered free. There was a conspiracy, apparent but not yet demonstrable, on the highest political level, that aimed to make slavery permissible in every State. Heretofore, Lincoln kept repeating, slavery had been looked upon as an evil existing when the Constitution was adopted; it was to be restricted; "in the course of ultimate extinction."

Now the institution, under the urge of southern hotheads and northern Democrats like Judge Douglas, of Lincoln's own State, was entering Kansas. The time had come, lonely, pondering Lincoln, lawyer and homely philosopher, decided to face the issue, attack the forward-sweeping scourge, call a halt.

The opportunity came at the close of the Republican State convention, held in Springfield on June 16, 1858. The convention had nominated Lincoln as Republican candidate for United States Senator. He was not present but came when sent for. He was asked to make a speech. He astonished the convention, we may suppose, by taking a manuscript from his pocket, or possibly from his hat, and beginning carefully to read his message. He had never done this before; his speeches had been delivered from his well-stored memory; this was to be something extraordinary, in which there must be no word added, deleted, or altered. He began, as he often did, with an axiom-like statement with which all hearers could agree:

"If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

We may imagine the delegates from town and country accepting this obvious truth and perhaps wonder at the grave manner in which it was set forth. Then came a sentence that may have caused eyebrows to be lifted:

"We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object and confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation."

We may believe the tall home town lawyer shifted a leaf or adjusted his glasses, affording a moment for this statement, which also was obvious, to be accepted. His next sentences contained graver matters:

"Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed."

We can almost see town and prairie delegates' shoulders jerk as they glance at one another. What is coming now? What is Lincoln getting at? Such queries may have leaped in hearers' minds. The great wide shoulders may have sagged; the vast sad eyes may have blinked, as he continued:

"'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other."

With what pain these grave conclusions must have pierced the hearts of the assembled prairie pioneers, men who had assumed their section of the country would be forever free from the degrading curse of slavery. But the speaker was not mincing his words. He had spent months pondering, studying, making notes, forming sentences. Sad, unwelcome, discouraging his speech was indeed, but human progress, eternal truth, national dignity demanded that it be spoken:

"Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South."

The tall lawyer continued. For an hour he went on, heaping up evidence of the secret agreement between Stephen A. Douglas, former President Franklin Pierce, Roger Taney, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and President James Buchanan. He came to the application of his evidence:

"Put this and that together and we have another niche, which we may ere long see filled with another Supreme Court decision, declaring that the Constitution does not permit a State to exclude slavery from its limits."

It was a Nation-shaking speech. Honest, clear-seeing Lincoln faced the unpleasant problem squarely, acted boldly, bravely. The people supported him. In time—it took a few years and a cruel war—the problem was settled for all history. Slavery was uprooted. Lincoln's nation became all free.

Good might be produced if every Senator and Representative, as well as our Chief Executive, should on Lincoln's birthday, reread this historic speech and weigh its wisdom and courage.

The Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, once the people of America recognize the political shackles which bind them through the electoral college, they will demand its abolition. I was pleased to note a most intelligent discussion of this issue in an editorial appearing in the Lynn County News on February 13, 1948. The Lynn County News is a progressive paper published by Mr. E. I. Hill at Tahoka, Tex. I wish to place his editorial in the RECORD:

GOSSETT HAS THE REMEDY

That civil-rights message that President Truman delivered to Congress recently stirred up a lot of criticism in the South. In fact, nearly all southern Representatives and Senators have expressed opposition, either publicly or privately.

Some of them are mightily wrought up. Others have kept their tempers. Most of the Texas delegation have been moderate in their criticisms. They have kept their tempers, we are persuaded, because they have scented little danger of the proposals being pressed to a vote. Secretly if not openly, they feel that the President was only playing a bit of politics. He was fishing for the Negro vote in the next election.

Of course, if he should be reelected, both he and the northern Democrats generally would doubtless make some sort of effort to have these proposals enacted into law, but it is not believed that he and other party leaders would press the fight to the extent of alienating the entire South from the Democratic Party. It is to be hoped that those who hold to this view will prove to be right.

The whole matter, however, has focused attention on some serious defects in our electoral system—defects for which Representative ED GOSSETT, of Wichita Falls, has been proposing a remedy for the past year or more.

Under our system of electing a President, certain minority groups have power in elections out of all proportion to their number, the power to swing the entire electoral vote of a State to the candidate of their choice, for, under our Constitution, if a candidate for the presidency gets a majority of even one of the popular votes cast in a State he thereby gets all of the electoral votes from that State.

Take New York, for instance. It has 45 electoral votes. Suppose that Truman gets 2,500,000 popular votes and his Republican opponent gets 2,499,900 popular votes in that State, Truman has carried the State by a popularity majority of only 100 votes but in the electoral college, which elects the President, he gets all 45 of New York's electoral votes. A change of 51 votes from the Democratic to the Republican candidate in the popular election would have swung the entire electoral vote away from Truman and to his Republican opponent. Therefore it is seen how a small block of voters in a doubtful State may be able to swing the entire electoral vote of that State to one candidate or the other as the block may choose. A thousand Negroes in New York might swing the entire electoral vote at the next election either to Truman or to the Republican candidate. Since there are many thousand Negro voters in New York, it behooves any candidate to win them to his side.

Now GOSSETT's proposal is that the electoral votes of a State be divided in the same proportion as is the popular vote. In that case, Truman, who gets 2,500,000 popular votes in New York, and his Republican opponent who gets virtually the same number, should likewise be given virtually the same number of electoral votes, practically 22½ each.

Texas has 23 electoral votes. If the Democratic candidate should get four-fifths of the vote and the Republican candidate one-fifth, then the 23 electoral votes would be divided up in the same proportion.

Under this system, one man's vote in Texas would count for just as much in a Presidential election as one man's vote in New York or any other State. Under the present system 1,000 Negro votes in New York may have more weight than a million white people's votes in Texas.

Under the present system, the man who carries New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Ohio, and Illinois by even a dozen majority in each State, gets all of the electoral votes of those five big States and is almost sure to be elected, even though his opponent might have a million majority in Texas, and might have a popular majority of millions in the United States.

We believe that the Texas delegation in Congress should get solidly behind the GOSSETT bill and press its passage. We believe that the people of a majority of the States would approve it.

And the power of the minority blocks would be reduced to their numerical size.

Lithuania's Lost Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, three decades ago, on February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania, a little country in northern Europe, proclaimed their declaration of independence. We, as a Nation, recognized them as a free and sovereign nation, dedicated, as we are, to the proposition that all men are created equal.

That Lithuanian Declaration of Independence had been earned through long decades of travail by a stalwart people. More than 120 years had elapsed between the time they lost their freedom and the time they regained it from foreign foes.

In 1940, the Lithuanians lost their freedom again, to a tyranny far more deadly than any known in the long roll call of history. They were swallowed up by the mighty Soviet Union, perhaps as part of a deal between Joseph Stalin and Adolf Hitler.

Now, through the acquiescence of Americans who glibly promised the people of the world the "four freedoms," Lithuanians in their native land have no freedom. American Lithuanians are still working to win their native country's freedom; but the fight sometimes seems hopeless.

Several days belatedly, but better late than never, I want to salute the efforts of those who are still trying to bring freedom to the people of Lithuania. The thirtieth anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence passed last Monday, February 16, but the spirit of freedom in Lithuanians around the world will not pass. It will live on, and, with the help of freemen everywhere, it will someday triumph.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the appropriate committees of Congress should immediately go into the Palestine situation. Too many blunders have already been made in this matter. Time is running out, and we may soon be face to face with World War III. An intelligent discussion of the issues involved appeared in an editorial in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday. For the information of the Congress and the entire country, I wish to insert that editorial in the RECORD:

SHOW-DOWN IN PALESTINE

The report of the United Nations Palestine Commission—a report which states bluntly that nothing but armed force can carry out the partition of the Holy Land—should end wishful thinking on this subject. For it is all too clear that the time for a show-down in Palestine is close at hand.

It was the end of November when the General Assembly, with this Government exerting pressure on member nations, adopted its resolution recommending the division of Palestine into Jewish and Arab states. At that time, although the Arabs had stated their intention to resist partition with force, it is improbable that many people foresaw the condition which confronts us today. It was said, and widely believed, that the Arabs were bluffing, that in the last analysis they would not oppose the moral force of the General Assembly's appeal. It was also said, and many believed it, that in event of armed resistance by the Arabs the Palestine Jews, through Haganah, their militia organization, would be capable of dealing with it.

Time demonstrated the fallacy of these assumptions. Then agitation developed for the modification by this Government of its arms embargo so that weapons could be shipped to the Jews to bolster their fight against the Arabs. The contention was that the Arabs could get arms and the Jews could not. Therefore, it was said, why not make arms available to the Jews, thereby balancing the forces in Palestine? This was another dubious assumption, one that has been thoroughly blasted by the report of the Palestine Commission. A balancing of power, instead of affording us an easy escape route, would almost certainly lead to fighting on a scale which would compel intervention.

The effect of these considerations, of course, is not to supply an answer to the problem. But a review of past errors should serve to underscore the danger of impulsive action and the overriding importance of taking further steps only after the most careful deliberation.

It is clear now that the United States committed itself to partition without any plan or program for its implementation. To act in that fashion is always dangerous. It will be doubly so if we now commit ourselves to the principle of the use of armed force against the Arabs without the fullest consideration of all the factors involved and the probable consequences of such a course.

Most of these considerations should be obvious. Some of those which lend support to the appeal for forcible implementation of the General Assembly's recommendation follow:

1. The right of the Jews to a national home in Palestine. This, of course, is a controversial point, but to those who believe in it, it is reason enough for action.

2. The prestige of the United Nations is at stake. The argument here is that if the Arabs are permitted to nullify with force a recommendation supported by two-thirds of the General Assembly, the already shaky foundations of the UN will be most seriously undermined. It cannot be denied that there is substance to this argument.

3. The opposition of the Arabs raises an intolerable situation which will go from bad to worse if nothing is done. Therefore, we should act promptly and decisively, through the UN, to compel acceptance of partition.

On the other side of the ledger one finds considerations such as these:

1. The sending of a United Nations force to Palestine—assuming that the Security Council would order that—probably would mean war with the Arab world. The military committee of the Arab League has said that if the United Nations sends troops to Palestine they will be opposed by force. We should assume that they mean this, and we should decide whether we are prepared to see such an undertaking through to a successful conclusion.

2. The Mediterranean and the Near and Middle East are of vital strategic importance to the United States and the rest of the western world. In event of war with Russia in the foreseeable future we would have to have bases in that part of the world. Hence, to what extent would our national interests be jeopardized by incurring the full hostility of the Arabs?

3. The oil in the Arab world is important to us, and even more so to Europe. It has become fashionable to jeer at any one who mentions oil in this connection. But the oil is an important consideration nevertheless. The Zionist leaders say that the Arab need of dollars is so great that, come what may, they would still sell their oil. But this is merely another assumption, and we should carefully consider its validity.

4. What are the motives and intentions of Soviet Russia in this situation? Russian policy for centuries has aimed at penetration of the Mediterranean and Persian Gulf areas. If a United Nations force should be sent to Palestine would it include Russian troops? On the other hand, if nothing is done and disorders continue, can Russia be expected to keep hands off this coveted area almost on her borders? Obviously, from the standpoint of our own national security, these are matters which should concern us deeply.

At the present time there is no evidence of a disposition on the part of our Government to discuss these questions publicly.

The President says we are supporting the United Nations, but he will not go beyond that, and his subordinates in the administration, among whom there is the sharpest difference of opinion, are unwilling to talk for publication. But our decision is not one which should be made in hush-hush fashion. There is little time left, for the British will surrender their League of Nations' mandate in May. What are we going to do then?

If we make a wrong decision the results can be calamitous for us. That being so, it is imperative that this matter be brought into the open where it can be publicly explored and discussed with a view to ascertaining where our real interests, and those of the rest of the world, lie. Too much is at stake to permit domestic political considerations, international pressures or anything else to block the fullest public consideration of the showdown which is impending in Palestine.

National Security Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, this week, February 12 through 22, is National Security Week in the United States. It is sponsored, as we all realize, by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States to promote sound public thinking on a matter of continuing public interest—security for our Nation against enemies at home and abroad, present or potential.

As every intelligent American knows, America relies upon its civilians for both manpower and leadership in time of crisis. This has been true in every war and it will be true if war comes again, although everyone of us naturally wants no war unless we have to have one.

In World War II, members of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States furnished more than 90 percent of the leadership of our armed forces at home and abroad. Now, in peacetime, this organization is furnishing leadership in warning our people of the perils of unpreparedness and in trying to enlighten everyone as to possible courses of action we must take to be economically and militarily strong at all times.

I know that I speak for every Member of Congress when I salute the Reserve Officers Association of the United States today and bid this organization of stalwart citizens godspeed in their efforts to enlighten and to inform the people and to encourage sound thinking every day in the year on such a vital public matter as national defense.

This Congress has evidenced its continuing interest in the needs of national defense, as everyone concedes. We have appropriated huge sums for the armed forces and we will stress even more in the future the need for a highly trained, mobile, powerful air force, second to none in scientific development and striking power. We will be true to the aims of the Reserve Officers Association and we hope that every American will cooperate, not only this week but every week in the year.

Georgia, an Adventure in Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 14, this year, at the Library of Congress in Washington, there were held commemorative services on the two hundred and fifteenth anniversary of the founding of the Georgia Colony. On that occasion my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] delivered a very scholarly address entitled "Georgia, an Adventure in Freedom." I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No attempt will be made to catalog achievements in agriculture, horticulture; manufacturing, trade, and commerce in which Georgia excels or has made noteworthy progress by common consent of all loyal Georgians at least. Rather, this happy occasion affords opportunity to interpret the State, albeit in an inadequate manner.

On the 1st day of February 1733 an English gentleman in the prime of life led a band of hopeful adventurers to Yamacraw Bluff, on the Savannah River. There he was greeted by a dignified Indian of about 90 winters. The white leader was James Edward Oglethorpe—a soldier of the King, a member of Parliament, a humanitarian, and the founder of Georgia. The red man was Tomochichi, chief of the Yamacraws, who later accompanied his soldier friend to England and sat for his portrait by the celebrated painter, William Verelst.

On the following day the pioneers of Georgia began a still-vital tradition by showing that they were not less religious than the Pilgrim Fathers. They assembled to render thanks to God for their safe journey and to ask His blessing upon their new venture for freedom.

Under the personal supervision of their leader, the colonists soon laid out a town of regular streets and squares—as it appears in Peter Gordon's famous engraving of 1734, showing the new buildings on a site cleared from the woods, with Oglethorpe's stately tent pitched in the foreground, overlooking the river. The picture may be seen in the Library of Congress Exhibit of the Week.

The imagination of the engraver symbolizes the character of Georgia's founding and much of its history. It had long existed in the orderly vision of Oglethorpe. It was the creation of a statesman, the first in a long succession of Georgians whose motto was the one he adopted for his colony: "Non nobis, sed aliis"—not for ourselves, but for others. The soldier's feelings were touched by the misery of poor debtors languishing in their cells, and the sufferings of persecuted minorities in Europe, especially the pious Lutherans of Salzburg, who marched through the lands of their exile singing hymns.

"Through the night of doubt and sorrow, onward goes the pilgrim band,
Singing songs of expectation, marching to the promised land."

He resolved to establish the promised land, where they might begin life anew and protect the King's dominions against the Spaniards. No doubt he had read the Description of the Golden Islands, which appeared in 1720, and Sir Robert Montgomery's rather impractical plans for the Margravate of Azilia, to be organized in "the most delightful country of the universe"—namely, Georgia. King George II liked Oglethorpe's idea, and on June 9, 1732, granted to him and other eminent gentlemen a charter for the region between the Savannah and Altamaha Rivers and "westward to the South Seas." That generous phrase gave Georgia her claim to the vast region from which were carved the States of Alabama and Mississippi. In 1763 the third royal George extended the bounds to Florida.

The Spaniards of St. Augustine doubtless did not appreciate that sweeping gesture of princely generosity and reflected bitterly that their predecessors had been making Georgia history for more than a century and a half before General Oglethorpe was born, in 1697. They must have reflected, too, that the new province remained safely in his soldierly grasp, when they had fought with him in 1742, at the Battle of Bloody Marsh, on one of the Golden Islands.

That battle occurred almost exactly two centuries after Hernando de Soto traversed the future territory of Georgia to the Savannah River, on his way to his solemn burial in the Mississippi River he discovered. His exploit fixed Spain's claim upon the spacious region from the Keys to Chesapeake Bay and from the Sea Islands to the Father of Waters, which became known to her soldiers and missionaries as La Florida. The determination of the bearded dons to maintain possession was shockingly illustrated in the massacre of the French colonists of the 1560's by the ruthless Governor of Florida, Pedro Menendez de Aviles. In 1566 he planted on St. Catherines Island the first of a chain of forts in Georgia which from that time was known to the Spanish chroniclers as Guale.

For over a century soldiers and monks maintained the forts and the missions, and Georgia was a frontier of Spain's far-flung empire. In 1606 Bishop Altamirano, of Cuba, traveled in state through Guale, confirming more than 1,000 converted Indians. Other Spanish explorers—Tristan de Luna, Pardo, and Boyano—entered Georgia by the back door in search of the mines of the Appalachians. Those mines for generations contributed to the coffers of the Emperor of the Indies, and eventually inspired the establishment of the famous branch mint of the United States at Dahlonega.

The missions survived repeated Indian rebellions and buccaneer raids, and fierce storms which pounded the outer beaches of the Golden Islands and shook the bearded oaks. But they retreated before British imperial aggression and the persistent Indian trader, who drew away the Indian converts and encouraged freebooters to loot the riches of Guale. After the founding of South Carolina in 1670, the chanting and the recitations of the Indian pupils gradually ceased. The solid mission buildings became silent ruins under the hoary trees.

Then the red man confronted a force far more hostile to his way of life than the soldiers and friars of Old Spain. That was the swarming of the north European hive, the myriad householders coming with wives and children to establish homes, plantations, gardens, churches and schools. The mounds scattered over Georgia told the red man that the land belonged to him, but treaties with the white man warned him that his heritage was slipping from his hands. The contest was long, and Georgia had passed the centennial mark before the last page was written and the Cherokee Nation sadly and reluctantly began the long trek to the far West.

With them passed a great tradition, for the Georgia Indians were not degenerate loafers hanging about the tavern hearth for stray drops of liquid comfort. They are proud, intelligent countenances that gaze from the portraits painted by famous artists, when the Indian dressed in his best for great occasions. There are Tomochichi the Yamacraw, friend of Oglethorpe, who buried him with honors at Savannah; Sequoyah, inventor of the Cherokee alphabet; and the Creek chief, William McIntosh, who sacrificed his life to the rage of his own people, to keep peace with Georgia. These were no mere barbarians. They cultivated farms, supported their own churches and schools under the guidance of missionaries, wrote letters to the Indian agents, and published their newspaper, the Cherokee Phenix, of New Echota, Ga. They gave the State the most vivid Indian history any Southern State can claim.

Into their lands swarmed the pioneers of Georgia—a cosmopolitan lot, gathered out of many kindreds, tongues, and religions: English Episcopaleans, Scottish Presbyterians, Catholic Piedmontese from Italy, German Lutherans, Moravians, Carolina Quakers, New England Puritans, French Huguenots, Jews, Welsh, and Swiss. The present-day Georgians are not the unmixed "Anglo-Saxons" absurdly claimed by the racial purists, but a blend of Wright, McIntosh, and Treutlen, Baldwin and Hall, Lanier and Ravenel, Sheftall, Mordecai, and Gwinnett. The mingling of these stocks undoubtedly accounts for the amazing intellectual brilliance of the State, as seen in a constellation of statesmen, orators, evangelists, and writers, hardly rivaled by any other Southern State.

Their idealism was a heritage from the original trustees, who pictured their dear Georgia as an empire abounding in silk, wines, oil, and indigo, and covered with rich vineyards, mulberry groves, gardens, and plantations cultivated by freemen, without the shadows of slavery. But philanthropy yielded to economic realities, and the Negro came to stay. He might arrive in the foul hold of a New England "slaver" from Goree, but soon he learned the master's language and religion, and to Georgia he brought the permanent gifts of his music, dancing, handicrafts, folklore, and soft fantasy.

Before 1776 Georgia had become a typical southern plantation colony, with a royal governor and an elected assembly after the trustees surrendered their rights of government in 1754. It had the usual established Episcopal Church, large estates tilled mostly by slaves, and also many small farmers, whose descendants became the majority of an intelligent, industrious, and religious people.

The advance of modern education and industry has not impaired the people's loyalty to the religion of the pioneers. There is a direct inheritance of spiritual aspiration, of longing after holiness, from the enthusiasm of the Wesley brothers, John and Charles, to the mysticism of Sidney Lanier's The Marshes of Glynn:

"As the marsh hen secretly builds on the watery sod,
Behold I will build me a nest on the greatness of God:
I will fly in the greatness of God as the marsh hen flies
In the freedom that fills all the space 'twixt the marsh and the skies:
By so many roots as the marsh grass send in the sod
I will heartily lay me ahold on the greatness of God."

This is a poet's interpretation of the personal religion instilled in the people by the Methodist circuit riders since Hope Hull, and by the evangelism of George Whitefield, and Jesse Mercer, and Daniel Marshall. The first southern hymn book, published in Charleston in 1737, was composed by John Wesley during his visit to Georgia.

Because of this tenacious tradition, Georgians today are a religious folk, with more than half of the people gathered into church membership. They are predominantly evangelical, whether they love the pure and precise English of the Book of Common Prayer, or the speaking in tongues at the Pentecostal meeting, or the trumpets of jubilee in some rustic praise house of the Sea Island Negro. It has been said that Christianity in America will be saved in the South; and when that happens, doubtless Georgians will be among the apostles. Yet they are not generally bigoted.

The Revolution of 1776 swept away religious privilege, along with imperial control—but only after an intense struggle. The founder and his friends had been good servants of their King, and imparted a loyalist tinge to the colony. But as imperialism attempted to tighten its grip after 1763, the traditional loyalty was opposed by a small but determined band of Sons of Liberty, organized in 1765.

Inspired by the influence of the able royal governor, James Wright, the loyalist party contrived to delay Georgia's representation in the Continental Congress—to the vast disgust of patriots. The contest became in part a desolating civil war, and perhaps none of the Thirteen States suffered more than Georgia. Through all the confusion and the barbarous devastations of partisans, Georgia emerged into statehood under her first constitution of 1777, and the leadership of such statesmen and soldiers as Lyman Hall, Lachlan McIntosh, and his rival, Button Gwinnett, John Milledge, John A. Treutlen, Samuel Elbert, William Few, and Abraham Baldwin. The last two sealed her union with her sister States, by signing the Federal Constitution, which the State ratifying convention unanimously accepted.

Georgians had scarcely adjusted themselves to the new order, when the plantation of their hero, Gen. Nathanael Greene, became the source of an invention—Eli Whitney's famous cotton gin—which introduced the golden age of the plantation economy. It strengthened the traditional prestige of the ownership of land, which had been the foundation of Georgia as a military frontier, and remained the hallmark of social position, the entree to political leadership, preferment, and statecraft. The men who made statesmanship a real craft, and who represented Georgia in the court and camp, in Congress and the Cabinet, were generally the masters of estates. Their wives were the mistresses of stately homes and gardens, which are still admired as models of gracious living.

Behind the planter aristocracy, but not behind in ability, were the masses of yeoman farmers whose many sons worked in the fields, and in 1861 dropped their tools to defend the cause of State rights and add to our wartime humor as they chaffed each other by the campfires. Then came the Negro, with his cabin and truck patch, and his frequent pride in the estate where he served. Sometimes, especially if he were ambitious and sensitive, he ran away and contributed to the embarrassment of statesmen who strove to keep the Union from breaking along the Ohio River. The ineffable "cracker" of the rough humorists was the freak of a fundamentally sound if not completely just society—he was not typical.

The plantation of romantic tradition, the white columns, the formal gardens and the family coach, did not completely represent the old order. The yellowed pages of our old census records, in the National Archives, reveal other phases of the story—the persistence of the nonslaveholding farmer and the local artisan. That varied economy was knit together and to other States by railroads, of which Georgia had more mileage in 1850 than any other Southern State. It made the Empire State the larder and arsenal of the Confederacy. And Federal strategists finally perceived that the only quick way to end the war was to invade Georgia, cut the Confederacy in half, and deprive the segments of much of their sustenance.

That rough surgery did not merely shatter an economic system, it also interrupted the evolution of a promising intellectual culture. The Federal Armies did not find in Georgia an utterly rustic people, steeped in mental torpor. The State was preeminent in the South as a stronghold of those typically American institutions, the free church, the church college, the academy, and the classical university supported by the State. Although the outlines of a democratic system of schools had barely emerged by 1860, Georgia was dotted with little private academies and colleges, which were featured in the illustrated guidebooks of the State, by the skill of the artist.

The old engravings of Georgia scenes—the rapids of the Chattahoochee, lonesome Rock Mountain, and Toccoa Falls—suggest the spirit of her early literature, which prolonged the romantic impulse of the first explorers, whose narratives inspired the DeBry engravings depicting the vivid and strange customs of the natives of Guale. The romantic spirit of the early nineteenth century suffused the poems of Georgia's first cluster of poets—Richard Henry Wilde, Paul Hamilton Hayne, and the "lost poet," Thomas Holley Chivers. The earthy realism of Augustus B. Longstreet, Richard Malcolm Johnston, and William Tappan Thompson kept Georgians from taking themselves too seriously, and foretold the growth of "realistic" fiction after the War Between the States.

In the old South, the term "literature" embraced political essays and oratory, and even the carefully styled letters of eminent men. The Georgian who listened intently to the rolling periods of Robert Toombs and Howell Cobb, or meditated on the closely reasoned constitutional arguments of "Little Alec" Stephens and Ben Hill, considered himself as a witness and even as a participant in the creation of literature. The literary atmosphere of old Georgia suggests that of the classical ancients, whose architectural masterpieces inspired the builders of her mansions, whose speeches thrilled the young collegians debating the questions of the day behind the white columns of Demosthenian Hall at the University of Georgia, in appropriately named Athens.

There came the long-dreaded but yet half-wished-for day when the fiery orators and the philosophers of State rights could see no resolution of the irrepressible conflict, save in secession and a resort to arms in defense of their conviction that Baldwin and Few had set their hands to the charter of a confederacy. The parting of the ways came hard. In 1850 the Georgia moderates prevailed, and greatly helped to keep the Southern States in the Union for another decade. Even in the fateful election of 1860, Georgians gave 43,000 votes to the Constitutional Union candidate for President (John Bell, of Tennessee), as against 51,000 for Breckinridge, the so-caled secessionist candidate.

Once the die was cast, however, the people rallied to the defense of their State. To many the war was, and in spite of General Sherman, remained a high adventure, a romantic and heroic experience. It must have been so to contribute to American literature such gems as Father Abram J. Hyan's The Conquered Banner, and Francis O. Ticknor's Little Giffen and Virginians of the Valley.

A people who sang in the face of ever-grimmer privations could endure the worst inflictions of the so-called reconstruction, which to most Georgians—white and colored—later came to seem more like a subversion of civilization. Their courage is symbolized in the brave letters written by Paul Hamilton Hayne from his cottage at Copse Hill, or by stricken Lanier, playing his beloved flute in the grim fastness of a Federal prison, and then returning to Georgia on foot. In a few years he was writing to Oliver Wendell Holmes, discoursing upon his theory of poetry as if nothing had happened, and in

1876 he was chosen to write the ode celebrating the centennial of the national independence. Bill Arp, one of Georgia's peculiar breed of earthy humorists, helped the Nation to forget the bitterness of what he so aptly described as the "uncivil war."

In that spirit the people began to reconstruct their life from the desolation, welcoming the northern capital which began a transformation of Georgia into a modern industrial as well as agricultural commonwealth. A new generation turned away from the embittered die-hards to look for inspiration to Henry W. Grady and other prophets of the new South, and to Tom Watson, author and "agrarian rebel," mouthpiece of uncounted small independent farmers.

The Negro, released from tutelage to the Freedman's Bureau and the carpetbegger, learned from Booker T. Washington and his followers that the promise of his future lay in first achieving economic independence. While he began slowly but steadily to acquire land and tools, he laid also the foundations of cultural independence, in his own schools and newspapers, and in the growth of a literature of slave narratives, reminiscences, poetry, novels, short stories, and social studies. The older folklore persists in studies of his music and customs, and the immortal one and only Uncle Remus.

The prophets of the new South insisted upon nothing more strongly than refounding the educational system on a democratic basis. The result of their labors in the present threefold system of private, denominational, and public schools, placed education within the reach of all classes, and culminated in the old State university at Athens. In the hard, uphill years a young woman of aristocratic lineage had a vision as she beheld the religious and mental destitution of the mountain children near her girlhood home at Rome. In a log-cabin Sunday school she began a venture of faith which eventually produced the world-famous Berry schools.

The diversity of modern Georgia prevails in the various character of the students in her schools. At Rabun Cap the farm family of the northern hills learns improved agriculture and home economics. The future minister or social worker adjusts the old religious culture to a new economic order, at one of the numerous denominational colleges and seminaries. The young engineer at Georgia Tech and the Negro youth in a laboratory at Atlanta University are types of the new industrialism. At Athens, walking past the classic Demosthenian Hall goes the successor of earlier seekers after wisdom and culture, who aspired to the editor's chair, to a literary career, or perhaps to a seat in Congress or the Cabinet. Their Georgia is far from the illiterate sodden South, pictured in radical political oratory in the era of the Bloody Shirt.

From 1871, when the State was readmitted to the Union—if we must use that dubious phrase—until the turn of the twentieth century, Georgia slowly recovered from the shocks of war and reconstruction. The modern era of Georgia history began in the decade of the 1890's. A surge of national feeling in 1898 found a ready response in the State and helped to wipe out the memories of 1865. Other harbingers of better times were the rise of a fresh literary movement and the memorable exposition at Atlanta in 1895.

The contemporary vogue of the historical novel carried to an unusual success one written by a Georgia-born woman, Augusta Evans Wilson, in a home thoroughly representative of the old regime—St. Elmo at Columbus. The book, which derived its name from the place, marked the new disposition to view the ante bellum days in a mood of romantic reminiscence rather than of bitterness over a lost cause.

At the exposition, Booker T. Washington made his fame as one of the foremost leaders of his people and challenged Georgia, as well as the South in general, to a new and more hopeful and practical view of interracial relations. The exposition in itself was a proclamation of the coming time of a balanced economy of improved agriculture and modern industrialism. It marked also the emergence of Atlanta as the capital and typical city of the new order—about which opinions still differed rather violently.

The vast changes then becoming obvious were destined to proceed with steadily increasing momentum in the First World War, when the State became a center of military training and war industry—as it had been on a more modest scale in the War Between the States. The Second World War simply repeated the same sudden burgeoning in a vastly larger measure. But in the latest emergency, Georgia had far more to start with than ever before, as in the meantime local enterprise and outside capital had collaborated to develop the highway system, port facilities, and electric-power resources, and had started or expanded many types of industry—such as metals, textiles, mining, quarrying, lumbering, and shipbuilding. The latter recalls that the timbers of the famous American warship *Constitution* "Old Ironsides" are said to have been cut in the liveoak groves of the Georgia Sea Islands.

The onset of industrialism speeded up the drift from country to city, brought to the State its first wave of labor organization and labor unrest, and stimulated a slow but continuous advance of urban psychology, the promotional spirit, and cosmopolitan taste. If Savannah symbolized the old order of slow and gracious living in its classic houses, iron grilles, and walled gardens, Atlanta stood for the new tempo, as seen in its towering office buildings, and its railroad yards and factories. This capital city is now considered by many Georgians to be as representative of their State as the columned mansions of Athens, Decatur, and Roswell.

The mechanical and scientific culture it represents has confronted Georgia with a whole new set of social problems, as small-town and country people (including many Negro farmers) have forsaken the old ways of life for crowded living conditions in cities. The strains have been eased partly by an enormous migration of Georgians (especially the Negroes) to other States, and more particularly to Northern industrial centers. And the interracial tension has noticeably declined, due not only to migration, but also to the earnest efforts of both sides to promote understanding, aided by the influences of progressive churches and of organizations founded for the express purpose of reducing the frequency of clashes.

With this shifting pattern of life has come a mood of self-appraisal. That is not entirely new to Georgians. Mr. Longstreet and several other early Georgia authors were dispesed not to set their people uncritically upon a pedestal. Steeped in classical learning, they were perfectly familiar with the Greek motto, "Know thyself." Against bitter opposition, prophets of the new South began the revaluation of old ideals, largely through the newspaper and the traditional mode of oratory.

That task has been taken up, more recently, by the younger generation of literary people. Their reaction from nineteenth-century romanticism and gentility has carried them to the opposite extreme of a morbid realism. Tobacco Road and Anger in July, which might be considered as representative of this whole train of thought, are but the obverse side of the vogue of Walter Scott, a favorite author of the ante-bellum South. The realistic fiction writers have turned Georgia and the whole of Dixie inside out, like an old coat, to find the frayed patches in the lining, and stood southern society on its head to see whether it really has clay eaters and clay feet. They have probed the sordid aspects of Cracker life, reveled in dissecting the new and raw mill town, and delineated the wrongs of the Georgia "nigger." They have cast off the romantic standard and tried to shock the conscience into a social compassion akin to Oglethorpe's for the turbid ebb and flow of human misery which in part inspired the founding of Georgia.

Their passion shows the effect of a sudden and rather violent impact of modernism upon a conservative society. Contemporary Georgia is not asleep.

More recently, there has been a marked reversion to the practical ideals of the older tradition, as seen in Margaret Mitchell's Gone With the Wind. Here is a new and salty type of romance, based upon documentary study of history, rather than mere sentiment. Refusing entirely to reject his past, the intelligent Georgian views it with a calmly realistic candor without morbidity. He would retain, if possible, the cult of honor heroism, and unselfishness expressed in the State's first motto "Non nobis, sed aliis" not for ourselves, but for others.

Address by Hon. John L. McClellan, of Arkansas, Before the Mississippi Valley Association at St. Louis, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. OVERTON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, at the annual dinner of the Mississippi Valley Association held at St. Louis, Mo., on January 26, 1948, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] delivered a very able and informative address. I ask unanimous consent that the address be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the association, ladies, and gentlemen, in view of the lateness of the hour, I think if I were smart, and I know if I were campaigning to get the votes of this audience, I should take a short cut to your friendship by being very brief, but I shall undertake to make some hurried remarks touching upon matters I think of common concern to all of us.

An occasion like this gives to us who are Members of Congress the privilege of keeping in contact with organizations of our most progressive and patriotic citizens who are vitally interested in national programs that have as their objectives the continued progress and prosperity of our people. Many of the programs in which your group is interested are not only necessary to continued growth and progress, but they are, in fact, indispensable to the economic life and the survival of our Nation.

The general objectives of the Mississippi Valley Association have my enthusiastic support. For this reason I am anxious to cooperate with you and with other organizations that are concerned, to the end that our great natural resources may be well conserved and developed. I derive genuine pleasure and reassurance from meetings and contacts like this with you. I am honored indeed to have the privilege, and I have greatly enjoyed being with you today.

Much of the world today is in a tragic disorder that borders on chaos and calamity of almost inconceivable proportions.

The strange vicissitudes that are moving with such force and rapidity across international scenes are having a terrific impact on human relations and goverments throughout the world. They are strongly influencing our policies and actions in foreign relations and also with respect to our domestic economy. Prudence dictates that as a matter of intelligent self-interest and for the safeguard of our liberties and their perpetuation we must, for the present at least, be prepared to the limit of our potential strength and capacity for any eventuality or crisis that may arise.

We are going to be asked to make a tremendous investment in foreign nations, in foreign people—to help rehabilitate the European nations where the grim specter of want, hunger, despair, and chaos threatens peace—at this session of Congress.

In connection with this it is my most fervent hope that the Marshall plan—the European recovery program—is so established that it will promote lasting peace—but let me say this to you: With all the stupendous problems we in America face—a tremendous national debt, the highest tax rates in history, the drain the war made on our resources, and the inflation which threatens our continued prosperity—in the light of these tremendous problems—I say that it is time we try to know what we are doing when we authorize these investments beyond our shores.

Among other things, it is my judgment that as we face this challenge—that as we take these steps to secure a just and lasting peace—that we must make plain to Russia and to every other nation whose ideology conflicts with ours that this is an investment in freedom—and that we intend to protect every dollar of it once the investment is made.

Until a genuine and just peace has been attained America, remembering the past, cannot be indifferent and slothful at the present nor unconcerned and neglectful of the future.

Every intelligent and informed American citizen knows, as Hitler and Mussolini would concede and verify if living, that the strength of America made possible two great world military victories during the past three decades, in which the two ideologies of aggressive totalitarianism and peace-loving democracy clashed for world supremacy. If a third conflict comes, the strength of our Nation, or her lack of strength, will surely determine the outcome of it. That there does exist a real threat and danger of another such unthinkable catastrophe cannot be denied. To avoid such a tragic and maybe fatal eventuality is the hope and highest aspiration of all mankind.

We are striving by international cooperation and by working through the United Nations and all other means available to us to establish a just and enduring peace. It must be just or it will not last. If all efforts should fail, and another clash of arms between totalitarian aggressors and the freedom-loving people of democracies should come, we must be prepared for it.

The question, then, arises how best can we work for peace with the expectancy that our efforts will be rewarded. What must we do to keep America so strong that no power will dare to attack, or if an attack is made, we can resist with such force as to destroy any ruthless aggressor? "Keep America strong" is a phrase of common warning and admonition today. But how?

There are multiple phases and factors involved in national strength both in peace and in time of war. Many of these are associated with the programs and policies that we may pursue.

It was the economic, industrial, physical, moral, and spiritual strength of America that provided the balance of power in two world wars and made the difference between victory and defeat. It is the continued economic, industrial, physical, moral, and spiritual strength of America upon which we and the remainder of the democracies of the world must depend to win the peace or to defeat totalitarian aggressors, when and if they attempt world conquest. We cannot permit our strength and vitality to become impaired nor can we permit it to remain static. It must be constantly increased.

Except for American might and power, armies of aggression would be marching today all over Europe, Asia, and Africa with designs for an ultimate invasion of the Western Hemisphere. That might and power serves at present as a barrier to the march of world banditry. If that barrier should be removed or broken, if we fail or neglect to progressively increase our might and power and keep it supreme, the peace will be lost, and the freedom of mankind will again be placed in fatal jeopardy.

When we speak of keeping America strong, too many of us think in restrictive terms. We have in mind the size of our Army, our Navy, and our Air Forces. True, they are important, indispensable factors. But they, by no means, represent all the elements that go to make up strength and power either as an effective means to peace or to victory in the event of war. France had her Maginot line and the largest standing army in the world, but when the test came she collapsed because she lacked many other essentials.

American might and power emanate from, and are reposed in, two principal sources: They are the natural, physical resources with which our land is endowed and the vision and intellect of our people. These two factors can hardly be segregated or isolated one from the other.

Our natural resources, although abundant, are not unlimited. Their quantity and extent can and have been fairly well determined, whereas the vision and resourcefulness of our people have not known, and need not know, any bounds or limitations.

If we measure up in vision and intellect to our opportunities and possibilities, we can make our natural resources sufficient and adequate to provide us with unexcelled material wealth and power for centuries to come. On the other hand, by slothfulness, indifference, and neglect we can fail to conserve or to develop for the maximum use and benefit to our welfare the natural resources that are our heritage. If we commit or permit such failure our strength can deteriorate in the course of time to the extent that we will be neither an international force for peace nor a potent instrumentality for victory in the event of war.

The four basic natural resources from which we draw and develop strength and power are our soil, our timber, our minerals, and our water—our lakes and streams. These actually provide the physical sustenance of human existence and are basic elements in our social structure, health, economy, and prosperity.

Minerals, by their very nature, are exhaustible. Man cannot replace them. Our soil and timber are depletable and can be wasted away. We have learned, however, by proper use and practices they can be conserved and the depletion that occurs from use and consumption can, in most instances be substantially restored. Our fourth great resource, water, is inexhaustible. It is constantly restored and replenished by nature.

With respect to our minerals, it is incumbent upon us to use all practical means for their conservation, to continue exploration for new discoveries of deposits wherever they can be found. Those that are scarce and of a strategic nature should be acquired from abroad and stock-piled to meet future needs that may arise.

Timber should be conserved, and new methods applied in the adaptation and use of wood products so as to avoid waste. By proper husbandry, by reforestation, and by forestry protection, we can largely reproduce our forests and greatly increase their growth and quantity.

Our soil is not so easily restored. Greater emphasis must be placed upon its conservation. The more extensively our lands are developed and agricultural production increased, the greater the drain upon our soil and the more it is depleted. Fortunately, adequate countermeasures are available to us to prevent erosion and waste and to revitalize the strength and fertility of our soil.

Cognizant of this situation, and accepting its responsibility during the past quarter of a century, our Government has inaugurated and conducted programs at Federal expense that encourage and help private enterprise in this Nation to conserve our mineral supply. We have made provision for mineral depletion—tax allowances to promote exploration for the discovery of new deposits. We have acquired considerable forestry reserves and placed them under proper usage and management. We have given Federal assistance to States and to private enterprise in programs for the protection and restoration of our timber resources throughout the Nation.

An extensive soil-conservation service has been established. Large areas of lands are now wisely and effectively protected from erosion. More and larger areas must continuously be brought under control and into this program. With an impoverished soil, there can be neither progress nor prosperity.

We have made rapid strides in the right direction with respect to conservation and wise development and usage of these great natural resources. There is still, however, much distance to go. With respect to these programs, there must be no let-up or relaxation. Instead, if we are to constantly increase national strength they need to be augmented and expanded.

Unlike the other three great natural resources, there are associated with our abundant waters—our streams—elements and forces of both good and evil. If man's ingenuity is not applied to make them more adaptable to the service of human needs, the evil elements and forces too often recurringly predominate, with resulting tremendous injury and loss. But with the application of human ingenuity, the elements of evil can be removed—at least, controlled and converted into service of immeasurable benefit to mankind.

Truly, our water resources have fascinating possibilities. Their potentialities intrigue the imagination and challenge and inspire us to explore and drive toward the frontiers of opportunity they present. Left uncontrolled, their destructive forces greatly depreciate their beneficial value. Excessive floods sweep with violent destruction throughout the valleys in which they flow. Devastating floods occur not at regular but at repeated intervals. In the past, they have done material damage beyond evaluation in dollars and cents and caused loss of life and untold human misery and suffering. The loss occasioned by floods during the period of our national existence would be far more than adequate—doubly so—to pay the cost that will be involved in making the improvements required on all of our major streams, to prevent recurrences of major floods and provide the improvements necessary to develop their potentialities to the highest degree, and thus give to our people and our Nation their maximum service and benefit.

The Divine Creator did not make the whole world a Garden of Eden. When He decreed that man should earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, he meant just that. And that applies to nations, to nationalities, and to peoples, as well as to individuals. He did not create a perfect physical world. Had He done so, there would be no work for man to do. But He has endowed our land with abundance and given to us the opportunity to build a nation of free men so strong and powerful that the evil force of totalitarianism cannot prevail against us.

Included in our rich heritage are our great, fertile valleys where these devastating floods occur. If they are ever developed to their maximum use and productivity, barring unprecedented providential hindrance, they have the capacity of banishing famine from the face of the earth. But our fertile valleys can never be fully developed agriculturally or industrially, until the menace and danger of destructive floods are removed. This can be done; it should be done, it must be done, if we are to preserve and develop our productive power and make and keep our Nation so strong that it will be invincible.

We have large areas in the Nation where for long seasons of the year there is a scarcity of water. On the upper regions of our great valleys, these areas exist. But there is no conflict with our interest in the lower valleys and those of the upper regions. They have too little water; we have too much. The problem can be resolved by adequate storage and conservation in the upper regions and by control and regulation in the lower regions. By the former, we will insure in the arid areas an adequate supply of water at all times for human and industrial needs. By the latter, we will provide the necessary protection of both human lives and property, prevent destruction, and convert the forces of this excess into constructive channels.

All these programs, and particularly our water resources and flood-control development, met with stubborn opposition in Congress. When first inaugurated the charge was frequently made that projects of this character fell within the category of political favoritism and "pork barrel" legislation. This charge has long since been repudiated, and Federal responsibility for their construction is now firmly established. It has been so successfully demonstrated that benefits from water resources development so greatly exceed the costs that they are now regarded as sound and prudent capital investments—investments from which the whole Nation profits in increased productive capacity that yields a higher per capita income and larger national revenue. The wealth, progress, prosperity, and standard of living of all our people are greatly enhanced as our river programs are advanced, and more and more of these projects are constructed and completed.

Last July 16, in a special message to Congress, the President of the United States recommended a 10-year program for the completion of all projects necessary for the protection of the Mississippi River Basin. I heartily approve, and I hope the Congress will have the wisdom and courage to make the necessary appropriation and see that the job is done. Yes; we will encounter opposition, but I believe we can overcome it. It will be earnestly contended that due to the tremendous national debt, the present current cost of Government, and the large sums to be expended for foreign aid, that this program should be deferred. But I maintain that delay in doing this job of consummating this great national improvement would be detrimental and inexcusable. This program is so important and essential to our growth and national strength and to the common welfare nothing should be permitted to interfere or hinder its progress to completion.

I agree with what President Truman said in his special message to Congress that:

"The major opportunity of our generation to increase the wealth of the Nation lies in the development of our great river systems."

That is a vigorous, forceful, truthful statement. The statesmanship it embraces and expresses is a challenge we must meet if we are to preserve and pass on to others a heritage equal to or greater than that we have so happily enjoyed.

If we expect to keep America strong and invincible, we must not fail in this trust. This generation in keeping with the spirit and finest traditions of the past will keep the wheels of progress rolling on toward the fulfillment of every challenging opportunity to make America stronger, to keep her invincible. For we know that only the productive can be strong, only the strong can be free.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by the able junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] at Boise, Idaho, on February 14, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is something so invigorating about the western spirit that when the invitation came to me to speak here in Boise, tonight, I eagerly welcomed the opportunity. I think it is no disloyalty to my own beloved State of Minnesota to say to you that I feel perfectly at home in the West. I feel especially at home here in Idaho where you have entrusted your State government to an able Republican leader, Governor Robins, and I appreciate the opportunity to visit the home environment of my friend and colleague, Senator HENRY DWORSHAK.

During the past year, I have become well acquainted with Senator DWORSHAK, who sits only a few seats from me in the Senate, and I have found him a most conscientious and earnest legislator. He is a student of the Federal budget and complicated finances of the Government, an earnest advocate of the economy that is so badly needed in Washington, and an able and respected champion of individual enterprise which we believe is the essential characteristic of America.

We are assembled here this evening as members of a political party that came into being under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln. That courageous and inspired leadership, which made possible the preservation and continuation of the United States, deserves the tributes of all our people. Lincoln is the symbol of freedom, of the lawful rights of the individual citizen under a constitutional government, and of the strength and initiative of a united people. That spirit of freedom has made America great. That spirit of initiative has built our industrial enterprises. That spirit of unity has attracted men and women from all the countries of the world to live together as neighbors and fellow citizens—builders of a strong, progressive, and hopeful nation that stands preeminent in the modern world.

From its very beginnings under Lincoln, the Republican Party has been a party of progress and development. You people of Idaho, in the heart of the West, have compelling reasons today to recognize that fact in the historic decisions which Republican Congresses have made in the development of this region.

In keeping with the important role of agriculture in building a strong nation, President Lincoln approved in 1862 three of the most important legislative steps ever taken by the Government in behalf of the farmer. They were the act creating the Department of Agriculture, the Homestead Act of 1862, and the Land-Grant College Act which granted to the States vast quantities of the public domain for educational purposes.

The Homestead Act of 1862, which flung open the door of opportunity to any citizen who would become a farmer, marked a new era in pioneering and homesteading which attracted the courageous youth and the sturdy immigrants. The land of the West was made accessible to settlers free of any purchase price in 160-acre homesteads, provided it was occupied for a minimum of 5 years. This act was responsible for the sweep of settlement westward to the Pacific. In the course of time, 275,000,000 acres were transferred to settlers under the basic provisions of the Homestead Act.

I

It was again a Republican Congress under a Republican President, Teddy Roosevelt, which passed the Reclamation Act of 1902 under which the Government of the United States undertook to champion the cause of irrigation by providing that irrigation works, beyond the easy reach of the ordinary cooperative methods, might be constructed with Federal funds. The investment was to be repaid gradually by the farmers.

As a result of this and supplementary acts, 54 projects have now been built, yielding water to more than 4,000,000 acres of land, and serving nearly 100,000 families. Under the direction of the Bureau of Reclamation and the cooperation of the people, an empire, uniting the two seacoasts of America, has been built. Some of the works have been described as wonders of the world, such as the pioneers did not dare to dream about.

I need not remind you people of Idaho what reclamation has meant to this region. Your effectively coordinated irrigation projects stretching from Jackson Lake on the headwaters of the Snake River, through American Falls Reservoir and Minidoka Dam, to Arrow Rock on the Boise River, have brought a million acres under cultivation. They have become the biggest single factor in Idaho's contribution to the agricultural wealth of the Nation, and have resulted in the production of huge crops at a time when the Nation was calling for the utmost in food production. Together with electric power benefits they have brought new resources into use.

I recently saw a chart prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation covering a 40-year period in six counties in south-central Idaho. That irrigation expansion alone creating your famous Magic Valley, had developed more than $130,000,000 in property values, an annual pay roll of $63,000,000, 1,600 business enterprises, and jobs for 26,000 persons. Without irrigation that section of the Snake River Valley would have remained as unproductive as the surrounding desert.

The Eightieth Congress has recognized the vital importance of the reclamation program by the extensive appropriations that were made for the present fiscal year, amounting to $142,000,000. Still more generous provision is anticipated for the immediate future to keep construction proceeding at a rate that will yield vast new irrigation and power benefits.

II

In Lincoln's day the slogan of the hour was the familiar cry, "Go West, young man, and grow up with the country." And many did that as the Nation spread itself across the continent. But that frontier, with its adventure and its hardships, with its opportunity and its growth, is no longer ours to exploit. The new frontiers of our day are rather to be found in such developments of our potential resources as the reclamation program. They will be found in the research laboratory. They are waiting to be explored in establishing better relations and understanding between labor and management. They lie before us in the obligation we have assumed in international affairs.

Ours is a great responsibility which requires not only a high sense of obligation as citizens but a fresh and eager leadership that has the vision, the courage, and the progressive spirit to chart the way forward.

1. We need a new leadership in the National Government in Washington as a first step to make possible a beginning toward that objective.

2. We are struggling against the threats of inflation and the difficulties which high prices for food and commodities impose upon the average family and especially upon the average wage earner. Yet the administration in Washington refuses to admit that these conditions are in part due to the pursuit of negative policies by the Government. It offers no solution except more rationing, more controls, more government.

3. We must have full production to relieve the shortages and to provide for the many things the American people need. Yet the administration in Washington declares that "at least $50,000,000,000 should be invested by industry to improve and expand our productive facilities over the next few years," but the President vetoes all efforts to reduce excessive taxes and proposes discouraging burdens upon venture capital.

4. We have a Republican majority in Congress which has attempted to cut down the cost of government by reducing personnel and trying to stop waste. Yet the administration in Washington which has a partisan control of every executive department and the innumerable administrative agencies can and does neutralize constructive legislation and in one breath says these cuts are "phony" and in the next claims it cannot give proper service because Congress has reduced its funds.

5. We have been concerned over the effect of the uncontrolled export of certain scarce commodities such as freight cars, oil, and pipe, to mention three that are in critical demand, and the President has had power since July 1940 to say whether or not a commodity shall be exported, how much, to what countries it shall go, and how much to each country. Yet we have an administration in Washington that not only has been negligent in the proper use of that power but has sought to shift the blame for its failure to Congress by demanding legislation to strengthen export controls when it has had ample authority all the time.

This negative atmosphere, resulting from the all too clear attempt of the Truman administration to carry water on all shoulders, makes difficult the development of constructive and badly needed new policies that will lead this great country through the difficult transition years of the immediate postwar period into a happier and better period. We simply cannot find the way to that new era if we adopt the cynical philosophy too often present in our thinking during the years of the New Deal which places an undue faith in bureaucratic government and shrugs off the spirit of initiative and enterprise on the part of our citizens.

For the first time in 15 years a Republican majority was in control of one arm of the Government last year—the Congress. In spite of the negative atmosphere in which it was necessary to work, with threats of vetoes from the White House and no assurance that Republican-sponsored policies and legislation would be effectively administered by executive agencies of the Government under complete control of the opposing party, and in spite of an accumulation of vexing problems that are the aftermath of war and of four New Deal terms, it was possible to establish a record of constructive legislation that merits confidence.

1. Thanks largely to Republican insistence, there has been a balanced budget for the first time in 15 years.

2. An actual decrease of over $3,000,000,000 in appropriations, as compared to budget estimates submitted by the Executive, was made. At the same time generous provision was made for reclamation projects, flood control, and river improvements, and the highest peacetime budget for national defense was provided.

3. A Labor-Management Relations Act to reestablish a balanced situation in industrial relations was passed despite the President's veto.

4. Following upon the legislative reorganization, which went into operation last year, steps were taken for a commission survey of the need for reorganization of the executive branch.

5. Numerous war-power and emergency enactments were repealed, and Congress has stood firm against a continuous demand for restoration of Government regimentation. Scores of constructive measures have been passed dealing with pressing domestic problems.

6. Full and generous cooperation has been extended the administration by the Republican majority in Congress in the bipartisan foreign policy, under the leadership of Senator VANDENBERG.

The contributions of the Republican Congress, described in broad terms, point the way to our most vital objectives: First, adherence to the belief that a strong, solvent, and free America is the basis of our greatest contribution to world order. Second, recognition of the leadership the Government must take in the resourceful utilization and use of our potential natural resources. Third, cultivation of an atmosphere of fair dealing and understanding in the relationship of our economic groups without which the free-enterprise system cannot be made to work. Fourth, acceptance of our responsibility and obligation to provide the stabilizing force in the world as war-torn and devastated nations seek to find their way to a stable and peaceful condition.

America's international obligations and responsibilities today are compelling. While we did not accept the full leadership in the world affairs which had been ours immediately following World War I, we must not make the same mistake now in the immediate years after World War II. A world leadership has been thrust upon us by the ability to produce which made it possible for us to supply not only our war needs, but also much of the requirements of our allies, and by the demonstration of skill and leadership and sacrifice which we gave to the struggle for the liberties and rights of man. We must not lose the lasting peace for which our gallant youth fought and died.

Our immediate obligation is to take an active part in the rehabilitation of the war-torn western European countries as they seek to reestablish sound governments based on human rights and freedom. This cannot be brought about easily. It will cost us appropriations to assist in this rehabilitation. The Marshall plan as it is now known could as well be said to be the Vandenberg plan. It was the able, distinguished Republican Senator, ARTHUR E. VANDENBERG, who said even before the war ended in 1945: "We will propose to help create the postwar world on a basis which will stop aggressors for keeps and, so far as humanly possible, substitute justice for force among freemen. We propose to do it primarily for our own sakes." Senator VANDENBERG's brilliant speech in the Senate in January 1945 really commenced the thinking on the European question which has culminated in the Marshall plan.

You and I may at times feel that this is a responsibility and burden that we should not enter upon; yet you and I in our own experience or memory know what a terrific impact on the economy of a community or State results from a devastating flood, a hailstorm, or a tornado. While I served as Governor of my own State, there were communities in my State that suffered shocking losses from storms or floods, and the State assisted them in their rehabilitation by direct appropriations. Neighboring communities also felt it their duty to help.

I think we must look upon our assistance in the rehabilitation of European countries in the same way. The devastation caused by war was more far-reaching than any calamity that we have experienced here. We should be a very grateful people that we have been spared twice in world conflict. We did not have our beautiful cities devastated as were those of England, some of France, the Netherlands, and all the others. Even the problem of the rehabilitation of Germany, which we might say is none of our affair, requires that their civilized life be reestablished and their industry made to serve the German people as they seek to lift themselves to a complete recovery.

Unless we lend a hand in a neighborly manner to bring hope and encouragement to Europe and to draw forth the hidden money of the businessman and the industrialist, we cannot expect other than chaos for those countries. Such a situation will permit the Communist philosophy to completely dominate by force those who now would like to reestablish governments for the people. If all of these countries are pulled back of the so-called iron curtain of Russia and the development of the resources in those countries becomes a part of Russia's economy, to be developed under the Soviet concept of world rule, I would say, and I say it most reverently: God help the people of this earth in this atomic age.

These years of crisis ahead lay down a challenge to the party of Lincoln for clear thinking and courage as our Nation assumes its destined place in a world that is struggling to rebuild and restore what years of war have laid waste.

They will require unity on the part of the American people, an adventurous and pioneering purpose, and a vital leadership that will kindle a rebirth of the American spirit.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Party of Lincoln in This Year of Grace," delivered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] at Detroit, in the Fifteenth Congressional District on February 10, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PARTY OF LINCOLN IN THIS YEAR OF GRACE

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is an honor I greatly appreciate that I am asked to talk with you this evening. There is no group of Republicans in the country whom I would rather meet with at this time than the group I find before me, composed as you are of the convinced, unterrified, and dauntless Republicans who have for many years maintained the faith in a district which has, I am told, always voted Democratic in national elections.

I have the faith to believe that your long years of hope and action will this year be crowned with success, so that we may add yet one more of our party to the swelling majority in the House of Representatives. You are already magnificently represented

in the Senate. To have two men like HOMER FERGUSON and ARTHUR VANDENBERG accredited to this State is an honor which any State may well envy. In particular am I personally proud to follow the leadership of your senior Senator in his wise and patriotic counsel as to foreign affairs. In this, as in much else, he stands head and shoulders above us all.

We want to attain our victory this fall in a solid sort of way, which will foreshadow years of success for our party in this spot instead of some temporary flash of success. To do that we must put a depth and solidity into the Republican program which will embody the enduring contribution which it can make to the welfare of the citizens of this district, this city, this State, and the Nation. It is my purpose to discuss some of those values with you this evening.

I know of no spot where the enduring values of our Nation are put in more tangible, visible form than in our National Capital. There we may behold the noblest vista ever planned and executed by the hand of man. At one end of that vista stands the Capitol itself—planned and built by our fathers on no mean and niggardly scale. There was in them a sense of the magnificent destiny of our Nation. There was in them a sense of its vast territorial extent. They envisioned the incredible riches of its rocks and soil and of the industry and ingenuity of the millions then living in this country—destined to increase and multiply by birth and immigration. With this faith and vision in their hearts, our fathers planned that great building with a grandeur and yet with a dignity which has never been surpassed among the similar works of man.

Westward from that structure, for more than a mile, extends an open vista. It is marred on its flanks by the exigencies of war in the shape of temporary buildings which, it is to be hoped, a world organized for peace will soon warrant us in removing, yet, as seen from the Capitol, the eye is not attracted to these temporary structures. Instead it reaches far down the open space and rests on that simple soaring symbol of our Nation's founder—the Washington Monument. What a stroke of genius is the design of this simple obelisk: Plain and solid in its structure, lofty in its height, with its summit pointing still farther upward than the reach of the structure itself, it is the physical embodiment of the character and attributes of the father of our country, whose memory it perpetuates in physical form, even as our history, our Constitution, and our very unity as a nation perpetuates his memory in a spiritual form.

That monument is a mighty structure. Seen in the varied aspects of early morning, bright noon, rosy sunset, and pale moonlight, it has an infinite variety of appeal. There have been times when, driving to my office in the morning, I have seen its base invisible in low-lying mist while its summit rose above those mists in the bright light of the morning sun. Such a sight is thrilling, indeed. It has a significance it is difficult to put into words.

But the monument is not the end of the vista. In the far distance, away beyond the monument, there is visible from the west front of the Capitol, a gleaming marble structure—the Lincoln Memorial. I suppose there is no spot in this Nation which has attracted, since it was built, more thousands of our citizens to pause, to wonder, and to submit themselves to an impelling flood of admiration and inspiration. That this unschooled and unpolished western pioneer should be enshrined here in classic marble is not incongruous. The stature of the man has grown with the years. His character and his achievement become greater as we recede from him and set his brief years of service in the time of the Nation's supreme need in the framework of human history. Truly, as Stanton said at Lincoln's deathbed, "He belongs with the ages."

Let us tonight in a humble and reverent way bring our minds and our emotions back to the life of that great man. Let us test our actions by the principles which ruled him. Let us see what we may gain of light and leading from his life to apply to the difficult and dangerous times in which we find ourselves today.

If the party of Lincoln is to be his political and spiritual successor, it will first of all have to concern itself with human beings. It was fundamental in our great leader's thinking and feeling that man had worth as a man without reference to his station and birth, to the material circumstances to which he was born, those which he acquired by his personal activity or those which fortune may have chanced to shower upon him. In this belief and with this guide to action Lincoln embodied in himself the great truth which the founder of our Christian religion brought to the world and which is the enduring substance of that religion wherever it is sincerely apprehended and taught. Our concern likewise is with human beings and not with things or with abstractions.

Let me digress at this point for a moment to tell of the personal experience of some of us who were engaged in hearings throughout the country last fall on the subject of the high and increasing cost of living. In one sense of the word, we discovered little which could not have been discovered by expert statisticians who analyze the information which governmental and private research organizations pour forth in an unceasing flood.

But instead of trusting to these dry and lifeless columns of figures, we went instead to the people themselves. My own panel covered the country east of the Alleghenies all the way from New Hampshire to Florida. I, likewise, visited hearings on the Pacific coast at Los Angeles and San Francisco. That western group had the same experiences that met us in the East and the significant experience was this: That masses of figures, for the most part dealing with averages, conceal human problems which are most easily revealed by going directly to people. To be specific, average wages may be better with relation to some average cost of living now than was the case in 1939, even though conditions have deteriorated somewhat from the peak of real wages in 1946. It became clear, however, that we could not indulge in complacency in spite of this generally favorable situation. Within those average incomes and average costs of living were to be found many millions of people who had been left behind in the war and postwar advances in incomes, and whose conditions were materially worse than they had been at any time, even worse for many of them than they had been during the depths of the depression.

Who were these people who had been left behind in spite of so great and general statistical advances? Among them, of course, were all of those who were trying to live in their older years on the savings of a lifetime. All who had been depending on pensions and retirement annuities were severely cramped. There are millions of wage earners, organized and unorganized, who have been left behind as the incomes of their more fortunate and aggressive fellow workmen had been increased. All of those who were connected with religious and charitable institutions were in serious straits. The incomes of those institutions have not gone up with the increases in the cost of living. Almost all employees of Federal, State, and local governments have lagged behind. As for myself, when I considered the serious difficulties in which school teachers, preachers, particularly young preachers, found themselves, I was astonished that radicalism had not gained a stronger hold on this influential group of our fellow citizens than appears to have been the case.

Let me suggest to my fellow members of the Republican Party that there is a party necessity, simply because there is a human necessity, to recognize the difficulties in which these great groups, numbering in the aggregate many millions, find themselves. It is this group of white-collar workers and low-income wage earners which can and will swing elections. For our party, the safest political strategy is to recognize the problems of these people, not only politically but with the heart and with the head.

Let us take another look at the great Abraham Lincoln. He had a profound confidence in popular government. This found its springs of belief and action in his acceptance of the Christian doctrine of the value of the individual human soul. It led him to the firm, instinctive belief that no man had the right to rule the beliefs and actions of another as a superior compelling the obedience of an inferior. It led him to look upon slavery with loathing. It led him to hold aloft that ideal of government which was expressed in the world's greatest example of noble and sincere eloquence—the Gettysburg Address: "That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain. That this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

It was reported in the papers a year or two ago that the Gettysburg Address had been translated into Russian and publicly disseminated to the Russian people through the Russian press. There was, however, a subtle change in the three propositions connecting the government and the people in that final sentence. As I remember, it read something like this: "That government of the people, through the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

That the people themselves are the instruments of their destiny was Lincoln's doctrine. It is the Republican doctrine. The people do not, except for short periods and under close control, depute to governments that authority and responsibility which rests directly in them. We do not in this country have unanimous elections. We will not in this country grant to any elected or appointed official unrestricted and unregulated powers, except as may be necessary for limited times under stress of total war or other severe national emergency.

With this retention of power in the people goes a depth of responsibility which is rejected by totalitarian governments, whether Fascist or Communist. We, the people, are the sovereign power. We also have the final responsibility. We cannot blame others. We ourselves are the authors of our destiny, whether the fate be fortunate and noble or unfortunate and tinged with shame.

There is another aspect of Lincoln's character and policy which has, I believe, never been sufficiently analyzed or appreciated. I refer to the fact that his speeches are all closely based on reason in spite of the fact that they dealt with highly emotional problems. The problem of human slavery is one which aroused the fiercest emotions which we can easily imagine, whether in the mind of its proponents or its opponents. The depth of those passions can be realized if we consider that they were of such an intensity that they were fast leading to the breaking up of the Union and the destruction of our country as an organized government based on the sacrifices and the principles of the founding fathers. In particular we have to remember the extreme emotionalism of the opponents of slavery which led, in its ultimate expression, to the endeavor of John Brown to foment and arm an insurrection of the Negro people against their southern owners.

No one felt the depth of moral degradation in slavery more deeply than did Lincoln. Yet that tremendously strong feeling at no time misled his mind in its consideration of the effective policy to be developed and applied in the face of the disintegration of the Union which was resulting from it. He put his finger on the preservation of the Union as the central problem of the American people. Slavery could be controlled. It could not be eliminated in the course of time unless the Union were preserved. As he said on one notable occasion, "If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that." And these words came from a man who hated slavery with the full intensity of all his moral nature.

The existence of the Union was threatened by slavery. It was this central problem to which the Republican Party addressed itself. That purpose was directed by a highly intelligent, intellectual analysis of the problem. It did not satisfy the abolitionists who, with an unintelligent but emotional approach to the problem, were bitterly opposed to the platform of the Republican Party. It likewise, of course, failed to satisfy those who were intent on the expansion of slavery into the new Territories of the West still under Federal domain, but which were in time to come to be self-governing States in their own right. In the fact of a moral problem charged with emotion, as no subsequent issue has ever been, it was wise, prudent analysis which controlled the policies of Abraham Lincoln and the great party which he led.

One may read the letters and addresses of our great leader (as I have done in recent months) and be astonished at the absence of appeals to a lower level than those of the citizen's conscience, the citizen's reason. The intellectual content of these letters and addresses is astonishingly high. I think it must be said that that intellectual content is higher than is customary in the political speeches of our own time. He had supreme confidence in the ability of the American people to follow a reasonable and effective course rather than an emotional and destructive one in dealing with the great issues which confronted them. His belief in popular government was one which he put to the test. In putting that belief to the test, the people did not fail him.

Let us revive our faith in the intelligence and practical wisdom of the American people. Let us avoid emotional appeals which lead to unwise action, whatever transitory and shallow support for party candidates and policies may be gained thereby. Should we succumb to the temptation which these deceptively attractive means to a current political victory lead, we will find, I am sure, that they will result in the progressive weakening and ultimate end to the useful and necessary part which we play in the direction of the course of our great country.

Let me make at this time, and particularly in this place, a practical application of this necessity for the appeal to the intelligence as well as the appeal to emotion.

A major problem which faces us today is that of maintaining and steadily increasing the standard of living of the American people, whether their life and work is found on the farm, in the factory, in the business office, in the store, on our railways, or wherever the lifework of the citizen has located his activities. In the endeavor to maintain and, if possible, to increase this provision of goods and services for the individual's enjoyment, we have perhaps been led to depend too strongly on increase in money income whether through wages or salaries or business profits. There is an obvious fallacy involved in the endeavor to improve our condition by such action alone. We do not eat money. We do not wear money. No piece of hard or paper currency, however large, will shelter us from the weather. Only the miser, and there are few of them indeed, can get joy or satisfaction out of the mere possession of these titles to real wealth. Yet all of us whether as businessmen, farmers, or wage earners, seem driven at times by the idea that by multiplying the volume of our money income we can as a people increase our standard of living.

The Nation is committed to the 40-hour week. We have what is to all intents and purposes full employment. That means that we have reached certain limitations as to the volume of goods and services which can be divided among us.

It is true that there are inequities in distribution. It is true that some business profits are too high to be justified on purely immediate social grounds. Observing this, the temptation is strong to attempt redistribution of those profits by wage advances beyond the limits of the present high rates enjoyed by many groups of workers. Our whole effort at the present moment seems to be directed toward the redistribution of a production of goods and services limited by our standard work week, our productive capacity, and by the high total volume of men and women available to operate those means of production and distribution.

Our concentration on trying to get advantages for ourselves or our particular group by the single route of competitive raises in income is leading to two very serious conditions. We must be intelligent enough, in the Lincoln tradition, to recognize and meet these conditions with effective action.

The first of these dangers touches the groups which are being left behind in this race for higher money incomes. Advantages gained by those most successful result, in a high percentage of the cases, in the necessity for increased cost in the goods and services produced and distributed. This in return results in a higher cost of living which those who are left behind are unable to meet. The advantages therefore gained by the fortunate group are at the expense of the submerged group. Let me say at once that this is true whether the advantages in money income sought by the more fortunate is in the form of wages, of salaries, or of unjustified profits.

Aside from these present injustices the endeavor to realize on limited production by increased income is an actual barrier to the increase in productivity, on which alone a continuance of our progress toward increased American living standards can be based.

I do not see that men work under any more severe physical and nervous strain than they did when I was a boy, and received as a machinist apprentice 4 cents an hour for a 60-hour week. I doubt if the worker in the steel mill today, with all the elaborate electrically-driven handling and manipulating equipment, uses or requires the same muscular energy than was the case 50 years ago. The farmer today, with his large use of mechanical equipment, is saved much of the drudgery of the farm work which I saw and experienced as a youth. Yet in spite of this, the output per man-hour, wherever the worker may be located, has increased tremendously during my lifetime. This tremendous increase in output has gone into an improvement in the goods and services available to the ordinary man and has marvelously raised the standard of living in this country. This has been done by the steady progress of research and invention applied to better business management, but particularly to improved processes, machinery and product. It is this which has given us our higher standard of living while we have shortened the workweek from 60 hours in my boyhood to the 40 hours of the present time.

Now we are by no means at the end of the possible improvement in products, equipment, and management. Those familiar with the possibilities ahead of us see no diminution in the rate of improvement possible. For the future, as in the past, our main dependence lies in raising the standard of living by these time-tested means.

Such improvement requires heavy investment. It requires expensive research. It requires months of design, development, and construction. It requires machinery far more intricate and expensive than anything dreamed of by an older generation. But the possibilities of improvement which those older generations grasped, applied, and enjoyed, still remain with us.

That brings us back to this question of profits. Profits for peacetime are unprecedentedly high. Yet we should remark in passing that if we should tax away all business profits, it would pay only one-half the annual expenses of our Federal Government alone, not to mention the high cost of our State and local governments.

It is, however, on these profits that we must depend for the coming heavy expenditures by which alone we may expect to make substantial contributions to a further increase in the standard of living of our people. Our national policies must be such as to encourage the flow of profits into these channels of improvement on which so much depends. This is not a secondary or incidental interest of the wage earner or the farmer. It is a pressing and primary interest, to which the best intelligence and the strong determination of our people must be directed. It is typical of the technical problems which must be faced by our legislators and administrators.

It is from the standpoint of the material well-being of our people that the most important of these problems must be faced. If problems of this sort are wisely solved, it will lead to a general improvement in material well-being which will affect every member of society—not merely some special group which has succeeded at the expense of others in obtaining for itself a larger share of a limited volume of current production. In offering solutions for this great social problem of the Nation by constructive means, our party will be following the intellectual tradition established by Lincoln, its great leader, rather than going down the political byways of lower appeals to lower emotions.

I would like at this point to say a few words with regard to liberalism and conservatism. I refer to that liberalism which the conservative calls radicalism, and that conservation which the liberal calls reaction.

I conceive that the proper use of the term "liberal" is to apply it to objectives rather than to means. I conceive that a proper objective is a continuing increase in the production of things we wish to consume and enjoy and equitable distribution of those goods to those able and willing to work, such distribution being measured in proper degree by the contribution toward the production of such wealth which each makes. There should be added to this a wise provision for the unfortunate and for those who have retired by reason of age from the full activity of productive life. There should finally be established as an objective not equality of ownership or equality of income, but equality of opportunity in this land of opportunities. These I consider to be liberal objectives.

I would further suggest that we abandon the words "radical," "liberal," "conservative," and "reactionary" when it comes to picking out means for reaching these objectives. There should be but two judgments supplied to the means. Are the proposed actions or policies honest? Will the proposed actions or policies, in fact, assist in reaching the liberal objectives?

This is important both politically and practically. The shallow political view attaches the tags, liberal and conservative, to the means for reaching desired results. For instance, if a given proposal seems on the face of it to be immediately favorable to railroads or public utilities, it may be classed in common parlance as being a conservative measure. If it seems on the face of it to be unfavorable to those institutions, it is too often classed as a liberal measure. As an opposite

example, everything which seems to be on the face of it immediately favorable to organized labor is classed as liberal. That which appears on the face of it to be unfavorable is classed as conservative or, more usually, as reactionary.

It is of exceeding importance that we cease to tie these tags onto methods, laws, and policies. If we are thoroughly convinced in our hearts of the desirability of our liberal objectives, such as those just described, let us with all the energy, ability, intelligence, and experience that we can bring to bear on the problem, examine these proposals for action on the basis of whether they are honest and whether they will actually assist us in reaching our objective. In no other way can we advance the real long-range interests of our country and of its citizens.

A careful reading of Lincoln's published words leaves me with the conviction that this was the principle by which he guided his political life and I feel no less convinced that it is on these principles that Lincoln's party should make its appeal to the voters today.

We are perhaps only slowly realizing the depth of moral strength and the innate knowledge of the moral laws of the universe which Abraham Lincoln possessed. This moral genius, for it was nothing less than genius of a very high order, found its highest expression in his second inaugural address. May I repeat to you the concluding paragraphs of that immortal document.

"The Almighty has His own purposes. 'Woe unto the world because of offenses! for it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that many by whom the offense cometh.' If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through his appointed time, he now wills to remove, and that he gives to both North and South this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said, 'the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

We, too, in the positions in which we find ourselves, must guide our lives by the principles which Lincoln saw so clearly and expressed so effectively. As citizens of this great Nation, destined to national and international responsibilities whose extent Lincoln in his day could only have dimly conceived, we are faced with moral responsibilities which we cannot escape. Those responsibilities devolve on us in all our capacities, whether as teachers of the young, producers of the Nation's wealth, organizers of that production and distribution, legislators and administrators, writers, preachers, or prophets. We ourselves make our country what it will be. If we work for wrong objectives or if we work for good objectives by bad means, we cannot escape bringing upon ourselves and others the inevitable evils of the choices which we have made. If, on the contrary, we set before ourselves high objectives, objectives higher than those in the particuluar group or even the party to which we belong, and if we pursue those objectives with all the intelligence, energy, and experience which we possess, we can play our part in our day in achieving that high destiny which our great leader in his day made possible by the strength of his will, the depth of his moral insight, and the intelligence of his action.

Treatment of Indians—Veto of Gideon Peon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Gideon Peon in the Background of a Presidential Veto," by John H. Holst, of Lake Whales, Fla., together with a related and brief comment on the same subject by Mr. Robert Yellowtail, former Superintendent of the Crow Agency of Montana, and one of the leading Indian spokesmen of this country at this time.

Mr. Holst was for many years a resident of Montana, was formerly a professor at the Montana State College at Bozeman, and was considered an educator of high standing. For 15 years he was associated with the education department of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, until his retirement a few years ago. He is a man of high standing and integrity, and while with the Indian Service had the opportunity to visit every Indian reservation in the United States. Consequently, he is familiar with the workings of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The Public Printer advises me that Mr. Holst's article is estimated to make two and one-fourth pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $159.55.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIDEON PEON IN THE BACKGROUND OF A PRESIDENTIAL VETO

(By John H. Holst)

A hundred years ago most of the Indians had been settled on reservations for their own protection and for that of the white pioneers. This was accomplished by treaties, the terms of which were proposed and imposed by Federal treaty commissions which gave the Government agencies complete control over the Indian groups and over their lands which were held in trust for the common use of the particular tribe.

Ninety-nine years ago the Indian Bureau was set up in the newly created Department of the Interior and was charged with the administration of Indian Affairs under the authorizations of Congress. The Indians were to be educated in thrift and industry and prepared to take their places as citizens.

But the reservation system did not operate to produce citizens because the Government, through its Indian Bureau, denied to the Indians the incentives that lead to the growth and development of individuals and groups under normal conditions. The Indians had only the rights of occupancy and use on the land and no assurance that they would be able to hold the improvements they might make or be able to pass them on to their heirs. It was not strange that they had no incentive to build today what they might lose tomorrow. Under the system of Government rationing, initiative, thrift, and industry were disregarded. Farmers, mechanics, and teachers provided by the Indian Bureau told the Indians what to do and when and how to do it, thus taking away all the challenge. Yet it is surprising that so many individual Indians inspired by the white system of economy about them struck out for themselves and attained a high degree of competency.

By 1870 the Indian Bureau had become notoriously corrupt and the Indians on the reservations had fallen into idleness, mischief, and mendicancy. They had no incentive to work since they could collect debts owed them by the Government in foods and materials which their work would otherwise buy. Thousands of them lived in bedraggled tepee villages about the field agencies to be ready for ration days. The others were continually gathering or waiting for rations. The central Indian office and the field agency staffs were mainly concerned with ration estimates, ration purchases, distributions of ration supplies to warehouses, and final distributions to Indians.

The General Allotment Act was intended as a solution to the intolerable reservation system. Under the plan for Indian home building and training in citizenship the Indians of a reservation were to be allowed to select lands for homesteads, usually 160 acres for an adult and 80 acres for each child under 21 years of age. In this way every Indian of any age or degree of blood was to be provided with basic land of his own selection to be held in trust for him for 25 years.

After the Indian residents and all having land rights on the reservation had made their individual selections of land the surplus was opened to sale and settlement for the benefit of the allottees. In that way Indians and non-Indians were interspersed in what became known as checkerboard areas. Whatever the method of disposal of surplus lands, the returns were placed in the particular tribal trust fund subject to the disposal of the Indian Bureau under congressional authorization.

The Indians lived among their white neighbors as noncontributing intruders because the Indian Bureau controlled their land and their trust funds and used the trust in both cases to control the Indians. The initiative was always with the Indian Bureau which assumed to know what the Indian needed and what would be best for him. But the Indian wanted the freedom of citizenship. Thousands of the more virile went out into the world on their own account. Many of them have said to the Bureau, "Here is my property through which you would control me. Lease it for me for whatever you will and I will someway manage to get what more I need for living." Trust-held lands are but picket pins for pauperized Indians.

The 25-year trust imposed upon Indian allottees and their subjection to the pauperizing indignities of the Indian Bureau were so destructive of Indian life that Congress enacted a law in 1906 giving the Secretary of the Interior the right to terminate the Federal trust on lands belonging to Indians whom he considered competent to manage their own affairs. He seldom exercised this authority.

Congress attempted to speed up the liquidation of Indian reservations through its acts of May 25, 1918, and June 30, 1919, which provided for the making of final rolls for the segregation and distribution of trust funds and property but too much was left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior whose Indian Bureau was ever dilatory but blamed its remissness on the failure of Congress to provide sufficient funds and particularized authorities. Many reservations were completely allotted but trust funds were not distributed. The Indian Bureau continued to hold the tribal funds and trust title to the allotted lands and so to control the Indians and sabotage the whole plan.

Under the trust allotment system Indian estates are not subject to division among heirs since the Government cannot make final settlement without liquidating its trusts and State laws cannot operate as against such trusts. The result is an inheritance tangle of ever-growing complexity. The Indian Bureau uses this as a justification, first, for increased appropriations for its administration and, second, under the Wheeler-Howard Act, for its so-called consolidation of Indian lands through which it forces the return of individual allotments to tribal status and common use under its control.

In 1934 came the Wheeler-Howard Act—only less famous than infamous—to turn back the clock of Indian progress a hundred years or more. It froze all Indian lands in perpetual trust, even the alloted lands. It delivered the Indians, body and soul, into the ruthless hands of the Secretary of the Interior and his irresponsible Indian Bureau, to become the guinea pigs for the New Deal social and economic planners. Under its terms the Indians exist for the support of the Bureau. The Indian allottees, 250,000 or more, are in desperate straits. They can neither sell their lands nor pledge them for equipment or operating funds. They cannot pay taxes in cooperation with their white neighbors for the welfare of their communities.

II

On January 27, 1947, Senator ZALES ECTON, of Montana, introduced the following bill in the United States Senate, a bill that was destined to have far more significance than was originally intended:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Gideon Peon, Flathead allottee No. 33, of Butte, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Lake County, State of Montana: The north half of the southwest quarter of section 33, township 19 north, range 19 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 80 acres."

Who is Gideon Peon? He is a citizen of the United States and a legal voter in Montana. He is 45 years of age, married, and lives with his family in Butte, Mont., where he has been a loyal and capable employee of the Federal Government in the Post Office Department for many years. He was born, allotted, and educated on the Flathead Reservation though he is less than one-half Indian blood. His allotment was to have been held in trust for him for 25 years as provided under the General Allotment Act of 1887, or until it should be patented to him during or after that time, when the Secretary of the Interior should consider him competent to manage his own affairs.

Was Gideon Peon competent to manage his own affairs? He had made his own way and managed his own affairs with credit since he was 15 years of age. Why, then, had he not been given his patent? Why had not 200,000 other mixed bloods and Indians been given their patents since they were and are as capable as the average white. Simply because the Indian Bureau fears the loss of its wards and the income they bring to it. It fears the loss of one, even, lest that start an Indian procession into full citizenship.

Did the 80-acre allotment actually belong to Gideon Peon? It certainly did, and under the strongest possible Federal guaranty, though it had been held in trust far beyond the 25-year period. And it did not belong to the United States any more than does the land held in trust by the Federal Government for 250,000 other so-called Indians.

Why was it necessary for Congress to authorize a patent for Gideon to his own land? Because for more than 40 years the Secretary of the Interior has refused to perform his duties under the law in relieving the land of competent Indians from restrictive trust.

Since Gideon Peon is representative of the scores of Indians who are asking Congress to authorize and require the Secretary of the Interior to perform his duties and grant to such as are evidently as competent as the ordinary citizen, the patents in fee which the Government has long promised them, and since he is also fairly representative of the scores of thousands of Indians of mixed blood who have been duped by the Indian Bureau into accepting its schemes instead of the promised patents in fee to their lands, attention is directed to the case of Gideon Peon against the Indian Bureau backed by the Secretary of the Interior supported by the President of the United States.

III

It is not often that so simple a piece of legislation as S. 403, only nine lines in length, has such a range of governmental implications and so much background involving social and economic principles. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Public Lands which, according to established custom, sent a copy of it to the Secretary of the Interior for his examination. It is in this way that we pay tribute to our multitude of bureaus. We concede that they must have an opportunity to protect their prestige even at the expense of citizens and the legitimate agencies of the Government.

In this case the Committee on Public Lands, in effect, called to Krug: "We see one of your branded steers wandering near your line fence which may have a gap in it." A word to the bureauwise was sufficient. Krug hit the saddle in person. Later as a score or two of like calls came, he gave instructions to his Danites to care for the immediate situation through adverse reports patterned after his, and through which he could direct a drift fence of conditional vetoes to turn back the steers that were escaping.

On April 17, 1947, the Secretary of the Interior reported adversely on the bill to give Gideon Peon the long promised patent to his land. Krug himself wrote the report. He neglected all facts pertinent to the case and confined himself to the well standardized stock of convenient arguments kept by the Indian Bureau to be used in adverse reports on all bills to give Indian allottees patents to their lands and to set them free from the Bureau. A critical analysis of Krug's report on the Peon bill is here attempted in the belief that it will serve sufficiently in the case of every report from that department on similar bills so long as it continues to fake the application of the seven stock arguments of the Indian Bureau to the .

In a show of originality, Mr. Krug says, "It is felt that the best interests of Mr. Peon would be served by retaining his land in trust status." He appears to have the feeling that Mr. Peon is getting along well enough under Indian Bureau supervision. The Indian Bureau is getting him $250 a year rent for his land and his white neighbors pay his taxes and furnish him with all the civic benefits that they possess. But that is not enough for the greedy Peon. He left the Flathead years ago because he was not willing to live among friends and neighbors who were paying for his social, educational, and civic welfare. He felt himself a pauper so long as he could not do his part.

Mr. Krug next says, "This is contrary to the best interests of the Indians of the Flathead Reservation who need to retain in Indian ownership and use as much as possible of the land on the reservation." This is a statement born of complete ignorance of the situation and a desire to serve his Indian Bureau. The fact is that the allotted lands on the Flathead are no part of the reservation; and no Indians live on the unallotted lands of the defunct reservation. It is under the complete control of the Indian Bureau.

Again Mr. Krug says, "Since Mr. Peon's land is in an area occupied by both Indians and non-Indians, the sale thereof to a non-Indian would further complicate and interfere with the consolidation of Indian holdings in that area." He continually talks of the sale of Indian land to confuse the issue. Mr. Peon was not asking permission to sell his land: he was asking for the long-promised patent to it. When Mr. Krug speaks of the "consolidation of Indian holdings" he refers to that communistic scheme under the authority of the Wheeler-Howard Act by which the Indian Bureau may induce or force the allotted Indians to turn their lands back into tribal status under Bureau control for the common use of the group. Only in the Sioux country is that plan meeting with any success. The Flatheads will have none of it though the Indian Bureau should torture them for a hundred years.

"If it becomes absolutely necessary for Mr. Peon to dispose of his land," says Mr. Krug, "it should be sold under departmental supervision to the tribe or to another individual Indian." He might have added, "at half price, the title passing to the Government for the manipulation of the Indian Bureau," but Mr. Peon is asking for patent to his land, not to sell it.

In a clarion voice of warning, Mr. Krug reiterates the oft-repeated lie of the Indian Bureau to say that "past efforts to bring about the wholesale removal of the protective restrictions against alienation and taxation of Indian lands have had disastrous results." Certainly no "wholesale removal of restrictions" was contemplated in the Peon case or in the other individual cases though such a thing would have been fully justified. Aside from Indian Bureau assertion, there is no evidence that the removal of restrictions on Indian allottees has had any baleful effects in the past. In fact, thousands of known cases attest the opposite. Does the Secretary know that after the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars on Indian education he now regards fewer Indians as competent than were so regarded by the Secretary of the Interior 40 years ago?

Mr. Krug, evidently reading from the card furnished him by the Indian Bureau, continues: "These restrictions are safeguards obtained by the Indians through treaty or agreement, as part compensation for the cession and surrender of vastly larger areas of land." That is not true. The restrictions were imposed upon the Indians by the general allotment act of 1887 and other statutes and had no connection with any land cessions. Section 5 of the Dawes or general allotment act reads: "That upon the approval of the allotments provided for in this act by the Secretary of the Interior, he shall cause patents to issue therefor in the name of the allottees, which patents shall be of the legal effect, and declare that the United States does and will hold the land thus allotted for the period of 25 years, in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Indian to whom such allotment shall have been made, or, in case of his decease, of his heirs according to the laws of the State or Territory where such land is located, and that at the expiration of said period the United States will convey the same by patent to said Indian, or his heirs as aforesaid, in fee, discharged of said trust and free of all charge or encumbrance whatsoever."

Finally Mr. Krug convicts himself and puts Bureau and Department self-interest above the authority of Congress when he says, "Under the act of May 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 182), the Secretary of the Interior has the authority to issue patents in fee for trust lands, provided that the applicants are competent to handle their affairs. For this reason additional legislation as proposed is not required."

So Krug admits he knew the law. He must have known that Peon was at least as competent as himself. Yet he denies both

law and justice to serve his Indian Bureau. The act which he correctly cites was passed by Congress to enable the Secretary of the Interior to modify the harsh effects of the general allotment act of 1887 in placing a 25-year trust period on the allotted lands of Indians and mixed bloods as the Indian Bureau had originally recommended. Under the law Krug could have granted patents in fee to Peon and other competent Indians by the thousands, but he chose to play the dog-in-the-manger act, doing nothing himself and denying to Congress the right to act in his default.

IV

Senator ECTON, for the Committee on Public Lands, having the Krug report on the Peon bill before him, reported, June 11, 1947, that "the land involved herein owned exclusively by Mr. Peon, * * * who is now and has since he reached the age of maturity been managing his own affairs. * * * The issuance of such a patent in fee would not complicate or interfere with other Indian holdings on the Flathead. * * * Would place said lands on the tax rolls of the county and State, thereby contributing its just share of responsibility which its possessor owes to the community. * * * Your committee is strongly of the opinion that to deny this Indian the right and privilege of managing his own property and the privilege of growing into a self-respecting and self-supporting citizen is to place an un-American stumbling block in his path of progress."

Congress passed the Peon bill on July 15, 1947, and sent it to the President for his action thereon.

The day before the scheduled recess of Congress the President sent the bill back with a veto message betraying his utter ignorance of the essential elements in the whole matter. Evidently he had accepted as his guide the Krug report and information from the Indian Bureau in place of the reasoned conclusions of Congress, but he could not refrain from adding his own impertinences which he had deduced from the misinformation he had received from his accepted sources, and which led him into making further blunders. Again it was evident that the balances of justice were weighted against a mere citizen in the person of Gideon Peon and in favor of the ruthless oppressors. Who would weigh this veto message against the facts, the conditions, and the legal conclusions in this simple matter involving the fundamental principles of law and justice may well question other veto decisions in matters affecting more complex matters and vastly greater numbers of citizens.

That the President was deceived by the information furnished either directly or indirectly, and mainly through Krug, by the Indian Bureau, does not excuse his action while any American citizens suffer through his gullability. The Indian Bureau did not hesitate to take advantage of his blunder. It was waiting with a news release on the veto which it had helped to condition.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, under date of February 6, 1948, I received the following information from Mr. Robert Yellowtail, who as I have previously said, was at one time superintendent of the Crow agency, and one of the leading Indians of the country:

Mr. J. J. Pickett, mentioned with Gideon Peon in the fake news item sent out by the Indian Bureau in connection with the Presidential veto of bills to give them patents to their own lands, is a veteran of World War I. He volunteered and served in the Navy on the U. S. S. *Covington* which was torpedoed off the coast of Ireland. Mr. Pickett was rescued after a long and perilous period in the icy waters of the Atlantic.

He served his country loyally and well through the perils of war and suffered untold hardships. As civilian employee in the Interior Department for many years, he was loyal and capable. Few citizens have a better record of Government service. But far from expressing any appreciation, the Government has denied his just and reasonable request for the right to handle and use his own land as other citizens do and as the law provides he may.

He certainly has received a raw deal, and the President of our great country should hang his head in shame for the part he has played in denying simple justice to one of the loyal soldiers and defenders of our country in time of national peril.

Mr. Pickett has been relieved of duty as fireman at the Crow Agency central heating plant because of heart trouble. He is in poor health, has a large family dependent upon him, and is hard put to feed them in these times of stress. He desperately needs the right to handle his land as other citizens handle theirs.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, at St. Paul, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the able address delivered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] at the Lincoln Day dinner at St. Paul, before the Lincoln Republican Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I consider it a great privilege to be invited to address the Lincoln Republican Club in St. Paul on this anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, a man who perhaps more than any other in the history of this country has expressed the ideals and the principles of the American Republic.

It is a pleasure to return the visit of courtesy which Harold Stassen paid us in Ohio in addressing the convention of the Ohio Republican Clubs in October. Subsequently I discussed with him in a very friendly meeting his proposed return to Ohio on a more serious mission, and tried to persuade him that it was against his own interest and that of the Republican Party. The contest in Ohio will be conducted on an entirely courteous basis, but by May 4 I think he will find that my advice was good.

I could not come to Minnesota without testifying to the voters of Minnesota with regard to the exceptional representation they have in the United States Senate. I have worked closely with JOE BALL on many problems and have the greatest admiration for his ability to think issues through to sound conclusions. ED THYE has been there a much shorter time, but he has acquired the sincere respect and affection of his colleagues. I am not in such close touch with the House of Representatives, but I know that the Minnesota delegation is one of the ablest and most influential in Republican councils. I can particularly congratulate the Twin Cities on having such able Representatives as ED DEVITT, WALTER JUDD, and GEORGE MACKINNON.

Lincoln's problems related primarily to the domestic field. He was the supreme advocate of liberty and equal opportunity. These are the principles on which I believe that progress can be made in the United States toward a people of stronger character, more self-reliance, and greater productivity. These are the bases, also, for further advancement in the field of material welfare, for while this country is the envy and example of the world, we have a long way to go before we reach the goals which we have set before us.

In the field of foreign relations, Lincoln simply extended his general principles of justice to our relations with other nations. The words of his second inaugural, which dealt primarily with the reconciliation between the North and the South, expressed his view of our relations also with the rest of the world:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

Today the problems of foreign policy are among the most difficult that we face, and no man can be certain that he is right in his approach to those problems because they involve knowledge of many facts for which he must rely primarily on others with preconceived opinions and prejudices, and often with a special interest.

I do think that we should realize first that foreign policy is not an end in itself. The Government of the United States is concerned with the welfare of the United States. It is concerned primarily with maintaining the liberty of its people, under conditions which will enable them freely to work out their own salvation. We are in favor of peace in the world primarily because we wish to protect our people against attack and threats of attack which probably would grow out of any war in the world today.

We are concerned with the over-all economic welfare of other nations because in a prosperous world we think it less likely that attacks will originate against our own security.

We Americans have always believed in charity for all. Our missionary enterprises and our philanthropies have reached into every continent. For more than a century American standards of health and well-being have been spread abroad by church effort, by welfare and relief groups, and by the Government on occasion. American aid went into Communist Russia in the days of Lenin, feeding the masses whom the Bolshevik leaders had liberated from depression to starvation. Other American help penetrated all of Europe after World War I. American aid was rushed to Tokyo on a large scale after the disastrous earthquake of 1923. The word "American" has come to mean "help" throughout the world. But such aid did not purport to solve the economic problems of these other nations. It was never in a volume which materially affected the permanent economy of other nations or constituted a strain on our own. We have been generous in the past because we have been rich, and could afford to be generous.

But aid on any such scale as is now proposed, imposing serious taxation on our people, and creating scarcity and high prices and economic unrest at home, is an entirely different matter. It becomes a question of foreign policy and can only be justified if it is for our own ultimate benefit. In aiding friendly nations we cannot do ourselves more harm than we can hope to achieve good from their improved condition. We should not aid totalitarian dictatorships at all. It can do us no good to encourage a world of totalitarian nations ruled by despots, whether they be kings or emperors or duces or so-called leaders of the proletariat. History shows that dictators are more likely to resort to war, and the stronger we make them the more likely they are to do so. We should adopt only those measures to aid other nations which may really tend to maintain freedom in the United States.

In the second place, I think we should realize our power to lead the world in the field of morals and political doctrine. Our power to lead the world is tremendous in the fields of morals, progressive thought and free government—a leadership which we have often asserted and rarely assumed. On the other hand, we greatly overestimate our economic power to influence the world through American dollars and American exports. After all, we are only 6 percent of the people of the world. We have less than 20 percent of the productive resources of the world.

Temporarily, we can aid and we can give economic assistance to others as now proposed in the Marshall plan. But in the long run the question whether other nations shall be Communist or anti-Communist, whether they shall be free or whether they shall be slaves, depends at least 90 percent on their own efforts and their own thinking, rather than on economic assistance from us.

We have strained ourselves to the utmost to give the economic aid which, at best, is partial and temporary. Up to this time we have failed to set an example for permanent peace and recovery by carrying out our own moral principles or the ideals which we have proclaimed.

In the Atlantic Charter we expressly stated that we respected the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they would live, and wished to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who had been forcibly deprived of them. But at Tehran and Yalta we gradually abandoned most of the ideals stated in the Atlantic Charter until today the attainment of many of them is impossible.

We have talked of justice, but we have shown no real interest in justice either in the United Nations Charter, in the drawing of boundaries and the assignment of territory, or in the Nuremberg trials in Germany where we enacted an ex post facto law and enforced it retroactively under the elaborate pretense of justice.

I have always believed that this Nation should associate itself with others to establish a rule of law, justice, and peace throughout the world. I supported the United Nations, and I believe our foreign policy should be built so far as possible around the United Nations, but I have substantial criticism of the Charter as it is now written. When the first draft was prepared at Dumbarton Oaks it certainly was not prepared by any men imbued with the principles of American history. Throughout the entire document there was no mention of the word "justice," there was no provision for the drafting of any law or the enforcement of any law. After Senator VANDENBERG was called into the picture he succeeded in changing the general spirit of the Charter by inserting in various places a reference to justice. But even today the action of the Security Council is an action of policy and expediency, and not of law. The Council is directed to take such measures as it sees fit to attain peace and security. It might well decree the destruction of some nation which had proved a center of dissension, regardless of the injustice involved to that particular nation. Fortunately, we can prevent with the veto power the adoption of any measure which is not in accord with the principles of justice as we see them.

The advocates of the United Nations itself have always laid tremendous stress on a strong police force. They have laid little stress on the law which the police are to enforce. It is like setting up a band of vigilantes without having written any criminal law. I feel very strongly that we should proceed to sit down with all of those nations who are willing to do so and write a law governing the relations of different nations with each other, and laying down a rule of conduct for nations, with particular reference to a definition of aggression. When that is done we should agree on an interpretation of that law by an impartial tribunal, and agree to abide by the decisions of that tribunal.

In 1911 my father negotiated two treaties with Great Britain and France which agreed to submit all justiciable disputes to arbitration, and also to submit the question whether or not a dispute was justiciable. The Senate unfortunately failed to ratify those treaties. The only hope of lasting peace in this world lies not so much in force as in the universal acceptance of the necessity of accepting decisions made by impartial courts set up to interpret a law of nations.

I believe that the United Nations charter can be rewritten to accomplish that result. I believe we can establish a world in which the great majority of nations will abide by a rule of law to which they have all agreed. I believe there can be established an international force backed by public opinion and the armed forces of individual states which will punish any violation of that law. It will take time, but it can be done. There are various plans proposed today by the American Legion and by others which promise substantial progress in that direction.

Up to date, however, we have paid little heed to the United Nations. We have bypassed it in Greece and we have by-passed it in the Marshall plan. We have shown little interest in international law, and none in international justice.

I am as much opposed to a world superstate as I am in favor of a sound association of nations, because I feel that it would defeat the very purpose of all foreign policy—the freedom of our own people. It is proposed that we set up such a state on the example of our own Federal Government, in which 13 colonies joined to make a single federal state. The analogy is completely false. The people of those colonies nearly all spoke the same language, they had the same governmental philosophy, they had approximately the same general standard of living, their interests were largely identical. The proposal now is to join together people who speak hundreds of different languages, and many of whom do not even understand how others of them begin to think. Their philosophy of life and of government is utterly and completely at variance. Probably the majority of those who would be inhabitants of such a state are utterly poverty-stricken, according to the standards of the more progressive nations. The difference in standards of living would produce continuous controversy and conflict. Finally, it is impossible for me to see how you can combine a democratic state with a totalitarian state, or a capitalist state with a Communist state.

Furthermore, if there were such a state, it would completely destroy the freedom of the people of the United States, which it is the very object of our foreign policy to protect. We would be in a small minority. The legislature of such a state could pass tax laws to take our wealth and distribute it elsewhere. It could destroy our industry and our trade. Its officers would direct our international commerce and control our airports and our seaports. Its army would be able at any time to destroy our cities and our people if they questioned the policies of an international legislature and an international executive.

I seriously question whether a state larger than the United States is today can be governed by its own people, whether it could be a government by the people and for the people. Perhaps the closest analogy is the British Empire, but that Empire has found it necessary to decentralize more and more because the people of each dominion have demanded freedom of action. It has no supreme executive and no supreme legislative power. Even in our own nation it is difficult to protect that local self-government so essential if a people is to remain free.

It is conceivable that the time may come when all the peoples of the world are sufficiently alike in language, philosophy and economic progress to make such a state possible, but today it is utterly dangerous, impractical, and ridiculous. It would not even promote peace, because it would fall to pieces whenever any important difference arose. In this country one difference relating to slavery almost wrecked the Union. There would be a dozen conflicts greater than the question of slavery in the problems of a world state. Civil war is just as possible and more destructive than international war. If we wish to attain peace in our time, we must adopt practical and realistic methods.

For the time being, at least, our tremendous interest in building up a practical association of nations has been subordinated by our concern about the policies adopted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. That policy prevents the establishment of any kind of world-wide association of nations and makes any international association infinitely more difficult. The effort of the U. S. S. R. to spread communism throughout the world by propaganda and infiltration, and perhaps by force, has forced us into a series of defensive measures, culminating in the Marshall plan.

Probably no administration has ever pursued as inept and futile a policy toward communism that have the administrations of Roosevelt and Truman. Until Senator VANDENBERG entered the picture, our attitude toward Russia was one of virtual and complete surrender. We gave them billions of dollars of goods under lend-lease without a condition looking to their performance in the postwar world. President Roosevelt knew of the bargain made by Stalin with Hitler which brought about the Second World War and knew of the conspiracy to divide Poland. Yet he apparently felt that if Mr. Stalin received military aid and kind treatment from England and the United States he would be transformed into an angel of light and do all that we asked when the war was over. This was the attitude clearly shown in the President's interviews with Forrest Davis, published in the Saturday Evening Post, and since referred to as "The Great Design."

The President was deeply influenced by the strong pro-Russian attitude of Harry Hopkins. He seemed to feel that Stalin conferred a favor upon us by continuing the battle against Germany. He accepted Stalin's view of the military strategy and attack which gave him the Balkans with Tito as the recognized leader of Yugoslavia. Later we begged Russia to enter the Japanese war when it was unnecessary, and resulted only in turning over Manchuria to Russia. We recognized the right of the Russian Army to occupy the Balkans, and also Berlin and Vienna, which gives them today their powerful hold in Europe. We actually withdrew our troops from territory which we had occupied in battle with Germany—occupied by us partly because the Russians were so busy seizing all of southeastern Europe except Greece.

At Potsdam President Truman and General Marshall confirmed the agreements and the policy of Yalta. They in substance approved the Morgenthau plan, while denying that they had given it consideration. It was not even suggested that Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia be given the sovereign rights of self-government assigned to them under the Atlantic Charter. Under feeble protests we agreed that a large part of Germany be turned over to Poland in order that Poland might be compensated for territory desired

by Russia, thus agreeing in effect to territorial changes contrary to the wishes of the people concerned, in violation of the Atlantic Charter. Thereafter, we practically abandoned Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and large sections of other territory to the rule of a Communist minority.

All of this was no mere mistake. It was prompted by the basic New Deal philosophy which influenced the whole administration. Many New Dealers would not go along with Mr. Henry Wallace, who felt that communism was merely another form of democracy, and perhaps a little better form than our democracy; but there were a lot who did have that attitude. Others doubted, but yielded to the party philosophy. Remember how soft they were toward the admission of Communists into Government departments, and even into the Army. There are bureaus today where there are many Communist sympathizers. Certainly, there are even Communist Party members, or President Truman would not at long last have demanded their dismissal 2 years after VJ-day, and requested $50,000,000 to get rid of them. We can see now what a complete misconception of the whole character of communism was involved in concessions which we made, and in the failure to exact guaranties regarding the postwar world.

But even today there are those in the Government who do not admit they were wrong. Why on earth should we continue today our policy in China? From the beginning we have encouraged the Chinese Communists. Every Commie sympathizer in the United States has been damning Chiang Kai-shek, whom we were taught in the early years of the war to regard as the greatest patriot in the Far East and the greatest friend of the United States. He was the same man then, with the same faults that he has now, but forces in the State Department have encouraged the propaganda against him. Yet he is today the only hope to prevent the spread of communism in China. His armies in Manchuria are surrounded, and are unable to combat the Communists, for the reason that we have given his armies no ammunition for their American arms, while the Communists have been lavishly supplied by the Soviets with the Japanese arms they captured at the end of the war.

Unless action is taken immediately, all Manchuria will be lost to communism. It is not only a tremendous agricultural area, but one of the great industrial sections of China. If communism dominates Manchuria, how can we hope that in future years we will be able to keep it out of Japan? The practicability of rehabilitation for China and the value of relief is open to question, but certainly we can provide the Chinese Government with the arms and ammunition necessary to resist Communist force in Manchuria as we have undertaken to resist it in Greece.

I believe very strongly that the Far East is ultimately even more important to our future peace than is Europe. It is futile to expend billions on a doubtful economic project in Europe to resist communism while practically inviting them to take over western shores of the Pacific.

Another curious instance of the administration's inconsistent battle against communism lies in the loan being granted to the Polish Government by the International Bank, which is practically under American control and uses American funds. Sixty million dollars is to be given Poland in coal-mining machinery. The theory is that the Poles will ship some of this coal to western Europe. The fact is they will do with their coal exactly what Russia tells them they can do. Whether or not any is shipped to western Europe you can be certain that the majority of it will go to munitions plants at Skoda and other factories to build up the military strength of Soviet Russia. The truth is we have in our departments, both in the Commerce Department and the State Department, men at the intermediate levels who yearn for more economic planning, and others who still sympathize with Russia in spite of all that has happened.

Apparently the administration is pinning all of its anti-Communist hopes on the Marshall plan, on which it hopes to expend $9,000,000,000 during the next 15 months, while it neglects the Far East and allows machinery and other American assistance to strengthen Russia. It doesn't make sense.

I am very strongly in favor of extending aid to the countries of western Europe. I believe we can help them recover more rapidly their prewar production and restore a standard of living to their people which will make the spread of communism more difficult. We have been helping Europe for 2 years at the rate of some $5,000,000,000 a year. No nation has ever been so generous before in the history of the world. We can still be of real assistance; first, to make up the deficiency in absolutely essential foodstuffs, and second, to provide the raw materials and machinery required to get their industries going with reasonably expanded capacity.

I do believe, however, that our aid should be confined to specific needs and to fields where we can see that it will actually accomplish the purpose we want to achieve. I believe very strongly that too lavish distribution of American dollars will do more harm than good. After all, we can hit only the high spots. Most of the economic recovery in these countries depends on the people themselves, on their willingness to work and on sound governmental policy. Only their own government can balance their budget, maintain a stable currency, and create the incentive to produce and export. All we can do is remove bottlenecks and prime the pump.

The threat of uncertain but potentially limitless American aid could deter all efforts of European businessmen, labor unions, and Government officials to rebuild on the basis of their own efforts. Why should they labor painfully to reconstruct this factory or that if a whole new factory may be given them, scot free from the United States, at some future date?

I object to the economic plan so characteristic of the New Deal, under which these countries are invited to add up their desired imports, subtract their possible exports, and hand us a bill for the difference. It is absolutely impossible to make any such calculation with any accuracy, because production depends entirely on the policies of their own governments.

We should not be in the position of deciding how high a standard of living each country shall have. If they are short of something, and we have it, we should help provide it. But let us not repeat the history of the British loan, where we gave $3,750,000,000 to be spent by the British for anything they wanted anywhere in the world. Many of the wisest Britons say that half of it was wasted, and only postponed the time when they had to face their essential problems.

After all, it is now nearly 3 years since VE-day. The productive facilities of many of these countries were hardly injured by the war, and yet they are still dependent on foreign aid. Is it our fault or theirs?

In giving aid to Europe, therefore, we should adopt at this time a practical and hard-boiled plan. We should set up an administration independent of the State Department and give away the money of American taxpayers only for those specific projects of which we can see the real value. In my experience the State Department is primarily concerned with pleasing foreign nations, without considering the cost to the American taxpayer or the American consumer. We should limit the amount of aid so that the Administrator will feel compelled to select only those projects of clear economic value to the European nation concerned. If any program does not produce results, it ought to be stopped.

As in all foreign aid of this magnitude, the only ultimate purpose should be to protect the freedom of the people of this country. It is utterly futile to strain our whole economy to the breaking point. By doing that we can easily destroy here at home that which it is the purpose of our foreign policy to protect. The distribution of American dollars abroad is at best an indirect means of protecting our country and may be wholly ineffective, and certainly it should be confined to a reasonable sum and projects whose values are clear.

The recent foreign policy of the United States is often described as a bipartisan foreign policy. I think this is incorrect. The Republican Party was invited to share, and did share, in some of the major foreign-policy decisions. Chief among these was the decision to write a United Nations Charter and to set up the United Nations Organization. It was only Senator VANDENBERG who finally turned President Truman and Secretary Byrnes to a stiff opposition to Russian demands. It was he who insisted on a new South American policy leading to the treaty made last summer at Rio, which may well prove the model for a larger effective association of nations.

But the other steps were not Republican steps. The appeasement of Stalin, the abandonment of constitutional Yugoslavia, the betrayal of the Polish patriots, the wild-goose chase for a Communist-Nationalist coalition in China—these, for example, were not Republican policies. The Republicans were invited to undo the mistakes of Tehran and Yalta, but they bear no responsibility for the original mistakes. The losing of the peace, thus far, has been a clear-cut Democratic responsibility.

Our foreign policy should be the expression of the interests and ideals of the American people. Its first concern should be with the peace of the world in order to protect our own peace. We should be willing to join with others in opposing aggression in order to preserve peace. We should insist upon the decision of questions according to fairness and justice. We should keep our promises when they are made.

In the meantime we should guide our domestic policies according to the principles of a free people and the rule of justice under law. We should not hesitate to assert throughout the world the benefits of a system of individual and economic freedom. Too long have the New Dealers apologized for that system. They have allowed it to be slandered and deprecated throughout the world because they themselves have been trying to change it. Only by our example can we hope to restore in the world the philosophy which can lead us toward peace and prosperity.

We cannot do better than apply Lincoln's words in his second inaugural quite literally to the present day. They proclaim a better peace policy than any now current in Washington:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; • • • to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Across the years these tremendous words ring true. You and I cannot improve on them; it is up to us only to live up to them.

The World Food and Market Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD, a copy of an able address entitled "Taking Stock of the World Food and Market Situation," delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson, at the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., February 18, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAKING STOCK OF THE WORLD FOOD AND MARKET SITUATION

In these days when so many people have set themselves up as experts on the world food situation and on the market situation it wouldn't be surprising if you and the people you write for found it a little difficult to keep track of what's going on. I know I do.

The whole picture has been complicated by changes in the production prospects of countries that have to import grain and of countries that export grain. It has been complicated by the behavior of the grain market in this country. It has been confused by investigating committees, by private citizens, and by individuals who hope that they will cease to be private citizens next November.

One man called the Department and said that he was notifying the White House that I had been trying for a year to break the wheat market and that I had finally succeeded and had lost the 1948 election. This was at the time that Senator TAFT was trying to prove that I had pushed prices up, while Congressman ANDRESEN charged that I had pushed them down. Congressman ROBERTSON, of North Dakota, celebrated Lincoln's birthday by a speech in the House that said the commodity market crash was "the only time in our history that any administration has deliberately caused a panic, and I charge that this panic has been created for purely political reasons." But "Pappy" O'DANIEL chimed in, saying that the Secretary of Agriculture, and he alone, had built up the high prices. It's quite a trick to push prices up and down at the same time. I hadn't realized that I had become so versatile.

Despite the confusing and conflicting statements about what's going on, I think it is possible to get a good straight account of the situation out of the official reports of the Department of Agriculture. I want to talk to you a little about the subject matter of two of those reports, one of which is for release tomorrow and the other for Saturday. And then I want to show you a chart which is related to both the world situation and to the market situation in this country.

Most of what I have to say today will be the type of thing I have been talking about for a long time and you can refer back to previously published statements and reports for that. My comments on the forthcoming reports on the world food situation and the wheat situation will be related to previous statements and reports.

Some people apparently have been able to get a pretty clear picture of what was ahead by following these public statements and reports closely. E. T. Maynard is quoted in an interview in the New York Times as saying that he read what the newspapers reported of my Detroit speech and that he saw where I had made certain predictions about the grain market. I think it is worth while to recall here my exact words on this subject in my talk before the Detroit Economic Club back on December 7, 1947. In that statement I took our total 1947 crop, subtracted the amounts needed for domestic use and got a figure 100,000,000 bushels larger than our export program of 450,000,000 bushels, of course, I did not take into account 70,000,000 bushels taken out by a requirement that carry-over be boosted to 150,000,000 bushels because Congress added that later. So I made my subtractions and said: "That leaves an extra 100,000,000 bushels to export, and yet the price of wheat keeps moving up day by day. I say to you that the stubborn fact of that 100,000,000 bushels is going to catch up with the speculators some day."

Mr. Maynard put a million dollars on the line on the theory that the Department might be right—and at last reports, was doing all right.

How did we reach the present situation in a marketing year in which we have witnessed wheat selling above $3? The forthcoming Department of Agriculture reports, I think do a pretty good job of analyzing and bringing the situation up to date.

Last year, as you know, Europe was hard hit with a series of natural disasters—severe freezes and winter killing of fall-sown crops, followed by spring floods and summer drought. The result was bread-grain production in Europe, excluding Russia, almost as small as in 1945, and 300,000,000 bushels below 1946 production. Bread rations were lowered, extraction rates increased, more coarse grains were added to bread mixtures, and the nations of Europe turned to the outside world for help to offset the decline in domestic production. It appeared last fall that the total world expcrtable supply of cereals would not be much greater than the 28,400,000 long tons shipped from all surplus-producing areas in the 1946–47 crop year. As the season progressed, however, the situation improved. There was an unusually good crop in Australia, much better than average yields in Argentina, a larger rice crop than last year in Asia, and some savings by grain conservation in this country. Australia will produce the largest wheat crop in its history this year, now estimated at 226,000,000 bushels, 110,000,000 more than the poor crop last year. Although the acreage seeded to wheat in Argentina is the smallest since 1904, indications now are that the crop will be at least as large as the 206,000,000 bushels produced in 1947. It now appears probable that exportable supplies of cereals world-wide may reach 32,000,000 long tons.

The price of grain in this marketing year is affected not only by the current supply-and-demand situation, but also by the prospects for the marketing year ahead. And the prospects now are more favorable than a few months ago. Weather conditions in Europe have been generally favorable. Russia reports ample moisture with crops more advanced than normal at this time. Russia already has agreed to export considerably more grain than was thought likely at the beginning of the current marketing year. Winter crops of cereals in India and China are reported to be progressing favorably, and prospects for our own winter wheat crop are improved over last fall.

In considering the improved prospects in Europe it should be remembered that the acreage devoted to bread grains still is 10 percent below prewar and that the shortage of fertilizer has resulted in depleted soil fertility so that better than average conditions are required to obtain average yields.

In the world as a whole, production of all major food products still is below prewar with a world population now about 10 percent larger than it was 10 years ago and with per capita food consumption in general much lower than in prewar days. It will be important to continue conservation of grain in this country because there will be need for all we can spare in this marketing year. Nevertheless, the improvement in Australia, in Argentina, and in the growing conditions in Europe and in this country have helped to bring about an adjustment in grain prices.

There has been purchased all but about 73,000,000 bushels of the wheat needed to complete the export program of 450,000,000 bushels, the basis on which we are programming shipments. Actually, if we count March commercial allocations already made, the figure drops to 67,100,000 bushels. The Cabinet Food Committee has unanimously agreed that the program will remain at 450,000,000 bushels, at least, until the end of March, when we shall know more about our crops and world needs. So in my discussion today I am dealing with a wheat export program of 450,000,000 bushels. We add to that an additional 70,000,000 bushels of coarse grains which has been a part of the export program since the start of this crop year and which has all been procured. In fact, there has been bought all but 73,400,000 bushels for the program.

For the period from January 1 to June 30, 1948, we have this situation:

Of the 795,000,000 bushels on hand at the beginning of the year, we must deduct the 150,000,000 bushels minimum carry-over required by law. That leaves 645,000,000 bushels. Of this amount, we may expect to use about 245,000,000 bushels for food and about 25,000,000 for seed, leaving 375,000,000 bushels.

Of the 450,000,000-bushel export program, we shipped through the end of December 258,000,000 bushels, and that leaves us still 192,000,000 bushels to export. Subtracting that amount from the 375,000,000 bushels we had remaining after deducting food and seed, leaves 183,000,000 bushels available for feed during the last 6 months of this crop year ending June 30. We used only 65,000,000 bushels of wheat in the first half of this crop year for feed and we might expect that feed use in the second half would range between one hundred and twenty-five and one hundred and seventy-five million bushels. Now, if wheat feeding is on the low side of that range—namely, 125,000,000 bushels—that would leave ample grain to take care of all of our present domestic requirements and perhaps enable us to increase our export program to a total of 500,000,000 bushels. If wheat feeding should be on the high side of the indicated range, then we will not have the grain to increase our export program above the 450,000,000 bushels. It is just as simple as that.

Another figure that I want to comment on is the 150,000,000-bushel minimum carry-over required by the Interim Aid Appropriation Act. With the improvement in world crop conditions and with our own improved domestic situation following the drought of last fall in the southern Great Plains wheat area, I do not feel that a mandatory carry-over of 150,000,000 bushels is essential. After all, we have gotten along with a much smaller carry-over than that on several occasions. We went into this crop year with a carry-over of 84,000,000 bushels and got along all right, and we could do it again if we were prepared with the necessary boxcars to move grain out of the Southwest as soon as it is harvested. If crop conditions are right this spring, we could shrink that 150,000,000-bushel carry-over and pick up some additional grain for export if it seemed desirable to do so. When the Congress moved to write in the provision for a 150,000,000-bushel carry-over, I opposed it. There was much discussion by grain traders and others that the carry-over should be 200,000,000 bushels. Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota, fought it vigorously, pointing out that it was

not fair to the farmer to build up a large carry-over here at home, thus making the farmer take an extra gamble on what he would get for the next year's crop.

On the matter of wheat feeding we are not simply making an estimate of the probable range and assuming that we may end up on the high side of that estimate. Instead, we have been making a special effort through our grain conservation campaign which we hope will bring us out on the low side of the estimated feeding range. Through the land-grant colleges, which do a large part of the Department of Agriculture's educational work among farmers, we have for several months been trying to impress upon farmers the desirability of finishing cattle with less grain, even though the grade may not be the best. We have asked that hogs be fattened to somewhat lighter weights than is normally the practice. We feel that farmers have made a conscientious effort to cooperate in this program although recently hogs have been coming to market at more nearly normal weights for the season than they did last fall.

A second effort we are making to conserve grain is through appeals to various industrial users. We at the Department of Agriculture have had meetings with many of these groups. Some of these meetings have not been satisfactory. Each group is, of course, willing that other groups conserve grain, but comparatively few of these people were willing to undertake a conservation program of their own.

At one time we expected that 95 percent of the brewing industry would join us in a grain-conservation program. Now I understand that the percentage of brewers who do not want to join in this effort has increased. We have no way of knowing exactly how much grain will be used by the distillers during this month as compared with the 2,500,000 bushels that were allocated to them during January, but the information we have about their use of grain during the first half of the month indicates that they will use at a rate of about 6,500,000 bushels per month. We think that is too much. We think it is unnecessary to distill whisky at that rate to go into storage. In times like these we should make as much grain as possible available for export and build up our storage stocks of whisky at a time when there may be a surplus of grain.

In the conservation program an effort has been made to take some of the pressure off of the demand for meat and thereby relieve some of the pressure on prices. If meat prices are too favorable that encourages heavier grain feeding to livestock and at this time we would rather see the farmer sell his wheat as wheat rather than to feed heavily. The result of the unfavorable relationship between grain and livestock prices showed up last fall in marketings of hogs at weights from 15 to 20 pounds below the same period in the previous year.

One of the important parts of the conservation program is the war against rats which is being carried on in cooperation with the Department of the Interior. When you realize that there are probably as many rats as there are people in this country and that each one that can get to grain is capable of destroying a bushel of grain in a year, it is easy to see the importance of the work which the Interior Department can do in the rat campaign.

There are many factors that have an influence on grain supplies and, of course, upon grain prices. Some factors other than supply and demand seem to influence prices. Bernard Baruch, who is an authority on many things including commodity markets, has referred to the recent price break as an adjustment of the market that is probably a good thing. The farmer has been getting far above parity for wheat and during the recent break prices have approached parity.

I am glad to have this opportunity to discuss the world food and market situation with you in advance of the Department of Agriculture reports which I mentioned. I hope no one will see anything in these reports which they will interpret as being intended to boost prices or beat prices down, because we have endeavored simply to report facts. One of our difficulties now is that implications which we do not intend are sometimes attributed to facts which we report.

We are operating the grain purchase program now just as it was operated during the war and in years since the war. I rely upon the judgment of the people of the Department of Agriculture who have had long years of experience in grain market operations. If we had gone into the grain market last Saturday when it looked somewhat stable some person in public life would have said that I should have let the market go to the bottom. At the same time, others in public life, as well as farmers, have asked why we did not go into the market on Saturday and keep it from breaking further. All we can say is that the export program has not been used to keep prices up or to run them down. We have price-support programs that are designed to protect prices and we will use those programs when they are necessary, but when we are acting as buying agents for the Army or for foreign countries we try to buy with as little disturbance to the market as possible and try not to allow our purchases to touch off booms or declines in the market.

In this connection I want to call your attention to a chart showing commodity credit wheat purchases and the total volume of trading in wheat in relation to the price variations since the beginning of this marketing year, July 1, 1946. It shows the heaviest purchases by the Government in the early part of the last two marketing years with greatly reduced purchases in the periods when the market made sharp upswings. This is in contrast to the total volume of trading on the market.

When the Department of Agriculture has been criticised for its buying policies, I have suggested that it might be revealing to compare the cost to the Government of 400,000,000 bushels of wheat with the cost to millers for a like amount.

During the entire calendar year 1947, average price paid by the Government for wheat was $2.44 per bushel. From January to June 1947, it averaged $2.14 per bushel, and from July to December 1947 the average price paid was $2.56 per bushel.

January	$2.06
February	2.16
March	2.00
April	1.94
May	2.16
June	2.32
July	2.20
August	2.28
September	2.47
October	2.81
November	2.95
December	2.89

Weighted average $2.44 per bushel.

We had profited by our experience in the 1945–46 marketing year when we did not get adequate advance information from claimant agencies and foreign countries and were faced with the necessity of buying heavily late in the year. This year and last we bought heavily in the early months of heavy marketing by farmers. Last July, August, September, October we bought wheat and flour equivalent to nearly 200,000,000 bushels. And now, as I have pointed out, we have about 70,000,000 bushels still to buy, a part of which will be by commercial concerns, to complete the minimum export program of 450,000,000 bushels. In other words, we have made an effort to buy in a manner that would disturb the market as little as possible.

Hogs: Average weight of barrows and gilts, packer and shipper purchases, Chicago and seven markets, specified weeks, October to February 1946–48

Week ended—	Average weight, Chicago	Average weight, 7 markets[1]
	Pounds	*Pounds*
1946		
Oct. 5	246	240
Oct. 12	240	235
Oct. 19	233	229
Oct. 26	230	231
Nov. 2	234	231
Nov. 9	231	232
Nov. 16	233	232
Nov. 23	234	231
Nov. 30	232	232
Dec. 7	236	234
Dec. 14	239	238
Dec. 21	239	238
Dec. 28	242	241
1947		
Jan. 4	246	245
Jan. 11	247	244
Jan. 18	247	249
Jan. 25	252	251
Feb. 1	250	253
Feb. 8	255	252
Oct. 4	225	219
Oct. 11	230	219
Oct. 18	229	219
Oct. 25	223	218
Nov. 1	222	217
Nov. 8	229	221
Nov. 15	228	221
Nov. 22	230	225
Nov. 29	235	226
Dec. 6	226	229
Dec. 13	229	230
Dec. 20	241	232
Dec. 27	245	236
1948		
Jan. 3	247	245
Jan. 10	252	241
Jan. 17	255	251
Jan. 24	255	250
Jan. 31	250	251
Feb. 7	257	255

[1] Include Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, St. Louis National Stock Yards, Sioux City South St. Joseph, and South St. Paul.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Division of Statistical and Historical Research.

Federal Control of Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL
OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a telegram dated February 14, 1948, from H. R. Cullen, of Houston, Tex., addressed to a number of persons, and bearing on the oil situation.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSTON, TEX., *February 14, 1948.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

The morning press states JOHN W. HESELTON, Republican Congressman from Massachusetts, drafting bill to put oil under Federal control. It is just hell when one has to continue to fight for freedom in this country. I sent you Harry Weiss' letter some time ago that showed that the oil production of this country has increased fourfold since 1920, while coal production has not increased any. Why do not the bureaucrats in Washington

jump on the coal business for a while and leave the oil men in peace? Bureaucracy working at its best held the price of oil down and put the price of coal up, with the consequence they are using fuel oil in the factories almost directly in the coal mines. This is an unhealthy condition and should be stopped by allowing the price of oil to rise high enough to force those industries in the coal States to use coal. Instead of putting in big headlines a shortage of supply they should stress an unprecedented demand aggravated by an unusually cold winter, plus a shortage of tankers, tank cars, and pipe lines due to war-created shortages. What are the facts? We are exporting around 163,000,000 barrels of petroleum a year.

Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma, called attention to the Senate Committee on May 27 of last year to the fact that in 20 months exports not of petroleum but of approximately 50,000 tons of piping, casings, and other tubular goods used by the petroleum industry had been shipped to the Russian Government under export licenses issued by our State Department. This, said Senator MOORE, meant that the American oil industry had been denied material for drilling about 1,500 wells, which should have produced for our own use over 135,000,000 barrels of new reserves. If this equipment had stayed here and not gone to Russia, there is little reason to believe that any fuel oil tanks would be empty in America today. It is time that some patriotic statesmen in Congress should state facts and save us from that condition recently presented by Under Secretary Archibald L. M. Wiggins to the leading bankers and businessmen of this country, who said: "And, surprisingly to me, about two-thirds of the things that happened in this country in the last 25 or 30 years fitted right into Harold Laski's theory of state socialism. So, it is not a matter of opinion, it is just a matter of putting the facts down side by side, and there it is." Copy sent to Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

H. R. CULLEN.

(Copies to: Leonard Read, Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., Irvington-on-Hudson, New York, N. Y.; Dick Tullis, 1707 N Street NW., Washington D. C.; Sam Pettengill, America's Future, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; Robert M. Harriss, care the Breakers, Palm Beach, Fla.; Frank C. Waldrop, Washington Times-Herald, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Leo E. Allen, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Carroll Reece, 1837 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Hon. George W. Malone, United States Senator from Nevada, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Arthur H. Vandenberg, United States Senator from Michigan, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Tom Connally, United States Senator from Texas, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Robert A. Taft, United States Senator from Ohio, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.)

The Federal Trade Commission—Minority Recommendations by Commissioner Mason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD legislative recommendations made to the Congress by Commissioner Mason, of the Federal Trade Commission. I am certain these provocative recommendations will prove of interest to every Member of Congress, and to American business and industry as well.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMISSIONER MASON'S STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF HIS MINORITY RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

In my opinion, the Commission spends a disproportionate amount of time on the sanction of force through hit and miss prosecutions of individual complaints and does not make sufficient effort towards a mass understanding and acceptance of the law. Many of the complaints are only indicative of common bad business habits which continue to flourish industry-wide in spite of single individual prosecutions.

Cease and desist orders issued after lengthy and costly trials may have served as deterrents in some cases, but often they only place the respondent under a handicap not imposed on his competitors. In addition, looking at it from the consumer's point of view, a cease and desist order entered against one company rarely results in protection to the public if the banned practice is common to others in the same business.

The failure in all punitive procedures is that they attack individual symptoms without removing the general causes, and seldom serve to bring a common understanding and acceptance of the law by those not parties to the litigation.

The President has recognized the inequality and ineffectiveness of hit or miss prosecutions as a means of getting a reign of law in commerce. He takes cognizance of the fact that some infractions of mercantile law are best remedied through cooperative means rather than by lengthy litigation against single companies. In his special message to Congress of May 17, 1946, he indicated we can obtain this through stipulation agreements to cease and desist or through the establishment of trade practice rules.

Congress approved his proposal on this phase of Commission work in 1946 by appropriating supplemental funds to carry out such a program. Later the President, in his 1947 message, fortified this proposal in these words:

"The Antitrust Division will concentrate its efforts on major violations of the antitrust laws. The Federal Trade Commission will increase its effectiveness by operating on an industry-wide basis rather than through the slower procedure of individual complaints. It will also sponsor a larger number of industry conferences designed to locate and eliminate unfair trade practices through cooperative action."

COMMISSIONER MASON'S STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF HIS MINORITY RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

With reference to my proposed amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act, bearing on the appointment of an administrative officer, it should be pointed out that executive leadership in the Federal Trade Commission by joint action of the Commissioners is inadequate for the following reasons:

1. Direct, day-by-day supervision by the entire group of Commissioners imposes great burdens on them and interferes with their broader duties of rule-making, administrative adjudication, and policy determination. The present method is also relatively slow and tends toward procrastination or inaction through deadlock.

2. Supervision through committees or groups of Commissioners also makes serious demands on the time of Commissioners which could be spent on broader duties. Moreover, it tends to produce uncoordinated action.

In a report to the monopoly subcommittee on small business, House of Representatives, pursuant to H. R. 64, Seventy-ninth Congress, the staff of the committee stated:

"The agency—the Federal Trade Commission—is headed by five Commissioners appointed for staggered terms of 7 years. The chairmanship is rotated every year among the five Commissioners.

"The five Commissioners divide up between them the administrative duties involved in carrying on the work of the Commission and supervising the activities of its five-hundred-odd employees. The Commissioners must also sit as judges in the hearing of cases. A member of the monopoly committee staff was informed verbally that the Commissioners meet every morning in executive session to discuss cases and meet on an average of two afternoons a week to hear cases.

"This would appear to be an extremely heavy load for anyone to carry. It is almost as though the Supreme Court Justices were asked to run War Assets Administration in their spare time. * * *"

There has been a tendency in recent years, as evidenced by the Report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure and by the passage of the Administrative Procedure Act, to encourage a separation of what are considered executive or administrative activities of Commissions from their quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative activities; the latter functions, and related matters, should be handled by joint action of the Commissioners, while executive and administrative matters should be placed under unified supervision, to be exercised within the framework of Commission policy, but not directly provided by the Commissioners themselves.

In order to conserve the time of the Commissioners for their basic duties, it is desirable for them to be assisted by an individual who will be responsible for executive or administrative leadership. This executive director, or administrator, should have adequate authority as follows:

1. The Commission should deal with internal administration only through him, and should not issue orders directly to anyone but him.

2. He should have authority to select and assign subordinates.

The Executive Director, or Administrator, should also have adequate staff assistance. The areas in which he will need such assistance include:

1. Allocation of men, materials, and money toward the fulfillment of Commission goals;
2. Development of efficient and economical organization and procedures;
3. Interpretation of the work of the Commission to the public;
4. Personnel administration;
5. Financial controls and records; and
6. Administrative services.

The Chairman should be designated by the President instead of by our present musical-chair procedure, which prevents the logrolling and spreads the glory but doesn't operate to the benefit of the taxpayer. The opportunity for leadership by the Chairman depends upon his authority. Presidential designation would substantially enhance his effectiveness because of the position he occupies as representative of the Commission in dealings with the executive and legislative branches of the Government. It would bring continuity to the management of the Commission and give stability to the administrative functions which now are wafted from the personality of one Commissioner to another on the first of each year. There is no authentic basis for the present method of rotating the chairmanship annually.

With reference to the compensation of Commissioners, the Federal Trade Commission Act was passed in 1914. Section 2 provided a yearly salary of $10,000 to each Commissioner. In those days $10,000 was $10,000,

with no income taxes. Today the take-home pay is $7,944.

The Consumers' Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that the dollar which the Government paid a Federal Trade Commissioner in 1914 bought exactly 46.6 cents worth of the necessities of life in 1946. A year ago this made the equivalent take-home pay for a Federal Trade Commissioner $3,734.07. The 1947 dollar brings even fewer of the necessities of life to one's doorstep.

Congress determined that the responsibilities and requirements of a Federal Trade Commissioner in 1914 called for a $10,000-a-year man. Then, this country's business economy was gaged at $40,400,000,000. In comparison, our industrial and economic growth today is represented by the figure of $203,700,000,000.

Octane Versus Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, several congressional committees have been studying various phases of our Nation's oil problem. The major question before them has been how we can meet our country's petroleum needs by conserving the present supply available or locating new sources of supply.

The chairman of the Railroad Commission of Texas, Col. Ernest O. Thompson, advances an idea that he believes would save us 75,000,000 barrels of crude oil annually and at the same time allow the automobile operator to put 2 cents back in his pocket every time he buys a gallon of gasoline.

Colonel Thompson's suggestion is that the driving public of America limit itself to the use of what is commonly known as regular gasoline instead of ethyl, octane, no-knock, or any of the other dozens of types of premium gasoline on the market.

Colonel Thompson is convinced that the best conservation program is the one which will give the most miles per barrel of crude. He contends that regular gasoline will take your car just as far as will the premium gas and contains a substantially smaller percentage of crude oil.

According to Colonel Thompson, almost any mechanic can adjust our car motors to give satisfactory performance on 65- to 70-octane gas. In fact, he says it has been established that, provided the engine has been properly adjusted for the fuel, no difference in performance between engines using 65-octane gas and 80-octane gas can be ascertained even by the best-trained technicians.

Colonel Thompson outlined his ideas on this subject most vividly in a paper he delivered before the Natural Gasoline Association of America in April 1947. While I am not a chemist and do not propose to understand the technicalities, Colonel Thompson's proposal could be of such far-reaching importance that I would like to include in my remarks the text of that paper:

OCTANE VERSUS CONSERVATION

(By Col. Ernest O. Thompson, chairman, Texas Railroad Commission)

Conservation of oil and natural gas has come a long way since 1932.

My reference to that date is made only to give the scope of my close study and intimate observation of the advance of the technology and science of getting a barrel of oil out of Mother Earth's storage reservoirs to the surface of the earth and then brought the pipe lines to the refinery and thence through the 400,000 filling stations of the United States, to the hungry motors of the citizen.

Surely gasoline and oil are important to the welfare and happiness and contentment of our people. Proof of this is amply given when it is called to our attention that there are in these United States 10 times as many filling stations as there are post offices.

It is proper also to state that gasoline today is one necessity of modern life that is of far superior quality and still much cheaper than the gasoline of 20 years ago.

In 1920, gasoline was 26 cents a gallon in the midcontinent, and then there was no Federal or State gasoline tax.

Today regular gasoline sells at the pump in Dallas, Tex., at 21 cents a gallon including 6 cents a gallon gasoline taxes. Compare this price with bread, butter, or meat.

Regular gasoline, less tax, is 15 cents a gallon today in Dallas, Tex. In 1920 it wes 26 cents a gallon and there was no gasoline tax.

Advertising has made the motorist octane conscious. Yet few motorists know what octane is, and even fewer understand how it affects the operations of their cars.

It's a lot like our insisting on our rice being white. That is what the public has been educated to want. They do not stop to think that the polishing of rice takes a lot of the nutrition from it.

It's the same way with gasoline. A lot of money is spent clearing up the color to please the eye.

Your own technicians, that is to say, the engineers in the motorcar industry and in the petroleum industry, have convinced me of one fact. Namely, that the average motorist gets no honest brass-tacks value in added performance of his motor for the additional octane numbers above say 65 in motorcars up to and including the 1947 models. Provided that the proper adjustments have been made and that the engine has been maintained in good order, octane numbers above this level appear to be relatively unimportant. Almost any mechanic, or so-called mechanic, can read the motorcar manuals and then adjust the spark so that the engine will knock even when using 80 octane. Conversely, it can be adjusted to give very satisfactory performance on 65 to 70 octane. It would take a college graduate with at least 4 years' training as a chemist, an engineer, and a technician, with the aid of specialized testing equipment to ascertain the difference in performance and horsepower of the engine when using 65-octane number, on the one hand, as compared to using the much more expensive 80 octane, on the other—provided that the engine in each case has been properly adjusted for the fuel.

If the motorist truly wants miles for his dollars, he will quit paying extra cents per gallon for those extra octane numbers that do not add anything to his motor's performance.

Conservation is still an issue. Petroleum resources which were counted on to carry us for years in the future have been consumed for war. We are now forced to look halfway around the world for emergency supplies of oil to fuel our Navy. In spite of continued drilling and the use of more scientific methods for finding reserves, our known reserves have been reduced.

During 1946 this country produced 1,733,424,000 barrels of crude oil and 115,153,000 barrels of natural gasoline, cycle products, and liquefied petroleum gases. Proven reserves as of January 1947 total 20,873,560,000 barrels of crude oil and 3,321,027,000 barrels of natural gasoline, cycle products, and liquefied petroleum gases. Of these volumes 55.79 percent of the crude oil, 60.43 percent of the condensate reserves, and 87.46 percent of the reserves of other light hydrocarbons are in Texas.

It is gratifying to consider the remarkable results of the cooperative efforts put forth by State regulatory bodies and the petroleum industry to improve the efficiency of oil and gas production in the interest of conservation. With few exceptions, wastage has been eliminated and petroleum reserves are being produced in an efficient manner.

For some unexplained reason, petroleum conservation has taken on the limited definition which restricts the application of the term to the production of crude hydrocarbons—or, at most, includes the processing of these crude materials into specification products. On the basis of such a limited definition, conservation has been successful, but why should our concern end at the refinery? It is not sufficient that the maximum crude be recovered from the reservoirs, or that the refineries process that crude efficiently. We must remember that our petroleum resources are funds of potential energy and our concept of petroleum conservation must be broadened to include the efficient utilization of that energy. From the standpoint of the motorist, who is primarily interested in conservation as it affects motor-fuel supply, the best conservation program is the one which will give the most miles per barrel or per pound of crude.

With this broader concept of petroleum conservation in mind, we have reviewed the subject of motor fuels and engines as it is related to the problem. Because of its technical nature, such subject matter is confined to the technical journals so that the average motorist, and perhaps the average engineer, never becomes familiar with the problem. With all due regard for past achievements of the motor industry, there is evidenced a decided room for improvement from the standpoint of petroleum economy. It is amazing how many technical articles have been written on fuels and engines by representatives of the refining and motorcar industries during the past 10 years, showing how real improvements can be achieved, and in a few respects it is amazing how little has been done about it. Perhaps the car designers and motorists are too much preoccupied with sleek body jobs to worry much about petroleum economy, but the technical record shows that improved car design and better maintenance would pay important dividends in customer satisfaction and in petroleum economy.

The point of this paper, which I believe is adequately confirmed by the literature references of the bibliography, is that present-day cars do not require fuels having octane numbers higher than—or as high as—those currently available. Any excess octane number quality which is obtained at the expense of yield is poor economy and a wastage of our resources.

There appears to be no disagreement between automotive engineers and refinery motor-fuel experts on the factors which are important to the problems of octane requirement, fuel economy, and engine performance.

It is now well known that neither the A. S. T. M. motor method nor the CFR research method octane numbers adequately express the road performance of a fuel. In general the former correlates with high speed and the latter with low-speed performance, but no simple combination will correlate with road performance over the full speed range. Recently there has been much emphasis placed on the difference between the research and motor method numbers which is expressed as "sensitivity" or "jump" and which is a measure of the degree to which a fuel has been cracked or reformed. The availability of wartime cracking and reforming capacity in certain refineries and the sales appeal of higher numbers are the most important factors in this emphasis at this time. Certainly there is no evidence to show that higher octane numbers are needed for operating reasons.

What are the factors affecting octane requirements and how can they be improved?

1. Basic ignition timing has received more attention than any other single item. Apparently the automotive engineers strive for an optimum spark setting which will deliver close to maximum power under any operating speed. Such a setting requires that the engine be actually detonating under full acceleration with the fuel used. Almost without exception the service manuals issued by the car manufacturers recommended adjusting the spark advance until a "slight ping" is obtained on full throttle acceleration.

The primary effect of this practice of adjusting the spark advance until detonation is obtained is to make it literally impossible to ever eliminate engine detonation by production and use of higher octane gasoline. As higher octane fuels are made available to eliminate knock complaints the recommended practice for adjusting cars in service will see to it that the improvement is offset and the knocking is retained. This situation has resulted in the amazing observation, pointed out in several octane number surveys, that so-called octane requirements were not so much a direct function of car design or operating conditions as of the octane number of the fuel available in a given territory.

This basic spark setting practice which keeps the knock forever with us might be reasonably condoned if the gain in power or mileage were significant—but such does not appear to be the case. Various road test programs have all come up with substantially the same answers of which the following are typical as reported by Van Hartesveldt and Field in 1940.

(a) Increasing the road octane number from 74 to 77 yielded only 1.8 percent increased power and a further increase to 80 octane number yielded only an additional 1.3 percent increased power.

(b) Increasing road octane number from 74 to 80 gave no increase in mileage at 40 m. p. h. for level-road driving and showed only 2.5-percent increased mileage at 20 m. p. h. with two-thirds throttle.

(c) Increasing road octane number from 74 to 77 gave no difference in acceleration time.

(d) Increasing octane number from 74 to 77 affected knock as follows:

Approximately 40 percent of cars, no difference.

Approximately 40 percent of cars, doubtful difference.

Approximately 20 percent of cars, noticeable reduction with the higher-octane fuel.

Other investigators have reported power losses of the order of only 2 percent and reductions in octane number requirement of 10 to 20 numbers by simply retarding spark from the maximum power setting.

In this connection it is interesting to note the effect of knock on power loss. In 1939 MacCoull reported that on several cars tested, hardly 2 percent in power loss occurred with a "medium" knock and that this small power loss accompanied use of a gasoline of almost 15 octane numbers lower value than required for complete absence of knock.

Another investigator states that "When high octane number gasoline is used in a car that does not knock on the lower-octane material no improvement in performance results; and when a car that knocks is fueled with a high-octane gasoline, the knock is reduced, but no additional power nor gasoline mileage is gained unless the knock was extremely loud. Knock must be so loud for power loss that no motorist with normal hearing, driving such a car, would fail to take the car to a repair shop."

2. Variation in spark timing from cylinder to cylinder in an engine has been shown to be also a serious difficulty. One investigator points out that by actual tests on individual cylinders of a stock car, some cylinders required as much as 35° spark advance over normal advance before audible change in knock intensity occurred, whereas, other cylinders gave appreciable increase in audible detonation with only an advance of ½° above normal. From one limited survey, octane requirement between cars of the same make and model has been reported to vary as much as 23 octane numbers. Variations such as these are traceable largely to variation in engine-distributor cam angle which can be corrected by reducing manufacturing tolerance. In the absence of corrective measures it is obvious that the cylinder having the greatest spark advance or the car requiring the highest octane number will in large measure determine the general level of octane number of the motor fuel marketed.

3. Mixture distribution is an important factor in determining octane requirement. With the complicated manifolding of present-day cars it is extremely difficult to obtain uniform air-fuel ratios to all cylinders. Maldistribution results in segregation of T. E. L. content or of high octane fractions to certain favored cylinders with the other cylinders penalized and the octane requirement of the engine increased. With perfectly synchronized spark advance to all cylinders, it is reported that the effect of varying mixture strength to individual cylinders may cause a variation in octane requirement of 15 numbers between individual cylinders. Maldistribution is worse for gasolines of higher boiling range, and this difficulty can be materially reduced by using more volatile gasolines.

4. Manifold heat, used to vaporize gasolines of low volatility, increases the octane requirement. Increased volatility of motor fuels reduces the necessity for high manifold temperatures but poor mixture distribution prevents the elimination of manifold heating.

5. Engine speed has an important effect on octane number requirement. A recent paper has shown that increasing speed from 1,000 to 2,500 revolutions per minute (20 to 50 miles per hour approximately) reduces the octane requirement by 10 or more numbers. New type transmissions, which will prevent low-speed loading, will permit use of lower octane fuels. Incidentally, such improvement will favor paraffinic or saturated type gasolines instead of cracked, olefinic type products.

6. Engine maintenance is strictly the responsibility of the motorist and therefore may not be as susceptible to improvement as are changes in the design and basic adjustment of the engine. Too few car owners have any appreciation of the improvement in performance which can be obtained by periodic checkups, and they are therefore prone to postpone servicing as long as possible. Removal of combustion chamber deposits alone has been observed to reduce octane requirement as much as 15 numbers, with 8 or 10 numbers being an average improvement which may be expected for deposit removal after 15,000 miles of driving.

Now let us look at some of the factors which affect fuel economy. In a paper presented before the SAE in November 1943, Mr. A. T. Colwell listed the major methods for improvement of economy in order of importance as follows:

1. Transmissions and rear-axle ratio.
2. Rolling resistance, wind resistance, and car weights.
3. Engine size—number of cylinders.
4. Compression ratio.

This listing may be surprising in that the major emphasis is not on increased compression ratio requiring more highly refined, and expensive, high-octane fuels.

By decreasing rear-axle ratio from 4.3 to 3.6, which would decrease performance slightly in the low-speed range, an additional 3 miles per gallon can be realized.

Reducing car weight from 3,500 to 3,000 pounds could improve economy by 3 to 5 miles per gallon without loss in performance if rear-axle ratio was simultaneously reduced.

As car weight is reduced, engine size can be reduced and load factor increased to improve economy.

Increase in compression ratios above the current 6.5/1 will improve thermal efficiency and give more miles per gallon. However, since an increase in compression ratio will require a simultaneous increase in fuel octane number, this gain in economy may be a delusion.

Loss in yield from crude to produce higher octane fuel may change this gain to an actual loss in fuel economy when considered on the basis of ton miles per gallon of crude instead of per gallon of gasoline. Such a figure is exceedingly difficult to arrive at, but the viewpoint is nonetheless important.

Additional benefits in economy are obtainable through proper design of fuel systems to use the maximum quantities of light hydrocarbons directly as fuel instead of requiring that they be processed with loss in yield merely for devolatilization. Butanes and pentanes are important contributors to octane number and good performance.

Operation of engines on leaner fuel mixtures may offer economy benefits. Increased spark gap width and spark energy may be necessary to promote firing and earlier timing to promote complete burning of the fuel. If successful, there would be less loss due to unburned fuel going out the exhaust pipe. The same investigator who reports improvement in mileage effected by the use of wider than normal spark gaps also shows even greater improvements in gasoline economy through the use of a special exhaust manifold which minimizes resonance effects and thus improves scavenging.

All of the foregoing points bearing on octane number requirement and fuel economy have been obtained from technical literature cited in the bibliography. Most of the suggestions have been found to be repeated by several authorities. While the whole subject is not nearly as simple as has been presented, the salient factors have been covered. It is regretted that time does not permit more detailed quotations but published presentations of this paper will include detailed excerpts from supporting literature.

Our primary interest is conservation of petroleum resources and it is our purpose here to remind everyone that conservation is not a practice limited to the old field but rather that the same efficiency of conservation practice should continue until the motor-fuel product is finally consumed. With this admonition to the automotive people we are willing to leave the problem of better car design up to them. They have shown the means of improvement and we are confident that more economical designs will follow.

One astonishing fact, however, stands out as an inexcusable situation. Both automotive and refinery engineers are apparently well agreed that, for one reason or another, the current high level of octane numbers is unnecessary—and certainly we don't need higher octane numbers at this time. Simple little improvements in the design of distributors and in factory and maintenance adjustment of spark timing would permit reduction in current octane levels by 5- or 10- or 15-octane numbers with no noticeable reduction in mileage or performance. Most cars on the road today could well get along with less than 74-octane fuel and yet there is every indication that the octane-number level is again increasing. One expert has referred to the octane number as the "refiner's will-o'-the-wisp" because current practices render any improvement short-lived.

In a paper published by Van Hartesveldt and Field in 1940, the authors estimated that the money cost of increasing octane number was approximately 5 cents per barrel octane number and that therefore an increase in average octane level from 74 to 80 for the 500,000,000 barrels produced per year in this country at the time of their estimate would cost somebody $150,000,000. Is there any doubt as to who will finally pay this bill for unnecessary improvement?

Aside from the money cost for octane number improvement, there are important penalties in the more rapid depletion of our petroleum reserves, both crude oil and naturally occurring light hydrocarbons. Consider first crude oil. I recall that when cracking processes first began to be used in the refining industry they rightly were considered to be a means of increasing the total yield of gasoline from the crude. How different the situation is now as refiners under the control of a "magnificent obsession" for greater octane numbers now process perfectly good naphthas at a yield of 20 to 30 percent in order to get a few more octane numbers in their over-all refinery output of motor fuel. It is, of course, impossible to give an exact figure of the total yield penalties because of the many different types of crudes and processes used. However, from examination of yield data for various processes, it appears that from 1.5 to 2.5 percent of motor fuel might be sacrificed for each increase of one octane number. Thus, raising the octane number of the current annual production of 750,000,000 barrels by one unit only would decrease the yield by perhaps 15,000,000 barrels, and this can only be made up by increased drafts on our total hydrocarbons reserves. An increase of five octane numbers, which is now considered quite possible by some, would mean an increase annual requirement of 75,000,000 barrels to offset these processing losses.

Many of the processes which the refiner has used in the race to obtain high octanes result in the production of additional light fractions such as butanes and pentanes duplicating and competing with supplies of these materials necessarily produced as an incident to the recovery of crude oil and natural gas. As a result there has been a total oversupply of these light fractions with very weak markets as was painfully obvious in the years preceding the recent war and again as recently as February and March 1946. Weak markets for these naturally available light fractions have surely been conducive to waste, a waste which we conservation authorities have been fighting with every legal means at our disposal. There is no way of knowing the magnitude of this waste but its reality has been clearly apparent to many of you who have seen casinghead gas of 2- to 3-gallon content burning with rich, smoky flame in field flares—burning because the market price of the useful fractions it contained was so low that no sensible businessman would undertake the expenditure to recover them. I tell you that this condition has been caused by the attitude and policy of the industry in not recognizing that petroleum supply and demand should be based on an over-all hydrocarbon balance. If refiners wish to make a real contribution to the conservation of our hydrocarbon reserves, they can do so by programing their operations to use naturally available volatiles and discontinuing the trend toward excessive cracking and thermal processing which now in contrast to the early days results in less gasoline from a barrel of crude oil rather than more. At a time when all are concerned about our Nation's reserves of liquid hydrocarbons, the possible saving of 75,000,000 barrels of crude oil annually and an additional indefinite but certainly worthwhile volume of natural light fractions is of sufficient magnitude to justify serious thought and reflection for every petroleum refiner and marketer.

I know it gives us regulatory authorities real concern. We believe the fruits of oil and gas conservation in waste prevention incident to production of oil and gas—the light hydrocarbons—natural distillates and condensates should be given first consideration in filling refiners requirements. We will have to, perhaps, consider these first, then supplement them with the balance from crude as needed in our allowable production orders.

Restriction of Liquor Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of an editorial published in a recent issue of the Cottonwood County Citizen, of Windom, Minn., in regard to efforts of that paper to restrict the activities of liquor manufacturers. It is such an able editorial that I send it to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURBING LIQUOR ADVERTISING

There is a bill in Congress known as the Capper bill which would restrict the activities of liquor manufacturers and distributors in their modes of advertising. It would forbid them to make claims that alcoholic beverages are beneficial to health, will increase social or business prestige, or is traditional in American family life and should be part of the atmosphere of the American home. Another bill would forbid suggesting liquor as part of the celebration of any religious holiday.

Aside from the fact that this would trample upon the freedom of the press, we still admit a shame in our profession that such legislation should be necessary. We never could see why any self-respecting newspaper or magazine should want to run advertising of the sort above named. In fact, it is so misleading that it is enough to shake the faith of the reading public in all advertising. We are happy that this newspaper has never accepted such advertising, though it has meant thousands of dollars in loss of revenue.

Senator Capehart's Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator CAPEHART's Proposal," published in the Marion (Ind.) Chronicle of February 10, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR CAPEHART'S PROPOSAL

Too little attention has been given to the proposal of Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART for a joint European recovery program. The speech advocating this program was made in Peoria, Ill., February 7. In brief, Senator CAPEHART advocates the formation of a world reconstruction finance corporation in which the United States would furnish 50 percent of the money and credit, and each European nation participating would furnish money by which to buy a reasonable percentage of the remaining stock. In short- and long-term investments and bank balances in the United States alone the 16 European nations designed to be covered by the Marshall plan have $13,000,000,000 in good credit dollars. Added to these very liquid dollars which these nations possess in the United States are other vast holdings in South and Central America and Switzerland.

Senator CAPEHART concedes that there is real merit for an outright gift to European nations to meet the needs of hungry and cold people, but he says: "That is a separate phase of European relief and should be dealt with separately even though the Marshall plan as proposed fails to do this.

"For 30 years the United States has experienced nothing but failures which have grown out of hasty, ill-advised action based on emergencies which found this Nation lacking in qualified leadership. We fought World War I to save democracy. Then came the Versailles Treaty and Disarmament Conference. The Kellogg-Briand Treaty was like the others; it never accomplished what it was designed to accomplish. * * * Then came the depression and the destructive philosophy of scarcity, which still is with us today.

"War again threatened us, and we had the Neutrality Act, Cash-and-Carry Act, and, finally, lend-lease; we only were fooling ourselves. Then we gave 50 destroyers to England with the silly belief they would keep us out of war. Business as usual was being carried on with Japan while our diplomats were edging closer to war with that nation."

Then the Senator traced the various actions taken during the war, including the Atlantic Charter we signed for the "four freedoms" which were to be the terms of an Allied victory for the world. We followed with the Bretton Woods monetary conference and the Export-Import Bank. These were proclaimed to be the harbingers of permanent international prosperity. But, the Senator continued: "Four freedoms, United Nations, Bretton Woods, Export-Import Bank were mere scraps of paper as we began getting the returns from Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

"The Morgenthau plan and the division of Germany boomed into the faces of those hoping for a quick return to the peaceful ways of the world.

"Russia began grabbing. We began fearing. Then came the Greek-Turkish loan to stop Russia's march to the Mediterranean oil pool.

"Now the Marshall plan."

The Marshall plan, Senator CAPEHART contends, continues the fallacy that American dollars given freely and without stint will restore European stability. Then, he says, there is an equal fallacy in the government-to-government plan proposed by Secretary Marshall. This plan provides that the United States Government will give goods or dollars to certain European nations who in turn will sell these goods or lend the dollars to their peoples needing them. This is the authorization plan of the superstate and can lead only to socialism or to statism, not only in the nation where the plan is employed but also in all probability in the United States. Pointing out that we already have given since the war, net aid amounting to more than $9,500,000,000, without producing an iota of even simulated stability in the nations where the money and goods have been channeled, Senator CAPEHART contends that additional grants will not produce stability unless the nations benefited by such credits will themselves assume responsibility according to their needs and resources.

"Let those nations where confidence prevails step forward with funds to help themselves; then Americans will step forward with an equal number of dollars to aid in the industrial recovery of that nation. With these dollars will be formed a vast pool of dollar credit which can be loaned for the purpose of restoring the production of that country.

"Money can be poured into private enterprise in the foreign nation through a credit allowance against the RFC in that nation. This will entitle applicants to an equal credit against the American RFC.

"Armed with his purchasing credit, the businessman moves into the world market to procure the materials he needs to restore production so badly needed in his country.

"This," the Senator contends, "is the American way. By this plan Americans call upon the Europeans to share in the risk of saving their country in a cooperative manner. It inspires the confidence needed to sufficiently preserve freedom and independence. This plan is the answer of the free-enterprise system to the ideology of government by dictators. It preserves our principle, it preserves our pledge to protect our Americans and our American resources. If we are right in our system in America, then our system is the greatest force with which to oppose communism."

It's Time To Do Something About Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "It's Time To Do Something About Germany," written by O. K. Armstrong and published in the current issue of the Reader's Digest. Mr. Armstrong is a distinguished Missouri journalist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S TIME TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT GERMANY

(By O. K. Armstrong, writer, publicist; former member Council of State Governments; former member Missouri Legislature)

The German people face a task as great as ever confronted any people on earth: to rebuild their country, economically, politically, and spiritually. We American people and our Government have assumed a major responsibility for the future of this defeated land. To date, our occupation policies have failed even to start Germany back toward democracy and economic self-sufficiency.

For many weeks last fall I talked with officials, clergymen, clerks, laborers, farmers, veterans, and housewives in all four of the occupied zones. There can be no doubt that the Germans know who lost the war. Almost every large city is still in ruins. Many of the small cities are from one-fourth to one-half destroyed. Some 2,750,000 troops and 450,000 civilians lost their lives. A large part of all German industry was bombed away or has been dismantled since the war.

Gaunt hunger stalks the land. Four million evacuees from bombed-out homes find shelter as best they can. About 25 percent of Germany—the best food-producing region—has been given to Russia and Poland. Nearly 13,000,000 displaced persons have been jammed into the remaining area of human misery.

There are now four Germanys. The Russians, holding the eastern third, flatly refuse to permit economic unity. The British and French are progressively shifting their occupation burdens to American shoulders. So we Americans must choose: Either we withdraw, leaving the heart of Europe in a chaotic state and a further prey to rampant totalitarianism, or we give leadership for creating a peaceful and democratic Germany. To succeed in the latter task, we must chart new policies so just and constructive that generations ahead will approve them.

Immediately, we should do four things:

1. ABANDON VENGEANCE AND ESTABLISH JUSTICE

Millions of Germans said, when American troops entered their defeated homeland: "The Americans are a just people. They will free us from Nazi rule and bring us democracy." Very quickly they learned their mistake. Our policy has been one of harsh and vindictive punishment for all the people.

It is understandable that Americans should think all Germans guilty of the crimes against humanity committed by their Nazi leaders. During the fighting this was the theme of effective propaganda in the United States. It is easy to say: "Mass punishment serves them right. They brought it on themselves." But this concept of mass guilt and this policy of mass vengeance are the very opposite of the basic principles of American justice.

These principles are implicit in our Bill of Rights: No ex post facto law shall be passed. Guilt for a crime is individual, there is no such thing as "collective guilt." One is presumed innocent until proved guilty. If cleared by one trial, one cannot be tried again for the same offense. Punishment must be humanely administered, having for its purpose rehabilitation rather than suffering and degradation. Every one of these ideals has been violated during our occupation of Germany.

Max Rheinstein, of the University of Chicago Law School, who served for 18 months in military government, has declared: "Our denazification methods retard economic rehabilitation and are driving into sterile hatred and resentful opposition millions of people who might otherwise have been sincere democrats."

Chief device for mass punishment is the denazification program. Certainly Germans expected that those guilty of crimes, military or civilian, would be punished. But denazification set up classifications of guilt for the entire population, with "automatic arrest" for all within certain categories. Proof of innocence, instead of guilt, has to be established. Meanwhile, accused persons are forbidden any occupation that might "influence the community" except manual labor.

Studying scores of denazification cases, I found such cases as these common: A manufacturer was forced to pay dues to the party or lose his business; now his business is confiscated, his property taken, and he is no longer allowed to work as an executive. Many German Red Cross units were incorporated as party auxiliaries, without consent of the members; now nurses of these units cannot engage in their profession. A pastor was gathered up with hundreds of accused and kept in a concentration camp for 7 months before trial; it proved to be mistaken identity.

Local denazification courts are conducted by Germans selected by occupation authorities. Even if men are ruled innocent by these courts, in the American zone a special branch can declare the judgment void. Thus thousands are tried again and again while held in confinement on starvation diets. A young Austrian who joined military government training while in a United States college in 1943, shortly after becoming an American citizen, is now high in the denazification program. He admitted to me that he had never studied law, but explained that in bringing about mass punishment of the Germans it is best to discard American legal procedures.

Bitterness fills the hearts of the German people over this application of American justice. Millions who never supported Hitler's policies of racial hatred and aggression recall that statesmen of the now victor nations once spoke warm endorsements for their dictator, that their governments recognized his regime.

Germany's physical stagnation and moral decay are stark proof that a policy of vengeance can produce nothing except more hate; that it is a fertile breeding ground of new conflicts; it cannot build the foundations for lasting peace. It is time to replace this policy with one of cooperation based upon justice.

2. REVIVE PEACEFUL GERMAN INDUSTRY

"Give us the right to work again," is the plea most frequently heard in Germany. Occupation rules prevent normal productive labor. Automatic elimination of persons accused of Nazi influence has completely stagnated industry. With most leaders of business, transportation, manufacturing, education, and so on, forced to haul rubble or grub the fields, production has no chance.

The policy of deindustrialization, added to the devastation of war, has left Germany a vast slum. This policy was incorporated, somewhat vaguely in a statement issued by allied leaders at Quebec in 1943, and implemented by the Potsdam agreement of August 1945. Details were never clear, but in actual practice the plan is geared to destroy Germany's principal industries and reduce the country to a pastoral, or farming, area. Reasons given are to eliminate Germany's future war potential and, less openly, to eliminate Germany as an industrial competitor of the victor nations.

A published statement of British and American technical experts in Germany in August 1945 branded the pastoral plan for this most highly industrialized nation in

Europe an absurdity, declaring: "World opinion will demand a fresh approach, after several years' experimentation. Germany can't feed itself, regardless of the diversity of German agriculture. The change in policy will occur in '48 or '49, after public opinion has changed."

To break the power of the German Army, railroads and other means of transportation were heavily bombed. Since the end of hostilities, industries that supplied material and repairs for railways, barge lines, and communications have not been permitted to function. With repair shops closed down, 75 percent of the locomotives rust idly in the yards and only a few trains move at all.

German coal mines fed about half the industries of continental Europe, and warmed the homes and working places of millions. Now so little coal is allotted the western zones that heavy industries could not function even if permitted, and countless people suffer from cold.

All types of industrial production are in this dreary picture of forbidden activities except for a few small items of manufacture. Bureaucratic control renders futile most attempts to revive allowable industries. Formulation of policies and enforcement of the countless supplementing edicts are in the hands of State and War departmental employees, most of whom are inexperienced in problems of production and distribution, and who, while eager for power, are loath to assume responsibility for decisions.

Most ghastly of all is the dismantling program, calling for continued destruction of German industrial plants. Some are dismantled as reparations, with a large share marked for Soviet Russia even after her leaders announced the formation of the Cominform dedicated to sabotaging our European-aid plan. On last October 16 British and American authorities announced that 682 industrial plants were still to be dismantled. A directive not made public but given to Senate committee members by an American officer, who could no longer stomach the destruction, listed schools, barracks, and hospitals yet to be blown up because they were used by troops during the war. This in the face of desperate need to house millions of Germany's homeless and sick.

The results of this policy of sterility and destruction are obvious: Thousands of idle men and youths wander about the western zones of Germany, staring into space, looking for scraps of food, or plotting some mischief to make up for productive labor. Such idleness is not permitted in the Soviet zone.

Starvation is taking its deadly toll. In normal times Germany exchanged industrial goods for about 40 percent of her food. Today the western zones need to import 65 percent of their food. From the mere subsistence level of the 1,550 calories per day allowed in 1945, food rations have steadily dropped until in many cities they average not more than 800 calories.

Conquering nations and their armies have no political or moral right to destroy a vanquished people's means of livelihood. It would be better to allow German laborers to produce goods at home for reparations than t take from them the very means of restitution. To try to eliminate the competition of German production is a misguided policy. The prosperity of one area strengthens that of all other areas of the world. As for war potential, it is clear that this can mean anything. In modern war, every plant, every institution of learning, every plot of ground, contributes to the war effort.

Peaceful German production is vital to the life of Europe. Her trade has long sustained the economies of her neighbor nations. With Germany industrially impotent, European standards of living must fall lower and lower and her neighbors must be permanently impoverished along with her own people. Today, the United States must sustain Germany and those neighbors with billions of aid. The alternative to reviving German industry is to continue this drain upon American taxpayers. Surely it is better to let the Germans resume work and support themselves.

3. MAKE JUST DISPOSAL OF DISPLACED PERSONS

There are two groups which intensify every social and economic problem in Germany. First, about 700,000 citizens of other countries, now under Russian seizure, such as Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, or under Russian domination, such as Poland, who refuse to return because of certainty of Soviet persecution.

Second, more than 12,000,000 "expellees," victims of the greatest mass uprooting of populations in history. They were driven from their homes in accordance with the Potsdam Agreement. This unbelievably tragic document reads, "The three Governments (United States, Britain, and Soviet Russia) * * * recognize that the transfer to Germany of German populations * * * will have to be undertaken." State Department officials explain that the Soviet Government promised that only 1,500,000 people would be affected; nearly nine times that many have been transferred. By the agreement, President Truman, speaking for the American people, gave approval to a mad stroke of racial vengeance. By this act, our Nation accepted the race theory against which the bitter war was fought.

In Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Silesia, Pomerania, East Prussia, Yugoslavia, and other areas these Volksdeutche were expelled from homes and farmlands that had been theirs for sometimes as long as 500 years. I talked to scores of them, from every area affected. Their stories are alike: The sudden appearance of armed men, the command to pack a few clothes and food, the forcible ejections with death to many who resisted; the loading into trucks and trains, the arrival in the American zone and forced implanting into homes of the local population.

These unfortunates are billeted mostly in small towns and rural areas. Often as many as a dozen men, women, and children are crowded into one room. The fears, tensions, and social problems thus created are immeasurable.

There can be no final settlement of Germany's vast problems until the displaced persons have been assisted to new homes and work in Germany, or resettled in other lands. Here is a task that demands the immediate attention of Congress.

4. HELP SAVE THE NEW GENERATION

Unless the new generation in Germany is salvaged, any program to create a peaceful nation will fail. The task cannot be accomplished by the inadequate welfare activities now administered through American military government. It must be a part of the broad plan of permanent rehabilitation.

Immensity of the problem can be seen in figures from a recent study of children in Berlin. Of 41 boys, aged 12 to 14, in one school class, 9 have lost both parents, and 22 others have lost father or mother. All but 2 mothers of the boys go out to work every day; 23 boys spend the whole day without any grown-ups looking after them. Only 4 have a bed of their own; 35 share their beds with 2 or more persons; 22 have no blankets. Only 5 have 2 warm meals a day. All are underweight. And saddest of all, 32 of these 41 boys admit they have stolen. Report on a class of 34 girls shows similar conditions, with the notation that 14 of the girls admit immorality to obtain food.

These are the children of Germany today. We Americans share responsibility for their future so long as we have a hand in Europe's destiny. If they continue in hunger and neglect, the inevitable delinquency, crime, and despair will take root and store up trouble for the future. Interesting and productive activities, foster homes and, above all, firm, friendly guidance must be supplied.

As a demonstration project, Dr. A. Freudenberg, Lutheran minister, has gathered up about 200 homeless youths who were arrested for black marketing and other delinquencies. In a work camp of their own construction the boys are finding new lives in profitable employment. "Unless this is done all over Germany, the land will be filled with dangerous nobodies," Dr. Freudenberg told me.

We must help Germany rebuild her educational system, along truly democratic lines. Tools and machinery should be supplied for reconstruction of schools and libraries, with the necessary dormitories and equipment. There must be new methods and programs.

Through nearly 3 years since VE-day, our governmental leaders have failed to find a constructive plan for Germany. We the American people need to tell members of Congress, our policy-making branch, to assume their responsibility in this critical matter. In cooperation with our friendly allies, we should assure the German people they will be given support in their long task of creating a law-abiding and self-sufficient nation. Then they will bring to the solution of their problems the determination of those who know what it means to lose wars and how important it is in the future to live in peace.

Mahatma Gandhi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Indian Saint," from the February 19 issue of the Christian Advocate, official organ of the Methodist Church.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INDIAN SAINT

At the moment that these lines are being prepared for publication it is impossible to anticipate the far-reaching effects of the senseless murder of Mahatma Gandhi at the hands of a fanatic. The Indian Government seems to be proceeding with dispatch and impartiality, even in the face of suspicions that run into the upper levels of the nation. It is impossible, however, to overestimate the seriousness of the tragedy which has overtaken the infant state in this, the most critical moment in Indian history during 1,000 years.

Greater variance of opinion has not gathered about any other individual of the century. By some he has been esteemed only a little less than a god; by others he has been the spirit of evil incarnate. But by the world in general he has been accepted as an idealist of transparent sincerity and absolute fidelity.

Because he has exhibited conspicuous Christian virtues there are those who have hailed him as a Christian, in spite of his denials of the title. Because he refused to declare his belief in certain Christian creeds, he has been labeled by others as almost an anti-Christ. For long years, as the leader of the independence movement for India, he was accounted by many Americans as the greatest patriot in the world. Because of his loyalty to his philosophy of nonviolence during the war, he was counted by millions of those same Americans as a fifth columnist, a Nazi sympathizer, an appeaser, or something even worse.

Inside India he was the victim of the same extravagant distortions of opinion, as his tragic death testifies. And for an explanation of this divergence we must look at the contradictions within his own life. As an idealist in certain controversial social fields, he was one of the purest souls the world has ever known, and there is great danger that his assassin may have paved a route by which he will be elevated to the rank of divinity by great masses of Indians. But his blind spots were almost as notable as his virtues, and just as it is unwise to judge him by his weaknesses, so also it is unrealistic to think of him only in terms of his amazing qualities.

Regardless of religious, racial, political, or personal opinions, the whole world stood at his bier and mourned. His going left a great darkness over the entire earth. In paying its tribute to the Indian saint, the Christian Advocate employs the lines of W. Russell Shull:

"That scrawny Hindu saint with body poor
Is full-grown giant in his height of soul,
And power of mind, and master skill to roll
On soul of empire weight of evil sore—
Until her lords and people did deplore,
And conscience keen bestirred to lift the dole
Of justice, and began to grant the goal
Of freedom which this seer did long implore.
He's master politician of the soul;
He won by will to suffer far, far more
Than all the nations' armies e'er have won;
And by his poised resistance reached the goal,
And brought the race to threshold of the door
Of ways to build our striving world as one."

Control of Margins on Commodity Exchanges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 20 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a telegram which was sent to me by Robert M. Harriss, of New York and Texas, the telegram coming from New Orleans, La., and being dated February 18. The original of the telegram was addressed to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, *February 18, 1948.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee,
Washington, D. C.,
Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE,
Chairman, House Agricultural Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

As one interested in farming in Texas, Oklahoma, and as a member of cotton and commodity exchanges, I urge you do not give control of margins on commodity exchanges to any governmental department or bureau because this, in effect, would give them a club for price control and destroy our free American marketing system which is the greatest in the world. Such governmental or bureaucratic control would naturally drive out of markets the speculator, trader, and investor who are as vital to our marketing system as the underwriters are to life, fire, and other forms of insurance. Thus our marketing system would be destroyed and the buying and selling of commodities be thrown into Government or bureaucratic hands and control. The commodity markets operate under Government or State charter regulation and supervision. They are an integral part of our national economy and the Government itself has often traded, bought, and sold in these markets. Business and the ventures of life itself are a gamble or speculation. May I bring the following to your attention, first, although agriculture is our greatest and basic industry it received less than 15 percent of the national income in 1947. Second, that Federal, State, county and city taxes took more than 35 percent of the national income in 1947 or more than two and one-half times as much as the total farmers and agricultural income and more than one dollar out of every three dollars the Nation produced. Third, that on the average the cost of the raw commodity is less than 12 percent of the cost of the manufactured goods to consumer. Fourth, that based on present cost of production cotton at 35 cents per pound is the equivalent of only 35 cents per hour for the farmers' labor, and during 1947 many commodities were sold below cost of production. Fifth, if farming is as profitable as some claim, why do not people return to the farm and increase production. Sixth, that if the farmers who are producing commodities and fiber to feed and clothe the Nation had given their commodities away for nothing in 1947 it would not have affected the cost of living 10 percent. Seventh, why not be honest with ourselves and acknowledge that high cost of living is due to the war debts and governmental taxes that are taking more than one dollar out of every three dollars of the people's income and have thus brought about the necessity of higher labor, manufacturing costs, transportation, merchandising, and cost of living. These excessive if not punitive taxes destroy incentive for industrial and agricultural production and make it impossible for the veteran and younger generation to have the same opportunities to succeed in business and other activities of life as their fathers had. Eighth, the recent decline in commodity and security markets has been due to the contraction of credit by the Federal Reserve policy and frightening speculators, traders, and investors out of the market. Ninth, as agriculture is our greatest and basic industry, our country was never prosperous and cannot be prosperous unless the farmer and agriculturer are receiving a fair and equitable share of the national income. Tenth, with the existing governmental debt and taxes, low commodity and agricultural prices will lead to the most serious depression in our history and the unemployment, loss of homes, farms, business and bank failures, etc., will be far worse than the depression and disaster of 1929–32 era. Eleventh, to maintain a sound economy our national income must not be less than $250,000,000,000. To accomplish this it is essential we have fair and equitable agricultural income coupled with the proper handling of money and credit and lower taxes and economy in Government. Congratulations on the good work your committee is doing for American agriculture and our country. May I ask this telegram be made part of your committee's record.

ROBERT M. HARRISS.

Allocation of Oil Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to me, I include in this extension the press release of last night from the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce as to the third revision made in the quotas since January 16—25 days. As you will all recall, each has been accompanied with a statement that it is the absolute, irreducible minimum. I have examined the minutes of the meeting of the review committee preceding the reduction announced February 10. I have been promised the minutes of the meeting this week, as well as of the one prior to January 16. I think it would be more useful to Members to have them available together and plan to submit them Monday, if possible.

In the meantime, on this point, let me quote parts of the minutes:

The Chairman (Mr. John D. Garrett) raised the question as to the possibility of reducing military shipments in view of the sharp increase in this movement in recent months. Mr. Fentress (Interior) * * * expressed the opinion that little further saving could be obtained from this source. (After the meeting, the representative of National Military Establishment, Comdr. Royal Firman, stated by telephone that military shipments of gas oil and distillates in the first quarter for use in the civilian economy of Japan and Ryukyus would be reduced to 100,000 barrels as against the 1,600,000 barrels called for in the established quota. The remainder will be procured in and shipped from the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Myer (OIT) stated that export licenses for the shipment of these petroleum products were going to a handful of exporters consisting of about 10 to 15 major producer-exporters shipping chiefly to their subsidiaries abroad.

The Chairman asked about the feasibility of having foreign missions or United States Embassies estimate the adequacy of existing stocks in foreign countries. * * * Mr. Trisko (ODC) referred to a study his office had attempted to make of foreign petroleum stocks. He regretted to report that reliable information of this kind was not available.

There was general agreement that some cuts could be made in residual fuel oil, kerosene, and gas distillate fuel oil provided these cuts would not establish a precedent for future quotas. * * * It was also generally agreed that the quotas as established already represented only the minimum essential needs of foreign countries for supplies from the United States.

The Interior Department felt that the cut in residual fuel oil should be larger.

The representative of the Agriculture Department supported the position taken by Interior.

Mr. Speaker, since the National Military Establishment took a substantial cut in its requirements it seems obvious that the one representative from the State Department and the four representatives from the Commerce Department carried the day against the proposal of further reductions.

The bulletin of February 19 follows:

A furuther reduction of 599,000 barrels of petroleum products in the first quarter export allocation was announced today by the Department of Commerce through its Office of International Trade.

The revised allocation, which includes a reduction announced on January 30, represents a total reduction of about 24 percent of the allocation of 11,850,000 barrels of these products announced on January 2, 1948.

This last reduction was made by OIT after consultation with the foreign governments concerned.

The revised country export quotas for the first quarter (January 1 to March 31, 1948) and the types of petroleum with their Census Schedule B numbers follow:

In barrels

	Aviation motor fuel (5016.00)	Other motor fuel (5017.00)	Kerosene (5027.00)	Gas oil and distillate fuel oil (5020.00)	Residual fuel oil (5031.00)
Argentina		120, 000			
Australia	20, 000	100, 000		95, 000	
Belgium		175, 000	8, 000	175, 000	70, 000
Brazil		80, 000			
British Honduras		5, 000			
China	2, 000	350, 000	2, 000	2, 500	
Costa Rica	60, 000	55, 000	55, 000	100, 000	
Cuba	2, 400	30, 000	3, 500	10, 000	20, 000
Denmark	25, 000	200, 000			500, 000
El Salvador		70, 000		120, 000	60, 000
Eire		12, 500	1, 500	3, 500	40, 000
France	15, 000				
Guatemala	120, 000			300, 000	
Honduras	5, 000	8, 000	2, 000		55, 000
Italy		1, 000			
Mexico	30, 000				
New Zealand	70, 000	350, 000		75, 000	280, 000
Norway	10, 000	140, 000	20, 000	35, 000	
Panama, Republic of		10, 000	2, 000		
Paraguay		40, 000	7, 000		25, 000
Philippines	100				
Portugal	1, 500				
Sweden	20, 000	280, 000	60, 000	135, 000	
United Kingdom	20, 000	50, 000	30, 000	10, 000	15, 000
Netherlands		225, 000	25, 000	250, 000	60, 000
Iceland	120, 000	1, 175, 000	55, 000	1, 000, 000	
British West Africa				60, 000	
Switzerland	35, 000	27, 000			
French West Africa	5, 000	70, 000	25, 000	20, 000	10, 000
Subtotal		20, 000	6, 000	50, 000	
Unallocated reserve	10, 000	60, 000	10, 000		15, 000
	571, 000	3, 088, 500	347, 000	2, 441, 000	824, 000
	119, 000	399, 000	147, 000	353, 500	151, 000
Total	950, 000	4, 097, 500	494, 000	2, 794, 500	975, 000

Exports of petroleum products to Canada are not included in these figures. Export licenses are not required for shipments to Canada.

Separate quotas of petroleum products for Greece and for Japan and the Ryukyus, as announced on February 10, have not been changed.

The amounts unallocated and listed as reserves have not been reduced below the totals announced on February 10. OIT officials explained that the unallocated amounts had already been reduced to the minimum necessary to take care of emergency needs and for exports to certain small countries not included in the allocations by country. It is hoped that it will not be necessary to use all the unallocated amounts. The amounts not used will represent a further saving, it was explained.

Mr. 'Speaker, I shall analyze this against the February 10 revision to determine the amounts of reductions against the amounts those countries reported they would accept. It seems as though we have some two dozen new 100-percent embargos. This is a very peculiar argument against the fear of disrupting foreign economies.

Sam Woods, Valuable Foreign Service Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, during hearings of the committee which makes appropriations for the Department of State, it was developed that a large number of our Foreign Service officers contributed unusual and valuable services to the war effort. Many of them have been decorated for this outstanding service. Among those who were so decorated was Sam E. Woods, now our consul general at Munich, Germany.

As chairman of the subcommittee for State Department appropriations, it was my pleasure to include in the hearings on the appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 a brief résumé of what Mr. Woods had accomplished in giving the State Department information about German plans and in aiding American aviators in Europe.

The Washington Evening Star, in its issue of Wednesday, February 18, 1948, printed an excerpt from the memoirs of former Secretary of State Hull, telling how Mr. Woods, then United States commercial attaché in Berlin, procured Hitler's plan to attack Russia.

By leave granted me, I include in these remarks the portion of Mr. Hull's memoirs that will acquaint the Congress with the valuable service rendered to our Government by this outstanding Foreign Service officer:

THE MEMOIRS OF CORDELL HULL—DETAILS OF HITLER'S PLAN FOR SOVIET INVASION OBTAINED BY UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL ATTACHÉ IN BERLIN

(Ch. XXI)

I was ill at home when word of Hitler's invasion of Russia on June 22, 1941, reached me. Immediately I telephoned the President and Under Secretary Welles. To each I said, in effect:

"We must give Russia all aid to the hilt. We have repeatedly said we will give all the help we can to any nation resisting the Axis. There can be no doubt for a moment that Russia comes within that category."

I knew that some military experts, both here and abroad, were predicting that Hitler would eliminate Russia from the war in a matter of a few weeks. But I could not believe it any more than I had believed the statements of so many that with the fall of France that collapse of Britain would be a matter of a few weeks.

I had felt that in rushing vast quantities of weapons to Britain in the summer of 1940 we were taking no real risk that they would fall into German hands. And similarly I believed we could send Russia all weapons and supplies possible without real risk that the Germans would overrun and capture them.

If the President and I had doubted Russia's ability to resist Germany it would have been foolhardy to have sent her arms that would only have fallen into Hitler's hands.

INVASION NO SURPRISE

For half a year we had had excellent reason to believe Hitler would attack Russia, hence the event of June 22 did not surprise us. In January 1941 there came to me a confidential report from Sam E. Woods, our commercial attaché in Berlin.

Woods had a German friend who, though an enemy of the Nazis, was closely connected with the Reich's ministries, the Reichsbank, and high party members. As early as August 1940, this friend informed Woods that conferences were then taking place at Hitler's headquarters concerning preparations for war against Russia. This information became more concrete after some weeks, when Hitler reportedly said he intended to have "only my soldiers from Vladivostok to Gibraltar."

Woods used to meet this friend in a Berlin motion-picture house. By buying reserved seats from an agency and sending two tickets to Woods, the friend managed to sit alongside him and in the semidarkness slipped notes into Woods' coat pocket.

The information from Woods was in marked contrast to the considerable evidence that Hitler was planning an invasion of Britain, but the contacts of Woods' friend said that the air raids against England served as a blind for Hitler's real and well-calculated plans and preparations for a sudden, devastating attack on Russia.

Later Woods' friend informed him that an organization of the Wehrmacht for the old 21 Russian Czarist regional governments had been formed, and that the economic staffs for these territories had been appointed. Bales of bank notes in rubles had been printed.

LEARNED CHIEF POINTS OF PLAN

Finally, through a contact this friend had on the German General Staff, Woods learned the chief points of Hitler's strategic plan—the three wedges, those of the north and the south and the decisive third one in the center, direct against Moscow. All preparations had to be completed in the spring of 1941.

When Woods' report, embracing all this information, came to me it was so circumstantial that, at first, I believed it a German plant. I turned it over to J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for his comment. Hoover thought it authentic.

Woods having told us of a method of confirming the standing and contacts of the source by checking with a prominent German exile in the United States, I asked Assistant Secretary of State Breckinridge Long to see him and obtain this confirmation, which he did. I also talked over the report with the President.

I then decided that the contents of the report should be communicated to Soviet Ambassador Oumansky. Such a step, I believed, was in keeping with the proper attitude this country should take toward Russia.

I requested Welles, who at my suggestion had been holding a series of conversations with Oumansky to straighten out the differences between our two countries, to call this information to the Ambassador's attention. This Welles did.

When further information from the same source came to me, I again turned it over to Welles, requesting him to communicate it to Oumansky. This he did on March 20.

EFFECT ON SOVIET UNKNOWN

Oumansky no doubt forwarded this information to his government, as he said he would. It is difficult to say what precise effect it had on Soviet policy. Only 3 weeks later, however, Stalin suddenly concluded a nonaggression treaty with Japanese Foreign Minister Matsuoka, at a moment when Matsuoka believed such a treaty impossible.

There is no doubt that Stalin made the treaty to protect himself in the Far East in the belief that Hitler intended attacking him in Europe. Furthermore, Russia was adopting a stronger policy toward the Balkan countries than might have been expected in the face of Hitler's plans to absorb them into the Axis.

Russia, after having stimulated Hitler in August 1939 to embark on the European war, and after having assisted him by invading Poland when the Poles were desperately resisting the German Army, had interfered with and obstructed Hitler's purpose in many ways since June 1940.

The information we had that Hitler was planning an invasion of Russia was particularly useful to me in my conversations with the Japanese. It ruled out any likelihood of an alliance between Russia and Japan, and it enabled us to adopt a firmer attitude toward Japan than would otherwise have been the case.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Hon. Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Fort Wayne, Ind., on February 19, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the outset let me state that the only group I enjoy addressing more than a Democratic audience is a Democratic audience that is fighting mad. From the way I appraise the situation the Democrats all over the country should be fighting mad. We lost the election in 1946 on a fluke and what better occasion to be fighting mad than a Jefferson-Jackson day dinner on the eve of a Presidential election campaign.

I am pleased to be in Indiana speaking to the assembled members of our party on the historic occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the Democratic National Committee as well as to do honor to the memory of those great American and Democrats to whose principles we so firmly adhere—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, one the philosopher, the other the practitioner of democratic principles.

Indiana is dear to me because so many of your citizens have played a leading part in the building of New Mexico. One of our counties is named after Grant's Vice President, Schuyler Colfax, a Congressman and Speaker of the House from Indiana. Lew Wallace was Territorial Governor of New Mexico in the stirring era of Billy the Kid, during which he wrote the famous novel, Ben Hur.

I have a further reason for being glad to be addressing a Democratic audience in Indiana. In your State the two parties are fairly evenly divided. Democrats have to fight like everything for what they get in Indiana. When I was growing up in New Mexico my relatives and everyone I knew were Republicans, but I became a Democrat before I could vote because I disapproved of the inequalities condoned by the Republican Party. In those days we fought hard but we didn't get anywhere. Times have changed and though we still have to fight for everything we get we've kept the Republicans well on the run for 18 years. The recent municipal elections in Indiana show the way the wind is blowing and point to a victory for you this fall. Keep up the good work.

What kind of a situation is the Democratic Party in today? The party is like the natural-born slugger who catches an unlucky clip on his jaw the first round, takes a count of nine and coasts; he has been coasting the second round and is now back on his feet. If his handler is good, he'll tell the boy to get out and start slugging—to try for a knock-out.

We caught an unlucky clip in 1946. That election was decided not on the record, not on principles, not on candidates, but rather because the American people were tired of the war, tired of controls, and too tired to appreciate the real issues of the campaign.

The second round was last year; it brought us the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress. The best we could do was hang on, but the third round is coming up. Our party is back on its feet, our head is clear, we still have our punch, and it's time for us to start slugging.

It may sound trite to recall the political philosophy of Jefferson and how Jackson transformed these principles into action. There is no better way of describing the difference between Democratic and Republican philosophy. Jefferson founded our party on the doctrine that the purpose of government is to improve the lot of the masses and not to serve the interests of special groups. Jackson put these principles in effect. The Republican Party has traditionally served the special interests.

Oh, it is true that there have been liberal and progressive Republicans, but tell me how much assistance the Norrises, La Follettes, Cuttings, and Shipsteads received from the administrations of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. About as much as TOBEY, AIKEN, BALDWIN, and MORSE can expect from a party controlled by reactionary conservative Republicans who do not see eye to eye with them on the necessity of improving the lot of the common man.

There are doubtless some conservative Democrats, but the party as a whole, its leaders, principal spokesmen, and the great mass of its followers are not satisfied with conditions as they now exist in the United States. Democrats do not agree with Voltaire's Dr. Pangloss that this is the best of all possible worlds, but we would like to make it the best.

We realize that our technology and science have opened up for us the innermost secrets of nature and that our industrial machine is producing at a rate unprecedented in the history of the world, and that our national income has never been so great. But we also know the answer to the questions: Does the common man share in this prosperity and is there democratic distribution of the comfort and riches which our technology is producing?

Must we not admit that there are millions of our people ill-clothed, ill-housed, badly nourished, uneducated and unhealthy?

Democrats know that so long as these conditions exist our Government is not fulfilling its mission as outlined by the great founder of our party, Thomas Jefferson.

Tonight I propose to contrast the position and record of our party and that of the Republican Party with respect to these points. This record will show beyond doubt that the Republican Party is hopelessly controlled by reactionary elements and that only the Democratic Party is capable of promoting and securing the welfare and happiness of the American people.

The coming election, in my opinion, will be fought along the following lines—control of inflation and deflation, public housing, civil liberties, broadening of social security and peace.

The Republican Party has made a wonderful record on most of these points. In fact, it is so wonderful a record that just as soon as it is brought home to the American public the result of the third round will be a cinch.

Ask the American housewife if she thinks there is anything wrong with prices and if Congress ought to do something. Oh, I know that the commodity market took a beating and that prices of groceries have gone down, but how many American families are still doing without butter, beef, bacon, and eggs because the prices are beyond the reach of their pocketbook?

The administration has advocated a concrete program for the control of prices. Most of the points outlined in the control program were accepted by the Republican Joint Committee, yet a complacent Republican Congress allowed prices to run away to unprecedented heights and sits back unconcerned when the break came in the commodity market. Most economists predict that prices will not go back to 1947 levels. They'll be less complacent when an angry public votes this November.

Ask the veteran living with his in-laws, or in a trailer, or sharing a flat with another family if the Government has been square with him on the housing proposition. Has the Republican Congress helped him secure adequate housing? The Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill has been bottled up in Congress since it was introduced. A powerful real estate lobby and Republican committee members say no to the veteran and refuse Congress a vote on the measure. The administration has consistently recommended low-cost public housing as the only solution to this problem—but what is the use? The Republican Party won't give it a chance.

What is the record of the Republican Party on education? Is it not disgraceful that the richest country on earth can afford to have millions of its children without adequate schooling? Five hundred thousand young men were rejected for service in the last war because they had no education. Five million youngsters between the ages of 6 and 17 are not going to school. The 1940 census revealed that 10,000,000 adults had failed to complete the fourth grade. Does this sound like everything is all right? Is the Republican Congress justified in refusing a vote on Federal Aid to Education?

We take pride in the health of our people. Americans are healthier than other people. How is it then that some fifty percent of the young men who appeared before Selective Service Boards were rejected because they were not physically fit to defend their country? It is a matter of record that these physical disabilities could have been eliminated if corrective medical attention had been given when these men were young. Do you know why they failed to receive necessary medical attention? Because these facilities were beyond the means of millions of American families. One-third of our 3,000 counties in the United States are without the services of so much as a county health officer. Our health is a matter of national concern. The Democratic Party supports national health insurance. We insist that the lack of medical attention by the underprivileged is the

concern of all—we propose to do something about it if the Republican controlled Congress will let us.

Since time immemorial the Republican Party has paid lip service to the cause of civil liberty. They point with pride, and justly so, to Lincoln and the removal of the blot of slavery from our country. This fall campaign halls will ring with praises of Lincoln and the Republican Party and what it has done for the Negro.

The Fair Employment Practices Commission bill was introduced early last session, yet the friends of the Negro do nothing about it. It will not become law for many prominent Republicans are opposed to it. The administration, on the contrary, has come out four square behind a program designed to protect the civil rights of all of our citizens. It includes FEPC. This program has constantly been insisted upon by our Democratic administration. The program is advocated in face of threatened revolts. Are you not proud of Harry Truman? I say we are true to the principles of Jefferson and that we are acting in accordance with the fighting traditions of Jackson when we endorse, champion, and fight for his civil-rights program.

Let us see how much help we get from the Republican Members of Congress. If it amounts to what they did in the first session of the Eightieth Congress civil liberties and the defenseless minorities will get lip service and nothing more.

The record of this Congress is not yet completed, but sufficient record has been made to enable us to discern a clear pattern of conservatism and reaction.

The Taft-Hartley bill is nothing more than a concrete manifestation of Republican subservience to the special interests' desire to throttle labor.

The advances which the Democratic Party made in behalf of the national welfare in matters such as soil conservation, flood control, reclamation, and rural electrification were ruthlessly sabotaged by the unwise economy of the blundering and inexperienced legislators who saw nothing but evil in these progressive measures. They dared not attack frontally because they knew the people were for them, but they accomplished their aims just the same by cutting appropriations and limiting the effectiveness of their administration.

The Republicans won't tell you that rural electrification is evil and serves no good purpose. Oh, no! they know that 150,000 farm units in Indiana have been electrified by the REA and that 25,000 units remain to be electrified; but they'll cut the appropriation.

When Republican Congressmen cut the funds for soil conservation they do not tell you that 100 years ago seven-eighths of Indiana was covered by forests and that today 100,000 acres in southern Indiana are in serious stages of erosion, and that precious topsoil from your farmlands has been borne away never to be returned, and that your lands are constantly threatened by floods as a result of this erosion and lack of adequate flood-control measures. Not one word about that, but in 1943 they promised a flat wholesale reduction in the budget, and they are out to get it at any cost. The cost this time is the welfare and safety of the American people.

We have every right to be proud of the record the Democratic Party has made on these issues. This record must be placed before the public. When the American people realize what they can expect from a Republican administration they will unquestionably vote the Democratic ticket.

We should be equally proud of the record of our Democratic administration on the subject of peace. Maintaining peace is the most important issue before the American people today.

The welfare of our people and the preservation of our American way of life depends on our remaining at peace. Certainly the last two blood baths should convince us of this point.

The hundreds of thousands of American boys who lost their lives, the tons of irreplaceable material expended, the billions of dollars we spent—all these should convince us that war does not pay and that we must work and pray and, if necessary, fight for the preservation of peace.

One need not be an expert on foreign affairs to realize that the peace of the world is threatened today. One has merely to glance over the threatened spots of the world—Greece, Korea, Trieste, China, and Palestine. Any one of these contain the elements of an explosion sufficient to start another world conflagration.

Why deceive ourselves about Russia? We have no quarrel with the Russian people, but one has to be mighty stupid not to be aware of the intentions of the totalitarian rulers of Soviet Russia. Their aim is world revolution; they plan the overthrow of all noncommunistic governments of the world. This is their avowed objective. From the first writings of Marx and Lenin to the present-day jingoistic utterings of Molotov and Stalin, the Russion rulers have been bent on world conquest and we might as well face the fact.

What then should we do in the face of this threat? How are we to maintain peace? How are we best to preserve our American way of life? There is only one road to peace. That path is straight and clear. It is beset by countless dangers but if we follow it resolutely there will be no war in our generation. This is the course we must follow:

First, we must organize and work for international cooperation. To this end we must devote all the energy and all the resources that we would utilize in waging war. The cause is equally important. This means strengthening and supporting the United Nations. This includes tightening our bonds with Latin America utilizing the pattern established within the framework of the United Nations Charter in the Inter-American Defense Pact, as well as by assisting our sister republics of this hemisphere to industrialize and elevate their standards of living.

Secondly, we must support wholeheartedly and with adequate resources the economic recovery of western Europe. These countries are our natural and traditional friends and allies. We must pledge them our assistance until the job is completed, provided, of course, that they help themselves to recover, and that they resolve their economic and political differences and combine and integrate their military defense.

At the same time we should without malice, but with firmness, and in a spirit of friendship for all peoples serve notice on Russia and the satellite nations that we are committed to peace but we are equally and unequivocally committed to the preservation of western civilization, and that we will resort to arms, if necessary, to defend it.

On the domestic front much has to be done. We need an air force second to none; it must be in constant readiness, first to defend our country against attack, and second, prepared to strike the enemy wherever he may be at the outbreak of hostilities.

Next, we need a reservoir of trained military reserves capable of instant mobilization, not within a year after the outbreak of hostilities, but the moment war is declared. The next time we may not have allies to hold off the enemy until we can train our manpower.

I do not subscribe to the theory that the day of the infantry is over, by any means, but in all branches of the service the technical personnel needed to man and to service the complicated instruments of war cannot be trained overnight. We need a standing and always ready reserve.

We also need an intelligence system, well trained and experienced, with services in all parts of the world. We were caught napping in the last war, next time we may not be able to afford it.

We need an industry organized and geared for war as well as peace which is ready at all times to change from the peacetime to wartime production.

Lastly, we need a civilian population organized, trained, and prepared for total war.

One might ask, what this has to do with the election? It has this to do with the election. How to preserve peace is the most important issue facing the American people today and I believe that the administration and the Democratic Party have a solution.

General Eisenhower, in his final accounting as Army Chief of Staff, said that the number one job of the United States is "to convince any European aggressor that he can press war only at the risk of his own destruction."

It is my humble opinion that the only road to peace is to champion and preach peace, but be prepared to fight for peace, if necessary.

How do the parties line up on the subject? As far as I can see, every Republican candidate for President is for peace.

They remind me of the candidate for Congress in Arkansas some years ago who ran on the platform of the Bible, the American flag, and mother. No one campaigned against him.

The important point is, however, what the Republican candidates and the Republican Congress are doing about peace besides advocating it.

In regard to the Marshall plan, the Republicans are hopelessly divided. One candidate in a recent Lincoln Day address said essentially, "Give them all the dough they need, but let's chuck their entire foreign policy out the window."

Another candidate, with his tongue in his cheek, said the same day, "Don't give them all they ask for. The plan may not work, and we'll lose less money."

If the situation were not so serious we might laugh at their antics, but we are not playing for peanuts. This is the most serious poker game we've ever gotten in. This game is for keeps. The lives of our sons, our own lives, the safety of our cities, the preservation of our institutions, and western civilization are at stake. Perhaps the Marshall plan may not work, but God help us if it doesn't.

Contrast this with the statesmanlike position of our President and his great Secretary of State. We are fortunate in having the knowledge, the genius, and the leadership which directed our armies and those of our allies in the last holocaust to guide us now in our fight for peace. There is here no division of opinion. They frankly and courageously recognize the danger of war, but they offer the American people a specific program devised to avoid it. The Democratic Party leads the way to peace.

In regard to national defense the Republicans are equally at a loss. They are either sniffing at the ethereal "one world" fragrance which has the wonder boy from Minnesota dizzy, or they are hiding their heads in the sand like an ostrich when it comes to national defense facts of life.

Take universal military training, for example. If conditions are as perilous as they seem, should we not accept the opinion of an experienced, competent, nonpolitical spokesman such as Eisenhower. He is for universal military training. Many good, sincere people are opposed to universal military training. But, nevertheless, if our fate is at stake, is it not criminal on the part of the Republican Party to refuse to allow this measure to reach the floor because it is too controversial and this is an election year? We should be given an opportunity to vote on universal military training.

I am quite sure that President Truman realizes how important to him the loss may be of the votes of thousands of people who sincerely oppose this measure. However, he also realizes and appreciates that our national security depends very definitely on a trained and ready reserve and that this can only be secured by universal military training.

Then we have the matter of a great air force. A great air force is just like the weather. Everybody talks about it and nobody does anything about it. By nobody I mean the Republicans.

In conformity with the recommendations of the President's Air Policy Committee, the President has sponsored a specific program that will give us an air force second to none. There is no question how the American people feel on this score. However, an air force costs money. I fail to see how the Republican budget committee is going to reconcile an air force second to none with their estimated budget cuts of billions of dollars.

I see now that the Republican candidates also want a superintelligence system. But why, I ask, were these voices silent when the penny-pinchers were cutting the funds for Central Intelligence and the State Department propaganda broadcasts? Who cut these appropriations? We were aware of the danger a year ago. The Democrats knew that what we were doing then and what we are doing now may well have a bearing on what happens 5 years from today. Of course, we need a highly organized intelligence system. It is vital for our national defense, but apparently it takes a Democratic administration to prove the point to the Republicans.

On every count the Republican Party and its representatives in Congress have failed the people. The record is there for all to examine. It establishes beyond doubt that the Republican Party is incapable of producing a program designed to resolve the problems of today.

Review in your own minds the failure of the Republican Congress to do anything about controlling inflation, housing for veterans, protecting the civil liberties of our minorities, educating our children, protecting the health of our citizens, maintaining national defense, or promoting peace.

The Republicans either fail to understand our problems or they are reluctant or incapable of solving them. In any case they should not be trusted with the destiny of our Nation in times so critical as these.

The third round is coming up. Our boy is rested. Personally, I think that our party will take the Republicans this fall. It will require only one punch. But that punch will pack plenty of steam, because behind it will be the weight of the American people. The Democratic Party will win by a knockout.

So tonight the past arises like a dream. We can see Thomas Jefferson opposing the Hamiltonian ideas of the power of might. We can see Andrew Jackson fighting the private bankers of his day in an effort to protect the common man. We can see the patient Lincoln, trying to secure dignity for the individual, and we can also see in our present-day life that humble and patient man in the White House, President Truman, whom the American public recognizes as the living counterpart of Jefferson and Jackson.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] at a dinner in Louisville, Ky., on February 12.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to be in Kentucky, the birthplace of Abraham Lincoln. Tonight we not only commemorate that event which took place in a Kentucky cabin 139 years ago and was to have such a far-reaching effect upon our Nation's history but we are also here to rededicate ourselves to the task of leading his party and ours to victory in the 1948 election.

It has been my privilege to serve on the county committee, and the State central committee in addition to my service on the Republican National Committee. Political campaigns cannot be won by last-minute efforts. To the contrary, it requires work throughout the year. Organizations such as yours have played, and will continue to play, an important part in mobilizing for the job confronting us.

I am firmly convinced that if we face up to our responsibilities the ticket we nominate at Philadelphia in June, will be elected in November.

From the Republicans of California I bring a symbolic "hands-across-the-continent" greeting. It is, I believe, indicative of the type of transcontinental unity that will spell success next year.

This is no time for Republicans to consider that they have the election "in the bag." Any such misconceptions, would in my opinion, be a serious mistake in judgment. While I recognize that the Wallace candidacy will be beneficial to our cause in a number of key States, I wish to point cut that this alone, or in conjunction with some democratic discontent in the South, is no guarantee of Republican success in November. It is certainly no substitute for a strong ticket and an active campaign on our part.

We have many able Republican candidates this year. I would urge that we spend our time in building them all up and tearing none of them down.

No person today can predict with certainty who the nominee of the convention will be. Whoever that nominee is all of us will have an obligation to put our shoulders to the wheel and cooperate to the fullest extent in making his election certain.

I am not one of those who believe that all the virtues are to be found in our party or all the faults in the opposition. If we will only take a realistic look at conditions at home and abroad, we must acknowledge that there are a number of problems that must have American rather than partisan solutions.

The United States has grown from a colony of 3,000,000 people to a Nation of 140,000,000 in the short space of 172 years. During this time our two-party system has played its part in the development of our national well-being and the carrying out of national policies.

This, in spite of the fact that at no place in the Constitution or in the Declaration of Independence does one find any mention of political parties. Yet the very necessities of the situation and the actual functioning of Government developed the need for our two-party system.

Political parties come and go but our constitutional government continues. The Federalist and Whig Parties played their part and passed from the political scene. But their demise did not leave for long a void. Other more vigorous groups took their places. Political parties must justify their existence or make way for others that will.

The national interest must in all cases override any partisan advantage. It was in this spirit that the framers of the Constitution drafted that document.

It was not we the Federalists or the Republicans, it was not we the employees or the employers, it was not we the merchants or the farmers, it was not we the landlords or the tenants, but it was: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Lincoln was elected to the House of Representatives from Illinois as a Whig in 1846 for one term. One hundred years ago in 1848, he was completing his last full year as a Member of the House.

In that same year of 1848 the Mexican War came to a close giving to the United States a large section of western territory. A part of it became the State of California, the thirty-first State to be admitted to the Union. In that same year gold was discovered in my State. Since that time most of what our miners have dug during the last century has been buried in Kentucky.

In 1848 President James K. Polk sat in the White House. In his fourth annual message that year he pointed out that the receipts of the Federal Government would amount to $57,048,969.90, the expenditures to $54,195,275.06, and the public debt stood at $65,778,450.41.

Much water passed under the bridge in the 13 years which followed Lincoln's retirement from the House of Representatives. In 1855 he was voted for by the Whig minority in the Illinois Legislature for the United States Senate. As soon as the Republican Party was fully organized throughout the country Lincoln became its leader in Illinois.

In 1858 he was selected by his party to oppose Stephen A. Douglas for the Senate. While the legislature chosen was favorable to Mr. Douglas, Lincoln had gained a national reputation as a result of the well-known series of debates. In May 1860, when the Republican convention met in Chicago, Abraham Lincoln was nominated for the Presidency on the third ballot and was elected on November 6 of that same year. His inauguration on March 4, 1861 was followed by the firing on Fort Sumter and the whole chain of events which followed.

In December 1861 Lincoln delivered his first annual message to Congress. He pointed out that revenues from all sources for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1861, amounted to $86,835,900.27 and the expenditures for the same period were $84,578,834.47.

How far we have come. After fighting World War II, our public debt is now $254,000,000,000. One modern battleship costs $80,000,000, which is greater than the entire public debt in President Polk's time. A large aircraft carrier of the *Midway* class costs $100,000,000—or more than Lincoln's 1861 fiscal-year governmental revenues.

We of this generation live in an accelerated age. In the 1,948 years since the birth of Christ, the annihilation of space has been largely concentrated in the last 48 years. The radio, airplane, and television are inventions of this century. There must be added the mass production of the automobile, which, while invented earlier, did not reach maturity until after the 1900's passed into oblivion.

Not yet to the half-way mark of the 1900's, we have already entered, for better or for worse, the atomic age. Within our hands we have the power to destroy civilization as we know it or to contribute to the opening of a new golden age.

To meet the problems of the atomic age, we need to streamline our governmental and economic facilities, yet, in so doing, we must not cast off from the solid truths that neither time nor space can change. The multiplication table has not changed by the

transition from the horse-and-buggy generation of our grandfathers to our jet-propelled era. Two and two still make four, in spite of the utopian theories and squirrel-cage thinking that has sometimes prevailed in high places. So, too, freedom is better than slavery behind the iron curtain.

Nor is security a good substitute for freedom. The most secure man is the inmate of the State penitentiary who has his food, clothing, and lodging guaranteed for life.

It is my firm belief that the functioning of our representative Republic is largely dependent upon having a fully informed electorate at home. Our people should recognize both the problems involved and the necessary steps that must be taken for their solution.

The long panorama of history clearly shows that freedom is not something that once achieved can be thereafter taken for granted. Not continual adolescent dreams of easy solutions but rather hard work and sacrifice are required if we are to preserve our institutions and fulfill our destiny.

There is no doubt that the great economic and political problems that confront us can be solved, in one way or another. The challenge we face is to solve them under our constitutional form of government and within the framework of the American system of personal liberty and free enterprise.

On all the great questions of the day there are bound to be honest differences of opinion among the members of both parties. Unless there is to be an irreconcilable split, somewhere along the way a common meeting ground must be found. As a general rule, but not always, the Republican Party seems better able to compose its difference than is our opposition.

The American system of profitable business and well-paid labor go hand in hand. Destroy one and you destroy both. We can, I firmly believe, do more under our American system for our people than the new socialism of Britain or the communism of Russia can do for their respective peoples. We don't need their methods but we can use some of their crusading zeal.

In American industry it is highly desirable that employees who are helping to build such industries or businesses have ever-increasing opportunities to improve their economic position through their contributions to increased productivity. In maintaining the profit system it is vital that an ever-increasing number of our people have a personal interest in its continued existence.

Labor or management must not be shackled. Business must be able to operate with profit and efficiency. There is no constructive future for workers or investors in closed factories or bankrupt firms.

The world needs peace in the international field and America needs domestic tranquillity if full production is to continue to raise our standards of living and permit us to help other nations to help themselves.

That we have a serious economic situation confronting the Nation is clear. Our responsibility as Republicans is to be sure that the cure is not worse than the disease. What are some of these contributory factors to present economic conditions?

As of February 5, 1948, we had a public debt amounting to $254,694,133,001.57 which compares with a pre-World War I debt (as of March 31, 1917) of $1,282,044,346. Our pre-Pearl Harbor debt was $61,363,857,932 as of November 30, 1941.

Certainly this huge public debt unparalleled in the history of the world is a contributing factor to the dangers confronting us. Until substantially reduced it will be a constant threat to the solvency of the Federal Government. A consistent program of debt reduction over the years has the unqualified support of the Republican Party. Not less than $2,500,000,000 should be provided for debt reduction in each fiscal year.

Another contributing factor is the total dollar supply (currency, commercial, and savings-bank accounts). In 1929, which was considered a boom year, it amounted to slightly over $54,000,000,000. In 1948 it amounts to more than $160,000,000,000. While it is true that production and services have also increased during that period of time, the increase is less than 75 percent. No one can deny that Government spending has contributed to the increase of the money supply. The pressure against the limited supplies of goods during the past several years played an important part in the inflationary price spiral.

The cost of the Federal Government has increased by leaps and bounds. In 1913 it amounted to $692,000,000. And by 1932 the cost had increased to $4,502,000,000. In 1941 it amounted to $18,988,000,000. The President of the United States on January 12 presented his budget calling for expenditures of approximately $40,000,000,000.

Interest on the public debt alone will amount to over $5,000,000,000; which is greater than the total peacetime expenditures of any year prior to 1933.

There is certainly room for a skilled congressional operation on the budget presented by the President. The job should be done with a surgeon's skill and not with a meat ax.

Frankly, I do not agree with the views of some of our opponents who follow the tortured reasoning that money spent by the Federal Government is not inflationary, while that spent by individual American citizens is in that category.

Despite the need for European recovery funds and adequate national defense appropriations, together with a debt-reduction program, it is still possible to have a moderate tax-reduction bill this year. After the Republican administration takes office in January of 1949 and the full cooperation of the executive branches of the Government is secured in cutting out the fat from the Federal budget, there will be excellent prospects for additional tax-relief legislation next year.

At times I find it most difficult to comprehend the inconsistent policies this administration pursues both at home and abroad. The President seeks power to reestablish a controlled economy in the United States. While the stated purpose was to check the inflationary pressures we find that Government agencies were following commodity-purchasing policies that encouraged high prices in grains at a time when they were far above parity support levels.

Our shipment of oil and industrial equipment to Russia has the same bad odor as the shipment of scrap iron and oil did to Japan during the 3 years preceding Pearl Harbor.

For the first 11 months of 1947 we exported $143,690,000 worth of goods, a large part of which was machinery and vehicles. We imported $71,900,000 worth, of which more than 50 percent constituted furs.

A major contribution that can be made to meeting the inflationary problem is to increase and assure the continued productivity of this Nation. In traveling through Europe last year I had the opportunity of getting behind the "iron curtain." Neither in Poland nor in any other country outside of the "iron curtain" did I see anything that encouraged me to believe that controls during peacetime would increase our productivity. To the contrary I came back with the strong belief that such peacetime controls would stifle it.

You cannot, in my judgment, go part way down the road to a controlled economy with regard to manufactured goods or agricultural products. If you control prices you must be prepared to control wages, profits, the allocation of raw materials, and ultimately (as in Britain) the allocation of labor. If we permit this Nation to undergo that type of rigid control in peacetime, I have grave doubts whether we can come out from under them in the foreseeable future. Speaking as one Member of the Senate I shall oppose their reimposition.

One of the great troubles with this administration is that associated with it are those who have worked with controls so long they have apparently lost confidence in the free-enterprise system. While they give it lip service they have no confidence in its ability to do the job.

Businessmen throughout the Nation instinctively know this. They also know that today the power of Government is vast and its actions have a far-reaching effect upon economic affairs, not only of this Nation but of the world. As a result, under present conditions, many do not believe they can plan with any degree of accuracy or feel confident in making long-term investments for the expansion of productive enterprise.

I cannot help but believe that in the years immediately ahead of us a strong America is essential to the peace of the world. Any display of weakness in an economic or military sense may be taken as a green light for those who desire to expand without too great a risk.

Twice in the past quarter of a century world wars were fought. One reason they came was that the aggressors thought that our Nation could not or would not fight. In their own minds they pictured us as a decadent democracy. Are such miscalculations again being made? I believe they are.

Certainly up to now the United Nations as an organization has not the force to preserve international law and order. As long as the veto exists, a potential aggressor nation could block effective action even if the United Nations was prepared to act. It should be apparent by now that some future Hitler, Tojo, or Mussolini, will not be stopped by debating society tactics.

We must face up to the question as to whether or not we believe it is in the best interest of world peace and our own national security to have a rehabilitated western Europe. I have no doubt in my own mind that this is not only desirable but is essential.

A necessary corollary is that we must provide this Nation with an adequate national defense on the sea, on land, and in the air and I lay special emphasis upon our air program. This will require an effective constantly modern striking air force in being and not on blueprints.

While we shall continue to work and pray for peace, like the pioneers who went westward from Kentucky, we shall keep our powder dry.

The peace today cannot be saved by appeasement of international blackmailers anymore than it could be at Munich. The sacrifice of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, and Manchuria did not buy peace but rather made certain that power hungry aggressors would be encouraged to raise the ante.

Let us make it crystal clear that the politburo in Moscow can gain no satisfaction from the Republican victory on November 2.

Our Nation has assumed obligations under the United Nations Charter. The Republican victory will not weaken but should strengthen the system of collective security.

I firmly believe this for two reasons. First, because a sound national economy and a solvent Federal Government is a prerequisite to a strong America and only under those conditions can we help to rehabilitate the war torn free world. Secondly, a Republican victory will mean a more consistent foreign policy.

It just does not make sense to ask the American people for billions of much needed help to save western Europe from going behind the "iron curtain" while we permit large shipments from our resources to the one nation that is a threat to human freedom.

It certainly is not consistent to make mighty efforts to prevent 200,000,000 Europeans from being enslaved by the Communist terror while complacency is shown about communistic activity which seeks to engulf 400,000,000 of our traditional friends, the Chinese.

It most emphatically does not make sense to send numerous "strong notes" on the Petkov case and then to have our Government give full recognition to the Soviet satellite government of Bulgaria 10 days after they have murdered the leader of the democratic opposition.

As a Nation we can no more return to isolation than an adult can return to childhood. We cannot, we dare not, turn our back on the rest of the world. If we do, the light of human freedom will go out and some day, in the not too distant future, from out of the ensuing darkness would come the knife thrust or the sword to strike us down. We must constantly keep in mind that we live in the age of the airplane and the atom.

The world must recognize the fact that only in an adequate system of international control can the world be safeguarded from the devastating effects of this new instrument of destruction. I have seen a considerable amount of war damage in Europe and Asia. Two years ago I had the opportunity of seeing Nagasaki where the second atomic bomb was dropped. The community looked as though it had been put through a coffee grinder and the remains scattered out over the landscape.

Every constructive proposal that has been made for the international control of atomic energy has been blocked by the Soviet Government. As long as an unlimited veto exists in the Security Council there cannot, in my opinion, be a satisfactory international control of atomic power. How is mankind to be protected if the potential aggressor nation itself can veto collective security action by the law-abiding nations of the world?

No man can say with certainty how long it will be until other nations are able to manufacture the atomic bomb. Some time in the not too distant future they will do so. Any nation which has in mind a full-scale "Pearl Harbor" attack upon the industrial and communications centers of America must be made to understand that no such blow will prevent this Nation from launching a swift, sure, and inevitable retaliation on a far greater scale.

This is not a happy prospect, but it is a realistic one. To do less than be fully prepared in these uncertain times would be worse than folly. It would be treason.

The Government would not be dealing with candor if it did not make clear that the policies we follow in Greece and Turkey involve risks. If Greece, Turkey, or Iran should succumb to overt outside pressure and lose their independence or have their territorial integrity violated without swift action to support them by all the law-abiding nations of the world, then the whole fabric of collective security will disintegrate and the United Nations would join the League of Nations in oblivion.

I feel certain that our people have a growing realization based on the experience of two world wars that peace, in this day and age, is indivisible.

The United States should take the lead in making the United Nations an effective agency for international law and order. If Russia persists in her obstructionist tactics, then the law-abiding nations will have to set up a collective security system outside of Russia and her satellites.

Lincoln, in his day, clearly understood that human freedom is also indivisible. In his second annual message to Congress he said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. * * * The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We, even we here, have the power and bear the responsibility. * * * In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free. * * * We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

If our citizens will give as much time and effort to upholding our form of government and our free enterprise system as the subversive groups are giving to their destruction, I feel certain that this generation of Americans will not lose this last best hope of earth.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Raymond E. Baldwin, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Connecticut delivered a very outstanding speech in Pittsburgh last Friday night. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have done me a great honor in asking me to come here and talk with you tonight. Connecticut has always had a great interest in Pennsylvania. As a matter of fact, our charter granted by King Charles II in 1662 bounded our colony on the west by the ocean. At that time no one was sure where the ocean was, but our people took advantage of the fact in a later day, by virtue of that generous grant, to extend the southerly and northerly boundaries westward in parallel lines so that they included a part of Pennsylvania and Ohio. We went to law about it, but were unable to sustain our claim, and so Pennsylvania got away from us. We are sure, however, that you have done better by this beautiful country than we ever could have done.

I am happy to be in the State represented in the Senate by ED MARTIN. I have known him as Governor and Senator, and it has been a great privilege to be associated with him these several years. I have the highest regard for his unusual ability, his sturdy character, and his broad capacities as a public officer. His colleagues in the United States Senate hold him in highest esteem. I am happy and proud to claim his friendship.

We hear many fine things about your good Gov. James Duff, who comes from this county. It is well that this great State should have as its chief executive such an able and competent citizen.

And I want to pay my respects to your Representatives in the Congress. My Connecticut colleagues have the highest regard for them. It has been my personal privilege to be associated with Congressman FULTON on the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy. Your great State is most ably represented in the Congress.

After I went to Washington last January I understood how Lincoln felt when a friend said that it would be good for him to get down to Washington. "I know it will," Lincoln answered. "I only wish I could have got there to lock the door before the horse was stolen, but when I get to the spot I can find the tracks."

Perhaps the tracks were clearer in Washington in those days, but when we Republicans went to Washington last year we found them well covered by the stampede of bureaucracy—and we found not too much remained of the principles of Lincoln that our party has followed.

These principles have become a part of our heritage and are close to the hearts of all Americans. Every American knows and loves from childhood the story of Abraham Lincoln—not because he was a military conquerer or a great inventor, or a political spellbinder, but because he was the heart of the people.

Lincoln loved democracy, but not the kind of democracy we sometimes hear extolled today, in which individuality and independence do not exist. Lincoln loved the democracy that is in the true freedom he described this way: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this—to the extent of the difference is no democracy."

We were not elected in 1946 as the Republican representatives of our people because any majority had belatedly decided that it was better after all to return to some good old days. We were elected in the hope that we would develop a progressive, positive program which would lead us out of the welter of confusion into which the country had dropped. To maintain our majority position as the chosen representatives of our people, will require the best intelligence, the hardest work, and the soundest thinking and the deepest understanding from all of us.

We came to Washington last year to face pressing problems created by others. We found that tremendous financial obligations had been contracted. We found that the planned inflation of the thirties had finally arrived in full bloom and was reflected in high prices. We found that our foreign policy was shot through with the same old WPA dole system thinking that had characterized our national policies a few years before. We found in Washington an administration befuddled by difficulties and willing and anxious to turn over to us the problems that it had created.

To add to our difficulties it soon turned out that the administration's pious promises of cooperation were nothing more than sighs of relief.

It isn't easy to recover from a $260,000,000,000 debt. It isn't easy to find the tracks of runaway spending, and it isn't easy to pull down the balloon of inflation into which hot air has been pumped for so many years. Lincoln in his day had our same problem and experienced our view in saying "* * * as an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest and next no one left to borrow from, so must it be with the Government."

An example of our difficulty is the problem of the budget. Early in January, we received the President's budget which this year contained 1,353 closely printed pages. It is almost exactly the size of your Pittsburgh telephone directory, and almost exactly as thick. Before February 15, we are required by law to present, on the basis of this, our legislative budget. It is little wonder that there is some disagreement as to the amount that it can be reduced. But the real problem lies in the question of where we are going to reduce the spending. We must make reductions with care, wisdom, and foresight. The present budget calls for about $39,500,000,000. Of that sum $33,500,000,000 are commitments that have already been made or are for the armed forces. Unless we want to sharply reduce our expenditures for defense, we are left with a total of about $6,000,000,000 on which we can wield the ax of economy.

I might give another example of fiscal difficulties we face. Our people demand, and well deserve, relief from burdensome taxes that have grown steadily larger ever

since this ever-increasing rate of spending began. The President is calling for increased production and the expansion of industry and at the same time asking for an increase in the taxes on the very industries he expects to expand. We are acutely aware that we must allow the retention of profits sufficient for the expansion of industry. We must relieve the tax load on our people already hard pressed by dangercusly high prices. On the other hand, as any businessman knows, when the dollar is cheap, that is the time to pay off debts and avoid the incurrence of new ones. Unless we do that, we will continue to pay a tremendous interest on our debt (now running at the rate of more than $5,000,000,000 a year) and have to continue to pay that interest at a later date when we can probably less well afford it. More than that, the release of any huge sums as a result of sharp tax reduction, can only give impetus to the inflation we are seeking to check. In the interests of our Nation's economy, we must be aware of those last two dangers. But in the interest of our people and in the interests of production, we must provide a tax reduction.

Since last the Republican Party was in a majority position, times have indeed changed and as Lincoln said, "The dogmas of the past are inadequate to the stormy present, the occasion is piled high with difficulties and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

We are not going to win one vote or advance the cause of our Republic one inch by any tiresome damning of the New Deal. The past is a dead memory.

There is no point in considering what might have been. Our problems today are the problems of the future. Ours can be a progressive, positive understanding of the problems before us that will bring success to our party and peace and prosperity to our people.

What are these issues we have before us?

First, and probably more important than any other, is the question of the maintenance of peace. We have already made long strides in the formulation of a positive policy. When history is written it will show that it was the leadership of Republicans that transformed a weak policy of appeasement and an expensive policy of doles into a realistic plan for the reconstruction of sound economies and political freedoms in the world. History will show that it was the Vandenbergs, the Stassens, the Lodges, and the Deweys, the Smiths, the Herters, the Dullesses, the Austins, and others who have built what is probably the most far-reaching unselfish concept for peace the world has ever known.

With all due credit to Secretary Marshall, is there any like number of equal influences who have produced a workable program on the Democratic side? I take no pride in interjecting here a partisan comparison into what should be an American issue. But I do take pride in the fact that it is members of our party who have finally—even though they were of a party not charged with the conduct of foreign affairs—showed the way that is the best for us now. I hold no particular brief for the Marshall plan. I do not know that it will work. But I do know, and I think we all know deep in our own souls, that isolationism or appeasement, or a repetition of any other errors of the past will surely bring us war. The Marshall plan is only the beginning of what we, as a party, can contribute in an effort to preserve the peace through international good will and cooperation.

The world has come a long way since the day of Abraham Lincoln. His problem was to reunite the several States of this Union. We have a similar problem on even a larger scale—that is to unite the nations of the world to prevent a war of aggression. We, as a party, have an opportunity to make clear that we will give more than lip service to the United Nations, in which our people place such trust. If we are to make that United Nations work in the pursuit of peace we must see that it never becomes a factory for idle resolutions. If it is to act in the interests of peace its decisions must carry strength and weight. It is our obligation, as the most powerful nation in the world, to insist that its decisions do carry that strength and weight. If any nation or combination of nations chooses to obstruct the path toward peace, or chooses to maliciously use its selfish desires to block the wishes of mankind, we will have to proceed without the help of that, or those, nations. But we must never close the door to open, fair, just dealings with any nation in the interests of peace.

The year 1948 has come to stay. We cannot turn back the clock of progress. We live, today, in a small world in which the oceans (that were once wide barriers between nations) are now only minor inconveniences. We live, today, in a big and rich house in a community of poor neighbors. It is ours to choose whether we will teach those nations the way to political freedom and economic prosperity and so live with them in the harmony of a peaceful neighborhood, or whether we will withdraw and so invite them to join together in an envious attack on our wealth. We live in a dangerous, explosive world—a world in which war could always be only a few hours away. There is an urgency in our racing time that demands we recognize the immediacy of these problems. If we do not plan and prepare for the future now, we will find one day that we have delayed too long.

We are troubled today with a problem of getting on peacefully in the world with the Soviet Union. It is unfortunate that Soviet leaders cannot find themselves able to cooperate in any common understanding of rights and principles of others in the building of peace.

A number of approaches to a better relationship with the Soviet Union have been proposed. There are those who, believing that war is inevitable, claim we should instigate a war now while we are still the stronger. Of them, I would ask only one question. Would they take upon their conscience the responsibility for having voted us into what still may be an unnecessary war, knowing, as we all know, that the next war will bring a destruction and a toll of death from which this world may never recover?

There are those who say that we can afford to desert the still free nations of Europe to political aggression so characteristic of Soviet policy, assuming that they will in good time come to see the error of their ways and return to a democratic fold. To them we can only say that in all our experience there has never been a way back from totalitarianism. Once the freedom and the spirit and the lives of the people are taken over by the armed might of a police state, there is no opportunity short of war for them to return to free living. Communism cannot be accepted on a trial basis and freely voted in or out, by a free people. Unfortunately there is no money-back guarantee that comes with dictatorship. Its followers are not allowed to see the cruel bayonets of regimentation that hide behind the false and glittering promises of communism until they have been pulled behind the dark curtain of political slavery.

Then there are those who propose to try again the theory of appeasement. We have already, in the past 3 years, seen another example of the failure of that often tried—and always failing—theory. We sought, in this war, to establish the principle of political and religious freedom in all nations. Yet the guns had not ceased firing before political and religious freedoms were snuffed out from the Baltic to the Balkans. Is there any reason to suppose that the appetite of any aggressor, whether his methods be military or political, will ever be satisfied so long as there remains 1 acre of free soil. Is there any reason to suppose that the dark wave of Soviet aggression would not roll on relentlessly across western Europe? Is there any reason, then, to suppose that this Nation would not one day face the combined forces of evil, directing a military machine of slaves recruited from the nations of all the world?

The only alternative left to us is the continued development of a firm, watchful policy. The dark forces of communism fear the light of knowledge and the light of freedom more than they fear any military might. If we can maintain adequate defenses at home, while recreating the possibility of political freedom and economic prosperity abroad, we have a good chance of surrounding ourselves with nations peaceful in their freedom. Unless we follow such a course I say—and I say with deep reverence—God help humanity in this atomic age.

At home we face the threat of a dangerous inflation which, unchecked, could wreck our plans for peace. An economic collapse here would leave little hope for building peace in the world.

We, as a party, did not create inflation. That was the studied plan of many years. Nevertheless, for us to only blame others would be to shirk our duty as a party and shirk our duty as Americans. We, as a party, do not believe in a controlled, regimented economy. And yet, having inherited this problem, we will either have to objectively and unselfishly take sterner means to combat inflation or we will force upon ourselves the very controls and regimentations we deplore.

Those who believe in the principles of our party—principles that need in no way be affected by changed conditions; those who believe in the Lincoln philosophies of freedom and integrity and opportunity for the individual have, indeed, a promising program to offer.

We need not hesitate or procrastinate because of any clefts in our own party thinking. We cannot all agree on any detail, but there are certain self-evident truths in which we all deeply believe. We do not have to keep the uneasy peace, as does the Democratic Party, between the ultra-conservatives of the deep South and the far left-wing of the North. We do not have to explain why traders in commodity markets are called gamblers in human misery and yet hold high office; we do not have to explain why we advocate price controls and still call them the methods of a police state; we do not have to explain why we were publicly appalled 15 years ago that there was a housing shortage and now have to admit that it still exists; we do not have to explain why we take credit for the high purchasing power of inflation and don't want to take the blame for the high prices that go with it; we do not have to explain we spent $17,000,000,000 on unplanned European relief before we recognized the need for an overall plan of reconstruction; we do not have to explain why we hunt Communists under one bed and hide them under another; we do not have to explain these things because we are not a divided party.

I've said that we Republicans must be builders and that the Democratic Party has been a party of empty promises. In political gatherings, that's an easy thing to say. So let's see how it has worked out.

Last month as I sat listening to the President read his State of the Union paper, I realized that I agreed with many of the things he was saying. He came out boldly for peace and prosperity. He said he favored more housing, higher wages, higher profits for the farmer, lower prices, economy in Government, better health, better education, better use of our resources, greater production, security in old age, and democracy.

As I sat listening, those fine ideals began to sound familiar. So later I looked over the section on housing and found that, according to the President, we have a "drastic housing shortage," and "need a long-range housing program." Now I happen to agree with that, but I remember that the late President said much the same thing in different words long ago. More than a decade ago, he said that one-third of the Nation was ill-housed. So I began asking myself what the Democrats had been doing about this condition that they had discovered so long ago, and why the shortage seemed to be worse today than when they first fastened on the issue—even though we had paid millions in taxes to develop these so-called housing programs. Perhaps this is the answer: According to the United States Government Manual for 1947, we still have 34 Federal agencies helping us out with the housing situation. Dealing with this serious matter for us we have agencies, authorities, administrations, expediters, corporations, departments, divisions, and coordinators—all of which sounds to me suspiciously like a lot of different ways of spelling a simple word "failure."

One in particular interested me. It is listed as "Housing—Greenbelt communities." According to the explanation, there are three of these. They have been developed by the Farm Security Administration, but are administered by the Federal Public Housing Authority which is one of the three constituent units of the National Housing Agency, which is administering the contracts of the United States Housing Authority which was created by the United States Housing Act to lend financial aid for slum clearance.

For many, many years, we have heard the oft-repeated warning that we must have higher wages, lower prices, more housing, better health, and all the other fine things that make life pleasant and easy. I repeat that I agree with those objectives. The thing that is so curious to me is why, after 15 years of Democratic administration, we need them worse than we did 15 years ago.

I do not propose to criticize the Democratic Party for much of what it has promised but rather for what it failed to accomplish. Even failure has been purchased at a staggering cost. Perhaps the executive department in determining its duties of administration found the wrong definition of that word. There is one dictionary definition that says an administration deals with the distribution of an estate. The present administration is admirably fitted for that work.

It is all of these promises that have caused some people to label the Democratic Party as liberal. If by liberal it is meant that the Democratic Party has been liberal with our money, I agree. But if by the term "liberal" it is suggested that the Democratic Party has been deeply concerned with the problems of the common man, the record will show that the concern has seldom gone beyond the stage of promise.

The world moves too fast today for such blundering, theoretical muddlers. The world, today, requires builders—builders of peace, builders of jobs, builders of security—and yes, builders of houses. That is the role the Republican Party can fill. We may not be able to make such sweeping promises, but knowing better the capacity of our Nation and the wants of our people, we can provide for them instead of promising them.

We represent the millions of Americans who do not choose to support the radical philosophies of either the right or the left, but choose to live honestly, simply, and independently in a free world of peace.

We have allowed our party to grow old during our years of disappointment. A new generation has grown up since we were last a majority. That new generation includes millions of young people without a political home. It was their support that elected us in 1946. It is their support that will be required to elect us in 1948.

It is up to each of us who is interested in the Republican Party and a good government and the future it stands for, to make our party the party of youth. We can only make it a party of youth by standing for the principles and beliefs of young men and women and by allowing them to help guide the destinies of our party. It is not that we do not appreciate the loyalty of those who have remained Republicans through these lean years, but it is a practical political fact that we are ourselves (as is the Democratic Party by itself) an insufficient number to be successful without the help of those who have no political home.

As workers in the party, we can impress upon them that in a party guided by the principles of Abraham Lincoln there can be every opportunity to voice and carry out the programs we need their energies to develop.

A winning party is one that has in it believers in (and energetic salesmen of) its principles. We need the help, the suggestions, and the support of each of you. Our victory will come from your good work.

We cannot be derelict in the exercise of democracy within our own party. We will not allow ourselves to be guided by the thinking that has brought us defeat in the past.

The last company in a parade may be dissatisfied with the road the parade is taking, but unless it can forge to the front and lead the way itself there is only the choice of marching—disconsolate and unnoticed—at the rear, or dropping out of the parade altogether. Abraham Lincoln led our people in troubled times with no precedents or political traditions to hinder him. We need not look sadly toward inevitable war or toward inevitable economic collapse here. We need not look toward a sad old age for our party, we, rather, look forward with eager anticipation to the development of new, progressive programs for the future; programs that can bring to America better education, better health, better living standards, security, and wealth under a Government that respects the freedoms and the rights of all. We can look forward to a world kept free and kept peaceful by a combination of nations working together toward the goal of all mankind. We as Americans can look forward to that peace and that prosperity if we cease to look at the past and regard 1948 as a challenge for the rebirth of a new, revitalized, young Republican Party, determined that "This Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Questions to South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of an editorial of recent date from the Monroe Morning World, of Monroe, La., as follows:

QUESTIONS TO SOUTH

At the present time the 13 solid South States and three border States, Kentucky, Oklahoma, and Tennessee, all definitely Democratic, provide more than half of the Democratic Party representation in Congress—53 percent in the Senate and 62 percent in the House.

Just why should 62 percent of the House Democrats be politically subservient to 38 percent? Just why should 53 percent of the Senate Democrats be politically subservient to 47 percent? Just why should either or both groups be politically subservient to an unelected President because he wears a party label, or to a New Deal bureaucracy set up in contradiction to both Democratic Party and southern principles and traditions?

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Sinking of the "Maine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, pursuant to Senate resolution, I went to Habana, Cuba, and there, on February 15, I delivered an address on the occasion of the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*. I ask unanimous consent that my speech may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Ambassador, distinguished guests, and citizens of Cuba, when I was notified by the President of the Senate of the United States that I was to represent the Congress of my country, along with these my colleagues, Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota, Congressmen CHARLES R. ROBERSON, of North Dakota, and ROBERT E. JONES, JR., of Alabama, together with a couple of the boys who, with a million others from the United States, volunteered their services and followed the example of Col. Theodore Roosevelt, later President of the United States, in remembering the *Maine* and fighting for your country's freedom, Commander Horace Havener of the Spanish-American War Veterans, and Hon. Lloyd Thurston, of Iowa, in sharing with the Government of Cuba the honor of commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, I considered it a signal honor for many reasons.

Fifty years ago the U. S. battleship *Maine* was sunk in the magnificent harbor of Habana, as the result of which 266 innocent men perished and gave their lives while in the service of their country. Many others were wounded. You know what followed, so today we gather here with veneration and reverence to pay our respect and show our gratitude to those who made the supreme sacrifice at that time. It is a solemn anniversary. The world shall always remember the *Maine*.

In the first place the State which I represent in the Congress is by heritage similar to that of your great country. The Spanish conquerors who left this beautiful island to conquer Mexico pushed on only 20 years after the conquest to explore not only my home State of New Mexico, but as far as the far-off States of Kansas and Nebraska in what is now the Middle West of North America.

We speak Spanish in New Mexico. Our State constitution provides that in our courts and our legislature the official language shall be English and Spanish. One half of the

population bear names such as those found here in your island.

In fact, the first Europeans to visit my State departed from Cuba in 1527 with Panfilo de Narvaez, to explore Florida, and having been wrecked on the coast of the Gulf of Mexico, started out on one of the most heroic and epic treks in history—from east Texas to Culiacan, a Spanish settlement on the west coast of Mexico, with tidings of the civilization which existed in the remote north, the land of Gran Quivira and the Seven Cities of Cibola.

I welcome also the opportunity of speaking to you in the language of my fathers—Spanish.

In this connection, I regret exceedingly that the Havana conference, i. e., Conferencia Mundial de Comercio y Empleo has failed to adopt Spanish along with French and English as an official language of the United Nations.

I say this with studied appreciation of the occasion of this visit, and I agree wholeheartedly with the arguments of the Government of Argentina and Peru that the aspirations of 20 voting nations in the great assembly of United Nations whose native and official tongue is Spanish, should be recognized. These nations have every right to demand that their tongue, Spanish, be considered in advance of one which only by tradition is the language of diplomacy, as well as English, the language of neighboring states, no matter how great their population might be, or how powerful their position is amongst nations.

I welcome the opportunity of speaking here because I feel that my country owes Cuba and her patriots a debt historically which should long ago have been paid.

I search in vain in the history books of my country for proper appreciation and recognition for the role which Cuban patriots played in the liberation of your country. It would seem that the Spanish-American War was fought solely by American soldiers. Not that I would in any way depreciate the patriotic service which my countrymen lent your country in 1898. Many of my fellow countrymen came to help you. From New Mexico came Lunes, Durans, Padillas, Cienfuegos, and Armijos. They left far-off New Mexico to fight for the freedom of this country and in defense of their ideals and their fatherland. To them every credit is due, and a grateful country and freedom-loving people everywhere will honor and praise them. However, I wish to take this occasion to assure you that patriots throughout the world appreciate the valor and unselfishness of the valiant Cuban patriots who long before their American brothers arrived here and fought, bled, and died for the liberation of their country.

I am now thinking of your supreme military commander, Maximo Gomez, who trained in guerrilla fighting in the wars for freedom in Santo Domingo, came to Cuba and rose to unsurpassed heights of military genius and leadership.

There was Antonio Maceo, a military leader whose genius, bravery, and patriotism is unexcelled in the annals of any nation. Freedom has never had a more gallant defender or more valiant champion, and there was, you recall, Calixto Garcia, to complete the triumvirate of freedom.

Cuba's liberation followed that of all other American Republics, but the delay was not for lack of patriots, nor for lack of men of determination and resolution. The proclamation of Yara of 1868 reverberates through history with all the beauty and grandeur of Concord or Dolores, and all praise is due the Mambises who so generously forsook their families and their homes to give their all for freedom.

There is hope for the world so long as there are men such as these willing to fight and die for the ideals of liberty and freedom; the great nations of the world would do well to reflect on the lesson of Cuba's struggle for freedom. Mankind was not born to be enslaved and I warn the arrogant and mighty leaders who heed not this lesson that the fate which overtook Hitler is the inevitable destiny of tyrants.

It seems sacrilegious to mention Cuba's great apostle so soon after mentioning the despicable name just uttered, but who can overlook doing honor to your great champion of brotherhood and Christianity—Marti, the apostle of liberty; Marti, the universal; Marti, Cuba's gift to a world which loves freedom and liberty and respects the dignity of the individual.

Jose Marti belongs to all ages. He is worthy of the company of the Grachi, of Jefferson, Bolivar, Lincoln, Juarez, and Gandhi. Marti belongs only with the great.

As a North American I am proud that my country received him in warmth and kindness during his many years of exile. The cause of your freedom, which he so ably championed throughout the length and breadth of my country was supported by words and deeds. My countrymen responded generously to his appeals.

Would that Marti were alive today. Marti would have rejoiced to see the decline of the colonial empires of the imperialistic nations which the world is witnessing. Were he alive his mighty pen and voice would be hurling diatribes of profoundness and wisdom in behalf of the oppressed people of this world.

Can you not see him hovering over the shoulders of Churchill and Roosevelt when they drafted their famous Atlantic Charter; and can you not see his spirit writhing because its principles were shamefully forgotten and disdained at Tehran and Yalta?

Oh, that Marti were alive today to praise and encourage President Truman to press hard and steadfastly in behalf of his program for protecting the civil rights of all American citizens, to assure the citizens of my country that the rights guaranteed by our Constitution, of suffrage, of opportunity to work, of freedom of expression, and of safety of person shall be denied to none because of color, race, or religious belief.

Were Marti alive today during the conference of world states taking place here in Habana, he would have expressed agreement with Torres Bodet and your own Foreign Minister Dr. Rafael P. Gonzales Munoz, when they championed the aspirations of the small nations of this world for economic, social, and industrial progress and for a standard of living equal to that of the great powers. These are more important and should be recognized before the desire of the great and wealthy nations to maintain conditions as they now exist.

I wish that I had more time to discuss at length the role which our countries played in your war of liberation, but time does not afford me that opportunity. However, in behalf of my colleagues, in behalf of the congress of my country, I wish to express the appreciation and admiration which we feel for the role which you played in the fight for freedom and how proud we are that we were given an opportunity to assist you with our arms in that campaign and we rejoice with you that freedom and liberty triumphed over oppression, tyranny, and enslavement.

Mr. President, my colleagues join me in congratulating you on the fight which you led in behalf of Cuba and for the liberation and freedom of its people. The great honor which your countrymen bestowed upon you was undoubtedly in recognition of the fact that you were carrying on the past traditions of the veterans of 50 years ago.

I wish to say a few words in praise of the able statesman who represents your country in Washington, His Excellency Don Guillermo Belt. Undaunted in the diplomatic halls or chanceries of great nations, he is always among the first to defend the rights and interests of the smaller countries. He is carrying on the cause for which Marti laid down his life at Dos Rios.

I would also like to say a few words concerning the ambassador to your country, His Excellency R. Henry Norweb. Representing the best traditions of the Foreign Service of our country, and schooled in the noble precepts of the good-neighbor policy, it is in the hands of such envoys as he which will do much to promote friendship amongst the American states.

In closing, may I say that my colleagues and I are happy to be here with you. We consider it a great honor and we thank you from the bottom of our hearts for the warm welcome and generous hospitality which you have extended us. We love your wonderful country. Expressing the sentiments of freemen, Para Siempre, Cuba Libre.

Conditions in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which a friend of mine received from a friend overseas, concerning the conditions which exist in Germany. I think it contains an account which ought to be read by Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1948.

OUR DEAREST FRIEND: Many thanks for your last letter, and I must apologize for having not written before, but I have been very busy on Christmas time, and I have so much to tell you that I could not start writing unless I get a little spare time. Now I think I'll better write twice, and to begin with I think I must tell you about the propaganda question that seems to interest you. First, it is perfectly true, as your Congressmen who traveled in Europe said, that your propaganda system was not efficient and Russia's was so much powerful. Of course, if the Communist ideology is spreading so much, it must be fed on something, and if so many people, most common people, go to the big party, they have some reasons to do it, and also some profits, and one must agree that the Russians have been very successful working in the same ways, exactly as the Germans, who had also good results with the collaborators in all occupied countries. First, the Voice of America simply disappeared and is very poorly managed, not at all interesting. I hear it once a day, but it is just wasting time. You should listen to the British broadcasting, which is also not so good as it used to be in wartimes, but still so much better than the Voice of America. But there are two impeding facts. First, they have reduced their broadcasting power. I mean it is much easily fading, and you can't hear it properly, especially when the weather is stormy, or if there is any electrical noise, etc. Besides, the Communists tried and succeeded choking the BBC. (I also must write to them.) For instance, when you get exactly the wave length you hear the voice very feebly and at the same time a big noise. You then turn a little on the left, the noise disappears; also the same on the right; but, of course, you do not hear the voice just the same. And those noises (we know them very much) are exactly the same as were those the Germans used to impede us to hear the BBC during the occupation. Are those noises (we then used to call them "Bouilleurs") worked by French local Communists, or I should rather think, as we are very near Germany, by Russians in occupied Germany? Anyhow, the popular broadcasts in the evening are worse and much worse than they used to be during the war. Another obstacle is that you can't hear on short waves (the few ones where you don't get that special noise). The BBC voice that is simply choked by Russian voice that you hear everywhere in the evening. They broadcast in French, German, and more of all in English. They are talking to the English people a lot, and I wonder why they are not discouraged, because they have no chance at all with the English. But on the same time we get fed up listening, or rather trying to listen, and hearing Italian, Germans, and more of all Russians, from Russia and a lot of German places in occupied Russian Germany. My husband suggests that you should hire Radio Luxemburg. They have a very powerful broadcasting system, and they are in the heart of western Europe. The English use it a lot and no doubt you could do just the same. But in any case you must do something in your radio propaganda, and I am afraid everything has to be done in that way.

Now, you should also start magazines or reviews with plenty of pictures about American life, American ways of doing everything, just showing how successful a capitalist democracy can be. Those magazines should be specially of pictures for people who can't read English, or very little, and they are just the crowd as you know. They would be so much interested being able to know and understand a little about America, and those magazines should be very cheap, so that the young people and the poor could easily get them. (The Germans used to do it, and got a lot of collaborators that way.)

Now, you should also try to start some clubs or associations of French friends of the United States of America. Also a German and successful idea. For instance, if I feel very miserable about our national ways and politic system and lacking of everything, and if I go simply to the Maison du peuple, the Communist house or club, as you like to call it, as did our friend, Michelot, many people are there to greet me, offering me this and this—American foodstuffs, by the way, supplied very generously by the UNRRA—why do not you hang the man who started this folly? They ask me what are my troubles, say and will help me in every way unless I have just to sign that I have become a Communist. Now, they will help me, give me moral and material assistance, but I must give them my name, attend their meetings, and they will use my name if I like it or not. On the other way I want to go to the Americans, how could I get in touch with them? Simply listen to the Voice of America, which is not a treat, and I shall hear about the American teams of basketball or some philosophical review or cinema or scientific research or the next campaign for the Presidential elections or to know what they are doing in ladies' clubs for the animals or the children, etc.—very meager to cheer up, as you see. But I should not buy an American magazine, could not get in touch with any American people or French pro-American, so you simply give it up and you go to the Maison du peuple and find the Russians so much generous and so understanding for you American food and stuffs (that is what you would be told about the important stock of canned food and soap and everything that so foolishly you give in 45V and 46 to the central Europe and Russia and that as so efficiently fed Communist propaganda). I am always speaking of the criminal stupidity that has been the UNRRA, and although I never had anything of that, I shall never swallow it.

If you had given all this to western Europe, there would hardly be 18 Communists in the French Assembly, and the Prest to England should have been more generous, and there also it would not have been such a waste of money. Perhaps there would not have needs of the plan Marshall as the European recovery would be now a reality instead of a hope, and perhaps just a dream. The peoples of France and England (western Europe) would not be so bitter, and on the other way central Europe could not be worse, neither Russian—for how grateful are they to you?—Yugoslavs, Bulgarians, Rumanians, and white Russians, etc. But now we are in the soup with 184 Communists in the assembly and the big party is still spreading among middle-class people.

You perhaps know that they have (I mean our Socialist government which is not any better than the Communists) put so many taxes on middle-class people that we will soon be overwhelmed under the burden. And many people who are selling their properties and thinking of giving up their trades or factories or charge do not worry much on the plan Marshall who is perhaps going to help our Government but not the people, and most of them get fed up and think of either leaving the country or going to the Communist Party.

I told you that this Socialist government is spending money on what we call social improvements (they share that hobby with the Communists) as they are very near each other except on foreign policy; you hardly see the differences. And those improvements are so expensive that it would ruin even the United States of America. Think that, as we told you, we give a lot of money for the children so that a man with five or six children get twice as much money for the children as he gets for his work. Besides, when two people give birth to a child they get a gift of twenty thousand as reward for the birth, so that a man who has six or seven children do not go to work but just stay at home and looks after his family. We have now very numerous families and I wonder what they are going to do with those children later on.

I must conclude and will soon write again about our worries toward the plan Marshall which is our last hope but that we should like to a success. I must excuse me for writing such a long letter in my bad English but I told you that we had a lot to tell you.

Good-by until very soon and many thanks again for not forgetting us.

With our best regards and very sincerely.

Haverhill Lincoln Day Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE J. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me before the Lincoln Republican Club, of Haverhill, Mass., on February 11, 1948:

This week Americans, young and old, revere the memory of a great leader, Abraham Lincoln, and may I add that it is fitting indeed that the Lincoln Republican Club, of Haverhill, should sponsor this gathering tonight in tribute to one whose words and works, have, and continue to be, an inspiration to our Nation.

Facing as we do, one of the most crucial periods of our history, following the maladjustments of the costliest and most destructive war the world has known, we need to turn to the principles, the wise counsel and sound resolution of that great President.

Momentous decisions confront our country, affecting the peace and security and welfare of all, and as in Lincoln's day, they demand the same real unity of purpose and action. The preservation of the Union was Lincoln's grave problem. The preservation of peace inextricably interwoven in a world striving to feed its peoples and seeking the reestablishment of economic health and vigor in the free countries of Europe is our problem.

Europe today, is still submerged in a state of disruption. The war smashed the vast and delicate mechanism by which European countries made their living; it destroyed coal mines and deprived the workshop of sufficient mechanical energy; it wiped out steel mills and thus cut down the workshop's material for fabrication; it wrecked transportation lines and equipment making it impossible to move goods and people; it eliminated to a great extent livestock herds; made fertilizers unobtainable and reduced soil fertility.

It was the war that destroyed merchant fleets and thus cut off accustomed income from carrying the world's goods; that caused the loss of so much of the foreign investments and the income which it has produced; which bled inventories and working capital out of existence; which shattered business relationship and markets and the sources of raw materials.

I was privileged to be among those who wished to see for themselves, the real picture abroad, and during this study, as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I had an opportunity to see and talk with the people who seek our help today. While primarily on a military mission, we found ample opportunities to view the political as well as the economic side of the general problem.

The 16 western European countries that have asked our aid, under the so-called Marshall plan, with a present population of 270,000,000 with western Germany almost twice our own, constitute an interdependent area containing some of the most highly industrialized nations of the world. As a group, they are one of the two major workshops of the world, and depend in large part on the processing of raw materials, largely imported from abroad, into finished goods and the furnishing of services to other areas. These goods and the proceeds therefrom paid for the necessary imports.

Germany was a striking example of this situation. Some 14 countries were visited during our tour of inspection, and in nearly every one of these we found these nations depending in one way or another upon German coal, steel, and finished goods, and also as a nation to which they would export their own goods.

For devastation, desolation, and dislocated persons and industries, as well as economy, none of the countries visited could compare with Germany. The constant and concentrated air attacks by the allies have scarred Germany completely, leaving great cities and towns a mass of ruin and rubble.

Yet, this is the country which our Armed Services Committee called the economic heart of Europe, and added, "There can be no general economic recovery in Europe until Germany is revitalized." As an indication of the interdependence of the 16 countries, an example may be given as in the case of Germany. Fifty-three percent of Germany's exports are consumed in the 16 countries set up under the Marshall plan. Thirty-five percent of Germany's imports came from these same countries of western Europe.

DROUGHTS AND WINTERS

Droughts and severe winters have added to the trials and tribulations of peoples and governments. Hit by a series of droughts, European farmers had poor crops in both

1945 and 1946. Then came the winter of 1946-47, the worst in recent history. Winter crops were ruined by the severe freeze and the spring floods that followed. Coal could be neither mined nor moved in adequate amounts. Factories had to close down because people could not get to work or do much work if they got there.

Still suffering from those conditions, Europe received a further set-back in the form of a summer drought last year. Traveling by auto in many parts of Germany and Austria in September enabled us to get a true picture of the gravity of this situation.

To make matters worse, the food which came from Europe's bread basket before the war, namely, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria, was going almost wholly to the Soviet Union. Adding to the misery were the delaying tactics of the Russians seeking to prevent Europe from regaining its economic strength quickly and thus hoping to reap a Communist harvest in that area.

These are some of the monumental problems and obstacles that now face our occupation forces, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay, in Germany, as they seek to restore a semblance of economic recovery despite Russian lack of cooperation.

From General Clay in Berlin came emphatic evidence of the need of strengthening the dikes of western Europe against the tide of communism. Here we found out why the Russians want to keep eastern Germany. First, to milk the eastern zone of all that it possesses; second, to attempt to fit the eastern zone into the economy of the Balkans and, third, that an economic recession in the United States will cause the withdrawal of the Americans in Germany and thus permit the Russians to take over completely.

MILITARY THREAT

These same people look fearfully to the east where large Russian and satellite armies are ready to march whenever Moscow decides to give the signal. These men and women ask what help America could send in case of invasion. They know that the American, British, and French armed forces in Europe are not strong enough to resist any substantial movement on the part of the Soviets in this respect.

We must be bluntly frank about the military situation. The Russians today would have little difficulty in overrunning western Europe to the channel ports as fast as they can drive there in their tanks and trucks. The probable reason the Soviets don't move in this respect is because they fear it would be the beginning of another world conflict, a long war for which they are not prepared. On the other hand, they may be quite satisfied with the progress they are now making in what is known as peaceful penetration and the setting up of satellite governments which now embrace 11 countries of Europe, all of which are in the so-called sphere of Soviet influence. The total population of these countries, together with Russia, is approximately 310,000,000. The peoples of Europe are worried about food, but they are also terrified at the prospects of a Russian march.

NATIONS MEET

In answer to Secretary Marshall's appeal for European initiative in planning for their own recovery with American help, the representatives of 16 nations of eastern Europe, all outside the ring of the so-called iron curtain, convened in Paris on July 12, 1947, for the purpose of discussing what joint action they could take for the restoration, or, more accurately, the continuance, of their civilization. The basic problems of each country are the same.

The participating nations organized themselves into a Committee of European Economic Cooperation and laid out a 4-year program of economic recovery. The fact that only 16 and not all of the European nations are involved in this great constructive endeavor is the responsibility of the Soviet Government, who opposed any action on the part of the satellite governments within the Soviet sphere of influence from participating in this movement. I am convinced that despite the Russian threat and Russian opposition to our aid, that the American people strongly desire to be of every possible help in aiding the people of Europe who are fighting to preserve their freedom. The efforts that these countries are making in earnestly attempting to find a secure foundation for such common action is convincing testimony of good faith and their sincerity of purpose.

In self-help and mutual cooperation among themselves, these nations described their intentions in three phases:

First, they will expand their production of major commodities during the next 4 years in accordance with specified annual targets.

Second, they will strengthen their internal financial stability in order to provide a sound foundation for maximum progress in recovery.

Third, they will cooperate more fully among themselves to increase trade and boost production through mutually helpful action. The plan is a large one and it calls for an unprecedented peacetime effort of work by the whole population of the participating countries.

The section on mutual assistance among these nations is perhaps the most important part of the Paris report, for European countries are not individually self-sufficient. They depend for livelihood on a large amount of trade among themselves and with other parts of the world.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

As a result of the Paris conference of the 16 nations, the President on December 19, 1947, placed before the Congress and the American people a proposal for United States assistance to a European economic recovery plan for those countries.

Americans have always shown a generous tendency in helping others, but a nation in which the voice of the people directs the conduct of its affairs cannot embark on an undertaking of such magnitude and significance for purely sentimental reasons. As representatives of the people, the Congress wants to know why Europe needs this help; how much is needed and how should the help be given.

The aid which will be required from us, according to the President, for the first 15 months—from April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949—is estimated at six and eight-tenths billions.

The funds we are asked to make available will enable them to import grain for current consumption and fertilizer and agricultural machinery to increase their food production. They will import fuel for current use and mining machinery to increase their coal output. In addition, they will obtain raw materials, such as cotton, for current production, and some manufacturing and transportation equipment to speed up their productive capacity.

The industrial goods we supply will be primarily to relieve critical shortages at a few strategic points which are now curtailing the great productive powers of Europe's industrial system.

A CONTINUING CHECK

In the light of the magnitude of the program of European assistance and its cost to the American taxpayers, we must assure Americans that the plan is not being used to aid any governments whose economic theories and practices do not conform to the American ideal of free enterprise.

We must also insist on a continuing check on the European nations being helped to make certain that the recipient country is meeting its production targets and its pledge of self-help, monetary reform, budget balancing, and of cooperation in the collective European recovery program.

Important also is the determination to see to it that funds are not corruptly or improperly used, that goods do not flow into the black market, and that the most efficient and businesslike methods of operation be pursued by those governments.

We must insist that any aid given to Europe under the suggested proposal should be administered by an independent agency of the Government and composed of top-grade businessmen, the best that can be found available for the job. Every safeguard must be thrown around the use of these funds to make sure that American substance is not being used for things which are not absolutely essential to the recovery program.

In assisting Europe, we must remember to keep our own financial house in order. We must ask ourselves, What will be the effect of this far-reaching measure on the internal economy of the United States, having in mind that the resources of our own country are not inexhaustible?

We have been told by the Krug, Nourse, and Harriman groups that made extensive studies and reports on this plan, that participation in this European recovery plan can be undertaken by this country without undue strain upon our internal economy or damaging depletion of our natural resources, but those conclusions will be subjected also to the closest scrutiny by the Congress.

The cost of the European recovery plan to us for the first 15 months is not clear at the present time. The first estimates called for $6,800,000,000. It is felt that this amount can be considerably reduced for the 15-month period to a sum substantially less than that amount, without impairing the ultimate objectives of the plan.

Congressional committees are now giving their closest study to those estimates and it is expected that a report will be made to Congress within a few weeks. The amount authorized, however, should be adequate so that a permanent foundation may be laid for the early recovery of the economy of Europe. To reduce the plan to a timid and narrow proportion would be the greatest possible waste and lead to the gravest consequences.

The United States has already spent billions to fight totalitarianism. The European recovery plan demands more sacrifices, but they are necessary to insure the recovery of friendly, democratic nations and in the interest of our own economy and security.

In my opinion, the decision behind the plan is whether the United States is prepared to help western Europe attain an economic health which will enable it to assist communistic pressure and violence, or whether to leave these nations to division and conquest.

If the United States fails to help make possible the return of western Europe to self-support, then the free peoples of western Europe may be forced to turn in large part to the east for survival. The price of such dependence, in the judgment of those nearest the facts, would mean the ultimate incorporation of all Europe in the economic and political system of totalitarian Russia.

The European recovery plan is our most effective step in preventing the fall of Europe under communistic domination. If western Europe should be swept by hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos, communism will certainly follow in their wake. Such an event would surely affect the future security and stability of our democracy in the United States.

It is my belief that it is to our interest in this crisis to participate in this program in order to win the high stakes of our own security and the welfare and peace of the world.

American Communists Are Traitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therewith Jack Beall's recent broadcast on Communism. Mr. Beall is conducting a series of 15-minute broadcasts on this subject and can be heard weekly from 6:45 to 7 p. m., eastern standard time, over the American Broadcasting Co.'s network. His broadcast of January 17 is as follows:

Good evening. I wish to address myself to the matter of American Communists as potential traitors to their own country in time of war. It directly concerns the matter of loyalty.

You may be surprised to know that the Communist international teaches and advocates treason, by the people of other nations, in favor of the Soviet Union. That is not so surprising, considering the fact that they openly advocate armed rebellion and overthrow by violence of all capitalist governments. But that they teach and advocate treason, as openly as they do is a little surprising.

As is so often the case, the root teaching is to be found in the Communist manifesto, which Marx and Engels wrote out just 100 years ago this month. They wrote that "modern industrial labor, modern subjection to capital * * * has stripped the proletarian of every trace of national character. * * * Proletarians have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property." Again they say:

"The Communists are * * * reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationalities. The workingmen have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got."

There is a fine example of a Marxian sophistry, right there. Another one of the theoretical writers and practical leaders of communism, Otto Kuusinen, wrote in the magazine, the Communist, published in February 1934, this further indication that the workers of the world owe loyalty—not to their own country—but to the Soviet Union.

Says Kuusinen: "The Bolsheviks were not afraid to come out for the defeat of their own government in the First World War. The main enemy is within one's own country. Such is the correct principle for action by a revolutionary worker's party. Turning the imperialist war into a civil war—such is the correct slogan.

And that last slogan derives from Lenin. He must have said and written these words "Turn the imperialist war into civil war," literally hundreds of times. If you want to look up just once instance, it can be found on page 232 of a collection of his speeches and writings, titled "The Imperialist War."

Well, what does this expression mean? It means very plainly and flatly this: Under the leadership of Communists the workers shall arise and use the arms which have been given them for use against the enemy, against their own officers and their own governments. This tactic is to be pursued even when the infiltrated country is not making war on the Soviet Union. The idea is that the so-called imperialist war is a good strategic time for armed rebellion, particularly if the country in question is being defeated by the enemy in the field. The soldiers have arms. The idea is to turn those arms against their own officers and their own country and take over power—and then affiliate with the Soviet Union, of course.

I have been able to get hold of a rare pamphlet—it is in only a few libraries. It contains the resolutions of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International in 1923, and as such it contains the official party line.

All Communist Parties which adhere to the Communist International consider these resolutions as the "law and the prophets." William Z. Foster, the president of the Communist Party in the United States, when these principles were laid down, had to adhere to them, even if he hadn't wanted to, on pain of being tossed into the outer limbo of nothingness, by excommunication from the party. It is the same Foster who is presently the head of the Communist Party here. Although the Communist International has not yet been officially resurrected in the United States, it actually never has been dissolved, except on paper. Undoubtedly the same views, the same disciplines exist as before the fake dissolution. I have yet to hear any Communist get up and say that any of the resolutions of the Communist International are null and void as to him, or the rest of the party.

And what does the little pamphlet say—this little pamphlet titled "The Struggle Against Imperialist War and the Tas": of the Communists"? Let's just browse through some of the pages. First, it says, "War is inseparable from capitalism." It follows this up by saying the "abolition of war is possible only thrcugh the abolition of capitalism." Then it says, "But the overthrow of capitalism is impossible without force, without armed uprising and proletarian wars against the bourgeoisie." (Maybe I ought to explain this "gobbledegook" again. The "proletarians" are the workers and the "bourgeoisie" are the employing class.)

But to get back to the pamphlet: "The proletariat has no country," it says, "until it has captured political power and has taken the means of production from the exploiters. The term 'national defense' is nothing but a catchword, and mostly a petty-bourgeois catchword, to justify war. In wars staged by the proletariat itself—or by a proletarian state against imperialism, the proletariat defends its Socialist country."

In other words, in case of war between the United States and the Soviet Union this resolution of the Communist International says that the proletarians—meaning the Communists and the workers generally, will defend their Socialist country—meaning the Soviet Union. It makes no difference if they are American citizens—they have got to defend the Soviet Union, fight against their own country, with every force available to them. This condition has been accepted without a blink by William Z. Foster, the president of the Communist Party—then and now.

The pamphlet envisages several sets of conditions of warfare. The first is where two capitalist, or as they call them usually, two imperialist countries, are fighting each other. Note that the Soviet Union is out of it entirely. But this is what they advise their Communist Parties in these other countries to do before the war breaks out. "Communists," they say, "wage a persistent fight against imperialist war and strive to prevent imperialist war by proletarian revolution. They strive to rally the masses around their standard in this struggle and, if unable to prevent the outbreak of war, they strive to transform it into civil war for the overthrow of the bourgoisie."

The first duty is to "tear down the screen" behind which the capitalists conceal their preparations for war, and to do this they make a fight "against pacifism." I am not in a position to prove it, but it looks very much as if when they fight pacifism in two capitalist countries which are on the verge of going to war—they are really doing all they can to urge them on to fight. But, in the sinuous twistings of verbiage, it comes out that they are merely out to "tear the veil" from the "hypocrisy of the bosses." Then, they get a little closer to home when they advise the Communist Parties in their various countries to expose the catch-word "national defense." This is another bit of humbuggery, they say—there being no fatherland for the worker, save the Soviet Union, it follows as the night the day that, if the worker lives in some other country, he cannot have a national home, therefore he can't be interested in "national defense." This prepares the wage earner for the idea he mustn't fight for his own country.

The Communist International then goes on with its instructions. Communists must infiltrate war industries—get ready for sabotage and strikes there. They must work with the farmers and youth. They must combat military training but only where volunteer enlistments are the rule. Apparently, too many Fascist-minded people rush to join the colors, under the volunteer system, and there is no use in putting arms into their hands. But in the case of compulsory military training, that is a different thing. The workers generally are in on that, and the rule is laid down that Communists should enter the army. Once inside the army they are to conduct "anti-militarist activity," that is, stir up as much discontent as possible and encourage disrespect for those in authority and other things which will be brought out later. All of this will hasten the great day, after war actually breaks out, when they can go ahead and turn the imperialist war into civil war.

Those who do not enter the army are supposed to prepare for war by getting ready to go underground, because when war comes, party work can only be conducted illegally, they admit. They must also link up all the possible dissatisfactions of the worker—his pay, his hours, his inconveniences, with the "imperialist war policies" of the Government.

Then, after war breaks out between two capitalist countries, each true-blue Communist is instructed by the International to work for the defeat of his own country. I don't think that can be glossed over. If that isn't preparing whole segments of the population in the very essence of treason, right there, I would like to know what it is.

The Constitution of the United States defines treason as levying war against the United States, or "adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort." The dictionary that I have defines treason as "betrayal, treachery, or breach of allegiance, or of obedience, toward the sovereign, or government."

I give you the very words in which the Sixth Congress of the Communist International gives the detailed instruction: "The main points of this program may be summarized as follows: (b) Defeatism, i. e., to work for the defeat of the home imperialist government in this war. (c) Revolutionary defeatist work to be carried on by the proletariat in all the belligerent countries, for the overthrow of their home bourgeoisie. (d) To transfer the war between the imperialist states into proletarian civil war against the bourgeoisie, for the purpose of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism—this transformation to be achieved by means of revolutionary mass action and fraternization at the front."

Right there I would like to say something about this "revolutionary mass action and fraternization at the front."

The Sixth Congress of the Communist International resolves as follows about that: "(A) In connection with the economic demands and complaints of the soldiers, collective refusal or sabotage of service and certain forms of soldiers' and sailors' strikes should be applied. (B) The most important slogan of action at the front is the slogan

of fraternization. The purpose of fraternization is to unite the worker and peasant soldiers, in the opposite lines of trenches, against their officers. Experience, in the last world war, has shown that mass-fraternization inevitably leads to class differentiation in the armies and to armed conflicts between soldiers and officers. The Communists in the army must organize mass fraternization and give it a clear, political color, particularly in regard to the question of peace and the organization of the revolutionary forces in the army."

It is emphasized that it won't do any good for a few to get together in the Army and say they won't bear arms or won't shoot at the enemy. What must be stirred up is "revolutionary mass action." The Communists must tell other soldiers in the ranks that the only way to stop war is by all working together to bring about the armed overthrow of the officers and the Government.

Again I say to you, if that not be treason, too much cannot be made of it.

Back on the home front the busy little Communists are instructed by the International in Moscow to conduct themselves in the following manner—and remember always that this is just a private fight, supposedly between two capitalist states; they are not even in it. The workers on the home front are told to engage in general strikes. Tying up the making of munitions, transportation, communications, everything—because this is a very important stage in the transformation of imperialist war into civil war. In order to pull these strikes they must "champion the economic demands of the workers and link up these demands with antiwar propaganda, organize revolutionary factory councils, capture the subordinate trade-union organizations, and then organize, lead, and extend partial strikes."

All this makes a pretty picture of what we can expect from the Communists—particularly if the next war turns out to be one with the Soviet Union. They have their very specific plans for that, too.

These same resolutions say about that: "In the event of an attack upon the Soviet Union, the Communists in oppressed nations, as well as those in imperialist countries, must exert all their efforts to rouse rebellion or wars of national liberation among the national minorities in Europe and in the colonial and semicolonial countries against the imperialist enemies of the Soviet state. • • • The proletariat (meaning the workers and the members of the Communist Party) in the imperialist countries must not only fight for the defeat of their own governments in this war but must actively strive to secure victory for the Soviet Union. • • • The Red Army is not an 'enemy' army but the army of the international proletariat. In the event of war against the Soviet Union, the workers in capitalist countries must not allow themselves to be scared from supporting the Red Army and from expressing their support by fighting against their own bourgeoisie, by the charges of treason that the bourgeoisie may hurl against them."

The Sixth Congress also resolved that "work must be immediately commenced to explain to the workers why they must stand for the defeat of their own imperialist countries in the coming war. The slogan: 'Transform imperialist war into civil war' must already become the leading idea in our propaganda before imperialist war breaks out."

Again it says: "The conditions favorable for transforming a war against the Soviet Union into a civil war will be much more speedily created • • • than in an ordinary imperialist war." They speak here of the chances for pulling general strikes and crippling the war effort by means of mass demonstrations, leading to clashes with the police and damaging home-front morale.

At the front, Communists in the army can help secure defeat of their own country, the resolutions point out, by collective refusal of service by soldiers and sailors—in other words, a soldiers and sailors strike. And still another method is to go over and fraternize with the enemy at the front—this to directly bring on defeat and demoralization of the Army.

Communists remember back to the period, at the end of the First World War, when military defeat, at the front, worked for revolutions against governments in many countries. They realize that, so long as an army is successful it is comparatively immune against Communist propaganda. But when it can be brought to suffer defeats the situation is ripe for them. Communists are urged to go out and call mass meetings of defeated, demoralized soldiers, take advantage of the time of despair and confusion to get them to turn their guns on their own officers and their own governments and thus overthrow them.

One of the small but enlightening bits of advice which Communists get from their Moscow headquarters is for Communist women to write their menfolk in the army and tell them all their troubles, complaining of the lack of food; demand that they come home from the front; ask what they are fighting for, anyway.

Of course, all these tactics are to be used by Communists in the armies of capitalist countries, like the United States, England, and France. Naturally, it does not apply to the armies of Soviet Russia. No defeatism is to be permitted there. Here is the Soviet Russian instructions to its agents, all over the world, on this point: "Although the proletariat in capitalist countries is not bound by the duty of national defense, in the land of the proletariat dictatorship, however, national defense is an unfailing revolutionary duty. Here the defenders are the armed proletariat, supported by the poor peasantry. Defense of the Soviet Union is a matter of class interest for the international proletariat, as well as a doubt of honor."

Ah, yes—that seldom-used word "honor," is here trotted out in a Soviet document. The Bolsheviks who snort and laugh at ideas of morality and honor in others—calling it "bourgeois stupidity"—here invoke the sacred word "honor" in order to persuade others to become traitors to their own countries, in support of the Soviet Union; to bring about the defeat of their own nations so that the Soviet Union may triumph. If it wasn't very serious, it would be almost funny. The serious side is that they actually persuaded millions of people, all over the world to subscribe to these resolutions. These very resolutions that I have read you were passed and subscribed to by the representatives of nearly 60 countries—among them—Communist party representatives from the United States. Not a word of protest was ever raised against them in the councils of the American Communist Party. Certainly, who were Communists, back in 1928, and who are still Communists—have these things in their minds and their hearts when they cry the slogan of "Defend the Soviet Union." When you next hear that cry raised, I hope you will remember that it means a great deal more than just defending the Soviet Union with words. Communists are direct-actionists and they regard their first loyalty as being to the flag of Russia.

It isn't so often that one has the opportunity of quoting the head of the Communist Party of this Nation when he admits that his loyalty is to the flag of another country. They are not frequently so frank. Maybe in this case it was an unguarded moment. Anyway, I'm going to read to you the testimony of William Z. Foster, before the so-called Fish committee. I remind you that Mr. Foster was the head of the Communist Party, back in 1928, when he subscribed to the sixth world congress resolutions. He was the candidate for President of the United States on the Communist ticket in that year. And he is now the head of the Communist Party, United States of America. I don't suppose his views have changed vastly in the meantime. Here is the colloquy which took place:

"The CHAIRMAN. Now if I understand you, the workers in this country look upon the Soviet Union as their country. Is that right?

"Mr. FOSTER. The more advanced workers do.

"The CHAIRMAN. They look upon the Soviet flag as their flag?

"Mr. FOSTER. The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag and that is the red flag. That is the flag of the proletarian revolution; it was also, incidentally, the flag of the American revolution, in its earlier stages. The red flag has been the flag of revolution for many years before the Russian revolution.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you owe allegiance to the American flag; does the Communist Party owe allegiance to the American flag?

"Mr. FOSTER. The workers—the revolutionary workers—in all the capitalist countries are an oppressed class, who are held in subjection by their respective capitalist governments, and their attitude toward these governments is the abolition of these governments and the establishment of Soviet governments.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, they do not claim any allegiance, then, to the American flag in this country?

"Mr. FOSTER. That is, you mean the support of capitalism in America? No.

"The CHAIRMAN. I mean if they had to choose between the Red flag and the American flag, I take it from you that you would choose the Red flag. Is that correct?

"Mr. FOSTER. I have stated my answer.

"The CHAIRMAN. I do not want to force you to answer if it embarrasses you, Mr. Foster.

"Mr. FOSTER. It does not embarrass me at all. I stated very clearly that the Red flag is the flag of the revolutionary class and we are part of the revolutionary class • • • and all capitalist flags are flags of the capitalist class and we owe no allegiance to any of them."

If that is not clear and explicit language, saying that Communists do not owe any allegiance to the American flag, but to the Red flag which is also the flag of the Soviet Union, then I don't know the meaning of language.

I want to drive this point home about the fundamental loyalties of Communists, living outside the Soviet Union, to some other country than their own native or adopted lands. I wish to call another witness. This time it is Benjamin Gitlow, one of the original organizers of the Communist Party in this country. He was general secretary of the party and a candidate for Vice President of the United States on the Communist ticket. He was finally kicked out of the party for a deviation from the Moscow line. In September of 1939, he testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee. One of the questions directed at him was this one by Congressman Casey: "I'm very much interested in your statement that Russia is the fatherland of all Communists. Does that mean that Communists in America owe a higher allegiance to Russia than they do to this country?"

And Banjamin Gitlow, one of the founders of the party here and its general secretary for a number of years, answered in two words: "Of course."

Later he said: "A Communist has only one loyalty and that is to the party and that applies to every service in which he is engaged."

And here is another witness, Louis Budenz, a former party member and so high in the councils of that party that he was editor of the Daily Worker.

Chairman THOMAS asked this question: "If there should be a war today, or at some time in the future, between the United States and Russia, the Communist leaders in this country would have their loyalty with Russia. Is not that true?"

"Mr. BUDENZ. Most decidedly. That is their only loyalty and, as I say, the proof of it is • • • their own change of line, in accordance with the wish of Russia; their praise of the Soviet leadership, even after the dissolution of the Communist International; their judgment of leaders in America on the basis of their friendship or subservience to Soviet Government desires. I cannot take up all the time confirming this, but it can be found, by examination of every Communist resolution, every Communist public meeting, and every Communist publication. • • • Have you ever seen a Communist publication that found even one fault in Josef Stalin? He cannot make any mistakes. Yet the American leaders are shuttled back and forth in the Communist press, browbeaten, even called abusive terms. The Communists slander, lie, and are abusive to these Americans because these men expressed some criticism of Soviet objectives. But can Stalin be attacked in that press? They cannot even find one small fault to speak of, or discuss any weakness of his in the course of his long career. He is without any defect, says the Communist press, in effect."

I think I've given you enough testimony to document the idea that the Communists in this country consider they do not owe loyalty to this country, but that their only loyalty is to the Soviet Union. The resolutions of the Comintern demand this loyalty even to the point of demanding that Communists be traitors, in time of war, to their own country.

I don't suppose I have to argue the point that one owes loyalty to one's own country. If that isn't a basic proposition, I don't know any more basic. And yet there are many who enjoy all the advantages of life in this country, who have such a twist in their mental and emotional make-ups that they readily adhere to some other country—they scorn the toast of Stephen Decatur: "My country—right or wrong." They call that national chauvinism. Maybe it is, but it is a much better toast, I submit, than the toast: "The Soviet Union—always right—my own country, always wrong," and that is the way the American Communists feel about it.

The Rent-Control Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from a very good friend of mine, Mr. Robert W. Prescott, who, I judge, disagrees with me on the question of rent control, together with an enclosure setting forth the position of the Eugene (Oreg.) Real Estate Board in regard to rent control, and a copy of my telegram in reply. As I say to Mr. Prescott in my telegram, it is such reasoned documents which are helpful to one in my position attempting to judge the merits of such an issue. I appreciate such documents as this, although, in connection with this subject, I may not reach the same conclusions as those reached by the Eugene Real Estate Board.

There being no objection, the letter, together with the enclosure and the telegram in reply, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUGENE, OREG., *February 14, 1948.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE.

DEAR WAYNE: Yesterday there was forwarded to you, from our local Realtor's Association, an analysis of the rent control problem, under my signature as the chairman of the housing committee; and I did not get to convey to you and to Mrs. Morse and your little daughters the personal esteem and best wishes of the Prescott family, always held for you and yours.

You have a most trying job, and I do not envy you. There is always the question of appeasing this group or that. Unless a legislator finds the truth concerning a particular subject of legislation, it would seem to me that he must move from one untenable position to another. Our economy is now so complicated, the divisions of it are so numerous and wide and interrelated that the very legislative minds, surely, can only find themselves scratching the surface of that knowledge necessary for wise and just and salutary laws. Without the help of the man who has been there, the man who knows, the best of legislators, in an era where society tries to handle all problems with another law and another bureau, cannot help but make serious blunders, most costly to the free and lighted world. In this particular age, our Congress, it does seem to me, under the great Constitution which Americans enjoy, almost if not quite, holds in its hands the destinies of the children of men.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. PRESCOTT.

At: Eugene, Oreg.
Date: Lincoln's Birthday, 1948.
By: The Eugene Real Estate Board.
To: The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE, Senator from Oregon, United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congress will shortly be called upon to modify, to extend, or to terminate the Federal Rent Control Act.

Many Congressmen, with their ears to the ground, will be sorely tempted to make a political decision in the matter, a decision of pure expediency because they fear to alienate the vote of tenant constituency. Other Congressmen will earnestly seek to make a socially scientific decision, a decision in line with constitutional rights, with equity and justice and perpetuative of the free world.

The hope for a scientific and just decision rests largely with Senators and Representatives from agricultural and from less industrialized communities. Such representatives are much less apt to be seduced from statesmanship by mob action and the pressures for expediency.

It is with this thought in mind that you are now approached by an occupational group whose daily labor and life work puts the group very close to the particular problem and qualifies it probably better than any other group for observation and reporting on just how the Rent Control Act is working. This group is the realtor group.

The realtor group is a politically nonpartisan group, most of the individual members being old and new Republicans and Democrats. The realtor association is a national association made up of hundreds of locals and of individuals pledged to a very high code of service and of ethics. A realty broker or salesman has to earn his right to the name "Realtor." It is a proud name and deservedly so.

The realtor believes in home ownership. A very heavy proportion of brokers and salesmen do own their own homes. They all have the purpose to achieve that end. They, therefore, do not belong to the tenant group.

On the other hand, few realtors belong to the landlord class. Until all citizens shall own their own homes, landlords are a necessity and will be a vital section of the national economy. But realtors, being close to the facts of tenantry and landlordism, are too smart to fly in the face of their own experience, which has taught them that landlords, as a group, no matter how fair and worthy they may be, nevertheless, are the subjects of envy, of suspicion, and hatred; and since the advent of rent controls, for 30 years in Europe and for a much shorter period in the United States, realtors see also that the very vital segment of the economy, rental housing, has been singled out by the Congress and by the administration for discriminatory and harassing and punitive treatment.

Again the attitude of realtors toward rental-control problems is not affected, one way or the other, by the amount of money to be made or lost either with or without rent control. With or without controls, a realtor would starve to death from commissions made on renting houses and apartments alone. Service in this branch of the industry is largely a courtesy and good-will service.

As a matter of fact, if the realtor's opinion of the Rent Control Act were determined by his financial interest in the subject matter, then he would be as highly prejudiced for the continuation of rent controls as is the tenant group itself. For the realtor has made infinitely more money than ever before from the sales of what normally, and without rent controls, would be and would remain purely rental property. A very large proportion of normal rental units has been removed from that category through the sale of the property at the request of despairing owners.

Thus the realtor, qualified by contacts and profession, and interested unselfishly, and often to his detriment, in the termination of rent controls, is in such a position that his voice should be officially and clearly lifted that the great free community of which he is a part may be guided to a wise decision.

The Federal Rent Control Act has been tried and has been found wanting everywhere; North, East, South, and West. To state the indictment of the Rent Act by the realtor group in a nutshell would be to brand the act as un-American because it is discriminatory and unjust, confiscatory, a theft, demagogy; an act which is dispossessing the whole tenant group; an act which is a spreader of slums; an act which if not terminated soon can only result in rents which either hit the sky or puts the Government into the housing business up to its ears, and finally, an act which is the entering wedge for the police state.

Let us look at the counts separately.

1. The Rent Control Act is a flagrant act of discrimination since, out of a free economy—which is an organically whole and indivisible thing—one branch of that economy alone is singled out for arbitrary and punitive treatment. These regulations are administered, in the final analysis, by distant political mercenaries and their stenographers, anxious to hold and to perpetuate their jobs and to maintain their particular power boss in office. But, irrespective of the wisdom or the motive of administrators, the fact remains that the property of a single economic group is taken and distributed arbitrarily amongst another social group, rich and poor alike, irrespective of affluence or of need.

2. The Rent Control Act is bitterly unjust because it does take the savings, chiefly of old-age groups who have been provident and have built up a social security of their own, and in the highest tradition of self-government and of the free world. The Rent

Control Act does take those savings, including provisions against the misfortunes attendant upon age, and it does distribute those savings indiscriminately hither and yon, cynically, ruthlessly, and designedly in the hope of political support.

3. The Rent Control Act is an act of confiscation and of theft. The act purports to manage. But housing units alone in the economy are compelled to try to operate with taxes doubled and with materials, supplies, and labor costs doubled and sometimes tripled. When Government is the perpetrator the act is euphoniously called confiscation. When an individual perpetrates a wrong then the Government prosecutes the tort under its proper classification.

4. The Rent Control Act takes its place by the side of the infamous shake-downs in vice-ridden communities by criminal gangs. As a price for not being "taken for a ride," the gang levies a weekly or monthly tribute. Under rent control the Government makes the shake-down, distributing the proceeds amongst those who, it expects, will bolster and support the perpetrators of the act.

Let us remember that the Rent Control Act is not a tax; the proceeds do not go into the Public Treasury to be paid out in an orderly and legal way for the maintenance of government.

To compel arbitrary contributions from a solitary branch of the economy in support of a social group, either because government is afraid and seeks to appease voters or because government is venal and cares not about its degradation, is not less infamous because the act is perpetuated under the aegis of government. Here is arbitrary power in the raw.

5. The Rent Control Act is an excuse for and breeder of demaggey, both the evidence and the source of a universal moral breakdown, and, if not terminated, the certain road to political degeneracy and chaos.

The Rent Control Act is alien to the spirit and to the governmental machinery of the free world, which is an indivisible thing. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of the right to assemble and petition against grievance, the right to vote, and the right of free industry, agriculture, commerce, and the right to work, anywhere, all are part and parcel of the free world as distinguished from the slave world. The right to earn, to save, to be secure from private and public gangs, and to live and die without arbitrary molestations is, inherently, a part of that same free world. The free world is the moral world. The Rent Control Act is a part of the slave and the immoral world. The act sets neighbor against neighbor; it breeds envy, suspicion, fear, and distrust. It sets group against group and hastens the cleavage between classes. In time of peace, when all other branches of the economy are returned to freedoms, it can only create an atmosphere wherein political racketeers in government will flourish and thrive.

6. The act is slowly and surely driving the tenant group into the street. Owners of rental housing see their property taken without compensation. It is a natural defense that they should put rental property upon the market for outright sale. A great number of normally rental units have been sold. The process of disposal is not abated by the sops thrown out by Congress to remove ceilings from new construction.

Any rental-control act, in a free economy, is not only a gun aimed at the heads of landlords and would-be landlords, but also the act aims at the tenant group itself; for the supply of rental units is steadily diminishing.

How can a vital branch of the national economy thrive and the supply be increased when the Government has proclaimed an open season on those from whom it must get and perpetuate the supply? But the question itself reveals the stupidity of the Rent Control Act.

7. The Rent Control Act, unless terminated speedily and convincingly, is bound to make a Nation of nomads and slum dwellers. The notable and convincing instance of what happens under prolonged rent controls is found in France, where rent controls have operated for 30 years. In France the housing industry has long since been dead. Property instincts are all but dead. Tenants own the property but pay no taxes nor will they keep the properties in repair. The mob is content to live in squalor, and government is frightened of the mob. How soon by temporizing will our Congress hasten and bring that condition to our America? Or will it now terminate the threat?

Mr. Senator, in view of these truths, which so far as we know, are here for the first time assembled and set down for your consideration, by Republicans and Democrats, men and women, young and old, whose occupation makes them scientific experts in this particular branch of the national economy, how—in the face of these truths—can you, or any of your colleagues, temporize further with an act and a policy so foreign, so alien, so hostile, so destructive of the American way as is the Rent Control Act?

Now, Senator, sir, you and all Senators were never so challenged to show your colors.

This challenge is not a challenge by your detractors; nor by your constituents; nor by your supporters. It is a challenge by the truth, and it is made to your common sense and to the spirit that moves you and to your hope to perpetuate for your own children and to the children of your friends and neighbors in this great expanding community that heritage which has been and still is the hope and the blessing of free and enlightened men and women.

Respectfully yours.

EUGENE REAL ESTATE BOARD,
By COMMITTEE ON HOUSING,
ROBERT W. PRESCOTT, *Chairman*.

FEBRUARY 18, 1948.

ROBERT W. PRESCOTT,
Realtor, Eugene, Oreg.:

Deeply appreciative your February 14 letter. It is such material as you have sent me which is most helpful to anyone sincerely trying to think through rent-control problem as I am. I'm not only going to call attention of Cain committee to your analysis of rent-control problem, but also going to insert it in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so all Members of Senate will have chance to read it. My present thinking on subject is that some form of rent control is needed for a while longer. Certainly legality of such control was well buttressed by unanimous decision of United States Supreme Court the other day. However, I believe most people are thinking entirely in terms of tenants' economic interests without any, or at least with little, thought being given to economic rights of property owners to fair return. Regards.

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.

Congress and the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Congress and the Republican Party, delivered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] before the Hennepin County Republican Committee at Minneapolis, Minn., February 11 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few days ago as I was looking forward to coming back among old friends in Minnesota I began to think of some of the men in whom we have recently placed your high public trust. Governor Youngdahl, Senator THYE, Governor Stassen, Senator BALL—all men big in body, big in mind, big in a strength and courage of conviction. Other States have great national figures, but perhaps none has in high office, or aspiring to high office, four young men who better represent in their high attainments, the traditions and the hopes and the beliefs and the fine open-heartedness we picture when we think of Americans.

Tonight, we again honor Abraham Lincoln, a great man, a great Republican—a great American. We can apply to Abraham Lincoln the very words he himself applied to Washington when he said, "* * * Washington is the mightiest name of earth—long since mightiest in the cause of civil liberty, still mightiest in moral reformation. On that name no eulogy is expected. It cannot be. To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Washington is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe pronounce the name, and in its naked deathless splendor leave it shining on." He has been known down through the years as a man of the people. In a deeper sense, we revere his memory because he was the people.

There is not one among us tonight who does not know the life of Lincoln. May this country always hold its heritage in such high regard that there will never be one among our children who will not be inspired by the life of Abrahnm Lincoln.

We, as Republicans, might, rather than review the sometimes sad, sometimes amusing, sometimes dramatic tales of Lincoln, consider instead whether our pattern of living and our pattern of party principles is such that it still reflects the thoughts and the hopes and the dreams that have made the name of Lincoln a synonym for freedom.

Abraham Lincoln was not restricted by party dogmas. He was not bound by party traditions. Lincoln shaped the principles and established the traditions of his party. It is well for us, to remember, as Republicans, that we, too, must build and progress and advance.

In any Lincoln Day observance it is customary to quote at length from the wise words of Lincoln. To some degree that has brought an overemphasis on the words of Lincoln. He was more than a man of words. He was a man of far-seeing vision and a man of vigorous action. He was not a man who chose to watch the Union fail so long as he had the strength to save it.

The Republican Party today stands at the doorway of a bright and hopeful future. We can make that future great, for we can apply the vigor of Lincoln's principles to our own problems.

The future is too challenging in this age to waste time or tears on the past. There may be some among us who, embittered by party failures of years gone by, say "No" to all proposals not their own—and then lack their own. Those who fall into such a position of negativist thinking are allowing their thoughts to be controlled by the political opposition.

The function of the political party in this Republic is to compete for the favor of a majority by advancing plans of hope and then providing proof of the soundness of the plans. Your great Minnesota football teams never won a game in which they didn't carry the ball.

There is no point in denying certain facts of our political life. For one reason or another, and probably to some large degree because of the accident of the times, we were defeated as a majority party 16 years ago. During those 16 years a new generation has grown up. New ideas, new circumstances have developed. During that time a heavy majority of the people voted for the other party largely because they thought it offered a better life and a better hope. We had become tired. Our thinking was out of tune with the majority. By 1946 the other party was weary and confused and old. That was our opportunity to provide a new party with constructive ideas and new faces and a bright future. That was the time to divorce ourselves from the past and provide a political home for the youth and the independent voters of the Nation.

We must be a party of youth. To deserve the support of youth we must be a party led by the ideas of youth—a new party challenging the future, not dreaming of the past. To believe that one day an adoring multitude will fall on its knees to give thanks for our platform of 1932 is to delude ourselves into oblivion.

We cannot allow ourselves to be held down by counsel that brings defeat. The youthful, the vigorous, the positive, progressive thinking Republicans have won the right to replace stubborn methods doomed to defeat; for we have an understanding program—a program of the people—which has in it the seed of victory.

The responsibility of a majority position further obligates us to think less of who is to blame for what, and more, of where we are going from here. When threatening problems hover over us, no timid hiding, no loud denials of their existence will make them any less real. Nor will shirking or false prophesies deserve any full confidence in our ability to conquer those threats.

We are facing, today, two great problems. It is the extent of our efforts to solve those problems that will bring to our new Republican Party success next year, or return an old party to the dreary depths of minority from which it has so recently come. The issues before us, today, sound simple because they concern simple, commonplace ideas—high prices and reconstruction. But they are not simple. In one is involved all the complexities of our national economic structure. In the other is involved the future of peace in this world. Each is dependent on the other. Their solutions are thus interdependent.

To both problems, we can well apply those words of Lincoln: "The dogmas of the past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise to the occasion. As our case is new, we must think anew and act anew."

No one in Lincoln's day would have dared to guess that within a century the United States of America would rise to a position in the world so commanding that our efforts alone might make or break the peace. No man would have guessed then, or perhaps would have guessed at any time in history, that democracy among free men banded together in a peaceful republic would be so successful as to reach a pinnacle of world success never attained by the force of all the aggressive military rulers in history. We find ourselves, today, in that position almost without knowing how we got there, without consciously caring to be there. Nevertheless, whether by design or accident, when a high position is achieved, it brings with it, as part of its price, a responsibility. The responsibility is not a Democratic one or a Republican one, it is an American responsibility.

National unity, in a bipartisan effort for a common good, does not call for the sacrifice of party affiliation or the loss of party integrity. It rather unites us to improve our chance of achieving the goal of security which is the self-evident hope of all Americans. We must, and we shall, bring ourselves to the positive position of setting before our people our own plans, our own programs, to which others may say "No" if they wish. Surely there are yet today some hopes, some ideals, and some beliefs that are above a party discipline. That does not mean that we can accept without question, or that we should regiment our thinking. It means, rather, that we should urge ourselves to propose and create and to select wisely between the good and the bad. In such matters which are too vast for mischief, let us not be blinded or diverted by the positions of others. Let us, rather, seek honestly and openly and thoughtfully to choose the way we shall go.

We must not exhibit a passive acceptance of the principles advanced by others, nor offer only dark warnings of failure. We must take a leadership in providing workable machinery for peace.

In the conduct of our relations with other nations, we have before us three broad paths, the safety of none of which we know now. We have the path labeled "isolation" which leads us toward a vast, costly, well-manned fort within which we might hope to guard our wealth from the inevitable onslaughts led by greed, poverty, and envy.

We have another choice labeled "appeasement," which leads us by a "round about" route toward the same fort of defense.

We have still another path labeled "international cooperation."

Even before technological advances made up a next-door neighbor in a small community of nations, isolationism had failed. Isolationism proved unworkable while this young nation was still in its teens. It is possible that we could develop within our own borders defenses so strong and walls so high that we might smugly think our land safe from the inevitable war of aggression, but in resigning ourselves to that conclusion, we are admitting that we will surely come, and are exchanging a few years of uneasy prosperity and frenzied preparation for a war which would be fought with horrible destruction in our own streets.

The appeasement path is well worn. The early British kings walked that path. Our own forefathers walked that path. Each time it brought them inevitably into conflict on a less desirable field of battle than that upon which they stood before they set out. Surely we cannot again believe that the appetite of a greedy aggressor is satisfied before he is stopped by force.

The third path is a new one overgrown by a jungle of difficulties. Whether that path leads toward peace and security, we cannot fully see. We do know that the other ways are costly and will surely bring war one day to our own homes. So however difficult—however long—that path may seem, so long as there is some hope, some chance that it avoids the horrible pitfalls of war, it is the path we should and we must follow.

We will not achieve peace, nor will we accomplish world cooperation, over night. The history of conflict, national jealousies, and human greed is too long; but we must, for the sake of humanity, try again to reach peace, this time by a new path.

We hear some criticism of the Republican position on foreign affairs (or at least the position of the Republican leadership on foreign affairs, as exemplified by ARTHUR VANDENBERG in the Senate, and Harold Stassen in the public forum) to the effect that it is a "me too" position. It is far from that.

When the history of this era is written and the documents of this age, and the lives of the men who shaped and wrote them, have been studied, and critically analyzed, it will be demonstrated beyond any doubt, that Republicans have made the greatest contribution to the evolvement of a sound foreign policy. The Democratic leadership have had nothing more to offer than the pattern of the years of depression and the application of that pattern to the reconstruction of a wartorn economy in Europe. That pattern was a continuation of doles—a pouring out of money. That pattern was pursued for more than 2 years after VE-day. That pattern is very much the pattern which has been applied to Greece. Something more was needed than money. Something more is being evolved today in a committee on foreign policy in both the Senate and the House under Republican leadership and with a Republican majority. I don't want to detract one bit from the great efforts made by General Marshall, nor from the contributions made by Democrats. But I do assert, again, that when this is all added up, examined, and studied in the laboratories of the historians of the future, it will be found that the Republicans rescued the Administration's foreign policy from failure and inaptitude, and have built in its place a constructive, forward-looking, hopeful program. If we have had a bipartisan foreign policy in any sense of the word, it has been because Republicans insisted upon it.

When has a party out of power made such contributions to the evolvement of any policy, foreign or domestic, as has been made by Harold Stassen and Arthur Vandenberg, and John Foster Dulles, Warren Austin, Alex Smith and Cabot Lodge, and Charles Eaton and Christian Herter, Tom Dewey, and others? Can you name men in the party now in power who are equal in influence and ability and number to those that I have just mentioned and who have made an equal contribution? Would the destiny of this Nation in the field of foreign affairs be safe in the hands of this kind of leadership? There can be no question about it.

There is another phase of this thing which I would ask you to look at very carefully. The Administration in Washington would have the country believe that the Marshall plan is the solution to peace. The Marshall plan is a step—and a very important, yes, an indispensable step—in the direction of peace, but it is not a plan for the establishment of peace. No, we have got a long way further to go than that.

Great Republican leaders in our party helped build the United Nations. As a Republican Party, we must now work to make that United Nations effective, and one of the vital steps in the direction of peace is the strengthening of the United Nations Charter. There has been too much tendency on the part of the administration, in its development of a foreign policy, to bypass the United Nations. The Democrats themselves were divided in the Senate last spring when the President deliberately bypassed the United Nations with the so-called Truman doctrine with reference to Greece. That policy has not turned out too well, so you don't hear so much about the Truman doctrine now. It was the Republicans who supported the Vandenberg amendment to the bill, providing aid for Greece and Turkey, that saved the administration a defeat by recognizing the interest and authority of the United Nations. That gesture made by the United States Congress, which was an offer to withdraw our aid at the request of a simple majority in the assembly of the United Nations—that gesture was the finest gesture of confidence in the United Nations that has yet been made.

Therefore, consistent with our policy, it must be part of our program to strengthen the United Nations as the instrument to effectuate world peace. In order that we might outlaw wars of aggression in this world, the United Nations must become a federation instead of a confederation, an organization in which so far as aggression is concerned, the veto power has no effect. If

Russia and her satellite nations do not wish to become part of an organization that has this as its policy, then let them stay out. We can extend an invitation and we can keep that invitation always open. But we cannot afford to be stalemated in our program for peace by the obstinacy or obstructionist tactics or the selfish purpose of one nation alone. Then, too, as a Republican Party, we can continue to press for those measures which prevent armament for aggression, and for the establishment of an international force of some kind in which all of the nations in the federation to prevent war are joined.

These are steps that go along with—yes, go beyond the Marshall plan—in building our program for world security. The great Republican Party leaders in the past were early in this field in which we now, as Republicans, must earnestly and intelligently labor. By doing so, we will be doing no more than keeping faith with our Republican traditions and Republican policies in foreign affairs that have been handed down to us from the past.

There is one further point of extreme urgency that the Administration has either overlooked or seems loath to consider at all. That extreme urgency is in taking the leadership in backing up, in every way possible, the decisions that have already been made in the United Nations. The United Nations Charter sets up no executive. It makes no provision for the enforcement of its decisions. Obviously, it was the intention of those who drafted it and those who became signatory to it, in all good faith, that the member nations would take care of the execution of its decisions. We must be prepared—as a Nation—to accept fully our share of that responsibility.

The League of Nations was criticized, and properly so, as being a mere debating society. We cannot let the United Nations repeat that mistake and thus become another factor for turning idle resolutions. The times call for something more than for puny policies and puny politicians. They call for positive action and high statesmanship.

Perhaps the European recovery plan was put forward by someone else, but when one considers the changes in our policy and the tremendous contributions made by Governor Stassen, Senator VANDENBERG, and other Republicans, there is little doubt that a blood test of the plan would soon prove its parentage.

So far as the cost is concerned, it is indeed expensive. But the cost of defenses that would have to be built as a result of our abandonment of Europe or the cost of even a few days of a modern destructive war, would make the billions spent on this program seem insignificant indeed, by comparison. The nations of Europe may be quarrelsome and may not properly appreciate our efforts, but it should be our purpose to take away a part of the reason for quarrel, and it should be our purpose to demonstrate to them that there is a way to peace and prosperity through the establishment of free institutions in free governments.

This is no wasteful, extravagant, purposeless effort. It should, and must, be a carefully calculated and efficiently carried out plan of self-protection. The very fact that we have succeeded in getting 16 European nations to agree among themselves to lower the barriers existing for so long between them and agree among themselves to share the resources and the wealth of their own nations, is in itself a long step toward international understanding.

I would say again, that the cost and the effort that must be put into this plan is not attractive to any American. There is no guaranty of success. But in the absence of any alternative offered by those who criticize it most, I see no other way.

At home, too, we are faced with difficult circumstances. Our people are harassed and worried by a threatening inflation. Prices of consumer necessities have reached a point where it is most difficult for millions of our people to adequately feed and clothe their families. There are those who would choose to deal with this threatening problem by ignoring it.

We are, today, in the midst of a dangerous economic spiral. The cost of food is in itself taking from our family budgets such a large share that our people's capacity to buy other commodities is falling off rapidly. If demand for other commodities is reduced, production must soon be reduced. Unemployment and less demand, and more unemployment, will rapidly spin us to the bottom of a depression.

Again, we cannot exhibit a negative thinking that does not contribute to a solution. We cannot piously hope that the "sun will melt" this inflation. We offered, in the Congress, even before the President did, certain constructive and far-reaching proposals—which would, I believe, with a little sacrifice on the part of all, stop the dangerous trend. It is only a fair warning that if we do not take more active, more concrete, and more effective steps in the direction of solving an inflationary trend, those of us who dislike rationing, price controls, wage controls most, may force these harsh controls on ourselves. The Congress cannot wave any magic legislative wand that will suddenly bring about 1933 prices. Lower prices will come only if the public, the administration, and the Congress see the danger clearly enough to join in bringing prices down. There are many other fields in which there is much to be accomplished.

After 15 years, and after the applied efforts of 34 Government agencies, we still have, in this country, a most severe housing shortage. It should be a challenge to the Republican Party to develop a sound and coordinated program designed to end the shortage which all the agencies and all the dollars of the New Deal could not alleviate.

We still have inadequate education and health programs in many parts of this country. It should be a challenge to the Republican Party to propose and carry out programs that would bring improved health and improved education to the children of America.

We still have, in this country, vast resources which through the development of reclamation and antierosion projects, could add tremendously to our productive capacity. It should be a challenge to the Republican Party to develop a program to harness and save more of the potential wealth of our land.

We have, in America, a vast industrial machine, the wheels of which are frequently stopped by friction between labor and management. While we approach other problems in production with modern, intricate, scientific tools, we still approach this problem of the human factor with a stone hammer. It should be a challenge to the Republican Party not to return to the days of 1930, or the days of 1900, but to develop a modern, progressive, sound, labor-management program that would deal with conditions as they are today, granting true rights and freedoms and prosperity to laboring men working under a profitable system of free enterprise.

We have, today, in America, threats to our civil liberties, and threats to the rights of minorities.

When all about us, men are using the guaranties of liberty which we cherish in attempts to bring upon us a system that has in it no regard for liberty, we must act carefully and wisely so that we do not destroy our own liberties by denying the expression of views to others only because they are not our own. Despotism by whatever name it is called, is the same the world over. Whether the loss of individual rights and political freedom come from the tyranny of kings, dictators, a ruling class, or a political machine, the selfish purpose is the same and the result is identical. It should be a challenge to Republicans to make sure that we have no despotism here.

For more than a decade we have borrowed on the future to pay for the reckless spending of the present. It should be a challenge to the Republican Party to prove we can serve the interests of our people and yet put their business back on its feet.

We have seen taxes mount higher each year. It should be a challenge to Republicans to be able to announce, "This year, for the first time you can now recall your tax bill is less than last year. You are now only paying for the service you bought."

It should be a challenge to the Republican Party to meet and defeat the stifling spread of the "weed" bureaucracy.

Perhaps we can't meet the ever-extending fine promises of the tired, confused administration; but a progressive, active, Republican administration can build houses instead of housing agencies; offer more service instead of more servants; and create sound, consistent Government instead of promising "all this and heaven too" to all people.

To one who supports the present administration, it must indeed be confusing to know whether he should believe in price relief through price control or believe that is the method of a police state; whether he should follow the southern or the northern line on antipoll tax and antilynching legislation; whether he should be opposed to tax reduction every year or only in nonelection years; whether he should castigate all speculators on grain markets or be one of them; whether he should hunt for Communists under the bed or hide them there; and which of the last two Vice Presidents he should believe on the subject of Russia. Perhaps we can't, as Republicans, bring that many divergent viewpoints together in a common cause of keeping command of the public trough, but neither do we suppose that even some of the American people will be fooled all of the time.

There are, in America, today, millions of young people who have grown up in depression and matured in war. They are not the radicals of a third party, nor are they the ultra conservatives clinging to the dogmas of the past. They are the young men and the young women who truly believe that Lincoln was, as he said, "a living witness that any one of your children may look to come to the White House, as my father's child has. It is in order that each one of you may have, through this free Government which we have enjoyed, an open field and a fair chance that the struggle should be maintained that we may not lose our birthright."

It is to these millions of Americans who love liberty and freedom and an equal chance for all men that the Republican Party offers an exciting and profitable future in taking upon itself the ideas of today—new progressive plans and programs—new faces and new goals visualized by the progressive leaders we have in our ranks.

The Republican Party cannot represent, or be thought to represent, any special interests save the interests of the whole people. We cannot have poverty here and defeat poverty abroad. We cannot see freedom lost in the world and keep our freedom here. If we are to hand to our children the heritage that Lincoln helped build for us, we must in some things be above petty disagreements of party politics, and, in others, provide, through our party, the strong, bold, and progressive leadership that can deal successfully with the new problems and the new conditions that a changing world has brought us. Above all else we must be the builders of peace, the builders of prosperity, the builders of one free world.

You have here in the rich rolling lands of Minnesota the spirit of progress, the broad vision, and the youthful, challenging ideas that will help to bring the Republican Party to a new and deserved victory in 1948. Abraham Lincoln came from obscurity to prove our belief in the rights and the dignity of man. He brought with him a hope for unifying the energies and the ideas that had split this still new Nation. The Republican Party will bring a hope for bridging the rifts that now separate the peoples of the world and threaten the peace. The Republican Party will advance the hopes of all peoples that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

The Man Who Got Rich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, older Members of the House recall former Representative Samuel B. Pettengill, of Indiana, with keen pleasure. Mr. Pettengill's service in this body was characterized by unusual industry and integrity. While a Democrat in politics, he at all times placed his country first so whenever he had anything to say he was always listened to with attention.

Mr. Pettengill voluntarily retired from Congress and now devotes himself entirely to spreading the doctrine of Americanism. Under the title "The Gentleman From Indiana" he issues press releases from time to time that are real nuggets of gold. Particularly good was his release of November 18 last, and now that the Marshall plan is before Congress what he then said is most timely. Under the title "The Man Who Got Rich" Mr. Pettengill's release follows:

THE MAN WHO GOT RICH

This is the story of a man who got rich giving his money away. Of course, you will want to know how he did it.

He was a kind-hearted, soft-headed, old chap who ran a little grocery store down by the Harry Hopkins High School in Nuttown. Sometimes he did pretty good, and then, again, not so good. So he got to thinking and thinking. Morning and night the boys and gals tramped by his store on their way to school. But they didn't buy anything much. So he asked them, how come? and they said "We suffer from a dollar shortage."

Well, right then the big idea was born. Uncle Sam (for that was what we called him) went to the People's Bank of Nuttown and borrowed a hundred bucks, in $1 bills, all crisp and crinkly-like. He gave a dollar to each of the first hundred school kids who went by. But he made them solemly promise that they'd spend the dollars in his store. They all promised.

Well, sales boomed all day. Uncle Sam never had so much business and was pleased as all get-out. Come night, he showed his wife his cash box jammed full of those dollar bills and bragged about his brains no end. He sure was tickeld with himself. He said he planned to do it that way every day. And so he did. Of course he ran up some big bills with his wholesalers because the school kids kept getting his money, and not them. Howsomever, he settled up with them by signing a flock of I O U's.

Well, Uncle Sam passed his grocery store plan on to President Truman, and Harry was pleased as punch with it. Harry had run a store once himself and hadn't done so well. But back there, he hadn't known how to do it—how to get rich by giving his dollars away.

So Harry called in his advisers, Marshall and Krug and Harriman, and told them how Uncle Sam had filled his store with customers. They all said, "Wonderful!" and bounced right back with a plan. It got to be known as the Marshall plan, but betwixt you and me, it was the grocery-store plan, but on a world scale. It was going to make all poor people rich by never letting them suffer from a "dollar shortage," and it was going to make us rich, perpetual-like, by having no end of customers with dollars to buy at our store.

Congress asked a lot of fool questions, so they had to start the Marshall "grocery store" plan on a small scale—with only $19,000,000,000. But we made our foreign friends promise to buy at our store. They promised.

So the ships left New York loaded with 19,000,000,000 dollar bills. And when they got to Southampton and Cherbourg, they turned plumb around and brought the dollars right back, same as the school kids, with orders for iron ore and coal and petroleum and boxcars and lumber and meat and butter and everything. And boy, how the plan did work.

We felt so good that we expanded the plan 10 times over for the Chinese and East Indians and Hottentots—one billion folks, in all—who were so much worse off than the Europeans that they could help us get rich by just no end, buying at our store.

And that is how we went on the biggest binge in history. It was just like Thanksgiving the year round. Everybody got so much turkey and I O U's that they almost choked.

Address by Robert P. Boylan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission granted me, I am very pleased to include in my remarks a speech made recently by Mr. Robert P. Boylan, chairman of the New York Stock Exchange, before a joint meeting of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce and the Association of Stock Exchange Firms on February 13, 1948.

Mr. Boylan in his remarks points out the necessity for a free and open market in commodities, as well as securities, and I commend his remarks to my colleagues for their consideration. He speaks with authority and, as I myself have been active in security markets for a great many years during my life, I know he speaks accurately and very much to the point. I am glad to see the progressive and sound management under which the New York Stock Exchange is operating as represented by men like Mr. Boylan.

The address follows:

It is a very happy experience for me to be here in your great Capital City which is surrounded with so many fine American traditions. I am pleased for many reasons. One of them is that, in this community, you have such a high devotion to our free institutions. I would not go so far as to say that this makes you greatly different from other important communities in our country, except in the sense that you have typified, for a long time, our respect for the kind of enterprises about which I am going to talk.

You will, I believe, have a special interest in the subject which I shall discuss with you. I am referring to one of the great free institutions in which you, because of your tremendous capital investments, have a vital interest— our free markets. Your continued progress, as well as that of other industrial centers, requires a full recognition of the fact that our institutions have to be maintained constructively if the process of creating wealth and culture is to go on.

It is not generally appreciated that our capital markets are threatened by an insidious encroachment upon them. Now, I believe that our people would become angrily excited if they thought that our other free institutions were in danger. But freedom of expression, freedom of worship, equality of justice, and all of the other great privileges granted under our Constitution and Bill of Rights are no less important than the liberty to bargain and to do business honorably within the limits, of course, that necessarily guard good conduct. Without recognizing the fact, we have permitted, in this country, an unnatural development which endangers our free markets. This danger is serious and it must be removed. It can be removed only by an aroused public opinion.

It is necessary that the campaign which certain elements have set in motion to discredit our free markets be stopped. Unfortunately, the essential necessity of these markets is not sufficiently understood. Uninformed people in our national community have constantly attempted and are still attempting to make scape-goats of these markets. I am not, for a moment, defending the occasional evils which occur under our free market system. Human beings, fallible as they always are, sometimes misuse the facilities of our markets, whether they be commodity markets or security markets.

Where the public has access to our free markets, as the public should have, there are episodes at times which do serious damage. In spite of our utmost effort to see that these activities do not occur, they do occur. Our responsibility is to continue our efforts to prevent abuses. We must be continuingly vigilant in this direction.

We must not allow the conduct of a few irresponsible individuals to destroy what is vital and valuable to our society in the system of free markets.

We either believe in free markets, or we do not believe in them. The attention of the American people needs to be focused upon the necessity of these markets as fundamental American institutions. It is our personal responsibility to see to it that thoughtless and hostile individuals do not reduce the efficiency of these markets. There is, I assure you, no thought in what I am saying of reflecting upon the excellent agency which regulates our particular market. My purpose, rather, is to awaken our people to the fact that free markets go to the very heart of our American system and that, without them, this system will decay.

I shall discuss, for a moment, the operations of these markets. I have been a member of the Chicago Board of Trade and of the New York Stock Exchange for many years. I had the honor of serving as president of the board of trade and I now have the honor of being chairman of the board of governors of the New York Stock Exchange. I say this not immodestly but for the purpose of illustrating the fact that I think I can speak with a considerable breadth of experience. I do not appear as an apologist for these markets. No apology is necessary. Markets are conducted for the service and benefit of our people and they have no other justification for their existence. They may seem

complex, but, as a matter of fact, their operation is very simple.

There is an impression, which is entirely understandable, that markets are made among buyers and sellers on a spontaneous basis. This would be, I dare say, the ideal concept of free markets. It so happens, however, that the orders of buyers and sellers do not come together as evenly as we would like to have them do. The professional, or as I prefer to call him, the risk bearer, steps in when there is an insufficient concentration of orders.

It is fortunate that the necessary services of the risk bearer are not fully recognized. When I speak of risk bearers I include particularly traders and dealer specialists, whose great contribution is in the making of close markets. These professionals supply not only their own capital but intelligence in taking care of the missing links in markets. They do it with great proficiency and at great financial risks, and their rewards, if any, are not large. They have no advantages over the public in their activities.

If you will bear with me, I should like to discuss another highly important factor in our economic life. There has been, particularly over the last 15 years, a deliberate effort to discredit the whole process of speculation. The people who attempt to undermine the business of speculation are either uninformed or they are purposeful enemies of our American way of life. As you all know, it was speculation which made this Nation what it is today. It will be speculation which will make it what it is to be in the future. I stress this fact because it is vital. We shall, of course, need to keep in effect measures to prevent abuses. In preventing abuses we must not go so far in the way of restrictions as to impair the essential usefulness of our markets. I frankly believe that we have already gone too far in some respects.

We cannot live as a free Nation without speculation. That point is overlooked by a great many of our political figures.

Speculation enters into all of our activities in this country. You cannot look out from your offices without seeing speculation going on all around you. It is the essence of our American way of life. Every element of your business operations here in Atlanta depends upon speculation.

One of our greatest and most useful speculators is the American farmer, although we seldom think of him as such. He sows his crop in the fall with the expectation that it will not winter-kill; that the following spring and summer will bring the proper balance of sunshine and rain to produce a crop that can be sold at a profit.

In defending speculation and the speculator, I want to make it clear that I am justifying risk bearing and risk takers, and not the manipulator and manipulation. There is no defense for manipulators. As you know, manipulation is outlawed by acts of Congress and is prohibited by rules of the exchange. Not only are the Securities and Exchange Commission and the exchange vigilant with respect to these laws, but we have the active cooperation of the various State securities commissioners whose duty it is to administer the blue-sky laws.

We cannot lose sight of the fact that it was the expansion, through the use of venture capital, that gave us those enterprises without which we could not have won the war. General Motors, the A. O. Smith Corp., Douglas Aircraft, the Glenn Martin Co., and many other companies developed with the money of risk bearers. It is commonplace information that these companies, including General Electric, Westinghouse Electric, United States Steel, Bethlehem Steel, and others, became large and productive because of the use of the funds of people who were willing to take risks. We cannot permit a trend to set in that will retard the growth and development of valuable and job-providing enterprises in this country. Instead of apologizing for speculation, we should be out proudly encouraging it as a necessary force in the further development of this country. Let us do that with our great resources and powers of expression.

I defend speculation as our fundamental means of improving our standard of living and of creating wealth. Without speculation, we shall inevitably stagnate. We need in this country, above everything else, a dynamic economy. Under no other system can we make progress. A dynamic economy can operate only in a friendly atmosphere. Unfortunately, we do not have today such an atmosphere. I refer to the political climate which will make it possible for business to perform profitably, in terms of the creation of wealth and of the advancement of our cultural life. The impulses that bring about the favorable atmosphere of which I speak must originate with the people. The impact of their opinions will bring corrections.

The basic need today is the removal of incompetent hands from all streams of decent business. This is one of the paramount problems facing us.

We have been tremendously handicapped by unwise tax policies. It is gratifying to observe that measures are being taken to correct this tax situation. I am encouraged to believe that the constructive forces in our National Legislature will carry out a strong program of tax revision. This should not be long delayed.

I hold the sincerest conviction that a reconstruction of our tax structure is urgently necessary if the country is to have further prosperity. I cannot overlook the fact that you have in this State of Georgia a man with great statesmanlike qualities, who not only understands the problems of our free institutions, but who has the courage to express his convictions. I have reference, of course, to your esteemed Senator, WALTER F. GEORGE.

All of us see everywhere evidence of the fact that busy and productive industry is the product of venture capital. We see it particularly here in Atlanta where you have developed so many great enterprises, such as the Coca-Cola Co. I do not know of a better example of the effective use of venture capital than in this particular company. Originated by Mr. Candler, it grew out of speculation. You have many other companies here which developed out of the same incentives. I cannot urge upon you too strongly the necessity for action, tax-wise, which will invigorate our enterprises and make our economy operate successfully and prosperously.

Federal Aid to States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Michigan Survey for February 23, 1948:

FEDERAL AID TO STATES—HOW MUCH DOES IT COST, AND HOW MUCH OF IT DO WE WANT?

Would you like to hire a good man to boss a few jobs around your home?

You know—things like cleaning and decorating, taking care of the yard and garden, watching the children's diet, and seeing that they take their baths?

It happens that the man who wants the job lives several hundred miles away—but what of it?

He knows what needs doing, and just how it ought to be done. He has plenty of experts to help him. And he'll send an inspector around once in a while to see that things are going according to plan.

Just mail him a check every 3 months. He'll pay the bills—minus a commission, of course. Experts and clerical help cost money.

But think of the fun you and your wife will have—not worrying about junior's vitamins, or dirt around the baseboards, or whether the bugs eat up your prize roses.

Federal aid to States works out something like that. At least a major part of it does.

Uncle Sam gets an idea for a project he thinks will be good for the 48 States. Congress votes an appropriation for it. Uncle Sam collects the money in taxes, then allots it to the States to be spent.

The Government makes the rules, and enforces them. It turns the actual bossing over to a commission, or a bureau or a department—and, naturally, the cost of these is paid out of tax money.

UNCLE SAM IS MIDDLEMAN

This whole subject of State aid is worrying a lot of people in a lot of States right now. They are asking pointed questions:

How much is "Federal aid" costing us? Can we afford it? Are all the projects sound, and nationally important? Can the Federal Government handle them better than the States? Are we getting back our fair share of the tax money we pay in to support them?

Let's look at a few facts and figures.

Federal grants-in-aid to the States are not new. They started in 1862, but their total for the first 60 years was only pin money, judged by later standards.

Federal "giving" is really a depression baby and a war baby. It didn't get to be big business until the 1930's. How much fat the baby has put on in the intervening years is shown in a recent study by the National Association of Manufacturers.

According to this study, Federal grant-in-aid expenditures from 1934 through 1946 totaled over $35,000,000,000. Depression emergency programs accounted for about 73 percent of that total—$25,700,000,000. And incidentally, that latter sum is larger than the entire national debt at the end of World War I.

The balance of the $35,000,000,000 grand total includes $2,805,000,000 for State-aid programs started before 1933, $4,200,000,000 for new continuing programs, and $2,300,000,000 for war-emergency programs.

FIGURE IT OUT

While all this was going on, what was happening to Federal taxes and national debt? And how were the States and cities of the country running their own affairs, in terms of debt and taxes?

A comparison between the period 1924-30 (boom years) and the period 1934-40 (pre-war years) is interesting. The figures are from the NAM survey.

From fiscal 1924 to fiscal 1930, the Federal debt was reduced by $6,100,000,000. From 1934 to 1940, it increased $25,000,000,000, in spite of the fact that Federal taxes were nearly $17,000,000,000 higher in the second period than in the first.

By comparison, public debts of the 48 States increased $1,000,000,000 between 1924 and 1930, and increased only $460,000,000 from 1934 to 1940.

In the same first period, local (city) debts throughout the country increased $6,400,000,000, and from 1934 to 1940 decreased $1,000,000,000.

In short, while Federal Government was spending, States and cities were saving; (on paper) but their people were paying heavily, in taxes, for the benefits they received.

Department of Commerce figures give another interesting angle on this Federal-local picture:

They show that Federal taxes, in 1929, were just under 4 percent of the net national product; and in 1947 were nearly 20 percent. In 1929, State and local taxes were 6.8 percent of the national product; in 1947, they dropped to 5.4 percent.

Again, we spend nationally while we save locally.

Federal aid to States hit its peak in 1939, with expenditures totaling slightly over $4,000,000,000 (not including social security payments).

In that same year, be it noted, the Federal Government came out with a deficit of over $3,300,000,000. And in that same year, too, Federal aid to States amounted to more than 24 percent of the cost of all government—national, State, and local.

PATERNALISM VERSUS LOCAL GOVERNMENT

What has been spent is over the dam—except that the bills still have to be paid. What is being spent and what will be spent is of prime interest to the Michigan Survey and the taxpayers for whom it speaks.

Federal expenditures for aid to States have tapered off from their $4,400,000,000 high in 1939 to $1,300,000,000 in 1946—but in that total was $845,000,000 in nonemergency continuing programs.

Budget requests for fiscal 1949 include hundreds of millions for medical insurance, education, housing, urban redevelopment, and other similar programs.

The issue is not Federal spending for projects of national scope and importance, which the States are unable to accomplish without Federal aid.

The issue is between subsidies, paternalism, and absentee supervision on the one hand and State handling of State problems on the other.

States, for example, have neither asked nor received Federal financial support for their public school systems. New York State has a full-fledged public housing program of its own. New Jersey has a State subsidy plan for veterans' housing.

FEDERAL AID COSTS MONEY

History shows, moreover, that a dollar paid in Federal taxes for State aid does not come back as a dollar's worth of benefits. The $35,000,000,000 spent on the States from 1934 to 1946 does not include the cost of maintaining the various bureaus and agencies that run the programs.

Further, the study indicates that 16 States got nearly $6,000,000,000 less in Federal grants from 1934 to 1946 than they paid in taxes earmarked for State aid.

Michigan was one of the 16. Its "loss," according to the study, was about $543,000,000. Michigan could use any part of that right now.

How do the States themselves feel about this question of Federal aid and its future expansion? Many of their representatives are speaking strongly on the subject.

After a recent conference, 80 Members of Congress and governors issued this statement: "Our States must cease relying on the Federal Government to do things for them and their citizens which they can do as well as or better than the Federal Government."

In a speech before the House 4 years ago, Congressman Lanham, of Texas, had this to say:

"The Federal Government has nothing to give to the people except what it takes from the people. * * * In the matter of these so-called grants other than those under constitutional authority, from each dollar that the Federal Government takes from the States, it retains and divides a part of that sum for the establishment or enlargement of some administrative agency, and then returns the remaining part to the States themselves, provided they will spend it in such a way as Federal agents in Washington direct."

INDIANA SPEAKS OUT

In a resolution adopted 3 years ago, the general assembly of Indiana spoke, in part, as follows:

"We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States.

"So we propose henceforward to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves. We are fed up with subsidies, doles, and paternalism. We are no one's stepchild. We serve notice that we will resist Washington, D. C.'s adopting us."

Resolutions of similar tone have been since adopted by the legislatures of Michigan and New Jersey. Key paragraph of the Michigan resolution is this:

"We respectfully petition and urge Michigan Senators and Congressmen in Congress to exert all their efforts in attempting to stop or at least reduce the offering of Federal aid to the several States and Territories."

WHAT CAN BE DONE

The Michigan survey urges the taxpayers of the State, and its governmental representatives, to raise their voices wherever possible in favor of a close, nonpartisan scrutiny of all proposals for Federal aid to States.

Let every grant-in-aid be judged by the answers to three questions:

Is it necessary?

Can we afford it?

Is it a matter of national welfare and interest, or one that the States can and should handle?

Postal Employees Deserve Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an article which appeared in the New York World-Telegram January 27. This article appears to be very timely, since hearings are scheduled to commence Wednesday before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on bills to increase salaries of postal employees.

It is my hope that Members of Congress will express to the committee their support of legislation to increase postal employees' pay. I feel confident that Members of Congress, as well as their constituents, are duly appreciative of the efficient service rendered by the postal employees, and recognize the need for increased compensation to meet the demands of the present cost of living.

The article referred to follows:

MAIL PAY LOW, UNITED STATES FIGURES SHOW

(By Fred W. Perkins)

CLEVELAND, January 27.—The typical post-office clerk is just about the typical white-collar worker with a fixed income.

So says Chan Harbour, vice president of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks. He has worked out some authentic household budgetary figures, according to a witness he produced for an interview. The witness was Clarence Carter, who works in the main Cleveland post office.

The main point proved by his figures, Mr. Harbour said with the backing of Mr. Carter, is that when the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics announced its recent finding on what the head of a four-person city family should make for a modest but adequate scale of living it did not consider what is actually paid by another branch of the Government—the Post Office Department.

COVERED MIDDLE WEST

Mr. Harbour said he did his figuring throughout the Middle West, not in the post offices of Cleveland alone. The average pay of all post office employees is $2,816 a year. But Mr. Carter's basic salary is $2,700. He was chosen because his family includes a wife and two children.

In Cleveland, according to the Bureau, such a family needs $3,296 a year.

Mr. Carter's basic pay is subject to annual tax deductions of $84 and a contribution of $135 to the Federal employees retirement fund. This would be classified later as savings, but it helps reduce his monthly take-home to $206.75. The budgetary figures show he should have household expenses of $282.90—but this would produce amonthly deficit of $76.15.

CUTS ALL CORNERS

How then, did Mr. Carter make out?

"By cutting all the corners," he said. "No telephone, no luxuries of any sort, trading Sunday newspapers and magazines with my neighbors, medical expenses only in cases of real necessity, buying nothing we don't have to buy."

This family's monthly budget is about as follows:

Food, $125, including groceries, $108; milk, $7; and eggs, $10

Rent, $46; plus winter fuel, $6; electricity, $5; gas, $4.40; house supplies, $6.

Clothing, $40; transportation, $9; medical expenses, $9; dental care, $5 hospitalization, $4; benevolences, $2; union dues, $1; furnishings, $5; gifts, $3, recreation, $5; newspapers and magazines, $2.50; life insurance, $5.

Mr. Harbour pointed out that this budget had no mention of educational and vacation expenses, State sales taxes, cleaning of clothes, automobile expenses, and barbershop expenditures for four persons.

Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, food prices are still up. The flurry in the commodity market that some people claim was the beginning of reduction in the prices of things that we eat and wear has not materialized.

The man who works for a living, the school teacher, disabled veterans living on compensation, GI's attending school, and old-age pensioners know the hard way that prices have not come down.

Under date of February 18, 1948, the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune published a story the heading of which was "Food still up in bay region."

I would like permission to read this news article because it hits the nail right on the head:

Despite last week's break in commodity markets, which many had believed would cause price reductions on foodstuffs at the

retail level, bay-area housewives are finding grocery bills as high as ever.

Housewives blamed retailers for the lack of price cuts, and they, in turn, blamed wholesalers and producers.

Wholesalers explained they are middlemen, bound to get the highest prices possible for their clients. If price reductions were not passed on to the ultimate consumer, it was not their fault, they added.

Producers laid the blame on high labor and production costs.

PHONY PRICE WAR

Recent retail price cuts were termed a phony price war by local merchants. One grocer, selling butter for 85 cents a pound, while chain stores charged 94 to 96 cents, declared:

"Sure, I'll take a loss on a few things to get customers into my store. Prices have dropped on items that people buy maybe once a week, but the bulk of food on the shelves is still far out of line."

Most retail grocers looked for no drop in canned goods, bread, vegetables, and fruits.

LENTEN DECLINE

A decline in demand at meat markets was reported by butchers, who consider it due to Lent. One said, "A lot of people are still paying off Christmas bills and can't afford much meat."

Prices of ham, bacon, fresh pork, and lamb chops were reduced 2 to 5 cents a pound in one major chain yesterday. The opposite trend was shown in eggs, which were boosted 2 cents a dozen.

There you have the history of a phony price war. It is a fine commentary on American life that merchants, in order to drag customers into their stores, drop prices on one or two commodities, take a loss on them, and then to have the people who should be doing something about price control use the reduction brought about by a phony price war to delude the American people into believing that commodity prices are really down.

Oregon Territorial Centennial Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proclamation of the Governor of the State of Oregon:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the year 1948 is the centennial of the creation of Oregon Territory, which marked the first extension of civil government under the flag of the United States to the Pacific coast; and

Whereas the act of Congress of August 14, 1848, creating Oregon Territory was an event of vital importance to the Pacific Northwest, insuring free American Government to a vast region and bringing to a successful conclusion the efforts of American settlers in Oregon; and

Whereas the creation of Oregon Territory secured for the United States an area of 283,730 square miles, embracing all of the present States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho and western Wyoming and Montana, which with one exception among lands on this continent added to the jurisdiction of the original United States, was obtained without the necessity of conquest or of purchase; and

Whereas under the beneficent Government of the United States and of the States over 3,000,000 people now reside in the area of the original Oregon Territory, enjoying abundant prosperity, personal liberty, security, and opportunity.

Now, therefore, I, John H. Hall, Governor of the State of Oregon, do proclaim that the year 1948 shall be designated Oregon Territorial Centennial Year, and urge that the creation of Oregon Territory a century ago be appropriately celebrated during the year by citizens and organizations to the end that people of this and other States and countries may know more of the history and geography, the development, and the future possibilities of the old Oregon country; and as Governor of the first State to be carved out of the old territory, I invite the other States with lands once forming part of this territory to join in recognizing the centennial anniversary of the creation of Oregon Territory.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Oregon. Done at Salem, the capital, this 16th day of February A. D. 1948.

[SEAL] JOHN H. HALL,
Governor.

Attest:

EARL T. NEWBERRY,
Secretary of State.

The Palestine Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted I insert herewith a resolution adopted on February 16, 1948, by Post No. 112, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Atlanta, Ga.:

Whereas the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, an organization which for the past 53 years, has stood as a symbol of the pride with which Americans of the Jewish faith have served their country's every military and peacetime effort to advance human rights and the security of political and individual freedom; and

Whereas we observe with profound dismay the admission of the British Government to a free flow of arms and munitions from that country in support of Arab aggression in Palestine; and

Whereas this action of a nation with which we allied ourselves in war and with whom we share membership in the United Nations is appalling; and

Whereas we deem it all the more reprehensive since the Jewish people of Palestine, in sharp contrast to the Arab nations who have avowed their intention to flout by force of arms a decision of the United Nations, were prompt to give their youth and labor when British forces in the Middle East reeled under the onslaught of the Nazi armies in World War II; and

Whereas the record of the Arab countries and the Grand Mufti in that hour of democracy's peril, was one of aid and comfort to those who had sworn to ravage and subjugate our own country and the British Isles as well; and

Whereas we cannot conceive that our country, the outstanding champion of a peaceful and democratic solution to the Palestinian question, will see fit to view with indifference the ready collaboration of a sister nation of the United States in a military offensive against a small defenseless people; and

Whereas the peace of the world rests with the upholding of decisions of the United Nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Atlanta, Ga., Post 112, do hereby in meeting assembled, call upon our Government to do everything in its power to implement the decision of the United Nations so that the decision of the United Nations shall be enforced and world peace be insured, since should the Arabs be permitted to flout the decision of the United Nations, it will mean the end of world peace through the destruction of the mandates of the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That our Government press for such speedy and appropriate action by the Security Council of the United Nations that would serve to enforce peace in the Holy Land; and be it further

Resolved, That our Government lift its embargo on the shipment of arms and material to the legitimate defense forces of the Jewish Agency in Palestine and permit these defense forces to obtain access to the arms and equipment necessary for the defense of their lives and freedom; and be it further

Resolved, That our Government demand in the Security Council of the United Nations that Great Britain be immediately urged to effectively maintain security in Palestine until the Mandate ends, and that she further conscientiously comply, as an avowed member of the United Nations, with the resolution of November 29, 1947; and be it further

Resolved, That our Government demand in the Security Council of the United Nations that the Council inform the Arab states that it will not tolerate their revolt against the authority of the United Nations and that the Council immediately request all members of the United Nations to place an embargo on arms shipments to the Arab League states; be it further

Resolved, That our Government demand in the Security Council of the United Nations that the Council immediately recognize Haganah as the militia of the Jewish people of Palestine, duly authorized by the United Nations, and that the Council immediately and affirmatively arrange for the equipment of Haganah for defense purposes by member nations of the United Nations. Further, that the Council itself establish with all possible speed an international police force for Palestine, made up of contingents supplied by the smaller powers to maintain internal order but backed by an assurance of big-power support in the event of external aggression; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be duly forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Senators from Georgia and to the Congressman from the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia.

Greatest Grand Jury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of February 20, 1948:

GREATEST GRAND JURY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The most important and most useful committee in Congress is the House Committee on Un-American Activities. When the history of our times is finally written that committee will undoubtedly be described as the key to survival of the American Republic.

Why? Because in days when it was dangerous and unpopular to describe the conspiracy of the Communists for what it is and always has been, that committee of the House stuck to the job.

Nowadays, the band wagon is so crowded that some of the old-time fellow travelers against the Kremlin are astonished to find themselves in such company. Never, it might be said, have so many tried to ease in among so few.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities began its work on May 26, 1938, as a special committee of temporary authority. Vice President John Nance Garner was the central inspiration for it.

Mr. Garner was a loyal Democrat and strict party man, all right, but more than that he was a loyal American and he didn't like the things going on within the Government of the United States.

So he gave an unobstrusive little nudge under the table to some friends and the House committee came into being with Martin Dies, Representative from Texas, as chairman.

Few people, except the Communists, knew the potentialities of the assignment. Dies, himself, said more than once afterward that he had no idea what a job he had undertaken.

All things considered, he was probably the best man who could have been found at the time, though he had obvious deficiencies.

For one thing, he had only a smattering of real knowledge about the Communists. For another, he was a man of considerable innocence. It took him a long time to believe a lot of things.

But he also had some magnificent virtues. For one, he was all-American from head to foot. He was physically rugged, he had a fast wit and by his own definition he was a demagogue. And he was scared of nobody.

Dies asked for $100,000 with which to begin his investigation. He got $25,000, which was as much as telling him that the New Deal didn't want any part of him. And, of course, it didn't. For the Communists inside the New Deal knew how dangerous the Dies committee could be to their conspiracy if it ever got started.

Well, Dies had a secretary by the name of Robert Stripling, another Texan as ignorant as he was concerning communism, but even tougher and more stubborn and more fearless.

Stripling volunteered to become secretary to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, "for nothin'" on the side above and beyond his regular line of duty.

Stripling set up a filing cabinet in the corner of Dies' outer office in the House Office Building. Then they hired J. B. Matthews, one-time professor of theology and, for awhile, a fellow traveler with the Communists, who had discovered where his fellow traveling was leading him. Matthews taught them what communism was all about, and gave the committee its first lessons in how to spot Reds. And so that is how history began to be made.

The casualties among individual committee members were high in those first years. The New Deal hated the committee and grew also to fear it. Roosevelt made the mistake of trying to scare Dies. Then he made the second mistake of trying to ridicule him.

Dies sassed him back, not only on the floor of the House but on Nation-wide hook-ups. He swapped insult for insult. More than that, he stood alone against all comers and never once lost a debate.

Finally, in 1944, he reached the limit of physical endurance and retired to Texas to rebuild his health and his income.

The second great moment in the career of the committee came when Representative JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, moved at the moment when Congress was organizing in January 1945 that the House Committee on Un-American Activities be made a permanent branch of the House.

RANKIN justified his career as an American citizen right there.

Dies was gone, Matthews was gone. Stripling was headed for the Army. The Communists and their fellow travelers were panting to get their hooks on the committee's files that had by then grown to enormous size. Once those files were transferred out of Stripling's hands, they felt, the whole war would be won.

But they figured without RANKIN, and he outsmarted them all to save an invaluable storehouse.

The committee began to set up for permanent action, which really began after the end of the war and the reorganization of the House in response to the voters' mandate of 1946.

The present chairman of the committee is that same J. PARNELL THOMAS, Republican, of New Jersey, who started out at the bottom of the list in 1938 as junior member of the committee and now is the sole survivor of the original group.

He is a master of committee management and procedure and drives the Reds wild by outsmarting them on parliamentary law.

Stripling is now at least as well-informed on Communists and Communist activity in the world as any man not a member of the Politburo in Moscow.

The committee has more than 600 filing cases filled with material; not a day goes by but that some executive agency of the Government calls on it for information, and not a Red in America but is mortally afraid of it.

Such great, blood-sweating New Deal characters as Morris Ernst and Adolf Berle are jumping at the chance to get their licks in and what they have just testified to about the clear and present danger of communism and how to combat it, outstrips Dies at his most violent. Times do change.

Just the same, it is time to remember. On May 26, 1948, the House committee will be 10 years old. That day should be set aside in Congress for the eulogy of some patriots who stood guard while others slept or were afraid to stay awake.

Dies, Thomas, Stripling, and old Doc Matthews who taught them the details of Communist dogma, deserve a day of praise.

How about the American Legion, Vets of Foreign Wars, et al., getting busy on this? The country owes these men something.

Oregon Ranks Third in Over-All Educational Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Oregon Voter:

OREGON RANKS THIRD IN OVER-ALL EDUCATIONAL PERFORMANCE

In a new volume, Education—America's Magic, issued by the Iowa College Press, Oregon is given third place among all the 48 States for its over-all educational performance. The author of the study is Raymond M. Hughes, professor of vocational education at Iowa State College. Here is the way he lists the States:

HIGHEST

1. Utah.
2. Kansas.
3. Oregon.
4. Nebraska.
5. Iowa.
6. Washington.
7. California.
8. Idaho.
9. New Hampshire.
10. Colorado.

HIGH

11. North Dakota.
12. Nevada.
13. Oklahoma.
14. South Dakota.
15. Massachusetts.
16. Montana.
17. New York.
18. Wisconsin.
19. Vermont.
20. Indiana.

MEDIUM

21. Minnesota.
22. Wyoming.
23. Ohio.
24. Maine.
25. Texas.
26. Illinois.
27. Michigan.
28. North Carolina.
29. Connecticut.
30. Missouri.

LOW

31. Arizona.
32. Pennsylvania.
33. Tennessee.
34. New Mexico.
35. South Carolina.
36. Louisiana.
37. West Virginia.
38. Mississippi.
39. Kentucky.

LOWEST

40. New Jersey.
41. Alabama.
42. Virginia.
43. Arkansas.
44. Rhode Island.
45. Florida.
46. Delaware.
47. Maryland.
48. Georgia.

Now, the bases of the author's ranking formula are interesting and that we may know on what basis we get this high place among the 10 highest States here are the 6 criteria he used:

1. Its educational accomplishment, as determined by its average achievement of five arbitrarily chosen, yet apparently attainable, educational goals.

2. Its ability to support education as indicated by its income per child.

3. The degree in which its accomplishment is commensurate with its ability, as determined by comparison of its actual accomplishment with that which normally would be expected in view of its known ability.

4. Its educational effort, as indicated by the percentage of its income devoted to the support of education.

5. Its efficiency in the expenditure of school funds, as found by comparing its accomplishment with that which normally would result

from its actual expenditures per child for education.

6. The educational level of the adult population, as determined by the average number of years of school completed by all persons 25 years of age or older.

There were a good many loose statements made about Oregon's educational performance during recent elections in which educational funds were sought in one way or another. Since the rating comes from an educator and not from an office holder or watchdog of the people's treasury his rating might be kept for handy reference by our own legislators. Our educational nest has been fouled too frequently for political purpose, it seems, and morally we doubt that the end justified the means.—Oregon City Enterprise.

Death Walks on Four Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Farm Journal:

DEATH WALKS ON FOUR FEET—FOOT-AND-MOUTH FAILURE

(By Paul Friggens, associate editor, Farm Journal)

We have lost the fight to wipe out foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico.

Eight months after the United States launched its ambitious $35,000,000 campaign, our eradication program is stopped dead, with no immediate prospect of resumption.

American livestock men, therefore, must be prepared to operate with the disease next door, and a constant threat for a long time to come—how long, nobody knows.

"Aftosa," as they call foot-and-mouth in Mexico, may jump our borders at any time. It's a miracle, in fact, that it hasn't already. If it does, the United States stands ready to stamp it out by slaughter, as it did before.

But even a single outbreak will mean serious loss, such as State quarantined against State, and the halting of all shipments of livestock and dangerous animal products. A general outbreak could threaten the whole $8,000,000,000 American livestock industry.

WE ARE BEING OUTFLANKED

Because Mexico forced us to stop slaughter—the only known way to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease—the United States is falling back to a quarantine line 750 miles across central Mexico. But, like the vaunted Maginot Line, it can and is being outflanked.

Meanwhile, the United States has agreed to vaccination, but vaccine never has been known to eradicate the disease in any country.

The Mexicans want the Americans to build two five-wire fences across malarial jungle and desert and mountains. But disease heeds no fence.

The inescapable truth is that we are worse off today than when we started. When we went into Mexico, we had only the disease to deal with—and a fighting chance to lick it. Today we have more disease, plus the animosity of the Mexican people, and the opposition of the politicians.

These are the blunt facts I found, myself, in Mexico—amidst the conflict and confusion of the Aftosa Commission offices. I talked to dozens of persons throughout the infected area, where Uncle Sam is pulling out altogether in order to try to hold the disease where it was February 1—only 300 miles from United States borders.

This is one time that Uncle Sam apparently bit off more than he could chew, at least in the way he went at it. In fairness, it must be said that aftosa has not yet broken out in the United States. Our $35,000,000 has forestalled that, so far. Another factor in our favor is that the natural movement of Mexican trade is not northward, but toward Mexico City.

A MOTLEY ARMY—AND CONFUSION

Eradicating aftosa in Mexico probably is the toughest job that veterinary science ever tackled. We relied on a corps of laboratory research men and professional veterinarians, plus a hastily recruited crew of Americans and Mexicans from all walks of life to do the job.

Few of the Americans understood Mexico or Mexicans, or even spoke the language. The doctors were all right—among the world's best—but it's been suggested that they could have used an Eisenhower in command.

The Aftosa Commission and the United States Department of Agriculture kept telling Americans at home that final success was just around the corner.

The facts were that American personnel feared for their own lives in Mexico, and had no doubt at all that the program was doomed.

Aftosa was first reported in December 1946. The United States soon closed the border, but 6 months were consumed in endless negotiations before we as much as landed a single blow. When we did get going, the disease had spread to 16 Mexican states.

Our method was to throw a ring around the infected area and to squeeze the disease out by slaughter of all infected and exposed animals—cattle, hogs, sheep, and goats. Instead, the disease squeezed out the veterinarians.

The United States, in its worst outbreak of foot-and-mouth, slaughtered only 172,000 animals. The campaign in Mexico called for killing 50,000 cattle a week and a like number of smaller animals—400,000 a month. There are roughly 7,000,000 cattle still in the infected zone today.

But Aftosa's wildfire spread was only the beginning of our problem. We were compelled to fight against overwhelming obstacles of Mexican custom, superstition, language, rumor, and political manipulation.

A PICTURE OF THE BATTLEGROUND

Most of the people live in communal villages, from which they drive their animals to a common pasture and back home at night. They have done this for centuries.

Everywhere I went I saw the Mexican and his burro. Apparently they travel at all times of the day and night, and unwittingly man and burro helped spread aftosa in Mexico. Next to the terrain, the second greatest obstacle to our program in Mexico was the Mexican himself.

Consider the problem. Mexico has 24,000,000 population. But great numbers in the rural areas are Indian. Many do not even speak Spanish. When Dr. Francis Mulhern went into Oaxaca State to locate a southern quarantine line, he found Indians who couldn't understand each other, let alone understand what aftosa was all about.

To be sure, not all of rural Mexico is as wild as Mulhern found it. Mexico also has broad, fertile valleys, and some of the richest land on earth. You may even see an occasional tractor. But everywhere the Americans found distrust, rumor, and political opposition.

Mexico has not forgotten two American invasions within a century, nor does the sight of 10-gallon hats, cowboy boots and Texas license plates advertising the Alamo help to soothe inter-American relations.

In this soil the first seeds of our defeat were sown. On the night that I arrived at San Luis Potosi traveling along the northern quarantine line, the mercury dipped to a new low for Mexico, and it was bitter cold. There had been snow at Christmas, the first snow in 35 years. The story was that Americans, probably monkeying with dry ice, were responsible for Mexico's unseasonable weather. The naturally superstitious average Mexican in the rural areas believed it.

He believed other rumors more vicious: that airplanes from the United States had deliberately spread aftosa, that Uncle Sam wanted to kill Mexico's cattle to destroy its meat industry, that even the soda-ash disinfectant American veterinarians used was a mysterious powder that carried aftosa and all manner of other fatal diseases.

YOU HAVE TO SEE THE "PRESIDENTE"

The United States' program started with one of the most cumbersome pieces of administrative machinery ever devised.

For every American official, for every American doctor, for every American appraiser, paymaster, technician, and general handyman, there was a Mexican counterpart. Then the governor and each little town's presidente, and often the padre, had to be consulted. On top of all this were superimposed the United States Bureau of Animal Industry, the United States Department of Agriculture, the State Department, and the Mexican Government. A doctor at one of the quarantine outposts said: "It got so that whether you wanted a bulldozer or a broom you had to go into negotiation."

And while the United States and Mexico negotiated, aftosa swept across Mexico northward toward the United States, and southward toward Guatemala.

Despite all this, however, the Americans began to make headway and eventually struck hard against the disease. Remembering that we started 6 months late, it was a splendid effort. By fall we had 1,500 pieces of heavy equipment on the ground—boats, bulldozers, mobile machine shops, weapon carriers, jeeps, and cranes. Two thousand men were on the pay roll, and we had started the slaughter of 1,000,000 head of animals.

At the start, the United States agreed to pay for all cattle slaughtered while the Mexicans were to pay for all hogs, sheep, and goats. The first thing American officials knew, the Mexican campesino was refusing to bring in his cattle because he said he had not yet been paid for the smaller animals killed.

The other extreme was the Mexican official who presented claims for "1,000 purebred Poland China hogs" he said were slaughtered, worth 1,000 pesos each about $200. When the Government opened the trenches, they found less than 50 pigs and pretty poor ones at that.

CATTLE HIDDEN IN THE MOUNTAINS

In view of all this, it was not long before the Mexicans were driving their animals far back into the mountains, not only defeating the slaughter program but spreading the disease further.

In October, the United States took over the payment of all animals—an average of $50 for cattle and $5 for small animals. The campesino led in his cattle, including his treasured oxen, the animals were shot the campesino signed with thumb print and was paid off (and joined his companions).

With every shot, the tension heightened. Women and children crawled on their hands and knees to cry over the dead oxen. If 200 owners were involved, many hundreds of campesinos might turn up to see the killing. Some would walk 40 miles to see "Aftosa," and, of course, carry the disease back home.

Under guard of Mexican troops, Americans shot the animals, then slashed the hides to prevent salvage and speed decomposition.

Afterward, the Americans sometimes found their jeep tires slashed.

One thing had been overlooked: No money on earth could repay the small Mexican farmer for his yoke of oxen. He loved his animals. Oxen worked his land, fed his children, provided his clothes. They were, as one Mexican told me, a part of the family.

THE GRINGOS SHOT MY CATTLE

To see them kicking and squirming in a slaughter pit, shot by "Gringos," was more than he could stand. He went home in hate, and this hate, fanned by local propagandists and anti-American elements, boiled up to help lick the United States in Mexico.

"First, you come and kill our cattle. Next, you will come and kill my wife and children," the campesinos told American veterinarians.

Another obstacle was that while aftosa cripples and seriously injures an animal, the mortality is low—3 to 5 percent. "I get sick lots of times and nobody kills me," says the Mexican Indian. "Why kill my cow?"

But for every farmer who cooperated, there were 10 to 100 or maybe 1,000 campesinos with their treasured oxen who did not—and may never—understand the necessity of slaughter and modern quarantine.

THIS WAS THE BEGINNING OF THE END

At Senguio village in Michoacan on September 1, Uncle Sam's foot-and-mouth eradication program definitely went on the rocks.

On September 1 Dr. Augusto Juares Medina, a Mexican veterinarian, and seven soldiers were pulled from their jeep and hacked to pieces. Eight Mexicans gave their lives that day because an infuriated, propagandized mob had been told that the United States was not paying a just price for cattle. We are lucky that no Americans have been killed in Mexico. Some have been shot at.

The story of Senguio swept through Mexico's back country even faster than the aftosa. Hundreds of miles away in widely separated communities veterinarians suddenly sensed a fresh hostility. On one day, a doctor told me, an entire village had agreed to bring in its infected cattle for slaughter. The next day, after the Senguio killing, the campesinos would have nothing to do with the Americans.

THE GOVERNMENT GIVES UP

In Mexico City the American section moved swiftly to withdraw its forces from the infected area until things quieted down. Simultaneously, the Mexican Government pressed for a complete stop of slaughter on the grounds that Mexico could not stand the economic impact.

We had killed nearly 1,000,000 animals, almost half of which were cattle. On November 26 the United States agreed to the Mexican demand and slaughter stopped.

So we were licked. Barring a miracle of science, foot-and-mouth disease is saddled on Mexico indefinitely.

Where do we go from here?

Let's look at the alternative. First take quarantine.

The United States has fallen back to a quarantine line which runs from Tampico in the jungle region of the Gulf coast westward across central Mexico to San Luis Potosi, Zacatecas, thence through Jalisco and Nayarit states to Puerto Vallarta on the Pacific coast.

Some say we should have tackled the disease from this point in the first place, pushing our drive southward. But the quarantine line runs through impenetrable jungle, across vast stretches of arid, rocky lands, over 10,000-foot mountains, down a canyon which some say is greater than the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, and to the sea.

For hundreds of miles you can travel this line by motor road in the more accessible areas. I traveled from Valles to San Luis Potosi and saw Mexican soldiers on an average of once every 40 miles.

Cattle wandered back and forth across the road that marked the quarantine line. I was told that the Mexican Army had decided to drop a new and shorter south line, which explained the few soldiers I had seen.

QUARANTINE IS A FARCE

At best a Mexican soldier must have little heart for his task. He gets less than a dollar a day on which he must feed himself. I saw soldiers with their families, mind you, living in crude huts by the roadside, in lonely villages, in the jungles. Some complained to me they had had no pay for some time. And this is the military force that backs up our northern quarantine line.

At one point, I asked a Mexican civilian employee of the Aftosa Commission how many cattle passed the quarantine line the previous night. "About 100," he told me blithely. If you have the right permit in Mexico, you can go anywhere.

A few days before I left Mexico the Aleman government dispatched a propaganda truck to the quarantine zone to explain the need for possible slaughter. Mexicans stoned the truck. Others have even refused to have their cattle inspected. In some sections Mexican cattlemen with bigger herds and who fear the spread of aftosa are cooperating splendidly. But there is always the campesino with his oxen and the "Gringo" hater in the hills.

Moreover, north-bound truck traffic is a constant hazard.

FENCES? VACCINES? WHAT?

The fence question goes along with quarantine. The Mexicans want the United States to build two 750-mile five-wire fences from the Gulf to the Pacific. But I came away with the feeling that a lot of fence might be a bad thing. Two fences might serve to weaken our vigilance and destroy that of the Mexicans altogether.

That leaves vaccine which the United States had always refused to consider. Vaccine never has been known to lick foot-and-mouth disease. It has been widely used in South America and Europe, but it has not stamped out the disease. In South America stockmen vaccinate and are resigned to at least a 20-percent annual loss from foot-and-mouth disease.

The United States could never tolerate that loss. Imagine what a sudden outbreak might do to the Iowa cattle feeder or the Colorado cattlemen ready to ship, and on short grass.

But we are going ahead with vaccines because Mexico has forced our hand.

Dr. M. S. Shahan, codirector of the fight in Mexico, is an outstanding authority on vaccine. "The truth is," he says, "that there is no immediate prospect of a better vaccine than those now available."

The amazing thing is that after previous outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States—one covering 22 States—we are caught flat-footed without a better solution than slaughter. Now, our Bureau of Animal Industry is working with world authorities on the problem and is laying out both short-term and long-term research programs. It will be up to Congress to decide what to do about them.

This much Congress should know: Mexico is saddled with foot-and-mouth disease indefinitely.

We are not even sure we can control it. Available vaccines don't eradicate. American agriculture and American science, therefore, are challenged as never before to think up something better. The United States cannot afford to harbor foot-and-mouth disease next door forever.

Dr. Shahan and his coworkers of the Department of Agriculture think that an all-out research program is the answer. Research, though, means untold millions of dollars for years to come. And what about aftosa meantime?

OUR BORDER LEFT UNGUARDED

Right now, the 1,200 miles of critical international boundary between Brownsville and El Paso, Tex., are guarded only 14 hours a day. Until recently, it was only 7.

On the other hand, many argue that the best thing to do is to hold the line in Mexico where we are right now—at any cost—until research does come up with a better solution than slaughter—say, a lifetime-immunity vaccine. It would be cheaper in any event than letting the disease get into the United States.

Other plans have been offered. One of the most thoughtful is the proposal of Robert J. Kleberg, Jr., president of the famous King Ranch in southern Texas.

"Aftosa," says Kleberg, "is as close to Americans right now as their dinner plates." He would clear out a clean zone along the northern quarantine line, move the infected stock to the south or salvage by slaughter and replace them, after 60 days, with vaccinated animals from the clean ranching areas of the north. Kleberg would then repeat the process moving to the south as fast as feasible. It might take 10 years to do this. It would be worth it, Kleberg believes.

One argument against his plan is that the replacement alone might involve 20,000,000 animals, and the same conditions that defeated the original program might work against this one. In a single village I found that 220 head of cattle were owned by 168 farmers who use a common watering place. That's the measure of our problem.

One of the world's greatest crops of veterinarians, that never lost a battle up to now, seems licked. Yet they take a philosophic view. I asked one what he thought about it all. He said:

"Just this: Whatever we do, we have to keep doing the job that best serves both the Mexican and American people."

That's our job—but it is later than we think.

National Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, this is National Brotherhood Week, so proclaimed by the President of the United States, Governors of many of the States and Territories, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. It has been observed ever since it was suggested by a Catholic priest, Msgr. Hugh McMennamin, of Denver, Colo., in 1934. In furtherance of this noble custom, I submit, for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a poem which, in my judgment, expresses the sentiments of our citizens everywhere. It is entitled "Law and Peace," was written by James Patrick McGovern, a captain in the American Expeditionary Forces during the First World War and a member of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post No. 105, Department of Maryland, of the American Legion, and the words have been set to music by Professor Franz C. Bornschein,

of the Conservatory of Music of the Peabody Institute of the city of Baltimore. The verses read as follows:

LAW AND PEACE

(By James Patrick McGovern)

What is the brotherhood of him who knows
no brother?
What is the faith of him whose creed respects
no other?
What is the kin of him who wrongs dust, all
men's mother?
What is the peace of him who sets it for
another?
Solon made laws for Greece, Aurelius for
Rome;
Moses wrote rules for Hebrews, Christ taught
all Christendom;
Hammurabi's code graced a Babylonian
dome;
All Europe has justice stored in many an
ancient tome.
The law is always dead in parchment, marble,
stone,
Unless each generation relives it as its own;
"A scrap of paper" adorned with names,
tempts power on its throne
As fuel for world-wide flames by all the four
winds blown.
When the spirit transcends the law, men see
beyond the letter,
When justice frames the law, revenge has no
abettor,
When mercy guides the law, virtue holds vice
its debtor,
When hearts enshrine the law, peace stands
free from fetter.

Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of February 18, 1948:

A POLICY OF RENT CONTROL

The Supreme Court has smothered the attack on Federal rent control through the courts and the Banking Committee of the House of Representatives has recommended a 1-month extension of the rent-control law after its date of expiration, February 29, presumably to give Congress time to fix on a rent-control policy.

This is a political year and it is almost certain that Congress will vote an additional extension of rent control, perhaps for a year, with a good many Representatives and some Senators squarely facing the fact that there are many more tenants than landlords.

There is another inescapable fact, that a sudden release of rent control now would produce an economic earthquake. The inherent evil of Government control was never better illustrated than in the case of rents. Once rent control is accepted, even temporarily, the pains attending its revocation threaten to be so severe that the decision is always put off to another day, and the procrastination tends to become perpetual. Temporary rent control has hung on in France since 1914, in Great Britain since 1915, and in other World War I countries since 1916.

Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, said the other day that it might be advisable to continue rent control in some areas for 3 years more. He is not the only one who fears a creeping disease less than a sharp cure.

Sudden release of rent controls now, as we said, would be too much of a shock in a country that already is feeling some mild tremors of readjustment. But Congress ought to establish a policy that will end the controls at a determined time, perhaps by a tapering-off process. For as long as there is no assurance that controls will end, there will be a housing shortage. The present law puts no rent ceilings on new construction, but investors in rental housing will be reluctant until they know that control is on its way out without threat of reconsideration of any of its phases.

Senator MCCARTHY, a war veteran himself, has a natural interest in housing for his fellow veterans. Yet he apparently has fallen into the error of believing that rent control helps veterans. The fact is that it has contributed to the veterans' housing shortage.

When servicemen who had had no homes of their own before the war came back to establish homes, they found all of the available housing occupied by nonveterans paying cheap rent. The Cleveland Plain Dealer said last week: "The people who stayed home during the war are the real rent profiteers. The Government said to them: 'You can continue living in the same quarters you have occupied and pay the same rent you formerly paid, in spite of the fact that prices of everything else have gone up and wages have increased'."

There was nothing for the veteran to do but buy or build a house at inflated prices. Desperate veterans who have taken this course find themselves saddled with monthly payments in lieu of rent which are much higher than landlords are allowed on housing subject to control and which are fixed through all kinds of economic weather for periods up to 20 years.

The long experience of free economy established reasonable rent as about one-fourth of income—1 week's pay in a month. Most household budget makers used to be advised to make their calculations on that basis. Rent control has enabled the average wage earner to pay his monthly rent with 3 days' pay instead of 5 days' pay, while the averages of all his living costs, except rent, are 61 percent higher than they were in 1935–39. His wages, incidentally, are more than 100 percent over the 1935–39 average.

This imbalance can't continue forever, or even for very much longer, without serious consequences to the whole economy. Even those citizens who are enjoying the low rents cannot take full satisfaction in the bargain rate; they must feel that the fruits of rent control are all of a piece with our meretricious prosperity, which cannot make anyone wholly happy.

Everybody fears the bust. Uncertainty is the plague of the time. That is one of the reasons that a declared policy on the decontrol of all rents is desirable. Congress can't and won't let the rent law go by default, but it should set an early date and legislate the procedure whereby all controls will be terminated.

Income-Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the statement of Mr. James E. Webb, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, presented to Ways and Means Committee on January 19, 1948.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that the Members will find this statement by the Budget Director most informative; likewise, reference should be made to the committee hearings beginning on page 193, which reveal that the cross-examination by committee members indicates that Mr. Webb is not only fully informed on the financial affairs of this country but is rendering a great service to the Nation as Director of the Budget.

STATEMENT OF JAMES E. WEBB, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, your request that I appear here today stated that you wished me to discuss the 1948 and the 1949 budgets. Since the President's budget message already has been received by the Congress I shall make this statement brief and limit it to a summary of the factors of major significance.

The items listed by your chairman for consideration today are as follows:

"(a) The size of the prospective surpluses;

"(b) The differences between the 1948 budget as it stands today and as presented to the Congress in January 1947;

"(c) The supplementary appropriations, if any, which the President regards as essential during the remainder of the fiscal year 1948;

"(d) The decrease in appropriations, if any, which the President regards as possible during the remainder of the fiscal year 1948;

"(e) The elements in the 1949 budget which represent legislation proposed by the President; and

"(f) The programs for which the 1949 budget provides amounts substantially above or below the current level of the 1948 budget."

In addition to these items, I shall refer generally to another paragraph in the chairman's letter of January 10, which reads as follows:

"In his recent message on the state of the Union, the President outlined a broad legislative program. At many points this program appeared to call for substantial increases in expenditures. The committee would appreciate your estimate of the total additional cost of these programs, and the portion of this cost which would be reflected in the budgets of the next few years."

Budget totals and surpluses: The President's budget recommendations for the fiscal year 1949 call for total expenditures of $39,700,000,000. The functions of the Federal Government which will be financed with these dollars have changed drastically in comparison with prewar years. The budgets for both the fiscal years 1948 and 1949 are dominated by five big functions—national defense, international affairs, veterans' affairs, interest, and tax refunds. These categories account for 79 percent of the 1949 budget. All other programs take up the remaining 21 percent. Interestingly, this represents almost an arithmetical reversal of the prewar ratio. In 1939 those five programs accounted for 29 percent of the budget, while the others accounted for 71 percent.

A total of $34,000,000,000 in the next year's proposed budget will be expended under existing laws. A total expenditure of $5,700,000,000 will be needed to put into effect new legislation recommended by the President. Here again, under this recommended new legislation, expenditures for national defense and international affairs dominate, and account for $5,100,000,000. European recovery and other foreign assistance and universal training are the largest items. Important domestic measures account for the remaining $600,000,000,000, and include such items as education, housing, and social welfare.

Both your committee and the Committee on Appropriations have been interested to know within what limits the Federal Government is firmly committed to expenditures in the next fiscal year. Expenditures for discretionary items in the budget are relatively a small proportion of the total. Excluding national defense functions of about $11,000,000,000 and international programs of $7,000,000,000, the remaining $21,600,000,000 include heavy fixed charges. About $9,360,000,000 of these fixed charges are accounted for by interest on the public debt, tax refunds, and veterans' pensions. Grants to States under long-term programs will amount to $2,300,000,000. Veterans' programs, apart from pensions, will amount to $4,000,000,000. Included within the remaining $6,000,000,000 are numerous other continuing programs which it would be difficult to change on short notice. For example, the natural-resources program, including atomic energy, flood control, and reclamation, amounting to $1,600,000,000, is not susceptible to rapid contraction without serious economic loss.

All of the expenditures estimates for 1949 are based upon the assumption that prices and employment will remain at about their present levels. If prices should rise further the cost of most of the things that the Government buys will rise with them. On the other hand, a general decrease in prices or an increase in unemployment would mean that budget expenditures for price support, public assistance, and veterans' unemployment compensation would rise.

The general policy of the President in transmitting his instructions for the preparation of appropriation estimates for 1949 was to hold the 1949 programs at or below the 1948 level. The first responsibility rested with the agencies. Then there followed several months of review of agency requests, both by the Bureau of the Budget and the President himself, with particular emphasis on review of requests for items in excess of 1948 appropriations which the agencies felt should be presented in this budget. The final results showed that departmental requests had been reduced by approximately $7,000,000,000.

Present estimates of Federal revenues indicate surpluses in both the fiscal years 1948 and 1949. For the current fiscal year 1948 receipts are estimated at $45,200,000,000, as against estimates of expenditures of 37.7, leaving an estimated surplus of $7,500,000,000.

For 1949 receipts are estimated under existing tax laws at $44,500,000,000, and expenditures at $39,700,000,000 leaving a surplus estimated at $4,800,000,000.

These surpluses, if realized, will be the largest in the Nation's history. However, to be properly considered they should be related to the national debt and the national income. Taking these 2 years together, the average surplus of $6,150,000,000 amount to 2½ percent of the present national debt and 3 percent of the present national income. These relationships are important in considering the effectiveness of fiscal policy in preventing further inflation and in paying off the public debt.

The 1948 budget: The committee has requested a comparison between the present estimates for 1948 and those contained in the budget submitted a year ago.

The present total of $37,700,000,000 compares with the previous total of $37,500,000,000. However, there have been substantial changes in estimated expenditures for individual functions. International programs now call for expenditures of $2,000,000,000 more than was estimated last January. Expenditures for other programe, including national defense, veterans, housing, and agriculture are expected to be below the estimate of a year ago. These reductions result from a combination of factors, such as high agricultural prices, shortages in materials, low levels of unemployment, and reductions made by the Congress.

While the total expenditure estimate for 1948 is almost unchanged there has been a marked increase in the estimate of receipts because of the rapid and continued rise in both personal incomes and corporation profits. Corporation profits for the calendar year 1947 were about $7,000,000,000 above 1946, and totaled $28,000,000,000. Personal incomes have risen by $20,000,000,000 to an annual rate of about $200,000,000,000 during the last half of 1947. These sharp increases in income and profits, above all expectations, are the basic explanation of the increased estimates of Federal revenues in the fiscal year 1948. More rapid sales of surplus property than originally anticipated have meant a large and nonrecurring increase in estimated miscellaneous receipts.

Two tables showing changes in the estimates of both expenditures and receipts for 1946 have been prepared for the committee and distributed to each member as an attachment to this statement. See tables I and II.

Supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1948: The committee has requested information about the supplemental appropriations for 1948 as recommended in the Budget. These will amount to $8,700,000,000, of which $7,300,000,000 will be for international purposes, including the first 15 months of the European recovery program. The total also includes $800,000,000 for refunds.

The $8,700,000,000 of supplemental appropriations will be used to finance $1,900,000,000 of expenditures in the fiscal year 1948 and $4,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949. Almost all of the remaining $2,300,000,000 will be obligated under the European recovery program in these years, but will not be paid out until after the close of the fiscal year 1949.

A special tabulation has been submitted to the committee to show the relationship of supplemental appropriations to expenditures in the fiscal years 1948 and 1949. See table III.

Unused appropriations in the fiscal year 1948: The committee also has requested information on any decreases in appropriations which may be possible during the balance of this fiscal year.

Immediately after the war the President recommended a number of major rescissions of existing appropriations which totaled more than $60,000,000,000. The program of rescinding wartime appropriations by specific legislative enactment was completed during the last session of Congress. It is estimated that at the end of this year the total unobligated balance from 1948 appropriations will amount to $183,000,000, almost all of which have been placed in reserve. Consequently, no expenditures have been included in the current budget from such balances. For detail, see table IV.

There are also small unobligated balances from other than 1948 appropriations which will not be spent. These are set forth in table V.

Changes in expenditures between fiscal years 1948 and 1949: Changes in expenditures between fiscal years 1948 and 1949 are discussed in some detail in the President's budget message. The largest increase will be for programs of international aid which are estimated to increase by a net amount of $1,500,000,000. While expenditures for new international programs are estimated at $4,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1949, they will be largely offset by decreases in existing programs.

Other major increases will be for universal training, Federal aid to education, flood control, and new plants and facilities for the atomic energy program. The largest decrease will occur in expenditures for veterans' unemployment benefits and educational and training allowances.

The major changes in estimates and brief explanations of them are contained in table VI.

Proposed legislation provided for in 1949 budget: The committee has also asked for information on the proposed legislation included in the budget. This is set forth in the table on pages 56 and 57 of the budget message. That table shows the estimated expenditures under the President's proposal for the fiscal year 1949 and the appropriations required, either as supplementals for 1948 or as 1949 appropriations.

Legislation proposed in the State of the Union message: For the convenience of the committee, I shall discuss the President's proposals in the State of the Union message under two headings—those which are taken into account in the budget, and those which point out broad objectives but make no specific recommendations. I shall not attempt to discuss those which require no sizable budget expenditures.

As to those which are taken into account in the budget, the 1949 estimates include the first year costs of the proposed programs on the assumption that they will be enacted during the present session of the Congress.

Some of the programs will increase in subsequent years. Universal training is estimated to cost $400,000,000 in the first year, but as stated in the budget message its eventual annual cost may reach $2,000,000,000.

The European recovery program will probably reach its peak in the fiscal year 1950, with an expenditure of over $5,000,000,000 in that year. After that, expenditures should decline and should cease after 1952—apart from liquidation expenses.

Other aid programs are still under consideration. Estimates, therefore, have been made for only 1 year.

The long-range housing program which is estimated to cost $40,000,000 the first year may increase to a total of about $150,000,000 in 1952.

The national health program as proposed is mainly self-financing but a Federal budget expenditure will be required to provide medical care for those unable to make the regular contributions. When the program gets fully under way this Federal support may amount to as much as $250,000,000 a year.

The President's recommendation for aid to elementary and secondary education are estimated to cost approximately $300,000,000 a year. Although proposals for Federal aid to higher education are under consideration, no definite recommendations have so far been formulated.

The proposals for increased benefits and extended coverage under the present social-security system will be financed for a number of years from the trust accounts.

The remaining specific recommendations in the State of the Union message include provision for the anti-inflation program at about $100,000,000 a year. Expenditures under these programs will cease after the danger of inflation is over.

The new proposals for agricultural support contained in the President's message represent modernization of existing programs. While they will be more effective than the present programs, they should require no greater expenditures.

If we turn now to the broad objectives stated by the President in his State of the Union message, we find that they relate mainly to the public-works field. The best estimates possible at this time indicate that the cost of the new proposals of the President will be largely offset by completion of public works already under way. Total Federal expenditures for civil public works, including grants to the States, will amount to

$2,800,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949. They are expected to increase to about $3,000,000,000 in 1950 and will probably continue at about that level.

Conclusion: I hope I have made it clear that several proposed programs and the present public-works program will expand in the future. A continuation of our present level of military strength will also mean higher expenditures in future years as the inventories carried over from the war are exhausted and as new procurement contracts are carried out.

It is my earnest hope that a large increase in the present national-defense expenditures can be avoided. However, we cannot escape the close relationship between the level of defense expenditures and the success of our efforts to promote world peace and economic recovery.

As the President said in his budget message:

"The plain fact is that our budget must remain high until we have met our international responsibilities and can see the way clear to a peaceful and prosperous world. Prudence demands that we plan our national finances in full recognition of this fact."

Let's Get Together on Rental Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter published by the Apartment Association of Los Angeles County, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.:

DEAR MR. AND MRS. TENANT AND YOU WHO WANT TO RENT—LET'S GET TOGETHER ON RENTAL HOUSING

AN OPEN LETTER TO AMERICANS

The rental housing business is our business. We have put our money and our time and our energies into it. We have given extensive study to the matter of providing living quarters for millions of Americans who wish to rent homes instead of buying or building.

Good tenants are our good customers. We want to serve you better. We want to provide rental housing to the standards you desire. We want to maintain our properties in good condition. We want to repair and redecorate them. We want to give better services of all kinds. We want to build new buildings to replace those which are obsolete or which are rapidly becoming obsolete. But we cannot do that now. We want you to know why. We invite you to do something about it for your own interest and welfare as American citizens.

We believe that the most efficient way—the only way—the American way—is to be allowed to come to mutual agreements with our tenants and prospective tenants on a free-market basis—you free to ask us for just what you want—we free to provide it—at rentals which are entirely satisfactory to both of us and on which we voluntarily agree.

That is the way America's present rental housing was built. That is the way America's living and housing standards became the world's highest. That is the way America can again go forward.

So much confusion has been disseminated on the subject of rent control that many of us forget how America's present rental housing came into being. We forget that the vast bulk of it was built when there were no rent controls. Americans were able to rent homes in any community—in any rent range—with or without any particular services—to better their own living and housing standards—and to move freely from one community to another as often as they desired. That is no longer true. Most of us are frozen where we now live, whether it is convenient or desirable or not.

America's housing is wearing out

Today's rental housing is becoming shabby and run-down. It is wearing out, and it will not last forever. Someday it will no longer be habitable. What then—for America's tenants?

Under restrictive rent control we, the owners of much of America's rental property, cannot maintain our properties as we would like to maintain them. We cannot know what types of buildings to erect or what facilities to include within them, or how many are needed, or how large, or what kind of renovating and remodeling is needed on existing buildings, until we have the right to bargain freely with tenants and build or remodel to the specifications for which they are able and freely willing to pay.

Those who seek to perpetuate rent controls have fanned the fears of tenants to fantastic extremes with dire threats of what would happen with the termination of controls. The fear of wholesale evictions has been played up out of all proportion. There would be no wave of evictions without rent control; there were no waves of evictions before we had rent control. Owners must have tenants in order to remain in business.

There is no form of coercion an owner can use to compel a tenant to pay more rental than he wishes to pay. Unless Americans are freely willing and able to pay higher rentals, owners will not be able to collect them. No new rental rate becomes an actual rental until some tenant voluntarily pays it. The termination of rent control would—of course—mean that some rentals would rise—but only to the point the tenant agrees. Rentals for many families would not be affected—for others they would be reduced. There would simply be an adjustment of rate, space, or services that would reflect comparative values as tenants view them today—not as they were several years ago under completely different conditions.

Controls have not stopped inflation

Rent control has not prevented inflation. Simple proof is that in the years we have had rent control we have had our greatest inflation. Rent control has kept the cost of housing down for some families but only at the expense of others. It has forced millions to buy or build at prices far higher than if rent control had not been in effect—and the cost of such purchased homes must be included in the cost of America's housing and America's living.

Rent control has been most costly to the tenant it has presumed to protect. That cost is the cost of services and comforts he cannot get—of deterioration of the unit in which he lives—the cost in the lack of constant improvements and higher living standards which newer and finer buildings might have provided if they could have been built. The most important effects of rent control have been to encourage inefficient use of existing rental space—to drive hundreds of thousands of rental units out of the rental market—and to prevent greater production of more rental housing. Tenants have been denied those newer and better housing standards.

More and more tenants are realizing that their rent dollars do not buy the same services and comforts that they bought before rent control. More and more tenants realize that it is only out of the property owner's rental income that he can provide those missing services and standards. More and more tenants realize that if they had been allowed to pay a more equitable rent in the last few years while their own incomes were rising, their rented homes would have been more satisfactorily maintained and modernized—thereby reducing pressure for new housing.

Amount of rent not most important thing

The tenant is not concerned primarily with the amount of rent he pays—but with what he gets for his money. One of the unfortunate results of rent control is that the amount of rent he pays has been fixed for him and placed first in importance—to the detriment of his right of occupancy—his serenity of occupancy and his comforts and services.

We believe that the original reason for rent control has now ceased to exist. The war-time emergency is over. There are no mass movements of workers pouring into communities to produce the weapons of war. There are no longer any mushrooming Army or Navy training centers—or ports of embarkation where wives and families of servicemen tend to congregate. The violent upheavals of the rental market which led in part to rent control are no longer present. We believe that it is essential for America to think now in terms of rental housing based on the new, postwar peacetime pattern—that emergency treatments merely prolong the seeming emergency.

You are told that a housing emergency still exists. Admittedly, many of us do not have the kind of housing we would like to have. Admittedly, most of us are dissatisfied with our present run-down and depreciated living quarters. Admittedly, many of us cannot locate the newer or better rental housing units we seek. Admittedly, we are frozen to our present quarters—whether they are satisfactory or convenient or not.

Shortage is in housing for rent

But census figures show that—by our own prewar standards of 1940—we have more housing now—and more per person—than ever before in the history of this or any other nation. There is no actual shortage of housing. There is merely a desperate shortage of housing which is for rent. One reason is that rentals have been held below their natural levels and countless people have occupied more space than they had before the war. That is why—between 1940 and 1946—almost 3,000,000 living units became occupied by only one or two persons instead of by larger families. This trend has continued—according to latest Census Bureau estimates. The housing is still there—but is not being used efficiently—and the would-be renter who is frozen on the outside is the loser.

I know it is hard to realize that our present-day widely accepted shortages are not shortages of housing space, but shortages of units available for rent. Let me call your attention to another comparison in the housing reports of the Bureau of Census:

In every one of the 34 metropolitan districts of the United States that were covered by a special study in 1947, the percentage of dwelling units that were rented declined from 1940 figures. These were not mild declines. Let me emphasize this point:

In Akron, 47½ percent of its dwellings were rented in 1940—in 1947, only 31 percent were rented. In Atlanta, 67 percent were rented in 1940—in 1947 it was 50 percent. In Dallas, it was 61 percent in 1940—40 percent in 1947. In San Antonio, it dropped from 88 percent to 55 percent.

Don't these comparisons show what is happening to the rental business in America under rent control? Don't they show why the renter is in an increasingly desperate plight in every area under rent control in the United States?

Why rentals are hard to find

In Philadelphia there were 432,680 rented homes in 1940, 380,046 in 1947. More than 50,000 fewer rented homes after rent control than before. In Pittsburgh there were 305,520 in 1940, 272,210 in 1947, a loss of more than 30,000. Chicago had 863,020 rented homes in 1940, 818,125 in 1947. All of these cities had increases in population. Is it any wonder that newcomers have a hard time finding rental housing? The housing is still there, but it is not for rent. These figures tell the story of rent control and what it is doing to the tenants of America.

The housing situation is called desperate in the New York area. It is desperate. Let us look at what makes it desperate. Residents are more dependent on rental housing there than in any other area in the nation. In 1940, 76 percent of the homes in that metropolitan district were rented. In 1947, after 5 years of rent control—the percentage had dropped to 67. In the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre area there has been a population decline of 15 percent—but there still is a desperate shortage of rental vacancies. Why? In 1940, 57 percent of its homes were rented. In 1947, 49 percent. Is it not clear that rent control has driven enormous numbers of rental units out of the rental market? What possible reason is there for rent control in an area where there has been a 15-percent loss in population—and where the result has been to create a critical shortage of rental vacancies where there was none before? Is that an "emergency defense rental area" which demands emergency Federal attention?

Those sharp declines do not show that fewer persons want to rent—or that rental units are going begging for lack of tenants. They show simply that as much as one-third of the dwellings which were on the rental market in 1940 were not on the rental market in 1947. Can any factor, other than rent control, be named which could have driven so many homes out of the rental market in so short a time?

Housing desires versus housing requirements

We recognize a tenant's desire for more spacious living quarters. It was out of such desires for better living standards that the American way of living was established and the rental housing industry was made possible. Today housing desires and housing requirements are all out of balance. The picture is so distorted that it is impossible for the investor to measure the amount of housing desired or required—and at what rental levels. It is only on a free market that we can learn how many rental units actually are needed to house our rental population in the way it wishes to be housed.

Every nation in Europe affords us an object lesson in the deterioration and stagnation of the building industry which inevitably follows in the wake of rent control. In spite of the desperate need and the war damage—there is little home construction—because the only ones who are able to provide it have no incentive to do so. We are following the same pattern here.

Before World War II we saw countless examples of those who preferred automobiles or fine clothing—or entertainment—to better housing. We were able to provide housing to the extent people preferred it to other items which were bidding for their money. Today, with rents alone controlled—we cannot measure the relative demand for housing that way because tenants are not allowed to express their desires. Those of us who are in the business of rental housing must either guess and gamble what the future true demand for housing will be—or refrain from providing any rental housing at all. Many of us have been forced to adopt the latter course—to the detriment of the persons who would express their desires for housing if only they were permitted to do so in a fair and competitive and free-market manner.

We seek the right to serve

We ask only the right to serve you to the best of our ability—in the way that you as tenants want us to serve you. We urge you to ask your Congressmen for the right to rent the kind of housing you want at the price you are able and freely willing to pay. You do not have that right now. Let us go back to the American way of bargaining freely among ourselves—arriving at our own agreements—buying or selling or producing what we wish to buy or sell or produce so long as it serves a constructive purpose. Let us throw off the choking restrictions and build our America—in the only way our America can be built.

One of the cruelest inequities of rent control has been the freezing in of the stay-at-home families who moved in while veterans were in service. It has frozen out the returning servicemen. Truly, the returning veteran and his family have been the greatest victims of rent control. We believe the best way in which a veteran can be helped to find a home to rent is to provide a reasonable selection of rental vacancies—in all rent ranges and in all communities. Those vacancies can be provided only by the redistribution of existing housing space not efficiently used—or by new rental construction. Rent control has acted as a barrier to either course. Redistribution of existing space can most quickly and most fairly be accomplished by the immediate termination of rent control. New construction will be tremendously speeded as soon as the rental market is clarified so that the owner of new construction can know on what basis he will have to compete with existing structures.

Let your Congressman know

Congress is considering now what steps to take. Write or wire your own Congressman and Senator. Tell him the stringent rental housing shortage must be eased, at once. Tell him it can be done only by removing the barriers of rent control which now prevent us—the owners of rental property in America—from providing you with the kind of living accommodations and services you desire and demand.

There is no time to lose. Wire or write today. Enclose this page with your letter.

A 7-year story

PERCENTAGE OF DWELLINGS RENTED TO TENANTS

Metropolitan district	1940	1947
Akron	47.5	30.8
Allentown-Beth-Easton	50.1	41.4
Atlanta	67.4	50.4
Baltimore	56.6	47.7
Birmingham	67.1	49.7
Boston	63.8	56.0
Chicago	69.8	60.9
Columbus	55.7	46.8
Dallas	61.2	42.8
Denver	58.2	45.1
Detroit	55.1	45.1
Los Angeles	50.5	45.4
Lowell-Lawrence-Haverhill	63.4	54.0
Memphis	68.0	53.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul	53.1	40.0
New Haven	62.6	46.0
New Orleans	74.4	63.4
New York-Northeast New Jersey	76.4	67.3
Norfolk-Portsmouth-Newport News	63.6	50.8
Philadelphia	67.3	39.7
Pittsburgh	60.9	48.0
Portland (Oreg.)	47.1	35.8
Rochester	54.5	42.1
Salt Lake City	48.2	36.0
San Antonio	88.1	55.3
San Francisco-Oakland	66.0	50.1
Scranton-Wilkes-Barre	57.0	49.3
Seattle	50.8	39.4
St. Louis	66.0	52.5
Toledo	60.1	39.4
Tulsa	57.4	39.3
Washington	57.8	38.6
Worcester	61.6	51.0
Youngstown	47.4	32.0

Source: U. S. Bureau of Census.

JOHN E. OWEN,
President, National-Apartment Owners Association, Washington, D. C.

Address by R. W. Frazier, Professor of Government and History, Southeastern State College, Durant, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to reprint the address given by Mr. R. W. Frazier, professor of government and history at Southeastern State Teachers' College, Durant, Okla. This address was given over radio station KSEO, Durant, Okla., on January 29, the occasion being the visit to that section of the Freedom Train:

A CHALLENGE TO OUR HERITAGE

DOCUMENTAL EVIDENCE OF OUR HERITAGE BORNE BY THE FREEDOM TRAIN

(By R. W. Frazier, professor of government and history, Southeastern State College, Durant, Okla.)

(As the Freedom Train—the first of its kind in the history of the Nation, was in Denison, Tex., only 21 miles south of Durant, the city of Southeastern State College, the college committee, for its weekly broadcast, selected a speaker in response and in appreciation of the Freedom Train movement, designed to better inform the American people of our sacred heritage to have and to hold.)

Thanks to the wisdom and and patriotic concept that emanated from the heart and mind of our illustrious statesman, Tom Clark, United States Attorney General, from our neighboring State of Texas, he, together with President Harry S. Truman, went into a conference at the White House on May 22, 1947, at which time the conceptions of the movement of the Freedom Train were crystallized into concrete form. Again we wish to thank our Congressman, CARL ALBERT, together with the Oklahoma congressional delegation, the Congress of the United States, and the 200 representatives of American businessmen who so generously responded to this first move, with their means and conveyances, in bringing the national mobile library to the general public, containing the most priceless documents ever scrolled by the pen of man. The documental records of the life of Christ, with all of His miraculous performances, as recorded by the inspired writers, stand out as the greatest of them all.

Where the old world ended following the crucifixion and the new world of faith and hope began with the resurrection, thus, the epochal documentary events, in shaping and guiding the destiny of man in a formal legal aspect, may be summarized in chronological order, as follows: The Magna Carta granted at Runnymede, June 15, 1215, the Petition of Rights in 1628, the English Bill of Rights in 1689, the Declaration of American Independence in 1776, the Articles of Confederation in 1778, the American Constitutional Convention in 1787, ratification of the Constitution in 1789, American Bill of Rights in 1791, the League of Nations in 1919, and the United Nations Charter in 1945.

These documentary milestones, covering a period of more than seven centuries, are reflections of well spent lives of service and statesmanship. They are reflections of unselfish service and devotion to the general welfare of the commonwealth which came within the purview and orbits of governmental regime.

It was wholly befitting that the Freedom Train began its 33,000 mile journey at Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love, the hallowed spot where our Constitution was conceived in the hearts and minds of our illustrious forefathers. The Convention assembled there about the middle of May 1787; of 74 colonial delegates summoned, 55 attended and only 39 signed this, the greatest national document of all time, on September 17 of the same year. Since September 17 is the birthday of our Constitution, and Philadelphia is the place of its origin; the time and place of this enlightened adventure to have its beginning on September 17, 1947, was very appropriate.

The most challenging of all our documents, with the exception of the declarations of war, was the Declaration of Independence declaring our freedom and independence from the iron hand of tyranny and oppression of our mother country, England. Had we failed in this daring and bold declaration, all the signers of this document would have been beheaded for this very act. Yes, we had to win and by the divine providence and unlimited courage, we cost England her most potent and valuable colonial possession and raised a new torchlight of civilization incorporated in the American Bill of Rights.

Our first adoption of a fundamental law governing the colonies, was known as the Articles of Confederation. This document was wholly void of an executive department. It had the power to levy a tax, but did not have power to force collection of same. It had power to declare war, but did not have sufficient power to conscript men to fight in the prosecuting of the war. This omission was not an oversight on the part of the framers of the articles, but they feared the repetition of tyrannical rule from royal governors and the British Parliament. After our present Constitution was ratified there was still a little fear that there might have been more power incorporated into the new department than was intended, therefore, the next move was to select some one for President in whom the whole country could place implicit trust, and would not abuse with surplus power the subjects within the realm of the "new law." For he who hath power and fails to temper justice with mercy is sure to fail. The man chosen for the Presidency of the United States was Gen. George Washington, who led his brave men in the Revolution to wrest from the tyrant hands of oppression those fundamental ideals that we hold so dearly in our beloved Government.

Thus, the throttle of the New Ship of State was intrusted to the hands of the man who suffered along with his comrades in the crucial winter at Valley Forge in 1777-78. Yes, the same hands that received the sword of surrender from Cornwallis at Yorktown in 1781. A new pilot on the intrepid seas of time, beneath whose lashing and angry waves have sunk the budding hopes of many rising statesmen. A new freedom ship of experimentation laden with the general welfare of human tolerance and liberties of mankind.

In 1492 the great discoverer of America stood on the deck of his shattered bark, leaning forward his harassed frame with anxious and eager eyes, to catch a vision of the sight of the unknown world. This successful adventure set a vast chain of events in motion known as the period of discovery which lasted for a period of 115 years. From 1607 down to 1732 was the period of colonization which lasted for 125 years, and from 1732 down to 1775, the first battle of the Revolution, only 43 years. This period was one of intolerance and oppression. These were times that tried and tested men's souls. Challenge after challenge issued forth by grim and merciless rulers, until the ideals of human rights and justice were conceived in the potent and flexible minds of our leaders which brought forth the issue in the battles of Lexington and Concord. It was "here to April's breeze unfurled, the embattled farmers stood and fired the shot heard around the world."

Yes, we were fortunate to be wafted upon the waves of divine providence. We were fortunate in having outstanding leaders of the age. What country could match our brain or brawn? What country could boast of a well-balanced leader greater than a George Washington? First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen. What country could match the wits of the aged counselor diplomat, and statesman, Benjamin Franklin? What country could boast of a greater writer and statesman than a Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence and the founder of the University of Virginia. What country could produce a financial genius equal to the brain of Alexander Hamilton? What country could produce a scholar of the fundamental law equal to that of James Madison, who may well be called the Father of our Constitution and the author of the Bill of Rights. Or what country had the equals of the fearless Patrick Henry or the pleadings of James Otis? These, along with many others, served their country with patriotic fervor and devotion, leading to a common cause—liberty and independence. Yes, it was Jefferson's statement that "Liberty is the price of eternal vigilance."

My countrymen, I wish to pause at this time to state that all that we hold dear to our hearts today within the sheltering folds of this liberal Government, the complacency of a high and refined society, the pursuits of life, liberty, and happiness, was bought and paid for by a most laudable and worthy group of courageous patriots who chose to sacrifice their lives in lieu of human bondage. Again we defended these principles in the War of 1812, again in 1848 and 1898.

We sent the flower of our young manhood across the seas in World War I to fight the war to end all wars and to save the world for all humanity. Again within a quarter of a century, we sent a greater array of our young manhood and young womanhood across the seas to fight in a greater war to bridle and subdue the dictators who sought to conquer, to exploit, to enslave, and to destroy the priceless heritage of all documentary torchlights of civilization which had been mothering humanity along the turbulent pathways of time.

I wish to ask you these questions: What is wrong? Why hasn't peace yet been confirmed? Why is the world, 2 years after the cessation of hostilities, still uneasy? When and where will be the peaceful complacency of us all? God himself only knows. What is the solution? How shall we best go about solving a correct solution? There is a challenge for us all.

First, there is a challenge to learn more about our own Government, its functions, its honor, to serve where we are best equipped to render service, its honor to obey and support with patriotic devotion. With this enlightened information, become active for the betterment of our country within our own boundaries.

The second challenge is a challenge to our noble heritage by the organized forces of communism—a way of life owing allegiance to those who seek to destroy our way of life, American democratic ideals. The Trojan horses are now within our walls. What does the propagandist for communism have to offer? Oh, my friends, nothing but utopian dreams which would ultimately end in servitude and slavery. The uninformed, the negligent, the carefree, and those with a self-complex, I warn you: "Beware; lest we forget, lest we forget."

To delay a crusade of American opposition to the Red wave of destruction which threatens to inundate us will spell disaster to all hard-earned victories of the glorious past. We must not permit these noble human achievements which have glorified and enriched the traditions of America, the world's greatest asylum for those who are impoverished and oppressed, to be cast aside by the dastard hands of traitors.

Not a single battle of the last two world wars was fought in your community; yet your sons, your fathers, your husbands, your brothers, your sisters and sweethearts fought and died in that holocaust of hell and hate that was set aflame by the pernicious philosophy of these Red devils who are now grafting upon the stem of our traditional freedom.

Do you think that the number of Communists in this country is too small to constitute a grave danger to American institutions? It does not require great numbers to light the flame of revolution. The 200,000,000 people of Russia have been reduced to social and economic status of medieval serfs by 5,000,000 members of the Third International. On October 7, 1917, when Lenin sparked the Proletariat Revolution there were only 30,000 Communists in that vast nation as against 180,000,000 of other people. With this handful of peasants, augmented by the inmates of criminal institutions and other elements of desperate and dangerous participants, they enacted a blood purge which culminated in the most brutal butchery of the world's many massacres. Millions of people perished from the dagger, sword, gun, and other deadly instruments in the hands of the disciples of Karl Marx.

Do you know how the 5,000,000 members of the Third International stifle the courage and break the spirit of 195,000,000 people in Russia? Here is the answer: The concentration camps of the barren and bitter Arctic regions; the firing squad; the mines of Siberia; the Soviet collectivist farms on which the intimidated peasants are driven to their slave labor by the lifted lash of criminal bosses. These make up the difference between a vast demoralized population and a small faction of well-equipped and vicious assassins.

Mr. Uninformed and Dissatisfied American, clothed with all the protection of the American Bill of Rights, do you subscribe to this communistic way of life?

My friends, there are more active Communists in many of the States of this Union than were in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, or even Russia, before the Communists seized the power under which they have reduced the weak democratic states of the Balkans to a condition of impotent vassalage.

At this time in the United States there is one Communist to every thousand of our voters; a number which represents a ratio of Communists which existed in Russia when the Soviet regime was ushered in.

The objectives of the American agents of the Third International are identical with the objectives of the Communist assassins who filled the sewers of Moscow and other cities of Russia with the blood of defenseless victims on October 7, 1917.

This Red American movement is more than an economic or political program. It is a conspiracy. This statement is verified by the recent interception of "secret papers" and "agreements" between Hitler and Stalin which had been stored in the German archives, later brought to light by the occupation or patrol troops now in the occupied territory of a conquered Germany.

My countrymen, this program is a conspiracy against all free people, against freedom of thought, of worship, of the press, of the right of assembly, of the right of petition of redress of public grievances—a conspiracy against every privilege that promotes the happiness of the individual—a conspiracy to enslave the body, blight the soul, stifle ambition, destroy the virtues and equal justice of mankind. The vital and supreme issue that challenges every American is: Shall the American way of life be preserved among the liberty-loving people of the earth, or shall we permit freedom to be wiped from the face of the earth?

Strange to say, but they held responsible, good-paying positions of trust within our own Government until President Harry S. Truman gave orders to purge the pay rolls and to stop feeding the hands that are fighting you and your heritage. They bed down in labor unions. They are shrewd parliamentarians thoroughly versed in economics and the inner workings of our Government. They soothe their victims with the soft voice of Jacob, and stab them with the hairy hand of Esau. Shall we blight the genius of our people in the poisonous fumes of atheism and anarchy? Are we ready to exchange our rich inheritance for the Utopian theory of Marxist pottage brewed in the cauldron of tyrants who connive to reduce us to a condition of mental servitude more hideous than the bondage that shattered the bodies and souls of the slaves chained to the galleys of their brutal Roman masters?

Communism and democratic capitalism cannot survive side by side. They can find no common soil in which to cultivate the seeds of their opposite purposes and ideologies. One of these systems must go. If we dedicate our lives and fortunes to the maintenance of the cardinal principles of liberty, equality, and justice, the stench of Marxism that is now befouling the free air of America will be smothered for all time to come.

A contrast between the two systems of the way of life is as follows:

What we must preserve

We sponsor government by consent.
We want liberty as we know and love it.
We demand equality of our people before the law.
We advocate government based on law and authority.
We are committed to the love of truth.
We worship an omnipotent and Divine God.
We advocate right.
We are dedicated to the principles of humanity.

What they would demand of us

They seek dictatorship.
They would replace such liberty with servile adherence to a Marxist state.
They would extend license and arbitrary privilege to an autocratic clique.
They would replace such government with a one-man brutal authority.
They resort to lying propaganda.
They would force all mankind to worship a centralized state, a ruler, a race, or party leader.
They would rule with the iron rod of might.
They resort to cruel and ruthless conquest.

Within the last three decades our dauntless manhood has suffered and died on the foreign battlefields of two World Wars in order to destroy the roots of insatiable ambitions of fiendish tyrants who sought to enslave humanity. Shall we permit the supreme sacrifices made by these immortal heroes to be all in vain? Shall we frown upon or shrink from these adventurous derelicts while they weave crowns of thorns for our brow, more cruel than those woven for us by the heartless assassins who directed the missiles of death that left thousands of our hero dead in unknown graves of distant climes? God forbid that we should let them spin the wheel of fortune which determines the future destiny of this glorious Republic.

The word "America" has become a world-wide synonym for truth, honor, charity, and justice. Wherever disaster has struck American benefactors have been the first to answer the call of distress. America has never blemished her escutcheon with cowardice. Her sons have fallen on every battlefield where the inherent rights of free people have been challenged since the birth of this Nation. What a travesty of a glorious past and a hopeful future to exchange a government possessing such honors for a system that would imperil her masses upon the vanishing sands of time.

The tide of freedom rises and falls in the constant cycles of human history. Greece, with her coterie of wise men, grew and blossomed into fruition of scholastic attainment which reached its highest stage of development and civilization under the wise guidance of Pericles. Her literature and art stands as a bulwark in the cultured realms of human achievements among the nations of the world, but she fell before the marching hordes of the Roman soldiers, and her torchlight of civilization went down in the dying embers of desolation and ruin.

The mighty Roman Empire spread its imperialistic wings over three continents and subdued the lesser powers of resistance and gave to the world her philosophy of legal justice and the scientific construction of roads and aqueducts, which reached its pinnacle of achievements under the great Augustus Caesar. But alas, she too fell, the somnambulist of a shattered dream. We propose to maintain our standard of freedom, and make it one which men cannot plunder or destroy, for such freedom once fixed in the hearts of our people, will become an everlasting source of universal kinship.

Our beloved country was not conceived by cowards and weaklings, but by men of destiny; strong, and fearless men; men who refused to live in bondage.

By an act of Congress of these United States of America, in the year 1918, this pledge has become a criterion of all citizens, laden with a moral obligation never to falter: "I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity, for which American patriots have sacrificed their lives and fortunes. I, therefore, believe it is my duty to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies." This pledge should be framed and hung on the walls of every schoolroom, carved in the archway over the doors of every temple of justice, read in every pulpit, taught to children in the classrooms throughout the land.

Our homes within this fair land are the sacred precincts across whose threshold kings, tyrants, and the demons of destruction should fear to tread.

For the throbbing pulse of this relentless world has never been pillowed in peaceful sleep. Across its snow-capped mountains and its rolling oceans, its waving forests, and trackless deserts, this white winged messenger of universal peace has never flown. Amid periods of turmoil and strife, the old world has pressed her way down through the ages.

One revolution after another has stirred her mighty heart; amidst the roar of battle has her history been written; by the lurid light of the campfire it has been read. Wrapped in the sable shrouds of desolation and death, the grim god of war has marched down through the centuries to the muffled drum beat of fallen nations and empires overthrown.

Looking backward into the past, I see a stormy day in December in the year 1606. A tiny fleet of three small vessels is forging its way against the lashing sea and biting wind, into the mouth of the historic James River. Few ships as small as these now cross the ocean, but they represented the fleet of North America, the white would-be inhabitants of this great continent. The passengers on these ships are lean, haggard, hungry, and seaworn, and on the little pinnace *Discovery* there stands Capt. John Smith with a purpose in his heart, determination plainly written on his face, and high hope swelling in his bosom; a hope to lead his suffering people from the land of tyranny and oppression into a country of moral and religious freedom where the sunlight of heaven shines over all with the same compassion of love, equality, and justice.

No vigor of youth, no maturity of manhood should ever lead a nation to forget the spot where its infancy was cradled and defended.

"Breathes there a man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
'This is my own, my native land.
'Land where our fathers died,
'Land of the Pilgrims' pride,
'From every mountain side
'Let freedom ring.'"

Margarine and the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to present excerpts of an article in regard to margarine and butter. This article appeared on page 11 of the November-December issue of the Labor Relations Bulletin of Milwaukee, Wis. It was written by Mr. Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary, Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperative, and is as follows:

MARGARINE AND THE CONSUMER

(By Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, for Labor-Public Relations Service Magazine)

The oleomargarine issue, as well as the product itself, has evolved through many stages during more than one-half a century of time. In this process of change has come change in consumer interest. With this have come conflicting viewpoints. Ethical, agricultural, and nutritional problems are at stake.

The issue today is largely whether two fats of vastly different origin and of somewhat different dietary standards are competing fairly or unfairly for consumer demands. Consumers and producers both have deep interest in the oleomargarine question.

Are producers of dairy products justified in their position that oleomargarine made and sold in the imitation of butter amounts to a trick on consumers and constitutes an unfair trade practice against dairymen? Are manufacturers and distributors of oleomargarine justified in trying to convince consumers that excise taxes on their products constitute an unfair trade barrier? Does the controversy involve misunderstanding between branches of agriculture and clash between sections of the country?

FARMER NETS LITTLE FROM SALE OF VEGETABLE OILS

To repeal or reduce excise taxes and licenses, to liberalize or tighten the extent to which oleomargarine may imitate butter—these questions do not involve conflict between branches of American agriculture. It is not an issue between cotton and soybean farmers on one side and dairy farmers on the other. According to prewar figures,

about one-half of 1 percent of the cotton growers' income was derived from the sale of oil used in oleomargarine. The use of soybean oil in oleomargarine accounted for only 5.3 percent of the grain soybean growers' income in 1940.

It is not a conflict between the North and the South. Oleomargarine is made largely in the North. Domestic fats and oils used in oleomargarine came as much from the North as from the South. The oil industry is growing in the North. The dairy industry is growing in the South.

If there is a clash of financial interest it is between the millions of dairy farmers who derive two-thirds or more of their income from the production of butterfat marketed in butter, and the handful of corporations and individuals who process vegetable oils into oleomargarine made in the imitation of butter. In the sale of butter the dairyman gets about 62.8 of the consumer's dollar. In the three principal butter-producing States, Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin, where 41 percent of the Nation's butter originates, 80 percent of the butter is made in cooperative creameries controlled entirely by dairy farmers living on and working family-sized farms. On the other hand, a few corporations control the bulk of oleomargarine made in America.

FARMER GETS MAJOR SHARE OF BUTTER INCOME

I think it is well for consumers to know something about comparable margins in the manufacturing of these two products. The price paid to the farmer for butterfat invariably exceeds the price per pound at which the butter is sold. As consumers you have the right to ask how this is possible.

The cost of manufacturing and distributing butter is taken out of overrun. What is "overrun"? Butter contains about 82 percent fat, about 15 percent water, 2 percent salt, and 1 percent curd. This 18 percent of a pound of butter made up of water, salt, and curd is known as overrun. It costs very little, while butterfat is the critical and difficult ingredient to produce. Because of the overrun which pays the cost of manufacturing and distributing, butter is generally solds for less than the price paid the dairy farmer for the butterfat.

On the contrary in the oleomargarine industry the farmer receives far less for the oil than the consumer pays for the finished product. Yet overrun is also an important factor in the making of oleomargarine. Oleomargarine is about 83 percent vegetable fat, 14 percent water, 3 percent salt and curd, and a preservative. Apparently this 17 percent overrun is absorbed in oleomargarine manufacturing profits.

VEGETABLE OILS IN OLEO VARY WITH AVAILABILITY

Vegetable oils, much cheaper in cost than butterfat, constitute the body of oleomargarine. The oleomargarine industry has great flexibility in that it can quickly change its source of fat supply, using whatever form of oil may be cheapest or most readily available. Oleomargarine uses cheap mechanical oil extraction processes. The butter industry depends upon the living biological processes of the cow that convert grains and grasses into milk proteins and butterfat.

Yet, in spite of these cost advantages, the price of oleomargarine fluctuates in relationship to the price of butter instead of being governed entirely by its own cost of production. In view of this oleomargarine price picture, have consumers any assurance that the oleomargarine interests will reduce consumer price to the extent that Federal or State excise taxes might be eliminated or reduced?

Consumers ask the question, "why a tax on oleomargarine?" Obviously the Federal tax of ¼ cent per pound on uncolored oleomargarine is not a burden nor does it restrict the use of this product. The 10 cents per pound Federal tax is applicable only when oleomargarine is colored butter-yellow. From the standpoint of food availability and digestibility, oleomargarine, not colored in imitation of butter, is just as nutritious and just as digestible as it is when colored butter-yellow. Hence, Federal taxes do not necessarily curtail the manufacture and distribution of oleomargarine.

DAIRYMEN RESENT ATTEMPTS TO IMITATE BUTTER

I think consumers should understand why dairymen feel that it's an unfair infringement for oleomargarine to be made in imitation of yellow butter. The farmer feels that butter has come down through the ages a basic food in the diet of civilized man. For thousands of years the natural yellow color of butter and its typical flavor have been universally recognized and accepted among all caucasian people.

The producer and the consumer know that butter is both a food and a flavor. To them color and flavor are the evidence of its identity. They believe that the consumer is entitled to buy either oleomargarine or butter with the feeling of assurance that there will be no confusion, no uncertainty, no parading in false colors.

LABELING PACKAGE DOES NOT IDENTIFY OLEO ON THE TABLE

Labeling the package is not the answer. Oleomargarine colored butter-yellow loses its identity when taken from the labeled package to be served on the table, in the hotel, in the restaurant, or dining car. It is for this reason that many States, including Wisconsin, prohibit the sale of oleomargarine colored butter-yellow.

There have long been recognized ethical standards restricting imitations. For example Brookshire cheese is too close to Swift & Co.'s Brookfield trade-mark to be permitted. Will Rogers found out that Illiterary Digest was too similar to Literary Digest. An automobile manufacturer was prevented from using a certain shape of radiator because it too closely resembled the Packard radiator design.

Why of all the colors in the spectrum do the oleomargarine people select the yellow color of butter? Why have the manufacturers of oleomargarine made every effort to duplicate the body and texture and melting point of butter? They have added 9,000 units of vitamin A per pound in an effort to approximate the vitamin A content of butter. The flavor of butter may also be added legally to oleomargarine so as to make identification almost impossible. A noteworthy deviation in legalizing these standards of imitation is the fact that the use of a preservative is permitted in oleomargarine but not in butter.

WHY NOT USE ANOTHER COLOR FOR OLEO?

With all this imitation permitted, there remains the feeling that consumers should be protected by a color identification so it would not be necessary to call on technical laboratory tests to determine whether it is butter or oleomargarine. If the product will sell in its own image, identified separately for what it is, there will be no basis for controversy. The dairy industry will guarantee never to imitate the color or characteristics of oleomargarine. Dairymen feel that asking the oleomargarine industry not to imitate the color of butter is only fair.

Peanut butter sells under its own characteristic brown color and its own typical flavor. Even though peanut butter uses the term "butter," still there is no controversy because there is no consumer deception.

And the question is asked "should it make any difference to the consumers which fat he is getting if in taste or color he can't detect the difference anyway?" Yes, for the same reason that consumers have a right to know whether or not the meat they are eating comes from a horse or a cow. Regardless of the fact that horse meat and beef are both nutritious and digestible, and when smothered with seasoning may taste the same the consumer has a moral and legal right to know the difference.

IMITATION AND DECEPTION SHOULD BE PREVENTED

Most consumers will agree that deception is a fact to be discouraged in the world of food. Even if there existed nutritive equivalency, the element of imitation and deception should be discouraged and prevented. We are in for trouble if the time comes when we accept the principle that approximate nutritive equivalency of an imitation food shall be the criterion of legitimacy.

For example, there is the possibility of opening the door for filled milk which means the substitution of vegetable oils for butterfat mixed with condensed skim milk. This product is a positive threat to the health and life of babies raised on a formula, because, unlike butterfat, vegetable oil lacks the growth factor. There is also the threat of filled cheese and filled ice cream.

In this connection let me point out that in Germany, according to an article by Mr. A. Imhausen, published in Kolloid Zeitschrift in May 1943, a method had been developed for the manufacture of fatty acids and edible fats from petroleum products using a byproduct of synthetic gasoline plants. As early as 1937 the production of synthetic butter was reported. Later than this, experiments in the production of synthetic fatty acids from coal were reported.

If we legalize consumer deception between butterfat and mechanically processed vegetable oils, then the next move may be the substitution of vegetable oils by synthetic fats made from coal and petroleum. In this connection here is what Mr. Imhausen of Germany says of these synthetic fats (translation):

"The Public Health Bureau of the Reich has, by thousands of experiments under the leadership of Dr. Flossner, demonstrated the high value of synthetic fats and has released it as the first synthetic food material of the world for human nourishment."

IS THERE MUCH NUTRITIVE EQUIVALENCY?

Consumers should know that as between oleomargarine and butter, there is a question of nutritive equivalency. I quote from the American Medical Association Journal:

"Since the nutritional factors have not all been identified, and since butter contains numerous additional fatty acids of unknown nutritional value, the consuming public has a right to demand that the practice of identifying oleomargarine and butter, so that anyone can differentiate between them, should be continued."

The use of a preservative in oleomargarine which is not used in butter should be remembered when considering nutritional equivalency.

BUTTERFAT MAKES BUTTER QUALITIES UNIVERSALLY DEPENDABLE

Butterfat is more consistent in origin than the imitation product. This adds to the question of nutritional equivalency. Butter is created in the living mammary glands of the cow from grains and grasses she has consumed. However, in a short span of years the fat sources of oleomargarine have shifted many times. In 1925 oleomargarine made in this country consisted of:

	Percent
1. Animal fats	40.2
2. American vegetable oils (principally cottonseed oil)	14.4
3. Imported vegetable fats (principally coconut oil)	45.4

By 1933, the use of animal fats and American vegetable fats declined, while the use of imported vegetable fats had increased as follows:

	Percent
1. Animal fats	14.0
2. American vegetable fats	10.5
3. Imported vegetable fats (Almost exclusively coconut oil)	75.5

In 1940, the percentages were as follows:

	Percent
1. Animal fats	9.4
2. American vegetable fats	79.7
3. Imported vegetable fats	10.9

Butterfat alone as compared with oleomargarine has superior dietary qualities. Consumer protection when oleomargarine is used lies in the hope that an adequate general mixed diet will be guaranteed and in the hope that oleomargarine will be adequately fortified with vitamin A.

BUTTER CONTAINS VERY ESSENTIAL VITAMIN E

The high nutritional value of butter is shown by recent experiment. Butterfat is found to be a very reliable source of vitamin E. Clinical reports now indicate that vitamin E is important in human reproduction; also, the most recent research work suggests interrelation of vitamin E and inositol in the prevention of muscular dyostrophy in human beings, and a high degree of success has been reported for clinical use of vitamin E in the treatment of lumbago. According to the National Dairy Council, results of recent experimentation indicate that this interrelationship plays a possible role in the prevention of certain kidney ailments and heart disorders.

According to Dr. E. B. Hart, of the University of Wisconsin department of biochemistry:

"The fat of milk is of most complex composition."

He points to a difference in the chemical constitution of butterfat and vegetable oils. Dr. Hart further states:

"It is probably the difference in the constitution of the fatty acids of the saponifiable fraction, although it may be due to some unrecognized essential nutrient carried by butterfat but not carried by the vegetable oils. The mammary gland has synthesized something special for which there is at present no known substitute."

Since nutritional equivalency between oleomargarine and butter is not an established fact, it is vital that each product be readily and clearly identified for the consumer. Therefore, maintaining characteristic color difference is sound policy.

EXCISE TAXES PREVENT FRAUD AND DECEPTION

An important reason for Federal and State excise taxes is to police against fraud and deception. Racketeers have pawned butter-yellow oleomargarine onto the public as being butter. Reputable manufacturers are not doing this. It is to their interest as well as to the interest of consumers to suppress fraud in the sale of oleomargarine.

For example, in 1931 a man with much sales ability got in with a reputable oleomargarine manufacturer as a New York-New England distributor. His objective was to pawn a cheaper product onto the 20,000,000 people living in that eastern metropolitan area. He picked the responsible-sounding name of Haddad Trading Co. He lined up two Boston citizens, Vincent Bruzzese, who was an operator of a small cheese plant, and a trucker by the name of DeMauro, whose name was well-known in Boston police files. Haddad would provide the oleomargarine. These men would color and sell it as butter. Margins were wide and profits were great. Haddad would report sales at 20 or more Boston bakeries. Instead the product would go to Bruzzese and DeMauro. As the illicit profits accumulated he would pay the Illinois manufacturer and credit the "accounts" of the bakers who were not getting a pound of the product. He had some legitimate customers, but it was the fraudulent product that paid off. He did fool the manufacturer and the consumer for a while, but he was soon tripped up by the internal-revenue people. This is but one of many similar cases prosecuted during the past 45 years out of funds provided by the Federal 10-cent tax on yellow oleomargarine.

WOULD DAMAGE SOIL

Complete loss of identity between oleomargarine and butter would tend to reduce the demand for and the production of butter. Normally in the United States 45 to 59 percent of our milk which is processed is made into butter. If butter production is drastically reduced, it would mean a decrease in total milk production. This would mean a decrease in the production of milk solids as well as milk fats. The over-all loss to general health would outrank the alleged benefits claimed by the handful of oleomargarine manufacturers.

Any discouragement to the dairy industry would tend to cause a shift from a livestock to a field crop type of agriculture. With this shift will come loss in soil fertility, more soil mining, and more soil erosion. All of this is of vital concern to consumers as well as to producers.

Hence it is seen that the oleomargarine question involves not only ethics in business—not only the question of trade barriers or unfair trade practices—but also it involves food policies basic to consumer health and welfare and changes fundamental to the permanency of American agriculture.

Statement of Irish Race Convention Before Senate Foreign Relations Committee Urging Freedom of North Ireland in Considering Marshall Plan Submitted by Joseph Scott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Irish race convention before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as follows:

(The statement prepared on behalf of the Irish race convention is as follows:)

In behalf of those for whom I have the honor to speak, I desire to thank your committee, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to be heard.

And, for the record, permit me to make it plain who it is for whom I speak.

It is for very proud American citizens, Mr. Chairman, hundreds of thousands of whom have signed their names and set their addresses to a monster petition now on its way to the President and to the Congress at Washington—but more of that in a moment.

I also speak at the direction of a very remarkable Irish race convention which was held in the city of New York on the 22d and 23d days of November 1947. I carry to you the unanimously expressed wishes and views of that great convention.

The sons and daughters of our American Irish were represented at that convention, Mr. Chairman, by their delegates from 38 States of the United States of America. All of the great Irish-American organizations sent their unqualified endorsements, and were, for the most part, represented in person by their national officers. I mean such organizations as the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the Clan-na-Gael, the united Irish county organizations, the Gaelic League, the American-Irish Historical Society, the Sean Oglaigh nah Eireann, the League for Irish Freedom of San Francisco, the Anti-Partition League of Philadelphia, the Irish Fellowship Club of Chicago, the Irish Cultural Society, and countless others.

I suppose, therefore, that without exaggeration I might say that I speak for millions of our citizens of Irish blood, and I want to tell you why it is that all of them are speaking with a single united voice—a voice which cannot be denied—it is, Mr. Chairman, because they have a very deep sense of grievance.

Let me, as quickly as I can, paint the situation for you in simple and direct words. I quote:

"That countless thousands of American citizens of Irish birth or blood are smarting under the indignity of the forcible partition of Ireland by England."

Those words, Mr. Chairman, are taken verbatim from the monster petition to which I have before referred.

And to prevent your minds, worthy Senators, from formulating the question: "What has that to do with this committee, and with these hearings?" permit me to quote a further line from the preamble of the petition:

"That England, by subsidy and otherwise, has maintained this partition against the voice of the overwhelming majority of the people of Ireland."

You quickly catch and note that word, subsidy, gentlemen. You quickly catch and note, too, those words "• • • against the • • • overwhelming majority • • •"

Meanwhile, the President of the United States of America has transmitted to the Congress of the United States his message on the European recovery program. The official outline of European recovery program shows that Ireland was one of the 16 countries invited to the Paris Conference.

The President has predicated his message upon the spirit of democracy as he sees it. In a later press release he refers to the plan for western Europe as both economic and spiritual. The President has also sent to the Congress proposed legislation which this committee is now considering for report to the Senate. That legislation calls for American money, vast amounts of it. And out of those very moneys England proposes to continue to support her invasion of Ireland, contrary to the democratically expressed wishes of the people of Ireland.

So, beyond peradventure of doubt, Mr. Chairman, this is the time and this is the place for our citizens of Irish birth or blood to be heard carefully and with grave consideration before further irreparable damage may be done.

Mistake it not, when these sons and daughters of Ireland say in their petition from which I have quoted that they are "• • • smarting under • • • indignity," they have indeed a grievance. Let us examine that grievance, and see what it is.

I asked a grandfather the other day, a simple man, a maker of things all his life, how we could best express it. He said:

"My sons were in the service. They were unable to answer the questions of their buddies, 'Where did your folks come from?' My sons couldn't say 'From Ireland,' because there is no Ireland. She is split into 6 counties and 26 counties.

"You heard of the man without a country. Well, England has made my sons men without a land of heritage.

"But worse than that, my sons, thank God, have come back safe. Now they are raising me a crop of grandchildren. How, in heaven's name, are those grandchildren going to explain where their ancestral stock came from? You'd have to feed them political history with their milk."

There you have it.

Take it another way. Sit you down at a business conference or sit you down at a luncheon. Gather at your place of worship or assemble at your club or at your lodge. Americans all. That typifies the strength of our America. As you look around at your fellow American citizens you tabulate them. Sure, that fellow over there is a Swiss; and that husky giant is a Norwegian; there's a Dane in the corner seat; and that chap over there is English. Each has his country of ancestral heritage. But we come to the stock that John Boyle O'Reilly wrote of, and what can we say of them? Think of the shame of it. If one of them so much as peeps up "My father was Irish," or "My mother's folks came from Ireland," immediately the questions start: "Which Ireland?" "Where?" "You mean from the English part of it or from the other part?"

Senators, they had a short name for the Pacific Ocean in this last war. They called it the Irish Sea.

Can we seriously imagine that the Kellys and Burkes and Sheas, or the Sullivans, who went down there to their last long sleep, or that the Murphys, the O'Briens, and the McCarthys, who were fortunate enough to come back from there, would want the United States of America to subsidize by our money the partition of Ireland, so that in very fact there is no Ireland but only two divided sections of counties of which the spokesman for the leading political party in Ireland has said, "If partition be not undone, then all that has been gained for Ireland in the last hundred years may be lost."

All that has been gained in the last hundred years. That seems a very casual way to treat a hundred years of event-packed history, Mr. Chairman. Our great United State of America is not yet in its two hundredth year. But let us look at it from the standpoint of Ireland's history. It was not until after the middle of the twelfth century that the English armed forces came to Ireland. Ever since then, and in each generation, the battle in Ireland against the invaders of Ireland has continued, and wherever throughout the world the exiled sons and daughters of the Gael were forced to go in order to find the liberty and to make the living which was denied to them by the oppression of the foreigner in the land of their forebears that battle has also continued, and will continue until the end, Mr. Chairman.

So, as of today, for almost 800 years, the Irish have fought the continued foothold of that English invader, and, at long length, they have driven that invader out of 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland.

Why England's subsidy supports a puppet government in the remaining six counties—against the majority vote, again and again recorded—of all of the people of Ireland, and how England does this, is too long a story for me to detain you with today, but there are two things which I can do without taking time: First, I can file with you copies of David O'Neill's 38-page brochure, The Partition of Ireland, How and Why It Was Accomplished, asking you, Mr. Chairman, to regard that exhibit as an extension of my remarks; and second, I can emphasize for this record the fact, that since the last printing of Mr. O'Neill's publication saw the light, the head of England's puppet government in the six counties, namely Sir Basil Brooke, the six-county premier, has admitted in a public speech that the minimum subsidy by which England sustains the unnatural partition of Ireland is $40,000,000 per year. And in many years, England's subsidies go far, far beyond that sum. She carefully conceals the figures, but qualified estimates place the average at $200,000,000 per year.

I recognize that in a vastly changed world order, there may be some Senator, or some Congressman, with but a few Irish in his constituency, who may say: "Oh, well, this is a new strange world we are living in. Other countries are partitioned. Other countries are split apart. Why not Ireland?"

The easy, quick answer, Mr. Chairman, is that the very antiquity of Ireland has ingrained the fight of the Irish against the invasion of the English to such an extent that the fight has become an integral part of worth-while Irish character, and in the very nature of things that fight can never end until the invader ceases to encroach upon Irish soil. Until then there can be no permanent peace in the world, Mr. Chairman, because history shows that in generation after generation the Irish in Ireland have adopted every legitimate means—just as the American Colonies sought aid from France—in the necessarily bloody battle to win independence.

Ireland's background, Ireland's antiquity, merits freedom and independence, Mr. Chairman.

It is not my purpose to unduly spend any of the time of this honorable body, and I suppose that I might, with every fairness, ask the Senators to take judicial notice of the antiquity of the Irish. So, for the purpose of the record, let me say merely this:

From more than 7 centuries before the birth of Christ, the historians have adduced what they consider as the beginning of indisputably authentic Irish history.

I quickly carry you over more than 9 centuries, during which law and learning and the arts progressed in Ireland. During those centuries, the land which we now know as England came under the domination of the Romans. Ireland remained with the Irish. During those centuries the world saw a new light—the Man of Galilee was born, and lived, and was crucified.

Two hundred and twenty-seven years after the birth of Christ, there came to the high throne of Ireland, Cormac the son of Art. Cormac gave us the Psalter of Tara—a compilation, mind you, of the then previously enacted and functioning laws of Ireland. No wonder there is pride in the people of Irish blood—Ireland's sons and daughters everywhere.

Merely in passing, and because there is a moral and a lesson to be well drawn from it, may I add that Cormac's father was the son of that Irish king known as Conn of the Hundred Battles. Seventeen centuries later, this battle which we are fighting here today is but another phase of the age-long battle of the Irish, because so long as a single foot of Irish soil remains within the possession or control of the foreign invader, so long will the sons and daughters of Ireland battle for Ireland throughout every country of the civilized world.

Then, 2 centuries more, and in A. D. 432 St. Patrick comes to Ireland. And Ireland took St. Patrick and Christianity to its warm Irish heart.

I don't have to tell you the story of that. Just let me remind you of the one incident: That of the Irish chieftain who was brought to renounced paganism and to embrace Christianity. St. Patrick stood before him, face to face, and for freedom of hand the saint took his spiked crozier and rammed it down into the soft Irish earth. Then he proceeded with the instructions to the new convert. It was not until he finished, that looking down he saw the ground covered with blood, and found that he had hammed his bishop's crozier right through the foot of the convert chieftain. That chieftain had never winced. He had not shown a sign of pain. And then St. Patrick apologized and asked him why he had not said something, the chieftain merely said that he thought it was part of the ceremony, that the suffering was just something to bear—a little token of the price of being a Christian.

Maybe there is a lesson in that for the troubled New World of today, Mr. Chairman.

Here we are, preparing to make vast sacrifices of our substance for a supposedly democratic and largely Christian western Europe, Mr. Chairman. And we are told to build high hopes upon that western Europe for our own safety, Mr. Chairman. We are told that it may keep communism out of America, out of our own United States.

I point this honorable committee back to that chieftain who knew how to suffer. I point you back to that little land of Ireland where communism never could show its dirty head. I point you back to that little island of saints and scholars which, through all of the early centuries and down through the Middle Ages, sent the teachings of Christianity and of democracy to all lands. In spite of her own sufferings at home, Ireland spread the light, Mr. Chairman—and in America's vast new projects of today and tomorrow, whatever form these projects may finally take, you will find no safer, no braver, no truer spot than little Ireland. You will neither find communism in Ireland, nor will you find it among Ireland's sons and daughters in our own land, Mr. Chairman.

But by what rule of logic, by what method of reasoning, can it be held a sensible thing to keep that stronghold of light and of Christian religion, that European outpost of Christianity and of democracy, divided against itself? The answer does not lie in logic or in reason, Mr. Chairman. The answer lies in the stubbornness and in the cupidity of England. Let us examine it:

England has about the same area as our own State of Illinois. But she is overpopulated and she is industrially outmoded. Those are the admissions of her own statesmen and of her own spokesmen. Her density of population is about 715 to the square mile. Even according to the estimates of Mr. Churchill, she must move out about one-third of her population. Probably one-half is nearer to the real picture.

Ireland has about the same area as our own State of Maine. But she is underpopulated, and is industrially underdeveloped. Her population is about 115 to the square mile. Even according to our own Department of State, the 26 counties of Ireland must be a good credit risk. The State Department's report to your own committee, I remind you Mr. Chairman, is that in the event of advance of moneys as contemplated by the so-called Marshall plan, the advance to the 26 counties would be by way of loan, whereas the advance to Britain must perforce, and obviously, be very largely by way of grant.

May I divert here, to suggest what must be quite apparent to your learned committee, and that is that no such two classes of money should ever be disbursed from a common or mingled fund. He who approaches the banker to seek a loan upon his credit, approaches that banker with head up—seeking that which he can in honor take and which he expects to pay back. But, he who approaches a donor seeking a gift or grant necessarily comes with hand outstretched, and is in no position to discuss terms. He is a beneficiary. He must listen to and obey the instructions of the donor.

But little Ireland—again as I say of the size of our State of Maine—is burdened by England with two governments, two sets of customs, an unnatural internal customs border more than 270 miles long, two sets of police, two sets of armed defense forces, two sets of everything from the highest to the lowest.

If the 26 counties, so circumstanced, and as just a part of Ireland, are a worthy credit risk for our taxpayers' money, why should not all of Ireland (the Irish Nation) under one sensible government of her people, and with England's needless waste and squandering eliminated, be in very fact an excellent credit risk?

Of course, the real answer is that the division of Ireland is England's plan—it is the age-old continuance of the policy of divide and conquer. What was once the Pale of Dublin has now in economic fact become the Pale of Belfast and of the six agricultural counties which serve that industrial city.

And, of course, the implements by which England maintains the division are subsidy and gerrymander. Again, I refer you to David O'Neill's pamphlet. Or, if you need some more figures, I refer you to Cahir Healy's Mutilation of a Nation.

It is true that the gerrymander may be for the Irish in Ireland to handle; but the subsidy is certainly not a thing for us to grant, Mr. Chairman.

Whence come the moneys which the Executive asks you to vote, Mr. Chairman? Answer: From the taxpayers. Well, taxpayers are before you, Mr. Chairman.

Speaking in the representative capacity in which I appear here today, it would be obviously improper for me to express either advocacy of or opposition to the projected legislation which lies before your committee. Each citizen is entitled to his or her own opinion upon the merits or the demerits of the so-called Marshall plan.

But upon one thing I do speak with all the emphasis that is at my command—and I bring to you all of the steadfast earnestness of the multitude of voters who have sent me to appear before you.

I speak and I protest—and we shall continue to speak and we shall continue to protest from hence forward—against the sending of a single dollar of American taxpayers' money to Britain while the Government at 10 Downing Street persists in the insane division of Ireland. It is beyond successful dispute that England is financing the partition of Ireland with American money. American citizens of Irish blood who are worth their salt are burning with hot indignation over this, Mr. Chairman.

As members of this honorable committee know, this Irish question is no new thing in Washington. But the difference is that it is no longer truly an Irish question. It is an English question.

The Irish in Ireland have demonstrated superb abilities in troubled times to govern themselves.

Our Irish citizenry in the United States have given us of their valor and of their zeal, in peacetime and in wartime, since the foundation of this our Republic, Mr. Chairman.

In the form and manner provided in the Constitution of the United States they are now bringing their protest to Washington. They have the right to be heard.

They say that England instituted the partition of Ireland under impelling threat of superior force. This is a fact of history, Mr. Chairman. Lloyd George admitted it, and gloried in the fact.

During the period of actual hostilities, and during the first step of reconstruction, our Irish voters have preserved an admirable attitude even when vast sums were being sent to England apparently to be very largely squandered.

But now, Mr. Chairman, what future moneys are to go, if any are to go, avowedly for constructive and allegedly for American protective purposes.

If this be so, there should be no waste. We assert that England's subsidy of Irish partition is unadulterated waste. We assert that it is both economic waste and military waste. Obviously a divided Ireland is less effective as a warm friend of the United States of America than would be a united Ireland.

If we are correct in saying that there should be no waste, then it follows that there should be no palpable violation of the democratic principles for which we assert that we are building. England's violation of democratic principles in the six counties of Ireland is open, is adverse, and is notorious.

If there should be no waste, there should be no weakening of the geographic and national units which might be expected to be a source of sound defense in the event of armed struggle between conflicting ideologies. England's interference in Ireland is a continuing cause of such weakening. It should not be permitted even to continue, much less should it be financed by the United States of America.

In the United States of America we give much weight to the free ballot, Mr. Chairman. I call to your attention the fact that free ballots are about ready to be cast in the 26 counties. But each of the conflicting political parties is in complete agreement with its opponents upon one thing, Mr. Chairman—partition of Ireland must end. That is a major plank in each political platform in Ireland.

Should question arise as to the propriety of what I am today discussing before your honorable committee, and of your action upon it, I call to your committee's attention the fact that this question of propriety was thrashed out before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives at the third session of the Sixty-fifth Congress almost 30 years ago. I refer to the record of the hearings on House Joint Resolution 357, December 12 and 13, 1918. As a result that question was affirmatively determined, and the decision was in favor of Ireland's cause. Likewise in the Senate before the Committee on Foreign Relations, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session. The Senate went on record 60 to 1 in favor of Ireland's cause.

Not until, by the valor of Ireland's sons, and by the force of public opinion throughout the civilized world, England was driven to it, never did England seriously approach the problem of her withdrawal from Ireland. Then, 27 years ago she devised the accursed plan of partition, and drove the 26 counties into a bloody civil war. Today, Ireland as Ireland is confronted by the enforced secession of 6 countries from the 32. It is the same kind of secession that had to be settled by our own Civil War, but with this added insult: England is actually subsidizing, directly and unashamedly, the entities which constitute the six seceding units in Ireland.

Upon behalf of my people I protest. I say that the United States of America cannot afford to subscribe to such an iniquitous outrage upon human liberty. That is my case, in the merest outline, Mr. Chairman.

May I thank the chairman and the committee for the time and the courtesy extended to me upon this hearing, and may I offer, upon behalf of my colleagues and myself, to furnish any other facts, data, historical, or other matter for the record which may be required by the committee or by its chairman.

* * * * *

Mr. SWEENEY. Again we present the problem solely as American taxpayers. I do not know how to characterize it. But I can say it would be repulsive, to say the least, if this great Republic of ours would permit $40,000,000 or $200,000,000—whatever the relative amount is—to be siphoned by the British Empire into the six counties in Ireland known as the Belfast Parliament, there established because of a shotgun treaty, as Mr. Scott has so ably and dramatically presented his side to the committee.

I think it would shock the taxpayers of America, no matter what their origin was, no matter what their blood, that this country would lend its aid and support to keep the scores of Irish irritation going in the six counties in Ireland. By every test of a plebiscite the people have repudiated this so-called shotgun treaty. Religious friction is there. Make no mistake about it. You can, Mr. Chairman, obtain from the Legislative Service the record of the amount of money spent to maintain this garrison in Ireland. Since 1920 at various times as many as 60,000 soldiers have been poured into there, into those six counties. I am not concerned about how many were there during the war, when we collaborated with Northern Ireland as a nation. Leave that out of it. I don't know what the relative figures are today. But there are several thousand, and I don't know how much money they will want to maintain that garrison there, and that bridgehead and that parliament. Suffice it to say we have the proof—our committee can give you the proof. We have the word of Sir Basil Brookes, Premier of the Belfast Parliament, as to the amount of money they need and do get from England. Where is England getting the money? From generous Uncle Sam, as she got it before. From your Uncle Sam and mine, who is punch drunk and dizzy and weak because he has been so generous in pouring out lavishly of his treasure all over the world because we are a Christian nation, gentlemen, and none of us stands in the way of extending the corporeal works of mercy to the distressed people of the world. We want to help to feed and clothe them, yes, and to give shelter to the homeless, but we certainly do not want to encourage an alien government anywhere against the accepted will of the majority of the people of any country, and I am certain the wisdom of this committee, which is laboring under terrific strain, I know, in the troublesome days we are living in, trying to do the best we can for this country, will be sure we do not drain our blood out and weaken our own Government and our own economy when we extend the hand of good fellowship and charity to those unfortunate nations that are in distress today.

As an American taxpayer, Senator VANDENBERG and members of the committee, I make my protest in that direction, and I hope your committee will consider it from that source.

Thank you.

What Six Billions Mean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have just received from a constituent of mine, a very excellent graphic illustration of what six billions means to the American people. It means so much that it is beyond the comprehension of many of us to appreciate fully. I quote the item sent me by my constituent as follows:

SIX BILLIONS

Since 1932 we have become used to talking in billions instead of millions, but it is doubtful whether many of us have real understanding of the magnitude of such sums. For example, we are preparing to vote $6,000,000,000 aid to Europe on the theory that we would rather have Europeans on their feet than on our hands, but $6,000,000,000 is a tremendous amount of money.

Suppose you owned the United States and all it contains and someone came to you and said, "Uncle, 16 European nations are in a bad way. They must have help."

"What sort of help?" you might ask.

"Not just money," the solicitor would reply. "How about giving us some of your big successful business concerns?"

"You mean some of our big business concerns with all their assets?"

"Yes; that's what I mean."

"How many and which ones?"

"Well, your Ford Motor Co., for one. Also, Sears, Roebuck & Co.; and General Electric, Chrysler Corp.; Armour & Co.; F. W. Woolworth Co.; the Eastman Kodak Co.; Atlantic Refining Co.; Aluminum Co. of America; the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.; Republic Steel; International Harvester Co.; and the Reynolds Tobacco Co."

"Great heavens!" you probably would exclaim. "Do you really think I could afford to give you all these great business concerns with all their assets?"

"Why not?" Their total value, with all their assets, is less than $6,000,000,000, which your Congress is going to vote us just for the first year of a 4-year aid program to get us back on our feet."

Does that give you any better understanding of what $6,000,000,000 amounts to?

What about $17,000,000,000?

Fort Douglas, Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Fort Douglas, in the State of Utah, is one of the oldest and most historic Army posts in this country. In addition, its strategic location is of vital military importance in the event of a future war.

It is located inland a sufficient distance to give adequate protection from a sudden strike against our west-coast defenses.

It is extreme folly for the Army to abandon posts of such extreme strategic importance as Fort Douglas. The United Veterans' Council of Utah, representing 20 veterans' organizations from the State of Utah, protested the abandonment of Fort Douglas, and with leave granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, herein is their letter which fully presents their views as well as my own:

UNITED VETERANS COUNCIL,
Salt Lake City, Utah, February 12, 1948.
Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Congressman for Utah, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAWSON: The undersigned committee represents 20 veterans' organizations, 20 auxiliary organizations, and 10 closely allied auxiliary organizations representing the Patriotic Council of Salt Lake City, Utah. In the aggregate, their membership consists of approximately 50,000 veterans, their families, and those interested in their welfare.

In a meeting held at the Newhouse Hotel February 11, with 100-percent attendance, they voted unanimously to protest abandonment of Fort Douglas by the Army of the United States. They do so to you vigorously and ask that you use your influence to see that such institutions are not abandoned, and that we stress with all our might the absolute necessity of a preparedness program to keep America strong.

It need not be said to you that in this group are men who served in three wars; fathers who gave their sons on the altar of sacrifice in defense of a great America; mothers who are gold-star mothers, diligently and unselfishly seeking a way to make America strong. They are a powerful group for good in America.

In order that you may know who they are, this letterhead represents all of the veterans and auxiliaries in Salt Lake County, and the additional group represents the following organizations: Patriotic Defense Council, Disabled War Veterans Auxiliary, Ladies of the GAR, VFW Auxiliary, Gold Star Mothers, United Spanish War Veterans Auxiliary, American Legion Auxiliary, Daughters of Indian War Veterans, Canadian Legion Auxiliary, No. 97, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Gold Star Wives, and Gold Star Sisters.

We reaffirm our protest and ask that this letter be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in defense of our stand.

Sincerely yours,

BIRNEY K. FARNSWORTH,
Chairman, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Mrs. J. E. PENNOCK,
Salt Lake City, Utah.
Mrs. J. ROY WILSON,
Salt Lake City, Utah.
CECIL H. WILKINSON,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

The Work of the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by my colleague, Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING, before the Connecticut Sheriffs Association on February 18, 1948:

Mr. Mitchell, Governor and Mrs. McConaughy, distinguished guests, members of the Republican State Central Committee, members of the Sheriffs Association, and Republican friends, it is a great privilege for me to be here this evening and a high honor to have been chosen to address your live organization which takes such an unusually active part in the affairs of your respective communities throughout the great State of Connecticut and exerts such a powerful influence for good government.

I feel unusually close to the congressional delegation from Connecticut, not simply because of our geographical proximity—and the natural affinity which two States would have which are much alike in their interests and requirements industrially, agriculturally, economically, and, I am happy to say, at least at the moment—politically—nor is it only because three of the delegation from Connecticut surround me and hem me in on all sides in the House Office Building. My chief reason for attachment to the State of Connecticut, I must confess, is because of the great respect and warm affection which I feel for the congressional delegation which you good people of Connecticut have sent to represent you in the halls of Congress.

Last month in New York, at the annual meeting of the New York State Bar Association, I was privileged to hear one of the finest addresses on the subject of foreign aid which has been made since the so-called European-recovery program was first envisioned. This address was by your distinguished Senator, RAY BALDWIN, and it so greatly impressed me that I asked Senator BALDWIN's permission to place his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that my colleagues might have the benefit of his practical, statesmanlike thinking on this great question. I can do no better in appraising RAY BALDWIN than to quote my description of the Speaker in my remarks in the House, when I said:

"The enthusiastic reception accorded the address of this experienced public servant in State and Nation, liberal statesman and forceful leader was thoroughly merited not alone by his always masterful delivery, but equally by the thoughtful and constructive character of his remarks.

"As we grapple with the gigantic problems embraced within the European recovery program, it seems to me helpful to bring to the attention of the membership of both Houses the views of one of our distinguished colleagues, who, in experience and devotion to the best interests of our Nation, represents public service in its finest expression." I am happy this evening to have the opportunity to restate this tribute.

In the House, the dean of your delegation is, of course, your own BILL MILLER, of the First District, embracing your own city of Hartford. It is hard to speak of BILL MILLER without giving way to what Bill, at least, would call exaggeration. This American patriot without peer, whose sacrifice for his country is unmatched by any other Member of Congress of any party, is continuing his great record of service to the Nation as one of the soundest, most constructive, and most respected Members of the House of Representatives. He is a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which handled some of the most important legislation presented to the Congress. The very reason why he is not here with us tonight, where we all know he is in spirit, is because his committee is right now, as it has been for some weeks, wrestling with the problem of petroleum and fuel oil for the country, and particularly the New England and eastern seaboard States. Bill, along with his distinguished colleague from neighboring Massachusetts, JOHN HESELTON, both members of the same committee, have been leaders in the struggle to alleviate the dire conditions brought about by the fuel-oil shortage. He called me up this morning before I left Washington and told me, as you would expect him to do, that the critical situation made him feel that his duty lay in keeping on the job in Washington. Where BILL MILLER's duty lies, he has never been found wanting.

Your Second District representative is my very good friend across the hall from me in the House Office Building, HORACE SEELY-BROWN. SEELY is a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and due to his war experiences, has taken an unusual interest in matters of national defense. If there is a more conscientious legislator who studies more thoroughly the great problems which confront us, I know not where to find him.

Next door to him and across the hall from me is ELLSWORTH FOOTE of your Third District. He sits with me on the House Judiciary Committee, where his fine legal and judicial background lend weight to his remarks and contribute greatly to the deliberations of this important Committee. Beneath that stern judicial manner, as those of you who know him realize, is a sense of humor which carries him, as well as his colleagues, over many of the rough spots which we all encounter.

JOHN LODGE, from the Fourth District, is my immediate next door neighbor. John has, as you would have expected, acquired in his first term of service, the stature of an old hand at the business of legislating. He is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which has been charged with the responsibility for passing on matters of preeminent importance, not only to the welfare of our own country, but of the entire world. His extensive background of training and experience, his facile pen and his agile mind have rendered his services invaluable in the solution of almost insoluble problems.

From your Fifth District comes JIM PATTERSON, who has demonstrated in the Congress the same qualities of fearless leadership which he displayed when he commended a tank company in the Fourth Division. When Jim goes after a thing he never lets up until he gets action. He is as good an illustration as I can name of the reason why the United States won the war. He is very properly a member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs and also was recently honored by being named by the Speaker to the Joint Atomic Energy Commission.

As your Congressman at Large you have TONY SADLAK, a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I have recently been working very closely with Tony on two propositions; one, to reduce the postage on shipments overseas of relief parcels containing food, clothing, medical supplies, and other necessaries, and the other to waive on behalf of aliens who served in our armed forces certain of the technical restrictions and fees which are now necessary in order to become citizens. Tony, too, is of course greatly interested in veterans' problems and has displayed this interest on many occasions.

There is one particular respect in which the entire Connecticut delegation is well known throughout the Halls of Congress. There is probably no group on the Hill whose average attendance record at the sessions of the House exceeds, if it equals, that of the Representatives from your State. Every one of them takes his job very seriously. One can and will make many mistakes in his legislative career, but barring illness or the unforeseen, it need not be because of inattention to duty. So long as the people of the State of Connecticut have the sound wisdom and good sense to return to Congress their present Representatives, the Nutmeg State will be able to hold its head high over the caliber of its representation in Washington.

When BILL MILLER called me on the telephone in my home city of Rochester, N. Y., and asked me to invade Connecticut, he said it would be appropriate to tell you people, who he said got around the State a bit and did no small amount of talking, second only, perhaps, to Congressmen, a little bit about the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress; what it has done to date, and as time permits, a few words about what we may expect this year, before the doors close at the end of the present session.

When the voters of this country spoke out in the fall of 1946 and said, "we want a Republican Congress," many views naturally emerged as to the significance of the overwhelming vote of confidence which they gave to our party. It has always seemed to me that the word "mandate" is somewhat overdone and is frequently employed as a device to justify a particular action which would have followed regardless of the preference voiced by the voters.

Nevertheless there were some fundamental questions upon which our party waged its last congressional campaign and as to which certainly most of us clung to the belief that the voters had taken a definite stand.

One of these was on the subject of the continued and ever-increasing controls—always a threat of bureaucracy—over the economic and personal life of the citizens of this great country, over the everyday questions of what to eat, what to wear, where to go, how much, how often, when, and why.

Accordingly, although the President, before Congress convened, by Executive action, eliminated price controls, this Congress has passed a number of laws removing certain other controls on our economy and extending the life for fixed periods of some of the more essential controls which are still needed to bridge over the conversion to a peacetime economy.

Illustrative of the type of control continued was the control on rents. The rent control bill which was passed has been the subject of much agitation and a large amount of misinformation. Those who voted for the bill have been accused of not properly representing the interests of the tenants. Any analysis indicates that exactly the reverse is true. Rent control under bills passed in the previous Congress would have expired automatically last June 30th unless it had been extended. Those who voted against the bill voted for the immediate termination of all controls on that date.

Probably the bill extending the controls was not written in all respects to satisfy any single Congressman. That is frequently true of legislation which is almost always the result of a certain amount of compromise. It provided for the extension of controls until March 1 this year without any increase in rents whatever. It further provided, however, that if a landlord was willing to grant a long-term lease, he and the tenant could agree on an increase in rent up to 15 percent by striking a mutual bargain on the subject. This provision made it possible for the tenant in many cases to get his house painted, or the inside redecorated, or the plumbing fixed up, or some other necessary repairs made as prerequisites to agreeing to a modest rent increase.

Now the appropriate committees of both Houses are wrestling with the problem of what to do with rent control. The housing shortage has certainly not been solved, and it is almost certain that rent control in some form will be extended for an additional period. In taking that step I have advocated what seems to me simple justice that there should not be discrimination against those who voluntarily entered into an agreement for an increase in their rents. Unless special provision is written into the rent-control law to protect them, we will be faced at the end of this year with the anomalous situation that those tenants who agreed to increases will be denied any protection whatever, whereas other tenants who refused to agree to increases will be protected. Such a result seems to me obviously unfair. When I appeared before the House committee a couple of weeks ago to press this point, I gained the impression that the committee was favorably disposed.

As to price and wage controls which the President has been demanding from this Congress, I can only say that there is no great enthusiasm in either body for any trend in the direction of a controlled economy. The President has been urging price controls and a return to the days of under-the-counter transactions, black markets, and scarcities in order to reduce the high cost of living. Then, on the second or third day when the grain market started to fall, he demanded controls in order to prevent prices from falling. I guess the answer is, he simply wants controls, whether it looks as if we were going up or down.

I do not belong to what might be described as the extreme school of thought on this subject of controls. I recognize the complexity of our economy and the many factors which impinge upon the daily life of the citizen to an extent totally unknown to our forefathers. I fully recognize the necessity for strict and extensive controls during an emergency period. I am most emphatic, however, as I believe the majority of the Congress to be, in my opposition to a tendency all too prevalent in this country to solve all problems by looking to Washington for help.

We have seen what has happened in every other country where effort has been made to regiment the citizen. The economy of those countries is cracking up. All of them now look to this great Nation for assistance.

Steering a middle course which will make adequate and proper provision for those of the lower incomes for whom the struggle to maintain a decent standard of living is always the hardest, we must always beware lest this country give way to the economic fallacy that Utopia lies along the path to the police state.

Another thing which I believe the voters said to us last fall was to reduce the expenses of running the Government, eliminate unnecessary employees from the public pay roll, and as a result, provide for reducing the burden of the harassed and oppressed taxpayers and increase their take-home pay, which we must always remember can only be done by reducing the expense of piloting the ship of state.

Government expenses were reduced. The Presidential budget was cut to the tune of about $2,700,000,000, and in addition another $1,700,000,000 represented reductions in the present Budget brought about by this Congress and rescissions of obligations previously created. This is a total of $4,400,000,000. True perhaps it is not all that might have been accomplished, but it is still the greatest reduction in budget figures, both dollar-wise and percentage-wise, which has ever been made by a Congress since the establishment of the Budget Bureau in the early twenties.

Every cent saved was in spite of the vigorous opposition and against the united objections of the spokesmen for the minority party in Congress. Every time an appropriation bill was brought before us which provided for a cut, a motion was made by those directing the Democratic strategy to restore the cut to the figure originally stated in the budget or in some instances even greater. It is only fair to say that there was a minority within the minority which did not subscribe to this policy of opposing each and every economy, but nevertheless that represented the consistent policy of the opposition.

Speeches were written by the so-called public-relations divisions of various Government departments—the propagandists paid for by the taxpayers—which would be delivered on the floor by the appropriate Democratic henchmen, sometimes so unfamiliar with their contents that they could not even read them without stumbling over the words. They predicted the most dire results which would come about if this or that particular reduction were made. You have heard a lot about lobbies and they are certainly very much in evidence in Washington, but the most prowerful lobby of them all, which in extent and degree of pressure none of them can touch, is the Government itself.

Some of you have heard the story, for instance, of the projected cut in the appropriation for the Customs Bureau of the Treasury Department. Here was a Bureau which in fiscal '46 had spent 20 percent more than the year before. Then they came to us asking for a 22 percent increase even over the amount spent that year. Extended hearings brought out a sad case of inefficiency, extravagance, and waste in this outfit. Many of their top administrators were unqualified and incapable of performing their duties. Four of them were over 80 years of age. One was a practicing physician who visited his office once in every 2 weeks—probably on pay day.

They were cut, but mind you, they were not cut below what they had the year before. They were, in fact, given more than they spent that year but not as much more as the 22 percent which they asked for.

What did they do? They sent out a notice to their employees out in the field, not those holding cushy jobs in Washington but out in the country where the full drama of the situation would be revealed, telling 85 percent of their employees that they faced a layoff or dismissal. Not one in Washington was laid off. Not a stenographer, office boy, or clerk. But only those out in the field that were charged with the duty of protecting the country against smugglers and illegal traffic. Of course, there was an immediate uproar throughout the country. In New York City

for instance, 734 inspectors were laid off and there were scare headlines in all the papers. Governors, mayors, chambers of commerce, and officials and individuals from all over immediately started wiring, writing, and calling their Senators and Congressmen.

Of course, there followed a congressional investigation of this unwarranted procedure which resulted, incidentally, in the speedy reinstatement of most of these laid-off customs officers. Even the Secretary of the Treasury expressed his regret and removed the Commissioner of Customs from office—to another post with the same salary.

The budget for the Post Office Department was cut by less than 1 percent, the least of any Government department. But here, again, all through the country headlines appeared in all the papers about the lay-off of employees and curtailment of service due to congressional reductions. When the Department was called on the mat over this, they admitted it was all a grave error and officially rebuked the postmasters. When he was asked if any blame whatsoever could be attached to Congress for impairment of service or dismissals in the postal department, the Postmaster General replied "None whatsoever." I could go on reporting instances like this as to practically every department or agency of the Government which suffered any kind of a cut, whether or not that cut involved a reduction in the amount which they had spent this past year.

It is therefore very apparent that this Congress, in bringing about the reduction in expenses which it did and the elimination of some 300,000 out of 2,000,000 from the public pay roll, performed a really surprising job against the most terrific opposition.

Of course, the only way to increase the take-home pay was by reducing the expenses of running the Government. You all know the sad story on that, about the decision by the President twice to veto a tax-reduction bill. In that action he failed to disclose, until after he had acted, the fact that the estimated surplus for the coming fiscal year would probably be four and one-half billion more than he had originally figured, and with the cuts made by the Republican Congress in expenses would have permitted the tax reduction as contemplated, with some five billion left over to apply on the national debt.

Now this year again we are faced with the problem of tax reduction. The House has already passed a bill which would raise the exemptions $100—from $500 to $600—and grant graduated reductions ranging from 30 percent in the lowest-income brackets to 10 percent in the higher incomes besides giving additional relief to the blind and those over 65. On top of this, the bill removes the discriminatory situation which has existed for taxpayers of your State and mine whereby a husband and wife were not permitted to split their income for tax purposes, whereas in certain so-called community-property States this tax was allowed. What will happen to this bill in the Senate remains to be seen.

The President still publicly states that he is opposed to income-tax reduction, except the purely demagogic approach which even his own party does not support, of allowing a $40 credit to each taxpayer and dependent. He says tax reduction is inflationary. Instead of allowing the people to spend the additional money which they would have in their pay envelopes by a tax reduction, he says, "No; you let the Government spend that money. If we spend it there will be no inflation, but if you spend it, that will lead to dire consequences. No, my children, Uncle knows best. It is no time to increase your pay by cutting down on the deduction from your pay envelopes."

It is my sincere hope and firm belief that a tax-reduction bill will be enacted by both Houses, which will be of such a character that the President will be forced to sign it or if he vetoes it, the required two-thirds majority in both Chambers will promptly be forthcoming to override his veto.

Finally, in my judgment the voters said to us last fall: "We must have some legislation which will reduce the industrial strife in this country and will give to the members of labor unions a greater voice in the affairs and policies of their own organization. We do not want any punitive or repressive laws. We want you to study the labor-management picture and come up with something effective and fair. We have witnessed recently and specifically in the year 1946 the greatest loss in man-hours through strikes in all our Nation's history with all the disruption to our economy, individual suffering for the workingman and his family, and hardship on the consuming public which such stoppages necessarily entail. In addition a few radical and dictatorial labor leaders have seized a power and are exercising a domination over the lives and liberties of those who toil, the very backbone of our country, which cries out for corrective measures. We believe in collective bargaining. We want to see labor unions which we know have done so much for the improvement of the workingman's condition strengthened and made secure. But we insist, and those of us who are members of these unions most of all insist, that steps be taken to eliminate the abuses upon which unrestricted power so often feeds."

That I believe is a fair statement of the mission enjoined upon the Eightieth Congress insofar as labor law is concerned. Some would differ. There are two camps of extremists. Some would say we should have done nothing. Others, just as many Democrats as Republicans, by the way, would say we did not go far enough in imposing restraints and curing abuses.

I would be the first to concede with our own Senator IVES and your Senator BALDWIN, both of whom have been such towers of strength in their first senatorial year, that it is not a perfect law. One of its best features is the provision for a continuing joint commission to observe the workings of the law in actual practice and recommend legislation to alter and amend and supplement its terms.

Time does not permit any discussion of the bill finally passed after the most exhaustive hearings with witnesses from all walks of life and volume of debate. I am confident that in practice the law will have none of the dire consequences which its opponents so freely and in such extravagant generalities predict even in the face of the signing since its passage of some of the most favorable contracts in the history of organized labor, but that, on the contrary, it will improve the position of the men and women who labor, will foster true collective bargaining, will strengthen the labor-union movement, and will restore a measure of harmony to the industrial picture to the ultimate benefit of labor, management, and the consuming public.

That this has, indeed, already happened is evidenced by the statistics which are now issued by the Department of Labor, showing that the average worker earned $72 more in 1947 than in 1946; that he only lost 16 days of employment in 1947, as compared with 25 days in 1946; that there were 31,000,000 more man-days lost due to idleness in 1946 than in 1947; and 1,385 more work stoppages. These benefits mean dolars in pocket to the men and women who labored to produce the wealth of this Nation. Daily they are coming more and more to realize that this law, far from enslaving them, has given them a measure of benefit and protection for which they yearned and which they richly deserved even far beyond the predictions of those who voted for the legislation.

I wish I might discuss with you also other measures passed by the last Congress, less publicized perhaps, but of equal importance and long-range significance. In the field of national defense, the bill for unification of the armed services, in so many Congresses the subject of talk but in this one for the first time, of action. The bill for reorganization of the Army and Navy, providing for promotion on merit, rather than mere seniority, said by many to be the most important measure ever passed affecting the armed services.

In the matter of legislation for war veterans, many of you will remember the words of the President in his message to Congress. "Except for minor adjustments, I believe our program of benefits for the veterans is now complete." The Eightieth Congress did not agree. They did not agree with the Secretary of the Treasury that it was fair and just and free from discrimination to give officers terminal-leave pay in cash and say to the enlisted men who bore the brunt of the heat of battle and who, in most cases, needed the money worse, "You must wait 5 years for your money." So they undid the work of the Seventy-ninth Congress and said the first government obligation to pay now is our outstanding debt to our Nation's defenders. They also passed in both House and Senate 24 other measures on behalf of the veterans and many more are still in various stages in the legislative process.

Then there was the bill for establishment of a National Science Foundation vetoed by the President because he wanted to name not only the 24 members but also the director, whereas the bill provided, as all scientific men agreed, that the scientists should choose their director.

I could go on at length. In all, the House passed 985 bills and the Senate 812 and both Houses 519 which went to the White House, a rather impressive record to be chalked up by a body of men and women whose detractors would paint them as a "do-nothing Congress."

Much has been done but much remains to be done. Time only permits a sketchy reference to the gigantic problems which now challenge this Congress for solution.

Uppermost in our minds at the moment for the security of the land we love and the peace of the world is the so-called European recovery program. I wish I might talk about this at length. All I can say is that I feel confident that the Republican majority, as it faces the responsibility of a decision on this issue, will not allow any considerations of narrow partisanship to influence its action. That is not to say, however, that it will swallow whole without thoroughly digesting the recommendations made by the administration. Neither it nor the Congress is the repository of all wisdom on this subject. No one can assure that the final action which the Congress takes will be the right answer, but this assurance I can give, that it will be taken with the utmost sincerity and in the prayerful hope that it will lead to stability, prosperity, and peace in the world.

On the domestic front the still high cost of living and housing are perhaps the most pressing problems which we face. Another is increasing the benefits and broadening the base of the social-security law, extending the benefits to domestic servants, agricultural workers, employees of charitable corporations and self-employed not now covered, and giving to those now in the evening of their lives a more adequate provision for support as I understand can be done without substantial increase in tax because of the large fund which is already accumulated.

Also I feel strongly, as do most of those on the Republican side of the aisle, that the party of Abraham Lincoln should not close its doors on the Eightieth Congress without enacting anti-poll-tax and antilynching legislation.

Also we face the solution in some manner consonant with justice and the national welfare of such complex problems as a universal training bill for our youth and the distressing and heart-rending plight of our displaced brothers in Europe.

Hundreds of other issues face us in the solution of which, as I said in my opening remarks, we are most grateful to the good people of Connecticut for the stature of the men whom they have sent to Congress to help us in our task.

The Republican majority has a great responsibility and a challenging opportunity. If we adopt and carry through a program of constructive liberalism within the framework of a free opportunity society, with our conscience as our guide, our eyes fixed singly on the ultimate welfare of the Nation we love, our political destiny is secure. Because by our fidelity to our public trust we shall have justified the confidence in us reposed, we shall celebrate together in November a smashing Republican victory.

Extent of Ratification of Anti-Third-Term Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article which appeared on February 16 in the Washington Times-Herald, reporting the present status of the anti-third-term amendment:

NINETEEN STATES HAVE RATIFIED TWO-TERM LIMIT AMENDMENT

The State Department revealed yesterday that 19 States have ratified a proposed constitutional amendment limiting a President to two terms in office. Thirty-six are required to make it effective.

Eighteen of the States have notified the State Department officially of their action, and Virginia, which also has approved the amendment, is expected to do so shortly.

Virginia is the most recent of the States to ratify the amendment and represents the only State with a Democratic legislature. It was the first State to act favorably on the amendment since last May 23.

The first 18 ratifications came shortly after the amendment was submitted to the States by Congress on March 23, 1947—between March 31 and May 23.

Most amendments have been ratified within a few years. The twenty-first amendment, which repealed prohibition, was adopted by the necessary 36 States in 1933 in 9½ months. Another proposed amendment, the so-called child labor amendment, was approved by Congress June 2, 1924, but has never been ratified by the required three-fourths of the States. Congress placed no time limitation on this proposed amendment.

The States which have ratified the proposed amendment and the dates on which they approved it in 1947 follow: Maine and Michigan, March 31; Iowa, Kansas, New Hampshire, April 1; Delaware, April 2; Illinois and Oregon, April 3; Colorado, April 12; California, New Jersey, and Vermont, April 15; Ohio and Wisconsin, April 16; Pennsylvania, April 29; Connecticut, May 21; Missouri, May 22, and Nebraska, May 23. Virginia ratified the amendment this year.

Cost-of-Living Index

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the editorial which follows, taken from the February 14, 1948, edition of the Long Beach Independent, of Long Beach, Calif., will be interesting to many Members. It is to be noted particularly that the cost-of-living index for all items has advanced steadily since 1933, its lowest point since 1915. Except for a slight drop in 1939, the tables show that the advance has been somewhat regular even during the years of controls on our economic life. A larger jump is evident in the readjustment which occurred after the general removal of controls in 1946.

LIVING COST INDEX

Our readers may be interested in the table showing the ups and downs of the living cost index over the past 34 years. It is the only official index that has consistently measured the rise and fall of prices. It is the Bureau of Labor Statistics index which has functioned under Republican as well as Democratic administrations. In our opinion it is a sound index and free of politics.

The table we attach to this article shows how costs of living since 1914 have been up and down many times. It is reasonable to expect them to fluctuate widely again. But we doubt that prices will again fall as low as they were in 1939. Most economists whose opinions we have read doubt that the index will fall more than 20 percent from the present level during the next several years.

The index is based on what it cost a moderate income family to live in the period 1935 to 1939. It will be noted that in 1914 it cost 28 percent less than in 1939. In December 1947 it cost 66 percent more than it did in 1939.

In between these dates was the great depression. But even in 1933 the cost of living fell only 6 percent below the 1939 average. The fall was 30 percent from 1929 when the depression set in. Labor unions are so much stronger now than before 1939 there is less chance that wages will be greatly reduced. Large industrial monopolies control production to a greater extent than in 1939. These two elements will be a force that will not allow prices to fall as far as they have in past recessions.

Many other factors will slow down price reductions. Some of them are parity payments to farmers, which means guaranteeing farmers a high price for the major crops. Social security payments to retired persons and the unemployed will maintain purchasing power completely lost in past recessions. We used up many of our raw materials during the war. It takes greater production of everything for our increased population and for higher living standards.

The following table shows living costs have fluctuated over the past 34 years. Each year is based on December, except in 1934 when October is used, and 1935 when only November is available. The reader should understand the column "all items" represents the average of all necessities needed by the moderate-income family. The other columns show how some items are lower than in 1939, while food is almost 100 percent higher. The "all items" average for last December at 166.1 is 65.7 percent higher than in 1939.—L. A. C.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics index for the 34 years is as follows:

Year	All items	Food	Clothing	Rent	Fuel, ice	Home furnishings	Miscellaneous
1914	74.1	91.7	65.7	102.8	84.1	52.4	52.5
1915	72.7	87.9	67.5	100.0	84.4	55.7	51.5
1916	79.3	98.8	73.1	100.2	86.0	64.5	56.6
1917	93.9	120.7	93.3	102.2	92.8	81.9	67.7
1918	114.6	148.4	137.8	107.3	99.0	114.3	79.9
1919	134.0	166.1	178.8	120.4	113.7	144.3	93.0
1920	143.8	153.7	175.2	176.2	134.7	158.3	105.4
1921	132.8	139.4	127.7	198.5	141.8	127.4	104.9
1922	131.2	131.4	117.0	200.3	129.0	124.7	103.7
1923	134.8	137.4	120.3	206.6	118.8	132.0	107.3
1924	132.0	133.0	118.5	198.7	119.1	124.5	107.3
1925	133.0	145.7	116.8	178.6	119.1	122.4	110.7
1926	128.7	139.8	115.1	166.3	118.5	117.3	108.1
1927	126.7	135.2	112.6	162.1	117.7	114.6	109.3
1928	126.0	136.8	112.0	154.0	114.3	109.2	110.8
1929	124.4	134.9	111.2	147.8	114.2	107.9	111.2
1930	116.0	115.4	105.3	140.8	110.7	101.1	110.4
1931	105.7	98.1	92.0	129.2	109.8	89.7	106.9
1932	95.0	84.8	83.0	107.5	110.2	78.3	103.1
1933	94.1	91.2	92.5	92.0	104.7	87.9	97.9
1934	96.3	98.8	96.0	87.9	104.4	91.1	97.9
1935	95.1	98.2	96.9	88.6	104.4	93.8	93.4
1936	99.4	101.6	97.5	94.5	99.5	98.5	99.5
1937	103.2	101.2	104.3	106.9	98.8	105.8	103.1
1938	102.0	100.7	102.3	100.0	98.8	101.8	102.4
1939	100.4	94.6	103.2	107.4	95.3	102.0	102.1
1940	102.2	99.0	103.4	106.4	95.5	101.1	102.9
1941	112.9	118.6	110.6	108.5	94.2	113.3	108.6
1942	123.9	142.8	127.5	110.0	94.2	118.4	114.5
1943	126.6	143.3	135.8	110.3	92.5	119.2	121.0
1944	129.1	143.9	139.9	110.7	92.5	138.0	125.3
1945	133.7	150.9	148.8	110.8	92.5	143.7	129.6
1946	154.5	195.1	168.3	111.7	92.5	173.1	138.2
1947	166.1	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Item not available for December 1947.

Worse Than Living Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the editorial page of the Daily Oklahoman of Oklahoma City, Okla., of January 19, 1948, speaks for itself:

WORSE THAN LIVING COSTS

Curiously missing from the average conversation on today's chief topic of discussion—the high cost of living—is another cost which not only is higher, percentagewise, than the cost of food, clothing, and shelter, but which is only adding to those costs as it goes along.

Bread costs rose between 1940 and today approximately 50 percent. In the same period governmental costs or Federal spending increased 370 percent. And Mr. Truman's budget calls for no reduction—rather it calls for $2,000,000,000 more than the 1947–48 fiscal year.

Possibly it is a blind spot in the average American's thinking. Perhaps the full import of Government spending has not yet dawned on him. But if living costs had gone up 370 percent in the past 7 years his blind spot would have been quickly overcome. Of course, much of the mushroomed governmental costs are in hidden form but, if they are, their cost is no less real.

If we, as a whole, are really concerned beyond the conversational stage about our living costs, we will quit grumbling and calling for controls and more regimentation and demand of our Senators and Representatives a sharp reduction in Government spending as the speediest and surest relief. Even Mr. TAFT hasn't scratched the surface when he

suggests a $3,000,000,000 cut. With bureaucracy four times larger now than it was in 1940, there is ample room for trimming far beyond the surface scratch proposed by the Ohio Senator, or the vote buying and illusory $40 tax cut suggested by Mr. Truman.

Proposed Aid to European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing a letter from a reputable and successful attorney in Los Angeles, Mr. William D. Mann, who has just recently spent over 20 months in France. He has served in a capacity in the Army which would grant him the opportunity to make observations which, in my opinion, would be far more valuable than those made by casual visitors. There has been so much propaganda and so many false statements about the conditions in France and other European countries that I think this letter should be read by all who are interested in the foreign situation.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 27, 1948.

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POULSON: This is merely to restate, in more comprehensive form, the views I expressed to you a few weeks ago, while you were in Los Angeles, pertaining to the proposed program for aid to European nations.

I have recently completed a tour of nearly 6 years of active duty as a Reserve officer in the United States Army. My last assignment was as Staff Judge Advocate, Headquarters, American Graves Registration Command, European Area, Paris, France, from February 1946 to October 1947. During that time, I lived in Paris, traveled over a goodly portion of France, talked with other officers, whose duties took them to all parts of western and central Europe, and conversed with many French people, in all walks of life. Further, I made motor trips over parts of Italy and England. As a result of my observations and what I learned from others, I have formed some rather positive opinions as to the present economic situation of the French, Italian, and English peoples, and the policies of their respective Governments. The announced policies of our Government and the intensive propaganda, which I found on my return to America, are so at variance with what I consider the factual situation to be, that I feel impelled to make my conclusions known to you.

In the first place, I do not believe there is starvation, or prospects of starvation, in France. There are no empty counters or shelves in the provision and meat stores and markets—wherever one goes, large stocks of foodstuffs are visible. It is true that there is a shortage of certain food products from time to time, but such things happen also in the United States. At the present time there is certainly a shortage of wheat on the open French market, resulting in reduced ration quotas of wheat bread and the use of mixtures of corn and other substitutes in the baking of bread, but it seems to be the thought that there is a year's supply of wheat on the farms, and the French Government has made some effort to loosen this up, by threats of prosecution. Then there are millions whose incomes are insufficient to meet the radically increased prices of the food necessaries of life and who certainly are suffering as a result. To my mind the problem is not one of supply but one of distribution. Profiteering and the black-market operations are rampant in France, and to this the inflation there is largely due. In that country inflation hits the wage earner much harder than it does here, for here compensatory wage adjustments have been accomplished through strikes and otherwise from time to time, while in France the wages until recently remained at about the 1938 level. I have been told that the cost of living for the poor man has increased about 800 percent since that year. So far as I could find any efforts of the Government of France to stamp out inflation have been very feeble indeed. On the other hand, that Government repeatedly and vigorously refused, until recently, to sanction any increase of wages to the worker, on the theory that such increase would operate as a further inflationary influence. In France the property classes can get just about anything they desire on the black market, but it is not their custom to readjust their appetities so as to permit a fair division of food products with their low-income brothers. The point I desire to emphasize is that the Congress should be careful to distinguish between inadequacy of supply and inadequate distribution methods and procedures. If it be true that the present food situation results from faulty distribution methods and economic administration, then the problem is clearly one for the respective nations and not one for us. An interesting side light as to France is dogs. Greater Paris is a city of about 6,000,000 people. Nearly every family has a dog. I've been told that there are 400,000 dogs in Paris. At that rate there would be nearly 3,000,000 dogs in all France. French do not go in for lap dogs or the small terrier type; they like big stout fellows, who need plenty of food. They take grand care of their animals; the horses are big, fat, and beautifully groomed, and I never did see a dog in Paris that didn't look very well fed. Now I am not advocating that they eat the dogs, but the willingness and apparent ability to support so many of them in the manner they do is a bit incompatible with the starvation story.

While I believe that there is no question but that the countries of western Europe should be supplied with some immediately needed machine tools, coal, and raw materials, or with the wherewithal to purchase the same, yet the coupling of political implications with the loans (or gifts), will, I think, prove to be a serious error in the long run. The peoples of Europe, particularly the Latins of Italy and France, have lived in an atmosphere of intrigue and suspicion for so many generations, that they suspect, not only their neighbors, but any who seek to influence them in their government processes or political economy. The proposed aid plan is considered by many Europeans as a device for American political and financial control of Europe. This apprehension is shared by many moderates. I am convinced that democracy cannot be successfully sold to the nations of Europe by the giving of a bonus in the form of financial support with political conditions attached. In any event, give them what we will, those peoples will be just the same after as before.

Assuredly, there are Communists in France, and trouble makers they are, too. But I have been told by intelligent French businessmen that France being predominately Catholic, a Communist dominated government in that country is impossible. Further, France is firmly entrenched in its parliamentary system. The average Frenchman is probably better informed as to political aspects and the administration of his Government than is the average voter in the United States. No radical change in its form of government could be accomplished excepting at the polls. Of course, if later a majority of the voters decide that a change to the communistic system would be desirable, that would be their business and our efforts and money would have been wasted anyway. However, that condition is very remote indeed. There are so many forms of socialism now that some of our people seem to find it difficult to distinguish between them. I am convinced that no nation of western Europe is, or will be, interested in the Russian brand.

For centuries the French have loved to demonstrate and parade. That is nothing new. I have seen long segments of parades converging on Place de la Concorde 200,000 strong. There doubtless were communistic elements involved in those demonstrations, and also in the recent parades accompanying strikes publicized by our papers. However, I believe that the primary motive for those strikes, as well as for prior strikes, was to force an increase of minimum wages from the equivalent of $58 per month to the official rate of exchange (it would be about $28 at the black-market rate) to the equivalent of $90 a month at the official rate. The newspaper headlines featured only "defeat of the Communists," yet in the text following I noted that substantial wage boosts had been sanctioned as a condition to termination of the strikes. As I see it, the strike situation in France grew out of the short-sighted policies of the French Government and its unwise and ineffectual administration of the economic affairs of the nation, rather than from a real communistic menace, which latter explanation the French may well be deliberately asserting for the purpose of protecting their upper and middle classes at our expense. It is very possible that those classes are crying "wolf" in order to avoid taxes necessary to feed their own poor and meet their country's needs.

As to Italy, I believe the situation and the country's needs to be about the same as in France, excepting as to the dog population. It is said that there, also, at least a year's supply of wheat is held on the farms. The large supplies of all types of merchandise in the stores of Florence, Rome, and other centers, indicate no lack of activity on the part of the factories. Certain bombed-out industrial centers are naturally in a bad way.

From what I saw of the farming regions of Germany they looked very prosperous indeed. Of course, in the bombed-out industrial cities there is much unemployment and many people do not have the means to buy sufficient supplies of food. But that situation does not act to decrease farm production—rather it has to do with distribution methods and procedures.

As to Great Britain, I think the situation to be rather different. Great Britain cannot raise enough food for its own people. It has in the past depended, and always must depend, on other nations for a large proportion of its food supply. Be that as it may, I feel that the British are of the opinion that they can work out their problems even without the proposed plan.

My purpose in writing this letter is to emphasize the importance of balanced thinking in any aid-to-Europe plan, and of measuring carefully the possible recoil thereof on our own domestic economy. The factual situation only, and not frantic propaganda, must be considered. Let's not get ourselves in a horrible jam. My own answer would be to permit substantial increase of coal production in the Ruhr and arrange a larger allocation of such coal to France, to send some wheat where absolutely needed and to supply needed machine tools immediately required. The vast balance planned to be spent I would appropriate to finance a universal military training program and to establish, train, and maintain the damndest, biggest Army, Air Force, and Navy in the world. In such a program lies our protection, not in a highly idealistic plan, however well meant.

Perhaps I should add something about myself. In civilian life I am a practicing attorney. I am a Hamiltonian Republican, having the deepest respect for the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, these days so frequently disregarded. I no more desire that this country become Fascist than I desire that it become communistic.

Very sincerely yours,
WILLIAM D. MANN,
Los Angeles, Calif.

Margarine Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following recent editorials from Wisconsin newspapers all advocating the removal of discriminatory Federal taxes on margarine:

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette of December 10, 1947]

MORE COMMENT ON ANTIMARGARINE LAWS

Dairy folks in Wisconsin are deluding themselves if they still think that we can legislate competition out of the market, no matter what the commodity. Opponents of natural gas tried it and failed. The people interested in forcing out unfair competition succeeded in getting laws in many States to rule out margarine colored to imitate butter's yellow.

Taxes to eliminate margarine competition in a free market, however, is a different thing. Today, with butter prices inflated to nearly $1 per pound, Wisconsin still persists in taxing retailers heavily for handling margarine, taxing colored margarine out of the market, and taxing margarine at 15 cents per pound.

Housewives here who cannot afford $1 butter are put under an unnecessary hardship. Why should Wisconsin housewives be forced to pay 15 cents per pound extra for margarine when butter is out of their reach? Wisconsin's State margarine tax is unjust and unreasonable.

The dairyman's original argument for the tax against colored oleomargarine was just. The yellow substitute was being foisted upon an unsuspecting public. Since then, however, the heavy Wisconsin tax has simply served to place an extra burden on Wisconsin housewives. It does not serve its original purpose of eliminating the butter substitute which was then made from southern vegetable oils.

Today Janesville's soybean plant is extracting soybean oil and shipping one to three tank cars per week. Part of it goes to the making of margarine. Is it logical that Wisconsin's heavy margarine tax, passed to eliminate cheap southern oils in margarine for Wisconsin butterfat in butter, should also be used to force out Wisconsin vegetable oils in the butter substitute?

Regardless of what we in Wisconsin think of margarine, and regardless of our pride and desire to protect the butter market, we are fooling ourselves if we think the country is not rising up against the antimargarine taxes.

Newspapers in 23 States recently have printed editorials against the antimargarine taxes. Part of their arguments lie in the fact that butter prices are so inflated. Some of these States, however, are heavy dairy producers, like Wisconsin.

We might as well face the facts. Margarine consumption is rising tremendously. It was given very helpful support by the New Deal during the war. If butter is to compete successfully, it must meet that competition squarely and on its own merits.

No commodity can long depend upon legislation to outlaw competition. It cannot be done successfully, for when the people learn how it affects them, they eventually repeal the law.

Butter is the finest table spread on the market. Wisconsin butter has no equal. Despite the exaggerated claims of the margarine makers, margarine cannot compete on the same plane with our luscious dairy product. But butter is suffering a terrific blow because of price. Now it is more necessary than ever to advertise and capitalize its merits.

[From the Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times of December 24, 1947]

UNFAIR OLEO TAXES

With butter nudging the $1-a-pound figure, this appears to be an opportune time to examine the fairness of the State and Federal taxes on butter substitutes.

Today's housewife, who cannot afford high-priced butter, is unable to purchase oleomargarine in many stores. Even where she can, it is higher than in other States and is uncolored.

The reasons, of course, are the numerous State and Federal taxes and license fees which were voted by Congress and the legislature under the misguided notion that they could eliminate competition for butter.

In Wisconsin, the State puts a tax of 15 cents a pound on uncolored oleo, and the Federal Government adds another tax of one-fourth of 1 cent. The Federal tax on colored oleo is 10 cents a pound.

In addition there are special license fees for both wholesalers and retailers. The State license for retail stores selling oleo is $25, and the Federal is another $6. The State license for wholesalers is $500 and the Federal $200. If the oleo is colored the Federal wholesale license fee goes up to $480, and the retail license from $6 to $48.

This, of course, only means that the price of oleo is artificially forced far above the competitive price. It means that the thrifty housewife is penalized if she seeks to find a substitute for $1-a-pound butter.

The American Public Health Association declared that Federal and State laws handicapping oleo in favor of butter are detrimental to public health. Many people who cannot afford butter, either use oleo or they do not get a necessary element of diet. These laws keep oleo off the shelves of many stores, especially small stores which would have to sell a lot of oleo to cover the license fees.

Wisconsin farmers should realize that butter should be sold on its merits, as the finest table spread on the market, but not forced upon a people by legislation that drives substitutes out of the market.

Regardless of what we in Wisconsin think of oleo, and regardless of our pride in Wisconsin-made butter, we are fooling ourselves if we think that the country is not rising up against the anti-oleo taxes and restrictions. The State tax is unjust and unreasonable.

These taxes not only penalize the consumer by raising the oleo price, but they also penalize the farmers in many States who raise soybeans, cotton seed, corn, and peanuts, used in making margarine.

The Federal restriction against free competition of margarine with butter was voted back in 1886, and it cotninues to exist because the House Agricultural Committee, dominated by the dairy interest, is unwilling to allow the question to be decided by the entire Congress.

Representative MITCHELL, of Indiana, and Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, have introduced a new measure the repeal the Federal taxes. We hope that this move will have more success in the new Congress.

[From the Oshkosh (Wis.) Northwestern of December 15, 1947]

MANY TURN TO MARGARINE

Last week, in some places, including Milwaukee, butter soared to a dollar a pound, with $1.03 being charged where the butter is sliced into four sections and each section separately wrapped, which latter proceeding many consumers feel is just a device for charging more.

That there is a cutback in the production of dairy fat is not to be denied. Among the reasons given for this is the high price of feed for the cattle of the dairy farmers, and the fact that housewives are buying more fluid milk than ever before, also more ice cream, cheese, evaporated milk, and dried milk. Thus consumption of these items has been going up, while production of butter has fallen off.

Many households have turned to oleomargarine as a substitute for high-priced butter, but the tax put on the substitute product through the united efforts of butter production prevents that article from being sold to consumers at as low a figure as would be possible if the tax burden on the manufacture and handling of margarine were reduced.

For example, some time ago oleomargarine shipped in to consumers in Oshkosh from points outside the State sold for 35 cents a pound. Lately it has been 55 cents a pound. Even the latter price is a substantial saving over 98-cent butter.

Regarding the oleomargarine situation, a Minneapolis newspaper stresses:

"Butter probably would be higher than it is if it weren't for booming margarine production. Housewives are flocking to the vegetable product in droves. In 1939 they bought only 303,000,000 pounds of it. Last year it was 540,000,000 and this year it will amount to something like 740,000,000 pounds. Retailing in the 35-to-55 cent price zone, margarine costs less than half as much as butter."

[From the Oshkosh (Wis.) Northwestern of January 13, 1948]

RENEWED BATTLE FOR OLEO

The price of butter has dropped slightly hereabouts in recent days, but it still tries hard to reach that dollar-a-pound level that is the worry of the perplexed housewives. And the high cost of this product has given a new incentive to those in Congress who aim to have tax burdens taken off oleomargarine, so it can become a cheaper substitute for butter than it is at present.

Signs point to another spirited battle in Congress over what might be called the freedom of oleo.

From 1939 to 1947 the per capita consumption of oleo doubled in this country, while that of butter fell off by a third. In 1939 oleo consumption was 13 percent of butter consumption. In 1947 the figure was 40 percent.

These spectacular increases have been due to the fact that people like oleomargarine well enough to take advantage of the difference in cost, when butter prices start soaring.

[From the Oshkosh (Wis.) Northwestern of January 16, 1948]

WASTED MARGARINE

Sometimes statistics can be frightening. They turn trifles into monstrous totals. When a thrifty housewife, using margarine in place of butter, colors the product to

satisfy her family's preference for a yellow bread spread, she is likely to do it in a bowl. Inevitably some margarine remains on the side of the bowl when the operation is over. How much?

According to Ersel Walley, president of the American Soybean Association, this remainder of margarine mounts up to an annual national total of 15,000,000 pounds. Turned into tonnage, the waste is still impressive. Some better use could certainly be made of 7,500 tons of margarine.

Another kind of waste worries Mr. Walley. He believes that the coloring of margarine consumes 88,000,000 woman-hours per annum, greatly to the annoyance of the busy housekeeper.

All these figures, and others, contribute to the argument of the soybean growers that the 10-cent Federal tax on each pound of colored margarine should be cut to one-fourth of a cent, the present tax on white margarine.

Congress may find it difficult, in the near future, to convince the kitchen electorate that it shouldn't make that reduction.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of February 14, 1948:

UNIVERSAL TRAINING VITAL FOR SECURITY—UNITED STATES WORLD POSITION DEMANDS POWER TO BACK PLANS

If the United States is to be in a position to preserve the peace in a world which looks upon us as a major arbiter among the nations, we need some form of universal military training, Representative HOMER R. JONES said yesterday in a letter to the Post-Intelligencer.

"Our world position demands of us that we have power to back up our proposals," JONES wrote. "It places us in the same position as an individual who must follow certain fundamental rules in order to maintain health and to build physical resistance to disease.

"In my opinion, protecting the security of the Nation and maintaining strength sufficient to resist and prevent aggression in any quarter of the world—a world no longer separated by simple arbitrary, geographical boundaries, but tightly knit together economically, politically and spiritually—are in the same category.

"I believe we can't afford again to repeat the mistakes of the past when lack of preparedness cost us thousands of lives and billions of dollars of resources. I do not believe that training the youth of our Nation to fulfill an obligation of citizenship in time of crisis is a move toward war, nor indicative of any national militaristic aspiration."

The Congressman said he believes that at this time the young men who would be called into service in the interest of preserving our possible national future would accept the responsibility as a form of national community service.

"It is not alone in times of war that our people have searched for ways in which to express their sense of responsibility and selfless devotion," JONES said. "In so-called times of peace a period of disciplined training might well represent to our young men a substitute for their wartime patriotism and could be an excellent beginning in their lives as citizens with a full sense of community responsibility.

"Such service could be for them the first intimation that they have obligations as well as privileges because of their citizenship in a democracy which, no matter how great the cost, all of us believe must be preserved."

JONES said he has the utmost respect for those who believe that universal military training might lead to distrust and world agitation, but is moved to extreme caution in the adoption of this point of view by his personal experiences and world occurrences, past and present.

"Were I convinced that total disarmament and abandonment of any training program by the United States would point the way to universal peace and set an example other countries would follow willingly, then I would embrace the theory which opposes universal military training.

"Certainly, I know something of the cost, the hardship, and the horrors of war, for I have served in uniform in both world conflicts, both as an enlisted man and as an officer.

"We look today at a world where hatred, suspicion, and greed seem to have been alleviated not a bit by the results of the late, great war. We see at least one nation pursuing policies and tactics reminiscent of the rise of Hitler in the 30's, and we watch this advocate of armed might engulfing smaller and weaker neighbors."

Universal military training, he said he believes, is the most important gesture which Americans can make to convince the nations of the world that the United States means to remain strong in a military way until some settlement is made within the United Nations organization which will make it possible for that body, "dedicated to the continuance of world concord and peace," to become strong enough to hold even a big nation in check.

"Until that time comes," he said, "I do not feel it is wisdom on our part to avoid any means of strengthening our ability to defend our interest in time of an emergency."

No Controls, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following expresses the thinking of many people of this country. One of my constituents has crystallized her thoughts and expressed them in verse on the subject, No Controls, Please.

They are pulling the wool down over your eyes
And telling you committeemen scarcity lies;
Yes, laying their plans for a police state,
Better get wise before it's too late.

They ask you Republicans for control legislation
And work to that end by misrepresentiton,
By hollering "No meat" and a "Big inflation";
It's simply a scheme for control of this Nation.

So they concoct excuses of the flimsiest kind,
Hoping you Congressmen will change your mind;
How I wish that I could sit in your place;
I'd tell 'em it's lies right to their face.

They are plenty shrewd and sly as a fox
And count you Republicans dumb as an ox,
And sometimes I'm thinking that maybe they're right;
If you don't say "no" and put an end to this fight.

If you were a landlady and in my place,
Then you'd perform the "right about face,"
You would kill the regiment of this OPA,
Else it'll grow a new head and be here to stay.

Under rent control there is no freedom;
Last August I was sued by a Mr. Creedom,
It's pure and simple old communism,
Just anything else but Americanism.

Mr. Woods wants power the landlords to sue;
Why not give him a deed to our properties, too;
Give him hundreds of police to turn him loose,
He'd soon have us all in the calaboose.

To extension of rent control we say "no";
We ask you give it a death-dealing blow,
For we elected you Republicans as our only hope,
Expecting you to rid us of this New Deal dope.

When you vote millions for the bureaucrats,
You make thousands of votes for the Democrats;
Now if I can see it then why can't you?
You could if you would and wanted to.

On February 29 we listen to hear you say,
You've ended rent control and the OPA;
No extension please, not even a day,
It's dangerous—no good—take it away.

Revive the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I addressed a Lincoln Day banquet at Point Pleasant, W. Va., February 21. At that time my attention was called to a statement prepared by the Mason County, W. Va., Superintendent of Schools, Robert H. Ferguson. It is a fine summary of evidence to prove that this Nation is a Republic, was so conceived, and that propaganda about Democracy is misleading. The sooner we try to get back, all the way, to a Republican form of government, the better off we will be. The clever propaganda campaign of the Democratic Party to convince America and the world that such political party is synonymous with the principles of our form of government has succeeded too well. It is time we woke up and insisted, with the founding fathers, that the Republic and our Republican form of government for which the Republican Party stands, should be preserved.

The statement of Superintendent Ferguson is as follows:

REVIVE OUR REPUBLIC

We are seeing and hearing the word "democracy" through press, radio, books, and textbooks. This habit so referring to our form of government has been growing since 1932. (Could it be that a clever campaign has been on for years and is continuing to din the word into our ears and into our brains so that we will believe it?) Russia has now adopted the word.

The truth is that this Nation was formed a Republic and for a long time was a Republic with a republican government. In a democracy the people vote on all public questions themselves. Proof is in the Constitution which says in the fourth article, sixth section: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

George Washington said, "The destiny of our republican model of government."

John Adams said, "A government in which the executive authority as well that that of all the branches of the legislature are executed by citizens selected at regular periods by their neighbors to make and execute laws for the general good."

Thomas Jefferson, who knew words so well that he was selected to write the Declaration of Independence, referred twice in the same address to republican government. He said, "We are all republicans." In the same address he said, "Let us then, with courage and confidence, pursue our own Federal and republican principles, our attachment to union and representative government."

President Madison said, "Our own republican institutions * * *. This rising Republic."

The learned John Quincy Adams referred to our Republic when he said, "Our happy condition under a Constitution founded upon the republican principle of equal rights."

Andrew "Old Hickory" Jackson said, "The eyes of all nations are fixed upon our Republic."

Martin Van Buren said, "The earliest and foremost pillars of the Republic * * * the power and influence of the Republic."

President Harrison said, "A simple representative democracy or Republic."

James K. Polk said, "The infancy of the Republic," and also "The ends for which our Republican Government was instituted."

Zachary Taylor was called "The Chief Magistrate of a Republic," he referred to, "Our own widespread Republic."

Daniel Webster spoke of our Nation as a Republic. He said in speaking of the death of President Taylor, "The Chief Magistrate of a Republic died suddenly * * * and those grand and imposing rites which the Republic confers on the most distinguished of her sons."

Franklin Pierce called our Nation a Republic. He said, "I have been called for a limited period, to preside over the destinies of the Republic."

James Buchanan spoke of our Nation as a Republic. In speaking of the necessity for honesty in our Government he said, "Public virtue is the vital spirit of republics."

Abraham Lincoln, who prized the United States of America above all considerations repeatedly referred to the Republic and republicanism.

President Grant said, "Our Republic" and "Under our Republic."

James A. Garfield said, "The new Republic was beset with dangers on every hand," and "Our own little children will soon control the destinies of the Republic."

Grover Cleveland said the "Constitution launched by the founders of the Republic," and "Presidential economies are best suited to the operation of a republican form of government."

Benjamin Harrison said, "Equipping the young Republic for the defense of its independence."

William McKinley said, "Our full duty as citizens of the great Republic," and illiteracy is "a grave peril to the Republic" and "the trust imposed upon the Chief Executive of the Republic" and "the builders of the Republic" and also "the Republic has marched on and on."

Teddy Roosevelt, who boasted one name only, said, "the tasks set before our fathers who founded this Republic in the days of Washington, which made great men who preserved the Republic in the days of Abraham Lincoln."

These men said, "Republic." What is a republic? It is a representative form of government in which sovereignty is "of the people, by the people, and for the people" but in which the sovereignty is not exercised by them directly but through selected representatives elected by the people and subject to their will.

Democracy is the form of popular government wherein the power to govern is retained by the people and exercised directly by the people as in Switzerland. Democracy is practicable only in very small countries. Democracy in a land of over 135,000,000 people would be unwieldy.

Representative government with the power of election, change, recall, resting in the people with representatives acting for them, is republican in form and makes a republic.

Were these great men we have quoted wrong in their statements? If they were wrong, then we are right in speaking of our Nation as being a democracy. If they were correct in statement, then we must be wrong in the use of the term "democratic." We conclude that unless this Nation has changed from the ideals set by our forefathers that this Nation is a republic with republican form of government. The choice of Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, McKinley, and the others as to what our form of government should be called is our guide.

What caused this sudden change from the republican ideals of our forefathers? Over the world today the cloak called "democracy" covers much and many allenisms. Let us reverently say again the pledge to the flag and stress "and the Republic for which it stands one Nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all."

Poems by Horace C. Carlisle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the passing of another birthday of Washington, with the present perplexed with national and international problems, and with the future beclouded with uncertainties and alarms, it is refreshing to view, in retrospect our patriotic past, whose most inspiring character is the immortal Washington, now and forever, first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.

In keeping with the persevering spirit inherent in the far-seeing founders of our Republic, Americans of today appreciate, in a very special way, the character, courage, and capacity of Washington, as portrayed in a small group of poems from the pen of Horace C. Carlisle, frequently referred to as the poet laureate of Congress, because of his many appropriate poems which have been published from time to time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Knowing, as many of us do, the hearty appreciation of the American people of Mr. Carlisle's contributions to the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD as part of my remarks this little group of picturesque poems, characteristic of the ever-enlarging life of the illustrious Washington, and unhesitatingly I recommend them to the teachers in the schools of the Nation as a means of implanting and cultivating the great fundamentals of patriotic Americanism in the minds and in the hearts of our aspiring youth:

WAKEFIELD

In the wilds of Westmoreland, Virginia,
Back when power laughed justice to scorn—
That such tyranny might not continue—
Freedom's unafraid founder was born,
Making Wakefield, the home of his parents—
As the banner of hope was unfurled—
Wherein virtue spurned further forbearance,
The New Bethlehem of the New World.

Tho' no star hovered over his manger
To direct the wise men, from the East,
To the spot where this newly born stranger
Lay, unchristened by prophet or priest,
As he humbly was born into being—
Ere the Stars and the Stripes were unfurled—
Wakefield woke, as the shadows were fleeing,
The New Bethlehem of the New World.

In the arms of caress—and correction—
Up thru infancy, Washington grew
Into childhood, approaching perfection—
Nearer still than his own parents knew—
And the site of the home of his childhood
Stands today, 'neath Old Glory unfurled,
Souvenir from the primitive wildwood,
The New Bethlehem of the New World.

"MARY, THE MOTHER OF WASHINGTON"

In the mem'rable days of devotion and danger,
With her hands folded peacefully over her breast,
The once belle of the famed Northern Neck of Virginia
By affection's kind hands was laid gently to rest—
And above the lone spot where she's silently sleeping,
Where in life oft she met with her Maker in prayer,
Simply, "Mary, the Mother of Washington", graven
On an obelisk, tells us who's slumbering there.

None but God knows the depths of the inner emotions
That welled up in the secrets of Washington's heart,
As he turned back the years, thru divine meditation,
At the spot where his mother and he had to part;
For this mother of his, who endowed him with being,
And in infancy taught him her love for the truth,
Had bequeathed him a character, conscience, and courage
That directed his course from his earlier youth.

And, in all the long years of the fierce Revolution,
Thru which Washington fought with miraculous skill,
The great principles, practiced in life by his mother,
And transmitted to him, were his guardians still;
And these principles, born in him at the beginning—
Robbing enmity's wounds of its coveted scars—
Guard America still in her every great struggle,
And give glory divine to the Stripes and the Stars.

WASHINGTON, FIRST PRESIDENT

Washington, first both in war and in peace,
Master supreme of the sword and the pen,
Was, long before his untimely decease,
First in the hearts of his own countrymen.
Character fashioned his boyhood and youth,
Not so much thru the restraints of the rod
As thru his love for the eternal truth,
Verified in the great volume of God.

Washington, back in his earlier teens,
Laid for his future a practical plan,
Using his every available means,
Growing in favor with God and with man—
He became master, deservedly so,
Of every great task that he tried to do—
And thru experience he'd come to know
That with God's help he could carry it thru.

Washington had a sweet mother, and she
Poured her best self into his budding life—
He, to her God, learned to pray at her knee—
And kept it up, in the midst of the strife
For independence, that had to be won
'Gainst proud Old England, in spite of her boast—
And, as he prayed, "Not my will, Thine be done,"
England surrendered, and her fight was lost.

Washington, when Independence was won,
Went to Mount Vernon, his haven of rest;
But, ere his surcease from toil was begun,
And peace, renewed, reigned supreme in his breast,
He was called back into service again,
And eight more years he courageously spent,
Serving his countrymen who, in refrain,
Hailed him their choice as their first President.

Washington, great both in peace and in war,
Shines upon history's pages today,
As the most lovely, illustrious star
That ever scattered the darkness away—
Throughout the dark Revolution's long night,
Briskly and brightly and bravely he shone
With a reflected, most marvelous light—
Pillar of fire through the night for his own.

Washington loved both the church and the state—
He loved them both from the depths of his heart—
But knew that both of them could operate
In greater harmony, if kept apart.
If throughout all wisdom's realm we should search
Out the real cause that makes both of them great,
Love is the power that governs the church,
Law is the power that governs the state.

MOUNT VERNON

By the side of the silver Potomac,
Where his waters flow silently on
Is the spot set apart
In America's heart
As the dearest the sun shines upon—
Here the flowers still grow in the garden,
And the grass still grow at our feet,
In the fashion that they
Grew in Washington's day,
When he lived in this quiet retreat.

Here the world's greatest human exemplar
Sought repose in the calm tides of life,
Hid away from the cares
Of the Nation's affairs,
Snuggled in from confusion and strife—
In the sweet rustic stillness of nature,
With her ways so entrancingly odd
Like the Psalmist of old,
Did he oftentimes hold
Sweet communion with nature and God.

Not a call ever came from his country
To which he did not gladly respond,
And when came the last call—
For life's curtain fall—
He was ready for heaven's beyond.

But his beautiful home at Mount Vernon
Still is ours to have and to hold—
May the footfalls of time
On this treasure sublime
Fall more tenderly, as it grows old.

When the wasting of centuries crumble
The old mansion to ashes and dust,
And the little brick room
Guarding Washington's tomb
Is dissolved by the rain and the rust,
Will his character, spotless and perfect—
Unbesmirched by iniquity's scars—
In the sweet by-and-by,
Where the great never die,
Ever shine, on and on, like the stars.

And our beautiful Capitol Building—
Like Mount Vernon in favor and fame—
On the Capitol Hill,
Grows more popular still,
With the worshipful Washington name.
Even tho it expands with the Nation,
More majestic, imposing, and grand,
It has graciously grown
Round the same cornerstone
That George Washington sealed with his hand.

AMERICA'S MEMORIAL TO WASHINGTON

Our National Capital, matchless in grandeur,
In every respect, from foundation to dome,
Stands fixed in the mind, an indelible picture—
"Wherever we wander, wherever we roam"—
A fitting memorial to its great founder—
Conceived in the womb of his wonderful brain—
Whose plans, from the past, for the present and future,
Conclusively prove that he planned not in vain.

And Washington City, with all its attractions,
In ready response to the call of the States,
Reaches out, past the District, in every direction,
Where natural beauty invitingly waits.
But this the great Capital of our great country—
That had its beginning in his thoughtful brain—
Is but a Memorial to its wise founder
Whose labors of love have been spent not in vain.

The United States, with its forty-eight nations,
United, by common consent, into one,
Long since recognized by the world's greatest powers
As first of all governments under the sun,
Expanding by leaps and by bounds down the ages——
Commensurate with the great breadth of his brain——
Is but proud America's master memorial
To Freedom's defender who fought not in vain.

NOT THE NATION'S WISH, BUT WASHINGTON'S WILL

Immediately under the spacious Rotunda,
Beneath the great Capitol Dome,
The crypt was perfected—tho later rejected—
For Washington's last earthly home;
For he had requested, as his will attested,
To be laid away to his rest,
To sleep thru the stages of time's ageless ages,
As Mount Vernon's time-honored guest.

While, like a song-poem, the river below him
Sings on 'neath the sky's changing gleam,
Unharmed and unhurried, unwatched and unworried,
He wished there to silently dream,
In unbroken slumber, thru years without number,
Till his Lord and Master shall come,
And gently awake him, and lovingly take him
To his waiting, eternal home.

Yes, directly under the vaulted Rotunda,
Beneath the world's most noted Dome,
His Nation intended that, when his life ended,
He should rest in this rock-wrought home;
But, since he requested to sleep, unmolested,
At Mount Vernon, he's laid away,
Contentedly sleeping, in her care and keeping,
Until comes the great Judgment Day.

LEAD US EVER ON

Blessed God of our salvation, on this, Washington's birthday,
O deliver us from evil, and purge all our sins away—
Grant that we Thy righteous precepts may remember and obey—
And lead us ever on

Chorus:
Look upon us, Lord, in mercy—look upon us, Lord, in mercy—
Look upon us, Lord in mercy——
And lead us ever on

As we look out on our country, may we stray not into doubt—
Banish every thought of envy, and thus drive all hatred out—
Lord, prepare these hearts of ours for a world-peace vict'ry shout—
And lead us ever on

May we keep on marching forward underneath the Stripes and Stars,
In the name of right and justice for the sake of freedom's cause,
May the Price of Peace direct us in our fight to end world wars,
And lead us ever on

By the valiant sacrifices that illuminate the past,
O Thou Father of the ages, from the first one to the last,
We've attained to heights of glory, now by shadows overcast,
Lead Thou us ever on

(Tune: Battle Hymn of the Republic.)

Service Activities of the DAV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, recently I had lunch with a long-time friend of mine, who is a past national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, which has served to remind me of the outstanding record of achievements and the future program of this unique organization of which I am proud to be a life member.

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official spokesman for America's disabled defenders.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

According to its Congressional Charter of Incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities, incurred during or by reason of active war service in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100—$50, if born before January 1, 1902—in cash, or by a down-payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year ending on June 30, after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing number are becoming DAV life members.

DAV SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 World War II handicapped veterans to become National Service officers. An intensive 6-months special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

The members of the tenth and last class of such trainees received their diplomas in May 1947 and are now completing their job training in all parts of the country.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization, to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nationwide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents, and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to set forth, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records and publishes the Disabled American Veterans' semimonthly newspaper containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, and VA Administrator, VA regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a badly wounded World War I veteran—an insurance agent in private life—who has had a broad background of 28 years of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer—business manager—of the organization, and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati, the Fifth Third Union Trust Co., has for 28 years been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and of its incorporated trusteeship, the Disabled American Veterans' Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Mr. Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by my good friend, Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has its office manager, John E. Fighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the United States Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are non-disabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

DAV SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The DAV has freely rendered technical help to thousands of disabled veterans each year in obtaining compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, pensions for dependents of deceased veterans, vocational training, civil service appointments and, last, but really first in importance, suitable, gainful employment.

During the past 18 years, for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the DAV have extended service as indicated by the following brief résumé:

Claims handled, 1,525,753.

Monetary benefits, $132,512,111.87.

Additional compensation payments thus obtained for thousands of disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to procure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities into community assets.

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical résumé, to indicate the many different types of service extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which subsequently have proved of value to hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed from service reports.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

Most citizens agree with the DAV that the Federal Government should bear the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were incurred in or aggravated by his military service.

To prove service connection of a disability, however, is not an easy thing to do, except where official records show its inception in service. An equitable claim cannot necessarily be legally established.

Many different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service, even though actually service-incurred or aggravated.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nationwide basis, a man-job-matching-method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veterans' abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice must be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation, its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they

will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

HOW DAV SERVICE IS FINANCED

The DAV has been able to maintain its extensive service program primarily out of funds contributed by disabled veterans themselves, by their payment of membership dues in the DAV through its State departments and 1,443 chapters.

A national per capita tax of $1, plus a national service fee of $1, is paid each year to the national headquarters by every local chapter for each of its members.

Local DAV chapters finance their own service and relief activities out of their portion of the annual membership dues which average about $5 per year, by annual Forget-Me-Not Day drives, dances, and other projects.

Nationally, the DAV has recently been successful in raising substantial needed funds through its sale of Ident-O-Tags, miniature automobile license plates, to be attached to one's key ring. The value of this Nation-wide key insurance is indicated by the fact that about 4,000 sets of lost keys are returned each month to their owners.

DAV SERVICE FOUNDATION

To make possible a much-needed expansion of its rehabilitation activities, the DAV is hopeful that understanding fellow Americans will help to build up a needed trust fund of $10,000,000 or more by generous donations to its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation, 1701 Eighteenth Street N. W., Washington 9, D. C.

This DAV Service Foundation has 11 trustees, 5 of whom each serve for 5-year terms, 1 expiring each year and replaced by another as confirmed by the annual national convention of the DAV, 2 of whom automatically consist of the national commander and national finance committee chairman of the DAV, with the remaining 4 consisting of prominent social-minded citizens, each successively elected to serve for a 4-year term.

Donations received by the DAV Service Foundation are placed in separate State trust-fund accounts according to State of origin, with 60 percent thereof to be available for allocation to the DAV when needed, for the expense of maintaining one or more full-time national service officers in each such State, and with the other 40 percent to be available for use wherever needed.

WHY DAV NEEDS OUTSIDE HELP

Many eligible disabled veterans fail to become paid-up members of the DAV and, thus, do not help to maintain its Nation-wide service set-up on behalf of less fortunate disabled veterans, for varied reasons—some because they know very little about the DAV, some because of indifference, others because of selfishness, some because of negligence, and many others because they cannot afford it. If they all understood the implications involved, every service disabled veteran would decide that he should belong to the DAV.

The American public is, I am confident, desirous of fulfilling its obligation that those who return from hazardous military employment in the armed forces of the United States, handicapped by reason of such active service, shall be adequately provided for by a grateful Nation.

Such a service program deserves the solid support of all service-disabled veterans and of all Americans.

COMMENDATIONS OF THE DAV

Among many statements commending the DAV and its rehabilitation services the following are a few examples:

I am glad to learn that the Disabled American Veterans is endeavoring to expand the rehabilitation program on behalf of all handicapped ex-servicemen. Your committee is to be complimented on its leadership and patriotism in placing your organization in a position to render adequate service to those men who have so well served the Nation. I am sure that all Americans, particularly families and relatives of the war disabled, will approve this step. You have my best wishes for the success of the endeavor. (President Harry S. Truman.)

I am delighted to learn that you are taking effective steps to raise substantial sums for the purpose of providing for the future welfare and rehabilitation of disabled veterans. Your efforts will be fully rewarded in the lasting appreciation of veterans who have sacrificed so much." (Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.)

The purpose of your Nation-wide rehabilitation program * * * to extend needed assistance to members of our armed forces who become disabled, as well as to disabled veterans of the World War and their dependents, is, indeed, a worthy one and merits the full support of our citizens. (Franklin D. Roosevelt.)

Please express for me to the Disabled American Veterans my continued appreciation of their services to the country. (Herbert Hoover, former President.)

It is, therefore, particularly gratifying to me to learn of the plans of the Disabled American Veterans to expand its already extensive service program so as to make available to the handicapped servicemen of World War II, who are coming out of the present conflict in ever-increasing numbers, the valuable advice and assistance it has long rendered their fathers of World War I. These new veterans and their dependents also will need a helping hand, and I hope that the organization will meet with complete success in its campaign to provide now for the extension to them of its worthy activities. (Gen. John J. Pershing.)

I accept membership in the Disabled American Veterans with a sense of distinction. Membership in no group in the world carries greater honor than does membership in the Disabled American Veterans. (Gen. Douglas MacArthur.)

I am pleased to add my endorsement of the national service fund of the Disabled American Veterans. Certainly this program, which has for its objective the rendering of service to those who served, is a worthy one. It merits the support of all who are interested in the welfare of our disabled ex-servicemen. Your efforts are commendable and I wish for your program the success it deserves. (Gen. Omar N. Bradley.)

I feel very keenly the necessity for our proving to the lads who have really taken the rap in this war that the American people do not intend to forget them. I want to congratulate you on your willingness to take leadership in the drive on behalf of the Disabled American Veterans. The way in which we respond to the needs of our returning soldiers and sailors, and particularly the proof of our enduring recollections of their sacrifices, will provide one of the great tests of this Republic. (James V. Forrestal, Secretary of Defense.)

The DAV is not appealing for your sympathy nor to your patriotism, but is presenting a practical plan for making useful, independent citizens of our disabled veterans. It is to be commended for its excellent work. (Robert R. Wason, former president, National Association of Manufacturers.)

Be assured that we of the American Federation of Labor, who have long relied upon the principle that unity develops strength, look with favor upon the valuable service-giving activities of the Disabled American Veterans organization. (William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor.)

Labor's heart goes out to the disabled veterans, many of whom come from its own ranks, and we are eager to do everything we can to help these handicapped veterans and their dependents to secure the fair and generous treatment to which they are entitled. (Philip Murray, president, CIO.)

The Military Order of the World War passed a resolution endorsing the Disabled American Veterans * * * for the purpose of assisting disabled veterans in the preparation and presentation of their claims * * * a most important work. (Col. George E. Ijams, past commander in chief, Military Order of the World War.)

I know of no organization that I can more heartily commend and support than the DAV, whose purpose is the rescue and helping of disabled veterans. Let us hope all loyal Americans will recognize the DAV's humanitarian objective and program as their opportunity to demonstrate loyalty and patriotism. The people of the United States must not and will not fail those who did not fail them. (Gen. Robert Lee Bullard.)

It affords me real pleasure to heartily endorse the Disabled American Veterans * * * to assist individual deserving veterans in their local needs and in the technical prosecution of their equitable claims for compensation resulting from war-incurred disabilities. (JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, past commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars.)

The DAV is helping to protect and to promote the best interests of disabled veterans, and of the general public, by maintaining and further expanding its national service bureau in Washington, D. C., and its Nation-wide set-up of national service officers. To do the job properly, however, the DAV needs to have at least three or four times as many full-time national service officers as it now has. (Congressman WALTER G. ANDREWS, of New York.)

The Unemployment Trust Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Social Security Act of 1937 provided for the laying and collecting of certain taxes from employers of labor in the States and for the use thereof for the relief of unemployed persons in those States.

In a closely divided Supreme Court, the constitutionality of the Social Security Act was upheld, on the theory that the greater number of the States had passed cooperating legislation and waived what was asserted as an infringement on the rights of States to manage their own internal affairs. At any rate most, but not all, of the States went along with the scheme contained in the Social Security Act for providing unemployment relief.

The Social Security Act, in the plainest of terms, provides that the moneys raised by taxes on employers of labor within the States shall constitute, and be, an unemployment trust fund in the Treasury of the United States. It is known, however, that no trust fund has ever been established, as required by Congress; and, on the other hand, the gigantic fund has been, and still is, being handled as a special deposit account which means that expenditures therefrom do not have to have the approval of the Comptroller General through the countersignature of warrants, as would be the case if the fund were handled as a true trust fund.

It is known that the Comptroller General, as early as 1937, insisted that the Treasury create a trust fund with those taxes, but the Treasury failed, neglected, and refused to do so, contrary to the will of Congress, with the assertion by the Treasury that a true trust fund would hamper the making of authorized investments of, and disbursements from, the fund. At any rate, despite the demand of the Comptroller General that the fund be established and handled pursuant to law, nothing has been done to carry out the expressed wish of Congress in that regard.

The Social Security Act authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such part of the unemployment trust fund as may not be needed for unemployment payments in direct obligations of the United States, or in obligations fully guaranteed by the United States. And the Secretary of the Treasury is empowered to credit the accounts of the several States with interest on the investments, namely, with interest payable on the securities in which the fund is invested. However, it has been ascertained that the Secretary of the Treasury has been, and is, crediting the accounts of the States with earnings at the rate of compound interest, so that the over-all earnings which have been credited amount to more than 6 percent of the total deposits made by the several States in the fund. Government securities do not bear compound interest, and it is manifest that Congress did not mean that compound interest should be credited and paid on the States' investments in this fund.

Inquiry discloses that, to June 30, 1947, the Government of the United States had credited compound interest on the States' investments amounting closely to $1,000,000,000, and the balance in the fund as of that date amounted to the very great sum of almost $7,000,000,000. Is not that a terrible price for the Government to pay for the mere privilege of receiving, handling, and paying out the States' funds deposited to relieve unemployment?

Examination of the Annual Reports of Social Security show, I am informed, that even during times of highest employment of labor throughout the States, withdrawals for the unemployed have far exceeded withdrawals in times when employment was far less than it was, and is, during, and since the war. Furthermore, it is said on good authority, that withdrawals since the war for unemployment have been heaviest in States where major and prolonged strikes took place; and it is known that, since the end of World War II's shooting, 11 of the participating States withdrew more from the fund than there was deposited by them in the years involved. Can it be that Congress meant and intended that this gigantic fund should be used, as it seems to have been used, as a war chest for striking workmen? It most certainly would seem that Congress did not so intend.

Another thing for consideration, in addition to the payment of compound interest on the investments, payments to strikers, and the like, is the fact that the longer this fund exists, the greater it becomes, and the greater the fund becomes, the greater its cost to the Federal Government.

With the recurring clamor for the extension of social security and the expansion of unemployment compensation benefits to be paid from the unemployment trust fund, and with rumored efforts of administrative officials to extend benefits of social security and unemployed persons without waiting for congressional extension of such privileges and benefits, it seems high time that these and possibly many other irregularities to which I have adverted be considered and corrected.

Much has been said concerning chiseling on these and other sociological plans of the administration; and it would be most interesting to know to what extent, if any, there has been overlapping of payments to persons entitled to unemployment compensation and other forms of governmental handouts. Surely, Congress did not mean and intend that one individual should receive duplicate benefits under the different schemes.

It has come to attention that the Social Security Agency's social workers, acting under the terms of Social Security Reports Nos. 8 and 10, have, in effect, passed out the word that citizens are expected to claim and get benefits under the Social Security Act any way they can; and that close questioning as to need and uses made of the benefits paid is not to be indulged in by representatives of the Social Security Agency. Those pamphlets certainly portray grossly loose methods of operation, and it is well to remember that the thoughts advanced and the policies followed by those administering the Social Security Act have been made the subject of a scathingly critical report by the Commission on Governmental Efficiency and Economy, Inc., Baltimore, Md., which conducted a survey of relief and charitable activities in that city by local relief agencies and the Social Security Agency of this National Government. That report was dated December 1937.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that it behooves Congress to examine these agencies with a view to corrective action.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., February 15, 1948, entitled "Seaway Peril To This Area," by Lester Allen:

SEAWAY PERIL TO THIS AREA—NEW ENGLAND TO PUT NOOSE AROUND NECK IF PLAN GOES THROUGH—MANY INDUSTRIES TO DIE

(By Lester Allen)

New England has a standing invitation to put an economic noose around its own neck by engineering an already unfavorable geographic location into a complete isolation.

If the Senate bill authorizing joint United States-Canadian action to provide a channel for ocean-going vessels from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes and construction of a 2,200,000-horsepower hydroelectric plant at Massena, N. Y., is voted on February 27, New England can mount the scaffold and make its farewell speech to the world.

That may sound drastic, but it is the inevitable effect of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, which will cost the Nation many times $500,000,000 before it is effective, and will compel New England through taxation to pay for a good share of the means of accomplishing its own ruin.

New England opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is not alone on the basis of the added tax burden. New England railroads are already operating at a grave disadvantage through this region's geographical isolation from the rest of the country, but the power development features will place New England at a great disadvantage, for today New England power needs can best be supplied by steam-generating plants.

Moreover, American-flag shipping will not be benefited by the seaway, if, indeed, the seaway were practicable in the first place. It would bypass all of New England's ports during 7 months of the year.

GREEDY GRAB

Coastal shipbuilding plants might just as well start to demolish their ways if the bill is passed, for this is a greedy grab on the part of heavy industry in the Great Lakes region to hog the business and put across a deal that will accomplish the ruination of New England. They have dressed it up with the phoniest set of statistics that ever beguiled and befuddled the people of a whole region.

Let's pry into the statistics the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway offer. Let's pry into the personalities shouting loudest for the seaway.

Starting with Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin Republican, who is merrily log-rolling in the Senate and threatening reprisals against Senators, interested in inland waterways and other measures if they do not vote for the seaway.

LARGE STAKE

The Senator is from a Great Lakes State, which today has a large stake in the iron and steel industry. The fact is that the Wisconsin and Minnesota iron-ore deposits are running out. What's that got to do with the St. Lawrence seaway? Just this: There are two alternatives for the Great Lakes States. They must either develop low-grade ores at enormous expense or get a supply of richer ores at a cost comparative to that of removing ore from the Lake Superior iron beds.

The only large bodies of such ore available are in Labrador and Newfoundland.

Do you begin to get the picture? Note that the ship channel advocated by these advocates of the seaway calls for a 27-foot channel. The channels in Boston are 40 feet, Philadelphia 35, Montreal 32, Baltimore 35, and New York City deeper than Boston with 42 feet.

FOR ORE BOATS

So it really isn't ocean-going steamers the boosters of the seaway want in the Great Lakes. By a strange coincidence Great Lakes ore boats draw slightly more than 20 feet, and the only port on the Great Lakes with a channel deeper than 26 feet is Detroit.

What is desired, then, is a seaway to take ore boats and not ocean-going steamers. There is, of course, still another alternative which is much cheaper than the seaway for the dilemma of the Lakes States. A New England steel industry could be built at a cost not greater than $100,000,000, one-fifth of the initial outlay proposed by the seaway boosters.

Even more strange is the opposition of Great Lakes shipowners to the seaway. In Ottawa a few days ago American and Canadian inland shipowners blasted the plan as a "political pork barrel." Canada and United States, they declared, would be saddled with $35,000,000 a year carrying charges. They neglected to add what their interest was in this, but at the moment it is the fact that existing vessels plying the Great Lakes would have to be rebuilt internally to use the seaway, since the Great Lakes are fresh water and the St. Lawrence River from the estuary to the rapids is salt water. Great Lakes steamers have no equipment for converting salt water to fresh for their boilers, and Diesel engine operation is enormously expensive on the lakes.

COST OF PROJECT

Senator WILEY has declared that the cost of the project would be amortised by payments from hydroelectric earnings and from tolls for passage of ships through the canals.

Let's take those claims in order. The development of hydroelectric generation does not depend upon the building of a ship canal. Such development could take place right now. But New England wouldn't get any of the power generated, much as the few friends the seaway has in New England would like to believe.

Right now Maine is experiencing a power shortage because of the freezing conditions which have caused low water on the rivers—and this same condition exists on the St. Lawrence, frozen 5 months out of every year. The problems of transmission of such power as the St. Lawrence project might produce for effective use in New England are technical and formidable, but for New York and points west, relatively simple. Therefore, New England can reckon on getting little or nothing from the power development.

BASED ON SURVEY

The tolls for the ship canal, based on a survey of possible traffic through such a canal, estimated at 4,000,000 tons of shipping each season of 7 months, would require a toll of $6 to $15 a ton, without a Government subsidy. The Senate limited the tolls to $1.25 a ton, which would produce a maximum revenue of $2,600,000 annually. The annual cost of the seaway under present plans would range from $25,000,000 to $62,000,000.

If you are willing to pay a subsidy to move Canadian grain to world markets, grain which during the winter season normally flows through east coast ports, then you ignore the economic facts of New England's position in world commerce. We are trying to build up New England ports instead of bypassing them.

The seaway, as planned, would have 67 miles of canals, 6 miles of restricted channels, and 18 locks through which vessels might pass from Duluth, Minn., to the open sea of the St. Lawrence estuary at Montreal. Five months a year this would be frozen fast. That means that for 5 months a year east coast ports would be expected to handle the leavings of commerce flowing out of the Great Lakes area, and 7 months of the year commerce would be ladled from hand to hand along the seaway in a spoon at enormous cost.

TO HAMSTRING HUB

Only one sample of cost of shipment is needed. Pittsburgh pays a little over $5 a ton for freighting ore. Gary, Ind., on the Lakes, pays about $2.60 a ton for freighting ore. A real toll cost of $6 to $15 for freighting ore through the seaway would mean that the American taxpayer would pay a subsidy to provide the steel industry with cheaper ore.

The power development, you may be certain, would benefit only the production of steel in electric furnaces from New York State ore deposits, and very little else.

Boston is the nearest big American port to Europe. But there seems to be a willful and even vicious desire to hamstring Boston and New England.

Another technique was adopted by the seaway boosters to isolate New England opposition, the possibility of a cut-off of the canal through Lake Champlain and the Hudson River, which would divert some traffic through the port of New York. This is an adroit move to line up the mid-Atlantic ports against Boston, Portland, and Providence.

NEGLIGIBLE FACTOR

Outbound commerce in the foreign trade is a negligible factor in the St. Lawrence seaway proposals. The chief items of outbound commerce from the Great Lakes are dairy products and grain. Dairy products are a perishable item and it is entirely unlikely that the 10 to 12 days in transit through the seaway project would be risked.

But inbound commerce is another matter. The chief import items here bound for the Midwest Lake States are coffee, vegetable oils, wood pulp, burlap, and jute. Special handling facilities for this traffic exist, in Boston—and the westbound freight is a vital part of New England economy.

Henry Foley,-who is one of the bulwarks of New England's fight against the seaway, has exposed the fallacies of the statistics offered by the seaway boosters over and over again. But that is not enough when a piece of legislation is being considered in the Senate. The log rolling and back scratching of expedient legislation make strange bedfellows.

ENTERING WEDGE

The $500,000,000 expenditure is only an entering wedge, a ruinous wedge for New England, which will be asked to pay a generous share in taxation to accomplish its own disaster. If the 27-foot channel proposed is deepened by only 3 feet, which would still not open up the ship channel for large ocean-going vessels, it would cost another $500,000,000.

New England now depends upon its waterborne commerce for the movement of a vast amount of freight, and its railroads are of minimum vital trackage for the needs of the area, and are staggering along under immense problems of decreasing revenue.

If the average wage earner in New England believes that all this rumpus about the seaway is not his concern, it is important to drive home the truth that the seaway will cause many, many New England industries to wither and die.

In effect the seaway chops New England off from the rest of the continent and makes it an island, a have-not area forever debarred from developing its chief resources, the technical skill of its people.

The noose is waiting. New England can put it around its own neck and strangle—or stage a fight now, before the seaway goes to vote in the Senate.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on February 21, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, within our community there live untold hundreds of patriotic citizens who have loved ones and relatives in the Old World.

Today, great concern is being expressed for these relatives, and Americans are responding privately as well as publicly to help them. Packages filled with much-needed food and clothing are being sent in greater amount each day.

I am receiving many letters from the people who are mailing such packages. They feel they are being compelled to pay an exorbitant price for necessary postage to carry this aid to its destination.

They tell me the cost of mailing bundles to Europe is as high as 14 cents a pound and upward.

To me this seems outrageous. I believe folks ought to be permitted to send such mercy packages for less. Oftentimes the postage exceeds the actual value of the contents by several times. Certainly, it is unfair. I hope the Postmaster General will take immediate steps to lower the high postal rates for sending articles overseas.

Bear in mind, also, there are many thousands of our boys serving on the Continent, and they like to hear from home, too.

This week I addressed the House on the Hall pension bill for veterans of World War I. My speech was as follows:

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I.

For the past 7 years the accent has been to spend billions of taxpayers' dollars in foreign countries. Without batting an eyelash we have voted tremendous sums of money to pour down the rat holes of Europe and Asia.

Some of this money must have found its way to succor the downtrodden, to feed the hungry, and clothe the naked. But much of it has been wasted and is being wasted.

Be that as it may, we keep providing these billions for the nations across the sea while our own people are laboring to keep their heads above water and the wolf from the door.

I regret that it has come to the point when a Member of this House runs the risk of attack and abuse when he becomes presumptuous enough to request something for the Americans he represents.

All of which strikes no fear to my heart because my job is to consider the needs of the Americans who elected me before anybody else abroad.

I believe the time is ripe to come to the aid of the veterans of World War I. With the natural importance placed upon the needs of our younger veterans, we have overlooked, for a time at least, those who served so valiantly in the stirring days of '17 and '18.

We are guilty, therefore, of forgetting that our World War I heroes are older, their ranks thinning, and the exigencies of former military sevice beginning to tell upon the numbes that remain.

They are the forgotten men of our generation. We have looked after the fighting men of every other American war but them.

As near as I can judge, the present average age of veterans of World War I is 57. Many are, of course, older. All have started down the trail which eventually leads to the setting sun.

These men are for the most part still vigorous. We owe them almost as much for what they did in the way of moral encouragement and keeping the home front in line during World War II as we owe them for their physical contributions in the first struggle.

But they ought to have consideration. We provided pensions for the GAR, the Spanish War vets, for all who went before. We have no choice but to begin thinking about the men who came back from France after participating in the war that was to end all wars.

Therefore, I submit the following bill and I urge upon the House its early, friendly acceptance. The Nation must be willing to meet her responsibility by preparing for final and equitable treatment of so patriotic and noble a group as the veterans of the first World War.

My bill reads:

"A bill granting service pensions of $75 per month to veterans of World War I, and for other purposes

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That any person who (1) served in the armed forces of the United States at any time between April 5, 1917, and July 3, 1921; (2) was honorably discharged from such service either after 90 days or more of service or for disability incurred in service in line of duty; and (3) either (A) is 60 years of age or over, or (B) has a disability of 10 percent or more and is 55 years of age or over, shall be entitled to receive a pension of $75 per month. If any such person is, on account of physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind, as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, he shall be entitled to receive a pension of $100 per month in lieu of such pension of $75 per month.

"SEC. 2. The original award of a pension to any person under this act shall be effective from the date of application or the first day of the second month following the enactment of this act, whichever is later.

"SEC. 3. No pension or compensation payable to any person under any law or Veterans Regulation in force on the date of the enactment of this act shall be reduced or discontinued by reason of any provision of this act, but a person may elect to receive pension under this act in lieu of such pension or compensation.

"SEC. 4. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

Fairness to Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, at the request of several of my constituents, I am including in these remarks the text of an excellent editorial on the subject of increasing and equalizing the pay of employees of the postal service. It appeared in the Kansas City Times of February 17, 1948, and is as follows:

FAIRNESS TO POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The efficiency of the United States postal service is a matter of concern to virtually every person in this country. That efficiency is now seriously threatened because of the shamefully low pay of the postal employees. They deserve better treatment not only on this ground but as a matter of plain justice.

These employees make up a group of faithful workers who have patiently borne the unfairness in pay. They are not threatening to strike and could not consider that alternative. But there is a limit to human endurance and the clear fact is they cannot meet their living costs under the present conditions. The morale of the service is being undermined and there is increasing difficulty in the enlistment of efficient workers into the service.

Since 1939 or since the start of the rise in living costs the postal employees have received total pay increases of only about 35 percent. In that time the pay of industrial workers has been just about doubled, while national income, industrial profits, farm income, and the like have increased still more. The last pay advance for the postal workers was more than 2 years ago. At that time the Associated Press wholesale price index of 35 basic commodities stood at less than 113, with 100 as the 1926 average. On the latest report, adjusted to the recent price declines, this index stood at approximately 186.

In this period of rapid living cost advances the postal employees have gained nothing. The situation has produced bills in both the Senate and the House which are designed to remove the injustice to a fair extent. Under these measures the numerous classifications of the employees and their pay would be given consideration. If no other workable method can be found there ought to be some adjustment in postal rates to provide the funds for this urgently needed compensation.

The responsibility for this action falls upon Congress. It can maintain the efficiency of this service to the public and will be held accountable if nothing is done. It should get busy and deal justly with a neglected group of public servants.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill for a deficiency appropriation of $300,000,000 for rural electrification.

That amount will be necessary in order to carry on this great program from now until the end of the present fiscal year.

Every dollar of it will come back with interest, and it will add untold millions of dollars and probably billions of dollars, to the wealth of the Nation.

When I started in this fight for rural electrification in 1933, just less than 10 percent of the farmers in this country had electricity in their homes; while 90 percent of the farmers of Germany, 94 percent of the farmers of France and Italy and approximately 90 percent of all the rest of the farmers of western Europe, as well as 90 percent of the farmers of Japan, had electricity in their homes.

After a struggle of 15 years we have managed to get electricity to about 60 percent of the farmers of this country.

The rest of them are pleading for this service.

It will mean more to them than everything else this Government has ever done for them.

While we are being urged to pour billions of dollars of our taxpayers' money into Europe and Asia, we had better pay a little more attention to the farmers of this Nation, who fight its battles in times of war, feed and clothe our people at all times, and sustain our institutions in times of peace.

By helping these farmers to electrify their homes, we are building up the strength of the Nation, and not dragging it down toward bankruptcy and destruction.

Let us electrify every farm home in this country, at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

I Am Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following quotations appear to have been first reprinted from Benjamin DeCasseres' column in the New York Journal-American. It should do our souls good to read, digest, and contemplate the basic philosophy contained in these statements. They are fundamentally American in their ideology, and are, perhaps, just as applicable today, for all practical purposes, as when they were written.

I AM PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(Reprinted from Benjamin DeCasseres' column in the New York Journal-American)

I am the spirit of private enterprise.

Wherever I have existed freedom of mind and body have existed.

Wherever I have been murdered by collectivist laws and governmental strangulation freedom of mind and freedom of body have died.

I was the physical lever of Athenian civilization.

I died in the collectivist feudal ages.

I was resurrected in the Renaissance, beginning the modern age.

With the rebirth of free private trading came the vastest expansion in the arts and sciences the world has ever known.

I, private enterprise, have brought men of the same countries and men of distant countries closer together in friendly intercourse than all the socialistic and communistic doctrines combined.

My trade routes have been the routes of human progress.

I am the expression and sustainer of all that is lordly in the human soul—self-reliance, the adventurous spirit, emotional and mental initiative, ambition, and inventive resourcefulness.

With my rebirth in the Renaissance the human level of living began to rise.

The shackles on slave labor began to rust and crack.

Money became international.

Man at my touch took on something of the aspect of a creative god.

I, private enterprise, built America.

If she is a giant today in production it is I who have made her a giant.

I cleared her forests.

I built her railroads.

I tunneled her mountains.

I erected her factories, dug the coal and ore in her mines, and sent out her ships on Seven Seas.

In my brain was born every creature comfort you enjoy.

I, private enterprise, with my free laborers and my unshackled captains of industry, built the muskets, the airplanes, the tanks, the submarines, the great guns that were used in the Revolutionary, Civil, and World War No. 1 and that are now protecting the United States from invasion.

I am the hope of Europe and Asia.

I, private enterprise, am the working classes, the middle classes, and the well-to-do classes.

I am the butcher shop, the bank, the newsstand, the great department store, the giant furnaces of Detroit and Pittsburgh, and the electric light.

I, private enterprise, am Edison, Ericsson, Goodyear, Wanamaker, Westinghouse, Fulton, Whitney, Morse, and the Wright brothers.

I am that free business, big and little, on which civilization alone depends.

I am the body of a great spiritual entity—liberty.

I am the body of a great sociological and biological fact—self-interest.

It is I, private and free enterprise, that is winning this war for Russia, England, China, and the United States of America.

I, private enterprise, am the power behind your son, your father, your brother fighting for you in Africa and the Pacific.

I am the minuteman of Uncle Sam.

I am the very essence and body of Jeffersonian democracy, for I am private property and personal liberty.

I am the old deal. I am America.

Lithuanian Independence Day, February 16, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this is the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of that small country on the shores of the Baltic Sea.

For 120 years prior to 1918, they had worked unceasingly to throw off the yoke of foreign domination.

All Americans, no matter from what race they stem, consider themselves as brothers, in mind and in spirit, to the people of Lithuania, because we both detest authoritarianism.

In the latter part of the eighteenth century, Americans and Lithuanians rose against their oppressors. Through the grace of God and the courage of our forefathers, we, in America, separated by 3,000 miles of ocean from those who held us in bondage, were able to win our freedom. Lithuania, however, hemmed in by large and powerful neighbors, was not so fortunate. But freedom is not isolated. To have meaning, it must be shared.

Through 120 years of tyranny, Lithuania did not despair. Her passion for freedom could not be smothered by ukase or by the secret police of her temporary masters. Her integrity and faith bore fruit in the hearts of those who had already won their independence. At the proper time, they would come to her assistance.

As a result—in 1918—and largely because of the principle of national self-determination as expressed by President Woodrow Wilson, the Lithuanians proclaimed their independence.

With the Allied victory, Lithuania stood up as a nation again, and her people rejoiced.

With liberty, came the incentive and the pride to work hard for progress. In the 1920's and 1930's, Lithuania hummed with constructive activity. Her people were free from fear, and soon they would be free from want.

They were too busy and happy to see the war clouds that were gathering. And when the storm broke and the floods came, communism and nazism swept back and forth, smearing the face of her fair land. There was no choice. Lithuania went under again.

But history has a strange way over the years of reversing itself. Lithuania has been conquered before but never for keeps. Her people have been schooled to endure temporary misfortunes, knowing that in the end, faith triumphs over material power.

This is the secret of Lithuania's character. It will not be denied.

Secure in the Christian faith which, in 1399, gave her the will to stop the Tartar invasion and thereby save the civilization of Europe from being overwhelmed by the barbarians, Lithuania will outlive the foreign dictatorship which presently enslaves her.

The people of Lithuania are proud of their religion, their language, and their culture. In spite of alien efforts to tear out her roots, they will not die.

Even at this black and depressing moment in history, when Lithuania is cut off from the rest of the world by the iron curtain of communism and her people the being subjected to relentless oppression, the passion for liberty is not extinguished.

The secret police cannot reach the hopes and aspirations that glow in every Lithuanian mind and heart as they silently rededicate themselves on this day to the eventual liberation of their homeland.

Lithuanians in all other parts of the world openly celebrate this day of their independence—an independence temporarily lost, but in the losing, inspiring them with fresh determination to work the harder for its redemption.

Here in the United States they are strengthened in their purpose by the moral support of their freedom-loving fellow Americans.

By the Marshall plan we shall help the countries of Europe to rebuild themselves so that they shall not fall victims to the juggernaut of communism.

In view of our realistic policy, there is hope that communism in time will moderate its ruthless treatment of small nations and their people.

Through this and the leadership of the United States in developing the United Nations into a strong federation where all peoples will have representations and will be heard, we have goals which can be reached.

In the truly democratic world toward which we strive we expect to see Lithuania present in her own right as a member of the family of nations.

Ex-New Dealers Now Work for Nations Seeking United States Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is the hope of the Truman administration that, with the Marshall plan in operation, it will be possible to reward the New Dealers and all the Communists, who, because of their un-American activities, were removed from the pay rolls of the United States Government by placing them in high-salaried jobs abroad.

Thus far it is obvious that the departments here have let many of their faithful New Dealers go abroad at increased salaries, but the real rewards will come under the Marshall plan. It is a clever way to fool the people, and with a propaganda machine that can charge the air with emotionalism, half-truths, and lies, the taxpayers at home, who pay the bill, can be kept in the dark with respect to all of these inside intrigues and deceptions.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on February 19, 1948. It may be many months before the political turpitude of the Marshall plan can be unearthed and revealed to the public, and unfortunately it will then be too late to either stop it or recover the billions of dollars paid out by the taxpayers of the United States.

EX-NEW DEALERS NOW WORK FOR NATIONS SEEKING UNITED STATES AID—JUSTICE FILES REVEAL HIGH FEES GIVEN FOR HELP CONCERNING MARSHALL PLAN

(By James Walter)

How numerous ex-New Dealers, most of them refugees from the State and Treasury Departments, are using their bureaucratic knowledge to help European governments climb aboard the Marshall-plan gravy train was revealed yesterday by the Justice Department.

Files in the foreign agents registration section of the Justice Department disclosed that scores of Roosevelt administration protégés, as well as many domestic Communists and fellow travelers, have hired themselves out for salaries as high as $3,000 weekly to the 16 nations which are slated to share in the spoils of the European recovery program.

ROBERT NATHAN ON LIST

Top names on the list include Robert Nathan, a long-time advocate of the planned economy favored by Henry Wallace and the CIO; Earl Browder, temporarily deposed boss of the United States Communist Party; Oscar Cox, former White House intimate and lease expert; and Alger Hiss, a protégé of Dean Acheson during the latter's reign in the State Department.

Browder, despite the fact that he was ousted as top-dog United States "commie" several years ago, is momentarily expected to resume leadership of the party with the personal backing of Premier Stalin. Meanwhile, Comrade Browder has listed himself as a literary advisor to the Soviet Union at a decidedly capitalistic salary.

Nathan is using the knowledge of Government finance he acquired under the New Deal for the advancement of the French and Polish Governments in return for fees as high as $20,000 for 6 months' work.

COX WORKS FOR THREE

Cox, who was buddy-buddy for years with Harry Hopkins, Roosevelt's Svengali, is hard at work for the Governments of Costa Rica, France, and Italy, in the last two of which Communists are particularly strong.

Harry Dexter White, who has been described as the "father of the international monetary fund," and who served as an assistant to Treasury Secretary Morgenthau, pulls down $18,000 yearly from the Bank of Mexico.

Randolph Feltus, a favorite of Florida's Senator PEPPER, gets $3,000 a week from France and the Netherlands Governments and received additional fees from the East Indies and Borneo. He also has an expense account of $500 a week.

FELTUS' $20,000 FEE

Feltus picked up a $20,000 fee from the Polish Government in 1947 for services rendered during the time when the Soviet satellite was trying to promote a $600,000,000 "loan" from Uncle Sam. Feltus, in turn, has his wife, Ann, on his pay roll and also one Robert T. Miller, who was permitted to resign from the State Department in 1946, and who appears often on the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

So steady has been the stream of ex-New Dealers from Uncle Sam's pay roll to that of the Marshall plan recipients that some Government bureau chiefs fear their organizations are "falling apart."

John W. Pehle and Lawrence S. Lesser, along with White and Feltus, resigned from the United States Treasury March 26, 1946. Pehle had been in the office of the General Counsel and was director of foreign funds control from 1940 to 1944. Lesser, an attorney with the Treasury Department, joined Pehle in setting up a law firm after the pair had quit the United States Government. They currently represent France and Romania.

Donald Hiss, a brother of Alger Hiss, also is connected with Acheson's law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson and Shorb. The firm now represents Denmark, Greece, and Iran. It formerly represented Poland, too.

Donald Hiss was a former State Department legal adviser and is an active member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action. His wife is a member of the League of Women Shoppers.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, since it is likely that the House will soon be considering the Marshall plan in all its aspects, I am pleased to present herewith a petition and memorandum in re European recovery program, as adopted by the West Coast Local No. 90, Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America.

I believe this petition and memorandum is worthy of careful consideration by every Member of Congress.

PETITION AND MEMORANDUM IN RE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM (MARSHALL PLAN)

Re Sections VII and VIII of the European recovery program

To the Honorable the President of the United States and the Members of Congress in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

On behalf of the national organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, west coast local No. 90, representing the licensed deck officers of the United States merchant marine who sail out of United States Pacific coast ports and who are 100 percent American citizens, we repectfully submit this petition to strike out sections VII and VIII of the European recovery program, hereinafter referred to as the Marshall plan.

UNITED STATES BEST INTERESTS

In making this request, we believe it is for the best interests of the United States merchant marine and of our country as a whole. Our organization is on record for the European recovery plan, and furthermore we wish to emphasize that we are not opposed to the Marshall plan.

Our organization is in favor of sound comprehensive legislation which will enable these nations to recover their prewar economic stability without damaging or ruining any specific American industry or our American economy as a whole. Under sections VII and VIII of the present plan, there is a recommendation for the allocation of 500 United States-owned merchant vessels to the 16 nations for the purpose of carrying all relief and other United States export cargo. It is inevitable that American labor and industry must make great sacrifices in order that this plan may serve its purpose. We sincerely believe that these unfortunate nations should be assisted in achieving their prewar status, and subsequently they should through their own ingenuity and energy provide for more stability and prosperity.

TESTIMONY GIVEN

National officers of our organization have testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in Washington, D. C., when that committee held public hearings on the Marshall plan. Therefore, we do not wish to repeat protestations made against sections VII and VIII of the plan. Neither is it our desire to submit voluminous statistics which disprove statements made by our State Department and others in favor of virtually giving the United States merchant marine to foreign nations. Such remonstrances have been ably presented by others, including the President's Merchant Marine Advisory Committee and the United States Maritime Commission, all of whom are vitally interested in keeping a United States merchant marine, second to none, for economic and security reasons in the best interests of the United States as a whole.

AMERICAN LABOR

On the west coast, because of our Government's selling over 1,000 vessels of all classes to foreign nations under better and more favorable terms than a United States citizen is able to secure, employment of American labor which mans, operates, builds, repairs, supplies, and supervises ships, has dangerously declined.

Tables below were prepared from an examination of advertising services of 17 lines of the 5 hereinafter-mentioned nations, and the number of vessels quoted would be greater if the vessels not advertised were included.

1947 compared with 1938

	1938	1947
Great Britain	13	35
Norway	20	40
Sweden	10	14
Denmark	(1)	12
Netherlands	8	23
Total	51	124

[1] Nonadvertised.

If these nations are sincere and willing to carry relief cargo, they have sufficient vessels to do so without the transfer of more American vessels to them. The more vessels they obtain from us, the more they will be able to deduct from their essential national trade and the more they will enter into competitive trade in the Pacific.

The following table will show how this has affected employment of officers and men in the merchant marine on the west coast, although it does not include shore workers.

Seafaring employment—west coast (officers and men)—total employment—average number men employed

For quarters ending—	
September, 1945	48,857
December, 1945	47,247
March, 1946	44,323
June, 1946	36,588
September, 1946	27,325
December, 1946	19,018
March, 1947	20,119
June, 1947	19,741
September, 1947	20,085
December, 1947	18,668

There is no justification for making more unemployed United States seamen. Hundreds of thousands of seamen have been trained, and millions of the taxpayers' money have been spent for that purpose during the past 6 years. When recruited during the past war, the men were promised a permanent seafaring future and that the history of the First World War would not be repeated. However, today many thousands of young men are disappointed, and again the seaman is the forgotten man, "beached," and the jobs are turned over to foreign seamen and in some instances to former enemies.

The American-built vessels which cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars should not be delivered to any other nation which will compete against our own by using cheap labor.

SPEND MILLIONS

The Maritime Commission and several States are still spending millions yearly of the taxpayers' money to train officers and men for the merchant marine. Are they trained to go on the unemployed relief?

Finally, what of our national-defense requirements? By Federal law our merchant marine is an auxiliary of our Army and Navy. If by some program, we give ships to other nations; reduce ourselves again to a third-rate maritime nation; do not provide for our required national security—the saving of a few millions, which is claimed to be made under the Marshall plan—could in another emergency mean a loss of billions.

This should be clear to you, Mr. President, gentlemen of Congress, and to the American taxpayers to whom it was brought home sharply in 1917 and again in 1941. No; do not let it happen again.

MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS

When legislation is adopted, we recommend that it include:

(1) That no funds under the European recovery program be used for the transfer, charter, purchase, or hire of any American vessel by foreign nations and for foreign-flag operation, and no ships built by foreign nations shall be paid for out of those funds.

(2) That a minimum of 65 percent of all cargo originating anywhere in the world under this European recovery program be carried on American ships, operated and manned by Americans.

There is no doubt that a workable plan must be adopted. We agree with the statement of our Secretary of State, General Marshall, that "the United States faces one of the greatest decisions in history, which will have a far-reaching effect on the whole world, and if adopted, it will stand as one of the great historic undertakings in the annals of world civilization." However, while we are giving aid to our unfortunate European friends at great risk to our own economy, let not our charity exceed reasonable bounds. Conditions do not justify the scuttling of our merchant marine to accomplish that purpose.

We hopefully appeal to you to help to strike out sections VII and VIII of the Marshall plan and in lieu thereof insert recommendations made by the National Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots of America.

Most respectfully submitted.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION MASTERS, MATES AND PILOTS OF AMERICA, WEST COAST LOCAL NO. 90,
Capt. C. F. MAY,
President and National Vice President.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Hon. Clinton P. Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner held in Louisville, Ky., on February 21, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TIDE IN THE AFFAIRS OF MEN

I am happy to be in Louisville to join you in honoring two superb Americans—two great Democrats, Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. There is a saying: "The nation—or the people—which does not honor the memory of its heroes is dead." This gathering tonight is wholly convincing: The Nation—and the Democratic Party—are very much alive.

But, most of all, I am glad to be here because being here gives me opportunity to get something off my chest. I want to tell you why I am proud to be a Democrat.

It is not only that the Democratic Party is the oldest of all existing American parties.

It is not only that the Democratic Party traces its beginnings back almost to the founding of our Nation.

Nor is it only that the Democratic Party is the one political organization which has stood by the people through virtually every period of the Nation's grand history—through boom and bust, through war and peace, through the many ebbs and flows of social progress.

Naturally I am proud of all this—who would not be?

But, above all, I am proud of the way the Democratic Party has contributed to the growth of progressive spirit in our Nation.

A hundred and fifty years ago it was Thomas Jefferson and his political followers who typified the progressive spirit of the infant Republic. In our day it has been Franklin D. Roosevelt—and it is Harry S. Truman—who have continued to typify that spirit. In the future, whatever it may bring, I am confident that Democrats will still lead the Nation to new frontiers of political, social, and economic progress.

I have come here to say to you in dead earnest that if I were starting out in life again—knowing the history of this country—wanting to be part of an organization that is attuned to American ideals—that stands for true economic and political freedom—that holds the best hope for the United States of America down the corridors of the future—then, I say that I would become a fighting Democrat.

Yes, a fighting Democrat.

You know we are taunted sometimes by our political opponents. They say we are a patchwork party. They say we can't even live peaceably with ourselves. They sneer whenever we squabble.

But let me ask you: Isn't it true that a donkey that doesn't kick up a little dust now and then—a donkey that doesn't bray from time to time—is a mighty sick critter? Certainly, we have the gumption to fight and squabble. But when election time comes, isn't it true that we stop kicking ourselves and start kicking the stuffing out of the Republican elephant? We have done it before. What do you think—can we do it again?

Personally, I have confidence in our ability to do it—here in Kentucky—and throughout the Nation—when November comes. For I keep thinking of something Woodrow Wilson said: "The great tides in human affairs • • • rise in their power and irresistible might and those who stand in the way are overwhelmed."

Those words sum up the history and predict the future of the Democratic Party. From Jefferson to Truman, by and large, the Democratic Party has ridden the crest of a great wave of progressive spirit. We have not stood in the way. Other parties of the past have stood in the way; and they have been overwhelmed and have disappeared in the turbulent seas of history. One political party is standing squarely in the way of that tide today.

I have brought with me a chart [not printed]—the chart that you see before you—which testifies that what I have just said is true.

Let me tell you how I came to bring this chart to Louisville.

I have a fondness for history, especially American history. The other day I was reading some American history of the period about a century ago, and I grew interested in an account of the election of 1840. That was an election in which the Whig Party defeated the Democrats by shenanigans. The Whigs had seen the people rally around Andrew Jackson in 1828 and 1832. They cunningly decided, therefore, to palm off their candidate in 1840 as a man of the people—another Jackson. He owned 2,000 acres, but that didn't matter. For electioneering purposes, he was as poor as a church mouse. Until election Tuesday in November he was going to be an honest-to-goodness "log-cabin" man.

So the Whigs got some big wagons and put log cabins on the wagons. They nailed coonskins to the cabin doors. They built atmosphere all right—they even had live raccoons climbing all over the premises. And, finally, they had big barrels of hard cider on tap.

It was a remarkable show. But who do you suppose was really sitting in those log cabins? A man of the people? Not on your life! The easy-money boys in their stovepipe hats and frock coats—the representatives of vested interests that Andrew Jackson had fought tooth and nail.

I hate to recall it, but the Whigs put their man over. But that isn't all of the story. You know the old sayings, honesty is the best policy? Well, the Whigs were just a little too slick. They chose for Vice President a Virginia Democrat, thinking that would make the election dead sure. And they were right. When the hot air of the election died down, their candidate caught pneumonia. A month after he was inaugurated he was dead. And the Whigs found they had put a Democrat in the White House—for sure.

Well, as I read that history, I thought how times have changed. Even our political opponents don't go in for such shenanigans nowadays. I certainly would not want to come to Louisville with a torch, a log cabin, or a barrel of hard cider. And I don't usually carry a live raccoon around in my pocket.

We need no shenanigans. We Democrats can fight our battle with facts—with reason—with truth.

And so I brought this chart. And just as the pen is mightier than the sword, so is this chart a much better weapon of truth than a torch, a log cabin, a live raccoon—and—I hope you will agree with me—even a big barrel of hard cider. For this chart points to a tide of human affairs—a tide like those Wilson was talking about—the tide of the American spirt of progress.

If you look at this chart, you will see much that is interesting. It shows the periods of control of the House of Representatives by each of the two major parties from 1854—when the Republican Party came into being—to 1946 when the general elections were last held.

Note that the periods of Democratic control are shown as peaks above the line. That is appropriate—those were the times when the Nation was having its "ups." The periods of Republican control are valleys below the line—when the Nation was having its "downs." Note that these valleys are depicted in dark colors—that, too, is appropriate—that is a sign of mourning.

Speaking seriously, I want to say that this chart has been prepared by a keen political analyst, Dr. Louis H. Bean; and it will be further developed in a forthcoming book. It is based upon cold facts, not fervid fancy.

Note the intensity of the swings up and down. In 1920, for example, the Republicans elected 60 percent of the House as against 31 percent for the Democrats. Sixteen years later, the Democrats elected 79 percent of the House, as against only 21 percent for the Republicans.

I seem to recall that there was some squabbling in the Democratic Party about that time, too.

Next, note the frequency with which minor trends have been reversed. Three times—in 1854, 1860, and 1868—the Republicans gained control of the House and lost it at the very next election. I think we might pay special attention to that—I think history is going to repeat in 1948.

But most significant of all, note the long-time trend of increasing Democratic control and the dwindling degree of Republican dominance. If this trend continues the Democratic Party in the future may be expected to elect on the average about 60 percent of the House of Representatives.

I am not indulging in wishful thinking when I say this. I am merely interpreting statistical facts and a historical trend. In the 1860's and 1870's a Republican-controlled House was the norm.

Today a Republican House is the exception.

In the future a Republican House could become the rare—the catastrophic—like an earthquake or a flood. In fact if the trend continues to its logical conclusion, the House of Representatives might well become just the place for the tired old Republican who longs to retire to the sweet delights of a quiet life.

No doubt there are many factors which must be taken into account in attempting to explain this chart. No doubt business conditions have much to do with the ups and downs of political popularity.

Another important factor probably is the increasing proportion of the voting population that is concentrated in large cities—for the large cities are predominantly Democratic. In 1860 only one-fifth of the vote was urban. In 1940 nearly three-fifths of the vote was urban.

But the big factor to my mind is the thing I keep stressing here tonight—the progressive spirit of the Democratic Party. We are a progressive people. From the time of Jefferson the Democratic Party has been a progressive party. It has been a party of the people, devoted primarily to the promotion of human rights.

You and I are the inheritors of great Democratic traditions. We should never lose sight of our responsibilities to push forward in the continuing struggle for human rights.

And I think one way to remain aware of these responsibilities is to recall to our minds from time to time the great men of the party—the great deeds of the party—and the great future which the party can help secure for America.

On this day, which we have dedicated to the memory of Jefferson and Jackson, nothing could be more fitting than that we should do this.

So let us ask ourselves some questions. What does America owe to Jefferson?

First of all, it owes much of the Bill of Rights.

Jefferson was a strong advocate of the Constitution. But he realized that the Constitution without a Bill of Rights could become a sword of Damocles poised threateningly over the head of human liberty. No one fought harder—and probably no one fought as effectively—for the right of the people—not just the propertied classes—for the right of the people to rule; for equality in the courts; for a free press; for the right to petition for redress of grievances; for religious freedom; for all those fundamental rights which are guaranteed by the first 10 amendments to the Constitution.

We have those rights today, you and I. Do we sometimes call to mind how much we are indebted to Jefferson?

After Jefferson, in an unbroken line came other Democratic Presidents—Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Van Buren.

That was a tremendous era. Near its end, the lean, vital figure of Andrew Jackson dominated the American scene. Again let us ask a question: What do we owe to Jackson?

Above all, we owe the strengthening of the belief in human equality. With him, no man was king and none was servant. He is known to history as the first "people's President."

I like to think of Jackson, the boy. When he was 14, the historians tell us, he was red-headed, aggressive, exuberant. Boylike, he could not bear to miss the fighting of the American Revolution, and he ran away and joined a band of backwoodsmen. Soon he was captured. One of his captors, sensing his fierce pride, ordered him to shine his shoes. But young Andy Jackson was servile to no man. He refused. He refused even when his captor swung his saber and cut a gash in his head.

That was Jackson, the boy. That same spunk was in Jackson, the general—Jackson, the President.

In the footprints of these magnificent leaders other men of similar stature followed.

There was Grover Cleveland toward the close of the nineteenth century. What do we owe to him? Cleveland brought to the White House a rugged honesty—like a breath of clean air sweeping away the stench of the Republican scandals of the preceding decade. He far overshadowed the Republican candidate who ran against him in 1884—so far, indeed, that a veritable army of liberal Republicans deserted their party and voted for Cleveland.

Then there was Woodrow Wilson. Do you think of Wilson only as a scholarly, gentle man who suffered, as President, the agony of leading a people whom he loved through a world war? Do you think of him only as the farsighted idealist—the disappointed architect of the League of Nations—who was vindicated only by a second and more terrible world war?

Wilson was all this and more. Wilson was a superb leader in a tremendous wave of progressive spirit—a wave exceeded only by that of the 1930's.

And then there was Roosevelt—and now Truman. I shall say more of the achievements and leadership of these men later.

But do you see how right it is that our hearts should swell with pride as we contemplate the pedestals that Democrats occupy in the halls of American history?

Let us turn now from men to deeds.

Picture the United States of America as it was about 1800. A small group of States clustered mainly about the Atlantic seaboard. A tiny Republic, sneered at by much of the world—expected to collapse like a toothpick house in the first gust of the winds of dissention. A Nation so weak that the minister of a foreign power threatened possible war unless we bought our way clear with money—and the deathless answer of our minister: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

And then picture that Nation 40 years later—after 40 years of democratic guidance. Now there are 26 States. By the Louisiana Purchase alone, the Nation has acquired a huge tract, stretching from the Mississippi to the Rockies, and from the Gulf to Canada. In that period of 40 years we have consolidated our independence by the War of 1812. We have promulgated the Monroe Doctrine, warning European nations that the American continents are not subject to European colonization or encroachment.

And in that period Jackson has thrown down the gage to the powerful Bank of the United States in the first clear-cut conflict between the rule of the people on the one hand and government by privilege on the other.

This was a bitter struggle. The bank fought Jackson with every weapon it had. It used its money to tempt the press by subtle bribery. Industrialists openly threatened to close their factories if Jackson were reelected. The supporters of Old Hickory found the channels of credit effectively closed against them.

The question of whether or not to fight the bank posed a terrible dilemma for Jackson. But as one historian has said, Jackson was ready at any time to meet a dilemma "more than half way and spit in its face." Figuratively speaking, he did exactly that. Neither as boy nor as President, would Jackson lick any man's boots.

And the result was that farmers and workers, recognizing him as a "people's President," flowed out of the fields and factories to the polls—to vote—and Andrew Jackson won reelection by a majority of more than 4 to 1.

Thus in those days more than a century past, the progressive spirit of the American people found its mate in the progressive spirit of the Democratic Party. And the marriage has been successful and no political opposition has been able permanently to put it asunder.

Oh yes, there have been family quarrels. Sometimes these quarrels left us unable to reform our shattered troops in time to win the next encounter. Sometimes the Democratic Party forgot its principles, and when that happened, the people punished the party.

We see that illustrated on the extreme left-handed side of the chart. In 1854—the very year it was organized—the Republican Party won control of the House of Representatives.

Do you know why? It was because the Whig Party—and many members of the Democratic Party—thought they could straddle a great issue. They tried proviso and compromise. They courted delay and indecision. They let the day pass when a solution might have been reached without bloodshed and by far less hurried disposition than a war finally achieved. But the Whigs and the Democrats straddled. With that election the Whigs virtually disappeared from the American scene. And although the Democratic Party recovered in the elections of 1856 and not only won control of the House but elected a President, yet 4 years later—in 1860—the Democrats split hopelessly again over the same issue. Then nominated two candidates—wrote two platforms—and while Abraham Lincoln wisely stayed home and made no speeches—Douglas in the North and Breckinridge in the South handed him the Presidency. I will not forget that history whenever I lift my voice in this election.

Looking again at the chart, you will note that it took quite a while before the American people remembered the old glories of Jefferson and Jackson and restored the Democratic Party to control of the House.

Even after it did so, in that period running through the larger part of the 18 years from 1874 to 1892, Republicans were in the White House most of the time.

They remained there, despite the scandals of the Grant administrations, until it began to dawn upon farmers and workers alike that the Republican Party had deserted them and was consorting only with the high priests of business and apostles of reaction.

Then, and then only, did the Democrats return to favor. But we need to pause and look at that history in relation to the election that lies ahead.

In 1860 when Lincoln came in, the progressive groups were behind him. The farmers, the labor leaders, the intellectual giants found congenial company in his camp.

But the progressive sentiments of Lincoln's party died with him. His party turned to conservative ideals. It lost labor, gradually but nonetheless surely. By 1900, labor was not welcome in the party.

The farmer in the Northern States stayed Republicans for a long period after labor left. The farmers didn't quit until the 1930's. They were busted then, the great mass were, and they rebelled because two Republican Presidents had vetoed the McNary-Haugen bill to bring them assistance.

So in the 1930's, the political situation was the reverse of 1860, labor, farmers, and progressive citizens generally uniting behind a Democratic candidate. The task to which we must dedicate our best endeavors is to make that combination stand in the election of 1948 behind President Truman and Democratic candidates over the Nation.

In the period that followed Lincoln's death, the Democratic Party continued to fight the battle of the common people. Constantly, it struggled against the mounting tariff which raised higher and higher the cost of living. And toward the end of the period, in the administration of Cleveland, an impressive step forward was made when the civil service was reformed so soundly that the merit system then inaugurated remains substantially the same today.

Thus, even in those difficult years, landmarks of progressive policy were established that are basic in our democracy in 1948.

And then with the elections of 1910, and 2 years later the victory of Wilson, the progressive tide began to flow in earnest. I mentioned earlier that Wilson was a great leader in this tide. Let me list some of the accomplishments of his administrations:

The Federal Reserve System was organized.

Labor was specifically and legally declared not a commodity.

Farm loan banks were organized to meet the need of farmers for loans at reasonable rates of interest.

Women were given the vote, Nation-wide.

The income tax amendment was adopted.

For the first time, Members of the Senate of the United States were elected by popular vote.

Do you know anyone who today would urge repeal of any of these progressive programs? Think for a moment how large these reforms bulk in your lives—you women who vote—you men and women who now can elect your Senators—you farmers who can obtain credit—you workers whose rights as human beings are safeguarded—you business and professional people who benefit from a sound banking system. Would you give these up without a fight?

And now we come to another period, an era when the tide of progressivism came in with a roar and literally swept aside all who stood in its way, just as Wilson had said it would.

The first hundred days of that era were among the most dynamic hundred days in American history. I believe historians of the future will agree that in that short period we traveled as with seven-league boots farther along the road of social progress than in all the Republican administrations since the time of Abraham Lincoln.

May I refresh your minds about those days?

Think back with me. It is March 3, 1933. In Wall Street and the Loop of Chicago howling mobs surge around the pillars of closed banks while the police struggle to hold them back.

There is a sickening sensation in everyone's heart as we watch the financial life of the country come to a dead stop.

And then suddenly a day later there is hope again—hope surging through the vitals of this Nation as a great leader—though he was a man who could not even walk unaided—comes to the microphone and tells you—and tells me—that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself.

Never will the Nation forget that day. Never will it forget those first 100 days that followed.

On Sunday, the day after inauguration, the President uses a lingering power from World War I to declare a 4-day bank holiday.

On Monday a conference of governors meets at the White House.

On Thursday Congress convenes, an emergency banking bill passes both Houses and is signed by the President.

Six days later, the economy bill becomes law.

The day after this, farm-relief legislation is sent to Congress.

And in the next 3 months:

The banks are made sounder than they have ever been.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act is passed, laying the foundation for the national-farm program which both parties now support.

The National Industrial Recovery Act is set up to provide jobs, improve wages, and eliminate unfair business practices.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act is passed to provide an example of long-range planning and use of natural soil and water resources.

The Civilian Conservation Corps is established to take boys off the streets and out of hobo "jungles" and give them useful work.

The Home Owners' Loan Act enables people to save their homes from foreclosure.

The Railroad Coordinator Act helps keep the railroads operating.

The Glass-Steagall Bank Act sets up the Federal Deposit Insurance program.

The Emergency Relief Act furnishes food and clothing to the needy and wipes out the bread lines.

The Securities Act protects investors against sharp stock-promotion dealers.

The Wagner Employment Exchange Act helps men and women find jobs.

One hundred days. One hundred days in which the wolf of depression is flung back from the throat of the American economy. One hundred days in which the progressive spirit rises triumphant over fear and despair.

You have heard Republicans curse the New Deal. They have now controlled the Congress for more than a year. What bills have they passed to repeal any of the acts I have mentioned?

Today the Democratic Party, under President Truman, still continues in the progressive spirit of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and Roosevelt. And strangely, that seems to trouble some people. They sometimes ask, "Why doesn't the President coast along? Why does he raise troublesome issues?"

Do you see why? Don't you see, it is because our party can never coast, can never straddle. There is no standing still. We are a great party because we forever push ahead toward the ideals of democracy. We are swept along on a great progressive tide and our strokes are with it—not against it.

Only so long as the Democratic Party remains the champion of human rights—the defender of human liberties—whether in the political or the economic sphere, only so long will it continue to ride the crest of the tide.

Otherwise, the two-party system goes dead and there is little to choose between the Democratic donkey and the Republican elephant.

The distinction between Democrat and Republican must remain clear. Democratic leadership must be as completely in step with the times as the Republican leadership is out of step. Many Republicans today are little more aware of the nature of the world crisis than they were in 1940 when the party overwhelmingly voted against selective service and lend-lease. Do not take my word for this. It was Candidate Harold Stassen who said last week that the Marshall plan faces "shortsighted opposition within our own party"—meaning the Republican Party. And it is Candidate ROBERT TAFT who wants to debate about the last $300,000,000 for ERP while the people of Europe scan the skies for signs of their deliverance.

Nor is the Republican leadership today any more aware of the nature of the domestic crisis than it was in 1929. Do you remember? With depression just around the corner, do you recall how Republicans hallelujahed that prosperity was here forever and soon there would be a chicken in every pot and two cars in every garage? And do you recall the classic remark of the radio comedian a few years later who said that if half the people who didn't have a pot would buy one, the pottery business would pick up? Do not take my word for it that the Republicans are still living in a dream world. It was Republican Senator AIKEN who suggested after the 1946 elections that his party had lost touch with reality.

True, the people momentarily turned to the Republican Party in 1946. But it has not taken them long to get enough. They are fed up with the results of what the Republicans themselves take credit for—high prices.

Again, do not take my word for it. It was a Republican, Senator WHERRY, who said: "TAFT! TAFT! Everybody is always talking about what TAFT has done to OPA. I'm the fellow that knocked out meat control." And it was Senator WHERRY who repeated recently, "It was the Republican leadership in the House and Senate that was responsible for ending OPA."

Last year you, the people of Kentucky, decided that you had had enough of that misguided leadership. You heard ALBEN BARKLEY stump this State in a great campaign on the cost-of-living issue. You voted Gov. Earle Clements into office by the biggest majority in Kentucky history.

In so doing, you proved once again the direction of the tide. Governor Clements, as a Congressman, fought for a progressive farm program. He took his stand against the Taft-Hartley bill. He was proud of his record, and it was on his record that he waged his campaign for the governorship. I am happy to see that the progressive tide—the tide that has so often reelected Senator BARKLEY—still runs strongly in the Blue Grass State. I expect that tide—Nation-wide—next year to return ALBEN BARKLEY to the post of majority leader in the Senate. And I expect, moreover, that when next January comes, the State of Kentucky will again be represented in the Senate by two Democrats.

The people are not long fooled. Last year, they were first amused, then worried, by the antics of the Republican ax wielders, who were going to chop up the budget like so much kindling wood. The House proposed to cut the budget by $6,000,000,000. Then, cooler heads in the Senate prevailed, and they came up with a compromise figure of four and a half billion.

What was the result? Congress finally appropriated for this fiscal year more money than the President had asked. The Republicans had merely marched their soldiers up the hill and marched them down again.

No, the people are not fooled. The Gallup polls daily look better to the Democratic eye.

And this chart doesn't look so bad, either.

And that is why, knowing all that is behind this party, I look hopefully to November and to the years ahead, why I rejoice to see the great tides in human affairs • • • rise in their power and irresistible might.

For this year we Democrats have both a short-run and a long-time trend with us.

In 1948, we enter the short-run trend when the big outturn at November Presidential elections works in our favor. We will prevail. We will reelect Harry S. Truman.

And when we make the hurdle in 1948, then we capitalize on the long-time trend that has carried us upward for 100 years—and can carry us higher.

But it will only do it if our armor shines spotless in the sun, if we are alert to our destiny at home and abroad, if we are loyal to our cause, if we remain the party of the people.

What South Can Expect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of February 20, 1948:

WHAT SOUTH CAN EXPECT

If Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH speaks for the Democratic Party's top command, the South now knows just how much consideration it can expect. It is none.

Senator MCGRATH must so speak, because he is the Democratic national chairman, and therefore one of the party's chief policy makers.

His statements relative to the impending visit of the southern governor's committee to Washington almost destroys hope that differences over President TRUMAN'S "civil rights" program can be settled within the party itself.

"I can't see," he says, "what purpose the committee hopes to accomplish."

Either Senator MCGRATH is politically blind or stupidly naive. Maybe it is both.

The governor's committee plans to make clear the South's position on the civil rights program and to demand greater consideration for the dominant position it occupies in the party. Senator MCGRATH'S declarations preclude any fruitful results, but the committee should go through with its plans if for no other reason than that of keeping the records straight.

He has made it plain that there will be no reversal of policy as to the civil rights program, and he attempts to explain Southern opposition by saying that it was due to the fact that all of the civil rights proposals were "wrapped up in one package."

He knows better. The South has opposed FEPC, antilynching, and antipoll tax legislation singly and collectively.

It will continue to oppose them.

It will continue to labor in behalf of the principles on which they are based through realistic methods. If that does not make sense to Senator MCGRATH, let him study the South's record of self-progress toward the ends of racial understanding and the elimination of mob violence.

On the same day that the Democratic Party's national chairman was expressing lack of understanding as to the purpose of the governors' visit, he made what was a shameless public appeal to Henry Wallace to repudiate his Communist supporters and return to the Democratic fold.

That was tantamount almost to a confession of desperation and another low in the field of political expediency. It will only serve to encourage the Wallace Reds and further disgust true Democrats.

If the Democratic Party's dismal failure in the recent Bronx congressional election and the so-called southern revolt brought that appeal about, the Democratic Party's top command had already lost all reason and balance.

Henry Wallace's political philosophy and followers are as alien to genuine Democratic Party principles as the civil rights program is in origin.

Neither deserve the consideration of right-thinking Democrats.

What doesn't seem to have penetrated the confused minds of Democratic leaders like Senator MCGRATH is that the South is in earnest.

Perhaps the governors' committee can, at least, set Washington and the rest of the country straight as to that.

There's infinitely more than the matter of a civil rights program at stake, although that is plenty of itself, involving, as it does, those rights to which the Democratic Party seems to be giving little heed—the constitutional rights of majorities.

There is involved that matter of being taken for granted—of assuming that after the South has been kicked around long enough it will still take more.

"Beware of the fury of a patient man," wrote Dryden. That goes for a section.

Patience and party loyalty both have their limitations.

Perhaps the governors' committee can help Senator MCGRATH see that.

Jefferson-Jackson Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian of February 17, 1948:

AT $100 A THROW

Oregon Democrats show both ambition and optimism in planning a Jefferson-Jackson banquet at $100 a plate. The figure is not an unusual one for this event in places where Democrats are in lucrative office, such as Washington, D. C. In Portland, attendance will have to depend upon party hopes and party enthusiasm, rather than upon party obligation.

There are, however, two elements that should help attract a Democratic turn-out in Portland. The principal speaker will be J. HOWARD MCGRATH, former Governor of Rhode Island, former solicitor general, now United States Senator and Democratic National Committeeman. The other element is that this year the Democratic National Committee attains its one hundredth birthday. The committee was formed in Baltimore on May 22, 1848. Oregon Democrats will dine on April 7.

April 7 has no direct significance as a day in party history that we know of. Neither has February 19, when Jefferson-Jackson dinners will be held in most other large cities. It is not the birthday of either founder of the party. Jefferson was born on an April 13; Jackson on a March 15. So April 7 is as good a combination date as February 19.

Orators at these banquets will have a wealth of material to recall respecting the statesmanship of Jefferson and Jackson. But comparison of the political philosophies of the two with the policies of the present-day party does not lend itself to warm acclaim. The party's founding fathers, were they now alive, would not recognize their child.

Both adhered to strict construction of the Constitution. That is to say they opposed centralization of Federal Government in internal affairs—and look what happened under the New Deal. The early proponents of liberal construction were Hamilton, the two Adamses, Webster, Story, Clay.

Jackson vetoed, on the ground of unconstitutionality, several bills appropriating Federal funds for internal improvements. Now localities compete for them. Jefferson thought his Louisiana purchase required validation by constitutional amendment, but nothing was ever done about it. Jefferson believed in economy in government and a small public debt; in confining the currency strictly to gold and silver; in a well-trained militia and a small standing army. What the latter-day party has done or wants to do, regarding the last three, would better be left unsaid by the banquet orators.

In one respect, however, the Democrats could defend Truman appointments on the basis of notable party precedent. Jackson believed in rewarding his personal friends. And, as already remarked, much can be declaimed about the two without going into embarrassing political contrasts.

These Jefferson-Jackson banquets are money-raising projects. The diners will not get $100 worth of food and drink. Whether they will be as financially productive as formerly is in some doubt. It had not been unusual for corporations, seeking good will come what might in politics, to buy blocks of tickets and distribute them among employees. But the Taft-Hartley law tightened restrictions on political activity by corporations. Formerly they were forbidden to make "contributions" in connection with election of a President or Congressman. Technically the buying of tickets to a banquet was not a contribution—the buyers received something in return. Now the law forbids "expenditure" by corporations in connection with any election at which the people vote for President or Congressmen.

A Democratic banquet at $100 a throw to help fill the campaign chest, now depends more closely on the open-handedness of individual party stalwarts.

TVA Handles a Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial from the New York Times, dated Saturday, February 21, 1948, concerning the handling of floodwaters by the Tennessee Valley Authority. This editorial is timely and praises the efficiency of the TVA system of harnessing and checking the recent high waters in the Tennessee Valley area. Areas without the TVA chain-dam system suffered great losses during the recent flood. High waters in the Tennessee Valley area were checked and millions of dollars saved our citizens by reason of the existence of this great flood-control project. Extensive damage occurred in the Duck River Valley and other areas in Tennessee where the TVA watershed does not extend. Nashville, Tennessee's capital city, situated on the banks of the Cumberland River, suffered losses variously estimated from $400,000 to $500,000 from the now waning and recent flood. The bringing of the Cumberland River and its tributaries under the TVA watershed would mean untold savings to the people of the South. Flood control is a great problem with which this Congress is or should be concerned. The example demonstrated by the benefits of the TVA program is clear and explicit.

The editorial is as follows:

TVA HANDLES A FLOOD

Latest reports on the recent high water in the Tennessee Valley again confirm the efficiency of TVA's system of tributary and main-river dams. The great reservoirs of Norris, Cherokee, Douglas, Fontana, and Hiwassee, on the tributary streams, took all the water that was poured into them and had plenty of room left. By this means the flood crest at Chattanooga was cut 10 feet, with an estimated saving of $6,000,000. Real damage was done in the valley of the Duck River, where the flood broke the Weather Bureau's 70-year record, but as there are no TVA dams on Duck River the blame must be placed on the weather.

Below Chattanooga some water from the main-river dams was allowed to inundate low-lying farm lands, causing losses of a few thousand dollars. This, however, is standard practice. Such lands are kept cleared of

farm structures and though occasionally flooded in winter are protected throughout the growing season. Finally, the vast Kentucky Reservoir, above the Ohio junction, still has sufficient capacity to halt the whole flow of the Tennessee, if necessary, while the flood crests pass down the Ohio.

It is important that these facts be understood. They are of record and in no way affected by political or economic controversy. They stand for sound engineering. We have a right to look forward to a day when comparable engineering will control the flow of the Missouri and other rivers not yet adequately under man's domination.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and petition:

LA CROSSE, WIS., *February 18, 1948.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A petition signed by some of the best citizens of La Crosse, urging you to further legislation establishing some form of universal military training is enclosed. This is not just an ordinary petition, for the reason that it represents the wishes of our thinking citizens in this community. We believe the cost of universal military training is a very small premium to pay for the protection of our country.

Very truly yours,

L. V. WEISENSEL.

PETITION

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Peace is worth striving for. Therefore we, citizens of the United States and voters, urge you, our Representative in the Eightieth Congress of the United States, to support and vote for legislation establishing a system of universal military training for American young men, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training.

Emie Georgie, John Michels, O. C. Smerog, Marvin M. Lee, J. D. Christie, William Gantenbein, Harry H. Miamto, Lawrence E. Clark, Louis George, Tom G. Dowling, Robert Rio, Delmer J. Secord, Robert Meyers, N. L. Gittetz, S. W. Gifford, R. I. Deml, R. S. Winesburg, George A. Rau, C. L. Klein, Cal Lachman, Roy Myers, La Crosse, Wis.

F. H. Rodenberg, W. J. Boeshard, R. T. McGeough, R. B. Rye, H. H. Keller, M. L. Park, R. T. Hess, Glen N. Lunde, S. Stellpflug, V. Schrader, S. D. Seguin, Edwin O. Norton, Howard L. Aiken, Leonard G. Harnish, Roy W. Posenwaldt, John W. Hengel, Harold Kostecki, Ardell C. Emerson, Edward J. Hengel, Robert A. Zischke, Dale B. Peterson, P. E. Wallace, D. J. Secord, R. C. Secord, L. V. Weisensel, La Crosse, Wis.

Mrs. Charles E. Knoblauch, J. F. Korpal, Mrs. J. F. Korpal, Mrs. W. A. Knoblauch, G. F. Seymour, Marilyn J. Bobwell, H. R. Russia, Robert Kracklauer, Max J. Peshak, Earl H. Bluske, Eugene V. Dugan, Robert Kachel, Edward J. Roth, C. O. Amundsen, Woodrow J. Schoenfeld, R. L. Lowell, James Bates, John G. Anderson, Wesley M. Thompson, John T. Gairhu, Leo R. Chapachi, E. G. Johnson, William L. Mason, E. L. Mason, Lee O. Sieve, George J. Renner, Clarence Papacek, R. H. Klein, Riley W. Walling, Lyle R. Mason, Harry B. Fillner, F. A. Kenney, Joseph Pathling, W. L. Becker, Alfred F. Tubanek, J. W. Reidelbach, La Crosse, Wis.

Sam Hardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, loyalty is one of the finest of all human virtues. Loyalty is a firm constant reliability which encompasses courtesy, honesty, and fidelity. A loyal friend or employee is one who will stand when others run away.

My good friend Sam Hardy exemplifies all these virtues every day as he goes about his duties as messenger for the Ways and Means Committee. He has been employed by the Ways and Means Committee for 40 years. During that time he has been intimately associated with many of the leaders in the House and Senate.

With an unfailing courtesy and with an alacrity, born of a desire to render helpful service, he has been a most efficient and popular employee. Many of his intimate acquaintances do not know his surname, but they all know Sam. Thousands of persons who have in the past 40 years had business with the Ways and Means Committee know and have known Sam. They know him as Sam and they will always remember him as Sam.

For the many kindnesses to me and for his readiness to render service which is a part of his position, I shall be forever grateful to him. May he continue long in the place which he has filled so competently.

The Steel Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter from Mr. John C. Virden, Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, concerning steel:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 16, 1948.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reply to your inquiry of February 10, the Steel Committee undoubtedly will explore the possibilities of using all iron and steel facilities to the utmost to insure as large production of the basic commodities as is possible during the present emergency.

We are gratified to learn of the increased facilities of several of the larger steel producers which will go into production this year. It is doubtful, however, even the stepped-up production will be sufficient to meet all emergency requirements of the farming, petroleum, and housing industries. Caution, accordingly, will have to be exercised in working out industry agreements whereby the more critical of the programs receive prior attention. Among the latter undoubtedly will have to be certain segments of the petroleum, gas, and oil industries. The steel requirements of the latter group are now being prepared by an industry advisory committee under the general guidance of the Department of the Interior. The necessary data is scheduled to be available by March 1.

The steel requirements for maintenance and repairs to keep the entire industry operating at full capacity will comprise the foundation of the report. Superimposed on these requirements will be the minimum steel requirements for increasing production to meet the over-all stepped-up domestic economy. How far one must go beyond these domestic requirements to take care of the European recovery program is naturally a matter of speculation at the moment.

Please be assured this office will make sure the question raised by you as to possible surplus war-plant steel facilities being available is given the serious consideration it deserves at the very earliest date.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. VIRDEN,
Special Assistant to the Secretary.

Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 20, 1948:

A COWARDLY BILL

The Senate Banking Committee has approved a bill to extend rent control to the end of April 1949. There is the usual palaver about liberalizing regulations to protect landlords against hardship, but all this boils down to the Senators' reluctance to pick the landlord's pocket of a dollar but their willingness to pick it of 85 cents.

One example of shocking bad faith is the provision that would extend those leases, voluntarily entered at 15 percent increases of rent, until the 1949 date. Last year's act, authorizing these leases, provided that they should expire at the end of this year, and that thereafter the properties so leased should be free of rent control. Now the control is extended, violating the legislative promise.

Congress has also provided that new construction shall be free of rent control. There has been very little new construction of rental properties, and after this action on the 15-percent leases, there may be still less. One reason that investors have been unwilling to put their money into rental properties has been the fears that when they are built Congress will go back on its word and slap rent controls on them. The Senate committee has shown that these fears are well justified.

This pending rent-control bill, like every other action of National, State, and local legislative bodies on the subject, betrays the complete cowardice of the politicians of the United States. They know there is no moral or legal justification for rent control and they vote for it for one reason only. That is their hope to win the votes of the vast army of tenants by helping them defraud their landlords.

Rent control is always presented in the same guise, which is that it is to give emergency relief from a shortage of housing. The emergency will last as long as the rent control, and not more than 6 months longer. As long as the control is maintained, the shortage will grow worse because rental units are wearing out and falling apart faster than new units are being built.

Removal of controls would of itself remedy most, if not all, of the housing shortage. It would force people who are occupying more space than they need, because they get it at artificially low rent, to restrict their use to fit their purses, and thereby make room for other tenants.

There should be no mistake that the lifting of rent controls would immediately result in a considerable increase in rents. It will also result in gouging by a certain number of landlords, though probably not by the more foresighted ones. The lifting of other controls has resulted in farmers getting the last penny they can for their crops and in labor unions getting the last penny they can in wage increases. Only the landlord is expected to defray 1948 costs out of 1942 income.

The only people who can gain in the long run by rent control are the public-housing racketeers. The housing shortage will persist and they will have an excuse to use tax funds to provide shelter at less than cost to another favored group. That racket, however, won't be financed by landlords alone. Tenants also pay income taxes.

Butter Industry Must Not Be Destroyed by Oleo—Here's What Grover Cleveland Said About It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts of Grover Cleveland's message to the Congress when he signed the oleo tax bill, August 2, 1886. These excerpts are:

[Excerpts from Suggesting Certain Amendments to the Oleomargarine Act (H. R. 8328—49th Cong., 1st sess.)]

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, August 2, 1886.

To the Congress:

I have this day approved a bill originating in the House of Representatives, entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine."

* * * * * *

The Constitution has invested Congress with a very wide legislative discretion both as to the necessity of taxation and the selection of the objects of its burdens. And though, if the question was presented to me as an original proposition, I might doubt the present need of increased taxation, I deem it my duty in this instance to defer to the judgment of the legislative branch of the Government, which has been so emphatically announced in both Houses of Congress upon the passage of this bill.

* * * * * *

It has been urged as an objection to this measure that, while purporting to be legislation for revenue, its real purpose is to destroy, by the use of the taxing power, one industry of our people for the protection and benefit of another.

If entitled to indulge in such a suspicion, as a basis of official action in this case, and if entirely satisfied that the consequences indicated would ensue, I should doubtless feel constrained to interpose Executive dissent.

But I do not feel called upon to interpret the motives of Congress otherwise than by the apparent character of the bill which has been presented to me, and I am convinced that the taxes which it creates cannot possibly destroy the open and legitimate manufacture and sale of the thing upon which it is levied. If this article has the merit which its friends claim for it, and if the people of the land, with full knowledge of its real character, desire to purchase and use it, the taxes exacted by this bill will permit a fair profit to both manufacturer and dealer. If the existence of the commodity taxed, and the profits of its manufacture and sale, depend upon disposing of it to the people for something else which it deceitfully imitates, the entire enterprise is a fraud and not an industry; and if it cannot endure the exhibition of its real character which will be effected by the inspection, supervision, and stamping which this bill directs, the sooner it is destroyed the better, in the interest of fair dealing.

* * * * * *

GROVER CLEVELAND

Source: The Writings and Speeches of Grover Cleveland, Library of Congress.

The Work of the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address made by the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, at the Veterans of Foreign Wars' Washington Birthday banquet at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 21, 1948:

Fellow citizens, it always gives me a special pleasure to talk with war veterans. The contact always renews my confidence in the capacity of our people and the strength of our Nation. The most wholesome and helpful practice we in America can adopt is always to keep in the forefront of our thinking the great debt of gratitude we owe the men and women who have worn the uniform of their country's service. We must never forget that our soldiers, sailors, and marines, dead and living, have preserved our America. They have kept strong the one remaining beacon of freedom in a dark and stormy world. They have kept the fires of freedom bright when despots, and ruthless aggressors, would have extinguished them in a night of horror and human suffering.

A great responsibility has rested upon the young Americans who, over the years, have gone forward to lay their all, if necessary, upon the altar of their country's service. War service always demands the flower of our citizenship, the best of our youth, and the greatest human sacrifice in suffering and agony known to humanity. You and the other citizens who have served in the armed forces discharged your responsibility well.

A great responsibility still rests upon you, and all the other young Americans who are now coming into control of the Nation. America is the last bulwark of liberty. It must be kept strong, and solvent, and free, to lead a world cooperative movement back to peace and sanity and prosperity. You will keep it so.

By virtue of the very service you have rendered your Nation, you are keenly aware that liberty is not something government gives to the people. Liberty is something the people keep government from taking away from them. The men who founded this Nation knew that. Therefore, they placed all the power of government in the hands of the people. They very cautiously gave only a few powers to the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches. They were careful to establish as many checks and balances as possible. Whenever these checks and balances are impaired, the liberty of the citizen is endangered. The veterans will see that our American system is preserved. They have seen all governments in the world in operation. They came home knowing by experience our American system is the best.

The Nation will always pay homage to those who, through valor, sacrifice, and courage, prevented aggressive despotism from enslaving perhaps the whole of the Old World.

You, as veterans and as citizens, have a major contribution to make to your peacetime Nation. The veterans have come back from the wars to undertake leading roles in industry, in agriculture, in the labor movement, in the professions. Above all, the veterans will continue to resist, as they have resisted with all their might, any subversive attempts to destroy our constitutional system of government, our free economy, our free society. The veterans will be the first to rise to the defense of our liberties when the Government seeks too much control over us, or when traitors to our Nation seek to curb our liberties. The veterans will be the mainstay of our Nation in any attempts which might be made earlier by stealth or by force to overthrow our American way of life.

The men and women who have laid away the uniforms of their country and their service continue to serve under the banners of the several veterans' organizations of the Nation. They continue, in those organizations, to serve the best interests of America. As the veterans were our country's first line of defense in war, they continue to be our first line of defense in that never-ending struggle to maintain our full liberties and privileges under our free way of life.

Something has happened in the world in the last few months that holds a very deep significance for the veterans of all our wars.

For many years some people have been telling us that perhaps in Russian communism there might be something a little better than our American system. I want to remind you now that under the test, communism utterly and completely failed. Revelations made within the past few weeks show conclusively and accurately that in the land where the Kremlin had complete control of government, industry, agriculture, labor, and of every detail of the private citizen's life that control has failed utterly to produce efficient results. They have had worse inflation in Russia than we have had in the United States. Our tax rates are too high, but in Russia just recently they executed a 90-percent capital levy. How would you veterans feel if your Government were to order you

to bring all of your dollars to the nearest bank and have the bank take 9 out of those 10 dollars and allow you to keep only one?

Russian living levels are only about a tenth as high as those of the United States. The prices of all goods and services in Russia are very much greater than in the United States. Men are chained by governmental decree to their jobs in factories, or on the land of the collective farms. Citizens are not permitted to have radios, or automobiles, or telephones, or any of the other luxuries or comforts of life. Wages are low and are rigidly regulated by the Kremlin. Labor strikes are impossible. They would be settled by a firing squad. There are grades and classes of living. The privileged rulers and their favorites deal at different stores. They get better goods and lower prices than do the rest of the people. Most of the Russian people live in mud hovels, log huts, or else are crowded like so many animals into quarters which would make even our crowded conditions in America seems highly luxurious. The people are slaves. Just the other day there came out of Russia an authentic statement on their budget. It revealed that inefficiency, waste, graft, and corruption have been widespread, and still are today in the whole of Russia. They have nothing under the system of the Soviet that even remotely compares in excellence, efficiency, or equality with our American system.

The job ahead of us now is to keep America the kind of country, to keep our Government and our economic system and our social system, the kind of Government, economy, and society you veterans and your comrades fought and bled and died to preserve.

There are some 18,000,000 veterans now. Actually a few aged veterans of the Civil War still live. Quite a few veterans of the Spanish-American War are among us. Still more of World War I—and about 14,000,000 World War II veterans.

We must make certain the debt this Nation owes to all veterans is paid in opportunity for progress, and not canceled by a crushing burden of taxation or in the corrosion of inflation.

Our first concern, as we go about this tremendous task of trying to lead a cooperative world movement back to peace, sanity, and decency, is to look to our national defense. We must have a defense—especially in the air—both military and naval, amply adequate to meet any possible need of the future. We know now that science has become a very important factor in our national defense.

Let me say to you at this point there are those who, either deliberately or unwittingly, seek to mislead the people as to the attitude of the Eightieth Congress toward the national defense. It has been claimed that by a pinchpenny policy the Eightieth Congress wrecked the national defense, reduced it to about fifth place in the world's defense system. It has been charged our defense in the air was made a hollow shell. Your veterans' organizations recognize this necessity for air supremacy to be in the hands of the United States. A resolution unanimously adopted at the forty-eighth national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Cleveland in September 1947 stressed this fact. Your excellent pamphlet entitled "Formula for Peace" is a powerful plea put forth to keep the Nation alert to the need for the most efficient defense possible for us to maintain.

Now, what are the facts about congressional recognition of this necessity? The truth is the first session of the Eightieth Congress allowed the air services $76,000,000 more to spend than the budget called for. Over the whole range of national defense, the Eightieth Congress reduced the requests by only $120,000,000 or 1.3 percent. We gave the services $9,400,000,000 to spend on the national defense. I do not have to tell you our national defense could not go to wrack and ruin on nearly $9,500,000,000 merely because the appropriations were reduced 1.3 percent. Of course, the Congress means to appropriate all the money necessary to maintain the safety and security of this Nation. We intend to be sure the money is actually needed. We intend so to safeguard expenditures that your dollars, and the dollars of the other taxpayers, will not be wasted. We intend to see that efficiency and economy are exercised to the last degree possible to attain. Duplication must be avoided. To that end the Eightieth Congress enacted unification of armed services. You know and I know that is the only way we will get a national defense which will stand up to its job if ever the time comes—and pray God it never will—that we have to use that national defense in war again.

One of the reasons why we must get back to a peacetime-size government, to peacetime-size bureaus and departments, is because it is the veterans and their families who have to help carry the crushing burden of taxes to pay for governmental spending. You and your comrades want your fair chance to get ahead; to establish homes; to save money; to lay up something for your old age. You cannot do that if the hand of the tax gatherer is going to be thrust into your pockets to take a third or half of all you can earn. You cannot do that if, at the retail counter, hidden in prices, you've got to pay taxes up to 20 or 25 percent of the price mark of all goods and services you need and use.

We recognize that we must aid Europe and the Orient. But there again efficiency, economy, common sense—and cooperation—must be attained if we expect our attempts to aid the other peoples of the world to be successful.

The war was like a fire breaking out in a settlement. All of us had to help put out the fire. Now all of us have to help clean up the ruins, stamp out the plagues; reestablish the sanitary systems; help homeless and desperate peoples to get back on their own feet. But America's help must be recognized as being designed not as a world WPA unlimited; it must be recognized as a cooperative effort to help the other peoples of the world to get in position to help and maintain themselves.

At this point I want to pay a tribute to the American soldiers, and sailors, and the Wacs, and the Waves, and all the others who were in the services abroad, as ambassadors of good will. There is no soldier in the world who is the equal of the American soldier for being an ambassador of good will in countries outside his own. While he might fight his enemies resistlessly, he never fails to be a fair foe. But just let a little child, or a hungry woman, or a suffering aged person, or even a beaten foe, appeal to him for help, and what is the first thing the American soldier does? He reaches for his chocolate bar, or his can of K-rations. He reaches for a shirt or a suit of underwear. He reaches for something to give comfort to those who are suffering. What a magnificent mission of good will that is.

Perhaps such small incidents as these may be lost sight of in the great program of international relations. But let me say to you good will among men grows out of a multiplicity of just such small incidents as these. Governments may make mistakes—and do; diplomats may blunder—and do; someone in business may be greedy—and some are; some tourists may behave like hoodlums—and a few do; but in the long run, it is the day-by-day kindnesses exchanged among peoples which generate good feeling or ill feeling. One of the greatest tributes in all history to American fighters is that they are always welcomed back in peacetime to the countries wherein they fought.

Our efforts to aid the world must be based on a foundation of understanding and good will between the masses of the peoples

Now I want to speak for a moment about what the Eightieth Congress has done to recognize the debt of gratitude we owe to the veterans of the United States. In broad general terms, you already know we stand for every educational advantage for the veteran it is possible to give him.

We have already passed a bill in the House of Representatives to lower tax rates. More than 71 percent of those reductions go to those in the lower-income brackets.

We are moving to reduce the debt as rapidly as practicable in order to take off of the veterans and their children as much of that service load as possible.

Here I would like to point out some of the accomplishments which have been achieved by the Eightieth Congress for the benefit of the veterans.

The Eightieth Congress did not have the benefit of a great publicity machine. But in spite of turbulent world problems much was accomplished for veterans. Following are the measures passed by the Eightieth Congress:

Public Law No. 5, to extend the time limitation for reinstatement of national service life insurance policies.

Public Law No. 34, to provide for renewal for a fifth 5-year period the 5-year level premium term insurance plan for World War I veterans.

Public Law No. 36, to grant officers of the Army and Navy Nurses Corps comparable rank, pay, and allowances with officers of the Army and Navy.

Public Law No. 82, to permit husband and wife to combine their armed services credit for homestead purposes.

Public Law No. 85, authorizing $35,500,000 to complete temporary reuse housing for veterans.

Public Law No. 115, increasing the revolving fund in the Veterans' Administration from $1,500,000 to $3,000,000 for the purpose of making noninterest bearing loans to disabled World War II veterans taking vocational rehabilitation courses.

Public Law No. 126, extending until January 1, 1948, the time during which alien fiancées of veterans may enter the United States without being subject to immigration quotas or visa regulations.

Public Law No. 161, to extend for another year the authority to purchase automobiles for World War II veterans who are leg amputees or have suffered the loss of use of a leg.

Public Law No. 213, to permit the admission to the United States of racially inadmissible alien spouses of veterans.

Public Law No. 254, to provide for the cash payment of terminal leave bonds any time after September 1, 1947.

Public Law No. 270, to provide a 20 percent pension increase for veterans of the Civil War and Spanish American War.

Public Law No. 310, to restore the tax exemption status of those members of the armed services removed from former American possessions during captivity by the Japanese.

Public Law No. 314, to authorize the acceptance by officers and enlisted men of the Armed Services of medals and decorations tendered them by co-belligerent and neutral nations of World War II.

Public Law No. 316, to permit retired Armed Services personnel to represent veterans organizations in claims before the Veterans' Administration.

Public Law No. 325, to make mandatory on Federal agencies the rulings of the Civil Service Commission on appeals by veterans for reinstatement.

Public Law No. 337, to improve the Army and Navy medical services.

Public Law No. 338, to increase the minimum allowances payable to disabled veterans undergoing vocational rehabilitation under Public Law No. 16.

Public Law No. 350, to provide cash in lieu of terminal leave for veterans.

Public Law No. 365, to provide additional pay of $100 per month for officers of the Army Medical Corps and Navy Medical Corps.

Public Law No. 367, to refund income tax so paid by any member of the armed services who died on active duty for the year in which death occurred and for the years during which he was in the armed services.

Public Law No. 377, to provide full subsistence allowances for veterans taking on-the-farm training.

Public Law No. 396, to extend veterans' preference benefits (civil service) to widowed mothers of certain ex-service men and ex-service women. Approved January 19, 1948.

Public Law No. 398, to increase by 20 percent the pensions payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans. Approved January 19, 1948.

Public Law No. 411, to increase the subsistence allowances to veterans pursuing full-time educational training courses under the GI bill of rights. The measure increased such allowances from $65 to $75 a month for single persons, from $90 to $105 for veterans with one dependent, and to $120 for veterans with more than one dependent. The increased allowances will go to about 1,500,000 veterans and cost arcund $217,000,000 a year. Approved February 14, 1948.

S. 1393 to raise the ceilings and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job is in conference. The Senate voted to increase the ceilings from $175 to $200 a month for a veteran without a dependent and from $200 to $250 for a veteran with dependents. The House voted to increase ceilings $250 for a veteran without dependents, $325 for a veteran with one dependent and $350 for a veteran with more than one dependent.

Hospital facilities for disabled veterans must be adequately expanded. No disabled veterans must ever be allowed to suffer for a lack of hospital care.

We are bedeviled by high prices. We are confronted with demands for further governmental controls. Nearly everyone now knows high prices are the result of years of deficit spending on the part of the Government and the inflationary effects of the war activities. The greater part of the goods and services were destroyed on the battlefields or sunk at sea, while the unspent wages and salaries stayed at home. The postwar demands for aid for foreign countries are also an inflationary force. Like war activities, the goods and services go abroad and the unspent wages and salaries stay at home.

Our shortages of materials, our inflated prices, aggravated by hidden taxes, which amount to 20 percent of price, all bear hard on the veteran and his family. These problems must be solved. The veterans will have a very important part in solving them. The answer, however, certainly is not more regimentation; more control over your lives; more interference with your activities or your business. We can never get this Nation back to economic soundness by thinking only in terms of governmental controls, curtailed liberties and privileges of the citizen, and planned economy, with the Government doing all of the planning. Other countries have that kind of government today. Under those governments people are being told what they must eat, what they must wear, where they must work, what their wages will be. Under that kind of government they may not travel about in automobiles. What they may buy is very sternly regulated. But that kind of government is bogging down. It doesn't work for people who love freedom.

We can't serve the best interests of the war veterans by a topheavy supercostly structure of inefficient governmental agencies. I suspect you veterans didn't always relish the necessity of having to snap to attention when the "big brass" barked, although discipline is vital to military efficiency. I am sure you do not want to spend the rest of your lives having to snap to attention and follow orders when bureaucratic "big brass" barks.

America must be kept the land in which the citizens tell the government what to do. It must not be permitted to become a country in which the government telis the citizens what to do. Every government tends to grow bigger and bigger. Our Government is no exception. One of the most bitter struggles being made by the bureaus today is against the Congress cutting them back to peacetime size and expenditures.

What this means to the veteran and his family may be realized when I tell you that as of January 31, 1948, the per capita debt in this country was $1,776.10. That meant that every veteran and his wife owed on the debt $3,552.20. If he has a child he owes another $1,776.10. It is now proposed to the Eightieth Congress that we permit the Administration to spend in fiscal 1949, $1,020 for every family of four in this country.

Those figures have a sinister meaning for veterans and other young people who are trying to get ahead in these times. It behooves us to cut back all governmental bureaus and activities which can be dispensed with, or reduced, so we may lighten as much as possible the tax load upon our people. In the interest of the veteran we must watch Government spending and its accumulation of debt.

After all, the veteran is a taxpayer the same as everybody else.

The Veterans' Administration has just completed a survey which shows that of every hundred Americans today 32 are veterans, or members of veterans' families.

It is estimated that within 5 years from now, veterans and their families will constitute 43 percent of the population.

A recent study shows that within 20 years, the veterans will comprise about half of all the taxpayers in this country. It is plain then the veteran is greatly concerned over continuing spending policies of the Government.

I do not need to take your time to warn you against subversion. You know as well as I there are too many people in this country who given their allegiance to foreign doctrines and foreign powers. They must be rooted out of position of influence in the Government, and rendered powerless to injure us in the moment of a national emergency. If we should send back to their own countries those who come here and find so much wrong with ours, there would be fewer subversionists to pester us. Strangely, none of those fellows ever want to go back home to their own countries. You veterans are going to have a lot to say about that situation, too.

Those who have fought in the wars of their country have kept faith with those who, under Washington, left their bloody footprints in the snows of Valley Forge. So we must keep faith with all of those, living and dead, who shed their blood, or risked their lives, in the defense of this grand, free Nation which Washington had such a great and noble share in building.

On the side of one of the great stone pillars supporting the arch to the main entrance to Valley Forge, there is this beautiful inscription:

"And here, in this place of sacrifice, in this vale of humiliation, in this valley of the shadow of that death out of which the life of America rose, regenerate and free, let us believe, with an abiding faith, that to them union will seem as dear, and liberty as sweet, and progress as glorious as they were to our fathers, and are to you and me; and that the institutions which have made us happy, preserved by the virtue of our children shall bless the remotest generation of the time to come."

Since tomorrow is the immortal Washington's birthday, and since, but a little while ago, we paid homage to the immortal Abraham Lincoln, I should like to conclude these remarks with that wonderful tribute to Washington voiced by Lincoln:

"On that name no eulogy is expected. It cannot be. To add brightness to the sun, or glory to the name of Washington, is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe pronounce the name, and in its naked, deathless splendor leave it shining on."

What Do the People Think?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following talk which I made February 21 and 22 over radio stations KWTO, KGBX, and KDRO, in my congressional district. In this talk I give the results of a poll of public opinion in my district on six controversial questions pending in Congress today.

Fellow citizens, I am glad to be back with you today to resume this series of radio reports from Washington, the Nation's Capital. It has been my privilege to bring you such a report over the air and on this station at this hour each week Congress has been in session during the 5 years I have been a Member. We are now starting the sixth year of that service. Congress is faced by many problems I expect to discuss with you today and in the weeks ahead. This is in the spirit of true representative government. You are invited to listen, tell your friends, and to write to me or to the radio stations giving your comments or views on the program or suggesting topics for discussion.

The main jobs the Eightieth Congress faced when it took office were tax reduction, reduction of Government spending, reduction of the number of Government employees, and passage of a law putting labor and management on equal footing before the law and reducing the causes of strikes. Congress has pretty well made good on all of these propositions, or has taken long strides toward their accomplishment. Of course, it hasn't reduced your income taxes yet. The President stopped that twice last year with his veto. However, he will be given another chance to reduce the high cost of living by approving a new tax-reduction bill in the near future.

This tax-reduction bill increases the exemptions for each taxpayer and each of his dependents; doubles the exemption for persons over the age of 65 years; increases the special exemption for the blind; eliminates the tax discrimination between taxpayers in community-property and other States; and reduces taxes from 10 to 30 percent, with the larger reduction applying to the lower-income groups. This bill gives the greatest reductions to those who need it most, those with lower incomes, the aged on fixed incomes, and the young people just beginning to earn a livelihood. This bill recently passed the House by an overwhelming vote.

What do the people think about these and other questions? Or do they think, or does it make any difference?

The founders of our form of government had two ideas about that. One idea was that the people should elect Congressmen who would devote their full time to the job, study the issues and evidence and vote as they saw fit without necessary regard to the public's wishes. The assumption was that the public didn't have time to go into the details of the complex legislative questions and that their trained and experienced representatives would vote in their interest and if it didn't work out that way they could be fired at the next election. The opposing view, was that the Senators and Representatives, should carefully feel the pulse of the public and vote the way the public wanted regardless of the views and conscience of the Congressman. In other words, the Congressman should be a sort of glorified weather vane which at all times could tell the direction of the political winds.

Your Congressman has tried to strike a happy medium between these extreme views. The public judgment is not always right because it is not always fully informed and cannot be expected to be. On the other hand, even an expert can give an answer to a problem which will look good on paper, or in theory, but which in practical application may not be in the best interests of the public. A good Congressman should give respectful hearing to the views of his constituents and, other things being equal, should give them considerable weight. He should keep in touch with the needs of his people, report to them frankly and often and solicit their opinions. Today, with the press and radio, the public is better informed than ever before, and it would be a foolish Congressman, indeed, who tried to assume he had all of the wisdom in his district. While exercising independent judgment based on his own studies and experiences tested in the fires of legislation, he should give due consideration to the popular will. That is both expedient and right. And it can be done.

In January, I sent out a questionnaire on the back of a Government bulletin check list offering the citizens of the Sixth Missouri Congressional District useful and valuable publications put out by their Federal Government. Each Congressman has a small annual allotment of these publications which are also for sale at the Government Printing Office. He can distribute his allotment any way he sees fit, free to his constituents.

The letter and questionnaire which went with this check list did not attempt to cover all of the questions of public and congressional interest just now but did make reference to six of the most important and controversial. Fifty-three thousand questionnaires were sent out in the Sixth District. They were distributed to all rural, star, and post-office boxholders in the district. In addition, 10,000 went to telephone subscribers in all of the various cities of the district. This distribution did not cover everybody but certainly is a complete cross-section of the political, racial, and occupational elements of the population in the district which the New Deal St. Louis Post-Dispatch in 1943 said, "Is perhaps the most typically representative American congressional district." A few returns are still coming in but indications are that the percentages will vary only slightly if at all. That is the way with polls and elections. Over 6 percent of those questioned have replied, filling out the questionnaire and furnishing their own return envelope and stamp. That is a higher return than any other Congressman has received who has followed the same plan this year. Two other Missouri Congressmen have done the same thing. Congressman PARKE M. BANTA of the Eighth District, adjoining the Sixth District on the east and running to the Mississippi River, had a 5-percent return. Congressman MAX SCHWABE, of the Second District, just east and north of the Sixth District, had a 4.8-percent return. Five percent would seem to be about average and far above the usual response to inquiries of this kind. But the higher return may be accounted for by two factors: People like to tell their Congressman how to conduct himself, to express their views to him, and the questionnaire carried the lure of an offer of free bulletins for any who completed and returned it.

Here are the six questions asked and the percentage answers from the Sixth Missouri Congressional District:

1. "Do you believe the Taft-Hartley labor law of 1947 should be left alone?" "Yes," said 57.1 percent. "Repealed," say 6.1 percent. "Changed and made stronger," say 15.5 percent. "No opinion" say 21.3 percent. Those who say it should be left alone or made stronger total 72.6 percent. This may be of interest to labor leaders who hope to drive union members to the polls this year like sheep, to vote against those Congressmen who voted for this labor bill. The rank and file of labor supports its provisions. The Gallup Poll of February 18, 1948 bears this out. The same question was asked by Dr. Gallup, and on a Nation-wide basis only 13 percent of the people who vote, favor repeal of the bill, as against 6 percent in our congressional district. But, there are no Detroits, New Yorks, and other big industrial centers in our district to run this percentage up to the national level as found by Gallup. The Look magazine poll says that 68 percent of union members approve the individual provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill. Apparently those who do oppose it haven't read it, don't know what is in it or are taking the word of the union bosses and press agents who don't like it because it has reduced the number of strikes, helped stabilize the industrial unrest, ousted many Communist leaders, and has given the working man (often at expense of the union leader) more democratic rights than he has ever had before over his union affairs. Nowhere can be found the "slaves" which union bosses said the bill would make of the working man.

2. The second question asked was: "Do you favor a reduction now from the wartime burden of taxation?" Those who say "yes" to this Republican proposal total 74.3 percent, "No," 21.3 percent, and "No opinion," 4.4 percent.

3. "Do you favor compulsory peacetime military training?" "Yes," say 44.7 percent, "No," say 48.5 percent. "No opinion," say 6.8 percent. This is very close with only about a 4 percent lead for those opposing, which may surprise some people.

4. The fourth question is based on the double request of the President in his message to the special session of Congress. The question inquires as to the Marshall foreign-aid plan and the restoration of wartime controls in peacetime. It is necessarily a little long. Here it is:

"Do you favor the so-called Truman-Marshall plan which calls for our Government to borrow and to raise by taxation $17,000,000,000 more to give foreign countries in the next 4 years and, as recommended by the President, to reestablish Government price fixing and rationing in this country as among the necessary steps which must be taken to prevent further inflation from such expenditures?"

The people of the Sixth Missouri Congressional District would seem very definitely to oppose these propositions. Here are the returns: "Yes, we favor such aid and controls," say 15.2 percent. "No," say 76.9 percent. "We have no opinion," say 7.9 percent.

5. "Do you think the administration is following the right course to avoid war with Russia?" "Yes," say only 17.7 percent. "No," say 56.3 percent. "We don't know," say 26 percent.

6. "Should undistributed profits of farm cooperatives be subject to Federal income tax in the future?" "Yes," say 45.8 percent. "No," say 40.3 percent. "No opinion," say 13.9 percent.

This last return is a little surprising in view of the tremendous strength of farm cooperatives in the Sixth District, where they have their largest plants in the State and probably the bulk of their members. Recently, some elements of business have been protesting what they claim is an unfair competitive advantage enjoyed by these organizations which pay no Federal income taxes, although they pay all other taxes. Some businessmen said that I had weighted the question in favor of the co-ops. If I did so, it was not intentional. They suggested it should have read as follows, and that this language would have brought a heavier percentage in favor of taxing them: "Should undistributed profits of farm cooperative corporations be subject to Federal income taxes in the future like other corporations?"

Just how Congress will resolve this controversial question is not now apparent. It is considering the Ploeser plan, to give all small business a tax-free base of profits up to $25,000 annually. At present there is double taxation on corporation profits. The whole matter is before the Ways and Means Committee, which has held hearings on it recently and which some say indicates informally that it would like to repeal that provision of the law giving cooperatives exemption from income taxes, if the cooperatives don't distribute their profits as patronage dividends to members but use them to expand or to go into new lines of business. It would be my guess that this touchy subject will not be legislated on in an election year. Whatever the committee does decide, however, will likely be adopted by Congress because tax bills are always brought out of committee under gag rule which prevents amendment from the floor, on the grounds that they are technical measures the average member shouldn't be allowed to clutter up with ideas not actuarily sound. But, if the tax laws could be in any worse mess than they are now, as written by the self-appointed experts, it would be interesting to see the mess.

I want to thank the thousands of constituents who cooperated in this project and who so often wrote me in considerable detail their views on these and other important national questions, for the most part in an intelligent and informed vein.

My time is running out. This is Congressman MARION T. BENNETT speaking and returning you to your local announcer.

Baptist Joint Conference Committee Endorses the Stratton Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations, established by four of the leading Baptist conventions of America, recently adopted a resolution endorsing the Stratton bill. This committee is composed of ministers and laymen who maintain an interest in foreign mission activities and

civic responsibilities of these denominations. I am confident that the individual members appreciate the difficulties confronted by members of the Judiciary Committee in considering the Stratton bill. While the committee favors the admission of displaced persons under the terms of the bill, it does not advocate the impairment of statutory standards for immigration which have been built up. The committee's formal resolution does, however, draw attention to the plight of fellow Christians and others in the camps for displaced persons in Europe.

Under leave previously granted, I include the resolution embodying the views of the joint conference committee:

Your committee would beg to call to your attention the matter of displaced persons now in Europe, for whom efforts are being made by the churches and other organizations, and some consideration has been given at the hands of Congress.

The failure of our Congress at its last session to act upon the Stratton bill (H. R. 2910) has placed upon the conscience of this Nation a great moral burden. This bill, which would authorize emergency legislation to permit the entrance of 100,000 displaced persons a year for 4 years, is now pending in the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, while close to 120 national organizations representing the bulk of church, farm, labor, civic, women's, veterans', and other important groups are asking that immediate action be taken. Now that the second session of the Eightieth Congress has convened, this call for humanitarian action on behalf of part of the 850,000 displaced persons of Europe should be considered along with all other measures intended to create a larger measure of well-being for all people everywhere, as well as fundamental freedoms and principles designed to create world peace.

Eighty percent of these unfortunate victims of the war are Christians. The largest part of them are in camps now under the supervision of the United States military government. We are deeply interested in the fate of all displaced persons, but have a special concern for the moral, spiritual, and physical welfare of these our fellow Christians.

More than money is needed. Back of the money should be a demonstration of our Nation's concern for suffering people, our love for liberty and justice, and the full realization of commitments already made to the United Nations. We, of the churches, believe that America should practice its humanitarian professions as voiced over the air waves and elsewhere. We are convinced that the United States Government cannot expect other nations to take all the responsibility for the resettlement of these displaced persons; that unless we, as a people, act quickly to aid these DP's we shall be guilty of creating in the very heart of Europe, just where reconstruction problems are the greatest, a physical and moral plague which no amount or cash will be able to cure. This is a human problem which requires humanitarian action.

Church World Service, our interdenominational cooperating organization for relief and rehabilitation, through its Committee on Displaced Persons, is ready to act. In fact, it has already taken as much action as the limiting provisions of the immigration quota system will allow. It is prepared to take action on a much broader scale just as soon as the Stratton bill becomes law. Already the committee, through its 36 workers in Europe and its staff in this country, besides other services, has given assistance to 1,488 persons coming at a rate of 100 a month. These have been resettled in 32 States and in 124 communities throughout the United States. The committee has a current operational budget calling for an estimated expenditure of a little over $1,000,000 a year.

In anticipation of the passage of the Stratton bill, which would permit the committee to do the service it was established to render, it is now in the process of making a careful and extensive survey of the practical aid which its constituent denominational members will be able to render in the resettlement of DP's. The Northern and Southern Baptist Conventions are cooperating with the Church World Service

We are recommending that once more, in line with expressions from our conventions approving this effort, we respectfully ask Congress quickly to enact the Stratton bill.

Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 19, 1948:

RENT CONTROLS

The Republican policy committee in Congress has decided to extend rent controls for "at least" another year. It seems to us that the Republicans are yielding to political pressure to perpetuate a moral inequity, and, from the practical viewpoint, an economic insanity.

As a matter of ethics we do not understand how Congress can rightfully single out one particular service, namely housing, and say that the provider of this service must subsidize the receiver when all other services are freely competitive. We have no wage controls; the laborer may exchange his service for money on a free market, selling it to the highest bidder. We have no price controls; the farmer can sell his wheat for whatever the public will pay him for it. But most landlords can sell their housing only for what some Government official thinks is right.

The public would be shocked at a law that required John Doe to subsidize John Smith. Smith himself would be indignant at the suggestion. Even in caring for our indigent we make the charity a community enterprise. But if John Doe is required to sell a month's housing to Smith for, say, $10 less than its value, we are making him subsidize Smith, give him charity, in a word, to the tune of $10 a month.

We agree that for many the cost of housing would go up if controls were ended. But morally there can be no justification for requiring Smith's lower cost of living to be subsidized by his landlord rather than by the farmer who supplies his food, or the coal miner who supplies his heat, or the garment worker who makes his clothes. Our whole wage-price level has moved upward. The seller of anything, labor or goods, gets more for it than he once did. That is, except some sellers of housing.

The inequities of rent controls do not stop with landlords. Smith may rent his apartment for $65 a month. Jones may rent an identical apartment (or perhaps one of poorer construction) in a new building across the street for $85 a month. Even the controllers know that today they cannot get the same apartment built to rent for $65. There is one standard for Smith; another for Jones.

Equal treatment under law has become inequity by law.

There is the controller's dilemma. He would like to restore equality among tenants by widening his rent ceilings to cover new as well as old housing. Yet if he does there is no new housing at all. The bricklayer and the carpenter, the brickmaker and the timber supplier, will not subsidize Jones' new apartment. They want full market value for their goods and labor. So the double standard is born.

The planners can see the hopelessness of trying to lick the housing shortage by holding the old line on new dwellings. They see no economic damage from holding it on old houses. In fact, if they relax it they will "just make landlords rich."

What they forget is that utility in a house is not a matter of age. We have many useful houses that antedate our country. But a house that falls into disuse from disrepair is as much a loss as a house that was never built. Anyone who lives in a rent-controlled house or apartment is aware that it is slowly falling apart around him.

Who is to keep it in repair? The man who lives in it? Or will we just increase the tenant's subsidy? Or perhaps the plumber will kindly work for prewar wages so that Smith can keep his prewar housing standard at the prewar rent?

Putting artificial price tags on housing is as blind and futile an operation as putting them on a man's labor or any other of his products. It not only creates impossible moral problems, it is also insane economics.

The rent-control law is legislation for a privileged class: those lucky enough to buy their housing at less than its market value. Economically it retards rather than promotes a real solution to our housing problem.

We had hoped the Republican leaders would not be carried away by the emotionalism of the word "rent" and would instead take a broader view of the housing problem, as they did on wage and price controls. Now we admit, ruefully, that it isn't likely.

Attack American Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. JASPER BELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I arise at this time to call your attention to the latest attack by the Communists upon this country through an appeal to the school teachers.

Because of the great debt of gratitude we owe to the high minded patriotic teachers of our children, preparing them as they have so well for the full duties of citizenship, I feel impelled to suggest that this information be made available to all of the teachers in your home districts to prepare them to ward off the appeals for their regimentation under the banners of the Russian Comintern.

It is well known that for many years the Communist Government of Russia, acting through the Comintern throughout the world, has secretly and quietly subsidized many professors and teachers in our schools and universities. Now by the use of that nucleus of converts to the ideologies of communism, an organization in New York City is now planning to

branch out by making a Nation-wide appeal to teachers everywhere.

I feel that such an appeal will be welcomed and accepted by only a few teachers and then only when they lack the background of information about the dastardly attack against our Government. I am sure they will understand, as we do, that the appeal comes from despicable traitorous rats who, while enjoying the shelter of their American citizenship, accept pay from a potential enemy of the United States and spend their time destroying the ideals and corcupting the thought of our youth.

I am inserting in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article clipped from the Washington Daily News of Monday, February 16, 1948, under the headline "New Commie Front To Ask Marxist Schools be Cleared." The article reads:

NEW COMMIE FRONT TO ASK MARXIST SCHOOLS BE CLEARED

(By Frederick Woltman)

NEW YORK, February 16.—A new Nation-wide Communist front is being hatched. It will be called a Statement of American Educators.

President Truman and Attorney General Tom Clark within a few weeks will receive an appeal to remove from the Government's list of subversive organizations the 11 so-called Marxist schools which the Justice Department found to be adjuncts of the Communist Party.

The plea will be in the form of an open letter with a statement bearing the names of professors and administrators from universities throughout the country.

The statement will speak in lofty terms of "academic freedom" and "our national ideal of freedom of thought."

But the catch is this: The whole deal has been cooked up by the Communist schools themselves.

As bait, the names of 12 professors are affixed to letters now making the academic rounds collecting signatures to the Statement of American Educators. Replies are to be addressed to Prof. Lyman R. Bradley, Five Hundred and Seventy-fifth Avenue of the Americas, New York 11, N. Y.

Omitted from the letter is the fact that No. 575 is the headquarters of the Jefferson School, chief of the Communist Party's training schools listed in the Clark report. Omitted also is the fact that Professor Bradley, New York University, is chairman of the board of trustees of the Jefferson School.

Nor is this mentioned: Three more of the twelve are trustees of the Jefferson School—Prof. Dorothy Brewster, Columbia; Prof. Margaret Schlauch, NYU; and Prof. Dirk J. Struik, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. One is a former trustee—Prof. Walter Rautenstrauch, Columbia—and one is an instructor there—Philip S. Roner, who was dismissed from City College in 1941 as a secret member of the Communist Party.

A seventh professor of the 12—F. O. Matthiessen, Harvard—is trustee of the Samuel Adams School in Boston, another of those cited as Communist.

The letter signed by the 12 professors is addressed "Dear Colleague."

"As educators," it begins, "we are perhaps more sensitive than some of our fellow Americans to the social and political implication of events and actions taking place today. We could not call ourselves responsible members of the teaching profession were this not so."

Then it asks for their signature to the prepared statement.

Citing the Jefferson school as an example, the statement holds that the 11 schools are victimized by "thought control" and "thought police" simply because they are teaching the philosophy of Marxism.

There is no hint that the Jefferson School was set up by the Communist Party; that it teaches, not theoretical Marxism, but revolutionary Stalinist-Marxism.

According to the prepared statement, "The right to study Marxism" is being "denied by arbitrary Government fiat." The fact is that no one has even suggested closing down these schools. They were included in the Clark subversive list as a guide for helping Government agencies determine whether any of their employes are Communists.

One of the signers of the come-on letter is Prof. Colston E. Warne (Amherst), who last November resigned a Federal job in protest against President Truman's loyalty check.

The program outlined indicates the daily increasing brazenness of the Communist attacks on America. For any teacher to join that attack by teaching Marxism in our schools would clearly indicate that teacher was a traitor in our midst.

It is my hope that the floodlight of truth and revelation of these nefarious enterprises will continue to be made through our daily press, by the Congress, the administration, and by right-thinking people everywhere in the United States.

Sam Jones Replies to Congressman Hébert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, who has apparently become the spokesman of Earl K. Long, candidate for Governor of Louisiana, sent Sam Jones, also a candidate for Governor, the following telegram requesting him to read it at the Sam Jones rally held in the city of New Orleans on that date. The telegram is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

SAM JONES,
New Orleans:

In order to keep the record straight I wish to inform you that Commissioner of Internal Revenue refused me permisison to examine your income-tax records based on authority which you say you issued that anybody could see the returns if they applied. Also informed that Commissioner of Internal Revenue previously notified you that your public statements to this effect as well as your request was not in accordance with law and you were informed that only manner in which records could be examined were under provisions of law which was manner in which Earl Long permitted me to have photostatic copies taken from the official files of the Internal Revenue Department proving conclusively charges made by Congressman DOMENGEAUX on floor of Congress not to be founded on the facts of the case. Commissioner of Internal Revenue George Schoeneman also told Congressman DOMENGEAUX the day before he made charges that he could not make such charges as they were not true and were not in accordance with the facts. Knowing your deal to keep the record straight I am sure you will take advantage of the opportunity to read this telegram at your rally tonight.

F. EDWARD HÉBERT.

Mr. Jones read the telegram as requested.

The following is a copy of the telegram which Mr. Jones sent to Congressman HÉBERT in reply:

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Re your telegram. I am disappointed that you were refused permission to examine my income-tax figures by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. However, I am easily remedying this by wiring Commissioner Schoeneman requesting him to give you copy of a letter addressed to me yesterday. Since you profess fairness you will, of course, read this to the House Monday, as I am reading your wire to our rally tonight.

Commissioner Schoeneman's letter confirms the income figures made public by me February 9. Earl Long still hides his official record. The office of Collector Donnelly and Revenue Agent Logan reveal there are no assessments or penalties against me. You are authorized to check with Pear, Marwick Mitchell & Co., CPA of New Orleans, on this.

Following is the text of Commissioner Schoeneman's letter: "Further reference is made to your telegram dated February 20, 1948, requesting to be advised by wire the total net income for the years 1936 through 1947, reported in the Federal income-tax returns by you and by your wife, Mrs. Louise G. Jones. Your income-tax returns presently available in this office, discloses the following listed net income for the years indicated: 1933, $4,580.20; 1939, $6,202.23; 1940, $3,953.25; 1941, $6,925.46; 1942, $7,614.05; 1943, $6,803.75; 1944, $9,690.87; 1945, $11,267.97; 1946, $13,640.39. A similar communication is being addressed to Mrs. Jones in your care. If further correspondence relative to this matter is necessary, pleas refer to IT:REC: IW:P-MSG."

In order to keep the record straight, I call your attention to these facts:

1. Both the United States Government and the State of Louisiana have tax claims pending against Earl K. Long. In your strange defense of the tangled tax matter of this "poor man" you have admitted that the case involves a fraud penalty.

2. You know, Eddie, that you blocked revelation by congressional action on Earl's complete tax and income record, and you know you blocked it because that record is packed with the fraud assessments you have confessed.

3. The State case against Earl Long is shown in the public records of the State board of tax appeals.

4. Earl Long swore to the people on the radio on February 16 that his total net income was (including his wife's), 1936, $6,124.80; 1937, $14,185.38. Earl Long reported to the State of Louisiana on his sworn tax return (including wife's), 1936, $10,967.50; 1937, $11,690.74. The State of Louisiana claims that Earl's actual income (including wife's) was, 1936, $50,728.12; 1937, $78,096.19.

5. The file notation of the board of tax appeals says of the "other income, taxpayer (Earl Long) received money from Mr. Clem Sehrt and Mr. Shirley Wimberly. He was the beneficiary of a so-called gift fund. He made numerous deposits of cash and receipts which he has refused to identify or explain. He received a monthly allowance from the Louisiana Democratic Association, commonly known as the deduct fund."

6. Mr. Long and his spokesmen have made the above admissions in the second primary campaign because they knew these facts could not be concealed from the people. Yet, on January 19—1 day before the first primary election—Long had published in full-page newspaper advertisements, in bold-faced type, this statement: "Long owes no tax. Statement of Charles A. Donnelly, United States collector of internal revenue for Louisiana * * * said he knew of no claim against Earl Long."

The intent and purpose of that Long ad was to deceive the voters of Louisiana on the eve of the election—to delude the people into believing that there was no tax case of any kind against Earl K. Long.

Most important, this case is now revealed to have been pending for a number of years. That means Earl Long deceived the people deliberately and falsely when he declared, and had collector Donnelly declare, before the first primary that there was no tax against him, that his hands were clean. Since then, Long's every action has been to prevent the hidden truth about his tax records from coming to light.

Throughout the first primary, Earl Long told the people of Louisiana that he was a poor man who never received 1 cent he was not entitled to get. But now that he is revealed to have enjoyed a large income, the people no longer believe his frantic efforts to pose as a poor man.

He has not come clean with the people as I have done. He will not do so because he cannot.

You remember, Eddie, my support put you in Congress. You became a political opportunist and deserted—not only me—but our cause of good government.

SAM JONES.

What I particularly object to in the statement in Representative HÉBERT's telegram is:

Commissioner of Internal Revenue George Schoeneman also told Congressman DOMENGEAUX the day before he made charges that he could not make such charges as they were not true and were not in accordance with the facts.

This statement of Congressman HÉBERT is entirely and completely incorrect and false.

On the same day and before I made the charges on the floor of the House I had a conference with Commissioner George Schoeneman and Mr. Aubrey R. Marrs, head of the technical staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I presented to these gentleman the charges that I were to make and Mr. Schoeneman replied that under the law he was prevented from discussing the case in any particular. Last Friday I had an opportunity to again see Mr. Schoeneman, together with Mr. Edward H. Foley, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. I told Mr. Schoeneman that he had been quoted as having said that he had told me that the charges I were about to make were incorrect and not based on facts. In the presence of Assistant Secretary Foley, Mr. Schoeneman said he had not made any such statement to me on this case.

All that Congressman HÉBERT needs do is to contact Mr. Schoeneman and I am certain he will be informed that the statement with reference thereto that I have made is correct. I think in all fairness he should do this.

The Polish Betrayal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, that eminent writer, Frank R. Kent, in the Chicago Journal of Commerce, on February 14, commented upon former Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane's book and pointed out the Polish were betrayed at Yalta. The evidence keeps on piling up against that unconscionable agreement. I am including as part of my remarks the article by Mr. Kent:

THE POLISH BETRAYAL

(By Frank R. Kent)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—It is typical of the worshipers of the late Mr. Roosevelt that they should agree with practically everything in the impressive and significant book of Mr. Arthur Bliss Lane, I Saw Poland Betrayed, except the single statement that at Yalta and Tehran Mr. Roosevelt, in his effort to charm Mr. Stalin, abandoned the principles of the Atlantic Charter and, in effect, cast aside his promises to Poland, opening wide the door for the savage and brutal domination of that suffering country by the Soviet forces.

That, of course, is an extremely serious charge—particularly when it is recalled that in 1944 hundreds of thousands of American Poles voted solidly for Mr. Roosevelt in the firm conviction that he was the vigilant and unshakable champion of Polish freedom and independence. But it is not a new charge. Others have asserted that at these Roosevelt-Stalin meetings Poland was blithely "sold down the river," the former American President trustingly relying upon the unsupported word of the Soviet dictator, utterly ignoring his long, black record for violation of treaties, agreements, and pledges; incredibly permitting him to have a free hand in Poland.

Of all who have made this devastating accusation, Mr. Lane carries the most weight, presents the most convincing evidence and was in best position to know the facts. It no more can be claimed that he was inspired by a personal or political motive than it can be contended he did not fully appreciate the nature and implications of his statements. Here is no Roosevelt hater, no representative of "reactionary forces," no "economic royalist" or ambitious seeker of office. Instead, here is an outstanding American with a distinguished career of diplomatic service covering more than 30 years in various parts of the world.

Appointed Ambassador to Poland by Mr. Roosevelt himself, he was in London in 1944 when Poland was occupied by the enemy and her Government was in London. He entered Warsaw immediately following the German surrender and remained there until last year, an eye-witness to every step of the Soviet seizure of Poland, with full understanding of the callousness of the pledge violation and of the humiliating failure of our Government to lift a hand to prevent, or utter an effective word to protest what, beyond question, was one of the most dreadful and indefensible crimes against a free people in all world history.

Because of his official position and by reason of our Government's apathy, Ambassador Lane was personally impotent to halt the strangulation of Poland. When he talked with Mr. Roosevelt, after the latter's election in 1944, he urged the importance of insisting to the Soviet Government that the independence of Poland be maintained. The Roosevelt reply was, "Do you want me to go to war with Russia?" When he returned to Warsaw he did what he could, but the Soviet representatives paid slight attention to him, and his own Government not only did not back him up but, over his earnest protest and with American citizens unjustly imprisoned, loaned the Polish puppet Government $90,000,000.

The whole story as told by Mr. Lane is a sickening one of shameless treachery, broken promises, and unshackled brutality. It is interesting to note that the Lane report, both as to responsibility for this murderous assault upon the integrity of a great people and upon the character of the occupation, coincides with that made in Mr. Jan Ciechanowski's book, published 2 years ago. Mr. Ciechanowski for many years was the distinguished Polish Ambassador to this country. By some it was unfairly argued that as a Pole he was prejudiced. But no prejudice can be charged against Mr. Lane. He is not a Pole; he is an American diplomat with no political connections, aspirations, or purposes. Early last year he resigned his post as Ambassador to Poland, and at the age of 52 closed his long diplomatic career solely to be able to tell the American people the truth of what happened to Poland—and why.

This he has done in his book and is doing in his lectures. It is a shocking story and few Americans can reflect upon their country's part in it without a feeling of shame. The defense of Mr. Roosevelt's role, at Yalta, Tehran, and after the seizure began, is not a convincing one. Chiefly, it amounts to statements from his former intimates that while Mr. Lane has made a valuable contribution, they personally know of Mr. Roosevelt's deep concern for Polish freedom and had often discussed with him his ideas for maintaining it. This clearly inadequate reply is supplemented by a transparently futile effort to shift the blame for what happened, first to former Secretary of State Stettinius and then to former Secretary of State Byrnes.

In other words, no reply worthy of the name has been made. Nor is it likely one will be. For the historians probably the kindest thing is to accept the explanation that Mr. Roosevelt was a sick man whose judgment was impaired. Certainly the notion, which so many agree Mr. Roosevelt cherished, that he, who spoke no word of Russian, could, through two interpreters, charm Mr. Stalin, who spoke no word of English, seems hard to reconcile with reason.

So These Are the Objectives of the Oleo Promoters?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in this oleo-butter controversy too few people realize that the whole dairy industry is being jeopardized. If oleo can be sold to masquerade as butter, then oleo evaporated milk will be the next legislative objective, then oleo cheese legislation, and then oleo milk, where the vegetable oil will be substituted for butterfat in milk will be the final goal.

Just because some dairyman sells his milk as fluid milk, or to a condensing

factory or to a cheese factory, he does not want to be deceiving himself into thinking that the market for his dairy product is not going to be faced with this substitute synthetic approach.

In Business Week of February 14, 1948, a copy of which the editor was kind enough to send me, I note several interesting statements on page 25 under the title of "Margarine Gets a Break." Among these statements are, first:

The margarine lobby's timetable has worked smoothly this year.

Second:

After that the lobby's high command believes the ways are greased for quick and favorable action by Congress and the President.

If oleo is used it will surely be greased.

Third, and be sure to get his one:

Repercussions: If the margarine people get what they want, it may have some repercussions elsewhere in the United States farm economy. Further inroads by margarine into the butter market would undoubtedly weaken butter prices. This, in turn, might well bring down fluid-milk prices. For fluid-milk prices are determined under a Federal-State formula, based on the prices for butter and skimmed milk. So dairy farmers would be sure to want a revised milk-price formula, based on something more solid than butter.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Kenneth B. Keating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a Lincoln Day address delivered by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, at Muncie, Ind., February 11, 1948:

Fellow Republicans, it is a great pleasure and high honor to have been chosen as the speaker as the Republicans of your fine city and community join in their annual celebration of Lincoln's birthday.

Indiana, and particularly the Tenth Congressional District, occupies a warm spot in my affections. There is something fundamentally fine about the soil of an area which produces men like the late Ray Springer, who represented your district with such marked distinction for some 9 years before his death last fall. I served on the Committee on the Judiciary with this true and loyal friend and this patriotic servant of the highest order. There and on the floor of the House and in his contacts with his colleagues, he rendered conspicuous service in matters of the utmost importance to the welfare of our people. With marked ability he guided through the committee and the House intricate bills of great complexity, such as the measures passed at the last session relating to various controls over the complex economy of our country.

In the mind of this statesman, so serious in purpose and so indefatigable in efforts, although like you good people, a loyal and professing Republican—at no time did considerations of narrow partisanship becloud his views or dictate his action.

Ray was always a great team player, preferring, with unassuming modesty to advance the common interest rather than his own personal fortunes. We who worked with him day in and day out and who came to know and love him, and you who sent this great public servant to us, can all be consoled and take comfort from the sure knowledge that he now enjoys the rewards of a good and faithful servant.

Following Ray's departure, you sent to us in the same tradition, a sound and sensible thinker and a most amiable gentleman in the person of RALPH HARVEY. Out of his extensive agricultural and business experience he is already, in this short time, making his presence and his influence felt among his colleagues in a most constructive fashion. He is a member, not only of the Committee on House Administration, but also the exceedingly important Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The responsibilities and corresponding opportunities for public service in work on this committee are almost limitless. When the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946 was adopted, with the vast expansion of the activities of the Federal Government touching the lives of more and more citizens at ever-increasing points, it was felt that some committee of the Congress must be charged with nothing else except to keep a watchful eye on the mounting expenditures in the executive departments and constantly study the governmental activities at all levels with a view of determining possibilities for ingreased economy and efficiency, and perhaps most important of all, to study and pass upon the constantly recurring reorganizations which necessarily take place in the various departments of government. This, then, is the extremely important work to which RALPH HARVEY has been called. Great indeed are his responsibilities, which we who have had the opportunity, as you have, to measure the man, have become convinced that he is well equipped indeed to discharge.

The entire Republican congressional delegation from the Hoosier State is one in which you Republicans have every reason for justifiable pride. Without detraction from the luster of the names of any of your Representatives, I know that all of them would join me in paying our highest tribute to the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives, who hails from Hoosierland—CHARLES A. HALLECK. With infinite tact and patience, utmost devotion to duty, and brilliant statesmanship he has guided the deliberations and legislative program of the Republican majority in the House in most trying times and against most stubborn opposition. A young man, as I classify anyone no older than myself, CHARLIE HALLECK, I predict, will rise even above his present exalted position of trust and honor.

The day before I left Washington a newspaper said: "Republican speakers will address this week the 700 Lincoln Day banquets which are slated to take place in 44 States. They will speak, of course, for the Republican Party and victory next November." True to form, I bespeak victory for the Republican Party next November. Having stated that, however, I turn not to the controversial issues of the day, but rather to a story, an epic which depicts better than anything else I know, the fundamental principles and philosophies for which the Republican Party has always stood.

In this time when civilization is menaced by the aftermath of war; in this time when free government is struggling for survival everywhere in the world; in this time when millions of people are questioning in their own hearts whether or not security under despotism may not be better than risk under freedom; in this time when America is the last great bulwark of individual liberty and freedom, I want to portray for you, if I can, an epic of liberty, opportunity, energy, perseverance, all transmused by a divine spark into a powerful, marvelous instrument of good. Nowhere but in America could this have happened in this way. Let me now recite the epic.

In a log cabin about 3 miles south of Hodgen's mill on what was known as the Singing Spring farm, in what was then Hardin, but is now LaRue County, Ky., a manchild was born. The condition of the parents, their way of life, could hardly have been more humble than it was. Life was a humdrum, backwoods existence. The birth of a boy baby to Tom and Nancy Hanks Lincoln was of no particular significance to the settlers.

Truly nothing had happened except that Abraham Lincoln had been born. His father was a shiftless, uneducated, self-sympathizing man who just couldn't seem to stick at anything long encugh to succeed. His first wife, Nancy Hanks, the mother of Abraham, like her husband, was untutored.

Abraham Lincoln's early childhood was spent about 8 miles from his birthplace at a locality known as Knob Creek. The family did not remain long there. When Abraham was seven his father and mother were on the move again. The Indiana woods was their destination. Here the family of four, the father, Abraham, Sarah, his sister, and the mother, lived very poorly. Scarcely more than a hut sheltered them the first winter. Broken by the hardships of pioneer life, Nancy Hanks sickened and died.

Then came another event. We can look back and see now how it must have been a part of a pattern planned by Providence. Thomas Lincoln married again. His second wife was Sarah Johnston, of Elizabethtown, Kentucky. She was a widow, who came with her three children to the Lincoln cabin. She became a very important factor in Abraham Lincoln's rearing and career. She was a real mother to him. She warmly encouraged his thirst for knowledge.

Lincoln's youth was that of an easy-going backwoods boy. He did hard labor on the homestead. He performed odd jobs for his neighbors. He had practically no formal schooling. His attendance did not exceed a year all together. But a singular and fateful destiny moved this boy. He had every opportunity to sympathize with himself, as his father had before him. He had every example to encourage him to be shiftless, and a no'er-do-well. He might easily have taken to the strong drink and the rude brawls of those backwoods days. He was a good wrestler. He might have frittered away his time in the excitements of the hunt, or the thrills of fishing. He loved the river. He was fond of fun. He had a natural bent for humor. He thoroughly enjoyed a joke, even on himself. But deep within that gangling awkward, backwoods boy Providence had planted a spark of genius. The All-Knowing had endowed that nature with a great thirst for knowledge. As a result Lincoln developed a deep sense of justice, and tolerance and a desire to serve his fellow men.

Stretched out on the floor of the rude shack, by the light of the fireplace he read such few books as he could get, and by the light of divine inspiration he came to have that philosophy of right and justice, of courage, of a simple, profound faith in God, and a simple profound faith in his fellowmen, which ultimated in the immortal Lincoln whose memory we honor here tonight. That boy baby born in that log cabin on Singing Spring Farm, where nothing ever happened, was the Abraham Lincoln who had the courage, and the faith, and the gentle justice, and deep love for his fellowmen which kept this Nation united when it was at a breaking point which might have made of this country two bitterly antagonistic peoples.

Never in all history has there been a more wonderful, beautiful epic of a rise from obscurity, through the vicissitudes and hardships of pioneer life, to a place of destiny such as that of Abrahsm Lincoln. He lifted his gaze from the soil with which he worked,

and, looking on high, sought his destiny in the stars. Strangley enough, just a few days ago another great emancipator, another great apostle of peace and gentleness, Mahatma Gandhi, of India, was martyred, as Lincoln was martyred, by a tragically mistaken fanatic with a smoking pistol.

Lincoln absorbed education. He was born with greatness in him. He got his wisdom not alone from books but from his meditations close to nature, and above all from his prayers to the Master who guided his destiny.

For several years—almost to midlife—Abraham Lincoln appeared to be more or less of a mediocre individual. He did not seem to succeed at anything he tried. The trouble was he was always in the wrong business up until the moment he found his true vocation. Lincoln's real business was being great. His real calling was to serve and guide his fellowmen.

He knew many sorrows. The great love of his life was denied him. The fires of those sorrows must have burned out any dross that may have been in his nature, leaving the pure gold of inspired greatness, molten and shining over the flame of his burning desire to serve his fellowmen. It was slavery, the cruelties and inhumanities practiced upon the negroes, which stirred him to his depths, and moved him to the epochal accomplishments of his life.

Although his life was filled with sorrows; although he knew the stings of bitterness, and the gall of ingratitude, and the poison of treachery—Abraham Lincoln never for a moment ceased to be a gentle, peaceful, forgiving, wise, and just man.

Picture him if you can, a shawl draped about his gaunt shoulders, pacing the corridors of the White House in the still hours of night, praying to his God for strength and guidance to save his Nation and his people from hatred, and war, and a severance of the Union which would have destroyed the great Nation the founding fathers had erected. He said many times that he was driven to his knees often because he had nowhere else to go. A better place he could not have gone.

Lincoln himself stated the marvelous opportunities which our American system of government, of economy, and society make possible better than anybody else ever stated it before or since. Said he:

"I happen temporarily to occupy this big White House. I am a living witness that anyone of your children may look to come here, as my father's child has. It is in order that each one of you may have, through this free Government which we have enjoyed, an open field and a fair chance * * * that the struggle should be maintained, that we may not lose our birthrights."

Think you, my friends, that the remarkable phenomenon of Abraham Lincoln could have taken place under a despotism? Think you he could have risen from the obscurity of a log cabin to his immortal place in history in any country which did not have the open field and fair chance that existed in America?

If we had no other example of the grand and glorious freedom of choice and equality of opportunity which lie before every boy and girl in the United States of America, Lincoln's life alone would prove the case.

Today, as it has always been in America, our way of progress to spiritual and cultural heights, and to material achievements, lies in equal opportunity for all, and not in limiting opportunity for some.

We can see Lincoln's divinely bestowed wisdom shining through when he declared that:

"The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations, and tongues, and kindreds. Nor should this lead to a war upon property, or the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; it is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise."

All the wisdom underlying free America was expressed in those words. Lincoln would never have been a Socialist. He would never have been a Communist. He believed every man and every woman was entitled to the right to get ahead, but not to pull the other fellow down in getting there.

What a marvelous instrument of Providence Lincoln turned out to be. He had none of the finished suavity of the slick politician. He was a man of the people. He loved the people. He believed they had inherent in them a wisdom and a sense of justice which would instinctively find the right path if they were given the truth and left alone to make their own decisions. How wise he was, how clearly he perceived the proper function of government when he said:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves in their separate and individual capacity. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

Now listen to these further words:

"I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruit of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights."

Now, my friends, to what are we to attribute the rise of our own Nation in 172 years from a humble, struggling group of colonies, just as Lincoln was a humble, struggling member of a humble, struggling family? You know, of course, that in 172 years we in America have accomplished spiritual, cultural, and material progress which nations in the Orient and Asia have not been able to do in more than 5,000 years, which other nations in continental Europe have not been able to equal in a 1,000 years of warfare and struggle.

From a country of log cabins and woods and pioneers the American people have produced the Washingtons, and the Jeffersons, and the Lincolns—a whole immortal group of men, wise with the wisdom of providential grace, and not with the fleeting and changing beliefs of unstable human theories.

We have in the United States the highest living levels; the highest wages; the best working conditions; the finest transportation and communication systems; the finest educational system; and the best government to be found anywhere on the globe.

Now, was it some peculiar genius on the part of our poplo which produced all this? That could not have been, because our forebears came from all these other nations in which for over 1,000 years their ancestors had failed to achieve what we in America have accomplished in a century and three-quarters on this continent. What did our forebears possess that set them apart from this great Providential demonstration in free Government, and the capacity of men to govern themselves? First, they had courage. They pulled themselves up by the roots, they left the scenes of their childhood and their early life; they embarked with their families in cockleshell boats, and dared the stormy seas. They were coming to the shores of a land which was uncharted forests and trailless plains. They were coming because they loved liberty more than they loved their early environment, or even security.

The real reason, however, that we in America today are the richest, most powerful Nation on the globe is because of the character and kind of Government, economy and society established by the founding fathers. They knew the people could not prosper, except in rare individual instances, under despotism and tyranny. They knew no autocrat could guide, and no tyrant could compel the people to wiser actions concerning their own affairs than they in their individual capacities might exercise. So the founding fathers set up the kind of a government which would act as an umpire; which would hold things even, so that the fair might not be injured by the unfair; so that the just and gentle might not suffer at the hands of unjust, aggressive despoilers. But as Lincoln said, they left every man free to do with the fruits of his labor as he chose, so long, and so far, as it in no wise interfered with any other man's rights.

It was under that kind of government, safeguarded by checks and balances against too much dominance or domination by any one or any two of the three coordinate branches, that our country grew great. It was under that kind of government, economy and society that Abraham Lincoln made his way by his own efforts from the little log cabin on Singing Spring Farm to the great white mansion in his Nation's Capital.

It is that kind of government, Lincoln's government, of, by, and for the people, that millions of our boys and girls went forth in two world wars to preserve against the onslaughts of ruthless, power-mad aggressors. It was that kind of government of opportunity we have always fought and always must fight to maintain and perpetuate.

And yet we have among us, and we have in other parts of the world, those who would proclaim that this kind of government has become obsolete and oppressive. They declare that the common man no longer has an opportunity in America. Let me say to you that if Lincoln were here tonight he would proclaim that opportunity in America never ceases to exist for the man or the woman who will embrace it and "work diligently to build a house for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built." The house Abraham Lincoln was talking about then was not a physical structure, either a log cabin or a marble palace. He was talking about a trade, a career, a calling, a profession, the accumulation of something for old age, the opportunity to exercise one's talents in freedom, and to raise as high as one can rise, if he has the inherent ability, energy, and integrity so to progress.

Therefore, let me say to you that we must, in justice to Washington, and Jefferson, and Lincoln; we must, in justice to all of those who have fallen in the past, in the wars in which we have engaged to preserve this great free Nation of ours in its freedom, we must continue to perpetuate free, constitutional government, free economy, and free society. We must continue to preserve that freedom of opportunity which will permit a child born in some hovel to aspire, if he will, to the portals of the White House.

Lincoln was always vigilant on behalf of liberty, just as he was always determined on behalf of justice. It is a striking fact that Lincoln's great strength was his gentleness. Go back of him and you will find that the great Nazarene, whose teachings he followed, found his great strength in His incomparable gentleness.

Oh, if only we can make every young man and woman in this country realize what it means to them to live in a land in which an obscure child born of unlettered, poor parents, can attain the wisdom, and make the journey to the State house, or to the halls of Congress, or to the White House, as Abraham Lincoln did.

Oh, if we can only make all the world realize what an inexpressible blessing our kind of Government and society is, some faults though it may have! Oh, if we can only make all mankind understand that the American people are moved by a sense of gentle justice in all they want to do for the other peoples of the world, driven into poverty and suffering and despair by war! How well we know we want only to help other peoples

to attain enduring peace and progress! How well we in American know that we want to be friendly, and just, and cooperative with everybody else in the world, if only they will let us.

No young man or woman can possibly study the life of Lincoln and not realize in the end that his whole career is a living, vibrant, shining proof in the pages of history that our American way is the finest way ever devised by the mind of man to permit individuals to rise to spiritual heights, to cultural achievements, and to material prosperity.

Thus we see this epic of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, which is a symbol of the inexpressible grandeur of our constitutional system of Government and our American equal opportunity society.

As we now leave until next year our observance of the life and works of this great man we can pay to him that beautiful tribute which he once voiced of Washington. As he said this of Washington, so we say of Abraham Lincoln: "To add brightness to the sun or glory to his name—is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe pronounce the name, and in its naked, deathless splendor leave it shining on."

Federal Regulation of the Petroleum Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call attention to a letter written by Mr. Russell B. Brown, general counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, to Mr. Merle Becker, of St. Louis, Mo., the president of that organization of independent oil operators.

Mr. Brown has a Nation-wide reputation as a profound student of the many problems affecting the petroleum industry. His rich background of experience enables him to speak with authority on all its phases of activity. His analysis of the present much-discussed oil situation and his expressed confidence in the ability of the domestic petroleum industry, functioning under conditions of free enterprise, to care for our future supply of petroleum and natural gas, has been widely commended. A thoughtful reading of his letter will serve to remove certain current misunderstandings. I commend it to my colleagues and others for such reading. Mr. Brown's letter follows:

MR. MERLE BECKER,
President, Independent Petroleum Association of America:

For the first time in several years Federal regulation of the oil industry in all its phase, including production, is formally proposed in Congress. A bill has been drafted by Congressman HESELTON, Republican, of Massachusetts which would establish a board or commission with broad powers.

The sponsor of the measure is a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House and has been one of the most active members of the committee in the hearings it has recently conducted on petroleum. His several speeches in the House on the supply and distribution problems affecting home heating with oil and his insistence on cutting down exports of petroleum during the period of shortage in eastern areas, have reflected his deep concern.

The exact details of the Heselton bill are not so important to us as the reasons for its introduction. Because of the over-all significance of the move to solve by legislation a number of interrelated problems, I am going to confine this report to discussion of the one subject.

Proposals of the type made by Congressman HESELTON are extreme and outside the normal concept of our Government. I seriously doubt that such remedies will provide the relief desired by those who make them. This is not a new method of meeting such situations and we do have some experience which should enable a critical examination. I would emphasize, however, that whatever inspires the attempt to use the method should have our careful and thoughtful attention. The proposals are not settled or minimized by refusing to honestly consider the elements which gave rise to them.

Many of our people in several areas have been cold because of lack of oil during this extremely severe winter. Cold homes and family suffering inspire determined impulses and action. The action may not always be logical but it cannot be ignored safely just because it is illogical. Sympathetic study and analysis would seem to be a sounder approach in answering the demand for action. It is not sufficient to say that there is no shortage of oil in the United States. There is a shortage of oil in the homes of the consumers who are making the complaints or a shortage at the factory which provides their income. That is real to them. The fact that there may be oil some other place and good and sufficient reasons why delivery cannot be made do not satisfy them. The fact that in all the history of the oil industry it never before failed under peacetime conditions of free enterprise to supply all of the products which were desired is also not a sufficient answer.

So, those in distress appeal to the Congressmen. The latter try to find an answer, not necessarily an answer that is fundamental but one that will provide relief. Failing to find assurance of oil supply they turn to the agencies of Government that are presumed to know something about the situation. Here again we run into the human element. Government agents often believe, quite honestly, that if they were given the power they could solve any problem, so they suggest controls—Government controls with power lodged in their hands. This being the only suggestion in sight of a solution to a difficult problem some will adopt it in the desperate hope that it will work.

FACTORS IN THE INCREASE IN CONSUMPTION

Too often hasty remedies, adopted in desperation and without careful consideration, may lead to serious consequences and inflict lasting harm. It is hoped that in the present situation there will be careful analysis of present conditions and of the suggested remedial measures. I would like to suggest to our people the study of certain outstanding facts in the hope that they will be helpful. The following factors are basic in the approach to the question:

1. There has been a general trend, and one that has been rapid in application, to convert the national fuel economy from traditional dependence on solid fuels—coal of various types—to the more desirable and convenient oil and gas fuels. The reasons for this trend have been, in part, as follows:

(a) The two fuels, oil and gas, were under severe Government price controls at depressed levels for a long time while other fuels were not so closely controlled. The result was that oil and gas prices for a number of years were much lower than prices of other fuels customarily used in home heating.

(b) The supply of oil and gas has heretofore been plentiful, uninterrupted, and sufficient to the needs of all users. Other fuels were subject to uncertainties of supply caused by labor interruptions and other factors affecting supply and distribution.

2. The use of oil and gas for fuel and power for farms, railroads, air transport, and many other uses has grown rapidly in recent years. The use of motor fuel has continued to increase. The sum of the several forms of increase in oil and gas use have been enormous. As an illustration, the demand for crude petroleum in the last full prewar year, 1940, was 3,635,000 barrels per day. In 1947 it was 5,090,000 and the projected demand for 1948 is 5,385,000 barrels per day. There was neither time nor materials to prepare for the swift increase, postwar, in the new and increased uses of oil and gas fuels. The experience of the industry had not been such as to enable it to be forewarned of the necessities. To illustrate, users of coal through long experience had learned to provide against heavy winter demands by storing the winter requirements gradually through the summer months, thus spreading procurement and transportation loads over a longer period. Like provision was not made as to oil for these reasons:

(a) Oil users had no experience as to the manner and quantity of storage required;

(b) Storage facilities required the use of great quantities of steel which has been in short supply ever since the close of the war.

Because of the foregoing factors, fuel-oil users relied on small storage and thus threw the heaviest load on transportation facilities during the heaviest consuming season. Where the coal consumer laid in a supply of fuel that would last for weeks, the householder heating with fuel oil is limited to storage that carries him for but a few days in severe weather. Transportation facilities, such as tank cars, pipe lines, and water transport were not developed sufficiently because of lack of material and lack of anticipation of the enormity of the problem.

DIFFICULTIES IN SUPPLYING ALL USES

The foregoing are some of the points of difficulty on the consuming side of the problem. On the supply side there have also been unusual difficulties. During the war steel went first into military usage. It was diverted from the usual petroleum producing, refining, and transportation needs to the more direct war uses. The petroleum industry was thus prevented from carrying on its customary scale of exploration, development, and maintenance work and the expansion of refining and transportation facilities in accordance with the needs of the consumers. There was thus no opportunity to conduct operations which would provide the surplus of capacity above immediate needs—the safety factor needed to meet new and unusual demands such as now confront the industry. The industry has done a tremendous job in increasing its operations under severe limitations but it has not been able to avoid spot shortages of serious proportions in some areas.

Thus, we have had and still have a problem of considerable proportions. We may now consider the suggested remedies. The first proposal, that of Government control, as suggested in the bill referred to earlier, relates only to petroleum. The sponsor of the bill was quoted as saying that natural gas was omitted because it was already under Federal control. I believe we may at this point consider the result of Federal regulation of natural gas.

To an extent it is true that there is such regulation. The transportation, distribution, and sale of natural gas in interstate commerce are controlled. The production of natural gas is not controlled by the Federal Government. The division of the industry that is not so controlled, acting through the free play of industrial effort, has built up the largest supply of natural gas in our entire history. Yet there is an ever-increasing and a largely unsatisfied demand for natural gas. The bottleneck is somewhere between that section of the industry which operates under free economics and those who desire gas for fuel. It is, therefore, in that section of the industry which is under Federal control.

It would seem that in this instance Federal control has not functioned to relieve unsatisfied demand.

RESERVE CAPACITY EXHAUSTED DURING WAR

As to petroleum and its products, the necessity of war suggested that the Federal Government exercise control over the industry's production and operations during the war. When the controls were first imposed the industry had a vast reserve of producing capacity. It also had a reserve of refining capacity above demand. The producing capacity was a million barrels per day or more above actual requirements. During the war this excess capacity was used up because of the inability of the producing industry to get the materials and the manpower and to exercise the freedom of action necessary to maintain normal operations. It was only through extreme rationing of petroleum products for civilian use that the military program was supplied. Again we have experience on which to draw as to the efficacy of Federal control. Again it does not suggest that control as being the answer to our increased demands.

In June 1946 when the last of the wartime controls were ended, the production of crude oil in the United States was approximately 4,900,000 barrels per day. Since that time, operating under conditions of free industrial activity, we have increased the production until we reached the daily average of 5,330,000 barrels for the 4 weeks ending February 7, 1948. This is the highest in the history of the industry in the United States. The gain was accomplished in spite of the serious handicap of shortage of steel for oilfield equipment.

CONTROLS HAVE BEEN INEFFECTIVE ELSEWHERE

It is to be hoped that the experience of an industry under control contrasted with its experience under free conditions will be given careful attention in the consideration of whether controls should be reimposed as the answer to current difficulties. We can look also to other countries for their experience in Government controls as a solution to fuel problems during cold weather. Great Britain in the winter of 1946–47 was desperately short of fuel. Government control of their coal and other fuel resources failed to provide the relief that was so greatly needed and it was the free-enterprise industries of the United States that were called upon to provide from our none too plentiful available supply much of the oil and coal that were needed.

We have much more in the experience of other countries which may well be considered. In our own hemisphere, Mexico and Bolivia confiscated the oil properties which had been discovered and developed by private industry. They attempted to operate these properties. The result is that our Government today is attempting to help those countries to alleviate their petroleum shortages by financing expansion and further development of their petroleum industries.

It is now proposed to further aid Great Britain and other European countries as well in the matter of fuel supplies, among other forms of aid. In the face of the experience under Government controls, wherever exercised, why will Government control be proposed here? I believe we may consider the following as principal or contributory answers to the question:

1. Desperation often suggests a change—any change—to those whose needs are great and remain unsatisfied. This is especially true of those commodities required for basic needs, such as food and fuel.

2. There are those in government who would like to exercise power under a system of control. Some of these, wholly lacking in experience, believe that with full power they could do a better job than industry has done. These have not failed to take advantage of the present difficulties to suggest Federal control as the remedy.

3. There are some whose philosophy of government is based upon the theory of centralized control of industries. They, too, have not failed to take advantage of the fuel-supply situation this winter.

4 Some in various branches of the petroleum industry have for different reasons been suggesting that the petroleum industry of the United States is not capable of further expansion to meet the increased demands. They suggest greater and greater reliance on the foreign sources of supply in which they are interested. This group has gone far toward building an atmosphere of uncertainty among those who do not have the opportunity to learn the facts and know the true condition. These persons and their friends, through careless testimony before congressional committees and through public utterances, have created an impression in the minds of some in Congress that the industry is greedy, selfish, and indifferent to the situation in which we find ourselves. Just a few days ago a man who has wide acceptance as an authority on some phases of the petroleum industry told a committee that the price increases on crude oil were unnecessary. He suggested certain impractical forms of relief. Such testimony has the effect of prejudicing the minds of some in Congress against the petroleum industry of the United States. Of course, all who are familiar with the industry's operations realize that such statements are unsound and stupid, but because of the reputation heretofore enjoyed by some of these spokesmen, there is a considerable contribution to the embarrassment of the industry.

INDUSTRY HAS MADE PROGRESS

The facts of the domestic situation should be kept in mind. The entire industry from the beginning of our participation in World War II has suffered severe restrictions on essential supplies of steel. Despite this the industry has continued to increase its discovered reserves of crude petroleum and natural gas until they are now at the highest point in history. The first published estimates of reserves, compiled by the Oil and Gas Journal, are 23,737,000,000 barrels. This is an increase of more than 4,000,000,000 barrels of presently available discovered crude oil over the estimated reserves at the close of 1941. In the meantime the domestic industry has supplied most of the oil used in our war effort and the greater part of that used by our allies during the war, as well as supplying our own economy.

These are typical of the facts which we should remember constantly. They are evidence of the assertion which the industry has always made—that it can be expected to grow and progress under free, competitive conditions. There is no magic in government. Is the rail-transportation system of the Nation perfect today? I think there is plenty of evidence that they have many problems. They have been under close Federal regulation for many years. And we may also ponder the fact that the "have not" nations in respect to petroleum are those which have either guided and directed their petroleum industries or conducted them as direct functions of government.

I would not minimize the proposal to regulate or control the industry. It grew, in the final sense, out of the current shortage of home-heating oil in some areas. It is the industry's job to do all that it can to ease the situation and to provide for future situations. It is also our job to keep in mind the fact that during the war government had a free hand in the distribution of supplies, yet people were cold—there were shortages of all kinds of fuel. The job which government tried to do then has been enlarged since 1941 by about 1,000,000 oil burners of the furnace type and 2,250,000 space heaters burning oil. This does not take into consideration all the other forms of increase in the use of petroleum products—locomotives, industrial plants, farm tractors and trucks, busses—the list is long and each item is significant of the greatly added burden on the petroleum industry.

Those who now suggest Federal control see disruptions in petroleum supply. Some of them honestly desire to correct the situation, even at the risk of employing drastic methods. What they should understand is that the industry is now convalescing from the very disease they now suggest as a remedy—Federal control.

All of us have heard of sufferers from a hang-over who proposed as a remedy the "hair of the dog that bit me." The dog did bite us all right, but there is neither scientific nor popular support for the theory that his hair will heal the injury; rather, repeated dosage will make the hang-over permanent.

Since the removal of the more direct type of controls there has been Government control on exports of steel. These controls have been used in a manner to take steel from the uses of the domestic oil industry and send it abroad. This process continues. The industry at home then is blamed for a condition which Government itself helped to produce—and the assertion by some of the men in Government is made that the shortage which they have helped to create will last through 1951.

Yours very truly,

RUSSELL B. BROWN.

Why Does Not Mr. Brennan Provide 7 Cents Per Quart Oleo Milk?—Why Does Not He Recommend 12 Cents Per Quart Reconstituted Whole Milk?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the February 5, 1948 Washington Evening Star:

BRENNAN CALLS FOR END OF OLEOMARGARINE TAX

Roland M. Brennan, purchasing officer for the District, has recommended to the Commissioners that they indorse the bill now pending in Congress to eliminate the tax on oleomargarine.

In a memorandum to the Commissioners, Mr. Brennan said his office has discontinued the purchase of butter "until the price of butter comes down to a figure within reason," and that if the tax were eliminated, the District would save considerable money.

The District has contracted to purchase, in this fiscal year, 37,750 pounds of uncolored oleomargarine at 35½ cents a pound and 7,200 pounds of colored oleomargarine at 47 cents a pound, which is more than the District paid for butter several years ago.

While the tax on uncolored oleo is only one-quarter of a cent a pound, there is a great deal of labor involved in coloring it in the various institutions, Mr. Brennan told the Commissioners.

Mr. Brennan could incorporate the vegetable oil in the skim milk without the "great deal of labor involved." At the support price the United States Department of Agriculture paid for skim milk for the school-lunch program, oleo milk could be produced for 7 cents per quart. At the support price for dried skim, this oleo milk could be made for less yet. Reconstituted whole milk and not a substitute for milk can be obtained and made at District institutions for 12 cents per quart. Why not this saving instead of telling the Commissioners to be telling the Congress what laws to pass?

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the Economic Club of Detroit, on February 23, 1948, in Detroit, Mich.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I consider it a great privilege to be invited to address the Economic Club of Detroit and have an opportunity again to visit Michigan where live so many of my old friends. I do not suppose there are any two States in the Nation more alike than Michigan and Ohio in their forms of local government and in the governmental philosophy of their peoples. Of course, it is pleasant for me to come to a State with a long Republican record and an able line of governors, mostly Republican, ending with your present efficient and excellent executive, Kim Sigler.

I could not come to Michigan without testifying to the voters of Michigan regarding the exceptional representation they have in the United States Senate. Since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have worked closely with your distinguished senior Senator, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG. From a minority of 17 just before my election in 1938, we have seen the Republican Party grow to command the Senate, and we have worked together in harmony for the development of progressive Republican policies. I shall discuss later his services to the Nation in the foreign field, but on every question, domestic or foreign, he commands the respect and admiration of his colleagues.

I have a warm affection also for your junior Senator, HOMER FERGUSON. I think he is the hardest worker in Washington. One of our duties is to investigate the doings of the executive administration and see that the people really understand what is going on. The Republicans have usually assigned Homer to this rather unpleasant job, and he has often had to sacrifice much more attractive work in order to carry it through with the success which he has achieved. No State has more influence in the Senate than Michigan.

I hope also that you may retain your very excellent representation among the Republicans of the House for as long as they will be willing to serve. There are none better than those who represent Wayne County, HOWARD COFFIN, HAROLD YOUNGBLOOD, and GEORGE DONDERO.

My title is given as "Congress Today." Since most of our thoughts at the moment are devoted to the Marshall plan, I desire to speak today on the foreign policy of the United States and its relation to the Democratic and the Republican Parties. How far is our foreign policy bipartisan? How do the foreign policies of the two parties differ? How far is foreign policy a partisan question at all?

In the first place, foreign policy is peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the President of the United States. Any role played by Congress or by a minority party must be a secondary one. Under the Constitution, the President is given the right to initiate all negotiations with foreign nations, to make executive agreements with such nations, to appoint ambassadors and to declare policy. Such an important policy as the Monroe Doctrine, for instance, was never formally approved by Congress and arose simply by a declaration of the President of the United States. True, when an agreement finally reaches the condition of a treaty, it must be confirmed by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, but more and more the Executive is claiming the right to cover almost all subjects by executive agreement which requires no consent of Congress unless appropriations are involved. In recent years, and particularly since the adoption of the United Nations Charter and its subsidiary agreements, still more power over foreign policy has been delegated to the President. He has been given complete power to direct the American representatives in the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations as to the action of the United States. Under this power he can even involve us in war without the declaration of war by Congress required by the Constitution. Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act he can lower tariffs to 25 percent of the statutory rate without any action by Congress. That is lower in most cases than the Underwood tariff, and gives the President the power to destroy an industry which requires protection. Almost the only power remaining to Congress is the power to refuse funds necessary to carry out any special feature of foreign policy. Since our relations today with foreign nations consist for the most part in loaning them money, this power is not negligible. But even in the remaining fields of congressional policy, the President can so far commit the Nation by his acts and statements that it becomes very difficult for Congress to make any substantial modification in his commitment.

Ordinarily, foreign policy has not been a party matter. In recent years, substantial differences on foreign policy have cut across both parties. In time of war it is regarded as almost unpatriotic to oppose the current foreign policy of the Government no matter how wrong it may be. In time of peace the condition is somewhat different, and I believe that those who regard any foreign policy as likely to involve the Nation in an unnecessary war or substantially interfere with our own economic welfare, are obligated to present a public opposition to administration policy. On the other hand, on less important matters I have felt also that between elections, at least, it is better to withhold criticism. Under the Constitution and laws I have described, only the President can be the effective voice of America, and unless issues vital to the welfare of America are involved it is better that foreign nations do not feel that we are speaking with two voices.

In accordance with this policy, the Republicans in the Senate have usually refrained from criticism where it could not change administration policy. They have often supported proposals which, to their own mind, contained little promise of success.

But certainly before an election, it is the duty of both parties to present to the people the foreign policy they will follow if elected. In such an election, I believe it is their duty as well as their right to criticize at that time those past policies of the administration which have failed and the present policies which threaten unnecessary disaster to the Nation. This week President Truman, in effect, opened his campaign for reelection. The campaign is on. At the Republican convention in June, we Republicans will agree on a program of foreign policy. I am confident it will be suited to the present world conditions. It will protect the interests of the American people while recognizing our responsibilities the world over.

Today, I wish, first, to point out the irreparable and destructive results of the foreign policies of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman; second, to show how the Republicans, for the most part through Senator VANDENBERG's participation, have been responsible for most of the recent improvements in that policy; and, third, point out a few of the dangerous prospects involved in administration policy today.

During the war, President Roosevelt practically ignored the Republican opposition, and the Democratic Party must assume full responsibility for everything that happened through the Potsdam Conference. Most of our difficulties today were brought about by the foreign policies of the Democratic administration.

The policy of unconditional surrender destroyed the German state. It left no one with whom we could even begin to negotiate and no possibility of setting up such a state. It left a vacuum in Europe into which Russia has successfully moved. Decisions were made at Tehran and Yalta which have completely wrecked the economy of Germany and thereby seriously hindered all European recovery. Reparations in impossible sums were agreed to which have resulted in the dismantling of German plants, many of which were used for civilian purposes long before the war. In effect, the Morgenthau plan which was adopted intended to reduce the German people to a bare subsistence level, largely on an agricultural basis. In Washington this plan was constantly denied, but, nevertheless, it was substantially put into effect. It was more than successful in its unwise aims, because it reduced the German people to well below the subsistence level, and it is now costing the United States $800,000,000 a year to bring them up to a subsistence level. In the meantime, they are unable to supply the goods needed by other European nations and of course, they do not provide a market for the goods of those nations. I once questioned Secretary Morgenthau in a committee meeting as to whether this would not be the necessary result of his proposal. He assured the committee that German industry was unnecessary, and that industry would spring up in all the surrounding countries to replace it. Of course that has not happened.

Neither in 1941, when we first extended lend-lease aid to Russia, nor at Tehran or Yalta was it ever suggested that Russia give some assurance of cooperation after the war in return for our lend-lease goods. The President knew of Stalin's deal with Hitler and his unjustified attack on Finland, yet he chose to put complete reliance on his own hunch that Stalin would behave in an angelic manner if we gave him everything that he asked. We poured out billions in aid to Russia without obtaining anything in return except their continuing to fight a war against Germany which they would have had to fight anyway. We agreed to Stalin's strategy of attack on Germany which resulted in the complete Soviet occupation of the Balkans, of Vienna, and of Berlin. In fact, we actually withdrew our troops from land which we had conquered to carry out our agreements while the Russian Government was not asked to make any agreements restricting its territorial advance, and failed to keep its other agreements.

In the course of this policy, we completely tore up the Atlantic Charter and all the ideals for which the war was fought. We never even mentioned the freedom of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. We failed to guard effectively the freedom of Poland, the very freedom for which England and France began the war. We abandoned Mihailovich and the Yugoslav patriots who had been urged to defiance against Hitler by our own State Department. We turned against Finland, whose only crime was that it was determined to be free from Soviet tyranny. We won the war against Germany, but we have not brought freedom or self-government to Europe or peace to the world. We have made a mockery of the Atlantic Charter.

At Yalta, President Roosevelt gave Russia wide interests in Manchuria and the best half of Korea, to say nothing of the Kurile Islands and the Japanese half of Sakhalin. These islands were given with no strings attached, so that they may be heavily fortified as a threat to our whole position in the Pacific. Secretary Marshall, who was at Yalta, says that he knew nothing of this agreement, although he admits that he insisted upon the necessity of getting Russia to enter the Japanese war. If anything is clear today, it is that he was completely mistaken and that the Japanese armies in Manchuria would never have been an important factor after their homeland was occupied.

Throughout the whole period, we seem to have been dominated by a complete inferiority complex to Russia. Whatever they asked they received, and gave nothing in return. This failure in foreign policy was not chance. It resulted from the character of the New Deal administration. For years they had criticized the American principles of republican government. They had favored the steady growth of a totalitarian state directing the economic and individual rights of all its citizens. Men like Henry Wallace, Vice President and Secretary of Commerce, had regarded communism as another form of democracy, perhaps a little better than our form of democracy. Communists were encouraged to support the Democratic candidate in national elections, and to take over important labor unions. Harry Hopkins, the President's adviser on foreign affairs, was extremely friendly to the Communist regime. Other men who were thus friendly were raised to influential positions in the departments. Those who expressed opposition to, or criticism of, Russia were silenced or relegated to nonentity. In fact, the Government service acquired so many Communists that President Truman a year ago requested $50,000,000 in order to investigate and rout them out. As Russia's attitude became more aggressive, Communist influence in the United States declined but even today there seem to be curious areas in some of the bureaus where opposition to Russian claims is deplored.

Just before his death, President Roosevelt for the first time invited Republican congressional cooperation in foreign policy by appointing Senator VANDENBERG as a member of the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference. The reason for this was obvious. Without Republican votes, the United Nations Charter could not be adopted. From the date of that appointment, however, the Republican Party can claim credit for most of the improvements in American foreign policy without which the present chaos would be infinitely worse. Senator VANDENBERG on January 10, 1945, saw very clearly the dangerous situation brought about by the Russian policy and the apparent determination of Russia to occupy all of eastern Europe. He proposed that if Russia abandoned that policy, we would agree to join Russia and Great Britain in a permanent occupation of Germany which would prevent a new aggression. He felt that if Russia could be certain of such a long continued occupation, it would feel safe against Germany and would not be suspicious of our using Germany to build up a new attack on Russia. President Roosevelt took copies of this proposal to Yalta, but as far as we know he never even suggested the idea to Mr. Stalin. The Russian attitude became more and more aggressive and difficult as we continued to yield on every point, if not openly, then by secret agreement of the President.

Republican influence had a substantial effect in improving the Charter of the United Nations. I do not know who wrote the original draft of Dumbarton Oaks proposals. They were based, however, entirely on force and expediency, and there was little discussion of law or justice. All power was concentrated in the Security Council dominated by the large powers and given power to act whenever it felt that it was desirable to act to maintain international peace and security. The word "justice" was not mentioned in the entire draft. Mr. Thomas Jefferson and the members of the Constitutional Convention would have shuddered at the first American approach toward an international organization.

It was through Senator VANDENBERG's insistence that the Charter of the United Nations required that all collective measures be taken in conformity with the principles of justice and international law (art. 1, par. 1); that members settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered (art 2, par. 3); that the General Assembly initiate studies encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification (art. 13). I think that the Charter still places too much dependence upon the arbitrary power given the Security Council to do whatever it may think opportune to secure peace and security, but now we have every right ourselves to exercise our veto power against any decision which does not include considerations of justice. The ground was laid for further improvement toward a world of equal justice under law, when the Charter is revised. It was also due to Republican insistence that the General Assembly was given wider freedom of debate (art. 10), and also the power to recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation regardless of origin (art. 14). We were determined that the whole proceedings of the United Nations be not dominated by the direction of the great powers.

Senator VANDENBERG participated in other conferences, particularly the conferences at Paris in 1946. It was largely his influence which finally forced the administration to abandon the policy of appeasing Russia. His experience at San Francisco and thereafter convinced him that nothing could be accomplished by adhering to that policy, and his influence with Secretary Byrnes was such that we finally committed ourselves definitely to complete opposition to further Russian expansion. Most of what had already been conceded could never be undone. It was also the influence of Senator VANDENBERG which forced through the only peace treaties which had been made with Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania. Unsatisfactory as they were, it was better that we work from a peace basis than from an armistice basis, and there can be no doubt of the improvement of conditions in Italy through the adoption of the Italian Treaty.

Again, in South America, most of the commendable policies have had a Republican origin. Senator Austin played a vitally important role at Chapultepec before the San Francisco Conference in working out the international agreement in such a way that it could be fitted later into the United Nations Charter. It was agreed that after the Charter was adopted the American nations would meet again to complete an inter-American peace agreement. State Department policy in South America after that, however, practically destroyed all of the friendship which had existed at the time of the San Francisco Conference. Secretary Braden carried on a largely unnecessary dispute with Argentina and continually postponed any further conference. It was only on Republican insistence that the Rio Conference was held in August 1947. Senator VANDENBERG was the American leader at that Conference. The results of his work and that of Senator Austin were finally made evident in the treaty between all the American nations entered into at Rio de Janeiro on September 2, 1947. Under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, 19 republics agreed that an armed attack by any state against an American state shall be considered as an attack against all the American states, and each undertook to assist in meeting the attack. For the first time an attempt was made to define aggression so that some tribunal could determine the merits of an international dispute on principles of law. This agreement may well set an example for future revision of the United Nations Charter. Without Republican insistence, guidance, and leadership this epoch-making agreement would not have been completed.

Republicans were not consulted in advance regarding the Greek and Turkish loan or the Marshall plan, involving no bipartisan policy. Though they were dubious as to the wisdom of the policy and particularly of the possibility of successful administration they, for the most part, felt that support of Greece and Turkey were in the national interest. I felt myself that the chance of our being involved in war was not great, and that some action was necessary in order to discourage Russian advance until the world could be stabilized. We did our best to impose conditions which would make the policy effective, recognizing, however, that the responsibility for its success must rest entirely on the Executive.

With regard to the Marshall plan, we have adopted the same generally cooperative attitude. I have always felt that we must continue Government aid to Europe while the threat of communism still remains substantial. It is vital to our interest that the philosophy of communism does not advance throughout the world. Certainly, it should not be assisted by the maintenance of unstable conditions which we can do something to improve.

I do not agree that there should be any economic plan for the world or for Europe. I don't think it is possible to make any such plan. I don't think this country can possibly underwrite any global plan for the world without wrecking our own economy. I do feel that these countries are handicapped in many ways and that without our aid, even assuming their own complete and effective action, it will take them many years to recover their prewar prosperity, whereas with our aid they can reach that goal much more quickly. I feel that we can supply machinery and raw materials which will enable them to put their people to more effective work and produce the exports necessary to pay for the import of food. We can prime the pump. We can help them remove bottlenecks. We can provide some food while they go to work. I agree with the theory of the plan that our aid must be contingent on their doing the best they can.

I do feel, however, that nine-tenths of their success will depend on their own efforts. It will depend on the policies of their governments whether they balance their

budgets, whether they stabilize their currencies, whether they give incentive to men to invest money in new or expanding plants, whether they give proper incentive to men to export their production. All we can do is help them to help themselves. I strongly object to the theory that they can add up their desired imports, subtract their possible exports, and hand us a bill for the difference. Secretary Marshall's claim that the appropriation must be $6,800,000,000 or nothing is about as fallacious as any argument ever presented to Congress. Whatever we give them will aid them that much, and if we give it too lavishly it can well do more harm than good. Why should a man struggle to build a new plant and produce more goods when there may be a chance several years from now to get one for nothing from the United States? Why should a government take unpopular steps to put its own house in order if it can get cash from the United States to carry it through, without critical examination of what it does with the money?

The whole success of the plan depends on the manner in which it is administered. I doubt if a wise and careful administrator can spend more than $4,000,000,000 in a year, exclusive of Germany. If he is not a wise and careful administrator and is not prepared to check each expenditure and see whether it is really producing results, we had better not give him more than four billion.

In this field the Republican Foreign Relations Committee under the leadership of Senator VANDENBERG has done a most effective job in improving the plan. They have removed the $17,000,000,000 figure from the bill, thus eliminating any implication of a commitment for that amount or any amount during the last three of the four years. By cutting down the period from 15 months to 1 year, the commitment implied at this time is reduced by a billion and a half dollars. Beyond that five billion three hundred million, I can see no moral commitment, though the momentum of the plan, of course, will carry it on at least into the second year at some additional expense. I still think this amount is too large and that it will encourage the granting of money for dubious projects which should properly be eliminated. This, however, is a question of degree and one on which men may differ, and do; but there is no difference of principle in such a question.

A magnificent job was done by the committee in completely destroying the State Department plan to have this money administered under the direction of the State Department. The Republicans in Congress, and I believe most of the Democrats, feel very strongly, and I think with justification, that the State Department has no consideration whatever for the American taxpayer or American economy. The Department seems to share the foreign view that this country is an inexhaustible reservoir of money and commodities. Sometimes I think it shares the view that we owe these European countries an annual present. Even $4,000,000,000 is not hay. Seven billion six hundred million dollars as originally proposed by Secretary Marshall (which includes $800,000,000 for the German civilian population) means on the average about $200 more taxes for every family in the United States this year payable in taxes or in higher prices or both. It means a tax of about $100,000,000 on the people of Detroit to provide their share of the proposed expense for the first 15 months. Excessive expenditures mean a drain on our resources which may further increase prices, particularly as the European countries want the very goods which are still in inadequate production. It is vitally important that this tremendous sum be administered by a hard-boiled businessman who only pays it out when he can see that results are obtained.

The committee has set up an independent administration with a man at the head of cabinet rank. He will be on an equal basis with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce in presenting his policies to the President, who will have the final decision. As far as the form of organization can control the administration, the Republican plan will do it. Let us hope that the President will appoint a man to act in accordance with the theory of that plan.

From Potsdam until today, Republican cooperation has strengthened the plans for international organization, has resisted the advance of communism and has insisted on economical and effective administration of assistance to war-torn nations. It was impossible to correct the mistakes of foreign policy committed at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, but the Republican Party can only be proud of the record that it has made.

But the ordinary day-to-day policy of the State Department is conducted without Republican participation of any kind. While the Marshall plan is justified by the restoring of production and opposition to communism, we dismantle German plants in direct opposition to the principle of the Marshall plan. We ship machinery to Russia. We distributed UNRRA supplies largely to the military advantage of Tito. Today in China we continue a policy which threatens to undo in the Far East everything the Marshall plan is trying to do in western Europe.

From the beginning we have encouraged the Chinese Communists. Every Commie sympathizer in the United States has been damning Chiang Kai-shek, whom we were taught in the early years of the war to regard as the greatest patriot in the Far East, and the greatest friend of the United States. He was the same man then with the same faults that he has now, but forces in the State Department have encouraged the propaganda against him. Yet he is today the only hope to prevent the spread of communism in China. His armies in Manchuria are surrounded, and are unable to combat the Communists, for the reason that for months we gave these armies no ammunition for their Americans arms, while the Communists have been lavishly supplied by the Soviets with the Japanese arms they captured at the end of the war.

Unless vigorous action is taken immediately, all Manchuria will be lost to communism. It is not only a tremendous agricultural area, but one of the great industrial sections of China. If communism dominates Manchuria, how can we hope that in future years we will be able to keep it out of Japan? The practicability of rehabilitation for China and the value of relief is open to question, but certainly we can provide the Chinese Government with the arms and ammunition necessary to resist Communist forces in Manchuria as we have undertaken to resist them in Greece.

This week, Secretary Marshall presented his Chinese plan to Congress and testified before the House committee. He said that China was completely wrecked by civil war, but he opposed the policy of extending vigorous military aid, which alone could bring an end to civil war. He suggested a limited amount of economic relief which, of course, by his own testimony, will completely fail to solve the problem. Secretary Marshall admitted on the stand that if the Chinese Government collapses, China north of the Yangtze River would be taken over by the Communists. He admitted that north China would present the equivalent of a second Poland under Russian domination. He admitted that under those circumstances, our position in Korea would be untenable. He admitted that Japan would probably be Communist when we withdraw. The truth is that Secretary Marshall does not like the Chinese and has no interest in their problems. For 7 months he tried to force Chiang to accept the Chinese Communists into his cabinet. He has been unwillingly forced into proposing a relief program. He says that ammunition is now being shipped to the Chinese, but obviously with no interest or vigor. Yesterday, the column of Mr. Joseph Alsop, who certainly is extremely friendly to General Marshall, said that he is deeply influenced in his views on China by a sharp personal distaste for Chiang which produces a wholly negative approach on his part to the Chinese problem.

Certainly, this whole policy is absolutely contrary to the traditional policy of the Republican Party in support of a free China and an open-door policy in China. I believe very strongly that the Far East is ultimately even more important to our future peace than is Europe. We should be at least as much concerned about the advance of communism to the shores of the Pacific through people who are ready to accept dictatorship as we are to its possible advance in Europe through nations which have a history of independence and popular government.

Another curious instance of the administration's inconsistent battle against communism lies in the loan being granted to the Polish Government by the International Bank, which is practically under American control and uses American funds. Sixty million dollars is to be given Poland in coal-mining machinery. The theory is that the Poles will ship some of this coal to western Europe. The fact is they will do with their coal exactly what Russia tells them they can do. Whether or not any is shipped to western Europe you can be certain that the majority of it will go to munitions plants at Skoda and other factories to build up the military strength of Soviet Russia. The truth is we have in our departments, both in the Commerce Department and the State Department, men at the intermediate levels who yearn for more economic planning, and others who still sympathize with Russia in spite of all that has happened.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that foreign policy is dominated by the President of the United States. He may assume the whole responsibility as did President Roosevelt. He may accept in selected fields the assistance of the minority party as has President Truman. The Republicans have had an opportunity to show not only their willingness to cooperate when consistent with their principles, but to suggest and carry through great improvements in special fields of foreign policy. If American policy, however, is to be consistent, if it is to represent first and above all the interest of the American people, if it is to stand open and unashamed for a system of freedom of the individual, of commerce, industry and agriculture and oppose consistently the philosophy of communism, then the only certain recourse is to put a Republican administration into control of all our foreign policy.

Freedom Is the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject "Freedom Is the Issue", delivered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the First National Convention of Americans for Democratic Action, at Philadelphia, Pa., February 21, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM IS THE ISSUE

Whenever the political life of a people, or their economic life is controlled for them instead of by them, they have lost freedom.

This first convention of Americans for Democratic Action has assembled because everywhere throughout America forward-looking men and women realize that the basic principle of Americanism is in our time undergoing one of its greatest tests and they are determined that freedom shall not be lost. I congratulate all who have assembled on the evidence you have given by coming here that you have enlisted for the duration in the fight to preserve liberty.

American for Democratic Action stand for the best traditions of American statesmanship. You recognize that the people come first, that the individual is free and that dictatorship, whether it is exercised in the name of the "haves" or in the name of the "have nots" is the negation of everything for which this Republic was brought into existence.

For the first 50 years after our Government was formed every President, either in an inaugural address or in a message to Congress, referred to popular government as an experiment, the fate of which resides in the hands of the people of the United States. Tomorrow when we celebrate Washington's birthday we can remember his declaration in his first inaugural that the preservation of liberty and the destiny of free government are to be considered as "deeply and finally staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people." In 1825, when John Quincy Adams assumed the duties of the Presidency, he looked back upon the history of the intervening years since Washington and asserted with gratification "that this experiment upon the theory of human rights has, at the close of that generation by which it was formed, been crowned with success equal to the most sanguine expectations of its founders." Almost three decades later another great American President made clear his conviction that ours was indeed "a new Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY THREATENED

We have lived to see the time when the experiment in popular sovereignty is once more threatened by arbitrary power. It is a more dangerous threat than ever arose before, because it is a threat of tyranny armed and strengthened by all the discoveries of science and the inventions of technology.

It is for those of us now living here in the United States to prepare for the Presidential election of 1948 with knowledge that we shall by our action shape the world in which our children and our children's children for generations to come are going to live. It will be a free world or it will be a controlled world and the lines are now forming between those who believe in freedom and those who believe in arbitrary power. We who are gathered here and the many thousands who are aligned with us throughout the United States have taken our stand upon the side of freedom. We are against arbitrary power. We are against tyranny. We are against all those who pretend to believe that they have the wit to tell the rest of us how we must live and how we must be governed.

Our first great task, therefore, is to make clear the issue which must be settled by this generation of men and women.

If we are to have a free world it will be a free world in which the individual is recognized as the only source of whatever authority, political or economic, that is to be exercised over him. That is the American system.

If, however, it is to be a controlled world the individual will not be the master of his own destiny either in economics or in politics, but will be subject to some arbitrary will that is imposed upon him.

BETWEEN TWO SYSTEMS

We stand between two systems. One of these is the authoritarian. It prevails by force. It will not tolerate the liberty of the individual. It ruthlessly stamps out any opposition to its will. It is headed back into the distant past from which civilization has so painfully emerged and this is true whether it is the authoritarianism of an alleged proletariat dictatorship or the authoritarianism of so-called "vested" economic power.

The other system and the one to which Americans have always given their allegiance is the one in which the individual is free, in which he is subject to no dictator, economic or political, in which he enjoys the right to govern himself and the right to support himself, in which by tolerance and cooperation he recognizes no barriers of race or creed, but devotes himself to the progress of all.

Democracy prevails by reason and self-restraint among all the individuals who compose society. Its very virtues are sometimes its greatest danger for democracy does not suppress opinion. It is not suspicious, it is tolerant and trustful. Democracy encourages debate. It is slow to anger. It hates war for it will not attack unless attacked, but in the modern world with all its scientific achievements, it can be overwhelmed by ruthless force before it is aware of its danger.

Thus it is that the people of America must rally as never before to the defense of the American system.

WHAT IS THE AMERICAN SYSTEM?

What is this American system which we have inherited from the past and which, in our time, has been repudiated by those who have yielded to the false dictatorship of totalitarianism. It is the system of popular sovereignty in the name of which every great advance in our history has been made. If anybody doubt that it was intended to be what Jefferson and Jackson called the government of all, or of what Lincoln described as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, let him read the Constitution itself. From the preamble to the tenth amendment its provisions constitute an assertion and a reassertion of the doctrine that the people and only the people are the source of power, that the government is an instrument to promote their welfare according to their will and that it is the constitutional duty of the Congress so to regulate commerce as to preserve the economic freedom of the people.

"Popular sovereignty," the phrase which was so common in the earlier history of this Nation, is the very heart of the American system, but upon this basis of popular control there has been superimposed in our time an economic system which is in conflict with the fundamental principles of individual supremacy. One finds little debate against the proposition that the state was meant to be the servant of men, but blind leaders of the blind are now contending in the camp of the police-state Communist and in the camp of the economic royalist that man is either the servant of the state, upon one hand, or of the economic system, upon the other, and that those who happen to be able to seize control of either the state or of the economic system are entitled by some divine right to impose their will upon their fellows.

During the current month we have been treated to the strange spectacle of hearing men who call themselves the followers of Abraham Lincoln proclaim a score of reasons why the Government should not be permitted to serve the people in economic affairs. Knowingly or unknowingly, they are willing to create the vacuum into which economic totalitarianism is always ready to rush and by assuming direction of the way men can live eventually gain control of their political rights as well.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S MESSAGE

To such persons I recommend the reading of a fragment of writing in Lincoln's hand found last July when the new Lincoln papers were opened in the Congressional Library. It is a message which all Republicans may well ponder while they are being urged to countenance the abandonment of the regulation of commerce into the hands of totalitarian industrial reaction. These are the words of Lincoln:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves the Government ought not to interfere."

The threat to freedom in our time has arisen from the fact that we have failed to follow the injunction of Lincoln who, like Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson in the early days, like Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Roosevelt in our time, have been devoted advocates of the principle that the people are entitled to use the powers of government to prevent the loss of their economic liberty. Central economic power, exercised in an arbitrary fashion by those who control the modern instruments of commerce, has been the cause of the development of arbitrary central political power in the modern world. Mussolini, Hitler, and Stalin, all three have been the direct products of the concentration of economic power. The fight for freedom begins with the fight against monopoly.

This fact was clearly seen by President Franklin D. Roosevelt who, in his masterful and penetrating message of April 29, 1938, laid before Congress a program for the establishment of economic freedom:

"Once it is realized that business monopoly in America paralyzes the system of free enterprise on which it is grafted, and is as fatal to those who manipulate it as to the people who suffer beneath its impositions, action by the Government to eliminate these artificial restraints will be welcomed by industry throughout the Nation."

COLLECTIVIST INDUSTRY

With unerring vision he pointed out that the danger of this centralization of economic power in the hands of a few giant corporations is not mitigated by the distribution of their shareholdings among a few hundred thousand people. He understood that concentrated industry is not managed by its owners, but by a few experts who are themselves employees and that the modern economic system thus has become a collectivist pattern for the collectivist state.

This is a lesson for all who believe in the democratic tradition to learn. It rises above all partisanship. It has nothing to do with political faction. It has its roots in the most sacred institutions of a free people and the members of this group of American citizens who have organized for democratic action can go forth to their neighbors and friends, Republicans and Democrats, firm in the knowledge that they are preaching the basic political doctrine to which the people of this country have adhered since the beginning.

If America is to lead the world to a higher standard of living for all peoples of all races and nations, if it is to teach all mankind how freedom can be maintained, it must begin by appealing to the instinctive belief of all Americans that our economic system,

as well as our political system, belongs to the people.

This is a campaign for Republicans as well as for Democrats for most Republican voters of this Nation, like most Democratic voters, are believers in popular sovereignty in all its aspects. Victory in this campaign depends upon our success in making it clear that the policy of economic laissez faire, the policy of tax concessions to the very wealthy, the policy of abandoning any pretense of Government regulation of monopolistic groups which has marked the 80th Congress will, if permitted to proceed, make impossible the attainment of the salutary objectives for which Democrats and Republicans alike have, in their best moments, labored.

The dominant steel companies which have now for the second time in 6 months decreed an increased price of steel will collect their tribute from Republican businessmen as well as from Democrats. They draw no party line. They regulate commerce in steel and by private decision fix the costs for all industry. A handful of big companies, acting behind closed doors, set the pattern for 140,000,000 people and the American Congress, under reactionary leadership, repudiates the concept of government function held by Lincoln and Jefferson and all other progressive American leaders by whatever party name they were called.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM ESSENTIAL

A Congress which refuses to exercise its constitutional powers to abate the spiraling cost of living and which surrenders to concentrated economic power the control of industry and of commerce, is false to every tradition of Americanism.

The old issues which have divided the political parties of America in the past have disappeared. The new issue is the fight against economic and political collectivism. They are one and the same for economic freedom is part of the same ideal as political freedom. Man cannot long preserve the right to govern himself if he is not free to support himself, and he cannot win back the right freely to support himself by yielding to Communist dictatorship.

Those advocates of social progress who are willing to compromise their convictions of individual liberty by appeasing the leaders or the advocates of political collectivism are even more dangerous foes of democracy than the frank advocates of arbitrary power. They are dangerous because they play the game of the totalitarian whose first step in the struggle for power is the attempt to create confusion. The political totalitarian sees in confusion the best instrument with which to abolish personal and democratic ideals and establish the all-powerful police state. There can be no compromise with the totalitarian. There can be no successful appeasement of him for he regards all such appeasement as only the silly and naive offerings of those who do not understand that the dictator has no associates, but only dependents, no equals, but only slaves.

The fight for democracy in the modern world begins in the economic field for it is in this field that the totalitarian doctrine of control from above first developed. We must base our fight upon the axiom of free society that the people and only the people are the sovereigns. All political organizations are created to serve them, not to rule them. Therefore no economic organization may be permitted to do that which the state itself cannot do.

We must recognize the fact that economic organization in the modern world, necessary though it is and beneficial though it can be, should never be permitted to gain control of the Government.

BIG BUSINESS SEEKS CONTROL

That battle is on right now. The stock exchange would like to control the Securities and Exchange Commission. The National Association of Manufacturers wants to direct the policies of the Federal Trade Commission. Private utilities are battling for dominance of the Federal Power Commission and are endeavoring to cripple the United States Bureau of Reclamation as an instrument of public power. Wall Street would like to take over control of credit. In short, concentrated business aspires to exercise the power to regulate commerce in its own interest, a power which, by the Constitution, was granted to the Congress of the United States to be exercised in the public interest.

Neither government nor monopoly should have the power to control the people. Government does have the power to regulate commerce, for the drafters of the Constitution placed that power in the Congress, but monopoly should have neither the power to control nor the power to regulate the affairs of the people.

As Americans for democratic action, we must first of all recognize the difference between the individual who is the creature of God and the economic organization which is only the creature of man. We must recognize that the people, through their Government, in self-protection must lay down the rule of order which the organization must observe.

We must recognize that we cannot safely permit economic concentration to proceed further than it has already gone. The end will only be the destruction of both economic and political freedom in the erection of the totalitarian state.

We must recognize that the road to social progress and to the establishment of prosperity is the road to the establishment and to the maintenance of economic opportunity. This road can be opened only by strict adherence to the antitrust laws, by the stimulation of investment in free competitive enterprise, and by the taxation of excess profits.

The people of America will not surrender the powers of government to those who abuse liberty by indulging in economic exploitation. Neither will they abandon their devotion to world peace by surrendering, upon the one hand, to the isolationist who does not realize that American genius has made the world so small that no people can isolate themselves, nor, upon the other, to the blind leaders of the blind who do not recognize that the prevention of the recovery of the people of western Europe would be the prelude to the triumph of totalitarian communism.

Now, for the second time in this century, the people of the United States have the opportunity to lead the world to peace. After World War I, we were turned aside by isolationists who, attacking the League of Nations first by indirection and deceit, finally prevented our adherence. As a consequence, mankind drifted into World War II.

ISOLATIONIST AND VISIONARY FOES OF PEACE

The price of that mistake was the sacrifice of the lives of more than 300,000 young Americans. Who can predict how many more hundreds of thousands will pay with their lives if the people of the United States should now fail again? We must not permit ourselves to be turned aside from the attainment of this great end so necessary to civilization either by isolationist leaders who are attacking the Marshall plan by the same indirection with which the fight against the League of Nations was launched, or by visionaries who would defeat the Marshall plan though such a failure would mean the destruction of economic freedom throughout Europe.

Those who pretend to shudder at the cost of the European recovery program are closing their eyes to some simple facts. In 1946, before the last election, the Seventy-ninth Congress rescinded war appropriations amounting to more than $63,000,000,000. Those were funds which had been appropriated without a dissenting voice for purposes of war. Had the conflict continued those $63,000,000,000 would have been expended for purposes of destruction within a period of 6 months, and no one in the United States would have hesitated at the expenditure.

Now we are asked to spend $17,000,000,000 for purposes of peace over a period of 4 years. Compare $17,000,000,000 which would be expended for reconstruction and rehabilitation in a constructive program during 4 years with $63,000,000,000 to be expended in 6 months to destroy all productive capacity as well as life itself. Shall we hesitate to spend for the restoration of the world one-third of the sum we were prepared to spend to destroy?

We are offered the choice of working for peace or of once more permitting ourselves to drift helplessly into war. The isolationist who does not recognize that American genius has made the world so small that no nation can live unto itself alone, is no less blind than the naive visionary who would keep the democratic peoples of western Europe in nonproductive misery while the police state with military and economic preparation lays its plans to erase both economic and political freedom throughout the world.

This is the challenge that is presented to those of you who have assembled as Americans for democratic action. Action is the word! Action! For freedom and liberty both in the field of government and in the field of peace.

The Heritage of John Wesley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Christian Advocate, Methodism's church-wide newspaper, in its issue of October 9, 1947, carried an article prepared by me entitled "The Heritage of John Wesley." The Alabama Christian Advocate, the official organ of the Alabama and North Alabama Conferences of the Methodist Church, carried the article in its issue of February 12, 1948. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HERITAGE OF JOHN WESLEY

(By Hon. LISTER HILL, of Alabama)

Sometimes I wonder whether we Methodists fully realize the heritage John Wesley left us. He was not only the foremost evangelist of modern times, and the founder of a mighty church which stands today as the shadow of a great rock in a weary world, but his gospel carried an influence far beyond his own faith.

His teachings brought light and hope to millions in his day who never heard of Methodism. His burning evangelism kindled vital reforms in other churches at the same time it drew millions into his own.

He lifted up a whole nation from moral degradation.

He awakened and challenged man's sense of responsibility for his brother.

And through the religious democracy of his gospel he inspired political democracy, the democracy upon which our Nation is built and the strength of the English-speaking peoples.

The heritage of John Wesley is still a living force, an abiding inspiration. The face of the world has changed, but his truths are eternal.

When Wesley rode across England on horseback carrying the word of life to the people, there was no atomic energy, no radios, no railroads, no steamboats. Even matches were unknown.

Science has moved far and swiftly since that day, until now the divine secret of the atom has been given man. But, for all its machines, the world we live in is still a world of men. The revelation Wesley brought to the people of his century is today the source of spiritual inspiration to all men.

Let us recall that in the middle of the eighteenth century the established church in England had sunk into moral lethargy. The fox-hunting parson and the absentee rector, attached to the nobility and the wealthy, devoted themselves largely to pleasure and material pursuits. Their concern was not with men's souls, certainly not with the souls of the common people.

By the time of Wesley's death his reform movement had served to cleanse the Church of England. For more than 150 years the religious life of that land has been vital and wholesome, and an influence for good in the affairs of all the world.

When Wesley began his ministry he found the English people of all classes sunk into almost helpless depravity. The fire of his evangelism aroused a moral enthusiasm which swept the nation. Through the pestholes of the cities and the primitive dwellings of the country his word caught the imagination of the people. Miners, workers, farm tenants bound for a lifetime to the same acres caught Wesley's vision. They became conscious of their manhood and jealous of its honor.

Life became to them something more than a sordid struggle for a bare existence. It assumed the dignity and sublimity of a great adventure of the soul. The people were lifted out of their depravity and started on the long journey to spiritual enlightenment.

The fervor of Wesley's gospel also stirred the nation's conscience. He was moved to anger by the callousness among civil officials and the upper classes to the conditions that existed among the common people. He knew that poverty brought moral decay.

In the cities of the time the poor lived in misery and want. Most of the labor was done in the "home factory" at viciously low wages. Women and children did much of the work. Coal miners worked beyond dawn-to-dusk for a pittance which could not give their families the necessities of life. Agricultural workers were treated more like beasts than human beings.

Wesley poured out the vials of his wrath upon those who prospered on the people's wretchedness. The whole nation was seized with compassion for the ignorance, the suffering, and the social degradation of the masses of the people. Hospitals were built, charities endowed, and refuges established for those who were helpless—physically or mentally. Sunday schools were founded for the religious education of poor and neglected children.

It was in the age of Wesley that Hannah Moore went among the agricultural workers and drew the attention of England to their poverty. John Howard began his struggles for prison reform. Edmund Burke made his great plea for the people of India. And Clarkson and Wilberforce started their crusade against the British slave trade.

Modern philanthropy and social reform flowed from the wellsprings of Wesley's evangelism. A people began to assume their responsibilities to their fellow beings.

Wesley made a further contribution to the modern Christian world. He carried over the land the gospel of universal redemption—of Christ's atonement for all mankind. His gospel proclaimed that each man possessed equal opportunity to save his own soul. The most wretched and depraved people learned from Wesley that it was within their own power to be redeemed. Men, seeking salvation, were freed from dependence upon social caste, ecclesiastical privilege, or royal favor.

The democracy of the Methodist teaching was contagious, the political institutions of the day caught it. Religious democracy lighted man's way to political democracy. The revelation of spiritual freedom created a passionate desire in the hearts of the English people for freedom from political bondage—for equal opportunity to achieve knowledge, place or power. Wesley's doctrine that men equal before God should be equal before their fellow men made him a founder and prophet of present-day democracy.

As we turn from a reading of John Wesley's life and times, we look upon a world which still has hunger and cold, fear and want. Millions over the globe face death from malnutrition and disease. The physical degradation Wesley fought still impedes the way to Christian peace in the world. If men are to dwel together in peace, there cannot be hunger in the midst of plenty, brotherhood in a world of distrust.

We have joined in setting up the machinery for achieving world peace—the United Nations. Into this family of nations America must carry the gospel of Wesley: All men are brothers; all men are equal in the eyes of God.

We Methodists must not forget that we share as individuals in the heritage of John Wesley. As he brought the word to the poor and oppressed despite threats and persecution and stoning by the mob, so must we practice his gospel in our daily lives. Each of us must make Wesley's teachings a living force within us, sharing God's beneficence through charities and good works. Each of us must do all we can, without counting too much the cost to ourselves, to right moral wrongs and correct the social injustices of our own day.

The goals of John Wesley must be our goals.

Decent housing to replace the slums of today, breeding ground of disease and crime and juvenile delinquency.

Commerce without exploitation so that men may receive just rewards for their toil.

Adequate education for our children so that they may grow up to be useful citizens.

On the farm and in the city, the opportunity for a decent American standard of living for all our people.

We must demonstrate the everlasting truths of the Christianity we profess and on which our democracy is built.

There is still a long road ahead. But Wesley's teachings yet burn in the hearts of men. Lasting peace and happiness can be won if we follow the Christian way.

Regulation of the Steel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Steel Industry Asking for Regulation," issued today by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL INDUSTRY ASKING FOR REGULATION

The action of the steel industry in announcing a second huge increase of prices within the past 6 months indicates that United States Steel has established a virtual monopoly in the industry upon which all little and local business and all consumers are dependent. By their indefensible action they are virtually asking Congress to declare the steel industry a public utility. Immediate remedies which are absolutely essential in the public interest are the adoption of an excess-profits tax and an appropriation sufficient to enable the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a thorough-going investigation into the big industry pricing policies.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION PROBE

The House of Representatives in acting upon the independent offices appropriation bill this year eliminated an appropriation of $185,000 requested by the Federal Trade Commission and the Bureau of the Budget to throw the spotlight of publicity on the methods used by the managers of big business to drive prices up and exploit the public.

I am introducing an amendment to the appropriation bill to restore the full amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

This is necessary because it is quite evident that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report which will allow some of the spokesmen for big steel to attempt to whitewash themselves next Thursday is not prepared to carry on the investigation which the facts demand.

No preliminary study has been made by the staff of the joint committee with respect to the activities of national interstate business in the pricing field, although it has been clear that interstate corporations have been making the greatest profits in history under the extortionate prices they have maintained. This is particularly true of steel, and when the joint committee goes into its steel session on Thursday, it will not have the benefit of any information gathered by its own staff.

Months ago it became apparent to the Small Business Committee that action in the case of steel was particularly necessary. A letter was written to the Federal Trade Commission on behalf of this committee, asking what the probable cost of such a study would be. The response was to the effect that it would cost about $225,000. There has been no action except the action of the House committee in cutting out the appropriation requested in the President's budget for a study of administered prices.

I am asking the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to have representatives of the Federal Trade Commission and of the Department of Justice present when the Economic Committee hearings open on Thursday. The Federal Trade Commission and the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice are equipped to make a much-needed revelation before the committee of the pricing policies followed in the steel industry.

Attention ought to be called to the fact that in August 1947 the Federal Trade Commission filed a complaint against the American Iron and Steel Institute and 101 steel producers, alleging price fixing and combination in restraint of trade. Several public hearings have been held already, but they have not received the public attention to which they are entitled. It was revealed at these hearings, for example, that during the year 1940, before war preparations had begun, whenever the Navy Department or the Tennessee Valley Authority had occasion to

buy steel products, identical bids had been submitted by the steel producers down to one ten-thousandth of a cent. It made no difference what steel company was the seller. There was no competition; the price was the same.

MONOPOLY IN STEEL INDUSTRY

Even though there are 101 defendants in the Federal Trade Commission case, the fact is that in all probability most of these defendants were compelled in self-defense to go along with the decisions of the few big companies which dominate the steel industries. They have no freedom of action, much less competition in this industry, because the little fellows stand at the mercy of the big companies which dominate the scene. The fact of the matter is that the four largest steel producers call the tune for the entire industry. As long ago as 1880 the four largest producers owned 25 percent of all American rolling-mill capacity. Before the beginning of World War I, more than 60 percent of the capacity was in the hands of the Big Four, and when World War II began, that control included about 64 percent. It is even greater now. As a matter of fact, the eight largest steel companies own approximately 80 percent of all steel capacity.

When these big fellows speak, all the others fall in line. Worse than that, seven of the eight fall into the "me, too," category because United States Steel alone has more than 35 percent of the total capacity. In other words, United States Steel is the controlling power in an effective steel-industry monopoly. Failure upon the part of Congress to act positively and speedily will only mean that these big steel companies will be confirmed in their power to turn on or off the supply of steel for all the people and all the industries of America, as well as to fix the price which all industry and all the people must pay.

These eight companies are United States Steel Corp., Bethlehem Steel Co., Republic Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., National Steel Corp., Inland Steel Co., and American Rolling Mill Co. There is every reason to believe that the American Iron and Steel Institute does the bidding of United States Steel as conveyed through this small group of eight.

It ought to be clear to the managers of big business that the action of the steel industry in announcing its latest price increase is an invitation to have the steel industry declared a public utility. Every State in the Union, every business which uses iron and steel, every worker employed in any position or industry which uses steel is now dependent upon the private decisions of these blind steel magnates who do not see that they are destroying the basis of free enterprise.

The action of the steel companies in making this most recent boost is evidence of their complete confidence that the Congress of the United States under its present leadership will do precisely what they want. That is to say, leave them alone to regulate the commerce of the country so that they may make huge profits.

EXCESS-PROFITS TAX PROPOSED

I have prepared and will introduce before the end of the week a new excess-profits-tax provision which I shall offer as an amendment to the pending tax bill.

This provision will be designed to force big business to decide either to cut prices so that little business and local business throughout the United States, as well as all consumers, may benefit, or be prepared to turn their excess profits over to the Government for application on the national debt.

This new excess-profits-tax provision will carry a sliding scale running from 50 perpercent of all profits in excess of the base rate to 100 percent, so that the choice will be inescapable. The mandate of this provision to big business will be:

"Unless you are content with reasonable profits, be prepared to reduce your prices or to pay all of your extortionate gains into the Federal Treasury to help reduce the public debt."

My amendment will allow an excess-profits credit of 135 percent of normal profits, so that there can be no allegation that reasonable profits are denied. The excess-profits-tax rate will be 50 percent on the first 5 percent above the 135 percent of normal profits, 75 percent of the amount of profits above the next 10 percent of normal profits, and 100 percent on all profits in excess of 150 percent of normal.

The Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address entitled "Your Future—the Missouri Basin Project," delivered by Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, before the student assembly, State Teachers' College, Minot, N. Dak., on February 9, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR FUTURE—THE MISSOURI BASIN PROJECT

Whether you plan to farm, to teach, or to start a business or a family in North Dakota or a neighboring State, what happens in the Missouri River Basin is of vital importance to your future, as well as that of the whole country

You've read and studied a great deal about conservation during the last few years. You have also seen the results of letting a river run hog wild during spring floods.

Some of you may even remember the drought of the 1930's when streams dried up and the soil of your home farm turned to dust and blew over into the next county, or farther away.

Because of recurrent floods and droughts, conservation has become more than a word in the Plains States. It is a way of life, of finding how to guard and use land and water and related resources so that they will multiply for the benefit of this and coming generations.

Conservation is more than contour farming; it's more than crop rotation; it's more than a sound irrigation policy.

Conservation is the sum total of measures for preserving and making wise use of our fish and wildlife, our forests, our minerals, our waters, our land. Each of these natural resources is interdependent. Denuded forests and grazing lands result in silt-burdened rivers that run amuck in flood time, wasting waters that should be salvaged for irrigation and hydroelectric power development.

The time has long since passed for merely talking conservation. Secretary Krug said recently, "If we lose our productive soil or if we fail to use it fully and properly, we are committing mass suicide as surely as if we turn loose our modern weapons of instantaneous destruction."

It is, therefore, literally of utmost importance that we conserve through prudent use our resources. Consider this: During the war we drew heavily on our natural resources capital. Our needs are still great, but if we continue to consume our reserves, careless of the future, we will be designing a catastrophe for our children.

For example, in order to preserve the fertility of our soil, we must return to it a ton of essential soil minerals for every ton used. Now, it is calculated, that about two tons of soil minerals are taken for each ton returned. One ton disappears in the harvested crop and another is lost, mind you lost, through erosion.

We must stop the waste and we must find new mineral reserves and develop them wisely. All of these things must be included in the development of our river systems, the first mature program we have architected to meet our recognized conservation needs. Our continued prosperity as a nation depends on the wise husbanding of the abundance of natural resources that are to be found in our fertile river basins.

The Missouri River Basin—one of America's greatest storehouses—contains almost fabulous riches of soils, phosphate, oil, and other nonmetallic minerals. "There is water power and enough coal here in this basin to have made a European kingdom rich.

During this critical period of world food shortages we have comfort in knowing that the Missouri River Basin is the source of many cereal grains, sheep, and cattle. In fact, this basin has been called the great American breadbasket, for here the Nation finds food to fill one-half of its cupboards and butter for about one-fifth of its bread. One-sixth of the pork, one-fifth of the beef, and a quarter of the mutton produced by the United States are raised right here in the Missouri River Valley. This is too great an American agricultural stake to risk through continued droughts and floods.

It is of national concern that the Missouri Basin faces serious economic problems, that its land resources are being wasted; its rivers are glutted with silt washed from its cultivated and grazing lands; that its people are leaving their impoverished lands to find other areas of opportunity.

An estimated 57,000 persons moved from North Dakota farms during the drought years prior to 1938. Approximately 45,000 people moved to villages and towns in North Dakota and in other States, and 12,000 established homes on farms in other States.

Some North Dakota counties, perhaps the one where you live, lost over 25 percent of their total population in the 1930's. In that same decade the State as a whole lost 16 percent of its population. In 5 years between 1930 and 1935 a total of 150,000 persons moved away from the Great Plains because their livelihood was removed by drought.

The drought of the 1930's is only one of many that the basin has endured. Back in 1890 it is said that 250,000 people were driven out of western Kansas by a series of bad years. Many returning prairie schooners carried the banner, "In God we trusted; in Kansas we busted." At that time 18,000 retreating prairie schooners passed eastward over the Omaha bridge in one season.

Dependence on a dry farm and range economy has weakened the social structure of the Great Plains States. Abandoned homes, forced sale of farms, of livestock and foundation herds, delinquent taxes, closed schools—these are evidence of a sick economy. A few years of good rain, good production, and good prices, such as have been experienced recently, should not cause us to forget; for they cannot, they will not last, and they are unable to correct the basic natural difficulty.

The Missouri River Basin project, a joint plan of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers, authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1944, is not a panacea for all basin ills, either. It can, however, cure many of the agricultural and industrial ailments that are now plaguing this region's prosperity. The Missouri Basin project has been designed to bring land and water resources of the basin into harmony; to make it possible for farmers here to make a more secure year-to-year living from their land. The project cannot prevent droughts, but it offers insurance against them and the means of safeguarding crops and livestock during long, dry periods. It offers a source of low-cost power that will lighten farm labors as well as attract new industries to the region. Those of you who don't plan to farm will have a better chance of finding a job to your liking in towns that will grow with the basin's industrial advancement.

The Missouri River Basin project will regulate the river, hold its waters in check, so that they can be used to benefit all of the people. Flood control, irrigation, hydroelectric power development, improved navigation, silt control, domestic and industrial water supplies, fish and wildlife preservation, and establishment of recreational areas—these are some of the benefits that accrue to you and to the Nation from such comprehensive basin plans.

Reservoirs will be created on the Missouri River and its tributaries in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. All of these will serve one fundamental purpose—to impound the water in periods of heavy run-off from the land and release it during periods of low stream flow.

In all cases, by impounding floodwaters, the reservoirs will reduce flood hazards downstream. Water released from the reservoirs will serve both rural and urban needs.

Irrigation is one of the most important benefits of the plan. Approximately 5,000,000 acres of land will be irrigated by the project in the basin States. Of this amount, about 27 percent, or 1¼ million acres, are in North Dakota.

Power plants will be built at many of the reservoirs to convert into electricity the energy from falling water. The fullest development of power is a basic principle incorporated in the Missouri Basin project. The plan as now contemplated includes 22 power plants, with a total installed capacity of approximately 1,900,000 kilowatts with power plants in North Dakota and South Dakota located at Garrison, Oahe, Big Bend, Fort Randall, Gavins Point, Crosby, Des Lacs, and Miller. These power plants will have a total capacity of approximately 1,500,000 kilowatts.

This is a gigantic amount of power when you stop to consider that the present power demands in North and South Dakota combined total only about 200,000 kilowatts. Some of the power will be used in pumping water for irrigation, but a large part of that block will be generated at power drops located on irrigation canals at Crosby and Des Lacs here in North Dakota and at Miller in South Dakota. Present studies indicate that approximately 1,000,000 kilowatts will be available for domestic, commercial, and industrial loads in North Dakota and South Dakota. A region-wide network of transmission lines, the main high-tension arteries of which will be built by the Bureau of Reclamation, will connect the power plants with each other, with other power systems and with consumer distribution facilities.

Good conservation practices demand that the waters of the Missouri River Basin must be used to the fullest. Flood prevention, irrigation, and power production alone do not discharge the responsibility. The Missouri Basin project plan demands more than that. Besides these beneficial uses, it calls for control of silt which glut our streams, for supply of water to domestic, industrial, and municipal consumers, for pollution abatement, for recreational development, for navigation, and for conservation of fish and wildlife. Never before has a conservation program of this magnitude been instigated by man.

The multiplicity of problems that are in need of solution before the Missouri Basin's vast store of resources can be made to serve its people are a challenge to everyone and particularly to you, to all of the young people of the Basin.

Generations preceding you have demonstrated their quality by their ability to withstand the rigors of the elements, by their steadfast determination to maintain homes and rear families despite drought, flood, and hail; by their hard work and their individualism.

I am sure that you have inherited from those ancestors the vigorous characteristics that will be required to carry the challenge of the problems. Individual characteristics of initiative and enterprise will be at a premium.

Development of the basin cannot be done overnight. Years will be required to carry out the detailed investigations. The vast Missouri-Souris unit, for example, which lies directly to the north of Minot is now under detailed investigation. The exact extent and pattern of its development will be determined only after careful soil classification, topographic mapping, economic studies, structure, and major canal lay-out plans are completed. The response of the local glacial soils to irrigation and the adaptability of diverse crops to the soils must be more exactly determined.

Your initiative and enterprise will be needed to its maximum extent in developing the farms for which irrigation water will be provided and in developing crops and adapting varieties to the 1,200,000 acres of land to be irrigated in North Dakota.

The full beneficial results from irrigation will be achieved if full integration is provided with the surrounding agricultural areas. Each irrigated acre is capable of supplementing many acres of nearby range land. In many areas an ideal enterprise is an integrated farm composed of a combination of irrigated land, dry farm land, and grazing land, with the irrigated land serving as a forage base during winters and unfavorable seasons.

Beyond the irrigation phases of the Missouri Basin project lies a real challenge to the people of the basin. The project as I have pointed out will bring about the production of vast amounts of power. Local initiative and enterprise will determine the extent of industrialization.

With low-cost power and an abundance of agricultural products, the people of this basin can well develop many regional industries processing agricultural products. They can also develop mineral resources. The basin is self-sufficient in nonmetallic minerals. To date, only a small portion of these has been used. A virtual catalog of minerals exist such as bentonite, refractory clays, gypsum, potash, phosphates, glauber's salt, arsenic, cadmium, iron, magnesium, tantalum, corundum, fluorspar, lithium, and tripoli. These are a representative few.

Coal reserves amount to 65 percent of the United States total. Of an estimated 92,000,000,000 barrels of oil in United States shales, 49,000,000,000 barrels are in the basin. About 8 percent of the United States crude petroleum output comes from the basin. The natural-gas potential is not determined, but there are indications of immense supplies.

The establishment of industries present many stubborn problems. Distances are great within the basin. Lower cost transportation and more transportation will be needed to bring the raw materials together and to transport the finished products to the consumers. Use of many resources will await the development of improved technological methods. Despite the problems, the industrial outlook for the basin is good under the influence of the Missouri Basin project.

There are those in the United States today who would stop this great resource program for fear that industrial developments here will lessen the area's dependence upon the older sections of the country for manufactured products. I have sufficient faith in the future of America to believe that we have not reached the acme of our agricultural and industrial development. There is plenty of room for extensive industrial development in the Missouri Basin as our Nation grows in economic security.

I have discussed briefly what the Missouri River Basin project can mean to this region and to North Dakota. I am personally convinced that the success of this undertaking rests upon you who will soon leave school to carry on the future activities of the basin. The greater goals, for the area and the Nation, can be attained only through hard work, consistent effort, and the youthful vision. That is your natural heritage.

Buying Good Bureaucrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, much has been said of late about the difficulty of securing men of high character and ability for positions of importance in the Government. This is a problem which justifies our serious consideration.

The Washington Post of February 11, 1948, carries a very timely article by the columnist, Malvina Lindsay, discussing this question. I think this article should be read and pondered by every Member of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUYING GOOD BUREAUCRATS—HECKLED LEADERS

(By Malvina Lindsay)

"No outstanding men or women will come to work for me," laments Uncle Sam.

"What is the country coming to?" cry the viewers with alarm. "We'll soon be completely governed by rabbity bureaucrats."

"Somebody do something quick!" shouts the public.

"I have it!" exclaims the man of the hour. "We'll pass a law—give 'em a raise of a thousand or two. No sound, high-caliber millionaire is willing to starve on $10,000 a year."

Thus it is all neatly settled, this crisis in Government executive service. For many of us would solve this problem the same way we would like to write Europe and China off our conscience—with a hand-out.

However, other reasons than money are causing able Americans to refuse executive posts, and causing many of those in such posts to leave them. Men and women highly paid by private business do not, as a rule, take governmental jobs for the salaries. Usually they are responding to calls to patriotism.

Badgering by Congress and ingratitude from the public cause many outstanding citizens to shy away from big Government jobs.

Also they cannot be sure of being backed loyally and aggressively by their superiors, or have security and stability in their work. They are in imminent danger of being made pawns of political conflict, of being thrown to the wolves personally by those who are fighting their programs. Sometimes the value of what they have done is recognized only after it has been torn down.

A case in point is that of William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Cultural Affairs, who is now receiving wide tribute for what he did in setting up an overseas information program, including the Voice of America. At the time of Mr. Benton's resignation the report was bandied about that he and Congress could not get on together, hence the paring down of his information program. But now Members of Congress, including those who were represented as clashing with him, have been praising him highly.

Members of Congress who went to Europe last summer came home enthusiastic about the foundation laid there for an information program. It is now generally recognized that Mr. Benton was responsible for getting from Congress the backing that enabled him to organize this program. The Government has continued calling on his services. He recently headed the United States delegation to the Mexico City Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. It is reported he will soon be asked by the Secretary of State to represent this country at another important world conference.

If the country is not to be run by the mercenary and the mediocre, some way must be found to create an atmosphere in Government that will attract the most capable men and women. No one can imagine a rush of volunteers to be heckled at congressional inquisitions, to be derided by an unthinking public baying "bureaucrat."

Women, of whom there should be more in policy-making governmental posts, often seem to be special game for this sort of thing. Who does not remember the punishment the first woman member of the Cabinet took? Lesser women officials frequently have to "ride the goat," suffering discourtesy and sarcasm, when presenting to congressional committees the needs of their departments.

Authorities on Government are deeply concerned about this, especially since the University of Chicago recently announced that it would no longer advise its faculty members, or graduates, to take governmental posts. A widespread education of the public is needed to awaken it and its representatives to the consequences of tearing down by misunderstanding and misstatement those it pays taxes to employ.

Government Decentralization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Friday night, February 20, 1948, I was scheduled to deliver an address on the subject of Government decentralization, over the network of the National Broadcasting Co., on the Pro or Con Program. Unfortunately, I developed a cold and was unable to appear personally to deliver my message. I was very grateful and happy that my colleague, the distinguished Representative of the first congressional district of my State, Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, kindly consented to give my message over the radio.

I ask unanimous consent at this time that the text of this message, which I prepared, and which my friend, Representative SMITH, so graciously and so well delivered, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECENTRALIZATION OR DOOMSDAY

I am going to talk to you during the next few minutes about the end of the world as we know it—the possible wiping out by war of all the progress that has been made since the beginning of recorded time. This is not a speech of idle speculation. It is not a scare message or an alarmist message. It is going to be a statement of cold fact, as I see it, in my humble opinion, and as many scientists, military men, and businessmen see it.

As you know, the end of the world, as we know it, has been something that has been discussed in scientific fiction, like H. G. Wells' War of the Worlds. It has been mentioned in talk by astronomers who have prophesied that one day the sun might explode, or some other natural catastrophe occur. Yes, this subject has been discussed, too, in children's comic books in flights of pure fancy.

OUR CHANCE FOR PEACE IF WE WILL IT

I am speaking to you now about how our world of machines and buildings and cities and culture on this little spinning planet can come to an end, because of the dread possibility of atomic and bacteriological warfare. I repeat, I am not trying to scare anybody or alarm anyone. I believe that we have a wonderful chance of preserving peace through the United Nations if all of us, particularly the Soviet Union, manifest the true spirit, the will, the intent, and the purpose for peace.

PRESENT STRAIN IN RELATIONS

But our eyes are open to the fact that international relations are severely strained. Our eyes are open to the fact that, whether or not we like to admit it, there is a possibility that man's ingenuity and inventiveness may unloose terrific forces, atomic, and other germ, in another war which could wipe out human living as we know it.

WHAT ARE WE TO DO IN UNITED NATIONS?

What are we going to do about it? We must redouble our efforts for international peace in the spirit of true friendship and cooperation. We must pray for divine guidance and direction for our faltering steps and those of other nations.

We must make sure, too, that we are adequately prepared with modern instruments of warfare for any eventuality of the atomic age. We are told that some brass hats always prepare for the preceding war rather than for future war because they are caught in ruts and in mental mires. We dare not risk the possibility of experiencing another Pearl Harbor which some of our brass hats may not be able to foresee. This means that we must decentralize government, industry, and population in the United States.

Why? Because, without decentralization, we will be ripe for a one-two punch which could end the war in a matter of seconds. The choice is ours—decentralization or doomsday. On America's fate hangs the fate of the world. If we endure, freedom will endure, and there will be no end to the world as civilized man knows it.

OUR PRESENT VULNERABILITY

Let's bear in mind these facts. Ten atomic bombs blasting Washington, New York, Detroit, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, St. Louis, Milwaukee, and New Orleans could destroy our principal agencies and offices of government, could obliterate 70 percent of our industrial facilities, kill or maim one-half of our national population and, in one terrible flash, end the world of democracy and human freedom and happiness.

All of this is possible. It is foolish to presume that the next war will be declared with months of speeches, with newspaper headlines, with a formal diplomatic break before a blow is struck.

On the contrary, in our time, two world wars have been lost by the aggressor because he failed to strike at America first with a holocaust blow. The next aggressor will not dare to take that chance. He will come like a thief in the night. • • • With the glowing arc of guided missiles hissing through the sky or the roar of clouds of planes, loaded with atomic bombs, winging down on 50,000,000 Americans peacefully asleep in their cities.

There would probably be no declaration of war—no warning. Our world could end in a horror of cities exploding into rubble. The mushroom clouds of atomic desolation would rise as tombstones above man's hope for freedom and democracy. Our world would end. And the reason for its end would be our own inert smugness and false sense of security in the oceans that surround us.

How, then, can we save ourselves? By speedy and adequately planned decentralization. It's not a military or economic cure-all; it's not a magic formula, but it will work.

WHAT DOES DECENTRALIZATION MEAN?

Decentralization means not only a physical spreading out of people away from the big cities and the centers of population. It means likewise a spreading out of concentrated economic power, of concentrated government and a universal reawakening of individual responsibility of each citizen for the common welfare.

It means, specifically, that enough factories and supply depots must be built in rural and semirural areas, away from the big cities, to insure us of an adequate supply of essential machines, airplanes, guns and bombs—in the event of our cities are destroyed by atomic attack.

Decentralization further means that the Federal Government in Washington must disperse some of its functions to small communities and to widely separated areas so that, when and if (and I pray it will never happen) the Capitol, the congressional office buildings, the War and Navy Departments, the White House, Supreme Court, and Pentagon Building are all destroyed, in a single atomic blast, our civil and military branches of government will still be able to function from decentralized secondary points.

NEED FOR ECONOMIC CHECKS AND BALANCES

The amazing thing about this whole decentralization concept is that it will have great social and economic benefits over and beyond its utter necessity as a measure of national defense.

Decentralization is important because it provides another check and balance in the American political and economic set-up. Monopoly, meaning lack of checks and balances, is dangerous wherever it exists. If we only have big business and no small business, if we only have healthy big cities but ailing small communities, it is a dangerous condition and must be corrected.

The frantic speed of city life, the crowded tenements, the high crime rates, the boss rule of many municipalities, the domination of men by machines, will all be remedied, if only in part, by decentralization. Getting close to the land, getting close to one's neighbor, getting close to one's God, means getting back to fundamental American truths and principles.

MORAL DECENTRALIZATION

We must have military, economic, political, and, yes, moral decentralization—uplifted moral standards brought about by our self-reliance rather than reliance on Government in Washington, D. C.

OTHER EFFORTS TO DECENTRALIZE

As you can see, my friends, this idea of decentralization is no flash in the pan. It is not somebody's brainstorm conceived one night and discussed the next night. Many men have been devoting years and years of intensive study to this problem. To cite but one man, Mr. Thomas Hewes, of Hadlyme, Conn., has written a stimulating book, Decentralize for Liberty, which provides possibly the most comprehensive plans for decentralization ever offered. Mr. Hewes is a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and I commend his book to your attention. Whether or not you or I agree in full detail with Mr. Hewes, the important fact for us to determine is whether or not we agree with the fundamental concept of decentralization in this atomic age and then to evaluate Mr. Hewes' plans.

I, personally, have been endeavoring to spread Uncle Sam's Government and to spread business out to the grass roots ever since I came to Washington in January 1939.

MILITARY ADVANTAGE OF DECENTRALIZATION

Decentralization, you understand, will strengthen America's hand in international diplomacy. Russia, for example, although a dictatorship, is far more decentralized than we are and has spread her government and industry over one-sixth the space of the earth. In any military emergency, we would be at a hopeless disadvantage with our bloated, congested cities ripe for atomic attack.

PROBLEMS OF DECENTRALIZING

Please don't think for one moment that I underestimate the terrific problems—administrative, financial, and others—of decentralization. But we do not have any adequate alternative to taking on these problems if we are to be adequate in our defense.

WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

Now, what are we going to do about all this? Here is what I respectfully suggest:

In your own community's organizations, start thinking, reading, talking, and acting decentralization. In your veterans' post, in your chamber of commerce, your women's club, in your fraternal group, wherever appropriate, emphasize to your friends and associates the need for decentralization for purposes of national defense.

In your talk to your legislators—and I mean city, State, and national leaders—try to point out the importance of speedy decentralization.

WHAT UNCLE SAM SHOULD DO

Of course, the Federal Government can't do the job alone, but it should pioneer in decentralizing because it is the most overcentralized octopus of all. How? Here's how:

(a) I believe that every committee of the Congress should begin to work with representatives of the Government department or agency within its jurisdiction to help lay plans to speed decentralization.

(b) The Congress should plan for decentralization of the legislative branch of Government. Yes, this might mean legislation by television, simultaneously from 30 or 40 different points in our country in case of a national emergency.

(c) Our armed services, in particular, should keep the wheels rolling. They should retrain personnel for decentralization and take the central headquarters of our Army, Navy, and Air Force out of the Pentagon Building in Washington, D. C.

(d) The Civilian Defense Unit of the Department of National Defense, which Secretary Forrestal has announced, is a very encouraging development. It should speedily mobilize the best brains in the land for adequate, practical, realistic planning on decentralization.

(e) Former President Hoover's Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch should, and I know it will, make suggestions on decentralization.

(f) The present trend of Federal agencies to recentralize, that is, to move back to Washington, should be halted and reversed.

CONCLUSION

My fellow Americans, I am grateful for your kind attention and to this great radio network for its cooperation.

There we are, my friends. The choice is ours; yours and mine.

Decentralization or doomsday.

Order or chaos.

Vigilant preparedness or smug inertia.

I know that with the fundamental intelligence of the American people, with our fundamental vision and initiative, we will be adequate to this problem.

"Without vision, the people perish," the Good Book tells us. We will have vision.

There will be no end to the world.

America shall endure under God.

Dr. Parran Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert several editorials which have appeared in the press with reference to Dr. Thomas Parran, for many years Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, who is about to retire from the Service.

The editorials follow:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 15, 1948]

DR. PARRAN RETIRES

The imminent retirement of Dr. Thomas A. Parran, Surgeon General of the United States, is occasion for some surprise and a good deal of regret. Dr. Parran has devoted his career to public health—nearly all of it, with the exception of the 6 years he served as commissioner of the New York State Department of Health, in the United States Public Health Service. To a high degree of technical competence he added enthusiasm and the capacity for dramatizing health problems in terms which the public would understand and to which it would respond. A notable instance of his ability to stir the popular consciousness of health problems was seen in his campaign against venereal disease, which admitted healing sunlight into a condition which had long festered in the shade of old taboos.

For Dr. Parran's long and successful service the Nation owes him a debt of gratitude. Fortunately, his designated successor, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, at present the Assistant Surgeon General, is also a distinguished member of the Public Health Service, who has been honored for his work in typhus control in western Europe, and who is now director of the National Cancer Institute. With the lively appreciation of the need for a national approach to health problems which now prevails, the post of Surgeon General will certainly increase rather than diminish in importance. The selection of Dr. Scheele gives reason to hope that the traditions which Dr. Parran did so much to establish will be carried forward.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of February 15, 1948]

DR. PARRAN STEPS DOWN

President Truman's decision not to reappoint Dr. Thomas Parran as Surgeon General of the Public Health Service when his term expires on April 6 could not have been an easy one to make. Dr. Parran has served so long and so well in that post that his replacement could be justified only on the most compelling grounds. It was the very length of his service, as a matter of fact, that was cited at the White House as the reason for a change.

Dr. Parran has occupied the important Federal health post for 12 years, or for three full terms. It would be manifestly unfair to his colleagues in the service to give him indefinite tenure as Surgeon General. It is sound policy to rotate the job among top-ranking officers of this essentially career service. Dr. Parran attracted the attention of the late President Roosevelt while the latter was governor and the physician was on loan to New York State as health commissioner. As head of the Public Health Service, Dr. Parran expanded to national proportions the campaign he had waged in New York to remove venereal diseases and cancer from behind the veil of tabooed subjects for general public discussion. He felt that the more the public knew about these killers, the better prepared it would be to fight them. His campaign has paid dividends in lives saved and suffering eased. His leadership in many other public-health endeavors has been outstanding.

It is fortunate that his successor, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, is one so closely identified with Dr. Parran's work and so highly regarded not only by the retiring Surgeon General but by the medical profession generally. Dr. Scheele, as Assistant Surgeon General in charge of the National Cancer Institute, has specialized in a field which, unlike that of venereal diseases, still puzzles the best minds of medical research. If, during Dr. Scheele's term as Surgeon General, as much progress is made toward ending the scourge of cancer as was made under Dr. Parran in the fight against syphilis, the Public Health Service will have even greater cause to be proud of its leaders and its record under their inspiration.

[From the New York Times of February 15, 1948]

DR. PARRAN'S RETIREMENT

Once upon a time there was a Secretary of the Treasury who decided that it was not in keeping with the dignity of the fiscal department of the Government to issue an educational bulletin for the benefit of the syphilitics cared for by its Public Health Service. When Dr. Thomas Parran was made Surgeon General of that Service this ice of reticence was broken. Largely influenced by him, the press has been discussing syphilis and gonorrhea openly for nearly 20 years. Because he was an expert in the field of venereal diseases he became health commissioner of this State and later Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. Franklin D. Roosevelt as Governor and President was responsible for both appointments.

Whatever the reason for Mr. Truman's failure to reappoint Dr. Parran, there will be Nation-wide regret at his departure from an office which he administered with zeal and distinction. His whole professional life has been devoted to the public health. Only 2 years after graduating from Georgetown University Medical School he joined the Public Health Service. By 1925, at the age of 32, he was head of the Service's division of venereal diseases and there made a remarkable record.

As Surgeon General he realized that it was far easier to deal with tuberculosis, influenza, and the epidemics that sweep the country at rare intervals than with the veneral diseases. Only a man of sterling honesty and high courage could deal with the worst of infecticus scourges by discussing them candidly in popular writings. No one man did more to reverse the traditional policy of the Treasury Department and to place syphilis on much the same basis as any other infectious disease.

It is not likely that so distinguished and useful a career has ended. Dr. Parran is still in the prime of life. That we shall hear more of him in public-health work is certain.

"F. D. Too Ill To Understand Quebec Pact"—Stimson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by Willard Edwards in the Washington Times-Herald, Tuesday, February 24, 1948.

The statement follows:

"F. D. TOO ILL TO UNDERSTAND QUEBEC PACT"—STIMSON

(By Willard Edwards)

The late President Roosevelt was so tired and unwell in September 1944, that he signed the Quebec Conference agreement to destroy Germany as an industrial state without realization of its purport, former War Secretary Stimson disclosed yesterday.

Stimson said Mr. Roosevelt himself confessed this at a White House meeting 2 weeks after he and British Prime Minister Churchill had initialed their endorsement of the Morgenthau plan.

The Quebec Conference took place 7 months before Mr. Roosevelt's death on April 12, 1945. The President was seeking a fourth term at the time with his followers insisting that his physical and mental health had never been better.

MORGENTHAU'S "BONER"

In the third installment of his wartime biography, published in the current Ladies Home Journal, Stimson's diary gave the following account of a White House luncheon October 3, 1944:

"I reminded him (the President) that he had asked me to talk with him over the treatment of Germany. He grinned and looked haughty and said 'Henry Morgenthau pulled a boner,' that he had no intention of turning Germany into an agrarian state.

"He got so affirmative to this effect that I warned him that the paper which Churchill had drawn and which he initialed (on September 16) did contain the proposition of converting Germany 'into a country primarily agricultural and pastoral in its character.'"

Stimson then read the agreement to Mr. Roosevelt.

HADN'T GIVEN IT THOUGHT

"He was frankly staggered by this and said he had no idea how he could have initialed this; that he had evidently done it without much thought," Stimson wrote in his diary.

Stimson revealed that he was practically alone in his battle against the Morgenthau plan. He termed it "the most violent interdepartmental struggle" of his Government career.

Former Treasury Secretary Morgenthau was "not unnaturally, very bitter," he wrote, and the leader of those who desired a Carthaginian peace. He found "to my tremendous surprise" that State Secretary Hull was "as bitter as Morgenthau against the Germans" but later modified his position.

HOPKINS FAVORED PLAN

The late Harry Hopkins, Mr. Roosevelt's intimate associate went along with Morgenthau and Hull so far as to wish to prevent the manufacture of steel in the Saar-Ruhr area, Stimson said, "which would pretty well sabotage everything else."

Stimson protested against "turning a gift of nature into a dust heap" and reducing the German people to the edge of poverty. Such methods, he contended, "do not prevent war; they tend to breed war."

Just before the Quebec conference with Churchill which began September 11, Stimson's diary disclosed that he was uneasy about the state of the President's body and mind.

FEARED REVOLT IN FRANCE

Mr. Roosevelt was hampered by an obsession that a revolution in France was forthcoming and "had worked himself up into an apprehension of this," Stimson wrote.

Morgenthau's ace argument at the Quebec conference was that the destruction of Germany's mines and heavy industry would give advantage to British trade, Stimson declared.

Storms of protest from the press greeted disclosure of the Quebec agreement and Stimson again pleaded his case against the plan. The obviously "tired and unwell" President then admitted that he had indorsed the agreement without knowledge of its most important terms.

Bad Weather Doesn't Stop the Rural Mail Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday. February 24, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, few of us realize how important the rural mail carrier is to the farm families on his rural route. In good weather and bad, he makes his appointed rounds and in addition to delivering the mail, is a daily contact between the farm family and the community. The average rural mail carrier is a friendly fellow who deserves and has the respect and cooperation of his patrons.

Just recently, I had the pleasure of reading a human-interest story published in the February 12 weekly Review of Battle Lake, Minn. The story was written by a Review reporter who made the rounds of a rural route with the mailman following a snow storm.

My chief purpose in bringing this story to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is to emphasize again the need for more adequate compensation and better retirement provisions for the faithful men who comprise the corps of mailmen serving the rural areas throughout our Nation.

The article follows:

"Now watch this dog," said Glen Salts to me.

I saw the animal, fine, tawny cattle dog, threading his way with exaggerated casualness through the thicket next to the road. Glen slowed his panel delivery truck to nearly a stop. The dog, with a disappointed look, slunk back into the thicket, thinking, no doubt, about the spoil-sport attitude of man.

"Can't take a chance of running over a dog," Glen said. "The kids would never forgive me."

All this came about Saturday, when, with a brisk breeze whipping up loose snow, a Review reporter accompanied a Battle Lake mailman on his rural route as a "scooper." A "scooper" is an assistant who helps a carrier dig out of drifts and through other hazards of the road.

Carrier Salts' route takes him west of Battle Lake then down through the Stalker Lake country and back. Even in the subzero cold and with a blanket of deep snow, the terrain on this route is beautiful—and doubly so in summer. But the beauty of the terrain, while appreciated by the carrier, is sloughed aside by the immediate task of getting the car through to the mail boxes. And there, as the man with chiggers said, is often the rub. Getting stuck is just something that a rural carrier accepts with the patience of Job.

"Take a look," said Glen, "at my weapons." Glen is an ex-GI who believes in preparedness against the elements, so he carries an assortment of chains, scoops, and other paraphernalia, all designed to get the mail through.

Much of the route was freshly plowed Saturday and the boss chortled with glee at the prospect of snapping mail into boxes that had been inaccessible for days.

"I've really got good people on my route," he said. "Finest people you ever knew." A few minutes later I learned part of the reason. One farmer double-timed quite a distance over the fields to warn him about the road and the plow operations ahead. "See what I mean?"

I learned, too, of the peculiar driving position a carrier assumes on approaching a mail box. He sits about halfway across the front seat and eases the car up to the box. Then with a bundle of mail in hand, he reaches out the right-hand window, unsnaps the box lid, and drops the packet.

"What," I asked, "are all those cans and jar covers I see in the mail boxes?" First one I saw I thought someone had cached a can of angleworms for fishing last summer and forgot to take it out. "Oh, those," he said. "You'll find out."

And so I did. They are used for pennies and small change for stamps when a snowbound patron has no access to getting stamps. I don't know the technicalities on this, but a carrier assumes it as part of his job. And he checks out with the patron and post office to the half cent.

A while back we mentioned snapping open the mail box and placing therein the mail. If you'll take a look at a rural carrier's right hand, you'll probably see it is chapped and scuffed. The lid often bangs against the hand—and those boxes are cold.

Snow was already drifting into the roads and it looked like some of the places would be filled by the next morning.

At one point two men came out to meet the carrier truck. As they transacted business, Iver Iverson told about his first, and only, experience with smoking. As a small lad he tried out an old pipe of his father's. He got a habit from it. A habit of never smoking. After the doctor had been called and he had recovered, he kept mum about the basic reason for his illness. "I thought I put one over on the folks by not telling," he explained. "But I noticed my father filled that old pipe with tobacco and laid it on the shelf. He didn't say a word. But I could hardly look at the thing."

All this took but a matter of minutes. Glen kept looking at his watch like a railroad engineer. "I try to keep a schedule," he said. "When the conditions are normal I can just about time it the same every day. But winter driving isn't normal. Down past Stalker there's a sharp left turn up an icy hill. Made it yesterday, O. K." But he didn't quite make it this time. He had to make a second run for it. "I was 3 inches off on that patch of ice the first time," he apologized.

As we drove along, Glen said aloud, "I wonder if my deer have gone through today." They had. There were tracks across the road leading from the woods to the field. He's seen deer there often. Not one but several.

Then, despite the cold, there was the little girl who came out to meet the mailman. "Hello, honey," said the mailman. "How are you today?" The little tyke smiled shyly, took the mail and went back to the house.

So it went—and the trip ended much on the same vein as the outset. A dog came down the road from the house. "Watch him now." The dog started, retreated, started again. Glen did the business of slowing down. The dog frustrated, ambled back to the house—a little miffed at calling off the race.

It's quite an experience, being a mailman. You have to give 'em credit.

It Can Be Peaceful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very timely article by Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., which appeared in the Worcester, Mass., Evening Gazette on February 5, 1948.

The article follows:

IT CAN BE PEACEFUL

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

We hear so much about strife and animosity in the field of labor relations that we often forget how much is accomplished on a peaceful basis. Right in our own back yard in the past month has been a good example of unheralded negotiating that has preserved peace in a big industry probably for 2 years to come.

In that time no less than 25 contracts have been signed between woolen, worsted, and felt manufacturers and the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO. Not a strike was called. Nobody evaded the Taft-Hartley law or tried to, though the union did have a clause inserted in the contract protecting it from financial damages in the case of wildcat strikes.

HOW IT WORKS

A quick history of those negotiations gives a good picture of how wage patterns are set and how collective bargaining works. Back in November the union's top men got together and decided what their basic demands on the wool and associated industries would be. They demanded raises, they said, because of the increased cost of living.

They settled on a bargaining figure of a 20 cents an hour wage increase and seven paid holidays plus a number of other demands. Then in early December they sent notices to the companies that negotiations for a new contract were beginning. This was because under the Taft-Hartley Act, 60 days' notice is required, and most of the contracts expired February 1.

Actual negotiations took about a month; that is, they lasted through most of January. In most cases the contracts weren't actually signed until shortly before the contract deadline. In the few that are still being negotiated, extensions have been granted and any wage increases finally agreed upon will be retroactive to February 1.

As would be expected, the union didn't get all it was asking for. The negotiations were no doubt helped by the fact that the huge American Woolen Co. signed up earlier for a 15-cent pay raise and six paid holidays. That pattern was followed pretty much throughout.

In every case the negotiating was carried on by officials of the company, Charles J. Auslander, regional director for the union, officials of the plant local, and occasionally one of the officers of the international union. Though it turned out that the basic pattern was about the same everywhere, each contract was worked out individually and there are some minor variations between them.

WILLING TO BARGAIN

Nobody is claiming that the companies enjoyed paying higher wages or that the union feels that now its men are as highly paid as they should be. There is no love lost between the manufacturers and the union. But on the other hand, there was a real willingness to bargain.

Sure, you can say that once the pattern was set, the companies figured that they'd have to fall in line. And true enough, most woolen and worsted companies raised their prices slightly in anticipation of the wage boost. No one will probably ever agree whether that price boost was necessary or justified. The union will continue to talk about high profits and the companies about high costs.

But just the same, the contracts were signed and work in the industry goes on. There is no trouble about Communists because the textile workers constitution won't allow a Communist or Fascist to be an officer anyway. The men still want the union, too, as is shown by the union-shop elections provided for by the Taft-Hartley Act and the contracts just signed. Of the men voting, 96 percent so far have favored a union shop, and that is 90 percent of the total membership in the shops.

As we said, there is probably no love lost. But the negotiations, both sides admit, were for the most part friendly. And labor peace was preserved for 7,500 textile workers and 25 manufacturing plants in Worcester County and part of Franklin County.

Article by Paul H. Eisenbise, of Morrill, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the following article written by Mr. Paul H. Eisenbise of Morrill, Kans.:

IS THIS THE WAY WE EXPRESS OUR THANKS?

After years of toil on the part of the American farmers, farmers' wives, farmers' sons and daughters working hard, working long hours, plowing, tilling, producing, and harvesting the food and fiber to feed and clothe our people, our armies, and our allies,

After years of sacrificing our sons on the battlefields of the world for the cause of freedom and liberty for those who would love and cherish freedom and liberty,

After years of making the best of shortages of the materials and machines they have so desperately needed to substitute for the shortage of labor to produce and harvest record-breaking crops to feed ourselves and those around us,

After years of sending food and clothing to the needy of the world and at the present time making up freedom trains with grains, etc., for the needy and suffering of the world,

After years of cooperating with God and the elements of nature to produce and feed more than we have ever fed, we get a large gift package handed us in the way of the biggest price drop for our commodities in the shortest length of time ever recorded at the Chicago Board of Trade.

Was it just a coincidence that a midwestern market receiving from 30 to 60 cars of corn daily should, a day before the price crash started, receive 261 cars? I ask again was this merely a coincidence?

Was it just a coincidence that a daily paper printed January 27, 1948, carried an article stating that the American Bankers Association urged banks to deny credit to the speculative farmer "who bins his wheat or cribs his corn purely for higher prices"?

This, according to the bankers, was an anti-inflation move.

Thus we would gather that storing grains on the farms where they are produced causes inflation, but if it's sold to the grain speculators it produces a very healthy condition. Healthy for whom?

Well, I can't say that we farmers are altogether thankful to those responsible for this sudden price crash in our commodity prices, and that's putting it mildly.

Haven't we been faithful to our charge of plowing, tilling, producing, and harvesting, when these commodities were most vitally needed?

Please consult our record of performance when it was vitally needed to maintain peace and security at home and help win the peace abroad.

Have you forgotten so soon?

As if this weren't enough to have our prices slashed as they have been the past 2 weeks, word comes from Washintgon that this is a step in the right direction.

Does this mean this is a step in the right direction to thank the American farmers for a good task faithfully and diligently performed?

Is this the new and modern way of thanking those who have been true, faithful, spent long hours toiling, sacrificing to feed our country and those around us?

It seems there has been enough uncertainty and unrest without adding more at this time.

Is this not biting the hands that have been feeding you?

Federal Aid for Education

REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the importance of education becomes more apparent with the passing years, but today the United States is confronted with a serious crisis in public-school education.

Our qualified teachers are abandoning their teaching profession for more lucrative pursuits, fewer and fewer graduates are coming from the teachers' colleges, schoolhouses are inadequate in many areas, and there are overcrowded classrooms and other disheartening conditions. Unless present trends are arrested, teaching may become a vanishing profession.

Education is a matter of national concern. It cannot be disputed that we do not have enough teachers and that many of our schools do not have proper and sufficient equipment with which to properly educate those who will direct the next generation. Education is not an activity that pertains merely to children and school teachers but has a direct bearing on all of us. Wage earners, housewives, farmers, and businessmen all share in the benefits that education affords and each individual should assume certain obligations toward it. If there are educational inadequacies in any State, the whole Nation suffers.

Fortunately, the State of Indiana, which I have the high honor to represent in Congress, has been able to keep its school system among the Nation's best although there is still room for improvement and much to be desired. But many States have struggled in vain, chiefly because they do not have sufficient resources to finance good schools for all their children. As pointed out in a recent editorial appearing in one of the leading Indianapolis newspapers, if Mississippi tried to bring its school expenditures per classroom up to the New York level, for example, the tax on Mississippi real estate—the chief source of school revenue in predominantly rural areas—would be so high as to be confiscatory.

The solution to this crisis has been offered in the form of Federal education bills pending before both Houses of Congress. As a former instructor in the Indiana public schools, a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, and a member of the bipartisan House Committee for the Support of Federal Aid for Public Schools, I believe it is the responsibility of the National Government, through grants-in-aid, to assist States in providing adequate public facilities and education standards, without exercising Federal control over education.

Legislation proposing Federal aid for education should receive immediate consideration by our Congress. The education of the Nation's future citizens cannot be ignored or slighted.

Issuance of New Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity of addressing myself to H. R. 5239 now before the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

This bill was introduced by my good friend, the Honorable FRANK SUNDSTRUM, of the Eleventh District of New Jersey, who has long been distinguished by the splendid work which he has been doing in this House.

Himself an economist—his devotion to duty and his work in behalf of good government on the several committees on which he serves, as well as on the floor of this House—has already won him the esteem of every last Member of this body.

The Sundstrom bill, H. R. 5239, provides for the recall, as well as the reissue of new currency.

It is not a so-called new money bill in any sense of the word, inasmuch as it does not change the value, void, or in any manner even impair the existing value or use of the dollar. It merely issues new bills for old, bills in identical denominations and identical amounts.

It has put one purpose—to bring out of hiding the illicit gains which have accrued to those engaged in bootlegging, black and gray markets, hoarding, and other operations—and upon which no income taxes have ever been paid.

Mr. Speaker, time after time we in this House have heard tell about the hoarding of money in foreign countries—and of the tremendous sums locked up in the safe-deposit boxes by foreign nationals.

Mr. Speaker, we in the United States, as Mr. SUNDSTROM has so ably pointed out, have a situation comparable if not more intolerable than that in Europe.

It has been stated, and on good authority, that there is at present some several billions of dollars—collected in transactions which for some reason these people did not want to disclose—or which if disclosed might be adjudged illegal by the Internal Revenue Bureau, now hidden away in safe deposit.

Many of these are ill-gotten gains. Fearful of disclosing their operations—and the sources of the revenue—the holders of the currency under question have deprived the Government of the United States of hundreds of millions in income taxes, revenue which they should have paid.

It is high time that we make it possible for the Internal Revenue Bureau to catch up with these malefactors.

The Sundstrom bill will enable that Bureau to see that these evaders are disclosed—and all legitimate revenue due on these holdings is covered into the Federal Treasury.

With the Sundstrom bill written into the law of the land the resultant revenue collected will enable us better and with greater ease to balance the annual budget—reduce the existing rates of income taxes now paid by all other classes who meet and pay their taxes. In this wise we can afford all American workers and housewives further relief from the currently prevailing high cost of living and government.

Change Our Presidential Election System So as To Make It Responsive to the Voters and the Political Parties—Address of Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, to Law Students of Vanderbilt University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address delivered by me to the law students at Vanderbilt University on February 11, 1948. The address is as follows:

A strong and real two-party system is the most intelligent, responsive and lasting way to operate a democracy. The party in power formulates the policy and program of the Government. The minority party criticizes and tries to improve that program.

The present system of electing a President prevents the candidates of the political parties from being truly expressive of the members of the parties. It also results in the head of the parties taking positions which are out of harmony with a large segment of the party.

Recently we have heard complaints from Republicans in the "sure" New England States to the effect that the Republican Party was not taking their viewpoint into consideration in connection with rationing, price control, and allocations. We are now hearing a loud and vociferous criticism from southern democrats to the effect that President Truman in his civil-rights message to Congress was disregarding the "solid South." Both of these accusations have substance. The truth is that Presidential candidates throughout the years have made whipping boys of those sections which are considered to be definitely in the camp of their party. That is, the Republican candidates do not feel that they have to worry too much about Maine, Vermont, Michigan, Wisconsin, etc., in formulating their platform. The Democratic candidates feel that they must appeal to the voters of the North and East in formulating their platform and in carrying out their program. The fault is with the system more than with the individuals. In the light of these circumstances let's examine our present method of selecting a President and see what can be done to make the heads of the parties more responsive to all segments which make up the large political parties.

Whenever I consider the fact that the United States has grown into the strongest and most enlightened nation in the world under our Constitution during the past 160 years, I marvel at the wisdom and foresight of the founding fathers who conceived this memorable document. It is, indeed, the most remarkable system and formula of government ever devised by human minds. The Constitution makers, however, recognized that changed conditions would require changes in our basic law and they wisely included a provision for amendments. The Constitution, as Jefferson so wisely said, must be a growing document which will embrace and guide the conduct of the people in generations to come under circumstances which could not be conceived by the founding fathers.

The greatest demonstration of popular government in our time is when 50,000,000 or more American citizens, untrammeled, with freedom of thought and action, go to the polls and determine who shall be the next President of the United States. No patriotic citizen will question the contention that such an election should be conducted under rules which will definitely result in the election of one of the candidates and that all votes should be counted by a method that will accurately and justly reflect the will of the American people. We do not have such a system today. Ever since 1824, when a deadlock threw the election into the House of Representatives, all students of government have recognized that our system of electing a President has serious defects and that they should be remedied.

Section I, article 2 of the Constitution provides that each State shall be entitled to a number of Presidential electors equivalent to the number of Senators and Representatives of that State in Congress; that the electors of each State shall meet in the State Capitol on the same day and choose a President and a Vice President.

I have joined a number of Representatives in Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, in sponsoring an amendment to the Constitution. House Joint Resolution 108 is the bill I have pending. It would provide for the elimination of the electors and that each State should be entitled to a number of Presidential votes, the same as we have at the present time, and that these votes should be divided between the candidates for President and Vice President in proportion to the number of popular votes cast in that State. For instance, in a Presidential election, assuming that the Democratic candidate secured 600,000 popular votes and the Republican 200,000 popular votes, the Federal votes for Tennessee would be divided on the basis of 9 for the Democrats and 3 for the Republicans. The votes under the amendment would be directly for the candidates and not for the electors.

Let us see the conditions that have arisen which makes this amendment necessary. The founding fathers did not anticipate political parties. They intended that the people of a State would elect a superior group of people known as electors and that these electors would use their independent judgment in selecting a President. This method was carried out for about 12 years but by 1800, with the formation of political parties, the electors became mere robots or automatons of the party will and since that time we have gone through the rather ridiculous formality of voting for electors who are not supposed to exercise any discretion in the choice of a President. This, however, places the Nation in a dangerous situation. During the last election you will recall certain Democratic electors in Texas threatened to vote for someone else other than the Democratic Party candidate. Had their threat been carried out, and if this had determined the result of the election, we might have had a very bad disturbance or a revolution in this country. There is no logic or wisdom in holding onto a system which does not represent what the people, by common practice, have decided should be done. We should make our Constitution comply with the practice which is actually taking place.

Under the present provision, if no candidate has a majority of the electoral votes, the election is thrown into the House of Representatives. The House then ballots on the three highest on the list. Each State, regardless of size, has one vote. The Jefferson-Burr controversy of 1801 almost wrecked the young Republic and resulted in the adoption of the twelfth amendment providing for separate votes for President and Vice President. In 1824 the Presidential election was thrown into the House. On that occasion the unquestioned will of the people was not followed because Jackson had a plurality of more than 50,000 votes, yet the third person on the list, John Quincy Adams, was elected President. The scandal which arose on that occasion did not do our Government any good. The Tilden-Hayes controversy in 1876 was so bitter that Congress could not decide the issue but set up a special commission and agreed to abide by its findings.

These controversies could not arise under the plan proposed in the amendment because in every instance some candidate would have a plurality of the Federal votes of the States.

There are other important and compelling reasons why this amendment should be adopted. Under the present system if any candidate wins by a plurality of one the entire electoral vote of that State goes for that candidate. The minority, therefore, has no voice in the election of the President. The result is that the Democratic and Republican national organizations fight out every Presidential election in a relatively few States. The Republicans mark off the solid South; the Democrats concede certain New England and Midwestern States will be in the column of the GOP and there is virtually no campaign carried on in those States which are conceded. The people in the solid South and those New England States do not actually participate in the Presidential election because it has already been determined which way those States will go. Under this proposed amendment every vote would count whether it was cast in the solid South or in the State of New York. The issues would be discussed in every State and every citizen who went to the polls would be actually participating in the work of our democracy.

We all recognize that the political control of States has a great deal to do with the benefits that will be secured from the Federal Government. It should not be that way but it always has and it always will be. The Democratic Party is inclined to feel that there is not much need of doing anything for the South because the South will be Democratic in any event. When the Republican Party is in power it does little for the South because its leaders feel that politically there is no need of placing improvements and benefits in our section. As a matter of fact, practically every Presidential election hinges upon the votes of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, California, and a few other States. And these are the sections that receive the special consideration in the way of patronage and public improvements from the two political parties. If the amendment I am proposing is adopted, each State in the Union would receive its fair and just share of Federal benefits.

Furthermore, the present system makes it impossible for practical purposes for a President to be elected from the South, from New England, or from the West. There are only a few States given consideration when the parties are looking for Presidential material. This amendment would change that situation entirely. It would give a candidate from Tennessee an equal chance with one from New York or Ohio.

Perhaps the most important reason why this amendment should be put into effect is that actually the United States is operated by its political parties. In other words, we have party government. It was not intended to be that way by those who wrote the Constitution, but the early statesmen of the country soon found that the best and most wholesome method of operating a democracy was on a party basis. That is, each party presents its platform and its candidate. The people choose between them. The party selected has the responsibility of fixing the policy and of administering the laws during the time it is in power. The minority party has the duty of criticism, of pointing out defects, of prodding the party in power when mistakes are made, and in that way trying to win control for itself.

From my years of experience in Congress I am convinced that a strong two-party system is the most logical, responsive, and satisfactory way to operate a democratic form of government. Those countries which have had multiple parties suffer from divided responsibility, and this is the cause of many of their failures. But it is not possible to have an effective two-party system under our present Constitution. In the South there is really only one party. In New England and many other States of the Union there is only one party, and both sections lose much of the benefit of criticism, of the incentive to get out the best possible candidates, and of seeing that their party is truly responsive to the needs and demands of the people.

There has been some criticism of this proposal on the ground that it would work to the disadvantage of the Democratic Party. It is true that under the system the Republican candidate for President would secure some Presidential votes from the States comprising the solid South; however, an analysis of the votes cast over a period of years shows that this loss to the Democratic Party would be made up by Presidential votes which the Democrats would secure from the so-called certain Republican States of the North and Northeast. If the system were adopted an end would be put to positions and platforms and messages by Presidents and Presidential candidates which play off one part of the Nation against another. The plan would certainly result in more consideration being given to all segments of the political parties by their candidates.

Another important result would be reducing the effectiveness of third parties. Third parties such as the pitiful effort now being made by Henry Wallace, do not expect to capture the Presidency. The result, and perhaps the hope of such abortive efforts is to change enough votes in a few pivotal States to throw the election to one or the other of the major political parties. This has happened several times in our history and it could happen in the coming Presidential election. If, under the proposal which several of us in Congress have made, a third party secured a few votes in the pivotal States, the result would not be of great importance. Each party would still receive its proportion of the Presidential votes and the third party would receive its small proportion. Even if Henry Wallace should take several hundred thousand votes away from the Democratic candidate in New York, the Presidential vote in New York would still be fairly evenly divided between the Republican and Democratic candidate. It is important, as I see it, to minimize the result of these third party movements. Certainly a minority party should not be able, by throwing a few Presidential votes one way or the other, to control the destiny of the Nation.

This amendment has been fully considered by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House. The subcommittee has taken favorable action upon it. I hope that the House and the Senate will at this session, submit it to the States for ratification and it may well become the twenty-second amendment. The proposal deserves your study and consideration.

Under this system we can transmute the election returns into a fair and accurate common unit of expressing the will of the Nation as the votes are counted. We can give the Nation a just system of electing a President and on a plan that will operate definitely, uniformly, and accurately under all circumstances. This proposal will make the parties responsible to all sections comprising it. It will reduce the ill results of

a third party movement. By adopting this plan we will make an important contribution to clean, efficient, and progressive government.

Steel and Henry Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes that appeared in the Washington Daily News of February 24, 1948:

STEEL AND HENRY WALLACE
(By Thomas L. Stokes)

There is a close relation of cause and effect between two recent widely publicized events in two entirely different spheres, though some persons involved apparently do not see it, which inspires this reminder.

One is the $5-a-ton increase in steel prices that will jack up prices of all sorts of essentials—for steel is a basic commodity—to whip up the already dangerous inflation.

The other is the third-party candidacy of Henry Wallace, which had its own inflationary fillip through election of an American Labor Party candidate for Congress in New York that has boosted the hope of third-party advocates all over the Nation.

Leaders of the steel industry probably are not conscious of it, but it is just such arrogant and selfish acts as this price advance in the midst of inflation that turn people to third parties and other media of protest against the established order.

The real meaning of this action, which came as so great a shock, was diagnosed by a Republican, Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, himself a manufacturer, who said bluntly that "the steel industry apparently does not yet realize the nature of the public interest in their business policies." He declared that "in an industry as fundamental as steel there are public questions involved as well as questions of private business policy."

So there are. Steel is a great empire of its own, in effect a private state that reaches far and wide in our land, affecting the lives and welfare of all of us. For that reason it is endowed with a public character and a public responsibility, whatever the master of steel may think.

It has, at times, shown itself stronger than the political Government created ostensibly by the people to direct their affairs and protect their interests. It is one of the larger units of a number of giant industrial enterprises which, taken together, are sometimes referred to as "the invisible government" or "the private government." Their influence has weighed heavily in politics and statecraft, of which fact no proof is needed.

There are those, and not nearly so leftist as Henry Wallace, who believe that such dominant industries as steel must be brought closer under regulation in the public interest. The attitude exemplified by the steel industry will be capitalized for this purpose.

Among these are Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming), who has a bill pending for Federal licensing of such giant interstate industry. Commenting on steel's price increase he said that "the supply of goods for 140,000,000 people is now controlled by a handful of industrial managers because of the tremendous concentration of economic power.

"There is no relief through competition because there really is no competition. When Big Steel acts the other companies follow in line. Six companies control approximately three-fourths of the steel production in the United States. Therefore, a basic economic decision is made for the people of the United States by a few corporate managers while Congress reluctantly assumes its duty of regulating the commerce so as to protect the people."

Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert an address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., on a program commemorating the two-hundred and ninety-fifth anniversary of the christening of the city of New York, Niew Amsterdam, under the auspices of the Citizens Committee for the Fiftieth Birthday Celebration of Greater New York and Federal Hall Memorial Associates, Inc., radio station WNYC, February 2, 1948.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Osborn, I appreciate your introduction, the gracious manner in which you have presented me to a vast listening radio audience, and before this assembled gathering of notables, here in Federal Hall Memorial Museum.

It is with reverence that I speak of the hallowed and historic ground whereon we are now standing. Here on the site of old Federal Hall, first Capitol of our country under the Constitution, General George Washington was inaugurated as President of these United States, 159 years ago this coming April 30.

Today we are here to commemorate the 295th anniversary of the christening of our city as New Amsterdam. This marked the actual struggling start of our great municipality of today, the greater city of New York, and the capital city of the world.

Director General Peter Stuyvesant of the then New Netherlands in America issued his proclamation on the eve of the Feast of Candlemas, February 2, 1653. He chose the name of the Holland seaport from which the Dutch settlers had sailed, the old Netherlands city of Amsterdam.

It is interesting at this point to note, also, that Stuyvesant, exactly 300 years ago, built part of a famous structure on this very spot in New York where we are gathered, at the corner of Wall and Nassau Streets. But more of that later.

Glancing about me here today, I am surrounded by priceless historic museum pieces, of all kinds and descriptions. They are painstakingly and well displayed, telling visually much of the thrilling story of the first years of our Nation, and of its leadership, including the famous collection of "Washingtonia" that has been assembled over the years and loaned by my friend, Messmore Kendall, past president general of the Sons of the American Revolution, and president of the Bill of Rights Commemorative Society.

That most precious document, the Bill of Rights, was finally written and enacted on this site. Here the first Presidential Cabinet was selected and met. Both the Senate and the House of Representatives convened here in 1789, and the first departments of our Government, including the Post Office Department, were created on this corner.

Around and about us today, in the museum, are priceless originals of many pertinent documents of the early days of our Republic and the authentic reproductions of many more; old prints, models of historic buildings of old New York of the revolutionary period; even the huge flagstone, saved from the floor of the balcony of old Federal Hall, whereon Washington stood when he took the oath of office as President.

Here is what might be termed a "stationary freedom train."

I am awed, and reverently so, as I stand here speaking to you.

All of you who can should visit this historic corner of our city when occasion and time permit.

In these trying days, particularly, here can be found heartening inspiration for all true Americans, for all lovers of freedom and democracy as our Government, together with that of the Netherlands, understands and interprets those frequently maligned words "freedom" and "democracy."

I believe that I am expressing the sentiments of the official representatives of the Netherlands Government who are with us today, Dr. van Kleffens, the Netherlands Ambassador, Dr. Koopmans, as consul general, in what I have said.

At the conclusion of these ceremonies, Ambassador van Kleffens will open a special exhibit of old Dutch colonial historia, dating back to the early days of New Amsterdam and the new Netherlands. This special display will continue for some weeks to come. It is a part of our citizen's committee's activities in connection with the golden anniversary celebration.

To continue with old Dutch colonial history, there is a point I had promised you all to make—that Peter Stuyvesant, too, was directly connected with this corner of Wall and Nassau Streets.

We know that he strode along on this spot in 1647, stumping along on his one good and his one copper-bound wooden leg. Walking here, he selected the site and caused to be erected a wooden palisades—a wall for the protection of the Dutch settlers from Indian marauders.

That wall, completed in 1648, just 300 years ago, crisscrossed this very land. It stretched east and west, directly across lower Manhattan Island, from the East to the North River, as they were originally named by the Dutch.

These palisades were flanked to the south by a roadway. This road came to be known as "Wall Street." The front of this structure wherein we are now assembled, the 105-year-old Subtreasury Building, faces Wall Street, as did old Federal Hall. And so Peter Stuyvesant made another historic entry on the books recording New York City's background.

This 1948 Greater New York Golden Anniversary Year presents an ideal occasion upon which to review in various ways and to impress upon the world of today our city's highlights in history. This I can say, as executive vice chairman of our citizens' committee, we are endeavoring to do. That is why we are gathered here today, believing it is vitally important that public consciousness of our traditions should be stimulated to offset the subversive, un-American propaganda now being disseminated on every hand throughout this land and throughout the world. We must endeavor to meet and to defeat such propaganda with positive presentations of democracy, as traced back through our history and brought up to date.

Commemoration of these and other events forming the background of our city's phenomenal growth is a part of our committee program for the year 1948. When we began picking various events and dates to be singled out for special celebrations, it seemed amazing that so many historic anniversaries were available, many of national interest, and not merely local.

As a former Postmaster General of the United States, I am particularly pleased that the Post Office Department in Washington approved our issuance of a series of 15 commemorative historic postal cachets. Seven in the series already have been issued. The eighth will be issued here today, to commemorate this event of Dutch Colonial days and the naming of our city "Nieuw Amsterdam." The cachet pictures Peter Stuyvesant.

To officially issue these cachets, a temporary branch post office has been built here in the Federal Hall Memorial Museum. I am standing directly in front of its philatelic stamp and cachet window, from which already more than 100,000 cacheted covers have been mailed. Only here can each cachet be affixed and only here will the special cancellation be applied, reading "Federal Hall Station, Greater New York Golden Jubilee, 1898–1948."

May I take this opportunity to state that our citizens' committee is cooperating wholeheartedly with all in the celebration of our city's golden anniversary. A citizens' committee is always important. It keeps alive our sense of civic responsibility. The temptation is always strong to expect the Government to take care of things. But, ladies and gentlemen, we of the Citizens Committee for the Fiftieth Birthday Celebration of Greater New York feel that the good old voluntary spirit is essential and vital to a healthy democracy. Let's make it work, each and every one of us.

New York State Legislature Requests Lifting of Palestine Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the New York State Legislature:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
IN SENATE,
Albany, February 10, 1948.

Whereas the United Nations has decreed that Palestine shall be partitioned into separate Arab and Jewish states; and

Whereas the Arab nations, in defiance of the decree of the United Nations, have refused to participate in negotiations preparatory or subsequent to the vote on the partition plan; and

Whereas the Arab nations have persistently followed a course of terror and violence designed to nullify and prevent the implementation of the United Nations Palestine decision; and

Whereas the Jews of the world, in a spirit of amity and compromise born of the suffering and persecution which they have endured through the ages, have gratefully accepted and agreed to be bound by the decision of the United Nations on Palestine although it does not carry out promises made to them in the Balfour declaration; and

Whereas the public press carries daily accounts of unprovoked mass Arab raids and terroristic attacks against the Jewish people in Palestine and the toll of wounded and dead Jewish people continues to mount with unabating intensity; and

Whereas the Arab attacks on the Jews threaten to disturb the peace of the world and the Jewish people should be permitted, assisted, and encouraged to arm and defend themselves against such attacks; and

Whereas this Nation, through its embargo on arms and munitions destined for shipment to the Middle East, has prevented the Jews of Palestine from obtaining the weapons of defense sorely needed by them to resist and defend themselves against the attacks of the Arabs, while the Arabs continue to secure arms and munitions from neighboring Arab and other states; and

Whereas the Honorable William O'Dwyer has openly announced his opposition to the arms embargo and has urged the Government of the United States to cancel the same and to permit the immediate shipment of weapons and munitions to the embattled Jews of Palestine; and

Whereas the people of the State of New York are justifiably disturbed and alarmed over the plight of these defenseless Jews in Palestine and urgently implore the President and the State Department to cancel the arms embargo without further delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the President, the State Department, and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully memorialized to take such steps as may be necessary to cancel the present embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to the Jewish people of Palestine who are defending the decision of the United Nations and make possible the immediate shipment of arms and munitions for the defense of the Jewish people of Palestine against the unprovoked acts of aggression and warfare of the Arabs; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York.

By order of the senate:
WILLIAM S. KING, *Clerk.*

In assembly, February 10, 1948. Concurred in without amendment.
ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

National Science Foundation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including a copy of the reasons filed by the President on August 8, 1947, when he disapproved S. 526, the National Science Foundation Act:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT

S. 526. I am withholding my approval of S. 526, the National Science Foundation bill.

I take this action with deep regret. On several occasions I have urged the Congress to enact legislation to establish a National Science Foundation. Our national security and welfare require that we give direct support to basic scientific research and take steps to increase the number of trained scientists. I had hoped earnestly that the Congress would enact a bill to establish a suitable agency to stimulate and correlate the activities of the Government directed toward these ends.

However, this bill contains provisions which represent such a marked departure from sound principles for the administration of public affairs that I cannot give it my approval. It would, in effect, vest the determination of vital national policies, the expenditure of large public funds, and the administration of important governmental functions in a group of individuals who would be essentially private citizens. The proposed National Science Foundation would be divorced from control by the people to an extent that implies a distinct lack of faith in democratic processes.

Moreover, the organization prescribed in the bill is so complex and unwieldy that there is grave danger that it would impede rather than promote the Government's effort to encourage scientific research. The Government's expenditures for scientific research and development activities currently amount to hundreds of millions of dollars a year. Under present world conditions this work is vital to our national welfare and security. We cannot afford to jeopardize it by imposing upon it an organization so likely to prove unworkable.

Under S. 526 the powers of the proposed foundation would be vested in 24 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. These members would be part-time officials required to meet only once each year. This group would in turn select biennially from among its 24 members an executive committee of 9 members and would exercise its powers through the executive committee. This nine-member executive committee would also be a part-time body required to meet only six times a year.

The Foundation would have a chief executive officer, known as the Director. He would be appointed by the 9-member executive committee unless the 24-member body itself chose to appoint him. The power and duties of the Director would be prescribed by the executive committee and exercised under its supervision.

There would be within the Foundation a number of divisions, each exercising such duties and performing such functions as the Foundation prescribed. There would be no limit upon the number of divisions which the Foundation could establish. For each division there would be a divisional committee. In the case of the Committee for the Division of National Defense, there would be a limit of 26 members, half of whom would be appointed by the Foundation and half of whom would be representatives of the armed services. In other cases, there would be no limit upon the number of members of each divisional committee and all of the members would be appointed by the Foundation. Not only would these part-time committees furnish advice and make recommendations concerning the Government's scientific research program, but each divisional committee would also exercise and perform the powers and duties of its division.

The Foundation would also be empowered to appoint commissions in various fields of

research. Three such commissions are specified in the bill, and the Foundation could appoint as many additional special commissions as it saw fit. Each such commission would consist of six eminent scientists and five members from the general public. After making a survey of public and private research already being carried on, each of these commissions would recommend a research program within its field and constantly review the manner in which such program was being carried out.

Apart from the conflicts and confusion which would result from this complex organization, the bill would violate basic principles which make for responsible government.

The Constitution places upon the President the responsibility for seeing that the laws are faithfully executed. In the administration of this law, however, he would be deprived of effective means for discharging his constitutional responsibility.

Full governmental authority and responsibility would be placed in 24 part-time officers whom the President could not effectively hold responsible for proper administration. Neither could the Director be held responsible by the President for he would be the appointee of the Foundation and would be insulated from the President by two layers of part-time boards. In the case of the divisions and special commissions, the lack of accountability would be even more aggravated.

The members of the Foundation would also be authorized to appoint the full-time administrative head of an important agency in the executive branch of the Government as well as more than 70 additional part-time officials in whom important governmental powers would be vested. This represents a substantial denial of the President's appointing power, as well as an impairment of his ability to see that the laws are faithfully executed.

The ability of the President to meet his constitutional responsibility would be further impaired by the provisions of the bill which would establish an Interdepartmental Committee on Science. The members of this committee would be representatives of departments and agencies who are responsible to the President, but its chairman would be the Director of the Foundation. It would be the duty of this committee to correlate data on all Federal scientific research activities and to make recommendations to the President, to the Foundation, and to the other departments and agencies of the Government concerning the performance of their functions in this field. Thus an officer who is not appointed by the President, and not responsible to him would be the man primarily charged with the performance of functions which are peculiarly within the scope of the President's duties; that is, the coordination of the work of executive agencies. This is especially unwise when the activities concerned are so intimately related to the national welfare and security.

There are other compelling reasons why control over the administration of this law should not be vested in the part-time members of the Foundation. The Foundation would make grants of Federal funds to support scientific research. The recipients of these grants would be determined in the discretion of the Foundation. The qualifications prescribed in the bill for members of the Foundation would insure that most of them would be individuals employed by institutions or organizations eligible for the grants. Thus, there is created a conflict of interests which would inevitably give rise to suspicions of favoritism, regardless of the complete integrity of the members of the Foundation.

It is unfair to individuals asked to accept public office that they should be put in such a vulnerable position. Moreover, colleges and universities and other organizations seeking aid for scientific research deserve the assurance that the manner and extent of their participation in a national program will be determined on a completely impartial and objective basis.

Adherence to the principle that responsibility for the administration of the law should be vested in full-time officers who can be held accountable will not prevent the Government from utilizing with great advantage the services of eminent scientists who are available only for part-time duty. We have ample evidence of the patriotic and unselfish contributions which such citizens can make to the success of governmental programs. The role to be played by such part-time participation, however, is more appropriately one of an advisory nature rather than of full responsibility. In other governmental programs of vast national importance this method is used to obtain advice and recommendations for impartial experts as well as from parties in interest. There is no reason why such a system cannot be incorporated in legislation establishing a National Science Foundation.

For the reasons I have indicated I believe that this bill raises basic issues of public policy. There would be no means for insuring responsible administration of the law. If the principles of this bill were extended throughout the Government, the result would be utter chaos. There is no justification in this case for not using sound principles for normal governmental operations. I cannot agree that our traditional democratic form of government is incapable of properly administering a program for encouraging scientific research and education.

It is unfortunate that this legislation cannot be approved in its present form. The withholding of my signature at this time, however, will not prevent the Government from engaging in the support of scientific research. Research activities are carried on extensively by various executive agencies under existing laws, and would continue to be carried on whether or not this bill became law. The only funds made available by the Congress for expenditure by the Foundation are funds which might be transferred from other agencies, thereby reducing the amounts which those other agencies could spend for similar purposes. No funds were made available for the scholarships and fellowships authorized in the bill. Thus, there would be no immediate gains which would justify accepting the risks involved in the approval of this legislation.

I am convinced that the long-range interests of scientific research and education will be best served by continuing our efforts to obtain a Science Foundation free from the vital defects of this bill. These defects in the structure of the proposed Foundation are so fundamental that it would not be practicable to permit its establishment in this form with the hope that the defects might be corrected at a later date. We must start with a law which is basically sound.

I hope that the Congress will reconsider this question and enact such a law early in its next session.

It will be remembered that this legislation passed in the Senate on May 20, 1947, and passed the House on July 16, 1947. Then, you will recall that the conference report was agreed to by both the Senate and the House. It will also be recalled that the bill as reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had received extensive consideration after long hearings.

I also include a memorandum prepared at my request by the Legislative Reference Service dealing with the basic objection expressed by the President to the administrative features of the legislation in that it contained "provisions which represent such a marked departure from sound principles for the administration of public affairs that I cannot give it my approval." I believe the memorandum is self-explanatory, and I think it is particularly interesting that the Hospital Construction and Survey Act furnished a clear precedent for this type of an approach to the problem of creating a very important Federal agency, and that it will be agreed that, if Congress and the President were correct in permitting that legislation to become law, they would be correct in approving the National Science Foundation Act as basically sound. The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM

To: Representative JOHN W. HESELTON.
Subject: Administrative provisions of S. 526, National Science Foundation bill.

This is with reference to your memorandum of January 8 requesting a report as to whether the provisions of S. 526, the National Science Foundation bill represent a marked departure from principles for the administration of public affairs.

Your memorandum also requests that the report include instances, if any, of the specific organizational features. The specific items will be dealt with first.

1. Instances where members of a commission, foundation, or other governmental agency, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, have been authorized through the main body or its executive committee to appoint a director or similar officer.

It is customary for statutes establishing governmental agencies to confer upon the head or heads of such agencies a general authorization to employ such officers and employees as are necessary in the execution of agency functions. Acting under this general authority, a number of commissions and other agencies have made provision for the appointment of an official with broad administrative powers, subject to the direction of the members of the agency.

As illustrations, the Tennessee Valley Authority has a general manager; the Railroad Retirement Board a chief executive officer; the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation an executive officer, and the Civil Service Commission an executive director and chief examiner.

In the case of the National Labor Relations Board, prior to its recent reorganization, the statute itself made provision for an executive secretary, to be appointed by the Board.

With respect to the officials designated above, great variation exists as to their duties. It would be difficult to make comparisons with the position of Director of the National Science Foundation established in S. 526. In all of the above cases the officials to whom the executive officer is responsible are full-time officials, so that the role actually played by the executive officer is probably less significant than was intended with respect to the Director of the National Science Foundation.

2. Instances "where authority has been given the foundation or main body to create divisions or small groupinga and prescribe the duties of such divisions or groupings."

Such authority is possessed by practically all Federal agencies, by virtue of its very power to "administer." It is sometimes, of course, limited by statute.

(The "divisions" provided for in S. 526 were to be administered by part-time committees. It is in this respect that they appear to be unusual.)

3. Instances "where responsibility for the administration of the law has not been vested in full-time offices."

Many such instances in the Federal Government may be cited. Among them are the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (U. S. Government Manual, 1947, 2d ed., p. 447); the Federal Hospital Council (60 Stat. 1040); the National Capital Park and Planning Commission (Manual, p. 456); the American Battle Monuments Commission (Manual, p. 395, 60 Stat. 317); the Commission of Fine Arts (Manual, p. 400); the Textile Foundation (Manual, p. 294, 298); and the Smithsonian Institution (Manual, p. 476). Note also the Federal Power Commission as set up by the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 1063). In addition, nearly all memorial commissions, etc., are composed of persons serving on a part-time basis.

While the above bodies consist of persons serving on a part-time basis, in most instances all or a majority of the members are full-time Government officials serving ex-officio, or appointed as representatives of their agencies. Exceptions are the Federal Hospital Council, which is discussed below, the American Battle Monuments Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts. The Battle Monumenta Commission is composed of "not more than 11 members" appointed by the President. The President also appoints one officer of the Regular Army to serve as its secretary. The members and the secretary serve at the pleasure of the President. Commissioned officers of the United States may be appointed members of the Commission. Members serve without compensation, except for payment of actual expenses.

The Commission of Fine Arts is the official advisory body of the Government upon matters of art. It is composed of seven "well-qualified judges of the fine arts," appointed by the President.

Comparison of the other agencies cited above with the National Science Foundation is made below.

Does the National Science Foundation bill "represent a marked departure from principles for the administration of public affairs?"

In terms of precedent, it may be said that none of the above-mentioned agencies possess all of the essential organizational features found in S. 526. Those administered by full-time boards or commissions would not seem to be comparable. The agencies administered by persons serving on a part-time basis have some but not all of these organizational features. For example, the American Battle Monuments Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts could be composed, so far as their governing statutes are concerned, by persons none of whom were full-time Government officials, thereby resembling the Foundation. However, apart from the fact that the responsibilities of these agencies are scarcely comparable to those of the Foundation, other features of their organization are quite different. The members of both are appointed solely by the President. In the case of the Battle Monuments Commission, the President also appoints as secretary an officer of the Regular Army. The members and the secretary serve at the pleasure of the President. Neither of these agencies has need for any elaborate internal organization.

It has occasionally been stated that the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is constituted similarly to the proposed National Science Foundation. Its members serve on a part-time basis and appoint a director of research. The differences, however, are substantial. In the case of S. 526, there is no requirement that any of the members of the Foundation be appointed from the Government, although some of them, of course, could be. In the case of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, however, the law specifies that the Committee shall consist of 15 members appointed by the President, and that it shall include two representatives each of the War and Navy Departments and the Civil Aeronautics Authority, one each of the Smithsonian Institution, the United States Weather Bureau, and the National Bureau of Standards, and six additional persons "acquainted with the needs of aeronautical science, either civil or military, or skilled in aeronautical engineering or its allied sciences." Thus, while the members serve on a part-time basis and without compensation, a majority of nine must be Government officials. Another difference is that the President is given full authority to make appointments. The position of Director of Aeronautical Research is not a statutory one, and he does not appear to have the authority of the Foundation Director, since the Committee also has an executive secretary, and an executive officer.

The situation is somewhat similar with respect to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The Commission is composed of 10 members, 6 of whom, however, serve ex officio, with 4 citizens appointed by the President. In the case of this agency the statute provides that the Director of the National Park Service shall be the executive officer.

The organization of the Smithsonian Institution resembles in some respects that of the Foundation. The Institution is legally an establishment, the members of which are the President, the Vice President, the Chief Justice, and the members of the Cabinet. It is governed, however, by a part-time Board of Regents who elect three of their own members as an executive committee. The statute also authorizes the Board of Regents to employ a Secretary, who is the actual Director of the Institution. The Secretary is removable by the Board of Regents. The composition of the Board, however, is quite different from that of the proposed Science Foundation. It is composed of the Vice President, the Chief Justice, three Members of the Senate appointed by the President thereof, three Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker, and six citizens of the United States appointed by joint resolution of Congress.

Another unusual organization is the Textile Foundation, created by act of Congress in 1930 (46 Stat. 539; 15 U. S. C. 501–503) for scientific and economic research for the benefit and development of the textile industry. The Board of Directors consists of the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture, ex officio, and three persons familiar with the textile industry, appointed by the President. The Board appoints a secretary. The statute provides that the Board shall direct the exercise of all the powers of the corporation. The Foundation administers a fund of nearly $2,000,000 arising out of the disposition of German dyes after World War I (U. S. General Accounting Office, Reference Manual of Government Corporations, S. Doc. No. 86, 79th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 254–257).

Attention is called to the Federal Hospital Council, established under the Hospital Construction and Survey Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1040). The Council consists of the Surgeon General and eight members appointed by the Federal Security Administrator. Four of the eight appointed members shall be persons who are outstanding in fields pertaining to hospital and health activities, three of whom shall be authorities in matters relating to the operation of hospitals, and the other four members shall be appointed to represent the consumers of hospital services and shall be persons familiar with the need for hospital services in urban or rural areas. The Council acts in part as an advisory body, but has in addition a very real measure of authority. For example, if the Surgeon General disapproves of any State plan as failing to conform to the requirements of the act, the Council, upon the request of the State agency, gives it a hearing. If the Council decides that the plan conforms to the requirements of the statute the Surgeon General must approve the plan (sec. 623 (b)). The statute also specifies that the general regulations prescribed by the Surgeon General must have the approval of the Federal Hospital Council as well as of the Federal Security Administrator (sec. 622).

It might be noted that a very close parallel to the organization provided in S. 526 is to be found in the original May-Johnson bill for the development and control of atomic energy (see H. R. 4566, 70th Cong., 1st sess.) This bill provided for an Atomic Energy Commission composed of nine members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commission was to appoint an administrator, who, subject to the direction and supervision of the Commission, was made responsible for the administration of the act. As finally enacted, however, the statute provided for a full-time Commission.

Another parallel is to be found in S. 1239, Eightieth Congress first session, providing for a National Education Agency. This provides for a National Board of Education, consisting of 11 members, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Members are to be selected for character, ability and special interest in education. It is to meet not less than twice nor more than four times a year. The Board appoints a Commissioner of Education, through whom it administers the act.

HUGH L. ELSBREE,
Legislative Reference Service.

FEBRUARY 11, 1948.

Since practically everyone admits that our national security and welfare require, as the President indicated, that we immediately direct support to basic scientific research and take steps to increase the number of trained scientists as well as develop an agency to stimulate and correlate the activities of government directed toward those ends, I have reintroduced the bill as it was reported in the conference report, so that we may review both the consideration of the legislation in the Congress last year in terms of the reasons given for its disapproval by the President and the precedents to which reference is made in the memorandum. This bill has been numbered H. R. 5532 and has been referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert an editorial with reference to the address of the Honorable James A. Farley before the Kingston Chamber of Commerce in Kingston, N. Y., on January 24.

This editorial appeared in the Kingston Daily Freeman on January 28, and is as follows:

FREE ENTERPRISE

Former Postmaster James A. Farley in his talk at the annual dinner of the Kingston Chamber of Commerce declared that some of the best brains that America's free-enterprise system has created should be drawn into the administration machinery to conduct our European aid.

We must look for management and direction to those who have successfully managed and directed the great productive enterprises in the United States. And these men ought to be drawn into service regardless of the party to which they owe allegiance, he said.

Free enterprise is not a political term. Some people seem to think that as soon as one begins to advance the idea that American business, industry, commerce, or agriculture was built upon free enterprise in this country, one must be a Republican. It was good to hear the former Democratic national chairman point to the free-enterprise system.

Free enterprise is a basic American principle, as free from politics as the Constitution of the United States itself. It came into being with the Constitution. It emerged from such episodes in American history as the Boston Tea Party and drew its first baptism of blood at Bunker Hill.

The implication of free enterprise is simple, straightforward, and honorable. It derives its rights from a natural human impulse: the right of the individual to the initiative, and to enjoy the liberties guaranteed in the Constitution; liberties bought with the blood of patriots, who pledged their lives and their sacred honor to establish these liberties.

Free enterprise has financed two world wars. It has created more wealth among some 140,000,000 people than exists in the rest of the world. It has enabled us to spend approximately $400,000,000,000 to train, equip, and mechanize an army to fight for the principles of free enterprise for ourselves, and that other people may be enriched.

Therefore, free enterprise is not a selfish system as claimed by some and it is not founded upon greed. It is based on human initiative and the right to create, share, and enjoy and spend the wealth amassed by our individual and collective efforts as a people.

As Democrats and Republicans, and especially as Americans, we will not surrender free enterprise to national socialism, communism, or to any dictatorship. Such agencies have been the downfall of governments since the beginning of history, because they fail to recognize a fundamental right—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and the right to the wealth the individual has honestly earned by creative genius and the sweat of the brow.

Free enterprise is American democracy in action.

Address by Hon. Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland, to Delaware Feed Dealers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] at a meeting of the Delaware Feed Dealers' Association held at Laurel, Del., February 13, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your business is an important factor in solving one of the most vital problems of the world today—providing an adequate supply of meat and poultry.

Efficiency in producing these vital products is more essential than ever before. It has always been important from the standpoint of the producers. It is now an important factor in the welfare of people generally that the available supplies of materials which go into this production are used most efficiently. The rehabilitation, and even the lives of millions of people, in foreign lands, are dependent upon the grains we send them. Our efficient use of the grain supplies at our disposal will determine in large measure the quantities we can send to starving populations while taking care of our people at home. I know of no group that has a more important role in the efficient use of grains than you, who supply feeds for the great livestock and poultry industries.

Scientists are constantly discovering new facts regarding nutritive requirements of various meat animals, about the value of new ingredients for feeds, and better utilization of the materials that have been in use. The feed industry is to be congratulated upon the prompt reception and welcome it has given to scientific advances, both by its own scientists and those of Federal and State agencies. Through this prompt action in the adoption of scientific principles on the part of your industry, the producers of animals, dairy and poultry products, have been enabled to increase their efficiency and profits.

It was not so many years ago that we knew absolutely nothing of the important role that vitamins play in the nutrition of all kinds of animals, as well as humans. It was not even known that such substances existed, let alone that they are essential for proper growth and health, and for the efficient utilization of other food ingredients. I wonder how long it would have been before the discoveries with respect to vitamins would have become so generally utilized in feeding animals and poultry had it not been for the services of those who have both the know-how and facilities for compounding rations containing them, such as your group possess.

The feed business of the Delmarva Peninsula is a great industry. It carries a heavy responsibility. According to the latest figures—those for 1946—Delaware broiler producers had about 55,000,000 broilers to feed, with a gross-income value of more than $51,000,000. Even that large number of broilers and gross-income value is a decided drop from the 75,000,000 produced in 1945, with a gross-income value of more than $65,000,000. I pay tribute to Delaware as the largest broiler-producing State in the Union, producing approximately 20 percent of the broilers in 1946.

The point I would make is that efficiency in production is extremely important in this great broiler industry. Major responsibility, no doubt, rests upon the producers. But I submit that the feed industry can, and does, have an important place in helping the producer to meet that responsibility. For efficient and profitable production, the producer must, of course, have the stock that can utilize feed efficiently—he must breed, or obtain in some manner the fast-growing strains of birds that produce the most meat from a given quantity of feed. At the same time, it has been demonstrated over and over again that more than half of the cost of producing broilers is represented by the feed bill. Possibly in these days of high prices feed may account for as much as 60 percent of the total cost of production. I am told that the broiler producers in Delaware spend in the neighborhood of $32,000,000 annually for feed. Certainly there is a responsibility in seeing that they get for that large sum the feeds which will enable them to provide well-balanced efficient diets for their birds.

The path of those engaged in the feed industry has been far from an easy road during the past several years. Shortages of materials and labor, abnormally fluctuating demand and costs, and the many other factors incident to wartime conditions and postwar adjustment period have all been yours in large measure. Perhaps you were too absorbed during those strenuous years in meeting the immediate problems as they arose to give a great deal of thought to the future. I believe that out of your efforts and services there have resulted lasting benefits for your industry. Ingredient scarcities and the necessity for finding substitutes for some of the commonly accepted materials has focused attention on mixed feeds to an extent that had not existed before. As someone has said, "The day of hit-or-miss and hope-for-the-best" in the rations used for poultry and livestock is past. The increased knowledge regarding the essential role of various vitamins and other ingredients in feeds has made the compounding and mixing of feeds more complex. It has made the facilities and know-how that you possess more and more necessary. The necessarily complex formula recommendations resulting from feed research are a powerful argument for the compact, time-saving value represented by the reliable, premixed, branded feed.

Since the poultry and particularly the broiler industry is so important a factor in your business, it would appear that the immediate future offers an opportunity. With the shortage of meat that exists and is predicted for months ahead, it would appear that increased supplies of poultry would help meet the shortage. While there was a recession in production of broilers in 1947, it would seem that the national situation is favorable for the industry and will lead to its stability. It is my understanding that an educational campaign has been launched in Delaware and Maryland, both private and cooperative, looking to stabilization of the business in this territory. At this particular time your industry is not only in position to render valuable service to the broiler industry in your trade territory, but at the same time will make a substantial contribution in the national food emergency.

I have referred to the poultry and broiler industry at some length because of its importance in this area. I am not unmindful that the dairy and livestock industries of the State are the source of millions of dollars in farm income and purchasers of large quantities of feeds.

Cattle and calves: 60,000 head—$1,908,000 gross income 1946.

Hogs: 34,000 head—$1,570,000 gross income 1946.

Sheep and lambs: 2,000 head—$7,000 gross income 1946.

There is one other topic about which I cannot refrain from commenting to those engaged in the feed industry. I refer to the conservation of our natural resources, particularly our soils. The wartime period placed a tremendous drain on all of the resources of this country. In the effort for maximum food production farmers were not able to give the attention to saving their basic resource that they would have given in more normal times. It is more gratifying to note, however, that the program of soil conservation launched prior to the war made substantial progress during the unsettled years. The loss of soil fertility was much less than might have been anticipated.

With the return to peace and with the continued need for full production, there is no more vital problem than saving our soils. It is by no means a problem that affects only those who live on and cultivate the land. It affects all of us, and, it seems to me, it is a problem in which your industry has as great, if not greater, stake than any other. Your sales are to those who must derive the funds from which to buy your goods from the soil. Your product contains the concentrated fertility taken from the soil by crops which must be returned in some form. It would appear no more than logical, and, I might add, self-interest, that those of the feed industry would not only maintain active interest in and support of all sound conservation programs and measures but would even be leaders in saving the resource upon which their industry, as well as the industry of their principal clients, depends.

Developments in the past several weeks, and more particularly of the last few days, in the commodity and stock markets unquestionably must have caused dealers in feeds to ask themselves, "Is this the beginning of the long-predicted 'bust'?"

All of you have felt, I am confident, that prices of feedstuffs had risen dangerously high. It was only natural, therefore, that reports of improved expectations of food production throughout the world would tend to bring a readjustment in this particular field. The desperate need for cereals throughout the world today, however, and the certainty that, even with the increased expectations for grain production due to improved weather conditions, the world will be short of food for some time to come, argue against any catastrophic decline in basic food prices at the present time.

Farmers as a whole have benefited appreciably from the high food prices occasioned by world needs throughout the war years and up to the present time. It is only natural to expect that with the European countries getting back to some semblance of normal production, and with good weather conditions prevailing there as compared to the very unfavorable weather of last year, the present high level of return to agriculture would be decreased.

In addition to the facts of weather and world need just mentioned there is, of course, the general picture of our national economy, which now is being reflected in lower stock-market prices and a growing belief that the upswing is about at its peak, with lower prices on many items almost a certainty for the months ahead.

With American industry rolling along at a far higher level of production than ever was possible even during the critical days of the war many of the shortages that plagued both individuals and industry have been relieved, to the point where future buying will be done entirely on the basis of immediate needs, with no backlog or inventory build-up to consider. I believe it is an entirely healthy situation that America so quickly has been able to accommodate itself to the backed-up needs of its citizens and of at least some phases of industry. There are so many wants to be supplied throughout the world that, once the fear of a "bust" is relieved by such readjustments as now are in process, our country can settle down with assurance, economists generally agree, to a period of prosperity far superior to any that even this most prosperous of all nations has ever experienced.

Our envious enemies abroad, particularly in Russia, are licking their chops in expectation of their predicted chaotic recession here in America. They are enraged because they haven't been able to match our forward strides. Their controlled economy does not afford the incentive or the opportunity which the American system does to individual and to industry to achieve new records of production.

If anyone needed to be resold on America and the American system, it would be necessary merely to look around the world today and note how vastly superior America's response in increased food and commodity production has been to that of Britain's and of Russia's. Even granting the disadvantages to those two countries occasioned by their severe war losses, it is immediately apparent that there are possibilities under the American system that are not offered under any other system of government in the world today.

Rubber Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, as a stanch believer in the free-enterprise system and long an advocate of measures to liquidate wartime controls, I must voice vigorous objections to pending legislation which threatens to shackle the Nation's great rubber manufacturing industry to long-term controls of a type common only to the authoritarian state. I refer to H. R. 5314, reported by the Armed Services Committee of the House on February 17. Not only in my own district, which embraces Akron, Ohio, the "rubber capital of the world," but throughout the country rubber manufacturers voice grave fears over the totalitarian implications of this measure.

For this reason, I commend to the Congress a careful study of the trenchant objections raised against H. R. 5314 in the Monthly Rubber Report by Mr. Warren S. Lockwood, of Washington, who is widely recognized both in this country and internationally, as one of the outstanding, independent authorities in the rubber field.

PERMANENT (?) RUBBER LEGISLATION

Whether the Shafer bill (H. R. 5314) becomes law in approximately its present form is a matter of prime concern to the rubber manufacturing industry, the rubber reclaiming industry, the synthetic rubber industry, the rubber trade in the primary markets of the world, and the natural rubber producing industry. It is also of direct interest to the millions of Americans who ride on rubber and the even larger number of millions who should know what Congress is doing when, in the name of national security, it takes an important step down the road of governmental regimentation.

With one vital amendment, we could swallow the bitter pill H. R. 5314 contains to our fundamental belief that the future of any industry is better assured in private than in Government hands.

We do not like the bill's inroads on the freedom of international trade. We do not like the implied acknowledgment that, in rubber, in peacetime, free enterprise cannot be trusted. We do not like the extraordinary powers granted to the President, under which, in the name of national security, almost any given production of synthetic rubber would be possible by an administrative action.

But, far and away the most dominant issue is the lack of a termination date.

The theory that once a bill becomes law, when conditions change the law can be changed, is fine. But try and change it.

What the Shafer bill proposes is, in effect, permanent legislation—a minimum of 200,000 tons of synthetic rubber in forced consumption whether or not we have an ample stock pile of natural. Sale of synthetic plants to private enterprise to produce rubber becomes next to impossible, whether or not such a sale might prove eminently desirable, during the many months Congress is not in session.

Here we see, in peacetime, a compounding by legislation theory written into law—forever, until changed—which gives the administration in power the right to tell a great American industry how to make its products, and the American public what kind of rubber products it can have.

Think of the implications of such permanent legislation. When will government in peacetime, and in the name of national security, tell us, for example, how automobiles should be made from some less critical material than steel? For certainly, of all our strategic and critical materials, rubber is one for which the future supply looks brightest, for which we have a huge synthetic plant which can be put in stand-by, for which private capital wants merely complete freedom to earn the fruits of its own research to develop a constantly better substitute material.

If we adopt this "government control necessary for national security in rubber" theory, where do we head for the materials that are really critical now?

Take petroleum, for instance. For every ton of synthetic rubber made we sacrific hundreds of gallons of 100-octane gasoline. All critical material supply problems are relative. Does anyone seriously think our rubber supply, present or potential, is more critical than our petroleum supply?

If a 2-year time limit is put on this bill, however, the rest of its provisions can be tolerated. It is not a matter of debate that we must use more than 200,000 tons of GR-S in both 1948 and 1949 in order to secure our natural rubber stock-pile goals. Probably sale of plants during this period, in any event, would be slow. National-security emergencies—on a temporary basis—provide a legitimate reason for government allocation of scarce materials and control of physical facilities. The smooth acquisition of a needed stock pile is a legitimate national security emergency.

It is only when you make a national security emergency permanent that the security from government control becomes the real national security.

Salute to Censors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Salute to Censors," from the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALUTE TO CENSORS!

(By Harlan Trott)

One way to spark public curiosity about a provocative publication is to suppress it.

It is doubtful whether the speech Marshall Adams was asked to give before the Detroit Adcraft Club would be attracting half as much attention around Washington today had Mr. Adams' prospective sponsors not canceled the invitation after finding out what was in the speech.

Mr. Adams is advertising manager of the Mullins Manufacturing Co., of Warren, Ohio, makers of kitchen equipment. Apparently, he does not entirely approve of the National Association of Manufacturers' sponsorship of a plan calling for an outlay of large sums of money by the Nation's big corporations on advertising in newspapers, magazines, and house organs to sell free enterprise.

What Mr. Adams was primed to tell the Detroit admen was that the undertaking looked like an effort to conceal faults inherent in free enterprise and to propagandize against changes to improve that system.

The Ohio advertising executive believes the NAM is still influenced by out-of-date diehards who insist that the American way of life is being destroyed.

"The American way of life isn't static and never will be," he insists. "It has undergone constant change for over a hundred years and will continue to undergo changes for the next hundred."

According to Mr. Adams' thesis, Joe Doakes doesn't have to be sold on the American way of life.

"He likes it and wants to keep on living it—and his greatest hope is that free enterprise will make it possible for him to keep on living it."

Furthermore, what Doakes wants among other things is work, social security, and decent living conditions, and so long as free enterprise provides them, he'll be for the system.

Mr. Adams thought it was worth telling the Detroit group that the NAM-sponsored advertising campaign was unsound because it aimed to persuade Doakes to "forget the still existing faults of the system by telling him how it works."

"If free enterprise is in any danger," Mr. Adams argues, "it's because of the defects in it, particularly the recurrence of depressions." He believes advertisers would do better to work out a program to prevent another depression and "buckle down to work to overcome the defects of the system."

It does not take a very long memory to recall the campaign of this kind undertaken shortly before the war which had for its slogan, "What is good for business is good for you."

Mr. Adams was itching to say quite frankly that that is a false slogan, and that it typifies a point of view that is the source of the present difficulties of the free-enterprise system.

He holds that the slogan should go the other way round: "What is good for you is good for business!"

"The same words," he declares, "but what a whale of a difference a few shifts make. And until free enterprise, as a whole, recognizes what many leaders know—that its long-pull welfare is dependent on the welfare of its customers as well as stockholders—it will be in danger."

If business really wants to sell somebody something, he suggests they try their hand at selling the shortsighted elements of free enterprise on the idea that what is good for Joe Doakes is good for free enterprise.

There is no way of telling how far afield Mr. Adams' views might have traveled in print had not the Detroit "Admen" decided not to give a hearing to this businessman's unorthodox ideas.

I think they unwittingly did him and the American free-enterprise system a good service. As any witness to a Boston bookburning knows, the worst censorship is often the best salesmanship.

In Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very pertinent article by Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw on Lithuania, which appeared in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram on February 16, 1948. Dr. Ekblaw is a professor at Clark University, Worcester, Mass., and is a recognized authority on international affairs.

The article follows:

(By Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, Clark University)

The world does not know what is happening in Lithuania now. Once the world knows, current apologists for Russia will find their tasks more difficult than ever. Their casuistries will then fall on deaf ears, for folk will be convinced finally of Russian perfidy, tyranny, and brutality. Their false objectivity will be revealed for what it truly is—subtle promotion of Russia's willful schemes for territorial and political aggrandizement and, ultimately, domination of the world's resources and man's activities.

It is 30 years since the peace of Versailles, when Lithuania became a free and sovereign state, restored to her rightful place in the family of nations. It is 30 years since Soviet Russia was forced to relinquish her throttling hold upon the Lithuanians, and other Baltic peoples. It is a little more than 30 years since the revolution laid the foundation for a new regime of implacable tyranny, treachery, and brutality, and the ruthless course for political aggrandizement and territorial imperialism which Russia has since followed. After three decades of brutalization in Russia, the idealism and humanity that characterizes Lenin's Communist teachings have been completely lost in materialism and inhumanity that mark every step of Stalin's rise to power and imperialistic policies.

The world does not know what has happened to Lithuania behind the somber, impenetrable Iron Curtain, dark and ominous as the walls of Hell itself. There is every reason to believe that behind the iron curtain tens and hundreds of thousands of good God-fearing Lithuanians have been liquidated, martyred for their patriotism, their religious faith, their steadfast resistance to tyranny. Tens and hundreds of thousands of good Lithuanians have been wrested from their families, their homes, their native haunts, for service as slaves in Siberia. It is slave labor that Russia is using to equip herself for further expansion, for further despotism, for further persecution, even for war and further conquest, and a goodly part of the slave force comes from Lithuania.

And still we temporize. We close our eyes to the injustice, we close our ears to the calls for help, we close our hearts to the suffering we know prevails behind the iron curtain. We cannot much longer ignore the tragedy that the iron curtain conceals. We cannot much longer endure the shame we feel over our tolerance of such brutality. We cannot much longer hold up our heads in self-respect and honor if we continue to associate economically or politically with a nation so devoid of humanity and sense of justice as the iron curtain shields. We should not accept the stamp of hypocrisy, the seal of selfishness, that continued toleration imposes upon us.

It is 30 years since Lithuania regained her freedom and independence. Her people were happy and prosperous in their own sovereignty, until they were again overrun by Russia. They are now being destroyed as a nation and exterminated or enslaved as a people; all that we are doing, all that we have done, is to acquiesce. Can we not do more?

Certainly we can renounce our associations with a power that betrays every right of minority peoples, that tramples upon every group that falls under its control, that ridicules our ideals and our principles—of government, of religion, of honor and justice. Certainly we can refrain from any economic or political exchange of benefits or advantages between them and us. As a man is known by the company he keeps, so is a state known by its associates; why should we accept the disgrace of association of any kind with so perfidious a power as Russia?

We must not recognize, or accede to, Russia's claims to sovereignty over the Baltic states. We must not yield to Russia's threats, her insidious propaganda, her insatiable demand for territory and power, and permit Lithuania to become only a memory. We must not, shall not, forget Lithuania and her right to sovereignty and freedom.

Oil Troubles the International Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Oil Troubles the International Waters," by Kirtley F. Mather, which appeared in the New York Times magazine for last Sunday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL TROUBLES THE INTERNATIONAL WATERS—ITS SCARCITY HAS PRODUCED CONFLICT ABROAD AND CONCERN AT HOME, BUT RESOURCES ARE STILL VAST

(By Kirtley F. Mather)

Petroleum is in many respects strategic mineral No. 1 in world affairs. Almost everywhere we look, as we try to utilize the earth's resources for the benefit of mankind, petroleum holds a central if not dominating position. Indispensable to our civilization, it is a compelling factor in relations between the major powers.

Competition for control of the marvelously rich oil lands of the Middle East is an important element in the dangerous tension between the United States and Soviet Russia. The far-flung holdings of British oil companies are fundamental to the foreign policy and economic planning of Great Britain.

Mesopotamian and Arabian oil has significant bearing upon American interest in the future of Palestine. Not even the good-neighbor policy in the Western Hemisphere can escape the implications of the presence of vast oil reserves in several of the Latin-American republics.

One reason for all this is that in many fields there is at present no adequate substitute for oil. Regardless of any developments that now seem likely with respect to atomic energy, oil will continue for many years to be a primary source of power for industrial nations. It will also be a basic raw material for numerous chemical industries.

Another reason for rivalry over oil is that it is by no means an inexhaustible resource. Our planet must be reckoned as a storehouse of such minerals as petroleum, not as a factory which generates them year by year, or even millennium by millennium. Each year we take away a few packages of the goods that remain on the shelves of the storehouse; if we keep doing that long enough, some day the cupboard will be bare. Indeed, petroleum is now being used at such a rate in relation to its total amount in the earth's crust that its complete exhaustion, from a geological standpoint, is alarmingly imminent.

Between 1859, when the first oil well was drilled in the United States, and January 1, 1948, the world production of petroleum has totaled nearly 55,000,000,000 barrels. Of this, the United States production has been approximately 32,000,000,000 barrels. The annual output, both for the world as a whole and for the United States, has increased each year since 1938 (except 1942, when America entered the war) and there is every indication that the increases will continue for the next few years. Probably the world oil production will average more than 3,000,000,000 barrels a year during the decade 1947–56.

This is significant when we note that estimates by competent geologists give a figure of slightly less than 72,000,000,000 barrels for the world's "proved" oil reserves as of January 1, 1948. It would be erroneous, however, to make the easy arithmetical calculation that the world's oil will be exhausted in 24 years. We know from past experience that the proved reserves are only a fraction of the actual reserves. But whether the fraction is one-half or one-tenth is a matter of great moment, and one that has much to do with the international competition for oil fields.

The reason for uncertainty on this point is that although geological and geophysical surveys permit the discovery of places beneath which some of the requisites of an oil field are evident, no one can guarantee in advance of drilling that oil will be encountered at depth. Not until the drill has yielded information concerning the texture and thickness of potential reservoir rocks within a favorable structure and has demonstrated the actual presence of petroleum can one begin to calculate the quantity of proved reserves for any oil field.

This broad outline of the world picture for petroleum suggests three vital questions relating to the extent and distribution of oil reserves. They are:

(1) What is the outlook on future petroleum supplies in the United States?

(2) Can the world's remaining oil be distributed equitably and peacefully, or will big-nation rivalry for it touch off a disastrous conflict?

(3) Can an adequate substitute for petroleum be found before oil resources are exhausted?

Our most immediate problems are involved in the first two questions. Both of these concern the relation between proved reserves and the total supply of petroleum in the ground. The meaning of the relationship is best illustrated by the recent history of American oil fields, where production is now at an all-time high.

Since 1936 there has been an intensive search for new oil fields in this country. The results have made possible an increase in annual production from about 1,000,000,000 barrels in 1936 to 1,890,000,000 barrels in 1947. In spite of this vast removal of oil, the proved reserves have been greater at each year's end than at the beginning of each year—with the exception of 1943, when the wartime need for steel cut into the use of steel for well casings.

On the face of it this would seem reason for optimism. But the trouble is that the curve representing additions to proven reserves rose steeply only from 1936 through 1939. Since then it has shown a definite tendency to level off. There is little doubt that the peak will be reached about 1950 and that thereafter the United States must increasingly depend upon existing proved reserves.

This somewhat gloomy forecast is borne out by detailed studies of operations in the chief oil-producing States of the Union. There the number of new major fields discovered each year has decreased steadily since 1940. The inference is plain; nearly all the large oil pools in those areas have been located. We are spending the capital provided by nature, and spending it rapidly.

The drain on American reserves is speeding the search for additional oil sources in the submerged parts of the continent, known to geologists as the Continental Shelves. A chief center of search is the submerged part of the coastal plain of Texas and Louisiana, which continues far out beneath the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. Geologically there is no reason to doubt the presence of oil-bearing salt domes there.

Despite the special engineering problems involved in this type of drilling, two wells have been completed and a number of others are being drilled at distances of from 10 to 40 miles from shore. So far, however, there has been no production in commercial quantities.

Extension of the search for oil to such submarine areas may be expected to add a few billion barrels to American reserves, but at best it will postpone by only a few years the time when American production will lag far behind American consumption of petroleum products. It is therefore appropriate to examine the prospects for meeting American needs by importing oil from other countries.

American interests control 75 percent of the nearly 9,000,000,000 barrels of proved reserves in South America, more than 40 percent of the 26,000,000,000 barrels of proved reserves in the Middle East, and nearly 30 percent of the 1.4 billion barrels of proved reserves in the Far East. Thus, if political factors are favorable, the United States may draw upon nearly as many barrels of foreign oil reserves as are presently available within its own boundaries.

But the United States does not exist in a geographical vacuum. It is but one among many nations having petroleum needs and rights.

The chief known resources of oil based upon estimates of proved reserves at the beginning of 1947, show that although continental United States possesses only a little more than 30 percent of the proved world reserves, its production has been running well over 60 percent of the yearly output.

Moreover, a graph depicting conditions 10 years hence would in all probability show a decrease in the proved reserves of the United States and an increase for most other countries. One may venture the guess that whereas the actual reserves beneath the United States are not much more than twice the amount of present proved reserves, the actual reserves in other producing countries (except Venezuela) average at least three times the proved reserves.

Most amazing is the position of Kuwait, the tiny country at the head of the Persian Gulf, whose proved oil reserves are exceeded only by those of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is also interesting to note that Iran, Iraq, and Arabia stand fifth, sixth, and seventh in the world in respect to petroleum potentialities. These all lie in the Middle East, the chief storm center of international rivalry for oil.

If present trends continue, the obvious deduction is that the United States in 10 to 20 years will be a "have not" Nation so far as petroleum is concerned. The chief "have" nations will be Soviet Russia, Kuwait, Iran, Iraq, Arabia, and the East Indies. It is no accident that practically all the potential oil fields of the five last-named countries are under the control of American, British, and Dutch corporations.

This picture of oil reserves has vital bearing on the world situation. The United States and Soviet Russia are the only two great industrial nations which at the moment have a chance to meet their petroleum needs from their own domestic production. But for us this happy situation will change in a few years; then we will be increasingly anxious to import oil from abroad.

Furthermore, most of the major industrial nations—Britain, France, Germany, the Scandinavian countries, Belgium, Holland, and Italy—cannot possibly supply their normal demands from domestic sources. On the other hand, Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, the countries of the Middle East and the islands of the southeastern Pacific are producing or could produce petroleum far in excess of their own needs. Thus, a large fraction of the world's oil happens to be in countries which at present cannot use it, while many of the countries that need oil today do not possess it.

The temptations arising from such a situation are virtually irresistible. Petroleum is "a natural" for "power politics." The political factors fall under two heads.

Less powerful nations possessing more oil than they can use, naturally desire to profit as much as possible from the exploitation of their resources by foreign capital. At the moment, the arrangements between the South American countries and the American and European oil companies have been stabilized on a basis that seems satisfactory to all parties concerned.

Regulations concerning royalties and taxes in Venezuela, for example, are fixed in such a way as to divide the profits from all operations on approximately a 50-50 basis between the Venezuelan Government and the operating companies. Similarly, the governments of certain countries in the Middle East derive a considerable part of their income from oil royalties.

All such arrangements are, however, subject to change in the future, either by revision of tax laws or through revolutionary changes in the government, such as occurred in Mexico two decades ago. Consequently, it is not surprising that the governments of the more powerful oil-seeking nations do their best to maintain friendly administrations in the oil countries.

The second political factor is the difficulty of avoiding cutthroat competition among the stronger nations which require foreign oil. As a result of the reshuffling of the political and economic cards during World War II, there are now three outstanding players in the international oil game, Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States. Their interests converge upon the Middle East, where racial and religious, as well as geographical and historic, factors provide abundant fuel for a world-wide conflagration.

Even in the event that a conflict can be avoided, are world supplies adequate to meet future world demands? The prospects are that the present rate of consumption (about 2,800,000,000 barrels a year) will soon be increased by larger consumption in countries which hitherto have not been heavy users of petroleum. For example, whereas the annual peacetime consumption in the United States is 450 gallons per capita, in Britain it is 80 gallons, in the Soviet Union 50 gallons, and for the world as a whole, outside the United States, only 15 gallons per capita.

Even so, it appears that the world reserves are adequate to meet world needs for half or three-quarters of a century. But to use the reserves in the most efficient way there must be almost complete freedom for distribution of the oil and its products from the regions of supply to all parts of the world, regardless of political boundaries. Probably this could best be attained by some sort of voluntary allotment or quota system.

The difficulties of allocation bring us to the third question posed by the oil situation—the likelihood of adequate substitutes before the oil pools are exhausted.

There are two reasons why alternative sources of gasoline, diesel oil, fuel oil and lubricants are now being sought in this country. One is the fear of political or economic barriers against the free flow of oil from South America and the Middle East when American production fails to meet American needs. The other is the fact that it is not too early to begin preparing for the inevitable day, which may come even before the end of the present century, when world production of oil will be inadequate for world requirements.

Already an appreciable fraction of the American requirements for petroleum products is being met by the condensation of liquid hydrocarbons from natural gas. A pilot plant for the synthesis of petroleum from oil shale is being completed and put into operation in Utah by the United States Bureau of Mines. Methods of synthesizing oil products from coal, developed by German scientists before and during the war, are being improved in our private and governmental laboratories.

There is no doubt that science and technology will have provided another source of supply long before the oil-pool resources of the world are exhausted. And these alternative sources are almost unbelievably abundant. In the United States alone there is enough oil shale and coal to provide the equivalent of 2,000,000,000 barrels of crude oil a year for at least a thousand years.

But such application of technical knowledge is not a simple matter. Processes now available are too expensive to permit competition with natural petroleum products except under extraordinary conditions.

Nevertheless, there is every reason to expect the gradual replacement of natural petroleum products by synthetic products in the more distant future. As supplies of crude oil are exhausted, this alternative source will take their place. And long before the oil shale and coal are used up, still other sources of energy, such as that released by nuclear fission, will be available to do the work.

Far more difficult than the technical problems involved in meeting the physical needs of humanity are the psychological and spiritual problems that retard the process of learning how to live properly in a world community. Perhaps knowledge that our small world is a world of potential abundance but of inescapable interdependence, as illustrated by such an inquiry as this concerning one typical, nonrenewable resource, may help to accelerate that learning process.

President Undermines Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House a flagrant misuse of executive power by the administration. The President of the United States and members of his official family are using their power over public buildings in order to circumvent and undermine the labor relations law.

To make the situation even more shocking, the administration is using its power not on behalf of a bona fide labor organization but to rescue from defeat one of the most notorious Communist-infested and Communist-dominated organizations, the so-called United Public Workers–CIO.

On January 5, 1948, a local branch of the UFW–CIO called an unwarranted strike against 42 Government cafeterias which are operated by Government Services, Inc., a nonprofit-semiofficial agency. The sole issue in dispute was the refusal of the officers of the UPW–CIO to sign statements under the Labor Relations Act that they are not Communists.

These officers seek to represent in collective-bargaining negotiations employees of the Government and employees working in Government buildings. Yet, Mr. Speaker, apparently they are not in a position to state under oath that they are not Communists.

Communist control of the UPW–CIO has been clearly and irrefutably established by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and by many official and unofficial organizations.

By refusing to sign the non-Communist affidavits required under the law, the UPW–CIO was automatically cut off from seeking the services of any Government agency in its strike. The National Labor Relations Board ruled specifically that the UPW–CIO was not qualified to represent any group of employees and the Federal Conciliation Service ruled that it could not lend its services unless the officers complied with the act.

These rulings were in specific compliance with the letter and spirit of the law. They were clearly contemplated by the Congress in passage of the Labor Relations Act of 1947. When that law was passed over Presidential veto, the Congress made it clear that one of the principal purposes of the act was to drive Communists from the labor movement. We had a right to expect the President to keep his promise to comply with and enforce the law.

What actually has happened is in direct violation of the Labor Relations Act. The President, the Secretary of Labor, and other officials of the Government have openly interceded on behalf of the United Public Workers–CIO, a Communist-dominated organization. They have brought pressure to bear on the trustees of GSI, all of whom are active or retired Government officials, to come to terms with the UPW–CIO, although that organization has absolutely no recourse at law.

GSI has been threatened with complete ruin by cancellation of its right to maintain cafeterias in Government buildings unless it accepted the edicts of the UPW–CIO.

To effect their purpose, Government officials have even appointed an outside mediator to assume the functions which the Federal Mediation Service was forced to decline in compliance with the law.

In his veto message on the Taft-Hartley law, the President stated that, and I quote:

> Cooperation cannot be achieved by force of law. We cannot create mutual respect and confidence by legislative fiat.

Does the President, then, think that cooperation can be achieved through the type of coercion which is being used against Government Services, Inc.? Does the President believe that cooperation can best be achieved by under-the-table threats of ruination?

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the Members of Congress will agree with me that the law provides machinery for settlement of disputes on an equitable cooperation basis, while illegal coercion does not.

Devaluation of the French Franc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

JANUARY 29, 1948.

Mr. CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor, Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHIP: According to the reports in the papers, the recent devaluation of the franc by the French Government was opposed not only by the British Government, but also by the directors of the International Monetary Fund, to which we make a predominant contribution.

Sections 3, 4, and 5 of section IV of the Bretton Woods agreements appear to raise impediments to the devaluation of currencies by all member governments of the International Monetary Fund.

On the other hand, the Government witnesses who have testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, as well as many Members of the House and many other distinguished citizens, have for a long time felt that the success of the European recovery program will hinge to a large extent on the measures taken by the governments of the participating nations to bridge the gap between the legal and the real value of their currencies. It has seemed to many people that such measures will allow these countries to increase their exports, thus diminish their dollar deficits, and thereby reduce the burden on the American taxpayer. Another consequence of such devaluation might also be a lowering of the cost of living in this country because of increased United States imports from the countries devaluating their currencies.

I am well aware of the fact that the entire problem of stabilization of currency is highly complex, especially with regard to the trade and fiscal relations among the participating nations. I realize that such devaluation might better proceed not on an improvised but on a planned basis in order that such devaluation may be effected with a minimum amount of economic dislocation.

In view of the foregoing, I shall appreciate it very much if you can let me have the State Department's official view with regard to the following questions:

1. Does the State Department favor the devaluation of the currencies of the 16 participating nations so as to achieve eventually a free market in these currencies in which the legal and real value of these currencies will be identical?

2. Does the State Department believe that the Bretton Woods Agreements should be revised, with particular reference to the problem of devaluation?

3. Does the State Department believe that in order to achieve such devaluation an international monetary conference, to be attended by the United States and 16 participating nations, should be called for the purpose of coordinating such devaluation?

4. Does the State Department believe that pending such a conference it would be desirable for the State Department to reach an agreement with Great Britain and the directors of the International Monetary Fund with respect to the devaluation of the currencies of the 16 participating nations?

5. Does the State Department believe that the European recovery program will fail of its objectives unless there is a maximum amount of reciprocal self-help among the 16 participating nations and that this is impossible of achievement until there has been at least a measure of devaluation of the currencies of these nations?

I thank you in advance for your attention to this important matter, and I look forward to receiving your answer at your early convenience.

With kind personal regards.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN DAVIS LODGE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 10, 1948.

Hon. JOHN DAVIS LODGE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JOHN: The specific questions contained in your letter of January 29, 1948, pertain primarily to matters which are the concern of the National Advisory Council. Accordingly, I am transmitting your letter to Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, Chairman of the National Advisory Council.

I should, however, like to comment informally on a number of the points raised in your letter. Your questions 1 and 5 refer to the role of devaluation in promoting self-help and reciprocal help among the ERP countries. An essential element of the ERP is, of course, to encourage maximum self-help by each of the participating countries and also reciprocal self-help among all the participants. If this is not achieved, an important objective of the ERP will not be met. The elimination of gaps between the real and legal value of currencies is an important step in this direction. The establishment of realistic exchange rates will assist in promoting exports, will reduce the necessity for artificial import controls, and will foster European economic recovery.

The problem, however, is not one of devaluation alone. Low production, unbalanced budgets, and excess purchasing power must be remedied if adjustment of exchange rates is to have the desired effects. A whole series of measures is, therefore, necessary if financial stabilization is to be achieved. These measures taken together are at the heart of the ERP. In the absence of such measures, devaluation can generally be expected to be merely a temporary palliative, leading to further deterioration and the need for further devaluations. The necessity for this type of approach to the problem is fully recognized in the Paris report of the CEEC countries and in the proposals of the executive branch respecting proposed United States assistance to European recovery.

Your fourth question implies that there was opposition by the International Monetary Fund and the British Government to devaluation of the franc. I believe it is important to bear in mind that the statement issued by the Fund on January 25, 1948, indicates that the opposition of the Fund to the French devaluation proposal did not apply to devaluation per se, but to certain aspects of the French proposal, particularly the provision that proceeds from exports to certain countries should be sold in a market with fluctuating rates while proceeds from exports to other countries are sold at fixed rates. Both the United States and the British Governments are in agreement with the position taken by the Fund. Responsible officials of this Government have indicated that they welcome steps by the ERP countries toward financial stabilization and, wherever appropriate, adjustment in exchange rate levels.

In view of the important position occupied by the Fund in this field, it is believed desirable to achieve coordination through the Fund. For this reason the executive branch has proposed that whenever exchange rates of ERP countries are so out of line so as to impose a burden on their balances of payments the countries concerned should be required to consult the Fund with respect to revision. Nonmember countries would consult directly with the United States Government. It is believed that coordination can be achieved without change in the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN, *Counselor.*

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, February 10, 1948.

Hon. JOHN DAVIS LODGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LODGE: Since your letter of January 29, 1948, addressed to Mr. Charles E. Bohlen regarding the recent devaluation of the French franc in relation to the International Monetary Fund raises questions within the competence of the National Advisory Council, he has referred your letter to the Council for reply. The State Department as one of the agencies represented in the Council associates itself with the views stated here. The Council wishes first to comment on the problem of devaluation as raised in your letter. The specific questions addressed to the Department of State are discussed below.

Sections 3, 4, and 5 of article IV of the Fund Agreement do not prevent the devaluation of member currencies or require adherence to a given par value when it has become inappropriate to the international position of the member concerned. On the contrary the agreement recognizes that adjustment of exchange rates may be necessary and desirable and provides a procedure for orderly adjustment in consultation with the Fund.

The United States Executive Director on the International Monetary Fund after consultation with the National Advisory Council fully concurred in the position of the Fund with respect to the necessity of a change in the par value of the franc. This was not the point at issue. The objections of the Fund were not to a devaluation but to the discriminatory multiple-currency practice which the French Government proposed to introduce in its exchange system. The Fund Agreement, among other things, is intended to protect the members against competitive exchange depreciation as a means of expanding the trade of one country at the expense of another country. Both the National Advisory Council and the International Monetary Fund held the view that the application by a country of a fluctuating rate on exports to one area while its rate on exports to other areas remains stable and while other countries maintain the paritfes agreed with the Fund would result in discriminatory depreciation. A system of this sort operating in an important trading country would encourage trade distortions and might cast unwarranted doubt on the real strength of other currencies through the apparent discount applied to them in the French system. Moreover, the widespread resort to such systems might lead to exchange instability and disorder from which all members would suffer. It was for these reasons that the proposal of the French Government was unacceptable to the Fund.

The National Advisory Council's views with regard to the specific questions raised in your letter addressed to the Department of State are as follows:

"1. Does the State Department favor the devaluation of the currencies of the 16 participating nations so as to achieve eventually a free market in these currencies in which the legal and real value of these currencies will be identical?"

The National Advisory Council believes that it will be necessary for some of the 16 countries to adjust their exchange rates. The fund agreement has as one of its objectives the maintenance of exchange stability with the minimum of control over exchange transactions for current account purposes. The market rate of exchange would then fluctuate within a narrow margin around the legal par value. Before this objective can be realized there will undoubtedly have to be devaluations of some of the currencies of the countries involved in the European recovery program. It is the opinion of the National Advisory Council that such adjustments in rates should be part of a developing program of internal and external stabilization, in conjunction with United States assistance. Mere devaluation without internal stability and without substantial equilibrium in the balances of payments of the countries concerned, would not be sufficient to realize the objectives of the European recovery program.

"2. Does the State Department believe that the Bretton Woods agreements should be revised, with particular reference to the problem of devaluation?

"3. Does the State Department believe that in order to achieve such devaluation an international monetary conference, to be attended by the United States and the 16 participating nations, should be called for the purpose of coordinating such devaluation?"

The National Advisory Council does not believe that the Bretton Woods agreements need modification in order to meet the problem of over-valued currencies, nor does it believe that this problem could be solved by calling an international conference for the specific purpose of dealing with this question. The fund mechanism, in its opinion, is entirely adequate for this purpose. The directors of the International Monetary Fund are continually in session and work in close consultation with their governments. The National Advisory Council is

satisfied that the fund is fully aware of the problem involved in over-valued exchanges and that the fund is more than ready to approve appropriate adjustments of exchange rates when they can be made with benefit to the countries concerned and to the world at large.

The conditions affecting the stability of exchange and the appropriateness of the rate structure of the countries participating in the European recovery program vary greatly. Accordingly, the proper time for devaluation will vary from country to country. Premature devaluation may have as unfortunate consequences for the economy of a country as the prolonged maintenance of an overvalued rate. It is the opinion of the Council that the method of procedure provided in the fund agreement is far more satisfactory than an attempt at dealing with the problem at an ad hoc conference would prove to be.

"4. Does the State Department believe that pending such a conference it would be desirable for the State Department to reach an agreement with Great Britain and the directors of the International Monetary Fund with respect to the devaluation of the currencies of the 16 participating countries?

For the reasons indicated above, the National Advisory Council believes that it is not desirable for the United States to enter into a particular agreement with Great Britain or the directors of the fund with respect to the prospective devaluation of the currencies of the participating nations.

"5. Does the State Department believe that the European recovery program will fail of its objectives unless there is a maximum amount of reciprocal self-help among the 16 participating nations and that this is impossible of achievement until there has been at least a measure of devaluation of the currencies of these nations?"

The executive branch has made its position clear that the extension of aid under the European-recovery program should be conditional on the maximum possible amount of reciprocal self-help among the participating countries. It recognizes that the maintenance of exchange rates which overvalue currencies can be a serious hindrance to the expansion of trade and that the expansion of European trade is essential for full European recovery. Consequently, the Council believes, as has been stated in testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, that exchange rates should be adjusted where this is an essential element in a program of stabilization. It was the opinion of the Council, however, that to make across-the-board devaluations a prerequisite to aid under the European-recovery program might interfere with the realization of its objectives.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER,
Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems.

FEBRUARY 24, 1948.

HON. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: Thank you for your letter of February 10 with respect to the question of devaluation.

I am very glad to have this statement of opinion from you as chairman of the National Advisory Council.

With respect to the question of devaluation, I might say that although I appreciate that other internal reforms are necessary in order to obtain full benefit from a devaluation, I believe that devaluation will act as a spur to production since it will have a tendency to replace the unstable conditions which are involved in a barter economy with satisfactory currency incentives. In other words, I think devaluation in itself will do more than simply help to create realistic exchange rates.

While I appreciate that the entire problem of devaluation is enormously complex, may I reiterate that I think it is vital that a concerted drive in that direction be made in order to precipitate an economic climate propitious for the operation of the European recovery program.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN DAVIS LODGE.

Statement of Gov. Earl Warren, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, in concert with my colleagues from California and other States, I have introduced a bill identical with Senate bill 1988, which is being considered by the Senate and House Judiciary Committees at this time. This demonstration manifests the vital concern of California and her sister States in a principle that transcends political or economic considerations. Yesterday the Governor of the State of California appeared before the joint committee to testify on behalf of the State of California in support of this legislation. His statement is noteworthy in many respects, and I set it forth below in full:

STATEMENT BY GOV. EARL WARREN, OF CALIFORNIA

It is generous of the governors and the attorneys general of the many States, waiting to be heard on Senate bill 1988, and others to arrange for my appearance before your distinguished committee as one of their first witnesses. It is a great accommodation to me to be able to give my testimony and return immediately to California for the annual session of our legislature, which convenes next Monday. If it were not for this necessity, I would happily give way to my colleagues in order that they might demonstrate to you early in this hearing the Nation-wide importance of this legislation.

Our State has been in a prominent position in this tidelands controversy for many years not because the title or use of our tidelands was distinguishable from the other States of the Union but because it was selected by the Government 11 years ago as the guinea pig for a new and startling doctrine concerning the relationship between the States and the Federal Government; a doctrine that ran counter to a legal principle that had been expounded by the Supreme Court more than a hundred years ago and reaffirmed by it more than fifty times in a myriad of circumstances; a principle that had been adopted without question by the executive branch of the Government in all of its administrative acts; a principle that to this day has never been abandoned by the Congress.

By force of circumstances I have been connected with the controversy almost from the beginning. Nine years ago almost to the day I appeared before your committee to testify concerning the Nye Senate resolution and the Hobbs House resolution, which were designed to accomplish the exact opposite of this resolution. At that time it was believed even by the originators of the Federal tidelands ownership theory that they could prevail only by the exercise of some sort of governmental legerdemain to make the 50 decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on the subject disappear in thin air. They selected California as the object of their dexterity. Their resolutions declared the Federal Government to be the owner of the California tidelands and sought to quiet its title against the State. If passed, they proposed to have the Executive Department act promptly on it and thus place it beyond the power of the courts to interfere.

They would not admit that the other States would be judged by the same theory. It was insinuated that there were some special conditions which placed California tidelands in a different status than those of other States. But the other coastal States refused to be lulled into a false sense of security. Then as now, they appeared in great numbers at the hearings.

At that time, I was the attorney general of my State, and I remained here for weeks working with my colleagues in the presentation of our cause. We were sustained by both committees.

Failing to convince the Congress, the matter simmered along until 1945, when the then Attorney General filed suit in the Supreme Court to invalidate California's title to her tidelands. Almost without exception, the States again rallied to the cause, but with the result which is well known to this committee.

The Court denied that title is in California, refused to find that it vests in the Federal Government, but stated without the citation of authority that the Federal Government has paramount rights irrespective of title to the tidelands and the resources underneath them.

It is now admitted by the Department of Justice that the California case applied to every State of the Union. We now all find ourselves in the position we anticipated, with the title to our lands beneath our navigable waters clouded for all purposes to the lasting injury of practically every State in the Union unless we obtain relief from this Congress.

So far as my State is concerned, the oil issue is a minor one compared with its other fundamental rights which are infringed. We have 1,200 miles of coast line. So far as we can ascertain, oil deposits are under only 15 miles of that coast line. Half of the estimated oil in those pools has already been extracted. We receive approximately $3,000,000 a year in royalties from them. That amount can be expected to diminish progressively until depletion of the deposits. Under the proposal of the Secretary of the Interior, we would continue to directly receive at least 37½ percent of the royalties, and indirectly an additional amount from that portion of the revenues which he would have revert to the reclamation fund. So it can be seen that the amount we would lose is not great by comparison with the other revenues of the State.

Our great concern is not that we may lose some oil revenues, but that our dominion over our tidelands for every purpose is clouded. Our coast line is one of our greatest natural resources. Our people have been energetic and forward-looking in the use of them. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been expended on our harbors, our fisheries, our pleasure resorts, and many other uses that are essential to the orderly development of our State. Our cities and counties all have additional plans for the future use of our tidelands.

If they do not belong to us, of course, those plans are retarded. We are subordinated to the Federal Government in matters that we, and all other States, have for over a hundred years been told by the Supreme Court are a matter of State sovereignty.

We are not here asking for anything new. We are not seeking to extend our rights at the expense of our Government. We are asking only to retain those rights which have been ours for the first century and three-quarters of our Nation's existence. We are asking Congress to confirm to us the fundamentil States' rights which are essential to the virility of the Republic.

I am a believer in a strong central government within the limits of the Constitution, but I do not believe that the Federal Government should encroach upon the powers and rights which were reserved to the States by the tenth amendment to the Constitution.

During the first half of the existence of the Nation, the States were strong and the Federal Government was weak. It was during this time that our great leaders strove to strengthen the Central Government so that it could perform its functions as a true sovereign; but now the situation has materially changed. As so often happens, the pendulum which in our early history had swung too far toward States' rights is now swinging in the opposite direction toward Federal power, until now it has reached a point where the continuance of our States as independent, sovereign political entities is threatened.

If we are to preserve our constitutional system of a Federal Union made up of sovereign States, it is just as important now to protect the States from excessive concentration of power in the Federal Government as it was 150 years ago to protect the Federal Government from an excessive concentration of power in the several States.

In 1819, Chief Justice Marshall said: "No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States, and of compounding the American people into one common mass." (*McCullough v. Maryland*, 4 Wheat 403). Let us hope that Marshall was right. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that the constant encroachment of Federal power and the extension of the jurisdiction of Federal bureaus over every aspect of our life has tended to weaken our States to such an extent that I believe now it is the duty of everyone who believes in the American Constitution to exert his efforts to bring back to the States the political and property rights which have been taken from them and to restore the just balance as between local and national power which is indispensable to the maintenance of our constitutional system.

A great and important step in that direction could be taken by the Congress in confirming to the States their title to the lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries, as is proposed in the legislation now before you.

And what would the Federal Government lose by the enactment of this bill? Precisely nothing. The States have never interfered in any way with the sovereign rights of the Government to impose its will over and its use upon these tidelands for the purposes of national defense, navigation, and international relations. We have never claimed nor wanted any such jurisdiction. The legislation before you expressly disclaims any such intent. The Federal Government now determines beforehand whether any proposed use by the States would be an interference with any of those national interests.

But the taking of oil drilled from the shore by slant drilling does not set up any obstructions; and if it did, the Government could restrain it. We do not engage in any practices that the Federal Government does not adopt with relation to its own naval oil reserves. We do not even exploit the pools unless they extend to the uplands and the private owners who are also over them start to drain them to the detriment of the public interest. As a conservation measure our legislature has prohibited exploitation except in such circumstances.

The Federal Government could do no more to conserve oil unless it did one of two things: either condemn the uplands ownership in eminent-domain proceedings or apply this newly conceived "paramount rights" doctrine to private property on the theory that the Government needs it and can, therefore, take it.

If the Government can take the property of the State without compensation merely because it needs it, where would that theory end? Could it not take the property of a citizen of a State?

The doctrine that natural resources can be appropriated without compensation by a power that transcends ownership to me means confiscation—taking property without due process of law.

So far as I know, no Court has ever held that the United States could acquire the natural resources of the soil in disregard of ownership, and the present Court cites no authority in support of this doctrine. The decision rests on the unsupported determination of the majority opinion.

Wrong as we believe the decision to be, we bow with all deference to the final judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, as every American should. On the other hand, we contend that this legislation is not in conflict with that decision.

On the contrary, the closing words of the majority opinion not only contemplate some action by the Congress, but in my opinion actually suggest it. It said: "We have not overlooked California's argument, buttressed by earnest briefs on behalf of other States, that improvements have been made along and near the shores at great expense to public and private agencies. * * * But however this may be, we are faced with the issue as to whether State or Nation has paramount rights and power over this ocean belt, and that great national question is not dependent upon what expenses may have been incurred upon mistaken assumptions. * * * We cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission."

The Attorney General, in his argument to the Court, has stated that the Government wants to see equity done. The Secretary of the Interior has introduced a bill, Senate bill 2165, which would continue to give the States 37½ percent of their oil revenues, and retain 52½ percent for the reclamation fund, and transfer the oil leases of the State to the Federal Government, continuing to exploit the fields as in the past. In other words, he would merely change the landlords of the oil operators, with slight appeasement to the States. That is his concept of equity in this matter.

Ours is different. We believe, and I am sure I speak the mind of practically all the governors and attorneys general of the Nation, that equity calls for the confirmation of the title that has been recognized since the beginning of the Republic.

In simple justice, we respectfully ask the Congress to enact S. 1988 confirming and establishing the title of the States in and beneath the navigable waters within their boundaries. To do so will greatly strengthen the 48 States, and will in no sense diminish the sovereignty, the effectiveness, or the stature of the United States of America.

Lincoln Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered before the Lincoln Associates, Lowell, Mass., on February 12, 1948, and which was broadcast over Station WLLH:

Mr. Chairman, fellow citizens, members of the radio audience, and friends, it is surely a very happy privilege and a great honor for me to respond this evening to the kind invitation of this fine, outstanding American organization to attend this impressive celebration of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln.

It is most fitting that we should pause on this day to commemorate the name, memory, and achievements of one of our greatest Presidents, and one of our truly immortal Americans, Abraham Lincoln was a great and noble leader. He came from the common people of the Nation. Born in humblest circumstances, by virtue of his own struggles, industry zeal, and great ability, he rose to the highest position within the gift of the American people.

The story of his life, of the difficulties that confronted him in his youth, of the dire poverty of his early days, his courageous struggle to overcome handicaps and obstacles, his brilliant career before the bar and in the public service, his unselfish work for his fellowman and his country mark him indelibly as one of the great figures of history. His career was typically American. As much perhaps as any other, it exemplified the unlimited opportunities of our country which are open to the ordinary citizen. It illustrates the truth that the poorest and humblest child born under the Stars and Stripes, if he but exercise the strength of will and the determination to develop his God-given talents and gifts, can rise surely and steadily up the ladder of success to the most exalted station in the land.

It is therefore most appropriate that the Lincoln Associates should dedicate themselves this evening on his natal day to recognition of the worth of Abraham Lincoln, his noble qualities as a man, his sterling ideals, his solid, fundamental American principles, his invincible spirit, and his great love of country, and sterling patriotism. Every community in the land should take the time today to consider the significance of the contributions made to the American way of life by the Great Emancipator

Like every generation, we are living principally in the present. We have our own problems to face and solve. They are problems just as compelling, just as vital, and just as urgent to the cause of free democratic government as the ones which confronted Lincoln. If we are but willing to speculate upon his achievements, and the manner in which he clung to his convictions when the Nation was threatened with division and destruction, when the clamor of secession rang in his ears, when the death-knell of a united American democracy was being sounded, we may well learn from his precepts and example the way to the solution of the tremendous problems which confront us in this dark hour in the history of civilization.

Lincoln had many remarkable attributes. He was possessed of a sharp, brilliant intellect, and a ready wit. By long years of study and application, he had educated himself, and was well informed on public questions. He was a capable trial lawyer, an able debater, a brilliant writer, and an accomplished story-teller, born with a keen sense of humor.

He believed in the philosphy of the American Government, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. No man could possibly be more devoted to the great truths that underlie fundamental Americanism than Abraham Lincoln. No man could have served more unselfishly the cause of national unity and freedom. No man could have perceived more clearly the basic issues that confronted the country as a result of the great struggle

over slavery and secession. If he had faltered for one moment, if he had ever wavered in his fundamental beliefs, if he had perchance compromised his principles, the Nation would have been split asunder, and the Union would have been shattered.

Apart from his great faith in America and her destiny, Lincoln was always marked by a truly unique quality of humility. He was a plain and simple man. There were no pretense or adornments in his make-up. He dealt with realities, and basic problems through the exercise of common sense and sound judgment. He had the faculty of going right to the heart of an issue. He had an abiding faith in the common people because he was one of them himself, and he never forgot his origin and early struggles. He devoutly believed that, given the opportunity, given the facts, given the true picture uncolored by propaganda or misrepresentation, the people would reach the right result. We all remember his timely words, "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time. But you cannot fool all of the people all of the time." This strong unwavering faith in the ultimate judgments of the people lived with him throughout his life, and he never lost his confidence in the ordinary man and woman who stood by his side and rendered him unflinching support in the darkest hours of the great conflict between the States when the very existence of the Republic hung in the balance.

Power of mind, logic, and the ability to think straight, calmness of spirit, and ability to make decisions were his great gifts. Humility, a quality not always found in public men, was also, as I have said, an unusual quality that endeared him to the people. But the two attributes which distinguished him as a great statesman and which contributed most to his achievements were his courage and his humaneness.

Abraham Lincoln had a kind and noble heart. There was nothing mean, or small, or narrow-minded about him. His mind was as broad as humanity itself, and encompassed in a very intimate way the perplexities, the bitter struggles, the difficulties, and the problems of the average man. His courage was fortified by a devout trust in the Almighty, and he never knew fear either in his private or his public life. He was known as Honest Abe, and he had earned that name not only by fair dealing and rectitude, but by honest thinking as well. Materially, intellectually, spiritually, Lincoln was profoundly clear-sighted, direct, humble, and honest, and this but served to accentuate and sustain his courage during every crisis which he and the Nation faced. Dauntless and straightforward, he never flinched from a decision because he had the courage of a lion, and an abiding faith in his God, himself, the American people, and his country.

His profound religious faith and trust in God was illustrated by the words of an informal speech he delivered to his friends and neighbors when he left home to assume the Presidency. He said, "I now leave not knowing when or whether ever I may return"—and he never did—"with the task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of the Divine Being who attended him I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail. I hope that in your prayers you will commend me."

A commentator once said of him, "When he spoke, he was transformed; his eye kindled, his voice rang, his face shone and seemed to light up the whole assembly." His style of speech and manner of delivery were severely simple, and were characterized by Lowell as the grand simplicity of the Bible with which he was so familiar. It was marvelous to see how this untutored man, by mere self-discipline and the chastening of his own spirit had found his way to the grandeur and strength of absolute simplicity.

There are many interesting episodes and stories told of the great Lincoln which I cannot enumerate here, but one or two of them may be pertinent to demonstrate the universality and appeal of his character. This one is attested to by my able and esteemed colleague, Congressman DONDERO, of Michigan, an outstanding authority on Lincoln, who relates it substantially as follows:

In 1847 two men were elected to Congress from widely separated sections of the country, one from the North, the other from the South. One was far above average height, the other was a small or under-sized man. Both were intellectual giants. One was opposed to slavery, the other opposed secession. During their respective congressional careers they became warm, personal friends and remained so until death. One was destined to become President of the United States, the other Vice President of the Confederacy. One was to be assassinated, the other was to become a political prisoner of the Government he had once served. One was Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, the other was Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia.

As is always the case in life, they parted in the House of Representatives in the year 1849, and it was not for 16 years that they met again. Meanwhile the Nation was torn by civil strife. Their next meeting took place at night on board a gunboat in Hampden Roads, Va., early in February 1865. The occasion was a famous peace conference which sought, but failed, to end the Civil War. President Lincoln and his Secretary of State represented the Union; Stephens was one of the delegates representing the Confederacy.

If Abraham Lincoln had not known that his former colleague in the House and his warm intimate friend Alexander Stephens was to be one of the emissaries, it is very doubtful that he would ever have agreed to meet representatives of the Confederacy.

When the parley ended in failure, Lincoln turned to his old and beloved colleague of congressional days and asked, "Alex, is there anything I can do for you personally?" Stephens informed Lincoln that he had a nephew who was a prisoner of war at Johnsons Island in Lake Erie near Sandusky, Ohio, but his family had heard nothing from him—could Lincoln find out something about him, could he get word to him that his people at home were well. That was all. The old friends parted.

But Lincoln had his own idea. Two days later, Lt. John Stephens, of the Confederate Army, arose as usual to begin the depressing, routine, life of a prisoner of war, just as he had done for 2 years without hope of change. The thermometer registered twenty below zero, and he was standing in his barracks near the stove trying to keep warm. An orderly appeared at the door informing him to report at once to the commanding officer. His surprise was great. What did the commander want of him? He had known of other prisoners who had been called out and never were heard from again. Was he to suffer the same fate? With the orderly, he went to the commander where a still greater surprise awaited him. He was shown a telegram which read:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 4, 1865.*
OFFICER IN COMMAND AT JOHNSON ISLAND, OHIO:

Parole Lt. John A. Stephens, prisoner of war, to report to me here in person and send him to me. It is in pursuance of an arrangement I made yesterday with his uncle, Hon. A. H. Stephens.

A. LINCOLN.

The boy was fairly stunned when he read this message, but the great drama proceeded. Wrapped in buffalo robes, placed on board a bobsled drawn by two mules across Lake Erie, was an experience undreamed of by this Confederate soldier. To be ordered to report to the President of the United States in person at the Nation's Capital was beyond the imagination of a son of the South in the Confederate Army.

In due time he was ushered into the presence of Abraham Lincoln. The President was lying full length on a long office table with his elbow on the table, and his face resting on his hand talking to Secretary of State Seward, who was seated in a nearby chair. He was cordially received and introduced to the Secretary of State. Lincoln suggested that if he had friends in Washington he could pay them a visit, then report back to him. No guard was necessary. He was under the parole to the President of the United States. Five days later the young lieutenant reported back to the White House and found the President alone. Lincoln talked about his uncle, their association in Congress, and their friendship. He handed the young Confederate officer a short letter for his uncle which read as follows:

"DEAR ALEC: According to our agreement, your nephew, Lieutenant Stephens, goes to you bearing this note. Please, in return, select and send to me that officer of some rank imprisoned at Richmond whose physical condition most urgently requires his release.

"Respectfully,

"A. LINCOLN."

Returning to his desk, he autographed a small photo of himself, and handed it to Stephens, saying, "Young man, suppose you take this along with you. I don't expect there are many of them down South."

Young Stephens was carried through the lines, arriving at his Georgia home during the first week in May 1865, and delivered Lincoln's letter to his uncle. By then the war was over. Lincoln was in his grave. Alexander Stephens became a fugitive, was arrested, and carried a political prisoner to Fort Warren in Boston Harbor.

One of the most touching incidents in all our history is the scene in the cell at Fort Warren on the morning of June 1, 1865. Alexander Stephens, Vice President of the Confederacy is awaiting his fate. This prisoner who opposed secession and loved, his Nation made an entry in his diary that morning. It is the day set apart by President Johnson as a fast day in memory of Abraham Lincoln. The entry in Stephen's journal for that morning reads, "Rose early. As it is a fast day and mourning in memory of Mr. Lincoln, I requested the corporal to bring me a cup of coffee and some rolls." We can almost hear the spirit of Lincoln whispering, "This hath he done in remembrance of me."

The letter relating to the release of Lieutenant Stephens and the autographed photo handed him by President Lincoln were framed and hung on the wall of Stephens' home in Georgia for over 70 years, as a silent reminder of one of the most unusual events in the history of the United States. This little-known story of the generosity and kindly impulses of Lincoln has a sequel.

Thirteen years later on February 12, 1878, the famous oil painting of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, in which Lincoln is the central figure, was presented to the United States Government. This picture now hangs in the old Supreme Court Chamber in the Capitol Building in Washington. On this occasion, Alexander H. Stephens, who had been reelected to Congress from Georgia, was chosen to deliver the acceptance speech on the part of the Government. In that address will be found this tribute by Stephens to his old friend Lincoln. I quote: "He was warm-hearted, he was generous, he was magnanimous. Every fountain of his heart was overflowing with the milk of human kindness."

That was the tribute of Alexander H. Stephens, one time Vice President of the Confederacy, to the President whom even the rancors of Civil War could not turn against an old friend.

I could go on indefinitely, if time permitted, to recite incidents in the life of this great man which illustrated his kindness, his generosity, his humaneness, and his courage. It is most fitting tonight that we should pause reverently to pay tribute to his sterling qualities of Americanism, and to his magnificent service to our country.

But we would be truly remiss on this occasion if we were not solemnly to resolve here and now to be inspired and guided henceforth during the crisis which now confronts us, during the threats to democracy which now face us, by the principles, the ideals, and the example of the immortal Lincoln.

We have just victoriously ended the greatest armed conflict in history. We waged bitter war against powerful and tyrannical enemies to defend our democracy, to preserve human freedom, and to achieve an enduring peace for our own Nation and for mankind. In that great conflict we sacrificed the flower of American youth and spent untold billions of American wealth. Millions of American boys interrupted their careers and left their homes to achieve victory and thus insure freedom and peace. Incalculable sacrifices were made by these gallant boys and by the entire American people.

How ironical the present situation is. Instead of the freedom, democracy, and peace which our boys fought and died for, we are now faced with continued turmoil, strife, contention, oppression, and the threats of war. We have defeated and smashed one set of tyrants only to find new tyrannies confronting us almost everywhere. Small nations continue to be enslaved, self-government and freedom continue to be denied, oppression of traditionally free peoples afflicts a sizable portion of Europe and the Orient. Our war aims are notoriously violated, our peace objectives scorned and repudiated, the United Nations hamstrung and checkmated. The officials of our Government are condemned and insulted. Vicious propaganda is directed against our Government and people on a world-wide front even within the confines of our own country. Age-old and sacred religious, governmental, social, and economic institutions are brazenly attacked and ridiculed. A new type of war—ideological war, a cold war, a war of nerves—is waged against democracy and freedom and everything they stand for in behalf of a superstate led by fanatical despots who are intent upon wrecking the civilization built upon free institutions.

These apostles of Marx, well organized, well financed, ably led are spreading poisonous hatred between nations, groups, and classes. They are seeking to divide and disrupt the forces of democracy, liberty, and Christianity. They openly seek the destruction of religion and private property. They are aiming at the enslavement of all mankind. They would superimpose upon us all, the will of the great Red colossus, which already stands astride of most of Europe and much of the Orient threatening western civilization and the spirit of liberty itself.

What would Abraham Lincoln's reaction be to this incredible situation? How would his stalwart Americanism judge these outrages? Would he be willing to appease these enemies of democracy and freedom? Would he remain silent and unprotesting in the face of their insults and threats, in the presence of their vilification and propaganda, in the midst of the steady expansion of their dominion over the lives and affairs of countless millions of helpless, defenseless peoples? I am sure that he would not. I am sure that he would insist on the carrying out of our war aims and objectives; our promises and pledges of freedom and self-determination for small nations, the right of human beings everywhere to choose their own way of life.

If we honestly and courageously apply the principles of Abraham Lincoln to the present international situation, we should inform the Soviet Government and her puppets that we seek honorable peace with all nations, but that we cannot tolerate continued violations of our war aims, that propaganda directed against us must cease, that aggression and infiltration against helpless free peoples must cease, that organized campaigns to promote world-wide bloody revolution must cease, that the rights, interests and ideals of this great Nation must be respected.

If we still believe in the principles of Lincoln, we cannot afford to be indifferent or spineless in this great contingency that faces the world. It is time to determine whether we and other democratic-minded peoples shall live in the free world of the Atlantic Charter or the slave world of communism.

Our country cannot compromise on this great issue. We do not seek war and we hope and trust that Russia does not seek war. We earnestly seek peace and harmonious relations for ourselves and all peoples. We will not tolerate unbridled militarism or warmongering in the Nation. But we are determined that the sacrifices which the American people have made since the inception of this Government and particularly the sacrifices which our gallant heroes, both living and dead have made in the name of freedom and democracy, shall not be in vain. We will not tolerate that any nation or group of nations set up with the avowed purpose of destroying free institutions, and inaugurating the radical, totalitarian state of serfdom and slavery, will be permitted to stand in the way of a just, lasting peace. We will not tolerate that any power shall conspire to undermine and destroy the great free Nation of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln which we have established here to guarantee the rights of our citizens and the free way of life.

It is most regrettable that such obstacles have been placed across the path to universal peace, but, like Lincoln, we must deal with the realities. Let us work to strengthen the United Nations and every other agency designed to preserve the peace. Let us cooperate wholeheartedly with other nations to check the outrages and aggressions, both physical and ideological, which are directed against free, democratic government. Let us use the economic weapons that we have at hand to bring Marxian zealots everywhere to their senses. Let us leave nothing undone to promote good will, friendship, confidence, and trust between the nations of the earth. Let us keep our own Nation strong, vigorous, free, and democratic, and uncorrupted by the poisons of radicalism and disruption. Let us check the enemies within our gates who are joining with their Moscow advisers to destroy our economy, our business system, and our free institutions which have not only brought salvation to the world, and hope and inspiration and assistance to the helpless, the suffering, the afflicted, and the oppressed, but which have also made possible for our own people the greatest, the happiest, and the most prosperous nation in the annals of history. Until international agencies possess the will, strength, and the capacity to check international outlaws and to maintain order and peace in the world, let us maintain a strong, impregnable national defense, an Army, Navy, and overwhelming Air Force comprised of mature, professionally trained, scientifically devised, armed forces—not 18-year-old boys—able to keep our Nation safe and secure against every attack and contingency.

And in our own broad land where liberty was nurtured, let us remember that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, that it can be lost far more easily than it was won, that once it is lost, it is difficult, if not impossible, to regain. In the spirit of Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, with his sense of fairness, justice, and humanity let us zealously protect all our civil liberties, and the great truths and doctrines upon which our Government was founded.

This is a Nation of opportunity for all, and let us keep it so. Let us relieve our people of burdensome taxes and inflated prices. Let us care and provide for our disabled veterans, and assist all our veterans who were the defenders of the Nation in time of greatest peril. Let us keep the doors of opportunity open so that every man, woman, and child can seek and find the chance, by virtue of industry, hard work, thrift, and ability, to rise to the top of the ladder of success. Let us banish the hatreds and passions of intolerance from our Nation because they are un-American, offensive to our faith in God and our Constitution and way of life, and provocative of distrust and antagonism among our people.

In brief, as we again receive inspiration, strength, and courage and guidance from the immortal Lincoln, let us resolve, each and every one of us, to make our own contribution which is so necessary at this time to the perpetuation of the Nation.

As John Macy said, he was finely sensitive, highly intellectual, meditative, uncommonly gifted with that rare thing called common sense to which was added great prophetic vision. That is why Lincoln is not only a statesman who belongs to history, but a man of letters who belongs to literature. His Gettysburg Address—and you all recall how on the occasion of its delivery he was matched against Edward Everett, of Boston, one of the great orators of the day—was a remarkable, historic document and a work of art. In a few words he expresses the essential emotion of the moment without flourish, without bombast, and in a quiet and calm style, in words that will live forever. Let me recall them to you:

"From these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

And as we face the problems of the hour, let us display the same patriotism, the same courage, the same fortitude, the same generosity, the same spirit of kindliness, tolerance, and charity which the immortal Lincoln displayed during a life of service to his country and fellow man. Let us remember:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in: To bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and for his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all the nations."

Thank you for listening and good night.

United States Hears of Russian-Polish Treaty as World Bank Considers Warsaw Loan

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following article of Constantine Brown, from the Washington Star of February 23, 1948:

UNITED STATES HEARS OF RUSSIAN-POLISH TREATY AS WORLD BANK CONSIDERS WARSAW LOAN

(By Constantine Brown)

Reports are being received in Washington on some of the main terms of the new secret military agreement between Poland and the U. S. S. R. last month. These come at a time when the World Bank is waiting for a favorable moment to announce a $60,000,000 loan to Warsaw.

According to information which has reached high Government quarters, the agreement was signed in Moscow by Foreign Minister Molotov for Russia and by the following Polish officials: Jacob Berman, Minister of State attached to the Office of the Polish Premier as a watchdog for the Politburo; Hilary Minc, Minister of National Economy; Field Marshal Zmierski, commander in chief of the Polish Army, and General Klenlewisz, a Russian attached to the Office of Marshal Zmierski.

The following terms of the Moscow agreement are known:

1. The Polish steel and armaments industries are to be integrated with those of Czechoslovakia and Russia. This may explain the pressure which is being exercised on the World Bank by friends of Poland for a $30,000,000 loan for modernization of the Polish mining industry.

DISCARD LEND-LEASE EQUIPMENT

2. All lend-lease and captured German equipment which is being used by the Polish Army at the end of 1949 is to be discarded. After that time Polish armaments will be standardized with those of the U. S. S. R.

3. Five infantry divisions are to be converted into motorized units, on the pattern of the Soviet Army. One new parachute division and two armored divisions are to be created.

4. Because of the difficulty of indoctrinating the prewar officers and noncommissioned officers in the new ideology, the new agreement provides that all these shall be retired by the end of 1949 and new personnel put in their places. Fifty percent of the new officers and noncoms will be trained beginning March 1, 1948, at the Central Soviet Armored Warfare School at Irkutsk, Siberia.

This school was organized in November 1947 for the purpose of training future officers and noncoms of the satellite states. The instructors have been carefully selected from the ranks of Soviet Army specialists and officers of former German panzer divisions.

DRAWN FROM VON PAULUS GROUP

The latter are drawn from those who were captured at Stalingrad and later joined the "liberation" army of Field Marshal Friedrich von Paulus and from among those who surrendered later. These men are reported to be reliable not only because they have become convinced that the future of the fatherland henceforth is tied up closely with that of Russia, but also because their families are hostages in Russian hands.

The agreement further provides that the Polish steel mills, particularly those at Gleiwitz and Beuten, will increase their production to 1,050,000 tons per week in 1948 and 1949 and to 2,060,000 tons by 1950. A part of this production will be used for construction of three new shipping yards in Yugoslavia. The Skoda works in Czechoslovakia are earmarked exclusively for the production of armaments.

American military officials are particularly interested in the fact that rejuvenation of the Polish army, according to the terms of the Moscow agreement in January, must be completed by the end of next year or the beginning of 1950.

This is interpreted to mean that by that time the war plans section of the Red Army wants to be prepared for any task the Politburo may consider necessary for the prosecution and implementation of its expansionist policies.

What Part Should We Play in Europe's Recovery?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a short radio address given by me on Washington's Birthday and carried by a national network of the Mutual Broadcasting System:

Today is Washington's birthday. One of the great documents of American history is Washington's farewell address, wherein he warned us in no uncertain terms to mind our own business and not meddle in the affairs of foreign countries. But the men who would now load on your back the Marshall plan, sneer at George Washington's advice. Yet these Marshall plan promoters have played into Stalin's hands again and again.

While they claim to be too smart for Washington, how smart were they on the United States Morgenthau vengeance plan, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. On all these situations the Marshall plan advocates played squarely into the hands of communism. Does that kind of performance justify giving them another chance to pay into Stalin's hands? Their mistakes to date are largely responsible for the present chaos in Europe.

The people in high places in this country who are destroying your savings through inflation are apparently the popular favorites at the moment. They come to you and say that we must bring about European recovery. Certainly, we should help Europe, but neither according to their demands nor our desires, but instead according to our capacity. On this point—"our capacity"— we have now reached the place where further gigantic hand-outs like the Marshall plan mean unlimited inflation in America. That means that prices are low in comparison with what prices will be if the Marshall plan goes through.

Prices in France are about 75 times as high—75 times as high—get that percentage—as they were when World War I started. If the Marshall plan goes through, prices here will double, treble, or quadruple, and who will that help? Only those who know what inflation is and put their savings into real property and tangibles, while trusting folks like my listeners put theirs into bonds and life insurance. But that is not all—not only will this handout program to Europe destroy what is left of sound currency in this country but the hand-out program itself is the greatest instrument today for world communism. Why do I say that? Because the money from the Marshall plan is going in a majority of cases to those governments run by Socialists. And socialism and communism according to an Army official statement, are blood brothers. And so, now then, let's make this plain—the so-called European recovery program is not a recovery program at all; it is a scheme to finance and entrench the power of Socialist politicians in various lands and enable them to maintain their stranglehold over people who are trying to regain freedom. It is being sold to the American people as a humanitarian project, just as a year ago they told you that the "aid to Greece" program was a humanitarian project, and now we learn that it was only a great bloody adventure.

The European people are entitled to relief from America from those who are willing through the practice of Christian charity to help the distressed of Europe. Actually, your Government has strangled and crippled Christian charity to Europe in many different ways. They have substituted a global WPA for Christian charity. A New Deal WPA is no better in Europe than it was in America.

Our global bleeding hearts—and some of them are well-meaning people—have the fantastic notion that we can interfere all over the world. Do you want to know how that will work out? Try going around your block, going up to each neighbor, and tell them you would like to help them run their personal affairs. I don't know how that would work where you live, but I know that where I live everything would be topsy-turvy in 48 hours. The way to make my neighborhood better is to run my family better so that my family would make a better contribution to the block.

America can make her best contribution to the world by persuasion and example. Have we treated the Indians fairly in this country? They have been our wards for 60 years. Have we treated the Puerto Ricans fairly? They have been our wards for 50 years. Have we treated the colored people fairly? They have relied on their Government since 1865. American responsibility for justice and fairness begins at home. Let's be fair to those in this country and by example and persuasion help the rest of the world to justice and opportunity. The recovery program for Europe is private charity for relief and sound, economic loans for sound, economic advancement and recovery. That means that the politicians in Washington would lose a lot of the jobs for their political hacks and carpetbaggers, but that is the method that will save Europe and America, and that is the method George Washington pleaded with us to adopt in his farewell message.

More "operation rat-hole" in Europe will not help the humble people of Europe adopt hard work and freedom from political parasites as their road to salvation. Continued hand-outs from America only makes it easier for their political rulers to postpone the day of going back to work. No outsider, not even the American taxpayer, can learn to walk for them.

Address of Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, on February 9 the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, visited Iowa and addressed a great gathering of militant Republicans at the capital city at Des Moines, the occasion being a celebration of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

This is the first occasion in many years that a Speaker of the House has visited Iowa and delivered an important address.

All good citizens of Iowa extended greetings to Speaker MARTIN.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the address made by the Speaker:

Fellow citizens, I am glad to be in this agricultural section of the Midwest. We are gathered here to pay a tribute to the memory of one of America's immortals, Abraham Lincoln. He was a man of the plain people. He loved the plain people. He was fond of saying God must have loved the poor because he made so many of them. Lincoln did not mean that literally. What he meant was that money, riches, do not make men noble, or women virtuous, but that the spirit, the innate personality, is what makes men and women good and noble and virtuous.

Lincoln was himself a man of the backwoods and the soil. He was close to nature. He drew his inspiration from nature. He had the simple sense of justice, deeply tinged with mercy, which the plain people always have.

Agriculture has always been the backbone of our American economy. Farmers have been among the most independent of our religious and political thinkers. The pitchfork has always been a symbol of strength in our Nation.

In our government of, by, and for the people, independence of thought and independence of action are essential. The very essence of the kind of government for which Lincoln fought and died is the principle of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise. By that method we reach the nearest approximation of good government and concrete truth.

That is one reason why our highway system has been so important. It has brought the farm nearer to the city. Together with the appliances which have been invented over the years, good roads and motor vehicles have taken much of the drudgery out of farm work and left those who labor with the soil more time for reading and meditation. Agricultural families can now live on a spacious farm, enjoy the outdoors, and all of the benefits and advantages of rural life. They can step into the automobile, and over good highways, be in the city, and at the theater, or at a concert, or at a church, in a matter of 15 or 20 or 30 minutes, at most.

American agriculture must be kept at a new high level of production and income. Of course, the farmers, like all other citizens, are concerned with high taxes, a constantly expanding government, and inflation.

The farmer is conscious of high taxes because it has not been too long ago when he realized that taxation might so impoverish him he couldn't follow his way of life. It is true that farmers are now making money. Nobody is happier about that than am I. We cannot have in America an impoverished farm class and the rest of the Nation still be prosperous. It is not possible in the United States for any great segment of the people, or for any great part of our free economy, to be broke, or poverty-stricken, without the rest of the Nation suffering in consequence.

We know the only possible answer in the United States to inflation and high prices is production and more production. The farmers of America want a fair price, a fair return on their products. To that they are richly entitled. The farmers do not want artificially inflated prices on everything they buy to be so high as to consume all they can take in and leave them nothing for a reserve. Such a condition is not a sound economy. It is the forerunner to a depression. None of the people can long stand such a condition as that.

The farmers, as well as everybody else, know the reason for the inflationary prices of today lies far back in years gone by when deficit spending was planting the seeds of today's crop of inflation.

The Republicans have warned all through those years that the practice of wild, reckless deficit spending—the policy of tax and tax, spend and spend—would bring ruin if persisted in. Following hard upon the heels of those years of waste, and extravagance, and deficit spending came the war. The war activities were inflationary because the goods and services produced for war went to the battlefields or to the bottom of the sea. The wages and salaries stayed at home unspent because there was nothing to buy in the home market. Then, following the war, came the demand for foreign aid. That constitutes a drain on our available production. The result is still another inflationary force, because again the goods and services go abroad and the wages and salaries poured out in the production of those goods and services stay at home.

All of this resulted, as the farmers and everybody else now know, in the accumulation of a great backlog of purchasing power in this country—much of it invested in Government bonds. At the same time, there accumulated a great backlog of unsatisfied desire for goods. People wanted automobiles, and ice boxes, and phonographs, and electric fans, and electric-heating stoves, and clothes—everything Americans had been accustomed to having. The only possible remedy for that condition is production and more production. But that production must be brought about under conditions which will not lead to overexpansion of either the agricultural plant or the industrial plant of America, and a consequent era of unemployment. A depression in this country would be just as disastrous, or more so, than the present condition of inflation.

The Agricultural Committee of the House of Representatives is now making a study of a long-range agricultural plan in order to prevent any recurrence of a deflation of agriculture.

We cannot contemplate with great concern, any depression in agriculture. We must maintain agriculture on a new high level of production, because not only the United States, but the world needs the products of American farms. We must preserve the soil. We must operate the farms of America efficiently. That means, farmers must have adequate, modern machinery by which to increase their production. They must have that machinery at a fair price in proportion to their income.

It is the farmer who feeds and clothes the rest of the people, as well as himself and his family. Clothing is now made from rayon, which is reprocessed cotton. Many useful things are made from milk. Even farm waste is being utilized. Incidentally, I want to say I have long been interested in farm chemurgy, which is the scientific use of farm products and farm waste, as the raw materials for factory manufacture. Ways can be found—ways are being found—to transform what formerly was waste into a revenue producer for the farmer. That is a very welcome innovation.

The farmer is concerned with expanding government, because nobody knows, better than he, the dangers of centralized power and an overgrown bureaucracy.

The veterans of the wars and all the young people on the farms and in the cities want their chance to get ahead. They deserve a chance to get ahead. They are going to get a chance to get ahead. But they do not want to spend their years snapping to attention at every command from bureaucratic "big brass." Government regulations and regimentation do not constitute a proper life for free citizens. We are determined that freedom, not governmental autocracy, shall rule in America.

Most of the farmers of Iowa, I suspect, can well remember those days when questionnaires and ration applications and gasoline permits had to be filled out. I am sure you recall the remarkable advice which once emanated from a Washington bureau to the farmers to take the horses' shoes off at night to save metal, and to change the shoes from foot to foot to equalize the wear. You have not forgotten the famous instruction which went out that there must be no more butchering of female steers. In other words, you, the farmers of Iowa, and the farmers of the rest of the country, remember very well, indeed, the way the starry-eyed theorists and temperamental tinkerers and economic quacks tried to tell the farmer how to run his farm, how to plant his seed, and how to reap his crops. I think you will agree with me when I say if there is anything that will make the farmer grab a pitchfork and use it for something besides pitching hay is for some theorist to try to tell him how to run his farm. Nevertheless, we can recall how, under governmental regulations, the farmer could not put up his fruit. He saw it spoil under the trees because his wife could not get enough sugar to preserve it. Clear across this broad land of ours, when food was of the most imperative importance, it was allowed to waste because somebody in Washington had decided how much sugar American housewives ought to use, but knew little or nothing about the fruit and berry crops.

Swollen government is always oppressive. The bigger and more concentrated government becomes, the farther it gets away from the people and the more remote the bureaucratic mazes are from the taxpayers.

The only way to prevent that is to keep government, well and safely in the hands of the people themselves.

What we need in Government is more of the spirit of 1776 and less of the spirit of 76,000 administrative regulations. To get that we will have to have a Republican administration throughout.

American freedom has been pretty seriously whittled away by the New Deal and later by the war powers. The citizens' liberties have ceased to be the paramount consideration of the administration and his privileges are being taken away one by one. We intend to restore them.

Now, the farmers are quite concerned—and properly so—over the proposition for us to help the other nations of the world back on their feet. We recognize the need for us to help rehabilitate these other countries, but we must be certain the American people's money will not be thrown away.

In a broadcast recently I proposed, and I repeat here, a rule of action by which we ought to administer any aid to Europe. That rule of action can be stated in four words: economy, efficiency, common sense, and cooperation.

The only possible way in which this proposal to help Europe can be successful is for us to have the full and complete cooperation of the countries we are trying to help.

The Congress intends to examine very carefully all of the proposals for European and Asiatic help. We sent many of our own Members over to get first-hand information as to the needs and as to how the relief can best be administered.

It is time for us to begin to think of keeping America safe, sound, solvent, and strong, not only for our own sake but for the sake of civilization.

For the past 15 years anybody who spoke a good word for our own country was immediately condemned. To be for our American system is the best brand of patriotism of which our people are capable.

We spilled rivers of precious blood and turned out torrents of goods and machines

and services to fight for freedom abroad. We intend to fight for freedom at home, and to keep freedom at home regardless of how tough a fight it may be.

I want to revert to taxes again for a moment. As the farmers of Iowa and the rest of the people know, we passed a tax bill twice in the first session of the Eightieth Congress. We gave by far the greatest benefits to those in the lower income brackets. We sought to relieve entirely elderly people living on fixed incomes of a thousand dollars a year of any taxes so they might have some of the comforts of life. Twice Mr. Truman saw fit to veto those tax bills because he did not think the American people should have a reduction in taxes.

We passed another tax bill in the House the other day. This bill gives 71.1 percent of the tax relief to the people with incomes of less than $5,000; it frees 6,000,000 people from paying any tax; it gives special relief to the neediest of our people, the aged and the blind. It helps the American taxpayer to meet the high prices. It provides incentive for men and capital to work together for needed expansion and more jobs for the people.

We know full well that in order to cut taxes, we must also cut governmental squandering. The only way it is possible to cut down governmental squandering is to survey the functions the Federal Government has usurped from State and local governments, over the past 16 years. We must return to the State and local levels the functions which belong there, and return to private endeavor the functions which belong there. A joint commission is studying that very problem. The commission will report back to what we are sure will be a Republican Congress, under a Republican President, in 1949. We will then move to separate a lot of bureaus and their functions from the Federal Government. We must cut down the size of Government. We are being asked today by the President for a peacetime budget which amounts to a thousand and twenty dollars for every family of four in the United States The Government pay rolls have been broadened and broadened, until now there are millions of people who have a vested interest in the administration remaining in power because they, or their relatives, want to hold on to soft jobs.

The Eightieth Congress intends to cut spending. It intends to cut taxes. It intends to cut taxes most heavily in the lower brackets. But the fact still remains we must give some incentive to venture capital to go into business to aid in increasing production. As I said a while ago, only through increased production can we hope to beat the inflationary rise.

We are determined our American economy shall not be tilted off balance by extortionate taxes, nor forced into an abyss of ruin by inflation. America can be kept strong and sound and solvent and free, but that cannot be done by giving the administration new powers of rationing, regimentation, regulation and coercion over the lives and activities of the citizens. America became great by traveling the highway of freedom. America is going to stay great by continuing on the highway of freedom.

I want to direct your attention at this point to the fact that for several years there has been an intensive propaganda drive against the Congress. Those who would destroy our American system and bring us under the rule of alien despots, under a foreign concept of government, know they must first destroy the Congress before they can hope to realize their nefarious scheme. The Congress is the people's special instrument of control over their Government and their administrators. It was designed to be so by the founding fathers, who set up our system of constitutional government, free economy, and free society. So long as the people have confidence in their Congress, and stand behind it, the Congress can prevent either of the other two departments of Government from getting out of hand. But the day the people lose their confidence in the Congress, and withdraw their support from it, will mark the day our American system of freedom will have gone by the board. Personal liberty will have been destroyed.

Lincoln had a great faith in government of, by, and for the people. He knew that so long as the people were given the truth they, in the mass, had an inherent wisdom which no individual and no small group could possibly hope to equal. I should like to give you an instance of how, wittingly or unwittingly, vilification and abuse of the Congress and distortion of facts have operated to discredit the Congress in the mind of the people.

We all realize that under conditions in the world, as they are today, we must have a defense wholly adequate to meet any sort of an emergency which may arise. That means a superdefense in the air. It means we must have the most modern and the most scientific defense ever devised by man. It means such a defense is going to be superexpensive. Yet, the statement has been made in the press, over the radio, in speeches, by authoritative spokesmen of the administration, by commentators and others, that the Eightieth Congress, by a pinch-penny policy, had destroyed our national defense and had caused it to become about a fifth-rate defense. It has been said our defense in the air is but a hollow shell. Now the fact is the Eightieth Congress, in its first session, gave permission to the air services to spent $76,000,000 more than the President asked for in his budget. Also, the total budget and spending for the rest of the armed services was reduced only 1.3 percent, or $120,000,000. Now, if a reduction of $120,000,000 knocked our national defense down to fifth place, what did they do with the $9,400,000,000 the Eightieth Congress appropriated for the national defense? That is a question every citizen has a right to ask. It is a question which ought to be answered. The fact is many, many people, a lot of them unwittingly, some of them with sinister design, have repeated those distorted statements and misstatements. Those distortions all operated to cause the people to believe the Eightieth Congress was blind to the necessities of the national defense, when exactly the opposite was the case.

You remember how, when appropriation bills were pending, the bureaus declared they would have to lay off border guards and mail carriers if they didn't get all the money they demanded. When the House Appropriations Committee began to look into these matters and investigate them, the bureaucrats backed off in a hurry. They had laid off border guards, but they put them back to work again, because it was found such action was not necessary at all. It was simply the technique of long-experienced bureaucrats trying to bluff the Congress into voting more and more billions of dollars of the people's money for the bureaucrats to spend.

The situation in the United States, as well as in the world, calls for economy, efficiency, common sense, not only in our international relations, but in our relations between classes and sections in the United States. There never has been a time in the history of America when we more desperately need to make every dollar count; to pull together as a united people to save this country, to help the other nations save themselves, and to save civilization.

God give us the strength and the courage to forge ahead with a strong, sane, sound, solvent America, to lead the rest of the world back to sanity and peace and progress.

The Port of San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the geographical location of the great international seaport city of San Francisco is of tremendous strategic importance to both the peacetime economy and national security of the Nation. This has been proven in the past by the great military and naval establishments, as well as the commercial and industrial establishments, in San Francisco and the bay area. The port of San Francisco and the great San Francisco international airport form the crossroads of commerce between America and the Orient. San Francisco Harbor and Airport mark the progress in the development of the great West. I invite attention to the following editorial which recently appeared in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin:

CENTURY OF PROGRESS—PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO ON THRESHOLD OF NEW GREATNESS 100 YEARS AFTER GOLD RUSH GAVE IT START

It is a centennial coincidence that it was just about a 100 years ago that the port of San Francisco began to take its place of importance in the Nation's economic picture, under the stimulus of the discovery of gold in California, and that today it is beginning to realize fully its vast possibilities as one of the foremost centers of commerce of our times.

Since the days when the Golden Gate was a lodestar to men eager for the quick wealth to be found in the mineral veins of the Sierra Ranges, our port has always been an important one.

It has all the natural advantages—location, climate, and one of the truly splendid harbors of the world.

Prior to the gold rush, these asseta were to a great extent ignored, for the reason that the West still was largely a frontier wilderness, and San Francisco not so much a capital of world trade as an outpost of that frontier, although, of course, it long had been an important community to the old California of the Dons and the Franciscans.

The discovery of gold, which came during a time when there was a general discovery of all the great resources of the West, gave San Francisco its first real start to economic greatness, and the port grew rapidly in importance, maintaining a steady increase through the years until after the First World War, when economic depression, with a consequent falling off of commerce, brought this expansion to a temporary halt.

The years of the Second World War saw a tremendous migration to California—a rediscovery of the West, as it were—and actually the great population tide which swept over the California border exceeded in volume the first migrations of the gold rush.

Now, San Francisco as a port is growing into another stage of its world importance.

This time, we have the added impetus of a general focusing of attention, both national and throughout the world, upon the region of the Pacific, and a general realization of the potentialities of the area, both sharpened by advances in communication and transportation.

Greatness will not fall into San Francisco's lap, however. There has to be some constructive action on our part.

Already, there is some; we are developing plans for a world trade center; our foreign trade zone awaits only the last word of official approval to become a reality; and the current discussion of tideland reclamation, in connection with the proposals to develop shoreline areas here for use as industrial and residential sites, illustrates the awakening interest in the city's possibilities. Next week, a California State Chamber of Commerce meeting is scheduled here at which the chief subject of discussion will be ways and means of increasing the flow of commerce through this—and other California ports.

This awakening interest is a wholesome sign. It should not be allowed to lag. We're started, but we've got quite a way to go yet, and we shouldn't slacken our pace.

M. E. Cremer, manager of the Marine Exchange, recently prepared an article on the steps which the port of New Orleans has taken to develop her maritime commerce, steps which have seen a 71.2 percent increase (during the first three quarters of last year over the same period the preceding year) in the movement of railway cars carrying export freight to that port. A foreign trade zone, diligent efforts to cultivate the good will of businessmen in Latin American countries situated to do business with the Gulf port, and zealous attention to rate structures affecting the port all have played a part in New Orleans' gains.

San Francisco can do likewise.

We've got our start. Let's keep going.

Accurate Forecast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on Friday, February 20, 1948:

ACCURATE FORECAST

In view of the widespread attention being given to the plight of thousands of wild ducks facing starvation this winter in the Parker River wildlife refuge established by the Federal Government over the opposition of numerous responsible citizens of Essex County, the interesting fact has come to light that the identical situation which exists there was predicted 5 years ago in connection with the fight against the project.

Among the foremost opponents of the plan from the time it was instituted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in the latter part of 1942 was the Committee on Preservation of Duck Hunting in Essex County and in accordance with its desires, Attorney Charles D. Mahoney, of Lawrence, the chairman, made an exhaustive study of the availability of the Parker River and Plum Island regions of the county for the establishment of the proposed wildlife refuge. His formal printed report to the committee in April 1943 went into great detail and in arriving at the conclusion that the project was neither necessary nor desirable and that the Federal agency should be requested to abandon its plans, one of Attorney Mahoney's outstanding contentions was the following: "The Fish and Wildlife Service claim that one of the greatest benefits of the proposed refuge will be that it will hold birds in the area for a longer period each fall. If it was established and had that effect, it would be a crime against the ducks. Having stayed too long, they would face slow starvation in a death trap."

Notwithstanding the strong objections of residents and property owners of the affected area, public officials, all the active sporting clubs in the county, and the Council of Sportsman's Clubs of Massachusetts, Inc., the United States Fish and Wildlife Service established the refuge and the situation forecast by Attorney Mahoney has become an exact reality, unfortunately for the ducks that are starving there this winter.

As evidence of its activity and versatility, the same Federal agency announced this week that the Albatross III, a converted United States Coast Guard vessel, is being made ready in East Boston to sail April 1 with a crew of 21 men to conduct the first official census of fish on Georges Bank, the Gulf of Maine, and off Nova Scotia. The operation will take several years and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service expects that it will result in a fairly accurate census of haddock, cod, flounder, halibut, and other food fish. As usual, the American taxpayers will foot the bills and it is to be hoped that they get a better return for their money than was the case in connection with the Parker River refuge; also that the fish fare better than the ducks did.

Charges on Germany Confirmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article from the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., February 23, 1948, written by John O'Donnell. It is self-explanatory.

Every loyal American and the country at large owes a debt of gratitude to men like John O'Donnell for the service they are rendering to the Nation.

Mr. O'Donnell is untiring in his efforts to expose Communists, who can only be considered in the light of traitors in their efforts to destroy our Government.

Mr. O'Donnell's article follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

Pardon us for a moment while we spit on our hands, grab a handful of Old Mother Earth, take a couple of practice swings and then tee off for a sockeroo down the fairway—all without yelling any warning "Fore" into the ears of a gent right in our line of fire. The gent in this case is New York City's eminent counselor and distinguished member of the Empire State bar, Attorney Abraham L. Pomerantz, of 295 Madison Avenue, Manhattan.

Now there are between 750 and 800 accredited newspaper correspondents in this Capital. In addition, there are around 150 accredited magazine writers and another 100 or so radio commentators.

And out of this brigade, the O'Donnell is the one who has before him a plea from Counselor Pomerantz, the self-proclaimed chief United States prosecutor at the Nurnberg trial of Nazi industrialists urging a kick-in to fatten up a defense fund for the convicted Communist Leon Josephson, of Manhattan's Uptown, Downtown, and In My Lady's Chamber, and please send your check, old top, to one Raymond C. Ingersoll, of the Civil Rights Congress of 205 East Forty-second Street.

O. K. babies, you asked for it. Hold your hats and let's go. We shall take up in turn the case of Pomerantz who asks for the dough, Ingersoll who's holding it, and Josephson, who hopes it will spring him.

For eminent Counselor Pomerantz: Last July 9, Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, in the course of his attack on some of the phonies that the War Department had sent as United States spokesmen to the war trials at Nurnberg and other civilian posts in Germany read into the record that "Pomerantz was forced to resign" and then damned the New Deal Washington superiors who appointed him in the first place.

Congressman DONDERO then read Attorney Pomerantz' written declarations in which Pomerantz denounced the tardy efforts of the Truman administration to rid Federal departments of Reds and pinkos as "the most Nazi-like and terrifying law since the Alien and Sedition Act."

And, as Representative DONDERO then pointed out, Mr. Pomerantz by the way is now addressing the Communist-controlled New York State Progressive Citizens of America which is boosting the stock of Henry Wallace, leading Soviet apologist.

Later, the record shows that Pomerantz was a darling of the Daily Worker in many a clip. He wrote for Soviet Russia Today praising pinko Bill Shirer's End of a Berlin Diary, and signed an indignant letter denouncing the canning of the Reds in Hollywood.

Now for the boy who's slated to hold the swag bag to spring convicted Josephson. This is Brother Raymond C. Ingersoll.

Ingersoll we might point out first of all last year was a candidate for State senator from New York City's Harlem-dominated twenty-third assembly district.

But get this. According to the Department of Justice, such outfits as the Civil Rights Congress and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship have been branded as Kremlin fronts, which function solely to overturn the Government of the United States by violence.

On October 10, 1947, Ingersoll filed, in accordance with the Foreign Agent and Lobby Act, a statement with the Clerk of the House of Representatives stating that he was on the pay roll of the Civil Rights Congress. On a letterhead of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, dated February 8, 1946, Ingersoll's name appears as a member of the board of directors.

Had enough? Well, let's go. Let's meditate on the boy they're soliciting the defense funds for, that fine outstanding American, Leon Josephson.

The Josephson racket in part was to take over the soft-headed upper crust of Manhattan's so-called cafe society and make the suckers like the idea of being slapped for a heavy tab while they lapped up, along with the booze, the all-important idea that their fathers, brothers, husbands who had earned the dough they were kicking in were really a bunch of capitalistic mobsters.

Which, all in all, was one of the smartest ways of taking suckers that we've yet met in the Red racket. The fall guys are not only taken for a ride, but they pay the fare as they go along.

Leon, according to the record, lived with his brother, Barney, down on Sixteenth Street, Manhattan, and his wife, Lucy, was a partner with Barney in the two cafe-society boob traps which were sold to the suckers as "hot spots with a social message" and where the philosophy of the proletariat could be

brought to high society without such repugnant requirements as rubbing elbows with the great unwashed.

One of Josephson's expensive Red traps was down in Greenwich Village, the second up on swankier East Fifty-eighth Street. As reporter Howard Rushmore noted a year ago these "two swanky night clubs which reaped hundreds of thousands of dollars of capitalist money while kidding patrons about the sad state of American democracy have for years been Communist Party fronts • • • Not only were Red Fascists assigned as entertainers, waiters, and captains, but Josephson was advised by high-ranking Communists to use Communist propaganda in shows for the cover charge customers."

Back in 1935 Leon Josephson, according to sworn testimony before the House un-American Activities Committee, was in cahoots with a Red fraudulent passport ring, and got nabbed in Denmark on charges of espionage.

Released from the Copenhagen jug he had a talk with Lester Maynard, American Consul General. And this American diplomat in a report to the State Department at that time gave this revealing bit of dope on the kind of a bird Josephson is:

"He explained to me his personal views in regard to the Communist movement, the pertinent part of which was that he considered the orders of his committee (Commie) superior to the laws of the United States and that he would do anything 'short of murder' to carry out the committee's orders."

The European Recovery Program and the International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear that the efforts to free world trade from artificial shackles and restrictions which diminish instead of increase it now going on at Havana through the conference to organize an International Trade Organization are essential to the success of the European recovery program. Without an enhanced opportunity for foreign trade it is difficult to see how the 16 western European nations to benefit from the European recovery program can pull out. The whole program is premised upon a greatly increased export by those countries taken up for the most in income they had before the war on overseas investments, shipping, insurance, and other similar remittances. The enhanced productivity and the vastly increased markets in the world generally make this kind of world stability distinctly practicable. The following article from the New York Herald Tribune of January 28, 1948, by my colleague, Hon. J. K. JAVITS, of New York, together with me, a delegate to the ITO Conference on Trade and Employment at Havana, explains this subject in all its practical aspects.

THE VITAL ISSUE AT HABANA—WORLD ECONOMIC RECOVERY AWAITS SUCCESSFUL LAUNCHING OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

(By Representative J. K. JAVITS, Twenty-first Congressional District, New York)

There has been considerable misunderstanding about the proposals for an International Trade Organization (ITO) now being considered by about 60 nations of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment at Habana. Especially has it been charged that the ITO represents a breakdown of the protective-tariff policies of the Republican Party. Without endeavoring to defend a traditional high-tariff policy at this stage of the world's economic development, it is fair to say, first, that our concern with the ITO is due to our concern with the success of United States foreign and domestic policy; and second, that the ITO does not break down the existing United States tariff policy and does not even change it.

It should be made clear here that no such organization as the ITO has as yet been formed. It is significant that among the 60 nations at Habana negotiating to form it are the world's principal trading nations except for the U. S. S. R., but that included at Habana are two of the so-called Soviet satellites—Czechoslovakia and Poland—as well as countries newly formed as a result of the break-up of prewar empires—Burma, Pakistan, and the Indonesian Republic.

This whole idea of fairer world trade is a United States sponsored idea. It had its origin in the United States-British lend-lease agreements early in the war in which the British promised to negotiate for lifting barriers to world trade after the war. The United States held the British to their promise and came out with proposals as early as December 1945. These proposals were refined in several international conferences, culminating in the conference at Geneva, which lasted from April to August 1947. At Geneva the 18 principal trading nations of the world, other than the U. S. S. R. adopted a draft charter for the ITO consisting of 9 chapters and 100 articles. This charter, if approved by a majority vote of the nations at Habana, will come into force 60 days after at least 20 of the nations at Habana ratify it.

The ITO charter proposes to bring about agreement on the part of the principal commercial nations of the world that artificial barriers against world trade shall be given up. These, for example, are quantitative restrictions—limitations on the quantity of a certain type of goods which may be imported into a particular country; preferential arrangements on imports between two countres which discriminate against other countries; discrimination in internal commerce with regard to excise taxes or sales restrictions on imports; or subsidization of exports by governments in order to capture foreign markets. These practices grew up during the depression of the thirties, when individual countries—and even the traditionally free-trade British Empire—thought they could insulate themselves against the economic troubles of others by building Chinese walls of trade restrictions and trade discriminations.

They were refined into a science by Hjalmar Schacht and the Nazis, who victimized half of Europe with coercive barter agreements, by which they foisted unneeded harmonicas and ersatz aspirin on peoples who were breaking their backs to produce foodstuffs for them. The ITO charter proposes to bring under control these foreign trade weapons, but as to tariffs, the proposed ITO charter only obligates the countries concerned to enter into "negotiations" for the progressive reduction of tariffs.

Our national tariff policy, today, operates under the reciprocal-trade agreements program in which selective reduction of tariffs with other countries is possible on a bargaining basis; that is if other countries will reduce, we will reduce, and makes the reduction available to all with whom we have trade treaties under the most-favored nation principle.

Let no one suppose that all is sweetness and light at Habana. A Latin-American and far-eastern group, spearheaded among others by Argentina, which consider themselves industrially underdeveloped states, are fighting tooth and nail for United States agreement to their continuing various kinds of restrictive foreign-trade practices. But where the shoe pinches is that these restrictions work both ways; if we are excluded from some foreign markets we can also exclude others from our own—and ours is the richest in the world. In these differences Brazil has been our stanch ally. Other nations at Habana have other troubles. Czechoslovakia and Poland are worried about their trade relations with the U. S. S. R., likely to be a nonmember of the ITO, while others express concern with the rights the ITO charter may make them extend to foreign investors.

Yet, there is a remarkable will to succeed at Habana and clear evidence in almost all the delegations that the price of failure in terms of a new international depression is well realized. And when we consider the restrictions to international trade which exist right now there is good reason for alarm. Of the total of 87 trading nations listed by the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce, 55 tightly control imports and require a Government permit before anything can be brought into the country; 61 tightly control foreign exchange to be used to pay for imports, and 69, or about 80 percent, have some type of import or exchange controls.

Since VJ-day two new dramatic factors have appeared on the world trade scene: (1) The effect of the destruction of European production resources and Soviet influence giving a great impetus to state trading in Europe as contrasted with private trading; and (2) the vastly increased United States industrial production rate making it the only really big source of supply of manufactures for export in the world. The latter trend is shown dramatically by the high degree of unbalance between our exports and imports—our exports running at the rate of about $15,000,000,000 a year and our imports at about $7,000,000,000 a year. Accordingly, the other trading nations of the world are now in the position where they fear that their markets will be flooded by our manufacturers and that their resources will be drained away by our goods as soon as they are no longer the proper subjects of benefits from us such as those in the various relief bills we have passed since the war and in the proposed ERP itself.

Without an international trade organization, we would expect that these countries would erect even higher barriers against our trade and engage in more discrimination and preferential arrangements than ever; and in view of the prevalence of State trading they are in a better position than ever to do so. If we retaliated, as indeed we would, and so would other nations, it would defeat the capability of the western European nations in the ERP to recover their trade and would jeopardize our own domestic economy.

Thus a guaranty of fairer world trade is on the one hand essential to our own economy and on the other vital to the success of the ERP. This is shown very clearly by the import figures. According to our past history, and taking into consideration the overall increase of about one-third in prices generally since prewar, we should be importing not $6,000,000,000 worth of goods but $9,000,000,000. Our imports from South America, from Canada and from Central America have held up to this level, but our imports from Europe are about one-half of what they were prewar, and from Asia about 25 percent; yet it takes just about $2,000,000,000 a year in additional trade to make up for the western European nations what they have lost in income from their investments, from shipping, insurance, and other enterprises which they had prewar but which they do not have postwar.

We are now practically all agreed that hunger and despair in the world are the perfect breeding ground for war, and yet an analysis of the world income figure shows how far we are from decent world living standards. Individuals in most countries have annual incomes which are a small fraction of that of the people in our country. Contrasted with our per capita income of $1,200 in 1946, countries like Colombia, Brazil, Guatemala, and Chile show per capita incomes of about $100 a person a year, and more industrially developed countries like France, the United Kingdom, and Argentina show incomes per capita of between $300 and $500 a year. Standards of living in the world are very low indeed, but with enormous increases in production in the United States and enormous increases in production in other countries to be logically expected as a result of the new direction of our foreign policy toward financing recovery, self-help, and mutual cooperation, great vistas of higher standards of living and general well-being are being opened up for us and other peoples.

Our whole purpose in undertaking the ERP and in our foreign policy generally is to attain a prosperous and peaceful world. This, it seems clear, is most likely to be attained if world trade can flow fairly and easily. It is the surest guaranty that programs of self-help and mutual cooperation like the ERP will realize their objective and really enable the nations that participate to continue to stand on their feet at the end. Success in organizing an ITO at Havana, therefore, will demonstrate the ability of the democratic nations to unite on economic principles which are essential to their success, while failure will be seized upon as the surest sign that the economic cataclysm is on the horizon which Soviet-inspired propagandists so insistently claim to be inescapable for the democratic world. Any such failure will be exploited to the full by those who seek to drive nations at this very moment engaged in a grim struggle for their own freedom into becoming "police states." United States leadership at Havana must be unfaltering. The democratic nations in conference there cannot—they dare not—fail.

Praise for Congressman Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, at the annual dinner of the Lincoln Association of Jersey City, which since 1866 has never failed to commemorate the birthday of the Great Emancipator, one of the two main speakers was our colleague the gentleman from New Jersey, Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE. I am pleased to enclose herewith a brief but complimentary appraisal of the speech he delivered on that occasion, as it appeared in the Jersey Journal of Saturday, February 14. It is as follows:

The people of Union County should be proud of CLIFFORD P. CASE, their Representative in Congress. His speech at the Lincoln Association of Jersey City was a courageous and plainly worded program of the kind of common sense which made Abraham Lincoln such a terror to his political rivals.

The Other Side of the Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this is Brotherhood Week. It is being observed throughout the country in an endeavor to emphasize to all of the people of the country that these United States were conceived and made strong by religious men who fervently believed in practicing the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God.

Permit me to direct your attention to an editorial written by the Rev. Robert W. Searle, D. D., which appeared in a recent issue of the Protestant Church Life, official weekly publication of the Protestant Council of the City of New York. It reads as follows:

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ROAD

"The other side" of the road has been deeply grooved by the feet of the many who have passed by.

The original Priest and Levite doubtless had ecclesiastical appointments which could not be deferred, or perhaps there were traditional services in which they were expected to participate. Whatever it was that caused them to pass by on the other side may have satisfied their conscience, but it did not in the supreme judgment of Jesus equal the obligation that lay on the far side of the road in the form of a human being in immediate need.

That deep groove which they initiated has been hollowed out by the feet of countless priests and Levites who, in the generations since, have followed the original footsteps, governed in their action by similar motives.

Today it is humanity itself that lies wounded by the roadside, and, because of America's unique resources, it is we, the clergy, the officials and the members of the American churches, who are walking the Jericho Road. We have approached the place where wounded humanity lies. We are at the moment of decision.

Is it more important for us at this moment to carry on our traditional ecclesiastical duties in the traditional and accepted pattern? Or should we, as clergy, officials, and laymen, agree to deviate our patterns so far as necessary to reach the place where wounded humanity lies, that we may do our utmost to make the will of America the will of the Good Samaritan, who not only bound up the wounds but made provision for "whatsoever more was needed"?

Also most apropos is the following versè, written by Rabbi Joseph Klein, of Temple Beth Emeth, of Brooklyn, N. Y.:

A THOUGHT FOR BROTHERHOOD MONTH

A prophet spoke this long ago
In ancient Palestine;
A simple statement of the faith
He held to be divine—
"It hath been told to thee, O man,
What to the Lord is good,
And what He doth require of thee,
Whatever be thy mood—
To do the just
And love the kind,
And humbly walk
With God in mind."

No observance of any brotherhood movement should pass without a rereading of Walter W. Van Kirk's Ten Commandments of Good Will, which follow:

TEN COMMANDMENTS OF GOOD WILL

I. I will respect all men and women regardless of their race or religion.

II. I will protect and defend my neighbor and my neighbor's children against the ravages of racial or religious bigotry.

III. I will exemplify in my own life the spirit of goodwill and understanding.

IV. I will challenge the philosophy of racial superiority by whomsoever it may be proclaimed, whether they be kings, dictators, or demagogues.

V. I will not be misled by the lying propaganda of those who seek to set race against race or nation against nation.

VI. I will refuse to support any organization that has for its purpose the spreading of anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, or anti-Protestanism.

VII. I will establish comradeship with those who seek to exalt the spirit of love and reconciliation throughout the world.

VIII. I will attribute to those who differ from me the same degree of sincerity that I claim for myself.

IX. I will uphold the civil rights and religious liberties of all citizens and groups whether I agree with them or not.

X. I will do more than live and let live—I will live and help live.

Mexican Trade Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States on February 2 sent to this Congress certain recommendations for a so-called civil-rights program. In his message he listed the securing fully of all our essential human rights as the most important of all of the goals toward which we should strive in order to strengthen our democracy. He said further, and I quote:

Unfortunately there still are examples—flagrant examples—of discrimination which are utterly contrary to our ideals.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to one of the most flagrant of these discriminations that has come to my attention. What makes it even more flagrant and undemocratic is the fact that it stems from and is the responsibility of our own Chief Executive.

I make no bald, unsupported statement. I offer proof, and I challenge the administration to attempt to disprove it. They dare not try—their only salvation lies in keeping it from the public—just one more violation of their obligations.

In 1942 the United States and Mexico negotiated a trade agreement in which each country agreed to reciprocal tariff reductions. In that agreement, if the President and his negotiators conformed to the spirit and the letter of the Trade Agreements Act then the tariff concessions granted by each party were roughly equivalent in value. The life and meaning of the agreement hinged on the continued effectiveness of the concessions

granted by one as a quid pro quo for those granted by the other.

This agreement became effective January 30, 1943, and was for a basic period of 3 years and thereafter until terminated by either government. This basic period expired just 2 years ago, but even as early as 1945 Mexico notified the United States that the terms of the agreement could no longer be adhered to. Mexico attempted over a long period to withdraw certain concessions and to terminate the agreement. If the ultra-secret records of the President's inner-sanctum State Department could be made public we would know for a surety that the United States tried desperately to keep the agreement alive. Such termination would have a serious effect on the whole program and prove what has long been maintained by American industry—that now is no time to force the world into a free-trade strait-jacket.

The State Department may deny that they ever received a definite, written unequivocal notice that Mexico intended to terminate the agreement. Only their secret files would reveal the truth of the matter, but we do know that about July 1947 this country was notified by Mexico of her positive intention to increase all her tariff rates and to abrogate every concession granted to the United States. Furthermore, on December 20, 1947, Mexico unconditionally and without a single reservation canceled, abrogated, and terminated every single concession granted under the terms of the agreement and increased duties and tariff rates to a point higher than those prevailing in 1942 when the agreement was negotiated.

Now the administration may claim that the agreement was merely modified by this drastic action. This would be a subterfuge so open and serious that I wonder if even the diplomatic immunity which the State Department so frequently hides behind would shield them. Yet it appears to be the President's claim.

The agreement gave either side the authority to terminate it. Mexico has taken every conceivable action designed to do so and it seems inconceivable that anyone would deny that the agreement has been ended. The President has no authority under any law, emergency or otherwise, to continue the many tariff cuts proclaimed when the agreement was made effective. He is openly and brazenly flouting the law and the rights of our laborers, producers, and of Congress itself.

I want to make one thing perfectly clear. I do not, and have not, claimed that the concessions made to Mexico have, as yet, wrecked American industry. It may be conceded that, the condition of the world being what it is, many of the concessions made to Mexico could be continued for some time without having too serious an effect on very many domestic industries. I have no intention of trying to narrow my vision in that respect. But all that is entirely beside the point.

The President has not kept the faith; he has not abided by his legal obligations. The termination of the Mexican agreement might be denied by him, but the continuation of American concessions cannot be justified in any sense of the word, under the Trade Agreements Act, his emergency powers, or in any other way. If the country of Mexico has only modified the former agreement, in the eyes of the President of the United States, then certainly every other nation with which we have agreements may properly, and many of them have already, renounce or modify their concessions to us without any feeling of having violated solemn obligations.

To show how bad the situation really is and how far the administration has gone in its ignoring of the legal rights of our citizens I call your attention to a recent announcement by the Acting Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Committee for Reciprocity Information that interested parties might file briefs and appear and be heard in connection with the renegotiation of the Mexican agreement. The public notices themselves completely transgress the first of the ideals which he urged upon Congress in his recent message, viz: to secure fully our essential civil, and human rights. These announcements specifically limited those who could appear and present their case to exporters. Domestic producers, labor organizations, importers, had no standing, had no apparent right or interest in the matter.

It is obvious to any close observer that the President does not intend to withdraw any of the concessions made to Mexico regardless of the rights of domestic labor or industry. He apparently intends to ask Mexico to revise certain of its tariffs which in some instances have been raised to the astronomical heights of over 5,000 percent. In this renegotiation of an agreement which has actually terminated but which the President claims was only "modified," the United States will have to do two things:

First. It will be necessary to prove to Mexico that reducing of duty will not injure the industries of that country. Our negotiators failed to do that in more than 2 years of attempts to dissuade the Mexican Government from terminating the agreement.

Second. They must offer the Mexicans some concessions, have everything to lose and nothing to gain unless some quid pro quo is offered.

Mr. Speaker, this situation is only typical of the mismanagement, secret negotiating, and outright violation of the authority granted to the President and the State Department to enter into foreign agreements. I wonder if the President will, after such fiascoes, ask this Congress for any extension of his authority to enter into these agreements. I wonder if he can face the producers of American goods who were denied the right to appear and present their case, and talk to them about human rights and civil liberties. I wonder if he will ever make an attempt to explain his actions to the American people.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson, from the Washington Star of February 23, 1948:

PREAMBLE TO ERP SEEN MAKING ERROR BY IGNORING PEOPLE'S DESPAIR IN EUROPE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The preamble to the European recovery program reiterates what I believe to be a fundamental error of analysis of the European crisis. This error is that the crisis is primarily economic. I think it is not.

The economic crisis is the result of European social, political, and spiritual crises, not the other way around. That is why the crisis cannot and will not be cured by economic aid. The aid is necessary to prevent imminent collapse. But it is folly to expect that, of itself, it will result in recovery.

The social and political crisis of all Europe is not postwar. It was prewar, otherwise there would have been no war—no Mussolini, no Franco, no Hitler, no periodic and perpetual breakdowns. Since World War I, there has been no prolonged period of social stability in any major country of Europe. The reasons, I repeat, were not primarily economic.

DESPAIR LED TO NAZIS

Germany did not go into the Nazi revolution because the people were starving or money was valueless or only because of a great depression. The latter accelerated the Nazi revolution but did not create it. It was created out of that always revolutionary phenomenon, spiritual despair, and collapse of faith in existing institutions of all kinds—a feeling of rootlessness and inner chaos which expressed itself everywhere in the phrase: "It can't go on like this; something must happen."

The Nazi revolution was itself nihilistic, chaotic in its essence, but its initial power consisted in creating the illusion that it would build a new organic society in which everyone would know his place and, therefore, be at peace.

The Nazi revolution presented a quiet voluntary relinquishment of "individual freedom," the maintenance of which the preamble to the ERP bill reiterates to be our objective. The reason so many millions were willing to relinquish individual "liberty" was, first, that the whole trend of modern times—in Europe, and here too—has progressively subordinated individual liberty to what is conceived to be the social or national welfare. Thus it created a schism between rights of the individual and the rights of society as a whole. Somewhere the schism had to be breached, and the Nazi revolution seemed to many a way of breaching it. It offered, for instance, a planned economy—and furthermore it delivered one which worked, as far as Germany herself was concerned.

SIMILAR TO FRENCH CRISIS

The French crisis is not dissimilar. What we have been seeing is the liquidation of the nineteenth-century liberal era, the liquidation bringing with it immense upheavals.

Why, for instance, must France import food? France is a rich agricultural country, large in area for its population, with further rich resources in its African colonies. Wholly situated in the temperate zone, with plentiful rainfall and excellent soil, France is one of the more favored nations of the earth.

France must import food because of the famous "scissors" between town and country. The French peasant still is living in the liberal era. The French industrial worker, however, is trying to live in a Socialist era. The French farmer expects to sell his produce for real money or real goods and at a profit to himself, while the French industrial worker wants to eat well, cheaply. If the farmer cannot get a profitable price for bread grains, he turns them into cattle food and if he cannot get a profitable price for meat, he butchers for home consumption or sells to black marketeers.

Precisely this condition in Russia in the early thirties led to the forcible collectivization of agriculture and the deportation of millions of "kulaks"—successful peasants—to Siberia.

New York State Legislature's Memorial Resolution for Lifting of Palestine Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the legislature of the State of New York has passed a resolution memorializing the President, the State Department, and the Congress to take immediate steps to cancel the present embargo on the shipments of arms and munitions to the Jewish people of Palestine who are defending the decision of the United Nations, which follows. The present situation in Palestine demands prompt, realistic, and constructive action along the lines called for in the resolution:

Senate Resolution 70

Whereas the United Nations has decreed that Palestine shall be partitioned into separate Arab and Jewish states; and

Whereas the Arab nations, in defiance of the decree of the United Nations, have refused to participate in negotiations preparatory or subsequent to the vote on the partition plan; and

Whereas the Arab nations have persistently followed a course of terror and violence designed to nullify and prevent the implementation of the United Nations Palestine decision; and

Whereas the Jews of the world, in a spirit of amity and compromise born of the suffering and persecution which they have endured through the ages, have gratefully accepted and agreed to be bound by the decision of the United Nations on Palestine although it does not carry out promises made to them in the Balfour declaration; and

Whereas the public press carries daily accounts of unprovoked mass Arab raids and terroristic attacks against the Jewish people in Palestine and the toll of wounded and dead Jewish people continues to mount with unabating intensity; and

Whereas the Arab attacks on the Jews threaten to disturb the peace of the world and the Jewish people should be permitted, assisted and encouraged to arm and defend themselves against such attacks; and

Whereas this Nation, through its embargo on arms and munitions destined for shipment to the Middle East, has prevented the Jews of Palestine from obtaining the weapons of defense sorely needed by them to resist and defend themselves against the attacks of the Arabs, while the Arabs continue to secure arms and munitions from neighboring Arab and other states; and

Whereas the Honorable William O'Dwyer has openly announced his opposition to the arms embargo and has urged the Government of the United States to cancel the same and to permit the immediate shipment of weapons and munitions to the embattled Jews of Palestine; and

Whereas the people of the State of New York are justifiably disturbed and alarmed over the plight of these defenseless Jews in Palestine and urgently implore the President and the State Department to cancel the arms embargo without further delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the President, the State Department, and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully memorialized to take such steps as may be necessary to cancel the present embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to the Jewish people of Palestine who are defending the decision of the United Nations and make possible the immediate shipment of arms and munitions for the defense of the Jewish people of Palestine against the unprovoked acts of aggression and warfare of the Arabs; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York.

By order of the senate,
WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

In assembly, February 10, 1948, concurred in without amendment.
ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Reserve Officers' Association Commended by Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Reserve Officers' Association, which speaks for the Reserves of the country, is making a great contribution to our national defenses through its sponsorship of National Security Week, February 12 to February 22, inclusive.

The Reserve Officers' Association enjoys the support of all the services, and among the many commendations is one from the Department of the Navy, over the signature of the Secretary, John L. Sullivan, which is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

I am very grateful for the opportunity to express on behalf of the Department of the Navy this unqualified endorsement of the twenty-sixth annual observance of National Security Week, sponsored by the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States.

For the past 25 years your splendid association has sought diligently to overcome public apathy toward the urgent needs of the Military Establishment and the problems of national security. You are performing a splendid service and making a great contribution to our national welfare, for it is upon the people themselves that the strength of our armed forces and the safety of our Nation ultimately depend.

The need for this service is great today. Public interest in preparedness tends to reach its lowest ebb immediately following the cessation of hostilities. This is a period hazardous to our national safety, for it is difficult to maintain our armed forces at their authorized complement on a voluntary basis.

I therefore commend the Reserve Officers' Association for its distinguished service in stimulating public awareness of the need for national security and of the means for insuring it. You are fighting a good fight, and—speaking for the Navy—I encourage you to persevere in this work to the satisfactory realization of our mutual objectives.

JOHN L. SULLIVAN,
Secretary of the Navy.

Internship in Government Proposed—Our Own American Government—People Should Be Fully Acquainted With Their Own Government Here in the United States—A Knowledge of Our Own Government Will Be the Greatest Bulwark Against Any Foreign Ideologies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am offering today a bill which is a step in the direction of giving young men and women interested in public life the best possible on-the-job training in legislative and administrative functions of our National Government. This will open up a vast amount of potential leadership.

The bill, if enacted, will create a commission to prepare a plan to enable selected students, who are training and who desire to train for Government service, to actually serve an internship in the Federal Government.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to create a commission to prepare a plan to enable selected students who are training or who desire to train for Government service to actually serve an internship within the Federal Government

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created a Commission on Internship in Federal Government, to be composed of the following members, to be appointed by the President: (1) Three officers of the executive branch of the Federal Government; (2) one representative from each of four different veterans' organizations incorporated by act of Congress; (3) such other members as the President deems advisable, also three Members of the Senate, to be selected by the President pro tempore of the Senate; three Members of the House of Representatives, to be selected by the Speaker of the House; and

three officers of the judicial branch of the Government, to be selected by the Chief Justice of the United States. The members of the Commission shall select a Chairman from among their number. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized and directed to prepare a comprehensive plan for the establishment of an internship program to enable selected students who are training or who desire to train for Government service to serve an internship within the Federal Government, thereby gaining practical experience in the operations of all branches of the Federal Government so that they may be better fitted to perform their duties in Government service as well as their obligations as citizens of the United States. The Commission shall submit such plan to the Congress and to the President as soon as practicable after the Eighty-first Congress is convened and organized. Ten days after the submission of such plan the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 3. (a) The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services as such, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(b) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as it deems necessary to the performance of its duties.

(c) All expenditures of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $50,000, to carry out the purposes of this act.

DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE AND INFORMATION

George Washington and Thomas Jefferson were both great believers in dissemination of knowledge and information to the people. It was their belief that if the people knew the truth, a great majority of them would do what was right, which would result in a good government, established upon the will of the people. In furtherance of that idea our Government, since its beginning, has allowed newspapers to be circulated free within the county where published, in order to encourage local newspapers that would carry current news and keep the people informed. This policy kept subscription rates to the minimum and caused wider distribution.

Another good policy was that the distribution of newspapers and magazines and all reading matter outside the county of publication should be sent through the mails at a very low postage rate; in fact, so low that the Government has made appropriations to make up for the deficit every year, but it caused a much wider distribution of reading matter.

In this day and age we are witnessing attacks upon our own American Government, which is the finest and greatest Government on the face of the earth. It is my personal belief that the best defense of our own Government will spring from our own people, who really know and understand our form of government.

When I first came to Congress—20 years ago—I made plans to prepare for my constituents each week a report in the form of a weekly letter, which has been published in most of the newspapers in the district I represent since that time. In order to properly discuss our Government, a question-and-answer method was adopted. Each week I would have in the weekly letter two or more questions and answers bringing out the important points in connection with the Federal Government. This method proved so popular that a number of the public-school superintendents asked for copies. They were reproduced in mimeographed form and distributed. Later, these questions and answers were inserted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Members of Congress expressed an interest in them and they were reprinted as a public document and distributed by many Members of Congress to their constituents, which aroused the interest of the citizens throughout the country. More than a million copies of these documents were sold by the Government Printing Office.

The 1946 revision of my booklet, which was a public document on Our American Government—What Is It? How Does It Function? became obsolete due to changes brought about in congressional procedure and executive policies caused by the enactment of the Maximum Employment Act, the Legislative Reorganization Act, the Atomic Energy Commission Act, the Armed Services Unification Act, and others.

Since it was not possible to have an expanded, up-to-date book printed as a public document, a private publisher—Ziff-Davis Publishing Co., of Chicago—agreed to print the book in a form that would insure wide distribution.

The present book includes 1,001 questions and answers and is now published by the Ziff-Davis Publishing Co. under the title, Our American Government—The Answers to 1,001 Questions on How It Works.

This book, I hope, is in the public interest and will make a contribution toward informing the people of our country on the virtues of our own great Government.

Permission having been granted, I am inserting herewith an editorial which appeared in the New York Times, January 25, 1948, on Schooling for Government:

SCHOOLING FOR GOVERNMENT

A number of recent developments point to the urgent necessity for reexamining the haphazard lack of system by which we staff our Government on all levels, Federal, State, and municipal. Yesterday's Times, for instance, reported some remarks made before the American Society of Civil Engineers, meeting in New York City, by the executive director of the Tax Institute, Inc. The engineers were told that leaders of today are as unprepared to plan a city functionally adapted to the needs of tomorrow as the leaders of 150 years ago were in planning a city for present needs. During the past week the Citizens' Budget Commission has been revealing some of the fantastic inefficiency and waste in New York City's sprawling government, whose expense budget runs now to more than $1,000,000,000 a year. Everywhere, in cities, States, and in the Federal Government, costs have been rising, and anxious officials are seeking ways that will make administration more businesslike. For government, our largest business, is far from being run like a business.

It is a curious fact that, as personnel numbers and Government costs have risen, as services expand and new concepts of responsibility take hold, we have paid little more attention than we did years ago to the training of young men and women specifically for careers in civil service and the higher posts in government. A young man may set his goal to be a physician and work specifically toward that end from his high-school days. He may do the same with law, with engineering, with teaching, and an infinite number of other specialties. But how rare it is to hear a young person say that he is studying for government.

As taxpayers and otherwise we are greatly the losers by the failure to see this problem whole and act upon it. President Truman commented on it some months ago at Princeton, which is one of the few institutions where a substantial attack is being made on this challenging problem. It would be a fine thing if a close partnership could be worked out between our colleges and our various governments whereby students training for government could actually serve on a part-time or vacation basis in municipal, State, and Federal offices, a form of internship not only educational for the students but helpful to government itself. There have been some experiments along this line, but no wide use of the plan. This might be arranged on a scholarship basis. It would bring fresh ideas into musty Government departments. It would also tend to make the schooling for government less theoretical and more practical. With a trained body of graduates to draw upon, the civil service would be constantly refreshed and strengthened.

Our governments have been extremely slow to recognize their needs and opportunities for college-trained staffs. Their tardiness is matched only by the lack of emphasis that our educational leaders have given to this field of possible service. Unfortunately, there is little evidence even now of any emerging program to remedy the defect.

I am also inserting herewith excerpts from President Harry Truman's talk at Princeton University recently as it appeared in the New York Times, June 18, 1947. It is as follows:

On an earlier occasion of equal significance in the history of this university, the President of the United States, Grover Cleveland, spoke in 1896 at the Princeton sesquicentennial ceremonies. President Cleveland seized that opportunity to charge our colleges and universities with the task of supplying a "constant stream of thoughtful, educated men" to the body politic—men who were eager to perform public service for the benefit of the Nation. He chided our institutions of higher learning for their lack of interest in public affairs, and held them responsible for the disdain with which many of the best-educated men of the day viewed politics and public affairs.

Happily for us, that attitude on the part of our universities vanished long ago. I am certain that no observer of the American scene in recent years has detected any reluctance on the part of our educators to enter the political arena when their services have been asked. And our schools have made much progress in supplying the "constant stream of thoughtful, educated men" for public service called for by President Cleveland half a century ago.

That task is more important today than at any previous time in our national history.

INTEGRITY NEEDED AS NEVER BEFORE

In our free society, knowledge and learning are endowed with a public purpose—a noble purpose, close to the heart of democracy. That purpose is to help men and women develop their talents for the benefit of their fellow citizens. Our advance in the natural sciences has led to almost miraculous achievements, but we have less reason to be proud of our progress in developing the capacity among men for cooperative living. In the present critical stage of world history, we need, more than ever before, to enlist all our native integrity and industry in the conduct of our common affairs.

The role of the United States is changing more rapidly than in any previous period of our history. We have had to assume world-wide responsibilities and commitments. Our people have placed their trust in the Government as the guardian of our democratic ideals and the instrument through which we work for enduring peace.

The success of the Government's efforts in achieving these ends will depend upon the quality of citizenship of our people. It will also depend upon the extent to which our leaders in business, labor, the professions, agriculture, and every other field, appreciate the role of their Government and the greatness of its tasks.

Our schools must train future leaders in all fields to understand and concern themselves with the expanded role of government, and, equally important, to see the need for effective administration of the Government's business in the public interest.

SHORTAGE OF OFFICIALS "CRITICAL"

I call your attention particularly to the problem of effective administration within the Government, where matters of unprecedented magnitude and complexity confront the public servant. If our national policies are to succeed, they must be administered by officials with broad experience, mature outlook, and sound judgment. There is, however, a critical shortage of such men—men who possess the capacity to deal with great affairs of state.

The Government has recruited from our academic institutions many members of its professional staffs—geologists, physicists, lawyers, economists, and others with specialized training. These men are essential to the conduct of the Government and the welfare of the Nation. But we have been much less effective in obtaining persons with broad understanding and an aptitude for management. We need men who can turn a group of specialists into a working team and who can combine imagination and practicability with a sound public program.

All large organizations, public or private, depend on the teamwork of specialists. Coordination is achieved by administrators trained to assemble the fruits of specialized knowledge and to build on that foundation a sound final decision. Men trained for this kind of administrative and political leadership are rare indeed.

In the task of finding and training men and women who will add strength to the public service, universities have a particular responsibility. They should develop in their students the capacity for seeing and meeting social problems as a whole and for relating special knowledge to broad issues. They should study the needs of Government, and encourage men and women with exceptional interests and aptitudes along the necessary lines to enter the Government service.

WOODROW WILSON SCHOOL CITED

The Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs of this university was established with this purpose in mind. It seeks to prepare students for public careers. It is significant that the school bears the name of a statesman whose concept of civic duty contributed so much to the Nation and to the world.

Of course, the Government cannot and does not expect to rely entirely upon our educational institutions for its administrators. It must bring into service from business and labor and the professions the best qualified persons to fill the posts at all levels.

The Government must take several steps to make its career service more attractive to the kind of men and women it needs.

Salary limitations prevent the Government, in many instances, from securing the kind of executives required to manage its vital activities. Capable administrators are too frequently drawn away from the Government to private positions with salaries many times what they could earn in Government service. This situation can be remedied only by laws to bring salaries more nearly into line with the heavy responsibilities that executives carry at the higher levels in the public service.

The complexities of the tasks now facing our top officials force them to spend most of their time in studying matters of policy. These officials should be supported by a career group of administrators skilled in the various aspects of management. If capable men and women can look forward to holding such posts as a reward for able service, they will be more eager to accept Government employment.

TRAINING PROGRAMS HELD NEEDED

Because of the difficult tasks of Government today, we should plan a program for the systematic training of civilian employees once they have entered the public service. It is not generally possible at the present time for the Federal Government to send its employees to universities for special short-term training programs. Nor is it permissible under existing law to spend Federal funds for Government schools to develop the knowledge and techniques required by officials in their work.

This is a problem that can be solved only by the joint efforts of the Government and the universities. Training programs can be formulated both on the job and on the campus. The Government must make provision for its employees to participate. The universities will need to provide courses well adapted to increasing the effectiveness of the employee in his job. Such a plan is certain to pay substantial dividends.

I have been speaking about the important contribution which educational institutions can make in the service of the Nation through preparing men and women to administer our far-flung public enterprises.

Statement of Mr. Michael A. McGrath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement of Michael A. McGrath, national president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies' Auxiliary in America, before the Foreign Affairs Committee, United States House of Representatives, on February 5, 1948:

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL A. M'GRATH, NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS AND LADIES' AUXILIARY IN AMERICA, BEFORE THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 5, 1948

Gentlemen, my appearance before your committee is in my capacity as the national president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies' Auxiliary in America.

The Ancient Order of Hibernians was organized in the United States in June 1836.

It affiliates itself with the American League for an Undivided Ireland, whose national president is the Honorable Joseph Scott, of California, who speaks before you, for 30,000,000 men and women of Irish blood by virtue of a mandate from the Irish Race Convention, held in the city of New York, November 22 and 23, 1947.

We are deeply concerned with the attempt of the British Empire, to receive a grant or loan from the United States under the Marshall plan, that your honorable committee now has under consideration.

Our opposition is primarily directed to a proposed allocation of money, which Sir Basil Brooke, Premier of the Ulster Government, who has stated that a minimum sum of $40,000,000 is necessary to carry on the military and some civic operations, in the northeast six counties of Ireland.

I am certain that your committee, and I believe the people of the United States, are fully aware of the weakened financial structure of the British Empire. The implication of this financial weakness was evident in 1946 when the Congress of the United States approved a loan of $3,750,000,000 to this same British Empire.

The thousands of men and women enrolled in the membership of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies Auxiliary, vigorously protest as American taxpayers, the rending of one red cent to the British Empire, for the purpose of maintaining a bridgehead in ancient Ireland, and to delay, if possible, the action of the large majority of the inhabitants of that ancient country to abolish the artificial boundary that has existed against all reason since 1920, and was set up by virtue of a shotgun treaty, reference to which has been made to your committee.

I am sure that your committee is not unmindful of the millions of Irish nationals who immigrated to these United States, who assimilated themselves and played a major part in the establishing of this Republic, and its maintenance down to this present date.

The magnificent contribution of Irish blood in every war in which our Nation has been compelled to engage, is not exceeded by any racial group, with all respect to the splendid contributions made by other groups to preserve our Union. From the time of the Continental Congress down to the present time, the halls of your National Legislature has resounded to the many tributes paid to the loyalty and valor of young Irish men and women to this country of their adoption.

Whatever emotional appeal myself or the various witnesses register in our opposition of the British grant or loan, call it what you may, is understandable from the standpoint of race pride.

The membership of the organization that I have the honor to represent, are Americans first. Their fealty has never been in question and it is as faithful and loyal American citizens and taxpayers, that we are vitally conberned with the political, social, economic, and financial welfare of the United States of America.

Men and women of the Irish race everywhere, have always followed the admonition of the Saviour, to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and give shelter to the homeless. We join with you Members of the Congress in the extension of Christian charity to all oppressed people everywhere in the world.

This protest, that comes from the millions of men and women of Irish lineage in the United States, is one that I respectfully submit to the Congress of the United States. It should be heeded. Before any allocation of money under the Marshall plan to the British Empire, there should be a definite and positive understanding that the American taxpayers' money will not be used in any fashion to thwart or delay the unity that Ireland enjoyed for centuries and which she seeks now to maintain in fact.

I submit this statement for your consideration.

Rationing and Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received a very cogent letter from a prominent rancher in my State of North Dakota. He has very clearly set forth facts relating to price control and rationing, and I should like every Member of the House of Representatives to have the advantage of reading his letter. I should like to include the letter of Mr. Paul Schoff under unanimous consent:

ST. ANTHONY, N. DAK., *February 3, 1948.*
Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: I want to touch a little on the subject of rationing and price controls on meat and other farm commodities. If Congress wants to impose meat rationing and price controls on meat and other farm products, it will have to go all out and include steel, farm machinery, automobiles, clothing, lumber, gas and oil, and labor. One of the best and most important things Congress could do today would be to cut out the black market on automobiles, farm trucks, and farm machinery. A $1,000 black-market premium on a $1,700 or $1,800 automobile, farm truck, or tractor is a common practice. The black-market dealers have rows of new autos, trucks, and tractors in line along the highway between Mandan and Bismarck and few can be obtained from the dealers.

The rationing of meat would drive the available supply into the hands of the black market racketeers, with huge profits to the black-market operators, at the expense of the consuming public and the farmers. There is a meat shortage because the supply is smaller than the demand. By discouraging production the problem will not be solved, on the contrary, production should be increased, and encouraged to be increased, to meet the demand. In order to bring about increased production of meat an increased supply of labor must be made available for the farms. At present no one wants to work on a farm because industrial wages are at an all-time peak, and workers are protected by a 40-hour week with time-and-a-half for overtime. As a result, no one wants to work on a farm under open-weather hazards, when in the towns many working places are even air conditioned.

The rancher has to haul six or seven loads of hay on Sunday, or Monday, or Saturday, every day of the week, whether he works 16- or 18-hour days. The pay is the same whether he works 80 or 90 hours a week, without any overtime. My boys and I have been putting in about 80 hours a week on our ranch all winter because no one wants to work on a farm. We winter about 400 head of livestock. We have cut down too much. Our ranch is capable of supporting 1,000 head of cattle on an average. We are hauling six and seven loads of hay every day, including Sundays, because we cannot catch up to bring in enough hay to last for Sunday without hauling on Sunday, because help is not available. I asked two young men at Mandan to work for me Saturday evening. I asked them what they had to have, and they replied: "I am making better than $200 per month here at 80 cents an hour and with time-and-a-half for overtime. So I would have to have about $250 per month. I know that's more than a farmer can afford to pay, but I would not even go out because in town I do not have to dig around in the snow and cold. In town I work inside all the time."

This, and only this, is the fundamental cause for the high cost of living, as the steaks and pork chops and all other cuts do not fall from the horizon ready to pick up, they still have to be worked for—and worked hard. Industrial wages, higher than ever before in history, have pushed farm wages way out of sight, where it is impossible to pay them, and further no one wants to work on a farm, or ranch any more. Farm wages in North Dakota today are higher than in any other State in the Union. Thousands of young farm couples and farm youth are drifting to the towns and cities to share in the high industrial wages and better working standards and shorter hours. For example, during and after World War I, a farmer could hire the best farm man for $500 or $600 a year. We had one man for 3 years in succession at $500 per year—the best man we ever had.

Then a good hand could be hired by the year at an average of $50 a month, in contrast to today when $150 to $250 per month is asked and the employee does not try to work, but just puts in his time to get his pay check. Twenty-five years ago one could get help that wanted to work, and knew how to work, and who did not want to put in most of the time sitting in some air-conditioned bar. (It's 27° below zero here now—not air-conditioned to haul hay.) Labor scarcity, and its unwillingness to work, is the cause for the short-meat supply, and also for the shortage of clothing, machinery, lumber, and everything else. Yes, the 40-hour week and time and a half is the cause for high prices. For example, if a bushel of apples is worth only $3, measured by the buyers ability to pay, and the labor is $1.50 per hour and it takes 3 hours to pick, crate, and ship the apples, costing $4.50 per bushel, then there just won't be any apples; that's what happens to meat, clothing, machinery, lumber, and all other items. That is why there are shortages.

I am not going on record to cut down wages, but I do go on record that the 40-hour week should be eliminated or raised to 60 hours a week. If labor would work more hours, all supplies would be plentiful * * * there would be no black market on autos, lumber, fence posts, farm machinery * * * yes, and the farmer's wife would not have to bring a nice chicken to some clerk in a clothing store to get two or three-yards of oil cloth for the farm kitchen table, or a few yards of cotton goods, and so on down the line. This has been the policy all through the war, and still is. Freight raise after freight raise is being granted, which so vitally affects the cost of farm products to the consumer, and the railroads have requested further increases in rates. These increases cannot continue on the one side, and the farmers' prices be cut down on the other side.

I will not, and the farmers as a whole will not, object to a price cut if the prices on everything else will be cut in proportion at the same time * * * on industrial products and on freight rates, and the quality of industrial products improved to a par with prewar products * * * not the price raised 500 percent and the product offered being an imitative one. These are some of the things that affect the public today, and will continue to affect all of us until remedied.

More congressional dickering with farm prices, and future farm income, can only result in a shorter supply of scarce farm products and tend to make agriculture more unstable.

This is a serious thing to do.

Very truly yours,

PAUL SCHOFF.

All Manner of Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, Malcolm Ross' new book, All Manner of Men, just published by Harcourt, Brace—Reynolds—and reviewed in the February 23, 1948, issue of the New York Herald Tribune, is a powerful documentation of the practicability of a Federal FEPC. Mr. Ross served as Chairman of the national Fair Employment Practices Commission from 1943 through 1946, and has told in this book of the broad experience he had with the actual workings of the Commission. It is a record which deserves to be read by all who are striving to take constructive action against the injustice of discrimination due to race, color, or creed in the economic structure of our country.

Lewis Gannett's review of the book follows:

BOOKS AND THINGS
(By Lewis Gannett)

(All Manner of Men, by Malcolm Ross)

Some of the southern politicians in revolt against President Truman's civil-rights program talk as if recreation of a Fair Employment Practices Commission would upset the whole southern way of life. They talked that way in wartime, too; they called the commission of which Malcolm Ross served as chairman from 1943 to 1946 a "cancer on the body politic," "an un-American, filthy agency," and a "tentacle of a devilfish." In All Manner of Men Malcolm Ross tells what the FEPC actually did, or tried to do, and how it went about it.

WHAT THE FEPC REALLY DID

It didn't upset either the Southern or the Northern way of life half as much as it would have liked to do. It worked mostly by persuasion, and here and there it was effective. A Texas oil company gave up its practice of paying Mexican-Americans "B" wages and "Anglos" "A" wages for the same work. An Alabama shipyard began by using a few Negroes as rough painters in January 1944, in August 1944, upgraded them, and in January 1945, employed its first Negro welders. A New England manufacturer of radar equipment stopped refusing jobs to men with names like Goldberg. The FEPC obtained the cooperation of some union officials and some plant managers in infiltrating Negro manpower into plants that had been accustomed to bar Negroes. In such conspicuous cases as those of the Washington trolley lines and the cartridge plant at East Alton, Ill., it failed.

It's a little difficult, reading Mr. Ross' story, to understand what all the orating is about.

IN THE CARTRIDGE PLANTS

The Western Cartridge Co., of East Alton, Ill., is owned by the same company that owns the Winchester Repeating Arms Co., in New Haven, Conn., which, on its own initiative, accepted Negro workers in any job for which they could prove fitness. The same parent company also owns the United States Cartridge Co., in St. Louis, where some white workers said they didn't want to work alongside colored workers. At United States Cartridge the union forced the issue. At the General Cable Co., in the same city the management forced the issue. There was no real trouble in either plant. East Alton stood pat.

East Alton, like other factory towns in wartime, was short of labor. Three miles away in Hartford, Ill., the International Shoe Co., imported Negro workers from Jamaica to help out. But East Alton, up to 25 years ago, had had a sign on its railway station: "Nigger, don't let the sun set on you in East Alton," and if the sign had gone, the spirit hadn't changed. The FEPC held hearings there; the company lawyer stated his conviction that one Negro in the plant would mean an instant stoppage of production, tough boys from the brass mill staged an invasion of the hearing—and the FEPC took no action.

What Mr. Ross' account seems to show is that in any community, North or South, where one or two decent community leaders or employers are willing to speak up firmly for equality of opportunity, equality of opportunity can be made to prevail. The commission helped; it couldn't—particularly with a local minority in Congress constantly yapping at it—force anything.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY—WHY NOT?

It seems astonishing that, South or North, many people can be found to openly to oppose the principle of equality of opportunity. It seems so plain, as Mr. Ross points out, that one contributing cause of Southern poverty is the failure of the section to use its own colored labor to maximum productive efficiency. Sometimes the commission was merely trying to restore an older Southern way of life. When Bester Steele, Negro fireman, went to work for the Louisville & Nashville Railway in 1910, some 80 percent of its firemen were colored when he was dropped in 1943, only 20 percent was colored. The role of the railway "brotherhoods" in squeezing Negroes off the Southern railways is one of the most disgraceful chapters in the history of the American labor movement. The FEPC couldn't stop that.

Malcolm Ross, obviously annoyed at all the pinpricks his commission received, tells with painful honesty some of the FEPC failures, and probes into the mixed history of racial and creedal tolerance in America. He finds enough black in the past to make him regard the gray present with considerable cheer. He still can't see why any community or section should permit a few leather-lunged loudmouths to stand in the way of its own progress, and feed propaganda material to the eager Russian Communists. And it isn't all South he's talking about. East Alton is in Illinois, Lincoln's State.

Should Our Government Be Run by Lawyers, Ministers, or Editors?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. VAIL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Whiteside County News, of Morrison, Ill., for January 26, 1948:

SHOULD OUR GOVERNMENT BE RUN BY LAWYERS, MINISTERS, OR EDITORS?

A letter from one of our readers:

"AN AMAZING EDITORIAL IN THE NEWS:

"We have no deep-seated prejudice or animosity against editors: For the most part we have found them rather likable and courteous gentlemen—some of high-grade intellectual and moral caliber; but, like all classes of professional and nonprofessionals, they sometimes get some very strange, fantastic notions in their heads.

"One conclusive proof of this fact is found in an editorial statement in the News as of January 9: 'What this Federal Government needs is more editors and fewer lawyers in charge of the United States.' Ye editor of the News speaks as one, who in a conclave of fellow editors, resolved themselves into a mutual admiration society, and decided they could do a fine job running the Government of the United States. Ye are reasonably certain that, if all the lawyers were turned out of Congress and their places filled with editors, it would make but very little, if any difference; the editors, like the ousted lawyers, would still be joined to their idols—hog-tied by the partisan, political prejudices, and instead of bettering conditions, we would have 'confusion worse confounded.'

"We believe we have a better remedy for our national ills than the editor of the News. How about turning all the editors and the lawyers out of Congress, and filling their places with honest-to-goodness preachers? Men like Harry Emerson Fosdick, Preston Bradley, Edgar De Witte Jones, Bromley Oxnam, and many others. As a preacher of more than 56 years of experience, I have a high regard for the character and ability of my fellow preachers.

"Respectfully,

"REV. C. W. MARLOW."

What we think—

Most people, Reverend Marlow, do not like an overabundance of ego, and I well realize that we stuck our neck out in making a statement that what the country needed was more editors at the head of our Government. It was not ego that prompted the thought, but, rather, the outstanding recommendations for better government that had been made by some of the editors of the Nation. No; we don't like ego either, when it is overdone.

It is our sincere opinion that there are too many lawyers in high Government positions, and many of them lack solid business training. They work on theory in the main.

However, God forbid turning the affairs of our Nation over to a group of ministers as suggested in your letter. However good their intentions or their theories, I cannot agree with you that their professional training fits them as legislators. I have the greatest respect for men of the cloth in their chosen work, but it has been my observation that a very small percentage of them are good businessmen, and believe me when I say that Government is big business and requires the keenest type of business training.

Well, anyway, folks have different callings; some have hankerings to tote bails, some referee the game, and others just pay the bills, or write about it. Yours truly, for the purpose of this dissertation, is only an insignificant crossroad critic. But critics, even the little ones, perform a very useful service to society. In the aggregate, they finally run the Government. Often people are phlegmatic, apathetic, slow to act. But, ultimately, when sufficiently aggravated, they become articulate and, by the sheer force of public opinion, they make crooked things straight again.

So we arrogate unto ourselves, for a few paragraphs, the enviable role of spokesman for the irritated masses. We speak for the restless Republicans and the disillusioned Democrats. We speak to tell the world what we would do if we were President and had the power now allocated to the highest officer of the land.

The first thing we would do would be to get right with the Constitution; we would know the rules, all of which are written down in the laws or in the court records. We would run the Executive offices, let Congress run its own legislative business, and the judges run the courts. If we did not understand the Constitution we had taken an oath to defend, we would retain the best constitutional lawyer in the country as our Attorney General. We would not go off half-cocked. We would veto all suspicious or illegal legislation.

If we were President, we would go back to the precepts and principles of our party—we would not betray the glorious memory of its dead, nor crush beneath our heels its hallowed traditions. We would not repudiate the expressed purpose of the parties' rank and file, nor break a single sacred promise.

We would likewise stay honest—we would not fool the people into believing we could spend our way to prosperity nor waste our way to wealth—we would balance the Federal budget, live within our national income if it took the standing Army to keep the hordes of political plunderers out of the public till.

If we were President, we would fire the Postmaster General and try to make this one great communistic experiment of running our post office a huge success as a perpetual yardstick—we would end forever the practice of making Postmaster Generals distributors of political pie. We would also shoot every star gazer in the Capital City on sight, in the seat of the pants with a load of rock salt, and turn them loose on their own to make an honest living for a while.

If we were President we would stick bills under the noses of our World War debtor states often enough to keep a perpetual chill running up and down their war-crazed spines. We would also let every Red know in no uncertain terms, that we would deport him to his own blessed fatherland if he were caught red-handed plotting against either the democratic ideal or the American system.

If we were President, we would not pick on any one industry—persecute one at the expense of the others—we'd tote fair with all of the people, and we would get the Federal Government out of business competition with its own taxpayers so quickly that it would make every person's head swim: whether or not it was making mattresses, producing power or printing envelopes.

If we were President, we would deliver the Government back to the people; we would crush the centralization of power in Washington; we would not trespass on the inalienable rights of its citizens or of the States, and we would do away with a political monopoly as quickly as possible.

If we were President, we would destroy all "new instruments of power," and go back to the old weapons; and we would pledge the armed forces of the Republic to a democracy that would brook no dictatorships on these shores, whether or not it was a dictatorship of organized capital, of labor, the proletariat or the politician.

If we were President, we would work for a united people—we would not take this liberty-loving, shirt-sleeved democracy, and try to arouse the rich against the poor, or the poor against the rich—we would not try to agitate a class consciousness where equal opportunity has been the people's trust and the eternal watchword.

And if we were President, we would tell the masses of men to turn to their plows and to their looms again, and tell them to produce in abundance—and we would turn a million trained salesmen loose into the markets of the world, and we would sell our wares, if we had to blow a hole in the tariff wall as big as Boulder Dam to do it. And we would sell neutrals and combatants alike, both food and contraband, in the American tradition, whenever they put the money on the barrel head.

If we were President, we would have common sense enough to know that every log-jam in a stream is caused by a key log, and we would find that log and start the raft downstream at a lively pace. We would look far

enough into the past of this great Republic to determine what had contributed most to its success, and we would do these common-sense things that coincide with the American idea—we would do away with social and economic synthetics.

And finally, if we were President, we would begin a patriotic revival, and we would bury New Dealism upside down so deep that it would take it at least another thousand years to sprout again.

These are some of the things we would do, if we were President, and we do not even profess to be smart like the professors, the lawyers, or the ministers, for we know that the destinies of this great Republic are in the hands of Almighty God.

Yes, Rev. Marlow, we do have very pronounced ideas as to what our Government should be, and how it should be run, and we feel that it is time that America awakens to its danger of being led into or, rather, thrown into the boiling pot of destruction or eternal slavery.

Two Amendments to the Taft-Hartley Labor Act Which Should Be Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is now evident that some changes are necessary in the Taft-Hartley Labor Act if the intent and purposes of that legislation are to be carried out to establish greater production and less strife in the labor field and improve relations between management.

I recognized the need for some changes in this law, and on July 14, 1947, I introduced two bills, H. R. 4193 and H. R. 4194, which would amend the Taft-Hartley Labor Act and would remove what are, in my opinion, the chief objections to the act which at the present time are creating dissention in the labor front.

H. R. 4193 would protect the civil rights of labor by permitting labor unions to use funds in political campaigns provided the members of the unions had voted in favor of such use of funds.

H. R. 4194 would equalize the legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers by requiring that the principal officers of business firms also sign affidavits stating that they are not Communists and do not belong to Communist organizations.

Adoption of these bills would have established better relationship between management and labor and would have safeguarded the rights of labor with relation to political activity. And passage of these bills would have removed the basis for legal action now pending in the courts relative to the Taft-Hartley Labor Act.

I have repeatedly urged the Education and Labor Committee to report H. R. 4193 and H. R. 4194 to the House for action. I appeared before the committee on July 25, 1947, and explained the purposes of these bills and urged immediate action by the committee. At the present time both bills are still pending awaiting committee action.

There is need for action on this legislation which would amend the Taft-Hartley Act, and the Education and Labor Committee should give immediate attention to bills which have been introduced for this purpose.

The Taft-Hartley bill was passed for the purpose of equalizing responsibility of labor and management. But the act requiring officials of labor unions to take an oath that they are not Communists or affiliated with Communist organizations did not provide any safeguard against communism within management. This has created an inequality in responsibility of labor and management which should be corrected.

H. R. 4194, requiring officials of corporations and business firms to sign the same affidavit required of labor officials, would equalize this responsibility.

The provision of the Taft-Hartley Act prohibiting the use of union funds for political purposes was intended to prevent labor leaders from using union funds for political purposes of their own, and such action was a necessary corrective measure. However, the act as it now stands infringes upon the civil rights of labor and has caused justifiable resentment in the rank and file of labor.

My bill, H. R. 4193, would correct this situation by permitting the members of each local union to decide by ballot whether or not union funds shall be used for political purposes. Under this legislation, funds would not be at the disposal of labor leaders, but would only be available for political use when the union members voted in favor of such use.

There can be no question that some correction in the Taft-Hartley Labor Act is necessary, and I personally cannot understand the reluctance of the Education and Labor Committee to hold hearings on H. R. 4193 and H. R. 4194 so that these bills may be carefully considered and passed to the House for action.

I believe that the Labor Management Relations Act was necessary to equalize responsibility of both labor and management. But I do not believe that any unjust or discriminatory restriction should be placed on labor. And where correction is needed in the present law, I believe now is the time when we should act to pass legislation which would remedy any inequality and result in improved relationship between management and labor.

George Washington and the Year 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on George Washington and the Year 1948, delivered on February 21 by Hon. Gordon Gray, Under Secretary of the Army, at the one hundred and forty-first annual banquet of the Washington Light Infantry, at Charleston, S. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful to Senator MAYBANK for the original invitation to be in Charleston tonight. I think you can better understand my gratitude when I disclose to you, to my own personal shame, the fact that this is my first visit to your beautiful city. Thus, you can well understand, and I trust that Senator MAYBANK will understand, why I seemed overanxious to accept the invitation. I think that he will recall that he had hardly finished extending it before it was accepted.

Later on, when Mr. Don Gestefeld kindly issued the formal invitation to me, he indicated the wide latitude which you were willing to allow me in speaking on the topic of the significance of Washington's Birthday. He very frankly advised me that most of the speakers who have appeared each year on this occasion have developed the theme of how the principles laid down by Washington should be interpreted in the light of present-day needs and in the light of present-day situations.

With all the freedom Mr. Gestefeld gave me, I must confess that I can think of no new way of approaching the subject. My talk will probably follow the old familiar pattern: How should we interpret the principles of George Washington under present-day circumstances?

I might digress long enough to say that the inevitability of this type of approach is in itself a tribute to the strength and stature and prescience of Washington. The fact is that he was a man who saw far beyond his time, and I suspect that his writings were deliberately planned to be of future help to the Nation to whose early beginnings he contributed so much.

Now, let me be more specific about the theme of my talk tonight.

It is that unless we do what Washington wanted us to do in order to maintain our national security—and unless we do it very soon—we may never have the chance to do it at all, because we might cease to be a free nation.

I do not make this statement just for the purpose of sounding like an alarmist. I am not one who believes that war is inevitable at any time, or that war is lurking around every corner, or that the fear of war should turn our national life topsy-turvy.

However, it should be made plain that the longer we delay in putting into practice the sensible ideas for national security which Washington first offered back in 1783—and we have delayed doing this for 164 years—the more possible it is for us to come to the day upon which it might be proved to us, by some powerful enemy, that Washington was right, after all.

My talk will be upon this theme because I am convinced that present-day events make this the most important single thing which George Washington has to say to us tonight over the bridge of those 164 years, and the vision of Washington was so keen that we can phrase his advice in his own words and find it ringing just as true in our ears as if it were being spoken by him right here and now.

I quote from his Presidential message to Congress of December 1793:

"The United States ought not to indulge a persuasion that—contrary to the order of human events—they will forever keep at a distance those painful appeals to arms with which the history of every other nation abounds. There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld—if not absolutely lost—by the reputation of weakness. * * * If we desire to avoid insult, we must be ready to repel it; if we desire to secure peace—one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity—it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

These words of Washington were not just so much rhetoric, unfortified by a practical plan. He had a practical plan which he put forth as the best means of achieving this condition of readiness in America.

What was Washington's plan? It involved two important factors:

The first was a small standing Army.

In listing his reasons for this he spoke first of the natural distaste which a democracy has for militarism—especially an ever-present militarism which might be dangerous to civil liberties.

He spoke secondly of the situation of the country in his own day—this was in 1783—of the fact that we were at a great distance from European States and, to quote him again, "from their numerous regular forces and the insults and dangers which are to be dreaded from their ambition."

And then he spoke not for his own day, but for the future, putting his finger upon one clear point which faces us today. He said, and I quote:

"But if our danger from those powers was more imminent, yet are we too poor to maintain a standing Army adequate to our defense, and was our country more populous, and more rich, still it could not be done without great oppression of the people."

In short, Washington had a healthy respect for the taxpayers' dollar. And he had a healthy pessimism regarding the strength of material wealth as such. For, rich as this country may be today—it is still too poor to stand the huge amount of expense which would be involved if we were to maintain a Regular Military Establishment large enough to deal with all the threats which might come to us.

Thus Washington set the traditional American pattern favoring a small standing Army.

Then he went on to the second point.

This was that the small Regular Army must be backed up by well-organized citizen-soldiers, uniformly trained in all the States, ready, in any emergency, to join with the Regular Army to resist any aggression against the country.

In developing this point, Washington faced the realities of his own day squarely and sensibly. There was a militia in existence at the time in which he wrote, but the greater part of it was ill-organized, lacking in uniform training—or, indeed, in any sensible training whatsoever. And Washington knew this only too well, because it was this very type of militia which had driven him wild during the Revolution—driven him to the point at which he had written that the militia—I quote: "come in you cannot tell where, consume your provisions, exhaust your stores, and leave you at last at a critical moment." He had called placing reliance upon it "resting on a broken staff" and said plainly that his experience with it had proven that "no man who regards order, regularity, and economy, or who has any regard for his own honor, character, or peace of mind, will risk them upon this issue."

But it was not this kind of untrained militia which had led him to his belief that the Nation must use the citizen-soldier as its best method of defense. He knew, also, what a trained, well-organized militia could do.

He knew that his own victorious Continental Army had been composed of ordinary citizen-soldiers who had been trained by the German Baron von Steuben. Training, to him, made all the difference between a defense establishment that could accomplish its mission of security and one which could not.

Any realistic system of security, Washington said, had to rest upon the basis, and again I quote, "That every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government owes not only a portion of his property, but even of his personal services to the defense of it," and that, as a consequence, every citizen of America, from the age of 18 to that of 50 should be carried upon the training rolls of the country.

He then went further into detail.

All this was before he became President. During his Presidency he presented this plan, with modifications, to Congress upon two occasions. The first time it was defeated. The second time it was amended out of recognition and workability.

There was a reason. In too many locations the existing militia had become a political football. In too many sectors of American life, self-interest had begun to rear its head in the fear of loss—even temporary loss—of manpower for some project other than that of national security.

Listen to this criticism of Washington's plan which was printed in the Pennsylvania Packet and Advertiser in 1790, and judge for yourselves whether it has a familiar ring today:

"ELIZABETHTOWN, April 14, 1790.—The plan for the organization of the militia of the United States by the Secretary of War is generally execrated in this State, as pregnant with mischief both to the agricultural and mining interests, as well as having a tendency to debauch the morals of the rising generation."

Washington's plan was never put through. He pleaded for its adoption until his death to no avail.

If Washington's plan, modified or not, had been adopted in any kind of workable condition in his day, we would not now be facing any choice over whether to establish universal military training—because we would have had the equivalent of UMT.

Every citizen would have been a member of the armed forces, privileged to have served in organizations such as your own, which bears the name of the father of this idea, as he was of the country.

Because of that service, all citizens would have a more complete understanding of their armed forces and their problems.

And it has been proved by many able men that our Nation would have been able to pass by much of the military grief that has been its lot in the past century and a half, if this plan had been adopted and continually revised to meet modern conditions.

In Washington's time we had thirteen separate sovereignties, all of whom had small military organizations for their separte but similar purposes. In a national emergency which arose on the Declaration of Independence, the system became the principal headache for Washington in his necessity for an integrated armed force to prosecute the war for our liberties. He needed an integrated force of trained men, who would remain on the job long enough to complete it; and which would obviate the necessity of constantly training, in the face of the emergency, new bodies of troops. The problem was further emphasized in the War of 1812.

It was not until the passage of what is known as the Dick bill in 1902 that some progress was made in training the citizen-soldier. With the passage of the National Defense Act in 1916 and its amended form in 1920 the National Guard made progress and it had taken on a name which was to mean much to it in the future. From the militia, it became the National Guard—still under the militia clause of the Constitution. This had great significance. It was to be first line troops for the defense of this country and it furnished 18 great divisions and many other troops and trained men in World War II.

The guard now faces another epoch in its evolution. With the increased velocity of war, it becomes more important in the scheme of national defense than ever before. We must have a force in being for M-day, which may well be D-day at any time in the future. This necessity points directly to the National Guard. Its future missions are more pressing and more demanding. We must have it at adequate strength, and, even more important, we must have it at a level of training where it can be expected to be ready for limited combat missions from the day of mobilization. The present time devoted to National Guard training gives it about 20 percent of the time required for combat missions. Universal military training would mean that we could raise this level of training to 60 percent of the required training. Therefore, universal military training has its greatest benefit directed toward vitalizing the National Guard. It is perhaps the only thing that will make it possible for the National Guard to become an adequate D-day force, as it has been an effective M-day force in the past.

We have reviewed Washington's views on training. If this were all he left us, he would have made a huge and significant contribution to solving one problem we face today.

But training is just that—one of many allied problems having to do with national security. Just over a year ago the Compton commission—was the body, nationally known, nonpartisan, and unbiased, appointed to make an over-all study of America's security needs—issued its report, and this report dealt with all the factors which, in the opinion of the commission, were necessary to fill those needs.

The Compton commission lists six necessities at the conclusion of its comprehensive study of security. These are a strong, healthy, educated population; a coordinated intelligence service; scientific research and development; industrial mobilization and stock piling; unified, balanced armed services, Army, Navy, and Air; and a system of universal training for security.

The report does not treat national security as a matter depending upon training alone. It stresses that the other five recommendations are of equal importance, and that all—not just one—of the recommendations must be carried out if we are to have real security.

It is amazing to compare the main points of Washington's plan, written at congressional request in 1783, with the main points of the Compton report, written in 1947. While Washington did not specifically mention the necessity of a strong, healthy, educated population in his plan, we know, from his other writings, that he firmly believed in it. Nor did he mention coordination of intelligence agencies, because this problem was not one of his time.

But the advice of Washington is highly similar to the four remaining points of the Compton commission's report.

On the need for scientific research and development he said that it would be necessary to establish—I quote—"Academies * * * for the instruction of the art military * * * also, manufactories of some kind of military stores"—in short, institutions in which the needs of warfare would be continually studied, backed by the practical machinery for national security.

This stress Washington laid upon manufacturing dovetails with the Compton report's stress upon the necessity for industrial mobilization and stock piling. Washington further stated that there should be—I quote—"Establishment of arsenals of all kinds of military stores." He saw the need

for peacetime production facilities for security and the further need for creating stock piles of essential defense materials.

When the Compton report speaks of the regular armed forces, under unified command, small in number and backed up by trained reserves, we can compare the point to Washington's emphasis upon an army just large enough—I quote—"to protect our trade, prevent the encroachment of our neighbors * * * and guard us at least from surprises." Naturally, he could not foresee an Air Force. But he had the basic common sense to know that the services are interdependent. He knew the importance of sea power, and he knew that the battle of Yorktown was won when the French fleet arrived at Yorktown in time to bottle up Cornwallis by sea, while his own forces continued the land attack. If there was ever a surplus of money for defense in America, he said it should be applied * * * in preparations for building and equipping a Navy. When Washington—a general of the Army—called for the creation of a Navy, the country took its first step towards unification.

And as I have explained at length previously in this talk, his stress in 1783 upon the importance of a plan for universal training is almost identical with the stress put upon the same idea in 1947 by the Compton report.

Much remains to be done if we are to have the truly balanced program for national security which today's world situation demands. We do have a plan, but it cannot be transformed into a real, over-all, working system of security until all of its points are put into action.

The biggest gap in the program is the need for trained manpower. At present there are many veterans of World War II within the Nation, but time is not going to stand still for them any more than it does for anyone else. Being one of them myself, I know—believe me. I'm not getting any younger, and neither is anyone else.

Time is bound to catch up with the efficiency of our veterans—nullify their physical resources and cause them to lose the skills they acquired in training. Unless these skills—which they went to so much trouble to obtain, are passed on to younger men, their replacements—and unless we constantly modernize our training, we may find ourselves engulfed by some disaster so huge that it will not permit time for mobilization or training.

Now, I know that there is always someone who will say, in effect, "All right. If Washington's plan was such a wonderful thing, how did we ever manage to survive without it, and grow to be such a great nation?"

Here's my answer to that question:

We survived without using Washington's approach to security at the cost of many lives, many billions of dollars, and much wasted work and energy. We are bearing tax burdens today which have grown and grown as a result of military unpreparedness and consequent wars. Unless and until we take some sensible action to put a stop to this vicious circle of unpreparedness, inviting war, which increases debt and causes further unpreparedness, and so on and on, we can rest assured that these burdens of blood and money and time are likely to continue to grow and grow.

And while we have had a hundred-and-sixty-odd years to indulge ourselves in the luxury of ignoring Washington's advice, we must remember that the pace of scientific development in warfare is catching up with us—that the time we have had to get ready for a war at the same time we were fighting it might, some day, run out.

In order to bridge the gap of all those years, and to set up a national-security organization which will resemble the one which Washington's plan would have evolved, we have much work to do.

This work belongs to each one of us, just as the consequences of its success or failure will belong to each one of us. It is not a matter for the Army, but for the Nation. Let's consider it fairly and unemotionally and let's do the best job we possibly can.

If the ideals for which Washington lived means so much to us, we owe at least that much to them and to his memory.

Address by Hon. C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois, Before Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, last night the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] delivered a very able address before the thirty-ninth annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, in Philadelphia. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was indeed a pleasure to receive and accept the kind invitation to address the thirty-ninth annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association and its casualty and fire-insurance companies. This pleasure was increased by the fact that the invitation was originally presented by Senator Mason Owlett, whom I have known and admired for a great number of years. The invitation was further extended by my dear friend and colleague, Senator EDWARD MARTIN, who honored us on February 10 by being our principal guest and speaker at the annual Lincoln Day observances in Illinois. His enthusiastic and intelligent devotion to the interests of the people of Pennsylvania and of the Nation is a constant inspiration to all of us from other States who are privileged to come in constant contact and work with him in the United States Senate.

Your delegation in Congress is one of the most faithful and forthright delegations in our Nation's Capital.

His Excellency, Governor James H. Duff, has already established for himself a reputation of leadership that brings dignity and honor to the State whose government he presently heads with real distinction.

Pennsylvania and her people hold a high position as an outstanding contributing force to the creation, development, and preservation of individual rights and human liberties. This has been true from the days when William Penn first established here an asylum for persecuted people of all lands. Through the days of the Confederacy and the signing of the Declaration of Independence; through the Revolution and the creation of a new Federal Government; through the intervening years of progress when many people settled here and others wandered westward; through the Civil War and the historic battle of Gettysburg; in fact, in every step and stage of the progress of America this State has proudly developed and maintained her position of leadership. A quick review of her contribution to liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and to the welfare of mankind generally, establishes beyond all possibility of doubt her right to the title she has worn through the years as the Keystone State.

Her present leadership in the production of petroleum, pig iron, and printed fabrics, coal, cocoa and chocolate, wool, silk and cotton textiles, leather goods and felt hats, lake, river and rail transportation, natural gas and steel, farm products and miscellaneous manufacturing, churches, libraries, and institutions of learning, all form a part of the pattern proudly called Pennsylvania. I am delighted to pay my personal tribute to the leaders and the people of this great State tonight.

Although the State of Illinois is much younger in years, we, too, are proud of our contributions to the romantic pages of history in the advancement of human rights and the preservation of the Republic.

Although his works and accomplishments belong to the ages, Illinois' greatest contribution was the presentation of Abraham Lincoln to lead and save our Republic in one of its most trying hours. He was not only the greatest citizen of Illinois, he was the founding father of the Republican Party and it was during his lifetime that the fundamental principles that have guided our destiny thus far became a living, vibrant reality.

Lincoln was born as humbly as the Son of God in a hovel; he was reared in poverty; he lived a life of struggle against adversity; he was elevated to the Presidency of the United States; he preserved the Union; he set more men free, and was crucified for his service to humanity. He hated oppression; he loved liberty. He wanted to free the slaves, but more than anything else, he wanted to preserve this, our Republic, under which liberty was established and under which it might be extended only if this form of government could survive.

That was the challenge of his day. It is no less a challenge to us in our day.

While Pennsylvania is justly proud of her industries that have grown great, we must always remember that in the United States there are over 3,650,000 small business concerns owned and operated on the average by two and one-half persons, or a total of 9,125,000 persons, constituting 92 percent of our entire economy; and that these concerns employ about 65 percent of all the commercial and industrial wage earners in America. From that fact alone, we can see at once that these small businesses constitute the backbone of our individual initiative, private enterprise, and provide the most eloquent testimony concerning the desirability of maintaining the American way of life. Adding to this figure of small businesses, the countless numbers of men and women who operate their own farms or follow the profession or vocation of their choice, we have the magnificent demonstration of the true effectiveness of private initiative and private enterprise.

This should not only bring pride to the millions engaged in it, but at the same time bring a dramatic realization that only in the United States of America is such opportunity for accomplishment even remotely possible today.

The American people have never been greedy with their freedom or their finances.

We the people of the United States have shipped more material, spent more money, and spilled more precious blood more thousands of miles from home, than any other people in the history of mankind, to protect human freedoms. Yet we are confronted with the reality that only here is that personal freedom of choice, initiative, and action still vibrantly alive today.

While those now in charge of the administration of this free Government constantly talk about preserving private enterprise and enforcing the rules against vast monopoly, the Government itself in the extension of its vast network of bureaus, agencies, and commissions, has become the most devastating monopoly preying upon the American people today.

While our people do engage in private enterprise, every average citizen works 3 days out of 10 to pay the present mounting cost of government. The cost of government is the No. 1 contributing factor to both our high prices and high taxes at the same time. Yet we constantly hear the demand for more power, more controls, and more regulations, which in turn mean more cost of Government which will tend to wipe out the incentive and initiative to continue the small businesses that have made us the freest, the richest, and the most powerful people on the face of the earth.

Since the close of the war the unprecedented shipment of food, machinery, and material already in overdemand in the United States, has contributed greatly to the difficulties of the small businessmen, and unless we can develop a restraining effort on this unusually large shipment of American supplies abroad, it may ultimately strangle and destroy not only the opportunity for small businessmen but complete regimentation of our entire economy.

During the war and since, the small businesses of our country have been hindered and hampered by shortages and Government controls, and no committee in Congress has rendered a greater service and no Member of the Senate has devoted more intelligence and time in securing steel, fuel, and other essentials to keep small businessmen alive than has the Small Business Committee of the Senate of the United States, with the guiding direction of Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania.

During the past year under the Truman administration, we exported goods and services out of the United States at the rate of $19,000,000,000. During the same period, we imported goods and services into the United States at the rate of only $8,000,000,000. This excessive export over import has added to our difficulties, our scarcities, our high prices, and will be reflected in higher taxes.

And that brings me to the discussion of the Marshall plan.

When the so-called Marshall plan was first announced, several of us immediately offered our protests because it was in reality no plan at all. It was an idea expressed in a speech delivered by Secretary Marshall on June 5, 1947, at Harvard University, suggesting that the western European nations get together, formulate a program to help themselves, and tell the taxpayers of the United States how much we should supply to carry out their ideas.

Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, of Great Britain grabbed the idea with enthusiasm. His Socialist government had just dissipated in a little more than 1 year almost all of the $3,750,000,000 of America's money that we provided for supposedly 5 years of their necessities. He called together the 16 nations in Paris and they presented us with their program. They estimated the imports they wished to have for 4 years, then subtracted the exports they thought they could ship, and the first bill they presented us amounted to $29,000,000,000, for the difference. This bill was subsequently reduced by them to $22,000,000,000. Our Government presented a figure of $17,000,000,000, but that did not include the $800,000,000 we must pay annually to feed the German population in the American zone, nor the $530,000,000 we must pay annually to feed those in the British zone when we take over British obligations there. Nor does it include any money to be spent in Asia, China, or South America.

This vague expenditure would mean several things:

1. It would mean that each average American family would have to increase its already heavy tax payment by $500.

2. It would mean higher prices for everything we purchase for many of these billions of dollars will be spent immediately or find their way back to compete with the American taxpayers here for wheat, food, scrap iron, farm machinery, fertilizer, transportation and mining equipment, and many other articles and raw materials already in short supply.

3. It would mean higher taxes which would cause wage increases and still higher prices.

4. It would mean greater shortages and demands for rationing, price controls, and further allocation and regimentation.

The President has already twice asked for unlimited authority to reestablish rationing and price controls in so-called "selective" forms. Make no mistake about it—if controls, rationing, and price fixing go on again in peacetime in America, it would be difficult to ever take them off, for we still live under the New Deal administration that has created and will create emergency after emergency that will call for ever greater controls over the lives of free American citizens.

While those who ardently advocated this vast expenditure constantly told the American people that it constituted only 5 percent of all our production, they were presenting a very misleading figure. Last year we exported 40 percent of our wheat, 20 percent of our steel in various forms, including machinery, etc. Last year we exported 35 percent of the boxcars produced in the United States as well as a substantial amount of our petroleum.

Every time the Government announced a larger figure of export of wheat, the price of wheat went up. This affected the price of the whole food bill in America. The same thing was true with farm and other machinery, which again increased the cost of our living.

The American people have been and still are the most charitable people on the face of the earth. A most generous people generally and individually. To be generous, even amazingly generous, is magnificent, but to be stupidly generous is akin to sin. We must remember constantly that we are only 7 percent of the world's people, we occupy only 7 percent on the earth's surface, and in our bumper years, we produce only 12 percent of the world's food supply. We are already carrying the largest national debt ever carried by any people supposed to be solvent in the history of mankind.

I repeat, that every average citizen is already working 3 days out of 10 to pay his taxes, and working the other 7 days to pay the ever-increasing cost of living. This will mean less money every year for civic, charitable, and church contributions on the part of the individual American citizen.

This heavy burden is carried not only to support our own Government, but to support socialistic governments abroad, who foster and follow policies of socialistic schemes, price fixing, rationing, regulations, restrictions, unbalanced budgets, and false values of currencies.

For instance, since the Socialist Government of Great Britain gained power it has taken the mines, the railroads, communications systems, and other industries, including over 2,500 farms, away from their owners. If you add up the total amount that they paid these owners, it will just about equal the $4,400,000,000 which we gave them in the British loan and credits a little more than a year ago. They now announce that they are instituting their socialistic health and hospital program that will guarantee Government hospitalization, medical, and health care literally from the cradle to the grave, at an annual cost of approximately $700,000,000.

No one can complain about costly socialistic schemes being instituted in any country if their economy can support it, but to adopt programs at our expense that retards private initiative while we are taxing our people to rehabilitate them is quite another matter.

Only a few days ago Reuters News Agency from London reported that as a result of a plebiscite conducted among 58,000 doctors in Great Britain, 89 percent disapproved this scheme to socialize the entire medical profession in Great Britain. Notwithstanding this fact, they insist on going forward with having their Government regulate the health and hospital facilities for all their people, and the American taxpayers will subsidize this as well as their other socialistic schemes.

Recently, in the House of Commons, in trying to explain the dissipation of the $3,750,000,000 gift—called a loan—and their future difficulties, the Chancelor of the Exchequer stated, and I quote him:

"The additional measures which the Government proposes were announced yesterday by my right honorable and learned friend the Minister for Economic Affairs, but I wish here to repeat one figure which he gave in his exposition; it is a very grave one, and needs to be underlined. Even if we succeed in achieving all that my right honorable and learned friend indicated yesterday in the program which he set forth, we shall still at the beginning of the year 1949 be facing a dollar deficit running at the rate of $1,000,000,000 a year * * *. Even if we succeed in all that we are planning to do, and even if the luck goes well, we shall still, at the beginning of 1949, be running a dollar deficit at the rate of $20,000,000 a week."

Further he stated:

"The National Insurance Act and the National Health Act, both passed last session, will come into operation in July, and will not be delayed as some people have suggested. They will come into operation in July, with all their social and financial implications; and, in spite of all the difficulties confronting us, we are not going to swerve aside from carrying through this most essential feature of the program on which the last election was fought."

Thus we see that they are engaging in vast socialistic programs at the expense of the American taxpayer, while our own Veterans' Administrator has recently announced that many of the badly needed veterans' hospitals in America could not be built because of the lack of essential materials and the ever-increasing cost.

This socialistic program in England brought forth this unusual reply from Winston Churchill who so successfully led the British people through the last tragic war, and I quote him:

"The first step to national recovery and indeed survival is to have a new parliament. Why can we not earn our own living, pay our own way, and stand on our own feet? It is because our whole living is being handled the wrong way around. The socialistic planners have miscalculated and mismanaged everything they have touched. They have tried to substitute Government control and direction for individual enterprise and skill. By their restrictions they make scarcity and when scarcity comes they call for more restrictions to carry on."

The same is true in other countries and that is why many of us objected strenuously and seriously to blindly adopting the original so-called Marshall plan. General Marshall did not outline the details of his plan nor was he present when the original bill was drawn, which was presented to Congress. It was drawn by 14 lawyers representing 14 different Government bureaus, and our contention was that if we turned $17,000,000,000 over to 16 countries following policies and practices that stifle initiative and enterprise, and to 14 different Government bureaus that have a constant lust for more power, the money would be dissipated the same as the $3,750,000,000 plus the additional credits we gave Great Britain—a sum dissipated in a little more than 1 year.

To consider their plight as temporary is the wrong approach. As long as we guarantee their constant deficits of "balance of payment" they are not going to change their course and they will not meet their own problems. Their problems are those of incentives to work and to produce to their maximum. Even that would not meet their difficulty completely, for no matter how much they produce, if they continue to take the proceeds of that production and devote it to extension of their socialistic practices they will never close the gap of their "balance of payment" and we will merely continue to pay for their trade deficit indefinitely.

During the war the American people heard great promises from our lesders that everything would be better when the war was over. That we would have one world and peace was loudly proclaimed.

Twice we went to Europe with our blood, brains, and brawn to stop Germany from being the colossus of Europe. Anyone who had studied history and especially those who sat in on the secret conferences and deals should have known that Russia had never given up her centuries-old ambition to expand, but had merely added to her desire the terrorist tactics to expand and enslave the people of the world. Certainly those in charge of our State Department and military who had in their possession the secret agreements between Stalin and Hitler to divide up and enslave the world should have protested against the vast amount of supplies and the almost criminal contributions and concessions we made constantly to Russia.

As a result of their mistakes and keeping hidden this secret information while continuing to contribute to Russian expansion, we now face another emergency and terrific problem.

Surely the people of America must know by now that this New Deal administration has neither the courage nor the capacity to properly administer either our domestic or our foreign policies.

It would be hard to conceive how a great country could win wars of such magnitude and find themselves at the end in such a deplorable condition as we find ourselves today across the face of the earth. Those who had authority and secret information were backed up by the resources of America as no other leaders were supported in all history. We the people provided the greatest Navy, Army, and Air Corps; we provided the greatest productive capacity, inventive genius, and industrial know-how to attain victory; only to find ourselves challenged anew throughout the world by one of our so-called allies.

Those of us who did oppose the initial presentation of the Marshall plan did so, first, because it was merely a trade-deficit plan on the part of 16 foreign countries; second, because the plan was written into the form of a bill by 14 Government bureau lawyers. We have already seen the transformation of that original suggestion into quite a different form.

The Foreign Relations Committee has revamped and revised it so that there may be a chance for a business management that will devote itself to the creation of incentives to work and production abroad. They have provided for the scrutiny of the program by a committee of Congress representing the people of the United States. They have indicated that emphasis should be laid on the production of food, coal, steel, and transportation equipment—the four fundamentals and basics of all needed production in western Europe.

We did then and we do now believe that neither the State Department nor the Military Department were equipped by training or experience to adequately or intelligently administer so vast a program as this one contemplates. The State Department and the military stood startled, stunned, and confused, when we were struck at Pearl Harbor, following the policies they had advocated. Then we had to call the experts of American industry, labor, and agriculture to provide the know-how, the industrial genius, the labor, and the food, to produce the essentials necessary to bring our enemies to their knees. That was a major operation.

The creation of incentives to work and produce in western Europe and to apply the proceeds of that production to support stable currencies, balanced budgets, and stable governments is another major operation and needs the leadership of the best brains in America in agriculture, industry, and labor, to administer the program.

We believed then and do believe now that American dollars will not save Europe, but production and hard work, plus the proper application of the proceeds of that work and production will constitute the only sound bulwark against the miseries of communism.

I repeat that during the war our leaders were talking about one world after the war, but at the same time they were helping make communism the colossus of Europe and Asia, and they were installing communistic-minded men and their sympathizers in the various departments of the Government of the United States.

Now we hear altogether too much talk about needing a third force in Europe, halfway between the totalitarianism of Russia and the free enterprise system of the United States. These socialistic sympathizers call this third force democratic socialism.

If we continue our unprecedented undertaking of rebuilding our former enemies and many of our former allies by constantly paying the trade deficits as they develop their so-called democratic socialism, it will mean a drain so constant and heavy upon the free-enterprise system of America, that we too will finally be drawn down to the depths of despair and will be bound by the mesh of rules, regulations, and controls, that form the chains that presently bind the energies of the countries of Europe.

None of us want to see people starve or unnecessarily go hungry anywhere, but since we are limited and cannot feed all the hungry, clothe all the naked, fire all the furnaces and hearthstones of the universe, we want to help those who will intelligently help themselves. We want to help people who will work, produce, and take steps to meet their own difficult problems. It is to our advantage to have a strong prosperous western Europe, but in our future contributions we must insist upon having intelligent, sound, and constructive management so that while helping them, we may preserve our own republic, and preserve our own American way of life to which Pennsylvania and Illinois have made such tremendous contributions.

We too, like Lincoln, hate oppression. We would like to extend human liberties, but, like Lincoln, we must remember that to preserve our own form of Government, our own solvency, and our own security, are the major challenges of this day.

Address by Most Rev. Francis P. Keough on the Occasion of His Installation as Archbishop of Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there are so many ideologies abroad in the world today utterly opposed to every principle and belief which we cherish as free Americans, that I consider it quite in order to request insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD of a superb address delivered yesterday by the newly installed archbishop of Baltimore, the Most Reverend Francis P. Keough.

It can be read and studied with profit by everyone with an appreciation of the problems of the day, and the necessity of divine guidance for their solution. It is a noble expression of the finest conception of a way of life, and I recommend it to the consideration of every thoughtful person.

As the newly installed head of the Primal See of the Catholic Church in America, Archbishop Keough adequately voices in his installation message the deeply rooted Christian morality and the rich heritage of religious toleration which first flourished in the colonial settlement of Maryland. From there spread the seed for Nation-wide extension of religious toleration and good will which now obtain throughout our beloved land.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Through the grace of God and the favor of the Apostolic See, there has been committed to my care this day the premier See of Baltimore.

I am humbly conscious of the great dignity which has been conferred upon me and of the grave responsibilities attaching themselves to my new office. Yet I am enabled to face up to my task with a more confident heart because I feel that your prayers will be with me.

My first sentiments are those of profound gratitude to the Holy Father in appointing me to this high dignity in the church and it shall be my task to exert every power at my command that I may fulfill it to the best of my ability. I am not unmindful of the debt of gratitude which I owe to his worthy representative, his excellency, the most reverend apostolic delegate, for his official presence here this morning.

MEANING OF TOLERATION

Standing in this historic cathedral of Baltimore, which has been raised to the dignity of a basilica, I am filled with the profound sense of gratitude and appreciation such as is shared by every American Catholic, for it was here in Maryland that Catholics experienced for the first time in this country the true meaning of toleration and religious liberty.

It was in this archdiocese and in this State that there first gleamed the ray of hope giving promise to all men of our great Nation that they might serve their God according to their conscience and right reason.

And as I stand before you today I am also conscious of the fact that I must follow in the footsteps of a succession of great archbishops. There passes this morning, before our mental vision, a glorious procession of prelates who have held sway in this ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

"ILLUSTRIOUS PREDECESSOR"

It is led by the great John Carroll, whose honored name is written so large into earlier chapters of our church and our Nation. Down through Archbishop Leonard Neale; the outstanding French prelate Marechal, who dedicated this cathedral in 1821; the learned Briton, Whitfield; the Sulpician Eccleston; Francis Patrick Kenrick, who convened the first plenary council of Baltimore; the scholarly Spalding; James Roosevelt Bayley, the beloved convert, and the immortal James Cardinal Gibbons.

My illustrious predecessor, Archbishop Michael J. Curley, won the affectionate regard of his clergy and his people to a marked degree. To win such affection, such love, manifests his amiable character, his saintly nobility. The saying, sacerdos alter Christus est, as the golden-tongued Chrysostom (St. John) declares was completely realized in his person. His prodigious accomplishments in this archdiocese will long keep his memory green in our minds while his charity, beautifully concealed on earth, is now on open book in the archives of Heaven.

These great ambassadors of Christ, my predecessors in office, are the glory of the church in the United States across all the years since the birth of this diocese in 1789. Their memory touches with a holy light the solemn ceremony of this morning.

BOUNTIFUL BLESSINGS

Such are the men I must succeed. That is not easy. Yet in a sense it is. Let me explain this apparent contradiction. My saintly predecessors have left the archdiocese the bountiful blessings of their glorious careers. every parish has felt their presence and shared the heritage they bequeathed to all. So that, as I rule and guide this archdiocese, I shall know that it is a blessed archdiocese, that its clergy and laity are blessed, for they are the children of saintly fathers who now, we trust, rest with God.

My installation comes at a time critical alike for the church and the world. The burden of modern living is pressing down upon us, the future is most uncertain. From eternal Rome comes the pleading, warning voice of the great shepherd of souls, Pius XII. Amid the roaring of voices, the mad hatred and confusion of humanity, there sounds the sweet, prophetic message of the Holy Father, calling, pleading to men and nations to return to Christ.

God grant that this world shall see the light, clear and tranquil, like the Star of Bethlehem above the manger where Christ, the King of Peace, was born. God grant that men may hear above the tumult, the song of Angels, the song of peace and hope and good will.

We may well look upon our present day as a time of historic change, for today we confront the sinister face of evil that would wipe out every vestige of Christianity, Catholic and Protestant alike.

"NIGHT OF SLAVERY"

If the enemy, inspired by satanic forces, should prove victorious, the night of slavery will fall on every land. Men can then no longer call their souls their own, but a world-wide state will wield the lash of a universal oppression that shall batter and bruise and kill the champions of truth and godliness. Justice will be no more. All the fine traditions of our forefathers, the great men who made America the land of the free, will be lost in the tragic mist which will envelop the earth and extinguish the light of Christian democracy.

Humanity has come a long road and a hard way to the precious freedoms we enjoy and accept, perhaps without thinking, just as we accept the sunlight and the air a good God has given us. From Runnymede and Magna Carta to the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms of Roosevelt and Churchill, it has been a forward march, marked by the fall of our brave sons who gave their lives that we might live, surrounded and uplifted by the dignity of freemen in a free country. But now shadows creep over the earth, intent on extinguishing the "light that came into the world"; social revolutions have upset the traditions of the past; men have grown hopeless and despairing; children, thin and pitiful, old people as well, all are victims of the totalitarian system of government in which the state alone rules and God is excluded.

"DREADFUL SIGNIFICANCE"

A distinguished scientist has said that "the next war will be fought with atom bombs and the next with clubs." The dreadful significance of this dismal prophecy falls upon us with ominous portent, for its meaning is obvious—civilization shall perish and men return to the state of primitive man without God. This is the picture; this the prophecy we face.

The motto of my office is Maria Spes Nostra—Mary Is Our Hope. Mary gave us Jesus, born into a world of paganism and cruelty, yet that pagan world was conquered by the cross of Christ. The church came forth from the dark catacombs, and upon the ruins of paganism, there arose the glory of St. Peter's. The church has endured through every persecution, through every revolution, during life long centuries. We have the assurance of her Divine Founder, the promise of Mary's Son, that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." And in these troubled times, as in the past, let us place our reliance in the church. Let us go to Mary as our Holy Father counsels us to do.

Then, out of the disorder with which we are surrounded, Mary can bring peace, for many a time before she has brought peace to a civilization that has been threatened with annihilation. As she brought the Prince of Peace into this world, so through our prayers to her, may she bring Him back to a world which desperately needs Him. Hoping in Mary we may look for her Son, and may the world this time take Him as its leader, so that, molded according to His gentle teachings, filled with something of His tender spirit, inspired with His sympathetic understanding for others, it may go its way in lasting peace and charity.

HOPE OF MANKIND

Gathering together in prayer, under the protective mantle of Mary, our Mother, let us ask her to dry the tears from the face of the world, to assist us in this our time of mourning and weeping. With our beads daily in our hands, may we wage war on the greatest of all disorders, sin, so that removing it from our own lives, we shall become greater influences for good in the lives of others. And if our beads are still in our hands when we come to die we need have no fear, for we shall know that we are going to her who is our life, our sweetness, and our hope, the hope of mankind, the hope of the world. Our hope—Maria Spes Nostra.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in the February 1948 issue of the American magazine there appeared an article entitled "We Are Cheating Our Children." The article was written by Oscar R. Ewing, the Social Security Administrator. It goes into the question of Federal aid to education, and the article is accompanied by a very illuminating table. I ask unanimous consent to have these printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, because I believe it would be wise for all Senators to read them.

There being no objection, the article, together with the table, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE CHEATING OUR CHILDREN

(By Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator)

We are cheating millions of our children, withholding from them their right to an education as good as, or better than, that of their parents.

Public-school education in America has become a lottery. If your child is lucky, you live in a community in which qualified teachers develop his aptitudes and talents and equip him to become a good provider and a good citizen. If he is unlucky, he attends a school manned by incompetents, enters the world shabbily equipped, and, through no fault of his own, has less chance to make the most of himself.

This appalling situation has deeply impressed me in the short time I have been Federal Security Administrator, charged with responsibility for the Office of Education, as well as for the Public Health Service, the Social Security Administration, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Food and Drug Administration, and related services.

When public-school education in States or school districts is bad, almost invariably the basic fault lies in the lack of money. In some cases, of course, the taxpayers could afford better teachers and better schools, but won't vote the funds, but in most instances the income of the taxpayers in the States or districts just isn't large enough.

Our children can't wait. The immediate remedy, the most practical way to distribute education fairly, is for the United States Government to give financial aid to the States for educational uses, according to their needs. The future of America depends upon the intelligence of its people. In helping to build a better America, a sounder America, dollars never will be better spent. President Truman has recommended such national action.

Surveys show that at least $300,000,000 a year should be distributed by the Government to lift the standard of education of boys and girls who, because of bad schooling—or none at all—are headed toward heartaches and handicaps. There are more than 2,000,000 who, educationally, are actually starving. Millions more are receiving an inadequate mental diet.

Smugly, we have ignored those unfortunates. We take it for granted that Americans are the best educated of all peoples. But our percentage of illiteracy ranks us down in the list. Countries that have done a better job at equipping nearly all their children with the three R's include Denmark, the British Isles, Finland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland.

In the years ahead the United States will be faced with vital problems, probably more complicated and more difficult to solve than any that ever faced our citizens before. They are problems of how to earn a good living, how to be happy; problems of local and national government, foreign affairs; problems of farmers, labor, business; problems of parents and homemakers; problems of national defense. It will be up to the boys and girls now in school to carry on, to continue to maintain the United States as the best country in the world.

But, stupidly and shamefully, we are allowing many boys and girls to receive such shoddy schooling that they may become a hindrance instead of a help in building a sound America. Good schools help to build character and competence. They help to keep children from becoming maladjusted. On the other hand, those who have had no chance at an education feed the ranks of the mentally unstable, the delinquents, the men and women who go on relief rolls. They may become recruits for the agitators who believe, sometimes with reason, that the world has treated them badly and who belligerently demand the destruction of government. If we don't invest in educating such children now, they will cost us many millions later.

States that are not giving their children even a fair education are usually in there trying, usually doing the best they can. Many of them tax their citizens more heavily

than do those States whose schools are better financed. In the school year 1944–45, for instance, Kentucky spent 1.72 percent of its residents' income (as determined by the Department of Commerce) to provide $80.94 per pupil. But Nevada had to spend only 1.43 percent of its residents' income to provide $155.28 per pupil. While Mississippi was spending 1.67 percent, which provided only $44.80 per pupil, rich Connecticut provided $159.50 per pupil with 1.36 percent of its residents' income.

Several proposals are pending in Congress now which would establish specific programs of Federal aid. Let us examine one such proposal to see what can be done—the nonpartisan Educational Finance Act, which has been approved by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and is now on the Senate calendar. A subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor has already reported favorably upon a bill with the same aims.

This Senate bill would distribute $300,000,000 a year to the States under a formula based upon the number of children 5 to 17 years of age in a State, and upon the total income of residents in the State. No State could use Government money to cut its own appropriations. In fact, the formula is arranged so as to stimulate States to appropriate an amount equal to at least 2.5 percent of the income of their citizens. They are to be rewarded for effort.

The poorer States, of course, would receive the largest per-pupil appropriations. No State would get less than $5 per pupil. Thus, according to the estimates for this bill, rich New York, with 2,402,000 children, would receive $12,010,000. Mississippi, with 595,000 children, would receive $5 per child, plus a bonus to make up for its inability to pay for good schools, and its total would be $16,985,000 a year. States with an annual per capita income of less than $4,000 for each child 5–17 years of age would receive more than $5 per child.

The average State expenditure throughout the United States in 1944–45 was $125.41 per child. Many States increased appropriations for the school year of 1946–47, but generally the ratios and the needs remain comparable. The Educational Finance Act would raise the average to $140.42.

Federal aid cannot perform miracles. The worst schools in America would not rise to be classed with the best, but additional appropriations would be an enormous stimulus. Better teachers could be employed, rattletrap buildings could be repaired. Most important would be the notice served to college men and women in every State that the teaching profession will once more offer decent pay and decent living conditions.

Plans for Federal aid provide for distribution to Negro schools in those States where segregation prevails by law, and proper audits and other reports must be made to the Government to make sure the money is used only according to the law. However, under the terms of this bill, the Government and its employees are prohibited from interfering with local and State control over the schools. No one in Washington could say who shall be employed, what shall be taught, what schools should be improved, where new ones shall be built. The State is boss.

Differences of opinion as to Federal aid to nonpublic schools are largely responsible for delay in the enactment of necessary legislation. Surely a program can be found that will resolve these differences in a manner that will be fair to the children. After all, their interests are paramount.

Most parents, taking it for granted that their children are being adequately educated, are not aware of the need for Federal aid. Your own school district may need it. You may be one of the millions who would be painfully surprised and profoundly shocked if you knew the full truth about the quality of education your school board, in spite of all its strivings, has been able to provide for your children. You do your best to give your children good, sound training at home. How can you afford to give them less when they are at school?

In at least one classroom out of eight, "education" is in the hands of men and women who are not qualified by training for their jobs. More than 100,000 teachers are substandard according to the qualifications demanded by their States. But because of the emergency, because boards of education can't get anybody else, they continued to be employed month after month and year after year. They may be well-meaning, earnest, and hard-working people. But teaching is a skilled art and needs special training and experience. Would you take your child to a doctor who was not fully licensed? Well, many of you send your children to teachers who are not fully licensed.

Boards of education that have limited funds must hire such teachers because there are not enough experienced teachers to go around. People can make more money as clerks or even by running elevators. In many cases, even the best of teachers cannot do a really good job for their pupils because classrooms are crowded, many pupils are on half-time, the equipment is out of date, and appropriations won't stretch to pay for needed improvements.

At least 50,000 children who are eager for an education are getting no schooling whatsoever because their school boards cannot get any kind of teachers for them at the miserable salaries they must offer. These usually are in the rural districts. There are probably a million more who are, in effect, truant. Every State has a compulsory education law, but in many districts it is not enforced, because there would be no room for the children if they were hauled back to school. These usually are the unfortunate boys and girls whose parents don't realize the value of an education and who let their children go to work at an early age.

This situation has been developing for years. It was aggravated, of course, by the war. From 1941 to 1945, in addition to the normal turn-over, 350,000 qualified teachers left their schools to enter the war or to take better-paying jobs. Comparatively few returned to the teaching profession, which in 60 percent of the cases pays less than $2,000 a year, and less than $1,200 a year in 16 percent. Faced with this financial situation, men and women who had been preparing themselves to teach, began to give up the idea and to take jobs in businesses in which they could meet the rising cost of living.

States and school boards have long been aware of these conditions. To their great credit, as soon as the war was over, two-thirds of the States and countless communities began trying to raise teachers' salaries. The increase comes to an average of about $300 a year, or 13 percent for this school year. Those increases help teachers meet the increased cost of living, and thus have kept on their jobs many good teachers who were being forced to consider new fields, in order to feed, clothe, and house themselves. But even in the richer States those increases do not bring many teachers' salaries up to the average paid for factory labor.

The trouble is that improvement is neither universal nor sufficient. A recent report by the Citizens Federal Committee on Education, an official group that advises the Federal Security Agency, declared, for instance, that in South Carolina college-trained new teachers are asked to work for around $1,000 a year, and experienced teachers with masters' degrees get from $1,305 to $2,286. A teacher with a bachelor's degree may receive as little as $1,700. Mississippi managed to raise its average salary from $800 to $1,200.

The National Education Association estimates that, even after raises in pay, classroom teachers receive an average of $1,850 in Iowa, $1,770 in Nebraska, and $1,500 in North Dakota. The States that make up the top class—that pay an average of more than $3,000 a year—are California, Connecticut, New York, Maryland, and Washington.

To show what a critical shortage of teachers lies ahead, the Citizens Committee points to Illinois, where the State schools will need 6,000 or 7,000 more elementary teachers in the next 5 or 6 years. Yet the six State teacher-education institutions in Illinois, which are designed to produce teachers for the State schools, graduated only 104 elementary teachers last year. And Illinois has an average salary better than many States—about $2,200 a year.

Our birth rate is increasing so rapidly that even the best-manned schools must expand quickly. In the last 5 years, 13,000,000 babies were born, when the experts had predicted the arrival of only 9,000,000. Some of these youngsters are now entering kindergarten. For their 12 school years competent teachers can do much to help parents make them good citizens. Without higher salaries and better opportunities we can't bring to all the schoolrooms that kind of teacher.

One of the objections to Federal aid comes from taxpayers in prosperous States who say, "Why should I pay to educate children in some other State?"

The answer lies in the fact that, like the world, the United States has become smaller. Migration is enormous. There is the migration from the farms and small towns to the nearby cities, and the migration from one State to another. Thus, lack of education in one part of the country can affect all of us.

Do your schools need Federal aid?

State	Expenditure per pupil in public elementary and secondary schools for 1944–45	Estimated per-pupil expenditure with proposed Federal aid [1]
United States average	$125.41	$140.42
Alabama	56.93	93.57
Arizona	127.55	146.69
Arkansas	60.26	99.50
California	163.38	169.53
Colorado	129.47	136.65
Connecticut	159.50	167.11
Delaware	125.05	140.92
District of Columbia	161.02	170.28
Florida	94.55	101.55
Georgia	64.92	97.39
Idaho	112.34	123.25
Illinois	169.02	177.20
Indiana	131.29	138.11
Iowa	124.53	131.32
Kansas	130.55	137.69
Kentucky	80.94	115.74
Louisiana	98.31	125.49
Maine	97.75	105.81
Maryland	113.68	122.32
Massachusetts	166.67	174.76
Michigan	127.73	134.69
Minnesota	144.29	151.43
Mississippi	44.80	82.66
Missouri	113.07	120.60
Montana	163.42	170.35
Nebraska	127.28	134.00
Nevada	155.88	152.91
New Hampshire	131.48	142.59
New Jersey	198.33	205.89
New Mexico	119.98	155.89
New York	194.47	202.14
North Carolina	68.91	109.92
North Dakota	132.55	148.97
Ohio	138.26	145.29
Oklahoma	96.61	120.74
Oregon	144.56	150.94
Pennsylvania	137.00	144.70
Rhode Island	148.96	157.98
South Carolina	65.17	103.44
South Dakota	144.62	150.43
Tennessee	68.70	98.71
Texas	102.46	120.89
Utah	128.24	132.78
Vermont	117.90	130.34
Virginia	83.49	100.76
Washington	158.78	165.09
West Virginia	93.18	121.82
Wisconsin	140.41	148.06
Wyoming	164.84	171.63

[1] Does not include any increases in local and State expenditures for the years 1944–45 through 1947–48.

Palestine Without Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Toledo Blade of February 23, 1948:

PALESTINE WITHOUT POLITICS

In two important respects the statement issued by Senator ROBERT A. TAFT Saturday on the Palestine situation differs from the pronouncements the American people have learned to expect from their politicians on the touchy subject.

In the first place, most politicians prefer to limit their remarks about Palestine to vague generalities about what should be done rather than to go into the specific details of how it is to be done. Thus, when President Truman and Gov. Thomas E. Dewey started calling for the admission of more Jews into Palestine a couple of years ago, their competition was based more on numbers than on methods. Each tried to outbid the other in proposing that the quota be raised by a good round figure, but one was no more specific than the other in suggesting the means by which this country would persuade Great Britain to accept either quota.

In the second place, most politicians prefer to issue such statements when it will do them rather than the Jews the most good. Thus, when Mr. Truman and Mr. Dewey started competing with each other with their Palestine pronouncements, no immediate decision on the issue was pending before the United Nations. New York just happened to be on the eve of an election.

But Senator TAFT, who so far as we recall has never tried to make political capital out of the Palestine controversy, was addressing himself both to the issue and to the occasion when he called on the United Nations to enforce its partition plan. Sometime this week the Security Council is expected to take up the recommendation of the Palestine Commission that the United Nations provide the troops required to do that job. And Senator TAFT says that it is now time for the United Nations to back up its decisions with force of arms.

As readers of these columns know, the Blade does not always see eye to eye with Ohio's senior Senator. We have taken issue with his views on many occasions before, and will undoubtedly do so again. Yet we have never questioned his political honesty any more than we have his personal integrity. He may be as reactionary as some of his critics say; he may be as cold-blooded as some of his opponents charge. But even on so controversial an issue as this Palestine question, he has the sense to see what should be done and the guts to say let's do it.

Lithuania Should Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I delivered in Worcester, Mass., on February 22, 1948, at a meeting of the Lithuanian Aid Association in commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania:

As United States Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts, I was glad to receive and accept the invitation to join with you in commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence.

This annual program is dear to the hearts of all Lithuanians because it is held to recollect that day of February 16, 1918, which marked the end of well over a century of suffering under a hostile foreign rule. Lithuania on that day stood forth as an independent, democratic republic. There was cause for rejoicing and the future was faced with confidence. Your people were happy and prosperous in their own sovereignty.

Unfortunately, in this year of 1948, our observance here is shaded with sorrow. The bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of tyranny. We gaze with sadness upon the advancing tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania; she has ceased to be an independent nation.

The principle of political independence enunciated in the declaration by the United Nations and the Atlantic Charter is a hollow mockery in the present suppression of the Lithuanian people. Lithuania is undergoing a shameless conquest, the victim of as bold and cynical a diplomatic campaign as any big state has ever waged against a gallant, honorable, but weaker neighbor.

Although we mourn over her present plight, there is no cause for despair. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has proved that her people can eventually overcome the temporary triumphs of oppressors. The Christian faith, which, in 1399, defeated the Tartar invasion and saved all Europe from barbarism, is still with her today. It gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any dictatorship. From my own knowledge and experience with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent, I know that deep in the heart of every Lithuanian is that passion for liberty and freedom which never dies. There is no power that can forever enslave a people who are determined to be free.

All over the world, Lithuanians are gathering, at this time, to renew their vows to work for the independence of their homeland. Here in the United States I earnestly believe that most Americans are becoming increasingly more concerned about the fate of Lithuania, which stands in accusing testimony to our failure to live and act according to the principles for which our people have fought and died in two World Wars. I consider it the solemn duty of every officer of our National Government to reveal the truth of the extinguishment of self-government, that is being forced upon the smaller nations, like Lithuania, by the Russian Government policy of expansion through fraud, intimidation and coercion. World War II was fought with the clear understanding and pledged purpose that common victory should bring restoration of self-government and territorial integrity to the oppressed nations of the world.

We cannot conceive of the recent war being won until that pledge has been carried out. The major world powers, including the United States, are acquiescent parties to the disgraceful betrayal of the smaller nations while they continue to allow peaceful, freedom-loving peoples to be cruelly dominated by the Soviet rule of imperialistic terrorism—which defies every decent concept of self-determination and democracy.

The case of Lithuania, and the other small nations, is a challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to establish the great, basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples. In simple justice, our Government must insist that the Lithuanian people be permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

You must dedicate yourselves today to the determined revelation and presentation—to the world—of the facts and truth about Lithuania so that the United Nations shall be called upon to meet the full moral and humanitarian responsibility of restoring the independence of Lithuania.

In this cause you will have the complete support of freedom-loving people throughout the world, they will join in your efforts and prayers that your homeland may be free to live again in the spirit of her ancient motto: "Be what may, Lithuania will always stay."

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MITCHELL JENKINS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at exercises before the statue of Kosciusko at Lafayette Park, Washington, D. C., February 12, 1948:

In the course of mankind's history here in this world, many nations and many peoples have had their brief day in the sun and, as the night has fallen, have sunk into obscurity. Empires have risen and fallen, but not often have they risen again. Few there are whose names are written on history's page, who have survived conquest and dismemberment only, like that fabled bird, the phoenix, to rise again from their own ashes and stand once more among their contemporaries, free and equal. And fewer still have survived three such experiences within a short span of less than a quarter of a century followed by over a hundred years of alien rule. Such, however, has been the history of Poland, and the reason for it is not too hard to find. All through its history there has been in Polish hearts a burning, consuming love of freedom which no amount of tyranny, no hardship, no oppression could quench. From father to son to grandson to great grandson, through the generations, the ideals of liberty and freedom have been passed on. Polish boys and Polish girls drank it in with their mothers' milk, and should a man falter and forget, his women bolstered up his failing courage.

No one individual, to the world at large, more dramatically personifies the Polish spirit, with the possible exception of Paderewski, than Thaddeus Kosciusko, whose memory we honor today. For me, a Welshman, to attempt to recount to you, of Polish extraction, the events of his life would be futile. For better than I, you know them for they are part of your racial and ancestral heritage. You know them, but they are part of mine too, as an American, for a part of Thaddeus Kosciusko, and no small part, either, belongs to America. It was to America that he came as a comparatively young man of 30 years of age, to offer his services in the fight for freedom and for six long years he risked his life, far from his native land, in a cause which many people would say was not his own. But to him, and to all men like him, who have in them some of the spark of divine fire, the cause of liberty loving people striving to

throw off oppression's yoke, is always their cause. To such men there are no racial or national boundary lines, for all men, everywhere, are their brothers and those who love liberty are always spiritually next of kin.

Fifteen years after he came to America to help us to win our freedom, he participated in the signing of the new constitution of his own Poland. We here in America can, with profit to ourselves, scan that constitution which, long before we freed our own slaves, made every man who set foot on Polish soil a free citizen; which recognized the responsibility of the legislative body to the people who created it; which guaranteed religious liberty and recognized the obligation of every citizen to defend his country in time of need. We owe much, we in America, to Poland and to the Americans of Polish extraction for their contributions to America.

But a constitution, such as the one Kosciusko helped to frame and into which he breathed his own love of freedom, could not long survive in the Europe of his day, surrounded as Poland was by Russia, Austria, and Prussia. Such a document, if allowed to stand unchallenged, could have kindled a flame throughout all of central Europe, which would have consumed the Hitlers and the Stalins of that time. And so, in but a few years—three short years—came the final partition of Poland and the end of Kosciusko's dream, although like the patriot and lover of freedom that he was, he never closed the light. He never lived to see that dream of a free Poland come true for he died in 1817.

For a brief time it did come to pass but again, today, as in the days of Catherine of Russia and the Czar Alexander, Poland, though with the outward trappings of freedom, is not free. Although its liberty is destroyed and its constitution, which Kosciusko helped to write, is but an empty mockery, yet his spirit lives on, and always will live, in the hearts of his countrymen. As it did before, Poland will rise again to take its place among the free nations of the world. A strong, freedom-loving people cannot die, for in that love of freedom are the seeds of immortality. And, we here in America, for whom he fought and who are the inheritors of his love for liberty, can and must help that day to come when Poland shall be truly free, when we can cleanse our soul of the sin against a people, whose only offense was that they were our allies, that they fought with us and for us, on the field of battle and in the underground, to the bitter end, and when we can undo the wrong that our representative, unbeknownst to us, did at Yalta.

Kosciusko still lives, and in the words of that song which expresses his own spirit—"Jeszcie Polska nie zginela." We salute him.

Joe Martin Came to Iowa—He Saw and He Conquered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1948, it was my good fortune to attend a very inspiring meeting and luncheon in Des Moines, Iowa, commemorating Lincoln's birthday. The speaker of the day was our own JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Speaker of the House of Representatives. I visited with hundreds of my friends from all over Iowa for several hours following that meeting and I have read with great interest many news reports and editorials in the newspapers of my district about the meeting and about JOE MARTIN.

The personal reports, news reports, editorial comments and letters I have received are unanimous in their praise for the inspiration JOE MARTIN gave everyone present or listening to his radio broadcast.

Typical of the editorial comment is the editorial that appeared in the Fairfield Daily Ledger of Wednesday, February 11, 1948, which I have secured permission to include in my remarks, so that Congress and the Nation may have the benefit of knowing how highly JOE MARTIN is held in the esteem of the Iowa leaders who heard him and met him and visited with him during his recent visit to that great State. It follows:

JOE MARTIN CAME TO IOWA—HE SAW AND HE CONQUERED

Sunday night, at a dinner given by the Register and Tribune in Hotel Kirkwood, Des Moines, we met a man who knows and knows why he knows. The meeting was in charge of the inimitable John Henry of the Des Moines newspapers.

He had invited a representative from each of the daily newspapers of Iowa to meet in an "off the record" conference, with JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Speaker of the National House of Representatives and heir-apparent to the Presidency of the United States, if there should be a vacancy between now and noon on January 20, 1949.

Questions were fired rapidly at the Speaker and were as rapidly, frankly, and completely answered. MARTIN'S answers were given in simple words that could not be misunderstood nor misconstrued.

Speaker MARTIN was questioned for more than 2 hours and not one of his replies was evasive. As he met the barrage of questions fired at him, we thought of the lines of Samuel Valentine Cole in his "Old Saw Reset":

"The man who knows and knows (why) he knows, to him your homage bring; he wields the power that waits and wins, and he is a rightful king."

JOE MARTIN knows and knows why he knows because he, a common man, like you and me, has been in the House of Representatives since 1925. He was elected first in 1924, the Presidential year, when Coolidge and Dawes were elected President and Vice President, respectively. At the expiration of his present term he will have served 24 years.

He was 1 of only 89 Republicans elected to the House in 1936, the great Roosevelt landslide. He had not been in Congress long till his Democratic as well as Republican colleagues discovered that he was clean, honest, and aggressive. By 1939, the Republican Members—then 169 in number—saw that he was the gentleman for the position of minority leader of the House.

He held that position till 1947 when the Republicans gained a majority in both the House and the Senate. The unassuming Congressman from the Fourteenth Massachusetts District was then elected Speaker of the House.

His Republican colleagues had learned long before, that JOE MARTIN knew and knew why he knew and he was just the lad to direct the course of the House after it had been in the hands of the New Dealers for 16 years.

Having seen the Republican membership of the House dwindle from 247 in 1925 to 89 in 1937, then with JOE MARTIN as minority leader, the Nation witnessed the greatest comeback in the history of the National House of Representatives. In 4 elections, the Republican membership had climbed back to 246—only 1 less than the membership in 1924, when JOE first entered the Congress.

What is the secret of the Speaker's success? As we view the man he is first of all a fighter for what he believes to be the right. He is a short, square-shouldered man who plants his feet on the floor, like the bulldog who intends to stand his ground against all comers.

But he is a fair fighter. No matter what the opposition does or has done, he is unalterably opposed to unfair tactics to gain a point or a victory. He is that type of a man who would rather go down in defeat in a fair fight than to win by unfair methods.

But back of it all he knows thoroughly every position he takes and knows why he knows. A fair fighter with that mental equipment rarely is defeated. He will keep on coming back for more till he does win.

He has an engaging smile that spreads all over his face and a hearty laugh that is contagious—qualities that draw to him men who are willing to listen to his words of wisdom and fairness in all dealings, even all political dealings.

He comes from a highly industrialized district. It is made up of parts of only four counties. The whole area, however, is probably no larger than Jefferson and Van Buren Counties. The population of his district is about 305,000, approximately 10 times the population of Jefferson and Van Buren. In this district are such cities as Fall River, Taunton, and Attleboro, and nearly 80 other smaller cities and towns of 10,000 and less.

There are, also a large number of truck farms in his district. He is a common man, like the rest of us, and acquainted with our problems.

MARTIN is the publisher of a daily paper in North Attleboro, a little city of approximately 10,000, 5 miles northwest of Attleboro. Our latest circulation reports places its circulation at 3,500. He has had his grief, like many other publishers, in getting print paper during and since the war.

We believe we are safe in saying that no candidate for the Presidency has ever appeared before an Iowa audience and made the friends that JOE MARTIN made in his address Monday noon.

All Monday forenoon we heard the remarks repeated again and again: "He is probably a great man, but he is too far east," "I do not believe in a dark horse. He should announce himself," "People want to know where a man stands when he seeks that office."

We milled around with the crowd in the Hotel Fort Des Moines lobby for a couple hours after the address and not once did we hear any objections. The talk then was, "I'm for that man." "I can take off my coat and work for him till the last vote is in the ballot box." "He's just the guy we need, he's not afraid to call a spade a spade." "No one can say that MARTIN tries to dodge the issues." "He's a statesman and I would like to move that nominations be closed and the fighter from Massachusetts be named by acclamation." Not one of these statements and not one of many others similar to these, was challenged.

The Increase in Steel Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, within the last few days all of us have been greatly disturbed by the announced increase in steel prices. Three very fine editorials on the subject have appeared in three of the Washington, D. C., newspapers—one in the Washington Evening Star, one in the Washington Daily News, and one in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 21, 1948]

INDUSTRIAL STATESMANSHIP

The 10-percent increase in the price of semifinished steel which has been put into effect by the leading steel makers has to be appraised, both as to its wisdom and its justification, in the light of the industry's profit position. When that is done, it makes one wonder what has become of that "industrial statesmanship" about which so much has been heard.

In 1947 the net profits of United States Steel, using approximate figures, were $126,000,000, as against $88,000,000 in 1946. Bethlehem, the second biggest steel producer, had net profits of $51,000,000 in 1947; $41,000,000 in 1946. The figures for Republic Steel, third in size, are $31,000,000 last year and $16,000,000 in 1946. Taking these profits into consideration, the steel industry is not going to be able to convince the public that there was any compelling need for a price increase at this time.

Benjamin F. Fairless, president of United States Steel, attempts to minimize the significance of the price increase by pointing out that it applies to a very small proportion of total steel output. It will result, he said, in an average increase in the price of semifinished steel of only one-quarter of a cent a pound. That is $5 a ton and if the price advance stops there the actual inflationary effect might not be too serious. On the other hand, if the net effect of the price increase is as inconsequential as Mr. Fairless indicates, there would seem to have been little reason for the steel companies, considering their profit position, to have made this unsettling move at this time.

Psychologically, at least, the influence of the steel advance is almost certain to be bad. Earlier in the week Philip Murray, president of the United Steel Workers, announced that the union would demand substantial wage increases in April. The price increase unquestionably leaves the steel industry in a weaker position to resist this demand and if the steel workers get a substantial increase the much-feared third round of wage hikes will be under way. Further than this, the price action has created uneasiness among the industrial users of semifinished steel who have to buy this commodity. Most of those who have spoken say they cannot absorb the increase and will have to pass it along in higher prices.

The president of the American Bankers' Association says that the increase "sounds inflationary" to him and Democratic National Chairman McGrath, who may be suspected of some political interest in the matter, sees the increase as evidence of an irresponsible get-yours-while-the-getting-is-good policy."

All factors considered, the boost in the price of semifinished steel appears to have been unfortunate, unnecessary, and unwise. If the next step is to be an increase in the price of finished steel the over-all effect can well be disastrous.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 21, 1948]

STEEL BEGS FOR TROUBLE

Again the steel industry has taken a step which affects America's whole economy. And very badly, we fear.

It has raised a batch of prices, at an estimated total cost of $68,000,000 a year. By the time the increases are passed to the public through higher prices on thousands of items, the bill may run larger. Moreover, the rash of increases for semifinished and special steels seems to forecast a coming general steel boost.

The timing of all this is amazing. If ever an industry seemed to be begging for trouble, it is steel.

It happens just after a year in which steel made profits that often broke all records.

It comes in the face of a major decline in commodity prices.

It comes after General Electric and some other firms had cut prices in an effort to check inflation.

It comes while the industry is running at full speed, with an eager buyer for every pound it produces.

And it comes just as the steelworkers' union is opening negotiations for higher wages—with Philip Murray clamoring against exorbitant profits and high prices. Mr. Murray said there would be no strike, and made no definite demands—just substantial rises. He must be psychic—his strategy couldn't have been better had he worked it out with the companies.

Here, then, goes that inflation bubble back up again, when it seemed to be losing some of its size.

In spite of Government policies and the warnings of economists. In spite of what seemed even more effective—a sudden application of the old law of supply and demand.

Steel is so big and vital in every phase of our economic life that its deliberate action can offset all this.

As has happened before.

It was United States Steel's negotiations with Mr. Murray which set a national pattern for the first big round of wage increases.

In the second round, Big Steel repeated the performance—that time with John L. Lewis. By granting demands running to about 44 cents an hour in total pay increases and a 10-cent royalty on each ton of coal, it gave an enormous boost to inflation.

Every steel firm and coal operator had to go along—including a lot of little companies on the remote edge of the steel and iron business, and a host of small and marginal coal producers.

These wage patterns were followed by price hikes that helped set the national price pattern.

A third historic case came when top steel men decided against expanding capacity as much as Government, business, and union economists claimed was essential.

Whatever the merits of that decision—and it is a highly technical matter—it must have had some bearing on the steel shortage which has squeezed thousands of businessmen, hampered production, and caused a vast and evil gray market.

Believing passionately in free enterprise, we still can't help wondering whether this is one of those cases where freedom is being abused and restraint is in order. Just as we have felt in the case of gigantic unions.

Big business and big unionism have the power to combine in behalf of high prices and wages—at the expense of the public. We are not charging collusion—just looking at what happened and thinking that had it existed we would have got just about what we have got.

There are dangers—great dangers—in the existence of companies and unions so big that they can upset Government policies and fix national trends for all prices and all wages. That power can become bigger than Government.

The steel industry is already involved in an antitrust suit. In the midst of it, leading companies seem to have had the same thought about the same prices at the same time.

This industry badly needs friends. But its part in dictating wage and price policies and its inability to supply steel and control the gray market have been making enemies. And they are by no means confined to the left-wingers.

We frankly fear that among the patterns it has been creating there may develop one for Government operation or control which would jeopardize our free economic system.

[From the Washington Post]

STEEL GOES UP

Soaring building costs will go still higher as a result of current increases in the prices of structural steel, while advances in the prices of semifinished steel products will doubtless be reflected in a rise in prices of a wide range of manufactured goods. To be sure, a large part of the semifinished steel output is processed by big steel concerns for their own use. Hence price increases may possibly be absorbed without an increase in the prices of their own finished products. But smaller concerns that depend upon the large integrated companies for supplies of semifinished steel are expected to raise the prices of their finished products, and these increases will be passed along in varying degrees to the ultimate consumers.

Spokesmen for the steel industry say that prices of semifinished steel are out of line with prices of finished steel products—that in some cases prices are below production costs. But there is a larger issue that the leaders of the steel industry have entirely ignored. That is the effect of rising prices on the general economy.

Since coal prices were raised last summer no marked changes have occurred in production costs that necessitate upward adjustments in steel prices. The rosy profits statements of the big steel companies are proof that they are under no compulsion to increase prices. Yet they have chosen to do so at a particularly critical stage of adjustment when it seemed as if the forces of inflation were subsiding and a salutary decline in prices and living costs might be achieved. Although the inflationary elements have not been eliminated, the drop in grain and food prices encouraged new hope of arresting the spiral of rising prices, higher wages, more price increases, and still higher living costs. The possibility of achieving stability depends to a great extent upon the policies pursued by business executives who are in a position to guide price policies in important individual fields, and by so doing influence the actions and the policies of businessmen in other fields.

Steel is a basic industry. Its price policies are of vital importance to a host of more-or-less dependent steel-using industries. Nevertheless, it is giving a fillip to the forces of inflation that may result in undoing all that has been done to take some of the inflation out of the consumer's food budget. In short, steel-price increases will not only produce more price increases; they also signify to the business world that the heads of a vital industry think that the country is still in the midst of inflation and that the economy will be able to sustain still higher prices.

In view of mounting consumer resistance to high living costs, this is a dangerous belief. Carried to its logical conclusion, it can only spell an eventual price collapse of heroic and

devastating proportion. The immediate effect of such short-sighted price policies will, of course, be to intensify demands for wage increases. Although the head of Republic Steel contends that present price advances are intended to compensate for past wage increases, it is a foregone conclusion that the increases will be regarded by steelworkers and workers in other industries, too, as a new argument for higher wages. For every price increase of this kind tends to raise prices of many articles that workers buy.

We conclude, therefore, that the heads of the steel industry have displayed a deplorable lack of responsible business leadership. They are pursuing price policies that stimulate inflationary forces instead of setting an example of restraint that would assist the administration's efforts to hold back destructive inflationary tides.

Resolutions For Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution unanimously adopted by the members of Our Lady of Vilna Parish and their guests at an assembly in Worcester, Mass., February 15, 1948, on the occasion of the commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania:

Whereas man has been endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights which no human power or authority can wrest from him; and

Whereas chief among these inalienable rights is the sovereign right of all peoples to choose for themselves the form of government under which they wish to live; and

Whereas the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which our Government signed, respect and guarantee this right of all nations, both large and small, to govern themselves without interference from any outside source; and

Whereas the Allied Nations, among these our own United States, fought World War II presumably for the assurance of peace to the entire world, a peace which cannot be if large nations are allowed against all principles of justice and charity to subject small nations to tyrannical rule; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, a neutral and liberty-loving nation, has proven by her 21 years (1918–39) of advancement in all fields of endeavor that she is capable of self-rule and has ever respected this right of self-government of all peoples; and

Whereas genocide, the extermination of a cultural group, has been declared by the General Assembly of the United Nations to be an international crime; and

Whereas Soviet Russia has ruthlessly and shamelessly deprived the Republic of Lithuania of her freedom and is now following a policy of the complete annihilation of her people through merciless deportation into Siberia, through the relentless destruction of her government, industry, culture, and educational system and through the cruel plunder of her population by wholesale murder and imprisonment; and

Whereas this policy followed by Soviet Russia against the Republic of Lithuania is openly and defiantly against the principles of the Atlantic Charter and against the democratic policy of our own United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Government of the United States firmly evoke the principles of the Atlantic Charter and effectively use its influence upon the United Nations to apply these principles to all nations, both large and small; be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States maintain and uphold its present policy of nonrecognition of Russian absorption of the Baltic States and ever use its influence to bring about the immediate and positive restoration of the independence of Lithuania and the other Baltic Nations; be it further

Resolved, That our Government insist upon the immediate cessation of the atrocities and inhumane treatment now being inflicted upon the Lithuanian and the other Baltic peoples by Soviet Russia; be it further

Resolved, That proper provision be made to have protests and grievances, addressed by small nonmember countries to the United Nations, be officially acknowledged by the Secretary General and taken before the Little Assembly; be it further

Resolved, That the Republic of Lithuania be admitted as a member of the United Nations and that her official representatives be permitted to enjoy the status of duly-elected delegates to that organization; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Harry S. Truman; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable George C. Marshall; to the Senators of Massachusetts, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall; and to the Representative from the Fourth Congressional District in Massachusetts, the Honorable Harold D. Donohue.

The Business Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Business Approach," appearing in the February 10, 1948, issue of the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Transcript.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUSINESS APPROACH

There is little disposition in the United States today to refuse assistance to those nations of western Europe which show an inclination to rebuild their war-shattered economies.

There is, however, widespread disagreement over the amount of assistance that those nations need and the amount which the United States can afford to offer. There also is widespread disagreement over the form which American assistance to the democratic nations of Europe shall take.

President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall have asked for the provision of $6,800,000,000 for operation of the program for the 15 months beginning April 1 next. They have made no specific proposals, however, as to just how the money is to be expended, what portion of it is to be in the form of loans and what portion in outright grants.

There seems little doubt that the Congress will scale down the figure asked by Mr. Truman and Secretary Marshall, despite the Secretary's ill-advised "all or nothing" demand. Various amounts have been proposed by Senators and other authorities upon European and American economics and there has been a growing disposition in Congress, among Democrats as well as among Republicans to put American aid upon a more businesslike basis than the vague proposals of the administration.

Concrete proposals for the administration of aid to Europe have been few, however, despite the repeated assertions of determination to examine our economic abilities before the granting of assistance.

One of the few specific formulas for the handling of European assistance was advanced in Peoria last Saturday night by Senator Capehart of Indiana. Speaking at the annual Lincoln Day banquet of the Peoria Bar Association, the Indiana Senator made the first public announcement of what appears to be a most carefully thought-out proposal which would result in our dealings with Europe being conducted upon a common-sense, businesslike basis instead of the ethereal proposals for the scattering of American dollars which have been made by the administration.

Roughly, Senator CAPEHART's plan proposes the setting up of an international division of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which would issue loans to private endeavors in foreign countries which could prove they were good credit risks. The plan further would require that the vast dollar holdings of the nationals of foreign ccuntries in this Nation be tapped and that each nation benefiting from the plan would contribute to the fund dollar for dollar with the United States participation.

The Capehart plan would utilize the successful American free enterprise system instead of adopting the socialized European system which the Marshall plan contemplates. It would be private enterprise dealing with private enterprise instead of government dealing with government. It further would require the people of the needy nations to signify their faith in their country by putting up half of the capital to be used instead of requiring faith in the future of Europe only from the Americans who would foot the bill.

The placing of European relief on a sound, business basis has been proposed by many but Senator CAPEHART is the first to come forward with a plan which would seem to accomplish that purpose.

The Textile Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently Mr. Douglas Comer, one of the outstanding textile men of the United States, wrote an article regarding the textile situation in this country, which was published in the New York Journal of Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, January 1948, textile edition]

The textile industry has seen the number of its spindles shrink from 37,000,000 in 1925 to a little over 22,000,000 today, and yet by efficient operation and extra shifts, production is at a high peak. Prevailing prices today are an encouragement to as near three-shift operations as possible and while there are a few textile fabrics that are unusually scarce, the general level on the whole is catching up with unfilled needs and there is every prospect for a leveling of prices as well.

Naturally goods made in foreign countries try to market themselves here in America because of our dollar value. Just a few goods coming into this country could easily result in the loss of confidence in our home values. It would not necessarily be just the few yards of cloth involved in an initial shipment. It would be that amount magnified many times in the minds of the buyer and which might be broadcast for the purpose of influencing the market.

We can spin and weave everything this country needs. The fact that American cotton may go to foreign looms does not justify the return of that cotton in goods to America. Their coming in here will only serve to displace that much cotton and that many jobs here in our American mills. We have sufficient capacity and we are tremendously competitive. Our average wage rate is over $1 per hour. Today we are spinning American cotton at the rate of 10,000,000 bales yearly—our business is prosperous as our farmers prosper. Foreign spinners encourage cotton growing in every other available part of the world.

Any speculation as to the future of the textile industry would have to take under consideration aid to Europe, whether under the Marshall plan or any other, because it involves the export of American cotton goods.

I am much cncerned about this question of aid to Europe. I have read with great interest several articles in the January Readers' Digest. One by W. T. Holliday, president of the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio; one by Henry Hazlitt; and one by Anne Morrow Lindbergh. We know Europe needs our help. The result of our help is going to depend most of all on how it is given. Anne Lindbergh says, "If we give simply out of duty, simply out of self-interest, or simply out of fear, then in the words of Saint Paul, 'it profiteth us nothing'" She quoted T. S. Eliot, "The last temptation is the greatest treason, to do the right deed for the wrong reason." What can be done individually has not yet been measured. Drew Pearson had an idea, and we saw Friendship trains gathering individual, voluntary contributions from one end of this country to the other in increasing amounts and surprising quantities.

If we should want to have two funds, one for relief and another dealing with more permanent upbuilding, I believe we would have an individual response that might amaze us. I am not suggesting a formula but I am impressed with what Mrs. Lindbergh had to say.

Many people, including those whose job it is to appraise economic conditions, continue to tell us that we are now in a period of growing inflation and that it has been building for several years past; and because in the past such periods have been followed by drastic recessions, we are being warned today of a similar happening.

Until we have settled this question of inflation and how much we need to do in order to help the fellow across the ocean, there should be no public-works spending anywhere for anything except just the barest necessities. That kind of spending should wait and any administration which declines to cut taxes and continues to ask for increased appropriations, whatever the need may be, should justify itself by economies in government, the kind which we have not seen now for many a day.

Inflation does not develop overnight; it is something that grows over a period of time. As a rule its growth is gradual. The question has been asked: Why, if inflation reaches its peak as a result of gradual ascent, the decline cannot also be gradual instead of tumbling precipitously.

Surely we would like to think such a result could be accomplished, not only for this time, but for other times as well. I believe that our antitrust laws do discourage business from attempting something on its own account in this connection. I think that planned results will have to come with both Government and business working together, and when I say business I mean all of us who have a part in the making or growing of things for sale, or performing some useful service.

The Government's and Congress' concern about present inflationary trends hasn't yet developed an acceptable remedy. No matter how much we may all agree on the need of some slowing down plan, we still seem unwilling again to adopt methods used by a police state, for which I am thankful. This gives me an opportunity of saying that I think we have been hurried into our present situation possibly because we were a little too quick in dropping war controls, and all of the excess-profits taxes. The resultant larger business earnings, with increased dividends, stimulated demands for increased wages, and the inflationary spiral was fairly started. Certainly a restoration of any part of this tax should not be for tax reduction somewhere else, but for debt reduction.

If controls came off too quickly after the war, I think it is not altogether fair to attribute this to the urging of industrial management. It surely was obvious to everybody that the administration of OPA, and all other controls as a matter of fact, became increasingly difficult with the war's end. Impatience with the continuation of controls was intensified because of bad administration, increasing black market, as well as other reasons. Personally I favored at the time a further continuation of controls, but I coupled my position with the necessity for improvement in the administration.

Our freight charges for 1946 were approximately $6,112,000,000, on which we are at present paying 20 percent war tax, which is $1,222,000,000. In October the railroads were granted a 10-percent increase in their rates, and now there is an announcement of an additional 10 percent. After adding this 20 percent on 1946 freight charges, we get a total of $7,334,000,000, and 20 percent tax on this amount increases the tax bill from $1,222,000,000 to $1,466,000,000. We realize that taxes on freight charges is a tax on our bread and meat, on everything that we haul for our use; this, of course, includes home-building materials. We know that this tax pyramids—in some cases several times—and it is hidden from the consumer. It is a concealed sales tax of the worst sort. This increase in freight rates was approved to take care of increased wages and railroad costs, and undoubtedly is justifiable, but it is one more upturn in the spiral. Representative KNUTSON is proposing to take off over $5,000,000,000 from individual income taxes, but I hear no one proposing to take off this one and a half billion tax on railroad freight rates. Also, increased freight charges slow down railroad business. If we are to have sales taxes, they should be in the open, over the counter, and, to prevent pyramiding, at the nearest point of consumption and in full view of the taxpayer. I think such sales taxes as a part of an over-all tax program, including license taxes, income and inheritance taxes, will give us the fairest tax program. If we are going to use selected groups of businesses (railroads in this case) as tax gatherers, let's try to limit the tax to passenger travel. We have become accustomed to sales taxes on luxury services and things.

There are two factors which I think bear largely on this whole problem, and which I would like to mention here. One has to do with wages. It seems to me that since the volume of money and the velocity of its turn-over is one of the causes of inflation that there lies in the hands of business an opportunity to do something to help.

The Government permits corporate earnings up to 15 percent of employees' wages to be set aside ahead of taxes in trust for old-age or retirement benefits. This money can be put aside without individual income-tax deduction for the benefit of the employees, the result being an increase in wages, but without an increase in the volume of money for the time being. This also puts such money in trust where it may be made available for needed capital funds. The Avondale Mills and the Cowikee Mills are pursuing this course.

This same money in the hands of each individual and after income taxes could not possibly buy equal benefits. Why argue for increased production as a cure for inflation and at the same time keep supplying more money and new money?

The Government has recently suggested, in the interest of curtailing inflation, a campaign for bond sales throughout the country. Without attempting a formula, it seems to me that these two branches of the Government—one proposing to reduce the income-tax levy $5,600,000,000 and another proposing a sale of bonds to these same people—could join hands, and, instead of turning loose $5,600,000,000 of new spending money at a time like this, could give to the taxpayer $5,600,000,000 of some sort of certificate (called a bond, if you wish) that could not be spent until some future agreed-upon date.

Any of us with our business experiences of the past, with operating results running in peaks and valleys, would gladly swap booms and busts for a fair leveled-off operating result. In markets like this, it is not so much the seller who marks prices up; but the buyer bidding for scarce goods—and the speculator plays his part.

I think not only industry but communities at all levels should look forward and do some planning.

I was interested in a recent news item outlining a $1,000,000,000 program for Pittsburgh.

In times like this I think suppliers should work very closely with their customers, that we should all be honest with each other as to our future plans and the extent of our inventories, and should do our utmost to stop speculation in our particular field. I think business, as far as possible, should keep a reserve for certain capital investments and expenditures. Our companies are doing this. I think the Government itself should have similar plans. No Government spending now except for absolute necessities, and I certainly think with our experiences of the past we ought to be able to go ahead and catch up with our extra needs and then level off without having to tumble off.

As taxpayers today, our first concern should not be so much for tax reduction, but for debt reduction, coupled with economy in government and of the strictest kind. In the accomplishment of these latter two aims, we will have a continuing sense of security for our home, our farm, our business—large or small—and for our job, of our choosing and where; and a trend that way means much to us in America today.

DONALD COMER.

The March of Russia in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stalin's Step Toward War," published in the Washington News of February 25, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STALIN'S STEP TOWARD WAR

Red seizure of Czechoslovakia has been only a matter of time ever since Yalta. One by one Stalin has picked off the nations of eastern Europe. Now only little Finland is left in the twilight zone of phony freedom.

It is the same old story of Communist treachery and betrayal, of the Soviet stab in the back. It has been repeated in so many places. Stalin's method and purpose should be known to all the world. And yet there are still a few even in America who call themselves non-Communists like Mr. Wallace, who profess to believe that democracy can be saved by appeasement.

Stalin has played it precisely like Hitler and the Japs—only with more skill. No Nazi or Jap fifth column ever operated with the insidious perfection of the Soviet agents who have taken over eastern Europe and who have bored so deeply into Italy, France, and China.

If the analogy holds, Stalin will go on until he provokes a world war; until his cheap victories over smaller nations end in his final defeat by the strong democracies he is trying to destroy.

There is one chance that he may be stopped without such a war. If the remaining free countries can transform their economic weakness into strength through the Marshall plan, and if they can combine in an effective defense pact under the United Nations, Stalin may retreat when faced by greater power.

But, whether he retreats or advances to war, the protective unity of the free nations now rests chiefly on American economic strength and military preparedness. That much at least is clear.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, the debate on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway continues both in Congress and in the country. I understand that on Friday of this week the other body will vote on a proposal that it has been considering for a number of weeks. There are many citizens interested in this proposal and millions will be affected by it if it should be approved by the Congress. In fact, it would permanently affect the very livelihood of millions of our people. For this reason I desire to present for the record some comments on various arguments that have been offered as reasons why the proposal should be adopted.

NATIONAL SECURITY

National security has been one of the arguments emphasized by the proponents of this measure. They point out the need for additional facilities to move our commerce out to sea in times of national emergency. They say that our railroad and other overland means of transportation are inadequate. Let me pause to remind my friends who share this view that during the war, that we believe has just ended, our railroads and trucks did a mammoth job and did it exceedingly well. Furthermore, they were greatly handicapped because of the fact that the Government took much of their equipment—equipment which was sorely needed—and gave it away to other countries under lend-lease. I am not in possession of the exact figures of just how much of our American railroad facilities were thus given away. I recall reading at one time, and this was early in the war years, where there had then been given to our ally, the Soviet Union, some 4,000 freight cars and 1,000 American locomotives. This equipment was badly needed here, Mr. Speaker, both during the war and since the war. Perhaps if that equipment were rolling over the rails in the United States we would have avoided many a bottleneck in our transportation that has handicapped us. Perhaps if we wait for a few more months until even a portion of what we gave away can be replaced by additional new freight cars, locomotives, trucks, and other factilities, we shall find that we have an abundance of transportation facilities.

Permit me also to state that railroad and truck transportation is so much faster than a narrow seaway that to think of using the inland waterway as a means of speeding up our transportation in time of war becomes little short of a joke. Certainly if additional facilities are needed we should be considering additional trunk line railroads, or additional tunneling of mountains, or modernizing our equipment including the tracks and roadbeds to actually speed up the transportation. To suggest a 10- to 14-mile per hour ship canal to take the place of our rapid overland transportation is about as feasible as suggesting that we return again to horses and wagons.

I also desire to point out that a single bomb dropped from the sky, or planted by a saboteur either on our side or somewhere along the line in Canada could easily put the entire seaway out of order.

Let us suppose the seaway were now operating. Let us suppose also that it does save the exporters and importers or the consumers in all countries where the goods are finally used a portion of the transportation cost. Then our friends would have us believe that we have really accomplished something in the service of mankind. Now, if it is such a success, what has happened to our railroads and trucking companies? The answer is obvious. Certainly they will go out of business to whatever extent that the seaway is successful. This means that their facilities will be contracted to whatever point that they are required to handle the volume that is left to them. That will mean the railroads and trucking companies operating from Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago, Cleveland, Buffalo, and other areas to the east will only have local freight to carry. This means their capacity to transport at say 50 to 60 or more miles per hour will be reduced down to a point where they are only able to carry the local freight. Then let us imagine that a war should break. Let us also consider the possibility that saboteurs either in this country or Canada should be ready with a planted bomb at any one of the many locks along your seaway. Now, Mr. Speaker, what becomes of the argument that we need such a seaway for national security? I say it would be far better for national security for our Government to lend its encouragement and support to the further development of our more modern and faster moving overland transportation. Let us do this rather than make huge appropriations that will add to their already excessive tax burden for the purpose of developing a ship canal largely in another country for the purpose of putting them out of business.

I am not merely thinking of the companies that own the railroads and truck lines. I am thinking even more of those tens of thousands of Americans who depend on them for their livelihood and that of their families. Also, I am thinking of the thousands of small businesses along the overland trade routes who are dependent entirely upon the trade they receive because of these transportation systems. In my mind, Mr. Speaker, it simply adds up to the inevitable conclusion that if the seaway is a success, then it would be a tragic mistake. If it fails, then of course it would not be so tragic to our economy and our security, it would be merely another of those impracticable, ill-begotten, boondoggling enterprises that have plagued America for these past several years. They have also in large measure accounted for the huge and threatening national debt which darkens the future for every American citizen.

Another reason that I feel this is just another pie-in-the-sky endeavor is the fact that its proponents have resorted to the characteristic and undignified method of calling ugly names against those of us who disagree with them. This is a label that we expect to find on every boondoggling enterprise, and now that it appears in bold relief on the seaway project, Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt how this project might well be classified.

Condemning our railroads, automobile, and trucking companies, and to suggest that our Government go further and further into the power production and distribution, also have a familiar sound. They seem to fit into this familiar pattern. But, once we point out the inadvisability of the seaway for transportation, then they turn to it as a power development project.

Is it necessary to develop a ship canal in Canada at the cost of a thousand million dollars for the purpose of providing electric power for one small area in northern New York State? Why not make available funds necessary for carefully planned power projects in many different sections of the country? There are thousands of good sites for dams on American rivers that will both provide the power in different areas and can also be adapted to both flood control and irrigation.

I have studied every argument, Mr. Speaker, that I have heard advanced in favor of this project. I admit they come out clothed in beautiful adjectives and adorned with high and noble purposes. But, once the clear light of analysis reflects upon them they melt into something that becomes neither beautiful nor desirable. We as Congressmen are sworn to promote the general welfare of our people. We should enact legislation for the good of our constituents as a whole. We should oppose vehemently those measures, even though they are made to look and sound good, that are not in accord with the best interests of the American citizens. And, Mr. Speaker, I for one will bitterly oppose all forms of boondoggling, generally, and the St. Lawrence seaway, particularly. Let us not go back to "horse and buggy" days.

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MITCHELL JENKINS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, those Americans of Lithuanian descent observed, with appropriate ceremonies, the thirtieth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, which came into being shortly after the First World War. It was not the first free government of Lithuania, however, for as far back as 1529 the people of Lithuania established themselves as a nation and down through the intervening years they have, although many times subjected to alien rule, preserved unquenched their love of liberty and have struggled to preserve it for themselves and their children. When the light of freedom burned low in many parts of Europe, it remained lit in the hearts and souls of the people of central Europe and not least in the hearts and souls of the people of Lithuania.

But, Mr. Speaker, today, on the anniversary of their independence, the hearts of the Americans of Lithuanian origin are sad, as are the hearts of their racial brothers in Europe, for that independence so hardly and dearly won, no longer exists. There is not today a free Republic of Lithuania, any more than there is a free Poland or a free Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, like her liberty-loving neighbors, lies prostrate under the oppressor's heel, chained to the Russian chariot like the captives of ancient Rome.

The conduct of the Moscow government in its relations with Lithuania possibly has been matched, in the past, in its cynical disregard of its pledged word and its treaty obligations, but certainly has never been surpassed. A bare narrative of what has been done should shock the conscience of all decent people. The ink was hardly dry on the treaty of 1926 and its successor of 1939, whereby Russia undertook to respect the territorial integrity and national inviolability of Lithuania when Russian troops were garrisoned in the country and its ultimate incorporation into the Soviet Republic was begun. In June 1940 Mr. Molotov, just a little over 6 months later, announced the incorporation of the country into the Russian system saying, "It would be unpardonable if the Soviet Union did not seize this opportunity, which may never recur." The next year Germany "liberated" it, and then later the Russians "liberated" it from the Germans. No one has yet liberated it for the Lithuanians.

No one, except possibly those of Lithuanian descent who still retain some contacts, tenuous though they may be, with the land of their ancestors, can have any realization of the horror that lies behind the bare recital of these facts. "Liberation," by both Germany and Russia, has meant for the people of Lithuania nothing but looting, and rape, murder, and deportation, imprisonment, and fear. Our eyes have been more sharply focused, perhaps, upon the sufferings of other peoples, because news of what has happened to them has come more readily to us. But they have been no greater than the sufferings of Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, as a lawyer of some years practice, I look to the record to see what has been done; and there I see that at Tehran, again at Yalta, and again at Potsdam, those who conducted our foreign relations on the one-man principle, and who were willing to gamble with the destinies of free people, acquiesced, so far as the record shows, in this crime against Lithuania, acquiesced in the violation of the treaties I have mentioned, and in the complete disregard of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, of which Russia was an adherent. But the American people, Mr. Speaker, do not acquiesce and can never condone what that record shows. We still regard Lithuania as an independent state and on this anniversary of its freedom look forward with confidence to the day when the Republic of Lithuania will again take its place among the free nations of the world.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread interest throughout this country in the amount of money which is being spent by the Government to disseminate proper information about this Nation abroad through the State Department's "Voice of America," I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix to the RECORD a letter which was cited by the noted authority on foreign policy, David J. Dallin, on February 21, 1948, in the publication, the New Leader:

A well-known French author writes me from Paris in a letter dated February 8:

"The influence of crypto-Communist intellectuals continues to be formidable in the universities, among publishers, and in the press. We don't have the collection of documents here which was published recently and appears to have made some impression in the United States. Three or four French newspapers have mentioned them—and that is all; the whole affair has passed virtually unnoticed. It is impossible to get hold of a copy at either the American Embassy, the American library, the Information Center, or at Brentano's. This illustrates American behavior only too well. Always too little or too late. They waste millions of dollars feeding Tito but save a few hundred dollars when the education of western Europe on essential points is at stake. Yet at the same time they should take a look at the publications and information agencies of the Communists. They actually overflow with all sorts of editions, on all subjects, in all formats—you wouldn't believe it unless you saw it.

"Camus' aphorism, 'Whatever happens, we get sacrificed by the Americans,' expresses only too well the attitude of those intellectuals who have neither succumbed to Soviet enticements nor lost their heads to the American mirage. The anti-American campaign of the Communists, succeeding that of de Gaulle, is extermely effective; its effects are considerable and lasting. No wonder that the movie, Grapes of Wrath, and the writings of Steinbeck, Hemingway, and Caldwell are having a terrific success, as they tend to discredit America."

Marshall Plan Must Not Scuttle Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. A. T. Wynn, secretary-treasurer of the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council of San Francisco, urging that the clause authorizing the transfer of 500 United States vessels to foreign governments be stricken from the Marshall plan bill. The Bay Cities Metal Trades Council represents 73,000 metal trades craftsmen in the San Francisco Bay area and Mr. A. T. Wynn is a citizen of high standing in that community.

The vital interest of his organization in the proposed amendment to the Marshall plan bill is set forth in his letter, as follows:

Our shipyard craftsmen and merchant marine men are greatly in need of the work required for the maintenance, repair, conversion, and manning of the vessels recommended for transfer under the plan. Retainment of the vessels is also vital to the national defense and the commerce of our Nation. These factors must be given first and serious consideration. Our representative will be in Washington on or about March 1 and will contact you to further our request. We will greatly appreciate your favorable consideration.

I have also received a letter from Capt. C. F. May, of San Francisco, president of the West Coast Local No. 90, National Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots of America, in which Captain May makes the following statement:

The situation in the maritime industry on the west coast is very deplorable, and we are all wondering what will become of the west coast in case that part of the Marshall plan would be adopted which refers to marine transportation, sections VII and VIII. We surely hope that all the Congressmen from the Pacific coast will assist in eliminating this provision. Otherwise, as you know, all A. P. of L. organizations are definitely for the European recovery program, but we cannot afford to scuttle the United States merchant marine completely. We do feel the increase of foreign vessels sailing out of the Pacific coast tremendously on our unemployed list, which is getting bigger and bigger. From our organization there are approximately 1,700 unemployed licensed men on this coast, and more are being laid off daily, while the companies return the chartered vessels back to the Government.

I am submitting these letters at this time in order that all of the Members of the House of Representatives may have an opportunity to consider them.

Resolutions of Vermont Soil Conservation District Supervisors' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following resolutions adopted by the Vermont Soil Conservation District Supervisors' Association at its annual meeting in Burlington, Vt., on February 6, 1948:

Whereas the conservation job is of tremendous importance to the Nation and so big and complex as to require the full-time efforts of a technical agency to insure the accomplishment of permanent conservation; and

Whereas the entire State of Vermont is now organized in soil conservation districts and these districts have assumed the local responsibility and management of the locally adapted soil-conservation programs in accordance with the State law; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has recommended one conservation agency and one soil-conservation program for the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State Association of District Supervisors:

1. Go on record as being ready and willing to assume the full local responsibility for the Nation's soil conservation operations program.

2. Urge that the Federal assistance made available to the districts be provided to the districts through the Soil Conservation Service, an agency that has already demonstrated its ability to work with and through such districts.

Whereas economic safeguards and assistance to farmers are in the national interest and are necessary to insure an abundance of farm products from the agricultural lands of the Nation, at the same time avoiding unwieldy surpluses of these products, and whereas such economic aids require the full-time efforts of an agency concerned with production goals, incentive payments, price supports, school-lunch programs, and the like, which agency should be armed with necessary authorities and incentive-payment resources to meet the constantly shifting economic conditions confronting farmers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State association of district supervisors:

1. Go on record in favor of continuing and improving the programs of economic aids to farmers.

2. Urge that elected county PMA committees be continued and made responsible for such programs of economic assistance as incentive payments, production adjustments, price supports, crop insurance, etc.

3. Favor the enactment of legislation for the use of cash payments and production aids, such as lime and fertilizer, as production-adjustment incentives.

Whereas the two types of assistance—one aimed at maintaining permanently the productive capacity of the land and the other with safeguarding the farmer's economic position—should be handled by different agencies, giving full time to their respective specialities; and

Whereas it is deemed advisable for the two agencies to work in harmony and with complete understanding of each other's objectives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State Association of District Supervisors—

1. Go on record as favoring the housing of personnel of all agricultural agencies operating in a county in a common building, the cost of such building to be borne jointly by Federal, State, and local governments.

2. Urge the Secretary of Agriculture to invite a representative of each of the organized farmer groups in a county to become a member of the county United States Department of Agriculture council and to instruct such councils to hold regular meetings for the exchange of program and policy information and to report on progress.

3. Urge the Secretary of Agriculture to strengthen the State United States Department of Agriculture councils by inviting representatives of each of the State-wide farmer organizations to become a member of the State council.

Whereas the soil conservation districts in Vermont are now staffed with the very minimum of personnel for efficient work; and

Whereas personnel will have to be drawn from these Vermont districts to staff new districts in other States if the appropriation is not increased to take care of the new districts: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State Association of District Supervisors go on record as favoring an increase in appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service adequate to provide effective assistance to newly organized districts and to continue, on at least the present basis, the assistance older districts are receiving.

Inflation Comes From the Acts of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, the cost of living is of real concern to the Congress and to all Americans. In this fateful election year it is essential that our citizens be correctly and intelligently informed about inflationary prices and where the responsibility for them lies.

The Republican, national party magazine, an outstanding publication printed in Chicago under the editorship of Mr. Richard Nowinson, carried an article of mine in the February issue entitled "Inflation Comes From the Acts of Government." Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the text of the article, as follows:

INFLATION COMES FROM THE ACTS OF GOVERNMENT

(By Representative FRED BUSBEY)

One year ago the majority of the economists associated with the Federal Government were warning the country of an imminent recession.

Instead of that recession we have developed additional inflation until people everywhere are complaining of prices which have, in their opinion, gone too high. At present the outlook appears to favor a substantial increase in the inflation. Retail merchants going into the markets to replenish their stocks, quite uniformly, find wholesale prices higher and still increasing. Therefore it is apparent that the American public, already resentful of the general price level, will be faced by still higher prices in the near future.

How has this come about?

NO ONE WANTS INFLATION

No one wants inflation. Consumers find it difficult to meet the current prices and do not want inflation. The retailers, who must assume the risk of carrying high-cost inventories, certainly are opposed to inflation. The President of the United States has often mentioned the necessity of halting the price advances and bringing things down to a more normal level, so we may assume the President does not want inflation. An important congressional committee has been investigating the causes of high prices and the Department of Justice has undertaken a campaign to root out monopolies as a means compelling lower prices. Therefore, it seems these officials definitely are not in favor of inflation.

Who, then, wants inflation and who, or what, has caused the present situation?

To find the answer we must go back to the long depression of the thirties. It will be remembered, we suffered during that period from a deflation which most of us believed had gone too far. Prices were abnormally low, almost every business concern was losing money, unemployment increased by leaps and bounds, employees receiving cuts in pay sighed with relief because the pay-cuts seemed to make their jobs more secure.

During that period, the Federal Government deliberately encouraged a certain degree of controlled inflation. The word "inflation" always has carried fearful implications with it, so the Government did not use that word; instead, it called the process of reviving our collapsed economic balloon by the milder term "reflation."

THE NRA IS THE BEGINNING

Congress passed the National Recovery Act and immediately every industry was busy writing codes to regulate the operation of business. The Government made no secret of the fact that the only important provisions of these codes were the restrictions on working hours and the increase in pay rates which all codes must contain. The purpose was to insure the employment of more people and to increase purchasing power. It was a deliberate effort to create inflation, but the country generally favored the move.

Then the Government abandoned the gold standard and reduced the gold content of the dollar to 59 cents. It fixed the price of gold at nearly double its long-time value, which cheapened the dollar.

It may be pointed out that a deflation comes when people prefer money to things and an inflation develops when people prefer things to money. By lowering the value of money, the Government hoped to increase the value of things, raise the depressed price level, and introduce a bit of inflation to offset the deflation from which the Nation was suffering.

Government action to make work, such as the PWA and the WPA, gave many unemployed work and compensation. Apart from public amusement over some of the worthless or nearly worthless things which people were paid to do, there was no strong demonstration of objection to these activities.

THE WIND-UP: THE WAR

It is unnecessary to dwell upon all of the inflationary things, which the Government did during those recovery years. Almost all of the important actions of the Government were inflationary in character. The wind up: the greatest producer of inflation which has ever been known, participation in a world war.

It is true that, upon facing the war, the Government eventually recognized the fact that, by undertaking some control over the economy, the effects of the inevitable inflation might be retarded. Congress enacted a price control law and established the Office of Price Administration. There seemed to be no recognition of the fact that prices have a sounder basis than the mere whim of the seller. That prices are and must be based upon costs had little consideration. As a matter of fact, when Leon Henderson, the first Price Administrator, assumed his task of trying to control all prices in this huge and complex economy, he glibly said that wages had nothing to do with prices. It would not be necessary to control wages.

THE OPA SUSPECTS EVERYONE

Naturally in such a complicated and large economic system as that of the United States, there is no man or group of men sufficiently experienced to handle such work as the OPA with 100 percent efficiency. The OPA made many mistakes, but the majority of the mistakes grew from the fact that every business representative was a suspect.

The fact that there were businessmen sincerely and unselfishly interested in supporting the Nation's war effort was an assumption which was not allowed to invade the precincts of the OPA. Too frequently, therefore, businessmen's advice was rejected, or grudgingly accepted when the soundness of the business position could be demonstrated so clearly that OPA no longer could find arguments to offset it. Businessmen saw their sons go to war, they put their surplus funds into war bonds, they participated in all of the patriotic activities of their localities; but when it came to the matter of prices, supposedly, businessmen were not to be trusted even when they were ted to cooperate with OPA.

In spite of these things, price controls were effective in keeping a check on price inflation during the worst years of the war; considerable credit should go to those who labored in jobs which never could have made them popular. It must be remembered that business generally cooperated wholeheartedly in the efforts of the OPA, had that not been the case, it is apparent that no price-control system could have been effective.

ADVANCING PRICES RESULT FROM INFLATION

It should be easy to recognize, however, that advancing prices are the result of inflation and not the cause. If that were not so, then it would be extremely easy to create an inflation by merely raising prices.

The Government's persistent efforts to overcome a deflation by creating an inflation, and the years which were required to produce such an effect are perhaps the soundest evidence that inflations are not easily produced. As a matter of fact, business—even if it desired to do so—could not create an inflation. Only the policies adopted by the Government can create an inflation.

While the OPA did hold down prices, it could do nothing to check the inflationary influences which the Government was generating. As far as the Government is concerned, it must be remembered that relatively little opposition to the course followed ever was voiced during the times when these things were done.

Because prices were controlled but the causes of inflation could not be controlled, the Government's control of prices may be compared to the compressing of a great spiral spring. When such a spring is compressed and then the pressure suddenly released, the spring will react violently. This violent reaction can be prevented, however, by a gradual relaxation of the pressure. Price control compressed the inflationary forces by an embargo against their natural outlet. The sudden ending of all price controls was similar in effect to the sudden removal of the pressure on the spring, and the identical violent reaction was inevitable.

FROZEN PRICES FIGHT MISCELLANEOUS INCREASES

The OPA held prices down, but under the surface were the forces of inflation awaiting an outlet which sooner or later would no longer be denied. This condition was greatly aggravated by OPA's own operation during the later phases of its control. Effective March 1942, prices had been frozen. As time went on, it became impossible for the OPA to hold the line completely and so miscellaneous increases in some prices were permitted.

Meanwhile, costs generally increased and many long-established manufacturing firms, which had facilities for turning out merchandise that the public greately needed, found that, under the prices which OPA permitted, they could no longer produce the articles they had been providing for the public for many years. Coming at a time when the war effort created shortages in civilian supplies, this meant a tragic loss of needed production. Moreover, probably because OPA actually realized the need for more production, new manufacturers would begin producing articles which the established manufacturers, restricted by OPA ceiling based on their prewar prices, could no longer produce profitably. The newcomers found little difficulty in securing the OPA's authorization to charge prices decidedly more liberal than the experienced concerns were allowed.

The new manufacturers usually lacked the experience and the facilities of the older manufacturers. Too often they were not men who intended to remain in that particular manufacturing field indefinitely, and so their products were often inferior. The OPA officials refused to face the facts realistically; as a result, there was an extreme shortage of all the lower-priced merchandise for which the public had a special demand.

When the war activities ended, the public demanded more and more merchandise; thanks mainly but not entirely to the OPA, the merchandise supplies were scarce and industries were in shackles, which made increased production difficult. Congress, recognizing these conditions, attempted to enact a modified price control measure which, while exerting a restraining influence on prices, would encourage the mass production which the country required. The President's veto put an end to all the price controls.

What happened then is common knowledge. Prices proceeded to seek their own level, and they still are seeking for that level. What the ultimate result may be, it is too early to predict.

It is natural that many Americans look back upon the price control days and sincerely believe that we need similar controls now. Prices were lower then, so they believe that if we had price control today the prices again would be lower and everything would be serene.

PRICE CONTROLS HOLD UP PRODUCTION

This point of view fails to see that price controls cannot cure the underlying condition. It may be hard to accept, but, nevertheless, it is a fact that even if price controls, as administered by the OPA, had been continued for several more years, when they finally came to an end, the inflationary influences underlying the rise in prices would be continued and increased so that, eventually, we would have a period somewhat like the present, through which we would have to live. The OPA philosophy that price controls should have been continued until production had caught up with demand, of course, completely fails to recognize the fact that price controls were preventing that needed increase in production.

Inflation has come from the policies of the Government, not from business, although it has been nourished by business and by the buying public. It would be both refreshing and beneficial if the Government would frankly inform the public of the situation.

Perhaps it is too much to expect, but how unity and understanding would be advanced if the Government would say, "Your Government has been confronted by great emergencies which have required it to follow policies resulting in inflation. The Government could do nothing else, but it is the obligation of every citizen to support the Government by using self-restraint in the presence of this great danger of inflation."

Such an official statement would help to remove the confusion and the suspicion which now exist. It would act to destroy the illusion that high prices are an unfailing proof of greed and dishonesty in the business which serves the public.

What is the outlook for the future?

It seems that we have not reached the peak. That opinion is based upon some recognition which Congress may vote in favor of the Marshall plan to aid Europe and China, which inevitably will entail more inflation.

As long as this problem is discussed in terms of "dollars" (I recommend reading Will Dollars Save the World? by Henry Hazlett), it may serve to disguise the actual situation and to prevent the public from understanding that, again, a governmental policy is inflationary in nature.

DOLLARS TO EUROPE MEAN HIGHER PRICES

Gifts of dollars to Europe would be meaningless if it were not that these dollars give the holders access to the supplies of commodities in this country. They can have no other use. Consequently, it is plain that what is under contemplation is the giving of part of our own supplies to other countries. It must be pointed out, however, that this is another inflation-producing policy and its effect will be to push American prices higher.

Politicians will argue that this will not be the case, but it is impossible to read any other result into it. Here again, the Administration should make an honest, frank statement of the situation and advise the people that the Marshall plan is inflationary and, naturally, higher prices will result.

In Washington there is the beginning recognition of the fact that one of the basic causes of the inflation is the great increase of money in circulation and the tremendous expansion of bank credit. Before the war the money in circulation was about $6,000,000,000 while now it is about $28,000,000,000. That fact alone would support a substantial inflation because the supply of available

goods has not increased sufficiently to balance it. Moreover, the huge volume of Government obligations in the hands of the bank has been a still greater influence in expanding bank credit. The banks can expand their credit six and one-half times the amount of the bonds which they hold.

By taking steps which will initiate the passing of this era of easy money, the Government could turn the inflationary tide. To do so, however, may involve hardship both to the Government and to the people. Therefore it is to be expected that such steps will not be taken, at least until it becomes increasingly apparent that no other way out is to be found. To put an end to what both business and the public mistakenly regard as good times would not be a popular step. That is why it is easier to talk about the return of price controls and all other sorts of controls over the economy of the Nation. Such controls cannot strike at the basic causes of inflation and so they would serve only to disguise the fact that we are heading into disaster.

Here is another example of how foolish it is for the Government to omit telling the public the real causes of inflation and inviting public cooperation in overcoming the situation.

Save Your Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I delivered recently:

I have obtained this time tonight over the Mutual Broadcasting System to talk to the workers of the Nation.

This day is of great significance to me; first, because it commemorates the anniversary of the birth of George Washington, the founder of our beloved Nation; second, because it happens to be my own birthday; and, third, because today the Taft-Hartley law is 6 months old.

While its full meaning is yet to be determined by decisions of the National Labor Relations Board and the courts, on the face of its first 6 months of trial the act refutes the hysterical and fanciful attacks made upon it by certain union leaders.

While they have toned down their adjectives in describing the Taft-Hartley law in recent months, I would like to remind you of some of the terms they employed in trying to defeat the legislation and later in condemning it after it was the law of the land.

Mr. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, called it a diabolical monstrosity. Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, in the multi-million-dollar campaign against the bill, coined the term "slave-labor law."

The fact of the matter is that the workers of this Nation are being kidded by their own officials, their own so-called leaders. Since they don't like the law, they are trying to tell you that you don't like it. The labor barons of this Nation don't like the law for one simple reason. It breaks up their dictatorship over you. It brings democracy to the labor movement. It in no way interferes with labor's legitimate rights. It seeks only to curb the abuses of power by certain of your labor leaders, and I say with regret that it doesn't curb all of them.

I would remind the workers of this Nation that every protection you ever had in the original Wagner Act against abuses by employer bosses is retained intact in the Taft-Hartley law. What we have done in the new labor law is to give you additional protection against abuses by labor bosses. That is why the labor bosses don't like the Taft-Hartley law. That is why they are trying to make you believe it is a "diabolical monstrosity" and a "slave labor law." That is why some of them are trying to sign contracts outside the Taft-Hartley Act; not to put your employer behind the eight ball but to keep you there. The big change in the Taft-Hartley law is the new power given you as a member of the union; power which you did not have until the new law was passed.

Here are some of the new rights which you haven't had before and wouldn't ever have had if the new law had not been enacted:

You can't be fired by your union under the Taft-Hartley Act. So long as you pay your initiation fees and your dues regularly you job is safe. The union can't have you laid off because they don't like your race or religion or you personally. There will be no more special assessments for political parties or candidates you don't want to support. If you don't want to pay them you don't have to and your union can't do anything about it. If perchance you are laid off for any such reason you can apply to the Government for reinstatement and make the union pay you for the time you lost.

Strong-arm and muscle-men methods by unions against its members are out under the Taft-Hartley law. If force is used in a union election or if it is used against a man who doesn't want to go along with something the union officials have decided to do that is an unfair labor practice under the Taft-Hartley Act. The union can lose its bargaining rights with the employer and its right of appeal to the Government. I am frank to say to you that in my judgment that provision in the law is not adequate. The strong arm methods I have observed in various parts of the Nation during industrial disputes can lead to but one thing and that is to strengthen that provision in the law.

I would not deny to any worker his fundamental right to strike. But there is an equally fundamental right, one which has been overlooked far too long, and that is the right of a worker to work if he wants to work free from any harm or threat of harm to himself or members of his family.

I propose to make it a Federal offense to interfere with the civil rights of any worker to go to his job, not only to preserve his right to work but to restore respect for law and order even in the conduct of an industrial dispute.

Here are some more of the things about the Taft-Hartley law which your labor bosses don't like but perhaps you will. You can now go straight to your employer if you have a grievance which your union wouldn't handle.

Check-offs can't be charged against you without your written permission. Excessive initiation fees and fines are outlawed. Jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts which have lost so much working time for union members are now illegal. Featherbedding, which means a loafer being put on the pay roll while someone else does the work, has been outlawed.

If your union is sued and a fine imposed the money can only be taken from the union as a whole; it can't be taken from you as an individual member. You have a right to a full financial report so that you can find out what the labor bosses are doing with your money they collect from you in dues and assessments.

You have the right to petition to get rid of the union if you have it where you work and don't want it any more.

The Taft-Hartley law also helps you rid yourself of the yoke of communistic leadership. Before the union can appeal to the Government for collective-bargaining rights it must file affidavits that no officer of the local is a member of the Communist Party or any other group which plans to overthrow the United States Government. There has been much to do about this provision in the law. I have been asked why should the head of a union declare he is not a Communist and, if we are going to make labor union leaders register as non-Communists why not have the same requirement for the heads of business groups? I see no objection to the latter suggestion and welcome such a proposal. But as to the reason for this provision in the law, may I say that most people recognize there is an international conspiracy intended to break down democratic government wherever it exists, especially in America, and replace it with a communistic dictatorship. Communists in all countries, including the United States, are part of this conspiracy. One of the main objectives of this program is to obtain control of the labor movement in every country.

In recent weeks and months we have witnessed the effect of communistic infiltration in the labor movement in France, Italy, and the Ruhr Valley in Germany. Already in the United States they have succeeded to the extent that the heads of several big unions are known Communists.

The American people well know that in communistic-controlled unions the purpose is to instill civil strife and prepare to destroy industrial machinery which would be our mainstay in the event of war.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act we endeavor to withdraw the protection of the Government from unions dominated by persons whose purpose is to break down our Government. In this particular, the Taft-Hartley Act is a necessary protection for America as well as for union members.

The Taft-Hartley law makes you free Americans. As I mentioned earlier, William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, has tried to make you believe this is a slave-labor law. There are supposed to be 16,000,000 workers in the organized-labor movement, A. F. of L., CIO, and independent unions. I challenge Mr. Green or anyone else in the labor movement to give me the name of a single one of the 16,000,000 organized workers in this Nation who has been made a slave laborer under this law. The fact is that some of the most favorable contracts ever written, from the union point of view, have been signed since the Taft-Hartley Act was passed.

It is interesting to note the results of various polls that have been taken among the workers of this Nation to find out what you think of the law and its provisions. These surveys uncovered a strange paradox, that notwithstanding their declared disapproval of the law, a majority of the workers favored every individual provision on which they were questioned. The accuracy of these polls has not been challenged by the labor leadership.

While I am attempting to answer the hundreds of attacks that have been made on this law, I am not asking you to accept my word for it. The law speaks for itself. It is easy to get a copy. I will send a copy to anyone listening to this broadcast. Read it for yourself. Every single point that I have mentioned as giving you new rights and powers is down in black and white in the law. I want you to have the facts, because you are being called on now to contribute millions of dollars into a fund to be spent by the labor bosses of this Nation, in an effort to purge from Congress the 331 Members of the House and the 68 Members of the Senate who voted to make the Taft-Hartley bill the law of the land.

I want to advise you not to give this money to your leaders. It will constitute a fund that in itself will accomplish nothing. You, as workers, must abhor this waste of your money.

I would like to remind you that 331 Members of the House who voted to override the President's veto, constituted an overwhelming majority of both political parties. Incidentally, that vote was the greatest vote ever to override a Presidential veto. This effort to purge the Members of Congress who voted to make this the law of the land is doomed to fail.

But even should the complexion of Congress revert to that of the Seventy-ninth, the Seventy-eighth, or even the Seventy-seventh Congress, there will still be enough Members in the House to protect the integrity of the Taft-Hartley law. In fact, fully 60 percent of the present law passed the House as far back as 1940. So I say to you that this law will not be emasculated nor repealed. This campaign by the leaders of organized labor of this Nation is hardly the way to win friends and influence people in or out of Congress.

On the other hand, if there is any provision of the new law which proves to be punitive, drastic, or unworkable, those of us who sponsored this measure will be the first to want to correct any defect. As evidence of our good faith, let me call your attention to the provision in the law setting up a joint committee composed of seven Members of the House and seven Members of the Senate to study the effect of this law and to recommend to the Congress any amendments that might prove desirable. I happen to be vice chairman of this committee. I can assure you that we have been making a thorough study of this law and how it is operating in all its particulars. On December 17 last, more than 2 months ago, this committee publicly invited anyone, including the labor leaders of this Nation, who had any fault to find with this law, or who had been injured by its operation, to tell us about it. Up to this moment not a single representative of organized labor has taken us up on this invitation. And let me repeat that the invitation is still open.

In other words, all we are asking the labor leadership to do is stop crying and tell us where the pain is. The fact is that they cannot give us a bill of particulars against this law and they know it.

The new labor law is a good law—for you, the workers, and for the American people. Those of us in Congress who contributed to its passage are proud of what we have done. If anyone who is now listening to me would like a copy of this speech or of the law, or of any of the material that we used in preparing this law, I would be glad to send it to you.

I thank you for having listened and bid you a cordial goodnight.

Port of Portland and Far Eastern Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, by leave heretofore granted, I include the following article on Far Eastern trade which appeared in the Portland (Oreg.) Journal on February 11, 1948:

FAR EASTERN TRADE

(By L. W. Harris, Jr., Ames, Harris, Neville Co.)

The port of Portland, the Columbia River basin and the State of Oregon, located as they are and constituting part of the western-seaboard community of the United States, all have a definite right to look in the direction of the Far East and the Middle East with the objective of forming and preserving trade and cultural ties. On August 15, 1947, the new dominion of India and the new dominion of Pakistan formally assumed their own responsibilities, each with dominion status, together comprising the territory which was formerly British India.

From a trade standpoint and of importance to all of us in this community are records of this port, which show that Portland is surpassed only by San Francisco in value of imports from British India to the Pacific coast. This is particularly notable, since from a general average of all imported products from all sources, Portland ranks fourth on the Pacific coast, but on cargo originating from British India our record puts us considerably ahead of Los Angeles and Seattle, principally because of the tonnage of jute burlap brought in through our port.

Burlap is the commercial designation for that cloth made from the fiber of the jute plant, which is successfully grown on a commercial basis only in certain provinces of India. The burlap is brought to this country in pressed bales via steamer, discharged over our own dock facilities, and is processed principally into burlap bags for shipment of agricultural products.

Approximately 600 people receive employment in Portland factories directly connected with the cutting, sewing, and printing of the burlap as it is manufactured into bags for such a variety of products as wheat, flour, sugar, seeds, poultry, dairy and animal foods, wool, potatoes, nuts, salt, beans, and fertilizer. Burlap bags thus manufactured in Portland are shipped into the great agricultural areas of the Pacific Northwest and Intermountain States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Utah, Montana, Wyoming, and northern California.

The factories actually producing burlap bags are in turn continually using manufacturing materials and supplies which are furnished from other factories of the community.

The bags used in the transportation and handling of these bulk commodities become part and parcel of the industrial and agricultural output of the Pacific Northwest. From the above, it can be seen how a product of a very distant country becomes part of our everyday life. Approximately 100 years ago President Fillmore was even then cognizant of the prospects of trade between Asia and the west coast of North America. Today 400,000,000 people who constitute the population of Pakistan and the Dominion of India are seeking opportunities to produce items which we can use in this country, and are equally anxious to obtain many items made in the United States. Recently more than the usual number of visitors have come to the United States as observers and investigators to bring their manufactures to a point of greater acceptability by us, while others endeavor to secure American products which can be used by their people.

There are other commodities, produced overseas, which can be imported with resultant advantage to our port and our industries. It is a two-way proposition which can well be cultivated with other countries, as well as with India.

Increase of Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT CROSSER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by William C. Doherty, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, before House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, my name is William C. Doherty. I am president of the National Association of Letter Carriers. Our organization represents 79,364 city, rural, and village letter carriers in the United States Postal Service. The NALC was founded in 1889, and has devoted nearly 60 years to the improvement of the postal service and the betterment of conditions affecting the welfare of letter carriers. I want to add that each of our 79,364 members is a classified civil-service employee. I should also tell you that we have local branches of our organization in more than 4,000 cities and villages throughout the 48 States, the Hawaiian Islands, and Puerto Rico.

In behalf of our entire membership, I desire to compliment the chairman and members of this committee for their presence here today to consider this very important subject of postal wages. Speaking for myself and every letter carrier in the Nation, I want to express deep appreciation for your prompt and friendly consideration of what I consider the paramount issue in each letter carrier's life, namely, the problem of stretching his postal-wage dollars to meet present high-living costs.

With respect to an upward wage adjustment for letter carriers, it might well be asked: Is there need of it? Is there need of it in the first place from the standpoint of the employees? Secondly, is there need of it from the viewpoint of the postal service? These are the questions which I wish to submit for the candid consideration of you gentlemen. If our respectful request to you is unjust or unreasonable, it should be rejected without apology. But if you find validity in our claim that letter carriers cannot live on their present postal wages, then we are satisfied that you are fair enough and wise enough to make possible the proper means for solving our economic problem.

Perhaps the best answer to the question of the need for a wage adjustment is to be found in the numerous bills anent the subject introduced in this session, both in the House and the Senate. In this connection, I am mindful that you, Mr. Chairman, very recently introduced your own bill, H. R. 5472, which provides for a temporary increase in the compensation of all Federal employees, including postal employees. You are to be complimented for the friendly consideration which prompted your action. Those same sentiments of appreciation go out to the several other members of your committee that have sponsored postal pay bills in the present session of the Congress.

While I have no ready reference at hand, I believe it is a fact that approximately 35 postal pay bills are now pending before the appropriate committee in each House. The fact that 35 different postal pay bills have been introduced can be interpreted as meaning but one thing, and one thing only, namely, a general acceptance of the fact that postal workers are not now receiving an adequate salary.

From a statistical standpoint, that is, figures based on accepted cost of living indices, it can be readily shown that an urgent need exists for an upward wage adjustment for letter carriers. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the over-all cost of living on December 15, 1945, stood at 129.9 points—with 1935–39 equaling 100 points. That same source shows that as of January 15, 1948, the index for the cost of all items had risen to 168.8 points. This rise represents an almost unbelievable jump of 29.9 percent in the over-all cost of living in the period involved.

For purposes of clarification I should say that the period from December 15, 1945, to

January 15, 1948, is used herein because the first-named date most nearly coincides with the date on which letter carriers last received a pay increase—that is, January 1, 1946, or 15 days subsequent to the example date used. The January 15, 1948, date is employed because it represents the last available period for which complete cost-of-living data have been compiled.

In other words, since Public Law 386 became effective on January 1, 1946, which gave letter carriers and most other postal personnel a horizontal pay increase of $400, the period of December 15, 1945, to January 15, 1948, is being utilized in this justification for an immediate wage increase.

Because food costs comprise approximately one-half of the average worker's personal budget I should like to invite your attention to the spectacular rise in the cost of food during the same period described above.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics on December 15, 1945, noted the food cost index as being 141.4. On January 15, 1948, it had soared to the astronomical figure of 209.7, a rise of 48.3 percent for the period involved. This rise in the cost of food has had and continues to have a crushing impact on the personal budget of letter carriers. He simply has not been able to match food prices with his sadly deflated purchasable dollar. In many instances he has not been able to put on his family table the basic foods that are so necessary to sustain him in the arduous duties of a letter carrier.

I am sure that most of you will recall the item which appeared in all the local newspapers a few weeks ago, concerning the testimony given a Senate subcommittee on postal wages by the wife of a local letter carrier. This lady very convincingly demonstrated that she could not provide butter for her family, which included three growing boys, on her husband's salary. I do not wish to intimate that letter carriers are starving to death in the streets. They are not. But at the same time their present woefully inadequate salary denies them their rightful participation in the ideals and bounty of the world's greatest democracy. This same totally inadequate salary excludes letter carriers from an equitable share in the material, social, intellectual, and moral prosperity of our day and age. Letter carriers do not want merely a living wage. We feel that we are entitled to no less than a saving wage. A saving wage and the American way of life are indivisible.

In other words, due to the inflation of our money, which affects everybody, the purchasing power of our dollar has decreased approximately one-half. In addition, we have nearly 30 percent less take-home pay. This situation has created chaos in the personal lives of our people. They are at their wit's end trying to make their salary stand up to present-day costs. Not only is there a glaring deficiency in their take-home pay, but not a single penny they sepend does its full duty. We lose in every transaction affecting our food, clothing, shelter, hygiene, schooling, amusements, and all the other necessities that go to make up our accepted American standard of living. I feel very strongly that the time has long since passed when the letter carriers' value should be assessed at the poverty line.

Admittedly, there was a break in grain prices beginning the first of the month. Perhaps I should admit further that it was the sharpest break in recent years. But I also contend that the break has had very little effect, if any, on the prices you and I pay at retail. As a matter of record, during the past week the BLS officials conducted a sample test of retail food prices. The results showed a decline of 3 to 4 percent—an infinitesimal decrease, to say the least. Moreover, there is sufficient evidence to justify the opinion held by those economists who say the food-price declines appear to be leveling off. If that turns out to be a correct estimate of the situation, the average letter carrier will be just as perplexed as he was before the price break.

On the other hand, the slight decrease in food prices has been more than offset by the continuing rise in consumer items, such as household products, clothing, fuel, and rents. It cost 31 percent more to wear shoes these days; fuel is up 20 percent; clothing approximately 19 percent. And there is no reason to be optimistic that a break will occur in the prices for these items, especially in view of the recently announced increase of 10 percent in certain types of steel products.

Actually, it is a case of one hand washing the other; bread and milk come down a penny or two, while consumer products go up in an equal amount. As far as the individual letter carrier is concerned, no downward trend in prices is reflected in his personal budget, and something more tangible is necessary than a 3-percent decline in food prices to convince him that his present postal salary is now adequate, or that it will become adequate in the immediate days ahead.

I should like to inject another point which is too often overlooked in considering wages for letter carriers. Reference is made to the fact that letter carriers are obliged to furnish their own uniforms for the proper performance of their duties. The cost of these uniforms constitutes no small item in his yearly budget. I say "uniforms" advisedly, because each letter carrier is obliged to furnish himself with two complete uniforms—one for winter wear and another for the summer period. I might also say that to the best of my knowledge no other department of the Government demands employees to furnish their own uniforms or other distinctive garb where required.

Let me quote some of the prices advertised for letter-carrier uniforms taken from advertisements appearing in the Postal Record, a monthly journal published by our organization.

One firm (and it is a typical firm as to prices) offers serge trousers at $15.75 each; 14-ounce gabardine trousers cost the letter carrier $16.

The same firm offers a summer-cloth suit, consisting of three pieces, for a total of $54.45; a medium-weight uniform suitable for mild winter weather costs $61.35.

A letter carrier's cap costs him a minimum of $2.50—and he must have at least two caps, one for winter and another for summer.

Shoes. There is hardly any need for me to impress upon you the fact that letter carriers in the daily performance of their duties are on their feet in all kinds of weather from 8 to 10 hours a day. The wear and tear on their shoes is terrific. A very conservative estimate for the cost of a year's supply of shoes for the average letter carrier would be $50, including the cost of repairs.

Shirts. The special accessories required on our work shirts, such as shoulder reinforcements, etc., increases the cost. It is impossible to get a quality letter carrier's shirt for less than $3.50 each, and because of the constant wear and tear on our clothing, a minimum of six shirts each is required for summer and winter wear.

All this adds up in a year's time. In fact, it costs a letter carrier no small portion of his salary each year to dress himself in the uniform required by the Post Office Department. As I mentioned previously, we are probably the only Federal employees required to furnish our own uniforms. It is a ridiculous situation. I sometimes wonder what would happen if an employer in outside industry hired a bookkeeper and then required the employee to furnish his own adding machine and all the other tools of his trade. Imagine yourselves hiring a secretary and then telling her to bring her own typewriter and file cabinets when she reported for work.

Again referring to the 29.9-percent rise in the over-all cost of living since last letter carriers received a wage adjustment, I want to point out the method used to justify the amount of increase we now feel is necessary to bring letter carriers up to par, so to speak.

On December 3, 1947, the legislative reference service of the Congressional Library stated that on July 1, 1946, the average salary paid postal workers in the field service was $2,708 per annum. If we multiply $2,703 by 29.9 percent, the result is $809.69. That figure represents the amount required to meet the average deficiency in postal salaries.

Now let me refer to another phase which must always be borne in mind in the consideration of postal salaries. Letter carriers are paid out of public funds—that is, Treasury Department funds—and I might use this occasion to insert in the record a correction of an erroneous impression that is becoming prevalent relative to the source of payments for postal salaries. There is an impression in some quarters that postal salaries are paid from postal revenues; moreover, there is a further interpretation put on this impression which would have postal salaries totally dependent upon postal revenues. I merely want the record to show that postal salaries are in no manner dependent upon postal revenues. By the same token, there is no connection between postal revenues and postal expenditures. If the Congress should, for example, appropriate $1,000,000,000 during any fiscal year for the operation of the Post Office Department, that is all the Department could use legally for the operation of the postal service, regardless of the fact that postal revenues during that period might be double or triple postal expenditures. Because letter carriers are paid out of public funds, there is always present a certain sensitivity as to the public reaction to any increase in public expenditures, be they for salaries or any other legitimate public expenses. The spokesman for the letter carriers is aware of that condition; letter carriers in general are also aware of the necessity of always presenting a reasonable request in the matter of wage advancements—after all, letter carriers are also taxpayers.

Along that line of thought, I want to quote at random some of the favorable reaction of the public press to our request for an upward wage adjustment. This is not a complete file on the subject, but it does indicate the attitude of the American people toward the request of the letter carrier for a decent salary. I might add these are all editorial comments:

From the Peoria Star, February 7:

"The request of the postal employees has our sympathy. Employees of the Post Office Department work for their salaries. They form a large group of our most reliable public servants. The service they render is essential to the Nation. The security they enjoy they pay for themselves. There is no featherbedding in the postal service. There are many places in the administration of our Federal Government where economy might be practiced before squeezing the purses of such a loyal and essential group of Government employees as those who operate the postal service."

A second comment from a paper in Illinois, the Peoria Journal, under date of February 11, stated: "Whenever the cost of living rises, as it has been doing for the past few years in the United States, persons with fixed incomes suffer the most. Some workers can get raised to offset at least a portion of the increased cost of living, but those whose incomes are stationary or whose salaries are set by law have a great deal of trouble keeping up with rising prices. Included in this category are the employees of the Post Office Department. Their salaries are set by law and it takes action by Congress to obtain an increase for them."

Taking a realistic view of the cost aspect involved in Federal salaries, the Journal continued: "There seems little doubt that the postal employees are entitled to the raise they are seeking. Few Government employees work as hard as the post-office employees and few give as faithful service as they. While we dislike to see any increase in the cost of Government, certainly the postal workers have earned what they are asking, and we are hopeful that their request will be granted."

On February 3, the editor of the Altoona Mirror, in Pennsylvania, said: "The letter carriers contend they can no longer meet current living costs on their pay scale * * * they maintain that, on their present pay scale, the average letter carrier is going in the hole at the rate of $35 a month. It is up to all of us to consider the facts and act accordingly. The carriers have done, and are doing a good job. Let's give them a pat on the back in the way it will do the most good. Write your Congressman."

The Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, on January 29, said: "Among the 10,000,000 or more Americans of fixed or relatively fixed incomes who find their purchasing power dwindling in the present inflationary period, few groups are more worthy of relief than the Nation's postal employees. Letter carriers and other postal workers are by no means the only ones suffering from rising prices. But in their case the remedy is at hand."

Advancing the thought that the well-known fair-mindedness of the American taxpayer would prompt him to see the justification of a pay raise for letter carriers, the editor of the St. Joseph (Mo.) Gazette, on February 3, stated: "Few American taxpayers are likely to object to a reasonable increase in the pay of the country's postal workers. Like everybody else, they have been squeezed by inflation, but no relief is in sight for them unless Congress approves raises in their pay. Congress, who believes in fair play, and expect the postman always to ring twice, should take steps for giving them a raise in pay."

The editor of the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph, February 6 edition, makes a point that should be given unusual consideration in dealing with the question of letter-carrier wages. The editorial referred to states, in part: "It is generally agreed that our postal employees are among the most faithful and deserving of all our public servants, but it is equally true that they have been greatly neglected." The editorial continues:

"An important consideration in this connection is that, while postal employees are organized, they are not allowed to strike, and, to be perfectly fair, they have shown no disposition to strike. They are content to rely upon a sense of fair play on the part of Congress and of the general public. There were weary years during which this reliance seemed misplaced."

I am not going to take up any more of your valuable time to read additional editorial excerpts in favor of a salary raise for letter carriers. There are a great many more on file in my office—among them comments from Milwaukee, Wis.; Atlanta, Ga.; Philadelphia, Pa., and others. I do want to mention, however, that the AFL executive council, of which I am privileged to be a member, in their recent winter session, voted unanimously to endorse our pay-raise request. Describing postal workers as being victimized by inflation, the statement accompanying the AFL endorsement added: "It is up to Congress to correct this mass injustice without delay. Government workers who cannot bargain collectively for wages or strike must depend upon the mercies of Congress."

In the forepart of my statement I propounded the question of the need for a salary raise from the viewpoint of the postal service. I also pointed out earlier in my testimony that the organization which I have the honor to represent has been engaged for the past 60 years not only in bettering the welfare of its membership, but doing everything within its power to advance the postal service. We, as postal employees, have a natural and abiding interest in the advancement of the service. We want to see it expanded; we want to see it give more and better service to the American people. To do these things it is absolutely necessary that modern equipment be furnished the postal service in sufficient quantities to do the job. It is imperative that the planning of the Department be harmonized with the technological advancements of our era. No less important is it that the Department secure and retain the high caliber of personnel which has brought the United States postal service to the high position which it now enjoys in its field. That point alone is sufficient justification to increase the wage of letter carriers and other postal workers.

Postal authorities will no doubt testify to the fact that it is no longer possible to recruit new employees on the present $2,100 entrance salary. New entrants who, for the most part, are veterans of World War II are required to serve 11 years before reaching the maximum pay grade of $3,100. As I have pointed out, the gap between the fixed salary of the top-grade letter carrier at $3,100 cannot be closed. How, then, can we expect the $2,100 letter carrier to cope with his economic problems? I can tell you he is not successfully coping with those problems.

In many instances these men are attempting to augment their postal wages with income from outside employment. There is little need for me to tell you that in so doing it is at the expense of a diminishing interest in the postal service. If these men stopped at part-time work it would be bad enough; but in altogether too many instances they are leaving the postal service for more lucrative positions in outside industry. That sort of situation is very costly to the Government. Considerable money is spent to train a postal recruit, and before there is time to collect on the investment the new man becomes disillusioned. He gives up any idea he might have had about a postal career and sells his labor elsewhere.

Most of us knew when we entered the postal service that we would never become wealthy men; we forfeited all thought of ever owning productive capital. But as matters now stand the job of carrying the mails is no longer attractive enough to induce young men to enter the service. Potential career men apply for an examination; they qualify in competition with other like-minded men, but as soon as they learn of the salary grades they turn their back on the service.

In this connection, let me quote a portion of an editorial recently appearing in the Wyoming Eagle, published at Cheyenne, Wyo. It points up the absolute need for making the job of carrying the mails attractive from a financial standpoint, if the historical efficiency of the service is to be maintained. The article is dated February 5, and reads in part: "As a result of the low beginning wage and the limitations placed upon these people, it is becoming increasingly difficult to secure capable young men for the postal service. And the volume of mail now being handled is considered to be at an all-time high. If the Government is to uphold the traditions of its efficient postal service and staff it with capable young men, it must offer them at least the inducements of other occupations. Among these a comfortable living wage."

This unwholesome condition is not something that has been conjured in our minds. It is real. Moreover, it will become progressively harder to rectify if allowed to continue unchecked. It is something that can be overcome only by thoughtful consideration and forceful action. There must be an immediate consideration given the underlying cause for its existence, namely the wage consideration.

I want to quote an announcement dated February 13, 1948, from the United States Civil Service Commission, Office of the Director, Eleventh United States Civil Service Region, with headquarters in Seattle, Wash.: The purpose of the announcement is to advertise a forthcoming civil-service examination for probational appointment to the positions of substitute clerk-carriers in the post office service. The interesting part about this announcement is that it is the third such amendment to the original call for the examination described. The reason for this third notice—and it is printed very plainly on the copy—is "because of insufficient applications." In other words, there is a third attempt being made to secure sufficient applications to warrant holding a civil-service examination to establish eligible rosters for the entire eleventh civil service region.

Getting a little closer to home, permit me to quote a news item which appeared in the Washington, D. C., Times-Herald on February 16. The caption of the story reads: "Postal Jobs Go Begging." The item reads in part: "The Civil Service Commission reported today that it has not received enough applications for substitute clerk and carrier jobs in the Washington post office—jobs for which it used to be deluged with applications." The remainder of the item is irrelevant to the point under consideration, as it merely outlines the place, time, et cetera, where applications may be secured for the examination.

The point I wish to bring to your attention is that no longer is there any financial reason why a young man should enter upon the postal service as a career.

Because of the acute situation within the Postal Service; a conference of letter carrier representatives was held in Washington, D. C., January 12 and 13. Approximately 700 letter carriers from 44 different States were on hand for that conference. Among other things, the group recorded itself in favor of an immediate $800 upward wage adjustment on a permanent basis, to be effective January 1, 1948.

This action taken by the National Association of Letter Carriers parallels that taken by the Government Employees' Council, American Federation of Labor, on December 9, 1947, when it endorsed a proposal seeking an immediate wage adjustment of not less than $800 per annum. This also carried the stipulation that such legislation would be permanent in nature and would become effective January 1, 1948. This last named group represents 21 unions whose membership in whole or in part are employed by the Federal Government. The Council has a membership of approximately 500,000 Government employees.

I have one more thought before I finish my testimony; along with millions of other American workers, letter carriers would much prefer a substantial reduction in the over-all cost of living in lieu of a wage boost. But the situation is one over which letter carriers have no control. It is a very critical situation both for the Postal Service and the employees. Simple justice demands that letter carriers be given an immediate wage increase.

Therefore, the National Association of Letter Carriers endorses the principle contained in the various pay raise bills pending before this distinguished committee. We are of the firm opinion, in fact, it is a deep-rooted conviction with us, that a permanent wage increase of not less than $800 per annum, effective January 1, 1948, is not only warranted but wholly justified.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Synthetic Rubber for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the February 24 issue of the Washington Star:

SYNTHETIC RUBBER FOR WAR

The House Armed Services Committee has recommended unanimously to the House a peacetime synthetic-rubber program that, if adopted without substantial change, should assure the Nation of an adequate supply of the critical material in any foreseeable emergency. World War II showed how risky it can be to rely on imported natural rubber to keep the war machine going. But for the amazing production feats of a war-born synthetic-rubber industry an Allied victory in that war might well have been impossible.

Congress now faces the problem of deciding what to do with this industry when the wartime synthetic rubber law expires on March 31 of this year. There is not much time left for deliberation. But the House committee, after 9 months of intensive study of the problem, has presented a series of proposals which should simplify the task of the House and the Senate. The program represents a number of compromises of prevailing views on the difficult subject and hence will provoke some debate on the floor.

Briefly, the measure calls for preservation of sufficient synthetic-rubber plants in operating or standby condition to produce 675,000 tons of the product annually, if necessary. The plants would remain under Government ownership, but they could be leased to private interests for rubber production under an arrangement requiring a total output of at least 225,000 tons each year. Sale of any of the fifty-odd Government plants would be prohibited except by special authority of Congress. Private interests would be encouraged, however, to build their own plants, to add to the potential productive capacity of the country.

The leasing of these Government plants, of course, should be surrounded by every safeguard necessary to protect the public's vital interest in the industry. Maintenance in efficient operating condition of adequate facilities for synthetic-rubber production is no less important to national security than availability of aircraft production facilities. Fortunately, synthetic rubber has become a valuable peacetime commodity, the demand for which is such as to assure a continued interest by private industry in its production. The cooperation of private industry should help to put the Government's proposed program on a self-liquidating basis.

New National Service Life Insurance Program in the Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, I have received several letters from interested insurance executives relating to an insurance program that I understand will be inaugurated to take the place of the national service life insurance in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

As is generally known, the present method of insurance used by the Government is both unduly expensive to taxpayers and socialistic in implication. Even more important, it is about as inefficiently handled as it possibly could be.

Insurance men who have had a chance to observe the workings of the Veterans' Administration are impressed, more than anything else, with the inefficiency of the present set-up. The service rendered policyholders is terrible.

One insurance friend of mine said recently:

It would be more economical and far more efficient if the Government would give the insurance to the veteran rather than charge him for it each month.

There is a great deal of interest in insurance circles, of course, as to the kind of legislation the armed services themselves will recommend in regard to a future mode of insuring service personnel. I am happy to be able to say that such a recommendation will be forthcoming soon, and I am serving notice now that my subcommittee will get busy on the legislation just as soon as the wishes of the armed services are made known.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that there be carried in the RECORD at this point a letter which I received recently from James V. Forrestal, Secretary of Defense, relating to forthcoming action along this line:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 20, 1948.

Hon. PAUL SHAFER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHAFER: The following is in amplification of my previous acknowledgment of your letter of December 31, with which you forwarded a letter from Mr. H. Loree Harvey, of the Equitable Life Insurance Co. of Iowa, relative to the report of a committee of the Joint Army-Navy Personnel Board on national service life insurance.

I find that the report to which Mr. Harvey refers has not been pigeonholed but that recommendations in the premises will be forthcoming in due course. Its status is as follows:

A committee, headed by Lt. Col. A. F. Penzold, Jr., USMC, appointed by the Joint Army-Navy Personnel Board, made a study of national service life insurance and made certain recommendations in its report to the board which included the granting of gratuitous life insurance to persons on active duty. The report of this committee has been approved by the Joint Army-Navy Personnel Board, but has been held in abeyance by that board pending completion of a study of the whole problem of pay, physical-disability benefits, and death gratuities, to which matters the subject is closely related, and with which it should be integrated.

The recommendations of the board when completed will be forwarded to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for comment and further recommendation prior to the initiation of legislation on this subject.

The enclosure forwarded with your letter is returned herewith as requested.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Cadets Want No Foreign Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the proposed sale and transfer of some 500 ships to foreign nations under the relief program, I am including a statement from the Alumni Association of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, who substantiate the position taken by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in which the committee took action to stop charter and sales to foreigners as well as recommending there being no free transfer of ships:

The Alumni Association of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, representing more than 8,000 deck and engine officers graduated from the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, Long Island, N. Y., wishes to state before this committee, that it opposes the sale or transfer of approximately 500 American ships to foreign nations under the emergency relief program.

At the same time, we wish to make it clear that since we sail our ships to most of the destitute countries in Europe, we are probably more familiar with the needs of those war-stricken nations than are most Americans. We will therefore, support very strongly the efforts of those interested in supplying the necessary aid to these countries. But aside from the humanitarian aspects of such a plan, we believe in the development of healthy trading between Americans and citizens of foreign countries. Stimulation of such trading at this time especially, is of utmost importance for the recovery and prosperity of the European nations, as well as the continuance of our own.

This committee has already been provided with statistical break-downs proving there will be little immediate saving and no long-range saving by using foreign crews and American ships in transporting American goods to nations in Europe. It is not our purpose then, to duplicate these figures but we do wish to point out a few other important aspects of the problem as it affects the American merchant marine, the American public, and in particular the American citizen who is also an American seaman.

In two World Wars the United States was caught with a pitifully inadequate peacetime merchant fleet. Since an abundance of merchant ships and well-trained crews is always the very first requirement in meeting such national emergencies, we, not having a healthy merchant marine, had to hastily build merchant ships during two world wars. Added to this, is the unestimated cost to the United States of the war due to delay in building ships and the many lives lost due to this same delay.

At the beginning of World Wars I and II, the percentage of goods transported to and from this country was 13 percent and 25 percent, respectively. At present, it is less than 50 percent with this figure decreasing steadily. Shouldn't it be the policy of the United States Government to maintain the American merchant marine at its highest possible level, especially when it can do this at such a relatively low cost? Shouldn't the Congress take the long-range view and endeavor to avoid the possibility of a recurrence of the extravagant spending concurrent with the last two wars? I am sure that if more

American citizens were aware of the cost of unpreparedness, they would want the Congress to take steps to prevent recurrence of this cost.

During the height of battle, the American seaman was praised from the President on down for his courage and willingness to sacrifice life and limb for his country. Since the cessation of hostilities, he has been almost completely forgotten. Now, more than 25,000 American seamen are facing replacement by foreign seamen on American ships.

The use of cheaper foreign labor which will directly put American citizens out of work in an industry vital to national defense just doesn't seem to be real Americanism.

It is the sincere hope of our association that the Congress will continue the 500 ships on an active status with American crews in the American merchant marine.

Life of Margaret Bondurant Devoted to Social Service in City and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 11, 1948, I called attention to the outstanding record of one of Oregon's distinguished public-spirited citizens, Margaret Bondurant. In these remarks I emphasized the remarkable work performed by Mrs. Bondurant in behalf of handicapped citizens. In the Portland Oregonian of February 22, 1948, M. Leona Nichols gave a brief review of the social service performed by Mrs. Bondurant in her long career in my State in her free-will service for the handicapped and the underprivileged. The article follows:

LIFE OF MARGARET BONDURANT DEVOTED TO SOCIAL SERVICE IN CITY AND STATE

(By M. Leona Nichols)

"Keep your face to the light and never turn back," was the advice given Margaret Bondurant when she began her first social service work in 1909. Her interest awakened, the underprivileged and their problems, continued to absorb her attention until now she devotes her full time to assisting the handicapped in find a self-supporting vocation.

Margaret Zwickel was born in Pittsburgh, Pa., the daughter of C. C. and Margaret Zwickel. Miss Zwickel came to Oregon in 1889 and later was married to Royal Edward Bondurant.

The duties of homemaking were deeply engrossing to Mrs. Bondurant, yet she did not allow her own security to crowd out her interest in those who experienced the seamy side of existence.

The story of a deserted family drew deeply upon her sympathies. After investigating the case, Mrs. Bondurant found the distress of these homeless ones deplorable and she went among her friends to collect enough funds to relieve the wife and her little ones. Her success astonished her for the response was liberal. Enough money was donated to clothe the entire family and to buy a small house for them. From this substantial start they were able to become self-supporting and new courage lifted them out of despondency.

Mrs. Bondurant now launched other projects to aid the needy and found much satisfaction in social-service work.

MANY PROJECTS SUPPORTED

Allying herself with other women who had the same objectives, she supported many projects for the benefit of women and children. Laws were lacking whereby State help might be secured for orphaned or deserted children, and mothers were obliged to leave their little ones to the care of older children while they became bread winners. In order to secure help for these dependents, Mrs. Bondurant sought the cooperation of the Oregon Congress of Mothers.

As chairman of the legislative council, she and her associates in 1912 formulated data for the passage of a widow's pension law. This and other remedial legislation was passed in 1913.

With this matter accomplished Mrs. Bondurant turned her attention to the Oregon Prisoners Aid Society Board and labored with that group from 1913 to 1936.

The years presented other problems needing solution, and since Mrs. Bondurant's sympathies were inclusive of all underprivileged, she served as a member of the board of the Children's Farm Home at Corvallis for 6 years, beginning in 1922. She was also president of the Albertina Kerr Nursery from 1919 to 1927 and was active in the affairs of the Louise Home.

Capacity to work for others made Mrs. Bondurant a prominent figure in social welfare, and her affiliations were many and varied. She was chairman of the State advisory board for the blind from 1930 to 1936 and treasurer for the Blind Relief Fund, Inc. It was under her supervision that a survey of the blind in the State was made. In this work Mrs. Sidney Teiser, representative of the blind commission for the Council of Jewish Women, was a valuable assistant, for it was a full-time job that required the careful investigation of those handicapped by partial or complete loss of sight.

Mrs. Bondurant also was instrumental in obtaining money from the State legislature for the first school to be held at the Louise home for the juvenile hospital at that institution. She also was active, together with Oscar W. Horne, in securing an initiative measure for creating the Oregon Blind Trade School.

HANDICAPPED PERSONS AIDED

Mrs. Boudurant was active in raising the standaid of the court of domestic relations. Her latest efforts were promoting the sale of articles made by handicapped persons. This store at 1325 Southwest Washington Street is sponsored by National Crippled Children and Adults, Inc. Mrs. Bondurant is keenly alert to the needs of those who are handicapped by physical affliction and her services are gratuitous in all of her activities.

Aside from her many charities, she is honorary president of the Holladay Park Hospital and has acted as treasurer of the Republican Woman's Club, Inc., of Oregon since 1937. She is also a member of the Eastern Star, the Daughters of the Nile, and Portland Woman's Club.

A daughter, Pauline, now Mrs. Hedley Hill, was born to Mr. and Mrs. Bondurant. Since the death of her husband in 1935, Mrs. Bondurant has found a renewal of interest in life in the arrival of her two grandchildren.

Equality for Aliens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of January 29, 1948, dealing with a bill, H. R. 5004, I have introduced to remedy a long-existing injustice, and to correct various technical difficulties, in our immigration and naturalization laws. I do not know any place where we can do more good to others and can get more benefits for our own country at so small a cost.

EQUALITY FOR ALIENS

The immigration and naturalization laws of the United States still contain a considerable element of racial discrimination which is at once an irritant to our relations in the Far East and a denial of our own vital principle that all men are created equal. The exclusionary features of the Immigration Act of 1924, directed against persons of oriental origin, were modified with respect to the Chinese in 1943 and with respect to the Filipinos and East Indians in 1946. However, persons from Burma, Japan, Siam, Indonesia, Korea, Indochina, the Malay States, and the Pacific islands are still barred from becoming naturalized as citizens of the United States and are, therefore, in general, ineligible even to enter this country as immigrants.

Representative WALTER H. JUDD has introduced a bill designed to cure this inequity. Its effect would be to do for other orientals what has already been done for Chinese, Filipinos, and East Indians—that is, to erase from our nationality and immigration policy any discrimination on racial grounds and treat them as we treat Europeans seeking to ente the United States. In practice, because stringent quotas are applicable to the peoples in question, no more than a few hundred Asiatics now ineligible to enter the United States would be granted admittance. Mr. JUDD's proposal would not change the quota law in any respect; it would merely extend it.

The most important effect of his bill would be to make eligible for naturalization an estimated 88,000 persons now in the United States and Hawaii who are barred from becoming citizens because of racial origin. The President's Committee on Civil Rights urged that this be done. Most of those who would be affected are Japanese whose loyalty to their adopted country was amply demonstrated during the war; they produced, among other things, the One Hundredth Battalion and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry Combat Team, which, as the late Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell put it, "bought an awful big hunk of America with their blood." Their present status makes them the victims of discriminatory land laws in some Western States prohibiting aliens ineligible to citizenship from buying, selling, or conveying land. In the Oyama case, the Supreme Court pointed out the other day the invidiousness of this kind of discrimination. Congress rather than the Court can furnish the most effective remedy. Americans of Japanese ancestry deserve fair pla-

The Enemy Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from yesterday's

Wall Street Journal should be required reading for every American:

THE ENEMY WITHIN

The thing we call the American way of life—for lack of a more definitive phrase—is beset on many fronts. We have just finished a war to protect it from one enemy. We are prepared, if it be necessary, to take up arms again to repel others who envy us. But in turning our faces outward, it seems to us, we are overlooking a more insidious enemy within our gates.

That enemy is doubt. It is a suspicion that, although we have the greatest liberty, the greatest wealth, and the widest distribution of both the liberty and wealth, of any nation now or before us—that although we have all these, the system by which we achieved them is somehow all wrong.

Our economic system rests on the profit motive, the theory that the best way to achieve maximum production and distribution of material goods is to permit each man to reap his own harvest. Our political system rests on the belief in personal liberty, a conviction that the individual must not be enslaved by the majority any more than by a tyrant.

Both beliefs are under suspicion. The suspicion is that the profit motive, the desire of a man to work for himself and his family, is not only unnecessary but is even undesirable, a thing of evil. And finally, that if we cannot have perfect equality and security without sacrificing liberty, then liberty has been overvalued.

The seeds of this doubt come in many forms and are dropped in many places. They are not fathered alone by conscious propagandists for foreign ideas. They are to be found in the words of many men of good will, teachers, intellectual and artistic leaders, and high Government officials.

It is probably not surprising that some among our artists and "intellectuals" are the most prolific sowers of suspicion, for they are by nature doubters of the world, however they may find it. But there is an ironic twist there, for they have profited greatly from the civilization they censure. Under no other system, for example, have the teacher, the writer, and the artist had greater rewards or greater freedom. Even in the Golden Ages of Greece and Rome, the teacher was a slave and the singer the sort of minstrel who, like today's Shostakovich, sang as he was told.

What is dangerous is that the suspicion has worked its way, perhaps unconsciously, into high places.

Last week President Truman addressed a Jackson Day dinner. It was admittedly a political speech designed to garner votes next November. But the words he used, the fact that both he and his hearers believed them to be vote-getters, shows how strongly the seeds of doubt has grown.

Wealth (i. e., money) to the President is never a thing that is put to work and performs any useful service. It is referred to always as "selfish wealth" and "concentrated wealth." Wages for labor and income for the farmer are good things, but the very word "profit" is an epithet and a reproach. Those who acquire it, or seek it, are engaged in a reckless pursuit of privilege and power.

Business, which is simply a name for the mechanism that produces and distributes wealth, has somehow become an enemy of the people. Even when Mr. Truman speaks of one of his policies as being beneficial to business, the implication is that business is a special group apart from the rest of the citizenry and has no relation to the laborer or the farmer. Mr. Truman is not doing something beneficial for the community as a whole; he is doing something nice for business.

Anyone who read this speech, and believed all of it, would be persuaded that wealth is an evil force enslaving mankind and that all men of business wear horns and a tail.

Mr. Truman, too, despairs of our progress in conquering prejudice, in extending political liberty, in providing educational opportunity. He sees little opportunity for progress under our present laws; we must give up a little more of our liberty to new laws and new Government bureaus to achieve more real liberty.

We do not think Mr. Truman intended any such sweeping denunciation; more probably he was tilting with Henry Wallace. Surely he could not be intentionally denouncing the very productive wealth with which he wants to uplift the rest of the world. Nor do we believe that he was intentionally castigating the system that gives our individual citizens so much freedom that they are now the envy of that world.

Perhaps he meant only to say the obvious: that the millennium is not here. But it seems to us he was reflecting the suspicion fashionable among too many people in the Government, that there is something wrong with our whole system, and that it ought to be junked simply because it has not produced that millennium.

These people are seeding suspicion of the very things that have made us among all nations the richest in both material goods and in freedom simply because we have not yet abolished all prejudice, all poverty, all greed. They are, as it were, doubting justice because some judges are venal.

Certainly we need to guard against dangers from without because our life is too rich a prize not to raise envy. Equally we need to guard against doubts from within lest we grow within ourselves the seeds of our disaster.

Palestine Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, upon hearing Senator Austin's statement before the Security Council on the Palestine situation, I issued the following statement:

The statement of our United Nations delegate, Warren Austin, before the Security Council is outrageously hypocritical. He asked the appointment of another committee to study the Palestine situation—as if there haven't been enough committees. There have been committee reports piled on committee reports on Palestine. It is like seeing a house burn and having the fire commissioner ask for the convocation of a debating society to determine whether or not to ply the hose on the conflagration. Action, not words, is wanted. Inaction only encourages Arab incursions and more bloodshed. This is further evidence of United States fumbling and faintness of heart. As a first positive action, the United States itself should lift the arms embargo forthwith and immediately demand without reservation the setting up of a Jewish militia, the opening of a seaport to Jewish immigration and necessary supplies, and the establishment of an international constabularly. No further committee studies are needed.

In Senator Austin's statement we see the retreat of the United States from the healthy leadership it had first provided in the General Assembly debates which led to the recommendation of partition. Frankly, the newspapers state that the terms of the long-delayed statement of the United States position on Palestine was so complicated that even the UN delegates skilled in the fine art of innuendo so dear to the diplomatic heart were themselves confused and uncertain as to what Warren Austin meant.

At least this is clear. The American statement leaves all the lead questions unanswered. Secondly, its many generalities and qualifications are a pretty obvious attempt to permit the United States plenty of elbowroom to go in many directions. It can go upward, downward, north, east, south, or west. It is hardly what one would expect from a nation which took the lead in the advocacy of partition last fall. The statement is a far cry from the forthright declarations made by Herschel Johnson concerning the partition plan. In Austin's statement there was absolutely no ring of leadership. It was a spineless, blurred attempt to confuse the issue. On one hand, the United States says that force can be used only to enforce peace in the Holy Land, and, on the other hand, the United States says that force cannot be used to enforce partition. Any child can tell you there is no peace in Palestine and that the absence of peace is a threat to international peace and that the sorry conditions in Palestine are the result of the Arab refusal to accept partition. The statement makes it appear as if Senator Austin and those responsible for the statement deliberately put blinders on their eyes and plugs in their ears so that they would not see nor hear of the horrendous conditions now existing in Palestine. In a single blast in Jerusalem on Sunday, British troops or Arabs disguised as British troops murdered 52 Jews. Hundreds were maimed. The violence continues unabated.

Who is guilty? Certainly, the Jews did not start the killing. It was the intransigence of the Arabs aided by Arab sovereignties who have brought death into the Holy Land, and amidst the tragedies, the Jews are unable to arm themselves against the attacks. The finger of guilt is pointed at the United States as well as at Great Britain. Despite Britain's promise to keep law and order in Palestine, despite the 100,000 troops she has in that area in her calculated way, she permitted acts of aggression by the Arabs directed against the Jews. She openly disregarded the United Nations injunction to open a port for Jewish immigration by February 1. She refused to permit the commission of five selected by member nations to set up shop in Palestine in time to make certain that Palestine would be a going concern before the British left. I knew well enough that Britain would not retreat gracefully, but I did not know then that she would precede by intrigue and councils of war with Arab leaders to so confuse the issue, to let blood so freely, that she could go back to the UN, pleading the unworkability of partition, even before partition had been tried. It was hoped, however, that with British and United States firmness squarely and without compromise placed before the Arabs, the Arab spokesmen like the ex-grand mufti of Jerusalem would understand fully the futility of opposition.

But the real joker in the deck was the United States. After the leadership, the earnest and affirmative and direct statements, plus Presidential pressure, which the United States gave in the partition debates, it is almost impossible to believe the evidence now spread before us, leading to the inescapable conclusion that our State Department favors the wrecking of the partition plan. We kept ominously silent when troops from Syria and Lebanon and Transjordan crossed the borders into Palestine to join in aggressive fighting against the Jews. I quote directly from the text of the UN Palestine Commission's first report to the Security Council, submitted on February 16: "Arab morale is considered to have risen steadily as a result of these reinforcements."

We did nothing to [illegible] to the [illegible] their own resp[illegible] law and or[illegible] bring the[illegible] tent[illegible] hesitate[illegible] issues of Greece, Iran, and Korea to the UN and take leadership in the ensuing discussion. While President Truman did plead with some of the Arab leaders to use restraint, it was purely a private conversation and in no way helped to allay the deliberately inflamed passions of the Arab populations.

These are some of the things we did not do. What we did instead was to place an embargo on arms to the Middle East. That is not only adding injury to injury but irony as well. As the report to the Security Council affirms, the Arabs are receiving arms and armed men from surrounding territories. The British admit sending arms to Arab countries and defend it on the ground of "contractual obligations." Arms from the United States can go to Pakistan and Iran, countries openly favoring the Arabs. We know these arms are being routed to Palestine. But the State Department sees fit to bar the Jews from such purchases from the United States while making it possible for the Arabs to arm at will. It almost appears as if our State Department had grown two heads, one nodding ineffectually to the idea of partition and the other voicing a great big welcome to the invading Arabs. In short, we behaved as if the only way to work out the puzzle was to cut pieces that do not fit.

Now comes Austin's statement, pale, inconclusive, and shy. How will the Arabs react now with this further evidence of retreat from center? Can they not rightfully conclude that their threats and their raids and their bloodshed have borne for them the desired fruit? Had we taken positive action before as indicated in my previous remarks, the question would not have been thrown back to the UN. As is, exactly what was planned by partition opponents, has come to pass. Colombia formally proposed that the Security Council convene a special session of the General Assembly to reconsider last fall's decision on partition. Naturally, step by step, by British refusal to cooperate, by United States pussyfooting in one direction and imposing the arms embargo in another direction, by refusal to set up a militia or providing arms for the defenders of the partition plan, by deliberately encouraging bloodshed and violence, it was secretly hoped that an impasse would be reached and reconsideration asked. Can we spell out one single affirmative act on the part of the United States or any other member nation, for that matter, that pointed to a determination that partition was conclusive? Did anybody really try? It seemed that the road back was being very carefully paved so that it could be pronounced that partition had failed before anyone except the Jews of Palestine had seriously tried to put it into operation. Now the failure is pinned on partition instead of where it really belongs—on these nations which refused deliberately to give authority to the United Nations decision on Palestine.

Warren Austin is worried about the niceties of the protocol. He says the General Assembly can only recommend. Of course, it can only recommend a decision, but the Security Council of which the United States is a member has a right to invoke sanctions just short of force by economic boycott, by cutting oil communications of offending nations like Syria, Lebanon, and Transjordan, radio, telegraphs, telephones, and the mails. It can oust the intransigent nations from the United Nations. If all this fails, it can invoke force. But Warren Austion was silent on all of these. He followed the protocol. The situation in Palestine is not a threat to peace; it is an actual breach of the peace of the world. It is actually such a breach of the peace that the Security Council was set up to stop, first by sanctions as aforesaid and then by a constabulary.

This is no longer only a Jewish problem. The United Nations prestige is at stake. The prestige of the United States is at stake. All peoples have a stake therein in the outcome. The press of the country is almost unanimous in their criticism of the mawkishness of our attitude. Already, the ambiguous statement of Warren Austin has been quickly followed by developments which have further muddied the waters of Palestine.

Warren Austin is most suddenly worried about strict charter constitutionality. But, mind you, the United States was not worried about any charter constitutionality last fall when Herschel Johnson formally proposed an international constabulary to keep the peace during partition. Austin stated:

The Security Council is authorized to take forceful measures with respect to Palestine to remove a threat to international peace.

What is happening in Palestine but just such a threat to international peace? He states further:

The charter of the UN does not empower the Security Council to enforce a political settlement whether it is pursuant to a recommendation of the General Assembly or of the Council itself.

What is any settlement emanating from the UN but a political settlement?

Austin proposes the Big Five Nations on the Council constitute a special committee to consider whether such a threat exists. Another committee. We have had committee piled upon committee until the very issue is being smothered for lack of air. Another proposal is that this thousandth and one committee negotiate with Arabs, Jews, and Britain to gain acquiescence to partition. This delaying maneuver is as obvious as a hanging petticoat. All through the debates prior to the recommendation, negotiations, the very same negotiations, were going on. If the negotiations failed then, how much more are their failure now with the attitude of the United States in [illegible]de. The Arabs recognize that the [illegible]ter is on the way to success. [illegible]than just silly even to talk about yielding to verbal persuasion.

One of the explan[illegible] forwarded by the State Department is the necessity for American security in terms of Middle East stability, as if Middle East stability can be obtained through permitting the Arabs to believe they can blackmail the United States at will. If there had been no prospect of a Jewish state in Palestine, the cauldron there would still seethe. The Middle East is undergoing transformation. The Arab peasant is slowly but surely awakening to the deprivations that have been forced upon him through these many decades by unscrupulous leaders. The ideologies of democracy and industrialization have crept through to the downtrodden Arab. Revolt is stirring. It has been aptly said that if there had not been zionism in Palestine, the Arab chieftans would have had to invent it. The Jewish state is used to divert the Arab peasant from contemplating his own ills. It will not take him too long to understand. The State Department with its cry for stability cannot hold back the tide. The Middle East will not remain stable even if all the wishful thinking of the State Department were woven into iron and placed around the whole Arab world. What the department overlooks is that the one stabilizing and dependable factor that can exist is the Jewish state which with its science and agriculture and industrialization can serve the United States best in that area if the need ever arises.

So it has come to this. The mighty, the moral, the superior United States refuses to stand up and be counted. The steady hand with which it pursued the General Assembly debates is palsied. Its hand has become sticky with the glue it uses to stick to the coattails of John Bull.

Finally, I am more than deeply concerned over the Palestine policy of the State Department. Everything that has been done or left undone has been kept secret. It is time to shed the light on it. It is time to draw the curtain back and expose the political intrigues, the brass hat interference, the ill-considered motives of our State Department in its delineation of the Palestine policy and its perversion of American traditional policy which since 1922 has favored the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish democratic commonwealth. To that end, I shall introduce a House resolution tomorrow calling for the investigation of the State Department in its conduct with

A1134 APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD A1135

Wall Street Journal should be required reading for every American:

THE ENEMY WITHIN

The thing we call the American way of life—for lack of a more definitive phrase—is beset on many fronts. We have just finished a war to protect it from one enemy. We are prepared, if it be necessary, to take up arms again to repel others who envy us. But in turning our faces outward, it seems to us, we are overlooking a more insidious enemy within our gates.

That enemy is doubt. It is a suspicion that, although we have the greatest liberty, the greatest wealth, and the widest distribution of both the liberty and wealth, of any nation now or before us—that although we have all these, the system by which we achieved them is somehow all wrong.

Our economic system rests on the profit motive, the theory that the best way to achieve maximum production and distribution of material goods is to permit each man to reap his own harvest. Our political system rests on the belief in personal liberty, a conviction that the individual must not be enslaved by the majority any more than by a tyrant.

Both beliefs are under suspicion. The suspicion is that the profit motive, the desire of a man to work for himself and his family, is not only unnecessary but is even undesirable, a thing of evil. And finally, that if we cannot have perfect equality and security without sacrificing liberty, then liberty has been overvalued.

The seeds of this doubt come in many forms and are dropped in many places. They are not fathered alone by conscious propagandists for foreign ideas. They are to be found in the words of many men of good will, teachers, intellectual and artistic leaders, and high Government officials.

It is probably not surprising that some among our artists and "intellectuals" are the most prolific sowers of suspicion, for they are by nature doubters of the world, however they may find it. But there is an ironic twist there, for they have profited greatly from the civilization they censure. Under no other system, for example, have the teacher, the writer, and the artist had greater rewards or greater freedom. Even in the Golden Ages of Greece and Rome, the teacher was a slave and the singer the sort of minstrel who, like today's Shostakovich, sang as he was told.

What is dangerous is that the suspicion has worked its way, perhaps unconsciously, into high places.

Last week President Truman addressed a Jackson Day dinner. It was admittedly a political speech designed to garner votes next November. But the words he used, the fact that both he and his hearers believed them to be vote-getters, shows how strongly the seeds of doubt has grown.

Wealth (i. e., money) to the President is never a thing that is put to work and performs any useful service. It is referred to always as "selfish wealth" and "concentrated wealth." Wages for labor and income for the farmer are good things, but the very word "profit" is an epithet and a reproach. Those who acquire it, or seek it, are engaged in a reckless pursuit of privilege and power.

Business, which is simply a name for the mechanism that produces and distributes wealth, has somehow become an enemy of the people. Even when Mr. Truman speaks of one of his policies as being beneficial to business, the implication is that business is a special group apart from the rest of the citizenry and has no relation to the laborer or the farmer. Mr. Truman is not doing something beneficial for the community as a whole; he is doing something nice for business.

Anyone who read this speech, and believed all of it, would be persuaded that wealth is an evil force enslaving mankind and that all men of business wear horns and a tail.

Mr. Truman, too, despairs of our progress in conquering prejudice, in extending political liberty, in providing educational opportunity. He sees little opportunity for progress under our present laws; we must give up a little more of our liberty to new laws and new Government bureaus to achieve more real liberty.

We do not think Mr. Truman intended any such sweeping denunciation; more probably he was tilting with Henry Wallace. Surely he could not be intentionally denouncing the very productive wealth with which he wants to uplift the rest of the world. Nor do we believe that he was intentionally castigating the system that gives our individual citizens so much freedom that they are now the envy of that world.

Perhaps he meant only to say the obvious: that the millennium is not here. But it seems to us he was reflecting the suspicion fashionable among too many people in the Government, that there is something wrong with our whole system, and that it ought to be junked simply because it has not produced that millennium.

These people are seeding suspicion of the very things that have made us among all nations the richest in both material goods and in freedom simply because we have not yet abolished all prejudice, all poverty, all greed. They are, as it were, doubting justice because some judges are venal.

Certainly we need to guard against dangers from without because our life is too rich a prize not to raise envy. Equally we need to guard against doubts from within lest we grow within ourselves the seeds of our disaster.

Palestine Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, upon hearing Senator Austin's statement before the Security Council on the Palestine situation, I issued the following statement:

The statement of our United Nations delegate, Warren Austin, before the Security Council is outrageously hypocritical. He asked the appointment of another committee to study the Palestine situation—as if there haven't been enough committees. There have been committee reports piled on committee reports on Palestine. It is like seeing a house burn and having the fire commissioner ask for the convocation of a debating society to determine whether or not to ply the hose on the conflagration. Action, not words, is wanted. Inaction only encourages Arab incursions and more bloodshed. This is further evidence of United States fumbling and faintness of heart. As a first positive action, the United States itself should lift the arms embargo forthwith and immediately demand without reservation the setting up of a Jewish militia, the opening of a seaport to Jewish immigration and necessary supplies, and the establishment of an international constabularly. No further committee studies are needed.

In Senator Austin's statement we see the retreat of the United States from the healthy leadership it had first provided in the General Assembly debates which led to the recommendation of partition. Frankly, the newspapers state that the terms of the long-delayed statement of the United States position on Palestine was so complicated that even the UN delegates skilled in the fine art of innuendo so dear to the diplomatic heart were themselves confused and uncertain as to what Warren Austin meant.

At least this is clear. The American statement leaves all the lead questions unanswered. Secondly, its many generalities and qualifications are a pretty obvious attempt to permit the United States plenty of elbowroom to go in many directions. It can go upward, downward, north, east, south, or west. It is hardly what one would expect from a nation which took the lead in the advocacy of partition last fall. The statement is a far cry from the forthright declarations made by Herschel Johnson concerning the partition plan. In Austin's statement there was absolutely no ring of leadership. It was a spineless, blurred attempt to confuse the issue. On one hand, the United States says that force can be used only to enforce peace in the Holy Land, and, on the other hand, the United States says that force cannot be used to enforce partition. Any child can tell you there is no peace in Palestine and that the absence of peace is a threat to international peace and that the sorry conditions in Palestine are the result of the Arab refusal to accept partition. The statement makes it appear as if Senator Austin and those responsible for the statement deliberately put blinders on their eyes and plugs in their ears so that they would not see nor hear of the horrendous conditions now existing in Palestine. In a single blast in Jerusalem on Sunday, British troops or Arabs disguised as British troops murdered 52 Jews. Hundreds were maimed. The violence continues unabated.

Who is guilty? Certainly, the Jews did not start the killing. It was the intransigence of the Arabs aided by Arab sovereignties who have brought death into the Holy Land, and amidst the tragedies, the Jews are unable to arm themselves against the attacks. The finger of guilt is pointed at the United States as well as at Great Britain. Despite Britain's promise to keep law and order in Palestine, despite the 100,000 troops she has in that area in her calculated way, she permitted acts of aggression by the Arabs directed against the Jews. She openly disregarded the United Nations injunction to open a port for Jewish immigration by February 1. She refused to permit the commission of five selected by member nations to set up shop in Palestine in time to make certain that Palestine would be a going concern before the British left. I knew well enough that Britain would not retreat gracefully, but I did not know then that she would precede by intrigue and councils of war with Arab leaders to so confuse the issue, to let blood so freely, that she could go back to the UN, pleading the unworkability of partition, even before partition had been tried. It was hoped, however, that with British and United States firmness squarely and without compromise placed before the Arabs, the Arab spokesmen like the ex-grand mufti of Jerusalem would understand fully the futility of opposition.

But the real joker in the deck was the United States. After the leadership, the earnest and affirmative and direct statements, plus Presidential pressure, which the United States gave in the partition debates, it is almost impossible to believe the evidence now spread before us, leading to the inescapable conclusion that our State Department favors the wrecking of the partition plan. We kept ominously silent when troops from Syria and Lebanon and Transjordan crossed the borders into Palestine to join in aggressive fighting against the Jews. I quote directly from the text of the UN Palestine Commission's first report to the Security Council, submitted on February 16: "Arab morale is considered to have risen steadily as a result of these reinforcements."

We did nothing to recall to the British their own responsibilities in maintaining law and order. We saw no reason to bring these acts of aggression to the attention of the UN, though we did not hesitate to carry the issues of Greece, Iran, and Korea to the UN and take leadership in the ensuing discussion. While President Truman did plead with some of the Arab leaders to use restraint, it was purely a private conversation and in no way helped to allay the deliberately inflamed passions of the Arab populations.

These are some of the things we did not do. What we did instead was to place an embargo on arms to the Middle East. That is not only adding injury to injury but irony as well. As the report to the Security Council affirms, the Arabs are receiving arms and armed men from surrounding territories. The British admit sending arms to Arab countries and defend it on the ground of "contractual obligations." Arms from the United States can go to Pakistan and Iran, countries openly favoring the Arabs. We know these arms are being routed to Palestine. But the State Department sees fit to bar the Jews from such purchases from the United States while making it possible for the Arabs to arm at will. It almost appears as if our State Department had grown two heads, one nodding ineffectually to the idea of partition and the other voicing a great big welcome to the invading Arabs. In short, we behaved as if the only way to work out the puzzle was to cut pieces that do not fit.

Now comes Austin's statement, pale, inconclusive, and shy. How will the Arabs react now with this further evidence of retreat from center? Can they not rightfully conclude that their threats and their raids and their bloodshed have borne for them the desired fruit? Had we taken positive action before as indicated in my previous remarks, the question would not have been thrown back to the UN. As is, exactly what was planned by partition opponents, has come to pass. Colombia formally proposed that the Security Council convene a special session of the General Assembly to reconsider last fall's decision on partition. Naturally, step by step, by British refusal to cooperate, by United States pussyfooting in one direction and imposing the arms embargo in another direction, by refusal to set up a militia or providing arms for the defenders of the partition plan, by deliberately encouraging bloodshed and violence, it was secretly hoped that an impasse would be reached and reconsideration asked. Can we spell out one single affirmative act on the part of the United States or any other member nation, for that matter, that pointed to a determination that partition was conclusive? Did anybody really try? It seemed that the road back was being very carefully paved so that it could be pronounced that partition had failed before anyone except the Jews of Palestine had seriously tried to put it into operation. Now the failure is pinned on partition instead of where it really belongs—on those nations which refused deliberately to give authority to the United Nations decision on Palestine.

Warren Austin is worried about the legal niceties of the protocol. He says that the General Assembly can only recommend. Of course, it can only recommend a decision, but the Security Council of which the United States is a member has a right to invoke sanctions just short of force by economic boycott, by cutting oil communications of offending nations like Syria, Lebanon, and Transjordan, radio, telegraphs, telephones, and the mails. It can oust the intransigent nations from the United Nations. If all this fails, it can invoke force. But Warren Austion was silent on all of these. He followed the protocol. The situation in Palestine is not a threat to peace; it is an actual breach of the peace of the world. It is actually such a breach of the peace that the Security Council was set up to stop, first by sanctions as aforesaid and then by a constabulary.

This is no longer only a Jewish problem. The United Nations prestige is at stake. The prestige of the United States is at stake. All peoples have a stake therein in the outcome. The press of the country is almost unanimous in their criticism of the mawkishness of our attitude. Already, the ambiguous statement of Warren Austin has been quickly followed by developments which have further muddied the waters of Palestine.

Warren Austin is most suddenly worried about strict charter constitutionality. But, mind you, the United States was not worried about any charter constitutionallty last fall when Herschel Johnson formally proposed an international constabulary to keep the peace during partition. Austin stated:

> The Security Council is authorized to take forceful measures with respect to Palestine to remove a threat to international peace.

What is happening in Palestine but just such a threat to international peace? He states further:

> The charter of the UN does not empower the Security Council to enforce a political settlement whether it is pursuant to a recommendation of the General Assembly or of the Council itself.

What is any settlement emanating from the UN but a political settlement?

Austin proposes the Big Five Nations on the Council constitute a special committee to consider whether such a threat exists. Another committee. We have had committee piled upon committee until the very issue is being smothered for lack of air. Another proposal is that this thousandth and one committee negotiate with Arabs, Jews, and Britain to gain acquiescence to partition. This delaying maneuver is as obvious as a hanging petticoat. All through the debates prior to the recommendation, negotiations, the very same negotiations, were going on. If the negotiations failed then, how much more certain are their failure now with the pulpy attitude of the United States in full parade. The Arabs recognize that their bluster is on the way to success. It is more than just silly even to talk about their yielding to verbal persuasion.

One of the explanations forwarded by the State Department is the necessity for American security in terms of Middle East stability, as if Middle East stability can be obtained through permitting the Arabs to believe they can blackmail the United States at will. If there had been no prospect of a Jewish state in Palestine, the cauldron there would still seethe. The Middle East is undergoing transformation. The Arab peasant is slowly but surely awakening to the deprivations that have been forced upon him through these many decades by unscrupulous leaders. The ideologies of democracy and industrialization have crept through to the downtrodden Arab. Revolt is stirring. It has been aptly said that if there had not been zionism in Palestine, the Arab chieftans would have had to invent it. The Jewish state is used to divert the Arab peasant from contemplating his own ills. It will not take him too long to understand. The State Department with its cry for stability cannot hold back the tide. The Middle East will not remain stable even if all the wishful thinking of the State Department were woven into iron and placed around the whole Arab world. What the department overlooks is that the one stabilizing and dependable factor that can exist is the Jewish state which with its science and agriculture and industrialization can serve the United States best in that area if the need ever arises.

So it has come to this. The mighty, the moral, the superior United States refuses to stand up and be counted. The steady hand with which it pursued the General Assembly debates is palsied. Its hand has become sticky with the glue it uses to stick to the coattails of John Bull.

Finally, I am more than deeply concerned over the Palestine policy of the State Department. Everything that has been done or left undone has been kept secret. It is time to shed the light on it. It is time to draw the curtain back and expose the political intrigues, the brass hat interference, the ill-considered motives of our State Department in its delineation of the Palestine policy and its perversion of American traditional policy which since 1922 has favored the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish democratic commonwealth. To that end, I shall introduce a House resolution tomorrow calling for the investigation of the State Department in its conduct with

reference to the Middle East. The text of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas the conduct of the State Department with reference to the Middle East has been subjected to continuous criticism; and

Whereas the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs has been charged with deliberately subverting the decision of the United Nations on Palestine; and

Whereas an arms embargo is imposed against countries of the Middle East without consultation with member nations of the United Nations; and

Whereas such unilateral conduct has been the very antithesis of neutrality although presumably based upon the Neutrality Act of 1939 and the Export-Import Controls Act of 1940; and

Whereas the activities of the Near Eastern Division have brought the State Department into disrepute; and

Whereas the activities of that division clearly indicate bad faith, ineptitude, indecision, and obscure motives; and

Whereas the Near East Division has initiated policies which are contrary to the American policy on Palestine; and

Whereas the said Division has deliberately contravened established policy by untoward instructions to our consular and diplomatic agents in the Middle East; and

Whereas the traditional American policy on Palestine has been reiterated in two congressional concurrent resolutions and by Executive declarations from President Wilson through and including President Truman, which policy has been traduced by officials of the said Division; and

Whereas the activities of this Division with reference to Palestine are contrary to stated public opinion as registered by the petitions of 40 Governors of the States and by 33 State legislatures: Now, then, be it

Resolved, That a special committee, composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House, is hereby authorized and directed to investigate the conduct of the Near East Division of the Department of State with reference to the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

More on Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of Saturday, February 21, 1948:

MORE ON YALTA

Mr. Byrnes in his book, Speaking Frankly, says that if he had been at Yalta on February 11, 1945, "it is probable" he would have learned of the Roosevelt gift of the Kuriles to Soviet Russia. Judging from Secretary Marshall's confession yesterday, we doubt it. Secretary (then General) Marshall was at Yalta, but he knew nothing about the Manchurian deal. Moscow, in return for a promise to go to war with Japan, got a reversion of the Manchurian concessions once enjoyed by the Czarists. Mr. Roosevelt, according to Mr. Byrnes, promised "to have China agree to that part affecting China's territory." And he kept his word. Under the Sino-Russian agreement of August 14, 1945, China ratified the Yalta understanding, and got as a quid pro quo a Russian pledge of friendship and support for Chiang Kai-shek's regime. The Soviet has honored the treaty by trying to turn Manchuria into a Soviet colony without regard to China's rights, especially at Dairen; and its friendship and support of Chiang have been expressed in silence and inactivity during his present travail.

Though these cessions were not known to Mr. Marshall, it must be said that it was because of his estimate of the military situation that they were made. It is said on good authority that he told Mr. Roosevelt Japan could hold out for 18 months after the collapse of Germany. Few errors in the war were more egregious than this. Actually, Japan was on the verge of disintegration while the deal on Manchuria was under discussion, and gave in within 4 months of the Allied victory in Europe. It is, we know, the fashion to give the credit to the atomic bomb, but no competent and honest observer believes it. In Navy circles, moreover, there was the utmost skepticism as to the expediency of courting the war entry of Russia, anyway. Mr. Roosevelt paid a purchase price for it which, in these days of Russian noncooperation with China or with the United States, is heavy on the American conscience, and which is one of the reasons that the conference at Yalta was the monumental blunder that we called it when the real news of what happened began to be public property.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this month marks the fiftieth anniversary of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. No doubt many Members of Congress belong to that organization. It was founded in my home town of Seattle, February 6, 1898, and is now one of the oldest fraternal organizations of the United States. Its record of social legislation and humanitarian achievement is without peer among fraternal organizations.

In the monthly magazine called the Eagle for February, the organization commemorates its fiftieth anniversary in a very fine article entitled "Fifty Years of Service," by Richard S. Davis, a well-known writer. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY YEARS OF SERVICE—EAGLEDOM'S FIRST HALF CENTURY HAS BROUGHT NEW HOPE AND SECURITY TO MANY MILLIONS OF PLAIN AMERICANS—AND A NEW KIND OF FELLOWSHIP

(By Richard S. Davis)

Since February of 1898, America has grown a half century older. The Fraternal Order of Eagles has become a half century old. Through storms and fair weather, in this era of stress, the stalwart father and the loyal son have steadily marched forward, arm in arm.

No man should speak of the Eagles apart from America, because the Eagles could not have been born and could not have become strong anywhere else on this troubled earth. No other soil and no other spirit could have been right for the lusty fellowship which in 50 years has grown from six members to more than a million. The heart, the mind, the soul, and the sinews of America are the Eagles' incomparable heritage. The Eagles are American democracy. They seek no part of anything else.

Six original members—that is the record. They were John Considine of Seattle and five of his cronies. They took a long walk together in the warm sunshine of February 6, 1898, and they sat on a lumber pile in the waterfront shipyards. There, in jovial fellowship, they founded the order which long since has come to mean not only brotherhood but infinitely more.

It is fitting that John Considine was a rugged chunk of a man, a square-jawed, broad-shouldered Irishman with twinkling blue eyes. It is fitting also that he had the dynamic, aggressive character which some years before had led him into the Klondike, where only the strong could survive. And it is further fitting that he and the other boys held their first meeting on a pile of redolent pine, which stood then for the might and beauty of the great Northwest, just as it does today.

Surely it was right for Eagles to spread their wings originally in the Northwest, and it was right for them to sweep across the continent. It was both right and inevitable, for the country had an impelling need for a brotherhood that eagerly welcomed the common man.

Then as now the Eagles welcomed men of the logging camps, the mines, and the mills. They welcomed men from the stores, and men of the professions, and men of the cloth, and men from the theater, and men from the taprooms and men who made their living in sports. In short, they welcomed all Americans who basically were clean.

The starch of social position was no requirement. High education was not asked. Mayflower ancestry meant no more than did an old man who had arrived with his straggling brood only the day before yesterday. Men whose shirts were stained by sweat, men whose hands were never quite free of grime, men who knew the dread of poverty—all these men were asked to be brothers.

No condescension was in it, nothing but deep understanding. It was understanding of the truth that all men, regardless of birth or station, hungered for the fellowship America so easily could give.

No use pretending that those early days of the order were not a lusty period. The steins were on the table—the smaller glasses and the fat bottles, too—and the good songs were ringing clear, often much later than was strictly proper.

The one and only John L. Sullivan once headed New York aerie. Sailor Tom Sharkey was the toast of many a loyal brother. It was a matter of course that James J. Jeffries, one of the truly great champions, should become an Eagle and do fine missionary work in his beloved West. And it was a certainty that the incomparable Jack Dempsey, in the not so long ago, should adopt the pin that in itself is symbolic of the heights. All through the years it has gone without saying that men who could fight were Eagles, and it's been almost equally true that, in every other branch of sport, the men who played the game to the hilt have instinctively turned to this order.

The two Roosevelts—Teddy and F. D. R.—both were proud to be Eagles. So was Warren G. Harding and so is Harry S. Truman. Senators, Representatives, Governors—man, what a list could be stretched out here if there were point in it! But let's get on with things that have more substance.

Countless times, in the lobby of English's Opera House in Indianapolis, little old ladies on the arms of their watchful sons have paused to read a bronze tablet, which bears this inscription:

"On this site, Sunday, February 7, 1904, the first known plea for a Nation-wide observance of Mothers' Day was made by Frank E. Hering, teacher, orator, humanitarian—in commemoration of Mother's Day and in honor of its beloved founder the Fraternal Order of Eagles erects this tablet May 10, 1931."

The little old ladies unfailingly have smiled in their warmly appreciative way, and the sons have said with pride that well became them: "Know who Mr. Hering was, mother? One of our Eagles. No wonder the boys are proud of him."

Somehow it's true that in all the order's long list of accomplishments, there is nothing that stirs more satisfaction among the men of the rank and file than Frank Hering's great address in Indianapolis 44 years ago. All America knows what finally came of his appeal.

Few words should be written about Frank E. Hering without linking his name to another of equal luster—the name of Conrad H. Mann, "the mighty oak of eagledom." They were leaders, those two, and though both of them now are gone their influence is still a living force.

The scholarly Hering, writer and speaker extraordinary, will always be remembered as the silver-haired advocate of lofty causes. The robust Mann—"a man's Mann" is the phrase that fits him best—will live through the years as the exemplar of the order's simpler virtues. A giant in physique, he owned a giant's heart, a heart with the warmth and capacity for unlimited friendship. The two men strode through much of their lives together.

Unwittingly, long before he died, Frank Hering wrote the perfect epitaph for both himself and Conrad Mann. His words were these: "So live that when you die the poor, the sick, the outcast will mourn the passing of a friend."

A round and kindly man whose eyes had extra light because they had seen so many shadows—Judge Edward Everett Porterfield, his name was—is also revered over the Nation, chiefly because of the bill he fathered in Missouri. It was this way with the judge:

Tearful kids and harassed mothers were coming to him in Jackson County's juvenile court, and many times he had to separate them, because the widowed mothers simply could not carry on. Black tragedy, it seemed to him, and he determined to do something about it. He put the case before brother Eagles, and they promised all their help.

The result was America's first mother's pension law, which became part of the Missouri statutes in 1911. Since then all but a few States have adopted counterparts.

And old-age pension laws, what is the record there? This is the record: In 1921 the order thundered out a demand that men and women be treated justly when the crushing years finally forced them out of employment. The aged who were in need, the Eagles said, must no longer be treated as paupers.

In two short years, Representative Lester H. Loble, of Montana, had drafted a bill of rights for the weary and had seen it through to passage by the State legislature. It was signed March 5, 1923, by Gov. Joseph M. Dixon, a life member of the order, who prophesied:

"You Eagles have planted this seed, and you can no more stop the progress of old-age pensions than you can stem the tide of the Pacific Ocean."

In Wisconsin, an Eagle drafted—it was Daniel Webster Hoan, for many years the mayor of Milwaukee—and Eagles supported the first workmen's compensation act passed in any State.

Nearly 20 years ago, Eagles endorsed the principle of the guaranteed annual wage and are effectively campaigning for its broader acceptance. Eagles were vigorous in the fight for the GI bill of rights. Eagles are lending their mighty support to efforts to provide medical and hospital benefits for millions who have never known the meaning of good medical care.

Eagles spent 14 years of the 50 which now are history in tenaciously working for the legislation known as the Social Security Act. If nothing else had been accomplished in this half century, the Social Security Act would fully justify the founding of the great order of the common man. America's men and women, to the number of more millions than anyone can now foresee, will bless the Eagles endlessly.

The battle for a better life, moreover, still goes on. It is the order's hope that provisions of the Social Security Act will be extended to protect many more millions now living and that eventually every American will know its benefits. Eagles have not forgotten these words of Franklin D. Roosevelt, when he signed the act on August 14, 1935, and gave the pen to the order:

"The pen I am presenting to the order is a symbol of my approval of the fraternity's vision and courage. May its possession inspire your members to rededicate their own efforts and those of the fraternity to the insuring of such economic and political conditions as will bring a greater degree of happiness to our people. Our countrymen owe the Eagles good will for their unselfish services."

Nearly 7 years have sped over the hill since another glowing entry in the record of the Eagles was written. On a clear, bright day in April 1941, the $160,000 Eagle dormitory at Boys' Town, Nebr., was presented to Father Flanagan. Frank Hering, who gave the presentation talk, spoke from the hearts of all Eagles when he said:

"The F. O. E. and Boys' Town were destined to meet. The order that dedicates itself to keeping the family together as the unit of the social, political, and spiritual life of the Nation, and Boys' Town, which is dedicated to care for the children from families that do not stay together—these two are like streams that rise in widely separated parts of the country and flow at an angle until their confluence, their union, forms a single, powerful river that moves majestically toward the sea of usefulness and happiness."

And why was the Boys' Town dormitory so significant? Because it was a forerunner of the order's youth-guidance program and because it gave tangible expression to the Eagle credo: "A chance at a real childhood for every American child."

Another dream of the Eagles is coming into full fruition. The great Memorial Foundation, treasured project of Managing Organizer Matthew L. Brown, is already a reality and is clearly destined to become a tremendous power for greater good as its resources increase.

Simply stated, the Foundation is a huge trust fund that will be held intact through the years as a living memorial to all the Eagle servicemen who have given their lives for their country. It is a memorial prepared to offer a lift to those who need help, particularly to the children of Eagles who died in the service. Youngsters will have the chance that would have been theirs if Dad had not been called away.

A record to be proud of? Brother, you can tell the world it is, but when all is said and done it may well be true that in these 50 years the greatest accomplishment of the Eagles is after all the simplest. It may be that what has counted most with hundreds of thousands of men is nothing more pretentious than this:

A card game with the boys over a battered table. A little Kelly pool. A thunderous bowling match. A picnic and sunburn out in the country. A dance to which a man could take his best girl and have the time of his life. A sociable drink with good scouts named Tom, and Bill, and Joe, and Olaf, Emil, and Giuseppe.

What all this means, as wise men know, is merely the chance to belong, to be recognized as somebody, to be, when the day's work is done, a kindly fellow hobnobbing with broad-shouldered equals.

And who among us can even attempt to measure the priceless value of just that?

Statement of Hon. Martin L. Sweeney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement of Hon. Martin L. Sweeney, a former Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for the record, my name is Martin L. Sweeney, I am a former Congressman from Ohio.

With several other individuals, we appear before your committee as a result of a mandate from an Irish race convention held in New York City November 22 and 23, 1947 This convention of over 2,000 delegates from 38 States of the Union met to protest the continuation of a partitioned Ireland. The call for this convention was issued by the Honorable Michael Donohoe of Philadelphia, a former Member of Congress from Pennsylvania. Practically every Irish-American organization in the United States responded to that call and sent delegates to the assembly as a result of the deliberation of the convention.

The American League for an Undivided Ireland, Inc., was organized. The president of this league is the Honorable Joseph Scott, the distinguished attorney from the State of California, and the gentleman who has just so eloquently addressed your committee.

The brochure you have before you briefly explains how the partition of Ireland was accomplished in 1920 by a "shot-gun treaty" which brought into existence two distinct forms of a national government in a country geographically the size of the State of Ohio. The Free State Government of 26 counties in Ireland functions with its parliament in Dublin. The British-controlled Government of six counties located in northeastern Ireland functions with its parliament in Belfast. This Belfast Government has been, since 1920, a source of irritation to the civilized world. By a clever system of gerrymander, the Catholic minority in the six-county area is denied equal representation in the national and local administration of their government. Religious bigotry is rampant in this section of Ireland. Discrimination and the denial of civil liberties to large segments of the population is notorious for its boldness.

Four hundred and twenty-five thousand Catholics in the six-county area pay 33⅓ percent of the costs of government in that area without fair representation and only 4 percent are allowed to participate in the administration of government affairs. In peacetime, during the past 27 years, as many as 60,000 British soldiers have been quartered in the Belfast sector. During a period of unusual prosperity, this six-county government has sent across the Irish Sea as much as 100,000 pounds to the British Crown. Today the Belfast Parliament depends upon

subsidies from the British Empire to maintain its bridgehead in Ireland.

We present these facts to you members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives as you study the so-called Marshall plan now under consideration by your committee. To say that the British Empire is defunct would be an understatement. Our recent loan of three billion five hundred million of American dollars to Great Britain confirms the fact.

The present Premier of the Ulster Parliament, Sir Basil Brook, in a budgetary request to the British Crown, states the need of $40,-000,000—some reports say as high an amount as $200,000,000—to maintain a bridgehead for the British Government in Ireland. Let's be frank about the situation. It is expected that in the allocation of grants or loans under the Marshall plan, approximately 60 percent will go to the British Empire. The Empire, in turn, will siphon from the funds furnished by the American taxpayers sufficient moneys to meet the budgetary request of Premier Basil Brook. Because we believe this will happen we are here, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as American taxpayers to strenuously protest against a grant or loan to Great Britain. Not one red cent should go to Great Britain as long as she continues to play the role of usurper and denies to the people of Ireland the God-given right to the unity the great majority of that ancient land desire.

The British Empire has released its strangle hold on India. It is currently getting out of Palestine. It should be told by Uncle Sam to get out of Ireland before we even consider her an applicant for more American dollars.

Thirty million Irish-Americans are watching the action of your committee and the Congress. We understand these are troublesome days for not only our beloved Republic but the entire world. As Christians who believe in the corporal works of mercy, we are in accord with a policy consistent with our own safety and our own needs in feeding the hungry, in clothing the naked, and in giving shelter to the homeless.

After two World Wars in which we lavishly gave of our young blood and our treasure in an effort to make the world safe for democracy, it would be repugnant, to say the least, if we at this late date directly or indirectly lend our financial support to frustrate the legitimate aspirations of the Irish people to be free of alien domination in one section of their country.

You heard our distinguished president, Mr. Joseph Scott, quote Will Rogers' famous statement, "We never lost a war, but we never won a conference." Along with scores of Members of Congress during my public career, I frequently quoted our late beloved American humorist.

We have been a cat's paw for the British Empire long enough. Twice in a quarter of a century we have pulled her chestnut from the fire and saved her as a world power. The previous speaker, I am sure, expressed the feelings of most Americans when he said with reference to the "gimmie" attitude of our British diplomats after hostilities are over, "The buzzards always take us to the cleaners."

Mr. Chairman, if we seem somewhat emotional in our appeal, I am sure you and your committee will sympathize with us. The long struggle of Ireland through several centuries to be free from British rule is known to every schoolboy.

On last Monday, February 2, I appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. I recalled to the committee that 84 years ago my father, a young Irish lad, landed in New York, driven from his native land because of the unjust, cruel, and vicious social, political, and economic hardships imposed upon him and his kind by an alien government. Millions of other men, women, and children left Ireland for the same reasons. They found asylum in this great new land. They became the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. They thanked God for the blessings of America. They became loyal subjects. In every military crisis in its history, no race has ever surpassed or equaled the contribution of the Irish to the preservation of the United States of America.

I observe, with pride, the presence before your committee today of the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, my successor in Congress from the Twentieth Ohio District. His paternal and maternal grandparents, like my father, were born in Ireland. They came to the United States for the same reasons. Their love of Ireland is second only to their love and devotion to the United States.

Our organization extends thanks to Congressman FEIGHAN for his presence and his contribution to this committee.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I state that negotiations under way in Ireland to abolish partition are sponsored by Catholic and Protestant alike. The struggle for a unified national independence is not a religious one. It is a political struggle, led as it has been in the past in most cases by men of the Protestant faith. When and how partition in Ireland is abolished is a problem solely for the Irish people themselves. If this Congress gives any American dollars or grants a loan to Great Britain to delay the struggle, it will, in my opinion, be an indignity to the Irish-Americans of the United States and an affront to the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, the national president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, founded in 1836, Mr. Michael A. McGrath, of Cleveland, Ohio, is unavoidably detained from appearing today before your committee. I respectfully ask that he be permitted to make a statement for the record.

My personal thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, and your committee for the reception and attention you accorded our organization here today.

The Postman Deserves a Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of February 19, 1948:

THE POSTMAN DESERVES A RAISE

During the present sequence of rising prices and salary adjustments the plight of the Nation's post-office employees continues to be largely unknown to the public and consistently ignored by Congress.

The National Federation of Post Office Clerks is a union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Apart from this identity, however, the post office employees' union operates under limitations which prevent it from forms of bargaining and pressure invoked by other organized workers to better themselves economically.

Thus they are prohibited from appealing to the Labor Relations Board and other facilities to compose salary grievances.

They must wait for Congress to consider their needs and be bound by the decisions of Congress.

In spite of these handicaps, the post-office employees loyally and patiently go about their vitally essential work.

Their only recourse is to enlist public opinion and hope that it will impress upon the Congress the now drastic need of better salaries.

In turn, Congress, not confronted with vigorous demands by highly organized and active pressure groups, finds it all too easy to ignore or delay the need and justice of the clerk's petitions.

This is not only unfair, but unintelligent. Efficient and swift service of the mail is an unrelaxing and constant national necessity.

The postman is a valuable and valued servant of the public.

He too has bills to meet, a home to support, children to educate, and the maintenance of adequate savings.

While other workers have kept their accounts even with rising prices, the postman has had to tighten his belt. While other workers went on strike, the postman went his rounds with unexampled dependability.

Obviously, Congress must get busy and correct this injustice.

And quite as obviously, the public must also get busy and remind Congress that proper and prompt action on this matter is a matter that can no longer wait.

The Geneva Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the American Milk Review of January 1948:

THE GENEVA AGREEMENT

If all of the oratory and all of the writing that has been expended on tariff questions in the United States could be gathered together it is doubtful that there is a library in the country big enough to hold the material. Almost without exception, every great epoch in our history from the Colonial Wars to the Marshall plan has been directly or indirectly related to tariff considerations.

The significance of these facts is not in the rightness or wrongness of our tariff laws, but in the high and controversial position that foreign trade—the economic relationship of nation with nation—occupies in the minds of men. Although we have been slow to admit it, the tariff controversies are irrefutable evidence that what goes on in one country is important to the people of another, and—on a far more localized scale—that the welfare of a textile worker in Lyon is, for better or worse, bound up with the price of butter in Fall River.

When 23 nations can sit down at the council table and hammer out a trade agreement covering 45,000 items and over 50 percent of all international trade, it is an achievement worthy of note. When the agreements are concluded in an atmosphere of mutual satisfaction it is a triumph. Such was the result of the long discussion that terminated in the Geneva agreements on tariff and trade.

We cannot agree with those in the dairy industry who view the cuts in our duties on dairy products with alarm. We do not believe that the reductions, even in butter, will affect the domestic market in this country any more than a BB gun would affect a General Sherman. Our dairy business is a big industry. It is one of the largest, if not the largest, industry in the world. And do not get the impression that the arrived-at

pacts were all given on the part of this country and its dairy field. It reflected horse trading all down the line, and if this Nation made concessions it received offsetting concessions in return.

A great deal has been said from time to time about industrial leadership. Perhaps even more has been said about getting Government out of business and the bureaucrat out of the market place. A lowering of tariffs and the reduction of governmental fetters on international economic intercourse are steps in that direction. If the dairy industry is to take its rightful responsibility of leadership, then it must lead as a part of the whole and not as a self-centered battalion that marches alone.

Along with millions of other men, your editor has seen 2 wars in 30 years. Your editor has also seen with his own eyes the awful explosion of two atomic bombs. Your editor has, therefore, little patience with those who would cry before they are hurt—who would sacrifice one of the first concrete measures for international accord on the altar of a fancied ill.

The Massachusetts Housing Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

THE MASSACHUSETTS HOUSING PICTURE—1911–47[1]

(By Harold Robinson and John I. Robinson)

Notwithstanding the general impression gained from the emphasis on veterans' housing, the housing shortage and the Federal and State attempts to remedy the situation are no recent phenomena. The World War II veteran, hardest hit of all in the rapidly growing housing crisis, thinks he discovered the problem. The debates in the legislature and newspaper stories have led the public and legislators alike to believe that the shortage is a war-born baby which will solve itself with the help of a few emergency expedients. The truth is that the housing shortage has been building up for a long time.

In 1939, even before wartime restrictions on building were invoked, New England found itself confronted with a serious housing problem. Housing construction was not only not keeping pace with increased population, but the net amount of housing (i. e., the total of all housing plus new construction, less demolished housing) was actually decreasing. Surveys show that from 1921–39, the supply of housing in New England was not sufficient for the natural increases in population and the replacement of old buildings. For 1930–37, the following figures are startling: The net change in Boston was a minus 517; in Cambridge the net change was a minus 29; Fall River, a minus 1,414; Holyoke, a minus 40, and New Bedford a minus 897. The need for replacements in the low-income brackets are even more startling. A survey of eight Massachusetts cities (Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Haverhill, Newton, Springfield, and Worcester) for the period 1931–38 shows that of 406,396 dwelling units surveyed, 40,000 were unfit for use or in need of major repairs. To date, the city councils and town meetings of 28 cities and towns of Massachusetts have found that there is a shortage of decent safe and sanitary dwellings for their citizens and have established local public-housing authorities empowered to undertake low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects. The Federal Public Housing Administration has on hand applications from Massachusetts localities for financial assistance for approximately 16,000 low-rent dwelling units in the amount of over $100,000,000. Other communities are expected to apply when Federal funds are available.

More recently, in December of 1947, a special recess commission of the general court estimated that conservatively more than 50,000 veterans in Massachusetts are in desperate need of housing. The commission estimated that approximately 350,000 new residential units would be needed in the Commonwealth in the next 10 years alone.

THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

In Massachusetts public housing has a legislative history of over 36 years.[2]

THE ADVISORY OPINION OF 1912

As far back as 1911 the Massachusetts Legislature debated the expenditure of public funds for housing for mechanics, laborers, and other wage earners. Only an adverse opinion of the supreme court in 1912 interfered with the construction of homes by the State for sale to citizens of the Commonwealth.[3] That court, maintaining a narrow view of what is conducive to the public welfare, decided that the provision of housing was not a public use for which public funds could be used.

Fortunately, the people of Massachusetts and their representatives to the constitutional convention of 1915–17 thought otherwise and adopted two amendments to the constitution.[4] One authorized the Commonwealth itself to build homes for sale in order to relieve the congestion of population and provide homes for citizens. The other empowered both the Commonwealth and the cities and towns to provide shelter during time of war, public exigency, emergency, or distress. Once the constitutional authority had been granted, the general court created a homestead commission, which built some 20 houses in the city of Lowell. That, however, constituted the extent of the Commonwealth's action until the passage of almost two decades.

ACTION IN 1933 AND 1935

Some 15 years later, in 1933, spurred on by the depression and unemployment in the building trades, as well as by the prospects of Federal aid, the general court created the State board of housing, empowered to regulate limited-dividend housing corporations and to construct housing itself. This time no funds at all were appropriated for construction. Nor, with the exception of one rehabilitation housing project in Chicopee Falls, was there any limited-dividend housing, although the Federal Government did make loans for seven limited-dividend housing projects in other parts of the country.

Shortly thereafter, in 1935, stimulated by the Housing Division of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works in Washington (of which one of the authors was Chief of the Opinions and Litigation Section), the General Court again adopted housing legislation. This time, the legislation provided for the establishment by the cities and towns of local public housing authorities (then a new financial and legal device)[5] empowered to borrow money and undertake the construction and operation of low cost housing projects. This time, too, it was contemplated that there would be no cost to the cities and towns since the debts of the housing authority would not be obligations of the city or towns for which it was established.

Once again, nothing came of the legislation. The Federal Government had embarked on a program of direct construction—Old Harbor Village in South Boston and New Towne Court in Cambridge were built and are still owned by the Federal Government, although leased to the Boston and Cambridge Housing Authorities for operation—and was not yet prepared to make loans and grants to local housing authorities. Until 1938, therefore, despite the increasing need for decent housing and employment in the building trades, the legislation enacted by the General Court was paper legislation only.

INTERVENING FEDERAL ACTION

In the interim, the Federal Government with its greater tax spread and program of social progress under President Roosevelt had been active.[6] In the early days of the depression, Congress established the Home Owners Loan Corporation to help distressed home owners and bail out the banks and mortgagees from bad or frozen investments. Congress too, set up the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages on new construction and thereby stimulate construction by that hidden subsidy to builder and bank alike. In addition, provision was made for other forms of financial assistance. Congress in 1932 had authorized loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to limited dividend housing corporations. In 1933 with the creation of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works under Secretary of the Interior Ickes (PWA and not to be confused with Harry Hopkins' WPA) this power was transferred to the PWA. When this program bogged down with the unsatisfactory result noted above, the PWA embarked on a short-lived program of direct Federal construction and ownership of large scale housing projects, building some 51 projects, including the two in Massachusetts. Here again, court action retarded the program and forced a change in policy. For in 1935, the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, in a two to one decision, ruled that the Federal Government could not take land for housing by eminent domain.[7]

Unwilling to jeopardize the whole spending program of the Federal Government—as a matter of fact, the Government appealed to the United States Supreme Court but asked permission to withdraw its appeal on the very day set for argument—and unable to proceed adequately without the power of condemnation, the program of Federal construction slowed down. Actually, the decision served to give impetus to the growing demand for a decentralized program of local construction

---

[1] Robinson, Thirty-six Years of Housing in Massachusetts (Veterans News, January 1, 1948); Robinson and Robinson, New England Spends for Housing (The New England Townsman, September 1947).

[2] Robinson, Public Housing in Massachusetts, 18 B. U. Law Review 83 (1938); Robinson and Altman, Equivalent Elimination Agreements in Public Housing Projects, 22 B. U. Law Review 375 (1942).

[3] 211 Mass. 624, 98 N. E. 611 (1912).

[4] Articles of Amendment, articles 43 and 47.

[5] See Foley, Low Renting Housing and State Financing (85 U. of Pa. L. Rev. 1 (1937)); Foley, Some Recent Developments in the Law Relating to Municipal Financing of Public Works, IV Fordham L. Rev. 13 (1935). For the most recent discussion of local housing authority financing see Miller, Public Housing and its Financing, Municipal Law Section, American Bar Association (1946).

[6] Keyserling, Legal Aspects of Public Housing, National Resources Committee, Government Printing Office, Washington (1939).

[7] *U. S. v. Certain Lands in Louisville* (78 F. (2d) 684 (C. C. A. 6th, 1935)). One of the authors was in charge of the preparation of the brief for the Government.

and operation with financial assistance, only, by the Government, and led to the United State Housing Act of 1937.[9]

BEGINNING OF THE LOW-RENT HOUSING PROGRAM

Twenty-six years after Massachusetts first gave consideration to the housing shortage, Congress took action which restimulated housing in Massachusetts. In the United States Housing Act of 1937, Congress, linking unemployment relief with an attack upon the social evils of bad housing, provided for loans to local housing authorities, authorized by State law to undertake low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects, and annual subsidies (contributions) to make up the difference between the so-called economic rent and the rent such low-income groups can afford to pay. This led to a complete revision of the Massachusetts Housing Authority law in 1938, a revision which is the basis of the 28 local housing authorities now existing in Massachusetts and has enabled the communities of the Commonwealth to participate in a decentralized program of local construction, ownership, and operation of low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects without any cost to the Commonwealth or its communities.

Before the war, and Congress' later failure to extend the low-rent program suspended further construction, low rent housing and slum clearance projects were built in Boston, Cambridge, Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, and New Bedford. As indicated above, the Federal Government has on hand applications for over $100,000,000 of projects from Massachusetts alone, with additional cities and towns eager to participate when the program is revived. In the meantime, the construction of low-rent housing projects in these cities has added 8,900 dwelling units to the supply of housing in Massachusetts. Had the shortsighted opposition been successful the housing shortage would have been aggravated by that number.

This time the supreme judicial court, on a taxpayers' petition, and later on a condemnation proceeding, found that the clearance of slums and the accompanying provision of housing is a public purpose for which public funds may be used, tax exemption granted, and condemnation permitted. In the 26 years since the opinion of 1912, the Court's attitude had changed to coincide with that of almost 40 other State courts. For it relied on the general welfare rather than the express constitutional amendments.[10]

THE WAR YEARS 1942–46

During the war years, the Federal Government was alone in the housing picture. Since private capital would not, and could not be expected to risk its funds in meeting the temporary demand for housing around the booming centers of munition and shipping production, the Government itself built housing just as it had had to do in 1918.[11] In Massachusetts, war housing projects were built by the Federal Government in Ayer, Boston, Chicopee, Falmouth, Hingham, New Bedford, North Weymouth, Pittsfield, Southbridge, and Springfield. In some instances, they were temporary dwellings; in others, permanent. In a few cases, they were managed by the Federal Government, itself; in others, by local housing authorities to whom they were turned over for operation. Pittsfield, Southbridge, and Springfield established housing authorities partly for this purpose.

With the close of the war, the recurrent housing shortage showed its head again, this time aggravated by the lack of building during the war and the rapid demobilization of the armed services. The threat of veterans' pressure had its usual effect, and Congress appropriated some $453,000,000 with which to demount, transport, reerect, and convert Army and Navy barracks and quonset huts into temporary dwelling units for veterans and their families. Again the Government paid the entire cost of this program, except that this time the cities had to furnish sites and prepare them for the buildings. In this case, ownership passed to the localities.

Temporary veterans housing projects of this nature were erected in 36 communities: Athol, Barnstable, Beverly, Boston, Braintree, Cambridge, Chatham, Chelsea, Chicopee, Fall River, Fitchburg, Framingham, Garner, Gloucester, Greenfield, Hingham, Ipswich, Lowell, Lynn, Malden, Marlboro, Medford, Needham, New Bedford, Northampton, Norwood, Quincy, Revere, Southbridge, Springfield, Taunton, Waltham, Wellesley, West Springfield, Winthrop, and Worcester. In addition, both family and dormitory units were built by the Government for college veterans attending Amherst, Boston College, Harvard, Atlantic Union, Fort Devens, Massachusetts State, MIT, Springfield College, State Teachers, and Tufts. To manage these projects, additional housing authorities were established in Brockton, Chelsea, Framingham, Gardner, Greenfield, Malden, Northampton (North Adams also has an authority), Quincy, Revere, Somerville, Wellesley, Woburn, and Worcester.

VETERANS HOUSING LAW OF 1946

When it became evident that an enlarged Federal program of permanent construction was not going to materialize and that the housing shortage was rapidly approaching the disaster stage, the general court once again took action.[12] Early in 1946, it had been the first legislature to authorize its communities to cooperate with the Federal Government in its program of temporary, reuse housing. (This type of legislation, too, was tested in an opinion of the justices, using as the basis for requesting an opinion, a specially drawn bill).[13] In May of 1946, largely through the efforts of Philip Nichols, then chairman of the State board of housing, the general court enlarged the scope of the earlier 1946 legislation by the enactment of the popularly termed chapter 372 to permit cities and towns to borrow money and build permanent housing fer rent and subsequent sale to veterans. Originally, as a result of the pressure of certain real-estate groups, construction was limited to single and two-family houses and a prohibition of 5 years imposed upon sale. This ban on sale, however, proved to be no deterrent, since, as it was later realized, the greatest need is for rental housing. In fact, the danger is that there will be pressure from the economy-minded taxpayer to dispose of the dwellings before the 5-year period, a possibility which is all the greater now that the act has been amended to permit such prior sale.

Despite this grant of power, few communities took action.[14] The act contemplated some annual operating loss since rents could, and were intended to be, set below the amount necessary to pay operating expenses and debt service. It also envisaged some loss on sale. Realizing this, only a scattering of localities availed themselves of the act. To induce action, therefore, the general court, in June of 1947 with considerable proddings from the veterans, and the Massachusetts Allied Veterans Housing Council in particular, and the able presentation of the new chairman of the State board of housing, Lewis H. Weinstein, further amended chapter 372 [15] to provide that the Commonwealth would reimburse any city or town, on the determination of final loss, for one-half of the loss suffered but no more than one-tenth of the outlay by the locality. This acted as a slight incentive to local action but the response has continued to be disheartening. Concord built some 20 houses, Boston has a large program, West Springfield is completing 43 single houses, Amherst has a program, Springfield and Worcester have projects in the planning stage, and several other smaller communities are contemplating action. Nevertheless, the amount built or contemplated is insignificant in view of the need.

THE 1948 BILLS

Several new bills have been introduced and are being considered by the 1948 session of the general court, as a direct result of the lack of community action and the realization that a housing crisis is here. One, in a form already ruled constitutional by the supreme judicial court,[16] would provide for construction by the State of some $250,000,000 of housing. Two others, more probable of enactment, were sponsored by the special recess commission appointed by the last session to study the problem of veterans' housing.[17] One of these would amend chapter 372, as amended, to provide for the Commonwealth bearing its portion of the cost of construction during the rental period rather than awaiting the end of the 5-year period. This would reduce the increase in local tax rates. The other, emulating the legislation in New York and New Hampshire, and, in part, Connecticut, is patterned after the United States Housing Act of 1937 and the public housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Essentially, it provides for the Commonwealth guaranteeing the bonds of local housing authorities and making annual subsidies over a 45-year period to local housing authorities of 1½ percent of the cost of each project. These projects would be low-rent housing projects, housing veterans only, until March 31, 1953, with a preference to low-income veterans; after that date, they would house low-income families only, with a preference to low-income veterans. The $3,000,000 aggregate annual subsidy would permit some $200,000,000 of construction, or a possible 20,000 dwelling units, at no cost to the community.

Space does not permit a discussion of the advantages and mechanics of the proposed legislation. This last bill, however, will meet the greatest need, that of rental housing at sufficiently low rentals. It is, too, a proven form of financing which has been developed during the last 10 years to the satisfaction of houser, bond counsel, and bond market. It has the added advantage of permitting a transfer of the subsidy burden to the Federal Government when the public housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill are passed by the Congress.

CONCLUSION

During the last few years, the general court passed a goodly number of acts pertaining to private and public housing, all aimed at increasing the housing supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing.[18] In some instances, the legislation entails the spending of public funds, Federal, State or local; in others, subsidies to private capital in the form of tax exemption, donation of publicly owned land, services or utilities, or the grant of the power of eminent domain. All these acts have failed of their purpose because of the reluctance of both local governments and private capital to move. Nevertheless, the passage of this legislation has evidenced the realization by the general court that the average person today cannot pay the prices or rents necessary to induce private capital to build sufficient new housing. It shows, too, that our representatives have finally come to the inevitable conclusion that a certain income group will never be able to afford decent, safe, and sanitary housing without public subsidy.

Until Congress awakens to the dangers inherent in the lack of such decent, safe, and sanitary housing, the Commonwealth must act to protect the health, welfare and moral well-being of its own citizens. The form this action should take is not emergency, but permanent legislation. The general court took cognizance of housing emergencies in 1911, 1912, 1915, 1917, 1933, 1935, 1938 and just about every year since then. We are presently in the midst of another of many housing emergencies. It is time that we cease thinking in terms of uneconomical and wasteful temporary measures and enact legislation which will relieve not only the present shortage but put an end, once and for all, to these recurrent crises.

[9] One of the authors participated in the drafting and fight for passage of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

[10] See Robinson, The Record Has Been Very Good (National Public Housing Conference Journal, November 1947).

[11] *Allydonn Realty Company* v. *Holyoke Housing Authority* (304 Mass. 288, 23 N. E. (2d) 664 (1929)); *Stockus* v. *Boston Housing Authority* (304 Mass. 507, 23 N. E. (2d) 333 (1939)).

[12] See Robinson, Some Problems of the Public Works Emergency Housing Corporation, 19 Cornell Law Quarterly 548 (1934).

[13] Chapter 13, Acts of 1946.

[14] 320 Mass. 799, 61 N. E. (2d) 588 (1947).

[15] Robinson and Robinson, New Housing Program in New England (The Daily Bond Buyer, December 1, 1947).

[16] Chapter 479, Acts of 1947.

[17] 74 N. E. (2d) 886 Mass. (1947).

[18] Robinson, $200,000,000 for Housing in Massachusetts (The Bond Buyer, December 12, 1947); Robinson, Need for Action (Veterans News, January 8, 1948).

Living With Lincoln—A New Impression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'Living With Lincoln'—A New Impression," by J. G. Randall, from the New York Times magazine of December 14, 1947. The article deals with the handling of the long-sealed papers of President Lincoln.

[18] The acts passed by the general court may be classified as follows:

(1) Housing authority law providing for the creation of local housing authorities empowered.

(2) Public urban redevelopment.

(3) Private urban redevelopment corporations.

(4) Nonprofit veterans' housing corporations.

(5) Temporary and permanent housing for veterans.

(6) Domestic life insurance companies authorized to undertake housing projects.

(7) Savings banks authorized to undertake housing projects.

(8) Defense housing law.

(9) War housing law.

(10) Special emergency housing commission to waive building and zoning codes and grant variances.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVING WITH LINCOLN—A NEW IMPRESSION—HANDLING THE LONG-SEALED PAPERS, A HISTORIAN SAYS, IS LIKE GOING BACK AND BEING WITH THE MAN HIMSELF

(By J. G. Randall)

In the past few weeks students have been at work among the newly opened papers of Abraham Lincoln in the Library of Congress. What they have found is a rich collection, with fresh material that is highly valuable from the historian's point of view. For these voluminous documents throw new light upon Lincoln and his associates and add greater depth to the picture of the man and the problems that beset him. It is apparent that a new phase of Lincoln studies has begun.

Appraisal of the papers, however, has required prolonged examination: meantime, certain ready-made questions have tended to create false impressions. For example, one is asked whether there is "anything sensational" in the papers. After 3 months' complete absorption in them the writer finds the query a bit off key, as if a statesman's record or the elaborate inner history of our Nation in an era of supreme crisis could be reduced to a short order of murder for breakfast or scandal for lunch.

Another question has become very familiar: "Do you find anything new in the letters?" The answer to this, contrary to a prevalent misconception, is an emphatic affirmative. What we have in the Lincoln papers is the essence of historical data. It is source material—the stuff out of which history is built. It is original, not second-hand or retrospective. It knows not of the assassination or what followed. It knows only the living Lincoln.

Before the recent opening the only writers who had access to the collection were Nicolay and Hay, but access is one thing and an adequate use is another. The newness of the collection is unimpaired in that much of it has been passed over. The papers have informal and warmly human aspects. They are especially valuable for the kind of book, or books, that Nicolay and Hay did not write.

Working with the papers week after week is like going back and living with Abraham Lincoln. Handling the letters and envelopes that he handled, one has the feeling of sitting with the man himself, sharing his irritation at a petulant missive, noting how complaint is patiently borne, hearing now and then a Presidential chuckle or hearty laugh, sensing more often the weariness of long-deferred hope, and feeling a welcome uplift, if only for a moment, when the incoming mail is friendly or favorable.

The collection comprises 194 volumes, with 41,751 "mounting numbers," each number representing a sheet of paper, one sheet consisting in many cases of two pages. Though the letters are mostly incoming, Lincoln's own autographs are very numerous—surveys, tables of election figures, tallies of appointments, fragments on various topics, memoranda, many working drafts or copies of outgoing letters, endorsements, and occasionally a copy by the President of what was received by him, as when Reverdy Johnson sent such an illegible letter that the President laboriously wrote it out so far as he could decipher it, leaving blanks for the words he missed.

Some of these writings by Lincoln himself—quite a few, indeed—are new. Nor are these new ones dull. They show the President in significant situations: giving a pardon with a statement of its conditions, declining to sponsor an inventor's interests, sending directions to the Secretary of War, and in one case copying in his own hand what Sherman wrote him from Atlanta concerning the Army view that there must be no wavering in the drafting of additional men. In one of the new items the President, when official duty required him to reprimand a captain, turned the reprimand into a handsome uplift for the young man's morale.

At times the President would request John Hay to write saying "The President desires * * * " etc., but such a letter would be signed by Hay. The papers show the falsity of the assertion sometimes made that nearly all of the letters signed by Lincoln were composed by Nicolay or Hay. Even when a letter was signed by Hay we cannot always be sure that Hay composed it; there were at least a few times when Lincoln, in his own hand, drafted a letter for the Secretary to "write" and sign.

As for the letters Lincoln signed, they were usually not only handwritten by him but worked up through his own preliminary drafts.

There is, running through the papers, a sense of urgency in the constant pressure of decision. Lincoln had to be both firm and conciliatory, staunch in upholding the Union, but friendly toward well-disposed Southerners. He had to decide what to do with Fremont (not to mention Mrs. Fremont), whether to retaliate when reports came as to the slaughter of colored Union soldiers—after surrender, it was asserted—at Fort Pillow (he did not retaliate); whether Burnside should advance in January 1863, or Meade in September of that year.

He had to decide whom to appoint, whom to remove, whether and when to make Cabinet changes, how to deal with civil versus military imbroglios such as that between General Butler at Norfolk and Governor Pierpoint, who functioned uncertainly as Union Governor of "restored Virginia." There were many such imbroglios.

To some men power is sweet. To Lincoln it was probably painful. He had the power of life and death as to men under military sentence; in political arrests he had to steer between laxity toward disloyal practices and infringement of civil liberty. To follow Lincoln's daily rounds through his problems is to understand what is meant by the executive function. It is to realize that government is largely a human art.

The collection is a mine or quarry from which, with careful study, many a chapter, book, or article could be hewn. Realities of the time were ugly and unromantic. There is enough for a volume on the Missouri muddle alone, with its feuds, civil commotion, guerrilla warfare, and pervasive terrorism. Much the same could be said for Kansas.

What we had in Lincoln's day was not only a war in the regular military sense. The irregular, criminal, chaotic, and violative aspects of the period—which Lincoln sought to cure or check—hardly appear in formal accounts of battles and campaigns. Such disturbances were always aggravated by "politics." Another book could be written on Union Sympathies in the South, of which there is abundant evidence.

Portraits of certain members of the Cabinet acquire new tints and shadings. Cameron's visage improves not at all. Chase's picture takes on unbecoming lines. Stanton's record, already darkened with arbitrariness and arrogance, receives a new tarnish.

In the letters that rolled in while Lincoln was President-elect one is impressed with what might be called the Cameron headache. So strong was the torrent of outraged indignation at the idea of the Pennsylvania politician's appointment that Lincoln, having offered him a Cabinet place, asked him to decline it; but such was Cameron's incredible persistence that Lincoln reluctantly made

him Secretary of War, which led to further headaches.

It was an inharmonious Cabinet, Blair and Seward being close to Lincoln in nonvindictive views, while Chase and Stanton, centers of radical pressure, were a continual source of dissension.

As to Chase, it was not merely his impatience at the President that caused the trouble, nor his normal pose of being "pained and surprised" at what the President was doing. The main difficulty arose from the schemes of the Chase political machine. Samuel Galloway (from Columbus, Ohio, February 20, 1864) wrote that officials of the Treasury Department were "using every false and foul effort to suppress the voice * * * of the people."

The previous August the statement had come from Louisiana, where Treasury patronage was heavy, that "every piece of official machinery (was) in motion for one object exclusively, namely the advancement President-wise of Mr. Chase." The Chase boom collapsed by early March, 1864, but at all times a Chase crisis was just around the corner, until finally the President accepted the Secretary's resignation in June 1864.

The embarrassment of Chase's rivalry, however, was slight when compared to the difficulty of dealing with Stanton, who had few friends and whose domineering methods were a perennial source of grief. "Stanton is so irritable * * * that * * * a citizen is not safe" is a typical comment. Time and again Lincoln's orders were ignored by his Secretary of War. Thomas H. Hicks, ex-Governor of Maryland, had a pleasant interview with Lincoln, who was convinced "by examining * * * numerous letters" that a prisoner ought to be released. Lincoln ordered the release and asked Hicks to deliver the order to Secretary Stanton.

"This I did," wrote Hicks, "and received * * * a lecture as uncalled for as it was unpleasant * * * and the rough refusal * * * to execute your order was not the least uncomfortable part of the interview." Stanton refused to examine the papers in the case and accused the ex-Governor of trying "to get rebels released," a charge that was taken as an insult by a man of Hicks' Union sympathies.

One of the strangest of Civil War episodes was the movement in the summer of 1864 to oust Lincoln—to have another Republican convention, name another candidate, and force Lincoln's withdrawal. (Lincoln had been renominated at Baltimore in early June.) It has been known that this movement existed, but certain angles of it come with new force and astonishment as one examines the papers; for instance, the intrigues associated with Gen. B. F. Butler.

From Freeport, Ill., Thomas J. Turner wrote: "I saw a letter from a prominent member of General Butler's staff wherein he advised all his friends 'not to commit themselves to Lincoln' * * * that 'Lincoln was hopelessly defeated.'" This writer was convinced that there was a "well-matured plan" to bring out General Butler in Lincoln's place.

The movement seems hard to envisage now, but in July and August of 1864, military failure, financial instability, a sickening sense of war-weariness, and vigorous peace agitation combined with radical disapproval of the President to create a wave of defeatism and a feeling among Republicans that Lincoln's reelection was impossible. An attitude of despair seemed to have gripped Republican managers.

It was not until September that the party's prospects were considerably brightened by Sherman's victory at Atlanta. An influence in the same direction was the widespread resentment at the "peace platform" of the Democratic Convention, which was denounced as a Copperhead move.

Plans of the anti-Lincoln Republicans were revealed to Lincoln by his friend, J. C. Conkling, of Springfield, Ill. Enclosing a copy of a circular issued by John Austin Stevens, president of the Bank of Commerce of New York City, Conkling wrote:

"The circular calls for a convention to be held at Cincinnati on the 28th inst. [September]—I understand the movement is made in favor of General Butler. His Chief of Staff has written in favor of such a convention. * * * It is said that a strong pressure is to be made, to induce you to resign * * * as a candidate in favor of the Cincinnati nominee * * * and that John Wentworth [of Chicago] has said that you had already written out a letter with reference to resignation."

We know that on August 23, 1864 (when Republican skies were thick with gloom), Lincoln wrote, not a letter with reference to his resignation, but a paper, something like a memorandum to himself, indicating that he considered his defeat "exceedingly probable."

A study of this whole movement shows Lincoln's wisdom in not letting anyone read that document till after the election. If there had been a "leak" as to this memorandum by the President, a great amount of mischief could have been done.

Nowadays a President has a battery of aides, secretaries, and assistants, with elaborate agencies to which business may be referred, but Lincoln handled a multitude of vexing and time-consuming matters himself. To enumerate the things brought to the President's attention would be to present a most diverse catalog, including many items of social history.

A United States marshal asked permission to arrest a Congressman whom he suspected of Confederate sympathies. The distinguished Negro leader, Frederick Douglass, gave advice as to bringing slaves out of the South. When General Rosecrans issued an order at St. Louis forbidding labor associations and strikes, there came a strong protest that the military had no right to intervene "in the social relations of our workingmen and the manufacturers."

Minor pleas ran into the thousands. Of course there were numerous autograph hunters. One young lady asked the President to autograph a piece of white silk for a wedding quilt. It was put up to him: without the autograph there could be no quilt, and without the quilt no wedding. A wounded soldier asked Lincoln to help collect a long-overdue note from a clerk in Washington; the clerk was getting $1,800 a year while the soldier was receiving $13 a month.

There was something coldly disagreeable about the abuse of Lincoln that was committed to writing and sent to him through the mail. It must have been disheartening to hear from his friend, Jesse Dubois in Illinois that he was ostracized because he favored Lincoln. As a way of consoling the abused President, the Shakespearean actor, James H. Hackett, sent a newspaper clipping showing how Washington had been similarly vilified.

On the other hand a larger amount of the incoming mail which has been preserved was favorable. Through the letters there runs a refrain: The people are with you; the people trust you. In a letter from the Army of the Potomac a Cabinet member was assured that the soldiers loved the President. The reason was given: the keynote to his personality as seen by the soldiers "consists mostly in his honesty, kindness of heart, and humanity." After the election of 1864 a soldier sent his reenlistment stripes to the President who had "reenlisted." Amos Tuck wrote from New Hampshire: "You have immortalized your name by one of the wisest administrations of power which any man in any country has ever exercised."

Contrary to the general impression, the collection contains a number of Lincoln and Todd family letters. A distressing story unfolds in two letters from Mrs. Lincoln's family. Her brother Levi O. Todd wrote from Lexington, Ky., September 12, 1864, telling how he was working for Lincoln's reelection and asking for a loan of $150 to $200 because of ill health and "actual necessity."

The sequel is deeply pathetic. Mrs. Lincoln's half-sister, Emily Todd Helm, widow of the Confederate general Ben H. Helm (killed at Chickamauga in September 1863), wrote to the President on October 30, 1864. She reached Lexington, she said, to find her half-brother Levi dead "from utter want and destitution." Lincoln loved Emily ("little sister") and her letter with its understandable bitterness must have hurt him deeply. "I would remind you," she wrote, "that your minnie [sic] bullets have made us what we are."

There are touching references to Lincoln's stepmother. In a letter of July 27, 1868, A. H. Chapman (who married her granddaughter) told how he read to her newspaper extracts eulogistic of Lincoln. "You can Hardly form an idea how proud it makes her," he wrote. On April 5, 1864, Dennis Hanks, Lincoln's cousin and son-in-law of Lincoln's stepmother, wrote: "Dere Abe I Received your Little Check for 50.00 I shoed it to Mother She cried like a child Abe * * *."

It is impossible in one article to cover so large and significant a collection. To see how Lincoln met his tasks day after day, and to observe how tremendous those tasks were, is to gain a new appreciation, as well as a fresh portrait, of the man. It is greatly to the credit of the Library of Congress that this unique record has been given an appropriate frame and niche.

Often in perusing these tens of thousands of handwritten pages one marvels how Lincoln lived through it all. As a gentleman from Shelbyville, Tenn., expressed it: "* * * when I think of your Incessant Labours I wonder to myself * * * as you are not Superhuman and cannot any more do without Sleeping Eating and Rest than other men nor cannot extend the day & night Beyond twenty-four hours."

The Nation's Power Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Collier's magazine of February 28, 1948, carries an article entitled, "Our Lights Are Going Out," by Mr. A. G. Mezerik. The article states that all over the Nation power lines are carrying peak loads, and that in many cases lower voltage is endangering the electric motors on which so much of American life depends. I ask to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR LIGHTS ARE GOING OUT
(By A. G. Mezerik)

In the operating amphitheater of a hospital, a surgeon was performing an appendectomy. Suddenly the overhead cluster of lights went out, as a power failure blacked out the hospital. For 40 minutes nervous doctors and nurses kept the patient under anesthesia. Finally the overworked power station which served the hospital recovered sufficiently to restore the lights.

Quick thinking had saved that patient's life, but the staff of the hospital today breathes no easier. They know that the danger is not past. Their X-ray and other essential therapy machines are not receiving sufficient voltage to operate efficiently and sometimes cannot be used at all. News comes to the staff of blackouts in other hospitals in distant areas, and they brace themselves for the worst. Entrusted with human life which can be so endangered by lack of light and power, the doctors and nurses are more conscious than the rest of us of a new creeping epidemic—the Nation-wide power shortage.

The signs of an impending breakdown in the Nation's power supply can be seen by more than the staffs of hospitals. In Maine, power is rationed. In California, workers have lost their jobs. The plants where they were employed manufactured aluminum and chemicals which consume huge blocks of electricity, and the power company had found that it couldn't continue to serve them and everyone else too.

At first workers didn't realize the reason for their summary dismissal. They shouted for their union representatives, thinking they were being locked out. It took a good deal of explaining to drive home the point that their jobs depended on electricity. Now, in California, the power shortage is No. 1 business for labor unions. They have demanded that a "brownout" be declared to save electricity and thereby their pay checks.

On the beaches near Los Angeles bathers soon learned that the shut-downs in the California factories curtailed not only employers' profits and workers' jobs, but also the right to swim. One of the affected plants was the Dow Chemical Co., makers of chlorine, which is vital to the purification of water. With the supply of chlorine exhausted, the beaches became unsafe and were closed by the State department of public health.

Up in Maine the streets are dark, and the gay red, gold, and green neon lights of the advertising signs have been blacked out by official edict. Forest fires, topping a basic shortage of electricity, destroyed a good part of Maine's electric distribution system, including poles and lines.

A state of emergency exists, and President Truman, recognizing the need, ordered the Navy to send to South Portland Bay the destroyer escort *Maloy*. Today the *Maloy* is not a ship so much as a power plant, its generators working around the clock to create electricity, which is then taken by the power system and distributed throughout the State. But Maine's troubles are far from over, and electricity is still rationed—2 hours on and 2 hours off.

Maine's plight is bad, but it is not much worse than that of its neighbors. The new year brought to Vermont an aggravated shortage which threatened paralysis of industries employing thousands of people. The State is frantically seeking emergency power. Even earlier Vermont officials had implored the Navy to send them a ship, too, but the Navy had none available, and a ship couldn't have got through the narrow canal into Lake Champlain anyway.

The power-hungry Vermonters would probably settle gladly for half a ship, which is exactly what the inhabitants of Eureka, Calif., are using. The people of Eureka towed in a foundered Russian craft which had broken in two offshore and put it to work creating light and power. Half a ship has also come in handy way up on top of the world, at Anchorage, Alaska, where half an abandoned Victory ship is supplying power.

Expedients of every type have been tried by utility companies and public agencies to get relief in this crisis. Arizona is the lucky borrower of an Army mobile power-generating train which, while inadequate, is helping a little. The proud Pacific Gas & Electric Co., one of the Nation's biggest power systems, is scouring the byways buying electricity wherever an extra kilowatt is available. It purchases from the Navy at Mare Island, from Letterman General Hospital, and from factories with tiny power equipment known to the trade as "tea kettles." Many utilities are emulating P. G. & E., and at least one utility system, dependent on water power, has tried sending a plane into the clouds to make rain with dry ice.

Most American utility systems today are inclined to be sorry they were such excellent salesmen of appliances in years past. A power company in Florida some years ago staged a sales drive on electric house heaters. It was a high-pressure campaign, much like those put on by power companies everywhere up to a few years ago, and it was successful.

Much too successful, it now turns out, because on the first cold day when all those heaters were plugged in, a transformer blew out.

UNSELLING ELECTRIC HEATERS

Today that utility company is using the same amount of advertising pressure to tell the buyers of those heaters to please, for Pete's sake, keep the things off the line. Though heating by electricity used to be one of the things most encouraged by utility companies, new installations are entirely forbidden today in many sections.

Cooling and air-conditioning sales campaigns were just as popular. Not so now. In Texas, restaurant, hotel and department-store owners have been requested to shut down their cooling equipment for part of each day. Yet the power saved by restrictions is infinitesimal compared to the need. Overloaded generating equipment all over the country remains in danger every minute.

In Beaumont, Tex., crews ride up and down the highways, peering at small transformers along the road. These indicate when they are dangerously overheated by automatically showing a red flag. When the men spot a red flag they dash for the transformer and deposit a cache of dry ice around it to cool it off. And the story isn't much different inside generating plants in every area, where in many cases fire hoses play constantly on aged, overheated machines to keep them from going up and out in smoke.

Across the country, advertisements are appearing like a rash. "We Need Your Help!" says the Union Electric Co. of St. Louis, offering hints to its customers on how to save electricity. The Otter Tail Power Co. in North Dakota thanks its customers for cooperating, but asks for more of the same. Another company buys space to apologize for a serious power failure and concludes by saying that it anticipates more of the same.

Meanwhile utility executives sit in their offices, dreading every storm which might throw out precarious lines and create an intolerable burden on generating and power-station equipment. The great snow which blanketed New York, and the record ice storms which swept across the country in late December were just such catastrophes. The snow, the ice and the wind would have worked havoc even had equipment and maintenance been at peak efficiency. This time, the combination very nearly broke the overloaded camel's back.

The executives thank their lucky stars that the engineers who build electrical machinery are such a conservative group. The equipment provides a wide safety margin and the present demand has led utility operators to push the equipment to limits of everyday use which were never visualized by the engineers. And as they contemplate all this, they think back on how the emergency came about and wonder what the public reaction will be.

The utility companies worked hard and well during the war and there was no power shortage, despite their inability to get necessary equipment. A regimented wartime economy had helped them. The Government told manufacturers that they must work three shifts, which meant that industrial loads could be distributed around the clock. Relief also came from power pools organized by the Government, which arranged interconnections so that one company in dire need could borrow from a temporarily richer neighbor. Daylight saving and rules which barred advertising display signs, Christmas lighting, and the manufacture of appliances helped too.

With the end of the war the rules went into the discard, and the power companies relaxed, expecting a long let-down, even a postwar depression. And for 11 months after VJ-day they had reason to think they had guessed right. Demand for electricity dropped below that of any year since 1943. Then suddenly reconversion was over and every plant which could hook in one more motor was demanding more current than ever before.

Nor was that all. Farmers, grown affluent with a succession of good crops and high prices, clamored for electrification and sometimes hired lawyers in their zeal for instant action.

THE FARMERS' BEST CHORE BOY

They had found out for themselves that electricity is an unparalleled chore boy, and with farm help increasingly hard to come by, electricity could do more. It was wonderful inside the farmhouse, too. Washers, refrigerators, radio, entertainment, and blessed light all came with that line. Small wonder the farmers demand electrification, but their chances of getting it are as dim as the interiors of their kerosene-lighted houses.

One exception is in the Tennessee Valley, where publicly owned TVA is not only continuing to serve its huge industrial customers such as du Pont and Eastman but has, since the end of the war, doubled the number of its farm consumers.

Incidentally, TVA, which is largely a water-power operation, owns a big steam plant near Wilson Dam. That plant is operating at full capacity right now, and is selling every last spark of its output to its neighbor utilities, the Georgia Power Co. and the Alabama Power Co. This has its ironical side because the Alabama Power Co. is using the courts to fight the growth of farm cooperative electricity in its own State on the ground that it can readily take care of all the requirements. At the same time it is buying power from publicly owned TVA.

Desire for electricity is, of course, not limited to farmers. Along the Pacific coast 1,500 wartime factories, thought by all to be headed for the scrap pile after the war, are still doing business, and twice that number of smaller plants have set up to sell goods to the bigger fellows. That takes power, and plenty of it, and the situation is roughly the same all over.

Government and military needs are also demanding more and more power. The creation of atomic bombs already takes huge blocks of power, and when the recently announced plans of the Atomic Energy Commission have been carried out, requirements will double. The hope that atomic energy might be used to make electricity, instead of consume it, has grown dimmer, the only optimism coming from Lewis Straus,, one of the members of AEC, who suggests that atomic storage batteries may one day be practical—but that is looking a long way into the future.

Meanwhile, other military installations are also increasing their demands. The Army is in quest of a site for a supersonic wind tunnel bigger than anything hitherto dreamed up anywhere else in the world. When it is built it will use plenty of power; those who know say it will require 500,000 kilowatts or about five times the power used by the city of Denver.

Aside from military needs, which will be met or else, there is still the ordinary American, trying to plug in his new automatic

laundry, his vacuum cleaner, his refrigerator, and his new floor lamps. There are more people in the country than ever before and each is using more electricity. In Los Angeles, the population has increased by 19 percent, and each consumer is using 35 percent more current. The power systems, everywhere seeking to make a little energy go a long way, have dropped their voltage in many places. If the light bulbs look dirty, if the water doesn't boil, and if the toast won't brown, it's probably low voltage.

DAMAGE TO HOUSEHOLD MOTORS

Low voltage can be very costly to householders, as the business of electrical repair shops in many parts of the country proves. Burned-out radio condensers and bad reception are only a part of the consequences, for low voltage causes motors of vacuum cleaners and refrigerators to go up in smoke. This low-voltage trouble has already caused owners of many electrically equipped homes to buy gasoline and kerosene lamps and to install stand-by cooking facilities in the form of wood, coal, oil, or bottled gas ranges.

Events, such as Maine's forest fires and the greatest drought ever experienced in the green Northeast, are in part responsible for this national shortage. Lack of rain affected the water supply from which electricity is made at Niagara Falls and at dams all over northern New York, New England, and Pennsylvania. Drought affected the West even more. The West depends on hydroelectricity, and the fuel for hydro is falling water. No falling water, no electricity, as the Bureau of Reclamation, which operates so many of the western hydro plants, will quickly prove. They make their point with a picture of the Elephant Butte Dam in New Mexico, which has not enough water in its reservoir to turn the big water wheels.

Those events were acts of nature, but people, singly and collectively, also contributed their share. Congress only last summer cut to the bone the appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation, despite the fact that the money was largely going into power projects, such as those in the Columbia River Basin, which are vitally necessary to the maintenance of our industrial and food production. Behind the action of Congress was the pressure of the less foresighted of the privately owned electrical systems.

The Idaho Power Co. is still resisting building of the dam and powerhouse at Hells Canyon on the Snake River, a project which would make possible the processing of the richest vein of phosphate rock in the world, at a time when fertilizer is not only short but indispensable if we are to carry out our immense plans for helping to feed the world. The president of the Utah Power & Light Co. only recently denounced the expansion of cheap electric power as political.

In many other areas the private power companies have not been oversanguine about the future of the country. The president of the national organization of the privately owned electric companies was perhaps thinking in this pattern when he said, in the face of rationed and curtailed electricity, that rumors of impending shortages were unwarranted and untrue. So also are the many utility men who speak of the present situation, not in terms of shortages and necessary expansion, but of abnormal demand.

They imply that demand will fall off, that people and industry will use less electricity. But the only foreseeable way that can happen is by a depression, and while a depression may prove a comfort to a few harassed operators of utilities, it is not the solution, which the Gallup poll would find popular.

If that is the picture in the privately owned systems, neither is all sweetness, much less light, among the Government agencies which are in the business of creating and selling power. The Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation build and run most of our great Government power plants. Each would like to do as much of the total job as possible. They have worked together to stop the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, which like TVA would be under the control of neither, but their jealousy is more often directed against each other.

In California each of the agencies is trying to keep the other from building and operating Folsom Dam. At present, the engineers are out in front, though qualified experts say the dam logically belongs in the framework of the big Central Valley project run by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The same experts say that Army control of the dam will cause duplication and uneconomical operation.

Whoever and whatever is responsible, whether fires, drought, or war, whether private operators or public agencies, it is obvious it will be a long time before we catch up with our present needs. There are only three generator manufacturers in the entire country and they are sold up for years to come. It takes 3 years and sometimes more to make one of the big generating machines. And shortages of copper, poles, and transformers plague everybody.

EUROPE'S NEEDS AN ADDED PROBLEM

On top of these handicaps there is ERP, better known as the Marshall plan, which may well be "operation rathole" unless it results in setting Europe's productive capacity on its feet. That cannot be done without generators. The famous Krug report, which inventories our natural resources with Europe's need in mind, suggests that Government allocation in this field may once more become necessary.

William E. Knox, president of the gigantic Westinghouse Electric International Co., which supplies power equipment to foreign countries, takes a pessimistic view of the effects of what he calls the international "woeful shortage of basic electric power." He says, "The estimates of the amounts of electric equipment requested from Europe are very large, and the studies of these estimates made by official American groups have so far not tended to reduce them." The Marshall plan, as Mr. Knox sees it, will have an undeniable impact on our domestic economy and our capacity to produce even our basic domestic needs.

However, if everything works in our favor and if, in addition, there is no oil, coal, or water shortage, this Nation will in 5 or 10 years, be where we ought to be now—supplying the existing demand without undue strain. Only after that will come the job of freeing and flexing the economic muscles of the country, and we will arrive there only if every possible source of electrical energy, public and private, it developed meanwhile.

INDUSTRIES NEED CHEAP POWER

Manufacturers such as the Reynolds Metals and the Aluminum Co. of America will then be able to find sources of cheap power, the lack of which now keeps them from expanding and making more products and more jobs. The great power-using chemical and metallurgical industries which emerged during the war now constitute but one-half of 1 percent of industry, yet already they are using 50 percent of all the power consumed in manufacturing. Given more power, that infant will really grow.

Highway and street lighting, badly needed across the country, will be undertaken. Businesses will proceed with long-deferred expansion. Farmers will get the power they are demanding, and the people of the cities will taste some of that postwar-world stuff they heard so much about awhile back.

Meanwhile, we will all save electricity in little ways and hope—hope that the private power systems will set up more interconnecting lines so they can borrow from one another when one or another has a power surplus; hope also that the three manufacturers of generators will expand and that more manufacturers will start making the big machines. We can wish that private-utility executives will keep their eyes on our potential and that the public Government agencies will quit quarreling. For it will take everybody in the power business, whether using steam, hydro or Diesel, whether cooperative, private or public, to get behind the stalled power wagon and shove if we are to get really on our way.

Until that dream comes true, the dark shadow will hang over us and strange things will continue to happen. Letters will come to the Navy, as one recently did from a cooperative in Florida, asking them to send a battleship to Miami to supplement their supplier's needs. And in your house and mine the lights may blink three times, the way they do now in Iowa, a signal that the load is getting too heavy and that somebody better get around pronto and flip the switches before all the lights go off.

United Nations Survival Threatened!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations organization has gone downhill in the past year according to Mr. Constantine Brown, noted writer and world traveler. This organization is getting weaker and not stronger, as it should.

Mr. Brown has written a very interesting article on this subject which appeared in the Washington Star on February 15, 1948. I include the article as part of my remarks:

DRASTIC STEPS NECESSARY TO INSURE UN SURVIVAL—WORLD ORGANIZATION HAS GONE DOWNHILL IN PAST YEAR AND THREATENS TO EXPIRE UNLESS A CURE IS FOUND SOON

(By Constantine Brown)

The United Nations, born less than 3 years ago amid the enthusiastic cheers of hopeful bystanders and the impassioned speeches of politicians throughout the world, is sick and dying.

In fact, the illusion that world peace could be achieved by the selfless collaboration of all nations has had a far shorter life in the United Nations than in the League of Nations. The Geneva organization lasted for nearly two decades. The Lake Success (nicknamed by some cynics Lake Flop) organization—more ambitious than that at Geneva—is now so wobbly that observers have begun to believe it was still-born.

STARTED IMPRESSIVELY

Many European statesmen in the past have accused the United States of responsibility for the demise of the League, contending that if we had joined it things would have been different. Teeth, in the form of military sanctions and actual intervention, it was said, could have been written into the covenant and the dictators who appeared after World War I could have been cowed into submission before they became strong enough to use force themselves.

Heeding this criticism, the organizers of the UN inserted plenty of teeth in the charter. Not only did the UN charter provide specifically that military sanctions should be applied when all other means of enforcing peace failed, but a special United Nations Army was provided for, with a staff drawn from the five big permanent members of the Security Council.

The charter was so framed that its members actually surrendered many of their sovereign rights to that organization. All their activities—political, economic, military, and social—were to be filtered through the various component parts of the new peace organization.

Hardly had the UN been organized before it became apparent that unless all the big nations were willing to play square the ambitious program inaugurated in 1945 at San Francisco would fail.

FROM BAD TO WORSE

The first blow—a minor one—came during the Russian-Iranian conflict when the U. S. S. R. representatives refused to obey the Council's injunctions and settled their differences with the Teheran Government alone. Since the worst fears of the non-Soviet members, that Azerbaijan Province of Iran would be incorporated into the U. S. S. R., did not materialize, every one hailed it as a victory, influenced indirectly by the moral power of the UN.

The "minor ailments" of the new-born UN—described by its parents as inevitable growing pains—in the last 12 months have developed into a serious illness which may have fatal results, unless some drastic means is devised to check it. Up to now no one has devised such a means.

Far from improving, matters are going from bad to worse. Whatever cure is discovered will not be applied. One of the UN's parents—the U. S. S. R.—is using the veto power to stymie modern democratic methods.

The old League of Nations frequently was accused of being the sounding board for the selfish interests of the big powers. In those days there was still at least a semblance of international morality, and the power-politics game played by Britain, France, Italy, Germany, and Japan at least was clothed in legality.

GREEK CASE TYPICAL

The United Nations exists at a time when all international morality seems to have disappeared and the sessions at Lake Success sound more like the vituperations of Billingsgate fishmongers than discussions by representatives of the great powers.

Untruths are expressed from the rostrum of that world-peace organization without any respect for diplomatic language. According to some of the members attending the hotter sessions, if the interpreters were to translate literally many of the Yugoslav and Soviet invectives they would be unprintable.

The stalemate has become complete, except in a few cases—such as the partition of Palestine—in which the Russians want, for their own purpose, to join in settlement of the problem.

The case of Greece is typical. In accordance with the Charter and its articles dealing with aggression against a member nation, a commission was sent to the Balkans in 1946 to investigate the justice of the Greek Government's complaint against its northern neighbors.

The whole thing became a tragic farce soon after the commission reached the country. The Russian and satellite delegates openly favored the Greek rebels, while the rest of the commission attempted to make an impartial report.

KOREA ANOTHER EXAMPLE

The findings at the end of the several months of investigation were presented to the Security Council, with the Russian and his associates making a minority report. The whole report was inconclusive. The rebels supported by Russia's satellites, continued their warfare, because Moscow decided to nullify the investigating committee's report and to continue the aggression which the Kremlin leaders expect will bring Greece finally behind the iron curtain. The peace efforts of the UN thus were flaunted.

The same thing applies to Korea. That country regained only nominal independence at the end of World War II, after having been a Japanese province for many years. The ill-advised Yalta agreements between the Big Three provided that Korea would be divided into two zones immediately after her liberation. The northern portion was occupied by Russian troops, while the southern was taken over by the Americans. This occupation was to be temporary, and only until such time as free and unfettered elections could be held, giving the Koreans their own government.

Immediately after the Soviet Army entered Korea it placed a solid iron curtain between north and south.

A secret police force, composed of Russians and Koreans trained for many years in Siberia, was organized. A Korean army composed of men who had sought refuge from Japan and had been trained by the Red Army in the maritime provinces was organized under Russian commanders.

The Koreans in the south—supported by the United States—began clamoring for an election, as they had been promised. They did not want to have their country chopped up into two parts, and were anxious to reunite the north and south under a native government.

At the United Nations, where the Korean claims were considered, it was decided that an international commission should be sent immediately to investigate conditions on the spot and to supervise an election throughout the country.

RUSSIA SULKED AT RULING

Russia opposed the plan, and suggested that before an election took place American and Soviet armies of occupation should be withdrawn. The Russian suggestion seemed logical, except that it meant that south as well as north Korea would be dominated by the Russians.

While in the American zone we had trained a police force armed only with pistols and light machine guns—for the sole purpose of maintaining law and order—in the north the Russians had organized a strong force armed with artillery and tanks and trained by Red officers.

The withdrawal of both occupation forces, it was obvious to us, would mean that the north would invade the south and impose Russia's will through another satellite armed force. By no stretch of the imagination could the southern police force match the northern Korean army.

Russia sulked at the decision of the United Nations and refused to participate in the commission sent to Korea. This group was empowered, under the mandate of the UN, to go everywhere in northern and southern Korea.

The commission arrived at Seoul, headquarters of the American occupation forces in the south. Agents from the north had preceded the commission's arrival and demonstrations were trumped up. These led to major disturbances, which had to be put down by the American military police.

When the UN commission attempted to cross the border to investigate popular feeling in northern Korea, it was peremptorily halted by the Russian Army commander, who refused admission without any further explanation. Once more the UN had taken a kick from the Soviet Government.

WEST SAVED FACE

To imagine that this organization, in which we have placed all our hopes for peace, can function efficiently henceforth under such conditions is to refuse to recognize a tragic—but factual—situation.

For the sake of accepting the theory of the UN, Prime Minister Stalin received handsome payment in allotment of territories to Russia. But all those who attended the Yalta Conference, where Mr. Stalin agreed to participate in the world peace organization, admit now that he never believed in this new democratic idea.

Mr. Stalin had suggested to President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill that the world be divided into three zones of influence, with Russia retaining the lion's share. When the American and British leaders refused to consider such barefaced villainy and offered the Soviet dictator important advantages in Manchuria and control of Eastern Europe, he agreed to have Russia represented at San Francisco.

The face of the western peacemakers thus was saved. They also hoped—for reasons which the ordinary citizen in this country cannot yet understand—that once Russia's thirst for territorial expansion was satisfied she would be willing to work for a stabilized peace and would become a useful member of the new society of peace-loving nations.

How Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill could have believed in this, after the experience of Prime Minister Chamberlain and Premier Daladier with Hitler, is difficult to understand. But subsequent developments since 1946 prove that Russia never intended to keep the UN alive, unless it could become a useful tool for her schemes of aggrandizement.

Now the United Nations is breathing heavily and the political doctors, while putting out optimistic bulletins, fear that the patient is in a real bad way.

United States Economic Foreign Policy and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the remarks by Norman Burns, adviser, Division of Commercial Policy, United States Department of State, before the Foreign Policy Association in Oklahoma City on February 19:

UNITED STATES ECONOMIC FOREIGN POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The Economic Foreign Policy of the United States is to promote, through cooperative action with other countries, world economic prosperity.

We believe, as a practical business matter, that economic prosperity in other countries is essential, in the long run, for the maintenance of prosperity in our own: no country can exist for long as an island of prosperity in a sea of depression. We believe in economic prosperity, also, for humanitarian reasons; it does not seem right for people to starve when the world has resources, which, if utilized, would provide food and clothing for all. We believe in economic prosperity, also, for ideological reasons: free institutions, freedom of thought, of speech and of worship do not flourish in a soil of economic desperation. All of these aspects of our economic foreign policy have been described many times in the press and in speeches. They have become familiar to, and have received the support of, the American people.

The purpose, here, is to concentrate on one aspect of our economic foreign policy, namely its implication from the point of view of our national security. National security, of course, is a function of various factors. It depends, in part, upon our own intrinsic strength, in part upon the relative strength of other countries, and in part upon the friendly or hostile nature of our relations with other countries.

UNITED STATES ECONOMIC FOREIGN POLICY

The method of our policy is one of cooperation with other countries. After World War I, we sought prosperity and peace by attempting to withdraw from world affairs—on the political front by dissociating ourselves from the League of Nations; on the economic front by attempting to isolate our economy from that of other countries through successive tariff increases in 1921, 1922, and 1930. The tragic end of that chapter we all know. After World War II we sought prosperity and peace, not through isolation but through cooperative action with other countries to solve our mutual problems. We sponsored the creation of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Bank, the International Fund, and the (proposed) International Trade Organization. We sponsored a European recovery program (the Marshall plan) and the multilateral trade-barrier reduction program. Our economic foreign policy has had the effect of greatly expanding the scope and area of cooperative action in international life. Since national security depends, in part, upon the friendly or hostile nature of our relations with other countries, it follows that an expansion in the scope of international cooperative action, which makes more friendly nations, is likely to contribute, in the long run, to our own national security. This, of course, is an intangible factor, but history is a record of the power of intangibles.

The extent of our cooperative action may be indicated more clearly, perhaps, by an account of two major programs of our economic foreign policy, the European recovery program and the trade-barrier reduction program.

European recovery program

The European recovery program was initiated by the European countries at the suggestion of Secretary of State George C. Marshall, June 5, 1947, to make Europe self-supporting again. Wartime dislocations had created downward spirals in the economics of western European countries which, in turn, set in motion other downward spirals until a kind of economic paralysis set in that made economic recovery a slow and difficult process. Coal production could not be increased sufficiently because mines lacked machinery and miners lacked food. Mining machinery to increase the output of coal, and agricultural machinery to increase the output of food, could not be produced in sufficient volume because machinery factories lacked coal. This is but one example of the vicious spiral. The European recovery program, if approved by Congress, would mean the expenditure by the United States of something like $17,000,000,000 within the next 4¼ years (approximately 2 percent of our total national income during that period, at the present level of business activity) to put Europe on its feet again. This plan is more than relief. If relief alone, its cost would of course be less. But relief alone would leave these countries in no better condition at the end of the 4¼ years than at the beginning. The real problem is to furnish enough economic support to ensure their full recovery. The 17 European countries participating in the plan have agreed to help each other, to the full extent of their resources, in addition to the aid from the United States. The participating countries are Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and western Germany. Other war-devastated countries in Europe are free to participate if they meet the terms prescribed and adopted by the other participating countries.

Multilateral trade-barrier-reduction program

The trade-barrier-reduction program, also initiated by the United States, culminated in the general agreement signed at Geneva by 23 countries, October 30, 1947, to mutually reduce their trade barriers for the purpose of expanding world trade. These countries reduced their tariffs and bound tariff rates on products that account for one-half of the world's total foreign trade—the most comprehensive attempt ever undertaken to reduce world-trade barriers. The general agreement assumes that a reduction in trade barriers will stimulate a revival in international trade that will cause production and trade to expand in all countries. It assumes that if the 65-odd countries of the world separate themselves from each other by trade barriers that create 65 more or less watertight economic compartments there will never be world economic prosperity.

The general agreement came into effect provisionally on January 1, 1948, as regards the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, France, Belgium, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, and Cuba. Other signatory countries are expected to put it into force by June 30.

The general agreement was followed by negotiations at Habana, among 60 countries, for the formulation of a charter that would provide a detailed set of rules to govern countries in their conduct of trade with each other and to encourage further reductions in various types of trade barriers. The charter provides, also, for the creation of an International Trade Organization, which members would join to facilitate the carrying out of their obligations under the charter. This charter, when completed, will be placed before Congress to decide whether or not the United States should adhere.

UNITED STATES PROSPERITY AND OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

The question arises now: If our economic foreign policy succeeds in promoting world prosperity, how will this affect our national security?

It is evident upon reflection that a vigorous foreign trade contributes to our own economic prosperity, partly because it creates or sustains a strong foreign market for our exports and partly because it creates a favorable climate for flourishing trade within this country. Economic prosperity is prerequisite for full production in the United States. Full production in peacetime is necessary to maintain a large industrial structure. A country without a large, well-balanced, industrial structure will lack both the plant capacity and the technological skill to produce the kind and volume of equipment required to carry on modern warfare. The United States could never have produced 60,000 planes or more per year during the last war, if we had not had a huge peacetime automobile industry. The United States could not have produced the ships necessary to carry military forces and supplies across two oceans, if we had not had factories and skilled workers to convert our resources into the ship building. The atomic bomb, synthetic rubber, penicillin, and many similar products could not have been produced in volume during the last war if this country had not possessed a reservoir of industrial capacity and technological know-how as a result of prosperous peacetime business.

A large industrial structure is necessary also to maximize food supply. A maximum food supply is essential from the point of view of national security, for no army can fight without adequate food, factories cannot produce with underfed workers, and civilian morale cannot be maintained indefinitely with hungry people. Factories are needed to make fertilizer, insecticides, and agricultural implements to produce the food, to make trucks and freight cars for transporting food and to make machinery for the processing of food that it may be utilized efficiently.

Economic depression would shrink our industrial capacity, stultify technological development and impair our national security.

The maintenance of full production in the United States will create a tremendous drain on our own natural resources. The Bureau of Mines, describing the wartime drain on our mineral resources, in the course of Senate hearings in May 1947, stated that the United States has less than a 35-year peacetime commercial supply of 21 basic minerals, including petroleum, copper, lead, zinc, bauxite, antimony, tungsten, platinum, manganese, chromite, nickel. Many of these are strategic materials absolutely essential in the production of implements of war. Under our trade barrier reduction program we have reduced tariff rates on a number of these minerals, so that more of our current requirements will be supplied by imports. This will help to conserve our dwindling domestic reserves.

It is claimed, in certain instances with validity, that reductions in our tariff might operate against national security if mines or factores should be closed as a result of drastic tariff reductions (note, the Trade Agreements Act permits no more than a 50-percent cut in duty on any product). It is feared that such action might make us too dependent upon overseas sources not easily accessible during an emergency. Our experience with rubber illustrates why the synthetic rubber industry, and certain other industries, should be maintained, even although the economic cost may be great. An operating industry to provide a nucleus of management and technical skill and to stimulate technological developments, is necessary in many lines of production, from the point of view of national security. On the other hand the national security argument for tariff protection should not be carried to extremes. For example, there are many cases where our reserves of minerals are inadequate for national security and tariff protection, no matter how high, will not increase nonexistent reserves. In other cases, our competitive strength is so great that imports would not impede domestic production, even if the tariff should be cut. For example, no country can compete against American automobiles. The safest procedure is to consider each case on its individual merits and to take tariff action on the basis of the combined consideration of the Department of State, the Department of National Defense and other Departments concerned with technical or economic aspects of the problem.

FOREIGN PROSPERITY AND OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

Economic prosperity in foreign countries, also, has significant implications from the point of view of our national security.

Hunger and poverty in foreign countries make for political unrest. Poverty is a fertile soil for the sowing of Communist ideology because hungry people are desperate people. It is no exaggeration to say that persistent economic disorganization and want in any country lead directly and inevitably to the loss of individual freedom, to the breakdown of free institutions and to the loss of national independence. Economic prosperity, as Secretary Marshall said, is essential to permit the "emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist." Economic prosperity is the ally of those people within a country who believe in freedom and democracy. Countries with a strong sentiment of democracy are likely to be friendly countries.

The Eurasian continent (Europe and Asia) has an area about double and a population about 10 times that of North America. The rimland of Eurasia, from the Bering Strait through Malaya, Aden, and Gibraltar, to northern Norway is fringed with approximately 50 countries or economic units, some large such as China and India and some smaller such as Italy, France, Belgium, etc., each of which is separated from the others by trade barriers that prevent the full development of their economic resources. Hence, the rimland countries are economically

weaker than they need be, in view of their aggregate population and resources. The heartland of Eurasia, on the other hand, is in large part covered by a single, large country, with an area twice as great and a population 50 percent greater than that of the United States. Because of its size, the diversity of its resources, and the unified direction of its economy, the heartland country is far less dependent upon international trade than are the many, smaller, rimland countries. The heartland can maximize its production without a large international trade; most of the rimland countries can develop their resources and maximize their production only through a large international trade.

If world trade barriers are reduced and international trade expands, all countries will benefit, but the rim land countries will benefit relatively more than the heart land country, simply because of their relatively greater dependence on international trade. A high level of production and economic activity in the rim land countries will contribute to their security, for the same reason as in the United States, namely that a large industrial structure is an essential of military strength. For these reasons we believe that economic prosperity in foreign countries will have a stabilizing political effect in the world today, that democracy will be strengthened and that these developments will contribute, in no small measure, to our own national security.

CONCLUSION

The economic foreign policy of the United States is essentially a strategy of economic prosperity. We seek economic prosperity through cooperative action with other countries. The immediate step is the European recovery program to lay a firm foundation for a permanently self-supporting Europe. The long-run step is the trade barrier reduction program to expand international trade. We believe that economic prosperity will contribue to political stability in the world today, that economic prosperity will contribute to our own national security and that, in world economic prosperity lies hope for world peace.

A Summons to Self-Reliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Earl O. Shreve, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

A SUMMONS TO SELF-RELIANCE

(By Earl O. Shreve, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, before Chamber of Commerce, St. Louis, Mo., February 9, 1948)

The world is living through a time of great confusion and despair, in this aftermath of the most destructive war in all human history. Vast populations are homeless, which is bad enough—and also hopeless, which is worse. Hundreds of millions in Europe and Asia had counted on the glorious hour of victory to bring them political freedom and economic progress. It brought them neither the one nor the other, thus adding bitter disillusionment to their general distress.

In such a time the frightened and angered masses of the world are eager to find a convenient scapegoat. And as always, the demagogs and adventurers are there to provide one. It is all too obvious that they have selected our America, and especially the American businessman, for that sacrificial role.

They are making our system of individual enterprise the principal target for their organized lies and malice. Their shrill accusations echo through the halls of the United Nations. The airwaves are clamorous with their invective against Wall Street and American imperialism and the other familiar figments of propaganda.

What we face, in effect, is an all-out offensive against our American business civilization. It is an offensive expertly organized by great masters of the strategy and tactics of confusion. It is led and financed by men who have preempted the resources of a dozen helpless countries, including Russia itself. Let no one shrug off the seriousness of the threat, the urgency of the challenge.

You and I, as Americans and as men of business, have no remote excuse for indifference. We must utilize every chance to consult together, to clarify our thinking and to fortify our self-confidence. That is why I am grateful for this opportunity to address another group of my fellow-Americans and fellow-businessmen.

There was a time when each of us could safely mind his own business, letting nature take its course on larger matters. That time is past. Those larger matters have become very much our business. Unless we set that course and fix its direction, others will do it for us—and in directions from which there will be no easy return.

I have neither the right nor the intention to lecture. I happen to be the head of the world's largest organization of businessmen, the United States Chamber of Commerce. But that does not magically endow me with any special wisdom or insight. It merely imposes on me the obligation to call attention to looming dangers and to take counsel with you on our common duties in confronting them. And that, more or less, is the assignment I have set for myself today.

The danger as I see it, is not alone in the attacks on our system of freedom.

No, the danger also is within ourselves. It is implicit in the question which many serious-minded Americans are asking themselves: Do we have the moral stamina, the inner confidence, the resources of faith in ourselves for the great contest between liberty and slavery?

We dare not succumb to a failure of nerve. That is the one calamity which would guarantee victory for the forces of human enslavement.

America must see to its psychological defenses. It seems to me essential that all of us, and leaders of the business community especially, revive the old sense of pride in our national achievements—and a clear-headed confidence in the way of life that made those achievements possible. I believe we must return to the springheads of American inspiration; to the fundamentals of individualism; to those attitudes of mind and heart which may be summed up in the word "self-reliance." Something of the pioneer spirit still lives in every American. Look at the boy selling newspapers on a street corner. He is quite sure that he will one day be among the successful—he feels himself, in his way, an American pioneer. Look at the young man starting a little business of his own, the miner or farmer who sends his son to college, the engineer planning to build a bridge or tunnel a mountain—each of them, too, feels himself a pioneer in the noble American tradition.

There was a time, within the memory of men still quite young, when the basic concepts of individual self-reliance, in all departments of life, were taken for granted in this country. No one felt called upon to defend them, any more than he needed to defend the air he breathed. We recognized, of course, that self-reliance involved risks and responsibilities but were willing to pay that price. Indeed, we relished the risks. They gave to business its tang of adventure.

The few who proposed to limit personal liberty in the name of security or some other goal were looked upon as cranks. Even in great emergencies, like war, we relinquished our individual prerogatives with the utmost reluctance, and always with a firm determination to restore them the moment the emergency was over. In short, we had a deep-down faith in ourselves, in our capacity for general progress through individual initiative.

That faith, alas, has been badly battered in recent decades. You can hardly open a magazine or turn on a radio without hearing a discussion as to how much freedom we ought to surrender to some Government agency or some super-duper "planners." The very fact that the issue of individualism can be seriously debated is a symptom of encroaching moral flabbiness.

Too many Americans have been infected by the very ideologies they profess to be fighting. Their efforts to insure free enterprise seem to be limited to pious declarations. But the proof of free enterprise, as of religion, is in everyday conduct.

You know as well as I do the kind of business leader who defends free enterprise in principle but is inclined to weaken on the principles in practice. Some of his kind are still about. He shouts hurrah for competition as lustily as the next fellow—but is not above a little price-fixing to squeeze out inconvenient interlopers when it suits his purpose. He waves the flag of free economy—but doesn't protest a helping hand from Government bureaucracy here and there.

There are not many of them, fortunately, but enough of them to serve as a warning. They are symptoms of the growing corrosion of that sense of self-reliance to which I have alluded.

The American system of economy has just been through two periods of intensive regimentation. The first, of course, was the New Deal era. Then, without a respite, came the second: The great war.

In both those periods, though for different reasons, business became in many vital respects the word of the all-powerful State. All the mechanisms of priorities and taxation, managed currency, and bureaucratic decrees, were used to cut down the natural creative energy of private enterprise. We saw a vast centralization of power in the Executive, and a virtual abandonment of the principle of free checks and balances.

Taken together these periods added up to 14 continuous years of subjection to centralized and often arbitrary dictation of manufacture, distribution, wages, prices, and other economic factors. The initiative of the individual businessman and manager was hemmed in and sometimes substituted by directives from the ever-multiplying bureaus and agencies.

Emerging from those years of bureaucratic restraint, our economy is a good deal like a patient who has been confined to bed for a long time. After his recovery he must learn to walk again, to stand on his own feet, to do without medication and without the guiding hand of nurse or doctor. In the first flush of his restored health, in fact, he sometimes misses the snug, relaxed routine of hospitalization.

Even thus, American private enterprise economy must learn to walk again, to stand on its own feet, to do without the plaster-cast of state regimentation. It must get over the habit of looking to the doctor in Washington.

Business tended to grow soft during those regimented periods. Let's acknowledge the fact, not in blame but in a spirit of candor. It lost a lot of its wonted drive and resourcefulness. It tended to become meek and compliant under pressures from above,

During the New Deal epoch the economic areas in which individualism and the profit drive could function were so restricted that certain faculties of our economy tended to become atrophied, like body muscles which are not used for a long time. Business, of necessity, relied more and more on lawyers and lobbyists and politicians—less and less on those abilities which are native to a free economy and individual resourcefulness.

During the war, of course, American business in nearly every dimension became in effect an instrument of government. That this was unavoidable in a total war does not alter the fact that the effects on business psychology were deep and dangerous. They added to the harm already done by the New Deal which preceded.

After all, a planned economy has a good deal of temptation for some businessmen. It takes off their shoulders problems and responsibilities. While their return on investment of capital and effort may be small, they believe it is at least more certain, with the Government behind them to cushion risks and absorb losses.

War industries had ready-made markets. Costs ceased to be a problem or a challenge. Competition was a thing of the dim past—the Government took all we could produce and clamored for more. The shortage of goods turned the once powerful consumer into a supplicant who could be treated with scant consideration.

The habits engendered by those two periods—the bad habits of leaning on government—must be unlearned, and that quickly, if our American system of economy is to regain its traditional vitality and self-reliance. Perhaps some industrialists, some merchants, actually miss the "good old days" of centralized regulation. Unless they be endowed with fortitude and daring, they may find it none too easy to adjust themselves to the responsibilities of freedom, to the problems of a free market, to the challenge of pace-setting competition.

Probably you know, as I do, instances of business groups which have sought to retain the protection of government for their own fields, even while demanding an end to regimentation in general. That's the kind of thing I have in mind in warning that the danger is in the first place in ourselves. How can we hope to muster the moral power to defend our freedom unless we restore freedom to its ancient eminence in our hearts and minds?

What's left of the civilized world looks to us with desperate hope for help and guidance. For millions throughout the world we represent the last outpost of the free human spirit. The same force which assured victory during the war—namely the American economy—now holds the one great promise of victory in the peace. It is our obligation not only to ourselves but to all mankind not to dilute or weaken the system that made possible the miracle of our abundant America.

And so I plead for a return to the philosophy and practice of American individualism, whose central virtue is self-reliance.

We must eliminate that undertone of apology—a hang-over from the intoxication of the New Deal spree—which is so often audible in our very defense of free enterprise. Remember always that capitalist America at worst—even in the depths of depression—provides its people with a more ample existence than totalitarian economy at its best. Remember always that the most under-privileged groups here live on a higher level than the privileged workers in Soviet Russia. As for the average American, he enjoys material and cultural advantages never before accessible to so many so continually in all the annals of man's ordeal on this earth.

We must recapture that dynamic sense of mastery over our own destiny that used to be characteristic of the American, and especially the American in business. He never doubted his own ability to meet any situation as it arose.

Two types of defeatism have sapped our national self-confidence in recent years. Both of them must be eliminated from our thinking and feeling if we would step up our economic morale.

The first species of defeatism holds that a drift toward some form of socialism or regimentation is inevitable. The pessimists draw graphs and charts to prove it. But they prove only their own weak faith. Socialization of a national economy, samples of which are on view in Russia and in England, is inevitable in these United States only if we make it so. To assume that we cannot escape it is a fatalistic view unworthy of self-reliant Americans.

Recently, as you may have read, some 8,000 tons of West Virginia coal were shipped from Baltimore to England—destination, and there's the kicker to the story—Newcastle, coals to Newcastle. The ancient phrase that expressed absurdity now translated into real life. What a dismal commentary on the failure of socialism. We need not, we must not, succumb to the defeatism which accepts any brand of socialism as a kind of inescapable disease of our times.

The second variety of defeatism was packaged for us in the official New Deal contention that material progress in America had reached its limit. Our economy, it was claimed, had become mature, and there was no more scope for expansion. It remained only for the Government—meaning a lot of big and little bureaucrats—to plan our economic lives in an economy which had attained its growth.

It was not the first time in our history that such a claim was made. Again and again, at points in our climb to abundance, there were pessimists who insisted that the tallest peak had been reached and that we could climb no more. In 1886, more than 60 years ago, the United States Commissioner of Labor, Carroll D. Wright, announced with all the authority of his official position that American economy had reached its natural limits.

"Industry has been enormously developed," he wrote, "cities have been transformed, distance covered, and a new set of economic tools has been given in profusion to rich countries and in a more reasonable amount to poorer ones. What is strictly necessary has been done oftentimes to superfluity. * * * The day of large profits is probably past. There may be room for further intensive, but not extensive, development of industry in the present area of civilization."

That defeatist forecast made on the edge of the greatest industrial expansion the world has ever seen, seems utterly ludicrous in the perspective of time. Well, I am convinced that the "maturity" prophets of our day will sound no less ludicrous as time unfolds the future. We cannot foresee the full potentialities of electronics, of nuclear energy, of new developments in chemistry, of sciences still in the womb of time—any more than shortsighted Mr. Wright could foresee the consequences of the telephone which had just been invented or of the horseless carriage with which some crackpots were already tinkering. But the potentialities are still there, mysterious and alluring.

There is ample reason for believing that, despite the difficulties of this day, we Americans are on the edge of another great flowering of creative genius in our economic life—provided the incentives to effort are not shackled. That flowering, we may be sure, will not be touched off by any Government action. It will grow out of the myriad ambitions, strivings, experiments, and visions of millions of individuals. It will burgeon through a thousand failures in a few brilliant successes. It will be nurtured by the indomitable spirit of free men, who in an atmosphere of freedom depend on themselves and their own capacities.

Our American way of life is under attack. Its assumptions have been opened to question. For these very reasons we must renew our pride in the American story, our confidence in American destiny. Only in that way can we match the fervor of detractors at home and sworn enemies abroad. The answer to the world-wide offensive against America is in ourselves and the name for that answer is good old-fashioned self-reliance.

Taxation Cutting Down Owners' Cherry Trees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include from the Boston Sunday Post of February 22, 1948, relating to home owners:

TAXATION CUTTING DOWN OWNERS' CHERRY TREES

Cutting down the cherry tree.

Property rights in Washington's day were inviolate, as the first President learned when he wielded an ax in his youth. Property rights on Washington's birthday, 1948, are insufferable, as the home owner is learning every day with tax rates mounting and real estate bearing the full burden of the cost of government. They are still cutting down the cherry trees of the home owner, and not only doing nothing about his predicament, but slowly and surely chopping his home from under him.

Regardless of the fact that Washington, our first realtor as well as our first President, recognized property and home ownership as basic, and it has been so recognized through the years since then, present-day officials in many municipalities appear to believe that property and the home are fodder for budget balancing. While the property stands on a foundation, it is now fair game for replenishing every raid on the Public Treasury. And an ax, well known in the days of Washington, is an unheard of implement when anyone suggests that it might be used to cut down waste and extravagance in municipal affairs.

Unorganized, as he is, the home owner has little chance to protest. Tears are shed for his plight around election time, and other sources of revenue are cited at the time which, when legislated, would shift the burden from his shoulders. But, when the election is over, he finds that his tax rate has advanced, the nonproperty owner has voted away more of the municipal treasury and organized forces, much more powerful, have prevented any possibility that these other sources of revenue be found. For many years now, the gradual draining of the resources of the home owner has been understood and the necessity that other sources of revenue be found has been admitted. Yet, today, the home owner stands alone, watching the tax rate mount, and impotent. His chances of relief are remote in his present unorganized state and his seeming indifference does nothing to alleviate his present condition.

TAX CUT WITH HOME OWNERS' HELP

True, not all home owners are indifferent, but too many of them sit idly by waiting for the other fellow to do battle. Whenever an opportunity is offered to help themselves they make but little effort and the measures that might aid, die aborning from lack of support. Such an opportunity is now offered in three amendments to the Internal Revenue Act sought for home owners by the National Association of Real Estate Boards and devised by a Boston realtor, Joseph W. Lund of R. M. Bradley & Co., Inc. These amendments, if enacted by Congress, will definitely help the home owner. They were drawn up in an attempt to give owners of homes parity with owners of other property.

These amendments would provide:

1. That the home owner be allowed to take depreciation on the home which he occupies. Homes are recognized as capital assets by many other departments of Government and should, therefore, be depreciated on the same basis as other assets.

2. That when a home owner exchanges his home for another, he not be taxed on an imputed profit but only on such profit as is realized in cash.

3. That home owners be permitted to deduct losses in the case of a sale, especially since they are now taxed upon any profit realized.

In commenting on the introduction of these amendments, the Washington realtor committee declares, "If Congress will adopt this legislation immediately, it will provide added and needed incentive to home ownership, and, therefore, to increase our housing supply."

MUST STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

Unquestionably it is high time that a home owner be allowed to take depreciation on the home he occupies. He is taxed enough—and more than enough as it is. But he will continue to pay—if he lends no support to the measure. And the extent of the support will be seen in the number of letters received in Washington by the Congress—particularly the individual Congressman and both of the Senators representing the home owner there.

Unless the home owner is concerned—nobody else is going to be. It's a simple test—and up to the home owner. He can sit back and allow his representatives in Congress to assume that these amendments are not important to home owners or he can sit down and, with a letter, lend his support. He can, too, assert that the relief he would get from such a change in the revenue act wouldn't be enough to put in his right eye. Yet, it is from the little things that he may begin to get an understanding of his potential power. And what can be done in Washington can be done just as effectively in his own community—if he will stand up and be counted.

Too many cherry trees in owners' orchards are being cut down now—Washington's Birthday is a good time to start dulling the ax of excessive taxation. The odds are against the home owner—but they are no greater than those Washington surmounted.

Federal and State Aids Defeat Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when municipalities or States accept aid for local services they begin to defeat home rule by the people. This great truth is pungently pointed out by Mr. Claude F. Eames, editor of one of my fine weekly newspapers, the Elkhorn Independent.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial by Mr. Eames, which appeared in his paper on February 12:

AID AND INDEPENDENCE

The insidious, hypnotic power of State and Federal aid is gradually removing home rule from the communities of the Nation in spite of the fact that everyone recognizes there is no such thing as "something for nothing."

When Elkhorn or Walworth County accepts a hand-out from above, it sells another part of its independence because along with easy money comes rules, regulations, permissions that must be granted from above, and red tape.

Plans are drawn for us in Washington and we are invited to cooperate while the aid bait is held before us. We grab it quickly, because, we reason, somebody else will. Suddenly we find that we are going through the motions of running our own business according to the formula provided by somebody we never heard of.

Somewhere along the line we have forgotten that Government's only source of revenue is us and that we are furnishing the money for Federal spending. We have lost sight of the fact that after the money is out of our hands somebody else decides how it shall be used. And only those who conform to the master pattern and regulations will benefit.

Costly governmental machinery takes money from us in the highest taxation program in American history. An expensive bureaucracy juggles our money and takes its cut for administration costs and then sends what is left back to the people, usually in a different distribution program than was used in the collection.

All these things are contributing factors in creating the highest peacetime budget in the history of the United States. This spend-thrift, wasteful Government, which asks $37,000,000,000 has gone so hog wild that it tosses billions around like small change, knowing full well that if it runs short, that inexhaustible supply will always be handy—the people!

It is high time this Nation took stock of its future. It is time Walworth County people surveyed their own situation and discovered a few of the places where Federal money flows freely. The termites of a strong central government are busy at the foundations of democracy.

Address of Hon. Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Representative MARY T. NORTON, of New Jersey, at the Jefferson-Jackson dinner, Mayflower Hotel in Washington, Thursday, February 19, 1948:

Tonight we and Democrats everywhere are honoring Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, one the founder of the Democratic Party, the other the great defender of Democratic ideals. The Democratic Party has come a long way since the days of Jefferson and Jackson and we want to see that party, which combines the ideals of these two great patriots, continued and strengthened throughout the coming years with distinction and honor. Through the years, and particularly the last 16, the Democratic Party has made a great contribution to our country. It is, and always has been, the party of the people, a progressive party that has been responsible for most of the humane laws on our statute books, laws which have as their objective prosperity for the farmer, a living wage for the working men and women of America, security for the aged, and higher standards of living and education for all of our people. These, and many more laws, have been enacted under the leadership of a great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and they will be continued and improved under the able leadership of President Truman.

However, all that we have gained in the last 16 years will be lost and the welfare of the common man, who is the bulwark of this Nation, will not be improved if we do not re-elect our President and return a Democratic Congress.

That, I can promise you, and, if you need proof, I can refer you to the record of the Republican Party in the Eightieth Congress and challenge you to point to a single outstanding act of this Congress to benefit the people of America or of the world. The Republicans have had their opportunity in the 14 months that they have controlled Congress, and how miserably they have failed. Even the Marshall plan, which should be nonpartisan, and which would do so much to establish a lasting peace, is being jockeyed around and made the same kind of a political football that succeeded in destroying the League of Nations following World War I. Are we to go through that same agony again? I say that we cannot if America and Europe are to survive and, whether we realize it or not, the survival of civilization itself is at stake this time. Make no mistake about that. We are faced with a tremendous responsibility and we must meet it. I know the Democratic women will do their part, particularly those women whose sons have made the supreme sacrifice in the late war. They know the price paid for war in tears, in suffering, and in sacrifice. We know the Democratic Party is responsible for the United Nations and the Marshall plan, which we hope will go far to end war, and we know that if either or both is to survive, we must reelect President Truman and a Democratic Congress. This, I believe, will be the No. 1 reason why women will support the Democratic Party this year.

Another, and very personal reason, is that the Republicans in Congress voted 9 to 1 to destroy OPA and brought about the highest food prices in our time. This will be remembered on election day—and there are 2,000,000 more women than men eligible to vote this year. Some people claim the women helped to elect the Republicans in 1946. Well, if they did, I know they have bitterly regretted it. It is true that women were tired of restrictions, tired of standing in line to buy food, and they foolishly thought the Republicans could improve conditions. They wanted a change. Well, they got it and what a change it has been. When we had to stand in line with coupons, we were treated fairly, and, although we fed a great Army and supplied our Allies with food, we were still able to get our share of food at reasonable prices, and fed our families properly because the price of food was controlled through the entire war. We did it through OPA but the record shows that the Republicans destroyed OPA. If you need proof of that, I call to your attention a statement made on February 5, 1948, in my own State by Senator WHERRY, acting majority leader of the Senate, before the Middle Atlantic Lumbermen's Association, and I quote, "I do not need to remind the membership of this association that it was the Republican leadership in the Senate and House that was responsible for ending OPA." Now that price controls are gone, we can look longingly at the nice cuts of meat and other foods, which only the rich can afford to buy.

Yes; women have had enough, and I predict they will come back to the party that gave the workers enough to eat at fair prices, a chance to live, to educate their children, to save for their old age, and to enjoy some of the comforts of life. Mr. President, we women are going to be a great factor in your reelection this year, and we shall elect a Democratic Congress to support you in your program. This is a challenge, and we shall meet it. And it would be a good idea and strengthen our organizations, if it were suggested to the leaders of our party that women be given a greater share in the policy-making councils of our party, particularly young women. I am old in years and 28 years old in service to the Democratic Party. I humbly acknowledge a great personal debt to my party for the privilege of serving nearly 24 years in Congress. I have no axe to grind, and my time is running out, but I do want to see more qualified women recognized for what they are worth. Women are willing and anxious to work.

The mothers of this country do not propose to be again separated from their husbands, their sons and daughters, and again wait in an agony of suspense, wondering whether or not they will receive that fatal message.

They are going to vote for the party and the candidate who show by specifics that they, too, want peace.

The Democrats will win this coming election if the campaign is waged in the image of Jefferson, Jackson, and Roosevelt.

We must be courageous and forthright.

We must face issues and not evade.

We must fight and not conciliate.

We must speak the truth and not mouth a lot of platitudes.

We must draw the lines clearly. We must be the people's party in spirit as well as in word.

If we are, we will elect a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress to support him.

In Favor of Library Demonstration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my views on the library demonstration bill.

I have studied the bill thoroughly and I am convinced of its merits. It seems to me to be the soundest approach to solving the problem of our 35,000,000 bookless Americans. The money required for the plan is indeed modest compared with the good it will do.

This bill would do a lot for my State of Texas, as well as for other States. There are more people in Texas without library service than in any other State. Over 3,000,000 Texans, or about half of our population, do not know what free public library service is.

Texas is first in a lot of things, but when it comes to library service we have to take thirty-eighth place among the other States. Of the 254 counties in Texas, 147 have no public library within their bounds. And only 33 counties have county-wide free library service. I would like to see this bill passed so our State library could have some help in getting libraries set up in these areas without them. I am sure there are other States who need Federal help just as much as Texas does.

One argument that has been raised about the bill is that the Federal Government will be getting involved in something the States should take care of. I think most of you will agree that Texans as a rule are pretty independent people, and will not favor any action which might take away their rightful powers.

Well, the people in my State are definitely in favor of the library demonstration bill, so at least there are a great many people who do not thing it invades States' rights.

I think one of the encouraging features of the bill is that it affords Federal aid for stimulating Nation-wide extension of free library service with initiative and full control of the movement left to State and local authorities.

I have here a collection of editorials from Texas papers which I want to submit for the RECORD. They point up the need for library service in Texas and the United States as a whole, and express the people's attitude toward the bill.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Express of May 8, 1946]

TEXAS' STAKE IN THE HILL-DOUGLAS LIBRARY BILL

One particularly sound feature of the Hill-Douglas bill now before Congress, is that it would afford Federal aid toward stimulating Nation-wide extension of free library facilities with complete assurance that initiative and full control of the movement would reside in State and local institutions.

With modest joint Federal-State financing, the proposed 4-year program would demonstrate—by working examples—how local initiative and resources can establish and maintain free public libraries. The effort would be concentrated in rural districts now most backward as regards library facilities to prove their worth in raising living standards, affording recreation and inspiring cultural improvement.

The bill specifically limits Federal interest to purely fiscal matters and progress reports. The State library agency—after consultation with local authorities—would design the detailed demonstration plan in each instance. The program would be entirely State operated; responsibility for selecting books and personnel, scheduling the services to be rendered, and all other related activities would be reserved to State and local officials and their advisers in the library field.

Previous experiments in some States support the theory behind the library-demonstration bill. When the 4-year program shall end, the people in the selected demonstration areas will strive independently to maintain the library facilities which they will then appreciate. The examples offered by the test areas will show State legislators and their constituencies the merits of State extension service for raising local educational levels through library service. Counties already possessing such facilities will benefit indirectly, but appreciably through resulting general improvements in the service and clearer popular understanding and support of the library movement.

Texas shares to a discreditable degree in the Nation's large number of poorly educated and relatively uninformed adults, to whom free public libraries offer the best opportunity for self-help under expert guidance. Texas is one of the 13 States with 45 percent or more of their population lacking public-library service.

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times of May 2, 1947]

UNITED STATES SENATE LIBRARY BILL VITALLY CONCERNS TEXANS

(By Leslie Carpenter)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—Texas has a big stake in the library demonstration bill which comes before the Senate Education and Labor Committee for hearings in May.

Texas has more people without library service than any other State. Almost 3,500,000 Texans do not have access to any libraries. This huge figure represents nearly half the State's population, and it represents 10 percent of the total number of people in the United States who are without libraries. The national figure is 35,000,000.

The Senate bill, co-authored by a Democrat and a Republican, Senators LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, would take great strides toward improving library service in rural communities. It would appropriate $25,000 for each of 5 years to the State library organization in each State. The State group would then use the money in any way it determined to demonstrate better library service in rural areas. Each State could also obtain up to $75,000 in addition in Federal money for all 5 years by matching it dollar-for-dollar.

The idea behind the bill is that after rural dwellers are given a 5-year demonstration of good libraries with Federal money, they will want to continue it and will be agreeable to supporting it with their own local tax moneys.

TOWNS TOO SMALL

"Take west Texas," says Paul Howard, formerly of Fort Worth, who is director of the national relations office of the American Library Association in Washington, "You drive hundreds of miles and don't find a town large enough to support a good public library. That's the reason Texas stands out as first in having the most people without library service."

What's the solution? The American Library Association thinks the best one under such conditions is to establish one good library for a group of several counties. Enough people would live within the area to support the library. The books could be distributed throughout the area by bookmobiles—trucks carrying books right to the ranch house or farm home; general stores could distribute books for the central library, with the stores' supply of books being changed frequently by the library for variety; schoolhouses and churches could also act as distributing centers; and the library itself would be open for those who could come.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Evening News of June 5, 1946]

WHY FARM LEADERS APPEAL FOR RURAL FREE LIBRARY SERVICE

Farmers' Union and National Grange lately expressed strong, informed support of the public library service demonstration bill now before Congress.

Leaders of those farmers' organizations know only too well that of the 35,000,000 or more people estimated by American Library Association to be without any free library service whatsoever, the great majority are in rural areas and their small communities—such as contain the larger part of Texas' population.

Those leaders agree with Dr. Luther Evans, Librarian of Congress, that "the level of information of our people as to current problems has to be raised if we are to meet our responsibilities." With Dr. John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, they perceive that "public library service is truly an essential factor in the educational program of the Nation."

Though the proposed measure is perhaps too modest a beginning—the farm leaders' only criticism—the plan it would finance has proved practical. The Federal-State funds to be allotted would enable demonstrations of library service in areas where the people are unfamiliar with its manifold benefits and with the relatively low cost of establishing and maintaining local libraries.

Once the demonstrations had been afforded the people in most such towns and counties, the outside financial support would terminate. The local populations themselves then would decide whether to forego library service such as they had been enjoying, or continue its maintenance on their own. Experience in several States shows that most would choose the latter course.

The Hill-Douglas bill would grant State library agencies full responsibility for planning the demonstration program within each State. Two general types of plans could be submitted—one for a basic demonstration using $25,000 a year for 4 years, financed solely by Federal funds; the other an expanded plan with an additional $25,000 to $50,000 in Federal funds, matched by the State. The plans thus could range in each State from $25,000 to $125,000 annually for 4 years.

Texas needs the maximum expenditure. More than half its population now has no public library service, and additional thousands are inadequately served. The program proposed would stimulate the continuing work of the people's library movement for Texas and the planned expansion of this State's library extension service.

Despite its obvious merit, the Hill-Douglas bill is moving too slowly toward final passage—bogged down behind more sensational issues which lately have involved Congress in wrangling. Firm expressions of support from still more individuals and organizations might speed its approval, however, and the need is urgent enough to warrant that popular appeal.

Make Meharry Medical College a Southern Regional Educational Institution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the meeting in Washington yesterday of southern governors in connection with the providing of regional educational institutions was a momentous one from the point of view of harmony, unanimity, and cooperation—all present favored the proposal for providing regional schools of higher learning in the South. There were no dissents or disagreements. The governors of 15 Southern States have completed action upon a compact to expand educational facilities for Negro students desiring to take advanced educational training in Southern States. There remain only two steps to be completed to bring this forward and progressive move into reality, namely, approval by Congress of House Joint Resolution 334, giving the consent of Congress to the compact of the Southern States on regional education, and two, passage by the respective legislatures of bills approving the joint compact for the purpose indicated.

Included within the plan is a specific provision for the acquisition by the States of Meharry Medical College, a class A medical and dental college for Negro students in Nashville, Tenn., to be jointly owned and operated by the Southern States. This is but a forerunner of other projects to benefit professional students throughout the South. Plans are under way for the establishment of schools of veterinary, science, forestry, agriculture, and schools providing other specialized training. The States and Federal Government should cooperate to the fullest extent in providing adequate educational opportunities. The approval by Congress of the pending resolution will facilitate this movement and certainly constitute a forward step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I desire to include two editorials from leading newspapers in Tennessee, namely, the Nashville Tennessean and the Nashville Banner, concerning the acquisition of Meharry Medical College by the Southern States and its operation under the regional educational plan.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean of February 10, 1948]

THE NEW ERA

The signing of a compact between southern governors for the establishment and support of regional institutions of higher education for Negroes and whites marks a historic advance for this portion of the country.

Nine governors have signed the compact. Four others have signified their willingness to do so.

Enabling action by State legislatures and Congress is still necessary before the plan begins to function, but no serious opposition is expected.

Governor McCord, of Tennessee, is to be commended for the leadership he has exercised in working up the plan and promoting its adoption.

Nashville in particular is pleased that the compact will assure continuation of Meharry Medical College for Negroes here and a widening of its influence and activity.

The Southern States have long been plagued by educational headaches. Paucity of funds and the need for maintaining dual facilities have been the chief stumbling blocks in the way of educational adequacy.

The new era opening for the South has been reached by changing from sectionalism to regionalism. It is a happy and progressive step which may well lead to others.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of February 14, 1948]

OPPORTUNITY KNOCKS VIA MEHARRY PLAN

There is every good reason for the Meharry Medical College plan—transition into a regional school, for use of all the Southern States—to be adopted. There is every good reason for it to succeed.

It was approved in substance when Gov. Jim McCord proposed it last October before the Southern Governors Conference. The idea was sound, and recognized as the ideal solution to a great present and growing need.

It received further substantiation, as a practical, worth-while, forward step, when five southern governors—meeting here as the committee on regional education—inspected the Meharry plant and went into further details of the plan. And we anticipate that when this committee makes its report to the Southern Governors Conference that body will sanction it and go to work on it immediately for full materialization.

It merits that instant treatment to clear whatever hurdles remain; as, for instance, congressional approval, which is necessary for any interstate commitments of appropriations and spending. As another instance, sanction by the State legislatures whereby the States in question can avail themselves of it.

We have said time and again that the South can solve any problem confronting it; that such problems—relating to individual States or to States regionally—belong in hands familiar with them and capable of handling them intelligently, without the handicap of kibitzing, intrusion, interference from afar. We have said that the South is not remiss on matters of duty toward its citizens. And these points bear repetition.

Institutional facilities exist to be used for this purpose. Meharry Medical College exists to train doctors, nurses, dentists, etc., as it has trained them and sent them out to work with distinction all over the United States. The record of its achievement is excellent, and used on the grand scale contemplated in this plan, the record of usefulness can be tremendously magnified.

And use of this plan with respect to Meharry, or even contemplation of the plan in the light of what it can accomplish through that institution, suggests its worth in the whole field of higher education. For the South possesses other great institutions of Negro education where a similar working plan can be devised.

The South, we are very sure, is in favor of that.

Meharry's favor of it speaks for itself. Meharry needs the support this plan would provide, enabling it to meet an economic situation so serious that it has been threatened with closing unless help can be secured. Help by the means suggested is the best that could be forthcoming.

Meharry has discharged its responsibilities as an institution, and admirably. The Southern States can discharge a like responsibility by availing themselves of the facilities at hand.

The plan is available, and the facilities are available. Let's use them. Let's speed this plan into full maturity.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an address given by the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE, at the dedication service on European recovery program at the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, Sunday, February 22, 1948. The remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] follow:

Everyone hopes that a European recovery program will succeed. Most of us believe that it can succeed. But we all know that it can fail.

For its success—for the European economy to be restored, or, more accurately, remade, so that it can maintain itself—many difficult problems must be solved, many uncertainties must be happily resolved.

I am confident that shortly Congress will authorize, and the great weight of American

opinion will support, an adequate and workable European recovery program. We shall do so soberly, with full recognition of the difficulties, with full appreciation of the uncertainties, with full awareness of the heavy cost. And because this is so, I believe that when the record of our century is written, the participation by the United States in the European recovery program will be recognized as one of the great conscious acts of faith in all history.

It is well, I think, that we should ourselves recognize that this is so. Nor does it detract from the importance of the act or lessen its significance that it is, as I am convinced it is, the most effective action we can take in the interest of our national security or for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a peaceful world. There is nothing unworthy in either of these objectives.

But even more important than the establishment and maintenance of a peaceful world is the kind of world we are able to maintain.

Peace and order, of a sort, can exist under a dictatorship. Quiet and stability can be maintained, or enforced, in a society which denies the dignity of the individual, which denies the existence of the human soul, which denies God.

It is not extravagant to believe, as I do, that the maintenance and restoration of these transcendent values in many parts, if not all, of western Europe depends upon the successful working out of the European recovery program. How much of our heritage of freedom had its origin in these very countries. How appropriate that we should now be able, in a measure, to repay that debt.

In planning and in carrying out the European recovery program, we must, of course, be concerned for the most part with cold, impersonal economic facts. Then, too, the magnitude of the problem requires that the program be essentially a relationship between governments, as opposed to relationships between the peoples of one nation and those of other nations. It is, therefore, good that we should pause from time to time, as we do today, to consider the moral aspects of the matter and the spiritual factors which are involved.

But faith without works is vain. And so I suggest that in this meeting of dedication today we should not be content with dedicating ourselves to thinking correct thoughts about the European recovery program and its high purposes and objectives. Each of us should also dedicate himself to the most effective participation of which he, as an individual, is capable in the effort to insure the success of the program.

One obvious form of such participation can be to urge and support sound action by our elected representatives in authorizing and administering the program insofar as the United States is concerned. Important as such activity is, however, we cannot stop there. It is clear beyond a question that the success or failure of the program, in the final analysis, depends not only upon what we in the United States or our Government does, but that it depends even more upon what is done in London, Paris, Rome, and the other capitals of Europe and upon what is done by the peoples of the European countries themselves.

Consider, for a moment, what must be accomplished to insure the success of the program.

Trade barriers between the nations of Europe must be broken down, internationally integrated industrial and agricultural production must be brought about, internationally integrated production of electric power and transportation and communication are vitally required. A high level of trade between eastern and western Europe—throughout the iron curtain, if you will—as well as with the rest of the world must be established. All this, in addition to the establishment within each country of sound fiscal policies and the development within each country of its own agricultural and industrial potential to a level far higher than ever before existed. And, further, conditions of political stability must be maintained.

To accomplish these results requires that the peoples of Europe rise above national aspirations, prides, and jealousies which have been nurtured for centuries. The program cannot succeed unless this is done. Many countries will want—indeed, they have already requested—independent self-sufficient basic industries; for example, a steel industry, an electric power industry, and the like. These requests cannot be granted except insofar as they fit into an integrated international program and many of them will have to be denied.

To induce the various countries and their peoples to accept such disappointments as a necessary contribution to the common effort will be a task of extraordinary difficulty. Especially is this so because the forces interested only in destroying the program will appeal to all the most selfish aspirations, to all the worst motives, to all the basest instincts of peoples whose moral and spiritual strength has already been greatly weakened by the ordeal through which they have gone and which they are still undergoing. They will be most susceptible to the suggestion that the refusal to grant to their particular countries the full measure and exact kinds of assistance which accord with their individual narrow desires represents but another attempt at imperialist dictation by the great colossus of the West.

This, I am convinced, is the very heart of the problem. Success or failure of the European recovery program, with all that it means to the peoples of Europe, to us and to the world, depends, first, upon bringing home to the peoples of Europe a clear understanding of the communal effort which is required, and, second, upon persuading them that wholehearted participation in that communal effort is in their own best interests.

It is here that the greatest service by the American private citizen is possible. Governmental efforts through the Voice of America and otherwise must be employed to the greatest possible extent. But they alone cannot succeed. Only by innumerable, direct, personal contacts between the people of America and the people of Europe can the latter be persuaded, first, of our own good intentions in the matter and, second, of the vital part which they themselves must play.

There are many ways by which the human relationships between our peoples and the peoples of the participating countries can be improved; by which we can avoid and eliminate where it exists, the natural resentment which one obliged to accept help from another feels toward his benefactor, the cynical belief that our actions are motivated essentially by self-interest which has given rise in certain quarters to the complaint that Uncle helps himself.

The Friendship Train, for example, is an outstanding instance of personal contact between the peoples of America and of Europe. It had, I am told, a most impressive effect abroad. American communities have adopted European towns and villages and have helped them to rebuild. On a less ambitious scale, American families have adopted European families or groups of European children. The rebuilding of bombed or ruined churches and synagogues in Europe, with the direct help of individual Christian and Jewish congregations in this country is another example of the manner in which the individual American can directly reach the individual European and become not only a source of material help but a moral and spiritual inspiration as well.

Activities of this sort should be continued and broadened. In addition, direct personal contacts between individual Americans and individual Europeans and between representatives of American churches, schools, the press, industrial and labor organizations, professional and scientific societies, libraries, clubs, service, fraternal, and other organizations and groups with their European counterparts are of vital importance. Everyone of us who is associated with any such organization should see that such contacts are established on every possible occasion. Through such personal communication, more effectively than through any governmental action, propaganda, or organized publicity, can the people of this country bring to the people of Europe, and especially to those in positions of leadership in private as well as in public life, an understanding of what the European recovery program requires on the part of their peoples and their governments. A suggestion to which the present occasion naturally gives rise is that there might be organized on the widest possible scale in the churches of Europe services of dedication to the principles and purposes of the European recovery program similar to this service today.

The importance of activities of this sort to the success of the program cannot, in my opinion, be exaggerated. Without the human relationships, the intellectual understanding of the problem, and the moral and spiritual lift which they alone can engender, I do not see how the program can succeed. Herein lies the responsibility of the individual American private citizen, the challenge which no one of us can fail to meet.

China Needs Military Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, no less an authority than General Chennault says that China must have military help if she is to survive as a free nation. He is willing to return to this country and testify before a House committee. As part of my remarks I include an article by Mr. Farnsworth which appeared in the Washington News on February 24.

AID FOR CHINESE IS UNITED STATES DEFENSE, SAYS CHENNAULT

(By Clyde A Farnsworth)

SHANGHAI, February 24.—The question of aiding China has become a question of defending the United States, Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault said today in an interview.

"Economic assistance now planned may help, but at best it will be only a partial answer to this urgent problem unless it is preceded or accompanied by decisive military help," said the retired general who formerly was chief of the Flying Tigers.

General Chennault, who may be invited to Washington to testify on the China aid program now before Congress, said he would be happy to accept such an invitation.

General Chennault's view is that Korea, where a Sovietized state was proclaimed last week, and Manchuria, where one may be proclaimed soon unless China gets military assistance, are the eastern anchor of the strategic belt across Asia which Russia wants to control in order to have freedom of action in Europe.

For that reason he believes a strong, friendly China could be America's greatest insurance against a third world war.

"TIME FUZE"

The situation in Manchuria, where the Nationalist government has been losing to Chinese Communists armed by Russia with captured Japanese weapons caused General Chennault to write in a dispatch to the Scripps-Howard newspapers 3 weeks ago that the time fuze of World War III was burning there.

He recommended American help for China—arms and ammunition and other supplies, and a corps of air and ground technicians to provide military advice.

The Chennault dispatch preceded presentation of the State Department's program of non-military aid for China.

The State Department's subsequent disclosure of new contracts for the sale of surplus American goods to China left General Chennault of the opinion that the United States Government is still not facing the realities of the situation here.

"Surplus war goods will not save Manchuria and probably will not save China," he said, "but our surplus talent of technical, tactical and strategical advice and direction might.

"China, in a strategical sense, is a defense frontier of the United States. A defense frontier when threatened deserves more than surplus goods and token economic assistance.

"DOWN A RAT HOLE

"Without intelligent military support to insure the continuity of the Nanking Government—which is the only government presently possible in China except a Communist puppet regime—General Marshall's proposed $570,000,000 may disappear like sand down a rat hole—a Communist rat hole.

"Difficulties of the Chinese Government are almost beyond comprehension, through no fault of its own. As, for example, the situation in Manchuria. There the Central Government has been trying almost hopelessly to undo our own misstep at Yalta.

"The time has passed for Americans to quibble over helping the Chinese Government because it fails to come up to their highest expectations. It is no longer a question of whether we should help China. It has become a greater question of whether we should help ourselves—whether we can defend ourselves on the Asiatic continent."

General Chennault said it was "questionable" whether the American position in Japan could be maintained with China lost.

"The first thing Washington should do is to take the handcuffs off the American Advisory Group," the general said. "As matters stand, the advisory mission gives the false impression that the United States is trying to help China militarily. Actually they have a dozen officers with Chinese troops in one troop training camp in Formosa, hundreds of miles from China's battlegrounds."

General Chennault thought that military advice alone, even if rendered at China's battlefronts, would prove insufficient. He said the situation called for "a bold Chinese-American partnership" in both advice and direction of China's efforts in aerial and ground warfare as well as in such subsidiary services as communications and supply.

"Moreover this partnership must be backed up by unstinting shipments of war matériel and a strong program of economic rehabilitation.

"Let's quit arguing about whether Nanking is 'reactionary' or whether Chinese Communists are 'agrarian' reformers," he said.

"Facts deny both propositions, I believe, but even that doesn't matter now. What does matter is that the United States is fast losing China as a defense position against world communism."

Curb Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the New England Homestead of February 14, 1948:

During the war the Nation was subject to controls of many kinds. We gave a sigh of relief when they were lifted and hoped that they were gone for good, but once again we are threatened with a renewal for this or that purpose. We have learned from past experience that once Washington starts on control measures, there is no end to their operations, for one measure inevitably leads to another, and each new control means an army of controlists and an anything but happy public. Remember what happened in Russia and in Germany, and what's happening in Britain today under socialistic control. It could happen here. Our past experience with Government control and its resulting racketeering and black-market operations should not be forgotten. We need more statesmen and fewer politicians down Washington way.

AMVETS Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an address delivered over radio station WHO, Des Moines, Iowa, on January 25, 1948, by Edgar C. Corry, Jr., national commander of the AMVETS:

This is the third winter of a peace which really is not a peace. It is the third winter which finds the world tottering on the brink of uncertainty about the future. There is a growing, permeating fear almost everywhere that another war will come. It is neither a pretty nor a welcome outlook. But where and when and under what circumstances war will come again, those apparently are the only factors missing insofar as an increasingly great number of people are concerned.

With each passing moment, with each tick of the clock, more and more individuals and nations are ready to give up the ghost of our newborn, hard-won peace which began with the end of World War II. Here and now, however, let me say that AMVETS do not believe that another war is coming. We know within our hearts, because of the sacrifices already made by so many of our comrades of War II, that another war must not come. And it need not come if we will strive as hard, as sincerely, for a permanent, workable peace as we did to win the military victory in the late global conflict.

It is axiomatic that it is better to win than to lose a war—but in some ways, not much better. For no one ever really wins a war. America paid a staggering price for victory—she paid with the lives of her young men; she paid by fantastically draining her natural resources, she paid by placing an astronomical burden on her present citizenry and upon generations yet to come. Such was the price of our victory. But victory was not just an empty cause, for today the world is free of the totalitarianism of the Nazis and the Fascists. And once again we have unequivocal proof that when America fights, she fights for humanity.

We of AMVETS know, as does every straight-thinking American, that another war could—perhaps would—mean the end of our civilization. With such a prospect in the event of another conflict, the just cause (that is the human cause) does not become one for which to fight a war. The just cause now becomes the matter of securing and maintaining a peace—a peace that must work.

Before going any further, gentlemen, let us agree on a definition for the word peace. According to Webster, there are several definitions—one being freedom from war. If we accept this definition, then the United States is at peace and the world is at peace. Certainly there are racial strifes, but there has been no formal declaration of war—therefore the world must be at peace. But Webster has another definition. He says peace is spiritual content. And I think if you ask the man on the street, he will agree with this last definition according to which there is practically no peace anywhere.

The fact that the American public now accepts this second definition is enough to restore our faith in miracles for it proves that our country has come of age. It proves that the sense of responsibility which took us into the last war has developed into an adult conception of the Golden Rule. It proves that this country has discarded isolationism and has assumed her rightful place in the family of nations. I use the word "family" advisedly for we now believe in a brotherhood of man that spans national boundaries.

Maybe you are thinking—but haven't we always believed in being our brother's keeper? This country was founded on a completely new philosophy of individual liberty and personal security, which was established in our remarkable Constitution and Bill of Rights. With the Monroe Doctrine, we proceeded one step further by proclaiming national integrity and freedom from aggression for this continent and the Americas to our south. In World War I we advanced again. We had so broadened our concepts that this country was fighting to make the whole world safe for democracy. We won that war but we lost the peace. We failed to achieve our great aim because we weren't big enough to accept the rules of the game. We would not join the League of Nations, we slammed our door in the face of the world and retreated back to our ideas of 1800. So immersed were we in our own selfish problems that we ridiculed and humiliated the men in this country who tried to awaken us in the thirties to what was going on all around us. We paid no attention to our military leaders, our scientific leaders, our educators, and certainly not to our spiritual leaders. The physical fact that we were separated by two oceans led us to believe that we were chosen people and that we could remain aloof from human misery and demagogs that fattened on it. It took a bomb in our own backyard to show us what deluded fools we had been.

Within a year this country reversed its train of thought. Within a year we decided that maybe the peoples of the world were worthy of the rights we so cherished for ourselves. We proclaimed that all people everywhere were entitled to the four freedoms, and we became quite suspicious of the fact that if the peoples of the world lacked these four freedoms that we could not hang onto them ourselves for long. While the war was still being fought and its outcome unknown we

fostered and participated in the establishment of the United Nations. Now, at last, we sincerely believe we are our brother's keeper.

So the formal fighting has been terminated for more than 2 years, but America knows no spiritual content. Thank God. And why doesn't she? Because she has a world conscience now. We promised the four freedoms to the world, and we are responsible for making them available. We are disturbed because they seem further from attainment than they did in 1945. We know that two-thirds of the world is starving. We know that freedom of worship has died everywhere the Red Army has put its foot; the Arabs and Jews in the Holy Land are murdering each other with a holy war promised. The Indians are massacring each other in the name of their respective gods.

What does freedom of speech mean to a Pole, a Lithuanian, a Finn, a Czech, a Hungarian, a Bulgarian, a Yugoslavian, a Greek, an Indonesian, or a Russian for that matter—quick death if he is lucky.

As far as freedom from fear is concerned, the whole world seems to be scared stiff. There is informal war on dozens of shifting fronts. Europe is afraid of being in the middle of another giant conflict. Russia is scared of us and the atomic bomb, and we are scared of Russia and the day when she will have it.

What to do about it? We have made our decision and there is no retreat. We must have faith in the success of the United Nations. We must be ready to carry out any decisions reached by that body. AMVETS pledge their aid wherever it is needed. But the United Nations alone is not enough. The country as a whole must—systematically and dynamically—plan for peace. AMVETS believe at least three sets of blueprints are necessary. One for Asia, one for Europe, and one for America.

The plan for Asia does not seem to exist—it has been sadly neglected, and it is high time that Congress and the people of this country together remember the pledges we have made, and the Russians have made to each other and to China and Korea. Millions of other people of the Orient are crying for the rights which we take for granted.

A master plan for Europe is well under way. To the great credit of our Congress and our people, we are ready to assume our full share and more for the responsibility of the economic recovery of Europe. That the Marshall plan will cost billions of dollars is a foregone conclusion. But to spend a relatively few billions now, as compared with countless billions of dollars and millions of lives in another war is not only the wise course, it is the only course. But there is a calculated risk in the Marshall plan. It will achieve its purpose only if the money and goods are so used as to prime the economic pump of Europe to the point where the recipients can work out there own peace, their own spiritual content. Only thus can the quickening march of communism be stopped. Europeans will be glad to stop it. Let us not worry too greatly about the risk. Congress must take proper steps to insure the wise administration of these funds and we will remember that this country was built by men who took risks, pioneers who were not afraid of failure, scientists who were not afraid of the truth, thinkers who were not afraid of progress, fighting men who were not afraid to die for a faith, and people as you and I who strive to live in the image of the Son of God.

The third plan for peace pertains to America. We have never planned for peace. The President of the United States believed this to be of primary importance when he appointed an Advisory Commission headed by Karl T. Compton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. This Commission, in its report of May 29, 1947, said that to have national security which AMVETS interpret to mean national peace, we must have the following:

1. A strong, united, healthy, and informed Nation.
2. A coordinated intelligence service.
3. Scientific research and development.
4. Industrial mobilization.
5. A striking air force.
6. Maintenance of the regular Army, Navy, Air Forces, Marine Corps, and Merchant Marine.
7. Unification of the armed forces.
8. Universal training.

AMVETS wholeheartedly pledges its entire support to the foregoing recommendations of the Compton report. Of these 8 points, only universal military training is controversial. The big cry against it is that the need for universal military training implies the belief that war is inevitable. Surely the veterans of this war would be the last to accept the concept of the inevitability of armed conflict. We don't want to fight another war. We don't want our sons to fight another war. We just don't believe that peace is inevitable. Even at the present moment, those allies who cooperate so closely just a couple of years ago are now stalemated in trying to work out a just peace. It is not inevitable that men will agree unanimously. The United Nations is still blocked by the veto power, there is no world police force, there is still no universal control of atomic energy. AMVETS agree with the Compton report which says "It is apparent from the lessons of history and from the experience of the postwar period that the only way in which we can lend authority to our voice in international affairs and inspire confidence in the ability of the United Nations to enforce peace is to maintain our armed forces at a level of efficiency and comprehensiveness that will defy challenge by any would-be aggressor."

Universal military training as conceived by the Compton report is not conscription, it is not training for militarism, it is not training for aggression. On the contrary, it introduces a completely new concept to the world because it is training for defense, it is training for responsibility, it is training for world peace.

History has taught us the hard way that weakness invites attack. England and France practically invited Hitler to march into the Ruhr, Austria, the Sudeten Land, and Czechoslovakia because they were in no position to enforce a command to halt. Hitler's eagerness for war increased as his estimate of the military strength of the democracies decreased.

It was this same logic that guided the Japanese war lords when they decided to attack Pearl Harbor. We know now that the democracies could have prevented this past war had they not been compelled to compromise, compromise, compromise with totalitarian aggressors because of their military impotency. Without the strength to back up our moral position or discharge our international commitments, we are impotent in a world where force is still, unfortunately, a determinant of the right.

Yet all of these plans and blueprints are futile if America does not have a rededication of faith. For faith, not fear must move us. At no other time of the year is the story of faith more graphically told than during the Christmas season. At no time in history has the need of faith, and the absence of fear been more great.

I would like to quote from Judge Learned Hand:

"The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias. The spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded. The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, near 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten: that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

Palestine Partition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, we are about to muddle into world war III meddling in other people's business. American leadership in the partition of Palestine was a shameful betrayal of the best interests of the American people. It is sincerely hoped by most Americans that the Security Council of the United Nations will not follow the recommendation of the United Nations Assembly and will not adopt or implement their recommendation for a partition of Palestine.

Our action in this matter has been motivated by cheap political considerations. Mr. Ernest Lindley, a leading New Deal columnist, writing in a leading New Deal paper, the Washington Post, on last December 12 made this damaging admission:

The policy and tactics of the United States in the Palestine controversy were, of course, influenced greatly by American Zionists. Domestic politics rather than a considered analysis of the interests of the United States has been the predominant factor in our policy concerning Palestine.

In the Evening Star of yesterday appeared a sound, thought-provoking editorial on this subject as follows:

DANGEROUS POLITICS

With the Security Council scheduled to take up the Palestine partition question tomorrow, current news reports reveal the extent of the political pressure which is being brought to bear against President Truman to make him approach this problem from a partisan political point of view.

The President is being told by his New York advisers that he cannot hope to keep that State with its 47 electoral votes in the Democratic column this November unless he acts decisively and promptly to lift the embargo on the shipment of arms to the Jews in Palestine and to bring about the sending of a United Nations police force to enforce partition. This is simply another way of saying that the President will lose the Jewish vote unless he meets this condition.

It seems quite likely that these warnings are well founded, for the Jewish vote in New York is big enough to affect the outcome of an election, and the result of the recent special election in the Bronx indicates that the Jews will vote for Henry Wallace instead of the President if their demands with respect to Palestine are not satisfied. If that should happen, it is a virtual certainty that the Republican Presidential candidate will carry New York State.

There is nothing new about this situation, of course, for minority groups in this country have often used their strategically placed

political power to achieve special ends. But it becomes an especially serious matter in this instance because of the very real danger that the interest of the Jews in the partition of Palestine may cut across other interests that are vital to the security of the United States.

As yet there has been no adequate public examination of this aspect of the problem. Presumably all of the ramifications have been explored during the course of the soul-searching which has been going on within the administration. But the final conclusions and the reasons for them have not yet been brought into the open for public scrutiny.

It should be perfectly evident that there is a national risk in lifting the embargo, in sending an armed force to fight the Arabs or in pursuing any course that might come to mind in this exceedingly difficult situation. And in making our final decision this element of risk should not be underestimated.

It would be compounding the danger to proceed on the assumption apparently entertained by Senator TAFT that a "moderate force" would be adequate to cope with the Arabs. If the British experience means anything, a very substantial force would be needed. We will also be compounding the danger if the decision as to our stand in the Security Council, which must finally be made by the President, is dictated by the question of whether the Democrats are to win or lose New York State this fall. If ever there was a problem which ought to be decided on the most careful appraisal of where our national interests lie—and that, in the long run, includes the interests of the Jews—this is it.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the principles involved in this controversy, America is going to suffer a tremendous economic loss. Leading Arabian statesmen from several of the Arabic nations in the Palestine area have assured me that when America moves into this area to enforce partition, all of our oil concessions will immediately be canceled.

On February 22, 1948, in the Wichita Daily Times, of my home city of Wichita Falls, appeared the following article based on reports of Mr. Oscar Burden:

BLACK DYNAMITE IN ARABIA COULD ROCK WORLD INTO NEW WAR, SAYS WICHITAN

(By Jack Harmon)

Black liquid dynamite coursing through Arabian subterranean shelves could rock the world again in war, according to Oscar R. Burden, 2201 Berkeley, who has the ticklish job of harnessing that oil for its ride to market.

Burden recently returned from almost 8 months in Beirut, Lebanon, where he has headquarters as manager of the western division of the Trans-Arabia Pipe Line Co.

In a land where the are only the rich and the poor, with no middle class—and Russia is pushing her quiet fight for a toehold against England, the United States, and other independent countries—it is Burden's job to lay pipe that will carry oil to market.

But in all the time he was there—from July 1947 until February 11, 1948—no pipe was laid in his western division.

The tap line, as he calls it, is to run from the Persian Gulf in Arabia to the Mediterranean, with the terminal point in Lebanon.

BUILT AIRPORTS

"But we hardly began to complete our objectives," he explained. During the time spent there, Burden said his men "worked on a couple of airports for the Government of Lebanon," did right-of-way work and constructed roads.

Currently their pipe-laying job is stalemated.

"We have considerable equipment stored out in the desert, guarded by the Arab Legion, a group of soldiers from Transjordan that is very well organized and competent," he explained. "The balance of our equipment is stored in Beirut in readiness to take to the line when we have permission to do so."

Burden is hopeful permission may be granted within the 60 days he plans to remain in the United States and confer with Trans-Arabia Pipe Line officials in San Francisco, Houston, or Tulsa.

Syria is holding out on permission to lay pipe, said Burden, a development which came only with the United States' move to have Palestine partitioned. "My opinion might not be in accord with the Government (of the United States)," he said, "but I speak as I see it there."

Then he brought out that Syria never ratified the convention—as they call a contract—made by the Government heads with the pipe line company. The convention was agreed upon by the President and Prime Minister, but not by the Parliament.

Thus efforts to lay pipe across Syria were halted.

APPROVAL PROBABLE

Now in session is the Arab League, composed of representatives from all Arabian countries, he said. Permission already had been granted by the countries of Lebanon, Transjordan, and Arabia. At the meeting in Cairo, it is very likely approval of the line construction will be given, Burden prophesied.

"Right now, we're concentrating effort on the east end in Arabia near the Persian Gulf until we see the results of the meeting in Cairo and what Syria does in the next parliament convening in March," he said.

Burden believes Syria balked because of a belief that "the United States put pressure on smaller nations, influencing them to approve partitioning of Palestine."

"While they (Syria) were very friendly and cooperative when we first went there, they are now just the reverse," he added and said the change of attitude occurred about the time the United States expressed itself on the Palestine partition.

"If Syria doesn't ratify the convention," he offered, "it is very possible the route will go to Alexandria or Port Said in Egypt; that would lengthen the line by considerable miles and involve crossing the Suez Canal."

Then there would be only two countries to deal with—Arabia and Egypt. But the Lebanese, "who will benefit from two large refineries and terminals, are very anxious for us to construct the line, it means so much to them," Burden explained.

OIL MEANS A LOT

Oil means a lot to that country, he pointed out. "If you shut off oil for 1 day there, everything stops. If they stop the sale of petrol, as they call gasoline, business comes almost to a standstill, for they depend on it for transportation."

"When I left there they already were rationing gasoline," Burden said. He reported passing service stations where people were lined up for blocks waiting to get their petrol.

Countries affected by the pipe line are two kingdoms, Arabia and Transjordan; two republics, Syria and Lebanon; and Palestine.

"If a war starts," he predicts, "it will begin there in the Middle East. Russia would like to have that oil."

In Beirut, the temperature is ideal. According to official government figures that cover the last 30 years, the temperature has never been as low as freezing there and seldom much over 100 degrees.

Right now, Burden said, bananas and oranges are plentiful and in full fruit. Gorgeous flowers are prolific and the climate of that section attracts many persons to seashore beaches to lounge and soak up the sun or swim in tepid waters.

Thirty minutes away are snow-covered mountains. In a half hour the vacationist can change from a mild climate to one of ice and snow. After climbing mountain roads which snowplows keep open, there is skiing or bobsledding while looking down on beaches left shortly before.

Mr. Burden is an outstanding businessman who writes from his experiences in Beirut.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that America should admit she has made a mistake. For the sake of American lives and of American principles, it is hoped that the Security Council, now debating this question, will not accept the fallacious and revolutionary recommendation of the United Nations Assembly. In the sentiments expressed herein I am satisfied the vast majority of the American people concur.

The Socialist's Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose an editorial entitled "Czechoslovakia," appearing in today's Washington Post which I feel would be better entitled "The Socialist Dilemma." It shows the fifth-column position in which the socialists find themselves and illustrates the fact that these Socialists are in reality what might be termed "50-percent Communists."

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

At this writing it appears likely that the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia will be consummated without direct intervention by the Red army, despite the courageous resistance by Dr. Benes and the apparent determination of the elements represented by the National Socialist Party to resist to the end. In Slovakia the Communists, through their control of the police and various important labor unions, appear to have obtained full control of the provincial administration and of the municipal government of Bratislava, the provincial capital. In Bohemia the situation is still confused, although there, too, the Communists through their control of the police seem to have gained the upper hand and to have arrested several National Socialist leaders, including Vladimir Krajina, secretary-general of the party.

The parliamentary situation, which is important only to the extent that Communist control of Parliament would give some pretense of legality to their seizure of power, is even more confused. President Benes remains firm in his refusal to accept the resignations of the non-Communist members of the cabinet and to accept the hand-picked ministry of the Communist Premier Gottwald. The tactics of the (Social Socialist Democratic) party in the crisis are extremely ambiguous and suggestive of a deep fission within the party itself. The Socialist ministers have declined to join the other non-Communist members in resigning from the Government, but the executive committee has called for a Government representative of all parties. The point is, of course, that a combination of Communists and Socialists could command a majority, which

would make possible Communist government by constitutional means which Dr. Benes would be legally obliged to accept.

Elsewhere, within the orbit of Russian power, and in many places outside it, the Communists have shown themselves extremely skillful either in retaining the support of the Socialists until the other parties had been eliminated or in reducing the Socialists to impotence by splitting their ranks. The reasons for this are not entirely clear, but they cannot be ascribed entirely to Communist intimidation. Part of it no doubt arises from a fear of reaction, and part of it from the fact that a party which must compete with the Communists for radical support cannot put itself in the position of seeming to be less radical than its rival.

It appears that, when confronted with the necessity, the Socialists find themselves unable or reluctant to choose between their much-affirmed devotion to parliamentary methods and their eagerness to hasten the advent of socialism. Or rather they have tended to delay the decision until a choice was no longer possible.

District of Columbia Home Rule Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take great pleasure in including therein a broadcast presented by the Evening Star, of Washington, over WMAL, entitled "News for Schools With Bill Coyle." This broadcast is brought right to the schoolrooms and is an effort to interest the young students in reviews of current events.

Recently this program was dedicated to a discussion of the proposed home-rule bill for the District of Columbia, H. R. 4902, and it was participated in by various young students 9 years of age.

I consider this a very interesting and constructive work because if the young people of the country become interested in the affairs of their city and Nation and are taught the principles of democracy, we need have little fear of the attacks of any other ideology.

I think that Bill Coyle and the Evening Star are to be highly commended for this constructive work and I am sure that my colleagues will be edified in reading this transcript of the broadcast concerning H. R. 4902.

The broadcast follows:

BILL COYLE. Good afternoon everyone, and welcome to another edition of News for Schools.

You'll certainly remember how the first part of this month the local headlines in the newspaper and on the radio were given over to hearings on the District of Columbia home rule bill that was proposed by Congressman AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey.

The hearings were held on Capitol Hill and have now been completed. But while they were going on it seemed that everyone in the District had a chance to say something about this home rule plan—either for it or against it.

And what could you expect? It has been 74 years since the people of the District of Columbia have had a chance to vote. No wonder there was so much interest in this bill.

But those hearings were devoted to the views of the grown-up leaders in the great community of our Nation's Capital. These grown-ups were businessmen, members of the Board of Education—the District Commissioners themselves, heads of civic clubs and many others. What isn't generally known is the fact that this whole business of home rule also was a big topic among the school students of the Nation's Capital. To them home rule is an important thing, too; because if home rule should come to the District these young people in a few years would find themselves the citizens doing the voting, who would be the citizens whom thousands of District residents might even some day elect to an office in the District of Columbia.

So why not give the school students an opportunity to be heard? Well, today we have that special hearing, all for their benefit. And now we are ready for that special hearing—just as if we were conducting it up on Capitol Hill with the subcommittee.

One of the most active groups in discussing the home rule bill and plans for a vote for the District of Columbia has been one made up of several young students at the Truesdell School. They represent the 4–A–B class at Truesdell, and their teachers, Miss Mandras and Mr. Israel. Miss Brown, principal of Truesdell, gave them permission to journey down to the radio station today to present their views.

So we have an important delegation on hand, and we're going to conduct this thing just as if it were a regular hearing, so that the voice of the 9-year older in the District of Columbia can be heard all around the town.

And now, for a little background on the discussion of news in the classroom. First of all, here is our first witness.

ELLEN ANTHOLIS. My name is Ellen Antholis, 9 years old, of 5201 Illinois Avenue NW. Since we've been in the fourth grade, we have been having news discussions twice or three times a week, besides listening to News for Schools each Thursday. We talk about events which take place at home, in the United States, and throughout the world.

One day a few weeks ago, as our class was looking over page 1 of a Washington newspaper, one of our classmates read a line about home rule. When our teacher asked us about it, most of us thought it referred to rules for each of our homes. Our teacher told us to check on it; so we decided to bring in news articles about it. As we brought in the clippings and discussed them, we learned that the plan referred to self-government for the people of Washington. Then we started a news booklet, in which we pasted each clipping.

In each discussion we began to express our opinion about the Auchincloss-Ball home-rule plan. It was quite difficult to understand.

BILL COYLE. Thank you, Ellen. That was very nicely presented. It certainly looks like people in the fourth grade are interested in the home rule along with everybody else.

And now for a few important points of the bill to be discussed by our next witness.

JUDY REDDING. My name is Judy Redding, 9 years old, of 713 Ingraham Street NW.

We knew that as fourth graders it would be impossible for us to learn about every detail of the bill. But we got help from news programs on the radio, news articles from the newspaper, our class discussions, and facts our parents and teachers told us. These are the main points of the Auchincloss-Ball bill we learned about:

1. All adults over 21, except for persons in prison or mental hospitals, who have lived in Washington at least 1 year, would have the right to elect a council of 12.

2. Legal residents of other States who live here would be voters, too.

3. The council of 12 would choose a city manager.

4. The city manager would have 12 departments to help in running the District government.

5. The Auchincloss-Ball bill would not give District of Columbia residents the right to vote for Senators, Representatives, or the President of the United States.

6. When the council and city manager wanted to pass a law, it would go to the House, Senate, and to the President of the United States.

7. If the President, Senate, and House didn't veto the plan, then it would become a District law.

BILL COYLE. Judy, that's very fine, and we are very much impressed by the fact that you have such a fine understanding of what this bill is all about. And now, for some information as to what the class has been doing, we turn to our third witness.

ROBERT MERIWETHER. My name is Robert Meriwether, 9 years old, of 5216 Fourth Street NW.

One day, after we had several news discussions, one of our classmates suggested we vote in our class to see if we favored the Auchincloss-Ball home-rule bill. Of 35 classmates, 32 of us voted, and we all favored the bill. Then another classmate suggested we write to Representative AUCHINCLOSS telling him about our vote. We decided to write to Bill Coyle, too, telling him about it.

When we wrote to Representative AUCHINCLOSS we told him that when we reached the age of 21 we would like to have the right to vote. One classmate told Mr. AUCHINCLOSS that we may seem quite young to decide now, but we hoped to know more about voting by the time we are 21.

Even though we voted unanimously for this home-rule bill, many of the fourth graders had different opinions about each part of the home-rule bill. These are some of the opinions we had.

BILL COYLE. All right, well, we certainly thank that fine witness for having presented us with some of the views of the class, and for informing us on some of the things the classmates have been doing in regard to the home-rule plan.

And now for the No. 4 witness; I wonder if he'll give his name and address.

MARTIN DILLON. I am Martin Dillon, aged 9, of 900 Longfellow Street NW.

The Constitution of the United States gives citizens the privilege of voting. This bill gives this right to Washington citizens. Some of us did feel that only legal residents should really be able to vote for District officials. People who live here but who vote in other States should vote in only their own States.

Our classmates favored having a council of 12. But a few of them favored perhaps 11 or an odd number, so whenever they had to vote, the vote would not come out even.

Most of our classmates hoped that perhaps the bill would include the right to vote for President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives, as well as city officials. Our classmates did favor this bill though, and hoped that later on District residents would get the vote for President, too.

BILL COYLE. Martin, we're much obliged to you. That was very nicely presented, and you had a lot of complicated opinions to report on the part of your classmates, and you did it very nicely.

Our poll of opinion continues on the Auchincloss home-rule bill, and we have witness No. 6 here now. I wonder what her name is.

JOAN YATES. My name is Joan Yates, age 9, of 5024 Seventh Place NW.

Some of the fourth graders suggested that instead of the council of 12 choosing the city manager, the council might suggest five candidates for city manager, then let the people elect the manager. One classmate favored having the people nominate five candidates for city manager, and have the council make the final choice. In regard to the passing of laws, our classmates thought it might be a good idea if a bill was signed by the President, Senate, and House of Representatives, if they favored it. Then the council would know that their plan for a bill was given an O. K.

BILL COYLE. All right. Now we're getting a very interesting story from our next witness. Thank you, Joan. And now, this is Kate, I believe.

All right, Kate, you just go right ahead. We're all set for you.

KATE BAIR. My name is Kate Bair. I live at 1106 Jefferson Street NW.

We certainly learned much about plans for home rule. And all of our classmates felt that Senator BALL and Representative AUCHINCLOSS were very thoughtful to give so much time working out a plan, and very clever for making it. The children in our class were so proud when we received personal letters from Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. We knew he was a kind person to take extra time to write to us. Here are some of letters we received.

BILL COYLE. Well, that's fine. And now, look who we have here. We have Paul Sandoe, who is going to read a couple of letters for us that came from Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

You go right ahead, Paul.

PAUL SANDOE. I am Paul Sandoe, age 9, of 5305 Seventh Street, NW.

This is Judy Redding's letter:

"Miss JUDY REDDING,
"Care of Mr. Israel's Class, Truesdell School, Ninth and Ingraham Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

"DEAR JUDY: Your letter of February 6 has reached me.

"I want you to know that I will do everything I can so that you will be able to vote when you grow up.

"Sincerely yours,
"JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS."

BILL COYLE. All right, now, let's have another letter, Paul.

PAUL SANDOE. This is Joan Yates' letter:

"Miss JOAN YATES,
"Care of Mr. Israel's Class, Truesdell School, Ninth and Ingraham Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

"DEAR JOAN: I have received your letter of February 6, in which you say you want to vote when you get to be 21.

"I will do everything within my power to have a bill passed by the Congress of the United States so that it will be possible for you.

"Sincerely yours,
"JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS."

BILL COYLE. All right, now let's have a final statement from you, Paul.

PAUL SANDOE. We hope all the boys and girls and their mothers and fathers will think about the home-rule plan.

BILL COYLE. We certainly thank all these fine witnesses for coming down here. I invited them to come and to present their views so that you could know and understand the amount of interest there is in home rule and a vote for the District of Columbia among the school children in our Nation's Capital.

Thank you, members of the 4–A–B class at the Truesdell School at Eighth and Ingraham Streets NW.

Washington Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a column entitled "Washington Scene," by George Dixon, published in the Washington Times-Herald on Tuesday, February 24, 1948, and syndicated by King Features Syndicate, Inc., of New York City:

Even the Jeffersonian-Jacksonian Democrats—I mean Democrats—are pretty well convinced, after the other night's fabulous fiasco, that they can't win with Harry S. Truman.

It cost them a C note per sucker, five cigarettes each thrown in free, to have this conviction pounded home. Mr. Big, as we call him for short, was pathetic.

"Sweetest little feller, everybody knows, doan know what to call him, but he's mighty lak' a rose." He's a sweet little feller, no denying, but they doan know what ta call him—except out on strikes.

The Jefferson-Jackson dough-raising dinner which was spread out over two hotels like a rooming-house tenant, bath convenient, aroused no enthusiasm except as spuriously manufactured. The only spontaneous applause all evening was for poker-faced James A. Farley, who is doing a better imitation of Ol' Man River this season than Jimmy Savo, not sayin' nothin'.

Incidentally, I grabbed J. Aloysius in the barber shop while he was having his kisser simonized for the party and asked if he still had any idea of running for Vice President. He gave me the bland Farley stare and said, "On what ticket?"

It was really sort of heartachy to hear the worthy Democrats, who had just been parading the banquet room with placards proclaiming Truman's reelection in a landslide, putting the slug on him the minute they escaped to the lobby. They should have been singing, "There'll be a two-time in the old town tonight."

Mostly, they didn't care whom they were talking to, either; they were so depressed by the events of the evening their usual political caution had fled. They told each other and anybody else listening they were dead unless they could find some way of ditching their titular leader—no mean chore, as any patronage seeker can tell you.

"He's a sweet guy," they kept repeating as they wandered from room to room trying to revive themselves with fast snorts. "But he can't open his mouth, even at the party's biggest dinner, without putting his foot in it."

They weren't referring only to the President's sad boner in paying tribute to Theodore Roosevelt when he meant Franklin. They felt he could have picked a more appropriate spot than this $100-a-plate champagne and terrapin feast to proclaim that the Democratic Party was the party of the common man, pledged to the undoing of the "statesmen of the stock exchange" and the forces of wealth and privilege.

All he had to do was look around to see such horny-handed and underprivileged tillers of the soil as James H. R. Cromwell, Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney, Ed (I'm Going to Keep on Speculating) Pauley, Tommy (The Cork) Corcoran, and the poor little kiddie from the oil tenements of Oklahoma, Perle (of Great Price) Mesta.

Incidentally I am afraid the privilege of feeding the Trumans on the cuff has swayed Mrs. Mesta. I seem to have the distinct recollection that she was a rip-snorting Republican when I met her at the Republican National Convention in Chicago 4 years ago.

But there she was at the Democrats' head table, one hand resting possessively on the shoulder of Margaret Truman. Toastmaster Barkley even called upon her to make a big bow for her splendid work in raising dough for the coffers of democracy.

Parenthetically the money men of the Democratic National Committee have been having a little trouble with Perle. The lady has been after certain big contributors to kick in with checks.

The money men, however, want these prize contributors to slip it to them in cash under the table because cash does not have to be accounted for and can be used advantageously wherever peculiar or ticklish political situations arise.

Every practical politician on both sides is hep to all this, but not Perle. And the money men feel she is too innocent, or anyway too talkative, to be told these political facts of life.

The lady, as honest as the day is long, is getting to be quite a problem in this respect, as one party stalwart observed wryly:

"She's the Republican Perle in the Democratic oyster."

I really felt sorry for Truman, the way they were conning him at both dinners, in the Statler and the Mayflower. I don't suppose he had a suspicion what they were saying behind his back.

I was glad I was at a table where we were just having fun, although I think I may have detected a note of sarcasm on the part of the blond and beautiful Mrs. Edward D. Madden, of New York.

Lifting a glass of champagne she nodded toward the orchestra, murmuring: "Dear me, how appropriate for here!"

The orchestra was playing: "The best things in life are free."

Fair Employment Practices and Anti-Lynching Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RILEY
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas there have been recently proposed in the Congress of the United States certain measures designed to curb unfair employment practices and to make lynching of persons a high Federal crime; and

Whereas the proponents of these measures do not take into consideration the great progress made by citizens of our Nation, individually and as States, toward achieving the harmony which these acts are intended to promote; and

Whereas the proposed measures seem impracticable and designed to thwart the sincere efforts of our people to settle these matters locally and amicably: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Euphradian Literary Society, a representative student organization at the University of South Carolina, That we are strongly opposed to the fair employment practices acts now pending before Congress, and the antilynching acts.

Brotherhood in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very able address on the subject "Brotherhood in

Action," delivered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], in Washington, D. C., on February 20, 1948, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I received your welcome invitation to speak here on brotherhood and began to prepare my remarks I tried to think of the most effective and forceful manner to present to you the real meaning of one of the great truths of American life—a truth that gives invincible strength and resiliency to our Nation and our people; the truth that we are of many races and creeds, but with loyalty to one Nation, one world, and one God.

What I shall say here tonight grows out of my deepest convictions as a believer in Christianity and American democracy. My remarks were prepared for this Sabbath and this house of worship, but they could be delivered in almost any church or cathedral in the land, for they express the ethical ideals and aspirations of all the great religions in our country. They could be made in almost any American town hall or legislature, for they conform to the self-evident truths about democracy which animate all the great parties and statesmen in our land. This unity behind our political and ethical aspirations—freedom and equality for all men—is our strength. The diversity and variety of American life does not weaken that unity; they enrich and enhance it. We represent all faiths, and we are Americans all, united by our belief in the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. It could not, and should not, be otherwise.

Every single American is here because he personally or his fathers before him sought escape from some type of oppression or intolerance in another land. All of us are descended from minority groups that have at some time deliberately sought to breathe the fresh air of freedom and decency in this new land. We are all human and fallible; we all have our quirks and prejudices—but deep down each of us who understands the web of history from which our country grew will check his intolerant impulses and whims.

Even before the Revolutionary War, the distinctive quality of the people in this new country was apparent to visitors from other shores. One of the earliest writers to report on America recounted his amazement at the way the new immigrants from England, France, Sweden, Germany—Anglicans, Methodists, Baptists, Catholics, and Jews—lived and worked in peace. "The American," he said, "is a new man who acts on new principles."

The qualities we cherish—boldness of mind, adventurousness of spirit, respect for the inherent dignity of all men regardless of status, the passion for fair play and a square deal for all, the devotion to living principles as against the dead hand of archaic custom—are not, of course, the monopoly of America or Americans, but I think it fair to say that they are here in fuller measure than they are in the lands from which our fathers came. We have only to recite the names of any representative list of contemporary great Americans—Roosevelt, Eisenhower, Nimitz, Murray, Baruch, Vandenberg, Wagner, LaGuardia, to mention only a few—to realize that no country but America could have produced them, no country but America could have developed and used so completely their great talents.

I say it is no accident that the greatest city in the world today is the one located on that little island in the Hudson where every nationality strain and religious faith, every shade of political coloration, is represented among its people. I think we will agree that New York's greatest mayor was LaGuardia and that he was the most typical of New Yorkers; typical even though he spent his first 25 years in Army posts among the mountain ranges of the West; typical even though his father was an Italian bandmaster and his mother a Jewess from Austria. Diversity is not a handicap to New York. It became one of the sources of New York's strength and greatness.

There are still too many among us who think that they own a copyright on Americanism, who think they can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion. They would establish first- and second-class citizenships. They would stigmatize as inferior Americans those who do not think like them, pray like them, or look like them.

They have forgotten that what the world respects and admires in America—what we here value and cherish as true Americanism—has grown out of the labor and creative effort of all Americans; that it was distilled out of the blood and sweat of the humble and the mighty, the heroes in our Hall of Fame and the forgotten men, the recent immigrants and the Mayflower descendants, those who built the railroads and dug our coal, as well as those who graced our White House and led our armies. They have forgotten that the genius of America's supremacy in the family of nations has been her leadership in releasing the creative energy of all her people, so that none would be denied the opportunity to contribute his strength and thought to the national welfare.

Ignorance, intolerance, and greed dissipate too much of the Nation's real strength. Prejudice rather than reason motivates too many actions. On this brotherhood observance I think it is axiomatic that we should seek out and endeavor to remove the fallacies that have led to the erection of barriers between people of different races, religions, and creeds.

I have said many times, and I wish to reiterate tonight, that racial and religious problems can never be solved by any one segment of our American life. Satisfactory solutions can be achieved only through moral cooperation of all men of good will.

The spirit of brotherhood can become a reality only through the cooperation of all peoples.

Anti-Semitism, one of our gravest problems, is a real challenge to our democratic society. I think there is more than a grain of truth in the assertion that anti-Semitism is a Christian problem, not a Jewish problem. But I believe the answer lies not in separate actions by Jews and Christians, but through the coordinated efforts of both. Anti-Semitism is an American problem, and Jews and Christians as Americans who are dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal must work together to wipe out this blot on the conscience of mankind.

Recently President Truman appointed a Committee on Civil Rights. He did not take the position that the protection of civil liberties was the principal responsibility of the Protestant white American majority. He regarded the responsibility as belonging to all Americans as Americans; and that committee was a true cross-section of American races, creeds, and political beliefs. The report of the committee has been one of the bravest and most heartening developments in the field of civil liberties. The committee did not merely view with alarm or utter pious hopes for reform. It pointed directly to many areas in American life where civil liberties were grossly violated, where the freedom and equality of opportunity promised by our Constitution had become dead letters, where discrimination based on race or religion was sapping the strength of our democracy. It proposed a series of specific, hard-hitting reforms in employment practices, in education, housing, and elsewhere. I hope that report will not become a "voice crying in the wilderness."

I was glad to see President Truman's recent message to the Congress in which he adopted the recommendations of the committee. President Truman reminded us that until all Americans have equal opportunities for jobs, for homes, for education, for health, and for political expression, we fail to realize the promise of American life. Said President Truman: "We seek answers which will embody the moral and spiritual elements of tolerance, unselfishness, and brotherhood upon which true freedom and opportunity must rest." I hope that the Congress will heed the President's recommendation.

The kind of brotherhood we honor here tonight is not merely an idea or a feeling. It is not a private matter which we should keep to ourselves. It must be a philosophy of communal action. It must animate our relations with our neighbors, our conduct in the office and the factory, the thinking of our educators and legislators. There are no innocent bystanders when injustice is perpetrated for all bystanders have a moral duty to use their powers to prevent injustice. True brotherhood will not tolerate injustice merely because it has been perpetrated by another, any more than the Good Samaritan could ignore the plight of a fellow human being.

Brotherhood must be an active, dynamic principle. It is the kind of spirit that was found on the troopship *Dorchester* just about 5 years ago today as it was sailing in North Atlantic waters with thousands of American GI's aboard. Shortly after midnight three Nazi torpedoes struck the heart of the *Dorchester* and soon she began to sink. On the deck of the ship were four chaplains—two Protestant, one Catholic, one Jewish. The records of the War Department tell us that the chaplains helped to quiet the panic among the passengers. They distributed spare life belts as long as the supply lasted. Finally, when four men came along who did not have any belts, the chaplains took off their own and forced them over the heads of the unwilling men. As the survivors were pulling away in their lifeboats, they could see the four chaplains still standing on the deck, feet braced and arms locked against the ever-deepening slant of the deck, praying—each in the tradition of his faith, each loyal to the noble ethics of his faith. When last seen, just before the waves engulfed the ship, they were still standing together in prayer for the safety of the men. They had learned the fine art of living together as brothers—and in death they were not divided.

The spirit of brotherhood can illumine all the avenues of life, the simple and the quiet as well as the heroic and dramatic.

Last year an international emergency conference to combat antisemitism was held in Seelisberg, Switzerland. A commission composed of four Protestant ministers and four Catholic priests prepared an address to the churches, which was unanimously approved by the delegates. They said, "It is shocking to discover that 2000 years of preaching of the gospel of love have not sufficed to prevent the manifestation among Christians, in various forms, of hatred and distrust toward the Jew. This would have been impossible if all Christians had been true to the teaching of Jesus Christ on the mercy of God and love of one's neighbor." They asked that school curricula and Christian publications be corrected wherever necessary to insure that they are not in conflict with the spirit of these words of St. Paul: "They are beloved for the Father's sake, for the gifts and the calling of God are without repentance." Here was true brotherhood and true religion in the churches.

I recall the story that the great war correspondent, Ernie Pyle, told about the time he was leaving Italy for a brief furlough in the United States. The day before he was scheduled to fly back, he was sitting around with the GI's who loved him so much. One of the GI's asked him where he was going to spend his leave. "New York," Ernie said. The GI said, "You are going to a place where there are a lot of Jews." Ernie answered, "Yes, and I just came from a place where there were a lot of Jews." "Where," asked the GI. Ernie answered, "Anzio beachhead where most of the First Division lies buried." I don't think that anyone who listened to Ernie that day will ever forget that simple human lesson in brotherhood.

I would not and shall not introduce any partisan political discussion. But there are some matters that come before the Congress where the claims of conscience and brotherhood are so strong and compelling that they should drive out all partisan political consideration. I wish to speak briefly now about two such matters. Our country is preparing to spend seventeen billions to aid in the recovery of Europe. It is a great and noble undertaking, and I support it. But, at the same time, we persist in a do-nothing policy for the 800,000 displaced persons who are still being forced to live on the edge of decency in the grisly concentration camps of Germany and Austria. Surely, those who managed to escape Hitler's death chambers have a claim on America's conscience and humanity, too. Surely they should not be forced to remain in the land which has been the graveyard of their relatives, their friends, and their hopes. I say we are weakening the moral force of the Marshall plan; we are making it possible for America's enemies to attack the motives behind the Marshall plan as long as we do nothing for the DP's.

Last week I said on the floor of the Senate some things that had been troubling me about the Palestine situation. I regard it as a matter of national honor that the solemn decision of the United Nations on Palestine, a decision in which this country supported in the United Nations, should be carried out, should not become a scrap of paper. The UN is our last great hope for world peace. The UN's moral fiber will be destroyed if the threat of a few thousand invaders and the greed for oil are permitted to upset a decision which represents the first important occasion when east and west saw eye-to-eye. I think the bloodshed in Palestine is tragically unnecessary and that simple firmness on the part of the leading powers could stop it right now.

We have condemned the use of the veto in the Security Council of the UN, charging that it prevents the development of world peace and order. That veto up to now has at least been open and direct, but what we face today in Palestine is an under-the-table pocket veto that prevents the UN partition decision from being carried out. I shall never be able to understand how democratic nations will sell arms to guerrilla bands while they continue an embargo on the democratic defense forces in Judaea on forces which are fighting to uphold a decision made by the conscience of mankind.

The nations of the world who cherish freedom must take appropriate action immediately to recognize the Jewish defense army in Palestine. We are a nation blessed by God with material riches beyond all others. Our mountains, our plains, our rivers, our harbors have given us industry and commerce, agriculture, and mining resources which are the envy and despair of the rest of the world. But our richest and our greatest resource is people—people living under free and fair institutions which permit them to develop fully the talents God gave them. We shall waste this richest of our resources unless here and everywhere, now and forever, we practice and cherish brotherhood.

If there is one simple truth in all history it is that man is a lonely creature. He needs the comfort and aid of his fellow men. I recall the words Horace Mann, that great American, passed on to his pupils: "Be ashamed to die until you have achieved some victory for humanity." I also recall that Ernest Hemingway's title, For Whom the Bell Tolls, comes from the pen of that great religious poet of the early seventeenth century, John Donne. The poet had been thinking of the custom of ringing the church bells on the occasion of the death of a native. Often people came running to find out who had died, to discover for whom the bell was tolling. John Donne's answer is one of the finest passages in literature:

"No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of a continent, a part of the main; any man's death diminished me, because I am involved in mankind; and, therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

Whenever you hear the bell toll for the death of justice, brotherhood, religion, tolerance, and democracy never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

Address by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, to Atlantic States Shippers Advisory Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me at the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the Atlantic States Shippers Advisory Board, Philadelphia, Pa., on January 15, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From a glance at the docket of your program for this morning, I can see that although you may not have settled among yourselves all of the problems facing the shippers and the railroads, you at least have a pretty thorough idea by now of what those problems are.

Consequently, there is no need for me to go back over the ground that was covered so thoroughly this morning and give you details and statistics on the magnitude of transport difficulties sure to arise in the coming year.

I am sure that all of you gentlemen, whether or not you attended the meeting this morning and heard the reports of the experts, have known for some time that 1948 is going to be anything but an easy year in the transport field. The boxcar shortage is certain to continue, and you shippers are going to scream at the railroads for over-long turn-around time and delays and the railroads are going to scream back at some of you for not unloading promptly enough, and we in Washington are going to get blamed for everything by both of you.

But frankly, gentlemen, the record which has been made in the past year and which will be made again this year, I am sure, in the field of transportation, and particularly from the standpoint of genuine cooperation on the part of the various segments of the transportation industry, is a truly magnificent record. It's the sort of record I like to think of when I hear the defeatists say that free enterprise and free democracy can't work. It works when free enterprise is determined that it must work. I think we have had that determination demonstrated many times in the past year in the transportation field.

Here at this gathering today where you have many outstanding railroad officials present, you have two groups which one would think were inherently antagonistic, and yet you have managed over the years to resolve your differences and to work together to remove causes for conflict. The Interstate Commerce Commission is the impartial referee in many of your issues, but there are comparatively few instances in which the ICC or the Congress must step in to break up any significant quarrels. Obviously, there is a need for a referee, but at the same time, the transportation industry generally has striven to suppress its passions and to reflect true restraint.

I mentioned earlier that 1948 is going to be a tough year on the railroads and on the shippers and many times there are going to be loud wails splitting the air. The finger pointing and the accusations will continue as they have in the past year, and, as a matter of fact, as they have over a number of years. Gentlemen, this may be little consolation to you, but these annoyances and aggravations and delays and shortages constitute a price we are paying for the greatest level of economic activity this country or any country ever experienced. We didn't have a boxcar shortage in 1932. We didn't have a steel shortage. If anybody wanted to build boxcars in 1932, there was plenty of steel around to do it with. Undoubtedly, as long as we keep on at the present level of industrial activity and national income—and we all pray that we will continue a 60 million job economy—we are going to run into shortages of one kind or another, different kinds at different times, until our industrial capacity has expanded to the point where we can meet every requirement expeditiously. We are heading in that direction but it is a long process because the backlog of demand is simply incomprehensible in its volume.

And when we do reach it, when we've got the steel capacity to turn out all the steel that everybody wants at the moment, when we have enough boxcars idle on the sidings or instantly available so that every shipper can get immediate delivery on his goods by rail, then, believe me, we better be well equipped with the machinery and with a willingness to use that machinery to keep such a vast industrial colossus operating. That will take some doing. It will take a lot of imagination and it will take a lot of faith in the free enterprise system on the part of free enterprise itself.

That is one of the places where Government must enter the picture. I do not mean a paternalistic government which takes over the entire economic machine and regiments it and orders each citizen around. I do mean Government action in research and in planning to help industry find markets for its products and to develop new products, to protect our natural resources against reckless exploitation, to keep the channels of interstate commerce open, and to help industry itself coordinate—that's a word that got in bad during the war, but it's a good word nevertheless—coordinate its efforts in behalf of maintaining an ever upward level of living standards in this country and throughout the world.

That's a big order and I guess you could say that it was expressed in pretty general terms and that I didn't pin myself down too closely to any panacea but, gentlemen, I hope that I make myself clear that I think our free enterprise system in this country is the best economic system for us, just as I think democracy is the best political system for us. In our democracy, in our best of all systems, we still have nevertheless a certain amount of necessary Government interference for the purpose of preventing anarchy, and in our free enterprise system

we must also, for the protection of that system itself, have a certain degree of interference and regulation, because otherwise we would have industrial anarchy, and when we have that our democracy gets pushed onto some pretty shaky ground.

So, as I say, we're going to have our troubles in transportation this coming year and troubles are no fun. But I think it's a whole lot better to have our troubles arise out of the fact that we still have an expanding economy with more and more and more people in the market for more and more goods causing shortages and disclocations than to have our troubles arise out of a contracting economy where lack of purchasing power is about the only real trouble, but one trouble like that is enough. All business and all industry and all of us as citizens have known that trouble in our lifetimes, and it is the kind of trouble we would like to avoid.

The important thing today is to mitigate those shortages as much as possible by intelligent action on the part of all concerned. That is easy to say and hard to do. It can, however, be done, and has been done in an amazingly successful manner, all things considered, in connection with this matter of boxcar supply.

As some of you may know, I am a member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee which began nearly a year ago to investigate the boxcar situation. Senator REED is the chairman. We knew before we started that there was an alarming shortage of rolling equipment. Some of you came down and told us in some detail how this situation was affecting you. In the face of the shortage of boxcars, there was also, and there still is, a tremendous deficit of available steel There was also a record wheat crop which required cars in record numbers. Manufacturing was hitting its reconverted peacetime strides and the demand for cars was obviously far out of line with supply.

We could have, had we wanted to, concentrated our fire on raising cain with every shipper who held a car overly long, with every railroad that took a little extra time in moving a car and wasn't prompt enough in returning it. We did a little bit of that. But it occurred to Senator REED and myself and other members of the subcommittee that the only effective solution was more cars. The car builders were willing to build them but that required steel, and also it took guaranteed orders from the railroads.

Instead of conducting the kind of Roman holiday that congressional hearings sometimes resemble, giving everybody a chance to come down and scream accusations at the other fellow, we conceived the idea of holding a conference where the top men in these three industries—steel, carbuilding and railroads—and also the responsible officials of Government could meet with us as the representatives of the Senate in this matter and work out a definite operating procedure which would have the support and the cooperation of the industry itself. We set a goal of 10,000 new cars a month.

It tok just about a year, but that goal has about been reached and now the sights are being set a little higher.

Top representatives of the 11 largest steel companies recognized immediately that the long-range well-being of American enterprise rested on adequate rail transportation. They pledged complete cooperation. The railroads did their part by reducing into written orders their long-standing needs for new cars. The boxcar builders got to work building cars. From time to time, one group or another in this voluntary agreement did some finger pointing at another, and there were some bugs to be worked out and some misunderstandings to be cleared up, but the important thing is that these three industries—three key industries—did get together and did work together and did make good. There was for a while a bugaboo over the antitrust laws, but in the face of an overwhelming desire on the part of free enterprise, as represented by these industries, to get together and work in the common good, we had no difficulty in getting assurances from the Justice Department that no one was going to suffer an antitrust rap for cooperating with the Senate of the United States and with the Office of Defense Transportation in a cause which was the cause of America itself.

We are working now on our report on our investigation. Here and there in the report there may be some criticisms of segments of the industry or of particular firms, or of this or that Government agency, but, on the whole, the report will reflect, I think, the same genuine appreciation which I have been expressing to you just now for cooperative American effort in solving a serious national problem.

You gentlemen, many of you, represent some pretty big business enterprises in the United States, but we down in Washington represent the biggest business in the country. Right now it's about a $40,000,000,000-a-year business. During the war it was even bigger. As a Member of the Senate of the United States, helping to draw up the rules and regulations governing this $40,000,000,000 business, I am, of course, expected to know everything about that business. No matter what goes on anywhere in the United States involving any agency of the Government of the United States, at least one of my constituents will write to me to demand immediate action on my part to do something about it. Usually hundreds, or even thousands, will write, wire, or telephone to register their opinions on the most important issues. Thousands of bills go into the House hopper during a congressional session and 1,000 to 1,500 into the Senate hopper at the same time. I'm expected to know everything about all of them.

What I'm driving at in recounting this dilemma is that I not only appreciate but I actually need help from the citizenry, from Pennsylvanians particularly, in sizing up the effects of some of these measures on Pennsylvania business and Pennsylvania industry and on Pennsylvania communities and residents. I pay attention to my mail, particularly when my mail contains informed facts. So often, however, a businessman will write to me or wire me with orders to vote for or against some obscure piece of legislation and expect me to do so merely on his say-so, with no facts on it.

Now, obviously, that's not fair, and it's not helpful.

And yet these same individuals could be extremely helpful to me in this tremendous task of developing intelligent appraisals of the flood of bills which come before us. I say to you gentlemen, who devote your lives to close study of transportation issues, that I am interested in your problems and in legislation affecting your businesses I want your views. I want you to feel free to send them to me. I want you to know that whether I can acknowledge every letter or not, whether I act as you wish on each matter or not, I do try to study the facts, and it's facts I want.

Right now, on the Senate Interstate Commerce Commitie, I am on a number of subcommittees considering 10 different aspects of transportation. I cited the boxcar investigation. There is another we have had under way in connection with the transportation of explosives; one on some far-reaching amendments to the ICC; one studying the car-service-rules question; another considering railroad-reorganization problems. We had the Bulwinkle bill before the committee last year, and we got it through the Senate, and now I understand it may come up in the House perhaps by next month. That bill is a complex, highly controversial one, and I appreciated the facts that I received from many of my shipper friends on it.

I've had a long association with that bill, going back to my days in the House when I was on the House Interstate Commerce Committee. And yet, although I have continuously supported the bill, there and in the Senate, I wanted the facts on it as the facts developed over the years. They came in many instances from some of you, and they were, as I said, not only appreciated but also helpful.

I think it is important to keep in mind that most Members of Congress are sincerely interested in knowing the facts on the things that come before them. If each Member of Congress specialized in one subject and studied everything on that subject and knew all about that subject, he would, of course, not need this assistance on matters related to that subject. But then, of course, he would hardly have the time to study the facts on any other subject.

I think you will find that most of us are fairly well informed on an amazing variety of things. But we can't all be technical experts.

It has been a great pleasure to be here with you today and to renew many old acquaintanceships and some real friendships and to make many new ones. I think you have a right to be proud of the great achievements in your field during the war and since the war. I am sure you will not rest on this record, but will work unceasingly to improve conditions in your basic field of activity, realizing that the long-range well-being of our economy rests primarily on rapid transportation and efficient transportation.

Since our very way of life depends at this moment on a strong and free and prosperous United States—we alone of all nations are in the position of being able to promote international stability—then you can see how really important your job is.

Pennsylvania's Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture:

Mr. Chairman, my name is L. H. GAVIN, and I represent the Nineteenth District of Pennsylvania. I want to present my statement to you on Pennsylvania's forests—an important and neglected asset, also pertinent statistical information.

I also want to take this opportunity to compliment the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. They have developed a great national-program of forest service and are turning in a magnificent performance of which they may well be proud. I am particularly pleased with the work the Forest Service is doing in my State of Pennsylvania.

Dr. V. L. Harper, director of the northeastern forest experiment station in Philadelphia, along with the other representatives of the Forest Service in Pennsylvania, are to be commended on the fine work they are doing in my State.

They are working out a comprehensive program of forestry development which is an excellent one and should be productive of great results; and, I might say, they are wholeheartedly cooperating with all State agencies in carrying out the forestry program.

Also, I want to compliment A. H. Anderson, the forest supervisor of the Allegheny National Forest, a great part of which is in my district, for the fine work he is doing.

I would say that in my opinion, speaking for my State of Pennsylvania, that the appropriations we in the Congress make for this service is a wise and sound investment of the American taxpayers' dollars for which we can look for excellent returns, and I sincerely hope that the appropriations which have been requested will be granted.

For years we paid little or no attention to our great natural resources—our forests and our waters. And I do not know of any place we can spend our money more wisely than in carrying out the practical, commonsense programs to reforest and rehabilitate, protect, and conserve these great forest areas that have made such great contributions to the economic life and productivity of our Nation. They are today one of the greatest factors in our prosperity and will continue to be if we are farsighted enough to make the necessary appropriations to carry on these programs through our Forest Service for their protection, rehabilitation, and development to give the generations that are to follow us the same opportunities which nature so generously provided for us. The Forest Service is doing a fine work; their money is wisely spent, and their recommendations should be given our careful consideration.

The Pennsylvania Conservation Committee, the affiliated organizations of which are: Brandywine Valley Association, Camp and Trail Club, Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Conservation Council of Pennsylvania, Delaware Valley Protective Association, Friends of the Land, Garden Club Federation of Pennsylvania, Garden Club of America, Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, Izaak Walton League of America (Pennsylvania division), Izaak Walton League of America (Philadelphia chapter), Keystone Automobile Club, Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Co-Operative Association, Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Pennsylvania Federation of Women's Clubs, Pennsylvania Forestry Association, Pennsylvania Land Conservation Association, Pennsylvania League of Women Voters, Pennsylvania Parks Association, Pennsylvania Roadside Council, Pennsylvania State Fish and Game Protective Association, Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, Schuylkill River Valley Restoration Association, Split Rock Club, Horse-Shoe Trail Club, National Wildlife Federation, at its annual meeting held February 9, when almost all of the affiliated organizations whose names appear above, unanimously voted: First, their disapproval of reduction of appropriations to the United States Forest Service for wildlife management and use, sale of national timber, forest development roads and aid to owners who want assistance in managing and selling their own private woodlots; and, second, their further disapproval of unwise cutting of expenditures for essential research work in conservation.

"Specifically, the following appropriations are strongly urged at this time: First: For management of our national forests: (a) Adequate appropriations to provide for development and use of the wildlife resources of our national forest areas; (b) an additional appropriation of $600,000 for adequate, suitable, and profitable cutting and marketing of timber which is now fit to be cut on all national-forest areas; (c) an appropriation of $25,000,000 for sufficient forest department roads to market national forest timber now ready to be cut but inaccessible; and (d) an increase of $1,000,000 for aid to owners who want aid in properly and profitably managing and marketing their own private woodlands.

"Second. For forest experimental research centers under the national forest program."

I want to again emphasize that I consider the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture one of the most important branches and services of our Government. My State of Pennsylvania is pleased at the opportunity to cooperate to the fullest extent of their ability to do so in these great forestry programs.

PENNSYLVANIA'S FORESTS: AN IMPORTANT BUT NEGLECTED ASSET

(A statement on the forest situation with pertinent statistical tables)

Every schoolboy in the country learns that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania got its name from the great forests that covered the lands granted to William Penn. The name was well deserved—there were mighty forests on those lands and the timber that was cut from them played a very important part in building the farms and cities and industries that have made Pennsylvania one of the leading wealth-producing States of the Union. Lumbering on a large scale got under way about 1870 and steadily increased to a peak about 1900. The annual cut at that time exceeded 2,000,000,000 board feet. About three-quarters of the excellent quality lumber produced was hemlock and white pine. Huge log rafts were a common eight on the Susquehanna and Allegheny Rivers. The city of Williamsport had about 90 sawmills. Large quantities of hemlock bark were used for the extraction of tannin. Timber cut for this use was often peeled in the woods. The bark was taken out but the logs were left to rot. One of the State's largest lumber companies was set up by a leather manufacturer as a means to get better utilization.

Pennsylvania led the Nation in the development of coal mining and petroleum. Wood for mine timbers and for oil-well derricks was available from the local forests. Heavy metallurgical industries had their beginning in the charcoal smelters of postcolonial times. Later the great mills and factories were built partially of lumber. Several thousand miles of railroad was laid down on wood crossties. Cities doubled and redoubled their population—all the time using wood as one of the principal building materials.

The generous forests were called upon to meet all these many demands for wood—but in meeting them the Commonwealth's timber-supply bank account was sadly overdrawn. By the early 1920's lumber production had fallen to about 15 percent of the 1900 level. By 1945, under the spur of war demands, the lumber cut had recovered slightly—but only a quarter of the output was in the softwoods. The timber conversion plants that once were so prominent in the Pennsylvania economy have now been eclipsed by metallurgical and other manufacturing industries. People have been giving scant attention to the forests—we should be more concerned because our welfare is at stake in more ways than we seem to realize.

The timber-products deficiency in Pennsylvania is about as critical as any found in the country. The volume of lumber normally consumed ranges from about one to one and five-tenths billion board feet. About two-thirds of this is in the softwood species. The present total within-State lumber production is equivalent to only about one-third of the quantity consumed. The softwood lumber output of the State has been ranging between a mere 7 to 15 percent of the softwood lumber consumption. The hardwood lumber cut has been about 75 percent of the hardwood lumber consumption. The paper and paperboard mills of the State in 1946 consumed 621,000 tons of new wood pulp. The within-State production of wood pulp in that same year was 273,000 tons or equivalent to 44 percent of the quantity consumed. The other 66 percent was obtained from Canada, from northern Europe and from other states. It is thus apparent that Penn's woods came far short of supplying the volume of wood fiber necessary to sustain the present paper and paperboard industry. Even the wood pulp produced within the State was not made wholly from Pennsylvania pulpwood. Quite large quantities of pulpwood are normally received from Canada, and from neighboring States. Taking this into account, it is probable that Pennsylvania forests are supplying not more than one-third of the wood fiber consumed by the State's paper and paperboard industry. Other timber commodities for which within-State production is not sufficient to meet consumption demands include hewed cross ties, veneer and plywood, shingles, and mine timbers. Specific figures on the deficiency are not available.

Timber products, of course, are only one of the several important values that reside in forests. In a highly-developed region like Pennsylvania adequacy and reliability of water supplies and the regulation of run-off that would otherwise cause destructive floods may even be more important than the wood supplies that come from timbered lands. There is hardly a large city in the State that does not need an improved municipal water supply. Many of the existing supplies were first developed when the cities were small and when the streams were relatively free from pollution. As time goes on these waters become increasingly laden with industrial wastes and sewage. The costs of reclaiming such water by filtration and chemical treatment have steadily gone up. Even when that is done the water still has an offensive odor and taste. The movement in present public water-supply procurement is toward the development of upland sources that can be kept relatively free of pollution. This, quite often, requires the public acquisition of forested watersheds and dedication of such land to this specific use. In addition to the domestic needs for water, there is also a huge industrial requirement—water for cooling purposes in steel mills and in steam power plants, water for the processing of pulp in the manufacture of paper, water for the washing of textiles, water for the washing of anthracite coal, water for the processing of food products, water for carrying away industrial wastes. The importance of adequate supplies for all of these purposes can hardly be overstated.

The availability of good-quality water is highly important but the role of forests in controlling floods is of even greater importance. The long-term average annual precipitation in Pennsylvania is about 42 inches—3¼ feet of water in the form of rain and snow. This amounts to about 4,400 tons of water that normally fall on each acre of land in the course of a year. In some localities it is somewhat less and in others somewhat more. The mechanical power of this much water to move soil downhill is enormous. Nothing but hard rock would stay in place on sloping ground were it not for the vegetative cover that absorbs the force of it. The role of the forests in regulating run-off and thus holding back waters that would otherwise cause destructive floods is probably more important than any other. Even though Pennsylvania ceased to use wood in any form, it would still need the forests as regulators of stream flow.

Still another value in Pennsylvania's forests lies in their use for recreation and for wildlife habitat. About 6,000 lakes and ponds, plus 100,000 miles of forest-bordered streams, afford pleasant and restful vacation spots as well as opportunities for sport fishing. About 50,000 acres have been set aside as public forested parks. Camp sites, picnic areas, swimming facilities, and hiking trails have been constructed for public enjoyment. Over 3,000 permanent summer-home sites are under lease in the State forests. Four or five million persons annually visit the State forests and parks, and the Allegheny National Forest. This is only a fraction of the total recreational use of Pennsylvania's forests.

In the field of wildlife restoration the State of Pennsylvania has been one of the leaders. Game refuges were first established in 1905. In 1919 the State game commission was authorized to use a part of the license revenues for the purchase of lands to be dedicated to game production. More than 700,000 acres, chiefly forest land, have since been acquired and placed under management for wildlife. These lands are in about 180 parcels scattered throughout the State. About 90 other primary game refuges have been set up on other public lands. Another 130 auxiliary State game refuges have been established through the cooperation of private-land owners. Altogether there are more than 1,000,000 acres of land now devoted primarily to wildlife. Deer and bear have once more become plentiful. The same is true for upland birds and small game.

Pennsylvania needs her forests—there can be no doubt about it. Fortunately, more than half the land area of the State (15,000,000 acres out of 29,000,000) is still in forest. Almost all of this land, and possibly some more that is now in other uses, is best suited for the growing of trees and should be permanently dedicated to that purpose. Why then is there such a deficit in timber? A close-up examination of the situation discloses the reasons. Forty percent of the forest acreage (6,400,000 acres out of 15,000,000) is occupied by seedlings or saplings or has been deforested. This is the direct consequence of the widespread clear cutting that has been practiced over a long period of time. Forest fires have also been a contributing cause. Another large block of the timber lands adding up to 4,900,000 acres, or 33 percent of the total, bear immature timber of pole size. The saw-timber stands, defined as those having a volume of 2,000 board feet per acre or more in 9-inch diameter or better softwood trees and in 11-inch diameter or better hardwood trees, occupy only about 1 acre out of every 4—3,700,000 acres out of the 15,000,000. The large acreage of poorly stocked and immature or poor-quality timber is indicative of the badly run-down condition of Pennsylvania's forests.

Only about 66 percent of the saw-timber volume is in stands that average better than 2,000 board feet per acre. The other 34 percent, or 7,000,000,000 board feet of saw-timber trees, are scattered throughout the stands of pole timber, saplings, and seedlings. Not much of this should be commercially utilized at present. Where it is removed and marketed in conjunction with products from the smaller timber, as too often happens, the residual growing stock is usually reduced to somewhere near the vanishing point.

The stand of softwood saw timber throughout all the forest lands now amounts to about 3,000,000,000 board feet. The cut of hemlock and pine lumber in 1899 was 1,800,000,000 board feet. The entire supply that now remains amounts to less than a 2-years' cut at that period. This heavy depletion of softwood saw timber is one index of the deterioration in timber quality. As the preferred species were cut off, less valuable hardwoods tended to take over the land. There is now a tremendous job of rehabilitation.

It is sometimes said that new techniques of timber utilization have made it possible to use small trees in place of the large ones that stood in the virgin forests. This is true to a limited extent, but we should not be misled. Even in Pennsylvania, in 1944, where large trees were scarce and expensive, the bulk of the wood that went into the important timber products, such as lumber, pulpwood, hewed crossties, veneer logs, and cooperage stock, was cut from saw-timber trees—no less than 89 percent of it. Products like fuelwood, fence posts, distillation wood, and mine timbers can be made from the trees removed in thinning and cleanings under good forest management. We still need good-sized trees, and, insofar as can be seen at present, we shall continue to need them. There is also the additional fact that trees reach their maximum of growth in volume and quality only after they have attained considerable size. The indiscriminate cutting of immature timber before it reaches the period of rapid growth is about as sensible as picking a lettuce crop just after the plants have come above the ground.

About 80 percent of the forest land is in private ownership. The pattern is one of small properties. Those containing more than 5,000 acres number less than 50 and add up to only 4 percent of all commercial forest lands. The number of small holdings runs to about 195,000, of which about 123,000 are farms. The acreage in this class of holdings adds up to 76 percent of the total forest-land area. The remaining 20 percent of the total acreage is in public ownership—chiefly in the 24 State forests that contain about 1,700,000 acres and in the 700,000 acres of State game lands. The Allegheny National Forest contains 442,000 acres—less than 3 percent of the total.

About 18 percent of the total acreage in private holdings is in properties that are being logged under good cutting practices. The rest of the acreage is being logged under practices that can be rated as only fair or poor. It is a sad fact that a people like ourselves, who have mastered and applied the principles of science in manufacturing, in commerce, and in farming, have made so little progress in applying the techniques of good forest management. A farmer who paid little or no attention to the maintenance of good breeding stock in his dairy herd and regarded it simply as an asset to be turned into cash as any suitable opportunity would not stay in business long—but that is just about the kind of management that forest lands are getting. Our methods for handling the forest growing stock are about as crude in their way as those used by the Indians in growing corn when the white man arrived in North America. Technical knowledge about forest management should be built up and applied to Pennsylvania's 105,000 timberland holdings with some of the same energy and force that have been used on farm-crop lands. When this is really done on the scale that is required, Penn's woods will begin to produce, not at the present average of about 35 cubic feet per acre per year, but possibly twice that much. When growth is brought up to a high level, a much larger part of it will be in high-quality logs—less in worthless brush, scrub oak, and low-quality poles.

The over-all picture of Pennsylvania's forests is not a flattering one. Fortunately, however, something has been and is being done about it. Under the cooperative Federal-State forest-fire-control program set up under the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924, the losses from fire have been cut to a moderate figure. Still further progress can, however, be made, particularly in parts of the anthracite region where forest fires are still serious. A further strengthening of the State-wide fire-control services is desirable.

A start has been made in tree-planting programs. This should be carried forward especially on critical forest-land watersheds and on those lands that are exposed to erosion damage. Lands that have been deforested or that have been strip-mined or otherwise torn up by oil-well-drilling operations are among those in need of planting. Still other areas that have been taken over by scrub oak and other low-value or worthless species could best be rehabilitated by planting.

The extension service of Pennsylvania State College, cooperating with other agencies, carries on an educational program in farm-woodland management. The Federal-State cooperative program in farm forestry, under the Norris-Doxey Act of 1937, is operating in Pennsylvania with nine farm foresters giving assistance on the timber management of woodlands. This is a good start but obviously inadequate to serve the 123,000 farm-woodland owners. A similar type of service is needed for the many small processors of wood products. The bulk of the small-forest owners and small processors still have no source of public on-the-ground technical assistance on their management and processing problems.

Pennsylvania has already come a long way with its program for the public acquisition of forest lands. The State forests, the Allegheny National Forest, and State game lands should be blocked into efficient operating units. Further extension of county and municipal forests to include lands not suitable for long-term private ownership and lands needed for watershed protection purposes is highly desirable. The State, Federal, and local governments should obviously lead the way in the development of high standards of forest management.

Fundamental to the formulation of forest policy and programs is accurate and up-to-date information on the forest acreage, timber volume, timber growth, and timber drain. All of these elements are essential in deciding what should be done to improve forest production. The survey initiated by the Forest Service in northwestern Pennsylvania in 1947 is a part of the Nation-wide forest survey authorized by Congress in 1928. It should be carried forward until the entire State is fully covered. Four counties were covered in 1947 but with present funds the entire State cannot be finished for several years. Thereafter, the basic data should be kept up to date.

The importance of clean water for domestic, industrial, and recreational uses has already been stressed. Floods have been increasing in frequency and in severity. Watershed management through improved land use is needed to maintain and improve the water resources. The Department of Agriculture has been authorized by Congress to make flood-control surveys on all the Pennsylvania watersheds. The Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service have begun this work on the Allegheny, the Youghiogheny, the Monongahela, and the Lehigh watersheds. These surveys will develop comprehensive programs for improved land use and other measures designed to retard run-off. Action programs to put these plans into effect will be presented to Congress. The State of Pennsylvania has already appropriated a substantial fund for water conservation and improvement purposes.

Still another and a highly important part of the remedial program should be the stepping up of forest research. The research on the Kane Experimental Forest (located in the Allegheny National Forest) and elsewhere is laying the basis for improved planting and timber-cutting practices. This research work is still on an inadequate scale. Entirely lacking in Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the Northeast is a research program to develop the badly needed information on watershed protection. The problems of flood control and of the sustained yield of usable water for domestic and industrial purposes are becoming increasingly critical. A forest-research center in the Delaware River Basin area to develop information on the basic water-forest land relationships and to service-problem areas has been proposed. Research to guide the needed remedial measures so that they may be most effective is an urgent requirement and should not be long delayed.

By working all fronts together it will ultimately be possible to restore the forest lands to a high state of productivity. Only then will Pennsylvania fully deserve its proud name—Penn's Woods.

STATISTICS PERTAINING TO THE TIMBER SITUATION IN PENNSYLVANIA

The existing estimates for Pennsylvania of the forest acreage, timber volume, timber growth, and timber drain are based upon a rough survey carried out on a sparse-sampling method in 1945 as part of the Forest Service's Nation-wide reappraisal of the forest situation." Existing figures are estimates subject to a considerable margin of error; this should be kept in mind in using the tables that follow.

Accurate data on the timber situation in Pennsylvania will be available upon completion by the Forest Service of the forest survey initiated in Pennsylvania in 1947.

TABLE 1.—*Land area in Pennsylvania in various land uses, 1945*

Land use:	Thousand acres
Total land area	28,829
Total forest land	15,226
Commercial	15,127
Noncommercial	101
Cropland in farms	9,240
Pasture and range	1,469
Other	2,802

Forest Service reappraisal data.

TABLE 2.—*Character of timber growth on commercial forest land of Pennsylvania, 1945*

Timber-stand class:	Thousand acres
Total commercial acreage	15,127
Saw timber	3,745
Virgin	20
Second growth	3,725
Pole timber	4,802
Seedling and sapling area	3,208
Poorly stocked and denuded	3,262

Forest Service reappraisal data.

TABLE 3.—*Ownership of commercial forest land in Pennsylvania by ownership and timber-stand class, 1945*

[Thousand acres]

Ownership class	Total acreage	Timber-stand class: Saw timber	Pole timber	Seedlings and saplings	Poorly stocked and denuded
Total	15,127	3,745	4,802	3,208	3,262
Private	12,143	3,435	3,644	2,997	2,067
Farm	3,369	729	1,040	705	895
Industrial and other	8,774	2,706	2,604	1,692	1,772
Public	2,984	310	1,158	811	615
National forest	442	55	129	227	31
Other Federal	28	3	13	6	6
State, county, and local	2,514	252	1,106	578	578

Forest Service reappraisal data.

TABLE 4.—*Estimated number of properties of privately owned commercial forest land in Pennsylvania, 1945*

Ownership class	Number of properties	Thousand acres	Average acres per property
Farm	123,254	3,369	27
Nonfarm	71,766	8,774	122
Total	195,020	12,143	62
Holdings of less than 5,000 acres	194,974	11,511	59
Holdings of 5,000–50,000 acres	44	518	11,773
Holdings of 50,000 acres and more	2	114	57,000
Total	195,020	12,143	62

Forest Service reappraisal data.

TABLE 5.—*Ownership of saw timber on commercial forest land in Pennsylvania, 1945*

Ownership class:	Million board feet
Private	17,702
Farm	4,208
Industrial and other	13,494
Public	2,860
National forest	433
Other Federal	27
State and local	2,420
Total	20,562

Forest Service reappraisal data.

TABLE 6.—*Board-foot volume of saw timber on commercial forest lands of Pennsylvania, 1945*

Kind and location:	Million board feet
Total	20,562
Hardwoods	17,495
Softwoods	3,067
On saw-timber areas	13,568
Hardwoods	11,533
Softwoods	2,035
On other areas	7,014
Hardwoods	5,962
Softwoods	1,052

Forest Service reappraisal data.

TABLE 7.—*Cubic-foot volume of timber on commercial forest lands of Pennsylvania, 1945*

Tree size, softwoods and hardwoods	Million cubic feet	Percent
Saw-timber trees:		
Hardwoods	4,729	49
Softwoods	617	7
Total	5,346	56
Pole-timber trees:		
Hardwoods	3,680	38
Softwoods	544	6
Total	4,224	44

TABLE 7.—*Cubic-foot volume of timber on commercial forest lands of Pennsylvania, 1945*—Continued

Tree size, softwoods and hardwoods	Million cubic feet	Percent
All trees:		
Hardwoods	8,409	88
Softwoods	1,161	12
Total	9,570	100

Forest Service reappraisal data

TABLE 8.—*Estimated species distribution of saw-timber volume on commercial forest lands of Pennsylvania, 1945*

Species class	Million board feet (lumber tally)	Percent
Hardwood:		
Oak	11,114	54
Birch, beech, maple	3,706	18
Yellow poplar	206	1
Cottonwood and aspen	206	1
Others	2,264	11
Total	17,495	85
Softwood:		
Yellow pines	147	1
Spruce and fir	21	(1)
White and Norway pine	1,224	6
Hemlock	883	4
Total	3,067	15
Total all species	20,562	100

[1] About one-tenth of 1 percent.
Forest Service reappraisal data

TABLE 9.—*Relationship of current annual timber growth to 1944 drain, Pennsylvania*

[Million cubic feet]

Kind of timber	Current growth	1944 drain	Surplus
Saw timber:			
Hardwood	273	155	118
Softwood	39	26	13
Total	312	181	131
Pole timber:			
Hardwood	219	103	116
Softwood	35	14	21
Total	254	117	137
All timber:			
Hardwood	491	257	234
Softwood	75	41	34
Total	566	298	268

Forest Service reappraisal data

TABLE 10.—*Lumber consumption in relation to lumber production in Pennsylvania in specified years, 1930–43*

Year	All lumber: Apparent consumption [1]	All lumber: Estimated production [2]	All lumber: Production as percent of consumption	Hardwoods: Apparent consumption [1]	Hardwoods: Estimated production [2]	Hardwoods: Production as percent of consumption	Softwoods: Apparent consumption [1]	Softwoods: Estimated production [2]	Softwoods: Production as percent of consumption
	M board feet	M board feet	Percent	M board feet	M board feet	Percent	M board feet	M board feet	Percent
1930	1,404,197	320,000	23	342,547	239,090	70	1,061,650	80,910	8
1932	595,552	162,000	27	160,312	93,396	58	435,237	68,604	16
1934	701,569	224,000	32	215,786	164,226	76	485,783	59,774	12
1936	926,630	300,000	38	250,504	251,291	100	676,126	98,709	15
1938	749,025	243,000	32	192,824	175,167	91	556,201	67,833	12
1940	1,190,729	386,668	30	260,800	263,172	94	929,929	93,496	10
1942	1,379,865	398,877	29	475,660	296,074	62	904,025	102,803	11
1943	1,367,930	447,046	33	486,541	341,082	70	881,389	106,014	12

[1] U. S. Forest Service: Domestic Lumber Consumption and Distribution (1930–43, inclusive). Apparent consumption includes foreign imports.
[2] Estimate by Forest Service—somewhat higher than figures reported by Census Bureau to take account of incomplete enumeration of small sawmills.

TABLE 11.—*Cubic-foot volume of timber cut for commodities in Pennsylvania, 1944*

[Thousand cubic feet]

Commodity class	Total	Hardwood	Softwood	Percent from saw-timber trees	
				Hardwood	Softwood
Lumber	110,260	91,603	18,657	98	92
Pulpwood	12,187	8,106	4,081	71	61
Hewed ties	4,310	4,265	45	100	100
Veneer logs	958	720	238	100	100
Cooperage stock	1,635	1,415	220	100	100
Shingles	2		2		100
Subtotal	129,352	106,109	23,243	87	96
Fuel wood	54,147	48,450	5,697	28	17
Fence posts	3,505	3,155	350	30	29
Mine timbers	81,400	71,200	10,200	26	21
All others	8,982	8,972	10	57	100
Subtotal	148,034	131,777	16,257	29	19
Grand total	277,386	237,886	39,500	59	59
Loss by fire, insect and other destructive agents	20,614	19,114	500		
Total drain	298,000	257,000	41,000		

Forest Service reappraisal data.

Economic and Political Conditions in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Municipal Association of South Carolina on February 24 last, in which I commented on economic and political conditions in the South.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A city, like a family, means nothing unless it means people. A city must pay rent, it must pay for clothing, professional services, medical care, fuel, building materials, and food. The same sharp increase in prices which is threatening the economic well-being of individual Americans and their families is taking its toll in efficient municipal service in each of your cities. A city represents the sum total of the families and individuals within its jurisdicton.

Glaring examples of the menace of inflation upon your municipalities are to be found in the cost estimates of capital projects or long range municipal improvements. Many of you have been contemplating and planning the construction of various public buildings, buildings like hospitals, libraries, city halls, and many others. Many of these projects were planned before the war. Contract negotiations were even entered into in some cases. But during the war, obviously, those negotiations, in most instances, were stopped entirely. Bare foundations and half completed buildings still testify to many heartaches and disappointments of late prewar planning. Since that time it has even been impossible to keep up with the estimates. By the time you get a plan drawn for a piece of construction the architect comes back and says he must do it all over again because of the increase in costs.

There is no way even to issue bonds and have a bond sale and know that there will be enough money to complete the cost when the bonds have been issued.

Municipal officers throughout the Nation have, of necessity, increased taxes in some instances in order to meet the higher costs of normal operation. However, it has been impossible to obtain sufficient revenue to maintain the same quality of service which was possible in 1945 or 1940.

Your cities are facing a bad situation in streets and sidewalks. It is next to impossible to plan a budget for the repair, extension, and improvement of streets and come to any degree of accuracy on it at all. In a nutshell, the American city today is a victim of inflation but unlike other victims it has not been permitted to help itself out of its predicament and no one has come to its rescue. As a result, our cities are today literally fighting for their economic lives.

Gentlemen, there was a recent article, as most of you no doubt know, in the American Mercury, entitled "The Plight of the American City." You who are familiar with municipal problems know that with very few exceptions every major municipality in this country is fighting a losing battle in terms of providing municipal services at a local level. I would like to offer this, too, that all too often the municipal government is looked upon as just a small area of government. What a mistaken and short-sighted conception. Basically, the Government of the United States is the sum total of the government of the municipalities that serve the vast section of our population.

I believe that, gentlemen, I believe it from the bottom of my heart. That is why I have taken, and will continue to take, every opportunity in the Senate of the United States to preserve the sovereignty of the individual States of this Nation and their rights to self-government within the confines of their own borders. In view of this, gentlemen, I am alarmed that our Democratic President, speaking for the national party, should propose enactment of measures which, in their entirety, constitute a mass invasion of State rights. Why such a thing has never before been even suggested, much less recommended, by any President of any party affiliation in the Nation's history.

The President has accepted and recommended the proposals of the committee known as the President's Committee on Civil Rights. He has recommended to the Congress the immediate passage of legislation to implement these recommendations.

As you know, from your newspapers and your radio, we are already faced with an anti-lynching bill. Such a law has long been considered unconstitutional, since it involves no interstate aspects. The fact that only one lynching occurred in the Nation last year—unfortunately, that one was in South Carolina—and the dominant desire manifested by southern people to prevent lynching by every possible means, have not deterred the proponents of this legislation from asking for its immediate enactment. It is clearly an invasion of State rights, and, if enacted, would establish a precedent for the Federal Government to take jurisdiction in other State crimes which are punishable under the laws of the respective States.

There is not one of you here today who, after reading this piece of proposed legislation, would not fight to your dying breath to have it killed outright. It is not an anti-lynching bill in any sense of the word. It does not make lynching any more of a crime than it always has been. Instead, it creates a new crime. It extends Federal jurisdiction to the office of the Attorney General of the United States to send his officers to your counties and to your municipalities and imprison your officers and fine your counties. The proposed bill would not have prevented the one lynching of 1947 any more than it would prevent any other lynching—past or future.

By another measure the enactment of the Federal Employment Practices Commission—the President proposes to establish another costly, powerful bureau of the Federal Government. This bureau would have the authority to muscle in on the daily business transactions of virtually every man's private business. It would, in effect, tell every man whom to hire, whom to fire, and whom to promote. These Federal strong-arms would reach into a man's books and papers without process of any court. Fines and imprisonment are provided for any person who hinders the operation of this Federal Commission.

The purpose of this commission, of course, is to force employers of the South to give employment in privately owned businesses to members of a minority race, even though such action may not be justified by the worth of the person to be employed. The employer may not have the power to hire a new employee or control the promotions within his own business. All of this can be done under the direction of this Federal Bureau.

This legislation is even now on the Senate Calendar. It was reported favorably by the Republican-controlled Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and our Democratic President has endorsed the principles of this so-called fair employment practice legislation.

The Commission then proposes, and the President has endorsed, not only the specific abolition of the poll tax in Federal elections, but also an authorization to the Department of Justice to use all civil and criminal powers of the Federal Government to supervise primaries and elections of representatives of the respective States in the Federal Government.

All of this is in direct defiance of the first article of the Constitution of the United States which specifically gives to the States the right to establish the qualification of voters and conduct all elections. If this should be done, then the very basic principle upon which the confederation of States was established, is destroyed. Abolition of the poll tax has been recommended before, but no President, so far as I know, since the days of the carpetbagger, has asked that the Department of Justice in Washington be given the power to use both civil and criminal sanctions to supervise and intervene in State elections. Why, gentlemen, this opens a new field for possible Federal abuse of power which could even be used to prevent the free discussion of the record of the party in power. Need I mention that all the dictators of the world have used the very same tactics in securing unanimous elections?

This amazing proposal strikes at the very heart of free speech and is certainly a long step toward total Federal Government and the abolition of State lines.

But these bills are coming up. They are already on the Senate Calendar. In the past, legislation of this nature has been routed out of the Senate by use of the filibuster. The first fight this time will be over the rule of cloture. I've been in on three of these fights—and we have won them all. This one will be more difficult. The Republicans and the President will do all in their power to put cloture on this debate but we of the South will try to stop it in one way or another—but it will be a long, hard, uphill fight. At the 1936 convention, I upheld and fought for the two-thirds rule. In fact, we delayed the convention with that fight. Right there was the turning point in the South's loss of influence.

It is with extreme regret that I have had to watch President Truman turn his back on the loyal South. The South was his friend. The Southern States voted for him for Vice President to beat Wallace. And yet, all of this is being recommended to the Nation by a man who was never elected President in the first place, but only succeeded because of the death of the President.

I cannot see what we in the South have done to deserve such treatment. We have remained loyal to the Democratic Party in good times and in bad times. Without the South there would be no National Democratic Party today. In what way, gentlemen, have we failed? Why should we be singled out by leaders who are determined to destroy that which enabled us to rise from the bitter ashes of the War Between the States? We had only our character and determination to go forward then.

We, in the Senate, are prepared to oppose this legislation by every legislative device within our power. We may lose the fight.

I hope with all my heart that at least the national party, which owes the South so much, may realize the injury which is being done to party unity and southern traditions.

I believe it would be a mistake for the South to bolt the party at this time. But we should elect independent democratic electors who will retain for us the control of our party.

The national party, of course, has no authority to interfere with our State party and we will not tolerate any interference by the national party into our State affairs. If necessary, we should separate our State party from the national party, but again I say we should not bolt the Democratic Party and leave it to those who, in many instances, are not real Democrats.

I mention this fight over civil rights to show you what goes on from day to day in order that the status quo of our States and their counties and their cities may be maintained. The day must never come when the actions of our governmental subdivisions will be bound by the rule of a government centralized in a Federal bureaucracy.

Some 70 percent of our people, according to our census, live in cities of 5,000 or over, and these municipalities, with very few exceptions, are the ones that provide the real service for our people.

The property owner, and in your cities that includes the majority of your people, is heavily burdened by the highest real-estate taxes in history. If the income of your cities had kept pace with the inflationary spiral, you would have had to have revenues and budgets far in excess to those with which you are currently having to operate.

The American city is being victimized by inflation. The American city represents the American people and just as the individual citizen sees his pay check consumed by high prices, so the municipality sees itself being liquidated by the spiral of inflation.

I have no fear for the future of the municipalities of South Carolina. We have met both depression and inflation in our time and we are still on top. When we weathered the depression of the thirties and actually got down to the point of issuing scrip in order to pay our employees we rededicated ourselves to the basic principles of municipal government.

You have inspired the confidence of your people. They turn to you automatically as head of their administrative house. It is you who put out their fires, police their streets and property and provide recreation for their children. And not only do they pat you on the back for the fine job you are doing, but their troubles and problems usually come to you first.

I know as well as you that before someone complains to his Governor or Congressman he goes first to the mayor and the aldermen. He wants to know why the streets cannot be finished or at least fixed up. He tells you he is paying higher taxes than he has ever paid before. You tell him he is right but cement is higher than before—just like steel and paving blocks and everything else you touch. It is impossible even if you have the means to do so, it is impossible to keep the tax rates going up in terms to meet the cost which a municipality is required to pay.

Now, obviously, my remarks up to this point have been of a very general nature relative to your problems as heads of municipalities. They are not yours alone, if at all. But it is the current picture the Nation over. It is particularly pleasing for me to note the high degree of success with which you have met these situations here in South Carolina. Let me commend you, each one of you, on the part you are playing in bringing the State of South Carolina to the forefront in the eyes of this Nation. You are making this possible by the businesslike manner in which you are conducting the day to day operation of your cities. You have shown your ability to administrate wisely in the face of great odds in the very way in which you have held your taxes down.

Every day you are helping the people of your State in bringing about businesss and industrial establishment, development, and expansion. Through your State Research, Planning and Development Board, you are taking advantage of your assets and natural resources. This board has been highly successful in its search for small industries closely related to your agricultural economy and using its products as raw materials. The record of this board speaks for itself. In the last 2 years 685 new industries have gone into 151 communities in South Carolina. These 685 new industries represent a capital investment of $130,000,000 and new employment to over 30,000 people of the State. Mark this, gentlemen, these figures are for new industries only. This does not include expansion of industries which were already established here. Combined with the report of expansion, the total figure would more than double those of new industries.

The Research, Planning, and Development Board is doing a wonderful job for you and for South Carolina. Fundamentally, that board is you. You do the research work for your individual communities; you negotiate with your local property owners; you make the tax and utility assessment allowances. In short, gentlemen, you are the trunk through which flows the lifeblood of the palmetto.

I am so happy to see the way in which South Carolina is making her readjustment to the postwar period. Our State stands today on the threshold of a glorious new era of industrial and economic expansion. It is so all over the State. We are swinging back with healthy strides into peacetime achievements.

Last week, for the first time since before the war, passengers left Charleston harbor for the Far East. Darlington County showed a $1,500,000 increase in the value of goods produced within the county. That figure is exclusive of lumber and other timber sales. Along with that increase, wages were up $2,500,000 over the previous year. In Abbeville the councilmen had taken a salary cut from $20 to $1, and the mayor had taken a cut from $100 to $50. Their former pay was restored just 2 weeks ago. In Greenville a group of educators will meet in May to discuss and plan for better rural life and education. Approximately 200 delegates will attend that conference. A request has been received from a citizen of Turkey who would like to come to South Carolina to learn more about the cultivation, care, and handling of Turkish tobacco. And no wonder. The average yield last year in South Carolina was 1,240 pounds per acre as compared with a yield of 600 pounds per acre in Turkey.

According to the last report of the Fifth Federal Reserve Bank District there were only seven business failures in the State of South Carolina during the period between January and September of last year. Only Maryland had a smaller number of failures.

Yes, gentlemen, we stand today on the very threshold of a great new era. Because of the foresight of men such as you and the confidence of our people, South Carolina stands ready today to take her rightful place as a leader in our logical march toward the agricultural and industrial rebirth of a new South.

There is a new pulse beat in the South today, a pulse beat that grows stronger and stronger day by day, each day bringing greater prosperity and progress to our land. I commend you, gentlemen. Your task is not easy, but with your strength and the will of your people you cannot fail.

American Legion's Freedom Booklets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I released today concerning the American Legion's Freedom Booklet campaign.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGION'S FREEDOM BOOKLETS

The American Legion has come up with a new Americanism program that sparkles with the promise of tremendous good for keeping America always American.

On April 1 it will start distributing to 1,000,000 American homes the first of a series of 12 monthly brochures designed to build a new and increased appreciation of the blessings of American citizenship.

Very aptly it calls these pamphlets its Freedom Booklet Explaining the Dividends From Democracy. We could think of no better title.

They are about the most dramatic and forceful presentations of the inherent values of the American way of life that we have yet seen. Written simply, printed in color, these freedom booklets take up the various aspects of our form of government and portray their superiority over any other system. They do this in terms of everyday living—in terms of individual rights and benefits, freedoms, purchasing power, automobiles, radios, electric refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, life insurance and other ordinary American necessities which are luxuries everywhere abroad.

This is a powerful weapon with which to combat alien subversive propaganda. It arms our people with up-to-the-last minute factual information about the actual margins of our superiority in every respect, with which to rebut attacks on our institutions and ideals by Communist elements and other "ism" groups. That's an effective way to bolster faith in America.

The American Legion hopes eventually to reach a distribution of 10,000,000 freedom booklets a month. It is offering the opportunity to groups of all kinds to participate in this campaign through a nonprofit subscription plan. Leaders of all walks of life, including Government, business, labor, church and civic organizations have endorsed the freedom booklets with enthusiasm.

More power to this American Legion drive to revitalize Americanism.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAN GURNEY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two addresses delivered by the Secretary of the Army, Hon. Kenneth C. Royall. The first address was delivered in Los Angeles on January 5 last, the second at Denver, Colo., on January 8. These addresses were so constructive and illuminating that I feel they should be made a matter of record.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE KENNETH C. ROYALL, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, AT TOWN HALL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., JANUARY 5, 1948

The Council of Foreign Ministers has recently ended its sessions in London—and ended them without any constructive results. This is one additional chapter in the story of postwar nonagreements and disagreements—one more evidence of difference in fundamental concepts and lack of mutual understanding between powerful nations of the world.

It is one more failure to clear definitely the path toward worldwide peace. It postpones again the hoped-for day when we can feel with assurance that all international difference can be composed without conflict. It emphasizes the necessity for a well-armed and a well-prepared America—a necessity already established by other disillusioning facts.

Our Nation has not abandoned—and will not abandon—its efforts for world accord. Under the able guidance of President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall, our Government—both legislative and executive—is moving with fairness and firmness toward the goal of peace—moving with perseverance and optimism in the face of discouragement.

But in a splendid demonstration on nonpartisan patriotism our leaders recognize that in this trial period we must have a strong America—in order to deter aggression and encourage peace as well as to provide for the contingency of war.

The question, therefore, is not "whether" but "how" we must strengthen our Military Establishment. What course must we follow to create a condition of preparedness which will in itself minimize the danger of war and which, if war should come, will provide us a reasonable assurance of victory?

In one brief talk I cannot discuss all our requirements. We need war matériel—planes and ships and tanks and artillery and bombs and rockets and camps and bases. We need these to be kept modern and continually improved by scientific and mechanical research and development. We need plans and preparation for industrial mobilization. There should be stockpiling of strategic materials, and a small reserve of specialized plants and a larger reserve of specialized machine tools.

But there is another need—the need which I will discuss today. We must have men—men for current requirements—occupation forces, garrison of bases, and a sufficient mobile striking force of Regulars in the Army, Navy, and Air Force to deal with at least the initial stages of any emergency. And in addition we must have a large reserve of manpower ready to serve promptly if an all-out war should come with suddenness.

When a prehistoric man first rolled stones down on the heads of his enemies he doubtless thought that the machine age, the "push-boulder" age of warfare had come. Thousands of years later when gunpowder was invented or long-range artillery came into use, other generations surely thought that manpower in war was becoming outmoded. And many will recall that with the development of planes and bombs it was freely said that the day of mass armies was definitely over. Perhaps, some of us here said just that.

But now fresh in our minds is the distressing fact that, despite the great strides of science—despite new and more powerful explosives, and faster and faster transportation, and much more effective electronics of offense and defense—despite all of these and other improved weapons, the last war required more military men in combat and more military men in supply than any previous war in human history.

Let me give you an interesting sidelight of 1945. For months German-held territory was subjected to terrific and insistent bombing—bombing which for a considerable period was practically unchallenged—precision bombing and area bombing. And yet the launching sites of the V–1 and V–2 rockets and the concentration points of the submarines were never destroyed—never even materially damaged—until the infantry reached them on the ground.

But the National Military Establishment need not—and does not—rely merely on history for its estimate of present and future manpower needs. Under the able guidance of Mr. Forrestal we are seeking to capitalize on the experience of the past, but at the same time to give full effect to the changes and developments of the present and the reasonable probabilities of the future. We have weighed the possible effect of atomic warfare and guided missiles upon our defense requirements.

As to the former we must recognize that agreements may effectively outlaw atomic weapons or—and this seems to me the more probable—fear of reprisal may prevent their use or the use of any other new weapons of destruction, just as was the case with poison gas in World War II.

Effective guided missiles are still far away. And, despite the drugstore quarterbacks, now graduated to cocktail-party experts, push-button warfare is not even in sight. And if it were in sight, I would like to inquire who would push the buttons, and who would push the enemy button pushers while they were pushing the buttons against us.

Even if we could safely tie our whole defense system to the premise that there would surely be the use of atomic or other new devastating weapons in a future war, we would still need military men to launch our bombs or other missiles, to reach and supply friendly bases, and to seize and hold bases in hostile territory, and to protect the lines of communication throughout the conflict.

In the matter of defense, our shores and cities and industrial centers could be protected from sea or air or from submarine attack only by planes and ships—manned by men. And if our own territory should be invaded by air or submarine—which well might happen in a future war—then ground troops would be needed to defend against the foe.

Finally, we are equally sure that without an invasion of foreign territory we would achieve at most a permanent armed stalemate, which would produce a constant and overhanging threat both to peace and to normal pursuits. The place to destroy an enemy is on his own home grounds, and to destroy him so completely that his readiness and willingness to visit our shores will be definitely canceled.

In short, the National Military Establishment is convinced that for the foreseeable future at least, success in war can be achieved only through the application of maximum pressure by land, sea, and air forces. Since another war may come with suddenness, we believe that for adequate protection of our Nation we must be prepared to put in the air, on the sea, and on the ground millions of men in uniform within a short period after a war emergency arises.

This is the opinion of the same men who estimated military manpower needs in World War II so accurately that at the time of our final victory we had committed to combat 88 of the 90 divisions we had activated, and had all 90 overseas.

How are we going to get these millions of men if a future emergency comes upon us? It is and has been the opinion of our military planners, it is the opinion of the splendid Compton Board appointed by President Truman, it is the opinion of many leaders of national thought and of an overwhelming number of war veterans and their national organizations that we cannot be prepared currently or for the future without universal military training.

I have somewhat reluctantly come to the same conclusion. "Reluctantly," I say, because I realize that, despite many compensating civilian benefits, a program of military training is an additional drain upon our dollars—and what is more important—an additional demand upon the available time of our young men. And I have also given careful thought to the argument that the plan would regiment the trainees and inculcate in them the spirit of militarism.

But the real need of the plan, for reasons which I will shortly give you, seems to me to justify the money and time involved. And I believe that the other arguments against the plan can be largely met either by proven facts, or by provisions in the plan which will alleviate, and compensate for, the sacrifices which would result.

Perhaps the best answer to the charge of militarism and regimentation—recently the word "fascism" was used by a political figure—the best answer is the 14,000,000 men from civil life who served in the armed forces during World War II—many of them for long periods. They have now returned home and you certainly do not find among them any spirit of militarism or lack of independence, or any fascism.

The suggestion of interference with a young man's education does not impress me overmuch. Only 6 months' continuous service is required, after which a trainee has certain part-time options which would not prevent school attendance.

Taking 6 months out of any 2-year period would leave time for two complete scholastic years of 9 months each. Schools and colleges showed great ingenuity and manifested great cooperation in order to meet the educational problems of wartime students and those of returning veterans. The problem of adjusting to a universal military training program—without any detriment to orderly education—would seem simple by comparison.

On the affirmative side, the current universal military training plan will provide a course of training which, to the maximum extent consistent with the military objectives, will afford to the trainee special educational and technical advantages—an opportunity to learn and develop along lines which would be of value to him in later civil life.

As to the real need of universal military training, may I give you a few facts? Congress has approved a total Army and Air Force of 1,070,000 enlisted men and officers—the number thought to be necessary to perform the current tasks of these two departments.

Our plans also include a National Guard of 681,000 and a Reserve Corps with a peacetime complement of 768,000. These totals will serve as the nucleus of the larger force needed for any mobilization day and for the period immediately following—a force which must be filled from the civilian population.

This is the over-all defense picture. And in our opinion every phase of it is dependent for its success upon universal military training. Neither the desired peacetime strength of any component nor the facility for necessary expansion in an emergency can be obtained without this program.

As has been previously stated, universal military training contemplates a 6-month minimum training period for all able-bodied young men. Thereafter the trainee would have among his options enlistment in the Regular Army, or joining the National Guard or the Organized Reserves.

Today the Regular Army and Air Force are nearly 170,000 behind in the necessary enlistments. It is felt that under universal military training the Regular Army option would be exercised by enough young men to help to an appreciable extent in supplying this deficit in presently needed strength.

The National Guard now has only 215,000 men, or less than one-third the required number. And this is true despite a recent intensive recruiting campaign. Universal military training is the only real hope of obtaining the required enrollment in the National Guard. And the same is substantially true of the Enlisted Reserve.

Finally, it is perfectly apparent that without universal military training we would have no reservoir of young men who would be able to serve promptly in the armed forces in event of a sudden war. As Mr. Truman said a year ago, "The development of a trained citizen reserve is vital to our national security. This can best be accomplished through universal military training."

Some of us may get a false sense of security from the number of present-day civilians who served in 1941–45. We are inclined to forget that the defense of our Nation requires young men. Already more than half of those who fought in 1941–45 are precluded from further military service because of age or added responsibilities or other causes—and by the time UMT could build up an adequate supply of trainees, practically none of these World War II veterans would be available.

But the men needed for war present a question of quality as well as quantity. In case of our National Guard and our Reserves, the training periods are relatively infrequent and in toto provide only a part of the hours needed to qualify a soldier for effective active service.

But with UMT trainees of 6 months' experience entering these components, we would have much more adequate and more advanced training. Six months of UMT would be equivalent in training value to 5 years in the National Guard or the active Reserve.

To those who might be called for duty in war the advantage of the added training is obvious. It is an advantage not only to the country, but also to the selectees and their brothers-in-arms. For the inexperienced combat soldier endangers both himself and the men who serve with him.

We do not have—and we cannot hope to have and we do not want to have—the largest Army in the world, either today or in case of war. But the advantage in numbers of the armed forces of any other country must be offset by providing our Nation not only with the best equipped but also with the best trained soldiers and sailors and airmen in the world.

Finally, I would call to your attention one other value of UMT. If war should come, it is perfectly possible that many of our cities would be faced with an emergency following an enemy bombing or other attack. In such event, a cadre of men with military training would help greatly to meet any situations which might arise.

In my talk today, as in prior talks, I am sensible of the fact, and sensitive to the fact, that all this sounds warlike. I realize that our people are so hopeful of avoiding war that they do not like to think of it even as a possibility, much less to discuss it.

I wish it were not necessary to discuss it. But the function of the Army and the Navy and the Air Force—in fact, their only function—is to provide for the contingency of war. If we could surely and safely dismiss from our minds, and from our plans and recommendations, all reference to armed conflict, then we would not need our armed services at all.

But, unfortunately, neither the facts of history nor the circumstances of the present world, make this course even thinkable. We must have defense forces, and adequate defense forces, forces which are designed for possible military combat.

It is my sincere hope that the international picture will so improve that UMT and much of our other preparedness program can be abandoned or, better still, never have to become completely operative. But until world conditions are better stabilized than they are today, we must plan and we must have universal military training in order to be ready properly to defend our Nation.

And if our preparation never has to be used for actual war; if instead the time and dollars spent for such preparation to deter an aggressor and avoid a conflict; if military strength, maintained by the most peace-loving of nations, succeeds in preserving the peace of the world, then this time and these dollars and this preparation will have bought for us the greatest value of all—peace for ourselves and for our children.

ADDRESS BY HON. KENNETH C. ROYALL, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, AT THE DENVER ROTARY CLUB, DENVER, COLO.

This year 1948 will bring into even more definite focus, the new role of America in the preservation of the peace and security of the world—will emphasize the leadership which this role requires and the responsibilities which it imposes upon us. This postwar period is indeed a new era in the affairs of America and of the world.

Perhaps the most novel development of all is the treatment of our defeated enemies. We must frankly admit that 2½ years ago few of us, if any, realized just what the victory would entail in the matter of occupation of enemy lands—or what this occupation would involve in men, in money, and in effort.

We had strained our every national fiber toward winning the war. Most of us felt that victory, when achieved, would solve our world difficulties—that we could quickly punish our enemies, sterilize their military potential, and be on our way to normal life, with nothing more than a small police force to preserve the peace.

But step by step new factors successively entered the picture—humanitarian considerations even toward the enemy peoples we had defeated, unrest and disorder and political conflict in the world, clear manifestations of the spirit of totalitarian expansion, disillusionment as to the conduct and purposes of other nations. These developments have combined to lead us to a broad occupation of Germany and Japan.

The job of this occupation has been given to the Army—with policies fixed by both the State and Army Departments. The Army does not want, and has not wanted, the nonmilitary part of the occupation job—which is the principal part. Both former Secretary Patterson and I have repeatedly sought to transfer it to some other Government agency.

But until this transfer can be made, we will use our best efforts—as we have done in the past—to carry out the occupation objectives of our Government. We are keeping in close touch with Congress, and will also keep the public advised of our general plans and results. For it is the Army and the money of our entire Nation that is being used in the occupation, and our people have a right to be informed.

Day before yesterday, in San Francisco, I discussed some phases of Japanese occupation. Today I will discuss Germany. The occupation of each country is a big, tough, complicated job. But in Germany we have—not a single nation with an existing government—but a country divided politically into four parts with only two of those parts—the British and American zones—having a joint economic administration. At this moment, the French and the Russian zones are operated separately and independently of the other two.

One of the zones is controlled by a government of a different ideology from that of the other three occupying countries, and the differences have become so marked that joint action—through an Allied control council—has been either difficult or—more frequently—impossible. The recent meeting of foreign ministers achieved no progress in rapprochement among the zones.

Not only are there vast political variances between the Russian zone and the others—difference in freedom of choice and freedom of action of the citizens—but there is also a serious economic schism in what was once a closely-knit nation—with much of the food-producing land in the hands of Poland or in the Russian zone and with the principal industrial plants in the British and French zones.

As already suggested, the first purpose of occupation was to prevent Germany from ever again upsetting the peace of the world. We had seen enough of German-initiated conflict in our time. Twice within a generation that nation had plunged the world into war—and the German people had an ugly history running back through the nineteenth century—and before that all the way to medieval and even ancient times.

England and France and Austria—Belgium and Holland and others—remembered these historical facts even more vividly and tragically than did we. Today they still remember—and remind us, if we forget—that after World War I, as in earlier times, the seeming penitence of Germany—and her simulation of weakness—had merely afforded the time and opportunity for secret—and then open—rearmament, which again plunged her neighbors into a war of Teutonic aggression.

While we were fighting World War II, we were determined to create conditions in Germany which would put a stop to her militarism once and for all. No matter how many other issues have now woven themselves into the German picture, we must not forget this original purpose of occupation. To this purpose we must still adhere—for the sake of our peace and the peace of the world.

Since May 1945 we have gone a long way toward demilitarization of Germany. We have brought her war criminals before the bar of justice. We have broken up and dispersed her military organization and her vicious and cruel Nazi groups. We have removed from positions of influence most of the top leaders who fomented and conducted the cruel war of oppression. We have abolished the pernicious cartels. We have dismantled the actual munition plants as well as some of the supporting industries.

In this dismantling there was another aspect—that of reparations. Those allied nations who had suffered so greatly from Nazi depredations—those whose own industry had been destroyed by Germany—had a feeling a rightous feeling, that the Germans should pay at least in part for their criminal destruction. Therefore, it was decided—and agreed between us and these allies—that there should be payment in kind—payment from certain dismantled German plants.

But as we have moved toward the destruction of the German military threat, we have

encountered other problems in the conquered nation. Some of them arose from the terrific damage inflicted by the Allies on the cities and towns even the countryside of Germany herself, on her plants and her transportation system—damage which some of you have seen.

This destruction has created a vast deficit in the German economy—a deficit aggravated by the millions of casualties among the young and able-bodied members of the population. In peacetime the British and American zones had not been self-sustaining in food. Their present deficiency is larger than before the war, and there is nowhere near enough production of other goods to pay for the importation of necessary food or other deficient necessities. And the surge of Germans—many of them nonproducers—from the Russian zones into our own, has added to the burden.

So in the case of the German people we are faced with a situation where—to quote a former War Department official—"we must starve 'em, shoot 'em, or feed 'em." To America there was but one alternative—the humanitarian answer. We would have fed them if there had been no other considerations. We would not walk out and leave them destitute.

But there were other valid reasons for feeding our former enemies. If Germany was to be removed as a threat to the world, she had to have a stable and peaceful government. Such a government could not exist under conditions of hunger, disease, and despair.

So we have helped the Germans—sending them each year hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of food and medicine and other necessities. We have done so, until we begin to wonder how long we must continue this expenditure. We are properly asking ourselves when it will end. The answer is obvious—we can either let Germany collapse or we can continue to help her until her own production and exports can pay her own way.

This brings us up against another situation. A bare subsistence diet will not enable Germany to work and produce. Her present minimum adult ration of 1,425 calories per day is little more than a hearty American breakfast. For workers, particularly in coal mining and other heavy labors, it was—and is—necessary to provide much more than this minimum in order to get the jobs done. This means a greater food contribution from America, which, in turn, calls for a greater production to meet eventually the added costs.

So it is that German industrial and economic recovery has become a major objective of German occupation. This is accentuated by the important part that Germany must play in general European recovery. An impoverished Germany might well be an economic millstone around the necks of its neighbors, and the recovery of the rest of Europe is definitely dependent on the coal and steel production of the Ruhr.

Another occupation factor of increasng moment is the sharp political conflict in Europe—the conflict which has arisen between free democracy and oppressive totalitarianism. There are alarming indications of another creeping aggression—at least a creeping political aggression. This development makes it important that there be built in Germany not only a free democratic government but a stable and self-sufficient one.

For these various reasons the need of an improved German economy is now felt so strongly that some of us are inclined to forget the original occupation purposes of demilitarization and reparation. Some find objections to further implementation of these policies. And all of us are sensing areas of possible conflict between the present objectives of occupation.

For example, the percentage of completely non-Nazi Germans was exceedingly small—too small to run Germany successfully. Among the Nazi sympathizers were many men of ability whose talents would be helpful in the present-day development of the German economy. It is urged upon us that too broad a purge of this entire group would greatly impede German progress.

Likewise, the demilitarization of German industry presents a possible conflict with economic recovery. The phrase "war potential" can include a wide range of plants, such as steel and chemical, which can contribute to economic recovery. And in selecting plants for reparations there is danger of destroying industrial capacity needed for full economic recovery of Germany.

These as well as other situations present questions of degree about which equally sincere and informed people may well differ. There can be no dogmatic rule of thumb. It is a matter of judgment under all the circumstances—often changing circumstances.

The Department of the Army is fortunate in having as military Governor of Germany—and also as theater commander—one of the most capable of officers, Gen. Lucius D. Clay. His character, intelligence, executive ability, energy, and singleness of purpose have distinguished his handling of the difficult problems which I have mentioned—as well as many other problems.

The Department of the Army is determined to complete the demilitarization of our zone in Germany and to build a freely democratic form of government which will help preserve the peace in Europe. We will also carry out as far as possible our international commitments for reparations to the western European countries and to any other nations which have not abrogated nor waived their rights under these commitments.

But, at the same time, we are also acutely conscious of the growing importance of German industry and exports. We recognize that a stable Germany which can stand on her own political and economic feet will prove the soundness of a true democracy and will serve as a deterrent against totalitarianism with its connotations and threats.

We have acted accordingly. During last summer we raised the permitted level of German industry—and lowered the projected reparations—thereby giving to German industry a chance to grow to the 1936 level. In dismantling we have, as far as possible, selected those plants which are in excess of German capacity for production. We have organized an Export-Import Agency which is functioning successfully. Agriculture is being encouraged and developed. In conjunction with the British, the operations of the important Ruhr coal mines have been improved.

There are still great difficulties to be overcome. The possible conflicts with demilitarization and reparations are at present a minor part of these difficulties. The war collapse of Germany and her people are still the principal factors.

Our Department is glad to report some results and progress. General industrial production has increased from a low of nearly 20 percent to 42 percent of the 1936 average. Steel production is up to 70 percent. The daily coal output has gone from 100,000 tons a day to 280,000 tons. Some commodities, including lumber, have passed their pre-war level.

The exportable surplus of Germany is growing and the proceeds are being used to acquire cotton and other raw materials needed for further increases in production. The transportation system is being rehabilitated, 30,000 cars having been restored to service in the last 3-month period. The recovery spiral is definitely upward.

In the meantime, General Clay and his staff have continued in their efforts to re-teach Germany the essence of free democratic government—which most of them had forgotten or had been afraid to practice. Germans are experiencing freedom of the press; freedom of thought; freedom of association; freedom of religion. They are being given a chance to see—and their eastern neighbors are being given a chance to see—how a capitalistic democracy works—how it benefits all the people of the country.

More than a year ago President Truman said: "We shall help the defeated enemy states establish peaceful democratic governments of their own free choice, and we shall try to attain a world in which nazism, fascism, and military aggression cannot exist."

The work of General Clay and his staff in Germany, and of Under Secretary Draper and his able helpers in Washington, is toward the achievement of the goal fixed by the President. In full recognition of the size and complexity of their task, they have sought the advice of competent men from every walk of life, from every school of political thought, and from every section of the country.

The job in Germany is not done—and in my opinion it will be many years before we can turn Germany loose on her own without endangering the attainment and preservation of our important goals. But in a much shorter period, I hope, we can see an end to our financial contributions.

But, whatever the duration, we must remember that occupation is a task which America has assumed. It is a flag responsibility. Its failure would be—not that of Germany or Japan—but that of the United States.

Conversely, if we succeed, we will get the credit and—what is much more important—we and the whole world will reap the benefits of a peace-loving and self-supporting nation, which will be an aid instead of a threat to the peace of the world.

With the splendid and unwavering assistance which we have been receiving from Congress and from the departments of government—and with the support of citizens such as yourselves—we expect to succeed in our task.

Air Power and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast:

Congressman DAVIS. Hello, friends in Wisconsin. This has been a busy week in the House of Representatives.

The report of the conference committee on the Langer-Stevenson Civil Service Retirement Act was approved. This, incidentally, culminated months of faithful and effective work by Congressman BILL STEVENSON, of La Crosse. Rent control and the President's powers under the Second War Powers Act were extended on their present basis for 30 days to permit thorough consideration of pending permanent legislation. The authority of the United States Maritime Commission to control and operate merchant vessels was extended until July 1, 1949.

The grinding out of appropriation bills has begun. Two of them were passed this past week. Other important subjects for House debate were the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, and the temporary freezing of existing social-security schedules.

Today, I want to divert from the important subjects of House action and discuss with you another matter that wasn't up for debate this week, but which is uppermost in the minds of many persons today. It is the matter of a stronger and improved Air Force, and its relation to national security. It isn't a new subject, but it is one that is receiving increased consideration every day. Some of the Nation's leaders who have stressed it since the days of Billy Mitchell, of Wisconsin, have included two of the leading Presidential candidates, Harold Stassen, of Minnesota, and ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio. Recently Senator TAFT declared his belief that American air power offered a better insurance of national security than the proposed universal-military-training program. Let's look into that angle for a few minutes today, and consider some of the facts about our air power. There has been so much loose talk about our Air Force that many of you may have the idea that the United States has almost no air strength today, and that we would be a push-over for any first-rate power that attacked us by air. Let's look at the facts.

There is no present concern over ability of the United States to protect the North American Continent from enemy air attack. According to the President's Air Policy Commission, the earliest date when that problem might become acute is January 1, 1953. However, while our present air strength is sufficient to cope with present national security requirements, we cannot be sure of what the next few years may bring in technical advances of aircraft and guided missiles. And ability of the air force to adequately support our American foreign policy is a more immediate problem.

The steadily deteriorating international situation under the Truman administration now indicates that United States air power may have to operate outside the continental United States in three troubled areas: The Middle East, western Europe, and the Far East. Of these three, the middle-eastern sector seems the most explosive, with its 4,000,000,000-barrel oil reserve as the stake in international maneuvering. We've taken the first steps in that direction by reopening some of the largest World War II air bases in the Mediterranean and middle eastern sections.

Now just how many planes do we have ready for service? Numerically, United States air power now consists of 6,805 combat planes with the air force and 4,900 combat planes in the carrier-combat groups and fleet-support units of the Navy. This total of 11,705 combat planes compares with the Russian air strength of 14,000 combat planes, as estimated by General Spaatz, Air Force Chief of Staff. In addition, the United States has 9,000 combat planes of the Air Force in storage and 3,000 naval combat planes in storage. These 12,000 planes can be reconditioned for combat on short notice, and would give us at the moment slightly under 24,000 fighting planes. Although many of these planes are already tactically obsolete, and more will become out of date in the next 2 years, they will form an important component of air power for several years more as trainer and utility-type planes. Thus we do have the planes available today, if we had the men to fly them. In case of a national emergency, part of the men to man these storage planes would come from ex-servicemen who would return to the Air Corps, and part would come from men trained in commercial aviation.

Would the rest of the men needed by the Air Force be available if universal military training should be adopted in this country? Not immediately, and perhaps not at all. The first 6 months of training under the UMT bill would be devoted to what the Army calls basic training. I don't have to explain that term to any ex-serviceman. It means 6 months of hayfoot, strawfoot, one-two-three-four, company, halt! After that period, the UMT candidate would have certain choices of which branch of service was to get him for the next 6 months, and then he would go back to civilian life. Even if we could train pilots in 6 months, they would be out of uniform at the end of that time, and we'd have to start all over on a new group of trainees.

But if increased attention is given to improving and developing the Air Force, manpower will be more easily obtained. Even during World War II when antiaircraft guns and enemy planes made flying indeed much more dangerous than in peacetime, a good share of men going into service wanted to get into aviation. You can talk to any group of high school students in our country today, and you'll find that flying has more appeal to them than ever before. The question of finding men to fly the planes on a long-term basis isn't as vital today as the problem of getting the planes to replace those becoming obsolete in the next few years.

The Air Coordinating Committee has set an annual production rate of 3,000 military aircraft with air-frame weight of 30,000,000 pounds as the minimum required to maintain a healthy aircraft industry capable of rapid emergency wartime expansion. Against these requirements are the facts that in the calendar year 1946, the aircraft industry built 1,330 military planes; in 1947, built 1,900 planes, and has for 1948 received procurement funds for 1,511 planes. To meet the committee's requirements, aircraft production rates would have to be trebled. Is this the fault of Congress? Let me read you a quotation from Aviation Week magazine for the issue of February 23. "Blame for the fiscal 1948 procurement plight rests squarely on President Truman, who slashed by more than 50 percent the 1948 Army-Navy request for 3,140 planes with an air-frame weight of 26,233,000 pounds." Aircraft procurement funds for the fiscal year 1949 have not yet been determined by the Congress. The President's budget called for a total of $1,172,000, which is expected to buy 2,131 military planes, of which 1,164 would be for the Air Force and 967 for the Navy.

Although congressional sentiment is not ready to accept the $6,000,000,000 annual expenditure that a huge Air Force would require, there is solid bipartisan support for as much as a 10-percent increase over the Presidential request for aircraft procurement. One reason that congressional thinking has not crystallized on this matter is that the joint chiefs of staff have not yet drawn up an over-all strategic defense plan for the United States. Lack of such a plan at present was bitterly accented recently in the President's air policy commission report.

Earlier I mentioned the possibility of advancement in aircraft designs and development of the guided missiles program making present fighting procedure obsolete. But don't think for 1 minute that we are standing still in that same field. We'll probably double the production and research in the guided missiles department this year. Our Second District of Wisconsin has a direct interest in this field, for the Nation's newest laboratory studying one part of guided missiles is located at Madison, Wis., under naval ordnance direction. Actually the United States Government is conducting the largest aeronautical research program in the entire world right now. We are spending more than $300,000,000 during the current fiscal year in an effort to gain new knowledge in the aeronautical sciences, to expand and crystallize presently available knowledge, and to build new equipment and train new workers for future research. And we are fostering this gigantic program because only through research can leadership in the air be assured. About 99 percent of the present aeronautical research effort is directly sponsored by the Federal Government. The reason is obvious. Any discoveries have immediate or potential value to the Air Force and naval aviation, in the design of new aircraft and missiles.

Outside of Russia, the United States is the only major power that is giving serious consideration to developing its air strength. In Britain, for example, the government there is gambling on 5 years of peace and putting all emphasis on long-term research, with little attention being given to keeping an adequate stand-by of fliers and planes. England's huge wartime aircraft industry is idling along now, or turning to other lines of manufacture. By contrast, Russia's aeronautical research program is estimated to be 5 years ahead of schedule, thanks to captured Nazi wind tunnels, German scientists, and laboratories operating night and day.

In all this discussion of air power and national security, I have not mentioned one all-important thing. That, of course, is the atomic bomb. Today we have it; how many we have in stock piles is a secret we cannot tell the world. But this we do know: We have the bomb and we can use it. No other nation will challenge us to combat as long as we have it and they do not; no other nation will want war with us if we have air power sufficient not only to make us secure here at home, but to take care of our far-flung commitments abroad.

It is for this reason that more and more people today are looking with favor upon the proposals to foster air-power development and scientific research. To many of us it seems a more safe and sane program, and certainly no more expensive than some of the security proposals that have received more discussion but little action in recent months.

It may take Fred Waring's orchestra to convince the mothers of America that they want their boys to be soldiers, but all it takes to convince young America that it wants to fly is one zooming airplane passing overhead and soaring off into the wide blue yonder. Fill our skies with modern planes and young Americans trained to fly them and we'll not have to worry so much about national security.

TVA Steam Plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I addressed to Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, on January 22, with reference to TVA's construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., and Mr. Clapp's reply dated February 10, with a memorandum to the Board of Directors on the constitutionality of the proposed TVA steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the matters will make 3¾ pages of the RECORD at a cost of $266.25.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
January 22, 1948.

Mr. GORDON R. CLAPP,
Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority,
Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. CLAPP: I note that the TVA is requesting this year an appropriation to begin the construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. Heretofore TVA has acquired a Federal steam plant at Muscle Shoals which was constructed by the Corps of Engineers during World War I under the war powers of the Executive, and a second steam plant at Watts Bar during the recent war, also under Executive war powers. In addition it acquired through purchase of private utilities a number of smaller steam plants in the area in 1939.

This proposed construction in peacetime of a steam plant by TVA is the first instance where it directly invades the field of steam generation.

Will you give me your legal opinion as to the constitutionality of this departure?

I particularly refer you to the colloquy of Mr. John Lord O'Brian, counsel for TVA in the Ashwander case.

Sincerely yours,

STYLES BRIDGES.

[Ashwander case, 297 U. S. 288]

Mr. Justice MCREYNOLDS. Is there a steam plant in connection with this project?

Mr. O'BRIAN. Yes, Your Honor. That was mentioned earlier. There is a large steam plant which was built at Muscle Shoals before the dam was built.

Mr. Justice MCREYNOLDS. For what purpose?

Mr. O'BRIAN. For the purpose of equipping the war munitions plant immediately, as quickly as possible with power.

Mr. Justice MCREYNOLDS. Is that used to generate electricity?

Mr. O'BRIAN. No, sir; it has never been used. It stands idle. Much is made in my opponents' brief of the danger of the Government selling power from the steam plant. That steam plant is not in this case. It has never been used. It has been maintained. It has been leased to the Alabama Power Co., which has used it as a stand-by facility with which to meet break-downs in its service. There is nothing in this record to show that the Authority ever intends to use it for the purpose of generating power for sale, and I disavow any such intention at this time.

Mr. Justice BUTLER. I know; but you assert the power, do you not?

Mr. O'BRIAN. No; I do not.

Mr. Justice BUTLER. Do you say that to aid in disposing of the electricity incidentally produced from this navigation dam, the Congress has no power under the Constitution to build stand-by plants to supply their customers, to keep the current going?

Mr. O'BRIAN. If you mean break-down facilities, yes; it could. It would have to. Any regulated system would have that.

Mr. Justice BUTLER. And then to meet great demands upon the peak?

Mr. O'BRIAN. No; I do not think that could be done in this case.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., February 10, 1948.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: In accordance with your letter of January 22, 1948, I have asked Mr. Joseph C. Swidler, TVA General Counsel, for an opinion on the constitutionality of TVA's construction of the proposed New Johnsonville steam plant.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the opinion which he has prepared.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON R. CLAPP,
Chairman of the Board.

FEBRUARY 9, 1948.

MEMORANDUM TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON CONSTITUTIONALITY OF PROPOSED TVA STEAM PLANT AT NEW JOHNSONVILLE, TENN.

In accordance with the request which the Chairman of the Board has received from Senator BRIDGES and referred to me, I am setting out below for the Board and for transmittal to the Senator a statement of my views on the constitutionality of TVA's construction of the proposed steam generating plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

I understand the pertinent facts to be as follows: Additional generating capacity is urgently required if TVA is to meet the steadily growing needs for power in its service area. This area, which covers about 80,000 square miles and has a population of 5,000,000, is wholly dependent upon TVA for its power supply. To help meet the demand for additional power, TVA plans to install additional generating units at several of its existing hydro projects, in addition to proceeding with the construction of the South Holston and Watauga projects. Since completion of TVA's Watts Bar steam plant, large installations of hydro capacity have been added to the system with no comparable additions in steam capacity. If much of the value of large quantities of hydro power is not to be wasted because stream-flow conditions limit the availability of such power to certain periods, additional steam capacity must be provided to firm up secondary and dump power produced at some of the existing hydro projects and by the additional new hydro units. The anticipated increase in power loads over the next few years will be particularly great in the western portion of TVA's service area. The need for additional quantities of firm power is, therefore, particularly great in this portion of the area. The proposed New Johnsonville plant will perform much the same function in firming up hydro power, particularly that produced in the western portion of the Tennessee Basin, as the Watts Bar plant presently performs in firming up part of the hydro power produced in the eastern section. Construction of the New Johnsonville plant accordingly offers the most practical and economical method of meeting present power needs.

TVA's statutory authority to construct steam plants is clear. See TVA Act, sections 4 (f), (i), and (j); 14; 15. The legislative history of the TVA Act demonstrates that Congress itself has consistently regarded the construction of steam plants as presenting no special constitutional problem.

The authorization to construct steam plants contained in the TVA Act accorded fully with prior congressional thinking on the subject. Provisions authorizing continued operation of the steam plant erected by the Federal Government at Muscle Shoals during World War I were included in the various Muscle Shoals bills introduced by Senator Norris prior to the enactment of the TVA Act in 1933, two of which were passed by Congress (S. J. Res. 46, 70th Cong., pocket-vetoed by President Coolidge, and S. J. Res. 49, 71st Cong., vetoed by President Hoover). One of the earlier Norris bills, S. 2147, Sixty-ninth Congress, would have declared it to be—

"SEC. 16. * * * the spirit and intention of Congress in passing this act—

"(c) To assist in the development of electric power by the complete storage and utilization of the waters of the Tennessee River and its tributaries, in conjunction with steam and other sources of fuel, to the end that electrical energy may receive the widest possible distribution at the minimum cost."

(Hearings before Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, 69th Cong., 1st sess. (1926), pp. 5–6.)

The same bill would have established a Federal Power Corporation with express authority—

"SEC. 9. * * * to complete the steam auxiliary plant at nitrate plant No. 2, and to construct such other steam auxiliary plants as may be necessary" (Id. at 4).

The later of the two earlier bills actually passed by Congress also contemplated that additional steam plants might be constructed (secs. 12 and 26, S. J. Res. 49, as reprinted in H. Rept. 2747, 71st Cong., 3d sess.).

In 1930, the Army engineers rendered a detailed report to Congress concerning the development of the Tennessee River in the interest of navigation, flood control, and power. This report proposed, basically, two alternative methods of development. The first involved improvement of the main river by a series of low dams. Such dams would have provided a navigable channel, though an inferior one, but no flood control or power. The second proposal was one for full-scale development, involving construction of high dams on both the main river and the tributaries for navigation, flood control, and power.[1] The report assumed that auxiliary steam generation would be both necessary and feasible if a plan for full-scale development which included generation of power were adopted. (See H. Doc. 328, 71st Cong., 2d sess. (1930), pp. 15, 66–68, 92.) The TVA Act represented, in effect, the adoption of this program of development as one to be built and operated by TVA.[2] A similar assumption as to the need for steam generation in this program was later made by the engineering staff of the joint congressional committee investigating TVA. (See S. Doc. 56, 76th Cong., 1st sess., part 3 (1939), pp. 156–164; see also the committee report, part 1, p. 151.)

The last two of the earlier Norris bills each contained a section providing for payments in lieu of taxes to Alabama based on generation of power at any existing or future steam plant, as well as at hydro plants, located in that State. Section 13 of the TVA bill as passed by the Senate contained a similar provision reading as follows:

"SEC. 13. Five percent of the gross proceeds received by the board for the sale of power generated at Dam No. 2, or from the steam plant located in that vicinity, or from any other steam plant hereafter constructed in the State of Alabama, shall be paid to the State of Alabama; and 5 percent of the gross proceeds from the sale of power generated at Cove Creek Dam, hereinafter provided for, or any other dam or steam plant located in the State of Tennessee shall be paid to the State of Tennessee." (Conference report on H. R. 5081, 73d Cong., 1st sess. (1933), p. 40.)

This provision was thoroughly debated and bitterly attacked, but solely on the ground that Alabama and Tennessee should not receive the direct benefits of the TVA program and in-lieu tax payments as well. That steam plants would in fact be constructed was assumed. The following colloquy between Senators King and Copeland during the debate in the Senate is of interest in this connection:

[1] Before the TVA Act was passed, the Army engineers were already proceeding with plans for construction of a high dam at the Wheeler site.

[2] See *Tennessee Electric Power Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (21 F. Supp. 947, 953 (E. D. Tenn., 1938)), where the Court stated: "The program adopted by the Authority, in its main features, and the choice of the sites for the various dams follow the broader multiple-project plan outlined in House Document 328 p. 43), commended by the board of engineers of rivers and harbors, as superior to the low-dam plan."

"Mr. KING. Mr. President, I want to address myself for the moment to the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. He certainly must be in error in saying that the bill contemplates the operation of a steam plant. I have been told that we have in the Tennessee Valley the greatest water power in the world, so important that the Government is justified in expending tens of millions of dollars in its development. Is not the Senator from New York in error in saying that we are to operate steam in addition to the water power?

"Mr. COPELAND. I am not surprised that the Senator asks the question. I invite his attention to the language on page 14, beginning in line 20:

"'Five percent of the gross proceeds received by the board for the sale of power generated at Dam No. 2, or from the steam plant located in that vicinity, or from any other steam plant hereafter constructed in the State of Alabama, shall be paid to the State of Alabama.'

"I suppose there is a certain amount of primary power which can be depended on throughout the year, but to make certain there is a uniform supply of power it has been necessary to erect a steam plant, and the States are to have 5 percent of the gross proceeds not only of the water-power plant but of the power generated in the steam plant." (77 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2633 (1933).)

The reference to steam plants in the in-lieu payment provision of the Senate bill was eliminated in conference. It was eliminated, however, not because the conferees thought that no steam plants should or would be constructed, but because they felt that the claims of Alabama and Tennessee to ownership of the waters of the Tennessee River might justify in-lieu payments based on production and sale of hydropower, but not of steam power. Representative McSwain expressly so stated during the House debate on the conference report. (77 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3595 (1933).)

In 1939, Congress authorized TVA to buy existing steam plants and clearly recognized, in the course of considering the amendatory legislation involved, that TVA might later have to build additional steam plants. Section 15c, the legislation in question, was enacted to make possible purchase by TVA of the generating and transmission line properties of the Tennessee Electric Power Co., as well as similar properties belonging to other subsidiaries of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp. Section 15c specifically authorized TVA to issue bonds in the total amount of $61,500,000 for the following, among other, purposes:

"(1) Not to exceed $46,000,000 * * * for the purchase of electric utility properties of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. and Southern Tennessee Power Co., as contemplated in the contract between the corporation and the Commonwealth & Southern Corp. and others, dated as of May 12, 1939.

"(2) Not to exceed $6,500,000 * * * for the purchase and rehabilitation of electric utility properties of the Alabama Power Co. and Mississippi Power Co. in the following-named counties in northern Alabama and northern Mississippi * * *.

"(3) Not to exceed $3,500,000 * * * for rebuilding, replacing, and repairing electric utility properties purchased by the corporation in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section." (53 Stat. 1083.)

Congress was fully aware, when it enacted these statutory provisions, that the electric-utility properties which TVA intended to acquire, in accordance with the contract of May 12, 1939, included important steam plants at Nashville, Hales Bar, and Parksville, as well as several smaller plants. The Nashville plant had an installed capacity of 48,000 kilowatts, the Hales Bar plant 40,000 kilowatts, and the Parksville plant 13,000 kilowatts. Moreover, Mr. J. A. Krug, then TVA manager of power, testified expressly before the House Military Affairs Committee during its consideration of the bill that TVA intended to operate the Nashville and Hales Bar steam plants if the purchase were consummated. (See hearings before Subcommittee of House Committee on Military Affairs, S. 1796, 76th Cong., 1st sess. (1939), pp. 19–21.)

With the facts fully before it, Congress itself did not regard the 1939 amendatory provisions as presenting any constitutional issue. From a constitutional standpoint, there obviously can be no distinction between the Government's power to acquire and to construct steam plants for operation in conjunction with an existing federally owned hydroelectric system. Certainly Congress recognized no distinction. Indeed, the principal reason given in Congress as to the need for the 1939 amendment was that while TVA already possessed authority to issue bonds in order to finance construction of steam or other generating plants, there was considerable doubt as to whether the proceeds of such bonds might be used for purchase of such plants as distinguished from construction. The Senate Committeee on Agriculture and Forestry stated in this connection:

"Under the existing Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, the Board of Directors of the Tennesseee Valley Authority are empowered to issue bonds and use the proceeds thereof for the construction of dams, steam plants, or any other facilities to be used for the generation and transmission of electric power; also for the construction or acquisition of transmission lines, and for making loans to municipalities and cooperative organizations for the purchase of existing transmission lines and distribution properties. The authority under the law to issue bonds for the purchase of existing generating plants is extremely doubtful. It is this defect in existing law which the proposed amendment is mainly designed to remedy. (S. Rept. 189, 76th Cong., 1st sess. (1939), pp. 1–2.)

The congressional decision to authorize acquisition of existing properties of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. and other companies within TVA's service area constituted, in effect, a determination that competition and duplication of facilities within that area would result in an uneconomic if not an impossible situation, and that TVA, therefore, should become the sole power supplier for the area. The Senate committee report on the bill containing the authorization (S. 1796, 76th Cong.) stated, in part:

"The agreement reached by the Commonwealth & Southern Corp. and the Tennessee Valley Authority to carry out this sale of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. properties would end all such controversies and do away with any possible competition between the parties.

* * * * *

"Notwithstanding the liberal price to be paid for the properties included in the contemplated sale, both the friends and critics of the Tennessee Valley Authority, as well as the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., the real owner of the property to be sold, are satisfied with the price agreed upon for the sale of such properties. The elimination of potentially wasteful competition in this area would be a factor of major importance. An audit of the properties to be purchased, made by the engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority, indicated that the value of the properties involved in the contemplated sale were not worth more than $70,000,000. The difference between this sum and the total consideration of $78,600,000 agreed upon can be regarded as the cost of eliminating this destructive competition, a competition damaging and injurious both to the Tennessee Valley Authority and to the private owner of the properties to be purchased." (S. Rept. 189, 76th Cong., 1st sess. (1939), pp. 3–7.)

Congress could not have reached a decision to eliminate competition in the area and to make it solely dependent on TVA for power service without recognizing that TVA would be responsible thereafter for providing such additional generating facilities as might become necessary to meet the area's needs. The House committee hearings on the bill indicate affirmatively that Congress, in reaching its decision, did recognize the possibility that additional generating facilities, including auxiliary steam-generating plants, might become necessary, and believed they could be provided. Mr. Krug, for example, testified on this question as follows:

Mr. CLASON. And the system of steam-generating plants you are getting from the Commonwealth & Southern, plus this water development that you contemplate, will be sufficient to supply all of that area?

"Mr. KRUG. Yes.

"Mr. CLASON. And you would not expect to have to build any more steam-generating plants in the near future?

"Mr. KRUG. Not in the near future. I think I should make it clear that in the power business it is virtually impossible to plan for longer than a 10-year period. Our plans run over approximately 10 years. After that time the load in this area will grow and additional capacity will have to be installed at some place in that area to take care of the growth in that load, if the present upward trend in the use of electricity continues.

* * * * *

"Mr. CLASON. But you have no plans now to develop anything further that will require any more steam-generating plants in this area for the next 10 years?

"Mr. KRUG. No, sir." (Hearing before subcommittee of House Committee on Military Affairs, S. 1796, 76th Cong., 1st sess. (1939), pp. 111-112.)

Moreover, both Mr. James L. Fly, who was then TVA general counsel, and Mr. William C. Fitts, Jr., who was then TVA solicitor and later became its general counsel, testified as to TVA's authority to construct future steam plants, and both stated that such construction, in their opinion, would be entirely proper. The following is excerpted from their testimony:

"Mr. FLY. * * * Section 4 (j), I believe, makes reference to powerhouses—that is section 4 (j) of the original statute—'and shall have power to acquire or construct powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects and incidental work in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations in one or more systems by transmission lines.'

"'That contemplates, of course, that any steam plants shall be within the region of the river and shall be integrated with the system which surrounds these hydroelectric projects. (Id, at 148).

"Mr. FITTS. * * * My own views about the limitations now in the statute are—and they are carried over, by the way, into this amendment—are that the TVA is authorized to construct dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries provided that those dams are related to navigation and flood control in a material sense and further, is authorized to construct steam plants to operate in conjunction to those dams within the Tennessee watershed. It is further my view——

"Mr. CLASON. Will you refer us to the section that would limit you to the Tennessee Valley watershed?

"Mr. FITTS. Yes, sir. Section 4 (j).

* * * * *

"Now, it is my conception, and it always has been ever since I have been the one assigned to construe this statute, that the power to construct generating plants is contained in this provision, and that it is limited to the construction of generating plants within the basin of the Tennessee River. Now, with transmission lines, of course, there

is a different provision. The Authority is authorized to construct or acquire transmission lines within transmission distance of the place where the power is generated.

"Mr. CLASON. They have, as I understand it, at the present time, the TVA has no right to either acquire or to construct any steam generating plant?

"Mr. FITTS. No, sir. I did not say that. I think it has the right to construct a steam generating plant that is an auxiliary to an existing hydroelectric system and it is located within the Tennessee River Valley. Section 4 (j) gives the right to construct power structures and powerhouses, plus the present language in section 15 where a steam plant is specifically covered in section 15 as it now stands" (Id. at 306).

Within 2 years after enacting the 1939 amendatory provisions, Congress specifically authorized TVA to construct the Watts Bar steam plant. Senator BRIDGES' letter refers to it as having been constructed "during the recent war * * * under the Executive war powers." In fact, it was constructed pursuant to a specific appropriation contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942 (55 Stat. 92, 118 (1941)). This act became law on April 5, 1941, before the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 7, 1941, and more than 8 months before the United States was attacked by the Japanese; and the appropriation which it contained for the Watts Bar plant, as well as for other TVA projects, was for the stated purpose "of carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933.'" Neither the hearings nor the subsequent committee reports and debates indicate that any constitutional question was thought to be presented. The situation which existed then was basically similar to that which exists now. At that time the United States was in a state of defense emergency limited by the President's proclamation of September 8, 1939, to national defense measures "within the limits of peacetime authorization." Today the state of war has not yet been terminated, and while hostilities have ceased, the international situation is unsettled. From a constitutional standpoint, there appears to be no difference between the congressional action concerning the Watts Bar steam plant and that which is sought now with respect to the new Johnsonville steam plant.

To summarize the legislative history, Congress has consistently assumed over a long period of years, that construction of supplementary steam generating facilities might be necessary and that such construction would present no constitutional problems. Congress included express authority to construct such plants in the original TVA Act. It empowered TVA in 1939 to issue bonds, the proceeds of which it knew would be used in substantial part for acquisition of existing steam-generating facilities that TVA intended to operate; and in 1941, 8 months before Pearl Harbor, it specifically authorized TVA to construct a steam plant at the Watts Bar site.

An examination of applicable Supreme Court cases indicates clearly that the assumption of Congress, over a period of many years, that there was no constitutional inhibition to the construction of steam plants is entirely sound. This conclusion has been reached with full regard for the statements concerning Federal operation and construction of steam plants made by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, who was serving as special counsel for TVA during the oral argument before the Supreme Court in *Ashwander* v. *TVA* (297 U. S. 288 (1936)). These statements must be considered in the light of the factual situation which existed at that time—a factual situation entirely different from that which exists today. TVA was then in the course of acquiring a market as a means of carrying out the objectives of the act, and the question was whether a steam plant could be used to increase the size of the market which TVA could take over by enabling it to meet peak demands that could not be met by power from Wilson Dam. Today TVA is serving an area which it took over to afford a market for its hydro power. The problem now is one of serving adequately the markets which TVA has already undertaken to serve; and the steam plant now proposed would supplement and make more efficient the existing system of hydro plants serving these established markets. It is speculative as to what Mr. O'Brian's position would have been, even in 1935, on the present state of facts. In any case constitutional law has undergone tremendous development during the 12 years since the Ashwander case was argued, and nowhere has such development been more rapid or sweeping than in those fields relating to the Government's power to undertake integrated watershed-development programs in the interest of commerce and to deal with its own property. Government activities in these fields once regarded as of doubtful constitutionality have not only been upheld in the courts when tested but have become commonplace. Any opinion expressed a dozen years ago on questions in these fields would need to be reexamined in the light of intervening developments in the law.

Since the New Johnsonville plant would be used for firming up hydro power, its construction clearly would be justified under the property clause of the Constitution (art. IV, sec. 3, clause 2), as a means of permitting fully effective use of the Government's hydroelectric projects. These projects, as well as the electric power which they are capable of generating, are property of the United States (TVA Act, sec. 4 (h)). *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, supra; *Tennessee Electric Power Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (21 F. Supp. 947 (E. D. Tenn., 1938), aff'd 306 U. S. 118 (1939)). The property clause of the Constitution provides:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Consitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

The Supreme Court has said of the power conferred under this constitutional provision:

"The power over the public land thus entrusted to Congress is without limitations. 'And it is not for the courts to say how that trust shall be administered. That is for Congress to determine.'" *United States* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 16, 29-30 (1940)).

There is no distinction between the powers granted by the clause with respect to territory and those granted with respect to other Federal property:

"The term territory, as here used, is merely descriptive of one kind of property; and is equivalent to the word lands. And Congress has the same power over it as over any other property belonging to the United States." *United States* v. *Gratiot* (14 Pet. 526, 536-537 (1940)).

With respect to any of its property, the Federal Government may exercise the rights of an ordinary proprietor. *Camfield* v. *United States* (167 U. S. 518 (1897)); *Light* v. *United States* (220 U. S. 523 (1911)); *Ruddy* v. *Rossi* (248 U. S. 104 (1918)). Among these rights is that of improving Federal property in order to enhance its usefulness and value. This right was exercised at least as far back as 1902, when the Reclamation Act, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to establish, construct, and maintain irrigation projects, was enacted in order to make marketable and habitable large areas of desert land within the public domain (*United States* v. *Hanson* (167 Fed. 861, 863 (C. C. A. 9th, 1909)). The power of Congress to legislate for such a purpose was expressly upheld in the Hanson case and in *Burley* v. *United States* (179 Fed. 1 (C. C. A. 9th, 1910)).

There is no question from an engineering standpoint concerning the necessity for auxiliary steam generating capacity to firm up hydroelectric power produced by most primarily hydroelectric systems. In the case of the TVA system, this need for auxiliary steam facilities has been recognized since the report on development of the Tennessee River made by the Army engineers in 1930, and has been acted upon in utilizing both the steam plants acquired from private utilities and the Watts Bar plant. At the present time, because during the later stages of World War II it was more feasible to construct hydroelectric than steam facilities, the proportion of steam facilities in the TVA system has declined from approximately 30 percent to approximately 20 percent of the system's total capacity. Engineering studies show that effective utilization of power produced at the hydroelectric plants requires more steam capacity. The cases cited above establish affirmatively that the Government possesses constitutional authority to provide such capacity, in order to effectuate full utilization of the Government's hydro properties.

Under the situation which now exists in TVA's service area, a steam plant might properly be constructed, under the commerce power and property clauses, whether or not it would serve to firm up hydro capacity. In *United States* v. *Appalachian Power Co.* (311 U. S. 377 (1940)), the Supreme Court defined the authority of the Federal Government over navigable waterways under the commerce clause in the following language:

"In our view, it cannot properly be said that the constitutional power of the United States over its waters is limited to control for navigation. By 'navigation' respondent means no more than operation of boats and improvement of the waterway itself. In truth the authority of the United States is the regulation of commerce on its waters. Navigability, in the sense just stated, is but a part of this whole. Flood protection, watershed development, recovery of the cost of improvements through utilization of power are likewise parts of commerce control. As respondent soundly argues, the United States cannot, by calling a project of its own 'a multiple-purpose dam,' give to itself additional powers, but equally truly the respondent cannot, by seeking to use a navigable waterway for power generation alone, avoid the authority of the Government over the stream. That authority is as broad as the needs of commerce" (p. 426).

In *Oklahoma* v. *Atkinson Co.* (313 U. S. 508 (1941)), the Court stated:

"We would, however, be less than frank if we failed to recognize this project as part of a comprehensive flood-control program for the Mississippi itself. But there is no constitutional reason why Congress or the courts should be blind to the engineering prospects of protecting the Nation's arteries of commerce through control of the watersheds. There is no constitutional reason why Congress cannot, under the commerce power, treat the watersheds as a key to flood control on navigable streams and their tributaries. Nor is there a constitutional necessity for viewing each reservoir project in isolation from a comprehensive plan covering the entire basin of a particular river. We need no survey to know that the Mississippi is a navigable river. We need no survey to know that the tributaries are generous contributors to the floods of the Mississippi. And it is common knowledge that Mississippi floods have paralyzed commerce in the affected areas and have impaired navigation itself. We have recently recognized that 'flood protection, watershed development, recovery of the cost of improvements through utilization of power are * * * parts of commerce control' (*United States* v. *Appalachian Power Co.*, supra, p. 426). And we now add that the power of flood control extends to the tributaries of navigable streams. For, just as control over the nonnavigable parts of a river may be essential or desirable in the interests of the navigable portions, so may the key to flood control on a navigable stream be found in whole or in part in flood control on its tributaries. As repeatedly recognized by this Court from *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316) to *United States* v. *Darby* (312 U. S. 100), the exercise of the granted power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce may be aided by appropriate and needful control of activities and agencies which, through intrastate, affect that commerce" (pp. 525-526).

These cases establish that the Government may embark on a program of full-scale development for a given watershed, and in so doing may proceed on the basis of an integrated plan which takes full cognizance of potentialities for the generation of electricity as well as for promotion of navigation and flood control.

In the case of the Tennessee Valley, Congress has embarked on a full-scale program for the development of the Tennessee River for navigation, flood control, and power, an essential part of that program being the wide distribution of electric power at low cost. To implement that program, Congress, in 1939, authorized TVA to acquire the properties of the existing utilities and thus to become the sole supplier of power for the area, a step which was clearly within the constitutional authority of Congress. *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288 (1936)); *Tennessee Electric Power Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (21 F. Supp. 947 (E. D. Tenn., 1938), aff'd 306 U. S. 118 (1939)); *United States* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 16 (1940)); *United States* v. *Gratiot* (14 Pet. 526 (1840)); *Oregon & Cal. R. R.* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 393 (1915)); *Ruddy* v. *Rossi* (248 U. S. 104 (1918)); *Tennessee Valley Authority* v. *Lenoir City* (72 F. Supp. 457 (E. D. Tenn., 1947). When Congress took this step, it assumed an implied obligation to meet the area's future as well as its existing demands for power. Indeed, if the Government could not assume such an obligation, a general watershed development might become wholly impracticable. If the servicing of such a market area is undertaken and the area's power demands later increase to a point where they exceed the capacity of a purely hydroelectric system, the Government can only (a) purchase such power as may be available from neighboring utilities; (b) construct steam facilities; or (c) sell out. It could hardly be contended that a tremendous Government investment in a multipurpose system must be sold whenever the demands of the area in which the system operates exceed actual and prospective hydro capacity. The Government's constitutional authority to purchase additional quantities of power from neighboring systems, under such circumstances, probably would be attacked by no one. There is no practical difference, however, between the Government's purchasing steam generated power from others and constructing steam generating facilities itself. The Government may obtain whatever it requires to conduct its program successfully; and if it may properly obtain its requirements by purchase, it should be equally at liberty to obtain them by direct production (*Cf. United States* v. *Allegheny County*, 322 U. S. 174, 177 (1944); *Clallam County* v. *United States*, 263 U. S. 341 (1923)).

Such steam-plant construction is also justified under the congressional power to appropriate for the common defense and the general welfare (Constitution, art. I, sec. 8, clause 1). The national defense, for example, would be seriously imperilled by a power shortage in an important production area like the Tennessee Valley area, which contains great electrometallurgical, electrochemical, and nuclear fission plants which are of key importance in time of war. In addition, there are defense installations in the Tennessee Valley presently in stand-by condition which, if another defense emergency should ever require their use, would be dependent on TVA power. Taken in conjunction with the present international situation, these considerations, as already noted, are similar to those which led Congress, in April 1941, to authorize construction of the Watts Bar steam plant.

With respect to the general welfare, it would seem that a threatening power shortage in an important area for whose power needs the Government has made itself responsible would "create a menace to the national welfare" (*Cleveland* v. *United States* (323 U. S. 329, 331 (1945)), and would, therefore, justify appropriation of Federal funds to relieve the shortage.

Prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U. S. 1 (1936)), lawyers had argued for years the respective merits of the two opposing interpretations of the general welfare clause: (a) the Madisonian view, to the effect that the power to tax and spend for the general welfare amounted to no more than the power to tax and spend in the exercise of those powers specifically conferred upon Congress by other sections of the Constitution; and (b) the Hamiltonian view, to the effect that the clause empowered Congress to tax and spend for the general welfare as an end in itself. The controversy was not resolved until, in the Butler case, the Court expressly adopted the Hamiltonian theory.

In *Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis* (301 U. S. 548 (1937)), and *Helvering* v. *Davis* (301 U. S. 619 (1937)), the Court reiterated this position in upholding the unemployment compensation and old-age benefit sections of the Social Security Act. In the last-cited case, the Court also stated that whether a given expenditure is for the general as opposed to a particular welfare is for Congress to determine (subject to the limitation that its determination will not be given effect if it is "clearly wrong, a display of arbitary power, not an exercise of judgment"). Provision of an adequate power supply for an important area of the country would seem clearly to meet the test of generality.

In *Cleveland* v. *United States* (323 U. S. 329 (1945)), affirming *United States* v. *Boyle* (52 F. Supp. 906 (N. D. Ohio, 1943)), the Supreme Court was called upon to determine whether the Government, under the general-welfare power, might expend funds for the purpose of constructing low-cost housing projects as part of its slum-clearance program. Mr. Justice Roberts, for a unanimous Court, answered the question thus presented in the affirmative on the authority of the Butler, Steward Machine Co., and Helvering cases. See also to the same effect, *United States* v. *Milwaukee* (49 F. Supp 436 (E. D. Wis., 1943)), affirmed (140 F. (2d) 286 (C. C. A. 7th, 1944)), certiorari denied (322 U. S. 735 (1944)); *Bastian* v. *United States* (118 F. (2d) 777 (C. C. A. 6th, 1941)); *Oklahoma City* v. *Sanders* (94 F. (2d) 323 (C. C. A. 10th, 1938)). If the Government may thus act to relieve a shortage of adequate housing, it would seem to follow, a fortiori, that it may also act, in an important region of the country, to relieve a threatened shortage of a commodity so basic to modern civilization as electric power.

For the reasons given, it is my opinion that construction of the proposed new Johnsonville plant is within the constitutional powers of the Federal Government.

JOSEPH C. SWIDLER.

Increase in Postal Workers' Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Mr. Daniel R. Sullivan, vice president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, when he appeared before a Senate subcommittee urging an increase in the pay of postal workers. This is a strong and persuasive statement in behalf of a fine but underpaid class of public servants who carry on 12 months in the year despite heat or cold, rain or shine. They trod the streets and sidewalks each day. They drive over the country roads delivering your mail and mine. They meet you at the post-office window with a smile. They are fine citizens in every community and always contribute their part to its civic activities—religious, educational, social. As a rule they are home owners with families. They educate their children and teach them to become good citizens. They constitute, Mr. President, a large, high-class segment of our patriotic citizenship and they should be compensated for their labor. Personally I would like to see an increase of $1,000 a year. They deserve it.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, my name is Daniel R. Sullivan. I am vice president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, an organization representing 79,364 city, rural, and village delivery letter carriers in the United States postal service. Our organization was founded in 1889, and has devoted nearly three-score years to the improvement of the postal service and conditions affecting the welfare of letter carriers. We have branches, numbering approximately 4,000, located in all of the 48 States, and the Hawaiian Islands and Puerto Rico.

In behalf of our entire membership, I desire to commend the chairman and members of this subcommittee for the timely action which made possible these public hearings on the vital subject of wage adjustments. We will always be grateful for your prompt and friendly consideration of this all-important topic.

We, likewise, wish to commend highly the chairman and members of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for having recommended the confirmation of Hon. Jesse M. Donaldson as Postmaster General of the United States. His appointment to that high office definitely spells the beginning of a new era in the postal service—an era which will redound to the credit of the President, the Congress, and the people of our great Republic.

On the matter of wage revisions, it would be well to call attention to the fact that numerous bills bearing on that problem have been introduced in both the Senate and House of Representatives. The postal pay increases contemplated in these measures range from a minimum $400 to a maximum

$1,000 per annum. Three of these proposals are now pending before your distinguished committee.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the over-all cost of living on December 15, 1945, stood at 129.9 points, or 29.9 points above the 1935–1939 level. The same source reveals that the over-all cost of living had risen to 164.9 points on November 15, 1947, or 64.9 points above the 1935–1939 level. These figures represent an increase of 26.9 percent in the 29-month period ended November 15, 1947. Since Public Law 386, which granted a $400 horizontal pay raise to most postal employees, became effective on January 1, 1946, the 2-year period December 15, 1945–December 15, 1947, is being utilized in this justification for an immediate additional increase.

Quoting the same source for the 2-year period just ended, it is noted that food costs on December 15, 1945, stood at 141.4 points, or 41.4 points above the 1935–1939 level, as compared with 202.7 points on November 15, 1947. These figures reveal that food costs have risen 43.4 percent in that period. The BLS experts have gaged the continuing rise in the over-all cost of living to be 2 points each month at the present time. Accordingly, we believe the BLS will readily acknowledge that the over-all increase in the cost of living from December 15, 1945, to January 15, 1948, is 27.3 percent. That is the actual amount by which letter-carrier wages have shrunken in that period. It is absolutely imperative that something be done immediately to make up for this tremendous deficiency in so-called take-home pay.

Under date of December 3, 1947, the Legislative Reference Service of the Congressional Library stated that on July 1, 1946, the average salary paid postal workers in the field service was $2,708 per annum. By multiplying $2,708 by 27.3 percent it will be noted that an increase of $739.28 is now required to meet the average deficiency. However, the vast majority of letter carriers have reached the top-wage bracket (grade 11) or $3,100 per annum. By multiplying $3,100 by 27.3 percent, the wage deficiency for the top grade letter carrier is $846.30.

Postal authorities will undoubtedly testify to the fact that it is no longer possible to recruit new employees on the entirely inadequate entrance salary of $2,100 per annum. New entrants, including numerous veterans of World War II, are required to serve a period of 11 years before reaching the maximum grade of $3,100. The gap between the fixed salaries of postal workers and the income needed to maintain a decent standard of living is ever widening. Under the prevailing circumstances, the job of carrying the mails is no longer attractive to those potential applicants who pass the civil-service examination and otherwise meet the necessary requirements.

Because of the acute situation within the Postal Service, a Conference of N. A. L. C. representatives was held here in Washington on January 12–13. Approximately 700 letter carriers from 45 different States assembled at the Hotel Statler to discuss their common problems. Among other things, the Conference recorded itself in favor of an immediate $600 upward wage adjustment on a permanent basis, to take effect January 1, 1948.

The action taken by the National Association of Letter Carriers' Conference parallels that taken by the Government Employees' Council of the American Federation of Labor on December 9, 1947, when it also endorsed the proposal to seek an immediate wage adjustment of $600 on a permanent basis, effective January 1, 1948. This last group represents some 21 unions whose membership in whole or part are employed by the Federal Government. The council has a membership of approximately 500,000 Government employees.

Along with millions of like-minded citizens, the National Association of Letter Carriers would much prefer a substantial reduction in the over-all cost of living in lieu of additional wage boosts. But the situation is now so critical that we have no alternative—simple justice demands that letter carriers be given an immediate wage increase.

Therefore, the National Association of Letter Carriers endorses the principle contained in the Langer-Chavez bill, S. 1849; and also the Cain bill, S. 1931. However, we are of the firm conviction that a permanent wage increase of at least $800 is not only warranted but wholly justifiable.

In view of all the factors mentioned previously, I am pleased to place the National Association of Letter Carriers on record as wholeheartedly endorsing the Baldwin bill, S. 1949, and express the sincere hope that it will be reported favorably at the earliest possible moment. Thank you.

Germany and Reparations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Germany and Reparations," published in the New York Times of February 21, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANY AND REPARATIONS

In another column on this page we print a letter from Julius C. C. Edelstein, special adviser to Secretary Marshall, regarding the allied reparations and dismantling program in western Germany. The problems discussed in it are fundamental, not only to the fate of Germany but to the recovery of western Europe and the success of the Marshall plan. Since these problems are bound to play a major role in the conference between the United States, Britain, and France (beginning next Monday), to discuss a merger of the French occupation zone with the combined American and British zones, we believe that they merit careful scrutiny and wide public understanding.

Mr. Edelstein holds that while this newspaper gives substantial weight to the political factors involved it does not yet see the basic economic factors that make this program advantageous to Europe and to the United States. We, on the contrary, believe that the program is contrary to the best interests of Europe and of the United States. There is no question that the victims of German aggression are entitled to the greatest possible amount of reparations, even though Germany has already paid in territories and seized properties more than any nation has ever paid before. There is likewise no doubt that short-time payments in capital equipment are preferable to long-drawn-out reparations from current production, which could only repeat the consequences of such a program following the First World War.

But we submit that such payments are limited by two factors which should take precedence over other considerations. The first is that even under the Potsdam agreement reparations payments are supposed to leave Germany enough resources to subsist without external assistance, which is not now the case, and that a self-supporting and viable Germany is the key to European recovery, as recognized in the European recovery program itself. The second is that the dismemberment of Germany and the loss of her eastern breadbasket—which, contrary to Mr. Edelstein's assumption, comprises not only the Soviet zone but all eastern Germany unilaterally annexed by Poland and Russia—have completely changed Germany's population and production picture. As a result the new level of industry, under which plants are still being dismantled as surplus, has become a snare and a delusion which can cost us and Europe dearly.

What the makers of the new reparation program have not yet faced up to, we think, is the fact that western Germany has become another Britain, with approximately the same population living in an approximately similar area, with coal as the only important raw material, and with an ability to produce only about half the food needed. Yet Britain with an unimpaired apparatus and complete freedom to produce and trade, with vast resources in her Empire which more than offset her Empire obligations, and vast American aid already given, is able to live only under the severest kind of austerity on a diet which, while still twice the total calories the Germans usually receive, is nevertheless considered to be close to the danger point. How, without any of these advantages, western Germany is not only to live but also to contribute to European recovery, under a program which would leave her only 75 percent of the per capita production capacity of 1936 (when she produced more than 80 percent of her own food) is an unexplained mystery for which we can see only one solution, and that is continued American subsidies to Germany and to Europe.

As regards the claim that the plants scheduled for dismantling can serve European recovery better if transplanted to the victor countries, we must point out that the dismantling and transplantation takes years and the labor of many thousands of men who could better be utilized in immediate production to relieve Europe's needs. And if it is said that the plants cannot be put into operation in Germany because of lack of skilled labor and raw materials, then we can only point to the fact that labor is withheld by the victors themselves through the retention of German war prisoners and that the raw materials are withheld by the allied policy of economic strangulation. That is attested not only by such experts as John Hynd, former British Cabinet Minister in charge of the British zone, and others, but also by the constant revision of the program itself, even to the extent of reactivating industries forbidden under the Potsdam Agreement.

This leaves as arguments for the program not any economic facts, but merely the force of political problems. It is to be hoped that these political problems will be subjected to a searching review at the forthcoming conference, and that this conference will be able to find a more realistic solution for them than is embodied in the dismantling program.

RFC's for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "RFC's for Europe," published in the Kokomo (Ind.) Tribune-Dispatch of February 10, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RFC'S FOR EUROPE

Senator CAPEHART's plan to finance European recovery through reconstruction finance corporations modeled after our own RFC has a strong appeal. It offers some guaranty that the money our people invest in Europe would not be wasted or squandered, but would be used exactly for the purposes our Nation would be granting it.

The Indiana Senator suggests that each European country qualify for our aid, set up an RFC, and that Americans be included as minority members on those boards. This certainly is no affront to any nation. When you are in a position of wanting and needing help, you should be agreeable to any reasonable requirement your benefactor makes.

Under Senator CAPEHART's plan, which he outlined Saturday night in an address to the Illinois Bar Association, the United States would put gifts of food, clothing, and fuel into Europe on government-to-government basis, but any aditional help would be on a business-to-business basis. The 16 European nations receiving our help would be required to invest their own American dollars in their own recovery.

The European RFC's would lend money to businesses, government agencies, individuals, etc., would buy what they need for expansion or improvement of production. CAPEHART would have the European governments provide about one-half of their own RFC funds from the $13,000,000,000 of investments which their nationals have in the United States.

Turn these investments over to the various governments and let those governments give their owners their nation's currency in exchange, says CAPEHART. The United States then would put up a dollar for every dollar the nations put in. This idea will bring a lot of squawk from abroad, but there's a good deal of fairness about it.

Negro Farm Families in Cleveland County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Cleveland Times, published in Shelby, N. C., which gives the record of 18 Cleveland County Negro farm families who have purchased farms under the Farmers Home Administration and who are successfully meeting their obligations.

While the professional agitators are engaging in a great hue and cry about civil rights, the great State of North Carolina is going steadily forward, providing equal opportunities in education, agriculture, and other material matters for the Negroes of our State.

This report of the 18 Negro families who recently purchased farms in my home county, Cleveland, indicates what is happening all over the State. Each year we have an increased number of Negroes who own their own farms and homes and who are establishing themselves in their communities and achieving real success in life. The average cash income per family was $2,300 in 1947 besides supplies consumed at home.

If those who are honestly interested in the civil-rights issue could visit North Carolina and see the real progress which is being made by the Negroes in all walks of life, the fine relationship existing between the races, and the spirit of cooperation and helpfulness manifested on every hand, I feel assured that they would be impressed with the fact that this peaceful and happy relationship ought not to be disturbed by the projection of issues which merely stir up strife and discord.

What is taking place in North Carolina is typical of the South, and it furnishes daily evidences of definite progress along all lines. This article gives but another object lesson of the way the South is solving its race problems.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EIGHTEEN COUNTY NEGRO FARM FAMILIES SHOW GAINS—ADVANCE IN FHA PROGRAM—FAMILIES AVERAGE $900 NET INCOME

Among 18 Negro families in Cleveland County who have purchased farms under the Farmers Home Administration, the average total cash income per family during 1947 equalled $2,300, the average increase per family in net worth—assets over liabilities—amounted to $1,200 during the past year, and each family averaged payments on their farms totaling $309 for 1947, or approximately 50 percent more than the amount of payments due during that period, according to a review of the year's work by Negro FHA families presented by John Faison, FHA supervisor, at the annual gathering of participating Negro families, held Saturday at Camp High School.

Approximately 30 persons attended the all-day program which began at 10 a. m. and which featured an address on Better Citizenship by J. W. Osborne, Shelby attorney, who described the toil and effort through which the American Nation has developed its democratic form of government. Mr. Osborne traced the Government's land policies during the past century and discussed the importance of soil conservation practices as evidence of better citizenship among farmers.

FOOD PRODUCTION

Thelma McVae, Negro Home Demonstration agent, speaking on home management and a successful live-at-home program reported that among Cleveland County Negro farmers last year, the average five-member family produced food equalling $1,800 in value, or approximately $350 per person on a county-wide basis.

Leon McDougle, Negro county agent, discussed the livestock program among Negro farmers and stated that a great percentage of the county's Negro rural families are without milk-producing cows. He pointed out that a movement has already been begun and will be pressed to import high-grade dairy cattle into Cleveland's agricultural Negro community and urged that Negro farmers avail themselves of the advantages offered by the county's artificial-breeding program.

John Ed Davis, assistant supervisor, of the FHA, reported that among the 18 Negro families represented in the plan in 1947, two had paid off the balance due on their farms and had been presented with deeds to their property. They were Levi Smith, of Camp community, and James McCree, of Long Branch community, who participated in the presentation ceremony which was part of Annual Farm Day observed by white FHA farmers several weeks ago.

Mr. Davis stated that the average net cash income of the 18 families last year was $900 after living and farm-operating expenses. A break-down of that amount showed that of the $900, an average $309 was paid against indebtedness for the farm, $450 was expended to increase livestock and equipment, leaving approximately $150 for other debts or investments.

Land utilization, conservation practices and development of fish ponds were discussed by Joe Craver, of the Soil Conservation Service.

Final event of the all-day schedule, which included a picnic lunch at noon, was recognition of outstanding achievements by Negro FHA farmers in 1947.

K. O. McKinney, of Grover, route 1, spent only $25 for food during 1947 and received a prize for the best live-at-home program. Levi Smith, of Camp community, was recognized as making the largest land payment during the year, $2,039, and for realizing the greatest increase in net worth, his assets over liabilities rising in the past 12 months to more than $8,000. Bill Good, of Grover, route 1, showed the best livestock program with a herd of five registered Jerseys which he started in 1947.

Other prize winners were: Matthew Williams, of Washington community, for pasture improvement: Willie Norris, of No. 1 township, for the best record book; and Roy Bell, of Grover, route 1, for alfalfa production. Prizes were donated by O. Z. Morgan Co.; Washburn's Hardware; Bridges & Hamrick, of Kings Mountain; Kiser Feed Co.; D. A. Beam Co.; and O. E. Ford Co.

Rural Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine, practical, and sensible address on the subject of the need for changes in our Federal road laws. The address emphasizes local or country roads, sometimes called farm-to-market roads. Mr. President, the man who delivered this address is Judge Andrew L. Burruss, of Obion County, Tenn., one of our progressive and highly productive counties. Judge Burruss is one of the most capable of public officials in Tennessee. He has made a close study of rural roads and is outstanding among those who are expert on the subject. I have introduced legislation in the Senate designed to set up an independent rural road department much as is described by Judge Burruss in his address, and I feel that until we have made more effective a method of establishing a practical type of rural road we will continue to be derelict in our duty toward our great rural population. I think farmers should have our guarantee of a road they can use 12 months in the year. I recommend the reading of Judge Burruss' timely and instructive address by all who are interested in this great problem of building rural roads in America.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED CHANGES IN THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT AFFECTING LOCAL HIGHWAYS

What do we mean by local highways?

In preparing this paper I have in mind rural roads that are not in the State or Federal system but the ones which come under the jurisdiction of the local highway organizations.

Not knowing how the Federal Highway Act works in other parts of the Nation I am using my own State, Tennessee, as a basis to show how it operates here and to point out some changes that would make it more effective in developing our rural roads.

We have in Tennessee about 57,500 miles of roads, 7,500 miles under the direct supervision of the State highway department and 50,000 miles under the supervision of 96 local highway organizations. Under the Federal Highway Act now in operation, the State highway department worked out an agreement with the local road department, setting up a secondary road system in the State, allowing each county to put into this system 6 percent of its entire mileage. They put in 2,500 miles of their roads, making a total mileage in the secondary system of 5,500 miles to be constructed over a period of 10 years with the use of Federal funds for local roads, the State department agreeing to match all of the Federal funds. Under the Federal law as it now stands the Public Bureau of Roads will not recognize a local road department but will cooperate only with the State highway department. That within itself gives the State department the final say in the location and construction of all of the rural roads that are to receive Federal aid. At the present rate of construction it will take 10 years to complete the secondary system in our State. There will be 50,000 miles of rural roads in Tennessee that have not been touched as far as Federal aid is concerned. All of the money will have been used for the secondary system, 5,500 miles or about one-tenth of the rural roads, that means that under the present system all of the Federal-aid money is being used to add a few miles of roads to the now existing State highway system. Now what we in Tennessee are interested in is help on the 50,000 miles of rural roads. Under the present set-up these roads are receiving very little aid. The only roads the State and Federal highway departments will accept for construction are the most important local highways and these are usually ones that have already been developed to a higher degree than the other local roads. I believe that the law should be changed so Federal aid would go to strictly rural roads and should not be used to further develop roads already in the State system. This could be accomplished by setting up within the Public Bureau of Roads a rural-road department by law, stating in the law that the personnel of this department must be filled with those having experience in the building of local roads. I know it is just as essential to have that rural-road-building experience to construct local roads as it is to have highly trained personnel in building State and Federal roads. While rural roads are a vital part of our whole system, because of the low traffic they do not have to be of high-type pavement. An all-weather road permitting travel throughout the year is all that is needed. I cannot conceive of a person who has devoted all of his talent to high construction being able to adjust his energies to building the lower type of country road.

I believe that the Federal Highway Act should be amended so that the Public Bureau of Roads, through its local road division could deal directly with the local road organization, or require the various State departments to set up a rural road department in their respective States in order to have contact between the Public Bureau of Roads and the local road department.

This method would serve two purposes. First it would be a means of keeping the Federal Bureau informed as to the needs and problems of the rural roads departments, and second it would be a great help in improving the efficiency of local highway organizations in the same manner in which it has improved the efficiency of all of the State highway organizations.

We need strong, well-organized, and efficient local roads departments, not only to construct and maintain local roads with Federal aid, but to construct and maintain all of the rural roads. I believe the local road department should be encouraged to construct the low type of road or at least have the right to do so if they will meet the Federal requirements.

We need all three organizations, Federal, State, and local if they will cooperate for the good of the whole country. But even good organizations can accomplish little if funds are not available. We all agree that our rural roads should be all-weather roads. The question is how should they be financed. Should the Federal Government participate in the expense and to what extent? The people pay all tax money. In the early history of our Government most of the taxes were used by the local goverment. A small part went to the State and still less was paid into the Federal coffers. That condition has been reversed. The largest part goes to the Federal Government, next the State, and a very small amount stays at home. In my county the people pay 4 times as much tax to the State and 10 times as much to the Federal Government as is paid to our local government. Almost the only means left for local taxes is a tax on real estate and that does not bring in enough revenue for the construction of local roads. About the only revenue we have for local roads in Tennessee is a portion of the gas tax and that is only enough for maintenance purposes. Farming is one of the great industries of our Nation. It is an important factor in the economic and social welfare of our country. I think the Federal Government realizes this, for it has spent and is spending great sums of money for soil conservation and the preservation of our farms, rural electrification—and this is right. More money should be spent on our rural roads. A great part of all of our food is raised in these rural sections. Not only America but the whole world is in dire need of this food. We must not let the bottleneck be at the very farm on which this food is raised. Our economy in these United States is so constructed that transportation is the blood stream that feeds it and transportation is no better than the road over which it travels.

Congress, I think, in the Federal act appropriated money for rural roads for only 3 years. I believe that it should continue at a larger sum and for 10 years instead of 3 more. If this is done it will allow the Public Bureau of Roads, the State highway department, and the local highway organizations to make long-time plans which are so essential to efficient road development. So to sum up the needed changes as I see it is: First, set up within the Public Bureau of Roads a rural road division staffed with a personnel of experienced local road men. Second, for the Public Bureau of Roads to recognize the local road organization or to work with them directly, or through a local rural road division, set up by the State organization, allowing the local organization the privilege of doing the work themselves, provided they meet the Public Bureau of Roads requirements. Third, I think the appropriation for local roads should be increased and extended over a longer period of time.

A. L. BURRUS,
County Judge of Obion County, Tenn.

The Handling of Pacific Islands by the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY CORDON
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, some time ago I submitted a resolution authorizing an investigation into the condition of the people resident on the so-called trust islands in the Pacific. In the Los Angeles Daily News of February 16, February 17, and February 18 of this year there appeared three articles by Frank Rogers concerning the plight of the residents of these islands. I ask unanimous consent that the three articles may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Daily News of February 16, 1948]

SECRET REPORT RAPS NAVY TREATMENT OF PACIFIC ISLES

(By Frank Rogers)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—Navy officials for more than 6 months have been sitting on a report which charges that to date the United States of America has not made good its obligations to the people of the Pacific islands. This the Daily News learned today.

This report, if it could be made public now, would have a timely effect on a legislative battle which is about to open in Congress.

That battle will be over whether the Navy is to be allowed to continue its semidictatorial rule over the people and the affairs of Guam, American Samoa and—perhaps most important of all—the inhabitants of what is known as the Trust Territory, the former Japanese-mandated islands.

Already before Congress are legislative bills calling for the writing of organic acts which would give citizenship to the people of Guam and Samoa, and end the Navy's long-established rule over these areas.

But the battle over whether the Navy stays in power in Guam and Samoa will be a small-scale operation compared to the tussle over whether the Navy is to be allowed to keep its grip on the hundreds of little Pacific islands given to the United States in trust by the United Nations.

For, it is being pointed out by Representatives and Senators who have armed themselves with the facts of the situation, the manner in which the world's greatest democracy exercises its stewardship in the Trust Territory is being closely watched by peoples the world over.

The Trust Territory includes more than 2,000 islands or islets spread out over an oceanic territory almost as large as the United States, although the land area involved is only 903 square miles.

As the last war proved, to Japan's advantage, the islands are useful as a long string of strategic military bases. They include the Mariana, Caroline, and Marshall island groups, all lumped under the single name of Micronesia. Their strategic value makes understandable the Navy's apparent desire to continue as the Government's administrative agent there.

But opponents of Navy rule—armed with some information gleaned from the semi-secret report mentioned earlier—argue that the Navy's administration is keeping the door closed on development of the kind of self-government and equal rights status, which we are pledged to give to the area, under the United Nations agreement.

This agreement, they point out, makes the continued operation of United States bases in the area perfectly legal—but it also requires us not to allow the islands to be forever ruled by military governors. The Trust Territory can have both civilian rule and military establishments, they argue.

Some of the information obtained in the report which the Navy has been keeping to itself, makes clear some possible reasons why the Navy has declined to publish it, or even reproduce it on a limited scale. Only seven typewritten copies are in existence.

While it praises the Navy's governorship in some respects, the report several times makes the blunt declaration that the islands' natives are worse off now than they were under Japanese rule.

The report calls the Navy to task for lack of an over-all administrative plan, for imposing a heavy tax on goods shipped in from areas other than the United States, hints that the natives are being forced to work against their wishes, and declares there is no concentrated effort to restore the islands' economy to something like its prewar level.

But, what is more important, the report—which in all includes some 16 volumes—contains the first real survey that Americans have ever been able to make of Micronesia. Experts from every branch of the Government on such subjects as geography, geology, human resources, economic resources, minerals, agriculture, livestock, nutrition and diet, and other matters, put their talents into the survey over a period of several months.

The job, done for the Navy by the United States Commercial Co. (a subsidiary of the RFC), cost at least $150,000. That figure represents only actual cash outlay; it might easily be doubled if the cost of various Government services were added to the bill.

Thus the report constitutes a veritable library of information which should be immensely valuable to our Government's functions as trustee for the area.

Our first-hand knowledge of the islands, the people, and their resources is limited almost entirely to the material gathered in this report, because the area was virtually closed to us under the long Japanese rule, and before that, by the German rule there.

Yet, say Navy spokesmen, the report cannot be published. Official reason: "It would cost $50,000 and we just haven't got it."

Furthermore, says Capt. W. F. Jennings, Chief of the Islands Government Section in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, it would not be practicable to publish even volume 1, which summarizes the findings of the other 15 volumes.

"The summary is of no use unless you can read the whole thing," he says

He added, however, that "parts" of the report may eventually be made available. Congressmen, he says, may be allowed to look at parts of the report upon application.

Whether that action will come before Congress is called upon to pass an organic act for the trust territory is not known. Many Congressmen would like to read that report before they vote, for reports are that when the administration sends up a trust territory bill, it will ask the civil administration be delegated to the Navy Department on an interim basis.

Another bill already introduced by Senator HUGH BUTLER, Republican, Nebraska, calls for the establishment of a civil administration under Department of the Interior supervision.

The issue is not whether the islanders shall be given self-government. The United Nations trust agreement stipulates that. The question is, When. Interior Department experts, believing they have had the best experience in civil administration in such cases, feel the sooner self-government is granted the better.

The Navy—cautious as always about military security—and perhaps anxious to have a chance to clean up some of the abuses charged in the USCC report, says it will take years before the natives can govern themselves.

[From the Los Angeles Daily News of February 17, 1948]

REPORT SHOWS NAVY BLUNDERING IN ISLAND EMPIRE

(By Frank Rogers)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—Indications appeared today that the Navy may be denied the right to continue as ruler of the United States new colonial empire, the Pacific Trust Territory.

Word is circulating here that the administration soon will ask Congress to pass an organic act for the Trust Territory which will place the Interior Department—not the Navy—in charge.

The Navy has been attempting—and even in view of this development there is no indication that it has given up the ship—to convince administration chiefs it should continue to control the Pacific islands as it has so long controlled Guam and American Samoa.

Background reason for the administration's reported change in plans—until recently top thinking had held that the Navy should continue as interim administrators for the islands for an indefinite number of years—may be that some of the charges of Navy misrule in the islands have reached the ears of the higher ups.

Another reason may be that the administration hopes to head off a congressional investigation of the Trust Territory. A resolution calling for a thoroughgoing investigation of this country's stewardship in the islands Japan formerly held under mandate was introduced recently by Senator GUY R. CORDON, Republican, of Oregon.

One reason for CORDON's resolution apparently is the fact that the Navy has failed to make public an extensive report on the Trust Territory, made at the Navy's request by the United States Commercial Co., an RFC subsidiary, at a cost of at least $150,000.

This report is, in several instances, sharply critical of the way the Navy has clung to military rule, despite the fact that the United Nations trusteeship agreement under which we took over the Pacific islands binds our country to lead the island people along the road toward self-government.

If the investigation is authorized, the Senators assigned to make the trip might save themselves some trouble (and might save the taxpayers some money) if they could first read at least parts of this report which the Navy for more than 6 months has declined to make public. The Navy has not offered the report to Congress. Any Congressman who wants to read it will have to ask for it.

If the senatorial investigators find the same things which the field experts for the U. S. Commercial Company wrote into their now-hushed-up report, the Navy's chances of continuing as administrative agent for this great new American colonial empire may be drastically reduced.

Congress will soon be called upon to decide whether to let the Navy continue its rule of the islands—with the self-government which the United States promised the UN it would provide thus delayed until sometime in the dim future—or whether to set up immediately a form of self-government administered by a civilian agency, the Department of the Interior.

The Navy pleads that it hasn't enough money—$50,000 by its estimates—to publish the USCC report so that Congress and the public may know something about this new territory. But a study of the summarizing volume brings to light some other reasons why the Navy may want to keep the report restricted to its present number of seven typewritten copies.

For this report declares that the Trust Territory natives, "who became our responsibility through no act of their own, look with hope for the economic and social benefits which they have always associated with the United States."

But so far, the report continues, all the natives have received is fine but vague talk and a succession of Navy administrators with no plan, little understanding of their problems, typical Navy officers' attitude toward little people, and a burning desire to leave island life behind them as soon as possible.

The Navy's disregard for the natives' land rights, the surveyors found, caused frequent complaints. On Saipan, Navy officers laid out a golf course on a large part of the island's best farming land and most of the natives hadn't been given back their farms although the war had long since been over.

Tillable land is scarce and on many islands the natives cannot raise enough food under the best conditions, but island commanders seldom remembered this.

On Guam, the native leaders feel the Navy has grabbed the best farming land and on Peleliu "the armed forces occupy much more of the best land than seems justified," the report declares, while the people of Fono Island were removed from their farms "because of the anticipated need for a naval recreation area."

On another island, Sanat, a small leper colony was established and all the healthy natives were evacuated and forced to abandon farms which produced far more food than the small leper colony could use.

During the war it was of course, necessary that many air strips be laid out on the island. It just happened that the best air strip locations were on the best farming land; but now that the war is over, the air strips are largely useless and abandoned. But many of them have not been returned to productivity because the coral and sand material which was laid down to make happy landings for our war craft is not easily removed. Even when it is reclaimed, much of the land has been so damaged by this process that it cannot be returned to producivity for many years, the report asserts.

Housing is a problem there, as here. For instance, the report states:

"In the Marshalls, after the Navy had had control for nearly 3 years, housing was still far from satisfactory. In areas such as Truk, Ponape, and Palau, where the Japs surrendered only a year ago, practically nothing has been done to ameliorate housing conditions."

It is in its economic chapters that the report deals most roughly with Navy policies. It points out that the island's economy was wiped out by the war, but that the return of peace hasn't meant much to the hungry natives.

"The native populations are impoverished; their living standards are far below prewar (i. e., when the Japanese were the islands' rulers) and although the war may be partly to blame, one reason for the continuance of this condition is the emphasis of the present administration on granting assistance only of the emergency type for making survival possible."

In addition to placing a heavy tariff on goods imported from areas other than the United States, the Navy administration has not encouraged importation of enough American goods to satisfy native needs and has compounded the economic fracture by devaluing the yen and restricting the natives to a small reserve of money.

"No group faces starvation," the report says, "but none has enough supplies to make possible restoration of the economy to the point where it can function as it once did.

"No one is totally lacking in shelter, but few have the kind of homes and household utensils which they possessed before the war.

"No one is without clothing, and yet there is a widespread demand for fabrics to make clothes like those formerly worn."

It pointed out that the Japs tried hard to make the islands self-sufficient—in addition, of course, to making them contribute to the Japanese economy—and warns we had better do the same.

"The presence or absence of imported goods means to most natives the difference between having a chance to become self-sufficient through their own production or being dependent on the Government for relief—the difference between progressing toward a better life or recession to the kind of life which existed in aboriginal times."

The Japanese saw to it that low-priced (if low quality) goods were made available at even the most remote atoll, while the American practice has been to unload our unwanted items on the natives regardless of their use for them, the report says. Goods which the Japs marketed there, while not high in quality, were suited to the needs of the islanders. This cheap market is now closed to the islanders by our new import taxes.

"Our administration should stop making a profit from sales to the natives," says the report, pointing out that the Japanese at times even subsidized the native purchases.

The islands probably will never be an important cog in the American economy, but they may constitute a heavy and steady drain on it unless current policies are drastically revised, high non-Navy officials say.

"If we continue to keep them on a dole economy," said one expert, "we'll just find ourselves running one 'helluva' big lifetime WPA over there."

The Japanese, however, not only found the islands useful militarily—they made a successful business venture out of their League of Nations mandate.

In 1940, the latest year for which figures are available, Japan imported from the mandated islands $8,300,000 yen worth of goods and in the same year sold their island wards goods valued at 41,000,000 yen.

[From the Los Angeles Daily News of February 18, 1948]

SEMISECRET REPORT RIPS NAVY RULE IN TRUST ISLES

(By Frank Rogers)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—When Congress sets out to decide who will manage America's new colonial empire—the Pacific trust territory—its Members can, if they wish, find some hot debating ammunition in two little-known sources.

The first is the semisecret report of the United States Commercial Co., which deals with the way the Navy has been administering the trust territory, formerly the Japanese mandated islands of the Pacific.

This report, prepared after an extensive field trip by a large company of Government and university experts, has not been released for public consumption by the Navy. Excerpts from it like this may indicate why:

"There is no excuse for continuing military government in time of peace. We can't continue to preach democracy to the people of the Pacific world if we don't practice it there."

The Navy can be expected to put up a fight to be allowed to continue its military rule of these islands of Micronesia—just as it has ruled Guam and American Samoa since 1900—but if congressional leaders dig very far into the files of a watchdog outfit called the Institute of Ethnic Affairs, Navy brass may have some explaining to do.

These files contain a carload of material designed to warm up the debate on what we are to do with the islands given us in trust by the United Nations.

Already the institute, supported on a nonprofit basis by people whose public spiritedness leans toward such things, has accused the Navy of violating in two instances the agreement under which the United States became trustee for Micronesia.

The institute, whose officers apparently are among the few people who have seen one of the ultra-scarce copies of the USCC report, back up Government experts who argue that the trust territory should be given a civil government now—not 10 years from now, as the Navy is proposing for Guam.

As an example of how insensitive Navy rulers are to the economic welfare of islanders who have become our wards through no choice of their own, they point to these two Navy decrees:

1. An import tax, averaging about 20 percent ad valorem which the natives must pay on any goods not produced in the United States or its possessions.

2. Opening of parts of Tinian Island to commercial agriculture enterprises under terms which exclude nationals of other United Nations members and shackle native farm labor to wages decreed by the Navy.

The first act, the institute charges, not only is a violation of the trust territory agreement, but was done against the recommendation of experts participating in the USCC report.

The second, the institute charges, "is a further, decisive step toward the economic ruin of the island natives." Wages decreed by the Navy are 5 to 7 cents an hour for common labor, 9 to 11½ cents an hour for skilled labor. The same rate applies whether the Navy or a private employer signs the paycheck.

Since the islanders' savings have been impounded by the Navy, they cannot bid for the large-scale commercial agriculture leases the Navy now is offering.

"So," says an institute announcement on the deal, "the leases will go to Americans and the islanders will function as impressed labor at the starvation wage the Navy has decreed. If they refuse this bondage, labor will be imported from outside the trust territory."

With wages held down by Navy decree and prices forced up by a severe shortage of goods, the natives are caught in a situation which is made even more stringent by the import taxes slapped on by the Navy. Cheap goods once available from the Orient and parts of the Pacific are locked out.

Much of this situation is caused, say both the USCC and the institute reports, by the Navy's determination to cling to the ways of war in time of peace.

The USCC experts found, for example, that in general the guiding principles of the Navy's administration are sound, but there is many a slip between the thought and the act.

The USCC report points to a lack of integrated postwar plan at the policy making level, and a failure to put into action at the field level whatever plans there are.

"Some native groups," the report states, "wonder if the Government really intends to help them restore their prewar levels of living or will abandon them to shift for themselves.

"They feel they do not understand what America wishes to do in the islands. Each succeeding set of officers in the islands outlines a policy, the plans of the preceding set are forgotten, and the natives are confused."

Too many of the military governors are impressed by the knowledge that their island assignments are only temporary, the report continues:

"By making island duty a career, the type of personnel desired might be attracted and retained," it adds.

"The tendency in some areas has been to regard the administration of native affairs as serving the shore bases rather than as an essential function in its own right.

"This perspective was necessary during the war, but now it seriously hampers reconstruction of the native economy."

In short, the report concludes, the Navy's methods were good and right during the war, but they miss the mark now, and little is being done to bring them up to date.

The USCC experts found among the Navy administrators little understanding of how to foster self-dependency, and encourage self-government. "The Navy's hand is not a helping one," they said, adding:

"Government controls should be exercised to assist natives to become self-dependent, not to restrict their actions merely to control them. This is one of the most challenging issues which confronts the administration in Micronesia today."

Centennial of the Woman's Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I delivered on the evening of February 17 before the Women's Bureau Conference in the city of Washington, entitled "Centennial of the Woman's Movement," as follows:

It was just a century ago this July, while attending the annual meeting of the Friends Society of western New York, that four women concluded to have a conference of the women of that State at Seneca Falls for the purpose of telling the world their grievances. Thus the first woman's rights movement was born.

Lucretia Mott, of Philadelphia, a leader among the Friends or Quakers, was visiting at the home of her sister, Martha Wright, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, formerly of Boston, had gone west to make her new home in Seneca Falls. These three and Mary Ann McClintock put their idea into action and set a convention for Wednesday and Thursday, the 19th and 20th days of July 1846.

The man who owned the town newspaper, the Seneca County Courier, must have been favorably impressed by the appeal of these four pioneer women, because it is said he did not charge the ladies for space in the Courier for the following notice appearing on Sunday, July 16:

"WOMAN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION

"A convention to discuss the social, civil, and religious condition and rights of woman will be held in the Wesleyan Chapel at Seneca Falls on Wednesday and Thursday, the 19th and 20th of July, commencing at 10 o'clock a. m.

"During the first day the meeting will be exclusively for women who are earnestly invited to attend.

"The public generally are invited to be present on the second day when Lucretia Mott, of Philadelphia, and other ladies and gentlemen will address the convention."

Those ladies did not have the background of world travel and the international, economic, and political experience that our friend Frieda Miller has, who is one of the leaders of your conference here in Washington today. But they did think of the causes of the American Revolution and other grievances expressed by our founding fathers in the Declaration of Independence. So Lucretia and Elizabeth, Mary and Martha, those four pioneers of the woman's movement, drew upon the Declaration of Independence as a model for the foundation of their program of action and resolution.

On Wednesday morning, July 19, 1848, men and women on foot and horseback and by horse and carriage, scores of them, arrived at the door of the Wesleyan Church—to find the door locked. But the women were undaunted. A young professor from Yale College was in the crowd. He climbed through a window of the church—fortunately left unlocked. The professor gaining entrance by way of the window then unlocked the door of the church from the inside, and the crowd of men and women, making up that first convention of the women's rights movement, soon filled the church.

The women had not intended to have their husbands, and the other men who had accompanied them to the church in a spirit of curiosity, take any part in the convention. But inasmuch as it was a man who had gained entrance to the church when the women found themselves locked out, helpless and unable to convene, they then and there decided to let their friends of the opposite sex join with them in the meetings.

In a prayerful attitude around the altar of the church the women concluded that the moment had arrived when the men should help them in their mission of bringing to the attention of the world the plight that woman was in.

And so it happened that the first convention of the women's rights movement was presided over by a man, James Mott, husband of Lucretia, who it is said made a very impressive chairman as he presided over the meetings, tall and dignified in his Quaker costume. Mary McClintock was named secretary of the convention. Lucretia Mott recited the objects of the meeting. A law student, Samuel Tillman, read from English and American law certain statutes reflecting the legal status of women, setting forth the "charity and mercy shown by men toward their wives," protecting them in their civil rights and taking over their property after marriage.

This conference of the Women's Bureau will be interested in the resolutions adopted by that convention. Some of them read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That woman is man's equal—was intended to be so by the Creator; and the highest good of the race demands that she should be recognized as such.

"*Resolved*, That the women of this country ought to be enlightened in regard to the laws under which they live; that they may no longer publish their degradation by declaring themselves satisfied with their present position—nor their ignorance by asserting that they have all the rights they want.

"*Resolved*, That the same amount of virtue, delicacy, and refinement of behavior that is required of woman in the social state, should also be required of men; and the same transgressions should be visited with equal severity on both man and woman.

"*Resolved*, That the objection of indelicacy and impropriety, which is so often brought against woman when she addresses a public audience, comes with a very ill grace from those who encourage by their attendance her appearance on the stage, in the concert, or in feats at the circus.

"*Resolved*, That it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves their sacred right to the elective franchise."

Thus was created the nucleus of the woman-suffrage movement, which resulted years later in the adoption of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, giving women the right to vote.

The suffrage resolution was the only declaration that was not unanimously adopted at the Seneca Falls convention. The women were not quite certain that the suffrage idea would be accepted by women universally throughout the country. But at the very moment they were about to falter it was a Negro and a former slave—the great Negro exponent of freedom and emancipation, a man who has gone down in history as one of the greatest Negroes in the world, Frederick Douglas, editor of the North Star, a weekly newspaper, devoted to the cause of freedom—who rose on that occasion and delivered one of the greatest orations advocating the freedom of women and their right to vote that has ever been spoken by a man.

It is said of Frederick Douglas that he had such great powers of eloquence he captivated his auditors and never failed to bring home to their hearts the cause which he pleaded. He was a polished gentleman, with a voice that was full and sonorous. He was dignified, without pretension, and a man of lofty reason. It is recorded of the eloquence of Frederick Douglas that his was the kind of eloquence that issued from the depth of his soul as from a spring, rolling along in copious floods, sweeping all before it, overwhelming by its force, more dazzling and more thundering than the bolt which leaps from crag to crag.

At that historical moment when the women of Seneca Falls were undecided whether to launch the cause of the women's suffrage movement, it is significant that it was through the effort and the eloquence of a former slave who, with Elizabeth Cady Stanton, inspired and encouraged the pioneers of the Woman's Movement at their first convention to adopt the suffrage declaration.

The declaration was signed by 100 men and women of the convention. This struck a responsive chord in the hearts of women everywhere.

The Seneca Falls conference passed a final declaration maintaining:

"We shall use every instrumentality within our power to effect our objective. We shall employ agents, circulate tracts, petition the State and national legislatures, and endeavor to enlist the pulpit and the press in our behalf. We hope this convention will be followed by a series of conventions embracing every part of the country."

Sounds very much like a resolution that might be passed by the Conference of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor today, doesn't it.

I am informed that there are today at this Women's Bureau conference representatives from 26 States of the United States and from the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, representing more than 155 different women's organizations. Ladies, I congratulate you.

There is in our Nation's Capitol a monumental shrine erected in marble, the rock of ages, dedicated to the founders of the Woman Movement of the World. It is the first monument of women to women, presented and executed by woman.

This monumental shrine to women everywhere is the work of the sculptress, Adelaide Johnson. It is composed of the three great pioneers and founders of the woman movement, Lucretia Mott, Susan B. Anthony, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. This monument was presented to the women of America by the National Woman's Party. It was accepted by Speaker Gillette of the House of Representatives in the name of the women of the Nation, and was unveiled in the rotunda of the National Capitol on the anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony on February 21, 1921, in an imposing ceremony attended by thousands of people, at which more than 8,500 persons were unable to gain entrance to the Capitol, so keen was the interest on that occasion.

I hope every one of the delegates to this conference will visit the shrine in the National Capitol while here to pay honor to the Woman Movement.

In the words of the sculptress, Adelaide Johnson:

"This monument was not made for entertainment, but as an immortal record of the mightiest thing in the evolution of humanity that has taken place since the dawn of mind in the brute. It was at Seneca Falls, in 1848, that began the first movement to succeed. That did not die, but grew, until for the first time in human history a cause reached every country, and expanded to every field of endeavor.

"No statement can be complete without including the three initiators of the women's movement, Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony. These three form a unique historic unit in the nature of a trinity, the one of which could not have done her work without the other. They became the embodiment of an idea. Of this trinity, Susan B. Anthony, peerless as an erect monolith reaching skyward out on the desert, whither humanity might journey as to a shrine, will forever stand alone, at the end of an age that produced her and her great contemporaries. Let me say that the National Woman's Party in their instrumentality in placing this monument in our Capitol, where they who have rendered signal service to the Nation are admitted, were in that act placing an everlasting jewel in their own crown of service."

When you view this shrine to the Woman Movement you will note the idea and the purpose of the sculptress Adelaide Johnson to picture the three founders of the Woman Movement, Lucretia Mott, Susan B. Anthony, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, as a trinity, as an ideal rising out of the desert "peerless as an erect monolith reaching skyward."

And when you go back to your homes, to your desks, to your work—contemplate the ideals of those pioneer women who met in the first convention of the Woman Movement at Seneca Falls a hundred years ago. Think of the obstacles they had to overcome, which they met and which they conquered. Then gird yourselves with the inspiration of victory, and say to the world: Our mission shall be accomplished.

Now ladies of the conference, you are about to hear one of the leading exponents of woman's rights in the world today, a distinguished educator, writer, and lecturer, the dean of Vassar College. She was the only woman member of the United States delegation to the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education in London in 1944, whose report of that conference has been published by the Foreign Policy Association. In 1945 she was again in London as a delegate and representative of the United States at the conference that drafted the constitution for UNESCO. Continuing her activity and influence in education, she has accepted the chair at the University of Georgia as consultant in education and professor of history. She is a writer of national and international acclaim. She has written books on southern history, among which are: Reconstruction in Georgia and Carpetbaggers in the United States Senate.

I now have the distinct pleasure and high honor to present to you the speaker of the evening, Dr. C. Mildred Thompson, dean of Vassar College, who will address you on the subject, Women's status—yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

National Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is fitting and appropriate on the occasion of the observance of National Brotherhood Week that I insert in the Record a very informative and interesting editorial on the subject of brotherhood, which appeared in today's Chicago Herald-Examiner. I am sure that the membership in reading it would join in my feeling that it would indeed be wonderful if we could live up to the intent of the Declaration of Independence as so well expressed in this editorial, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD WEEK

It is a very great service to the country, and a great credit to the churches and religious organizations which sponsor the observance, that National Brotherhood Week is designated annually as an occasion for emphasis upon the manner in which the happiness of the American people is dependent upon religious and racial tolerance and understanding.

In the matters of religious faith and racial origin, and especially of religion, the American people have many contrasting interests and many other conflicting beliefs and traditions, all deeply rooted in the lands and times of their fathers and thus inexorably and most properly constituting the intellectual pattern by which their present lives are largely shaped.

This is not a new condition among the American people, but a very old one.

It existed, and was recognized, at the time when the founders of the American Republic wrote the Declaration of Independence, in which it was asserted that all men, irrespective of race or religion, have certain inalienable rights as their endowment from the Creator, these being life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Its existence was more substantially and irrevocably recognized when the Constitution of the United States, by the first act of amendment, totally and permanently withheld from the Congress of the United States the power to enact any law respecting an establishment of religion or in any degree infringing upon the freedom of worship.

By these devices, which gave recognition to the religious and racial differences among the American people, it was sought to assure them in perpetuity against any future acts of prejudice or discrimination.

It is to be significantly noted that in the pursuit and fulfillment of this purpose the founders of the country deemed it of the utmost necessity to provide for the protection and integrity of religious and racial minorities.

Accordingly, it was not the attainment of a single conviction by the American people with respect to religion that was held to be a proper object or responsibility of the people, but instead the attainment by them of a spiritual and cultural state of sincere and earnest brotherhood.

This is the high purpose to which the American people give recognition, and to which they rededicate themselves in the manner of their founding fathers, by their observance of national brotherhood.

There has never been a total attainment of an estate of absolute brotherhood among the contrasting and conflicting religious and racial groups of the American Nation.

But the American people as a whole, to their very great credit and profit, have never failed to recognize the wisdom of their fathers, and have never ceased to strive for and progress toward the full estate of American brotherhood as a matter of national aspiration and dedication.

The churches and religious organizations, which themselves exist and prosper in the country by virtue of the freedom and dignity to which its basic laws entitle them, have fulfilled their most vital duty to the country by organizing the National Brotherhood Week observance and thus giving the strength of national unity and purpose to the desire and intention of the American people to live together with tolerance of all faiths and respect for all opinions.

Portrait of a "Progressive Liberal"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the RECORD an editorial of Wednesday, February 25, from the Chicago Tribune.

The subject of this editorial, Portrait of a Progressive Liberal, gives a word picture of Truman liberalism well worth careful reading.

PORTRAIT OF A "PROGRESSIVE LIBERAL"

The despoilers paid $100 a plate to hear Harry Truman mock the memory of Jefferson and Jackson by announcing himself as the custodian of the true faith of "progressive liberalism." He referred to New Dealers as "we of the forward looking faith." Anybody else was a "reactionary." Before taking to the radio, he announced that conditions were too grave to turn the Government over to a "bunch of reactionaries."

"If anyone chooses to call this politics," he said in the windup, "then it is the politics of Jefferson and Jackson, Wilson and Roosevelt—and it is good enough for me." We do not know whether Washington and Lincoln were good enough for High Tax Harry, too. He has rather peculiar standards.

Let us look at a few of the things that are good enough for this self-styled progressive liberal. The convicted crooks of the Pendergast Kansas City gang were good enough for him. They stole the election which first assured him a Senate seat. They loaned his mother $35,000 on the family farm out of the trust fund of the school children of Kansas City. Yes, they were good enough for him. He pardoned them after an honest Democratic United States attorney, termed by Truman a traitor to the party, had sent them to the penitentiary.

They were still good enough for him when he determined to purge Representative Slaughter in the Democratic primary of 1946. With Harry directing operations on the grounds, they stole that election. A whole raft of them were indicted, but then they blew the courthouse safe and stole the evidence of the fraudulent voting. It was a slick trick. It was good enough for him.

When the scandal was at its height, Harry's Attorney General, Tom Clark, thought he had better do a little window dressing. He announced an FBI investigation, but he directed the FBI agents to do just enough investigating to make it look good. That is the testimony of the No. 2 G-man, Edward A. Tamm, now nominated by Harry for a Federal judgeship.

Senator DONNELL, Missouri Republican, struggled last year to obtain a full scale investigation of Clark's brush-off of the stolen election. The party of "progressive liberalism" blocked action by a filibuster. That was good enough for Harry.

The parole of the four Chicago Capone mobsters, Ricca, Campagna, D'Andrea, and Gioe, who shook down the movie industry for a million dollars, was good enough for this administration, too. The testimony shows that Paul Dillon, Harry's old St. Louis sidekick and campaign manager, who figured in the fix, collected $10,000 from the mob. Another $20,000 went to the widow of Futty Nose Brady, another shining light in the St. Louis wing of the party of progressive liberalism. Brady's services were to get Dillon to "intervene" for the gangsters. With whom?

Well, we have Dillon's statement that when he went to Washington last August 6 to talk to parole board members, he was entertained by President and Mrs. Truman in the White House. He was good enough for them.

We know that a favorable climate for parole was developed here in the 1946 congressional election when five gangster controlled Republican ward committeemen delivered solidly for the party of progressive liberalism. That was good enough for it.

What else is good enough for the great progressive liberal who holds hands with election thieves and hoodlums? The United Nations fraud, for one, with its apparatus to perpetuate imperialist slavery in Indonesia. Human slavery, for another. The German prisoners of war in this country were released into the tender bondage of the British and French and are still engaged in slave labor almost 3 years after the end of the war in Europe. Any nation other than the United States, for a third: three billion seven hundred and fifty million for Britain, seventeen more billions for Britain and her pals, five hundred and seventy million for China, ten million for Iran, four hundred million for Greece and Turkey, five hundred and twenty-two million for France, Italy, and Austria, etc. These panhandlers are good enough for him.

Such people and such things are good enough for the great balcony builder in the White House. Who is he good enough for? We very much doubt that the people of the United States can be induced to agree next November that he is good enough for them.

Good Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excellent article from the Chelsea Evening Record, Chelsea, Mass., entitled "Good Brotherhood":

GOOD BROTHERHOOD

President Truman, in accepting honorary chairmanship of National Brotherhood Week, February 22-29, said, "I commend the cooperation of all agencies of religion, education, and community life, and all media of communication in making brotherhood a living reality in every corner of our country." During the war years Americans shared the responsibilities and sorrows of the Nation without segregation of race or religion. Likewise during this period of time greater effort was expended in public schools to give children a better understanding of the peoples of the world.

The observance of brotherhood in our public schools, therefore, has ceased to be merely a week set apart for each year in which to be reminded of good brotherhood. Since it has long been recognized that a child has no prejudices of race and religion until the seeds of discrimination have been planted by some adult, our schools today endeavor to give a more truthful picture of the background, customs, and practices of people from other countries. Stereotyped characters are no longer presented as accurate pictures of the ancestors of new Americans. With the wealth of materials available from UNESCO, United Nations, the Pan American Union, the East and West Association, and innumerable other organizations, it is now no longer necessary to overwork the imagination in this respect. Older brothers and sisters have returned from war service bringing pictures, stories, and memories as witness that other people are no different in their hopes and fears than we are.

No race or nationality is, therefore, set apart as one to be regarded as different from us in its emotions. The National Conference of Christians and Jews is doing much to secure greater religious tolerance among children. Children are taught that many of the great musical compositions, folk songs, masterpieces of famous artists, the ballet and folk dances of the world found much of their origin in countries across the Atlantic or the Pacific. In and out of school listening to radio programs brings the literature and music of these countries nearer to the child's understanding.

With the improved means of communication, we now teach our children to rise above the level of narrow thinking and to develop in fullness and accuracy the knowledge of life in all nations as it really is. We teach them that in having this appreciation they must also respect and love a democratic form of government which can and does give equal opportunity to all people, regardless of race, color, or creed.

South's Political Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority, I was granted leave to extend my remarks by inserting a newspaper article and I now submit a copy of an article by Columnist Gould Lincoln which appeared in the Washington Star of Washington, D. C., of date February 26, 1948, entitled "South's Revolt No Joke," and so forth, as follows:

SOUTH'S REVOLT NO JOKE FOR TRUMAN'S CANDIDACY—DENIAL OF ELECTORAL VOTES COULD CAUSE WORST DEFEAT IN UNITED STATES HISTORY

(By Gould Lincoln)

And so the Southern revolt—against President Truman's civil-rights program—was a "joke." So much of a joke that there is doubt, now, in the minds of some of the Southern Democratic leaders that Mr. Truman will have the electoral votes of these States, which since reconstruction days have been voting almost automatically for Democratic Presidential nominees. First, the southerners would like to deny Mr. Truman the Presidential nomination. If they fail there, as seems probable, then they plan to deny him the electoral votes of their States. If this happened, it would be within the bounds of probability that Mr. Truman would be the worst defeated candidate for President, not even excepting Alf Landon, who in 1936 carried two States—Maine and Vermont.

The promoters of the "joke" idea suggested that the Southern Democrats, even if they did not like Mr. Truman and his proposals for antilynching, anti-poll-tax, and anti-segregation legislation, had "no place to go"; that they would prefer Mr. Truman in any event to a Republican in the White House, which a desertion of Mr. Truman would probably bring about.

1928 REVOLT DISREGARDED

They counted, however, upon old political-party ties being stronger than certain institutions and principles of government in which southerners have been grounded for years. They paid no attention to the historical fact that a revolt of the Southern voters 20 years ago found five of the States of the Democratic "Solid South" giving their electoral votes to a Republican, Herbert Hoover. These States were Texas, Florida, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Virginia. The religious issue was paramount in this desertion of the Democratic Presidential nominee, Al Smith—although also involved were the South's stand for prohibition and against a "wet."

The recalcitrant Southerners say they are fighting Mr. Truman on two grounds. First, they are strongly opposed to his proposal for doing away with segregation of the races—white and colored. Second, they are opposed to his proposals which would flatten out States' rights and make the Federal Government supreme in matters which, they insist, must remain within the jurisdiction of the States if the present form of government is to continue. By antisegregation laws, by anti-poll-tax Federal laws, and by antilynching Federal laws, it is argued, the Federal Government would take over control of elections, police, employment, travel conditions, and education.

Mr. Truman and the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Senator MCGRATH of Rhode Island, have turned their backs on appeals from the southerners for some mitigation of the civil-rights program which Mr. Truman has demanded of Congress. A committee of southern governors, presenting to Mr. MCGRATH a series of questions asking what his stand as chairman of the party's national committee would be, obtained no satisfaction. Indeed, they received an emphatic "No" to all their requests.

LEADERS PRESSED BY PEOPLE

While the governors were rebuffed, the very rebuff served to point up the sharp differences between the southern Democrats and Mr. Truman. Because this revolt in the South goes down to the grass roots, it is far more serious than if it were just a revolt on the part of some of the party leaders. The leaders are being pressed by the people they lead. In 1928, when southern voters revolted against Al Smith, the party leaders—with two notable exceptions, Senator Simmons of North Carolina and Senator Heflin of Alabama—went along with the Smith presidential candidacy—on the surface at least. The southern Democratic leaders today face the alternative of fighting Mr. Truman up to and through the election or of merely voicing their protests. What the rank-and-file voters of the South may do is another thing.

One of the moves now proposed is to take Mr. Truman off the Democratic ticket in the Southern States, even if he be nominated by the Democratic National Convention, and so permit the voters to vote for individual Democratic electors, who in the electoral college would cast their ballots for some Democrat other than Mr. Truman. If followed out, this would be an effective way of denying Mr. Truman the votes of the Southern States.

It is beginning to look as though Mr. Truman's efforts to line up for him the Negro votes of the Northern and Western States may be as disastrous as his efforts to win the Jewish vote.

AIC Stenos Basketball Team of Davenport, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the American Institute of Commerce of Davenport, Iowa, has been a great exponent of international good will and they have proceeded to back up their belief with action. They have an outstanding girls' basketball team that has made an annual tour throughout the eastern part of the United States. They play under the name of AIC Stenos.

Last year a girls' team from Mexico came to our country and played the AIC Steno team at Davenport and the good will that developed from their tour of America gave Mr. S. D. Fenton, director of the American Institute of Commerce, the desire to return their visit and also to extend their trip to other Central American countries. The girls who make up the AIC Steno team are all from Iowa families, they receive no pay, and at no cost to the Government of the United States the girls have been of help in promoting the good will between nations that we are all striving for. These girls did much to engender the feeling of good will that exists between Central America and Mexico and the United States.

The trip of the AIC Stenos basketball team through Central America this winter has brought forth many expressions of appreciation and good will from the countries visited by these girls. I have received several communications and newspapers from Mexico and Central America praising the American Institute of Commerce team and I set forth here a translation of a typical article that appeared in La Estrella de Nicaragua, Managua, D. N., February 3, 1948:

SO THEY TELL US—GOSSIPS ABOUT THE BASKETBALL SERIES

Well, the Davenport's starlets have heard so much of the pinoleras when we refer to the Nicaraguan basketball girls and certainly they do not know what it is all about.

They are called pinoleras because most of everybody in this country drinks a typical national beverage named pinol. It is a sort of a drink made of corn. Sometimes it is mixed up with chocolate and then we call it pinolillo which is a delicious drink but it does not have a kick, so the distinguished visitors don't have to worry about it. The beverage is comfortable and refreshing.

Although the pinol is not dangerous, the pinoleras might be tonight and the Stenos should beware. Our players have decided to

cradle all the Davenport babies and put them to sleep during the second game.

Miss Stolte has only 18 years of age and none of the Iowan beauties have reached the 20 years' goal. They are all teenagers, but, for God's sake, how they shoot at the basket, how they pass around, and how they run.

Miss Stolte told us that if she made one point in the first game, she would be lucky. Well she made 22 and we hope that in the second game she will keep up to her promise and score only one point. That is the best souvenir she could leave us. Atta girl!

Although the diplomatic relations between the United States and Nicaragua are practically severed, because of someone whose name we do not wish to remember, the Davenport's peaches are the best diplomats that Uncle Sam could send down to Nicaragua.

It is too bad they do not remain here for good.

But perhaps it is so much the better, because the American Embassy would have to be all the time crowded with apparent refugees. So they tell us.

FIVE THOUSAND SEE THE STENOS BEAT OUR GIRLS—THE PUBLIC WAS THRILLED BY THE HIGH SCORE OF THE LOCAL PLAYERS

The Nicaraguan team was beaten by the Stenos at the gym Friday night; but the local fans were left speechless when our girls made 35 points against 52 scored by the visiting outfit.

It was a marvelous night and this hot city became the hottest spot in the world when the American beauties made their appearance before 5,000 fans who gave them a rousing welcome.

Fortunately nobody got burned and the game was played smoothly mid a great number of spectacular thrills.

Miss Stolte was the star of the game, scoring 22 points. She delivered the ball in the basket as she pleased. The public was amazed and gave her a big hand each time she developed her streamlined plays.

All the enchanting American players had a wonderful night and were enthusiastically admired by the Nicaraguans who were delighted to see such a marvelous bunch of basketball stars displaying their ability at the utmost.

Lois Lepley, Blanche Loving, Charlotte Tomlin, Joan Hendricks, Beverly Lauer, Jane Schmidt, Lucy Kurt, LaVerne Stolte and Marjorie Logan were actual miracles on the floor and it is really very hard to pick up the best one in the game, although, as we said before, Miss Stolte was the top scorer.

There was plenty of "poetry in movement" and everybody's heart was beating strongly and ceaselessly during the whole game.

All the fans were all dressed up to start a big celebration hoping that our team could win, but they left the gym with a broken heart, although very fond of the wonders of Davenport.

The "Stenos" have won not only a victory in the first game but also the thoughts of the public which is terribly eager to see new thrills in the second game Monday.

The "invading army" of the "Stenos" certainly has conquered all of us and we gladly have surrendered. We, simply, can't help it.

Federal Barge Lines on Missouri River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement made by Mr. Harold O. Benson, of Sioux City, Iowa, before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on February 26, 1948, relating to legislation pertaining to the sale of the Federal Barge Lines. Mr. Benson is chairman of the waterways committee of the Sioux City Chamber of Commerce. His statement follows:

My name is Harold O. Benson. I am appearing before this committee as chairman of the waterways committee of the Sioux City Chamber of Commerce. I have been engaged in the furniture business in Sioux City for the past 18 years except for 4 years when I was in the Army. During my service in the Army, I was in charge of several tug boats and barges transporting supplies in the South Seas.

The Sioux City Chamber of Commerce is an organization with 1,540 members. It is composed of individuals in all types of trade and industry. Its waterways committee is charged with the responsibility of doing all possible to develop commerce on the Missouri River. I am submitting herewith, on their instructions, a copy of the resolutions unanimously adopted by the board of directors at their meeting on February 4, 1948, in opposition to any sale of the Inland Waterways Corp. to any private interests until such pioneering work has been completed on the Missouri and other rivers as is required.

Sioux City lies in the center of the greatest agricultural area in the United States and at almost the geographical center. Development of our resources has been hampered due to the fact that our land lies so far from the consuming areas. Using Sioux City as a typical origin point, it is roughly 1,200 miles to New Orleans, 1,800 miles to San Francisco and 1,500 miles to New York. It can be readily seen that transportation costs by truck or rail must necessarily be high and it is our studied opinion based on past experience that products of the farm and many commodities consumed on the farm can be transported by water at a much lower cost.

In the year 1947 the State of Nebraska produced 308,000,000 bushels of grain and the State of South Dakota produced 261,000,000 bushels of grain. This production alone warrants navigation on the Missouri River, but figures could also be cited to cover grain produced in Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Wyoming, North Dakota, and Montana, which will be available tonnage for the river. With the completion of the irrigation projects now under construction in South Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, and Nebraska this production will be materially increased. It must also be noted that irrigation projects bring increased population which must be served with adequate transportation, increasing the opportunity to bring tonnage up the river. We would like to direct your attention to such commodities as coffee, sugar, oyster shells, petroleum products from the lower Mississippi River; cotton piece goods, coal, and fertilizer from the Tennessee; steel, coal, etc., from the Ohio River; and coal from the Illinois River, as typical commodities which would move upstream which are available to water transportation.

We would also like to direct your attention to the increase in population in the United States during the past 10 years and to suggest that the most advantageous new territory in which to settle this population would be in the sparsely settled area of the Missouri River Basin. Being away from the seaboard, this would be a safety factor should the United States be forced into war. Many industries should be located in this area for the same reason, and they would need the cheapest transportation available.

Facts have been submitted from time to time to show the loss in revenue incurred in the operations of the Federal Barge Lines, but we are sure this will not apply to the Missouri River as we can profit by the errors committed in pioneering on the Mississippi and other rivers in installing terminal facilities, etc. Furthermore, no credit is given in savings to the producers and consumers in the areas directly tributary to the Mississippi, Illinois, and Ohio Rivers in savings in reduced transportation charges forced by the competition of low-cost water transportation. Granted that there has been a monetary loss in the operation of the Federal Barge Lines, areas tributary to the above-named rivers were able to recoup this loss by the use of reduced transportation costs. However, residents in the Missouri River area have had no such opportunity, although they have willingly borne their share of the taxation necessary to keep the Federal Barge Line in operation, being under the impression that the same type of pioneering work would be done on the Missouri River as soon as the Missouri River was available for such service. The Missouri is now ready for the initial stages of this pioneering work and it should be started at once.

Sioux City is opposed to any type of legislation that would in any way retard the pioneering work on the Missouri River. It feels that this Congress has a moral obligation to see that the work of pioneering as contemplated in the original Organic Act of 1924 creating the Federal Barge Line should be carried to a successful conclusion by continued operation of the Federal Barge Line until such time as this pioneering work is finished on all rivers.

RESOLUTION

Whereas there is now pending before the Honorable Averell Harriman, the Secretary of the Department of Commerce of the United States, an offer to purchase part of the equipment and all of the operating rights of the Inland Waterways Corporation, such offer being made by Mr. Theodore Brent, of New Orleans, and his associates; and

Whereas shippers, receivers, manufacturers, grain, livestock, and agricultural interests represented by the Sioux City Chamber of Commerce have authorized and directed its waterways committee to transmit its views and position relative to the proposed disposal of this equipment and business known under the trade name as Federal Barge Lines; Therefore be it

Resolved by the waterways committee on behalf of the aforesaid interests, That it favors the continuation of the present operations of the Inland Waterways Corporation and requests our Members of the Congress to urge the appropriation of the needed funds for the rehabilitation of equipment and the continued operation of the line by the Government for the following reasons:

(a) The Inland Waterways Corporation is operating practically as the only common carrier rendering "less than barge load" service on the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

(b) This "less than barge load" service is essential to the shipping needs of the smaller businesses of the valley.

(c) There is a definite need for pioneering of barge service on the upper Missouri River, as has been done by the Government on other navigable streams. We feel that the people of the Missouri River valley are entitled to similar consideration.

(d) Private interests who might purchase the Inland Waterways equipment at this time will not voluntarily pioneer the development of terminals and Missouri River barge service; be it further

Resolved, That until such time as private interests will make an offer to the Government to purchase the entire assets of Inland Waterways Corporation Federal Barge Lines at a fair and reasonable price and will agree to continue and fulfill the basic provisions of the organic act which established and created the Federal Barge Lines, that this committee recommends to the Congress that the operations in the Inland Waterways Corporation be continued by the Government of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Secretary Harriman, Senators Wilson and Hickenlooper, and Congressmen from Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, Kansas, and Missouri.

Respectfully submitted.

HAROLD MURPHY,
Secretary, Chamber of Commerce,
Sioux City, Iowa.

Resolutions Relative to the Admission of Eire and All Other Peace-Loving Nations as Members of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas it is reliably reported that the Soviet Union through its power of veto has excluded Eire and other peace-loving nations from membership in the United Nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts affirms its conviction that the cause of peace will be best served if Eire, and all other peace-loving nations, are made members of the United Nations, and views with alarm the acts of the Soviet Union, specifically the unwarranted exercise of its power of veto and the spread of harmful propaganda against the United States and other democratic nations; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, and to the representatives of all nations participating in the United Nations organization.

In the house of representatives, adopted, February 17, 1948.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

What United States Gets for Aid Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the United States News-World Report for February 27, 1948:

WHAT THE UNITED STATES GETS FOR AID ABROAD—REPORTED FROM WASHINGTON, LONDON, AND PARIS

Government pump priming is to be started on a global scale.

Scope of Marshall plan aid is almost double that of New Deal.

Recovery planning puts the United States in a position to direct production and business activity for much of the world.

Spending abroad has the advantage of being less visible to taxpayers than spending at home. Program may become permanent.

Pump priming, once confined to the United States under the New Deal, is to be tried for much of the world under the Marshall plan. Dollars are to be used on a planned basis to try to bring back prosperity where it is lacking, or to support prosperity where it is shaky.

Plans for fueling world recovery with dollars are moving out of the blueprint stage into the stage of action. Unanimous approval for those plans is given by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Final Senate action is not far off. There will be a battle and some modification in the House, but billions will be voted. Within 2 or 3 months a program will start that may turn out to be a permanent one.

For the outside world, dollars are to be provided on a larger scale than they were for the New Deal. The plan for the year ahead calls for almost twice as many dollars as the New Deal ever spent in a year for relief and recovery at home. In Paris, London, and Rome, among other places, governments are making plans on the basis of these dollars. Deep cuts in living standards are being avoided. Leaders of governments flirting with bankruptcy are confident that dollars will come in time to keep the sheriff away.

The accompanying charts show the scale of emergency spending that is about to begin, compared with the scale of domestic spending at the peak of New Deal efforts.

Prewar pump priming cost $4,000,000,000 in its most expensive year. That was for the 12 months ending June 30, 1939, when the Government poured out money to offset the 1938 business setback. This sum represents only dollars spent to employ the jobless, relieve the distressed and assist the farmers. It does not include the more or less regular outlays for public works.

The money was distributed as follows: $2,200,000,000 through the Work Projects Administration and other relief agencies, $300,000,000 for the Civilian Conservation Corps for reforestation work, $1,200,000,000 in aids to agriculture, and $300,000,000 for assistance under the Social Security System.

Cost of priming United States pump, July 1, 1938–June 30, 1939, via relief spending (WPA, etc.) at home, $4,000,000,000.

Postwar pump priming, under existing plans, calls for $7,000,000,000 for the year starting July 1. This sum is asked by the President and may be trimmed a bit by Congress. But it does not include all the aid that is coming up. There is to be more money for China, for Greece, maybe for Germany and Japan.

The plan calls for a super-WPA to be run on a global scale by an administrator with more power and more money than the late Harry Hopkins ever had. This official is to have the status of a Cabinet officer and is to be paid $20,000 a year, $5,000 more than a Cabinet officer. He will deal with foreign countries separately and in groups. He will determine which countries get loans and which get gifts. He will supervise buying in this country and will oversee spending abroad. He will have agents almost everywhere, directed by a "roving Ambassador."

Foreign governments are setting up organizations to handle their end of the pump-priming project. The British are sending to Washington a new Ambassador, Sir Oliver Franks, a man who knows more about the program than anyone else in Britain. The 16 nations that are to receive United States dollars are to meet soon to set up a joint organization for the receiving end.

The Administrator of the program actually is to become a director of world business. He will be in a position to tell France, for example, whether to rebuild railroads or to improve highways. He can decide whether farms are to be mechanized. He will determine whether Britain or the Ruhr gets first call on coal-mining machinery. And he can stop the dollar flow altogether if countries do not abide by his terms.

World trade patterns will be influenced by the Administrator's decisions. He has power to decide whether timber shall be purchased from Finland, Sweden, or Canada; whether United States wheat or Canadian wheat should get priority in dollar sales; whether Brazil or the United States should supply cotton to European textile mills.

When it comes to purely relief operations, the Administrator, on the basis of Senate plans, is to have almost absolute power. Congress will appropriate relief money to him and he will make grants-in-aid to the various countries. He may decide what countries get the food, the coal, the petroleum, the medical supplies, and the raw materials that the United States pays for. He also has power to buy these supplies directly, anywhere in the world.

When it comes to loans, the Administrator must consult with the National Advisory Council on International and Monetary Problems, of which he is to become a member. The Administrator's activities also will be subject to check by the Secretary of State on foreign-policy matters, by a 12-man Public Advisory Board, and by a 14-man congressional Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation.

Some advantages over domestic pump priming are seen in the world program that is about to begin. Effects of spending will not be so visible inside the United States. American taxpayers will not have WPA leaf-raking projects before their eyes. They won't see courthouses being built, sidewalks laid, or murals painted with Federal money. The result is that there may be less criticism.

The foreign-aid program also may promise an easier way of keeping United States business active and of getting rid of surpluses. Most industrial orders will be for heavy goods—machinery, trucks, tractors, electrical equipment—a sector of industry that the New Deal never could revive until the war. Foreign outlets for surplus grains and fruit and cotton may prove more effective than relief stamp programs at home.

Overseas pump priming, in addition, is expected to pay off in increased good will toward the United States. New Dealers found that voters on relief showed their gratitude at the polls. Now this country expects to produce allies in the campaign to stop the spread of communism.

Disadvantages are numerous, too. Current domestic shortages of steel, farm equipment, and oil may be prolonged as shipments to Europe continue. The political trouble these shortages can cause already has been demonstrated in the case of oil. Criticism also may develop over plans to modernize plants of foreign competitors at little or no cost to their owners, possibly giving them an advantage over United States producers in future world markets.

There is a risk that world recovery could result in a surfeit of goods like that which plagued the world just before the war. In that event, United States manufacturers might find themselves competing with producers whose costs were reduced by gifts or easy-term sales of modern American machinery. Such a development, however, is unlikely for several years.

Standards, meanwhile, are to be imposed on countries that are to receive aid. The law proposed in the Senate suggests that pump-priming dollars be concentrated on projects that will increase output of coal, steel, and food, and that will improve transportation systems. In addition, receiving countries are to be required to agree to take steps to balance their budgets, to stabilize their currencies, to lower trade barriers, and

to do what they can to use the dollar resources of their own citizens. These standards are to be written in a series of treaties between the United States and the countries that receive aid.

The Administrator also is to have a voice in deciding what other countries are to do with the proceeds from United States goods that are sold to their citizens. A basic idea is to persuade European governments to use these funds to help balance their own budgets and give their currencies stable values. France, for example, is expected to get around $54,000,000 worth of United States farm machinery. That probably will be sold to French farmers for francs. The Administrator might induce France to use those francs either to apply on the French budget or to reduce the volume of circulating money.

A flow of $7,000,000,000 worth of goods to Europe, most of which is to be sold to European citizens and industries, is expected to provide a sum that could be used to restore a degree of financial order in inflation-ridden countries. The Senate plan definitely contemplates that gifts are to be paid for in local currencies and that these receipts are to be used to put finances under better control.

Cost of priming United States pump, July 1, 1948–June 30, 1949, via relief spending abroad, $7,000,000,000.

In Europe, governments already are preparing their programs for American aid. They expect to be ready with detailed programs by the time Congress approves the recovery program and an Administrator is appointed.

Britain is depending on United States aid to close the gap between her imports and exports for the 12 months beginning next July 1—a gap that created a deficit of around $2,000,000,000 in 1947. Dollar aids also are expected to ease the deficit for the sterling area, which Britain backed last year to the tune of $4,092,000,000.

France, the next largest beneficiary, faces in the same period a deficit that is expected to approach $1,000,000,000. Smaller deficits, to be made up by American aid, are in prospect for Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, and Greece.'

An end to the aid program is suggested by 1952. By then, it is hoped, European recovery will be on a firm basis, requiring no further assistance. Such programs, however, tend to become permanent. United States farmers will receive Government payments despite a record income, and Federal outlays for old-age relief are larger than in 1939, despite full employment.

REA Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to take a minute's time to refer to the defeat of the amendment seeking $300,000,000 additional funds for REA which several Members voted to add to the urgent deficiency bill before the House.

The roll call came on the motion to recommit. I voted against the motion to recommit, as did a majority of the Members of the House, and the motion failed, as it should have.

I was surprised at many Members voting to spend $300,000,000 without any request being made for this money by Claude R. Wickard, Administrator of REA, and at their being willing to completely by-pass the regular subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which is now holding hearings on the amount of money necessary to be voted for REA for the coming fiscal year.

The regular course is for hearings to be held before the proper subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee where those interested in additional REA appropriations always come, and, with facts and figures, justify their request for appropriations. The gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman KEEFE, when the amendment was suggested, told the Members of the House that hearings would be held, and that a bill would be brought to the floor in regular order about the middle of March, which will carry the request for appropriations for the REA for the coming year.

The gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman KEEFE, further stated that there was $73,000,000 in cash, now allocated, to run REA up to June 30, 1948. Also, the gentleman from New York, Congressman TABER, read into the RECORD that REA now has on hand to its credit $451,000,000 in cash. Congressman CASE inserted in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Wickard stating that they had on hand, from February 13 to June 30, 1948, $73,017,126.

Mr. Speaker, Administrator Wickard, in the same letter, said that the appropriations for the coming fiscal year, beginning June 30, 1948, which will be requested for the REA loan fund for 1949, will be $300,000,000. It should be quite clear to anyone that the $300,000,000 which was voted down on the amendment should not have been offered, but that it should come before the Congress after it has been considered by the regular Appropriations Committee. That is the reason why a majority of the House voted against the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, could it be that many Members supporting the amendment out of its place, and without consideration, were influenced by political expediency, rather than greater and quicker extension of power lines to the people?

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons people throughout the Nation have not been able to secure extension of light and power as rapidly as they desire is not for lack of funds appropriated by the Congress, but is due to lack of material brought about largely because of the war. I want to point out now that many of those who attempted by their vote to indicate their great interest in extending light and power to the people of America by supporting the motion to recommit, will doubtless within a few weeks' time vote to continue this shortage of materials. They will vote for the Marshall plan, which is voting to give away materials we need for the extension of light and power to European nations, and many of our American people who want light and power will still be waiting, because many who supported the amendment will have supported the Marshall plan. That will be the best test of how much they are interested in getting light and power to the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I have voted to continue the backlog of millions of dollars for the rapid extension of REA, and will vote for ample funds in addition for REA when the regular appropriation bill comes to this House within a few weeks. I will vote to reduce to a minimum the sending of supplies to Europe under the Marshall plan so that we may use those supplies here in the future for the extension of REA, and for the building of homes for our people, for more farm machinery which is badly needed, and to keep the oil in this country necessary to run the trucks, automobiles, and tractors of the farmers.

United States Citizenship for Aliens Who Served in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution memorializing Congress in favor of conferring United States citizenship upon aliens who served in the armed forces of the United States during the world wars and were honorably discharged from such service

Whereas there are approximately 250,000 alien World War veterans who took the oath of allegiance to our country and served in our armed forces during the world wars and were honorably discharged from such service who believe themselves by reason of such service to have become citizens of the United States automatically; and

Whereas there are hundreds of these aliens who died on the fields of France for the preservation and perpetuation of our institutions; hundreds came back mentally and physically wrecked; and hundreds of these men, in caskets draped with the American Flag, were lowered to their last resting place as aliens by reason of the technical interpretation of the law; and

Whereas to consider these men as aliens is contrary to our conception of American justice as handed down by the forefathers of this glorious country of ours; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts hereby respectfully petitions the Congress and the president of the United States to declare these alien World War veterans who honorably served in our armed forces citizens of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In House of Representatives, adopted February 5, 1948.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

In Senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 16, 1948.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Increase of Pay for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, the esteemed Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is now considering proposals to provide higher compensation for post-office employees. By this means I express my wholehearted endorsement of a substantial salary increase for this worthy group of civil servants.

The pay raise granted to post-office employees in 1946 was adequate at the time; however, prices have continued to rise and now an additional pay increase seems to be fully justified. Many newer postal employees, no doubt, are leaving the service to accept employment with private industry where wages provide a better standard of living. Wages of many groups have kept in balance with the inflationary spiral and those wages have far outstripped the salaries of postal employees who in 1947 tried to hold the line against salary increases. This action on their part deserves much credit. The postal employees, as a group, have been faithful in maintaining the high standards of the postal service and the quality of their work has remained consistently high.

It is my earnest hope that a bill will be reported out without delay which will adjust postal salary rates to a degree commensurate with increased costs of living.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me as author of the bill to abolish the poll tax in Federal elections at a dinner in my honor sponsored by the National Committee To Abolish the Poll Tax, Statler Hotel, February 24, 1948:

Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we are nearing the end of a long fight to abolish the poll tax.

I cannot begin to tell you how deeply I appreciate the honor of this dinner tonight. I am proud to be here. I am proud that it was the Bender bill to abolish the poll tax in Federal elections which was passed by the House of Representatives with an overwhelming majority in this session of Congress. I am proud that it will be the Bender bill which will shortly be enacted by the Senate and which will finally put an end to the poll tax.

But this is really a dinner in honor of many people, a few of them who are well known and hundreds of others who are not, who have labored over the years to restore the right to vote to 10,000,000 disfranchised American citizens.

The one man to whom, more than any other, I should like to pay tribute tonight, is the late Congressman Lee E. Geyer, of California. I wish that he might have lived to see the fight to abolish the poll tax on the threshold of victory, as it is tonight, and to see the poll tax finally abolished, as it will be in this session of Congress.

Congressman Geyer and I served together as freshman Members of Congress nearly a decade ago. It was Congressman Geyer who, in the Seventy-sixth Congress, on August 5, 1939, introduced the first bill to abolish the poll tax. Hearings were held on the bill but the hearings were never published and the bill was never reported from committee.

That was the beginning of the fight.

I do not need to recount here the long history of the struggle to abolish the poll tax. For most of you it is a familiar story. You know how a second bill was introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress in 1941. You know how after more than a year and half, it was forced out of committee by a discharge petition signed by a majority of the Members of the House, how it was passed by the House and killed for the Seventy-seventh Congress by a filibuster in the Senate.

Many of you saw much the same pattern repeated in the Seventy-eighth, and in the Seventy-ninth Congresses. But each time, support for Federal action to abolish the poll tax grew. The people of the whole country became aware of the poll tax and how it works and what it means in the denial of basic political rights. They learned that it is not a matter which affects the poll-tax States alone but that it is a national issue.

When the third anti-poll-tax bill was introduced in the House of Representatives in January 1943 by Congressman MARCANTONIO—a courageous fighter who is here tonight—it had the active support of a nonpartisan group of Republican and Democratic Members. The signatures of the necessary majority of the House for a discharge petition were secured in a record 32 legislative days.

In the present Eightieth Congress it was no longer necessary to employ a discharge petition to force the bill out of committee. And in the Eightieth Congress a filibuster will not be permitted to kill the bill in the Senate.

With Congressman Geyer there is another man to whom I should like to pay tribute this evening. And I wish that he too could be present to see the final enactment of the anti-poll-tax bill. That man is the late George W. Norris of Nebraska.

In 1942 Senator Norris, one of the truly distinguished men in the history of Congress, then in his thirty-ninth consecutive year of congressional service, wrote the masterful report of the Senate Judiciary Committee which favorably reported the anti-poll-tax bill to the Senate. That report remains one of the great statements on poll-tax restrictions on the franchise.

Senator Norris was an independent Republican. Lee Geyer was a Democrat. Congressman MARCANTONIO is the leader of the American Labor Party. We who have worked for the removal of the poll-tax restriction from the ballot know that all virtue is not confined to any one political party. We know that a deep belief in fundamental American rights is not the property of any one party. Mr. Walter Lippmann in his commentary yesterday on a recent political speech—a speech which advanced a parcel theory of American political history—pointed out some of the difficulties of so simple a theory. Mr. Lippmann wrote:

"The fitting of American history into these two parcels will keep any man busy who tries it. But he will not succeed. For in making up the Republican parcel under the Truman doctrine of our party history it would be quite puzzling to know what to do with Washington, with Lincoln, with Theodore Roosevelt, or with Norris, Pinchot, Borah, La Follette. * * * In making up the Democratic parcel it would not be clear just what to do with Franklin Pierce and James Buchanan or with Flynn, Hague, Pendergast, and Pauley in more recent times."

No, it is too simple a theory, as Mr. Lippmann has suggested—even for an election year—that all the virtue is in one parcel.

But the important thing is for the people to have an opportunity to make a choice.

It is the denial of that opportunity which makes the poll tax a device which is detested by all men who believe in the American tradition of democracy—whether they look to Jefferson and Jackson or to Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt for their inspiration.

There has been a good deal of talk during the past week or two by some Representatives and Senators—yes, and by some Governors—about outside interference in the affairs of the South.

I need not remind this audience, which includes so many distinguished Southerners who have worked long and courageously for the abolition of the poll tax, that the charge of "outside interference" is hollow.

That charge comes from those who have been at great pains to prevent any inside interference with their rule in the poll tax States.

I know that the majority of the people of the South, just like the majority of the people everywhere in America, are in favor of civil rights and of fair play and majority rule. I look forward to the day—which is now not far distant—when the majority of the people in the South, not just 2 or 3 or 4 percent of the people, will have the opportunity to express themselves on these issues—to express themselves where it is felt, through the ballot box.

The people of the South have the right to look to their Federal Congress for the guaranty of a free ballot in Federal elections. They have the right—for they are citizens of the United States as well as citizens of the individual States. And many of you who have been in the thick of the fight, in the several States where the poll tax still exists, know even better than I that the people of the South must have the help of the Federal Government to abolish the poll tax in Federal elections.

In every State where the people of the South could abolish the poll tax by a simple majority vote, the poll tax has been abolished. In the remaining States the poll tax is so embedded in the State constitutions that the disfranchised are powerless to enfranchise themselves. The men who imposed the poll tax around the turn of the present century went to great lengths to see that their work could not easily be undone. The people of the poll-tax States have the right to look to their Federal Congress for help.

As you who are here tonight know, the majority of the people of the South are deeply concerned with the problems of civil liberties and democratic rights. I think one of the most eloquent statements about the poll tax which I have heard was made by a southerner testifying in favor of the bill before a committee of Congress. It was made by Mr. Herbert Agar, who was then editor of a great southern newspaper, the Louisville Courier Journal. He said: "The result of the poll tax is to keep the poor from voting, or to keep the Negroes from voting, or both. If you keep the poor from voting, you make a joke of Jefferson. If you keep the Negroes from voting, you make a joke of Lincoln. If you do both these things at the same time, you make a joke of the American idea."

As you who are here tonight know, this is no matter of States rights or outside interference—however, much the few men who benefit by the restrictions on the suffrage try

to confuse the issue. The rights of States are important rights, and I know of no disposition to interfere with any of the legitimate rights of the States. But I say that no State has the right to deny any American citizen of the equal protection of the law. No State has the right to deny any American citizen of the right to vote because of his race or because he is poor. There are States rights, yes, but there are rights of individuals, too. There are rights of individuals which, under our American democracy, the Federal Government has the authority and the duty to protect even against Mississippi or Ohio. The right to vote in Federal elections is such a right.

We trust that our friends from the Senate, who have honored this dinner by their appearance here tonight, will give a tremendous heave together, in a genuine nonpartisan way, to remove this restriction on the basic right of American citizens to vote.

They will need the help of everyone of us. And under the leadership of that courageous and hard-working organization, the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, I know that they will get, throughout the whole country, the kind of support they need.

Address of Gov. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. James H. Duff, Governor of Pennsylvania, at the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association dinner, Philadelphia, Tuesday, February 24, 1948:

In the profoundly disturbed and chaotic world of today the leadership and influence of America are needed as never before. For upon us rests the last hope of restoring stability and equilibrium in the world.

But it is clear that our ability to exert that leadership and influence depends in the final analysis upon the continued stability and integrity of our own financial and economic structure.

It would be unrealistic to assume that if an acutely disturbed economic situation reoccurred here that either our leadership or our aid would be of the same character and quality as they would if we remained sound and prosperous.

Superficially the Nation seems to be in a state of unexampled prosperity. Sixty million of our people are gainfully employed, a figure considered fantastic even as late as the end of the war. The take-home pay is at a peak for times of peace. Corporate profits are greater than they have ever been. The national income is at the annual rate of $200,000,000,000, as compared to a previous peacetime peak of only ninety billions in 1929.

The sum of these situations would ordinarily warrant an appraisal of unprecedented prosperity. Yet it becomes increasingly evident that there is a widespread and growing feeling of uneasiness and uncertainty throughout the Nation.

This striking contrast between what we seem to have and how we feel about what we seem to have should make even the most optimistic of us begin to stop, look, and listen. For the fact is that inflation has been sweeping the country at express-train speed and no effective effort has been made to deal with it.

The recent decline in commodity prices resulting in a slight decrease in living costs offered momentary hope that prices had reached the peak. But last week the Nation was surprised and shocked by an announced increase in the price of steel. This new increase, coming at the very time when the steel workers' union is demanding another round of wage increases, demonstrated that the upward spiral of inflation was still accelerating.

The situation developing as a result of this unexpected increase in the price of steel is alarming because it is a duplication of the situation which gave the first great impetus to the current inflation in its primary phases. If past experience is an index for the future we may predict with assurance that this new increase in the price of steel will have the same general inflationary effect that it had before in the steel and wage price increases of 1946.

For one of our greatest corporations and one of our most powerful labor unions to take action, however separate, which has the effect of acting in concert to further raise prices, shows a shocking disregard for public opinion and the national welfare.

At such a tremendously critical time as the present it would seem that some of our industrial and labor leaders are either unaware of, or refuse to accept the challenge of events. One of those challenges undoubtedly is the necessity of achieving a discipline of moderation when the welfare both of the Nation and the world is in the balance.

Great as the necessity is, the fact is that inflation is not being curbed. If another round of price and wage increases is permitted to develop, we may reach the point where there will be no turning back.

Then what? At a time certainly not too remote, and possibly unbelievably near, a deflationary "bust" could be predicted with certainty. We dare not undertake that risk.

Of all the great nations of the world we are now alone in believing in the free-enterprise system as we are accustomed to define it. Under that system the United States has developed the most unparalleled capacity for production of any nation in history. Also, as a result of that production, the average American enjoys a greater condition of well-being than ever before enjoyed by the average man anywhere in the whole course of civilization. And, together with this unprecedented material well-being, he also enjoys in America complete civil and religious liberty.

Is it our purpose to risk and hazard all these blessings because we are unwilling to undertake the imperatively necessary, although decidedly unpleasant job of halting inflation? If we allow inflation to grow until we have a bust, resulting in financial collapse comparable to the 1930's, there is every reason to believe, in the light of what has happened elsewhere to the great nations of the world, that we will end up as they did, with some form of collectivism. Nor can any informed person be unaware that communism patiently awaits a major depression in America to pursue uninterruptedly its march around the world.

To be sure we have had efforts to head off inflation. But those efforts have not been determined, or aggressive, or effective.

As Americans, we resent Government controls, not only because they are offensive to us by reason of our untrammeled life as a people, but also because we rightfully fear that they will endanger our system of enterprise under which we have come to lead the world.

Therefore let us realize that if we do not desire to be driven to Government controls we must be strong and determined enough to do what we know in our hearts we must do if we are to avoid them.

Unfortunately there is no magic cure for inflation. But it can be cured by voluntary action even at this late date. The cure will call for unpleasant medicine, and industry ought to set the example by talking the first dose. Unpleasant though it may be, it will still be much easier to take than return to controls or to the havoc of a deflationary bust.

If as a Nation we intend by voluntary action to pull ourselves out of this inflationary spiral, the primary essential is that we must be willing to put the public welfare ahead of our self-interest until we have worked out of this crisis. For unless we stop inflation it will stop us. We will be ruined by inflation if it is not controlled.

The national administration at Washington has thus far failed to provide the direction for the absolutely essential action if we are to avoid falling into controls. On the contrary, it has gambled with our future by perpetuation of policies and practices which gave inflation a running start, and also by failure to understand or to label the spiral for what it is—our gravest national emergency.

Federal Government policies have encouraged us to become a Nation divided, a Nation of classes, a Nation of businessmen and industrialists, a Nation of farmers, a Nation of laborers, a Nation of privileged and underprivileged, and, strangely somehow, for it draws its membership from all the others, a Nation of consumers.

This playing of one group against another must cease. Labor, industry, and agriculture must be made to see that if they don't work together they will soon be engulfed together. Now is the time to summon representatives of labor, industry, and agriculture to a fateful conference on inflation, and to demand that they agree simultaneously to adopt a program to combat it.

Business must be told: "Our first need is a price roll-back. Everyone is going to have to sacrifice. But the initiative must be taken by the group in the best position to afford the risk involved. That group is business."

Business can well afford to take the lead. Its earnings are at the highest level ever recorded. According to Federal Reserve data, profits after taxes are more than double any prewar year and almost double any war year. This roll-back must spread throughout the entire business structure.

Some manufacturing companies have already taken a step in this direction, but the movement has not been general enough to become effective.

Let business meet this crisis by showing the Nation the same concerted action it did in prying off the price-control lid. There was no question about unanimity then. There should be none now, because the crisis today is infinitely greater than it was then.

Agriculture, too, must act for the common good. Farmers must be told: "Inflation has been particularly acute in the prices of farm products hitting at the great mass of consumers. Your profits have been enormous. You can't shrug this off as merely supply and demand. Government price-pegging policies permit prices to move upward but discourage downward swings of the commodity markets. You must agree to accept modification of Government price policies that will permit farm prices more nearly at the parity level."

What farmers want and should have is a steady demand for their produce at prices which yield a fair return rather than a boom or bust, in which they may lose everything. They should remember that, added to our domestic needs, the European relief program assures them of a reasonable demand for

years to come, and that as business rolls back its prices, implements, fertilizers, clothing, and other necessities will cost them less. Certainly agriculture as a whole is sufficiently concerned with the country's welfare to accept Government price-support policies which will make it possible to establish a freer market in farm products.

Equally important, if our economic salvation is to be achieved by voluntary means, is labor's contribution. Working men and women must be told: "Your wages are higher now than ever before, but have you really gained from higher wages when you pay higher and higher prices for everything you buy? New demands by you at this time may well build up inflationary pressures to the bursting point. You must hold the wage line."

If business rolls back prices and farmers take a lower price on their products, labor will be better off than if it fights for and wins another increase that accelerates the price spiral. Labor cannot afford not to go along. But also it has another obligation, and that is to produce as never before. For greater productivity is vital to the solution of our problem.

However, in foregoing wage demands at this time, labor must have the assurance that when balance has again been achieved in our economy, it will again be given the green light to seek a share of increased productivity.

We all have enough faith in the patriotism and wisdom of each of these groups to believe that they can and will develop a workable solution on this basis if they are given to understand in unmistakable terms that the future of our country is in their hands. Knowing the consequences of their actions, none of them would want to, and none of them would dare, to see that conference fail.

While this is going on, the Government must put its own house in order. Government expenditures—Federal, State and local—must be cut to essentials until the crisis is past. In much of their spending our governments are competing directly with their own citizens, bidding against them in the market for labor, for scarce building materials, for automotive equipment and for various other necessities. Let Government make these contributions:

1. Substantial reduction of the Federal Budget as submitted to the Congress by the President;

2. Examination of State and local government postwar building and service programs with a view to reduction to genuine necessity;

3. Retirement of the Federal debt as rapidly as possible, particularly the large bank-held portion to help contract the monetary base and relieve inflationary pressure;

4. Stronger encouragement of individual savings. Some form of income tax credit should be considered to provide an added incentive to save.

5. Adoption of more restrictive Government credit policies, including restoration of restrictions in installment buying and other consumer credits. Since a plentiful supply of money is one of the basic causes of our high prices, is it not foolhardy to spread that money still further and force prices still higher through abuse of credit?

6. Action to eliminate restrictive business and labor practices which hamper free competition require unnecessary work and result in needlessly higher costs. If industry and agriculture and labor could work together in an unprecedented display of mass strength to win the war, they surely can with proper leadership repeat the effort and win the equally vital battle against inflation and the world chaos that will accompany it.

The only alternatives to an immediate voluntary get-together by industry, labor, and agriculture are controls by government or inflation unlimited until the bubble bursts.

Government will never save our free economic system although it may easily ruin it by unwise and restrictive interference and controls.

The salvation of our free enterprise depends upon the men and women, both in management and labor, who run the system. It depends upon how fully and comprehensively they appreciate and understand its responsibilities as well as its benefits and privileges. That salvation depends also upon their clear and distinct realization that there are times when their moral and patriotic obligations rise far superior to their duties to their stockholders or to the members of their labor unions. Now, when institutions and governments everywhere are being shaken to the very base of their foundations, is surely one of those times.

We can either continue on our separate selfish pathways to destruction or we can walk and work together toward lasting stability and prosperity, not only for our own country, but also ultimately for the whole world.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the House did not see fit to recommit the deficiency appropriation bill and include $300,000,000 for rural electrification. There are thousands of rural homes that are burning coal-oil lamps tonight whose owners have been signed up for rural electrification for years.

We have been fortunate in my district to extend rural electrification as much as we have. However, there are thousands who have filed their applications with the co-ops but cannot be served because of lack of funds. We could not have avoided the delays occasioned by the war, but we certainly can and should avoid continuing these delays during the years of peace.

Recently I asked the manager of one of the co-ops in my district to let me have a list of those persons who had applied for service and paid their membership fee but whose homes had not yet been electrified. I was amazed when that list came to find that it contained nearly as many names as did the list of those who have been extended service since 1937. A large percentage of these people paid their REA membership fees in 1939, 1940, and 1941. They waited with patience until after VJ-day. Now they realize that wire, poles, transformers and other materials are fast becoming available and they do not understand why they can not have electricity.

While it is too late to do any good so far as this deficiency appropriation bill is concerned, I understand that the Appropriation Committee plans to report another one soon, and I sincerely hope that the committee will be able to include a substantial fund for rural electrification when that bill comes up next month.

On the Rocks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Economist of London, reprinted in the United States News of February 27, 1948:

[From the United States News of February 27, 1948]

"ON THE ROCKS"

(British periodical outlines grim realities of Britain's economic plight—Decries improvident spending and dependence on loans in face of bankruptcy—Calls for national policy of hard work, hard living, and more production.)

(From the Economist, London, February 14, 1948)

Britain faces bankruptcy. That is the real significance of the Government's latest white paper. At last, the British people now know where they stand. In the past 2 years, they have as a community overspent their income to the extent of £4,000,000[1] and the rate of overspending was almost twice as large in 1947 as in the preceding year. At the present rate of expenditure (which has fallen since its peak last August but now shows signs of settling down at a monthly figure of some $160,000,000), the remaining reserves of about $2,400,000,000 in gold, dollars, and unexhausted credits may last Britain and the sterling area until midsummer. After that, it will just be impossible to buy either the food or the raw materials which are necessary for Britain to eat and work. The specter of starvation and mass unemployment is now alarmingly close.

To translate the tables and figures of the white paper into more homely terms, Britain has been living like an improvident family which, failing to make both ends meet, first spends the accumulated capital of the past, then borrows from friends—from American friends, from Canadian friends, from South African friends—and when their loans are exhausted, begins to pawn the furniture. How else can one describe the latest deal with Argentina in which the whole capital asset represented by the British-owned railways is bartered away for 18 months' supply of meat? It is, of course, true that there is nothing discreditable in the events which led the British community to this desperate plight. Alone of the belligerents (except the German aggressors) Britain fought in two world wars from the first day to the last. The income from oversees' investments which nearly bridged the gap between imports and exports in 1938 disappeared in the struggle. Exceptional conditions of world demand created by war devastation added $1,200,000,000 to the cost of British imports in 1947. But, in fact, the reasons which have brought the British to beggary are less likely to be remembered than the fact that they are beggars. The old soldier showing his campaign medals at the street corners is an object of pity, not of respect.

When a family faces bankruptcy, either it goes under to a life of perpetual makeshift and pauperism, or it restores its solvency by vigorous action—by buying less, by cutting down every kind of expense and by straining every nerve to sell more of its goods and services. A nation is in no different case and the

[1] All figures converted from pounds sterling to dollars at rate of $4 to the pound.

choice open to the British people is in reality precisely the same difficult choice between pauperism and gruelling recovery. The only question worth asking today—when the crisis is, in Sir Stafford Cripps' words, not a matter of years, but of months and weeks—is what further steps the British people can take to consume less and produce more, to reduce their standard of living and at the same time do harder work. The subject is being debated in the Commons as the Economist goes to press, but clearly the Government's plea—it is not much more—that neither wages nor profits shall rise at this juncture is one small part of the much bigger effort that is needed to restore solvency to the British people.

Both wages and profits have to contribute their share. Bankruptcy is a family responsibility and no section of the community can avoid its hardships. The real need for workers and managers alike is longer hours and more output for the same income. In this way, more goods could be produced for export without new financial pressure being created to divert those goods to consumption at home. So drastic a departure from current industrial practice is too much to hope for, but at least the principle of no further wage increases save for cases where workers are genuinely below an adequate level of subsistence must be endorsed. Further, there is certainly a case for increasing the contribution to national solvency by those who, despite their reduced standards, can still afford it best. Heavier taxation or limitation of dividends and the control of expense accounts (upon which so much of the "conspicuous waste" in the big cities is based) will help politically, and to some extent economically. Even if such steps must wait upon the budget, their announcement would go far to relate the question of wages to the wider action needed to counter bankruptcy abroad and inflation at home.

But, although it will be necessary to temper the cuts by considerations of social justice, the brute fact remains that standards of consumption in Britain do not reflect the insolvency which may lie only a few months ahead. Can it be said that the rationing of domestic fuel has been drastic enough in view of the vital importance of coal as an export? Can Britain afford $800,000,000 for government expenditure overseas, or to feed 1,000,000 mouths in the forces in return for no productive work? It is easy to make a case for keeping 2,000,000 government servants, but if 500,000 were returned to industry, would the gain in output not ease the burden of the controls? By what yardstick can the overseas expenditure of $200,000,000 on tourism in 1947 be justified?

It is no longer a question of choosing whether or not to maintain certain amenities. The stark fact is that the means to provide them no longer exist.

In spite of the recent cuts in capital expenditure, it is clear that more has to be done. No one will criticize the government for wishing to build better schools, new hospitals, and more and better-equipped houses. But this program has added to Britain's insolvency by diverting materials and manpower from the export industries; in that sense it is Americans, Canadians, and South Africans who have been paying for part of the British program of development at home. No one denies the desirability of these things, but it is not usual to add a bathroom to the house just as the receivers walk in.

The last items to be cut back should obviously be productive assets, the renewal and modernization of plant. The reductions already announced in these items are severe—probably too severe—but in another field the figures suggest that outlay has been too heavy. The sum of $720,000,000 for new assets overseas, a large part of which must be represented by various schemes of colonial development, seems unduly high in relation to the time which must elapse before they begin to yield their fruits.

These are a few instances picked from a possible list of further cuts and reductions, but simply to set them down shows how painful their execution would be and what appalling stresses it would introduce into the national life. But bankruptcy is necessarily an ugly, painful, and distressing business. It tests the temper of the most united family. It requires not only fortitude and patience but considerable humility to weather it with dignity and success. Yet bankruptcy is nevertheless the crisis through which this Nation may be about to pass. What are its chances of surviving this latest test—a test with none of the glory and solidarity of a Nation at war but perhaps more grueling as a result?

It cannot be said that the outlook is encouraging. In the first place, the country so far has remained in ignorance of the facts. The Government's powers of explanation have never been high, but its inability to convey to the public the significance of the gathering economic crisis is beyond all previous failures. And this is not simply a question of poor public relations. The failure goes deeper. It is not only that the Government has not talked as though the crisis was serious; until quite recently, it has not behaved as though it were. In 1946, before the catastrophic rise in American prices and the fierce winter, there was some excuse for believing that Britain could recapture its export trade, police Europe, rebuild its industries, create new social services, rehouse the people, and provide cheap food all at the same time. But the writing on the wall was there for all to see after January or February 1947. The fatal flux of gold and dollars had begun. The gap between imports and exports was growing. Home production continued to lag, but the Government went on its Micawberish way, waiting for something to turn up. Mr. Dalton was happy with his balanced budget. Mr. Morrison declared that no further sacrifices could be demanded of the people. Today, with the gap wide open and no prospect for filling it from British resources, even Sir Stafford Cripps' realism may be too late.

If the British had been made to realize in 1945 that in many ways the problems of reconstruction facing them were no less urgent than that which faced, say, Poland, they might have set to and worked as the Poles have done; but cradled in illusions, they have advanced in their crisis like somnambulists. It is the illusion either of infinite prosperity or of infinitely squeezeable profits that makes it still possible for the trade-unions to press for more wages for fewer hours. It is the illusion of wealth withheld by a spiteful government that has turned large sections of the more well-to-do against the controls and restrictions which they recognized as necessary during the war. Yet the reality is of a nation in greater economic straits than at any time since the Napoleonic wars. If the present attitude of the different classes in society cannot be mobilized into something more than the collective and disgruntled selfishness they show today, then the British will be obliged to face their supreme economic crisis without the only assets upon which they could still draw—their political balance, their deep natural unity, their phenomenal staying power.

This statement will no doubt be contested. Why speak of "Britain's only assets" when there is every chance that by midsummer the Marshall plan will have been passed by Congress and assistance will be assured for the next 18 months at least? Even Sir Stafford Cripps has said that the only hope lies in American assistance, to give Britain the necessary time to bring about the restoration of normal conditions. But herein lies precisely the danger. Continual borrowing can have the same effect as continual drinking. The borrower's, like the drunkard's, sense of reality tends to fade. Britain has already had the American loan and the Canadian loan and will get the South African loan. All have been necessary but all have helped to mask from Government and people alike the country's true economic straits. A standard of living has been maintained, reserves have been eaten up, expenditures undertaken on a scale which is quite out of accord with Britain's real economic position. And what guaranty is there that the Marshall plan may not be used in the same way? The only proper, the only long-sighted, the only courageous course would be for Britain to pursue now the policy it would pursue if the Marshall plan were reduced to a half or a third, and to use the surplus thus created to build up reserves, modernize industry, develop economic integration in western Europe and undertake now the program of hard living and hard working in which in the long run salvation alone will lie.

Stop Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the President's proposal to greatly increase taxes on corporations, it has been often pointed out that it would increase rather than help inflation, and an excellent statement on the subject has been made in the recent editorial appearing in the Bridgeton Evening News, which I herewith include:

PHONY RELIEF

A communication in last Saturday's issue of the News, the writer of which we presume from the trend of his article is a supporter of the President's policies, accuses us of bearing false witness against Mr. Truman in our editorial, drawing a tax analogy between the President and King Rehoboam of the Hebrew nation, in that we didn't give the President credit for proposing to give taxpayers with an income under $5,000 a rebate of $40 for himself and each dependent on his income tax.

Well, we were discussing the burden of taxation in that article. Did this proposal of Mr. Truman do anything to lessen the burden of taxation? Not on your life, not one dollar. What it did was simply to lessen the taxes on one class of individuals and impose the same burden on the big corporations, for the President had bluntly said the receipts of the Government must not be reduced one dollar.

But would the big corporations pay these increased taxes?

Not on your life. What they would have done would have been to add these increased taxes to the price of their products and services, whatever they might be, and pass them on to the consumer. Even the people who received the rebate on their income taxes would have had to use some of their savings to pay some of the taxes of these big corporations to meet the increased price on the products they purchased, while thousands who pay no income taxes would be saddled with that additional cost of living. Thus another rise would have been made to the high cost of living and the spiral of inflation sent reeling upward.

The whole proposal was phony, put out to catch votes in this Presidential year, so phony, in fact, that it has been laughed out of the tax picture by all responsible lawmakers in Washington and cast into the ash can.

To have given Mr. Truman credit for this phony proposal would have been to abet him in perpetrating a fraud on the American taxpayer.

The only way to reduce the burden of taxes is to reduce spending, and Mr. Truman has refused to do this, because he has presented to the Congress the largest budget in the history of the Nation and demands its adoption.

Much of Mr. Truman's spending in the past and that planned for the future, is as wasteful and useless as that of the Hebrew King cited, even if not as vicious.

There is only one way to reduce the tax burden—stop spending. Subterfuge will not do the trick and is entitled to no credit.

W. E. M.

International Bankers Back Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the RECORD one of a series of news articles clipped from the Chicago Tribune of February 25, which is further proof that the Truman New Deal is now completely in the control of the international bankers, exporters, and Wall Street.

This article names only a few of the hundreds of them who have organized to put over the Marshall plan for the benefit of the international bankers and exporters at the cost of continuing the high cost of living to the American people, and, doubtless, the reimposing of Federal controls over the entire economy of the Nation.

Never before has any administration gathered together so many multimillionaires in an attempt to further its, and their own interest at the expense of John Q. Public, the ordinary American taxpayer who cannot organize in opposition to this insidious lobby, and whose only protection are the Members of this Congress.

MARSHALL PLAN GROUP INCLUDES MANY BANKERS

(By William Clark)

(This is the third of four articles describing the interests behind the Marshall plan.)

The committee for the Marshall plan, headed by Henry L. Stimson and Robert P. Patterson, is stoutly bulwarked by members of the eastern banking fraternity, an analysis of records of the gift-aid boosters organization showed yesterday. The group also is liberally sprinkled with insurance company executives.

Banks in New York City alone contributed 22 officers and directors to the Stimson troupe. Of the committee's 294 members, at least 89 hold positions with commercial banks, investment banking houses, or finance companies—by far the largest representation from anyone line of business. A majority of these banking connections are with eastern institutions.

ALDRICH HEADS LIST

The list of bankers is headed by Winthrop W. Aldrich, a member of the Marshall plan committee's 30-man executive group. Aldrich is chairman of The Chase National Bank of New York. He also is a director of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, International Paper Co., and Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.

Arthur W. Page also is a member of the committee's executive council and a director of Chase National Bank, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. His other company affiliations include membership on the boards of directors of Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Continental Oil Co., and Kennecott Copper Corp.

ALTSCHUL HAS PLACE

Frank Altschul, another member of the executive platoon, is president and director of General American Investors Co., a general management trust sponsored by Lazard Freres & Co. and Lehman Bros. Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of General Electric Co. and a fourth member of the committee's executive contingent, is a director of Bankers Trust Co. and Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

The balance of the Marshall plan committee, the 274-man national council, includes the 26 persons listed in the committee's releases as bankers, plus some 50 others listed as manufacturers, lawyers, or educators who also have strong banking affiliations.

Thomas J. Watson, president of International Business Machines Corp., and Charles E. Dunlap, president of Berwind-White Coal Mining Co., are both directors of Guaranty Trust Co., New York City. Dunlap also is a director of International Telephone & Telegraph Co., whose chairman, Sosthenes Behn, is a committee member.

DIRECTORS ALL INCLUDED

National City Bank of New York has two of its directors on the committee, Behn and Gerard Swope, honorary chairman of International General Electric Co. New York Trust Co. is represented by a trustee, B. B. Jennings, president of Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. Bankers Trust Co. is another with two of its directors on the committee, Reed and Ward Melville, president of Melville Shoe Corp.

John M. Franklin, president of United States Lines, is a member of the board of Manufacturers Trust Co. Irving Trust Co. contributed two members of its board to the Stimson organization. Henry P. Bristol, president of Bristol-Myers Co., and David L. Luke, Jr., president of West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.

TWO FROM HANOVER BANK

Stimson also enlisted a duo of Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co. directors. C. M. Chester, honorary chairman of General Foods Corp., and Gwilym A. Price, president of Westinghouse Electric Corp. The First National Bank of the City of New York gave of its directors George L. Harrison, also president of New York Life Insurance Co.

The Federal Reserve System has a strong representation on the Marshall plan committee, headed by Thomas B. McCabe, president of Scott Paper Co. and newly appointed chairman of the reserve system's board of governors.

FEDERAL RESERVE AIDS

Committee members who are officers or directors of Federal Reserve banks in addition to McCabe and Aldrich include Allan Forbes, president of the State Street Trust Co., Boston: Charles E. Adams, chairman of Air Reduction Sales Co.; Chester C. Davis, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis; Tom K. Smith, president of Boatmen's National Bank of St. Louis, and William W. Crocker, president of Crocker First National Bank, San Francisco.

Address of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, before the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, in the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., Tuesday evening, February 24, 1948:

This is a magnificent meeting. We need more meetings such as this in every city, town, and village.

It is good for America to have men and women interested in government, business, labor, agriculture, and the professions assemble at frequent intervals to discuss the general welfare of our country.

Such meetings are in accordance with our duty as citizens. They stimulate more widespread interest in government and politics. People should be proud to take part in politics because good government can be achieved only through honest politics.

In a free country—where the people rule—politics is a serious business and a great responsibility. It calls for hard work, intelligence, courage, and the will to sacrifice in the interest of all the people.

Politics is not only the science of government—it is really the American Government in action. If every voter would take a real part in politics, it would mean good, sound, economical government based on the best traditions of the United States.

It is a tragic loss to America that so many business and professional men, educators, and even men of the church, feel that participation in politics is something to be avoided.

General Eisenhower, one of the world's great military leaders, in his statement a few weeks ago, paid a fine tribute to politics.

"Politics is a profession," General Eisenhower said, "a serious complicated, and, in its true sense, a noble one."

That should satisfy anyone who believes political activity is degrading.

The Republican Party stands today on the threshold of victory. If we all do our part in politics, it will be an overwhelming victory.

In the next few months there will be nothing more important to the future of our country than a great Republican crusade to rescue our Government from the free-spending bureaucrats who will bankrupt America unless their wasteful course is checked.

We are honored tonight by the presence of Senator BROOKS, one of the most outstanding and courageous men in the United States Senate. Illinois has every right to be proud of him, not only as a great statesman but as a soldier with an exceptional record.

Senator BROOKS, I want you to know that in this audience are members of Pennsylvania's Republican delegation in the House

of Representatives. With you, Senator, they represent the Federal level of government.

This delegation is doing a wonderful job in Washington. It has been an honor to be associated with them, and a real privilege to sit in at their meetings. I have been profoundly impressed by their deep understanding of the national problems, their great sincerity, and their firm determination to do what is for the best interests of America. All are hard workers and faithful to the trust imposed upon them.

We have here, representing the State level of government, Pennsylvania's distinguished Governor and many members of his cabinet. Also, the leaders and members of the Pennsylvania Legislature.

The local level of government is represented by the most important local officers, members of the boards of county commissioners and other county officials.

On the political side we have Mason Owlett, our national committeeman; Harvey Taylor, our State chairman; many of our county chairmen and other stalwarts—all of whom have guided the Republican Party to splendid victories in our Commonwealth.

There are so many others here tonight who are equally important but time does not permit enumerating them all.

But you can readily see how much good can be accomplished by the united and enthusiastic support of such a powerful, patriotic, and influential group.

Combined with similar groups throughout the Nation, they could, for instance, cut down the cost of government. They could simplify and decentralize government and bring it back to the people.

They could have a powerful voice in determining the amount of taxes that could be imposed upon the people without damaging the economic structure of our country.

They could insist upon a more equitable distribution of functions among the three levels of government. They could put a stop to the encroachment by the higher levels of government upon the taxing areas that properly belong to the lower levels.

That would bring more government back to the precincts and election districts, borough halls, city halls, courthouses, and State capitals. That would mean better, more economical government because it would be closer to the people who pay the bills.

That is why this meeting is so important. In the 14 months that I have been in Washington I have seen how the taxpayers' money is tossed about recklessly by the bureaucrats.

I have seen the stubborn resistance with which every department, agency, board, and commission fights against any suggestion to curtail their functions or to cut down their swollen pay rolls.

I have seen how individuals, organizations, and even cities and States combine into pressure groups to demand money—the taxpayers' money—for their pet projects.

That is why I am so deeply concerned and alarmed over the future of our country.

Let me give you a few figures to illustrate just what the high cost of Federal Government means to the people of Philadelphia.

I have added together the cost of operating your city and county governments, your school taxes, your Red Cross contributions, and all the money paid into your Community Chest, and I find the total for 1947 was approximately $117,000,000.

I have figured Philadelphia's share of the taxes collected by the Federal Government in the last fiscal year. That comes to $612,000,000—enough to run your city and county, your schools, your Red Cross, and your Community Chest for more than 5 years.

We can stop that sort of spending if we have the will to do it. But the will must grow and develop out of the spirit of the people—from organizations of business and industrial leaders—from the wage earner, the farmer, the white collar worker—from every decent, self-respecting, law-abiding citizen who loves America and wants to keep it safe, sound, and solvent.

You men in politics know that the most effective appeal to the voters is a positive, constructive program, not for the benefit of any special class or section, but one that offers the greatest good for the greatest number.

In these critical times there is no program more constructive or more vital than a return to a sound fiscal policy. That is the only way to assure our freedom and to safeguard the liberties for which heroes and patriots have died in every generation.

Every nation that has gone down to destruction was wrecked on the rocks of economic weakness. Let us keep America solvent. Let's keep America dynamic. Let's keep America a courageous country where the individual will recognize national solvency as a guarantee of freedom and the only true foundation for security.

Let us remember that government did not build America but that America was made by hard work, courage, thrift, prayer, devotion and reverence for the laws of God and man.

If you believe as I do, and I'm sure you do, it is your duty to carry the doctrine of sound Republicanism into every corner of Pennsylvania. Let the message go out beyond our Commonwealth's borders. Let it roll through the length and breadth of our land. Let it roll till it culminates in a tidal wave of political power to sweep out the big spenders who are squandering the Nation's substance.

I would like to quote tonight the words of a great American statesman, an illustrious exponent of liberty, who believed with all his heart in individual freedom. I would ask that you give these words your close attention because they have unmistakable application to conditions of today.

Here is the quotation:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt.

"We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude.

"If we run into such debts we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labors and our amusements.

"If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them they will be happy.

"The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the disposition of public money.

"We are endeavoring to reduce the Government to the practice of rigid economy to avoid burdening the people and arming the magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt the principles of our Government."

That is the end of the quotation.

That stern warning was given to the American people 150 years ago by a man whose praises were loudly proclaimed last week by men who have turned their backs on the principles for which he stood. They paid lip service to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, great disciple of good government, but they have completely abandoned his teachings. Not a single Democratic speaker at any of their numerous $100 dinners voiced one word on behalf of economy which Jefferson placed among the first and most important virtues of government.

All of us who are workers in the Republican ranks can be justly proud of the strength and unity that makes Pennsylvania Republicanism a shining example for other States to follow.

I have had the opportunity of observing the political organizations in most of our 48 States. Out of that experience I am firmly convinced that Pennsylvania has one of the finest, cleanest, and strongest political organizations of our country.

Never has there been a time in our history when we were as solidly unified as we are today. We have fine, loyal, hard-working county leaders directed by a wise and experienced State chairman. We have splendid leadership and devoted workers in our women's organizations.

We are fortunate that there is none among us who would not be willing to make any sacrifice for our country and our party.

When you have an army as strong as we have in Pennsylvania, it is not surprising that the strategists of the opposition make every effort to divide us in order that they may make a flank attack upon us.

Within the past few days we have observed how the opposition has attempted to divide and disrupt our ranks by falsehoods and deception.

Let me say now, as emphatically as I know how, that all their efforts have failed and will fail. I want to say again, as I have said many times before, that when my friend of many years, Jim Duff, served in my Cabinet, he was my close confidant and advisor—a loyal, able, and courageous Attorney General.

He discharged the duties of that high office in a manner that brought great credit to himself and the Republican Party. The splendid record he made in my administration has been continued with added brilliance as Governor of our Commonwealth.

Let me assure you here and now that we will work together to crush every attempt by those whose obvious purpose is to divide and conquer. Standing shoulder to shoulder, with the State and county leaders, we will remain united. We will go forward to victory in the important fight to restore honest and decent constitutional government to the American people. We will keep Pennsylvania solidly Republican. We will send a bigger delegation to Congress to strengthen Pennsylvania's prestige and influence, and we will put a Republican President in the White House.

Address of Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 19, the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, under the auspices of the New Jersey Democracy, took place at the Essex House in Newark. It was attended by more than 2,100 diners, and the confidence and enthusiasm of those in attendance were most marked. It was the most successful dinner in the series marking this occasion.

The featured speaker of the evening was the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. John W. Snyder. His address was concise and factual and held the attention of his large audience from beginning to end.

The dinner was marked by the presentation to the audience of the candidate approved by the New Jersey State organization for the United States senatorship, Mr. Archibald Stevens Alexander, Jr., whose appearance was greeted with prolonged applause.

The honorary chairman of the dinner committee was Col. William H. Kelly, chairman of the Essex County Democratic Committee; the general chairman of the dinner was Hon. Felix Forlenza; and the toastmaster was Gerald Foley, Esq., a leading member of the New Jersey bar. In addition to Secretary Snyder, the speakers were Hon. Vincent J. Murphy, mayor of Newark; Hon. Frank H. Eggers, mayor of Jersey City; and myself.

The address delivered by Secretary Snyder follows herewith:

Tonight the National Democratic Party is redeclaring its firm purpose to protect and preserve for every citizen of this country the great social and economic gains made during 15 years of Democratic leadership.

In gatherings such as this throughout the Nation, we are reasserting the fundamental principles of our party, and we are rededicating those principles to the continued progress and prosperity of this Nation.

I believe it particularly appropriate that at this same time we pay joint honor to Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, as well as to those other statesmen who molded our party doctrines and purpose, and who contributed so immeasurably to the spiritual and material growth of the United States.

Thomas Jefferson's sane philosophies and truths are deeply imbedded in our system of government. He endeavored continually to convince Americans how vital it was, even as it is today, to defend staunchly their basic liberties and standards of free endeavor.

Jackson, too, was an outstanding advocate of human rights, and his ideals and work ably complemented the achievements of Jefferson. He brought to the leadership of the Nation and party vigor and resoluteness of purpose.

It is well to remember that in the annals of our party history, the accomplishments of these men, and their notable contributions to our system of government, were the results of unceasing and steadfast devotion to country.

Thomas Jefferson said that "the whole art of government consists in the art of being honest," and upon this truth, the Democratic Party has consistently and conscientiously based its pattern of service and its policy measures.

The history of Democratic leadership amply supports our assertion of accomplishment.

We are entitled to particular satisfaction with the social and economic progress of this country during the past 15 years of Democratic administration.

The 15 years that have passed since our party assumed the responsibilities of government cannot dim the recollection of the economic disorder that prevailed at that time. Nor do they allow us to forget that our present social and economic achievements have, in a large part, been accomplished only through hard and continuous fighting by the Democratic administration against bitter opposition.

Fifteen years ago we were in the depths of a depression for which the then-incumbent administration had not the slightest remedy. Twelve million workers were vainly seeking jobs, while factories were closing their doors. Businesses were failing at the rate of over 30,000 a year. Most great industries were operating at fractional capacity.

In this extremity the speedy and courageous action of a Democratic administration brought to a halt the worst depression of modern times. It took dynamic leadership, with great vision, to appraise properly the weaknesses of the old system and to compel their elimination.

In 1933 we had two huge tasks to accomplish: First, to halt the deflationary trend which had been under way since 1929; and second, to develop a balanced and expanding economy, based upon the maintenance of a high volume of production and of purchasing power. To gain these ends the entire level of employment and incomes had to be greatly increased, along with the over-all business activity, and at the same time a repetition of the speculative unbalance which had developed in 1929 had to be prevented.

Shortly after the new Democratic administration took office and began a constructive expansion program, the national income started rising. By the end of the year income payments were 20 percent higher than in March 1933. With the rise in purchasing power retail trade immediately began to increase and a general business improvement spread over the country. The industrial production rate started to climb, employment began to increase, people began to spend more money, and the improvement became cumulative.

Inspired Democratic leadership gave a discouraged people a new hope and a new sense of responsibility for the social and economic welfare of their fellow men. Through aggressive action the administration achieved lasting benefits for unemployment and old-age security, for the protection of individuals against unjust practices, for the safeguarding of our banking system, for the expansion of credit facilities which were not available to banks, railroads, and other private industries, for the improvement of our agricultural resources, and for the healthy and strong development of our entire national economy.

The wage earner's position had been strengthened by national recognition of the rights of workmen to bargain collectively with their employers.

Laws enacted for the regulation of security offerings, requiring sellers to reveal the facts about new security issues, have done much to protect people against misrepresentation in this field.

Agriculture has been placed in a stronger position by legislation for the conservation of the soil and for the encouragement of better farming practices. The strengthening of our agricultural industry brought welcome dividends during the war, when our farms yielded one-third more food than before the war despite shortages of equipment and manpower.

The insurance of bank deposits under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has provided protection against a repetition of the bank-failure tragedy of 1933.

These and other measures inaugurated during the Democratic administration have given a new sense of economic security to our people, and have enormously contributed to our record peacetime level of business activity and to our present high standard of living.

We must not forget, either, the far-sighted steps taken to provide for the military preparedness of our Nation—steps taken against stubborn opposition—which nevertheless proved our salvation.

During World War II, we came nearer than ever before to learning our true strength and our national capabilities. These factors of strength supplied the men and materials for the greatest all-out war effort in history. When called upon to give vital assistance in protecting the very core of modern civilization, the United States not only out-produced the rest of the world, but at the same time maintained its own national standards of living.

Our wartime strength could not have developed without an essentially strong foundation. Under the recovery measures taken by the Democratic administration, the health of our economic structure has been steadily improving since early 1933. The steel industry, as an important example, turned out only 1,000,000 tons of ingots in March 1933, but it raised its output to over 4,000,000 tons per month at the outbreak of war in August 1939, and to 7,000,000 tons per month when we entered the war in December 1941. And now, in time of peace, it has reached the total of 7,460,000 tons per month.

The victory over our enemies precipitated the tremendous peacetime problems of demobilization and reconversion—problems which were no less vital to our national security than those faced—and solved—in wartime.

The problems of peace and postwar transition fell on the shoulders of President Truman. He has borne his heavy responsibilities, the heaviest in the world, with outstanding courage and skill.

Of foremost concern, certainly foremost in the minds of their families, was the return to civilian life of more than 12,000,000 members of our armed services. The swift and orderly discharge of our service men and women, their return to peaceful pursuits, and their absorption into our economy, are accomplishments of which we can be proud.

The industrial change-over from war to peacetime production was completed more rapidly than anyone dared predict. War contracts were quickly settled and war plants were speedily cleared for a volume of civilian output never before equaled.

At present, with our economy again soundly established on a peacetime basis, we find that the total personal incomes are now running at an annual rate of over $200,000,000,000, as compared with $49,000,000,000 in 1932.

Workers in manufacturing industries now average $1.27 an hour, or $51 in weekly earnings. In March 1933 their average earnings were $15 a week and 41 cents an hour. And they felt lucky to even get that.

Corporate earnings have likewise shown an enormous improvement since the dark days of 15 years ago. In 1932 corporations showed a deficit of over $3,000,000,000, but by 1934 they had moved into the black, and profits rose sharply in succeeding years until in 1947 they are estimated at $17,000,000,000, after taxes.

These comparisons in dollar terms are in part due to the present high price levels. But comparisons on a purely physical basis tell the same story. Perhaps the best measure of economic welfare is the number of people employed. This figure in recent months reached the unprecedented total of 60,000,000. In 1933 the average number of employed was only 39,000,000 persons.

The output of our manufacturing and mining industries has been at the highest levels in our peacetime history, and far above the prewar level. The index of industrial production reached 191 in December 1947, as compared with the depression low of 54 reached in March 1933.

This present business activity is a tribute to the vitality of the American system of free enterprise. But it is also the product of wise policy and prudent management on the part of this administration under the leadership of President Harry S. Truman.

Our fiscal policies have been closely related to those in the economic field. Our purpose is to practice economy in Government and to maintain the revenues at a level sufficient to secure a balanced budget and provide for debt reduction.

As Secretary of the Treasury I feel that the financial integrity of our Government must always be a first consideration. Particularly so with a Government debt, largely war

created, of $255,000,000,000. Under such circumstances, it is not only the financial integrity of the Government which is at stake but the soundness of the whole economy. This Government's fiscal policies are irrevocably wrapped up in the entire financial structure of our country.

It is estimated that in the current fiscal year which ends on next June 30 the surplus of Federal receipts over expenditures will amount to $7,500,000,000.

We have been using this surplus as it accumulates for debt retirement in the manner in which it would be most effective, and we shall continue to do so.

The President's budget estimates for the fiscal year 1949 show receipts of $44,500,000,000, and a surplus of $4,800,000,000 in that fiscal year to apply toward further reductions in the debt.

On the expenditures side the President has pared the budget to the minimum which he considers consistent with the country's domestic and international responsibilities.

Expenditures are estimated at $39,700,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949. Seventy-nine percent of the estimated expenditures for fiscal 1949 are war related—they either reflect the direct costs of war, the aftermath of war, or our efforts to prevent a future war.

In this category, we have expenditures for national defense which amount to $11,000,000,000, or 28 percent of the total budget. It would be possible, of course, to cut this amount, but I do not believe that the Congress will want to take this step at the expense of our national security.

Expenditures for international-aid programs also come in this category, and total $7,000,000,000, or 18 percent of the total budget. These expenditures could also be cut; but again I do not believe that any of us want to recommend such a cut when we know that it would endanger our hope of achieving a peaceful world.

Veterans' benefits amount to $6,000,000,000, or 15 percent of the budget. They represent an obligation which we owe to those persons who made great personal sacrifices for the Nation during the war. It is an obligation for which a Democratic Congress has already provided by legislation, and certainly none of us want to propose that any of this legislation be repealed.

The other two items which enter into the war-cost category are $5,000,000,000 for interest on the public debt and $2,000,000,000 for tax refunds. These are financial obligations of the Government which it must meet.

In analyzing the Government's peacetime operations, we find that 16 percent, or $6,200,000,000, of the budget covers expenditures to finance the Government's programs in many broad areas, such as social welfare, agriculture, natural resources, and transportation and communication. These programs include expenditures for public assistance, for flood control, for soil conservation, for reclamation, for State aid to highways, for development of rivers and harbors, and for atomic energy.

These programs include activities which the Government must perform in order to conserve our natural resources. More importantly, however, they finance functions which the Government is obligated to perform in conserving our human resources—for programs which contribute to the health and well-being of the American people and which have long been a part of the Democratic platform.

Any reduction in these programs would be false economy.

The remainder of the budget, that which is left for the operational costs of the Government, is not relatively large, amounting as it does to only 5 percent, or $2,100,000,000. This amount covers the Congress, and the Executive Office. It includes Treasury activities in collecting taxes, administering the public debt, and keeping the Government's books, and the expenditures of various other agencies. To cut large sums out of this group would be a difficult undertaking.

As a matter of fact, any cuts in this budget will be difficult if we are not to jeopardize our national defense, ignore our national welfare, or threaten our efforts to attain world peace.

Finally, let me call your attention to the policies of President Truman and your administration in the field of foreign affairs. As Democrats and as citizens of these United States, we can be thankful for the leadership that has brought about an unprecedented unanimity of opinion in this country in our dealings with other nations.

Our international policy is essentially an American policy and it represents the views and the wishes of the Nation.

Looking toward the future, the task of Democratic leadership is clear. Under the continued guidance of President Harry S. Truman, we will direct our policies toward developing a balanced and expanding economy. We must maintain a high volume of purchasing power to provide a broad market for the products of industry and agriculture. We must insure that business profits remain at adequate levels to provide a steadily expanding industrial capacity, and that the capital markets function smoothly in financing our business expansion.

We must provide for the development of our human and material resources, to the end that we may continue as a Nation of high living standards and high productivity.

The aims and purposes of the Democratic Party can be eloquently summed up in the words of President Truman: "We seek a peaceful world, a prosperous world, a free world, a world of good neighbors, living on terms of equality and mutual respect."

Thirtieth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 I was privileged to attend a banquet in Baltimore given by the Council of Lithuanian Societies, in observance of the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Thirty years ago Americans joined with the people of Lithuania in celebrating Lithuanian independence. More than 100 years of servitude under a foreign rule were over. Unfortunately, however, today we again find Lithuania without her independence. For her today there are no longer any four freedoms, the freedoms for which the true democracies of the world struggled so long and so patiently during the last war.

But all over the world today, Lithuanians are gathered to renew their efforts and to encourage one another to continue to work for the independence of their homeland. Millions of fellow Americans join with them in their desire for the liberation of their homeland. We refuse to recognize the destruction of Lithuanian independence as valid. We still regard Lithuania as an independent state. The cause of Lithuania's independence must be supported by our country, because it is based upon American principles of representative government.

The peoples of Europe who respect these principles and ideals should be given the opportunity to embrace them and shape their own way of life and choose their own form of government.

The spark of liberty is strong in Lithuania. Under the tyranny of her conquerors, Lithuania suffers a living death, but yet lives. There will always be a Lithuania—a Lithuania in the hearts of men, a Lithuania in the history of the world's struggle for freedom, and in due time, a Lithuania at the conference table of the world's great family of nations.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address delivered by Mr. Juozas Kajeckas, attaché at the Lithuanian Legation, at the banquet, and also a resolution which was adopted by the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore City at that time:

LITHUANIA'S THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

(Address by J. Kajeckas, attaché, Lithuanian Legation, February 16, 1948, at Lithuanian Hall, Baltimore, Md.)

During the years of Lithuania's independence, in the period between the two world wars, it was customary on February 16—the anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence—to draw up a balance sheet of the progress that had been achieved by the Lithuanian people and the Lithuanian state. This record showed that with every year the Lithuanian people were maturing in statesmanship, and that Lithuania was rapidly catching up with western Europe, compensating for the 123 years that had been lost to progress under the Russian czarist yoke.

From the fateful day of June 15, 1940, when the aggressive hand of the Soviets destroyed at a single stroke the attainments of Lithuania's years of independence, regression set in. From the summer of 1940 we began to enumerate not the attainments of progress but the injustices to which Lithuania was subjected—the spilled blood of her sons and daughters—their tears, their grief, their misery.

The Lithuanian people did not deserve this cup of sorrow. Their martyrdom, occurring in the present—the twentieth century—after the oft-repeated promulgation of so many high-sounding ideals of Christianity and humanitarianism, would make it seem that the very forces of hell are unleashed, in order to try out on the Lithuanian nation the full cruelty of Red barbarism, the like of which the world has never before witnessed.

Nevertheless, on this the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence, we can state that there are indications pointing toward the liberation of Lithuania, and from these we may take comfort.

First of all, we may be proud of the iron will, and the determination to resist the occupant, of our people who remain in the homeland, as well as of those who were forcibly exiled to the east. Many sons and daughters of Lithuania have perished because of loyalty to their country and to its beloved tricolor. Those who survive have remained true to the ideal of Lithuania's freedom. The spirit of the Lithuanians, even as that of the early Christians in the time of Nero, proved to be stronger than the terror of the executioner. The youth of Lithuania continues to defend the right and the honor of the homeland by force of arms.

We may also be proud of the firm resolve of the Lithuanians who live in exile in western Europe; in spite of unenviable living conditions in unfriendly Germany they remain deaf to the enticements held out by the Soviets to return to occupied Lithuania. Furthermore, they who live in exile have accomplished much for the cause of their country's liberation, and have achieved high standards in fields of cultural endeavor, such as education, journalism, art, etc.

In seeking Lithuania's liberation, we can also derive encouragement from the fact that the free countries of the world understand, and sympathize with the plight of the Lithuanian people. The seizure of Lithuania by the Soviets is now viewed in the light of further aggressive actions by the eastern bear. Today countries of Europe held captive behind the iron curtain pray, together with the Lithuanian Nation, for liberation from the eastern liberators, whereas that part of Europe which remains free prays for support against, and deliverance from, the threat of that same slavery.

On this occasion we may also be heartened by the recent appearance of a certain book; namely, Nazi-Soviet Relations: 1939–1941. This collection of documentary evidence, published by the United States Government, discloses, among other revelations, the conspiracy of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia to divide Lithuania among themselves. The fact that these documents are now brought to light dispels the smoke screen of the Soviets, their propaganda line about the happiness of the Lithuanian people over the slavery imposed upon them, about the free elections, and the self-determination of the Lithuanian people. This publication knocks the props out from under the propaganda of the Bolsheviks, whereby they attempt to vilify Lithuania and to distort the truth. It exposes to the world the vile injustice committed on Lithuania by the Soviets. These documents prove that in seizing Lithuania, the Bolshevik leadership did not consult the wishes of the Lithuanian Government and people but, instead, obtained approval of their act from Hitler, Russia's great friend at the time; and later paid to that same Hitler the accursed pennies of Judas in payment for part of Lithuania. This volume was published on the initiative of the United States, which makes the material it contains all the more valuable to Lithuania's cause. Therefore, we greet this publication with great satisfaction. The appearance of this book at this time is of greater value to Lithuania than millions of dollars or several Army divisions, for it unmasks the complicity of the Soviets and the Germans, as well as the shameless duplicity of which Lithuania was the victim.

To the items that give encouragement to, and are important for, the morale of Lithuanians in their aspirations for freedom may be added proclamations and statements made on this anniversary by State governors and mayors of cities in the United States, including proclamations by Gov. William Preston Lane, Jr., of Maryland, and the Honorable Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of Baltimore. It is said that in misfortune one may recognize one's friends, and the Lithuanian nation recognizes among its friends the past and present governors of Maryland, mayors of this city, and senators and representatives of this State.

Besides these and other proclamations which give strong moral support to the Lithuanians, are the noteworthy statements issued by two world-renowned Americans on the occasion of this anniversary. I quote from the bulletin published by the Lithuanian legation current news on the Lithuanian situation, of February 1948, the statements of the Honorable William C. Bullitt and the Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane, both of whom are acquainted with Lithuania from personal experience. Said the Honorable William C. Bullitt:

"During my visit to Lithuania I was greatly impressed by two attributes of the Lithuanians: First, the moral fiber of the people who constituted a strong bastion of Christian civilization against Communist malice. Second, the very high level of the Lithuanian architects, artists, and literary men.

"It was my good fortune to be the friend of your great poet Baltrusaitis, who was one of the most eminent men I have known. He was my guide in Lithuania, and introduced me to persons of all classes, including the members of the official family of President Smetona.

"Like all other Americans who acquired even a slight first-hand knowledge of the Lithuanians, I hope profoundly that someday Lithuania will again enjoy the complete liberty which she deserves."

The Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane, accredited United States Minister to the Baltic States, including Lithuania, in 1936–37, commented:

"Filled with gratitude to the Lithuanian people for their contribution to the intellectual and economic growth of the United States, I pay my tribute, with countless others, on this thirtieth anniversary of the signing of the declaration of Lithuanian independence.

"Our hearts are heavy today as we contemplate Lithuania's present plight. We sorrow for those Lithuanian patriots who, together with their Latvian and Estonian brothers and sisters, are enduring today the temporary loss of their liberty. But we rejoice that the Lithuanian spirit of independence has in no wise been tarnished. There has been no moral capitulation, no surrender of principles.

"The Lithuanian people and all Americans of Lithuanian origin may well be proud, even in the present martyrdom of their mother country, that Lithuania's record is unsullied. when international justice is meted out—we fervently hope in the very near future—the brave sacrifice of Lithuania on behalf of democracy must not and will not be forgotten."

And, finally, may I bring to your attention today's editorial in the New York Times:

"LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

"With their country still writhing under the heel of the conqueror, the Lithuanian people commemorate today with heads bloodied but unbowed the thirtieth anniversary of the signing of their declaration of independence. After more than a century of struggle against oppression by the Russian czars, and in defiance of the armies of the Kaiser then still on Lithuanian soil, the Council of Lithuania, on February 16, 1918, in consultation with American Lithuanians, formally declared the country to be free and independent. This act conformed with President Wilson's doctrine of the right of self-determination. There seemed to be every prospect for its continued success and prosperity when the Kaiser's Empire collapsed, and when the Russian revolutionary government proclaimed that the age of 'imperialistic ravishers' was over. In the peace treaty with Lithuania the Soviets 'voluntarily and for all time abandoned all the sovereign rights of Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territories.'

"The independence of Lithuania is still recognized by the United States and most other countries, and Lithuanian diplomatic missions still function abroad. But Russia, reverting to the policies of the 'imperialistic ravishers,' has renounced all her pledges and treaty obligations and has again annexed Lithuania, like the two other Baltic Republics, by her own unilateral action. Moreover, she is subjecting their people not only to the oppression and terrorism that is the lot of everybody under Moscow's rule, but is deliberately pursuing a policy of extermination and deportation in the effort to replace the 'unfriendly' native populations with reliable Russian Communists.

"But the Lithuanian people continue to fight for independence. They are fighting as partisans in the forests. They are fighting, insofar as that is possible, at the ballot boxes. Even the Russians had to admit that in recent local elections the Communists polled only 11.6 percent of the vote, the rest going to 'nonparty' candidates. Above all, they are fighting to arouse the conscience of the world, in particular that of the United Nations, to which they have submitted a plea for action against the genocide being practiced in their land. Sooner or later the world will have to take note of their struggle and give it the support it deserves." (New York Times, Feb. 16, 1948.)

These signs of hope for the liberation of Lithuania, and the words of sympathy and encouragement which I have quoted, are but a few of many factors which give moral support to Lithuania and to her people in their struggle for the restoration of a free, independent, and democratic homeland.

To this generation of Lithuanians falls the responsibility of a glorious task—the liberation of enslaved Lithuania. A part of the Lithuanian people has made the supreme sacrifice. Other Lithuanians are redeeming Lithuania's independence by suffering imprisonment and exile, by their tears, by their grief, by their willingness to make sacrifices and to endure the hardships of ill health, starvation, shortages of the most elementary necessities. Let us, too, add our bit: by our prayers, by our deeds, by our pennies, let us with warm hearts and with good words support this just and rightful cause, and advance the liberation of Lithuania. Let us remember that whatever we may do will be but a fraction of what has already been done or is now being done by those who have given their all for their beloved Lithuania. In the past, Lithuanian Americans assisted in the restoration of Lithuania's freedom. Let us hope that, within the limits of existing possibilities, they will do so again.

In closing, let me quote the words of an American war veteran, Alvin C. York, who said at the Unknown Soldier's Tomb in Arlington on May 30, 1941:

"Liberty and freedom and democracy are so very precious that you do not fight to win them once—and then stop. Liberty and freedom and democracy are prizes awarded only to those people who fight to win and then keep fighting eternally to hold them."

We, citizens of Baltimore, State of Maryland, gathered under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore City, in commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of Lithuania, held on the 16th day of February 1948, at Lithuanian Hall, after due deliberations regarding the international situation prevailing in Europe, take note of the following:

Nearly 3 years have elapsed since the Allied Powers gained a military victory in Europe and yet the numerous promises of freedom, happiness, and justice to the people of Nazi-enslaved Europe remain unfulfilled. In fact, the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are now subjected to an enslavement which is even more oppressive than their former enslavement by Nazi Germany.

The Baltic States are occupied by the armed forces of the Soviet Union. They have had no opportunity to hold free and unfettered elections in order to honestly elect their representatives to form a government of their own choice. They have no authorized delegates to represent them in the United Nations.

Masses of political refugees from the Baltic States in the occupied zones are suffering from moral and physical oppression, with no hope in sight of ever returning to their native countries.

Wherefore, in the name of the millions who spilled their life's blood on hundreds of battlefields so as to make this world a better place in which to live and for the sake of justice and a permanent peace, we respectfully urge the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to lead the nations of the world in adopting appropriate measures to accomplish the following:

The removal from the territory of all Baltic nations all foreign armies and agencies, so that the refugees from these countries may be enabled to return to their native lands from all displaced-person camps, prison camps of Soviet Russia, and other parts of the world to free, independent, and sovereign countries.

That after their governments have been reestablished they should be invited to join the United Nations and be given a full status.

COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES,
ANTHONY J. MICEIKA,
President.
KONSTANT MATULIAUSKAS,
Secretary.

Taxes and Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include a copy of a letter from Arthur H. Booth, president, United Farmers of America, Inc., to the CIO Packing House Workers' Union, Chicago, Ill., who are threatening to strike for a raise in wages.

His letter points out facts with reference to the effect of high taxes on the cost of living which is worthy of careful consideration.

To the Members of Organized Labor, Greeting:

The writer is national president of the United Farmers of America, Inc., and has operated a retail business and was formerly a member of the United Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

The United Farmers are trying to get a floor under farm prices at not less than our average cost of production, as we cannot operate on less than our cost any more than can big or little businessmen.

We know that the city workers are our best customers for farm products and we are theirs, as we buy 40 percent of all the products of industry. We have 10 times more money invested and employ 10 times more labor than does both the auto and steel industries combined, hence the records over the past 28 years prove, that for every dollar of farm income, the city worker gets a like number of dollars, no more nor no less, so your and our welfare are closely knitted.

Wheat recently was $3.50 a bushel and bread was 15 cents a loaf. Wheat went down a dollar a bushel and bread declined 1 cent a loaf. Question: What would you have to pay for bread if we gave the bakers our wheat?

I recently assisted a farmer in compiling his income-tax report. He was one of these landlords, and after deducting actual expenses, which does not include his labor value, his net income of 80 acres, worth $8,000, was less than $75 or less than three-fourths of 1 percent interest on his investment. This is not an isolated case, as many farmers even with the recent high farm prices received nothing for their labor.

The writer having earned his bread at public labor for a wage, having been an officer of a labor organization, I understand the problems that are confronting you.

Fifty-seven cents out of each dollar you spend for food, clothing, or what not, is taxes concealed in everything you buy. If labor and agriculture had the intelligence that God gave a goose, we would unite and eliminate all the unnecessary expenses of our Government.

If we could lower the Government budget by $6,000,000,000, and it is asking for $40,000,000,000 for the coming year, and pass this reduction back to the taxpayers, both city and rural, it would lower your living costs exactly the same amount as if farm income declined 30 percent without lowering your wage or the farmer's prices.

But the Administration, according to a report of February 17, is shipping out fuel oil to the Fiji Islands, that we are in short supply, and exchanging it for coconut oil, that we can produce an abundance of, here on our own farms in soy bean oil and cottonseed oil.

The result will be that this coconut oil produced by labor who are receiving in some cases 10 cents a month, and the profits go to the absentee landlords, of Washington, New York, London, and Amsterdam, who now have more income than they can consume. This will cause a further decline in farm prices, with the resultant decline in the factory pay roll, dollar per dollar, which will mean either a cut in your wages or a lay-off for your job.

We are asked to send twenty million to feed the hungry in Europe and this is a partial list of the food that we propose to send them: Coal, mine machinery, timber, electrical equipment, trucks, freight cars, etc., which you and I will have to pay for with higher taxes and hence a lower living standard.

We must also buy 70 percent of our sugar consumed from overseas, although two States can supply our domestic needs, hence when the farmer is not permitted to grow the sugar you want, he quits farming and goes to the city looking for your job.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR H. BOOTH.

South Dakota's Governor Mickelson Urges Justice for Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I desire to call attention to the following statement made by Gov. George T. Mickelson, of South Dakota. It deals with an urgent situation now confronting the Indians of our area and provides additional evidence that Congress and the country owe to America's first citizens better and more adequate consideration than they have been receiving.

I hope, sir, that when the next appropriations bill comes before us to provide funds for the education, the health, and the economic opportunity of our American Indians that Members will unite in dealing with these requests both justly and generously.

PIERRE, S. DAK., February 18, 1948.—Gov. George T. Mickelson stated today that he was convinced the various Indian agencies in South Dakota were in real need of the additional Federal funds which they have recently requested to supplement their regular welfare allotments. The need for these funds for relief to Indians will grow more pressing as the end of the fiscal year in June approaches. The present plight of the Indian appears to be but a repetition of previous winters. One may well ask whether such conditions must continue year after year. It seems to call for study and consideration of a sound, longer range plan of rehabilitation that will enable the American Indian to become a self-sustaining, happy member of our society.

The Governor revealed that more than 4 weeks ago he had requested the social security department to secure information from all the reservations in South Dakota regarding the welfare of the Indians. Although the Indian is recognized as a responsibility of the Federal Government, the State of South Dakota with matched Federal funds assists many Indians through the old-age-assistance, aid-to-dependent-children, and aid-to-the-blind programs of the State social security department.

As a result of contacts with agency superintendents and reservation social workers, with county social-security directors, with Indians themselves, and other interested citizens, Jay Roney, Director of the Department of Social Security, has given the governor information, some previously published, concerning the welfare of the Indian which has kept him currently informed. There has been no actual starvation but there has been hunger and malnutrition and there will be more if adequate supplementary Federal funds are not provided. High living costs, a hard winter, lack of employment on the reservation and lack of housing off the reservation has made this season especially difficult.

In February, 843 Indians were receiving old-age assistance, the average grant being about $25 per person. This is slightly lower than the State average of about $31 primarily because the Indian often has no rent or fuel to pay and consequently not included in his budget. All grants for assistance are determined in the same manner. Resources available are deducted as in all other cases. Four hundred and twenty-five families with 927 children received aid to dependent children and 96 Indians received blind aid. The total assistance given in February was $40,640. The total assistance to the Indian by the State with Federal matching funds approximates $487,640.

The Indian Bureau provides assistance to those who do not qualify for the State social security program. The reservations in South Dakota have been allocated about $89,000 in Federal funds for welfare purposes for the fiscal year ending June 1948. An additional $16,500 in tribal money is being used on the Cheyenne Reservation. Payments to Indians in need from these funds have averaged about $12 per person per month. To maintain even this low rate, additional funds are needed and thus the superintendents of the South Dakota Indian agencies have requested an additional $55,000 in supplementary Federal welfare funds. This, Mickelson said, appears to be a conservative, modest request, and whereas Indians receiving State social security aid were feeling the pressure of rising costs those receiving Federal agency assistance of about one-half the rate were in a serious plight.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Joseph P. O'Hara, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Member of Congress from Minnesota, at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Bridgeport Lincoln Day Committee, Bridgeport, Conn., Thursday, February 12, 1948:

It is altogether fitting and proper that Republicans everywhere revere the memory of Abraham Lincoln. Indeed, there has been no time since his tragic death when it was more appropriate to do so, no time when it was more profitable to gather strength and comfort from his life and wisdom.

We have come to the fullness of a crucial period in our history. The maladjustments of the costliest and most destructive war the world has known are great and many. They demand wise counsel and sound resolution, else our American form of government will be in great jeopardy. It may be difficult to preserve it, for the American system—call it what you will: the capitalist system, the profits system, or the free-enterprise system—has been under attack for 15 years, an attack which has twisted it into something the founding fathers never intended, subjecting it to the whims of the overlords of our bureaucracy who long have fed upon it. A system so weakened needs careful nourishing.

That is why it benefits us to turn to Lincoln for wisdom, to learn and profit from his profoundly wise words and principles, so many of them as cogent and pointed today as they were in the tragic era which was their source.

We pay tribute to Lincoln, not alone because he was the first President of the Republican Party, one of the noble men who brought it into being and made it great. Lincoln was a great party leader, but he long since ceased to be merely that. Long before we faced today's crisis, he had become an American institution, far removed from political divisions. He had become the epitome of all that is truly American. He remains epitome, forever enshrined in the hearts of American everywhere, and we can return to him today for counsel and wisdom, with great profit to ourselves and our Nation.

Yes, Lincoln belongs to the ages, to all Americans, to all people—but let us not forget, in all pride, that he belongs uniquely and particularly to the Republican Party. In principle and tradition we belong to him. He shaped us in our formative years. He believed in the party, as the instrument of the public welfare, and it believed in him. He brought to it his lifelong principles, and those principles have been our beacon ever since.

Stupendous problems confront us, and upon their solution rests our future. We have no problem of preserving the Union, as we had in Lincoln's age, but real unity of purpose and action still remains a major factor in all we do to resolve these problems, in peace and security, for the welfare of all.

And, as in Lincoln's day, we must be clear in our minds about one thing, as clear and forceful and far-seeing as he was. That one thing is this: Whatever foundation we build for the future must be erected upon our historic traditions, our great American institutions. They must remain effective if future generations are going to know the peace and security and happiness, the opportunity and prosperity that should be their inheritance from those of us who must meet these problems.

Those historic traditions and institutions were in Lincoln's blood, his inheritance, as they are yours, from our forefathers, and he could not see them destroyed, however great and terrible the issue, however mighty and costly the sacrifices. He saved them, he preserved the Union, and in doing so, he greatly enlarged the ambition of human liberty.

This point is well taken. The argument is made advisedly. For our historic traditions, our American institutions, our representative form of government, our free-enterprise system are a major stake today. For 15 years the American people have lived under crisis and emergency government, moving from one crisis to another, each succeeding one the product of its predecessor, some created by the men in power to enlarge their powers over American citizens and American industry. It has been a long period of license and abuse. A period when sectional jealousies, class prejudices and suspicions and strife were encouraged; a period of experimentation and improvisation in government; so much of it dangerous to the American system of representative government; a period in which the Nation abandoned for a time a fundamental principle laid down by the men who founded our Republic—the principle that this should be a government of laws and not a government by men—and made the mistake of nurturing a too elaborate, entrenched, and far-flung bureaucracy; a period of government encroachment upon business and industry; a period of immunities and privileges granted one class, for the sake of political power, and denied to all others; a period in which new instruments of public power were created which, in the words of their author, could and might provide shackles for the liberties of the people; a period of prodigious spending, with votes the major aim; a long, long period of reckless and wasteful deficit financing on an unprecedented scale, and the accumulation of an enormous public debt which is the source of the costly inflation now bedeviling the American people; an inflation that endangers American economy; a period of many attacks upon constitutional government and its institutions—some by men in power, some by advocates and preachers of foreign ideologies who would substitute some form of the corporate state for our republican form of representative government.

Today we are confronted again with crisis government, and the administration shows every sign of using it for political purposes. Inflation is a costly and troublesome thing. The source of ours is well known to the administration, which does nothing to attack the evil at its base—it advocates only plans to treat the symptoms; proposes new control powers which, under the circumstances, could fasten the police state upon the American people.

The long period of license and abuse is drawing to a close. The beginning of the end came in 1946, when the voters, rising in revolt against the very thing the administration again proposes, elected a Republican Congress. That Congress already has done much to mend the evils which confront us. This year, the people will complete the job. The party of Lincoln is still the party of America, its faith in American traditions and institutions as great as ever. It will preserve those traditions and institutions.

In America, in the future as in the past, progress will be found in encouragement of free enterprise; in full production, full employment, lower prices, better quality, lower taxes, more home rule and less Washington rule, more individual opportunity and initiative and less bureaucratic dictation and regimentation.

Lincoln faced a nation half slave, half free, and he said it could not permanently endure so long as that situation obtained. We face a nation in which the Government has placed a crippling hand upon American economy; a nation in which the Government is operating an enormous part of the country's business in competition with the rest of it; a nation in which the Government enters the commodity markets as a competitor in bidding for scarce goods, and thereby accelerates the inflation. We have seen the Government's powers over business and industry enlarged so prodigiously that there is scarcely a business in the country today that is not subjected to the restricting control and regulations which the Government now exercises and administers. We have known strict regimentation in very realistic and costly forms, and the administration would return to it. We have seen whole industries paralyzed by strikes by labor monopolies, which the administration created out of the immunities and privileges granted by discriminatory legislation. We have seen America's productive capacity, the greatest in the world, reduced almost to the vanishing point by these strikes, all of them forced upon the Nation in the pursuit of more powers and more benefits, without any thought of assuming responsibilities.

None of this was done by the party of Lincoln, but the party of Lincoln must redress it; has already done much to redress it.

The Republican Congress has passed the Taft-Hartley Act, which has done no more than balance the scales as between labor and industry. You have heard it called a slave-labor act. That is transparent nonsense. It is the very antithesis of slave labor law. Under it, the laboring man has not lost a single right or privilege or liberty guaranteed him by the Wagner Labor Relations Act. Indeed, the benefits conferred upon him by that law are retained in the new act, written into it in the same precise language contained in the Wagner law.

The difference between the number of strikes which were existing before the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act and the condition of the country now as to number of strikes leads to the conclusion that there was something wrong before or that the Taft-Hartley law is a better law than some of the agitators are trying to make out.

And bear this in mind: The Taft-Hartley Act not only does not take from the laboring man a single right and privilege granted by the Wagner law, but it also broadens the scope of his individual rights and liberties by guaranteeing him new ones which his unions had denied him. In every respect, the Taft-Hartley law benefits the individual worker, protects his job, guards him from the abuses of unscrupulous and power-seeking union leaders. The Wagner Act was a union leaders' act in every respect, and it was used by many leaders to perpetuate themselves in power. It did nothing for the individual as an individual. Not so the Taft-Hartley Act. It deprives the leaders of some of the powers they had, and that is why they do not like it. That is why they call it a slave-labor act; why they collect huge campaign funds to defeat the Congressmen who voted for it, and to fight for its repeal.

The Republican Party has adopted as its program the reduction of taxes, along with the reduction of expenses of Government;

and the encouragement of both labor and management to new ventures.

There is no hope to the wasteful program of an administration which insists on taxing and spending, and spending and taxing.

Lincoln knew what the American way of life was when he said:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

He knew the American system, too, when he said at New Haven, Connecticut, in 1860:

"I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free to acquire property as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in law to prevent a man from getting rich. It would do more harm than good. So while we do not propose any war on capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else."

That doctrine means, too, the right of every individual to go about his business unmolested, unregulated, unregimented by his government, so long as he does not interfere with the rights of his fellow citizens.

"I believe each individual," Lincoln said, "is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruit of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights."

He also made the observation, at Columbus, Ohio, in 1838, that:

"We shall sooner have the fowl by hatching the egg than by smashing it."

Regarding the right and freedom of man to progress through the medium of his own industry and resourcefulness, he said in 1859 at Cincinnati:

"The prudent penniless beginner in the world labors for wages a while, saves his surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account for another while, and at length hires another to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all, gives hope to all, and consequently an improvement of condition to all."

In the same year at Milwaukee, Wis., Lincoln said:

"Property is the fruit of labor. * * * Property is desirable as a positive good in the world. * * * That some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence is just encouragement to industry and interprise."

That is the doctrine which has made America great; the doctrine which brought us to our great position of the most productive, the most prosperous, the most enlightened, the most powerful nation in the world, with the highest standard of living found anywhere on earth. It is a doctrine that stems from our constitutional form of government. It is inherent in American traditions and institutions, which are the basis of our way of life, our representative form of government, our free-enterprise system. It is that doctrine which will enable this Nation to endure for all time, its historic traditions and institutions honored and secure, and fulfill its mighty destiny in the atomic age of man. We must be faithful to that doctrine if we are to give a heritage of freedom, security, peace, prosperity, and happiness to the coming generations. Faithful to that doctrine, we will never falter in our allegiance to the Constitution and to the Bill of Rights, or to our representative Republic. Faithful to it, Republicans will restore American institutions to their historic greatness and effectiveness.

The advice which Lincoln gave his fellow men in his second inaugural address on March 4, 1865, is as appropriate today.

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan, and do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

In honoring the memory of our first Republican President of the United States, I can conclude in no better way than to paraphrase Lincoln's own tribute to George Washington:

"To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Abraham Lincoln is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe we pronounce the name, and in its naked deathless splendor, leave it shining on."

Protect the Employment of Glassworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I continue to be disturbed by the effects of international trade agreements on the great glass industry in my district. This industry has a substantial amount of capital invested in a number of fine modern plants and employs upwards of 9,000 of our citizens. They are threatened now with pending trade agreements in Mexico. They suffered as a result of the Geneva Conference, as I knew they would when we delegated all of our tariff authority to the Executive in 1945. I warned of this situation then in a speech in the House. I repeated my warning on April 29, 1947, in another speech in the House, which I am incorporating herewith.

Mr. Speaker, I shall continue my efforts to protect these workers and this industry from unfair foreign competition. My fears are shared by Mr. Harry H. Cook, the president of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America, who on December 20, 1947, said to me:

We are fearful that our American industry and the American glass workers will become the victims of importation as a result of the present tariff legislation.

I see no reason to change the position I took in my speech of April 29, 1947, which follows:

RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I have long been troubled with the ultimate effect that the Reciprocal Trade Act will have on the industry of America and its labor force. When Congress extended this act in 1945 for an additional 3 years, and provided that tariffs might be lowered by another 50 percent, we abdicated our control over tariffs and delegated all our responsibility to the executive department. It was for this reason that I then spoke against the passage of the bill and voted against it, and in the 2 years that have passed since then, during which I have given continuous study to the question, I have not changed my mind.

I represent the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, which comprises Atlantic, Cumberland, and Cape May Counties. This is the home of many substantial industries. Food processing and the manufacture of clothing is carried on extensively. Commercial fishing is of great importance; and primarily, so far as tariff questions are concerned, the district, particularly Cumberland County, is one of the most important producers of glassware in the United States.

There are today between 9,000 and 10,000 workers occupied in the production of glass products in this district. The glassware manufactured here varies from ordinary containers to intricate apparatus for laboratory use, and represents a sales volume between $30,000,000 and $35,000,000 per annum.

The actual labor involved represents from 25 percent of the cost of fully automatic machine-made containers to 89 percent in the production of glass apparatus for laboratory or industrial use.

The average hourly wages, on a basis of a 40-hour workweek, range from $0.985 to $1.614.

During the past 10 years, wage rates have increased 107 percent for male workers and 135 percent for female help. The plant and equipment investment per worker averages about $4,000.

I would like to say in passing that the labor relations in this industry in my district have been for the most part exceptionally good, and the combination of excellent management and high-grade workers made an important contribution of vital materials to the United States during the war.

This essential industry and other important businesses in my area are threatened by the power of the Executive Department to manipulate and decrease tariffs. The International Conference at Geneva, which began April 8, can spell the difference between the continuance and discontinuance of this and many American enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in the exclusion of foreign products, and I recognize the necessity of cultivating foreign trade, but there are some specified industries which by their very nature require reasonable and adequate protection; and require, in my judgment, that that protection be guarded and provided by the elected representatives of the people in Congress, and not by the State Department, which, in its zeal to cultivate our foreign relations, often neglects our domestic welfare.

It is for this reason that I have introduced a bill to restore to Congress at least the right of veto of tariff treaties which are harmful. I think the bill is necessary, and I hope it will have the prompt attention of the Ways and Means Committee and of the House. It does not interfere with the international conference about to proceed, and it does not retard foreign trade. It merely restores to the Congress, where it rightfully belongs, ultimate authority over tariff questions, the protection of the American worker, and American industry. This bill is brief and reads as follows:

"A bill to require approval by Congress of executive agreements with respect to the reduction of tariff rates before the same become effective

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That on and after the effective date of this act no Executive agreement which contains any provision for reduction of tariff rates shall become effective until such agreement shall have been filed for a period of 90 days with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and with the Secretary of the Senate. If during such period of 90 days the Congress shall, by joint resolution, disapprove the agreement, it shall not thereafter be executed and shall for all purposes be void."

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution gives the Congress jurisdiction over the regulation of foreign trade, custom duties, and tariffs. When Congress passed the original Reciprocal Trade Act in 1934, as well as the extensions of that act, it abdicated its responsibility under the Constitution, and departed from a program which had been in effect in this country for many years.

It is my feeling that Congress should take action to restrain or delay the negotiating of reciprocal treaties which are about to be undertaken. If agreements are made now, they should be very flexible. World conditions are changing rapidly, and trade agreements must reflect such changes.

If the United States is to help in mending a torn world, we must maintain a sound productive economy within our own borders. Domestic producers and manufacturers must be in a position to compete in the domestic market on an equitable basis with foreign products of similar character. An equitable tariff cannot be considered a barrier to trade; it has the opposite effect. Fair competition is stimulating to business. At this time nearly all of the other countries of the world with whom the treaties are to be negotiated have nationalized industry, and for us to believe that the free enterprise of this country can compete with nationalized industry in other countries is fantastic, unless adequate safeguards are provided. Before negotiating treaties we should have definite assurances as to wage scales that are going to be maintained abroad, agreements that governments will not use their nationalized industries to pour foreign products into our country to the great detriment of our own labor and industries.

Another matter of great concern is the question of protecting certain key industries in the United States which have made it possible for this country to wage two successful wars. Tariffs should not be lowered on the products of these key industries, as they are indispensable to our national existence and our very life. Most of these industries are highly specialized and require the highest type of both skilled and unskilled workers. Labor costs are one of the most important factors, and we must not subject these industries to foreign competition that would render them impotent. While at the present time labor and industry seem to be far apart on many of their problems, their interests dovetail on tariffs, and many labor unions throughout the United States have joined in the protest against the lowering of tariff rates and have filed briefs with the Reciprocity Information Committee. One prominent union, representing thousands of workers, stated in its protest:

"We are not opposed to imports even though those which are competitive with the products of our own American workers We are opposed to the entry into America's market of competitive articles, delivered at total wholesale costs, duties paid, which are less than our costs of production.

"We do not seek any monopoly. However, we will not knowingly or willingly permit any Government officials to deprive us of our work opportunities, and make us dependent on either the charity of the Government, our relatives, or our friends in order to satisfy the theories of some or to add to the riches of others.

"We contend that with the changed conditions which now exist in Germany, Japan, Czechoslovakia, and other foreign countries, which in former years were the major source of supplies for American distributors of foreign hand-made glassware articles, there is no definite way at this time of knowing what the production costs of competitive hand-made glassware articles are or will be in the immediate future in those countries.

"In addition, it is of interest to have in mind that millions of dollars worth of the latest American automatic machinery has been installed in these foreign countries, at little or no cost to the operators of such machinery and that their future cost of production will soon be much lower than it has been in former years.

"One does not have to be equipped with a college training or recognition as an economist to realize that tariff rates which permit of competitive foreign-made products being delivered into America's market at less than American costs of production would soon result in the closing down of America's factories and unemployment for those American workers dependent upon such factories and workshops for their livelihood."

On the other hand, the American Tariff League which represents several hundred industries was very fair in its brief filed with the committee which stated:

"Currently the world's economy is chaotic. The United States is at present engaged, as are other countries, in endeavoring to catch up with a demand for goods created by wartime shortages. We do not have any general surplus for export and it will take considerable time to reconstruct and improve our domestic facilities to meet domestic needs and create an exportable surplus. During this chaotic period, we respectfully submit, it is unwise to complicate the situation still further by a mass revision of our tariff.

"Indeed the league believes it is unfair at this particular time to expect domestic producers to furnish to the committee for reciprocity information the kind of statistical and informational material which the committee ought to have in its work of correlating information about domestic production, imports, foreign costs, etc."

It is quite apparent that Congress should adopt a definite policy in connection with reciprocal trade agreements. It should:

First. Pass a resolution calling for a delay of at least 6 months before any new treaties are entered into, during which time a further study of world conditions could be made.

Second. Pass suitable legislation protecting the key industries of the United States which have helped win two wars.

Third. Provide that treaties would not be extended under the favored-nation clause unless all of the nations that would benefit from such an extension would agree to increase wage rates so that the commodities produced in the foreign countries would be on an equal basis with the commodities produced in this country. A study should be made to determine how far the foreign countries with whom we are to negotiate treaties are going in the nationalization of industries and ascertain the effect that such nationalization will have on the treaties to be executed.

I am including a memorandum entitled "History of Scientific Glassware in America" which, I think, is pertinent to this subject:

"HISTORY OF SCIENTIFIC GLASSWARE IN AMERICA

"At the time of the Allied embargo in 1914, the manufacturing of scientific glassware in this country was negligible, being limited to small shops working largely on repairs or filling shortages of import orders. Along with certain chemicals, drugs, dyes, and optical glassware, laboratory glassware had, up to this time, been a complete German monopoly.

"Unlike the other industries mentioned, for some reason the German firms did not see fit to even establish an American subsidiary for making scientific apparatus. As a result, when the blockade became effective and imports were shut off, there was, in England and America, a real crisis.

"England immediately called together her glass manufacturers and scientists and, in addition to establishing and subsidizing a school of glass technology, she placed all scientific glassware under the safeguarding of Key Industries Act.

"Late in the spring of 1917 the Council of National Defense called together in Washington a group of American glass manufacturers, and from that meeting a new American industry was born.

"No promises were extracted, but each plant took upon itself the development of suitable glasses, the training of men, and the necessary capital that was required to meet what would otherwise have been a serious situation, not only to our War Department, but to every major supporting industry requiring the smallest degree of scientific research or control.

"At the signing of the armistice there were at least 15 factories producing blown chemical ware and double that number fabricating and graduating laboratory apparatus.

"Early in 1919, before central Europe was in a position to enter the American market, there was a flood of Japanese glassware, which demoralized the entire market. This was so serious that in June 1919 this industry, the importance of which was still fresh in the minds of both our Government officials and scientists, was picked out as one of the few industries that should come under the administration's emergency tariff consideration.

"In spite of the Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930, the industry was carried on by a decreasing number of plants, who practically subsidized these departments. Under June of 1933, previous to the devaluation of the dollar, imports from Germany, Czechoslovakia, Italy, and Japan were seriously curtailing the American production of this small but important industry.

"This industry is highly specialized and requires the highest type of both skilled and unskilled workers and this branch of the glass industry is still considered by the War Department and Public Health Service as one of the critical industries, the supply of which must be assured.

"Because it is an industry whose labor cost is the important factor, the controlling element of foreign competition is, therefore, the standard of wages paid in these countries, further amplified by the unstable currency condition in both Europe and the Orient.

"At the outbreak of World War II, this industry was in a position to rapidly expand and furnish the Army and Navy medical services, as well as the Public Health Service, with enormous quantities of items that were required in the war effort. Such production would have been impossible if the industry had not been continued after the First World War, as modern science and medicine are entirely dependent upon scientific apparatus."

Mr. Speaker, I close by repeating that whatever ultimate changes it would seem wise to make in our tariff laws, it is, at the very least, necessary to immediately restore to Congress the veto right over agreements negotiated by the executive department, which may be regarded by the Congress as improvident. Congress has no right, in my judgment, to shirk its responsibility in this regard. My bill will again clothe Congress with the power and responsibility which belongs to it.

Mr. BATES of Massuchetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman ought to be complimented for the very splendid statement he is making this afternoon in calling to the attention of the House and the American people the real danger that lies before us insofar as foreign trade is concerned. While we all agree that we ought to do what we can to rehabilitate Europe, we must defend our own industries from this type of foreign competition, particularly from those totalitarian governments of Europe and elsewhere, and who are taking over the industries completely and subsidizing them and then later on, through reciprocal arrangements, are hoping to deluge this country with the cheap products of those countries in competition with our own labor.

Mr. HAND. I am in complete accord with what the gentleman has said, Mr. Speaker, and I know he has in mind, among other things, the every disastrous effects that unwise agreements would have on the great fishing industry which he represents and which to a certain extent I represent, together with shoes and textiles.

I am particularly interested in glass, which is particularly vulnerable in the present state of the law. I think if we restore the situation so that Congress can have the final say, the ultimate veto power, so to speak, on these unwise agreements that may be negotiated, that that will go a long way to solve the problem.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The Committee on Ways and Means has given serious thought to many of those problems in the continuous hearings they have been holding over a period of days and weeks and will continue for some time to come, and I hope from that there will come some solution along the lines suggested, that others will have something to say other than the executive department of the Government.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman. Both the gentleman and I have testified before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Betrayal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Post of February 25, written by my friend, Ted Thackrey, copublisher of the Post, who has headed the editorial very simply, "Betrayal."

In a few sharp words Mr. Thackrey has summed up the reaction of millions of American citizens to the statement presented for the United States to the United Nations Tuesday.

The text of the editorial follows:

BETRAYAL

(By T. O. Thackrey)

Stripped of platitudes, the statement of the United States before the United Nations Security Council yesterday canceled out the plan for the partition of Palestine the United States fought to secure last November 29.

This is betrayal, though quick study of the statement does not disclose it—as it was intended not to disclose it.

The statement is intended to make us believe the United States is merely seeking a method of carrying out the partition decision.

The United States asks the Council to determine whether there is a threat to peace; it offers to consult with the other great powers on the formation of an international army to enforce the peace, if it is found to be threatened; it pledges to support whatever action the Council takes.

This has the sound of a constructive policy, particularly when coupled with intimations that, if the Council decides an armed militia is required to enforce the peace, a way would be found to supply arms.

It was intended to sound constructive.

But it was betrayal.

The first of the significant statements—an outrageous statement containing the very essence of betrayal—was this from the United States:

"The Council's action • • • is directed to keeping the peace and not to enforcing partition."

But if enforcement of the partition decision is not the business of the Council, the only United Nations organ empowered to use force, then it is the business of nobody and is meaningless.

The United States statement is not content with nullifying the partition decision by conspiring to negate any possibility of its enforcement, however; it goes further.

"The Charter does not empower the Security Council to enforce a political settlement whether it is pursuant to a recommendation of the General Assembly or of the Council itself" is what the United States delegate said.

This statement terms the action of the General Assembly a recommendation, which it is not, rather than a decision, which it was.

It also embarks on the most dangerous of all concepts—that whether the General Assembly, or the Security Council, or both, reach political decisions, the United Nations under no circumstances is empowered to enforce them.

Since every question involving a threat to peace is a political question, what the United States has actually said in its anxiety to avoid enforcement of the partition decision is that no decisions can be enforced.

This is another way of stating that the way to nullify any decision is for the opposed group or groups to attack, threaten the peace, and then have the Security Council maintain peace by nullifying the decision that caused the attack.

The United States also proposes a five-power Security Council Commission to study the Palestine problem.

This commission supersedes, of course, the Palestine Commission empowered by the General Assembly to implement a decision which we now deny was a decision.

What really was done at Lake Success yesterday by the United States was to do these things:

1. Kill the partition decision reached by the General Assembly.

2. Take the whole Palestine problem away from the Assembly and place it effectively in British and Arabian hands for "settlement."

Next, we shall, no doubt, see the spectacle of the United States urging that Great Britain be begged to remain in Palestine "to keep the peace."

It would have been more honest to state flatly that we have placed our foreign policy in the tender hands of the British Foreign and Colonial Offices, and have empowered the Nazi-Arab war criminal, the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, our new secretary of state for Palestine.

If no other course can restore us to honor, perhaps it is not too soon to raise the question of impeachment.

Address of Hon. Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner held in the city of Washington on February 19, 1948, among the distinguished speakers, headed by the President of the United States, was our able colleague the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Hon. MARY T. NORTON, who is also the Democratic national committeewoman for the State of New Jersey. Although not present at the Washington dinner, I have heard many compliments uttered by some of those who were there, addressed toward the speech of the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Representative NORTON, which follows herewith:

Tonight, we, and Democrats everywhere, are honoring Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, one the founder of the Democratic Party, the other the great defender of Democratic ideals. The Democratic Party has come a long way since the days of Jefferson and Jackson and we want to see that party, which combines the ideals of these two great patriots, continued and strengthened throughout the coming years with distinction and honor. Through the years, and particularly the last 16, the Democratic Party has made a great contribution to our country. It is, and always has been, the party of the people, a progressive party that has been responsible for most of the humane laws on our statute books; laws which have as their objective prosperity for the farmer, a living wage for the working men and women of America, security for the aged, and higher standards of living and education for all of our people. These, and many more laws have been enacted under the leadership of a great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and they will be continued and improved under the able leadership of President Truman.

However, all that we have gained in the last 16 years will be lost and the welfare of the common man, who is the bulwark of this Nation, will not be improved if we do not reelect our President and return a Democratic Congress. That, I can promise you, and, if you need proof I can refer you to the record of the Republican Party in the Eightieth Congress and challenge you to point to a single outstanding act of this Congress to benefit the people of America or of the world. The Republicans have had their opportunity in the 14 months that they have controlled Congress and how miserably they have failed. Even the Marshall plan, which should be nonpartisan, and which would do so much to establish a lasting peace, is being jockeyed around and made the same kind of a political football that succeeded in destroying the League of Nations following World War I. Are we to go through that same agony again? I say that we cannot if America and Europe are to survive and, whether we realize it or not, the survival of civilization itself is at stake this time. Make no mistake about that. We are faced with a tremendous responsibility and we must meet it. I know the Democratic women will do their part, particularly those women whose sons have made the supreme sacrifice in the late war. They know the price paid for war in tears, in suffering, and in sacrifice. We know the Democratic Party is responsible for the United Nations and the Marshall plan, which we hope will go far to end wars, and we know that if either or both is to survive, we must reelect President Truman and a Democratic Congress. This, I believe, will be the No. 1 reason why women will support the Democratic Party this year.

Another, and very personal, reason is that the Republicans in Congress voted 9 to 1 to destroy OPA and brought about the highest food prices in our times. This will be remembered on election day—and there are 2,000,000 more women than men eligible to vote this year. Some people claim the women helped to elect the Republicans in 1946. Well, if they did, I know they have bitterly regretted it. It is true that women were tired of restrictions, tired of standing in line to buy food, and they foolishly thought the Republicans could improve conditions. They wanted a change. Well, they got it, and what a change it has been. When we had to stand in line with coupons, we were treated fairly, and, although we fed a great Army and supplied our allies with food, we were still able to get our share of food at reasonable prices, and feed our families properly because the price of food was controlled through the entire war. We did it through OPA, but the record shows that the Republicans destroyed OPA. If you need proof, I call to your attention a statement made on February 5, 1948, in my own State by Senator WHERRY, acting majority leader of the Senate, before the Middle Atlantic Lumberman's Association, and I quote, "I do not need to remind the membership of this association that it was the Republican leadership in the Senate and House that was responsible for ending OPA." Now that price controls are gone, we can look longingly at the nice cuts of meat and other foods, which only the rich can afford to buy.

Yes; women have had enough and I predict they will come back to the party that gave the workers enough to eat at fair prices, a chance to live, to educate their children, to save for their old age, and to enjoy some of the comforts of life. Mr. President, we women are going to be a great factor in your reelection this year and we shall elect a Democratic Congress to support you in your program. This is a challenge and we shall meet it. And, it would be a good idea and strengthen our organization, if it were suggested to the leaders of our party that women be given a greater share in the policy-making councils of our party, particularly young women.

I want to see more qualified women recognized for what they are worth. Women are willing and anxious to work but we are human and when the election is won, we do not want to be forgotten until the next election. We ask an opportunity to serve with our men. That is all. We need more women in the State legislatures and in Congress. There are all too few. We want to apply our housekeeping talents to serve America and when our sons are called upon to fight, and if need be die for our country, we want to have something to say about the rules. Two million more women than men eligible to vote could, properly organized, do much to make the rules.

And, finally, Mr. Chairman, we want to assist in carrying on the ideals of that great President who gave his life to maintain freedom and justice in a war-torn world and to help his worthy successor, who has carried on a very difficult job with vision, ability, and great integrity. President Truman has presented to Congress a 10-point program which will go far in establishing at home and abroad the ideals for which so many of our young men fought and died and we owe it to him and to them to do everything in our power to bring about the realization of that program so that we can continue our high standard of living with freedom and justice to all.

Mr. Chairman, the Eightieth Congress will go down in history as the Congress that destroyed OPA and brought about the highest prices in generations—the Congress that has placed political expediency above the welfare of America—the Congress that promised much and accomplished nothing. We should not find it too difficult to elect Democrats this year.

National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement in the nature of a report by the Honorable Basil O'Connor in connection with the work of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR 10 YEARS THE MARCH OF DIMES HAS MARCHED ON

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, on January 3, 1938, grew to its present size and usefulness during what was probably the most turbulent decade the world ever had known. Scarcely a year after it was formed for the purpose of making the fight against infantile paralysis Nation-wide in character, war broke out in Europe. For almost 4 years of the 10, the United States was fighting in that global war. Yet the National Foundation, created with the dimes and dollars given by millions of Americans, emerged from an ideal set down on paper, took on flesh and blood, strengthened, became an active, potent force in the life and health of the country.

In the 10 years from 1938 to 1948 the national foundation gave financial assistance to an estimated 88,000 polio patients; helped increase the number of hospitals admitting acute polio cases from about 300 in 1938 to 717 in 1948; trained some 1,300 professional workers urgently needed in hospitals and laboratories through scholarships and fellowships; authorized grants for 540 research and education projects in 83 institutions in 29 States.

As a result of the tremendous public interest in the fight against infantile paralysis, the cooperation and advice of medical and public health authorities and the practical, fluid organization of the national foundation's 2,738 local chapters, that enabled them to act swiftly as needs arose in all parts of the country, there is today better care for polio patients, less permanent deformity and crippling and vastly diminished panic in time of epidemic than at any time in the Nation's history.

The present structure of the national foundation and many of its current activities were matters of evolution. Policies necessarily were dictated by need and experience. But as each year demonstrated new needs and added to the young organization's experience, additions and changes in the program were possible with minimum delay.

From the first the advice and counsel of medical authorities were provided for. On June 21, 1938, the first board of trustees and medical advisory committee were appointed. Thenceforth all allotments of money for research, education, and medical care programs were made with the advice of committees composed of physicians and scientists who were specialists in the various related fields. In this way the lay organization was kept up to date with medical findings and procedure.

It is estimated that leaders in 24 specialty fields—from chemistry to mechanical engineering, from psychology to internal medicine—play their parts in the quest for knowledge to overcome infantile paralysis today. Few, if any, new projects could be undertaken at present without duplication, if indeed qualified personnel could be found to engage in them. The problem in polio research today is lack of personnel. Properly trained new workers in this field were not produced during the war years.

The national foundation today is conducting the most intensive and comprehensive attack on a single disease ever launched by a private agency anywhere in the world. The number and size of its scientific efforts have multiplied and grown with each year, despite even the difficulties attendant upon war years. For instance, in the first 21 months of the decade there were 45 grants and appropriations amounting to about half a million dollars for research and education. In the last 12-month period ended May 31, 1947, there were 87 grants and appropriations, totaling almost $2,000,000.

Eminent specialists engaged in national foundation research and the institutions with which they are connected offer assurance of the use of the best minds in a wide variety of fields for this particular attack. Furthermore, these men and women, celebrated in the world of science, have chosen their work because of deep personal interest in the problems involved, bring to it a tacit promise of continuation until final victory is achieved.

RESEARCH

Polio research requires the skills, abilities, and experience of a great many diversified scientists, each approaching the problem from a special vantage point to form a circle converging on the ultimate truth. Since no one can tell in advance from which source will come the vital clue, the national foundation deliberately has brought to bear on the problem representatives of many specialties, each engaging in specialized research. This process of far-flung exploration has a bearing on similar quests for knowledge directed at other unsolved diseases. National foundation scientists are undertaking to determine the fundamental nature of living organisms, of which the virus remains the most mysterious. When this fundamental knowledge is gathered, it may well speed the day of control of many diseases, perhaps all disease. Who knows but that the answer to cancer or tuberculosis or the common cold may be found in the course of seeking a solution to infantile paralysis?

Already byproducts of research financed by the national foundation have made most important contributions to the understanding and control of a group of diseases known as the encephalitides. In the course of national foundation work came the application of the oximeter, a clinical device to measure oxygen in the circulating blood, thus allowing with increased safety surgical operations such as that for blue babies, heretofore considered extremely dangerous. And new, improved artificial extremities—soon to be distributed to war veterans—evolved in part from studies supported by national foundation funds.

Many advances have been made since 1938 in the polio field itself, although no human preventive vaccine as yet has been discovered. Treatment of the disease has improved as a result of research, even the treatment of bulbar polio, a serious type of the disease affecting the nerve centers of breathing, swallowing, and circulation, and accounting for most polio deaths.

AN ARMY OF WORKERS

To accomplish all this, an increase in our army of professional workers was an obvious necessity. Through its education program the national foundation financed the training of 693 physical therapists; 106 medical social workers; 87 hospital and public-health orthopedic nursing supervisors, teachers, and head nurses; 58 health educators; 35 sanitary engineers; 30 virologists; 27 orthopedic surgeons; 18 public-health physicians; 22 medical-record librarians; 7 pedistricians. More are being added each year. Many important universities and medical schools have received assistance from the national foundation, making this training available.

The United States Public Health Service alone has received grants totaling $348,400 for fellowships in health education, the specialized training of health officers, and sanitary engineers whose services are employed by Federal, State, and local public-health agencies.

The national foundation's grants for public-health research and training alone, total about $2,400,000.

LOCAL CHAPTERS

In the field of patient care, the 10 years have brought many changes. The first chapter of the national foundation, for example, was recognized on May 12, 1939. Today the 2,738 local chapters, manned largely by volunteers, provide financial assistance for patients unable to meet the full costs of polio care and to assist local treatment centers to obtain professional staff and special equipment needed for the modern care of this disease. The chapters receive half of all net receipts of the annual March of Dimes. At the end of the last fiscal period, May 31, 1947, the chapters had spent about $32,000,000 for service to polio patients in their own areas.

The local chapters have become the liaison group between patients and patients' families and official agencies. In time of epidemic, there are many and diverse services the chapters render. For example, through national headquarters they are able to obtain medical specialists, orthopedic nurses, physical therapists from all parts of the country, to augment local hospital staffs. They can obtain without delay iron lungs, hot-pack machines, and other supplies urgently needed. In many communities, without these supplemental services, patients would not have been as well cared for, since the budgets allowed, many local health authorities are predetermined before the summer polio season, and official funds are not available in an emergency. Chapter funds may be spent for services and equipment dictated by emergencies, without waiting for meetings of legislative bodies.

The services of chapter volunteers in arranging transportation, housing, and other details for visiting professional workers, as well as their unpaid work in hospitals and homes have helped to mitigate the effects of nursing and other hospital personnel shortages. There can be no monetary value placed upon the beneficial influence of enthusiastic, well-informed volunteers.

AID OF THE RED CROSS

From the time of the establishment of the chapters of the national foundation to the present, new services for polio patients have been added each year. In 1940, the American Red Cross for the first time recruited nurses for polio epidemics. This recruitment now is part of the disaster service of the Red Cross. Approximately 4,000 nurses have been recruited, their salaries and transportation costs paid by the national foundation.

In 1943 the first advance of funds from national headquarters to supplement dwindling chapter resources in time of epidemic was made. Chapters whose treasuries are depleted by unusual demands due to outbreaks promptly receive advances to guarantee adequate treatment of all polio patients, regardless of age, race, creed, or color, wherever they are. A total of $10,701,397 had been advanced to chapters by October 1, 1947.

PREPAREDNESS FOR EPIDEMICS

In 1944 the first of a series of preparedness meetings attended by representatives of all State and local agencies, including chapters, was held in Columbus, Ohio. Its purpose was to prepare, in advance, for handling any epidemics the State might experience. These meetings are in keeping with national foundation policy to work with and supplement, where necessary, the activities of official health agencies. A thorough survey and discussion of facilities and personnel available, a plan to be put into operation when and if necessary, and working agreements among all those who have a part to play in handling any emergency are the major steps of such meetings. There are 32 in 21 States up to now.

In 1945 teams of professional experts, experienced in the care of infantile paralysis and ready to make emergency visits to stricken areas on short notice, were set up in four strategic geographical areas: Harvard University, Boston; D. T. Watson School of Physical Therapy, Leetsdale, Pa.; Northwestern University, Chicago; and Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif. Emergency epidemic aid units, whose expenses are paid by the National Foundation, have gone out 13 times in 3 summers to help local hospitals organize polio care.

Also in 1945, recognizing the critical shortage of qualified physical therapists whose services are so important in the modern treatment of infantile paralysis, the National Foundation launched a $1,267,600 physical therapy training program. Scholarships had been offered through the American Physiotherapy Association since 1942, but the number was tremendously increased in 1945. Almost 1,000 scholarships and fellowships have been awarded in this field, and 684 students had completed their training by October 1, 1947. This represents an increase of about 25 percent in the supply of qualified physical therapists in this country. More than 600 have been recruited by the National Foundation to serve in epidemics since 1943.

THE PEV'S

In May 1945, the Polio Emergency Volunteers were organized. These units consist of women who take brief courses in bedside care of polio to prepare them to assist nurses and physical therapists—without compensation—in hospitals and homes. About 2,000 PEV's were trained in 1945; there are 9,000 now.

On August 6, 1946, an equipment depot was established at Des Moines, Iowa, to assemble iron lungs, hot pack machines, and other equipment urgently needed by epidemic communities in the middle western area that was hard hit that year (1946 saw the largest number of reported polio cases since 1916—more than 25,000 new victims). Today there are five equipment depots located in the transportation centers of Boston, Columbus, Ohio; Atlanta, San Antonio, and Denver, where equipment will be ready to serve all parts of the country during 1948.

Sharing of medical knowledge has become more widespread each year. Last September a clinical conference on polio was held at the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation, to review progress in medical treatment of infantile paralysis since 1927, when Warm Springs came into being. In July 1948, an international conference of physicians will be held in New York City, for the purpose of pooling medical information in both the research and treatment fields. Representatives of 60 nations have been invited by our State Department to attend. The conference theme is: "Polio—World Problem."

The national foundation is concerned with all aspects of the fight against infantile paralysis. In the words of Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service:

"Every year infantile paralysis adds more names to the thousands, mostly defenseless children, who have been crippled by its treacherous attacks. An epidemic disease such as this can be controlled only by a well-organized campaign on a Nation-wide scale. This the national foundation has prosecuted vigorously."

Ten years, in world history, is but a moment. To mothers and fathers it is half their children's lives as children. What has been done in the 10 years just ended gives a picture of progress, though much more remains to be done in the years ahead.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] at Olympia, Wash., on February 10, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is such a genuine pleasure for me to be here in this capital city of the State of Washington, and I feel so much at home in the Pacific Northwest, that I find the reception you have accorded me to be like a welcome home.

I can think of no place where I should rather speak at an event that commemorates the birthday of Abraham Lincoln than right here in Olympia. I like the spirit of this great State of yours, the friendly western good will, the enterprise and initiative, and the faith in America and American ideals which it seems to me you reflect. It is that spirit which is going to carry a Republican Party—the party of Lincoln—to victory. Thus I am especially glad to be present at a rally of Republican men and women of the State of Washington.

There is an added satisfaction, also to be in the home State of HARRY CAIN, whose friendship I have enjoyed and whose qualities of leadership and conscientious endeavor I have admired so much during our first year together in the Senate. I look forward to becoming even better acquainted with your State when I visit Tacoma tomorrow and Everett on the actual anniversary of Lincoln's birth, February 12.

We face such critical problems in this country today—and such great opportunities—that it is unfortunate that in the Nation's Capital a smugly negative attitude has been created by a Democratic administration that has been in power so long that it has become incapable of assuming the vigorous leadership that will carry the American people forward. Its members are so singularly busy carrying water on all shoulders and blaming everything on the Republican Congress that they have succeeded only in creating a situation in Washington that handicaps constructive legislation.

To solve the complex problems of our times—to meet the challenge of large responsibilities—there must first be a new spirit in national leadership. It must be expressed through a party of principle, and not a party of expediency. It must be honest and forthright. It must have ideas and vision, and the vigor to make them effective.

I believe the party of Lincoln has these necessary attributes and that the American people will recognize that fact next November when they will decree a well-earned vacation for those who have become self-satisfied, careless, and cynical in public office.

I

One of Abraham Lincoln's most famous remarks ran something like this: "You can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time." I should like to apply that formula to some recent happenings:

1. When they are struggling against the threat of inflation and the hardships of high costs of living, the American people are not going to be fooled into believing that the only solution is more rationing, more controls, more government, and more red tape.

2. When they seek full production to relieve shortages and provide for their unsatisfied needs, the American people are not going to be fooled into believing that the way to do it is to heap taxes high and curtail iniative and enterprise by more Government controls.

3. When they hear the President say that industry must expand and that at least $50,000,000,000 should be invested to improve production facilities, the American people are not going to be fooled into believing he intends to encourage such essential expansion since he repeatedly recommends policies that deprive business of the use of venture capital with which to expand.

4. When they see a Republican Congress cut $3,000,000,000 from the executive budget the American people are not going to be fooled by the Democrat charge that this is a phony cut, especially if Government bureaucrats at the same time complain that the reason their agencies are not giving better service is because Congress has reduced their funds.

5. When they see the Federal budget balanced for the first time in 15 years simultaneously with the appearance in Washington of the first Republican Congress in 15 years, the American people are not going to be fooled by administration claims of exclusive credit for this accomplishment.

6. When they see no control applied to exports of scarce oil and steel and other critical items needed by the people during a time when the President had ample powers to exercise such controls but neglected to do so, the American people are not going to be fooled by the administration's obvious efforts to shift the blame to Congress for the inflationary threats that are aggravated by shortages.

No, Lincoln was right. "You can't fool all the people all the time." The American people are quick to sense when their vital needs are made the football of politics.

There is a great opportunity for a strong, young, vigorous Republican Party in this period of our history. It must be a party that appreciates the public good and recognizes the power and ability of our people. It must be a party that knows where it wants to go and how to get there, just as Lincoln did in his day. It must be a party that has "an abiding faith in the American people."

II

I think the Republican majority of the Eightieth Congress has shown that abiding faith in the American people.

1. The Republicans in Congress have shown their confidence in the power and ability of the people by refusing to succumb to the unimaginative thinking which places such undue faith in bureaucratic government and discounts the spirit of initiative and enterprise on the part of our citizens. They remember what Lincoln said: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

2. The Republicans in Congress believe that an economy of abundant production is both economically sound and necessary. They know that this is the real answer to inflation and high prices which can mean profits only for the few. Scarcity means there is not enough to go around at a fair price and at that point it favors the rich and those with high incomes against the wage-earner and those of moderate incomes. Only the few profit from scarcity and high prices at the expense of the many.

3. The Republicans in Congress know that without a balanced relationship of fair dealing and understanding between our economic groups the free enterprise system cannot be made to work. That is why they passed the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to supplement the old Wagner Labor Relations Act which had denied certain rights to employers and needed revision also to assure freedom and democratic procedures for workingmen. These changes have been made with full appreciation of Labor's great contribution and with the expectation that given a fair chance the new law will safeguard the interest of both labor and management and help build a stronger Nation.

4. The Republicans in Congress have not forgotten that it was under Lincoln that the Homestead Act of 1862 was passed, opening the door of opportunity to courageous youth and sturdy immigrants in the sweep of settlement westward to the Pacific. They have not forgotten that it was under Theodore Roosevelt that the Reclamation Act of 1902 was passed and the Government undertook to champion the cause of irrigation. They have recognized the vital importance of continuing the vast reclamation projects in 17 western States, and appropriated $142,000,000 for this purpose with still more generous provisions contemplated to continue this great constructive program bringing new resources into productive use.

5. The Republicans in Congress have recognized that with the disappearance of our once great land frontier, new opportunities for the future are to be found in such development of our potential resources as your own great Columbia River Basin project here in Washington. The $30,000,000 which was appropriated by Congress last year in the regular and special sessions—the highest appropriation ever made in any one year for the Columbia River improvement—clearly indicates the interest of Congress in this project. I do not believe that the importance of this remarkable resource to your State can be overestimated. I do not think I am wrong in calling it your greatest physical resource.

6. The Republicans in Congress have realized the tremendous importance of capital in expanding production. They know that prices are high because too many people with money are competing with one another for the available supply of goods, and that to get prices down and stop the inflation, goods must be supplied in such abundance and at such prices that the sellers will compete with one another for the consumers' dollars.

There must be encouragement of venture capital to supply the worker with more efficient tools and machines, to develop new companies and new industries, to give our expanding population opportunities and jobs. Taxation has become so burdensome as to destroy initiative.

We must never lose sight of the fact that the fundamental achievement of America is based on individual initiative and the right of man to own property. When Lincoln said that "property is the fruit of labor" and "that some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise," he described a profound principle of our American system that has had far too little encouragement in recent years.

7. The Republicans in Congress have recognized our responsibility and obligation as a Nation—strong, solvent, and free—to provide a stabilizing force in the world as war-torn and devastated nations seek to find their way back to stability and peace.

Our immediate obligation is to take an active part in the rehabilitation of western European countries as they seek to reestablish sound governments based on human rights and freedom. This cannot be brought about easily. It will cost us appropriations to assist in this rehabilitation. It will need to be properly safeguarded and administered. Yet we cannot escape the alternative which may be chaos in government in western Europe and absorption of these nations into communism.

The Marshall plan, as it is now known, could as well be called the Vandenberg plan. It was the able, distinguished Republican Senator, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, who said even before the war ended in 1945: "We still propose to help create the postwar world on a basis which will stop aggressors for keeps, and, so far as humanly possible, substitute justice for force among free men. We propose to do it primarily for our own sakes." Senator VANDENBERG'S brilliant speech in the Senate in January 1945 really started the thinking on the European question which has culminated in the Marshall plan and formed an important link in the bipartisan foreign policy.

Our humanitarian recognition of Europe's need does not mean that we should go about it without careful planning and proper safeguards. I am in full sympathy with the basic purposes of the proposed assistance to the 16 western European nations, but I believe that Congress has a fundamental obligation to scrutinize the program realistically and carefully, and I am confident this can and will be done without dangerous delay. However, I am anxious that it shall be done with the spirit that motivated Abraham Lincoln when he called upon the American people at the close of the Civil War "to do all which may achieve a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

III

As we consider all of these economic problems, we realize how important are our human resources. Take the field of labor-management relations, for example. You and I must remember that with our vast expansion as a Nation our industries have grown away from the small plants of only a few men where the executive knew his men by their first names, knew their families and all the living conditions, and there was a feeling of mutual interest between the owner and the worker. With industrial growth in our complicated machine age and its vast corporations, the personal relationship between worker and management ended. Too often management acted as if it were elevated far above the average worker. In the strained relationship that resulted there was a fertile field for radical labor leadership which sometimes has exploited the honest, sincere workingman. There are many fair-minded men in Congress who want to see a better and a closer relationship between management and labor. We cannot progress without that sound understanding.

We are really such a young Nation that it seems only yesterday that our mothers and fathers blazed trails out across the wilderness. As a Nation our people have been builders, but we have also exploited our resources. We have exploited our soil and forests, failing to provide sufficient care so that future generations might have some of those resources with which to work. We have carelessly exploited our lands when there was always the chance to move into new areas. Now those areas are all occupied. Fortunately, there lies within the people themselves an even greater challenge to seek by educational opportunities and social

benefits a richer and a better American life. Such problems as providing adequate housing, eliminating slums in our crowded cities, and in providing schools and jobs and security present a challenge to our thinking and planning as a people.

We have a greater responsibility to future generations to see that we do not continue to exploit our resources by poor management. As I have come out across this country and seen the splendid forests, I have likewise observed the cuttings that have been made and note you have done some of that with the vast timber resources of Washington, just as we in Minnesota ruthlessly cut our beautiful pine with no thought of the future. It is only because of the splendid work of present-day members of the lumber, pulpwood, and paper industries, cooperating in the sincere effort of State and Federal Governments, that we have started to rebuild our forests. With proper forest-fire protection and management we can see for future generations a profitable business from the timber as well as from the lesser trees that will provide the raw supply for the wood byproducts and paper.

In the care and the management of the fertility of our land, we have been ruthlessly destructive, also. In the relatively brief life of this young Nation we have destroyed the topsoil of more than 282,000,000 acres of land, and another 700,000,000 acres are in danger. All of it comes on in such a gradual way that we do not realize that yields are diminishing and that the black topsoil is gradually eroding down the hillsides and into the streams. I have flown over much of the United States, often flying at a low altitude, and I have particularly noticed the change in the color of the land as it approaches the hilltop, knowing full well that the topsoil has gone. I have been down in the older areas of the southeast and have noted where some of the land had lost all of its fertility and had become so badly eroded that it seemed a useless attempt to continue its tillage. Yet, through soil conservation practices, we have secured some recoveries by proper contour farming and strip cropping to tie the soil back and get it into a grass crop. With such good management it has been possible to completely reestablish a splendid production.

We cannot continue to use our coal deposits and our oil deposits in the generating of power. We must harness our waters as this source does not deplete or wear out. It is constant. Power must be developed in order that our industrial needs may be met in an economical way. Only in this manner will we be able to continue to develop opportunities for our constantly increasing population. Only in this way can our economy be expanded so that we are able to meet the demands upon us because of the huge national debt incurred during the mechanical war in which we were engaged. As we develop the great resources in our Nation, we will be able to maintain the leadership that is ours today.

These years of crisis ahead lay down a challenge to the party of Lincoln for clear thinking and courage and vision as our Nation assumes its destined place in a world that is struggling to rebuild and restore what years of war have laid waste.

Only a strong America, enjoying economic and social health, can undertake this great task. Only an America that is well informed and united in spirit can do it. Only an America that commands the respect and goodwill of the world can do it.

Ours is the great opportunity as a party to provide the vital leadership that will inspire a rebirth of this historic spirit of America.

Electoral Votes Are Subject to State Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "Electoral Votes Are Subject to State Powers," written by Mr. Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of February 27.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTORAL VOTES ARE SUBJECT TO STATE POWERS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—Nothing in the Constitution or in any high court ruling thus far interposes a legal bar to the proposal of Governor Tuck to the Virginia Legislature that Presidential electors chosen by the popular majority in November shall be free to vote for any citizens they may wish for President and Vice President. And the act of February 3, 1887, specifically makes each State the absolute and final judge in any dispute that may arise over how its electoral vote shall be cast.

VIRGINIA'S POSITION

Whichever candidates for elector Virginia or any other State may choose in 1948 are not legally bound to support the nominees of any national political convention. They are not morally bound unless they pledge such action in advance, which is the prevailing custom, and this moral obligation is the stronger when the names of the electoral candidates appear on ballots that also carry the names of the candidates of one of the national party conventions. Governor Tuck's proposal, if accepted by the Virginia Legislature, will clinch the electors' legal right of free choice by omitting from the State's ballots the names of the national convention nominees. In many States these do not appear anyhow, but in Virginia they do; hence the law requiring this must be repealed to assist the Governor's purpose.

Its larger design, of course, is to withhold the electoral votes of Virginia from the Democratic national candidates, if desired, and yet permit a set of electors to be chosen who belong to the Democratic Party and have been nominated by the party organization in the State. The design will be plainly stated to the voters of Virginia, and, if they favor it by giving a majority to such a slate of candidates for electors, the moral obligation will be wiped out and every constitutional and statutory requirement be met.

THE 1912 PRECEDENT

The clearest precedent is to be found in South Dakota in 1912. There the Republican organization seceded from the national party convention before President Taft had been renominated, and its candidates for elector announced that if chosen in November they would register the State for Theodore Roosevelt, the Bull Moose Party candidate (no Bull Moose electoral slate having been nominated). In that knowledge, the voters chose the Republican candidates for elector over the Democratic, and South Dakota's vote was cast for Roosevelt without the slightest challenge of legality. Not a letter in the Constitution offered support for a challenge, and the act of February 3, 1887, allowed no room for it at all.

The present majority of the Supreme Court might entertain a plea against the Virginia plan, if it proceeds to a full climax, but on some basis which no legal student of these matters consulted by this correspondent today could conceive. It might find some way to order State electors to cast their votes for the national candidates of the party with which they are locally affiliated, even though the final State power under the act of 1887 had previously been invoked to bind the electors otherwise. If the names of such national candidates had appeared on the same ballot with the successful candidates for elector (which Governor Tuck proposes to forestall in Virginia, and other southern Governors will follow suit), the Supreme Court might have some footing, though the authorities canvassed today do not think so. But they are unanimous in the opinion that if the names of the convention candidates do not so appear the Supreme Court would have no jurisdiction and could not enforce an order even if one were issued.

SOUTHERN THREAT MATERIALIZED

This legal situation, the consequence of retaining the archaic system of directly electing Presidential and Vice Presidential electors instead of party nominees, renders Governor Tuck's message of the highest importance and materializes the threat of southern Democrats to prevent the election of President Truman if he is nominated. If several other States join in the Virginia plan, as they are expected to do, the democratic organizations which are sure to carry them can, as in 1824, throw the Presidential election into the House if the contest elsewhere is close. In the House they would then have a veto on the candidates for President, and this would undoubtedly be used against President Truman if he is nominated on the civil rights platform which is the immediate occasion of the southern democratic revolt. But if elsewhere there is a landslide either way the ultimate effect of the movement is not calculable in advance except that it would not transfer the Presidential choice to the House.

THE PROBLEM

The possibility of a democratic landslide elsewhere, however, is so remote that Governor Tuck's proposal is accepted by all politicians as the grave development it is.

Bolting, especially in the South, has meant oblivion for Democratic leaders, but on those occasions the organizations were regular. Half-bolting, which this move would be, supported by the organizations, would be a very different matter.

If Virginia and other States adopt the electoral plan, the chief problem of the Democratic organizations will be how to send delegations to the national party convention and yet remain morally unbound by the decisions of its majority, like the South Dakota Republicans in 1912.

Political Conditions in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials regarding the Communist conquest of Czechoslovakia; one from the Manchester Union, of Manchester, N. H., and two from the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union]

NOW CZECHOSLOVAKIA

One sees in the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia the operation of the same program followed by the Soviets in the absorption of other countries behind the iron curtain.

This program consists of four distinct steps, cleverly designed to disguise the process of Soviet domination. The first step is to form a coalition government in which the Communists must be included, no matter how small their initial strength may be. This is followed by the inflexible demand that the Communists must control the ministry of the interior, under which the domestic police in European countries operate.

Then in due time when the Communist grip on the police is considered adequate, the charge of plotting against the state is trumped up against other parties in the government that resist Communist dictates, as a pretext for an assault upon them and their ejection from the government. This gives the Communist minority in the government an excuse for seizing control, backed by the overshadowing presence of a Russian army somewhere in the offing.

What has happened in Czechoslovakia is not new. It runs perfectly true to form. It is the same thing that has happened in Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, and that we may expect to happen again and again as the program of Soviet expansion works itself out.

True, the Western World has been more deeply shocked by the death of democracy in Czechoslovakia than it was by the submission of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania to Soviet dictation. The Czechs are traditionally a democratic people. They set up a republic after World War I with Western help and they made democracy work even beyond the most sanguine expectations. Democratic peoples elsewhere cannot but be saddened at seeing this brave, freedom-loving people hamstrung and hoodwinked into bondage.

Moreover, Czechoslovakia has a strategic importance in the fight for freedom in Europe far beyond Hungary and the two Balkan states. It lies at the center of the political framework of Europe, a fact that the Soviets have certainly not overlooked.

The question is: What is the Western World going to do about it? Will it stand by and see one free nation after another fall like pins in a bowling alley before Soviet machinations? The world is faced today with a new method of conquest, bloodless usually, but nonetheless effective in its operation. What nation will be next in the march of communism? One may believe that others are listed for Communist absorption in due time following Czechoslovakia.

Will the next in the list be Greece, Italy, Austria, or France? Time will tell unless the Western World awakes and decides to meet the challenge to freedom with something more than words. Let there be an end of chatter about an understanding with Russia. A sharp line of division has been drawn across the world by Moscow, and only firmness and force can stop the slow Communist attrition that blots out a free nation in a day as in Czechoslovakia.

[From the New York Times of February 26, 1948]

RED TRIUMPH IN PRAGUE

As the result of a Communist revolution which has forced President Benes to acquiesce in something that was "not in complete accordance with his wishes," Czechoslovakia has today become a totalitarian police state under a Communist dictatorship and the last flickering lights of freedom that shimmered through the iron curtain are going out.

The new dictatorship is still thinly disguised by a government which, like the governments of other east European countries, contains a few non-Communists, among them Jan Masaryk, the son of the democratic founder of the Czechoslovak state, and himself a professed adherent of a rapprochement with the west. But these figures only serve as window dressing, insofar as they are not merely time-serving opportunists who have climbed on the Communist bandwagon. Their survival will depend entirely on their complete compliance with Communist orders. For Moscow has long since announced that in its war against the western imperialists there can be no middle position. In Communist eyes any opposition to the dictates of the party leadership becomes treason, punishable by death.

There are still two factors in the situation that must be clarified. One is the exact position of President Benes, who has postponed or cancelled his announced broadcast to the nation and remains personally incommunicado in his palace, surrounded by armed police and troop contingents. The other is Parliament, which must give the new government a majority to make it technically constitutional. But these factors can no longer change the course of events. For the Communists have already seized power through the Communist-controlled police and army, and through their action committees. They have taken over both central ministries and local governments, have purged the opposition parties, arrested more than a hundred on charges of plotting against their rule, suppressed freedom of press and speech, occupied factories, and broken up counter-demonstrations with rifle fire. Communists, once in power, do not resign because of a mere adverse vote.

As a result, Czechoslovakia, already tied to Russia and her satellites by military alliances, has now become an integral part of the vast totalitarian bloc that stretches from the Baltic to the Adriatic, and from the Oder, or perhaps the Elbe, to the Bering Strait. One more nation has been engulfed by the tide of Russo-Communist expansion. Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Zorin, who "happened" to be in Prague during the coup d'état, can now take his place besides Vishinsky and Zhdanov and Dekanozov and Tito and Dimitro as a conquering commissar who can report to Stalin that another country has been brought into the fold. This means not only the collapse of the world of Tehran and Yalta, in the same manner that Hitler's seizure of Czechoslovakia meant the collapse of the world of Versailles, but also a further shift in the balance of power in Europe.

Communist seizure of Czechoslovakia rounds out a new Russian empire which has not only extended dominion over an additional 100,000,000 people and their armies but has also gained a tremendous additional war potential. It has gained the "little Ruhr" of Silesia, turned over to Russia's polish puppet. Now it has also gained the Skoda armament works—the Krupps of the east. It has long been an axiom of European politics that whoever controls Bohemia has at least a good chance to control Europe. It is an ironic sidelight on postwar history that Russia's latest prize was put on its feet by nearly a quarter of a billion dollars advanced by the United States.

When Hitler seized the Sudetenland he announced that this was his last territorial claim in Europe. It was a lie to lull the west to sleep. Moscow has disdained to disguise its own intentions. There is no reason to expect that Czechoslovakia will be the last target of Russo-Communist expansion.

[From the New York Times of February 27, 1948]

THE PATTERN OF CONQUEST

Shocked by the Communist coup d'état in Czechoslovakia into their first joint action on Russo-Communist expansion, the Governments of the United States, Britain, and France have condemned what they characterize bluntly as the establishment of a one-party dictatorship disguised under the cloak of a Government of National Union. They are conferring on the advisability of refusing to recognize this new regime. But neither of these steps, reminiscent of similar protests against Hitler's methods, will stop the course of events. Nor will they dispel the fear that is stalking through Europe, where other nations feel themselves to be the next potential victims. But they do reveal that the last stubborn illusions are failing, that world opinion is at last beginning to crystallize, and that out of this process is emerging the realization that appeasement still carries its own penalty, and that doing business with Stalin is just as dangerous and as profitless as it was with Hitler.

Like Hitler, Stalin has been taking over one country after another, sometimes by direct conquest, as in the cases of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; sometimes by traitorous fifth columns backed by Russian troops or commissars, as in the cases of Poland, Yugoslavia, and Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary, and now Czechoslovakia. Today, Stalin's acquisitions already amount to more than four times those of Hitler prior to the war, and, like Hitler, he is reaching out for more.

Equally striking is the virtual identity of the methods by which both the Nazis and the Communists attained power, as exemplified especially in Czechoslovakia, whose "directed" democracy was comparable with that of the German Republic. Both began as small parties able to flourish under ultra-democratic proportional representation, but determined to use democratic methods only for the destruction of democracy and making no secret of the fact. Hitler served early notice that once he was in power heads will roll, and Gottwald, his Czech counterpart, told Benes and his followers long ago that he would "break their necks." Despite this, both Hitler and Gottwald were made heads of government with the cooperation of the parties they had vowed to destroy. And once in office, they undertook to capture the state from within.

First they took over the police and made it a party instrument for the extension of their power and the terrorization of the opposition. Then they neutralized the army by putting in command officers loyal to themselves, and, in the case of Czechoslovakia, pledging the army to loyalty to the Soviet Union. With these two instruments of power in hand, they began to regiment the population. They took over the ministry of propaganda, or information, and with it control of the radio and the film industry. They restricted freedom of the press by taking control of the supply of paper and by compelling all journalists to join a union under Communist control. They took over control of industry—Hitler by organizing it into associations under Nazi domination, Gottwald by nationalizing it and organizing an armed workers militia to guard it. They conscripted labor, put all labor unions into one labor front under their control, and thereby obtained control of every worker's job and livelihood, with power to penalize any worker who dared to oppose them. Finally, national socialism in Germany and communism in Czechoslovakia resembled each other even in the matter of a racial policy;

Hitler turned against the Jews in the name of pan-Germanism and the Slav Communists against the Germans and Hungarians in the name of pan-Slavism.

It seems amazing that, having seen these things happen in Germany under Hitler, the Czech leaders and parties, still dedicated to democracy, should have permitted them to happen in Czechoslovakia—going along step by step, making one concession after another, until they were powerless to resist.

That in itself is a warning to all countries still under the delusion that they can cooperate with Communists without signing their own death warrant.

Stalin's Step Toward War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very timely editorial which appeared in the Knoxville News Sentinel, Knoxville, Tenn., on February 25, 1948.

This editorial accurately and truthfully points out that the Red seizure of Czechoslovakia strikes a familiar communistic chord and it is the same old story of communistic treachery and betrayal.

Certainly, it is running true to Soviet form and anyone who has observed the Stalin finesse sees definitely the same old pattern being cut.

This editorial points out that we should act quickly on the Marshall plan and that we should strengthen the United Nations. It also shows the importance of strengthening ourselves here in America from within. America should have no patience with communism. It is the most dangerous enemy of the civilized world today. It challenges the right of free people to remain free. This is a timely editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STALIN'S STEP TOWARD WAR

Red seizure of Czechoslovakia has been only a matter of time ever since Yalta. One by one, Stalin has picked off the nations of eastern Europe. Now only little Finland is left in the twilight zone of phony freedom.

It is the same old story of Communist treachery and betrayal, of the Soviet stab in the back. It has been repeated in so many places, Stalin's method and purpose should be known to all the world. And yet there are still a few even in America who call themselves non-Communists like Mr. Wallace, who profess to believe that democracy can be saved by appeasement.

Stalin has played it precisely like Hitler and the Japs—only with more skill. No Nazi or Jap fifth column ever operated with the insidious perfection of the Soviet agents who have taken over eastern Europe and who have bored so deeply into Italy, France, and China.

If the analogy holds, Stalin will go on until he provokes a world war; until his cheap victories over smaller nations end in his final defeat by the strong democracies he is trying to destroy.

There is one chance that he may be stopped without such a war. If the remaining free countries can transform their economic weakness into strength through the Marshall plan, and if they can combine in an effective defense pact under the United Nations, Stalin may retreat when faced by greater power.

But, whether he retreats or advances to war, the protective unity of the free nations now rests chiefly on American economic strength and military preparedness. That much at least is clear.

Hardwood Court Fiesta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include the following article, written by Henry Lesesne and published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 21, 1948, describing the annual Southern Textile Basketball Tournament at Greenville, S. C., an event unique in the sports world in that it is the largest basketball tournament on earth and all participating teams represent textile communities in the South:

HARDWOOD COURT FIESTA—GREENVILLE, S. C., HAS SOME BIG BASKETBALL NAMES AND KEEN TOURNAMENT COMPETITION

(By Henry Lesesne)

Basketball in the South Atlantic States is hardly the popular sport it is in some parts of the country from both a player and spectator point of view. This makes it all the more surprising that the region boasts the largest basketball tournament in the country under a single roof, and each year it is getting bigger and bigger—1,000 players, 100 teams now.

Even so, there was a time in the Southeast when basketball was not nearly as popular as it is today. In the years after World War I, the semipro teams of the textile communities were not able to schedule nearly all the games they desired with the schools and colleges. So the athletic or recreation directors of a few mills in the Carolina foothills hit upon the happy thought of a regional industrial tournament, both as a means of providing competition and promoting interest in the sport.

Their first tournament in 1921 attracted only six teams. It went by the ambitious name of the Southern Textile Basketball Tournament. But each year it grew fairly steadily and today overflow crowds of customers come a long way to see and enjoy the spectacular play, the matchless spirit of competition, and the clean sportsmanship among the teams, men's and women's from the textile communities.

For 4 days every year, at about the time spring is coming to the coast and moving up slowly to the Appalachian foothills, Greenville, S. C., is probably the most basketball-conscious city in America. You can't get a hotel room and the players from a six-State area seem to be everywhere in their smart uniforms. They are interested in basketball, yes; but they are also renewing old friendships and making new ones. Many of them come back year after year. And proudly they wear their banners—names, many of them, that are household words in textiles, names familiar to everyone who reads advertisements.

From early morning until far into the night the games, usually two at a time, sometimes three, are in progress at big Textile Hall in downtown Greenville. It is a field day for the visiting sports scribes from the principal textile cities. The games are usually fast and it's not uncommon to see a husky youngster or blond bombshell toss a spectacular one-hander. Often almost as many women's teams as men's participate.

The Southeast is essentially a baseball country rather than a basketball country, and it is not surprising that some of the big drawing cards at the basketball tournaments are big names in baseball for whom the customers from textile communities root all summer.

For instance, there's Earl Wooten, who plays basketball for nearby Pelzer, but is an outfielder for Washington and Chattanooga. He came up in the community, played high-school and sandlot baseball. And for the Pelzer basketball team he'll play a long stretch of games averaging 25 points or better. Though of average height, he's fast as a shuttle on a loom and usually a tournament sensation.

Or there's Virgil Stallcup of the Cincinnati Reds, who played with Jersey City last year. He wears the Ware Shoals, S. C., insignia at Greenville. Or there's Marion Rackley, St. Paul outfielder, who spends his winters in a nearby textile community. These are just a few of the baseball stars who hail from the immediate vicinity of Greenville who also play in the basketball tournament. The players come from a six-State area and among the men's teams there are any number of baseball stars.

And the crowds? What, for instance does a spectator do when there are two games being played side by side simultaneously? He simply goes to the side of the big Textile Hall that the game in which he's most interested is being played, or if he wants to limber up his neck muscles he can try keeping an eye on both. Basketball even of the collegiate variety seldom draws an impressive crowd in the South, but 5,000 or more spectators watch the games at Greenville, and on the night of the finals there is really no place in town large enough to hold them all.

There's seldom, if ever, any rowdiness and not much of the old alma mater spirit. The people are just home folks, most of them from small towns and communities in the valleys who come to watch their hard-fighting young people, men and women both, doing their best to excel in a sport they love. A typical crowd is usually spotted with names well known in the textile industry. For the industry naturally takes a pride in the tournament, and mill owners and executives follow the careers of the mill teams closely.

Still, the amazing growth and success of this largest of industrial basketball tournaments is the envy of some college associations. It has always been self-supporting and has never once gone in the red. It is managed by the Southern Textile Athletic Association, headed by C. T. Thomas, of Greenville. The association's work down the years has been not only to sponsor the basketball tournament but also other activities that take in all fields of textile athletics in the southern area.

There are small basketball tournaments confined to certain areas within the States. Reference was made a moment ago to baseball consciousness in the textile communities. There are also many textile baseball leagues covering small areas: amateur leagues and semipro leagues. Now in the making is a baseball tournament for the textile communities on the same grand scale as the Greenville basketball tournament. It should be an even greater success than the hardwood carnival.

For over the years there has been no greener pastures for the big-league baseball scouts than the small communities of the Southeast. A glance at the big-league baseball rosters shows a surprising number of players from the region.

In a small area of which Greenville is the center there's Ernie White, of the Boston Braves, who comes from Pacolet; Bill Voiselle, also of the Braves, who calls Ninety-Six home; Buddy Lewis, of the Washington Senators, from Gastonia; Lew Brissie, Athletics pitcher, from Ware Shoals, just to name a few from textile communities. Brissie, an ex-GI, was injured in Italy, but made a strike-out record for the Sally League last year, playing with Savannah, and Connie Mack says he has more on the ball than Lefty Grove did when he moved up to the majors. In winter, Brissie attends Erskine College, near Ware Shoals, as a day student.

Larger textile mills and many of the smaller ones all have planned recreation programs and facilities for every sports or outdoor activity in the alphabet. Many of the facilities are modest—about what you'd expect in a community elsewhere of the same size—but some of them are picture-book sort of things you would expect at a resort. Look in almost any one of these towns in the Carolinas or Georgia or Alabama and the chances are you'll find a fairly well-known baseball player who considers it more to his liking and pocketbook to head up the athletic program in a mill town, sometimes the same town in which he grew up and played sand-lot baseball.

A mill may send any number of teams it desires to the tournament if they meet requirements. But the idea is, of course, to send teams that will win.

It's not all a matter of trophies, or even dollars and cents. Pride in achievement, nor the zest for living and work and play, can't be computed that way.

Lincoln Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Lincoln Day address delivered by me to the Kiwanis Club, at Ripley, Ohio, Thursday, February 12, 1948:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

"Abraham Lincoln, his hand and his pen,
He may learn to write but God knows when."

So wrote 9-year-old Abraham Lincoln on the back of a black old shovel with a charred end of a burned stick as he lay on the floor of a log cabin in front of a low fire. This instance is a slight illustration of the natural originality of the boy, to become sometime immortal.

He was born about 3 miles south of the present site of Hodgenville, Ky., in what is now Larue County, February 12, 1809, 139 years ago this morning. But Abraham Lincoln never saw Hodgenville. Yes, Lincoln was born in a log cabin. But, it is not necessary to be born in a log cabin to become President. Millions of Americans have been born in log cabins who never became President. But, one writer said, "A log cabin is as good a place to be born in as anywhere else if a man intends to be President." Andrew Jackson, William Henry Harrison, Millard Fillmore, and James A. Garfield were born in log cabins, and so were other great men. There were lots of log cabins in those days.

William Henry Harrison was probably the first Presidential candidate to capitalize on being born in a log cabin, for you doubtless remember from reading your histories that William Henry Harrison was called the "hard cider and log cabin candidate." You know they wheeled little log cabins around from place to place where speeches were made in Harrison's campaign. If I may digress a moment, I might remind you that William Henry Harrison was clerk of the Hamilton County, Ohio, courts at Cincinnati. And this region also is the immediate bailiwick of Gen. U. S. Grant; so you see southern Ohio has had some great men. A number of others could be named.

When the lack of modern conveniences and sanitary arrangements are known as they were in those days of Lincoln, isn't it a wonder that there are very many Americans today? Or did such an environment help to produce a hardy race? Although he could trace his line no further back than to certain ancestors in Berks County, Pa., research disclosed a lineage reaching back to Samuel Lincoln, who came from Hingham, England, and settled in Hingham, Mass., in 1637. The Lincolns were pioneers. Lincoln thought his ancestors were Quakers, but they were not. They were Baptists.

Both of Lincoln's parents were born in Virginia and both came to Kentucky in early childhood. The story that they were first cousins is without foundation. The families of both were poor. They were of decent, average American stock. There was nothing in either of the parents that would lead us to expect so great a son; neither was there apparent any marked disqualification for such a high honor.

As some of you may have noticed when you travel on Route 50 to Washington, D. C., on Allegheny Front Mountain, well toward the top, is a sign on which is inscribed, "About 6 miles beyond the saddle Nancy Hanks the mother of Abraham Lincoln was born." As you stand near the sign on the side of the road, you will see the saddle, which is a long, graceful, curving dip along the ridge of the opposite mountain. You stand with reverential awe as you let your imagination fly swiftly back to that event and note its eternal importance. It presaged the end of slavery in the United States and the preservation of the Union.

No; Nancy Hanks was not a blond. She was tall, dark, and sallow. Her hair was dark brown, almost black. Her eyes were small and gray. Calling to mind the pictures of Lincoln, can you not see that his eyes were like hers? She had a prominent forehead, which her relatives said indicated unusual mental ability; she was above medium height and weighed about 130 pounds. Isn't it important to portray her picture, when we are reminded that Lincoln believed he inherited his qualities from his mother? He had this in mind when he said, "God bless my mother; all that I am or hope to be I owe to her."

Lincoln said that he had not controlled events, but had been controlled by them. William E. Barton, one of Lincoln's biographers, said, "We cannot understand Lincoln apart from his environments; neither can we understand his environments without a knowledge of the growing personality of Lincoln." I think that all of us can agree with those statements. If so, it would seem fitting and proper to sketch his environments briefly. Thomas Lincoln, Abraham's father, had grown up literally without education. He changed his occupation several times, moved his residence frequently, made nothing of his poorly chosen farms, and bequeathed little to his son besides life itself. His first wife, Nancy Hanks, was the mother of Abraham. She, like her husband, was illiterate.

Abraham Lincoln's early boyhood was spent about 8 miles from his birthplace on Knob Creek—a place of natural beauty. The uncertainty of land titles caused the family to move soon, at a time when Abraham was only 7. The Indiana woods was their destination, and here the family of four—mother, father, Abraham, and Sarah, his sister—lived very poorly with little more than a hut to shelter them the first winter. It was not long before Nancy Lincoln became ill, was without medical care for a week, and died in October 1818. We know how Lincoln as a boy grieved over the loss of his mother. You have read that pathetic story with tears in your eyes.

Thomas Lincoln's second wife, Sarah (Bush) Johnston, of Elizabethtown, Ky., widow of Daniel Johnston, came with her three children to the cabin.

Abraham's stepmother became an important factor in his rearing. She cleaned things up in the cabin and around it in a hurry and made Thomas do his share of the work. She was a masterful woman.

Lincoln's youth was that of an easy-going backwoods youth; he did hard labor on the homestead and performed odd jobs for neighbors. He shunned vociferous camp meetings of the time and used his leisure for self-improvement by the reading of a few good books, among which were the Bible, Robinson Crusoe, Pilgrim's Progress, Aesop's Fables, William Grinshaw's History of the United States, Weem's Life of Washington, and various other biographies and books of verse. Lincoln had very little formal schooling; in all, his attendance at school would not exceed 1 year.

The one-teacher kind of a school that he attended was known as a blabb school. Have you heard of the blabb schools? The children had to spell or read out loud when they studied so the teacher would know when they studied. He marched around among the pupils and hit those that were not blabbing.

Lincoln grew up without the frontier vices, shunned liquor, and was free from dissoluteness and profanity. The river entered largely into his early life. Of course, you had read of how he got his big barge over the dam and about his trip on a flat boat to New Orleans. Since his relations with his father were not altogether happy, he welcomed the day when he could shift for himself.

In 1830 the Lincolns again moved. This time to Macon County, Ill. Abraham was now 21 years of age and remained with his family only long enough to help with the building of a new cabin and to assist with the rough tasks of the following winter. The 6-year period 1831–37 was spent in earning a living by working in a store until "it petered out," managing a mill, doing odd jobs, acting as village postmaster, traversing the country as deputy surveyor, all of the time reading law, studying grammar, widening his acquaintances, following the trend of national politics, and laying the foundations for a wide personal influence. It is of interest to know that during this period he served in the Black Hawk War.

In 1834 Lincoln was chosen to the State legislature, where he served during four successive terms, 1834–41, first at Vandalia and later at Springfield. He gained his first political training in this frontier legislature where party maneuvers were spirited. National issues were of great concern to him. In these early days as later, he avoided associations with abolitionists; he nevertheless did not want himself to be thought of as in positive support of slavery.

Lincoln moved from New Salem to Springfield in 1837 and was so poor that his surveying instruments had been attached to pay a debt. Having been licensed as an attorney September 9, 1836, he began the practice of law in Springfield and formed a partnership with J. T. Stuart, a man of influential family, who was an able lawyer and prominent in Whig circles. While in New Salem he had courted Ann Rutledge, who died August 25, 1835. He married Mary Todd in Springfield on November 4, 1842, after a troubled courtship. It is difficult to say what degree of happiness attended their marriage. Their first son, Robert Todd, was born August 1, 1843, and was their only child to grow to manhood.

In the year 1847–49 Lincoln served one term in Congress where he had the distinction of being the only Whig from Illinois. Most worthy of comment in his career as Congressman is his attack upon President Polk for having begun the Mexican War. This deeply offended the people of his own State, as also did his stand in regard to slavery. On January 10, 1849, he read a proposal to abolish slavery in the National Capital. Although the Whigs nationally were successful in the election of 1848, the party lost out in Lincoln's own district. With a sense of futility he said goodbye to Washington; and while the slavery crisis was shaking the country, he returned to Springfield and sadly resumed his law practice.

As a lawyer Lincoln rose to front rank in his own State. He was associated with capable partners—John Todd Stuart, Stephan T. Logan, and William Herndon. An important and extensive practice in the State supreme court and in the Federal courts made him a familiar figure throughout the State. He became popular for his aptness at political speeches and for his humor and story telling. Such qualities as common sense, shrewdness, effectiveness before a jury, his reputation for honesty, searching thoroughness for investigation, familiarity with pertinent judicial doctrines, ability to get at the core of a controversy made him more than a country lawyer.

Lincoln was a man of individuality. Of more than average height, 6 feet 4 inches, uncommon length of arms and legs, rugged face which revealed character whose depth was not easily sounded, his manner of dress and appearance was apparently of no concern to him.

In the agitation which swept the country with the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, Lincoln emerged from political inactivity. A new tone appeared in his speeches and he narrowed the contest to one phase of the slavery question, making it a suitable party issue. In 1856 he became identified with the new Republican Party. The Illinois State Republican Convention met at Bloomington May 29, 1856, and excited anti-Nebraska Democrats, Whigs, and Abolitionists were pouring into the city. When the convention got under way, Abe was on the platform, there were calls for a speech. Lincoln unwound his long legs, came forward and began to speak. Reporters who started to take down his words forgot to use their pencils. I quote:

"He stood before the throne of eternal right and unburdened a penitential and inspired soul." "We must make this a land of liberty in fact, as it is in name. We shall say to the Southern disunionists, 'We won't go out of the Union and you shan't.'"

The grandeur of the speech was talked of by those who heard it until it became a legend. Because no word of it was recorded by newspapermen, it became known by the romantic name of the "Lost Speech." It put Lincoln in line for the Presidency.

Successful in getting the Republican senatorial nomination in 1858, he delivered at a Republican State Convention in Springfield on June 16, 1858, his famous "House Divided" speech. This revealed his position on the slavery question. He denounced the Dred Scott decision as part of a proslavery conspiracy to recognize slavery even within the free States. Then followed a series of debates with the leading Democrat, Douglas, in the senatorial campaign in which he showed his strength as a leader and politician. Lincoln's campaign was effective in that his party carried districts containing a larger population than those carried by the Democrats, but unequitable apportionment gave Douglas a majority in the legislature, insuring his election.

As a figure of national prominence now, Lincoln's name was mentioned for the Presidency. Named as Illinois' choice for the Presidency at the State convention, he was nominated at the National Convention at Chicago because he was a candidate who was not too radical or too conservative and who could avoid offense.

The National Convention was held in a large hall called the Wigwam with a seating capacity of 10,000 people. Lincoln's manager had nailed Indiana and Pennsylvania for Lincoln. A terrific roar followed the nomination of Seward. Lincoln was nominated in a speech that wound up with the statement that Lincoln was a man who could split rails and maul Democrats, and the convention went wild. On the first ballot, Seward led with 173½ votes with Lincoln in second place with 102 and Cameron with 50. On the second ballot, Cameron withdrew, giving his votes to Lincoln. The score now stood, Seward 184½ and Lincoln 181. The convention was filled with excitement over the dark horse from Illinois. As ballots were called on the third vote, the suspense grew tense—231½ for Lincoln, making him need only 2½ more votes to give him the nomination. A man in the Ohio delegation leaped on a chair and shouted, "Mr. Chairman, I rise to change four votes from Chase to Lincoln." A moment of utter stillness, and then an explosion of 10,000 terrific whoops. Ohio had made old Abe the Republican President of the United States. That night all Illinois celebrated. At far-off Washington, Senator Douglas said, "There won't be a tar barrel left in Illinois tonight."

During the ensuing campaign, he stayed quietly in Springfield and avoided political speeches. He was chosen President by pluralities in enough States to give him a considerable electoral majority, but in regard to the whole popular vote, he was a minority President.

In the period between his election and his inauguration, Lincoln continued his political silence and made no speeches or public statements as to his policies. During this time the Southern Confederacy was formed. Lincoln never doubted the Federal Government's authority to maintain itself. In his inaugural address, he disclaimed any intention to interfere with slavery in the States, advised observance of all Federal laws and pleaded for the preservation of the Union.

To a man inexperienced in executive matters, the duties that fell upon him as President brought many pressing problems which had to be dealt with immediately, such as the Fort Sumter crisis involving the issue of civil war. Often during his administration, he faced a hostile Congress and at times seemed almost deserted. Abolition demands required his utmost tact. The pressure of military duties was great. Throughout this trying period he demonstrated that he was able to deal fairly with his enemies, maintain cooperation in his ill-assorted Cabinet, and respond to criticism with humor and understanding.

As the Great Emancipator, it must not be thought that he suddenly struck the shackles from millions of slaves by the stroke of the pen. A preliminary proclamation given out in September 1862, and the proclamation of January 1, 1863, served chiefly to pave the way for effective liberation of the slaves through State action and through the anti-slavery amendment to the Constitution.

Lincoln's manners as President were out of the ordinary and unconventional; his habits were irregular. He labored continually under a great strain and often felt extreme mental weariness. He made very few public speeches during his years in the White House and confined himself to his inaugurals, the Gettysburg Address, November 19, 1863, and his last speech, April 11, 1865.

Lincoln received a sweep of the electoral votes in the election of 1864 in spite of opposition within his own party. Paying great attention to the last military phase of the war, President Lincoln visited the Army and remained with General Grant at City Point from March 24, 1865, until April 9, 1865, except for a 2-day visit to Richmond. He returned to Washington on the day that Lee surrendered. He did not experience the ensuing struggle for reconstruction, for he was assassinated on the night of April 16, 1865, in the Ford Theater by John Wilkes Booth. After lying unconscious all night, he died the following morning. Funeral services were held in Washington and the burial was in Springfield.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution on Lithuanian independence adopted by the Federated American Lithuanian Societies and Clubs, citizens of the United States, at a meeting held on February 15, 1948, in St. George Auditorium, Shenandoah, Pa.:

Whereas following World War I the nations of the world found the cause of Lithuanian freedom and independence to be just and her people to be worthy of self-government and political independence; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania was thereby established and accorded political recognition by all of the independent governments of the world; and

Whereas, during its existence as a free and independent nation, the Republic of Lithuania made progress and flourished and proved its ability of self-government and to be a worthy member of the community of nations; and

Whereas, in the recent global struggle which began in 1939, the United States of America and Great Britain proclaimed certain principles of freedom and justice to all nations and expressed this in the Atlantic Charter and Four Freedoms, to which the U. S. S. R. officially subscribed; and

Whereas, in violation of these principles, Soviet Russia on devious pretexts and in conformity with a secret agreement entered into with Nazi Germany in 1939, by overwhelming military forces, occupied Lithuania in 1940 and now arbitrarily deprives this Republic of its independent political life and membership in the community of nations of the world; and

Whereas, since this predatory occupation of Lithuania, the U. S. S. R. pursued and continues to pursue a ruthless policy of planned liquidation, deportation, and dispersion of the Lithuanian people in order to destroy the Lithuanian national entity which constitutes a crime of international magnitude; and

Whereas the crime of genocide which the U. S. S. R. is perpetrating upon the defenseless Lithuanian nation violates all principles of human rights, international law, all the covenants and agreements entered into between the U. S. S. R. and the Lithuanian Republic and the avowed war aims of the Allied Powers and expressed in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms"; and

Whereas we recognize and acknowledge that the representatives of the people, the Congress of the United States was not consulted and had no part in the infamous secret agreements whereby innocent nations were committed to communism, and its peoples exposed to the throes of slavery and Siberian deportation and possible extinction: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we petition the Government of the United States to renounce, denounce, and repudiate all such secret agreements that violate human rights; and be it further

Resolved, That we request our representatives at the United Nations to demand that the General Assembly of the United Nations take steps and proper measures to make Soviet Russia conform to the United Nations Charter and other international agreements and covenants; that the U. S. S. R. armed forces, puppet regimes, and terrorist police forces be withdrawn from Lithuania and other invaded countries and that their deported nationals be returned to their homes and families; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition the Government of the United States to initiate proper and firm measures for the purpose of rendering effective aid for the restoration of the violated sovereignties of Lithuania and other European countries; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be presented to our Senators, Hon EDWARD S. MARTIN and Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS, and to our Representative in Congress, Hon. Dr. IVOR D. FENTON, with a request to have them read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to have them forwarded to other officials for presentation to the proper authorities of the United Nations.

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES AND CLUBS,
A. J. STANISKAS, *Chairman.*

Attest:
W. J. KRENCEWICZ,
Secretary.

Foreign Gifts and Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following radio address given by me February 27, 1948, over the network facilities of the National Broadcasting Co.:

The Marshall plan is nothing new. It is merely a proposal to extend the New Deal foreign hand-out policy.

Since the end of the war we have sent abroad nearly $22,000,000,000. Contrary to expectations, it has gone for the most part to help entrench Socialist elements that have squandered this huge assistance, which we were told would be used for the reestablishment of freedom, politically, socially, and economically.

Our people are now led to believe that the Marshall plan is something new, but it is only a proposal to carry on the existing program of gifts and loans to foreign countries. I would be for the program if I thought it would do what is claimed, bring peace, reconstruction, and freedom to the nations. But it is not a plan to aid starving European people. When the sponsors of the program keep talking about starving people they are dishonestly playing on our heartstrings.

You see, our Government extracts dollars from our taxpayers and gives the dollars to foreign governments who in turn use these dollars to purchase goods and sell them to their own people. We do not send the goods to the people of the foreign countries directly. These gifts are government to government subsidies. European government leaders will be able to refuse food and aid to citizens who do not support their socialistic programs. For example, England insists that she will need at least a billion United States dollars in 1949, yet Parliament was told that the Beveridge cradle-to-the-grave plan will be put into operation in July, with all its social and financial costs. We are subsidizing the Socialists' program of England and preventing their returning to sound finance.

When President Truman presented the Marshall plan to Congress he asked for what he himself has called "police state controls." He and many others contend that the European recovery program will make such controls necessary. Official propaganda may make them politically necessary. The sacrifices required by the Marshall plan are likely to be so great that most Americans will be unable to carry the load. It would thus be necessary to put this burden of billions on the backs of our greatest wealth producers. Under price control they would be asked to produce without hope of profits. This would kill their incentive to produce and dry up supplies of investment capital. Our houses and factories would wear out. What would our workers do then? The Marshall plan can thus cause the break-down of the American economy, which is now the backbone of the world's hopes. It might be the last billion that would break our back and pull the whole world down into chaos and dictatorship. Neither Europe nor America wants this—only the Communists.

Private loans for genuine recovery are advisable if we would say to these countries that before they get a cent they must throw off their socialist controls and adopt private enterprise and free labor. The trouble is, our present leaders are not going to make such a request because our own leaders are not private enterprise minded. In short, Socialist thinkers, a similar group of planners, are in control over here as well as in the European countries. Why gamble further our precious freedom by this gigantic hand-out to finance hostile economic systems? Is it not ridiculous to tax private enterprise at home to finance socialism abroad? Are you willing to mortgage your children in an attempt to lift the standard of living in foreign countries to the point where we are dragged down to their level? This is the pay-off of world socialism or communism.

Make no mistake about it, those of you who believe in the American way of life, freedom and opportunity, the Marshall plan has little to do with feeding starving people or with European recovery. The starving people and economic recovery are being used as a shield or a blind so that you will unwittingly approve as a taxpayer the financing of not a four year but a permanent world-wide planned economy. A planned economy is dictatorship—look at Russia today. It is a planned economy.

For eight long months you have been hearing glowing words and promises for the Marshall plan. All this oratory reminds me of a wise old Englishmen who said: "It is not important what men say, nor the way in which they say it; it is what they propose to do."

This Englishman was, of course, just restating a solemn truth phrased long ago by the Man of Galilee when he said to his disciples, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

The people who have been spouting the oratory and making the promises for the Marshall plan are the same people who have been strutting across America making promises to you for 10 years. What have been the fruits of their promises? To determine whether their promises for the Marshall plan are worth considering, let us look at the record of these global planners.

In 1940 the clique now promoting the Marshall plan was demanding a peacetime draft army. They claimed that by having a peacetime draft we would keep out of war. Was that promise true or false?

In 1941 the Wall Street crowd now promoting the Marshall plan told you that lend-lease would keep us out of war. Was that promise true or false?

In 1942–43 the present promoters of the Marshall plan were telling you that we were fighting for the Atlantic Charter and that would be the law everywhere. Was that promise true or false?

In 1943–44 the Marshall plan promoters were promising the "four freedoms" to the whole world. Was that promise true or false?

In 1944–45 the Marshall plan promoters were telling us that Russia was a great democracy and a friend of America. Was that promise true or false?

In 1944 the Marshall plan promoters were telling you that UNRRA, into which the United States poured $2,750,000,000, was going to bring about recovery in Europe and was going to help prevent communism in Europe. The record shows that hundreds of millions of UNRRA went to Tito's forces. Was that promise to stop communism in Europe with UNRRA funds true or false?

In 1945 the present promoters of the Marshall plan told you that Bretton Woods, into which the United States has poured some billions of dollars, would insure world peace and make it unnecessary to send more hand-outs abroad. Was that promise true or false?

In 1946 the promoters of the Marshall plan drove through a hypnotized Congress the British loan. They promised that that hand-out would bring recovery to England and make further aid unnecessary. Was that promise true or false?

In 1947 the clique now promoting the Marshall plan asked for $400,000,000 for Greek and Turk aid and said it was to relieve human suffering and distress in those lands and that it would stop communism there. Was that promise true or false, or are they now wanting more money and conniving to start a shooting war?

The answer, friends, to all the foregoing questions is that in each and every case the promises made by the promoters of the Marshall plan have been utterly worthless. They have not made good on a single promise.

Now let me ask you a question. If a man came to you and said that he was an expert chauffeur and 10 times in a row you provided him with a new car and every time he wrecked it and each time his accident put some of your family in the hospital, wouldn't you conclude that he was either a deliberate liar or was deliberately wrecking the cars? Would you continue to provide him with new cars to smash up and injure your children, simply because he continued to claim that he was a good driver and the next time he would get there safely?

No, my fellow Americans, the simple truth is that this administration has been playing

into the hands of the Communists from the date Mr. Roosevelt recognized the infamous Communist regime in 1933. And this administration, through the Marshall plan, will continue to play into Stalin's hands.

This program, the so-called Marshall plan, is not to stop communism. This program will promote communism by underwriting and propping up the Socialist dictatorships of Europe. These Socialist dictatorships are blood brothers with communism. The only difference is that Socialists enslave the people by degrees while the Communists, who don't get direct American hand-outs to sweeten the transition, make the change-over from freedom to despotism at one stroke.

Further than that, this program will continue the deterioration of the American currency and cause the cost of living to go higher and higher. Lenin said that the surest way to overthrow the existing social order was through debauchery of the currency.

The Marshall plan will cause prices in this country to go higher and higher. It will cause shortages in critical items like steel and oil; it is already causing black markets and a demand for regimentation of the people. It is laying the foundation for the shackles of a police state in America in peacetime. The very name, Marshall plan, on this program, should be a give-away, because General Marshall was one of the architects of the Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam agreements. All those deals have played into Stalin's hands.

Adolf Hitler said that by clever and sustained propaganda an entire people can be made to believe that heaven is hell and the most miserable existence is paradise. Is that deadly trick being played upon the American people by the same propaganda methods? You are being told the Marshall plan is to bring about peace but on the floor of Congress it is being openly conceded that the Marshall plan is lend-lease for another war.

The situation reminds me of one of the incidents that took place in 1944. Roosevelt was seeking the so-called Polish vote in America. A slogan to fool voters of Polish descent was spread over the Nation. Here was the way it read "Vote for Roosevelt; save Poland."

At the very time the slogan was ballyhooed, Poland had already been sold down the river to Stalin. We know that now. So it will be with the Marshall plan. They tell you the Marshall plan is to bring peace. At the very time they make you that promise, the Marshall plan is promoting undeclared war.

Just as in the case of Poland, the administration is promising peace while promoting war. This means that there is only one thing that can save the people of America. If your sons and daughters are not again to die on far-flung battle fronts all over the world, the Marshall plan must go into the ash can.

America must again fulfill her role as the light of the world—making the world better by the Christian virtues of persuasion and example, not by guns and bribery.

More Facts on UMT—The Sugar Coat Name for Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 30, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a recent news story appearing in the Omaha World Herald and a recent article appearing in the Christian Century:

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World Herald]

UMT PLAN ASSAILED BY EXECUTIVES

A group of Omaha business and professional men, all members of the American Legion, Thursday expressed opposition to universal military training.

The men represent no organization, but spoke as private citizens, they said.

Victor E. Spittler, attorney, said he contacted the group.

"I felt that some of us who oppose UMT should speak up," he said. "I believe the opinions of these men carry weight.

"I think UMT is a departure from the American way of life and another step toward totalitarianism. If you agree to conscripting youth in peacetime you can't object to conscripting labor and capital. This all adds up to dictatorship. We were supposed to be fighting dictatorship in the last war. I'm opposed to big government and regimentation."

TELLS OF DEFERMENT

Said W. O. Larson, Omaha real-estate man and member of the metropolitan utilities district board: "I can't go for UMT. I spent 5 years on a selective-service board in the last war. I know how people with influence in Government were able to get their sons or the sons of their friends deferred. In my opinion, UMT will not work in a democracy because there are too many ways politicians can do favors for people."

George J. Cleary, vice president of Mutual Benefit Health and Accident Association: "I'm solidly opposed to the plan. I like Representative HOWARD BUFFET's idea. I think we ought to know where we are going before we get into UMT. I believe we are being pressured into something that just isn't necessary."

Daniel J. Monen, vice president of the Omaha National Bank: "Conscription of youth in peacetime will, through interruption of study in science and engineering and democratic processes, do more damage than good. A future war will not be won by squads right and squads left."

OPPOSES COMPULSION

Denman Kountze, president of Midstate Underwriters, Inc.: "I'm thoroughly opposed to compulsory training. My reasons are so many and varied it would take an hour to list them."

James Wells, executive of Scott Tent & Awning Co., and World War II Signal Corps captain: "I am against the compulsory part of UMT. I think it violates the concepts of freedom we have always held. If UMT is put into effect it should be by constitutional amendment and not by the staff of the Army."

[From the Christian Century]

UMT IS CONSCRIPTION

With characteristic vigor, Dr. Daniel A. Poling is campaigning in behalf of universal military training. He spoke in Omaha on January 14 to a meeting to which the American Legion invited church and civic leaders. Particular pains were taken to invite members of the Christian Endeavor and of the Baptist Young People's Union to the Legion Hall to hear him. But a story which appeared on the front page of the Omaha World Herald the same evening pointed out that neither the Nebraska Christian Endeavor Union nor the Baptist Young People's Union was committed to UMT. It also carried the information that a poll of 152 ministers and rabbis in Omaha showed 92 opposed, 45 in favor, and 15 undecided.

On January 17 Dr. Poling was in Washington, where he got a friendlier reception at the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, in which the principal organization is the American Legion Auxiliary. According to the Associated Press, he informed the embattled women that "in universal training, trainees are not in the service, they are not in uniform, they are not under the Articles of War. They are not subject to Army court martial and could not be sent out of the country. Should another crisis arise, it would still require a special act of Congress to induct them." He vigorously denied that such training would be "peacetime conscription" and complained that great confusion is arising because people have not read the report issued last May by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, to which Dr. Poling was appointed as a Protestant minister.

It is a fact that a considerable number of people are puzzled by all the hullabaloo over military training, but we doubt that Dr. Poling has laid his finger on the cause. That seems to be, in part at least, the language of H. R. 4278, "a bill to enact the National Security Training Act," which differs so widely from the descriptions of it given to the public by its advocates. It is that bill, and not the report of the President' commission, which the American Legion and its friends seek to make law. Dr. Poling's statements give rise to the suspicion that he may not have read the bill himself.

This bill states in its preamble that "to provide for the common defense • • • every male citizen of the United States and every other male person residing in the United States owes to our country an obligation to undergo training which will fit him to contribute to its protection in time of emergency." It sets up the National Security Training Corps, "to be composed of trainees who shall be inducted into it only for training as hereinafter provided, and who shall be organized, administered, and trained • • • by appropriate departments and agencies of the United States. As used in this act, the term 'department concerned' means the War Department or the Navy Department, or such other department or agency as may be appropriate. The terms 'military training' or 'military training program' as used in this act means the training for duty with the armed forces of the United States."

Such language has quite a different tone from that used by Dr. Poling. In the first place, the training is universal. In the second place, it is military. In the third place, it is conducted under the Army and Navy. The other departments referred to may have jurisdiction only over conscientious objectors, as section 206 of the bill shows. The statement that the young men trained under this bill are "not in the service" is eyewash, because the National Security Training Corps will be a branch of the Army and Navy, which handle every detail of its administration. It is true that its top echelon of authority is the National Security Training Commission, but even that is under the President in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the military arm of government. One of its three members "shall be a member of the armed forces." The bill states that "the operation of the program, as it applies to all persons qualified for any form of military training, shall be the direct responsibility of the several service agencies." Not in the service? Nonsense.

Dr. Poling states that the trainees "are not in uniform." Section 105 of the bill states that "the President shall prescribe the uniform to be worn by the trainees, which uniform shall include a distinctive insignia." So the truth is that the trainees will be in uniform, a military uniform, which will differ from that of other branches of the armed services only as they differ from each other. Persons who advocate this measure should read the bill.

Dr. Poling states that trainees are not under the Articles of War, which is the law of the military service, and will not be court-martialed. The fact is that if this bill passes they will be under a detailed system of law which is incorporated under title II, chapter III, of the bill as a Code of Conduct. We have not had opportunity to compare the wording of this code with the Articles of War, but the language of this section of the bill leaves no doubt that the law it prescribes is military and not civil law. "All trainees • • • shall, from the time of actual induction • • • be subject to the provisions of this code," says section 303. The code provides that discipline shall be imposed by direct command of officers or by national security training courts. These courts shall be "composed of five officers of the service," says section 304. If this is not what soldiers know as a court martial, the difference is so slight that it is invisible to the naked eye. Appeals from decisions of such courts are taken to higher officers.

Some of the long list of offenses and punishments described in this code of military law are startling. The bill prescribes that induction into the corps occurs when the trainee takes an oath to "bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America" and to "obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over me according to law and the rules of the code of conduct of the National Security Training Corps." Refusal to accept actual induction "shall be in violation of this act and as such is liable, upon conviction in a civil court, to punishment of a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both." Trainees who have finished their first 6 months of basic training and who refuse to go through with the second 6 months "shall be punished by a fine of not to exceed $500, or imprisonment for 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

This section clearly reveals the compulsory nature of this form of military service, but the heaviest penalties—5 years' imprisonment and $10,000 fine, or both—appear in section 212, which seems to cover the same offenses, as well as others. This section deals with registration, classification and induction. It says in part: "Any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certification as to the fitness or liability or nonliability of himself or any other person for training under the provisions of this act, or rules or regulations made pursuant thereto; or who otherwise evades registration, induction, or training or any of the requirements of title I of this act, or who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to evade registration or training or any of the requirements of this act, or of said rules and regulations • • • or any person selected for training under this act who shall refuse to complete the training as prescribed under this act, shall upon conviction in the district court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof be punished" as indicated above. What does this mean except that if a trainee leaves camp before he has completed his year, he is subject to this heavy penalty? And if he goes home and is taken in by his family, doesn't it say that both his father and his mother are also subject to imprisonment for 5 years and a fine of $10,000, or both, for receiving their own son?

There are, besides, pages upon pages in the law prescribing heavy penalties for desertion, aiding deserters, striking an officer or "offering" violence against an officer, "collective insubordination," including slowdowns or "any concerted action in the nature of a strike" ($2,000 fine or a year's imprisonment or both for that), failure to aid in suppressing such insubordination or failure to report it to officers when the trainee has reason to believe it may be contemplated, losing Government property, and so on. Then there follow 18 sections, starting with absence without leave and carrying through to "all disorders and neglects to the prejudice of good order and trainee discipline," which carry the sweeping and unlimited penalty that the trainee "shall be punished as a national security training court may direct." Anyone familiar with the capacity of 18-year-olds to get into trouble will find it hard to read these sections of the law without wondering how large a portion of the boyhood of the Nation faces the prospect of spending some time in jail.

Section 383 permits punishment of trainees for crimes of which they are not guilty and concerning which they have no knowledge. It provides that where damages are done to property and "where the offenders cannot be ascertained, but the organization or detachment to which they belong is known, stoppage [of pay] to the amount of damages inflicted may be made and assessed in such proportion as may be deemed just upon the individual members thereof." No democratic civil court would or could follow this principle of collective guilt for the acts of individuals. This is military law, which is essentially despotic and undemocratic. Of what value is such discipline to men who are citizens of a democratic society?

Dr. Poling's main attack in his Washington speech was aimed at the people who denounce universal military training as conscription. He says that this is not conscription and that the difference between universal military training and conscription is basic. We fail to follow his logic. Here is a plan to draft young men between the ages of 17 and 20. It is universal in its application. Its purpose is military training. Its uniformed trainees are members of a corps which is in fact and in organization a branch of the armed forces, under the commander in chief. There is not a line in the bill which says that they may not be sent out of the country. They are under military law. The corps is administered by military officers. In the event of war, Congress could act in 5 minutes to sweep aside the flimsy civilian camouflage under which the National Security Training structure is masked. But even this would not be necessary. The corps is committed to obey the orders of the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, just as other branches of these forces are.

It is possible, of course, that Dr. Poling may not have a copy of H. R. 4278 at hand, and that he is too busy making addresses under the sponsorship of the American Legion to read its 82 pages. He may not even have a dictionary in his briefcase. So we quote a definition of conscription from Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language, second edition, which was published in 1940: "Conscription, n., a compulsory enrollment for military or naval service; a draft." Conscript, a transitive verb, is defined as "to enroll by compulsion for military service; to draft." Conscript, the noun, is defined as "one compulsorily enrolled to serve as a soldier or sailor; a recruit secured by compulsion."

So Dr. Poling is wrong. UMT is conscription. It is peacetime conscription. The trainees are conscripts. The attempt to make universal military training appear to be anything else than conscription is deliberately dishonest. It is a specious evasion of the plain and universally accepted meaning of an English word. The confusion that this evasion has created in the public mind concerning universal military training is calculated to get the people of America to accept one thing in the guise of something else. That confusion is rapidly clearing up as the people come to understand the real nature of the system which the militarists are trying to impose on them.

This is peacetime conscription and it must be accepted or rejected as such. We believe it should be rejected.

Token China Aid Is Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of February 23, 1948:

TOKEN CHINA AID IS NOT ENOUGH

The State Department under pressure has changed its no-aid-to-China policy. But unless it is prepared to go much further and faster in getting help to China, there is little prospect that the new policy will be more than a cruelly deceptive gesture.

Secretary Marshall now says the Communist armies may take the rest of Manchuria and north China; and that this soon would make our position in Korea untenable and our position in Japan insecure. So there is no longer any official question that American security interests are involved.

He now urges $570,000,000 in the next fiscal year for nonmilitary aid, and points out that supplying these civilian goods will release Chinese funds for purchase here of other essentials. That is, military materials. The State Department says army supplies are going forward; that some were loaded on Chinese ships at Saipan last week, that 150 transport planes are being readied, that low-cost contracts for surplus ammunition from the Marianas and Hawaii were signed last month and will be filled rapidly.

Finally Secretary Marshall emphasizes the lack of training of Chinese Nationalist troops and the inability of their officers to get maximum results without expert military advice—such as he gave to little avail when in China in 1946.

So in theory Washington favors the sending of military supplies and American military advisers, with such experts as Generals Wedemeyer and Chennault considered absolutely imperative to enable Chiang Kai-shek to halt the Red advance. The many congressional and other friends of China aid are now relieved of the time-consuming task of proving the obvious wisdom of this policy. They now can concentrate on getting it applied effectively.

As for munitions, the contracts already made are mere tokens. Far larger amounts are required, plus the men and the ships to guarantee quick delivery. Planes are of little use without spare parts and military equipment.

In the case of military advisers—the most desperate need of all—we suggest that the American military mission now cooling its heels in China be assigned to that duty at once. Washington implies that the Nanking government does not want such advisers, but Nanking indicates that it does. This absurdly costly confusion would be clarified within a few hours if Washington would lift its reported order to its military mission to refrain from advisory activities.

The Chinese Government certainly shares with Washington the blame for the impasse which has so long paralyzed effective cooperation for mutual benefits. But that is all the more reason for both parties now, in view of the vastly greater Communist military threat, to forget old feuds and face-saving maneuvers and to work together.

Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky:

THESE DAYS
(By George E. Sokolsky)

There are always men, great and small, who are certain that they can do the impossible. You have known them; the man who can run the banks of the country differently and better; the man who can operate the United States Steel Corp. better than Ben Fairless; the man who never laughs when he sees a play by George Bernard Shaw; the man who knows precisely how to manage the newspaper you are now reading better than its publisher.

Among the statesmen, such a man runs his head into a stone wall of historic fact.

Such a man is Eduard Benes, President of Czechoslovakia, who conceived the brilliant idea of looking both east and west simultaneously. This Janus-faced policy was supposed to be the smartest ever conceived and the Czechs have been inordinately proud of their achievement.

It was designed to make it possible for Czechoslovakia to be a western nation while at the same time it was an eastern nation.

Czechoslovakia was to have a free economy while at the same time it permitted their own Communists to select the premier, to accelerate a Communist propaganda and to become what is called a majority parity, changing the freedom of western European economics into the slavery of Marxism.

The first sign that the Czechs had that they were not in control of their own affairs was when Jan Masaryk at the San Francisco conference served as a diplomatic valet to Molotov. That was the tip-off.

Masaryk is not a Communist but he could work with them if it suited him. He is an opportunist.

The second sign was when Czechoslovakia wanted to join the nations of western Europe that were to meet to consider the Marshall plan. Russia told Czechoslovakia to stay away.

And Czechoslovakia stayed away. That was the second tip-off, and it was an unmistakable one. Whether one is for or against the Marshall plan, it was to be admitted that the nations of western Europe that met at Paris to set up the program represented, together with Spain, all that is left of what might be called western civilization in Europe.

Czechoslovakia, which rightly belonged at the conference, was not present. Czechoslovakia there and then became a part of the Russian world.

Benes at that point could have appealed to the United Nations to judge between him and Stalin, between the right of a sovereign nation to form its own foreign policy, to determine its own economic policy, without interference from outside.

Stalin did interfere in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia, and Benes took it.

He probably thought he had another trick up his sleeve.

Maybe he thought that Masaryk had another trick up his sleeve. Maybe he thought that he could outwit a steam roller that is not to be resisted by speeches.

So now it has come at last. Russia is moving on Czechoslovakia as it moved on Hungary, as it moved on every Balkan country except Greece. This is war by propaganda—war by treachery and the utilization of quislings.

What Hitler planned at Munich, what traitors did in every country into which the German armies marched, was petty larceny compared with the horrible miseries that Stalin is bringing to country after country.

And there is no stopping him at any particular point as long as the western powers lack the will or daring to stand up to him even on the basis of their opposition to Hitler. Czechoslovakia is only another step in the march to Europe's death.

There are men who serve Russia in every country: Togliatti in Italy; Thorez and Duclos in France; Gottwald in Czechoslovakia.

Who is the man in the United States who, in pursuit of personal power and personal advantage, is playing this silly game of believing, like Benes, that he can evade becoming the prisoner of those who are willing to feed his vanity, supply him with a claque to applaud his platitudes, to cheer his every gesture, while he, Janus-faced, looks both east and west, playing both ends against the middle?

It would seem to me that Henry Wallace is the Eduard Benes of America—albeit a less graceful one.

Truman Permits Vital Security Program To Bog Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the present political administration has been drumming up a feeling of urgency among our people by making it seem that there is danger of a war with Russia. Every time a new plan for spending American tax money overseas is O. K.'d in the White House, a new incident of some kind is publicized from overseas to scare Americans into making the appropriation.

We in Congress, as most of us realize, are kept busy digging to get the truth. Frequently, we see evidences of chicanery and half-truth or lies by innuendos and omissions, in the testimony of prominent Democrats and in the stream of propaganda issued by one or the other of the Federal departments.

I, for one, am going to get all the information possible into the hands of the people, for only through knowing the facts can the average man make up his mind about what policies he wants our Government to follow. Let the people know. That should be our watchword.

As we know, and I repeat, the administration has been leaving the hint, clearly and unmistakably, that there is danger of a war, that we are in an emergency period. It has used this old and familiar technique to promote any of a dozen projects in Congress, notably universal military training, the so-called Marshall plan, and the Greek-Turk drain.

Now, as chairman of a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, I am in a position to know that the administration has fallen down on one of the most important bases of a strong and prepared America—stock piling of strategic materials.

Enacting new laws ostensibly to make America strong will be meaningless if we do not have good administration of laws already in effect.

Approximately 3 years ago, Congress passed the stock-piling law, which was designed to assure us that we never would be caught short on strategic materials such as natural rubber, molybdenum, industrial diamonds, and many others, in case of another war. Ample funds were voted by Congress to start this program.

Now, after 3 years, we might legitimately ask, in view of the emergency attitude fostered by the executive branch of the Government, how are we getting along on strategic stock piling? Since the official reports are labeled "confidential," I do not feel free to give exact figures of the so-called Stock-piling Board, but I have read the latest report and I am amazed that the administration could have the effrontery to suggest other measures while failing to see that the stock-piling legislation works.

Of something more than 65 strategic materials included in the stock-piling program, only two or three are in full supply in this Nation. On several of the acquistion programs, the stock pile is as big as the program contemplates for this time, in other words, up to schedule. But in more than 60 strategic metals, minerals, and materials, we are not up to schedule on our stock piling.

What good would it do to have millions of men under arms, or trained to fight, Mr. Speaker, when the minerals and metals and materials needed to supply these men were not available through poor administration of a law passed by Congress? An army is no more efficient than its lines of supply, and the lines of supply cannot be kept filled unless the minerals and metals and materials needed to make the implements of war are available.

After Pearl Harbor, as we all can remember clearly, this Nation faced a rubber emergency of the first magnitude. We were caught short in respect to a vital commodity. A hasty and, of course, expensive synthetic rubber construction program was undertaken and carried through in the nick of time. But there were still widespread dislocations. Motorists had to make old tires work long after these tires should have been junked.

Now you and I would think that the executive branch of the Government would have learned a lesson from this. But apparently not. Today, the armed services have not stock-piled rubber in anything like the quantities they should have, although the militarists keep talking war, war, and more war. We have the synthetic plants, to be sure, but we still need plenty of natural rubber, or would need it in case of a major war.

The administration of our stock-piling program is in such a mess that the Government's right hand doesn't know what its left hand is doing. Merely to acquire a little natural rubber, the bureaucrats have to pass an order through 6 or 7 different boards, councils, or committees. There is no one person in authority to move fast if the occasion demands.

Not long ago, I am reliably informed, the Government had a chance to acquire 20,000 tons of natural rubber at a fair price. Under existing procedures, if the price of natural rubber is higher than 18 cents a pound, the Government does not buy. If it falls under that figure, the Government can buy. This rubber I am talking about was for sale below 18 cents a pound and the Government wanted to buy it. But by the time the idea was kicked around by 6 or 7 groups in the Government, and finally was approved, the bureaucrats learned that the rubber already had been sold to a private company.

This kind of run-around and slipshod administration is one of the big reasons why the whole stock-piling program is in such a mess. Yet, we are continually being urged to pass new legislation with the implication that there is a threat to our security somewhere or the other.

As a matter of fact, as we all know, the President originally this year was going to ask for $660,000,000 for the stock-piling program. But the Bureau of the Budget, one of the President's own personal agencies in the executive department, cut the figure down to $225,000,000. That is, relatively, chicken feed compared to the billions we are talking about shipping overseas for foreign nations and considering the billions we are throwing away in other pretty obvious ways. Yet, that is the total amount Congress is being asked to appropriate for one of the most important and vital programs for national security imaginable.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we are going to have another war in the next decade. I am not in favor of another war, with Russia or any other nation. I was against our entry into World War II until we were forced into it, and I will be against world war III. But one thing is certain: If we are going to have a war, or even if we are not, we should be prepared. A lot of people want to get prepared in obvious ways—by having kids march around with rifles on their shoulders and waving flags. That is one way of being prepared, but it did not help France in 1940, and it will not help us in the atomic and guided-missiles war of the future. Another way of being prepared is to have adequate stock piles of every kind of metal, mineral, precious and semiprecious jewelry, a strong industrial system, and a scientifically trained and alert citizenry. That is the way I want to be prepared for war. You can have the parades. Give me the strategic materials. Wars are won by real force, not apparent force.

The Russians, and every other civilized people, can learn very easily the state of our unpreparedness. Not because of any laws we in Congress do or do not pass, but merely by checking up on our industrial capacity and the strategic materials available to us. They will not be influenced one way or another by any show of strength we make, as long as they know we lack strength in the most vital parts of our industrial and military anatomy.

Death of Hon. Thomas M. Hederman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the sad news of the passing of Hon. Thomas M. Hederman, owner and editor of the Clarion Ledger at Jackson, Miss.

In his passing my State loses one of its finest and most valuable citizens; a true patriot, and Christian gentleman in every sense of the word.

The last editorial he ever wrote had reference to my services here. It appeared in the Clarion Ledger on Wednesday morning, February 25. He sent me a copy of that editorial together with a personal note which was mailed on the morning of February 25. He passed away that afternoon.

It is impossible for me to express my heartfelt gratitude for this last expression of a true and loyal friend. My heart goes out to his bereaved loved ones in their hour of sorrow.

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mixed in him, that nature might stand up
And say to all the world this was a man.

The editorial referred to follows:

HIGH PRAISE OF HOUSE COMMITTEE AND MISSISSIPPI'S JOHN RANKIN

"The most important and most useful committee in Congress is the House Committee on Un-American Activities," Frank C. Waldrop declares in a full-column editorial page article in the Washington Times-Herald.

And when Mississippi's Representative JOHN RANKIN in 1945, by a smart, bold, and foresighted move, caused that committee to be made a permanent House committee, Mr. RANKIN justified his career as an American citizen right there, Waldrop states further:

"When the history of our times is finally written," he predicts, "that committee will undoubtedly be described as the key to the survival of the American Republic.

"Why? Because in days when it was dangerous and unpopular to describe the conspiracy of the Communists for what it is and always has been, that committee of the House stuck to the job."

Mr. Waldrop reviews the whole history of the committee, from the time of its creation in 1938 with Martin Dies as chairman. He tell how the New Deal hated the committee and grew also to fear it. How Dies was attacked and ridiculed but fought back valiantly until breaking health forced his resignation. (JOHN RANKIN was the target of similar threats and ridicule by the same groups.)

"The second great moment in the career of the committee came when Representative JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, moved at the moment when Congress was organizing in January 1945 that the House Committee on Un-American Activities be made a permanent branch of the House.

"RANKIN justified his career as an American citizen right there.

"Dies was gone. Matthews was gone. Stripling was headed for the Army. The Communists and fellow travelers were panting to get their hooks on the committee's files that had by then grown to enormous size. Once those files were transferred out of Stripling's hands, they felt, the whole war would be won.

"But they figured without RANKIN, and he outsmarted them all, to save an invaluable storehouse."

We take pleasure in noting this article not only because it gives Mississippi's JOHN RANKIN deserved praise and credit but also because of its tribute to the much-maligned Martin Dies.

We think many Mississippians will find it interesting. And, as the times become more critical and the menace of the Communist plots and activities becomes clearer to all, many others in Washington and over the country will endorse this statement that this committee may be described by historians as "the key to the survival of the American Republic."

Problem in Korea—Opportunity in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to call to the attention of Members of Congress an editorial appearing in the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald this week. It points out anew the obvious truths present in an interesting article written by Gen. Bonner Fellers, military secretary to Gen. Douglas MacArthur and later secretary-general to the Allied Council for Japan. The article, written for the current issue of Nation's Business, has already been included in the Appendix to the RECORD through the good offices of my distinguished colleague, Hon. ABE MCGREGOR GOFF, of Idaho.

The editorial follows:

PROBLEM IN KOREA—OPPORTUNITY IN JAPAN

Russia pulled a fast, though not unexpected, one the other day, when a radio station in Pyong Yang, capital of the north Korea Russian zone, announced creation of a thing called the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

This outfit, of course, is a Moscow marionette which will dance to any string Joe Stalin jerks. According to United States occupation authorities in Seoul, capital of southern Korea, the infant "republic" has an army well equipped with Russian arms, ammunition, and light planes.

The birth of the new "government" throws the spotlight on our problem in Korea, and it is a first-class one. We've been occupying the southern part of that peninsula since

soon after VJ-day, pursuant to an understanding with Russia that Moscow and Washington would pull their troops out of there when an independent Korean Government should be solidly established.

The United Nations Korean Commission is badly worried over this development and is warning of a possible new world war, originating in Korea, unless the Little Assembly can do something in a vigorous way to prevent it. The Little Assembly has no armed forces. Russia wants us out of there—and has much heavier fighting strength on the unhappy peninsula than we have.

What we'll finally do is anybody's guess. Meanwhile, it seems to us a highly attractive opportunity is beckoning in Japan, whose islands bracket Korea.

This opportunity is set forth in detail in a long and interesting article in the current Nation's Business magazine by Gen. Bonner Fellers, military secretary to Gen. Douglas MacArthur during the war and later secretary general to the Allied Council for Japan.

General Fellers discusses the vile atrocities Japs inflicted on captured Americans from the Bataan death march to the end of the war. He asks none of us to forgive those crimes, and probably none of us ever will. But he does offer an explanation for them which seems sound.

He blames the atrocities on three things, mainly—the cheapness of human life in the overpopulated Orient; the Shinto religion, which preaches nothing about a decent regard for one's fellowman; and the fact that the Japanese warrior caste taught the soldiers that they belonged to the master race and were duty bound to kill off, torment, or enslave all non-Japanese, especially white ones.

MAKE PEACE WITH JAPAN

All that, says Fellers, is gone. The militarists are discredited; atrocity instigators are still being jailed or executed. Christianity is making heavy inroads on Shintoism. Tetsu Katayama (Socialist) was Japan's first Christian premier. He was succeeded Saturday by Hitoshi Ashida, head of the Japanese Democratic Party.

The native Communists are doing their best to take over Japan for Russia. MacArthur has given them every leeway, every possible bit of rope to hang themselves. Meanwhile, MacArthur keeps the Russians in Toyko Allied occupation councils firmly under his thumb.

MacArthur says that the Japanese Government is now strong enough to keep the Reds where they belong if United States occupation forces are pulled out.

Fellers says that "the new Japan, provided we don't blunder, will eventually emerge as a Christian democracy and a stanch friend of the United States." Japan, incidentally, has 80,000,000 people.

The country is now one big poorhouse which is costing us $300,000,000 a year to feed. It can relieve us of that bill only by getting back on its feet economically.

MacArthur's prescription for quick Japanese recovery and firm United States-Japanese friendship is, as reported by General Fellers: Conclude a peace treaty as fast as possible, with or without Russian participation, and then withdraw United States occupation forces; and virtually forget reparations.

If we can make fast friends and potential allies of the Japanese, it seems by all odds that we'd be fools not to try. And if anybody should know how it can be done, MacArthur should.

How about serious consideration of these suggestions in United States Government circles? We're aware that the Marshall plan is taking up the time and energies of most of the statesmen; but can't some of them please give thought to the possibility of making 80,000,000 real friends for the United States at reasonable cost and at a spot on the world map where we need all the friends we can find?

New York Democratic State Committee Asks Active Support of Palestine Partition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD under previous leave the statement issued by Paul E. Fitzpatrick, chairman of the Democratic State Committee of New York, which asks full support of the United Nations decision for partition of Palestine and for lifting the arms embargo and enforcing the UN determination:

Support of the United Nations' partition of the Holy Land by lifting the United States embargo against the shipment of arms to Jews in Palestine is essential to world peace, Paul E. Fitzpatrick, Chairman of the Democratic State Committee, declared today in a four-point program submitted to the New York State congressional delegation.

Such positive action, Mr. Fitzpatrick pointed out, would go far toward backing up President Truman's declaration February 12 that the United States is supporting the UN settlement, and would reinforce Secretary George C. Marshall's statement the day before that no change in our policy of support is contemplated.

Emphasizing that American troops are neither necessary nor desired, the New York State chairman strongly urged that the United States also support UN proposals for a voluntary police force, and clearly warn Great Britain against any "scuttling" of the partition.

His recommendations supplemented a proposed joint resolution introduced in the New York State Legislature Tuesday by the Democratic Party, calling on Congress to lift the arms embargo.

Mr. Fitzpatrick's complete statement follows:

"The New York State Democratic Committee is heartily in accord with President Truman's statement that the United States support the United Nations' settlement of the Palestine issue. We welcome the assurance from Secretary of State George C. Marshall that this Government contemplates no change in support of that decision.

"We are convinced that such support is essential to the future if not the very life of the United Nations as an instrument for the peaceful settlement of disputes. We also believe, however, that such support must be positive and real for those defending the United Nations' decision against aggressors who would ignore that decision and nullify it.

"We therefore respectfully but strongly recommend that the members of the New York State delegation in Congress actively support a program that would:

"1. Bolster the United Nations in this, its first important decision, lest its effectiveness for peace be destroyed.

"2. Lift the United States arms embargo so that Jews can defend the decision of the United Nations within Palestine against Arab aggression.

"3. Inform the British Government clearly that this Government will not tolerate scuttling of the partition.

"4. Support proposals by the UN Palestine Commission made to the Security Council that a voluntary police force be sent into Palestine. It is not necessary to send United States forces, for Palestine does not want American troops.

"The New York State Democratic committee sincerely believes that the above program is the only real way to back up President Truman and reinforce Secretary Marshall, in their aim to safeguard the United Nations and world peace."

Taxes Discourage Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the gentlemen holding the inverted theory that by taxing the initiative out of business the Nation will be led to new levels of prosperity, I have an interesting answer. This is not a communication from John Jones, owner of a multimillion-dollar corporation, but from the editor of the progressive semimonthly, the Nebraska Farmer.

Here is what Editor Tom Leadley has to say in an editorial published February 21, 1948:

TAXES DISCOURAGE PRODUCTION

Somewhere in the murky haze surrounding our incomprehensible level of Federal spending, debt, and tax burdens, the planners have missed a vital point in human nature, if not in economic law.

That is the effect of high taxes in discouraging individual initiative and maximum production.

Many big wheat growers in western Nebraska and Kansas were reported to be little concerned about the effect of the dry fall on their 1948 wheat crop. They don't care whether or not they raise a crop. The reason is because they will be about as well off without it. Their bins are already full of 1946 and 1947 wheat crops on which the Government will collect a major part of the selling price if sold in any one year. Maybe they would have 50 to 75 cents a bushel left net. By spreading their sales over a longer period, they keep their income brackets at a lower level and will have about as much left by that means as they would have by raising a new crop.

Probably to a lesser degree thousands of wheat growers are in a similar frame of circumstances and mind. It all works out to discourage production of a vitally needed food crop because income-tax rates are almost confiscatory. But curtailed production won't feed a hungry, starving world, nor permit production to catch up with demand and thus lower prices.

The effect is about the same in business. Proprietors don't have much enthusiasm for risking money for expansion of their business with Uncle Sam getting the lion's share of profits in corporation and individual income taxes. Instead, the normal inclination is to play safe, even curtail production, and by charging all the traffic will bear, try to offset lower volume and high taxes by higher and higher prices.

At the same time this high-tax burden closes the door to new business that would provide additional competition, and normally force prices to reasonable levels. Thus there is something to be said for the theory that lowering income taxes will result in lower prices and in an equally high and much sounder level of general prosperity through greater volume of sales, profits, and employment. This will bring more tax revenue to the Federal Government, as was proven after World War I.

Our Government and Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAYTON E. PHILLIPS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address by W. I. Jones, administrative secretary, Lincoln Memorial University, delivered at Harrogate, Tenn., February 16, 1948:

OUR GOVERNMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION

(By W. I. Jones, administrative secretary, Lincoln Memorial University)

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, one of the reasons why our great country is today the citadel of freedom, the pantry, the treasury and the arsenal of all free peoples, is that from the beginning we have built schools and churches along with our factories and railways. While we were developing agriculture and commerce, science and industry, we have been developing character and knowledge; producing young manhood with keen eyes, steady nerves and the "know how" that is unsurpassed anywhere in the world. We built and equipped laboratories for scientific exploration, libraries for study and research; opened vast stores of knowledge for those who desired to excel. In all this we did not neglect physical and spiritual development for the well-rounded man or woman.

For a good many years, prior to World War II, there was a gradual increase in the percentage of high school graduates seeking a higher education. Universities and colleges were finding themselves crowded but were gradually expanding to meet the needs and it is quite probable that gradual and normal expansion of facilities would have met the problem of increased enrollment. There has been a gradual awakening, on the part of parents and young people, to the need of higher education. During the past 50 years there has been an increase of about 90 percent in our population. At the same time enrollment in our colleges has increased over 260 percent. It is claimed that only 2 percent of our population are college-trained but that this 2 percent make up 86 percent of the leadership of service in the business and professional world. We may, therefore, conclude that the matter of providing facilities for increasing this 2 percent of college-trained people is of prime importance. Through the years this gradual increase placed a heavy strain on the institutions of higher education. However, through taxation, endowments, private subscriptions and from whatever source, facilities were enlarged, so that expansions for the most part, met the needs created by increased enrollment.

Then came World War II. Suddenly colleges and universities found themselves with only 25 percent of the normal potential student pool to draw from. Male high-school graduates were taken out for war duty. Half of the female graduates went into war plants, industry, or the armed forces, leaving only about half of the female high-school graduates, or one-fourth of the whole, to keep our great institutions going. Some institutions became training centers for the armed forces, holding up the income for a while, but acting as a hypodermic, easing the pain before the operation.

Institutions of higher learning were, therefore, faced with a long period of curtailed income from student fees. Also, the scarcity of material and labor and the lack of finances made it impossible for colleges and universities to keep their buildings and equipment in normal repair. Leaking roofs, broken windows, damaged plaster, and faulty heating and lighting had to wait. Laboratories, libraries, dining halls, fire-fighting and all other equipment suffered. Everything, from typewriters to heating plants, had to wait. Taking millions of our young people to war had a devastating effect on our colleges and universities. It had a damaging effect on our young people themselves. Let us take the mythical John Doe, age 18. John was graduated from high school with honors and made application to a college to become an engineer. But he was called to the colors, and as he left us we said, "Now, don't worry, John, when you come back we will send you to college." For 3 years John braved the weather, the heat of battle, the hunger, and hell of war, and then one day he came home and prepared to go to college, and realize his great ambition to become an engineer.

But other things had happened. Universities and colleges had not been able to expand. In fact, they were in worse condition than when he left for the war. Also, by then, the normal crop of high-school graduates were applying for admission to college, and these were sufficient to fill these institutions to capacity. Too, 3,000,000 other John Does had come back and were applying for admission. Also, the girls who left high school for war work had come home and wanted to go to college. Added to all this was another factor. Many parents found themselves with more money than usual and decided to give their children an education. All these factors reveal tragic conditions. Not only John Doe, but over 1,000,000 others equally ambitious and who had been promised an education, received the discouraging news, "Sorry, we have no room."

This situation was the fault of no one in particular. Our first duty was to win the war. Be it always to the credit of John Doe and all the others, that they were patient in the realization of what happened, and have adapted themselves to the situation. There was, however, a realization that something had to be done and in a hurry. Educators, public officials, civic leaders, business and professional men began to study the problem. On August 8, 1946 the Congress made available $75,000,000 with which to increase temporary facilities on the campuses of colleges and universities, to enable them to increase student enrollment. Each institution was asked to make known its needs to the United States Office of Education. After a "finding of need" was established, the Federal Works Administration, through the Bureau of Community Facilities, undertook to make facilities available to colleges and universities. As needs were established vast Army camps and equipment were dismantled, moved to the campuses and rerected as temporary buildings. These installations included dormitories, libraries, dining halls, gymnasiums, classrooms, and offices. Also, much equipment was given including office equipment, refrigeration, cafeteria, fire-fighting, laboratory and industrial machinery. This program was carried out with dispatch and efficiency in a way that relieved the tension and made it possible for many more students to be enrolled and added to the effectiveness of the instruction to all who were in classes.

The program carried out under Public Law 607 was of a temporary nature but was most effective. Buildings in camps were needing paint and repairs. A few years and they would have been a total loss. Equipment was also rusting and becoming a liability. To turn these vast resources into effective, if temporary, assets to higher learning was a wise and valuable decision. Distribution was made on an equitable basis, taking into account the number of veterans enrolled, the actual need in each case, and the ability of the institution to meet the need in question. Statistics show that 1,777,028 veterans approved by the Veterans' Administration are enrolled in institutions of higher learning and that 3,000,000 already approved have not yet enrolled.

Lincoln Memorial University highly appreciates the effective aid given in this great emergency. The first aid received was a supply of desks, typewriters, and filing cabinets, replenishing worn out equipment that could not be found on the market. We also needed refrigeration to stop spoilage of food and safeguard the health of our students. This need was met. Through the war our fire fighting equipment had deteriorated beyond repair or use. Every building was a hazard. A fire engine and a number of extinguishers were supplied, removing that danger. For a number of years we had needed a gymnasium but the large number of veterans wanting to become coaches and athletic directors made this a must. Due to this need and other factors, we were awarded the sports arena at Camp Forrest which is now being rebuilt on the campus, with concrete block walls and brick veneer, making it into a permanent building. These and other valuable items have enabled Lincoln Memorial University to be effective in its courses of instruction given to veterans, and for which we are grateful. We have found, without exception, that all Federal agencies participating in this program have been fair and have striven to establish the need and meet it regardless of race, creed, or color.

This use of surplus properties gave temporary relief at a minimum cost. A total of $75,000,000 was spent, enabling an increased enrollment of thousands of students in colleges and universities. Veterans and non-veterans, who were enrolled benefited from this relief. This was a small expenditure for so great a result.

That brings us up to now. What of the future: Institutions of higher learning must face realities. In the first place, there is certain to be an increase in the percentage of new high school graduates entering college and the increase in population will normally swell the enrollment in colleges and universities. From reliable sources it is estimated that the peak of veteran enrollment will not be reached until 1951, and that the veteran enrollment will not end until about 1960. That factor plus normal increase from high schools, plus problems that may arise due to military training in the future, and all add up to a continuing demand beyond the ability of institutions to handle. Also, shortly the temporary buildings erected will no longer be of service and this depreciation will lessen the ability of schools to continue their present capacity. It is claimed that 1,200,000 veterans are now enrolled in institutions of higher learning and that the peak has not been reached. Whether the peak has been reached or not, it is true that veterans will be enrolled for 8 or 10 years, that there will be a normal increase in non-veteran enrollment, and that all institutions of higher learning will be filled to capacity with thousands unable

to enroll. Many veterans are yet in high schools and will go on to college later.

Looking toward a permanent solution of the educational stresses, a bill, S. 971, has been introduced in the Senate and H. R. 2845 into the House, calling for an appropriation of $250,000,000 to be made available to public and private (nonprofit) institutions on a matching basis for the erection of permanent buildings, such as laboratories, libraries, and classrooms. Such an aid would go far toward a solution of the problems of today. It is hoped that the amount will be increased to $500,000,000 on a matching formula, which would give $1,000,000,000 to institutions of higher learning to build facilities for the present and the future. From authentic records we learn that some temporary buildings were erected at a cost of $8 per square foot, with the average being $4.27 and the Government paying it all. It is estimated that new and permanent buildings can be erected at a cost of $11 per square foot, which shows that the cost to the Government would be $5.50 per square foot for permanent buildings instead of the $4.27 for temporary ones, the other half to be paid by the institutions themselves.

Federal authorities state that the proposed $250,000,000 will provide facilities for two-sevenths of the veterans now unable to enroll for lack of room. By doubling the amount four-sevenths could enroll. Nor will this money be wasted after the veterans' program is finished. This Nation must step up its educational facilities to keep pace with other nations. As a matter of security, our chemists, engineers, and scientists must be second to none. Whether in war or peace, we must invest in a well-educated citizenship ready at all times to measure arms with students from all other lands.

It is safe to predict that the present number of veterans will require from 8 to 12 years for the end of their educational program. Then their sons and daughters will wish higher education. Too, there may be other wars, in which case our educational institutions will be bulwarks in national defense. It is claimed that wars are being fought more and more in laboratories and test tubes. That agriculture and transportation, physics, chemistry, steam, steel, and electricity are now the weapons we will use. That being true, it is as important to have laboratories, libraries, and classrooms as it is to develop defenses against the atomic bomb. Added to these is the necessity of developing strong and intelligent men and women to use the weapons we create. For these reasons we hope the Congress will give immediate and careful consideration to an appropriation large enough to ease the strain of today and meet the needs of tomorrow.

Institutions of higher learning cannot do these things of themselves. The cost per student exceeds the income per student. By the time most institutions keep up repairs, pay present salaries, and replace worn-out equipment, they cannot meet the complete cost of new buildings needed. It is believed that from present resources, plus what can be raised from private subscriptions, colleges and universities could match appropriations from the Government and realize the improvements needed. When we realize the potential strength in peace and in war of a powerful, technically trained young American manhood and womanhood no cost is too great, and when we think of the dangers of this age in electronics, in bacteriology, in all phases of science, we realize that the maximum in education becomes a must.

In the 1,700 institutions of higher learning, projects of expansion are already planned for $180,000,000 for 350 projects for public institutions. Add to this proposed project that is needed and we have a necessary expansion program of over $1,000,000,000 for the next 3 or 4 years. It is presumed that from funds already raised and to be raised, plus tax appropriations for public institutions, half of the billion-dollar program can be raised. If, therefore, the Government could or would supply the other half, a greatly improved program of education could be realized in time to give full benefits to veterans in their junior and senior years, and for those now enrolled and the full 4 years for those yet to enroll.

It has been shown by Federal officials that the $250,000,000 would, on a 50–50 basis, enable construction of 42,500,000 square feet of space for veterans, or two-sevenths of the 141,000,000 square feet of space needed today. An appropriation of $500,000,000 would provide for four-sevenths of the needed floor space and, while not meeting the full need, would go a long way. Let us now fulfill our promise to young John Doe that he will have a chance to complete his education. Above housing, bonuses, or unemployment relief stands this promise to give opportunity to the 3,000,000 who want to go to college and cannot.

The question has arisen as to whether these Federal funds should go to public institutions or be shared with private, non-tax-supported institutions. It has been stated officially that today 40 percent of all veterans in higher institutions of learning are in private institutions. From the beginning of education in this country, private schools have pioneered, carrying their full share of the load. Another principle involved here is that the veteran may enroll in the school of his choice, and to deny the private school assistance would work an injustice both on schools and veterans. The private (non-tax supported and nonprofit) school has been and will continue to be a great source of educated leadership and an asset to the country in great emergencies.

There is another principle involved. S. 971 states that, "no department, agency, or officer of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any institution of higher learning to which a grant may be made hereunder nor shall any conditions or requirement be imposed, either in the grant agreement or otherwise, which shall in any way prescribe or affect the administration, personnel, curriculum, instructon, methods of instruction or materials of instruction of such institution."

This is important, it preserves the freedom of instruction called "academic freedom." In the distribution of surplus property under the emergency program the Office of Education and the Bureau of Community Facilities carried out this principle fully, and there was no discrimination as to race, creed, or color. Relief was given on the basis of proven need after the "finding of need" had been duly executed. In carrying out the provisions of S. 971 it is hoped that the same basic principles will be followed as prevailed in the distribution of surplus property under the program of temporary relief. In this way all institutions of higher learning can present a solid front. In this way by 1950 most of the three and one-fourth million students who will apply, can find accommodations.

This great need rises above political expediency. The future of this Nation in peace and in war depends upon training of our young people in the "know how" of living. This is particularly true of the sciences. To survive we must have chemists, engineers, physicians, and leaders in management second to none among the nations. Of what use will be the billions of dollars spent on relief, on hydroelectric power, on agricultural development, on our armed forces, unless we make provisions for the full development of our greatest resource—the young manhood and womanhood of America? The function, therefore, of our Government is not to restrict, hamper, or control education, but to assist institutions of higher learning in providing opportunity to every student in every part of our country to become an asset to our Republic. Our institutions cannot do this alone. Our Government cannot do it alone. But all of us, the Government, public and private institutions working together, sharing the load together, can meet the greatest challenge we have had in the history of our country.

Rent Control and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as I stated on the floor in making my fight against the extension of rent control, it is a long step toward the very communism our alleged leaders presume to fear.

Under the Constitution, we cannot "take private property for public use" without just compensation. But under the Rent Control Act we are taking private property for private use without just compensation and without any constitutional authority at all.

The next step toward communism would be price fixing and the rationing of purchases—together with the so-called civil-rights program which certain demagogs are now trying to foist onto the American people, in order to placate small groups of organized racial minorities.

At this point I am inserting a letter which I received from New York this morning, and which I hope every Member of Congress will read, especially the ones who voted for the extension of rent control.

You are going to get many such letters as time goes on, I hope.

The matter referred to follows:

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANKIN: I have seen in today's newspapers the fight that you put up against the rent-control bill in the House of Representatives. Congratulations, Mr. RANKIN, and keep up the good work. I would like to tell you my story in short: In 1945 in order to get an apartment I bought a three-family house and moved in on the second floor, the only apartment available in the house. For the down payment of $5,000 I used all my life savings and sold my life insurance policies. In the 3 years that I owned this house my wife and I have got heart trouble and high blood pressure through the aggravation caused by the tenant on the first floor. He is making our lives miserable in every possible way and is the most undesirable tenant I have ever seen. We are both over 50 years of age and both go to work in order to make ends meet. Our physician has advised us to move on the ground floor, so we have offered 2 months' rent to our tenant to vacate the apartment. He expects 1 year's rent to move out, we cannot afford that. He earns $6,000 a year and his wife is a New York City school teacher.

Would it be possible through your gallant fight to add an amendment to the new rent law where an owner of a two- or three-family house, sick and under his doctor's advice, can move in his own house on the ground floor, where there are no war veterans involved?

After we bought the house we found out the former owner sold the house on account of this first-floor tenant. Do we have to do the same thing in order to get a ground-floor apartment and get peace in the house?

My apartment on the second floor is also registered with the OPA so I am not for the money, just for our health.

I thank you from the bottom of my heart for whatever you can do and keep up the gallant fight, I remain,

Respectfully yours.

Statement of Hon. Charles E. Potter, of Michigan, Before Dirksen Subcommittee of Appropriations, February 25, 1948, in Connection With Forest Service Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Dirksen subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling the Forest Service:

Gentlemen of the committee, I am appearing before you today on behalf of the State of Michigan, which at one time held an enviable position among the timber-producing States of our country. Michigan still boasts some 19 million acres of forest land, a considerable portion of which, however, is neglected second-growth timber—not because we do not recognize the need for the acceleration of research and reforestation programs but because the moneys sought in the past have not been forthcoming to the extent necessary. Within the scope of funds available, the Forest Service has done a commendable job in its established fields of endeavor also in our State.

We have in Michigan many wood-using industries which now must import much of their lumber and pulpwood. If our reforestation and other forest programs were accelerated, it would not be many years before those industries could again secure a considerable portion of their lumber from Michigan forests.

Our State of Michigan Conservation Department, with the aid of moneys made available through the Clarke-McNary fund, has been able to establish a commendable record in protecting our forests from fire. Fire losses have been something like a tenth of 1 percent of our total acreage. It is hoped that no reduction will be made in the fund as set up in the budget.

We have some 30 forest districts of which Michigan finances 24, the other six being Norris-Doxey districts where foresters provide assistance and technical advice to farmers who are woodland owners and thus encourage better wood management. These six districts receive 50 percent of their financing funds from the Government under the Norris-Doxey Act of 1937. Expansion of this technical advice to the other 24 districts is badly needed. We have 181,000 small owners whose total forest ownership equals seven and three quarter millions of acres—a very significant proportion of the total forest area in our State. Adoption of progressive cutting practices on this area would do much to safeguard the future of our timber supply and industries. An expansion of the Norris-Doxey program would be of immense help in accomplishing this. I, therefore, urge that budget figures for farm and other private forestry activities be increased.

The development of research centers under Federal leadership, and in cooperation with the State agencies, is one of the important steps in getting the basic facts we need to solve our very vexing forestry problems. We appreciate the fact that this program has been favorably considered on a national basis by your committee in the past. We feel, however, that we ought to expand the plan rapidly. I want to stress particularly that a research center for central and southern Michigan is badly needed. We can assure the committee that if one is established, it will get the warmest support and cooperative assistance from existing State agencies—the Michigan Department of Conservation, its universities and colleges.

We are also interested in establishing for the Lake States a field utilization service unit to work with the Madison Laboratory and our Lake States Experiment Station at St. Paul. Our reasons for this support are based on reports from other territories on the usefulness of such a unit and the contention of our industrial groups that the work of the Madison Laboratory can be brought to the attention of the wood industries by the activities of a utilization service unit. It is also a responsibility of this unit to bring the problems of the industry to the attention of the laboratory for solution.

To date, the Lake States is the only major timber-producing area that has been denied such a utilization service unit. In this connection, I respectfully call your committee's attention to the testimony on behalf of such a unit presented by Dr. Grover C. Dillman, president of the Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Houghton, Mich., during the Forest Service hearings of March 1945. Your attention is also directed to the correspondence from Dr. Dillman and Prof. Hereford Garland, director of the forest products research division of the same college, which I referred to Mr. DIRKSEN under date of February 2, 1948.

The cost of establishing such service is minor indeed compared to the billions we are appropriating for overseas relief and rehabilitation. It is, therefore, respectfully asked that an appropriation of $30,000 be earmarked for the establishment of a forest utilization service unit for the Lake States area even though it may mean the budget figure be increased by this amount.

If we continue to supply foreign countries with the fruits of our natural resources, it certainly becomes of greatest necessity that we do everything possible to conserve and further develop those resources. Foresight is better than hindsight—also in the field of forest conservation. Too long have we economized on forest-conservation programs. Our children may well some day denounce us for our foolish economy.

Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which I heard given by Mr. Wendell Noble on Newscope. I thought this such a fine article that I wrote Mr. Noble requesting that he send a copy to me and I would like the entire membership of this Congress to read this quotation:

YOUTH

Youth is not a time of life. It is a state of mind. It is not a matter of ripe cheeks, red lips, and supple knees. It is a temper of the will, a quality of the imagination, a vigor of the emotions. It is a freshness of the deep things in life.

Youth means a temperamental predominance of courage over timidity, of the appetite for adventure over love of ease And this often exists in a man of 50 more than in a youth of 20.

Nobody grows old merely by living a number of years. People grow old only by deserting their ideals. Years wrinkle the skin, but to give up enthusiasm wrinkles the soul. Worry, doubt, self-distrust, fear, and despair—these are the long, long years that bow the head and turn the growing spirit back to dust.

Whether 70 or 17, there is in every being's heart the love of wonder, the sweet amazement of the stars and starlike things and thoughts, the undaunted challenge of events, the unfailing childlike appetite for what next, and the jog and game of life.

You are as young as your faith, as old as your doubt, as young as your self-confidence, as old as your fears, as young as your hope, as old as our despair.

In the central place of our heart there is a wireless station. So long as it receives messages of beauty, hope, cheer, courage, grandeur, and power from the earth, from man, and from the infinite, so long are you young. But when the wires are all down, and the central place of your heart is covered with the snows of pessimism and the ice of cynicism, then you are grown old—very old, indeed. And may God have mercy on your soul.—ANONYMOUS.

The Powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the Washington newspapers of the past few days have carried the news that President Truman's aides doubt that he has authority to commit American forces to Holy Land use. This discussion raises the very question that has been uppermost in my mind throughout the years that universal military service and universal military training have been before Congress for consideration. I have studied this issue for many years and the practically unlimited powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States under our Constitution is one of the main points on which I have always based my opposition to compulsory and universal military service as a peacetime policy while at the same time I vigorously support universal military training.

Many years ago I searched the writings of recognized authorities in this field to determine what powers the President can exercise as Commander in Chief of

the armed forces and I included some of my findings in my arguments against compulsory military service in peacetime. I will set out here a portion of my previous discussion from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1946, in the hope that my discussion on this point may be of some help to Congress and to President Truman in their study and consideration of this important issue:

This point in my analysis of this legislation has to do with the division of powers between the President and the people as represented by Congress. Selective service places men in the armed forces of the United States. Universal military training does not. Selective service brings men as soldiers and sailors involuntarily within the command of the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces. This power over all men in our Nation is very essential in wartime, but it should be carefully examined and thoroughly understood before it is adopted as a peacetime policy.

I have been impressed with the wide divergence of views with reference to the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States in peacetime. It is extremely important at this time that we examine as carefully and thoroughly as possible the extent of these powers. At the outset of my search for information, I was very much impressed when I found in reading the book, The Making of the Constitution, page 530, by Charles Warren, the following statement:

"On August 27, 1787, another power suggested by the committee was granted to the President, without debate (so far as appears from Madison's notes) that of 'Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States.' Such a power had been vested in the State Governors in practically all the State constitutions; and in some the Governor had few powers or functions other than military."

That is why they did not debate the matter very thoroughly in the Constitutional Convention. So going back to the Constitutional Convention you cannot find any very great light on the division of power between the President and the Congress in the matter of national defense. The wording of the Constitution, of course, is quite general.

I was very much impressed in reading the annotations of the Constitution of the United States to find so few references therein to discussions of the peacetime power by our Supreme Court. In some of these cases, the statement is made that Congress has the power not only to raise and support and govern armies but to declare war and that it has therefore the power to provide by law for carrying on war. The Court in these cases states further that the command of forces and the conduct of campaigns are powers derived from the Constitution, but inasmuch as neither is defined by that instrument, their extent must be determined by their nature and by the principles of our institutions. The Court states also that the power to make the necessary laws is in Congress and the power to execute is in the President, and each includes all authority essential to its due exercise "but neither can the President, in war more than in peace, intrude upon the proper authority of Congress, nor Congress upon the proper authority of the President" (*Ex parte Milligan* (4 Wall. 2, 139 (1866)); *Swaim v. United States* (28 C. Cls. 173, 221 (1893)), affirmed 165 U. S. 553 (1897)).

I have made a very brief search for authoritative statements with particular reference to the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States in time of peace. My purpose in making this small contribution to the discussion at this time is to impress upon the House the importance of the full exercise at this time of such powers as the House may wish to exercise in restricting the power of the President.

Prof. Edward S. Corwin, on the President's Control of Foreign Relations, states:

"I conclude that the Presidential power under survey (the right to perform acts of war without congressional authorization where the question is as to his right to take measures which are technically acts of war in protection of American rights abroad) is somewhat analogous to the so-called right of self-preservation at international law. Theoretically the power is a defensive power and reserved for grave and sudden emergencies. Practically, the limit to it is to be found in the powers of Congress and public opinion."

Elihu Root, in a famous debate in the Senate in 1912, had the following statement to make:

"In my judgment, there is no law which forbids the President to send troops of the United States out of this country into any country where he considers it to be his duty as Commander in Chief of the Army to send them, unless it be for the purpose of making war, which, of course, he cannot do.

"Doubtless, Congress could by law forbid the troops being sent out of the country; doubtless Congress has not done it; and I apprehend that any Congress which undertook to do it would find a general protest from the people of the United States against depriving the Commander in Chief of the Army of the power to protect our citizens under those circumstances which exist widely throughout the world, in countries whose governments have not the power to maintain order within their jurisdiction. From time immemorial it has been the practice of civilized nations to send troops into those countries whose governments were too feeble or too ill-organized, too deficient in power to enforce their laws and protect foreigners."

This has primarily to do, of course, with protecting our own citizens abroad.

Prof. Clarence A. Berdahl, in his book, War Powers of the Executive in the United States, has the following to say:

"An eminent authority (Elihu Root) thinks that Congress could probably by law forbid the troops being sent out of the jurisdiction of the United States in time of peace; but in time of war the authority of the President is recognized as being absolute as to where the war is to be conducted, whether to await the onslaughts of the enemy and wage a purely defensive war within the boundaries of the United States, or to send the armed forces of the United States out of the country to carry on an offensive war in the enemy territory, in the territory of an ally, or perhaps even in the territory of a neutral."

William Howard Taft, in one of his lectures on Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers, had the following to say:

"The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and the militia when called into the service of the United States. Under this he can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation. Of course, the instrumentality which this power furnishes, gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that it would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect. Under the Constitution, only Congress has the power to declare war, but with the Army and the Navy, the President can take action such as to involve the country in war and to leave Congress no option but to declare it or to recognize its existence. This was the charge made against President Polk in beginning the Mexican War. War as a legal fact, it was decided by the Supreme Court in prize cases, can exist by invasion of this country by a foreign enemy or by such an insurrection as occurred during the Civil War, without any declaration of war by Congress at all, and it is only in the case of a war of our aggression against a foreign country that the power of Congress must be affirmatively asserted to establish its legal existence.

"What constitutes an act of war by the land or naval forces of the United States is sometimes a nice question of law and fact. It really seems to differ with the character of the nation whose relations with the United States are affected. The unstable condition as to law and order of some of the Central American republics seems to create different rules of international law from those that obtain in governments that can be depended upon to maintain their own peace and order. It has been frequently necessary for the President to direct the landing of Naval Marines from United States vessels in Central America to protect the American consulate and American citizens and their property. He has done this under his general power as Commander in Chief. It grows not out of any specific act of Congress but out of that obligation, inferable from the Constitution, of the Government to protect the rights of an American citizen against foreign aggression, as in the Kotza incident, cited by Mr. Justice Miller in the Neagle case. In practice the use of the Naval Marines for such a purpose has become so common that their landing is treated as a mere local police measure, whereas if troops of the Regular Army are used for such a purpose, it seems to take on the color of an act of war.

"Thus it would be difficult to explain the landing of our Army in Vera Cruz by force as anything but an act of war to punish the government of Huerta in Mexico for its refusal to render what was deemed by President Wilson as a proper apology for a violation of our international rights in the arrest of some of our sailors. This act was committed before authority was given by Congress, but the necessary authority for it had passed one House and was passing another at the time, and the question as to the right of the Executive to take the action without congressional authority was avoided by full and immediate ratification.

"In Nicaragua in my administration an insurrection had led to the immurement of American citizens by insurrectos and the threatened destruction of American property. The President of Nicaragua, whom we had recognized and whose minister we had received, called upon us to protect our own citizens and their property because he was unable to render them the protection which their treaty rights gave them. This led to the landing of marines, and quite a campaign, which resulted in the maintenance of law and order and the elimination of the insurrectos. This was not an act of war because it was done at the request and with the consent of the lawful authorities of the territory where it took place."

The Importance of Farm Parity Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, after a long program of farm support prices, recently we have witnessed a tremendous nose-dive in the prices of farm commodities. Were it not for the support program, in all probability the nose-dive of 2 weeks ago could have led us on to genuine danger.

We have now seen conclusively the value of the parity program, especially on farm products. We must ever be mindful of the fact that only with a satisfactory price on farm products will the prices of industriel products, wages of labor, and so forth, have a permanent setting. Everything is dependent upon the farm.

With the thought in mind that perhaps there are some Members of Congress and many citizens in the country not thoroughly familiar with how the farm parity works, I am including herewith an article taken from the United States News of February 27, dealing with the technical aspect of how the farm parity program works:

WE'VE BEEN ASKED HOW FARM PARITY PROGRAM WORKS

The prices of many farm commodities must be supported by the Government at 90 percent of "parity." This support can be extended by the Government to almost any product of the country's farms. The power to support prices runs until January 1, 1949. Before Congress goes home it will be pressed to extend the price-support program to January 1, 1950, with chances strongly favoring such an extention.

Many questions are raised about price supports as a result of the recent break in prices of several farm commodities. There are questions about the definition of parity. Other questions relate to how the Government may fulfill its obligation to support prices, and to the exact commodities that either are being supported or may be supported.

Costs of supports can run into big figures if a farm price decline continues. That cost will fall on taxpayers who, in effect, are committed to underwriting a minimum level of farm income. If prices go on declining taxpayer pressure will be on the side of ending or modifying the Government commitment to uphold farm prices. Pressure from farming regions, however, will be on the side of continuing controls, and probably broader controls. The result could be a planned operation of the agricultural industry in the future.

Just what is parity price? Parity is the price of a bushel of wheat or corn, or of a unit of some other commodity, that will return to the farmer the same volume of things that he buys as it would have returned back in an earlier period, usually 1910–14. It is a sort of purchasing-power guaranty. And, of course, parity prices of various farm products can rise or fall from time to time as the cost of things a farmer buys rises and falls. The parity figure and the price-support level for a commodity usually are fixed at the beginning of the marketing year. In some cases these stand for the entire support period, in others they are revised to reflect changes.

Does Government guarantee parity? It does not guarantee full parity. The guarantee is to support five "basic" commodities at 90 percent of parity and a sixth, cotton, at 92.5 percent of parity all through 1948. A simple act of Congress can extend that guaranty beyond 1948. The guaranty also is to support 14 other so-called Steagall commodities at 90 percent of parity. The Government asked farmers to increase production of these commodities during the war emergency. In addition, the Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to support, in his discretion, the prices of almost any farm commodities with available funds.

What commodities are affected? Basic commodities in the price-support program are corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts for nuts, and rice. Steagall commodities are hogs, eggs, chickens, turkeys, milk, butterfat, dry peas, dry edible beans, soybeans for oil, peanuts for oil, flaxseed for oil, American-Egyptian cotton, potatoes, and sweetpotatoes. Support for wool also is mandatory.

Cattle need not be supported, but can be. Support programs for other farm commodities, which the Secretary of Agriculture can support in his discretion, already are announced for this year or were in effect last year. These include dried fruits, flax, hemp, certain seed, sugar beets, sugarcane, rosin and turpentine, grain sorghums, and tung oil.

How are prices supported? Two methods are used. The first is to make loans to farmers, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, at the guaranteed price. If the price goes up, the farmer can pay off the loan with interest, and sell the commodity at the higher market price. If the price goes down, the farmer can let the Government have the commodity, but he keeps the money he got through the loan and pays no interest.

The second method of price support is Government purchase of products at the guaranteed price. These purchases can be made directly from the farmer, who sometimes stores the commodity on his farm or delivers it to a warehouse or to the Government. Also, the Government can buy farm products through dealers, cooperative associations, processors, and others.

Can the Government buy directly in the markets? Yes. The CCC can go into the commodity markets to buy farm products at anytime. These purchases can be either to support falling prices or to acquire commodities for foreign export or for other purposes. Thus, if a commodity began to fall below the support level, CCC would be likely to buy on the market in a move to check this decline. At the same time, it also might make direct purchases or loans so that producers could withhold this commodity from the market. Sometimes purchases might have the double purpose of holding prices at support levels and filling the Government's need for certain commodities.

How are loans made? CCC can make loans directly to farmers. But often it allows a farmer to make arrangements for a loan from a bank or other lending agency, with a supported commodity as collateral. Then the CCC guarantees the loan, assuring the lender 100-percent protection against a loss. Details of making loans vary for the several support programs.

Who bears any loss? The Government, and the taxpayer finally. But, in some cases, commodities bought by the Government through price-support programs have been resold later without a loss. The war gave the Government the opportunity to dispose of quantities of cotton and grains without having to take expected losses. Some recent loses have been taken in supporting the prices of such commodities as wool and potatoes. Losses could rise and amount to big sums if the Government bought large supplies of commodities to support prices, and later should be forced to sell at less than the buying prices.

How does the Government dispose of these commodities? The Government can sell to foreign governments, or to United States agencies, for relief abroad. It can direct these commodities into such channels as school-lunch programs. There are some restrictions, however, against returning commodities to competitive markets at less than the original support prices paid by the Government. That is, they cannot be dumped on the domestic markets.

How are price supports financed? The Commodity Credit Corporation, which finances most of the price-support program, has authority to spend or lend more than $5,000,000,000. Some of this already is tied up, but Congress from time to time appropriates money for the agency to finance specific programs. For example, the Department of Agriculture's appropriations each year specify that a certain amount of customs receipts shall be used for farm programs. These include purchase of commodities for school lunches, diversion to new uses or new markets, and for humane purposes. Purchase of these products also can be made an additional step in supporting farm prices.

The Government, thus, has far-reaching powers that can be used to support farm commodities against sharp price declines. Greater use of these powers may be called for this year. But Congress will decide whether to continue the price-support program—and in what form—after 1948.

How Can Peace Be Maintained in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 10 it was my privilege to have appeared on Town Meeting at Philadelphia along with Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, a former Member of this House and Messrs. Cecil Hourani and Moshe Shertok. Our topic for debate was How Can Peace Be Maintained In Palestine. Pursuant to permission already granted I am inserting the opening statements by my colleagues and myself made at that meeting and the opening remarks by the moderator, Mr. George V. Denny:

During my freshman days at college, sophomores studying physics used to put this question to us: "Do you know what happens when an irresistible force meets an immovable body?"

I puzzled for along time over this question until somebody told me the answer. The answer was: An inconceivable smash.

On November 29, 1947, the United Nations, led by the United States and Soviet Russia, rendered its decision on the partition of Palestine, which was designed to prevent an inconceivable smash between the irresistible force of Zionism and the immovable position of the Arabs. Your Town Meeting has devoted several programs to the Palestine question during the past few years, and we turn to it again tonight as we approach the eventful day when the British occupation ends and the power of the United Nations to keep the peace will meet its first real test.

Authorities on this subject differ greatly over the possible outcome. Should the proposed new Jewish state in Palestine be allowed to work out its own salvation in the face of the threats of the Arabs not to accept the United Nations decision? Or, should the United States and Russia, through the instrumentality of the United Nations, having taken the lead in the partition action, send in troops to keep the peace?

What should be done now to prevent the present clashes from breaking out into full-fledged warfare?

Our first speaker tonight has been the head of the political department of the Jewish Agency in Palestine since 1933. He was only 11 years old when his parents took him to Palestine to live in a purely Arabian village not far from Jerusalem. He completed his education after the First World War at the

London School of Economics. Then he returned to Palestine to become assistant editor of Davar, a Hebrew labor daily. During World War II he was responsible for the recruiting of over 20,000 volunteers in Palestine for the service in the armies of the United Nations. It is a pleasure to welcome back to Town Meeting, Mr. Moshe Shertok. Mr. Shertok. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERTOK. A discussion of the Palestine problem today cannot be gained from fundamentals. The problem has been discussed inside out for years past. For fully 8 months, it was under examination by the United Nations. The solution urged by the Arabs that the whole of Palestine should become an Arab state with the Jews remaining forever a minority under Arab rule was rejected just as it had been rejected by the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations throughout its existence, by the British Royal Commission in 1937, and by the Anglo-American Commission in 1947.

On the other hand, the United Nations were unable to accept the solution advocated by the Jews. The Jewish immigration and settlement proceeded unchecked until the whole of Palestine became a Jewish state. What the United Nations Special Committee recommended and what they essentially approved with a majority of two-thirds plus seven was a compromise solution to divide Palestine in two and to set up two states, one Arab and one Jewish.

The Jews have accepted the compromise. The Arabs are trying to defeat it by bloodshed. They are out to enforce their own solution, the one which the Assembly has rejected, by methods which the Charter condemns.

When the question of peace in Palestine is now posed, it must not be forgotten that peace and justice are inseparable. The verdict of international justice has most authoritatively been pronounced. It decreed the reestablishment of the Jewish state and the admission of the Jewish people as an equal partner to the family of nations.

The Jewish state is to embrace only a fraction, exactly one-eighth, of the area originally set aside for the Jewish National Home. In the remainder one Arab state already exists and another, the eighth Arab state of the Middle East, is to be set up.

If this settlement is implemented, stability and peace will eventually prevail. The very existence of the Jewish state will compel the acceptance of the fact by its neighbor, while its own self-interest will force it to seek friendly contacts with them.

But if the decision is flaunted, if the Arab states set out to crush the long-cherished hope of the Jews for independence by brutal force, the Jews will never submit. They will defend every square foot of the territory assigned to them by the United Nations. Volunteers will rush to their help from all countries where Jews live.

Above all, the authority of the United Nations will suffer a shattering blow and the peace of the world will be endangered by the collapse of the international machinery for settling disputes.

The issue is one of burning urgency. So far, the Jews of Palestine have withstood the onslaught. Every attack on their settlements was beaten off with heavy losses to their attackers. In military prowess, in organization, and in tactics, the Jewish settlers have proved greatly superior to their adversaries.

The boomerang effects of the aggression on the economic condition of the Arab population have been disastrous, but the odds against the Jews are mounting, encouraged by the United Nations passivity, the invasion of Palestine by bands from outside is proceeding apace.

The British Government, out to obstruct and defeat the United Nations plan, continues to supply arms to the Arab states, prevents the Jews from importing arms by sea blockade, and disarms the Jewish defenders inside the country. The effect of the British policy is to enclose the Jews in a death trap.

Defenselessness invites aggression. Let the Jews be enabled to acquire arms for their defense and to set up their militia—that is a first condition. But in the face of concerted Arab aggression from outside, their force alone may not suffice.

Moreover, the target of attack is United Nations authority, not only the Jews. The United Nations decision was adopted in the teeth of very violent threats to defy it. Now that the threats are materializing, the challenge must be taken up by the nations of the world.

The difficulty of setting up an international force is nothing as compared with the crisis which the world will eventually have to face if the Jews are left to fight it out alone with all the hordes converging on them from all sides.

Responsibility is in the habit of pursuing those who flee from it and avenging itself on those who shirk it. Failure to undertake even a slight effort of prevention may in the end entail an extremely costly cure.

Whatever happens, the Jews of Palestine will not retreat and the Jews of the world will not let them down. But it is up to the great international organization to uphold its decision if it wants to survive. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Mr. Shertok. Our next speaker is a graduate of Oxford University in England, who taught for 2 years at the American University at Beyrouth, and held a commission in the British Army from 1943 to 1946 when he was elected secretary of the Arab Office in Washington, which position he now holds. I take pleasure in welcoming to our platform, Mr. Cecil Hourani. Mr. Hourani. [Applause.]

Mr. HOURANI. Mr. Shertok has argued that peace can be maintained in Palestine by implementation of the United Nations plan to partition Palestine. My first remark is that the question should have been, "How can peace be restored in Palestine?" because today there is no peace there. There has been none ever since November 29 when United Nations made the recommendation which more and more people are coming to realize was a mistake—the recommendation to cut up tiny Palestine into an Arab state, a Jewish state, and an international regime for Jerusalem.

Why did the United Nations recommendation to partition Palestine disturb the peace so gravely that more than 1,000 people have already been killed there? Because the decision was taken against the wishes and interests of the vast majority of the population of the country who are the Arabs.

The Arabs refuse to accept partition for the same reason that you American citizens would refuse to agree to the establishment of a non-American State on any portion of your territory, or would refuse to allow any section of your population to secede from the majority and establish its own sovereign State.

Senator MAGNUSON, you will remember that when the Southern States of your American Union tried to secede, you did not allow them to. Imagine that the movement for secession had been financed from outside, that its purpose had been to allow thousands of foreigners to come into the country to change it from being an American land into something else. You will then understand exactly why the Arabs object to partition.

Partition is a gesture of despair, not of hope. It separates, instead of bringing together. It erects new walls between peoples at a time when mankind is striving to break down barriers.

Many delegations in the United Nations, including that of the United States, voted for partition, because they had been led to believe that it would bring peace to Palestine. Events have proved that they were mistaken. What has happened since partition was recommended is far worse than what was happening before, or what would have happened had partition been defeated.

The United Nations recommendation only inflamed the hopes of the Jews on the one hand, and enraged the Arabs on the other. The result is the present bloodshed.

It should have been obvious to the United Nations that partition could never succeed, unless a considerable section of both Arabs and Jews were prepared to accept it. That has proved not to be the case. There are many Jews and even many Zionists who do not accept partition, and the entire Arab population of Palestine, without exception, as well as the entire Arab and Moslem worlds, rejects partition. Not one Arab has been found who will have anything to do with it.

Partition, therefore, could only be implemented by the use of force against the Arabs. But that defeats its whole purpose—which was to bring peace. To send an international police force to Palestine to implement partition would be like asking a man, who has put a bomb in a house and blown up half of it, to come along with another bomb and repair the damage. All he could do would be to blow up the rest of the house.

What is needed now is not arms and police forces, but a new approach. Mr. Shertok, you have painted a picture of the Arabs in revolt against the United Nations, and you have argued that the future of this organization depends upon the implementation of partition. If you will allow me to say so, that is a false picture. It is not the Arabs who are attacking the United Nations. It is the United Nations which has made a recommendation, which if implemented would rob the Arabs of Palestine of more than half of their country.

The United Nations would not be destroyed if it has the moral courage to admit an error. It will only be destroyed if it insists in a course of action which has now been shown was made on false assumptions. If the United Nations now tries to implement partition by force, it will be adding oil to the flames of violence in Palestine instead of putting them out.

Since the United States of America took the lead in pushing partition through the United Nations, she should now take the lead in helping the United Nations to reconsider and reverse its decision before it is too late. This it can do—

1. By refusing to send her troops or to take the initiative in the formation of an international force to coerce the Arabs of Palestine.

2. By refusing to allow arms or ammunition or money to go to Palestine to be used in acts of violence.

3. By taking the initiative in referring the problem back to the United Nations for reconsideration, and then supporting a unitary solution which really takes into account the interest of all the people of Palestine, the majority of whom do not accept partition. Once partition is dead, peace can be restored to Palestine. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Mr. Hourani. Now we're going to hear from the senior Senator from the State of Washington, a Democrat, the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, a veteran of World War II, who was elected to the Senate in 1944, after having served four consecutive terms as a Member of the House of Representatives. Welcome back to Town Meeting, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON. [Applause.]

Senator MAGNUSON. Thank you, Mr. Denny. Dr. Hourani, in his discussion, stated that the situation in Palestine now was somewhat like the situation here in America, when several States tried to secede from the Union. It's true, Dr. Hourani, we did not allow those States to do that. We fought a war over that, because we had formed within the Constitution, the United States.

Now, in an effort, in an attempt to achieve world peace, we have formed the United Nations. [Applause.] The United Nations have made a decision. He suggests a reconsideration. Why, this Palestine matter has been reconsidered, not once but 500 times. [Applause.]

I believe that the United Nations should enforce its decisions just as surely as we did [applause]—just as surely as we did when we fought a war, to keep this Nation and the United States intact.

Now, a few days ago, the world was shocked by the assassination of its most peace-loving citizen. Today, the Hebrews in Palestine are practically as defenseless against possible extermination as was India's great leader.

In Palestine today, violence, bloodshed, and murder are the order of the day. Yet there are police forces in Palestine. There are troops in Palestine, but any semblance of order is rapidly disappearing.

The British are surrendering their mandate on May 15. That's about 90 days from now. That is the date set to proceed in full scale, again, with some of Hitler's old tricks.

Time is slipping away fast. There is a strong possibility that within 90 days, unless we do something, we might witness all the stakes in Palestine washed away in blood.

What are those stakes? They're the stakes, Dr. Hourani, of 800,000 Hebrew pioneers, and the lives of hundreds of thousands of peaceful and innocent Arabs who will also fall victims to this bloody conspiracy.

But more is involved. At stake is the future of the United Nations and the honor and the faith of the United States of America and all 52 other nations. [Applause.]

The Hebrews of Palestine have no arms or ammunition except for the paltry arsenals of the underground groups. The United States has refused to allow materials of war to go to either Hebrew or Arabs. But we imposed this embargo after we transferred to the Arab league states $37,000,000 worth of surplus war materials and nothing to the Jews. Quantities of British arms are being supplied to the Arabs. Warfare of this kind would clearly mean annihilation.

There are many reasons why warfare of this kind must be averted in Palestine. Among the most important is this: The coming partition of Palestine was the first major decision ever made by the United Nations. What happens in Palestine will be the test. Destroy that decision and we will diminish a thousandfold the chances of ever making any United Nations decision stick. [Applause.]

Americans, particularly those Americans who have followed the long, torturous, and sometimes confusing struggle of the Hebrews for a national homeland support the United Nations compromise because they believe it is justice. They know that the Arabs have seven states in the Middle East alone; that the Hebrews whose national territory is Palestine have none. They want peace maintained. So we should make two things completely clear tonight.

First, the Hebrews of Palestine are asking only for one thing: The opportunity to defend their own lives in their own country. I propose that we give them that chance by lifting the embargo as long as the other side has arms.

We might guarantee a well-regulated militia that might be necessary to the security of a free state. The right of people to keep and bear arms that shall not be infringed is one of the tenets of our own American democracy—one of the things that you people here in Philadelphia know so well; one of the things in which you have many national shrines.

Second, we should call on the United Nations to make its first order of business the enforcing of peace in the Middle East. The United Nations must demonstrate that it will not be bamboozled or black-mailed by a wanton band of mercenaries who answer the solemn decision of the world with threats of warfare, and, even today, in the newspaper suggested that on the 15th of this month that may happen.

How? By using America's moral force within the United Nations to uphold our promise to all the nations that join with us in this decent attempt to form a world peace. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Senator MAGNUSON. Now, let's switch to the other branch of our National Legislature and hear from Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH, a Republican, from Racine, Wis.; a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; a veteran of World War I; and a national executive committeeman of the American Legion. Congressman SMITH. [Applause.]

Congressman SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Denny. Mr. Shertok says we can't begin now to discuss the fundamental issues in this controversy; that we can't turn back now. He and Senator MAGNUSON advocate armed conflict. That's war. This is the essence of their argument:

I believe that peace is impossible for Palestine under partition. This fact is obvious to all. The action by the United Nations Assembly will fail, (1) because it is unfair and lacks moral justification; (2) because it lacks legal authority.

I take no partisan position on this question. I contend for a principle. If the position of the parties were reversed, Mr. Hourani, my argument would be the same.

As a nation, we have always stood for fair play. Partition as recommended by the United Nations Assembly ignores the wishes of two-thirds of the people who live there and who are Arabs and they, incidentally, have been in Palestine for 1,300 years. [Applause.]

The records of the Assembly meetings fail to indicate that any effort was made to bring the Arab and the Jew together; no suggestion as to a middle ground which might provide a working plan. This in spite of the stated objectives of the United Nations Charter to exercise the principles of justice when a breach of peace threatened.

Our Nation has always carried the torch for equal rights and self-determination. Not so long ago, President Truman said, "We shall approve no territorial changes in any part of the world unless they accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

In view of this language, Senator MAGNUSON, how can the United States now approve a partition which denies the principle of self-determination?

High-level Government officials and influential private citizens are reported to have exerted considerable pressure for the adoption of the partition scheme. Congress has a responsibility to investigate this situation. I hope it will, so the integrity of the United States may be protected and, Senator, I hope you will join in this request.

Now, by what legal authority did the Assembly act? In effect, it recommended the establishment of an independent state which shall forever be under the jurisdiction of the United Nations administration. The functions of government are not in the people who live there. Permanent sovereignty is in the hands of a joint economic board without responsibility to the people.

Peace cannot be secured under these circumstances. If the parties refuse to cooperate, then blood-shed and violence will continue until the rights of the people are recognized.

I repeat again that the partition of Palestine lacks moral justification and legal authority, and it is contrary to the American spirit of fair play. Already, the United States is being asked to lift the embargo on arms. Next will come the request for our military services. Yet, it was the understanding that partition was to be achieved without resort to force.

A request for military force will be made to Russia, also. Now this means war—nothing less. It will place Russia in the Middle East where she has aimed to go for centuries, and here lies our national interest.

The danger—yes, the threat—to our oil supplies is obvious to everybody. Our policies in Greece and in Turkey are likewise in jeopardy. Secretary Forrestal recently called attention to that situation.

We are spending billions of dollars to stop the march of communism in western Europe, under the Truman doctrine. We have tried to keep the door locked against communism in Greece and in Turkey. In Palestine, we open the door wide and invite them in.

It is common knowledge that Communists are infiltrating into Palestine. The old Trojan horse technique is in operation again. All this is a part of the scheme to put Russia in the Mediterranean without firing a shot.

Time is running out, but it is not too late for reasonable men on both sides of this controversy to work out a compromise. This is a job for the United Nations. If it fails, there is little hope that it can survive the stormy years ahead. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Congressman SMITH.

Gift Loans to Europe Mean Big Commissions to Ex-New Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, George Washington, the Father of our Nation, warned in his Farewell Address against the "insidious wiles of foreign influence." He advised us to be "constantly awake" toward such influence and he asserted that "the great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible."

Today, I want to warn the Congress against the insidious wiles of Americans who have sold themselves and their country out to foreign influence. They are not in Paris, in Rome, in Berlin, or in London. They are right here in Washington, born in America and nurtured in our traditions. Yet, like the American Communists who recently were indicted for refusing to answer questions before a congressional committee, somewhere along the pathway of life these other Americans either have cynically decided to sell out the United States or have been hoodwinked by cleverer men.

I am sure that many Members of Congress have seen in the Washington Times-Herald of recent date the names of these Americans who have succumbed to the insidious wiles of foreigners and have sold their birthright for what amounts to a mess of pottage. On February 19, 1948, under the heading "Ex-New Dealers now work for nations seeking United States aid," there was a

list of former Goverment officials registered with the Department of Justice as foreign agents. On February 21, 1948, under the heading "Currie among ex-New Dealers prospering as foreign agents," there appeared another list.

Reading these two articles, the authenticity of which cannot be questioned, we see the names of the following former officials of the Federal Government among those listed with the Department of Justice, as required by law, as agents of foreign governments:

Lauchlin Currie, formerly one of the nine young men with a "passion for anonymity," who resigned his post as administrative assistant in the White House in June 1945 for "urgent personal considerations." He was making $10,000 a year on the Federal pay roll. Now, as a director of Robert Nathan and Associates, he is listed as representing Poland and France, while his association with the Inter-American Construction Co. entitles him to a listing among agents of Argentina, which Government paid Inter-American $1,100,820 in advance for services to be rendered.

Included in the list is the name of Robert Nathan, a long-time advocate of planned economy, who is using the knowledge of Government finance he acquired under the New Deal for the advancement of the French and Polish Governments in return for fees as high as $20,000 for 6 weeks' work.

On down the list is the name of Oscar Cox, who used to be a buddy of Harry Hopkins, had ready access to the White House for years during the regime of Franklin D. Rooseveit, and was classified as a lend-lease expert. Cox must have been really an expert on lend-lease, for he is hard at work for, and is being well paid for his work, in behalf of Costa Rica, France, and Italy.

Harry Dexter White, who never has objected to being described as "the father of the international monetary fund," and who for years served as assistant to Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, is on the Department of Justice list as a representative of the Bank of Mexico—at a stipend of $18,000 annually.

Randolph Feltus, formerly also on the staff of the United States Treasury and a favorite of the pinks around Washington and New York, picked up a $20,000 fee in 1947 for services rendered during the time when that Soviet satellite was attempting to get $600,000 from Uncle Sam in the form of a gift-loan. Feltus probably had a lot to do with the maneuvering of the recent, but not yet announced, decision of the World Bank to lend Poland millions of dollars to renovate its coal mines so that, in case of another war, the Russians will have plenty of fuel to power their industry to make guns and tanks to kill American boys.

On Feltus' pay roll is one Robert T. Miller, who was permitted to resign from the Department of State in 1946, and whose name appears often on the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

On the list also are the names of John W. Pehle and Lawrence S. Lesser, who resigned from the United States Treasury in 1946. They now represent France and Rumania, both trying to take money away from the American taxpayer and give it to European interests.

Everywhere you turn, when you hear about attempts to get American money funneled into foreign pockets, Mr. Speaker, you run into the law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb. Not long ago, you will recall, Dean Acheson, one of the darlings of the Truman administration, was in the State Department as an Under Secretary. He resigned a few weeks ago and now represents many foreign governments. No wonder, less than a month ago, he appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and endorsed the so-called Marshall plan down to the dotting of an "i" and the crossing of a "t."

Mr. Acheson, it will be recalled, was in the Department of State during the time this Federal Government gave or loaned more than $1,600,000,000 to Russia, or Russian satellite countries, according to Senate Document No. 112, issued December 15, 1947. Yet, in that same period Mr. Acheson must have known of the Nazi-Soviet collaboration recently bared by the Department of State, and, although he may plead stupidity, he could not possibly have been so stupid as not to have guessed that Russia was going to play us for every dime she could get and then tell us, in effect, to go to hell.

What did Mr. Acheson do to protect America from being double-crossed by Russia? You know the answer to that one. He did nothing. But, behind the scenes, the law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb were busy getting every kind of fee possible out of all the countries possible to funnel all the American money and goods possible out of the United States and into the foreign nations.

Besides Mr. Acheson, let me name some more names in that law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb. I feel very keenly, Mr. Speaker, that Congress ought to subpena every member of that law firm when the so-called Marshall plan is before our Foreign Affairs Committee, and question them closely about all the money they have made in propagandizing and lobbying and finagling to get American money and materials into the hands of Russia and Russian satellite countries.

On the foreign registration files are the names of Edward G. Burling and John G. Laylin. Burling, formerly of the Immigration Service, and Laylin, formerly of the Treasury Department, are members of the law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb.

Looking further through the list, you find the name of Donald Hiss, a brother of Alger Hiss, who also is connected with Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb. Donald Hiss is a former State Department legal adviser and an active member of the Washington Committee of Democratic Action.

Altogether, so far as I know, the firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, and its various partners, represent, or have represented at times, the Governments of Iran, Poland, Denmark, and Greece. By now the firm probably has picked up a few more clients among foreign nations as a result of Mr. Acheson's all-out endorsement of the Marshall plan, or the so-called European recovery plan.

Mr. Speaker, if George Washington were alive today and serving as President and heard of former officials of his Government serving foreign governments here as lobbyists and propagandists and agents, he would rebuke them in stinging terms. If the veterans of America, the millions of farmers and plain workingmen, could know of the intrigue in which these former so-called friends of the common man, took part, they would never support any measure these men endorsed in any shape, form, or fashion.

The only thing that protects these men from the scorn they rightly deserve from Americans is that it is difficult to get the news out in America. Many newspapers carry it, but not enough of them are interested in exposing the enemies of America who would sell us short. I say that we ought to be warned against the insidious wiles of foreign influence and also the insidious wiles of men who pose as Americans but are foreign agents in disguise. They will sell us out for mere cash. We must not let them betray us. We must expose them at every turn, until the people, being forewarned, can be forearmed against the insidious influence of men who would do anything for a dollar.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the aforesaid articles from the Washington Times-Herald:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 19, 1948]

EX-NEW DEALERS NOW WORK FOR NATIONS SEEKING UNITED STATES AID—JUSTICE FILES REVEAL HIGH FEES GIVEN FOR HELP CONCERNING MARSHALL PLAN

(By James Walter)

How numerous ex-New Dealers, most of them refugees from the State and Treasury Departments, are using their bureaucratic know-how to help European governments climb aboard the Marshall-plan gravy train was revealed yesterday by the Justice Department.

Files in the foreign-agents registration section of the Justice Department disclosed that scores of Roosevelt administration protegees, as well as many domestic Communists and fellow-travelers, have hired themselves out for salaries as high as $3,000 weekly to the 16 nations which are slated to share in the spoils of the European recovery program.

ROBERT NATHAN ON LIST

Top names on the list include Robert Nathan, a long-time advocate of the "planned economy" favored by Henry Wallace and the CIO; Earl Browder, temporarily deposed boss of the United States Communist Party; Oscar Cox, former White House intimate and lend-lease expert, and Alger Hiss, a protege of Dean Acheson during the latter's reign in the State Department.

Browder, despite the fact that he was ousted as top-dog United States Commie several years ago, is momentarily expected to resume leadership of the party with the personal backing of Premier Stalin. Meanwhile, Comrade Browder has listed himself as a literary advisor to the Soviet Union at a decidedly capitalistic salary.

Nathan is using the knowledge of Government finance he acquired under the New Deal for the advancement of the French and Polish Governments in return for fees as high as $20,000 for 6 months' work.

COX WORKS FOR THREE

Cox, who was buddy-buddy for years with Harry Hopkins, Roosevelt's Svengali, is hard at work for the governments of Costa Rica, France and Italy, in the last two of which Communists are particularly strong.

Harry Dexter White, who has been described as the father of the international monetary fund, and who served as an assistant to Treasury Secretary Morgenthau, pulls down $18,000 yearly from the Bank of Mexico.

Randolph Feltus, a favorite of Florida's Senator Pepper, gets $3,000 a week from France and the Netherlands governments and received additional fees from the East Indies and Borneo. He also has an expense account of $500 a week.

FELTUS' $20,000 FEE

Feltus picked up a $20,000 fee from the Polish Government in 1947 for services rendered during the time when the Soviet satellite was trying to promote a $600,000,000 loan from Uncle Sam. Feltus, in turn, has his wife, Ann, on his pay roll and also one Robert T. Miller, who was permitted to resign from the State Department in 1946, and who appears often on the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

So steady has been the stream of ex-New Dealers from Uncle Sam's pay roll to that of the Marshall plan recipients that some Government bureau chiefs fear their organizations are failing apart.

John Pehle and Lawrence S. Lesser, along with White and Feltus, resigned from the United States Treasury March 26, 1946. Pehle had been in the office of the general counsel and was Director of Foreign Funds Control from 1940 to 1944. Lesser, an attorney with the Treasury Department, joined Pehle in setting up a law firm after the pair had quit the United States Government. They currently represent France and Rumania.

Donald Hiss, a brother of Alger Hiss, also is connected with Acheson's law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb. The firm now represents Denmark, Greece, and Iran. It formerly represented Poland, too.

Donald Hiss was a former State Department legal adviser and is an active member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action. His wife is a member of the League of Women Shoppers.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 21, 1948]

CURRIE AMONG EX-NEW DEALERS PROSPERING AS FOREIGN AGENTS—AIDES BURLING AND LAYLIN ALSO ACTIVE; FULL LIST TO BE DISCLOSED NEXT WEEK

(By James Walter)

Lauchlin Currie, whose passion for anonymity helped to qualify him as one of Franklin D. Roosevelt's top administrative assistants, currently is indulging a lucrative passion for representing foreign governments in their one-way financial deals with Uncle Sam, a search of Justice Department files disclosed yesterday.

For urgent personal considerations, Currie resigned his $10,000-a-year White House post in June 1945. As a director of Robert Nathan & Associates, he is now listed as representing Poland and France, while his association with the Inter-American Construction Co. entitles him to a listing among agents of Argentina, which paid Inter-American $1,100,820 in advance for services to be rendered.

MORE NEW DEALERS LISTED

Two more former New Dealers whose names repose in the foreign-registration files are Edward B. Burling and John G. Laylin. Burling, formerly of the Immigration Service, and Laylin, formerly of the Treasury Department, are partners in the law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson, & Shorb, which represents Poland, Denmark, Greece, and Iran.

Commonly known as Dean Acheson's law firm, the aggregation specializes in arranging loans for the countries it represents through the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Representative STEFAN, of Nebraska, chairman of a subcommittee on appropriations, said last night he would make public the full list of persons registered as foreign agents in his report to Congress next Wednesday. Beyond predicting his report would be very illuminating, STEFAN declined to discuss it. From other sources it was learned the report deals with $500,000,000 in appropriations for four divisions of the Government's executive branch.

SHAFER SEES GAIN

Representative SHAFER, Republican, of Michigan, characterized the disclosure that many former New Dealers were registered as agents of foreign powers as evidence that these men have been making big business out of our foreign loan program for their own personal gain.

"It has been big business ever since we started making the loans and these disclosures merely back up what I've been saying all along," SHAFER said. "These men, Acheson, Currie, Harry D. White, Oscar Cox, Randolph Feltus, John W. Pehle, Donald Hiss, Nathan, and others, have turned our foreign aid program into big business at great personal gain."

Meanwhile, Capitol Hill puzzled last night over how a Washington lawyer, Martin Popper, of 1731 Harvard Street, NW., managed to breach Russia's Iron Curtain in 1946, a year before his legal firm of Wolf, Popper, and Wolf was paid $1,000 for a month's service to Poland.

In his registration statement Popper said he visited France and Russia in connection with the establishment of an international bar association. The lawyer is national executive secretary of the National Lawyers' guild, which the House Committee on Un-American Activities has called subversive. The same group also was called subversive by the New York committee which investigated municipal civil service.

COMMITTEE WAS A CLIENT

The firm assisted in the defense of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee which Attorney General Clark has branded subversive and lately has been aiding the 10 Hollywood writers who were cited for contempt of Congress. Popper, himself, is a member of the executive board of Henry Wallace's political action committee.

Justice Department records show that Popper visited Russia during a trip he made as an observer to the Nuremburg trials in Germany.

Americanism Week—Jaycee Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a speech I made at Cleveland, Tenn., February 20, 1948, at a meeting sponsored by the Cleveland, Tenn., Junior Chamber of Commerce as part of the Americanism Week of the Jaycees:

I congratulate you upon Americanism Week. Throughout the Nation more than 2,000 active Jaycee Clubs have emphasized the great privilege of being an American. They have pointed out however, that every privilege carries a responsibility. You have done a good job of talking about the virtues of freedom, opportunity, and progress, exemplified by our American system.

Sometimes when one hears the grumbling and criticism of our Government and of our public officials we wonder about the future of our Nation. Wouldn't it be well to concentrate and talk more of what's right with our country rather than what's wrong with it? Constructive criticism is fine and always needed, but let's be certain we have a better solution before we condemn those things our Government is doing.

Sure, we all love America, but are we doing what we can to protect her? You may say, "I'm just one person—what can I do?" Suppose everyone said that? There must be a reawakening of individual responsibility. I think I see signs of such an awakening. This program tonight, the keen interest of young people throughout the land are heartening signs.

The truth is, our country is fine and there is nothing fundamentally wrong with it or with our people. We are, to be sure, entering a new era. We can make this the greatest era in our history if we will. America has only one-sixteenth of the earth's population but she produces nearly 40 percent of the world's goods. Her people own 46 percent of the world's electric power, 48 percent of its radios, 54 percent of its telephones, 59 percent of its steel capacity, 60 percent of its life-insurance policies, 85 percent of its automobiles, and 92 percent of its modern bathtubs.

Yes, it is statistically true that in the 150 years of her dynamic, adventurous life, America has made more progress than all the other nations have made in 6,000 years. What has she got that the rest of the world has not?

She has only 6 percent of the world's area. Other nations have more land and more people. Some are more richly endowed with natural resources. Several enjoy a general level of health, education, political freedom, and native ingenuity approximately comparable to our own. Carry the comparison on down the line, and you will be forced to the conclusion that the one thing which America has that the other nations lack is the American desire for freedom and of opportunity. Personal freedom and the chance of every boy and girl to get ahead.

Contrast this with other systems. Capitalism and communism stand at opposite economic poles. Communism—born of poverty and hunger—seeks to perfect a system for the equal distribution of a scarcity of goods, so that ultimately no man has enough of anything. Capitalism—born of hardship and toil—seeks to provide such a plentitude of goods that, ultimately, all men may have enough of everything. Communism is content that no man should be rich. Communism strives on keeping people poor. Furthermore, communism is just as arbitrary and despotic as was fascism. There is little difference except in the technique of the leaders.

Economically speaking, the system which provides the greatest good for the greatest number is the system which provides the greatest supply of goods for the greatest number. By any standard of comparison that system is free American capitalism. It has enabled every American worker to produce and to possess more than six times as many goods as the average worker outside the United States. No other system has equaled, or closely approached, that record.

During the war one nation, single-handed, outproduced the combined powers of the Axis. The nation was America.

No one must assume that because we have the world's most enlightened civilization and productive power that our future is easy. Greatness brings responsibility. The call for world leadership has been beckoning us for 50 years—we are just now hearing it. If light and peace are to come to the world this Nation will furnish them. We cannot escape the power and the responsibility of the American flag.

In the world today either we are going to succeed and have a period of peace or the Soviets are going to succeed and drag the world into one of its darkest ages. Our Government understands this and through a bipartisan policy is doing something about it.

We appeased Russia as long as there was a chance of agreement through that course. The Greek-Turkish loan was notice that we would stand our ground—the emergency aid program was to hold the fort against communism and to help our friends until a recovery program could be put into effect. Through the Marshall program we hope to unite 16 European nations with us in holding the mantle of freedom and peace. This program must and I believe will succeed—then a third step is necessary. Through American leadership we must work out with those other democracies a common purpose for the future. We must stand together with determination to prevent chaos and warfare. We hope, of course, that other peoples under new leadership may join in this noble undertaking, but we cannot depend on this. This means eventually a kind of federation or union of free and peace-loving nations—common defense measures, trade, exchange of ideals, understanding of one another's problems and of assistance when a friend is in trouble.

This is where the Jaycees come in, new leadership is required. You are training your members not only to help in local communities, but to take leadership in national and international problems. Training for leadership is your motto. Through your organization more than 200,000 young men are going forward to see that the force and character of this Nation is used in the interest of world peace. The Nation needs you. Your interest is another ray of hope. I know you will carry on and show the world that we are capable of meeting the destiny which has come to America.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alonzo F. Myers:

THE PRICE ASKED FOR UMT

(By Alonzo F. Myers, chairman, department of higher education, New York University)

No intelligent decision on the question of universal military training can be reached until we have considered carefully what it would cost.

The President's Commission on Universal Training predicted the annual cost would be $1,750,000,000. However, Hanson W. Baldwin, New York Times military analyst, estimated between three and five billion would be required annually. When a similar training system was put in operation in Australia it cost almost twice as much as its sponsors had predicted.

To the direct expense must be added the indirect cost of withdrawing more than 750,000 young men each year from the labor force, apprenticeship training, and higher education. Economists have estimated almost $2,000,000,000 a year would be lost to the Nation in this manner.

It would appear then that $3,000,000,000 a year would be a very conservative estimate as to the total cost of a universal military training program. Before we add that sum to the $10,000,000,000 already appropriated to the Military Establishment for the year let us try to visualize what it would represent in terms of our civilian educational program.

According to the latest survey of the United States Office of Education, the total expenditure for education in this country during the school year 1943–44 was $3,522,007,441. This included all elementary and secondary schools, colleges and universities, professional schools, teachers' colleges and normal schools, schools for the delinquent, blind and deaf, the mentally deficient, and Federal schools for Indians.

The money we would spend for 2 years of UMT would represent more than the total value of all existing facilities for higher education in this country. According to latest Government statistics the entire value of land, buildings, equipment, endowments, and other funds of institutions of higher education in the country is slightly more than $4,500,000,000.

Three years of UMT would consume more than enough money to double the present public-school facilities in the Nation. Value of all land, buildings, equipment, permanent and sinking funds, for the public schools in the entire country, is less than $9,000,000,000.

According to the Director of the Budget, the administration advocates that UMT be given priority over aid-to-education legislation. If the present plight of the Nation's schools is overlooked in the rush to set up a compulsory military training program, we shall pay dearly for such a policy. I do not question the necessity of developing and training the minds and bodies of our youth, but if they are to be prepared to serve their country in time of peace or war we dare not siphon off billions into a military training program at the expense of our basic educational needs.

The validity of such a conclusion seems to be thoroughly established by the following factors:

Approximately one-third of all men called up by selective service during World War II were rejected because of physical, mental, and educational deficiencies. The majority of these men could have been fit for military service, if they had received the proper nutrition, medical care, and educational opportunity in childhood and youth.

A sample study during 3 months of 1942 showed that 38 of every 1,000 registrants were rejected for illiteracy. In some States rejections for educational deficiency ran as high as 74 per 1,000 among whites and 258 per 1,000 among Negroes. States with low per capita expenditures for education produced the highest percentage of these disqualified men.

The outcome of any future war will be decided in the scientific laboratories of our colleges, universities, and industries. The day is long since past when military strength can be reckoned in number of men under arms. A few dozen scientists can turn out weapons more dangerous than millions of marching men.

Yet our Nation today is confronted with a grave shortage of scientists. Diverting billions of dollars into a UMT program and interrupting the studies of our potential scientists for a year's time would contribute further to this dangerous deficiency.

The President's Scientific Research Board reported recently that the drafting of science students during the war was a major factor in producing a loss of 40,000 scientists and research engineers. Because of the dearth of qualified men the Atomic Energy Commission has had difficulty in carrying out its research, while the Army's guided missile program is only three-quarters staffed.

The field of medical research—so vital to the health of our people—has experienced a drastice reduction in qualified personnel. Between 1941 and 1945 the number of persons receiving doctor of philosophy degrees in the basic medical science dropped from 548 to 217. Federal agencies engaged in medical research report deficits in personnel up to 40 percent. Important projects are gathering dust for lack of competent men to tackle them.

The crisis in science can only be met by greater support for our schools, colleges, and universities. Our entire educational structure—from first grade through the graduate and professional schools—has suffered a terrible set-back due to the war. Putting that system back on its feet should be a number one priority in any security program.

Those who say we must have UMT to keep ahead of Russia, even though it means skimping on our educational budget, ought to be reminded that last year the Soviet Union devoted twice as much of her income to her schools, colleges, and basic research programs as did the United States.

During the war hundreds of thousands of teachers left our public schools. Present salaries are too low to attract the needed men and women to instruct our children. The average salary for teachers and school officials during 1945 was only $1,846. Today we need 78,000 qualified teachers.

There is an urgent need for new school buildings. The Office of Education predicts that our high-school population in 1960 will be 50 percent larger than in 1943–44, due to the sharp upswing in wartime birth rates. To replace obsolete structures and to provide for this new crop of children we must spend $10,000,000,000 on new public-school facilities within the next decade. If we put out $10,000,000,000 on UMT during the same time our school-building program is certain to be slighted.

Our colleges and universities are literally bursting at the seams, yet an estimated 250,000 qualified men and women, eager to attend, were turned away during the past year. Those who managed to squeeze in are being cheated out of the full benefits because of shortage of professors, lack of adequate facilities and the feverish, crowded atmosphere of the postwar academic program.

In the field of science alone we would require 15,000 more instructors, including 4,500 with doctor's degrees, in order to meet the prewar student-teacher ratio.

The percentage of income derived from endowments has been declining for many years. Our institutions of higher learning are having to depend more and more on public funds for their support. If we give the military first priority in our tax funds, our schools are bound to suffer.

We are wasting an enormous amount of human talent because qualified young people cannot afford the expense of a college education. A recent study in New York State showed that 59 percent of high-school students in the top fourth of their classes fail to attend college, if their family income is less than $5,000 a year. In Pennsylvania a survey revealed that 105 of each 1,000 high-school graduates entered college, but 174 of each 1,000, with the same mental abilities as the other group, could not attend due to lack of funds.

With the $3,000,000,000 we would spend on UMT each year we could provide free $500 annual scholarships for a million of these capable young people who cannot afford a college education. We would have enough left to raise the average public-school teacher's salary $1,000 a year, provide $1,000,000,000 worth of new buildings and facilities for our public schools each year, and expend $500,000,000 on our colleges, universities, medical schools, and other institutions of higher learning. Within a 10-year period such an annual expenditure would more than double the present value of our entire system of higher education.

In a survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center a cross-section of the American public was asked the following question: "If the Government had $2,000,000,000 a year to spend, would you rather have it spent on a program of better regular education in the schools, or on a program of compulsory military training in the Army or Navy?" Sixty-nine percent of those expressing a definite opinion favored the regular education system, while only 31 percent preferred military training.

Civilian education and military training are both competing for available funds. If we decide to spend $3,000,000,000 every year for UMT, we cannot expect to appropriate a similar amount in addition to what our schools are already receiving.

We must make a choice. The clear-thinking Americans who answered the public-opinion poll have indicated a wise course for the Nation to follow.

Steel Plow and Iron Curtain—One American Farmer Can Produce As Much As Six Russians—Equipment and Methods Help Him Do It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the interesting article entitled "Steel Plow and Iron Curtain" by Herrell DeGraff, professor of agricultural economics, Cornell University, which appeared in the November 1947 issue of Steelways, published bimonthly by the American Iron and Steel Institute.

It is a story of the United States and Russia and the lead we hold in the vital race of food production, of the advantages we enjoy, of the supremacy we can keep, provided we never forget how it was achieved. The story is authored by Herrell DeGraff and Arthur Bartlett.

It follows:

One of my ex-GI students was speaking, the other day, of a country in which he spent some time during the war—a country which had put up a briefly valiant but futile struggle against invasion. "They fought the way they farm," he said. "Plenty of determination and brute strength, but with methods and equipment strictly from the Dark Ages."

It was an acute observation, which only a farm-bred soldier would have been likely to make. We are no longer a Nation of farmers and it is easy for nonfarmers to miss the fact that most peoples fight—and live—just about the way they farm. A country's way of farming constitutes a reasonably accurate barometer of its whole level of accomplishment, in peace or war.

The reason is very simple. Food is the first essential of life. The more people it takes in any country to produce the food to keep the country alive, the fewer are available to produce goods and services.

In other words, the farm is, and always has been, the irreplaceable foundation of the structure of society. If it takes four families on the land to produce enough surplus over their own requirements to feed one nonfarm family, then only 20 percent of a population is free to produce other things. Only as each farmer, by using more efficient methods and equipment, increases his production, are more hands and brains freed for other tasks.

We have moved so far and fast in this direction in the United States that most of us take food more or less for granted, and tend to overlook these elementary facts. Yet their implications are so far reaching that we cannot afford to overlook them much longer. They contain the key to the whole complicated world situation of today.

Back in 1943 Wendell Willkie performed a great service to the people of this country when he crystallized our realization of "one world." We had come to realize that war in Europe or creeping invasion along the southeast coast of Asia or even a squabble in Chaco were, after all, our concern in the United States; that we were, indeed, citizens of one world in which our acts affected others and the acts of others affected us.

Now with confusion and concern we see an iron curtain drawn down across Europe and pressing westward. A curtain that has shoved out to enclose a half score of nearby neighbors and threatens to extend farther. The one world has fissioned into two. We don't like it. We worry about it. We even wonder: Must there be another war? If we are spared that, as we all must hope, we still realize that we face, at least, an economic and political rivalry which may be a showdown struggle between our way of life, our system of government, and those of the Soviet Union.

We start this struggle with a tremendous advantage—the basic advantage of an agricultural system which makes Russia's look like a 14-year-old boy pitted against a brawny blacksmith in a weight-lifting contest.

Let's look at some over-all figures. First, Russia is the vastest nation in the world. She extends from 20° east longitude to 170° west longitude. She contains one-sixth of the land area of the world and the sun never sets upon her territory. The area of Russia is more than two and one-half times as great as that of the United States. She has a population one-third greater than ours, not counting the many recently brought within her influence.

But, at least agriculturally speaking, the strength of Russia ends with those figures. She has about the same harvested-crop acreage as the United States, but from our similar acreage we harvested, prewar, one and one-half times as much agricultural production as she. I am using prewar figures, for which I have drawn heavily on the writing of N. Jasny, a United States Government economist who was with the Foreign Economic Administration during the war, because, even if we had the information, it would hardly be satisfactory to draw a comparison between Russian and American agriculture today. Russia was far more disrupted by the war than we were. Her agricultural production from the thirties has been much reduced; ours has been vastly expanded. Even in the late thirties, however, our output of farm produce exceeded Russia's by 50 percent.

The most important reason for this greater total production is that the territory of the United States is far more favorably situated than the vast area of Russia. If anyone on the day of creation had staked out 3,000,000 square miles of desirable territory, he could have done much worse than to have driven his stakes in Florida, California, Washington, and Maine. Where the beat of the Tropics leaves off, the United States of America begins. Close to where the cold of the North sets in, the United States of America leaves off. Enclosed is a vast area of temperate productive lands, none of it too hot, little of it too cold, little of it too wet, but some of it too dry.

Russia suffers from being north. The port of Odessa on the Black Sea lies in the latitude of Duluth, Minn., and Aroostook County, Maine. Russia extends on north. Vast areas are too cold for agriculture. Vast areas are unproductive, spruce-forest soils. Vast areas beginning in the Ukraine and extending on east into Siberia are some of the most productive soils in the world, but they don't get adequate or evenly distributed rainfall. Too cold and too dry characterize vastly more of Russia than of the United States.

Our truly significant advantage, however, is not indicated in the total production figures, favorable as they are. The important thing is that each worker in American agriculture turned out, in those prewar years, six times as much production as each worker on the land in Russia. We have to go back to shortly before the Civil War in this country to find the time when the American farmer's productivity was as low as the Russian farmer's output in 1938.

Russia has made claims, which many of us have read, to have the most mechanized agriculture in the world. It is, of course, a gross exaggeration, though it is true with respect to a few operations. For example, 71½ percent of all spring plowing was performed by tractors in Russia in 1938. We fell far short of that figure. About half of Russia's grain acreage was harvested with the combine in 1938, and again, except for our wheat crop, we fell far short. But aside from these few operations, the vast bulk of Russian farm work is performed, not with tractors, not with machines, but by hand. The Russian farm worker in the late thirties had less than one-half horsepower in the form of draft animals, tractors, trucks, or stationary motors. The average American farmer at the same time used more than three horsepower in tractors and horses alone.

The Russian farmer worked 63 hours to grow and harvest an acre of corn. Our farmers used 27 hours on the average—only 16 in the Corn Belt—and produced double the Russian yield per acre. Russians used 330 hours to raise and harvest an acre of cotton. Our cotton producers worked 91 hours on an acre. Russia farmers worked about 47 hours to raise and harvest an acre of wheat. Our farmers worked 9 hours and the wheat yielded more bushels per acre. Russian farmers worked 530 hours to raise and harvest an acre of sugar beets. Our farmers worked 92 hours. They worked 265 hours to raise and harvest an acre of potatoes. Our farmers worked 68 hours. They worked 460 hours a year to care for a dairy cow. Our farmers worked 140 hours and produced twice as much milk per cow. On the Russian farms producing poultry, one person cares for about 500 birds. Our poultryman takes care of 1,500 or more.

Back in Civil War times, when the efficiency of our agriculture was similar to that of Russia today, we had hardly more than started using equipment as we now know it. McCormick's reaper was in use, but not widely so. The basic horse-drawn tools had been introduced, and were coming into use. Since then, however, we have been through a prolonged agricultural revolution. Soil science has been developed and applied to a previously unknown degree. Crop and livestock improvements have shot far ahead. Pest control has made unprecedented progress. Most important of all, the American farmer, using machines, mostly of steel, supplied by an aggressive American industry, has never since that time ceased to expand the effectiveness of his work.

In 1862 Ezra Cornell, the founder of Cornell University, in his presidential address to the New York State Agricultural Society, made a plea for the improvement of farm livestock. The cows of New York dairy farms were then producing almost precisely what the Russian cow produces now. He saw no reason why cows could not be twice as good as they then were. Not only has that goal been achieved but actually American husbandry has gone on to exceed it by one-third or more.

Here, then, in the great vitality and productiveness of American agriculture, has been the basis of the rising strength of the Nation and the rising standard of living of the American people. Since 1850 the percentage of the United States labor force engaged in agriculture has declined at a nearly constant rate of 6 percent per decade. We now use only one-sixth of the Nation's productive effort directly on the land; we produce enough to provide the best standard of food living to our people that is enjoyed by any nation, possibly excepting New Zealand, and still ship 10 percent of our farm products overseas.

As the productivity of the American farmer has expanded other workers, no longer required to produce the basic foods and fibers, have been able to shift to producing the thousand and one other things that add up to our high standard of living and that make our Nation so strong. As a result, the standard of living of our people has increased at the rate of 2 percent a year for the past 100 years. We have gone on to produce more autos for more people, more refrigerators, more radios, more telephones, more nylons, and more eggs for breakfast than are enjoyed by any other people in the world.

If agricultural progress has made possible our industrial society, it is just as true that our industrial economy, in turn, has made possible the expanding effectiveness of the farmer. For example, a few years ago a young chap of my acquaintance left promising nonfarm employment to return to his boyhood home in the dairy land of central New York. It was a little farm carrying 12 cows producing an average of 6,000 pounds each—just average sort of cows. And the cows were the only source of farm income. He knew scientific farming and he knew how to apply American methods of production. Within 4 years he brought up that farm to carry 20 cows instead of 12, with an average yield of 9,500 pounds of milk per head instead of 6,000 pounds. He added a flock of poultry to the farm. Four years after he took over the business he turned out a volume of production four times that of his predecessor.

He did all this with no more help than his father had used. He used machines instead. He wired electricity into his building, and used this "cheapest of all hired hands" to run a milking machine and pump water and do other jobs that would have required much hand work. He bought a manure spreader and a small tractor. He hauled hay with a buck rake. He cooled milk with electricity instead of tugging ice into the ice house all winter and out all summer. In 4 years' time he nearly doubled the farm's net worth.

Here is the record of another farm. It is 405 acres on the prairies of Illinois. All but 18 acres are in cultivation. The farm produces 200 acres of corn, 75 acres of soybeans, 60 acres of oats, 25 acres of hay, and the rest is in rotation pasture. A couple of years ago, when I saw the records of the operation, it had produced these crops and, in addition, fed 125 head of cattle to 12,000 pounds of gain and raised 165 hogs to 34,000 pounds live weight. It is a business capitalized at well over $100,000, and two brothers run it without any hired help.

How can two men handle so much business? Obviously, they could not do it without machinery. The farm is equipped with two tractors, four-row planting and cultivating equipment, combine, pick-up baler and corn picker. The steel industry and its allied industries, making possible such machines of ever-increasing efficiency, constantly reduce still further the manpower needed to produce food, and thus release still more men to devise and produce still more ways to build still higher the level of our civilization and accomplishment. It is an interlocking, self-priming system, and the end is nowhere in sight.

Why has it worked so much better for us here in the United States than for any other country? The answer is clear. It is because here individuals have had freedom to work and to enjoy the fruits of labor. Under that freedom we have built an economic system that has vastly stimulated production, individually and in the mass. It is a system in which capital, in the form of tools and production facilities, has constantly increased our enormous production per man, whether on the farm or elsewhere. The farmer's incentive to use more and better machines is that through them he can make his capital work for him, and thus be able to buy more of all an expanding civilization offers. So it works through the whole society—if it is allowed to work.

The Socialists and Communists, in recent years, have adopted the slogan, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," as if they had the only answer to that sound aim. It ought to be obvious enough that it is we who have been outstandingly successful in that respect, not Russia with her Stakhanovist system to speed up the accomplishment of a worker. And we can still get "from each according to his ability" if we will continue to maintain our free productive system.

In the past two decades we have done much to compromise the private-enterprise system. We have done all kinds of damnably foolish things in the field of restrictive economics. For 10 years before the war we were telling farmers that they had to restrict production because they produced too much. One would think we expected to become more wealthy by cutting down on the production of wealth. We have told the workman that he could work only 40 hours a week. Who knows if everyone wants limited work hours and enforced idleness as against the opportunity to work? We have built up a system of economic controls based upon decisions by committees. Committees are made up of individuals who, like other individuals, can be wrong. And when they are wrong, they are wrong for everybody.

To finance a planned economy and a committee system of economic control, we have in recent years piled a progressive income tax upon American production. It works to discourage the producer because he gets penalized for producing another dollar. It works also to discourage production from the nonproducer because by getting the essentials of life without working, he is made more indolent still. We have drained off for government use dollars of personal and business earnings which should have gone back into the expansion of our capital facilities. We have so discouraged capital investment by the tax burden upon earnings and by the application of restrictive economics that the labor force of the country has been increasing faster than the production facilities for them to use. Capital per person has been decreasing.

This is cause for concern. It is more disturbing than any immediate challenge from the Russians or their system.

Whatever else may be hidden behind the iron curtain, we know it hides great weaknesses. Our strength is in plain sight: The steel coming from our mills, the machines from our factories, and the production from our farms to make it possible to get from each according to his ability, in increasing measure, the stuff of life.

Russia's challenge is not to a shooting war—not yet, at least. It cannot become so unless and until she wins the war of steel plows and the general productive efficiency which they symbolize. That is a war in which we are far ahead. We can lose only by forgetting how we got there.

Will You Buy the Marshall Plan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry J. Taylor:

[From Cosmopolitan Magazine of March 1948]

WILL YOU BUY THE MARSHALL PLAN?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Look in your cupboard, coal bin or clothes closet. There you will see the future workings of the Marshall plan.

Look at the prices in the grocery store. Ask yourself why it is hard to build a house or get a car. What are you paying for milk? For meat? Ponder tonight the connection between the steel famine and your own job security, the oil shortage and this country on wheels, the machinery scarcity and the problem of new production to whip inflation. Now you and I are ready to think about the Marshall plan.

For the Marshall plan—officially known, since Secretary Marshall disavowed that title, as the European recovery program—does not mean dollars. It means goods—mostly the same goods that America itself needs.

Never before in the history of the world has a relief proposal like this subsidy-in-goods been assembled.

It means the difference between the products that 16 European nations (chiefly Britain) believe they need and the products they can produce or buy in the next 4 years—with America donating that difference.

We American people are already paying the bill for the Government's postwar relief programs abroad at the annual rate of $376 per United States family. By this proposal the bill would be built up to $862 per American family by 1951.

Accordingly, the pocketbook, the personal welfare, and the future of every American citizen are directly involved in the question: Will you buy the Marshall plan?

Knowing that every farm, every home, every factory, every pay roll, prices, pensions, taxes, individual security, and the basic stability of the United States are all directly affected, it is up to each of us to be honestly informed and to answer. For now is the time the question must be decided in Congress in accord with the will of the people.

What is our will? Given the facts, we can find our own way to this answer for both our own good and also the good of the hard-pressed world. But we need to know the plain, unvarnished truth. And, at the moment, propaganda rules the roost.

It is not enough to say we want to help Europe—the needy, the heartworn, and weary. Everyone agrees about that. In the past 4 years of war unnumbered men have died to give humanity another chance. We who remain cannot say good-by to their efforts—not when we remember that they said good-by to life itself. But to humanity, in the end, it is results—not pronouncements—which count. And in these critical times we cannot indefinitely postpone getting real results from anything we do for relief and recovery abroad.

The war has been over nearly 3 years. After all, something must be wrong with the way we have aided Europe so far, or the gigantic postwar aid already given would have helped more than it has and possibly won us more friends.

Our world-recovery donations ($22,000,000,000 since the end of the war) have failed to achieve their promised objectives. If they had not failed we would not now be called upon to send so many new billions.

But when earlier expenditures fail to deliver promised results, attention is generally distracted from the failures by making new promises and putting the objectives on an even wider base. New labels are sought, new slogans concocted, new arguments advanced. Generalities about the future smother the facts and fiascos of the past.

What are the chief arguments usually advanced for our buying the latest plan now that it is no longer merely an idea with good objectives but has become a specific piece of proposed legislation, presented on in all-or-nothing basis?

1. We must protect western Europe from the Communist menace.

2. Our own economic self-interest (i. e., avoiding a depression) is involved.

3. We can afford to be generous on this scale on a humanitarian basis.

Before we examine the validity of these arguments, let's see how and where the "plan" really began.

It began in London. I was there when it started. While it was being put together abroad, I journeyed to most countries involved: England, France, Italy, Greece, Switzerland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, and Germany. I went to Paris while it was finally being thrashed out there. I came home and saw it finished in Washington, D. C.

Much of the European story behind the headlines and public speeches has not been told. The facts about the birth of the plan abroad, the inside inter-European commitments and cross-trades, the amazing contradictions in the program itself—all are vital, but smothered. The effect on us in our homes and work places is certainly not clearly understood. So come to London for the real beginning.

In January 1947 British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin notified Secretary Marshall that new large-scale American aid for England was necessary or Britain would suffer economic collapse by June.

He made a request that was kept "top secret." He asked for the equivalent of five and a half billion dollars over the next 4 years. The 1945 Congressional grant of $3,750,000,000 was being consumed at twice the rate anticipated. It was passing through the British economic system without long-term effect.

Bevin's preliminary appeal for a new loan was not made known to either the American or British public. Even the forthcoming crisis itself, foreseeable from the inside, was played down until it burst full-blown in July. Meanwhile, this is what was happening:

In a series of January dispatches to London, Secretary Marshall told Bevin that in his opinion Congress would not again appropriate a large, new fund for Britain except possibly as part of a general economic program for European recovery. Congress had objected to the original British loan because it did not represent a rounded European solution.

Throughout February, Bevin replied that the British Government understood this objection, in principle, but—as at the time of the original 1945 grant—England could not wait for such a widespread program.

In London you could see that a feeling of being bogged down permeated the British Foreign Office. Bevin needed action. He got it. He implemented his claim for separate aid by suddenly announcing that Britain was so hard-pressed that she would have to withdraw immediately from Greece.

Bevin ruffled tempers in the State Department, for he announced this in Washington and London at the same time, and publicly. But the American agreement to take Britain's place in Greece (with Turkey later included) and to vote $400,000,000 for this purpose, was the answer.

Revealed March 12 as the Truman doctrine, this was, in fact, a stopgap substitute for new, large and direct aid for England, which it was clear Congress would not grant.

Prospective British withdrawal from obligations in western Germany, and the assumption of these occupation costs by America were agreed to at the same time. But this part of the agreement remained "top secret," and announcement was withheld until November.

Nevertheless, British insistence on straight separate aid did not slacken. The pressure was increased throughout the spring, not only on President Truman and Secretary Marshall but also on most members of the United States Cabinet, and especially on Secretary of the Treasury Snyder. That pressure had reached a climax by June 1.

On June 5, Secretary Marshall made his now famous commencement speech at Harvard. He was speaking primarily to England—a fact fully realized by Bevin but lost on the British and American public alike—when he said, in three sentences, that further large-scale American aid could be expected only as a part of a general coordinated European program. With that, Secretary Marshall dropped the subject. But when Mr. Bevin tagged it the Marshall plan the force of a great American name was lent to the subsequent European proposals.

I was in London when the British Ambassador in Washington confirmed the fears of the British Government that England had lost her priority on American assistance. At that point what has since been called the Marshall plan became really the Bevin plan. It became Secretary Bevin's responsibility to construct an outline for American aid to other countries in such a manner that approximately the same amount of aid would go to Britain as if the separate aid, asked for in January, had been judged agreeable to Congress.

This Mr. Bevin accomplished in the Paris meetings of 16 nations during July, August, and September, which I went to Paris to observe.

Mr. Bevin's January appeal to Secretary Marshall for $5,500,000,000 went into the Paris plan from the outset, and stayed there.

France and Italy objected strenuously to the British proportion. But they played along with England's big long-term proportion in exchange for a bird-in-hand understanding that England would support immediate United States stopgap aid for them amounting to $685,000,000.

Mr. Bevin agreed. The British Government went on record with Secretary Marshall as urging $685,000,000 American stopgap aid for France and Italy, $227,000,000 to Italy, $458,000,000 to France. They got $540,000,000 in stopgap aid on December 19.

Now the time has come to act on the long-range presentation—predominantly aid-to-Britain, plus the additional collateral reliefs.

The overshadowing aid-to-Britain feature was kept carefully under wraps, a fact first noted by Washington newspaperman Peter Edson.

Page after page of other statistics are supplied in the official presentation to Congress. But in all the 131 pages, the percentage of American aid allocated to each country and the predominate share scheduled for England are not revealed. It required a separate investigation to obtain for this article the official figures showing where our billions would go, country by country.

Here are the facts:

England	$5,348,000,000
France	3,701,000,000
Italy	2,913,000,000
United States-British Zone Germany	2,499,000,000
Holland	2,436,000,000
Belgium-Luxemberg	1,419,000,000
Austria	719,000,000
Denmark	582,000,000
Ireland	497,000,000
Greece	473,000,000
Norway	235,000,000
Portugal	150,000,000
Iceland	38,000,000
Turkey	16,000,000
Total	21,021,000,000

Sweden and Switzerland are in for nothing. Actually they expect a favorable trade balance of about $176,000,000. This means net requests for over $20,000,000,000 from Uncle Sam. The difference between that figure and the announced 17,000,000,000 is to be made up chiefly by the International Bank and Monetary Fund, which is also 80 percent United States taxpayers' money.

England's $5,348,000,000, which is one-third of the $17,000,000,000 in the Marshall plan, is exactly the amount asked for by Bevin in January 6 months before Marshall attempted to answer England at Harvard University.

That, in brief, is the background of the plan. Now let us consider the arguments advanced for its support.

Is the threat of communism in western Europe a valid argument? If so, Britain's 32 percent share in the funds must be automatically excluded from this claim. No one has even suggested that the British people are on the verge of voting Communist under any circumstances.

This is admittedly and equally true of 9 more among the 15 other countries involved: Ireland, Iceland, Denmark, Portugal, Belgium, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland. These represent another $5,000,000,000; a billion dollars to Ireland and Denmark alone.

The Communist problem in two other countries involved, Austria and Greece, is commonly conceded to be military, not economic. This means that anticommunism appeal for us to buy the plan, is largely confined to France and Italy, where communism has been consistently losing ground in the grass roots for over 2 years; and western Germany where the last Communist vote was 7 percent, Turkey 4 percent.

Once revealed on a country-by-country basis, the anti-Communist angle in the overall "all or nothing" $17,000,000,000 presentation takes on a different aspect. And, in any case, few military men would care to argue that dollars alone would be effective if the Red Army marched.

What about the argument that America's economic self-interest is involved, that we must export to avoid depression?

We are in a fight against inflation. Yet nothing could be more inflationary than vast exports at public expense, not repaid, striking us squarely in our shortages.

Our exports in 1947 totaled $14,500,000,000, chiefly free. Our balancing imports were $5,500,000,000; an over-export gap of $9,000,000,000. We know, or should know, these exports are abnormal.

Our real trouble today is that the home demand—to say nothing of foreign gifts—is far in excess of our ability to produce.

We need not worry about a falling off in demand for things we can't produce. We should not buy that idea. If there is to be a decrease in our exports—and that appears to be the thing the foreign-relief planners and other prophets of our domestic doom seem to fear—this is the best possible time

to absorb the reduction. They should either admit this fact or else not claim they are trying to fight inflation. Both contentions cannot be true. If there is really going to be "boom and bust," all we have to do is ship enough goods abroad for which we won't be paid to assure it. We went on that ride once before—after the last war.

And the argument that we can afford to be this generous on a humanitarian basis? This is the major claim on which the issue must be decided and changes in the commitments made or not made in the plan.

It is the direct cost at home and the results abroad which must be considered.

Our civilization is founded on compassion and charity. The deep and honest desire of the American people is to help people abroad as much as we can within good and generous limits. No other nation in the history of the world has ever regarded the rest of the world in this light. That is another reason why we can be proud we are Americans. But this does not permit continually giving Europe a blank check on our resources or on our lives.

Further, why are we not told clearly a little-known fact about our official charity; namely, that our aid does not actually reach people abroad as a free gift, as millions of Americans suppose.

By and large, the people abroad buy from their governments or middlemen what our Government sends free. They do not receive our gifts as charity. Their governments, and others overseas, pocket the difference. Practically none of the official donations of the United States Government end up as charity to the wretched. That is why so much of our vast aid is unknown to individuals in Europe.

In our own Government, who finally constructed the Marshall plan? Who wrote the President's presentation?

Clark Clifford and Charles Murphy, young White House advisers, did the actual writing. A young task force put the program together, directed by Under Secretary of State Lovett.

"We started to figure this thing out on the back of an envelope, and it got slightly out of hand," explains Charles Kindleberger, 37, a State Department adviser on financial policy.

Earlier reports by the Krug, Harriman, and Nourse committees were purely advisory, and the vital administrative features recommended in the Harriman report were ignored. The names of the actual planners hardly carry national prestige. These are the men in the Washington task force who came up with the final answers: Charles Bonesteel, 3d (State), Frank Southard (Treasury), Frederick Northrup (Agriculture), James Boyd (Interior), Philip Kaiser (Labor), Col. Raymond M. Cheseldine (Army Civil Affairs), Thomas Blaisdell (Commerce), Burke Knapp (Federal Reserve), and a special State Department planning group consisting of William Bray, Lincoln Gordon, Ernest Gross, Arthur Kimbell, Charles Kindleberger, Paul Nitze, William Phillips, Harold Spiegel, and Walter Surrey. Nearly all are in their thirties. Theirs was the program which was finally taken to Congress with the request for a 4-year commitment and $17,000,000,000—all or nothing.

Will the plan, if adopted, be ably administered? No one can say, but we will have to do better than we have been doing. Look at the way we have handled our No. 1 problem—Germany.

As working people in America, our dole to Germany is costing us about a billion dollars a year.

The Marshall plan countries surrounding Germany—Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, France, Italy—whose economies are interwoven with Germany's productivity, suffer through the German paralysis. So most are among the 16 nations now asking us for aid. With Germany on a dole, they must ask us for a dole too.

Accordingly, in restoring the productivity of Europe, it is only common sense to begin with Germany—the sector most demoralized and over which we have large control—yet with all safeguards against German rearmament of any kind.

Since we say the Marshall plan is dedicated to European recovery, and Secretary Marshall himself speaks of German peace-production recovery as the crux of the problem, our public may suppose that at last we have changed our original "scorched earth" policy in Germany. But fantastic as it may seem, at the same time that one set of hands in one of the 20 separate buildings that house the State Department in Washington was writing the Marshall plan for Congress, another set of hands in another building was writing a new and sweeping directive for further dismantling peace-production machinery in Germany.

In our own western area over 600 nonwar German industrial plants are now to be dismantled, scrapped, or removed as reparations under this new 1948 dismantling policy. Some 30,000 German workers have been withdrawn from production to carry out this new dismantling program.

The paralysis we are maintaining in Germany hits Italy more seriously than any other country in western Europe. Accordingly, Congress was called upon to vote Italy $227,000,000 stopgap aid in December, and the Marshall plan emphasizes, with nearly $3,000,000,000 more, the difficult situation there.

With one hand we choke off German peacetime productivity in the center of Europe and deal out a dole; with the other hand we enlarge the dole to Germany's neighboring countries. It seems one hand doesn't know what the other is doing.

Europe's recovery problem is primarily a production problem. Any program we enact, in order to succeed, must be administered here and abroad by hard-headed, realistic, production-minded Americans especially qualified for the gigantic task and operating as a selected agency for this complex effort.

Instead, nine departments are directly involved in a setup so confused, conflicting, intertwining, and unworkable that the official organization chart itself is utterly bewildering—even to the men who drew it. Said one of them to me, "It looks like Gracie Field's biggest 'aspidistra in the world'."

If we haven't learned anything administratively from the $22,000,000,000 we've already spent, we had better learn something, and make the necessary administrative changes, before we spend $17,000,000,000 more; an amount equal to practically the entire profits of all American industry here at home last year.

Some farm aid to Europe is doubtless indicated, but is it not reasonable to suggest that any further congressional appropriation be limited to 1 year? We should not be committed for a longer program since we cannot know what our friends abroad may ar may not do for their own self-help or what may develop here at home. Further bills can always be passed, when and if needed.

The Marshall plan means $7,000,000,000 of taxes in 1948 from all of us beyond what we would otherwise pay.

Some say that if a billion dollars of the new aid is handled by the International Bank (80 percent United States money), the taxes may be "only" $6,000,000,000 additional this year. But the plan calls for $6,800,000,000 in the first 15 months. This sum is nearly two-fifths of the total sum paid in personal income taxes by everybody in America this year. It almost equals the income taxes paid by all American corporations. It is about 70 percent as large as our entire national defense budget already voted. Yet it excludes new and forthcoming "little Marshall plans" for Latin America Asia, the Middle East, and Indonesia, the patterns for which it will establish.

It does not seem to take into account the fact that there's a limit to the number of failures Americans can absorb.

At some point our leaders failed, or we would not have suffered as we did in the depression. At another point our leaders failed, or we should have been so strong on land and sea and in the air that there could have been no war, and certainly no Pearl Harbor.

Now they fail again if they do not see that the future peace of the world depends on the internal strength of the United States. And they fail yet again if they squander our strength so we are weak when the chips are down.

Address of Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, at the Jefferson-Jackson dinner, Statler Hotel, in Washington, Thursday, February 19, 1948:

If you can believe what the Republicans and their helpers say about a fellow these days, I ought to be putting on a magic show instead of making a talk.

Look at commodity prices. Senator TAFT proclaims that the administration tried to force up the price of grain at great cost to consumers. Congressman ANDRESEN declares that we forced down the price of grain and ruined the market for his voting farmers in Minnesota. And our own "Pappy" O'DANIEL says that the Secretary of Agriculture and he alone is responsible for rising prices. Thus you see the power of this great Democratic administration. We push the market up and pull it down at the same minute of the same hour of the same day.

Joshua commanded the sun to stand still and that was regarded as quite a feat in those days. But now the Democrats command the market to stand still, to rise, and to fall—all at the same time.

So I thought I ought to bring along my magic lantern and give you a little demonstration of how it works. But the National Committee felt that since this banquet was in honor of Thomas Jefferson, we should have something scholarly, and since it was in honor also of Andrew Jackson, we should have something of service to the common people. The law establishing the Department of Agriculture where I work stipulates that it shall gather and diffuse among the people useful information. Therefore, the committee, knowing of my close contact with scientists, suggested that I present scientific information here tonight.

So I decided that I would talk about the identification and control of Republicans. Whenever a new bug, beast, or blossom is discovered, the species has to be captured, classified and controlled. Captured, classified and controlled; that's the CCC of agriculture that you hear so much about.

Now to identify Republicans for you, any proper scientist would bring along his specimens. But the national committee would not permit me to have living specimens. Hence I could have no specimens at all because no Republican would be caught dead in this distinguished gathering. However, I can give you evidence of some fossils. If you think there are no fossil remains of Republicans, you need only go to the home State of the distinguished chairman of these banquets—the Honorable Wilson Wyatt. In the State of Kentucky you will find that a Republican Party grew and blossomed and gave promise of long, fruitful life. But since the election of last fall, it is as dead as Julius Caesar and doesn't even have a Mark Antony to come and speak at its funeral.

In determining the exact species, microscopic examination is often essential. Occassionally you will find an AIKEN or MORSE who does not fit into the Republican pattern, a specimen that can best be described in scientific language as a mutation or a sport. Or there may be rare and exotic—sometimes military—specimens which classify neither as Republican or Democrat and successfully confuse the experts. But we also encounter a few of those border-line cases which the expert recognizes as throw-backs—specimens which classify themselves as Democrats for election purposes, but who display Darwin's theories in reverse by evolving to a lower stage of life and adhering to Republican ideals. But it is not my purpose to concern myself with mutations, sports, exotic specimens or throw-backs, but to deal with more stabilized forms of republicanism.

One characteristic common to the Republican species is the desire to win an election and win it quickly. Republicans have been hearing so much about atomic energy and the possibility that one great explosion of bombs could destroy the world that they are overanxious. Bob Hope, in his priceless discussion a few nights ago, summed up this predicament with persuasive eloquence when he said that the Republicans were afraid that the world would go out just as they got in.

But the world is not going out and they are not coming in.

As to habitat, the Republican species can live anywhere in the Nation. One great region is almost completely free of them, but the process of eradication meets with occasional reverses in other parts of the country. In 1936, with only Maine and Vermont in the Republican fold, it looked as if the species might disappear as did the dinosaur, the cohippus, and the Whigs. But 10 years later the restraints, the burdens, the inconveniences, and annoyances of war had made possible a fresh outbreak in many States, even in that happy hunting ground of Missouri.

This year Dr. Gallup has been making some allergy tests and finds very little reaction on most exposed surfaces. Specifically, he has found no Republican Presidential candidate who stands a chance of election.

But I hasten to give you some further means of identification. Republicans cling to lofty aims. They believe in reducing the public debt and reducing taxes at the same time. When you search for economic specimens, don't look on the top of hills; you will usually find them back of depressions. Perhaps I should remind you that you can spot them by their vision which seems to be a little impaired right now. They have a myopic condition which has become more apparent since they have been looking under every rug and into every corner for a morsel of inside information. I have had a chance to study this condition at close range. Their myopic impairment persuades them that only Republicans make money in commodity trading without special help. Only last Monday the biggest speculator of the month was to appear before a Senate committee for examination. But he didn't appear. Nobody questioned him. Nobody badgered him. Nobody accused him of having inside information. He had a simple defense. He was a Republican, and like the priest and the Levite, they passed him by on the other side of the road without a glance. There was no good Samaritan to look at his wounds.

There is another way by which you can identify the species, and that is by its mating call, which during the vote-getting season sounds like "me toooooo! me too! me tooo!" Why, only a few days ago that noted Ohio farmer, ROBERT TAFT, visited Nebraska and discoursed upon farm plans. He was in favor of parity, but a different kind of parity. He wanted the farmer to have equality with other groups of society, but to use his words, "at a much less percentage of parity than 90 percent." We don't know exactly what he means, but we suppose that the level which he would establish will be measured by the extremity of his need in the Philadelphia convention.

But he did lay out a farm plan and it was a pretty good farm plan, because it followed in fairly accurate what the Department of Agriculture had laid down before congressional committees this last spring and fall as the essentials for a long-term agricultural planning. That program had been reviewed by the Senate Agricultural Committee and it had published a very fine report following almost exactly the pattern of testimony by the Department of Agriculture. And so Candidate TAFT sounded the mating call to the Nebraska farmers, "Me too!"

Before applying control methods you must know something about the life habits of the specimen on whom you have designs. Don't be misled if in examining your specimens you find them covered by the hard shell of conservatism. No, just as surely as the spring warms the soil and starts the sap to running in the trees, then in every even-numbered year the hard shell of the cocoon begins to itch and the little larva within it tries hard to shuck it off and don the shiny wings of liberalism. TAFT, with the chiny wings of liberalism, is the new look for 1949.

Now, I give you one final identifying mark. You will find all Republicans harmonious. It's a little divided harmony, but why not? Every orchestra must have its sections of wind and brass and someone to beat the drum.

Well, once you have learned to classify and identify your specimens, control is no problem. All we have to do is give them a good dusting during the voting season. It takes some work but the results are guaranteed. We, in the Department of Agriculture, had a share in developing an insect eradicator called DDT. We also developed a weed killer called 2,4–D. In the light of this experience, I now suggest that we shake the dust off our feet and mix with it a good dose of H. S. T. This powerful ingredient is certain to be lethal to all Republican hopefuls. This product we guarantee—to control the GOP, use H. S. T. For H. S. T. is Harry S. Truman.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on February 22, 1948, over Station WBAL, Baltimore, Md.:

Ladies and gentlemen, as a member of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives I have been very much interested by the daily debates which have ensued during the past week in reference to the proposed St. Lawrence waterway and power project.

The St. Lawrence waterway project has been before the Congress a number of times during the past 50 years. Until last year, however, the navigation aspects of that project have been urged upon the Congress without any effort to place the proposal on a sound economic basis. In other words, it has been proposed to spend over $300,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury to open the improved St. Lawrence waterway free of charge to the ships of all nations and to have Uncle Sam foot the greater portion of the bill, a much smaller part being allocated to Canada.

In my opinion the St. Lawrence seaway has lacked justification through the years and still lacks it. The official records are filled with factual material supporting this premise. In testimony offered before the Senate committee this week it was indicated that the cost to complete this undertaking would be close to seven hundred and seventy-five million. This is the estimated cost by the Army engineers. However, the actual cost is unknown but in the end it will probably reach a billion dollars. For such projects have almost always exceeded their estimates. For example—and I could cite many more if I had the time—the estimated cost of the Panama Canal was one hundred and fifty million, whereas when completed the cost was three hundred and seventy-five million—a difference of two hundred and twenty-five million. If we are going to make such a vast expenditure as this seaway would cost we could with this money improve 85 percent of our own American harbors.

Throughout the hearings during which the proposal to complete this project has been under consideration by Congress, there has been unanimous opposition on the part of the members and employees of the railroads of the United States. Many of these railroads are major trunk lines which feed the port of Baltimore millions of dollars in exports. I am informed concerning their attitude and am safe in asserting that probably without exception they are all opposed to the establishment of another great medium of waterway transportation. They are opposed because of their definite belief that the waterway will divert millions of tons of revenue freight from railroads serving the areas from which the waterway is expected to attract its business and that this will result in a substantial reduction of railroad jobs. During the past year railroad employment has decreased and security of railroad employment especially for younger men in the service is extremely precarious. During the war the railroads demonstrated their indispensability to our national security. In order to maintain efficient and save railroad transportation the country must have a trained personnel available to carry on the work of transporting the country's freight and passengers at all times. To the extent that the uncertainty of continuous employment will be increased by the establishment of a seasonal facility, which the seaway closed to navigation 5 months of the year unquestionably would be, the stability of railroad employment will be decreased and the availability of men to carry on that work in times of emergency diminished. In my judgment this is one factor of the problem that should be given most serious attention in the consideration of the national-defense phase of the matter. In the light of unsettled, uncertain, and unpredictable international conditions this country cannot afford to establish additional transportation competing agencies which will undermine and injure those already in existence.

The volume of bulk freight which would be diverted presents a serious issue for American railroads. And for seaboard ports such as Baltimore which specializes in this cargo

and have built up expensive facilities and services to handle it. Millions of tons of freight annually would be diverted from existing transportation routes. The jobs of nearly 30,000 men in the port are at stake in this matter.

By latest figures from the Department of Commerce, Baltimore handled the second largest amount of foreign commerce among all the ports of the United States in 1946, and this record was excelled in 1947. Should the seaway go through there is indicated a prospective diversion from Baltimore of over a million and a half tons of cargo or nearly 10 percent of the port's average annual total of foreign and domestic commerce.

It is only too obvious that Baltimore can ill afford such losses and it is hardly fair to the interests of our State to ask her to do so. Baltimore is a great city chiefly because it is a great port, and as the greatest asset to the city and State of Maryland, the port influences the welfare of every business and of every citizen. Its national significance is even greater than its local importance and for 235 years it has served this country well and faithfully. It is to the Nation's interest, as well as our own, to keep the port active and busy through the full 12 months of the year as was conclusively proved in the recent war when almost overnight we in Baltimore were called upon to provide the facilities for handling an almost incredible volume of war materials and supplies.

Baltimore has long been the principal seaboard service harbor for the Central West because it is the closest port geographically to the interior cargo areas of the United States. Over one hundred million dollars is invested in terminals and warehouses by private interests. Baltimore's investment of fifteen million in piers and three million in channels and the Federal investment of nearly twenty million in harbor dredging are all largely based upon the handling of interior business. Of the port's normal average annual commerce of about twenty million tons valued at over a billion dollars (of which eight million tons valued at two million is foreign trade) A substantial part is inland rail-haul business. The Government collects from ten to twenty million a year in customs duties based to a great extent on goods shipped to the interior. The four thousand deep-sea ships which annually visit our port are influenced largely by inland movement.

The seaway proposal threatens many of our port commodities which have been leading factors in the development of the harbor and for which facilities have been provided costing millions of dollars. Grain, steel, woodpulp, and packing-house products are leading examples. Other materials both in- and out-bound for which special handling equipment has been created in Baltimore at large cost. It is now proposed to divert from the Atlantic seaboard and ship through the long and torturous seaway route.

By injecting the idea of self-liquidation into the present discussion of the project the proponents apparently seek to make it less objectionable in the eyes of the public. However, a most superficial examination of the records to date leads to the inevitable conclusion that no assurance can be given that the project will ever be self-liquidating.

There has been no assertion by any responsible governmental agency that the imposition of tolls is feasible. A check of all steamship companies operating under the American flag fails to reveal a single steamship company among them that would utilize the seaway if constructed. Who then is to pay these tolls that are to make the project self-liquidating? Obviously many foreign ships would use it, particularly tramp ships with low-operating costs, and take from American flag lines hundreds of thousands of tons of this country's export and import freight.

In the brief time allotted to me it is impossible for me to deal thoroughly with this subject. I have, however, exhaustively examined each phase of the project, its economic effects, and its relationship to national defense. On the basis of the testimony I have heard I find it impossible to concur in the opinion that the project is economically sound. In my judgment this proposal threatens the welfare of the port of Baltimore, as it does that of every other major harbor on the Atlantic and Gulf seaboards. It is an ill-advised project, which cannot be justified on any sound basis of national or regional economy. At this time, with the high price of materials and the extreme doubtfulness as to its effect, I cannot agree that such vast expenditures as are involved should be undertaken. To me, no phraseology about agreeing "in principle" to charging of tolls can change the grim prospect that it will be an economic millstone about the necks of the people of the United States, which will drag doubly hard on the million people in the port of Baltimore district. I shall with all sincerity and all the emphasis I can command urge the defeat of this resolution.

Cost of ERP to Third Michigan Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, how much will the New Deal's recovery program take out of the pockets of the citizens of Michigan's Third Congressional District?

According to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, it will cost, if the Marshall plan is adopted, $312.14 for every man, woman, and child.

That means that citizens of the congressional district who I have the honor to represent will pay an equivalent of their school, township, county, and State taxes for 25 years to finance the European recovery program.

The New Deal's ERP has already cost the citizens of Michigan's Third Congressional District $51,861,917, according to the Library of Congress. If the Marshall plan is adopted it will cost an additional $36,583,577, or a total of $88,445,494. On a per-capita basis, based on the 1940 census, this means $312.14 for every person residing in the district.

Can Kalamazoo County afford to send $31,240,532 to Europe? Can Calhoun County afford to send $29,405,461, and Eaton County $10,651,466, and Hillsdale County $9,080,777, and Branch County $8,067,258?

Indeed, it is difficult to conceive the true meaning of a figure as large as $17,000,000,000, asked for ERP under the Marshall plan. But it is not difficult to realize that $312.14 per pocketbook, in addition to other current high costs of living, would destroy practically every taxpayer in the Third District.

As someone has well stated, "providing relief to Europe is a gamble at its best. It is no sure method of stopping communism, or socialism, or war. But it is a sure method of overtaxing the American citizen and a sure method of further inflating prices."

A big question to be decided, therefore, is whether the gamble on peace in Europe is worth destruction by taxation and high prices at home.

Under permission to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include a table furnished me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress of the cost of the New Deal's European recovery program for Michigan's Third Congressional District:

Cost of foreign aid to the Third Congressional District of Michigan, by counties and principal cities

	Population 1940	Share of foreign aid, July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1947 (population × $133.03), based on $24,099,211,087	Share of foreign aid proposed by Marshall plan, 1948–52 (population × $129.11), based on $17,000,000,000	Share of total foreign aid provided and proposed, 1945–47, 1948–52 (col. II plus col. III) ($312.14 per capita), based on $41,099,211,087
Branch County	25,845	$4,730,410	$3,336,848	$8,067,258
Coldwater City [1]	7,343	1,343,999	948,055	2,292,044
Calhoun County	94,206	17,242,524	12,162,937	29,405,461
Albion City	8,345	1,527,385	1,077,423	2,604,808
Battle Creek City	43,453	7,953,203	5,610,217	13,563,420
Marshall City [1]	5,253	961,457	678,218	1,639,672
Eaton County	34,124	6,245,716	4,405,750	10,651,466
Charlotte City [1]	5,544	1,014,718	715,786	1,730,504
Hillsdale County	29,092	5,324,709	3,756,068	9,080,777
Hillsdale City [1]	6,381	1,167,914	823,851	1,991,765
Kalamazoo County	100,085	18,318,508	12,921,974	31,240,532
Kalamazoo City [1]	54,097	9,901,374	6,984,464	16,885,838
Total for counties	283,352	51,861,917	36,583,577	88,445,494

[1] County seat.

Source: Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940, Population, vol. I, pp. 506–508.

NOTE.—The 1940 population figure for the continental United States is used because later figures are not available for every local unit. Population of the Nation (excluding armed forces overseas) has grown from 131,669,275 in 1940 to 143,382,000 (estimated) by July 1, 1947. If the latter figure is used, the per capita cost of foreign aid between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947, is $168.08 rather than $133.03.

Merger Menace and the Steel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, on the floor of Congress and throughout the Nation we are hearing a great many complaints about the recent increase in the price of steel. Several investigating committees and the Department of Justice are looking into the reasons for the recent and rather unexpected boost in steel prices. Considerable interest and concern is cast about the fact that all of the major steel companies found the same price increase necessary and gave notice of the increase at the same time. It is, of course, wholesome that this matter should be looked into. At a time when we are trying to hold the line against inflation a substantial price raise of steel makes this job much more difficult.

I submit, however, that the investigating committees of Congress and the Department of Justice are not getting at the basic reason for the recent price increase. The reason is the dominant position in the industry which has been gained by the United States Steel Corp. The dominant position enables the United States Steel Corp. to set the pace and the lesser companies inevitably follow along. The condition is the result, in a substantial degree, to the merger program of the United States Steel Corp. during the past 20 years. This acquisition of competing steel companies has been the result of the failure of Congress to plug the loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act. Section 7 of the Clayton Act was intended to prevent monopolies from being created by the acquisition of a corporation by its competitor. It prohibited the acquisition of capital stock of a competitor where the result would be a monopoly. Means of evading section 7 was discovered in 1927 through the acquiring of physical properties of a competitor rather than the capital stock. Since that time section 7 of the Clayton Act has been a dead letter and this fact has enabled the United States Steel Corp. to acquire a substantial number of competitors.

The situation and the remedy is described in an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of February 26, 1948. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this editorial, which is as follows:

MERGER MENACE

Between 1940 and 1946, says the Federal Trade Commission, more than 1,800 manufacturing and mining concerns with assets exceeding $4,000,000,000 disappeared because of mergers and acquisitions. And the trend continued during 1947. This merger movement, taking the form principally of purchases of the assets of smaller concerns by big firms, has been facilitated by the ineffectiveness of the Clayton Act, which, as interpreted by the courts, deprives the Federal Trade Commission of power to prevent a company from purchasing outright the assets of another company unless the resultant merger creates a monopoly. Since the FTC does have the power under the Clayton Act to prevent acquisition of a company's stock by another company, if the purchase would merely lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, the result has been encouragement of industrial concentration by the merger route.

The FTC has long urged Congress to amend the Clayton Act as a means of enabling it to proceed against corporate mergers brought about through purchase of assets. A bill amending the act with that purpose in mind, the Kefauver bill, has been reported out by the House Judiciary Committee but is at the moment bottled up in the Rules Committee. The proposal has been the subject of extensive hearings, resulting in revision of the bill originally introduced. The Federal Trade Commission also made an exhaustive study of the merger developments of recent years, emphasizing the threat to free enterprise of current trends. Congress should certainly be afforded an opportunity at this session to pass on the merits of this measure, which aims to protect the interests of small business from unfair competition and monopolistic encroachments.

The postwar growth of mergers furthering the concentration of wealth and income in the hands of giant concerns emphasizes the need for plugging those loopholes in the antitrust laws that hamper the FTC's efforts to deal effectively with the merger problem. And it makes it all the more imperative for Chairman ALLEN of the Rules Committee to take the Kefauver bill out of cold storage and give Congress a chance to examine it.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the Department of Justice and the congressional committees that are investigating the present steel-price raise to consider the merger record of the United States Steel Corp. It is as follows:

The United States Steel Corp., in acquiring the different combinations in 1901, issued its stock aggregating $76,968,994 in exchange for the promotion stock given the underwriters who promoted the various consolidations which the steel corporation afterward absorbed. And the steel corporation paid its own underwriters stock of the steel corporation aggregating $73,997,500. Thus, more than $150,000,000 of the stock of the steel corporation ($41,845,600 preferred and $109,120,890 common) was issued, either directly or indirectly for mere promotion or underwriting services.

Immediately following the organization of the steel corporation, it apparently made no effort to secure control of any of the large iron and steel concerns which competed with it other than the Shelby Steel Tube Co., as hereinabove stated. However, in December 1902 the corporation acquired the entire capital stock of the Union Steel Co., which had been an exceptionally aggressive competitor. That company had theretofore absorbed the Sharon Steel Co. and had acquired the entire issue of the capital stock of the Sharon Ore Co., the Sharon Coke Co., the Sharon Sheet Steel Co., the Donora Mining Co., the Republic Coke Co., the River Coal Co., and control of the stock of the Sharon Tin Plate Co., and the Sharon Coal & Limestone Co. This acquisition cost the steel corporation over $90,000,000.

In January 1903, the steel corporation acquired, through a subsidiary, Troy Steel Products for $1,000,000. This purchase gave the corporation additional blast furnaces, steel works, and rolling mills. The plant was never operated and was dismantled in 1907.

In 1904, the corporation acquired the Clairton Steel Co., a fairly important concern, at a cost of nearly $11,000,000.

In 1907, the steel corporation acquired the Tennessee Coal Iron & Railroad Co. at a cost of nearly $49,000,000. By this acquisition, the steel corporation eliminated a competitor of growing importance with its manufacturing plants in Alabama. The acquisition was made at the time of the panic of 1907 and was claimed to be important in averting a disaster of the financial stability of the country. The acquisition made the steel corporation the most important steel factor in the southern region.

In 1908, the corporation acquired the plant and equipment of the Shoen Steel Wheel Co., which manufactured about 200,000 wheels per annum.

In 1924, the Cyclone Fence Co. was acquired by the corporation.

In 1930, the properties and business of three major companies were purchased by the steel corporation, namely Atlas Portland Cement Co., Columbia Steel Corp., and Oil Well Supply Co. The corporation stated that the value of the properties, plants, business, net current and working assets acquired by these purchases amounted to $91,000,000.

The steel corporation produced cement as a byproduct of slag, and its own Universal Portland Cement Co. had by 1928 a production of approximately 15,000,000 barrels from its three plants at Chicago, Pittsburgh, and Duluth. By the acquisition of the Atlas Portland Cement Co. with its seven cement plants located in the States of Pennsylvania, Missouri, Alabama, New York, and Kansas, it acquired plants whose annual total production was over 19,000,000 barrels, which makes it today much larger than any other cement manufacturer in the country.

The Columbia Steel Corporation was a combination of Columbia Steel Co., with plants in Portland, Oreg., and Pittsburg, Calif., and the Utah Coal & Coke Co. which controlled extensive coal properties in Utah. In 1923 it had acquired the Llewellyn Steel Co. of Los Angeles. It owned large properties in Utah estimated to contain 40,000,000 tons high-grade iron ore and 60,000,000 tons of coking coal, with rail connections.

Oil Well Supply Co. was an established organization operating throughout the United States and abroad, which dealt in large quantities of steel pipe, wire rope, and other products used in the development and operation of oil and gas properties, such products having been similar to those manufactured by subsidiaries of the steel corporation. The Oil Well Supply Co. also handled a complete line of equipment and machinery of its own manufacture and of the manufacture of others for use in the development and use of gas and oil properties.

In 1936, the corporation acquired the Virginia Bridge & Iron Co. property, with its three plants at Roanoke, Va.; Memphis, Tenn.; and Birmingham, Ala.

In 1937, the corporation acquired the Gerrard Co., Inc., manufacturer of machines for tying containers with wire.

In 1939, the corporation acquired properties of Boyle Manufacturing Co., of California, manufacturer of sheet-metal products such as barrels, tanks, etc.

In 1940, the corporation acquired the Savannah Wire Cloth Mills, manufacturers of screen wire.

In 1943, the corporation acquired the physical assets of the Moise Steel Co., at Milwaukee, Wis.

Later in the same year, the corporation, through a subsidiary, acquired the Petroleum Iron Works Co. of Texas, a subsidiary of American Republics Corp. Petroleum Iron Works made steel containers.

In 1944, the corporation made three reported acquisitions. First, it acquired the capital stock of the Gunnison Housing Corp.,

a producer of prefabricated houses. Next, through a subsidiary, the corporation acquired the Witte Engine Works, manufacturers of Diesel engines for oil-well pumps and other uses. Finally, in August of 1944, the corporation acquired the Bennett Manufacturing Co., a steel-drum manufacturer.

In 1945, through its cement producing subsidiary, Universal Atlas Cement Co., the corporation acquired the Wabash Portland Cement Co.

Also in 1945, the corporation, again through a subsidiary, acquired the Nelson Pump Co., a producer of subsurface pumps.

In May 1946, the corporation made its biggest acquisition in recent years when it bought, with Department of Justice approval, the Geneva, Utah, steel plant from the WAA. This plant had cost $200,600,000, but was sold to the corporation for $47,500,000.

In June 1946, the corporation acquired from the WAA the rolling mills and steel works at Homestead, Pa. This plant had cost about $86,500,000; the corporation paid $44,100,000 for it.

Also in June 1946, the corporation acquired from the WAA blast furnaces at Braddock, Pa. These furnaces had cost $22,600,000 to build; the corporation paid $14,400,000.

In the same month the corporation acquired an electric steel and heat-treating plant at Duquesne, Pa., from the WAA. This plant had cost $10,800,000 and was sold to the corporation for $6,500,000.

The corporation's last purchase from the WAA in June 1946 was a blast furnace at Duluth, Minn. The cost of this furnace had been $7,600,000, while the price to the corporation was $1,800,000.

In March 1947, the WAA sold the corporation a town site at a coal-mining property in Dragerton, Utah, for $1,600,000. The cost of this property was listed at $4,200,000.

Also in 1947, the corporation attempted to acquire the Consolidated Steel Corp. at Los Angeles, but has been challenged by the Justice Department. The United States Supreme Court on December 22, 1947, agreed to review the case; so far as is known at this time no decision has been handed down.

On January 9, 1948, WAA approved the sale to the corporation of an aluminum reduction plant at Torrance, Calif. This plant, which had originally cost $12,900,000, was sold to the corporation for $4,200,000.

A New Housing Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech prepared for delivery by my colleague, the Honorable RALPH A. GAMBLE, chairman, Joint Committee on Housing, at the annual meeting, National Association of Home Builders, Wednesday afternoon, February 25, 1948, Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Ill.:

A NEW HOUSING POLICY

At the outset let me say that, in my opinion, what we need is a national housing policy. We have never had one. We do not have one now. I hope our committee, in collaboration with the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees, may develop one. Given a national housing policy, legislation is simple.

The trouble with most discussions of the housing problem of which I have heard or read is that the approach is made, either from a personal, a business, or a class standpoint. Out of this diversity of opinion has developed our present situation, in which he who speaks the loudest, the most frequently, and who applies the most pressure is supposed to get the most attention.

If the Joint Committee on Housing accomplished nothing more than to center attention on the common interest, it would make a substantial contribution. I hope and expect that it will accomplish far more. The subject on which I was asked to speak is: A New Housing Policy. Our Committee has not yet made its report—and will not until the time set in the authorizing resolution, which is March 15. So what I have to say here today should not be regarded as foreshadowing our recommendations, but as simply reflecting my own opinions.

To address the National Association of Home Builders is about like speaking to a combined gathering of realtors, mortgage bankers, and general contractors, with not a few important materials' dealers thrown in. From a relatively weak and diffused group of small operators, you have so expanded in size and so magnified your influence, both through external circumstances, and your own progressiveness, that you are today potentially the greatest power in the building industry. How shall this power be applied?

As individual enterprisers all of you must be aware that business growth comes, not so much through the prevention of bad conditions, as through the promotion of good ones. It comes far less from developing skill in the art of grinding one's own ax, as it does from thinking of the people as a whole. If those of you who are convinced that the world's direst need is a rise in the interest rate or an increase in authorized insurance under section 608 of title VI of FHA, regard what I have just said as angel patter, let me observe that a Congressman sometimes knows more than he is credited with knowing. We get to be Congressmen—and remain such—only as we anticipate or approximate what the people want.

What do the people want? In general, they want a little more assurance on the part of business that business is interested in the common welfare. I read in a New York financial paper the other day that many of the large corporations—including manufacturers of essential building materials—were worried because the profits they made last year were too large. But well might they be concerned.

I personally have no doubt that Congress will take additional action in the extension and increase of insurance for loans under section 608 of title VI of FHA. No one can predict what will happen to the interest rate; personally, I hope it will be held where it is, or even reduced, as it well could be, were the great aggregations of private capital now virtually in hiding to emerge and go to work. What I mean is that the inflationary operation of section 608 is a threat to your industry, and consequently to the country, and that what the self-styled stewards of private capital (such as accumulated insurance funds) fail to do, will most certainly be undertaken by Government, if pressure is applied by minorities at the right time, and if the generally mute majority does not find more unselfish spokesmen among the leaders in private enterprise.

Please do not misunderstand what I have just said, but I hope you take seriously to heart that there is a tremendous demand that additional 608 moneys go into rental housing.

I do not believe that public housing is a dead issue. I do not believe that an artificial boom in dwelling construction can substitute for the kind of substantial construction which has many times averted a depression. I do not believe that labor relations can be made all right merely by saying so. I do believe that the kind of thinking you do at this convention will be a strong factor in what Congress does on public housing. I do believe that, unless you as a group pay more attention to the kind of materials used, and the construction methods followed, in Government-financed housing, we all will have reason to regret such oversight. I do believe that, in your organized dealings with labor, there must be recognition of the good faith of organized labor itself. I do believe, too, that by telling your grievances to labor, as frankly as you demand that they express their grievances to you, you will have done more than you might believe possible to combat the trend toward socialization.

Last year 854,500 new dwelling units were started, 835,000 were completed. I congratulate you home builders and private industry on this record. This year, the minimum should be 1,000,000. If we are to make any appreciable reduction in the accumulated shortage, that figure should be increased. How much it can be increased depends upon a series of steps which, if intelligently taken, will in themselves be correctives of greater value than large amounts of new construction prosecuted without regard to underlying causes.

I am personally convinced that were municipalities simply to enforce their safety and sanitary codes, some shortages could be immediately done away with, and the artificial demand for public housing somewhat abated.

There is no necessity to wait until the sweet by-and-by for the 2,000 localities to modernize and harmonize their building codes. Any division of private enterprise that can be as articulate as realtors and builders are in opposing what they regard as undesirable legislation can certainly be far more active in urging legislation which is universally acknowledged to be desirable for the public.

It is well known among you mortgagee-realtor-home builders that public housing advances slum clearance as its principal objective—its principal housing objective. Here in Chicago, early last November, we held a hearing of our committee. One of our most helpful witnesses was Philip M. Klutznick, president of American Home Builders, whose partner, I believe, is president of the Chicago Metropolitan Association of Home Builders. Without agreeing to all that was said on that occasion by Mr. Klutznick, I commend the following as being of very great value to you. "We must stop thinking of slum clearance and urban redevelopment as housing problems," he said. "Undoubtedly there is a housing aspect, but essentially they are problems in municipal solvency." Now, as most of you undoubtedly know, Mr. Klutznick was formerly Commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority. It appears to be quite possible for him to reconcile his views on improved housing, with his significant individual enterprise. It should be equally possible for you to reconcile your views as builders for profit with the unquestioned demand that something be done—not merely to erect great and costly castles for the poor on former slum sites, but to put former slum land to work in the creation of wealth, thereby making some progress, at least, in the age-old battle of preventing the unfortunate and the incompetent from slipping deeper into a social morass.

Do you gather, from what I have just said, that housing is primarily a local problem? And if the locality is incapable of financially meeting its responsibilities, or insensible to them morally, that housing then becomes a State problem? No better illustration is possible as to how municipality and State can work together than that which we find here in Chicago. I may be wrong, but it is difficult for me to recall more than a few realtors, bankers, or builders who came forward with proposals other than those which would immediately benefit their own particular type of enterprise.

Now, where does all this lead us? Simply to the conclusion that, if we suspect public housing to be a Trojan horse for socializing society, we should do something more than object. May I ask you to do this something, back in your home town? And to do it quickly? This something is to examine your home town's finances. Build your own business with your right hand, if you will, but devote at least the skill of your left hand to public service. It may be that your home town through bad management, is incapable of solving its housing as well as its slum clearance problems. If so, lend it a hand through the State. I do not suppose that all States will be as sympathetic to the proposal that they buy back influence with their own municipalities as is being done in Illinois, but the responsibility is present none the less. And I predict that unless the States do accept this responsibility, your problems of socialized competition will rapidly multiply.

Revert for a moment to the synonymous terms of urban redevelopment and slum clearance. Those proponents of what is loosely and inaccurately termed "public housing," who are really the advance agents of socialized society, would have the people believe that a benevolent and inexhaustibly rich Federal Government is the answer. Therefore they urge the ceaseless appropriation of countless billions of dollars by the Government for housing, added to the twenty billions to which the United States Treasury is already committed, either directly or by contingent liability. The fact is that the Federal Government gets by far most of its income from the cities themselves. The delusion that Government is a producer, and therefore the inexhaustible source of appropriations, must be dissolved. We are trying to do this nationally, but it can best be achieved locally.

You can rest assured that the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress is private-enterprise-minded. This committee is predominantly private-enterprise-minded. But you will have to help us to help you. Let me sum up:

First, see well that the type of construction you are doing under Federal aid merits commendation, not condemnation—and there have been many evidences of bad construction brought to our attention and the committee has seen a lot more over the country. It will come back to plague the GI.

Second, apply, as the Housing Committee has, constant pressure to your building-material resources to reduce their prices.

Third, devote the energies of your local groups to putting the local community's finances in order, and thereby reducing taxes.

Fourth, join with other groups in urging the Illinois plan of urban redevelopment—which is just another word for slum clearance—and thereby help the local community to increase its production of wealth.

Fifth, recognize that there is a need for housing in the lower-income groups, which can be met, on progressively lower-income levels, through some such device as limited-dividend corporations, successfully employed for a number of years by New York State.

In conclusion, let me say one more word on labor. Perhaps what I have to say on this point deserves to rank as the sixth and most important recommendation. If management and labor agree, we need have no fear as to the continuance of our private-enterprise system. You know of this Housing Committee's attitude toward labor. We chose to seek their cooperation, just as we have sought yours. At our hearings I have noted a reluctance on the part of builders to speak publicly on the subject of labor practices. I have also noted a reluctance on the part of labor to correct certain practices until they were publicly called to their attention and proved. Now, to my simple way of thinking, neither attitude is correct.

A few weeks ago I had the privilege of meeting informally in Miami with the members of the executive council of the building-trades department of the AFL. At this meeting a number of questions were directed to me, and because of their significance, I asked the help of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which, not incidentally, but directly, have been most helpful and cooperative. H. E. Riley, Chief of the ELS Construction Statistics Division, writes me under date of February 5, as follows:

"The congressional Joint Committee on Housing is faced with a number of significant questions regarding labor costs, about which unfortunately very little reliable information is available. Questions recently raised on this subject, and some comments on them follow:

"(1) What has been the trend of labor costs in housing construction over the past 5 or 10 years?

"Labor costs in construction are affected by wage rates, labor efficiency, and labor utilization as controlled through proper management of the job, adequate equipment, regular flow of materials, etc. We do not have a measure of labor costs which takes into consideration all of these factors. Testimony prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the committee includes some data indicating that there has been relatively little change in recent years in the proportion of site labor cost to total construction cost in housing. Studies made in 1940 showed that site labor constituted about 32.3 percent of construction cost. In 1946 labor at the site accounted for about 31 percent. During the period from January 1940 to October 1947 average hourly earnings in building construction increased by 79 percent. Wholesale prices of building materials increased by 96 percent between 1940 and October 1947. The residential construction cost index published by the Housing and Home Finance Agency showed an increase of 79 percent between 1940 and July 1947. If these various figures are accepted as substantially accurate, they suggest that labor utilization was better in 1947 than in 1940, otherwise the combination of a 79 percent increase in hourly earnings and a 96 percent increase in building materials costs would have resulted in an increase of more than 79 percent in the construction cost index.

"(2) What has happened to the spread between labor costs and other principal costs in dwelling construction and with selling prices of homes?

"We have no information on selling prices of houses which can be related to the construction cost elements. The report of the Flanders subcommittee cited selling-price data developed by United Industrial Associates, a private organization. This information was obtained by analyzing newspaper advertisements. Aside from the dubious validity of the source of material, we have no way of relating construction cost data to the selling prices obtained from that source.

"(3) Information has been requested concerning labor cost increases since 1939 or 1941 in the manufacture of gypsum products.

"The measurement of labor costs in manufacture involves the same considerations as were noted in the comments under question 1 regarding labor and management efficiency. Our data on average hourly earnings do not extend back of 1946.

"(4) What percentage of the total construction cost in housing is represented by direct and indirect labor costs?

"It has been noted above that construction labor accounts for between 30 and 35 percent of construction cost. Total materials costs represent roughly 50 percent of construction costs, while the direct labor cost in industries producing materials represents at the outside around 75 percent of the cost of material delivered at the site. This means that the nonconstruction labor costs in housing construction would account for 35 to 40 percent. Therefore the total labor cost, including site construction labor and the cost of industrial labor in producing materials, would constitute about 70 percent of construction cost. This estimate excludes labor costs remotely involved in materials production. For example, the estimate of labor costs excludes the value of raw materials in their natural state, interest charges on capital of the materials producers, profits of the materials producers and distributors, and promotional costs. Promotional costs, of course, include salaries of employees in advertising firms, etc. These are not counted as labor costs in the above estimate.

"In summary, using the definition of direct and indirect labor costs as above described, it is believed that the total labor costs do not exceed 70 percent of construction cost and perhaps is closer to 60 percent under present conditions."

In behalf of the public interest I urge that the National Association of Home Builders and the Building Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor work out some cooperative means of face-to-face discussions of their mutual problems. Perhaps this could be accomplished by the appointment of committees by local home builders and local building trades councils. It is incredible to me that this was not done a long time ago. To meet once a year simply to discuss questions of wages and hours, and then not to see each other for 12 months simply doesn't make sense. The construction industry, next to agriculture, is our biggest industry. In its relations with labor, mutual trust and respect, the will to live and let live, above all to produce the best that is possible in the public interest, transcend all else. If this viewpoint is adopted and put into effect, I predict our housing problem will quickly disappear, and with it will also disappear a very real threat to private enterprise and to the American way of life, in which neither capital nor labor is all, but in which each plays its indispensable part.

These are only my views as a member of the House-Senate Joint Housing Committee, whose lease on life expires March 15 when we file a report and pass out of existence. We have tried to be factual after over 7,000 pages of testimony. If you don't agree with me write for a copy of the testimony and try to keep awake reading it. Thank you for inviting me to come to Chicago to meet with you.

Résumé of Veterans' Legislation Approved by the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, from time to time discussions are held concerning benefits and privileges granted to our veteran population by the Eightieth Congress.

On February 21 Speaker of the House JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., in an address to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the

United States at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., enumerated the benefits to veterans enacted by the Eightieth Congress.

For the information of the Members of Congress, I am inserting, at this point, a portion of Speaker MARTIN's speech, commenting on what the Eightieth Congress had done to recognize the debt of gratitude the American people owe to the veterans of the United States.

Speaker MARTIN's remarks are as follows:

Now I want to speak for a moment about what the Eightieth Congress has done to recognize the debt of gratitude we owe to the veterans of the United States. In broad general terms, you already know we stand for every educational advantage for the veteran it is possible to give him.

We have already passed a bill in the House of Representatives to lower tax rates. More than 71 percent of those reductions go to those in the lower-income brackets.

We are moving to reduce the debt as rapidly as practicable in order to take off of the veterans and their children as much of that service load as possible.

Here I would like to point out some of the accomplishments which have been achieved by the Eightieth Congress for the benefit of the veterans.

The Eightieth Congress did not have the benefit of a great publicity machine. But in spite of turbulent world problems much was accomplished for veterans. Following are the measures passed by the Eightieth Congress:

Public Law No. 5, to extend the time limitation for reinstatement of national service life insurance policies.

Public Law No. 34, to provide for renewal for a fifth 5-year period the 5-year level premium term insurance plan for World War I veterans.

Public Law No. 36, to grant officers of the Army and Navy Nurses Corps comparable rank, pay, and allowances with officers of the Army and Navy.

Public Law No. 82, to permit husband and wife to combine their armed services credit for homestead purposes.

Public Law No. 85, authorizing $35,500,000 to complete temporary reuse housing for veterans.

Public Law No. 115, increasing the revolving fund in the Veterans' Administration from $1,500,000 to $3,000,000 for the purpose of making non-interest-bearing loans to disabled World War II veterans taking vocational rehabilitation courses.

Public Law No. 126, extending until January 1, 1948, the time during which alien fiancées of veterans may enter the United States without being subject to immigration quotas or visa regulations.

Public Law No. 161, to extend for another year the authority to purchase automobiles for World War II veterans who are leg amputees or have suffered the loss of use of a leg.

Public Law No. 213, to permit the admission to the United States of racially inadmissible alien spouses of veterans.

Public Law No. 254, to provide for the cash payment of terminal-leave bonds any time after September 1, 1947.

Public Law No. 270, to provide a 20-percent pension increase for veterans of the Civil War and Spanish-American War.

Public Law No. 310, to restore the tax exemption status of those members of the armed services removed from former American possessions during captivity by the Japanese.

Public Law No. 314, to authorize the acceptance by officers and enlisted men of the armed services of medals and decorations tendered them by cobelligerent and neutral nations of World War II.

Public Law No. 316, to permit retired armed services personnel to represent veterans organizations in claims before the Veterans' Administration.

Public Law No. 325, to make mandatory on Federal agencies the rulings of the Civil Service Commission on appeals by veterans for reinstatement.

Public Law No. 337, to improve the Army and Navy medical services.

Public Law No. 338, to increase the minimum allowances payable to disabled veterans undergoing vocational rehabilitation under Public Law No. 16.

Public Law No. 350, to provide cash in lieu of terminal leave for veterans.

Public Law No. 365, to provide additional pay of $100 per month for officers of the Army Medical Corps and Navy Medical Corps.

Public Law No. 367, to refund income tax so paid by any member of the armed services who died on active duty for the year in which death occurred and for the years during which he was in the armed services.

Public Law No. 377, to provide full subsistence allowances for veterans taking on-the-farm training.

Public Law No. 396, to extend veterans' preference benefits (civil service) to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen. Approved January 19, 1948.

Public Law 398, to increase by 20 percent the pensions payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans. Approved January 19, 1948.

Public Law No. 411, to increase the subsistence allowances to veterans pursuing full-time educational training courses under the GI bill of rights. The measure increased such allowances from $65 to $75 a month for single persons, from $90 to $105 for veterans with one dependent, and to $120 for veterans with more than one dependent. The increased allowances will go to about 1,500,000 veterans and cost around $217,000,000 a year. Approved February 14, 1948.

S. 1393, to raise the ceilings and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job is in conference. The Senate voted to increase the ceilings from $175 to $200 a month for a veteran without a dependent and from $200 to $250 for a veteran with dependents. The House voted to increase ceilings $250 for a veteran without dependents, $325 for a veteran with one dependent and $350 for a veteran with more than one dependent.

Hospital facilities for disabled veterans must be adequately expanded. No disabled veterans must ever be allowed to suffer for a lack of hospital care.

Abraham Lincoln and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Harry Frantz, United Press staff correspondent, pointing out the interest which President Lincoln had in Hawaii, even though at that time Hawaii was an independent monarchy and not a part of the United States:

WASHINGTON.—Advocates of Hawaiian political advancement often cite Abraham Lincoln among the illustrious friends of the Hawaiian people, although his presidency occurred when the mid-Pacific islands were still a kingdom and today's campaign for statehood could not have been predicted.

The slavery question and the War of the States monopolized most of the Emancipator President's days in the White House, but official records reveal many indications of his deep interest in affairs of the Pacific region and his more than casual sympathy for the Hawaiian people.

"In every light in which the state of the Hawaiian Islands can be contemplated, it is an object of profound interest for the United States," President Lincoln once said.

Virtually it was once a colony. It is a haven of shelter and refreshment for our merchants, fishermen, seamen, and other citizens when on their lawful occasions they are navigating the eastern seas and oceans. Its people are free, and its laws, language, and religion are largely the fruit of our own teaching and example.

According to an official collection of Lincoln documents, these remarks were made to an envoy from the Hawaiian Islands, June 11, 1864, but name of the envoy was not noted. The House of Representatives' report on the present statehood bill quoted similar remarks by President Lincoln in a letter to Elisha Allen, Envoy Extraordinary from the United States to Hawaii, in the same year.

That President Lincoln's friendly disposition toward the Hawaiian people was reciprocated is indicated by communications from Honolulu at the time of Lincoln's death in 1865, officially published in Diplomatic Archives.

A memorial meeting at Lahaina, island of Maui, presided by M. Hihie, with D. Kahawlilio as secretary, adopted a resolution expressive of the sympathy of Lahaina, and deploring the assassination of the great, the good, the liberator Abraham Lincoln.

"Yet live his mighty deeds, victory, peace, and the emancipation of those despised," said the communication.

In 1863, the United States elevated its diplomatic representative before the Hawaiian monarchy from the rank of Commissioner to that of Minister. During Lincoln's Presidency Thomas J. Dryer was Commissioner from 1861 to 1863, and James McBride served as Minister Resident from 1863 until 1866.

In those years, the chief diplomatic tasks were to avert the possible use of Hawaiian ports by Confederate privateers, negotiation of a reciprocity treaty, and attention to seafaring matters that grew out of Honolulu's position on trans-Pacific routes to China and Japan. Depot needs of United States naval craft already had foreshadowed the future importance of the islands in mainland naval defense.

Lincoln's Secretary of State William Seward with a notably friendly attitude toward the Hawaiian Government twice declined to "intervene" in Hawaiian domestic matters, once in connection with proposed changes in the constitution, and once in reference to a customs dispute.

"The interpretation of their own revenue laws is the prerogative of the Hawaiian Government, and the application of them must be left to their own sense of equity," wrote Secretary Seward to the United States Minister at Honolulu.

Lincoln except for the Civil War might swiftly have advanced plans for an Atlantic-to-Pacific canal on the Nicaraguan route, a trans-Pacific cable, and a general broadening of Pacific commerce. These matters are frequently mentioned in state papers of the period. Officials of the time were keenly aware of the importance of Hawaii in the commerce, communications, and military strategy of the entire Pacific area.

In his last state of the Union message to Congress on December 6, 1864, President Lincoln said that a rebellion in China had been suppressed, "with the cooperating good offices of the United States Government and other western commercial states.

"China seems to be accepting with hearty good will the conventional laws which regulate commercial and social intercourse with the United States.

"Owing to the peculiar situation of Japan and the anomalous form of its government, the action of that empire in performing treaty stipulations is inconstant and capricious. Nevertheless, good progress has been effected by the western powers, moving with enlightened concert. Our own pecuniary claims have been allowed or put in course of settlement, and the Inland Sea has been reopened to commerce. There is reason also to believe that these proceedings have increased rather than diminished the friendship of Japan toward the United States."

Home Rule in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under the authority granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am very pleased to include therein a thoughtful and constructive letter which I have received from Mr. Joseph W. Cheyney, who is now living in Gaithersburg, Md.

Mr. Cheyney is a native-born Washingtonian and is very much interested in the proposed legislation for home rule and the reorganization of the District government, and his letter carries a great deal of interesting historical information as well as constructive suggestions for the improvement of the act, H. R. 4902.

The subcommittee of the District Committee which has this matter under consideration will most certainly give Mr. Cheyney's suggestion its closest attention and we are indeed very grateful to him for his interest. I am sure the Members of the House will be interested to read this well-written and informative letter.

GAITHERSBURG, MD., *February 24, 1948.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on District of Columbia and Home Rule.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Congress of the United States is always deeply impressed and influenced by precedents; therefore the emphasis should be placed on restoring local self-government to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia—a fundamental right, which, by acts of Congress of the United States, they enjoyed for 70 years—from 1801 to 1871. This will inform your fellow legislators that you are asking them to do again what our forefathers did before.

If you will take the 1929 Code of Law for the District of Columbia and begin at page 449 and read through to and including page 495, you will have a complete picture of what the Congress has done to perpetuate and provide for the exercise of the right of the inhabitants at the seat of government of the United States to have their own local self-government.

During the hearings you were told that James Madison (in the Federalist) wrote that a municipal legislature for local purposes will of course be allowed the inhabitants of the seat of government of the United States. This promise was faithfully kept, for by section 16 of the first act of Congress concerning the Territory of Columbia (February 27, 1801; 2 Stat. 103, ch. 15) it was enacted:

"That nothing in this act contained shall in anywise alter, impeach, or impair the rights granted by or derived from the incorporation of Alexandria and Georgtown, or of any other body corporate or politic, within the said District except as far as it relates to the judicial powers of the corporations of Georgetown and Alexandria."

(Georgetown in the Maryland part; Alexandria on the Virginia side of the District of Columbia.)

Whatever construction may be placed upon the "exclusive legislative" clause of the Constitution concerning the District of Columbia or the seat of Government of the United States, it is plainly evident that the Congress in former times did not believe that it deprived the inhabitants thereof of the right of local self-government. Able expositors of the Constitution have agreed that it means no more than that no State could have jurisdiction over the seat of Government of the United States; and the tenth amendment to the Constitution should be held to be a limitation upon the clause, so far as local self-government for the District of Columbia is concerned. By acts of our forefather legislators in Congress, they certainly so observed it.

Then in 1802 (by act of Congress May 3) local self-government was provided for the city of Washington. Pages following in the 1929 code set before you how the Congress liberalized the local governments in the District of Columbia by enlarging home rule and vesting more powers in the District of Columbia municipalities. There is impressive illumination in section 7 of the act of Congress, May 3, 1802, incorporating the inhabitants of the city of Washington as a municipality. At the very beginning of that section 7 the corporation so created shall have full power and authority to pass all bylaws and ordinances. The word "by" comes from an old Norse word that means "town," so that bylaws in connection with city ordinances are "town laws." They are not legislative laws in the sense that Congress and the State legislatures enact "legislation"; and there is no delegation of legislative power when the Congress provides for a home rule council to make municipal laws for the District of Columbia. The United States Supreme Court has said that "the District of Columbia is a municipal corporation, and as such it may be invested with legislative authority; but it can exercise only such powers which are expressly conferred by statute, which must be of a strictly municipal nature." (Cases are cited in S. Doc. No. 154, 68th Cong., 1st sess., which contains a synopsis of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States from its establishment to December 1, 1924. See p. 239.) Note particularly that "powers granted must be expressly conferred by statute" and "must be of a strictly municipal nature." You will find such an enumeration of powers in section 7 of the act of Congress, May 3, 1802 (pp. 450–451, 1929 Code, D. C.). These mean that acts of a District of Columbia council may not include such as are exercised through a State legislature or the Congress and are not properly municipal town laws. This would not permit the Public Utilities Commission and similar agencies to be regulated by a District of Columbia municipal council. To comply with the above quoted court limitations, your bill will have to continue the District of Columbia as a municipal corporation to justify its existence through municipal powers granted thereto.

I think that the strongest argument for the abolition of the commissioner form of government of the District of Columbia is that an Army officer (while still in the Army of the United States) is one of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia who make municipal ordinances, disguised as regulations. By section 3 of the Temporary Organic Act of the District of Columbia (p. 474, 1929 Code, D. C.) he is designated as "an officer of Engineer Corps of the Army of the United States" and shall perform the duties heretofore devolved upon the Board of Public Works, abolished under this act by the act of Congress wiping out the legislative assembly under the Territorial Act for the District of Columbia. His duties are itemized in that section "and he shall not be deemed by reason of anything in this act contained to hold a civil office under the laws of the United States." In section 2 of the Permanent Organic Act for the District of Columbia (p. 477, 1929 Code, D. C.) he shall not be required to perform any other duty. As the above provisions of the Temporary Organic Act for the District of Columbia are not inconsistent with the Permanent Organic Act for the District of Columbia, they are presumed to be still in force. Certainly it does not seem proper that a Commissioner, limited to engineer duties, should be both a United States Army officer and a municipal legislator at the same time. A change to a civilian engineer to perform the duties of a United States Army officer certainly would be an improvement in a local government by the people of the District of Columbia.

It should be particularly emphasized that as citizens of the States of Maryland and Virginia, these people of the seat of Government of the United States had the right of local self-government before the Territory of Columbia was ceded to the Congress and Government of the United States—before we had a Constitution—and the mere act of cession did not take them out of the Union or deprive them of their freeman right to have and retain local self-government. Corroborative of that is that the act of 1801 concerning the Territory of Columbia expressly continued in force the laws of Maryland as they then existed and the laws of Virginia as were then in force, except the judicial powers. A great and inexcusable wrong would be undone by a change now to local self-government for the people of the District of Columbia. They would be set free from the stigma that they are subjects of the Congress of the United States, now governed at its will and pleasure, for neither Maryland nor Virginia had any authority over their freemen citizenry as would justify either State to consign them to the vassalage of subjects.

By the change to local self-government the people of the District of Columbia would feel that they are no longer mere subjects of the Congress. Are they subjects now? By section 1 of the Act of Congress of June 11, 1878 (the Organic Act of the District of Columbia, p. 477, 1929 Code, D. C.) said: District and the property and persons that may be therein shall be subject, etc." Then read what the United States Supreme Court once said: "The United States, under the present Constitution, cannot acquire territory to be held as a colony, to be governed at its will and pleasure. And may establish a local government • • • in respect to the rights of persons or rights of property" (*Dred Scott* v. *Sandford* (19 How. 373)). The Court meant territorial form of government but our forefathers went further and perpetuated and enlarged local self-government (or home rule) in the District of Columbia for 70 years.

Section 17 of the act of Congress establishing the Territorial form of government for the District of Columbia (p. 471, 1929 Code D. C.) sets forth what the local legislative assembly could not do, while the charter of the city of Washington (1802), by section 7, pages 451, 452, 1929 Code, District of Columbia, specified what the city council

could do, including to "lay and collect taxes." It would be informative to read both lists.

A very important part of said section 17 of the Territorial Act is a prohibition against "granting to any corporation, association or individual any special or exclusive privilege, immunity, or franchise whatsoever." Such a prohibition might well be in your bill for home rule for the District of Columbia, as it would do away with the favoritism now shown the bands of irresponsible public lobbyists who presume to represent large sections of the District without lawful authority and other cliques here (not responsible to the people) who are ever seeking to further their own selfish interests at public expense.

Your attention is called also to section 24 of the act of Congress establishing the Territorial form of government for the District of Columbia (p. 473, 1929 Code, D. C.) in which you find "and the Constitution and all the laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within the said District of Columbia as elsewhere within the United States." The Supreme Court of the United States declares: "When the Constitution has been once extended by Congress to Territories, neither Congress nor the Territorial legislatures can enact laws inconsistent therewith." (In re Ross, 140 U. S. 464; *Downes v. Bidwell*, 182 U. S. 251). Does it not seem to be a great wrong when Congress took away the right to vote from the inhabitants of the District of Columbia?

All necessary safeguards to prevent fraud in elections should be included in your bill. There should be no election by minority vote, but run-offs should be required when the candidate for any office does not receive a majority of the votes cast.

You might also use the wording (as necessarily modified) found in section 18 of said Territorial Act of 1871 (p. 471, 1929 Code, D. C.): ["For good and sufficient cause,] (add) all acts of the legislative assembly [District of Columbia municipal council] shall at all times be [liable] (not subject) to repeal or modification by the Congress of the United States, and nothing herein shall be construed to deprive Congress of legislation over said District in as ample a manner as if this law had not been enacted." No veto power is vested in the Congress of the United States, nor can it approve by inaction. It must disapprove, modify, or repeal by positive legislative act in the usual and regular constitutional course. The above modified language of section 18 settles a disputed point.

My purpose in writing is to send you such information of a conclusive nature as will mightily help to accomplish your laudable purpose. I am sincerely grateful to you for all you have done and are doing in behalf of the disfranchised subjects of the District of Columbia.

It seems to me that if such parts of this letter as you may verify and approve as helpful could be made into an extension of remarks by you or by your able assistants and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you would have a very forceful argument to influence your fellow legislators to favor and vote for home rule for the District of Columbia. They will then know that it is a restoration of a right that never should have been taken away.

I was born in Washington, D. C., have lived there the greater part of my life, and have advocated a return of local self-government for the District of Columbia since 1890 in local newspapers and at congressional hearings. Due to heart trouble, I have been staying with a relative in Gaithersburg, Md., since last May, but I still have interests in the District of Columbia that would be affected by a change in the government to home rule, and I believe it would be highly beneficial to all the people living therein, all the griping at it, and selfish interests opposing it to the contrary notwithstanding.

Hoping and praying that you will win gloriously in your efforts to restore local self-government to the people of the District of Columbia.

Gratefully and respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH W. CHEYNEY.

Federal School Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission of the House, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared February 22, 1948, in the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item:

FEDERAL SCHOOL SUPPORT

Let the Government sober up from its spending spree, and the local communities will have enough money to finance their schools.

The bright boys at Washington cannot see that the dollars they are taking from the incomes of the people back home are the dollars that should be used for local purposes.

The National Education Association says school support is "inadequate" and schooling opportunities are "unequal."

Its executive secretary uses that as a reason why the Congress should give $300,000,000 Federal aid to needy school districts.

The Federal bureaucrats would like to put the schools under their control. If Federal school aid is granted, another group of bureaucrats will be added to the Federal pay roll.

The more functions and services the bureaucrats are allowed to perform, the more they will build up their power.

The vast army of men and women who are on the Federal pay roll is a drain on the income of the people.

The bureaucrats are not producers. They are not working in our shops and stores. They are not helping to run our railroads or operate our utilities.

They are not adding to the national income through their work. But they are living off the country. Part of our incomes is used to pay their salaries.

The move to extend Federal aid to the schools is in line with the program of the bureaucrats. It is a big question whether more expensive schools will give better education.

The motive behind the demand for Federal aid is the desire to strengthen big Government at Washington and to give the bureaucrats more power.

Address of Harrington Wimberly, Vice Chairman, Federal Power Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESTON E. PEDEN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 30, 1947, the Honorable Harrington Wimberly, Vice Chairman, Federal Power Commission, delivered a very able and far-sighted address before the sixteenth annual association of the National Reclamation Association at Phoenix, Ariz.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this address, which very thoughtfully discusses the important problem of conservation and development of our water resources:

It is with considerable personal satisfaction that I am privileged to address this gathering of leaders from our Western States who are devoting their time and energies to a most worthy cause—the conservation and utilization of the Nation's more important natural resources—our lands and the waters of the countless streams that father our mighty rivers.

If you will pardon a brief personal reference, I wish to note that my active interest in the preservation of water resources to the end that they will be dedicated to the welfare of the greatest number predates many years my membership on the Federal Power Commission. My entire life has been spent in a section of the country where every drop of rain that falls that can be impounded or otherwise preserved for future use is a blessing.

It is my natural inclination to look first to the benefits that can be achieved by returning to the land, to the fullest extent feasible, the waters that drain from it. I know how very useful a little water can be at the right time. I am fully aware of the struggle that land owners often experience before an irrigation dream becomes a reality. During the past years I have witnessed at first-hand what often is required to secure for a section the lasting benefits of a Bureau of Reclamation project.

Today, however, my subject for discussion is not so much irrigation and water conservation as it is the related and often bitterly debated question of Federal jurisdiction over the Nation's rivers. Of course, some will charge that I ought to include the tiny streams in the same category with the rivers, but it is my intention to keep as far as possible from the highly controversial aspects of this problem. Certainly, it would not be helpful at such a meeting as this to suggest issues that might cloud the broader objectives of this convention.

There is one thing that I do wish to emphasize. It is something that gives me no trouble and I do not think needs be much of a problem to anyone. I refer to the interest and the direct responsibility of the National Government in the waters of our navigable rivers and their tributaries. I want to make it as clear as I can that my conception of the basic jurisdiction of the Federal Government in these matters has not changed since I left my newspaper office in the town of Altus, in southwest Oklahoma, to become a member of the Federal Power Commission.

I have heard this subject of jurisdiction debated in my State from all angles, and in the end the compelling argument would prevail, that no region and no locality can do a complete job of conservation of its water resources without invoking the jurisdictional authority and receiving the aid of the National Government.

The realistic situation as I have tried to interpret it need not cause alarm or excite prejudices. We are in a period of progressive thinking and action when there is an acute realization of both Federal and State responsibilities over the control and utilization of water resources. Of practically no river basin can it be said that the responsibility for adequate comprehensive and wise use of water in the public interest is solely a matter of Federal responsibility and most certainly it is not a responsibility that a State alone can assume. There is, we all must recognize, a proper and necessary role to be played by all governmental agencies

and neither State nor Federal Government can infringe upon the rights and responsibilities of the other without jeopardy to the interests of the people as a whole.

It has been charged by some that the "encroachment"—and bear in mind I emphasize the quotes—of the National Government has been fostered by the Federal Power Commission among other agencies. A review of the history of the long and often disheartening struggle for Federal water power legislation which would effectively operate in the interests of the people refutes any such misconception. As laymen, as I am sure most of us are, there can be no mistake in our minds regarding the powers granted and implied in the Constitution to the Congress to control, regulate, and develop the navigable rivers and their tributaries. The Congress exercised such jurisdiction long before the passage of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 and in so doing it was repeatedly upheld by the Supreme Court. As you also know, the assertion of jurisdiction by the Federal Power Commission over water power plants has also been consistently sustained by the Supreme Court.

Briefly, the first national legislation dealing with streams had to do with permitting and removing obstructions to navigation within the inland waterways.[1] Nearly 60 years ago, and continuing for more than 2 decades thereafter, Congress followed a policy of virtually giving away to private interests for an unlimited time extremely valuable water power sites on many of our rivers. This policy of permitting private exploitation, with few limitations, and without payment, supervision, or control, was followed generally until a sharp awakening occurred in 1908 when President Theodore Roosevelt vetoed a license extension bill for a water-power site on the Rainy River in Minnesota.[2]

Later there were lapses back to a "give away" policy until President Taft on August 24, 1912, vetoed the Coosa River bill authorizing the Alabama Power Co. to build a dam at Lock 18, and firmed up our present-day conception of the public's interest in our water resources.

The veto messages of these two Presidents did not deal with jurisdictional questions. It was largely a matter of whether the public interest was paramount to the exploitations by private interests. A private company, said President Theodore Roosevelt, was not required, under the legislation previously passed by Congress, to develop these resources in a logical and comprehensive manner and the rights of the general public were largely neglected.

These principles were crystallized in March 1908 when he appointed the Inland Waterways Commission to study the waters of the United States and formulate plans for their more complete use. I think it would be quite illuminating to some if I would quote portions of his letters to members of that Commission. These statements indicate clearly his conception of Federal jurisdiction and how it might be properly exercised, and these accepted concepts have not changed during the past 40 years. President Theodore Roosevelt wrote to the Commission, in part, as follows:

"Works designed to control our waterways have thus far usually been undertaken for a single purpose, such as the improvement of navigation, the development of power, the irrigation of arid lands, the protection of lowlands from floods, or to supply water for domestic and manufacturing purposes. While the rights of the people to these and similar uses of water must be respected, the time has come for merging local projects and uses of the inland waters in a comprehensive plan designed for the benefit of the entire country. Such a plan should consider and include all the uses to which streams may be put, and should bring together and coordinate the points of view of all users of waters.

* * * * * *

"It is not possible to properly frame so large a plan as this for the control of our rivers without taking account of the orderly development of other natural resources. Therefore, I ask that the Inland Waterways Commission shall consider the relations of the streams to the use of all the great permanent natural resources and their conservation for the making and maintenance of prosperous homes."[3]

From that time until June 10, 1920 when President Woodrow Wilson signed the Federal Water Power Act creating the Federal Power Commission, the batle over public and private rights in water use of national streams raged in Congress and elsewhere. Many of you are already familiar with the hectic legislative history of this water power statute which finally resulted in expression of a definite and progressive congressional policy. Under this statute many valuable water power sites have been developed for public benefit by private power interests.

Too frequently in other fields arguments along jurisdictional lines have generated so much heat and aroused so much enmity that the public interest has suffered, and at times valuable resources have been irretrievably dissipated. As a member of the Federal Power Commission and a citizen of a State vitally interested in these matters, it is my earnest hope that in the future these unfortunate results may be avoided in the field of water control and use.

In addition to private power developments, our national policy has also considered public river improvements. In the long series of legislative acts evidencing Federal interest in the full utilization of water courses under comprehensive plans, the River and Harbor Act of 1927[4] inaugurated the active start of another era in national planning and river control with necessary funds being supplied from the Federal Treasury. This statute enacted into law the recommendations of the Army engineers, as set forth in the famous House Document No. 308 of the Sixty-third Congress, first session, and called for detailed study and reports on all possible uses of the principal river basins subject to Federal jurisdiction.

The disastrous flood of 1927 in the Mississippi River Basin and the agitation which followed prompted Congress to pass the Mississippi River Flood Control Act of 1928,[5] and the Nation was finally on its way to the full utilization and adequate control of these great natural resources.

The purpose of this movement is not only to prevent loss of life and property, but to enable our citizens to live a more secure life, to have the use of available water for municipal and domestic purposes, to irrigate their lands, to convert the restless waters into electric power for industrial, residential, and farming purposes, and to improve transportation channels for low-cost water carriage.

Another important part of this program, and one that means so much to many of us in the plains country, is development of the recreational opportunities which are being opened up for hundreds of thousands of our citizens.

In more recent years the movement for such constructive work has gathered further impetus from the achievements and benefits which are increasingly in evidence. Although Federal expenditures for river and harbor improvement started in 1822, up to 1938 only $558,000,000 had been spent for flood control. By way of contrast, the expenditures for river and harbor work, up to 1938, amounted to a total of $2,432,000,000 after having started off with a modest expenditure of $530 in 1822. The last decade has shown us to be well on our way. Between 1939 and 1945, the United States spent over $728,000,000 for flood control, and over $604,000,000 for river and harbor work. The grand total for all such work shows the United States has spent over $4,324,000,000 through 1945 in furtherance of the objectives to which I have referred.

To the expenditures through the War Department for river control and development may be added the expenditures of the Department of the Interior. Up to June 30 of this year the Bureau of Reclamation had spent approximately $1,100,000,000, of which around $600,000,000 could be allocated to reclamation, and other expenditures going chiefly to power plants and power facilities, but including a number of other incidental purposes. We might also mention the Tennessee Valley Authority, whose tremendous achievements are of immeasurable value to the Nation as well as creating a new economy in the large area embraced within the Tennessee River watershed. Over $842,000,000 had been expended by the TVA up to June 30 of this year.

Referring to my earlier remarks, I want again to remind you that the assertion of Federal control over tributary streams has long been recognized as an appropriate exercise of constitutional authority. Judicial recognition of this authority has kept pace with the measures found by Congress to be necessary to advance or protect the general welfare. In 1899, the Supreme Court said that a provision in the River and Harbor Act of 1890[6] extending Federal control to nonnavigable streams for the protection of lower navigable capacity was constitutional. In that case it was held that the Elephant Butte Dam in New Mexico, then under construction as a non-Federal development, would require Federal approval if it was found to impair substantially lower navigable capacity.[7]

It was not, however, until the United States constructed a flood-control and power dam in an admittedly nonnavigable stream, and its authority to do so was directly challenged, that the Supreme Court finally passed upon the question of the authority of Congress to construct multiple-purpose projects in nonnavigable tributaries. In this case, which involved the Denison Dam, located between Texas and Oklahoma on the Red River, the Supreme Court stated the obvious when it remarked, "Floods pay no respect to State lines."

This project was merely one of a series of reservoirs in tributaries of the Mississippi River which would serve the double purpose of keeping back large floods and relieving summer navigation from obstruction by allowing the surplus so retained to pass down in the season of low water.

The Court further remarked:

"There is no constitutional reason why Congress cannot, under the commerce power, treat the watersheds as a key to flood control on navigable streams and their tributaries. Nor is there a constitutional necessity for viewing each reservoir project in isolation from a comprehensive plan covering the entire basin of a particular river."[8]

Congress has stated on many occasions, and it is now quite generally recognized, that the national government is not confined in its protective and control measures to those sections of a stream which are navigable in interstate commerce, but that this jurisdiction extends to the very headwaters of such streams to the full extent necessary to promote and protect interstate commerce.

---

[1] E. g., River and Harbor Act of 1890, 26 Stat. 454, and the earlier river and harbor acts.

[2] Senate Doc. 438, 60–1, Apr. 13, 1908.

[3] S. Doc. 325, 60–1 (1908).

[4] Act of Jan. 21, 1927, 44 Stat. 1010.

[5] 45 Stat. 534.

[6] 26 Stat. 454.

[7] *U. S.* v. *Rio Grande Dam and Irrigation Co.* (174 U. S. 690 (1899)).

[8] *Oklahoma* v. *Atkinson* (313 U. S. 508 (1941)).

However, when we come to consider the exercise of this authority in connection with the effect upon State jurisdiction, we have a more difficult and more complex situation. But the solution is a proper manner of this problem will result in the general development of the great waterways of the United States for the benefit of the largest number of people, and with the least friction among all State and Federal agencies concerned.

With respect to the construction of multiple-purpose projects by the corps of engineers, it is the Federal Power Commission's function to pass upon the feasibility of power development and to recommend the installation of penstocks and appurtenant power facilities. In order that this may be done, it is necessary, of course, to know where the power can be marketed and the general economic picture which should be considered by Congress in authorizing construction. The Commission, therefore, makes appropriate recommendations in such cases submitting recommendations jointly with the Chief of Engineers to the Secretary of the Army.

Those projects which are constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation are the responsibility of that agency. The power-market studies and power-analysis possibilities at any particular site which must be made by the Commission for a variety of reasons, such as its licensed project work and its work under the Flood Control and River and Harbor Acts have been found by the Bureau of Reclamation to be extremely valuable and of great assistance. With respect to the approval of rate schedules for sale of power from Government projects, the Federal Power Commission's participation is required for those projects constructed under the Flood Control and River and Harbor Acts and the Fort Peck and Bonneville projects.

In addition to Federal developments, there are many private and State power projects constructed under the Federal Power Act and so designed as to be best adapted to the most comprehensive plans for stream development and control. The Federal Power Act, as you know, and as the Commission was reminded only a couple of weeks ago by a large group of power companies,[9] is drawn upon lines designed to encourage private construction of water-power projects on streams subject to the jurisdiction of Congress under appropriate terms and in the public interest. It is important to keep in mind that the licensing of private power projects represents one means of securing comprehensive development of water resources without the expenditure of Federal funds.

Some concern was expressed by various State groups following the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the First Iowa case.[10] I do not find it difficult to follow the Court's analysis of the problem presented or to rationalize administration of the Federal Power Act in conformity with it, while at the same time giving full recognition to the rights and statutes of the several States. In reality, the Court no more than repeated what it had said in the *Oklahoma* v. *Atkinson Co.* case. The Court evidently had in mind the long struggle for the effective control of the waters over which Congress might constitutionally assert jurisdiction. Speaking of the effect the Iowa statute might have on the administration of the Federal Power Act, the Court said:

"We find that when that [Federal Power] act is read in the light of its long and colorful legislative history, it discloses both a vigorous determination of Congress to make progress with the development of the long-idle water-power resources of the Nation and a determination to avoid unconstitutional invasion of the jurisdiction of the States. The solution reached is to apply the principle of the division of constitutional powers between the State and Federal Governments. This has resulted in a dual system involving the close integration of these powers rather than a dual system of futile duplication of two authorities over the same subject matter."

At every gathering where water resources and their development is the subject of discussion the charge is made that the Federal Government and its agencies are exceeding proper and constitutional authority. The fear will probably always be expressed that our national resources are gradually being nationalized. I, for one, will always support every proper interest the States may have, but at the same time we want to make sure that private interests that would exploit are not confused with genuine public interests within the State. I will be perfectly frank in stating that, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the Federal Power Commission has not been guilty of inflicting or causing to be inflicted any real injury to any State in the administration of the Federal Power Act. Naturally, I am not in a position to ascertain first-hand all that has transpired in other fields where Federal jurisdiction has been invoked. But I do wish to point out that my own State of Oklahoma fought a losing battle to prevent the construction of the Denison flood-control and power dam, to which I have referred previously, and today a very large majority of the people of Oklahoma recognize that great project as a blessing that will be enjoyed in our time and one that will bring happiness and better living to our children and our children's children.

I would be the last to suggest that the States should sit idly by and leave all the planning and development of these natural resources to the National Government. State participation in all these activities is highly desirable, if not essential. But all must recognize that the States have a responsibility that can be carried out without wasting time at every turn to engage in a new jurisdictional battle.

There is a most promising experiment under way in the Missouri Basin and I am sure that every person who is intensely interested in the development of our water resources is hopeful of its accomplishments because it can be a pattern of cooperation in every section of the United States. Most of you know of the work of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee. Here we have an example of State and Federal groups striving toward a common goal without the conflicts of jurisdiction becoming an issue. The States have a right and duty to insist that their local interests and general welfare receive protection and consideration. Congress, acting through duly constituted Federal agencies, charged with specific responsibilities in connection with the general welfare, cannot properly be asked to limit constitutional prerogatives but the great undertaking so essential to progress and security in the 10 great States drained by the Missouri and its tributaries must go forward.

There are those present who have attended and participated in the meetings of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee during the past year. They can give an accurate and detailed account of the problems that have been faced and how they have been met by the Governors and their aides and other State representatives and Federal agency men sitting around the table in a cooperative and friendly atmosphere. It now appears that the committee will present to Congress a highly comprehensive and uniform plan with the proposal that the entire matter be heard by a single congressional committee. The Federal and State budgets will be coordinated and a unified front will be maintained. It is not as simple as this brief explanation might indicate but this is a bold and worthy step in the direction of eliminating most of the controversies between State and National Government that have had a disturbing and retarding effect in the past.

The entire Nation should be grateful to the Governors of the 10 Missouri Basin States for their participation in the successful endeavors of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee. Special mention should be made of the Governors of Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Wyoming, who, as representatives of these 10 Missouri Basin States, have participated so diligently and wholeheartedly in the work of the committee. They have been guiding spirits in Federal-State relationships that might well serve as a model for all groups striving for comprehensive development of our water resources.

The Federal Power Commission has been represented on this interagency committee from its beginning by Mr. B. H. Green, regional engineer in charge of our Chicago office.

We also have regional offices in San Francisco, Fort Worth, Atlanta, and New York, where Regional Engineers L. S. Wing, W. F. Fairlamb, M. F. Hetherington, and D. J. Wait are always ready to assist in any way possible. These men are well qualified in their field and we hope they will serve to bring about closer cooperation with those of you who are in such intimate touch with water problems.

Finally, may I repeat that the matter of jurisdiction need not be an issue where all concerned have one objective—that of dedicating to the widest and most beneficial uses the waters of our streams and rivers. Unanimity and mutual confidence and recognition of the responsibilities of each State and Federal authority will achieve greater results in conserving our soil, irrigating the arid regions of the West and Middle West, controlling the floodwaters, developing the maximum of hydroelectric power, and protecting navigation on our inland waterways, than will dissention and discord.

In such a great and lasting program we must not give a second thought to the red herrings that will be dragged across our paths with never-ending regularity.

[9] During a hearing at Docket R-105 in connection with a proposal to amend the Commission's substantive rules.

[10] *First Iowa Hydro-Electric Coop.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (328 U. S. 152); rehearing denied, 328 U. S. 879 (1946).

Increase in Subsistence Pay to Student Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and enclosure from Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, a former Member of the House from Indiana:

FEBRUARY 16, 1948.

Hon. ROBERT RICH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: The enclosed is a thoughtful letter from a YMCA employee, which I think you will be glad to read.

Sincerely yours,
SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

REGARDING INCREASE IN SUBSISTENCE PAY TO STUDENT VETERANS—SOME FACTS TO BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION

(By a personnel worker)

The thinking public does not have much patience with the slogan, "A hero yesterday, a heel today," now used by veteran organizations, or by individuals in behalf of veterans, for the public is doing some thinking for itself, and is seeing conditions as they are, and facing facts, and drawing its own conclusions.

Right-thinking and right-hearted people think and feel that every consideration, and full and just compensation, are due every veteran (student and nonstudent) who suffered in any way from the ravages of war service, mentally or physically; who were maimed in any way; whose health is impaired in any way because of war service; who are now handicaped because of war service, etc.

But the public also thinks and feels that glaring facts should be taken into consideration by the Administration in Washington before any increase in subsistence pay to student veterans is allowed, since taxpayers' money is already being spent too freely by those who need to be more economy minded for the good of everybody concerned. The public knows that what it sees going on in its own town, city, and school is multiplied over the country.

Many student veterans ride to school (even a short distance) in a car, or jeep or motorcycle. Many of them belong to fraternities and have cars—as parked cars at fraternity houses, day and night attest. And many of these veteran students in fraternities drink, stay up half the night, or come in late or early, and keep the neighbors awake—and the neighbors do not fail to express themselves about all this. Nonfraternity student veterans do their share of drinking, too; and practically all of the student veterans smoke pack after pack of cigarettes. They all have money for liquor or cigarettes. And the student veterans have more money to spend on food than do many of the nonveteran students, some of the latter being unable to buy much meat, if any.

Countless numbers of ex-service men received monthly pay, full subsistence or maintenance, free dental and medical, etc., from the Government while in training and in service, and had a chance to save a good deal of money. Some were officers and drew good pay, and never left the United States, and had a chance to save money; and the veterans who are now students ought to be able to get by on the present gift of tuition, books, supplies, and $65 a month if single, or $90, if married.

A student veteran who did office work while in camps in United States, and oversens, said he was in England, France, Switzerland, etc., and did traveling he never could have afforded to do, and saved $1,500, then received other allowance from the Government; and felt the Government was doing too much for veterans at the expense of taxpayers in his family and on the outside. Such cases can be multiplied.

A student veteran told a personnel worker among students of his being on the GI bill, also of having received special money from the Government; said his room rent was less than $10 a month; that he worked at a place where his meals and cash pay amounted to about $20 a week, and figured his income ran from $175 to $180 a month.

A student said his friend—a student veteran under the GI bill—was also receiving a special allowance from the Government for a slight shoulder shrapnel wound that had long ago cleared up.

A student veteran who had just gotten his discharge said he had applied for the 20–52 unemployment pay despite the fact that in 6 weeks' time he would be enrolled in college under the GI bill.

(Close checking on the part of the VA might reveal that a good many veterans in and out of school are drawing disability pay long after a disability ceased to exist, or perhaps find some students under the GI bill drawing unemployment pay.)

Some student veterans have other financial interests or personal cash incomes and do not need even what they now get from the Government.

Many single student veterans are handling part-time work or odd jobs now and then to supplement their pay from the Government.

Many married veterans' wives are working, and in a vast number of cases both husband and wife are working, and their incomes are well over $200 a month, doubtless sometimes a good deal more than that amount.

Personnel workers know that some student veterans who apply for work turn up their noses at the mention of certain types of jobs offered them. They want light work, short hours, big pay. In other words, they want something for nothing, according to the growing spirit in this country because of the New Deal hand-outs.

The public feels that the able-bodied student veterans who cannot or will not economize and try to live within the Government allowances should be willing to do part-time work to supplement their Government pay (if they do not have personal incomes) if work is available and if free time from studies permits. Red-blooded men will do this when possible and not receive pay from the pockets of taxpayers who earn as little as $20 to $30 per week (with many obligations to meet from this small salary and the need of looking after their future); and many taxpayers who are on small monthly allowances, some faring far less well than many of the student veterans on the present rate of pay.

(Since writing the above paragraph a nonveteran student looking for work, having to make his entire way through school, said, "If I'd get from the Government tuition, books, etc., and $65 a month, I'd have no trouble getting along on that amount. I'd be satisfied.")

Increase in subsistence pay would mean that an army of student-veterans would marry before getting out of college because they could draw more pay as husbands, and thus greatly increase the housing shortage all over the country, and run rents and property costs higher. As is, many students, even freshmen and sophomores, marry before they have gotten part-time work, or found an apartment, and some even have to hunt for a room for a couple, after marriage.

A few months ago a youthful student-veteran said it was to his advantage to get married, for he'd get more money from the Government and his wife could work. He is still without a job—and in case of an addition to the family, there might be some rough sailing. A great many veterans who figured as he did soon found their wives expectant mothers, who had to give up their work—and there was also the problem of finding a place to stay, with a baby in the family.

A married student-veteran had to leave school and get a regular job, because, he said, a baby had come and his wife was so disagreeable and was always "griping" because of lack of money and conditions she did not want to put up with any longer.

It was recently stated over the radio that there were 31 divorces out of every 100 marriages last year. No wonder, with boys and girls marrying at such early ages, before they were prepared to take such a serious and important step, and when conditions were not conducive to happy married life and there were obstacles at every turn.

Several years ago a student was drafted just a few months before his graduation from college, and was greatly upset because he couldn't finish up and get his diploma before going into training, since he did not see any urgent need of his being taken out of school at that time. He was in training 1 year. Under the GI bill he went back to college (though he could have easily financed his way without outside help), got married, drew $90 a month from the Government, got work at the college, and his wife also got a job.

A present student veteran hadn't been in school long as a freshman, had a part-time job and was making his way satisfactorily when, to his great displeasure, he was drafted. When back to the campus on a furlough, he was still complaining about the break in his studies, unnecessarily, he felt, right after the war was over. At the end of the year's training he was back in school, and soon became engaged—in keeping with the early-age marrying spree that is growing all over the country.

People who thought it all right to give increased pay to student veterans on getting married right after the war, since they were in war service several years, with no chance to marry, are now asking the question, "Now that the war is way back in the past, where is the reason for the Government continuing to pay student veterans to get married, especially at the early ages of 18 to 22?"

The public does a lot of talking about the veterans—their attitudes and actions; the way the rich, as well as the needy, veterans receive money they do not need and should not take from the pockets of taxpayers who can ill afford to pay income taxes at all; the way they spend money; the way they drink; the way they turn down jobs they would have been eager to get before the war; the way they drive for more money, etc. It is often said that the veterans who endured and suffered most complain less and ask for less.

People—even veterans—think the New Deal administration catered to veterans for votes just as it catered to labor for votes. Ever since the New Dealers got into power, certain groups have pressed or fought for their particular selfish interests without giving any thought to the people at large, who have to bear the brunt of things.

It is often said that, as to legislation concerning veterans, the administration did not take into consideration the fact that it could not make up to every group or individual for what they lost or suffered because of the war. Some of those who were not in service lost loved ones because of the war; had heartaches and heartbreaks because of what happened to them or to their people in and out of service; some lost homes and small businesses during war years; some lost rents they depended on for a living—on one block in a city there were five large houses vacant, and after losing 2 years of rent, the owner of one of these houses sold the house for about half price, fearing the bottom had dropped out of the bucket; many rooming and boarding houses had to close, depriving many of a livelihood; workers put up with inconveniences and hardships of all sorts when they went to crowded industrial centers to do war work, then came back home without a place to live, or had to pay high rent, or live in crowded conditions that greatly affected their living; some people who had been living in houses or apartments for years were evicted by veterans who married young, or by unscrupulous owners or agents who cared more for the almighty dollar than for human beings. Everybody has to remember there was a war; that wars cost most everybody something, in one way or another; and that no government can make up to everybody for what a war cost him.

Antilynching legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two statements

made by the Honorable KENNETH KEATING on the Forum of the Air regarding proposed antilynching legislation:

MR. GRANIK. Mr. KEATING, you are the author of an antilynching bill. Why do you feel that there is a need for Federal legislation on this subject?

MR. KEATING. In less than 50 years lynch mobs have caused the deaths of over 5,150 persons in the United States. This has happened while many States have on their statute books State laws against murder and other violence. The simple fact is that in many States these laws are not enforced.

The fourteenth amendment to the United States Constitution provides that no person shall be denied by any State the equal protection of the laws. Then it gives to Congress the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

On top of that, this Nation has signed the United Nations Charter, agreeing to promote, among other things, universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, or religion. Certainly one of those fundamental freedoms must be freedom from violence and from the fear thereof.

It seems to me, therefore, our clear duty as a Nation to enact Federal legislation to end the abuses which some States continue, by inaction at least, to condone.

In order to maintain our domestic tranquillity, as well as our position of world leadership, it is essential that the basic human rights embraced within the civil rights proposals be safeguarded and strengthened.

Racial superiority, religious intolerance, false pride of national origin are the concepts we have just sacrificed the finest of our youth and uncounted wealth to destroy.

Yet we permit to exist in this great country conditions which belie the lofty ideas and principles we proclaim. So long as lynch mobs are allowed, to seize and murder American citizens because of the color of their skin, so long as others can only peer at the ballot box through the bars of the dollar sign, so long as jobs are denied because of religious faith, our material achievements profit us nothing. To gain the world, we must not lose our own souls. No nation can retain greatness which sacrifices righteousness.

Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1948

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of hearing an address by Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd on the subject of Peace. Admiral Bird discussed particularly the role of the United Nations as an agency for bringing about a just and lasting peace of the world. The address was presented at a banquet of the Society of Virginia at the Statler Hotel on the evening of January 29, at which Admiral Byrd was tendered the Society's Gold Medal of Achievement for his Arctic and Antarctic explorations. I commend the reading of this address to every Member of the House:

PEACE

I

My old friend Rixey Smith has asked me to discuss peace. It is a subject I have studied all my life, but my interest was much quickened when, as a young ensign in the Navy, I served aboard the Presidential yacht the USS *Mayflower*, as one of the aides to that great Virginian and great prophet of peace, Woodrow Wilson.

In discussing peace tonight I will attempt to fit it into the whole-world picture and to take the element of time into consideration; in other words, the long-term view. That seems to be the only way I can tackle the problem. And I think that is bad news for you Virginians who have to listen to me.

There is a very great emphasis placed today on the preservation of peace, which, of course, is as it should be. But there is one thing which we know to be more important than the preservation of peace and that is the preservation of freedom. But freedom, that is in grave peril the world over, has no chance whatever of survival if the peace is lost and a Third World War is to be fought with atomic and chemical weapons. The danger of war now is very slight, but we have only 4 or 5 years to secure the peace. (It always irritates me when some of our sages returning from visits to Russia make the flat statment: "There is no danger of war with Russia" without any reference to the danger that will exist when Russia gets rehabilitated. A year is no more than a few days in the life of a great nation, and relatively an even shorter time in the life of the human race.)

Time is running out. It is later perhaps than we think. Only a few years of grace now remain to the world before other nations, totalitarian nations, will possess the atomic bomb and bacteriological weapons that may be just as devastating as the bomb.

And when that time comes, Christianity itself will be imperiled because freedom is the implementation of the spirit and essence of Christianity. Make no mistake about it—a totalitarian dictator sees in the idea of a Divine Being a rival with which he finds it most difficult, or impossible, to compete. The dictator must establish the state as God, with himself as the state.

And so, the world over, people of good will who are liberty loving, decent, kindly, and well meaning, are in a titantic cold struggle against an evil minority to prevent the destruction of that great trinity—peace, liberty, and freedom of worship.

I am going to start with a premise that there is nothing wrong individually with the Russian people. They are simply misled. There has been so much criticism of Russianism that I would like to show that the potentialities for the development of a very powerful and dangerous Russia have been made possible by a fundamental and gravely serious problem that mankind as a whole (and Americans in particular) has itself created. It is important that we face this truth. I am greatly puzzled by the failure of international leaders to face the truth.

II

Please bear with me while I attempt to isolate the devastating germ that is causing our troubles—our world disease. We must discover this germ and develop a culture with which to inoculate mankind for its destruction. How can we cure the disease by giving all of our time to fighting the symptoms only, which means acting for expediency's sake, haphazardly, spasmodically, and inadequately, as we neglect the long-term remedies. There are, of course, urgent, pressing matters that must be attended to with the utmost vigor. But if the world's peace loving leaders act from expediency to the neglect of the long-term absolutely essential remedies, there is not the slightest chance to preserve freedom in the world. As I see it, it is just plain stupidity and futility to blame Stalinism for all of our troubles.

We have witnessed at the beginning of the twentieth century the dawn of a new era, the technological era, where man has made lightninglike advances in material progress with his scientific and mechanical genius while he neglected the science of human relations, which thus stood still as his spiritual self suffered a sickness and went backward under the deteriorating influence of our material progress.

The technology of the twentieth century, by suddenly shrinking the world, created an interdependence of human relationships that was so great that man was unprepared to cope with it. The mechanism of our economic organization and group and national relations became so delicate and complicated that it made war not only obsolete but very dangerous to the progress of the human race.

Thus we who went through the First World War learned how disruptive was such a war to the delicate mechanism of this new kind of civilization. The great confusion that resulted from that war was a very poisonous soil for the growth of freedom as it was a very fertile soil for the growth of tyranny. The masses of the people became too confused to guide their own destinies and so democracies began to go down like torpedoed ships.

Thus we learned that it was not just wars alone that threatened freedom, but that our own technological progress created a fundamental hazard to the human race, even without wars. But with war added to our troubles, the result was devastating.

Then, following World War I, we witnessed the human race, and more particularly the Americans, joyously creating ever better machines that shrank the world with an ever increasing acceleration, which meant increasing complexity and confusion. The task of ruling ourselves by slow democratic processes thus became increasingly difficult.

And then, of course, more and more destructive became the weapons of warfare, and we who love freedom, didn't stop to consider that the more devastating the destructive power of weapons of war, the more it worked against freedom to weaken it, and on the side of tyranny to strengthen it.

When the United States discarded Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations and followed George Clemenceau's idea of power politics, World War II became a certainty. Thus it was inevitable that some tyrants, such as Hitler and Mussolini, should use our new devastating technological weapons to blitz the world.

And to top it all, the United States developed and dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima. In that fatal instant we leaped ahead tens of centuries into an even more sinister era, which placed liberty in an even greater peril by our utter unpreparedness to cope with it.

To sum up: Our worldly material sciences have made incredible advances while our science of human relations has stood still and our spiritual progress has actually gone backward.

III

And now, where do we stand today? Our isolation is suddenly gone—destroyed. From several worlds, as it was before the twentieth century, we suddenly have become one world, and we are unprepared in the field of human relations and the spiritual realm to coordinate and integrate the nations of that world.

In short, we destroyed the isolation of nations long before nations were ready for integration.

This greatly shrunken world puts groups and nations right up against each other. When nations are, in effect, jammed up against each other—running athwart of each other's prejudices, hates, ambitions, and misunderstandings—they eventually find themselves at each other's throats. This illustrates how difficult General Marshall's task is.

Is it not ironical that man has himself created an environment in which he, as a free man, is unfit to survive.

This new kind of environment calls for such things as universal good will and understanding, the brotherhood of man, kindliness, give and take, and common decency. In short, it calls for the application of the Golden Rule.

If the major trouble with people is people, can we put all the blame on the dictators? Their success is a symptom, a dangerous sympton, of our fundamental problems.

How can we solve that problem and eradicate the evil that is striking us down until we know exactly the nature of that evil.

And so that is why I have painted this picture rather carefully to show that our greatest problem is not with such things as chemical warfare, atomic bombs, and other davastating weapons, but with man himself. This fact must, I believe, be realized and acted upon if there is the remotest chance that we shall achieve peace and succeed in holding in leash warlike dictators.

Our predicament is such that many things must be done, immediately, vigorously and simultaneously, on a wide front. Adequate education is the great long-term need.

And now, before giving my opinion as to some methods of meeting this predicament, I would like to make a short introductory statement.

IV

When after World War I this Nation refused to join the League of Nations, it was discouraging to see the various nations of the world play their handicapped and fumbling parts on the world stage. During that period it was my misfortune to be in a position to look behind the scenes of the tragedy that was being played and to witness some of the grevious mistakes of weakness and appeasement made in secret negotiations by honorable, well-meaning men. But it is not my object to attack those men. We have had enough criticisms that are purely negative.

My object is to attempt to give something constructive, however small it may be, that is calculated to strengthen the arm of President Truman and General Marshall and the Congress where they are on the right track.

So devastating was the nature of World War II, and so great the loss of life and human degradation and misery, that the masses of the people of the world seemed at long last to be convinced that it was absolutely essential that war be abolished as an instrument of national policy. In the organization of the United Nations, the star of hope for lasting peace was lifted high in the heavens.

Subsequently the people of the world were greatly fortified in this hope by the barrage of statements made by many great leaders of the day concerning law and fair play and justice for the proposed UNO. Naturally the people believed and many still believe that an effective instrument for peace was achieved.

And yet the sad fact is that there wasn't the slightest chance of obtaining a really workable organization at San Francisco. But there was no one to tell the people the whole truth.

V

More than anything else, it was the veto formula of the UNO that makes it unworkable. This formula gave any one of the five great nations the power to veto any punitive action against any act of aggression that might occur anywhere in the world. And, further, it allowed, and it still allows, a veto of any change in this veto formula, and thus crystallized, and still crystallizes, the UNO solidly in its impracticable shape. I feel that I have a right to make this statement now because before the San Francisco meeting I protested to our leaders as strongly as was in my power against the veto formula. What I particularly dwelt upon was the ability of one of the Big Five to veto any change in the veto formula. This formula provides a shield for the strong nations and is in the nature of a mockery for the weak ones. I made a plea then and I make it again now for protection and justice for the smaller nations.

Any provision for the exercise of power by one or several great nations over any weaker nation and a veto to make that power permanent is certainly the opposite to justice. It is more akin to the law of the jungle than it is to civilized law. It means that the weaker nations of the United Nations are subject to penalties, and even to punishment, without fair representation. It is, in fact, akin to the might-is-right idea.

The advocates and framers of the veto formula claimed that the United States Senate would not ratify any UNO that contained an amendment to this power to veto any change in the veto formula. I denied then, and I vigorously deny now, the truth of that contention. I know that several Senators flew to San Francisco bent upon an effort to amend this veto formula. There were other Senators who felt the same way.

I believe that if history tells the truth, it will have to record the shocking fact that the United States and Great Britain are responsible, along with Russia (and I can't blame Russia too much), for that part of the veto formula, that gives any one of these three great nations the power, by itself, acting alone, to prohibit, in fact actually completely to block progress or growth and development of the UNO, even though at its birth it was dwarfed by the might-is-right idea.

Even though I will be guilty of repetition, I want to make the issue upon which I stand absolutely clear. I know too well the subtlety and sophistry of the arguments made by those, who from a sense of guilt, or even for perfectly honest reasons of expediency, desire to becloud the issue and hide forever the truth about what really happened at San Francisco. That issue is the right given in the Charter of the UN to Russia acting alone (Great Britain and the United States have the same right) to prevent by veto any change in the veto power of the great powers. The intent was clear: to prevent any change in the Security Council's totalitarian idealogy; for who could be stupid enough to think that Russia, so long as she has the veto power, would fail to veto any change in the veto formula that would make the UN less totalitarian and more democratic? And who could blame her?

At San Francisco a fanatical, communistic imperialism (ideological and expansionist) plus a fear born of mistrust of free enterprise nations sabotaged the good judgment of the Russian leaders. Fear for the life of the British Empire sabotaged the good judgment of the British leaders. Fear of not getting Russia into the UNO, combined with a lack of faith in the common sense of the Senate and people of this Nation, sabotaged the good judgment of the American leaders. (This is oversimplification of course, but the general idea conveyed I believe to be correct.)

Now I want to pause here to say that I do not recommend the abolition of the UN. I recommend strongly that it be amended so that it can be saved. That, as I see it, is the only way it can be saved.

VI

Before I give my suggestions for peace, I would like to lay down several assumptions.

1. That there is little danger of war as long as Russia is as weak as she is today.

2. That the Russian people are just as fine people as exist in the world and that they would value liberty and freedom and the American way of life if they knew about it and could get it.

3. But that the philosophy of a dictator such as Stalin is that the end justifies any means whatsoever, and that such things as logic and reason and justice are not to be considered if they interfere with his plans.

4. That Russia, well within 5 years, will possess the atomic bomb.

5. That the moment Russia possesses an adequate supply of atomic bombs and is rehabilitated from the ravages of World War II is the moment that the danger to freedom the world over becomes very grave.

6. That the Russian people do not have freedom and have no conception of the American way of life because they do not have freedom of the press and will never have freedom of the press as long as men like Joseph Stalin are at the helm of Russia. Nor will Russia's satellites enjoy freedom of the press.

7. That freedom of the press is the mark of liberty and the completely controlled press by a dictator is the mark of slavery.

8. That no normal human being would of free choice elect to live under a police state that utilizes gestapo methods.

9. That the Russian leaders are imperialistic and fanatical crusaders to extend communism by infiltration.

10. That Stalin considers that an orderly western Europe and an orderly Far East and a workable United Nations are undesirable because they work on the side of democracy and freedom and that therefore he must do all possible to create a world-wide confusion, which is the most fertile of all soils for tyranny.

11. That I do not believe that this Nation, if it becomes (and it may so become) an oasis in a desert of world communism, could preserve its American way of life.

12. That Communists in the United States and in other nations give their allegiance to Stalin instead of to their own native land. That, therefore, they are a menace to freedom.

13. That democracies cannot stand wars, just as dictatorships cannot survive with long periods of peace. That, therefore, dictatorships are more naturally warlike than democracies.

14. That the Marxist philosophy holds that the capitalist countries will eventully attack Soviet Russia. If Stalin really believes this we can forgive him some of the things he has done. We must remember that we did not always, in prewar days, treat Russia with all the consideration we might have. Let's be honest about this.

15. That Russia is very unlikely to make any satisfactory settlement with free-enterprise nations so long as there is confusion in western Europe. With western European solidarity Russia would probably find some kind of settlement to her advantage.

16. That appeasement of dictators by free-enterprise nations by the sacrifice of their most sacred principles has gotten these peace-loving nations into their present dangerous position. Such appeasement leads inevitably to war. General Marshall knows that and he should be backed up in his courageous course. If this Nation and Great Britain are too timid to protect small nations that are still free from reprisals from Russia for daring to resist aggressive communistic infiltration, then those nations will continually be mortally afraid to offend Russia and will lose their respect and friendship for us. Great moral strength and courage behind what the ages have taught us is right is the dire need of the hour. But this does not mean that we should be careless about or indifferent to fair play and justice when dealing with any nation. Justice and fairness are in fact what we profess and in the end must live by.

VII

Based on these assumptions and other statements I have made tonight, I submit the following suggestions for peace:

A. That first and of great importance is that the people of democratic nations in general, and this Republic in particular, be kept thoroughly informed, where practicable, of all moves for peace. I believe that General Marshall has been doing just that.

Never again must the millions of free people be betrayed by keeping them absolutely ignorant of the real meaning of the problems and the issues and their settlements that are being made by the leaders of democracies for a peaceful world.

B. That the nations of western Europe be shown the dire need of and encouraged in the formation of a federation for economic collaboration and coordination, collective security, interchange of information, and mutual understanding and education. And that representatives from China and the British Commonwealth of Nations be invited to attend the deliberations of the federation.

C. That a settlement with Russia is very desirable. But that such a settlement must not be in the nature of appeasement nor above all the sacrifice of principles that will provide a breathing spell for Russia to continue, by peacetime aggressive infiltration, to rub out freedom in weaker nations and thus to spread communism.

D. That a temporary answer to "might is right" is "right plus might." That, therefore, this Nation keep itself physically strong and that it encourage other peace- and freedom-loving nations of the world to do the same. The purpose of this is to hold in leash the power-mad aggressive leaders of dictator nations until the world can achieve a workable United Nations organization. We know that what dictators respect most is strength and power and that there is nothing for which they have more contempt than military weakness or any kind of weakness. But I conceive of strong armaments as being an emergency measure. Armament races have never achieved peace and probably never will. Thus, in the long run, physical strength alone is but an uncertain prop upon which to lean for the achievement of lasting peace. And let us not forget that it would not take many years for an armament race to bankrupt the world.

E. That the veto formula of the Security Council of the United Nations be amended.

1. But there are other considerable changes aside from the veto formula that are necessary to remake the UN into a sufficiently strong and workable instrument of peace. As I have said, there is no adequate provision within its structure to enact laws for its growth and development. We must admit that the power of one of the big five to veto any change in the veto formula appears on the face of it almost an impossible hurdle to get over. But it is not impossible; it must not be impossible. Without a workable UN, there is, I fear, little hope in the long run for the preservation of freedom in the world.

2. Here is one way, I believe, is to be possible to change the UN. The General Assembly to be given power to enact world law but only in the fields necessary for keeping the peace. It should not have authority to enact law affecting the political, economic, or religious systems of the member nations, but only on such matters as the control of weapons of mass destruction, limitation of armaments, and provision for, and government of, an international police force. These laws should apply to individuals in any nation so that a Hitler who commenced to rearm his nation for warlike purposes would be subject to be indicted, punished, and tried as soon as his acts were discovered by the international inspection force.

3. The leaders of the powerful democratic nations seem reluctant to relinquish even a tiny bit of sovereignty, and the leaders of the dictatorial nations are determined not to relinquish any sovereignty whatever. It is this matter of sovereignty that is blocking peace and endangering freedom. And it must be admitted that it may become the nemesis of liberty and Christianity. On this planet, which we have shrunk until it is one world, freedom cannot live so long as any nation that is powerful and mighty uses that power to put its heavy heel down on the rights of weaker nations.

4. In the early days this Nation had its troubles with individual sovereignty. In a community or a town where each individual had the right to do as he pleased, order and peace and safety were found to be impossible. This I will call intense individualism. The western pioneer cities before the establishment of law and order show what happens when individuals can do as they please.

5. And in the first part of the twentieth century we saw what evils selfish capitalism could create and of later years we have seen what damage aggressive narrow-minded minorities can do to this Nation. I will call this intense groupism. These groups are now being curbed in the democratic way.

6. But some powerful nations are not yet curbed and still demand the right to do as they please and to hold themselves above any law of God or man. I will call this passionate nationalism. It has ever been the world's greatest war monger.

7. Just as individuals and groups within a nation have learned that they cannot achieve internal harmony and peace until they relinquish the right to do as they please; so the nations of the world cannot achieve world peace until the strong nations relinquish the right to commit at their pleasure depredation upon the weaker nations.

8. This question of sovereignty over a sovereign power plagued the original 13 States. The Articles of Confederation under which they organized required unanimous consent. This in effect gave any State the right of veto. Yet this hurdle was overcome when the necessity of solidarity was realized and the Constitution was substituted for the Articles of Confederation.

9. To give the General Assembly of the United Nations the law-making power, it would be necessary to change the system of representation from the present one-nation one-vote rule to a system by which each nation would have a number of votes fairly representative of its relative position in the world. Several formulae have been devised for making such apportionment in relation to a nation's population, productive capacity, natural resources, literacy, and similar factors.

10. Only with such balanced representation in the Assembly could all the powerful nations be expected even to consider amendments to the veto power in the Security Council.

11. The Security Council, with an amended veto, should be made the executive of the United Nations with the responsibility of enforcing the laws passed by the Assembly. The use of any police force that might be decided upon, would be limited to the fields in which the United Nations is given power to legislate.

12. The permanent Court of International Justice should be given compulsory instead of optional jurisdiction over international disputes and all cases arising under the laws enacted by the assembly. The international police should be charged with the enforcement of the decrees of the court.

13. Senate Resolution No. 24, and House Resolution Nos. 59–68, now pending in Congress, state that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should immediately take the initiative in calling a general conference of the United Nations pursuant to article 190 for the purpose of making the United Nations capable of enacting, interpreting and enforcing world law to prevent war. I believe that these resolutions should be passed, and that if they are passed, the President will instruct United States delegates to advocate the calling of such a conference, and that if called, amendments like the above will be submitted to the member nations for ratification. No veto can be exercised to prevent the calling of such a conference. If any country should refuse to ratify the amendments when submitted to them, the nations favoring them would be free to withdraw from the present organization and set up the amended one without the adherence of those nations which might elect to stay out. Agreements arrived at at the San Francisco conference permit nations voting for such amendments to withdraw under these circumstances. Such action would closely follow that which was taken when our own Constitution was adopted. The previous Articles of Confederation forbade amendments except by unanimous consent. Nevertheless, the Constitution went into effect when adopted by only nine of the States.

14. We must do all possible to keep Russia in the UN. If the Soviet Union should elect to stay out of a strengthened United Nations, I believe that in the course of a few years she would follow the example of Rhode Island and North Carolina, which originally remained out of our Federal Union. The Soviet leaders would probably find it very uncomfortable to continue in isolation, to conduct an atomic armaments race against a union of the non-Communist part of the world, when the alternative would be to join and participate in a workable United Nations that could protect the Soviet Union and all other member nations from any kind of external aggression. Russia need not then fear aggression. Nor need we with a workable UN fear giving to Russia the oil and the access to the sea (warm water) that she needs. If we do this Russia may remain in the UN. If she agrees to a workable UN on condition that these concessions be made, then such concessions would be steps toward freedom. At this point I pause to admit that dictators in the past have been given to the habit of breaking agreements. Perhaps this weakens my contentions, but I submit that breaking a law established by the great family of nations would be a more serious step than breaking an agreement made between two or three nations.

F. That this Nation do all within its power to prevent the spread of communism throughout the world. President Truman and General Marshall should be backed up in every way possible, short of war, and short of giving so much to Europe and Asia that our own economy will be disrupted. It is clear that a serious collapse of our national economy would lose for this Nation and all other freedom-loving nations the battle for world freedom, and the American way of life. The great point is, How far can this Nation go without bringing about economic disaster. This point will, I am sure, be considered carefully and prayerfully. It would seem that our aid to Europe and Asia should be kept in a flexible status, so that this Nation can correct any mistakes that might bring about our own economic collapse. All other freedom-loving nations should be asked to do their part for Europe and China according to their capacity to help.

G. I have said that keeping this Nation and other democratic nations physically strong is an emergency measure. The aid to Eurasia is also an emergency measure. The establishment of a workable UN is both an urgent emergency step and long-term measure as well. Even with these three moves carried out efficiently peace is still not secured. The very long term absolute necessity, as I have pointed out, is for man to learn to cope with and fit himself into this dangerous environment that he has created with his scientific and mechanical genius. Within the Nation intense individualism and intense groupism must be abandoned. They make for internal discord and lack of solidarity and unity, just as intense nationalism has always been, and still is, I repeat, the greatest cause for war. If we are to survive as free beings, we must learn that the well-being of individuals depends upon the well-being of other individuals; that the well-being of groups is dependent upon the well-being of other groups; and that the well-being of a nation depends upon the well-being of other nations. Selfish minorities cannot impose their will upon all the other people of a nation without hurting themselves as well.

H. I repeat that man will not be willing to change his infinitely complex environment or even consider putting an end to his shrinking of this world with an ever-increasing acceleration, which means ever-increasing complexity. That, therefore, he must fit himself into this environment since he flatly refuses to fit the environment to himself. As certainly as the sun rises and sets freedom will be lost unless man achieves this goal. I have been told many times by political leaders that it is impossible for man to change his age-old attitude and selfish practices in time to save freedom.

I. But I would like to say emphatically that I believe it can be done. Man can achieve the necessary universal good will and feelings of brotherhood for his fellow man by eradicating fear. He is afraid of starvation, and he is afraid of the destruction of his family unit, and he is afraid of sudden death from tyrants in peacetime and from combat in wartime. And he is afraid of the chaos that breeds all these things. And now I come to the most important point that I can make, and I wish that I could get this truth to every human being in the world: That man can change his hates and selfish practices only by getting rid of the abovementioned fears by protection under some system that operates by law, backed by force, to achieve fair play and justice for small nations. I make this statement with all the force at my command.

J. Thus we see that due to the chaos that exists in the world within nations and between nations, those nations are working at cross purposes. There must be, I submit, a common purpose for all mankind, just as there is a common purpose for the cities and States of the United States.

K. Therefore, the world must be united by integrating it behind a common global purpose by means of a workable method. The only common global purpose that is conceivable to me is the achievement of the design of creation, which I take to be a chance for human beings the world over for the enjoyment of liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And the workable method I take to be the utilization of Christian principles, which is the same golden rule that Buddha and Confucius taught.

L. This method calls for the expression of the decency that is in man through organization. It is the effective implementation of the good will that individuals in the world possess in abundance, by means of law and order to suppress the evil that unfortunately predominates when there is no law—when confusion or chaos rules. The human race can no more implement its good will when living in a state of chaos than the decent citizens of early western towns could achieve local peace until they achieved order and law. This method, in short, calls for the mobilization of decency to save men from destruction by the technological Frankenstein monster that his genius has created. Only the comparatively few Communists among the Russians would refuse to vote in the direction of decency if they had the chance.

And now in conclusion:

M. I have tired to show that nations can change their ancient hates and selfish practices but that such a change can only be effected under the encouragement and protection and deterrents of international law and justice. That applies to the weak as well as the strong nation. That, as I see it, is how mankind can develop its potentialities for spiritual growth and strength into an implement of checks and restraints of the evil that would destroy peace and freedom. Thus can mankind go forward under God to its destiny.

Commercial Fisheries—Canada Expands While United States Shrinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an address by Hon. James A. MacKinnon, Canadian Minister of Fisheries at East Coast Fisheries Conference, Quebec, Canada, February 3–5, 1948.

I am impressed by the fact that while our appropriations for, and interest in, our fisheries seems to be in process of reduction, yet our competitors north of us are increasing their expenditures. It seems very shortsighted that our commercial fishery appropriations should be severely cut while our chief competitor is reorganizing and expanding.

I hope that all Members interested in our fisheries will take notice. We have incurred an enormous debt in the World War. We must expand our business in commerce and in our fisheries. All that Mr. MacKinnon advocates for Canada applies all the more to us.

Commenting on Mr. MacKinnon's speech, the National Fisheries Institute at Washington, D. C., which is always alert to the best interest of our fisheries and diligent to promote them, says:

Mr. MacKinnon is the Minister of Fisheries in Canada, the same status as a member of the Cabinet in the United States. Recognizing the growing importance of fisheries, particularly in the international field, Canada is losing no time to protect and advance her fishing industry. Mr. MacKinnon was formerly Minister of Trade and Commerce. He has just returned from a 15,000-mile trade tour in Africa and other parts of the world. Canada is looking to the future and leaving no stone unturned to build and protect her fisheries.

Meanwhile, let us review the situation on our side of the border. For lack of funds the Fish and Wildlife Service can no longer mail the daily Market News Reports—efforts are being made to secure a deficiency appropriation from Congress. But this is just one blow. The Commercial Fisheries Division of FWS, the main Government unit servicing our fishing industry, is struggling along with reduced personnel, on just barely half the appropriation they had last year. The House reduced the appropriation last year almost 80 percent, but in the end some items were restored, so that the appropriation for commercial fisheries work ended up with only a 50-percent cut. Trained personnel have been dropped, statistical records which are essential for Government use in international treaty-making are becoming disorganized. What a parallel. Canada expands while United States shrinks.

Mr. MacKinnon spoke as follows:

As Minister of Trade and Commerce I have been associated over a fairly lengthy period with the Canadian fishing industry on its export marketing side. Fisheries have always had an important part in our export trade As a matter of fact, 70 percent of the products of Canadian fisheries are sold in markets outside Canada.

At the present time I believe problems of marketing, rather than production, are the chief concern of the fishing industry of this country. Canada has experienced years of abnormal demand for food products of every kind. There has been an outlet for all the fish Canada could supply. Today the world is still in need of food but many countries in urgent need of supplies have not the means with which to buy. This points up our problem which officials of the department have been discussing and will possibly discuss with you further.

In regard to the market within Canada for fish, the prospects are favorable. Domestic buying power is at a high level. There is no sign of an early reversal in the upward trend of business activity generally. Meat and possibly some other foods which compete with fish are in relatively short supply. Fish should, therefore, obtain a higher share of the food business than has formerly been the case. I do not mean that a large volume of increased sales will come to the industry automatically. There will need to be a continuance of dependable quality in the product, energetic selling efforts as well as efficient handling of products at every stage of distribution, if full advantage is to be taken of improvement in domestic-market conditions.

Fishing and agriculture are the two great national food-producing industries. Annual conferences are held with representatives of the Canadian Council of Agriculture meeting with Federal Department of Agriculture officials as well as with members of the Federal Government. The usefulness to the agricultural industry generally of these discussions, held regularly and on an official basis, has been demonstrated. I realize that it is not always possible to apply to one primary industry what has been proven successful in the case of another. For instance, it is not practical in the case of fisheries to set up annual production targets or goals as has been done in agriculture. But I believe something like the same conference procedure could be adopted with benefit to the fishing industry. Progress in this connection is being made. Our east and west coast regional conferences are a step in this direction. Another step is the practice of the Fisheries Department in submitting annually proposed regulations to groups in the industry for study and comment.

As to exports, 1948 promises to be another good year in the United States market. The United States, of course, is the best single customer for the products of our fisheries. Recent official market surveys in that country indicate that food supplies this year are likely to be somewhat less than in 1947. The same market examination shows that the demand in the United States for fish will continue to be strong. There is a distinct possibility that fish prices in the United States will rise in the first half of the present year above the level reached in the corresponding period of 1947.

The marketing situation elsewhere for some of our fish and fish products is less definitely favorable. Unsettled world conditions and problems of international exchange becloud the future so far as the general flow of Canadian goods abroad is concerned. Last year, as you know, post-UNRRA purchasing by the Federal Government relieved the situation. Buying on the part of a number of European countries under the Marshall plan may develop during this year. All these factors present problems and their complete solution does not rest with one authority or even one country in this modern, complex, and highly interdependent world.

The Federal Government will, however, proceed vigorously to find satisfactory outlets for Canadian fish production. Preparations are now under way to establish in the Department of Fisheries a special market service, one feature of departmental reorganization and expansion. I believe that the functions of the Department of Fisheries should be concerned with more than administration, important as those duties may be

The Department should also be a service organization, designed to assist as well as to regulate. The chief aim of this new marketing service will be to assist the fishing industry in developing profitable outlets for its products. It will put under way research activities and make available market reports and other information useful to the fishing industry generally. This service will be integrated with the Fisheries Prices Support Board and, of course, will work in close cooperation with the Department of Trade and Commerce. I am satisfied that as this program develops its benefits will be widely and rapidly felt.

One of the chief difficulties experienced in setting up this new service, has been the matter of finding men available and qualified to fill senior administrative positions. We are hopeful that this obstacle will soon be overcome but any assistance which the industry can volunteer in this connection will be appreciated. The senior appointments in this marketing service will be of prime importance—from your point of view as well as from ours. We need competent men for these positions.

This same personnel difficulty has also retarded some department plans. I think, however, I should say that the record shows that very considerable progress has been made in the past year. Everyone here from the maritimes is already familiar, I am sure, with what has been done to expand and strengthen our field force in those provinces. The same sort of thing has been done in British Columbia. In the matter also of strengthening our staff in Ottawa progress has been made and is continuing to be made. The whitefish inspection staff in the midwest has also been strengthened. Certain important adjustments have been made in the department with a view to better coordination of work and greater efficiency in operation. Plans are in preparation to add to the effectiveness of various branches of departmental service—plans, for instance, such as those for further improvement in our marine patrol service in the interest of conservation. This service is essential if the fishermen's livelihood is to be safeguarded.

I have rather closely followed the development of commercial fishing in our northern lakes, particularly in Great Slave Lake, recently, and in Athabasca and other lakes for a longer period. Great Slave is one of the continent's largest bodies of fresh water. It had never been fished commercially, however, until 1945. For that matter there had been no commercial fishing anywhere in the northwest territories previous to 1945. Each year since, however, fishermen employed by an Edmonton company have been sending to Canadian and United States cities several million pounds of lake trout and whitefish. The interesting thing to me about these operations is the fact that individually wrapped consumer packages of fish fillets are processed by fast-freezing equipment operated on barges, and the product is transported by air to Canadian and United States buyers. I have, personally, seen these operations. Because of this development, the productive map of Canada is being expanded and a new area of enterprise is being opened up for the first time. I am mentioning this interior fishing not in an attempt to detract in any way from the great fishing centers of the St. Lawrence and the two coasts but by way of contrast, as it were, to emphasize the extent of Canada's principal fishing areas.

I have passed over a good deal of reorganization detail but I think I should say a word in particular about the establishment of the economics division. The Canadian fisheries' position would be strengthened if there could be a more adequate stream of authoritative information in the field of fisheries' economics. Certainly in these times we cannot trust hit-or-miss knowledge of economic conditions in our fisheries and the different factors affecting the operations and progress of the industry generally. In the operations of the industry and in the establishing of departmental policy, something better is required as a guide to proper action.

It is the job of the economics division to build up, by trained and careful research, a continuing body of economic facts relating to the fisheries and their development—to discover, assemble, and interpret accurate data for the benefit of industry and government alike. This division services both the department and the Fisheries Prices Support Board, and through them it will also serve industry. It operates both at headquarters and in the field. Members of its staff have already been at work for some time in fishing areas in different parts of Canada.

The Fisheries Research Board were anxious to have the services of Mr. D. H. Sutherland, who has been assistant deputy minister of the department. This is being arranged, and we believe that this move will improve the administrative liaison between the Fisheries Research Board and the department.

Mr. Sutherland's transfer to the board position means a new assistant deputy minister. Anticipating the question which I am sure is in some minds, perhaps I might answer right now that we don't know who the new assistant deputy will be. All I can say is that we would like the appointment to be made as soon as possible, and when it takes place we will follow it with a closer coordination of several administrative branches of the department under the assistant deputy.

We visualize the department as an agency of service to the fishing industry rather than simply concerned with administration. That is what is being sought through the present process of reorganization and expansion. All its plans and adjustments are directed to making the department an instrument of service.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall on communism:

Good evening. Recently, I have been trying to show that the Communist International teaches and demands mass disloyalty and treason of its followers to all nations except the Soviet Union. I have used their own official documents to show it.

What I want to demonstrate today is the direct control by the Communist International, in Moscow, of all activities of the American Communist Party. In other words, what I have to say tends to prove that Communists are agents of a foreign power.

Right now Congress has before it a bill that would force Communists to register their names as agents of a foreign government. I hope all of you who feel strongly on this point will write in to your Congressmen to support the Mundt bill. It deserves support.

For one thing, the passage of the Mundt bill will force a legal test of this whole thing—a test which has never been put up to the Supreme Court in this form. Communists have been doing their utmost to prevent any clear-cut ruling by the Supreme Court, holding that they are, in truth and in fact, and as a matter of law, a subversive outfit which serves a foreign power. It is high time we had just such a ruling and one of the best ways to get it is through enacting a statute along the lines of the Mundt bill. The same thing is true of the Cole bill, which would bar a subversive party from the ballot.

Well, what is some of the evidence of Communists being agents of a foreign power?

Again, I go to a fundamental document—the Constitution and Rules of the Communist International. That provides that all parties calling themselves Communist Parties throughout the world shall be merely sections of the Communist International, with headquarters in Moscow. Section III says the executive committee of the Communist International—which is generally called the ECCI—"gives instructions to all sections (or parties) and controls their activities." It adds: "The decisions of the ECCI are obligatory for all sections" and the ECCI has the right to annul or amend decisions of party congresses and central committees of individual parties and make decisions which are obligatory for them."

This is so plain on the face of it that there can be no argument. The executive committee of the Communist International in Moscow runs the Communist Parties all over the world. Whoever runs the executive committee runs the Communist Parties in the United States and in 60 other countries. Of course, the Politburo, with Stalin at its head, runs the ECCI and makes decisions purely in the interest of the Soviet Union. Therefore, how can there be any question but what Stalin and the Politburo of the Soviet Union run the Communist Party in this country?

And they have it rigged so that the Russian party can never lose control. They have the right to annul or amend decisions of the individual parties throughout the world. They can expel whole parties which disagree with them, as well as individuals, and only the Russian party can instruct its representatives to the world congress. They can send out their representatives to the various parties throughout the world and, actually and practically, the representative can overturn their decisions. One man, sent out from Moscow, mind you, can absolutely control the decisions of the Communist Party of the United States of America. Listen to the testimony of Ben Gitlow—a former general secretary of the party in this country. He is talking about what Communists call the CI Rep—the Communist International representative. Incidentally, Gerhart Eisler stands accused of having been the CI Rep to this country at one time—the top secret figure who transmitted orders from Moscow.

Here is what Gitlow says about the CI Rep: "A representative of the Communist International to the United States was the boss of the party. In other words, he could step into the central committee of the party and say, 'I, as a representative of the Communist International, using my mandate, order the American party to do this thing and that thing and something else,' and that had to be carried out. In other words, he was commander in chief of the party while in the United States. • • •

"If he happened to be in the minority in the vote—when he wanted the minority to be a majority—all he had to do was to impose his power and mandate, as a CI representative, and then his view would prevail. Generally, American Communists never take a position in opposition to the representative of the Communist International. They know his special powers in the country."

Apparently the whole thing of the special powers of the CI Rep to order things around to suit Moscow and overturn a majority vote of the American party came to a head back in 1929. Over in Russia, Stalin was engaged in purging another one of the older Bolshevists, who might threaten him. This time it was Bukharin, one of the most brilliant theoreticians of communism. As usual, there were great repercussions of the struggle here in America. Jay Lovestone, the head of the party here, and various others, were suspected by Stalin of sympathizing with Bukharin. So Stalin set out to depose Lovestone. He sent a letter to William Z. Foster, letting all Communists know that Foster was Stalin's candidate. But back in 1929, this still wasn't enough. The party had not yet learned its lesson of absolute obedience to Moscow. Before the national convention of the American Communist Party was held, Foster had only from 5 to 10 percent of the votes. It appeared that Foster wasn't going to get the job after all. So the Communist International sent a cable directing the American party to elect Foster and also ordering that Lovestone, an American citizen, mind you, be removed and deported from America, to work in Moscow. The party still resisted but Lovestone and his followers did go to Moscow, where a sort of trial was held. Stalin made several speeches. Molotov laid down the doctrine that from then onward, when Moscow sent over a CI Rep, he (quoting Gitlow) "shall have full power and complete control over the American party and his decisions shall be binding, with veto power over any kind of decision the party might happen to make."

This was made an order of the International and, says Gitlow, it "established the complete bossism of Stalin over the American Communist movement."

Lovestone and his henchmen were kept in Moscow for months while Stalin's agents went to New York and completely reorganized the party in the United States along the lines laid down by Moscow. The only compromise was that Stalin picked Earl Browder instead of Foster. Later on, when the American party would have liked to kick Browder out, Stalin came to his rescue and kept him in.

There may be those who say, "Yes, but all that is changed now—the Communist International has been dissolved. It no longer interferes in American affairs." Well, that is a subject all by itself and I am not going to get sidetracked on it now. There is a wealth of evidence that the Comintern was dissolved only on paper and that it kept right on doing what it had always done, but not so openly. I will cite only one example of their direction of American affairs—while the Communist International was supposedly not even in existence. During the war, Browder had been the head of the party here and had been following the united front tactics. They coincided, of course, with American policy, we being wartime allies of Soviet Russia. Russia wanted to help us get out production and set up a second front. Up through Tehran, the attitude of cooperation between the two countries still persisted but soon a most significant thing happened.

A French Communist named Jacques Duclos, known to all Communists, everywhere, as a representative of the Communist International, wrote a piece in a French periodical. It came out in April 1945, the month in which President Roosevelt died. It told the initiate that the season of Soviet-American good will and cooperation was over with and it did it in a single phrase: The Tehran Pact, said the Duclos article, was only a diplomatic gesture. At the same time it attacked Earl Browder, the symbol of the Communist united front. It called Browder a revisionist and said that he should be supplanted. Now, mark you, Earl Browder, the head of the party here, was accustomed to 30-minute ovations from the faithful when he appeared at Madison Square Garden to make speeches. But so subservient was the American party to the whim, will and word of Moscow—even from a somewhat concealed source, this French Communist named Duclos—that it turned on Browder overnight. Browder even began beating his own breast and uttering mea culpas. He withdrew from the secretary generalship, and he said a very significant thing when he did so. He said this condemnation of him by Duclos, undoubtedly represents the opinion of all leading European Marxists. Of course, the leading European Marxists are Stalin, Molotov, Vishinsky, et al.

It shows the absolute servility of the American Communists to the edict of Moscow. Just a few words in an obscure French journal, but from a right source—an old Comintern representative—could overturn the leadership of the American Communist Party. But doesn't it show something else? Doesn't it show that the Comintern—the Communist International that was supposedly dissolved—was still operating at the old stand?

I want to give you some testimony of Louis Budenz, the former Communist and former editor of the Daily Worker, where he had a front-row seat.

Budenz said before the House Un-American Activities Committee, in November 1946: "Browder and Foster have no life except that which is granted them by Moscow, no political life of their own. I want to illustrate this by what happens in the Communist Party, to show how this works out. For instance, Browder used to go back and forth to Moscow and every time he came back there was a new line. A classical case that I remember • • • was when a conference on unemployment insurance was going on, in January 1935, and they (meaning the Communist Party) were denouncing the idea of a Labor Party. The Communists were fighting tooth and nail against it when, lo and behold, Browder arrives on a ship from Moscow, rushes to Washington and declares that anyone who is against the Labor Party is anathema; that anyone who is opposed to the Labor Party is opposed to the interests of the workers and the labor movement. And the Communists flip-flopped over and became just as enthusiastic, in 2 minutes, for the Labor Party as they had been bitterly opposed to it, all along before.

"Now, we are all sensible people. We know that Browder did not go to Moscow for the fun of it. He went to get the line on the Labor Party and he came back with it. That happened over and over again."

Budenz gives another rather amusing picture of the feverish search of the Communists for the one true party line, direct from Moscow, so that they could veer with it and not be thrown off when it took a sudden turn. He depicts the search for the true gospel in the pages of the two great Moscow newspapers, Pravda and Izvestia, which get to this country 10 days or 2 weeks after publication.

"If there is anything that would give you a picture of a Communist leader," says Budenz, "it is his feverish search, every day of what Pravda or Izvestia says, to make sure he has the proper sensitivity regarding the line that must be followed for that day or for that period. If there are some lapses, it is largely due to difficulties of communication or the time element."

As a clincher to all I have been saying, let me give you just one more quote to show that the Kremlin dog wags the American Party tail.

Here is Browder speaking in 1939:

He said there is "no single instance where the Communist Party of the United States has ever disagreed with the Communist line in Russia."

How could this be mere coincidence?

This is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

Taxes and Government Extravagance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcasts:

CONGRESSMAN HAND ON TAXES AND GOVERNMENT EXTRAVAGANCE

(A series of three radio broadcasts).

I

As I suggested in last week's broadcast, the House passed the tax-reduction bill without difficulty, but I am bound to say I was surprised by the actual vote of 292 to 120, which was a larger margin that I expected, and larger than would be necessary to override another Presidential veto. The bill has been sent to the Senate, and I regret to report that it will be delayed there for some time. However, while there will be an unfortunate delay, I think there is no doubt whatever that the Senate will pass a tax-reduction bill in some form by spring. It is possible that they will have to substantially reduce the cuts which the House has proposed in order to get enough Democratic votes to override an expected veto.

It is a shame that bargains of this kind have to be made at the expense of the taxpayer. Under the Constitution the House is the body which is charged with raising revenue, and this is the fifth time in recent months that the House has overwhelmingly voted for tax reduction, only to find their efforts foiled by vetoes and the lack of a working majority in the Senate.

The House bill provides substantial relief to all taxpayers, and relief, which in my judgment, the people need and the Government can well afford. Tax reductions range from 30 percent to 10 percent according to the size of income. Briefly, persons with net income of $1,000 or less after exemption get a 30-percent reduction in their tax bill, and 20 percent on any excess up to $1,400. Those with net incomes from $1,400 to $4,000 get a reduction of 20 percent. Those with net incomes in excess of $4,000 get a reduction of 20 percent on the first $4,000 and 10 percent on income in excess of that amount. In addition, exemptions are increased from $500 to $600 which alone will take millions in the lower brackets off the tax rolls entirely; and additional exemptions are allowed for taxpayers over 65 years of age. This latter provision has been criticized as discriminatory, but the cold facts are that persons in that age group, as a rule, suffer greatly impaired earnings, and are the most seriously affected by high living costs which, indeed, affect all of us.

In addition to affording very substantial relief to those who are in the lower brackets, the merit of the bill is that it provides reasonable relief for the great middle class of this country, earning, say, between $2,500 and $5,000; and some encouragement for those in the upper brackets.

Those who advocate a definite soak-the-rich program overlook two basic facts:

1. That if all of the income of all the really rich was confiscated, it would run the Government but a very few days.

2. That some promise, at least, of tax relief must be given to those who have spare capital, in order to give them some incentive for investing money, because it is only through the investment of capital that jobs are created. The livelihood of everyone depends upon the prudent investment of capital which will not be invested if tax

rates continue on a wartime confiscatory basis.

I wish that time would permit me to give you a number of examples of tax savings to the average citizen, which are effected under this bill. Millions who paid taxes last year will be exempt entirely this year. A married couple with two dependents earning $2,500 will pay about $13 under this bill as against approximately $100 under the present law, because under this bill, as you know, the benefits of the so-called community property States will extend to all taxpayers, thus eliminating an unjustifiable discrimination. And, as I have said, older persons are especially benefitted.

The President's proposal to greatly increase corporate taxes overlooks the fact that it would probably reduce employment, and unquestionably increase prices, because the corporations that make the goods of the country will, of course, pass their burdens on to the consumer.

Despite charges that you have heard to the contrary, this tax reduction can be effected without disturbing the operations of Government, without impairing the Government's foreign program, and with due allowance to the orderly reduction of the national debt. I hope the Senate will not change it too drastically and that the President will have the good judgment to finally agree with Congress that reasonable tax relief is needed and is entirely practicable this year.

II

I think it will be agreed that one problem of paramount importance this year is to make a real beginning on the problem of the drastic reduction of Government expenditures. Like Mark Twain's observation about the weather, everybody talks about it but nobody does anything.

It has been calculated that Federal, State, and local taxes take as much as 30 percent of the average income. Another way to put it is that all of us work possibly 1 day out of 3 for the tax collector.

The cost of food is extremely high, but the cost of Government is even higher. The Federal budget alone costs us as much or more than our food bill. Moreover, in every item of food that we buy, a substantial part of the price is in taxes. The citizen who pays a small income tax, or perhaps none at all, and who pays no local real-estate tax, sometimes thinks that the tax burden is none of his concern. That is a great mistake. Every time he goes to the corner store to buy a loaf of bread, he helps to pay the taxes of the merchant, the baker, the flour manufacturer, the taxes of the farmer who grows the wheat, and innumerable other taxes that are imposed along the way—and it will be found that a very substantial part of the 16 cents paid for the bread finds it way into the hands of the tax collectors for the local, State, and Federal Governments.

The President's budget of nearly $40,000,000,000 is about four times as high as the peacetime budgets under the Roosevelt administration. Of course, there are reasons why it is necessarily higher. The cost of national defense, the cost of adequate care for veterans of the war, and the interest on the public debt are three reasons why we cannot escape from higher budgets. But that is not to say there is any justification for multiplying the expense of Government four times. That is the result of waste, extravagance, inefficiencies, and above all the psychology of spending and spending, which has taken hold of governments generally.

It is obvious that if we are going to maintain a sound economy at home, pay off our crushing national debt, and lift an intolerable burden from the backs of our taxpayers, we are going to have to cut out waste, and extravagance, and unnecessary services, and furthermore (and this I want to particularly emphasize), we are going to have to cut out even those expenditures and services which are desirable, but not imperative. In other words, first things must come first, and second things, even though we are used to them and would rather like to continue them, and find them convenient, must go if we are to truly economize.

With the exception of civilian employees in the Army and Navy, which obviously have been reduced since the war, the number of employees of many departments of the Federal Government have actually increased since the war.

Therefore, I am keenly disappointed at the action taken on the first appropriation bill of the year. It was passed last week by a top-heavy vote, but I felt bound to vote against it, and did. The committee told us that they had saved $56,000,000 under the budget estimates, and they did, but the fact still remains that the bill provided appropriations of $196,000,000 in excess of the moneys spent in 1947. The President's emergency fund, for example, last year was $500,000. This year the President asked for $1,000,000. The committee thought they were economizing when they reduced the request to $700,000, but the simple fact is they raised the item $200,000 over last year. This is a sort of petty-cash account which Presidents for many years did not find necessary at all. And so it goes with almost all the 27 agencies covered by the bill. The committee cut down their extravagant requests, but still appropriated more than the previous year.

Let me reiterate that if we are to cut the budget, and we must, we will have to do it far more drastically, far more courageously, and far more radically than action on this first bill would indicate.

III

At the risk of harping too much on the same problem, I ask your leave to again emphasize the importance of continuing the fight against Government extravagance.

You will recall that last week I said I was disappointed with the first appropriation bill passed by the House this year. I charged that although the committee had reduced the extravagant claims made by the agencies that they had nonetheless approved appropriations almost 200 millions in excess of the requirements of the preceding year, which is surely economizing backwards. In the intervening week my charge has received strong and welcome support. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, speaking on the same subject a day or two ago, said: "Too frequently Congress is satisfied with itself when it whistles the Executive's budget request, but actually allows increases over the previous year. This is the case with the * * * (appropriation) bill reported to the House last week."

Senator BYRD was right, as he mostly is. I have had occasion before to pay tribute to him as an outstanding member of the Democratic Party, who has done highly useful work in exposing extravagant expenditures and unnecessary Government pay rolls.

Speaking of Government pay rolls, the situation is still relatively unimproved. Personnel in December 1947 was close to the 2,000,000 mark, and although a net reduction has been made in the last 6 months, an analysis of that reduction indicates that less than 1 percent of total savings may be attributed to a real effort on the part of the executive department to economize. The reminder of the reduction is either seasonable, or results from a liquidation of war agencies, which have no possible right to a continued existence.

The discouraging fact is that in nearly half of the agencies there has actually been an increase in the number on the pay roll.

Now, more than 2 years after the war, it is startling to discover continued increases in the vast pay-roll army. A notable offender is the Post Office Department, which increases its pay rolls very substantially month by month, and which added almost 1,700 new employees from November to December. The pay of postal employees needs to be brought more nearly in line with present living costs, and this could be better done if the Department would not continue to pad its pay rolls with thousands of employees not needed for the efficient conduct of its business. It is no wonder that the Post Office anticipates an operating loss running into millions and is planning a general increase in postal rates to partly relieve the deficit.

On the basis of the President's requests, the budget for fiscal 1949 would provide employment for 2,010,000 persons, who would be paid more than $6,000,000,000. And it is to be assumed that thousands more will be added to implement various foreign programs—and this fact stands out in bold relief—exclusive of civilian employment in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, Federal employment has increased 60,000 over the peak of wartime employment in June 1945.

The primary blame for this obviously rests on the executive department, which plans and does all of this hiring, but Congress cannot evade the responsibility for not putting a stop to it—because after all, with its control of appropriations, its historic control of the purse strings, it can and most certainly should call a halt to an orgy of waste and extravagance which continues almost unabated, and will continue until we say "No" in a loud and certain voice.

Now that the break in the price of commodities gives us reason to hope that the ever-increasing cost of foodstuffs has broken, it is more than ever time for us to cut the price of Government, which is always an important factor in living costs generally.

We do not set our sights nearly high enough. We talk about cutting two or three billion from the present budget, and we should think in terms of a minimum cut of five billion. We talk about reducing employees in the thousands, and we should talk about reducing them in the hundreds of thousands. It is practical, and with a will it can be done. Listening to the people of my district, I know they insist it be done.

A Bow to Sea Isle City and Mayor Bill Haffert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Max Leuchter, the publisher and editor of the Vineland Times Journal, recently published in his interesting column an article entitled "A Bow to Sea Isle City and Mayor Bill Haffert."

The bow was a well merited recognition of a man who is a first class citizen, a newspaper publisher, the publisher of a well known farm magazine, and who has been a friend of mine for many years.

The significance of the article, however, is its brief reference to Mayor Haffert's town meetings, which are modeled after the town meetings of early New England, and which are an interesting and valuable experiment in true democratic government. It is for this reason in particular that I include herewith a part of the article referred to:

If Charles K. Landis could have been present at the recent town meeting held at Sea Isle City, he would have been very proud of the resort town which he founded, and which, as in Vineland, honors his memory in naming its main street Landis Avenue. The town meetings in Sea Isle City are the inspiration and the initiative of Mayor William A. (Bill) Haffert, newspaper and farm-magazine publisher and prominent Rotarian. Bill believes that the Sea Isle City commissioners should be guided in all major decisions by the direct opinion of the city's residents, and he has held six town meetings since 1945.

Vineland has more than a pasing interest in the welfare of Sea Isle City. Quite a number of residents of this area spend many summer week ends there. In our opinion, no south Jersey beach equals the Sea Isle City in its gentle slope seaward. Given any kind of an opportunity, Sea Isle can grow into a wonderful home resort, minus the bluff and bluster of the more highly advertised and pressurized coast places. Its residents have shown unusual honestly and courage in turning down a financial windfall. We hope that potential residents, seeking year-around homes at the shore in the future, will respond to this friendly invitation by the people of Sea Isle City. With new homes will come additional ratables, with which the city commissioners can improve beach-front facilities.

The report of the town meeting, as carried in the Atlantic City Press, stated in conclusion: "T. Leyard Blakesman, chief of the New Jersey State Bureau of Planning, a guest at the meeting, declared that it was the finest example of real democracy at work that he had ever seen."

To Mayor Bill Haffert, whose faith in the good judgment of his fellow townsmen caused him to revive a good, old-fashioned, colonial custom of liberty-loving New England, and make it work in a south Jersey municipality—our admiration and congratulations. To Sea Isle City, which wants to be honest with its friends and visitors, good luck and prosperity!

MAX LEUCHTER.

Low-Cost Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a proposal for a low-cost housing plan prepared by a constituent of mine which I think merits careful reading by the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the proposal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LOW-COST HOUSING PLAN

It has come to our attention that the Government is in the process of trying to sell the land and houses under the jurisdiction of the Vancouver Housing Authority, McLoughlin Heights, Vancouver, Wash.

Homes under $1,000 sounds unbelievable but is a working reality with the proper cooperation of Government agencies—mainly the Public Housing Authority and Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Therefore, we urge the careful study of the plan herein stated.

PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY PLAN

Floyd S. Ratchford, executive director, Vancouver Housing Authority, McLoughlin Heights, Vancouver, Wash., has set forth his plan in a series of personal interviews with us. The plan consists of dividing the McLoughlin Heights area into large plots and having the land and the buildings appraised and the property sold to interested builders or investors for redevelopment. This area of 832.15 acres has 3,394 single construction demountable houses, 498 family units in row houses, three schools, a fire station, two large general store buildings, a recreation area, and administration buildings.

An 11-acre plot containing 85 houses was used as an example of what the investor would be required to do. The land would be sold to an investor at $600 per acre. The 85 units would be sold at an appraised value according to respective accommodations—a 2-bedroom house having a value of $650. The investor would be required to replot the area into lots so that only 41 units would remain in the 11 acres, and the additional 44 units would have to be moved to some other plot of land purchased by the investor. It was suggested this other land could be made available through War Assets Administration. The 41 units remaining on the 11 acres would each be moved intact from its original site to a new location and placed on a concrete-block foundation and rebuilt to conform with FHA specifications and the city of Vancouver specifications, as it was further planned that the city of Vancouver would incorporate each redeveloped plot into the city.

A description of the remodeling of a sample house in the McLoughlin Heights area and the cost of remodeling is shown in an enclosed pamphlet published by the Vancouver Housing Authority. The cost of this two-bedroom converted house is $5,550.

Two other such units in the McLoughlin Heights area have been remodeled to such an extent that the selling price would reach $8,800 and $9,200, respectively. Therefore, it can be assumed that the pamphlet does show a conservative figure at $5,550.

FALLACIES IN THE PLAN OF THE HOUSING AUTHORITY

1. The McLoughlin Heights area is very well planned and does not need any moving or shifting around of the houses. As the area now stands, it is far, far better than can be found in many city residential areas, including some of the adjoining areas in the city of Vancouver. The city has an ordinance requiring 5,000 square feet to each Vancouver city lot. The 11 acres to be taken into the city on March 1, 1948, have 85 houses. This will average out to 5,637 square feet per lot; actually, however, some lots will fall slightly below the requirement and some will run a little larger. It can, therefore, be reasonably assumed that the area would be taken into the city as it is now laid out. Any objections on the part of the city can be handled in a democratic manner, namely, by public reaction and opinion.

2. The appearance of the house, after a remodeling job, alone costing $4,509.29, is improved only slightly more than could be done by a coat of paint.

3. These remodeled houses would have to sell for $5,559 plus title insurance, and any expert's opinion is that they are not worth as much as $3,500.

4. The added utility room is not heated and could scarcely be used in the winter months without an additional expense for heating equipment.

5. The hardwood floor used in the sample remodeled house was of inferior quality.

6. The change of the wall structure is not worth the tremedous cost for remodeling the same.

7. Private capital will not support such a fantastic plan as that proposed for the remodeling of the McLoughlin Heights area. Any capital support would give only 50 cents on a dollar, therefore requiring $2,780 for down payment.

8. The amount of building being done in the Portland-Vancouver area has created a heavy demand upon building materials, and a shortage of material already exists in this locality. The amount of material necessary to remodel these 3,394 homes (and they are being used as homes at present) would create such an additional demand that it would only tend to increase building material prices, which are already too high, and also to create a severe shortage of material for other homes being built in this vicinity. It is a known fact that material shortages have caused many builders to take up to a year to complete a single home.

At a cost of $16,000,000 for remodeling no new homes are to be created in this area, and therefore no housing shortage for this area will be solved, but rather the proposed remodeling will only divert the material that could be used for other new homes.

9. The public housing areas provide the only rental housing that the average veteran can afford. Remodeling or transfiguring these areas at present inflationary prices would completely deprive them of shelter.

OUR PROPOSED PLAN

A careful study of the housing situation in the Portland-Vancouver area and information received from a recent survey, sponsored jointly by the city of Vancouver and the PHA, proved the immediate necessity for a workable low cost housing plan—one that would keep us away from the road that leads to inflation. We have that plan and urge the Government to consider our proposals. We feel confident that our proposals will receive a tremendous amount of favorable public reaction. There are many similar projects over the Nation, therefore this plan can help solve thousands and thousands of housing problems.

We propose that the housing authority make this McLoughlin Heights property available in units of one house to each eligible purchaser with rules to be set up as to eligibility and priority similar to those stated below:

Eligible purchasers will consist only of persons who do not own a home in the Portland-Vancouver area.

First priority: First 2-month period held for sale to present occupants.

Second priority: Second 2-month period held for sale to veterans in need of a home.

Third priority: After 4 months open to low-income families in need of a home.

We suggest also that a deed will not be issued until 1 year after date of purchase, and resale of said property will not be permitted during the first year, except in case of death or some other unforeseen circumstances that would require or cause the purchaser to move from this area. The sale, in that case, would be handled by the PHA under the regular priority system with a fair charge being made for rental and damage. This clause would prevent racketeering in the purchase of these low-cost homes.

Mr. Ratchford informed us that the investor would receive a two-bedroom house with refrigerator, electric range, hot-water heater, and heating stove for the price of $650; a three-bedroom house for $720. We, therefore, propose that the buildings, equipped as stated, be made available to the eligible purchasers at the same price.

We propose that the three schools, fire station, playground or park area, and administration buildings be given as communal property to the city of Vancouver on condition that the area be accepted into the city limits, or to a new city of the McLoughlin Heights area to be chartered if Vancouver refuses admittance of the area as it now stands.

The price of the land was set at $600 per acre to an investor. If this land value was divided between the 3,394 houses and 2 general stores, it would make the price of each average-sized lot about $147. With care and good judgment, lots larger than average would be priced a little higher and lots smaller than average would be priced a

little less. This plan is reasonable as it would automatically pay for the area occupied as communal property mentioned in the previous paragraph. It is only fair for the property owners to pay for the communal property as they would benefit directly by it.

The 498 row units would be sold as salvage at the present appraised value and removed from the area.

Buildings now used as business establishments would be sold by sealed bids.

The land has to be plotted and surveyed by a staff of competent engineers. Abstracts and title insurance will have to be drawn up for each piece of property. This cost could amount to as much as $50 per house. The buildings turned over as communal property have some value and the administration of such an undertaking would be high. Someone has to pay for all this so we propose that a handling fee of not greater than 15 percent be charged. Therefore it can be concluded that a two-bedroom house would have a selling price as indicated below:

House (two-bedroom)	$650.00
Lot	147.00
Total	797.00
15-percent handling cost	119.55
Total cost to purchaser	916.55

It is easy for one to sit and dream of some splendid, magnificent, superresidential area, but in the face of reality, one must accept the facts. Our Nation lacks any home plan whereby the lower-income group can acquire a home at some nominal fee that would not be injurious to their future well being. Many of our potential home buyers can ill afford to pay more than $916.55, and very few home buyers can actually afford to sign themselves into indebtedness for the rest of their lives and thereby bring about want and hardships to their families. There are undoubtedly many veterans who cannot even afford a home with a down payment of $916.55. Therefore, we urge that these low-income people be given a chance by making some small down payment with the remainder financed by RFC and paid back in regular monthly installments amounting only to a low-rent rate of $25 to $50 per month—the only rate an average veteran can afford to pay.

In the past veterans have strongly criticized WAA for their handling of surplus Government supplies and the making of surplus supplies available only in carload lots—quantities too large for the individual consumer. Let's get behind this program of single-package units with a push and let the veterans know that their Government is for them by giving them a chance to start out with a home and a clear outlook for the future.

ALTERNATE PLAN

Should the Government be unwilling to carry out our plan, we propose that the property in the McLoughlin Heights area be made available to us (a committee of veterans) financed by RFC, and we will agree to carry out this program or some similar program that could be agreed upon. We believe we could handle the entire plan more cheaply than the Government and charge a handling fee of about 10 percent plus 1 percent added for each calendar quarter until the sale is consummated. This additional 1 percent handling charge per calendar quarter would reimburse us for interest charged by RFC.

Example

FIRST QUARTER PERIOD, OR FIRST 3 MONTHS OF SALE

House	$650.00
Lot	147.00
Total	797.00
10 percent handling charge	[1] 79.70
1 percent handling charge	7.97
Selling price	884.67

SECOND QUARTER, PERIOD FROM 3 TO 6 MONTHS AFTER SALE OPENS

House	$650.00
Lot	147.00
Total	797.00
10 percent handling charge	[1] 79.70
2 percent handling charge	15.94
Selling price	892.64

[1] Handling charge covers the expense of plotting, land surveying, abstract or title insurance, communal buildings, and administration of the program.

The following statistical data from a recently completed survey of the city of Vancouver and its environs is given for your information:

Population of city of Vancouver	20,871
Population in housing areas adjacent to Vancouver	19,342
Total population of Vancouver and housing areas	40,213
Number of households planning to buy or build in or adjacent to the city of Vancouver before 1950	1,991
Total number who now live in public housing areas who plan to build	5,120

These figures are astounding and should cause a great deal of concern. It must be kept in mind that this survey does not include the 415,000 population of the city of Portland, Oreg., just across the river from Vancouver. If the ratio for new homes according to population were to run the same, there would be over 20,000 households planning to build in and around Portland before 1950.

One other fact must be taken into consideration. The survey only indicates the number planning to build and does not indicate the number of low-income households who would plan to build if they could afford to do so.

All these figures taken into consideration would indicate the tremendous demand for the McLoughlin Heights homes to be made available at low cost and also indicates the financial soundness for RFC support.

The plight of the occupants, the veteran, and the low-income group, who cannot afford to pay present inflationary prices, should be of the greatest concern to our Nation. Since there is a complete lack of an effective housing program for this group and our plan would in some degree alleviate this condition, we urge your utmost consideration and approval.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH H. SELLIKEN,
Committee Chairman, Portland, Oreg.

Fair Employment Practices Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an able editorial which appeared in the Chicago Defender, under date of February 28, 1948, on Senate bill 984. In my opinion it has such merit that it should be brought to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD BUSINESS SENSE

A group of distinguished business leaders, including the celebrated Nelson Rockefeller, Paul Hoffman, Beardsley Rumi, and Eric Johnston, called upon the Congress last week to pass the Ives-Fulton FEPC bill.

In a telegram addressed to Senator VANDENBERG and Congressman JOE MARTIN, the businessmen declared that discrimination in employment operates against the best interests of the country in that it results in an unsound use of manpower and retards the development of purchasing power.

Besides the purely economic reasons advanced by the business leaders, they charged that such discrimination is "undemocratic and inhuman. * * * that it weakens the position of the United States in the eyes of the world."

Realistically, they wrote: "In our judgment the Ives-Fulton bill if enacted into law will substantially advance the cause of nondiscrimination in employment. * * * We do not believe that passage of this bill will eliminate prejudice in America, but it will be an effective step along the road."

The sound, truly American position taken by these eminent leaders of business cannot be dismissed as an empty gesture made by soft-headed do-gooders. These men are realists who do not permit sentiments and emotions to influence their judgment. They know that job discrimination weakens the economic structure of our society and artificially circumscribes business opportunities.

The purchasing power of the Negro will be immeasurably increased when our workers enjoy equality of opportunity, and this purchasing power will turn the wheels of business and industry. Business cannot prosper in the long run without adequate markets.

Today, despite the limitations imposed upon us, the annual purchasing power of Negro Americans is far greater than the annual income of many foreign countries where American business is now seeking to establish beachheads. These facts the business leaders know well.

The strong economic and moral arguments which were advanced last week by these businessmen should inspire the Congress to speedy action on the fair employment practice legislation. These arguments cannot be negated by the windy pronouncements of filibusterers who appeal to prejudice instead of reason.

Los Angeles City Council Endorses H. R. 4999 and S. 1988 To Clarify Title of Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *February 26, 1948.*
Hon. GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCDONOUGH: May I take the liberty of calling to your attention the pending bills, S. 1988 and H. R. 4999, now before subcommittees of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, which have for their purpose the declaration of title of the several States to the 3-mile marginal belt along the coast.

As you doubtless know, these so-called tideland bills are not merely of State concern, but of vital importance to Los Angeles and other port cities of California, as well as all cities throughout the country having property interests in harbors, or any tide or submerged lands and inland waterways. The recent decision of the United States Supreme Court has cast a cloud upon the title of the State of California in and to its tidelands and inland waters. The statement of the United States Attorney General that there is no intention to acquire submerged lands in ports, harbors, and rivers is no guaranty for the future. The legal principle being once established the United States Department of Justice may at any future time take improved city property just as is now being done with reference to lands seaward of the low tideline and within the 3-mile limit that has always heretofore been regarded as the property of the States. The city of Los Angeles derives its title to its harbor and its beaches from the State of California and with full reliance thereon has invested many millions of dollars in the development and improvement of Los Angeles Harbor, as well as its extensive beaches, and the future of these valuable public facilities is now in serious jeopardy.

The Council of the City of Los Angeles has adopted a resolution on this subject, a copy of which I enclose herewith. I fully endorse the resolution and ask that you give these bills your personal consideration and active support.

With sincere appreciation on behalf of the city of Los Angeles for your kindness in this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FLETCHER BOWRON, *Mayor.*

Resolution urging the adoption by Congress of S. 1988 or H. R. 4999 or similar legislation

Whereas the State of California has heretofore granted to the city of Los Angeles all its right, title, and interest in and to all tide and submerged lands, whether filled or unfilled, within the boundaries of the city of Los Angeles; and

Whereas by the expenditure of many millions of dollars obtained from general obligation bonds of the city of Los Angeles and from revenues from the operation of Los Angeles Harbor in San Pedro Bay, the city of Los Angeles has created, built, and improved a large modern harbor which is devoted to serving the commerce of the United States, southern California, and the city of Los Angeles, and which is indispensable to the United States and the citizens of Los Angeles and southern California for purposes of national defense and the maintenance of a merchant marine; and

Whereas said Los Angeles Harbor is located upon tide and submerged lands in San Pedro Bay; and

Whereas the city of Los Angeles has expended large sums in establishing and maintaining public beaches and other public recreational facilities on tide and submerged lands within the city of Los Angeles in Santa Monica and San Pedro Bays, and has in contemplation a program of further extensive improvements and additions to such recreational facilities; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in *United States* v. *California* (Original 12, October term 1946) has determined and decided that the State of California and its grantees do not own the marginal sea, lying seaward of the ordinary low water mark, exclusive of bays, harbors, and other inland waters; and

Whereas the Attorney General of the United States is now endeavoring by petition in the Supreme Court of the United States to establish that a large part of Los Angeles Harbor is not inland water, is not owned by the city of Los Angeles, and was not owned by the State of California; and

Whereas the Attorney General of the United States is now endeavoring by petition in the Supreme Court of the United States that Santa Monica Bay, seaward of the ordinary low water mark, may not be a bay or inland water, but may be within the marginal sea and hence may not be owned by the city of Los Angeles or the State of California; and

Whereas the Attorney General of the United States has refused to recognize any legal distinction between the rights of the United States in and to the marginal sea and in and to bays, harbors, and other inland waters, and hence has refused to concede that the State of California and its grantees are even the owners of bays, harbors, and other inland waters, though that question was not actually in issue before the Supreme Court of the United States in said proceeding entitled *United States* v. *California;* and

Whereas the ownership and use of a portion of the tide and submerged lands, heretofore used and occupied by the city of Los Angeles in the interests of commerce, navigation, and fishery, are jeopardized by the said recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the said petition of the Attorney General of the United States to have a portion of Los Angeles Harbor declared to lie within the marginal sea; and

Whereas a cloud upon the title of the city of Los Angeles in and to any and all of the tide and submerged lands lying within its boundaries, in both San Pedro and Santa Monica Bays, over which tide and submerged lands the State of California and the city of Los Angeles have exercised all rights of sovereignty, ownership, and control since 1850, in reliance upon decisions of the Supreme Court and acts and conduct of Congress and of departments and officials of the United States, has been created by the policies recently adopted by the Attorney General of the United States and by other Federal departments and bureaus; and

Whereas the future and further development and improvement by the city of Los Angeles of the tide and submerged lands within its boundaries in the interests of commerce, navigation, fishery, and recreation has been, and will continue to be, impeded and hindered, and local and civic interests have been, and will continue to be, adversely affected, until the uncertainties of title and ownership engendered by said decision of the Supreme Court and said policies adopted by the Attorney General and other Federal departments and bureaus have been dispelled: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and earnestly urged to adopt and pass S. 1988 and H. R. 4999, being bills to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, or similar legislation; and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of the United States and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives of the United States are hereby earnestly urged and requested to report favorably upon S. 1988 and H. R. 4999, respectively, or upon similar legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That Arthur W. Nordstrom, assistant city attorney, be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to represent and speak for this council and the city of Los Angeles in behalf of such legislation before said Committees on the Judiciary and any subcommittee thereof that may hold hearings relative thereto.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the council of the city of Los Angeles at its meeting held on the 10th day of February 1948.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES,
WALTER C. PETERSON, *City Clerk.*

Constantine Brown Scores State Department Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very instructive and enlightened article entitled "State Department Scored for Patched-Quilt Policy," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Star of yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT SCORED FOR PATCHED-QUILT POLICY—ANALYST SAYS LEGISLATORS LACK CONFIDENCE IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH AND THE GULF BETWEEN THEM GROWS WIDER

(By Constantine Brown)

Never in the memory of old-timers in Congress—not even during the bitter debate on the Versailles Treaty—has there been a greater gulf between the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

At no time has there been greater lack of confidence on the Hill in the actions and activities of the State Department.

In the last 12 months Senators and Representatives have become more aware—and almost vocal—about the failings of the State Department, which in turn is irked by "indiscreet" questioning by Congress of its actions.

DIFFERENT DURING THE WAR

During the war Congress was acquiescent, resigned to voting anything the administration demanded without asking questions. When some "rebels" wanted to know the whys and wherefore of the executive branch's actions, they were answered with the statement that even communication of such explanations in executive sessions would be damaging to the conduct of the war and our relations with the other allies. The "rebels" had to let it go at that.

Today the United States has undertaken global economic obligations and regional political and military commitments greater than those assumed by the old Roman Empire. Yet the conduct of these affairs, which vitally affect every American, is in the hands of people who either are confused or uncertain over how to handle the ship of state in the world's present international tempest.

After the brilliant feats of American armed forces, we found ourselves at the end of 1946 in a situation which indicated clearly that although we had won the war militarily we had lost it politically.

Administration leaders realized full well that after having contributed to the war effort to the tune of about 1,200,000 casualties and more than $73,000,000,000 in lend-lease, UNRRA, and other help to our wartime associates, the American people would react unfavorably to another armament race leading to a probable third world war.

DECIDED TO BUY FRIENDSHIP

Because of a misconceived policy of appeasement toward Russia in the year following VJ-day it became obvious to most observers in Washington that we would not have peace in our time. Not daring to reveal the monumental diplomatic blunders committed between 1941 and 1945, the administration had to find a solution. The solution was to spend more of the taxpayers' money to buy friendship and thus stem the Soviet drive for world domination.

The top officials of the State Department decided to counter Moscow's drive by promising large amounts of goods, money, and raw materials to governments which would resist communism.

These policy framers had not progressed in their mental processes since World War I, when communism first made its appearance in many parts of Europe. At that time it was contended that poverty tended to breed communism and that nations which suffered privations adopted most easily the neo-Marxist doctrines of Lenin and his followers.

American policy framers and their advisers—young self-seeking career diplomats—refused to realize that Stalin had adopted a new brand of communism which was in no way different from nazism. They also realized that nations do not "go" Communist, but are coerced into the Russian fold by terroristic police methods.

In order to slow down Russia's march, it was proposed to spend billions of the taxpayers' money in all kinds of economic and financial schemes. But because of the fear of justifying Moscow's charges that we were warmongers and militant imperialists, there was a distinct reluctance to listen to experienced voices in Europe and Asia which said that a really strong American military force and supplies of military equipment for the nations on the periphery of the iron curtain would be as much help as food and machine tools for the peoples menaced by the Red avalanche.

It was only in the spring of 1947 that we decided timidly to support Greece and Turkey. The Truman doctrine, which clearly stated that America would assist those countries to maintain their sovereignty and independence, was the first practical approach to the problem. Later, in December, last year, the same promise was made to Italy in a somewhat nebulous statement from the White House.

But strange as it may seem to the man in the street, while we adopted this attitude toward Europe, we refused to extend it to the Far East, where Russian activities are as energetic as in Europe.

PRESSURED INTO AIDING CHINA

We promised the benefits of the Marshall plan to the 16 European nations, provided, of course, that they maintain their democratic forms of government. In regard to China, however, the State Department insisted after months of passivity that Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek should include Communists in his government in order to get the full benefit of America's global bonanza.

Under pressure from Congress, the State Department produced a plan of assistance to China amounting to $570,000,000. But at the same time—while the matter was being discussed in Congress—America's Ambassador to Nanking, Dr. John Leighton Stuart, reiterated the demand that General Chiang should broaden the government by including some of the Moscow puppets. Dr. Stuart's statement is reliably stated to have been drafted in main outline—if not altogether written—in the State Department.

There is not a single top military man in the Department of Defense—and, for that matter, not a single realistically minded civilian entrusted with national defense—who is not convinced that China, and especially Manchuria, is of utmost military importance to the defense of this country.

The conduct of America's foreign affairs since last year has been in the hands of one of our ablest tacticians, General Marshall. But the fact that he is a distinguished tactician and logistical expert does not mean that he is also a far-seeing statesman. Although diplomacy and military strategy are interwoven closely these days, General Marshall's military training makes him an indifferent diplomat with a strong distaste for anything political.

Throughout the war—when General Marshall was a member of the Joint and Combined Chiefs of Staff—he tried to avoid participation in any discussions which were flavored with international politics. General Marshall accepted his first diplomatic job as Special Ambassador to China as a chore because his Commander in Chief demanded that he give up his retirement and attempt to settle the Chinese crisis, which some State Department experts ascribed to General Chiang's dictatorial ambitions.

General Marshall did not fare well in his first attempt at diplomacy because he had espoused the idea of the "experts," namely, that the Chinese Communists were mere agrarian "reformers," as they had been identified by State Department ideologists and "liberal" newspapers and magazines in this country.

However, the Secretary of State is not used to failure.

NOT USED TO FAILURE

General Marshall agreed to succeed Secretary of State Byrnes out of loyalty and obedience to the desires of his Commander in Chief.

It is probable that in his own heart General Marshall did not think he could do the job as well as he did his wartime job as Army Chief of Staff. He must have been aware that the conduct of America's foreign policies in the midst of Moscow's dark intrigues and conspiracies is the most difficult job any American citizen ever undertook in the history of the Republic.

As a military man General Marshall realized how little actual force we have to implement a policy of direct and forceful talk to Moscow. Because of this disadvantage he is compelled to accept the suggestions of a few advisers whom he chose when he went to the State Department and must follow a patched-quilt policy.

It is this lack of a "straight line," accompanied by failure to provide Congress Members with the vital information to which they consider themselves entitled, that has produced the gulf between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Connecticut Ranks High in New Who's Who

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Sheldon Garber, United Press correspondent, pointing out that Connecticut has 76 out of every 100,000 residents included in the anniversary edition of Who's Who. This article appeared in the Hartford (Conn.) Daily Courant of Tuesday, February 24, 1948:

STATE RANKS HIGH IN NEW WHO'S WHO—HAS 76 OUT OF EVERY 100,000 RESIDENTS IN ANNIVERSARY EDITION

(By Sheldon Garber)

CHICAGO, February 23.—The editors of Who's Who in America issued their fiftieth anniversary edition today with a soothing word for readers not to feel too badly if they don't find their names in it.

The chances are you won't. The odds are better than 3,000 to 1 against you getting your name into the blue book of famous people, the editors said.

About 5,000 persons, including Crooner Frank Sinatra, actress Paulette Goddard, cowboy Roy Rogers, and radio's Mrs. Nussbaum, are among the newcomers who made the grade in the 1948-49 edition. More than 100 wartime officers of the various armed services were dropped because they "automatically" lost their prominence when they left service.

FORTY-ONE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FOUR LISTED

Wheeler Sammons, publisher of Who's Who, got his name into the new edition. But he gave himself only 8 lines among the 41,194 famous persons the book lists.

The editors said graduates of small colleges have a four times better chance of getting listed than those of big colleges. An analysis of the vocations and professions listed disclosed 35 explorers, 7 bridge engineers, 8 diabetic specialists, 15 impressarios, 27 criminologists, 2 magicians, and 52 astronomers.

All the names that go into the book are "screened" by a five-man editorial board whose primary job is to see that the people are "not the best but the best known."

The oldest person in the book is 97-year-old Calvin F. Adams, a Massachusetts engineer. The youngest is 11-year-old Margaret O'Brien, Hollywood screen star.

The most space is given to Thomas J. Watson, president of the International Business Machine Co. It cost the publishers $50 to print his biography, taking 201 lines.

President Truman's data cost only $5 to publish.

Connecticut has the largest number for each 100,000 population listed in the new book, 76.3.

American Foreign Policy Respecting China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on our foreign policy in China by Alexander H. Uhl, which appeared in the newspaper PM on Sunday, December 21, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINA: FOREIGN POLICY BY BLACKMAIL

(By Alexander H. Uhl)

WASHINGTON.—Despite the obvious reluctance of the State Department, the United States of America is now being driven toward an all-out policy of help to Chiang Kai-shek against the Communists with the possibility that within a matter of months new tensions will develop between the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. over China.

What has happened during the past 2 weeks is that by an extraordinary pressure campaign on the part of a few Republican Congressmen, plus an assist from the Luce publications, Secretary of State Marshall is being forced into a China policy contrary to his own recommendations and the advice of many China experts in his Department.

WHAT IT MEANS

The shift in policy—if the Chiang Kai-shek admirers have their way fully—means not only economic help to the Nationalist Government, but military help in every phase needed to crush the Chinese Communists. This policy has long been opposed by China experts for two reasons:

That should the United States of America give all-out help to Chiang, the Russians are likely to retaliate by extensive help to the Chinese Communists. Should that happen the China problem by degrees may enter a phase directly involving the United States of America and U. S. S. R. in the Chinese civil war.

That the Chinese situation by its very magnitude and complexity is different from the situation in western Europe and that help poufed into China under present conditions is a gross waste of American taxpayers' money for the benefit of a handful of Chinese profiteers.

HOW IT WORKS

The technique by which the Department has all but been stripped of its policy-making power so far as China is concerned might well be called foreign policy by blackmail.

It has been marked by State Department fear that if it did not placate Congress on China, its requested appropriations would be cut. And it has been marked, too, by a smear campaign against the China section of the Department with all but open accusations that Communists influence has been behind its decisions.

No one who has been at the hearings of the past week, particularly those of the Senate Appropriations Committee, could fail to be convinced that the Department was being bullied and threatened into a policy in which it has no faith. And that unless Secretary Marshall blows up, it will find itself doing things in which it does not believe.

TOP ACTORS

The two men who have played the most important role in this GOP foreign policy for China, are Representative WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, Minnesota, former missionary in China and long one of Chiang's greatest defenders, and Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, New Hampshire, who has come along on the China ride somewhat belatedly but with considerable vehemence.

BRIDGES isn't even a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Republican, Michigan, who has long opposed the Department's China policy—he thinks we should help Chiang, too—has played a somewhat more modest role and has been willing to be more patient with Marshall than have JUDD or BRIDGES.

SOME MANEUVERS

It was JUDD who put through an amendment authorizing $60,000,000 for China in the House interim aid bill even though the State Department preferred to bring in a separate China program after the first of the year.

The Senate knocked China out of the bill, but Senator BRIDGES, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, got it back to the tune of $20,000,000. He held a series of hearings that for a one-sided presentation of the case makes a first-class scandal.

He invited Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, author of the highly secret Wedemeyer report, to testify and got exactly what he wanted. Wedemeyer did not reveal his report on China, but he spared no pains to make it clear that he thought we hadn't been treating Chiang right and that we ought to be giving him military and economic aid as part of our stop-communism policy.

LOADED TESTIMONY

Then BRIDGES invited William C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to Moscow and an ardent supporter of Chiang, to testify. Bullitt reiterated much of what he wrote in his China article in Life, ending with sharp criticism of the China desk in the State Department and suggesting that a military man like Gen. Douglas MacArthur ought to be sent to China.

Finally BRIDGES invited Clare Booth Luce, president of the American China Policy Association, which follows the Luce line on help to China. Mrs. Luce couldn't come, being absent in California, but Alfred Kohlberg, chairman of the board of directors of the association, came, and turned out eminently satisfactory from BRIDGES' viewpoint.

THROW 'EM OUT

He accused some members of the China desk as being lovers of Moscow, but thought that everyone who didn't agree with an aggressive anti-Communist policy in China should be thrown out of the Department.

What was striking about these hearings is that none of the China experts in Washington who are strongly opposed to any more aid to Chiang, particularly military aid, was invited. The anti-Chiang side of the picture never even got a chance for a hearing.

There were hints, for example, that some malign influence had been working on the Export-Import Bank for its failure to attend to the $500,000,000 credit to Chiang earmarked more than a year ago for Chinese reconstruction.

WHAT IT'S ABOUT

Yet, apparently, it never occurred to BRIDGES to call representatives of the bank to say why they had not voted the loan, although it has long been known that they turned thumbs down on it because they saw no chance of ever getting their money back.

The State Department now finds itself caught between GOP determination to help Chiang on the military as well as economic front and its own concern over the wisdom of plunging again into further intervention in the Chinese civil war.

Behind this concern are two factors:

To talk about "working the Communists out of China," as Bullitt does, is no small-scale operation. That operation in Greece with its 20,000 to 25,000 guerrillas is proving a difficult enough task. But China represents even more than a localized civil war, since the Communists control territory in which there are perhaps 100,000,000 people.

Although the State Department admits that the Russians in all likelihood turned over captured Japanese weapons to the Communists, Secretary Marshall has insisted repeatedly that there is no evidence of any large-scale help to them.

BULLITT DENIES IT

This Bullitt denies, insisting that the Russians are now manufacturing and shipping arms and ammunition to the Communists.

At any rate what seems clear is that open American intervention on the side of Chiang may produce more open and more direct aid to the Communists by the Russians. In a competition of that sort there is no telling where it would stop.

Again, nationalist China has received about $3,000,000,000 in aid of one kind or another in the past 6 years, much of it since VJ-day, yet conditions in China today are admittedly deteriorating more rapidly than ever.

CORRUPTION UNIMPORTANT

Men like JUDD concede inefficiency and corruption in China, but contend that these are relatively unimportant before the fact that Chiang is firmly anti-Communist and therefore on our side.

Actually this has not been the only criticism directed against new aid to China. What has played an important role, is that Chiang by a campaign of terrorism has destroyed the Democratic League, the very group upon whom Marshall pinned great hope in a reorganization of the Chinese regime.

Probably the most striking example of the role of corruption is what happened to the $500,000,000 granted China in 1942 with virtually no strings attached.

SPECULATORS' FIELD DAY

Part of this loan was used to buy gold and it wasn't long before speculators were having a field day. When the gold was all but gone, the Government finally clamped down on any more sales.

Premier T. V. Soong was forced out of office on that deal, the head of the Central Bank was impeached and other officials were arrested. But the gold was mostly gone into private pockets.

The break-down in Nationalist morale has been so severe in the face of corruption that a considerable amount of the military equipment used by the Communists has been obtained from units outfitted and trained by the United States of America and there is real fear that new equipment may go the same way.

There is no doubt that the State Department would like to find some way of helping Chiang hold the Communists. Marshall, himself, has promised Congress a $300,000,000 program beginning next year, averaging $20,000,000 a month for 15 months.

ECONOMIC PROGRAM

This program was originally designed to be economic, and the big problem the State Department has been trying to solve is how to get it used constructively rather than be swallowed up by corruption and inefficiency. Now all the indications are that in addition, military help will be demanded by Congress and probably obtained.

Actually the State Department's throat was cut on its China policy by President Truman himself in his speech last March on aid for Greece and Turkey. With that clearly avowed anti-Communist policy, Chiang's supporters have been drumming steadily on the logic that if we help Europe to stem communism, we must equally help the Far East.

The result is that the basic problems of China—land distribution, usury and exploitation by war lords and landholders—are not even mentioned any more.

Wallace Acts for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, the St. Paul Pioneer Press for February 27, 1948, contained a splendid editorial entitled "Wallace Acts for War" which I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WALLACE ACTS FOR WAR

It is time to stop mincing words on this occasion of Henry A. Wallace's visit to the Twin Cities and to recognize bluntly that, judged by his acts, Wallace is for war.

He talks as plausibly for peace in our time as Neville Chamberlain did in 1938 at Munich. Many peaceful people want to believe and do believe that Wallace is serving peace now as Chamberlain was thought to be then. Wallace may even have convinced himself completely of the practicability of his methods, though it is hard to see how a mind trained in science and schooled in politics could be so naive.

But in reality Wallace's method, if followed, would lay the basis for World War III just as clearly as Chamberlain's in 1938 laid the basis for World War II. The method is the self-same one of appeasement. Confronting democracy again is the force of dictatorship. The difference between aggressive communism and fascism is nil. Each concession given the one is being followed up by a new act of war, just as was the case with the other.

The Communists' seizure of Czechoslovakia is inherently an act of war now just as Hitler's seizure was in 1938. Russia's arming of the Greek Communists is incipient war. Appeasement with the Middle East's oil while this country and Britain and western Europe face an oil emergency would court war for that resource. And today's applause by Russia's fifth column of Communists in this and other democracies for each new concession to dictatorship that is put forward under the luring guise of peace is ominous, just as the similar applause of Hitler's fifth columnists in the democracies turned out to be an omen of war.

Henry Wallace is the Neville Chamberlain of world war III. He even has under his arm a deceptive token of peace to substitute for Chamberlain's umbrella, and this is the callow Senator GLEN TAYLOR, of Idaho.

And if the pooled political power of the Communists and the well-meaning but deluded pacifists of this country should be able to make appeasement the foreign policy of this country, the path to world war III would be opened. Perhaps even the time schedule of it could be foretold almost with the definiteness and accuracy with which Ambassador William E. Dodd once foretold from appeasement the coming of World War II. At the rate she now is traveling, Russian readiness appears less than a decade away.

And if war should come again as a result of appeasement, it would find Russia through her puppets astride the same resources in Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary that Hitler coveted and the Communist forces possessed of the same strategic assets in Czechoslovakia that Hitler won through appeasement. Due to the weakness of western Europe and Britain, and strife or weakness elsewhere, there would be no strong ally available for this country anywhere in the world. And the war that would sear the peaceful cities and lovely countryside of this and other nations would make even the scourge that appeasement in the 1930's turned loose on Europe and Asia look like a pink tea.

Regardless of Wallace's motives, that is the kind of fire with which he and his course of appeasement are playing for this country and the world. His words are those of peace. But his acts invite dictatorship to advance, as it just has advanced in Czechoslovakia, along the path to world war III.

Recipients of Earned Social Security Benefits Are in Misery Because of the High Cost of Living—Congress Must Provide Relief

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress in 1939 there was talk of amending the Social Security Act. While it is true that some minor changes were made in the law, we are still just talking about the major amendments that will bring needed relief to millions of recipients of earned social-security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, since 1939 we have heard the excuse that delay is necessary in order that certain committees should study the subject. We have had the excuse that a board of actuarial experts similar to those employed by insurance companies should study the financial structure of the social security fund and the possible impact of such amendments.

We have been told in the name of economy it has been necessary to postpone liberalization of benefits under the Social Security Act. This waiting policy has long run its course and the American people are sick and tired of such dilly-dallying over a matter that concerns the health and welfare of millions of our citizens.

We, in the Congress of the United States, should be ashamed of our actions in pouring out billions of dollars to foreign nations, while we turn our backs to the needs of our fellow Americans, who, by the sweat of their brows, have made this Nation possible. These same American citizens contributed to the prosperity of our Nation only to witness it being dissipated by international hand-outs to foreign nations without any hope of a dollar ever being repaid.

Approximately 2,000,000 persons are receiving benefits under the Social Security Act. There are 875,000 retired workers over 65 years of age, who get approximately $25 a month. Two hundred and seventy thousand of their wives receive a half allowance, or about $13 a month. Thus, a man and wife receive about $38 monthly.

There are 135,000 widows with young children who receive $20 monthly; 165,000 aged widows of deceased workers get $20 a month; 10,000 aged dependent parents receive about $13.50 a month; 525,000 children of deceased workers get $13 a month.

We have been told time and again from this floor of the sufferings of people in Germany, Korea, France, Italy, England, and other foreign nations. We have had Members of Congress tell us that foreign citizens were not obtaining sufficient food to provide the necessary calories. What about our own American citizens?

Let us forget about the rest of the world for a moment and devote our attention to the plight of the average retired citizen, who is receiving earned social-security benefits. If you consider the average retired couple in your congressional district, you will find that they are receiving on an average of $38 monthly. Let us ask ourselves, in all sincerity, Could my mother and father exist on $38 a month in the face of present living costs? The answer is so obvious that even a school child of tender years can reply to such a question.

Let us consider the widowed mother and the $20 monthly she receives under the Social Security Act. Who in this Congress will deny the fact that a person cannot live on $20 a month? Many are in ill health by reason of age alone and their plight is rendered more serious on that account.

A recent Government report states that only 1 out of 10 Americans past 65 has enough independent income to live. Ten million Americans are past that age. Some are supported or aided by relatives. The report says 3,500,000 have to keep on working.

We could discuss at length the misery and suffering that is being borne with patience and fortitude by the elderly citizens of America. However, there are two age-old sayings, "Talk is cheap," and "Actions speak louder than words." These eternal truths should be borne in mind as we study the attitude of Congress with respect to the need of amending the Social Security Act.

All we have heard is talk during the past several years when it concerns amendments to the Social Security Act. As evidence of our failure to act, it is a known fact that each succeeding Congress has witnessed the introduction of dozens of bills that year after year die in committee. At the moment there are numerous bills in the House Committee on Ways and Means, designed to amend the Social Security Act. It is the same old story, we must make a study of the situation and consult actuarial reports. Delay. Delay. Delay. It is the only answer we get.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to do something practical about this situation. For that purpose, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 5636, embodying two simple amendments, not over six lines in length that will do a world of good in providing welcome relief to millions of recipients of earned Social Security benefits.

My bill is a short cut, providing definite and speedy relief, whereas cumbersome omnibus bills languish and eventually die in committee, with the result that such action shatters the confidence and hope of millions of good American citizens.

The first amendment increases the amount a retired person may earn while receiving earned Social Security benefits. Under the existing law, a recipient who earns over $15 monthly in outside employment is denied Social Security benefits. I propose to increase the amount he may earn from $15 to $40.

I am informed by the Social Security Board that this particular amendment will have little effect on the social-security fund. In fact, it will permit retired persons to receive earned social-security benefits and augment the amount received by securing part-time employment. The net result is to contribute to their health and well-being by building up their morale and self-respect. The Social Security Board informs me that such an amendment will result in no more than 3-percent increase in the total disbursements of the social-security fund.

The second amendment contained in H. R. 5636 revises the benefit formula in the following manner. At the present time, when an employee retires his benefits are computed by taking 40 percent of the first $50 of his monthly wages and 10 percent on the remainder, with a percentage of the total credited for his years of service.

My amendment changes this formula to allow 40 percent on the first $100 and 10 percent on the remainder with the percentage now added for years of service remaining the same as under the existing law.

As an example, let us consider the case of a retired employee, who has an average monthly salary of $200 and who has been employed for 10 years.

Under the present formula, 40 percent of the first $50 provides $20 and 10 percent on the remainder an additional $15, making a total of $35. His 10 years of service is credited at 1 percent for each year or 10 percent, which amounts to $3.50 additional. This retired employee receives as benefits $38.50 monthly.

By comparison, my amendment would give this employee 40 percent of the first $100 or $40, plus 10 percent of the second $100 or $10, making a total of $50, to which 10 percent is added for his 10 years of service, making a total of $55 as his monthly benefit.

I am inserting at this point in my remarks a table of benefits, illustrating the effect of my amendment as compared with the amount received as benefits under the present law.

Average monthly wage	Basic benefit			10 years' coverage			20 years' coverage		
	Present law	Proposed revision	Increase	Present law	Proposed revision	Increase	Present law	Proposed revision	Increase
$100	$25	$40	$15	$27.50	$44.00	$16.50	$30	$48	$18
$150	30	45	15	33.00	49.50	16.50	36	54	18
$200	35	50	15	38.50	55.00	16.50	42	60	18
$250	40	55	15	44.00	60.50	16.50	48	66	18

The above table shows the increases in the benefits for the retired workers, which will be about $16 for the majority of the retired individuals at present, although averaging probably about $13, because of the fact that some persons have wages below $100 or have been in the insurance system less than 10 years. Likewise, increases will be made for eligible wives of retired workers, amounting to about $7 on the average. Also, the change in the benefits will be passed on to the survivor beneficiaries, with the increase amounting to about $7 on the average for the eligible children, and to about $10 for the widow beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, having introduced these amendments, I want to emphasize that the cost is negligible and that the impact on the social security fund will be at a minimum.

According to the Social Security Board, there are adequate funds available and no increase in payroll tax will be necessary in the future to cover the cost of these amendments.

The present rate of pay-roll tax, based on wage levels today, is producing an annual income to the social-security fund, far in excess of the cost of present-day benefits, including the cost of my amendment.

I am inserting, at this point, a table furnished me by the Social Security Board, showing transactions for the period 1941 to 1947, inclusive. The table is as follows:

TABLE 5.—*Operations of the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund, fiscal years 1941–47*

[In millions]

Fiscal year	Fund beginning of year [1]	Transactions during year							Fund at end of year
		Income			Disbursements				
		Total	Appropriations [2]	Interest on investments	Total	Benefit payments	Administrative expenses	Net increase in fund	
1941	$1,745	$744	$698	$46	$91	$64	$27	$653	$2,398
1942	2,398	967	896	71	137	110	27	830	3,227
1943	3,227	1,218	1,130	87	177	149	27	1,041	4,268
1944	4,268	1,395	1,292	103	217	185	33	1,178	5,445
1945	5,445	1,434	1,310	124	267	240	27	1,167	6,613
1946	6,613	1,386	1,238	148	358	321	37	1,028	7,641
1947	7,641	1,623	1,459	163	466	426	41	1,157	8,798

[1] Totals shown in this and other columns do not necessarily equal the sum of rounded components.
[2] Include 100 percent of contributions which are automatically appropriated to the trust fund, and reimbursements equivalent to any additional payments arising from the extension of survivors insurance protection to certain veterans of World War II (Social Security Act amendments of 1946).

You will observe that the net funds on hand at the end of the fiscal year 1941 amounted to $2,398,000,000. Each year there has been a steady increase, with the result that at the close of the fiscal year 1947, after all expenses were paid the social-security fund amounted to $8,798,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in my opening remarks, it is necessary that we do something immediately to relieve the suffering and misery of those receiving earned benefits under the Social Security Act.

The cost of my proposed amendments is about 3 percent of the billions of dollars unexpended in the social-security fund. My amendments will add nothing to the national debt and requires no increase in taxation from any source.

Here is an opportunity for us to do something for millions of our own American people. We have spent months pondering over the plight of foreign nations and, with Congress adjourning in June, we should move immediately to consider our own people without any further pussyfooting or side-stepping.

We have granted retired civil-service employees increased benefits. The retired Army and Navy personnel have received similar increases. At the moment we are considering increases in salaries for postal employees and other Federal employees because of the inability of these groups to meet present-day living costs.

The recipients of earned social-security benefits and those receiving old-age assistance through the various States are the victims of our neglect.

I hope that action will be taken in the various States to increase old-age assistance benefits and that our Federal Government will sanction such action by increasing Federal appropriations to the several States for that purpose.

At the moment we have an opportunity to consider my amendments as the first step in liberalizing social-security benefits to those who have earned them by reason of their employment.

I sincerely hope that all of you will join me in getting prompt action for this group of forgotten Americans.

Six Months of Taft-Hartley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLLA C. McMILLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

SIX MONTHS OF TAFT-HARTLEY

Congress enacted the Taft-Hartley labor relations law over the Presidential veto in late June 1947, and a considerable section of organized labor immediately denounced the law as a "slave labor" act.

Six months later the opposition of organized labor has subsided to some extent although the legislation is an issue in various congressional primary elections. There is less public sympathy for the opposition chiefly because the dire predictions of labor leaders have failed to materialize.

Meanwhile the law seems to be working. Various provisions are being tested in the courts, the usual democratic procedure in such cases. The labor unions have been doing some housecleaning. Communist influences have been ousted and the unions are working to eliminate jurisdictional differences among themselves.

Strikes are at a record peacetime low for a dozen years and secondary boycotts have declined. Although certain union labor leaders protested that the purpose of the Taft-Hartley law was to break the unions, no victim has been reported.

In fairness it must be noted that the law has been in effect during the season of the year when strikes are infrequent. Various strikes have been threatened later in the year. And many union contracts were signed in advance of the effective date of the Taft-Hartley law. A considerable body of organized labor is employed under contracts which do not embody the provisions of the new act. Furthermore, certain unions are working without contracts, and so are beyond the jurisdiction of certain provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

Another reason, and a good one, why employers and unions seem to be getting along these days is that they are feeling each other out while, at the same time, they wait for interpretation of the courts and by Government agencies.

Altogether the labor situation is hopeful. The Taft-Hartley law is not perfect legislation and there must be changes in some major provisions. Those changes will come as a result of court decisions and of experience in applying the new law to actual conditions.

Report on Fuel Conditions in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to me, I wish to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD to include a current report on fuel conditions in Massachusetts, under date of February 27, 1948, from George F. Hines, special representative of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In general, you will note not only the optimism expressed in the report but also the note of caution in the third paragraph, which I repeat for emphasis:

It is the considered opinion of all dealing directly with the situation that while another severe or prolonged cold spell will immediately create another critical shortage, the emergency will not be so widespread, not involve so many consumers, and be of shorter duration.

I also wish to emphasize the following paragraph:

The principal danger spots at the moment are the Fall River area, north of Boston, and the western part of the State, but these sections are receiving special attention.

As I have reported, there has been some real concern about the so-called spot shortages in the western part of the State, but there has been excellent cooperation and a minimum of real hardship. I sincerely hope that will continue.

Finally, I call your attention to the opinion expressed that the supply of gasoline is going to be short this summer. This is a matter which, I think, deserves immediate attention and constructive effort, and I propose to get all the available facts for your consideration just as soon as possible.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
OFFICE OF SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1948.

REPORT ON FUEL CONDITIONS IN MASSACHUSETTS

Congressman JOHN W. HESELTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HESELTON: Massachusetts has passed through the worst period of this winter's fuel shortage in the opinion of George Rockwell, State emergency fuel coordinator: and his staff of volunteer area and local coordinators and oil-industry advisors.

The recent 10 days of mild weather was most helpful in relieving the extremely tight and constant demand for emergency supplies and the splendid team work built up between suppliers, distributors, and local cooperating agencies has enabled the State to catch up a little on the problem.

It is the considered opinion of all dealing directly with the situation that while another severe or prolonged cold spell will immediately create another critical shortage, the emergency will not be so widespread, not involve so many consumers, and be of shorter duration.

The large independent distributors, who have been the cause of principal concern throughout the last 2 months, are now in better shape, at least temporarily, as the result of help received from the large suppliers. On this top level the only problem that remains is to provide these distributors with regular sources of supply.

The State Fuel Co. is O. K. to March 3 on kerosene and to March 10 on No. 2. The White Fuel Co. has been able to borrow considerable quantities of both kerosene and No. 2. Hartols tanker has arrived.

Generally speaking, supplier and large distributors report that their stocks are at low levels because the mild spell has permitted them to increase the amounts in householders' tanks a little higher than the dangerously low levels under which they have been operating for the past 6 weeks.

In other words, the big fellows have pushed out their stocks into the consumers' tanks so that they have slight reserves to meet any sudden sharp drop in temperatures. All dealers are trying to build up their in-stock positions. On the consumer levels the situation changes every day. Emergency fuel coordinators still are receiving emergency calls, but not so many.

Kerosene continues to be the most critical shortage and the most dangerous. Through March and April, when the weather moderates and the consumption of No. 2 declines in homes a further increased demand for kerosene is expected as householders shift from their central heating plants to keeping the chill out of the houses by running their kitchen kerosene ranges.

In Boston all kerosene users are being adequately supplied and every consumer has "got by." Emphasis has been placed on providing kerosene for the poorer sections of greater Boston and the other large cities. In this connection the bank of emergency supplies made available to the fuel coordinator by the large suppliers has been a great help.

To summarize: Massachusetts has successfully met this crisis so far with no householder reported cold. No relief stations have been established, and there have been no Red Cross alerts, but on several occasions distress has been avoided by very narrow margins. The danger is not yet over. The return of extremely cold weather will immediately precipitate another crisis, but everyone is hopeful that with the approach of spring further drastic steps will not be necessary.

To show how critical the situation was, one incident is related. A family in Wellesley was completely out of oil and no immediate relief was possible for a few days. The Wellesley volunteer fuel coordinator invited the distressed family over to his home to spend the week end.

The principal danger spots at the moment are the Fall River area, north of Boston and the western part of the State, but these sections are receiving special attention.

On the whole Atlantic coast, stocks of both kerosene and No. 2 are still very low. Suppliers are borrowing well into March stocks and depending on more moderate weather to see them through. Reports of spot hold-up prices continue to be received in Washington of small dealers charging 48 cents for kerosene in Baltimore and 35 cents in Detroit, but these are quite unique. One of the remarkable phases of the entire country-wide shortage has been the relatively small amount of chiseling on prices.

It is reported here that Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota are still very short areas. Considerable quantities of oil have been shipped by the long-rail haul from west Texas, Kansas, and Montana into the upper Middle West, and there has even been all-rail shipments of oil from Oklahoma to New England. In most cases the companies are taking a licking on this long, all-rail movement of tank cars.

Appeals for users of heating oils to continue to conserve are still being made. At the moment the country's supply of available gasoline is as good as last year, although there is every evidence that the supply of gasoline is going to be short this summer.

In Massachusetts discussions are being held as to how long it will be necessary to maintain the emergency fuel coordinator's organization. No provision has as yet been made to maintain a permanent State or local set-up to plan for the gasoline shortage expected late this coming summer or for next fall when it is expected heating oils will be as short as they are in the winter now ending.

I hope this information is of assistance to you.

Yours very truly,
GEORGE F. HINES,
Special Representative.

How To Write Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the March 1948 issue of the magazine, Successful Farming, the magazine of farm business and farm homes, contains an article which I prepared on how American farmers should write their Congressmen. In this article I presented certain suggestions which are applicable not only to farmers, but to all other groups, in presenting suggestions and requests for assistance to their legislators.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN—OUR UNITED STATES LEGISLATORS NEED YOUR HELP IN SHAPING THE NATION'S POLICIES; HERE'S HOW TO WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN

(By the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

The voice of the American people is expressed in the form of hundreds of thousands of letters which find their way to the desks of United States Congressmen each year. The messages are varied. They range from personal inquiries to expressions of views on current legislative questions.

As efficient congressional letter-writers, farmers hold their own, or beat the best records of any other group in the country. Occasionally, however, we receive a letter such as the following one, which was written by a Georgia farmer to his Senator:

"STONE MOUNTAIN, GA.

"Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
"Senator of Georgia.

"DEAR SENATOR: I wrote to you for some information on medicinal herbs and you have sent me a whole batch of bulletins on chicken raising. I know all I want to know about chickens; what has chickens got to do with medicine herbs?

"On March 18, 1894, 44 years ago, I wrote to my Congressman for information on pecan trees and their care, and he sent me bulletins on Belgian rabbits and guinea pigs. What has rabbits and guinea pigs got to do with pecans?

"I am an old man, 72 years old. Old enough to know better than to write to a Senator or Congressman, but I heard such a nice talk over the radio during the Home and Farm Hour that in a moment of weakness I sat down and wrote to you for which I most humbly beg your pardon for bothering you. I did not want bulletins about chickens. I am so disgusted and outdone. Two times, 44 years apart, I get the same kind of a deal. Serves me right.

"Thank you? I haven't anything to thank you for; there are seven votes in this house and we have made it a rule not to miss a chance to vote on important Government or State elections.

"Respectfully.

"Only two times in all my life did I ever write to a Congressman or Senator."

Most farmers who write their Congressmen have much better luck than our Georgia friend did, for Congressmen who don't correspond with their constituents efficiently don't continue in office long.

Moreover, farmers do place a much higher value on letter writing to their legislators than did this particular fellow. Farm people are becoming more aware of the fact that letter writing to the United States Congress pays off in advancing the welfare of American agriculture as a whole, and in protecting their personal interests.

Around 300 letters reach my desk daily from farm people alone.

Of course, we can't answer all these inquiries—and, believe me, they come in on every subject. For instance, you'll get a kick out of this letter which Representative HOMER D. ANGELL, of Oregon, received:

"DEAR SIR: I thought I would write you this letter for it is very important matter to take up in Congress. You see it like this. I would like to get marry and I cannot get a wife so I thought I would write to you to see if you could help me out and get a wife.

"I am a young man about 40 years old and have not been marry, it seem that I cannot get a wife. I would like to get a wife about 21 or 24 years old. I am a signel man and I want home and have a family. It would be kind of you to help me out very much.

"Sincerely."

Do you see what I mean?

IMPORTANCE OF CORRESPONDENCE

I have operated a dairy farm in Barron County, Wis., for over 30 years, which is a lot longer than my 8 years in the United States Senate. From experiences on the farm and in the Congress, I am particularly interested in seeing to it that there is even closer contact between the men who work the soil and their elected representatives.

I well remember how, back in the 1930's, Wisconsin farmers were getting 90 cents per hundredweight of milk, which cost them $1.80 per hundredweight to produce. I remember the disastrous foreclosing of mortgages on countless farms. Those times must never come back.

One of the factors which will help guarantee against situations like this is capable letter writing of American farmers to their legislators—helping to assure Congress' understanding of the farmers' problems.

KINDS OF CORRESPONDENCE

We might note that there are two principal kinds of farm letters to Congressmen:

1. In the first or departmental type, the farmer asks specific assistance from the legislator for the purpose of getting something done at a Government agency.

The farmer may write, "Please contact the Veterans' Administration to speed up their handling of my application for a farm loan," or "Please contact the United States Tariff Commission and find out what's what on discussions of tariff reduction on these agricultural products." This kind of question involves work of some Government bureau.

In departmental correspondence, you can also include farmers' requests to their legislators for agricultural yearbooks, for farmers' bulletins, or for applications for fish planting.

2. In the second, or legislative type of letter, the farmer isn't asking for specific assistance from some Government agency, but is presenting his views on a current affair or bill. He may write, "Please vote for the Smith amendment to the Jones bill for the raising of parity prices," or "Please vote against S. 1000, which would impose needless restrictions on soil-conservation funds," or "Please vote against the nomination of Mr. John Jones for the farm post."

Through correspondence such as this, a Congressman can get a fair view of how the folks back home are thinking on matters of national interest.

HOW TO WRITE GOOD CORRESPONDENCE

How can you be sure you are writing good letters to your Congressmen, and how can you improve on them? There are certain standards you might follow in sending either a departmental or a legislative letter.

The standards are quite simple, and are already quite universally followed, with some exceptions. Here they are:

(1) Correct addressing: Your letter should be sent to either of your two United States Senators, or to the Representative from your home district—particularly if you are writing for some specific assistance. Of course, if you are writing on a national problem, you have every right to express your views to out-of-State legislators; however, your views probably will carry more weight with your own legislators.

We might note, too, when writing on a purely State-wide problem, that some folks misaddress their letters by sending them to their United States Senator, instead of to their State senator in the State capital. Your United States Senators are located in the Senate Office Building; your Representatives in the House Office Building. When addressing them there, it is helpful to include the postal zone: Washington 25, D. C.

If you are writing your legislators during a period when you know Congress is not in session and your Congressman is probably home, you can address him at his home office. It is important to note, however, that part or all of congressional office forces usually remain on hand in Washington, whether or not Congress is in session, and whether or not the Congressman is in the Capital. These office forces will be ready to assist you at all times.

When you want Government information only, write to the United States Information Office, 1400 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 24, D. C.

(2) Legibility: Most letters are quite readable. They are typed, or the penmanship is fair, words are not crowded, and there is plenty of paragraphing. Now and then, however, a letter comes in which can't be answered because the writer's handwriting is illegible; his address is scrawled, and his sentences look like a spiderweb of crisscrossing.

Congressmen don't ask you to write a penmanship masterpiece, but since they do have to read so many letters, legibility becomes an important factor in helping them to help you.

(3) Brevity: There are very few farmers who have to be told to keep their letters brief because, obviously, they have enough to do on the farm without writing long-winded communications to Washington. Most of them condense their thoughts in letters very well, often putting a two-three word digest in the upper right-hand corner of the letter, such as "Subject: Defeat S. 400, Kennedy bill."

Still, some folks do become involved in telling irrelevant stories of their Aunt Emma and of Uncle Pete, which are a long way from the subjects they have to discuss with their Congressmen.

(4) Completeness. Be sure, however, to include all pertinent facts, such as the history of your effort to get satisfaction from some Government agency, dates on which you wrote the agency, to whom you wrote, replies you received. Don't send original copies of important documents or other correspondence unless it is absolutely necessary. Copies should be sent instead. Congressmen can't be expected to return material.

LEGISLATIVE LETTERS

There are certain rules which especially apply to writing legislative letters. Here are a few:

(1) Keep them friendly. "Of all the stupid, blankety-blank actions I have ever heard a Congressman take, yours wins the rotten cake." That might be the way you feel about your Congressman, but it would be best to restrain your feelings, and write him in as respectful and calm a manner as possible.

This does not mean that you should not be frank; on the contrary, Congressmen appreciate blunt, straight-shooting talk. But they don't appreciate the nasty letters which a handful of folks write to them. Actually, when a writer gets excited, he limits the effectiveness in presenting his case to his Congressman.

(2) Keep them personal. Instead of using "canned" thoughts supplied by various organizations, the farmer should write about his own experiences in a personal way, straight from the heart.

"Here is the picture of how the farm-labor shortage and the machinery shortage is hurting production on my 600-acre farm. I have one hired man where I used to have four. My wife and three children help me out all they can, but we are way behind in our work, and our health suffers because of the burden."

A legislator can understand these facts, and they mean more to him than all the high-falutin', impersonal talk that some organizations mistakenly advise.

(3) Be reasonable. The farmer should present the facts behind his suggestions, rather than simply stating, "Do this" or "Vote this way" or "Protest this action." The legislator will listen if there is a good basis for your suggestion.

(4) Be timely. Many folks unfortunately send their letters in too late. When an important bill is coming up, farmers should make certain that their letters will arrive in time.

This does not mean sending a telegram or air-mail special delivery long before a bill comes up. An ordinary letter, well timed, is better than these expensive rush forms. So follow newspaper, magazine, and radio reports to learn when things will break in Washington, and then act accordingly.

(5) Follow up on your letter. Analyze the answer that your Congressman makes to your letter. Sometimes if many other farmers (and possibly city folks) have written in to him on the same subject, he may have to use a mimeographed-form response. You shouldn't mind this because, on the whole, Congressmen like to use form letters as little as farmers like to receive them, but often they are necessary.

When you receive a reply, ask yourself if the Congressman answered the questions you raised, or if he listened to your point of view with understanding.

In his reply, the Congressman may not be able to indicate a final commitment on the bill you asked him to support. This does not mean that he is hedging. In fact, a noncommittal answer may be the best for all concerned.

It is foolhardy for the legislator to give a blanket endorsement to any subject which is still in committee, and which may be amended there beyond recognition, or which may be vastly revised on the floor of the Senate or House.

Many farmers, in writing their legislator, say, "You needn't acknowledge nor answer this letter because I know you're busy. It is your action that counts, and I'll be following it."

This is a wise point of view because it is the action that the legislator takes and the reasons for it that really count more than an answer in words alone. So follow up on the results of your correspondence by watching for the roll-call votes on measures, and the reasons your Congressman gave for voting the way he did. If you like his vote, tell him so; if not, don't hesitate to advise him accordingly.

When the farmer writes his Congressman, he helps himself, the Congress, and American agriculture.

The Public Share in Indian Assimilation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, before the annual meeting of the Home Missions Council of North America, Inc., Buckhill Falls, Pa., January 6, 1948:

The avowed objective of the Indian Service of the Department of the Interior through the years has been to work itself out of a job. Within the last year the committees of the Congress which are concerned with Indian Affairs have expressed some doubts whether the controls were being released rapidly enough. To reaffirm this policy of releasing Indians from Government supervision, the Congress made substantial reductions in funds appropriated for this fiscal year for Indian administration at all levels of the service.

My direct connection with Indian problems dates from last July 1, when I became Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, in general charge of the Office of Indian Affairs, among others. As it happened, the drive to reemphasize the withdrawal of the Indian Office coincided with my entry on new duty, though there was no other relationship between the two events. Nevertheless, the United States has before it, posed anew, the question of its treatment and relationships with the Indians.

Government management and leasing of Indian property were based on the assumption that Indians lacked the experience to compete with whites in handling their own affairs in our economy. Money from these operations have remained in restricted status. I am sure that this is one of the greatest causes of Indian resentment at Federal supervision, and rightly so. It has been increasingly clear that the Indian field service has been reluctant, perhaps because of imposed regulations, to relinquish control over funds of individual Indians, as rapidly as the increasing competence of Indians should have dictated. One result of the current cut in administrative funds has been that we have had to withdraw much of the supervision of individual funds and individual leasing of land that was formerly exercised by agency officials. The suddenness of this transition will work to the disadvantage of some Indians, but the change as a whole is a move in the right direction.

Wholesale and indiscriminate relinquishment of Federal responsibilities for the protection of Indian property rights is not justifiable, however, and would be dangerous to the Indians. Many critics fail to discriminate adequately between those Indians who have progressed a long way toward assimilation, and those like the Navaho, Apache, and Eskimos who have as yet had little opportunity for association with non-Indians. As a matter of fact, it is easy, when discussing Indians in Oklahoma, to be so impressed with the economic and political competence of many representatives of the Five Civilized Tribes as to forget that there are several thousand members of these same tribes isolated in 100 percent Indian communities in the eroded Cookson Hills, and in eastern McCurtain County who speak very little English, and who a few years ago had an average net annual cash income of $54 a year.

Haste would make waste of many an Indian patrimony. The Indian Office should promptly and finally wean the competent Indians, but the Nation must not wean the starvelings among this Indian brood. They must first have an adequate economic foothold in modern society, or they will be lost.

An increasing number of Indians each year are drifting from the reservations into urban life and industrial employment. I am sure that this movement could be greatly accelerated if the public played its part in welcoming these graduates into economic and social equality. These phases of Indian assimilation are at present largely outside the scope of the Federal Government's efforts. But here in this movement lies the final answer for most of the Indians themselves to the age-old problem that we and our ancestors have created by occupancy of this great and beautiful land.

At the close of the Indian wars, treaties were drawn providing for the ceding of Indian lands and the education and civilization of the Indians. Many of the eastern tribes gave up all of their lands and accepted land set aside in a vague Indian territory west of the Mississippi.

Most of these tribes were partially adjusted to non-Indian ways of earning a living, and had long since given up any active opposition to the Government, or to their white neighbors. This was not so of many of the Plains Tribes, however. The peace treaties with the Sioux, the Blackfeet, the Shoshone and their plains neighbors provided that the leaders of these tribes would keep their members within the borders of the reserved lands. The Government also agreed that the Army would keep non-Indians out of these areas. The letter and spirit of these treaties were often broken by the whites, but until about a dozen years ago the regulations of the Indian Office still provided that Indians might not leave their reservations without permission from the superintendent. Actually, these regulations were seldom enforced, but they remained in the book.

Today, any Indian in the United States is as free to come and go as is any other citizen. Many of the rights of citizenship that are only spottily accorded to Indians, such as the right to vote in the States of Arizona and New Mexico, and throughout the South, and the right to receive social-security benefits are outside the jurisdiction of the Indian Office and the Department of the Interior. These are matters which rest on State laws and public attitudes.

The vast field of law and order presents another problem. In early days, Indian tribes were classified as dependent nations. Each had its own recognized customs and regulations governing personal and tribal conduct.

Onto this structure of local law and order was placed the Federal definition of offenses which must be punished by the white man's code, murder, rape, etc. A limited corps of Federal enforcement officers was created. The enforcement of the Indian liquor law came in time to occupy much of the attention of these agents.

The Indian Reorganization Act gave a well-defined place in Indian self-government to the enforcement of law and order. Tribal councils were recognized as competent to enact regulatory ordinances and fix penalties; tribal courts were reinforced; and the tribes were encouraged to employ law-enforcement officers. Many tribes have established effective local systems of law and order on their reservations. In areas where there is still operating an effective body of tribal lore and custom, this is probably as it should be. There is just as much reason to permit the passage and enforcement of local regulations in an Indian community as in any other American town or community. The Indians because of their peculiar legal status in the national life derive much of their authority for local self-government by inherent right, as distinguished from cities which are chartered by the States, but the powers exercised by the tribes and by cities are similar.

There are many reservations, however, on which Indian customs are no longer strong. The Indians live side by side with non-Indians, and to all intents and purposes are fitting into the general culture pattern. In many of these areas there is no interest on the part of the Indians in setting up and operating a tribal code or tribal courts. Their right to do so is sometimes used as an excuse to interfere with the enforcement of local law upon restricted Indian property. The Indian Office recognizes this situation and has for a decade prepared legislative proposals that would permit State law enforcement agencies to assume the responsibility in many parts of the country. Legislation transferring the responsibility has already been enacted for Kansas and for one reservation in North Dakota. It is our belief that similar legislation should be passed at an early date for the Indians residing in California, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and some other States.

Indians, when they leave the reservation, are subject to the laws of the State and the community in which they live. They are entitled to no special consideration. They cannot legally be deported back to their reservations. Sometimes reservation officials or others, in an endeavor to work out a solution more favorable to the Indian in view of his tribal attitudes, may urge him to return to the reservation and avoid contact with a community with which he is not equipped to deal.

Some advocates of emancipation of the Indians presume that the Federal Government is somehow or other exercising restraint. As a matter of fact, the instances which are quoted in support of the assumption are usually outside the province of the Federal Government. Indians do face discrimination and Indians are in many States deprived of full and functioning citizenship, but these are matters largely beyond Federal control. In these areas emancipation will be gained chiefly through public opinion. As active participants in the formulation of public opinion within your home communities, I bring these matters to your attention.

It is true that reservation Indians may not vote in Arizona and New Mexico. While the Department of the Interior believes that this is a matter of racial discrimination, the restrictions are not expressed in racial terms. The determination of voting qualifications is vested in the State legislatures by the Federal Constitution, so this is largely a matter which must be settled by the citizenry of those States. The courts of Arizona some 20 years ago interpreted the State constitution as barring ward Indians from voting. The Constitution of New Mexico debars from voting Indians not taxed. The qualifying tax has been determined to be an ad valorem land tax. In recent months test suits have been started in both States in an endeavor to have the constitutional questions decided by the United States Supreme Court. In the long run, the question of Indian voting in these States will be greatly influenced by the local public opinion. If this is favorable, barriers may be broken down. That job is logically in your sphere.

It is true that Indian citizens in Arizona and New Mexico do not receive social-security benefits. In view of the large Indian populations of these States in proportion to the number of non-Indians and the further presence of large units of nontaxable Federal land within the States, the reluctance of these States to assume the burden is understandable. Indians, however, are subject to the payment of certain State taxes, proceeds of which are used to raise the State's share in these benefits. This matter is now before the Social Security Board for a ruling, and some change may be made in favor of Indians.

When an issue is made of the nontaxpaying status of Indians, one should remember that in general the only taxes which Indians do not pay are those on real and personal trust property. Indians with few exceptions are subject to State and Federal income taxes, State and Federal inheritance taxes, sales taxes, automobile use taxes, and the various excise levies. What an individual Indian pays under any of these levies is small, usually. But there are millions of non-Indian citizens who pay no property taxes because they own no property and whose contribution to excise levies are infinitesimal. The basic resistance to including Indians in State and local services requiring outlay of funds grows out of a belief that the Indian makes no economic contribution to the community, and unfairly escapes his share of taxation. These assumptions are erroneous, in my belief, but no Federal regulation can change public thinking based on them. Enlightened public opinion would help.

The Navajos, poor as they are, contribute much to the economic life of the cities bordering the reservation, for example. As the Navajos profit, so do the traders and other citizens of Gallup, Farmington, Holbrook, and Winslow profit. As the Navajos starve, so are these communities less well-to-do. When public opinion makes this connection between the welfare of Indians and their non-Indian neighbors, there will be less discrimination against Indians. I have tied these remarks to the Navajo. They apply with equal force to every area where there are large groups of Indians.

It is true that Indians sometimes cannot get a square deal with the police and the courts of the cities bordering the reservations. Corrupt police ignore the preying by bootleggers on Indians but arrest the drunken Indians, and occasionally, at least, strip them of their money and jewelry. There is hardly a person in this room who can't fit that description to the towns bordering many of our reservations. The Indian Office can attempt to discover the bootleggers, but it can't influence the courts which dismiss such cases without even a reprimand. And whether a town will put up with corruption in its police force can only be determined by the citizens, including the substantial businessmen, the teachers, and others of the community. People like yourselves can bring such matters to public attention in such a way as to change the climate of opinion, and it needs improvement.

It is true that there are many towns and cities in the United States where an Indian cannot be served in most restaurants and stores, cannot register at the leading hotels, cannot rent a home in some sections of town. The discrimination is racial, and bears little relationship to the cultural status of the individuals. Until such barriers are removed and well-behaved Indians are accepted as other well-behaved citizens are accepted, Indians will choose to remain in their reservation homes, where they at least enjoy the respect of their associates. This discrimination depends on public opinion, which you can influence much better than can a government agency.

It is true that in many parts of the country Indians are included in the races barred by restrictive covenants on land. The legality of such covenants is now being tested in the Supreme Court, and the Government has entered the cases to ask that these covenants be declared illegal. Regardless of the Court decision, the spirit of a people who have entered into such covenants must be changed if Indians are to receive a square deal in the cities. In these same areas, Indians are usually not welcome in the churches, their children are not wanted in the public schools. They also suffer discrimination in the kinds of jobs that are open to them, and are the first to be laid off in times of slack employment. No Government can control such public opinion. You can offer leadership to a better type of thinking.

It is true that in many States, intermarriage between Indians and Caucasians is prohibited by law. Many of you, in discussing the ultimate solution of the Indian problem point to the successful amalgamation of races which has taken place in Oklahoma, and say that is the American way. That is the ultimate solution. So long as intermarriage is prohibited, such amalgamation must wait on the outcome of illicit unions, which is hardly what we would recommend. The revision of the marriage statutes rests upon public opinion. You rather than I can develop that public opinion.

It is still true in many States that Indians are not called to serve on juries, though the courts have begun to throw out cases on appeal in which it can be proved that the peers of a man of a minority group were systematically excluded from the jury panels drawn in his case. Also there are still a few States where the competence of Indian witnesses to testify in court may be challenged. In practice, I know of no recent case in which this latter has happened, but it is clear in the court records that in several States Indian testimony is discounted. No group enjoys full citizenship under these circumstances. Emancipation here also is dependent upon enlightened public opinion, not a change in Federal law.

The products of Indian handicraft, though widely sought, are still thought of by many people as something to be obtained for a song. Traders and public alike resent paying a price for something made by an Indian commensurate with the work involved in making it. This is merely a reflection of a belief that Indian competence is less and is therefore not worthy of the same reward. These are beliefs, not facts. Something must be done to change them, to alter public opinion.

People are not willfully inconsiderate in dealing with Indians, I think. They are simply reflecting a stereotype which has come down from the past when Indians were facing the destruction of their way of life, and groping for new values. There are still old and middle-aged Indians in every Indian group who in some degree justify these critical attitudes. It is unreasonable, however, to penalize the younger, educated group, who are making a tremendous effort to find a place in the society and economy of the majority group of Americans, because of these exceptions among their people. The change does not rest on Government action. It is you who must initiate it.

It is true that when Indians do succeed in an individual or a tribal enterprise there is likely to be political pressure exerted to interfere with their activities, on the ground that they enjoy an unfair competitive status because of Government subsidy. It seldom is so, but that doesn't stop the agitation. Aside from the nontaxable status of Indian property, which is guaranteed in the constitutions of most of the Western States, Indians usually experience a handicap instead of an advantage in starting or carrying on any business. It is because the normal sources of credit which are open to you and to me are not open to Indians, that the Federal Government inaugurated Federal loans. But Indians are not alone in receiving this aid. Small home owners, even large railroads, have not hesitated to accept loans from the Government when the banks which would normally be expected to supply such credit, failed to do so.

I believe too much emphasis is being placed on the nontaxable status of Indian land. It is always cited as though Indians were alone in enjoying this status. Again, the Indian is not alone. In many of the Western States, homestead or veterans' exemption acts have been passed in the last two decades, which have taken a great deal of real and personal property off the tax roll. While I have not compiled all of the figures, it is a fair guess that the amount of non-Indian land taken off the tax rolls in Oklahoma, for example, by the homestead exemption act greatly exceeds in value all of the nontaxable Indian land in the State. Similar comparisons could be made in most of the other States where such laws exist.

Having made reference to these several ways in which all of us as private individuals might help our Indian citizens to take their rightful places in our communities, it is only proper that I should refer briefly to some of the things the Federal Government is now doing to remove sources of irritation and bring better conditions for the Indians.

First, I will remind you that until a year ago, it was legally impossible for the Secretary to delegate to the Commissioner or any lesser official of the Indian Office any of his multitudinous authorities placed in 100 years of Indian law-making. The Secretary personally until then had to approve a staggering number of transactions involving expenditures of less than $10, for example. Now we expect to and are actually moving control over essential administrative details closer to the communities in which the Indians live. I have already mentioned that supervision over individual Indian moneys and leasing of individual Indian lands has been relaxed.

Instructions recently were issued urging Indian tribal groups to deposit their corporate funds in local commercial banks rather than with the agency headquarters for the reservation. This again will reduce some of the clerical burden on the agency, but more important is the effect it should have in giving the Indians experience in handling their own money.

The Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1936 empowered the Commissioner to enter into contracts to provide for education, health services, and welfare by other agencies than the Indian Office. Under this authority, contracts were made with the States of Minnesota, Washington, and California, by which the entire educational service for Indians in those States was assumed by the State. More than 1,000 contracts were made with separate school districts for the operation of individual schools within the States, where the State was not prepared to assume the entire responsibility. However, we have steadily moved in the direction of State-wide contracts and have just completed negotiations resulting in the signing of two more contracts of this nature—with the State of Wisconsin on December .2 and with the State of Montana only a few days ago.

The Indian Office has long had an arrangement with the United States Public Health Service by which it obtains medical personnel and professional assistance of various kinds from that agency.

Finally, I might refer to the testimony given by Acting Commissioner Zimmerman before a committee of the United States Senate last winter in which it was proposed that certain tribes, possessed of resources and already well assimilated, were at the point where Federal supervision could be withdrawn almost immediately. Other tribes should come to this point in another 10 years, and all tribes should be moving in this direction. All of us in the Department of the Interior are hopeful that the day is not too far off when we may see the end of our guardianship responsibility with respect to the Indian people. That day will come at different times for different tribes, but everyone will welcome the advent of each such day.

Let us part with two conclusions. First: The Federal Government is not giving things to Indians. Reservation lands always belonged to Indians or were acquired in trade for other lands considered more desirable by the white man. School and health services are either explicit or implicit in most of the early treaties, sometimes in part payment for ceded land, often as a matter of self-protection. Second: That achievement of full assimilation for Indians involves attitudes of mind on the part of the non-Indian group which are beyond the reach of law and regulation. The Department of the Interior is working on these attitudes, and on other requirements of complete assimilation. You, my friends, can spearhead a drive for the needed change in public attitudes.

Clarence Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of very real sorrow to me that I did not have the honor and pleasure of being in the House of Representatives at the same time as the Honorable Clarence Hancock.

I knew Clarence Hancock personally, and his wife very well, indeed.

I have been greatly impressed since coming to Washington to see in what great and lasting esteem he is held on both sides of the aisle and especially the deep regard and affection that the entire New York delegation, his own delegation, have for him.

It is a great tribute to this man's personality and character that his memory is so greatly cherished. It must, indeed, be a source of solemn pride and joy to his widow and family.

It can in very truth be said that this man was a true and patriotic American, devoted always to the service of his country. That he is and will remain an example to those who come after him as well as to those who served with him. And that all will rise up and call his memory blessed.

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, aside from the actual shortage of housing units, another obstacle, high rents, faces the returned veteran of modest income as he searches for a home.

I have today introduced a bill which, if enacted into law, will cause a material reduction in rent for those veterans who either now or in the future may occupy dwelling units in low-rent housing projects.

This measure seeks to amend section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt from income tax the interest on bonds, notes, or other obligations issued in connection with such projects by corporations or associations engaged solely in providing or constructing such homes for veterans.

Under the law of New York, and I understand a number of other States, authority is given for the formation of limited dividend corporations to make available additional veterans' housing. A number of communities, including the city of Rochester, N. Y., have undertaken to try to alleviate the housing shortage in part by proceeding under the provisions of such laws to raise the necessary capital to commence construction of housing developments.

In the case, which has been brought to my attention by a group of my constituents, certain public-spirited citizens have indicated their willingness to purchase some $30,000 of authorized capital stock to create a corporation known as the Rochester Civil Redevelopment Co., Inc. This corporation is to receive land from the city of Rochester which it has acquired under tax foreclosure in exchange for $27,000 of the capital stock. Under the contract of sale it is provided that no dividend will be paid on this stock. The agreement between the corporation and the city of Rochester further provides that the corporation will pay taxes only on the value of the unimproved land for a period of 25 years. The corporation proposes to obtain the cost of constructing a low-rent housing project for veterans on the land acquired from the city by borrowing money from local banks on its unsecured notes. It is contemplated that after the project has been completed the corporation will take up the notes by means of a mortgage. The corporation has already applied to the Federal Housing Administration for insurance on its mortgage under the provisions of the National Housing Act of 1934.

The certificate of incorporation of the corporation provides that its purpose is to acquire areas and to construct, operate, sell, and convey projects pursuant to the terms and provisions of the redevelopment companies law of the State of New York. Provision is made for limited income with respect to those holding obligations of the corporation. It is stated that the corporation is organized to serve a public purpose and that all surplus income upon dissolution will be paid to the city of Rochester. The bylaws provide that no dividends will be paid on the stock of the corporation. There is, therefore, no possibility of any profit or gain for the stockholders of the company.

The redevelopment companies law of the State of New York states that public interest requires the rehabilitation of unsanitary and substandard areas and the provision of adequate, safe, and sanitary housing accommodations.

The United States Housing Act of 1937 expressly exempts from all taxation obligations, including interest thereon, issued by public-housing agencies in connection with low-rent housing projects. A ruling has been made, however, by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that, since this limited dividend corporation, although not a source of profit to anyone, is not truly a public-housing agency, interest on its obligations cannot be exempted from Federal income tax.

Those interested in furthering this worth-while project have arranged for a substantially lower interest rate on the notes and subsequent mortgage issued by the corporation, provided the income from such obligations is tax-exempt. Such a result will, of course, make it possible for the project to be self-sustaining upon a correspondingly lower rental to be charged to tenants.

Every argument which applies to the merit of existing legislation granting tax exemption to public housing projects applies with equal force to the obligations of such nonprofit corporations. Obviously, such a tax advantage should be limited strictly to those situations where the project can truly be said to be entirely free from any profit incentive.

The state of facts which I have outlined no doubt finds its parallel in many similar cases throughout the country. In the case I have related, and no doubt in many others, earnest and public-spirited citizens have devoted long hours and tireless energy to an attempt to assist in the alleviation of the distressing plight of so many of those who have served our country well and who can now find no adequate living accommodations within their pocketbooks. They have now turned to the Congress for help but have only said that they want the same consideration given to the nonprofit projects which they are promoting, which is now accorded to those sponsored by the Federal Government.

It may very well be that private enterprise and initiative may not be able to solve all of the problems connected with providing homes for those of modest incomes. Perhaps, too, it will not be possible in all communities to find financial institutions which are willing to cooperate to the extent of lending money to a corporation whose only asset is an unimproved plot of ground.

But certainly every legitimate encouragement should be extended to those who seek to secure moderate-cost housing accommodations for our veterans, through the medium of private enterprise and local management and control.

It is appropriate that this bill should be introduced at a time when so many veterans are gathered here in the Nation's capital to discuss the acute housing situation which they face throughout the Nation. The measure is by no means intended as a cure-all. It must be supplemented by other housing legislation. In that connection, also, we must not forget the obligation which we owe to the millions who served so faithfully and patriotically on the home front and who also are faced with the problem, often heart-rending and acute, of finding a place for them and their families to live.

I am confident, however, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation will result in substantial rent reductions for those occupying the privately financed nonprofit low-cost housing units and will thus go a long way toward fulfilling the obligation which is ours, to assist those who, when their country turned to them in its hour of emergency, responded without hesitation and without condition.

Lithuanian Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago we joined with the people of Lithuania in celebrating her independence after more than 100 years of servitude under foreign rule. Today we find Lithuania without her independence. The aspirations of her people were brutally betrayed in the secret dealings at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam at the behest of the Soviet Union. Under the tyranny of her conquerors, Lithuania suffers, but yet lives. In due time, however, Lithuania will rise again as a free and independent nation and take her seat at the conference table of the family of nations.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the Lithuanian-American Council of New Haven, Conn., on February 22, 1948:

The following resolution was voted by citizens of the city of New Haven and State of Connecticut at the observance of the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of Lithuania, held under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council of New Haven, at the St. Casimir's Hall on the 22d day of February 1948:

"Whereas the American people continue to believe in certain inalienable principles of the American Declaration of Independence and wartime policy declarations; and

"Whereas the people of Lithuania and countries adjacent to it, firmly espousing the selfsame principles in their declarations of independence promulgated in 1918, have won their liberty by valiant fight against their oppressors, and made substantial contribution to the United Nations victory over the Nazi-Fascist enemies by their unified, vigorous, and heroic underground resistance movements during the late war; and

"Whereas the aspirations of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Ukraine, and other similarly situated countries were brutally betrayed in the secret deals at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam at the behest of the conniving and imperialistic masters of the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the peoples of Lithuania and other countries lying between the Baltic, Black, and Adriatic Seas continue to wage relentless war for liberation from enslavement by the Soviet Union, cosignatory of the Atlantic Charter and United Nations Charter; and

"Whereas the people of the United States are directly benefiting from the said liberation fight, in that the ultimate Soviet aggression against the United States is in this manner deterred; and

"Whereas the present precarious armed truce imposes heavy burdens on the American taxpayers whose public and voluntary contributions for the relief of the countries remaining beyond the immediate reach of the Soviet aggressor, fall short of the intended effect by reason of the disruptive actions manipulated by Communist fifth columns; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union consistently and unilaterally violated all of the pacts and declarations solemnly underwritten by it, viz, peace and nonaggression pacts with the Baltic States and Poland, the Atlantic Charter, Four Freedoms, the United Nations Charter, Yalta Declaration to liberated European peoples, and the Potsdam Agreement; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we petition the Government of the United States—

"(a) to terminate all of the secret pacts concluded, without the consent or knowledge of the Congress of the United States, at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, and

"(b) to demand that the Soviet Union conform to the letter and spirit of the Atlantic Charter, to wit:

"That Soviet armed forces, puppet regimes, and terrorist personnel be immediately withdrawn from all of the countries invaded by the Soviet Union since September 1939 in connivance with Hitler; further

"*Resolved*, That we petition the Government of the United States to initiate firm measures and render effective aid for the restoration of the violated sovereignty of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and for the reopening of freedom of navigation of the Baltic Sea; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we petition Members of Congress of the United States to expedite enactment of the legislation necessary for translating the European recovery program into an effective policy, and for admission of a fair share of displaced persons from Europe under an equitable pro rata distribution to visas among the respective racial groups presently living in and out of camps in Germany and Austria; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President, Secretary of State, and Members of Congress of the United States, and to the local press."

Yours respectfully,
MATHEW J. VOKETAITIS,
Chairman, Lithuanian American Council of New Haven.
MAE JAKUBAITIS, *Secretary.*

Mikolajczyk Tells How the Big Three at Tehran Carved Up Poland Without Any Regard for the Principles of the Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include two additional installments on Mikolajczyk's story as contained in the Milwaukee Sentinel. These articles disclose the hapiessness of the true Polish Government, the London Poles, after the Big Three had carved up Poland at Tehran without consulting the representatives of the Polish people. The American people were led to believe that World War II was fought on the principles of the Atlantic Charter but our representative at Tehran was not much troubled with the rights of conquered peoples when he sold out to Stalin on the question of Poland.

The following are two additional articles:

STALIN SPURNS NEW POLAND PLAN

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment XVIII)

Back in London, after my fruitless visit to Moscow in August, 1944, I reported my failure to come to terms with Stalin about the future of Poland, and set to work on a compromise that I hoped would make possible a resumption of Soviet-Polish relations.

With the aid of my government in London, and after many communications with our underground leaders in embattled Warsaw, we drew up a postwar plan for Poland in which our five major political parties would have recognition.

As Prime Minister I would form a temporary government made up of equal numbers of the five parties. We would draft a new constitution. We would hold a free election. The elected parliament would settle our growing frontier dispute with Russia and see to it that the Red Army was asked to leave the country when hostilities ceased.

We pledged also to continue the Allied fight against Germany.

I submitted the plan to Russian Ambassador Lebiedov on August 22. A month later I asked him how the plan had been received in Moscow.

"It was turned over to the Lublin committee," he said.

The British were friendlier. "The British government indorses the Polish plan," Anthony Eden told me at the Foreign Office.

Early in October, Churchill sent me a letter from Moscow:

"I hope that you and whatever colleagues you think necessary to bring with you will be able to fly at once to join us in Moscow.

"I am sure that this is the only way in which we can break the present deadlock."

AGREES TO GO

I answered that I was prepared to fly to Moscow, but could not agree to go there if Churchill planned to confer also with the Lublin Poles.

Eden replied, "I am now expecting you. Discussion will, of course, be with the Soviet

government and ourselves as well as with the Polish (Lublin) committee."

I talked the matter over with our Government in London, and was urged—against my better feeling—to go.

We met on October 13 with Stalin, Churchill, Eden, and Averell Harriman at the Soviet Foreign Office.

POLISH GUESTS

Molotov, the chairman, seated us around an oval table and welcomed the American and British. He referred to us as "our Polish guests," then called on me to speak.

I restated the postwar plan which Stalin had previously ignored, and concluded, "Our aim is to bring about an agreement between Poland and Russia, not between Russia and a handful of Poles."

Stalin spoke up:

"You say this plan has the backing of the Polish underground. I doubt that. It's good plan for them to have engaged in such work lately."

"Marshal Stalin, perhaps you forget that as a younger man you, too, were in an underground and remained active making plans and programs which affected your country," I said.

"Ah, yes," he said, "we held six big congresses and about 25 meetings of the central committee of the Communist Party while I was underground."

"What about the Lublin committee?" Churchill asked. "Was its advice sought?"

"I went much deeper than the Lublin Poles," I said. "I went to the Polish people."

"Your plan has two big defects," Stalin said. "It ignores the Lublin committee, which has done such a good job in that part of Poland which the Soviet Army has liberated; and, secondly, if any Polish Government wants relations with the Soviet Union, it must recognize the Curzon line as an actuality."

CHURCHILL PLEASED

Churchill expressed a great and sudden happiness.

"I see now a new hope for agreement," he said enthusiastically. "Regarding the new frontier along the Curzon line, I must announce in the name of the British Government that, taking into account the huge losses suffered by the U. S. S. R., and how the Red Army has helped liberate Poland, the line must be your eastern frontier.

"We will see to it that for the land you have lost there will be compensations in eastern Germany, in East Prussia, and Silesia. You'll get a nice outlet to the sea, a good port at Danzig, and the priceless minerals of Silesia."

I looked at Stalin.

"You accuse me of ignoring the Lublin committee," I said. "You're ignoring the Polish Government which has fought the Germans for 5 years, which created strong armies, a navy, and air force, and which now fights on all fronts."

"I recognize this," he answered. "I have given proper credit."

CONTRADICTS STALIN

"But you haven't," I insisted.

"I want no argument," Stalin said.

"I can't accept the Curzon line," I said.

Stalin then went into a lengthy argument in which he insisted that the Polish lands then liberated were really White Russia and the Ukraine, which, of course, was not true.

Molotov told me—officially—that the Big Three had agreed on the Curzon line as a Polish-Russian frontier at their Tehran Conference—a fact which had never been revealed.

I looked from Churchill to Harriman, silently begging them to call this damnable deal a lie.

Harriman was silent. Churchill looked straight back at me. "I confirm this," he said quietly.

It made Churchill angry and, turning on me, he demanded that I agree then and there.

"You don't have to make a public announcement," Churchill said. "I don't want to put you in a difficult position with the Polish people."

I could make no private deal either, I told him. He went on:

"But you can at least agree that the Curzon line is the de facto frontier, and you may appeal for adjustment at the peace conference."

But before I could answer, Stalin rose indignantly.

"I want this very clear," he said gruffly. "Mr. Churchill's thought of any future changes in the frontier is not acceptable to the Soviet Government. We will not change our frontiers from time to time. That's all."

Churchill held out his hands, looked up to the ceiling, and wheezed with a despairing impatience.

MIKOLAJCZYK RECALLS NEAR BREAK WITH CHURCHILL

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment XIX)

In view of what has subsequently happened in Poland, my efforts in Moscow in 1944 to save our land and sovereignty, which had been imperiled by the secret agreements of Tehran, take on considerable significance.

Churchill and Roosevelt had yielded completely to the demands of Stalin in regard to Poland at their Tehran Conference. They had agreed to split Poland, an ally, through the middle with the Curzon Line. Each had made a number of notable statements about refusing to recognize territories gained by aggression, and continued to do so even after Tehran. But Stalin's will prevailed.

HINT OF POLISH SPLIT

When I refused to become a party to this deal, at Moscow in October 1944, Churchill became very angry at me. In a series of conferences, aimed at solving the issue, he demanded that I agree to the new eastern frontier between Russia and Poland, accept a verbal promise of future gains of land from Germany and a similar promise about the future political independence of what would be left of Poland.

He blamed me for not appeasing the Russians early in 1944, when there was a hint that the Big Three had decided to split our country, and he said that because of my stubborn refusal at that time I had provoked Stalin into setting up the Lublin Committee of Polish Communists.

"How near we got the beginning of the year," Churchill stormed. "If you had come to an agreement with the Russians at that time, you would not have today those Lublin people. They are going to be a frightful nuisance. They will build up a rival government and gradually take over authority in Poland."

I reminded him of the Atlantic Charter and the other pacts and promises made to such states as Poland.

"I shall tell Parliament that I have agreed with Stalin," Churchill flatly declared. "Our relations with Russia are much better than they have ever been. I talked to your General Anders the other day and he seems to entertain the hope that after the defeat of the Germans the Russians then will be beaten.

"This is crazy. You cannot defeat the Russians. I beg of you to settle upon the frontier question. Suppose you lose the support of some of the Poles? Think what you will gain in return. The British Ambassador will be with you. The Americans will send an Ambassador—the greatest military power in the world."

IMPUGNATES CHURCHILL

I shook my head and it infuriated him.

"Then I wash my hands of this," he said. "We are not going to wreck the peace of Europe. In your obstinacy you do not see what is at stake. It is not in friendship that we shall part. We shall tell the world how unreasonable you are. You will start a war in which 20,000,000 lives will be lost."

"You settled our fate at Tehran," I said.

"Poland was saved at Tehran," he stormed.

"I am not a person whose patriotism is diluted enough to force me to give away half of my country," I replied.

"Unless you accept the frontier you are out of business forever," Churchill cried. "The Russians will sweep through your country and your people will be liquidated. You are on the verge of annihilation. . . . We will become sick and tired of you if you go on arguing."

Anthony Eden smoothed matters for a moment, but Churchill came back strongly.

"If you accept the frontier the United States of America will take a great interest in the rehabilitation of Poland and may grant you a big loan, possibly without interest. As for ourselves, we shall be poor after this war. . . . You are bound to accept the decision of the great powers."

It seemed the proper time to remind him again of Poland's shocking losses in the fight against the Germans, and the better treatment being accorded such enemies as Italy and Rumania. But he dismissed this argument.

"You are no government," Churchill said, adding:

"I will have to call on the other Poles. This Lublin Government may function very well. It will be the government. This is a criminal attempt on your part to wreck, by your liberum veto, agreement between the allies. It is cowardice on your part."

I resented everything he said and told him so.

"I am not going to worry Mr. Stalin," he replied. "If you want to conquer Russia, we shall let you go your own way. You ought to be in a lunatic asylum. I don't know whether the British Government will continue to recognize you. You hate the Russians. I know you hate them."

Eden again attempted to smooth matters, but Churchill interrupted. In a calmer voice he promised me that if I acquiesced in this bold sell-out of a nation that had lost nearly 6,000,000 people in the war, and if I accepted Russia's claim to the half of Poland which the Red Army seized in 1939 while an ally of Hitler, he, Churchill, would personally guarantee that what was left of Poland would be free of Russian interference.

I was furious at the man, and could not conceal it.

"Mr. Prime Minister," I said, "I once asked you for permission to parachute into Warsaw and rejoin the underground that is at this very hour fighting the Germans, while the Red Army sits in the suburbs and refuses to help. You refused to give me that permission. Now I ask it again."

"Why?" Churchill asked.

"Because I prefer to die, fighting for the independence of my country, rather than be hanged later by the Russians in full view of the British Ambassador."

It hurt the old man . . . hurt him more than I had wanted to, for he had been and remains, my friend. He turned on his heel and walked out of the room. But after a few minutes he returned and put an arm around my shoulders . . . and we were both on the point of tears.

I asked to see Stalin alone before I left Moscow. I still hoped I might appeal to him to relent in his outrageous demands.

"Poles will bless your name if you make a generous gesture here and now," I appealed to him. "Even if we retain only the area around Lwow and Vilna we will be grateful."

"I cannot and will not do this," he said.

I pleaded for Poland's future political independence and envisioned a day when a sovereign Poland would have enduring pacts with "Russia, the United States, Great Britain, France, and Czechoslovakia."

He nodded, then said, "You must include Hungary in that group." His statement was a surprise, for Hungary was at that time an ally of Germany and was busily engaged fighting the Red Army.

"Hungary?" I asked, incredulously.

"Hungary," he said, steadily "will change completely when we get there." He had obviously completed his plan for the future political domination of that country.

I asked him if he intended to make Poland a Communist state after the war.

"No," he said. "Absolutely no. Communism does not fit the Poles. They are too individualistic, too nationalistic. Poland's future economy should be based on private enterprise and Poland will be a capitalistic state."

He saw my surprise.

"There is no middle system," he explained, after a bit. "Capitalism can assume many forms, have many different controls. But what is not communism is capitalism."

"Will you order the Communist Party in Poland not to seek a revolution after the war? I asked him.

"I will order that," he said. "Poland will not be disturbed by ideological strife. But there are certain people—both left and right—we cannot allow in Polish politics."

"But Marshal," I protested, "one cannot dictate who shall not be in public life—if the person's party is behind him."

Stalin looked at me as if I were indeed a lunatic and abruptly ended the conference, and so again I went back empty handed to what was left of the Polish Government in London.

Czech Liberties Vanish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of February 29, 1948:

EUROPE FEARFUL AS CZECH LIBERTIES VANISH

(By Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr.)

What happened in Prague last week was murder most foul—the murder of the civil liberties and free institutions of 12,000,000 people.

A week ago the people of Czechoslovakia could read what they liked, say what they liked, vote as they liked. Their country was in the Soviet sphere of influence, tied to Russia by a military and political alliance, but in its internal affairs it was still free.

The Czechs could read attacks on their Government in newspapers of the opposition parties. They could go to see American or Soviet films, as they chose. They could buy foreign publications. They could move and travel where they wished.

Today the non-Communist newspapers have been taken over by a disciplined Communist minority. Politicians of the non-Communist parties have been arrested and jailed. Soon there will be the purges, the concentration camps, and perhaps the firing squad or gallows.

From now on, into an indefinite future, the Czechoslovak people can look forward only to the dread sound and symbol of the police state—what Dean Acheson, former Under Secretary of State, once called "the knock on the door at night that strikes terror into men and women."

THE CLOCK SPINS BACK

The Czechs have heard it all before. Nine years ago next month Hitler's mechanized armies rumbled into Prague, bringing with them the black-shirted secret police, the concentration camps, and the living death of their liberty, and it took years of occupation and war to set them free.

In the eyes of the remaining free nations of Europe, this second extinction of Czech freedom is not only tragic but deadly serious. For Western Europe looked upon the Czech people as allies in terrain but Western in culture, tradition, and achievement.

The sight of these people being swallowed into the Soviet system has given western Europe a greater shock than anything since the end of the war. In Paris and London, still half prostrate from the wounds of one war, it looks as if Russia is on the march once more; as if the Kremlin has regained the initiative which Secretary Marshall took from it last summer. Each country again looks at its neighbor, as it did in Hitler's day, and asks, "Who's next?"

And there is a haunting sense in western Europe that only the United States, acting with more swiftness and strength than ever before, can prevent the Czechoslovak pattern from being followed in Italy before summer.

If the sense of shock has not yet hit official Washington—and there is little sign that it has—it is because the United States long ago wrote off Czechoslovakia as a genuinely independent country. Officials here have felt that the death warrant of Czechoslovak liberties was signed almost 2 years ago, on the fateful day when President Eduard Benes accepted Klement Gottwald, a Moscow-trained Communist, as Premier.

COOPERATED INTERNALLY

Gottwald was accepted because his Communist Party had won 38 percent of the votes in the April 1946 election, and had become the biggest single party in the state. He promised to cooperate with the non-Communist parties in the cabinet; he let the country have genuine democracy and free institutions within its borders, as long as it suited his purposes.

But from the day he became Premier, Czechoslovakia ceased to follow an independent foreign policy. Her delegates at foreign conferences voted obediently and monotonously with the Soviet Union and its satellites. Only in trade and cultural relations with the outer world did the Czechs differ from their Soviet masters, and then they did it by permission.

The final proof of their lost independence, in American eyes, came last summer in the aftermath of Secretary Marshall's famous speech at Harvard. The British and French invited the Czechs, together with all other European countries except Spain, to come to Paris and discuss European economic cooperation. The Czechs accepted promptly.

But it was not long before their Premier and their Foreign Minister, Jan Masaryk, were summoned to Moscow. The Czechs were compelled to withdraw their acceptance of the Paris invitation. They declined to take part in the Marshall plan, and their spokesmen at home and abroad began attacking it as an attempt to dominate the peoples of Europe.

From that moment official Washington no longer regarded Czechoslovakia as an independent country able to carry out its own policies in its own interests. Its civil liberties and parliamentary institutions were admirable, but they could be wiped out by the flick of a finger in the Kremlin.

TOUGH BUT PASSIVE

When the crisis finally came last week, the Czechs submitted more tamely than their less-cultured and less-democratic Balkan neighbors. They are tough people, so tough that the old Austrian Empire could not crush their national spirit in hundreds of years, but their traditional role under Austria and Hitler Germany was that of passive resisters, noncooperators, and saboteurs, rather than active rebels. It remains to be seen how they will withstand the Soviet version of totalitarian rule.

The overturn in Prague differed in these respects from the Communist coups in Hungary, Rumania, and Poland. They are differences in detail but they are worth considering and remembering, for the Czech overturn contains clues to what may be expected from the Communists elsewhere.

In the first place, there was no Red Army actually in Czechoslovak soil, and not even any Soviet troops ostensibly guarding communication lines as they did in Hungary. The actual tramp of Red Army boots was not needed. Soviet territory adjoins Czechoslovakia at its narrow eastern border, and Soviet armed power spoke as loudly in its absence as if it had been on the spot.

In the second place, the Czechoslovak overturn was the first in eastern Europe in which the trade-unions played a prominent and perhaps decisive part. In Poland, and still more in the Balkan countries, trade-unions are comparatively weak. In Czechoslovakia, an industrial country, they are strong, disciplined, and well organized. The seizure of Communist power last week could not have taken place so smoothly without their connivance and cooperation.

Finally, Czechoslovakia was one of the few European countries where an important wing of the Socialist Party had continued to cooperate with the Communists. Although European socialism and communism are deadly enemies, the left wing of Czech socialism had a leader, former Premier Zdenek Fierlinger, who was ready to do the Communists' bidding. It may yet be that Socialist leader Pietro Nenni in Italy will play the Fierlinger role when communism is ready to try for power in the Mediterranean.

BYRNES EXPLAINS "SHOVE"

At moments like these an American may wonder whether the United States could not have saved the Czechs from their present purgatory. Leading Czechs, friendly to the western world, have often complained that Secretary Byrnes helped to throw them into Russian arms in 1946 by cutting off American economic help.

The reasons were told in the Byrnes book, Speaking Frankly. At the Paris Peace Conference of 1946, Andrei Vishinsky, of Russia, had just finished a denunciation of the United States for trying to dominate the world by hand-outs. Byrnes noticed two of the Czechoslovak delegates applauding heartily.

At that very time, he remembered, the Czechs had been allotted a $50,000,000 surplus-property credit from the United States. He also discovered that a Communist minister, without the knowledge of Foreign Minister Masaryk, had contracted to relend $10,000,000 of this to Rumania at a higher rate of interest.

Byrnes promptly cut off the credit with the bitter remark that he did not want to offend the Czechs further by giving them American hand-outs.

Partly from this episode came Byrnes' determination to give strictly American help to countries who would not denounce us for giving them the relief they asked for, in place of internationally administered relief on the UNRRA model.

The record shows, however, that the United States continued giving some help to the Czechs long after their foreign policy passed into virtual Soviet control.

Czechoslovakia had received a total of $263,250,000 from UNRRA up to the end of 1946, 70 percent of it contributed by the United States. It had used $9,304,694 of the surplus property credit before Byrnes cut it off. It had received $3,042,000 in direct and indirect lend-lease help following the liberation. Yet in February of last year it got $20,000,000 from the Export-Import Bank to buy American cotton, and two million for tobacco.

Apart from these sums, the Czechs asked, but did not get, a further cotton credit of twenty million and a surplus property credit of the same amount. They also sent the World Bank a letter of intent for a $350,000,000-reconstruction loan, but no formal application has ever been received.

SMALL BUSINESS' TURN

The seizure of power by the Communists probably extinguishes any hopes the Czechs may have had of getting economic help from the west, except for the indirect effects to be expected from a revival of east-west trade under the Marshall plan.

The economic consequences will be serious in other ways. Czechoslovakia until now has been a nation of small-business men and some big industries. Until now the small businesses have been allowed to follow paths of free enterprise even though the big industries have been nationalized. The advent of a straight Communist regime is expected to lead to the gradual nationalizing of all businesses, and the small-business man may be driven to the wall.

Politically, the new regime is also expected to move gradually after its lightning seizure of power. The scheduled elections will be held with the opposition leaders in jail or powerless to speak; therefore a rigged result is almost certain. The parliamentary forms may be preserved until a new Soviet-type constitution can be written, but they will be a hollow mockery.

Whether or not President Benes remains, his power to control events appears gone. He had his value to the Communists as a symbol of the Czechoslovak Nation. He had compromised with them in a wholly sincere belief that east and west could live together in peace and that Czechoslovakia, as bridge between them, could belong to neither side.

If he stayed, the Communists, being what they are, would have used him until it suited their purposes to discard him, just as they discarded King Michael, likewise a symbol of the state in Rumania.

THE ROAD TO ROME

What can the outer world do about it now? Probably it is too late to do anything for Czechoslovakia except to keep open every possible channel of communication to the Czech people, the majority of whom are democratic to the marrow of their bones.

It is not too late, however, to take to heart the lessons of this latest Soviet triumph. The pattern of bloodless conquest has now taken the Soviet system farther west than it has ever penetrated before.

The finger of future trouble now points squarely at Italy, where the government is shaky, the Communists strong and ably led, the Socialists divided. A general election in Italy is due April 18. It is wholly likely that the Communist machine will begin a drumbeat to discredit the election results in advance, as it did in Greece, and then attempt a coup d'etat of the kind it engineered with such deadly skill and precision in Prague.

So far American policy makers have not faced up to this situation. Their thoughts and energies have been devoted to getting the European recovery program passed promptly by Congress and followed up by the western Europeans.

Secretary Marshall has said already that Europe's immediate future depends on ERP, and that there can be no true peace until American economic help can repair the weaknesses of the western European countries.

But the past week's events have made it clear that economic help is not enough. Unless western Europe is tightened as swiftly as possible, by political as well as economic measures, there may yet be a repetition of the tragic events in Prague.

Los Angeles Needs a Foreign-Trade Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Los Angeles, Calif., is now one of the leading industrial centers in the United States, and is tied in sixth place with Pittsburgh, Pa., as an industrial city.

Los Angeles has excellent harbor facilities which today provide a gateway for the constant flow of raw and processed materials from South and Central America, and this harbor is situated more than 300 miles closer to the source of these materials than any other major shipping port.

I have advocated the establishment of a foreign-trade zone at Los Angeles Harbor since 1945 because such a zone will contribute materially to the expanding industry of Los Angeles and southern California, and through increased production in that area will benefit the entire Nation.

I am glad to find that Mayor Bowron, of Los Angeles, agrees with me in a recent radio address delivered over radio station KMPC on February 1. Mayor Bowron's speech follows:

Citizens of Los Angeles, all too few people realize the importance of our harbor, what it has meant in the development of this metropolitan area and the great Southwest, and what world trade will mean to Los Angeles and southern California in the future. There was a time when harbor affairs were of the most important subjects of local consideration. But for nearly a quarter of a century it has been one of those things, vital to our economy, which has been taken for granted.

With the great increase in population in this area, there are hundreds of thousands of people who are not familiar with the fact that most of the water-front land and improvements and shipping facilities at the harbor, including wharves, slips, docks, and warehouses, are city-owned, and that the management and operation of the harbor is a municipal enterprise. More people should know about their harbor. It is true that we should have better access. It is hoped that before long we will have a harbor freeway. But I should like to urge those people who are not familiar with one of the city's great assets to go to San Pedro and Wilmington and Terminal Island and look around. Many of you will be surprised at what you will see.

Although shipping, both domestic and foreign, has not anywhere near reached the volume and importance of the prewar years, nevertheless there is much activity. You will see ships bearing the flags of many foreign nations and you will get a much better idea of the important place Los Angeles holds in commerce and how this city is in direct contact with many foreign lands over the sea routes.

Prior to the commencement of World War II, much of the commerce through the port of Los Angeles, both domestic (that is, coastwise and intercoastal movements) and of foreign commerce, inbound and outbound, was the result of local production and consumption. Based upon this prewar experience, it is reasonable to presume that, with our great increase in population and industrial growth, upon the stabilization of conditions affecting maritime service, our port will handle greatly increased commerce movements. At the present time ships entering our local harbor are handling about 60 percent of prewar day domestic commerce, and we are looking forward to very substantial increases in foreign trade.

Anticipating a big shipping increase, the city harbor department has adopted an all-time record budget of more than $17,000,000 for the current fiscal year's operation, and of this amount about $9,250,000 has been earmarked for new construction, including freight terminals, berths, wharves, and facilities for passengers and the United States Customs Service. Some new warehouses will be constructed. A new wharf for the commercial fishing industry is under way. The building of a combination passenger-marine terminal facility in the west basin, at an estimated cost of $3,900,000, is proposed as soon as conditions permit, which means the removing of the existing drawbridge, which has impeded the development of this portion of the inner harbor. The city is actively pressing its application with the United States War Department to order the removal of this drawbridge, and it is hoped that such order may be made in the near future.

The board of harbor commissioners has before it for consideration reports dealing with promotion activities and is considering the creation of a traffic and public relations department for the purpose of stimulating more commerce through our port. The publication of a brochure has just been completed setting forth pertinent information about the port of Los Angeles, and copies will be widely distributed to traffic managers of large industries throughout the country as well as in foreign countries. Our harbor department is constantly in touch with larger shippers, both domestic and foreign, with steamship operators, and with railroad and truck carriers who serve our port, for the purpose of ascertaining how their needs can be better served.

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has a well-staffed department under the very capable direction of Stanley T. Olafsson, the entire activities of which are directed to increasing world trade, and the city harbor administration works closely with this organization, and also with the Foreign Trade Association, and all other similar organizations interested in promoting commerce.

Recently the harbor department had made an industrial and administrative survey of the business and property of the city at the harbor. This was done by a nationally known firm of engineers, and the report and recommendations are now being carefully studied by the board of harbor commissioners and the general manager of the department.

A matter of far-reaching importance is the establishment of a foreign-trade zone at the Los Angeles Harbor. While I cannot anticipate the final action of the board of harbor commissioners, which is still studying this matter, it is my belief that within a very short time formal application will be made to the Federal Government for the necessary authority. A foreign-trade zone is sometimes improperly referred to as a free port. It is a customs-guarded area operated as a public utility, into which goods, whether foreign or domestic, dutiable or free, may be brought and stored. Within the zone such goods may be cleaned, graded, reconditioned, and then reshipped or sold. If reshipped to a foreign destination, no customs duties need be paid.

In December 1946, the board of harbor commissioners appropriated funds to make a reinvestigation and economic survey leading to the determination as to what should be done in connection with the establishment of a foreign-trade zone. Two competent consulting engineers and port authorities, Col. Charles T. Leeds and Gerald C. Fitzgerald, were employed for this purpose. Their study and preparation of a report required nearly a year's work, and was finally submitted to the board of harbor commissioners on October 15, last. The report submitted was very informative and included much detail, and pointed out an economical method of financing. The establishment of a foreign-trade zone in our port has been the subject of continuous interest for the past 10 years, but heretofore there was considerable objection to the estimated cost, and the necessary information has been lacking as to economic feasibility, and full data has never before been collected in such form as would meet the exacting United States Government foreign-trade requirement. Now we have it.

Heretofore it has been estimated that construction costs would amount to $1,000,000 or more. The Leeds-Fitzgerald report shows a way by which a foreign-trade zone may be established at very small capital outlay and with low operating cost, by using a portion of an existing facility, warehouse No. 1 and berth 60 in the outer harbor of the San Pedro area. The large warehouse that stands at the entrance of the harbor has, during the past years, been something of a white elephant, and since it has not returned substantial revenue heretofore, except during a period when it was used for storage of cotton, there will be no great loss by using a portion of this facility for a foreign zone. At the beginning of the operation of a foreign-trade zone there will be a considerable expense to the city. In addition to the original construction costs, which will include necessary fences and gates to make it impossible for goods either to be taken inside or outside of the zone without checking and official permission, the operation of a foreign trade zone will require adequate lighting by night, the continuous employment of guards, and additional personnel.

The question to be decided is whether the indirect and potential benefits will or will not be commensurate with the deficit incurred during the development period. In other words, will the increased convenience and savings afforded to foreign traders, the stimulation of foreign trade, the advertising of the port, the diversion to the port of Los Angeles of trade that might go to other harbors, and the indirect benefit through increased commercial activity in southern California, will more than offset the expense involved.

The Leeds-Fitzgerald report reviews all of the factors, and undertakes to make an estimate of the potential tonnage that will pass through the foreign trade zone, if one should be established. On the basis of estimates, it is indicated that a foreign-trade zone will be a losing venture financially for at least 3 years; that it should break even about the fourth year; and return a profit to the city from its operations by the eighth year. It is further calculated that all capital expenditures and accumulated deficits would be liquidated within 10 years. It should be understood that the objective of a foreign-trade zone is not to produce revenue but to stimulate commerce. Its benefits will be found in increased activity at the harbor, greater revenue from docking fees and other charges collected by the harbor department, and stimulation of business activity in this general area. We are particularly interested in increasing world trade, as it is now more appropriately termed, because such trade and commerce will be the means of expanding local industrial production, giving more employment, increasing business in this area.

Foreign trade zone experience in this country is limited. The first zone was established in New York in 1937, and during the war the location of the zone had to be moved twice, but the experience there has justified its establishment. A foreign-trade zone was established in Mobile, Ala., in 1938, but was closed after only 6 months' operation. Authority to open a foreign-trade zone in New Orleans was given more than a year ago, and operations started May 1, 1947. San Francisco made application for a zone in 1935 but the application was denied because the site was unsuitable. More recently a new site was selected which complied with the Federal requirements, and San Francisco will soon be operating a foreign-trade zone. The matter has been under study at Seattle for some years but no action has been taken.

The world trade committee and the harbor affairs committee of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce have recommended the establishment of a foreign-trade zone at our port in the following language:

"In our world trade the emphasis today is on the necessity of importing more goods from other lands in order to supply our industries with raw materials and to assist in creating new sources of dollars to pay for our exports. Our opinion is that the Los Angeles Harbor Department should install and maintain every available modern facility and service that will advertise, publicize, and assist in sustaining our world trade at the highest possible levels. The establishment of a foreign trade zone facility would be an important contributing factor in developing and expanding our international trade."

As I said before, I cannot anticipate the action of the board of harbor commissioners. The decision must be made by that body. There may be factors concerning which I am not fully informed, that may be advanced as negative reasoning, but I feel that the application should be made and that the port of Los Angeles should not permit New York, New Orleans, and San Francisco to forge ahead in bidding for foreign commerce. In this area we have a veritable empire, representing in population and business the equivalent of many States in the Union. Our production should find foreign markets and our industries need foreign goods. Los Angeles is a city of world-wide importance and we must recognize our position in world trade and world-wide affairs.

What Is Necessary To Provide the Largest Number of Housing Units in the Shortest Possible Time in Metropolitan Detroit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hiram Perry Holmes, president, Detroit Real Estate Board, as presented before the Detroit and State Affairs Section of the Economic Club of Detroit, January 28, 1948:

The purpose of this discussion is to attempt to bring forth practical and possible ideas that will help to make available as quickly as possible more family living units. As I see the problem, there are two general ways in which this can be done. One is to construct more new units. The other is to make the best possible use of existing structures. Because of the urgency of the problem, I believe we should first explore the condition of what we have already. If we find that anything can be done to improve their use, with proper cooperation, it can be done in less time than it would take to build new ones.

May I say here that by no means do I wish to discount the importance of exercising immediately all of our abilities and facilities in developing new construction. In fact, may I urge that every citizen in this country capable of constructive thinking do his or her best in helping to bring out into the open the causes of existing bottlenecks in the construction field today. More important still than telling us what is wrong with the situation, I hope that they will follow through with some useful ideas on how to eliminate the troubles of the contractor, as well as how to convince private investors that they can safely invest more capital in rental housing. Too many good citizens, in my opinion, are too modest in their own estimate of their ability to think. There are others, of course, even though they are able, who are too lazy to think. They are the parasites of our society who, perhaps unconsciously, are not only contributing nothing but are rapidly helping to destroy what we have.

During my life, and particularly in the past 25 years, it has been my lot to be closely associated with the two fundamentals of life—food and shelter. In this time I have had actual and practical experience as a farmer, a carpenter, a builder, and a property owner. Most of my working experience has been that of a property manager whose true role is to act as a sort of a trustee between four related groups of people. They are the property owners, the tenants, the workmen, and the public. Management is now my business, my means of livelihood. As a property manager I am a servant of all of these people, and here may I inject the fact that in this country, not until lately, has there ever been any thought of classes or one class versus another. This is a foreign idea and unnecessary and undesirable under our Constitution. The workman (the employee) can be and often is both a tenant and a property owner. The tenant must be a workman or a property owner. He can be both. The property owner is a workman of the past. All make up the public and are important members of our society of high specialization and intense cooperation. That is as it should be for time has already proved it.

Reference of personal experience is made here only with the hope that it may help to qualify me in the minds of others from all walks of life as a qualified witness for the rental-housing business. It is my sincere hope that the thoughts which I shall present will be received in the spirit in which they are given. I have tried to base my conclusions on actual experience, facts, and findings, without passion, prejudice, personal selfishness, or political philosophy.

The value of housing space or time of occupancy is purchased, as in the case of any other commodity, on its worth to the tenant and the tenant's ability to pay. Any other standard of value disrupts the entire housing field and creates artificial shortages

or vacancies just as in the manufacturing, retail, or labor markets. But the relationship between the property owner and the tenant differs in some respects from the merchant and his customer. It is a constant relationship of 24 hours a day, 365 days of the year. This relationship shares the good with the bad, sickness, good health, financial reverses, and good fortune. The renting of living accommodations owned by another is a privilege and not an inherent right. With this relationship goes certain privileges, responsibilities, and obligations on the part of both parties. If they are respected the relationship is pleasant and satisfactory to everyone. But, to be harmonious, that relationship between the property owner and the tenant must be fair and equitable to both parties.

In my opinion, at least 95 percent of the tenants I know do respect these privileges and responsibilities. They are desirable and we hope that we can keep them. The other 5 percent are undesirable for one reason or another and they are generally considered so by their neighbor tenants. They may be destructive, disturbers of peaceful living, or creators of fire or other hazards. They may be causes of crime and delinquency. Almost always they add more to the cost of maintenance than do the good tenants. In a free society it is the duty of management to dispossess these tenants but, bear in mind, these vacancies are immediately filled for property owners must have tenants to remain in business.

I offer this thought because I believe the eviction scare has been vastly overplayed and stressed completely out of proportion to its actual importance. There would be no wave of evictions without rent control. Nothing of this kind happened before rent control. Property owners want tenants just as badly as the tenants want living space.

Advocates of rent control frequently say that elimination of controls would cause rental housing to be available only to the well-to-do. I believe that they are generally well provided with housing now and those others are not enough in numbers to make any dent in the supply. We used to have a rule that it was unwise to sell rental space to a tenant to any lesser quality than the best he could afford to pay for. If we did, he would not stay settled long. His pride compelled him to look for and find the best he could afford to pay for.

One point generally overlooked is that rents cannot be arbitrarily raised to any point desired by the property owner. There must always be a tenant able and willing to pay the price. Removal of rent control would permit the asking of higher rentals but in most cases the new rates would truly reflect comparative values as tenants view them today, not as they were several years ago under completely different conditions.

Proponents of rent control claim that it must be retained to prevent or retard inflation. Simple proof that their contention is wrong is the fact that during the years we have had rent control we have had our greatest inflation. Rent control has served only to conceal some of the effects of inflation by distorting relative values of housing and other commodities. Holding down the rent of a family has made it possible to bid up the prices of food, clothing, and other essential and nonessential commodities. Thus rent controls have removed some price pressures—only at the expense of others. Rent control has had the effect of increasing the incomes of some tenant families (those in possession) but at the expense of other families—those who own rental property, those seeking rental housing, and those who have been forced to buy houses before they were really able to do so. In other words, the owners of rental housing, together with those seeking housing, have been required to subsidize not only the tenants in possession but other kinds of business enterprises patronized by these tenants.

Rent control has not kept the cost of housing or the cost of living down for the Nation as a whole. It has kept the cost down for some of the tenants, but only at the expense of other of our citizens.

The points brought out so far are, in my opinion, necessary as a foundation for understanding of why, under rent control, we have not made the best use of our existing structures or why rent control has served to reduce the number of rental family units which are available to those families seeking rental housing. At the same time rent control has contributed to the prevention of greater production of new rental housing.

It is time to cease thinking in terms of an emergency. As long as emergency treatment continues, the emergency will stay with us, at least in our minds. With reference to position, there is a certain segment of our population in a real state of emergency, but I shall discuss that later. I believe that it is necessary and advisable now to think in terms of a rental housing market based on this new, postwar, peacetime pattern and adjust ourselves to it. The wartime emergency is over. The original justification for rent control now ceases to exist. Army and navy training centers, mobilization bases, or ports of embarkation where wives and children congregated to be with husbands and fathers no longer exist. There are no mass movements of war workers to centers for production of war weapons. The war-displaced population has either settled permanently in its new communities or returned to its former home communities. We have begun to assume our true postwar pattern as a nation. We are no longer in an extreme state of flux.

Census figures show that by our own prewar standards there is more housing today, and more housing space per person, than ever before in the history of this or any other nation. In other words, there is no actual shortage of housing.

When any necessary commodity—and rental housing space is a commodity—is priced below its free market value, people will rush to buy it. With rents less than 7 percent over the 1942 market value and with average wages and incomes of our rental population more than 100 percent over the 1942 level, rental housing space has become a cheap commodity in relation to earnings. In 1942 approximately 22 percent to 25 percent of the average income was devoted to rent. Today rent absorbs only about 9 percent to 14 percent of this average individual income. Under this situation people have followed their natural desire and sought larger and better living space. This situation continues today. In actual practice the owners and tenants have been partners in contributing to this overconsumption of space per person. The fewer the tenants in a given space the less wear and tear and maintenance expense there is on that space. Even the OPA and the Housing Expediter have encouraged this wasteful use of rental housing. With very few exceptions, they have made higher rents for increased occupancy impossible. That is why, from 1940 to 1946, the number of houses and apartments occupied by one person increased by approximately 800,000. In other words, 800,000 living units, formerly occupied by two or more persons, became occupied by only one person. This was an increase of about 30 percent. The number of living units occupied by only two persons during this period increased by approximately 1,900,000, an increase of 22 percent. Again, in other words, approximately 2,700,000 living units became occupied by only one or two people instead of larger families. This under-occupancy trend was noted in all sizes and classes of living units. This wasteful use of housing space still continues. The housing is still there but it is not being used as it was originally intended. Existing buildings now contain fewer persons. I know it is hard to grasp the true import of this situation but it is true that our present-day widely accepted shortages are not shortages of housing space, but shortages of available rental space—particularly rental vacancies.

A special study of 34 metropolitan districts in 1947 showed that in every one of them the percentage of dwelling units that were rented, instead of owner-occupied, declined from the 1940 figures. In many of these districts the decline was tremendous. Time will not permit the quoting of percentages but they clearly show what is happening to the rental business under rent controls. They clearly show why the the plight of the renter is becoming increasingly desperate. There is a shortage of rental housing because rent controls are forcing it off the market.

Today's tenants live in buildings which were constructed from yesterday's profits. If there are no profits today, who will provide the buildings of tomorrow? Some say that public housing is the answer. I believe that public housing is not an incident or a trading point in our politics today. It is a touchstone by which we can judge a man's entire political philosophy. The person who sincerely believes in public housing and thinks that we must have a little of it to pacify certain segments of our population has to accept the implications. That man does not any longer believe in the American private-enterprise system. He is a Socialist at heart. Destruction of private enterprise and the ultimate victory of socialism always starts with public housing. We have but to refer to the history of France, England, Austria, and Russia to realize this.

The philosophy of rent control has been based upon the assumption that the amount of rent a tenant pays is his most important consideration in renting a home. It is my considered opinion that this is not so. From my own experience, I have learned that the tenant looks for four things: (1) His first consideration is a home for his family wherein there is security and safety. If he were allowed to occupy a castle free and he felt that his life or the lives of his family were in danger, he would not want to live there. (2) He looks for all of the comforts, conveniences, physical appearances, and atmosphere that he can find. (3) He seeks to establish his home wherever he can enjoy peace and freedom from annoyance, wherein he can live peaceably with the owner, other tenants and others in the same neighborhood. (4) He wants all of these things to the fullest extent that he can pay for them in order to satisfy his pride of living. Under rent control item 4 has been placed first, and it has in many cases made it impossible for him to satisfy the first three desires.

Rent control as it has been maintained has prevented the attainment of the tenant's goal. The longer controls are so maintained, the further the tenant will be from complete satisfaction. Aside from the fact that there were no rental units available the rent-control act has forced millions of families to purchase homes at too high a price in order to satisfy these fundamental living desires. These families, unfortunately many of them veterans, are experiencing a higher cost of living which offsets the apparent savings of the tenants in possession. Even those tenants in possession of the rent-controlled living units are beginning to realize through missing services and standards of living that their rental payments are not buying as much as they did before rent control. More and more tenants are finding out that the rental housing of 1941 and 1942 cannot be bought with 1948 dollars.

Earlier I made reference to one segment of our population who are in a state of emergency. These are the elderly people who have worked hard all of their lives at modest salaries, who have saved and deprived themselves of many wants and who have looked forward to being property owners. They were confident that by becoming a property owner they would escape the humiliation of becoming public charges when they were no longer able to work. The majority of these people have only the net income from one, two, or three tenants to depend upon. These poor people are really in a state of emergency. Removal of rent control would restore their confidence in this country and permit them to pass on the same incentive to be industrious and thrifty to their children. These people have always been the backbone of any country; perhaps too few realize how many of these people there are in this country. According to statistics taken from the Federal income-tax returns 74.7 percent of all of the property owners of this country have net incomes of $5,000 or less. Approximately 80 percent of our rental units are in small buildings such as single dwellings, duplexes, or four-family structures.

It is only on a free market that we can learn how many rental units are actually needed to house our rental population in the manner in which it wishes to be housed. Today these desires and demands are all out of balance. The picture has become so distorted that it is impossible for the investor or builder of housing to know just how much housing is actually required and at what rental levels. If we based our construction of housing on the artificial demand of today, we would run the risk of creating the greatest property depression the country has ever known. The longer the elimination of rent controls is postponed, the greater will be the unbalance and confusion. For the history of what has happened in France by renewing rent control for just one more year for 33 consecutive times, I refer you to an article that appeared in the December 29 issue of the Wall Street Journal. People in that country just cannot understand why we cannot learn from their experiences. They know now that the longer removal of controls is put off, the harder it is to do it. One so-called emergency seems always to follow another while available rental housing keeps getting worse and worse.

In conclusion, may I briefly summarize the important reasons why I believe removal of rent controls as of February 28, 1948, will quickly result in the balancing of supply with demand and thereby provide sufficient rental housing family units for all of those who desire them. Property owners need tenants and desire all good tenants to remain. Fears of wholesale evictions are completely groundless. Structures in use today are not housing the number of tenants for which they were originally designed. The tenants, the property owners, OPA, and the Housing Expediter have all contributed to a less efficient use than could be made of the existing structures. The emergency for which the Rent Control Act was created no longer exists. Under the act as it now stands, one segment of our economy is paralyzed, thereby throwing our whole system further out of balance. It is time to establish ourselves on a new, normal peacetime pattern. Strictly speaking, there is not a housing shortage but rather a shortage of dwelling units which are available for rental. The returning veteran, instead of being aided by rent control, has been its principal victim. The housing picture is so distorted under rent control that an accurate picture of the real needs is impossible to obtain. Rehabilitation and modernization of present structures will materially reduce pressure for new housing. We are using up faster than many realize the housing that is now in use and confidence must be restored to the investor in order to stimulate building for the future.

If this is not the time to permit Federal rent controls to expire, then the time will never come. There is no single argument for continuing rent control that cannot be repeated next year and the next year, as France has done for 33 years. Give the property owners the right and the confidence to build a new America in the only way it can be built.

Water for Long Beach, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I place herewith a resolution adopted by the Board of Water Commissioners of the City of Long Beach, Calif., before the House for the consideration of its Members. It is to be noted that this resolution expresses the unqualified opposition of the Board of Water Commissioners of Long Beach, Calif., to Senate bill 1175—the central Arizona project—and its wholehearted support to Senate Joint Resolution 145.

Whereas the city of Long Beach has reached what is believed to be the safe maximum yield of its wells in the Coastal Plain and is now taking 40 percent of its water requirements from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, of which district said city is a member; and

Whereas the city of Long Beach has increased in population from 164,271 in 1940 to approximately 285,000 at the present time and is still expanding rapidly, requiring steadily increasing quantities of water from said water district; and

Whereas said Metropolitan water district holds filings upon 1,655 cubic feet per second of the flow of the Colorado River and has expended some $200,000,000 in the construction of an aqueduct to deliver said water into the metroplitan area of southern California; and

Whereas said water district has made these expenditures in reliance upon definite contracts with the Government of the United States; and

Whereas the Metropolitan water district and other southern California organizations have in effect underwritten the construction costs of Hoover Dam through firm contracts to purchase the power developed at said dam and to store water behind said dam; and

Whereas the central Arizona project (Senate bill 1175) is unsound, economically infeasible, and indefensible in that it cannot be constructed and supplied with water without serious encroachment upon the water rights of the Metropolitan water district and in that it proposes to saddle the power users with the major part of its costs, which means, inasmuch as the market for such power is in southern California, that if this pernicious bill is enacted into law, southern California will be required to finance Arizona's taking of water rightfully belonging to southern California; and

Whereas Senate Joint Resolution 145 provides for settling the controversy between California and Arizona before the Supreme Court of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Water Commissioners of the City of Long Beach, acting for and in behalf of said city, That said board hereby expresses its unqualified opposition to Senate bill 1175 (the central Arizona project) and its wholehearted support of Senate Joint Resolution 145, and urges the defeat of the former and the passage of the latter; be it further

Resolved, That the board of water commissioners hereby authorizes distribution of copies of this resolution whenever and wherever necessary in order to make known the board's position on this proposed legislation.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Water Commissioners of the city of Long Beach at its meeting of the 5th day of February 1948, by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Johnson, Wall, Hilbert, Martin, and Wilson.
Noes: Commissioners, none.
Absent: Commissioners, none.

[SEAL] HELEN L. PENLAND,
Secretary of the Board of Water Commissioners.

Steel Export Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about the steel situation these days, and rightly so.

I want to discuss briefly the steel export situation, with specific remarks on how these exports affect industries, small and large, in my district. I want to include the suggested solution of one small manufacturer in my district, since this suggestion makes complete sense to me.

This suggestion is that steel export controls be clamped on so rigidly that no permit be issued on any steel export item until the manufacturer can show that his steel firm is not more than 6 months behind in domestic shipments and no domestic orders be refused, providing the purchaser was a customer in good standing during the years 1938 to June 1942, when all production went on a wartime basis.

We hear a lot about steel export controls as they exist today. There has been some degree of improvement in recent months, it is true. But it also is evident large amounts of steel, badly needed by American industry, are still being shipped to foreign markets, perhaps because prices are higher in these markets. Whatever the reasons, these exports should be far more tightly and sensibly controlled, right now, in the interests of all the people of this country.

I was amazed to pick up a copy of Report No. 825 of the Senate Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business a few days ago and read the following from page 11 of that report, dated January 16, 1948:

In securing figures from the Bureau of the Census on steel exports for the year 1946 and the first three-quarters of 1947, the subcommittee found that total exports are on the rise in 1947 over 1946, at a rate which will be an increase of 2,000,000 tons of steel products this year. This also represents about a million and a half more tons of steel than exported in the prewar year of 1938, when there was no shortage of steel and exports were unrestricted.

Exports of steel-mill products are leaving the United States this year (1947) at the rate of 7,000,000 tons, or 11.1 percent of current production. At the half-year mark the figure was 6,500,000 tons, or 10.5 percent of what it was then estimated production would be. At the three-quarter mark production

of steel products is running at the yearly rate of 62,300,000 tons.

Exports of such critical products as sheet steel and steel pipe and tubing have doubled and trebled in 1946 and 1947 over shipments of those items in normal prewar years.

During its preliminary investigation, the steel subcommittee was especially interested in shipments of sheet steel and steel pipe and the countries to which these shipments were being made. Census figures indicate that our prime country of export on most steel products, and especially of sheet steel, is Canada. Next in volume are such countries as Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and Sweden and other nations not involved in war-rehabilitation projects. Only one country in the devastated areas of Europe—France—has been a major participant in current export trade.

In the case of steel pipe, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Russia have been the chief recipients. In the case of Venezuela and Colombia, investigation has shown that American oil firms are developing new oil resources in those countries, which accounts for large shipments of pipe. In the case of Russia, however, it is difficult to determine any reason for the shipment of 65,000 tons of critically short steel pipe and tubing to that country in 1946, shipments which continued at the rate of 20,923 tons in the first quarter of 1947. This situation was brought to the attention of the Bureau of Export Controls, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce, by the subcommittee in May 1947. Since that time it is noted that all shipments of steel products to Russia have been curtailed; steel-pipe shipments in particular were reduced to 1,056 tons by the third quarter of 1947. The subcommittee is heartily in accord with this move.

It so happens that the manufacturer whose suggestion is cited in the opening paragraph of these remarks is in the business of making irrigation systems, and thus pipe is the principal ingredient in his business.

Believe it or not, his firm is now making a sizable shipment, of special fittings only, to Barbados in the lower West Indies just off the coast of Venezuela, where they can get all the pipe they want. But the same firm cannot get pipe enough to ship 300 feet to a plant grower in Georgia to grow small plants for northern markets. The same old story: Plenty of United States pipe in South America but still an extremely critical shortage in the United States.

If the American steel companies want to capture a new market, let them first supply the market that lies at their door, which in turn will supply labor, taxes and productive materials for our own needs. A shipment of $1,000 worth of pipe to South America will add possibly $100 or less to the taxable income of the steel company. That same pipe in the business of the man who makes irrigation systems, for example, will add the same profit and in addition will add taxable income from the men who work for him, will add taxable income from his factory and will add taxable income from the growers who use his product.

A policy of rigid controls based on domestic shipments would not work any undue hardship on the steel industry. It would not curtail sales. An export permit would merely assure the little fellow that he was being taken care of to the best of the ability of the steel industry. It would not require that one company be compelled to fill the gap for the entire demand. It would only compel the various companies to take care of their old customers before exploiting brand new markets.

There will be no expansion of steel production as long as any sizable segment of that industry can force American users, even the smallest of them, to play second fiddle. If the South American market, or any other, is to be developed, let it be by new investment in new production capacity, and not out of the hides of America's small-business men.

This pipe situation is already bad—

Reports the irrigation manufacturer in my own district—

not alone for me but for everybody else, of course. It is, for example, one of the big factors in the housing crisis. I wish I knew the months of occupation of new homes that have been lost by lack of plumbing. In my own community, Muskegon, Mich., I have seen new homes plumbed with electric conduit, which will rust in a few years and have to be replaced. I have seen sinks and toilets and bathtubs hooked up with discarded boiler tubes and water connections made with rubber hose. I have been offered a dollar a foot for pipe that should sell for 12 cents. It is this shortage that makes the shortage for me.

Here is the point: As everybody knows, steel will be scarce for quite a while. The mills and other suppliers know full well that customer good will is something they will not have to reckon with too seriously for some time. In too many instances their present attitude reflects this, as any steel buyer will verify.

I am told there is ample legislative authority now for far more rigid control of steel exports. I hope the congressional committees concerned with this question, and all other Members of Congress as well, will press for licensing of steel exports on a basis where no permit will be granted until the producer in question can show that it is no more than 6 months behind in domestic shipments. A 6-month leeway on delivery of domestic orders would allow for planning by the mills. It would also allow for a more definite delivery schedule to small domestic consumers. If the mills cannot do that, they should not be allowed to export a pound of steel.

Luxemburg, Wis.: The Village of Friendly Folk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the backbone of America is the people in our small towns and villages. It is from this source that our finest leaders, our great ideals, and our cherished traditions have sprung. Typical of these small towns and villages is the thriving village of Luxemburg, Wis., located in my district in the heart of dairyland. As an example of the progressive and alert spirit that has made America great, I include as part of my remarks an open letter from the village of Luxemburg to the people of America:

WHY DO THEY STILL RING CHURCH BELLS ON SUNDAY?

An advance man for a circus once suggested to a small-town storekeeper that he take space on the circus posters to advertise his business.

"Why should I advertise?" countered the storekeeper. "Been here 20 years, everybody knows me." The circus man pointed to a church across the street. "How long has that been there?" he asked. "About a hundred years, I'd say." "And yet," exclaimed the circus man, "they still ring the church bell every Sunday."

Today we must be reminded more often than taught. You may have heard about Luxemburg but you would fail to appreciate the many advantages of this little community if we did not tell you more about it. The write-up on the edge of the enclosed letterhead and the reproductions on the reverse side should give you some idea of this fine little burg. However, a number of changes have taken place since this was printed. The recent installation of a modern waterworks plant and disposal system has created a great deal of added building activity, the laying out of several new plats of land into lots, opening of a number of new streets, etc., and it is evident that the entire village as well as the fine adjoining surrounding community has been stepped up just a bit as regards enthusiasm, and the desire to promote the growth of Luxemburg. However, no community can keep up that enthusiasm, or can attain any degree of such growth unless there is provided sufficient employment for its people and those in the outlying territory. With this thought in mind, that we may thereby interest some individual, or group of individuals to come to our town, we are sending out this brief publicity matter. Our thought is that we would be more interested in a number of small plants rather than too large a factory. While we do not have many vacant buildings, there are available some fine factory sites, especially suitable for small or medium-sized businesses. It would be useless to make any attempt here to go into details about this. To you who may be at all interested, we hope that through this publicity we can induce you to make a personal call, look over our town, contact some of the businessmen and meet some of those listed here at the bottom of this letter. Investigations through other sources would, of course, be most welcome to us.

Naturally, we might be prejudiced, but we feel that we have a mighty swell little community and that we can offer a number of advantages to anyone looking for a small factory location or a place to build a home. While we are a prosperous community, we could hardly be classed as a wealthy community. Our most treasured asset lies in the fact that there exists here a spirit of community cooperation that is seldom evidenced anywhere—the envy of many communities much larger than ours. It is in that spirit that we solicit a visit from you who may be interested in what we state here, with the hope that you may decide to locate here and share this with us.

In conclusion, we believe that the hospitality of Luxemburg village and the surrounding community can best be demonstrated by quoting in whole a welcome invitation contained in a booklet that was mailed out to publicize a local Legion Fourth of July celebration some years ago over the signature of its long-term chief executive:

"WELCOME

"On behalf of the citizens of the village of Luxemburg, it is my pleasure to extend to you a most cordial welcome to be our guests during the Fourth of July festivities.

"Luxemburg is an inland village of happy homes and contented people, where the latchstring is always out and where friendship is deep and true. You will like us as we shall like you. Come then, laugh with us and play with us while we forget our troubles and pack them up in the kit bag of understanding and good will.

"And we are a patriotic people, too, for while we represent many nationalities and religious and political beliefs, we believe in the American way of life. Each for all and all for each. Not all of us may speak the same language with our lips, but we do with hearts—the language of American democracy, where the poor are as good as the rich and one race as good as another.

"Welcome then to Luxemburg, the village of friendly folk, whose hearts beat true to the red, white, and blue. God bless America."

As stated, while we should very much solicit a personal visit, however should you desire additional information we ask that you write to any of the undersigned, or any member of the village board, who we are sure will be pleased to answer your inquiry.

Cordially yours,

Charles L. Peters, Village President; Richard Seidl, Cashier, Bank of Luxemburg; Rev. J. Huhn, Pastor, St. Marys Congregation; George Gregor, Principal, High School; Dolores Sands, President, American Legion Auxiliary; Elroy Hoppe, Fair Secretary; Lawrence Rueckl, President, Luxemburg Milling Co.; Dr. E. J. DeWane, Dentist; Gordon Zemlika, High School Director; Clem Rass, Village Clerk; John Schwab, Jr., Town and Country Club; Rev. J. H. Nau, Lutheran Minister; Earl Peot, Commander, American Legion; John L. Miller, CRCOF; Austin Allard, Postmaster; Peter Colle, Zoning Committee; Dr. R. R. Jandrain, Physician; Ed Dalebroux, Manager, Farmers Trading Co.

LUXEMBURG, WIS.

Situated in Kewaunee County, population 500, on the Kewaunee, Green Bay & Western Railway. It is located in Wisconsin's richest dairy belt, 14 miles from Lake Michigan, ideal shipping facilities to the East.

Luxemburg is honored as having one of the finest bank buildings in the State, housing the Bank of Luxemburg, which is a community institution.

Luxemburg's population consists of a Belgian, Czech, and German mixture, which makes it a consistent and energetic populace.

Luxemburg has a modern street-lighting system, Kewaunee County fair grounds, a community newspaper, firemen's band, a 50-piece high-school band, two parochial schools, an excellent high school with a new and modern $40,000 gymnasium and auditorium, two churches, paved streets, and 5 miles of cement sidewalks. It also boasts of three large general stores, a grocery store, several variety stores, radio shop, two electric shops, two appliance stores, furniture store and undertaking establishment, drugstore, two hotels, two grain elevators, several hay dealers, four garages, a telephone exchange, three implement dealers, opera house, lumberyard, two barber shops, two beauty parlors, a modern art studio, two meat markets, a shoe store, real-estate dealers, jewelry store, harness store, two welding shops, a tool and lawn mower service station, a freezer plant, two fur farms, large cheese factory with a capacity or 45,000 pounds of milk daily, a planing mill and cheese-box factory, flour mill, a plumbing shop, bowling alleys, a number of well-regulated taverns and lunchrooms, beet-loading station, large apple and cherry orchards, three bulk oil stations, six gasoline service stations, several livestock shippers, and in the near vicinity are the largest gravel pits in the State, a pulverized limestone plant. Two doctors, two dentists, and a veterinarian take care of human and animal ailments.

Luxemburg has an active service organization, the Town and Country Club, who are alert to the commercial and industrial needs of the community and take the lead in promoting clean and wholesome social activities for both young and old.

The village has a supervised municipal playground, public park, excellent police protection, a modern up-to-date post office, and an efficient volunteer fire department equipped with the latest fire-fighting apparatus, and serving both the local and surrounding territory.

The village has just completed the installation of a complete municipal waterworks and sewage-disposal plant, designed to add much to the convenience and comfort of home owners and others. Building lots are available at very reasonable prices and prospects are invited to establish themselves in this fine village.

The businessmen are wide awake, and will lend their cooperation to those wishing to invest capital or locate in this prosperous community. Dairying is the chief farming industry and is largely practiced, although the land is fertile and crops of all kinds grow in abundance.

Italy Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop taken from today's New York Herald Tribune.

It seems to me that the world picture is beginning to take definite form. Heretofore, ever since VJ-day, our Government has been doing everything possible to appease the Soviet Government. Everyone has been confused. What has recently happened in Czechoslovakia and what is threatened in Finland begins to clear the pattern that Russia is following.

The following article informs us about what can take place in Italy. There are those who believe that the Scandinavian countries can likewise be taken over by the strategy directed from Moscow. By this strategy Stalin is accomplishing even more than Hitler did by force. Soon the powers that be will have to decide whether the United Nations is capable of satisfactorily adjusting our international disputes. Most certainly the United States will have to take a leading position in this decision.

Many of my constituents have expressed their opposition to universal military training. Again I repeat that few of us like a military program. We all have hoped and prayed that the United Nations would be effective. Another world war will be ruinous—but what is the answer? We may have a selective service draft program forced on us in the near future. Are we going to sit by and let communism spread or are we going to carry through our desire to free the downtrodden peoples of the world through democratic forms of government?

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

ITALY NEXT?

What has just occurred in Czechoslovakia, and what is clearly in the process of occurring in Finland, may happen within the next few months in Italy. That is the stark fact of which the American policy makers are fully and agonizingly aware. Serious as the Czech and Finnish events are, they do not greatly alter the balance of power between the Soviet sphere and the West. If Italy enters the Soviet sphere, the United States and the whole western world will have suffered a disastrous defeat.

An Italian election is scheduled for April 19. Italian politics are volatile and unpredictable. Yet, as of now, it appears probable that the Communist-run Italian people's bloc, which has been gaining rapidly in recent weeks, may poll well over 40 percent of the total vote. If that happens, it will almost certainly be politically impossible for Premier Alcide de Gasperi or any other non-Communist leader to form a non-Communist government. That is why Italian Communist leader Palmiro Togliatti is now reported to be exuding a supreme confidence.

Field reversed by Reds

Togliatti's leadership of the Italian Communists and their stooges has recently thoroughly justified his reputation as the shrewdest Communist outside Moscow. All observers agreed last autumn that the Moscow-ordered campaign of violence had frightened and alienated a large proportion of the Italian electorate. But since then the Communists have neatly reversed their field. They have assumed again the disguise of true democrats and patriots. Moreover, Togliatti has finally persuaded his old friends in the Kremlin to join him in wooing the Italian voters.

Thus an Italian mission was sent to Albania shortly after the war, and was promptly jailed on orders from Moscow. Its members have now been released through the intervention of the Italian Communists, and relations with Albania resumed. Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito has been equally cooperative. Seventy-odd Italian fishing boats have been quite illegally seized in the Adriatic by the Yugoslavs (one Yugoslav gunboat even pursued an Italian fisherman with machine-gun fire, right into an Italian port). Recently a direct appeal from the Communist trade-union leader De Vittorio has elicited from the Yugoslav dictator the gracious promise that the Italian boats will be returned.

Such triumphs of Communist diplomacy have been widely advertised in the pro-Communist Italian press. There have been broad hints that they are no more than preliminary tidbits. If the Communists come to power, the grand prize, the return of the city of Trieste to Italy, will be forthcoming.

Moreover, the Soviets, after treating the Italians with open contempt since the end of the war, have suddenly begun to bid for Italian favor. Within the last few days they have announced that they are "still" in favor of Italian trusteeship for the former Italian colonies. And last Friday they stated that they were very much in favor of the return of Italy to the International Tangiers regime.

Such announcements have been published with much fanfare in the powerful pro-Communist Italian press (which is lavishly and

somewhat mysteriously supplied with paper). The fact that all the other Tangiers signatories, including Britain and France, had 3 months before signified their willingness to invite Italy back to Tangiers was studiously disregarded. So was the fact that the Soviets had previously tried to grab the Italian colonies for themselves. Instead, a riot in British-held Italian Somaliland, in which 52 Italians lost their lives, was held up as further proof of western imperialism, duplicity, and hatred of the Italian people.

Few cards to play

In this rather squalid game of bidding for the favor of Italian nationalists, the United States and the western nations have few cards to play. If the red tape in which the Maritime Commission is as usually firmly bound can be unraveled, some 15 Liberty ships will shortly be dispatched to Italy, as authorized by Congress. But against such minor gestures, the Soviets can still play their ace. They can renounce a portion of their Italian reparations.

Meanwhile, Togliatti's grip on Pietro Nenni, Italian Socialist leader, is as tight as Gottwald's grip on the traitorous Fierlinger; indeed, the Italian Communist Party is known to pay more than nine-tenths of the expenses of Nenni's Socialists. The other parties in the people's bloc, the Action Party, and the Republican Alliance, are in like case. With such tight organization, with apparently unlimited funds and with the miseries of postwar Italy working in their favor, it is now believed seriously possible that the Communists and their stooges will poll a vote sufficiently large to prevent the formation of any non-Communist government. Then the venal Nenni will be propelled into the premiership, and the reins of power will stretch back through the hands of Togliatti into the Kremlin.

If that happens—and it must be emphasized that it is regarded by those who should know as a wholly serious possibility—the whole western position in the Near and Middle East will be outflanked, and the power balance in Europe itself will be disastrously altered. The world will then be close to war.

Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday, over radio station WOL in Washington, at 8 o'clock in the morning, Mr. George E. Reedy, the popular commentator, discussed the fall of Czechoslovakia to the Communists. I quote:

The fall of Czechoslovakia to the Communists has brought the United States to its greatest diplomatic crisis since the beginning of the late war. American officials are making no attempt to disguise their deep concern.

Of course, Czechoslovakia is only one of a long series of nations to fall to the Communists. It has been preceded by practically all of eastern Europe. Soviet domination of border countries has become the pattern of the postwar world.

But the fall of Czechoslovakia presents a different picture. The other nations had been under Russian domination in one form or another for several centuries.

Their nation, which grew out of the First World War, was patterned after our own. Its government was modeled on the lines of our Government, and its people had a passionate devotion to liberty. They have proved it over and over.

From a strategic standpoint, the capture of Czechoslovakia was important to the Communists. It advances the Russian sphere of influence to western Europe itself, and it brings to the Soviets an important industrial prize.

The Soviet Union has always lacked a pool of skilled workers. Czechoslovakia as an industrial nation has plenty. Before the war it was one of the most important manufacturing centers on the Continent.

There is little doubt that Russia will be able to make good use of this pool of workmen. The Germans proved that it could be done, and the Communists are fully as efficient as the Nazis. The Czechs will work—whether they want to or not.

All of these things considered, it is not surprising that the United States, Great Britain, and France have joined to denounce the Communist stroke. Their language is bitter and undiplomatic, but it is justified.

The three-power note calls the coup a "disguised dictatorship of a single party." It calls the crisis which was used to bring it about "artificially and deliberately instigated." No words are minced—or softened.

Such language, of course, does nothing but give the three nations a chance to blow off some steam. They are still faced with the problem of doing something to halt a further Soviet advance. Czechoslovakia must be written off the books.

Secretary of State Marshall has already asked Congress for more aid to Greece—the only non-Communist country adjoining the Soviet sphere. He wants $275,000,000 to strengthen the Greek Government.

But the real fear is that the Communists have designs on France and Italy. Those are the two vulnerable points in western Europe. The Communists know they cannot take them except by force from the outside.

A strike at either by Soviet forces would put this country directly on the spot. We would either have to fight or get out of Europe altogether. Neither alternative would be a happy one. Either alternative could be disastrous.

The true significance of the fall of Czechoslovakia is this: There are now no more buffers in the world. From here on out international diplomacy is played for keeps. Any further Soviet expansion means we must put up—or shut up.

Mr. Speaker, and so ends the commentary last Friday morning of Mr. George E. Reedy.

Much of what Mr. Reedy said about Czechoslovakia and her current situation I am sure most of us will agree with.

However, I wish to most earnestly correct Mr. Reedy's remark that "Czechoslovakia must be written off the books."

Mr. Reedy and the world must never forget that Czechoslovakia is a young republic, younger even than our own United States. And youth has vitality, strength, and courage. Nor must the world forget that the people of Czechoslovakia cherish in their hearts a deep love of liberty as passionate and sincere as is our own.

It is true that a Russian rider sits in the Czech saddle. But if I know those people, and I think I do, the spirit of democracy will not die as long as one Czech lives.

It is also my belief that the Russian rider will find that he sits astride a strong-willed and bucking mount.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on February 28, 1948.

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, first I want to acknowledge the telegrams representing hundreds of post-office employees, clerks, railway-mail men, letter carriers, and custodians, which were sent me this week.

You boys are asking for a raise from $600 to $1,000, and I think you ought to have it. You're the only ones on the Federal pay roll who have been left out in the cold. Whatever the committee decides to do for the rest, the postal workers ought to be given the limit.

I want you to know that I complied with your request to plead your case before the Rees committee. The chairman very courteously received me and gave to me the opportunity of stating your wishes in the matter.

A message from Mr. Howard J. McNamara, chairman of the Broome County Red Cross Chapter, reminds us that the National Red Cross campaign begins March 1. He says that the quota for Broome this year is $147,000, more than 45 percent higher than for 1947.

It is scarcely necessary to point out the necessity of public support for the Red Cross. The record of this great organization is written on the hearts of Americans the country over. Let us hope the response will more than take care of the increased requisition.

George Washington had a lot to contend with fighting the enemies of the people of that day, just as your own Congressman struggles against the intolerance and sham thrown up to barricade his efforts. The House recently observed another Washington's Birthday and, impressed with the significance of such an occasion, I made the following speech before Congress:

"Mr. Speaker, whenever, on these annual occasions, Washington's Farewell Address is read, I never fail to get a new angle. I am always impressed by some different phase of this immortal message.

"I suppose the Nation would be better off today if our leaders and statesmen down through the years had taken Washington's advice more to heart. A lot of decisions made since might have been changed for the wiser, if his parting, fatherly words had been contemplated oftener.

"The public knows George Washington as the Father of His County. He is looked upon as the foremost military man of his generation. He won the War of American Independence and, as our greatest Revolutionary hero, was the logical man to become our first president.

"Washington's record as head of the new America was unimpeachable. Under his administration the country emerged as a strong Nation, young as she was.

"While all of us know Washington for his amazing public accomplishments, few realize that he was as hard working in private affairs. No matter how great the cares of his military or executive office, he always seemed to find the time to develop his farm lands in Virginia.

"History tells us he was an authority on agriculture. He burned the midnight oil studying about ways to improve the soil and develop new programs of fertility and farm development.

"George Washington knew more about farming than some of the so-called experts down in the Department of Agriculture. If he came back today, he could probably teach a lot of the specialists things they never heard of about the soil.

"Each Member of Congress has in his office a set of volumes containing Washington's letters. If you peruse them you will find how versatile this great man was and what a wealth of knowledge he possessed.

"So, in addition, Washington can be looked upon as first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of American farmers."

Sale of American Merchant Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying, indeed, to note that the Congress has seen fit to stop all sales of American war-built merchant ships to foreign nations or to foreign individuals as of February 29, 1948. This, of course, is only the first step in the struggle to prevent the sale or transfer of a large number of such American merchant ships in connection with the forthcoming European-recovery plan legislation.

As an indication of the widespread support which the complete stoppage of foreign ship sales has behind it, I take pleasure in publishing herewith a letter from the secretary of the California State Federation of Labor of February 6, 1948. I invite attention to this clear presentation of the reasons why additional ships should not be sold foreign:

CALIFORNIA STATE
FEDERATION OF LABOR,
San Francisco, February 6, 1948.

Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADLEY: This will acknowledge and thank you for the copy of your letter to Mr. Bassett regarding our opposition to that portion of the Marshall plan which proposes to sell and/or charter 500 American merchant ships to European nations.

The basis for our action rests on the following conclusions:

First of all, it is important that our country maintain a strong merchant marine for foreign and domestic commerce and to support our national economy. On at least two occasions in our Nation's history, we have passed through critical situations due to the lack of the necessary ships and trained personnel to support our national defense. The reduction in our merchant marine is an obvious danger to the adequate defense of this country.

Moreover, it is recognized that competition exists between the various fleets of the world for the transportation of international cargoes, and that to the extent that one fleet is successful, another one is deprived. To overtonnage the fleets of our foreign competitors from our surplus war-built fleet, at a low price with the resulting low capital costs, would deprive American ships of a proper competitive position in international trade. With the low wages and living standards aboard foreign ships, and further aided by low capital costs, our foreign competitors would have an advantage sufficient to more than offset the low speed and relative inefficiencies of certain of our surplus war-built vessels.

Investigation discloses that on an over-all basis the 1939 fleets of foreign nations, other than those of our enemies, have been restored up to or more than their prewar strength on a tonnage basis alone. That does not take into account the increased lifting capacity of the higher speed and more modern vessels which have been built or acquired. Certainly there can be no obligation to build up our foreign competitors beyond their 1939 status, and it is not in the interest of our merchant marine or in the public interest to do so.

There are many other arguments that can be advanced proving the need of opposing this proposed transfer of American ships to foreign registry.

We are very appreci. tive of the effective presentation of this position which you made on the floor of the House, and we wish to congratulate you for taking this position.

You are free to insert in the RECORD any of the opinions expressed above.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. HAGGERTY,
Secretary.

Germany and Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, now when so many Members of Congress are being driven by fear and fear propagandists and are about to make decisions on foreign policy which may have an adverse effect upon our Nation and our relations with the nations of the world, it is good to see once in awhile a ray of sunshine break through these dark and disturbing clouds.

Yesterday I received a letter from E. M. Poe, GI student at the University of Michigan. He tells of a lecture delivered by Dr. Ferenac Kiss at the church auditorium. Dr. Kiss is head of the Free Church—Protestant—movement in Hungary, and was teaching anatomy at the University of Budapest. He was released by the Russians and is the only member of his faculty that was not shot by the Germans, or is not in jail. He has been in the United States for 3 months and is making a tour of this country and Canada under the auspices of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship. He has so far given 100 lectures.

Dr. Kiss is not only a scientist, but he is also a great Christian leader. He is not one that believes that science or new knowledge should supersede Christianity or the teachings of Christ. Although he has written an anatomy text, atlases, and 40 or 50 scientific papers, he has not forsaken the greater teachings of religion.

Dr. Kiss stated:

The problem of Russia is only secondary. It is the European organism that is primary. We used to teach that germs cause diseases. Now we teach that if the organism is weak, it will be subject to attacks of various kinds. The real cause of Europe's present plight is the lack of positive Christianity and social reform, which alone could have prevented World War II.

Russia broke from Christianity, but we must remember that the aristocracy of Europe and their close imitators, the middle classes, also decided that—

Religion was only an opiate for the masses. The top class must set an example for the masses. They have the power, the government, and the lives of the people are in their hands. Along with this power there is a great responsibility. A moral one. If the rulers become corrupt they are like a sore on an arm. Some day the whole skin underneath will slough off that dead, corrupt, and useless old tissue. While still alive and performing its function as skin and protecting flesh beneath, it will continue to be fed by the body. When it forgets its duties it dies and will be pushed off.

Germany became the leading scientific country and decided that science was greater than God. They pushed God out and substituted lectures on science for sermons on morality. They taught nothing but science in school and put all faith in armies and the military.

After World War I some tried to urge Germany back to God but the learned professors only laughed and said, "The real trouble was not lack of God, but that they had started the war too soon before science was sufficiently well developed."

So they redoubled their scientific efforts and they knew far more than the United States about a lot of things. So they tried again. Again it was the Christian countries than won the war. Then these non-Christian German scientists were called before the courts at Nuremberg. At the trials they said, "We are not responsible. We had to obey Hitler's orders. It was all his fault."

We said, "You are of the intelligent class. You are the men of learning, of science. You are the leaders." Yes; they were men of pure science who had forgotten God, and they could not succeed.

We need science and we should learn all we can, but we must remember that we are responsible for our inventions and machines, to see that they work for the good of the people and that science does not desert the teachings of God.

In England the Government leaders admit that it was not their armies that held the Empire intact. It was their preachers, hymns, and Christian literature that gave courage to the people and held them together. Likewise in Poland, when all hope was gone, it was the faith and belief in God that held them together. Today the churches are filled and Christianity is stronger than ever in Poland. Without bulldozers, mammoth tractors and trucks, thousands of people are picking up rubble, brick by brick, stone by stone, with their bare hands and loading them on wheelbarrows and horse carts. Every visitor and correspondent who visits Warsaw and other Polish cities is amazed at the Polish people when they witness their desire to live and excavate themselves from the ruins. Poland is a great Christian nation. It is not a nation of science and

scientists. But the people possess a far greater asset. It is hope and faith in God. Yes, Germany had great scientists. But no man must set himself on a plane higher than God.

A true Christian is not a fearful man. Today in Congress I believe we are being driven by fear and told to believe in the protection of science and the military. This road will not lead us to peace, friendship, and security. We must not allow German scientists or atheistic leadership to sway us.

We have recently appropriated substantial sums for the Voice of America. How much time is being devoted to bring a Christian message from us to the people of Europe? Dr. Kiss, as a scientist and a Christian leader, has a real message to deliver to the people of Europe—yes; the people that he knows so well and the conditions under which they have lived for centuries. Why not invite Dr. Kiss and other religious leaders like Monsignor Sheen to deliver a Christian message to the people of Europe? Of course, this would mean that our foreign policy would have to be changed in accordance with the Christian message that these men would send. It would mean giving help, aid, and assistance on a Christian basis.

We must send a spiritual message to Europe before we send our dollars. Otherwise, our dollars will do no good. In the Middle Ages the body of Europe died and remained dead until the Renaissance came and picked up the people's spirit. This we did not get after World War I, nor have we so far developed anything after World War II. The people are in a vacuum. They are lost in the jungle. Go to the left or go to the right. No other choice. They want to take a Christian Democratic road that goes down the middle. Perhaps our great Christian teachers will provide the leadership. I have hope, I have faith, that neither the right nor left shall prevail, because both roads lead to destruction. The world does not want leadership from militarists, monopolists, royalists, or dictators.

Real Christian leadership has a golden opportunity, and it must be kind, charitable, understanding, and not permit itself to be used by any powerful group or interests.

European-recovery money should not be wasted on arms and armaments. It should go for reconstruction, education, food, medicines, to restore farms and factories and—yes—even a few dollars to restore churches and religious institutions.

MacArthur: The Man of the Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the recent statesmanlike utterance by Gen. Douglas MacArthur is refreshing in that it offers new hope to millions of our people who are weary of being exploited by politicians.

MacArthur asserted:

The Republican Party is peculiarly well fitted * * * to further arouse in the youthful mind the all-important concept of public responsibility, for the Republican Party has never deviated from the proposition that all political power resides in the people.

It has never failed in its staunch advocacy for the maximum of personal freedom and individual responsibility, and has tenaciously held as a principle inviolate equality of opportunity.

Undoubtedly the above words quoted from a statement by General MacArthur to the Republican National Committee endorsing a drive to establish Young Republican Clubs on the Nation's 1,730 college campuses has prompted today's double-column front-page editorial in the New York Journal American entitled "The Man of the Hour," as follows:

THE MAN OF THE HOUR

More than at any time since Abraham Lincoln was summoned to the White House to save the Republic, these United States need a statesman and not a politician at the head of the National Government.

None of the avowed candidates for the Presidency meets the public need.

And the responsibilities that lie upon us are too grave and too consequential to be committed into feeble or uncertain hands.

Misled by vainglorious ambitions and false alien ideologies, we have departed dangerously from the sound traditions and the equally sound practices of our successful past.

We have become a debt-ridden commonwealth, with a debased currency, drifting like a rudderless bark in the shoals of inflation toward shipwreck on the rocks of depression.

The seeds of class hatred and class conflict have been sown in our soil and are bearing poisonous fruit.

The tribunals of justice have been debaunched; arbitrary administrative edicts are taking the place of just laws justly enforced; and a vast bureaucracy is being erected over us to devour our substance.

Taxation has been made an instrument of pillage and persecution, so that the accumulation of generative and productive wealth is diminishing; the fountains of philanthropy are vanishing; the creative energies of our people are faltering; and the dependencies of the dole are being substituted for the virtues of self-reliance and self-respect.

Beyond our shores, our so-called diplomacy has been carried on in a disgraceful medley of secrecy and deception and usurped authority, until no man knows what our foreign policies are—or what they portend.

And meanwhile, in a world where the embers of unextinguished war still smolder and there is no peace anywhere, our defenses are permitted to decline and decay.

A free republic that is so beset with manifold errors and evils cannot—in Lincoln's historic phrase—"long endure."

The times are indeed critical, calling for saving leadership—and America would be indeed bankrupt if the leadership were lacking.

But fortunately for us and for posterity, the leadership awaits—the kind of virile leadership that democracy requires.

Above any man of his generation, Gen. Douglas MacArthur has demonstrated in many capacities his superlative qualities.

He has the statesman's touch along with the patriot's consecration, and he has the inspired and selfless "gift of command" which extreme exigencies always require.

In every call to duty that has been made upon him he has always responded—and he has never failed.

No difficulty, however great, has ever daunted him.

Knowing that we cannot believe that General MacArthur would fail his beloved country now.

We need him.

We need his experience and his judgment and his superb executive ability at Washington.

If we are to save ourselves from our own follies, we must draft General MacArthur for the Presidency.

For beyond any rivalry and any partisanship and any questioning, Douglas MacArthur is America's man of the hour.

Federal Council of Churches' Advocacy of Marshall Plan Questioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I received a letter from Charles Taft, president of the Federal Council of Churches. Mr. Taft's letter set out that the executive committee of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America was whole-heartedly supporting the Marshall plan.

Mr. Taft's message to Members of Congress was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and so it appears some reply might likewise be made public.

Mr. Speaker, years ago I was saddened as I studied the record of how Hitler slyly prostituted church institutions in Germany for his evil purposes—although ultimately the strongest opposition to Hitler from within came from courageous churchmen.

Probably no greater tragedy could ever befall American Christianity than that its power and influence be, in any part, unwittingly used to promote the goals of militarism and power politics. I hope that in advocating the Marshall plan the federal council is not making that kind of error, but, as my letter to Mr. Taft indicates, I have real anxiety on this score.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1948.

MR. CHARLES P. TAFT,
President, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. TAFT: This will acknowledge your letter of January 28, advising me that the executive committee of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America is wholeheartedly supporting the European recovery program.

Because of my deep respect for the religious leaders of this country of all faiths, I am interested in learning the procedure whereby the council's executive committee arrived at this conclusion.

Accordingly, I will appreciate being advised as to what expert testimony from witnesses favoring this program was received by the committee, and also the witnesses the council heard giving the arguments against this scheme.

Also, I note the federal council believes that this Government "must be zealously on guard against imposing, or appearing to impose, conditions in the granting of foreign aid which would seem to threaten the political independence of the nations of Europe or their right to choose their own way of life."

1. Is it the belief of the federal council that this plan is devoid of provisions designed to influence the political, economic, and military behavior of the governments receiving the subsidies involved in this scheme?

2. The Senate Armed Services Committee has recently been told by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the extended American position in Europe required by the European recovery program makes necessary a doubled annual military budget. Did the federal council have knowledge of this military expansion aspect of this scheme, and am I to understand that the federal council favors the growing military dominance of American life promoted by this plan?

3. What evidence does the federal council have that the European relief program will be more successful than the Bretton Woods agreements, which were supposed to accomplish the same objective?

4. The House committee report on Bretton Woods, advocating that legislation, carried this paragraph:

"On the other hand, if some countries should find it difficult to secure through private investment the minimum capital needed from abroad, they will be tempted to seek this capital in other ways. Foreign loans may be arranged on a political rather than an economic basis. Such a policy would be most unfortunate, for it could only means a resumption of the use of power politics in international economic relations."

From the foregoing it would seem that the European recovery program initiates the power politics which the Bretton Woods agreements were designed to prevent.

Did the executive committee of the federal council consider this aspect of the European recovery program? If so, is the federal council now an advocate of "power politics"?

5. Does the Federal Council of Churches believe that the Anglo-American decision to build a western European military alliance is an action for which the churches of America should be the advocate?

6. Does the executive committee of the federal council know of any country in which the peacetime economic regimentation (rationing and price control) demanded by the advocates of the Marshall plan has existed side by side with religious freedom?

7. Has your executive committee analyzed to what extent this program will accelerate the deterioration of the American dollar? If so, what conclusions were reached by the committee?

8. Does the federal council believe that the motives and objectives behind this program have been forthrightly and fairly laid before the people? Or that the American people have had a fair presentation of both sides of this controversial issue in the press and on the radio?

If so, how would the committee account for the fact recently established by Congressman MAX SCHWABE that the radio networks have given about 10 hours of radio time to the promoters of this program to every single hour granted to the opponents of the program?

I am not writing this letter simply because I believe the European recovery program will be as futile and disastrous as the British loan was for both the recipients and for ourselves. Instead, I write it because I have the conviction that only by brilliant spiritual leadership will we be able to save our country from the materialism and imperialism that have ruined former civilizations.

I am concerned lest the federal council make the same mistake that many top intellectuals made in Germany when totalitarian government was on the march in that land.

In November 1933, the following Associated Press dispatch came from Leipzig, Germany:

"In picturesque Leipzig University German professors, in an Armistice Day meeting, appealed to the intelligentsia of the world today for a better understanding of Germany.

"It was their way of urging popular support for the Nazi government in tomorrow's elections. The appeal followed along broad lines one released during the war when professors and scientists appealed for a better understanding of the German Nation.

"German professors, today's appeal said, placed themselves in the front ranks of field leaders and fighters in behalf of 'German's honor, justice, and for world peace'."

It is plain now that these men of great intellect were being used as pawns by adventurers in ruthless power politics. It would be an irreparable disaster to Christianity if the federal council, possessing the power to speak for millions of Christians, now makes a series of similar blunders in this country, wouldn't it?

Sincerely yours.

What Is Our Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESTON E. PEDEN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herein an editorial from the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., February 29, 1948:

WHAT IS OUR POLICY?

On Tuesday of last week our representative in the United Nations said that this Government was prepared to enter into consultations looking toward the sending to Palestine of a UN force, presumably including both American and Russian troops, to maintain peace. Two days later Secretary of State Marshall asked Congress to appropriate $275,000,000—this in addition to the $400,000,000 already provided—for Greece and Turkey. The additional money is to be used to provide military assistance to the Governments of Greece and Turkey in an effort to keep those countries from being overrun by the Russians and their Communist stooges in the satellite nations.

If this can be called a national policy, what kind of policy is it?

The Star has supported the policy of assisting Greece and Turkey. And it continues to support that policy in the belief that our vital national interests and our national security would be gravely threatened if those strategically placed countries should be taken over by the aggressive Communist fifth columns, aided by outside forces.

When one looks at a map, however, the logic, if any, of spending $675,000,000 to keep the Communists out of Greece and Turkey, while pursuing at the same time a policy which would bring the Russian Army into Palestine, is utterly incomprehensible to the lay mind. For once the Russians are in Palestine, they have outflanked Greece and Turkey. And once those countries are outflanked by the Red Army they are done for.

Surely, this seemingly contradictory policy ought to be explained, if any explanation is possible. But no one in an official position has offered a word of explanation. On the face of the matter, the American people, at considerable expense, are being asked to march up the hill in Greece and Turkey and to march down again in Palestine. It is doubtful that they will be willing to accede for long to any such request. To the layman it does not make sense, and a policy which, on its face, does not make sense is going to be hard to sell to the people of this country.

In the letter accompanying the request for additional funds, General Marshall said that the Communists, in their ambition to dominate Greece and Turkey, are convinced that time will play into their hands. To this might be added the thought that the Communists may be convinced that not only time but also American policy will play into their hands.

The Racial Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, the March 1948 issue of U. S. Public Opinion, published here in Washington, contains an interesting and instructive article on the racial issue entitled "Race Issue Looms Bigger Than Ever in Politics." I believe this article is worthy of careful study and consideration, particularly by those who would seek to make politics out of a problem which the South best understands.

U. S. Public Opinion, a new publication, treats national and world issues in a very entertaining and original manner. It has attracted considerable interest, and I believe its success is assured. The editor and publisher is Mr. John T. Parkerson, a native of the Third Louisiana District I represent in Congress. Mr. Parkerson has had wide experience in reporting, analyzing, and interpreting public opinion. He served as war correspondent for the Associated Press in both World War I and II, and represented the Hearst newspapers at the Paris Peace Conference at the close of the first world conflict. He remained in Paris to become business manager of the Paris edition of the New York Herald, and upon his return to the United States was one of the founders of Trans-Radio Press Service. For the past several years he has served as commercial manager of Press Wireless, in which a number of the Nation's largest newspapers are interested.

Mr. Parkerson understands the South and the fight the Southern States are making to preserve long-established ideals and principles. He knows that the South has often been misunderstood and has also often been the victim of prejudice and of attempts by outside influence to destroy barriers that are necessary for the mutual welfare of the white and colored races. He understands the motives and purposes back of these attempts. For these reasons the following article under his editorship is of special interest, particularly to all southerners:

RACE ISSUE LOOMS BIGGER THAN EVER IN POLITICS—IS SOCIAL BAIT HELD OUT FOR NEGRO VOTE?

With a national election only a few months away, and all parties vying for the votes of the huge Negro population, particularly in

cities of pivotal States, the race question has suddenly sprung into a prominence never before equaled in the history of the country.

"End of racial bars demanded by President's Committee on Civil Rights," says one glaring headline.

The Nation's Capital is held up as "a graphic illustration of a failure of democracy," and the manner in which the Negro population of Washington is treated is denounced by the committee as intolerable and shameful.

The United States Army tells our troops throughout the world that three-fourths of the people of the earth are what we call "colored" and warns that racial and religious prejudice endanger democracy and peace.

HENRY WALLACE'S PARTY

Out in Chicago, where Henry Wallace was acclaimed by his Gideon's army of extreme left-wingers, someone called for Paul Robeson, the Negro singer, "for Vice President," and the crowd roared, "We want Robeson."

The Supreme Court ruling that "equal educational facilities" must be made available for Negroes in all State institutions of learning creates a problem in the South. At the same time, when the question of restrictive covenants aimed at Negroes and other minorities comes before them, three of the Justices of the Supreme Court disqualify themselves from acting in the case.

"Antisouthern legislation," sponsored by President Truman and his Committee on Civil Rights, constitutes "a greater menace to the Nation than the international clash between democracy and communism," declares Gov. Fielding L. Wright, of Mississippi, who urges southern Democrats to secede from the national party unless this situation is corrected. "Such legislation," adds the Governor, "violates the very experience of man, namely, that the problems of human relationships are so varied and diverse that we can never begin to solve all of them by laws."

An ultimatum of the southern Governors, castigating President Truman for his civil rights message and calling on the National Democratic Party to reverse its stand with the President, or face a threat of secession by the traditionally solid South, is the big political story of the day.

DEMOCRATS ON SPOT

It is no secret that a revolt within the Democratic Party has been brewing for some time, and the suggestion has even been made that the Southern States unite upon a candidate like Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, and vote for their Presidential electors to support him in the electoral college. Such action would, of course, insure the election this year of a Republican President, which many Southern Democrats openly admit they would prefer to continuation of the Truman policy and his support of what they term "the infamous proposals" of his civil liberties committee.

Southern whites, who claim to know something about the subject, because they say they have had to live with most of the Negroes, contend that the sudden interest in the Negro's social status stems chiefly from political considerations. Perhaps the answer was given in an article which appeared in Liberty magazine in December, 1945, by Sam H. Jones and James Aswell, of Louisiana, who estimated that 5,000,000 Negroes had quit the South and headed north between 1940 and 1945. More have left since.

WHY THEY'VE MOVED AWAY

The reason for this vast exodus—mechanical cotton pickers, flame cultivators, etc. One farmer who formerly employed 1,000 workers now has 250. Under primitive methods, two Negroes and two mules per 20 acres of sugarcane. Today, with tractors, mechanical cane cutters, and loaders, one man can handle 100 acres.

"The war which ended in '65 did not free the Negro," said Messrs. Jones and Aswell. "Instead, it enslaved both the white people and the Negroes of the South. But now, ahead, both races see the first crack in their chains."

WILL NEGROES BENEFIT?

With the steadily increasing population of Negroes in New York, Chicago, and other large cities, "politics has taken direction of the race question." Where will it lead? Will the Negro be better off?

Nearly half a century ago a magazine entitled "White America" appeared on the news stand in Los Angeles, Calif.—a magazine, which it proclaimed, was "devoted to the race question." What it said at that time on the question of social equality between the races is interesting to quote now. Here is an excerpt:

SAYS IT'S FALSE HOPE

"Even though this euphemistic dream could be realized, it would be done at a sacrifice of all moral compunctions and * * * at such a cost * * * that society would be wrecked and stung to its death. There can be no pesce as long as simpering idiots who pose as philanthropists advocate a social harmony which they do not practice. * * * No white-skinned declaimer of amalgamation seeks marital alliance with the Negro hero whose cause he champions. It is criminal to inspire a hope or an ambition in the Negro in which disappointment gives birth to ranking bitterness. * * * The inequalities of birth, and blood, and tastes, and instincts, and the natural antipathies and incompatibilities had their origin in divine economy, and the man who does not see it is a fool; and the man who sees it and then lures the Negro to his certain doom by such an ignis fatuus is a knave of the deepest dye."

What do you think?

Weak Electoral System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to submit the following newspaper article from the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., of date February 29, 1948, as follows:

WEAK ELECTORAL SYSTEM

We suspect that Mr. Average Citizen is likely to regard Governor Tuck's request that the Virginia Legislature vote President Truman's name off the ballot as an unconstitutional device for defeating the will of the people. The pathetic fact is that it is not only constitutional but also seems to be fully in accord with what the founding fathers intended. The people have so long exercised the right of electing the President and Vice President that they forget the Constitution accords them no such privilege.

Any skepticism on the subject can be readily dissipated by turning to article II, section 1, of the Constitution. "Each State," it reads, "shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress."

Three electors choose the President and Vice President. The practice of pledging the electors to individual party candidates, so that the electors become mere recorders of the will of the people, has grown up by usage. Virginia is thus free to elect uninstructed electors, or even to have them appointed by the legislature or the Governor, without the slightest deference to the national conventions where Republican and Democratic candidates for President will be chosen.

There seems to be little question as to enactment of the Tuck proposal at Richmond, and similar bills are likely to emerge in other State capitals. Indeed, a number of States do not now permit the names of Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates to be printed on the ballots. The voters in those States vote for electors only, and if those electors are not committed to candidates named in advance, the will of the majority may be defeated. The critical weakness of our electoral system is thus strikingly illustrated.

For years the Washington Post has been urging Congress to throw safeguards around this Achilles' heel in our representative government by constitutional amendment. We are confident that the people would vote overwhelmingly for confirmation in the basic law of the right they have been exercising to elect their own President. What is needed, in our opinion, is a new constitutional provision that would divide the electoral votes of each State among the candidates in the same proportion as the ballots actually cast are divided. That would preserve the present relative influence of each State in the choice of the President while at the same time eliminating opportunities for finagling. Incidentally, it would recover for the South much of the influence and prestige it now loses by having its electoral votes automatically counted in the Democratic column. For minority protest votes would then count against the most favored candidate to the extent of their actual number.

Of course, nothing can be done in time to affect the 1948 election. But Congress can and should set up a commission of experts to work out a foolproof electoral system. If the revolt in the South inspires action in this direction, it will have at least one constructive result.

What Is Our Foreign Policy—Why Are We Rebuilding Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following speech that I will make over radio station WWJ in Detroit, Mich., on Monday, March 1, as follows:

What is our foreign policy? Why are we rebuilding Germany? Why does everyone talk of war instead of peace? These are questions that are being asked most frequently by my constituents. People are deeply disturbed and rightly so, and I believe that every Congressman should speak up frankly and honestly. I do not like our foreign policy and I believe that it leads to war.

I voted against the Greek-Turkish loan and I shall vote against the Marshall plan.

I have repeatedly expressed my opposition to the rebuilding of a strong and militaristic Germany. I believe that money for European recovery should go first to those countries that suffered the most in this war at the hands of the Nazis. The present policy divides Europe into east and west blocs, giving the western bloc forty billions of our dollars, as against one and one-half billions for the countries of eastern and central Europe, which countries lost over 35,000,000 people killed, and suffered twice as much destruction to their cities and villages and to their factories and farms. Most people are amazed to hear this and ask, Who is responsible?

I blame it on the present bipartisan government, which is the result of the 1946 elections, wherein the people gave a Republican Congress to a Democratic President.

The Republicans brought in Herbert Hoover and John Foster Dulles as their leaders and spokesmen. Hoover and Dulles brought in Dillon, Read & Co., international bankers, and all of their cartellists and monopolist friends, and poor old General Marshall, who is a good and sincere man, is being shunted aside and the program is becoming a part of a plan to revive Germany as the great industrial center of a European military bloc, that will restore back into power the European monopolists, cartellists, royalists, and landed aristocracy. That's why the Republican Herter plan calls for the removal of the program from General Marshall and the State Department. It is to be administered by someone approved by this Republican Congress. General Marshall will be used until Congress appropriates the money so that the big boys can get their hands on it.

Never have the American people been so high-pressured by such a tremendous propaganda campaign as they are at this time to pour out their billions in tax dollars.

A scare psychology. This is "aid to stop communism." Anything to bribe us into this deal.

To make factories run, you must have energy. Europe's source of energy is coal. The two greatest suppliers of coal for Europe are the United States of America and Poland. The Ruhr should be No. 1 source of supply. But Ruhr coal is being hoarded for Germany, only about 5,000,000 tons of this coal was made available for other nations. Poland exported about 30,000,000 tons. Seventy-five percent of Polish export coal went to western European nations, such as Austria, eastern Germany, Italy, France, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, England, Czechoslovakia. Poland's request for $60,000,000 to modernize her coal-mining equipment has not been acted upon. Why? Are the proponents sincere in their desire to rebuild Europe, or are they just interested in rebuilding Germany?

Is it not their purpose to withhold recovery in Europe until Germany has complete industrial domination again and the big boys can make their billions?

Recently, Senator TAFT made a pitiful plea for the poor Nazis' standing trial at Nuremberg. On February 24, before the Economic Club at Detroit, he was sorry that Germany had to surrender unconditionally. He deplored reparations and any plan that might adversely affect German economy. He deplored the UNRRA aid that was given to our battered allies, and he was opposed to granting a Polish loan for coal-mining machinery. And Senator TAFT is not the only Republican weeping tears for poor Germany and the monopolists.

Not one kind word for the victims of German Nazi brutality! Not one kind thought to aid them in their struggle for reconstruction! Not even a thought for Europe's orphaned and destitute children!

After a hard struggle last year, we managed to squeeze out a bare $40,000,000 for the United Nation's Children's Relief Fund. Only $15,000,000 of this money has actually gone to the children's fund. Many private and charitable organizations are now seeking private donations to the extent of $60,000,000 to implement this meager and inadequate fund.

Yes, billions for Germany, billions for European politics, billions for militarism! For the poor, for the unfortunate, for the victims of Nazi aggression, not a kind word, not a dollar, just a stone-deaf ear!

In Palestine we see a continuation of this policy. Human beings, they mean nothing. Profits from oil—that's what counts. There we have a policy laid down by American and British oil monopolists. That 10,000,000 Jews were killed, tortured, placed in slave labor camps, and now that the remaining few would like to go to their homeland in Palestine, that all means nothing. Money, profits, bigger and better monopolies, and bigger and better cartel agreements, even if made with the devil, yes, that's what counts.

Well, isn't President Truman responsible for this foreign policy? No, my friends. It's the voters, who in 1946 gave to the Nation a bipartisan government. They gave to the international bankers, monopolists, cartellists and militarists a fertile field to work in.

Today, paid newspaper columnists and radio commentators are reeking with pro-German propaganda. In 1945 they would not have dared to do it, because the stench from the cremated bodies at Oswiecim, Treblinka, Buchenwald, Dachau, and Belsen, was still fresh in the nostrils of the people. Then many an American mother was weeping for her boy killed in Italy, France, Germany, and in the Pacific.

At that time these Germany-firsters had to lie low, but now they are all out in the open, white-washing the terrible crimes of the Germans, and are creating a political climate that is ripe for the betrayal of our loyal friends and allies.

We must remember that Germany remains a spawning ground for lust, for conquest. They are not sorry for their sins, they are only sorry that they lost the war, and they hate Hitler not because he waged this brutal war, but because he was not victorious.

These Germany-firsters are trying to keep Germany's war potential intact. They are trying to keep Ruhr coal in Germany so that her neighbors cannot restore their destroyed industry. They are trying to protect Nazi war criminals. Yes; they are planning on partnership and business arrangements and to participate in German industry and German profits.

Our policy toward Germany is important because what we do in Germany will ultimately determine whether Europe and the United States can go forward in peace, prosperity, and security. For centuries, Germany's neighbors have been slaughtered and butchered by German militarists. Now, even many Germans are demanding that the German warmongers, those wealthy German families like Krupp-Von Bohlen und Halbach, Mannesman, Stinnes, Klockner, all those who owned the heavy war industries, the Vereingte, Stahlwerke and the coal mines, be dispossessed of their holdings, and that these properties be nationalized. Why shouldn't they be permitted to do so? Perhaps there would be no money in it for the monopolists and cartellists, is the right answer.

As to our policy in the Pacific, we hear Senator KNOWLAND, the wealthy California Republican, shouting that the United States is promoting socialism in Japan, by breaking up the industrial and financial combines owned by a few rich "Zaibatsu" families in that country. Senator KNOWLAND and American big business interests would keep on top the Jap warmonger families who misruled and enslaved their people and who together with the militarists attacked China, Pearl Harbor, and the Philippines.

We must see to it that big business does not resume its prewar "international cartel" ties with the industrial and financial combines of Germany, Italy, Japan, and other nations. It was these foreign industrialists and financiers who, with the help of American international bankers and American corporations, put Hitler and Mussolini in power, used the Japanese Emperor as their puppet, militarized their nations, destroyed trade-unions and democracy, and plunged the world into a bloody war.

The desires and hopes of the people of Europe, Asia, and the United States are all the same. Liberty, freedom, democracy—better living conditions. They want neither to go left nor right. But they are squeezed and shoved from the middle of the road that they desire to follow.

Just recently we heard the Minister of Bulgaria propose an alliance of the 100,000,000 people that live in the Balkans and the eastern and central European states. Moscow squelched the idea immediately. Why? Because she was afraid that such an alliance might turn against her. Yet to these same nations and these same people we refuse to loan a dollar, and tell them to go to Russia for help. Why? Because Churchill and Hoover told us that they were behind an iron curtain and that they are satellites. Now just recently Churchill and Hoover have played their trump card. They propose to militarize and arm the western bloc. Will they succeed? I don't think so.

European economy requires cooperation between eastern and western European countries. Trade agreements have already been completed between most of the European countries. Nationalization or socialization of heavy industries, utilities, transportation, shall continue. The era of kings, queens, dukes, and princes has come to an end—even in Greece the German King will have to abdicate. The days of the landed aristocracy of Europe are over.

Must we have wars with countries because they go socialistic? I say "No." Can we do business with socialistic countries? I say "Yes."

Should we release the gold that we are holding that belongs to socialistic countries? I say "Yes."

Secretary of Commerce Harriman, banker and railroad magnate, says that no credits will be granted to Socialist countries. Well, I say that he is wrong. We cannot turn the clock back. After the First World War many crowns toppled, the Hohenzollerns, the Czars, the Hapsburgs, the Ottoman Empire. After this war more and greater changes have taken place.

We should insist that assistance be given first to our allies—those nations in eastern or western Europe who suffered the most and were devastated the most by the Fascists and the Nazis;

That relief be handled through established charitable organizations with no political strings attached;

That all credits and loans be used for economic reconstruction and peaceful purposes, and not for military armaments;

That we work to restore the UN to greater power, not to by-pass it; in fact, the whole recovery program should be worked out through the UN.

The hour is late, but the fight for peace and security can still be won. It remains for all of us to join hands as we did during the war years and demand that our Government get back on the right track.

Lift Arms Embargo—Support of Partition of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, support of the United Nations' partition of the Holy Land by lifting the United States embargo against the shipment of arms to Jews in Palestine is essential to world peace. Paul E. Fitzpatrick, chairman of

the Democratic State committee, declared today in a four-point program submitted to the New York State congressional delegation.

Such positive action, Mr. Fitzpatrick pointed out, would go far toward backing up President Truman's declaration February 12 that the United States is supporting the UN settlement, and would reenforce Secretary George C. Marshall's statement the day before that no change in our policy of support is contemplated.

Emphasizing that American troops are neither necessary nor desired, the New York State chairman strongly urged that the United States also support UN proposals for a voluntary police force, and clearly warn Great Britain against any scuttling of the partition.

His recommendations supplemented a proposed joint resolution introduced in the New York State Legislature Tuesday by the Democratic Party, calling on Congress to lift the arms embargo.

Mr. Fitzpatrick's complete statement follows:

The New York State Democratic Committee is heartily in accord with President Truman's statement that the United States support the United Nations' settlement of the Palestine issue. We welcome the assurance from Secretary of State George C. Marshall that this Government contemplates no change in support of that decision.

We are convinced that such support is essential to the future if not the very life of the United Nations as an instrument for the peaceful settlement of disputes. We also believe, however, that such support must be positive and real for those defending the United Nations' decision against aggressors who would ignore that decision and nullify it.

We therefore respectfully but strongly recommend that the members of the New York State delegation in Congress actively support a program that would:

1. Bolster the United Nations in this, its first important decision, lest its effectiveness for peace be destroyed.

2. Lift the United States arms embargo so that Jews can defend the decision of the United Nations within Palestine against Arab aggression.

3. Inform the British Government clearly that this Government will not tolerate scuttling of the partition.

4. Support proposals by the UN Palestine Commission made to the Security Council that a voluntary police force be sent into Palestine. It is not necessary to send United States forces for Palestine does not want American troops.

The New York State Democratic Committee sincerely believes that the above program is the only real way to back up President Truman and reinforce Secretary Marshall, in their aim to safeguard the United Nations and world peace.

Racine, Wis., Memorial to Veterans of World War II First in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on this coming Memorial Day the first memorial to veterans of World War II will be dedicated at Racine, Wis. This memorial has been erected in Mound Cemetery. It is the gift of Mr. William R. Wadewitz, himself a veteran of World War I, as a member of that famous Thirty-second Division, and with which he served with honor and distinction.

Mr. Speaker, this memorial is to perpetuate the memory of 375 Racine County veterans who gave their last full measure of devotion in the hope that a just and lasting peace might be achieved. The people of Racine County will always honor and revere their memory. Likewise, they appreciate the gift by Mr. Wadewitz of this fine memorial, for it will be a living witness to his patriotism and civic-mindedness.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the following article, which appeared in the Racine Journal-Times of February 20, 1948, pertinent to this subject:

GIFT OF WAR DEAD MEMORIAL TO BE DEDICATED ON MAY 30

To perpetuate the memory of 375 Racine County veterans who lost their lives in World War II, a Court of Honor will be dedicated in Graceland Cemetery on Memorial Day, May 30.

The Court of Honor includes a plot, large enough at present for 450 graves, and a Veterans' Memorial Shelter. The shelter was constructed as the gift of William R. Wadewitz, vice president of Western Printing & Lithographing Co., who is starting his sixth term on the Racine Board of Cemetery Commissioners. The plot is so constructed that 1,500 graves can be added.

PLOT HAS GARDEN EFFECT

The shelter was designed by Hoffman & Schneider, Racine architects, and was constructed by Johnson & Henrickson. It is 122 by 13 feet in size with two galleries or wings, each 25 feet long, and it is entered by circular steps which can be used as a stage. It is constructed of Lannon stone with Bedford facings and trimmings, slate roof and flooring, and oak panelled ceilings.

On an elevation facing the south, the stone shelter can be seen from all parts of the cemetery. Block 15, set aside by the city in 1945 for the dead of World War II, has been landscaped on designs of Hare & Hare, Kansas City, who originally designed the cemetery.

Six 20-year-old maple trees are being moved to the site which is bisected by red granite walks. Shrubbery and grass will add to the beauty of the plot when it is completed and the artificial lake adds to the picture. A large flag staff has been erected there. Graves will not be in rotation but on a garden design.

HONOR LOLL A FEATURE

Central feature in the main shelter will be the honor roll on which will be listed the name of each of the Racine county veterans who died in action or because of illness between the years 1941-'45. These will be carved in four plaques, 7 feet 6 inches by 2 feet 10 inches, of Tennessee marble. Cut over the north wall, which will carry the roll, is the inscription, "1941—They Gave the Last Full Measure of Their Devotion—1945" and over the four plaques will be the wording, "Racine County's World War II Honored Dead."

A further inscription, "Time shall not dim the glory of their dead," tops the entrance. On the east and west friezes are listed the battle areas in which these men saw service, so arranged that Pearl Harbor is the first and Japan the last.

VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Back of the building is the wording, "Memorial Court of Honor Dedicated to All Racine Veterans of World War II." A panel on the northeast bears the inscription, "God's Everlasting Peace to All Nations of the World," while that on the northwest panel bears lettering, "Presented to Racine by W. R. Wadewitz, Memorial Day, May 30, 1948."

Wadewitz, a veteran of World War I and one of the founders of the Racine Legion Drum and Bugle Corps, has been active in veterans' work for years. When the cemetery commission, on which he has served for 25 years, began considering a plot in Graceland Cemetery for dead of the recent war, he suggested that Superintendent Leroy Jerstad write to the original landscape architects, Hare & Hare, Kansas City, for suggestions.

These architects drafted designs for laying out the large plot which they featured with outlines of a shelter. The city council had given the commission authority to proceed with the landscaping which was done under the direction of Superintendent Jerstad.

WORK ON HONOR ROLL

When the place began to assume form, Jerstad asked the commissioners what to do about the shelter. It was then that Wadewitz announced that he and the Western Printing & Lithographing Co. would assume the costs.

The foundations were started last fall. The building was completed during the winter. It is expected that cutting of the honor roll of Racine's war dead on the plaques will be finished by Memorial Day.

FIRST IN NATION

Jerstad in commenting on the gift said, "Through the generosity of Mr. Wadewitz, Racine is the first city in the United States to be in a position to dedicate a memorial to its World War II dead by Memorial Day. This I know as a member of the National Cemetery Association which is devoting a special article to our memorial in its spring edition."

Washington Cooperative Farmers Association Resents Unfair Attacks on Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, one of the largest farm cooperatives in the Northwest is the Washington Cooperative Farmers Association of the State of Washington. Thirty thousand Washington State farm families own and patronize this great organization. They recently held their thirty-first annual meeting and passed two resolutions which I feel should be called to the attention of the House. This cooperative and other cooperatives in my State deeply resent the unfair attacks which are being made against our farmers. I heartily subscribe to the position taken by our Northwest farmer cooperatives.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following resolutions to be printed in the RECORD:

Resolution on financial contributions to NTEA

Whereas our association and other farmer cooperatives have made their records of receipts and disbursements for the last 12 years available to the House Small Business Committee; and

Whereas that committee has officially requested the National Tax Equality Association to furnish to it the names of the contributors to the National Tax Equality Association and records of its receipts and disbursements for the past 2 years; and

Whereas the public in general and farmers in particular are entitled to know who seek to destroy farmer cooperatives and to divide and alienate segments of private industry of this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of Washington Cooperative Farmers Association, assembled at their thirty-first annual meeting, vigorously urge that the Congress of the United States take action to require the National Tax Equality Association to furnish to the Congress the names and addresses of each and every contributor and the amount contributed by each to the National Tax Equality Association during the past 2 years, together with a complete record of all receipts and disbursements for the like period.

Resolution on planks in party platform

Whereas farmer cooperative associations have been recognized and encouraged by the American people in the public interest under the administrations of the Federal Government by both the great political parties of the United States; and

Whereas for many years the Democratic and Republican Parties have recognized by their actions the fundamental right of farmers to cooperatively market their own farm products and cooperatively purchase their own farm supplies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of Washington Cooperative Farmers Association, assembled in their thirty-first annual meeting, hereby call upon the leadership of both great political parties to reaffirm, by platform pledge and prompt affirmative performance, their belief and faith in farmer cooperative associations; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of Washington Cooperative Farmers Association denounce the activities of those individuals who have violated the pledges of their parties by attempting to cripple agricultural credit and seeking to destroy the right of farmers to cooperatively market their own products and to cooperatively purchase their own farm supplies.

Amos Richard Webber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lorain (Ohio) Journal of February 26, 1948:

AMOS RICHARD WEBBER

Some years ago the editors of Who's Who in America wrote Judge A. R. Webber for information concerning himself.

He complied only on condition that the biographical sketch include the statement that, as a Congressman, he introduced the first prohibition bill to make the District of Columbia dry.

It was not so much that he was proud of the furor his bill caused in Washington more than 40 years ago. He was concerned with the importance of the issue, rather than the part he played in making it a vital force in the Nation for so many years. Judge Webber was a sincere as well as a vigorous advocate of prohibition. And it was for that that he was known and respected throughout Ohio, even among those not in accord with his views on prohibition.

He insisted that alcohol had no place in either good being or good living, and during his more than a decade on the common pleas bench of Lorain County he frequently posed for photographers in his court with a glass of water in his hand.

Now he is dead. The marvelously durable heart and body that outlasted his family and his associates ran down at 96.

Until the day of his final illness, he practiced what he preached, which was to live simply, maintain good habits and keep busy. He was a total abstainer from the use of tobacco and intoxicating liquor and believed the way to start the day right was to arise early.

For most of his 96 years he was a power and an influence in and out of public office. As county prosecutor, Congressman, and judge he gave a great part of his life to public service. Even after his retirement at 83, he refused to be idle and persisted in his writing. He wrote four books, all of them after reaching 70. His purpose was not profit, but, as he himself expressed it, "to keep alive the names and good deeds of our forefathers to whom we owe so much."

It is not strange that he should have written of the hardy pioneers who carved the Western Reserve from the Ohio wilderness. His grandfather came from Massachusetts, purchased 125 acres of solid woods in Medina County, put up a log house, and felled and burned trees in order to make room to plant corn.

Many honors came to Judge Webber. None of these did he prize more than the tribute paid him by members of the county bar association on the occasion of his eightieth birthday, when he was called from his bench in court and presented with a metal card, rolled out of gold coins, as a testimonial to his "integrity, wisdom, and leadership."

Baldwin-Wallace College, from which he graduated in 1876, honored him twice in recent years, conferring on him the honorary degree of doctor of laws in 1935 and presenting him a special centennial merit award in 1946 when the institution celebrated its hundredth anniversary.

On this occasion, Judge Webber expressed the philosophy of almost a century of living. "I became convinced many years ago," he said, "that true success is never attained in accumulating dollars or holding official positions, from the President down, unless the recipient of such earthly honors uses them in accordance with the divine teachings."

Power and Water Shortage in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which gives further indication of the water shortage in California and of the power shortage which follows from it. Every resident of the district which I represent is feeling the effects of this shortage.

The article which is taken from the Oakland Post Enquirer of February 25, 1948, follows:

BEGIN OAKLAND DIM-OUT TONIGHT

At midnight tonight Oakland and the rest of California from the Oregon border to the Tehachapis will be darkened by an emergency brown-out on orders issued by the State public utilities commission to save electricity.

The drastic action—reminiscent of wartime power restrictions—was forced by one of the worst winter droughts in California's history which has brought on an electric-power crisis.

The commission called for a 10-percent reduction in consumption of electrical energy by all classes of power users, including householders.

All outdoor lighting, except theater marquees, was banned. Floodlighting of outdoor sports events was cut in half. Street lighting will be curtailed.

The commission, after an emergency hearing in San Francisco yesterday, ordered seven utility companies to shut off the electricity of any violator after 3 days' notice. This measure will be invoked only against commercial users.

Persuasion will be used against household violators.

Specifically, the program—which is expected to continue at least until autumn rains next fall—provides:

1. The seven power companies will furnish up to 90 percent of their present delivery for commercial, residential, and agricultural uses, and up to 60 percent for outdoor displays and advertising.

2. The companies will cut their frequencies from 60 cycles to 59½ cycles for the entire 24-hour period instead of 8 hours as has been the case recently. Voltage will be reduced by 5 percent.

3. New businesses and new customers will receive only minimum service essential for public health and safety. New lighting for outdoor sports, signboards, and exterior lighting will be prohibited.

4. Residential customers must use 10 percent less electricity. The commission may demand greater cuts if conditions warrant.

5. All agricultural pumping plant operation shall be prohibited during peak power use hours. Kilowatt-hour consumption shall be reduced by about 10 percent.

6. Special establishments other than theaters may be permitted one formal indentification sign from sunset until closing. Theaters may use marquee signs indicating current and coming attractions only. Under-marquee lighting must be reduced 50 percent.

7. Sports floodlighting must not be turned on until 8 p. m. and must be limited to half the amount used the same month a year ago.

8. Street lighting, except for all-night safety lights, shall be prohibited.

Southern California was excepted from the order because it gets electric power from the Hoover Dam.

No termination date was set for the order affecting the drought area, but commission officials predicted the shortage will last until fall. Only abnormal spring rains and adoption of daylight saving time may ease the crisis, the commission said, but not enough to end the dimout.

The commission urged the State legislature to adopt daylight saving time as another measure to save electricity. State Senator Gerald J. O'Gara, of San Francisco, announced he would ask the legislature convening March 1 to enact a daylight saving law.

The Pattern of Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the New York Times of February 27, 1948, entitled "The Pattern of Conquest":

THE PATTERN OF CONQUEST

Shocked by the Communist coup d'état in Czechoslovakia into their first joint action on Russo-Communist expansion, the Governments of the United States, Britain, and France have condemned what they characterize bluntly as the establishment of a one-party dictatorship disguised under the cloak of a government of national union. They are conferring on the advisability of refusing to recognize this new regime. But neither of these steps, reminiscent of similar protests against Hitler's methods, will stop the course of events. Nor will they dispel the fear that is stalking through Europe, where other nations feel themselves to be the next potential victims. But they do reveal that the last stubborn illusions are falling, that world opinion is at last beginning to crystallize, and that out of this process is emerging the realisation that appeasement still carries its own penalty, and that doing business with Stalin is just as dangerous and as profitless as it was with Hitler.

Like Hitler, Stalin has been taking over one country after another, sometimes by direct conquest, as in the cases of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; sometimes by traitorous fifth columns backed by Russian troops or commissars, as in the cases of Poland, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and now Czechoslovakia. Today, Stalin's acquisitions already amount to more than four times those of Hitler prior to the war, and, like Hitler, he is reaching out for more.

Equally striking is the virtual identity of the methods by which both the Nazis and the Communists attained power, as exemplified especially in Czechoslovakia, whose directed democracy was comparable with that of the German Republic. Both began as small parties able to flourish under ultra-democratic proportional representation, but determined to use democratic methods only for the destruction of democracy, and making no secret of the fact. Hitler served early notice that once he was in power heads will roll, and Gottwald, his Czech counterpart, told Benes and his followers long ago that he would break their necks. Despite this, both Hitler and Gottwald were made heads of government with the cooperation of the parties they had vowed to destroy. And once in office they undertook to capture the state from within.

First they took over the police and made it a party instrument for the extension of their power and the terrorization of the opposition. Then they neutralized the army by putting in command officers loyal to themselves and, in the case of Czechoslovakia, pledging the army to loyalty to the Soviet Union. With these two instruments of power in hand, they began to regiment the population. They took over the Ministry of Propaganda, or Information, and with it control of the radio and the film industry. They restricted freedom of the press by taking control of the supply of paper and by compelling all journalists to join a union under Communist control. They took over control of industry—Hitler by organizing it into associations under Nazi domination, Gottwald by nationalizing it and organizing an armed workers militia to guard it. They conscripted labor, put all labor unions into one labor front under their control, and thereby obtained control of every worker's job and livelihood, with power to penalize any worker who dared to oppose them. Finally, national socialism in Germany and communism in Czechoslovakia resembled each other even in the matter of a racial policy: Hitler turned against the Jews in the name of pan-Germanism and the Slav Communists against the Germans and Hungarians in the name of pan-Slavism.

It seems amazing that, having seen these things happen in Germany under Hitler, the Czech leaders and parties still dedicated to democracy should have permitted them to happen in Czechoslovakia—going along step by step, making one concession after another, until they were powerless to resist.

That in itself is a warning to all countries still under the delusion that they can cooperate with Communists without signing their own death warrant.

What Is Our Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to submit the following newspaper article from the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., of date February 29, 1948, as follows:

WHAT IS OUR POLICY?

On Tuesday of last week our representative in the United Nations said that this Government was prepared to enter into consultations looking toward the sending to Palestine of a UN force, presumably including both American and Russian troops, to maintain peace. Two days later, Secretary of State Marshall asked Congress to appropriate $275,000,000—this in addition to the $400,000,000 already provided—for Greece and Turkey. The additional money is to be used to provide military assistance to the Governments of Greece and Turkey in an effort to keep those countries from being overrun by the Russians and their Communist stooges in the satellite nations.

If this can be called a national policy, what kind of policy is it?

The Star has supported the policy of assisting Greece and Turkey. And it continues to support that policy in the belief that our vital national interests and our national security would be gravely threatened if those strategically placed countries should be taken over by the aggressive Communist fifth columns, aided by outside forces.

When one looks at a map, however, the logic, if any, of spending $675,000,000 to keep the Communists out of Greece and Turkey, while pursuing at the same time a policy which would bring the Russian Army into Palestine, is utterly incomprehensible to the lay mind. For once the Russians are in Palestine, they have outflanked Greece and Turkey. And once those countries are outflanked by the Red Army they are done for.

Surely, this seemingly contradictory policy ought to be explained, if any explanation is possible. But no one in an official position has offered a word of explanation. On the face of the matter, the American people, at considerable expense, are being asked to march up the hill in Greece and Turkey, and to march down again in Palestine. It is doubtful that they will be willing to accede for long to any such request. To the layman it does not make sense, and a policy which, on its face, does not make sense, is going to be hard to sell to the people of this country.

In the letter accompanying the request for additional funds, General Marshall said that the Communists, in their ambition to dominate Greece and Turkey, are convinced that time will play into their hands. To this might be added the thought that the Communists may be convinced that not only time, but also American policy, will play into their hands.

ERP Should Not Subsidize European Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems in the European recovery program, as the bill is now written, is that it would impose further socialization of the 16 European countries who are to be the beneficiaries under the act. I have informed my constituents that I will not support any program which will further the cause of socialism in Europe. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 Mr. Merwin K. Hart, president of the National Economic Council, delivered a radio address on the subject Let's Not Subsidize European Socialism.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including his address at this point:

You and I want to see the United States help European countries, but not at the cost of our own economic stability, our own liberties, our own Republican form of government. To give help to other countries is nothing new for Americans. We have long shared with other peoples the benefits of our private enterprise.

But unless the Marshall plan is drastically revised, then, instead of helping to establish freedom in western Europe, we will merely promote socialism, and socialism is unsound and will end in economic and political bondage.

The February 14 issue of the London Economist, Great Britain's leading financial weekly, says, Britain faces bankruptcy. That is part of an editorial entitled "On the Rocks."

Kenneth de Courcy, of London, in the February issue of his Review of World Affairs, speaking of Britain, said:

"The immediate economic prospects could scarcely be graver. Whether they are going to be felt to the extreme point depends almost entirely upon the degree of further American aid."

If you or I had a friend in financial straits, we'd do two things—first relieve his pressing needs and then look into his business methods; and if we found his methods impractical, before we came around with more solid support, we'd demand he adopt a sounder plan.

Well, our friend Britain is in just this predicament—as are also certain other European countries. Britain asked help 2 years ago, and we gave her nearly $4,000,000,000. That was to last 5 years and put her on her feet. But it was nearly gone in a year.

Britain is in worse shape today because her methods are unsound.

It's as simple as that. Just before we gave her the four billions Britain had decided to discard the private-enterprise system and to substitute socialism. Under socialism, the responsibility of individuals is scrapped, except for a few intellectuals who tell everybody what to do, and the people are invited to stop worrying and lean on the government.

Socialism has never succeeded in supporting a people. Ambition languishes. Nobody gets ahead, no matter how hard he works. And so nobody tries.

And today's misguided British leaders, while they and other European countries are asking you American taxpayers to give them $17,000,000,000, defiantly insist they will go ahead with their socialism. They will continue to nationalize their industries. They will proceed with such schemes as putting all British doctors on the public pay roll, and furnishing free medical treatment to everybody, even though a few days ago 89 percent of all British doctors said they were against it.

Now the giving of seventeen billions to Europe is the object of the Marshall plan. The Senate is beginning to debate it. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs has not yet acted. There is still time for you, Mr. and Mrs. Citizen, to do something about this.

If you don't act, then the Congress under the pressure of propaganda, will pass this Marshall plan as is. And President Truman has asked Congress for practically unlimited power to impose wartime controls. Perhaps you like rationing and standing in line and black markets.

In short, the Marshall plan is a scheme to finance socialism in Europe, to put socialism thoroughly on its feet. And to do it we will probably go Socialist ourselves. For once we go back to wartime controls, in peacetime, we may never see the end of them.

If we could teach Europe what free enterprise has done for us, what it can do for them, we would be doing far more than the mere giving of goods and dollars. We ought to cease our silly attitude that to make conditions for giving or lending money is indelicate. Your banker and mine do not hesitate to make conditions when we ask for a loan. We should get down to realities and tell these countries, as a condition, to reopen the door to free enterprise.

So keen are the British Socialists over the Marshall plan that they have called a Marshall plan conference of European Socialists to meet in London in March.

Some defenders of the Marshall plan say the Socialists are on our side in the struggle against communism. But socialism and communism are much alike. Both are Marxist. Both are opposed to capitalism and free enterprise. Both want to abolish private property—both discourage initiative—destroy incentive. They want to take the steam out of the steam engine.

Mr. Marshall has said that our policy is not directed against any country or doctrine.

But we ought to be against a doctrine that means the destruction of free institutions. But not being against socialism, we are inviting disaster upon Europe and eventually upon the whole world.

Perhaps no American industry has rendered greater service to the people than the oil industry. Yet a bill has been introduced in Congress to put the oil industry under Government control.

Excessive steel and other exports to Europe for their own use and benefit have handicapped the oil industry. Due to these exports there haven't been enough tankers to take the oil north. Already, without any Marshall plan, many of our people have been threatened with cold and hunger. Through industry cooperation and through assisting the fuel coordinators, this unregulated industry has ably met the crisis.

But how able to serve the American people do you think the oil industry would be under Government control? Yet this and more socialistic threats to American industry will come if the Marshall plan goes through.

And how much more financial strain can the United States stand? Are we to give Europe a book of blank checks on what is left of American savings?

It is unsafe to believe Soviet Russia is really against the Marshall plan despite appearances and despite the propaganda. The Communists are for anything that weakens us as a free enterprise nation. The United States is "the number one target of Soviet Russia"—George Dimitrov, exiled Bulgarian peasant leader, told a congressional committee that only last week. Since the Soviets could today seize all Europe up to the Pyrenees, why would they not wait until America had spent its seventeen billions building up Europe's plant and equipment?

In addition to the financial burden, the Marshall plan would give one more grant of unlimited power to the President. The bill authorizes the Administrator to employ personnel for duty outside the United States without regard to the law limiting the number of persons who may be employed in the Government.

As though we do not have enough bureaucrats today.

Since both experience and prudence prompt us to make sure what we do will be of value, the Marshall plan should be amended in these ways:

First. Every country, in order to receive its benefits, must fully abandon all further schemes to nationalize industry or to promote socialistic activities, and must stop all present socialistic plans that can be stopped.

Second. The aid given should be limited to food and supplies vitally necessary to help bring western European plant and equipment back to prewar status only. We can't afford to make the proposed grand gesture of building European industry up to 30 percent above prewar level.

Third. The whole project of aiding Europe should be placed in the hands of a commission, the chairman and a substantial majority of whom shall be business men with a record of high achievement in private enterprise. They should be men who believe in private enterprise and in the incentive system, and are convinced that recovery can come only through production. The chairman should be given Cabinet rank and serve directly under the President. Our purpose should be frankly to convert Europe back to private enterprise.

Fourth. Spain should be included among the countries to be offered aid in any plan adopted. Spain with moderate commercial loans can soon help in the rehabilitation of Europe. Spain is a good credit risk; never in her history has she defaulted on a foreign loan. And in event of war, Spain would be our most powerful ally on the Continent of Europe.

Some years ago Betrand de Jouvenel, a Frenchman, lived in Washington as a newspaperman. He came up the hard way, but he got to know America well. Recently, after another visit to this country, he wrote a friend:

"My main impression, after visiting America, is that production can do for the worker what socialism can only promise. While Europe has been losing its time and strength with paper reforms, commerce has provided America with the means of decent living for everyone."

Why can't Europe learn the secret of how the United States has been able to achieve so much? Here come 16 nations of Europe, all Socialist in varying degrees, asking us to help them. If we had not had our private-enterprise system all these years, we couldn't do it.

Mr. and Mrs. Citizen, if you don't care enough about private enterprise to defend it against Marxism, then there is nothing for you to do. But if you do care, and I know you do, you better tell your Congressman what you think about this Marshall plan.

Let's get down to fundamental realities in our next grant of aid to Europe.

Let's be a sympathetic and generous banker, on businesslike terms, to the rest of a world that is willing to work and to open its doors to the ways of freedom.

Let's not accept the Marshall plan, as is. Let's amend it to conform with what we have learned from our own experience. Let's not invest private-enterprise earnings in Socialist schemes. We'll only throw money away.

In his Farewell Address to the American people, George Washington, whose birthday we have just celebrated, said to his fellow citizens:

"The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings, and success."

Let's not permit steps to be taken that will destroy our American heritage.

America's Postwar Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members regarding the current situation and future prospects of the American merchant marine, I include herein extracts from a number of articles published in the February 1948 issue of the Marine News, one of the leading publications of the American shipping world, edited by Commander Wendell Phillips Dodge, a well-known authority on shipping affairs.

Mr. Andrew W. Robertson, chairman of the board of the Westinghouse Electric Corp.—also a member of the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine—writes under the heading entitled "The Need of American Passenger Ships," as follows:

If we lived in a storybook "one world" of brotherly love, it might be safe for the United States to be without passenger ships; but in the world as we know it today, with its international problems aggravated by the aftermath of the war and the lack of friendliness between people, it is foolhardy for the United States to be without the necessary ships to carry its citizens wherever they wish to go. If it were not so serious, it would be comic to picture the all-important role the United States is playing in world economy at the present time in contrast to its pitifully weak position in the maritime passenger-carrying field.

Every day the newspapers print statements to the effect that America must spend vast sums to relieve the distress of Europe to the end that the people of Europe may thereby be saved from communism. There is a broad insinuation in the discussion that it might be necessary to use force. This cold war of supplying aid and comfort to our openly avowed friends and denying it to our less openly avowed enemies may well burst into a shooting war. If that happens we would find ourselves without adequate passenger vessels to aid in troop transportation. In other words, if we had to fight another war, we would be handicapped because of a lack of passenger ships, notwithstanding the hundreds of naval vessels and cargo ships we have built. And the next time, perhaps we could not rely on the *Queen Mary* and the

Queen Elizabeth to carry thousands of troops quickly from port to port.

This is a brief picture of our need for passenger ships for national security.

The complete lack of appreciation of the need of passenger ships by a great majority of our people is paradoxical in the light of the well-known American urge to excel in the mechanical arts. During the war we demonstrated that we not only have everything available to build ships so far as materials are concerned, but we also have the required skill and know-how to build ships better and faster than the master builders of other lands. We discuss in academic terms the need of selling surplus goods abroad, but pay no heed to the matter of the ships necessary to carry American citizens engaged in world trade. When we think of the matter at all, we seem to have a childlike faith that somehow, someway, the necessary ships to carry our people will be provided. * * *

Our neglect of the sea amounts almost to an aversion. Like some animals, we do not like water. As a common practice our sons do not go down to the sea in ships. Our daughters, unlike Helen of Greece, could no doubt start a million automobiles, but the best of them could not launch a dozen American ships, not because our women are not beautiful and exert a powerful influence but because, as a people, we prefer the land and are woefully ignorant of maritime affairs.

To make matters worse, we supplement our lack of interest in ocean travel by creating all sorts of difficulties for the few who make a living by operating ships. For instance, our standards of safety are higher than those required by other nations. Our standards of comfort and space for the crews of our ships are also higher than those of any other nation. Our laws limiting hours of labor add greatly to the expense of operating American ships. At the present time these cumulative costs make the operation of an American ship twice as expensive as the most expensively operated foreign ship. These are difficult conditions to overcome, but they must be overcome if we are to have American passenger ships. These extra expenses are largely due to the attitude of our people, either as expressed in their laws or interpretation of public opinion. And since the public is responsible for the expense, it is inevitable that the public must pay the cost. This means, of course, a subsidy of some kind. This has been a common practice for years, so that the present question is not so much one of a subsidy or not a subsidy but rather the amount of the subsidy.

Following Mr. Robertson's article is one by myself, headed "Ocean shipping and the European recovery program," which says in part:

The funeral of an adequate American merchant marine has been arranged by the State Department. The pallbearers may well be some 16 foreign nations. The dirge is misleading propaganda. The mourners will all be Americans. The outline of a European recovery program prepared under the direction of the State Department and submitted to Congress, aims a near mortal blow at our present merchant marine. It may be that Congress can save the patient's life and disappoint those who hopefully anticipate the reading of the last will and testament.

I favor reasonable help to western European nations, and to their citizens to enable them to regain their economic footing even though such help is an additional burden upon our taxpayers. But I do not comprehend, as a part of that help, a program which will strip us apart of our principal defense assets and will relegate our entire shipping industry to a very inferior standing among the fleets of the world.

Under the proposals of the State Department we shall sell to European nations some 200 oceangoing steamships and, in addition, transfer to them on a temporary basis up to 300 more bulk-cargo ships under bare-boat charter. In substance, this is a proposal to transfer 5,000,000 tons of American ships—about 25 percent of our reserve dry-cargo fleet to foreign nations under the Marshall plan. It is a proposal to transfer foreign about half as many ships as now constitute our entire privately owned ocean-going merchant marine.

This astonishing proposal has come forth even though the merchant fleets of the 16 Marshall plan nations will exceed the level of their prewar capacity when their present construction programs are completed. This proposal is made notwithstanding the fact that in 1951 these same nations expect to have 10,000,000 tons (over 20 percent) more shipping than they had prewar. It is made notwithstanding the fact that even after allowing excessively heavy withdrawals for obsolescence by 1951 they will still exceed their 1938 capacity by the equivalent of 750 ships of an average of 10,000 deadweight tons each. This proposal is made notwithstanding the fact that the United States has already made a material contribution toward increasing the postwar tonnage of these nations by selling them over 750 of our war-built ships.

Then follows a forthright article by Mr. George Killion, president of the American President Lines, under the title "United States Has Sunk to Seventh Place Among Nations of World in Ship Construction," stating in part:

I have been invited by the editor of Marine News to contribute a "forthright article pointing up the vital necessity for a strong American merchant marine."

To those of us in the shipping business and on the shipping-trade publications such an article seems as unnecessary as one on why food, sunshine, and fresh air are necessary to maintain life. Yet there are hundreds of thousands of good, sound, loyal American citizens living within the interior of our great country who have not the faintest idea why a large fleet of merchant ships should be maintained as a matter of national policy after a war is won.

While the conflict rages, yes. Everybody knows we need ships. We need them to transport troops, munitions, and supplies to battle areas; to fuel and service combat ships of the Navy, and to bring the boys home when the firing ceases. It has been said that most of our merchant seamen during the war hailed from the Middle West and other inland States, and because of this it was felt that the value of the merchant marine would be so impressed on everyone's mind that we simply could not let this important industry deteriorate again as we did after World War I.

But here we are in the same old doldrums. Shipyards are idle and rusting away, and the skilled hands that fitted ships for victory a few years back have of necessity gone into other occupations. Not a single passenger liner keel has been laid in an American yard since the war ended. The new luxury liner *President Cleveland*, recently turned out at Bethlehem-Alameda, and her sister ship, the *President Wilson*, still under construction, rose from keels laid during the war and were intended for troop transports.

Meanwhile Great Britain has no less than 125 ships presently under construction, and even the hard-pressed nations of France and Italy have 11 and 9 ships respectively on the ways. The United States, the wealthiest and most influential nation on earth, with 10,000 miles of coastline to protect, has sunk to seventh place among the nations of the world in new ship construction.

Why is it that we do not learn the lesson so clearly pointed by two world wars?

I believe that a large part of the fault lies within the industry itself. By industry I mean both shipbuilding and ship operation, not to mention all the allied concerns that have a collateral interest in one or more of the many phases of the maritime scene.

I believe that the maritime industry, in collaboration with the United States Maritime Commission and other interested Government bodies and officials must give unified, intelligent leadership to a campaign of public education concerning the merits and necessity of a strong American merchant marine as a continuing institution, in peacetime as in war.

I am convinced that unless the majority of our citizens can be persuaded, through common-sense logic and reasoning, that a strong American merchant marine is in the public interest; and these same citizens become articulate through their duly elected representatives in Washington, we shall just continue to muddle along as a third-rate power on the high seas.

We can trust the American people. They have never failed to respond favorably to an appeal which they believe to be in the public interest. A minority group of Americans know that we must have an adequate merchant marine both for reasons of national security and national economy. But the majority of our citizens do not understand this necessity. If they did, their will would be reflected in the Congress and we would have the necessary appropriations and legislation.

Mr. M. G. Gamble, general manager of marine department of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, writing on the topic of "Tanker Transportation," has this to say, in part:

The foremost question within the industry today on the subject of tankers is, "Are there enough tankers?" If there are, why are we experiencing such a transportation shortage as now exists? The correct answer to the first question, I believe, is that there are ample tankers in the world today. As of October 1, 1947, there were 96 United States Government-owned T-2-type vessels in tie-up, over and above nearly 200 in operation. In regard to the second question, the prolonged shipyard strike kept a substantial number of tankers out of service from July to November. Several months have been required in most cases to process the purchase by private industry of T-2's from the United States Maritime Commission. Also, both military and commercial requirements have proved to be far in excess of previously estimated needs. All these factors, I think, explain why, in spite of there being enough tankers over the longer term, we are at present handicapped by an artificial shortage of water transportation.

We understand that progress is now being made in returning all modern tankers formerly in tie-up to active operation and are pleased that steps are being taken to sell all United States Maritime Commission tankers promptly to private interests. However, it is difficult to foresee when all of these steps will be effective in remedying the situation because of the extent of the accumulated shortage. As vessels taken out of tie-up for sale or operation require repairs, the shipyard situation will largely govern the speed with which the shortage can be alleviated and finally overcome.

From a long-range standpoint, it is felt that building in Europe, which apparently is being greatly retarded by material and labor shortages, will not in itself provide all tonnage needed to keep pace with world requirements, and construction in United States yards will, therefore, be necessary.

For national defense purposes tankers should be fast, modern, and efficient in order to minimize the risk from enemy action and to insure prompt delivery of cargo. No less is this true for economical commercial operation. It is fortunate, therefore, that the Government has promoted sales to legitimate buyers for foreign registry, as this will provide an opportunity in the future for modernization of the United States-flag tanker fleet.

WAR CONSTRUCTION

The war resulted in the loss of about 40 percent of the prewar world-wide tanker fleet. However, it also had the effect of hastening the general utilization of larger and faster ships. For example, the average prewar American-flag tanker had a deadweight tonnage of about 11,500 tons and a speed of about 10 knots, whereas today the average American tanker has a deadweight of about 15,000 tons and a speed of 14 knots. In general, we might safely say that the size and speed of a tanker, within certain limits, are all-important in reducing operating costs. This is particularly true with today's high and rising costs.

Our Government constructed during the war about 9,000,000 tons of T-2 type tankers. These vessels have a deadweight of about 16,600 tons, a speed of 15 knots, and a capacity of 138,000 barrels of gasoline. In most trades oil can be transported in them about 25 percent cheaper than in a prewar 13,000-ton 12-knot tanker, and for about 30 to 40 percent less than on the old 11,000-ton vessels. Looking at this question in another way, it is estimated that out-of-pocket operating costs have about doubled since 1939. However, the increased size and speed of the modern fleet, with consequent increased haulage capacity, has fortunately reduced the cost per ton-mile, so that the effective rise on that basis has only been about 65 percent.

NEW TANKER TYPES

Inasmuch as it is obvious from the foregoing that large fast tankers are an answer to the high cost which owners—and, I might say, particularly American owners—are experiencing today, the question naturally arises as to how far one should go in this matter of size and speed.

"What's Ahead for the American Merchant Marine?" is the title of an article appearing in this issue of Marine News, by Mr. Howard P. Bish, manager of the aircraft, Federal and marine divisions of the General Electric Co., setting forth in part:

What is ahead for the American Merchant Marine? Last November 1, the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine made its official report to President Truman. This committee, composed of four nationally known and successful business leaders and a high-ranking naval officer, has performed a patriotic service by making a most careful and comprehensive study of this highly complicated and important problem. Its members have concluded "that a modern, efficient merchant fleet, and an effective and progressive shipbuilding industry are necessary economic adjuncts to the peacetime economy of the United States, despite the unavoidable present necessity of Government financial aid to maintain them." What makes this conclusion more potent is that it has been arrived at impartially by leaders who are not directly connected with either shipbuilding or the shipping industry.

Events of the past eight years have pushed us to the forefront of world leaders. Whether we, as placid, self-sufficient, self-satisfied citizens of the United States like it or not, we have arrived at a position of world leadership which places upon us responsibilities that we cannot avoid nor shirk. Our merchant fleet constitutes the life lines of our world commerce, and to place it largely in the hands of foreign nations, as we have in the past, is fraught with real danger.

Prior to World War I, and between the two World Wars, there were discriminations against our ships in many foreign ports which proved to be detrimental both to our economy and to our national safety. Certain nations practically closed their ports of call to our ships by discriminatory laws which helped them to build strong merchant fleets and tended to weaken our national defenses.

We came out of the war with well over 5,000 merchant ships, but the vast majority of these cannot compete economically with ships built since the war by other nations. Also, there are certain types of ships, such as passenger liners and combination cargo and passenger ships, which are vitally needed, but virtually none of which were constructed during the war.

Even before the war, the number of passenger liners and cargo-passenger vessels was pitifully inadequate from a security standpoint. At that time, there were only 118 vessels of these types in service. All were requisitioned for war duty. Thirty-one were lost during the war. Ten were sold to foreign operators, and 10 were retained by the Army or Navy. There are another 30 of these vessels now laid up because it is uneconomical to recondition them for further service. There remain, then, from the already inadequate 118-ship prewar fleet of passenger and cargo-passenger ships, only 37 vessels which will be in service when all reconditioning work on them has been accomplished. These 37 vessels have an average age of more than 18½ years.

Since the end of the war, 18 vessels of these types originally intended for war service have been converted during construction, and completed for commercial use. One more, the steamship *President Wilson*, is under construction. These, added to the 37 which remain from the prewar fleet of such vessels, bring our total postwar fleet of these types to less than half of the dangerously low number of passenger and cargo-passenger ships which we had in 1941. And yet, with the exception of the one vessel already mentioned, there are no ships of these types now under construction.

At present, only 32 ocean-going merchant vessels and four large dredges aggregating 200,000 gross tons are under construction in private yards. All of these vessels, half of which are for foreign owners, will be completed by the middle of 1948. By contrast, Great Britain currently is building more than 2,000,000 tons of merchant shipping and 125 of the vessels presently on the ways are passenger or cargo-passenger types.

"Don't Dump the Ships," is the title of another article by Mr. H. Myron Bull, president of A. H. Bull Steamship Co., in which he states:

The Government war-built fleet presented two contrasting possibilities for the American merchant marine—one good, one bad. The better ships furnished a substantially adequate supply for the rehabilitation of our pre-war fleets which were, for the most part, obsolete at the outbreak of the war and lost or largely worn out by war use. However, the large number of slow Liberty-type vessels constituted a threat of disaster, for if thrown upon the market there would result such a surplus of tonnage as to destroy all values. * * *

We should, therefore, further build up and modernize our merchant marine, not by drawing upon the surplus Liberty ships, but by encouraging new construction.

Shipyards in going condition are no less essential to national defense than the fleet in being. A subsidy to them, so that they may turn out ships for domestic as well as foreign trade, is no less justified in terms of national defense.

The principles of the Ship Sales Act are now being cast aside.

The State Department has recommended, and this recommendation has been adopted by President Truman, that 200 additional vessels be sold to foreigners and an additional 300 be chartered to foreigners.

When the Ship Sales Act was under consideration, the industry opposed sales to foreigners, but unsuccessfully. It then proposed that sales foreign be limited to the rehabilitation, but not expansion, of the Allied foreign fleets. This would seem to have been a reasonable place to hold the line. Prewar American vessels carried about 30 percent of our own foreign commerce. Foreigners had 70 percent. It appears reasonable that American vessels should carry at least 50 percent, but this objective cannot be reached merely by stating it. Fifty percent or any other percent can be obtained only by competing for it, and if we largely expand the foreign fleets, we make the competition infinitely more severe while we subsidize the American vessels to meet that competition. The State Department proposal envisages that by 1951 we will carry only 20 percent of our foreign commerce. Even without adoption of the proposal for further sales and charters foreign, it is anticipated that by 1951 the foreign fleets will be 20 to 25 percent above their prewar tonnages.

Another manifestation of the dumping theory is the recommendation of the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine that 250 Liberty and Victory vessels be sold for domestic operation, for what they will bring.

The shipping industry, either domestic or foreign, like any other industry, cannot be healthy when the quantity of service it has to offer substantially exceeds the demand therefor. If trades are greatly overtonnaged, the American operator will suffer devastating losses. The effect of overtonnaging on the shipping industry is so well known that it should not need restatement and further emphasis, and yet, today, it appears completely to have been lost sight of.

The stock argument that the Liberty ship is not a competitive ship and that the purchasers of the better ships need not be concerned with the sale of the Liberty ships simply does not make sense. There has been much controversy about the merits of the Liberty ship. It cannot be classified categorically as a good ship or a bad ship. It is a very useful ship for certain purposes, but by and large it is not a competitive ship for berth services, nor is it competitive, generally speaking, with specially designed bulk carriers. A limited number for services to which they are fitted would be a proper component of an American merchant marine and useful for national defense, but the number is definitely limited.

The conclusion must not be drawn from the foregoing that a Liberty ship cannot be competitive. Any ship that can carry cargo is potentially competitive, and if it is available cheap enough and in sufficient quantity, it can wholly disorganize the industry, because it involves no capital costs and invites irresponsible and speculative operations. The prudent and essentially long-range planning which is involved in large investments of private capital in modern vessels, and with which goes dependability and permanency of service, is impossible against the competition of cut-rate, cheap ship operation.

Mr. John F. Gehan, vice president of American Export Lines, Inc., has contributed an article with a punch entitled "Positive Thinking and Action Called for To Accomplish the Merchant Marine Destiny," in which he states, in part:

At a recent merchant marine conference, an inland delegate not associated with the industry said: "If we support subsidies for the maritime industry, then why not subsidies for other major American industries?"

The answer is that some domestic industries do receive subsidies in one form or another.

National thinking on the subject of subsidy wavers from time to time. In the long

run, a substantial body of public opinion has upheld the principle where necessary to protect and to encourage essential industries, particularly those which vitally affect our national defense and economic security.

We do not find consistency with respect to the merchant marine. At government level and among the public at large, there are frequent changes in attitude, which in turn have serious effect upon the course of the maritime industry.

The shipping industry is international in scope. While dedicated to the transportation of a substantial part of our Nation's commerce—generally interpreted at 50 percent of our imports and exports—it is in constant competition with vessels flying all manner of foreign flags. The crux of the matter is that foreign-flag vessels inherently are built at lower cost and are cheaper to operate than American-built and manned vessels. Thus the purpose of American differentials and operating differentials is to provide a means of equalizing cost for American operators under varying foreign competitive situations.

The public frequently loses sight of the fact that the prime purpose of the American merchant marine is to carry American commerce in good times and bad, in peacetime as in war. No foreign flag competitor is dedicated to a similar purpose. Lack of this service concept at a time when America lacked a merchant marine cost American business tremendous sums and likewise handicapped our military preparedness. * * *

There is urgent need for straight thinking and honest understanding of the nature and purposes of the construction differentials and operating differentials (subsidies) as provided under the 1936 act. The act provides for construction differential up to 50 percent, and for operating differential, where required, to provide equalization of costs for Americans who compete with vessels constructed and operated by foreign-flag owners.

American Export Lines and certain other lines have applied for 50-percent construction differential in connection with their proposals to acquire new passenger vessels.

In determining the need for 50-percent differentials in the 1936 and 1948 acts, recognition was given to the inherent spread in constructing costs here and abroad.

The Ship Sales Act of 1946 authorizes the Government to dispose of war-built vessels at 50 percent of their estimated prewar domestic cost.

Current reports indicate that foreign shipyards are operating close to capacity and that many are favored with extensive backlogs of orders for additional new vessels. Foreign costs are currently reported above their long-term averages. Because of this current condition, there is a feeling in some Government quarters that 50-percent construction differential is not necessary here at this time. Proponents of this view must not overlook the situation at home, where American yards are completely lacking new construction contracts and their costs have advanced 60 percent since the start of the war.

The public does not seem to understand that operating differential (subsidy) is subject to recapture by the Government if earned. Perhaps not enough publicity has been given to the fact that for the 5-year period, 1937-42, the Government dispersed about $50,000,000 in operating-differential payments, and that of this sum approximately $30,000,000 was earned, hence subject to recapture. Thus, the net cost to the taxpayer for this vital service averages $4,000,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, one interested in American ocean shipping will find other pertinent articles in this same issue of the Marine News. I recommend it for general reading—by those particularly interested in the merchant marine, to bolster their knowledge and enthusiasm; by those who lack interest, to make them understand better the problems of shipping and, perhaps, to develop a more sympathetic feeling for those who go down to the sea in ships.

Now Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union of February 26, 1948, entitled "Now Czechoslovakia":

NOW CZECHOSLOVAKIA

One sees in the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia the operation of the same program followed by the Soviets in the absorption of other countries behind the iron curtain.

This program consists of four distinct steps, cleverly designed to disguise the process of Soviet domination. The first step is to form a coalition government in which the Communists must be included, no matter how small their initial strength may be. This is followed by the inflexible demand that the Communists must control the ministry of the interior, under which the domestic police in European countries operate.

Then in due time when the Communist grip on the police is considered adequate, the charge of plotting against the state is trumped up against other parties in the government that resist Communist dictates, as a pretext for an assault upon them and their ejection from the government. This gives the Communist minority in the government an excuse for seizing control, backed by the overshadowing presence of a Russian Army somewhere in the offing.

What has happened in Czechoslovakia is not new. It runs perfectly true to form. It is the same thing that has happened in Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, and that we may expect to happen again and again as the program of Soviet expansion works itself out.

True, the Western World has been more deeply shocked by the death of democracy in Czechoslovakia than it was by the submission of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania to Soviet dictation. The Czechs are traditionally a democratic people. They set up a republic after World War I with western help and they made democracy work even beyond the most sanguine expectations. Democratic peoples elsewhere cannot but be saddened at seeing this brave, freedom-loving people hamstrung and hoodwinked into bondage.

Moreover, Czechoslovakia has a strategic importance in the fight for freedom in Europe far beyond Hungary and the two Balkan States. It lies at the center of the political framework of Europe, a fact that the Soviets have certainly not overlooked.

The question is: What is the Western World going to do about it? Will it stand by and see one free nation after another fall like pins in a bowling alley before Soviet machinations? The world is faced today with a new method of conquest, bloodless usually, but nonetheless effective in its operation. What nation will be next in the march of communism? One may believe that others are listed for Communist absorption in due time following Czechoslovakia.

Will the next in the list be Greece, Italy, Austria, or France? Time will tell unless the Western World awakes and decides to meet the challenge to freedom with something more than words. Let there be an end of chatter about an understanding with Russia. A sharp line of division has been drawn across the world by Moscow, and only firmness and force can stop the slow Communist attrition that blots out a free nation in a day as in Czechoslovakia.

Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Air Power delivered by me at the opening of the Air Forces University, Maxwell Field, Ala., on September 2, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General Vandenberg, General Fairchild, distinguished guests, gentlemen of the faculty and student body, ladies, and gentlemen, I wish to thank General Vandenberg for his kind introduction and for extending to me the privilege and opportunity of addressing this opening class of the Air University. As we realize the dreams which we have so long cherished for an autonomous air arm within a single military establishment of Air, Ground, and Sea Forces, I am conscious of the honor of being bidden to speak on this significant and historic occasion.

This Air University—with its member schools at Maxwell Field, Craig Field, and Gunter Field in Alabama, Tyndall Field in Florida, and Randolph Field in Texas—epitomizes all that we have fought for in our efforts to build for the United States a strong defense structure that will always meet the requirements of the hour.

You gentlemen—perhaps more than any other single group in the country—are the guardians of the future of America.

It has been well said that "Air power is peace power."

This school is the cradle of the principles upon which this declaration is based. It is the laboratory in which those principles are studied and nurtured and developed. The United Nations, the Atomic Energy Commission, and our security forces hold among them the key to the survival of our civilization and perhaps even of the human race. If the United Nations and the Atomic Energy Commission cannot control the forces of totalitarian aggression and atomic destruction, our hope for the preservation of our freedom and our democratic institutions lies in the success of this Air University and the task which our country now places in your hands.

As student officers chosen from among many, you fully appreciate the responsibility which is yours. In your daily work you will keep constantly before you the trust imposed in you.

Here at Maxwell Field the air university brings together those elements of the Military Establishment which many of us have long deemed vital to our national security—unification of the armed forces, development of air power, and military education. May I express the pride of Alabama that Maxwell Field is the home of this significant, unique, and profoundly important institution.

Maxwell Field had its beginning 37 years ago when the Wright brothers came here to carry forward the experiments begun at Kitty Hawk and to pass on their knowledge to a pitifully small handful of aviation enthusiasts. The field's first use was in the nature of a laboratory and a school when American aviation was still largely a dream.

I have watched Maxwell Field, aviation, the Air Forces, the Army educational system, and Alabama grow and develop together. We in Alabama have watched this growth as the fond parent watches the growth of his child.

In the First World War, Maxwell Field served as an aircraft-engine and repair depot. Since 1922 it has borne the name of that gallant pioneer airman, Lt. William C. Maxwell, of Atmore, Ala., who gave his life in the Philippines.

In 1931, the Air Corps Tactical School was moved to the field, and here were developed the tactics, stratagems, and techniques which made possible General Eisenhower's immortal words to the Army Ground Forces on D-day, 1944:

"If you see any airplanes, they are ours."

Maxwell Field, as an advanced flying school in World War II, turned out a long line of fighting airmen whose courage and valor will never be surpassed.

Historic Austin Hall is the birthplace of that air-ground cooperation which, joining with our naval power, finished off Japan in the far Pacific and made the race across France and Germany the most brilliant and complete victory in all military history.

After the war, the Air University of the Army Air Forces was founded here and graduated its first and only class. You gentlemen are the first class of the Air University of the United States Air Force. I know you feel pride in your selection and I congratulate each of you.

This school inherits the fine traditions of the old Army Air Service, the Army Air Corps, and the Army Air Forces, but it must ever go forward, looking ahead, thinking ahead, and planning ahead.

We must remember that there is no more reason for believing that there will always be a long-range bomber than there was for the belief that there will always be a horse cavalry. We must remember that a victorious nation tends to prepare to fight the last war while a defeated nation always plans to fight the next one. You will question yourselves frequently and search yourselves deeply to insure that your planning does not take the pattern of fighting the air war of 1940-45 all over again. You will not permit your wise concentration upon building a long-range attacking air force to obscure the need for air defense of the United States or the need perchance of an air umbrella for your comrades of the Ground Forces.

In keeping with your spirit of self-analysis, the Air Educational Advisory Board, headed by Dr. Kenneth Williams, formerly dean of the College of Education at the University of Georgia, has been established here and General Fairchild has invited civilian leaders to come here and cross-examine your dream boys from the layman's practical point of view.

We must remember that America's military strength is built upon the bedrock of America's economic strength. Our Air Force can be foremost only if we maintain supplies of strategic materials, air research of every type, and vast productive capacity.

The great problem that confronts our military establishment today is to keep the Nation aware of the need for air training and education for American youth, for maintaining and continually advancing technical research, and for preserving our aircraft industry, our factories, mills, mines, and workshops, to insure us the air power we must have if we are to remain strong and preserve the peace.

Only last week, General Spaatz, Commanding General of the Air Force, expressed deep concern over the severe reductions in Air Force personnel and the ability of the Air Force to get the replacement planes they will need this year. Two thousand replacement planes are needed, General Spaatz pointed out, but only 800 are being secured this year. He told how worried he was over the enormous decline in aircraft production and yet the aircraft industry is a fundamental element of the national security.

Your designers and your engineers and your production experts are the sinews of your air power. We must remember that tactical and strategic proficiency can be taught and acquired much more readily than aircraft technical knowledge and productive capacity can be developed.

To recover the lost ground, to rebuild and maintain the Nation's air force at security levels is a difficult task. But when things look darkest, that is the time to work the hardest. If we think that things look dark today, we have only to recall the discouraging and heart-breaking picture back in the days of Billy Mitchell, when for so long he knocked in vain at the closed door of official minds. If he and Andrews, Hickam, Knerr, Kenney, Arnold, Spaatz, Eaker, and Walter Weaver, beloved of Alabamians—if they had throttled down when the going got rough, instead of being a victorious Nation today we might be fighting with our backs to the wall. And surely we would not have unification of our armed forces with a separate autonomous air force.

Since 1921, there has been a continuous struggle for unification. Alongside the old invincibles of the early Air Corps, I joined that struggle. In 1931, we lost a bill for unification in the House of Representatives by 153 to 135. We were that close to victory. Though we lost year after year we never gave up. Like old England, we lost every battle but the last one—the pay off.

Now we have the single military establishment and a separate autonomous air arm under the National Security Act of 1947, which gives us a sound military structure.

It creates the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board, that we may make certain that our foreign and military policies are coordinated and mutually supporting; that a central intelligence agency may collect and analyze that mass of information which is so essential for the Government to maintain peace and without which the Government cannot wage war successfully; that scientific research and development may be coordinated, not only within the military services, but between the military services and other Government agencies, and with industrial and educational activities; that intelligent planning may guarantee coordination of our military program with the Nation's resources in manpower, materials, and production facilities; and that all of these objectives may be accomplished with the greatest possible economy consistent with a strong and effective national security.

In the last war time was bought for us by the blood of those peoples who were attacked first; time to prepare; time to mobilize; time to plan; time to forge our winning war machine. Time saved us. But it was given to us by others. We will not have this gift again.

Our other indispensable ally was space. There was a barrier of thousands of miles of ocean between us and our enemies. The weapons of 1941 could not cross this barrier. But—like our ally of time—space will not save us again. The weapons of today can cross that barrier. The weapons of tomorrow will laugh at it. By VJ-day we had entered a new age of science, of warfare, and of world relations.

The United States has attained an unprecedented ascendancy among nations. Willing or not, we have acquired new and awful obligations. So much of the responsibility for the future peace of the world rests with us. The world looks to us for our cooperation, but even more the world depends upon our willingness and our ability to back cooperation with the military power to preserve the peace. The peaceful nations of the world know that they can cooperate to preserve the peace only if they are backed by a strong United States, strong not only in moral values and material resources, but strong in military potential.

In the United Nations we have set up the machinery for building the peace. While a strong America stands guard over the peace, we must work to make the United Nations an effective instrumentality to prevent war among nations—that through the United Nations we may substitute the rule of law and reason for force and violence.

Until this day comes, bear always in your minds and carry in your hearts the trust and the faith that America has placed in you. You are the guardians of the peace, the guardians of America.

Address by Hon. Olin D., Johnston, of South Carolina, Before South Carolina Regional Conference on United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the brief talk which I made before the South Carolina Regional Conference of the United Jewish Appeal, which met in Columbia, S. C., on Sunday last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a known fact that since 1918, from the administration of Woodrow Wilson through the Presidencies of Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, and even including the present administration, our national policy has been publicly stated and restated as supporting the establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jewish people.

I state at the outset that this is no longer an issue. Since the pronouncement of the Balfour Declaration in November 1918 and the establishment of Great Britain as the mandatory power over that country with the consent of all of the sovereign powers of the

civilized world, there may have still been an issue, but that has been resolved for all time by the determination of what we all hope will become the most sovereign power on earth—the United Nations Assembly.

The world has long recognized that in the short period since 1918 a small but hardy band of Jews has made of Palestine a virtual oasis—a garden spot out of a desert.

Despite the Arab failure to assist the Allied cause in World War I, the Arabs received recognition for sovereign states covering over 1,000,000 square miles, with all of present-day Palestine but 10,000 square miles. Despite the aid given to Hitler by the Grand Mufti of the Arabs, who fled to Berlin to give such assistance to our common enemy, the United Nations Assembly partitioned Palestine and left for the remnant of a butchered people but 500 square miles, and yet the Arab feudal lords are not satisfied and are carrying on a holy war. What is so holy about that war? It is born of a fear that the feudal barons from all Arab kingdoms will, with the development and evolution of higher living standards in Jewish Palestine and among the masses of Arabs—most of whom are and would—continue to be friendly but for the fear of reprisal from the hired thugs of the overlords.

Our country has, happily, attained the position as the first power on earth. As such, we wield an influence in proportion to that power. Do we, however, measure up to the responsibilities which the power and influence require? I fear not, but sure hope we will. We cannot and must not stand idly by. We must take such steps which will, at the very threshold of the existence of the United Nations, implement and make effective the decisions of that body. We cannot—we must not—fail to exercise that same power and influence which brought the United Nations Assembly decision resolving the Palestine issue by partition between Arab and Jew to implement that determination.

I have called to the attention of the administration in Washington in language as forceful and, yet, as friendly as is within my command, that its silence under conditions where a people harassed, maimed, and destroyed during many centuries, but more recently in the heart of central Hitler Europe, is itself un-Christian and inhuman.

We have failed in our responsibility actively to give life to and enforce the decision of the United Nations Assembly. We have, on the contrary, actively taken a position hostile to and destructive of the international conclusion arrived at. We permit an embargo upon arms and equipment which the Jews so sorely need to defend themselves, while Great Britain disarms the Jews—gives aid and comfort to the Arabs, who, from the first, have defied the United Nations decision.

Our Nation should immediately announce that it stands foursquare behind the United Nations decision; permit United States citizens or residents to volunteer as members of an international military force representing the United Nations in such numbers and at such times as will enforce with other members in the United Nations the international decree. We will thereby give breath, vigor, and life to the international body so recently created and make its decisions the law of the civilized world.

We have heard much and read more about our interests in oil in the Middle East, particularly in Saudi Arabia. Are we to permit human blood, be it Arab or Jew, to be spilled for that reason? It is hoped that the President of the United States will restate that which is historically true—that the traditions of this country make it impossible for us now, or at any time, to permit blood to be traded for property—even oil.

It is only fair and in the commands of Christian teaching that the steps I have suggested be taken by the President, who will have not alone the support of the vast numbers of our country's citizens but also the approval and approbation of the civilized world, save for those with special interest—and you know who those are. To paraphrase Holy Writ, the Prophet Isaiah said, "Let us not be among those who justify the wicked for a reward, and deprive the righteous of justice."

The Wallace Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Jim Chaney, from the Raleigh News and Observer, which discusses a very unusual meeting held at Chapel Hill. It was called a Wallace seminar. The meeting was held last Saturday and Sunday. A number of students from other colleges in North Carolina were invited to attend, and they were given instructions as to how to proceed with the Wallace campaign. There are one or two items I should like to call to the attention of the Senate, as they relate to the methods of proceeding. The students were told:

Write simple and plain letters to the editors of newspapers in which you say: "If you want to save the country from war, Wallace seems to be the only man to make President."

They were also told to write:

Why is your newspaper playing down Wallace news?

Again, these students were admonished to get into the churches, the effect being to utilize the facilities of these religious institutions to circulate and disseminate Wallace propaganda.

They were told:

But don't make your purposes too obvious. People will see your letters and get in touch with you.

Another suggestion which was made to these organizers for Wallace was:

Get on the radio stations. There are many which give free time, especially to college groups, if you sell them on the idea that it is a public-service feature. Ask for time to hold a forum with candidates of other parties taking part. A good trick is to offer four persons to debate a third-party issue or other issues. You don't bother to explain that all four are pro-Wallace.

Mr. President, I think it might be quite revealing to study the methods which will be adopted in pushing forward this "idealistic" campaign on behalf of Henry Wallace.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANS FOR WALLACE DRIVE OUTLINED AT CHAPEL HILL

(By Jim Chaney)

CHAPEL HILL, February 28.—A heterogeneous collection of 126 progressives—similar only in their conviction that Russia and the minorities are the victims of a capitalistic greed—laid the groundwork here today for the Wallace movement in North Carolina.

To 99 percent of the population of this university village, it was Saturday and no more. To the 43 UNC students and instructors who sponsored the war council and their 83 visitors, it was M-day for the common man.

Assembled for a Tar Heel-students-for Wallace rally, they received from experts in liberal-front promotion the basic lessons in salesmanship for the common cause—how to get free time on the radio, how to push petitions, how to work through letters to the editor departments of newspapers, and how to sell the cause with words.

"There are many times," their teachers told them, "when you must not reveal your real objective."

"As students you will have many opportunities," they were told, "to campaign by talking to the right people."

The progressive method, laid down at the seminars by CIO Organizer Mike Ross and Veteran Progressive Mary Price, follows easy steps:

1. Write simple and plain letters to the editors of newspapers in which you say: "If you want to save the country from war, Wallace seems to be the only man to make President," or "Why is your newspaper playing down Wallace news?" But don't make your purposes too obvious. People will see your letters and get in touch with you. Soon you will have little groups from which to work.

2. Get on the radio stations. There are many which give free time, especially to college groups, if you sell them on the idea that it is a public-service feature. Ask for time to hold a forum with candidates of other parties taking part. A good trick is to offer four persons to debate a third-party issue or other issues. You don't bother to explain that all four are pro-Wallace.

3. Get into the churches. There are many chances to talk among church groups, especially among young peoples' groups, and if you are a church member you aren't as subject to as much criticism.

4. Get into organizations and try to get pro-Wallace speakers on the program. Newspapers and radios generally will carry speeches made at civic clubs when they might otherwise refuse them.

5. Organize entertainments and social events, chiefly as social events. They provide good opportunities to talk to people about the "progressive" program.

6. If people call you a Red, brush it off as a smear. If they go too far, remind them that they can be sued for libel.

7. Work with race groups and groups which have something definite to gain by the "progressive" movement.

8. Find out who is registered in your community. Take the people who aren't registered to the voting places and see that they register. If you carry them there, they will be more likely to vote for your candidate.

Go push the New Republic liberal magazine. It carries Wallace's speeches.

More than a third of the 126 were Negroes, chiefly from Johnson C. Smith University in Charlotte and North Carolina College in Durham. Approximately half originally were from out of State. A majority were members or past members of other liberal-front groups, particularly the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

At least 20 listed New York as their home State; 6 New Jersey; 5, Alabama; 4, the District of Columbia; 3, Florida; and 3, South Carolina.

Ohio, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Virginia, California, Maryland, and Mississippi were represented by two delegates each. Others claimed Missouri, Georgia, Arkansas, Illinois, and Connecticut.

The break-down for North Carolina residents showed seven were from Greensboro, four from Charlotte, four from Stanly County, five from Alamance County, four from Durham, two from Lumberton, two from High Point, two from Wake County, and two from Columbus.

Single delegates were registered from Gastonia, Wilmington, Cabarus, Elm City, Fayetteville, Elkin, Winston-Salem, Craven, Goldsboro, Robeson, Asheville, Greenville, Davidson, Randolph, Cleveland and Brunswick.

A few names picked from the registration cards are typical:

Carl S. Leonard of Washington, D. C., State College; Thomas McPhasher of Lexington, Johnson C. Smith University; Floyd Spaulding of Clarkton, Johnson C. Smith; Sigrid Lehribereger of New York, Duke; Wallace F. Daley of Hartford, Conn., Johnson C. Smith.

Helen Mercer, of Westfield, N. J., Duke; Nancy Bone, of Toledo, Ohio, Duke; M. J. Simpson, of Hagerstown, Md., Duke; Sidney Fletcher, of Elkin, UNC; Stanley A. Simpson, of Orange County, UNC; Richard B. Null, of Gettysburg, Pa., Duke; Charles D. Lucas, of Matthews, Duke.

Mary Upshur Elliott, of Norfolk, Va., woman's college; Arlene Batchelor, of Brooklyn, N. Y., woman's college; Miri W. Whitaker, of Batesville, Miss., Duke; Elias Freedland, UNC instructor.

W. A. McGirt, Jr., of Wilmington, former Duke student.

Marge Frantz, of Orange County, UNC; Albert H. Haney, of Birmingham, Ala., Elon; Dick Koral, of Brooklyn, N. Y., UNC; Grover C. Adams, of Charlotte, Johnson C. Smith, Walter Robinson, of New York, UNC; Don G. Harris, of Shelby, UNC; Bill Cannon, of Durham, Duke; Dot Arnett, of Greensboro, UNC; E. D. Miller, of High Point, Elon.

Sylvan Routh, of Franklinville, Elon; Hale Chamberlain, UNC instructor; J. F. Blake, of Charlotte, UNC; L. Dixon Lyon, of New Jersey, woman's college; Dorothy Blake, of Orange County, UNC; S. J. Klein, of New York, UNC; M. Lucille Davidson, of Fayetteville, N. C. college.

Daniel B. Jackson, of Orange County, UNC; Roy Watson Coble, Richard E. Deane, Doyle Edison Cowder, and Gerald Reid Chandler, all students of Pfieffer College, from Stanly County.

James Charles Johnson, of Washington, D. C., Shaw University; Ralph L. Fleming, Jr., of Greenville, Duke; James W. Stanford, of Asheville, UNC; Betsy Bush, of Florida, Duke; Isabel Elmore, of Alabama, Duke; Elizabeth Rhoads, of California, UNC.

Mildred L. Haney, of Burlington, Elon; Nancy Keen, of Burlington, Elon; William E. Gibson, Jr., of Marion, S. C., Johnson C. Smith; John H. Kier, of Mississippi, Duke; and Louise P. Schneider, of the Bronx, N. Y., Duke.

Their candidate, Henry A. Wallace, featured speakers of the two-day program reported tonight, is certain of victory.

James Waterman Wise, director of the council against intolerance and co-chairman of the citizens committee which supported Progressive candidate Leo Isacson in his successful Bronx race for Congress, told the group "the very formation of a third party today is an act of faith in democracy."

FOREMAN SPEAKS

Clark Foreman of Atlanta, Ga., president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and member of the national Wallace campaign committee, declared the Democratic Party is crumbling.

The word from Henry A. Wallace—received in a speech read by Sam Hirsch, Trenton, N. J., member of the Carolina Playmakers—backed up the prediction. Through a "progressive" party, Wallace's statement promised, Americans can work for peace with Russia, the adoption of Fair Employment Practices legislation and elimination of "Jim Crow" discriminations.

In sessions Sunday, the group will hear reports on operating plans; attend services at the Presbyterian Church; adopt an organization plan; elect officers, and conclude their rally with a folk-song recital by Ballad-Singing Pete Seeger.

Hardly the spontaneous demonstration some notices had described as the rally was organized by a youth who reports he plans to make the "progressive" party his career, Leonard Nelson of Miami, Fla.

A 24-year-old veteran and graduate of Columbia University, Nelson now holds the title of secretary of the National Students for Wallace, but he plans to go higher.

If Wallace wins, he told The News and Observer during a telephone conversation, he expects to find a permanent job.

If Wallace doesn't win—

"That," says Nelson, "is a chance everybody has to take in politics."

At Chapel Hill, among the members of the University of North Carolina Wallace Club, Nelson found ready and experienced workers—among them Junius Scales, son of a prominent Greensboro industrialist and reportedly a former leader of Chapel Hill Communists.

The president of the club, Bill Richardson, is a former resident of Belhaven. The active members are part-time and junior instructors, their wives and older students.

Kingston, Once Capital of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very historically interesting story written by Mr. E. E. Patton, of Knoxville, Tenn., one time mayor of that city, and published in the Knoxville Journal of February 29, 1948.

The story concerns the interesting fact that Kingston was at one time actually the capital city of Tennessee by reason of a promise made to the Cherokee Indians in the area at that time.

I recommend the article as interesting reading.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PROMISE" TO INDIANS MADE KINGSTON CAPITAL OF TENNESSEE FOR 2 HOURS

(By E. E. Patton)

Four cities have had the honor of being the capital of Tennessee: Knoxville, Kingston, Murfreesboro, and Nashville. The dates are as follows: Knoxville, 1796 to 1802; 1807 to 1811; 1817 to 1819. Kingston, 1807—1 day, 2 hours. Nashville, 1812 to 1815; 1826 to 1843, when it became the permanent capital. Murfreesboro from 1819 to 1825. In this article I shall deal only with Kingston. I quote:

"On October 27, 1805, the State made the Treaty of Tellico with the Cherokee Indians, in which is the following clause:

"Whereas it has been represented by the one party or the other, that the section of land on which the garrison at South West Point, and which extends to Kingston, is likely to be a desirable place for the Assembly of Tennessee to convene at—now, the Cherokee, being possesed of a spirit of conciliation, and seeing that this tract is desirable for public purposes and not for individual advantages—cede to the United States the said section of land, understanding at the same time, that the buildings erected by the public are to belong to the public, as well as the occupation of the same, during the pleasure of the government."

"In order to give color of claim made in the Treaty of Tellico, the General Assembly on September 13, 1806, directed that Knoxville should be the seat of government after the second Monday in September 1807. On September 21, 1807, the legislature convened at Kingston but adjourned the same day to meet 2 days later in Knoxville."

The above is a quotation which gives the history of the capital at Kingston; it is recited in a very few words, and those words are very hazy. They must have been written by a career diplomat. The statement has been made that the State authorities felt honor bound to have the capital at Kingston on account of a promise made to the Cherokees. If the above quotation contains a promise, I fail to find it. It merely states that Kingston is a "desirable place for the assembly of Tennessee to convene at"—bad grammar.

At any rate, the legislature—house and senate—and the Governor made a pious pilgrimage to Kingston; both houses were called to order; and in 2 hours or less time, they had adjourned to meet 2 days later in Knoxville. They then climbed into their wagons, buggies, or carry-alls, or straddled their horses and came back to Knoxville by easy stages.

Roane County was named for Archibald Roane, second Governor of Tennessee. He was highly educated; was an eminent lawyer and outstanding judge. Under the Tennessee constitution, a governor may not serve more than three consecutive terms. John Sevier was Governor from 1796 to 1802: Roane succeeded him and was a candidate for reelection in 1804, but was defeated by Sevier, who served three more terms, going out of office in 1810. Roane is buried in a cemetery about halfway between Concord and the Farragut High School; his grave is marked by a handsome monument erected by the State, the bill having been sponsored by the late Hon. John C. Houk.

Roane County is famous in many ways: it has rich soil and as capable farmers as may be found anywhere. It has fine coal mines and is rich in high-grade iron ore. Harriman and Rockwood are as important manufacturing cities, of their size, as you will find anywhere. The public-school system is one of the best in the State, Mr. J. F. Brittain has been superintendent of schools for many years, and his heart is in the work. The principals and teachers of the grammar and high schools are most capable and efficient.

Roane County has been a veritable breeding ground for eminent lawyers and judges. Martin W. Littleton, one of the great New York lawyers, was a native of Roane. Then there were Judge Thomas A. R. Nelson, Judge W. B. Staley, Judge Robert M. Jones, for many years chancellor of Knox County, the late Hon. W. L. Weicker, and Judge James Sevier, one of the most eminent lawyers the State has produced. Sam Rayburn, for several years Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, was born in Roane County. Hon. James G. Crumbliss, son of Maj. Henry Crumbliss, judge of the county court, clerk, and master and for 4 years United States marshal of east Tennessee, is a native of Roane.

Miss Rachel Littleton of Kingston married Cornelius Vanderbilt, Jr., in one of the most notable weddings in New York.

I have mentioned the schools of Roane County, and I want to state further that no

county in the State has a better class of citizenship that Roane. Most of them own their own homes; they are law abiding; there is very little crime in that county. The business and professional men are among the leaders of the State.

There is little race or religious prejudice in the county, and the county has the distinction of having within its borders the first Christian Church organized in Tennessee; it is Post Oak Springs Church, on the highway between Kingston and Rockwood. Judge John R. Neal's father, a Confederate officer, lawyer, and Congressman, is buried just east of the church mentioned above.

I want to speak of the movement that has been discussed for many years: the erection of a suitable and appropriate tablet or marker on the site of the first capitol in Knoxville and also a similar action in regard to the site of the capitol in Kingston. The State historical commission is granted funds every year by the legislature for purposes just like this, and it would seem that no more appropriate action could be taken by this commission than to mark the sites of the capitols in Knoxville and Kingston.

The Knoxville Journal has been very interested in matters of this kind; in fact, it has marked a number of historic spots in and around Knoxville, and I believe the people of Roane County will appreciate a program for marking this historic spot. There are 95 counties, but only 4 of them have had the honor of having the capital within their borders.

An appropriation by the State historical commission, the county court of Roane County could be matched by subscriptions from the progressive and loyal people of the county. This marker should be worthy of the place that it memorializes; and we would expect it to stand as long as America is kept free. If you are favorable toward a movement of this kind, write the editor of the Knoxville Journal and express your views.

A Salutary Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, recently I submitted a concurrent resolution seeking to reform senatorial committee procedure. On March 1 of this year the New York Herald Tribune published a very important editorial under the caption, "A salutary reform," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SALUTARY REFORM

The congressional investigation is a most useful, indeed an essential, tool of Government in the United States. It is the best official means of keeping the public informed of the operations of Federal administration, of examining into errors and frauds, of functioning in the twilight zone where the law itself cannot—or for some reason does not—take effective action, and where the press is unable to obtain access to all the facts. The investigating committee is particularly important now when the threat to the American system may take forms which are not comprehended in the constitutional system of safeguards for the State and the individual. Unfortunately, the congressional investigation can be and has been abused for party or private advantage.

Senator LUCAS has therefore introduced a concurrent resolution which would bind the committees of both Senate and House to certain rules protecting witnesses and accused persons. Hitherto, the committees have been able to establish their own rules of procedure which depended upon the good taste, judgment, and fairness of the committee majority, and which often resulted in the browbeating of witnesses, the utterance of unsubstantiated charges to which the accused was not permitted to make formal reply, and a number of other infringements upon individual rights and the public interest.

Senator LUCAS's proposals include many rules, not all of which may be found necessary or advisable. But the principles upon which he bases his code are certainly in accord with the American tradition. They would not hamper a congressional committee in getting to the roots of any matter. They would cause no change in the procedure of committees which normally conduct their investigations decently. They would, however, put a bridle on fanatics.

It is difficult to see how this would interfere with the necessary flexibility of a congressional investigation. Instead, it would give such investigations enhanced prestige and authority. Therefore, Congress in its own interest and the public for its own security, should get behind the Lucas resolution and see that its spirit is written into congressional practice. There is plenty of work for congressional investigating committees, and they should be made to perform their tasks in an atmosphere which will give the best possible results.

Address of Hon. L. B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. L. B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor, before the Jefferson-Jackson centennial dinner, February 19, 1948, in Albuquerque, N. Mex.:

I appreciate this opportunity to come back to the West and to join with you in commemorating the birthdays of Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson founded our party. It was through his vision that it was conceived. It took Jackson, however, with all of his strength of character and virility and toughness against opposition so to strengthen it that it might be preserved as an instrument for the protection of American democracy through the many decades since Jackson's death.

To the Americans of Jackson's day he was looked upon as coming out of, and speaking for, the West. To most Americans on the Atlantic seaboard President Truman is looked upon as coming from the West. Andrew Jackson was being critized for being plain, common. It was said that he was not sufficiently erudite to occupy the high office of the Presidency. Many of the things that were said about Jackson then are being said about President Truman today. Jackson had the courage and the faith to carry on his fight against most bitter opposition. He knew he could, and he did succeed in protecting the institution of American democracy. All I know about Andrew Jackson is what I have read in many volumes printed about him. I have known President Truman well over the past 11 years. I know that he, too, has that same courage and that same faith in the American people, and that under his leadership we will carry through with a solution of the almost overwhelming problems with which we are today confronted.

I was particularly delighted to accept this invitation to come to Albuquerque. This was because of the fact that during the last 13 years I have come to have a very intimate acquaintanceship with, and a very affectionate regard for, three of the public servants that you have sent to Washington. The first of these whom I met was Senator HATCH. When first I met him I did not realize fully the deepness of his strength of character. He was soft of voice, kind, and considerate. It took only a short time for me to realize, as I watched him debate on the Senate floor, that he could present as tough a debate as any Member of that body. No man has gained a position of respect for intelligence and integrity higher than that of Senator HATCH. A few months later Senator CHAVEZ was sworn in as a Member of the Senate. He, too, has gained the respect of the Members of that body. He has the remarkable attribute which is possessed by too few people—to know that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. He plunges into a debate armed with the facts, and it makes it rather difficult for anyone to withstand the force of his argument because he has so carefully conceived the point which he intends to make. I did not know Secretary Anderson until I returned to Washington in July 1945. I have known several Secretaries of Agriculture. I served on a Committee of Agriculture when I was in the Senate. During that 6-year period not only the Secretaries, but the Assistants and many experts from the Department testified. I can say without qualification that Secretary Anderson has a better grasp of the broad problems of the farm than anyone who appeared before our committee during the 6 years I was in the Senate.

My home, as you know, is in Spokane, Wash. To a great extent the eastern part of the State of Washington is similar to New Mexico. We have some of the same problems. We have the problem of reclamation and irrigation. We have the problem of the development of power through the dams, which not only are an aid to navigation, but which also are used for the purpose of flood control. So I think I know a little about the problems of New Mexico which went through years and decades of Republican neglect, and which have at least partially been solved by the interest which the Democratic administrations have shown since 1933.

Probably no State in the Union is more vitally concerned with problems of irrigation and reclamation than is your State of New Mexico. My State of Washington, with its vast supplies of water and power generated from projects made possible under Democratic administration, has difficulty in conceiving of water shortages which exist in the more arid regions of the Southwest, but at the same time present serious problems of flood control.

Yet, I understand from my more or less intimate association with your representatives in the Congress and from other sources, that you here in New Mexico, even in this fair city of Albuquerque, do have both problems to consider and sometimes they exist almost simultaneously, however impossible that may seem to be to those who have no genuine conception of the great Southwest.

When I say those who do not understand the problems of the Southwest, I might just as well include all of the West, which embraces my own State in the northwestern part of the Nation. After all, the West is the West, whether it is the Southwest or the Northwest.

While we on the one hand have an abundance of water supply, and you on the other may have a scarcity, nevertheless the unalterable fact remains that the development of our great regions depends upon a continuation of the philosophies and theories advocated and carried out by Democratic administration of the Federal Government. Without Federal assistance, we in the Northwest never would have been able to construct our vast projects which contributed so much to the war effort and without which a different production story might have been written.

As more or less a stranger within your State, I shall not attempt to discuss specific projects. I do know that here at Albuquerque you are vitally concerned in adequate flood control and protection against the waters of the Rio Grande. Also, I am told that there are some differences existing between those of you interested in the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District and others of your citizens in the southern part of your State—including, but never overlooking, your neighboring State of Texas. Whatever these differences may be—and I am sure they are real—they can be reconciled. Under a Democratic Congress, with a Democratic President, whatever flood protection is needed in the middle Rio Grande can and will be given; and, at the same time, ample protection for the users of water under the Elephant Butte project will be afforded. In the end the development and protection of this area can go forward without injury to any, and real benefit to all.

The same is true of your greatly needed developments at Tucumcari, Fort Sumner, and Carlsbad. Your problems on the Gila and the San Juan are not insignificant. All in all, these different streams and systems add up to a general situation which prevails throughout the entire West. This general condition, prevalent all over the West, requires an administration which is cognizant of and sympathetic with our natural resources and their proper development. This has never occurred under Republican administration, and the actions of the present Congress speak more loudly than any words of mine the absolute impossibility of any future development by any Republican administration.

I want to talk to you for awhile about an old friend of mine. I met him on January 3, 1935. There were 14 of us in the group, including my good friend, Senator Guffey, of Pennsylvania. We knocked upon the doors of the United States Senate, presented our credentials, and were accepted into membership in that body. One of the most unassuming and humble of that group was Harry S. Truman, now the President of the United States. I am sure that no one of us on that cold January day had the slightest thought of, or aspiration to, the office of the Presidency. There was within the group a feeling of friendliness and mutual respect that I have not seen in any group entering the Senate since. We had no bloc of votes. We held no caucuses. Yet because of the fact that we were the first group of new Senators elected after President Roosevelt assumed office, and because we had all pledged ourselves to our constituencies to uphold the hand of the President in his efforts, there was a certain solidarity about the group which made it distinctive.

Senator Truman did not speak on very many subjects. He wasn't one who thought he knew the answer to all of the questions that might arise. Yet, when he did speak, it was found that he knew the facts and knew the problem, and spoke only because he sincerely believed that the particular piece of legislation would meet the situation as it then existed. For example, we found out, when the question came up of railroad reorganizations because of improper financing of such reorganizations in the past, that Senator Truman knew more about it than any other Member of that body. The same was true when the civil aeronautics bill came on for consideration. Slowly, gradually, but nevertheless deeply ingrained in the minds of the Members of the Senate, there developed a feeling of confidence in, and respect for, the ability, the integrity, and the sincerity of this unassuming man.

After 6 years I left the Senate and moved back to my home to go on the Federal bench. During that 6 years of effort to advance the welfare and well-being of the American people Senator Truman made a record which in itself is proof of the intensity of his belief that, insofar as it can, the Federal Government must be ever-watchful to guard the interests and the welfare of the great mass of the people. Let us glance briefly at that record. During our first year he voted for the Wagner Labor Act, social security, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and the ratification of the Treaty of Adherence to the World Court. In 1936 he voted for the Soil Conservation Act and against sustaining the bonus payment veto, and against returning relief to the States. In 1937 he voted for the low-cost housing bill, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the continuation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and the continuance of reciprocal trade agreements. In 1938 he favored the antilynching bill cloture, the naval expansion bill, and WPA appropriations. In 1939 he voted for the civil liberties bill, the Hatch Act, the lifting of the arms embargo, and for adequate appropriations for aeroplanes, ships, and military stock piles. In 1940 he voted for the conscription bill and farm parity payments.

Those are but a few of the votes which he cast while I was a Member of the Senate. I have selected them as typical. Surely, that record alone must be proof to anyone that he has sympathy and understanding of the problems of those people who have no special lobbies and who have no one to speak upon their behalf before the committees which prepare such bills for consideration.

Then the war came on and Senator Truman saw the difficulties which would arise. We were going into a war program—the largest in the history of any nation in the world. We were undertaking to supply, not only our own armies, but the armies of most of our allies. He introduced a resolution which the Senate approved by which there was authorized the setting up of a War Investigating Committee. He became chairman of that committee. I might go on for an hour discussing the success that committee had in almost every field involving the war effort. Let me give you three illustrations. It ended the army camp scandals and saved the taxpayers $250,000,000. It broke the bottleneck on aluminum and made possible the subsequent record in airplane production that contributed so largely to winning the war. It came to the aid of small business which was being pushed out of the war picture by large corporations. You may inquire how this committee, functioning during the strenuous wartime period and having to combat the very natural pressures by which the patriotism of the country made it difficult for any committee of this nature effectively to function because of the criticisms that it was impeding the war effort, did function, and did succeed. This inquiry might very well result from what you have read and heard about the same committee a few months ago when, in its first major postwar investigation, it turned the committee hearing into a hippodrome and caused those in charge to look like clowns because of their ineptness and their lack of knowledge of the facts which they set out to investigate. The answer is very simple. During the war the committee was chaired by Senator Truman. He adopted certain rules for the conduct of the committee. The first was that the committee should not prejudge any case until first it had mastered the facts of that case. It was a committee of inquiry, and not of persecution. Its hearings, for the most part, were held quietly and without demonstration or display. Mr. Truman does not have a flair for dramatics. He sought no personal publicity, although the success of his efforts in itself resulted in Nation-wide publicity. It was not a partisan committee which had as its purpose the smearing of individuals. Whether they dealt with industry, labor, or the Government, the committee called its shots as they saw them even if, as a result, those in charge of the war might be hit by them. By and large throughout the country confidence in the committee and Mr. Truman was so great that the people were willing to make many more sacrifices which they would not have made had they lacked that confidence. Here was a simple man who honestly and courageously investigated and told them the truth no matter what might result therefrom.

It was but natural in 1944 when the Democratic Convention in Chicago selecting a candidate for Vice President it turned to the same man who had such a reputation for honesty, integrity, and fearlessness as did the Senator from Missouri. He was elected to that office and was happy in it because it gave him the opportunity to deal and work with the group of men in the Senate whom he had come to know and to admire regardless of their political party affiliations. He was permitted to occupy that office but a few months. Suddenly, and with no warning as to its imminence, the hand of death stopped the beating of the heart and stifled the voice of the man who for 12 years had carried the burdens of the American people.

Late one afternoon Harry Truman was called to the White House and informed that, then and there, he must assume the responsibilities and obligations and the duties of the Presidency of the United States. Events since have proved that on that afternoon he took over the most stupendous task which any man has ever undertaken in any country in the world. Undaunted and unafraid, he assumed the obligations. Even he did not then realize how rough and rocky was the road ahead. A few weeks after he became President the shooting war in Europe collapsed. To many, that meant a partial end of war activities. The problems of reconversion and reconstruction presented themselves immediately. The President was faced with the task of balancing the two. On the one side, he must provide leadership to a successful termination of the campaign in the Far East; on the other side, he must attempt to make the delicate adjustments from war to peace in a portion of our economy without disturbing the necessary activities behind the campaign against Japan.

In a few short months that campaign ended with the collapse of Japan's Empire and its unconditional surrender. That surrender was greeted with heart-felt thanks by every man, woman, and child in the United States, even including those who knew that their own brothers or husbands or sons would never return from the battlefields in which they were buried.

It has taken a considerable length of time for the American people to realize that reconversion to peace is even more difficult than conversion for war. After the almost 4 years duration of the war people were tired; they had worked long hours; many hours of the day when they did not work the time was spent in extra duties performed for the benefit of the war. The end of the shooting was

in no sense the end of the war. The lives and portions of the bodies of our men were given that the democratic process and the free enterprise system would be permitted to exist wherever in the world the people wanted it to exist. Until we reach that point, the war is not yet over.

During all of that time, and up to and including this very minute, the policy of President Truman has not changed. He has worked consistently and energetically to bring about such a condition. Yet, even today, there are those who look wishfully back at 1939 and would seek to a return to it. We will not return to the days of 1939—this, for the simple reason that we cannot return to those days. We cannot do it and maintain our economic system or the democratic privileges which our forefathers gave us. If that wishful thinking were not so tragic, I would get amusement out of it. I was in the Senate then. I not only read, but I analyzed my mail. I know that those same people who today wish to return to the conditions of that time were extremely unhappy in those days because they wanted to turn back the clock 10 years to the predepression days of 1928 and the first 6 months of 1929.

The problems which confront us now are immediate, important, and emergent. The President discussed them with the American people from time to time. He described them as "high prices at home and hunger and cold abroad." As he said, "We could choose the course of inaction, we could wait until depression caught up with us, until our living standards sank and our people tramped the streets looking for jobs." Other democratic nations would lose hope and become easy victims of totalitarian aggression. That would be the course of defeatism and cowardice." This call to the American people was made modestly and unassumingly, yet it was made courageously and even daringly. The time has come for the American people to respond to this call. The goal which the Administration seeks is easy of understanding, but difficult of attainment. This is no time for timidity. This is no time for delay or quibbling. The President seeks, as he rightfully should, the cooperation of the people of America. We must have faith in our system of Government, faith in our economic system of free enterprise, and faith in the God who guides our footsteps. If each of us imbued with that spirit of faith is moved onward by determination and courage and daring, there can be no doubt that we will attain that goal for which the war was fought, and for which so many lives were given, and so much of our resources expended. We cannot do less.

Are Treaties Meaningless?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, what nations in western Europe will be our allies if and when hostilities break out between the United States and Russia?

I invite attention to two treaties of fairly recent date, one entered into in 1942 between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Great Britain, and the other between the Socialist Republic and France, the latter executed in 1944.

I am inserting these treaties in the RECORD under unanimous consent:

LONDON, *May 26, 1942.*

[Ratifications exchanged at Moscow, July 4, 1942.]

TREATY OF ALLIANCE IN THE WAR AGAINST HITLERITE GERMANY AND HER ASSOCIATES IN EUROPE AND OF COLLABORATION AND MUTUAL ASSISTANCE THEREAFTER CONCLUDED BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

His Majesty The King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, and the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

Desiring to confirm the stipulations of the Agreement between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for joint action in the war against Germany, signed at Moscow on the 12th July, 1941,[1] and to replace them by a formal treaty;

Desiring to contribute after the war to the maintenance of peace and to the prevention of further aggression by Germany or the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe;

Desiring, moreover, to give expression to their intention to collaborate closely with one another as well as with the other United Nations at the peace settlement and during the ensuing period of reconstruction on the basis of the principles enunciated in the declaration made on the 14th August, 1941,[2] by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Great Britain to which the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has adhered;

Desiring, finally, to provide for mutual assistance in the event of an attack upon either High Contracting Party by Germany or any of the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

Have decided to conclude a treaty for that purpose and have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

His Majesty The King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India,

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; The Right Honourable Anthony Eden, M. P., His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;

The Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: M. Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs,

Who, having communicated their Full Powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

PART I

Article I

In virtue of the alliance established between the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the High Contracting Parties mutually undertake to afford one another military and other assistance and support of all kinds in the war against Germany and all those States which are associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

Article II

The High Contracting Parties undertake not to enter into any negotiations with the Hitlerite Government or any other Government in Germany that does not clearly renounce all aggressive intentions, and not to negotiate or conclude except by mutual consent any armistice or peace treaty with Germany or any other State associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

PART II

Article III

(1) The High Contracting Parties declare their desire to unite with other like-minded States in adopting proposals for common action to preserve peace and resist aggression in the post-war period.

(2) Pending the adoption of such proposals, they will after the termination of hostilities take all the measures in their power to render impossible a repetition of aggression and violation of the peace by Germany or any of the States associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

Article IV

Should one of the High Contracting Parties during the post-war period become involved in hostilities with Germany or any of the States mentioned in Article III (2) in consequence of an attack by that State against that Party, the other High Contracting Party will at once give to the Contracting Party so involved in hostilities all the military and other support and assistance in his power.

This Article shall remain in force until the High Contracting Parties by mutual agreement, shall recognise that it is superseded by the adoption of the proposals contemplated in Article III (1). In default of the adoption of such proposals, it shall remain in force for a period of twenty years, and thereafter until terminated by either High Contracting Party, as provided in Article VIII.

Article V

The High Contracting Parties, having regard to the interests of the security of each of them, agree to work together in close and friendly collaboration after the re-establishment of peace for the organisation of security and economic prosperity in Europe. They will take into account the interests of the United Nations in these objects, and they will act in accordance with the two principles of not seeking territorial aggrandisement for themselves and of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

Article VI

The High Contracting Parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

Article VII

Each High Contracting Party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other High Contracting Party.

Article VIII

The Present Treaty is subject to ratification in the shortest possible time and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged in Moscow as soon as possible.

It comes into force immediately on the exchange of the instruments of ratification and shall thereupon replace the Agreement between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, signed at Moscow on the 12th July, 1941.

Part I of the present treaty shall remain in force until the reestablishment of peace between the High Contracting Parties and Germany and the Powers associated with her in acts of aggression in Europe.

Part II of the present Treaty shall remain in force for a period of twenty years. Thereafter, unless twelve months' notice has been given by either Party to terminate the Treaty at the end of the said period of twenty years, it shall continue in force until twelve months after either High Contracting Party shall have given notice to the other in writing of his intention to terminate it.

In witness whereof the above-named Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in duplicate in London on the 26th day of May, 1942, in the English and Russian languages, both texts being equally authentic.

(L.S.) ANTHONY EDEN.
(L.S.) V. MOLOTOV.

TEXT OF THE RUSSIAN-FRENCH ALLIANCE

(The following is the text of the treaty of alliance and mutual assistance between the Provisional Government of the French Republic and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, as transmitted today by the French Telegraph Service and reported by the Federal Communications Commission:)

The Provisional Government of the French Republic and the Praesidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

Resolve to pursue together, and until the end, the war against Germany;

Convinced that, once victory has been achieved, the reestablishment of peace on a stable basis and its maintenance for a lasting future require the existence of close collaboration between them and with all the United Nations;

Resolved to collaborate with a view to creating an international system of security, making possible an effective maintenance of general peace and guaranteeing the harmonious development of relations between nations;

Desirous of confirming reciprocal commitments resulting from an exchange of letters on Sept. 20, 1941, relating to joint action in the war against Germany;

Certain of meeting, through the conclusion of an alliance between France and the U. S. S. R., the feelings as well as the interests of the two nations, the demands of war as well as the requirements of peace and of economic reconstruction in full conformity with the aims adopted by the United Nations,

Have resolved to conclude a treaty and to this effect have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The Provisional Government of the French Republic, M. Georges Bidault, Minister of Foreign Affairs; the Praesidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, M. Vyacheslaff Mikhailovitch Molotoff, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs. Their appointments having been recognized as being fully valid, they have agreed on the following provisions:

ARTICLE I

Each of the high contracting parties will continue to fight by the side of the other and of the United Nations until final victory over Germany. Each of the high contracting parties undertakes to afford to the other help and assistance in this struggle by all the means at its disposal.

ARTICLE II

The high contracting parties undertake not to enter into separate negotiations with Germany or to conclude, without mutual consent, an armistice or a treaty of peace with either the Hitlerite Government or any government or authority set up in Germany with the aim of prolonging or maintaining the German policy of aggression.

ARTICLE III

The high contracting parties undertake to adopt in complete agreement, at the end of the present conflict with Germany, all measures necessary to eliminate any new threat on the part of Germany and to oppose any initiative of a nature capable of making possible a new attempt at aggression on her part.

ARTICLE IV

If one of the high contracting parties should find itself involved in hostilities with Germany either as the result of an aggression committed by Germany or as the result of the provisions of the above Article III, the other high contracting power will immediately give the contracting power so involved all the help and assistance in its power.

ARTICLE V

The high contracting parties undertake not to conclude alliances and not to participate in any coalition directed against one of them.

ARTICLE VI

The high contracting parties agree to give each other all possible economic assistance after the war in order to facilitate and hasten the reconstruction of the two countries and in order to contribute to the prosperity of the world.

ARTICLE VII

The present treaty in no way affects the commitments previously undertaken by the high contracting parties toward third parties by virtue of published treaties.

ARTICLE VIII

The present treaty, of which the French and Russian texts are equally valid, will be ratified and instruments of ratification thereof will be exchanged in Paris as soon as possible. It will take effect immediately on the exchange of instruments of ratification and will remain in force for twenty years. If this treaty is not denounced by one of the high contracting parties at least one year before the expiration of this period, it will remain in force without limitation as to its duration, each one of the high contracting parties being then able to terminate it by means of declaration to this effect subject to one year's notice.

The plenipotentiaries above named have hereunto set their hands and seals.

Made in Moscow in duplicate on Dec. 10, 1944.

BIDAULT,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.
MOLOTOFF,
Commissar for Foreign Affairs.

[1] "Treaty Series No. 15 (1941)." Cmd. 6304.
[2] "United States No. 3 (1941)." Cmd. 6321. (The declaration was drawn up by the Prime Minister and the President of the United States of America on August 12, 1941, and made public on August 14.)

Devious Ways of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able and thought-provoking editorial from the Nashville Banner, published in Nashville, Tenn.

This editorial appeared on Saturday, February 28, 1948, and I commend its reading to all interested in the defeat of communism. It points out that while we spend billions to stem the tide of communism in Europe, we are tolerating things in our own country which are utterly inconsistent with our anti-communistic flames.

I commend this editorial and congratulate the editor and the newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM, A SNEAK ENEMY, BETRAYS ITS HAND

In communism, the civilized world faces an enemy which is at once a sneak and a pervert, a lying, murderous foe, spawned in hell and doing its master's bidding. It breeds on treachery, and fastens by that method on the weak and sleeping. It penetrates, where permitted, to seduce the unvigilant. It exploits at the same time every advantage occasioned by the reluctance of contemporaries to initiate a breach in present "peace" machinery.

We mention the latter point thus early in the discussion because it is obvious that Russia—bound body and soul by this design of world revolution—will block every effort of the United Nations to achieve any working formula of peace. The Kremlin is using UN, and its power of obstruction therein, to stultify joint action against this conspiracy of infamy, expansionism, and aggression, while its own agents knock over government after government in nation after nation. It will continue to do that so long as by choice on its part and sufferance on the part of the rest, it remains ostensibly a "member" of this organization of the "peace-loving."

While deploring Communist conquest of such nations as Czechoslovakia, the likely conquest of Finland, the possible spring putsches against France and Italy, contemporaries like the Big Three and Four still shake the hands of Communist-Kremlin delegates, debate with them, and go through all the ceremonious motions of sweet and trusting fraternity. Yes, we even contemplate termination of diplomatic recognition where Czechoslovakia is concerned, because it now is captive, yet preserve full recognition of its captor, lest we offend as outspoken and back-stabbing an enemy as we ever have had.

We spend billions, and contemplate spending other multiplied billions of dollars to stem the tide of surrender to communism in Europe, but break bread with it at the peace table and tolerate its conspiracy within our very doors. We wax indignant (and properly so) when liberty falls within the area which communism has designated as its own immediate orbit, and purges ensue to seal with blood a covenant with the devil over there, but ignore territorial plans drawn at Moscow, picked up and advertised and propagandized here, to carve the southland into a Soviet colony populated and ruled on a racial basis.

Yes, the Kremlin has all its maps ready—including the United States map. It has filled in part of those maps, by expansion and aggression. Its plans are worldwide. What has happened in Czechoslovakia, and is in store for Finland; what the Kremlin contemplates in its renewed drive on France and Italy, are all part of its plan. It is divide and conquer, penetrate and conquer, attack where necessary and conquer, purging as it goes.

But it is also: Maintain the subterfuge of peace-loving participation in joint efforts as long as possible; play on the sympathy, the gullibility, the patience of these nations as long as possible; be misunderstood as long as possible Arm meanwhile. Sabotage meanwhile. Steal atom secrets meanwhile. Do missionary work, meanwhile, and count on the stupidity of sympathetic jackasses to get in a kind word for continuing appeasement.

Communism is a sneak, the most depraved and dangerous in history. Yet we are playing with it—and that is its danger.

It can be defeated. It can be contained in a small area where it will die of its own rottenness and eventually be buried as were nazism and fascism of another hue. But we're certainly not going to kill it with kindness, or discourage its caress of death all over the earth by submitting to its embrace for just the seduction that is on its perverted mind. When the United Nations wake up to this, a sufficient number remaining will be United Nations to take care of the Kremlin threat.

The International Communist Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD at this point excerpts from the official organ of the new international Communist alliance, the Communist information bureau or cominform.

In view of the current congressional study of plans to finance foreign countries in their fight against Communist domination and also in view of forthcoming legislative proposals dealing with the Communist problem within the United States, I believe that Members of Congress will find helpful these expressions by the ringleaders of the international Communist conspiracy.

Through the wide distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the schools and libraries of the country, I feel that the general public will also benefit from this timely and significant material.

The Cominform was established during a secret meeting of leaders from nine European Communist parties in Poland last September. This organization, which has its headquarters in the Soviet puppet state of Yugoslavia, is recognized as nothing more than a resumption of open activities by the old Communist International, that Moscow-directed alliance for world revolution which Stalin pretended to dissolve in 1943 when he needed our help to defeat Hitler.

I am submitting excerpts from the first issue of the Cominform's publication, dated November 10, 1947, as well as excerpts from the issue of December 1, 1947. The articles leave no doubt that the international Communist movement considers the United States to be the chief stumbling block to world-wide Communist control, and as such is to be made the chief target of attack by Communists throughout the world, including the United States Communists.

The publication bluntly tells us that the Communists are now on the offensive. A. Zhdanov, a secretary of the Soviet Communist Party and member of the powerful Politburo of the Soviet Union, who was one of the leaders in the formation of the Cominform, confesses that the U. S. S. R. plans to bend every effort to see that the Marshall plan is doomed to failure. This lieutenant of Stalin also reveals that Russia is hoping that a defeat of the Marshall plan will hasten what to Russia is an inevitable economic crisis in the United States. How the Communists profit from economic crises within a country is already known to us from the difficulties in France and Italy.

The Cominform organ promises to present articles showing how the theories of Marxism and Leninism can be applied by the Communist parties of various countries. As you know, the theories of Marx and Lenin are founded on the violent overthrow of non-Communist systems of government.

I would like to call particular attention to the admission by Soviet Leader Malenkov that the Soviet Union maintains social and political contacts with organizations in other countries through which it strengthens the international influence of the Soviet Union.

The predominance of writings by Soviet Communist leaders in the Cominform publication is evidence of the predominant role that the Soviet Union is playing in this international Communist alliance. In addition to articles by Zhdanov, there are discussions by G. Malenkov, another one of Stalin's lieutenants, who also serves on the Politburo of the Soviet Union and the Secretariat of the Soviet Communist Party.

Although the Cominform membership is allegedly limited to the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, France, and Italy, there is little doubt after reading the official organ that the information serves as instructions to Communist Parties in all the other countries of the world.

For example, an editorial in the first issue of the organ lays down the rule that "Communist Parties everywhere must become a leader or organizer of the popular masses in the struggle for peace and a people's democracy."

Communists, of course, have their own definitions for terms such as peace and democracy. As the Cominform organ itself discloses, peace is that which the Soviet Union is seeking and which America is trying to destroy; while democracy is the form of government in the totalitarian Soviet Union and its puppet states. Thus only can one understand the significance of the title of the Cominform publication, which is "For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy."

The matter referred to follows:

[From For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy, of November 10, 1947]

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION [1]

(By A. Zhdanov)

I. THE POSTWAR WORLD SITUATION

The end of the Second World War brought with it big changes in the world situation. The military defeat of the bloc of Fascist states, the character of the war as a war of liberation from fascism and the decisive role played by the Soviet Union in the vanquishing of the Fascist aggressors sharply altered the alinement of forces between the two systems—the socialist and the capitalist—in favor of socialism.

What is the essential nature of these changes?

The principal outcome of World War II was the military defeat of Germany and Japan, the two most militaristic and aggressive of the capitalist countries. The reactionary imperialist elements all over the world, notably in Britain, America, and France, had reposed great hopes in Germany and Japan, and chiefly in Hitler Germany; firstly, as in a force most capable of inflicting a blow on the Soviet Union in order to, if not having it destroyed altogether, weaken it at least and undermine its influence; secondly, as in a force capable of smashing the revolutionary labor and democratic movement in Germany herself and in all countries singled out for Nazi aggression, and thereby strengthening capitalism generally. This was the chief reason for the prewar policy of appeasement and encouragement of Fascist aggression, the so-called Munich policy consistently pursued by the imperialist ruling circles of Britain, France, and the United States.

But the hopes reposed by the British, French, and American imperialists in the Hitlerites were not realized. The Hitlerites proved to be weaker, and the Soviet Union and the freedom-loving nations stronger than the Munichists had anticipated. As the result of World War II the major forces of bellicose international Fascist reaction had been smashed and put out of commission for a long time to come.

This was accompanied by another serious loss to the world capitalist system generally. Whereas the principal result of World War I had been that the united imperialist front was breached and that Russia dropped out of the world capitalist system, and whereas, as a consequence of the triumph of the Socialist system in the U. S. S. R., capitalism ceased to be an integral, world-wide economic system, World War II and the defeat of fascism, the weakening of the world position of capitalism, and the enhanced strength of the anti-Fascist movement resulted in a number of countries in central and southeastern Europe dropping out of the imperialist system. In these countries new, popular, democratic regimes arose. The impressive lesson given by the patriotic war of the Soviet Union and the liberating role of the Soviet Army were accompanied by a mass struggle of the freedom-loving peoples for national liberation from the Fascist invaders and their accomplices. In the course of this struggle the pro-Fascist elements, the collaborators with Hitler—the most influential of the big capitalists, large landowners, high officials, and monarchist officers—were exposed as betrayers of the national interests. In the Danubian countries, liberation from German Fascist slavery was accompanied by the removal from power of the top bourgeoisie and landlords, compromised by collaborating with German fascism, and by the rise to power of new forces from among the people who had proved their worth in the struggle against the Hitlerite conquerors. In these countries, representatives of the workers, the peasants, and the progressive intellectuals took over power. Since the working class had everywhere displayed the greatest heroism, the greatest consistency and implacability in the struggle against fascism, its prestige and influence among the people have increased immensely.

The new democratic power in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Albania, backed by the mass of the people, was able within a minimum period to carry through such progressive democratic reforms as bourgeois democracy is no longer capable of effecting. Agrarian reform turned over the land to the peasants and led to the elimination of the landlord class. Nationalization of large-scale industry and banks, and the confiscation of the property of traitors who had collaborated with the Germans radically undermined the position of monopoly capital in these countries and redeemed the masses from imperialist bondage. Together with this, the foundation was laid of state, national ownership, and a new type of state was created—the people's republic, where the power belongs to the people, where large-scale industry, transport, and banks are owned by the state, and where a bloc of the laboring classes of the population, headed by the working class, constitute a leading force. As a result, the peoples of these countries have not only torn themselves from the clutches of imperialism, but are paving the way for entry onto the path of Socialist development.

[1] A speech delivered at the Informative Conference of representatives of a number of the Communist Parties held in Poland at the end of September 1947.

The war immensely enhanced the international significance and prestige of the U. S. S. R. The U. S. S. R. was the leading force and the guiding spirit in the military defeat of Germany and Japan. The progressive democratic forces of the whole world rallied around the Soviet Union. The Socialist state successfully stood the strenuous test of the war and emerged victorious from the mortal struggle with a most powerful enemy. Instead of being enfeebled, the U. S. S. R. became stronger.

The capitalist world has also undergone a substantial change. Of the six so-called great imperialist powers—Germany, Japan, Great Britain, the United States of America, France, and Italy—three have been eliminated by military defeat—Germany, Italy, and Japan. France has also been weakened and has lost its significance as a great power. As a result, only two great imperialist world powers remain—the United States and Great Britain. But the position of one of them, Great Britain, has been undermined. The war revealed that militarily and politically British imperialism was not so strong as it had been. In Europe, Britain was helpless against German aggression. In Asia, Britain, one of the biggest of the imperialist powers, was unable to retain hold of her colonial possessions without outside aid. Temporarily cut off from colonies that supplied her with food and raw materials and absorbed a large part of her industrial products, Britain found herself dependent, militarily and economically, upon American supplies of food and manufactured goods. After the war, Britain became increasingly dependent financially and economically, on the United States. Although she succeeded in recovering her colonies after the war, Britain found herself faced there with the enhanced influence of American imperialism, which during the war had invaded all the regions that before the war had been regarded as exclusive spheres of influence of British capital (the Arab east, southeast Asia). America has also increased her influence in the British dominions and in South America, where the former role of Britain is very largely and to an ever-increasing extent, passed to the United States.

World War II aggravated the crisis of the colonial system, as expressed in the rise of a powerful movement for national liberation in the colonies and dependencies. This has placed the rear of the capitalist system in jeopardy. The peoples of the colonies no longer wish to live in the old way. The ruling classes of the metropolitan countries can no longer govern the colonies on the old lines. Attempts to crush the national liberation movement by military force now increasingly encounter armed resistance on the part of the colonial peoples and lead to protracted colonial wars (Holland-Indonesia, France—Viet Nam).

The war—itself a product of the unevenness of capitalist development in the different countries—still further intensified this unevenness. Of all the capitalist powers, only one—the United States—emerged from the war not only unweakened but even considerably stronger economically and militarily. The war greatly enriched the American capitalists. The American people, on the other hand, did not experience the privations that accompany war, the hardship of occupation, or aerial bombardment, and since America entered the war practically in its concluding stage, when the issue was already decided, her human casualties were relatively small. For the United States of America, the war was primarily and chiefly a spur to extensive industrial development and to a substantial increase of exports, principally to Europe.

But the end of the war confronted the United States with a number of new problems. The capitalist monopolies were anxious to maintain their profits at the former high level, and accordingly pressed hard to prevent a reduction of the wartime volume of deliveries. But this meant that the United States must retain the foreign markets which had absorbed American products during the war, and, moreover, acquire new markets, inasmuch as the war had substantially lowered the purchasing power of most of the countries. The financial and economic dependence of these countries on the United States of America had likewise increased. The United States extended credits abroad to a sum of $19,000,000,000, not counting investments in the International Bank and the International Currency Fund. America's principal competitors, Germany and Japan, have disappeared from the world market, and this has opened up new and very considerable opportunities for the United States. Whereas before World War II the more influential reactionary circles of American imperialism had adhered to an isolationist policy and had refrained from active interference in the affairs of Europe and Asia, in the new, postwar conditions the Wall Street bosses adopted a new policy. They advanced a program of utilizing America's military and economic might, not only to retain and consolidate the positions won abroad during the war but to expand them to the maximum and to replace Germany, Japan, and Italy in the world market. The sharp decline of the economic power of the other capitalist states makes it possible to speculate on their postwar economic difficulties, and, in particular, on the postwar economic difficulties of Great Britain, which makes it easier to bring these countries under American control. The United States proclaimed a new frankly predatory and expansionist course.

The purpose of this new, frankly expansionist course is to establish the world supremacy of American imperialism. With a view to consolidating America's monopoly position in the markets gained as a result of the disappearance of her two biggest competitors, Germany and Japan, and the weakening of her capitalist partners, Great Britain and France, the new course of United States policy envisages a broad program of military, economic, and political measures, designed to establish United States political and economic domination in all countries marked out for American expansion, to reduce these countries to the status of satellites of the United States, and to set up regimes within them which would eliminate all obstacles on the part of the labor and democratic movement to the exploitation of these countries by American capital. The United States is now endeavoring to extend this new line of policy not only to its enemies in the war and to neutral countries, but in an increasing degree to its wartime allies.

Special attention is being paid to the exploitation of the economic difficulties of Great Britain, which is not only America's ally but also a long-standing capitalist rival and competitor. It is the design of America's expansionist policy not only to prevent Britain from escaping from the vise of economic dependence on the United States in which she was gripped during the war, but, on the contrary, to increase the pressure, with a view of gradually depriving her of control over her colonies, ousting her from her spheres of influence, and reducing her to the status of a vassal state.

Thus the new policy of the United States is designed to consolidate its monopoly position and to reduce its capitalist partners to a state of subordination and dependence on America.

But America's aspiration to world supremacy encounter an obstacle in the U. S. S. R., the stronghold of anti-imperialist and anti-Fascist policy, and its growing international influence, in the new democracies, which have escaped from the control of British and American imperialism, and in the workers of all countries, including America itself, who do not want a new war for the supremacy of their oppressors. Accordingly, the new expansionist and reactionary policy of the United States envisages a struggle against the U. S. S. R., against the labor movement in all countries, including the United States and against the emancipationist, anti-imperialist forces in all countries.

Alarmed by the achievements of socialism in the U. S. S. R., by the achievements of the new democracies, and by the postwar growth of the labor and democratic movement in all countries, the American reactionaries are disposed to take upon themselves the mission of saviors of the capitalist system from communism.

The frank expansionist program of the United States is therefore highly reminiscent of the reckless program, which failed so ignominiously, of the Fascist aggressors, who, as we know, also made a bid for world supremacy.

Just as the Hitlerites, when they were making their preparations for piratical aggression, adopted the camouflage of anticommunism in order to make it possible to oppress and enslave all peoples and primarily and chiefly their own people, America's present-day ruling circles mask their expansionist policy, and even their offensive against the vital interests of their weaker imperialist rival, Great Britain, by fictitious considerations of defense against communism. The feverish piling up of armaments, the construction of new military bases and the creation of bridgeheads for the American armed forces in all parts of the world is justified on the false and pharisaical grounds of defense against an imaginary threat of war on the part of the U. S. S. R. With the help of intimidation, bribery, and chicanery, American diplomacy finds it easy to extort from other capitalist countries, and primarily from Great Britain, consent to the legitimization of America's superior position in Europe and Asia—in the western zones of Germany, in Austria, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, Iran, Afghanistan, China, Japan and so forth.

The American imperialists regard themselves as the principal force opposed to the U. S. S. R., the new democracies and the labor and democratic movement in all countries of the world, as the bulwark of the reactionary, antidemocratic forces in all parts of the globe. Accordingly, literally on the day following the conclusion of World War II, they set to work to build up a front hostile to the U. S. S. R. and world democracy, and to encourage the antipopular reactionary forces—collaborationists and former capitalist stooges—in the European countries which had been liberated from the Nazi yoke and which were beginning to arrange their affairs according to their own choice.

The more malignant and unbalanced imperialist politicians followed the lead of Churchill in hatching plans for the speedy launching of a preventive war against the U. S. S. R. and openly called for the employment of America's temporary monopoly of the atomic weapon against the Soviet people. The new war mongers are trying to intimidate and browbeat not only the U. S. S. R. but other countries as well, notably China and India, by libelously depicting the U. S. S. R. as a potential aggressor, while they themselves pose as friends of China and India, as saviors from the Communist peril, their mission being to help the weak. By these means they are seeking to keep India and China under the sway of imperialism

and in continued political and economic bondage.

II. THE NEW POSTWAR ALINEMENT OF POLITICAL FORCES AND THE FORMATION OF TWO CAMPS: THE IMPERIALIST AND ANTIDEMOCRATIC CAMP, AND THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST AND DEMOCRATIC ONE

The fundamental changes caused by the war on the international scene and in the position of individual countries has entirely changed the political landscape of the world. A new alinement of political forces has arisen. The more the war recedes into the past the more distinct become two major trends in postwar international policy, corresponding to the division of the political forces operating on the international arena into two major camps: the imperialist and antidemocratic camp, on the one hand, and the anti-imperialist and democratic camp, on the other. The principal driving force of the imperialist camp is the United States of America. Allied with it are Great Britain and France. The existence of the Attlee-Bevin labor government in Britain and the Ramadier Socialist Government in France does not hinder these countries from playing the part of satellites of the United States and following the lead of its imperialist policy on all major questions. The imperialist camp is also supported by colony-owning countries, such as Belgium and Holland, by countries with reactionary antidemocratic regimes, such as Turkey and Greece, and by countries politically and economically dependent on the United States, such as the near eastern and South American countries and China.

The cardinal purpose of the imperialist camp is to strengthen imperialism, to hatch a new imperialist war, to combat socialism and democracy, and to support reactionary and antidemocratic pro-Fascist regimes and movements everywhere.

In the pursuit of these ends the imperialist camp is prepared to rely on reactionary and anitdemcratic forces in all countries, and to support its former adversaries in the war against its wartime allies.

The anti-Fascist forces comprise the second camp. This camp is based on the U. S. S. R. and the new democracies. It also includes countries that have broken with imperialism and have firmly set foot on the path of democratic development, such as Rumania, Hungary, and Finland. Indonesia and Viet Nam are associated with it; it has the sympathy of India, Egypt, and Syria. The anti-imperialist camp is backed by the labor and democratic movement and by the fraternal Communist Parties in all countries, by the fighters for national liberation in the colonies and dependencies, by all progressive and democratic forces in every country. The purpose of this camp is to resist the threat of new wars and imperialist expansion, to strengthen democracy and to extirpate the vestiges of fascism.

The end of the Second World War confronted all the freedom-loving nations with the cardinal task of securing a lasting democratic peace sealing victory over fascism. In the accomplishment of this fundamental task of the postwar period the Soviet Union and its foreign policy are playing a leading role. This follows from the very nature of the Soviet Socialist state, to which motives of aggression and exploitation are utterly alien, and which is interested in creating the most favorable conditions for the building of a Communist society. One of these conditions is external peace. As embodiment of a new and superior social system, the Soviet Union reflects in its foreign policy the aspirations of progressive mankind, which desires lasting peace and has nothing to gain from a new war hatched by capitalism. The Soviet Union is a staunch supporter of the liberty and independence of all nations, and a foe of national and racial oppression and colonial exploitation in any shape or form. The change in the general alinement of forces between the capitalist world and the Socialist world brought about by the war has still further enhanced the significance of the foreign policy of the Soviet state and enlarged the scope of its activity on the international arena.

All the forces of the anti-imperialist and anti-Fascist camp are united in the effort to secure a just and democratic peace. It is this united effort that has brought about and strengthened friendly cooperation between the U. S. S. R. and democratic countries on all questions of foreign policy. These countries, and in the first place the new democracies—Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Albania which played a big part in the war of liberation from fascism, as well as Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and to some extent Finland, which have joined the anti-Fascist front—have proved themselves in the postwar period staunch defenders of peace, democracy and their own liberty and independence against all attempts on the part of the United States and Great Britain to turn them back in their course and to bring them again under the imperialist yoke.

The successes and the growing international prestige of the democratic camp were not to the liking of the imperialists. Even while World War II was still on, reactionary forces in Great Britain and the United States became increasingly active, striving to prevent concerted action by the Allied Powers, to protract the war, to bleed the U. S. S. R., and to save the Fascist aggressors from utter defeat. The sabotage of the Second Front by the Anglo-Saxon imperialists, headed by Churchill, was a clear reflection of this tendency, which was in point of fact a continuation of the Munich policy in the new and changed conditions. But while the war was still in progress British and American reactionary circles did not venture to come out openly against the Soviet Union and the democratic countries, realizing that they had the undivided sympathy of the masses all over the world. But in the concluding months of the war the situation began to change. The British and American imperialists already manifested their unwillingness to respect the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union and the democratic countries at the Potsdam tripartite conference, in July 1945.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the democratic countries in these two past years has been a policy of consistently working for the observance of the democratic principles in the postwar settlement. The countries of the anti-imperialist camp have loyally and consistently striven for the implementation of these principles, without deviating from them one iota. Consequently, the major objective of the postwar foreign policy of the democratic states has been a democratic peace, the eradication of the vestiges of facism and the prevention of a resurgence of Fascist imperialist aggression, the recognition of the principle of the equality of nations and respect for their sovereignty, and general reduction of all armaments and the outlawing of the most destructive weapons, those designed for the mass slaughter of the civilian population. In their effort to secure these objectives Soviet diplomacy and the diplomacy of the democratic countries met with the resistance of Anglo-American diplomacy, which since the war has persistently and unswervingly striven for the rejection of the general principles of the postwar settlement proclaimed by the Allies during the war, and to replace the policy of peace and consolidation of democracy by a new policy, a policy aiming at violating general peace, protecting Fascist elements, and persecuting democracy in all countries.

Of immense importance are the joint efforts of the diplomacy of the U. S. S. R. and that of the other democratic countries to secure a reduction of armaments and the outlawing of the most destructive of them—the atomic bomb.

On the initiative of the Soviet Union, a resolution was moved in the United Nations calling for a general reduction of armaments and the recognition, as a primary task, of the necessity to prohibit the production and use of atomic energy for warlike purposes. This motion of the Soviet Government was fiercely resisted by the United States and Great Britain. All the efforts of the imperialist elements were concentrated on sabotaging this decision by erecting endless and fruitless obstacles and barriers, with the object of preventing the adoption of any effective practical measures. The activities of the delegates of the U. S. S. R. and the other democratic countries in the agencies of the United Nations bear the character of a systematic, stubborn day-to-day struggle for democratic principles of international cooperation, for the exposure of the intrigues of the imperialist plotters against the peace and security of the nations.

This was openly demonstrated, for example, in the discussion of the situation on Greece's northern frontiers. The Soviet Union and Poland vigorously objected to the Security Council being used as a means of discrediting Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania, who are falsely accused by the imperialists of aggressive acts against Greece.

Soviet foreign policy proceeds from the fact of the coexistence for a long period of the two systems—capitalism and socialism. From this it follows that cooperation between the U. S. S. R. and countries with other systems is possible, provided that the principle of reciprocity is observed and that obligations once assumed are honored. Everyone knows that the U. S. S. R. has always honored the obligations it has assumed. The Soviet Union has demonstrated its will and desire for cooperation.

Britain and America are pursuing the very opposite policy in the United Nations. They are doing everything they can to renounce their commitments and to secure a free hand for the prosecution of a new policy, a policy which envisages not cooperation among the nations, but the hounding of one against the other, violation of the rights and interests of democratic nations, and the isolation of the U. S. S. R.

Soviet policy follows the line of maintaining loyal, good-neighbor relations with all states that display the desire for cooperation. As to the countries that are its genuine friends and allies, the Soviet Union has always behaved, and will always behave, as their true friend and ally. Soviet foreign policy envisages a further extension of friendly aid by the Soviet Union to these countries.

Soviet foreign policy, defending the cause of peace, discountenances a policy of vengeance toward the vanquished countries.

It is known that the U. S. S. R. is in favor of a united, peace-loving, demilitarized, and democratic Germany. Comrade Stalin formulated the Soviet policy toward Germany when he said: "In short, the policy of the Soviet Union on the German question reduces itself to the demilitarization and democratization of Germany. The demilitarization and democratization of Germany is one of the most important guarantees for the establishment of a solid and lasting peace." However, this policy of the Soviet Union toward Germany is being encountered by frantic opposition from the imperialist circles in the United States and Great Britain.

The meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in Moscow in March and April 1947 demonstrated that the United States, Great Britain, and France are prepared not only to prevent the democratic reconstruction and demilitarization of Germany, but even to liquidate her as an integral state, to dismember her, and to settle the question of peace separately.

Today this policy is being conducted under new conditions, now that America has abandoned the old course of Roosevelt and is passing to a new policy, a policy of preparing for new military adventures.

III. THE AMERICAN PLAN FOR THE ENTHRALLMENT OF EUROPE

The aggressive and frankly expansionist course to which American imperialism has committed itself since the end of World War II finds expression in both the foreign and home policy of the United States. The active support rendered to the reactionary, antidemocratic forces all over the world, the sabotage of the Potsdam decisions which call for the democratic reconstruction and demilitarization of Germany, the protection given to Japanese reactionaries, the extensive war preparations, and the accumulation of atomic bombs—all this goes hand in hand with an offensive against the elementary democratic rights of the working people in the United States itself.

Although the United States of America suffered comparatively little from the war, the vast majority of the Americans do not want another war, with its accompanying sacrifices and limitations. This has induced monopoly capital and its servitors among the ruling circles in the United States to resort to extraordinary means in order to crush the opposition at home to the aggressive expansionist course and to secure a free hand for the further prosecutions of this dangerous policy.

But the crusade against communism proclaimed by America's ruling circles with the backing of the capitalist monopolies leads as a logical consequence to attacks on the fundamental rights and interests of the American working people, to the fascistization of America's political life, and to the dissemination of the most savage and misanthropic theories and views. Dreaming about preparing for a new, a third world war, American expansionist circles are vitally interested in stifling all possible resistance within the country to adventures abroad, in poisoning the minds of the politically backward and unenlightened American masses with the virus of chauvinism and militarism, and in stultifying the average American with the help of all the diverse means of anti-Soviet and anti-Communist propaganda—the cinema, the radio, the church, and the press. The expansionist foreign policy inspired and conducted by the American reactionaries envisages simultaneous action along all lines:

(1) Strategical military measures;
(2) Economic expansion; and
(3) Ideological struggle.

Realization of the strategical plans for future aggression is connected with the desire to utilize to the utmost the war-production facilities of the United States, which had grown to enormous proportions by the end of World War II. American imperialism is persistently pursuing a policy of militarizing the country. Expenditures on the United States Army and Navy exceeds $11,000,000,000 per annum. In 1947-48 35 percent of America's budget was appropriated for the armed forces, or 11 times more than in 1937-38.

On the outbreak of World War II the American Army was the seventeenth largest in the capitalist world; today it is the largest one. The United States is not only accumulating stocks of atomic bombs; American strategy says quite openly that it is preparing bacteriological weapons.

The strategical plans of the United States envisage the creation in peacetime of numerous bases and vantage grounds situated at great distances from the American continent and designed to be used for aggressive purposes against the U. S. S. R. and the countries of the new democracy. America has built, or is building, air and naval bases in Alaska, Japan, Italy, South Korea, China, Egypt, Iran, Turkey, Greece, Austria, and western Germany. There are American military missions in Afghanistan, and even in Nepal. Feverish preparations are being made to use the Arctic for purposes of military aggression.

Although the war has long since ended, the military alliance between Britain and the United States and even a combined Anglo-American military staff continue to exist. Under the guise of agreement for the standardization of weapons the United States has established its control over the armed forces and military plans of other countries, notably of Great Britain and Canada. Under the guise of joint defense of the Western Hemisphere, the countries of Latin America are being brought into the orbit of America's plans of military expansion. The United States Government has officially declared that it has committed itself to assist in the modernization of the Turkish Army, the army of the reactionary Kuomintang is being trained by American instructors and armed with American material. The military circles are becoming an active political force in the United States, supplying large numbers of Government officials and diplomats who are directing the whole policy of the country into an aggressive military course.

Economic expansion is an important supplement to the realization of America's strategical plan. American imperialism is endeavoring, like a usurer, to take advantage of the postwar difficulties of the European countries, in particular of the shortage of raw materials, fuel, and food in the Allied countries that suffered most from the war, to dictate to them extortionate terms for any assistance rendered. With an eye to the impending economic crisis, the United States is in a hurry to find new monopoly spheres of capital investment and markets for its goods. American economic assistance pursues the broad aim of bringing Europe into bondage to American capital. The more drastic the economic situation of a country is, the harsher are the terms which the American monopolies endeavor to dictate to it.

But economic control logically leads to political subjugation to American imperialism. Thus the United States combines the extension of monopoly markets for its goods with the acquisition of new bridgeheads for its fight against the new democratic forces of Europe. In saving a country from starvation and collapse, the American monopolies at the same time seek to rob it of all vestige of independence. American assistance automatically involves a change in the policy of the country to which it is rendered; parties and individuals come to power that are prepared, on directions from Washington, to carry out a program of home and foreign policy suitable to the United States (France, Italy, and so on).

Lastly, the aspiration to world supremacy and the antidemocratic policy of the United States involve an ideological struggle. The principal purpose of the ideological part of the American strategical plan is to deceive public opinion by slanderously accusing the Soviet Union and the new democracies of aggressive intentions, and thus representing the Anglo-Saxon bloc in a defensive role and absolving it of responsibility for preparing a new war. During the Second World War the popularity of the Soviet Union in foreign countries was enormously enhanced. Its devoted and heroic struggle against imperialism earned it the affection and respect of working people in all countries. The military and economic might of the Socialist state, the invincible strength of the moral and political unity of Soviet society were graphically demonstrated to the whole world. The reactionary circles in the United States and Great Britain are anxious to erase the deep impression made by the Socialist system on the working people of the world. The warmongers fully realize that long ideological preparation is necessary before they can get their soldiers to fight the Soviet Union.

In their ideological struggle against the U. S. S. R., the American imperialists, who have no great insight into political questions, demonstrate their ignorance by laying primary stress on the allegation that the Soviet Union is undemocratic and totalitarian, while the United States and Great Britain and the whole capitalist world are democratic. On this platform of ideological struggle—on this defense of bourgeois pseudo-democracy and condemnation of communism as totalitarian—are united all the enemies of the working class without exception, from the capitalist magnates to the Right Socialist leaders, who seize with the greatest eagerness on any slanderous imputations against the U. S. S. R. suggested to them by their imperialist masters. The pith and substance of this fraudulent propaganda is the claim that the earmark of true democracy is the existence of a plurality of parties and of an organized opposition minority. On these grounds the British Laborites, who spare no effort in their fight against communism, would like to discover antagonistic classes and a corresponding struggle of parties in the U. S. S. R. Political ignoramuses that they are, they cannot understand that capitalists and landlords, antagonistic classes, and hence a plurality of parties, have long ceased to exist in the U. S. S. R. They would like to have in the U. S. S. R. the bourgeois parties which are so dear to their hearts, including pseudo-socialistic parties, as an agency of imperialism. But to their bitter regret, these parties of the exploiting bourgeoisie have been doomed by history to disappear from the scene.

Th laborites and other advocates of bourgeois democracy will go to any length to slander the Soviet regime, but at the same time they regard the bloody dictatorship of the Fascist minority over the people in Greece and Turkey as perfectly normal, they close their eyes to many crying violations even of formal democracy in the bourgeois countries, and say nothing about the national and racial oppression, the corruption and the unceremonious abrogation of democratic rights in the United States of America.

One of the lines taken by the ideological campaign that goes hand in hand with the plans for the enslavement of Europe is an attack on the principle of national sovereignty, an appeal for the renouncement of the sovereign rights of nations to which is opposed the idea of a world government. The purpose of this campaign is to mask the unbridled expansion of American imperialism, which is ruthlessly violating the sovereign rights of nations, to represent the United States as a champion of universal laws, and those who resist American penetration as believers in an obsolete and selfish nationalism. The idea of a world government has been taken up by bourgeois intellectual cranks and pacifists, and is being exploited not only as a means of pressure, with the purpose of ideologically disarming the nations that defend their independence against the encroachments of American imperialism, but also as a slogan specially directed against the Soviet Union, which indefatigably and consistently upholds the principle of real equality and protection of the sovereign rights of all nations, big and small. Under present conditions imperialist countries like the United States of America, Great Britain, and the states closely associated with them become dangerous enemies of national independence and the self-determination of nations, while the Soviet Union and the new democracies are a reliable bulwark against encroachments on the equality and self-determination of nations.

It is a noteworthy fact that American military-political intelligence agents of the Bullitt breed, yellow trade-union leaders of the Green brand, the French Socialists headed by that inveterate apologian of capitalism, Blum, the German social democrat, Schumacher, and labor leaders of the Bevin type, are all united in close fellowship in carrying out the ideological plan of American imperialism.

At this present juncture the expansionist ambitions of the United States find concrete expression in the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan. Although they differ in form of presentation, both are an expression of a single policy, they are both an embodiment of the American design to enslave Europe.

We thus see that America is endeavoring to build a western bloc not on the pattern of Churchill's plan for a United States of Europe, which was conceived as an instrument of British policy, but as an American protectorate, in which sovereign European states, not excluding Britain itself, are to be assigned a role not very far removed from that of a forty-ninth State of America.

The Marshall plan strikes at the industrialization of the democratic countries of Europe and hence at the foundations of their integrity and independence. And if the plan for the Dawes-ization of Europe was doomed to failure, at a time when the forces of resistance to the Dawes plan were much weaker than they are now, today, in postwar Europe, there are quite sufficient forces, even leaving aside the Soviet Union, and if they display the will and determination, they can foil this plan of enslavement. All that is needed is the determination and readiness of the peoples of Europe to resist. As to the U. S. S. R., it will bend every effort in order that this plan be doomed to failure.

The assessment given by the countries of the anti-imperialist camp of the Marshall plan has been completely confirmed by the whole course of developments. In relation to the Marshall plan, the camp of democratic countries have proved that they are a mighty force standing guard over the independence and sovereignty of all European nations, that they refuse to yield to browbeating and intimidation, just as they refuse to be deceived by the hypocritical maneuvers of dollar diplomacy.

The Soviet Government has never objected to using foreign, and in particular American, credits as a means capable of expediting the process of economic rehabilitation. However, the Soviet Union has always taken the stand that the terms of credits must not be extortionate, and must not result in the economic and political subjugation of the debtor country to the creditor country. From this political stand, the Soviet Union has always held that foreign credits must not be the principal means of restoring a country's economy. The chief and paramount condition of a country's economic rehabilitation must be the utilization of its own internal forces and resources and the creation of its own industry. Only in this way can its independence be guaranteed against encroachments on the part of foreign capital, which constantly displays a tendency to utilize credits as an instrument of political and economic enthrallment. Such precisely is the Marshall plan, which would strike at the industrialization of the European countries and is consequently designed to undermine their independence.

The Soviet Union unswervingly holds the position that political and economic relations between states must be built exclusively on the basis of equality of the parties and mutual respect for their sovereign rights. Soviet foreign policy and, in particular, Soviet economic relations with foreign countries, are based on the principle of equality, on the principle that agreements must be of advantage to both parties. Treaties with the U. S. S. R. are agreements that are of mutual advantage to both parties and never contain anything that encroaches on the national independence and sovereignty of the contracting parties. This fundamental feature of the agreements of the U. S. S. R. with other states stands out particularly vividly just now, in the light of the unfair and unequal treaties being concluded or planned by the United States. Unequal agreements are alien to Soviet foreign trade policy. More, the development of the Soviet Union's economic relations with all countries interested in such relations demonstrates on what principles normal relations between states should be built. Suffice it to recall the treaties recently concluded by the U. S. S. R. with Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Finland. In this way the U. S. S. R. has clearly shown along what lines Europe may find the way out of its present economic plight. Britain might have had a similar treaty, if the Labor Government had not, under outside pressure, frustrated the agreement with the U. S. S. R., the agreement which was already on its way to conclusion.

The exposure of the American plan for the economic enslavement of the European countries is an indisputable service rendered by the foreign policy of the U. S. S. R. and the new democracies.

It should be borne in mind that America herself is threatened with an economic crisis. There are weighty reasons for Marshall's official generosity. If the European countries do not receive American credits, their demand for American goods will diminish, and this will tend to accelerate and intensify the approaching economic crisis in the United States. Accordingly, if the European countries display the necessary stamina and readiness to resist the enthralling terms of the American credit, America may find herself compelled to beat a retreat.

[From speech by G. Malenkov printed in December 1, 1947, issue, page 1, of For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy]

The great historic victories won by the Soviet Union during the war were possible only due to the preliminary preparations for defense made by our country under Comrade Stalin's leadership in the prewar years. It would be a mistake to imagine that a victory of such historic importance could have been achieved without preliminary preparations for active defense by the entire country, or that such preparations could have been effected in a short space of time, say in 3 or 4 years.

To withstand the blows of such an enemy as Hitler Germany, to repel this enemy, and then inflict utter defeat on him, required, apart from the unexampled bravery of our troops, the possession of armaments that were quite up to date and, moreover, in sufficient quantities, and of a well-organized system of supplies, also available in sufficient quantities. To make that possible one had to possess metals, fuel, a developed engineering industry, grain, and cotton. But in order to have all of this our country had to be transformed from a backward agrarian country into a historic and up-to-date industrial state. This historic transformation was effected in the course of the three 5-year plan periods, beginning with 1928.

Even prior to its participation in the Second World War, the U. S. S. R. possessed the minimum of material resources necessary to meet the basic requirements of the battle fronts. These material resources were created as a result of the fulfillment of three 5-year plans of national economic development by our country and our party under the leadership of Comrade Stalin. Thereby was established the economic base of the U. S. S. R. that could be used for the conduct of a victorious war.

[From speech by G. Malenkov, printed in December 1, 1947 issue, p. 3, of For A Lasting Peace for a People's Democracy]

One is the policy pursued by the Soviet Union and the new democracies. The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and of the democratic countries is designed to undermine imperialism, secure a stable democratic peace among the nations and generally strengthen amicable cooperation among the peace-loving nations.

In following this line, our foreign policy is supported by the increased international significance of the Soviet state and the new democracies.

The other trend in international politics is headed by the ruling clique of American imperialists. In their efforts to consolidate the position which American monopoly capital gained in Europe and Asia during the war, this clique has taken the path of outright expansion, of enthralling the weakened capitalist states of Europe and the colonial and dependent countries. It has chosen the path of hatching new war plans against the U. S. S. R. and the new democracies under the banner of combating the Communist menace. The clearest and most specific expression of this policy pursued by American capital is provided by the Truman-Marshall plans.

Such are the two trends in present-day international politics.

The wise Stalin foreign policy of the Soviet Union, both prior to the war and in the course of its conduct, enabled us correctly to utilize the contradictions existing within the imperialist camp, and this was one of the important factors making for our victory in the war.

We proceed from the fact that the coexistence of two systems—capitalism and socialism—is inevitable for a long period of time, and we follow the line of maintaining loyal good-neighborly relations with all states manifesting a desire for friendly cooperation on the condition that the principle of reciprocity is observed and that obligations undertaken are fulfilled. The U. S. S. R., true to its international treaties and obligations, pursues this policy with the utmost consistency and firmness.

But at the same time we are prepared to repel any policy hostile to the Soviet Union, no matter from what quarter it comes.

The CPSU (B) devotes much attention to problems of foreign policy and shows special concern for the selection and proper training of cadres capable of putting into effect the party's line in the sphere of foreign policy.

With regard to countries that have proven true friends and loyal allies of the Soviet state—the new democracies—the U. S. S. R. is always prepared to come to their assistance, and actually does so by rendering them extensive aid and firmly defending their interests.

The U. S. S. R. and the new democracies pursue a policy of unswerving support with regard to colonial and dependent countries fighting for their national liberation from the yoke of imperialism.

One of the major results of the Second World War is the strengthening of the U. S. S. R. and the establishment in a number of countries of new democracy systems under the leadership of the working class.

The defeat of Germany and Japan signify the weakening of the imperialist camp and the further aggravation of the general crisis of the capitalist system. Of the capitalist countries the United States of America emerged from the war considerably strengthened, while her partners, Great Britain and France, were weakened by the war.

In a situation in which America's chief competitors, Germany and Japan, have been removed and Great Britain and France weakened, the United States of America adopted a new openly expansionist policy aimed at establishing American world supremacy.

After the war, Soviet public organizations received extensive possibilities actively to participate in international trade-union and other democratic organizations, and to develop friendly contact with national democratic organizations in the vast majority of countries.

The active participation of the Soviet trade-unions and other public bodies in international democratic organizations is of assistance to our fraternal Communist parties in their struggle for the unity of the labor and democratic movement abroad. Our participation counteracts the splitting activities of the right-wing Socialists and other enemies of unity, facilitates the growth and consolidation of progressive organizations, and, at the same time, strengthens the international influence of the U. S. S. R.

Our cultural and political contact with democratic organizations in various countries, exercised in different forms, helps to spread the truth about the Socialist state, strengthens the influence of the Soviet Union, and facilitates the activities of democratic organizations.

[From editorial printed in December 1, 1947, p. 1, issue of For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy]

In the past few weeks all the political and diplomatic activity of the United States Government has been aimed at facilitating the preparations for a new war to win world domination for American imperialism. The United States delegation at the UNO General Assembly frenziedly resisted the efforts of the representatives of the Soviet Union and the countries of the people's democracy to curb the warmongers. With the vigorous support of their English, South American, French, and other vassals, the Americans are steadily digging under the foundations of UNO, in an effort to turn it into an executive organ of the United States State Department.

On orders from the American reactionaries the Fascist provocateurs in Brazil and Chile have broken off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and other countries of the people's democracy, thus preparing the ground for an unbridled anti-Soviet and anti-Communist campaign, which in its turn would facilitate the preparation for war.

The American imperialists are hurriedly building up a military arsenal in Europe in preparation for their military adventure. That is why they have split up Germany. They are restoring the industrial might of western Germany, by transforming the Anglo-American zone—Bizonia—into their protectorate which is entirely in the hands of the American militarists and their assistants—the German imperialists who are dreaming of revenge.

A new government has been formed in France on instructions from Washington, a government which aims through Draconic measures to destroy the French democratic and labor organizations. In Italy the de Gasperi government is forming a bloc with the Fascists to start a crusade against the labor organizations.

At the same time the American imperialists, supported by the British laborites, are making feverish military preparations. They are establishing strategic bases in Greece, in the Near and Middle East; are opening new military bases in Greenland, on Alaska; are extending the existing bases in Iceland, in Japan, in Korea; are sending troops and munition to China.

In an effort to mislead the politically backward sections of the population the warmongers have started a new campaign of lies and slander against the vanguard of the defenders of peace, against the Soviet Union, the countries of the people's democracy, the Communist parties, and against all active champions of peace.

The imperialists and their lackeys are frightened at the development and power of the world democratic movement, which is headed by the working class and its vanguard—the Communist parties. The forces fighting for peace and democracy are growing daily, and their resistance to the onslaught of the Anglo-Saxon imperialists is increasing. The more insistent the American imperialists are in their efforts to enslave the European countries economically, and to deprive them of their national sovereignty, the more consistent and resolute the resistance of the popular masses to the attempts to transform Europe into an American colony.

The valiant troops of the Greek Democratic Army, who are setting heroic examples in the struggle for freedom and independence, are frustrating the intentions of the Anglo-American warmongers to enslave the Greek people and to convert Greece into a springboard for a new war.

The French workers, united in the General Confederation of Labor, have exposed and branded the Marshall plan as an odious plot of a handful of United States industrial and finance magnates to enslave France. The mass strikes in Marseilles, Paris, and other French cities demonstrate that the anti-French and antilabor plot of the French bourgeoisie, who are acting on orders from Washington, is meeting with powerful resistance of the working class and other sections of the French people.

The workers of northern Italy who have unanimously opposed the Fascist provocations, have proved to the whole world that they are able to resist the treacherous plots of the American flunkey, De Gasperi.

The popular movement for peace is spreading to all countries. The people want peace. The peoples of Europe are ready to fight for peace, for freedom, and their national independence, which is now threatened by American-British imperialism, with the same determination displayed by them in the struggle for their liberation from Hitler Fascist slavery.

Communists who showed examples of heroism, courage, and selflessness in the struggle against the Hitler invaders, rallied and led the masses and won victory in a number of countries. There is no doubt whatsoever that today, when the ranks of the Communist Parties have increased, when the Communist Parties have developed politically, and grown stronger organizationally, when their influence among the popular masses has spread and taken deeper root, the Communists will be able to expose the instigators of war and to defend the freedom and independence of their countries.

[From the declaration released by the conference of Communist Parties at Belgrade, p. 1 of November 10, 1947, issue of For a Lasting Peace for a People's Democracy]

Under these circumstances it is necessary that the anti-imperialist, democratic camp should close its ranks, draw up an agreed program of actions and work out its own tactics against the main forces of the imperialist camp, against American imperialism and its British and French allies, against the right-wing Socialists, primarily in Britain and France.

[From editorial in November 10, 1947, issue, page 1, of For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy]

The imperialist and antidemocratic camp has intensified its propaganda and preparations for a new war. The Anglo-American imperialists continue to impose and reinforce the monarcho-fascist regimes in the countries dependent on them; continue to wreck the democratic organizations of the working class, to use corrupt politicians, known for their criminal ties with the Fascist Hitlerite regimes.

The policy of enslaving Europe economically, the preparations for a new war, the destruction of the democratic forces are veiled with hypocritical phrases about saving western democracy.

The Anglo-American imperialists boast about their democracy; their press, cinema, literature depict the domination of the handful of industrial magnates as a model example of democracy. However, genuine democracy is possible only where the people possess real political power, where the people can use this power against the landlords and capitalists. What democracy can there be in the United States of America today when the imperialist bourgeoisie, holding the reigns of political power, is the supreme master of all the tools and means of production? There is not very much of a difference in England and France, where parties, which call themselves Socialist parties, are in power.

The right-wing Socialists, slavishly devoted to the imperialist bourgeoisie, resort to pseudo-socialist demagogy, cover up and justify the bandit actions of the American imperialists.

The imperialist and antidemocratic camp is counterbalanced by the anti-imperialist and democratic camp, headed by the U. S. S. R. and the countries of the new people's democracy: Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Albania.

The countries of the new democracy, which have recently thrown off the yoke of their oppressors together with their Anglo-American imperialist masters, have introduced socio-economic and political reforms such as go to show that the people themselves in these countries are governing the country's life and promoting its development along the path to socialism.

These countries have become genuine democratic, independent, and sovereign states.

In contrast to the policy of the imperialist camp, the U. S. S. R. and the countries of the new democracy stand for peace and international cooperation on democratic principles.

The experience of the war and that of the postwar period has shown that henceforth the bourgeoisie of Europe have definitely taken the path of betrayal of the national interests and rejection of the sovereignty of their countries. This same experience has shown that the working class, headed by the Communist parties, is the most consistent leader of all the patriotic and democratic forces who defend the sovereignty and independence of their country.

[From editorial, November 10, 1947, issue of For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy]

The Communist Parties everywhere can, and must, take upon themselves the role of leader and organizer of the popular masses in the struggle for a lasting peace, for a people's democracy.

The journal For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy will exert every effort to help the Communist Parties rally their peoples into a powerful united camp, closely brought together by their vital interests in the struggle against the imperialist and antidemocratic camp.

Our journal will help the Communist Parties exchange experience, will help strengthen the mutual contacts and fraternal solidarity of the working peoples of the different countries in their great struggle for a lasting peace and a people's democracy.

The journal also sets itself the task to further elaborate questions of the great and invincible theory of Marxism-Leninism, the concrete application of this theory and its theses by the Communist Parties in conditions of the given country.

Among the important tasks of the journal is that of reporting on the activities of the Communist Parties to consolidate the democratic and patriotic forces of the people for struggle against the danger of a new war, on the achievements of the democratic forces in each country.

We shall conduct a struggle against bourgeois ideology, against opportunist and revisionist theories propagated by the enemies of the working class.

The journal will carry material showing the experience of socialist construction in the U. S. S. R., the experience of state and economic construction in the countries of the new democracies, material reflecting the activity of the democratic forces in all countries.

From the pages of our journal will resound the voice of the peoples against the warmongers.

We warmly salute all democratic and patriotic forces of the peoples who are fighting for the honor, freedom, and national independence of their countries.

We salute the fraternal Communist Parties, which are heading the struggle of all the anti-Fascist, freedom-loving elements against the Anglo-American plans of expansion to enslave Europe.

For a lasting peace, for a people's democracy.

Tragic Lesson of the Czechs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I desire to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding editorial which appeared in the Wednesday, February 25 issue of the Chattanooga News-Free Press, published at Chattanooga, Tenn. This editorial is entitled "Tragic Lesson of the Czechs."

It points out that Russia has now taken care of the liberties of the people of this one-time democracy, the little state that was set up by Woodrow Wilson and others following World War I, and the editorial observes that probably the Czechs are worse off than they were during the German occupation which occurred a few years ago when the late Neville Chamberlain appeased Hitler at Munich.

This is communism on the march. It is time for America to wake up. As the editorial observes, one cannot play with communism any more than a child can play with fire.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRAGIC LESSON OF THE CZECHS

Nine years ago when Hitler ranted at the helpless Neville Chamberlain at Munich and took the Sudentenland of Czechoslovakia as the price of a short-lived "peace in our time," the world trembled on the brink of war and "liberals" everywhere screamed for other folks to start fighting.

Germany's gobbling up of the Sudeten was one of the initial steps in Hitler's program of ruthless aggression, but, inexcusable as it was, the Nazis could at least argue that this area was inhabited by Germans. The fighting in World War II started a few months later when the Nazis extended their aggressions to Poland, but the outrage of Munich still rankled in the mind of the democratic world and was at least an important contributory casus belli.

Now, in a couple of days of terrorism, Communist agents of the Soviet Empire have taken over all of Czechoslovakia and converted it into a police state, and not an effort has been made by the rest of the world to stop them. What would be the use? Everyone seems to recognize the futility of opposition.

Yet poor old Chamberlain was denounced and ridiculed for appeasement.

Few of the alleged liberals who cried so loudly for Hitler's blood will be heard in condemnation of the Communist rape of Czechoslovakia. Many of them condemn those who do protest against the Red annexations of first one country and then another as warmongers.

To be frank about it, nothing but war could save Czechoslovakia now, just as nothing but war could have saved Poland, or Yugoslavia, or Hungary, or Bulgaria, or Romania—all victims of the brutal aggressions of the mobsters of Moscow; and the world has no stomach right now for such a war. Not even those who most wholeheartedly hate the Communist reign of banditry are ready to go to war to stop it—not many, anyway.

This absence of warlike fervor is not hard to understand.

In the first place, except for the United States, the western nations that fought Germany are too weak to fight today. In addition, these nations are strongly infected with leftism, including communism and the milder forms of this ideological disease. Non-Communist leftists talk a lot about liberty, but they don't look with abhorrence on loss of liberty as real believers in the free way of life do.

Our own Government's appeasement of the Soviets, in which the victims of these conquests were practically handed to the aggressors, has dulled American preception of the Russians' guilt. Until comparatively recently Americans who showed concern over Russian aggressions were brushed off as Roosevelt haters.

Then, too, we have just fought a great and disastrous war to rid the world of aggression, and we now find the world in worse shape than it was in when that war started. So what would be the use of fighting for the same thing again?

There is also much fear that another war would be the end of what we know as civilization—as well it might.

Even so, there will be war if the Reds push their aggressions too far. Just how far too far is, however, is very uncertain.

There is one significant lesson in the fall of Czech freedom: A few months ago there was a rash of apologists for Czechoslovakia in this country. Writers and speakers of alleged liberal leanings were busy explaining that the Czechs had found a way to cooperate with the Russians and still retain their liberty. Czech cooperation with the Commies was "voluntary" and the Commies respected and would continue to respect the freedom of the Czechs, these pundits said.

Of course, the Czechs had nationalized industries and adopted other measures that were Communist in nature. But these were presented by the apologists as really necessary and progressive steps. The Czechs were great lovers of liberty, we were assured. In fact, it was strongly hinted that they were such great lovers of liberty that the Commies knew they'd better not try to get tough in that country.

Well, the Commies have now taken care of Czech liberties and the Czechs are as bad off as they were during the German occupation. Maybe worse.

The lesson is the one that children have to learn about fire—you can't play with communism.

Czechoslovakia's warning to the world is that the people who are determined to stay free had better find some way of stamping out their own Communist fifth columns. They have the same objective everywhere that they had in Czechoslovakia.

The Case for Stassen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, Life magazine this week carries a splendid article about Presidential candidate Harold E. Stassen which I am sure the membership of the House will be interested in reading. I include the article as part of my remarks:

THE CASE FOR STASSEN—HE COULD SWING THE INDEPENDENT LIBERAL VOTE THAT THE REPUBLICANS WILL NEED TO WIN THE PRESIDENCY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The frankest way to make the case for Harold Stassen as the next United States President is to begin by making four admissions; Govs. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, and Earl Warren, of California, have each had greater administrative experience; Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, has had greater legislative experience; Gen. Douglas MacArthur has had greater military experience; Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan, has had greater experience in foreign affairs.

To make these honest admissions is in keeping with the candor of Stassen's approach to politics. It will not surprise Mr. Stassen to see the case for his candidacy opened with these unpolitic admissions. His attitude is unique. Few Presidential candidates have admitted during campaigns that they did not know everything about everything. Honest humility is a very rare quality in politics.

But these admissions, fair and factual as they are, do not damage the Stassen candidacy. Stassen's record easily stands scrutiny; he need not campaign by minimizing his competitors. The plain fact is that Stassen's total experience excels that of any one of his opponents. Certainly he has had far more foreign-policy and military experience than Governor Dewey. Three times governor of Minnesota, he has had far more administrative experience than Senator Taft. In the military field his 2 years of combat service under Admiral Halsey have given him a fuller military background than any other civilian presidential aspirant. Stassen may not have the intimate foreign-policy experience of Senator Vandenberg, but he was one of the strongest members of the American delegation to the UN San Francisco Conference. And he is the only candidate for the Republican nomination who has dealt with Stalin at first-hand, as well as the only one who has made the grand tour of postwar Europe.

Thus Harold Stassen exceeds all his competitors in sum-total experience. He is not a specialist candidate for the nomination. To his supporters it seems an objective fact that he is the best-equipped candidate available to the party and the country.

Harold Stassen has practiced the art of government nearly all his life. In 1928 his burly, overalled father, Farmer William Stassen, accepted the post of Dakota County Republican chairman with the understanding that Harold, then 21, "would do all the work." Stassen, now 40, has been doing political work—and succeeding at it—ever since.

Physically, in hulk and agility—he is 6 foot 3 and weighs 210 pounds—Stassen is molded along the lines of Gene Tunney, and he plans his campaigns far ahead, as did Tunney, with a plan for the 11th round as well as the first. A big man, he has only a faint trace of paunch. He has light, thinning blond hair; large, steady blue eyes, and a quickness of manner and movement that belie his size-17 collar and size-12 shoes.

His suits, always double-breasted, always blues and browns, are usually store-bought, picked from a rack. He always keeps his coat on, however small or informal the group, and always keeps it buttoned, however hot the day. He does not diet to keep down his weight, but he has not gained or lost more than a pound since the end of the war. He is a light breakfaster, with one egg when he has a heavy schedule; his big meal is in the evening. He drinks coffee heavily all day long, but he doesn't smoke and he rigidly limits his social drinking.

Stassen's intimates and his audiences—he usually attracts large crowds—find him disarmingly candid, direct, and likable. He is rarely witty, but this is not fatal in a politician or a President. George Washington was pretty humorless, and Franklin Roosevelt's satiric cracks were offensive to many. Stassen is not a great orator or a gifted phrasemaker, but he does have the knack of clarity, presenting complex matters simply. On the platform he does not act: he stands erect and still, using a short, upward gesture with pointed finger. His vigor, his clarity, and his obvious supreme confidence in the American future are the qualities that hold his audiences.

The most discerning tribute to his character comes from Washington correspondents, those skeptics who are alert to detect artificialities in public men, but who have noticeably avoided ironic criticism of Stassen. The reporters never ridicule Stassen, and this is a rare tribute in itself.

During Stassen's recent 6,000-mile tour by plane through 12 Southern and Western States, this item appeared on the detailed itinerary furnished by his staff to the accompanying correspondents, "Quiet day in Denver. Morning church, afternoon hike." To the press, that had all the earmarks of a bid for the religious vote and an invitation to the photographers. But it developed that that was just the way it was, with no publicity. And in last summer's American Legion parade up Fifth Avenue in New York City, when most State governors, politicians, and celebrities rode in huge Cadillacs, Stassen footed it all the way—in the Minnesota ranks, without ballyhoo.

FROM FARM TO STATE CAPITOL

Besides his physical well-being, Stassen enjoys remarkable mental and spiritual balance. This gives him a simplicity that is never forced and a detachment that helps him appraise himself objectively. A radio correspondent recently confronted Stassen with Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.'s searchingly critical review of his new book, Where I Stand. He wanted to know what Stassen thought of the review. "What do you think?" Stassen asked. The radio commentator said he thought a lot of it was valid. "I think so, too," Stassen replied.

Stassen's balanced view of himself, his reserve of good health and his understanding of plain people are inevitable products of his breeding and upbringing. His parents, through whose blood run strains from Norway, Czechoslovakia, and Germany, were hard-working, successful truck farmers in West St. Paul when Harold, the third of four sons, was born on April 13, 1907, and they still operate their farm today. His brother, William, is a sheet-metal worker, brother Elmer a grocer, and brother Arthur a State employee; his tall, attractive sister, Mrs. Rollin Crawford, manages his St. Paul office.

The Stassen family had to work to live. In 1921 his father fell ill. Harold delayed going to college and took over the family farm for a year. Then, to support himself for 6 years at the University of Minnesota and its law school, Stassen worked at every kind of odd job—grocery clerk, pan greaser in a bakery, conductor on the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad. Working people are not just statistics to him; they are people he has worked with.

When Stassen became attorney of Dakota County in 1930, he heard that distressed dairy farmers were talking of using violent methods to get fair prices for their milk. He attended a farmers' meeting to see what could be done. "Block the highways, spill the milk," one speaker urged the gathering. "If the county attorney gets in the way, run him out."

But Stassen would not be run out. He pushed his way to the platform and announced, "I'll prosecute any act of violence which is committed." But he also said, "If you will appoint me your attorney, I'll represent you without fee and do everything I can to help you get justice." He did. There was no violence. He got milk prices upped 30 cents per 100 pounds—with no increase to the consumer.

The sensible humanity of his approach gave the voters of Minnesota confidence in Stassen. As a result he was able to carry the GOP to victory three times in his State, winning in spite of the national trend that kept reelecting Roosevelt and coattail riders of the New Deal. As governor he replaced a socialistic, class-conscious Farmer-Labor administration with a progressive, solvent, and humane Republican administration which ultimately won even the support of labor leaders. The top command of the A. F. of L. supported him in 1940, and both the A. F. of L. and CIO leaders supported him in 1942—although he had never amended by one particle his Minnesota labor-peace law (in its provisions a forerunner of the Taft-Hartley Act), which they had earlier called the Stassen slave law.

HE GAVE MINNESOTA INDUSTRIAL PEACE

In Minnesota Stassen showed that he could create a political climate favorable to both labor and capital. He earned the respect of the greatest number on both sides in the old labor-management controversy. As an advocate of free enterprise, he worked to guarantee the citizen protection against abuses by both capital and labor, with further guaranties of security against unemployment and old age.

Stassen put an end to four terms of Farmer-Labor government in Minnesota at a time when the State was experiencing the most serious industrial unrest in the whole United States and faced the prospect of class strife of ominous intensity. He dealt with the trouble-making Communist leaders by appealing directly and persuasively to the unemployed they were trying to mislead and by correcting the conditions which were breeding radicalism. Shortly after his inauguration an organized mob marched on the capitol to protest against relief methods. Stassen did not call on the police. He invited their spokesmen to state their case in his office. After listening, he went with them to address the mob from the statehouse steps. The crowd booed. After the booing died, he said, "That's one nice thing about this country. You can boo your officials without getting pushed up against a wall and shot." Then he discussed the relief problem frankly, admitting some faults and pledging to do his best to correct them. He was cheered when he finished—and he carried through his promised reforms, to the dismay of the Communist leaders.

Harold Stassen created a new atmosphere and was rewarded with the greatest popular pluralities ever given a Minnesota Governor. But his major achievement was that he operated without rancor and without turning the clock back to reaction. He founded an honestly progressive administration with manifest good will toward all groups.

The argument of the people who now back Stassen is that he could do the same job on a national scale; that he would be the most effective instrument with which the Republican Party would terminate in 1948 four terms of New Dealish government in the Nation.

It is easy enough to show that Harold Stassen is, in the old nominating phrase, "a true man of the pee-pul." He is unpretentious, a man of plain and homely tastes, a good family man, well educated but not overeducated, well dressed but not overdressed—all characteristics that the American voters traditionally are supposed to like. And it is easy to show that he has the qualities of moderation that the voters respect—the plain piety of an honestly religious man who does not need to end every address with an invocation; an honest liberalism without any of the radicalism that Americans have learned to suspect; and honest conservatism in the best sense, of preserving the fundamentals of the American system.

These are all sound qualities. But are they enough?

One great political lesson of our times is that the voters will sacrifice every other consideration in a candidate for a single condition: the capacity for imaginative leadership. In Stassen's judgment the three great tasks for American leadership are:

1. To keep the American system of modern capitalism strong and stable, to avoid any serious economic crash, to make sure that free enterprise includes humanitarianism.

2. To provide a firm, calm, and consistent conduct of foreign policy calculated to defeat totalitarian concepts in the world—without war.

3. To face frankly the reality that if the spread of totalitarian concepts cannot be stopped without war, then the Nation must maintain its victorious leadership through war.

Stassen has said to Americans and Europeans, and he told Stalin himself during their conversation in the Kremlin, that America's "free capitalistic system, wisely regulated but not unduly burdened," is capable of avoiding crises and crashes, recessions and depressions. Stassen knows that the United States can do most to build a secure peace by remaining strong at home.

He would bring to the great tasks of the Government the humanity of approach that has given him his international reputation as a liberal. In the winter of 1946 he gave his name and assistance to the Committee To Aid the Families of General Motors Strikers. He knew this action would bring criticism; he knew it would cost him political support. But he would do it again.

He argues: "Anyone who investigated the facts would agree on the impelling humanitarian importance of granting this aid.

"Veterans of World War II who had just returned from service, particularly if they had served as privates or seamen, had no accumulation of war bonds or wartime savings. If they were ambitious and went to work for General Motors soon after their discharge and were caught in the strike, they had no resources to fall back on. Because they were unemployed due to a strike, even though it was no fault of their own, they were ineligible for unemployment compensation.

"Thus the veteran across the street who was taking it easy and did not try to go back to work was drawing his unemployment compensation of $20 a week steadily, but the veteran who had gone back to work and was thrown out of his job by the strike could not draw unemployment compensation."

"We must," he says, "never permit the left wing to claim a monopoly on humanitarianism."

The Republican Party must nominate an electable as well as a capable Presidential candidate. Stassen supporters believe that his prospects of winning are better than

those of the other candidates. The preeminent reason is that Stassen has shown that he has a compelling appeal to the nonparty or independent voter. The independent vote, which the Republican Party lost in every Presidential election since 1928, is obviously indispensable to a Republican victory. Only a few die-hard old guardsmen now fail to see this.

INDEPENDENTS WOULD VOTE FOR HIM

One such unconvinced Republican in Iowa recently cross-examined Stassen during the course of a small private dinner. After hurling all kinds of critical questions at him, the conservative began his next question with this statement: "There is a man in my neighborhood who I am certain is a Democrat. I know he has been a Democrat for 25 years. He told me the other day that if you were nominated he would vote for you." He paused and then concluded in accusatory tones, "Mr. Stassen, how do you account for that?" No doubt it does appall such Republicans to think that their candidate could appeal to other than traditional Republican voters, but if their candidate doesn't do so, it is obvious that he is not going to be elected.

That is the central problem of the Republicans; their appeal must reach beyond traditional Republican ranks to win. And the Roper public opinion polls in Fortune magazine have shown that of all the possible candidates of both parties, Stassen stands highest with the independent voters.

His supporters believe that President Trumans' weaknesses would stand out most vividly in contrast to Stassen's strength. In the campaign, Mr. Truman would be tied to his mimeographed hand-outs and the speeches prepared for him, while Stassen could exhibit, as he does in his public appearances and his packed Washington press conferences, his full mind and quick grasp of matters.

Stassen 's young in body and mature in mind. He possesses the mental and physical vitality needed to deal calmly but tirelessly with the press of problems at home and abroad. It has been argued that he is too young for the Presidency, but if he goes to the White House in January 1949, he would be only 14 months younger than Teddy Roosevelt who took office at 42. His election would almost certainly assure the country and his party of 8 years of sustained leadership over a most critical period. The evidence of Mr. Roosevelt's impaired physical strength at Yalta, disclosed in James E. Byrnes' and Edward Flynn's recent books, underlines how needful it is that the Nation have an administration likely to continue strong and virile.

Is Stassen too "radical"? His "radicalism" is actually fictitious, based only on charges circulated mostly by old guardsmen who want to head him off. He knows and frankly says that neither the Nation nor the Republican Party can turn the clock back; at the same time he sees socialism a monumental failure in Europe. That is the extent of his "radicalism."

He advocates a taxation ceiling of 50 percent. On this point he says, "Let me make it clear that when I say that not more than 50 percent of a person's income should be taken from him, I mean not more than 50 percent of his total income, including that portion which comes from tax-exempt bonds or capital gains. But I strongly believe that a government which demands more than half of the total fruit of a citizen's labors, or ingenuity, or inventiveness or other income is a government killing the future of its average citizen and weakening the long-range strength of its economic system."

A FEET-ON-THE-GROUND INTERNATIONALIST

Is he a disloyal Republican? Stassen has always worked with and through the Republican Party, not around it or outside it. On one occasion, it is true, he has opposed particular party leaders, as when he first sought the governorship of Minnesota in 1938. What Stassen said then he would say today: "I look about this hall," he used to tell his audiences, "and I see men and women whom I know to be Democrats. I see others whom I know to be Farmer-Laborites. I see others who have never taken an active part in politics. I know that you have all gathered here in full realization that my candidacy shall be Republican. The men and women in every walk of life have everything in common with each other and nothing in common either with the radical racketeers on one extreme or the selfish reactionaries on the other. The time has come when the voters of this State must take a temporary vacation from their party and unite in a crusade to bring about a wholesome and necessary change in our government."

He has consistently supported major Republican policies despite particular differences. The tax-reduction bill and the Taft-Hartley Act of the last session of Congress are good examples. He disagreed with some provisions of the tax bill; the Taft-Hartley law contained some restrictions he opposed. After both were passed, he opposed the President's tax veto and defended the Taft-Hartley bill almost as strongly as Senator TAFT himself.

Is Stassen too advanced an internationalist, too much of a global stargazer? The record reveals him as a pretty careful, feet-on-the-ground internationalist. He unqualifiedly accepts the premise that the United States cannot secede from the world, that America cannot maintain its own prosperity and security if there is insecurity and chaos abroad.

He is completely aware that Russia and Russia's totalitarian concepts are acting to suffocate human freedom. He told Stalin that the Kremlin might as well realize now that Russia would lose out on its two major hopes—that the American economic system would fall into depression and that the Communist Party could successfully infiltrate the American people or the American Government.

One of Stassen's outstanding qualities is his foresight. In 1942 he called for the early creation of a UN organization before President Roosevelt had lifted a finger to prepare the way. Furthermore at the San Francisco Conference, which drafted the UN Charter, he led a fight within the American delegation to keep the veto out of the Charter. He yielded only in face of the State Department's contention that the American Government was bound by the Yalta agreement. It was on his initiative that a provision was approved by which members of the UN are free to defend themselves collectively against aggression, a provision which is an essential balance against the use of the veto by an aggressor.

In his Jefferson, Iowa, speech of last May he urged that for the next 10 years "10 percent of our total production of goods and food" be used to aid the stricken economies of the world. This was a month before the administration unfolded the then vague Marshall plan. He urged that it "not be a sharpster lending program, not • • • a lightheaded give-away program, but a practical, sound, long-visioned businesslike approach."

Stassen is devoting himself to learning all he can about all of America—its problems, its needs, its hopes, its possibilities—from the vantage points of every State of the Union, instead of from the single vantage point of Washington. Stassen knows America and all its people as few in public or private life do today. He knows the qualified leaders whom he could later call to public service.

Since his release from the Navy, he has devoted about 16 hours a day to doing two things: earning his living and introducing himself to the country. He gets about 50 speaking invitations a week, 75 to 100 letters a day. He often speaks for nothing; he lectures professionally to some extent, his fees ranging from $500 to $1,000 a lecture. Through these activities, plus selling some dozen mass-circulation magazine articles a year, he nets an average annual income of about $42,000. He doesn't need to be in politics to make a livelihood.

Stassen finances his political expenses from his own earned income. The additional costs of his wide-ranging preconvention campaign have been defrayed largely by the Minnesota Finance Committee whose major funds come from small contributions ranging from $1 to $100. Another committee in Minnesota takes contributions up to $1,000; and now preliminary finance committees have been set up in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, San Francisco, St. Louis, Los Angeles, and Portland. The average contribution to his campaign is about $14.60 per contributor.

Stassen will bring to the Republican 1948 convention a minimum of 100 to 130 pledged delegates. He may pick up another 50 delegates from the South and West. But delegate speculation is obviously premature this early, particularly when the Presidential nominating primaries are only a few weeks away. The primaries will be stern tests this year, weeding the men from the boys, and there is good reason to predict that Stassen will show some extraordinary strength. The primaries will not be cut and dried, because Stassen has refused to negotiate any of those private little agreements under which the leading candidates usually stay out of each other's back yards.

His invasion of Ohio is a typical exhibit of his cool political audacity and his hard common sense. He is certain to break through the Taft forces in Ohio to pick up at least a few delegates, and perhaps as many as a dozen. He cannot lose anything; he may win new prestige. But this is not his only motivation—he firmly believes in the American direct-primary system. He thinks the people should have a chance to nominate their Presidents as well as to elect them. And he believes that the American people should have a direct opportunity to pass on his candidacy. He is content to abide by the result. For Harold Stassen does not want to master and manage the people of his country but to serve them.

The Late Hon. Clarence E. Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HADWEN C. FULLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of our former colleague, Clarence E. Hancock, is mourned by all the Members of the Congress, as well as by his family and a host of friends.

He was outstanding in this body, exceedingly able and withal kindly and generous of heart. When I first entered the Congress a few years ago, on more than one occasion I leaned on his advice and counsel, and benefited greatly from his wisdom.

His congressional district adjoins mine on the south, and many of his problems were my problems. No man could have been more kind in his assistance.

Clarence Hancock was a Member of the House for nearly 20 years, and was

ranking minority member on the great Judiciary Committee. Not only was he at all times soundly American as he influenced the destiny of our great Nation, but no problem of any constituent was too small for his time and effort. He endeared himself to untold thousands of the people of his district by his devotion and interest in what concerned them individually and collectively.

His decision to retire from active service in the Congress on January 3, 1947, came as a blow to all of us. His health at that time was very poor, and he had more than justification in reaching his decision, but there are few men with the courage and character of Clarence Hancock and he could ill be spared.

The affection with which his memory is held, the long record of achievement in public life, are enduring monuments to his name.

What builds the Nation's pillars high
And its foundations strong
What makes it mighty to defy
The foes that round it throng?
No gold, but only men can make
A people great and strong;
Men who, for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long.
Brave men who work while others sleep
Who dare while others fly—
They build a nation's pillars deep
And lift them to the sky.

Accountancy Profession Attacked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under law to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article by the National Society of Public Accountants entitled "Accountancy Profession Attacked":

ACCOUNTANCY PROFESSION ATTACKED—H. R. 2657 SEEKS TO RESTRICT THE PRACTICE OF ALL PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS BEFORE AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

H. R. 2657 was introduced by the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE, Member of Congress from the Third District of Iowa, on March 20, 1947. The bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee by the Speaker of the House. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee appointed a subcommittee to conduct hearings, and appointed as chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. GWYNNE, the author of the bill. Hearings by the subcommittee began July 9, 1947, and were discontinued; however, hearings were resumed on January 26, 1948. The provisions of H. R. 2657 may be summarized as follows:

This bill is entitled, "Administrative Practitioners Act," however, it seems to have two separate and distinct purposes.

First, it provides for the creation and appointment of a credentials committee, whose duty shall be to register lawyers to practice before the various governmental agencies and bureaus. This is of some great advantage to the legal profession, especially to those lawyers who desire to practice before a number or all of the various governmental agencies or bureaus, and if such is the intent, of course, it will cause no particular injury to the members of the accountancy profession. However, there seems to be no justification for the creation of another bureau to regulate practice before governmental agencies and incur additional expenses to the already overburdened taxpayer. The necessity for the creation of an additional bureau has not been explained.

Secondly, and this is the provision to which the accountants take exception, the resolution requires all persons, lawyers or nonlawyers who practice before governmental agencies, first to obtain credentials from the so-called Credentials Committee. This section of the bill certainly abridges the right of accountants to practice before the Treasury Department, as well as other agencies. It has, for its purpose, the creation of a monopoly for lawyers in certain forms of practice dealing with fact and not legal matters and it certainly deprives the existing bureaus and agencies of the right to determine the qualification of the individual practicing before such agency or bureau. Therefore, it discriminates between members of the legal profession and the accounting profession in such a manner as to be of no discernible benefit to the public.

Section 3 of the bill further provides that there shall be created a Credentials Committee of five members, three of whom shall constitute a quorum, four to be designated by the Attorney General of the United States with the approval of the President, from among officers otherwise serving in the executive branch of the Government, and it further provides that they must be confirmed by the Senate; one other member shall be appointed, but the bill specifically states that he must be a representative of the legal profession, and it further provides that four must hold or be eligible to hold credentials as provided under section 5. This provision in itself, could deny to the accounting profession the right of having a representative on the Credentials Committee, as most of the individuals today, holding executive positions are members of the legal profession.

Under the provisions of the bill as now written, it would place the members of the accounting profession in the position of having to serve as employees of the legal profession in tax matters. In other words, it could be, by regulation or otherwise provide that the preparation of income-tax returns could be construed as practicing law, and an accountant, unless he was permitted by the Credentials Committee, could not prepare income-tax returns. However, in the preparation of income-tax returns, accountants are dealing with facts and not legal matters. In the examination of returns by the Treasury Department, the accountant deals with facts and not legal questions. In cases wherein a controversy exists between the Internal Revenue Bureau and the taxpayer, these matters are settled in conference by the accountant and the internal revenue agent, or the conferee in the office of the internal revenue agent in charge, and if no settlement is arrived at as a result of a conference, then the accountant attempts to settle the matter with the technical staff. Up o this point, the accountants are dealing with facts. If no settlement is made with the technical staff, a 90-day letter is issued, and, of course, it becomes a legal matter, as the controversy must be tried before The Tax Court of the United States. Where can a lawyer be of any assistance to the taxpayer during these proceedings? The accountant is dealing with accounting and tax matters of which he is especially skilled, while the majority of the legal profession have little or no knowledge of accounting or tax matters.

Under our code of ethics, accountants are not allowed to split fees, therefore they must charge the taxpayer direct and if the taxpayer be required, which H. R. 2657 would make mandatory, to hire a member of the legal profession, the taxpayer would be required to pay double or triple the amount for the service that he receives, which will still have to be handled by the accountant, and for which the member of the legal profesion could render little or no service. This will be admitted by the majority of the members of the legal profesion.

This is not the first attempt to regulate practice before the agencies of the Government. The Congress of the United States, on June 11, 1946, enacted the Administrative Procedure Act, which allowed the agencies to determine for themselves to what extent taxpayers and others might be represented by nonlawyers. As far back as 1834 the Secretary of the Treasury prescribed by rules and regulations for those who would be recognized as agents or attorneys practicing before that department, and at the present time enrollment of individuals to practice before the Treasury Department is governed by Circular No. 230, and we submit that there has been no complaint, either on the part of the practitioner or the taxpayer up to this date, and the Government seems to be getting on very well with its present program. It has been admitted by many of the courts that tax practice as far as the taxpayer has been concerned has, to a large extent, been turned over to the accounting profession, for the reason that a finding or a determination in a tax controversy is largely a matter of accounting facts which are distinguishable from legal interpretation. However, this bill goes even further than the Treasury Department. It would prohibit traffic representatives of the various chambers of commerce from practicing before the Interstate Commerce Commission; it would prohibit farm agents and others from appearing before the Department of Agriculture and also prohibit members of labor organizations from appearing before the National Labor Relations Board. In other words, it would prohibit any one not licensed by the credentials committee from appearing before any of the agencies of the Government because H. R. 2657 provides in section 2 that "practice means any form of appearance or participation in any agency proceeding other than that of a witness."

We have no objections to that part of the bill which provides for a Credentials Committee to register lawyers and make it unnecessary for any particular lawyer to be admitted to practice before a multitude of agencies, but the bill does not stop there; it goes further, and would bring all practitioners within its purview. It would appear that the purpose of this bill would be to convert all agencies of the Government into "quasi courts" in which lawyers would have a superior right to practice. We can only judge the future by the past, and when we look back to the time when Congress changed the name of the Board of Tax Appeals to the Tax Court of the United States, and provided that that court, by rule and regulations, could determine who could practice before them, we now have a condition where only lawyers are eligible to practice before the Tax Court of the United States, unless the individual passes a legal examination prepared by members of that court and hence nonlawyers are finding it difficult to practice before that court while a member of the bar does not have to pass any examination.

This bill certainly discriminates unduly between lawyers and accountants, in that a lawyer may be enrolled on a showing that he is a member in good standing of the bar and that he is engaged in the active practice of law, irrespective of his qualification, and upon making that showing, which any attorney can do, credentials must be immediately issued to him. On the other hand, an accountant or nonlawyer must first obtain a certificate from the agency in question, after undergoing an examination and investigation, and thereafter must be governed by the whims of the Credentials Committee, which has discretionary power as to admission. All rights and privileges of lawyers

are carefully safeguarded. Disbarment proceedings must be instituted and a court proceeding "de novo" must try and determine the facts; an accountant or nonlawyer, may be disbarred by the agency and his credentials are immediately revoked by the committee, as the present bill does not provide for a hearing or trial of a nonlawyer or an accountant.

The purposes of this bill are clear: It creates a monopoly for certain lawyers residing in Washington and New York to practice befor the agencies of the Government. The public certainly is not protected by reason of that fact. Members of the accountancy profession should immediately obtain a copy H. R. 2657 by writing to your Congressman, and certainly the members of our profession should inform your Member of Congress that you are viciously opposed to the passage of this bill, for if this bill is enacted into law, the accountancy profession, insofar as practice before governmental agencies is concerned, is done for. On the other hand, if the legal profession is attempting to do something to regulate their own profession in providing qualified lawyers to appear befcre the various governmental agencies, then they certainly should provide in this bill that lawyers be required to take the same examination as accountants before they are permitted to practice before agencies of the Government. This is fair and is the American way of doing things. The bill has, for its purpose, the creation of a monopoly for certain members of the legal profession, and certainly places a heavy additional burden upon the American taxpayer, in that taxpayers will be required to pay double fees for the same service they are now receiving. It has been stated that there are more lawyers per capita in this country today than there are medical doctors by two to one, and the bar association has been very active in the past few years creating additional courts and agencies of Government, all of which have for their purpose providing employment for the members of the legal profession, and yet this overcrowded profession is continuing to turn out from the various schools of our country, more and more lawyers, until it has reached the point where the public can no longer absorb them. What we need today, are fewer and better trained lawyers, and if the Congress will spend as much time in investigating the public pay rolls as to needless and useless members of the legal profession, and eliminating that expense, as they are putting into this bill, the taxpayers will receive a substantial reduction in the cost of Government.

This bill can be of no benefit to the public. It only adds to their already hard financial burden, and when it's all said and done, Congress should consider the public before the enactment of any legislation. Accountants cannot stand idly by and see themselves legislated out of business, we must stand together and fight this bill or any similar class legislation that will restrict or discriminate against our profession or any group of our citizens.

Whereas there has been introduced in the Eightieth Congress of the United States a bill entitled "This action may be cited as the Administrative Practioner's Act," said bill being designated as H. R. 2657; and

Whereas it is the purpose and purport of H. R. 2657 to set up or cause to be established a committee, which by the terms and provisions of H. R. 2657, would have arbitrary and dictatorial authority and power to legally prevent, restrict, and discriminate against taxpayers and citizens of these United States, in the lawful pursuit of their business or profession in such a manner and to such an extent as to prevent and prohibit qualified persons from appearing before agencies or bureaus of the Government, as agents or representatives for citizens or taxpayers; unless such person possess the qualification or professional standing as may be determined by the committee in their absolute discretion; and

Whereas the enactment into law of H. R. 2657 will cause undue hardship and irreparable damage to the public accountants of the United States and its territories, and to all other citizens similarly situated, and to the public generally, in that it will deny and deprive all, except certain members of the legal profession of their constitutional right to engage upon their business or professional duties in appearing on behalf of those citizens and taxpayers who have business with the agencies or bureaus of the Government, the character of which is exactly or similar to the duties and responsibilities which they now perform and assume on behalf of citizens and taxpayers who desire and do employ their services in the several States and Territories of these United States, all of which they are entitled to and privileged to do under the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas H. R. 2657 discriminates against the accounting profession and all other professions in favor of and creates a monopoly for certain members of the legal profession: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Society of Public Accountants in annual convention assembled in St. Louis, Mo., this 15th day of August 1947, That we condemn and oppose the passage of H. R. 2657 or any similar resolution or measure as class legislation and discriminatory against the accounting and other professions, in that it has for its purpose the creation of a monopoly for certain members of the legal profession and a denial to the public accountants and others similarly situated of their constitutional rights and guaranties to engage in business or pursue their profession; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each and every Member of the Congress of the United States and to all public accountants of the United States and its territories.

H. E. ALFORD, *President.*

Attested:

GEO. L. LA COSTE,
Executive Secretary.

Germany's Share in the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article that appeared in the Central European Observer, London, England, on February 6, 1948, by Jean Pajus:

GERMANY'S SHARE IN THE MARSHALL PLAN

(By Jean Pajus)

Two of America's foremost experts on foreign affairs, Secretary Marshall and Sumner Welles, have stated their views on European recovery. They have also told us about some of the inherent dangers involved in the revival of the German economy. These views are most pertinent to the Nationwide discussions now going on and they must serve as guides for our program of helping Europe.

Secretary Marshall, speaking to the Nation from Chicago on the eve of his departure for the London Conference of Foreign Ministers, November 18, 1947, told us why we must restore Germany. "The restoration of Europe involved the restoration of Germany," he said. "Without a revival of German production there can be no revival of Europe's economy. But we must be very careful to see that a revived Germany could not again threaten the European community."

Secretary Marshall stressed the importance of controlling the German economy by reminding us that the implementation of that policy raises a most difficult and complicated problem, because "there is an imperative necessity for 'safeguards' to insure that the economic power of Germany shall not be used by a future German Government as a weapon for the furtherance of exclusively German policies." However, Secretary Marshall has not told us yet how to solve this complicated problem.

Former Under Secretary Sumner Welles was more critical as he grappled with the problem. He says: "The Germans are still dangerous. The Marshall plan is not worth the paper it is written on so long as the western democracies do not obtain a guarantee against renewed aggression from Germany; so long as the Ruhr coal and steel are not integrated in the whole western economy and so long as they benefit Germany only."

No doubt the American people will applaud Secretary Marshall when he tells them to be careful, because certainly no one wants to make the same mistakes all the time.

Perhaps the American people will listen more carefully to former Under Secretary Welles for the simple reason that he is a little more explicit on the score of safeguards because he singles out coal, steel, and Ruhr as the most important factors in the Marshall plan. It is interesting to note that Secretary Marshall speaks of guaranties against German aggression. What do these words mean in practical terms? Since neither the Secretary nor the former Under Secretary have spelled out the details of the safeguards—or the guaranties—we believe the following comments and questions will be pertinent to the discussion:

1. WHY SELECT 1936?

When we say that the restoration of Europe involves the restoration of Germany—what kind of a German economy do we want to restore? The Germany of the thirties or the Germany of the twenties? What year are we going to use as a yardstick?

More than a year ago the British and American economists agreed that 1936 will be the year upon which to base the revival of German industry. The arguments used by these economists were:

a. That 1936 was the last year before Germany began intensive rearmament.

b. That 1936 was a normal year, marked neither by a depression nor by a boom.

In the spring of 1947, former President Herbert Hoover, after a hurried trip to Germany, also selected 1936 as a basis for German production.

On August 29, 1947, the experts of the United States and the United Kingdom Governments agreed to raise the level of German industry to that obtained either in 1938 or in 1936. For instance, in the case of chemical industry, the year 1936 was selected, to which was added 42 percent.

While Secretary Marshall did not specifically single out 1936, it is expected that 1936 will be used as a basis for the revival of German industry. The facts are: in 1936, Germany was working hard towards preparing for war; her iron and steel industries made a better showing than the record year of 1929. The output of pig iron rose to 15,303,000 tons and ingot production advanced to 19,158,000 tons, compared with a production of only 5,751,000 tons in 1932.

That year, too, under the impetus of large armament orders, the production of machinery established a new record and reached the prewar high of 1938 in tonnage. Industrial production of 1936, as a whole, was 80 percent over 1932. The truth is that 1936 was merely a continuation of 1935 which set the whole rearmament program in motion.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-six was the fourth year of Hitler's regime, a year in which Germany made it amply clear to the world at large that it intended to attain the political mastery of Europe. Considering, therefore, that Germany's foreign economic policy was aimed primarily at weakening the economic strength of the countries which the Third Reich regarded as potential obstacles to the carrying out of its aggressive policies, the fundamental question is why 1936, or for that matter, any Hitler year was selected as the year upon which to base the revival of the German industry?

What makes this question more crucial is the statement made by another former Under Secretary, Dean Acheson, on June 25, 1947, the man who had much to do with the elaboration of the Marshall plan. Speaking about Europe's recovery, Acheson said: "Putting in working order the German production is considered by the American Government as the cornerstone of the plan which the European countries will be able to elaborate within the framework of the Marshall plan." The American people are entitled to know how the German economy of 1936 can offer them the proper guaranties or safeguards against renewed aggression, and whether such an economy can serve as the cornerstone of the Marshall plan.

2. SHOULD THE GERMAN ECONOMY BE RESTORED?

Perhaps some will say that the Germany of the twenties was a peaceful Germany because, after all, it was the Germany of the Weimar Republic and of the Social Democrats. Before we decide to restore the economy of the twenties, it is pertinent to state plainly the economic realities of those times.

In 1926 the German Republic appointed an inquiry commission to make a thorough analysis of the German economy. The inquiry lasted 5 years. The commission was composed of members of the German Parliament, industry, agriculture, trade-union leaders, and economists. The most important work, from our point of view, was done by a subcommittee charged with the task of making a most exhaustive inquiry into the workings of the German iron and steel industries. The findings of the committee were signed unanimously by all its members and subsequently published by the German Government.

No effort was spared by the subcommittee on iron and steel to ascertain the true facts of the German economy. All official data of the German Government were available to it; the leading directors and top managers of the German iron and steel trusts appeared before that committee to give testimony. Top union leaders presented their point of view and, indeed, no effort was spared to arrive at a correct conclusion regarding the functioning of the German heavy industry.

The unanimous opinion expressed in that report was that the German iron and steel industries could not subsist unless they received tremendous subsidies in the form of protective tariffs, freight rebates, and direct Government subsidies. Even these costly measures did not suffice to sustain the heavy industries for, in the course of the hearings, the steel makers and industrialists flatly asserted that the major German trusts could not even survive without support derived from the activities of the international cartels.

With reference to the domestic prices for German steel, the leaders of the German cartels frankly admitted that the German consumer was forced to pay double the world market price for German products in order to sustain Germany's export of steel. The report also brought out the startling fact that the German iron and steel industries were financed by a dangerous overstructure of largely short-term indebtedness.

Nor did the report overlook the political aspects of the relations between the heavy industries and the German Government. In its analysis of the German heavy industry of the twenties, the Commission revealed that the industry, in order to obtain the subsidies from the government, had to maintain a strong influence over the German Government. Because the heavy industry was constantly afraid of losing the government subsidies, it was forced to exert all its pressure upon the German Government to embark upon policies which would make the existence of a large German steel industry necessary, regardless of economic justification. This constant pressure of the German industry finally resulted in a policy of aggression, since of necessity military consideration forced the German Government to override all sound economic judgments. In other words, the Weimar Republic became the ally of Pan-German industrialists. What happened after the advent of Hitler is too well known to both Germany and the world at large. Thus the Weimar Republic served the interests of the industrialists well.

As soon as they realized the possibilities of nazism, the industrialists made use of Hitler's chauvinism to further their aims. If history, therefore, is any guide, it is clear that a restoration of the iron and steel industries of the twenties, as now contemplated, will inevitably restore the conditions which have, time and again, forced the German iron and steel industries to play the role of the strongest promoter of the forces of aggression. The question again therefore is: Can we take the German economy of the twenties as a guidepost or as the cornerstone of the Marshall plan?

3. HOW DID GERMANY BUILD UP HER HEAVY INDUSTRIES?

The answer is, she did it with coal. Coal was the heart of the German economy of both the twenties and the thirties. It was the source of nearly all the country's energy, including that expressed in electric power and liquid fuels. In addition, it was of primary importance as a commodity, particularly with respect to coke, chemicals, and other products—the basis of her industrial economy of the twenties which enabled her to overcome her enemies in World War I and without which she would not have been able to build her war machine of the thirties.

A quick glance at Germany's consumption of coal during the years of preparation for war will suffice to explain Germany's power. It is estimated that the consumption of coal within Germany, in hard coal units, increased from 116,000,000 tons in 1933, to 197,000,000 tons in 1943. During the same period, coke consumption increased from 16,000,000 tons to 41,000,000 tons. Most of these increases were related to war preparation.

Taking the Ruhr as a separate unit, the following picture is obtained. In 1937, the Ruhr produced 128,000,000 tons of hard coal, of which 68,000,000 tons was bituminous coke and coal. This is striking evidence of the tremendous importance of the Ruhr as the backbone of the German industrial structure.

In 1937 Germany produced 106,000,000 tons of coking coal, yet her requirements were only 63,000,000 tons, or approximately 60 percent of the total. Most of the remainder was exported. The same year the reported coke production was about 41,000,000 tons, of which about thirty-two millions were produced in the Ruhr region. In other words, about 77 percent of the entire coke production originated in the Ruhr region.

To indicate the importance of the Ruhr as the center of Germany's war-machinery structure, it will suffice to mention that in 1937 the Ruhr contained 80 out of 113 metallurgical coke plants and 11,050 out of 14,471 coke ovens in Germany.

In the field of heavy chemicals, as a result of this tremendous concentration of coke capacity in the Ruhr, Germany was in a position to produce by 1943, 70 percent of crude benzol, crude tar, ammonia, and sulphur produced in German-occupied Europe.

Should Germany be allowed to retain such a share of the European production of by-products of the coke industry?

4. COAL FOR GERMANY'S NEIGHBORS

An analysis of Germany's exports in 1937 reveals that she exported 2,564,000 tons of steel and imported 645,000 tons of steel. Had this exported steel been made in other countries; that is, Belgium, France, or Holland, and had Germany only supplied the coal or coke to these countries for the production of the same steel, it would have been necessary to export about the same quantity of coal as steel, or, in terms of coke, Germany would have had to export about 2,000,000 tons of coke more than she exported. How much Germany's neighbors depended on her for coal products is revealed in a study of Germany's 1937 export of coal and coke to France, Belgium, and Luxemburg, Italy, and Sweden—all recipients of the benefits of the Marshall plan:

German exports of coal and coke

To—	Hard coal	Coke	Production of steel ingots and castings
France	8,045,000	2,338,000	7,893,000
Belgium	5,325,000	96,000	3,853,000
Luxemburg	76,000	2,567,000	2,510,000
Italy	7,980,000	160,000	2,099,000
Sweden	632,000	873,000	1,106,000
Total	21,988,000	6,043,000	17,473,000

Source: Statistical Yearbook, League of Nations—1942-43—Geneva.

The steel capacity of these countries has not changed much since 1937; they are willing and able to produce the same steel products. Nor has the coal situation changed for the better; if anything, it is worse because no other supplies of coal are available. Consequently, if these countries are to produce their 1937 quota—which is not asking them too much—they will have to import about 18,000,000 tons of coking coal for steel ingots and castings, and probably additional tonnages for related products.

Will these countries obtain the necessary coal to produce their steel products or will Germany be allowed to retain the coke and prevent the neighboring countries from producing what they are able to produce?

5. VICIOUS CIRCLE OF GERMAN EXPORTS

It is claimed in most responsible quarters that the restoration of German industry will benefit the European economy. The advocates of this theory maintain that the revival of the Ruhr will substantially alleviate our financial burden.

If this theory is to be proved correct on all points, the Ruhr should be developed to its maximum capacity and should logically absorb all of its coal production. In this case, very little would be available for its neighbors. Eventually, but not immediately, the Ruhr will succeed in producing tremendous quantities of steel products, machinery, and chemical products for Europe. These products could, theoretically, be purchased by Germany's neighbors provided they had the dollars to pay for them. But Germany's neighbors have no dollars to pay, nor can they expect to have them in the near future, because they can obtain dollars only if they can produce goods for export. In order to produce for export, Germany's neighbors need coal to manufacture goods which they could sell for dollars with which to pay for German products. In other words, it is a vicious circle. The sad truth of the matter is that Germany's neighbors have neither the markets nor the dollars, because for the past few years the United States has replaced the German market in Europe. The

former buyers of German goods have no money to pay for either American or German goods, so that the deficit in German production for exports is largely theoretical. So long, therefore, as Europe has only a very restricted market, and so long as Europe is short of raw materials, very few new markets can be created for German goods.

Europe's postwar economic situation is such that the shortage of raw materials, particularly food and above all, coal, is greater than the shortage of machinery. As between manufactured goods and coal, the latter could bring dollars much faster, provided it were available.

The advocates of the restoration of the German economy for the benefit of European recovery overlook another very important tendency of our times, namely, autarchy. All the western countries are now anxious to make ends meet by concentrating their credits in order to buy food. Each nation is desperately trying to become as self-sufficient as possible in order to export as much as possible and to derive enough dollars to buy essentials. Today, the competition for the sale of manufactured goods is very great. This means that all western nations are competing for the same raw materials and all are trying to increase the production of their own industries. In other words, all European nations are anxious to export manufactured goods, rather than to import.

As there is no lessening of that trend, it is inevitable that:

(a) Germany—assuming that she is able to produce the goods—will encounter greater competition than before the war.

(b) Assuming that Germany is in a position to export the manufactured goods—which is very unlikely—it is hard to see that the western European nations will stand by and allow Germany to dominate the European export market again. This will create a tremendous political problem as well as an economic one, unless it is deliberately so willed by the United States.

But the most important question has yet to be answered, namely: How will the western nations pay for the German goods? One hates to think that the only alternative will be credits from the United States to enable the western nations to buy from Germany. If this is true, then it follows that Germany:

(a) will recover first, and

(b) the American taxpayer will foot the bill.

A further corollary will be that Europe will have to plan its economic life with a view to providing the market for German goods and with a view to becoming an exporter of raw materials for Germany. This does not make sense; this is not what Europe fought for, and such an economy cannot provide the western nations with a livelihood.

6. WHY SUBSIDIZE GERMAN STEEL?

This leads us to another important problem involved in the European recovery—priorities. Which economy should be rebuilt first? The German or the western European? If the Ruhr is to be rebuilt first, where will it get the ore which it does not have in abundance? Before the war, Germany, because of her control of the international steel and coal cartels, was in a position to import French and Swedish iron ore for the Ruhr blast furnaces. This enabled Germany to become the blacksmith of Europe in the interwar period. If the Ruhr is to be rebuilt first, it follows that France, for instance, will have to send to the Ruhr her iron ore, bauxite, phosphates, etc. If she is forced to do so, she will retard her own economy, which is exactly what happened in the thirties, and with disastrous results.

Between 1935–38 the French iron and steel industries imported from Britain and Germany approximately 1,300,000 tons of coal per month.

Britain is no longer in a position to ship any coal to France. Germany, plus the Saar, have been shipping in recent months an average of 208,000 tons a month, or one-sixth of the prewar shipments of coal to France. The lack of supplies of coke and coal has affected the French steel industry very badly, with the results that her steel production is only working about 50 percent capacity. The French experts have produced all the data to prove that if France could receive 1,000,000 tons of coal per month from Germany her output of consumer goods would so rise as to completely change her economic life. They claim that France would be in a position to produce her own machinery and her own tractors and farming equipment, thus eliminating the extremely costly import of these goods from the United States—imports for which France must find dollars, and which she has not. These experts have also produced all the evidence to show that France will need at least an additional 7,400,000 tons of coke to achieve the stated goal of her 1951 steel production.

Nor did the French overlook the most important problem—the cost of producing a ton of steel. A legend has grown that Germany can produce steel products cheaper than her neighbors. As discussed earlier in point 1, if the western nations had studied the report of the German Inquiry Commission (1926–31), they could easily have discovered that Germany's cost of production was not cheaper. They would have realized that so long as the domestic consumer in Germany was willing to pay for Germany's exports of steel goods, the German industry could boast of alleged cheaper production. But those times are gone. So is the German republic which made it possible. Times have changed now, and it is the American taxpayer who will be called upon to finance the reconstruction of the Ruhr steel. It is only fair therefore that the cost of production in Germany and western Europe be compared. This was done by the French experts at the Paris conference and the figures they adduced are most startling.

They show that the cost of production of one ton of Thomas steel in the Ruhr area is 86.3 prewar marks, whereas the same ton of steel can be produced in the Lorraine mills for 53.3 prewar marks. Moreover, the experts claim that the Lorraine mills require less coke than German mills. If this claim is true—and it can be checked easily—the problem of priorities assumes a totally different character and it is quite in order to ask: Should the American taxpayer be taxed heavily in order to subsidize the more expensive German steel mills?

The most elementary common sense—let alone economic sense—would suggest that the goods essential to the European recovery be produced at the lowest possible cost. By the same token, it is elementary economics to send one ton of coke from Germany to France and let the French produce a ton of steel rather than force France to send three tons of ore to the Ruhr in order to produce one ton of steel there. Moreover, contrary to allegations that French are short of labor, it takes little manpower to produce steel and the French have that manpower.

An attempt to answer the all-important question of priority was made by the Harriman committee. On page 16 of the report released November 12, 1947, the following recommendation is made: As between steel production in Germany and an equivalent steel production in France, the priority should go to the latter. This recommendation is in line with one of the fundamental principles of the Marshall program which calls for the full utilization of the available production facilities of the 16 nations.

7. WHY FAVOR GERMANY?

It would appear thus far that the demands of Germany's neighbors will, in theory, be taken care of. According to the Paris economic recovery program, steel production of the 16 nations and western Germany will, in 1951, have increased by 20 percent compared with 1938. The total production of these countries will rise from 45,500,000 tons in 1938 to 55,400,000 tons in 1951. The major question, however, is how this program will be met. No doubt, the steel-producing nations are able and willing to increase their 1938 output. They can do it provided they receive an adequate supply of coal and coke from Germany. Every effort is being made to provide machinery, raw materials, food, and other supplies which are required to increase the Ruhr coal production. Indeed, the coal production has received the highest priority at the Paris Conference. A quick glance at the requirements of coal-mining equipment of all categories will reveal that the Paris Conference has allocated for this purpose a total of $3,563,000,000, covering a period of 4 years, to the following countries: Western Germany, $1,414,000,000; United Kingdom, $1,042,000,000; and France, $656,000,000; the rest going to other countries.

Taking into account that the Ruhr mines were newly equipped in the period 1922–26, and that in the thirties and during World War II the process of mechanization proceeded further, an investment of so large an amount—40 percent of the total—is bound to favor Germany more than any other country. Meanwhile, the iron and steel industries of France, Belgium, Luxemburg, and Sweden are still in a quandary as to whether they are going to get the coal and coke. Their coal deficit is estimated at 12,500,000 tons, and at this juncture the prospects of obtaining it are not bright.

Since the Paris report does not tell us how these countries will make good their coal deficit, it is clear that only a greater rate of carbonization in western Germany and a higher proportion of hard coke exports from the Ruhr can meet the legitimate demands of the industrial nations of the Paris Conference.

8. WESTERN EUROPE MUST GET PRIORITY

A preview of things to come is provided in the report on German exports for the next 4 years, submitted to the Paris Conference by the American and British bizonal authorities. It is reported that in 1951, western Germany will export 5,500,000 tons of coke. Her total production in 1951 is given at 29,000,000 tons. In this connection, it is pertinent to point out that in 1936 western Germany produced 36,700,000 tons of coke, which is nearly 8,000,000 tons more than the stated production for 1951. If the proposed export of 5,500,000 tons of coke in 1951 remains the final target, it will constitute the greatest blow to Germany's neighbors. Since Germany in 1929 exported 10,000,000 tons of coke, and in 1936—a time of intense war preparations—she was still able to supply her neighbors with 6,000,000 tons of coke, one is completely at a loss to explain the low production and the low export of coke for 1951. Only one interpretation is possible—the military authorities in western Germany do not agree with the recommendations of the Harriman committee which give to France priorities in production of steel.

Nor is this all the bad news the reports of the Paris Conference reveal. The same reports have it that the military authorities plan to extract 16,000,000 tons of ore in western Germany in 1951. Since the total production in Germany in 1936 was 6,900,000 tons of ore, and the highest under the Hitler regime was 11,000,000 tons, the net effect of the 16,000,000 tons program will be that Germany will embark on a new autarchy program.

If this became a reality, then we will witness a repetition of the German economy of the thirties when Goering tried to make Germany economically self-sufficient. The Nazis called the system "autarchy." The system was economically unsound because it was costly to Germany but not to Goering,

for money was no obstacle to him, so long as he was in a position to develop certain German industries essential to preparing for war. The tremendous cost involved in setting up the Hermann Goering Works is a typical example. The cost of extracting iron ore was, by our standards, prohibitive. However, from the point of view of the German war lords, it was sound since it enabled the German war machine to obtain more steel. In any case, if Germany is allowed to produce 16,000,000 tons of iron ore, this can mean only one thing—Germany will need all the coal and the coke she can produce in order to fabricate the steel products from her own iron ore. This in turn means that Belgium, France, Sweden and the other countries will not get the coke to enable them to exploit their own steel capacity.

In other words, while Germany today is consuming 6 out of every 7 tons of coal produced there, under the proposed program she will become the greatest competitor in western Europe for coal and other vital raw materials, instead of resuming her role as the chief supplier of coal to western Europe.

Meanwhile, what are the western European heavy industries going to do without the needed coal? Surely, this cannot be the intent of the Marshall plan.

Coal and the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial appearing in the current issue of the United Mine Workers Journal. This editorial deals with the use of oil and coal for power purposes by our American railroads. We have heard so much recently about the shortage of oil for heating purposes, and this editorial throws some light upon what is in store in the future for the consumers of oil. It is not an encouraging picture by any means.

For anyone familiar with the coal industry it is difficult to understand why large carriers of coal should discontinue the use of coal for locomotives. The question arises as to why these coal-carrying roads substituted oil for coal when it was within the realm of possibility that they could have designed locomotives driven by electric current produced by powdered coal. I believe a recent news item indicated that the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad was experimenting with such a locomotive, and it sounds like good common sense. Users of oil for heating purposes would be smart to convert their plants to coal, for instance, by using the stoker-fed furnace. This would eliminate a lot of discomfort and worry next winter and in the winters beyond. I hope my friends in the East will read this editorial and give some thought to it.

COAL CONSTITUTES 22 PERCENT OF ALL RAILROAD FREIGHT BUT CARRIERS ARE GIVING COAL THE BOOT

The coal industry is the best customer of American railroads. In 1947 railroads hauled 9,088,216 cars of coal, 520,000,000 tons of the total of 677,000,000 tons. Coke freight totaled 732,010 cars, making a grand total of 9,820,235 cars or 22 percent of the total of 44,503,349 of all railroad car loadings.

Coal loadings in 1947 established a new record, topping all other commodities, 13.5 percent over 1946 and coke 24.7 percent over 1946.

The average layman and the professional advocates of reciprocity would naturally think that the railroads in turn would do something for the coal industry. But the facts reveal that the railroads are converting from coal to oil as rapidly as delivery of Diesel engines will permit.

In this change-over the railroads are not only contributing to decreased coal consumption when normal conditions return but are also the largest single contributing factor to the present day oil shortage.

Spokesmen for the petroleum industry assert that the increased use of Diesel oil by the railroads since 1940 has been sevenfold—from 1,000,000 barrels to 7,000,000 barrels. The petroleum industry estimates that if the present ratio of purchases of Diesel engines by the railroads continues, supplanting coal-burning locomotives, Diesel oil consumption by the railroads will increase to 90,000,000 barrels in 1952.

Six hundred and six new Diesel locomotives were put in service in 1947. At present there are 1,192 Diesels on order, as against only 30 steam locomotives and 4 electrics. As compared with last year, Diesel orders have more than doubled while steam locomotive orders have decreased one-half. Diesel locomotives are being turned out on a mass-production basis—around 120 a month.

On the southwestern railroads Diesels are first choice by reason of the absence of coal production. But certainly this is not true of the railroads serving our geography north of Alabama and Tennessee and east of the Mississippi and the western intermountain States.

When the railroads embarked upon the transition from steam to Diesel locomotives oil was plentiful. Diesel oil like the small sizes of coal—stoker coal for example—was offered below cost of production. But, again like stoker coal with the widespread sale of stokers, Diesel oil now accounts for such a large portion of the petroleum industry's production that the industry must receive a price that will not only pay production costs but return a profit. Consequently, both small sizes of coal and Diesel oil now command a price comparable with other oils and sizes of coal.

The economy advantage that was the first consideration in the railroads' use of Diesels has now been largely dissipated and coal is available f. o. b. the mines cheaper than Diesel oil on a comparable haulage cost, B. t. u. ton-mile basis.

The railroads are constantly importuning the coal operators and the UMWA to fight waterpower development and pipe-line construction for gas and oil that would eliminate coal and oil traffic. In other words, the railroads are anxious and vigorous in their endeavors to hold down the consumption of pipe-line oil and gas and electricity generated from water power for domestic and industrial consumers in order to maintain their freight haulage, but railroads are unwilling to continue to use coal to generate motive power.

It is a paradox that puts the railroads on the spot and a commercial indictment that they cannot answer.

Locomotive-manufacturing companies that have heretofore engaged in the production of steam locomotives are wondering what to do with their equipment. Representatives of these companies have placed before the Joint Army-Navy Munitions Board a program for the purchase of military steam-powered locomotives in order to save the manufacturing facilities of these plants for wartime production. The steam-locomotive producers assert that when and if war should come, the demand for oil would be so great from our fighting forces that it would be necessary for the railroads to replace Diesel engines with steam-powered locomotives. These companies have $35,000,000 of equipment and no orders. So they want to know whether national defense requirements are such as to make it feasible for the Government to keep their stand-by capacity in productive condition.

The leadership of the coal industry have ever humbled themselves to the railroads. Prior to passage of the Bituminous Coal Act in 1937, the railroads practically dictated the purchase price of railroad coal. The operators intrigued, scraped, and bowed, used political influence, and every other conceivable contact to get railroad orders on a production-cost basis.

Coal-industry leaders have been unable to convince the railroads of the practicality and necessity of reciprocal trade. On the other hand, such large companies as General Motors, Fairbanks-Morse, and others engaged in the manufacture of automobiles and varied products have been able to sell the railroads Diesel engines on the strength of the freight these companies furnish the railroads.

Here again is a demonstration of the evils of monopoly control. As an example, General Motors could not swing railroad purchases of Diesels on the shipment of automobiles alone. But since GM makes Frigidaires and a varied line of other products which railroads compete for the shipment of, GM is consequently able to turn the trick.

Freight rate hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission have proven time and time again that coal is the most profitable freight hauled by the railroads. Coal carriers like the Chesapeake & Ohio and the Norfolk & Western earn money when other railroads are going in the red.

Since 1940 coal freight rates have increased 45 cents a ton, or $24.75 per 55-ton car. We do not believe that railroad costs have increased this much.

But regardless of increased expenses incurred by the railroads and recognizing the fact that greatly increased coal production is a leverage for an increased earnings ratio for railroads, we do not believe that the latter is totally responsible for the large earnings of such coal-carrying railroads as the Norfolk & Western, whose earnings increased from $22,733,409 in 1946 or $3.88 a share to $32,292,608 or $5.58 a share in 1947, and the Chesapeake & Ohio, whose earnings increased from $28,372,066 or $3.54 a share in 1946 to $35,387,327 or $4.44 a share in 1947. Certainly the earnings of these railroads demonstrate the profitability of coal freight. And we think unduly high rate increases are to be credited as a big factor.

So the next time you read a railroad advertisement in the newspapers telling all about how the railroads cooperate with industries on their lines, just remember to reflect on the kind of treatment the railroads are handing the coal industry plus the fact that coal production in any period of great demand is always hampered by an inadequate railroad car supply, which in the past has contributed to increased conversion from coal to oil and gas.

Vandenberg's Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, herewith is an editorial from this morning's

Washington Post entitled "VANDENBERG'S Lead" which I ask be included in the Appendix to the RECORD as an extension of my remarks. It is a good, sound editorial and well written.

VANDENBERG'S LEAD

ERP has now been transformed into a bill which on enactment will be called ECA—the Economic Cooperation Act. The story of the transformation is familiar enough. Last June 5 Secretary Marshall electrified the world by suggesting that the Europeans get together and submit to the United States a program for the revival of Europe as "a working economy." In due course the program arrived in Washington. It was screened by the country's best brains. To the Senate Foreign Relations Committee fell the role of hammering out a bill. Under Senator VANDENBERG'S chairmanship the committee spent 5 weeks in public hearings and 10 days in continuous executive sessions. The bill that grew out of all this work and which was introduced yesterday by Senator VANDENBERG is submitted to the Senate with the unanimous recommendation of the seven Republicans and six Democrats making up the committee.

The occasion is appropriate to say (and the applauding Senate recognized it) that Senator VANDENBERG has proved himself the model of the vision and courage that he bespoke after Secretary Marshall's declaration. If Marshall was the prophet, VANDENBERG has been the engineer of the heroic adventure, and now he is undertaking the pilot's job. He got the barque off yesterday with an allocution in part narrative and in part advocacy, and the whole was shot through with an apocalyptic sense of history in the making.

There will be a disposition in Congress to quibble over the details of ECA. Particularly, as the Herter committee makes clear, an effort is brewing to whittle down the amount. Originally this was $6,800,000,000 for 15 months after April 1. The figure was the result of rigorous pruning by the executive agencies of Europe's proposals for $8,400,000,000 as well as a realistic appraisal of domestic availabilities. The committee decided to launch the plan on a timetable which would permit early review. Thus the first authorization would be for five billion three hundred million instead of $6,800,000,000, and for a year of operation instead of 15 months. Senator VANDENBERG pleads that this figure should be left untouched. The figures, he admits, are not sacred. We ourselves would say they are an exercise in faith. But in the light of the powerful credentials they possess, unless the Appropriations Committee can strongly prove them wrong, let's give them the benefit of any doubts for the time being. Next January is not long to wait for the accounting with so much at stake.

The plea was advanced with compelling power. The debate is taking place while the enemies of the plan in what Senator VANDENBERG calls the Soviet police empire are moving heaven and earth to frustrate it. They are bent upon breaking up the embryonic chain of ERP Europe. Italy is the most exposed, if not the weakest, link, and the drive to communize Italy is now on. Nothing would hearten the Italians more than the early and triumphant passage of the Economic Cooperation Act. The aid afforded by this bill is needed desperately to prop them up, not by way of what Senator VANDENBERG calls a sterile dole, but for the purpose of fitting them and their neighbors into an integrated continental system. Italy has been in the van in the preparatory work to unite Europe.

Unity—that is the concept of ECA. To put the nations of Europe on their individual feet while the Colossus is on the march would be to increase their value without mitigating their defenselessness. Unity is the only strength in today's momentous contest. It is the thing that Soviet Russia most fears. Senator VANDENBERG sees this requirement with a clarity that has been nourished by actual experience of diplomacy with Soviet Russia. He reminded Congress that the continuity of our assistance is made dependent on the deepening of intra-European cooperation. The central body in Europe with which the ECA will work can be made into the nucleus of a new Europa if we insist that it shall be equipped with an international staff operating a sort of peace production board. Only such an entity will give Europe and us any safeguard against the advancing hordes of the Slav aggressor. The Vandenberg speech was a mobilization call expressed with deep seriousness and minus heroics. If it is not heeded, there is no doubt that another kind of mobilization will be forthcoming.

Reserve Corps' Importance in Nation's Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following address which was delivered by me to a group of Reserve Corps men at Chattanooga, Tenn.:

Upon the 28,000 Army and Air Force Reserves in Tennessee and upon the hundreds of thousands of other Reserves throughout the Nation rests a great responsibility—perhaps we should call it an opportunity—in connection with the formulation and disposition of vital national-defense questions.

RELATIONSHIP OF RESERVE CORPS TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

We are all concerned today with the question of national security and of vital importance are these matters which are before Congress, or which may come before it affecting national security.

To begin with let me first give you a picture of your relationship, collectively and individually, to the national-defense program. Perhaps you know this already. No doubt most of you do. But it is so basic, so very important a point, that it cannot be repeated too often. The Organized Reserves now number well over a million people, with slightly more enlisted men than officers. Just what are all of you supposed to do? Just where do you fit in in the national-defense scheme? Well, let's look back a bit.

RESERVE CORPS PAPER UNITS AFTER WORLD WAR I

After World War I we had an Officers' Reserve Corps organized into units of officers only, and these were essentially paper units. There were about 3,000 enlisted Reservists who enlisted primarily as a means to secure commissions. No enlisted men were assigned to units nor was any equipment provided for training. As late as 1940 the Officers' Reserve Corps had a strength of about 100,000. Only about 6,000 of these were from among the 200,000 officers who served in the First World War. So you can see that in a period of about 21 years the Officers' Reserve Corps decreased insofar as war-trained officers are concerned from 200,000 to 6,000.

The rest of the 100,000 Reserve officers we had when Pearl Harbor was bombed were principally ROTC graduates, as no doubt many of you are. By Pearl Harbor day over 80,000 of these 100,000 had been called to active duty to augment the officer personnel of the Regular Army and National Guard.

Now, here is the problem that developed. By December 7, 1941, even the paper officer units of the Reserve had been entirely dissipated. The fact is, not one of the Reserve units as such was ever called to duty during the entire war. Actually, because many of the officers on duty had been promoted, no appropriate vacancies existed in the units to absorb them even if they had been returned to their former Reserve-unit assignments.

WAR DEPARTMENT ESTIMATES TOO CONSERVATIVE

What had happened was that War Department planning for officer strength had been too conservative. The Department had provided in all components a strength of about 135,000 officers. But some 800,000 were needed. Here, then, was a lesson from the last war affecting the reserves vitally, that required corrective legislation in this Congress. Such legislation is now in the mill, and I will tell you about it a little later.

What I have just been over very generally is the backdrop for what we have today. I am intentionally skipping over how the Reserves contributed to the winning of the war. All of you know about that, much better than anyone else. I will just remind you of General Marshall's remark that—and I quote—"Just what we would have done in the first phases of our mobilization and training without the Reserves I do not know. I do know that our plans would have had to be greatly curtailed, and the cessation of hostilities on the European front would have been delayed accordingly." Certainly there's no need to expand on that.

SITUATION IN EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Now, what situation faces the Reserves in the present Congress? Some very important legislation is now pending before the Committee on Armed Services and the House of Representatives that will affect each one of you here this evening. Incidentally, I think it is a safe statement that this Congress has already initiated more basic Reserve legislation, with more far-reaching effects on the Reserves, than any previous Congress.

INACTIVE-DUTY TRAINING BILL

We have, for example, one bill that I know many of you are curious about. It is the so-called inactive-duty training-pay bill. We call it H. R. 3227, the number meaning, by the way, that 3,226 other bills had been introduced in the House of Representatives before it came along. I mention this so you can understand that there are a relatively large number of legislative items confronting a Congressman.

This inactive duty training pay bill, as you may know, contemplates giving inactive duty training pay, for the first time, to the Army Reserves, thereby giving them the same status in this respect as Marine Corps and Navy Reservists and the National Guard.

This measure will cost the American taxpayer, if it is enacted into law, somewhere around $117,000,000 a year. That is a lot of money. However, the Reserves must be kept active if we are to have an adequate national defense program and equity requires the compensation of Army Reserves on the same basis as Navy Reservists, Marine Corps Reservists, and the National Guard.

This bill was voted out of the Armed Services Committee favorably and I made a vigorous effort to have it passed by the House of Representatives before it adjourned on July 26. A companion bill had already been passed by the Senate.

PRESENT STATUS OF MEASURE

The Rules Committee has not granted a rule on the bill and it will be brought up on the floor of the House shortly. Even though considerable debate may develop in the House because of the cost this legislation will incur, I think we can get it through and that, reasonably soon, you fellows and the thousands of other Army Reserves will be receiving inactive duty pay.

You can easily compute how much pay you will get from this bill if and when it becomes law. The bill specifies that inactive duty pay will be at the rate of one-thirtieth of 1 month's base and longevity pay for each training period of two or more hours. Neither you nor I want to see these funds wasted. I am glad to say that the program is to be very closely administered, and the law was written with that in view.

HOW THE BILL WILL OPERATE

To be paid, you will have to belong to a class A, class B, or class C unit—or else be a certain type of specialist, such as a pilot, a radar technician, a doctor, and so on, who can be paid even though assigned outside such units. If you belong to a class A unit—four of them have been activated in the country so far—you can have 48 training periods a year, or about one a week, for which you can be paid. If you are in a class B or class C unit you will get half as much as the fellows in class A units or 24 training periods for which you can be paid annually.

The Army expects this legislation to cost about $35,000,000 in 1948. Twenty million of it will go to the Ground Forces, and about fifteen and a half million to the Air Forces. Eventually, as reserve units are activated and advanced into class B and class A status, the cost is expected to reach about $117,000,000 a year.

RESERVISTS RETIREMENT BILL

Another bill came out of the Armed Services Committee this session which also will affect every reserve here tonight. The so-called retirement bill known to us in Congress as H. R. 2744, reported late in the first session of the Eightieth Congress by the Armed Services Committee, is to be considered this week by the House. It is likely to be passed, although it is somewhat more controversial than the inactive duty training bill.

Tied in with this bill is the Regular Army retirement plan and also a program by which inefficient and substandard Regular officers will be eliminated. But what concerns you particularly is that part of the bill which sets up for the first time a retirement program for Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force reservists. Of course, the bill also applies to the National Guard. The end result of the legislation is that if you stay with your reserve training until you are 60 years old and qualify under detailed standards specified in the bill, you will receive a retirement income from the Federal Government. It will be computed similarly to that received by Regular officers of the Services. The formula by which your retirement income will be computed is not exactly simple.

HOW IT WILL AFFECT YOU

Take the base pay, plus the longevity pay, of the highest grade you anticipate attaining in the reserve, then take 2½ percent of that. Multiply the result by the number of years you will have served on active duty. Then add to that total one-half of 1 percent multiplied by the number of years of inactive duty you will have had. What comes out is your retirement pay. It will be relatively substantial for an officer in the grade of colonel who has had some 25 or 30 years of service. For an officer, the average annual benefit will be about $1,300 a year, beginning at age 60. For an enlisted man it will average about $500.

For your officers to buy such a 60-year retirement income from an insurance company beginning at age 20 and maintained on a 30-year payment basis, you would be out about $300 a year. So you can see that this legislation will be worth, on the average, about $300 a year to each Reserve who stays active and qualifies for retirement under the terms of this bill.

This program will cost the taxpayers about $50,000 in 1949. By 1957 the War Department estimates the cost to be about one and one-half millions a year. Some estimates are much higher. The President's Budget Bureau, for example, thinks the cost will be very much higher than the War Department estimate.

However, the program is, in my opinion, still warranted, even though it may become expensive. It dovetails closely into the concept of the inactive duty pay bill. By providing inactive duty pay, we hope the Reserves will stay active while they are young—that is, when the weekly or bimonthly inactive duty pay checks from Uncle Sam mean a good deal. Retirement programs seem rather distant and unrealistic to most young men; they are likely to worry more about the present than the future.

By the time a fellow gets around 30 or 35 years old, he begins to think about his future, his insurance, his retirement, his established personal estate. Around this time, too, he begins to lose interest, if he has been successful, in the comparatively small income he can derive from the inactive duty pay. In here steps in the retirement program. It offers the Reservist the equivalent of a $300 a year retirement policy if he will remain active as a Reserve officer.

I think these two programs are excellent. The fact is, they are absolutely necessary in my judgment, if we are to avoid severe attrition in the Reserves and an expensive turn-over of officers during the peacetime years.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Another bill you may have heard something about is the universal military training bill which was reported to the House on the last day of the session. At this point it is sufficient to say only that the bill would require all qualified young men between the ages of 18 and 20 to undergo military training to fit them to contribute to the protection of the country in time of emergency. I do not know whether the Congress will enact universal military training into law or not. But I can certainly assure you that I am going to make a strong effort to get it passed. For I think that universal military training is a vastly important and absolutely imperative element in the national security program. And you realize, of course, that it is also exceedingly important for the healthful development of the Organized Reserves and the National Guard.

OTHER MEASURES

There are a great number of legislative matters in the mill and for that matter enacted into law during the last session but I do not want to extend this summary too long. It suffices to say that we passed 59 laws affecting the armed forces which is one out of six of all laws passed by the Congress last session.

Now, in conclusion, I want to emphasize that you men here this evening are, whether you will it or not, representative of one of the most important elements of the Nation's defense. I mean this sincerely. A lot has been said about it and written about it lately. And it is definitely true. We in Congress have initiated legislation which we believe will help you keep active in the reserve components. If you do not, then the Nation is certain to be hard put to maintain an effective defense establishment. I agree completely and unreservedly with the remark of the President's Advisory Commission on universal military training when it said that military weakness "is a passport to aggression."

RESERVE CORPS, BACKBONE OF REGULAR SERVICES

The Regular Army, the Regular Navy, the Regular Air Forces, and the Regular Marine Corps are but one element, and the smallest element, I may say, in our defense structure. Upon you Army reservists and other civilian components hinge the efficacy of the Regular services in repelling aggression. I know you can perform, if given the materials and incentives necessary for your peacetime training. We are working vigorously in the Congress to give you just that. If you have any suggestions to improve what we have done or have not done, I trust you will let me and others in our Tennessee delegation in Congress have them. We are as determined as you are to insure that our armed forces and their civilian components are properly and sufficiently equipped to meet any crisis in the world that may arise.

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to make these remarks to you.

The Human Side of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley at Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., on February 17, 1948, at the opening of the university's 1948 series of lectures in human relations:

THE HUMAN SIDE OF POLITICS

For more than a quarter of a century I have carried in my pockets a definition of politics which has been an inspiration and a comfort in hours of striving and stress. I am not certain of the identity of the author beyond the fact that his name is Oliver. I believe that the sentences are the product of Andrew Oliver, the younger, scholar and founder of the Political Journal, rather than of his father, Andrew Oliver, the Colonial political leader, who was hanged in effigy on his appointment as stamp officer for the crown and at whose grave in Boston in 1774 patriots cheered when his coffin was lowered into the ground. Both father and son had postgraduate courses in the hard school of practical experience, which would have given either of them the background for the lines I quote:

"Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is not another in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures—neither is there any in which by a mere loss of nerve he may do widespread harm—nor is there another in which he may so easily lose his own soul—nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the inseparable companion of honor. With all the temptations and degradations that beset it, politics is still the noblest career that any man can choose."

As they say in the precise language of academic halls, Mr. Oliver said a mouthful. I can attest to that out of instructive, if at times trying, experience gathered in 35 years of active political life. For the past 4 years I have been an interested observer on the sidelines where I have learned much that escaped me when I was in the rough and tumble of town, county, State, and national arenas. In these later years I have been urged, now and then, to expound my political philosophy. While I am not a philosopher, except as the passage of years promotes contemplation and reflection on one's way of life, I do have some knowledge of politics.

If you would know politics, look about you. I do not entirely subscribe to the dictum that the proper study of mankind is man; I would raise our eyes higher to the contemplation of a divine and beneficent Providence, but for the politician there is no study more rewarding than the cultivation of his fellow men

in each and every walk of life. Only through knowledge of his fellows can a man hope to lead or influence them. A love of his fellow men helps, but, it is to be regretted, is not essential since it can be so readily simulated.

The hazards of politics, I have often thought, are not campaigns and elections, as might be commonly supposed, but rather the human element, the very nature of the animal that engages in politics. Ambition, love, jealousy, hate, and the many emotions and reactions man is heir to frequently affect the course of the nation and of the world more than principles or circumstances or events. This was so from the dawn of time, is true today, and will ever be in the history of man's search for perfection.

Moses, first of the great leaders, had the wisdom of a statesman and was perhaps the only political leader who kept all his campaign promises, as Pharaoh learned to his sorrow. Yet, he was not without opposition even from within his own family. Miriam and Aaron, his sister and his brother, spoke against him. He saw other tribes bitter with jealousy against his tribe and his own tribe envious of his preeminence. He knew the worldly considerations by which some of his followers were moved as told in the story of the children of Reuben and Gad, who sought permission to remain in the land of Gilead because the country was well suited for the raising of cattle, instead of passing over the Jordan into the promised land with the other children of Israel. He was disturbed over the lack of faith in the people and their readiness to lapse into idolatrous ways. Frequently he meditated on these weaknesses and pondered on ways of combating these threats to national existence. One of his ways was the preparation of a farewell address, which precedent undoubtedly influenced that great Moses of the west, George Washington, when he closed his career by offering a political valedictory for the instruction of his countrymen.

Moses was not without weaknesses of his own, not the least of which was vanity. It will be remembered that at the encampment at Kadesh, where Moses and Aaron were bidden by God to speak to the rock, Moses said to the murmuring people, "Hear now, ye rebels: shall we bring forth water out of this rock?" and he smote the rock twice with his staff so that it gushed forth water. Like many a politician who has followed them, the brothers failed to recognize their subordinate position. At that moment they felt they were the leaders of the people, forgetful that it was God who led the tribes out of Egyptian bondage and fed them in the wilderness for 40 years. Moses and Aaron paid dearly for this sin, being denied the honor and privilege of leading the children of Israel into the promised land.

Vanity, the insatiable sixth sense common to man but most highly developed in politicians, has ruined many a political career, as has vaulting ambition. Reluctance to relinquish power, particularly where the hand is feeble and the mind is tired, is fraught with danger to parties and to the Nation. This weakness is often the salvation of courtiers and coat-tail riders. In the vital relay of politics, every lap of which measures the progress of man, the torch of leadership must be passed on to trained younger men. If younger men are not trained to take over leadership, the party and the Nation are weakened, with the danger that the race may be lost.

Politics is no place for the timid man; he who hesitates will lose the election. Frequently the man in public life is called upon to make split-second decisions, usually in the heat of campaigns or in times of crises in office. While it is true, delay solves some problems, the man who puts off decisions too long finds his career crushed by the weight of the accumulated heap. And politics is no place for the corrupt or dishonest. Sooner or later, evil deeds rise to confound the guilty. In my time I have been criticized for helping men who have betrayed their trust. Somehow I could never feel anything but pity for them. I have no capacity for hate and but little for censure. I feel that a man found wanting in political honesty suffers enough in standing revealed as a weakling, unworthy of the reliance placed in him by his friends and the electorate. I have sympathy for him as one has a sympathy for the afflicted, but without any trace of the admiration that goes for the latter.

In the final analysis, the politician has nothing to offer but his word. If he tells the truth and keeps his word, he gains the devotion of his friends and the respect of his enemies. Men may and do have honest differences. More often than not there is something to be said on both sides of a question. Compromise is the usual measure of political progress. This does not mean that principles or ideals are to be raised or lowered in any skirmish; they can and should be nailed to the mast.

The man who does not tell the truth is distrusted and shunned, and rightfully so. There are those whose first instinct is not to tell the truth even when it best serves their own purposes just as there are those in whom the dog of ambition is pursued by a rabbit of conscience. Truth is by far the easier as well as the most respected course. I had an early lesson in this from Charles E. Murphy, leader of Tammany Hall, whom many of you might regard as a strange preceptor. I approached him after Alfred E. Smith was first elected Governor of New York, after a campaign in which I played a small part. I felt entitled to the post of secretary to the State Industrial Commission. My sights were not, I modestly felt, fixed too high. Mr. Murphy told me that while he was impressed by my earnestness and ability, he felt I lacked experience for the place, and that it should go to someone else. I was a bit bitter for a time, but as disappointment died, the more reasonable Mr. Murphy's attitude seemed to me. As a result I have never concealed the truth from an applicant for a position. In the end I always found him grateful as I was.

In the rare instances where one cannot tell the truth, because he is bound by his word not to reveal confidences or advance information, it is not necessary to become involved in complicated evasions or falsehoods. Again the easier method is to acknowledge that you are sorry but just can't answer the questions. The passing of one's word is the execution of a sacred bond. It is so with most men in political life as it is with the great majority of men everywhere.

In politics, it is well to start at the very bottom rung of the ladder, because each rung gained has its delights, and the loftier the climb, the more gratifying the view from above. The usual first step is bringing voters to the polls. There is no better way to meet people in the district than by offering them a favor. This develops courtesy and ability to meet people. The second step is ringing doorbells to solicit votes for a candidate or party. Here salesmanship and personality are developed. If the young man attracts the notice of his superiors he is given greater responsibilities either within the party organization or in public service or both. He may rise in responsible but appointive administrative posts; he may work into the ranks of the king makers, or he may travel by the elective rung to the highest office in his city, county, State, or Nation. In mention of the highest office within the gift of our fellow countrymen, I am glad that each passing year brings us nearer to the ideal where any American mother, regardless of race or creed, can look into the crib holding her child and say to herself, "Some day he may be President of the United States."

Where the opportunities are limitless so are the capacities for service. Nothing has given me greater pleasure in my years in politics than the services I was able to do for the people as a whole or as individuals. To this day I find, wherever I go, someone is always taking my hand to thank me for a service I have usually forgotten. The services I have given will ever be a source of joy to me. Those in academic life among you know too well that money is not the highest reward; that the metal of service outshines gold.

Heretofore, for the most part, I have confined myself to approaching politics from the viewpoint of the individual. I now propose to consider politics from the viewpoint of groups of individuals or parties. It is fitting and proper that we should be governed by political parties. From the dawn of self-government in Greece it was natural that political parties should vie for the management of the government.

It is not surprising that parties should take color and appeal from their leadership. However, it should not be forgotten that parties have basic principles, which differ sharply. These basic principles are constantly being renovated by the play of social and economic forces and by the interplay of conditions and events within the party and within the country.

In our own country we have two parties with more or less fixed ranks of the party faithful and a large number of independent voters who swing from party to party under the attraction of personalities or party platforms, or the pressure of forces or events, but often out of disappointment with the performances of the party in power. This is, I am convinced, as it should be. As a lifelong Democrat, I am a firm believer in the two-party system and feel it would be a tragedy if either the Democratic or the Republican Party were to pass from the national scene.

I believe that men and women should seek to correct what they dislike in the party from within the party. In my own case I strongly opposed the majority of my party on the issue of a third term. I am still opposed to a third term. But I am not opposed to the Democratic Party. I participated in the national convention that voted for a third term and by that participation bound myself to accept the will of the majority. While I resigned from the Cabinet, not wishing to embarrass the administration by remaining in a high position, I voted the Democratic ticket. Again in 1944, when my opposition had increased rather than lessened, I voted the Democratic ticket because I had once more participated in the national convention where I and others like me were overwhelmingly voted down.

I was not then happy in the Democratic Party, but I could not bring myself to enter the Republican Party for the sole purpose of defeating the party to which I owed so much and which I had helped to put in power. Nor could I form a third party merely to have a yard of my own to play in because the big boys wouldn't play my way. We have a third party today, formed by one who wouldn't play according to the rules in the Republican or the Democratic Parties. I, for one, don't want a third party in this country. The two great political parties help our Nation by promoting unity. A third party can only promote minority rule and tend to leave the country the prey of demagogs and malcontents.

Disappointment and discontent should not promote cynicism, for the bitter cynic loses his friends and damages his soul. Not all aspirants can win nomination and only one candidate can win the election. While defeat is not pleasant, it is seldom fatal and there is always another election on the horizon. Those disappointed over failure to gain an appointment should remember officeholders are mortal.

I am reminded of the story of the persistent office seeker who rushed to a former State senator, the late Pat McCarran, on learning of the death of an official: "Can I take Flanagan's place?" he pleaded. The senator, wearied by previous entreaties, snapped, "It's all right with me if you can square it with the undertaker."

Discontent is a more virulent disease. Its invasion of the pride is far more serious. Often it is the harder to bear because it entails ostracism of a sort. Once a man stripes himself, or is divested of the powers of his office, he frequently finds those he regarded as friends pass him by and those for whom he did most know him not. It is not a pleasant experience, although there are some who hold it to be a great developer of character. In my own case I was saved from cynicism by the firm knowledge I was right and by the kind words of the many who sought me out in my travels to commend my action or to give thanks for services I had rendered. I shall ever be grateful to them.

As I favor the two-party system, so am I opposed to the one-party system in vogue in some nations where it is proclaimed as true democracy. I do not want to confine my participation in government to voting "ja," "yes," "aye," or "da" to the whim of any totalitarian overlord. The party should be the servant of its members, not their master. It should be open to all who wish to join it, not an exclusive society of assassins. And it should be competing for national good will, not dictating the way of life.

In concluding, I should like to dwell on Oliver's statement that politics, with all its faults, is still the noblest of careers. It may appear, as Robert Louis Stevenson said, "Politics is perhaps the only profession for which no preparation is thought necessary." Yet no other is so essential for the distribution of temporal happiness and the preservation of the freedoms and liberties that make our way of life.

Plato and after him Aristotle held the good politician in high esteem. In fact the latter placed him at the topmost step of a graduated sort of heaven he evolved in the vast cathedral of his mind. It may be that the highest step is not crowded or even empty as has been suggested to me. If so, then let it be said of us we are reaching for the ideal state and coming ever nearer. I am supremely confident man will solve his problems; that the future is bright though the day be dark.

He who chooses politics as a career will have the experience of ages to guide him in reaching for higher if unattainable goals. In extending his grasp he may give his name to an age when it may shine brightly for all time. For those to whom such fame is denied, there is comfort in knowing that we are providing experience to be drawn upon by those to come. We are the progenitors of the perfect rulers of the future, men in whom thought and action are delicately balanced and from whose rule political blessings will flow.

Bipartisan Foreign Policy Stifles Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the victory of Henry Wallace's personal candidate in the Bronx, N. Y., election last week was interpreted in many ways by Congressmen and commentators, but most of them agreed on one point: The so-called bipartisan foreign policy is wilting away.

I have little confidence in Henry Wallace. His domestic policies proved to be fallacious and ill-timed, and he has been noted more as a coat-tail rider in the field of foreign policy than for any contributions of his own.

However, by attacking the so-called bipartisan foreign policy, he has hit on a basic issue that has increasingly threatened to split both major parties asunder in recent years.

The truth is, the people are frustrated by any so-called bipartisan foreign policy such as we have had in recent years. A spokesman for the minority party—the Republicans until a little more than a year ago—presumed to speak for millions of Americans who were of the same minority party, but it was doubtful if these millions of Americans went along with the spokesman. Yet, to keep from splitting the party wide open, they had to acquiesce.

As a result, the so-called bipartisan foreign policy has become more and more an instrument for repressing the people and a device to prevent both sides of any issue in the field of foreign affairs to be discussed.

A bipartisan foreign policy does more than stop politics at the water's edge. It stifles discussion in Congress, by the two national committees and by political leaders and people throughout the country. It gives to most thoughtful Americans a feeling of futility. You can fight one machine, as long as you have a machine, however small it may be, but when you find yourself up against two machines you are apt to retreat.

In a nation as big as this one, with as many varying interests, there must be opportunities for discussion and for voting on every part of every issue, whether in the field of domestic or foreign policy. Any other course, by means of which two or three men become the self-proclaimed spokesmen for millions of Americans and commit them to a course they do not like, is suicidal to representative government. It is frustrating, anomalous, and, in fact, as deadening in the affairs of government as any blight that ever attacked a farm crop.

Let the people know and let the people debate and let the people decide. That, or some similar slogan, should be the watchword of the American people. If the people are fully informed as to what is happening all over the world—and they never have been currently informed in the past 15 years as to what is cooking—they can make sound decisions. Lacking full information, they naturally are confused and bewildered—and can be handled by demagogues.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was the architect of the so-called bipartisan foreign policy and full responsibility for it must be laid at his door. He carved it out as insurance against being attacked for his foreign-policy blunders in the fourth-term campaign. He did it so subtly that some Republicans now even claim that they started the bipartisan foreign policy.

As an instrument to help keep the hush-hush on foreign-policy debates and to assure his reelection, the ailing Roosevelt and the little group around him found the bipartisan foreign-policy strategy good. It stifled potential opposition from the only effective place from which it could come—the Republican Party.

Later, of course, international bankers and other predatory groups saw that it would help them, too, in their designs on the American people and the American Government. The Communists, you will remember, were all for the bipartisan foreign policy—as long as its adherents were for shipping billions of dollars worth of goods and materials to Russia, long after war was over.

The people in those days who opposed the bipartisan foreign policy were accused of being Fascists. Now, the ones who oppose the bipartisan foreign policy sometimes are accused of being Communists. The groups that want to rule America, whether meaningly or not, have adopted the Communist technique of smear.

Relationship Between Cities and Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address which I made at the National Conference on Government of the National Municipal League at Nashville, Tenn. The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, the relationship between the Congress or the Federal Government and the cities of the Nation is considerably more complex than the average citizen appreciates. It is only natural that with the development of technology that cities and the Federal Government should become more interrelated in their governmental functions. In these days, the Federal Government and the cities have a joint and common interest in air-line transportation, streets, housing, schools, and commerce. The problem that vexes both Congress and city officials is arriving at a proper line of demarcation between the activities which should be wholly in the hands of the cities and those which should also be the concern of Congress and the Federal Government. It is axiomatic that democracy works best when it is close to the people. The town-meeting plan can be the nearest approach to pure democracy that we have in this country.

On this premise, I think we will all be in agreement that those matters which can be handled by either the local municipality or by the Federal Government should be left with the local group. This will preserve and develop the maximum of initiative and responsibility at local levels which is the healthiest possible attitude for a democracy.

But before going into the implications of Federal participation in city affairs, let us first examine the instances in which the Federal Government is taking a part in municipal matters and also look at some of

the further proposals for Federal participation that have been made recently.

GROWTH OF FEDERAL SERVICES TO CITIES

According to a survey made by the National Resources Committee, only 14 services were performed by the National Government for urban communities in 1875. By 1900 the number had risen to 30; 47 more had been added by 1920. During the depression years, 42 new activities were begun. This great growth of direct Federal-municipal contacts during the depression resulted from the cities' need for aid and the States' inability to furnish it. The National Government then moved in to supply the necessary help. During the Second World War, with its resulting emergency conditions, many departures were made from the traditional way of doing things, and this was true in the field of Federal-city relations, where many new relations were established. During the past 50 years the new activities which the National Government has undertaken for cities have in few instances been replacements for old functions, because in the great majority of cases the old functions have been retained by the Federal Government. There are now more than 100 agencies of the Federal Government, including bureaus, boards, and independent establishments, which are concerned in one way or another with municipal activities.

INDIRECT FEDERAL SERVICES

Many of the activities undertaken by the Federal Government involve no formal agreements or even informal understandings with the cities—they are, in other words, relatively indirect. In this category are included those agencies which collect information concerning municipal affairs. For instance, the Bureau of the Census publishes an annual volume on city finances. Studies and surveys made by the United States Office of Education have proved of great value to local school officials. The Public Roads Administration conducts research on the best methods of street construction; the studies of the United States Public Health Service are of great significance to local health departments. There are many other instances of such indirect Federal aid to cities. During the 1930's, Federal-municipal relations were, for the most part, of this casual or incidental nature, arising from the necessity for close contact between governmental levels of administration. This aid took the form of statistics, research, information, and advisory services. During the period the number of direct contacts and services with cities was also increased.

At this point may be mentioned the way in which the Federal Government during the Nation-wide depression of the 1930's assumed responsibilities which would otherwise have fallen on the State and municipal governments. An extensive relief program was set up which saved the States and cities from having to provide for hundreds of thousands of unemployed workers. In addition, the States and cities were given direct grants from the Federal Government for public works projects involving relief labor.

DIRECT FEDERAL SERVICES

There are a number of ways in which the Federal Government is in direct contact with the cities. Perhaps the best known example of this is in the field of law enforcement. The Federal Bureau of Investigation of the United States Department of Justice maintains an elaborate fingerprint file of millions of known criminals. The facilities of this system are available to local law enforcement officials upon request. FBI agents also cooperate in several other aspects of crime detection. The local police departments of course give assistance to the Federal agency in turn, and a semiannual publication of the FBI, Uniform Crime Reports, is based on information furnished by local police departments.

Another area of close contact between the two levels of government is that of public personnel. The United States Civil Service Commission has prepared standard tests for the use of municipal officials. Many of the Federal grants to the States are conditioned upon administration by trained State and local personnel. For instance, the United States Public Health Service requires that every city receiving public health funds directly must have a properly trained full-time health officer and an adequate number of trained assistants. The qualifications for these officers were determined by the Public Health Service and the Conference of State and Provincial Health Officers. In addition, there are a number of in-service training programs conducted by agencies to provide advanced training for local as well as Federal employees.

There are many other agencies whose work is concerned with local conditions. For instance the State and municipal employment agencies work with the United States Employment Service to reduce unemployment.

An important change in Federal-municipal relations has taken place as regards street construction. Federal funds have been made available to the States for highway construction for the last 30 years, but until 1932 it was specifically stated that none of the Federal funds and none of the matching funds supplied by the State could be used for the construction of city streets. In 1934 the reversal of Federal policy was made complete by an Executive order decreeing that one-fourth of the emergency highway grants must be used for municipal street construction. The latest Federal highway program has an allowance for city street construction.

WAR PERIOD DEVELOPMENTS

The Office of Civilian Defense established many local defense councils and eventually was provided with the means of enforcing its regulations. Loans of Federal equipment to localities were conditioned upon the acceptance of Federal rules. The Office of Defense Transportation received cooperation from many cities on its list of suggested revisions of traffic regulations in order to save tires, gasoline, and time.

The major problems occurred, however, in the cities in which war industries were concentrated. Housing was at a premium, schools were overcrowded, medical and recreational facilities were inadequate. The Federal Government assisted in this crisis by authorizing an extensive war housing program, and by providing grants to permit cities to expand certain of their regular services to take care of their increased populations. A National Committee for Congested Production Areas was created and charged with the task of coordinating Federal, State, and local activities in the crowded urban centers.

LEGISLATION OF EIGHTIETH CONGRESS AFFECTING CITIES

Housing and rent control: A matter which is necessarily of great importance to any community is the manner in which its citizens are housed. Of recent years there has been an attempt all over the country to improve the living conditions of our people, especially of low-income families living in slum districts of our cities. There have, of course, been programs designed to improve the lot of rural residents, but the demand for new housing has been concentrated largely in the cities. Low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects have been initiated or seriously considered in many municipalities. But, as you members of the National Municipal League are well aware, more than the mere recognition of a housing problem is required in a community if concrete attempts at solution are decided upon. The biggest hurdle is probably that of financing the project.

Today we are facing the fact that the United States, the richest nation on this earth, does not have decent homes to offer its veterans. It must have been a bitter pill for these men to swallow when they returned from the battlefields and found that while we had made all sorts of advances in means of carrying on war our housing production methods showed little advancement over the methods of the horse-and-buggy era. The housing facilities of our cities were strained to the utmost during the war by the influx of defense workers. Now the war is over, but the crisis in housing is still with us. Our millions of veterans have returned to civilian life and are now trying to establish themselves or to pick up where they left off when they were called into service. Many of these veterans are married and have children. No one questions that they are entitled to a decent place to live. But, nevertheless, the Bureau of the Census has reported that between 30 and 40 percent of the married veterans of this country are living in single rooms or have been forced to share living accommodations with in-laws or other relatives, a most unsatisfactory arrangement for all concerned. It was also found that many of these veterans were making salaries or wages which would not justify the expenditure of more than $6,000 for a house. You and I know that with prices as they are right now you can't get much of a house for $6,000. This does not alter the recognized fact that the veteran is entitled to the best that we can give him—at a price that he can afford to pay. The veteran does not want to be given special privileges by any government, either Federal or local, but he does want a fair deal. Unfortunately, it is not only veterans who are being forced to live in cramped, miserable quarters; there are thousands of nonveterans in the low-income group who should be provided with more adequate housing facilities.

Who is to take care of all this? Whose responsibility is it? The municipality is, of course, the unit most immediately concerned. But this is not a condition which prevails in only a few scattered cities—it is a state of affairs which can be found in nearly every city in the country. For this reason and because of its serious nature, it is a problem which must be of concern to the Federal Government—at least to the extent of giving assistance to the local governments in attempting to resolve it. Let us now take a look at what the Eightieth Congress has done or failed to do in the field of housing.

One of the most significant pieces of legislation proposed to the Eightieth Congress for its consideration was the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. This bill contained provision for public aid to localities for low-rent housing for low-income families; encouragement of private investment in rental housing by setting up a system of Federal insurance; establishment of a more adequate program of farm housing; aid to cities for the clearance of slum areas; additions to the existing aids to home financing; and a program of housing research aimed at reducing the cost of housing. The bill was supported and endorsed by many organizations. It was felt that this would be one great step forward in giving the veteran and the low-income families the sort of housing which they should have.

But what happened? The Senate Banking and Currency Committee reported the bill out on April 24, but the leadership in the Senate did not see fit to bring the measure to a vote before the end of the session. A companion measure in the House was not reported by the committee to which it was referred.

The net result of certain other activities of the Eightieth Congress has been to toss the problem of rent control back into the laps of the various State and local governments. Several bills were introduced dealing with the subject. Senator HAWKES, Republican of New Jersey, introduced a measure calling for periodic increases in rents; Senator BUCK, Republican, of Delaware, introduced S. 590, which provided for a 10-percent rent increase with all controls to be dropped at the end of a year; Senator WHERRY, Republican, of Nebraska, introduced a bill asking outright repeal of rent controls. The bill introduced by Representative WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, which was eventually passed and became law, extended rent control to March 1, 1948, except that "voluntary" increases of 15 percent were allowed if the tenants signed leases extending beyond 1948.

Thus, unless the Congress takes some action before the first of next March, the rent-control problem will be squarely up to the State and local governments. They will have to decide whether the landlords are entitled to increased rents, or whether the landlords are already receiving an adequate return on their investments.

There were a few bits of legislation—of rather minor importance in view of the pressing need for major action in this field—which did become law. On February 28, President Truman sent a message to the Congress asking for an appropriation of $50,000,000 so that the Federal Government might be able to fulfill its commitment to supply a certain number of Army barracks or civilian wartime structures for conversion into temporary-housing units to rent at an average price of $30 monthly. A sum of $35,000,000 was appropriated for this purpose. An amendment to the National Housing Act of 1937 was approved which allows local governments to receive Federal funds to the amount of $5,000 and the actual cost of construction. Perhaps the most important contribution of the Eightieth Congress was the approval of the President's reorganization plan which placed all Federal housing activities under one responsible head. Even this was opposed by the House.

In addition to the bills which were passed or passed over, as the case might be, four separate committees were set up to investigate various aspects of the housing situation.

Federal aid to education: During the first session of the Eightieth Congress, 21 bills proposing Federal aid to the States for education were introduced. One bill (S. 472), introduced by Senators TAFT, THOMAS of Utah, ELLENDER, HILL, SMITH, COOPER, TOBEY, and CHAVEZ, is on the Senate calendar after having been reported out of committee. It would authorize $150,000,000 for 1948, $200,000,000 for 1949, and $250,000,000 for 1950, and each year thereafter to aid the States, Territories, and the possessions of the United States in financing their public, elementary, and secondary school systems, and to more nearly equalize school opportunities throughout the States. In order to be eligible for Federal aid the State itself must spend 2.5 percent of its average annual income for a 5-year period, an amount equal to the annual national average. No Federal control over schools receiving aid under this act is permitted.

In the House the McCowen subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor reported favorably on one educational aid bill (H. R. 2953), but no report came from the full committee. This measure would provide somewhat larger sums than the Senate bill and would provide a minimum of $3 per child to all States, whereas the Senate bill would apportion the funds on the basis of need. In other respects the two measures are quite similar.

Disposal of surplus airports: The provisions for the disposal of surplus airports, airport facilities, and their equipment were contained in a bill which was introduced by Senators MCMAHON and BALDWIN, and which eventually became Public Law 289. By its terms disposition may be made to States, political subdivisions, municipalities, or tax-supported institutions without monetary consideration to the Federal Government. Certain conditions, such as restrictions on use of United States property and reservations during an emergency, are imposed.

Water pollution control: Passed by the Senate late in the session, this bill (S. 418) provides that the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and the Federal Works Administrator in cooperation with other Federal agencies, State water-pollution agencies, and interstate agencies, and municipalities involved, shall prepare comprehensive programs for water-pollution control projects. The bill carries an authorization of $100,000,000 annually for: (1) grants-in-aid to local governments and other public bodies for engineering reports, plans, and for construction of treatment works; and (2) loans to industrial enterprises for engineering reports, etc. Five million dollars would be available annually to State and interstate agencies for studies and investigations; and $12,000,000 annually for advances to States or municipalities to aid in financing the costs of activities preliminary to construction of water-pollution control projects. Four bills introduced in the House on this subject failed to come to a vote.

Technical information and services: A bill introduced by Senators FULBRIGHT and AIKEN, reported in the Senate on June 27, authorizes the establishment in the Department of Commerce of a clearinghouse for the collection, dissemination, and exchange of scientific, technical, and engineering information. Such information would be available to Federal, State, and local agencies as well as to business, industry, and the general public.

IMPLICATIONS OF DIRECT FEDERAL AID TO CITIES

The original method by which the Federal Government made contact with the cities was through the medium of the State. We have already seen an example of this method in the appropriation of Federal funds to the States for highway construction, with the provision that a certain portion be spent for construction of city streets. But increasingly in periods of emergency the Federal Government has made grants directly to the cities, thus bypassing the State governments and potentially modifying the traditional Federal-State-municipal relationship. As a rule, Federal grants have carried no unreasonable restrictions but there is the possibility that this new policy might be the beginning of greater and greater Federal control of municipal affairs by means of conditional grants from the Federal Treasury. That this is desirable is highly debatable and the development of the new pattern has aroused considerable comment among students of government about "the new federalism." Furthermore, the authority and power of the State governments are impaired by this procedure. There are also important political considerations in the situation, frequently found, in which the same major political party does not control Federal, State, and city government.

Due to the development of present-day science, especially in fields of transportation and communications, we will never again see the day when the cities and the Federal Government operate in watertight compartments. I think there must be joint interest and participation in many governmental functions. Nevertheless, the lack of initiative on the part of some local officials that has resulted from Federal participation is most disturbing. "Let's wait until we can get a Federal grant" or "The project is too big for us—let's get Uncle Sam to help," are expressions frequently voiced by some local officials. This tendency to pass the buck has had very damaging results. I am glad that statesmanship and self-restraint on the part of both Federal and local officials are checking this unhealthy trend.

Local self-government is a cherished part of our democratic process. It must be preserved. Wise and strong local governments go far toward assuring a sound national government. People of a democracy are made more capable of carrying on their cities if they participate actively at the local levels. They can if they will handle most problems better than some bureau of the central government, and they will be the stronger by having found their own solutions. Therefore, let us hope that when the job can be done at home or at Washington, that it will be done at home.

The people are going to have good service. Let us not mistake this fact. They demand this whether it comes from the city council or from the Congress. The challenge is, therefore, to give them the best service locally. This is part of the program of the National Municipal League, and I am delighted to see that you are on the road to success. I see on all hands a renewed interest and faith in local government. The extent to which people are interesting themselves in State and local affairs is most encouraging. They are doing this not by crying out against the invasion of States rights, but by getting down to the business of intelligent government themselves. This means improving the caliber of local officials, bringing charters and constitutions up to date, public discussion, and an active-citizen interest. Local governments can be restored to their place in the sun. If local officials and the citizens are willing to shoulder the heavy burden of local self-government, it will be done.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 1, 1948:

THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW

The Senate debate beginning today on the European-recovery program—the Marshall plan—is of vast importance to the future of America and the world. At stake in it is the security of free men and free nations everywhere. If they are to be safe, if they are to perpetuate their way of life, if they are to deal effectively with the creeping menace of Soviet totalitarianism, then the final vote in Congress must be a resoundingly affirmative one.

The proposition involved is an either-or proposition. Either the United States and like-minded lands will work together in doing the job that needs to be done, or they will be taking the risk of being picked off, one by one, by a tyranny quite as black and aggressive as any mankind has seen in modern times. Politically, economically, militarily, the situation thus offers only one choice to democracies in their right minds. It is to act in unison, on time and on the grand scale required, to insure their common survival against the common peril now confronting them.

As far as the United States is concerned, this means that there must be at this stage the promptest possible favorable action on the Marshall plan. Without such action, the participating European countries cannot hope to achieve the stability they must have to save themselves from eventual Soviet dominance—a stability vital not merely to them, but to our own long-term American future and to the happiness and peace of the entire world as well. Chairman VANDENBERG of the

Foreign Relations Committee, together with the unanimous voice of the committee itself, has left no room for doubt on that score. Nor has he exaggerated the urgency of the situation in solemnly warning that "time is of the essence" and in indirectly appealing for an end to the Senate debate and an affirmative vote by March 15.

Senator VANDENBERG'S profoundly well-informed counsel ought certainly to be heeded. The Marshall plan has been so thoroughly studied and discussed for months past that neither the Senate nor House can have justification for getting bogged down in a protracted debate. As the latest events in Czechoslovakia and Finland make clear, the Kremlin, like time, is waiting for no man, least of all for any Senator or Representative who may be addicted to the dangerous luxury of dilly-dallying. The hour is here for action. History is moving too fast and too portentously to permit America and the rest of the free world to conduct themselves on a too-little-too-late basis.

What To Do About Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, at the present time there is an unknown quantity of water flowing down the Colorado River into the Gulf of Mexico—water which means so much to the Southwest, principally California and Arizona. It is true, there is a dispute as to who has the prior rights to this water. While we are making our various charges, both States are suffering for lack of water and there are untold numbers of kilowatts of hydroelectrical power going to waste because the issue remains unsettled. Because we in California realize this, we earnestly ask the Congress to request the Attorney General to start suit immediately to determine these water rights. Many of us have introduced legislation to that effect.

The editorial which I am enclosing is one of several such editorials written by Mr. Lester E. Claypool, of the editorial staff of the Los Angeles Daily News. Mr. Claypool has recently spent several weeks in Arizona talking with the various leaders, getting their opinions, and this editorial is evidently the result of that expedition and is a good argument for the passage of this legislation which is now before the Judiciary Committee.

WHAT TO DO ABOUT WATER

Public officials and many leading residents of Arizona are considerably perturbed about what they have been led to believe California proposes to do with Colorado River water.

Such phrases as "California is at it again," "California wants to hog the water," "California refuses to negotiate," are heard on all sides in the State to the east.

Actually the people of Arizona have been misled in some instances and in others they lack an unbiased understanding of the situation. They have been encouraged in their position by certain Colorado newspapers, especially in Denver. It is so easy to take the position that a great, sinister city (meaning Los Angeles, of course) is about to rob, if it hasn't already robbed, a poor struggling community (meaning Arizona).

Arizona has some rightful claim to Colorado River water. There is no doubt that the central Arizona project may require some of it. There may be other projects there that are entitled to water on the basis of economic and population needs. These needs should not be met on the basis of who can yell the loudest or who can distribute the most convincing propaganda. Water is something more than votes or semantics.

Arizona lays great store by the fact that more of the Colorado River lies in that State than runs through California and claims ipso facto that Arizona contributes much and California little to the stream. If the stream's route and locale were the determining factors, most of the water could rightfully be claimed before the river gets to Arizona. Fortunately they are not.

The law on riparian rights is too complicated for an editorial, either here or in Denver, or, for that matter, in Phoenix. But this much is known to any intelligent layman who has ever studied water problems at all. The right to water, in every civilized nation that has legislated about it, stems from beneficial use and potential beneficial use.

Courts have held time and again that a stream coursing through a farm, but which has its source and mouth elsewhere, is only partially and incidentally the property of the owner of that farm. He is entitled to a just portion, provided he puts it to an admitted beneficial use, but no more.

Use by people to drink, to bathe, to wash, to cook and to operate business and industry is the most beneficial use to which water can conceivably be put. Next to that is the use of water for livestock. And of course use by people includes putting out fires, irrigating land, sprinkling lawns, when there is plenty, and a dozen other things that could be named.

To determine the extent of beneficial use it is necessary only to estimate the number of people, the kind of society they live in and what would happen if they ceased to get water. Los Angeles County alone probably has a larger population than that of the other six States in the Colorado River basin. Person for person the people here are no better and no more deserving than those elsewhere. But 5,000,000 people (in southern California) add up to a greater need than 3,500,000, which is more or less the population of all the other States concerned.

Gov. Earl Warren has repeatedly offered to negotiate, personally or via his agents, with officials of Arizona. He has even proposed arbitration after efforts at negotiation failed. Neither proposal has been accepted and if Arizona persists in maintaining its present attitude, litigation is all that is left and that we all deplore. But it must be settled.—L. E. C.

Kind Words for Congress Prove Popular

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, late in December of last year Wally Boren, who writes Wally's Wagon column in the This Week magazine, which appears as a supplement in so many of the Nation's Sunday newspapers, saw fit to turn one of his columns into a comment on Congress. In his usual humorous, easy-going manner he made the point that maybe all Congressmen were not thieves and nitwits; that maybe Congress was not solely to blame for all the many problems that face our country.

With Wally Boren's permission, early in January I inserted that column in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The results, Wally says, were quite startling, so much so that he decided to write another column as a kind of follow-up on the same subject. It appeared in This Week Sunday, February 29. It is equally good and for the benefit of those who may not have seen it Sunday I am, again with Wally's permission, including it here:

I guess I have joined the immortals an' gone an' got my name in the history books.

Do you remember that piece I wrote back in December—to the effect that maybe Congress wasn't entirely to blame for the country bein' busted, blasted, an' hardly worth savin'? An' how I thought somebody better say a kind word for the Senators an' Representatives?

Well, let me tell you what happened. I started in gettin' letters from lots of them—an' both Democratic an' Republican too.

Herman, the mailman, got worried.

"Wally, you must be a grain speculator," Herman said to me. "Nobody honest gets 30 to 40 letters a day from Congressmen."

So I showed Herman some of the mail. "They're just so grateful for a little appreciation it makes your heart ache," I told him. "Here—Congressman FRIEST, for instance, writes me: 'Here in the House of Representatives right now you could have all 435 votes for anything you wanted!'"

"Jee-pers!" Herman's eyes bulged, "A word of praise must hit a Congressman like a quart o' benzedrine!"

"Yep," I tell him. "An' look here, Senator KILGORE wants to treat me to a meal in the Senate Restaurant. An' Congressman CASE wants to send what I said out to a guy in his district in South Dakota. An' Congressman CHIPERFIELD writes me two pages. So does Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada.

"Congressman ENGEL of Michigan an' Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut, an' the Atom Commission, both want to put what I said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD——"

"Oh, oh—that does it!" Herman throws up his hands. "You know what's goin' to happen to you, don't you? About 25 or a hundred years from now, some history professor will get around to readin' what you done. An' he will go put it in the history books. After that, there will be one more date to bedevil kids with.

"Yessir, them kids off in the dim future will be recitin': '1492 Columbus discovered America; 1620 the Pilgrims landed; 1865 Lincoln was shot; 1947 some dope defended Congress.'"

"Hey," I say to Herman, "That'll make me unpopular with millions of kids!"

"You shoulda thought of that," says Herman. "My advice for a man who is speakin' to posterity is to keep his mouth shut."

WALLY BOREN.

Investigation of Dr. Edward U. Condon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting this partial report on the Condon case. The Members would be shocked beyond measure if they could read the full report in this case.

The partial report reads as follows:

REPORT TO THE FULL COMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

When the Committee on Un-American Activities was reorganized in January 1947, it adopted an eight-point program of investigation. The fourth point of that program stated: "Those groups and movements who are trying to dissipate our atomic bomb know-how for the benefit of a foreign power will have the undivided attention of our committee agents, as well as those who are seeking to weaken other aspects of our national security." While your subcommittee is fully aware that it is not our responsibility to detect and counter the espionage activities of foreign countries in the United States, nevertheless in our continuing investigation of the extent and character of communism here, we necessarily have to check on the activities of Soviet agents, because of the integration and tie-up between so-called domestic Communist activities and that of the official Soviet Government.

That the Soviet Union and her satellite nations have been desperately attempting to not only secure our complete atomic know-how, but also to weaken or destroy our hold of this important knowledge, is plainly evident to this subcommittee. As the full committee is aware, for over a year now agents of the committee have been assigned to special investigations in this field, and, while their investigation is not yet completed, the subcommittee feels that it should submit a preliminary report, particularly on one aspect of this matter which is of such importance that it demands immediate attention. It has to do with Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. From the evidence at hand, it appears that Dr. Condon is one of the weakest links in our atomic security. In substantiation of this statement, the subcommittee respectfully submits the following information:

PERSONAL HISTORY AND EDUCATION OF DR. EDWARD U. CONDON

Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, was born at Alamogordo, N. Mex., on March 2, 1902. On November 9, 1922, he married Emilie Honzek, an American-born woman of Czechoslovakian descent. Dr. Condon is a graduate of the University of California, having received an A. B. degree from that institution in 1924 and a Ph. D. in 1926. During the years 1926 and 1927, Condon studied at the Universities of Munich and Gottingen, in Germany. In 1928 Dr. Condon was a lecturer on physics at Columbia University, in New York City. In 1929 Condon was a professor of physics at Princeton University, and during the years 1930 to 1937 he was associate director of the physics department at the institution. From September 1937 through November 4, 1945, Dr. Condon was employed by the Westinghouse Laboratories at Pittsburgh, Pa. While with the Westinghouse Laboratories, where he was employed as director, Condon was a consultant on war research projects being performed at the radiation laboratories of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., and the University of California, at Berkeley, Calif. Condon is principally regarded as a theoretical physicist, which involves radar, nuclear physics, radioactive tracers, mass spectroscopy, and the elastic properties of metals. On November 5, 1945, Dr. Edward U. Condon was appointed Director of the National Bureau of Standards. Dr. Condon was recommended by Henry A. Wallace, who was then Secretary of Commerce. The Bureau of Standards is a bureau in the Department of Commerce.

In addition to the employment mentioned above, it should be noted that during the year 1940, Condon was a member of the National Defense Research Committee and that during the year 1941, he was a member of the Roosevelt Committee on Uranium Research. During the Seventy-ninth Congress, Dr. Condon was Scientific Adviser to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy. In July 1946, Dr. Condon was a member of the President's Evaluation Committee which was formed for the purpose of observing the effects of the atom bomb test made at Bikini Atoll. Condon has also served as an adviser to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

INFORMATION REGARDING THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The National Bureau of Standards is the principal agency of the Federal Government for research in physics, mathematics, chemicals, and engineering. It acts as custodian of the Nation's basic scientific standards and serves Government and industry in an advisory capacity on any scientific and technical matters in the physical sciences. The Bureau's direct appropriations for the fiscal year totaled approximately $6,800,000 which was supplemented by approximately $10,800,000 in funds transferred by the Army, Navy, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the office of the Secretary of Commerce, the Bureau of the Census, and other Federal agencies.

The bulk of the Bureau's work is conducted at its laboratories in Washington, D. C. However, it has several field testing stations located at various points within the United States and its territorial possessions. Included in the research work presently being conducted by the Bureau of Standards is the field of radio propagation, which relates to guided missiles. In conducting its radio-propagation activities, the Bureau of Standards maintains field stations in Sterling, Va.; Adak, Alaska; Punnene, Maui, T. H.; Palmyra Island; Guam Island; Trinidad, British West Indies; and Las Cruces, White Sands proving ground, N. Mex. Research projects engaged in by the Bureau of Standards at the present time concern atomic energy, radar proximity fuses, instrument-landing systems, and radiosonde. During the year 1947, the Bureau of Standards conducted research work on classified projects for the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

With reference to the work performed under the auspices of the Atomic Energy Commission, it should be noted that the background for this activity extends to the early years of the twentieth century, for in the atomic energy field, the National Bureau of Standards has had the responsibility for conducting basic research, associated with the scientific standards, the physical constances and properties of substances, and methods of measurement and instrumentation. The atomic-bomb project itself originated in the Bureau in 1939.

Other national defense work carried on by the Bureau of Standards during the year 1947, particularly for the Army and Navy, consisted of basic studies of the properties of electro-magnetic radiation in connection with communication and radar activities, the development of related instrumentation, and radio-propagation research. The Bureau also conducted special research regarding jet fuels, the design and construction of new types of optical-range finders, and methods of retarding gun erosion.

The Bureau of Standards is one of the most important national-defense research organizations in the United States. Because of this, it has become the target of espionage agents of numerous foreign powers.

The subcommittee has in its possession a list of employees of the National Bureau of Standards who have been cleared by the Atomic Energy Commission to perform work on atomic projects. Because of the fact that this list contains restricted data, it is not being included in this report. However, it is to be noted that when this list was issued at the end of November 1947, the name of Dr. Edward U. Condon was carried in a pending status. This list contains the names of all of those persons who are qualified to work on atomic energy projects from a loyalty standpoint. The fact that the name of the Director of the Bureau of Standards was carried in a pending status by the Atomic Energy Commission as late as November 1947, becomes a matter of serious concern to us when it is recalled that he had, as early as 1941, held several important positions in the United States Government which related to the development of atomic energy. For instance, in 1941, he was a member of the Roosevelt Committee on Uranium Research, and in July 1946 he was a member of the President's Evaluation Committee which, as stated previously in this report, was formed for the purpose of observing the effects of the atom bomb test made at Bikini Atoll.

It is of interest to note that in May 1947 Dr. Condon reorganized the Bureau of Standards and set up 14 separate divisions. Despite the fact that he had not been cleared to perform work on atomic energy projects for the Atomic Energy Commission, he appointed himself head of the Atomic Physics Division, one of the divisions involved in the reorganization.

That the Atomic Energy Commission had reason to doubt the loyalty of Dr. Condon is evidenced by a letter, the original of which the subcommittee has in its possession, which letter was dated July 11, 1946, and is addressed to a Member of Congress, who at that time was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress. This letter was written by a person who held a high post in the security division of the Manhattan project, and who is now a ranking official of the Atomic Energy Commission. The first paragraph of this letted is quoted in part as follows:

"Attached is a very hurried attempt which may be of some help. Unfortunately, the ——— group has loaded me down in preparation for Friday's meeting. May I suggest that you demand Dr. Condon's record of the FBI. It would be enlightening."

The associations of Dr. Condon and his wife have been cause for great concern to the agencies charged with the security of the United States. Dr. Condon, knowingly or unknowingly, entertained and associated with persons who are alleged Soviet espionage agents, and persons now reported to be under investigation by a Federal grand jury. So serious have Dr. Condon's associations been, that on May 15, 1947, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sent a confidential letter to W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce. The letter is quoted in part as follows:

"The files of the Bureau reflect that Dr. Edward U. Condon has been in contact as late as 1947 with an individual alleged, by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent, to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C., from 1941 to 1944.

"Mr. and Mrs. Condon associated with several individuals connected with the Polish Embassy in Washington, D. C. Among these are Mrs. Joseph Winiewize, wife of the Polish Ambassador; Virginia Woark, a clerk employee of the Polish Embassy; Helen M. Harris, secretary of the Polish Embassy; and Ignace Zlotowski, former counselor of the Polish Embassy and presently a Polish delegate to the United Nations.

"Helen Harris is identified as a former secretary to the American Soviet Science Society during the time it was known as Science Committee of the National American Soviet Friendship Society. She went to work for the Polish Embassy in the fall of 1946.

"Zlotowski is identified as a nuclear scientist who studied under Joliet Curie, known member of the Communist Party. He was

ex-secretary of the American Soviet Society. It is known that in February 1947, Zlotowski purchased 270 books on atomic energy which had been published by the Department of Commerce.

"It is also known that Mr. and Mrs. Condon were in contact with several other persons closely associated with this alleged Soviet espionage agent. It is also reliably reported that in March 1947, Zlotowski offered the use of the Polish diplomatic pouch to scientific groups as a means of transmitting scientific material outside the United States, dissemination of which had to be restricted because of security reasons by military authorities.

"Zlotowski was in contact with Anatole Gromov, First Secretary of the Soviet Embassy who has since returned to Russia. Mrs. Emily Condon applied for passports for European travel in 1926, and passport for travel to Russia in 1945. Passports were withdrawn. Condon issued passport 276319 on October 11, 1946, to travel and study in Germany, France, Holland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Great Britain, Denmark, and Switzerland. He applied for passport June 4, 1946, to Russia which was issued but was later canceled by the Army."

There are other instances in which Dr. Condon and his wife have been guests at the home of persons who are attached to the Embassies of Soviet satellite nations. Also present were the representatives of official Soviet agencies.

We have previously stated herein that the Bureau of Standards, because of its importance to the national defense, has become a focal point for espionage agents attached to foreign governments. For a great many years, the Bureau of Standards has been visited by representatives of many foreign governments.

In order to accommodate foreign visitors, shortly after his own appointment as Director of the Bureau of Standards, Dr. Condon appointed Demetry I. Vinogradoff, a Russian-born scientist, as the liaison representative of the Bureau. Vinogradoff, prior to his affiliation with the Bureau of Standards, was employed by the Westinghouse Laboratories at Pittsburgh, Pa. During the wartime years, he was in charge of liaison between the Westinghouse Electric Co. and the representatives of the Soviet Purchasing Commission.

During the period July 1936 through March 31, 1947, a total of 238 visitors and 64 delegates from foreign nations, including Russia and Poland, visited the National Bureau of Standards. During this period, a total of 39 Russians and 3 Polish nationals visited the Bureau. Among these visitors were the naval attaché and the assistant naval attaché of the Russian Embassy, and 3 representatives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Since March 1947, a total of 666 persons representing foreign governments have visited the Bureau. Very few Russian or Russian satellite-nation representatives are included in this number. The reason for the decline in the number of Russian visitors to the Bureau of Standards is unknown to the subcommittee. However, it should be noted that during the month of December 1946, Demetry I. Vinogradoff, liaison officer of the Bureau of Standards, made arrangements with F. T. Orekahov, the first secretary of the Russian Embassy in Washington, D. C., to discuss the problem of exchanging books, pamphlets, and other written material. The arrangements for the discussion were made by Vinogradoff at the request of Dr. Condon, and it was agreed that the discussion between Orekahov and Vinogradoff would be informal because, otherwise, it would be necessary to obtain a clearance from the State Department.

It is also known that Vinogradoff has been in close touch with Capt. A. F. Belikov, assistant naval attaché of the Russian Embassy.

Your subcommittee would like to point out to the full committee that the exchange of scientific material with the Soviet Union is a one-way street, and that our Government is pursuing a dangerous and foolish policy of making scientific data available to the Soviet Union, since they will not permit us to inspect any of their bureaus, nor will they exchange any information with us. Early last year, the chairman of the committee, Mr. THOMAS, disclosed that the Soviet Union, acting through its fronts, had secured hundreds of thousands of patents from our patent office and our present investigation along these lines reveals that even today they are continuing to order thousands of patents. We are convinced from the information we have that what the Soviet Union is actually doing is setting up her own patent bureau by obtaining all of curs, at the rate of 10 and 25 cents each We should like to point out that the Russian Government has refused to give the United States a single patent since 1928.

Your subcommittee, by a very diligent investigation, has determined that Dr. Condon has in the past 5 years been in personal contact and communication with a number of individuals who are American citizens, but who are members of the Communist Party. There is no evidence in our possession that Dr. Condon is a member of the Communist Party, however, but as a member of the Executive Committee of the American-Soviet Science Society, which is affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., and which was recently cited as a subversive organization by Attorney General Clark, he has lent his name and influence to one of the principal Communist endeavors in the United States.

The extent to which he has aided and abetted this Communist front is illustrated by the following letter, dated March 7, 1946, addressed to certain employees of the National Bureau of Standards by Samuel Gelfan, for the membership committee of the American-Soviet Science Society:

("American-Soviet Science Society, affiliated with National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., 114 East Thirty-second Street, New York 16, N. Y., Murray Hill 3-2082, March 7, 1946)

"———, ———,

"National Bureau of Standards, United States Department of Commerce, "Washington, D. C.

"DEAR ———:

"It has been suggested by Dr. Condon, who is a member of our executive committee, that you might be interested in the activities of our society and membership in same.

"We are, therefore, enclosing a brief statement concerning the objectives and activity of our organization, and under separate cover are also mailing you a copy of our latest bulletin.

"Sincerely yours,

"SAMUEL GELFAN,
"For the Membership Committee."

In response to this letter 10 scientists of the Bureau of Standards joined this subversive organization. The subcommittee is cognizant, however, of the implied pressure which Dr. Condon, as Director of the Bureau, applied to his subordinates, and therefore it should not necessarily reflect upon these 10 employees. It does, however, indicate the dangerous extremes to which Dr. Condon has gone in an effort to cooperate with Communist forces in the United States.

Speaking before the Fifth Annual Scientific Institute March 5, 1946, Dr. Condon stated, in speaking of Russia:

"We must welcome their scientists to our laboratories, as they have welcomed ours to theirs, and extend the base of scientific cooperation with this great people. Of course, we must behave this way toward the scientists of all nations. I only mention Russia because it is right now the target of attack by those irresponsibles who think she would be a suitable adversary in the next world war."

This subcommittee is in possession of no evidence or information which indicates that the Soviet Government has in the past, or will in the future permit the scientists of the United States in their laboratories or to make available to them any information of any scientific importance. Any Government official who is not aware that the Soviet Union is bent upon the Stalinization of the world, is not qualified to hold a strategic position which affects the security of the United States.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In considering the case of Dr. Condon, we wish to emphasize that what is involved is not a question of freedom of speech or research. The ruthless rush of Stalin through Europe, in the opinion of this subcommittee necessitates a revision of the policy and thinking of this Government and the people of the United States, regarding communism. We should bear in mind that the Government is charged not only with the administration of public affairs, but it is also charged with the security of the people and the institutions of the United States. Whether we like it or not, we are now engaged in a great epochal struggle; not a struggle with guns, because the Communists don't fight that way. They didn't take over Czechoslovakia with guns, they merely employed the strategy of getting a few men in the government and then a few more, and then they took over the entire government without firing a single shot or calling out a single regiment of soldiers.

They are conducting exactly the same kind of campaign in other countries. In this country they haven't gotten as far as they have in Czechoslovakia, but they got pretty far, because they got a man as Vice President of the United States, and he is now their candidate for President, and he is the same man who recommended Dr. Condon as Director of the Bureau of Standards.

It is the unanimous opinion of this subcommittee that Dr. Condon should either be removed or a statement should be forthcoming from the Secretary of Commerce setting forth the reasons why he has retained Dr. Condon, in view of the derogatory information which he has had before him.

We further recommend that the full committee address a communication to the President of the United States, calling to his attention the fact that the situation as regards Dr. Condon is not an isolated one, but that there are other Government officials in strategic positions who are playing Stalin's game to the detriment of the United States. It should also be pointed out to the President that the evidence before our subcommittee and the evidence which we are sure should be available to him, indicates very strongly that there is in operation at the present time in the United States an extensive Soviet espionage ring, and to permit this ring to continue, in view of the high atomic prizes which they are seeking, is folly, and can only lead to ultimate disaster.

We recommend that all of the evidence in the committee's possession be forwarded to the President for his consideration.

Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am asking permission to insert in the RECORD this advertisement which was placed in all of the metropolitan papers in Los Angeles, to show the serious fight we are facing in southern California. Water is the only obstacle in the path which will threaten in any way the future growth of southern California. This advertisement was inserted and paid for by the Los Angeles city-owned department of water and power. It gives the story in a very concise fashion. It also shows the need of passing certain legislation which is now before the Judiciary Committee of the House.

WATER?

The serious drought prevailing throughout all of California and the Southwest, resulting in rationing of water in some communities and agricultural areas, has aroused concern in the minds of many people as to the local supply.

There is no prospect of curtailment of water use in the city of Los Angeles in 1948.

LOS ANGELES HAS WATER TODAY

Because of the foresight and courage of the people of Los Angeles throughout the past 45 years, the city has an adequate water supply for the needs of today.

Originally, the Los Angeles River basin was the sole source of water—a source sufficient for a population of not more than 300,000 persons.

Envisioning the future growth of the community, the citizens of Los Angeles, in 1905, began to plan importation of additional water supplies. In 1913 the aqueduct bringing in the waters of the Owens River was completed. In 1940, the Mono extension to this system was finished, assuring supplies for almost 2,000,000 population from these sources.

Again, because of evidence of continuing and accelerated population growth and industrial expansion, the citizens of Los Angeles led the movement to bring in water from the Colorado—a movement leading to formation of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, serving more than 3,000,000 persons in areas from San Diego to Santa Monica on the coast, and extending inland to the Sierra Madres.

BUT WHAT ABOUT TOMORROW

Adequate water supplies for the future, in the city of Los Angeles, and throughout southern California, depend upon the vision, and the courage, and the acts of the citizens of today.

The 1947 rainfall in the Los Angeles area was the lowest on record. Below-normal precipitation in the Owens Valley-Mono Basin area caused the storage reservoirs of the department of water and power to be filled to only 56 percent of total capacity. After 35 years of operation, the population has just about caught up with the local and aqueduct supplies. In case of prolonged drouth, and for the future, the Colorado River is the city's only available source of additional water.

Upon the basis of allocation of water provided in the Colorado River compact, and succeeding agreements, Los Angeles and her sister communities have invested or committed $550,000,000 in water and power developments depending on Colorado River water. The city's rights and the rights of all southern California are now in jeopardy, because the State of Arizona is seeking authority to divert water from the river—water for which our developments have been designed and built.

Arizona is demanding a greater share of water, which would be taken from California's share of lower-basin supply. All efforts to settle interstate disputes over the river waters by arbitration and negotiation have failed. Since the basic difference between the States is in interpretation of the agreements apportioning water in the Lower Basin States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, the city of Los Angeles has joined other California agencies with water rights in the Colorado, in asking Congress to make it possible to secure an interpretation by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Protection of our existing water rights is essential to the future domestic, industrial, and agricultural development of Los Angeles and southern California. That future rests in the Colorado—our last waterhole.

CHEAPER THAN DIRT

Despite its being brought into the city from high-mountain areas hundreds of miles distant, water supplied to the people of Los Angeles through their municipal water system is literally "cheaper than dirt." It costs, delivered to the city's homes and industries, less than 5 cents a ton—slightly more than 240 gallons. And you use it by the cupful—or tubful—in any quantity desired—at any hour of the day or night. Los Angeles municipal water rates are among the lowest in the Nation among cities dependent upon imported supplies.

LOS ANGELES CITY-OWNED
DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER.

Universal Military Training Should Be Enacted Immediately

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the column of Alfred Mynders, Next to the News, in the Chattanooga Times of February 28, 1948, which includes a letter on the urgency of Congress adopting universal military training, written by Col. Louis D. Hutson, United States Army, retired. The column is as follows:

NEXT TO THE NEWS
(By Alfred Mynders)

Col. Louis D. Hutson, United States Army, retired, was with MacArthur in the Philippines when war broke over the western world, was wounded on Bataan, and was for 3 years a prisoner of the Japanese. Now a resident of Chattanooga, Colonel Hutson has been impressed during the last 2 years with the record of Mr. ESTES KEFAUVER in Congress and especially with Mr. KEFAUVER's advocacy of universal military training. One who has known the bitterest of war experiences gets a respectful hearing when he warns his country of what may come again.

Colonel Hutson's article makes vivid and interesting reading, and is as follows:

CHATTANOOGA.

To the EDITOR OF THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES:

During the recent war years while I was absent overseas in the Army, and since my return to the States in 1945, Chattanooga has been the official residence for myself and family. As a war veteran of two wars and a Chattanoogan by adoption, I feel qualified to express my opinion concerning the candidacy of ESTES KEFAUVER for Senator from Tennessee.

During the period I have resided in this State I have followed with interest the activities of Congressman KEFAUVER. I believe him to be a sound man in matters of business interest, veterans' affairs, and national policy. His attitude towards labor appears to be fair and impartial. As a representative of his district, it is his duty to protect the interest of all the citizens and not just one class. I believe he has done this to the best of his ability and conscience.

Recently, certain opposing interests have attempted to aline Congressman KEFAUVER with the communistic elements in the United States. This smear campaign has not detracted from the greatness of Congressman KEFAUVER'S stature, nor damaged his fine reputation. To the contrary, I believe it has benefited him to the extent of arousing the people's resentment and sympathy.

Congressman KEFAUVER has declared himself in favor of universal military training and has pressed for passage of this in Congress. I feel that he is justified in his actions on this matter.

This is a most controversial issue and is being violently opposed by certain groups and elements in the United States. Some of this opposition comes from people who are definitely aligned with the subversive communistic elements or are out-and-out Communists. Nothing would please those people more than to defeat the proposed training bill.

The fact that Congressman KEFAUVER is working hard for the passage of this bill speaks for itself. Lack of preparedness in our country will do more to foster, to bring on that ghastly debacle, that cataclysm of war, than any other single factor in the causes of war. With the histories of the last two wars before us, each brought about by lack of preparedness, and short-sightedness of our people, we still hesitate to take steps to prevent another—another war more horrible and vastly more devastating.

Our lack of preparedness is but an open invitation to an aggressor nation to attack—an invitation that will strike with lightning speed when he is assured that our defenses have dwindled, and victory is his for the taking. Our only check on his ambition is strength, strength in military preparedness. The cost is heavy, but will amount to only a small trickle of dollars, as compared to the tidal expenditures, to the sea of dollars that will flow in the event of war.

"I do not believe that universal training will prevent another war. I do not believe that the exponents of this training think so, either. It is but one of the many steps necessary in being prepared.

There are other steps more important.

Those of us who face realities are convinced that World War III will be won or lost in the air. The nation that has superiority in the air, in both offense and defense, will win that war. We must not only have weapons in defense to check the sudden undeclared attack of an aggressor, but we must have superior offensive air weapons to inflict reprisals and defeat upon the attacker. Our research, development and production of these instruments and weapons must be more advanced than any other nation—if we are going to survive.

The state of the world today is such that the realities and facts should not be ignored by our people and their representatives in Congress.

The four main veterans' organizations have endorsed universal military training. Military training is a builder of character, a builder of healthy bodies. Aside from the necessity of this training as a preparedness measure, the youths of our country will be much better citizens for a brief period of training of both their bodies and minds. Military training inspires obedience to law and order, something our youth can stand a lot of.

I have stated that the next war will be won or lost in the air. What need, then, for universal military training? The answer is quite simple.

While it is possible for modern air attacks to demolish, destroy, and demoralize the

enemy, yet it holds no power to take and occupy enemy territory. Large bodies of organized, trained troops are going to be needed for this purpose. There will be no time to train these forces after the shooting starts. It will be at least a year before they could be organized and trained. Action in the next war will be fast. Troops must move immediately into the areas demolished by the air force, to seize, to consolidate, to mop up, if necessary, and to hold and occupy the ground.

Millions of trained men will be needed for this purpose.

In addition to Congressman KEFAUVER'S backing of universal military training, he has shown that he is a firm friend of the veteran. He has consistently voted in favor of bills beneficial to the veterans. It is to be noted and highly commended, that he is one of the authors of a bill recently passed in Congress authorizing increases to veterans and their dependents who are taking educational training under the GI bill. * * *

Congressman KEFAUVER is a very likeable and personable man and when elected to the Senate will uphold the dignity and integrity of his great State. The voters of Tennessee will be well represented in the Senate when they elect ESTES KEFAUVER.

LOUIS D. HUTSON,
Colonel, United States Army. (retired).

Soil Conservation Cannot Be Postponed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a speech by myself delivered at the National Convention of Soil Conservation District Commissioners, at Des Moines, Iowa, February 27:

SOIL CONSERVATION CANNOT BE POSTPONED

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, I am pleased to talk to so many "doctors of the soil." Welcome to Iowa.

Modern soil conservation is probably the most significant agricultural development of the times. It is proving itself the only practical way by which any real permanency can be assured for our cultivated land.

From time immemorial, regardless of race or creed, humans have known that their existence and welfare are derived from the natural resources with which they have been surrounded. And yet only recently have we Americans seen fit to use these treasures which the Maker has so generously bestowed on us. And, gentlemen—you, the directors, commissioners, and supervisors of soil conservation districts are the first to fully accept the responsibility of conserving the soil and water resources of a nation, and to cure our sick soil. That is why I address you as "doctors of the soil."

Compare, for example, Greece as a world power before the coming of Christ with that of her present plight. Greece has squandered her resources and now lies weak and exhausted. Man has left a terrible pattern of ruin across the pages of history in Asia Minor, Africa, Europe, China, and India.

United States is the youngest of the major nations in the world today. In less than 200 years of its existence it has become the most progressive, prosperous, and powerful country on the globe. Its rise to the pinnacle of supremacy can be attibuted to two major factors: 1. The abundance and diversity of its resources; and 2, its principles of constitutional government. How long can America continue to maintain its enviable position of world superiority? The answer hinges on how effectively the United States utilizes its natural resources from now on, together with how tenaciously it clings to the principles of government which has served it so well. I believe we can have a free and democratic government as long as we maintain resources to properly feed, clothe, and house our people, and give them a reasonable opportunity to succeed on their own initiative. Soil and water conservation is indeed America's most basic problem. The major responsibility for conserving the soil and water resources of our Nation rests on your shoulders.

THE LAND SITUATION TODAY

There once was a time when there was so much productive land that people saw no need for concern over the possibility of its decline. But that time is past. General lack of information about the erosion problem, until recent years, was reflected in an almost total absence of concern anywhere for the condition or welfare of our productive land—the most indispensable resource we have. But we do have, at long last, a highly effective soil-conservation program under way in the United States. What is needed is increased speed—more technicians in the Soil Conservation Service to help farmers in soil conservation districts.

Looking at the world situation, wherever there is productive land, hunger is an unnecessary, costly outgrowth of inadequate farm methods, ignorance, and lack of decision on the part of nations to take up vigorously the job of erosion control and soil betterment—that is to say, soil conservation to save their source of food and raiment. Soil conservation in the modern sense is not just controlling erosion; it's that and whatever else needs to be done to keep the land permanently productive while in use. It is not just terracing, contouring, strip cropping, and crop rotations; it is that and draining land where it's too wet, applying water where it's too dry, and so on.

That is why I want to point out with all the emphasis at my command the extraordinary need now for improving and maintaining the productivity of our limited and shrinking area of productive land. If soil conservation does not soon become a major factor in our national and international deliberations, decisions, and actions, the alternative can scarcely be less than widespread world food shortages in the not too distant future. No one really believes, I am sure, that the United States can feed the world from its limited supply of cropland. We can help, but we can't do the whole job indefinitely. If we let much more of our good productive land run down the rivers to the sea, the time could come when there would no longer be quantities of food to export.

UNITED STATES NEARS DANGER LINE

The United States is somewhat better off, of course, than most nations from the standpoint of area of productive land, chiefly because of its rich heritage of good soil. But there is no cause for complacency; for we, too, have come all too close to the danger line as the result of careless land use. We now have left in the United States only about 460,000,000 acres of high-grade cropland, as well as can be determined from erosion surveys. That is slightly more, on the basis of present population, than the 3 acres per person it is estimated are required to meet the food and other requirements per person, including soil-sustaining crops, plus some land to take care of industrial, clothing, and other needs. Unfortunately, all but about 100,000,000 acres of this 460,000,000 acres is subject to erosion, poor drainage, and other forms of soil impoverishment.

About a fourth of our good cropland (some 115,000,000 acres (is being damaged at a critically rapid rate by erosion. It ought to be protected—and must be—during the next 10 to 15 years, or not later than by 1960. Still another large area of cropland, estimated at some 115 to 120 million acres in extent, should, for the same reason, receive adequate protection not later than 1970. And we cannot afford to neglect the additional millions of acres on which erosion is beginning or is likely to begin at any time. We should never again allow ourselves to overlook the recent findings of our over-delayed erosion research which, among numerous discoveries, has shown that accelerated erosion sometimes proceeds a thousand times faster than natural erosion under the protection of trees and grass.

PRODUCTIVE SOIL AND HEALTH

We have made great strides in medical science, health, sanitation, lowering mortality rates, and prolonging life. In the final analysis, however, it is the good soil of our fields and pastures on which we must rely for survival and good health. Land stripped of its productive topsoil down to raw, unprocessed subsoil, not only produces less but what is produced is generally of lower nutritional value, and may be lacking in some of the essential food elements. Although the subsoil may contain as much of the major elements of plant nutrition (except nitrogen and organic matter) as the topsoil, as revealed by chemical analysis, they are frequently unavailable to the plant. If the major elements of nutrition are unavailable, probably the minor nutritional elements, as copper, cobalt, etc., also are unavailable in the raw material.

So soil conservation of the kind that fights to hold the topsoil, as well as to improve lands depleted of plant nutrients, is a national must. Delay in getting ahead with this job—even 1 year's delay—is probably the most unwise act that a nation can be guilty of, for this crime leads surely and rapidly to the gravest kind of national danger. I have a word which, to my way of thinking, fits the crime against our precious soil. That word is "solicide." We of this generation can and must stop it.

SOIL-CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Modern soil and water conservation, practically applied with the full cooperation of farmers and ranchers, is beginning to catch up with the land-depletion problem. This is being done through farmer-organized and farmer-directed soil-conservation districts, with the Soil Conservation Service furnishing technical assistance. The program is supported by other aids, such as educational help from State extension services, by research carried on by the Service in cooperation with State agricultural experiment stations, wildlife conservation organizations, and by credit and conservation materials supplied by numerous public and private agencies.

It has been shown that there is no shortcut method for getting the job done, no quick and easy way to do it. The damage that has been done to our land over more than 150 years cannot be cured overnight. In order to assure the continued productivity of our agricultural land, every acre must be adequately treated—which means treatment according to the need of the land and its use according to capability for producing the various crops, whether it is corn, wheat, grass, or timber. This has been proved to be the first basic principle of sound soil conservation.

Highly effective conservation of soil and water is being done through sound land planning and treatment by the farmer and the soil conservationist working cooperatively out on the land, field by field, in every pasture and woodlot, in every gully, and over every piece of idle land. Moreover, this means a diversified type of production that

fits the needs of the land, and gives people more of the nutritious food they need. This program is flexible enough to be responsible to changing market or other demands, such as the present food-producing emergency, and it gives us the basis for the permanent maintenance of the soil to support a permanent agriculture and a permanent nation, and this is exactly what the present national program of soil conservation is doing, and can continue to do with increasing speed.

Farmers and ranchers of the 48 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have formed about 2,000 soil-conservation districts already. Additional districts continue to be voted in by the farmers. They now cover more than a billion acres and 4,500,000 farms and ranches, or three-fourths of all the farms and ranches in the country. Alaska and Hawaii also now have district laws.

These districts, as you know, are managed by local farmers, locally selected. There are now between 9,000 and 10,000 district governing officials who thus are giving unselfishly of their time and energies in the furtherance of soil conservation throughout the country. They are on nobody's pay roll and are obligated to no group, no individual, and to no State, Federal, or other outside authority. They draw on the support and facilities of everybody who can contribute something to district progress, including business establishments and civic organizations, schools, banks, churches, railroads, newspapers, and so on. These districts, in my judgment, come nearest to representing farmer control of their own agricultural affairs of any plan ever developed anywhere down across the whole history of mankind here on earth. Nothing has ever even approached this district movement for getting a common need like soil conservation attended to promptly—effectively.

Also, it is the best possible way of getting permanency into our conservation efforts. So, when any of the authority which the 48 States have legally granted the districts is taken away from them and given to some other agency or group, I don't care what agency or group it may be, you thereby undermine and emasculate the districts and disloyally, whether consciously or unconsciously, sabotage and hurt the people of the United States of America.

I have been interested in soil conservation a long time—since I watched the gullies form in our Iowa corn fields after every rain. I've talked with a great many district supervisors—read their letters—I have had personal contact with many employees of the Soil Conservation Service. I've never heard a hint on any of their part to bring soil conservation into politics. What they are doing is this—they are fighting to retain the best means yet found to get permanent soil and water conservation applied to the lands of our country promptly and efficiently. For that I compliment you—don't give up ever—it is a fight to save America. Politics is not involved—everyone is for soil conservation. No one should play politics with our precious soil. That would be "solicide" in the nth degree.

As you know, I introduced H. R. 4417—the national land policy bill—so that through soil conservation districts soil and water conservation could be applied to the lands of our country faster. My bill recognizes that more technical on-the-farm help is needed in addition to more education and research in soil conservation. It provides for more funds for the Extension Service to get the needed educational job done. It provides for a conservation timetable to guide districts, the agencies cooperating with them, and the Congress in making appropriations to get the soil conservation job done on time.

In addition to providing for necessary surveys, research, education, and technical on-the-farm assistance, grants-in-aid are to be made on the basis of the need to get the job done. By grants-in-aid I mean machinery, seeds, trees, and other conservation materials, but no payments in cash to farmers. There are a great many farmers who don't need grants-in-aid. They have, either on their own farms or can readily obtain, all the conservation materials they need. But, in every State, many more in some than others, there are farmers who don't have and can't get what they need to finish the job of conserving their land. We have millions of acres of poor land on which farmers are trying to make a living. I can't describe it better than to call it sick land. When one is sick he needs help—just as does this poor badly eroded land.

Furthermore, the excess run-off water and silt from these badly eroding lands contributes to damage on neighboring downstream lands. It is the responsibility of the Government to assist these farmers in preventing run-off and stopping erosion. When the damage has been repaired by the farmer with needed Governmental assistance no further grants need be made.

H. R. 4417 makes grants-in-aid for soil conservation a responsibility of the Soil Conservation Service. I have been asked frequently, "What about the Agricultural Conservation Program or the Production and Marketing Administration, popularly known as the AAA?" They aren't mentioned in the bill and there was never any attempt to harm them in the least. We need to retain county and community committemen to handle crop loans and numerous other services necessary to maintain a prosperous agriculture which is basic to national prosperity just as productive soil is basic to farm prosperity. Hence, high-productive soil is basic to permanent national prosperity. So, as Don Berry, of Indianola, Iowa, says, "This is a program that counts everybody in."

SOIL CONSERVATION WORK IS MOVING FASTER

According to the annual report of the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947:

The conservation of our remaining productive land is still our most urgent farm problem. Proper land management and treatment of land is the base on which other phases of our agricultural program must rest. Improved breeds and varieties; hybrid seed; insect and disease control; better machinery and more efficient cultural methods; scientific feeding, grazing, and management of livestock; and improved marketing practices are of the utmost value, of course, but they are of only temporary value to the farmer who is losing his soil and wasting his water. The price of agricultural commodities means little to the farmer who does not and cannot produce efficiently because of excessive erosion and run-off of the rainfall. The land—productive land—is basic.

We now have much of the information needed to put American agriculture on a permanent, self-sustaining basis. And we have made enough progress toward getting the right kind of conservation farming measures in use on farm and range land to point the way. The major part of our soil-conservation job, however, is still ahead of us—and it is an urgent job, demanding immediate attention. Postponement means a more difficult and expensive job, and for some land it means oblivion insofar as further cultivation is concerned.

"Progress in getting soil conservation on the land was greater during the fiscal year 1947 than in any previous year," the report says.

Continuing, the Service report says:

"During the year 1947 we put more than twice as much conservation work on the land as during 1945 and increased the 1946 record by more than 25 percent. In 1947 some 127,000 farm plans were made that covered about 36,000,000 acres, and conservation treatment was completed on more than 20,000,000 acres. In addition, soil-conservation practices were spread to thousands of neighboring farms and ranches. * * * The supervisors of most districts are taking a more active interest in administration of the districts and in other ways of helping to speed up the work. Farmers in districts are working together far better than ever before."

A NEW AGRICULTURAL TECHNIQUE

Soil conservation, as practiced by trained and experienced soil conservationists today, is a technique in land use and protection that was never previously employed in any general way anywhere. It is not only the cheapest and most effective way of protecting farm land from impoverishing erosion; it is the only practical way to keep cultivated and grazing land permanently productive. Such other methods as the old single-practice method of terracing have failed to the extent of permitting millions of acres to be ruined for any further cultivation.

We have learned this modern way of conserving our soil and water resources since 1934. It is just 12 years since the first soil-conservation district was organized. Complete conservation plans have been made covering more than 200,000,000 acres of farm and ranch land in districts throughout the United States to date. The land treated under these plans now totals more than 100,000,000 acres. The cost to the Federal Government for assistance in getting this much done has been about $185,000,000. That is proof that the job is being done cheaply and efficiently.

Being on the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives has made it necessary for me to closely scrutinize Federal appropriations. The time may come, and soon, that our national income will shrink to the point where it will not yield the revenue from taxes to support such a tremendously large Federal budget as we now have. When that happens we will be looking for reductions that can be made and those programs that get the most good for the money spent will be least affected. The figures show that the national income is always approximately seven times the farm income. That is why we must of necessity maintain a high farm income. Farm income comes from production and production springs from the land.

There is no Federal, State, or local agency that duplicates the work of the Soil Conservation Service. This is the only agency that works with individual farmers, out in their fields, pastures, woodlots, gullies, and idle lands to develop and carry out soil and water conservation farm plans. It is the only agency that makes scientific soil conservation surveys and land capability maps for use to guide, scientifically, the development of detailed farm plans for soil and water conservation and for application of the needed practices to the proper kinds of land appropriately used for adaptable crops and cropping systems. In most communities the Service technicians are the only experienced and trained personnel available to help farmers properly apply soil-conservation practices.

The technical aid that this Service furnishes to farmers and ranchers in soil-conservation districts—accurate conservation surveys to determine land capability, detailed conservation farm plans, and technical assistance in applying conservation practices on the land according to its needs—is the vital key to an adequate and permanent soil- and water-conservation program. And there is no other group of technicians trained to do these jobs.

We must stop erosion on this land. We must stop the mining of the soil. We must stop bad land use and bad water management now.

We must prevent dust bowls and gullying and give to every acre of farm land in the United States the treatment it needs to protect it and make it productive and keep it

productive, and we must use it for the crop it is best fitted to produce.

These are more of the reasons that I introduced H. R. 4417, known as the national land-policy bill, on July 26 last year. H. R. 4417, you will recall, was designed to provide for a national land policy based on the conservation of our soil and water resources, the orderly development and protection of the Nation's agricultural lands, and for other purposes. Here are some of the important things that H. R. 4417 would do if enacted into law:

First, it would establish a new national land policy, recognizing the conservation of soil and water resources and the orderly development and protection of the Nation's agricultural lands as a basic consideration of American agriculture. Just as a prosperous agriculture is the basic essential to national welfare and prosperity, so productive land is essential to a prosperous agriculture. However, not since pioneer days has the United States Government had a definitely stated and publicly accepted land policy.

In the second place, H. R. 4417 would safeguard the interests of the Nation and of the people of the United States in the conservation of America's land and water resources upon which the Nation and the people depend for their wealth and—in the end—for their very existence.

Third, H. R. 4417 would get the basic conservation job done in time to prevent further large-scale irreparable damage and loss to America's agricultural land, and this is a vital consideration

Fourth, H. R. 4417 recognizes the urgency and the size of the conservation job. Land damage in the United States still is proceeding at a faster rate than conservation. In other words, our progress is still too slow, although we have a program that is unmistakably proving its worth, and is making progressively faster progress.

The fifth point is this: This bill recognizes the interrelationship of soil conservation, drainage, irrigation, land use, soil fertility maintenance and improvement, control of sedimentation, conservation, and proper management of water, and flood prevention on agricultural lands. We must keep in mind that any work to maintain and improve soil fertility is ineffective without corresponding work of soil and water conservation.

No one has yet been able to induce the flow of water in rivers to stop at State lines. Yet it has been proposed that we adopt a program, administered by States, to retard silt and prevent excess run-off. How can 48 States effectively administer a program of flood prevention on the lands of this country in cooperation with the Army's flood control work on the streams. I believe it essential that flood control and flood prevention programs be planned and carried out on a watershed or river valley basis. We are beginning to make progress in the Missouri Valley under the Pick-Sloan plan. Soil conservation districts are involved and they have already shown in the Little Sioux River watershed in northwestern Iowa that they can cooperate in getting permanent flood prevention in the valley.

For the sixth point, H. R. 4417 would recognize the technical nature of the job ahead. There is no more uniformity in land and water problems than there is in the landscape. Conditions, as we all know, vary with almost every field we cross.

My seventh point is the provision of this technical assistance to farmers and ranchers in handling their soil and water conservation work.

My eighth point is that increased educational work in conservation is necessary and would be provided for under this bill. This would be provided largely through the Federal and State Extension Services.

My ninth point is that this bill would provide grants-in-aid, but no cash payments, wherever such grants-in-aid are necessary to supplement the contributions of the farmers themselves in dealing effectively with their physical land and water problems.

When I say "no cash payment," I mean the Soil Conservation Service will not give benefit in cash payment which has nothing whatever to do with the triple A compliance payments. In short, my bill H. R. 4417 provides a plan to speed up the conservation of our soil and water resources and for flood prevention in the most economical way that can be devised in the opinion of a great majority of our people.

Tenth, by making this work available through soil conservation districts and other authorized districts, H. R. 4417 would stimulate self-government, strengthen the soil conservation districts of the United States, and give more local farmer control of soil-conservation work.

My eleventh point is that this bill would assure a conservation program of technical excellence based on fact-finding surveys and research carried on in cooperation with the State Agricultural Experiment Stations, thus bringing to the solution of soil and water conservation problems the methods and materials found to be best adapted to the areas in which the work is to be done.

The twelfth point is that H. R. 4417 would provide for rapid completion of a conservation survey of the Nation's farm and ranch lands. This type of analysis provides the factual basis on which present-day soil and water conservation operations are carried out.

My next point is—and this is extremely important—that this bill provides for the development and protection of new agricultural land. You will recall that of the more than 420,000,000 acres now in crop production, many millions of acres should be retired to grassland or woodland use.

Finally H. R. 4417 recognizes the desirability of having all technical action programs and grants in aid programs involving conservation, drainage, water development, and flood prevention on farm and ranch lands technically directed by one agency. This would include the technical aspects of irrigation work on the land as well as the development of new agricultural lands. This bill would assign that responsibility to the Soil Conservation Service. In assigning these basic responsibilities to the Soil Conservation Service the bill recognizes the agency of Government that has pioneered in the development of effective soil-conservation measures, as well as in the procedures for getting them applied with full farmer understanding and without any semblance of regulation.

Soil conservation cannot be postponed. It is everyone's wish that there be no more wars. We had plenty of good, nutritious food produced from highly fertile land in winning World Wars I and II. Let us always be ready and have a storehouse of productive land or in event of another war we will not be so fortunate.

Yours is a great responsibility. Yes; even more, you have a grave responsibility, my friends of the Soil Conservation Service, for America is looking to you to keep our soil healthy and productive so that we and our children may be happy, healthy, and prosperous, and that our Nation under God may be preserved.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of Tuesday, March 2, 1948, entitled "Five Tests—What Now?":

FIVE TESTS—WHAT NOW?

For 14 years the Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been the economic keystone of this country's foreign policy. The act will expire a few weeks hence. Yesterday President Truman urged its extension for an additional 3 years. He could do so on the sound ground that foreign trade is necessarily a two-way process and that it is more essential today than ever before to strengthen the economic ties between those nations—the democratic nations—which are the chief beneficiaries of this legislation.

Including its original enactment, the Hull trade program has come before Congress on five occasions: In 1934, and again, for a renewal of its powers, in 1937, 1940, 1943, and 1945. The Senate votes on these five tests have shown:

1934: Democrats for, 51; against, 5; Republicans for, 5; against, 28.

1937: Democrats for, 56; against 9; Republicans for, 0; against, 14.

1940: Democrats for, 41; against 15; Republicans for, 0; against, 20.

1943: Democrats for, 41; against, 8; Republicans for, 18; against, 14.

1945: Democrats for, 38; against, 5; Republicans for, 15; against, 16.

Meantime, in the same years, the votes in the House of Repreesntatives have shown:

1934: Democrats for, 269; against, 11; Republicans for, 2; against, 99.

1937: Democrats for, 278; against, 11; Republicans for, 3; against, 81.

1940: Democrats for, 212; against, 20; Republicans for, 5; against, 146.

1943: Democrats for, 193; against, 3; Republicans for, 163; against, 26.

1945: Democrats for, 205; against, 12; Republicans for, 33; against, 140.

What do these figures show? They show that with the single exception of the war year 1943—when there was a general disposition in Congress to follow the President's leadership in foreign affairs—the Republican Party in Congress has consistently opposed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; that on no occasion in any peacetime year has the Republican Party in either branch of Congress cast a majority of its votes in favor of this legislation; and that its majorities against have usually been almost unanimous.

The forthcoming test will provide an interesting and particularly timely answer to the question of how far the Republican Party has emerged from prewar isolationism—in its thinking on international economic issues—in this election year.

John L. Lewis and 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by George E. Reedy:

For weeks the country has been watching the "cold" war in Europe. It has been so engrossed that it has failed to note the war of nerves in our own back yard. But it is there and ready to burst out any day now.

The kingpin of our domestic war of nerves is stormy John L. Lewis, boss of the United Mine Workers. Lewis has never let a year go by without creating at least one crisis. Nineteen hundred and forty-eight promises to be no exception.

Most of the operators have resigned themselves to a major strike, complete with Shakespearean quotations. They are ready for the eyebrow waggling and table thumping that always goes with a Lewis campaign.

Their only difficulty is that they don't know where and when he will strike. He has already passed up one excellent opportunity. But that isn't any sign he intends to pass it up permanently. There are other days coming.

The issue of the coming strike is already known. It is Lewis' demand for a $100-a-month pension to miners over 60 years of age. He asks that it be paid out of the health and welfare fund, which is financed by a royalty on coal.

The operators have refused. They claim that such a demand would require an increase in the 10-cent-a-ton royalty. Therefore, they have begun a Nation-wide survey to form a counter offer that will be presented in the near future.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, Lewis must notify the Federal Mediation Service 30 days before he takes his men out on strike. Yesterday was his first chance to do so, as he does not have the right to terminate his present contracts until March 30.

Of course, everyone is looking for John to defy the law. He has branded it a "slave labor act" and charged that it is unconstitutional. At the very least, he will put it to a stiff test and try to get it knocked out in the courts.

Government officials are watching the situation very closely. In the first place, a soft coal strike would damage the Nation's economy considerably. In the second place, it would call into effect a major section of the Taft-Hartley law.

This is the provision designed to give the country some protection against paralyzing strikes in basic industries. It permits court injunctions to stall off strikes for 80 days. So far this section has not been given a real test.

Lewis, of course, will give it that real test. No other section of the act affects him so vitally. He has to find out where he stands and this is as good a time as any other. He will have an excellent chance to prove his power.

Government authorities have already made it clear that they will put up a fight. They want no part of a break-down in the country's coal supply in the midst of a diplomatic crisis. That would be a drastic blow to American foreign policy.

However, officials cannot forever prevent the miners from striking. The Taft-Hartley Act puts a limitation on the number of days the union can be enjoined. But they do hope they can put a strike off to late spring.

At that time the need for coal will be less desperate. Lewis then can use his power only against the operators. He cannot make the public suffer. Perhaps this time the strike can be confined to an economic struggle between the miners and their bosses.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herein an editorial from the Watertown Times, Watertown, N. Y., February 28, 1948. It, of course, is a great disappointment that this bill was recommitted but since that action was taken, I think the enclosed editorial reflects pretty well the feeling of those of us who have been so strong in advocating the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The editorial follows:

SEAWAY POSTPONEMENT

On motion of Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, the St. Lawrence seaway resolution has been recommitted to the Foreign Affairs Committee for further study. Strong advocates of the seaway, notably Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, and Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, opposed the motion strongly but without avail. The vote was 57 to 30.

This vote probably does not represent the relative strength of seaway advocates and opponents in the Senate. There is good reason to believe that some of those who voted for recommittal would have voted in favor of the seaway resolution had there been a show-down vote. But they thought it better strategy to keep the resolution alive rather than to invite almost certain defeat in a show-down vote at this time.

It is not correct to say, as some Washington correspondents write, that the seaway proposal has been "scuttled" as a result of this Senate vote. It has not yet been defeated As a matter of fact, it has not been voted upon. The effect of the recommittal vote is simply to postpone a decision to some later time.

This means, evidently, that no attempt will be made to revive the proposal during the present session of Congress. Proponents realize that chances of passages will be better after the Presidential election. But both Senators AIKEN and WILEY promise that the fight will go on. The seaway is not dead by any means.

When the seaway proposal was first advanced to the floor of the Senate, chances for passage appeared bright. But proponents underestimated the strength of the powerful railroad and utility lobbies. The most intense kind of a campaign was put on to switch the votes of those who might otherwise have been favorable and the campaign was successful.

The opposition of Senator IRVING M. IVES of this State was also most damaging. When a representative of the State destined to benefit the most from the seaway and the resulting power development did everything he could to defeat it, the effect was bound to be bad.

By the same token, Governor Dewey's silence was unfortunate. True, Dewey is on record for the seaway but his failure to speak out when it would do the most good together with the position taken by his protégé, IVES, gave the impression to some western Senators that Dewey was not too much concerned one way or another.

These were the handicaps the advocates of the seaway faced, the strong opposition of the Republican Senator from New York, the silence of Governor Dewey, the activity of the railroad and power lobbies, the heavy appropriations needed to implement the Marshall plan and the fact that the seaway got involved in Presidential year politics.

There will be disappointment among those who had hoped that at last the seaway might be authorized but it may be a different story next year. Not only will a President be elected this fall but also a new Congress. The new Congress may be much more favorable to public projects of this nature than the present one and the selfish lobbies may not exercise the influence then that they do now.

We must carry on the fight and we must go to the grass roots as Senator AIKEN suggests. The people are for the seaway. Even the people of Buffalo, a public opinion poll showed, are for it. We must find a way to bring public sentiment to bear on our legislative representatives, both in Congress and the State legislature.

We have found it necessary to stage a strategic retreat but the issue is still far from decided.

Mikolajczyk Tells of the Beginnings of the Polish Satellite State Amid a Scene of Soviet Bullets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks two additional articles of the former Prime Minister of Poland, Mikolajczyk, as printed in the Milwaukee Sentinel. They continue to tell the story of the tremendous pressure used by Russia to set up its satellite state in Poland under the leadership of the Soviet agent, Bierut, as the new President of the Polish satellite state.

Following are the two articles:

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment XX)

Back in London after a discouraging trip to Moscow in the fall of 1944, I reported my failures to the Polish Cabinet and the Polish underground.

There remained one ray of hope, President Roosevelt. After Winston Churchill told Commons "important progress was made toward a solution of the Polish question"—which was not the truth—and then blamed my government's difficulties on the fact that we would not accept the Big Three's callous division of Poland, I wired Roosevelt:

"Mr. President," I wrote, "you probably have heard of the recent transactions at Moscow from Ambassador Harriman, and you know of the great pressure put on us to recognize the Curzon line as the future frontier between Poland and Russia.

"I think you appreciate, too, how terrible would be the injury to the Polish nation if, after all the losses it has suffered in this war, it would be then forced to suffer the loss of one-half of its territory.

EFFORTS IN VAIN

"I tried to persuade Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill to permit us to retain at least the Lwow area, with its oil and potash, for it is a region that never belonged to Russia. But my efforts were in vain.

"Before I make my final decision, I would like to know your attitude. I remember your own feelings about our retention of the Lwow area, as expressed at our last meeting."

LETTER FROM F. D. R.

Ambassador Harriman brought me a letter from President Roosevelt, after the latter's election, incorporating anawers to both notes I sent to him.

"I have constantly in mind the problems you are facing in your endeavors to bring about an equitable and permanent solution of the Polish-Soviet difficulties and particularly the questions which you raised in your message of October 26," Roosevelt wrote.

"I am giving below in broad outline the general position of this Government in the

hope that it may be of some assistance to you in your difficult task.

"1. The United States Government stands unequivocally for a strong, free and independent Polish state with the untrammeled right of the Polish people to order their internal existence as they see fit.

"2. In regard to the future frontiers of Poland, if a mutual agreement on this subject including the proposed compensation for Poland from Germany is reached between the Polish, Soviet and British Governments, this Government would offer no objection. Insofar as the United States guaranty of any specific frontiers is concerned I am sure you will understand that this Government in accordance with its traditional policy, cannot give a guaranty for any specific frontiers.

"3. If the Polish Government and people desire in connection with the new frontiers of the Polish state to bring about the transfer to and from the territory of Poland of national minorities, the United States Government will raise no objection and as far as practicable will facilitate such transfer.

"4. The United States Government is prepared, subject to legislative authority, to assist insofar as practicable in the postwar economic reconstruction of the Polish state.

"Very sincerely yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

I submitted the British and American notes to the Polish Government in London and, by radio, to the desperate men who were fighting the Germans in Warsaw.

PROTESTS IGNORED

The NKVD was continuing to arrest and, in some cases, execute Polish underground fighters immediately after the Red Army and the Poles liberated the cities of Poland. My protests to Moscow were being ignored.

We knew, too, that Britain and the United States were in no mood to back our demands. The London government would soon become completely isolated. And taking all these things into consideration, I resigned as Prime Minister on November 24, 1944.

I was succeeded as Prime Minister of the Polish Government in exile by Tomas Arciszewski, veteran Socialist, who had spent most of the war in the Warsaw underground. Arciszewski took office November 29, 1944, in an atmosphere of deepening despair for Poles at home and abroad.

LUBLIN RECOGNIZED

On December 15 of that year, Prime Minister Churchill's changed outlook on Poland was endorsed by Commons. The Kremlin on January 5, 1945, recognized the Lublin Poles as the official government of Poland.

Stalin now received Churchill and Roosevelt at Yalta, for what turned out to be the final meeting of these three, who were among the most powerful individuals in history.

In the case of Poland, Churchill and Roosevelt either yielded again to Stalin or strengthened decisions they had secretly reached at Tehran.

The Polish government in London promptly rejected the Yalta decisions on Poland on the ground that the Polish government, which was recognized by every other country except Russia, had not been consulted in the matter of its postwar fate.

At the beginning of March 1945 leaders of the Polish underground, consisting of all recognized parties except the Communist Party, were asked by representatives of the Lublin government to go to Moscow for political conversations concerning the future of Poland. They were promised on the word of honor of a Russian general that they would have safe conduct in Russia and permission to go thereafter to London and then return home.

On March 27, Vice Premier Jan Jankowski, speaker of the underground parliament, Puzak, and Col. M. Okulicki, former commander of the home army, met Colonel General Invanov in the suburbs of Warsaw. They did not return from the meeting.

On the following day 13 more Polish leaders, including the chairmen of the parties represented in the underground, journeyed to the same meeting place. They, too, did not return.

From London we announced to the world on April 6 that Soviet promises of safe conduct had been broken, that the 16 leaders had been arrested and disappeared.

Molotov finally admitted to Eden and Secretary of State Stettinius, at the San Francisco Conference, that Russia was holding the men.

The charge against them was announced the next day, May 5, by Tass, which stated officially they had been guilty of "diversionary tactics in the rear of the Red Army" and were awaiting trial.

CHURCHILL PESSIMISTIC

On June 11, I received an invitation from the Big Three to go to Moscow for consultations. I accepted on the 12th and Moscow immediately announced that the trial of the 16 Polish leaders would begin on the 18th.

I saw Churchill before I left for Moscow and found him deeply pessimistic about the future of Europe.

This is why I agreed to return:

1. Inside Poland, the Russians were arresting, shooting, and deporting thousands of members of the Home Army and the underground—with the servile agreement of the Communist Lublin Government.

2. Russia was dismantling and shipping to the U. S. S. R. a great number of Polish factories;

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND FACE SLAVERY

3. There were 150,000 members of my Peasant Party battalion in extreme danger of being annihilated or sent into Siberia and slavery, as was the fate of 40,000 other Home Army men.

4. The 5,000,000 Poles living in that section of Poland which had been given to Russia by Yalta, had to be rescued and removed to safety.

5. I knew of the impending Potsdam Conference and, knowing that the Lublin Poles would agree to anything Russia proposed, I wanted to make my independent voice heard there.

(Installment XXI)

My return to Warsaw on June 26, 1945, to take my place as second deputy prime minister and minister of agriculture in the Communist-dominated Polish provisional government filled me with mingled emotions.

Fresh in my mind were our last hours in Moscow, hours of countless frustrations and the ever increasing clarity of the fact that Russia had no intention of living up to promises it signed jointly with the United States and Great Britain.

FEARS PLAIN TO SEE

Subtly, terribly, the Poland which had been guaranteed its independence was becoming an isolated ally dominated by Russia. Soviet influence pervaded us. Indeed, in one of the final meetings during the formation of the government, Boleslaw Bierut, who was to be president of Poland, spoke in Russian during a statement to the representatives of the Big Three.

"Please translate what this Pole is saying," I asked.

Ambassador Harriman's own fears, and those of British Ambassador Clark-Kerr, were plain to see. Harriman especially kept mentioning to Bierut and the Russians that the Yalta agreement provided that there must be a free and unfettered election in Poland as soon as possible.

PROMISE IN POCKET

At last the new government took off for Warsaw in Russian planes. In my pocket I held a signed agreement calling for freedom of the vote and the press, a promise by the new government to remove the Red army from Poland, an amnesty for those brave Polish underground army men who, having seen so many of their colleagues arrested by the Russians, were still in hiding, and six seats for independents in the 19-seat provisional administration.

We landed at Okecie airport, outside Warsaw, and my heart swelled at the sight of countless thousands of Polish people.

They called for a speech and as I moved to the microphone, filled with emotion, Bierut—and the three NKVD men who always stood at his side—stopped me for a moment.

"When you speak," Bierut hissed to me, "you must address these people, at first, by saying 'Obywetele.'" It is a salutation that is older even than "comrades." I turned my back on him, took the microphone, and began, "My sisters and brothers."

The ceremonies at the airport ended, we drove into the city. It was a sight that shocked me beyond expression. Warsaw was an eternity of rubble, and the sweet, sick smell of the dead that lay under the debris filled the world.

In the Ghetto alone, the Germans had killed more than 100,000 Jews. Nearly a quarter of a million other Poles had perished in the uprising.

DRIVES TO SEE WITOS

On the second day at home, I drove to Krakow and to the village of the old and ailing president of the Peasant Party, Mr. Witos. The village lay only 40 miles outside of Krakow but the trip took 12 hours. The roads were jammed with Red Army troops returning from Germany and western Poland, carrying with them loot of such quantity and variety as to defy description.

Many were drunk. Some who had captured German or Polish automobiles drove them crazily and often crashed. Some of the victors dragged along German and Polish girls.

I found Witos sick and pessimistic. Three times Premier of Poland and one of democracy's greatest voices in the history of our country, he lived in poverty and continuing peril.

I reported the results of the Moscow meeting to him, the mock trial and stern sentences which had been handed down to 14 of the 16 leading Polish patriots, and my fruitless appeals to Molotov for their release.

On the same day I was to learn that instead of our possessing nearly a third of the seats in the provisional government, we now had less. Two Communist members had been added to the government without the consent of the United States and Britain.

Our increasingly pathetic efforts to avert the growing catastrophe that was overtaking "liberated" Poland began the following day in Krakow when I met with Peasant Party leaders of that area.

The street in front of the meeting place had been filled with tens of thousands of Poles as we entered the conference. But when I stepped out of the place that night the street was empty and ghostly. Not a living person stirred.

I thought it odd, but I stepped into my open car and started away. And then I realized there was indeed life in that street. A flaming burst of machine-gun fire swept over my head, and in the light from the gun I could see that Red Army troops and Polish security police were standing with their backs against the walls of the buildings • • • as far as the eye could see.

I drove down that 600-yard street with the shots streaking just over my head. They could have killed me easily, of course. But they had their instructions. This canopy of fire they placed over my head as I drove along was to be simply a warning.

READY FOR ANYTHING

On the following day, at the first meeting of the new government on Polish soil, I let President Bierut and the others know that I was aware of the significance of the gun play.

"I see you have warned me," I said, "but if you think you can frighten me, you're mistaken. I was warned long before I got back to Poland. I'm prepared for anything."

I had contacted my mother as soon as I returned to Poland, and I soon flew to Poznan to see her. It was our first meeting since the day I left in August 1939, to join the Polish Army that was about to be attacked by both Hitler and Stalin.

On the same day that I saw my mother, I spoke in Poznan's Place of Freedom before 60,000.

POSITION DIFFICULT

I thought the Potsdam Conference might enable the independent members of the provisional government to state their case to American and British leaders. But whatever we were able to tell them was overshadowed by concessions which the Russians later forced upon us.

My position was extremely difficult there. Bierut and the others, acting on instructions from the Kremlin, set out to antagonize President Truman and Prime Minister Churchill and, after Churchill's defeat in the British general elections, Prime Minister Attlee.

At Potsdam it was agreed "the U. S. S. R. undertakes to settle the reparation claims of Poland from its own share of reparations."

Here is but one result of that decision:

In mid-August 1945, after the Americans and British had left Potsdam, the Polish Government was abruptly ordered by Stalin to come to Moscow for consultation.

There, Molotov told us that our share of the reparations which Russia planned to extract from Germany (15 percent) would total $500,000,000.

"Poland is luckier than the Soviet Union," Molotov told us. "You get this amount in addition to the $6,000,000,000 you've already received."

"What $6,000,000,000?" I asked, startled.

"Don't you understand?" he asked coldly. "Poland has given eastern Poland to Russia. The Polish property left there totaled $3,500,000,000. You receive from Germany an area whose property is worth $9,500,000,000. So it is clear that you have gained $6,000,000,000.

"Just a moment," I said. "You say the property in the new western part of Poland is worth $9,500,000,000. But don't you remember that you've stripped it of its factories, railroads, plants, homes, livestock, and everything else you could transport?"

Molotov scoffed. "Oh, that has only amounted to about $500,000,000," and abruptly adjourned the meeting.

The Late Clarence Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I knew Clarence Hancock when he was a student at Wesleyan in 1905, and our friendship continued down through the years until it was very greatly strengthened when I came to Congress in 1937 and became a Member of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Clarence was always very popular with his school and college mates, and was the center of all reunions. I had considerable contact with him when he was the corporation counsel of the city of Syracuse, and his fine application to his duty marked him as an outstanding lawyer and public servant. He became the ranking member of our committee and we looked forward to his chairmanship in the event his party came into the majority.

His character was of the loftiest, and with a high sense of love of home, country, and friends, I know of no man who was held in higher respect than he.

In my humble judgment our country never had a more loyal and conscientious public servant than our dear, departed Clarence Hancock, and I extend my deepest sympathy to his devoted widow and son.

The Effect of Inflation on Endowed Educational Institutions, Charitable Organizations, and Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a cry is going up from our endowed institutions, especially from our universities and colleges, that inflation is reducing the purchasing power of the income from their endowments. I fear that the economic principles which some of the complaining institutions have been teaching during the past 14 years are coming home to roost.

I recall, vividly, an article entitled "Endowments in Jeopardy" which appeared in the Atlantic Monthly, December 1937, page 737, which reminds me that the March 1948 issue of the same outstanding magazine carries an article relating to the same subject by the distinguished president of Williams College, James Phinney Baxter.

When Germany started the printing presses to flood the nation with fiat money, the purchasing price of the income from endowments went down until even the endowments of the educational institutions almost vanished.

The deficit financing of the Government by the New Deal has had much the same effect in the United States. The proposed Marshall plan, if carried out as planned, will inflate prices and rapidly whittle away the endowments of our universities and colleges. Yet, my mail indicates that many educational leaders condemn those of us who resist waste, extravagance, and reckless spending, believing as some of us do that a solvent government is of more worth to the world than a weak, insolvent one.

Under unanimous consent I am inserting a survey made by eminent men showing the effects of inflation in Germany after World War I:

THE EFFECT OF INFLATION ON ENDOWED EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS, AND HOSPITALS

THE VULNERABILITY OF ENDOWED INSTITUTIONS UNDER INFLATION

Endowed institutions of all kinds stand in a particularly vulnerable position with respect to inflation. Endowments given to institutions are granted by their donors either in the form of investments from which the institutions in question draw the income, or are turned over in the form of outright payments which the institutions themselves invest. (Sometimes it may be a combination of the two.) In the former case, business precaution has been responsible for the fact that such investments usually are in high-grade bonds of Government or corporations of a category termed "gilt edged," the yields from which may be expected to be steady over the years. If institutions are called upon to invest or reinvest money or securities given to them outright not only business precaution but law restricts their investments to securities having as small an element of speculation as possible, which again means in effect high-class securities bearing a fixed rate of interest. It should be further added that a large proportion of endowments are inviolable, meaning that the principal must be kept intact, leaving only the income for use by the recipient of the endowment.

Now, it is just this type of investment that is affected most disastrously by inflation. It pays by contract a fixed percent which remains unchanged even though the purchasing power of the sum so paid has fallen practically to nothing. And for this very reason the face value of the securities themselves falls precipitously and little if anything can be realized from their sale. This is in contradistinction to common stocks, which pay on earnings and hence whose yields and face value go up during an inflationary period though not nearly so much as the purchasing power of the currency unit declines.

DEPRECIATION OF THE ENDOWMENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FRANKFURT

A striking effect of the German inflation on endowments of educational institutions may be noted in a table which lists the face value of the 38 inviolable endowments which constituted the main support of the University of Frankfurt, first in 1922 just before inflation became uncontrollable and then after revalorization. It should be noted that under the German revalorization law (February 14, 1924) the currency was stabilized on the approximate basis of 1,000,000,000,000 paper marks to 1 gold mark, and furthermore in this general revalorization law certain types of securities were decreed to be worth more than that at which they were currently quoted. Thus, Government and other high-grade bonds were revalorized at 2½ to 12½ percent of their face value (according to qualification), savings bank deposits at 10 percent, and mortgages at 25 percent. Under this dispensation it will be noted in the table (which on account of its length is appended hereto) that less than 15 percent of the face value of these endowments was recovered and that the one endowment (Jakob Schiff) which returned better than 50 percent was due to the fact that 57 percent was invested in American railroad bonds. It should be further noted that 11 of the endowments were revalorized at less than 10 percent and 3 of them at 2½ percent or less.

THE STROOF ENDOWMENT

Another example is worth citing at considerable length because it is not extreme but is typical of what happened to endowed institutions—educational, charitable, and medical—as a result of Germany's experiment with inflation. Its parallel will also be found in other European countries, the extent of the ensuing disaster being contingent on the degree and severity of the course of inflation in the individual countries concerned.

In 1921 there died in Germany one Dr. Stroof, who being a public-spirited man, in his will endowed the University of Frankfurt with the sum of nearly 8,000,000 marks for the purpose of fostering research. The only condition imposed was that certain employees of Dr. Stroof should be paid pensions out of this fund amounting to approximately 666 marks a year. The first installment to the university consisting of 1,000,000 marks

in inconvertible Reich Treasury notes was paid in January 1922. By that time the German inflation characterized by ever larger issues of currency irredeemable in gold was under way, and so the 1,000,000 marks in question was worth only 25,000 gold marks—or about $5,950 at the prewar rate of exchange. One month later, a second installment of 1,000,000 marks in treasury notes was paid, but by that time it was worth only 22,000 gold marks ($5,236). Again in March 1922, a third installment—this time of 1,250,000 marks—was transferred to the university, yet this larger sum was worth only 18,000 gold marks ($4,284). No payments were made for the next 13 months, but in April 1923 Prussian State bonds with a face value of 450,000 marks were turned over to the fund. By that time the uncontrollable phase of the German inflation had been reached and the entire sum was equivalent in value only to 86 gold marks ($20.46). In May 1923, the fund received 700,000 marks in treasury notes, but this amount—nearly twice as large as the sum paid 1 month earlier—was worth only 90 gold marks ($21.42), and in July an installment of 171,000 marks in treasury notes had a value of only 2.6 gold marks (about 62 cents). The final chapter was written when in December 1923, the last installment of 3,250,000 marks in treasury notes was paid. This installment, it will be noted, was about three times as large as any previously made and yet it was worth only thirty-eight one hundred millionths of a single gold mark, or such an infinitesimal fraction of 1 cent in American money as almost to defy computation.

Put into the following tabular form the figures become even more startling:

	Face value of installments	Gold value of installments	Approximate value in American money (prewar rate of exchange)
	Marks	*Marks*	
January 1922	1,000,000	25,000	$5,950
February 1922	1,000,000	22,000	5,236
March 1922	1,250,000	18,000	4,284
April 1923	450,000	86	20.46
May 1923	700,000	90	21.42
July 1923	171,000	2.6	0.618
December 1923	3,250,000	0.000000038	(7)
Total	7,821,000	65,178.6+	15,512.498+

It should, of course, be understood that whatever the value with relation to gold marks, the various installments had at the time they were paid into the fund, these steadily depreciated, and, in fact, they all reached the level of the value of the final installment of December 1923. In short, by December 1923 the gold value of the entire Stroof endowment shrank to such an infinitesimal fraction of a single gold mark that for all practical purposes it was completely wiped out.

An ironical aftermath may be found in the fact that the university was still bound to pay the small pensions of the Stroof employees and, in fact, after the revalorization of the mark, had to do so out of the small remnant of funds still left to the institution even though the Stroof endowment itself had been inflated out of existence.

THE CASE OF THE THERESIAN ACADEMY OF VIENNA

This institution, equivalent in standards to an American high school, was founded in 1778 by the Empress Maria Theresa and by 1914, and through funds added to its original endowment, had approximately 8,000,000 crowns (about $1,600,000). At the beginning of 1925 when the Austrian crown was finally stabilized after the inflation period on the basis of about 14,400 paper crowns to 1 gold crown, this endowment was discovered to have a value of just over $112 as compared with $1,600,000 in 1914. Under this severe loss the school was no longer able to care for needy but deserving students. It had to take with little discrimination only students who could pay their own way, and besides it had to curtail its plant and equipment in every possible manner even to the extent of renting unused rooms and turning the school stables into garages which were rented to outsiders.

THE THIERS FOUNDATION

While the course of inflation in France was not nearly as severe as in Germany or Austria, the franc being stabilized in 1925 at about one-fifth its prewar value, nevertheless it was sufficiently severe to cause tremendous losses particularly to those whose living was derived from fixed incomes. The case of the Thiers Foundation was a typical case in point. This institution was founded by Adolph Thiers, the first President of the French Republic, as an aid to students in obtaining the highest instruction in law and medicine and also to qualify them for doctors' degrees in literature and science. It received the income from a fixed capital fund invested in government bonds and in coal mine securities. The institution had already had its income severely curtailed during the war through the occupation of the French coal mine ares by the German armies. But after the war the rising tide of inflation so depleted the purchasing power of its income that it became necessary to secure permission from the State to sell the jewels of Mme. Thiers which were conserved for the foundation in the Louvre museum. Even though this sale nearly doubled the foundation's capital, the purchasing power of the increased income was little more than one-seventh of the purchasing power of its original prewar income and left the institution close to the brink of insolvency.

CHARITABLE AND WELFARE INSTITUTIONS AND FOUNDATIONS

So far we have cited only examples relating to educational institutions. The consequences of inflation are equally disastrous upon charitable and welfare institutions of all kinds. For instance, the city of Frankfurt like nearly all German cities possesses numerous institutions of this character supported largely by trust funds (contributed by philanthropic citizens) which under the law have to be invested in mundelsicher securities, i. e., highest grade state, municipal and corporation bonds, paying fixed rates of interest. In 1914, foundations for the care of children and young people possessed assets of about 922,000 marks, and foundations for the poor possessed assets of approximately 5,372,000 marks. But when these assets were revalorized at the beginning of 1925, the assets of the former had shrunk to about 112,000 marks and the latter to 655,000 marks, these sums being in each case about 12 percent of the 1914 assets. The highest amount recovered in any of the individual foundations was 37 percent and in many cases the rate of recovery was 5 percent or less of the original amounts. Tables showing the details relating to these foundations are appended. Obviously the drastic curtailment of the income and assets of these foundations under inflation meant that the poor, the aged, and the destitute had to be denied the help they needed.

HOMES FOR THE AGED AND INFIRM (FRANKFURT)

Nowhere are the disasters of inflation upon the poor and aged more strikingly brought out than in the case of the Home for Aged and Infirm in Frankfurt. Again it should be reiterated that this is only one typical case selected at random out of many.

This institution was founded in 1816 and was originally a workhouse, but later developed into a home into which aged men and women (to the number of 300) purchased a life residence out of their meager savings and, in addition any additional savings which they possessed were entrusted to the institution which paid them interest on it. These entrance fees and savings funds constituted the main portion of the working capital of the home, and consequently under inflation it found itself utterly unable to provide for its inmates or to pay the small amounts of interest due them from the savings which had been entrusted to it. Furthermore, as inflation progressively advanced, great pressure was brought upon the home to aid more and more people who themselves were rendered poverty stricken by the disastrous economic conditions which inflation was producing. Obviously the home had to refuse further aid, no matter how necessitous the circumstances.

An idea of the astronomical character of Germany's inflation may be visualized in the fact that the food bill for the home in the fiscal year 1923–24 reached a total of 23,293,366,276,337,266 paper marks (the item for black bread alone was 2,986,973,878,061,060 paper marks), while it cost 10,246,434,361,231,396 paper marks to supply heat for the establishment. The income from all investments during this year, reckoned in paper marks, covered less than 3 percent of the food bill alone. And whereas in 1914 the income of the home from its investments amounted to more than two-thirds of its total receipts, in 1923–24 it was less than one-seventieth of the total. In short, the home itself became dependent upon the city of Frankfurt for aid, and hence lost its character as a self-supporting institution, whose large and growing endowments had enabled it to meet an expanding need in the community.

WELFARE INSTITUTIONS IN AUSTRIA

Endowments of charitable and welfare institutions in Austria fared worse than those in Germany, because, even though in the former currency depreciation did not go so far as in the latter, Austria did not revalorize as did Germany. Without going into detail, a survey made in 1927 shows that only about 6 percent of the charitable institutions in Vienna in 1914 still remained, that their capital and revenues were only 1 percent of the 1914 total and that they were rendering assistance to only 2 percent of the people cared for in 1914.

THE SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

With the above examples in mind can it be doubted as to what would happen under inflation to endowed institutions in the United States? Whether they are educational, welfare, or charitable institutions the result would be utter disaster.

Consider first that over one-half of our higher education is being carried on by privately supported colleges. Consider also that the endowments of such institutions total over $1,500,000,000. Consider, finally, that endowments of this character are considered to be of such great social importance that in the words of E. W. Kemmerer: "We protect many of them by special laws which restrict the investment of trust funds to a limited and supposedly safe field of investments. In these restrictions, high-grade bonds and mortgages are favored, and common stocks are usually disfavored. This policy is enforced both by law and by traditional public opinion." (Endowments in Jeopardy, the Atlantic Monthly, December 1937—p. 737.)

For example, six of our best-known endowed educational institutions are Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Cornell, the University of Chicago, and the University of Pennsylvania. As of 1936 the total endowments of these

universities reached a total of $355,000,000. Of this total about $311,000,000 was invested in securities, and of this sum approximately $213,000,000, or nearly 69 percent, was invested in fixed income securities such as bonds and mortgages as against only $98,000,000 invested in equities consisting mostly of common stocks. This 69 percent is an average, be it said, for Princeton University has nearly 83 percent of its invested endowment in fixed securities and Harvard has over 72 percent of its endowment so invested.

While this example covers only educational institutions, the type of investment made by charitable institutions is of an exactly similar character and would be subject to the same disastrous consequences under inflation.

And once these endowments were impaired or destroyed, how would they ever be restored. To quote Professor Kemmerer again:

"In the face of our large and growing governmental control of business, in the face of increasing resort to highly progressive income, inheritance, and gift taxes on the part of both our National Government and the States, taxes whose combined rates in the higher brackets are already the highest of any advanced country in the world, and in the face of the commonly neglected fact that inflation continually pushes all taxable incomes into higher and higher brackets, although the real or purchasing power value of these incomes may be actually declining—in the face of such facts, who will restore the endowments of these educational institutions if they are greatly depreciated or destroyed by inflation?"

To sum up, then, the ultimate threat of inflation to endowed institutions is as expressed in the words of Professor Kemmerer:

"Excessively burdensome government debts are usually not paid by taxation. The political resistance to taxes adequate for the purpose becomes too strong. Such debt burdens are usually reduced to politically workable proportions by inflation. The burden is thereby shifted largely from vigorously protesting taxpayers who have votes by the millions to bondholders and other 'economic royalist' creditors whose numerical protest at the ballot box is weak. In this class belong our privately endowed colleges, universities, scientific research institutions, and hospitals. In America the greatest and most irreparable damage that unsound monetary policies and Government financing by inflation threaten is the undermining of these great public-welfare institutions."

Sources: The greater part of the material presented above was derived from the following sources:

1. Inflation and After, Philip G. Wright (published by the Duke University endowment).

2. Inflation, E. C. Harwood and Donald G. Ferguson, American Institute of Economic Research.

3. Endowments in Jeopardy, Prof. E. W. Kemmerer, Atlantic Monthly, December 1937.

TABLE I.—*Inviolable endowments of the University of Frankfurt-am-Main*

[Values in marks]

Name of endowment	Face value of investments in 1922	Revalorized value, 1928	Percent recovered
Leo Gans	999,353.10	132,766.92	13.28
Karl Kohn	51,200.00	625.00	1.22
Ladenburg	37,353.57	4,321.82	11.57
Cohnstaedt	17,075.79	1,842.16	10.79
Adlekes	29,651.98	3,630.88	12.24
Merton	300,000.00	37,500.00	12.50
Neufville	100,000.00	12,000.00	12.00
Ellinger	6,937.50	850.85	12.26
Economic Institute	46,000.00	2,873.00	6.25
General Welfare Institute	100,000.00	12,500.00	12.50
Flersheim	1,200,000.00	147,500.00	12.29
Fade	100,000.00	12,500.00	12.50
Wolf	10,200.00	1,250.00	12.25
Kotzenberg	300,000.00	67,438.12	22.48
Anonymous	176,426.35	16,500.00	9.41
Beihmann	250,000.00	31,250.00	12.50

TABLE I.—*Inviolable endowments of the University of Frankfurt-am-Main*—Con.

[Values in marks]

Name of endowment	Face value of investments in 1922	Revalorized value, 1928	Percent recovered
Hanck	100,000.00	12,500.00	12.50
Emden	136,000.00	3,400.00	2.50
Braunfels	737,757.00	90,721.10	12.97
Edinger	350,000.00	43,750.00	12.50
Anna Edinger	250,000.00	124,900.00	50.00
Oppenheim	250,000.00	16,025.00	6.41
Sulzbach	287,464.60	32,141.15	12.48
Speyer	653,909.20	236,196.92	36.12
Budge	257,464.60	32,197.04	12.51
Jakob Schiff	329,000.00	196,720.00	62.77
Beit von Speyer	257,464.60	32,197.04	12.51
Ludwig Fraunfels	30,304.00	3,015.45	9.95
Lucius Meister	726,961.00	58,809.55	8.09
Neher	102,984.00	12,887.00	12.51
Passavant	202,270.60	37,833.90	13.60
Tornow	462,520.00	3,711.85	.80
Varrentrapp	107,000.00	16,275.00	15.21
Weinberg	606,475.20	38,349.75	6.32
Wertheimer	100,000.00	24,995.33	25.00
Jugel	1,111,343.42	106,508.42	9.58
General Welfare Institute	2,000,000.00	225,000.00	11.25
Bardorff	1,225,366.62	167,085.01	13.64
Total	13,827,483.46	1,989,403.77	14.39

Source: Inflation and After, Philip G. Wright, Duke University endowment fund.

TABLE II.—*Foundations for the care of children and young people in Frankfurt*

Name of foundation	Assets		Percent recovery
	1914	1925	
Kroger	5,310	14	.26
Katzenstein	101,346	20,988	20.71
Marx	1,058	1	.67
Tatzenith	2,320	14	.60
Feist	73,535	4,697	6.39
Kroger	2,571	642	24.97
Neufville	11,800	62	.53
Bachmann	8,700	512	5.98
Kroger	2,571	324	12.40
Gruendeich	857	107	12.49
Hoeklin	500	62	12.40
Lehnemann	1,050	307	24.84
Heinrich	447	64	14.32
Stempel	51,000	5,624	11.05
Kaufmann	115,000		
Knodt	120,000	34,018	28.34
Lindheimer	25,516	3,118	12.22
Salomer	20,000	2,500	12.50
Infants Home	210,000		
Heldelbach	90,000	27,175	30.19
Thorwart	50,000	5,693	11.31
Treser	5,662	4	.07
Strauss	28,345	7,565	21.90
Total	921,990	111,596	12.10

Source: Inflation and After, Philip G. Wright, Duke University endowment fund.

TABLE III.—*Foundations for the poor and for welfare work in Frankfurt*

Name of foundation	Assets		Percent recovery
	1914	1925	
Schumann	113,905	17,800	15.63
Ettling	40,735	54	.13
May	63,706	15,650	24.23
Siebert	25,062	3,135	12.51
Ehinger	548,670	54,488	9.93
Stiebel	10,900	1,250	12.14
Siesmayer	2,000	250	12.50
Hilker	10,456	1,356	12.01
Kratz	44,841	16,643	37.12
Von Reinach	60,000	765	1.28
Von Rothschild	127,320	14	.01
Von Rothschild	31,315	1	
Rosenkecher	17,040	2,129	12.49
Sakermann	5,075	134	2.64
Von Schwartzhopf	703	73	10.67
Steffens	4,212	438	10.16
Steuernagel	155,800	18,110	11.62
Rueker	964,197	188,994	16.06
Speyer	480,000	120,000	25.00
May	12,200	1,518	12.44
Margarethen	58,750	8,574	15.10
Textor	45,887		
Schmey	286,924	53,373	18.60
Heister	341,121	30,000	8.79
Zeh	657	69	10.50
Miedinger	331,464	18,221	5.50

TABLE III.—*Foundations for the poor and for welfare work in Frankfurt*—Continued

Name of foundation	Assets		Percent recovery
	1914	1925	
Middle class fund	7,841		
Lindheimer	326,797	40,000	12.24
Welfare fund	58,206	5,182	9.04
Clauer	198,545	12,320	6.31
Heussenstamm	150,000	25,252	16.83
Home for the aged	1,126	164	14.44
Scherbius	270,068	32,205	11.93
Frank	20,000	2,250	11.25
Hamburger	122,183	9,312	7.62
War survivors	437,000	5,437	1.24
Total	5,372,216	655,515	12.20

Source: Inflation and After, Philip G. Wright, Duke University endowment fund.

The New Plan for European Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am proposing a new plan for European recovery. The Marshall plan originated in Socialist Europe. It is admitted that the Europeans devised it so that the Socialist elements in our own State Department would continue to finance their Socialist cabinets abroad.

Without exception, American political dollars have helped to entrench the Socialist elements, and defeated our friends who fought for freedom against socialism.

Ever since VE-day they have deceived Americans into a kind of pathetic trust that our political dollars delivered to Marxist state Socialist planners would reestablish freedom, politically, socially, and economically. They also played upon our fear and sentimentalism, even our hatred of communism, as a means to peace, reconstruction, and freedom to the nations. We have acted up to now in ignorance of the facts and against all reason and logic. Our failure is as revealing as it is tragic.

Look at Soviet Poland where we handed Mr. Bierut and his camarilla $448,000,000 since VE-day, while he and his fellow Socialists delivered Poland to the Soviets. Look at Soviet Czechoslovakia, where Mr. Klement Gottwald received $257,000,000 before he crushed, only yesterday, the Czech nation under the hammer and the sickle. Today her Communists and Socialists have united to work for the same boss. Look at the Soviet Hungary of Mr. Rakosi and Soviet Albania. Above all, remember how we strengthened Tito, until he made his tyranny complete in Yugoslavia with the help of $303,000,000 in American goods and services.

This total of $1,053,000,000 speaks with a mighty voice of what mere dollars will do, to Europe and to us, if we permit this self-defeating and treacherous policy to continue. No billions of dollars can change the basic truth that a Socialist planned economy can only operate in an absolute police state. So far, without

exception, it has merged into communism without a fight.

Since that is the underlying drift in this twentieth century, we must tell both our own people and Europe that unless the creative and productive genius of free men and women is again released, there can be no economic recovery. A plan, therefore, that finances Socialist governments instead of free individuals in commerce and trade is no plan at all for Americans.

When I felt compelled to vote against the so-called interim aid to Europe in the special session, December 1947, I had earlier voted both for the British gift of $3,750,000,000 and for the gifts of $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey. Our party voted for these immense gifts because it was sincerely hoped that these billions, together with all the other billions of dollars previously given, would provide the freedom-loving people of these nations with still another breathing spell. They needed it in order to recover their own freedom from the groups of political and economic tyranny found in power when they returned to their own homes after fighting tyranny abroad.

No such resurgence of freedom has taken place. On the contrary, Socialist cabinets are actually in control of every western European country except Holland, Belgium, Portugal, and Switzerland. The whole European economy is fast becoming that of a controlled statism, operated according to the false and pernicious bible of Karl Marx. What sense is there in making fine distinctions between their socialism and outright communism?

Take Great Britain, the land of Adam Smith, where a Marxist cabinet has led the nation ever further down the treacherous and liberty-killing road of not less but more nationalization. Winston Churchill has stated that the Socialist cabinet squandered $700,000,000 of the American loan in Egypt and India alone. Sir William Darling, of the British Parliament, has repeatedly pointed out that the money from America helped the British Socialist Government to inaugurate a 5-day week, higher wages, shorter hours, and a British brand of slow-down, feather-bedding, underproduction, price fixing, currency control, and inflation with general compulsory management of trade and commerce, including the land itself. In brief, free England is abjectly subject to a handful of planners in London.

The lamentable end result is an economic situation which the London Economist just recently called bankruptcy. Its editors explained that the Socialist planners had used the previous gifts of $4,750,000,000 from America to live and to spend on a scale out of accord with Britain's real economic position.

And what guaranty is there—

The Economist asked—

that the Marshall plan may not be used in the same way?

Mr. Speaker, the guaranty on the basis of experience is that it will be used the same way.

Instead of loaning, trading or giving as free American men and women to the free men and women of England to strengthen their individual freedom we weakened it and abandoned our own ideals in all our dealings with them.

Because our whole postwar policy for world recovery was built on the utterly false and self-defeating principle of supporting temporary socialist cabinets with billions of dollars, our assistance has failed miserably in arousing the freedom instinct in the peoples of Europe. Where are the free democracies of the west? Not England, not France, not Italy?

Witness the failure in France, a nation which did not, by comparison, suffer any extensive material destruction from World War II. One would think that the $2,260,000,000 which we Americans recklessly but hopefully sent to France, would have resulted in a great productive and economic renaissance in the French people. Instead, France is just gasping for another billion dollar transfusion from America. And then another, and yet another.

For more than three post-liberation years, the French cabinets fixed an artificial value on currency. Farmers could not produce food at the Government ceiling prices, nor would they accept the inflated francs in exchange because they could not get what they wanted and needed for their farms and families. So they simply quit shipping food to Paris and other cities. During 1946–47, the French farmers took more than a million acres out of wheat production. The cities starved because the socialist government deceived them into thinking they could work 5 days a week and slow down and yet be rich with Government price fixing and issuance of currency to pay higher wages. This man-made French starvation American taxpayers have been deceived into financing. This despite the fact that half of our own American people are already struggling with a family economy which has reached the breaking point and should not be forced to pay taxes for such outlandish purposes.

Yet M. Leon Blum and other notorious foes of economic freedom flew into Washington, D. C., to tell their dishonest sob stories of a bleeding France. France was not bleeding. She was simply mismanaged and corrupted by promises that the city people would not have to work hard any more and that purchasing power could be created by printing more money.

Look at Scandinavia, which we Americans some years back were told to regard as "the middle way." The idea was that the Scandinavian countries had proved, alone among all the nations, how it was possible to reap all the blessings of socialization without paying the price of economic tyranny. The heroic resistance in Denmark and Norway against nazism seemed to prove that these Scandinavians would never yield an inch of their freedom.

Now let us read a paragraph of the almost incredible law which the Norwegian labor cabinet pressed through the Norwegian Parliament with the help of the Communists.

The law reads:

The King or whomsoever he shall authorize shall make such regulations as are found to be necessary to regulate and control: (a) Prices, profits, and gains of all kinds; (b) production, distribution, and all other economic enterprise, for the purpose of counteracting harmful competitive activity, or other economic conditions which shall be held to be unreasonable or harmful to the public interest, or to advance a rational organization of the (national) economic life.

To the extent to which it is found necessary to further said aims, the King or whomsoever he shall authorize may inter alia also make regulations of the following kind:

(1) Forbid producers to curtail or stop production, distribution, or other economic activity.

(2) Decree that new plants must not be erected nor existing plants expanded without his approval, or that production, distribution, or other economic activity must be parceled out among the producers according to the directives hereunder, or that the production in any plant must be curtailed or stopped.

(3) Decree that producers produce certain articles or perform certain services at the prices stipulated and fulfill other conditions which are decreed. No order made hereunder shall vary the purposes for which any plant shall be organized.

This law in one of the stoutest and most highly regarded of the 16 nations is now typical of all of them with few exceptions. Their laws are as totalitarian in economics as any human logic can conceive and write.

Individual freedom is gone. Inventiveness, creativeness, imagination is dead. The State is all and over all. And certainly it would be foolish to expect that human nature would care to exert itself under such an economic slave system. The truth is that as long as the Marshall plan is going to operate on the basis of government-to-government control, you can write off European recovery as impossible and a bad dream. No man or woman will for long endure hard work and austere living just for the sake of keeping Marxist bureaucrats satisfied.

The new plan for recovery encourages and supports the elements in rebellion against statism, and not the elements of oppression inherent in the socialism most of the 16 countries now have.

Let me quote the recent words of Mr. Sigurd Hoel, until recently a leading Socialist intellectual of Scandinavia:

They are clamoring for the state. The state must take over. The state must take over everything. In the end, the state takes us over. And then I must say that I prefer to be exploited and suppressed by a person rather than by the state.

Such people who fight for freedom are our only friends. We should finance them because we can trust them.

Instead of that we have financed our actual and potential enemies throughout eastern Europe and now all our friends there are silenced.

If we continue to finance the same forces, our enemies of freedom in western Europe, we shall have not one friend left on the Continent. And we shall deserve it.

However, since the anti-Marxist freedom forces of Europe—farmers, business-trade and shipping people, builders, teachers, clergy, and professional people—today are close to or in some nations exceed 50 percent of the population, they will soon take the lead, if we do not defeat them. It is perfectly

superfluous to point out that it is the men and women of these creative groups that built European civilization into its former greatness. They can do it again. They are worth financing.

So if it is freedom and recovery we are after in western Europe, it is now clear that the Marshall plan of government-to-socialist-government controlled funds contradicts the very purpose we seek to accomplish. This House therefore must write a completely new bill, embodying the principle of individual economic responsibility, free individual self-assertion in things economic without the deadly encroachments of state planning. To do otherwise is to deny our own faith and abandon those in Europe capable of making a recovery.

The new plan invites the free movement of men and materials from us to the people of Europe as distinct from their temporary socialist overlords. We ask them to join with the free peoples of North and South America in a crusade for the rebirth of free economy on both sides of the Atlantic.

I emphasize the point about getting the South American nations to take an active part in this recovery crusade as full and equal partners with Europe and the United States.

It is imperative that such nations in South America which have essential contributions to make to the exports of food, fuel, and fertilizer to Europe, at long last, be invited to the expanded circle of the cooperating ERP countries. Political considerations demand such an arrangement. The economic reasons are equally obvious. Otherwise, we may soon see the Secretary of State appear on this Hill with a Marshall plan for the Western Hemisphere. And what insolence it would be to expect the other nations of this hemisphere to advance credit and adjust their prices for the benefit of a program in which they have no voice whatever.

Now turning to the new plan itself. It follows quite closely the suggestions of the 16 nations in their Paris meeting in the fall of 1947. A careful examination of the Paris report by the CEEC—State Department Document 2930, European Series No. 28—leads to the astonishing discovery that the 16 European nations did not come to us, asking us to foot the whole bill.

They offered to carry much of the financial burden themselves. They did not expect any American lend-lease.

On page 51 of the above-mentioned Paris report we read that the European nations proposed to meet part of the expenses by "the expenditures of other financial resources by the participating countries." Inasmuch as these countries have a total amount of gold and dollar assets of $13,312,000,000 as reported by the International Monetary Fund the 16 nations will be able to reduce requirements by $1,000,000,000 from the $6,800,000,000 total, originally proposed.

When the public was finally told that Switzerland has $2,620,000,000 in assets, Netherlands $1,481,000,000, Belgium $1,016,000,000, it seems apparent that $5,800,000,000 of new financing is an ample over-all figure for the first 15 months.

Next, we find that the Europeans expect to finance certain of their ERP purchases "by the repatriation of capital after the restoration of internal financial stability"—ibid., page 54. Now, inasmuch as our own Treasury has informed us that it has found $750,000,000 of hoarded assets held by Europeans here, such assets are available to meet the different and respective countries' purchases within the ERP. To the $750,000,000, we can add a further $750,000,000 of hoarded assets, which can be found in Europe itself, once the vast amount of billions of hidden assets again come out of hiding.

Although the Paris report states that it does not propose to give solutions for the payment problem—ibid, page 50—it does makes the observation about the International Bank that "the bank's recent report shows the important part which it should be able to play"—page 54. The Paris meeting expected that $918,000,000 for equipment, other than agricultural and mining machinery, for 1948 might be financed by "loans from the International Bank or other credit operations." So the new plan looks to the World Bank to lend $300,000,000 for capital goods, the "private investment" which the Paris report hopes for—ibid, page 54—would certainly be forthcoming.

The European proposals for financing some of the recovery expenses by their own financial resources, by hoarded assets, by loans from the World Bank and other credit operations, including private investments, should all be written into the new bill. We simply take the 16 nations' own proposals.

When steps have been taken to invite the South and Central American export nations to partnership in ERP and assurance given them that their own needs of heavy equipment and plants will become an integral part of an over-all export program carried on by this country price adjustments and credits in Central and South America might well rise to a $500,000,000 total on the purchases by European nations of food, fertilizer and fuel.

A similar amount of $500,000,000 may be deductible for sinking prices in our own country in 1948–49 as compared with the prices of July 1, 1947, upon which the ERP figures were built. World conditions, market and production conditions, and the needs of our own people demand that our prices go down within the next half a year. If they go up, our own domestic economy will burst at the seams and the whole ERP may have to be called off.

The new plan provides that $1,500,000,000 for American purchases of strategic materials required for our stockpile of which we are dangerously short, such as tin, chrome, manganese, nickel, copper, lead, zinc, bauxite, and so forth, be purchased so as to contribute to the recovery program. This sum can be made available by a readjustment in the armed forces budget and if passed, as it no doubt will be, requires no new appropriation.

Another $1,000,000,000 credit should be provided by the United States through the Export-Import Bank, so that the European nations could feel that the whole cooperative effort is on a mutually responsible basis. Above all, the ERP must on every turn and in every chapter, be written so as to make maximum use of direct trader-to-trader contact. Regular prewar trade channels must be given a maximum chance to operate. We do not want another UNRRA hierarchy with thousands and thousands of highly paid bureaucrats and experts, who excel in self-importance because they lack any true motivation of real service in the cause of free trade among free peoples.

Finally, $500,000,000 shall be set aside as a gift of the American people to relieve suffering and hunger wherever it may appear. This contribution shall be distributed through the regular established channels for the distribution and administration of charity. If required we propose the organization of World Relief, Inc., a private organization comparable to the Red Cross to which private gifts would be made and supplemented by Congress when required. The unadvertised, unheralded good that has come from person to person giving and that will continue to come from such giving where the spirit of the giver may go with the gift will do the good for the morale required above al, else for this suffering world. A bill to carry out this plan will be offered presently.

It will be designed to furnish a living, tangible example of American faith in the workings of free men through the regular channels of trade, commerce and giving between the citizens of two hemispheres.

To summarize:

Total demand for European recovery for 15 months	$6,800,000,000
Deduct resources mentioned by the European countries in Paris report	1,000,000,000
Leaving	$5,800,000,000
Repatriation of capital hoarded by Europeans found by U. S. Treasury in United States of America	$750,000,000
Leaving	5,050,000,000
A further sum hoarded in Switzerland and other countries of Europe available when confidence is restored	750,000,000
Leaving	4,300,000,000
International Bank loan as expected by Paris report	800,000,000
Leaving	3,500,000,000
Western Hemisphere loans outside the United States of America	500,000,000
Leaving	3,000,000,000
United States of America purchase of strategic materials for defense (no new appropriation required)	1,500,000,000
Leaving	1,500,000,000

United States of America subscription to capital of Export-Import Bank	1,000,000,000
Leaving	500,000,000
Gift for relief of hunger through private channels	500,000,000
Leaving	0

Hon. Frank B. Keefe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable FRANK B. KEEFE, from Wisconsin, during his almost 10 years as a Member of the House has achieved a national reputation.

His thorough knowledge of the fiscal affairs of the country, and his power in debate have made him widely sought as a speaker. He has championed Republicanism and Americanism in all parts of the country. The following editorial which I include as a part of these remarks is a fitting tribute to FRANK KEEFE:

[From the Daily Northwestern, Oshkosh, Wis., February 16, 1948]

TALK OF KEEFE FOR VICE PRESIDENT

At an overflow gathering of Republicans of the Sixth Congressional District, held Saturday evening at Fond du Lac, with a banquet at the Retlaw Hotel, the major speaker of the occasion, Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK, of Idaho, paid high tribute to the record of FRANK B. KEEFE, of Oshkosh, Representative of the Sixth Congressional District, and sincerely and vigorously suggested that Mr. KEEFE would make an excellent Vice President of the United States.

In fact, he told interviewers that the Idaho delegation to the Republican National Convention, to be held next June at Philadelphia, intends to propose the name of the Oshkosh Member of Congress for that position. Mr. KEEFE recently delivered a speech in Idaho and made such a deep impression that the decision to place his name among the candidates for Vice President was the result.

The Idaho Senator said that, of course, Mr. KEEFE would be out of the running if a midwestener should be nominated for President by the GOP convention.

The Sixth District Congressman, who introduced Senator DWORSHAK in terms of high praise for his courageous record of opposition to the huge appropriations sought by the New Deal administrations, indicated surprise at the mention of his name for Vice Presidential place, but added that he had heard of talk in various parts of the country linking him with the Vice Presidential candidacy and expressed appreciation for that consideration, remarking that stranger things than that have happened.

Senator DWORSHAK and Congressman KEEFE became Members of the Seventy-sixth Congress in the same year, 1939, and the Oshkosh man long has been a hard-working Member of the House Appropriations Committee, endeavoring to hold down administration appropriations to essentials and force the practice of economy in Government.

In advancing the idea of Mr. KEEFE for Vice President on the GOP national ticket, the Idaho Senator declared he knew of no one better qualified for the Vice Presidency, or even the Presidency, and that the Oshkosh Representative has been a fearless crusader for honest government and the American way of life.

He said further that it has been hard to accomplish anything against New Deal opposition in the hectic New Deal days, that most of the difficult work of reducing appropriations and bringing about economy in the Federal Government is done in committee rooms and it is there that Mr. KEEFE has been a tower of strength.

In introducing the Idaho Senator, Representative KEEFE stated his conviction that the Republican Party is the only one that can solve the problems ahead. He said he liked his job in Congress because of the work there is to do.

The suggestion of Mr. KEEFE as a Vice Presidential candidate brought expressions of approval on the part of many of the Republicans at the Lincoln Day dinner and produced a greater realization than ever that the Oshkosh man occupies a prominent place at Washington as a veteran national legislator and is widely esteemed for the services he has performed both on a district and on a national basis.

In his address Senator DWORSHAK charged the New Deal administration of national affairs with being inconsistent and illogical as to foreign policies, and the result has been a serious delay in the establishment of peace. It was his assertion that the claim that American foreign policy is bipartisan is an error.

"In some instances," he said "Congress has been permitted to give its approval to prearranged plans, but the lack of information as to details of the secret agreements negotiated at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam has placed full responsibility for failure of foreign policy squarely upon the New Dealers."

One of the features of the dinner meeting, in which over 600 were served and the overflow had to be accommodated in dining rooms other than the main one, was the opportunity given supporters of several rival candidates for the GOP nomination for President to be heard in boosting their favorites.

William J. Campbell, of Oshkosh, who is a candidate for delegate at large at the State Presidential preference primary to be held April 6, spoke for Gen. Douglas MacArthur for President and urged a delegation pledged to him as Wisconsin's favorite son. He said MacArthur would not get this country into war and that no military man chosen President has ever done that.

Lester Bradshaw, of Milwaukee, put in some good words for Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, emphasizing the New York Governor's opposition to Communists.

William G. Van Pelt, of Fond du Lac, paid compliments to Harold Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota. He said Stassen makes his own decisions and that these decisions have proved right. The people, he declared, know exactly where he stands on the issues and as Governor he made a record for cutting the Minnesota State debt and the property taxes. He is also for fewer Federal employees.

Brooklyn's Congressional Delegation and Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Brooklyn congressional delegation has long been aware of the desperate situation in Palestine and, while doing everything possible to improve conditions there, they very regretfully have watched them get worse.

We were pleased to have our efforts supported by Borough President John Cashmore, who, among other things, took the time to make a special trip to Washington to visit the President and to urge upon him the implementation of the United Nations decision, and the modification of the embargo on arms to the Jewish militia in Palestine. Mayor William O'Dwyer also has vigorously urged the same action.

Last week our efforts were fortified by the issuance of a statement by Paul E. Fitzpatrick, chairman of the Democratic State Committee, in which he urged the New York State congressional delegation to actively support a program to sustain and make effective the United Nations decision to set up a Jewish state in Palestine, and to modify the arms embargo. He also urged that the British Government be informed that our Government intended to vigorously urge and support partition, and the sending by the United Nations of a voluntary police force to save the peace.

Yesterday I was very happy to be able to accompany the Brooklyn congressional delegation to the State Department with a delegation led by Mr. Nathan Dinkes, president of the Brooklyn division of the American Jewish Congress, and Mrs. Henry A. Baron, president of the Women's Division of the same organization.

Our arguments were bolstered by a petition which was submitted to the State Department for transmission to the President, which contained upwards of 165,000 signatures of American citizens residing in Brooklyn. Christians and Jews signed the petition because they realize that this is no longer a Jewish question but rather one of worldwide peace.

A Time for Brave and Honorable Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Syracuse Herald-Journal of Friday, February 20, 1948:

A TIME FOR BRAVE AND HONORABLE MEN

Delivering the first of the Colgate University 1948 series of lectures on human relations, former Postmaster General James A. Farley staunchly defended the American two-party system.

With obvious reference to current political fireworks set off by Henry Wallace, he argued that a third party "can only promote minority rule and tend to leave the country the prey of demagogues and malcontents."

He has even less use for the one-party system as exemplified in Soviet Russia. A political party, he said, "should be the servant of its members, not the master * * * it should be open to all who wish to join it, not an exclusive society of assassins."

All this is sound common sense, in the best American tradition. Jim Farley has always been a very clean, plain spoken person and he was in good form at Hamilton.

It will be recalled that he broke with the late President Roosevelt and left Washington because he did not believe in violating the American two-term tradition and hence could not go along with the third-term movement. But he didn't organize a third party.

In his Colgate address, he remarked that politics is no place for a timid man or for the corrupt or dishonest. Every thoughtful American will say amen to that. In these parlous times, democratic America must have bold, brave, and honorable men, and many of them, if our free way of life is to survive.

Minnesota Towns Hit by Oil Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the St. Paul Dispatch:

MINNESOTA TOWNS HIT BY OIL SHORTAGE

All Minnesota communities with fuel-oil shortages have now been sent supplies except one, and that will have oil by tonight.

That report came from the office of James W. Clark, State fuel oil conservator, today when it was announced that continued warm weather had further relieved the shortage.

Clark said 231 towns in the State have now called for and received oil, all except Maple Plain, which will get supplies late today. The 231 towns in this State were compared with 108 in Wisconsin which had fuel-oil shortages. Clark said the figures prove that it was imperative for the State government to step in and try to organize relief.

Present supplies of oil-shortage towns do not mean that the critical situation is over, according to Clark. He said the towns now have oil but only the weather will decide how long they will last.

Joseph N. McIntyre, city conservator, said calls for fuel oil at his office have now fallen to 40 or 50 per day.

McIntyre said he plans to attend a meeting scheduled by the Northwest Petroleum Association at noon Friday in the Radisson Hotel, Minneapolis, at which plans will be made to inaugurate the new reconversion plan there.

Minneapolis residents who can't get fuel oil will be allotted 50 gallons. In return they must sign an affidavit that they will reconvert to other fuels. This plan has not been adopted in St. Paul. The city conservator said he plans to attend the meeting to learn what the oil companies will do for St. Paul.

International Falls closed down its emergency fuel oil office today and advised consumers to get fuel through their dealer.

At 10 a. m. the Minnesota Highway Department received the following reports from district stations:

Willmar: 1 below; winds 58 miles an hour; visibility, zero.

Crookston: 4 below; winds 45 miles an hour; 1 inch of new snow; no visibility.

Brainerd: 4 below; winds 45 miles an hour; 1 inch of new snow; visibility poor.

Morris: 8 below; winds 48 miles an hour; no visibility.

Duluth: 4 below; winds 35 miles an hour; sleet; highways icy.

Thief River Falls: 9 below; visibility zero; all schools closed.

In North Dakota the State highway department warned motorists not to attempt to travel in the eastern half of the State where many highways were reported blocked.

The weather bureau said the cold wave is headed eastward across the country and probably will extend to the Atlantic Coast by Saturday. It is expected to cover States as far south as Oklahoma and Arkansas.

The observers said the cold air mass is moving so rapidly that it may last only a few days, although present indications are that it will hang over the North Central States through Saturday, with a slight rise in temperature Sunday and Monday.

Louisiana Investigation, House Resolution 462

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this Congess appropriated the sum of $188,000,000 last year for the purpose of investigating income-tax cases. It appropriated an unusually large amount in order that the Treasury Department might have sufficient money, without stinting, for this purpose. The representation was made that if ample money was given additional men would be trained and put to work on this type of investigation. I am informed that men have been trained and are now at work in all parts of this country. They have this job to do and I think generally they are active and doing a creditable work.

This resolution would change this. It would bring to an investigating committee of the House this type of problem. It would create the precedent of passing separate resolutions to investigate individual cases. It would substitute untrained investigators for trained ones. It would place upon the already burdened shoulders of this Congress additional problems with the consequent additional harassment and irritations. It would, in my opinion, substitute politics for equity and justice. It is therefore a bad policy—and unfortunate precedent.

Someone may say that perhaps the Justice Department should be investigated, or it may be the Treasury Department is falling down on the job. Should it be felt that this is the case, I submit that H. Res. 462 is not the way to handle the job. A general investigation by the committee of the Department would not begin with the investigation of one tax return. On the contrary, it should begin with an investigation of the over-all procedure used by the Department, its efficiency, and its methods. It should, if this be the intent, check the qualifications of the personnel together with its background and its training. Nothing of this character is intended by the instant resolution.

This resolution came into being as a result of a great political campaign in Louisiana. Out of the heat of the campaign charges developed and they were brought to the floor of this House. They were picked up by the Appropriations Committee Treasury Department Subcommittee, and made the subject I am told of an hour-and-a-half hearing. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] interrogated Commissioner Schoeneman, chief of the Internal Revenue Bureau, for a long period of time. This testimony was taken in secret session; and although many requests have been made to inspect it, no one save the committee to this hour have been permitted to read those remarks taken down within the sanctum of the Subcommittee on Treasury. Upon the basis apparently of this secret record, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] makes speeches on this floor and statements referring to the secret testimony. This shows the unfairness of this type of procedure.

The normal way for handling income-tax violations is through the Treasury Department. In my judgment, we should not try to substitute for the work of the Treasury an investigating committee of the House of Representatives.

Endorsement by Episcopal Church of Civil Rights Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter which I have received from Mr. Allen M. Taylor, chairman, legislative committee, Department of Christian Social Relations, Diocese of Long Island, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

DEPARTMENT OF CHRISTIAN
SOCIAL RELATIONS,
DIOCESE OF LONG ISLAND,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

The Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At a recent meeting of this department, which represents the Episcopal Church of Long Island in these matters, it was decided to inform you of our endorsement of certain legislation currently pending before Congress and urge you to give it your support.

Full endorsement was given to the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, particularly the sections on antilynching, antipoll tax, a permanent Federal employment practices act; especially it is recommended that serious consideration be given to implementing section I, subsection 3, the Right to Freedom of Conscience and Expression.

Approval of the President's 10 points on inflation was given, especially the controls of consumer credit, commodity exchanges, rents, rationing, price and wage ceilings; a stand also was taken against reduction of income taxes.

It was recommended that the European recovery program be implemented promptly, in sufficient quantity, and regardless of the political set-up of the recipients.

Your support, also, is urged for the bill H. R. 2910, "to authorize the United States during an emergency period to undertake its fair share in the resettlement."

Also the bill H. R. 4418, "to provide for the naturalization of persons legally in the United States."

Our endorsement of the above is based, we believe, on the Christian principles of the worth of the individual, the security and welfare of all the people, and the peace of the world. As Christians, therefore, as well as Americans, we urge you, as our elected representative, to work for the passage of this legislation.

Respectfully,

ALLEN M. TAYLOR,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by Hon. Paul E. Fitzpatrick, chairman of the Democratic State Committee, in connection with a four-point program submitted to the New York State congressional delegation with reference to the lifting of the United States embargo against the shipment of arms to Jews in Palestine:

Support of the United Nations' partition of the Holy Land by lifting the United States embargo against the shipment of arms to Jews in Palestine is essential to world peace, Paul E. Fitzpatrick, chairman of the Democratic State Committee, declared today in a four-point program submitted to the New York State congressional delegation.

Such positive action, Mr. Fitzpatrick pointed out, would go far toward backing up President Truman's declaration February 12 that the United States is supporting the UN settlement, and would reinforce Secretary George C. Marshall's statement the day before that no change in our policy of support is contemplated.

Emphasizing that American troops are neither necessary nor desired, the New York State chairman strongly urged that the United States also support UN proposals for a voluntary police force, and clearly warn Great Britain against any "scuttling" of the partition.

His recommendations supplemented a proposed joint resolution introduced in the New York State Legislature Tuesday by the Democratic Party, calling on Congress to lift the arms embargo.

Mr. Fitzpatrick's complete statement follows:

"The New York State Democratic Committee is heartily in accord with President Truman's statement that the United States support the United Nations' settlement of the Palestine issue. We welcome the assurance from Secretary of State George C. Marshall that this Government contemplates no change in support of that decision.

"We are convinced that such support is essential to the future if not the very life of the United Nations as an instrument for the peaceful settlement of disputes. We also believe, however, that such support must be positive and real for those defending the United Nations' decision against aggressors who would ignore that decision and nullify it.

"We therefore respectfully but strongly recommend that the members of the New York State delegation in Congress actively support a program that would—

"1. Bolster the United Nations in this, its first important decision, lest its effectiveness for peace be destroyed.

"2. Lift the United States arms embargo so that Jews can defend the decisions of the United Nations within Palestine against Arab aggression.

"3. Inform the British Government clearly that this Government will not tolerate scuttling of the partition.

"4. Support proposals by the UN Palestine Commission made to the Security Council that a voluntary police force be sent into Palestine. It is not necessary to send United States forces, for Palestine does not want American troops.

"The New York State Democratic Committee sincerely believes that the above program is the only real way to back up President Truman and reinforce Secretary Marshall, in their aim to safeguard the United Nations and world peace."

Was Adam Irish?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include one of a series of statements prepared for American Brotherhood Week by Richard Ginder. The statements were released under the sponsorship of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

It is my belief that the spirit of brotherhood can only become a reality through the cooperation of all mankind.

WAS ADAM IRISH?
(By Richard Ginder)

You remember Adam, don't you? Eve's husband. The first of all men to walk the earth.

Was he Irish or Polish?—English or German?—black or white?

It's an interesting question, isn't it?

To tell the truth, the Bible doesn't say anything about his race or his nationality. Adam was a man. It makes that point very clear. He had a body and a soul especially created by the good God. And it was his soul that gave him his immense dignity. It made him a human being. It was the seat of his power to think and control his actions, to recall the past and imagine the future.

He gave the animals their names and ruled over them. Because of his human powers, he would always be able to throw a saddle over a horse, confident that the roles would never be reversed—that no horse would be able to get a saddle across his back.

Was he Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish? Adam wasn't any of these. The Jews didn't come into existence as a religious people until many thousands of years after Adam; and Christianity didn't develop until thousands of years after the days of Abraham. Not that Adam didn't worship God. No, indeed. He was a deeply religious man. He accepted God's revelation with simplicity, and although he sinned mightily against his Lord, there is a solid opinion that he repented that sin and that he is happy with God in heaven right now.

But why the talk about Adam? Because it is through him that we are literally made cousins. We are all kin one to another. We all have the same grandparents—maybe a great, great, great to the nth degree, but still, we're all members of the same human family.

Some of our cousins are Irish and some are Swedes; some are Syrian; some are Japanese. What of it? We'll never know, in this life, the color of Adam's complexion. The Bible is wisely silent on this point.

As for our religion, over here in America, at least, we're all divided up among Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. Whatever our creed, each of us is sincerely convinced that ours is the belief God wants us to follow. And we know that conscience, if we follow it, is going to lead us straight to God our Heavenly Father.

These considerations are presented in view of American Brotherhood Week extending from February 22 to 29. It's a time for renewing our convictions on the very real brotherhood of man through the blood of Adam and Eve, under the spiritual parenthood of the Almighty God in heaven.

Truth of National Service Life Insurance Surplus Should Be Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the National Underwriters, in its issue of February 20, carries an editorial which in substance states that President Harry S. Truman estimates the surplus of national service life insurance will reach $7,300,000,000 by June 30, 1949. I figured you and the public might be interested to know how this is being accomplished.

Bear in mind that the NSLI was organized to pay death claims resulting from war service. It was only these claims that the private insurance companies could not afford to pay. NSLI was given a "blank check" on the Federal Treasury for the purpose of keeping the company solvent. As far as life insurance agents and the public were concerned, that was all.

Now, it is revealed that the total claims attributable to war were not paid from this fund, but from the Federal Treasury in whole. Only deaths coverable by the private life insurance companies were charged to NSLI. This resulted in about $3,000,000,000 expense, so I am informed, charged to the Federal Treasury, which should have been charged to the NSLI fund.

In fairness to the taxpaying public and to the insurance fraternity, I would like to see that the Federal Treasury is reimbursed for the fake robbery that has occurred before NSLI is permitted to declare a surplus of any kind and distribute a dividend.

The life insurance men of the United States were the main supporters and backers of NSLI on the principles of its organization. The present accumulation of dividends and the tremendous amount of publicity on this subject make unrealistic and unfair results as compared to the present accomplishments of life insurance companies. The public has been led to believe that insurance sold by private companies could be much cheaper than it really is, if the companies were willing to forego profits. And this publicity comes from Government sources at the very time the private companies still do most of the contact work in connection with NSLI.

Mr. Speaker, the insurance men of this country—the companies, the agents, and the men who work on debits and earn their living by selling insurance—deserve better than they have been getting from Uncle Sam on the NSLI deal. The people ought to know the truth about how certain agencies have used double bookkeeping to make the public think that something is true that is not true at all. Congress ought to get to the bottom of this insurance mix-up and see to it that the people get the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

European Recovery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the European recovery plan, commonly known as the Marshall plan, will be considered soon by Congress. Senate bill 2202 has been reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an informal summary analysis of this bill. It was prepared by the Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery. This committee is composed of a broad, representative cross section of prominent Americans. The Honorable Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War, is the national chairman.

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF S. 2202, THE VANDENBERG-CONNALLY BILL

FEBRUARY 25, 1948.

1. ADMINISTRATION

The bill establishes an Economic Cooperation Administration headed by an Administrator of Cabinet rank who is in charge of the program. In Europe there is to be a special ECA mission in each country, reporting to the Administrator. The head of each such mission will rank immediately after our Ambassador or Minister, and will assure performance of ECA operations.

The Administrator and the Secretary of State are required to keep each other informed of current and prospective actions of mutual interest, both in the United States and abroad. Any disagreements that cannot be settled between them will be referred to the President for decision.

The bill also establishes a special representative with the rank of Ambassador to act as our representative at the continuing organization to be established by the participating countries. He may also be designated United States representative on the Economic Commission for Europe. He is to work in cooperation with the chiefs of the ECA missions.

The Administrator is responsible for determining whether aid shall be made available on a cash, credit, or grant basis, or in return for materials for stockpiling. In making these determinations, he is to act in consultation with the National Advisory Council, of which he is to be a member. The determinations are to be based on the character and purpose of the assistance, and on ability to pay. The administration of credits decided on by the Administrator is to be handled by the Export-Import Bank with funds allocated for the purpose by the Administrator.

The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Administrator, is responsible for negotiating the agreements provided for in the bill.

The bill provides for a bipartisan Public Advisory Board to advise the Administrator and also for a Joint Congressional Committee to make a continuous review of programs of United States economic assistance to foreign countries.

2. SCOPE, PERIOD, FINANCING

Countries eligible to participate include the 16 nations (with their dependent areas) which signed the Paris report plus any other European country (including the occupation zones and Trieste) that adheres to the joint recovery program.

The bill authorizes the continuance of the program to June 30, 1952. It authorizes an appropriation of $5,300,000,000 for the first year after enactment. It likewise authorizes an advance of $1,000,000,000 from the RFC to be repaid from appropriations.

Three billion dollars of the first appropriation are to be charged against the expenditures of the fiscal year 1948 even though expended during the fiscal year 1949.

3. COMMODITIES AND PROCUREMENT

The bill authorizes the Administrator to make available any commodity or service (except merchant vessels: see below) that is needed for the program.

The Administrator may furnish commodities procured by the United States Government or may make funds available to the participating countries or their agents to be used in making purchases from private suppliers, under approved supply programs.

Commodities or services may be procured either in the United States or elsewhere.

4. LOCAL CURRENCY

Under the bill the participating country will put into a special account the local currency equivalent of goods and services made available as a grant. Each agreement with a participating country must provide that the country will use these funds only in ways agreed to by the country and the Administrator. The disposition of the balance remaining on June 30, 1952, must be approved by Congress.

5. COOPERATION WITH UN AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES

In addition to the duties of the special representative (see above), the bill authorizes the Administrator, in the President's discretion, to perform his functions or any part of them "by acting in cooperation with the United Nations or with other international agencies." The President is also authorized to use the services and facilities of UN or its affiliated agencies, and to pay for such services from ECA funds. The President is to transmit copies of his reports to Congress to the Secretary General of UN and agreements are to be registered with UN as required by the charter.

6. BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL AGREEMENTS

Each participating country must agree to promote industrial and agricultural production, to establish sound currency and a valid rate of exchange, to cooperate in stimulating international trade, to make efficient use of all available resources, including assets of its nationals in the United States, to facilitate transfer of materials for stock-piling, to set up special local currency accounts, to publish reports on operations, and to furnish information.

7. PROTECTION OF THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY

In providing for procurement of commodities in the United States, the Administrator is to minimize the drain on United States resources and the impact on the domestic economy, and must avoid impairing the fulfillment of the vital needs of the people of the United States.

To the maximum practicable extent, petroleum is to be procured outside the United States, and the installation of petroleum-consuming equipment is to be discouraged, where alternative practices are feasible.

When long-supply United States agricultural commodities are being procured for transfer by grant, proportionate quantities of the various types of such commodities are to be procured, where practicable.

8. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

A. Strategic materials

The bill provides that the agreements with recipient countries should include the supplying of raw materials for stock piling by the United States, under reasonable agreed conditions. It also provides for the use of funds to enlarge productive facilities for such raw materials in the recipient countries for such purpose. It also provides that such materials may be applied in payment for aid.

B. Joint continuing organization

The Administrator is to encourage the joint continuing organization of the participating countries to establish a follow-up system to insure that each country is making efficient use of its resources.

C. Guaranty of private investments

The bill provides that up to 5 percent of the total funds appropriated may be used to guarantee the exchange convertibility of funds realized from investments made by United States investors in projects approved by the participating country and by the Administrator. The guaranty is limited to the amount of the investment and applies only to currency conversion, not to business losses.

D. Ships

The bill permits the Administrator, with the approval of the President, to put into operating condition not more than 300 surplus dry-cargo vessels, and to charter these ships to participating countries.

E. Termination of assistance

Assistance will be terminated if a country does not abide by its agreement (and if no other remedial action is feasible) or if, because of changed conditions, assistance is no longer consistent with the national interest of the United States.

NOTE

The Export-Import Bank is a United States Government corporation established "to aid in the financing and to facilitate exports and imports and the exchange of commodities between the United States * * * and any foreign country or the agencies or nationals thereof."

Its loans are supposed to offer reasonable assurance of repayment, and are repayable in dollars, with interest.

The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems was established by the Bretton Woods law. Its members include the Secretary of the Treasury (Chairman), Secretary of State, Secretary of Commerce, Chairman of the Board of the Export-Import Bank, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The function of the NAC is to coordinate all our foreign fiscal policies. The United States executive directors of the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund attend all meetings of the NAC.

The Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, housing for veterans, housing for war workers who are returning to their homes, housing for couples who have been living with their in-laws continue to be problems unsolved.

As a member of the Naval Affairs Congested Area Committee, I saw many war-housing projects developed and knew considerable about housing problems, so while there is a serious shortage of housing, I have been watching the disposal of some of these war-housing projects.

I visited Redbank Village when in Portland and talked with several members of the Redbank tenants' council so that I could get first-hand their reasons for wanting the sale of these houses postponed.

The Lanham Act was a wartime measure. It authorized housing and other projects that would help municipalities carry the burden arising from war production. This act calls for the disposal of temporary housing, but Redbank Village is of permanent construction and the houses are in excellent condition, so I asked the Federal Works Agency under what authority these are to be sold, and request that the reply of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency be inserted herewith.

Following Mr. Foley's letter is one received from Rev. Charles W. Crooker, chairman of the disposition committee, which is confirmation of my discussion with him. I believe this will be helpful to others interested in the proposed disposition of public war housing.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1948.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: I have your letter of January 20 requesting information as to the jurisdiction of the Redbank Village housing project in South Portland, Maine, in consideration of prospective disposition of the project.

Redbank Village was built as a permanent war housing project under the provisions of the Lanham Act, which covers both temporary and permanent war housing, and it is under the jurisdiction of this agency. I believe from your inquiry that you are particularly interested in the policy and procedure in effect in disposing of the permanent war housing projects, and I would like to take this opportunity to outline for you the circumstances upon which our policy for moving ahead with the sale of these projects is based.

Considerable attention was given, during the first session of the Congress last year, to the disposition of war housing. Hearings were held before both the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees. The House of Representatives passed H. R. 3492, a bill which would have made it mandatory to sell all the projects within a very short period of time, to give an absolute first preference to veterans in the disposition of the housing, to subdivide large projects into the smallest feasible units of sale, and to require that all sales be for cash. As a result of these hearings and of the passage by the House of H. R. 3492, it was our conclusion that our policies should conform with the wishes of Congress as expressed in these hearings and by the passage of the bill referred to.

While the Lanham Act, which is the basic legislation under which this housing was built, does not require disposition of the permanent housing within a given time limit, it does state in section 4 that it is the policy of the act that housing provided under it may be disposed of as expeditiously as possible. Subsequent amendments to this basic legislation as well as discussions with the congressional committees seem to indicate clearly that we should dispose of this housing just as rapidly as the resources and staff at our disposal will permit. Our revised policies are set forth in Public Regulations No. 1, copy of which is enclosed for your information.

We are attempting to proceed with the present policy of sales in as orderly a manner as possible and with the least disruption to present occupants. Because of wartime restrictions that were in effect at the time this housing was built, problems will arise in connection with its sale for private residential purposes which will delay disposition of many projects for varying periods of time. It is important, however, that we move ahead with sale of projects which do reach the stage where offerings can be made if we are to succeed in meeting a schedule of final disposition within a reasonable period of time.

The Redbank Village project is expected to reach the stage where sales offer may be made by late spring or early summer of this year. Before such offer is made, however, full opportunity will be afforded the community for discussions locally with public housing administration officials regarding the plans or problems affecting the sale, as required by Public Regulation No. 1. We have already been in touch with the South Portland Housing Authority in connection with the problems involved in the disposition of the Redbank Village project. Enclosed is a copy of our letter of January 2 to Mr. Frank Preti, chairman of the South Portland Housing Authority, on this matter. You will note that we have taken steps to assure full and proper consultation with the city government and the South Portland Housing Authority toward working out a plan of disposition for the Redbank Village project which will be in the best interests of all concerned.

Sincerely yours,
RAYMOND M. FOLEY,
Administrator.

SOUTH PORTLAND, MAINE,
January 27, 1948.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: At your request, the disposition committee of the Redbank Tenants' Council has asked me to send you the following facts which we hope will be useful to you.

1. Over-all housing picture in Portland area:

Among the 4 Government housing projects in the Portland area, 420 families moved out during the year 1947. Out of that number, only 67 moved because they had purchased homes of their own. I happen to know personally of several families who have bought well outside the city limits. One hundred and ninety-five of the 420 moved out because they were unable to pay their rent, were evicted, or had a change in employment which caused them to move.

Among the 759 applicants for admission to these projects during 1947, 390 gave as their reason for applying that they had been living with another family, were in overcrowded quarters, or were living in substandard housing; 129 of the 759 applicants had been evicted from their former residence because it had been sold to someone else. Since no one but veterans can be admitted to these projects, it is safe to assume that most of these applicants had first choice in buying the homes from which they were evicted, but were unable to make the purchase.

In Redbank, of the 500 resident families, 64 have no children at all, 188 have 1 child, 130 have 2 children, 56 families have 3 children, 41 families have 4 children. The other 21 families have 5, 6, or 7 children. To take this out of the realm of statistics, it is certain that by next year the number of families with 2 or less children will be substantially increased. In short, the overwhelming proportion of residents in Redbank are young veterans who are just starting their families. If they should be forced to move during the present shortage of housing, they would have extreme difficulty in finding a decent place in which to bring up their families.

Finally, a reasonable estimate of the average income of Redbank families is $2,000. I hope these figures give a fairly clear idea that the average veteran is not in a position to buy a home at the present time. I have little doubt but what most of the houses in Redbank could be purchased within a short time after being put up for sale. What disturbs me is that only the more fortunate financially would be able to purchase, while the average as represented by most of the present population would be left to scramble for what was left over. As a Christian minister, I am violently opposed to the attitude, "Let the common people take what's left."

2. The financial risk involved:

Although we have no figures to prove it, I think it is obvious that a large proportion of these young families are not settled or secure enough to be asked to take the risk of purchasing a home. If Redbank is offered for sale while the total housing picture is still chaotic, many of these families will buy in desperation and thereby jeopardize their financial future. In addition, several leading bankers have announced privately that the banks in this area have almost reached their limit in the amount of money they are able to loan veterans for the purchase of homes.

3. Constructive alternatives to immediate sales:

Redbank was designed to be and ought to be a pioneer type of community. It is laid out as a unit, with the streets running in more or less concentric circles around the community building, playground, and school as the focus. It has had since the early shipyard days an active and vigorous Tenants' Council, which supervises the use of the community building, sponsors recreational and cultural activities, and acts as representative for the tenants in all affairs which concern them. It is democracy at its best. In a community which has had to face the problem of a gigantic turnover of population, the tenants' council has kept Redbank from becoming just a place where you hang your hat and has helped maintain a real unity of spirit. Redbank is also a place where, by necessity, the neighbors must live in very close contact with one another. Every house contains two families, with the exception of the barracks, which contain four. If this village were sold piecemeal, the residents, instead of focussing their attention on those things which are for the welfare of the whole community, would be preoccupied in their own private interests. Finally, these houses are best adapted to those families in the relatively low income group. Yet it is just these people who will be least able to buy.

For a long time I have been interested in the idea of the residents of Redbank organizing into a mutual ownership corporation. As you perhaps know, this is a nonprofit organization in which the residents buy the whole community on a cooperative basis. By pooling their resources, they are able to have a far more satisfactory home than for the same amount of money elsewhere. The advantage of mutual housing is two-fold. First, it enables families in a low-income group to own their homes who otherwise could not. Second, it would perpetuate the unity and democracy that already exists. We are entering an age where we must learn to pool our resources for the common welfare or else end in chaos. What better way to pioneer that new age than by a group of average people pooling their resources so they can have more adequate housing?

Another constructive possibility for Redbank which would not break its unity is that of low-rent housing. If the time ever comes when Maine passes the necessary enabling legislation, the existence of Redbank would be a wonderful opportunity to destroy one substandard dwelling in this area for every housing unit in this village. People in the very lowest income group would have an opportunity to bring up their children in a wholesome environment.

4. Summary:

We are opposed to the sale of Redbank this spring (1) because it would create too great a hardship; (2) there are far better methods of disposal than merely a quick cash sale.

Finally, let me point out that since Redbank is a paying proposition from the Government point of view, the only loss caused by a delay would be a loss of the theoretical principle that the Government ought to get out of the housing business.

Sincerely yours,
Rev. CHARLES W. CROOKER,
Chairman, Disposition Committee.

Request for a Statement of Expenditures for Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday I sent the enclosed request to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, to the House and Senate members of the Foreign Affairs Committee on Appropriations.

Now that we are embarking on a continuing program of spending billions of dollars in Europe and Asia, we should at least know where this money is going and where we have spent our previous billions. I have read the report prepared by the Case committee on Germany, and I must frankly state that this report is poorly prepared, misleading as to facts, and in no way supplies the information that all of us are entitled to have. I hope that this information that I requested will be made available to the Members of Congress quickly. My request follows:

In order to give full and thorough consideration to the Marshall plan and to the program of European recovery, I believe that the following information should be made available to every Member of Congress:

1. Total American expenditures for occupying Germany since VE-day to comprise:

(a) The disease and unrest program;

(b) The purchases of food and raw materials bought in the United States and foreign countries;

(c) Expenditures incurred by the import-export program of the United States zone;

(d) Expenses incurred by the United States authorities in transporting and importing from foreign countries, of food and raw materials to Germany.

2. Total value of surplus materials turned over to the Germans by the United States since VE-day (original value and for how much it was sold).

3. Total value of credits granted by the various United States Government agencies to Germany since VE-day.

4. Total value of German exports, the proceeds of which are to be charged to our expenditures and credits in Germany since VE-day.

5. If American private loans and/or investments have been granted to Germany since VE-day, what is their approximate value?

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have before me an editorial that I have taken from the Harvard (Ill.) Herald of Thursday, January 22, 1948, which I am inserting in the RECORD.

You will note, sir, that the editor of the Harvard Herald fears that Members of Congress do not or may not read editorials such as this which appear in country weeklies. Indeed, but for the fact that my attention was especially directed to this editorial I, too, may have missed it. Mr. Speaker, now that I have read it, however, I commend it to you and to our colleagues for we shall soon be confronted with this problem in legislative form.

I think it is of more than passing interest to note that Harvard, Ill., is a thriving community of about 3,500 inhabitants and is known as the dairy capital of the United States.

VIEW OF MARSHALL PLAN

One of our newspaper magazines published in New York says that only 54 percent of this Nation's farmers know what the Marshall plan is. We'd say that's a pretty good percentage. If more than half the farmers in our Harvard area have taken the time to read and find out how the Government proposes to spend $17,000,000,000 in 4 years to try and put Europe on its feet, then we can express an opinion on a subject in which a good share of our readers are interested.

This is one of those country weekly editorials which we hope the Congressmen and other politicians will read. But they probably won't. Nevertheless, if we don't air our views, and this terrifically important plan becomes law, who can we blame first but ourselves? Timidity, after all, is democracy's most insidious evil. So we shall speak up, clearly, we hope, and to the point.

Thinking of our own country first, the outpouring of these billions will naturally make our present inflation worse. How can it possibly do otherwise? We have inflation now, and we don't like it. It is taking all our earnings, leaving little or no room for savings. And currently we are sending some $2,000,000,000 worth of aid to Europe and Asia annually. This deliberate act of charity is partly responsible for today's dollar-a-pound butter.

If we had any assurance that the Marshall plan would really be the answer, we might be inclined to risk further inflation. But we haven't. The $400,000,000 loan to Greece and Turkey is not restoring those tiny countries very fast. Greece still has its civil war. Turkey, if she appreciates the funds, hasn't bothered to inform us of her progress. And our three and one-half billion loan to Great Britain, what of that?

The Marshall plan means 4 years of charity; 4 years of delay in the restoration of Europe's character. There is surely a better, more direct way of getting food to the starving Germans and Hungarians than this grandiose scheme. We say, let's beat down this proposal and ask for a saner one.

Civil Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Membership of the House a timely editorial entitled "South No Longer in Bag for Truman," which appeared in the Jackson Sun on February 26, 1948, a fine newspaper published in my home city of Jackson, Tenn.

This splendid paper has always loyally and actively supported all democratic nominees and is intensely interested in the principles, traditions, and success of the Democratic Party. The editorial in question ends with the paragraph:

If Truman persists in clinging to his civil-rights program, it will be useless, we think, for him to campaign for the electoral votes in the South.

I believe that the Democratic national leaders must now realize that the revolt or the resentment in the South over President Truman's civil-rights program is quite serious. At first some of our leaders were saying that the revolt would soon die down in the South since only a few "hot-headed southerners were getting off a little steam," and that the opposition in the South would soon cease.

In the interest of party harmony and success I hope that President Truman will not be a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President at the National Democratic Convention to be held in Philadelphia next July, and that the convention will nominate for President either Senator Harry Byrd, Secretary of State George Marshall, Chief Justice Fred Vinson of the United States Supreme Court, or Senator Millard Tydings.

The editorial in the Jackson Sun is as follows:

SOUTH NO LONGER IN BAG FOR TRUMAN

A delegation of southern governors, incensed over President Truman's civil-rights declaration, his intention to try to get the 10 points enacted into law, and his avowed purpose of seeing them written into the Democratic platform at the national convention this year, called upon Senator MCGRATH, of Rhode Island, chairman of the National Democratic Executive Committee, with a view

of getting retraction, but met with dismal failure.

Whereupon these Democratic governors from the South gave expression to the following sentiments:

"We feel we are expressing the firm conviction of our people when we say that the present leadership of the Democratic Party has deserted the principles of government upon which the Democratic Party was founded."

This statement represents the studied sentiments of accredited representatives of the Southern Governors Conference recently held at Tallahassee, Fla. It represents an open split on the part of a representative group from the South speaking with real authority. It is a declaration that the solid South is no longer in the bag for Truman.

When the governors of these Democratic States describe the party leadership as unfit and as a violation of the traditional party principles, the declarations cannot be dismissed as mere twaddle.

If Truman persists in clinging to his civil-rights program, it will be useless, we think, for him to campaign for the electoral votes in the South.

Presentation of Air Force Association Medal to Irving W. C. Hamlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 14, 1948, an incident occurred which to my way of thinking brought signal honor to Lancaster, Ohio, which is the county seat of Fairfield County, which is one of the five counties comprising the Eleventh Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. On that day Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the United States Air Force, visited Ohio University at Athens, Ohio, where he addressed the advanced air corps and other ROTC students as well as faculty members and the general public.

The high light of Mr. Zuckert's visit was the presenting of the Air Force Association Medal to the most outstanding Air ROTC student at the university. This is where Lancaster, Ohio, figures into the proceedings. It so happens that living in Lancaster and attending Ohio University is a young man 23 years of age by the name of Irving W. C. Hamlin, who was the recipient of that valued medal. Mr. Hamlin is a graduate of the Lancaster High School and was attending Dennison University at the time of his entry into the armed services in July 1943. He served as a rifleman in the Seventy-first and Twenty-ninth Infantry Divisions, and was a private first class on his discharge in December of 1945. He will graduate in June from the university and plans to remain in the Air Force after graduation and make it his life's work.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that so long as men like Mr. Hamlin, who have come up through the ranks and without any pull or special favor, arrive at the heights to which this young man has arrived by sheer ability, that those of us who are so dependent upon our American youth can relax with assurance that the future of America will be in good hands.

I offer my congratulations to Irving as well as to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Horace J. Hamlin, on their good fortune in having such a distinguished son.

Universal Training as Nation's Great Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article I wrote which appeared in the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Eagle on February 29, 1948:

UNIVERSAL TRAINING AS NATION'S GREAT NECESSITY

After the report and the recommendations of the President's Advisory Commission on universal training many bills were introduced in Congress. The one receiving most discussion is that on the Union Calendar in the House, known as H. R. 4278, entitled "The National Security Training Act."

At the present time it seems unlikely that the bill will be brought before the House for action at this session. That being so, some people may say that we can postpone discussion of this proposed law. It is my thought that the discussion, at least about the principle involved in the law, should be encouraged now in order that public opinion may be carefully formulated. In this article I do not intend to discuss the various details by which the principle is to be effectuated. There will always be a difference of opinion as to what is the best method of effectuating a particular plan, even by the supporters thereof. The details can be worked out later. The important thing to do first is to determine upon the principle. In order to arrive at a proper conclusion it is important that we first understand the subject.

On December 19, 1946, President Truman appointed the Advisory Commission on Universal Training, and on December 20, 1946, said to the members of the Commission:

"I want our young people to be informed on what this Government is—what it stands for—its responsibilities. And I think the best way to do this is through a universal training program. I don't like to think of it as a universal military training program. I want it to be a universal training program, giving our young people a background in the disciplinary approach of getting along with one another, informing them of their physical make-up, and what it means to take care of this temple which God gave us. If we get that instilled into them, and then instill into them a responsibility which begins in the township, in the city ward, the first thing you know we will have sold our Republic to the coming generations as Madison and Hamilton and Jefferson sold it in the first place.

"Then go outside the executive branch and talk to leaders in the House and Senate. I want you to be known as the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training. I want that word 'military' left out. The military phase is incidental to what I have in mind."

CONCERN FOR SECUAITY

When the Commission unanimously reported to the President under date of May 29, 1947, it said, in part, as follows:

"In your original charge to us, and in subsequent discussion with you, it was clear that your concern for the security of our country penetrates beyond the aspects of military organization into those deeper attributes of character and physical and mental fitness which must be the basis of effective service by the citizen to his country.

"Universal training cannot be evaluated except in its relation to, and its effect upon many other activities. Hence, with your approval, we have considered international, economic, educational, medical, and religious implications. We have envisaged possible types and risks of future war; and have studied the various requirements of military strategy to avoid these risks if possible and to overcome them if necessary. We have sought and secured information, ideas, advice, and criticism from individuals and organizations of many types and interests, and have given most serious consideration to all the problems involved.

"Out of these studies we have come to a clear, unanimous, and strong conviction about the course which our country should follow in respect to universal training in the foreseeable future. We recommend this course as a wise and prudent investment in American security, liberty, and prosperity."

Universal military training has been urged upon our country many times in the past, and by leaders whose sincerity of purpose was beyond dispute. Among them, history tells us, were George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, and James Monroe. Present-day leaders in political life, regardless of party affiliation, have also taken a firm stand in favor of a universal training program. It is not a political issue. I trust it will never become one.

Not the least of those who have taken a position in favor of universal military training are former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, present Secretary of State George C. Marshall, former General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John Foster Dulles.

SETS FORTH PURPOSES

The Committee on Armed Services, in reporting the bill referred to above, sets forth its purposes as follows:

"The purpose of this bill is to provide for the common defense by requiring all young men between the ages of 18 and 20 to undergo a period of training which will fit them to contribute to the protection of the country in time of emergency.

"The young men liable for training under the terms of this bill, although they shall be legally deemed to have military status, shall not be members of the armed forces, shall be subject to no duty other than training, and shall be liable to bear arms for the United States only in the event of a national emergency so declared by Congress and the President, and by the enactment of a new conscription act. They shall not be subject to the Articles of War, nor to the Articles for the Government of the Navy, but to a special disciplinary code as outlined below in this report."

It is my feeling that most persons who are opposed to universal training as presently proposed would soon become earnest supporters of the program if they took the time to read and analyze the report of the President's Advisory Commission, which, incidentally, is on sale by the Superintendent of Documents, at the United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., for 75 cents. The Commission heard witnesses for and against the program. It gave as careful and as full consideration to the opponents as to the proponents. No phase of the problem has been overlooked.

My own position in favor of the early enactment of the program is based not upon emotion reactions but upon fact and upon reason.

ANTICIPATES MUCH MAIL

I have no doubt that immediately after the publication of this article I will receive much mail, urging me to change my position. I hope that those who take the time to write me on the subject will at least first acquaint themselves with the full contents of the report and of the proposed legislation, and then, after having done that, I hope they will not simply say to me that they are against the program, but that they will set forth their reasons.

The subject is one about which either side can easily get emotional and oratorical and end up with flag waving. People who approach the problem that way do not do justice to either side.

I am just as anxious as every other good American that world-wide peace be made the order of the day, that war be banished from the earth.

I am certain that the United States will never be an aggressor nation. I am just as firmly convinced, however, that the same cannot be said of Soviet Russia. It matters not whether you refer to Soviet Russia's policy as defensive aggression or just plain aggression. The fact is that she is gobbling up Europe as fast as possible, peacefully when the people succumb without fighting back, and at the point of a bayonet when they attempt to resist.

Despite that, our country alone and through the United Nations is ready and willing at any time to sit down around the conference table with Russia in an effort to bring about world disarmament. Only one who utterly ignores the facts, however, will think for 1 minute that Russia would ever agree to such a plan. She is armed to the teeth today and will continue to be so armed, not because she is afraid of attack from the outside, but because her leaders are imbued with the insatiable desire to conquer the world. In Soviet Russia every man, woman, and child from 16 to 50 is subject to the most rigorous military training program, every person being fitted into a niche, whether they like it or not, where their every daily effort is utilized to support the totalitarian dictatorship and its world-wide aims. That is the danger that we face. That is the danger that we must prepare against.

HAS NO SUBSTITUTE

Of those who oppose universal military training I ask the question: "What will you substitute in its place so that these United States may remain so strong that no country will dare attack us?"

To those who say the next war will be an atomic war, against which that is no defense, I say we must leave that to the scientists and military experts. We must at least give those working with the civilian authorities, placed in charge of the proposed universal training program, the opportunity to train our youth in that defense. There is nothing in the proposed program which intends to teach our youth that by learning to march they will be able to defend our country. It will be a modern program, teaching modern methods.

To those who say it will regiment our youth and take them away from religious beliefs and concepts, I say that the program encompasses the moral and religious aspects of training and may bring forth a more religious youth, rather than a less religious youth. It is well to note here that more than 50 percent of our American population are not affiliated with any church or synagogue. More youths in the armed services of our country attended religious services than civilian youths. Under the proposed program even those with no religious affiliation will at least be submitted to good moral training.

WOULD NOT DEPRIVE OTHERS

To those who argue that a universal training program will be expensive and that, instead of spending the money for that purpose we should spend it for education, health, housing, unemployment insurance, social security, and any or all of the other social services and welfare projects that a great democracy should foster, the obvious answer is: Not one penny must be taken from any of those programs for universal training. At the same time we must assume the additional burden of universal training. The universal-training program is not intended as a substitute for any other program, or for part of any other program. It is a supplement to all of them. It is not urged as a cure-all, but as a necessary incident and as but a part of an over-all national security program.

To those who say, Let us rely on the United Nations for world peace, I say, when the United Nations is so constituted that no country can exercise a veto power and that all countries will submit in a democratic way to decisions of the United Nations, arrived at in a democratic way, and when the United Nations is implemented with a police force sufficient to prevent aggression by any and all nations, then we can disband our program for universal training.

Let me conclude with the following quotation from the last paragraph of the report of the President's Commission:

"We recommend the adoption of universal training because we are convinced that weakness on our part not only involves our country in grave risks but also weakens the United Nations, on which rest our hopes for lasting peace. A weak and irresolute America is an invitation to failure. A strong and resolute America is the best guaranty for our safety and for the success of the United Nations."

Poem by Former Lt. Sidney B. Gault

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the following beautiful and inspiring poem which appeared in the 1948 January issue of the United States Air Services magazine. This poem was written by a young man, former Lt. Sidney B. Gault, of the Air Forces, whose home is in Spartanburg, S. C. I take pleasure in submitting these inspiring words for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FROM HIGH ATOP THE SPIRES OF SPACE

From high atop the spires of space I've seen
The murky dawn give way to morning's birth.
I've watched the fingers of the sun stretch out
To rouse from lethargy the sleeping earth.
I've sailed my ship on silvery wings above
The vast expanse where men and beast belong,
And, hovering there in calm serenity,
I've heard angelic choirs burst forth in song.
At night, in shimmering moonlight, I have soared
Above the overcast that hides earth's face;
And frolicked o'er its fluffy blanket top
To dance and skip across its downy lace.
I've scaled, with ease, the breathless slopes of air
To poise, in peace, above the burnished sod;
And wondered why the foolish rushing throng
Paused not to heed the handiwork of God.
—*Sidney B. Gault.*

Mr. Marshall, How About Those Planes for China?—Congress Is Entitled To Have the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last week the press of the country carried a startling story to the effect that the United States had been sending bombers and fighters to China under a secret agreement. This morning, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Honorable William C. Bullitt, formerly Ambassador to Moscow, testified that such was not the fact. The Times-Herald, in a feature article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, likewise questions the statement by Mr. Marshall and indicates just what has transpired so far as planes to China are concerned. Under permission to extend my remarks I include the article by Mr. Waldrop which appeared in this morning's Times-Herald:

CHINA'S PLANES
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Either Air Force Secretary Symington or State Secretary Marshall is trying to kid the public. Maybe they're in it together.

In any case it is a dirty, defenseless trick and here's hoping somebody in Congress has the courage to call the pair of them to the witness stand for an explanation.

Perhaps you saw a United Press story headlined in last Saturday's Times-Herald, thus: "United States bombers, fighters sent to China."

That headline and the story following were utterly misleading, utterly unjustified, utterly false in emphasis, though neither the United Press nor this newspaper had any way of knowing that to be the case at the time.

Frankly, the reading public is entitled to know that the UP and not only this but the newspapers of the country, generally, were by that story made the victims of a shabby piece of misdirection. The true emphasis would have had to say aid to China has been stopped, not begun. Here is a chronological history of the actual case:

1. Back in December 1945, Mr. Truman and T. V. Soong, for China, came to a general agreement that the United States would furnish air aid to Chiang Kai-shek.

2. On the basis of that agreement, our air experts worked out a deal to equip Chinese with eight and one-third air groups, consisting of 1,071 combat planes, plus spare and replacement parts, ammunition, and so forth. Marshall himself approved the final form of the agreement jointly with Chiang, while Marshall was in Nanking on the President's mission of supposed aid to China.

3. In August 1946, Secretary Marshall ordered the sending of further equipment under that agreement to be stopped.

It was stopped. It has never been resumed. Thus, the commitment by the President of the United States of December 1945 was broken.

Congress ought to find out why.

As to the details of execution of the agreement up to the time Marshall ordered it broken, here are further facts:

We promised the Chinese 1,071 planes, plus parts and ammunitions. We delivered them 158 planes which would not fly. We delivered them 304 planes that would fly but for which we furnished no spare parts or replacements. We earmarked 135 more planes but did not actually deliver them. We counted in still more planes that had been given to China in the course of the war with Japan and were no longer serviceable.

And there the contract stopped. No further allocations of planes. No deliveries of spare parts or ammunition at all.

To keep aloft those few planes which could be flown, the Chinese have had to cannibalize their meager air force, that is, take parts off one plane to equip another.

The over-all deal, as such, has never been executed.

General Marshall's attitude toward China is undoubtedly the most peculiar feature of his record in public office, to date.

The recognized government of China is that of Chiang Kai-shek. We recognized it years and years ago. This recognized government, with which we have long since exchanged ambassadors, has been at war with the Communists from the day it started, something more than a generation ago.

In between, it fought a war with Japan into which we were finally drawn and in which we delivered the victory. But the war with communism has kept right on going.

To help the Communists, Russia gave Chiang's enemies vast stores of Japanese weapons and equipment captured during Russia's brief and phony war with the already defeated Japs.

Obviously, if we cared at all about keeping China out of Russian hands, our cue was then and there to give Chiang the kind of help he needed, namely, weapons and not kicks in the teeth.

But General Marshall, as head of a special mission to China, let himself be influenced to give Chiang a kick in the teeth because Chiang would not surrender any part of his country's sovereignty to Russia.

It would be interesting to know who influenced Marshall to make that fatal boner, as now all the world knows it to have been.

No man on earth can square Marshall's attitude on China with common sense, in view of his attitude on Europe.

In Europe, he asks the American taxpayers to spend seventeen thousand million dollars, plus, to keep the Reds from conquering any more territory.

In China, he asks the only government we recognize, to surrender to the Reds and let them help govern, which is merely opening the gates wide to Stalin and everybody knows it.

Who led Marshall into that trap? How did the great military man come to make that boner? Why has he let this fake story of air-power aid to Chiang go unexplained?

Congress should find out.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that the text of a radio address I broadcast over Wisconsin stations be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The St. Lawrence seaway battle continues, in spite of the recommittal of the bill to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on February 27, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY BATTLE GOES ON

Fellow citizens of Wisconsin, the battle for the St. Lawrence seaway will go on.

The seaway suffered only a temporary setback in the Senate on February 27, when, by a vote of 57 to 30, it was decided to recommit the resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee for further study.

This vote followed many days of intensive debate which explored all the phases of this bill. It was my pleasure and privilege to manage this nonpartisan resolution on the floor of the Senate. It had previously been my responsibility to serve as chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee which held hearings on the resolution and which reported it favorably to the full committee.

WISCONSIN'S ENDORSEMENT OF SEAWAY

I wish that each of my listeners might have been with us during the hearings, during the discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor of the Senate as this great project—so vital in the national interest—was discussed. I know, however, from the many fine communications from all over our State, that the people of Wisconsin followed this issue with the closest and keenest attention.

I am grateful for all the magnificent letters and wires which poured into my office before, during, and after the debate. Wisconsin rallied virtually unanimously behind this important objective. Farm groups, labor unions, businessmen's clubs, associations of commerce, mayors, county supervisors, the Great Lakes Harbors Association, the Deep Waterways Commission, and countless other individuals and leading organizations wrote and telegraphed me. They expressed the almost unanimous conviction of our State that this great project is necessary for the national welfare.

OUR PURPOSE TODAY

It is not my purpose at this time to review in detail the record of the seaway battle, because you are familiar with it. "What is past is but the prologue" anyway. I do want to discuss some of the brief high lights of our effort and then to submit a suggested answer to the big question, "Where do we go from here?"

OUR ACCEPTANCE OF RECOMMITTAL MOTION

First, it should be said that we accept the recommittal vote without rancor and without bitterness. We fought as hard as we could for this objective, but now that the decision has been reached, we accept it, although only as a temporary set-back. "Truth crushed to earth will rise again." The forces of progress, though temporarily halted, are irresistible, and move ever forward.

SEAWAY REQUIRED FOR NATIONAL INTEREST

Throughout the seaway debate, it was my purpose to point out that this great project is necessary in the national interest, for national defense, for national economic benefits to agriculture, business and labor, for the development of 2,200,000 horsepower of needed electrical energy. I stated that what the Senate needed and what all America needs was the vision, without which we are told, "a people perish," the vision to see that this project is needed now and for the future. It is needed today to handle the expanding needs of our Nation of 145,000,000 people, and will be needed even more in the future when America will have 160,000,000 and then 200,000,000 people.

History will render the final verdict on the decision of the Senate to recommit the resolution. I hope that history will not be too harsh in its judgment of the men who unfortunately voted to defer this project.

You and I know that the St. Lawrence seaway is the largest single untapped natural resource left on the North American Continent. We know that no man ever progressed who did not use the talents the good Lord gave him. No nation ever prospered which did not use its natural resources, its coal, its iron, its minerals, its oil, and its great rivers. Now that the Mesabi iron range is nearing depletion, because of the tremendous amounts of ore we have extracted from it, we felt that it was urgent that the seaway resolution pass, so that through this great natural artery, we could import Labrador ores to maintain our midwestern steel industry at its present location.

MIDWEST DESPERATELY NEEDS SEAWAY

It was pointed out in the debate that the 50,000,000 people of the land-locked inland empire of America desperately need this seaway. The economic health of the Middle West, the bread basket of America, requires this seaway. We of the Middle West have given unselfishly of our resources to the Nation. We of the Middle West have voted for projects which we felt were vital to the economic health of other regions. But, unfortunately, when it came to voting as a loan the sum of $720,000,000—the combined United States and Canadian cost for both the seaway and the power project—other sections of our Nation were less willing than we had been, to build a vital project, a self-liquidating project.

EXCUSES AND PHONY THINKING AGAINST SEAWAY

Throughout the debate, I am frank to say, every sort of excuse and smoke screen was devised to postpone the resolution. We heard fear expressed on the floor of the Senate, the fear of the eastern ports, the fear expressed by representatives of other means of transportation that the seaway would hurt them. To answer this fear, we tried to implant faith—faith in our country, faith in our future to prove that not only would this seaway not hurt present economic interests, but that it would contribute to their economic health.

We heard synthetic thinking, questioning the mass of documents supporting the seaway—questioning the costs, the channel depths, the constitutionality and countless other features which had been proved and proved again in the past.

We have no regrets for what we did. We fought for hour after hour, day after day on the floor of the Senate, contesting the claims of the opposition. My colleague, Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, and I spoke over the radio on behalf of the seaway. We prepared statements for the press to spread truth and light on this long-debate issue. We were in continuous contact with Federal agencies and private organizations and individuals to mobilize the facts.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Now that the seaway resolution has been recommitted, the question remains—"where do we go from here?" What does the future hold for the St. Lawrence seaway?

You and I have no crystal ball, but we can foresee something of the future.

It is a fact that the St. Lawrence seaway resolution cannot be revived in the Eightieth Congress. However, we are not going to lose any time in crying over spilt milk meanwhile. Looking toward the future, we are going to mobilize still more facts from the finest authorities in the land, from the United States Corps of Engineers, from the Department of Commerce, from the United States Maritime Commission, the State Department, from business, labor, and farm groups. We are considering the possibility of asking for the establishment of a special Presidential commission impartially and objectively to study this project in the light of our current and future needs.

SEVERE OPPOSITION STILL EXPECTED

But we know the battle will not be an easy one. The opposition is not going to be easily convinced. I respect the sincerity and the integrity of my colleagues, but as I have candidly stated to them on the floor of the Senate, there are unfortunately some who have "eyes to see but do not see, and ears to hear but do not hear."

In 1949, the grounds for their opposition will undoubtedly have changed somewhat, as they have in the past. The opponents will have new arguments against the seaway. Just because we have accumulated more facts, they are not going to be won over automatically. You and I know that if we mobilize all the literature that has already been developed on the seaway, it would fill a warehouse. But even if we have five warehouses full of facts, it probably could not convince an opponent whose judgment had been foreclosed.

FAITH IN CONGRESS' ULTIMATE VOTE FOR SEAWAY

But we have sufficient faith in the intelligence, in the reason, in the understanding of the Members of the United States Congress and of the American public that when they are presented with the true facts of the situation, they will accept this project as being necessary in the national interest.

WHAT MIDWEST WANTS

Just what do we of the Midwest want?

1. We want to continue to grow in population and in economic health.

2. We of the Middle West do not want to see idle factories, lines of jobless men developing, because the Middle West is placed at an economic disadvantage in this highly competitive age as compared with the advantages enjoyed by the eastern and Pacific seaboards.

3. We of the Middle West do not want to see America finding herself, in the event of some future national emergency, unprepared, lacking adequate shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities, such as could be enjoyed through the seaway. We do not want to see our beloved America critically short of sufficient electrical energy to produce modern implements of defense and to support every industry.

All of the signs, however, point to these unfortunate results—idle factories, unpreparedness—unless we of this generation demonstrate the vision to prevent them by building the seaway.

WHAT CAN WE DO FOR SEAWAY?

Now, what can you and I do to help bring the seaway into completion?

The first and most important thing, I feel, is not to become discouraged over this setback and the previous reverses which we have suffered. Throughout the history of human progress, pioneers have always temporarily suffered the taunts and the set-backs by men who lacked vision.

But the pioneers who built this great country had faith in themselves and in the future—the faith that, we are told, moves mountains. The men who built the Suez Canal, the Panama Canal, who pioneered with the automobile, the steam engine, the railroads, the airplane—these men and women would not admit defeat. They would not give power to defeat by accepting it, and therefore they triumphed. So, too, we shall triumph because progress, although stayed, can never be defeated.

OUR MISSIONARY JOB TO PROMOTE SEAWAY

But you and I each have a missionary job also. It is up to us to think, talk, and act for the St. Lawrence seaway, not only in our own State, among those who may still be unconvinced on the facts, but in all sections of the Union. Each of us has colleagues, friends, business and other acquaintances, relatives in other States of the Union. Each of us should take it upon himself or herself to conduct a constant educational campaign to present the facts in this matter, to point out the fact that it is to the economic self-interest, not only of Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, the Dakotas, but of the people of all the 48 States, to enact this resolution.

We believe in our cause and we are reminded of a familiar verse:

"Then conquer we must,
When our cause it is just.
And this be our motto,
In God is our trust."

CONCLUSIONS

Wisconsin this year celebrates the centennial of its admission into the Union. We had hoped that the St. Lawrence seaway might have been begun in this, the opening year, of Wisconsin's second century of statehood. The seaway will have a wonderful impact on every last community and hamlet of our State, on every citizen, every group—accelerating progress, increasing prosperity.

Our hopes, our dreams, our faith will yet be fulfilled. The battle for the St. Lawrence seaway goes on. We are not discouraged, we are not defeated. We are in this fight until victory is finally achieved.

Stand united, stand with faith, my fellow citizens and this magnificent 2,300-mile artery will yet be constructed.

Justice and truth shall prevail. Forward, Wisconsin. Forward, America.

The Partition of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address which I delivered before a rally of the American Emergency Zionist Council, at the Manhattan Center, New York City, N. Y., on March 1, 1948, concerning America's obligation to support United Nations' decision to partition Palestine.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The problem before the United Nations is crystal clear. Shall its decisions be honored and carried out—particularly by member nations—or shall they be ignored as "scraps of paper," again by member nations?

Similarly, the problem before the United States is equally clear. Shall it use its great influence to strengthen the United Nations, particularly in reference to such decisions as it took the initiative to make, or shall it use its influence in undermining the authority of the United Nations and thus hasten its complete disintegration?

Any action suggested or any suggestion made which can cause a deviation from this clear policy which has been ours in relation to the United Nations and which policy has been in the minds and hearts of the American people for years should be considered contrary to America's well-being.

It is all right to have committees to investigate, committees to follow up, and committees to report, but never should any committee be considered as a medium for deciding a reversal of policy once that policy has been decided and has become accepted by the vote of other nations. For America to recommend anything contrary to decisions made when other nations have agreed is a step toward a reversal of an international agreement. That step should not be a one-sided action.

America has both officially and sentimentally stood so long for the restoration of Jerusalem and the return of the Jews to Palestine that that policy cannot be given up without shocking the conscience of all of our people. America's ideological fight, running over 150 years, has been a fight which has said that democracy has a right to be in the world and that democratic ideals must be respected. We have built our whole theory around the Monroe Doctrine which has now evolved into the notion of unity in our hemisphere for defense purposes, based on the idea and with the ideal that imperialism is a thing of the past, that colonialism is bad, that people have a right to be independent and a right to work out their own destinies without hindrance from the outside. Therefore, America has stood for the policy of protection for small states and she has accepted the theory that is basic in international law, that states, no matter what their size, have equality in the sisterhood of nations. We assumed that when the ideal of a mandate was set up that the first duty of the state which held the mandatory power was to administer affairs within the mandate so that it could become capable of an independent existence. Logically and ideologically, therefore, America should stand for the decisions which have been made throughout the years in regard to Palestine. The big question is not whether the Jewish national state shall be set up now. It is, Shall we go back upon our pledged word and a decision made in accordance with the machinery which we have pledged ourselves to support?

The American people know that if we are to sustain international law, deliberation before action, and respect for promises made and covenants entered into, they must sustain the action of any institution set up to operate in accordance with the theories of a peaceful process.

The final analysis of a peaceful process always results in a compromise on the theory that compromise is better than the alternative. This still leaves room for future struggle for right and change. But to let opportunity after opportunity go by to make strong the deliberative action is a mistake.

The United Nations has acted in regard to the Palestinian question. Their action

was, of course, a compromise. Neither side had its absolute way. But it did afford a new start for peaceful institutional building and the age-old striving for a national home for the Jews saw the light. All forces the United States has should now be used to unite with all of the nations that supported it in the United Nations decision to maintain that decision for the sake of a future world organization.

A Jewish national state is an insignificant thing, indeed, compared to the proper functioning of a world organization. To go back on the Jewish national state merely retards for the time being the inevitable. But to turn our backs on world-wide action and the pledged word of the nations of the earth in formal deliberation may destroy all the progress we have made toward world organization and the peaceful settlement of disputes for generations. If man loses faith, now, in nations' ability to cooperate with each other to make decisions and to stand by those decisions, when will we have a chance again to move forward toward what has been the desire not only of nations but the prayer of the people of the world since the concept of progress dawned on man?

America must marshal those nations which voted to support the United Nations decisions. There is no retreating from that stand. We cannot afford in this generation a Corfu affair which destroyed the hopes of the last generation.

We hear echoed on all sides that if we do not give aid to Europe democracy is at stake, I say, if America and the nations of the world do not stand by their pledged word, world organization is at stake. And without world organization, democracy ultimately may fail because democracy rests upon the peaceful process and so does world organization.

Palestine, United States, and Security Council: What Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an address delivered last evening by Dr. Israel Goldstein, chairman, World Confederation of General Zionists, and chairman, United Palestine Appeal, speaking before the Palaver Club, of Washington, D. C., and also remarks I made in presenting Dr. Goldstein to this group.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is my rare privilege this evening to present as our speaker one of the outstanding Jewish leaders in the entire world and a truly great world citizen, Dr. Goldstein graduated from the Jewish Theological Seminary in 1918 and received the degree of doctor of Hebrew literature from the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in 1927. In 1945 he was awarded a doctor of divinity degree. He is at the present time an able leader of numerous organizations. He serves as chairman of the United Palestine Appeal, co-chairman of the United Jewish Appeal, chairman of the World Confederation of General Zionists, and president of the Jewish Conciliation Board of America. He is the former co-chairman of the Commission on Religious Organizations of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and a former president of the Zionist Organization of America. He is the public representative on the Committee of the United States Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division, on Meat, Poultry, and Dairy Industry.

He is the former president of the Synagogue Council of America, a former chairman of the Jewish section of the Interfaith Committee for Aid to the Democracies.

In his honor the British War Relief Society has established the Dr. Israel Goldstein Children's Nursing Home in England. On the occasion of his fiftieth birthday in 1945, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America established in his honor the Dr. Israel Goldstein lectureship.

The Dr. Israel Goldstein Children's Home in Lyons, France, has been dedicated in his honor. In Palestine a large tract of land has been named for him by the Jewish National Fund of America. He is the author of two books, a Century of Judaism in New York, a very scholarly work published in 1930; and Towards a Solution, published in 1940. He is a contributor to Encyclopaedia Britannica and to the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia.

Today, Palestine is the most serious trouble spot in the entire world. I believe that our speaker this evening is better equipped to discuss the interest of the Jewish people and the interest of the United States in the peaceful solution of the Palestine problem than any other American. I therefore take pride and pleasure in presenting Dr. Goldstein.

Dr. GOLDSTEIN. Was November 29 a fool's paradise? I do not think so.

No Jew felt then that the Jewish people got all it was entitled to get from the UN. The area allotted to the Jewish state was whittled down to one-eighth of what had been contemplated by the Balfour Declaration. But it was a sacrifice which the Jewish people felt was worth making because it was the final compromise and it was worth making, because it was final, because it was a settlement at last, because it meant that in that area, small as it is, there would be at last a Jewish state so that in the future no alien hand could bar any Jew from his homeland, and so that the Jewish people, after 19 centuries of abnormality, would have at last a place, a voice, a name in the councils of the nations.

No one expected that the Arabs would meekly submit to the November 29 vote. It was anticipated that the Arab League would try to make trouble, but it was also anticipated that the Arab states would be slapped down at the first attempt to sabotage the decision of the UN, slapped down by stern warnings from the great powers, especially from the United States, and sobered by serious international planning for an international force. And it was also expected that if the Arabs in Palestine itself would make trouble, the Haganah could handle them, since it would have no difficulty in securing arms from those states who voted for partition, and especially from the United States, which was the leader of the propartition forces.

No one expected that the British mandatory government would take an active part in helping to bring about the partition plan, but the British spokesman was taken at his word when he said that his Government would be loyal to the UN, would not obstruct its decision.

No one delved into the legal technicalities of whether the UN Assembly vote was a recommendation or a decision. It was taken for granted that it had the force of a decision. Otherwise it would have made no sense to appoint a commission on implementation and it certainly would have made no sense to bring the Security Council, the acting body of the UN, into the picture, a step which was taken after considerable debate in which the opponents of the resolution who resisted the tie-up with the Security Council, were defeated.

No one assumed that the active interest of the United States delegation in the closing days of the debate was a hastily improvised benevolence. It was no secret that in the State Department there was considerable opposition, that in the President's mind there had been some doubts, opposition and doubts which had to do with Middle East oil, with uneasiness over the possibility of a war with Russia, and with reluctance to contemplate the possibility of America's participation in an international force. But the doubts and the misgivings were overruled by President Truman and Secretary Marshall—overruled with open eyes—and the United States not only cast its vote in favor of the partition plan but by casting its vote firmly and with strong advocacy influenced other states who were looking to American leadership.

This brief orientation helps us to evaluate what is happening now.

Is our Government backing down from its firm position of November 29, and why? This is the main question.

We could, if we had the time, spend some of it in arraigning the Arab states, members of the UN, for blatantly defying international policy, but it would serve no useful purpose since our castigations would fall on deaf ears. We should, if we had enough time, draw up an indictment against the British Government for shamelessly conniving with the Arab saboteurs of the UN. The facts have been presented by the Jewish Agency in an official memorandum. This British alliance with erstwhile Hitlerites will be exposed again and again until the civilized world fully understands that we are witnessing the moral decline and fall of a once great empire, an ignominious descent, from Balfour to Bevin. But we should not be diverted too long by that theme, for we have a more profitable theme to consider, more profitable because more amenable to correction.

Our main purpose is to evaluate the attitude of our own Government. It is our duty to do so as American citizens and because our Government's attitude is the key to the attitude of the Security Council. The supermodesty and self-effacement of those American officials who say "The United States is only one member of the UN; we shall do whatever the UN decides" will not fool anyone. The United States cannot, out of one side of its mouth, declare that it is ready with its billions of dollars to put western Europe on its feet, and declare out of the other side of its mouth that it is insignificant and helpless. When the United States wants something strongly enough, it knows how to get it, or at least how to try to get it. If it cares enough about the Palestine question, our Government can speak quite effectively to Great Britain and to the Arab States, who need us more than we need them.

I am sorry to have to point the accusing finger at my own Government, but I believe with all my conscience that I am rendering a patriotic service in doing it because what is involved is not only the fate of the Jewish people but the honor of the United States and the future of the United Nations.

American Jews yield to no one in their concern for American national interests. We don't have to proclaim our patriotism. It is an open book, our record in peace and in war. A propaganda campaign has been sedulously promoted, in part no doubt by the oil companies, and has apparently persuaded high quarters in Government that the implementation of the partition plan for Palestine will jeopardize America's access to the Middle East oil supply and that therefore our national interest is at stake. Mr. Harold Ickes is a greater expert on oil problems than Mr. Forrestal and as much of a patriot. He and many others do not consider that our national interests are being jeopardized. The Arab States need American dollars so desperately that in the final test they will all do what Ibn Saud, the strongest of them, is doing, not permitting ideology to interfere with business. American oil companies, making huge profits out of Middle East oil on which they are probably not paying taxes to our Government, are naturally eager to keep the Arabs as sweet as possible, but their private interest is not to be confused with our national interest.

Our highest national interest at the present juncture in world affairs is to keep the UN, the one remaining hope of world peace, from becoming bankrupt, discredited, and defunct, as it would become if its first great moral decision becomes a scrap of paper. That is why I believe we are performing a patriotic duty when we criticize our Government in the hope of correcting a hurtful trend.

I accuse my Government of having contributed to the deterioration of the Palestine situation. By failing to utter a single word of rebuke to the Arabs in Palestine and to the Arab states around Palestine who were openly defying the UN, our Government seemingly condoned their misdeeds. By failing to criticize Great Britain's obstructionism, our Government encouraged British tactics of pettiness, spitefulness, and connivance with the aggressor. Why should the United States have hesitated to talk up to Great Britain, a recipient of billions of dollars of American aid, and a suppliant for billions more? By imposing an embargo on arms to Palestine which, obviously, helped the Arabs and hurt the Jews, our Government, doing this thing which it was not called upon by the UN to do, emboldened the Arabs, heartened the British, and handicapped the Haganah. Though it was not the intention, this was the effect.

Had our Government acted as it should have acted, things in Palestine would never have come to this pass.

And now, having been partly to blame for the deteriorated situation, our Government, speaking through its delegate to the Security Council, gives the impression of being intimidated by the very difficulties it has had a part in bringing about. Or is that impression of Mr. Austin's speech unfounded? Nothing would please us more than to be told that it is an unfounded impression and that the speech and the resolution presented by the United States delegate to the Security Council does not mark any change in the Government's November 29 position. Perhaps we shall be told that our Government, having discovered that the UN Assembly has only the legal right to recommend partition, but not to enforce it, is trying to find a legal way to bring about partition and the way is to have the Security Council deal with the threat to peace and security, which it has the legal right to do, summon an international force of some kind to safeguard peace and security in and around Palestine, so that while it is holding the Arabs in check, a Jewish state can be brought into being by the Jews themselves in cooperation with the UN Commission on Implementation. Thus, the legal limitations of the UN Assembly would be observed and yet the purpose of its November 29 vote would be served. How gratifying it would be to hear that this, indeed, is the President's interpretation of Mr. Austin's resolution before the Security Council. But in the absence of such an interpretation one can only wonder why the legal technicalities were raised by the United States when, as a matter of fact, the mandatory power itself treats the UN vote of the 29th as a decision, when it states it will give up the mandate on May 15 and turn over the Palestine administration to the UN Commission. Why does Mr. Austin propose that the Palestine question be studied again and consulted about again after it has been so painstakingly studied, consulted about, and settled by the UN. Why, after the compromise solution of November 29, does the American delegate now suggest an attempt be made to compromise even this compromise, which can only mean at the expense of the Jewish part of Palestine?

On the face of it, one cannot escape the conclusion that our Government seems to be backing down from its position of November 29, seems to be suggesting delay in implementation, and seems to be hoping that the irreducible Jewish minimum may be reduced with a view to appeasing the Arabs. If that is so, then the American people have got to speak up to our Government and say both clearly and firmly "The final compromise was made on November 29. Further delay in implementation will bring further deterioration. Our Government dare not back down, for if it does back down in the face of Arab force, it will be driving the first nail into the coffin of the UN."

If the charitable view of Mr. Austin's resolution is the correct one, it should become evident soon enough. The first evidence should be a decision by the State Department to permit the shipping of arms to Palestine. At the same time our Government should take the leadership and initiative among the Big Five in the Security Council to the following end: (1) To establish that there is a threat to peace and security in the Palestine situation; (2) to authorize the Haganah as the Jewish militia in the part assigned to the Jewish state; (3) to place the port of Telaviv immediately under Jewish control; (4) to proceed with the organization of an international force of some kind, even if it be composed of regular troops or volunteers, is necessary for safeguarding the borders and preventing external aggression, to organize and equip such a force, and thus to create the conditions which will permit the Jewish state to come into being.

Munich, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester (N. H.) Evening Leader, March 2, entitled "Munich, 1948." This editorial is particularly significant in view of the current critical world situation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUNICH, 1948

The history of our times is being decided now. With sledge-hammer blows, today's policies are shaping the kind of world we are going to live in.

We are faced with the immediate necessity for deciding whether we want a world of international law and order, or of anarchy and violence. Once we make our decision, we must take whatever steps are necessary to give it fulfillment.

A decision not supported is no decision at all. It is only a confession of indecision and weakness. In making our choice we must realize that more than a statement of preference is required. There must also be adequate physical evidence that we mean exactly what we say.

This is no simple selection. Neither is this a simple world. Appeasement and moral retreat might save us inconvenience temporarily. Side-stepping issues will enable us for the moment to avoid drastic measures imposing fresh burdens.

But that is not the way to peace. Today's indifference can mean tomorrow's destruction. Momentary gain is at the risk of permanent loss.

Our policy can be determined as much by uncertain inaction as by decisiveness. History will not wait, while we waver, tormented by doubts and fears.

Absence of a firm stand will have sad effect upon our natural allies. We can suffer isolation that will be the result of the loss, one by one, of those countries whose interests are akin to our own—until at last we remain in terrifying solitude.

By now, we should have learned that appeasement is not the road to security. Feeding the demands of dictators only whets their appetites for more.

The philosophy of Munich will not be any more successful or realistic in 1948 than in 1938.

The Nazi timetable in the thirties was the Rhineland, the Saar, Austria, Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia, Danzig, Poland. The Communist timetable in the forties is Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia—with Finland, Austria, Greece, Italy, and France marked as the next stops on its fire-breathing express.

Part of our problem is a direct inheritance from the Munich of 1938. Czechs, remembering how they were betrayed at a conference with Hitler—to which neither they nor the Russians were invited—have little confidence in the word of the western powers.

Once again we are sowing seeds which will sprout the poisonous weeds of distrust. The crisis abroad, from Prague to Palestine, is part of the same world picture. Our friends can well be dismayed at the sight of our moral retreat while Russia marches ahead.

Integrity is indivisible. Honor is not a cloak worn in some instances and discarded in others. Other countries can feel that if we repudiate a decision of the United Nations when it suits our interests, we might desert them similarly at some future date.

The validity of international judgments must be upheld, or else it will be the end of the United Nations. We will have made the change from united action and peace to anarchy and war. Reassurance must be given that our policies are built upon concrete determination and not upon fleeting words.

In today's crisis, neither fulsome speeches before the Security Council nor polite letters of protest will avail. Diplomatic regrets after the deed is done will have no more potency now than when Hitler set the pattern.

We must evidence, so that the world will know beyond any question, that our hearts are as brave and our strength as alert as our words are full of promise. The Government and people of the United States should join in some clear program, such as:

1. Joining with the other free nations in an agressive stand in the Security Council for the maintenance of democratic ideals. Life and significance must be given to the judgments of the United Nations—whether it be in connection with Greece, Korea, or Palestine—lest otherwise speeding history run the UN down and destroy this instrument for international cooperation.

2. Providing all necessary aid, in military supplies, food, and finances, to the remaining independent countries of Europe and Asia. The Marshall plan must be carried forward.

3. Bringing our military strength up to the state of preparedness dictated by current conditions. Our air power particularly should be enlarged with both heavy, long-range bombers and speedy fighters. Universal military training should be initiated for a 5-year period, to be continued or ended then as circumstances at that time should recommend.

4. Coupling these moves with a steadfast will for peace. Defense preparations should not be confused as a desire for war. To this end, having made our resoluteness known, we should initiate proposals within the United Nations which will lead to eventual general reduction of armaments. While we should arm as long as other nations undermine peace, we should evidence our readiness to join in universal disarmament.

5. Added to this, the American people should elect an administration next November, regardless of party, which will have the character to project some comprehensive policy along the lines summarized here.

This program is not offered as a complete and final thing. All that we seek and urge is a wedding of faith and courage into a single policy of action which will bring hope for peace to liberty-loving people throughout the world.

The Hour of Crisis in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY CORDON
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Hour of Crisis in Palestine," published in the Washington Evening Star of February 25, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOUR OF CRISIS IN PALESTINE

The conflicting interpretations which have been placed upon Ambassador Austin's address to the Security Council on the Palestine issue are the best evidence of the lack of clarity, if not the lack of candor in the statement itself.

Yet this is not a matter in which there should be any ambiguity, or in which words should be used to say one thing when something else is intended. There is good reason to believe the problem of Palestine and the method of its solution will directly affect the welfare and the security of the United States. If that is so, then it seems obvious that the American people should not be led into any course of action unless they fully understand what it is that they are doing and what the consequences are apt to be.

It is not easy to get this full understanding from Mr. Austin's statement. When his remarks are read carefully, however, their meaning and significance seem clear.

Mr. Austin begins by saying that the Security Council can and should act on the first request made by the General Assembly in connection with its recommendation for partition of Palestine. This request was that the Council "take the necessary measures as provided for in the partition plan for its implementation."

The most important of these necessary measures calls upon the Council "to take such action as the Security Council may deem proper with respect to either the Jewish or the Arab state if by April 1, 1948, a provisional council of government cannot be selected for that state, or, if selected, cannot carry out its functions." If this language means anything it means that the Security Council is asked to implement the partition plan. Mr. Austin, speaking for this Government, says, "We believe it is clear that the Security Council can undertake the above-mentioned measures," and he plainly indicates his belief that this should be done.

Mr. Austin next takes up the question whether the disorders within Palestine and the threats of armed resistance to partition by other Arab states constitute an actual or threatened breach of the peace. It is not necessary to review his arguments in this respect, for it is perfectly evident that both an actual and a threatened breach of the peace are present in Palestine.

If the Security Council finds this to be the fact, Mr. Austin declares, then it is required by the UN Charter to act, and the action which he clearly contemplates is the use of force to maintain peace in Palestine. Furthermore, Mr. Austin adds, if the Security Council decides that armed force is necessary, the United States "would be ready to consult under the Charter with a view to such action as may be necessary to maintain international peace."

In the next phase of the address Mr. Austin attempts to make a distinction between the use of armed force to maintain peace and the use of armed force to enforce partition. The Council, he says, has the power and the duty to do the first; it has no authority to undertake the latter.

This is equivocation, for the distinction is meaningless. Under whatever guise force is employed the intended result would be the same—the implementation of partition. There should be no misunderstanding about this, and it is regrettable that Mr. Austin was not more candid in his discussion of the point. For if the Arabs resist partition, as they say they intend to do, and if the United Nations sends an armed force to Palestine to maintain peace, the result is going to be a war between that armed force and the Arabs. It might prove to be a minor war or a serious one, but in either event the American people should not be led into it unless they know what is being undertaken and are prepared to go through with it.

In the Star's view, the most disturbing aspect of this long step toward a commitment to use American troops in Palestine is the failure of the administration to bring out into the open all of the factors and risks involved. Mr. Austin rests his case squarely and wholly on the proposition that we must support the United Nations in any decision made. This is a very important consideration, for it can hardly be doubted that a refusal by the United States to support a Security Council decision in this matter would be a very heavy blow to the United Nations. But there are other important considerations involved, and there ought to be some opportunity to bring them forward for public consideration.

One of these has to do with the oil of the Middle East. A war with the Arabs might close that source of supply. If so, how vital is this oil to the recovery of western Europe under the Marshall plan? And how vital would it be to us in the event of war with Russia?

Any mention of oil in this connection is apt to be condemned as a placing of sordid economic considerations ahead of considerations of justice and humaneness. But that is not the case. If this oil really is vital to our security or to the security of the western world, that is a consideration which has a significant bearing on what our course of action in Palestine should be. And it is a consideration which ought to be fully explored.

A second and even more important consideration involves the wisdom of opening Palestine and the Middle East to penetration by Russian troops. We propose to spend billions of dollars to keep Russia and her satellites out of western Europe. We are already spending hundreds of millions of dollars and incurring a risk of war to keep them out of Greece and Turkey. Yet under the apparent intent of Mr. Austin's proposal a United Nations force consisting primarily of Russian and American troops would be sent into Palestine. Once there they would outflank Greece and Turkey, and if they came in through Iran and Iraq or Syria the Russians could be expected to insist on maintaining troops in those countries to insure their lines of supply.

This might not be such a serious consideration if the good faith of the Russians could be relied upon; if it were reasonable to assume that their aim really is to uphold the United Nations and not to secure a foothold in the Middle East pursuant to the historic Russian ambition to expand in that direction. But can it be assumed that the Russians would act in good faith? We can see what has just happened in Czechoslovakia. We have a measure of their good faith in what has happened to joint undertakings in Germany and in Korea. Clearly, it would be folly raised to the nth degree to go into this undertaking with the Russians in any expectation that they will not act in furtherance of their own interests. If we invite the Red army into Palestine we had better consider carefully how we are going to get it out after the fight with the Arabs is over.

There may be other considerations of national interest at stake in this matter. But these are the principal ones. And if they are not given the consideration they deserve before we commit ourselves to any course of action in Palestine, we can expect the people of this country, when they learn the facts from bitter experience, to react in a manner which can do great injury to the best interests of all concerned.

Appellate Tribunal in Income-Tax Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which will have the effect of giving residents of the District of Columbia the right to use the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia as an appellate tribunal in income-tax cases. An anomalous situation is presented by the present wording of the Internal Revenue Code as it pertains to appeals from the United States Tax Court. The statute provides that such appeals are reviewable by the circuit court of appeals for the circuit in which the internal revenue collector's office is located. Residents of the District of Columbia file their tax returns with the collector at Baltimore. Residents of Washington must, therefore, appeal their tax cases from the Tax Court in Washington to the Circuit Court of the Fourth Circuit. This requires the taxpayer to go to Richmond, Va., or Asheville, N. C., in order to argue his appeal. Why should he be obliged to do this when the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia is located in his home town?

The bill which I have filed today gives the taxpayer the choice of filing his appeal in the circuit in which the internal revenue collector's office is located or in the circuit court of appeals for the circuit in which his principal place of business or principal office is located. In addition to making such appeals more convenient for the residents of the District of Columbia, it also makes the appellate courts more convenient for taxpayers in other sections of the country whose business organizations are creatures of the law of Delaware or some other State, but who maintain their principal place of business at a point far removed from the place of incorporation where, under the present statute, it is necessary to file such an appeal.

Economic Sanctions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a leading editorial which appeared in the Boston Post March 1, 1948, entitled "Economic Sanctions":

There are numerous reliable evaluations of the economy of the Soviet Union. These evaluations differ in many details but they are agreed upon one thing—the Soviet Union is striving to rebuild its heavy industry to produce war materials in quantity as a primary objective and to produce consumer goods as a secondary objective.

Today the three great powers at present opposing Soviet entry into the political vacuum of central Europe are agreed upon a protest against the seizure of Czechoslovakia and the inexorable pressure upon Finland. The protest is in the form of a polite diplomatic memorandum telling the dictators of the Politburo what they already know—that the western powers disapprove of Soviet tactics and Soviet unilateral action in central Europe.

More positive action must be taken if the Russians are to be stopped here and now before these tensions manufactured in the Kremlin result in war, a war no one wants and for which no one but the Russians are prepared.

Soviet ships are frequently seen in west coast harbors loading machinery and raw materials, exports from the United States to a nation which is a sworn and implacable enemy of the democratic way of life. Great Britain has a trade pact with the Soviet Union and is similarly engaged in exporting machinery and other primary industrial equipment to the Soviet Union.

In the so-called cold war of ideologies, the power of economic sanctions brought to bear upon the Soviet Union has been underestimated. The seizure of the entire Czechoslovak state, with its highly developed industrial complexes, is ample proof that the Russians are desperate for an efficient productive political entity within the sphere of Soviet domination. It is the use of economic sanctions that the Russians fear most.

Without the help of instruments, heavy equipment, and electrical generating equipment from outside of the Soviet Union it is not possible for the Russians to build an atomic fission plant like those at Oak Ridge and Hanford. Only the superb technical, industrial, and engineering might of the United States made it possible here. Industrially the Soviet Union is more than 50 years behind the United States.

It would seem, on the basis of these facts, that our foreign policy as it affects the Soviet Union should encompass an embargo against shipment of electrical generating equipment, instruments, heavy machinery, raw materials, railroad equipment, and rails to Russia.

It is possible to appraise the effect of economic sanctions applied against the Soviet Union. There is the case of Japan. The United States armed Japan for the eventual attack upon Pearl Harbor. If economic sanctions had been applied against Japan at the time of the Manchurian incident, even at the time of the attack upon Shanghai, the Japanese could not have gone to war. The claim by Japanese statesmen that the embargo finally applied against shipments to Japan precipitated the war has been disproved over and over again. The embargo was seized upon as justification for the attack.

Notes of protest to the Soviet Union are without merit, without force, and lack effect. Economic isolation of the Soviet Union, even breaking off diplomatic relations, would be far more effective in the present state of affairs.

When the people of the Soviet Union feel the pinch of world disapproval in their already depressed standard of living, there is hope for the counterrevolution, and not until then.

Let's Face It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, we cannot let matters in Palestine drift.

If we are to maintain our moral leadership within the United Nations, we cannot continue our present course of vacillation. We must act at once to support partition.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include a speech which I made on September 25, 1947, at the Hollywood Bowl in Los Angeles, Calif.:

LET'S FACE IT

History will record that World War II began in 1939. (For the Jews in Europe, World War II began 6 years earlier.) For the Jews in Europe, World War II began in 1933.

They were the first victims of Germanic sadism. It was their shame, grief, and despair that sounded the first alarm.

In the German plan for world domination, the first battle was fought against this helpless minority. The remnants of that minority have found no peace. It is 2 years after the defeat of the German armies and yet, they have found no peace. Two years after the war's end, and 250,000 of these miserable human beings find themselves still behind a barbed wire fence. For them freedom is still a word that has no meaning. Freedom means more than the dubious privilege of existing from day to day.

After 14 years, fundamental human rights are still denied them. Daily they watch their skills and talents and hopes rot away, while we ease our conscience with investigations and recommendations. We now have charts and graphs showing just how much the dignity of man can endure. Oh, yes—we keep a close watch on the patient. Periodically we take his pulse to reassure ourselves that the individual is still worth saving. And then we smugly consign our findings to the first convenient pigeonhole and put aside the ugly thought that we are perpetuating Hitler's crime until the hue and cry for the next report.

For those Jews who are fortunate, or unfortunate enough, as you please to view it, to be outside these reconstructed 1947 concentration camps, they are condemned to live in countries with proven anti-Semitic records; where the suspicion is ever present that one's neighbor may have been the informer or the murderer of one's loved ones.

Even in those countries where there was very little or no antisemitism before the war, the Jews are met with sullen hostility and stubborn resistance when they seek to reestablish themselves.

The bloodstream of Europe is still poisoned with Hitler's propaganda.

Poverty and misery create new hate when the survivors returning to their homes, rightfully ask that their property be returned to them.

And for those who are rash enough to try and escape, they are beset on the high seas by their legal protector—beaten, gassed, murdered—and as a final indignity, returned to the land that for them is filled with graveyards, gas chambers, and human furnaces.

At the war's end, the Jews asked only that they be allowed to survive as free men in the land pledged to the Jewish people; that they might regain dignity; once more learn to hold up their heads.

If the statesmen of the world agreed that the Jews had a need of Palestine after World War I, how much greater is the need after World War II.

Palestine is the natural refuge.

But that refuge was closed to the Jews in 1939 by the British white paper. That refuge remains closed today.

In 1939, in the white paper, Great Britain broke the terms of the mandate.

Because of the impending war and the open collaboration between certain Arab leaders and the Germans, Great Britain sought to buy Arab loyalty from the Axis powers. The price was Jewish lives. The Jews were caught in 1939 power politics.

At the war's end it was to be expected that the mandatory power would hasten to repair the mortal injury to the people and the land entrusted to its care—that the doors of Palestine would be opened.

No one should forget that in 1939, had the doors of Palestine not been closed in the face of thousands of fleeting Jews, they would be alive today.

It should not be forgotten that thousands of Palestinian Jewish volunteers served in the Army, Navy, and Air Force on our side. It shouldn't be forgotten that when Montgomery's army was cut off from supplies, it was the Palestinians who manufactured the guns, the clothes, and spare parts that were needed.

It should not be forgotten that the Palestinians were not afraid to stand by the Allies even though they were but a small community surrounded by a hostile Arab world where neutrality thinly veiled pro-Axis sympathy and collaboration.

The white paper of 1939 did not buy Arab friendship. The Mufti fled to Berlin from where he directed the Arab fifth column.

Now that the war is over, it was to be expected that the doors of Palestine would be opened.

But the doors remain closed while the mandatory power proceeds, in the face of international agreements, to turn the Jewish homeland into another German ghetto.

Why? Why is this? Why has it happened? Why has a great nation so debased herself?

That is for Great Britain to answer.

But this I do know, and we must face it.

The United States has as yet made no concrete contribution to the solution of the Palestinian problem.

We have talked. We have protested. We have sat on commissions. We have made reports and recommendations. We have shed tears. But we have done nothing concrete. It is easy enough to blame Great Britain, but it is high time we took an active hand ourselves in the solution.

If we had done something besides talk and advise, it might have been a different picture today.

Palestine cannot be isolated from the rest of the world. The world's problems must be settled in terms of people as the United Nations Charter affirms.

The United States is committed to uphold the Charter.

If the welfare of people is our high goal, and I believe it is, Palestine is as good a place to begin as Greece.

The United States has a legal and a moral responsibility in seeing that the terms of the Palestinian mandate are carried out. The United States endorsed the Balfour declaration of 1917. Great Britain was granted the mandate by the League of Nations in 1922.

The United States entered into a treaty with Great Britain establishing the British mandate over Palestine in 1924.

These international agreements are still valid. The charter of the United Nations guarantees their validity.

Great Britain hasn't sovereign power over Palestine. She can't do just as she pleases in Palestine.

Great Britain was granted the mandate over Palestine by 52 nations for the specific purpose of "establishing in Palestine a national homeland for the Jewish people."

In the Palestine mandate, approved by the Council of the League of Nations on the 24th of July 1922, it stated that, "recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country."

The British Government was made responsible "for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home," and, with this end in view, was enjoined to "facilitate Jewish immigration" and "encourage • • • close settlement by Jews on the land."

The Arabs agreed to this mandate. They sat at the peace table.

An agreement was reached in 1919 at the Peace Conference between Emir Feisal and Dr. Chaim Weizmann. The terms of the agreement provided for the close cooperation between the Arabs and Jews in the building of a Jewish homeland.

And why shouldn't they have agreed. Palestine was to be carved from what had been the Turkish Empire before World War I. The Arabs were to receive over 1,000,000 square miles of that empire and the Jews 40,000 square miles. That contract with the Arabs has been kept.

The contract with the Jews has been broken.

The ink was hardly dry on the mandate when the Trans-Jordan was cut away from the land promised the Jews and closed to Jewish immigration.

In 1939 Palestine itself was virtually closed to Jewish immigration.

Yet the rights guaranteed the Jews under the mandate were very specific.

On the strength of international agreements and faith in these international agreements, the Jews of the world gave money to build the Jewish homeland in Palestine.

The men and women who have gone there have made the desert bloom. They have built cities, and universities, libraries, and scientific laboratories. They have brought health and new life to a feudal land, raised the standard of living of the native population.

The Jewish return to Palestine is unique in the history of colonization. They did not steal the land from the natives for a few dollars and then exploit them as cheap labor. They paid dearly for desert and marsh land from Arab chiefs and then they allowed the peasants who primitively tilled the soil for these Arab chiefs to remain on the land until they had time to find a new home. The Jews did not drive the Arabs from Palestine.

In the years between 1920–40, the Arab population doubled in Palestine, while in neighboring Trans-Jordan, over three times the size of Palestine, the Arab population remained static and impoverished, even though it too was under British mandate.

The Arabs in Palestine today enjoy a higher standard of living than in any part of the Arab world.

How then can the doors any longer remain closed in face of the Jewish record in Palestine and the needs of the Jews in Europe.

That is the question the United Nations must now answe. for it has been put to them. The traged: of Palestine and European Jewry is in their hands. They will speak for the conscience of the world.

The Jewish Agency for Palestine does not come before the bar of world opinion, hat in hand, as a new supplicant. They ask only that promises made be fulfilled; that commitments undertaken be completed; that international law be upheld; that a solemn international treaty not be treated as a scrap of paper.

The United Nations this spring called a special session to consider Palestine. A special committee on Palestine was set up. That committee has now made its report.

On 11 points there was unanimous agreement by the 11 members of the committee.

What was the first of those 11 points? I quote:

"The mandate for Palestine shall be terminated at the earliest practicable date."

The committee also unanimously reported:

1. The question of Palestine is of extreme urgency.

2. Immediate action must be taken to alleviate the plight of the survivors of European Jewry.

There was also a majority and a minority report. The majority report was signed by seven members, the minority signed by three members. Australia, abstained from voting but agreed to abide by any United Nations decision.

The majority recognized the legality and justice of an independent Jewish state.

It recommended (1) partition and (2) that the doors of Palestine be opened.

The majority report of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine reflects the justice we can and must expect tomorrow.

Even though the Jewish homeland now outlined in it is but a small part of the territory guaranteed to the Jews by the world.

Even though for a second time Palestine is to be partitioned, the action committee of the Jewish agency has accepted the United Nations majority report as a basis of discussion. It has accepted the report with heavy heart to show it good faith. It did so to show its willingness to work toward world peace.

Secretary Marshall, speaking for the United States, in his opening address to the United Nations, endorsed the majority report and pledged United States support for the solution of the Palestine problem at this session of the General Assembly.

The United Nations Charter demands that the nations "establish conditions under which justice and respect for obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained."

Recommendations, resolutions, and advice to Great Britain are not enough.

The United Nations must take whatever action is necessary to make the majority report a reality.

Action must be based on legality and justice—not on Arab favor and oil. The Jews must not be caught again in power politics, 1947 power politics.

The United States must be willing and prepared to shoulder her share of the responsibility.

If Palestine must be policed until such time as independent Arab and Jewish states are established, the United States must be willing and prepared to lend a helping hand.

If Great Britain is unwilling or unable to share this responsibility, then it is up to the United States and the United Nations to see that the United Nations recommendations are put into effect.

We do not raise our voice tonight so much against the British or so much for the Jews as we do in support of justice that we may get on with the building of peace.

A Tribute to the Jewish War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the glowing tribute to the Jewish War Veterans of the United States which follows, on the occasion of their fifty-third anniversary; and I consider it an honor to be a member of that organization:

A TRIBUTE TO THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States represents the patriotic voice of American Jewry.

Our Nation salutes the Jewish War Veterans of the United States on their fifty-third anniversary.

The JWV has a glorious tradition.

It has rendered service with honor and distinction.

It has ever been on guard to preserve our priceless heritage.

The JWV is dedicated to God and country.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States was founded on April 20, 1896, by men who fought with the Union Army during the Civil War.

It is today the second oldest veterans' organization in the United States.

It is headed by Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, a fearless fighter for freedom.

How proud the heritage of these noble men.

How inspiring the task which confronts them.

The Jewish War Veterans are pledged—

To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America.

To foster and perpetuate true Americanism.

To combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our blessed institutions.

To uphold the fair name of the Jew.

To fight his battles whenever unjustly assailed.

To combat the powers of bigotry and darkness.

To instill the love of God, country, and flag in all.

To preserve the doctrine of justice for all men.

To preserve the doctrine of universal liberty.

To preserve the spirit of comradeship.

To preserve the honored memories of Jewish war dead.

The Jewish War Veterans have always fought with head, with hand, and with heart for the country they love, for the institutions they cherish, and for the principles that gave it birth.

Let us unfold the scroll of the fighting Jews.

The Jews have played a glorious role in the development of American history since the birth of our Nation.

They have been identified with our colonial growth and helped finance the revolution.

They have served with gallantry under the leadership of Gen. George Washington.

They have fought in all the wars of the Republic.

They have won the highest commendation from every President of our Nation.

Let us call the roll of these gallant Jews in freedom's holy cause.

We see them at Valley Forge when the spirit of the American people hung low, and only the stout of heart stood fast and constant by Washington.

Of the 3,000 Jews in all the Colonies, 4 of them were lieutenants, 3 majors, 6 captains, and many in the ranks.

Lt. Col. Isaac Frank was aide-de-camp to General Washington.

Haym Salomon dedicated his entire fortune of $640,000 to the young Republic and later died impoverished.

We see them in the War of 1812.

We see Uriah P. Levy, commander of the brig-o-war *Argus*, run the British blockade and destroy 21 British merchantmen.

With tongue and pen Commander Levy succeeded in effecting the abolition of bodily punishment in the United States Navy.

He died a commodore, then the Navy's highest rank.

We see them in the Mexican War, the fight for Texas, and in the Seminole wars. Again the fighting Jew in action.

Again the healing Jew—in the person of Surg. Gen. David Deleon.

We see them in the Civil War rallying under the inspiration of Abraham Lincoln.

Of the 200,000 Jews then in the United States—10,000 saw active service, 7 received the Congressional Medal of Merit.

Frederick Knefler of Indiana rose to the rank of major general.

Edward S. Solomon was brigadier general. President Lincoln named Leopold Newman of New York a brigadier general while he lay dying of battle wounds received at Chancellorsville.

We see them in the Spanish-American War with William McKinley striking the shackles of bondage from a neighboring people and bringing forth an island republic.

America accepted the challenge of Spanish tyranny.

"Remember the *Maine*."

Fifteen Jews were on the ill-fated battleship. Sgt. Maurice Joost, of California, was the first to fall in the attack of Manila.

Five thousand intrepid Jewish volunteers gladly answered the call of their President.

We see them in World War I with Woodrow Wilson fighting to make the world safe for democracy.

Two hundred and fifty thousand Jews were in uniform, constituting 5 percent of the fighting forces.

Ten thousand Jews held commission ranks, and 1,000 Jews were cited for valor in action.

The greatest epic of courage ever to come out of that war—the exploits of the "Lost Battalion"—was a demonstration of conspicuous bravery.

We see them in World War II with Franklin D. Roosevelt fighting to make democracy safe for the world.

First American penetration of German soil was made by the Third Armored Division, commanded by Maj. Gen. Maurice Rose, who gave his life for his country.

First Japanese battleship hit in the war was the *Haruna*, bombed by a plane piloted by Capt. Colin Kelly, whose bombardier was Sgt. Meyer Levin.

First American assault boat to hit the shore of France on D-day was commanded by Lt. Abe Condiotti.

First four-medal winner in the American Army in World War II was Lt. Morris Berenson.

There are scores of Americans of Jewish faith whose names will live forever in the archives of our Government.

Travel where you may through American cemeteries on a thousand battlefields, travel where the delicate poppies carpet the earth with their rich red blossoms or in the glistening white stones rising from the flower-strewn mounds—

One beneath the cross of Christianity, and one beneath the star of David. Jew and Christian—pillowed in eternal glory.

They have fought, they have bled, they have worshipped, they have died together.

So hail, JWV—lovers of liberty—on this your glorious fifty-third anniversary.

Play your martial music, unfurl your battle-scarred colors, for you have demonstrated the truth that the American Jew is a patriot.

May your deeds fill your hearts with renewed patriotism.

May your deeds fill your minds with renewed resolves—that America shall ever be free.

May you continue to spread your ideals and may you help bring nearer to humanity the realization of Isaiah's dream of universal peace.

Guard blessed America.

God bless America.

Postal Employees Deserve Salary Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, a large amount of mail has been received in my office in recent months concerning the measures which are pending before your committee to increase the salaries of postal employees. I have also talked with a number of representatives of postal organizations about the matter and after close study it has become apparent to me that some wage adjustment is necessary.

The need and importance of such an increase was vividly demonstrated when I found that during this Eightieth Congress more than 40 bills have been introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives proposing increases ranging from a minimum of $480 a year to a maximum of $1,000 a year in postal salaries. This fact alone indicates that postal employees are not being adequately compensated.

As of February 1, 1948, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported the cost of living to be 69 percent above the August 1939 level. To raise the salaries of postal employees to meet this increased cost would mean that we would have to increase their salaries 35 percent above the 1939 average, or slightly more than $850.

A recently released report from the same source shows that food costs on December 15, 1945, stood at 141.4 points, or 41.4 points above the 1935–39 level, as compared with 202.7 points on November 15, 1947. Thus, it was revealed that food costs have risen 43.4 percent in that period. These experts further estimated the continuing rise in the over-all cost of living to be 2 points each month at the present time. This would mean the increase in the cost of living from December 15, 1945, to January 1948 is 27.3 percent. Therefore, the wages of the postal employee have been cut by that amount for this period. Their take-home pay has been seriously reduced and corrective action is imperative.

Workers in industry have, through strikes, secured necessary wage adjustments. But postal employees and all Government workers, since their salaries are fixed by law, must appeal to Congress for relief.

Some facts that shed an interesting light on the subject are as follows:

Wages in retail trade have increased nearly 70 percent since 1939.

In manufacturing, the wages have increased 100 percent.

In coal mining they have gone up 175 percent.

In the postal service, 20 percent.

As against these incomes, the price of all items have climbed 65 percent above the 1935–39 level.

It is important that we secure and retain the high caliber of personnel which has brought the United States postal service to the unique position it now holds. It has become increasingly clear to postal officials that they cannot hope to recruit new personnel on the entirely inadequate entrance salary of $2,100 per annum. Actually, in terms of the purchasing power of the 1939 dollars, these people are receiving a wage of about $23.38 per week. This, if you please, before withholding tax and retirement deductions. Twenty-three dollars and thirty-eight cents was far from a sufficient wage in 1939, and the 1948 equivalent is even more grossly inadequate. New postal employees are required to serve a period of 11 years before reaching the maximum salary of $3,100. Under these conditions the job of carrying the mail has ceased to hold the promise of security it once offered to those potential applicants who pass the civil-service examination and otherwise meet the necessary requirements. I am convinced that if we are to maintain a high standard of efficiency and morale in the postal service, salaries must be made more attractive.

It is true that many new entrants in the postal service are attempting to augment their postal wages with income from outside employment. This action on their part results in many instances in a diminishing interest in the postal service.

Not only is there the danger of our mail service being impaired by the possibility of inadequate performance by overtired men who are trying to hold down two jobs, but we must also realize that in too many instances these men are leaving the postal service for other jobs that offer higher salaries. This sort of situation is one that inflicts considerable expense on the Government. A good deal of money is spent to train a postal recruit and before there is time to collect on the investment the new man becomes disillusioned. He gives up any idea he might have had about a postal career and sells his services elsewhere.

In addition to this, in a good many other cases we find the wives of workers invading the labor market so that through their efforts the strain on the family budget may be lessened to some extent.

This sort of existence is not good for the family. There can be no normal home life when the father and mother must combine their energies to support the family. We constantly are being reminded that special attention should be given to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency—the Nation's No. 1 social enemy.

Gentlemen, the elimination of this grave problem must begin in the home. If we are to have healthy, normal youngsters we must provide them with the proper environment. Parents who must constantly spend their time worrying about the family's financial condition cannot give their children the guidance they so vitally need.

The last increase granted to postal employees effective January 1, 1946, was designed to at least partially assist them in meeting the then prevailing living costs. Actually this did not accomplish its purpose for as I have pointed out earlier, increases in prices continued, and according to these statistics the need for a salary adjustment for this group is greater now than ever before.

The postal service forms a large group of our most reliable public servants. The service they render is essential to the well-being of our Nation. This Congress has the opportunity to recognize and reward this faithful and untiring service in a highly justified manner. I sincerely hope this committee will favorably consider a permanent salary increase of not less than $800 per annum for postal employees.

What Shall We Do About the Marshall Plan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following address given on February 2, 1948, before the Economic Club of Detroit.

The plainest fact we face today is that we don't have one world, as we had hoped we would have. We have two worlds. Men and nations are split straight down the middle. Politically, economically, ideologically, and spiritually.

We don't believe in the same things and, therefore, are not pursuing the same objectives.

People can reach agreement no matter how far apart they are in the beginning if both sides want good relations. But if, for whatever reason, either side does not want agreement, then there is no way you can get them together just by negotiation.

The second plainest fact is that we cannot go on indefinitely as two worlds. We must become one world. This planet is too shrunken. Modern means of communication and transportation are so efficient, we are so dependent on each other for all sorts of raw materials and manufactured commodities, for economic as well as security reasons, that it is inconceivable we can go on indefinitely as we are.

And that brings us to a third plain fact, that there are only 2 ways by which the two worlds can become one. One is by conquest; the other is by agreement.

It seems to me there have been in all history but two basic forms or philosophies of government; one is the philosophy perhaps best described as dictatorship. It may be dictatorship by a man or by a party. We have seen recent examples of that abroad, some nearer home. It may be dictatorship by a class, ranging from the aristocracy to the proletariat. It may be dictatorship by a race, the Nordic race, the Yamato race, etc. Or it may be dictatorship by a bloc, economic or otherwise. This is the form democracies have tended to develop.

The key characteristic of a dictatorship is that it tolerates no opposition. One group imposes its will, and the opposition has no rights.

Over against that is the other basic philosophy of government which I would describe by the word "federation"—federation of all the classes, all the races, all the blocs, working for the good of all as the way to promote the good of each. It provides a mechanism by which one group can come to power and govern—you have got to have some way by which one group or another gets power to govern. But there are certain rights reserved for the opposition which the man or group in power cannot override, cannot suppress. Perhaps the most important right reserved for the opposition is the right to try to become the governing power.

Today's two worlds must move either toward dictatorship by one over the other or toward some sort of voluntary federation.

Mr. Stalin understands perfectly that they must come together. He wrote 20 years ago:

"It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic can exist for an indefinite period side by side with western imperialist states." (By imperialist he means, of course, non-Communist states.)

He recognizes the split frankly. Why should we imagine it isn't there? He added: "Ultimately one or the other must conquer." He apparently thinks the only way we can get together is by conquest. You and I don't believe in or want that method. We don't want conquest of us by them, but we are not in the least interested in conquest of them by us.

Our task then in the year 1948, at this great crossroads in history, is to try to get the two worlds together by agreement; try to get a set of circumstances where there is more to gain for both sides by coming together in common acceptance of certain mutually agreed upon rules of behavior than there is by continuing disagreement or by conquest.

On the street corner we have red and green lights. No matter how unlike the cars and the drivers, we have agreed we are all going to follow a certain pattern of behavior—we will all stop when the light is red and we will all go when it is green. That doesn't mean we cease being capitalists and Communists, Republicans and Democrats, Catholics and Protestants and Jews, rich and poor. We maintain our different ideas and goals, but we have agreed that it is mutually beneficial, it is to everybody's advantage for everybody to stop when it is red and go when it is green.

Can we get these two worlds together on some such basis—mutual agreement as to the traffic rules by which life and intercourse, exchange of goods, personalities, and ideas are to be carried on on this planet? If we cannot, then we are doomed to another war, with little hope our system can survive even if we win that war.

To achieve that agreement is the job of our foreign policy.

Well, how have we tried to do it heretofore? Our policy for 2 years prior to VJ-day and for a year and a half thereafter was to try to do it by appeasement. Our leaders assumed that the only way we could get along with Russia was by yielding to her. They feared that not to appease her might lead to war; and we didn't want war. So we appeased. It was a policy that led to unmitigated disaster. Appeasement of aggression by an expanding military dictatorship always leads to disaster. Show me one exception.

We tried to appease the Japanese militarists. We thought we could buy them off by shipping scrap iron and oil for them to use against China. Did it lead to peace with Japan? No; it led straight to war.

England and France didn't want war with Hitler. So they appeased him—with other people's territory. They tried to buy him off by giving him part of Czechoslovakia. Did it lead to peace with Hitler? No; it led straight to war.

Russia tried to get peace with Hitler, as you have all read in the documents recently released, by giving him other people's territory—in this case, Poland's. Did it lead to peace? No; it led straight to war.

Appeasement of aggression always leads either to abject surrender or to resistance, by war, if necessary, and we will not abjectly surrender.

Despite tragic lessons, our leaders at Yalta and elsewhere committed the incredible folly of risking everything on one gamble—namely, that by yielding to Russia, we could get the confidence and good will of the politburo. They thought the way to get security for our Nation and peace for the world was to insist on believing that the tough realists in the Kremlin aren't really Communists—they are just Jeffersonian Democrats. The results of such naive folly are apparent.

When at last the sound instincts of the people rebelled against further attempts to get peace by sacrificing our principles and other people's territory, Henry Wallace accused America of getting tough with Russia, of provoking her to aggressive action against other countries. That is plain distortion of the truth. Our change of attitude was the too-long-delayed consequence, not the cause of Russia's aggression.

What are the facts? On VJ-day the United States had the greatest military strength any country in history ever had—in the air, on the land, on the sea, and under the sea. If we had had a single grain of imperialism in our national soul, if we had had a single design on Russia or on anyone else we could have imposed our will. If we had had a grain of imperialism in our national soul, we would have. They were all scraping the bottom of the barrel and our strength was at an all-time high. But what did we do with our military superiority? We tore it all to pieces and threw it away in 6 months. Does that look like imperialism? And yet we are the one accused of getting tough.

Somebody will say, "We could afford to do that because we had the super ace, the atomic bomb." Well, what did we do with that? We said, "Russia, we will give that to you, too, subject only to the condition that any use you make of atomic energy be under the full inspection and supervision of an international commission, without any vetoes—just the same as any use we make of atomic energy, our own invention, our own Oak Ridge, will be under the full inspection and supervision of that same international commission, without any vetoes by us either."

Actually that was the most radical, the most far-reaching proposal any strong, sovereign, victorious nation ever made in history. And it was made by so-called reactionary, capitalistic Uncle Sam.

How can anybody be taken in by charges that we are the ones getting tough? Look at the deed.

We went further. We turned our faces in the other direction while Russia destroyed the independence of half a dozen countries in Eastern Europe, whose independence had been proclaimed to the world as the reason for the war in the first place.

We accepted her thesis that in order to be secure she had to impose her will on almost a hundred million people in Eastern Europe who are not Russians.

We went even further. In order to assure her that we would not interfere with what she was doing in Eastern Europe, in flagrant violation of her pledges under the Atlantic Charter, we threw the Charter out of the window. One of its two authors, our President, publicly repudiated it, said it wasn't an official document, just some notes.

Did such appeasement lead to better relations? No. They got steadily worse. Surely it is clear that appeasement is not the way to get agreement.

What next? We finally woke up with a start in March 1947, when the British Government belatedly realized that it could not carry all its obligations, and it dropped the Greece mess in our laps almost on 24 hours' notice. We had to move on from the appeasement stage. If we yielded there to Soviet pressure, the Mediterranean would soon be a Russian lake. Because if Greece were to go down, Turkey would be outflanked and would go down within a year and all the Middle East would go with it.

Then Italy and France would go. Actually Greece would have been taken over by the Communist minority in March, Italy in April, and France in May or June, if we had not acted. The timetable was all set up. Without vigorous help from us nothing could have stopped Russia from gaining effective control of the whole Mediterranean area last year.

Then England would have been neutralized, as she almost was at the end of the last war by the rocket bomb alone. She couldn't move under her own power, and she couldn't again be a base for us as she was in the last two wars.

Then Germany would have been effectively encircled and the battle for Europe would have been over.

For the crux of the struggle in Europe is which way Germany is to go. We know who defeated the Germans. But we won't know who won World War II until it is clear who wins the Germans—wins their minds and hearts. They occupy a strategically advantageous central position, they have great mineral resources, and they are 68,000,000 people with a real genius for organization. They have unusual abilities along scientific and mechanical and inventive lines. They have proved twice in our lifetime they have the capacity to commit themselves to an idea, and, no matter whether it is good or bad, pursue that idea with singleness of purpose and with extraordinary efficiency and devotion. Which way are the Germans to go? That will largely determine the fate of Europe.

Stalin couldn't get western Germany by direct action short of war. So he set out to get it by a flanking movement beginning in Greece. If it hadn't been for our taking the strong stand we did in Greece—inexcusable as it was that we should have made the Tehran and Yalta deals which gave Russia the Balkans and the chance to put such pressure on Greece—the fact remains that in a few months all of Europe would have been under the control of Russian satellites. That, of course, was one reason Marshall couldn't get anywhere with Molotov and Stalin at Moscow last spring. Why should they enter into any agreement that would limit their freedom of action with respect to Germany, if within a few months, as they expected, they were going to have Germany in the bag—by our default?

So when almost a year ago we moved on from the appeasement stage to the resistance stage, the so-called Truman doctrine—it wasn't just the fate of a few little Greek peninsulas at stake. The fate of Turkey, the fate of Italy, the fate of France, England, and Germany, the fate of Europe were at stake. That meant the fate of north Africa was at stake. And that meant the security of South America was involved. Dakar is only half as far from the bulge of Brazil as is the United States. Our own security, even in the Western Hemisphere, was involved.

But the Truman doctrine could give only a temporary respite. It was a sort of hold-that-line policy. It bought us a little time.

When I was a boy out in Nebraska we had a couple of bad prairie fires. The first thing we did was get out a team of horses and dig a furrow across its path. Can one furrow of moist, black soil stop a prairie fire? No. The heat of a blazing prairie fire is so fierce it will jump over a narrow furrow. But you can use that furrow as a base from which to start a backfire against the main fire—that way you can stop it.

The Truman doctrine was merely such a furrow. From it we had to start a backfire, which is the principle involved in what has been called the Marshall plan: help resist further expansion of the area of tyranny and dictatorship; at the same time, assist expansion of the area of freedom and federation.

We must stop, if possible, the alarming spread of slavery and the contraction of liberty which have been going on during the last 20 or 25 years. We must reverse those trends and resume the trends in the other direction that prevailed from 1776 to 1931.

That is the idea behind the European recovery plan. We are now in the midst of a great national debate on the course we should adopt, a course which will determine our future for years and decades to come.

It seems to me we can reduce the problem to two sets of calculated risks.

First, if we don't promptly carry out some program of helping these European nations get on their feet, so that they can become sound economically and strong in the sense of presenting a united military barrier to Russian aggression either from without their borders or from within, then they will go down one by one; and most of Europe will be under the effective control of the Soviet Union, and so will much of Asia by the end of this year.

If we do carry out such a program, there is a chance the 16 western European nations can be saved, and an area of freedom preserved from which it can perhaps penetrate back into eastern Europe, until ultimately the Soviets will crack. Their whole system is so immoral, so cruel, that it must crack eventually. But we can't sit down and wait for that to happen. That would be like saying, "Don't worry about the flood. A flood always goes down." Certainly, but I don't want it to take my house with it. A fire, too, always burns out. But that gives me no consolation if it first destroys my city.

If we don't give assistance to these nations, there is no hope. If we do, there is hope. Therefore, we should give it.

That is the way you would reason if you consider only the first set of alternatives.

But there is a second set of calculated risks which cannot be ignored. They rise from the plain fact that we can't carry out this huge program without weakening the United States—at least temporarily—draining its limited resources, putting a severe strain on our own economy.

It isn't the money that is so important. If we should be left without friends and allies, the cost in taxes for our own armaments each year would be greater than the whole contemplated cost of the European recovery plan for 4 years. We originally thought our budget for defense this year would be about six or seven billions. Before we were through, it was eleven. If Europe goes down, it will be eighteen billion by next year. And still more the next year; don't make any mistake about that.

It is the drain on our resources that is most dangerous—the necessity to export materials and commodities already in short supply, the increase in inflationary pressures that raises prices and lowers standards of living here, causing unrest and upsetting our whole economy. These are far more serious than just the dollars involved.

If, by doing this, we can succeed in producing a compensating increase in the strength of those countries—which will add to our own security, reduce the burdens for our own armaments, and preserve and expand the area of freedom with which we can trade in the future—then it is a justifiable risk, even a sound investment.

On the other hand, if we don't succeed, and at the end of 1952 when American aid ends, those nations still go down, or are still economically unsound and insolvent, then all we will have done is endangered, perhaps destroyed our own soundness—and not have done them any long-term good in the process.

In this kind of a world, somebody somewhere has got to stay free, somebody has got to stay strong, somebody has got to be able to hold aloft the torch of freedom to which people can at least look with hope until the day comes when they themselves can once more rally to it. The United States is their only hope and we dare not allow it to falter.

I was in Europe last fall. Our committee visited 22 countries, and in each we talked with the cabinet or some of its members. One of the most instructive visits was in Sweden. They adopted a sort of Marshall plan right after the war. They had come through the war years unscathed, in fact had prospered. They had a praiseworthy humanitarian urge to help their neighbors, and a sense of special obligation, as have we, because they had been spared the horrors and the destruction of war and invasion. Besides it would be good business to get the economies of their customers functioning again. So they embarked upon a plan to help Norway, Denmark, Finland, and others recover. They made loans and grants which represented more in proportion to their national wealth than seventeen billions is in proportion to ours. But they now find they got in too deep, and they have to come to us to bail them out.

Well, if the United States miscalculates and gets in too deep, who will or can bail us out? That is the hard risk we cannot ignore.

How can we resolve this second set of calculated risks? It seems to me that if we

can be reasonably sure of a better than 50–50 chance of success, then we ought to make the effort because the risks in allowing Europe to go by default are plain and inescapable and exceedingly grave.

If there isn't a better than 50–50 chance of success, then we have no right to take such a gamble. Instead we should do everything possible to keep our country strong, sound, and solvent—and hope the Soviet-dominated part of the world cracks up before we do.

How can we estimate the chances of success?

There are about five criteria which seem to me the most important, probably the minimum that must be met if there is to be a better than 50–50 chance of success.

The first is this:

No matter how much we put in, the European recovery plan cannot succeed unless these 16 nations in Europe are willing to make a far more vigorous and aggressive attack upon their own economic problems, both individually and collectively, than most of them have been willing to make up to the present.

Just to restore France as she was, to restore England as she was, to restore Norway and Italy, and so on, as they were, won't be good enough, because most of them were unsound before. The war merely revealed how badly they were running downhill, and accelerated the rate. Western Europe was not self-sustaining even when it was able to trade with eastern Europe, which is the surplus area of Europe.

If Europe, when it was all together, was not basically sound economically, what is it now with eastern Europe cut off? And how can the western European nations recover, if each of the 16 insists on remaining a separate individual economic unit?

We talked about this to almost every cabinet group we met in Europe. Frequently I said something like this: "Many people seem to think that the main reason America is strong today is just because we have a large population, great resources, and were spared the destruction of war. Those are important, but the single biggest reason is because of the system our forefathers had the sense to establish, a system under which we have 48 separate political units, but only one economic unit.

"My State is Minnesota. We have high-grade iron ore, but we can't get prosperous on iron ore unless we can get it with good coal. We don't have coal in Minnesota. Where is the coal? In West Virginia, a thousand miles away.

"Why were we able to grow so strong? Because the iron ore from Minnesota and the coal from West Virginia can get together in Pittsburgh and Cleveland and Detroit and Gary, Ind., without going through three or four sets of currencies and customs barriers, with delays, confusion, and loss of time and money at each."

If the basic system which has prevailed in Europe is continued it will be impossible for any amount of money or goods poured into Europe to cure the situation. It is like giving a sick patient palliative transfusions and no real remedies. He looks a little better after each transfusion but when they end he collapses.

Will the countries take the steps necessary to remedy their underlying maladies?

Last fall when I was there I had serious doubts about it. For example, I was more discouraged in England than almost anywhere else. We talked with Mr. Bevin and other members of the British Cabinet. Mr. Attlee was away that week end for a vacation. We talked, among other things, about coal production, because that is the crux of the situation today, just as coal was the major factor that enabled the enterprising Britishers of yesterday to build the greatest empire of all time. Someone has rightly said that England could become great because it is an island lying on a bed of coal.

It was their coal that enabled them to make steel from their iron ore, to build ships, and power the ships, and send their products, manufactured more cheaply by coal than others could make them by hand, to the ends of the earth, exchange them for raw materials, bring them back, process them with coal and send them out again. Besides they had surpluses of coal which they could export to Sweden in exchange for iron ore, to Norway for wood pulp and sardines, to France for textiles and silks and wines, to Italy for fruits, vegetables, olive oil, to Denmark for butter, eggs, bacon, and so on.

Then England failed to mine enough coal. The production rate has been steadily falling for many years. To be sure most of the best beds have been worked, the seams are narrow and crooked and the mines are deeper, but there is still plenty of coal in England for two or three hundred years.

One reason for the acute crisis is that during the six war years, thousands and thousands of British boys, instead of following their fathers into the mines, went off to war. They encountered the hazards of battle but at least they could be in the fresh air. Many of them are not willing to go back into the coal mines.

But more important and basic has been the long-standing opposition of British labor leaders and miners to mechanization of the mines. That was understandable, though shortsighted. They remembered the long years of unemployment when they were on the dole. So they fought against any machinery that would increase production, because a machine might put a man out of work. As a result coal production went down and down and the price went up. They didn't realize they were pricing their coal out of the world market as against coal produced by machines, until they would have, not a few miners, but most of the industry out of work.

Our American miners by and large also opposed mechanization, but they had a tough leader who went into their conventions year after year, slugged it out with them and won by sheer force of vision and courage. He cooperated with management to mechanize the mines until today the American miner produces four to five tons a day, while the British miner can seldom produce one ton. The American miner has become one of the best paid workers in the world as a result. John L. Lewis gets enough brickbats so that he ought to have a bouquet when he deserves one.

There is another reason for England's troubles. The Labor Party for decades advocated nationalization of the mines. That was supposed to cure all the problems. But could anyone expect the owners to put their money into improving the mines if they might then be taken over at a confiscatory rate?

The different policies, economic and political, in our two countries has produced this illuminating set of figures: more than 70 percent of the net profits of American coal mines in the last 20 years has been plowed back into improvement of the mines; in England less than 20 percent. That tells the whole story.

Why did capital not act in the normal way in England as it did in America? Because there was no incentive. Neither men nor money will work without incentive. The state then resorts to compulsion, and it always ultimately fails.

The labor groups in England focused their attention so completely on getting a more equitable distribution of goods and money that they forgot that first you have to produce or there isn't anything to distribute—except cold, hunger, and want. Like many reformers, in their emphasis on the weaknesses of the capitalistic system they forgot its very great strength, its capacity to get production.

The first requirement in England and in Europe is greater production. Lack of that is the cause of most of their troubles which it is proposed to remedy by the Marshall plan. Now can they get the productive mechanism going? We asked Mr. Bevin what they were doing about this. He said they had just reduced the hours of work from 47 to 40 a week. They had promised it, and they had to do it. That is a strange way to begin increasing production.

When he said, "We must have your help," we made bold to ask, "Mr. Secretary, do you really think we can go back to the people of the United States and persuade them they must work harder to save England than the English are willing to work to save England?"

He was asking for the gold buried in Kentucky. But far more essential for their recovery is the coal buried in England.

On the basis of the state of affairs in England in September, I could see little hope. You can't save a patient no matter how much medicine you pour into him if he hasn't the will to do the things necessary for his recovery.

The British have a magnificent negative courage. One always comes away with the highest respect and admiration for their unbelievable ability to endure. But what they need is more than negative courage to endure. They have got to regain a positive imaginative courage to correct.

Contrast their leadership with that in Holland. One night we talked to the Dutch cabinet, and a leading minister said to us, "Imagine the difficulty of my position. I am a Labor Party leader. I am a Socialist. I have worked all my life to get my party into power so that we could reduce hours, increase wages, improve working conditions, and carry out the reforms for which we have campaigned. And then we come to power at a time when Holland is on her back, and I have to go down to my own party's convention and tell them we can't shorten the hours of work per week. We have got to lengthen them. We simply can't carry out our promises. We have to put them aside until Holland is restored."

He had political courage. He had the realism to subordinate dogma to facts. Holland's difficulties were about as great as England's but her leaders had the will and the courage to attack those difficulties positively and Holland has bounced back surprisingly.

Look at the cabinet of Belgium. Of all the cabinets we visited, this one was to me the most impressive. The average age of its members is 42. Most are veterans of the war. The Deputy Prime Minister is about 38. The Minister of Labor is 32. They weren't sitting down resigning themselves to their difficulties—just pulling their belts tighter. They were grabbing hold of the difficulties with imagination and vigor. As a result Belgium has recovered more rapidly than any other country, even though she too was occupied 5 years.

Fortunately, for whatever reason, some of the leaders in England woke up about September to the fact that the United States couldn't save them unless they were willing to work harder and more realistically. They modified their dogmas somewhat, set aside some of their program, instituted some incentives, and as a result every week since, with the exception of thet Christmas holiday, there has been an increase in coal production. There is real hope in the situation today as there wasn't last fall.

Look at France for a moment. We talked to members of the French cabinet about closer economic cooperation in Europe. Mr. Ramadier was Prime Minister—a fine, genial old gentleman and scholar. He said, "Of course, these things ought to be done, we know that, but it is very difficult to do them. France is an old country and we have great traditions." Everywhere we found that the greater a nation's past, the more it is hampered by its traditions. That, too, is understandable. We know they can't accomplish all the changes overnight or in a year or in a decade, but they never can change at all, or even survive, unless they are willing to start, and start now.

I ventured to say, "Mr. Prime Minister, we in the United States have some traditions, too. We are not a young republic. We are the oldest of the republics. What is our No. 1 tradition—our most deep-rooted and firmly held tradition? It is this: Don't have anything to do with Europe. You expect us to reverse our strongest tradition, but you aren't willing to attempt to modify your own traditions."

We talked about the problem of getting Germany back into production. It is admittedly a tough question. If we had been through what they have at the hands of the Germans, we doubtless would feel as they do. I don't blame them for the way they feel, but the fact remains they cannot solve the problems with their emotions and fears.

The Belgians and the Dutch fear the German military just as much as France does, but they are facing the problem with their heads, rather than with their hearts. They know if the Germans aren't permitted to go back to work at industrial production, turning out steel and machinery and chemicals and fertilizer, France, too, cannot recover, Belgium and Holland cannot recover—Europe cannot recover. To wreck German industry isn't just destroying Germany; it is destroying themselves, too.

For the Ruhr is more than a German asset. The Ruhr is a European asset. Western Europe simply cannot become a sound economic organism until the Ruhr is put to work, producing manufactured goods to ship abroad to get foreign exchange to buy the foods and raw materials Europe must have to live. Western Europeans must find other ways than destruction of Germany to get the security they properly want and need.

They are at last beginning, I believe, to wake up to the hard fact that their choice is not between allowing the Germans to produce or not allowing them to produce. Their choice is between having the Germans produce with and for western Europe, or having them produce for Russia. If western Europe and ourselves do not permit, even assist the Germans to get on their feet to produce the goods of peace, do not succeed in tying their economy in with western Europe's so it is more profitable for them to go along with the peaceful democratic nations of the world than with the totalitarians, then the unrest in Germany will grow until it becomes uncontrollable by us, communism will win, and the Germans will be put to work with their production used by and for the Soviet Union.

The Germans will either be working with the free nations, or they will be working for the Soviet. That is the only choice France has.

In summary, the question in western Europe is not whether they are to get together or not get together. The question is whether they will get together voluntarily on some basis of federation, or be eventually gotten together involuntarily on the basis of dictatorship.

The 16 free nations and western Germany are now like our 13 colonies were. Either they will hang together, or they will hang separately.

Eastern Europe too was made up of nations that were very nationalistic. Bulgaria was very jealous of her complete independence, economically as well as politically. So was Poland, and so were the rest of them. Believe me, they are not independent now. The wheat from Bulgaria, the oil from Rumania, the coal from Poland, all go where the Soviet Union decides. They are already one economic unit and are moving rapidly toward, in effect, political union, whether they like it or not. With Russia's own great manpower and resources and those of the eastern European nations working as one economic unit they have an enormous advantage over divided Western Europe. The western nations will either get together voluntarily and stay free, or they will be gotten together involuntary and be slaves.

We can't succeed in producing economic recovery, no matter how much money and goods and effort we put in, unless they themselves are willing to make a more determined collective attack on their problems. I think there is now a 75-percent chance that they will do it. They have gotten a glimpse of what goes on behind the iron curtain. They have seen the strength and the intentions of their own Communist minorities. They desire freedom now as never before. I think they are willing to make the necessary effort—if they have hope of assistance. On this first criterion I think our aid program is justified—and necessary.

The second condition necessary to give ERP a 50–50 chance of success is that Asia be kept free too, because if Asia is lost to the Soviets, in my judgment, we will lose ultimately in Europe also.

As China goes, so will go Asia. I talked about the situation in China when I was with you last, 3 years ago. Today, as then, the key question is not whether we are going to help the Chinese; it is whether they are to be in a position to help us; whether we are going to be able the keep the Chinese free and on our side in the struggle between the two worlds.

I am willing to hazard the prediction that future historians will agree that World War II from the beginning was a war more than anything else to determine who is going to control the development of Asia.

Suppose we go into the Marshall plan in Europe and we succeed even better than anybody expects. What do we have? Still two worlds: On one side Russia with her satellites; and on the other these 16 countries of Europe, the United States, Canada, Australia, and a few others—two great armed camps. Who holds the balance of power? The billion and a quarter people who live in Asia.

The crucial question of the twentieth century is this: Which way are the people of Asia going? With the free world, as overwhelmingly they prefer? Or in helplessness and despair with the totalitarian police state world?

Lenin understood that. He wrote about 1921 that the final decision would be made by the millions in Asia. In contrast, our Government's actions, or inaction, indicate it considers that what happens in Asia is of relatively little or no concern to us. Some of our key leaders have systematically built up and encouraged the widely-held attitude that if the Chinese Government—exhausted by 8 years of war against Japan and 2 against a Communist rebellion—can't solve its problems, let the Communists take over.

But for what did we fight the last war, pray tell? If China and Asia are not to be free then it would have been better for us to have them under Japan than under Russia. If China is not to be free, then the war against Japan was not only useless—it was criminal—because we are left with less security than before we resisted Japan.

If Russia is to be the strongest power in Europe, it would have been better for us to have Japan dominant in Asia rather than to have Russia the strongest power in both Europe and Asia.

One hundred thousand American boys died to win victory in the Pacific and it is all but thrown away in two and a half years by bungling, or worse, in our own Governments especially in our State Department.

When in history did a nation ever lose so much as we have lost by drift, indecision, default, and folly since VJ-day?

If China doesn't have the right kind of help from us quickly, she will collapse or be taken over by the Communists, just as Greece, Italy and France would have months ago if they had not had very decisive help—and as they and others will still collapse without help from us.

The State Department spokesmen say these European countries can't recover without help. Then they say that we can't help China until she recovers. That is precisely like saying to a desperately sick man, "You get well first and then we will give you the penicillin." But China cannot recover until she has help.

Conditions are indeed bad in China. During every prolonged invasion anywhere there is a break-down of morals and of morale, along with economic and political deterioration. Our own South didn't look very good, either, after Sherman got through with it. It took it 50 years to recover from 1 or 2 years of occupation.

But the Chinese had 8 years of invasion and occupation by the Japanese—8 years of disruption of their economy, their communications, their society. Eight years in which their people were taught that the ancient vices were now virtues, that it was patriotic and therefore honorable to cheat and steal and defraud the invader. Then the war ended and some Americans naively imagined those new habits could be reversed overnight—just like turning off the faucet that gives hot water and turning on another and getting cold water.

China has got to have help or it cannot resist the Communist inroads at a time when the Government and the economy are so weakened. If China goes down, then Russia will have control, through her ruthlessly efficient Communist fifth column, of the greatest body of manpower on earth, occupying the strategically advantageous central position—the hub—in Asia, just as Germany is the hub in Europe.

Then the rest of east Asia can be taken under the Soviet wing almost at will. The assassination of Mr. Gandhi removed almost the last remaining bulwark in that land against extreme violence and confusion which would leave the country so divided and chaotic that a disciplined handful of Communists with a program of attractive promises can take over. In no country they have seized does the hard core of Communist rulers constitute more than 2 or 3 percent of the people.

Then Korea will go.

Three months ago in Korea I talked one night to Mr. Kim Koo, who from about 1905 to 1945 was the head of the Korean Government-in-exile in China. After VJ-day, he was able to come back to Korea.

I said to him, "What should America do now? We have delayed 2 years hoping we could get agreement with the Russians that would reunite Korea, but cooperation with them hasn't worked here any better than anywhere else. Should we delay longer, waiting for the UN Commission to see what it can do? Should we go ahead in south Korea anyway, hold elections, set up a defense force and try to get the country on its feet and withdraw our forces? Or what?"

He studied a minute and then said, "It doesn't make any difference what you do now. There isn't any way to get Korea so that she can be independent and secure and self-sustaining, until you solve the Communist problem across the border in Manchuria."

He knows that if Russia controls Manchuria, the Communists, when we leave Korea, will take it over too.

Japan also will go. I talked one night for an hour and a half with General MacArthur, one of the greatest men I have ever met. He said he was no longer worried about Japan as such. What kept him awake at night, he said, is the situation in China.

All we do in Japan will stand or fall on what happens in China. Japan's problem now is basically economic. She simply doesn't have the raw materials to enable her to live without access to those of Manchuria, China, and other parts of Asia. She must either be supported indefinitely by us, or she must be able to restore much of her prewar pattern of trade with the Asiatic Continent, which she can never do if it is kept in chaos or is cut off by the iron curtain, as north Korea is cut off from south Korea and eastern Europe from western Europe.

So we have either got to go back on our pledges, turn over the Japanese to Russian control, and abandon the western Pacific, or else we have got to subsidize Japan with hundreds of millions of your dollars each year and defend her with your boys. Don't make any mistake about that.

We disarmed Japan. We wrote into her new constitution she never again can go to war. Therefore she can't have an army. What happens when we walk out? Why, of course, the Soviets take over.

The Japanese are realistic. They are about to write us off as a bunch of politically immature incompetents when it comes to handling our foreign relations. They are resigning themselves to what now seems to them almost inevitable.

Then the Philippines will go. Let no one imagine the Philippine Republic can ever become self-sustaining or secure, or long remain free, if the continent off which it lies and on which it must depend for most of its future trade is controlled by the Soviets.

Still further, how can the Marshall plan get England and Holland on their own feet and off the American taxpayers' back if East Asia is under the Soviets? They would not have been solvent before without their trade with the Far East. It was its tin, rubber, spices, oil, etc., which gave them most of the dollars they had then and lack of which forces us to supply them now. Does anyone think we are going to be able to stop subsidizing the British and the Netherlands in 1952 if they have not been able to restore, on a mutually beneficial basis, something like their prewar pattern of trade with those areas formerly their colonies?

Most important of all, Russia will have a far better chance of defeating the recovery program in Europe, if she can get first China and then East Asia under her control so she can focus her efforts more boldly and aggressively against our efforts in Europe.

We seem intent on making the same mistake a second time in one decade—the mistake of thinking that what happens in Europe is more important to us than what happens in Asia; or thinking that events in Asia are less likely to get us into war than those in Europe.

But we did not get into the last war in Europe. Hitler did not move against us until Japan had attacked us so he knew we would have to fight a two-front war. And Japan did not attack us until she thought she had China broken so she wouldn't have to fight a two-front war.

The tough men in the Kremlin are hardly so dumb as to get themselves into a two-front war. They are most unlikely to risk a showdown with us in Europe unless they can first get satellites and security along their Asiatic border so that if war comes they won't have to fight on two fronts.

It may well be that our single best hope of preventing World War III is to keep Russia compelled to divide her forces, her attention, her efforts between her east and her west. If she can beguile us into looking in the other direction until China goes down—as all our left wingers and their dupes have tried for several years, and successfully, to persuade us to do—then Russia can concentrate all her attention and her efforts on defeating recovery in Europe, which she has officially announced she is determined to do. My guess is that under such circumstances she can probably succeed. I don't like this conclusion but I cannot escape it.

So our choice in Asia is not between helping the present Chinese Government, and something better. I wish it were. Our choice is between the Chinese Government and the Communists—which is infinitely worse.

Right after Pearl Harbor the United States Congress passed a bill appropriating $500,000,000 for China. It wasn't a loan; it was an outright grant. It was passed with little debate and without a dissenting vote.

Why? Because there was a good government in China? An efficient government? A noncorrupt government? No, indeed. It was the very same government that is there now—the one we are being told is too bad for us to support or associate with. It was passed because we desperately needed China on our side

Well, is an independent and friendly China less vital to our security now than then? I think not.

If it hadn't been so humiliating, it would have been comical to witness the great United States that had been supplying the Japanese militarists against China now practically down on its knees, pleading, "Please, China, please hang on, hold the Japanese three long years until we can rebuild our sunk navy, capture the islands one by one, develop the B-29 and the atomic bomb and then bring our superior power to bear on Japan."

China bled herself white buying that time for us—and now gets pushed aside allegedly because her Government isn't as democratic or efficient as we would like. China's weaknesses today are in large part the result of her loyalty, not of her disloyalty. Some of them are badges of honor, not of disgrace.

The Chinese leaders whom we now label Fascists or reactionaries are mostly those who warned Chiang Kai-shek we would throw China down. Now we insist that he kick them out. How can he kick them out when they were right? They urged after Pearl Harbor that he concentrate on eliminating the Communists, and let us fight the Japanese. After all, we were the ones who had made the money selling Japan the scrap iron and the oil—why not let us do the fighting?

But Chiang and most of his people believed our Government's promises; they assumed we would stand by them after the war as they had stood by us during the war. China is disintegrating today largely because of that misplaced faith.

But my primary concern is not for the Chinese. They know how to "eat bitterness." Somehow they will pull through. Besides they have clear consciences; they haven't betrayed anyone; they can sleep at night.

My greatest concern is for my own country. How much more will it cost us—in money and resources and men—to keep western Europe free, or even ourselves, if China and Asia go down?

In the long run we need them worse than they need us. Almost everyone in Asia sees that clearly. They wonder why we fail to, why a nation with all the aces insists on playing them so badly, or even throws them away.

I doubt that ERP can succeed in Europe if Russia gets control of China—which means Asia—as Russia will if we don't help effectively and at once.

An intelligent and immediate program of aid to China consisting of moral support, surplus munitions, American personnel for military training and advice at all levels, dollars to balance China's international payments, stabilize her currency, and loans for specified development projects would not cost more than a billion and a half dollars. If that billion and a half for China should make the difference between success and failure of the proposed seventeen billion for Europe, it would seem to me a good investment.

It is to save money, not to waste it, that I believe we must make a real effort to keep China independent and on our side.

The third criterion necessary to give ERP a 50–50 chance of success, in addition to vigorous collective effort by the European countries and prompt action to save the Far East, is that we get an organization to administer the program that can and will do it on a hard-headed, businesslike, efficient basis. Its personnel must have warm hearts but completely cold heads.

Money, materials, and good will alone won't do the job. We have to have top-notch men who will actually get the coal mines producing coal, get the railroads running, get the steel plants and the fertilizer factories producing, the fertilizer out on the fields, and so on.

There are plenty of Americans who have that administrative know-how. But there are not many in old-line Government agencies. And no one need expect that they will come in and work under such agencies. The old-line agencies are not set up and staffed to administer. They are set up to make studies and prepare reports, to consider and evaluate, to formulate policies and general plans.

Then, again, they operate on the seniority basis, or, as we call it, the senility basis. Every normal man wants to get ahead in life, and if you are in an outfit organized on the seniority basis, the one thing that is necessary for you to get to the top is just this: To live long enough.

Well, that is not quite true. You also must make no enemies. And what is necessary to make no enemies? You must never have an idea. You can't get ahead if you have ideas, if you exercise initiative and imagination.

In any bureaucratic organization operating on the basis of seniority there is a premium on conforming and a penalty on imagination, initiative, drive. This job can't be done by any such Government agency. It will require the very best executives America has to make it succeed.

I never can vote for this proposal if it is placed in or under one of the regular old-line departments or agencies, because they are not set up or trained or equipped to do it. They have to deal with other governments in traditional methods. Their main concern must be to avoid incidents or hurting feelings.

The administrator of this program has to deal with other governments and foreign business or industrial organizations on a basis of hard-headed efficiency and results in tons of food and steel. If it is not done that way, the resources and strength of the United States will be squandered and the desired results still not obtained, the people over there still not saved. I think we will get such an administrative set-up in the law—if the administration will cooperate and appoint top-notch men.

My fourth criterion is this: We must be willing to put in enough to win.

Would you like your doctor to say: "You have pneumonia, and you are mighty sick. I will give you a million units of penicillin, but I am telling you in advance that if you don't get well on the one million, I won't give you any more."

We don't say when we go to war, "We will spend $100,000,000,000, and if we don't win with that, we will quit, we will surrender."

When the President comes to us and says it has to be $17,000,000,000 or nothing, I can't accept that without careful scrutiny—because the $17,000,000,000 figure is merely the sum of about 17 other figures—one for each of 16 countries plus western Germany. Until each of those amounts is explained and justified to us, obviously the sum of them cannot be accepted.

So I do not know just what the proper estimate is. But I am convinced that if we are prepared to put in whatever it takes, it will cost us less—rather than more—assuming the other criteria are also fulfilled.

That is, if we are willing to put in twenty or twenty-five billion if necessary to win, I don't think it will actually take $12,000,000,000. There are far larger reserves in those countries than are now visible. Farmers in France and Italy are not going to bring out their grain, their hogs, or chickens to sell for paper money when there isn't anything to be bought with it that they want, and as long as its value is steadily depreciating. But once there is hope of revival, of stability, of factories being put into operation turning out goods they want and need, you will find enormously greater resources than expected in commodities, in industry and initiative, and in productive capacity, both agricultural and industrial.

Russia hangs over their heads day and night. They are not sure who is friend and who is enemy even in their own countries. You can't expect them to be too bold in standing up against the Communists, unless they are reasonably sure they will be supported effectively. If we are willing to stay in and pitch until we win, I am confident they are stronger than either we or they realize. Together we can win if we go all-out. If we are not prepared to do that, I doubt that it is wise to start.

There was a very wise man who once said, "If you are going out to war and you find the enemy has 20,000 men and you have only 10,000 men, you'd better not get into that battle. Better try to resolve your differences some other way.

"If you are planning to build a house, first decide whether you have enough to complete it. If not, better not start at all."

His name was Jesus. He is usually thought of as a sentimentalist. Actually He was a hard-headed realist. We must have men in government with His wisdom and practical good sense.

The other day I participated in a forum on this issue, and one of my colleagues said, "We should attempt this recovery program even if we fail. It is better to try it and fail than not to try it at all."

I cannot agree for a moment. We had better not try it at all than try it and fail. That is inexcusable. It does no one any good, and can bring disaster. If we are not prepared to make a go of it, then let's not start.

And now the fifth criterion. We must move on to another stage in our foreign policy—from appease, then resist, then assist to reorganize and strengthen the United Nations.

At best, the ERP buys time—holds back the dictatorship world to give the free world time in which to try to get organized on a better, sounder basis. Will we use that time to get the United Nations re-formed, with its charter revised or amended so that it can take on the job of resisting aggression anywhere which we are compelled to assume in this emergency? We had to do it when Greece and Turkey were threatened. We have to do it now when Italy, France, and others are threatened. We are at present the only Nation with the resources and strength to do it. So we have to do the best we can. But we haven't the resources or wealth or strength to carry on this policeman's job indefinitely—and we haven't the wisdom. Furthermore, if we try to do it indefinitely the rest of the world will come to hate us in the process.

If we can win a little time, a breathing spell, and if we use that time to exercise positive, vigorous, imaginative leadership to get the nations together on a workable basis, since the present United Nations structure has proved not workable, then I think the program makes sense. We must get the world organization so it can handle emergencies like these—in the name and in the strength of humanity, not of just one or a few nations. We must get it with Russia if possible—without her if necessary.

Stalin and his Politbureau apparently think that we think we cannot get along without Russia, and we act as if they were right. I am convinced that if and when we demonstrate to the Russians that we and the other free peoples of the world can work without them, we will soon find we will be able to work with them.

Probably 80 percent of the people of the world is still willing and able to come along on such a program of organizing to resist further expansion of the area of slavery and dictatorship and to assist expansion of the area of freedom and federation. But they can't do it without our full participation—yes, our active initiative and leadership.

We went into the United Nations with the idea that the veto would be used only to block any possibility of the organization getting out of hand and making war unjustifiably on any member. We were so decent ourselves, and so naive, that we couldn't imagine any nation's leaders coldly planning to use the veto, not to block war, but to block peace. Actually the devil himself could not have thought up a more diabolically ingenious device by which any one of the Big Five with perfect legality and without reproach could use the veto to prevent the making of peace. Russia hasn't used the veto once to block war. She has used it over a score of times to block measures or decisions that were steps in the direction of peace.

We have got to get an organization with laws and a policeman which the peaceful nations can use to prevent aggression and make peace, and not one which a nonpeaceful nation (if one of the Big Five) can use to protect aggression and block peace.

The United States cannot carry this load indefinitely, or very long. Even this emergency program will be a terrific strain. If out of it comes 80 percent of the world organized on a workable basis of voluntary federation, then it will be a good investment, one of the best bargains in history. Without such a result we will have postponed, perhaps, but not prevented the crack-up.

I do not think war with Russia is inevitable, as so many assume. I do not think it is at all probable—if the United States and the nations still free prove worthy in this great crisis and challenge.

The Marshall plan alone is not enough. It is just one important component of the sound over-all foreign policy and program that we must develop and carry through with skill and efficiency if we are to win this political war so as to avoid an atomic war with unforeseeable destruction, if not extermination. No component is more important than getting the world organization reformed either under article 109 or article 51, so that it can function as it is clear the present structure is not functioning. Will we have the wisdom and the greatness to rise to this occasion?

We started out with the big five. China was included out of recognition of the great strength, and moral insight, the great fortitude and endurance she had contributed in holding the line almost alone for 13 years—and because of her enormous potentialities. Actually she was too exhausted to carry much of the load, so it really was the big four.

Then we discovered France was far more broken and divided than generally realized. She had to have help rather than give help. So it was really only the big three.

Then we discovered England was also desperately weakened. She has only a couple of deuces left, although she still plays them masterfully as if they were all aces. So in reality there are only the big two—the two worlds with which I began.

It must become the big one. Is it to be by Congress? Or by agreement?

I am convinced it can be by agreement. Whenever enough of the peaceful governments and peoples of the world get together on a basis that makes clear to the Kremlin that Russia doesn't need to go to war to get security or satisfaction of any legitimate grievances she may have, and that she can't succeed even if she does go to war—at that point agreement becomes more advantageous for Russia, for her own sake, than attempted conquest—and I believe she will come along.

She will still be what she is, yes, but will agree, along with the rest of the world, to stop when the light is red and go when the light is green.

She will come along, not because of anyone's persuasion or bribing or secret deals, as were tried before, but because there is more for her to gain by agreeing than by disagreeing.

As we stand at this great crossroads in our foreign relations, most people are asking, "What is the Kremlin going to do?" That really isn't the place to look. For the decisions in the Kremlin still depend on the decisions in Washington.

And, thank God, the United States is one of the few remaining places on this earth where common people just like ourselves still can determine what the decisions are to be in their Capital City.

And who can do more to shape the views and attitudes of our people toward the expanding role our Nation must assume than those who day in and day out have charge of the training of the minds and hearts of the Nation's children? How great indeed is your opportunity—how terrible your responsibility.

The Ruhr and European Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in the current talk on the revival of German industrial production as it relates to the European recovery program, the practicability of a renewed German military machine striking yet a third time for world conquest should be constantly before us. A balance between productive usefulness, and a renewal of grave danger to the world's security must somehow be struck. Present thinking is in the direction of internationalization of the industrial productive resources of Germany, concentrated in the Ruhr. The following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune is illuminating on this issue:

THE RUHR AND EUROPEAN UNITY

Governor Dewey, in his Lincoln Day address, again called attention to one of the critical phases of a European settlement which American statesmanship has thus far failed to confront. "It was nearly 4 years ago," said Mr. Dewey, "that I proposed that the Ruhr be internationalized to prevent a revival of German militarism and that it then be started full blast as a servant of the people of Europe."

This concept is one which has widespread support within Europe. The nations of the western portion of the continent still fear Germany. They recognize that a recrudescence of German militarism is not a present danger; what they fear is that Germany may be built up, under predominantly American auspices, as a servant of the west and then abandoned, by some turn in American policy, to become its master. The American proposal for a long-term military alliance against Germany is a step toward

meeting this fear, but, in the existing political and economic chaos of the world, it does not carry full conviction to peoples who have seen the Nazi blitzkrieg sweep through their own lands; who, like the French, have been invaded from the east three times within three-quarters of a century.

Internationalization of the Ruhr poses many problems, to be sure. The desire of the Russians to participate is one of them, and a very thorny one. But when so much of the rest of western Germany is being organized without the Russians, and when the latter are already exploiting eastern Germany, it hardly seems that Russian objections should be considered a major stumbling block to the establishment of a western regime in the Ruhr. The dangers of a further fragmentation of Germany, with the possibilities of increasing nationalist tensions there and of weakening the economic structure of the already shattered western zones, must also be taken into account. But surely it is not beyond human ingenuity to internationalize the economic control of the Ruhr without decentralizing the political aspects of Germany beyond a practicable point. Moreover, the Ruhr should be made to work for Germany as well as for western Europe; its production should be available for obtaining foreign exchange for the other, less highly industrialized portions of the occupied territories.

Such a solution of the Ruhr problem would be a long step toward meeting French fears, which have thus far been largely ignored. It would also permit the participation of Belgium and the Netherlands, nations which have voiced some annoyance over the fact that they have not been consulted about a German settlement. It would give a solid core of partnership to a union of western Europe and stimulate progress toward that desirable goal. Above all, it would provide the form of control that would best combine a useful Germany with a safe Germany. Governor Dewey deserves credit for bringing this issue into the spotlight of the campaign.

The European Trade-Unions Are the Strata Through Which the Communists Will Seek To Wreck ERP; the American ERP Agency Must Contain Representatives of Free Trade-Unionism Working Shoulder to Shoulder With Representatives of Industry and Engineering Skill

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press report from Helsinki, Finland, under date line of March 2, states that Finland's Communists today began organizing factory and trade-union meetings to support a military pact with Russia.

The Communists already have possession of the police in Finland and they are attempting to take over the trade-unions of that unfortunate country. The Communists make their most vital and forceful appeals to the workers of any country, promising them the millennium.

Recently Mr. Vino Leskinen, on a lecture tour in Sweden, told of the long-term efforts of the Communists to take over the trade-unions in Finland. He stated that he thought the trade-unions of the Finns could be taken over only by foreign intervention.

It becomes increasingly apparent that it should be the basic policy of our program of aid in the reconstruction of Europe that sound American trade-unionists should participate with the representatives of management, industry, engineering, and agricultural skill. We know that the Communists will attempt to wreck our efforts and that one of their main efforts will be in the trade-unions of Europe.

I wish to include in my remarks an excellent article set forth in Labor's Monthly Survey published by the American Federation of Labor on this subject:

THE ISSUE IS FREEDOM

As Soviet pressures move toward a climax in Europe, the American Federation of Labor is more than ever aware of the grave issues involved. A war is on, a cold war waged by the Soviet Union against our democratic way of life with its guaranties of individual rights and human freedoms. The Soviet objective is to bring free peoples under Moscow's police state, where every individual is subject to the will of the dictator, enforced by spies, police, prisons and the concentration camp, and where there is no recognition of basic personal rights or liberties. In the economic field, it is a struggle to end the system of free enterprise and free unions, and substitute the Communist system of party-controlled industry, where industrial managers are servants of the politbureau and unions have become merely transmission belts to carry the will of the dictator to the workers and get compliance. In countries under Soviet control, there is no such thing as a free union or a free election of union officers. Collective bargaining is unknown.

As the Soviet imperialistic purpose has unfolded in these postwar years, workers in all parts of the world have been roused to its true meaning for them. Although many were at first confused by Soviet propaganda and misuse of the word democracy, there have been strong groups in the trade-union movements of different countries who recognized the real issues from the start. Today free unions, alarmed for their safety, are coming forward to join together for common ideals and purposes, and to protect their freedom against a common enemy.

As the largest and strongest free union movement in the world, the American Federation of Labor recognizes its responsibility to help those unions who are daily struggling against the Communist menace at their very doors. This we owe to our own members as well, for our ultimate danger here in America is as great as that of free workers anywhere else. Moscow has its trained fifth column agents working in the Americas as in Europe and Asia, and is training more Quislings to replace or reinforce the Browders, the Fosters, and the Eislers of today.

A. F. OF L. AIDS FREE UNION MOVEMENT

Because the urge for freedom and self-government comes from people themselves and cannot be imposed from above, the federation's task is to give help where it is asked. This we are doing. Our work began during the war, when we organized relief for trade-unionists who were victims of totalitarian persecution in Europe and China, and tried to maintain relations with them even through the underground.

Today we are answering calls from millions of workers abroad who are giving all they can to save and rebuild their democratic organizations. Our representatives are working from three centers, helping with food, friendship, information, union supplies. In Tokyo, we are giving guidance in techniques of collective bargaining and education in trade-unionism. From our German center, we are aiding workers in Germany and Austria as they rebuild the once strong democratic union movements Hitler tried to destroy. In these two countries, a free trade-union movement is the cornerstone of democracy and the best guaranty against nazism, militarism, and communism. We do not seek to influence the type of union organization, but give wholehearted support to their freely elected officers. Cut off for 12 years from international union movements, these workers hungered for news of union experience. We have distributed literature, given supplementary food, helped to set up rehabilitation camps for young people, addressed forums and labor colleges. Our representative says: "If these movements continue under the idealism which governed them in the past, they will be the force to keep these countries free."

Our center in Brussels works with representatives of 30,000,000 unionists in 20 European countries, and has been effective in clearing up confusion caused by misleading anti-American propaganda of the Soviet Union. Our representative reports that European unions see in the Marshall plan the hope for economic recovery by democratic methods, a means of unifying Europe for mutual progress, a way to preserve free trade-unionism, and escape the new despotism that threatens them To many, the AFL has become a strong partner in the struggle for justice, human values, peace, and democracy. By our own declarations on principles of genuine trade-unionism and against communism and our efforts to get declarations from the United Nations on freedom of association and human rights and against slave labor, we have tried to help them maintain courage and vision. The unions of western Europe are still free and democratic, although Communists have become leaders in some unions, supported by other members whose guidance comes from Moscow. In France and Italy, Communists in political parties and in the unions seek to control the labor movements by a system of terrorism, violence, and a gangster machine which prohibits free voting. In France, more than a million workers have broken away from the Communist leadership and set up a free union movement, the Force Ouvriere. In Czechoslovakia, the Communists, through their control over the trade-unions, the police, and the army, have seized the government and have overpowered President Benes, who insisted on rule by law and parliamentary procedures. The seizure of this country which struggled for democracy is a humiliation to all who believe in democracy.

HEMISPHERE LABOR CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAS

At Lima, Peru, January 10 to 13, representatives of 14,000,000 workers in 16 American countries took forward steps in international labor organization. Representatives of the federation, the railway labor executives, and the machinists of the United States of America participated in the Inter-American Trade Union conference. Because all delegates represented free trade unions, frantic efforts were made by Communists and the government-dominated unions in Argentina to sabotage the conference, but efforts to misrepresent its aims, arouse opposition and create disorder were of no avail. The meeting exceeded all expectations in number of union movements represented, unity of purpose and constructive decisions. It was acclaimed by immense crowds of workers. By unanimous vote the delegates set up the Inter-American Confederation of Labor to become the permanent organization of free trade-unions in the Western Hemisphere. Delegates expressed as their common goals: To assure workers' right to organization and collective bargaining; to build strong effective trade-unions, guided by democratic principles and subject to no outside control; to raise living and working conditions for all workers of the Western Hemisphere and especially those of Latin American countries which have long been depressed; to work for the maintenance of individual liberties and the establishment of permanent peace based on democratic principles. "We want a democratic Inter-Americanism without imperialism," said the United States of America delegation. They emphasized the importance of autonomy for each union group, and independence of trade-unions from control by political parties and governments. The constitution of the new federation bars from membership all totalitarian organizations and groups dominated by them.

Deeply conscious of the world-wide struggle of workers to maintain their freedom, the delegates passed resolutions to promote and strengthen world organization of free unions. They called for organization of a new International Federation of Trade Unions free from Communist domination. They also recommended that all transport and metal workers' unions affiliate with the International Transport Workers' Federation and International Metal Workers' Federation, respectively, thus strengthening the two pre-war international trade-union secretariats which still remain free. This action puts American labor in the forefront of the move to rebuild a genuine democratic world labor movement. Railway unions of the United States of America have already joined the International Transport Workers' Federation.

Bernardo Ibanez, of Chile, is president of the new confederation; George Meany and Bert Jewell, of the United States of America, and representatives of eight other countries are vice presidents. Serafino Romualdi, of the A. F. of L., is secretary of relations. As its contribution to the new organization, the federation has made him its Latin-American representative to devote full time to its affairs.

CONFERENCE OF FREE UNIONS IN MARSHALL PLAN COUNTRIES

The American Federation of Labor has steadfastly refused to join the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions because it is clearly an instrument of Moscow's foreign policy, unable to act independently or to promote the welfare of workers. The need for a genuine international organization of free unions is now keenly felt by the workers of many countries. For one thing, democratic unions in the Marshall plan countries want an opportunity to participate in promoting the European recovery program. They need an organization through which they can cooperate. Without the active cooperation of free unions, such an international undertaking could not hope to reach its goal of reconstruction and progress toward world peace and security.

As far back as last October, the federation proposed a conference of unions in the Marshall plan countries. This conference has now been called for March 8 in London. It can provide a means for rallying and activating the democratic forces that can save European civilization.

THE MARSHALL PLAN BEFORE CONGRESS

President Green appeared before both Senate and House committees to express the federation's wholehearted endorsement of the plan. We want to see a fully adequate program enacted by Congress, without crippling amendments. We are deeply concerned that workers shall have a full chance to participate and contribute to the plan's successful operation. President Green said: "I cannot emphasize too strongly that American labor can perform a basic and distinguished service in this program. We are the only national group that can communicate directly, forcefully, and convincingly to a parallel group in these 16 countries to secure the cooperation of workers essential to the success of the program." He urged that an advisory committee of representatives of functional economic groups, including industry, agriculture, labor, transportation, and finance be set up to assist the Administrator, and a similar committee to work with the executive in Europe. He insisted that the right of wage earners everywhere to join trade-unions of their own choosing be assured, for the purpose of promoting their program. Without this right, democratic institutions are impossible. Germany and Austria must share in the recovery, he said, and dismantling of their factories must stop at once, so they can get production under way in time to supply the needs of the program.

"Economic rehabilitation of Europe is in the interest of all wage earners," he said. "Soviet opposition • • • clearly reveals its rule-or-ruin policy. The American Federation of Labor understands that the European recovery program requires sacrifices and self-discipline on the part of United States citizens. We stand ready to make these sacrifices and to assume new responsibilities. We cannot shut our eyes to the fear and hunger that are the daily portion of those human beings who are close to armed Soviet aggression. We cannot stand by and watch the lights of freedom go out in those lands from which our forefathers came."

On February 17 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously approved a bill authorizing a 4-year European recovery program with $5,300,000,000 for the first year's operation. This sum provides the minimum amount which experts consider adequate. It will cost our country less than 22 days of World War II.[1] Prompt passage of this bill and its companion in the House, without crippling amendments or reduction of funds, will be essential to meet the April 1 deadline when temporary relief for these countries runs out.

FREE TRADE-UNIONS ARE THE BASIS OF A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Workers are the largest group of citizens in most industrial countries. The meaning of trade-unionism in today's struggle for freedom and representative government is clearly illustrated in the statement below by Fritz Tarnow, an outstanding leader of the democratic trade-union movement in pre-Hitler Germany. Active under the Weimar Republic, forced to flee during Hitler's regime, he has now returned to help build a democratic Germany and aid free unions in their struggle against communism. He speaks from the experiences he has lived through, and represents a large number of German unionists. He shows why a free labor movement constantly struggles to realize and maintain democracy, and his statement, clearly specifying what democracy is and what it is not, will do much to clear up confusion caused by Soviet misuse of the word.

FRITZ TARNOW DEFINES DEMOCRACY AND UNION FUNCTIONS

Fritz Tarnow is zonal secretary of trade-unions in United States zone of Germany.

I. "The trade-unions represent the social and economic interests of the employed persons in the economy, the state, and society. The trade-unions declare themselves independent of the state, of private as well as public enterprise, and of the political parties. They declare themselves politically neutral, but they expect the political parties to pass legislation designed to further the interests and demands of the trade-unions with each party itself determining the relationship between itself and the trade-unions.

"The trade-unions fight for the basic human rights and freedoms of all those who respect the rights and freedoms of others.

[1] Expenditures from July 1940 to June 1946 to cover 1,364 days of war. Source: U. S. Treasury.

The safeguarding of the rights of man can only be attained within a democratic state in which all power emanates from the people and all organs of the state are subject to control by the people.

II. "As the existence and activities of trade-unions can be secured only under the freedom of a democratic regime, the fight for the realization of democracy is among their most important tasks.

"By democracy, the trade-unions understand a social order which guarantees the constitution of the state and constitutional institutions:

"1. A representation of the people chosen in general and free elections and having the exclusive right of legislation and the right to institute and dismiss governments;

"2. Freedom of opinion and its expression in speech and in writing, freedom of organization and assembly as well as the freedom to act according to one's religious and philosophical beliefs. These freedoms do not exclude restrictive measures against such activities as are directed against these freedoms or menace their existence. Measures of this kind, however, are admissible only if decreed by regular legislation, and their execution is reserved to the organs of the normal administration of justice.

"3. The obligation of the state to protect life and property of every citizen against arbitrary encroachments, searchings of his house and seizure of his property, which must only be carried through in accordance with existing laws and upon legal order. In cases where immediate police action is necessary, judiciary approval must be procured within 24 hours.

III. "In order to counteract the spiritual confusion caused • • • through the abuse of the word 'democracy', and in order to help to understand the difference between democratic and nondemocratic regimes, the trade-unions explicitly name the following as characteristic of an antidemocratic regime:

"1. Wherever the state leadership has seized power without the free elections by the people, and evades the control of the freely elected representation of the people—there is no democracy.

"2. Wherever plebiscites and elections are carried through without there being freedom of opinion and its expression in speech and writing; wherever a free and independent press is not permitted; wherever the means to shape public opinion are monopolized and at the exclusive disposal of the state authority and the ruling group, thus rendering democratic elections impossible—there is no democracy.

"3. Wherever criticism of state policy is prohibited, persecuted, and threatened with reprisals—there is no democracy.

"4. Wherever the executive power of a state is linked to a monopolized and privileged party, while other parties and movements are prohibited or suppressed—there is no democracy.

"5. Wherever there exists a secret political state police which stands outside the laws and the normal administration of justice, and which can terrorize the population without control through a democratic representation of the people—there is no democracy.

"6. Wherever there are concentration camps, forced labor and similar institutions, in which the ruling group is at liberty to deprive persons of their freedom without laws and legal judgment, where people are authorized by the executive power to maltreat and torture the prisoners in their power, to destroy their health and kill them without being called to account for it—there is no democracy.

"By thus pointing out some of the essential characteristics, every one of which suffices to recognize a regime which is in sharp contradiction to democracy, and which in shape of the criminal Nazi state has evoked the deepest horror and the contempt of the whole civilized world, the German trade-unions

dedicate themselves to a true democracy of freedom, humanity, and respect for the dignity of man."

Mexican Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the recent hearings before the Committee for Reciprocity Information concerning the so-called Mexican trade agreement were probably considered successful by the State Department. The purpose of these hearings was to hear complaints of exporters who felt that Mexico was applying restrictions on our shipments to that country. I cannot agree that in our democracy we will provide opportunity for exporters to be heard while domestic producers, farmers, and laborers are not allowed the same privilege.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following letter which I received concerning this matter and also extracts from a brief filed with the Committee for Reciprocity Information:

FEBRUARY 19, 1948.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Acting Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: Since your committee will soon be considering whether or not to recommend amendments to or termination of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, we felt that you would be interested in the enclosed brief presented to the Committee for Reciprocity Information on behalf of the American producers of fluorspar in connection with the currently proposed negotiation of a reciprocal trade agreement with Mexico.

The State Department announcement of these proposed negotiations with Mexico denies to American producers interested in imports from Mexico their absolute right, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, to appear and present their views before any trade agreement is negotiated or concluded with any foreign country. The State Department announcement invites only exporters to present their views, and states that the negotiation is limited to a revision of schedule I of the 1942 Mexican agreement—that is the Mexican concessions.

This is obviously an attempt to mislead the American public and to deny American producers interested in imports an opportunity to appear and present their views. Mexico terminated the 1942 trade agreement and abolished schedule 2 thereof effective December 20, 1947. It is obviously impossible to negotiate a revision of a tariff schedule that does not exist under a trade agreement that has been terminated by Mexico.

Our argument, briefly, is that since Mexico terminated the agreement on December 20, 1947, the President should, and at least morally is bound to, terminate his proclamation of December 28, 1942, which gave effect to the American concessions granted under that terminated agreement. If the President desires to negotiate a new trade agreement with Mexico under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, he should announce that intention and publish a list of United States commodities on which tariff concessions will be considered, and thus give American producers interested in those commodities an opportunity to appear and present their views.

The President has no authority under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to negotiate a limited agreement with Mexico by saying that we will give you the same concessions which we gave you in 1942 if you will give us a new set of concessions from your December 1947 tariff schedule which provides higher rates of duty.

The American producers of fluorspar have an absolute right to appear and present their views as do millions of other American producers, but this right is being denied them by the President and the State Department.

We have presented this brief to the Committee for Reciprocity Information but since the fluorspar producers are interested in imports and not in exports it is probable that the Committee for Reciprocity Information will refuse to consider it since they have limited the privilege of presenting views to exporters.

Very truly yours,
JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

SUMMARY OF VIEWS

1. Mexico terminated the 1942 reciprocal trade agreement in accordance with the terms of article XVIII thereof on December 20, 1947, by abolishing schedule I of the agreement and publishing a new tariff schedule raising the rates of duty.

2. As a result, United States tariff concessions under the now-terminated Mexican agreement should no longer be permitted to remain in effect.

3. The President, under the intent of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, should have terminated, on December 20, 1947, his proclamation of December 28, 1942, giving effect to the tariff reductions covered in the now-terminated Mexican agreement, thus restoring the tariff rates effective in 1942.

4. The reduction in the duty on low-grade fluorspar from $8.40 to $6.30 per long ton agreed to under the Mexican trade agreement was made ineffective by Mexico's termination of that agreement.

5. The proper current rate of duty on low-grade fluorspar is that prescribed in paragraph 207 of the Tariff Act of 1930—$8.40 per long ton.

6. It is impossible to negotiate a revision of schedule I of the Mexican agreement, as announced by the State Department, since that agreement was terminated and schedule I abolished and replaced by a new tariff schedule with higher rates of duty.

7. Any trade-agreement negotiation with Mexico must necessarily involve a revision of Mexico's new tariff schedule published in December 1947 and must necessarily be based on a reciprocal revision in United States tariff rates in effect in 1942 prior to the now-terminated agreement and properly in effect today.

8. The real intent, though not expressed in the State Department's public notice of December 30, 1947, apparently is to negotiate an entirely new trade agreement. The intent is to negotiate with Mexico an entirely new set of concessions to be granted by Mexico from the new and increased tariff rates recently imposed in the new tariff schedule in consideration of the President's failure to terminate, as contemplated by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the concessions made to Mexico in schedule II of the now-terminated 1942 agreement.

9. The President has no authority to negotiate such an agreement based on an unauthorized failure to terminate his proclamation of December 28, 1942, without giving those Americans interested in imports from Mexico an opportunity to express their views as to the concessions to be offered.

10. The President should terminate forthwith his proclamation of December 28, 1942, as required by Mexico's termination of the 1942 trade agreement and thus restore the 1942 rates of duty.

11. Thereafter the State Department should issue a new public notice announcing intention to negotiate a trade agreement with Mexico and list the commodities on which the United States tariff concessions will be considered.

In 1942 the United States and Mexico negotiated a trade agreement in which each country agreed to reciprocal tariff reductions or bindings on certain commodities imported from the other. The tariff concessions on each side were supposed to be roughly equivalent in value and conditioned on the continued effectiveness of the concessions on the other side.

This agreement was signed on December 23, 1942, and the respective tariff concessions became effective January 30, 1943, for a basic period of 3 years and thereafter subject to continuation indefinitely by mutual consent or termination by either government on 6 months' notice (art. XVIII).

The basic period of 3 years expired January 30, 1946. As early as the latter part of 1945 Mexico notified the United States of her desire and intent to revise and increase the tariff rates covered by the agreement. Mexico felt it essential to increase these tariff rates but could find no means of doing so without terminating the 1942 trade agreement with the United States. After long, closed-door negotiations, during which the United States tried to dissuade Mexico from terminating the agreement, Mexico, about July 1947, notified the United States of her positive intention to increase her tariff rates and terminate the agreement. This was not made public but Mexico finally did, effective December 20, 1947, unconditionally terminate the agreement by increasing the tariff rates on Mexican concession items (schedule I of the agreement) to rates equivalent to those prevailing in 1942 prior to the agreement (Decree of Mexican Government published December 15, 1947, in the "Diario Official" and effective December 20, 1947). Prior to that Mexico had already greatly increased her tariff rates on most products imported from the United States and not covered by the agreement.

By the terms of the agreement, this action by Mexico terminated the agreement and the President of the United States should have terminated his proclamation of December 28, 1942, thus restoring the 1942 tariff rates on United States concession items (schedule II of the agreement). However, the President has not taken this action. Only the reduced tariffs on United States concession items (schedule II) are being collected by the United States customs officials.

After a foreign trade agreement negotiated under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been terminated, there is no authority for the continued effectiveness of a Presidential Proclamation fixing the United States tariff rates covered by the terminated agreement. The authority of the President to proclaim modifications in tariff rates and other customs treatment is limited by the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act to "such modifications * * * of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder."

There is no, and since December 20, 1947, there has been no, "foreign trade agreement" requiring the customs modifications contained in the President's Proclamation of December 28, 1942, which covered customs modifications previously required by the terminated Mexican agreement. It therefore necessarily follows that continued effectiveness of the tariff reductions fixed in this proclamation is without any basic authority. It is the President's moral and ethical duty to United States producers affected, if not his legal duty, to terminate forthwith his proclamation of December 28, 1942, and thus restore the affected tariff rates to the legal rates fixed by the Tariff Act of 1930 or an existing and effective foreign trade agreement.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act does not specifically state that the President shall terminate a proclamation when the foreign-trade agreement to which it relates has been terminated. The act merely states that:

"The President may at any time terminate any such proclamation in whole or in part."

Undoubtedly this is the basis of the President's failure to terminate the proclamation covering the terminated Mexican agreement. However, this does not satisfy the President's obligation to the American producers affected by the unauthorized tariff reductions nor his obligation to Congress and to the American public to carry out the intent of Congress as expressed in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and to collect the proper customs duties.

That Congress intended termination of any proclamation issued by the President on the basis of a particular foreign trade agreement immediately upon termination of that agreement, either by the foreign government (Mexico in this case) or the United States, seems too clear to require argument except for the President's recent inaction in so completely ignoring that intent. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act provides that:

"Every foreign trade agreement concluded pursuant to part III shall be subject to termination, upon due notice to the foreign government concerned, at the end of not more than 3 years from the date on which the agreement comes into force, and if not then terminated, shall be subject to termination thereafter upon not more than 6 months' notice."

It would take a warped sense of justice to argue that because the act merely says, "The President may * * * terminate any such proclamation * * *" the Congress meant that the agreement to which the proclamation gave effect could be terminated without at the same time terminating the proclamation. Also, to argue that Congress intended the termination provisions to apply only to a termination by the United States and not to a termination by a foreign country would take a warped sense of justice and would be an insult to the millions of Yankee traders in the United States and in Congress. No Yankee trader ever gave X an automobile for a dog and let X retain the automobile after X had taken the dog back.

Mexico has terminated the agreement with the United States and taken back the tariff reductions granted under that agreement, yet the President has not terminated his proclamation. The customs officials are still collecting only the reduced import duties specified in the terminated Mexican agreement. Is this proper merely because Congress put too much reliance in the good faith and common, Yankee trading sense of those who would administer the act and said "may" instead of "shall" terminate any such proclamation?

To hold that it is proper or to hold that the President is not required to terminate a proclamation giving effect to a particular foreign trade agreement when that agreement is terminated would be holding that the Congress intended all tariff reductions negotiated by the President to remain in effect permanently even after all foreign countries had terminated the trade agreements providing for such tariff reductions. In other words, every existing trade agreement could be terminated by the foreign (governments) contracting parties and still all the United States tariff reductions agreed to in those terminated agreements would remain permanently in effect if the President so desired. Certainly Congress did not so intend. A serious person could hardly argue that Congress did not intend to require the President to terminate the tariff concessions involved when the agreement providing for such concessions is terminated by the foreign government involved.

The duty on low-grade fluorspar (containing not more than 97 percent calcium fluoride) was set at $8.40 per long ton in the Tariff Act of 1930. This rate of duty was reduced to $6.30 effective January 30, 1943, by Presidential proclamation of December 28, 1942, under the 1942 trade agreement with Mexico. Since this trade agreement was terminated by Mexico effective December 20, 1947, the only authorized rate of duty is $8.40 per long ton. Yet the customs officials are collecting only the $6.30 rate because of the President's failure to terminate his proclamation.

The fluorspar producers of the United States are being injured by the failure of the customs officials to collect the full rate of duty fixed in the Tariff Act of 1930. Also every American taxpayer is being injured by the failure of customs officials to collect the full amount of the authorized tariff rate on fluorspar and other products covered in the now terminated Mexican agreement. The fluorspar producers respectfully urge that the President immediately terminate his proclamation and instruct the customs officials to collect the full rate of $8.40 on all future importations of low-grade fluorspar.

Any negotiation with Mexico should be the negotiation of an entirely new trade agreement. Intention to conduct such a negotiation should be announced by the State Department and all interested persons (including those interested in imports from Mexico) given an opportunity to express their views.

Department of State press release No. 968 of December 13, 1947, states:

"The United States has consented to this action (termination of agreement) in recognition of the acute need of the Government of Mexico to correct the imbalance in its trade relations with the United States and to afford a more reasonable measure of protection for Mexican industries until such time as the negotiations for a more definitive schedule I mentioned above can be concluded.

"Those negotiations will be undertaken immediately following the termination of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment now in session at Habana, and will be conducted pursuant to the Trade Agreements Act and in accordance with the procedures established thereunder. The customary public notice of intention to negotiate will be issued, and interested parties invited to submit views to the Committee for Reciprocity Information in writing and orally at public hearings. The contemplated negotiations will include, for the present, changes in schedule I only."

The public notice mentioned in the above quote was issued by the State Department on December 30, 1947, but only exporters were invited to submit views. The American public interested in imports from Mexico were not invited to submit views. This notice stated that such negotiations are to be limited to "the revision of schedule I of the trade agreement."

This is obviously an attempt to negotiate an entirely new trade agreement with Mexico based on the tariff reductions proclaimed by the President under the terminated agreement of 1942 in return for a new set of concessions from the new and higher Mexican tariff schedule. The purpose of this misleading attempt is apparently to deny that portion of the American public interested in imports from Mexico their absolute right under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to appear and present their views as to what tariff concessions should be offered to the Mexican Government.

It is impossible to conduct a negotiation such as the State Department has announced to the public. To attempt to so mislead the American public is an insult to their intelligence.

Schedule I of the trade agreement does not exist. Mexico has terminated the trade agreement, abolished Schedule I and has published an entirely new tariff schedule for all items listed in the old schedule I. How can the State Department negotiate a revision of something that does not exist?

Obviously any negotiation with Mexico must look to an entirely new trade agreement and must necessarily be based on the now effective Mexican tariff schedule and the United States tariff schedule effective in 1942 and properly applicable today since termination of the Mexican agreement on December 20, 1947. The American public should be so advised and given an opportunity to present its views on any revision of the legal rates of 1942.

It is respectfully suggested that the President should terminate his proclamation of December 28, 1942 and thus restore the legal rates of duty effective in 1942, and that the State Department should issue a new public notice of intention to negotiate a trade agreement with Mexico, publishing therewith a list of commodities on which United States tariff concessions will be considered. This would give, as required by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and Executive orders issued thereunder, those Americans interested in imports notice of the commodities on which concessions by the United States will be considered and an opportunity to express their views on each such commodity.

Without first giving any interested person, including those interested in imports, an opportunity to present his views, the President has no authority, in a trade agreement with Mexico, to agree to grant Mexico the same concessions which had been granted in 1942 under a separate and terminated trade agreement; or, to put it another way, to agree with Mexico, in return for a new set of concessions from Mexico, to fail to terminate his proclamation of December 28, 1942, as was intended by Congress and clearly contemplated by the wording of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act provides that:

"Before any foreign trade agreement is concluded with any foreign government or instrumentality thereof under the provisions of part III of this title, reasonable public notice of the intention to negotiate an agreement with such government or instrumentality shall be given in order that any interested person may have an opportunity to present his views to the President, or to such agency as the President may designate, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe."

It is thus apparent that the President has no authority to conduct the announced negotiation with Mexico without first giving all interested persons an opportunity to express their views. Those persons interested in imports from Mexico have not been given such an opportunity.

Address Before St. David's Society of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

made by me before the St. David's Society of Washington, D. C., on March 1, 1948:

I bring you greetings tonight from the Welsh people of Wisconsin's Second Congressional District. Tonight, hundreds of Welsh-Americans are meeting in Wisconsin communities like Cambria, Wales, Dodgeville, Newey, and Waukesha to celebrate St. David's day, just as their fathers and their grandfathers have done for many, many years. There will be Welsh food, and Welsh stories, but most of all, there will be the singing of the old Welsh songs.

For centuries, England has tried to assimilate Wales, but without success. For over two years, Welsh people have lived in Wisconsin. Their Welsh blood strain has been diluted by intermarriage with the Scotch, the Irish, the Germans and the Scandinavians in Wisconsin, but through this more than a century in America, the Welsh of Wisconsin have steadfastly refused to be assimilated. It is all the more remarkable when you realize that the Welsh language has never been taught in our schools of Wisconsin, the Welsh tongue is seldom heard in our church sermons today, and the Welsh traditions have prevailed only because they have been handed down from father to son, and from mother to daughter.

The first Welsh came into Wisconsin in 1840, 8 years before Wisconsin became a State. They settled in the section of the State which I now represent in Congress, and they found their homes in the rolling hills, the moorlands and along the rivers and lakes of our district because this new land reminded them of home. They gave many of our communities the names of their homes in Wales. One such settlement in my home county is called Wales. Many of the other names are familiar to you people too, for we have Welsh Prairie, Jerusalem Prairie, Peniel, Ixonia, Bangor, Davis Corners, Somerset, and Sussex.

Unlike the German and Scandinavian peoples, who poured into Wisconsin in its early days, we never had large Welsh immigrant stock in Wisconsin. A census taken in 1905, for example, showed that in our entire State we had only 2,811 native Welshmen who had come to America, and they had 10,603 American-born children. That such a small group of people coming into a strange land could make so lasting an impact on the new country is proof enough of their character and leadership.

While the Germans and the Scandinavians spread over our entire State, the Welsh settled in colonies together and many of the farms in my district today are owned and farmed by direct descendants of those early Welshmen, who came to our State shortly after 1840. As a result, many of us of Welsh blood are related to folks in all the surrounding area, and we have family kinships that are unknown in many States where settlers tarried for a time and then moved on.

In fact, that brings to my mind something that happened when I ran for Congress in a special election in our district last year. A friend of my opponent came over to my county and started campaigning against me among the farmers of southern Waukesha County. He soon discovered that he wasn't making much headway, and finally he asked the reason why.

"Well, I'll tell you," an old Welsh farmer in the town of Vernon said. "GLENN DAVIS is related to just about all the folks around here, and them that ain't related to him are related to his wife."

The Welsh came to Wisconsin originally for two reasons. Probably nine-tenths of those who came between 1840 and 1850 were dissenters, Calvinistic Methodists, Baptists, and Congregationalists, who objected to paying tithes for the support of the state religion in Wales. Other factors in causing Welsh people to leave home and come to Wisconsin were economic conditions, and dissatisfaction with landlords.

Due in great part to the Welsh influence, Wisconsin never has had the slightest direct relationship between church and state. And our farmers are widely known as hardy, independent folks who own and operate their own acres. So in Wisconsin the children of Welsh families found the freedom and ethics of life that caused their forefathers to leave the homeland.

One of the settlements which sprang up in the section that I now represent in Congress is Cambria. A thriving little community of about 1,000 persons, it is distinctly Welsh. A survey made there a few years ago revealed that 80 percent could speak the Welsh tongue. But even if the native language had been forgotten, and fortunes no longer was passed on, their names would still betray their nationalistic origin.

For the survey revealed there are 32 Jones families, 20 Williams families, and many Rowlands, Roberts, Edwards, Thomas, Hughes, Davies, Owens, Morris, and Evans families in Cambria. For many years it was customary to distinguish among the many Jones families by adding to their full names some Welsh word that described where they lived—a handle for distinction, they called it. Some of the words, translated into English, mean hilly slope, big woods, brick house, and highest mountain.

Tonight at the Hughes Restaurant back in Cambria, the Welsh people will be celebrating St. David's Day, just as you are here in Washington. Probably only a handful of them actually have seen Wales, but the tradition and the songs of the homeland live on, nurtured by a love of land their fathers recalled.

For many years the Welsh language was heard every Sunday in Sunday schools and churches of these Wisconsin Welsh settlements. Today it is only in three communities that Welsh sermons are preached, and there only at irregular intervals. But it was not until 1920 that the Welsh churches lost their separate identities. In that year the Welsh congregations of Wisconsin affiliated with the Presbyterians as an independent Welsh synod. For the most part, church services now conform with those of other Presbyterians.

But in all this gradual change, there has been one thing that the Welsh have retained without any deviation. That, of course, is their singing. This love of music and of poetry, the Welsh have passed on to their children and to the entire State. All Welshmen try to attend at least one Gymanfa Ganu, although sometimes the Welsh have trouble getting inside the building because there are so many Irish and Germans and Scandinavians already inside to listen to but not participate in the music. Most of these singing festivals are led by trained choirmasters brought in from Milwaukee or Chicago, and the affairs last for hours, with time out only for the serving of delicious foods.

Many of Wisconsin's sons of Welshmen have gone on to earn national fame, and with pardonable pride, I would like to mention a few of them.

There was Evan A. Evans, of Baraboo, who was appointed Federal judge at Chicago by President Wilson and has served there with distinction for 30 years. William A. Jones, of Mineral Point, served as Commissioner of Indian Affairs during the administrations of Presidents McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt. Joseph E. Davies, of Watertown, whose father was a Welsh minister and whose mother was a poetess, was ambassador to Russia under President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his book on Mission to Moscow later was made into a movie. The Reverend Jenkin Lloyd Jones, of Madison, was head of the Abraham Lincoln center in Chicago and his son, Richard Lloyd Jones, a newspaper publisher, is generally credited with having brought about the preservation of Lincoln's birthplace at Hodgenville, Ky., through a series of articles written when Jones was associate editor of Collier's magazine. Peter Houston, who came to the Welsh settlement at Cambria, Wis., with his parents in the early 1840's, invented the folding film roll of Kodak, later purchased by George Eastman. All of you have heard of another Wisconsin Welshman, Frank Lloyd Wright, of Spring Green, admitted to be one of the world's outstanding architects.

I have spent considerable time talking to you about the part that Welshmen have played in Wisconsin's early development. I have done so intentionally, because I felt this probably was the one new bit of information I could bring you on St. David's day.

But no discussion of anything Welsh on this day would be complete without mention of the patron saint of Wales that we honor with our attendance here tonight. The Irish may have their St. Patrick and the Scotch may have their St. Andrew, but today is the Welshman's day, for this is St. David's day.

Recently I put a little item in my news letter to the folks back home in my district, telling them of your kind invitation to attend this dinner tonight. But something went wrong in the typing of that letter, and when the folks back home received it they discovered to their horror that Welsh had been spelled W-e-l-c-h. I don't have to tell you that I heard about that letter from many of my constituents. One of them wrote me that it was not only a shame but a blasphemy for a Welshman to misspell that word, and he closed his letter with this crackling remark: "Always remember that we are a people, and not a grape juice."

One of the reasons that the Welsh are a people, and never have been assimilated by conquesting races, has been the steadfast devotion through all the years to the principles of religion. And, of course, it is because of St. David that this is true.

It is unusual, however, that so little should be known today about this patron saint of over 2,000,000 native Welshmen and countless descendants of Welshmen throughout the entire world. Although historical facts may be lacking, Welsh traditions are rich in stories about St. David. But one thing we do know from history, and that is that it was St. David who saved Wales from the beliefs of religious fanatics; and his canonization about 1120 by Calixtus II at the personal urging of King Henry I, represented a tribute to the leadership of one man who brought about final victory in his land for Christ over a host of pagan deities.

Today, the history of Wales stands as a shining hope for the rest of the world. Again pagan forces are seeking to roll across Europe and subdue many peoples in a godless system called communism. Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania, and now Czechoslovakia already have fallen before the onrushing forces of communism, and Finland may be the next victim. But the history of Wales leads us to hope that the religion, the culture and the democratic beliefs of once-free people of those European countries may still survive under foreign rule and one day emerge into the light of freedom again.

For just as in Wales the majority of the citizens never embraced the beliefs of the invaders, so do we believe that in the majority of nations now under the heel of communistic rule, the people themselves are not in sympathy with communism. That is the reason behind the move in Czechoslovakia. In May, that nation would have held a free election which no one doubts would have tossed out the Communist leaders who now have seized power. The Commies had to move fast or lose out by democratic processes.

Unless past examples are a poor guide, the iron curtain will fall on the Czechs now, and we will hear very little of actual happenings in that unhappy nation in the next months. Non-Communist political opposition will be liquidated, certain Czech patriots may face imprisonment or death on false charges to remove them from the political scene, and the oppression and terrorism of a police state is ahead for the people of Czechoslovakia. It is a sad future for the decent, God-fearing, traditionally democratic people of the little nation that Woodrow Wilson created out of World War I.

The Russian Government speaks of true democracy under communism. Let us recall a recent cartoon by Bob Ripley that quite shows how much freedom and liberty a Russian has today, compared with Americans. Ripley pointed out that no Russian citizen may own land, be tried by a jury, choose his own job, absent himself from work, strike, picket, employ labor, travel, own jewelry, ring a doorbell, or be friends with a foreigner. He is forbidden freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, and freedom of soul. That is the kind of thing that Russians call true democracy. We know it for what it is, slavery under a police state.

Welsh people can sympathize with those under the domination of communism, for they too were oppressed for many years. But many were able to come to America, and when the Declaration of Independence was signed, there were no persons more proud or more freedom-loving than those sons of Wales who were among the leaders in formation of our American Republic.

It is to America today that liberty-minded people of all the world look for inspiration and leadership. Great Britain is in no position to be a world leader today. She is waiting for another David Lloyd George to come out of Wales and lead her back from the pits into which the present Socialist government has hurled her.

And as the world sees the forces of communism battling against religious, democratic peoples, the world too is waiting for someone with the spirit and courage of another St. David to carry the banner of right through to final victory. Ultimately, we know and trust, the forces of Christianity will win out and after these trying times that the world no faces, we may emerge into a day of peace and happiness, where a man's right to liberty, and his chance to worship his God according to his own conscience will go unquestioned. To that cause, and to the speeding of that day, all of us who take our hope from the history of the people of Wales pledge our strength and our united support.

Communist Plans for American 1948 Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the June 1947 number of the magazine called Political Affairs is an official Communist plan for the 1948 American elections. The monthly magazine Political Affairs is published by the New Century Publishers, 832 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and is designated in its title as "a magazine devoted to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism." The publication Political Affairs was formerly known as The Communist. The change in name occurred in December-January, 1944–45. The last issue of The Communist was in December of 1944 with Earl Browder as editor, Eugene Dennis as associate editor, and V. J. Jerome, managing editor. This was designated as volume 23. The first issue of Political Affairs was January 1945, with Earl Browder as editor, Eugene Dennis as associate editor and V. J. Jerome as managing editor. This was designated as volume 24.

A perusal of the names of the contributors to the various numbers of The Communist and Political Affairs will indicate that it is an organ used by leading Communists from everywhere. The names of Thorliatti, William Z. Foster, Smirnov, and other well-known Communists will be found among its contributors.

The article to which I would like particularly to refer is contained, as I previously stated, in the June 1947 issue. It is by Alexander Bittleman. The title of the article is "Problems of Peace, Democracy, and National Independence."

Bittleman is a chief theoretician of the Communist Party in the United States and is a chief writer on theoretical political matters. It is my understanding that everything he writes is approved by Moscow in advance. For years he has been a leading member of the political committee of the Communist Party. On January 14 of this year he was arrested as an alien and is now, as I understand, out on $5,000 bond.

By quoting a portion of his article, I should like to illustrate the Communist line as laid down in June of 1947 to be used by American Communists for the 1948 American elections. Bittleman's article is a severe criticism of Earl Browder's book War or Peace With Russia. The article was written after Browder had deviated from the official Communist line. Bittleman speaks with the authority of Moscow in dictating the path of the American elections for 1948. I quote from his article as follows:

In the face of these facts as distinct from Browder's fictions, what is the problem of a "joint" American-Soviet peace? It certainly cannot mean the "joining" of the Soviet policy of a democratic world peace with Wall Street's policy of world domination. It can only mean that the American people have to combat, check, and defeat Wall Street's policies, expressed and enforced by Truman, Vandenberg & Co. It can and must mean, further, that the American people have to consolidate a democratic and anti-imperialistic coalition capable of materially influencing and, eventually, determining the policies of the American Government in the direction and in favor of a democratic and people's peace. Thus and only thus will the American and Soviet policies begin to be "joined." But then the product of this process will tend to be not just a "joint" American-Soviet peace but a democratic and people's world peace. And this is exactly what is dictated by the national interests of the American people as opposed to the selfish imperialist interests of the American monopolies.

* * * * *

ROOSEVELT, TRUMAN, AND THE PEOPLE'S COALITION

* * * * *

What about the Truman doctrine? Is that also in accord with Roosevelt's foreign policies, according to Browder? This doctrine did not just fall down from heaven, but was a culmination and full development of an imperialist line of aggressive struggle for world domination which Truman had been following for a long time. True, he was following that line under the pressures of the more extreme imperialists and reactionaries—Dulles, Vandenberg & Co.—but he was following that line, the "get tough with Russia" line, which contains all the elements of the Truman doctrine.

THE 1948 ELECTIONS

* * * * *

To Marxists and responsible anti-Fascists and progressives generally, the exact terms in which the people's anti-Fascist and anti-imperialist coalition (to be strictly differentiated from Browder's fictions incessantly) will participate in the 1948 election struggle, are still under discussion. What considerations are urged in this and changing almost daily as far as the capacity of political factionalism is concerned and as far as the mass of the people are concerned. Many surprising developments, favorable to the cause of the people's coalition, may yet take place between now and the 1948 elections. But it is equally obvious to responsible anti-Fascists and pro-Roosevelt progressives that the forces of the people's coalition will have to act as an independent political force—a democratic, progressive, anti-Fascist, anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist force—in the election struggles of 1948; that the forces of this people's coalition must strive to bring into existence a pro-Roosevelt progressive united ticket for 1948; that the people's coalition must make the election struggle of 1948 a major stage in the process of consolidating a third, a people's antimonopoly party in the United States.

* * * * *

Wallace said, when asked in London if he will support the Democratic Party in 1948, "I shall be campaigning in 1948 with all my power, but I will be campaigning for the ideals of one free world and the men who best express these ideals. I hope, but I cannot guarantee, that they will be on the Democratic ticket." (New York Times, April 12, 1947.) Thus spoke a leader, a fighter for the Roosevelt policies, who is in no hurry with the creation of a third party or even ticket, but who is determined that the people shall have the opportunity to support in the 1948 elections Roosevelt men and policies whatever the party ticket, even though he hopes it may be the Democratic Party ticket. Wallace is in no hurry to leave the American people, as Browder is, with no choice but Truman.

* * * And these new developments are operating powerfully among the masses of the people to produce large scale independent political action, to stimulate the growth of independent people's and labor's political organizations, to create conditions favorable for the further growth of that new political realinement called the people's antimonopoly coalition, to create favorable opportunities for a united, pro-Roosevelt, progressive ticket in 1948, and for the consolidation of a third, a people's party.

Furthermore, for Marxists there can be no question of the objective necessity and need for a third, a people's party, in the shortest possible time. Only such a party can make fully effective in the political life of the country the objectives and policies of the people's antimonopoly and anti-imperialist coalition.

* * * * *

The question of the exact forms of political and party organization to be created and adopted by the people's coalition in the national elections of 1948 is one of major importance, and is now being discussed very intensely in the ranks of the coalition. It is becoming clear that whatever will be the final decision by the basic forces of the coalition, the objective need and possibility for a

third, a people's ticket in the national elections of 1948 is becoming ever more urgent and favorable. It is also becoming clear that the forces of the people's coalition must therefore concentrate their energies on creating all necessary conditions—political and organizational—for the launching of such a ticket in the 1948 elections.

Naturally, this does not prejudge any of the tactical questions of form or alliances which the coalition forces will finally decide upon. Much will be happening all the time. But one question needs decision now. It is the question of creating all necessary political and organizational conditions for the successful launching of a third, a people's ticket in the national elections of 1948. It is necessary to decide now that the main efforts, all efforts, of the independent forces in the coalition must be directed toward creating the conditions for a third ticket. We must make absolutely sure that when the people of this country decide * * * they will find a people's ticket or a people's party through which to express themselves in the national elections of 1948.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the official Moscow line has directed that a third party be formed in the United States. This is because the Democratic Party has finally recognized the mortal danger in alliance with the Communists. The Republican Party has recognized at all times that you cannot make a political alliance with the Communists. The grand design of Roosevelt to win the Communists by appeasement has proven a gigantic failure. The grand design was taken in by the grander design of Stalin.

The events in Czechoslovakia are just the latest instance of proof that you cannot cooperate with the Communists.

The American people should know that the official Moscow line is to formulate a third party and that that line was laid down as early as June 1947, by the American Moscow agent, Alexander Bittleman.

America's Historic Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "America's Historic Goals," written by President James B. Conant of Harvard University and appearing in Think magazine for February 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S HISTORIC GOALS
(By James B. Conant, president, Harvard University)

A number of writers have recently emphasized that the problem of getting on with Russia is basically a problem of the vigor of our own society—our own fitness to survive. Few would deny that our survival in turn depends on a vigorous demonstration in the next decade that we can make our form of democracy function even in a war-torn world. This in turn means imaginative and bold policies both abroad and at home; a realization of our international responsibilities as a great power, and a satisfactory development of our internal economy; above all, a realization of the unique nature of American democracy and a determination to move a few steps nearer our historic goals.

All of which is admittedly a large order. To discuss all the problems implicit in even this brief summary of the challenge before us would require a volume of many pages. I propose in this short article to consider one group of questions which seems to me central to all discussions of the future of this country. What are the historic goals of the United States? That is, what sort of society do we wish to develop in the next few decades here in the United States? If this society is to be continuous with our past development and a reflection of our traditional aspirations, we must know what are the basic ideals of American democracy and how we can further their realization.

I have referred to the uniqueness of American democracy. To my mind we rarely do justice to this fact. Of course, on many counts the evolution of our political and legal systems may be considered as only a slight variant of a much wider pattern. We share with Great Britain in particular many ideals, traditions, and even details of operating a democratic government. Representative government, universal suffrage, and free elections are in this century the basis of all truly democratic governments. All nations which have this minimum in common are drawn together in this period of history as never before. But without in the least weakening this vital international link, we would do well to emphasize the special nature of the ideals which characterize us as a nation. These have arisen from our history and should, if we meet the challenge of our day, point the way for the next stage of our journey.

Our Nation, unlike almost any other nation, has not arisen from a state founded on military conquest. Therefore, we have nowhere in our tradition the notion of an aristocracy entitled to rule by right of birth. Run through the other democratic nations of the world and, if you recall their history, you will see how striking is our exceptional origin and growth. Neither political nor economic nor social privilege comes to one by right of birth according to our American ideals. On the contrary, the members of each new generation are supposed to start from scratch. Merit alone should win.

The cynical may shrug their shoulders and say this is theory—the facts of modern American life are far different. Granted; but such comments betray a failure to understand that in an open society like ours ideals represent goals toward which men and women may move by concerted action. They never can be reached in practice, almost by definition, but we can readily recognize whether we are moving toward them or retreating. Our American ideals in part correspond to the goals of all democracies; in part they represent a special contribution to the world. If we are to survive, we must make these ideals explicit by our actions; words alone will not suffice.

The United States has developed its greatness as a Nation in a period in which a highly fluid society overran a rich and empty continent; one of the highly significant ideals of the American Nation has long been equality of opportunity. This concept may well represent an exportable commodity sorely needed by the other democracies of the world today. There is considerable reason to believe that the absence of this idea in France and Italy, for example, has been responsible in no small measure for the large inroads of communistic philosophy and the subsequent sympathy with Soviet foreign policy. To the degree that we can demonstrate in the next few years that this unique American ideal is no mere myth or legend, we may both contribute to the stability of other nations and forward our own democracy along its historic path.

Our free, tax-supported schools represent in concrete form those special ideals which characterize this country. Our educational system of universal education with its emphasis on flexibility and careers open to the talented is unlike any other either now or in the past. Our public schools are the sinews of our democracy. We must keep them strong. The machinery of our democratic form of government must likewise be vigilantly maintained. Our educational system, our political institutions, and our social ideals form a closely interwoven pattern. Equality of opportunity could be realized only in a political democracy; it would have meaning only in a competitive society in which private ownership and the profit motive were accepted as basic principles.

I hardly need remind the reader that a a competitive society, which each generation draws nearer to the goal of equal opportunity, is not to be had just for the asking, nor is it just a question of economics. There are few today who would deny that economics, politics, and social ideals are thoroughly interwoven. The history of this century has taught all thinking men that neither do modern industry and trade proceed in a vacuum nor do human beings behave in reality like economic symbols. The problem of morale exists in almost every working group in our society.

As never before, business needs men who appreciate the responsibilities of business to itself and to that unique society of freemen which has been developed on this continent. Such men must understand not only the practical workings of business organizations but also the economic and social climate in which business operates. Management and labor share with the statesmen whom we elect to office the responsibility for our future. Less directly but ultimately to an equal degree, so do those who guide our vast system of public schools. They should be statesmen, too. Professional men and leaders of opinion, particularly members of the bar and the press, are likewise heavily involved in this question of our survival. Cannot all these people, indeed the majority of our citizens, subscribe to a common set of postulates as to what we desire to accomplish in the coming years? The goals of equality of opportunity, a minimum of class distinction, a maximum degree of individual freedom, and a wide distribution of centers of initiative are inherent in the American creed. If the United States is to continue as a vigorous and healthy republic of freemen, it must continue to move toward these historic goals.

The going will be tough; no one can gainsay that. Statesmanship will be required not only in affairs of state, but in other vital areas. I have in mind two in particular, not usually associated together: industry and education. One may reach this conclusion from the following considerations.

The future prosperity of America depends on the capacity of its economy to remain dynamic while providing satisfying employment for all capable of employment. Perhaps you will all agree to that. But every year some two or three million boys and girls mature and enter our society looking for jobs. We believe they are all entitled to a fair chance. Our schools are to a large degree ladders of opportunity.

In short, our educational system must guide and educate a diversity of talent for the best interests of the Nation. Particular emphasis should be placed on the word "guide" in the preceding sentence because the process of helping people to determine the activity for which their abilities best qualify them is of great importance at all levels of our schools and colleges. I may state parenthetically that we are beginning to have sound knowledge as to how such guidance can be provided.

Now it is obvious that the best minds of the country should be devoted to a study of the many problems arising as a consequence of our endeavors through industry and education to keep our society prosperous, strong, and democratic. It is at this point that I believe our universities have a special contribution to make. The methods of certain of the social sciences have already been developed to a point where studies of society by competent scholars can provide basic information to assist the leaders of industry and of education. Both fundamental investigations as to the nature of man and society and immediate studies of specific problems are required.

The morale of a small group of men or a large nation (if it is a free nation) depends in no small measure on agreement as to the ends for which all labor. If we can agree on the goals toward which we desire to move, the knowledge and skills of our younger social scientists and scholars can be mobilized as never before to assist the peaceful development of the Nation. Without expecting any miracles I have confidence that in the years ahead our universities can play a major role in assuring that in the future American society will be a strong, vigorous, and united body of freemen.

What Time Is It, Buddy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial in the Palm Beach Post, West Palm Beach, Fla., written by Charles Francis Coe, editor and publisher, entitled "What Time Is It, Buddy?" This is a very timely and thought-provoking article:

WHAT TIME IS IT, BUDDY?

By "Buddy" we mean every citizen of this Republic.

Whether you swing a 1 pound hammer or a 10-ton pile driver, you are asked that question. There looms on your doorstep a hydra-headed monster that is possessed of two things. The first is the power to destroy you. The second is the willingness to use that power.

For 15 years, you have steadily been jockeyed into the shadow of the ominous thing called inflation. While you labored and saved, this giant grew fat on the idiotic mental gymnastics of crackpots in power.

Your home became surrounded by bureaus. Your doorstep sagged under the weight of incompetents in sudden glory. The dollar you saved would buy less and less of the things you saved to buy. While you deposited it snugly in the bank, this giant inflation calmly invaded it.

He did not steal the dollar bill from the vault, of course. He just let it lay there and grow smaller and smaller in purchasing power. The dollar you placed there a year ago is not worth nearly as much today as it was when you placed it there.

Yet you saved it. You sacrificed to make that deposit. You, hand in hand with Uncle Sam, saved that dollar by application of your sweat, your intellect, your integrity, and your faith in the American way of life. As scaly a group of speculators, chiselers, mountebanks, and sheer incompetents as ever assaulted the body politic, has robbed you while you slept.

The attrition of your liberties has kept pace with the shriveling of your savings. Rubber money has been used to smoke screen this devilish operation. Now, what time is it?

While you have a watch, you had better look. We beg of you to look. We beg of you to fire your soul with the spirit which made this free people. We beg of you to realize that sacred trusts are in the management of men with so little sense that their whole thinking apparatus would be lost in the palm of an anemone.

Into that vacuum of intellectual powers has crept the inevitable political connivance which fattens upon the lethargy of the people. What time is it, Buddy? We will tell you what time we think it is. But your opinion is the one we seek, primarily.

It is time you awakened to the destruction of your property values. It is time you recognized that between worker and manager there is a relationship which must not be transgressed by greed. It is time you realize that rising prices are the direct gift of inadequate government in the patriotic sense and excessive government in the political sense.

It is time that we heard again the ominous roll of drums, thunder of the guns, moans of the anguished. It is time that we fired our spirits to the defense of our homeland, so that these horrendous sounds may not encroach again upon our homes and families.

It is time that we dismissed every school teacher, from primary to college, who repudiates the Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights: It is time that we rose in peaceful but irresistible power, just as there rose our forefathers before us. It is time we uproot from high places the sycophants and satellites who obscure the road to continuing freedom.

It is time we give heed to our children; time we assume again the burden of self-government; time we read plainly the all too plain signs of political bartering, while our Republic stands too near the flames; time we turn again to the simple faith and stalwart courage of our founders; time we kick out our regional hatred, racial disputations, religious bigotry; time we turn our faces to the God of Liberty who has so faithfully guarded our democracy in days agone.

It is time, Buddy, that we compare again the fruits of communism with our own lot in life; the simple, direct statements of the early patriots, with the double talk of the current crop of political plunderers. It is time that we, you and you, and you, who make America, face a few bald facts.

We stand to be taken over by political polluters. Our wages to be set by bureaucratic nitwits, our prices to be set by bureaucratic dimtops, our hours of labor, manner of labor, privilege of labor, to be set by goons and disbrained profiteers who garb themselves in the habiliments of the godly but grub themselves with the abandonment of special privilege.

You do not care what time it is, Buddy? Then turn your back to our war dead. Cast your insubstantial shadow across the grave of freedom. Sneer at our flag. Tread upon our sacred institutions. Cast aside your home, your life insurance, your savings, in whatsoever form they may be.

In that event, unfurl your banner of selfishness, taunt your offspring with the lyrical lie of communism. Sing your litany of lust. Let it flow upon the ears of Americans. Join the throng who forgot what time it was in Russia, Italy, France, Germany, China, Japan. Join the blinded throngs who deserve no liberty because they know not how to defend and preserve it.

Throw away your watch. There is no time but the moment. All is well without your vote. All is good and fine, and true and permanent. The pathway for your children's feet is paved smoothly. Your obligation to God and country is a myth.

What time is it, Buddy? In reverence, in affection, in prayerful sincerity, we make bold to suggest to you, Buddy, that it is time you found out what time it is.

CHARLES FRANCIS COE.

Soil Conservation of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the soils of the United States have been continually depleted in fertility since the first settlers arrived in our country.

In many sections the soil fertility has in effect been mined by the crop practices followed. In other sections, where livestock farming has prevailed, the losses of soil fertility have been greatly reduced. However, in the greatest livestock and dairy sections there has been and now is a constant loss of the mineral elements like phosphates and potash, although in many of these sections the nitrogen content of the soil has been maintained by the raising of clovers, alfalfa, and other legumes.

While the problem of soil conservation has been dramatized the past few years, the fact still remains that soil fertility is not being maintained.

A bill introduced by our colleague from Illinois, the Honorable EVERETT DIRKSEN, H. R. 4752, is an approach to this soil-fertility problem that merits our consideration and approval.

At this point I include table 12 from Bulletin 607 by the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station:

TABLE 12.—*Annual balance of plant nutrients in soils of the United States, 1930*

	N	P	K	CA	Mg	S
	Tons	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*
Losses (harvested crops, grazing, erosion, leaching)	22,890,046	4,221,302	50,108,560	68,185,730	24,557,881	12,043,911
Additions (fertilizers and liming materials, manures and bedding, rainfall, irrigation waters, seeds, nitrogen fixed)	16,253,862	1,447,835	5,151,076	12,561,673	4,040,813	9,029,690
Net annual loss	6,645,184	2,773,467	44,957,484	55,624,057	20,517,068	3,014,221

All figures subject to change and correction.

ANNUAL BALANCE SHEET

By deducting the annual net additions from the annual net losses of plant ingredients, we are able to ascertain the annual net loss from our inventory. This is indicated in table 12.

The annual additions and losses are summarized in table 12. The figures show that our soils are suffering enormous losses of the six important plant nutrients. The significance of these figures will become more clear if we bear in mind that such credits as atmospheric precipitation apply to about three-quarters of our land area. On the other hand, the losses of plant nutrients are relatively much greater from land used for the growing of harvested crops and the more intensive types of livestock grazing. Attention should be called, in the first place, to the net losses of calcium, potassium, and magnesium. The removal of these elements involves a gradual rise of soil acidity. With the loss of the basic substances of which these elements are a part, there is a more intense loss of phosphorus. Indeed, too much stress cannot be laid on the fact that our soils are suffering a net annual loss of about 3,000,000 tons of phosphorus—or almost 10 times as much as is supplied by chemical fertilizers. It is well known that in some countries where the cumulative losses of basic materials have not been made up by liming, marling, and so forth, there has been a striking increase in soil acidity, a serious loss of phosphorus, and a marked shrinkage in the size of domestic animals.

The net annual loss of nitrogen, indicated at about 6,500,000 tons, is really much greater insofar as our cropland is concerned. An assumed annual loss of 10,000,000 tons of nitrogen in our agricultural land would be a reasonably conservative estimate. This would be equivalent to more than 30 times the amount of nitrogen supplied by chemical fertilizers.

The losses of the plant nutrients mentioned, as well as of sulfur, are of such a character as to call for the prompt adoption of measures which would offer to us assurance of more or less effective conservation and of a lessening drain on our resources of plant nutrients. Changed methods of soil management, which would include proper provision for lessening the losses due to erosion and leaching, would represent a major conservation measure. Such changes in our soil- and crop-management systems as would permit a lessening in the run-off, an increase in the amount of water stored in the soil, an increase in the area occupied by legumes, an increase in nonsymbiotic nitrogen fixation, and a decrease in the excessive oxidation of organic matter would almost, if not quite, permit the elimination of the annual deficit in respect to our soil-nitrogen resources.

It is hoped that the data recorded, even though they be preliminary and very general in character, will draw attention to a situation which is of major economic and social significance. They should be a helpful contribution to the effective use of our soil and land resources.

In compiling and organizing the information given in this bulletin, the writer had the help of a group of technical and clerical assistants, to whom he feels deeply indebted. Much of this work would not have been possible without the aid which was received from CWA, ERA, and WPA. The loyal cooperation and the friendly help of the county, State, and Federal personnel of these administrations are herewith gratefully acknowledged.

The Dirksen bill would provide the machinery to correlate the findings in the soil studies of the various State experiment stations.

HOW SECTION 32 FUNDS ARE DISTRIBUTED

Mr. Speaker, the following official table indicates the use that is being made of section 32 in the Eightieth Congress:

Exportation and domestic conservation of agricultural commodities—Approved programs and obligations by commodities (July 1, 1947, to Jan. 31, 1948)

	Approved programs as of Jan. 31, 1948	Obligation incurred	
		July 1, 1947, to Jan. 31, 1948	During January 1948
Purchases for direct distribution:			
Apple, fresh	$2,445,000.00		
Pear, fresh	293,750.00		
Apple, peach, prune, raisin, dried	4,850,000.00	$2,569,715.09	$1,453,697.76
Fig, dried	1,220,000.00	992,055.15	992,055.15
Grapefruit juice, canned	3,500,000.00		
Irish potato	6,250,000.00	3,632,494.42	514,694.48
Sweetpotato	1,500,000.00	548,857.61	61,692.53
General vegetable	1,125,000.00	119,047.39	3,955.02
Egg	750,000.00	608,771.46	172,570.44
Prior year transportation costs	157.12	157.12	
Total	22,033,907.12	8,471,018.21	3,198,573.38
Exportation: Cotton	2,000,000.00	1,407,784.82	263,411.22
Diversion:			
Cotton:			
Insulation	1,000,000.00	813,625.00	345,000.00
Paper	200,000.00		
Pear, fresh	135,000.00		
Irish potato	1,000,000.00		
Total	2,335,000.00	813,625.00	345,000.00
Administration of marketing agreements	700,000.00	335,875.00	62,500.00
Other administrative expenses	1,060,000.00	754,269.12	83,841.47
Total	1,760,000.00	1,090,144.12	146,341.47
Grand total	28,128,907.12	11,782,602.18	3,953,299.07

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration.

Delaware Selected for National Chicken Production Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, a matter of interest to housewives throughout the Nation and to all those engaged in the production of chickens is the fact that after 3 years of intensive experimentation, the final stages of the National Chicken-of-Tomorrow Contest are now under way.

As every chicken producer in the Nation knows, the over-all objective of the program, of this search for that barnyard bird now known as the chicken-of-tomorrow, is to produce poultry which will be in a better position to compete with other foods for a place on the country's dinner table. It is to produce a meatier, broader-breasted chicken having a larger proportion of flesh to bone. As a result of this National Chicken-of-Tomorrow Contest, we are also certain to see completely new methods in the production and marketing of poultry meat.

The State of Delaware is proud to have been selected as the site for this contest. It will be staged at the University of Delaware's agricultural experimental station, located at Georgetown, Del., from March 24 to June 24, 1948. Although many other States were extremely active in their efforts to obtain this national contest, the National Chicken-of-Tomorrow Committee selected Delaware because of its superior facilities and established leadership in the production of chickens.

Mr. Speaker, this is no idle statement. Let us consider these facts for any substantiation which may be needed. More commercial broilers are produced annually in the State of Delaware than in any other State in the Union. In fact, during the past several years Delaware has produced nearly one-fourth—between 20 and 24 percent—of the entire number of commercial broilers placed on the market in the United States. The size of this industry in Delaware may be further emphasized by pointing out that approximately 60 percent of Delaware's agricultural income is from the production of chickens. In Delaware the income from this industry has reached the amazing total of about $65,000,000 per year. The Delaware broiler is rapidly becoming known from coast to coast.

It is no accident, Mr. Speaker, that Delaware is the leader in the broiler-production industry. It has achieved that top ranking position because of its easy access to large marketing areas, because of the high quality of feed available there, because of its tremendous hatchery facilities, and because Delawareans by long experience have developed the all-important know-how.

According to Professor A. E. Tomhave, chairman of the Delaware Chicken-of-Tomorrow Committee and head of the department of animal and poultry industry at the University of Delaware, this Nation-wide contest will provide valuable data concerning hatchability, rate of growth, feathering, feed consumption, percentage of mortality and culls—all of which are of the utmost importance to the successful production and marketing of chickens.

Professor Tomhave also points out that this event will focus attention of the entire poultry industry upon Delaware during the next few months, for in the finals of this 3-year-long national contest will be 40 chicken breeders from 26 States. As a matter of fact, poultrymen in 44 of our States have actually participated in the State and regional contests conducted during 1946 and 1947.

This contest is also an educational program and has had the effect of turning the country's hen houses into a Nation-wide chicken-breeding laboratory.

During last month each of the 40 finalists from 26 different States shipped into Delaware 720 hatching eggs. Two days ago these were set, and they will be hatched on March 22. For the following 12-week period they will be reared at the University of Delaware's experimental substation under identical conditions. Then, on June 22 and 23, the entries will be judged. The prize-winning breeders will be announced in the Chicken-of-Tomorrow Field Day at Georgetown, Del., on June 24, 1948. This field day will be a gala affair, attended by an estimated 1,000 out-of-State visitors as well as editors of poultry magazines and farm-news radio broadcasters. An interesting educational program and a display of both live and dressed specimens of birds entered in the contest will be among other features of this closing event of the 3-year chicken-of-tomorrow program.

Delaware is indeed proud of its achievements in the chicken industry and proud of its selection as host to the Nation's outstanding and most successful chicken breeders.

Humility Begets Greatness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Sunday, February 29, 1948:

HUMILITY BEGETS GREATNESS

It is representative of ecclesiastical leaders that their shining temporal and spiritual achievements remain comparatively obscure through the years and duly deserved recognition often comes belatedly. The lives of the saints reflect such a circumstance.

And yet they who so dedicate their lives would not have it any other way. Of all the virtues practiced so militantly, they practice none more constantly and faithfully than that of humility.

Today, people of all faiths throughout the Nation, and abroad, recognize the great spiritual and temporal leadership of Archbishop Richard J. Cushing. His amazing talent, and seemingly unlimited capacity, for benevolent leadership and organization was not dormant during the earlier years of his life but was exercised with such humility that the greatness of it was not readily discernible.

But humility begets greatness and thus the greatness of Archbishop Cushing emerges into full view.

Rev. Arthur V. Lyons was among the people of Lynn for 18 years. But his ecclesiastical duty was performed so unobtrusively that his real stature was not recognized.

No clergyman in this city's bright history epitomized more benevolence and humility as clearly as Father Lyons while he was curate at St. Joseph's Church. He assisted in the latter years of his curateship in the administration of the parish with the late pastor, Rev. Michael J. Welch. Yet, while he became endeared to people of all faiths in the community, it is only now that the real stature of the devoted priest emerges.

Today, Father Lyons is archdiocesan director of cemeteries and business manager of the Pilot, official weekly Catholic publication in the archdiocese.

Each assignment in itself is a tribute to Father Lyons' executive ability. As archdiocesan director he will reorganize and supervise 68 cemeteries embracing vast acreage of land. A burial lot is a hallowed recess in the eyes of every Catholic family. The scope of Father Lyons' duties as director might be estimated from the fact that there are some 20,000 burials a year in the 68 cemeteries which he supervises including he 21 on the North Shore. The detail attendant on current interments, together with care of graves of the faithful departed through the years, constitute a project of immense proportion. Already Father Lyons has acquitted himself admirably in this directorship.

As business manager of the Pilot, Father Lyons participates actively in the publication of a periodical which brings the weekly news into more than 60,000 Catholic homes in the archdiocese. Again, guiding the destiny of the 119-year-old Pilot constitutes a highly important undertaking in itself and such an undertaking benefits by Father Lyons' store of business acumen.

Archbishop Cushing called a devoted curate to the two important administrative posts and Father Lyons has responded with the same zeal and humility which characterized his 18 years of priesthood in Lynn. But as ecclesiastical duty called for administrative and financial attributes it is learned that he possesses a lore of such matters as well as innate piety.

Father Lyons may continue the demanding tasks of his duties with the knowledge that the entire archdiocese joins the city of Lynn in a full measure of constant support of his mission.

American Youth Makes Its Choice Between the Two Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members may understand just what type of Americanism the younger members of the Republican Party are advocating, I take pleasure in presenting herewith the principal part of an address made by Mr. Ralph Becker, chairman of the National Young Republican Federation, before the Republican Women's Study Club of Long Beach, Calif., on February 16, 1948:

We have been living in an era of indifference toward politics on the part of many people. These people flatly refuse to participate in public affairs in any way whatsoever, and some of them will not even vote. They are perfectly willing to let the business of government go by default to scoundraters or even to racketeers and criminals. Strangely enough, they are usually men and women of action—in business or professions or service, lawyers, doctors, engineers, and the like. They are unquestionably able people and otherwise good citizens. Yet while they flatly refuse to have anything to do with politics, while on election day many of them insist on going out and playing golf or indulging in some other form of personal amusement at social get-togethers, they will invariably make speeches to the effect that the country is "going to the dogs," that political parties "have no leadership," that "there ought to be a law," and "why doesn't somebody do something about it."

These people look down on the business of government as something which is not worth their time or their effort, as something which is not quite honest and perhaps not even clean. They have an idea that people in politics don't wash behind the ears. To them government and politics is something which operates on the wrong side of the tracks. Personally, I feel that these people are relics of the past. They are not living in the present time. They are living in the realm of thought of days gone by when politics and government could be mere incidentals to personal life.

Interestingly enough, however, there is a different attitude on the part of young people today, and by the phrase young people of today, I refer specifically to the Young Republican Group; people who are in their 20's and 30's. We have an attitude which is entirely different because we young people have been brought up under entirely different circumstances from those of our fathers. We have been brought up during the period of the most intense warfare between ideas which the world has ever seen.

* * * * *

In addition to that, we young people have been exposed to a rough war between the free-enterprise capitalistic system on the one hand and the novel ideas of communism and socialism on the other. On the domestic front, during the nineteen thirties, the New Dealers loudly predicted that our free-enterprise system was through, that capitalism was passing from the earth, that our society would never again be the same. This was in contrast to the economic theory with which the country had grown up, the theory that our prosperity was based primarily upon our system of free-enterprise capitalism. We young people could not help being exposed to this warfare of ideas between free enterprise and left-wing theory. We had to think about these things and reach conclusions for ourselves. We were striving to make our way in the world and, unlike some older people, we had no established pattern of thinking, no established habits of living to carry us through without further mental effort.

And on top of all these troubles at home, we have been exposed to catastrophic events in the field of international affairs, which have also been accompanied by a warfare between ideas. At the present time not only do we have the propaganda of Soviet Russia to the effect that communism is superior to free-enterprise capitalism; we have also

just been through the period of the Hitlerite and Mussolini dictatorships, which in their turn advocated new and startling ideas. They advocated the Nietzsche doctrine that there were supermen and superraces in the world which were destined to rule the rest of the people; and we had to think that one over, too. Were there indeed supermen and superraces who were destined to rule the rest of the people in the world; or is there a real basis, as set forth in our Constitution, for individuals of all kinds, types, races, colors, and creeds, to live together in reasonable harmony on a foundation of principles of fair play and mutual respect? And don't forget too that Hitler and Mussolini proclaimed that dictatorship was the only efficient system of government; that the democracies were decadent and bound to disappear from the earth as outmoded relics of the past. We had to think all these things over because we have our own future to work out. And we gradually came to realize that all these ideas were basic to the working out of our own destiny.

Thus out of this warfare between ideas, this rough and tumble battle of conflicting ideologies to which we young people were exposed in the plastic years of life, two significant conclusions emerged. The first conclusion was this: Government is the basic factor, of more importance by far than anything else in everyone's life. It is the pattern of government which, more than anything else, sets the pattern for the life of the individual. Look at the miserable life of the people today in Soviet Russia. Think of what the people in Germany went through, and are still going through because of Adolph Hitler's dictatorship. And look at the relative prosperity and stability which we enjoy in this country under our form of government. If we look at all these things we simply must come to the conclusion that government, its form and administration, is, far more than anything else, the basic factor in everyone's life, the thing which gives direction to the life of the individual, the thing which either enables the individual to work out his own destiny and make the most of his own opportunities, or keeps him in chains. So we young people came to the conclusion that we had better take a hand in this business of government, if we wanted to help shape our own future and destiny.

The second conclusion which we came to is that government is not something which just happens all by itself. The business of government is not something which just appears mysteriously out of nowhere. On the contrary, it is something which is based on the laws of human nature. It is set up and run by people, and the participation of people in public affairs we call politics. The result is that, as we young people decided to take an interest in the business of government, we necessarily also decided to take an interest in politics. Just as the pattern of our individual lives depends more upon our system of government administration than upon anything else, so the caliber and tone of our government administration depends upon political leadership. In its turn, the leadership in ordinary politics depends upon the type of people who get into it. We young people have come to the conclusion that we must continue to produce leaders, real leaders on the political scene who can eventually improve our government administration. After all, the demand for leadership in public affairs is not equalled anywhere else. Unless the leaders among the people become also the leaders in politics and in government, we cannot expect the best results in government administration, nor the best results for us as in our individual lives.

That means that we young people have been squarely up against the problem of choosing between one of the political groups in this country and, thus in the main, to choose between the Republican and Democratic Parties. So let me state frankly some of the things which we Republicans stand for, as I see it. Some of these things you will find in party platforms. Some of them you may find only between the lines. Some you will find only in the feelings of people. But there are differences between the two major parties and I will try to explain them as I undertsand them.

First, we Republicans stand, beyond any question, for a republican form of government, that is, representative "democracy" where the people choose their own leaders to represent them. Nobody can question our stand on that.

* * * * *

Second, another thing we Republicans stand for is the two-party system. We are flatly and unalterably against the one-party systems of Soviet Russia, Germany, and Italy. We are also against the multiparty system, which prevents any single issue from being squarely presented on a yes-or-no basis to the people. One great trouble with the governments of certain European countries during these past decades is that the prime minister or chief of state is selected by a parliament composed of a number of different parties. The cabinet, in its turn, is composed of a coalition between those parties. If the cabinet falls, there is no new election by the people, and the people have no chance to express themselves. Instead, the hodgepodge parliament selects another prime minister and he selects another coalition cabinet, which is another hodgepodge of ideas. Hence no administration can present or pursue a clear, distinct philosophy and give it a chance to work out. Instead, each one necessarily becomes a conglomeration of ideas, compromise, and intrigue. It tends to prevent any clear issue from being put to the people. Let's not delude ourselves. Issues have to be decided on a yes-or-no basis sooner or later. Ideas have to be worked out. Either they are good or they are not so good, and the more the process of working out ideas is delayed, the more confusion and chaos result. This is what the multiparty system does. It prevents the presentation of simple issues to the people and the crystallization of ideas.

* * * * *

Third, another thing which we Republicans stand for is free-enterprise capitalism or individualism, as opposed to communism, socialism, and other left-winged theories. Let there be no mistake about that. We believe in the capitalistic system, without reservations, and we are not ashamed to say so. We do not believe in dictatorship and central planning. We do not believe in the cartel systems of state-sponsored monopoly which are in vogue elsewhere in the world. We want free-enterprise capitalism; we believe in individual incentive, initiative, and responsibility. We don't want to compromise with these things, and we are not ashamed to say so. It has weaknesses, but none which cannot be corrected. It is that system, combined with the political stability provided by our Constitution, which has given this country its great prosperity, its high standard of living for the average fellow, that high standard of living and opportunity for prosperity and happiness which, so far as I know, is unequalled elsewhere on the face of the earth.

Let me explain a little more what I mean by free-enterprise capitalism, because those words have been kicked around a good deal in the last few years, and I am afraid many of the people who do the kicking don't understand what they are talking about. By free-free-enterprise capitalism, I mean an economic system where government regulation is kept to the necessary minimum to prevent crime, fraud, monopoly, and other economic practices which are inimical to the public welfare. We simply have to have that kind of government regulation in order to be able to live together on a basis of fair play, mutual respect, and harmony. But free-enterprise capitalism is diametrically opposed to a system where economic controls are imposed so as to set up a system of central planning. It is diametrically opposed to the idea of the service state, or the welfare state, which runs everybody's life on the theory that people are incapable of taking responsibility for their own lives and working the problems of everyday life out for themselves; the theory that the state must plan, service, and control everyone's life. We are against that. That is what they have in Russia, Germany, and Italy. It is what they are tending to in England today, and that is what the Democrats have been telling us we have to have here. But we Republicans don't want it. We want free-enterprise capitalism, not paternalism, central planning, and abdication of responsibility by the individual.

Fourth, we Republicans stand for the use of careful thinking and sound methods. We do not believe that a political party should trot out any half-baked, wildcat scheme as a basis for Government action, just because it will make good headlines in the newspaper. Every time some hairbrained idea is tried, it costs the taxpayers money, upsets people's lives, and accomplishes very little.

* * * * *

We were exposed to a lot of things like that in the thirties. It is hardly necessary to mention more than a few. We had, for instance, the gold-buying scheme, that is, the theory that as the price of gold was increased the price of commodities would automatically increase. Wonderful, wasn't it? The only trouble with it was that it wouldn't work. It was contrary to the views of the sound economists and it cost the American taxpayers large sums of money. Then we had the NRA. In its time that, too, made good headlines. Indeed, the newspapers screamed with publicity about the NRA when it was in vogue. It was going to save the world but it, too, was a colossal failure, simply because it didn't work. It would have been repealed if the Supreme Court had not pointed out that it did not fit our dual system of government. It cost the American taxpayers large sums of money; it disrupted American business and, in effect, ripped the controls out of our economy at a critical time; and it finally disappeared in a haze of confusion and disillusionment, leaving a sorry wake of disruption in business.

That is not the style, the method, or approach of us Republicans. We do not believe that the objective of a political party is to dazzle the public by any means at hand, regardless of how dishonest, superficial, or unsound those means may be, in order to obtain their votes. Frankly, we believe that the business of government is a much more serious thing. The result is that our method of approach to the business of government is one of an effort to use careful thinking and sound workmanlike methods. To be sure, no man or group of men has any monopoly on good ideas or the right answers to the problems of modern life. We Republicans cannot claim, any more than anyone can claim, that we always get the right answers, rather than to dazzle the public for shallow political purposes; and we believe that we can only obtain the right answers to the pressing problems of today and every other generation, by trying to use careful thinking and the use of sound, workmanlike methods.

Now, these are some of the things for which the Republican Party stands, as I see them: (1) A Republican form of government; (2) the two-party system; (3) free-enterprise capitalism; and (4) realistic thinking and sound workmanlike methods. These are things which all we young people have been thinking a great deal about, for, as I said earlier, we are more interested in government and in politics than our predecessors were some 20 years ago. And as we interest ourselves in politics, we must make a decision as to which political party we prefer. In the main this boils down to a choice between the two major parties. Which one are we going to choose? Before we can decide that, we must ask ourselves exactly what we believe in.

Without any question we are in favor of our Republican form of government and the two-party system. But the last two principles of the Republican Party which I have described, that of free-enterprise capitalism and the use of realistic thinking and sound workmanlike methods, have a special appeal to young people. Let me explain these as I see it.

Youth has high aspirations. It wants to see the world become a better place in a great many respects, and it does not want to suffer the dismal pain of disillusionment and frustration. And this is where we come to the Republican Party. The Republican Party also wants to see the world become a better place; but it does not believe that that objective can be accomplished through the use of sloppy thinking, half-baked methods, and shallow political expediency. The use of methods of that kind can, in the long run, only bring to young people disillusionment and frustration. The objectives of youth can be realized only through the use of careful thinking and sound workmanlike methods.

Now what about this other Republican principle, free-enterprise capitalism, or individualism as I like to call it? Here is how we young people feel about it, as best I have been able to ascertain.

We young people do not want to subordinate ourselves to the state. We want opportunity, and we are not afraid of responsibility—the things which are afforded by individualism. So believing, we simply cannot affiliate ourselves with the Democrats, because they are the political bedfellows of the Communists and left-wingers, and the advocates of central planning by the Government. If we are to keep faith with ourselves, with our desire for opportunity, and our willingness to take responsibility, our destiny lies with individualism and the Republican Party. We don't want to kid ourselves. We are all interested in own own economic future, and in carrying out our own destiny. We do not believe that Utopia is just around the corner and that we can get in without any trouble and even without an admission fee by leaving all responsibility to the state. We do not believe that there is any easy road to success and fulfillment. We are willing to do our share of the work. So, if we are to follow these principles, which are basic to the ideals, the hopefulness, and enthusiasm of youth, we must necessarily stick to the Republican Party. Only through its faith in the ordinary individual, and its basic approach of careful study of facts, realistic thinking, and sound workmanlike methods, can youth realize its dreams and accomplish the things of which it is capable.

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution of the general court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, facilitating the construction of housing for veterans of World War II and others:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, so called, facilitating the construction of housing for veterans of World War II and others

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, so called, facilitating the construction of housing for veterans of World War II and others, as provided therein; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, February 19, 1948.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

A true copy.
Attest: F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

"Why I Am for MacArthur"—Article by Hon. Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like at this time, to present a magazine article written by a great American statesman who has frequently demonstrated a selfishness willingness to place the good of his country above personal thought and feeling.

Some of us have read his speeches on the floor of the Senate and been swayed by their logic.

I refer to Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and frequently mentioned as a candidate for the Republican nomination as President of the United States.

The magazine article written by the Senator appeared in Collier's magazine on February 12, 1944, and presented sound and logical reasoning for his position on the need of these United States for inspired leadership in the crisis existing at that date.

I feel that the reasons advanced for Senator VANDENBERG'S position as taken in his article 4 years ago are as sound today as they were when the article appeared, though the nature of the crisis then, and the crisis existing today are technically different.

The article was entitled "Why I Am for MacArthur."

Mr. Speaker, the text is as follows:

WHY I AM FOR MACARTHUR

(By ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, United States Senator from Michigan)

All right, Collier's, I'll answer your question. I'll tell you why I favor Gen. Douglas MacArthur for the Republican nomination for President of the United States. It's the first time I have put it down in black and white. I have not wanted to say or do anything which might embarrass a great friend, a great soldier, a great citizen, and a very great American.

But with so much at stake, 1944 ought to be a year of plain speaking and, with a number of MacArthur critics now significantly busy trying to head him off, I think I am entitled to state why, with the greatest respect for other distinguished and available Republicans, I am for MacArthur—not only because I believe him to be the strongest candidate but, more important, because I believe he would make the strongest President in the tough days that lie ahead.

First let me clear up my own status in this affair. If circumstances have seemed to identify me prominently with a MacArthur movement, it is entirely the result of the circumstances. I speak for no organization. Most emphatically I do not speak for MacArthur. I speak only for myself. It all started as the result of a casual newspaper interview 1 year ago. Since then I have spent about half of my time answering "MacArthur mail."

Apparently there are thousands of kindred spirits up and down the land. Doctor Gallup and other temperature-takers have spectacularly found that out, and it's an amazing phenomenon in view of the total lack of any sort of an organized MacArthur campaign.

To one and all I have said one simple thing. MacArthur can only be nominated as the result of a pure draft (which no American can refuse, no matter what he says ahead of time). It cannot come from any ordinary, preconvention, political methods. It can only come through the free decision of a free convention and in response to a spontaneous demonstration of popular faith. He can have no part in the campaign.

A MIRACLE IS ALWAYS POSSIBLE

The politicians tell me such miracles do not happen. But I saw Mr. Justice Hughes nominated that way in 1916 and I have seen other miracles in this democracy since Pearl Harbor. Besides there is such a thing as destiny and there still is such a thing as logic.

It may not happen. But that is beside the point. You have asked me why I am for MacArthur. Here is the answer to your question. This is what I think—win, lose, or draw:

First: The American people will be thinking more about the election of a Commander in Chief next November than about the election of a President as such. That will be their conscious or subconscious thought. If the war is over in Europe (which, pray, it may be), there will still, and even more significantly, be the war in the Pacific. I judge that President Roosevelt himself agrees with me about this, in view of his adroit and subtle suggestion that he wants to substitute a fourth term "Win the War" slogan for his three term New Deal trademark. When it comes to politics, you will never go far wrong by taking a leaf out of F. D. R.'s book. He intends to run primarily as Commander in Chief. He expects the people to vote for a Commander in Chief.

Well—

Need I go on? Should we not offer the people a better Commander in Chief—not merely for political reasons, but fundamentally for the sake of the war effort? Isn't that our paramount business? By common consent, is there any greater soldier in the world than MacArthur? Could there be a more eligible Commander in Chief? And won't this be even more emphatically obvious if, by next November, we are concentrating on wiping Japan from the Pacific map?

Suppose the Republicans nominate an eminent civilian without war experience, how impressive will he be as prospective Commander in Chief against Roosevelt's "Win

the War" appeal and against swapping horses, etc.? Must we not wholly answer the patriotic anxieties which will dominate the minds of all our people—in particular the anguished hearts of 10,000,000 fathers and mothers of 10,000,000 soldier sons and daughters? Must we not answer with a wholly competent Commander in Chief? How could we successfully turn mass electoral attention to the dreadfully important domestic issues, which ought to control next November's decision, unless we first get over this hump?

My correspondence suggests that many of our good people think MacArthur is so good a soldier that he ought to stay where he is. They think he is too badly needed as a field commander in the Pacific war to be drafted into the Presidency; but they only unwillingly confirm my point. If he is indispensable to us as a four-star general, then we simply give our country and the United Nations the maximum use of his tremendous military genius when we promote him to commander in chief and thus give him total away over the military decisions which we think he is so incomparably qualified to make. He would not be deserting Bataan, which he would never do, if he is promoted by the American people from general to commander in chief; he is simply given supreme command. He is released to his maximum utility. He can then deliver the goods without handicap or hamper. This isn't politics. It is vital, vivid service to humanity.

LET'S GET ON WITH THE WAR

In response to all questions about his own future, MacArthur consistently has been content to say, "Let's get on with the war!" It is a torch in his soul. Isn't he getting on with the war? And how! If he becomes commander in chief, as I conceive the situation, he would never, for an instant, leave his present responsibilities until the final moment when, without the slightest campaign participation on his part, he would become the President of the United States. Then he would accept more responsibility, not less. He would enlarge his responsibility but he would leave none behind.

MacArthur is the son of a great soldier. He was born in peril and, for his country's sake, he has lived in peril almost ever since. He was a great soldier in the First World War. He led and personified the tremendous Rainbow Division in France. He was gassed. He was wounded twice. He was decorated 13 times for extreme bravery under fire. He was cited seven additional times for bravery. I quote just one citation:

"He displayed indomitable resolution and great courage in rallying broken lines and in reforming attacks, thereby making victory possible. On a field where courage was the rule, his courage was the dominant feature."

Whatever else we do, and regardless of 1944 vicissitudes, let's not forget our history or our debt. Against this unparalleled record, the petty, little slingshots of today deserve nothing but the contempt they so richly merit. Let's not befoul our own pantheon.

MacArthur subsequently became a great peacetime Chief of Staff, so great that President Roosevelt reappointed him, which was without a precedent. His demands upon Congress were replete with prescient pleadings for modern arms—motorized and aerial—to prepare against the day of judgment. He was an exceptional administrator, an important quality not to be ignored in the current discussion. He became a great generalissimo in the Philippines where he organized the defenses of the new commonwealth. His record in World War II is an equal epic.

It is not too much to say that he became the living symbol of our own bruised but indomitable hopes in half a world when our fortunes were at lowest ebb. Never has a commander done so much with so little. His critics can spread all the petty smears they please. Against them, he will stand upon the horizon like a monolith of honor, courage, devotion and achievement.

I can't help but think that's the kind of commander in chief Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public would like to choose when, pursuant to the formula dictated by President Roosevelt himself, the next campaign is settled on a win-the-war basis. At any rate, that's the kind of President I want when he is to become our new commander in chief. And that's the kind of candidate I want to stand as F. D. R.'s opposite number on the ballot. And that, Mr. Editor, is my reason No. 1 in response to your question.

Now for reason No. 2: Anyone who has any practical familiarity with Washington knows that the next President of the United States must make hard, harsh decisions every day of his administration when the time comes to put this country back on its postwar feet. Many of our postwar tasks will be even more trying to men's souls than the war itself if we are to renew free institutions and free enterprise. The next President will have to consult solely the independent welfare of our whole citizenship. He can never flirt with pressure groups, no matter how powerful politically. He can never yield to special pleaders for special privilege in any direction. He must have but one unselfish devotion. He must travel the undeviating line of duty. We shall need a Gibraltar in the peace just as desperately as we need it in the war, an American Gibraltar personified at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Probably it is a one-term job, with no thought of the consequences.

I may be wrong about it, but I sometimes wonder whether this characteristic (in sufficient quantity) can stem from ordinary, political soil. At any rate, this I know: I know that MacArthur has been making hard, life-and-death decisions all through his sturdy career. Then he has been seeing these decisions through to a conclusive finish. I know that MacArthur is the embodiment of loyalty to our American destiny at any cost. The proof stands on the record.

I know that he is as devoid of political entanglements as he was of reinforcements at Bataan. I know that he would come to the White House with no thought or purpose except to serve America, at home and abroad, in the climax of his devoted career. Any racketeer of any sort would last about 1 minute in his presence. I know that he has never shirked a tough job in his life or compromised with it. He is granite in the face of duty.

WHAT I'D LIKE TO VOTE FOR

That's not my enthusiasm speaking. It is the voice of time and events. I know that his training and experience produce an integrity of character which will persist in any assignment he accepts. I'd like to vote for integrity of character. It means more to me than a thousand campaign promises. Isn't that what America needs? Isn't it?

MacArthur would be nominated as a Republican, and that's appropriate because he comes of Republican stock. Of course he would play team ball because no one knows better than he that it is finally the team that counts, and I would expect him, on the basis of the record, to put together the best team we have seen in many a day. He has the know-how because he has dealt with Government all his life. But my view of it is that he would be elected, in this emergency, as something vastly more than a Republican in any narrow, partisan sense. He is utterly detached from our party schisms and our party feuds and our interparty divisions. More than any other Presidential possibility, he would be elected as a great, unifying American who would win his country's unified support by deserving it. The very nature of his draft, void of any obligation save to his country, would dramatize and implement his selfless dedication. That's the kind of President I want next time and, incidentally, perhaps that's the reason so many southern Democrats tell me that he is the one Republican nominee who could crack Mason and Dixon's line. And I know plenty of northern Democrats, including one of the biggest, who feel the same way about it.

Now let's come down to reason No. 3. Although MacArthur has been a soldier all his life, I never knew a man in whom spiritual values are more predominant. He is infinitely more than a soldier. This is important because the family hearthstone means more to us, in our ideology, than battlefields; and it means infinitely more to him. He once said at a reunion of his Rainbow Division, "No one desires peace as much as the soldier, for he must pay the greatest penalty in war."

THE KIND OF PRESIDENT I WANT

I repeat that spiritual values rule his mind. This blossoms in every speech he ever made (and, by the way, he has an incomparable gift of tongue) and in every statement he ever uttered. I recall his thrilling, sanctified radio message from the hard-pressed Philippines to the little church in Arkansas where he was confirmed as a boy—the message sent on a beleaguered Easter morning—a message eloquently suggesting that we need God on our side in this titanic struggle and humbly asking for His aid. I find everlasting consolation and assurance in this simple Christian's reliance upon divine grace.

That's the kind of President I want, Mr. Editor.

In my opinion, such a President will never go far wrong. I would not for an instant suggest the absence of this quality in others. I simply certify to its abundant reality in the MacArthur character.

When a group of Canadian newsmen recently interviewed MacArthur—off the record—he talked frankly with them for some 2 hours. They couldn't report what he said, but one of them did print the opinion that he rivaled even Churchill in his command of our common language (which would be the final British compliment) and that he quoted constantly from three favorite authorities—the Bible, Adam Smith, and Abraham Lincoln. I know of no better key to his thinking on sociology, on economics, and on the realities of life in the pattern of American ideals. Meanwhile, the Republican national platform will spell out the details. We ought to be able to agree upon those authorities. At any rate, that's the kind of President I want.

No, it doesn't answer all the detailed questions regarding national policies upon which one might wish more specific enlightenment. But I have come to believe that the basic characteristics of a man are more important than campaign promises, and I think I know this man from days of old.

It is unfortunate that MacArthur cannot stump the country. It would be a landslide. But he can't. He must stay where he is. He must just "get on with the war." But answering for myself, I assert my complete confidence in a superlatively fine American mind which has developed on sound American doctrine and which certainly knows—the hard way—what our position, at home and abroad, must be in the postwar world.

No one could be more a "citizen of the world," with an experience and vision that roam the hemispheres; yet no one could have more faithfully dedicated a loyal lifetime to his own United States. Yes; that's the kind of President I want in lieu of a fourth-term dynasty.

Oh, I am familiar with much that is being said—and make no mistake—often being deliberately propagandized by those who politically fear this powerful personality. Envy and malice and fear have always chosen shining targets. MacArthur has been pursued by them all his life—and never with so much at stake as now. I'm familiar with some of the often earnest but mistaken prejudice against him (such as always rises against any formidable Presidential probability).

For example, I have heard from some bonus marchers whom he, in line of duty, was ordered to evict from Washington—once more doing his hard, tough duty under orders which a soldier must obey. But I haven't heard that he was responsible for the loss of a single life in the way he did the job. I haven't heard that he delegated this repugnant task to some subordinate. But I have heard, in person, from one of the top commanders of that bonus army that he is for MacArthur—as am I—and that he is prepared to go anywhere, any time, to prove that, even in that tragic hour, MacArthur was a soldier's soldier and the soldiers' friend.

Anyway, he faced and did his hard duty to his Government on an assignment not of his own choosing. Let's separate his duty from the event itself. On that basis, it simply helps to clinch my point. On that basis, I'll say again that's the kind of President—tried by fire and by the acid test—I want, and that the country needs next year.

I have heard it said—perhaps for want of some better brick to throw—that historically General McClellan made a poor nominee and that General Grant made a poor President. So what? Does that forever bar every other general? Any such analogy is ridiculous, pro or con.

It would be just as logical to speak of General Washington or General Andrew Jackson as exhibits to the contrary. And how about the fact that the military was the background for almost every President from Hayes to Taft, during great epochs in our national life? Yes; and Gen. Leonard Wood would have been elected President in 1920 instead of Warren Harding if he could have been saved from a few of his misguided friends.

I venture the prediction that when 10,000,000 of our fighting sons are home again, every President for two generations to come will have been a stalwart figure in this fighting war. I do not run from such a prophecy. I think it is sound democracy. Who has better earned the right? Who has better kept the faith? Who has better served the Republic? Who better knows what America is worth? In my view, MacArthur is richly endowed to be the monitor in this regard. This isn't militarism. It is the exact opposite, because no one hates war quite so much as its own veterans. It isn't militarism; it is practical citizenship.

LET THE PEOPLE SPEAK

I constantly hear it said that a "pure draft" of a Presidential nominee is impossible. Maybe so. Certainly if General MacArthur is nominated, it will be a "pure draft" so far as he is concerned. But that does not alter his eligibility—and I am discussing only that theme at the moment. It will remain for the Republican National Convention, which I hope may be dominated by uninstructed delegates who sit in a truly deliberative party parliament to determine whether this eligibility is greater than that of any of the other distinguished and able Republicans who will be similarly weighed. It will be for the people, meanwhile, to speak their minds.

That is what I am doing, Mr. Editor, in answer to your question. I think I know at first hand something about what the next Presidency will require. I believe that General MacArthur has what it takes in full measure. He is a composite of all our necessities. He is unique in respect to many of them. He has the maturity of vast experience, yet he is in his physical and mental prime. If nominated, he will be elected. If elected, he will bring a great mind, a great heart, a great capacity, and a great devotion to the proud leadership of a great Nation. And now—on with the show. And may the best man win.

Greek Royalists Make Us Uncle Sap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include the following article by William L. Shirer in the New York Herald Tribune, February 22, 1948:

GREEK ROYALISTS FOUND SNIPING AT UNITED STATES MISSION AND REPORTERS—POLITICOS IN POWER, SHIRER SAYS, CALL AMERICANS REDS, USE SAME ARGUMENTS AGAINST THEM AS COMMUNISTS DO; ATTACKS SEEN AS EFFECTIVE

(By William L. Shirer)

Those extremely able, calculating, hard-boiled, and not-too-scrupulous Royalist politicos who run Greece, which President Truman said last week was "still a free country," must really subscribe to the gag about the United States being good old Uncle Sap.

At the moment last week when the President was asking Congress for more millions to bolster the Greek Army's war against the guerrillas, whom it outnumbers 10 to 1, the right-wing forces in control of Greece were actively conducting a two-pronged campaign against the American-aid mission and against most of the American correspondents in Greece, whose insistence on reporting the facts has so alarmed the Royalists that they have begun to resort to tactics which Americans, who are footing the bill in Greece, ought to know of.

These are matters which Mr. Truman did not touch on in his second quarterly report on aid to Greece and Turkey last week. But the intelligence I get from responsible Americans in Greece—not to mention from Greeks—is so startling that perhaps it should be passed on.

DIRECTLY TO THE BOSS

Responsible American reporters for every conservative American newspaper have already grown accustomed to being called Communists by the reactionary clique which dominates Greece. But they may not have been prepared for a new tactic which the Greek Government recently has used in an attempt to prevent American newspapers and radio from publishing and broadcasting the truth.

This consists of the Greek Government complaining directly to the correspondent's boss in the United States.

I know of one case where the Greek Ambassador, Vassili Dendramis, wrote to the American employer of one of the best of our reporters in Athens, complaining of the journalist's "exaggerations" and "complete distortions of the truth." If the Greek Ambassador, unmindful of the American tradition of press freedom, thought that in this case he might bring about the correspondent's recall, he was sadly mistaken. I am glad to report that the employer in this case fully backed his correspondent.

There may be need of solidarity among our press and radio executives, for the American reporters in Athens feel there may soon be an attempt by the Royalist clique, which is becoming impatient for a Royalist dictatorship, to remove all the fearless correspondents.

The treatment of thes American correspondents has become a scandal, and I am surprised that the President and the Congress are not more concerned about it. If the American taxpayer is to continue to cough up the money to keep Greece going he at least has the right to be informed by his own press and radio of what is going on there. The official State Department reports are of not much help.

Our correspondents in Greece work under great difficulties. The Greek Government constantly thwarts their efforts to travel around the country to see what is up. It obstructs their work in dozens of ingenious ways. It stoops to having agents spread malicious slander about correspondents whose stories displease it.

HOPE TO FRIGHTEN MISSION

The purpose of the right-wing attack on the American mission in Greece apparently is to make it afraid to take a firm line in cleaning up the corruption and the injustices of the present regime. How effective this campaign has been may be judged by the fact that 90 percent of the American personnel of the mission wan. to come home by June 30, when their contracts run out.

Amusingly enough, but indicative of the mentality of the Greek Royalists whom we keep in power, one charge against the American mission is that it is full of Communists—the very people President Truman says we're spending our millions to fight in Greece.

Recently, the Royalist newspaper Estia suggested that the American mission had become infiltrated by Communists and that the American Federal Bureau of Investigation should come to Greece to investigate. Commenting on an airfield which the Americans were building for the Greeks, Estia expressed the sarcastic hope that the field was not being constructed by "Americans who are Communist-minded, like so many American mission members."

Experiments turned out on investigation to be nothing more than the honest and sincere efforts of our mission to get food, medicine, and blankets to the half-million starving Greeks.

Finally, my informants in Greece report the supreme irony of all. They find that since the first of the year the propaganda line of the Communists and of the dominant Royalist Populist Party in regard to America has become almost identical. Both charge the United States with interference in internal Greek affairs. Both say that Washington is trying to use the Greek people to further its own ends.

The Communist line is well known, but it will come as a surprise to many to learn that the group we support in Athens because it is against Communists is now also plugging the thesis that the United States is trying to establish a puppet government in the Greek capital so that Greeks will fight America's war against the Soviet Union.

This was expressed in part recently by Greece's second-largest newspaper, the Royalist Vrathini. "If one observes the notices," it observed, "being issued to the Greek Government by American Administrator Dwight P. Griswold, one must conclude that these were formulated in Tokyo, addressed to the conquered Japanese or some other gangster-dominated country. * * * Ironically, these tactics are being used by a people who surrendered Europe to the worst of enemies and now are trying to win the war which was lost at Yalta and Potsdam. * * * Further, the Americans, and our other allies, are chiefly to blame for the misery, devastation and loss of life in Greece during the last year because of refusal to give the Greek army sufficient arms for use against the bandits in the hills."

One might reply, of course, that we already have given the Greeks $172,000,000 worth of arms and that Maj. Gen. William G. Livesay, military adviser to the American Aid Mission, recently said that the arms and equipment of the Greek army are superior in every respect to those of the guerrillas.

But, as the President rather ruefully admitted, in fact, last week, this equipment has not done much good. Is Greece, perchance, a bottomless pit?

Tinkling Cymbals and Sounding Brasses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lincoln County Times of Brookhaven, Miss.:

TINKLING CYMBALS AND SOUNDING BRASSES
(An editorial by T. P. Brady)

The eyes of our Nation are upon the South. Mississippi has spoken and the Nation is looking to ascertain what Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, Florida, and all the other Southern States are going to do. The Nation knows the South gave it the true Democratic Party. It knows that we are the heart and soul of that party and that we alone can now save it from destruction. The sneers of northern Democratic political bosses are fading from their faces. The slurs of northern writers and news commentators are being silenced. Northern "raw deal" Democrats realize now that the true Jeffersonian Democrats throughout the Nation are aroused, united, and determined to purge the party of its un-American leftists. With wondering eyes they peer to see if a united South can accomplish this purge.

Their sneers and slurs will be abandoned, but in their place appeasement, threats, and coercion will be substituted and utilized. The selection of Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, as ex officio chairman of a committee of southern Democratic Representatives consisting of 12 members has convinced the most dubious that 30,000,000 white southern Democrats are determined and will not be denied their constitutional rights by 3,000,000 Negro Democrats of the North; 76 of the 108 southern Democratic Congressmen have promptly responded to the demand of their 30,000,000 constituents, and the other 32 will do likewise without having to be shown the expediency of such a response. This committee of southern Congressmen, through its chairman, Representative COLMER, today will endeavor with Gov. Strom Thurman, of South Carolina, chairman of the southern governors committee, and Governors Laney, of Arkansas; Cherry, of North Carolina; Jester, of Texas; and Tuck, fo Virginia, to convince J. HOWARD MCGRATH, national chairman of the national Democratic Party, that 14 Southern States will be denied their constitutional prerogatives, and 30,000,000 white Jeffersonian Democratic citizens their constitutional rights by President Truman's vicious four-point anti-southern program.

It is proposed that this gallant gesture should be made, but it is a futile one. Today J. HOWARD MCGRATH will not sneer at nor slur these 12 Jeffersonian Democrats. He will smile and smile and blandly assure them he will be glad to discuss their requests that President Truman withdraw his four recommendations for the enactment of anti-segregation, antipoll tax, antilynch, and FEPC Federal legislation with the titular head of the Democratic Party. That will end the gesture. President Truman knew of the Southern Governors Conference. He also knew of the scheduled meeting with Chairman MCGRATH and the 12 southern Congressmen, and either fearing this meeting, or indifferent thereto, he has flown to Haiti and today is in conference with more distinguished dignitaries upon more important matters on a well-timed vacation.

Upon the Missourian's return, the northern Democrats with their Negro cohorts will initiate their machine strategy. Appeasement will be their first line of attack, and realizing this will fail, then threats will be forthcoming followed closely by coercion. We are not deceived; we cannot be placated with baubles. We realize we were recently given a Vice President and this bauble has availed us nothing. We cannot be intimidated and we cannot be coerced. We are the Democratic Party and we are going to remain so. We are furthermore determined to purge the Democratic Party of the canker that is slowly eating into its vitals before our party is utterly destroyed.

Any representative of any Southern State, be he United States Senator, Congressman, governor, Presidential elector, committeeman, or what not, who does not realize this fact or for any reason whatsoever fails to do all within his power to block these four vicious, discriminatory proposed Federal enactments and purge his party of these mongrelizing elements which will destroy it, is not worthy of bearing the name of a southerner or a Democrat. The mongrel Democrats of the northern wing will utilize, in their coercive strategy, the tinkling symbols of the South. These tinkling symbols consist first of a few misguided educators, religious fanatics, and racial minority groups who have been inoculated with Russian Soviet philosophy which did not take, but did produce an unhealthy pink rash. Many of this number are conscientious in their misguided diluted beliefs. They are easily recognized and will be quickly reconverted or silenced.

A second group of tinklers are more formidable. It is composed of selfish and frequently benevolent southern Democrats who do not appreciate the seriousness of this crisis and who have capitalized on northern Democratic assistance in many forms, and on southern tradition, utilizing often a controlled Negro vote for their selfish interest or ambition. This group will have to be reckoned with. If they will not conform to our idealogy and customs voluntarily then they must be forced to do so.

A third group consists of the so-called intellectual Negroes. In this group can be found a few who honestly realize that the abolition of segregation and the poll tax would produce a catastrophe in the South for white and Negro alike. The majority, however, because of the rash, politically expedient promises of the northern Democrats, have adopted these futile promises as their dearest objectives. The thought of mating a vulture with an eagle, contrary to the laws of God and nature, is appealing to them. Just as they left the Republican Party when they were promised these Utopian privileges, contrary to said laws of God and nature, after carpetbag days, so they will leave the northern Democratic Party for the Communist Party when it promises the same or something even more attractive. The eyes of communistic Russia are upon the South today. God have mercy on the South and the United States if the northern Democrats should franchise the Negro and the Communist Party assimilate them. As the iron curtain has fallen over the mongrelized communistic nations of Europe, so will it then fall over and encircle these United States.

As for the sounding brasses which will blow from the North, they will shout and scream party loyalty when they do not even know the meaning of the words. Northern Democrats will thus endeavor to deceive and mislead conscientious, misguided, loyal, southern Jeffersonian Democrats. Millions of dollars furnished by northern Negro Democratic organizations under the control of Walter White, the Negro secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the titular head of 753 branches of Negro youth councils which has a paid membership of 350,000, augmented by funds from un-American racial minority groups in the North and even the Communist Party are at their command to keep the brasses blowing throughout the South and Nation. Federal patronage and Federal projects are within the control of the left northern wing of the party which will affect thousands upon thousands of southerners. They too, will be sounding off. Coercion in its most sinster forms will be the instruments of destruction used by the northern sounding brasses!

But, in the last analysis, the solution and answer to this great crisis which faces the South and our Nation will hang on one question. That question is—Does the true Democratic Party have the leadership to cope with this problem? Are the descendants of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Sam Houston, Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, John C. Calhoun, Claiborne, Pinkney, and the thousands of other true Democrats, who gave us this heritage and party, strong encugh and willing enough to fight and if necessary die for the preservation of their party? Do the true Democrats of the South value their honor, their heritage, the sanctity of their homes, the protection of their mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, and sweethearts more than mercenary, selfish benefits which will be offered in barter for these priceless traditions and heritage?

The answer to this question has never been doubted. Thirty million white Democratic citizens will rise as a man and our brothers in the North and West who believe as we believe, who trust as we trust, and who love their country as we do, will rally to our aid and this malignant canker will be eradicated. A regeneration of true democracy must and will come to our party, the American Democratic Party of sovereign States and our Government, a union of these sovereign States, will be protected and its continuation insured.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and to provide adequate appropriations for the preservation of the security of the Nation, by the creation of the world's strongest Air Force and Air National Guard and for the creation of a National Science Foundation for scientific research, to make available scientific discoveries and knowledge for the information and guidance of officials responsible for our national security

Whereas In World War II the value and importance of the Regular Air Force and Air National Guard as component parts of our national defense and security program were demonstrated, and in the development of said air force, the need for scientific study in the field of science related to national defense and security was demonstrated and continues to exist: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide for the world's strongest Regular Air Force and Air National Guard and to provide for an adequate appropriation of funds to permit this to be done; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the establishment of a National Science Foundation, with the appropriation of sufficient funds to encourage scientific research to be conducted which shall be made available to the directors of the armed forces and insure national security in the future; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from this commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, February 12, 1948.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 19, 1948.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

A true copy. Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Tolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to include an article published in today's issue of the Washington Times-Herald telling of the friendship between the new archbishop of Baltimore and a Jewish tailor of New Britain, Conn., which I believe is a splendid example of tolerance:

NEW BALTIMORE ARCHBISHOP HONORS EARLY JEWISH MENTOR

NEW BRITAIN, CONN., March 2.—Forty-five years ago Samuel Greenberg, a Jewish tailor, encouraged a little boy called "Frankie" to study for the Catholic priesthood.

The boy, devoted to the neighborhood tailor who used to put patches on the seat of his pants, is now the Most Reverend Francis P. Keough, 56, new archbishop of Baltimore.

Sam and his wife have just returned from Baltimore where they were honored guests at the elevation ceremony.

This is the story Sam, now 75, told today in his little Seneca Street shop:

"When I heard 'Frankie' was to be made an archbishop, I did not suspect I would be beside him at his consecration. Then an invitation came.

"I borrowed money from my daughter, and my wife, Sonia, and I got on the train. When we arrived, a priest met us at the station and ushered us to a pew set aside especially for us."

The aged tailor continued:

"When Keough passed by our pew, flanked by all those church dignitaries, he stopped and said: 'Hello, Sam.' I was so amazed I was scared."

That was not all the bishop did for his old friend. He kept the Greenbergs in Baltimore for a week, expenses paid—and provided kosher meals throughout the visit.

We Have a Federal Power Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past many months I have heard any number of voices raised on this floor to the effect that we need a Federal power policy for the United States. What most of them have meant, I am sure, was that they wanted a different power policy. But in working toward that end, they have contrived to spread the impression that there was no present, organized Federal policy on electric power.

Since there has been so much said on this subject by those who want to change our Federal power laws to their own designs, it should be in order at this time to insert into the RECORD the full text of a declaration and petition on Federal power policy, agreed to by the Northwest Public Power Association, which is the organization comprising all local public power distribution agencies in the Pacific Northwest, at its recent convention at Lewiston, Idaho.

This document is important chiefly because it points up the fact that we do have a Federal power policy; that, while it has some faults, it is effectively working in the people's interest; that it has been developed over a period of some 65 years—or since the advent of electric power; and that any attempt to tamper with it should be made in at atmosphere of caution and due regard for the precedents and principles which have been established for so long.

I do not say that I necessarily agree with each and every point outlined in this declaration. I am deeply gratified, however, that the association apparently tried to allow for such differences of opinion by stating broad general principles, rather than specific limitations.

As an example, the March 1948 issue of Rural Electrification magazine in its discussion of the declaration, points out that—

The magazine goes on to comment:

Proponents of a Columbia Valley Authority and Representative WALT HORAN's competing proposal differ on these points in pointing out the advantages of their bills. The NWPPA declaration doesn't mention either bill, and makes a studied effort to incorporate the advantages of both proposals.

It is only by such willingness to allow for the different points of view that we can ever evolve a firm and acceptable Federal power policy. It is the all-or-nothing attitude of extreme partisans which makes for continuing controversy and confusion.

I cannot urge too strongly that every Member of this body who is interested in the conservation and development of our country's electric power potential read this document carefully. I urge them that in so reading they recognize that the sponsoring organization is the chosen representative and duly-elected voice of the hundreds of thousands of citizen-owner-customers who have their money and their future invested in the power distribution systems which serve them.

Every citizen has a stake in the evolution of our Federal power policy. Federal power revenues already are committed to the repayment of more than $1,000,000,000 in subsidies to reclamation and other natural resource development, in addition to the liquidation of the investment in Federal power plants themselves. Federal power plants already have increased the taxable valuation of newly developed sections of the country by hundreds of millions of dollars. Federal power plants gave us the electric energy which won the war of production and is winning the production battle for peace.

The Federal power goose has been laying golden eggs for many years, to the benefit of all our people. Let us think long and cautiously before we allow any man to swing an ax over its head.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the declaration and petition of the Northwest Public Power Association relating to Federal power policy at this point in today's RECORD:

THE FEDERAL POWER POLICY

(A declaration and petition of the Northwest Public Power Association, Inc., Vancouver, Wash.)

The public power systems of Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, and Alaska represented by delegates in convention at Lewiston, Idaho, this 6th day of February 1948 as members of the Northwest Public Power Association, a nonprofit service corporation in the State of Washington

Declare and publish certain fundamental principles and considerations relative to the continued formulation of a sound Federal power policy to the end that such policy may guide and render more effective the Federal power program, and furthermore do

Petition the Congress of the United States to preserve intact these principles and to strengthen this policy by means of legislation providing administrative coordination, legislative consistency and more business-like financing.

I. PREAMBLE

The furnishing of electric energy has developed since 1882 into the second most important public utility function of government, second only to the furnishing of safe domestic water supply. To help meet this need for electric energy the Congress has evolved over the past half century a Federal power program. This program has demonstrated the constitutional authority of the Congress to generate electric energy at flood control, navigation, irrigation, and other multipurpose projects, including the right to construct supplementary fuel-burning generating plants and the transmission lines necessary for the marketing of such electric energy. The Congress has also recognized the importance of the role of electric energy in increased national production, both in time of war and peace, and secondly, the role of rural electrification as a means to greater agricultural production and for the improvement of the general welfare, and thirdly, the role of the Federal power program as an integral part of the broader program for the conservation and development of the natural

resources. By these actions the Congress has assigned to various Federal agencies the important public-utility responsibility of supplying adequate supplies of electric energy. In certain sections of the Nation, and particularly in the Pacific Northwest, the Federal Government is the predominant supplier of electric energy. And it is as a guide for the conduct of the Federal power program that the Congress has written into law and has frequently reiterated the fundamental principles which constitute our Federal power policy.

II. BASIC PRINCIPLES

We favor the continued formulation and implementation of the Federal power policy based on the following four historic principles:

A. To encourage the most widespread use of electric energy.

B. At the lowest possible rates to consumers.

C. Consistent with sound business principles.

D. With preference to public bodies and cooperatives.

III. RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT

We favor the policy of the Congress, long established in law, providing for the development by the United States Government as rapidly as practicable of all the potential hydropower of our rivers as an incident and principal self-liquidating factor in the broader program of controlling the floods, aiding navigation, providing irrigation, and for other conservation purposes. In the planning of multipurpose river projects due consideration and proper weight shall be given to the preservation or relocation of the fish and other marine and wildlife, and to the scenic and recreational values of the area.

IV. NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

We recommend that the natural resources of the various States be developed on a regional and national basis. We urge that the development in the Pacific Northwest be executed in accordance with the broad outlines laid out in the following detailed reports:

A Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission Report issued by the National Resources Committee in May 1936.

B. Proposed Program of Development of Columbia Drainage Basin, issued December 17, 1943, by the Northwest States Development Association consisting of the Governors of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming.

C. Advance Program of System Development, 1948-54, preliminary report issued by the Bonneville Power Administration October 1947, as amended and endorsed by the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee in November 1947 and issued in final form February 6, 1948.

D. Development of Resources and of Economic Opportunity in the Pacific Northwest, published in October 1942 by the National Resources Planning Board.

V. LOCAL AUTONOMY

Where the natural resources of a State or a region are proposed for development by a Federal agency, we recommend a maximum degree of home rule consistent with national objectives, and that this policy shall be implemented by means of local public hearings, and by local representation on advisory and administrative boards and councils.

VI. THE BONNEVILLE ACT

We endorse the Bonneville Act as amended, and we recommend in addition the following amendments:

A. The Bonneville Act should be amended so as to enable the Bonneville Power Administration to employ the revenues for maintenance, operating and administrative purposes, and secondly to set aside revenues in excess of operating, maintenance, and administrative expenses, interest and debt amortization charges, and to employ such surplus revenues for capital purposes, including investment in transmission lines, substations and related facilities except major transmission facilities into an area not previously approved for service in connection with an appropriation act.

B. We recommend that the Bonneville Act be amended to authorize the Bonneville Power Administration to borrow capital loan funds from the United States Treasury for the construction or replacement of transmission lines, substations, and related facilities.

C. We recommend that those provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act relating to business-type budgets be made applicable to the Bonneville Power Administration. In addition to the financial controls in the Government Corporation Control Act, the Congress in reviewing the business-type budget may reject the proposed expenditure of borrowed capital loan funds for the construction of major transmission facilities into an area not previously served by the Administration.

D. The Bonneville Act should be amended for the purpose of designating the Bonneville Power Administration as the exclusive marketing agency for surplus electrical energy generated at Army constructed flood control or navigation dams in the States of Washington and Oregon and on the Columbia River and its tributaries, and from such Bureau of Reclamation hydroelectric facilities as the Secretary of the Interior shall designate.

E. We recommend that the Bonneville Act be amended for the purpose of authorizing and directing the Bonneville Power Administration to determine power rates and schedules for the repayment of Federal investment in power facilities, both subject to approval of the Federal Power Commission, and that in making such determinations the Bonneville Power Administration shall set rates and repayments on a system-wide basis rather than on an individual project basis, provided that payments should otherwise conform to existing laws. In other words, two or more related projects may be considered as a unit.

VII. FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1944

We endorse and urge the retention of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, and furthermore urge the extension and application of the provisions of section 5 of the act to all other flood-control and navigation projects constructed or in future to be constructed by the War Department. We oppose most vigorously any proposed legislation which seeks to eliminate the benefits of section 5 of said act. The applicable section of the Flood Control Act of 1944 reads as follows:

"SEC. 5. Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery (upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities of the projects) of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power over a reasonable period of years. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized from funds to be appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available at wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies. All moneys received from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

We further urge the amendment of section 5 by striking the last three words "as miscellaneous receipts" and adding the following language "to appropriate accounts and funds credited to the respective Federal agencies."

VIII. BUS BAR SALE

We oppose any proposed legislation requiring the sale of hydroelectric energy from Federal projects at the bus bar.

IX. PREFERENCE TO PUBLIC BODIES AND COOPERATIVES

We recommend that the Department of the Interior in carrying out the policy of the Congress requiring that preference in the sale of electric energy be given to public bodies and cooperatives should be required to construct or purchase electric transmission lines, substations, and related facilities necessary to deliver the energy at wholesale to the load centers of the public body or cooperative at their required voltage.

X. ENERGY SALES BY THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

We oppose any proposed legislation requiring or permitting the Federal Power Commission to market electric energy or to exercise authority over contracts for the sale of energy by any Federal agency. We believe that as a police or regulatory agency, the Federal Power Commission should be excluded from the proprietary or business side of the Federal power program. The quasi-judicial functions of the Federal Power Commission preclude, under our theory of the separation of governmental powers, the annexation of proprietary or managerial authority such as selling energy or passing on power sales contracts.

XI. RETAILING OF ENERGY BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

We favor the policy of the Congress in limiting the marketing authority of Federal agencies to wholesale accounts. In accordance with this policy the retailing of electrical energy by any Federal agency should be discontinued as rapidly as practicable. Furthermore, we believe that no Federal marketing agency should sell power to private industries within the distribution area of any public body or cooperative unless expressly requested by such public or cooperative body.

XII. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

We urge the most expeditious electrification of the 2,250,000 unelectrified farms of this Nation. To this end we urge that the Congress adopt a policy of granting appropriations to the Rural Electrification Administration sufficient to make available capital-loan funds to REA borrowers in all cases where the project is determined to be financially feasible on a self-liquidating basis. Secondly, we urge adequate appropriations for the cost of processing these loans. Thirdly, we endorse the program of the Agricultural Research Administration for research in the rural utilization of electricity, and urge that the Congress appropriate sufficient funds to carry out this program. Fourthly, we disapprove of any riders or restrictions on the making of loans to REA borrowers for the construction or purchase of generating facilities. We feel that the rural-electrification program should be executed with dispatch in the interest of increased agricultural production and for the purpose of reducing the inconveniences of rural living.

XIII. NATIONAL DEFENSE

We consider an adequate supply of electric power as a critical element in the national defense, and we must point out that the present Nation-wide power shortage is a definite indication of military weakness and unpreparedness. We note that in the recent war, the strength of our enemies and of our allies was largely in proportion to their supply of electric energy. We note that our War Production Board translated large military orders into electric-power demand and then ordered the building of defense plants in areas where electric energy either was available or could be made available. The War Production Board regarded the electric-energy supply as more important than any other production factor except manpower. Under the War Production Board we installed the remaining Bonneville Dam generators and diverted two Shasta Dam generators to Grand Coulee. This was done for increased war production. We believe that this Nation, strictly from concern for the national defense, should install generating facilities at such a rate that we shall always have a reserve of at least 10 percent excess generating capacity above peak loads. We deplore the lack of a national military policy providing for adequate supplies of electric energy. To correct this deficiency we urge that the Congress by law require the Secretary of the Defense, through his National Security Resources Council, and in cooperation with the Federal Power Commission and other agencies, to conduct continuing surveys of our national electric-energy requirements for war production and to make annual or more frequent reports to the President and to the Congress with recommendations for the meeting of such electrical requirements.

XIV. FUEL CONSERVATION

We urge the development of the potential hydroelectric sites of the Nation as a measure for the conservation of fuel oil and other expendable energy sources, the timing of such development to be governed by the financial feasibility of each project or group of projects.

XV. SOUND BUSINESS PRINCIPLES

Inasmuch as the operation of Federal hydroelectric facilities, transmission lines, and substations is a business of proprietary function, we believe that these activities should be managed and financed on a businesslike basis. Firstly, the management of an electric system requires a business type of administrative structure preferably with most of the attributes of a corporation. Secondly, we recommend that the following provisions be made for the orderly financing of the Federal power program:

1. That accounting and budgeting practice should clearly distinguish capital and operating accounts.

2. That each Federal power agency should be required to repay the reimbursable costs of the projects on the basis of the useful lifetime of each project or group of projects.

3. That each Federal power agency should be authorized and directed to borrow capital loan funds and to use its revenues in order to carry out its public-utility responsibility.

XVI. REGULATION OF THE ELECTRIC UTILITY COMPANIES

We recognize that private electric companies in performing public-utility functions are operating under special privileges granted by the various units of government. They are given governmental power to condemn private property, they are granted franchises and certificates of convenience and necessity and are given the use of highway right-of-way. We recommend that the Congress order a comprehensive investigation of the electric public-utility industry for the following purposes:

1. To determine the effectiveness of present governmental regulation, Federal, State, and municipal.

2. To determine the extent of propaganda, political and lobbying activity of the private electrical companies.

3. To determine the efforts being made by the companies to thwart and discredit municipal and cooperative electric systems.

4. To determine the extent to which the electric public utility industry is meeting its public utility responsibility.

5. To determine the extent to which the purposes of the Public Utility Holding Company Act have been carried out by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

This investigation should be made by the Federal Trade Commission and should be in addition to the surveys now required by law to be made by the Federal Power Commission and in addition to any military surveys which the Congress may require of the Secretary of the Defense.

XVII. ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION

We recommend that the responsibility for administrative coordination of the Federal-power program be placed in two agencies as follows: The Federal Power Commission to be assigned all authority with respect to the policing and regulation of certain activities of both private and public power systems. With respect to the Federal power program the Federal Power Commission should be assigned uniform authority reviewing the allocation of the cost of Federal projects to power and other purposes, secondly the requiring of a uniform system of accounts and accounting practices, thirdly approval of rate schedules, and fourthly consultation in connection with project and market surveys if made by any agency other than the Federal Power Commission.

On the other hand, we recommend that the Department of the Interior be assigned the responsibility for coordinating the proprietary or business component of the Federal power program, particularly with respect to the marketing of electric energy and the construction of electrical facilities. Under this policy neither the Army nor the Federal Power Commission would be enabled to market energy. Nor would the assignment of coordinating responsibility in the Department of the Interior preclude the granting of a measure of local autonomy within the various regions.

The Department of the Interior would also be in the best position to coordinate hydroelectric development with the other objectives of multipurpose projects. As the Department primarily concerned with the conservation and development of natural resources, this Department would best insure that the Federal power program would be conducted as an integral part of the national conservation program.

XVIII. LEGISLATIVE COORDINATION

The recognition of the Federal power program as a component part of the national conservation program would suggest that one committee in each House of Congress be assigned to the study of legislation relative to conservation, including all power matters. Under the same concept the present laws relating to the Federal power program should be recodified at the time of the next revision of the United States Code and placed under title 16, Conservation.

XIX. SOUND ENGINEERING

We believe that a sound Federal power program requires a close coordination among three factors.

1. Continuing load studies: To provide sound estimates of future electrical loads.

2. Engineering studies: To plan the construction of facilities for generating and delivering the power to the various electrical regions of the Nation.

3. Congressional appropriations: To meet the construction costs and operating expenses of the various Federal power agencies.

If the load studies and the engineering studies are sound, we believe that appropriations based thereon will be sound.

We further submit that technological considerations dictate that within the various electrical regions high-voltage transmission lines should be constructed to interconnect the various electric-power plants with one another and with the various load centers of the electrical region together with high-voltage interregional tie lines.

XX. CONCLUSION

We respectfully submit that most of the desirable elements of a sound Federal power policy already exist in the form of Federal laws. These laws are scattered at present and should be brought together. Administratively a large measure of coordination is already being effected through the Department of the Interior. Further coordination is needed. The vigorous prosecution of the rural-electrification program, of multi-purpose-project construction, and the building of transmission lines is necessary not only as a means for the increase of our peacetime productive capacity but likewise for the strengthening of our national defense. The sale of electric energy from multi-purpose projects, furthermore, facilitates the carrying out of many other conservation activities. Electricity in many respects is the paying partner. We in the Pacific Northwest are generally happy over our experience with Federal construction of multi-purpose projects and transmission lines as well as with the administration of the Bonneville Power Administration in wholesaling the energy to the load centers of public bodies, cooperatives, and other large users of energy. We consider this pattern of administration and construction to be highly effective. We would like to see a more businesslike administrative structure and a more businesslike method of financing. The most critical accounting analysis also reveals that this approach enables us to enjoy low-cost energy, development of our natural resources, and therewith the satisfaction that the Federal Government will be repaid its entire investment in the power facilities together with interest.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following letter which I received recently from Celia Ferrell, secretary of the Hattie Harden School Mothers' Club, of Salem, W. Va., concerning the school-lunch program:

SALEM, W. VA., *February 29, 1948.*

Hon. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the regular monthly meeting of the Hattie Harden School Mothers' Club on February 18, 1948, a resolution was passed by that organization deploring Congress' action in reducing the appropriation for the school lunch from the $81,000,000 allotted for that purpose during the previous year to the $65,000,000 appropriated for the fiscal year 1947-48.

We understand that this reduction was actuated by Congress' desire to economize. And while we consider this desire laudable when not carried to the extreme, we feel, and feel most strongly, that a reduction in funds which vitally affects the health of the Nation's school children, many of whom are inadequately fed at home, is a false economy, indeed. We therefore go on record as advocating that for the fiscal year 1948–49, the amount be increased to a sum commensurate to meet the needs of the increased school enrollment and the rising cost of living.

So, as mothers with the interests of both our own children and other mothers' children at heart, we are appealing to you for support of this vital measure. We trust that you will not let us and the children down.

Very truly yours,

HATTIE HARDEN SCHOOL MOTHERS' CLUB,
By CELIA FERRELL, *Secretary*.

The Plot Thickens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal sold the United States to Soviet Russia; it sold Poland to Russia; it armed Tito; it armed Japan; and now the same crew of despoilers is asking for $12,000,000,000 to further lower our prestige abroad and also weaken our whole economy at home through an accentuated inflation of prices which is bound to result from the Marshall plan.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following article by Dorothy Thompson in the Washington Star March 3, 1948:

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY SEEN CRUMBLING AS RUSSIA BUILDS FORTRESS EUROPA

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The fact is that our foreign policy is crumbling to bits.

In Czechoslovakia another most valuable piece of Europe has fallen away. Others will follow in due time.

The eastern zone of the German Reich is long since lost to communism and Russian revolutionary-imperialism, a fact of far greater long-range consequence than last week's events in Czechoslovakia. For Germany will not remain forever divided into two patterns of civilization; it will all be one or the other.

Eastern Europe was lost at Teheran, Yalta, and by agreements regarding the disposition of Allied armies. When General Patton was forced to halt his troops an hour's march from Prague and to stand helpless while some 2,500 Czechs were slaughtered in a last battle with the SS, waiting for a Russian tank corps to travel 300 miles from Berlin, the certainty of last week's events was fixed.

ASSIGNED TO RUSSIAN SPHERE

Czechoslovakia, as Dr. Benes' memoirs clearly show—and like Poland—was simply assigned to the Russian sphere. That it becomes, as a result, a totalitarian Communist state is logical. Belated expressions of outrage and sympathy leave this columnist cold. The Czech people do not want communism; true. Neither did they, nor the Poles, want to be disposed of like so much rubbish. What have the wishes of peoples got to do with anything, today?

Until a year ago, it was positively dangerous for any writer in this country to criticize whatever arrangements had been made. Pressure did not even come from the Government, but from organized claques in the public. To be pessimistic, to utter any warnings, to criticize the structure of the United Nations—above all, to question the measures for Germany—was interpreted as tantamount to treason against peace.

But the chickens always come home to roost.

This columnist went down to Washington to testify against the Italian peace treaty. That testimony is on the record, I presume. I said the treaty would cost the west the loss of Italy, and I stand by it. While we tried to hold Greece we laid Italy wide open to Tito and the Russians. We gave the Italian Communists the opportunity to win back Trieste and Venezia Giulia for Italy. Do you think Stalin would not force Tito to cough up this loot for a Communist Italy? What would frontiers matter in an all-Communist Europe?

If Italy goes, Greece, Palestine, and the Middle East are lost.

GERMANS OFFERED IDEA

Similarly only Stalin can restore to Germany all or part of the Prussian lands lost to Poland.

Does Stalin have to worry about Poland if he has a Communist Germany?

And what do we and the rest of Europe offer Germany? Perpetual military occupation? Incorporation in a European confederation? On what terms?

I believe I know something about the German mind. Germans can live almost without food, almost without shelter. But they cannot live without an idea. A bad idea, to the Germans, is better than no idea.

The Russians offer them an idea—a place in a tangible scheme. They also, and very importantly, offer them individual atonement. Any Nazi can wipe out his past record by joining the Communist Party.

The Russians are building a system—a "Fortress Europa." While the west talks about a European confederation, the Russians are making one. The Russians long have been prepared for what they are doing. But all our moves are last-minute reactions to the Russian initiative. Back in 1943 Winston Churchill proposed (as a war aim) a council of Europe, a confederation. It was turned down in our State Department. Why?

Our Government has never told us the why of any measures it has taken.

Export of Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska, for his courtesy in obtaining permission for me to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD. I regret that an executive committee meeting detained me so that I could not take advantage of the time allotted to me.

First, I wish to report with very real regret that I have received a message from Mr. David Bruce, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, that—

The position of the Department of Commerce on the export of petroleum products to Europe remains unchanged.

I interpret that to mean that the refusal to release any of the reserve items for transportation to the Northeast and Midwest applies to exports to any country and, consequently, I have abandoned my hope of a solution of our problem along these lines. I believe it would have been a most constructive solution if the Department had been willing to act as requested, but I recognize it must discharge its responsibilities as it deems best. I think it is crystal clear that we must now accept the discharge of our full responsibility, and I hope this will take the form of prompt enactment of House Joint Resolution 323, as reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Next, I want to discuss briefly an amendment I wish to offer during the course of the reading of the appropriation bill now being debated, H. R. 5607. I have furnished the chairman and ranking member of the committee with a copy of this amendment and have, also, discussed it with the clerk of the committee. I have sent a copy to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] because of his concern as to whether this form of an amendment is entirely wise. I want to repeat that I shall join gladly with him or with anyone else in perfecting the language of these amendments so that no hardship or uneconomic action may result.

My sole objective is to make certain that we will not have a recurrence of the very unfortunate action at the marine hospital in Boston last December when the heating units were converted from coal to oil at substantial expense and cannot now be reconverted without long delay and further expense. I know you will recall that with two burners operating that hospital is consuming a much-needed type of fuel oil at the rate of 1,200 gallons a day. This is not only an economic waste but an exhibition of the poorest kind of judgment, for which no explanation or apology has ever been made.

The bill contains a substantial appropriation for the Federal-aid airport program. I have discussed the matter with Mr. H. A. Hook, Assistant Administrator for Airports, by telephone this afternoon. He advises me that it would be almost impossible to give me full information as to the building program, but he thinks approximately 60 buildings are involved, most of them relatively small. I understand the largest is to be located in Seattle. The function of the Civil Aeronautics Administrator is to determine whether the plans submitted are appropriate and reasonable, and I do not think any particular stress has been laid upon the wisdom of installing new oil-burner units.

I have, also, discussed the item covering the boiler at the Washington National Airport, to which brief reference is made at page 415 of the hearings. Mr. P. F. Steiner, assistant airport administrator, told me that this boiler heats partially by oil and partially by coal. It is mainly

intended to provide heat for five new hangars. I understand that the work has been actually completed and that there has been no substantial change in the type of heating since 1947. However, Mr. Steiner did advise me that the method of heating had been changed twice since 1944, largely depending upon fuel conditions. Mr. Steiner does not feel that this would be of any great moment, relatively speaking. While I can agree with him as to that, on an over-all basis, I still feel that when individuals are urged to conserve and when some homes and buildings are actually cold, it is incumbent upon the Federal Government, through its agencies, to set the example of conservation and to undertake no conversions or new installations unless they are certain that they can obtain an adequate supply without diminishing the supplies available for providing citizens and industries.

I cannot help but refer to the fact that we now know that The Alaskan Railroad contemplates placing Diesel engines to the number of 33 in operation. While justification is sought in the argument that such engines must be operated through the tunnels, it remains the fact that the ordinary three-unit Diesel engine is said to consume on an average run from 800,000 to 1,250,000 gallons of Diesel oil in a year. At a minimum, this is more than the total consumption of 433 domestic oil burners or a maximum of 625. I am further informed by a reliable person that quite recently a streamlined Diesel unit was placed in operation on that railroad, which had to be abandoned because the engine was found to be too heavy for the tracks. It has been suggested that inquiry should be made as to whether the railroad did not originally own the coal mine and then leased it, and that a further inquiry should be made as to the comparative price of coal under railroad ownership and under this lease.

It is my deep conviction that adoption of this amendment cannot conceivably do any harm, and it may do a great deal of good in terms of the threatened recurrent fuel-oil shortages in the coming years. Basically, it is only a warning to the several agencies to present a thoroughly satisfactory case for any such conversion or any new installation. I have supreme confidence that the several subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee will see that any such requests are thoroughly considered and authorized if they are in the interests of the Nation as a whole.

I hope very much that the members of the subcommittee will see fit to accept this amendment as was the case when we had the independent offices appropriation bill and the deficiency appropriation bill before us.

The amendment follows:

On page 74, line 23, after the word "law", insert a new section 502: "That no part of the appropriations contained in this act shall be used for the purpose of converting any coal heating units to oil or natural gas in any federally owned or rented buildings in or outside the District of Columbia, or for the installation of oil heating units in any new construction."

And renumber section 502.

Put Europe on a Production Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Hennepin County Review, Hopkins, Minn., which appeared on February 19, 1948. This editorial is a constructive analysis of the original Marshall plan and it is based on sound judgment. I commend the thoughtful suggestion to my colleagues. The editorial recognizes the need and the merit of sound reasonable assistance to Europe without falling into the fallacy of the hysterialists who demand that the highest suggested amount be appropriated practically without inquiry and without any restrictions for administration by an agency without experience. There is a need for haste, but there is room for inquiry. There is a need for money, but the future need will be less and will be met more willingly if we prescribe reasonable precautions to prevent this from becoming a European WPA.

The editorial is as follows:

WHOSE STRATEGY?

The Wallace people are now urging the Truman people to bury the hatchet so far as the Presidential race is concerned and "concentrate" with them in the job of electing progressive Senators and Representatives.

Whether this turns out to be a good idea or not depends on who the Wallace high command decides to support for the congressional seats. If they make it their rule that no candidate for Congress can be supported unless he denounces the Marshall plan, then the idea certainly can be regarded a Communist Party idea. There will be many progressive candidates for Congress this year, including some incumbents, whose progressive records on all domestic issues have been 100 percent and who are also supporting the so-called Marshall plan. To oppose these candidates simply because they support the Marshall plan will be for the Wallace people to admit their strategy is being formed by the Communists.

It is the wish of the Soviet Government at Moscow to smash the Marshall plan. If this is done it means we will pull out of Europe, leave Europe to its misery and the influence of Russia. So it becomes the duty of American Communists to oppose the Marshall plan. If opposition to the Marshall plan then is a must for all candidates for Congress who get the support of the forces behind Henry Wallace, the deep suspicion that the Communist influence is the principal influence behind the Wallace candidacy will indeed be pretty well grounded.

This is going to be a mighty interesting angle to watch, and the ultimate policy in this respect will pretty well tell the story as to who is who on the top levels of strategy in the Wallace headquarters.

Some sort of a Marshall plan is a must in the present Congress. It is the moral obligation of the world's breadbasket to help feed the starving millions of Europe, and to assist them intelligently in putting themselves on a production basis at the earliest moment. Many who have some fault to find with the Marshall plan as it is presently shaping up are freely accused of preaching the "'Commie' line." This should not deter them from putting their views plainly before their representatives at Washington.

The plan in principle is good, but it must not be twisted and distorted until it becomes simply a glorified hand-out to those countries whom we can depend upon to trade with us and to boycott Russia. Within such a dishonest framework it can never accomplish any lasting benefits, but on the contrary is certain to add to the continuing woes of the world in general and Europe in particular.

Here's one item on which we can go along with Joseph Lincoln Ball: a little less than $262,000,000 worth of tobacco for the beneficiaries of the Marshall plan in the first 15 months.

Italy—Stalin's Target No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mario P. Alfieri, from Plain Talk for February 1948:

ITALY—STALIN'S TARGET NO. 1

(By Mario P. Alfieri)

Upon returning to the United States from Rome after nearly 2 years, I was quite surprised by the lack of accurate information Americans have about Italy. The average American with whom I have talked considers Italy a washed-up, demoralized country whose starving people we are expected to feed. Americans don't object to feeding starving Italians, but they usually fail to see how any possible good could come to the United States by so doing. They fail to see Italy's importance in that strategic "no man's land" between two worlds that are ideologically opposed. They have never been told of communism's plan for Italy as the No. 1 target in the conquest of the western world.

Despite the optimistic reports of many of our columnists and Government officials that the political tide in Europe has now turned in our favor, the Communist Party in Italy has never lost ground; it has steadily gained. The best that can be said at present is that its rate of progress has been reduced. The Communists are generally acknowledged to control 30 percent of the votes. Even if they gain no more, they will be the strongest single party in the first parliamentary elections of the new Italian Republic, to be held this spring. I am sure that, if the Communists in Italy are not checked within a few months, they will surge to complete control by next summer. The European recovery program is Italy's last hope. If it fails, the Italian people will resign themselves to their fate, a fate which millions have already accepted.

In cold reality, we have tragically and unwittingly and indirectly sponsored communism in Italy, yet there is still hope of turning the tide if the United States acts speedily and intelligently. We paid the bill, but the Communists are taking over. Our occupation was temporary, but that of Russia is designed to be permanent. The omnipresent Red shadows are now gradually emerging from the background. The showdown is near.

The time for that showdown had to be delayed until Allied troops had departed. Meanwhile, the Communist position has been consolidated and strengthened, not only in Italy, but throughout the international Red periphery. In 1946, and until late in 1947, Communist politica and economic sabotage in Italy was limited and camouflaged to a degree sufficient to steer internal developments more or less in the direction desired, while forcing responsibility for ineffective

government and economic and financial chaos upon the Communists' political opponents. The plan has been brilliantly successful

While the United States said with innocent faith to a liberated Italy, "Rehabilitate yourself democratically, and you will be left in peace in a world that wants peace," Russia gazing through the refocused lenses of world revolution, saw Italy for what it really is—a geographical, psychological, and spiritual gateway to world conquest. Russia knows that the Italian boot offers access for world revolution into Europe, Africa, and the entire West.

More than a year ago—in November 1946—I attended a Communist meeting in Rome. The audience was told that Henry Wallace had already organized the third party in the United States. Within 2 months that piece of information was widely disseminated in Italy. The official act would be a mere formality, said the Italian Communists in 1946. The implication was that the United States was trying to stop communism in Italy, but that it couldn't even stop communism at home.

On February 6, 1947, identical public forums on the topic, Where Is America Going? were held in all 52 of the Communist Party's sectional headquarters in Rome. I attended the meeting in the Piazza Bologna area. When the principal speaker, Avv. Natoli, had finished, I am certain that the crowd would have lynched me on the spot had they known that I was an American.

The audience was entirely convinced that Italy's plight was caused by an international conspiracy of United States capitalists. The new and tremendous industrial establishment of the United States can survive and prosper only by a program of imperialism and expansionism, the speaker said. Without such a program, a terrible economic depression would soon be precipitated. All unfavorable postwar developments in Italy were due to the United States master plan to secure a stranglehold on the economic structure of the world. Even UNRRA was depicted as a United States instrument for suffocating Italian industrial rehabilitation.

In one night, in Rome alone, more than 10,000 easy-to-convince people had heard the same story. But the program didn't stop there. Within a few days it was repeated at every Communist headquarters throughout Italy. The next day, the hundreds of thousands of Communist "cells" took up the torch. Each cell member promotes in his daily life the gospels he hears at headquarters. Virtually every working-class Italian, therefore, is subjected to organized, carefully prepared propaganda. It is especially effective because it is delivered at close range, by plain people, by the friends and neighbors of millions of unsuspecting victims.

In any central square, on almost any night, two cell members open an argument between themselves. The conversation gets lively. The crowd gathers. And the subject is "Where Is America Going?" Who wins every point of the argument? You guessed it—the Communist Party, the same party that prepared the "impromptu" conversation.

To bolster and steer the activities of the Red cells, various leaflets and publications containing vicious anti-American propaganda are given a limited distribution. But, very shrewdly, the Communists have maintained relatively moderate tone in the attacks on the United States in their official daily press organs. By this method the man in the street hears the awful "truth" from outside sources, not clearly identified as Communist, and the official Communist allegations therefore appear reasonable and authentic. The same strategem has served to conceal from American observers the true intensity of anti-American propaganda.

Communism became the dominant political force in Italy during the war. While the Allies were gradually liberating the peninsula from the Nazi-Fascist, the Italian underground, in the form of partisans, was slowly organizing itself into political as well as military forces. Russia, while still fighting for survival on the eastern front, did not fail to recognize a golden opportunity to establish a Communist beachhead in northern Italy. Communist agents with Communist finances found little difficulty in organizing the majority of the partisans under the Red banner. That 1944 beachhead has now engulfed all of northern Italy and extended itself deep into southern Italy. It has paid enormous dividends to Russia.

After the liberation, Communist partisans or their families were skillfully implanted in all fields of economic, political, and social endeavor in the north. They took many leading roles in the police force, local government, organized labor, transportation, commerce, and agriculture. Before it was realized, the Reds were supreme in the rich industrial and agricultural heart of the nation. The partisan associations of different political color were gradually reduced to relative unimportance. In accordance with our naive principles of those days, the AMG drew no political lines.

Complete regiments of Communist partisans were transferred directly into the Public Security Forces, Italy's national police structure. The Communists became the strongest force in organized labor, a mighty political weapon. At first gradually, then at a rapidly accelerating rate, the non-Communist officials were eliminated from the General Confederation of Italian Workers (CGIL) and the National Association of Italian Partisans (ANPI), until Communist domination became Communist monopoly early in 1947. Members of the CGIL are now effective Communists whether they like it or not. The ANPI will eventually become a 100-percent Red front.

The number of partisans has probably doubled since the liberation. ANPI officials simply issue false documents to their faithful. The Italian Youth Front and Democratic Union of Italian Women, with centers in every city and commune, are also well organized and financed. No similar anti-Communist movements of significance exist to compete with them.

As the 1946 elections approached, Italy's new democracy seemed to be making commendable progress. The Allied Commission in Rome was quite pleased with itself. The Communists were avoiding political agitation and demonstrations which might have interfered with the elections, for they knew that only after the elections would Allied control be relinquished.

The complacent Allied Commission decreed that all Americans stay away from all voting places in order to permit the Italians to do it in their own way. That gives a fair idea of the absolute lack of apprehension about communism that existed in Italy among American forces during 1946. Yet competent, though disregarded, observers had reported months before the elections that the Communists had carefully planned a deliberate campaign to sell out the government of which they were to become a part, and to sabotage all efforts for the democratic rehabilitation of Italy.

The elections came, and a new republic was born. The Demo-Christians, a left-of-center, anti-Communist party headed by Alcide De Gasperi, polled roughly 40 percent of the votes, about the same percentage as the Communists and the Socialists combined. The Communists were in third place. "I told you so," was a common expression in Italy after the results were known. "Italy will never go Communist." Yet 4,000,000 people previously wary of communism had voted the Red ticket.

Few of us at that time stopped to think that the Communists already held the real power—the power to paralyze industry, commerce, and transportation. We remained oblivious to this fact for a long time because we were half blind, and because Palmiro Togliatti, Italy's Red chief, has administered his power by prescribed doses only. His policy has been guided by two broad considerations: (1) the Italian Communists were rapidly building up popular support as a democratic party, and open attempts to sabotage recovery would have meant loss of votes; (2) international communism was advertising itself as "true democracy," and aggressive tactics in Italy, still outside the iron curtain, would have hastened the advent of the United States "containment of Russia" policy.

While the Communists were building support among the masses, they obstructed all governmental efforts toward economic recovery. Throughout the country, the people were approached at close range by members of Communist cells and offered guidance and assistance. Sharecroppers were told that "the land belongs to those who work it." Hundreds of small local groups of sharecroppers were led in uprisings and the land was appropriated. In the factories, the Communists clamored for workers management councils. In local government (where non-Communist communal councils were in office), they formed their own councils of the people to "democratically represent the workers and their interests to the competent authorities." The people were constantly told that their insufficient rations and sad economic situation were the fault of the reactionary government.

From the very first the Reds advocated the doubling of wages and all-out worker benefits which they knew to be impracticable and conducive to an inflationary economy. Nevertheless, this portrayed the Communist members of the coalition cabinet as the only real champions of the working people.

In the late summer of 1946, when the weak De Gasperi government was faced by a runaway financial situation, a new Treasury Minister, the conservative Corbino, outlined an excellent anti-inflationary plan. It never advanced beyond vague plans and speeches, for the Reds opened a full-scale offensive. Not only were Corbino's policies condemned, but a wild cry went up for higher wages and for payment of a bonus to all workers. Strikes and demonstrations, controlled by CGIL, broke out like a rash.

The average citizen understood nothing about inflation. All he knew was that the Communists wanted to give him bread and work, while the Government sought to take it away. The Communists held the Finance Ministry and controlled sources of revenue. The Government's program was paralyzed. Corbino finally resigned in disgust, and the hapless cabinet collapsed after him. The Communists had won a tremendous victory.

Ever since the Corbino affair, the Communists have successfully manipulated labor and the general economic front for their own purposes. The fact that they took over control of all local government in Milan in a demonstration during the last week of November 1947 is a clear indication of their strength in Italy's industrial capital. The Milan incident was only a dress rehearsal, designed to test the Communist military apparatus.

Manipulation of food supplies is helping communism to catch on in the South. The northern cities, where local government is dominated by the Reds, always got their bread and pasta ration on schedule. In other cities, like Naples and Bari, where a rightist local government had been voted into office, rations would not be delivered. When Naples and Bari were finally starved into agitation, the Communists came to their aid, denounced the local administration and forced the Rome government to make emergency provisions to meet the situation. The Reds took all the credit and enrolled many new Communists.

The stories of mass starvation in Italy are exaggerated. Italy, like England, is greatly in need of austerity measures. But no country in Europe has as much food or other consumer goods to offer in its markets. Apparently limitless stocks of meats, cheeses, and vegetables are always available in countless neighborhood shops and outdoor markets. To the superficial observer, Italy is a land of plenty. But the vast majority of the population eats poorly, and a large part are definitely underfed. The official ration is too low to meet minimum subsistence requirements. And the average Italian does not have the purchasing power to buy a sufficient quantity of the proper food from the only available source, the black market.

For more than 2 years the government has been warning that it intends to confiscate war profits, convert all currency with new issue, impose a high tax on personal wealth, etc. The result of such an all-talk-no-action policy has been to goad the paper-rich minority into buying everything they can, and consuming far above their normal requirements. This free spending is constantly contributing to the spiraling inflation. A sound financial program would have stopped it long ago.

Certainly that which Italy has could be made to go much further. More people should be better fed and better clothed. But before such a program can be realized, the lira must be stabilized, the economic structure strengthened, and reconstruction accelerated. But who is to wield the steel broom? After more than 2 years of floundering, the Italian Government, hopelessly stalemated by incompatible extremes, has gotten nowhere along these lines. The Communists are doing all they can to deepen the economic chaos, and ironically, they are receiving the cooperation of their mutual enemies, the neo-Fascist fronts.

As long as Italy's government is weak, the fanatical, greedy residue of fascism will remain among its subversive elements. The neo-Fascists do serve as a definite threat to public order and they have contributed to undermining political and economic stability. But they are now weakly organized and poorly financed, and they lack party discipline and outside support. The successful modern dictator must be "democratically minded" and clever enough to convince the people that only he can bring them freedom and well-being. So today there are only two potential dictators in Italy worth considering. Giannini, the monocled playwright boss of Italy's monarchic-reactionary, rightist conglomeration called the Qualunquists (L'Uomo Qualunque or Common Man front) is one. The other and immeasurably the stronger is Togliatti, the Red boss, who has proved conclusively that communism is not an ideology, but cold and calculating tyranny that opportunistically shapes its policy in accordance with the public pulse.

The Demo-Christians, the only real force opposing communism, are a relatively weak party. They have but a small following in the Communist-controlled north. In the south they are weaker than the Qualunquists and other rightists combined. Their vote failed to match that of the Reds even in Rome, where they are the Vatican-directed rallying point against communism.

Togliatti's anti-Vatican propaganda has been calculated to show that Communists are among the most ardent of Catholics. The official Communist propaganda is therefore always pro-Catholic, but anticlerical. Leading clergymen are depicted as fellow-conspirators of United States capitalists in their plot to enslave the working classes. That is why the Vatican has chosen to attack communism, Togliatti explains.

By their use of independent tabloid-type periodicals, the Communists have carried on a vulgar and sacrilegious campaign against the clergy. Obscene caricatures show priests committing shameful deeds; their brothers in sin are usually Mussolini, greedy industrialists, or American capitalists. Don Basilio, the worst of these scandal sheets, set the pace in 1946 when it first dared to caricature the Pope himself.

The prime reason why it is important to the Kremlin to gain domination over Italy is because the ancient gray-walled Vatican stands inside Rome. Long before the United States was aware of it, the Catholic Church had identified the demagogic tyranny which called itself communism and sought to rule the world by starving the human spirit and reducing the human body to a commodity.

The Vatican intelligence service is the best in the world. And, like any supreme authority, the Vatican is well equipped to recognize its enemies and to mobolize its worldwide resources for resistance. Russia wants Italy just as it wants Austria and France, but it also wants Italy because through Italy it can get to the Vatican in a direct and physical sense. Make no mistake about it, once Togliatti has delivered Italy, the iron curtain will eventually be drawn around and over the Vatican, and the most important anti-Communist force in the world will be neutralized. But that is not all. Through Moscow's new concept of extraterritoriality, the Vatican may conceivably be converted into a puppet Kremlin outpost: There would have to be a change of personality, of course, but such a maneuver would nevertheless be very effective for spreading propaganda to Communist-dominated countries. Possibly this has a connection with the Soviet policy of would-be religious tolerance.

A second reason why Stalin has signified Italy as a primary target is the fact that Mussolini's almost perfect police state structure still exists there, merely waiting for a new dictator and a partial change of staff. Italian police are of two broad categories—military police (Carabinieri), with jurisdiction over civilians, and straight civilian police (Forse di Publica Secureza). There is no regional police autonomy; all final police authority emanates directly from the office of the Ministry of the Interior in Rome, though the Ministry of War retains limited jurisdiction over the Carabinieri. Such military and civilian interrelationship of police authority makes for total and absolute centralization of control over all phases of Italian life. It gives any potential dictator a police-state structure that controls not only all civilians but also the military.

Secret agents exist in both arms of the police force. Their lists of special informants could easily be converted into an organization such as Mussolini's dreaded OVRA. The process is already underway. Telephone tapping is a past art which the secret agents do not leave neglected. How well I know it. Many restaurants and other public places are still lined with microphones. Though most of them have been dropped from the "active list" for the present, the whole system perfected by the Fascists could be easily shifted back into high gear.

In general the police forces are now functioning democratically, because all political factions are still represented. But the Communists are infiltrating the lower ranks rapidly. The formality of switching the top men will be simple in the event that the Communists succeed in gaining control of the Ministry of the Interior.

There is only one key to control of Italy—the Ministry of the Interior. It provides and controls all Italian police, it also administers, polices, and regulates all elections—a perfect formula for one-party supremacy. As the strongest party the Communists would have the right to this ministry. And one year after they took it over Italy would be a strong-arm, one-party police state.

This totalitarian police structure seems to me the most overlooked, but nevertheless the most critical information about Italy. The Italians are ignorant of it because they have never known another system, and the Americans have just failed to look.

At the close of the war no people were more anxious to try democracy than the Italians. With the United States, the greatest of all democracies, present to guide and to help, optimism and hope were high. But in little more than 2 years the Italians have again resigned themselves to the old ideas of dictatorship, patronage, corruption, deceit, and fear. Communism, once the most hated of all systems, has emerged as the most powerful public force in Italy.

The odds have turned against us, but democracy may still win if we really get down to business. Swift, decisive, and authoritative action is needed—a good program and, above all, good men. The second-raters, the joy riders, the blind, and the indifferent have been there long enough.

We should try to help Italian industry by sending larger numbers of skilled industrialists directly into Italian factories. Their job would be to arrange for delivery of needed equipment, factory by factory, and to stay at the plant long enough to see it in use. We should assign agricultural experts, province by province, to supervise the distribution of fertilizer and equipment. We should have crop estimators there to measure the results.

We should help Italy to stabilize its currency, something we failed to do in 2 years of occupation. Money in circulation has officially increased more than 250 percent; no one knows how much counterfeit money has been printed. There are many other things we should do, but most of all we should launch a strong pro-American propaganda campaign, designed not only to counteract the Communist propaganda against us, but to let the Italians know of our help to them and of the benefits of democracy. The truth of words should be backed up by the truth of action.

There are only a few months left in which to act.

Opposes Women in the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter written by a disabled Navy veteran to the editor of the Washington Star of March 2, 1948, in which the veteran expresses his views with reference to S. 1641:

OPPOSES WOMEN IN THE NAVY

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Not that I think it will do very much good, but I'd like to add my 2 cents' worth to the almost unheard voice of protest about the Navy's enlisted men being sold down the river at last Wednesday's hearing on the WAC-WAVES bill, now under consideration by the House Armed Services Committee (Subcommittee on Organization and Mobilization).

The most junior of the five persons testifying at that hearing was packing four twinkling stars. It's been so long since any of them had direct, man-to-man conversation with any enlisted men that they seem to have forgotten how they think. This may serve to refresh their collective memory a little.

The enlisted men of the Navy are bitterly opposed to the inclusion of a regular female complement in their service, and with good reason. They admit that the WAVES did a a good job during the war, but think that

they should go home now. A poll taken by Our Navy Magazine last fall proved this beyond a shadow of a doubt. The main arguments advanced against it are:

1. If the WAVES cannot be placed on an equal footing with men in all matters (and they obviously cannot) there is no valid reason for them to be given equal pay, rate, and privilege.

2. The WAVES, by reason of their sex, will no be available for much assignment outside the continental limits of the United States, thereby cutting down the chances of shore duty for men in our fleet.

3. The passage of this legislation (S. 1641) would keep many male members of the service from steady routine advancement from one pay grade to the next highest. The WAVES cannot meet the same requirements for advancement required of men. For example: For a man to advance from first-class petty officer to chief petty officer, he must serve at least 3 years as first class, 1 year of which shall be served at sea. How does Admiral Denfield propose to get around that if he intends to place women on an equal footing with men in the Navy? An interesting sidelight on the rate situation is that there are 1,787 enlisted WAVES on active duty, of which only 68 do not hold petty-officer ratings.

4. Passed off as it may be by some people, it is the traditions of the Navy and of the sea that keep many men in the service for 20 or 30 years. The history of the Naval Establishment is weighed down with such traditions as "Men make the Navy and the Navy makes men," "Iron men and modern ships," "Men of the sea," the time-honored belief that women and ships don't make a good mixture, and many others of a similar type. Perhaps it's romanticism or even foolishness but the fact remains that a great number of sailors believe in it.

5. A great many women's organizations are opposed to the measure for moral reasons, and, as a reminder to the Congressmen on the committee, these women vote.

The Navy Department seriously should consider these arguments before going all out for a permanent female complement, as should Congress. They may build up their immediate strength, but it's highly probable that each woman brought in will mean a man lost, and it still takes men to sail and fight ships, regardless of what arguments Navy top rankers can muster in favor of S. 1641.

A DISABLED NAVY VETERAN.

Federal Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago an appropriation bill cleared through the House carrying certain appropriations for building and maintaining highways.

Throughout the United States the people who use the roads are now paying tremendous sums of money into the Federal and State treasuries in the way of automobile and truck license fees, and State and Federal taxes on gasoline and lubricating oils.

I repeat, when these payments are taken as an aggregate they constitute extremely large sums of money. From day to day more trucks and more automobiles are being registered, and this fact in addition to the fact that we have substantial highways already constructed, many miles of which are in a first-class state of repair, are facts which take on great significance when considering appropriations for building highways and maintaining highways.

In my opinion, Prof. John S. Worley, of the University of Michigan, is one of our outstanding authorities on highway problems. He has just released a statement dealing with the question of how much Federal highway funds are needed. I submit his statement for the information of those who are interested in this subject:

NO FEDERAL HIGHWAY FUNDS NEEDED
(By Prof. John S. Worley, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.)

At this time—February 1—there are three bills before Congress which provide for annual Federal appropriations ranging from $300,000,000 to $500,000,000 for highway improvements, the periods for which such appropriations would run varying from 3 to 5 years to "in perpetuity." The adoption or rejection of any one of these proposals should depend upon whether or not such help is needed from the Federal Government and upon whether the public benefits would justify the cost.

The proponents of such legislation claim that the war traffic did great damage to paving surfaces—a plausible statement. The writer, during the period since the war, has driven over the main highways of a majority of the States, without finding evidence of the destruction which has received such emphasis. Questioning of those in position to know likewise brought forth no evidence to support such a claim. If a few short stretches of road, 1 or 2 miles in length, were damaged, this was likely due to poor construction or soft subgrade.

It has been said that the "extensive damage" was due to a large volume of traffic and excessive load. The official statistics of motortruck traffic, private and for hire, as reported by the ICC for the years 1939 to 1945, indicate that there was little, if any, increase in the ton-miles passing over the highways. During the war period, five States increased their allowable axle loads to 18,000 pounds and their gross loads to conform with those of adjoining States. A total of 11 States granted, as a temporary war measure, an increase in gross loads. In a few instances special permits were granted for larger loads, but this was unusual. Neither the volume of traffic nor the size of loads during the war period support the theory that they had a damaging effect upon our highways.

MAINTENANCE HAS GONE ON

Superimposed upon the claim of destruction of our highways by war traffic is the claim of deferred maintenance. During the war period (1942 to 1945, inclusive), passenger-car-miles totaled 1,397,000,000 compared with 1,970,000,000 for the 4 years just preceding the war. We have already seen that there was no material increase of truck traffic. But the amount spent for highway maintenance has a bearing upon the subject. The Public Roads Administration reports that for the years preceding the war (1938 to 1941, inclusive) the cost of administration and maintenance was $2,922,000,000 and for the 4-year war period (1942 to 1945, inclusive) it was $3,206,000,000. In light of the foregoing, it is difficult to see how deferred maintenance, if any, could have been a significant amount.

Then we hear that the construction of additional highways was stopped during the war. This is partially true. However, the Public Roads Administration reports $3,503,000,000 spent on new construction for the 4 years preceding the war and $1,877,000,000 during the years 1942 to 1945, inclusive. Totaling the two, observe that for the 4-year war period there was spent for the construction and maintenance of roads and streets $5,173,000,000, compared with $6,495,000,000 for the 4 years just preceding the war. Attention is called to the fact of an increase in costs particularly during the last 2 years of the war.

Among the other reasons advanced for large Federal appropriations for highways is the desire to build safety into our roads and streets. Motor vehicle accidents are our No. 1 headache. Safety should be a dominant factor in the design and construction of roads and streets. However, a study of highway accidents frequently shows that they are caused by something other than the physical characteristics of the road and that the expenditure of large sums of money is not necessary to correction.

MILITARY ASPECT IMPORTANT

The development of a highway plant capable of meeting our future military needs furnishes more justification for the appropriation of Federal funds for highway purposes than all others. The location of the improvements, their nature, and the cost as it pertains to national defense are subjects for military determination. However, it is reasonable to suppose that they will largely be confined to and consist of the improvement of the existing interstate highway system, the length of which is less than 40,000 miles.

A highway system to meet our permanent future domestic needs is of great importance. Currently, improvements are needed for exit and entrance to our urban areas—not the improvement of every road, but rather, the main arteries of travel. The length of a road and the nature of its improvements will depend upon each particular situation and the size of the urban community. With few exceptions, these improvements will be needed for cities of 50,000 population or more. Of these there are 188 in the United States.

Then there are expressways, grade separations, and detours which should be built. Rural roads not immediately adjacent to or entering cities of less than 50,000 population are, as a rule, sufficient for current needs. Some natural-resource arteries, as well as some farm-to-market roads, need to be built or improved. But all of these are local projects—the benefits are for the citizens of the community or State and they should pay the full cost of construction and maintenance.

HIGHWAY PLANT ABOUT ALL PAID FOR

An examination of highway financing sheds some interesting light upon the subject. As of January 1, 1947, we had a road and street system which cost approximately $32,000,000,000. There is, however, a $1,173,000,000 outstanding State-highway indebtedness and an estimated $2,066,000,000 county- and city-highway indebtedness. That is to say, we have a $32,000,000,000 plant for future use, all of which has been paid for, with the exception of an indebtedness of approximately 10 percent.

As of this time, we have a highway system which largely meets our domestic needs. Its cost has largely been met by current highway revenues. The additional improvements during the next 27 years will probably not be more than those of the last 27 years, in which the present system was constructed. Our present system of taxation is such as to provide annual highway revenue in excess of that of past years. This highway revenue will be further increased by an increase in the number of vehicles using our roads.

The foregoing analysis can lead to but one conclusion, that, excepting for military purposes, we are not in need of Federal funds to provide a highway system which will be in keeping with our social and commercial needs. The bills before Congress should be amended to provide only funds for the improvement of the interstate highway system and roads located within Federal reservations.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend the following address made in my district recently by a friend of mine Mr. Albert E. Schoenbeck:

ADDRESS DELIVERED TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1948, BEFORE THE TWELFTH WARD REPUBLICAN CLUB, 4704 HAMPTON AVENUE, BY ALBERT E. SCHOENBECK, ATTORNEY, AND MEMBER OF THE ST. LOUIS CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman, neighbors and friends, in a national election year, possibly no problem of the Federal Government can be considered wholly nonpolitical. If, however, there is any domestic issue upon which both major parties should now agree, it is that the Federal individual income-tax law should be revised and the tax rates reduced.

America needs a tea party, not a social affair for gentle ladies, but a blood and thunder protest of the 1775 variety when American men and women, sick of taxation without representation and tired by years of fruitless waiting for action by the British ministry, finally took things into their own hands by dumping His Majesty's tea smack into the Atlantic Ocean.

For 2½ years now, the American people have been waiting for sensible revisions in the individual income tax law and substantial cuts in the confiscatory, wartime rates. During the war, although some grumbled, most Americans were willing to pay abnormally high taxes. They felt that in doing so, they were in some measure helping in the conflict in which their sons and daughters, brothers, sisters and friends were sacrificing the comforts of home, good-paying jobs and even their lives. But the war is now over. It has been over for 2½ years, and for that long the American people have been waiting for a cut in wartime tax rates.

In 1946, the American people voted for tax reduction. That was one of the clear-cut issues of that congressional campaign, and the overwhelming manner in which Americans turned out the "ins" and voted in the "outs" was conclusive evidence of their feelings. They wanted their taxes cut.

And so when the Eightieth Congress organized in January 1947, the very first bill introduced into the House of Representatives, H. R. bill No. 1, was a tax-relief bill. You are familiar with its fate. After being passed by both Houses of the Congress, it was vetoed by the President. Later in 1947, a second tax-relief bill was adopted by Congress but it too was vetoed by the President. The House voted to override the veto, but a corporal's guard of hold-over Senators—it only takes one more than one-third of those voting—voted to sustain the veto. Thus, for 2½ years, the fulfillment of the desire of the American people for tax relief has been thwarted by the President and a handful of Senators.

Now there is a new tax bill before the Congress, House bill No. 4790, known as the Knutson bill and hopefully entitled "The Revenue Act of 1948." The bill, after being recommended by the House Committee on Ways and Means, was enthusiastically passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 297 to 120. That is 19 more votes than necessary to override a Presidential veto. It is now in the Senate where it, as its ill-fated predecessors, must run the gantlet. There are some indications that the bill may be amended in the Senate. If it is, it will have to go back to the House for passage there. And then, of course, will come the most rugged part of its journey into law, the trip through the White House.

The Knutson bill, if enacted, will do three things. It will reduce the wartime rates of the individual-income tax. It will give relief from the high cost of living to all taxpayers, particularly those in the low-income brackets. It will equalize the tax burdens of married couples in common-law and community-property States.

Each one of these things sorely needs to be done. Certainly the wartime rates of the individual-income tax must be reduced to again encourage the initiative, skill and ingenuity of the American people. The present rates are so high and so quickly ascend to confiscatory levels that it is almost impossible to take home more than a limited amount of pay. For regardless of how high a man's wages nominally are, when he goes to the paymaster's counter on pay day, he learns that the tax collector has been there ahead of him and has cut a big piece off the check. If the following week he works harder and longer, and then once more makes his way to the paymaster's counter, he again finds that the little man with the big hands has been there first and has grabbed an even bigger chunk from his check. The tax collector is never satisfied; the more you make, the bigger percentage of your pay he takes. You can't win.

The ultimate effect of these confiscatory tax rates is to limit, arbitrarily, what a man can make. Abraham Lincoln in an address before striking shoe workers in New Haven, Conn., told the men that he believed in the right of workingmen to strike, but went on to add:

"I don't believe in a law to prevent a man from getting rich; it would do more harm than good. So while we do not propose to war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else. When one starts poor, as most do, in the race of life, free society is such that he knows he can better his condition; he knows that there is no fixed condition of labor for his whole life."

We need to replace the present theory of limited incomes, bound by confiscatory taxes, with the concept of freedom of opportunity for all. The young people of America have a real stake in seeing that this is done and done quickly.

Although an economic philosophy of limited incomes for all was temporarily accepted by Russia, it was soon abandoned as unworkable. Certainly, the disciples of the Kremlin in our midst should not be permitted to saddle us in times of peace with a tax policy that destroys rather than builds nations. High on the list of factors which have made America great has been our national concept of free enterprise. This concept is founded in part upon two Christian principles. As a people, we recognize the fact that to some have been given five talents, to others, two, and to some, one; we also recognize that every laborer is worthy of his hire. The Soviet-born theory of leveling all incomes would strike down those principles.

For too long now too many Americans, fully realizing that the bigger their pay checks the bigger percentage of them is grabbed by the tax collector, have been saying: "What's the use?" and "Let's not work any longer since we're working for the tax collector anyway." That philosophy cannot longer continue without harming the character of the American people. When individual income-tax rates are so high that they place a premium upon laziness, poor work, and lack of ingenuity, they can morally bankrupt a people. Economic bankruptcy usually follows moral bankruptcy. Point to a good-for-nothing loafer and you usually point to a penniless bum.

The Knutson bill would permit the worker to receive a larger share of his earnings, and in doing so it will encourage his normal and healthy desire to get ahead in life and to better provide for himself and his family. The bill grants reductions in the rates of taxation ranging from 30 percent in the low-income brackets to 10 percent in the high-income brackets. Persons with annual net incomes of $1,000 or less after exemptions would receive a 30-percent reduction in their tax. Persons with incomes of $1,000 to $1,400 after exemptions would receive a reduction of from 30 percent to 20 percent in their tax. Those with net incomes of from $1,400 to $4,000 after exemptions would receive a reduction of 20 percent in their tax.

Those having net incomes of $4,000 after exemptions would receive a reduction of 20 percent in the tax on their first $4,000 of net income after exemptions and of 10 percent in the tax on any remaining net income. Now, although you will find that even with these reductions, your taxes will still be high enough, at least it will be some encouragement to get these reductions.

The second reason that the Knutson bill should be enacted into law is that it will give relief from the present high cost of living to all taxpayers, particularly in the low-income brackets. Every man and woman present is keenly aware of the tremendous rise in the cost of living which has occurred since 1939. If the period of 1935 to 1939 be considered as reflecting the normal cost of living, and a price index of 100 is assigned to that period, then based upon the same index, the cost of living has risen until by March 1946, it was 156 percent, and by November 1947 it was 165 percent. And although the wages of many have increased in the same period, there is substantial evidence to show that individual income after taxes has not kept pace with the cost of living.

"On a per capita basis and in 1947 dollars, income after taxes has shrunk from an average of $1,285 in the first quarter of 1946 to $1,188 in the fourth quarter of 1947, a drop of nearly $100." (Report, House Committee on Ways and Means on H. R. 4790, p. 35.) And while wages and prices have continued to spiral, people whose incomes are fixed, those who are retired or aged, those who are blind, have suffered.

It is time that relief from the high cost of living be given all taxpayers, particularly in low-income brackets, and the one way to give it without increasing the inflationary forces of new wage increases is to cut taxes. The American breadwinner who saves a dollar from the tax collector has a dollar of greater worth than one given him in a wage increase.

The Knutson bill increases the personal exemption of every taxpayer and for each of his dependents from $500 to $600 per year. This will put dollars into the pockets of the American people—real dollars, not cheaper dollars—and surely all of us could stand a few more real dollars today. The bill grants an additional exemption of $600 to a taxpayer who is 65 years of age or over. If both the husband and wife are 65, each receives that exemption. An extra exemption of $600 is granted to a taxpayer who is blind. Certainly these humanitarian aspects of the bill are justified to aid those of our aged and blind who are taking care of themselves under the severe handicap of the present cost of living. This, then, is the second good reason why the bill should be enacted.

There is a third reason: The bill extends to married couples in common-law States, such as Missouri, the same advantage of being able to split their income for tax purposes as is now enjoyed by couples in 13 community-property States, such as California.

At present, married people in Missouri and other common-law States, whose net income is greater than $4,000 per year pay from 3½ percent to 40 percent higher Federal income taxes than married couples in community-property States. This is obviously unfair. Federal income taxes should fall equally upon people of like income in all 48 States, and the Knutson bill will cause them to do so. Incidentally, there is an advantage for single persons under this feature of the bill, for inasmuch as the maximum standard deduction for married couples is increased to $1,000, the standard deduction for a single person is likewise increased to $1,000.

Here are three examples of what the Knutson bill, if enacted, will do to the income taxes of various individuals:

1. A single person who has no dependents whose net income is $150 per month now pays a $247 tax per year; under the bill, he would pay $173 per year, a saving of $74.

2. A married person who has two dependents whose net income is $250 per month now pays a $190 tax per year; under the Knutson bill, he would pay $80 per year, a saving of $110.

3. A married person whose wife and he are both over 65 years of age and whose net income is $150 per month now pays a $152 tax per year; under the bill, he would not have to pay any Federal income tax, a saving of $152.

These, then, are some of the things which the Knutson bill will do. Although it is just a step in the right direction of revision of the individual income-tax law and substantially lower rates, it is at least a step. Let's hope that it does become the Revenue Act of 1948. Surely the President and a few Senators have made us wait too long for this needed revision and reductions in rates. It once took the Boston Tea Party to get rid of taxation without representation; possibly it will take a national election to get rid of it now. But, whether it does or does not, we shall not have to wait too much longer for tax relief.

The Continuance of Veterans' Flight Training Is Vital to Both Civilian and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include several letters from constituents and others who are greatly interested in the continuance of the veterans' flight-training program under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. These letters are representative of numerous communications received from students, instructors, operators, and officials of educational institutions—all appraising the benefits of the veterans' flight-training program and the need for continuance of aviation instruction during this the air age of America.

The letters are as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION, POST No. 5,
Nashville, Tenn., February 26, 1948.

Hon. JOE EVINS,
Congressman, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: I understand that the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, under Chairman RAMEY, of Ohio, is considering the matter of continuing or discontinuing appropriations for flight training under the GI bill.

I want to urge that you lend your efforts to have this training continued and the necessary appropriation made therefor.

There are 63 of these schools in Tennessee, 56 percent of them owned by veterans. They have 473 employees, 256 of which are veterans.

Twenty-five percent of the gasoline-tax revenue accruing to the Tennessee bureau of aeronautics comes from these operations, and this money is used to improve air fields in the State.

These flight-training schools in Tennessee represent an investment of $3,500,000.

Personally, I think the veterans who want to take up pilot training under the GI bill should have the right to do so.

I am in favor of a continued program of flight training for the youth of our country, because we are going to have to call upon them to furnish the manpower for these National Guard squadrons, flying fighter planes when the present World War II veterans become too old for this type of flying.

Appreciating the kind consideration you have always given our requests, I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,
RICHARD D. GLEAVES.

FEBRUARY 11, 1948.

Hon. JOE EVINS,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing on behalf of the flight-training program, and appeal to you for support for the continuation of this phase of training under the veterans' GI bill of rights.

At the beginning of flight training we prepared ourselves and equipped our school for a program of 7 years' duration, which required a considerable investment.

To suddenly stop this program would be catastrophic to every individual and business interested in progressive aviation.

Our veteran graduates have maintained a high sense of responsibility during and after completion of these courses at our school. Approximately 95 percent of our graduates have gained employment in the aviation industry. Some have established flight schools operating under Veterans' Administration contracts.

This company last year paid more than $7,000 in licenses and Federal and State taxes; paid a gross pay roll to 100 percent veteran employees of more than $23,000.

The value of this training to the veteran, and of them in turn to our country's defense, cannot be expressed in dollars if there is ever another national emergency.

We respectfully urge you to support the continuation of flight training under the GI bill of rights.

Yours very truly,
KNOXVILLE FLYING SERVICE, INC.,
MELVIN M. CAYLOR, *President.*

TENNESSEE AVIATION ASSOCIATION,
Clarksville, Tenn., January 19, 1948.

Hon. JOE EVINS,
Representative from Tennessee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: According to a recent Associated Press release, President Truman has recommended to Congress that the GI bill of rights (Public Law 346) be amended to eliminate courses of study which are not constructively vocational. The writer of this press article has interpreted the President's views on courses which are not constructively vocational to include the GI flight-training program.

I wish to emphasize the importance of this training program to the economic structure of the aviation industry of the United States. In anticipation of a full 7-year program, flight operators throughout the country have increased in number four-fold in the past 2 years and have made heavy investments which cannot be financially realized unless the program follows through a normal development and recess in a natural sequence. An unnatural, abrupt termination of such a vital phase of the aviation industry would indeed be a catastrophe.

In behalf of the aviation operators of Tennessee, and in behalf of the thousands of veterans who desire the course, I am urging you to defend the GI flight-training program.

Sincerely yours,
BUFORD B. LEDBETTER,
President.

(Enclosure: Copy of letter from Dr. C. H. Gilmore, director of research, Department of Education, State of Tennessee, Nashville, Tenn.)

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Nashville, February 25, 1948.

MR. BUFORD B. LEDBETTER,
President, Tennessee Flight Operators Association, Clarksville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. LEDBETTER: I have been informed that the Veterans' Administration is taking the position that flight instruction is largely avocational and the major vocational opportunity is as commercial air-line pilot. I am unable to go along with this position. In the first place I feel that ground-school and flight training have an important bearing on one's concept of world geography and world problems. As coordinator of the civilian pilot-training program, the Navy War Training Service, and as director of aviation education in the State department of education, I found that relatively few people teaching geography even in college really had a clear understanding as to what the airplane has done, not only to the size of the world, but also to the development of new routes of travel. It is my opinion that many high-school students who have had aviation training have a better understanding of these problems than most adults.

I have every confidence that aviation is going to continue to develop as a great industry The pilot end of aviation is only one of the vocational opportunities available. However, ground and flight training are an important phase of education of individuals who hold positions in related areas. For example, in my experience as director of aviation education, I only found one man in Tennessee who had a rather thorough understanding of aviation insurance. He got his stimulus and basic understanding by virtue of the fact that he had had flight training. As a result of his knowledge of the problem his company was given the contracts for all of the insurance under our State programs because of his ability to work out satisfactory policies and continually reduce the cost of the premiums.

In my opinion, every aviation mechanic and every person working around an airport should have as a part of his training flight experience. He not only has a better understanding of what is involved in his job, but in practically every case is more enthusiastic and is a better salesman for the service which he is rendering.

Yours very truly,
C. H. GILMORE,
Director of Research.

WILKS FLYING SERVICE,
Fayetteville, Tenn., January 21, 1948.

The Honorable JOE L. EVINS,
House of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. EVINS: Reports say that according to the President's speech of the 12th of January, the GI program for flying may be eliminated. This is causing me, as well as thousands of other airport operators, great consternation, after all our efforts to bring our fields and equipment up to meet the strict demands of the Veterans' Administration. They alone have caused us to spend what seems an uncalled for amount of money on our projects.

We operators have been told that we can train a man to fly at an expense far less than the Government can through the Army or Navy. That alone is something to think about. In training these boys now, we are aiding to promote aviation to its place in the industries of America today, as it should be. We feel, too, that if we train these boys to fly now, they will be better qualified to meet the needs of Uncle Sam, if and when the occasion arises again, and we all feel sure that it will.

Then there is this viewpoint, if it wasn't for the GI progfam, many of our boys and girls would not be able to take the many courses in aviation that they are now afforded. If you could only hear the opinions of some of the veterans who have taken these courses, you would see that there is no need for question as to whether the program should be continued.

I am writing you this, hoping that my letter will help you to see our viewpoints on the matter, and what it means to us. When the matter is brought up in Congress, I hope that you will give it your ultimate attention.

Very respectfully yours,
CLYDE W. WILKS.

HARRIS FLYING SCHOOL,
White Pine, Tenn., February 16, 1948.

Hon. JOE EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At present there is a bill before the House of Representatives to amend the GI bill of rights and exclude flight training thereunder, or to give the Veterans' Administration full authority to approve or disapprove a veterans' request for flight training.

Either amendment to the GI bill would be a serious detriment to aviation and an unfair decision to the veteran. I sincerely hope that any amendment to the bill taking away part of the training program and privileges under the GI bill will not pass. Although it is true that I have a pecuniary interest in this matter, as I earn my living by teaching flight training, I am against the exclusion of flight training for many other reasons.

Everyone knows that the world political affairs are more unsettled now than during the period preceding the last war, and I feel that during such times flight training is exceedingly important. The Veterans' Administration now terms flying as a "frivolous avocation," but it was not considered so when we were flying troops and cargo for the war effort. Preparedness seems to be the only answer against aggression. I was an Army pilot during the last war and I well know the importance of proper training.

Most all flight operators in the country have expanded their operations accordingly to take care of the veterans' training program and much of our investments will be lost if the training is terminated on such short notice. I hope that you will see fit to oppose this amendment.

I thank you for your time in reading this letter, and I wish you the best of health and success.

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT C. HARRIS,
Manager.

FAYETTEVILLE, TENN., *February 18, 1948.*

The Honorable JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. EVINS: I have heard and read about the act being brought about in Congress to wipe out the GI flight-training program. This, in my point of view, is rather a drastic thing to do, when you stop to think of all the things that are being done to promote aviation in America today. The Government is asking for greater air power, they're helping to build bigger and better airports all over the country, they're teaching boys to fly in various contracts and spending lots of money different ways to help support aviation. Then, why should they attempt to damage the other part that is being done by cutting out the one most important way they do have to create interest in aviation. Most small airports anyway will be greatly damaged by the discontinuation of the GI program, many to the extent that they will be forced to close. Every airport today is doing its best to promote the good will of aviation and without the ones that will have to close much of this will be discontinued too.

I am a veteran of the Second World War and I entered a course of flight training for a commercial license so that I may be able to fly for hire and, by doing so, have a means of support. I flew on this program until my entitlement exhausted and now I am still training on my own resources. I am happy for those boys that can train on the GI program and I know it means a lot to them. I, knowing from experience just what the program did for me, would hate to see the program taken from them.

Very respectfully yours,
AUSTIN WILLIAMS.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement dated October 1, 1947, issued by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in opposition to universal compulsory military training.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGAINST UNIVERSAL COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

On my recent trip I have been asked several times my position on universal compulsory military training. As I understand it, no one is proposing to conscript men for service in the Army, but only for training. Therefore, the question has no relation to the problem of securing enough men for the Regular Army.

The question of universal compulsory military training is of course directly connected with our foreign policy and the armed forces necessary to maintain it, which I discussed at Tacoma.

It cannot be justified merely as a method of education unless we are prepared to turn over to the Federal Government and the Army an active part in conducting the education of our youth. I have always regarded the local administration of education as one of the foundations of American freedom. Each community must retain the right to decide how their children shall be educated, if we wish to avoid the dangers of a totalitarian state.

I set forth at Tacoma what I thought should be the keystones of our foreign policy. The first principle of any American Government, in my opinion, should be to maintain peace as long as world conditions do not threaten the freedom of the people of the United States. In my opinion that has not been the guiding principle of our foreign policy in the last 15 years. I do not feel confident it is the guiding principle of our Government today.

Secondly, I believe our foreign policy should be built around the United Nations, changing the whole emphasis of the organization to the establishment of law, and equal justice under law, and on the new Pan-American Treaty. We should join in giving the United Nations an adequate military force.

Third, we should fight the ideology of communism in the United States and do everything reasonably effective for other countries to help their people fight communism, including loans effective to increase their productivity.

Fourth, we should make peace with Germany and Japan and permit them to develop a self-supporting economy, with military restraint to prevent their developing any new power to make war.

For all of these purposes, for the present, we must maintain an Army, Navy, and Air Force strong enough to resist any attack on the United States by any combination of nations; and while the Russian attitude remains what it is, we had better retain the atomic bomb.

I do not agree that our Army, Navy, and Air Force have fallen to pieces, and I am supported in this by competent observers. Our military machine is still the most powerful in the world unless we want to fight the Russian millions in eastern Europe. If we cannot maintain adequate armed forces with an expenditure of ten and a half billion dollars a year, then we must have an inefficient management of the Army and Navy. We know that is not so.

We want the most expert, best trained, and best equipped armed forces in the world to meet the contingencies of modern warfare. This Congress has already taken the most important steps in that direction by unifying the armed services under one department of national defense, and modifying the seniority system in the Army to provide for greater promotion by merit. The greatest essential of defense is brains and organizing ability.

To secure such an Army we need the best research for military purposes. We have provided money to secure it.

We want the best organized intelligence service. The unification law attempts to provide it.

It is also desirable that we have organized reserves to back up the million and a half men in the armed forces. I have never felt, however, that universal compulsory military training is the best method of providing such reserves. Many military experts agree with that position. Universal compulsory military training would train about 1,000,000 boys a year at an expense of two or three billion dollars. The training of most of them would be superficial.

Nor would we have need for 10,000,000 half-trained men of military age, much of their training out of date, unless we were again forced to invade Europe or Asia with mass armies. It would take 2 years to get the new and up-to-date equipment necessary for such an expedition, which would give time to train effectively by the most modern methods applicable to the war conditions then existing men who would actually compose such an expeditionary force.

For defense we need as reserves a much less number of technically trained men. I believe they could be secured on a voluntary paid basis through a National Guard organization more closely coordinated than heretofore with the National Military Establishment. If physical training is the result sought, it could be obtained through the stimulation of physical education programs in all of our schools, assisted by the Federal Government.

We should explore every possibility of providing such an expert technical reserve by the best possible means and not plunge into a huge bureaucratic organization required for universal compulsory military training by the Army. The expense of that organization alone might lead to the skimping of vital appropriations for the Regular Army and Navy, for research and for intelligence service. In my opinion it would not as well serve the purposes of our foreign policy as the organization which I have outlined.

Furthermore, I believe the adoption of universal compulsory military training by the United States would force the same policy on every nation in the world and prove an obstacle to peace. In the end I think it would encourage war rather than discourage it.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 4 (legisldtive day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "University of Chicago Professor Tells Off Harvard on Marshall Plan," written by George Weller and published in the Chicago Daily News of March 2, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PROFESSOR TELLS OFF HARVARD ON MARSHALL PLAN

(By George Weller).

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—A farm-bred teacher from the University of Chicago boldly gave Harvard the hotfoot last week end.

Charging in substance that the Marshall plan has become a gigantic export racket, Prof. Theodore Schultz, head of Chicago's department of economics, provided Harvard's dominantly pro-Marshall faculty and students with their stiffest criticism in months.

Schultz's challenge, that the Marshall plan is actually an adventure in state-trading contrary to American principles, has set Cambridge buzzing.

SEES PROFIT MOTIVE

The Chicagoan told meetings of both students and professors that well-heeled lobbies of industrialists and farmers were backing the European recovery program for profits rather than for European recovery.

The Marshall plan in operation, if not in inspiration, is prolonging artificial "prosperity" by Government buying of surpluses at inflated prices, Schultz charged.

The views of this Midwesterner, who is known for leading the "oleomargarine revolt" at Iowa State University, broke with star-shell effect at Harvard because only Communist or Wallace opposition to the Marshall plan has so far gained much hearing.

The Ambassadors of France, Britain, and the Netherlands are lecturing here in favor of European aid.

DUMPING OPERATION

Schultz threw discord into this chorus of agreement by charging that the Marshall plan is actually a vast dumping operation aimed to relieve a glut of farm and industrial products and head off price declines.

Schultz agreed with Harvard's distribution expert, Prof. Seymour Harris, that many American middlemen, besides manufacturers and farmers, are planning to get their slices of Marshall money before aid leaves American shores.

ADVANCE ORDERS

The Chicago teacher said he knew cases where European governments had placed advance orders with American exporters for filling only if Marshall aid is voted. Such conditional orders encouraged lobbies to push the Marshall plan through Congress, he suggested.

The Marshall plan is causing another split in American foreign policy, Schultz pointed out.

While American delegates at the Habana world trade conference are fighting subsidies and dumping, the Marshall plan is promoting state-supported exports on a colossal scale, Schultz warned.

The Battle for Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, editor of Progress magazine, and general superintendent of the International Reform Federation, of Washington, D. C., which will appear in the March 1948 issue of that magazine under the title "The Battle for Bread."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BATTLE FOR BREAD

The first engagement in the battle for bread launched by President Truman led by "Commander" Charles Luckman, the soap king, ended in a fiasco. When this top $300,000 per year salaried industrialist took over, the first order he issued to feed a hungry world was a slice of bread less per day at every American table. There was also to be a similar sacrifice made by the chickens and cattle, but not by the brewers and distillers, who with 6,000,000 gallons of surplus whisky in Government bond, and an output of 86,000,000 barrels of beer, were pouring 150,000,000 bushels of food grains into the vat and still for home consumption, while the President proclaimed that we were 50,000,000 bushels short on our pledged allotment to feed the starving in Europe.

THE SECOND BATTLE

The distillers were summoned to the White House for a conference, and under heavy pressure agreed to a voluntary holiday of 60 days' shut-down, which was proclaimed as a patriotic sacrifice and a saving of at least 100,000,000 bushels of food grains for bread. But the second engagement ended in another fiasco worse than the first, as no restriction was placed upon the industry in the purchase of enormous supplies of food grains prior to the shut-down, while the surplus of whisky in bond kept the consumption at par, so that at the end of the voluntary 60-day holiday, which expired on Christmas, the industry shot their 2,500,000 allotment per month up to 6,000,000 from the surplus they had purchased in the unrestricted market from December 1946 to the 25th of October 1947, when the distillery holiday went into effect.

Not a bushel of grain was saved for human food despite the sacrifice of the children, the poultry, the hogs, and cattle. The fact is that the 67,000,000 bushels of grain used in 1947 was the equivalent of 4,500,000,000 loaves, or 1,100,000,000,000 slices of bread. The only effect of the Luckman plan was to increase the cost of these essential commodities to the consumers at home and reduce the quantity of grain for export sbroad. Thus the second battle for bread was a worse defeat than the first.

THE THIRD BATTLE

The third battle began when the Senate passed the bill to revive the war powers of the President to extend the 2,500,000 allotment. When this bill reached the House Banking Committee the wet chairman, WOLCOTT, of Michigan, had the bill pigeon-holed by his committee and went West. Still the battle for bread raged in both Houses.

KANSAS TO THE RESCUE

In the meantime Congressman REES, of Kansas, a trustee of our Federation, introduced a bill in the House to stop the use of grain for the manufacture of intoxicating liquors for 1 year; and Senator CAPPER, another of our trustees, introduced a similar bill in the Senate, February 20, now before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. These two bills brought a joint meeting of the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which reported favorably Senator FLANDERS' Senate bill, Senate Joint Resolution 186, extending the war powers of the President to limit the use of food grains by the distillers to 2,500,000 bushels per month, while the normal consumption for distillers is five to six million bushels per month, and the brewers 8,000,000 bushels.

VICTORY IN SENATE COMMITTEE

After several hours of debate this bill, with certain discretionary powers to the President, extending the 2,500,000-bushel limitation to the distillers until October 31, 1948, passed the Senate on February 26. It now goes to the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, where its chances for favorable action are not so good. Indeed, there is no telling when and whether the chairman of the House committee, Mr. JESSE WOLCOTT, will agree to a vote. But progress in the battle for bread has been made, and can be won if the members of the committee hear from back home.

The editor sat in the gallery of the Senate yesterday and listened to the debate, led by Senator BARKLEY, Democrat, of Kentucky, and Senator MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania. There were many surprising statements, but the most surprising of all was by Senator MYERS (Catholic, of Philadelphia), "As for me, I think it would be better to stop all distilling now; not to the extent of 2,500,000 bushels of grain, but entirely. I do not think distilling is necessary. If the situation is so critical that we need to have the grain, then I, for one, would immediately say that we should not allocate for any distilling purpose." Let the Protestant Members take notice.

"OUR DAILY BREAD"

That is what the Son of God taught his church to pray for—our daily bread. That is what the world is starving for—our daily bread. That is what the little children in many lands are crying for—our daily bread. Bread is the one universal food on which the world depends.

The prayer may be interpreted to include food, but bread is the one essential and universal element in food. Almost every other kind of food is dependent upon grain from which comes our bread, without which we would have a limited supply of milk, meat, eggs, and butter, which make up a large part of the food supply of the world. Grain is the one basic commodity upon which the life of humanity depends.

NOT ME, NOT MINE—US

A failure in the grain crop means famine, disease, disorder, death, and completely upsets the social order unless the shortage is supplied by some more favored and prospercus nation. That is exactly the situation in which the nations find themselves today. Their hands are stretched across the sea saying to the United States, "Come over into Europe and help us." The United States is the only hope of the dying nations of Europe who are faced with famine, haunted by hunger, disease, destitution, and ravaged by war. The "us" in our Lord's prayer includes them.

It seems that every agency in America today is responsive to that prayer except one—the liquor interests. They know only one prayer, "Give us this day our daily drink," even if it should take the bread out of the mouths of the starving millions across the sea. It offers them a choice between hunger and hooch; hunger for them, hooch for us.

With several years' supply of whisky now on hand, and millions of gallons more in Government bond, the distillers are moving politics and perdition to increase their supply at the cost of human hunger, using up the substance of bread at this very moment on the basis of 6,000,000 bushels of grain per month to answer their prayer for prosperity, for profits, for surplus, for that which is not bread, and satisfieth not, for which their victims spend their money, despite the woes pronounced upon their business by Almighty God. In coast to coast full-page ads they ask, "Is prohibition coming back?" You can bet your bottom dollar it is, and soon.

Civil Rights Agitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled, "From the Grass Roots, the South Is Acting," printed in the Nashville Banner, at Nashville, Tenn., on March 1, 1948.

This editorial very forcefully expresses the feeling of the majority of the people of my State and probably the entire South toward the so-called civil-rights planks.

It is a source of deep regret among the southern Democrats that this misnamed civil-rights agitation should have been brought before the Congress. It can do nothing except create racial strife at a time when national unity is indeed most important.

It is my sincere and earnest hope, as it is the hope of all other southerners I am sure, that this situation can be relieved, because there is not a single plank in the entire list that is needed or is even desirable. The people of the South, both black and white, are working out their own problems, and in the past 25 years have made most remarkable progress.

I commend two Tennessee Congressmen, the Honorable WIRT COURTNEY, of the Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee, and the Honorable TOM MURRAY, of the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee, for their outspoken denunciation of this unnecessary agitation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE GRASS ROOTS, THE SOUTH IS ACTING

There's no misreading the grass-roots sentiment of the South where Mr. Truman and his force bill of reconstruction are concerned.

The tide stirred by these vicious planks—again disinterred by vote-desperate titular leadership to recapture the leftwing vote—swells as each passing day gives the southern people new opportunity to speak their mind about it. The outburst of indignant protest was spontaneous. In formal resolutions crystallized out of that sentiment they are now acting in unison, laying the ground work for climactic action in November.

Down at Somerville, in Fayette County, the voice of Tennessee democracy was heard, a forerunner of district-wide, State-wide action in denunciation of the reconstruction move. The people are not, in that, being led. They are leading, and what they are saying will be heard clear to Washington, D. C.

They do not expect Mr. Truman and his political tacticians—blind and indifferent to the realities of this southern sentiment—to alter in any degree their vicious program of force; a program of contempt and abuse that follows perfectly the pattern designed during 15 years of New Deal treatment of the South and its Democratic constituency. It is just as well that this is the reality of the case, and Mr. Truman's unswerving devotion to that force principle recognized for what it is; for retraction of it in a moment of expediency would only hold it in abeyance until its sponsors secured (if they secure) the opportunity to put it over on the South. The South is acting to assure against that betrayal, and there is only one way to do that.

This is a grass-roots movement, the people of the South having detected the monstrous character of an FEPC proposal, and attendant force bills transgressing both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. The people of the South are tired of being pushed around, subjected to abuse, invaded by a constant influx of odd characters bent on reforming it to suit their own designs of reconstruction. They don't want that from any source, and are outraged that this endless inquisition stems from interloper elements using their own party to accomplish it.

Two Tennessee Congressmen, WIRT COURTNEY and TOM MURRAY, speak the sentiment of their State and their Southland, when they joined southern delegations denouncing at Washington the Truman force bill. Voters of their districts commend the forthrightness of their position.

In sheer desperation to match Wallaceism with Wallaceism—if not actualy outdo that outright pinko amalgam in social and socialistic operation—Mr. Truman chose to throw the South overboard as a sacrifice to the political gods of radicalism. He did that deliberately.

The South sees that. It is acting in the light of what it sees.

International RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from William H. Krieg regarding the international RFC.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, *February 16, 1948.*

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have read with great interest not only the newspaper accounts and various complimentary editorials, but also a complete reprint of the address which you delivered before the Illinois State Bar Association last Saturday, February 7, concerning your plan now commonly referred to as the "International RFC."

Your plan is simple, brilliant, and so far as I know, without a flaw. Our activities in foreign relations since the end of World War I, have been a dismal failure. The billions we have spent and given away in treasure, man work hours, and energy to our foreign friends have been without benefit to us. Certainly we have learned our lesson that the American dollar given to help others has paid us nothing good in return. It has given the recipients of our wealth a feeling of animosity and ingratitude, and has in no way stopped or possibly even hindered the machination of these people in the world who seek power and authority by force of arms. Are our memories so short that we fail to recollect that when we tried to collect the first war debts which were decently made and honestly received, but indecently and dishonestly repudiated, we were known throughout the world as Uncle Shylock?

Why repeat the same mistakes through the medium of the Marshall plan?

While I am perfectly in favor of helping starving peoples to avoid death by starvation, and freezing peoples to avoid death from the cold, I am unwilling to lend $1 in Europe or elsewhere for business purposes except on a business basis. The Marshall plan is not businesslike; your plan is. The salutary feature of your plan is that it will permit the economy and industrial recovery of Europe through dealings between the individual businessman of Europe and the individual businessman of America, rather than foster monopolistic buying on the part of our Government for goods to be delivered to European governments which, in turn, will sell the merchandise, or give it away to their own nationals. Such is proposed in the Marshall plan.

I have discussed your "International RFC" with possibly 25 business and professional men in my own community, and each one is in favor of your plan and against the Marshall plan, with one exception. One man raised the objection that your plan would require the French, for example, to force its nationals to sell or hypothecate their investments in America and to take in exchange therefor French francs in order to provide the dollars for the French Government to invest in the capital of the RFC. This man was opposed to our Government causing the French Government to "confiscate" its own nationals' property.

This objection is ridiculous and the answer is simple. In the first place, the French Government would not be asked to confiscate its nationals' wealth, but rather the French Government would exchange the official money of France for the dollars owned by its nationals. This is less drastic and autocratic than our own Government's repudiation of the gold standard.

Under the Marshall plan, my own Government, by way of taxation, will confiscate my dollars to give away to Frenchmen and the other 15 governments. It's high time that our own Government had some regard for the confiscation of the earnings of the American citizens by way of income and other taxes. Certainly it would be fair and

more equitable for the Frenchman, for example, to exchange his dollars for his own Government's francs to help himself, his Government, and other Frenchmen, than for my Government to confiscate my dollars for the purpose of helping Frenchmen and the French Government through the Marshall plan.

I apologize for the length of this letter, but thought it my duty as an American to tell you what's in my mind and heart on this important issue.

I wish you total success in persuading your colleagues in the Congress of the United States to pass legislation embodying the principals of your wonderful plan and in defeating the Marshall plan as now proposed.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. KRIEG.

Depreciation to Fore as Inflation Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Depreciation to Fore as Inflation Problem," by George Ericson, editor of the financial pages of the Christian Science Monitor, from the Christian Science Monitor for February 21, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPRECIATION TO FORE AS INFLATION PROBLEM

(By George Ericson)

The question of depreciation is one which has a most important bearing on taxes, profits, and dividends. Therefore, it should commend itself to the attention of all students of our economy despite the fact that it appears to be largely an accounting procedure problem. The reason for the emergence of this question to a more prominent place on the basket of national thinking is the inflation of currency visible in the loss of dollar purchasing power.

This shrinkage in dollar value has reached a point where competent authorities are urging business in general to take account of the need to set aside an adequate portion of earnings to replace worn or obsolescent fixed assets.

DEPRECIATION CHARGES HELD INADEQUATE

Thinking among businessmen on this subject has been sharpened in recent months because of extremely high replacement costs. It is estimated that current depreciation charges are hardly more than enough to take care of half the money required to replace worn-out facilities. Therefore companies have had to go out in the capital market to maintain their equipment at full efficiency or to meet increasing demand.

This has resulted in business expenditures for durable equipment or fixed assets running recently at a rate well in excess of $20,000,000,000 a year. Despite the fact that union spokesmen repeat that corporate profits are too high, the earnings of a great many concerns have not been in available cash, but were largely absorbed by the higher dollar inventories and investment in higher-cost plant and equipment.

The question then arises as to what extent earnings currently reported are being overstated in view of the fact that depreciation charges are generally based on original cost. Such a situation could mislead employers, employees, and the public as well, since partly fictitious profits would be reported unless adequate provision is made for higher replacement costs. The tax laws and Treasury regulations based on them are regarded by many executives as a deterrent to proper reserves for depreciation.

MORE TAXPAYER DISCRETION SOUGHT

It is to be noted that there has been very little change in the attitude of the Bureau of Internal Revenue toward depreciation and its uses since 1913 when taxation of income by the Government came into being, unless it has been to reduce taxpayer discretion. Prior to 1934, it was the policy of the bureau to allow, within limits, business judgment to decide the rate of depreciation on capitalized assets. But in that year a rule was adopted which placed the burden of proof flatly on the taxpaying concern to justify whatever depreciation rate was used. Designed to expand revenues, its effect was to cut sharply the allowed annual rate of depreciation and to extend the life expectancy base of certain assets.

Much of industry today is irked by the abandonment of the old rule. It feels that this rule, whereby depreciation deductions taken by taxpayers "will not be disallowed unless shown by clear and convincing evidence to be unreasonable," was entirely proper, fair and not against public interest. This would be in the interest of soundly dealing with the rise in replacement costs and of stimulating capital expansion. Another proposal is that the Government permit a special tax-free replacement reserve, such allowance to be authorized for a limited period, say, of 3 to 5 years.

TREASURY POLICY MODIFICATION ASKED

The last suggestion receives the support of the Brookings Institution, which urges that any tax-free credits to replacement reserves must be used in not less than 8 or 10 years. The institution thinks the time has arrived for a modification of Treasury policy on depreciation and offers three changes for consideration: (1) Large initial depreciation; (2) accelerated rates, especially on new investments in machinery and equipment; and (3) greater taxpayer discretion in fixing depreciation allowances.

Both Nos. 1 and 2 were in use during the war under the sanction of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which said in September 1944 that such action "would induce many companies to hazard new ventures, thereby increasing employment. It would give a real incentive to companies to keep our industry ahead of the rest of the world technologically." Great Britain also permitted high initial depreciation allowances in the Income Tax Act of 1945. The adoption of No. 3 would not be disadvantageous to the Government, since any immediate declines in revenue would be offset in later years. Moreover, it would tend to induce management to adopt more rapidly the latest improvements and so tend to increase production.

NEED TO RECOVER CAPITAL VALUE

While there are some objections by certain industrial firms and by the Government to adjusting depreciation policy to allow for shrinkage in the dollar, it is generally admitted that capital is fully recovered only, as George Terborgh says, when the recovery is equal to the original investment in terms of purchasing power. Industry must set aside enough of its income to maintain its efficiency and ability to produce.

Today, generally speaking, business is setting aside depreciation reserves on the bases of original purchase price. Yet today it costs far more, twice and in some cases three times as much, to renew or replace plants and machinery as it did originally. Hence it is plain that under such a policy taxes are being levied on a portion of profit which is not an actual profit, since it contains a certain percentage of unrecognized depreciation.

Security holders who buy stocks of these concerns whose net income has not been properly shrunk by deduction of sufficient depreciation for obsolescence or depreciation are being duped. Keen eyes eventually discern such practices. And whether a depreciation policy which aims at a realistic provision for its own physical perpetuation is recognized for tax purposes or not, it is good accounting procedure and, better still, common sense. Senator CAPEHART and Representative GRANT of Indiana recognize the need for legislation on this subject and are proposing a liberalization of the revenue law so that true income and not capital will be taxed.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an editorial entitled "Question of Hawaiian Statehood," from the Chester (Pa.) Times of February 21 last. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTION OF HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

(This is the second of several editorial articles having to do with a recent western trip by the editor of the Chester Times.)

On the day of our arrival in Honolulu, Senator CORDON, of Oregon, was completing his official visitation with the expectation of reporting back to the Public Lands Committee of the United States Senate, which has present consideration of Hawaiian statehood.

There was a gigantic luncheon affair with 600 present to hear not only Senator CORDON, but also JOSEPH FARRINGTON, Island delegate to Congress, and a distinguished vacation visitor, Gen. Mark Clark. It was an impressive affair. Those in attendance were alert, cheerful people, who, in our language, may be described as typical Americans. That description goes also for the sprinkling of persons of oriental descent, aggregating about one-tenth of the attendance.

There was the same good-natured banter characteristic of a civic gathering on the mainland (as it is always referred to on the islands). Senator CORDON was relaxed and friendly. His audience understood that he could make no official commitment, but we have the word of A. A. (Bud) Smyser (older brother of the Chester Times' Dick Smyser) that Senator CORDON had become convinced that Hawaii is ready for statehood. Smyser, as a reporter on the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, had been a shadow of Senator CORDON throughout his visit.

Following the luncheon the writer greeted JOE FARRINGTON with whom he had served as a reporter on the Philadelphia Public Ledger back in 1919 and 1920. In a few minutes we were in an automobile with FARRINGTON and Senator CORDON driving back from the Waikiki Beach resort where the luncheon had been held, en route to the historic Hawaiian capitol building where temporary offices had been established for Senator CORDON. The Oregon Senator, who in private life was a small-town Oregon attorney, spoke repeatedly of his favorable impressions of the islands, and particularly of its whole-hearted friendliness and hospitality. He had been the recipient of much testimony including the voices of a limited few who feel that Hawaii should wait still longer before being admitted as the forty-ninth State. CORDON has found, however, overwhelming favorable evidence.

There are more than one-half million people living in the islands which produce well over 90 percent of America's pineapple. They provide about one-seventh of America's sugar. In 1946, Hawaii's effective buying income averaged $5,400 per family. That is considerably larger than the average family's buying income on the mainland. Last year Hawaii paid, in Federal taxes, more than were paid by 14 States.

A repeated argument against statehood is the diversified population—Hawaiian, Chinese, Japanese, Caucasian, Korean, Filipinos—all kinds of people, but it is amazing how they live together happily.

There is the testimony of Admiral Nimitz: "Before World War II, I entertained some doubt as to the loyalty of the American citizens of Japanese ancestry in the event of war with Japan. From my observation during World War II, I no longer have that doubt." The performance of AJA (meaning Americans of Japanese Ancestry) troops on European battlefields particularly substantiates Admiral Nimitz' evidence.

It is not the purpose of this article to make a formal case in behalf of Hawaiian statehood. The fact remains that for nearly a half a century, as a Territory of the United States, Hawaii has pleaded for statehood and today stands on the threshold of achievement. The House has already approved the measure for statehood, so final decision is up to the Senate.

For more than a fortnight on the islands, meeting numerous friends of long duration, we asked questions to bring out frank opinion. The fact that Harry Bridges of the longshoremen's union has organized field workers into a gigantic combine is the basis of much concern. The objection is not to the labor organization, but to the judgment that too much power is given the CIO leader due to his control of shipping, which obviously is vital to Hawaii's economy. However, the independence of the mixed population in Hawaii is dramatically proven by the fact that following a long and costly strike among sugar workers, a similar strike among the pineapple workers failed miserably in 5 days. They (a large population of oriental descent) simply wouldn't go along.

The two daily newspapers in Honolulu are the Evening Honolulu Star-Bulletin with 80,000 circulation and the morning Honolulu Advertiser with 50,000 circulation.

This observer admits that, vacation or no vacation, he is unable to restrain an overwhelming impulse to make it a busman's holiday and acquaint himself with the inside workings of the available newspapers.

Undoubtedly because of the fact that the islands are 2,200 miles from the United States, there is a strong tradition on the part of both newspapers to emphasize local news to a greater degree than many newspapers, on the mainland. That doesn't mean that international and national affairs are not given reasonable coverage.

As the publisher of a newspaper which holds its distinctive place within a few miles of Philadelphia, we can testify as to the desire for local news. The newspapers of Honolulu actually are more adequate publications in serving their community than the average newspaper in cities of similar size in the States. The Honolulu newspapers proved an inspiration to this "visiting fireman."

Delegate FARRINGTON is devoting 99 percent of his energies in quest of statehood and the favorable vote of the House of Representatives was undoubtedly a personal tribute. It might be mentioned that in private life Mr. FARRINGTON is the controlling owner of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and prior to his taking office he was an active newspaper executive.

Our Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this great body are almost unanimously, if not unanimous, in favor of conservation of our natural resources. Among those resources is our timber. In our State we have the Ozark National Forest, and I have received the following information, which I requested, from Mr. Paul H. Gerrard, forest supervisor of the Ozark National Forest, Russellville, Ark., and which I will include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
OZARK NATIONAL FOREST,
Russellville, Ark., February 25, 1948.

Hon. JIM TRIMBLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TRIMBLE: The report of the Chief of the Forest Service for 1947 deals mainly with the Nation's water resources. It ties in so closely with the water problems and what the people in Arkansas are attempting to accomplish in the Arkansas, White, and other river basin areas that I thought you would be especially interested in it.

The act of June 4, 1897, creating the national forests states in part: "For the purpose of securing favorable conditions of water flow and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of the citizens of the United States." The 1,000,000 acres of the Ozark and 1,400,000 acres of the Ouachita National Forests are a stabilizing influence on the flow of headwater streams of our most troublesome rivers. They also provide water for some of our main cities; namely, Little Rock, Fort Smith, and others. Forest Service policies and management on the national forests in Colorado affect the Arkansas River as well as the private land. Hence, the sections "How Forest and Range Treatment Affect Watersheds" and "National Forest Watersheds", will be of interest to those desiring a comprehensive flood control program on the lower Arkansas.

Along with watershed management, we have timber, grazing, and wildlife management, as well as recreation and other special uses. In other words, we are operating on a multiple use system, devoting the land to its most productive use or uses, correlating these so as to provide maximum benefits to the greatest number of people. Other Forest Service activities include research, cooperative assistance to the State in fire control, providing tree seedlings, and farm forestry. (A total of $161,000 Federal funds were provided for these cooperative projects.) These are covered in the report. Also attached is a brief statement of forest facts for Arkansas.

Like other people, we have many problems in administration of the national forests in addition to trying to obtain full value for the taxpayer's dollar which we spend. Hence, any suggestion or comment you have to offer concerning the forest or ways and means of increasing benefits to the people will be gladly received.

Very sincerely yours,

PAUL H. GERRARD, *Forest Supervisor.*

Facts and figures, fiscal year 1947, national forests

	Ozark	Ouachita	Total
Area, Arkansas (acres)	683,216	1,208,742	2,202,058
Area, Oklahoma (acres)	.....	167,000	167,000
Receipts (timber, grazing, special use, etc.)	$709,207	$286,744	$994,151
Forest products cut (thousands of board feet)	19,473	18,801	38,274
Forest fires (number)	172	245	417
Acres burned, United States land	2,028	3,242	5,270
Roads maintained (miles)	1,522	1,033	2,555
Recreation developments	17	15	32
Game refuges (number of areas)	1	4	5
Acres	41,500	105,740	144,440
Number of deer	9,000	4,000	13,000
Number of elk	100	None	100
Number of turkey	150	250	400
Recreation visitors	163,000	125,000	288,000
Hunters, fishermen, and trappers	29,000	25,200	54,200
25 percent receipts to counties:			
Arkansas	$74,592	$85,742	$160,334
Oklahoma	.....	$16,944	$16,944
Rate returns per acre	$0.075	$0.060	.....

Includes hunters, fishermen, and trappers.

COOPERATION WITH STATE

Division of forestry

Fire control: In fiscal year 1947 some 11,083,000 acres protected, at a cost of $344,364, of which $158,580 was Federal funds, balance from State and private sources. In calendar year 1946 (1947 data not yet available) 59,980 acres protected land burned, or 0.5 percent, whereas 11.6 percent unprotected land burned. State now extending protection to new areas.

Nursery—Tree seedlings: Seedlings totaling 5,500,000 produced and distributed by State forester. Federal funds supplemented those of State. Demand for seedlings exceeding supply and State forester is increasing production.

Extension service

Federal funds helped to provide one farm forester for on-the-ground technical council in proper management of small woodlands; 109 owners assisted, involving 12,000 acres timberland, 1,292,000 feet of forest products, with value of $24,740.

Game and fish commission

Cooperative game studies concerning number of deer and distribution on White Rock and Sylamore. Also deer-browse or game-management study on Sylamore district; 350 deer on forest trapped for stocking various areas in State; no forest-service cooperative funds involved.

FOREST EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Ozark branch, Harrison: Research forest-management practices with upland hardwoods. Also forest-grazing, game-management, and red-cedar studies.

Crossett branch, Crossett: Research forest-management practices with pine, includes farm woodland.

Southern station, New Orleans: Forest survey, northwest Arkansas; dry-kiln course, cooperation Arkansas lumbermen; wood utilization, cooperation Arkansas lumbermen; lumber production, Arkansas mills.

Wages Lost Through Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the wage earners who were on strike in 1946 lost a total of $920,000,000—at the rate of $8 per day—in comparison to $281,600,000 lost in 1947. The $920,000,000 would have given 1,277,777 old people $60 per month for 1 year.

The State of Pennsylvania led the list with a loss of $160,800,000. Michigan and Ohio tied for second with a loss of $84,300,000 each. Indiana lost $43,760,000. Workers in Indiana industries that lost the most through strikes were: Automobile, $12,320,000; iron and steel, $11,280,000; machinery, $6,248,000; electrical, $4,936,000; and those in mining lost $4,912,000.

Workers in Indiana's largest industrial cities lost the following amounts: Indianapolis, $5,400,000; Gary, $5,304,000; East Chicago, $3,128,000; South Bend, $1,376,000; Evansville, $249,600; and Terre Haute, $148,000.

The following shows the loss of wages through strikes in 1946 by States:

States	Stoppages	Workers	Man-days idle	Loss in wages at $8 per day
Alabama	118	121,000	2,060,000	$16,480,000
Arizona	20	6,980	257,000	2,056,000
Arkansas	46	14,300	226,000	1,808,000
California	246	288,000	6,090,000	48,720,000
Colorado	26	26,200	590,000	4,720,000
Connecticut	86	50,200	3,160,000	25,280,000
Delaware	17	5,890	95,000	760,000
District of Columbia	29	21,800	180,000	1,440,000
Florida	42	17,200	152,000	1,216,000
Georgia	61	27,700	540,000	4,320,000
Idaho	13	3,290	33,100	264,800
Illinois	438	339,000	9,040,000	72,320,000
Indiana	171	178,000	5,470,000	43,760,000
Iowa	66	49,700	561,000	4,488,000
Kansas	33	31,400	290,000	2,320,000
Kentucky	165	138,000	2,960,000	23,680,000
Louisiana	50	29,000	372,000	2,976,000
Maine	22	10,500	44,800	358,400
Maryland	53	90,700	1,400,000	11,200,000
Massachusetts	266	111,000	3,230,000	25,840,000
Michigan	311	248,000	10,600,000	84,800,000
Minnesota	55	45,100	573,000	6,984,000
Mississippi	26	14,600	147,000	1,176,000
Missouri	168	63,800	1,700,000	13,600,000
Montana	15	11,300	223,000	1,784,000
Nebraska	19	15,500	235,000	1,880,000
Nevada	9	2,200	17,600	136,000
New Hampshire	23	5,540	130,000	1,040,000
New Jersey	247	193,000	6,590,000	52,280,000
New Mexico	15	5,870	103,000	824,000
New York	679	432,000	9,350,000	74,800,000
North Carolina	56	14,400	452,000	3,616,000
North Dakota	9	4,250	61,000	488,000
Ohio	396	490,000	10,600,000	84,800,000
Oklahoma	42	16,800	329,000	2,632,000
Oregon	45	21,400	272,000	1,376,000
Pennsylvania	639	877,000	20,100,000	160,800,000
Rhode Island	48	11,400	257,000	2,056,000
South Carolina	19	10,200	388,000	3,104,000
South Dakota	7	2,300	13,700	109,600
Tennessee	131	64,900	1,110,000	8,880,000
Texas	97	94,800	2,010,000	16,080,000
Utah	17	16,700	782,000	6,256,000
Vermont	7	2,000	16,100	128,800
Virginia	108	72,200	1,240,000	9,920,000
Washington	79	49,600	884,000	7,072,000
West Virginia	150	229,000	5,600,000	44,800,000
Wisconsin	91	73,700	4,820,000	38,560,000
Wyoming	10	10,600	208,000	1,640,000

Sixty-four-dollar question: How much did the labor leaders lose in wages in 1946?

Rent Control and the Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday and Monday several thousand veterans, members of all national veterans' organizations, assembled here in Washington to urge action by Congress to help solve their serious housing problems:

Veterans are as a group the most acutely affected by the housing shortage. The Census Bureau in October 1947 reported that in April 1947 about 27 percent of all occupied dwelling units contained a veteran household. About 14 percent of such dwelling units contained doubled-up families as compared with only 4 percent of the nonveteran households. About 2,764,000 married couples, or 8.3 percent of all married couples in private households, were living doubled up in April 1947. This represents an increase of about 50 percent over the corresponding number, 1,846,000, who were living doubled up in 1940.

The Housing Expediter, in his testimony before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, stated his studies showed that monthly rents on dwelling units decontrolled under the 1947 act had on the average rise about 70 percent—the individual increases varying from very little up to over 300 percent.

Veterans are having to compete for these uncontrolled accommodations, including newly-built units, and when fortunate to get shelter at all they are forced to pay exorbitant rents.

The Senate on February 24 passed a bill continuing the requirement that newly-built rental units must first be offered for rent to veterans. But the law provides no limit on what rent the owner can demand of the veteran. Many newly-built rental units are being legally rented to nonveterans because within the required 30-day period no veteran who can afford the outrageous rents can be found. What a farce.

Furthermore, the Senate in the new law proposes to exempt from rent control rooms in private homes. This is to enable home owners who are mostly nonveterans to gouge veterans, both single and married, who are forced by the housing shortage to live in furnished rooms. This open season on veterans will especially hurt those trying to make ends meet on veterans' allowances while attending colleges and universities.

The Senate, in continuing the inflationary lease device, further hurt veterans. Under the 1947 act such leases had to be made with tenants who were in possession. Under the new law the Senators provided that new tenants—most of whom will be veterans—can also be stuck.

The Senators, on the initiative of Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, provided that landlords may willfully flagrantly violate the rent law without any criminal prosecution or punishment. The Senate in its effort to pass a law which controls rents, in name only, also denied the Housing Expediter the necessary authority to sue for treble damages those landlords who illegally overcharge.

The Senate bill allows landlords to evict tenants without notice to the Rent Administration and without an adequate waiting period where eviction is sought for reasons beyond the tenants control, such as for occupancy by the owner or a relative, a new purchaser, or to alter the accommodations or to withdraw the unit from the market.

The assembled veterans, recognizing these shortcomings of the proposed rent bill, unanimously passed the following resolution:

RENT CONTROL

Whereas rent controls are scheduled to expire on April 1 unless Congress acts to further extend it; and

Whereas thousands of families will be thrown into economic chaos following termination of controls; and

Whereas hundreds of thousands of veterans and their families will be left homeless if the eviction provisions of the law are terminated; and

Whereas the passage of the T-E-W bill will not relieve the rental problem for several years: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Veterans' Housing Conference hereby goes on record demanding that Congress immediately enact a strengthened rent-control law that will be in effect until the housing shortage has been relieved. And that the bill contain provisions for adequate enforcement, strengthened provisions against eviction, and the elimination from the pending bill of the clause permitting landlords to remove their properties from the rental market for the purpose of creating a false surplus.

Hon. William M. Whittington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, some days ago the Honorable WILL M. WHITTINGTON, the able and distinguished Representative from the Third Congressional District of the State of Mississippi, announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection to the office in which he has so long and ably served.

This came as a distinct shock to his many friends and admirers in and out of Congress. And while it is customary to wait until a man is dead to pay tribute to his virtues, I want to depart from that custom and place this flower in his lapel while he is enjoying the fullness of life.

WILL WHITTINGTON came to Congress from that rich delta section of Mississippi designated as the Third Congressional District on March 4, 1925, and he has served with ability and distinction in this body continuously since that time. Prior to his service here, he served as a member of the State senate in the State legislature of Mississippi where his ability, sound judgment, and forceful character made him a leader of that body even as he has become a leader in the Nation's legislature. Few men in the Congress of the United States today enjoy the respect and confidence of their fellow members more than does our able colleague. This is no accident. WILL WHITTINGTON has risen to this place of eminence in Congress because of his ability, hard work, and attention to the Nation's business. He is recognized as an outstanding authority on flood control. For several years during the Democratic administration he served as chairman of the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives, and has been largely responsible for much of the constructive program of flood control in the Nation. His capacity for hard work is apparently limitless, and I doubt if any Member of this body has been more conversant with and made a more studious effort to study the many bills which have come to the floor for consideration and enactment. His deep sense of conscientious duty has impelled him to meticulously study the various bills which came up for consideration. His Delta district, which has profited so enormously as the result of his representation here, and the country at large, can ill afford to lose his services at this time. But WILL WHITTINGTON has arrived at the conclusion, reluctantly I am sure, that after these long years of service, he is entitled to enjoy his remaining years in his beloved delta section of Mississippi where he can devote his time to his plantation, and enjoy his friends and the companionship of his family.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I submit the following from a number of editorials which have appeared in the press lauding the efforts of our colleague who will leave us with the respect and best wishes of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle:

[From the Greenwood (Miss.) Morning Star of January 3, 1948]

WHITTINGTON WON'T BE CANDIDATE AGAIN, RETIREMENT TO BE AT EXPIRATION OF TERM—BIG SHOES TO FILL

The citizens of Greenwood and the Third District of the State of Mississippi and the Democratic Party as a whole will have big shoes to fill when Representative WILL M. WHITTINGTON writes finis to his career as a Congressman at the expiration of his present term.

Only last summer Mr. WHITTINGTON, known throughout the State and the Nation as one of the most powerful and influential men in the House of Representatives, turned down requests from Mississippi supporters to enter the race for a United States Senate post. His long record of service and legislation caused strong support to swing to the drive to urge him to run in the November election for the senatorial seat left vacant by the death of Theodore Bilbo, but he rejected the bid to run.

As the head of the powerful Democratic caucus during past administrations the Greenwood Representative has long been regarded as one of the powers in the Democratic Party. His record in flood-control legislation, compiled under his leadership as chairman of the vital committee, speaks for itself.

At present he is a ranking member of the Committee on Public Works and a ranking member of the Committee on Highways. He also compiled a long record of work in tax and revenue legislation.

The last paragraph of Mr. WHITTINGTON'S statement of yesterday characterizes his every thought according to men associated with him: "The welfare of my district, State, and country always came first with me as a public official, and will continue first with me as a private citizen."

Representative WILL M. WHITTINGTON, veteran Congressman from Greenwood and this district, announced yesterday that he would retire as a Member of Congress at the expiration of his term and would not be a candidate for reelection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON made the following statement in announcing his retirement: "I shall be 70 years of age next May. I would like to retire as a Member of Congress at the expiration of my term. I shall not, therefore, be a candidate for reelection.

"The people of the Third District have been kind and generous to me. I am deeply grateful for election and reelection for 24 years.

"The welfare of my district, State, and country always came first with me as a public official and will continue first with me as a private citizen."

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of January 18, 1948]

A WORK WELL DONE

Congressman BILL WHITTINGTON, veteran House Member from the third district, is one of the few men in public life who has accomplished practically everything he started out to do at the beginning of his political career. To put Old Man River under control in its devastating sweep from Memphis to the Gulf was his main objective and engineers regard that as practically accomplished. All the levees along the river have been rebuilt, enlarged, and strengthened. Protection of the Yazoo delta from inundation was another objective. Four of the largest flood-control dams in the Nation have been authorized along the tributaries of the Yazoo, two of which are completed and two others are well under way. Some other objectives were in his program and they have been given the stamp of approval by Army engineers and now await appropriations. BILL WHITTINGTON has had a long and honorable career.

He shows good common sense by deciding to retire gracefully, before he becomes old and useless, like some men in public life, and it is certain he will retire gratefully, holding in keen appreciation the honors showered upon him.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of January 20, 1948]

HE HAS SERVED US WELL

Announcement by Representative WILL WHITTINGTON that he will not seek reelection to Congress is a reminder to the entire Mississippi Valley, as well as sections elsewhere, of the tremendous debt they owe him.

His departure from the House will deprive it of its foremost flood control expert and one who labored indefatigably in behalf of all areas where floods are prevalent. His is no mere legislative knowledge. When he entered Congress more than 20 years ago, he was already an advanced student of flooding rivers. He knew the flood propensities of China's Yellow River and Egypt's Nile as well as he did the Mississippi. Through all the years following he studied zealously to add to that knowledge until he became the most proficient member of the House on the subject. It was knowledge which served him invaluably during the many years he was Chairman of the old Flood Control Committee.

He has served Mississippi with dignity and well. He was unselfish in laboring for sections outside of his own State. He has displayed fine qualities of statesmanship. He has worked without regard for hours or personal discomfort.

His retirement is a matter of personal decision. It is the choice of a man who can seek rest with finest of conscience.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of January 4, 1948.]

BILL WHITTINGTON

No man in the political history of Mississippi ever served the Commonwealth more capably, faithfully, and energetically than Congressman W. M. WHITTINGTON, of the Third District, who announces that he will retire at the expiration of his present term.

When BILL WHITTINGTON leaves the Halls of Congress 1 year hence it will be a distinct loss to the State and Nation.

The lower House of the national lawmaking body has 435 Members, but its actual work is handled by a body of not exceeding 40 Members, and BILL WHITTINGTON happens to be among that 40. He has, since almost the beginning of his long tenure of office, been one of the most influential Members of the House, and as chairman of the Committee on Flood Control he framed and piloted the passage of legislation that has placed the Father of Waters under control and the Southland is no longer afflicted with disastrous floods.

Our Third District has always been ably represented in Congress. Mr. WHITTINGTON'S immediate predecessors were two truly great men, Gen. Thomas C. Catchings and Benj. Humphreys. The latter's son served a short term after his father's death and was succeeded by Mr. WHITTINGTON who is now completing his twelfth term in the body.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of yesterday.

REAL, GRIM, AND URGENT

Senator VANDENBERG has not strayed into a land of hobgoblin make-believe in appealing to Congress for swift adoption of the Marshall plan to help stop World War III before it starts. The dark realities of the hour fully justify the note of alarm and urgency in his eloquence. A ruthless and vaultingly ambitious tyranny—the tyranny of Red totalitarianism—is on the march. If it is allowed to keep marching, then the chances are that on some tomorrow, not many years from now, there will be a titanic death struggle between it and what is left of the earth's free nations, meaning chiefly our own.

This danger is as real as life. It is not part of some bad dream that jittery or emotionally unstable men are dreaming in the night. It exists just as surely as the Soviet Union itself exists, and it threatens not only the whole of free western Europe, including Britain, but America as well. One by one, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, and Czechoslovakia have succumbed to it, and Finland now is in the process of going the same way. Unless the

non-Communist lands unite against it, therefore, and make effective use of such imperative measures as the Marshall plan, France and Italy may be the next to fall. Then, as Mr. VANDENBERG warns, the iron curtain would be clamped down all the way to the rims of the Atlantic, the British Isles would be almost hopelessly vulnerable, and our own country—with precious few allies left in a largely hostile, Red-dominated world—would have to prepare for the eventuality of either abject capitulation or total war.

If there are Americans—in Congress or out—who are inclined to scoff at warnings of this sort, they owe it to themselves and their country to think twice about the matter, and to think soberly and long. They would be well advised, certainly, to read with the greatest care such searching and well-documented reports as the one just published by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Dealing with the strategy and tactics of world communism, it makes a thoroughly persuasive case for the thesis that the Soviet dictatorship—representing the most backward and oppressive system of the age—is working toward one goal only, and that that goal is universal dominance through universal revolution. To that end, operating through Communist fifth columns in all lands, the men of the Kremlin have been systematically seeking to promote chaos in the west in preparation for what they believe to be inevitable—namely, a final catastrophic war culminating in the overthrow of capitalism and the triumph of Red totalitarianism on a global scale. In short, according to the report, they are dedicated to objectives of extreme violence and, unless firmly countered now, will pursue those objectives even to the point of setting off a world-wide explosion.

That is why Mr. VANDENBERG is completely right when he says that "aggressive communism threatens all freedom and security in the Old World or the New when it puts free peoples anywhere in chains." That is why every wide-awake American must agree with his solemn warning that if there are risks in adopting the Marshall plan, the risks of rejecting it, or whittling it down, would be far greater. Of itself, of course, it cannot be the answer to everything. But it is an indispensable key part of all that the democracies must do together now to cope with the immense danger before them. The situation is not an imaginary one. The Soviet Union has made it very real, very grim and very urgent.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein a copy of my radio address over Station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Thursday, March 4, 1948, on the St. Lawrence seaway project:

Fellow citizens of Massachusetts and New England, the St. Lawrence seaway project is a threat, and a challenge, to all people who make their living in New England.

This twin project, designed to provide a channel for ships traveling between Europe and the Great Lakes of our Middle West and to provide for hydroelectric power, will cut off our region and reduce it to economic serfdom.

Boston is a major port. It is nearer to Europe than any other port on the Atlantic seaboard. Through it come the raw materials which are the lifeblood of our industries, and the westbound freight which is a vital part of our transport business. Boston is also an export outlet to Europe. Its strategic position along the routes of travel and trade is a "natural." By land, by sea, and by air, this hub of New England is the western terminal for trans-Atlantic traffic.

But for 25 years those behind the St. Lawrence seaway project have been trying to put it over on the unsuspecting public of the United States. From time to time they change the emphasis. First it is essential for navigation. Then it becomes a power imperative. Later on it is termed a "must" for national defense. When these arguments fail to break down our resistance, they try to scare us into it by using the word "depression" and representing the project as a means for creating jobs. Lately, in view of our huge national debt, they try to prove that this white elephant—whose eventual cost might reach a billion dollars—will pay for itself through tolls.

They do not mention the blow to Atlantic coast shipping and railroads. Or the taxes to be levied on New England, for instance, for the purpose of bypassing its economy and turning its industrial cities into ghost towns with a past instead of a future. They do not even extend to us the comfort that such a project might help to solve our soil-erosion and flood-control problems. They simply say to New England, "You are finished, through, hand over your business to the Middle West, and retire to your rocking chair and your memories."

The initial cost of this project to the people of the United States would be $500,000,000, but our experience with the Panama Canal, and other such developments, is that the final cost is several times that of the original estimate.

Who is behind this fantastic proposal, anyway? Year after year it crops up with a persistency that will not admit defeat. Middle western interests are the chief sponsors. The Great Lakes cities want to be ocean ports. They propose a 27-foot channel for the St Lawrence, so that seagoing vessels could bring and take goods directly from foreign ports to such inland cities as Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee, and Chicago. They also claim that the iron-ore deposits in Wisconsin and Minnesota are running out. To counter this, they must develop low-grade ores at great expense or transport available ores by water from Labrador and Newfoundland.

So, advocate a 27-foot channel, whereas the ship channel already in use at Boston is 40 feet, at Montreal 32 feet, and at New York 42 feet.

Behind the gaudy camouflage is the intent to develop a channel to accommodate ore boats and not oceangoing steamers. No publicity has been given to the fact that ocean and inland steamship companies are either indifferent or hostile toward the project. Ocean shipping experts say that their ships are not designed for operation on calm waters with a swift current in narrow channels and at low rates of speed. Their hulls, engines, and steering gear are not built for this type of service. Insurance on ocean shipping using these canals would be at a very high rate, so as to make the movement of larger vessels on the canals uneconomical.

In addition, ocean and inland steamship operators alike know that the shortness of the season on the St. Lawrence route cancels out any advantages to be gained by an enlargement of the canal system. For any shipping interests using this route can only benefit from expenditures on it for part of the year. During the winter months it is ice locked, and traffic has to be carried by rail to the ice-free ports on the Atlantic coast.

Furthermore, the Great Lakes are fresh water, and the St. Lawrence, up to the rapids, is salt water. Great Lakes steamers are not equipped to convert salt water to fresh water for their boilers, and the cost of operating Diesel engines on the lakes is prohibitive.

Coming down to the question of the ability of the project to pay for itself, note the results of a recent survey. On a traffic estimate of 4,000,000 tons during the open season tolls of six to fifteen dollars a ton would be required, without a Government subsidy. The bill in the United States Senate would limit the tolls to $1.25 a ton. This would only produce a revenue of two and a half million dollars each year. But the actual cost of operating the seaway would run from $25,000,000 to $62,000,000 annually. Self-liquidating? Impossible. A Government subsidy would be necessary to make the project pay its way, and that would mean more money taken from our pockets. We already have railroad and east coast port facilities to handle this flow of commerce. It does not seem sensible that we should junk them in favor of this grand illusion.

Supporters of the St. Lawrence seaway claim that it is necessary for national defense, both as an artery of transport and as a source of hydroelectric power.

A channel depth of 27 feet is inadequate for modern navigation needs. The modern oil tanker, for example, draws well over 30 feet when fully loaded. Those in favor of this project are trying to sell it to public opinion on a minimum-cost base. They know that once the authority for it is granted the plan will be revised to call for a 35-foot channel, and maybe more, at a cost running into billions.

Consider the history of the Panama Canal, to see what I mean. Original estimates called for an expenditure of $200,000,000. It cost over four hundred million. In order to improve it as a lock canal, with greater depth and width and larger locks, we would now have to pay close to two and a half billion dollars.

Ships using the St. Lawrence waterway would eventually depend upon some 50 locks in all. A determined enemy attack by air, hitting one out of six locks exposed to destruction, would put the waterway out of commission.

From surveys made at Panama, we are warned that a lock canal, even with improvements, would still be deficient in resistance to modern weapons and could be destroyed by sabotage. We are considering the building of a new sea-level canal at Panama, or Nicaragua, as the only safe type to meet national-defense requirements. However, it is impossible to construct a sea-level canal between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean, along the St. Lawrence.

To defend the lock system of the St. Lawrence seaway, we would have to divert a large portion of our armed forces, together with their guided missiles, robot planes, and atomic bombs. It would therefore burden us with additional responsibilities.

As the proponents for the St Lawrence seaway jump from argument to argument, trying to establish a solid base for their claims, they finally wind up with a brief for the hydroelectric power to be gained from it. What started out as a seaway becomes a public power development shared, strangely enough, by Canada and the State of New York.

As the Quebec Chronicle Telegraph stated on December 1, 1947: "To sum up, the new project is a power scheme. Its advantages should be judged wholly on that basis, and its costs should be borne entirely by those communities which would benefit from the additional provision of power."

Personally, I have always favored such public power developments as the Tennessee Valley Authority, to develop more and cheaper electricity from the flows of waters in our rivers. I have consistently worked for the establishment of a Merrimack Valley Authority to benefit the people and the industries of this area. The over-all, integrated project for the full utilization of a river is tied in with flood control, the prevention of soil erosion, the elimination of pollution, and to generate power for our homes and factories.

As a Congressman from Massachusetts, I am disturbed by the slow but steady migration of our industries, as they leave New England to locate in the South, where they are serviced by a full supply of low-cost power.

The lack of adequate power in New England became noticeable during the war. Recurring shortages in the supply of coal and fuel oil, during the post-war period, have underscored our dependence on outside sources from which we want to free ourselves.

New England has the potential water power, which it should develop for its own use.

Under the proposed seaway plan, New York would be given sole ownership of the project's power, and control of its distribution. This does not suit New England's regional needs.

Furthermore, in the event of any future national emergency, such a concentrated power plant would be a prime target for an enemy. He would only have to destroy it, and in doing so, seriously curtail production in haf of the Atlantic Seaboard States. To my mind, we've got to disperse our installations, as the best method of defense. It is time that the many smaller river projects, like the Merrimack, be developed, rather than the few big ones whose break-down would paralyze the Nation.

What the St. Lawrence seaway would do to the railroads and shipping of the New England coastal States, is sad to contemplate. It would result in unemployment. It would sidetrack our development.

Those who would make us a dependency of another region, miscalculate the enterprise and independence of New Englanders. They overlook the fact that more GI's are settling in New England and California than in any other sections of the country. Plainly, these young men and women believe that they will have a future here. So must we.

Alert to our own needs and untapped resources, we refuse to support the St. Lawrence seaway. We will not become the end of the line, when our position on the map shows that we are a natural transfer station on air, land, and sea routes between the heart of America and the nations of Europe.

But something more than passive resistance to the seaway is necessary. Unless we actively oppose it we shall wake up some day to find this extra burden saddled on our backs—forevermore.

The soundest criticism is that which is constructive. We resist the St. Lawrence project and counter with a better plan, and that is a demand for the long-overdue development of our home resources—meaning New England's waterpower.

We already have rail and shipping facilities which connect Europe, through us, to the Middle West. We shall improve on that service when our economy is strengthened by a cheap and abundant supply of hydroelectric power made in this region.

New England's answer to the stubborn challenge of those who sponsor the St. Lawrence seaway is this:

We shall produce the power we need, from our own waterways, and we shall do it first.

Strength in Our Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Joseph, Mo., Gazette:

STRENGTH IN OUR SOIL

Awakening of the American people to the importance of their farm products in the diplomatic struggle for American security and world democracy has been accelerated by E. H. Taylor, associate editor of the Country Gentleman and one of the country's leading authorities on American land policy.

"Without the products of our soil," he said in a recent speech before the Soil Conservation Society of America, "the European recovery program or any other effort to stay the march of communism in Europe will be impotent." He believes, not only that food production on American farms must be stepped up now to ease the foreign policy crisis, but that the United States must back its show of military power in world affairs by increased food production if it is to maintain its security.

His plea is, of course, for conserving the country's soil resources. The food reserves upon which the American people have depended in all wars to make them strong are now gone. The fertility of the soil is being used up more rapidly than it is being replaced.

He put the question to the American people in these words: "Shall we repeat the folly of past nations that now 'whisper out of the dust'? Or shall we realize, in time, that a stock pile of productivity, stored in the soil, is as necessary to the national security as a stock pile of bombs or other weapons?"

Saving and adding to the fertility of the nation's soil calls for no more than carrying out a land-use program which every progressive American farmer knows all about. But what the farmer needs is not the know-how, but the support of a national soil policy that will recognize his place in world recovery and encourage and reward him accordingly. He needs to be protected from the Congressman who last year foolishly cut down the Federal appropriation for soil conservation instruction and technical help. He needs statesmanship in Washington.

Ownership of Tide and Submerged Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Joint Senate and House Judiciary Committee on S. 1988 and H. R. 5443:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I represent the First Congressional District of the State of Washington and appear today to present a brief statement in support of the passage of proposed legislation incorporated in Senate bill 1988. I have introduced a similar measure in the House, namely, H. R. 5443, believing that this legislation when passed will provide the equity and justice undeniably due the State of Washington and all other States wherein title to tide and submerged lands has been or may be contested, and where a cloud has been cast upon the status of inland waters and the lands beneath them.

Mr. Chairman, you have been informed by the Office of the Commissioner of Public Lands of the State of Washington the revenues from oil and gas permits have not been large and the potentialities thereof are as yet unknown. However, in consideration of the port and harbor developments, the fishing industry, other industrial activities, and the possibilities of further mineral production, the State of Washington certainly has a stake and a duty to defend all trusts imposed upon it. The State of Washington, Mr. Chairman, ranks eleventh among all the States in the area of inland waters lying within a State boundary. Computations by the General Land Office of the Department of the Interior indicate these inland water areas to be 1,215 square miles, out of a total area within the State's boundaries of 68,836 square miles.

The incongruity of the existence of any claim other than the State of Washington to the tide and submarginal lands covering thus so vast an area, Mr. Chairman, must be emphasized. The existence of any cloud on titles to these inland waters must not be permitted. The Constitution of the State of Washington, pursuant to an enabling act of Congress approved on February 22, 1889, and proclaimed by the President in Proclamation No. 8, dated November 11, 1889, cited in Twenty-sixth Statutes 1552, provides specifically as follows: "Declaration of State ownership: The State of Washington asserts its ownership to the beds and shores of all navigable waters in the State up to and including the line of ordinary high tide in waters where the tide ebbs and flows, and up to and including the line of ordinary high water within the banks of all navigable rivers and lakes."

In consideration of this ratified statement of ownership and the uncontroverted fact that all States were admitted to the Union on an equal footing in all respects whatsoever, the incongruity I have referred to that the title of any State to tide and submerged lands should be questioned, is obvious.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, faced as we are with the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *United States* versus *California*, which decision can be considered only the first of an extensive series of similar decrees yet to come unless there be enacted clarifying legislation as provided in the bill before you—I urge that favorable report be given by this committee to S. 1988. The ultimate passage of this measure will dispose of the myriad of problems as to titles and equities in the manner suggested by the Supreme Court in the statement: "We cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will exercise its powers in such a way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission."

The passage of S. 1988 or the similar companion House measures germane to this subject will be consistent with this statement of the Court, Mr. Chairman, and will eliminate the now existing confusion in titles and rights which has resulted and which will continue to exist in the absence of this subject legislation.

I earnestly urge upon you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, immediate favorable consideration of the measure.

The Late Honorable Clarence Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, all our hearts were saddened by the passing of our dear friend and former colleague, the Honorable Clarence Hancock, who while in Congress represented the Thirty-sixth Congressional District of New York.

As one of the younger Members from the State of New York, I did not have the years of personal association and contact with him that some of my other colleagues have had. However, during my service here I soon realized that he was a man of the very highest character and one who possessed those attributes that endeared him to all who had the privilege of knowing him. He was benevolent and kind and considerate of others and won the friendship of the entire membership of the House. His district, the State of New York, and the Nation have lost an able and faithful public servant.

Salary Increases for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made on Federal employee salary increase legislation befor the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, March 3, 1948:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing in support of legislation providing an increase of not less than $800 a year in the base pay of employees of all Federal departments and agencies and the government of the District of Columbia. I want to call your attention, particularly, to two bills which I have introduced on this subject, namely, H. R. 4727, which I introduced on December 15, and H. R. 4773, which I introduced on December 17 of last year.

As one who during the course of his career has worked for wages, I can appreciate just how difficult it is for the honest, faithful, and efficient employees to make ends meet under present cost-of-living conditions. Government pay has fallen behind the rising cost of living to such an extent that thousands of employees are compelled even to do without the bare necessities of life. Recent trends in the commodity markets to the contrary, we all know that there has been no decline in the cost of living in recent months or weeks, and if we may judge by the recent increase in the price of semi-fabricated steel, there is not likely to be any serious reduction in the cost of living in the near future.

I would say to my colleagues who sit as members of this subcommittee that the need for higher pay has reached the state of a virtual emergency, insofar as Federal employees are concerned. Evidence of this fact can be gained by reviewing a schedule of increased indebtedness incurred by postal employees as determined from reports of the postal credit unions for the years 1945, 1946, and 1947. I should like to incorporate the schedule into the record at this point. I should call your attention, in so doing, to the fact that it pertains to a period following the most recent legislation on the subject. It is my understanding that the totals of this report are already in the record of these hearings, having been introduced by Mr. E. C. Hallbeck, legislative representative of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks. The whole schedule, however, I believe, is of primary importance to the considerations of this committee, for the breakdown by cities conclusively demonstrates that the condition is not confined to a particular locality but prevails throughout the Nation.

The increasing indebtedness of postal employees as determined from reports of postal credit unions for the years 1945–47

	Dec. 31, 1945		Dec. 31, 1946		Dec. 31, 1947	
	Number loan accounts	Total loans	Number loan accounts	Total loans	Number loan accounts	Total loans
Louisville, Ky.	345	$40,550.25	391	$69,653.66	466	$81,087.80
Indianapolis, Ind.	466	85,275.15	498	180,155.46	579	211,130.65
Chicago, Ill.	3,176	471,302.87	3,517	588,047.25	4,136	803,738.46
Nashville, Tenn.	491	128,675.96	613	193,974.80	682	259,944.49
Cincinnati, Ohio	127	17,661.00	147	21,904.00	183	27,859.00
Buffalo, N. Y.	246	41,500.83	266	55,795.68	346	85,177.80
Houston, Tex.	280	65,634.63	430	109,652.30	553	127,398.19
Norfolk, Va.	81	15,000.16	123	29,430.24	151	38,915.55
Los Angeles, Calif.	742	107,902.46	1,024	207,955.79	1,700	313,017.80
St. Louis, Mo.	1,094	198,139.15	1,384	301,992.33	1,897	434,310.19
New York, N. Y.	251	14,747.81	304	58,042.99	406	71,071.40
Total	7,499	1,378,940.26	8,715	2,147,730.64	10,949	3,138,960.31
Cleveland, Ohio	440	45,030.11	491	67,114.47	674	81,654.64
Oakland, Calif.	780	970,046.31	930	1,098,418.87	1,193	651,798.10
Boston, Mass.	1,880	195,150.03	2,200	301,553.00	2,488	1,004,485.00
San Francisco	675	138,187.70	973	176,462.11	1,300	969,700.73
Grand total	11,222	3,077,380.07	13,289	3,992,748.08	16,314	6,414,824.68

The emergency condition thus indicated is so acute, Mr. Chairman, that I believe you will agree with me that the need now for increased pay is undebatable. The only problem is to ascertain how much will be needed to bring Government employees back to something approximating their economic position before price increases robbed them of so much of their buying power.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in submitting this plea for higher pay, I do not confine my remarks to the employees who receive an annual salary but I earnestly urge equivalent relief for those whose compensation is at an hourly rate. I would exclude from present consideration those whose pay is fixed by wage boards. I would suggest, further, that the wage rates for the hourly employees be advanced 40 cents an hour.

Government salaries and wages have been slow to rise. The first raise for per annum employees was in the form of overtime, and therefore, actually not a salary increase. When the basic rates for employees under the Classification Act were finally raised, the war was nearly over; Germany had capitulated and the price rise was already on its way upward. That first increase became effective July 1, 1945. A year later another raise was granted, but pay rates still lagged behind prices. Neither increase restored the 1939 buying value of rates of pay. This purchasing power must be restored at once in order to enable Government employees to live in accordance with decent American standards.

A year and a half has passed since the second increase, but the passing months have served only to emphasize its insufficiency and the need for increasing pay without further delay. Taking the years immediately prior to the outbreak of the war as the standard of measurement of value of the income of Government employees, and assuming that $1 bought a dollar's worth of the commodities they need, it is evident that it has been difficult—yes impossible—to meet the demands, in many cases, of even a subsistence plane of living.

Measured by the official price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the buying power of a dollar had shrunken to approximately 60 cents by the end of 1947. Thus, a Government employee has 60 cents to spend today as compared with $1 before the war. But that is his buying power as measured by the combined effect of all prices. When he buys food, the situation is even worse. And this is what confronts the married man who is the support of a family. By December 1947, his dollar for food alone was worth only 48 cents.

How much should pay be increased to provide some semblance of relief in the face of such an emergency? Why do I suggest $800? I have selected that figure because it can be substantiated factually as the minimum amount that would provide a reasonable addition to existing pay rates to bring them to a bare cost of living basis.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, there are several ways to approach the problem of determining how much the increase should be. Cost of living appears to be the most direct and sound method of ascertaining the amount pay should be raised. It may be pointed out that some of the arguments that may be used for workers in commerce and industry lose their force or significance when applied to Government workers. The latter cannot relate their request for salaries or wage increase to increased productivity, disproportionate profits of an employer, or industry's ability to pay.

It is true that Government employees' take-home pay has shrunken disastrously and that salaries and wages of persons employed in industry have advanced considerably. To relate the whole problem of the Government worker directly to the over-all cost of living provides the most direct method, as well as one which would cut across the variations in the plane of living, personal obligations and responsibilities, and those other factors that differentiate the single person from the married, and the person with no dependents from the man who must support a wife and children.

The $800 figure which I am urging as the minimum annual increase for Government employees has been determined on the basis of the average salary of $3,000. From July 1946 to the end of 1947 the price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which is used to measure living costs, rose from 133.3 to 167.0. It has been estimated that prices have undergone a further increase since the end of the year, with the result that the rise in living costs since July 1946 has been about 27 percent. To bring the salaries of Government employees up to a bare cost of living level, it will, therefore, be necessary to add 27 percent to existing pay rates. Twenty-seven percent of the average annual salary is slightly more than $800. I believe that an $800 increase will be fair to all employees, since it represents a figure based on average pay for the whole group.

It is reasonable to expect Mr. Chairman, that when further measures are taken by the Congress to control the upward advance of prices, these legislative actions will not halt the current advance abruptly, nor will prices drop appreciably below the present level for some time to come. To bring about such a decrease too rapidly would be dangerous to many phases of our national economy. This was recognized when Congress acted recently on the anti-inflation measure. Even if control is gained over the price rise, the Government employee—or any other worker—will still have a buying power far below that of prewar days. This is, in my opinion, evidence that basic pay rates should be raised at once and that $800 added to current rates provides an amount that will represent a minimum need for months to come.

I was delighted to learn that Mr. William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, had appeared before this subcommittee in support of this legislation and while I did not have the opportunity to hear his statement, if one may judge from the newspaper accounts, he made a very impressive argument in favor of substantial increases. His statement that "The way to get most efficient, economical, and high-quality work is compensation that will enable employees to live in accord with American standards and save for future needs," has my complete approval. Speaking as he does for more than 7,000,000 taxpayers, I believe he was voicing a collective opinion reflected throughout America on this subject.

Present day postal and Federal salaries are not sufficiently high to attract the best qualified people to Government employment and when that condition exists the public welfare must suffer. We should attract the highest type of people to Government service and it is not sufficient to offer them merely a subsistence wage that allows them to live in a state of shabby aristocracy, content in the knowledge that they are performing a service for all of the people.

It is my considered opinion and I wish to repeat what I have already stated, that the legislation to be enacted should be permanent legislation, providing for increases in the basic salary, and that such legislation should be retroactive at least until January 1 of this year in order to allow these employees to pay some of the debts which they have accumulated during the past year. I further believe that the long-established principle of enacting separate legislation for postal and other Federal employees should be continued. My information is that previous attempts to solve this problem by means of a single bill have led to difficulties of administration which should be avoided.

I, therefore, urge the enactment of legislation providing for a base pay increase of not less than $800 per annum for all employees of the Federal Government and the Government of the District of Columbia.

In addition to this, I urge an increase of income, or increased pay, for those employees not under wage boards, who are paid on a per hour or per diem basis of 40 cents per hour.

Furthermore, I would oppose any legislation which has for its purpose the absorption of any pay raises by: (1) Reduction in force; (2) extension of hours of work; (3) downgrading or reclassification for the purpose of saving money.

I urge my colleagues of the subcommittee to make an early report to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service so that we may take prompt action to correct the present situation, and while I am not one to suffer from the pangs which accompany a "pride of authorship," I hope you will give earnest consideration to H. R. 4727 and H. R. 4773.

Extension of Aid to China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

MARCH 3, 1948.

From: CINCFE, Tokyo, Japan, signed "MacArthur."

To: The Honorable CHARLES A. EATON, chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Information: Department of Army (CSUSA).

I am grateful to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives for the confidence reflected in its desire that I appear before it to give my views on American policy in the extension of aid to China. The pressure of my operational duties in the administration of Japan especially at this time of change in the Japanese Government, however, renders it impracticable for me to leave my post. And even were it otherwise, I gravely doubt that I could give constructive and helpful advice as to details involved in pending aid proposals, which I have not seen nor had any opportunity to study. China, as you perhaps know, is a theater of United States Navy control, outside the scope of my existing authority. I have no representatives there, and, apart from general background knowledge, such detailed information as has been made available to me has been derived largely by indirection. Exhaustive investigations of the Chinese situation have been made by responsible United States officials, but these studies are not within my channel of information or command, and in consequence I am not adequately familiar therewith. I have, furthermore, not had the opportunity to visit China for many years. With this background, you will readily perceive I am not in a position to render authoritative advice with reference to the myriad of details on which a definitive policy for this particular area must necessarily rest.

In general answer to your specific questions, I can say without the slightest hesitation that a free, independent, peaceful, and friendly China is of profound importance to the peace of the world and to the position of the United States. It is the fundamental keystone to the Pacific arch. Underlying all issues in China is now the military problem. Until it is resolved, little progress can be expected toward internal rehabilitation, regardless of the extent of outside aid. Once it is resolved, however, there is little doubt but that China's traditional resiliency will provide the basis for rapid recovery to relative stability.

The Chinese problem is part of a global situation which should be considered in its entirety in the orientation of American policy. Fragmentary decisions in disconnected sectors of the world will not bring an integrated solution. The problem insofar as the United States is concerned is an overall one and can only be resolved on the broadest possible global basis. It would be utterly fallacious to underrate either China's needs or her importance. For if we embark upon a general policy to bulwark the frontiers of freedom against the assults of political despotism, one major frontier is no less important than another, and a decisive breach of any will inevitably threaten to engulf all. Because of deep-rooted racial and cultural and business ties, we are prone to overconcentrate on happenings and events to our east and to underemphasise the importance of those to our west. America's past lies deeply rooted in the areas across the Atlantic but the hope of American generations of the future to keep pace with the progress of those of the past lies no less in the happenings and events across the Pacific. While fully availing ourselves of the potential to the east, to our western horizon we must look both for hope of a better life through yet untapped opportunities for trade and commerce in the advance of Asiatic races, and threat against the life with which we are even now endowed. For beyond horizon upon the outcome of the ideological struggles in which opposing forces are now engaged and the restoration of political, economic, and social stability, rests war or peace, assurance or threat, hope, or fear.

The international aspect of the Chinese problem unfortunately has become somewhat clouded by demands for internal reform. Desirable as such reform may be, its importance is but secondary to the issue of civil strife now engulfing the land, and the two issues are as impossible of synchronization as it would be to alter the structural design of a house while the same was being consumed by flame. Friendly and searching as our interest may be in the reformation of China's institutions and practices to bring them closer into line with our own concept of liberty and justice, and right and wrong, the maintenance of China's integrity against destructive forces which threaten her engulfment is of infinitely more immediate concern. For with the firm maintenance of such integrity, reform will gradually take place in the evolutionary processes of China's future.

The flow to China of military supplies surplus to our own requirements has been resumed. Additional material support should be measured in equitable relation to such global aid as may be determined upon in the orientation of American policy, without underrating the strategic importance to us, as to the world, of a free and peaceful China, without ignoring her impoverishment and fatigue in consequence of so many years of violent struggle over her soil, without failing accurately to assess her potential in the stability and advancement of our own future standard of life, and without neglecting to recognize our long and friendly relationship, well tested through years of peace and years of war.

In the determination of our global policy care must, of course, be exercised to avoid commitment of our resources beyond what we can safely spare—the sapping of our national strength to the point of jeopardy to our own security—and the overburdening of

our people beyond their capacity to maintain a standard of life consistent with the energies with which they are naturally endowed. For it would be illogical for us to yield our own liberties in the safeguard of the liberties of others—to forfeit our own heritage of freedom in securing the freedom of others. No less illogical would it be to extend our material aid beyond hope of reciprocal repayment through contribution in one form or another to human progress. For it would not serve our purpose merely to create in return for our sacrifice a condition of indigence and mendicancy elsewhere, to become a brake upon human advancement.

It is one of the traditional characteristics of the American people that in time of great crises they have never failed to rise to masterful height to meet the challenge of the time. Never before has our wise, fearless, and positive leadership of a confused world been more needed as a stabilizing influence. Never before have the American people been more ready to assist others if it be a purposeful sacrifice. For we on American soil bare before the eyes of the entire world the working of a way of life which, despite the veil of confusion and disorder and self-serving ambition, is the cherished hope and goal of all mankind. Let us above all else preserve it.

Schedule of Vested Property Returned as Included in Return Orders as at February 6, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some information which has been furnished me by the Alien Property Custodian.

SCHEDULE OF VESTED PROPERTY RETURNED AS INCLUDED IN RETURN ORDERS AS AT FEBRUARY 6, 1948

Enrique Kummerfeldt, a/k/a Enrique Kummerfeldt Koops; a/k/a H. Kummerfeldt: 362 shares of common capital stock and $26,426 in cash.

David Jona: A one-fourth interest in a patent.

Fritz Hohenemzer: $7,753.68 in cash.

Helene Zentgraf: $3,442.54 in cash and life interest in trust.

Georges Joseph Christian Simenon: Copyright and royalties in the amount of $8,483.79.

The First National Bank of Chicago, administrator with the will annexed of the estate of Alfred Quensel: $30,861.84 in cash.

Rudolf A. Sems: $1,658.96 in cash.

Clarence A. Hearley: A one-half interest in a patent.

Lawrence Harbury: A patent.

Henry J. Beal: $111.76.

Joachim Kolbe: 9 patents.

Rose Latino, Agnes Latino, Frank Latino, Biagie Latino, Carmela Latino: $1,229.37 in cash and real estate.

Stephanie Schyblisky Posament: $2,066.49 in cash.

Josephine M. Lorsch: $14,197.57 in cash.

Henri Wouter Jonkhoff: Four patents.

Underwood Corporation: 59 patents.

Emma Lochner: $12,853.58 in cash.

Herman H. Frischer: 7 patents.

Karl W. Posnansky: A patent.

Raoul Roland Raymond Sarazin: Three patents.

Joseph Mahler: A patent.

The Sancdarm Co., Inc.: A patent.

Francoise Seignobosc: Copyrights and royalties in the amount of $2,198.87.

Raymond Saulnier: 11 patents.

Standard Brands, Inc.: A patent.

Titan Co., Inc.: A patent.

Hensea Corp.: $16,264.14 in royalties and 40 percent interest in the property.

American Chain & Cable Co., Inc.: A patent.

Antonina Vallentine Luchaire: Copyrights and royalties in the amount of $23,182.63.

Builders Iron Foundry: A patent.

Shell Development Co.: A patent.

Ottmar Loew (formerly Ottmar Makoto Loew): A one-half interest in a patent.

Ellis Miller: 4 patents.

Eastman Kodak Co.: A patent.

Rolf Bie: A patent.

Dr. August von Borosini: A patent.

Radio Corp. of America: A patent.

Kislyn Corp.: 7 patents.

Charles N. Ehrlich: A patent.

R. Hoe & Co., Inc.: A patent.

The Light Conditioning Co. of America, Inc.: A patent.

Pyrene Development Corp. (formerly Pyrene-Minimax): A patent.

Herbert Raymond Loder: $5,776.36 in cash and a life interest.

Albert H. Stronstorff: A patent.

Societe Nationale des Chemins de fer Francais: $207,199.61; $30.04; $613.21; $111,487.43; $4,817.70 in cash; $52,000 Kingdom of Belgium 6 percent bonds and $80,000 Kingdom of Belgium 6½ percent bonds; and other miscellaneous property.

Clair L. Fairand: A patent.

Andrew A. Kramer: A patent.

Dr. Walter R. Hearst (formerly Dr. Walter Herz): A patent.

Maywood Chemical Wks.: 9 patents.

The Singer Manufacturing Co.: A patent.

Jackson & Perkins Co.: 2 patents.

The Celotex Corp.: 2 patents.

Christian Heinrich Hofsess: $128.50 in cash.

Walter M. Weis: A patent.

Bagpak, Inc.: 2 patents.

The Bates Manufacturing Co.: A patent.

Celanese Corp. of America: A patent.

Petrolite Corp., Ltd.: A patent.

Rudolph Waldman: A patent.

Rudolph Grodetzky and Paul Schleissner, co-partners, doing business as Uneeda Notions Manufacturers: A patent.

Emil Zipper: 3 patents.

Verne Haas: A patent.

International Shoe Co.: A patent.

California Spray-Chemical Corp.: A patent.

Walter H. Lowston: A patent.

Hans Lewin: 2 patents.

Ingersoll-Rand Co.: A patent.

James P. Robinson: A patent.

The Philippine Manufacturing Co.: 6 patents.

Arno Brasch: 5 patents.

Gaston Desagnat: 6 patents.

Arnold Janowitz: A patent.

Paul Nickelsberg: A patent.

Franz Schatzky: A patent.

Arthur M. Seligman: 7 patents.

Delamere Co., Inc.: A patent.

Norbert Bernheimer: A patent.

Max Jacoby: A patent.

Inter-Allied Patent Corp.: A patent.

Harriot Daly Sigray: $40,827.36 and $4,985.02 in cash, and life interest in trust, remainder interest under will, and bequest of personalty and one-fourth interest in residue.

E. A. M. Biering: $67,066.55 in cash.

Elizabeth P. King: $9,058.12 in cash and an interest in real estate.

Amalie Frese: $874.69.

Emil Reichert: 19 shares of stock and $126.79.

Julien Dungler: Two patents and $16,960.

Anemostat Corp. of America: One patent.

Nichibei Kinema Co.: 135 Japanese films.

Erica and Hagbarth Rotheim: Six patents and $1.

Aaron & Dautch: $266.50.

Kremer & Leavitt: $237.32.

John L. Nicholas: $246.83.

Barbara Gwiazdowski: One copyright and $218.36.

Sophie Carpenter Gordigiani: $7,696.69 and interest in two trust estates.

Babette Brehm: $167 and a one-ninth interest in real property.

Staatsbedrijf der Posterijen Telegrafie en Telefonie: One patent.

Alfred Edouard Lamarthe: One patent and $4,138.98.

Gaston Fleischel: 13 patents.

Serge Koussevitzky: $4,208.10 and one copyright.

Erminia Binda: $5,362.46 and real property.

Leslie Co.: One patent.

Kurt M. Vogel: 13 patents.

Carolyn Kent di Robilant: $599.31 and $22,213.59, real property and securities.

Elizabeth Lewin: One patent.

Societe Normande de Produitz Chimiquez: Two patents.

Isaac Frenkel: One patent.

Diedrich and Anna Burgdorff: $8,834.26.

Laura Guenebaum-Oppenheim: $7,802.65 and interest in a trust.

Heberlein Patent Corp: Six patents.

Puiseux, Boulange: et Cie, Societe en Commandite par Actions (formerly known as Michelin et Cie): 14 patents.

Oesterreichische Magnesit A. G.: Six patents and 1,886 shares of $100 par value preferred stock.

Rafael Gimenez Ruiz Makati, Rizal: One patent.

Walter C. Voss: Seven patents.

Ella Miller: One patent.

Anna Andreyev: One copyright and $790.56.

Jeanne Marguerite Badaire: One copyright and $526.68.

Etienne Gilson: Two copyrights and $1,372.83.

Marie Eugenie Decourbey Goguel: One copyright and $868.98.

Martha Loeb Bonatz: $2,675.15 and interest in a trust.

Gisela Altschul: $1,626.21.

Yettchen Behr: $1,853.01, one $1,500 United States Treasury 2¾-percent bond, and interest in one trust.

Max Hoch: Nine shares of stock, and $657.

Era McMurtrie Licari: Interest in one trust and $1,490.14.

Louis Marx & Co., Inc.: One patent.

Ludvik Rasch: Two patents.

Nicholaus Per Mathiesen: One patent.

Millicent Drake: $15,948.67; 5 shares valued at $600; 7 shares valued at $897; 3 paintings and 21 pieces of jewelry.

Franz Vasarhelyi: One patent.

Consolidated Amusement Co., Ltd.: 105 Japanese films.

Adelma Dennini: Three parcels of real property; $73,817.14.

List of larger title claims based on claimants' valuation

Aktiebolaget Vargos	$120,375.00
Ater Jorskringa Aktiebolaget	201,230.00
Ernest E. Bing	60,960.00
Grete Blas	50,000.00
Charles Bruening Co., Inc.	85,146.16
Forsakringsaktiebolaget	176,250.00
General Aniline & Film Corp.	12,193,190.98
Societe de Prospection	411,000.00
SA des Ateliers Brullie Freres	90,000.00
Societe des Usines Chimiques Rhone Poulenc	333,255.00
Hongkong & Shanghai Banking Corp	64,911.15
Hope & Co., Continental Handels Bank	349,771.02
Hermann H. Kind	89,074.11
Carl Schreiner	107,187.76
Shanghai Power Co	920,456.39
Brandjorsokrimeaktiebolaget Veritas Svenska	215,781.00
W. Sobernheim	137,624.12

Shanghai Power Co	$211,318.51
James F. Egan	187,179.74
Jean Jobert	150,000.00
Societe Rodiaceta	2,500,000.00
Compagnies Reunies des Glaces	190,000.00
Hans Biederbach	68,405.48
Everett Arlon	62,000.00
Fanny Palmer	100,000.00
Establissments & Laboratories Georges	51,033.94
Bruno Carl Reinicke	250,000.00
Bank Waldenswil	100,000.00
Leo Zittman	148,000.00
Sterling Carr	66,892.65
Combined Investment Corp	187,500.00
Alexander C. Dencks	62,000.00
Frank A. Chambers	164,111.42
Nagamo Kaku	75,000.00
H. M. Garibaldi	170,453.23
Karl Wurth	77,484.03
Hong Kong & Shanghai Banking Corp	70,000.00
Louis Pieroni	192,000.00
Homer L. Loomis	152,000.00
Annette Schlubach	105,000.00
Shinzaburo Sumida	70,000.00
Daizo Sumida	50,000.00
Ina Luisa Gurau	165,000.00
Eller Moltke Huitfeldt	50,000.00
Industrielle Maatschappij Activit N. V	136,000.00
Ruth Francke	200,000.00
Ottilie Francke Muller	200,000.00
Title Guarantee & Trust Co., Temp. Admr. Est. Emma A. C. H. Schraeder	86,000.00
Elektro Kemisk A/S	1,500,000.00
Hermine K. Hassencamp	58,000.00
Ellen Biddle von Stackelberg	166,000.00
L. Z. von Vietinghoff	175,000.00
Banco de Sicilia	173,000.00
Max Philippsohn	67,000.00
Yuri Yojuna	100,000.00
Otto Hass	560,000.00
David Kamerman	70,000.00
Dr. Leonardo Cerini	50,000.00
Irene Albert	493,000.00
Servo-Frein Newandre S. A	82,400.00
Superflexit	97,337.71
Ford Motor Co	63,345.57
Helmut Legerlotz	500,000.00
Nordisk Insulin Laboratorium	600,000.00
Societe des Usines Chimique Rhone Poulenc	170,606.00
Maria J. von Tongeren Boers	54,618.15
Societe Anonyme de Manufacture et Produits Chimiques de St. Gobain	190,000.00
Latvian Cargo & Passenger Steamship Line	1,184,187.01
Nils Erik Lenander	75,000.00

Sampling of larger debt claims filed

	Amount alleged to be owed
J. P. Morgan & Co	$91,305,600.00
Do	59,633,400.00
Do	20,000,000.00
Rudolf Steiner	344,800.00
Stanco, Inc	255,489.30
Bank of American National Trust & Savings Association	992,251.37
Guaranty Trust of New York	176,738.00
Lee Higginson & Co	1,133,364.71
Light Claus	8,000,000.00
John Henry and Dora Kahn	172,549.03
Joseph Z. Dalinda	1,390,000.00
Standard Vacuum Oil Co	439,843.75
Franz Oppenheimer	663,421.23
Siegfried Beeber	286,303.00
Broadway Exchange Corp	353,819.83
General Petroleum Corp	1,159,920.74
Guaranty Trust Co. of New York	4,587,925.00
Bank of America	1,315,274.38
Do	2,112,181.67
Do	1,066,160.47
Do	2,283,979.24
Do	992,251.37
Maj. William L. Luxton	$2,000,000.00
Manufacturers Trust Co	928,495.89
Do	845,792.70
Do	2,379,557.79
Do	984,230.19
Do	2,119,433.09
Do	1,380,830.29
Do	416,509.31
Waide C. Hiberly	
Hongkong & Shanghai Bank Corp	200,000.00
Do	373,805.35
Hermann Hummell	250,000.00
International Silk Guild, Inc	578,425.60
Japan Cotton & Silk Trading Co	500,000.00
Shirley Johnson	800,000.00
National City Bank of New York	16,694,726.44
Do	5,230,438.54
Do	6,318,185.46
Do	2,412,395.00
National Shawmut Bank of Boston	535,338.67
Do	735,996.89
Do	1,562,891.14
Do	1,448,607.99
Do	1,176,726.23
Do	1,098,587.00
Do	1,098,587.00
Do	1,098,587.00
Do	1,098,587.00
Do	1,098,587.00
Do	1,098,587.00
Do	843,556.94
Do	1,098,587.00
Do	1,448,607.99
Do	1,562,891.14
Do	1,098,587.00
Do	1,098,587.00
Do	1,448,607.99
Do	1,562,891.14
Do	1,098,587.00
New York Trust Co	1,237,335.37
Wilhelm Roth	442,000.00
Silesian-American Corp	3,216,130.18
61 Broadway Corp	595,972.16
Eric M. Warbury	1,955,495.53

A Thinking Citizen's View of the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, recently the Gallup poll reported that a majority of citizens who know about the Marshall plan are for it. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an excellent, thought-provoking letter received this morning from a young man in my district, Mr. Perry Ewing, Jr., of Columbia, Mo., explaining why he is against the Marshall plan. I dare say that the random poll above mentioned did not include many who had given serious thought to the plan but instead accepted the administration's propaganda on the radio, in the press, and in the movies. I quote:

COLUMBIA, MO., *March 1, 1948.*

Congressman MAX SCHWABE,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: It is gratifying to have the privilege to write to one of the lawmakers in this land of ours and express my heartfelt views on one of the major decisions now being considered there in Washington, the Marshall plan.

Some time ago you sent me a questionnaire, contained therein and the last question was "Do you favor enactment of the Marshall plan?" I am sorry to say that I neglected at the time to return this questionnaire to you. Then and now I am still against the enactment—the Marshall plan.

Here is why I am against it. It is not sound economy. It is not sound politics. It is not good business. It is not good international public relations. It constitutes a weak foreign policy. It would invoke a burden of sufficient magnitude on the American people to weaken America as a nation, draining twenty billions in national resources, labor, transportation, and all the other complexities involved in such an undertaking of this magnitude.

It is not sound economy because the coal, iron, grain, and raw materials can never be replaced and we will be weakened as a future producing Nation. Our future lies in a strong economy here at home and exploitation of our national resources now means less in the future. I am thinking of America now and her future position as a world power.

It is not sound politics because American goods delivered under the Marshall plan go to various foreign governments, who in turn sell our products to their citizenry. The French peasant and the Italian office worker have to pay for the American goods. Were I in their position I would feel embittered toward a country who supposedly promises to give, then through my own country charges for those commodities. Where the money goes makes little difference when I have little money to buy with and each meal is a hardship. I would not like it.

It is not good business because of our uncertain position at home. Our Army has practically evaporated and our Air Force and Navy are far below good protective strength. If we pour billions into certain European countries will we ever get any returns? I doubt it. If after spending three billion in Italy, some agressor nation decides to bring Italy into its sphere of influence, either by invitation, civil uprising, or outright walking in and taking over our three billion has definitely strengthened the resources of that aggressor nation. Should such a thing occur I don't think the United States could or would do anything about it. Our present policy in Palestine leads us to believe this would be the case. I can see where half the Marshall plan's appropriations could go this way and we would sit by and watch.

We paid for World War II in dollars and commodities to the tune of more than all the rest of the participants combined. We went to war because of German aggression. The 3 years since the war have brought a greater change in the map of Europe than all the years preceeding the war—and don't forget China and Asia on the other side.

The administration of the Marshall plan both here and abroad would be a gigantic task. I feel sure that graft, politics, and favoritism would run rampant in those foreign countries where this multitude of goods went.

Now, just suppose this vast amount of American wealth were used to strengthen economically such countries as Canada, Brazil, Mexico, and our other neighbors here in the Western Hemisphere, I believe we would have a greater bulwark against aggressor expansion and we could figure on some returns in aid. Economically and militarily in the event we are again faced with participation in a global war, this time it would be for our very way of life.

There is no way short of war in stopping Russian expansion in western Europe and in Asia for that matter. Diplomacy, compromise, and fair dealing, as we think of

them, are not in the Russian vocabulary. With them any means justifies the end.

Were I sitting in the Kremlin, I would like nothing better than to see the Marshall plan enacted. It would and will sweeten the plums on the European tree which I would be about to pick. If I could get all the wealth of America scattered in Europe, then control that Europe, there would be no need for me to worry about the potentialities of America as a dominant force in world affairs.

I am speaking as a taxpayer now. I would rather give my additional taxes that will be imposed upon me if the Marshall plan is enacted to the Canadian Government than pay them to the Collector of Internal Revenue here and have him turn them (indirectly) over to Russia.

Thanks for listening.

Sincerely yours,

PERRY EWING, Jr.

How Loud Is the Farmer's Voice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that many Members of Congress will want to read the article which appeared in the February issue of the Southern Agriculturist magazine entitled "How Loud Is the Farmer's Voice?" It is a careful analysis of the work done by the farm organizations here in Washington by officials of the three largest farm groups—Farm Bureau, Grange, and Farmers Union.

Wayne Darrow, who publishes his Washington Farmletter as a private weekly report for agriculturists and other businessmen, supplied the editors of the Southern Agriculturist magazine with most of the information about the farm organizations and how they present the opinion of their group on legislation pending in Congress. Mr. Darrow, a Texan from the district I represent, is highly qualified to report on agricultural matters and it is a pleasure to commend him for this careful study of farm organizations.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the article entitled "How Loud Is the Farmer's Voice?" which was published in the February issue of the Southern Agriculturist magazine:

HOW LOUD IS THE FARMER'S VOICE?—THE LANGUAGE OF THE CROSSROADS IS CLEAR AND AUTHORITATIVE BY THE TIME IT REACHES WASHINGTON—WILL CONGRESS LISTEN TO YOUR SPOKESMAN?—AND WHAT WILL HE SAY?

(By the editors of Southern Agriculturist)

The power of organizations is the greatest influence on Federal legislation. Sometimes this power is used rightly—sometimes not. How is the power you lend your farm organization used? In your name, all manner of laws are passed, rulings made, programs built.

Politically, the farmer has come of age in the last 20 years. He has done it through organization.

His strength is at the grass roots, but his voice is heard clearly in the halls of Congress, in the White House study, and in the corridors of the south Agriculture Building.

The farm spokesmen most recognized in Washington are the Big Three general farm organizations—Farm Bureau, Grange, Farmers' Union.

Next to them in importance, notably on specialized marketing issues, are the National Council of Farm Cooperatives and the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Association.

The Big Three have a combined membership representing about 1,250,000 of the 4,000,000 farmers whose primary occupation is farming. Farm Bureau claims 1,275,000 members; Grange, 825,000; Farmers Union, 145,000. Outsiders estimate the farmers represented by each in the rough ratio of 7-3-1: Bureau, Grange, Union.

Next to the Midwest, the South is the stronghold of the Farm Bureau. There the Grange and Farmers Union are weak. The South, with about half the total United States farm population, has only one-quarter of the total Big Three farm organization membership.

Yet the South, with its strong southern farm bloc in Congress, for years has swung a preponderant weight in national farm affairs, despite the inclination of many Southern States to ignore the lead of their national group.

Like labor, agriculture is only about 40 percent organized. Add in co-op membership and it won't run above 50 percent. And like organized labor, organized agriculture is badly split. Farm leaders find it hard to agree on more than a few things.

In spite of family quarrels, and of being a minority group in society, agriculture is no longer the Nation's underdog. The Big Three can point with pride to a long list of laws—mostly constructive—to the fast-growing co-op movement, to strong influence in local affairs, and to its farm lobbies, rated the most potent in Washington.

Farm Bureau has the most influence in the Capitol, but not as much as a few years ago. The Grange has come to the front fast, especially since Republicans captured Congress.

Farm Bureau's setback—perhaps only temporary—is chiefly due to antagonisms aroused among some Congressmen and in other farm groups by its hard driving pressure politics. The Bureau overplayed its very strong hand.

Led for years by likable Ed O'Neal, of Alabama, with tireless Ray Ogg doing the spadework, the Bureau pressed hard to win its points, knew all the tricks of the trade, and used them.

The Farm Bureau now has a new president. The resignation of O'Neal, the Alabamian, was accepted last December, and an Iowan, Allan Kline, who had been vice president, was elected to sit in the top chair. R. E. Short, of Arkansas, was elected vice president.

What Kline's new leadership may mean can only be a matter of conjecture this soon. Moreover, the Farm Bureau is anything but a one-man organization, and it's not likely to undergo any violent changes in its system or "tactical warfare" just because the venerable O'Neal has departed and someone else is the chief.

On the other hand, Kline, although a comparatively silent sort of man in the past, is generally believed to be more liberal in his views than his predecessor from Montgomery—and some effect of this newer farm philosophy is likely to be seen, sooner or later, in the principles and practices of the Bureau.

Even more specific, there's a decisive geographical difference in these two men's background. Alabama is definitely not Iowa, not even agriculturally speaking, and this presidential hop from Montgomery to Des Moines may be an important factor in the Bureau's future.

But the way the Farm Bureau gets things done isn't going to change. It's a highly efficient organization. It puts in its best licks back among its county membership. There, in each Congressman's district, the fires are laid and nourished by the local farm bureaus. In Washington, the Farm Bureau lobby waits just long enough for the Congressmen to feel the fire getting hot—then it moves in to get action.

The American Farm Bureau Federation threatens no Congressman's political life—that's done back home.

Farm Bureau communication lines from grass roots to Washington are fast, and the whole pressure system is remarkably effective. On a more limited scale, Farmers Union uses the same tactics.

The Grange communication lines into Washington operate more slowly, and pressure politics are avoided. The Grange makes a point of never asking Congressmen to vote its way. Its lobbyists simply explain the organization's position, and let it go at that.

The Grange swings political power, just the same. Throughout the long Democratic regime, its leadership has rated here as predominantly Republican. This is natural since its membership is heaviest in the normally GOP dairy, poultry, livestock, and fruit and vegetable areas of the Northeast, Lake, and Midwest States, and the Pacific Coast. When the GOP took over Congress the Grange just naturally had the inside track.

National master of the Grange is Albert Goss, as quiet and cautious as Ed O'Neal was colorful and bold, or as Farmers Union's Jim Patton is forceful and eloquent.

Two southerners have great influence in National Grange headquarters in Washington: Fred Bailey, publicity director, and ex-newspaperman from Texas, and Dr. J. T. Sanders, legislative representative, a former professor of economics at Oklahoma A. and M. College.

Farmers Union influence in Congress is mostly through left-wingers—of whom only a handful remain. This is one reason the union cut its Washington staff to one man—Russel Smith, a Georgian. (The Grange has 14, the Farm Bureau, 9.)

Where the Bureau is rich, and Grange well-off, the union is poor. It is small in membership, and its dues are low. Its ideal is the family-type farm, and it champions the small farmer.

Second oldest of the three, founded in Texas in 1902, Farmers Union's greatest strength is in the Great Plains. North Dakota is its No. 1 State. This may explain its radical tradition, for it is the plains that gave birth to populism, the farmer-labor movement, and the late Senator George Norris, "father" of TVA.

In Washington the union and its dynamic, young Coloradan president, Jim Patton, have strong backing from labor and liberal groups in the East. Some see this as the union's weakness—charge that it's stronger in New York City than in the Corn Belt.

Yet this backing, plus its plains strength and Patton's strong personality, have given the Farmers Union a national influence out of all proportion to its membership.

Patton himself is an eloquent speaker, a master of the bell-ringing phrase. Some examples:

"Every dollar of every price boost gives roughly 90 cents to those farmers who are better off and 10 cents to those who most need increased income * * * the children and the land are the long-time victims of rural poverty * * * while prices must be protected, something more needs to be done."

Grange leaders believe that the Farm Bureau's new president, Kline, thinks more nearly as they do on the fundamental difference between the two organizations—the part government should play in farm affairs.

The Farm Bureau would have the Government go much further in underwriting farm prices, and consequently regulating farm production, than would the Grange. The Grange sees the primary responsibility on the farmer, with the Government coming into the picture only when conditions get beyond control of the individual.

In the 1930's the Grange took little interest in AAA and other programs the Farm Bureau pushed. The Grange is old, conservative, and not easily excited.

The chief things Grange and Farm Bureau agree on are the new market research program, marketing agreements, protection for co-ops and the need for soil conservation—but there's complete disagreement on methods. The Farmers Union would also agree on these same things.

The Farm Bureau would abolish the Soil Conservation Service and turn it over pretty much to the Extension Service and state experiment stations. It has four bills in Congress to do this.

Both Grange and Farmers Union are fighting this—they always team up against the Farm Bureau on its tie-up with the Extension Service. They claim this is unfair public subsidization of one farm organization to the exclusion of the others.

Goss, however, at last November's annual session of the Grange at Columbus, Ohio, made a statement about soil conservation that deserved more attention than it got. It was plainly critical of the present system by which soil conservation work is carried on.

"One of our most serious domestic problems," he admitted, "is the continual drain on our soils largely through erosion. While we have made wonderful progress in soil conservation as compared with the past, we must recognize," he added, significantly, "that a system which pays cash bonuses to farmers for doing what good farmers ought to do anyway, and which does not reach land owners who persist in allowing their soils to wash away, can hardly be considered the basis for a sound, permanent program."

On the other hand, the Grange is fighting against and the Farmers Union is supporting the Farm Bureau fertilizer bill. This would expand Government fertilizer manufacture and distribute it cooperatively on a demonstration basis. Bureau and Union want more fertilizer and think it proper for the Government to help get it. Grange isn't against more fertilizer, but thinks private industry can supply it, and sees the bill as a step toward State socialism.

The Grange stands for accepted things like conservation, research, and hard money. It's not unprogressive, but moves cautiously. It makes much of its fraternal rites and local social affairs.

At the other extreme is the Farmers Union, which prides itself on having advanced ideas on most subjects. In McNary-Haugen days it went for cost-of-production. In New Deal days it fathered crop insurance and took the old Farm Security Administration under its wing.

During the war it urged full production by complete use of all land and labor down to the last sharecropper and Government contract with farmers to assure fair dealing. Now it advocates a cradle-to-the-grave farm program that promises more than any long-range program yet offered.

Between these two extremes stands the Farm Bureau, which comes nearer in its outlook to representing the business farmer than the others. This isn't to say the Bureau doesn't have many small farmers—perhaps more than any other organization—nor that the majority of Grange and Farmers Union members aren't business farmers.

It's simply that Farm Bureau councils seem most concerned with the economic needs of the growing class of business farmers.

Looking to the future, all three are more or less haunted by the farmer's fear of surpluses, but their responses are different. Farm Bureau would control production through AAA. Grange would adjust production by lowering price supports for surplus commodities. Farmers Union would avoid surpluses altogether by having the Government underwrite full industrial employment, consumption, and farm income.

On price supports, the Farm Bureau would keep them high; the Grange would have them low, but adjustable up or down; the Farmers Union would have the Government guarantee annual prices agreed upon every year by representatives of agriculture, consumers, and the Government.

All would push markets to the limit, but their limits differ. Farm Bureau would subsidize exports, but not domestic consumption. Grange opposes export subsidies, but in a pinch might agree to subsidize food for low-income groups. Farmers Union would do both. It sees no limit until hunger is banished from the earth.

As to farm programs, all three will fight to keep the Commodity Credit Corporation as the giant bank for farm price support. All would retain the farm credit system, but the Farm Bureau and Grange would make it independent of the Department of Agriculture. The Farmers Union would liberalize it, and slant it more to the needs of the small farmer.

All three back soil conservation, but vary on methods. All favor extension work, but the Grange and Farmers Union would divorce it from the Farm Bureau in States where there is a close tie-up.

Farm Bureau and Farmers Union believe in local farm program administration by elected farmer committees. The Grange, perhaps because it sees less need for Government programs, is lukewarm on this.

The Grange is the most conservative as to lowering tariff barriers and freer world trade; Farmers Union is the most liberal. All three agree in hearty support of Food and Agricultural Organization as the one United Nations agency which is agriculture's own. They see it as a means of improving world food production and distribution and of spreading agricultural know-how to all.

Each believes it is fair toward organized labor, but labor leaders usually rate the Farm Bureau and Grange as hostile. Farmers Union is outright prolabor. The view is growing among all, however, that labor is the farmer's chief customer, and that labor's record in support of farm measures is good.

The total different farms represented by members in southern agriculturist States, as claimed by each organization—subject to small reductions in Farm Bureau figures in a few States because of contributing members in towns and cities, and of scattering but unorganized Grange members unreported in a few States—are:

	Farm Bureau	Grange	Farmers Union
Alabama	55,111	----------	1,000
Arkansas	40,012	400	2,000
Florida	6,201	----------	----------
Georgia	45,922	----------	----------
Kentucky	37,179	----------	----------
Louisiana	7,919	----------	500
Mississippi	26,661	----------	----------
North Carolina	55,785	7,000	----------
Oklahoma	7,550	2,100	28,000
South Carolina	8,452	2,300	----------
Tennessee	27,823	1,200	400
Texas	18,653	2,000	1,500
Virginia	17,562	1,700	----------
West Virginia	13,227	1,200	----------
Total	378,068	17,900	33,500

Civil Rights Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am introducing into the Appendix of the RECORD a most thought-provoking article written recently by Wright Bryan, editor of the Atlanta Journal, Atlanta, Ga.

I am in hearty accord with what Mr. Bryan says with the reservation that I favor a white primary if such can be maintained within the framework of our Federal Constitution.

The article follows:

THE SOUTH HAS ONE BEST ANSWER IN CONTROVERSY OVER CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Wright Bryan)

The South can, if it will, make a more effective answer than any yet sounded to the clamor from other sections for forcible protection of civil rights.

That answer will come through actions, not words.

The South can see to it that Negroes are protected in their lives and property, their freedom of person and of speech, as well as other citizens are protected.

The South can insure its Negroes equal justice through police authorities and courts.

The South can grant to qualified Negroes the right to vote in all elections and deny the franchise to individual Negroes only on the same basis that unqualified white persons are denied it.

The South can provide for its Negroes education and public-health services and economic opportunity which will raise the living standards of all our people, white and black.

SOUTH MUST LEAD

The South can do all those things through its own leadership and with its own methods.

In many places and in many ways the South is moving toward those goals. Progress has been made and is being made—but not enough.

Until the South does those things for itself, we can expect to be the target of outside criticism and of unworkable plans for securing civil rights by Federal fiat.

Many of those outside demands are made for cheap or dangerous political purposes. No wonder the South denounces them.

Some of them, it must be conceded, are made by sincere and well meaning people who do not understand the effect of such controversy.

HERE IS TRAGEDY

The tragedy of it is that this insistence on sudden and forcible over-turning of deep-rooted customs, customs for which good reason exists, encourages and provides ammunition for political demagogues and self-serving apostles of violence.

It helps nobody but the hatemongers.

At the same time it makes immeasurably more difficult the task of southern men and women of good will who strive to deal with conditions fairly and justly and helpfully.

It arouses in some of them, and in many of the people with whom they must work, a spirit of antagonism instead of a spirit of cooperation.

They cannot afford, however, to let irritation and anger deflect them from their task.

The South must press forward for itself.

The best answer, the only effective answer the South can make to what is being said elsewhere is to set our own house in order.

POLITICIANS HAVE CHANCE

Southern political leaders who actually are as aroused as they claim to be can accomplish more by working within the South for improvement of our own conditions than by name-calling and threats of vengeance.

One of the clearest statements yet made of their need was in an editorial of the Arkansas Gazette, which said:

"There is still time, however, for the South to give an affirmative answer to its critics. We can do this by substituting intelligent, concerted action for the lip-service we have all too frequently given our own ideals of fair treatment for the Negro race. We can accept, without reservation, the special responsibility that falls upon the dominant race and discharge it in good faith, giving the Negro educational, economic, and political opportunities not because we are forced to but because we recognize his right to them. In this way, and only in this way, can we justify the principle of social segregation to which we are dedicated."

Tax Revision a Must in the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative, if this Nation is to remain strong and hold its leadership, that we must not lose sight of one very important fact that stands out in this confused situation of the national viewpoint.

There are so many things to think about in our now complex society, there are so many people demanding so much of government, there are so many people demanding a further concentration of power in Washington, and apparently a refusal to accept the responsibility that goes with citizenship of a State.

In this confusion, no more important matter must claim the attention of the American society than the revision of taxes. If the Nation is to grow and expand and employ labor and hold its place under our system of profits, we must have profits. Money must be rewarded, whether it be in the hands of a laborer or an investor, because it is the sum total of investors' money which makes expansion of American business, and this makes for permanent employment. And more than that, it makes for added employment. And so the question, Mr. Speaker, to me is clear-cut. The Nation must have tax relief. That is a must for the Eightieth Congress.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial taken from the Bismarck Tribune, Bismarck, N. Dak., of March 1, 1948:

TAX REVISION NEEDED

No truer words were ever spoken than those uttered recently by Gwilym A. Price, president of Westinghouse Electric Co., when he said: "If the dynamic business pace which this country has experienced since the end of World War II is to continue, there is a very real need to stimulate the investment of equity or venture capital in industry."

Everyone with common sense will agree with this since continued expansion is vital to the successful operation of the capitalistic system. It is the only way we can insure jobs and maintain a high standard of living.

As Mr. Price points out, investment capital now is taxed twice; first as a corporation tax and second as a tax on the individual who receives dividends. His proposed remedy is to exempt from tax liability dividends received by stockholders.

A better way would be to exempt corporations from taxation on that portion of their income paid out as dividends. It might require a bigger tax-collecting machine to do the job, but it would be fairer and would have the added benefit of making every individual fully aware of the taxes which he pays.

In any event, regardless of the way it is done, we must find some practical method of keeping the investment system going. The alternative is eventual changes in our basic system of operations.

The Palestine Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the very interesting and timely statement of Harold L. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, entitled "Man to Man":

MAN TO MAN
(By Harold L. Ickes)

The question of Palestine involves more than giving the Jews the abbreviated homeland that has been promised them. The good faith and honor of the British Empire is involved. More important still, from our point of view, the good faith and honor of this country is involved.

Nor do these tell the tale. The very life of the United Nations and its promise for world peace, even though at times feeble, may depend upon what happens in Palestine during the next few months.

Every American knows that the Balfour Declaration, issued at the end of the First World War, promised Palestine to the Jews as a homeland. This was underwritten by the United States. Moreover, it had the approval of the Arab leaders of that day. Then during the late war, Great Britain, by its iniquitous white paper, brought to a stop the immigration into Palestine. The United States meekly acquiesced in this betrayal.

Then the Arabs, when the Allies had freed them from the Ottoman Empire, became truculent. They insisted that a stop be put to Jewish immigration into the Holy Land. There was a time, after the latest defeat of Germany, when Great Britain and the United States, acting in concert, or even separately, might have grasped this Arab nettle firmly and insisted upon enforcing the original agreement as expressed in the Balfour paper. But these two strong nations stood with quaking knees before a few weak Arab tribes.

A commission of inquiry composed of British and Americans visited Palestine. Bevin had promised that if this commission should make a unanimous report, Great Britain would agree to it. It did make a unanimous report, but again Great Britain broke faith. The United States, through President Truman, pretended to accept this report, at least to the extent that 100,000 homeless Jews be at once admitted to Palestine. But President Truman, if he meant what he said, did nothing to make good on his promise.

Then the question came before the United Nations, which set up another committee consisting of representatives of some of the smaller nations of the world. This committee visited Palestine and recommended that there be created two independent states, one Jewish and one Arab. This proposal was accepted by the United Nations, including Russia. The Jews were willing to take the half loaf instead of the whole one that had been promised.

Ever since this agreement the Jews have been calling for action. They have wanted the United Nations to send to Palestine at least a token police force, which, of course, would include Russians. However, the UN continues to sit supinely while the only action taken by the virile United States has been to refuse the Jews the right to purchase arms for the defense of the territory that the United Nations has decreed should be theirs. But the Arabs, who are the aggressors against Palestine, are able to buy arms to use against the Jews.

Here is an international scandal of the first order. Here is weak indirection. Again is the United States in default of its good faith and honor. Again has a road to a hell on earth been paved with good intentions. Meanwhile, President Truman pretends to be supporting the partition of Palestine. He represents to the Jewish leaders in the United States that he favors redressing the wrongs of their people.

But this cannot be real, because it is the Secretary of Defense, James V. Forrestal, who, under cover, to be sure, is leading a belligerent fight for the Arabs. It is Secretary Forrestal, who, in whispered conversations with congressional leaders on the Hill and at cocktail parties, is attempting to defeat the supposed objective of his chief, the President, with respect to Palestine.

If President Truman is sincere in his concern for the shrunken Palestine as a homeland for the hapless Jews of the world, he will call in his Secretary of Defense and tell him sternly that he will either be loyal or get out. He will also tell Mr. Forrestal that he does not credit the statement that he made to the press last week that he is not opposing the partition of Palestine, because he has been doing that very thing.

And in his opposition, he has the enthusiastic support of at least part of the staff of Secretary of State Marshall, which is also attempting to run with the hares while hunting with the hounds. President Truman is entitled to loyalty in his own Cabinet, just as Secretary Marshall is entitled to loyalty in his Department. Neither is getting it. But either can put a stop to disloyalty, if that is what he wants to do.

Secretary Forrestal is trying to defeat the legitimate aspirations of the Jews for reasons of security, which in this instance means the oil of the Middle East, particularly that in Saudi Arabia. But where, I venture to ask Secretary Forrestal, would the Arabs be able to sell their oil for dollars except to American companies, and how long would Saudi Arabia be able to exist economically if it were not for the royalties that it gets for its oil?

The War Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a thoughtful letter from Dean A. W. Smith, of Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cockeville, Tenn.:

TENNESSEE POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
Cookeville, Tenn., March 1, 1948.

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GORE: Russia must be stopped now. This is a mighty duel between her and the United States. Dillydallying will be fatal. It may mean war of the most vicious character with us making the first move in the dark. The day of ethics in war has gone. When one deals with the devil he must use devilish means.

The United Nations cannot work with the present world condition. That organization is based on democracy and Russia does not fit into it top side or bottom and cannot. It is ridiculous to think of a dictatorship playing democracy. If Russia were knocked out, the rest of the nations would immediately join the UN and it would work at least for years to come. Nothing, perhaps, will keep peace forever.

When Russia says she must have security she means against us and that means she must control Europe, Africa, and Asia.

The time and method used by us in the next war cannot be made known to the American public nor discussed publicly in Congress. The destiny of every American is in the hands of the Government and that Government must act largely without his knowledge or previous consent. I do not want to know what is being done but I do want to know that the Government has the knowledge, the courage and determination to strike when and where unheralded, if necessary, to make us secure.

When we lose there will be no trials. Nothing but calling of names and crack of rifles. We are in it up to our eyes and we must see the world through. We are the only ones who can. The world is praying not so much to God as to America.

Good luck.

AUSTIN W. SMITH.

Helpless Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Helpless Finland." Finland's tragic difficulty today arises primarily from the vicious unilateral treaty that was forced upon her by the Russians prior to the end of World War II.

The editorial follows:

HELPLESS FINLAND

Finland's helplessness makes the Soviet insistence upon a military alliance with Finland a tragic joke. Under the peace treaty the thousand-mile frontier with Russia was so rearranged that Finland could neither attack Russia nor defend herself from Russia. In the south, Karelia, the traditional gateway, is now Russian; in the center, the Finnish waistline was so narrowed as to make it easy for Russia to cut the country in two; in the north, the Russians made adjustments allowing of swift control. In addition the Gulf of Finland was Russified, and the capital at Helsinki was put within Russian cannon's reach by acquisition of a military base at Porkkala. Yet the Russians insist on new military guaranties. The reason lies in the Stalinist fear-struck phobia militarily to consolidate the territory behind the iron curtain and to bludgeon oppositionists into compliance or silence.

It is sad to see all independence in process of extinguishment in a country which raised itself after its liberation, consequent upon the First World War, into an ideal commonwealth. In 1939, when Russia fell upon Finland, the decline started, for Finland suffered great losses in manpower and resources. The decline was accelerated by the fresh travail incurred when Finland was dragged into a new war with Russia after the German assault upon Russia. Since the pence the Finns, perhaps the hardest working people in the world, have been trying to pay the reparation bill imposed by Moscow. They were resigned to the task, and the Soviet Union, so far as can be discovered, had nothing to complain about. But the Soviet seemingly cannot afford even the possibility of a tug-of-war behind the iron curtain. Even the nominal independence left to Finland is something that cannot be tolerated. As one country after another is ground under the Slav heel, the lesson for the free world is clear. It is to unite before it is too late. The Kremlin will not be satisfied as long as there is any liberty left anywhere.

Pay Raises for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert my testimony before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, advocating favorable action on pay-raise legislation for Post Office Department and other Federal employees:

Mr. Chairman, during the past few weeks I have received a great many communications from my constituents, stressing the need for legislation to grant salary increases to postal workers, as well as other Federal employees.

Whenever the cost of living rises, as it has been doing for the past few years, we know that persons living on fixed incomes suffer most. While some workers are able to secure raises to offset the higher living costs, those persons whose salaries are fixed by law, have a difficult time in keeping up with the rising prices.

The last increase in salary seemed adequate at the time, but soaring prices have far outstripped increased wages. The trend in living costs is definitely upward, and likely to remain so. The tremendous loss in buying power in the last few years has created undue hardships on the majority of Government workers.

In a great many cases, salaries are not sufficient to provide even the bare necessities of life. Many Federal employees have found it necessary to cash their bonds and use what little savings they had. Many have had to secure outside employment, in addition to their Government work. The present inadequate salaries deny them their rightful participation and their equitable share in the material and social prosperity of our times.

It is true there has been a slight decline in food prices within the past few weeks, but the decline has been so slight that it is insignificant. Furthermore, this small decline has been more than offset by the rise in the cost of other consumer items, such as clothing, fuel, household products, etc.

We expect efficient work from Federal employees. But they certainly cannot do their best work when they are living under an economic and financial strain, or when they are compelled to hold more than one job to make ends meet.

We cannot expect Government employees to hope and pray that prices will return to normal, or prewar levels. There is no indication that they will. Workers in private industry resort to strikes to gain an increase in wages, but Government workers cannot do that. They must wait patiently until the realization dawns on the Members of Congress that if we wish to maintain governmental efficiency, we must grant living wages. They are asking, and have a right to expect, a salary that will permit them to live according to our American standards.

I am sure that statistics have been cited many times during these hearings and that they will prove the need for salary increases.

I am convinced that an increase of not less than $800 is fully justified at this time; and feel that in the consideration of appropriation bills for the coming fiscal year, sufficient funds should be appropriated to provide for the increases.

It is my sincere hope that the committee will approve a bill to make possible the much-needed salary increases.

Water Power "Sparks" a Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article, which appeared in the magazine section of the Christian Science Monitor of February 28, 1948; and a letter I received from Mr. P. O. Davis, Director of Extension Service, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala., dated February 28, 1948:

WATER POWER "SPARKS" A TOWN—DECATUR, ALA., RISES FROM SLUMP AND BECOMES "SUCCESS STORY"

(By Sidney Ross)

Towns go bankrupt for various reasons. It happened to Decatur, Ala., a community of some 20,000 residents hugging the Tennessee River, in the northern part of the State.

It happened in 1931. Decatur, already staggering from the effects of the depression, just folded up when its one real industry, the Louisville & Nashville Railroad repair yards, closed. Employing 2,000 people whose pay checks literally supported the town, when the L. & N. moved away the glimmering hopes of Decatur's citizens went with it.

Not only the industrial workers and the business people of Decatur, but the hard-bitten "one crop" farmers were ready to call it quits. Many families packed up and moved away.

That was before Tennessee Valley Authority.

It's different now. Today the amazing transformation of this small southern city can be written in three short words: "TVA—Success Story."

Today Decatur, Ala., is a thriving and enthusiastic community with tremendous confidence in itself and its future. As Barrett

Sheldon, editor-publisher of Decatur's one newspaper—the Daily—puts it—"TVA showed us how to get up again after being knocked on the floor for what looked like keeps."

"It wasn't magic," continued Mr. Shelton, "TVA made us want to help ourselves. We have done just that."

TVA means many things to Decatur, and for that matter to all of the communities, large and small, in the shadow of the broad Tennessee River, which has been harnessed and put to work by the great Government project.

To the worker it has meant a job, because TVA has brought navigation to the Tennessee River and attracted varied industries employing many hundreds of people to Decatur.

To the housewife it has meant a better life, with cheap power and the resultantly phenomenal increase in use of modern electrical appliances.

To the farmer it has meant electric lights perhaps for the first time in his life, and soil conservation and new agricultural markets.

To the mother it has meant better conditions for her children.

To the occupant of low-lying land it has meant an end forever to the concern of flood.

Actually, all of these things are not separate. They are like the fingers of a hand working cooperatively and complementing each other—applying to every one alike, child and adult, farmer and businessman, worker and banker.

Most people think of TVA as synonymous with cheap power. Yes, TVA means that. But as the proprietor of a store on Decatur's Second Avenue explained: "They can take the power out of TVA if they want to. Just leave us the flood control and health improvement."

The store proprietor made this comment at the time last summer when the rampaging Mississippi and Missouri Rivers were wreaking destruction upon wide areas of the Middle West.

In 1934 (the first year of Decatur's coexistence with TVA), there were 29 industries in Decatur, employing 1,420 workers, with a total pay roll of $1,060,000.

The last report available as this was written was issued on September 1, 1946. It showed 81 industrial establishments, giving employment to 4,275 men (and women), Negro and white, with a total annual wage of $7,481,646, a better than 700 percent increase.

Bank deposits highlight an even more startling contrast. In 1933, Decatur's citizens were able to put away the none-too-impressive sum of $291,736. But during 1946, the bank-deposit slips added up to $17,154,462.

To Maynard Layman, Decatur Daily agricultural editor and effervescent one-man chamber of commerce for his home town, TVA's greatest accomplishment has been its sociological effect in transforming the thinking patterns of the people.

"In pre-TVA years," asserts Mr. Layman, "our people had one-track minds. Nobody much cared about the farmer, and the farmer didn't see further than his one crop—cotton. We thought only in terms of industry—factories. Now we think of farmer and industry in the same breath."

The result has been a healthy integration of farm and city economy. The farmer used to sweat out his 5-cent cotton and was at the mercy of the mills. The best that he could get for himself was a pair of overalls, no shoes. He got poorer and poorer and nobody had a solution.

"Look at this," said Mr. Layman, shuffling through a litter of papers, and finally coming up with his latest yearly agricultural report. "During 1946, farmers in the Decatur area received the sum of $15,644,219 for farm products marketed or processed through Decatur plants. Since TVA, the farmer has been really introduced to livestock and dairy herds; to better care of the soil, providing not only a longer staple (better grade) cotton, but also a diversification of crops."

Let's take a look at industry since TVA. Suppose we examine the case of the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., which located in Decatur in 1934 on what had been an old cotton patch.

Why did Ingalls, which thus became Alabama's first industrial development on the Tennessee River, choose Decatur? There was a good skilled-labor supply available from pre-TVA days, but without the new navigational facilities linking the city with the Gulf of Mexico, 1,300 miles away.

The Ingalls organization's 600 workers are busy these days turning out self-propelled river barges for the French Government. The barges are loaded in half sections on ships, floated to the Gulf, and then transported across the Atlantic.

Or examine the Southeastern Metals Corp., which operates the biggest aluminum press in the South. Southeastern began in 1945. Although it made Army canteens under contract for a while, it wasn't a war baby that grabbed big money and then quit.

From Army canteens they turned to Boy Scout camping kits. These days they're stamping out thousands of complete household utensils every week, from dishpans to dippers. They employ mostly women with no previous industrial experience.

Southeastern was started from scratch. Ask R. A. McMasters, vice president of the firm, why they picked Decatur to locate their plant and this is his answer:

"Sure, it was our home town. But more important, it had cheap power. Because of navigation on the river, we can get our raw product directly from Reynolds Alumium at Lister Hill, Ala., which exists itself only because of TVA. We used to get all of our household wares from the East. We're the first aluminum household-products manufacturer in the South. We sell our products not only locally (at a saving to our people), but also all over the United States of America, and for export."

Looming up impressively by the river is the gleaming white concrete colossus that is the Alabama Flour Mill, which opened for business in 1941, and which grinds approximately 1,200 barrels of brand-name flour per day.

"The reason we have to keep on fighting for TVA," says editor-publisher Barrett Shelton of the Decatur Daily, "is not because TVA is a failure, but because it has been successful. From its very inception we have had to practice eternal vigilance."

ALABAMA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
EXTENSION SERVICE,
Auburn, Ala., February 28, 1948.

Hon. ROBERT E. JONES, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR BOB: In talking to the home demonstration council here recently, about which you wrote me, I first called attention to a statement made by President Truman in his message to Congress that in 1946 per capita farm income was $779 against $1,288 for nonfarm people.

This means that during 1946 when farm production in the United States hit its peak to date the nonfarm person had an income of better than $3 for each $2 per farm person.

There are several ways which farmers can increase their income, but the best one is higher production per person with a fair price per unit.

Farmers increase their production by expanding their acreage per person or by increasing the volume per acre or per animal. This, of course, involves shifts from crops to livestock and a greater use of machines.

On the matter of land, we found that in the United States and Canada the per capita amount of cropland is 3½ acres, of which 3 produces for our use and one-half for export.

Russia has 2 acres of cropland per capita; Europe, except Russia, 1 acre; China, one-half acre; Japan, one-fourth acre.

These figures explain why people of the Orient can never have a diet of meat, milk, and eggs. They don't have that much land.

A diet of meat, milk, and eggs requires four to eight times as much land as a diet of grains.

Incidentally, one-fourth acre in sugar beets or sugarcane will produce as many calories as an average person should consume in a year.

I then gave them a few facts about rural health, quoting from Secretary Anderson that during the Second World War the rejection rate for farm people for military service was 53.4 percent compared to an overall of 43 percent; and that in the 18-19 age group farmers were turned down at a rate 40 percent higher than for all others based upon physical defects alone.

The women were interested in a survey conducted by Successful Farming on Why Don't Farm Boys Marry Earlier? Answers from farm people were as follows: (1) 32.5 percent unwilling to live on farms; (2) 28.1 percent said farm girls go to cities at the usual marrying ages, with the result that farm boys don't have a chance to meet either farm girls or city girls; (3) 23.5 percent said farm boys postpone marriage because they are kept too busy on the farm; (4) 9.3 percent mentioned financial insecurity.

Distaste of women for farm life is accented by a poll of Iowa farmers, published in Wallace's Farmer.

Only 46 percent want their daughters to marry farmers, although 66 percent want their sons to farm. Main objections mentioned by farm wives were outdoor work and lack of conveniences.

Similarly the Farm Journal (February 1947) reports a survey of college girls by Dr. Hazel M. Cushing of Washington State College. Only 24 percent of the girls with farm backgrounds and 6 percent of the city girls prefer to marry farmers. Most of the girls in each group would marry farmers if all else were equal, but this would demand that the farmer have as much education as his college wife, devote himself mainly to cash crops and keep away from poultry farming. In other words they wanted to live on farms with high incomes and less drudgery work for wives.

During the discussion I referred to some statistics presented recently by Dr. O. E. Baker, of the University of Maryland. Dr. Baker has spent much of his life studying people along with geography. In a recent article he predicted that the population of the Orient a century hence will be double that of today, with a half billion more in Russia and her satellites, but fewer in the remainder of Europe, and much fewer in the United States.

With every good wish, I am
Sincerely yours,
P. O. DAVIS, *Director.*

The Holloway Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the Holloway plan, known as the naval officer procurement plan, is a most comprehensive and well conceived means of obtaining officers for the United States Navy. This plan not only utilizes the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis but 52 colleges throughout the Nation as a means of obtaining the best possible officer material for the navies of the future.

Fleet Admiral Nimitz, on September 15, 1947, commended this program to all the personnel of the Navy. I need not remind the Members of the House of the contribution made to the winning of the war by this the greatest of our modern-day admirals.

I commend knowledge of the Holloway plan to all Members of the House, and under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include herewith the letter from Admiral Nimitz, along with a summary of the Holloway plan:

THE HOLLOWAY PLAN (NAVAL OFFICER PROCUREMENT PLAN)—A SUMMARY VIEW AND COMMENTARY

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C., September 15, 1947.

To the EDITOR, UNITED STATES NAVAL INSTITUTE PROCEEDINGS, ANNAPOLIS, MD.:

Although the postwar system of procuring and training officers for the United States Navy has been in effect for some time, I believe that there is still considerable misapprehension among the public and even among some naval personnel as to its operation.

Hence I read the present article with interest, and I am glad that the Naval Institute Proceedings is publishing such a complete and definitive exposition of the plan, its purpose, and its procedure. I hope that it will be read by all naval personnel, and that it will be reprinted by newspapers and other media for the general information of the public as well.

Sincerely,

C. W. NIMITZ,
Fleet Admiral, United States Navy.

Comment by many having knowledge of the United States Navy's new plan for training officers has dealt, on numerous occasions, with categories and phases of particular interest to the group addressed. This is natural and very much in order.

However, questions asked and comments made by people within and without the service indicate that the over-all and general understanding of the plan can be greatly improved. And full understanding by the Navy and by the interested public is essential to effective implementation.

The opportunity to know this plan well, in both policy and administrative areas, has been accorded me by circumstance. The object of this paper is to assist in attaining a widespread understanding of the Holloway plan by presenting here, in an overview, the entire plan. The perimeter of the summary and comment is calculated to encompass all parts and categories and to show the plan's pattern with all its features simultaneously brought to light in integration.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Fundamentally and in all its phases our postwar officer education and procurement plan is one of integration. Superimposing any group above another, or introducing blocs of special categories in the line is not envisioned.

The first nationally screened input of regular NROTC midshipmen enters the 52 NROTC institutions this fall. Graduation for them is 1951; 2 years' service as ensigns, United States Navy, is completed by all, after which some return to civil life and some enter upon regular Navy careers in 1953. Career men as lieutenants (junior grade), together with Naval Academy contemporaries, go to general line school about 1956 and become available for assignment at senior watch and division level in 1957-58. At that time high-grade university men, adequately seasoned, matured in, and pointed for active naval service, in appreciable number will appear as regular officers of experience—flight section leaders, destroyer engineer and gunnery officers, flag lieutenants, and so on, fully correlated in assignments with their Naval Academy brethren. In other words, 10 years are involved to see the pipe line filled, and integration accomplished as planned. The Department and the Service must be patient and tenacious to see the plan through for a decade to prove it, as time surely will.

The Marine Corps participates fully in the plan. Some 17 percent of all the students of each NROTC unit of the program may in their junior and senior year select the Marine Corps training; each NROTC unit has one or more marine officers as assistant professors of naval science, and marine officers are assigned as professors of naval science in charge of the unit in several instances. Marine Corps integration in the program is close and complete.

BACKGROUND

Immediately after the war the Navy Department embarked upon three important projects:

I. Demobilization, in which we separated some 3,000,000 officers and men from the naval service in 12 months.

II. Preparation of a force operating plan envisioning an eventual naval strength of approximately half a million men and 50,000 officers.

III. Personnel procurement and training plans to implement this force operating plan.

Ready on VJ-day was a plan calculated to supply the officers for a four to five hundred thousand man Navy by channeling all new officer material through 2 years at the Naval Academy after 3 years of college. The Navy Department did not elect to adopt this plan, and set up the Holloway Board to study and recommend the form, system, and method of education of naval officers. The Board consisted of the following members: Rear Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy, senior member; Dr. James P. Baxter, president of Williams College; Dr. Henry T. Heald, president Illinois Institute of Technology; Capt. (now Rear Admiral) Felix L. Johnson, United States Navy; Capt. (now Rear Admiral) Charles D. Wheelock, United States Navy; Capt. (now Rear Admiral) Stuart H. Ingersoll, United States Navy; Capt. John P. W. Vest, United States Navy; Capt. Arthur S. Adams, United States Navy (retired), (now provost of Cornell University); Commander Charles K. Duncan, United States Navy; and Commander Douglas M. Swift, United States Navy, member and recorder.

Studies indicated that the annual input required to maintain the officer strength envisioned for the postwar Navy could be obtained in general terms in three ways:

1. The channeling of all career officers through the Naval Academy in a reduced 2- or 1-year course designed to follow 2 to 4 years in civilian college;

2. The building of a second Naval Academy, at the same time expanding our present plant here at Annapolis; or,

3. Utilizing the NROTC and the Naval Academy, maintaining the 4-year undergraduate pattern in each category.

Scheme 1, that is, converting the Naval Academy to a graduate or semigraduate institution, was rejected. Rejection was unanimous on the part of the Board because of the importance all members placed on the 4-year undergraduate pattern in a single institution. The record of the Naval Academy in developing, in students together there for 4 years at undergraduate level, a permanent desire for naval service was also an important consideration.

Scheme 2, that is, construction of an additional Naval Academy, was rejected because of the delays involved in establishing such a plant and expanding the existing one. Furthermore, it was deemed wiser that the Naval Academy at Annapolis, with its history and traditions, be the single institution representing in its contribution the ultimate in professional and personal standards, and a principal binding force in the creation of loyalty and ideals of service in the Navy as a whole.

Scheme 3 was recommended and adopted because it employs methods that have been proven in the case of the Naval Academy throughout its history, and also in the case of the NROTC (and its closely associated V-12 and Midshipmen School programs) both before and during World War II. This scheme also provides flexibility in that, by means of varying the input of career officers from the NROTC line, changes in personnel requirements can be best accommodated. It permits employment of the short-term commission on an eminently fair and advantageous basis in connection with the Regular (fully subsidized) NROTC student, which has the advantage of providing a continually replenished reservoir of young and experienced Reserve officers composed of those who return to civil life after their 2 years' service. It further provides the great number of junior officers needed in active service without launching an unnecessarily large number upon permanent careers, an arrangement serving to greatly lessen forced attrition and accompanying waste and expense of retirement in an officer's highly productive years.

OUTLINE OF THE HOLLOWAY PLAN

Part I

There are essentially three parts to this plan. The first deals with the undergraduate phase of officer procurement. The two major and fundamental lines of procurement are the Naval Academy and the NROTC. This is stressed because it is sometimes overlooked that the Naval Academy is incorporated in and as much a part of the Holloway plan as is the NROTC.

Other sources of initial procurement are:

(A) The Naval aviation college program, in which the candidate selected for flight training may attend any college of his choice for 2 years, followed by 2 years of flight training and active service in fleet aeronautical organizations. This program is currently carried at diminished numbers, as experience and review indicate desirability of taking the NROTC and Naval Academy graduate alike into flight training after a year or more of service in the fleet, as the basic and major method of obtaining aviation officers. (Entry into the NACP has been suspended for the fiscal year 1949 in accordance with ALNAV No. 179.)

(B) Commissioning a limited number of particularly qualified graduates of any college or university. (This to include unsubsidized NROTC students.)

(C) Commissioning directly a substantial increment of enlisted men annually.

Part II

The second major part of the plan deals with the education and training for officers transferred into the Regular Navy after World War II. This part of the plan is now being implemented vigorously by the Bureau of Naval Personnel and is mentioned solely to round out the picture and to indicate the firm integration envisioned; integration in precedence, in spirit, and in professional and academic education.

Part III

Part III of the Holloway plan deals with the graduate education of permanent commissioned officers, and it likewise is now in the process of Departmental implementation in all essential features. This phase is mentioned here because it plays an important part in the over-all integration of officers from all sources. I regard its fundamental cornerstone to be the General Line School for all officers, regardless of source, upon the completion of their fifth to eighth year of commissioned service. At this time maturity has developed, actual experience in the field renders the reaffirmation of professional subjects significant to a higher degree, and there exists a greater opportunity for mutual social and professional understanding than at any prior period in the officer's career.

Before discussing the details, the advantages, and the contributions envisioned of the two major sources of procurement, that is, NROTC and United States Naval Academy, and the integration of these, we might profitably recapitulate the departmental action in approving the plan. On October 30, 1945, the Secretary of the Navy approved the Holloway board report in general terms as follows:

The total output of the Naval Academy (less those who fail to meet aptitude requirements during the probationary commissioned service) will be utilized to provide career officers for the Navy.

Career officers required annually in addition to those obtained from the Naval Academy will be obtained from the other sources provided under the Holloway plan; this means that numbers required additional to those from the Naval Academy for purposes of career will be drawn principally from the NROTC graduates completing their 2-year short term commission commitment. Legislation incorporating NROTC features of the plan passed both Houses of Congress unanimously and was signed by the President and became law on August 13, 1946.

The plan providing for the education and training of the Reserve and temporary officers transferred to the Regular Navy was approved for immediate implementation.

That part of the report concerning the graduate education of naval officers was approved in principle, with the direction that such action be taken now and at later dates as would best effect the accomplishment of the plan.

NROTC

The selection of candidates to go, under Navy subsidy, to the 52 NROTC institutions is geographical, and is basically that employed in screening for the V–12 during the war, with which is combined the bilateral selection on the part of the college and individual wherein the latter selects his college, presents his Navy certificate and his secondary-school credits, and in turn is selected by the college of his choice. This unique provision has been accepted wholeheartedly by all the colleges and universities of the program. The first national screening, early in 1947, covered some 50,000 young men, of whom 10,000 passed high enough to be presented to the State boards and from whom the State boards selected some 3,000 to enter the institutions as freshmen in the fall of 1947. This indicates the high quality of officer material we should get. It is agreed that this input can be considered not simply the subsidization of boys who would go to college anyway, but that it will represent in effect an increase in the total number of outstanding youths of our country who are able to go to high-grade institutions.

The stipend paid the NROTC student selected for the program (regular) under discussion is a good one compared with undergraduate scholarships in force throughout the United States. In addition to $50 per month the student receives his books, tuition, and laboratory fees. Out of this amount the student must clothe, house, and feed himself. If that is insufficient, he must obtain funds either from home or by working at college. It was interesting to observe on a recent visit to an eastern university that quite a few of the NROTC students were waiting on table in the dining hall, and that many of these students indulge in this type of self-help rather than lean heavily on home assistance. This is pointed out to correct an erroneous impression held in the service and other circles that the $50 a month is over and above board and lodging. Substantial though the sum may be, it is insufficient in most schools to carry a boy through unless he makes additional effort or receives home assistance. I believe this scholarship is the optimum in view of the benefit imparted to the country through the higher education of more worthy youths than would otherwise be the case, and in the return given the Navy in the form of 2 years' active service in the fleet as Regular officers, followed by service either as career officers or as Reserve officers.

The advantages to the NROTC subsidized student can be summed up somewhat as follows: He can go to the civilian college of his choice (subject, of course, to his own negotiation and his acceptance by that college). He receives one of the best undergraduate scholarships in existence. He is limited as to the courses he takes only in that in his first 2 years he must satisfy certain fundamental conditions in mathematics, physics, and English, and must take during the 4 years some 24 semester hours of naval professional studies. This means that, except in very difficult courses in engineering schools and colleges, the student has great freedom of choice; he can take pre-law, or a professional course at undergraduate level, or general academic, as he may choose, subject only to minimum requirements to ensure his reasonable and immediate usefulness as a junior officer in his 2 years of active service. To use a common expression, he is to a certain extent having his cake and eating it too, in that he is obtaining an excellent civilian education and preparation for civilian life at Government expense, with the power of decision as to following a civilian career or a naval career (unlimited in the first instance, though limited as to naval career by selection and need on the part of the Navy), though he does give 2 years' active service in the fleet and appreciable service in the Reserve in return for the Government stipend.

While the NROTC source of procurement for the Navy may be considered to represent an optimum return to all interested parties, it is nevertheless true that, unless it was a plan of positive merit and advantage to the Naval Service, it is not conceivable that it would have been proposed and adopted. It is in this area of advantage to the Naval Service that much misunderstanding lies. Those who evolved this plan believe that the integration of the best type of college and university man from the outstanding institution associated with the NROTC will be of positive benefit to the Navy; benefit in that there will be associated, in the permanent and career officers, outstanding young college men of diverse and superior educational background representing a wide and catholic range of interest, imposing and introducing a critical sense of values, frankly unregimented in a professional sense, but so equipped withal by practical experience on summer cruises and a modicum of essential nomenclature (that is, language of naval equipment, method, and custom) as to permit their immediate and reasonable usefulness as junior officers in the Fleet and their development into capable senior officers as well.

In accepting the above advantages and conditions, those evolving the plan had no thought of establishing extensions of the Naval Academy in the civilian college campuses. They recognized essential differences from the Naval Academy in that professional content of education and training, financial support, and commitment and obligation to the Navy are not as all-embracing. These differences were recognized and considered desirable as productive of a healthy and dynamic spirit for incorporation in the naval service.

Another contribution offered by the NROTC will be an active Naval Reserve composed of young officers of superior talents and a high order of education who have had 2 years' active service in the fleet; this will represent a Reserve of effectiveness and dynamic capacity unequalled in the history of this country, or of any country. We will have young men—later, older, and mature men—in the Naval Reserve and in civil life with naval associations based on life in the fleet with those officers who go on in their career and later become senior commanders, administrators, and policy makers. There are mutual understandings and sympathies created by this which will continue through the life of those concerned.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The conditions of education and incorporation into the Service of the NROTC, and the envisioned contribution to the Navy have been outlined. It is in order that the contribution of the Naval Academy to the service be considered next.

The following is quoted from the Superintendent's statement to the Board of Visitors in 1947:

"We believe the role of the Naval Academy to be more important than at any other time in its history. We believe the Naval Academy should represent the ultimate in professional and personal standards, and that it and its graduates should be a tremendous binding force in the creation of a solidarity of loyalty and ideals of service in the Navy as a whole."

I am convinced of the paramount importance and essentialness to the service of this role. I conceive the contribution of the Naval Academy to be both spiritual and professional. The daily life of the Academy is one of discipline, frugality, and subordination of personal freedom, all pointed to ideals of devotion to duty and responsibility to country. The role of the austere life in connection with training and leadership and character is well recognized by students of military education and leadership. The Naval Academy is an undergraduate institution which no man should enter unless he wishes to make the Navy a life career. It is a known quantity in having a capacity to inspire large groups and high percentages of graduates of intelligence and character to stay in the Navy in years of comparative penury and hardship, and to be available in the hour of war.

West Point and the Naval Academy face squarely this question of instilling a permanent desire for military and naval service, and have achieved a great measure of success. This professional esprit must continue to permeate the services as the touchstone and binding force in loyalty and devotion to the public interest.

Statistical evidence of the Naval Academy graduate's capacity and readiness for devotion and self-sacrifice in line of duty is available so that he who runs may read. Forty-six Naval Academy classes (classes of 1901 to 1946, inclusive) served in World War II. Six and three-tenths percent of all these graduates in service were killed in combat. The classes graduating during the 10 years prior to Pearl Harbor, who furnished such a large number of destroyer, submarine, and air squadron commanders (that is, field officers), lost 12 percent killed in combat. The classes of 1934, 1935, 1936 lost in action 12 percent, 14 percent, and 16 percent, respectively.

A factor contributing strongly to the Naval Academy's role is its singleness of purpose and the fact that it stands alone in this purpose. This was previously mentioned in discussing the board's rejection of a second Naval Academy. I am completely convinced of the value to the naval service of maintaining the one Naval Academy at Annapolis that can inspire continuity of tradition and professional excellence, and can serve as an important factor of correlation for the Navy's undergraduate education. I cannot forbear to remark in passing that this value and this factor would be almost entirely defeated by converting the Naval Academy to a graduate or semi-graduate institution.

We should include for recognition, among the factors developing the Naval Academy's role, the manner in which its candidates are selected.

The method of screening and obtaining candidates for the NROTC is one of which I approve, but I do not favor putting all our eggs in one basket insofar as methods of initial procurement are concerned. Just as I believe that there is health, vigor, and dynamic characteristic to the integration of superior young officers of different categories (the NROTC and U. S. N. A.), so do I think that there is merit to different types of selection. The system of congressional appointments has advantages which I hold most important. The participation and the interest on the part of the Members of Congress is of great importance in maintaining our best American traditions, and I am not sure that a purely mechanical and academic aptitude test, if such tests were the only one employed for the Navy as a whole, would produce the optimum. It is undoubtedly true that many of our effective leaders, civic, professional, and otherwise, matured slowly but with considerable firmness for the long drag, and would not, at the ages of 17 to 21, have shown in the top brackets if subjected to some of the testing methods currently employed. Even so, any candidate nominated by the Congress is in strong competition academically with his alternates and must attain high standards physically.

The Congress has made available for enlisted men of the Navy and Naval Reserve a larger number of annual appointments to the Naval Academy than at any prior time. This represents another healthy influx and method of selection. In selecting candidates for the examinations to enter the Naval Academy, commanding officers base their decisions not only on their evaluation of the candidate's academic aptitude, but also upon his moral integrity and the elements of character and leadership exhibited.

The financial status of the midshipman at the Naval Academy is an important factor in his development. Having accepted a disciplined life of restricted personal freedom and one pointed not for a civilian pursuit but solely for professional career in the Navy, and in pursuance of this having figuratively burned his bridges behind him, the midshipman, United States Navy, is supported financially by the Government. His pay is $78 per month, with a ration allowance of $1 a day—or in pay and emoluments, over $100 per month. Even though this amount is adequate for his full support, frugality and modesty of circumstances must characterize the conditions of life of the midshipmen at the Naval Academy. For that reason many of us feel that the Academy is basically one of the most democratic institutions in the world, and in that area is a genuine contribution. Once through the gates of the Naval Academy, the young men stand on their own feet, receiving identical stipends, in a life where no one knows or cares what one another's social or economic background may have been.

The curriculum, professional and academic, figures importantly in the Naval Academy's role in representing the ultimate in professional and personal standards. In the field of curriculum the Naval Academy stresses a broad basic education to include the fundamental sciences, the humanities, and the fundamentals of professional education (including aviation as a basic category such as navigation and seamanship), and gives considerable effort and time in the academic calendar to leadership and the study of human relations. Encompassed within a disciplined life of subordination and a high order of effort, it is pointed completely to the naval life.

Personnel in whom the professional side is strongly developed, and who are charged, furthermore, with great moral responsibility in effecting genuine integration, have a paramount need for effectiveness in human relations and leadership. I hold the thought that warmth and sincerity of feeling oriented to devotion, self-sacrifice, and loyalty, are basic, but that they must be supplemented by technique in the psychological area.

INTEGRATION

The basis of integration lies in the nuances of mutual emulation and respect. Each source of young officers contributes to the body of naval officers as a whole. The experience of the Marine Corps has been that loyalty to corps, to service, and to the country is the over-riding feeling, and the undergraduate school from which each officer came is of small moment. Sophomoric prejudices are not characteristic of high-grade personnel; mutual appreciation and enthusiasm are characteristic of people of intelligence and character.

Precedence among officers upon being initially commissioned is established by integration in the truest sense of the word. The detailed method of accomplishing this is set forth in a Navy Department directive. Furthermore, the Navy's new promotion law is so drawn as to provide equity and assurance of opportunity to career officers for promotion and assignment, regardless of source of initial entry.

The contributions to the service envisioned for the two major sources of entry—that is, the NROTC and the Naval Academy—are set forth under the appropriate captions above. The contributions are presented, not for invidious comparison in detail, but to indicate the areas of individual development available and stressed. Great merit would appear to be in the firm integration in the service of the fine but different qualities of each. It is doubtful that in one institution or category, and in one curriculum, there could be attained at once and at the same time the qualities which can be contributed on the one hand by the NROTC graduate and on the other hand by the Naval Academy graduate.

Today, of our regular and permanent officers, totaling some 20,000, about 11,000 are graduates of the Naval Academy and some 9,000 come from other schools and sources. Thus the problem and necessity for genuine integration confronts us on a grand scale, in addition to those pertaining to initial entry in the postwar period. All is in the same administrative problem being solved by genuine integration, equality of opportunity, and fairness in assignment. A contributing measure to this over-all solution is part II of the Holloway board report providing for raising of transferees to a five-semester college level and assigning them at the earliest practicable opportunity to the general line school. The Navy, in its personnel distribution, is making great sacrifices in order to implement this program, which represents a moral commitment. The Navy recognized that many young men who obtained commissions and served well during the war and then have become career officers in the Navy, missed much of their undergraduate college work. The five-semester program is calculated as the optimum to restore to them a balance in this respect. By the same token, the general line school is calculated to round out professional education and to serve as an affirmation of practical experience in the field.

ULTIMATE SYNTHESIS

Professional competence, particularly in the role of command and in association with operations, is a sine qua non in the line officer. It is of paramount importance in the senior officer operating at policy level and exercising high command involving naval and military statesmanship and important administration. This is for two fundamental reasons. First, professional competence, acknowledged and confirmed by continued sea or field assignments appropriate to age and rank, is required to insure the confidence of the service as a whole. Secondly, and closely allied with the first, sea or field experience is essential for creation of balance and a sense of values, professionally speaking. And this last, in all matters of administration and policy, must be integrated at high level, if direction and implementing measures are to be thoroughly objective.

From the springboard of professional knowledge and ability, our officers, particularly upon and after attaining command rank, must operate effectively in manifold areas in addition to the technical, tactical, or operational. To mention a few, there are personnel research, public relations, foreign commissions, legislative and congressional liaison, organization and direction of research, instruction, and education, all types of administration, duty with Reserve components, fiscal control, and planning at high level involving historical, political, sociological, and economic perceptiveness of the highest order. All these are things to which a diverse intellectual input into the Line of the Navy should contribute, through creation of a synthesis of thinking, expression, and experience which will serve to improve the capacity of the corps of officers as a whole.

The Navy's extensive educational plan for officers is intended to combine and further develop professional competence, practical experience, and a capacity for original thought in attaining the over-all professional synthesis. The program extends throughout the officer's career, encompassing all the technical and operations phases and graduations of the Naval Service appropriate to his time, age, and rank. It progresses from the General Line School, previously referred to as the cornerstone of professional integration, through exchange with other Service schools up through the Armed Forces Staff College, the Naval War College, and finally to the National War College. In this field of education and development the graduates of no institution can be considered in competition with graduates of other institutions. Assignment and performance are entirely dependent upon the intellect, the character, the industry, and the enthusiasm of the individual officer.

Letter From Commandant of Soldiers' Home, Chelsea, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

wish to include herein a letter received from Mr. Lawrence F. Quigley, commandant of the Soldiers' Home, Chelsea, Mass., concerning H. R. 5180, a bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
SOLDIERS' HOME,
Chelsea, February 26, 1948.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On August 4, 1939, President Roosevelt signed a bill which increased the allowance made by the Federal Government to State soldiers' home and hospitals. The increase was from 33⅓ cents to 66⅔ cents per veteran per diem. The original bill called for an allowance of $1 per day; however, there was a compromise to 66⅔ cents. This was the first increase these State homes had received since their inception in 1888. At that time the 33⅓ cents from the Federal Government covered two-thirds of the total cost of maintenance.

The increased contribution of 66⅔ cents per day covered only 25 percent of the actual cost of maintenance of the Massachusetts Soldiers' Home, which I think was true of the 29 homes in the other 26 States that maintain them.

In 1943, another bill was introduced requesting $1 per day, approximately 36 percent of the cost. A compromise was again effected, and a bill was passed allowing 83⅓ cents per day per veteran, which was about 29 percent of our cost at that time.

Since that time, in view of rising costs and added demands on the services of the State soldiers' home, bills have been introduced for additional aid. Such bills came before the Congress in 1946 and 1947; however, the Veterans' Administration did not react favorably to them; and the Congress prorogued both years before any action was taken on same. Thus, in spite of ever-ascending maintenance costs, we are still receiving 83⅓ cents per veteran per day, which is approximately 15 percent of the present daily cost of $5.64.

Last year the expenses of the Soldiers' Home in Massachusetts were $716,500.05. We were reimbursed to the extent of $109,264.10, by the Federal Government for the members on the Federal rolls as accepted by the Veterans' Administration. This left a net cost to the State of Massachusetts of $607,235.95 for the care of its veterans.

The 26 States that maintain State homes and hospitals for veterans care for a large number of veterans who come within the scope of the Veterans' Administration facilities. Their maintenance cost, on an average, is $8 to $9, in comparison with our $5.64. If these States were not caring for these cases, the entire cost would have to be borne by the Federal Government. The States should be reimbursed for at least half of the cost for the maintenance of veterans in the State home and hospital, particularly in view of our lower maintenance cost and the large saving to the Government.

A bill has been introduced in this session of Congress, H. R. 5180, for further reimbursement to the States, requesting an increase from the present allotment of $300 to $912.50 per veteran per annum (from 83⅓ cents to $2.50 per day). A companion bill is also being introduced in the Senate. These bills have a great deal of merit as the increase in cost of maintaining these homes and hospitals has been exceptionally large, with inflated prices and higher wages for employees, as well as greatly increased demands on our services from Spanish War veterans and World War I veterans, as well as the vast number of World War II veterans now in need of care and treatment.

Your assistance in the passage of this bill would be greatly appreciated by the States and the soldiers' home and hospitals. It would be much-needed relief to the State taxpayer for the Federal Government to assume a more equitable share of the cost of this essential service to our veterans.

Yours very truly,
LAWRENCE F. QUIGLEY,
Commandant.

Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, the March 6 edition of Collier's magazine contains an article by Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, entitled "Toward Peace in Labor"—sets forth the necessity for cooperation between labor and management, and the results thus far attained since enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD this article is quoted in full:

TOWARD PEACE IN LABOR
(By ROBERT A. TAFT, United States Senator from Ohio)

Last September an enterprising new company purchased a few LST ships from the Government. It planned to carry loaded truck trailers from New York City to Albany. Since up to 50 trailers might be loaded on an LST, the new company was able to make a very attractive proposition to New York shippers. It meant a saving on gasoline, wear and tear on their trucks and the time of 50 drivers. The shippers readily took advantage of it.

It looked like a profitable business until the Teamsters Union demanded that the shippers pay its members "stand-by time" for the full time it took to ship the trailers to their destination. There would be no saving to the shippers if they had to pay both the new company and the teamsters for carrying their freight to Albany. The ships lay idle and the Trailership Co. found itself stopped before it had started.

The Longshoremen's Union had counted on the new Trailership venture to supply work for some of its members. It promptly struck the port of Albany, refusing to permit any ship in that port to be moved. The object of the strike was to force the shippers to use the new trailerships. Large quantities of perishable food, much of which was destined for European consumption, could not be moved.

The shippers immediately filed charges with the National Labor Relations Board alleging a secondary boycott on the part of the longshoremen and a feather-bedding practice on the part of the teamsters. The Board first proceeded against the longshoremen and at once obtained a restraining order in the Federal district court. The strike was over and the port opened the following day. The Board then prepared its complaint against the teamsters. That union, however, realizing that the Board meant business, rescinded its demand for "stand-in pay." The converted LST ships started to haul trailers from New York City to Albany.

Prior to June 22, 1947, no legal remedy existed for the shippers, the Trailership Co., or any other business confronted with similar difficulties. On that date the Labor-Management Relations Act was passed over President Truman's veto. Perhaps the most carefully drawn of any of its provisions were those outlawing the secondary boycott. This case is by no means an isolated instance of the operation of the new law.

In Pennsylvania the Rural Motor Express Co. operated as a connecting carrier between two large interstate terminals. This small company's employees refused to join a union of truck drivers. The union then resorted to the tactics used so successfully before passage of the new law. The drivers at the connecting terminals refused to handle the goods carried by Rural Motor Express.

The shippers had to divert their shipments by a longer route, and Rural Motor Express had no business. It filed a charge with NLRB. The drivers' union did not wait for the issuance of a formal complaint against it. The boycott was stopped, and it agreed in writing not to reinstitute it. Rural Motor Express is again operating as a connecting carrier.

TEAMSTERS PICKET HATTERS

In New York City during the October strike at American Railway Express, a group of hat manufacturers hired independent truckers to haul their products to terminals outside New York City for shipment to their customers. The Teamsters Union sent pickets into the hatters' district of the city, who suggested to the independent truckers that they not load the hatters' products. The hatters' association filed charges with NLRB and instructed their lawyers to file a suit for damages under another section of the new law. The NLRB sent investigators into the district, and the pickets were removed before nightfall.

Are unions calling off their secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes because of possible court injunctions or cease-and-desist orders obtained by NLRB, or because the new law gives the injured party a right to sue and collect damages out of union treasuries grown rich by wartime dues? The unions aren't saying, but neither remedy would exist but for the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

Hundreds of examples of such boycotts were presented to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Each of them imposed unjust hardships on innocent third parties. No witness appeared before our committee to defend this racketeering practice. Perhaps the best proof of the act's effectiveness is in the infrequency of such disputes in the news today. Where they have occurred, the filing of a charge with the NLRB, and the commencement of its investigations, has usually resulted in their elimination.

The Taft-Hartley law was passed over the President's veto by a vote of 331 to 83 in the House of Representatives, and 68 to 25 in the Senate. Not only did practically all the Republicans vote for the law, but more than a majority of the Democrats in Congress voted to override the veto of the Democratic President. This public opinion has been reflected in the attitude of many labor union members. I have countless letters from them, and many of them have come to see me personally to say that they approve the law because it protects them against the arbitrary actions and orders of those who control the unions.

Of course, after the bill was passed, there were plenty of protests, as witness these samples in my mail: "Today (May 13, 1947, the day the bill first passed the Senate) is just as much an infamy as Pearl Harbor."

"I am 100 percent against your slave labor bill."

The authors of the act were accused of attempting "to take away from workers" all the

gains and rights they have won in the last 10 or 12 years.

But all labor letters were not hostile when the bill was passed, and today I hear many commendations. For example: "The majority of the rank and file of labor endorses the Taft-Hartley Act." The law is described in another letter as "a guardian of the basic rights of every American." In personal conversation union men have spoken of the new law to me as labor's bill of rights. And so on.

The greater part of the new law's provisions have only been in effect since August 22, but it is already possible to assess their value. Hardly a day goes by without proving how wrong the law's opponents were in their dire predictions as to its effect. In order that the Congress might be kept informed on the day-to-day operation of the new law, we created a study committee and charged it with the responsibility of watching its administration. As a member of that committee, I have been able to observe how the new law has been meeting its objectives.

PUBLIC IS BETTER PROTECTED

I think it is fair to say that nearly all of the many amendments made to existing labor laws by the new act have worked satisfactorily to promote justice between employers and employees and between labor union leaders and their members. At the same time greater protection has been given to the public, and the number of strikes has decreased.

The committee has requested anyone who feels aggrieved to appear before it, state the case and suggest amendments, but at this time we see no reason for recommending amendments to the 1948 session.

The Wagner Act made it easy for employees to obtain representation by a union. They merely voted for the union at a Government-conducted election. If the union proved unsatisfactory, however, the only way for the employees to get rid of it was to vote in another union. The NLRB refused to recognize a petition for no union. We were assured by the union leaders that it was only the employers who ever wanted to discharge the union as bargaining agent, but we nevertheless provided that when 30 percent of the employees informed the NLRB that they no longer desired the union to represent them, an election would be held.

Apparently the union leaders were wrong. Statistical releases by NLRB at the end of the first 60 days of operation under the new statute disclosed that 18 percent of the petitions for elections were filed by employees to obtain decertification of the union that had been representing them.

After twice reversing itself on the issue, the NLRB on December 6, 1945, ordered the Packard Motor Car Co. to bargain with a union of its foremen, and a new source of dues dollars became available to the unions. Union after union rushed into the field in a national campaign to organize supervisory employees.

Foremen are, of course, management's representative on the production line. In addition to their duties of supervision, they occupy a key position in labor-management relation. They communicate management policies to the worker and in turn inform management of the worker's problems and grievances. Their unionization had the effect of aligning them directly with the workers they were paid to supervise.

This was especially true when they joined the same union as that to which their production employees belonged.

ADVERSE EFFECT ON PRODUCTION

The ultimate result of such a policy would be the socialization of industry. Not only would such a result bring a stop to the further investment of capital in productive plants, but it would have an immediate effect on the discipline of employees and, therefore, on the production so necessary for our prosperity and for the welfare of the workers themselves.

One example testified to before our committee was the experience of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. After its mine supervisors were organized by the United Mine Workers, disciplinary slips issued by the underground foremen fell off by two thirds and the accident rate in each mine doubled. The new law neither prevents foremen from organizing nor an employer from bargaining with their organization. But in relieving the employer from the governmental compulsion of bargaining with them, the law removes the provisions of the Wagner Act which required a foreman to serve two employers. The foreman is responsible to the employer and not to the men whom he supervises.

We were told that by taking away the Government's protection of foremen's unions, we would encourage such employees to strike. The only strike of any importance involving supervisory employees in recent months was the one at the Ford Motor Car Co. That strike started before passage of the new law when the company declined to renew its contract with the foremen's union. The strike ended soon after the Congress voted to override the President's veto.

During recent years there has been an increasing demand by unions that employers contribute to a welfare fund. While many of such funds have had a laudable purpose, the need for some control to insure participation by the employees for whose benefit they were intended soon became apparent. The new law provides such protection by requiring that they be trust funds administered jointly by the employer and the union, with annual audits. Payments from such funds are further strictly limited to such purposes as medical care, pensions, and disability and sickness benefits.

All of the dire predictions that the act would destroy welfare funds have been completely disapproved. The only difference is that the rights of the individual employee in the benefits of the fund are now guaranteed.

In a number of ways the new law attempted to restore an equality of bargaining power between unions and employers. Under the Wagner Act only the employer was required to bargain in good faith and sign a contract covering the terms of an agreement when reached. That duty now exists on both sides of the bargaining table.

Unions were also made subject to suit in the Federal courts for violation of their contracts. Care was taken to protect union members from any personal liability. Judgments may only be collected from the union treasuries. The only argument advanced against this provision was that it subjected unions to harassment by suits. Of course this was always a specious argument. There has been no harassment by lawsuits.

A good deal of fear has been expressed that the law is being bypassed by contracts which exempt the unions from liability. Such a fear arises out of misunderstanding of the purpose of the law and of the contracts which have been made. Of course, a contract which entirely exempts the union from any responsibility at all is not a contract. A union which insists on such a clause is engaging in an unfair labor practice and the employer may file charges with the Board. On the other hand, I see no reason why a union should not protect itself against liability for which it is, in fact, not responsible, such as that caused by insurgent members entering into a "wildcat" strike.

There has been one extremely important development attributable to this provision. While seeking to exempt themselves from direct liability, they have undertaken expressly to do all they can to prevent the unauthorized "wildcat" strikes which have so much delayed the development of greatly needed postwar production. In return for the employer's promise to exempt the union from suit for violations of contract over which the union has no control, unions have agreed to take definite steps to end "wildcat" strikes.

For example, the International Harvester contract with UAW-CIO and the Murray Body Corp. contract with that union both provide that in the event of a strike unauthorized by the union, it will immediately so state in writing on the company's bulletin boards and direct the strikers to return to work.

TOO MANY DUTIES FOR THE BOARD

Under the Wagner Act the NLRB acted in a capacity of prosecutor, judge, and reviewing court. Its field lawyers tried the cases, its trial examiners heard them and made recommendations, and the Board itself reviewed the evidence and issued its orders. That such a many-sided role was productive of great abuse was clearly evident from the testimony presented before our committee year after year.

The new law created a General Counsel appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate and gave him responsibility for the prosecution of cases. The Board now functions like a court.

The new law makes no attempt to regulate the internal affairs of unions except as they may affect the right of a workman to secure and hold a job. A union may still refuse membership for any reason it chooses or expel a member without governmental restraint. However, it cannot require the employer to discharge the worker denied or expelled from membership even if it has a union-shop contract unless the reason for such denial or expulsion was nonpayment of initiation fees or dues.

I am still receiving a considerable volume of mail from individuals all over the country who have been discharged pursuant to closed and union-shop contracts. Many of their cases are pathetic. They are from people who have been expelled from the union for conduct unbecoming a union member. Opposition to any plan of the union leader, supporting the unsuccessful candidate for union office, requesting an accounting of union funds, supporting a political party which the union has decided to oppose, turning out more production than the standard set by the union, and criticism of the government of Soviet Russia are among the many instances of conduct unbecoming a union member.

Investigation of such complaints discloses that the discharges were pursuant to contracts entered into prior to the passage of the new law. The law, of course, did not affect existing contracts. But none of these reasons can cost a worker his job after those contracts have expired. A closed shop cannot be renewed or now entered into. A union-shop contract must first be authorized by a majority vote of the employees to be affected by it.

At the present time a determined stand is being made by some unions which have enjoyed the closed shop in the past against any modification in their status. A printers' union has refused to bargain at all because no contract can legally provide for a closed shop. As a matter of fact, these same unions could by vote of their members provide for a union shop and they would get practically every protection for their union which they desire.

The closed shop has been prohibited by the railroad labor law for many years, but the railroad labor unions are among the strongest in the country. Suggestions have been made that a closed shop should be permitted by vote of the members, but I feel that this is a question of principle on which I, at least, would not be willing to compromise. A closed shop in a few industries has not done great harm, although it has undoubtedly limited apprentices and cut down the number of men available in the particular trades to a point which is contrary to the public interest, particularly when an increase in production is desirable.

If, under authorization of law, the closed shop continued to expand to cover most of American labor it would be a serious detriment to the freedom of the American people. A man no longer could start work in that particular occupation to which he was best suited unless some labor union was willing to admit him into the charmed circle. It would tend gradually to freeze employment just as did the guilds of the medieval cities, a condition which accounted largely for their decline in importance.

Many States have prohibited the closed shop by initiative or by statute. As long as we provide an effective substitute in the union shop without the restrictions on freedom, I do not believe we should compromise on the closed-shop question. I might say, however, that I don't think Congress intended that this provision extend to local building-trade unions whose work is, in fact, intrastate in character. The status of such unions ought to be left to the State law.

CONDITIONS TO SAFEGUARD DEMOCRACY

The Wagner Act provided many benefits for labor unions and not one of these benefits has been taken away by the new law. Congress has, however, conditioned the enjoyment of these benefits by requiring union officers to file certain information before they may seek the services of NLRB. It was believed that democracy in unions could best be achieved by making it possible for union members to learn how and by whom their unions were being run. Thus, unions are now required to make a detailed statement of the proceedures used in the conduct of their affairs to the Secretary of Labor, and also furnish a financial statement to each member.

A third requirement which has received much attention in the press is the one making it necessary for union officers to make non-Communist affidavits. Unions having officers who cannot sign such affidavits are handicapped and many of their members are suffering hardships. They cannot go to the Government or the courts to obtain reinstatement and back pay when they are discharged for union activity.

The answer for them is obvious. Get rid of such officers. That is exactly what has happened already in a few cases. I am told by my Canadian friends that a number of the Communist officers of labor unions driven out of the United States have come into Canada, and are trying to get into the unions there.

Little attention has been given to that portion of the act establishing an independent Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. The old United States Conciliation Service was a part of the Department of Labor. When a strike occurred, either the union or the employer frequently requested that a conciliator be sent in to help them work out a settlement. The conciliator usually first tried to find out the issues by talking privately to each side. He would then try to arrange a meeting of the parties and suggest middle grounds upon which they could agree.

The successful conciliator was one who could obtain the confidence of both the employer and the union. That is the only way for him to learn the real issues causing the strike. Since the Department of Labor was expressly created to advance the cause of unions, conciliators coming from that Department were frequently handicapped by the belief on the part of employers that they would not act impartially.

The new law gives them an independent status in an agency headed by a director appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. To advise and assist the director a panel of 12 members is created. To this panel the President must appoint 6 persons outstanding in the field of management and 6 outstanding persons in the field of labor.

The new law stresses the duties of the service in the prevention of disputes. Mr. Ching, the newly appointed director, expressed very well the intent of Congress when he recently stated that he wished to be judged not by the number of fires he put out, but by the infrequency of fires which occurred.

OBJECTIONS ARE NOT SPECIFIC

The CIO called it a "wreck labor bill," a "ripper law to get unions," "treason," "crucifixion," and "butcher shop legislation." The A. F. of L. has referred to it as "evil," "vicious," "offensive," "infamous," and "reprehensible." They have threatened to spend millions of dollars to defeat every Senator and Congressman who voted for it. Of course, they do not specify the particular matters to which they object because if they did their arguments could be easily answered and the union members themselves would be even more in favor of the specific provisions of the act.

Eighty percent of the unfair labor practice charges filed with NLRB since the new law went into effect are against employers under the sections retained from the Wagner Act. This demonstrates very clearly the ridiculousness of the charge that labor has been emasculated. It also indicates that employers are not rushing in to take advantage of the new rights given them. There has been no harassment of unions by lawsuits. On November 1 there had been less than 20 suits brought against unions in all of the United States since passage of the new law.

The union leader whose interest is in promoting the interest of his members has found nothing in the law to interfere with his proper and normal method of negotiating with the employer for them. There have been a number of contracts of high importance to the unions entered into since passage of the new law. A study of such contracts does not show that the employees have lost anything. Every union newspaper stresses new gains for their members. For example, newspapers of the United Rubber Workers, CIO, announcing the new contracts in the rubber industry carried this headline: "Master contract wins many gains."

"You can't legislate labor relations," the labor leaders told our committee. The same statement was repeated by many of the so-called experts who testified before us this year and in prior years. It became a sort of axiom advanced to meet the public demand for curbs of the many union abuses of power.

Of course, this overlooked the fact that labor relations had not been legislated in the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the Wagner Act. The only difficulty was that these laws operated only against the employer, and for practical purposes were construed to protect labor-union leaders against action by anyone designed to prevent excesses in their demands or their actions. Naturally, extremists among the labor unions took advantage of the special privileges given by these laws, and even the more reasonable leaders had to follow them or lose their positions. Organized labor became a big business, without the responsibilities placed by law on all corporations and employers.

The arbitrary power asserted by many labor-union leaders created a strong public resentment against their action, which was reflected in the overwhelming demand for revision of the labor laws.

The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 has been in effect but a short time. It has been a period of comparative industrial peace. I am not enough of an optimist to believe that such is a permanent state of affairs. Most of the contracts expire during the next 6 months.

It must be remembered that the new act in no way interferes with the right of men to strike for better hours, wages, or working conditions. It is based entirely on free collective bargaining, which means that if an agreement cannot be reached there may be no work done.

Most of the public seem to feel that strikes should be prohibited by law. They do not realize that if strikes are prohibited some method must be found to fix a fair wage, by arbitration or otherwise. That means that in the long run the Government must appoint the arbitrators and must finally assume the responsibility of fixing a wage pattern. If the Government fixes wages, the argument for fixing prices cannot be fairly met. If prices are fixed it means rationing and a complete control of distribution. That is the end of a free economy.

Gandhi Paved Way for This

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I am including an editorial appearing in the current issue of Labor. The editorial really requires no comment from me, as it makes its point better than I could. However, we might do well to reflect on the fact that India, always considered so backward, has come forward with a constitution carrying social justice to such an extent, while certain expressly stated provisions of our own Constitution are given mere lip service.

GANDHI PAVED WAY FOR THIS

Perhaps we focus our eyes too much on Europe when we decide the world is slipping backward. If we look in the other direction we can see an inspiring sign of progress.

India, whose 330 million people about equal the population of all European nations put together, is adopting a new constitution, patterned after the American model, and in some respects going even further forward.

Gandhi, India's frail saint, is dead, but he paved the way for this charter of the nation for which he won freedom.

Long ago, Gandhi defied ancient and ironclad tradition and prejudice. He went among the 60 million "Untouchables," the outcasts of India, and pleaded their cause. If anyone but Gandhi had done it, he would have been torn limb from limb by the prouder "castes."

Now the new constitution forbids oppression of Untouchables. They can mingle freely with the other people of India, and rise in the social and economic scale, according to their individual abilities.

The constitution promises "justice, liberty, equality, and fraternity" to all Indians, regardless of caste, race, religion, or sex.

The American and other constitutions have made similar pledges, but India's adds something new.

It commits the government to see that all the people have a chance to make the kind of a living which will lead them out of the dire poverty they have suffered in the past.

In other words, India plans a constitution which will contain a "full employment" pledge, and more.

The government is to provide, in a vast country now sunk in ignorance, "free education for all children until the age of 14, within 10 years."

Americans can take pride in the fact that a man educated at Columbia University in New York, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, headed the committee which wrote this constitution. It's the kind of document which would have gladdened the hearts of the forefathers of the United States.

What Is the Administration Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the record of Harry S. Truman as President is an astonishing series of contradictions and inconsistencies, which have spread, multiplied, and confounded the confusion in which his administration was begun. The same pattern of changes, contradictions and inconsistencies prevails in major policy matters and minor executive and administration actions. "Foot-in-the mouth," and "off again, on again, gone again" tactics are so frequent they seem typical of the Truman administration. In view of this record the question may and should be raised as to whether the Truman administration has any fixed policies. Truman policies are far too often like one-way railroad tickets—"good for this train and this day only." Such a condition in Government is dangerous to this Nation. It leaves Congress and the people confused and in the dark as to ultimate administration intentions.

In order to get a clear picture, or at least the clearest possible picture of these inconsistencies and this confusion, it actually is necessary to divide these inconsistencies into categories. I first want to deal with prices—rationing, inflation.

Let us consider price control and rationing:

After VJ-day in August 1945, rationing of most consumer goods was ended. On January 31, 1946, President Truman criticized a proposal of Mr. Henry Ford 2d that price controls be removed because they were stifling America's ability to produce. The proposal, said President Truman, could not be accomplished without inviting wild inflation.

On June 29, 1946, President Truman vetoed the OPA extension bill asserting it would lead to disaster. On July 11, 1946, in a statement on the OWMR seventh report, he asserted that the ground which we had won against inflation would be irretrievably lost without a workable price-control law. On July 25, 1946, after a 25-day hiatus without price-control legislation, President Truman signed the substitute OPA bill—reluctantly, he said, because it failed to assure maintenance of stable prices. If the measure failed to halt inflation, he said:

I shall have no alternative but to call Congress back into special session * * * to enact * * * such legislation as we need to save us from the threat of economic disaster.

On September 5, 1946, President Truman said he had no intention of calling a special session of Congress to consider OPA or anything else. He said he thought Members of Congress were entitled to campaign without interference. Anyway, he said, no emergency existed which called for an extra session. On September 12, 1946, President Truman indicated that he had no intention of requesting additional legislation to support the administration's "hold-the-line" program. He also indicated that he had ample powers to combat inflation.

On October 3, 1946, President Truman and OWMR Director Steelman joined in issuing a solemn warning that another depression might be just around the corner, possibly as soon as early next year, if prices and wages continued to soar.

On November 9, 1946, President Truman summarily terminated all price and wage controls, except those on rents, sugar, and rice:

I am convinced that the time has come when these controls can serve no useful purpose. I am, indeed, convinced that their further continuance would do the Nation's economy more harm than good.

On November 17, 1947, President Truman requested of the Congress, which he had called back into emergency session, authority to impose consumer rationing on products in short supply which basically affect the cost of living, and authority to establish price ceilings on products in short supply which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production.

Now let us look at Mr. Truman's police state policies—or should I say his supposedly antipolice state policies:

On October 16, 1947, President Truman said at his press conference that controls, including those over rents, represent police state methods even in wartime.

Yet on November 17, 1947, in his personal message to Congress, President Truman called for the renewal of the very types of controls which he had condemned as those of a police state.

In asking for renewal of price controls, consumer rationing controls, inventory controls, wage controls, and so forth, President Truman was advocating returning to the police-state methods of the Office of Price Administration, the War Labor Board, the War Production Board—with a bigger and more colossal Federal bureaucracy than had flourished in wartime, with hundreds of thousands of police agents prying into the daily lives of millions of American people.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, said President Truman was proposing the "greatest economic regimentation of our home affairs ever suggested in time of peace." He asked what assurance there was that the regimentation would not become permanent, with the result that free enterprise "will stagnate and die a slow but sure death if businessmen lose control of their own business, and competition is eliminated."

Now let us consider meat controls, and the President's shifting policy in connection therewith:

During the summer and fall of 1946, it was obvious the black market in meat, which was threatening the health and welfare of the Nation, was actually being protected by the administration's policies.

A White House statement of May 3, 1946, to clarify the confusion created by President Truman's remark in his press conference the previous day, made it clear President Truman stood for the continuance of price control on meat, regardless of the outcome of efforts to control the black market by reinstatement of marketing quotas.

Efforts by Democratic leaders to persuade President Truman to end meat controls were unavailing. On September 24, 1946, President Truman refused again to remove meat controls.

I happen to know of my own knowledge something about the meat situation. * * * In July and August, when there was no price control on meat, meat was abundant. Now there is price control and meat is short. It is natural, therefore, for the people to blame the shortage on price control. This line of reasoning is wholly wrong.

On September 26, 1946, President Truman read to his press conference a long analysis of the meat situation in which he asserted that the Congress and not the renewal of price control was responsible for the meat shortage.

On October 10, 1946, at his press conference, President Truman refused to say whether Executive action in the meat situation was imminent.

On October 14, 1946, President Truman removed all price controls on meat, effective October 15. Admitting there were millions of cattle and hogs on farms and in feed lots, President Truman claimed the reason why there was a meat shortage was easily answered.

The reason was not price control. Said he:

The real story is a simple one. The responsibility rests squarely on a few men in the Congress.

Let us now consider the strange and deviating policy on food prices:

On October 16, 1947, President Truman said the idea that exporting grain caused higher prices was misinformation. He claimed the country had always exported a third or more of its crops and that current export was not out of line with what it always had been.

The fact, as shown by crop export reports of the United States Department of Agriculture, is that in the drought years 1934–36 this country had to import wheat. In the years between 1936 and World War II, exports did not average as high as 10 percent of production. Last year, when the country had a record crop, 400,000,000 bushels were exported from a 1,156,000,000-bushel production.

Again on October 5, 1947, in a radio address on the food problem, President Truman claimed that "most of the upward pressure on prices is a result of competition among Americans for scarce goods. The success of our food-saving program will help to reduce these inflationary pressures."

But if the conservation of 100,000,000 bushels of grain, which was the administration's program, would reduce inflationary pressure, it is difficult to understand why the export of 400,000,000 bushels should be practically disregarded as a factor in the rise of prices.

Here is the strange shifting policy of the administration on the question of inflation:

In his personal message to the "emergency" session of Congress on November 17, 1947, President Truman presented an undefined 10-point program which he said was necessary to check inflation, including restoration of price control and rationing.

Yet most of the powers needed to control inflation are already in President Truman's hands and have been there all along.

What causes high prices? The causes are easily identified. Among them the most important are: insufficient production to meet demand; high governmental spending; governmental deficit spending, inflation of the currency; inflationary effects of war activities and abnormal exports which reduce the supply of available goods; and crop shortages.

The President twice vetoed tax-reduction bills which would have increased consumer purchasing power and which also would have encouraged maximum production.

He has had it in his power to reduce high Government spending but has chosen instead to recommend the biggest budget in any peacetime year of our history.

He has had full power to limit exports, but has not done so.

On November 21, 1947, when the President's attention was called to the fact that he had control powers which he had not used, President Truman replied that the administration never made what he called complete use of every power granted by Congress.

Now, what was his course concerning consumer-credit controls?

President Truman's views on continuation of consumer-credit controls were presented in a letter to Federal Reserve Chairman Marriner S. Eccles, dated June 5, 1947. The President stated that he desired legislation to permit continuing such controls, but—

> If the Congress does not see fit to provide the necessary legislative authority, it is my intention to vacate the Executive order because I do not believe that such regulation should rest indefinitely in peacetime on emergency or war powers after the Congress has had ample opportunity to consider the subject.

At his press conference on July 24, 1947, however, President Truman said that he might not necessarily lift consumer credit controls in case Congress refused to authorize their extension.

As Representative WOLCOTT, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, said:

> If I can read the English language, the President said he would remove those controls unless he got specific peacetime authority from Congress. The President should not make such statements unless he is going to follow them through.

Congress enacted a law, which President Truman approved on August 8, 1947, terminating after November 1, 1947, the consumer-credit controls but providing that they might be exercised in wartime or any national emergency declared by the President.

On November 17, 1947, President Truman requested Congress to restore consumer-credit controls.

Mr. Speaker, labor problems still beset this Nation. How has Mr. Truman handled the labor situation?

President Truman's chameleonlike course on labor problems has varied from almost capricious light-heartedness to drastic severity.

On August 16, 1945, 3 days after Japan's surrender, President Truman, brushing aside the Little Steel formula, said:

> I am therefore authorizing the WLB to release voluntary wage increases from the necessity of approval on condition they will not be used in whole or in part as a basis for seeking an increase in price ceilings.

On September 25, 1945, President Truman expressed optimism on the labor situation and was sure Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach would succeed in ending the current wave of strikes.

On October 8, 1945, at a press conference near Tiptonville, Tenn., President Truman lightly dismissed the current strike wave as a reaction from the war effort—he was not worried about it at all.

On October 10, 1945, in his remarks at Gilbertsville, Ky., President Truman referred to the labor situation in these words:

> We are having our little troubles now, a few of them. They are not serious. Just a blow-up after a let-down from war. * * * Now let's all go home and go to work. Cut out the foolishness.

On October 29, 1945, President Truman canceled all his planned trips for the next 6 weeks so that he might deal with the pressing problems of the labor situation.

On November 1, 1945, President Truman told groups of delegates to the Labor-Management Conference that unless labor-management peace was established, the whole country would suffer and the country's leadership in world affairs would be imperiled.

On January 21, 1946, President Truman stated:

> We are having our troubles now as a result of turmoil and dissatisfaction with wages and hours and conditions of work. But I am not a pessimist. * * * I am not alarmed.

On January 31, 1946, as work stoppages in industry across the Nation grew, due to the strike of 750,000 steel workers, President Truman said that the general labor situation was improving all the time.

On February 7, 1946, deeply involved in confusion over the steel strike, which was already 18 days old, President Truman insisted the situation would not interfere with his plans for a vacation in Florida and a cruise in southern waters. He had not forgotten how to do business by telephone. Then, on February 8, 1946, President Truman canceled all plans for the vacation and cruise.

A rising tide of wage demands against an immovable price ceiling quickly doomed Mr. Truman's hopeless politico-economic philosophy which had persisted during the winter of 1945–46. With 1,400,000 persons on strike, including General Motors, and the steel strikes, the President was forced to contradict his boost-wages-hold-prices command.

On February 14, 1946, the President announced a new wage-price policy to settle the steel strike. In return for an 18.5-cent-an-hour wage increase he approved a $5-a-ton price increase.

On May 4, 1946, President Truman released a reconversion report which described the 34-day-old strike of 400,000 soft-coal miners as a national disaster damaging the reconversion program so seriously it would take months to retrieve the losses.

On May 25, 1946, President Truman appeared before Congress to demand immediate legislation granting him emergency powers to break strikes against the Federal Government, including authority to draft strikers into the armed forces.

Behind the President's extreme demand lay the following situation revealed by Senator WAYNE MORSE in the Senate on May 27, 1946—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 5, page 5801:

> Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from California aware of the fact that before noon on Saturday (May 25) the White House knew that the railroad workers were willing to go back on the basis of the report of the President's own emergency board * * * that when the President of the United States spoke Saturday afternoon at 4 o'clock he did not tell the American people that fact?

On June 11, 1946, President Truman vetoed the Case bill, condemning the measure as hitting at symptoms and ignoring the underlying causes of industrial strife, and charging that it would force men to work under compulsion for private employers in a peacetime economy.

On January 6, 1947, President Truman in his State of the Union message called for legislation to outlaw indefensible jurisdictional strikes and require binding arbitration of disputed labor contract terms.

On June 20, 1947, President Truman vetoed the Taft-Hartley bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look briefly at the administration's changes of policy on the labor fact-finding boards.

On December 3, 1945, President Truman requested Congress to pass legislation authorizing the appointment by the President of fact-finding boards similar to the emergency boards provided for under the Railway Labor Act to make thorough investigation of all facts deemed relevant in labor controversies.

The President in the same message announced that he was appointing such fact-finding boards for the General Motors strike, and on December 31, 1945, he appointed a fact-finding board for the steel strike.

Although the steel fact-finding board was given until February 10, 1946, to submit its report, President Truman preempted its jurisdiction and, on January 16, 1946, the White House announced that President Truman would offer his own solution to the disputants.

By taking the decision out of the hands of the fact-finding board, President Truman made it impossible for the board to continue on the course he had outlined for it.

The inconsistency of the President's fact-finding plan was revealed in the President's own statement of January 18, 1946:

> The fact-finding board * * * has reported to me informally. It has not had the opportunity to go into the merits of the case very fully, as it would have done if there were legislation now on the books for a cooling-off period. Nevertheless, after hearing the board and after long consideration, I believe that the suggestion made by me of * * * 18½ cents per hour is fair.

Then there was the Victory Day pay reversal.

In the flush of victory following the defeat of Japan, the President let himself in for another contradiction of orders.

On August 14, 1945, the White House issued this order:

> The President amended Executive Order No. 9240 (issued by F. D. R., regarding holidays) to declare August 15 and 16 legal holidays for premium pay purposes under the order. (New York Times, Aug. 15, 1945.)

The confusion was so great, particularly for contractors operating on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, that the White House revoked it next day with the following explanation:

> The President merely excused Government employees from work on those two days. The second statement, "making today and Thursday legal holidays for premium pay purposes," was issued in error. (New York Times, Aug. 16, 1945.)

Out of the confusion rose the millions of dollars question: Who should pay for the White House blunder? The answer was simple—the taxpayer.

Now, let us look at the ability-to-pay theory.

During the General Motors strike of 113 days in the winter of 1945–46, President Truman made a tragic blunder in lining himself up with a socialistic contention which turned out to be a hoax.

It was tragic because it showed clearly the President's confused economic thinking. It was tragic also because it undoubtedly lengthened the strike by supporting a rigged issue so absurdly false that both sides finally threw it out the window in order to reach a settlement.

To the consternation of many of his official family, President Truman fell completely for the canard that "ability to pay" should be the yardstick of wages, and that General Motors should open its books for the application of this yardstick.

On December 20, 1945, the President declared:

> Ability to pay is always one of the facts relevant to the issue of an increase in wages. It is essential for the fulfillment of its duty for the board (appointed by him) * * * to examine the books of the employer. (New York Times, December 21, 1945.)

On March 24, 1946, when R. J. Thomas, then president of UAWA, added his doubts to a deluge of doubts at Reuther's ability-to-pay theory, Reuther publicly announced that his demand for General Motors to open its books "was just a maneuver to win public support and get the company over a barrel"—New York Times, March 26, 1946.

It was Mr. Truman who was left over a barrel. He slipped as unobtrusively as possible off the barrel, and never advocated the "arithmetic of the books" for any future wage settlements.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take up the case of that sterling New Dealer and friend of the Kremlin, Henry Wallace.

On September 12, 1946, a speech which was to be delivered by Henry Wallace at Madison Square Garden was read by reporters with surprise because, despite its assertions that our policy had been too harsh toward the Russians and that a more conciliatory policy was necessary, it stated:

> When President Truman read these words he said that they represented the policy of the administration.

President Truman was therefore asked, at his press conference on September 12, 1946, whether this endorsement applied to the whole of Mr. Wallace's speech or just the paragraph in which it appeared. President Truman replied that it applied to the whole speech. He was then asked whether he regarded the Wallace speech as a departure from the policy of Secretary of State Byrnes. No, President Truman replied, he thought they were exactly in line.

On September 14, 1947, President Truman was forced to repudiate his endorsement of Mr. Wallace's speech. In a special press conference he attempted to explain that in expressing his approval of the Wallace speech he had not conveyed the thought he had intended to convey. What he had intended to express, he said, was that he approved the right of Mr. Wallace to deliver the speech. He did not intend to indicate, he said, that he approved the speech as constituting a statement of the foreign policy of this country.

President Truman's efforts to straighten out this mess soon became a farce. Mr. Wallace released to the press a letter he had submitted to President Truman under date of July 23, 1946, urging definite guarantees to Russia which would be tantamount to appeasement. President Truman had attempted to prevent the publication of this letter, but was not able to do so.

On September 18, 1946, after a conference with President Truman, Mr. Wallace reported:

> The President and the Secretary of Commerce had a most detailed and friendly discussion, after which the Secretary reached the conclusion he would make no public statements or speeches until the Foreign Ministers' Conference in Paris is concluded.

Despite this understanding, on September 20, 1946, President Truman announced at a press conference:

> I have today asked Mr. Wallace to resign from the Cabinet. It had become clear that between his views on foreign policy and those of the administration * * * there was a fundamental conflict.

It had taken an ultimatum from Secretary of State Byrnes to make it clear to President Truman how great the "fundamental conflict" was between Mr. Wallace's views on foreign policy and those of the administration.

This discussion now brings us to the problem of foreign affairs.

Let us look first at export control.

On April 15, 1947, President Truman requested that Congress revise the Neutrality Act so as to permit barring of exports to aggressors. Under existing law, he said, the Government is obliged to "treat aggressor and aggrieved, peacemaker and trouble-maker, alike in the matter of permitting American manufacturers to supply them with arms, ammunition, or implements of war." President Truman said such impartiality "is no longer consistent with this country's commitments and requirements."

Meanwhile, President Truman made no move to exercise the export controls he had had all along, to halt the export of food and other goods to Communist-dominated territory, while he asked millions of dollars to fight the spread of communism in other directions.

On November 21, 1947, President Truman said he saw no reason to stop the shipment of the United States' industrial equipment and heavy machinery to Russia. President Truman admitted that a Soviet Purchasing Commission in this country has been allowed to purchase heavy machinery—allegedly for the repair of Russian hydroelectric dams destroyed by the Germans during the war.

With regard to cancellation of lend-lease debts, on August 30, 1945, President Truman recommended to Congress the cancellation of nearly $43,000,000,000 due the United States for lend-lease materials supplied to the Allies during the war.

Senators VANDENBERG and TAFT, among others, pointed out that whereas termination of lend-lease operations on VJ-day had put the United States in a favorable bargaining position for coming economic negotiations, the President's statement on cancellation of lend-lease debts had destroyed that bargaining position.

On September 6, 1945, President Truman shifted his ground, stating:

> We must recognize that it will not be possible for our Allies to pay us dollars for the overwhelming portion of the lend-lease obligations * * * but this does not mean that all lend-lease obligations are to be canceled.

The secret pledge to the Arabs is another phase of the administration's shifting foreign policy.

On September 26, 1945, President Truman vigorously denied that any commitment had been made for the United States by the late President Roosevelt at a post-Yalta meeting with King Ibn Saud, of Saudi Arabia, as claimed by Arab leaders. No such commitment had been made, said President Truman; he had looked carefully for it.

Then, on October 18, 1945, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, confronted by Arab leaders with a facsimile of the document, which they threatened to publish, found and made public Mr. Roosevelt's letter to his great and good friend, King Ibn Saud, pledging that he, as Chief Executive of the United States, would take no action which might prove hostile to the Arab people.

In addition to these cases I have enumerated, there are several other miscellaneous instances, all pointing up the fact that the administration does not know one day what it will do the next. Take the calling of the special session.

On July 10, 1947, President Truman said at his press conference that he saw no necessity for a special session of Congress in the immediate future.

On August 14, 1947, President Truman again said at his press conference there were no circumstances on the horizon which would necessitate his calling a special session of Congress before the regular session in January.

As late as September 12, 1947, aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri*, President Truman was reported as still unconvinced of the need for a special session of Congress.

On September 29, 1947, President Truman met with congressional leaders and later held a press conference. He stated that while a special session of Congress was thoroughly discussed, he did not propose that one be called, and asked only that key congressional committees meet at the earliest possible date to consider problems of European relief.

On October 21, 1947, President Truman asked congressional leaders to meet with him on October 23 for "a further discussion of foreign aid."

At the October 23, 1947, meeting with congressional leaders, President Truman announced that he was calling Congress back into session. He did not consult with these leaders as to the advisability of calling Congress back to Washington. On the contrary, he was all prepared with a statement announcing his decision, with the date set and everything.

Government controls are another vital subject on which Mr. Truman swings about like a weather vane.

Out of one side of his mouth President Truman called for ending Government controls.

On October 30, 1945, in announcing a new wage-price policy, President Truman urged that we "get away as quickly as possible from Government controls."

His wage-price policy, however, moved in the direction of more rather than less Government controls.

Still pursuing the contradictory policy of pushing wages up while insisting that prices need not be increased, President Truman was forced to revise his wage-price policy again and again.

On February 14, 1946, in announcing still another wage-price policy, President Truman said:

> I trust that the Congress will: (1) Extend the stabilization statutes without amendment, and will do so with all possible speed * * *; (2) extend the subsidy program for another full year; (3) enact promptly the Patman bill to establish price controls over housing * * *; (4) extend promptly the Second War Powers Act.

After abandoning price and wage controls in 1945 and 1946, on November 17, 1947, Truman asked Congress for their restoration along with several other controls.

Subversive employees and communism offer still another example of constant Presidential vacillation.

On February 28, 1947, President Truman wrote in a letter to former Gov. George H. Earle, of Pennsylvania:

> People are very much wrought up about the Communist bugaboo, but I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe so far as communism is concerned—we have too many sane people. Our Government is made for the welfare of the people, and I don't believe there will ever come a time when anyone will really want to overturn it.

On March 22, 1947, President Truman issued an Executive order providing for the investigation of the loyalty of Federal employees. "The presence within the Government service of any disloyal and subversive person constitutes a threat to our democratic processes," said President Truman. He asked Congress for $25,000,000 which he said would be necessary to rid the Government of dangerous disloyalists.

A short time earlier, on March 12, 1947, President Truman had launched his Truman doctrine for the containment of communism, and had requested that Congress appropriate $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey against totalitarian—Communist—aggression.

On April 3, 1947, at his press conference, President Truman confirmed the views he had expressed in his letter to Mr. Earle, saying again that he has no fear that the Communist Party will take over the American Government.

The Ickes-Pauley incident offered still another example of shifting Presidential policies.

After Secretary of the Interior Ickes had testified on the unfitness of Edwin W. Pauley for the post of Under Secretary of the Navy, to which President Truman had nominated him, reporters questioned President Truman at his press conference on February 7, 1946. President Truman asserted then that Mr. Ickes had not consulted him prior to his testimony on Pauley.

According to Mr. Ickes, Ickes told President Truman he had been called to testify on Pauley, and President Truman said:

> Of course you must tell the truth, but be as gentle as you can with Ed Pauley.

At his press conference on February 15, 1946, President Truman substantially confirmed the statement of Mr. Ickes and admitted that he had told Ickes to "be kind to him"—Pauley.

This vacillation of policy has continued up to the present time and there is evidently no reason to suppose it will not be so while Mr. Truman remains in office. On Thursday, December 11, the President flatly told a news conference the Republican proposal for partial repeal of the antitrust laws would never go into effect as long as he is President.

On Friday, running true to form, a White House spokesman told reporters the relaxation of antitrust laws is acceptable to the President.

Mr. Speaker, when the President of the United States issues such a succession of orders in conflict with one another in a storm-tossed world, how can the people have any confidence that he knows what he is doing, and where he is heading the Ship of State?

Mr. Truman's reversals have been so many and so glaring we would be risking the future of ourselves and our country if we should continue blindly and unquestioningly to follow his contradictory commands.

If he will not or cannot straighten out his thinking, we had better lose no time straightening it out for him—or we will all be on the rocks together.

Dr. Joseph F. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to place in the RECORD an article written by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, on Correct Terminology as an Aid to Peace. Dr. Thorning, or Father Thorning, as I am prone to call him, because he is a Catholic priest, is one of the outstanding authorities of the Nation on Pan-American relations. He has just returned, after having been invited to make an address at the inauguration of President-elect Romulo Gallegos of the Republic of Venezuela. By your gracious consent, Mr. Speaker, and with the approval of our wonderful Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, Dr. Thorning will offer the opening prayer before the House on Pan-American Day, April 14, 1948.

I have had the extreme pleasure of reading Dr. Thorning's very excellent article, which discusses the habit which radio commentators, newspaper editors, lecturers; yes, also Congressmen, have of describing the Soviet Union as Russia." I suggest that the Members of the House read the message. It will be time well spent. I ask that the article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

CORRECT TERMINOLOGY: AN AID TO PEACE
(By Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs)

"Words are weapons" is only a half-truth. Words are much more than weapons. Rightly used, they have a magic that can create understanding and good will. Above all, they should be employed in such wise that they can penetrate any artificial walls built up by governments against and around the people who are forced to exist behind curtains of misinformation and hate. Under such circumstances, the right words can develop right thinking and decent feelings toward millions of human beings who have no control over the totalitarian régimes which are exploiting them. In the contemporaneous world, words can and should be the building blocks of peace.

One of the most fundamental suggestions that can be offered in the domain of language is that radio commentators, newspaper editors, lecturers, and politicians forego the slovenly habit of describing the Soviet Union as "Russia." Geographically or politically, there is no such body politic as "Russia." Why not examine official maps for the correct designation? Across huge slices of territory in Europe and Asia the student can read the letters, "U. S. S. R." or "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." The obvious abbreviation is "The Soviet Union."

This truth is recognized in every official interchange of notes between the U. S. S. R. and the United States. Secretary of State George C. Marshall and the Assistant Secretary of State for political affairs throughout the globe, the Honorable Norman Armour, are careful to use the correct terminology. Indeed, State Department practice is firmly established in this regard. There is every reason why our citizens, who wish to be exact, should note standards of correctness which aim at better understanding among peoples.

In the United Nations, Messrs. Andrei Vishinsky and Andrei Gromyko are invariably introduced as the Soviet delegates, not as the Russian representatives. This is sound procedure, because there is no such entity as Russia listed on the roster of the United Nations. Reporters and newscasters from the world organization, therefore, have a special obligation not to change the record by introducing talk about Russia and the Russians. It is as easy as it is correct to say the Soviet Union and the Soviets. The New York Times correspondents at Lake Success do this quite consistently, although radio and wire-service correspondents are not quite so accurate. Generally speaking, the radio commentators are worst offenders.

Looking to the future, we should be anxious not to build up a bogey in the minds of the people of the United States. When radio listeners hear that "the Russians" or "Russia," which necessarily connotes "Russians," have denounced our Government at Lake Success or at Moscow, it is almost inevitable, it seems to me, that millions of people will jump to the conclusion that "Russia" and "the Russians" are our enemies. Actually, they deserve our friendship as we would like to merit theirs.

In this connection a recent piece in the New York Times Magazine: The Politburo Tries a New Tack, by H. R. Trevor-Roper, invites attention. This Oxford don leads off by mentioning "the Soviet Union" and "the Soviet Government." His single use of the term "Russia" is correct. He is writing about the pre-Soviet body politic. When Mr. Trevor-Roper employs the term "Russian," it is linked with "communism." To my mind, this is precise diction.

In another passage of the same article, the Oxford scholar indicates how unrealistic it is to speak about Soviet policy without a thorough consideration of the dialectical materialism of Karl Marx. Mr. Trevor-Roper writes as follows:

> "Marxism after all is more than a theology and a political technique. It is a gigantic intellectual system that claims to explain and answer every problem. It analyzes the past and prophesies the future, and, it must be admitted, its analyses and its prophecy, although often erroneous in detail, have permanently affected the study of politics."

Marxism is the common bond among totalitarian followers of the party line throughout the world. The dialectical materialism of Marx constitutes the essence of the new religion, whose headquarters happen to be the Kremlin in Moscow. Just as there are millions outside the Soviet Union who profess their faith in Marxism, so there are millions of Russians who continue to believe in God and consequently are not Marxists. "Russian" and "Marxist" are not convertible terms. Indeed, it is safe to claim that the majority of people, victimized by the Soviet Politburo either in the Soviet Union or in the Soviet-dominated eastern European states, are not fanatical adherents of Marxian philosophy. Most of the farmers of the Baltic region and of the Balkans believe in the rights of conscience, freedom of speech, the right to own private property, and the traditional values of family life. It is wrong to classify them with the Soviet clique, temporarily in control.

The international character of Marxism, as contradistinguished from Russian culture, may be elucidated by a few simple questions. Is Eugene Dennis a Russian? Are William Z. Foster and Earl Browder Russians? Are Jacques Duclos, Maurice Thorez, and Marcel Cachin Russians? Can it be claimed that Gerhart Eisler, recently convicted in a United States court, is a Russian? Are Palmiro Togliatti and Luigi Longo Russians? Is Matyas Rakosi, who seized the Government of Hungary, a Russian? Or are the Marxist totalitarians in the Far East Russians?

Some radio commentators try to defend their use of the term "Russia" by claiming that "the aim of Soviet Moscow is precisely the same as that of Czarist Moscow and St. Petersburg—that of establishing a supreme central authority."

To be sure, numerous elements of Russian imperialism remain active in the Soviet Union. There is a line of historical continuity. The Soviet commissars, like the Czars, tend to expand their conquests toward the Baltic and the Mediterranean ports. The masters of the Kremlin, like Peter I and Catherine II, are eager to exploit the Orthodox churches for the purposes of territorial aggrandizement and political domination. One could easily give additional items in a catalog of policies that coincide as of yesterday and today.

Is this the whole story? Are not the most formidable elements those that have organized fifth columns in every nation on the face of the earth? Can it be contended that Peter I and Catherine II, autocrats of all the Russias, systematically trained nationalist leaders and agitators for Asia, Africa, Australia, Europe, and the Western Hemisphere?

Was it the aim of Czarist Moscow and St. Petersburg to establish a supreme central authority, not simply for all the Russias but for the world community?

Failure to calculate these facts has caused Mrs. Vera Micheles Dean, of the Foreign Policy Association, to produce an inadequate evaluation of Marxism and the Soviet Union. The very title of her book, The United States and Russia, is misleading. A true description of the U. S. S. R. is reserved for the subtitle. This clear subordination of the Soviet Union to a nonexistent Russia is no accident. Marxist sympathizers in the United States are prone to talk about "Russia" and "the Russians." Mr. Henry A. Wallace and Senator CLAUDE A. PEPPER are two spokesmen for appeasement who rarely, if ever, mention the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Does any thoughtful reader imagine that this choice of language is not deliberate, although incorrect? With such radiant diction, Marxist apologists in our country try to plead the cause of the clique that runs the Soviet Union. The interests of the Soviet Politburo and the Russian people, it may be noted, do not often coincide.

Why not be realistic as well as exact in this sphere of semantics? The distinction between tyrants and their slaves can and should be recorded every time that we mention the Soviet Union and the Russian people. By precise language we can safeguard our own security and, at the same time, maintain a friendly attitude toward the non-Soviet Russians.

Truth depends upon accuracy of expression. Furthermore, fairness to all concerned demands that there be no name-calling. This is a case where the rulers of the Soviet Union have themselves chosen their own titles and their own descriptions. They are the self-proclaimed leaders of a federation which, avowedly, aims to embrace the world with its peoples. That is the gospel according to Marx, Lenin and Stalin. The constitution of the U. S. S. R. was drawn up with explicit provisions for the incorporation of all other political entities. Numerous people in Europe and Asia are already painfully aware of the operation of this doctrine. We are talking about a condition, not a theory.

The case was clearly put by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times. Explaining the peril of withdrawing United States troops from Europe, Mr. Baldwin wrote as follows:

> "The assumption that evacuation is a solution stems from another erroneous assumption—that the Soviet Union as a national entity, rather than communism, as an international force, is the real opponent of the West."

Mr. Alexander Kerensky, whose Social Democratic government was overthrown by the Bolsheviks, should know something about Soviet techniques and Soviet foreign policy. On more than one occasion, he has called for an end to "this mischievous business of confusing the Soviet Union with Russia, the objectives of world communism with Russian national interests."

Although "soviet" originally meant "council" and, therefore, was a term without sinister connotations, it has gradually assumed new significance. Does not the verb, "to sovietize," mean "to collectivize"? Are not "the soviets" known today as "the collectivizers"? Forcible collectivization is the notion that soviet conveys in the contemporaneous world. Nothing of that kind is regarded as desirable by the Russian people. As Mr. Kerensky pointed out, "nowhere has hatred of totalitarian communism become as sharp as within Russia."

Since the Russian people are among our best allies, it is wrong, ethically as well as semantically, to confuse them with the Soviet oligarchy Mr. Cyrus L. Sulzberger, European correspondent of the New York Times, knows this. As a result you can search through his dispatches in vain for any loose talk about Russia or the Russians. In fact, Mr. Sulzberger is rather emphatic in his use of the complete title of the Soviet Union, "the U. S. S. R." He has seen enough totalitarian Marxists outside the U. S. S. R. to realize that Marxism cuts across all national boundaries and all racial groups.

Another writer who is conscientious about his language is Prof. Arnold J. Toynbee, director of international studies at the Royal Institute and professor of international history in the University of London. University and college professors in the United States could benefit by this example.

Neither educators nor radio speakers nor newspaper reporters can excuse themselves on the vague grounds of common usage. The good reporters and the best correspondents usually try to make the correct usage clear, exact, and paramount. Only when the accurate expressions have been established and emphasized do they have resort, for variety's sake, to any other phrase or term. Every one in the field of public relations has an obligation to strive for good usage, accuracy of expression, precise truth, and peace education. Good will, like truth, depends upon the right words.

America Trails Britain on the Road to Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of March 2, 1948:

AMERICA TRAILS BRITAIN ON THE ROAD TO RUIN

Britain as long as 35 years ago began a program of social betterment for its poorer people. The Government share of the cost was obtained by taxes on individuals in the higher income ranges. Professor Pigou, of Cambridge University, pointed out in a paper in 1927 that the savings available for investment in capital were 25 percent smaller in 1925 than in 1911. The reduction in the fund available for investment was almost the identical amount of the increase in the expenditures for social services.

The Conservative Party which came into power in 1931 did not interrupt the decay of

British industry. The first duty of a politician is to stay in office. The so-called Conservatives provided more and more social services and did it by raising taxes higher and higher, chiefly by levying upon the upper ranges of income and upon business.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt sought to soak the rich he could always show that the British were soaking the rich even harder. When Roosevelt proposed and obtained a heavy tax on earnings retained by corporations for development, he got the idea from Britain. Fortunately, it took only 2 years for Congress to perceive the lunacy of punishing companies which held back profits for expansion and development.

Although our undistributed profits tax was repealed in 1938, tax rates on personal incomes and on corporations were raised during the war to new peak levels. The wartime excess-profits tax has been repealed in the United States, but taxes on business and the upper brackets of individual incomes have been retained and are higher than those which before the war reduced the flow of capital into British industry to a trickle.

Employing British economic policies, the United States has choked off fresh productive investment. People who formerly would have bought common stocks each year now are obliged to sell part of their holdings to live. Last year only a little more than half a billion dollars of new risk capital was obtained by American corporations. The Government last year collected and spent $60 for every dollar that went into risk capital. In these taxes, especially upon the investing class and upon business, the Government eats up the money that would otherwise be available for expansion and improved production.

In Britain today can be seen the end result of the taxing and spending policies followed for some years in the United States.

So Runs the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from Plain Talk:

SO RUNS THE WORLD

It is difficult to resist the temptation to leaf through the New Year editorials of our great newspapers for 1944 and 1945 and 1946 and 1947, on the threshold of another decisive year in the continuing twilight of civilization, marked by the break-down of the London Peace Conference.

If you would explore the wilderness in which our mighty leaders of opinion and molders of policy have been wandering during these 4 years since the fatal Teheran Conference in December 1943, go and consult their writings and statements on the eves of each New Year. You will either be nauseated by the pollyanna praises sung to the "peace-loving" Kremlin or you will be crushed by the blindness of our pathfinders who thrive on dispensing optimism to the millions.

Now that the harsh truth is beginning to dawn even on the most deluded among our mentors, it is more than ever necessary to tell the people the one fundamental truth which has been carefully hidden from them all these years, and which is still wrapped in the foggy columns of our commentators and official spokesmen.

This truth is that we have not been engaged since VJ-day in the making of peace. We have in reality been engaged in the unmaking of the secret peace framed, signed, and sealed at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

This bitter truth must and will come out. The few who had the vision to see it and the courage to say it must get a hearing. The secret peace was made behind the backs of the peoples of the world, while men were still dying on the battlefields for its sake; it was made in an atmosphere filled with the propaganda fumes generated by the most massive and expensive propaganda machinery ever foisted upon a free world.

The secret peace, for which the Government of the United States must bear the major responsibility, cannot be matched in the long list of Carthaginian peace settlements in the history of man. Since the days of tribal chieftains, Parthian despots, Mongol invaders, and conquering Caesars, there has never been a peace as dishonorable, as treacherous, as irresponsible, as inhuman, and as short-sighted as the one negotiated by the little men with big names who crossed the Atlantic to meet the Moscow satraps and brought them ever-increasing offerings at the expense of humanity.

We sold sovereign and intrepid Yugoslavia, after encouraging her resistance against the Nazi invaders, into the bondage of Soviet totalitarianism;

We agreed to the dismemberment of Poland, in the absence of her legally constituted representatives, when her sons were falling by the hundreds at Monte Cassino;

We then betrayed the legitimate Polish Government, with which we had solemnly fraternized, to the new Tartary;

We surrendered to Stalin's executioners Bulgaria and the democratic, anti-Fascist leaders of her people, after they had negotiated a provisional peace with us before the fall of Hitler;

We let down, similarly, the liberty-seeking forces in Rumania and Hungary, condemning them to servitude under ruthless foreign dictatorship;

We turned over to the mercies of that merciless power the three Baltic nations, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, whose independence we had proudly and publicly vouchsafed during the war itself;

We gave Russia the city Königsberg, which the Russian people had never claimed and do not wish;

We allowed the Red Army to occupy Prague, by the grace of diplomatic pressure and not because of military exigencies, so as to enable Moscow to hold a dagger at the vitals of Europe;

We nodded approval when the junta in the Kremlin dismembered and shackled the remainder of Finland;

We trampled upon the very soul of humanity when we consented to feed into the Soviet maw, by force if necessary, many hundreds of thousands of refugees and runaway Russians who, in their quest for freedom, had left or deserted the tyranny in their homeland;

We presented to Russia, gratis, the Kurile Islands, a vital link in the American defense system between the Aleutians and Japan;

We delivered, behind the back of our ally, China, control over two of her major strategic ports;

We encouraged the Chinese Communist satellites of Moscow to seize most of Manchuria, which contains more than one-half of the resources of all of China, and stood by when the Red Army had looted that province;

We betrayed the trust of the long-enslaved people of Korea by arbitrarily cutting their country in two and throwing the developed, industrial north into the lap of the new enslaver.

And in a supreme gesture of appeasement, we helped establish exclusive Soviet possession of eastern Germany as far as Berlin, arming Stalin with an ace weapon against us.

The American people were not consulted in the perpetration of this none-too-complete catalog of misdeeds which constitutes the framework of the secret peace we are now trying to dismantle, and many of those on our national scene who have had a hand in fashioning that monstrosity are continuing to befuddle the issue.

Already voices are being raised that the blame for the collapse of the London conference, convoked to draft peace settlements for Germany and Austria, must be laid upon the instrument employed—the Council of Foreign Ministers. Already the misleaders of yesteryear are putting the emphasis on the procedure for the settlement of the differences, and not upon the differences themselves. We are asked to believe that the Council of Foreign Ministers could not solve the differences in public, but that the time-honored diplomatic means of private negotiations could produce an enduring peace. Nothing can be further from the truth.

The real issue is: How can we unmake the secret peace by which we have let an incendiary loose in the premises of civilization? The real and only question facing us is: How can we drive the marauder out of Europe and make him return to his own preserves?

It cannot be repeated too often that genuine peace will not be established until the area of freedom is restored. We must dissolve the chains we have forged in the secret peace, chains in which a dozen nations are now languishing. We must undo the crimes of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. We must liberate those whom we have helped to fetter. And we must do more than render lip service to the battle cries of justice and freedom before the light of a lasting peace will begin to glimmer on the horizon of a world in chaos.—I. D. L.

Power and Water Shortage in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter addressed to the members of the Oakland Chamber of Commerce by its president concerning the water and power shortage in California. The letter sets forth rather forcefully the severity of the situation and the measures which the people of California are taking to voluntarily meet the situation. Every person in the community is called upon to curtail his use of electrical energy at home and at work.

The tremendous need of California to conserve the water in its mountains for use for irrigation is again emphasized. The completion of present and future power projects must be hastened.

The letter from James H. L'Hommedieu, president of the chamber of commerce, is as follows:

FEBRUARY 11, 1948.

To Oakland Chamber of Commerce Members:

The power shortage is critical and you are urged to join in widespread plans to conserve electricity.

An appeal has been made to the public, and your chamber of commerce, upon unanimous action of the board of directors, is urging chamber members to make a special effort to assist during the indefinite period of crisis.

William H. Park, a vice president of this chamber and district manager of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., appeared before the board at its latest meeting and explained that farmers, due to the lack of rain and snow, are now using more than 200,000 horsepower to pump water for the irrigation of crops. This immense load, to which is added increased population requirements, usually occurs in May instead of February, thus taking an unexpected drain at this time.

The recent light rains offered no appreciable relief, and how long the shortage will continue is entirely dependent upon the weather, Mr. Park said. He pointed out that the company is sacrificing income in urging power conservation, and added the observation that prosperity in California is dependent on crops, crops dependent upon water, and water takes from electric power. Cooperation now will accrue to the benefit of all later.

Therefore, I urge upon you the following voluntary means of curtailing power use:

1. Discontinue illumination of all outside signs and floodlights.
2. Reduce window lights by 50 percent by reducing window illumination wattage either by lamp or floodlights by one-third, and extinguish all window lights at 8 p. m. Avoid use of electricity as much as possible between 4 and 8 p. m., the peak-load hours.
3. Reduce inside lights to the limits of safe and efficient operation.
4. Light no unused rooms. Use appliances as briefly as possible.
5. Use electricity as sparingly as possible.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES H. L'HOMMEDIEU,
President.

Abide With Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on February 14 I was privileged to listen to one of the most beautiful programs featured by the National Broadcasting Co. and its affiliated stations. This particular program was the one hundred and seventieth of a series entitled "Home Is What You Make It." The program dramatized the World Day of Prayer and was entitled "Abide With Me."

This program is sponsored in cooperation with the American Home Economics Association, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the United Council of Church Women. The narrator on the program is Mr. Ben Grauer. The script for the program is written by Mr. Lou Hazam, and it is directed by Mr. Jack Kuney.

In my humble opinion this series, Home Is What You Make It, is making a very effective contribution to the solution of many of the perplexing problems that confront us. The specific program of February 14 was so impressive that I felt it should be preserved in the permanent records of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, my thanks go to the National Broadcasting Co. and those co-operating with it in the presentation of this series. Under unanimous consent, I include the script of this program as part of my remarks:

Jesus: And I say unto you, ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.

(Chorus)

"Holy, holy, holy! Lord God Almighty!
Early in the morning our song shall rise to Thee!
Holy, holy, holy! merciful and mighty!
God in three persons, blessed Trinity!"

Announcer: The sounds of prayer, spoken in myriad tongues throughout the world, have but a few hours ago faded away. The seventy-first World Day of Prayer, sponsored on the first Friday of Lent by the United Council of Church Women, has become history. And while the strains still echo in the hearts of those who knelt under shade trees to mark this day, in thatched-roof chapels, in kraals, in cathedrals, from the Fiji Islands at the edge of the international date line, to St. Lawrence Island in the cold Arctic, Home Is What You Make It, brought to you by the National Broadcasting Co., and its affiliated independent stations, pauses to salute the significance of this glorious day with a special program dedicated to the miracle of prayer, entitled "Abide With Me."

Narrator: With a chain of strength, the World Day of Prayer has linked the globe. On continent, on island, unnumbered people, in 1,068 languages and dialects, together proclaimed their trust in God. Thus on a day in February, in the third year of the Atomic Age, twentieth century, Anno Domini, modern man, creator of the machine which has made him self-sufficient in almost all things, admits, like the men who came before him, he cannot live by bread alone.

This is not strange. This is not new. It has always been so from the beginning. And if you will bear with us some 30 minutes, we will lift your heart with the glory and wonder of it.

We begin with a clap of thunder; because here, we are told, is where man began blindly to lift his eyes beyond himself and search for an ally against the things which thwarted him. To the rugged mountains, to the all-powerful sun, to the mysterious lightning, the roaring waterfall, and to that crashing thunder, man raised his voice in his first pathetic calls for help.

Man: O loud-voiced one, help me, help me.

Narrator: A kind of prayer, this a prayer born of ignorance and fear, but not less a prayer. And as man increased his dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, he began attributing spirits to natural wonders. And in time named the spirits and endowed each with godhood. And to these he prayed.

In Egyptian.

Egyptian: Thy dawning is beautiful in the horizon of heaven, O living Aton, beginning of life. When thou risest in the eastern heaven, thou fillest every land with thy beauty; for thou art beautiful, great, glittering, high over the earth; thy rays, they encompass the lands, even all thou hast made. Thou art Ra, and thou hast carried them all away captive.

Narrator: In Assyrian.

Assyrian: In Heaven who is great—thou alone art great. On earth who is great—thou alone art great. When thy voice resounds in heaven, the gods fall prostrate. When thy voice resounds on earth, all the genii kiss the dust.

Narrator: In Aztec, to the corn god.

Aztec: Our mother the earth goddess, whose food is on the nine plains, goddess of the seven ears, arise, awake. The yellow blossom has flowered. The white blossom has burst open.

Narrator: In Indian, at the foothills of the Himalayas.

Indian: From unreality take me into reality, from darkness into light, from death take me into immortality. May the supreme Pransva gratify me with knowledge.

Narrator: Politely, in ancient Chinese.

Chinese: I, the Emperor, had respectfully prepared this paper, to inform the spirit of the sun, the moon, the five planets, the spirit of the stars and of the clouds, the spirit of the four seas and the great rivers, and the spirit of the present year: That on the first day of next month we shall reverently lead our officers and people to honor the great name of the god Shag-Ti. That you will exert your spiritual power.

Narrator: In Greece, where many gods peopled Olympus, the relationship between gods and men was close and familiar. From one of these gods, Euripides, the playwright, sought council thusly:

Euripides: O thou that stayest the earth and hast thy firm throne thereon, whosoever thou art, unfathomable to human knowledge, whether thou art Zeus or the necessity of Nature, or the mind of man, to thee I raise my voice.

Narrator: And Socrates prayed to the horned deities, before his friend Phraedus, thus:

Socrates: O beloved Pan and all ye other gods of this place, grant to me that I may be made beautiful in my soul within and that all eternal possessions be in harmony with my inner man. May I consider the wise man rich, and may I have wealth as only the self-restrained man can endure. Do we need anything more, Phraedus? For me, that is prayer enough.

Narrator: Many prayers to many gods, but perhaps none compared with the prayers that sprang from the heart of man when at last he found one God through Moses.

Moses: Thou shalt have no other gods than Yaweh.

Narrator: In the days that followed Moses, prayers to God—God whom we came to know better with the passing of years—were separately born to take their place as psalms in the Old Testament for men to echo to the end of time. And perhaps nowhere in the writings of man can words be found more beautiful and moving than these God-plucked ones. Listen:

Psalm 46.

Voice: God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea; though the waters thereof be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof. The Lord of hosts is with us.

Narrator: Psalm 1.

Second voice: Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.

Narrator: Psalm 27.

Third voice: The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid? Though a host should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear: though war should rise against me, even then will I be confident. One thing have I asked of the Lord, that will I seek after: that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life.

Narrator: Psalm 33.

Fourth voice: Rejoice in the Lord, O ye righteous; for praise is comely for the upright. Praise the Lord with harp; sing unto

him with the psaltery and an instrument of ten strings. Sing unto him a new song: play skillfully with a loud noise, for the word of the Lord is right, and all his works are done in truth.

Narrator: And then He came, Jesus the Christ. And He taught men not only a way of life to guide theirs, but taught them how to pray. For it is written in the Gospel of St. Luke, chapter II:

Bible voice: And when it came to pass that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples. And he said unto them:

Jesus: When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil.

Narrator: From His day until ours man has never ceased praying to Almighty God. In diverse ways and in all the many tongues, in poetry, in song, in sculpture, in painting, men, thirsty for His love, have prayed to Him. And found in prayer—

Woman: A way to lift up my heart to God.

Man: A sort of meeting place between God and me.

Second woman: A ladder I can climb to reach Him.

Second man: It's how I talk to God—in petition, for intercession, as thanksgiving, worship, in adoration, as meditation, prayer is a key to the Christian life, the fire we kindle by which we warm our soul.

It fell as nourishment for a hungry world from the lips of our Christian fathers—like St. Augustine—

Augustine: Watch Thou, dear Lord, with those who wake or watch or weep tonight, and give Thine angels charge over those who sleep. Tend Thy sick ones, O Lord Christ. Rest Thy weary ones. Bless Thy dying ones. Soothe Thy suffering ones. Pity Thine afflicted ones. Shield Thy joyous ones. And all for Thy love's sake. Amen.

Narrator: And as it did the saint, prayer clothed the warrior with invisible armor.

Second narrator: It is the year 1587. Sir Francis Drake prepares to dash into the harbor of Cadiz to put the strength of his English vessels against the armada might of Philip II. Aboard his vessel, to God and God alone, he raises his voice.

Drake: O Lord God, when Thou givest to Thy servants to endeavor in any great matter, grant us also to know that it is not the beginning but the continuing of the same until it be thoroughly finished, which yieldeth the true glory; through Him that for the finishing of Thy work laid down His life. Amen.

Narrator: This same prayer, in all the churches of England, was prayed during another crisis—the spring of 1941.

Oliver Cromwell, lying on his deathbed in 1658, sent one of the most unusual prayers to heaven recorded in history.

Cromwell: Lord, though I am a miserable and wretched creature, I am in covenant with Thee through grace. And I may, I will come to Thee, for Thy people. Thou has made me, though very unworthy, a mean instrument to do them some good, and Thee service; and many of them have set too high a value upon me, though others wish and would be glad of my death. Lord, however Thou dost dispose of me, continue and go on to do good for them. Teach those who look too much on Thy instruments to depend more upon Thyself. Pardon such as desire to trample upon the dust of a poor worm, for they are Thy people, too. And pardon the folly of this short prayer, even for Jesus Christ's sake. And give us a good night, if it be Thy pleasure. Amen.

Narrator: Lord Nelson gave the signal for the Battle of Trafalgar, and retired to his cabin to pray this way:

Nelson: May the great God whom I worship grant to my country and for the benefit of Europe in general a great and glorious victory, and may no misconduct in anyone tarnish it; and may humanity after victory be the predominant feature in the British Fleet. For myself individually, I commit my life to Him that made me; and may His blessing alight upon my endeavors for serving my country faithfully. To Him I resign myself, and the just cause which is entrusted to me to defend. Amen. Amen. Amen.

Narrator: Men have crystallized their prayers in the form we call poetry. Quiet men, like Thoreau, the hermit of Walden Pond.

Thoreau: Great God, I ask Thee no meaner pelf than that I may not disappoint myself; that in my action I may soar as high as I can now discern with this clear eye.

Narrator: Lord Byron.

Byron: Father of Light! To Thee I call; my soul is dark within; Thou who canst mark the sparrow's fall avert the death of sin.

Thou who canst guide the wandering star, who calm'st the elemental war, whose mantle is yon boundless sky, my thoughts, my words, my crimes forgive; and since I soon must cease to live, instruct me how to die.

Narrator: Shakespeare put this thankful prayer into the mouth of Henry V after the Battle of Agincourt:

Henry V: O God, Thy arm was here; and not to us, but to Thy arm alone ascribe we all. When without strategem, but in plain shock and even play of battle, was ever known so great and little loss on one part and the other? Take it, God, for it is none but Thine.

Narrator: But to match the great poets—and they are numberless—who put their thoughts of God to rhyme, is a woman, whose name is lost but whose simple, disarming poem for grace perhaps strikes the most responsive chord of all:

Woman:

Lord of all pots and pans and things, since
I've no time to be
A saint by doing lovely things of watching late with Thee,
Or dreaming in the dawnlight or storming heaven's gates,
Make me a saint by getting meals and washing up the plates.
Altho I must have Martha's hands, I have a Mary mind;
And when I black the boots and shoes, Thy sandals, Lord, I find:
I think of how they trod the earth, what time I scrub the floor;
Accept this meditation, Lord, I haven't time for more.
Warm all the kitchen with Thy love, and light it with Thy peace;
Forgive me all my worrying, and make all grumbling cease.
Thou who didst love to give men food, in room or by the sea,
Accept this service that I do—I do it unto Thee.

Narrator: Just as poets have molded their praise of God in words, men have been moved to worship Him in music. William H. Monk was so inspired by these words of the Reverend Henry Leyte that in 10 minutes he was able to put them to a melody that has come down through a hundred years as one of the best-loved of all our hymns. Listen:

Leyte:

Abide with me; fast falls the eventide;
The darkness deepens; Lord, with me abide.
When other helpers fail, and comforts flee,
Help of the helpless, oh, abide with me.
Swift to its close ebbs out life's little day;
Earth's joys grow dim, its glories pass away.
Change and decay in all around I see;
O Thou, who changest not, abide with me.
Hold Thou Thy cross before my closing eyes;
Shine through the gloom, and point me to the skies.
Heaven's morning breaks, and earth's vain shadows flee.
In life, in death, O Lord, abide with me.

Narrator: Strangely enough, the reverse procedure has bequeathed us equal dividends. It was another minister—with a name as American as Smith—who, in 1832, when his eyes fell upon the British anthem, picked up a scrap of paper and wrote the words to the anthem we know as America. Perhaps you never realized it before, but when you sing America, you are actually singing a prayer. See for yourself:

Voice:

Our fathers' God! to Thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee we sing:
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King!

Narrator: Truly in the words of the ninth psalm:

Psalmist: I will be glad and rejoice in Thee: yea, my songs will make of Thy Name, O thou Most Highest.

Narrator: Not only poets and song-makers, not only warriors of old, but all manner of men and women have turned to God in prayer. Ludwig van Beethoven:

Beethoven: We must praise Thy goodness, that Thou has left nothing undone to draw us to Thyself. But one thing we ask of Thee, our God, not to cease Thy work in our improvement. Let us tend towards Thee, no matter by what means, and be fruitful in good works, for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Narrator: Lady Jane Grey, who sought the throne of England before her execution on Tower Hill:

Lady Jane: O Merciful God, be Thou to me a strong tower of defense, I humbly entreat Thee. Give me grace to await Thy leisure, and patiently to bear what Thou doest unto me; nothing doubting or mistrusting Thy goodness towards me; for Thou knowest what is good for me better than I do. Therefore do with me in all things what Thou wilt; only arm me, I beseech Thee, with Thine armor, that I may stand fast. I am assuredly persuaded that all Thou doest cannot but be well; and unto Thee be all honor and glory.

Narrator: On the tomb of Livingstone, the famous missionary, are inscribed there, his words:

Livingstone: May Heaven's richest blessing come down on everyone, American, English or Turk who will heal the open sore of the world.

Narrator: Washington, concluding his farewell speech:

Washington: I consider it my indispensable duty to close this last solemn act of my official life by commending the interests of our dearest country to Almighty God, and Thou who have the superintendence of them to His Holy keeping.

Narrator: Abe Lincoln was a deeply religious man. From youth he was taught to pray by his stepmother, and spent hours reading from the Bible with her. An everlasting source of inspiration through the trials and troubles that were his fate. As he said himself:

Lincoln: I have been drawn to my knees many times by the conviction that I had no place else to go.

Narrator: The humbleness of Lincoln before God is best exemplified, perhaps, not in his Gettysburg address nor his many speeches that have about them that biblical feeling, but in this simple prayer, uttered on the porch of the White House, when he could no longer stand the sound of the cannon from the second battle of Bull Run:

Lincoln: O Thou God, who heard Solomon in the night when he prayed for wisdom, hear me now. I cannot lead this people without Thy help. I am poor and weak and sinful. O God, who didst hear Solomon when he cried for wisdom, hear me, and save this Nation.

Narrator: And in our last great crisis, as our troops assaulted the beaches of Normandy on D-day, it is to the same God that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt asked the Nation to join him in prayer. Here, thanks to the magic of radio, is an actual recording of the beginning of the prayer he made on that fateful day:

Roosevelt: In this poignant hour, I ask you to join me in prayer.

Almighty God: Our sons, pride of our Nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor to preserve our Republic, our religion, our civilization, and to set free a suffering humanity. Lead them straight and true, give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness in their faith. They will need Thy blessing; their road will be long and hard. For the enemy is strong. They may hurl back our forces. Success may come with not rushing speed, but we shall return again and again and we know that by Thy grace and by the righteousness of our cause, our sons will triumph.

Narrator: And so it has ever been since the first time man raised his eyes from his food and wondered—

Man: Who has given me this sweet, and given my brother dust to eat?

Narrator: And found God. Since has man lifted his heart to Him. And because he does—in the words of Tennyson—

Tennyson: More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of.

Narrator: Sufficient testament of this is the life of the leader whose great soul was freed, just the other day, by an assassin's bullet—Mohandad Karamchand Gandhi:

Gandhi: Prayer has saved my life.

Narrator: There are his own words.

Gandhi (continuing): Without it, I should have been a lunatic long ago. Prayer came out of sheer necessity. The more my faith in God increased, the more irresistible became the yearning for prayer. Life seems to be dull and vacant without it.

Narrator: The conscience of Gandhi will never be stilled. Nor will the conscience of man as long as he, of his only will and volition, for the sake of all men, does as millions did a few hours ago, during the World Day of Prayer—raised a million voices to ask:

Voice: Father of all mankind, grant us faith to look with fearless eye beyond the chaos of our world and time, knowing that out of this shall rise, lifted by Thy grace, peace with justice and a time of brotherhood.

Narrator: And——

Second voice: Vouchsafe unto us the will to work together. May our deeds reflect the mind of Christ.

Narrator: And——

Third voice: Throughout the earth may that which we profess come alive in human relations. May we serve Thee better and love Thee more, that Thy kingdom may come on earth as it is in Heaven.

Narrator: On this 14th day of February—though the World Day of Prayer is over—it is still not too late to pray. It is never too late to pray. We have but to remember the Thief on the Cross:

Biblical voice: And he said unto Jesus, "Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom." And Jesus said unto him,

Jesus: "Verily I say unto thee, today shalt thou be with me in paradise."

Announcer: You have just heard the one hundred and seventieth program of Home Is What You Make It, saluting the World Day of Prayer and entitled "Abide With Me."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. The Holy Bible, St. Luke 11: 9–10.
2. Egyptian prayer, deciphered by Breasted, Story of Religion.
3. Assyrian prayer from Prayers, Ancient, and Modern (see Nancy Woodard).
4. Aztec, original.
5. Indian, from the Upanishads, one of the three works which are the bans of much of the Hindu faith.
6. Chinese (see Nancy Woodard).
7. Euripides (480–406 B. C.), Troades Socrates (Phraedus, 427–347 B. C.).
8. St. Augustine (354–430 A. D.).
9. Sir Francis Drake (1540–96).
10. Cromwell (1599–1658).
11. Nelson (1758–1805).
12. Henry David Thoreau (1817–62).
13. Lord Byron (1788–1824).
14. Woman's poem, anonymous.
15. Beethoven (1770–1827).
16. Lady Jane Grey (1537–54).

The Late Honorable Clarence E. Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct shock to me when I learned of the death of our former colleague, Hon. Clarence E. Hancock, of Syracuse, N. Y. He was one of God's noblemen, possessing a charm of personality that was most unusual. His quiet manner and his unobtrusive way won him many friends. His ability was outstanding and his clear thinking and convincing speech established him as a debater of rare talent.

I met him when I first came to Washington in the Seventy-sixth Congress and our casual acquaintance developed into a sincere friendship which I shall always cherish.

Clarence Hancock was a splendid representative of the people in his community. The State of New York and the United States lost a truly distinguished citizen in his death.

Medical Care for Veterans Big Problem for Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, without doubt one of the most serious problems facing the country at the present time, and a problem certain to grow more serious with the passing years, is that of providing adequate medical care for our war veterans. I desire to call the attention of the Congress and the country as well to a survey of the problem published in last Sunday's New York Times, together with an editorial on the same subject in the same issue:

[From the New York Times of February 22, 1948]

MEDICAL CARE FOR VETERANS BIG PROBLEM FOR COUNTRY—POLICY SET UP IN 1924 HELD UNREALISTIC TODAY—LACK OF PERSONNEL STRESSED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

Periodically 25 of the Nation's top medical specialists meet in Washington as the national consultants' committee to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine policy and discuss problems of veterans' medical care. At their meeting in October and again in January two of the principal items on the agenda were the need for more personnel and the feasibility of placing a fixed ceiling on the number of hospital beds that the VA will operate.

Today, the VA operates a total of 103,189 beds, and has 5,649 beds closed because of inability to obtain personnel. Their patient census is 95,652 in their own hospitals and 13,949 in Army, Navy, State, and civilian contract hospitals. Of the 109,601 patients (as of January 15, 1948), however, 66 percent are non-service-connected, that is, the disabilities for which they are hospitalized have no relationship to their military service.

There are 18,026 veterans awaiting admission to VA hospitals, of which only 88 are definitely service-connected and 448 are presumed service-connected on the basis of available evidence. The remaining 17,492 have disabilities that were not incurred in service.

The hospitalization policy in VA hospitals, as dictated by existing laws, is that veterans with service-connected disabilities shall have admission priority, but that veterans with non-service-connected disabilities may be admitted if, by their own statement, they are unable to pay for hospital care and if a bed is available in an existing facility.

POLICY ESTABLISHED IN 1924

This policy was established by Congress in 1924 when there were empty beds in VA hospitals. A secondary factor was that a large number of veterans, especially those with mental disorders and tuberculosis, were unable then to obtain care in civilian hospitals within their own communities.

Since 1924, however, the picture has changed considerably. There were only 4,000,000 veterans then; today there are 20,000,000. Because of the quality of medical care at that time, fewer veterans sought admission; today more and more veterans, as they realize that the VA medical services are second to none, are applying for care. The VA had empty beds then and personnel to staff them; today VA hospitals are crowded, and Dr. Paul Magnuson, new VA Medical Director, has said it is impossible to staff more than 120,000 beds and keep the quality of medical care at its existing high level.

The VA now has 126 hospitals and Congress has approved the building of 91 more at a cost of $1,000,000,000. Many of these new hospitals are necessary to replace existing outdated hospitals situated in areas so geographically remote that it is impossible to staff them adequately. Others are necessary as replacements for the temporary wartime Army and Navy hospitals that the VA has taken over. Biggest factor in the building program, however, is the policy of furnishing free medical care to non-service-connected cases.

In defense of the VA, it should be made clear that this policy is not one developed

by the VA, but results directly from congressional action. Although a veteran with a non-service-connected disability to be admitted must sign "No" to the question, "Are you financially able to pay the necessary expense of hospital care?" and is liable to a fine amounting to $10,000 for swearing a false affidavit, the VA has neither the legal right to question nor the machinery to investigate such affidavits.

It is common knowledge that many non-service-connected cases now in VA hospitals have signed such statements, although they could well afford to pay for medical care. Not a single such case has ever been prosecuted. Of the few instances the writer has been able to find in which the Government has recovered funds to pay for hospital care, one was the case of a veteran who died in the hospital and was found to have left an estate valued in excess of $250,000.

"AVAILABLE BED" QUESTION

Nor has there ever been, from the VA's standpoint, a satisfactory interpretation of the words "if a bed is available in an existing facility." The policy, it appears, has been to permit available beds to be filled with non-service-connected cases and then to construct new hospitals ostensibly to accommodate veterans with service-connected conditions.

That the medically indigent veteran should receive care from the VA regardless of the origin of his disability seems logical, for it gives the patient a sense of dignity in that he feels it is a right he has earned, rather than charity. If he cannot pay for care nor receive it in a VA hospital he would, of necessity, have to be cared for in a local or State hospital as a free patient. It is merely a matter of the taxpayer paying from either his right or left pocket.

This is particularly true for psychiatric and tuberculosis patients who constitute 60 percent of all VA patients and approximately half of whom are not service-connected cases, for experience has shown that only a small percentage of such patients, either veterans or civilians, can afford the cost of care. Dr. Daniel Blain, chief of the VA Neuropsychiatric Service, has said that the neuropsychiatric services in VA hospitals have reached the saturation point. He pointed out that approximately the same number of neuropsychiatric cases were being discharged as were being admitted, but warned that even though more beds were made available, personnel could not be found to staff them.

The same need for personnel exists in all types of medical service. Another serious factor to be considered is that if the VA continues indefinitely to build more hospitals, civilian hospitals will be faced by even more serious personnel shortages than exist today. There is simply just not enough trained personnel to go round.

The fundamental question is whether the VA shall continue to build hospitals primarily for non-service-connected cases. The national consultants, pointing out that the present policy establishes an elastic ceiling that is subject to many diverse pressures, has said: "It is the opinion of this group of consultants to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that a definite ceiling should be put on the number of beds to be provided in VA hospitals, and that such a ceiling, in the opinion of this group, should not exceed the 140,000 beds already authorized by Congress."

PERSONNEL INADEQUATE

They further warned: "It will be practically impossible to find adequately trained personnel to operate this number of beds, when, at the present time, 5,649 beds are already closed solely because of lack of personnel. Secondly, to attempt to go beyond this ceiling would further deplete the number of trained individuals available to meet civilian needs."

Dr. Magnuson was even more conservative and said that 120,000 beds represented, in his opinion, the maximum number of permanent beds the VA could operate and give top-flight medical care without disturbing the balance between VA and civilian hospitalization.

Although Congress is appropriating funds for the building of new hospitals that will be filled primarily by non-service-connected cases, many of whom are able to pay for their medical care, it has never, by formal action, made the Federal Government responsible for complete care of all veterans. Nor does examination of congressional records indicate that such was ever the intent. The present situation has arisen as a result of a policy adopted in 1924, which was expedient then but unrealistic and unwise today.

It is a policy that should be examined carefully by Congress unless it is the express intention that the Government should assume full responsibility for medical care for all veterans regardless of service connection or the individual's ability to pay.

VETERANS' MEDICAL CARE

[From the New York Times of February 22, 1948]

In other columns of this newspaper today Dr. Howard Rusk, who is a member of the National Consultants Committee to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, discusses the crisis that daily grows more acute in VA hospitals resulting from the hospitalization of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities. Such veterans amounted to 66 percent of VA's 109,601 patients on January 15.

Non-service-connected cases are handled by the Veterans' Administration under an act of Congress passed in 1924, when there were many empty beds in VA hospitals and 4,000,000 war veterans on the rolls. At that time large numbers of veterans were unable to obtain adequate care in civilian hospitals near their homes. The medical service provided then also was not of a high caliber and there was no great demand from the veterans for admission to a veterans' hospital. Today the picture is entirely different. There now are 20,000,000 veterans on VA's rolls. VA medical service is equal to, or superior to, that of most private hospitals. There is a demand that far outstrips the VA's ability to supply the care. Yet the 1924 policy still stands.

It is time—we agree with Dr. Rusk—that Congress took a long look at the problem of hospital care of veterans and set a definite and realistic policy. Does Congress intend that the Veterans' Administration should assume full responsibility for hospital care of all veterans regardless of service connection or the individual's ability to pay? If it does, then many more hospitals will have to be built and private practice will have to be raided for the personnel to man them. If it intends only that service-connected cases be handled, or those and cases where the fundless veteran otherwise would have to enter some other public institution, then that position should be stated clearly, and the Veterans' Administration given the investigatory powers and means to keep out of its hospitals those veterans who could afford a private institution.

The problem is a complex one, involving a present shortage of medical personnel, the veteran's right to treatment in a veterans' hospital instead of the charity ward of a private hospital if he is ill, no matter what the connection with service of his illness, and the fact that long psychiatric or tubercular treatment is beyond the financial capacity of a large percentage of veterans. It is a problem that is the responsibility of Congress, not that of the Veterans' Administration, and one that should be faced promptly before the present strains become greater.

Slum-Clearance Activities of Hon. Robert F. Wagner, of New York

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in yesterday's Washington Star about the activities of our colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] relative to slum clearance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE OTHER HAND—SENATOR WAGNER UNDERTAKES ONE MORE SERVICE FOR SLUM DWELLERS

(By Lowell Mellett)

One of the grand old men of the United States Senate, ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York, has just turned in one of his characteristic jobs. He was asked back in September by Chairman GAMBLE, of the Joint Congressional Committee on Housing, to undertake a study of the broad problem of slum clearance for the benefit of the committee.

He could have replied that he had been studying that subject the greater part of his adult life and that the results of his study are embodied in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. This is a bill passed last year by the Senate but never permitted by the House leadership to reach the floor.

The Senator, however, did not make that reply. Instead, he accepted the assignment and undertook to gather some further facts for Representative GAMBLE. His health these days not being as good as it might be, he conducted the study by mail. He sent questionnaires to the governors of all the States, to the mayors of all cities of 50,000 or more, and to a certain number of prominent citizens throughout the country.

SUMMARIZES REPLIES

His report, just made public, summarizes the replies received. It contains statements such as this from Mayor De Muro, of Passaic, N. J.:

"Slums wreck people and slums not checked can wreck a city. * * * It is hard to say in dollars what it costs a child to be raised in filth, disease, and vicious moral surroundings."

And this from Mayor Palmer of Miami, Fla.:

"After people have suffered long and unreasonably they lose faith. They also lose perspective. They reach the point of desperation, when they are willing to listen with sympathy to social orders incompatible with our democratic institutions."

When we think of slums we are apt to think only of the larger cities, particularly of New York. But the Senator received from the mayors these estimates of the families in their cities living in slum or substandard housing:

Los Angeles, 58,400; San Francisco, 38,678; Waterbury, Conn., 4,000; Jacksonville, Fla., 17,000; Atlanta, 40,000; Chicago, 100,000; Peoria, Ill., 4,500; Louisville, 25,000; New Orleans, 50,000; Baltimore, 50,000; Boston, 45,000; Fall River Mass., 6,200; Detroit, 68,000; Saginaw, Mich., 9,000; Minneapolis, 11,000; Kansas City, 42,000; Omaha, 10,000; Camden, N. J., 11,864 (of which 3,919 are unfit for habitation); Newark, 38,423; New York, 450,000; Utica, N. Y., 2,530; Fargo, N. Dak., 200; Cincinnati, 75,000; Cleveland, 25,000; Bethlehem, Pa., 4,400; Philadelphia 83,703; Providence, R. I., 12,000; Charleston, S. C., 6,200; Memphis, Tenn., 45,000; Dallas, Tex., 33,369; Fort Worth, Tex., 22,583; Charleston, W. Va., 8,000; Madison, Wis., 600.

HOW FIGURES WERE REACHED

The mayors reached their figures by various methods. Mayor Allen of Hartford, Conn., arrived at 10,000 by taking into account the 3,500 veteran families living in rented rooms, trailers, and tourist cabins, the waiting list of the local housing authority, and the lack of repairs in lower rental accommodations.

The Senator's questionnaires included this one: "In your opinion, is private enterprise in a position now or in the foreseeable future to provide decent housing, new or old, for all low-income families at rents or prices within their ability to pay?" Of the governors 3 said "yes" and 23 said "no." Of the mayors, 7 said "yes" and 70 said "no."

In the House, nevertheless, the disposition seems to be to pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill—if the House leaders allow it to reach the floor—with all provisions for slum clearance stricken out. TAFT says he will fight to keep those provisions in.

Protection of Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, by request, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD copy of a letter addressed by Mr. Clarence C. Smith, of Indianapolis, Ind., to the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *March 2, 1948.*

His Excellency, the Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,

President of the United States of America, White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Constantine Consistory No. 25 AASRFM, NMJ, United States of America, Inc. (Prince Hall affiliation) deeply appreciates your official actions in favor of full civil rights to all citizens of the United States of America. The execution of your program will be the greatest advancement of democracy in this country since the emancipation of slaves and bestowing the right to vote upon women. Such an expansion of the application of the principles of equality will make it impossible for communism or any other un-American ideals of government to get a foothold in our great country.

We are proud of the firm, courageous and intelligent way you face and combat the foes of this righteous movement. The time will come when the significance of your actions will be understood more completely and appreciated more greatly than it is today.

You are right. The foes of your program are wrong. You demonstrate greatness. They demonstrate smallness. You are not afraid for all men to be free. They are. You have faith in all humanity. They don't. You know that if democracy continues to hesitate, to doubt the righteousness and wisdom of applying itself to all people right now, it not only stultifies itself before the whole world but the security of government of the people, by the people and for the people is greatly threatened at the most inopportune time in all history.

God bless you in your good work. We believe that He will keep you steadfast and crown your civil-rights program with victory.

As an additional token of our appreciation enclosed herewith is an invitation extended to you to attend our annual grande affaire on March 6, 1948. Also a program.

Very respectfully yours,

CLARENCE C. SMITH,

Thirty-third Degree, Commander in Chief.

Good Ways to Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short article by Wheeler McMillen entitled "Good Ways to Ruin," published in the Pathfinder of February 25, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD WAYS TO RUIN

(By Wheeler McMillen)

How dangerous is it to support good purposes? Is doing good really the road to ruin?

For long years the American people have supported public schools. They thought education was a good. They believed that literacy was essential to self-government.

At first, it was enough to provide schoolhouses and instructors able to teach the three R's. If parents chose to take advantage of what was offered to their children, that was their privilege; if not, there was no penalty. Because some parents were negligent and because education was good, compulsory attendance laws were passed.

Then, because a little education was good and more must be better, high schools were built. The age for compulsory attendance was pushed upward. The cost of education climbed upward.

Who can say whether 6, or 8, or 12 years of compulsory public schooling at public expense is exactly the right amount? How about 14 or 16 years? That very question is being asked now. Universal college education may not be many years ahead, free to all except the taxpayers. Then, no doubt, because it is good, some will wish to make it compulsory.

Certainly no one doubts that education is good. But at what point shall we cease charging this good thing to the taxpayer?

Health, also, is a good thing. So the United States and the States now spend increasing sums to insure that the public shall be healthy. This seems to be a good investment. The sick are not productive. They may become public charges. Perhaps much more should be spent for health.

But where does public health leave off and private health begin? All health must equally be a good; and since it is a good thing, should not everybody have it? Why not give free hospital and medical service to everybody, including the taxpayer?

Cleanliness, undoubtedly, is a very good thing. Why not free soap for everybody? A cake a week, sent postage-free from Washington and delivered by the postman? For that matter, since cleanliness is good, how about having the postman give free baths, too? Or, better yet, compel everybody to take the free baths?

Then, since soap is soap and dishes also get dirty, how about free soap powder too? Most women say they hate to wash dishes. Surely it would be a good idea to relieve them of this drudgery. So, why not have the postman who brings the soap powder wash the dishes, too? That would make a lot more good, steady Government jobs.

One can see that this idea has possibilities. Find enough good purposes that ought to be accomplished, pass laws to charge the costs to the taxpayers' and you can build up quite a lot of government. All this could be done without passing a single law for any bad purpose.

In addition to doing the things which must be done, Government is increasingly implored to undertake other things for the good of the country.

Taken individually, each such proposal might appear worthy. We might discover that if the things were done many would benefit, few or none would be harmed, and in the long run the Nation would be richer.

"This is not an expense; it is an investment." Ask any member of the Appropriations Committee how often he has heard those words.

Yet, to spend public money for all the good things, even for those which really might prove to be investments, could easily cost the taxpayer another day's work out of his week; or maybe his whole week.

Well-meaning people with the best of intentions can do infinite harm to their debt-burdened country now by demanding that Congress provide funds for more good purposes. They can push the United States on into bankruptcy.

No one needs to urge bad laws now to ruin the country. Just give us enough expensive good ones.

Pay Raises for Postal and Other Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 4, I appeared before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in support of legislation that would give our worthy postal and Federal employees a much-needed increase in salary of $1,000 per year.

My statement to the committee appears below:

Mr. Chairman, although I am the author of H. R. 4806 and H. R. 4807, which would provide a permanent increase of $800 per annum to postmasters and employees of the postal system and other Federal employees, I am here today to urge this distinguished committee to report favorably on H. R. 4704 and H. R. 4705, authored by the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan. These bills are identical with S. 1848 and S. 1849, and provide for a permanent increase in salary for postal and Federal employees of $1,000 per annum.

I am advised that the Senate bills were introduced by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Civil Service

Committee after appropriate hearings on the subject of increases in salary for postal and other Federal employees, by a duly appointed subcommittee.

Many Members of Congress have introduced bills providing for salary increases, but these bills were based upon information secured from sources available to individual Members. However, since the Senate bills represent the efforts of a committee of Congress, every respect should be given to its findings as a basis for legislation. For this reason, I appear here today in support of legislation other than my own.

The problem before this committee is tragically and fundamentally simple. Everyone agrees that the postal worker is the most underpaid employee in the country today. All that seems to be in doubt is the amount of increase in salary that should be given these worthy public servants to breast this tide of engulfing inflation.

The research of Senator LANGER'S subcommittee reveals that $1,000 per annum is a modest amount when we are confronted with the actual facts. He found that, all things considered, in line with what has taken place in industry, postal employees and other Federal employees should receive an increase of $1,160 per annum rather than $1,000.

It is not new to this committee that the starting wage for a letter carrier and postal clerk is $2,100 per annum, with take-home pay even less when we consider retirement deductions. The average gross salary for all employees in the field service of the postal system is approximately $2,708 per annum.

It does not take much research to determine that these postal employees cannot keep abreast of their economic needs with today's runaway prices—notwithstanding the recent commodity market adjustment\ for the trend in prices is still upward as witness the recent increase in the price of steel. Yet, while it is generally agreed that there is a continuing rise in the cost of living, particularly in the cost of basic necessities, many people do not appreciate the full extent of the inflationary trend. When anyone says that the cost of living has risen, a certain number of percentage points, or that the index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates a certain percentage of increase, we are very much interested. We tend, however, to counterbalance the price increase in our own minds by giving consideration to certain wage increases which others have received during the period when prices were rising, and on a basis of the figures, have a rather uneasy feeling as to the many conclusions that are drawn therefrom. Every housewife knows, for example, that despite Bureau of Labor Statistics figures, showing that the cost of living has risen only by some 64 percent since 1939, measured by her own purchases, the increase has been considerably greater. A dollar just hasn't the purchasing power that it should have, and all of the experts' figures will not convince her otherwise.

Just how true this is may be demonstrated from the following statistics gleaned from the Guarantee Survey for November 26, 1947. Let it first be understood that the Guarantee Survey is not a group of long-haired theorists, hired to prove a particular point, but a regular monthly business survey published by the Guarantee Trust Co., of New York, a banking institution with more than $2,000,000,000 of assets. If there is any bias whatever it certainly would not be in the direction of the average wage earner, either as an individual or as a group. Rather, the survey is a factual study prepared for the guidance of the business and investment world, which must at all times have the benefit of accurate information. This survey then may be considered as reliable as human frailty will allow with a reasonable margin of error. According to this survey, "of special interest in connection with the President's observations concerning wage-price relationships is the latest official report on workers' earnings and the cost of living. This indicates that the average weekly earnings of factory workers rose from $24.54 to $46.32 in June 1945, but that the benefit to workers was halved by the rise that took place in the cost of living during the same period, despite wartime price controls. In terms of 1939 dollars, the average wage rose from $24.54 to $34.10. Between June 1945 and September 1947, money wages increased further, from $46.32 to $50.42; but the cost of living rose more rapidly, with the result that wages in terms of 1939 dollars declined from $34.10 to $29.46. During the entire period from 1939 to September of this year, money wages more than doubled; but four-fifths of the increase was offset by the rise in the cost of living, leaving an advance of 20 percent in real wages or purchasing power."

Thus it will be seen that despite an increase of almost 100 percent in weekly wages, the real wage of factory workers has increased only 14.92 or 20.4 percent during the period between June of 1939 and September of 1947. In the case of the postal worker, however, the story is altogether different. He not only fails to show an increase in real wages, but has actually suffered a reduction in real wages of $10.01 per week, or a decrease of more than 24 percent during the period between June 1939 and September 1947. Assuming the enactment of legislation to provide for an increase of $1,000 per annum, or $19.23 per week before taxes or retirement deductions, the actual increase in real wages contrasted to 1939 would be exactly $1.17 per week.

Postal workers, therefore, are not at all unreasonable when they request the Congress to take early steps to adjust postal salaries to present-day conditions. Even the increase of $1.17 per week would not restore post office employees to the positions enjoyed in June of 1939.

Cuts in the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter which I have received as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs from the national commander, American Veterans of World War II, concerning the proposed 'cuts in the Veterans' Administration:

AMVETS OF WORLD WAR II,
Washington, D. C., March 4, 1948.
The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: As the chartered spokesmen for the Veterans of World War II, AMVETS are unalterably opposed to the pending butcher-knife blitzkrieg against Veterans' Administration personnel which Gen. Carl M. Gray, Jr., the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has himself called drastic.

While sympathizing with the Administrator in his budgetary predicament, AMVETS believes that all other avenues of economy should be explored before resorting to meat-ax method that can result only in impaired service to veterans and even more chaotic morale within the Veterans' Administration itself.

In this connection, AMVETS wishes to commend heartily the constructive and humane action of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for its forward-looking resolution of March 3, 1948, urging General Gray to hold his reduction in abeyance until such time as a more detailed review of the problem is possible.

By this action, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has given a demonstration of thoughtful public service that is worthy of high praise as an example of congressional guidance and solicitude.

On the basis of reports from its own service officers throughout the country, AMVEIS feels that if the present VA reduction program is followed it will create either tremendous backlogs of nonadjudicated cases or, worse, increase the volume of sloppy adjudication of veterans' claims.

For example, one VA official in the New York office has testified that the proposed slashes will reduce his vocational guidance staff for the aid of disabled veterans under Public Law 16, from 250 to 85, requiring each man to be responsible for a thousand cases in that area, an obvious impossibility.

AMVETS have long been convinced that the Veterans' Administration could better stay within its budget and better provide service to veterans by the outright abolition of its branch offices.

First of all, such a course would return death claims and insurance cases to regional offices where they would be more accessible to individual veterans with better service resulting.

Second, such a move would help preserve a larger staff, at less cost, on the adjudication and operational levels by ridding VA of high-classified administrative jobs of doubtful need in branch offices.

In many instances, the present personnel reduction plan contemplates weeding out Grades 6, 7, and 8 at regional office levels. It's the old story of lopping off the people at the point of contact with the veteran to preserve the job entities of higher-ups.

One example of this situation can be found in a regional office that has recently come to our attention: This office now has four rating boards; it has between 1,000 and 1,200 cases per month. Computing this on a 20- or 21-day month and an 8-hour day, the 4 boards now existing could give an average of only 10 minutes consideration to each case.

Under the present reduction plan one board would be eliminated from this office, leaving but three, although the case load will in no way diminish; therefore, the cases will get 7½ minutes consideration or, of necessity, a tremendous backlog will build up.

Considering that experienced service officers of the veterans organizations feel the average time for consideration of average cases must be 30 minutes in order to do full justice and to be sure the law and all facts are given consideration, it would be a rank injustice to the veteran clients to establish a condition in which average consideration cannot exceed 7½ minutes.

Therefore, AMVETS urges you to consider the non-essentiality of VA branch offices bearing in mind not only that such action would obviate the personnel economies envisioned and make death and insurance claims more accessible but also that such action, once and for all, would end the vicious practice of shifting every reduction in force onto the lowest and most functional levels to safeguard the jobs of remote administrative personnel in the higher grades.

All these proposals conform with mandates of the last AMVETS national convention in Columbus, Ohio, which condemned the financial mismanagement and unnecessary cost in branch office operations and urged establishment of three area offices having the same function and authority as the central office.

Copies of both resolutions are enclosed for your information.

Yours sincerely,
EDGAR C. CORRY, Jr.,
National Commander.

Resolution 31

AMVETS condemns the present financial mismanagement and unnecessary costs resulting therefrom at the branch-office level of Veterans' Administration, since this draws away from the operating levels funds which are necessary to the proper service to veterans. This is aimed, particularly, at the present conditions which are, in many instances, preventing the payment of transportation to veterans who require physical examinations, or counseling and guidance at Veterans' Administration regional offices.

Resolution 30

Be it resolved in AMVET convention assembled at Columbus, Ohio, October 2–5, 1947, That the Congress of the United States and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be memorialized to abolish Veterans' Administration branch offices, by returning the functions of same to the regional offices, and that in the place of branch offices there be established three area offices having the same functions and authority as the central office, these three area offices to be located as follows:

I. In the northern area, centrally located to serve the Northeastern States plus a portion of the Middle Western States.

II. To be located centrally to serve the Southern States and a portion of the Southwestern States.

III. To be centrally located to serve the far West States plus a portion of the Midwestern States.

ERP: It Is No Alternative to Armament Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by Mr. Wilbur J. Brons, writer in the Chicago Journal of Commerce, on February 28, 1948:

ERP WAS ASSUMED TO BE ALTERNATIVE TO ARMAMENT RACE

If the architects of American foreign policy had not carried over into the postwar period their wartime habit of cultivating a new international folklore, they probably would not now be up against the problem of explaining away some obvious inconsistencies.

In retrospect, it seems likely that we would have been a good ally of Russia without having propagated the fairy tale that Stalin had become a champion of a common brand of democracy. Having taken that line, however, our State Department is confronted with the current necessity of convincing us that the Soviet Man of Steel never really changed at all.

Similarly, official propaganda for the European recovery plan now turns out to be as full of holes as a blue ribbon Swiss cheese. For example, the major argument in favor of ERP has been that it was an alternative to something too horrible to contemplate. In other words, we were confronted with a choice.

We were told that by providing the sinews of the cold war we could prevent the hot war that would inevitably ensue when all of Western Europe had gone Communist. On that basis, $17,000,000,000 for a 5-year program of European economic aid was an A–1 bargain in any man's reckoning. Following this line, Army Secretary Royall even went so far as to intimate that ERP was about the only thing that could save us from immediate rearmament and another draft army.

Millions of American citizens sold themselves on ERP on the basis of that reasoning. They now learn, to their dismay, that military men do not believe we can underwrite European economic recovery without being prepared for trouble. According to Washington reports, these men have informed the Senate Armed Services Committee that ERP means we must also step up our spending for military preparedness about 100 percent.

The new budget with which Congress is currently wrestling calls for some $11,000,000,000 of military appropriations. To bring the figure to the level the military men regard as safe would mean to increase it to $22,000,000,000.

There is, of course, nothing sacred about military estimates of what will be needed for defense. The military arm is traditionally careless of dollars. But the fact that military men do not believe we have a choice between ERP and turning the country once more into an armed camp demonstrates that Congress has been on sound ground all along in not wanting to be pushed into the recovery program on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

No other nations on earth, so far as we have been able to discover, apologizes for putting self-interest first. But in the United States intelligent self-interest seems to be as reprehensible now as it was before Pearl Harbor when it was pointed out that lend-lease was not an alternative to war, but a downhill road into the conflict.

Housing's Straw Man—The Taft-Ellender-Wagner Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement entitled "Housing's Straw Man—The T-E-W Bill," Henry M. Propper, executive vice president of the National Committee on Housing:

The National Committee on Housing is a citizen organization of leaders in all related fields which devotes itself to constructive activity for the building of better homes and communities and to impartial and objective study of the many problems involved.

For 2 years Congress has been stalemated on housing legislation in the face of a persisting shortage of homes which for gravity and sheer magnitude surpasses anything in the Nation's history. At last count more than 100 housing bills are pending in House and Senate. For the most part they represent attempts to flank the Taft-Ellender-Wagner comprehensive housing bill—by now a sort of "West Wall" around which so furious a battle has been fought that any question of the bill itself or its current value has been overlooked in the heat of the struggle. It is no minor skirmish when Senator TAFT is accused of following the Communist Party line for sponsoring a piece of housing legislation and then the finger is put on his accusers by President Truman as a lobby which has shown a ruthless disregard of the public welfare. (Herbert U. Nelson, spokesman for the National Association of Real Estate Boards, has since apologized publicly for his crack at the senior Senator from Ohio, but the President's charge, while it did not produce the congressional investigation he asked for, probably had some connection with the indictment which the Department of Justice obtained a few weeks later accusing NAREB of conspiring to fix real estate commissions.)

These incidents more or less typify the sort of battle royal which has been fought over the T-E-W bill from the time of its first introduction in the fall of 1945. Conceived as a bipartisan measure to take housing out of politics, the bill was the product of much politics, the bill was the product of much more thorough-going study than is common with legislative formulations. It blazed a number of new trails. For the first time a genuine attempt was made to tackle the Nation's housing problem in its entirety, not just rehousing low-income families living in city slums, but also farm housing; the housing of moderate-income families; basic research into housing's many problems; rebuilding decaying older sections of cities; fostering investment in housing by large insurance companies and similar groups, and not least important, gathering together under one permanent central agency the Federal Government's money, diffuse, and frequently competitive housing interests and activities.

Battles have been waged over every one of these proposals and reached a peak of white-hot ferocity in the clash over the bill's provisions for continuing the Government subsidized public housing program initiated first as a PWA project in 1934 and formalized into a definite Federal program under the United States Housing Act of 1937. To the real estate and residential-construction industries, the mortgage bankers and the manufacturers of building materials, this is socialized housing. It spells the end of the free enterprise system and must lead inevitably to state socialism. To many labor unions, housing, civic, religious, and welfare organizations and liberal groups generally, it is the only way to make adequate, safe, and healthful homes available for low-income families.

A 2-YEAR FIGHT

So the battle lines were drawn when the bill was introduced more than 2 years ago. Each side has had its successes, the pro-T-E-W bill forces winning a favorable Senate vote in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress in the spring of 1946 only to be blocked by the opposition when the bill came to the House. At the last session (the first of the 80th Congress) the bill barely got out of committee in the Senate by a 7 to 6 vote, and made no headway whatever on the House side of the Capitol.

Now those battle lines have grown fast. More than that, the T-E-W bill has itself become a symbol, a standard for rallying the forces of good and evil. To one side all who favor it are reds, bureaucrats, or long-haired visionaries who would destroy the American way of life; to the other, those who oppose

it are grasping, predatory, selfish individuals and groups of great power ready to thwart all human progress for their own enrichment.

BILL NOW A SHELL

The sad fact is that today they are fighting with undiminished fury over a straw man. As a comprehensive over-all housing program, the T-E-W bill is by now pretty much an empty shell. Of its 13 divisions, or titles, as they are called, only 3 can be said to have much point or purpose in dealing with the immediate emergency or the long-range need for housing. The other 10 titles either have been enacted into law or are obviously ill-advised under present conditions or no longer fit the situations with which they were intended to deal and therefore need comprehensive restudy.

No matter what the angle of approach, housing is a highly complex, technical subject and likewise any legislation dealing with it. Little wonder then that the T-E-W bill's 112 pages covering the entire housing front have proved too big a mouthful for popular digestion, leaving the battle to be fought with slogans, catch phrases, and name-calling.

Let's look at the bill, title by title:

Title I is really a preamble which sets forth a Government housing policy and purpose in broad general terms, and like most preambles, offers little reason for specific quarrels. For the purpose of this review, therefore, it can be rated of little importance.

SOME PROVISIONS ENACTED

Title II. This title would establish a single permanent agency of the Federal Government under which would be gathered rather loosely its many housing-related activities. Such a single agency had been set up on a temporary wartime basis in 1942 by executive order of President Roosevelt but would have lapsed within 6 months after the end of the war emergency. Substantially the same purpose has been accomplished under President Truman's Reorganization Order No. 3 which became operative in July 1947. Over the hard-fought opposition of real-estate, home-building, and other interests, a permanent central housing agency was established under the general procedure enacted by Congress for the reorganization of Government agencies when the Senate refused to join the House in disapproving the plan within the required 60-day period following its presentation. Watered down somewhat from the formula originally provided in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and therefore not altogether acceptable to housing purists, the Housing and Home Finance Agency as set up by the President's reorganization order can accomplish the major intent of title II. Even the most ardent Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill supporter would be unwilling to fight, bleed, or die for what is left.

Title III. During the defense and war emergency periods a number of the Government's housing-related agencies were shunted around and new ones created to the point where their legal genealogies and relationships became pretty badly tangled. This title, largely administrative and legalistic, seeks to untagle these lines and reestablish the status of the agencies. President Truman's Reorganization Order No. 3 covered much of what title III undertook to accomplish and therefore this title, too, can be dismissed as unimportant.

ONE NONCONTROVERSIAL SECTION

Title IV is important but relatively noncontroversial. It provides for governmental research and studies in the housing field, where both are greatly needed. In the original version of the bill, the research title seemed to some building-material manufacturers and university research centers to threaten an invasion of their territories or a duplication of their efforts. Subsequent modifications allayed most of these fears, making title IV one of the very few over which there has been no knock-down and drag-out fight. The need for basic studies and research in housing is greater than ever.

Title V is another of those administrative and legalistic affairs intended in this instance to facilitate the mortgage-insurance operations of the Federal Housing Administration and the federally chartered savings and loan associations. Almost all of the modifications proposed have been enacted into laws in separate bills so that what remains of title V need give no one sleepless nights.

Title VI was intended to help supply an answer to the housing problem of that great in-between group which exists between the lowest-income families eligible for Government subsidized housing and the families that have enough income to buy or rent adequate housing in the open market—the so-called no-man's land in housing. Further liberalization of mortgage credit is the method proposed with special encouragement for so-called mutual or cooperative housing undertaken by trade unions, limited-dividend companies and similar groups. However estimable in purpose, the idea of further liberalizing mortgage credit for housing economists, analysts and groups as soon as the bill was introduced. They contended that mortgage money was the one essential to a large-scale housing program which was in abundant supply. Title VI of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, they said, would serve only to feed the inflation already evidencing itself.

OPPOSITION WELL FOUNDED

Events of the past 2 years have proved this opposition more than well founded. The Government's housing credit program of insuring 90-percent mortgage loans under the Federal Housing Administration and the well-intentioned 100-percent housing loans to veterans under the GI bill of rights, was capitalized promptly in the form of higher costs and thus contributed largely to the present inflation in construction. If the recent anti-inflation talk heard in Washington at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, is any criterion, this fact is now being recognized, if somewhat belatedly. In any event, put T-E-W title VI down as one section of the bill that we will do much better without.

Title VII—yield insurance——was intended to open the door to what has long been talked of almost as a housing nirvana—the building of moderate rental apartments on a long-term investment basis instead of as a speculation. The arguments in favor of the investment approach are unassailable whether from the standpoint of the tenant or the community except that we have been unable, so far at least, to develop a formula that will attract large-scale investors as distinguished from real-estate speculators. Under title VII, insurance companies were to be attracted on the theory that direct investment in apartment houses as owners, builders and operators would provide an unusually suitable outlet for their funds. Since they would be interested in the security of their investment and assured long-term income, they would produce better housing and be satisfied with a moderate but certain return instead of seeking quick speculative profits. The principal objection of insurance companies, savings banks, and similar institutions has always been that as trustees for the funds of policyholders or depositors they could not in conscience accept the risks involved in long-term real-estate investments.

PROVIDED GOVERNMENT INSURANCE

Title VII was designed to remove the risks by having the Federal Government guarantee under an insurance scheme that such investments would produce a return of not less than 2¾ percent annually. If not, it would make up the difference or take over the projects. But the plan also put a ceiling of 4 percent on the profit from such housing project investments and lodged fairly strict supervisory authority in the Government. In 1944 when the plan was worked out with insurance company representatives, it looked pretty good to a number of important companies. By 1946 and 1947 they had lost all interest and were going ahead on their own. Spokesmen for leading companies have stated flatly that they would not operate under the yield-insurance plan if enacted. Without the active interest of the insurance companies, yield insurance is a dead duck and so we can mark title VII off the list.

The next title, No. 8, deals with urban redevelopment, one of the most pressing and difficult problems confronting American cities—a problem that seriously burdens municipal finances and presents a very real threat to their future. Essentially, urban redevelopment is a problem in city planning rather than housing, although many confuse the two, particularly "housers." It arises from the fact that almost all American cities have grown and continued to grow on the edges in ever-widening rings while the older central areas suffer more and more from blight and decay. Older residential areas keep slipping down hill until they become slums. Older business districts go the same way. The disease is progressive and may in the end prove fatal since it saps real-estate values and tax revenues.

The only known cure is to replan and rebuild the blighted areas, but is almost impossible to apply in the ordinary course of economic events. Centrally located city land is high-priced land even though it is burdened with hopelessly antiquated or perhaps boarded-up buildings. These structures also add to the price. And it costs plenty to tear down the old buildings to clear the way for new construction. Put all these factors together and you have a land acquisition cost so high that it is virtually impossible to set up an economically sound rebuilding plan in terms of the current reuse value of the land. A number of States and cities were at long last beginning to face up to urban redevelopment in the years just before the war, but for the most part their efforts served only to demonstrate that no plan could accomplish very much without offering some way of absorbing the difference between the cost of buying up the blighted areas and their reuse value.

INVOLVES HUGE SUMS

The sums involved in urban redevelopment are so huge that few cities or States can even think in terms of the amounts required to write down the land cost to the point where rebuilding for residential, business, or any other use is feasible. Therefore, they looked to the Federal Government and title VIII was devised to provide loan funds and a subsidy of up to 50 percent of the land cost. Of course the subsidy grants would be hedged about with all sorts of restrictive conditions, Federal supervision, and requirements for matching local contributions of various kinds, all of which added up to one of the most involved and intricate formulas ever devised even in the housing field. Some State and municipal officials don't want Federal aid because of the "dictation from Washington" which it may involve, but many would welcome it as the only practical way out of their urban redevelopment dilemma.

At the moment very little can be done about actually clearing and rebuilding blighted city areas. Any plan that requires tearing down an existing dwelling, even the poorest slum tenement, must be postponed until other housing is available into which to move the families that are to be displaced. But every urban redevelopment job is loaded with legal and technical difficulties and requires a tremendous amount of planning and preparation. It is none too soon to work out a program or formula so that cities may know what help they are to get, if any, and can start making definite plans though their execution may be 2, 3, or 4 years off. Title VIII then is still something to think about and merits prompt action.

Title IX is the villian of the piece in the eyes of the real estate, home-building, and allied industries. This is the title which would continue the public subsidized housing program initiated under the United States Housing Act of 1937 by which the Federal Government made loans and subsidy grants to municipalities and other local governments to provide housing for low-income families. About 200,000 family dwelling units of the Nation's total of 40,000,000 have been built under the program and the new bill proposes an additional 5?0,000 units to be built over a 4-year period.

This particular fight has been going on for years. It has its roots in the fact that historically, in good years and in bad, a sizable part of the population could not afford safe, healthful, adequate housing, including a substantial proportion of families who could stand on their own feet insofar as food, clothing, and other essentials were concerned—but not housing. As our standard of living progressed upward, so did our ideas of what was a minimum standard of safe, adequate and healthful housing. Inevitably the typical slum tenements of Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, New York, and other cities suffered more and more by comparison. Private enterprise never could and cannot now build new homes for this portion of the population as a straight business proposition. Its contention has been that the normal economic process by which it builds for those who can afford to pay makes the housing vacated by these families available to those lower down the economic ladder and so the process of upgrading the housing of lower income families goes on continually.

HELD TO BE NO ANSWER

That answer never satisfied the civic, welfare, religious leaders and others who kept hammering away at slum housing. They insisted that by the time housing came down within reach of low-income families, it was slum housing and as slum housing went on almost indefinitely. The social ill effects of substandard housing, its toll in lives due to fire and health hazards, its disease and crime-breeding potential, its crippling effect on family life, all were stressed along with the burdens, financial and social, which these ills imposed on the rest of the population. Government subsidy to make up the difference between what these families could afford to pay and the cost of adequate housing was the only rational answer to their view. In the progressive economic and social climate of the 1930's, the program was initiated which provided something less than 200,000 family dwelling units, but an attempt to extend the program in 1939 encountered mounting opposition which continued to grow during the war years.

WASTE AND INEFFICIENCY CHARGED

With the introduction of the T-E-W bill at the war's end, the fight really assumed major proportions and has continued unabated ever since. Behind the more generalized attack of the real estate, home building and other industries which labels public housing as socialistic or communistic, are specific charges of waste Government funds, competition with private enterprise, inefficiency in operation and administration, and using public housing for political purposes. These have been aired in congressional hearings and investigations, in the press and on the radio. Whether any of the charges have been proved or disproved depends pretty much on individual emotional slants and the will to believe. That there have been a number of instances of all these malpractices is undoubtedly true. It is equally true that many of the local housing authorities which plan and manage the public-housing projects have been efficient, economical and nonpolitical in their operations. (All building is done under contract by private construction firms.) These local housing authorities are in almost all instances agencies of the local municipal government and by and large it may be said that where local municipal administration is good, the work of the housing authority will also be of a pretty high order. The 500,000 additional units proposed in title IX of the T-E-W bill would be developed and operated by local housing authorities as under the United States Housing Act of 1937.

NEEDS PERSIST

To the building and real estate industries all the rest of the T-E-W bill is a cloak fashioned by the public housers to cover title IX coupled with the further villainy of trying to masquerade it as an emergency measure which will help house veterans in the current acute shortage. The latter half of that charge is not without substance. The T-E-W bill was devised as a long-range program and few of its provisions would have had any beneficial effect on the immediate situation even if it had been enacted promptly when introduced. Put that down as a tactical blunder on the part of the bill's supporters. It does not alter the basic fact that many thousands of low-income families—veterans and others—are unable to obtain adequate homes. And as the price spiral in construction continues upward, their chances become even dimmer. The low-income veteran in the northern half of the country wants to rent a house or apartment for somewhere between $30 and $50 a month. That is the most he can afford. Many nonveteran families can afford no more. This year's record home building provides nothing for either at anywhere near that price. Both the immediate problem of homes for veterans who cannot afford today's prices and the permanent problem of housing low-income families have to be faced. Sooner or later the issues present in title IX must be fought out and determined.

FARM HOUSING PROGRAMS

Titles X and XI deal with farm and rural nonfarm housing and were included to make good what was perhaps the most glaring omission in the United States Housing Act of 1937. That measure, while it spoke of housing generically, was framed in terms of urban conditions and needs—yes; even big-city conditions and needs—and offers no workable basis for extending public-housing assistance to the rural and farm population. When this lack became apparent, some attempts were made to provide subsidies for farm housing which produced a few houses but proved conclusively the practical impossibility of bending the big-city program to fit farm conditions. For the T-E-W bill the Department of Agriculture prepared a farm housing program while still another program was devised for rural nonfarm housing. Like the rest of the bill, these titles are the product of 1944 thinking in terms of prewar farm conditions which many thought would return after the war's end. Today's farmer is quite another person living under totally different economic conditions.

Not that all tenant farmers, share croppers, and tillers of scabby hillside patches have become wheat kings, but obviously farm housing needs now are not what they were before the war. Likewise the 1940 housing census statistics used in formulating the program are by this time completely meaningless. The very least that can be said about Titles X and XI is that they need complete restudy.

The two remaining titles, numbers XII and XIII, need not delay us long. The substance of Title XII providing regulations for the disposal of Government-built war housing has been covered in a bill passed at the last sessions. Title XIII consists of a series of perfecting and administrative provisions important to lawmakers and lawyers but scarcely to anyone else.

SHOULD SEPARATE ISSUES

Just where does that leave the T-E-W bill? Actually it leaves three titles which merit serious consideration: the research section, title IV; the urban redevelopment section, title VIII; and the public housing section, title IX. To speak of it as a comprehensive housing bill is obviously inaccurate. Worse than that is the confusion which is created in the minds of sincere people. At least two of the three remaining sections embody policies and programs on which there is sharp conflict of opinion, more or less reasoned in the case of urban redevelopment and highly emotional in the case of public housing. Decisions of some sort should be reached promptly—almost any decision would be better than the present stalemate. And the surest way to reach those decisions, to strip away much of the present lack of understanding and confusion would be to dump the T-E-W bill overboard. Then these three remaining sections could be fought out individually. The time, thought and painstaking effort that went into the preparation of the T-E-W bill have not been wasted. As nothing else could, discussion of the T-E-W bill hammered home the fact that housing is not a problem of low-income families alone but of all the housing of all the people; perhaps even more important, it stressed the relation of all housing to the growth and development of communities, and pointed up the need for long-range planning and programing. These ends have been served and the accomplishment can be put down to the credit of the T-E-W bill.

In the final analysis, the American electorate will decide how much, if any, public subsidized housing it wants; how much it wants the Federal Government to bail out our cities. These decisions can be made more soundly and more quickly if the issues are clear cut.

Coal-Mine Fatalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a very enlightening report from the United States Bureau of Mines which appeared in the March 1, 1948, issue of the United Mine Workers Journal:

SIXTY-FOUR THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIVE COAL MINERS KILLED AND INJURED IN 1947 WHILE SAFETY LEGISLATION IS STYMIED

American coal miners paid a terrible price in 1947 to provide the Nation with an abundance of coal, the highest peacetime production in history. A toll of 1,165 killed and

63,000 injured, with figures on the permanently and partially disabled still to be compiled, tells the story of the continued maiming and slaughter of American coal miners.

Nothing could be more obvious from the shocking record of 1947 than that the Federal Congress must enact police powers for Federal coal mine inspectors to enforce the standards of the Federal Mine Safety Code. The appalling toll of dead and injured reflects only too clearly the laxity of State enforcement and the inadequacies of State safety laws.

By way of comparison with previous years, the 1947 total of killed and disabled is the highest since the war year 1944, when 64,990 miners, or 825 more than last year, were casualties on the production front.

Revealing of the rampant negligence and laxity is the fact that there were 6 major mine disasters in 1947 which snuffed out the lives of 179 men. This ghastly record is worse than that of any of the war years, including 1943 when 8 major disasters claimed 175 lives.

Following the old pattern, falls of roof and face claimed the highest number of lives, 545. Haulage accidents, ranking second, resulted in 213 fatalities. Explosions—local- and major—took 188 lives, compared to 32 in 1946.

Despite all the ballyhoo last year about 1946 establishing an all-time low as regards accident frequency in American coal mines, it now comes to light that while numerically, fewer miners were hurt and killed in 1946 than in the preceding war years, actually the fatality rate, based on man-hours of exposure, was the same as in 1945 and the nonfatal rate in fact was higher.

Preliminary figures of the United States Bureau of Mines, which take into account all time spent underground portal-to-portal, disclosed that the fatality rate per million man-hours of exposure was 1.1 in 1945 and 1946. The injury rate was 64.25 in 1946 compared to 60.32 in the preceding year and 59.06 in 1944.

Statistically, nearly two-thirds of the men employed in anthracite and bituminous coal mines have been killed or injured in the past 5 years. Following is the record of lost-time injuries and fatalities for the years 1943 to 1947 inclusive:

1943:
- Fatal accidents 1,451
- Nonfatal accidents 64,594
- Total accidents 66,045

Twenty-six permanent total disabilities; 1,287 permanent partial disabilities; 8 major disasters with loss of 175 lives.

1944:
- Fatal accidents 1,299
- Nonfatal accidents 63,691
- Total accidents 64,990

Seventeen permanent total disabilities; 1,293 permanent partial disabilities; 4 major disasters claimed 94 lives.

1945:
- Fatal accidents 1,079
- Nonfatal accidents 59,350
- Total accidents 60,429

Five major disasters, 68 lives lost.

1946:
- Fatal accidents 974
- Nonfatal accidents 56,800
- Total accidents 57,774

Two major disasters, 27 lives lost.

1947:
- Fatal accidents 1,165
- Nonfatal accidents 63,000
- Total accidents 64,165

Six major disasters took a total of 179 lives.

The United States Bureau of Mines announced that fatality figures for the years 1945, 1946, and 1947 are incomplete. In fact, like production figures, the Bureau apparently is never able to secure from State mining departments the complete totals covering fatal and nonfatal accidents.

1947 coal-mine fatalities, by State and cause

State	Underground								Shaft	Opencut	Surface	Grand total
	Falls of roof	Falls of face	Haulage	Gas or dust explosions	Explosives	Electricity	Machinery	Other causes	Total underground				
Alabama	13	5	5			2	3		33	1			34
Alaska								1	1				1
Arkansas			1						1		1	1	2
Colorado	3	1	5				1		10		1	3	14
Illinois	27	3	15	141	2	2		1	191	2	4	8	205
Indiana	19	2	4	10	1	1			37		3	1	41
Iowa	1		1						2	3			5
Kansas	3								3				3
Kentucky	100	3	20	1	10	4	3	2	143			4	147
Maryland	5								5				5
Michigan		1							1				1
Missouri	1								1	1	1		3
Montana	1		1						2				2
New Mexico	1								1				1
North Dakota											1		1
Ohio	17		11				1	1	30		4	2	36
Oklahoma	4					2			6		1		7
Pennsylvania (bit.)	73	1	43		1	8	2	2	128	1	12	7	149
South Dakota													
Tennessee	12	1	4				1		18			1	19
Texas													
Utah	3	1	4				1		9			3	12
Virginia	26		8		2	1		5	42			1	43
Washington	1		1						2				2
West Virginia	118	8	71	1	5	7	11	7	228		6	17	251
Wyoming	2	1	2					1	6				6
Total bituminous	435	27	195	153	21	24	24	21	900	8	35	47	990
Pennsylvania (anthracite)	81	2	18	35	8	3		7	154	1	6	14	175
Grand total	516	29	213	188	29	27	24	28	1,054	9	41	61	1,165

Comparison of fatalities by cause at United States coal mines in 1947 and 1946 [1]

[Number killed]

	Bituminous coal		Pennsylvania anthracite		Total	
	1947	1946	1947	1946	1947	1946
Underground:						
Falls of roof or face	462	445	83	104	545	549
Haulage	195	164	18	21	213	185
Gas or dust explosions:						
Local	7	3	2	2	9	5
Major	146	27	33		179	27
Explosives	21	12	8	8	29	20
Electricity	24	24	3	3	27	27
Machinery	24	27		1	24	28
Shaft	8	8	1	1	9	9
Miscellaneous	21	24	7	13	28	37
Total underground	908	734	155	153	1,063	887
Stripping or open-cut	35	22	6	9	41	31
Surface	47	44	14	12	61	56
Grand total	990	800	175	174	1,165	974

[1] All figures are subject to revision.

Major disasters at United States coal mines in 1947

Date	Mine	Nearest town	Number killed	Cause
Bituminous:				
Mar. 25	Mine No. 5	Centralia, Ill.	111	Explosion.
Apr. 30	Spring Hill	Terre Haute, Ind.	8	Do.
July 24	Old Ben No. 8	West Frankfort, Ill.	27	Do.
Anthracite:				
Jan. 15	Nottingham	Plymouth, Pa.	15	Do.
Apr. 10	Schooley	West Wyoming, Pa.	10	Do.
Dec. 11	Franklin	Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	8	Do.

The Work of the Subcommittee for Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PREPARATORY COMMISSION, INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION,
December 1, 1947.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: A copy of your report to Congress giving your views and conclusions on the operations of IRO and, in the larger sense, the displaced-persons problem, has just been delivered to me. May I say that it is the most accurate, objective, and constructive statement that I have encountered in 4 years of work in this field. The shortcomings of our efforts are not high lighted for sensational purposes and our accomplishments are adequately and fairly recognized. It is not a sob document but a rational presentation of an intricate, moral and social problem worthy of consideration and action on the part of those who share our political creed.

It is only right that I should advise you that as of January 1, 1948, our United States zone operation will effect a further reduction in personnel. The present staff of 675 persons will be reduced to 590. We will not suffer particularly in operations but it does reduce the amount of manpower that can be devoted to such programs as Child Welfare and to supplementary services. We are reviewing the program assignments of the voluntary agencies in an endeavour to achieve more effective coverage of these areas of operations.

I enclose herewith a recent information product of our office and will send along others under separate cover. I believe this document has value and meaning for use in educating the people of our country as to who and what the displaced persons are.

May I again say that your visit, discussions and observations on the United States zone operations are a source of encouragement and satisfaction to those of us who live and work so intimately with this problem and these people.

Sincerely,

PAUL B. EDWARDS,
Chief of Operations.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter on the poll tax which I have received from the Hon. Virgil H. Goode, Commonwealth's attorney of Franklin County, Va. Mr. Goode has served four terms as a member of the general assembly of Virginia and he knows from first-hand experience just how the poll-tax system works in a poll-tax State.

FEBRUARY 10, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE H. BENDER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENDER: I wish to acknowledge your letter of February 3, 1948, relative to your bill, H. R. 29, which has for its purpose the abolishment of the infernal poll tax, now being imposed upon the citizens of seven southern States. I think if your bill could be enacted it would be one of the greatest blessings that could ever happen to the people of the South.

I represented my county for four terms in the general assembly of Virginia, and was recently elected Commonwealth's attorney of Franklin County, and as an office holder, I am in favor of abolishing the poll tax, but I would say that 90 percent of the office holders are not in favor of abolishing the poll tax, because it is used as a means of perpetuating themselves in office.

I certainly trust that your bill will be enacted into law this session so that the people of the South would have the privilege of voting for Federal officials under this new law.

Wishing you success with this bill, I am,

Yours very truly,

VIRGIL H. GOODE.

United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] at Yale University on February 13, 1948:

Mr. Chairman, in the remote epoch before Adolf Hitler flung his Wehrmacht at the Poles, it was a favorite practice of rhetoricians to paint word pictures of gray and cynical old men sitting in Parliaments and Chanceries voting away the lives of brave and beautiful young men in the name of national aggrandizement or glory. The rhetoricians must now paint an entirely new set of pictures. The statesmen of the future may be as gray, as cynical, and as unprincipled as those of the past but, whatever else they will do, they will not sit safely in their parliaments and chanceries while young men fight wars. In the wars of the future they are going to be killed, and the chances are that they will be killed a little sooner than the brave and beautiful young men. And this, as far as I am concerned, is as it should be. Members of Congress would do well to consider that they can die atomic deaths fairly early in the course of another conflict.

If this were a class in constitutional law I would pose to you the question just how we would conduct a war if the President, all his Cabinet, and the majority of the Members of Congress were wiped out in one air attack over Washington. Who would vote the appropriations? Where would we get the new President if all his statutory successors were annihilated? Should we amend the Federal Constitution to provide for the eventuality of a virtual annihilation of the Federal Government? Can Congressmen function as such if dispersed in their home towns communicating only by radio and telephone and television? These visions of national anarchy flit through the mind of a Congressman when he contemplates future wars.

I have talked to very serious thinkers who seriously urge that our great American cities be fragmented and dispersed over the continent, the larger cities to be 30 miles long and half a mile wide, so as to be less vulnerable targets. I do not think that Congress would get much support in public opinion for a program so preposterous and so expensive. I just don't think that New York and Chicago, Pittsburgh, and Detroit can be transplanted in this way. It is true that we can put the aircraft industry underground and the munition factories in the mountains. We could have a score of blast furnaces in each of the Rockies. Mount McKinley would shelter a thousand, and there is always the Mammoth Cave. But you must still raise crops where the sun and the rain will reach them. Human beings have not yet conditioned themselves to a permanently subterranean life. What good would it do to put the aircraft industry underground if all the people who work in the aircraft factories have to live above ground and be killed? Man is still a supraterranean animal, and unless you can give him a supraterranean future he might as well have none at all.

The Romans had a phrase for this idea. They used to say that it was no use propter vitam causas vivendi perdere—for the sake of living to lose all the reasons for living. Our problem is to preserve not merely vitam but the causas vivendi as well. And the problem cannot be too often or too boldly stated.

And consider the budgetary aspect of the situation. Ten billion, in round figures, for defense this year. But the President's Air Policy Commission, writing of survival in the air age, correctly points out that we have no adequate air policy and are not beginning to spend enough on aviation. By 1952 we must be spending 18 billions annually for defense, three times the whole cost of government in 1939. I hear politicians reproached for being unwilling to face these simple facts. It may be that they are. Probably all leaders need a certain amount of leading. That is where you come in. Everybody would like to be living in the days not merely before Hiroshima but before Coventry and Guernica as well, but it will do no good. We have got to learn our history this time. It's the one course we can't afford to flunk.

There is no doubt a case for saying that that homo sapiens should follow the course of the great saurians and more recently of the marsh hen, not to mention the more familiar dodo. Without wishing to be cynical and without being cynical in fact, I might say that the case for man's survival does not seem to me today so good as it did when I was a college undergraduate. In the two wars and the period of the dictatorships in Europe, men have certainly exhibited an incapacity to deal with their problems which few men of my age suspected in their youths. When other great mammals have been unable to adjust to their environment, they succumbed and are remembered only as fossils. Perhaps man who is after all only an exceptionally gifted mammal can ask for no better fate. But if we were agreed upon the mood of despair, we shouldn't have taken the trouble to come here at all. We are agreed that we are going to try to do something

about it. We are still continuing the experiment of the man whose birthday we observed only yesterday, to see not merely whether any nation conceived in liberty can long endure, but whether men who love liberty can endure to compose such nations.

What is the remedy? It is no doubt world government. But that will not help us much unless we know what we mean by world government and how we propose to obtain it. Otherwise this resounding phrase will deceive and repel and not elucidate or persuade. Indeed I am rather afraid that the phrase has already done a good deal of harm. It suggests that somehow we can suddenly slough off national governments and substitute for them a parliament of man sitting I know not where, ordaining the future of all men everywhere. I do not believe anything of the sort. The people of the United States will not suffer themselves to have their domestic lives regulated by the vast majorities of the human race which live on the continent of Asia. I do not envisage any world society which in any foreseeable period will supersede all existing governments. I do envisage an authority supranational in character with powers adequate to the maintenance of peace. I mean by this the prevention of aggression, the disposal of armed forces, the control of atomic weapons, and of other instrumentalities capable of exterminating lives on this planet. And this supranational authority must be an authority acting upon individuals and not merely on nations.

How is such an authority to be brought about? Shall we begin now by suffering the United Nations to follow the League of Nations, and calling a convention to create a new supranational organization which shall succeed where these have failed? I do not think so. I think that we must take the United Nations as a basis and proceed to give it greater powers. This was the idea which animated a group of us in introducing a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 66) which we introduced on the 9th of last July. "That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should immediately take the initiative in calling a general conference of the United Nations pursuant to article 109 for the purpose of making the United Nations capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war."

I believe that action can be obtained on this or some similar resolution at the present Congress. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs has promised to give it consideration immediately after the completion of the hearings on the Marshall plan. In the meantime there is in the House a movement afoot to introduce a more concrete resolution specifically advocating the elimination of the veto right by a permanent member in the Security Council but only in matters of aggression and armament for aggression, the prevention of armament for aggression, and the establishment of an international but tyranny proof world police force. The contemplated definition of aggression is to be "an attack by weapons of violence by a state or its citizens against the recognized territory of a member state." Such a resolution might deal even more specifically with armament quotas, vote revisions in the Security Council, etc. In any legislative body one must be governed by practicalities but the more powerful the expression of opinion we can obtain, the better. This is not a matter in which we need fear a certain measure of opportunism. Since the introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 66 everything internationally speaking has gone wrong. The Council of Foreign Ministers broke up. Our relations with Russia have steadily deteriorated. If the Marshall plan does not lead toward a closer union of the 16 participants I will prove to be what its enemies have been calling it—"operation rat hole."

If by a determined policy the Politburo will cooperate in revising the Charter of the United Nations, it is so much the better. But with or without Soviet cooperation, we must strive for a world society. I am not at all hopeful of getting Soviet cooperation. Still if we can be firm enough to convince the Kremlin that we have the strength and the will to resist their aggression, its leaders might decide that it would be worth while to come along.

In the formulation of opinion in this country, and in the world at large, organizations like yours can do immense good. My congratulations go to Cord Meyer for his fine book, Peace or Anarchy.

The American Legion, which has sometimes been thought of as being on the chauvinistic side, has made a most constructive contribution on the subject. Its executive committee in November 1946 adopted a resolution recommending three amendments to the United Nations Charter: First, reorganization of the Security Council and the World Court with a more effective representation of the nations and a final decision by majority vote abolishing the veto in all matters involving aggression or preparation for aggression; second, delegation to the Security Council of adequate powers to suppress aggression and prevent preparation therefor; and finally the establishment of a strong world police force to support the powers of the Security Council.

Senator TAFT has commended the Legion's suggestions, and I should be pleased if the party platform of my party were to adopt proposals of this character.

I should like also to commend the good work of those citizens, notably in Massachusetts, who have caused various towns to recommend action along these lines. Several towns in Maine are, I believe, preparing to take similar action at town meetings next month.

An almost vulgar publicity is now given to the fact that time marches on. We cannot move too soon or act too firmly. The mobilization of public opinion is a great undertaking, but I believe that you will find it singularly responsive to effort. Let me say as a practicing politician that women are particularly good at any organization or mobilization of opinion. Most politicians will agree that they are better than men.

Help us in the Congress all you can, and we in turn will try to help you for the survival of our species in a world society that will justify its survival.

Palestine—Are We Going to War Over It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable misunderstanding of the issues and implications involved in the Palestine partition matter. The Arabs and Jews today are at war as a result of a recommendation made by the United Nations Assembly on November 29, 1947. The purpose of the United Nations is to maintain peace in the world. The action by the Assembly has resulted in war. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette a pertinent editorial in the March 1 issue of that paper. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including it at this point:

WILL WE FIGHT FOR PALESTINE?

Are the American people prepared to send American soldiers, sailors, and airmen to Palestine to carry out the terms of the partition which the United States has forced upon the United Nations? Zionists declare that partition is a fait accompli, but new states are created in only two ways: by agreement of the populations concerned, or by force of arms. There is no agreement. Therefore, the projected Zionist state must be set up by force.

Will Americans supply the force? British forces are now leaving Palestine and will be out by May 15.

By our pressure-tactics we forced France, Liberia, Haiti, Greece, Ethiopia, and the Philippines to vote with us for partition of Palestine—against their will—and thus earned their disapproval and aroused opposition among our good friends. At the same time and by the same act the United States, which had been held in high esteem by the Arabs, has thus inspired hatred where we previously had friendship. And those same Arabs control the oil wealth for which the Soviet Union hungers.

Make no mistake, those Americans, Jew and non-Jew, who want the establishment of a new Jewish state are not backward in their insistence upon American money, American arms, American ships, and American men to guarantee peaceful partition of Palestine. They are short-sighted. They will not admit the inevitable consequences.

There are many facets to this distorted political picture, including the Greek problem, the British withdrawal from Palestine, the oil, the opposition now uniting the entire Arab League, and the UN powerless to carry out the proposition which we placed before it—powerless because it has no military force with which to enforce partition.

Zionism is the cause of a new political Jewish state. Zionists are those who are determined to establish it, regardless of the consequences.

Judaism is the ancient religion of the Jews, a great moral force which has influenced men for centuries.

Zionism is based upon the hope of a Jewish nation in Palestine, a national home for Jews of all nations.

To the non-Zionist Jew his patriotism, his allegiance is to his own homeland, wherever he is a citizen. His faith in Judaism is as the faith of other religious men in their own religions—it has nothing to do with the political concept of a Jewish national state.

We in the United States, however, have been put in a very precarious position by the action of the administration in forcing upon the United Nations the partition of Palestine. Since we insisted that the Jewish state be established by dividing up Palestine into Arab and Jewish territory, we are more responsible for its security than any other of the United Nations.

It must be remembered that 6,000,000 Jews were killed by the Nazis during the war and that thousands of others in Europe hope to find a home in Zionist Palestine. Many of these are in a hopeless condition, suffering, impoverished, dependent, hungry.

Among the agencies trying to help them is the United Jewish Appeal, now seeking $283,000,000. Part of this fund will be used for relief, but much will be used to transport Jews to Palestine, where they cannot enter legally. Part will be used to buy arms to fight the Arabs, part to establish the Zionist national state.

It argues that "establishment of a new Jewish state was not merely the plan of American Jewry but had become an integral part of the foreign policy of the United States."

Julian Venezky, national chairman for regions of the United Jewish Appeal, declared that development and defense of the new Jewish state were "not merely the expression of the will and hope of the Jewish people but a matter of the foreign policy of the United States Government."

"American leadership in the program for the partition of Palestine into Jewish and Arab states," he said, "placed the United Jewish Appeal's drive in the position of backing up the accepted and official policy of our Government in the same way that we have embarked on the Marshall plan and other policies to sustain democracy in other parts of the world."

Eliezar Kaplan, treasurer of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, declared that the appeal for American funds would cover the cost of transporting 75,000 immigrants to be sent to Palestine this year because he was "confident transportation would be supplied by the United States Government."

He added that "the United States will be asked for loans and for surplus arms for the defense of the new Jewish state in Palestine. A small token international force in Palestine would make the Arab states think twice before attacking the Jewish state." The Zionists expect that private contributions for the new Jewish state must be supplemented by public funds, that our Government "or some appropriate agency must make it possible for the Jews of Palestine to secure without delay the arms and equipment they need for self-defense."

Many Americans who have proved their racial and religious tolerance, including a minority of the Jewish community, do not accept these assumptions. They support the American embargo on further armament sales to Palestine. Those who oppose Zionism risk being called anti-Semitic, however sincere their sympathy in behalf of Jews and all other human beings.

We are solicitous for the welfare of all peoples, including the homeless Jews of Europe, but cannot see a solution in the Zionist program.

As the well-known Minneapolis editor, Carroll Binder, has said, "If such a state could be created without harm to the rest of the world, I would support rather than oppose the Zionist proposals."

The two political parties have paid lip service to Zionism, courting Zionist votes. Pro-Zionist resolutions have been passed in Congress. Mr. Truman and Mr. Dewey have tried to force the British to allow immigration of 100,000 Jews into Palestine, against avowed Arab opposition.

Now, however, British soldiers will be recalled. Will American armed forces replace them? Will American taxpayers pay for protection of Jew from Arab and of Arab from Jew?

Until now it was easy to non-Jewish Americans, both tolerant and intolerant, to pass the buck to the British who were in control of Palestine. Now it is the problem of the United States and the United Nations.

Career diplomats and our foreign consulars in the Middle East have warned our State Department not to take this fatal step, but we forced partition, willy-nilly.

It is a problem now before the UN. We have not made our position clear—for we insisted upon partition, calling for security in Palestine by UN armed forces when the UN has no such forces.

We have jeopardized the world position of UN. It is worth watching from day to day.

Hon. Pete Jarman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have included in my extension of remarks a newspaper article, issued by the Daily News Bureau, which appears in prominent newspapers throughout the country, making an appraisal of the fine work of my distinguished colleague the Honorable PETE JARMAN. It is my high privilege to offer this article for the RECORD in order that it might come to the attention of the Members of the House who universally hold him in esteem and value the great work he is rendering our Nation.

ALABAMA'S JARMAN IDEAL CONGRES-MAN

(By Mac Lowry, Atlanta Journal Bureau)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—PETE JARMAN, sixth-term Democrat from Alabama, is a Congressman's Congressman. The phrase would fit several gentlemen on Capitol Hill, but it fits none any better, at least, than JARMAN.

JARMAN has courage, charm, and political know-how. He is a winner. He is about an 85 percent regular on partisan votes. His position as president of the Jefferson Islands Club means that he is just about the best Democratic "mixer" in the House.

But he would not be a Congressman's Congressman if he did not have something else—the political security which enables him to represent, in his own words, "the best interests of my whole country." When his convictions are stirred, JARMAN scorns the silent gentlemen "running for reelection" at his side.

A veteran of many years in the House puts it this way: "Pete goes along until the pinch comes and then moves out in front."

Representative JARMAN moved out in front last November when the House Republican leadership took what he thought was an unnecessarily long time to get a vote on the interim aid bill.

How long, he asked, would the Foreign Affairs Committee "continue this laborious, boring, unnecessary tweedledee and tweedledum?"

PETE JARMAN "tweedledeed" and "tweedledummed" the House until Capitol observers began digging into the record of this 55-year-old Alabama Congressman who was already in his sixth term. How had they missed him before?

When the interim aid bill finally came up for debate, the ranking Foreign Affairs Committee Democrat turned much of the floor work over to JARMAN.

The Alabamian, with the South in his mouth, a broad smile, and an inexhaustible fund of charm, talked and laughed many of his Democratic neighbors out of the fertilizer amendment and other restrictions to the bill.

"Mr. Chairman," he said, "the farmers of Alabama also need great amounts of fertilizer. The farmers of Alabama are also confronted with the unfortunate shortage of fertilizer to which reference has been made. The farmers of Alabama have also been misled into believing that shortage of fertilizer results largely, if not entirely, from the relief program.

"I yield to no man in my desire to appropriately represent the farmers of my district, but let us assume they are men with four sides, square men, and the farmers of my district are as square shooters as there are in the world. I do not want to represent just one of those sides. I believe that in voting for this amendment to eliminate fertilizer and farm implements from this bill I would be voting for one of the four sides of that farmer only."

The Jarman charm and political skill are such that while this homily was being delivered the gentlemen from Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and other Southern States did nothing but beam at their colleague from Alabama.

JARMAN'S confident support of the administration's foreign policy—his record since lend-lease days is 100 percent—and his ability to draw his colleagues along are the products of two separate developments in the life of a congressman.

One began in Tuscaloosa, Ala., in 1938, when JARMAN, then running for his second term in Congress, heard Adolf Hitler make a vitriolic attack on the Czech president, Eduard Benes. JARMAN returned to Washington the following January with the aim of getting on the Foreign Affairs Committee, something he had only vaguely considered when his fellow Alabamian, Speaker Bankhead, had suggested it the previous term.

In 8 years on the House Foreign Affairs Committee JARMAN has traveled around the world, represented the House in South American republics and been in every European country outside Russia, Yugoslavia, and Albania.

He has vigorously defended the State Department, not only in major foreign policies but in such unpopular efforts as its overseas information program. When the House "Taberized" the Voice of America last summer JARMAN went out of his way to support even the much-ridiculed circus ladies in the State Department's traveling art show.

"We have circus ladies like that in this country," he said, "without embellishment, without making propaganda of it, and without, of course, emphasizing the defects, too.

"The serious effort of this program is to present * * * to the rest of the world a true picture of America."

His colleagues listen to JARMAN in a wholly different frame of mind from that they accord official witnesses, because they see in him the proven product of native American politics.

JARMAN'S father, Peter Bryant Jarman, was sheriff, tax collector, and probate judge of Sumter County, Ala., for 30-odd years. In his last county race the elder Jarman said:

"I have been in politics for more than 30 years and, so far as I know, there has never been a vote stolen or bought for or against me—that is the strongest compliment I could pay to this county."

"My father would have known if one vote had been bought, too," Representative JARMAN says today, in speaking of the man who was a greater political influence on his son than such Alabama intimates as the late Speaker Bankhead and the State's present Senators, LISTER HILL and JOHN SPARKMAN.

After graduating from the University of Alabama in 1913, PETE JARMAN tutored under his father in the probate office of Sumter County. When World War I came he attended the first officers' training camp and went overseas as a first lieutenant. He returned September 2, 1919, having been wounded in France.

His veteran's status was one motive for his appointment as assistant examiner of accounts of the State of Alabama by a man his father had opposed, Governor Kilby. His American Legion and National Guard activities helped him again in 1931 when he beat two strong rivals for secretary of state.

In 1934 JARMAN made his one unsuccessful race for Congress, losing out by only 2,717 votes to the incumbent, who had not been opposed since he had beaten William B. Bankhead 20 years before.

His potency at the ballot box assured, JARMAN bided his time until the retirement of the encumbent, serving in the meanwhile as State comproller under appointment from Gov. Bibb Graves. In 1938 JARMAN snowed his opponent under, 7 to 1.

In 30 years of political experience JARMAN has been aided immeasurably by a fund of good spirits. The list of organizations he has joined reads like a cross section of American life. None, perhaps, is more revealing of his current status than the Jefferson Islands Club, sponsor of President Roosevelt's many "harmony" sessions down on Chesapeake Bay.

JARMAN is president of the organization, which now will use St. Catherine Island, 59 miles from Washington, its old clubhouse having burned down in 1945. Vice presidents include such Democratic notables as Sam Rayburn, Alben Barkley, Millard Tydings, Jesse Jones, Bernard Baruch, Leslie Biffle, and Breckinridge Long.

The tongue-in-cheek objects of the club form almost a poem on the Democratic political spirit of which PETE JARMAN is the congressional denominator:

"For the purpose of supporting, defending, and advancing the fundamental principles of government enunciated by Thomas Jefferson.

"To provide a clubhouse with suitable surrounding and comforts where members may assemble, discuss, and promote Jeffersonian philosophies, to the end they may become controlling in Federal and State Governments."

The Importance of the Marshall Plan and Strengthening the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared on February 25, 1948, in the Daily News of Los Angeles, Calif.

I wrote this editorial in response to an invitation from Mr. Manchester Boddy, the editor of the Daily News.

The title of the editorial is "The Importance of the Marshall Plan and Strengthening the United Nations":

(Perhaps no issue before the American public has been so widely investigated, explained, and debated as the Marshall plan. Practically every Member of Congress had an opportunity to study the implications and problems involved in it at first hand, both in Europe and behind closed doors in official Washington. There has been ample time for deliberation and mature consideration. Soon the hour will strike when our Representatives in Congress must stand where all can see them and vote in support of or for the defeat of the Marshall plan. Today we hear from the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, Member of Congress from Los Angeles' Nineteenth District. Congressman HOLIFIELD is a Democrat serving his third term in Congress, to which he was first elected in 1942.)

Why is the European recovery plan which is commonly called the "Marshall plan," important to the butcher, the baker, and the haberdasher, on the main streets of our Nation?

Why should we continue paying high taxes in order to send food, machinery, and medicine across the oceans?

First, I will define my conception of the type of assistance to be given, and the main purposes of the Marshall plan.

(a) A plan to furnish 16 western European nations such food, machinery, medicine, and supplies as we can spare from our economy. These 16 recipient nations are composed of nations who have voluntarily expressed a willingness to cooperate with each other and with the United States in a program of mutual economic assistance.

(b) The purpose of extending this aid to these war-ravaged nations is to (1) restore normal economic functions within each nation and to facilitate the normal commercial exchange of area surpluses between all cooperating nations; (2) to strengthen existing constitutional governing bodies within each nation, so that government based on the principle of majority rule may be maintained and developed along democratic lines.

Let me state at once that I would prefer that our assistance to other nations be channeled through a functioning United Nations. Until the United Nations adopts the democratic principle of majority rule in place of the absolute veto by a single member nation, its function is frustrated. In the absence of a functioning United Nations, and until several Charter improvements are made, I believe we are justified in joining with groups of nations in mutual assistance programs. While this type of mutual assistance is not within the formal framework of the United Nations, it is certainly in harmony with the spirit of regional assistance groups permitted by the United Nations Charter.

The attempt to classify the so-called Truman doctrine plan of intervention in Greece with the Marshall plan as being the same is both deceitful and unjustified. The difference is important.

The Truman doctrine bypassed the United Nations by sending both arms, soldiers, and civilian supplies to Turkey and Greece. It was a unilateral move on the part of the United States with the acquiescence of the Greek Government.

It was in direct contradiction to the principle of multilateral solution purposed in the Charter.

The Marshall plan is a civilian rehabilitation program (no arms, no soldiers) arranged by mutual agreement between 17 nations, and is clearly in harmony with the United Nations purpose of peaceful, multilateral solution of international problems.

I voted against the Truman doctrine, and shall vote for the Marshall plan, if it conforms finally to the principles outlined.

We spent over $200,000,000,000 to win the war against the totalitarian nations of Germany, Italy, and Japan. We won the war, but our goal of world peace has not been achieved. Neither do we have any assurance that a totalitarian ideology of another kind will not spring from the chaos of Europe's ruined cities to replace the ideology destroyed.

Until the goal of world peace is achieved, our task is not finished. Unless we press on to finish the job, today's cessation of active war will be only the interlude between World War II and World War III.

On VJ-day, the United States found itself the strongest military nation in the world. We also had become the greatest industrial producer of all time.

The rest of the world, both victors and vanquished, were either crippled by physical destruction or bankrupt. Most of the European nations were both crippled and bankrupt. The mantle of world leadership was, therefore, thrust upon us.

It seems to fit us poorly, and the "new look" is still a bit uncomfortable. We have been loath to wear our new mantle with either the ease of experience, or confidence in our ability to fill the new role.

We must not bury our heads in the sands of yesteryear isolationism, but we must accept world leadership, because in this shrunken world we live or die together. Universal peace is inextricably dependent on a stable economic world. Unless western Europe is rehabilitated, her nations cannot resume their functions in international commerce and she cannot maintain or develop free constitutional governments.

Without world trade between free nations, we shall soon find ourselves in a domestic depression. We exported $14,000,000,000 worth of goods in 1947, and we imported $9,000,000,000 worth of goods. A better balance is necessary for world stability. This balance can be attained only through increased production abroad.

Unless stability is reestablished in western Europe, we shall see a totalitarian ideology arise from the wreckage of World War II. First Europe and then Asia will be melded into the Soviet orbit. Free governments and free commerce will disappear from four-fifths of the world's surface. And we shall be alone.

We shall be, for a short time, a free enterprise, constitutional island in a totalitarian world. I specifically say, "for a short time," because our constitutional liberties and our free-enterprise economy would soon be forfeited in the attempt to defend ourselves against a hostile world.

The cost of the Marshall plan in dollars may be 2½ percent of our national annual income each year, for a few years. It may total 6 percent of the amount we spent in the recent war. In comparison with the cost of World War II, and the potential cost of a Third World War, the cost of the Marshall plan is relatively small.

Let us be truthful and admit that there is no guarantee that the plan will be successful. Our wisest statesmen and economists frankly said: "The Marshall plan is a calculated risk, a gamble for world peace."

The American people, through their Congress, must make the decision soon. If we fail to accept the responsibility of world leadership, what will be the evaluation of history? What will the alternative be?

We are reaching against time, and the unknown factor of psychological reaction of desperate people. Our philosophy of freedom is competing with the slave philosophy of totalitarianism which thrives best in the soil of economic chaos.

We are racing against the deadline of atomic discovery in foreign laboratories.

The Moral Crisis Facing Our World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is commonplace to talk in terms of crisis today. The world has become accustomed to the use of scare words, and it has become hard-boiled and cynical about them.

Yet no other word than crisis will do to describe the circumstances in which we find ourselves at this moment in world history. We are passing into one of the most important periods in the records of mankind, and the traditional guides which have charted the course of human conduct in ages gone by are impatiently pushed aside. Those who worship science and ignore humanity are ruling the roost. Their emphasis upon materialism has turned the world toward a mad race to accumulate power and wealth, no matter what may be the ultimate cost.

This is the moral crisis which confronts us at the opening of the atomic age. It is the same challenge that was flung at the world when the industrial revolution broke upon western Europe at the end of the eighteenth century. We failed to meet the issue then, and unless we reshape our thinking and our living today, we shall fail to meet it now.

Gilbert Chesterton once said:

Christianity has not been tried and found wanting. It has been found difficult and not tried.

It is time to try it and to practice it if we are to survive.

What is the situation which confronts us today? We stand at the dawn of an era when the struggle of man to obtain his daily bread will no longer be the burdensome task it has always been before. The hours of work for the average man have been reduced from the daily 16 they were in the seventeenth century, the 14 they reached in the eighteenth, 12 in the nineteenth century to 8 and less than 8 in our time. The scientists tell us that 1 pound of uranium 235 has the energy equivalent of 20,000,000 pounds of coal or 10,000,000 pounds of gasoline. They are looking forward to the release of vast quantities of this revolutionary fuel power within the next 25 years. The hours of work which must be performed by men with this new resource at their command may diminish still further, if we use our power wisely.

If we can harness the potential power of this energy to the task of making the world a better place in which to live, we may establish heaven on earth. But if we do with atomic energy what we did with TNT, what we did with aviation, we may well succeed in destroying the earth itself. The use we make of this great power will determine the future of our civilization, and the decision we make must be a moral and an ethical decision.

Where shall we obtain the insights to reach this wisdom? Where shall we find the guidance we need to create peace on earth? There is one place, and only one where men have found the eternal truths we must have. That place is in the realm of religious idealism. Brotherhood, love, equality, happiness, kindliness, consideration for our fellowmen, help for the hungry, the weak, the sorrowing, justice for all, mercy, humility—these are the messages of religion. These are the teachings of Christ and of the prophets. These are the lessons of the Sermon on the Mount. Blessed are the meek—not blessed are the powerful and the cruel; blessed are the poor—not the rich and the arrogant.

What are the ingredients of happiness which all men seek? Surely, we have seen enough of the superficially successful to realize that neither wealth nor power can lead to personal contentment. Surely, we have watched humble, simple men and women who devote their lives to helping others around them achieve the happiness and peace which are more significant than anything else in life. The motives of religion move these people to action.

What is true for individuals must come to be equally true for nations. No country has long survived with dignity and worth when it chooses to abandon the quest for human betterment and seeks to impose its will upon the world. The lesson of the Old Testament is as valid today as it was in the days when Assyria and Tyre and Babylon bestrode the earth. Those who live by the sword must perish by the sword. Those who wish to live must live in accordance with the laws of God.

We need today a religious reawakening. We need a reassertion of the religious yearnings we have noted in history. The spirit of men like Abraham Lincoln who drew his inspiration from the Bible, the courage of women like Joan of Arc who drew her strength from religious zeal can rebuild our world and lead us bravely into the atomic age.

Nothing less will fortify us for the world of the future. We must be prepared not only to die for the principles of humanity we cherish, we must also prepare to live for them, and by them. If we do, we shall create a braver, better world for our children. Only the wisdom of the ages, expressed in religious idealism, can point the way. If we are to survive we must walk in their paths and let Him teach us His ways.

Russia Still Has Our Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the Times-Herald of March 5, 1948, under Associated Press dispatch from Yokohama, it is stated that two more lend-lease tankers have been returned to the United States by Russia at a time of critical world shortage, of such vessels, yet she had 95 American merchant ships. During the hearings last summer it was disclosed that the Commerce Department was rushing oil and petroleum products to Russia during 1945, 1946, and 1947, and that there was a great shortage of fuel oil, gasoline, and petroleum products in the United States, beginning in June 1947. At that time in June, seven of these tankers were loading gasoline and petroleum products at the docks on the western coast and at the same time the Department of Commerce was testifying of the great shortage of oil and petroleum products in the United States, especially during the coming winter of 1947-48. These were vessels paid for by the taxpayers of the United States, yet the President of the United States knowing through the Department of Commerce and from other sources and presently testifying of the great oil shortage, gave custom's clearance to these American-owned tankers to carry gasoline and petroleum products to Russia. These were the ships owned by the United States and there comes with poor grace at this time after the oil shortage of all winter, a dispatch from Yokohama saying the Russians had delivered two American tankers at Yokohama where American crews could get them and that others will be delivered in the near future.

However, I find from the Los Angeles Examiner of January 22 of this year, that a tanker paid for by the American taxpayer, the Russian name being *Kolhoznik* and formerly the *Charles Wilkes* of the United States merchant marine, is transporting petroleum products from the west coast of the United States to Russia. The ship was pictured in the California Los Angeles Examiner and the news item read:

SHIPS OF A DIFFERENT COLOR

Observers at yesterday's ceremonies dedicating California's milk ship noticed how different ship cargoes can be. While millions of cans of milk were being loaded on the *Golden Bear*, destined for Italy, Greece, and France to aid undernourished victims of World War II, not many yards away the *Kolhoznik* was taking on United States oil for Russia.

This is the American-owned ship *Charles Wilkes* under the authority of the President of the United States, carrying petroleum products to Russia making for the expansion of communism while petroleum products are short in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, for nearly 3 years this same program has continued on with the use of the American taxpayers' ships, carrying goods and machinery to Russia, paid for by the American taxpayer, all assisting to make Russia strong to build its empire of communism over the protest of American citizens.

Churchill's Speech 2 Years Ago Is Found Borne Out by Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan taken from the New York Herald Tribune of today.

Mr. Speaker, about 2 days ago I received a letter from a constituent of mine

reminding me of those good old days when on Main Street we found horses instead of jeeps and you never heard the words "Fascist" or "Communist." Of course, I believe all of us would appreciate such a calm and peaceful setting again—but the world moves on—and, unfortunately, not in the right direction. Our ambitions are to make the world such that our children and our grandchildren might have the same opportunities to live and develop in a free world, at least with opportunities equal to those that most of us and our parents enjoyed. I cannot believe that the ordinary, common run-of-the-mill people anywhere in the world want war, and certainly I do not believe that the American people would ever want what goes with an atomic war and experience here the destruction of our cities, homes, and industries, plus the death and suffering of our people.

That is why our people did not accept favorably the speech of Winston Churchill given 2 years ago in Missouri. To go back further than that, our Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee, after our return from Europe and visit to Russia in the fall of 1945, reported directly to President Truman and urged him, from information gained, to stop trying to appease the Russians and to deal firmly from then on. But no; the administration followed a be-nice-to-Russia policy, and the American people must know that the foreign policy of this Nation is the responsibility of the President.

The article follows:

CHURCHILL'S SPEECH 2 YEARS AGO IS FOUND BORNE OUT BY EVENTS—MARK SULLIVAN CITES MISSOURI ADDRESS COINING PHRASE "THE IRON CURTAIN," RECALLS HOW IT SHOCKED NATION, LINKS IT TO CURRENT NEWS

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, March 4.—This is written on the eve of March 5, and deals with that date. Only the year is not 1948, it is 1946. It is about the speech Winston Churchill made at Fulton, Mo., exactly 2 years ago, with the events that have taken place since—and especially the events taking place this very day which almost sensationally bear out much that Mr. Churchill said.

For recalling the Churchill speech, an easy identification is the phrase he there uttered. "The iron curtain," now made memorable by millions of quotations that have carried it into the common tongue and for recalling what Mr. Churchill described and forecast, to our then surprise and dismay, the best beginning is to quote the passage in which Mr. Churchill used his history-making phrase: "* * * an iron curtain has descended across the Continent (Europe). Behind the line lie all the ancient states of central and western Europe * * * all lie in the Soviet sphere and all are subject * * * not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and increasing measure of control from Moscow. * * * The Communist Parties, which were very small in all these eastern states of Europe, have been raised to prominence and power far beyond their numbers, and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control."

SPEECH SURPRISED UNITED STATES

For the effect of surprise that Mr. Churchill's speech had upon us, one reason was that he described something which had taken place without our noticing it. Another reason, for both the surprise and the dismay, was that the actuality he pictured was so contrary to the ideal for which we had fought the war, the ideal of liberation and independence for all countries and peoples.

Our emotion went beyond suprise and dismay, it included resentment. After Mr. Churchill had made his speech, as his train rolled eastward from Missouri, Time magazine recorded a poignant scene: "The old man read the papers that were brought him, his pink face lengthening, his blue eyes hardening at the angry editorial comment his speech had aroused."

For the unfavorable reaction to his speech, a reason given was his proposal for a continuance of the intimate relationships which during the war had existed between the British and American armed forces, amounting to a suggestion of permanent military cooperation. But neither that, nor even his suggestion of an ultimate common citizenship was the real reason for our resentful mood. Under ordinary circumstances, so far as we disapproved that, we would have laughed it off.

What really accounted for our resentment was the intrusion of Mr. Churchill's speech upon our comfortable feeling, common at the time, that we were going to cooperate with Soviet Russia, even appease her so much as might be necessary, to the end of peace in a unified world. That course was accepted by most of our people, was urged upon us by many spokesmen, was advocated as the proper policy of government—Henry Wallace was still in the Cabinet and 6 months later was able to persuade President Truman to approve a speech by him advocating a be-nice-to-Russia policy.

That easy-going comfort, Mr. Churchill's speech disabused. He further intruded upon our comfort by calling attention to our responsibility, never a popular thing to do:

"The United States stands at this time at the pinnacle of the whole world. It is a solemn moment for the American democracy. With primacy in power is also joined an awe-inspiring accountability to the future. As you look around you, you must feel not only the sense of duty but also feel anxiety lest you fall below the level of achievement."

ONE YEAR LATER

Almost exactly a year after Mr. Churchill's speech, the sense of responsibility caught up with us and accountability was accepted, in the address of President Truman to Congress in March 1947, in which he said we would give help to countries striving to keep their independence against aggression by totalitarian power, and specifically recommended aid to Greece and Turkey, then under acute pressure from Russian communism.

On the second anniversary of Mr. Churchill's speech, the chief activity of our Government, in the administration and in Congress, is centered about defense of western European nations against aggression by Russian communism. It was epitomized in the report of the news last Wednesday, March 3, on the radio program Three Star Extra. It is nearing approach to what Mr. Felix Morley expressed as a "show-down between the United States and Soviet Russia."

Civil Rights for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the past few weeks have seen a great deal of public display and agitation because of the President's recommendations on civil rights.

On February 2, the President sent to Congress a message outlining his views on civil rights. Civil rights can only be interpreted as those rights which should be available to all of our citizens. Most of us seldom stop to realize that many of our people are deprived of the rights which the majority of us take very lightly. I speak, of course, of those of us who, because of race, creed, or national origin, meet different amounts of discrimination. Practically the entire southern delegation in the Congress has become aroused over the President's advocacy of equal rights for all. In essence, that is what the program is—equal rights for all of our citizens.

We read in our newspapers and hear over the radio almost daily the word "democracy" and the blessings which are provided by this system. The American people have become smug with the feeling that our Nation does provide equal justice to all. Such is not the case. Is it equal justice when a Negro is deprived of the sacred ballot? Is it equal justice when many of our citizens of various races or colors are delegated to slum areas? Is it equal justice when job opportunities are not available to some of our citizens for these same reasons? It would be nonsensical to continue evading the fact that this great Nation does not grant equal justice to all. We cannot remain as ostriches with our heads in the sand.

The program the President recommended is not new. It has been before other sessions of Congress and has failed of passage. In this Eightieth Congress there are bills covering all of the points mentioned by the President. It is my hope that favorable consideration will be given to them in the coming months. The three classifications which are the greatest bars to equal citizenship are these: The inability to get vigorous prosecution of persons suspected of lynching, the inability of many of our citizens to vote in various parts of the country, and the inability to attain employment commensurate with ability for many of our citizens.

These three practices can only be stopped by enactment of legislation by Congress. A bill to allow Federal prosecution of those accused of lynching has been favorably considered by a congressional subcommittee and will soon be before the House for action. The passage of this measure will grant protection to our colored citizens in the South who have been in the past years the subject of mob rule and thus deprived of their rights before a court.

The Senate will soon consider legislation setting up a Fair Employment Practice Commission. This Commission would operate along the lines of the one now in operation in New York State. We in Connecticut, have a similar agency for protection against employment discrimination. Surely the chance for employment, and the opportunity for advancement, is a part of any civil-rights program. This legislation is necessary to grant a greater share of our democracy to those now deprived of many of its rights and privileges.

The third major bill being considered by the Congress is that concerning the abolition of the poll tax. Most of our Southern States require the payment of a poll tax as a requisite for voting in general elections. This device is used to bar the Negro from participation in elections because most of them in the South cannot afford to pay this tax. Injustice becomes greater as nonpayment each year makes for accumulation of the tax, so that it would be necessary for the southern Negro to pay large sums of money for the privilege of voting.

These are the three major legislative measures which, if enacted into law, would guarantee equal justice to all of our citizens. If such a program is not adopted by the Congress, we in America will aid in the growth of communism here in this country. Communistic tendencies are fed by flames of despair and injustice. During the past war thousands of American boys died to bring democracy to all the people of the world. It is pure mockery to deprive the families of many of those who died, of their share in democracy.

All during my service in the Marine Corps I worked and fought side by side with men of all races and creeds, and with many of our colored boys who fought so valiantly for the cause in which they believed.

We are currently engaged in a program of appropriating billions of dollars to combat the menace of communism abroad. This menace has grown and will continue to grow in this country if these conditions are not corrected. We, as the strongest and richest Nation in the world, can and must provide equal opportunities for all our citizens—opportunities for education and employment in particular.

How can a man truly represent the people of his district when less than 10 percent of them have had the opportunity to vote at the election in which he was chosen? This is not democracy. It is not fair play. It is not equal justice. We must abolish these practices in America if we are to remain free and remain strong.

Extend Hand of Welcome to Additional Greek Nationals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to increase the immigration quota for Greece an additional 5,000 for each of the next three fiscal years. I believe it is in our national interest and in the interest of world peace and humanitarianism that we increase the Greek quota by this number at this time.

The United States has extended a helping hand to the people of Greece in their fight for economic rehabilitation. We have joined with Greece in her valiant effort to prevent outside forces from imposing a communistic regime upon the Greek Nation. Our economic and friendly relations should be and would be broadened by permitting this additional number of Greek nationals, the great majority of whom will be parents, children, or brothers and sisters of American citizens, to immigrate to the United States within the next 3 years. This friendly and humanitarian gesture on our part would stiffen the back of every Greek citizen in his fight against communism.

There are now in the United States approximately 300,000 persons of Greek origin. We all know that the Greek is marked by his thrift, industriousness, and self-sufficiency. Likewise, the Greek is established as possessing in the highest degree the most desirable qualifications of law-abiding citizenry. They have made fine citizens and have exhibited the highest degree of loyalty to the United States and its form of government and its institutions.

The people of America from its inception have been privileged to sense the needs of humanity and historically have dealt with them in the Christian spirit. This has been manifested by extending every reasonable aid to the maintenance of family ties of those who have come to our shores. Approximately 30,000 close relatives of American Greeks have filled visa applications to come to the United States. Under the present quota, only 308 will be permitted to enter yearly. Although the additional number proposed for admission is relatively small, it will bring together thousands of American-Greek families.

The paralyzing effect of economic distress following the havoc and ravage of war has been intensified by the deplorable internal civil strife now prevailing in Greece. Communist guerrilla depredations have made untold thousands homeless, helpless, and public charges on the already creaking economy. The effect of this measure would be to provide alleviation of such suffering where relief is mostly needed. That would be in harmony with our broad policy toward Greece, and should prove in a substantial degree a blow to Communist terrorism.

The Greek people have probably contributed more than any other to the arts and sciences and to the culture of the world, but, basically, they are a producing, a working people. These additional Greeks are needed in America today. Not only will broken families be joined, but as have those who have already made America their home, these industrious people will make invaluable contributions to the strengthening of our American way of life and to the progress of America.

The Flat Top Is Still a Handy Sort of Thing, Even in Modern Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, never in our peacetime history were the problems of national defense so important to our safety as they seem to be at the present time. For this reason I desire to call special attention to an article by William H. Harrison, published in last Sunday's Washington Star, entitled "The Flat Top Is Still a Handy Sort of Thing—Even in Modern Warfare." Mr. Harrison emphasizes a point vital to our security in what military strategists choose to call the foreseeable future. His conclusions are worthy of earnest consideration by those charged with the responsibility for maintaining our defense establishment at a level adequate to meet the demands of the uncertain world in which we find ourselves. Mr. Harrison's discussion follows:

THE FLAT TOP IS STILL A HANDY SORT OF THING—EVEN IN MODERN WARFARE

(By William H. Harrison)

In terms of the foreseeable future, aircraft carriers—large and small—are here to stay. Stated another way, although considerable doubt may be cast on the Navy's plan to build them on a super scale, ranging from 60,000 to 80,000 tons, they will be of vital importance to us in any war likely to break out within the next 10 or 15 years.

REVELATION OF HARD WORK

After that—after 15 years, say—conventional carriers conceivably may be as obsolete as the whalebone corset, made so by the development of intercontinental atomic rockets, guided missiles, supersonic space ships, and the numerous other horrendous devices being predicted by the push-button experts for the world of tomorrow. Meanwhile, through, until that world is more clearly in sight, we had better not neglect our carrier power. It is insurance we cannot afford to let lapse; it is the heart—as was once the battleship—of the great naval strength we must have for a balanced system of security in the troubled age ahead.

This conclusion is based on a wide variety of opinions expressed to the writer by some of the world's best and most experienced naval airmen during 10 days aboard the U. S. S. *Leyte* on the Atlantic Fleet exercises now nearing an end in the vicinity of Panama. The exercises, one of the largest since the close of the war, began on February 9 when the 27,000-ton Essex-class *Leyte* and its sister ship, the *Philippine Sea*, set out from Quonset Point, R. I., later to rendezvous with 15 destroyers and 3 cruisers for a majestic southward movement in support of amphibious Army and Marine landings on Vieques Islands, a few miles east of Puerto Rico.

To a landlubber observer the exercises were at once a revelation of the hard work involved in keeping the Navy trim in peacetime and a convincing demonstration of the carrier's overshadowing role in the employment of seapower. Nothing new—tactically or strategically—had any part in the exercises. The pattern was the same as that used against the Japanese in the Pacific.

The sole objective was training—to keep old hands from losing their touch and to give new ones experience.

Ten days aboard the *Leyte* would be enough to persuade any relatively soft-living civilian that the operating Navy, even in peacetime, is no bed of roses. A carrier of this type is a beautiful thing, but it is not home. The food aboard is good; the officers' staterooms are comfortable; the crew's quarters are clean and sleepable; the medical, dental, and sick-bay facilities are excellent; libraries and soda fountains are available; there are frequent movies on the hangar deck, and every night the chaplain speaks a brief but impressive prayer over the public-address system. Yet to be a part of this is not like being in your own house with your own family. You are just one among about 1,800 individuals (the wartime complement is approximately 2,900), and a goodly portion of these—junior officers and men—are green hands.

NOT WITHOUT RISKS

Psychologically, such a way of life can be occasionally trying, especially when you have to spend 6 weeks or more at sea with perhaps only one short shore leave. As for the physical end of it, it certainly is not restful. There is always brain-and-muscle work to be done on every deck. During the exercises from Quonset to Puerto Rico, for instance, there were days when many officers and men averaged only 2 or 3 hours' sleep a night, there were days, too, when general quarters' calls—summoning all hands to battle stations—were sounded frequently, entailing on-the-double climbing, roughly equivalent to running up a skyscraper.

Further the exercises were not without risks. Over 11,000 postwar landings have been made on the *Leyte* without a single fatality or serious injury, but there have been some losses on launching and in the air, and a crack-up is always possible when the planes come in. The writer saw more than a few of the *Leyte's* 90-odd fighters and bombers crash on deck in a way that made the pilots' escape seem near-miraculous. And during the same period a flyer was lost from the *Philippine Sea* and another saved in the water by the *Leyte's* helicopter—a highly serviceable and reassuring machine, likely to be attached to all carrier task forces in the future for intership mail deliveries, personnel transfers, and rescue work.

These factors—the risks, the hard work, the boredom that can come during a long stay at sea—all are accepted as an inescapable part of peacetime Navy life. In spite of them, perhaps because of them, the morale is reasonably high. During the exercises down to and off Puerto Rico, the spirit aboard the *Leyte* was a lively and cheerful one, expressing itself in many ways, not least of all in a progressive improvement in operations. At first, for example, owing to the rustiness of some and the inexperience of others, the movement and spotting of planes added up to a mediocre performance; but a couple of days later the picture was one of near-perfection, with flight-deck officers and crewmen working together with such swift grace and precision that planes were being launched at 10-second intervals—a rate the Navy says is faster than any land base can achieve with single takeoffs.

The *Leyte's* impressive showing is attributable to a long list of individuals, notable among them being Capt. E. R. Peck, the commanding officer; Comdr. J. R. Van Evera, executive officer; Comdr. W. E. Hastings, operations officer; Comdr. V. L. Hathorn, air officer; Lts. R. J. Zender and A. F. Franceschi, flight and hangar deck officers, and flying officers like Commander Al Boyd—all veterans of the Pacific war and all experts on naval air. These men and several others of equal rank and experience aboard; having lived and fought with carriers for a long time, speak with authority on the subject, and it is significant that their opinions vary, though there is common agreement that ships like the *Leyte* will be a security essential for many years to come.

One can find on the *Leyte* a few senior officers—none named here—who favor the earliest feasible merger of naval aviation and the United States Air Force, an arrangement that would place carrier and land-based operations under a single over-all command. Most others aboard, however, believe in a continued separation, but they do not deny that after the "foreseeable future" has come and gone, the present set-up may be senseless.

ADMIRAL DUNCAN'S VIEWS

As for super flat tops there is no fixed opinion, but there seems to be considerable coolness to the idea, with some holding that the 45,000-ton *Midway* class is less efficient than the *Essex* class, and that to build ones of 60,000 or 80,000 tons would be a dubious venture.

But to Vice Adm. Donald Bradley Duncan—aboard the *Leyte* with his staff as a kind of "guest" and over-all observer and evaluator of the exercises—it seems surprising that anyone should argue against the giant carrier. As former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (air) and now commander of the Second Task Fleet, he is emphatically for it. He does not like to use the word "super" in describing it. As he told the writer, there is nothing fantastic about it; "it is simply the logical development of a proven weapon—the weapon of seagoing naval aviation." Moreover, "its sole purpose is to extend and improve upon the usefulness and power of that weapon; it is not meant to supplant, it is meant to complement, other services."

As one of the Navy's most competent and war-seasoned airmen, Admiral Duncan considers it "ridiculous" for anybody to set an arbitrary limit on the size of carriers or to get excited over the Nimitz thesis that they might be used to deliver atomic weapons against vital enemy targets many hundreds of miles inland. As he sees it, if the size-worriers had had their way in times past, the United States would have third-class ships today. Further, what sense is there in resisting the idea of the Navy's extending its attack-reach if to do so will improve the security and over-all striking power of the Nation?

Admiral Duncan is not a static thinker. He is quite willing to admit that the grim art of warfare is going through a period of revolutionary change. Nor does he rule out the possibility—the seemingly remote possibility—that in another 15 years or so something like submarine-carriers may have to replace the surface type. For the present, however, he has his feet on the ground. He wants flat tops of any size required to do the job that needs to be done to keep America safe—the job of offense and defense, of being ready at all times to support expeditionary forces, seize outlying bases, fend off transoceanic attack, carry the fight to the enemy, and keep the supplies and manpower flowing overseas wherever or whenever necessary.

The Duncan view, in essence, is the view held by virtually all naval airmen. After 10 days of seeing them in action aboard the *Leyte*, a civilian observer, no matter what his preconceived notions, finds it difficult not to feel and believe pretty much the same way.

Men, Take Hold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Sunday, February 29, 1948, to hear a sermon by the Reverend James Curtis Fahl, pastor of the Metropolitan Presbyterian Church, at Washington, D. C., his subject being Men, Take Hold. It deals with the problems of the day in a masterful manner. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the sermon of the Reverend Fahl, as follows:

MEN, TAKE HOLD!

Text: "For He has made known to us in all wisdom and insight the mystery of His will, according to His purpose which He set forth in Christ as a plan for the fullness of time, to unite all things in Him, things in Heaven and things on earth." Ephesians 1: 9 (revised standard version).

Events of the past week have caused many to search their hearts and to question the faith by which they have been living. Has our Nation been following an effective foreign policy since the cessation of hostilities? Can the democratic way of life stand up against the onslaughts of communism? Or have we simply seen a further demonstration of the ability of a disciplined minority to outmaneuver an undisciplined and apathetic majority? Certainly thoughts like these have run through the minds of many earnest Christians as they have learned of the bloodless communistic coup d'état in Czechoslovakia.

It was a vicious reminder to me of a conversation that I had with a former German soldier in the Saxony city of Bitterfeld in June of 1945. This big young man had lost a leg in the fighting on the eastern front so perhaps he did not have an unprejudiced mind where the Russians were concerned. Since he spoke English well and I understood a little German, we talked together several times in the drugstore where he worked. One day he said to me most earnestly: "If America and England are not very careful, Russia will be on the Rhine inside of 10 years." In the intervening 3 years, Russia has truly progressed a long way toward the Rhine. To straighten out her battle line she is now making demands upon Finland, the last of her neighbors from whom she has not gained the treaty rights she has desired. In such a situation what must be the response of Christian men and women?

As earnest Christian men and women, we may sincerely differ radically as to the necessary response. Dr. Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., moderator of our Presbyterian General Assembly, told 350 laymen and ministers on Friday night that "Our Christian culture is being threatened today as never before." Certainly, it is only the part of wisdom to recognize that we cannot be at ease in Zion. Opposed as any one of us is, instinctively—and for many of us through bitter experience, to a further trial of arms, we must recognize that such an outcome is not beyond the realm of the possible. Several months ago, a man high in the councils of our Nation—who had been given abundant opportunities for gaining knowledge upon which to make his observation made three statements to his colleagues in a closed meeting: (1) It is my firm conviction that Russia does not want to fight soon; (2) I further believe that she is physically incapable of waging all-out war now, nor will she be able to do so in the immediate future; (3) but, after everything about Russia has been said, don't overlook the fact that Russia is partly Oriental and some day to save face, she might feel forced to fight.

To avoid such a possibility, should we as Christians then pull back behind our twin shore lines? On the face of it, any thinking man or woman would answer that query with a resounding "No." But we must remember that Let the Rest of the World Go By is a song whose sentiments are beloved by many Americans other than honeymooners. Despite the sometimes enchanting prospect of having no relationship with any other nations, it is a delusion at best that is worthy of our supposedly less-rational friends at St. Elizabeths and other mental hospitals. Isolation? The hard-headed realist must admit that there is no spot in America that is out of range of guided missiles which our probable enemies could conceivably construct and loose upon us. If matters of the spirit and the mind still appeal to us who have received the glorious heritage of freedom in America, then we cannot isolate ourselves from the sufferings and strivings of other peoples. Moderator LaRoe pleaded with us Friday night to be concerned about the 20,000 democratic, freedom-loving Poles who tried to flee from that dictatorship-ridden land, and who are now languishing in forced-labor camps and mines. He urged us to be sympathetic with the handful of Argentine students who recently published a manifesto of protest in which they asked for support to resist the efforts of the Peron government to dictate the course of study at their university. Isolation? No!

If not isolation, then what? At least two different responses can be made to the ideologies and nations that threaten our Christian culture. Conceivably, many people who are sincerely devoted to the cause of Christ, and actively endeavoring to live up to that cause, will choose each one. It would seem that many of the 2,000,000 Presbyterians (Reformed) in Hungary will adopt an attitude of acceptance and compliance toward the communistic government which has ruled that nation since early last summer. These Christians in Hungary and our Christian friends in Czechoslovakia, accustomed through long generations of being dominated, know that one can live a life of some usefulness despite unwelcome rulers. Making religion more a personal, interior, pietistic matter than we of activistic America can accept or understand, they can still be loyal to Christ according to their lights. Their faith is one reason why they can accept an unpleasant and antagonistic government. For they would accept with us the binding truth of Paul's statement to the church in Ephesus: "For He (God) has made known to us in all wisdom and insight the mystery of His will, according to His purpose which He set forth in Christ as a plan for the fullness of time, to unite all, things in Him (Christ), things in heaven and things on earth." Who are we to insist that one can be a faithful Christian only if he can enjoy either the protection of the active nonintervention of a friendly government in his practice of his faith?

What then should be our response to the viable threat to our Christian culture? We cannot isolate nor insulate ourselves from it. Making our religion simply an interior matter of religious exercise and soul development and cultivation seems to be foreign to our nature. How about an active attack against these threats where we see them? Let us remember that the threat of our Christian culture of a completely secular and pagan culture is not confined to the efforts of communistic materialism under the sponsorship of the little men who make up the Politburo in Moscow. The seeds of decay of our Christian culture are present right here in America. Russia is simply more obvious in her attack upon our Christian culture. From recent events we should learn that the Communists mean what they say when they breathe out threats and slaughter. Twenty-nine years ago a rough young deputy headed the 30 Communists who had just been elected to the Czech Parliament. When Deputy Gottwald was asked what the Communists purposed to do now that they had received the recognition of public office, he replied in this fashion: "You ask what we purpose to do, I answer you that we mean to break your necks. I mean that literally, if we ever have the opportunity." Perhaps 29 years is not too long to wait for political triumph which enables the victor to become such a terribly accurate prophet. We should now be able to disabuse our minds of the easy fiction that there are different varieties and kinds of Communists. They all own one final allegiance and take orders from one headquarters. What can Christians do to effectively oppose the further encroachments in Europe which threaten to engulf the entire Western World?

As the best and simplest answer to the powers and persons who threaten our Christian culture, we can simply quit playing with being followers of Christ. In this line, the most significant promise our church has of truly going to work on this matter of being living witnesses for Christ lies in the newly organized national council of Presbyterian men. For generations we have unrealistically set aside the highest offices of our churches for our men and then they have been treated as purely honorary positions. During the late war, while I was serving in Europe with an armored division—and, incidentally wondering quite often what madness had led me to forsake the pleasures and comforts of my family—I received one letter from my wife which made a deep impression upon me. After telling me that I was missed daily, she wrote this: "But I know that you would be desperately unhappy if you were still here. This morning I looked around in church and the congregation was made up entirely of old people, mostly elderly women, and children."

Too often, that is the basic reason why our Christian witness is so ineffectual. There are not enough men sufficiently touched by the saving power of Christ to follow His imperious bidding to attempt great things for Him. It is, therefore, tremendously significant that this new Council of Presbyterian Men has been called into being under the permissive guidance of our dynamic and courageous moderator. February 12 to 14 will go down in Presbyterian annals as days of tremendous importance. During those days 370 laymen from every corner of our land met in the Palmer House in Chicago to organize the new council and elect its first officers, including Dr. Charles J. Turck, president of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn. Moderator LaRoe sent the gathering off to a glorious start when he gave the keynote address the first night on the subject, What the Presbyterian Church Expects of Its Laymen. At the outset of his address, Mr. LaRoe said:

"We have come here for no light purpose. You and I are here because we are aware of what conditions are in the world and because we believe that the world is crying for spiritual leadership to rescue it from its present chaos and bring freedom and the abundant life to countless millions who have surrendered their freedom for bread or rice or who, without voluntarily surrendering their freedom, are nevertheless the virtual slaves of dictatorial governments.

"The alternatives which face us as we gather here today are so plain that we can all see them:

"1. Surrender to the dictators, which you and I will never do as long as there is a drop of blood left in our veins.

"2. War, that horrible un-Christian thing which produces such unspeakable cruelty and suffering and which often seems but to lay the foundation for more wars.

"3. The principles of the Christian religion. • • •

"The first thing that I would say to you as your moderator, therefore, is that you and I have got to take the church far more seriously than we have, looking upon each local church as a fortification on freedom's battleline, each minister as a general in the army of Christ, and each leading layman as an important officer in that army. • • •

"My second point, then, is that we must become convinced that our job is the building of Christian communities and that the church is the agency or instrumentality which we use to make more effective the building of Christian communities."

Men, take hold! Too long we have been content to think and act as though the church were composed of women, children, and a sprinkling of men. No war was ever won by a handful of men. We are engaged in a more desperate struggle today than at any time in our history. The Church of Christ calls out to the finest and strongest men that it has need of them. But these men need what the Church stands for, too. We all stand powerless in our own strength. It is our earnest faith that God in His wisdom purposes to unite all things in Christ. With that faith to sustain us, Christ to lead us, and the full unity of all men and women of good will as our goal, let us take heart and take hold. We need to quit fiddling around with being part-time followers of Christ. We simply cannot give Him sovereignty over a portion of our lives—reserving the rest for our selfish indulgences and self-satisfactions. To take the Christian faith seriously we need to outlive, outgive, and outbelieve those who would project ideologies and cultures that would destroy Christianity.

What we need is more men like Gov. Luther Youngdahl, of Minnesota. You who have Scandinavian blood in your veins and you who come from our great Midwest can be proud of this fine, stalwart governor. When he saw his State overrun by the gambling craze, he saw an opportunity for a tremendous housecleaning. The infamous one-armed bandits—slot machines to you—we don't follow the gambling vernacular, which were taking $7,000,000 a year from Minnesota were the object of his campaign. Early in the campaign in the legislature, the St. Paul Council of Churches sprang to his aid and through this council, the State Council of Churches got behind the campaign. The tremendous popular support of the Governor's antigambling legislations was so marked that the bills passed both houses of the legislature by overwhelming margins. Once the legislation was passed, it began to be strictly enforced. The Association of Sheriffs had the full backing of the Governor and his popularity so they cracked down wherever slot machines were found. One year after the clean-up Minnesota still has no slot-machines. The feeling is general in Minnesota that the slot-machines are out as long as Youngdahl is in. But Youngdahl is no negative person—as no true Christian is. His main aim is the enrichment of human lives. Agreeing with General MacArthur that our primary need is for spiritual regeneration, he believes this must take place through the home, the church, and the school.

The Governor has definite convictions about Christians. He believes that they must learn to work together. His second conviction is that Christians must apply their religion to life. Addressing the Minnesota pastors' conference not long ago, the Governor summed up his convictions in his closing words: "The church can have the kind of society it is willing to tolerate, or the kind of society it is willing to fight for."

This is a fight we are engaged in. Men, take hold, a good fight requires all the manpower that we can muster. This is our task—to live each day with the moral earnestness with which the reformed alcoholic prays, as he clenches his fists: "God, deliver me from alcohol for 24 hours." With that spirit, and abiding faith in God's rule, let us make each day a day for working and fighting that our Christian culture may stand up against all the onslaughts of all persons who would attack it.

Italian Immigration Quota Backlog Should Be Used Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which provides that the annual immigration quotas for Italy for the fiscal years 1949 and 1950 shall be increased by an amount equal to the unused Italian quotas for the past 10 years.

As is known, the Italian quota is fixed at a total of 5,802 immigrants a year—a quota which is less than that of any other of the European nations which have much smaller populations than that of Italy. During the war the quota was completely suspended. The suspension blocked the entry for permanent residence into the United States of approximately 34,000 Italians.

Because of the tragic conditions in which Europe finds itself, the United States has already liberalized its rigid immigration laws to help solve the pressing problem of the refugees. Legislation to permit additional large numbers of displaced persons to enter the United States is now under consideration. This bill would in a measure fall under this category and would give to Italian refugees the same facilities accorded to other refugees. The same humane considerations which have motivated the United States to open the doors of mercy of America to the disinherited who roam from nation to nation, should induce them to make the same gesture to the disinherited of Italy who go without any means from one region to another.

Among the resources of Italy, the greatest is her manpower which has raised the Italian worker to the pinnacle of productive ability. There are not fields of endeavor which the Italian worker cannot render fertile. There are not dangers which the Italian worker is not ready to meet with the audacity of the pioneer. For the Italian, work is a mission; better still, a religion to which he devotes himself with a fervor which has no equal.

Italians have been outstanding in the professions, but fundamentally they are workers, producers, and builders. American Italians have made notable contribution to the progress and growth of the United States. They are the best of citizens.

America is giving so much proof of seriously wanting to help Italy rehabilitate herself and take her place among the great democratic nations of the world. The proposed bill would contribute to integrate the program which America intends to carry out to help Italy and neutralize the diabolic influence which seeks to spread chaos in a nation of 45,000,000 inhabitants, which can render so many signal services to the cause of peace, to the order and security of the world.

The history of our country shows that the American people have had a phenomenal growth in the spiritual as well as the material, in the cultural as well as technical field because we have welcomed freedom-loving immigrants. By serving as a haven for these people yesterday, we helped ourselves to our fortunate position of today. By serving as a haven for them today, we will be strengthening our national democratic foundation for an even better tomorrow.

Let us admit now this relatively small additional number on the basis of using the backlog immigration quotas unused in the years of war. Let us be the first to welcome them, so that we will have the first choice of their skills and talents.

By permitting these additional Italians to immigrate to the United States, we will be helping our Nation's economy. The progress and prosperity of our country have always been inseparable from a growing population. Only by securing a substantial addition of fresh blood and new life will we insure the continued growth of our economy.

It is not proposed that immigration requirements be relaxed in any manner. Every applicant should be screened to prevent the infiltration of Communists. A preponderance of the admitted will be close relatives of American citizens of Italian origin. In all fairness and justice, and in the interest of the furtherance of Italian-American amity, this bill should receive favorable consideration by the Congress.

The Late Honorable Clarence Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of a great personal loss that I express my humble tribute to the life and character of my departed friend, the late Representative Clarence Hancock. It was my privilege and honor to know him and to have been associated with him. The people of New York State and the entire Nation lost the service of a true and able statesman when he answered the last call. Mr. Hancock served the Thirty-sixth District of New York with honor and distinction, and during his entire public service he kept the welfare of his constituency uppermost in his mind. He was held in the highest esteem by his colleagues and those who knew him well. He was one of the finest and noblest men it has been my pleasure to know. He was indeed a true and loyal friend and his memory will always be an inspiration.

Purchase of United States Patents by Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention that the Russians are still being permitted to obtain data on United States inventions.

The Congress has repeatedly requested that this information be denied the Soviets but for some unexplained reason it appears that it is still going on.

In this connection I am introducing into the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper clipping by Edward Nellor and sent to me by Mr. Daniel Lee McWhorter, of Summerville, Ga. This article calls attention to the fact that the Reds can buy our patents but refuse in return to give us any information.

It seems entirely illogical and absurd when all the world stands in fear of the perfection of the atom bomb by the Russians, to permit them to have access to our inventions.

The article follows:

CONGRESS PROTEST IGNORED—REDS CAN BUY UNITED STATES PATENTS; GIVE US NO INFORMATION

(By Edward Nellor)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—Patent-hungry Russians still are raiding the American storehouse of industrial know-how with the latest order for data on United States inventions totaling 460, this reporter has learned.

Despite Congressional demands that the Reds be barred from buying United States patents for 25 cents each, the Department of Commerce continues to insist that present laws force officials to fill all Soviet orders which, according to a recent statement by Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, Republican, New Jersey, often total 600,000 at a clip. The United States has received no patent information from the Soviets since 1927.

The latest order has not been completely filled, the Patent Office told this reporter. The order placed by the Four Continent Book Corp., of New York was honored to the extent of 80 patents, since the organization's credit totaled only $21.50. The corporation has been notified that its funds are exhausted and officials expect a new check to be forthcoming momentarily to cover the cost the remaining 400 patents desired.

The Four Continent Book Corp., exposed in March of last year as being subsidized by the Soviet Government, masquerades as a rare-book importing firm. According to THOMAS, the corporation is engaged in "legalized espionage" and is a Red-front organization associated with AMTORG, the Soviet purchasing agency in the United States. A search of records at the time of disclosure showed that the corporation is registered as an agency of the Soviet Union and that vast sums of money reach it annually at the direction of the Kremlin. In one 6-month period last year $333,676 came from Moscow for the corporation's use.

One other subject is troubling the Office of Technical Service in Washington. This Bureau of the Department of Commerce handles patents and other technical reports, including declassified atomic-energy data, as well as wartime secrets wrested from the Germans and Italians. The Allies, with the exception of Russia, agreed to pool all of these discoveries. Blocking the Reds from sharing is difficult, the Office of Technical Service admits.

The Russians have already tipped their hand in circumventing the patent roadblock. Reports by the United States agency are printed once each month. A list of captured patents on foreign developments is available to anyone in the United States or in the other nations sharing in the program. The OTS states that it watches for requests from Reds for the data, "but you can't check every letter."

The number of patents and reports in the hands of American patent officials is staggering. Requests already have been made for 100,000 of them.

The atomic data, as it is declassified by the Senate Atomic Energy Commission, is transferred by the Office of Technical Information. Not all of this is released for publication by the OTI, but in most cases it is shared with Canada and Great Britain, codevelopers of the atomic bomb.

Salary Increase for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 3, 1948.*

Hon. HOMER ANGELL,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: I earnestly request you to support and vote for a salary raise for Federal employees when it comes up. I work in post office branch of the Federal service.

I am in hopes that we can make the goal of $1,000 per year increase without having the clause in a bill of a termination date for this increase in salary, like the one that was reported from the House committee which was a whole lot less than we should have of $1,000.

I believe that when high cost of living decreases to the extent justifying less salaries that should be time enough to think about any termination dates, or not any salary cuts unless by a bill and act of Congress.

I am sending with this letter a budget of our living cost. You can see for yourself that our present salaries are not anywhere near enough to keep up a home with a family and children in high school.

If it was not for my wife working my postal salary would not near meet the expenses, and I believe that there are many besides myself that has the same problem.

I believe that $1,000 is not too much to ask under the present living.

I again request you to do all in your power to bring about for passage of no less an increase above mentioned.

Yours very truly,

Clerk, Post Office, Portland, Oreg.

P. S. It is also my wish for you to show this budget to other Members of the House, whoever is against this amount of increase it might change their minds.

BUDGET

	Per month
Payments on home	$51.00
Groceries	95.00
Telephone	3.74
Electric (average)	8.50
Clothing (average)	15.00
Transportation	10.00
Paper	1.50
Music for children	3.50
Fuel	10.00
Milk	8.50
Car expenses	15.00
Payments on personal loans	27.70
Insurances, all types	26.95
Taxes on home	8.60
Miscellaneous	16.00
Total	299.99
My salary after Federal deductions (not including State income tax)	248.00
My wife's	83.60
Total salaries	331.60
Expenditures above	299.99
Balance left of 2 salaries	31.61

This leaves only $31.61 balance with both of us working and part of that is spent.

Social Security in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, we passed a resolution last week, House Resolution 296, which should have been entitled "Social Security in Reverse."

The Washington Post and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch have this to say about the bill the Republicans offered to the House. The Eightieth Congress has broken faith with the promises made in campaign platforms on the all-important subject of social security.

Under premission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the articles:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 1, 1948]

TURN THE CLOCK BACK?

By more than 5 to 1, the House has voted to exclude 500,000 to 750,000 workers from social security. The affected employees include door-to-door salesmen and persons who do piecework for industry in their homes—some of the least secure Americans against the hazards of unemployment and old age.

The House resolution purports to maintain the status quo, which led Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS to say: "We never need legislation to maintain the status quo. Legislation is required only to create change, which may be either forward or backward. • • • I have grown accustomed to the sight of this Congress turning back the clock—crippling where they dare not repeal, boring away like termites in an effort to undermine the progress of the preceding 14 years."

This highly industrialized and urban country is beset by lurking terrors of individual insecurity. Social insurance is one of the costs of maintaining such a society. It is also a stabilizing force and a source of purchasing power to prevent another collapse like that of 1929–33.

The House brushed all this aside. It is up to the Senate, which has shown much less desire to turn back the clock, to defeat the resolution.

[From the Washington Post of March 5, 1948]

SOCIAL SECURITY

The Gearhart bill, passed by the House on Friday, would have the effect of denying protection under the old-age and survivors' insurance program of the Social Security Act to about 500,000 to 750,000 employees and their dependents whom the Supreme Court recently held to be entitled to such protection. The employees involved are so-called outside workers—salesmen and others working on a commission basis or under contract—who, although perhaps not employees in the narrow, old-fashioned sense of the term, are, nevertheless, dependent upon employers for their livelihoods. The pending bill would nullify the Supreme Court's decisions and invite endless litigation over definition of the term "employee" in respect not only of the Social Security Act but doubtless of the Fair Labor Standards Act as well.

The expressed purpose of the bill, according to its title, is "to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage." It would do this by excluding from coverage anyone who is not an employee under the "usual common-law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship." But, as the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee pointed out in their report, the title is grossly misleading; so far from maintaining the status quo, the measure would deny coverage to persons assured it by judicial interpretation of the Social Security Act.

This would be a contraction of the act running directly counter to the expansion of its protection which Congress ought to legislate without any more delay. As President Truman said when he vetoed a similar bill last summer, it "proceeds in a direction which is exactly opposed to the one our Nation should pursue. • • • We must not open our social security structure to piecemeal attack and to slow undermining. We must, instead, devote our energies to expanding and strengthening that system."

The Republican Congress Has Failed the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an address I made over radio

station WIND, in Chicago, Ill., on Friday, February 27, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, from time to time it has been my privilege to speak to you over the facilities of this station for the purpose of reviewing the trend of our national affairs.

As I do so again today I want to frankly emphasize the vital importance of the election of 1948. Seldom, if ever, have such crucial issues hung upon the decision of the people as those which will be resolved by your votes next November and intervening primary elections.

Speaking out of an experience in our Nation's Capitol that goes back for 42 years—longer than that of any other Member—I say to you solemnly that the citizens of our country, through the exercise of their privilege of franchise, hold in their own hands the power to determine not only their own well-being during the next 4 years, but the future state of our national economy and the peace of the world as well.

Some political sage once remarked that the people always get the kind of government they deserve; in other words, that the character of government reflects the interest or the neglect of their own welfare shown by the people in the only manner or means at their command, namely, through the ballot.

When voters fail to vote, when they do not make use of the sole weapon in their possession to influence the conduct of their public servants, they surrender the field of battle to their enemies. When the people fail in their duty to themselves then the special interests, the monopolists, the economic robber barons, the foes of labor and their army of lobbyists move in to take control away from the average man.

The present Congress is a perfect example of this truth. In the first place, the Republican majority came into control of both Houses by a vote of less than one-third of the electorate. Just think of that. At the last congressional election in November 1946 there were more than 91,000,000 potential voters in the United States, yet the fact is that only 34,000,000 voted. This means that more than 57,000,000 did not vote. This shameful neglect of citizenship responsibility explains—but it does not excuse—the conduct of the present Republican Congress. This is government by minority—supremely contemptuous of the will and rights of the majority of people.

The Republican Congress stands indicted today by its own record. It has consistently flouted the public interest. It has refused to legislate inflation controls to reduce the high cost of living. It has failed to stamp out the hoarding, black marketeering, and profiteering that blocks the construction of adequate, decent low-cost homes. It has failed to enact public-health laws that would help the average family meet medical and hospital expenses. This record of the Republican Congress was written, mind you, in the face of the Republicans' promises in 1946 to remedy all those conditions.

Instead of enacting a program of relief of the people, the Republican Congress has enacted the Taft-Hartley slave-labor bill. It passed the Knutson bill—drafted and forced through the House by big business. This Republican tax bill will put from $25,000 to more than $100,000 into the pockets of persons with very large incomes. But the only benefits to the little fellows, with meager incomes of $2,000 or less, will be a mere $38 a year. This is one example how the Republican Party is betraying the average citizen. If they could be fair with the people, they would have passed a bill that would afford relief to those that need and deserve it most instead of giving it to the wealthy that need it the least.

REPUBLICANS ASSURED AMERICAN HOUSEWIVES REMOVAL OF PRICE CONTROLS WOULD REDUCE PRICES AND ELIMINATE BLACK MARKETS

And here is another even greater act of betrayal: During the 1946 campaign the Republican Party promised and assured American housewives that the removal of price controls would bring about an ample supply of meats, foods, and other living necessities at reduced prices and eliminate the black markets. They promised that private builders would be able to construct low-cost homes for exservicemen and hundreds of thousands of others in need of decent living quarters. You radio listeners know those promises were not kept; in fact, prices and the cost of living have increased by over 30 cents on every dollar since 1946.

President Truman, on the other hand, heeding the plight of the consumer, called the Eightieth Congress into special session and presented a 10-point program to relieve the cost of living—providing for the reenacting of the OPA and rationing in order that those of low incomes would not be deprived and prevented from obtaining needed foods and necessities of life.

Up to this time the Republicans did nothing to relieve the deplorable situation, except that some of their leaders suggested the people eat less, but instead authorized the manufacturers, producers, and big business to enter into voluntary agreements to control prices. It seems ridiculous to me to expect industry to voluntarily reduce their great profits. It is like the owner of a flock of sheep relying on a pack of wolves to protect them.

Yes; and at the same time they are exempting combines and corporations from the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, which will further encourage them to control and fix their prices to their heart's content.

BUSINESS ENJOYING ITS HIGHEST PROFITS AT THE EXPENSE OF 18,000,000 WHITE COLLAR WORKERS

In the meantime, the trusts, combines and industrial czars have and are enjoying an orgy of the highest profits in their existence at the expense of the consumer, particularly the 18,000,000 white-collar workers in this country earning $25 a week or less, the pensioners and others living on modest fixed incomes who are suffering the most. These men and women and their children are being deprived of a decent living and are being forced to exist on the barest and poorest of foodstuffs and necessities because they cannot afford to pay the high prices, while the profits of industry have skyrocketed as much as 50 to 100 percent during 1947.

Again during the current session the President urged relief for the American consumer, and again the Republican majority refused to take action. But the President's firm stand for an investigation of speculators and gamblers in grains and other foodstuffs finally resulted in the first break in the market. A few of these reductions have been temporarily passed on to the consumer, but there is no assurance that prices will go down to reasonable levels unless Congress will act, and, up to this day, the Republicans have not indicated that they intend to reduce the high cost of living or act against another rise in exorbitant prices.

COMPARE PRESENT-DAY PRICES WITH THOSE OF 1946

I invite you to compare present-day prices with those of 1946 on all kinds of meats, butter, milk, cheese; yes, on all foodstuffs as well as wearing apparel, shoes, and other commodities that the Republicans and the National Association of Manufacturers promised would be reduced.

The Republican Party has again proven that its platform pledges and campaign promises are worthless. They promised that so-called free enterprise and the natural law of supply and demand would eliminate the black markets and relieve the consumer. But instead they made a holiday for the professional manipulator, the speculator, and the hoarder. They opened the way and have encouraged a greater black market in steel, lumber, textiles, and in almost every major industrial field that existed under OPA. Actually free enterprise is not free. The distribution of commodities and materials, and their prices, are controlled by the big manufacturers and manipulators but, the small independent businessmen, who cannot afford to pay the unreasonable black market extra-profit charges, are frozen out of the market along with the average consumer.

The Republican Party's promises that "free enterprise" would be able to break the bottleneck in housing construction has been proven as false as all the rest of its promises. They bottled up the Wagner-Ellender-Taft Housing bill for nearly 2 years, which would make possible the building of low-cost homes on a large scale. And the Republican bankers have further restricted the construction of homes by demanding a higher rate of interest under title 6 of the Housing Act.

With no issues to go before the people, the Republicans are resorting to badgering politics in trying to mislead and confuse them by labeling and smearing every Democrat and Progressive with being a Communist. Instead of legislating relief from high prices so that people can buy sufficient and decent food, they are only interested in the big financiers and industrialists who have and are contributing lavishly to their campaign funds to enable them to repeat their deceptions of the 1946 campaign. But the people are awakened and by their votes, I am confident, will rebuke them in the coming election.

There you have the record of the Republican betrayal of the people. Now you know how little Republican promises are worth. I feel that the citizenry owe it to themselves as well as to the country to drive out of office all those Republicans who have shamefully betrayed them. They should start to register so that they will be in position to vote at the next election to elect men who have proven that they can be trusted and who will not lead them astray as they were in 1946 by the Republicans who are controlled by the avaricious Wall Street combines, trusts, and war profiteers who, in the last year—yes, in the last year alone—have extracted from your pockets $27,000,000,000 in profits, or nearly $200 from every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Hold That Crimson Tide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article printed in the January 1948 alumni bulletin of the University of Richmond, Richmond, Va.:

HOLD THAT CRIMSON TIDE

(By J. VAUGHAN GARY, '12, Congressman, Third District of Virginia)

You and I have an expression we sometimes use when we want to give emphasis to an opinion: "I'll tell the world."

That's what you and I, Mr. and Mrs. America need to do today. Tell the world about the American way of life. Of free enterprise. Of equal opportunity. Of all the blessings that are ours in this land of the free.

Unfortunately, that is exactly what we are not doing. Like so many clams on the seashore, we remain mute while on another shore the exponents of another way of life, a political and moral philosophy foreign and repulsive to most of us, are sending forth a mighty chorus of propaganda and misstatement.

Unless the Voice of America is heard abroad—and soon—Russia will win, hands down, the cold war which is being waged relentlessly behind the iron curtain. And if Russia wins that cold war, we will have to fight with bombs and bullets in a World War III that will be more horrible than any holocaust the mind can imagine.

We must tell the world about America. We must combat Russian propaganda about our dirty capitalistic system with the true story of free enterprise, with accurate word pictures of the living conditions of free American citizens. If we can get the truth to the peoples of Europe we can hold back the tide of Russian domination. If we let the Communist program of misrepresentation and vilification go unanswered, all Europe will be in the embrace of the Russian bear.

During the current session of Congress I shall do everything in my power to win converts for the State Department's information and cultural program. I shall insist that we appropriate not less than the $31,000,000 asked last year to carry the Voice of America into oppressed nations of Europe. When the Congress last year cut the recommended $31,000,000 to $11,000,000, it for all practical purposes made an appropriation of $20,000,000—the amount saved—to the Russian Communist Party.

We must stop kidding ourselves. There's nothing subtle about the Russian way of spreading its dominion. The plan follows closely the pattern executed by the late and unlamented Adolf Hitler. The Soviet plan is simply to stir up strife and create chaos in smaller European nations, one after the other. Then, having created the chaos, the Russians make use of this unrest as an excuse for moving in. Doesn't that sound familiar?

Although the Russian intent is obvious, doubly obvious to persons who were privileged as was I to visit in Europe this summer, we in America are making little or no effort to curb the Red tide which is sweeping the Continent. And, let me emphasize this, whatever we do, if it is to be effective, must be done now. The United States must exert her leadership in bringing light into darkest Europe and in bringing food and warmth to peoples which are pitifully hungry and cold.

I visited 10 European countries this summer as a member of the House Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on the State Department. Although the purpose of this trip was to visit United States embassies rather than to study economic conditions, I was constantly brought face to face with conditions of abject poverty.

These conditions applied even to our cousins in England, those conquerors who have not yet tasted the fruits of victory. For them I have only admiration and affection. Living frugally amidst the rubble of war, they are accepting their hardships with courage and are rigidly enforcing their rationing system. I was told there was no black market in England and I believe that statement to be true.

I saw nothing alarming in the "social experiment" in England. As a matter of fact, the nationalization of industry had not proceeded as far as I had been led to believe. As an American long accustomed to public ownership of utilities, and rigid control of other utilities not actually owned by the Government, I found nothing shocking or even revolutionary in the English program. The British frankly described Government ownership of the coal mines as an "experiment" prompted by the extreme shortage of this most necessary fuel and the inability of owners, because of lack of funds, to modernize the mines and step up production. There was no evidence of any intention to expand the program but, to the contrary, elections held while we were in London indicated a trend in the opposite direction.

Coal and steel hold much of the answer to the riddle of European recovery. But two other twins, hunger and despair, may crush Europe before the giants of the earth can produce the goods which will bring prosperity. In the Ruhr Valley, one of the world's richest industrial areas, I literally saw the spectre of hunger. The British are doing as good a job as they can under the circumstances, but it is not good enough.

It is true that 152 out of 157 coal mines which were in operation prior to the war are now being worked. But it is equally true, appallingly true, that production is only 30 percent of normal. Similar conditions exist in the steel mills. I saw men doing manual labor, the hardest kind of manual labor, who were weak, emaciated, actually cadaverous in appearance. I talked to one gaunt steel worker who told me he was 40 pounds underweight.

Give them food and the workers of the Ruhr and other hungry European countries will step up production almost to the prewar normal. If they remain hungry they will remain inefficient. Absenteeism will increase. So will the accident rate. Aside from the humanitarian motive, it is sound business to feed the starving.

Let me say, in passing, that I have no illusions about the Germans. They are by nature a militaristic people. Let them work. Make them work—but don't permit them to rebuild their war industries. I am in thorough sympathy with the French fear of German military resurgence and in accord with their insistence that the German Nation never again be permitted to build instruments of war.

Space limitations will not permit me to touch, other than hurriedly, on conditions I found in other countries visited by the subcommittee. In Italy I was assured by responsible spokesmen for the Government that "Italy will never go Communist, for the same reason the United States will never elect a Huey Long to the Presidency."

Although we have no Ambassador in Spain and do not recognize the Franco government, we maintain an embassy there. This Nation escaped the ravages of war and at the present time is engaged in a building program more extensive than that of any other nation visited by us.

Recovery would not be difficult in Turkey and Greece but for the fear of Sovietism, which is forcing these nations to spend 50 percent of their income for defense.

In conclusion, as one who has seen at first hand the effect of communistic doctrine on a weary, a hungry, and a misinformed Europe, let me urge that we make the voice of America heard in every land and that we bolster our story of prosperity with visual evidence—food for the starving. In this critical time in our history we cannot afford to do less.

If we would save ourselves, we must first save Europe.

Clarence Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, Clarence Hancock was one of our ablest Congressmen. He had earned the respect of all of his colleagues irrespective of their political affiliations. Further, he was a good friend. I was fortunate to count him as my friend. I shall always remember his friendship as one of the most cherished rewards that I have received out of my service in the House of Representatives.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the New Haven (Conn.) Journal-Courier, a newspaper founded in 1756, dealing with the present situation in Palestine:

A TOUGH DECISION

The technically sound but practically indecisive United States position on Palestine, as stated by Delegate Austin, can mean only one thing; asking a restudy by the Security Council indicates that President Truman still stalls in agonized indecision. This country, the statement said, will not impose partition by force, but will join in any United Nations effort to safeguard international peace and security.

There seem to be only three courses open now. The first and most obvious is enforcement of the partition decision, made largely through United States influence. The second is a continuation of UN trusteeship. The third is abrogation of the partition and reopening of the whole question, which would be to "eat crow," appease the Arabs and set in motion violent political repercussions.

There are considerations of policy and politics beneath the surface of the major powers' attitude toward enforcement. This Government, for example, has to think about such things as the oil that the Arabs sell us, and the possible result of Soviet participation in enforcement. It must weigh the demand for lifting the embargo on arms for the Jews against the opposition to such shipments by Britain, which is still the mandatory power.

But these considerations, and those of other countries, seem trivial compared to what will happen to Palestine and the UN if partition is not enforced. It is quite evident what will happen if nothing is done. The Jews will have a bad time of it, even if they are supplied with arms after the British leave. They will be greatly outnumbered by an international army of invading Arabs.

UN prestige will receive a heavy blow. The Palestine question finally found Washington and Moscow in agreement. That was encouraging. But if the UN is to bow before the first challenge of its first major decision, it may collapse like the League of Nations—only much faster.

It seems certain that the blustering Arab front would dissolve before any concerted show of power. By modern military standards, the Arabs' equipment is primitive. Their threats and saber-rattling are directed toward the nations that are their best customers. It is unlikely that, in a showdown, they would want to cut themselves off from their major source of revenue.

But any enforcement action must come through the UN. If individual governments should intervene, the present suspicions and ambitions would increase. They might sow the seeds of World War III. So there is only one choice. The UN must act, and act quickly.

We are not informed as to whether the UN has considered Sumner Welles' recent suggestion that a Palestine force be formed from the regular establishments of five or more intermediate or smaller nations. This solution, if practicable, would solve one United States difficulty—that our currently reduced forces are not adequate to send a sizeable contingent to Palestine. But whatever the Security Council's decision, it must be made quickly and it should be a courageous one. Further indecision and stalling can hardly mean anything but loss of face for the UN, division of opinion at home and a greater embroilment of clashing interests in Palestine.

Gasolines and Motor Fuels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from C. E. Paden, president, Lubri-Gas International, Inc., and an article from the National Petroleum News of December 17, 1941:

LUBRI-GAS INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., March 3, 1948.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just noted a news item concerning your ideas regarding premium and regular grade gasolines and motor fuels, as well as the changing of motor oil every thousand miles or so. I want to compliment you on the fact that I think you have started an idea and proposition that should be thoroughly investigated—and the public thoroughly and fully advised concerning gasolines.

Without a question the biggest graft that has ever been put over on the American public is ethyl gasoline. No one could have put it over but the Standard Oil Co., and the only difference between ethyl and regular, if you get the truth of matters, is that in perhaps 15 or 20 percent of high-compression engines in automobiles, leaded gasoline will prevent the knock. However, if this percent of automobiles were properly timed they would not need ethyl. You are quoted as saying in the news article that I read, "Information from industrial sources show that premium is no better than regular for ordinary driving, and actually worse on hills." Oftentimes ethyl lead gas causes a chemical reaction in the fuel to which it is added, and actually makes for a poorer gasoline so far as quality and mileage are concerned.

To give you an idea of some of the graft and unfair charges connected with the Standard Oil Co. and the ethyl-lead proposition throughout the country—all through the OPA set-up the OPA permitted oil dealers to sell ethyl gasoline at a premium price, but there never was any genuine ethyl in any pump in the United States. Oftentimes there was no lead in the gasoline. There is a lot of gasoline being sold in the United States under the name of ethyl that is not genuine ethyl gasoline.

We ourselves use gasoline to convey lubricating oil to the piston rings and cylinders, and when we add our oil to the gasoline, which may be regular, ethyl, or Diesel fuel, we do not in any way change the specifications of the gasoline. But through lubrication, which is carried to the working parts of the engine by the fuel, we do, of course, give the consumer more for his money.

I have had Lubri-Gas for over 30 years. Since 1925 the Standard Oil Co. and the Ethyl Corp. have learned that by simply taking lead they could make from 1 to 1½ cents per gallon more on their gasoline. Years ago the public would not pay the price to suit these oil companies, so they put 1 cubic centimeter of lead into all gasoline; and this was known as Q gasoline. A lot of gasoline today contains lead, but the refiner uses this lead to bring his gasoline up to a regular grade, or a premium grade. He should not be allowed, and no retailer should be allowed, to charge a premium price, because a chemical, which in this case is lead, is added to the gas to make it conform with specifications of their competitors.

If all gasolines were the same when they were made, and then if the refiner wished to add something of value, or use the gas to carry something to the engine that would be of value, then he would be entitled to make a reasonable charge for it.

Now the major oil companies have two sources of supply for lead—the Du Pont Co., who have always manufactured the lead up until January 1, 1948, for the Ethyl Corp., and the Ethyl Corp. The major oil companies are taking down the name "ethyl" as trade name and setting up their own grades, leaving the independent refiner handicapped, because he will have to continue using ethyl as a premium name. If the public knew that this name "ethyl," and the name of the major oil companies, was just a name they were paying for, they would save millions of dollars yearly.

The value of high-octane gas in automobile engines today is absolutely nil, as any car manufacturer will testify. Ask any car manufacturer if the car he builds must have premium gas to operate, and he will tell you "No." They will operate on any grade of gasoline. You never see any of the automobile factories advertise. Finally the use of lead in any gasoline is very injurious to the working parts of the engine. I think the Society of Automotive Engineers would tell you that the use of Ethyl gasoline causes corrosion, causes a scale and crust around the valves causing them not to seat properly, and in many cases if there is too much lead in the gas, actually will destroy the working parts of the engine.

We have consistently fought the use of lead and leaded fuels, but we are not able to tell the public that they are being defrauded when they are buying premium gasoline. You understand that in aviation engines, high-octane gas is C. K., yet our Government did not allow the training schools of our Air Corps the price to buy premium gasoline. After all, when you come to figure the actual B. t. u. values of the fuel, there are no more miles in a gallon of gasoline than there is in a gallon of kerosene, but our carburetors do not handle it so easily, and the American public wants to get started in a hurry.

You will not get the oil companies to inform the public concerning the difference between regular and premium gasoline. It will take an announcement of some kind about gasoline through our Bureau of Standards, or something, to get the public to stop wasting their money.

I have a lot of material along this line, and if, at any time, it would be of value to you, same can be prepared and submitted to you.

Yours very truly,
LUBRI-GAS INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
C. E. PADEN, *President.*

[From the National Petroleum News of December 17, 1941]

65-OCTANE GOOD 'NUFF TO RUN MANY LATE MODELS, OPA SAYS

"Many late-model cars can operate without undesirable knocking on gasoline with an octane rating as low as 65. Third-grade gasoline with an octane rating as low as 60 is quite satisfactory for older cars, and for several of the latest models."

This is the opinion of engineering consultants to the Consumer Division of the Office of Price Administration, which has issued the following press release:

"The Consumer Division of the Office of Price Administration today branded as exaggerated and misleading the recently circulated contention that reduction of the octane rating of regular gasoline from 75 to 70 would reduce gasoline mileage by as much as 10 percent.

"Engineering consultants of the Division termed 'particularly absurd' the statements that such an octane reduction would for the country as a whole increase gasoline consumption by 5 percent.

"The estimates of the industry that a reduction of regular gasoline from 75 to 70 would cost $250,000,000 should be turned around, engineers of the Consumer Division report. Motorists are now wasting millions of dollars every year in burning higher-grade gasolines than are required by their cars.

"They point out that octane ratings for most regular gasolines were increased from 70 to 75 within only the last 3 years. Only a few of the latest models require a gasoline with an octane rating as high as 75.

"In a very few cases a simple and inexpensive change in ignition timing would be required to eliminate objectionable knocking on 70-octane fuel. If this adjustment is correctly made, the resulting loss of power and economy would be too small to be detected by the drivers of these cars.

"Most cars will operate as efficiently on fuels with a 70-octane rating as they do on higher-octane fuels. Many late-model cars can operate without undesirable knocking on gasolines with an octane rating as low as 65.

"Third-grade gasolines with an octane rating as low as 60 are quite satisfactory for older cars, and for reveral of the latest models.

"Gasoline with an octane rating higher than needed by the car will not give added power or improved car performance in any respect, engineers state.

"Our tanks and military planes will require large quantities of gasoline with high octane ratings. This means that there will be a heavy war demand for high-grade gasoline and the tetraethyl lead used to increase octane, or antiknock quality, in gasoline.

"In addition, two materials—chlorine and lead—used in the manufacture of tetraethyl lead are scarce, being in wide demand for essential military and other defense uses.

"Motorists may help relieve the pressure on tetraethyl supplies by avoiding the use of gasoline with octane ratings higher than necessary, the Consumer Division points out.

"A slight amount of 'pinging' on rapid acceleration or under heavy loads on hills is not harmful to a car, Division engineers comment. In fact, auto mechanics often listen for a slight 'pinging' to indicate that the spark is adjusted to give maximum gas mileage."

Address of Hon. William E. Borah, of Idaho, on January 7, 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered in the Senate of the United States by Senator Borah on January 7, 1938:

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this measure, in a slightly different form but embodying the same principles, came to this body about 25 years ago. At that time I was a member of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and was appointed by the late Senator Nelson, chairman of a subcommittee to pass upon the measure, particularly its constitutional features. I shall not at this time go into the history of the action of the committee at that time. It may be necessary to do so later in order to throw light upon some features of this matter. It is sufficient now to say that I reached a conclusion as to the merits of the bill, which conclusion I still entertain.

Heretofore I have confined my remarks upon this bill largely to the question of its constitutionality. Those questions still interest me, and probably I shall discuss them later. Today, however, I desire to address my attention for a time to the policy involved in this measure. Assuming for the purpose of the argument that we have the constitutional power to pass such a measure as this, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to the wisdom of doing so. I think it only a little less important, perhaps no less important, than the constitutional question itself.

Notwithstanding anything that has been said or that may be said to the contrary, this is a sectional measure. It is an attempt upon the part of States practically free from the race problem to sit in harsh judgment upon their sister States where the problem is always heavy and sometimes acute. It is proposed to condemn these States and the people in them because it is claimed that they have failed properly to meet and adjust this most difficult of all problems. No more drastic condemnation could be offered by a measure than that which is offered by the measure now before the Senate.

It proposes to authorize the national Government to enter into the States, and to take charge of and prosecute as criminals the duly elected officials of the States, from the governor down. It proposes that the Federal Government shall be the sole judge of the guilt or innocence of State officials.

In my opinion that requires a review of some unfortunate history, and the recalling of some unpleasant facts. These States are not to be pilloried and condemned without a full presentation of the nature of the task which fate and circumstances imposed upon them, and not without a complete record as to the weight and difficulty of the task, what has been done, and with what good faith it has been met. I shall contend that the southern people have met the race problem and dealt with it with greater patience, greater tolerance, greater intelligence, and greater success than any people in recorded history, dealing with a problem of similar nature. Let us inquire what it is that the South has had to do, how it has done it, and what reason there is now, after 70 years of great effort, to pass censure or condemnation of those great States and that great people.

Paraphrasing the language of one of the most eloquent of men, when the Confederate soldier pulled his gray cap over his brow, and lifted his pallid and tear-stained face for the last time to the graves which dotted the hills of old Virginia, and started on his slow and painful journey home, what was he to find? What were the problems, what was the task, what were the conditions which confronted him? His home was destroyed, his plantation devastated, his help gone, his money worthless, his civilization imperiled. This was the condition in addition to the other problem with which we are more particularly concerned today, and which confronted the South as it entered upon its great task of rebuilding.

I shall not go into details as to the reconstruction period. I recall it sufficiently and only that we may understand something of the antecedents of this problem and something as to the good faith and the ability with which it has been met. I recall a single instance in the way of illustration. When Congress met in December 1865, the then leader of the House—perhaps the most complete master of the House of Representatives that history records—Thaddeus Stevens, outlined the program with reference to the then pending situation. Among other things, he said:

"The future condition of the conquered power depends upon the will of the conqueror."

He said further that the conquered provinces were to be admitted as States—

"Only when the Constitution has been amended so as to secure the perpetual ascendancy of the party of the Union"—

The Republican Party—

"Every government is a despotism. • • • The Constitution has nothing to do with it [the program].. • • • I propose to deal with you [the South] entirely by the laws of war. • • • The conquered people have no right to appeal to the courts to test the constitutionality of the law. The Constitution has nothing to do with them or they with it."

Thus they were to take up the work of rebuilding and of carrying the race problem with the threat of having all constitutional guaranties withdrawn.

Mr. President, I have always felt that in many respects the reconstruction period is the most regrettable page of American history. Had Abraham Lincoln lived through his second term, it probably would have been the most readable page, one of the noblest pages in all history. It would have been characterized by wide sympathy, by breadth of understanding, and by that wisdom which flows from the heart as well as the brain, which passeth all understanding. It would have been free from that blind partisanship which disregards constitutions and constitutional limitations as well as national honor and national unity.

A short time before the Great Emancipator was removed from the scene he had outlined his views on reconstruction. What a different story would have been written had those views prevailed. What a different national life would have been lived had those views obtained. But before his body had reached Springfield the committee had met and had determined upon the complete rejection of the entire policy theretofore announced by the dead President. Ben Butler's views superseded those of Abraham Lincoln; and a more tragic thing could not happen in a crisis confronting a nation. These measures with reference to reconstruction therefore were written from the standpoint of partisanship not unmingled with a desire to punish.

The measure now before the body embodies the same principle upon which those measures were founded. The same arguments are made in support of the pending measure, to wit, that the southern people are to be distrusted and are incapable of local self-government.

We know now what those measures in those days did. They retarded and frustrated the coming together of the people of the different States. They gave us the solid South. They separated us politically, which separation continues until this day. They implanted a sense of bitterness in the minds of those people, not because of what had happened upon the field but because of what happened in Congress.

It is not in the interest of national unity to stir old embers, to arouse old fears, to lacerate old wounds, to again, after all these years, brand the southern people as incapable or unwilling to deal with the question of human life. This bill is not in the interests of that good feeling between the two races so essential to the welfare of the colored people.

Nations are not held together merely by constitutions and laws. They are held together by mutual respect, by mutual confidence, by toleration for conditions in different parts of the country, by confidence that the people in the different parts of the country will solve their problems; and that is just as essential today as it was in 1865 and 1870.

In the beginning, Mr. President, I reject the pending measure as fundamentally not in the interest of the white people of the South, not in the interest of the black people of the South, not in the interest of national unity nor of national solidarity, not in the interest of eliminating crime. History has proven that it will be a failure, and those who suffer most will be the weaker race.

Mr. President, the race problem is the most difficult of all problems, and, in addition to the conditions which I have outlined briefly, the southern people had placed upon them the race problem under circumstances and conditions never before experienced by any people, so far as I know, in recorded history. In addition to and on top of all other problems the South had to grapple with the race problem. How well has it dealt with it?

At the close of the Civil War there were a little over 5,000,000 white people in the South; there were 3,500,000 Negroes. In Mississippi there were 100,000 more colored people than white people. In South Carolina there were something like 150,000 more colored people than white people. There were the two races, living upon the same soil, now equally free under the Constitution, one of them untrained and unschooled in the affairs of state, and untrained in citizenship. The problem had to be met. Was it easy of solution? Can one conceive of a more difficult problem placed before a people? I wish we could place ourselves in their position. It will help us to be sympathetic, sane, and just.

I call attention to some facts which lead up to the question of lynching. History shows that in the North in 1889, 1 Negro in every 165 was in jail; in the South, 1

in every 446. In the North the percentage of Negro prisoners was six times as great as that of the native whites, in the South four times as great.

Monroe S. Work, of Tuskegee College, has said:

"There is a much higher rate of crime among the Negroes in the North than in the South."

That speaks volumes for the southern Negro and no less for the whites.

Professor Johnson, of Fisk University, has said:

"The rate for Negroes is much higher in the Northern States than in the Southern States as to crime. Judging by the figures alone, for a 10,000-Negro population, the commitments were 88 in the South, 283 in the North."

In a volume entitled "Negro Housing" published in 1932, I find the following:

"The extent of property ownership by Negroes has in the past been greater in the South than in the North."

It will be disclosed that in some of the Southern cities the percentage of Negro ownership of homes runs as high as 45 percent of the Negro population; in other places as high as 30 to 39 percent of the Negroes own their own homes.

In a bulletin issued by the Department of Agriculture in 1930 we find the statement that the value of land and buildings of farm property owned by Negroes increased from 1910 to 1930 as follows, giving the round figures:

	Percent
Virginia	58
North Carolina	140
Georgia	11
Florida	29
Louisiana	142
Texas	97
Mississippi	68
Alabama	41
Oklahoma	54
West Virginia	37

I mention these figures to show the progress of the Negro throughout the South in an economic way, for, after all, only in proportion as he acquires property and economic power can he hope to be secure in his political rights. That is just as true of the white man as of the colored man. And in proportion that he advances in education, in the acquisition of property, and in the acquisition of economic rights, in that proportion he will come to be regarded as an essential factor of the southern civilization, and treated as such; and to accomplish that has been the aim of the southern Negro, encouraged and assisted by the white people of the South.

I shall now read from a little volume to which I called attention a few days ago during the debate on the farm bill, a volume written by Gerald W. Johnson, who, I have been informed, is one of the editors of the Baltimore Evening Sun. He has written a remarkable volume upon the questions which pertain to the southern portion of the country. On page 8 of the volume he says, referring always to the South:

"The problem of public education, for example, has not been solved. It is further from solution in the South than in any other region. But when one considers that the South has to teach more Negro children than there are children of all kinds in New England; and when one notes that it is spending far more of its total income on schools than is spent by any other region, its effort, even though but half successful, must command respect and admiration."

They must educate more Negro children in carrying this load than all the children of New England, and they are doing so; and by educating them they are fitting them for citizenship, schooling them against crime, and they are laying the only sure foundation there is for the extinguishment of crime among the Negroes. They are laying at tremendous cost the foundation for the good citizenship of the Negro, and while lynching can never be justified, nevertheless there is no more successful approach to the ending of lynching than through education, through bringing both races to understand their responsibility to society. I know of no finer sense of duty than that displayed by the South in the help it gives the Negro in bettering his condition as to property, as to economical strength, and as to education.

I read again from this able writer:

It has been the fashion in some quarters to assume that the Southeast has remained almost completely inert in the presence of its social problems. This is far from the truth. A mere glance at the educational statistics of the region is enough to dissipate the impression that the Southeast has been indifferent or lethargic in this respect. The State of Florida, for example, spends 5.76 percent of its total income for school purposes, and North Carolina 4.38 percent; this is the largest percentage that is spent for similar purposes by any other States save the Dakotas. * * * The Southeast spends 3 percent of its total income for higher education, the highest percentage in the Nation. It enrolled more high-school students in 1930 than the whole country did in 1900, and there are more accredited high schools in this region than there were in the United States at the end of the century. Its present army of 60,000 high-school graduates annually represents an increase of 500 percent within the last 2 decades.

I pause to say that if we knew as much about the South and what they have done and are doing as we pretend to know, we would not be so free to criticize. It is a horrible thing to see the body of a Negro burned to a crisp, swinging from the limb of a tree; it is a horrible thing to have a daughter or son, perhaps a mere child, snatched from your homes, carried into hiding, perhaps murdered. These are our problems, pressing for consideration, and they are making as determined an effort to clear the stain from the honor of the South as are we to rescue our honor in the North. "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye and considered not the beam that is in thine own eye."

During the last session of Congress we had under consideration in the Committee on Education and Labor what is known as the educational bill, and, of course, it vitally affected the Negro people of the South, and they appeared in great numbers before the committee. At that time Senator Black, now Justice Black, was chairman of the committee. The most difficult problem was to work out absolute protection for the colored children in the enjoyment of the fund proposed to be set up. I must say that I never knew a person more meticulous, more determined, more vigilant to protect the colored students in the enjoyment of that fund than was Justice Black. I was impressed with the fact that there was a determination upon his part to reach the Negro at that point in his life where he could best serve him not only with reference to general citizenship but as to the reduction of crime. Mr. Johnson states further in this volume:

"The most conspicuous characteristic of the southern population, however, is its biracial character. A group of 8,000,000 people of a different color from the other 17,000,000 is a feature so startling that it may be expected to attract more attention than perhaps it deserves.

* * * * * *

"The inevitable result has been enormous waste of the Negro's potential value to the social structure Not all of this is the fault of the white South by any means. The hasty and ill-advised effort made in the sixties to project the newly emancipated slaves into a political and social position they were not prepared to occupy has made any realistic treatment of their position extremely difficult. Not only did it create appalling prejudices but it erected very substantial legal barriers against any direct and forthright approach and forced southern political and social polity into a sinuousness that has been productive of a thousand evils.

"This is, however, water over the dam. What confronts the Southeast today is the problem of making the best possible use of 8,000,000 blacks.

* * * * * *

"Only comparatively recently has any considerable effort been made to treat the disease, rather than to alleviate its symptoms—or, rather, only recently has the idea begun to spread that perhaps there isn't any organic disease, but only a series of functional disturbances. Since the turn of the century the Southeast has been making real, if not always adequate, efforts in the field of Negro education. With the rise of the Negro in the cultural and economic scale there has come also an appreciable reduction of the rigor of civil and social disabilities. And with both there is a strengthening belief that perhaps the traditional approach to this situation has been faulty."

Everywhere we find a determination to find the right way. The Negro is there. He is there to stay. The South knows that he is there to stay, that he is a part of the wealth of the South. We in the North may be interested in the Negro politically. We care little about him economically. But he is an indispensable factor in the economic development of the South. They can and will do for him far better without our interference or advice than with it.

Mr. President, the Negro has had a hard road to travel ever since he was given his freedom. A hundred-and-odd years of slavery afforded poor training for citizenship in the most advanced of nations. Almost overnight he went from slavery to take up the obligations of a free man in a free country; but, everything considered, he has done well; his advancement has been marked. Restricted, not by the Constitution of his country or the decisions of its highest courts, but restricted, almost cabined and confined, by the iron laws of society, nevertheless he has made progress. And where has that progress been greatest? In the South. In spite of prejudice, and statements to the contrary, facts and figures show it has been greatest in the South. In the acquisition of property and economic advancement generally the Negro has fared better in the South than elsewhere.

It is true, as is contended here, that at times he has suffered from mob violence in the South, but it is equally true that he has suffered from race riots in the North. But in all things which make for the advancement of the race as a race, the North has no advantage over the South in the story of the advancement of the Negro. We have shown no greater patience, no greater tolerance, no greater ability to deal with this race than have our brothers of the South. And now, because there is the power, because there are the votes, because it is possible to do so, it is proposed to call these great States and these people before the bar of public opinion and, after 70 years of arduous effort on their part, condemn them as unfit and unwilling to deal with this great problem, condemn them for having failed in the essential principle of home government, of home rule. After these 70 years, and after 150 years, taking the Government's history as a whole, we now come to the time when we are asked to say that home rule or local government has

broken down in a number of the States of the Union. We call these States and these proud people to judgment before the whole world and spread upon the records of the Congress our condemnation, our judgment that in the most vital things of free government they have failed.

Broken down. Why? Because eight Negroes were lynched last year. There were 20 kidnaping cases in the United States last year. After all the efforts of the States and all the efforts of the Federal Government, taking charge of those who crossed State lines, we still had 20 kidnaping cases as against the 8 lynching cases in the South. Is that an indication that the South is not in good faith and with honorable effort trying to protect the colored race and to give it the same protection that it gives the white race?

Lynching is the one crime, Mr. President, that is distinctly and markedly on the decrease in the United States.

I shall take time to read briefly some facts and give some figures.

Prof. Charles S. Johnson, of Fisk University, says:

"Taking the period of 1889 to 1893 as 100 percent, it is of interest to note that every 5-year period has shown a decrease in the total number of individuals lynched."

He then gives the figures showing that from 1924 to 1928 there was a decrease of Negro lynching amounting to 84.8 percent. He concludes by saying:

"It will be discovered from the accompanying graphs and tables that at the present rate of decrease lynching will apparently cease to be a problem in race relations due to its disappearance."

Further, he says:

"In the 30-year period from 1889 to 1918, inclusive, there were 2,522 Negroes lynched. That is about 84 a year.

He then calls attention to the fact that in 1924 the number had dropped to 16. Last year the number was 8. In many of the Southern States lynching has practically disappeared. Virginia had only 1 case in 10 years. West Virginia had none during the past 5 years. South Carolina had none during the past 3 years. Oklahoma had 1 in 10 years. North Carolina had 2 in 7 years. Arkansas had 3 in 9 years. Maryland had 2 in 10 years, and none for the past 3 years.

I call your attention to a statement from the great Tuskegee Institute located in the State of Alabama. It reads:

"There are a number of interesting features to be noted. From 1882 to 1885 there were more whites lynched than Negroes. Concerning the decline of lynchings in the United States, I call attention to sheet No. 2, 'Lynchings, white and Negroes, by periods, 1882–1936.' You will note that there has been a steady decline in the number of lynchings for each of the 10-year periods, 1887–96 to 1927–36. Judging from the trends shown in this table, there is every reason to believe that there will be a further decline in lynchings.

"There are probably three major factors that have contributed to this decline. The first of these is the tendency for frontier characteristics in the South to disappear (lynching was a special characteristic of the frontier in America, both in the West and in the South). Second, the breaking down of isolation in the South by increased facilities: (1) Rural free delivery; (2) more telegraph offices; (3) more telephones in small towns and rural areas, and (4) recently the radio and paved roads. Third, increasing agitation within the South during the past 40 years against lynchings. This has resulted in an increasing sentiment against the evil. This sentiment has expressed itself in the increasing efforts to prevent lynchings.

"From 1914 to 1919 the number of persons lynched was much greater than the number of persons prevented from being lynched. From 1920 to the present the number each year prevented being lynched has greatly exceeded the number lynched.

"These facts and trends seem to indicate unquestionably that there will continue to be a decline in lynchings in the United States. Not only in these statistics but in many other ways is there employed a growth in the humanitarian attitude of the American people. This growth, I believe, has paralleled the development of educational and social agencies, all of which bid fair to rid this Nation of the barbaric practice of lynching."

In other words, the problem is being met, the problem is being solved, and it is being solved in the way that America solves her problems when they are local and of a local nature; and that is through the activity and the cooperation and the determination of the people themselves.

Mr. President, suppose Congress passes this bill; suppose it becomes a law; where must we go for its enforcement? The bill may be passed by votes from other States, but for its enforcement we must go to the juries in those communities which we condemn. The bill may be passed in the theoretical atmosphere of Washington, but it must be enforced down among the people in the realistic atmosphere of the southern States. There will be the southern district attorney, the southern judges, the southern juries, and they must be depended upon for the enforcement of the law. Do Senators think they will more likely enforce the law when they have been condemned in the sight of all the world, and in face of such condemnation, than when they are appealed to from the standpoint of the sense of duty of their State and their sense of duty of citizenry?

We get back, after all, to the people themselves for the enforcement of the law. We have had an experience in this country showing that we cannot enforce a law when public opinion is not behind the law. The only way in which we can hope to have the law enforced is by the method that is now pursued by the southern people—that is, to educate the people up to an understanding that it is to their interest and to their honor to maintain law and order in their communities—and that they are doing.

Some years ago a great southerner discussed this question, and I cannot refrain from calling attention to some of his language. It seems to me fair, just, and so in accordance with the sentiments of the true patriot that it is worth while for us to stop and hear the voices of those who are wrestling with the problem at home.

Mr. Henry W. Grady said:

"Nothing, sir, but this problem and the suspicions it breeds, hinders a clear understanding and a perfect union. Nothing else stands between us and such love as bound Georgia and Massachusetts at Valley Forge and Yorktown. * * *

"I thank God as heartily as you do that human slavery is gone forever from American soil. But the freeman remains. With him a problem without precedent or parallel. Note its appalling conditions. Two utterly dissimilar races on the same soil—with equal political and civil rights—almost equal in numbers, but terribly unequal in intelligence and responsibility. * * * Under these, adverse at every point, we are required to carry these two races in peace and honor to the end.

"Never has such a task been given to mortal stewardship."

Is that not true? Can we find anywhere in history a task such as was assigned to the southern people at the close of the Civil War, with slaves for 100 years released, free as they should have been, but given the power to participate in politics without any training and without any experience? It was beyond their capacity, as it would have been beyond the capacity of any race immediately to assume in full, and properly discharge, the duties of citizenship. But those were the conditions which confronted the South, and with which they have been dealing.

"The resolute, clear-headed, broad-minded men of the South * * * wear this problem in their hearts and brains, by day and by night. They realize, as you cannot, what this problem means—what they owe to this kindly and dependent race—the measure of their debt to the world in whose despite they defended and maintained slavery.

"If you insist that they are ruffians, blindly striving with bludgeon and shotgun to plunder and oppress a race, then I shall sacrifice my self-respect and tax your patience in vain. But admit that they are men of common sense and common honesty, wisely modifying an environment they cannot wholly disregard—guiding and controlling as best they can the vicious and irresponsible of either race * * * admit this, and we may reach an understanding without delay."

Let us admit that the South is dealing with this question as best it can, admit that the men and women of the South are just as patriotic as we are, just as devoted to the principles of the Constitution as we are, just as willing to sacrifice for the success of their communities as we are. Let us give them credit as American citizens, and cooperate with them, sympathize with them, and help them in the solution of their problem, instead of condemning them. We are one people, one Nation, and they are entitled to be treated upon that basis.

Mr. President, I now turn briefly to another feature of this measure. I shall discuss it later in more detail, referring to court opinions. But I call attention to this feature now which must be of concern to every Member of this body, to everyone who believes in our dual system of government. This bill as it is drawn—observe my language—this bill as it is drawn strikes at the very heart, at the very life of local self-government. I ask Senators to reread the bill in the light of that assertion. It would place a construction upon the fourteenth amendment never contemplated by the men who wrote it—in fact, specifically rejected by them—and which, in my opinion, a fair construction in no sense sustains.

The bill openly and professedly declares in effect—and that is the theory upon which it rests—that the people in these States are either unwilling or unfit to maintain the most ordinary principles of organized society, and that in the face of the facts which I have shown, that they are really solving the problem.

Permit me to say here before I go further that I make no contention but that the fourteenth amendment has forever placed it beyond the power of any State to deny any person the equal protection of the laws, or to deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process. I recognize also that the State acts and speaks through its officers, legislative, judicial, and executive. I am not going to take refuge in technicalities, but I contend for what I believe to be a fundamental principle, and that is that while you may call a State thus acting and thus speaking to account, you cannot take jurisdiction over or deal with acts and deeds not done by the authority and by the direction of the State. It must at all times be State action. You cannot deal with acts under the fourteenth amendment not done by and under the authority and direction of the State. The dereliction of an officer in violation of the laws of the State, in disregard of the sworn duty exacted of him by the State, and subject to punishment by the

laws of the State, cannot by any possible construction, either in law or in conscience, be the act of the State. To establish any such principle would be to undermine and break down the integrity of every State in the Union. If a State may not be entrusted exclusively with the authority and relied upon to exercise the authority to punish those who violate its own laws, public or private persons, then there is no such thing as local government, because the State is deprived of the very instrumentality by which it maintains State integrity.

Since this proposition first came before Congress the Senators from the Southern States have borne the brunt of the debate. They have been made to feel the criticism of those who lock upon opposition as mere local prejudice. We are all prone to consider the race question as peculiarly a southern problem, and we leave our southern friends to deal with it without very much sympathy or interest. But assuming that we are going to continue this narrow and selfish course, when we come to read this bill it is found that it goes an arrow's flight beyond any race question. The way it is drawn and its legal terms lift the bill out of the region of the race question into the region of governmental principles.

I do not contend, of course, that the authors of the bill or its supporters are taking advantage of the horror which we all feel toward the crime of lynching to strike a blow at our dual system of government, but that is precisely what is happening; that is precisely what will happen in view of the manner in which the bill is drawn. The constitutional feature of this bill under its terms is just as vital to Idaho as to Alabama; it is of just as much concern to Massachusetts as to Georgia. If the Federal Government can send a United States marshal into the State of Tennessee to arrest a sheriff because he has failed to protect a colored man from violence, it can, under the same principle, send a United States marshal into the State of New York to arrest a sheriff, or other officer on whom the duty is imposed, because he neglected to protect the life of a citizen against the violence of thugs. It is just as much the duty of the State to protect the citizen from violence not under arrest or not assailed by three but by two or one. The Constitution does not classify crimes. It does not say that lynching is subject to the terms of the Constitution and that death by the act of thugs is not.

What does this bill provide? There is not a word in it which indicates that the failure to protect in any instance was due to the fact that the prisoner was a Negro. There is no provision indicating that the States of the South or their officers maintain one rule of conduct for the Negro and another for the whites. There is nothing to the effect that the laws of the States favor the whites and do not favor the Negro. There is no indication or intimation in the bill that the failure of the officers to act was due to the fact that his prisoner was a Negro. This bill is not based in its terms upon discrimination against the Negro, because of unequal treatment of the Negro, but upon the theory the States have broken down in maintaining order and protecting life. That is not a local question but a national question. If the States no longer protect life and property not because of discrimination but because of failure to execute laws regardless of race then we have a great national problem to be met by constitutional amendment. The fourteenth amendment does not cover any such question.

In all the cases which are cited in the briefs sustaining this measure there will be found a specific provision in the statutes concerning the failure of the officer to act being due to the fact that the party in interest was a Negro. There is no such provision in this bill. This is a general proposition, dealing as much with one race as with the other. Let me read from the bill:

"SEC. 3. Whenever a lynching of any person or persons shall occur, any officer or employee of a State or any governmental subdivision thereof who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee"—

That would include the Governor and all his subordinates in the executive department—

"to protect such person or persons from lynching and shall have willfully neglected, refused, or failed to make all diligent efforts to protect such person or persons from lynching and any officer or employee of a State or governmental subdivision thereof who shall have had custody of the person or persons lynched and shall have willfully neglected, refused, or failed to make all diligent efforts to protect such person or persons from lynching, and any officer or employee of a State or governmental subdivision thereof who, having the duty as such officer or employee, shall willfully neglect, refuse, or fail to make all diligent efforts to apprehend, keep in custody, or prosecute the members or any member of the lynching mob, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

Where is the provision there that deals with the lack of equality between the races or discrimination as to the races? There are no provisions in the bill requiring a showing that the failure of communities to protect a person was due to the fact that he was a Negro. In all the cases cited, there will be found a statute specifically requiring a showing that the officer refused to act or failed to or did not act because of the fact that race was involved and that a Negro was the person involved.

Let us carry this a little further. It is the first duty of a State, is it not, to enact laws to provide officers to protect life, liberty, and property? That is the first duty of every State. Suppose that a man is killed by thugs, we will say, in one of the great cities, without mentioning any particular one—and while the South lost eight Negroes by lynching last year the North lost hundreds because of acts of violence committed by thugs—and suppose that the State failed to take proper action under its laws and by its officers to protect the citizen on the highway or in his home against the acts of thugs; may we not, under the principle of law invoked in this bill, send an officer into that State to take charge of those police officers? What is the distinction in this bill between violence committed by a combination of thugs and violence committed by those who are combined into a mob? We are somewhat at a disadvantage in discussing the bill, because its authors have been entirely silent in presenting those features, and I am having to present it upon the briefs which I have read.

I think it might not be out of place here to call attention to another matter. The proponents of the bill are undoubtedly maintaining that the Federal Government will protect men in the South better than will the local communities. They are undoubtedly basing the entire measure upon the proposition that the Federal Government will execute the law. Well, we have the Federal Government in control of the city of Washington, which now, if not the first, is at least the second capital city of the world which is most plagued with crime. Seventy-five people here have been robbed of their property in one night. How close the police were I do not know. I understand the police escaped being robbed.

We can all recall instance after instance published in the papers of young women disappearing and their bodies being found outraged and the criminals never being intercepted. Why is there any reason to believe that the Federal Government can enforce criminal laws better than can the State governments? The enforcement of law and the punishment of crime depends upon the will and purpose of the community where the crime is committed. Those advocating this bill are on a venture. They are going to take the responsibility away from the people in the South; they are going to say to them, "You are not qualified or willing to do the work; we are going to do it." Where is the record which shows that they will do it? What is the record?

We have now at the head of the crime department, if I may call it that, in the Department of Justice, perhaps the greatest specialist in the world in the running down of crime and criminals; we have a Federal kidnaping law by reason of the fact that kidnaping crimes generally pass State lines; but last year, 1937, there were 20 kidnaping cases in the United States, with the State and Federal Governments both working, and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover says that there never will come a time when there will not, in all probability, be kidnaping in the United States; that it is impossible to wipe out the crime; that so long as greed and the appetite for money are found in the human system, there will be kidnaping. Mr. Hoover very frankly states that it is impossible to wholly wipe out such crimes. They can be reduced to a minimum and lynching has been reduced to a minimum in the South.

Coming back to our Capital as an example of Federal enforcement, I read from a local paper:

"The criminals of Washington are taking $30,000,000 a year from the citizens of this city."

They are being deprived of life, liberty, and property, certainly without due process of law as that term is applied here. And the men in charge of the District seem to have thrown up their hands; they do not know how to deal with the situation. Yet, the Federal Government is in control here; the Federal Government is back of them. They are not by any means doing as well as are the people of the Southern States in meeting the crime problem.

Mr. President, we are dealing with the race problem. We need not blind our eyes to that fact. And the race problem is a problem which does not readily yield to legislative solution, to the rigid demands of the law. Take, for instance, the colored girl who, under great handicaps, has earned the right to be employed by her Government upon an equality with everyone else. She goes with a certificate of competency from the Civil Service Commission to one of the departments here in Washington—here in Washington, under the aegis of the Federal Government—and when she enters the door and her color is discovered, she is told that the place is filled, which is probably false. That happens not once but many times. She suffers injustice at the hands of her Federal Government. But that is a race question, and no law was ever made tight enough or strong enough to remove all its harshnesses and to eliminate all its injustices. Only the patient process of education, the uplifting power of religion, the tolerant, noble-minded men and women who give their thoughts to the cause, can remove or mollify such injustices or such harshnesses. And that is being done; it is being done in the South; that result the South is achieving; the record so shows; and the people of the South are entitled to our commendation and not our condemnation. They are entitled to our cooperation and support.

This, Mr. President, is another compromise with a vital principle of our dual system of government. It is bartering the future for the supposed and transient demands of the present, and at a time when the present is taking care of the problem. It is another instance in which our confidence in our scheme of government is not strong enough to say to all races, all creeds, all groups, and all factions: "Your problems, however serious, are subordinate to the principles of this Government; and you must work them out within the compass of the long-tested and well-accepted principles of democracy."

Every American must feel a slight sense of guilt, if not a sting of remorse, when he reads the Premier of Italy's reference to the bellowing herds of democracy, to free institutions as the decadent breeding grounds of insincerity and confusion. The fundamental principles and precepts of popular government are not in doubt. There is no confusion there. The confusion arises when we depart from those principles. It was the embodiment of the precepts and principles of popular government in the Constitution of the United States which put confusion to rout in this country, gave ordered liberty to the people, and strength and direction to government. For centuries prior to the declaration that the powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed, and the dedication of a new continent to that sublime conception, there had been nothing but confusion, nothing but turmoil and misery, nothing but brute force and enslaved masses. And all that will happen again if the advocates of arbitrary power, now inveighing against free institutions in the presence of their assembled slaves, have their way and the world again comes under their sway. Contrast the conditions of those periods with the period since the adoption of the Federal Constitution, with its establishment of law and order, the spread of contentment and happiness among the masses, with its unprecedented progress in the arts and the sciences, and you not only have your answer to those whose sole right to rule rests upon the law of force, but you have the most powerful appeal that can be made by mortal man to those who would compromise or weaken the safeguards of popular power.

I am perfectly aware, as we all are, of the tide which seems to be running against popular government everywhere, of the base betrayal of the people in many countries where they once had at least some authority and hoped for more, of that profound egotism which regards as of no significance the bitter experience of men and women in their long quest for liberty. But against all these things, if we have the confidence in our form of government which we profess, we can place, not theory, not hopes, not ideals merely, but 150 years of achievement, of demonstrated popular rule, with its wealth of human happiness and human progress. How puny and hollow and fleeting in comparison are the achievements of usurped power, every hour of whose existence depends upon the continued suppression of human liberty.

And, Mr. President, in conclusion, the progress, the development, and the advancement of the South, including the last 70 arduous years, her history from Washington and Jefferson down, rich with the names of leaders, orators, and statesmen; her soil, her sunshine, her brave and hospitable people, her patient and successful wrestling with the most difficult of all problems, are all a part of the achievements of our common country and constitute no ignoble portion of the strength and glory of the American democracy. I will cast no vote in this Chamber which reflects upon her fidelity to our institutions or upon her ability and purpose to maintain the principles upon which they rest.

Clarence E. Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I knew Clarence Hancock well. His integrity and sincerity were impressive. Both on the floor of the House and in committee meetings, I found him always to be a man of understanding, a man with a well-tempered and disciplined mind. He richly deserved the high regard in which we all held him.

Now that he is gone we remember more vividly his acts of kindness and sympathy. We remember him with an affection which, though not always expressed, must nonetheless have been felt by him. It is more than the formal regret we feel at his passing; it is rather a sense of personal loss, a sense that life in some measure has narrowed.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall, who is heard at 6:45 p. m., eastern standard time, each Saturday over the American Broadcasting Co.'s network:

For the past several weeks I have been discussing the topic of basic loyalties. I think I have shown rather conclusively, by its own documents, that the Communist International is the general staff of a mass conspiracy, in more than 60 countries of the world, to prepare the way for bloody revolution, when the time comes, and for setting up of revolutionary governments, which will be puppets of the Soviet Union. There is no doubt, from the documents which I have read you—the documents of the Communist International—that they expect and demand that the Communist parties, in the different countries, be subservient to the Comintern and that individual members of those parties do the will and bidding of the Comintern—even to the point of committing treason against their own countries.

I have shown the tight, centralized control of the American Communist Party and other parties by the Comintern, wherein they give up all autonomy and independence. They hand over to Moscow the complete power to annul and set aside any decision of a national party which Moscow may not like. I have shown how they slavishly follow all twists and turns of the party line from the Kremlin and even how Stalin could intervene in their own party elections, set aside the will of a majority and put in his own candidate, although that candidate was in a small minority. I have shown how, after one short, sharp struggle, the American party learned its lesson and agreed thereafter to accept the long-distance dictation of Stalin as transmitted through the mouth of the Comintern representative to this country. The titular heads of the American party and the decision formally reached by the party can be overturned by this single Comintern representative—a shadowy, behind-the-scenes character, who never, never exposes himself to more than a handful of the top leaders. Now, with all this apparatus for transmitting power impulses from the Kremlin throughout the world, there is one circuit which is still open. It may be presumed that the officers of the party obey the mandates from Moscow, but what about the rank-and-file party members themselves? Do they carry out orders? Do they follow through? Are they dependable fifth columnists of this world conspiracy?

I suppose the best answer to that is to look about you. If you can pick up a newspaper without seeing at least 5 percent of it devoted to the doings and activities of Communists all over the world it is a quiet day on the Red front.

Something you must hold in mind is the fact that in this country the actual party members are not very numerous. No figures exist as to the exact number of card-holding members, but I have never seen a larger number than 100,000 mentioned. Of course, for every card-holding member there are upward of 10 nonmembers—fellow-travelers, sympathetic liberals, confused intellectuals, who are willing to do the bidding of the party and who front for its various activies. Still, it is all moved by that nucleus of 100,000. How do they do it? How do they make such a huge splash in the news and in the affairs of this country; how are their activities and their impact so disproportionate to their numbers?

The main answer, to my mind, is in their discipline. The fact that they are backed with a leadership and almost unlimited funds, from abroad, is not to be discounted. But, without the party discipline, this would not mean so much. So let's take a look at this thing called party discipline.

It is party discipline which permits them to fulfill their boast that, given just 2 percent of the membership of almost any organization, they can take it over and control it. They all take orders from above; there is no dissent from those orders. They are not vulnerable, from the standpoint of listening to reason or argument. They have their orders, they know what they are supposed to do; their higher command knows what it wants and they go to it.

One of the major sins within the Communist Party is what they call deviation. The line is marked out for them—they toe that line, they follow that line, without having to think. All the thinking is done by somebody else. The dedicated Communist is almost never torn by doubts; he is almost never torn by considerations of human decency, of honor, of morals. Robot-like, his energies are freed for the task in hand. Fanaticism, aided by lack of ordinary deterrents, contributes to an almost frictionless drive.

But it takes discipline, in the first place, to produce this. And that discipline is rigidly inculcated from above, almost exactly like a military organization.

The program of the Communist International states that the world Communist Party is a "revolutionary organization, bound by iron discipline and strict revolutionary rules of democratic centralism." And what sort of obligations does the Communist Party member take? The following statement appears on the 1938 membership card:

"The undersigned declares his adherence to the program and statutes of the Communist International and of the Communist Party of the United States of America and agrees to submit to the discipline of the party and to engage actively in our work."

Earl Browder, when he initiated 2,000 recruits to the party, back in 1935, had them take this pledge:

"I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism. I pledge myself to remain, at all times a vigilant and firm defender of the Leninist line of the party, the only line that insures the triumph of Soviet power in the United States."

Please note this adherence to the program and statutes of the Communist International—which calls for treason against one's own government, in the interest of defending the Soviet Union and of achieving the triumph of Soviet power in the United States.

Benjamin Gitlow, one of the early organizers of the American party, says this, speaking of what it means to submit to the discipline of the party:

"When an American citizen joins the Communist Party he throws himself under the discipline of the party and he must do whatever the party directs him to do. * * * It is like joining the marines. Those who join the marines are soldiers and whatever commands their superior officers give, the marines and soldiers must carry out * * * The Communist Party and the Communist International are not organized on a democratic basis; they are organized on a military basis. The Communist International runs the world Communist movement, from the top down. In other words, the leaders of the Communist international give the orders and the Communist parties, all over the world, must carry out those orders or be expelled."

Speaking of the American party, he added that once a decision is made by the leadership "the decision becomes law, becomes tantamount to a political command given by a general, and has to be carried out explicitly." If it is not carried out, then the disobedient one has to suffer the penalties of party discipline.

The penalties for breach of party discipline are about what they would be in the army. They range from bawlings out, all the way through expulsion from the party, down to sentence of death for high treason. And I mean just that. Death is the penalty, in many cases, where Communists in the secret apparatus, those engaged in the secret, illegal work of the party "turn sour," as it is called, and tell too much of what they know of the party, or threaten to tell. That's what happened to General Krivitsky, who had been in the intelligence service of the Soviet Army. He was found dead, right here, in a Washington hotel room. There was some mystery about it. Suicide was indicated, also. But there seems to be little doubt in leftist circles that he was killed by the agents of the Soviet secret police, right in the Capital City of the United States. If you doubt that these secret police agents are here, I refer you to the testimony of Louis Budenz, who says that he met and talked to them, on several occasions, when he was editor of the Daily Worker.

Incidentally, there are all sorts of rumors going around Washington that the Russian secret police have been active in this neighborhood recently and that the disappearance of certain people who knew too much was not accidental. Nothing has appeared in the papers. I am not prepared to state it as a fact. I can only pass it on as a rumor that killings on the order of the Krivitsky case have recently occurred.

But I can state on my own knowledge that Victor Kravchenko, the author of I Found Freedom, walks daily in fear of his life.

One of the prime mysteries of the day is the disappearance of Julia Stuart Poyntz, a former American school teacher, who had been drawn into the Communist Party, was very active in it, and had even gotten into the secret, illegal apparatus of the party. She was suspected of going "sour" and one day she simply disappeared, in thin air, while walking down a street in New York.

Sometimes, the offense is not so heinous. It can be simply that some leader guessed wrong on how the party line from Moscow might swing. That is why they hang on words of Pravda and Izvestia, searching it for hidden meanings. Otherwise they might suddenly find themselves out of power, or guilty of some minor heresy which could be used by enemies to undermine them in the councils of the party. Mr. Budenz says he has seen Earl Browder "look like he was struck with a most intense fright, on more than one occasion" and Jack Stachel "looks like somebody is chasing him all the time."

"This fear is not of America, it is not even a sense of fear of imprisonment in America" says Budenz. "It is this peculiar shadow in back of those people that puts fright into their hearts. Maybe it is a feeling of their obligation to the Soviet dictators. I am not going to analyze it, but it does represent a sense of fear."

Life magazine carried recently a remarkable piece about a Communist, how he got into the party, what made him tick, and what he expected to get out of it. If you read it you will probably remember the part about when he was on the fringes of the party, he was given laborious jobs, given things to do which were graded upward in difficulty and in ways of testing his undeviating loyalty, his unthinking obedience to those above him. When his leaders were satisfied that he could stand the gaff and never, never deviate, never try to think for himself, he was admitted as a party member. He had been seasoned by the process through which the Communist International hopes to test and season its members against the day when a strong, disciplined nucleus can lead a revolution in this country. They have no use for the summer soldier. They do not go out for mere numbers. They want seasoned, toughened fighters, who won't weaken, who won't let them down, when the going gets rough. And they expect it to get very rough, indeed, when "comes the revolution."

The article also described how difficult it was on those who did not measure up. Those who weakened were smeared with every known insult and accusation of depravity. They were cast aside into nether darkness; all former comrades turned against them. These are methods of party discipline, too. The Life article goes on to state that, usually, there are only two courses open to such a person who has been excommunicated from the party—a mental crack-up or going into very active opposition.

I know some former Communists who had to make the choice and they tell me how their lives had been almost wrecked by their expulsion. They felt the most intense pain from their changed mode of life—after their entire waking moments had been dedicated to revolutionary work, even forsaking family and former friends and living, sleeping, eating nothing but the party over many years.

It is all part and parcel of the discipline of the Communist Party to force those who become enmeshed to stay in, and to galvanize others into further activity so that they may escape disciplinary action.

And again I say, if you doubt the effectiveness of the party whip—look about you and consider whether the party members have been busy and have been carrying out their assignments from Moscow. Never, in human history, have so many been pushed around by so few.

Analysis of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have been asked by Members of Congress to present for the RECORD an analysis of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1948. This act, Public Law 426 of the Eightieth Congress, makes extensive revisions in the Federal civil-service-retirement system. In response to these requests, I am explaining the main provisions of the law.

INCREASED ANNUITIES

The new act increases the annuity of those already on the retirement rolls by 25 percent, or $300, whichever is less. The retired employee has a choice of taking the increase or keeping his old rate and naming his wife to receive upon his death an annuity equal to one-half of what he is receiving under the old law. The amount his wife may receive, however, cannot exceed $600. The married female annuitant has the same right to name her husband as survivor-annuitant.

AGE AND OPTIONAL RETIREMENT

The new law does not change the conditions in connection with age and optional retirement, after certain periods of service. These remain as before, briefly:

The employee must retire at age 70 if he has at least 15 years of service.

The employee may retire at age 60 with 30 years of service.

The employee may retire at age 62 with 15 years of service.

The employee may retire at age 55 with 30 years of service on a reduced annuity.

Employees who are involuntarily separated after 25 years of service may retire and receive an annuity reduced by ¼ of 1 percent a month for each month the employee is under age 60.

Employees who leave the Federal Government prior to retirement age may not start receiving annuities until 62 years of age.

COMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES

A simple basic formula is provided in the act to be used in computing the annuity of each person. When the average salary for the highest five consecutive years of Federal service is $5,000 or more, the individual's annuity is computed by taking 1½ percent of that average multiplied by the total number of years of service. The product of that simple computation is the annuity. If the 5-year average salary is less than $5,000, take 1 percent, add $25, and multiply by the total years of service.

WIDOWS' AND CHILDREN'S BENEFITS

Husbands retiring under the act may provide an annuity for their widows equal to 50 percent of their own life annuity by taking a reduced annuity at the time of retirement. This reduced annuity is equal to 90 percent of the regular life annuity to which he would be entitled, reduced by three-fourths of 1 percent for each full year, if any, his wife may be under age 60 at the time he retires. However, this annuity would not be reduced below 75 percent of the full annuity.

Unmarried employees in good health may, upon retirement, elect to receive a reduced annuity during their lifetime and provide a survivor's annuity to anyone having an insurable interest in them.

If the father dies while in active service and leaves both a widow and children the widow will receive an immediate annuity. Each child will receive an immediate annuity. This latter annuity will be one of the following, whichever is the least: (1) 25 percent of the amount which would have been due the father; (2) $360; or (3) the amount obtained by dividing $900 by the number of surviving children. If, however, the father dies as a widower, or the mother dies a widow, each surviving child will receive an immediate annuity amounting to one of the following, whichever is the least: (1) 50 percent of the amount which would have been due the parent; (2) $480, or (3) the amount obtained by dividing $1,200 by the number of children entitled to annuities.

When a retired employee dies and leaves a widow but no children who qualify for annuity benefits, his widow will receive an annuity beginning at her age 50 if he provided one for her when he retired by naming her as his survivor-annuitant. That is the only way this widow can get an annuity on the Government service performed by her husband.

If the deceased annuitant leaves a widow and one or more children who are entitled to benefits, the widow will be in line (like the widow of the man who died in active service) for a monthly check based on the existence of the children. She will receive this benefit until she dies, remarries, or reaches age 50. This annuity will be equal to 50 percent of her husband's basic annuity (excluding any portion purchased by voluntary contributions).

When the annuitant is survived by both his widow and a child (or children) the child who qualifies for such benefit with respect to age and dependency will receive an immediate annuity consisting of one of the following, whichever is least: (1) 50 percent of the annuity payable to the widow; (2) $360; or (3) the amount obtained by dividing $900 by the number of children involved.

When an annuitant dies as a widow or widower (the other spouse being deceased), each surviving child gets payments immediately. Each child will be entitled to one of the following, whichever is the least: (1) 50 percent of the basic annuity the deceased person was entitled to; (2) $480; or (3) the amount obtained by dividing $1,200 by the number of children involved.

Children's benefits terminate when the children reach age 18 (unless physically or mentally incapable of self-support), marry, or die. In cases in which several individuals (children, or widow-and-child combinations) are receiving survivor benefits, when the benefit to any one of the children ceases or the widow dies, the payments to the remaining children are recomputed on the basis of the new number of survivors involved.

When an employee member of the retirement system dies there will be money in the fund to his credit. Whether it can be paid right away to the beneficiary he has named—or to his estate—depends on whether he leaves a surviving widow or children entitled to immediate or future annuity payments.

If he does not leave a widow or children, his beneficiary will receive, in the form of a lump-sum payment, everything in the fund to the employee's credit with interest, regardless of how long the worker was employed. If the deceased person leaves a survivor entitled to an immediate annuity, or a future annuity at age 50, the question of a lump-sum payment of an unexpended balance cannot arise until we see, after all survivorship payments are made, whether anything remains in the fund.

If the employee dies leaving a widow or other survivor, or both, entitled to any benefit, there will not be a lump-sum payment due anyone if the annuities which are paid wipe out the total credited to the deceased worker. If, however, there is any balance left because the survivors' payments cease—on account of remarriage or death, for instance—that unexpended balance will go to the beneficiary or the estate.

REFUNDS AND DEPOSITS

If a person leaves, or is separated from the Government with less than 20 years of civilian service to his credit and before becoming eligible for optional retirement, he can get a refund of the money to his credit in the fund. If he served more than 1 year, he will also get the interest on his deductions; if he served 1 year or less, no interest will be paid.

Military service is not counted in computing this 20-year period for refund purposes.

If a person has served 20 years or more in Federal civilian work, he is not entitled to a refund of his account money; he is entitled to an annuity at age 62.

If a separated person has over 5 years' but less than 20 years' civilian service to his credit, he has a choice of either taking a refund or leaving the money in the system for annuity purposes.

If a person leaves the service and takes his refund, and then returns to the Government, he is not required to repay the money he withdrew.

If such a person wishes to repay his refunded money, there will be an interest charge.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Employees' contributions are increased from 5 to 6 percent, effective the first day of the first pay period after June 30, 1948.

The tontine charge, which was a $1-a-month assessment against the retirement accounts of employees, is eliminated except in the cases of persons separated prior to April 1, 1948.

All years of Federal service may be counted toward retirement, including periods of service performed overseas under authority of the United States Government, and periods of service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. However, when some part of the Federal career was in work for which no deductions were made, that person's annuity will be somewhat lower if he does not make deposits covering that period.

The effective date of the act is April 1, 1948, except for: (a) increase in deduction rate which is the first day of first pay period after June 30, 1948; (b) interest rate, January 1, 1948; (c) survivor benefits, February 28, 1948; (d) involuntary separation after 25 years of service, July 1, 1947.

Colleges for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a significant portion of the chapter on education and government from the recent noteworthy book, Colleges for Freedom, authored by Dr. Donald J. Cowling, retired president of Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., and Carter Davidson. For many years Dr. Cowling has been recognized throughout the Nation as one of the foremost educators of our time. For this reason his views with respect to the dangers inherent in our educational system, if Federal aid is adopted, should be entitled to great weight. His views on Federal aid are as follows:

In 1918 there was submitted to Congress a bill proposing an appropriation of $100,000,000 a year for education, to be distributed among the States upon a plan involving a dollar of State money for every Federal dollar. This would have meant that a small group in Washington would control the spending of $200,000,000 a year in the field of education in this country. This was at that time about 20 percent of our entire national budget for education. The proposal was a menace to the future of our free institutions and sooner or later would have involved dictation from Washington. The sponsors of the bill, of course, disclaimed having any such thought, but they overlooked the inescapable law that the source of support inevitably becomes the source of control.

Having this situation in mind, President Nicholas Murray Butler in his annual report for 1921 to the trustees of Columbia University made the following statement: "One of the most noteworthy of recent developments in American life is the zeal with which machinery is designed and built ostensibly to serve various public interests and undertakings, but in reality to control them.

Perhaps in no other way is the decline of faith in liberty so clearly marked. • • • When anything appears to go wrong, or when any desirable movement seems to lag, a cry goes up for the creation of some new board or commission, and for an appropriation of public funds to maintain it in reasonable comfort. An infinite number of blank forms must be filled and an infinite number of records must be kept, classified, and audited at steadily mounting cost. • • •

"So far as education is concerned, there has been overorganization for a long time past. Too many persons are engaged in supervising, in inspecting, and in recording the work of other persons. There is too much machinery, and in consequence a steady temptation to lay more stress upon the form of education than upon its content. Statistics displace scholarship. There are, in addition, too many laws and too many precise laws, and not enough opportunity for those mistakes and failures due to individual initiative and experiment which are the foundation for great and lasting success.

"It is now proposed to bureaucratize and to bring into uniformity the educational system of the whole United States, while making the most solemn assurance that nothing of the kind is intended. The glory and the successes of education in the United States are due to its freedom, to its unevennesses, to its reflection of the needs and ambitions and capacities of local communities, and to its being kept in close and constant touch with the people themselves. There is not money enough in the United States, even if every dollar of it were expended on education, to produce by Federal authority or through what is naively called cooperation between the Federal Government and the several States, educational results that would be at all comparable with those that have already been reached under the free and natural system that has grown up among us. • • • It is universally acknowledged that the unhappy decline in German university freedom and effectiveness, and the equally unhappy subjection of the educated classes to the dictates of the political and military ruling groups, were the direct result of the highly centralized and efficient control from Berlin of the nation's schools and universities.

"For Americans now to accept oversight and direction of their tax-supported schools and colleges from Washington would mean that they had failed to learn one of the plainest and most weighty lessons of the war. It is true that education is a national problem and a national responsibility; it is also true that it has been characteristic of the American people to solve their most difficult national problems and to bear their heaviest national responsibilities through their own action in the field of liberty, rather than through the agency of organized government. Once more to tap the Federal Treasury under the guise of aiding the States, and once more to establish an army of bureaucrats in Washington and another army of inspectors roaming at large throughout the land, will not only fail to accomplish any permanent improvement in the education of our people, but it will assist in effecting so great a revolution in our American form of government as one day to endanger its perpetuity. • • • The true path of advance in education is to be found in the direction of keeping the people's schools closely in touch with the people themselves. • • • Unless the school is both the work and the pride of the community which it serves, it is nothing.

"A school system that grows naturally in response to the needs and ambitions of a hundred thousand different localities will be a better school system than any which can be imposed upon those localities by the aid of grants of public money from the Federal Treasury, accompanied by Federal regulations, Federal inspections, Federal reports, and Federal uniformities."

Since 1918 repeated attempts have been made to persuade Congress to appropriate vast sums for the current support of education along the general lines first proposed, except that the matching feature—a State dollar to go with each Federal dollar—has been dropped and repudiated as involving too obvious Federal control. The case for Federal aid to education has been admirably formulated and may now be regarded as having reached its final stage. It is doubtful whether any future presentation will be more convincing. The bills now submitted to Congress are based on surveys and studies conducted by competent persons who are close to the problems involved—a little too close, perhaps, for the widest perspective.

The claim that Federal aid is needed rests basically on the acknowledged inequalities of educational opportunities to be found in the various States. It is pointed out that many of the poorest States have the largest percentage of children and that the percentage of tax money that goes for education is largest in some States which notwithstanding this effort are able to maintain only substandard schools. It is further pointed out that the freedom of individuals to live where they please spreads the handicaps of poor education beyond State lines and involves every State in concern for the educational facilities of every other, thus creating a truly national responsibility.

In these presentations no emphasis is placed on the fact that, in spite of the inequalities pointed out and other weaknesses in our schools, the United States through its system of decentralized control and local responsibility has developed more widespread educational opportunities and has enabled a larger percentage of its population to profit by them and at higher levels than has been possible in any large nation under any other system. Nor do the proponents of Federal aid make clear that no State is devoting an impressive amount of money to education if considered as a percentage of its total income rather than of the tax dollar. If States and local school districts should become convinced that no Federal funds will be available, it is not unreasonable to believe that local interest and initiative would still continue to improve their schools.

The basic argument against Federal aid for schools is that it would place in the hands of those in political authority the power to transform our whole way of life. Certain controls are conceded to be necessary from the start—joint responsibility in the preparation of educational plans for each State with authority resting with the United States Commissioner of Education for final approval according to standards which he determines; for regional representatives of the Federal agency and for financial accounting to it of all money spent, and for annual reports covering the educational results achieved. These controls involve supervision not only of funds supplied by the Federal Government but of State funds as well. Dr. John J. Tigert, president of the University of Florida, formerly United States Commissioner of Education, for 8 years in charge of administering the funds of the Federal Office of Education, has pointed out the menace inherent in all proposals for permanent Federal aid to education:

"We have shown that Federal aid to the schools must be attended by Federal control under present conditions if we are to avoid general waste and misuse of these funds. We have also pointed out that Federal control will tend to become greater and that centralized operation of the schools is a menace to our institutions and ideals. • • • If we turn over to the Federal Government the responsibility of the operation of our schools, we have forged the weapons whereby some able and self-seeking individual may some day transform our political, social, and economic system." In a later statement (1940) he says: "There is grave danger that somewhere along through the years, in the oft-recurring crises that inevitably confront us, someone may be tempted to take up the weapons which have been forged by the entrance of our Government in the field of education and use them as a way of affecting the thoughts of 20,000,000 children in the elementary schools and 6,000,000 in the high schools, with the result that a new idea of government, a new social order and a new economic order will be formed far from our present ideals."

The recent proposal of the present administration that a universal training program (the word military to be omitted) be established to give our young people a background in the disciplinary approach of getting along with one another and to inform them on what this government is, what it stands for—its responsibilities—a national program for the indoctrination of all youth by the Army—would seem to leave little to the imagination as to what would happen now if those responsible for this proposal had authority over the schools of the country.

It would be nothing short of a national calamity to have a few men in Washington given the authority, in connection with this recent proposal or any other plan, to control the thinking of the people of this country. There is no man competent to think for the United States—no three or four men competent to do so, no fifty or a hundred—no thousand or ten thousand, men who should be given the right to compel their fellow citizens to follow their modes of thought or to support their conclusions. The whole idea of having a few people do the thinking and having the rest become followers and loyal subjects is repugnant to the spirit of America and contrary to its fundamental ideas. All such proposals represent theories of social control diametrically opposed to those upon which this country was founded and upon the basis of which we have made such wonderful progress in the comparatively few years of our national life.

The fundamental assumption of our Government is that there is no sovereignty anywhere except the sovereignty of the individual. As Lincoln said, "No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent." Oswald Spengler, who profoundly disbelieves in our form of government, in his book, the Hour of Decision, written a few years ago, says that "this whole crushing depression is purely and simply the result of the decline of State power." Much of the political machinery set up in the world in recent years is based on the same conviction—a denial of the sovereignty of the individual and the assumption that a few people have the right to use the instrumentalities of government to force their ideas upon their fellows and compel their submission. There is nothing new in these procedures. They are based on old ideas which have been repeatedly tried and have always resulted in privileges for the few and in slavery, or at least submission, for the mass of the people.

The ideas upon which this country was founded have never yet had a fair trial, so far as the world as a whole is concerned. Even in our own country their application has been limited and in part thwarted by the rapid development of our industrial life, involving constant and in many respects radical changes in social relations and in the distribution of wealth. But in spite of all this, a life of freedom and of reasonable prosperity for the masses of our population has been achieved to a degree beyond that attained by any other nation. We shall in time see more clearly than we do now the application of our democratic principles to the industrial, financial, and social problems that confronts us, and with that increased understanding will come fresh confidence in our basic conceptions and a larger life for all our people.

In the meantime, let us not seek to find a solution of the material problems that confront us by reverting to ideas which have been tried out time and again and which have resulted not in the enlargement of life but in its degradation. The ideal of individual liberty and the rights that go with it—the right to think being the most important of all—are more precious than any material advantage that could possibly be secured by their sacrifice. We must not barter our freedom for any material prosperity, nor for any easy and quick solution of the problems that trouble us today.

Thinking based on integrity and good will is our hope for the future—liberal education based on religion and made effective through democratic society. The freedoms we have cherished—intellectual and spiritual, political and economic—are an essential unity, and the understanding of this unity and of its implications for ourselves and for the world is the concern of our American colleges—for freedom.

Father of Oregon Geology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anita Hamlin from the Sunday Oregonian of February 25, 1948:

FATHER OF OREGON GEOLOGY—THOMAS CONDON, PREACHER-SCIENTIST, FOUND FAME 'MID ROCKS AND FOSSILS OF STRANGE, WILD LAND IN THE WEST

(By Anita Hamlin)

Everyone is agreed that childhood is a period glorified with sensations of taste, smell, touch, seeing, and hearing.

No doubt even small Thomas Condon, later to be known as the father of Oregon geology, poked tentatively at the limestone quarry near his home, more from boyish curiosity than scientific insight. Perhaps he even evoked scoldings from his parents for sucking on rocks like any other small boy. Assuredly his interest in geology, however vague, began early.

We are told that Thomas Condon was born in Ireland, later was transplanted to New York. He was goaded by an unceasing appetite for knowledge and was given to exploring the historic revolutionary fortifications near the city. He even went rabbit hunting in Central Park, at that time a wilderness, which proved he had all the tendencies of normal boyhood, despite the germinating seed of genius.

At 18 he was working, studying, teaching, and in his leisure hours devoting his energy to gathering fossils in the hills and quarries, as well as studying geological formations. He acquired theological training at Auburn Seminary, thereby establishing a "mental set" for the news that ministerial assistance was needed in Oregon. With youthful enthusiasm he packed up his bride and probably well-loved fossils for a clipper-ship journey around Cape Horn.

This was the year 1852, and when the Condons arrived in San Francisco, the gay little city was just beginning to put forth the tinsel for which it became famous.

Oregon beckoned. Trappers, miners, and formers were finding here a paradise of furs, gold, and fertile soil, but scientific resources had been overlooked. People were busy clearing land, felling trees, building homes, planting crops, starting schools, organizing churches, and subduing the Indians. The Condons of psychological extroversion and physical necessity participated actively in these endeavors.

For 10 years the Condons lived in western Oregon, and then, desiring a more needy field for his ministerial work, Condon brought his family to The Dalles, at that time head of navigation on the Columbia. There the rough-and-tumble mining crowd on their way to the gold mines of eastern Oregon and the Army boys from the local military post contributed a great deal to the local color, but probably did little to edify the solid citizens of the region.

Whether the intellectual Condon found conditions to his liking is a matter of conjecture. Nevertheless, during the years his friendships ranged from illiterate and necessarily profane teamsters to scientists and the cultured groups. He knew saloon keepers and gamblers by their first names, and upon these he could count for $20 gold pieces toward any charitable cause he sponsored. Dan Handley, Catholic proprietor of the plush Umatilla House, made provision in his will for a sum of $500 to be paid Condon's church at the death of the former.

"Thomas Condon's sermons were deep," recalled William Condon, nephew of the well-known minister-geologist. The nephew related that his uncle's exhortations lacked poetic fancy, but rather stressed the great and simple truths as he saw them. He spared neither effort nor words to make his point clear. His text usually followed the pattern of outline, with proper elucidation of each point. He would break his discourse into sections with the words 'firstly, secondly, thirdly,' and 'in conclusion.'"

Thomas Condon is said to have lived the gospel that he preached. His mission in life seems to have been the religious interpretation of science. As a scientist, he probed the geological history of the earth before the birth of mankind: as a minister he sought to explain creation, to supplement what we read in Genesis. He did his utmost to effect a marriage of the theory of evolution with religious concepts.

Professor Condon's daughter, the late Mrs. E. C. McCormack, had this to say of her father's scientific endeavors:

"An Army officer returning from an expedition against hostile Indians brought Mr. Condon his first eastern Oregon fossils from the Crooked River country. These fossils aroused the keen interest of the student of nature, and in 1862 or 1863 he obtained permission to accompany a party of cavalry carrying supplies to Harney Valley. They returned by way of old Camp Watson on the John Day River, and here Mr. Condon found his first fossils, in the now famous John Day Valley.

"These glimpses of this fossil field only served to make him eager for more, and as soon as the Indians had been subdued and it was safe to venture among those hills and ravines without an Army escort, Mr. Condon spent his vacations exploring in the John Day country. On one of these trips he found and named Turtle Cove, which has since proved to be one of the richest fossil beds in the valley. He employed young men to spend their summers collecting the fossils exposed by the wear of winter storms. He made friends with the rough teamsters who drove the great Government freight wagons from Fort Dalles to the Army posts in the wilderness. As these teamsters returned with empty wagons they often brought a few rocks or a fine box of fossils for their new friend at The Dalles.

"In a few years Mr. Condon found in his possession a large quantity of valuable material that must be classified and described. But he was without scientific books, was thousands of miles from the great libraries and museums of the East, and far from other scientists with whom to confer."

At the time the United States Government was making a geological survey of the 40th parallel (which includes an area 100 miles wide connecting the geology of the great plains to the east of the Rockies with that of the Pacific Coast and California), Clarence King, leader of the survey, reached The Dalles. Mutual interest brought the two geologists together, and one might imagine the friendly Condon playing gracious host and holding forth till the wee hours on the geological growth of Oregon, while his guest studied with enthusiasm the fossil collection now housed in the Condon Museum at the University of Oregon.

VISITORS BRING EASTERN VIEWS TO WESTERN ISOLATION

Another visitor to the Condon home was a Mr. Blake, an eastern geologist. The first specimens to reach the Atlantic coast were some fossil leaves which Condon presented to Blake, and which later fell into the hands of Dr. Newberry of Columbia College, New York, a specialist in fossil botany. Arnold Hague, also associated with the 40th parallel survey, brought to Condon's western isolation some of the spirit of scientific endeavor being carried on in the East.

The Condon home stood on the site now occupied by the Van Dellen Lumber Co. at Third and Laughlin Streets, The Dalles. In 1871 at the time of the fire which demolished a large section of the business district, Condon's many friends exhibited their affection for him when they converged on his house in order to save it, as well as the cabinet which contained his precious fossil collection.

William Condon remembers the human skulls with the mark of a scalping knife on them which terrified his boyish imagination. There was a wealth of Indian artifacts and arrowheads beautifully executed, so many in fact that he salvaged three-fourths of a five-gallon oil can of them for play purposes after they had been discarded by his uncle.

CONDON ENTERTAINS TRAVELERS WHO VISIT THE DALLES

Oregon was now coming into her own. The first transcontinental railroad sped at what was then considered an incredible speed to the Pacific Northwest. Large parties of ultra moderns from the East did the fashionable thing by coming on a sightseeing tour to the Columbia River. Often they were obliged to spend the night in The Dalles, and what could be more interesting than whiling away the hours in the home of the local geologist who made stories about earth formation and fossils so entertaining? And what good conversation it furnished these ladies and gentlemen of culture when they returned to their homes.

In 1870 Condon shipped his first boxes of specimens to the Smithsonian Institution at Washington and from there they were sent to the Philadelphia Academy of Sciences for examination by the experts. Other educational centers to receive mementos of Oregon's Paleozoic age were Columbia College, the recipient of fossil leaves; American

Museum of Natural History, shells; Yale, fossil mammals.

Well diggers discovered the first fossil horse in the Pacific Northwest in 1866, and this was announced in a lecture by Condon. Later an account was published in the Oregonian. Although Condon is credited with the discovery of a miniature three-toed horse by later geologists and historians, he makes no mention of this in his book, The Two Islands.

An amusing anecdote was related by Will Condon regarding one of his uncle's acquaintances. It seems that this Irishman had formed the habit of drinking often from a jug. When the geologist asked him the nature of his refreshment, the man replied that it was alcohol in which a scorpion was preserved. The drinker downed the remainder of the fiery liquid, then presented the scorpion to Mr Condon for his natural-history collection.

Will Condon remembered pieces of white quartz and similar material containing brilliant gold fragments which fell into the hands of his uncle, but they had no value to him other than scientific.

Among Condon's published geological works are The Rocks of the John Day Valley, which appeared in the Overland Monthly, May 1871, and The Willamette Sound, printed in November 1871, in the same magazine. The Two Islands, a full-length book on Oregon geology, written for the layman, was published in 1902 when the writer was 80 years old. For nearly half a century this has formed the basis for study of Oregon's most ancient history.

Regarding the first two works mentioned above, Condon's daughter wrote: "These two papers fairly represent Mr. Condon's strength as a constructive geological worker. They indicate his ability to begin at ocean level and by means of mountain upheavals, marine and lake sediments, fossil leaves and bones, and volcanic outflows, to reconstruct and make wonderfully vivid the geological past of a new country."

She also wrote: "It gave Mr Condon real pleasure to sit down beside a rough block of sandstone with only the corner of one glistening tooth in sight, to pick and chip and chisel until another tooth and part of the jaw were seen, to continue with careful skill until the beautiful agatized molars were laid bare, to work patiently on until there stood before him no longer the shapeless mass of stone but a fine fossil head to add its testimony to the record of the past. But it gave him greater pleasure still to work with rough unpolished human character and discover the glint of gold hidden under the rough exterior. The book of nature was indeed fascinating, but did not appeal to him as did the work with men. He had the artist's eye for seeing the beautiful in character and the enthusiasm of a sculptor for shaping rough, faulty, human nature until its beauty reflected the divine."

Mrs. McCormack summed up her father's theory of uniting the scientific with the religious in this way: "To Mr. Condon the theory of evolution presented to the human mind a wider conception of God than the world has ever known. It involved a plan of unthinkable grandeur, beginning with the smallest, simplest things gradually unfolding into more complex life, often interrupted by some great unturning of nature, but never losing the continuity of purpose, the steady progress toward the culminating glory of all: The spiritual life of man."

Condon longed to spread the truth (a relative matter in any circumstance) about the earth's creative process to the young people who had come with their parents to make a home in the wilderness. This missionary zeal in scientific clothing, together with the growing needs of a family ripe for education, led him in 1873 to leave his pulpit at the Congregational Church and accept a place with the faculty of Pacific University, Forest Grove. In 1876 he accepted the chair of geology and natural history at the University of Oregon.

Besides changing to a new teaching post in 1876, the year became memorable to Condon through his discovery of fossil bird bones in the Silver Lake region of southeastern Oregon. The same site has yielded some of the finest mammals in the State.

Oregon was now passing from the growing pains of pioneering to a more mature development. People talked of industrial development and statehood. The prospector shaking his pan of gold dust was becoming an important figure in the scheme of things. When the question of coal was broached, when families began to wonder if their land had the right geological formation for artesian well water, when cement rock, copper or limestone was needed, but no one knew where to find it, they said: "We'll ask Thomas Condon. He'll know." And he did. He shared his extensive knowledge with them. Advice was free for the asking. He analyzed specimens of everything sent him and in turn brought specimens to others when he traveled to fill lecture engagements.

LECTURES: OFTEN GIVEN STUDENT OF OREGON GEOLOGY

He was a frequent passenger on the old river boats and the snail-paced trains. His destination was often Portland, where he would address the cultured city fathers; or a college where the audience was eager and fresh and interested; or the State fair, where the farmers congregated with prosaic matters of livelihood on their minds.

His summers were spent at Nye Brook cottage on the ocean, and there on the beach he would hold an "informal" not unlike that conducted on the shores of Galilee centuries ago, though the text for discussion was slightly different. Members of his audience perched on rocks, on driftwood. His daughter said: "He with his tall alpenstock in his hand, his broad hat and loose raglan coat, made a picturesque figure standing in their midst. Perhaps he talked of the three beaches, the one upon which they stood, the two old geological beaches so plainly visible in the ocean bluff just behind them. * * * But the most common picture, the one that makes the Condon cottage at Nye Brook an almost sacred spot for some, was the party strolling homeward from a morning on the beach—especially at low tide. They always stopped beside his door to show their treasures. There were baskets, tin pails, and all sorts of packages filled with curios gathered on the morning walk; one had a rare shellfish, another an unusual fossil, some had sea moss, others only a group of bright pebbles, while a few proudly exhibited their water agates. All had their eager questions and his kindly helpful interest never failed. * * *

INTEREST OF CONDON SPREAD OVER MANY SUBJECTS

"Mr. Condon's love for knowledge was not confined to natural science, for his interests were broad as the universe. To him, human history began with the men of preglacial age, and he sought eagerly for every ray of light that archeological research could throw upon the old cave dwellers of prehistoric times. He studied all primitive peoples, their religion, industries, and social development, and endeavored to trace their relationship to common ancestry. There were but few obscure nations of the world in which he was not deeply interested: he knew their past history, their present political condition and struggles for liberty. He prized the history of our Aryan ancestors and treasured their old Vedic hymns as among the first bright glimpses of the human soul in reaching out for its Creator. The religion, art, and literature of the Egyptians, Arabians, Persians, and Greeks were to him a source of great pleasure. He followed the lives of noted statesmen. * * * All great religious movements, including the higher criticism and the relation of science were matters of absorbing interest. And yet there were but few who knew and loved Oregon's trees, shrubs, and wild flowers so well as he. * * *

"He was the pioneer geologist who by his own original research caught the first glimpse of Oregon's oldest land as it rose from the ocean bed; he saw the seashells upon her oldest beaches; watched the development of her grand forests; saw her first strange mammals feeding upon her old lake shores; he listened in imagination to the cannonading of her first volcanos and traced the showers of ashes and great floods of lava. He followed the creation of Oregon step by step all through her long geological history and then entered with enthusiasm into the industrial and educational development of her present life."

More than a scientist, Condon was, if the testimony of his associates may be accepted, an understanding person, who knew how to ally himself with his fellow human beings.

"Come in," he said once to a friend, "when your cup is effervescing and let us enjoy the overflow." That simple injunction expressed warmth and hospitality.

In the memorial bulletin issued by the University of Oregon in 1907 were these words written by Joseph Schafer: "He was by endowment a poet. It was nearly impossible for him to be commonplace for a moment."

His turns of expression showed a subtle humor. For instance when he was particularly happy over the arrival of the Rocky Mountain nautilus specimen he invited someone in to "help him hurrah." On this same occasion he whistled a happy little tune, then remarked. "Oh, the tune inside of me is too big for my whistle."

Condon's students, who, if they are living, are probably in their seventieth or seventy-fifth summer, must surely have found it difficult to believe that Oregan was once twin islands and an inland sea, but if he said so, it must be true as gospel, for the great man knew. "He was one convincing Irishman," they probably reminisce, as they pull on a long cigar and settle comfortably for an after-dinner doze.

Civil Service Booklet Text Explains New Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first installment of a series of interpretative articles by an able Washington reporter, Jerry Kluttz, in connection with the recently passed Retirement Act. I shall continue these extensions until they are completed and then shall have them reprinted in a single article. If any of my colleagues wish to obtain some of these reprints for distribution, I shall be glad to have them advise my office, and I will arrange for such reprints.

I do want to take this opportunity of making a brief comment as to the title of the act, Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Retirement Act. I think all of us realize the immense amount of intelligent effort which our able colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] devoted toward the preparation and enactment of this law. This was true not only this year, when the other body approved the law, but last year when he pioneered in this field and obtained overwhelming support of his colleagues in committee and on the floor. It is due to no fault of his that the act did not become law in the last session. I think it could be justly stated that this is the "Stevenson act."

Jerry Kluttz's article follows:

CIVIL SERVICE BOOKLET TEXT EXPLAINS NEW RETIREMENT ACT

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The Washington Post today begins publication of the full text of the Civil Service booklet that explains in detail the new Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Retirement Act. The law affects in some way about 1,500,000 Government employees.

The booklet is eagerly sought by tens of thousands of Federal workers. More than 15,000 requests for it have been received by this writer. Each of them will be filled within the next week or 10 days.

Civil Service is overwhelmed by the demand for the booklet. It has the resources to print 50,000 copies, which it thought would be ample to fill the need. But it has had requests for upward of half a million copies. The individual written requests now on file for single copies will be filled, but Civil Service has been forced to turn down Treasury, Agriculture, Federal Security, Army, and many other agencies that sought a copy for each of their employees.

Because of the enormous demand for the booklet and because many persons who are seeking it may be disappointed, the Washington Post is glad to publish the text in installments beginning today. We suggest that Federal workers clip and save this and the installments to follow and make a booklet for themselves.

THE NEW RETIREMENT ACT

The Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Act changed some of the basic features of the original retirement act; it made some additions to the old system, and it also eliminated some of the former provisions.

The new law provides that for separations on or after the 1st of April, 1948, a minimum of 5 years of Federal civilian service is needed to qualify for any annuity benefits. Military service cannot be substituted for civilian work in connection with this minimum.

The new law increases the deductions from salary for retirement purposes from 5 to 6 percent, effective with the first pay period after June 30, 1948. Interest on deductions of active employees was lowered from 4 to 3 percent as of the beginning of 1948.

AGE CONDITIONS REMAIN

The new act did not change the conditions in connection with age and optional retirement after certain periods of service. These remain as before, briefly:

The employee must retire at age 70 if he has at least 15 years of service.

He may retire at age 60 with 30 years of service.

He may retire at age 62 with 15 years of service.

He may retire at age 55 with 30 years of service; in this case, however, his annuity will be scaled down from that which he would get if he were age 60, and, once set, does not change as time goes on.

An immediate annuity is available, under certain conditions, to employees who leave the Government after 25 years of service. This applies to a person who is separated through no fault of his own (in a reduction in force, for example).

As an illustration, an employee with 26 years of Federal service to his credit toward retirement is separated from the Government on account of a cut-back in personnel; he can get an immediate annuity regardless of his age at the time he is laid off.

A somewhat similar provision of law was in effect for a temporary period ending June 30 last year (the Forand Act). This portion of the new law was made retroactive to July 1, 1947.

The amount such a person receives will not be a full annuity if he is less than 60 years old. It will be scaled down at the rate of one-fourth of 1 percent per month (3 percent per year) for each full month under 60 at the date of separation.

After April 1, there is but one age at which annuity starts for those people who work for the Government for at least 5 civilian years and then leave before reaching retirement age. That age is 62. In the past, anyone who earned the right to a future annuity by virtue of 5 years' employment could elect to start getting his annuity payments at either age 55 or 62, depending on whether he had been dropped involuntarily or resigned. Now, the reason for separation does not matter, and the discontinued service annuity, as we call it, starts at age 62.

In connection with this, the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Act says that if a person serves at least 5 civilian years, but hasn't reached the 20-year mark, he has the choice of taking a refund of all the money to his credit in the fund (including interest) or leaving it in the fund for annuity purposes when he reaches age 62. If he takes the refund, he is out of luck so far as the annuity is concerned.

DISABILITY RETIREMENT

One must have completed at least 5 years of civilian Government service to be eligible for disability retirement, but in this case the annuity payments start immediately, regardless of age. There are two good points under the new law, and one which is not so favorable, so far as the disability annuitants are concerned.

First of all, a good point is that any employee who is undergoing hospital treatment when he is separated from his agency, or who is hospitalized at any time during the 6 months after his separation, can delay making his application for disability retirement for as long as 6 months after hospitalization ends. This is a break for those folks whose illness or incapacities prevent them from making their annuity arrangements with us right away.

With respect to those who join, or are already on, the disability rolls, it is no longer necessary for any of them to have annual physical examinations after they get to be 60 years old. Under the old system, such examinations could be ordered each year until the annuitant reached 70. The Government will save money on this new provision, and we won't bother these annuitants after age 60.

The one new feature of the act which is not so attractive with respect to the disability annuitants is this: Heretofore, when such an annuitant made a recovery, and became employable but was not able to obtain Federal employment, that person could be treated as having been involuntarily separated. His disability annuity stopped, and he then became eligible for reduced annuity benefits at age 55, or regular annuity at age 62. The new act takes away this age 55 provision; hereafter, if such an individual is unable to get Government employment he must wait until age 62 for the regular annuity to start.

One of the nice thing about the 1948 act is the way it eases much of the figuring of the retirement income. There is now a simple basic formula which is used in computing the annuity of each person. This is it: When the person's average salary for his highest five consecutive years of Federal service is $5,000 or more, we merely take 1½ percent of that average and multiply by the total number of years of service. The product of that simple computation is the annuity.

If the person's 5-year average salary is less than $5,000, we take 1 percent of it, add $25 to that, and then multiply by the total years of service. The result is the annuity which is payable to the former employee.

Formula: When best 5-year average salary is $5,000 or more.

Example: Average is $6,000; all service after August 1, 1920, is covered by deposits; 30 years of service.

Take 1½ percent of salary	$90
Multiply by years of service	×30
Annuity	2,700

Formula: When best 5-year average salary is less than $5,000.

Example: Average is $4,000; all service after August 1, 1920 is covered by deposits; 30 years of service.

Take 1 percent of the salary	$40
Add $25	25
	65
Multiply by years of service	×30
Annuity	1,950

The Displaced-Persons Problem Cannot Be Wished Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee recommends an emasculated immigration bill which only ostensibly appears to attack the displaced-persons problem. Its terms, however, are such as to indicate clearly that the bill is only being used as a gesture to answer criticism of inaction. It no more solves the problem than does inaction.

From the original proposal of the admission of 400,000 displaced persons in 4 years, 100,000 to be admitted yearly, the Senate subcommittee recommends the admission of 100,000 in 2 years, 50,000 to be admitted each year. It recommends that half of the displaced persons admitted under the bill be persons whose native countries have been annexed. What does annexation mean? Would it not exclude natives of Germany, natives of Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, though such natives may be in displaced-persons camps. Does it provide any assistance to those who are presently stateless or those who do not want to return to Russian-dominated countries?

Or are annexation and domination synonymous? This business of annexed countries—whatever it may mean—can

be used for deliberate racial and religious debarment.

Fifty percent must be farmers and be employed on farms in this country. In other words, 50 percent of the DP's are barred and penalized if they are not farmers. This is done, apparently, in a confused concept of self-interest. We need carpenters, lathers, tailors, plumbers, mechanics, domestics, doctors, dentists, scientists, and unskilled labor. Both the A. F. of L. and the CIO have testified in favor of the Stratton bill which contains no such restrictions.

The bill further permits entry of persons who have assurance of housing and jobs in the United States without displacing citizens. The labor organizations are not worried about loss of jobs. Their leaders testified that immigration creates jobs. Our immigration laws provide that applicants must give guaranty that they will not become public charges. Protection already exists and I cannot see how any declaration of secured homes and jobs is susceptible of proof. What does displacing a citizen mean? If a job is available, does that mean it must be offered first to a citizen? Does the same apply to available housing? The immigrant under the Senate bill must report quarterly—like a criminal on parole. If the immigrant loses his job for any cause is he subject to deportation?

"Also, there appears to be a serious constitutional question involved in the requirement which makes it mandatory for the alien to report periodically after entrance to the country. This may conflict with the constitutional provision according to equal protection of the law.

It is further provided that if the 50,000 yearly allotment is not exhausted then the remaining number lapses. The intent is obvious to whittle down to even a smaller number than the 100,000 the bill calls for. If 50,000 DP's cannot be processed under the very restrictive conditions then the unfilled numbers lapse and are not carried over to the next year.

Referring to the matter of annexation in the proposed Senate bill, there is a grievous political mistake in the sense that preference is given, as I stated above, to DP's and displaced orphans whose place of origin or country of nationality has been annexed by a foreign power. This apparently is an attempt to recognize the annexation by Russia of the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. It also recognizes politically the annexation by Russia of that portion of Poland east of the Curzon line. This inference is emphasized on page 55 of the report issued by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

There has never been any treaty or any agreement ratified by the Senate involving such territorial changes. As a matter of fact we still recognize these three Baltic States as independent and still have their accredited representatives in Washington.

The bill is not a solution. It does not even answer the question of why the American taxpayer must continue to pay for keeping large numbers of DP's in camps when the admission of 400,000 in a 4-year period could dissipate the problem without costing the Government any money at all. Under this bill, an unhealthy percentage will still remain in our camps; the taxpayer will still carry the burden of their support; the United States will not be taking its fair share; the rehabilitation of the DP's into useful, secure people remains academic. When the powerful United States so hems its humanitarianism with restrictions as to render it meaningless, then how will less economically favored countries respond?

It is sincerely hoped that the House subcommittee on immigration with the wealth of testimony before it given by General Eisenhower, former Secretary Patterson, Attorney General Clark, General Marshall, the A. F. of L., the CIO, the religious groups, including Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish will not produce so barren a bill that fails to meet even the edges of the problem.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio broadcast delivered this week by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to his constituents in Washington State on the subject of rent control. The junior Senator from Washington State prepared his address in condensed version to explain both sides in the matter to his State over a network of 28 radio stations. The talk is worth the consideration of all of us.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After an absence of several months from the air it is good to begin again a series of weekly reports to the State of Washington. During the first session of the Eightieth Congress I discussed with you each week some of the problems which confronted, and were being considered, and acted upon, by your Congress. I endeavored to keep partisan politics out of the discussions. As best I can I shall endeavor to pursue this practice on this coming broadcast and on those to come. There are so many interesting and important problems to think about, in a factual and objective way, that there should be little cause or need for spending time on their political aspects.

Before making some observations on several of the issues of the moment in which you have a particular concern, I want to express my appreciation, and that of my staff, for the happy and cordial and reasonable relationship which has been established between us and most of you. Your letters and telegrams and telephone calls, which come in ever-increasing numbers, are replied to just as rapidly as time will permit. I think, for example, that we have recently received more than 5,000 communications from Washington State on the subject of rents alone. Many of these inquiries have not yet received a reply. All of them will be acknowledged in due time.

Just a thought by way of preface. The longer we have been in the Senate the more conscious we have become of the distance which separates the Congress from you at home. Your representatives, both in the Senate and in the House, are 3,000 miles away. It is all too easy for us to lose some of the contacts at home which we treasure and respect. These reports will be of material assistance in bridging that gap which distance has created. If there are particular subjects and things you would like to have us talk about, please let me know. Some of us will often disagree about matters of policy and procedure but these differences will be the more easily compromised and satisfied if we have a personal interest and relationship with each other. Many of us will often be in complete agreement and the intended broadcasts will encourage and permit us to see eye to eye on matters which are of mutual concern to you and me and to our State and Nation.

Now for some business: From a score and more of big problems I should like to talk now about rents. This situation affects most of you, many of you individually and all of you collectively: We should probably first bring you up to date on what is happening to the question of, "Should there be continuing Federal rent controls in this country," and if the decision is affirmative, "What sort of a rent-control law ought to govern in American for the next year or 14 months?"

As most of you have read and been told, the Senate recently passed a Rent Act for 1948. This bill resulted from several weeks of intensive hearings and more than 11 hours of continuing debate on the floor of the Senate. The approved measure was forwarded to the House on Wednesday, February 25.

While the Senate was busy with its rent hearings and debate, the House was busy with other matters. The House passed a resolution which merely extended the Rent Act of 1947 for 30 days. The Senate necessarily concurred in this resolution because the Rent Act of 1947 would have expired on the last day of last month if the House didn't see fit to take any action on the 1948 Senate proposals. For the reason of this resolution you are still operating under the law of 1947, which was to have expired on February 29. The House is now considering what action it thinks ought to be taken after the extended 30-day period has run its course. The House can write its own bill or it can approve the Senate bill, or it can amend the Senate bill in any way the House sees fit. I hazard a guess that the House of Representatives will add some liberalizing amendments to the Senate bill. The amended measure will then go to conference and in turn be passed by both Houses of the Congress and probably signed by the President.

Everybody in America ought to be concerned by what your Nation does with the problem of rents, because the problem involves prevailing housing shortages and the field of private property. There are more than 14,000,000 housing units in more than 600 defense areas in America under rent control today. If the Congress continues a rent-control law, as there is every reason to believe that it will, these millions of apartments and housing accommodations will continue under control. Let us bear in mind also that some 8,500,000 individuals presently offer accommodations for rent throughout this Nation. These are factors that emphasize the impact of rent control upon the American people.

Ironically the American property owner represents the only segment of our society under control. How long shall we defend and support a system which is part slave and part free? Thinking people think this an interesting question. The proposed law of 1948 is essentially a continuing improvement over the law of 1947. The coming law will undoubtedly continue the right of tenant and landlord to sign a voluntary lease for an increased rent figure not to exceed 15 percent.

Local advisory rent boards, of which there are a number in Washington State, will be urged to do a more thorough job of examining conditions within their respective areas of influence in order that these boards may intelligently recommend to the National Rent Administrator that given defense-rental areas promptly should be decontrolled or that the rent structures within their areas should be raised or that prevailing rent levels in certain areas are adequate and ought to be continued. If these local rent advisory boards do a thoroughly competent job and if the Federal Rent Administrator gives consideration to, and takes action on, their recommendations, I think that the 1948 law can be effectively administered.

The law presumes that local advisory boards and the Federal Administrator will move in the direction of decontrol as rapidly as conditions warrant. It has generally been admitted by everybody in authority that too little emphasis has been placed on decontrolling rent areas since the end of the war.

It is probably a fact that the subject of rent controls is as highly controversial as any problem which presently confronts your Congress. Special pleaders in most instances are either vehemently in favor of far more stringent controls than the Senate has recommended, or they are totally in opposition to controls of any character. These are natural positions for interested persons to take because those who speak for the average renter in America are only concerned with keeping rents at a low level, while those who have their money invested in the field of rental facilities are chiefly and naturally desirous of managing their own properties as they had always done in the years before the war.

There is yet another group which presently ought to be interested in the national rent problem, but this group either knows nothing about the subject or isn't very much interested by what it does know. These are mostly home owners who are not affected by restrictions placed on others. In part we direct these observations at them because in years to come they may become either tenant or landlord.

Rent controls possess one virtue. They can maintain rents at an artificially low level. The less a family pays for rent the more that family can pay for other things.

This virtue, however, can often possess a resulting vice. If the landlords of America can't take in enough in rent to pay for their cost of operation and maintenance, their properties depreciate in value and the services which tenants have a right to expect are often either diminished or cut off altogether.

The problem before the Congress is to endeavor to make certain that rents are adequate to provide upkeep and services of a reasonable character and that rent levels don't go up too rapidly or too far. This is no small task to attempt by legislation.

Regardless of the virtues which rent controls may possess it has become completely obvious that the prevailing shortage in rental accommodations will never be corrected for as long as this Nation continues rent controls. Building construction has been tremendously accelerated in the last year but not much of this construction has been for rental purposes. You are certain to be interested in knowing that we are and have been constantly losing ground in the national effort to place more and more rental accommodations on the market. The reason is clear and simple enough. Investors aren't willing to venture their capital in creating rental units which may have restrictions placed upon them, and far too many of those who have offered their facilities for rent in recent years have either converted their premises for commercial purposes or they have sold their rental properties outright to others who use them for other purposes. Since 1940 more than 4,000,000 rental properties have disappeared from the rental market for the reasons stated. However much someone may believe in the theory of rent controls he ought to be conscious of the obstacle rent control is to the creating of rental accommodations.

We speak of rent control as something which America has labored under since early in the war. That term is both misleading and inaccurate. In tens of thousands of cases America has suffered from a rent freeze which was anything but proper control. Control means that a property owner ought to benefit from a rent income which reflects the items included in his cost and maintenance, and he ought to have a fair return. A freezing of rents simply means that these necessary items aren't taken into consideration.

For the first time the Congress is actually concerning itself with a rent control problem. The proposed 1948 law declares that no property owner shall be required to operate his facilities at a loss and that every property owner is entitled to a fair return on his investment. It rather horrifies one to know and understand that we have thought it necessary in this country to pursue a contrary course in recent years.

It has never occurred to some people that thousands of our citizens have been expected to subsidize other thousands of citizens because of the rent freeze which took hold beginning in 1941. Generally people understand that hardship cases were to be given relief by the Federal Rent Administrator and his many agents. It is true that relief has been granted to thousands of property owners but other thousands haven't been granted relief commensurate with their losses. The reason is this: The Rent Administrator used 1939 as a base. In considering a hardship application he would let the property owner use the best of any two operating years since 1939 as the measure of relief which the property owner was entitled to. If there were not any two best years, and often the property owner has operated at a loss since 1939, he could only be given relief which would result in his losing no more money than he lost in his two best years. This vicious circumstance has actually operated in your country for years. The Congress is completely determined to see that it doesn't happen in the future.

I am among those Senators who think that rent controls have largely outlived their usefulness and who absolutely believe that we can't solve our rental shortage unless we get rid of rent controls. Nearly every Senator I know agrees with my latter premise, but a majority of the Senate and House of Representatives think the time isn't yet here when the controls can be taken away. All of us are therefore in agreement that if a rent-control law is to be continued for probably 14 months, that the law must be more pliable and more effective and more fair than any law we have had before this time.

History tells us that rent controls have practically wrecked and always depreciated the field of private property in the nations where it has been tried. It will do precisely for us what it has done for others if we permit it to continue too long. If there is to be a rent-control law in 1948, let us hope for a good law, but, more importantly, let us look for an end to the need for any rent-restrictive measures, and to the need for abusing property rights. In the long run we will suffer badly if these restrictive measures continue.

I hope you have enjoyed this conversation with me. Certainly I have enjoyed being with you again. Time having disappeared, I will keep the subject of post offices and the Marshall plan for a coming broadcast. At the moment I am going back to the floor to take part in that gigantic foreign-relations debate which is intended to help us understand how far America can go in helping other nations without visiting serious damage and lasting injury on the United States.

Federal Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the transcript of a discussion between the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and New York City Housing Commissioner Robert F. Wagner, Jr., on the subject of housing, over the American Broadcasting Co. network.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. SPARKMAN. Today some 1,500 veterans of World War II were in Washington asking some very pointed questions of Congress.

These veterans wanted to know when they were going to have a chance for a decent home and a normal family life.

They wanted to know why the Republican majority of the Congress has not passed a comprehensive housing bill.

It all boiled down to this. For 2 years they have waited patiently for housing to become available at prices to fit a veteran's pocketbook.

Today they asked when something was going to be done to get that housing.

Robert F. Wagner, Jr., chairman of the city planning commission of New York City, a veteran, and the son of the distinguished New York Senator who has been a pioneer in fighting for low cost housing, was one of the leaders of that meeting.

Bob, can you tell us something about the veteran's housing conference?

Mr. WAGNER. Senator SPARKMAN, I'm glad to get the veteran's story across to the people of the country. To put the veteran's plight in its proper perspective let me go into a little ancient history on the housing problem.

America has had a housing shortage for a long time. By that I mean there haven't been enough decent homes to go around at prices that most people could afford. For more than a decade, the number of new families formed each year has been greater than the number of new housing units that were built.

Even during the depression we had a basic housing shortage, but we didn't realize it because families were so hard up that two or three of them moved into one place to save money. This was bad, but because these people couldn't afford to go out and try to

rent a separate home of their own, we didn't notice that we had a housing shortage.

Then the war came along. Millions of our young men were taken from their homes and into the armed services. The population shifted in many areas of the country. And people began to make enough money to be able to stop doubling up and move into separate homes of their own.

Meantime, new housing construction was held to the minimum necessary to the war effort.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That's right. We channeled all of our materials into the war effort. Outside of war housing, construction was stopped. And I remember that even with millions of our young men in barracks here and millions more serving overseas, housing was still mighty tight in the United States.

Mr. WAGNER. That's the story, all right. So when the fighting stopped and our servicemen returned to civilian life, they were greeted with huge banners saying, "Welcome Home," but after the welcome was over we found that the homes weren't there. Pretty soon the "Welcome Home" signs were taken down and all the veteran could see was that "No Vacancy" sign which greeted him everywhere.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We did make a start toward solving the problem, but it was a tremendous task. More than 3,500,000 families were [illegible]

and also for more public housing projects in the cities.

Mr. WAGNER. I can certainly emphasize the need for it in the cities. I know how badly it is needed from my own experience in New York City.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, the report your father has just completed shows that it is badly needed throughout the Nation. He polled governors, mayors, and civic leaders all over the country and nine out of ten of them said the need for housing for low-income families is acute and that Federal aid is needed to get this housing. I hope that the report will have some effect on the Republican leadership. Why, the mayors of 78 cities representing 41 percent of the city population, estimated that 1,800,000 housing units in their cities need major repairs or lack decent plumbing facilities. And of 230 replies, 206 state that they do not expect private builders to be able to meet the needs of low-income families in the foreseeable future. That shows the need for Congress to act.

Mr. WAGNER. I agree with you. This public housing doesn't compete with private enterprise. But it's awfully important in making good, healthy citizens out of people who grow bitter and disillusioned from living in the slums.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That's what a lot of the mayors wrote your father. For example, [illegible]

Mr. WAGNER. That is certainly a major point. In 1947 nearly 1,000,000 housing units were added to the Nation's supply. But less than 1[illegible] percent was rental housing. And most veterans should be renting at this time and not buying a home until later.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is quite true. Many of them are working on small salaries and have no idea what their future income is likely to be.

Mr. WAGNER. And veterans in general have no business buying a $15,000 house or paying $70 or $80 a month rent. They just aren't making that kind of money. In fact, it's not just veterans who find the prices of new homes too high today. Millions of others also see new housing selling or renting at prices far beyond their means.

Mr. SPARKMAN. President Truman warned against the danger of housing pricing itself out of the market in his message to the Congress the other day. He pointed out how construction fell off after the last war when prices got so high in 1925 that people just couldn't afford to buy.

Mr. WAGNER. The way to keep the building industry in a continued state of good health is for it to produce homes at prices which the mass market can afford. One of the important points of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is the provision it contains to expand [illegible]

Position of Hon. C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois, on the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the remarks of Mr. Cedrick Foster, the able radio commentator, delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System, on March 3, 1948.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is Cedric Foster reporting to you from Boston.

Today in Washington, as the Ambassador from Czechoslovakia resigned in order to fight for the freedom of his country from Communist rule, Secretary Marshall and Secretary Forrestal asked that financial aid for [illegible]

emphasis, in a statement which he made on the Marshall plan, on the need for obtaining production in Europe if the continent is to survive the ravages of postwar inflation and ills. The Senator from Illinois believes, and firmly so, and I believe, that it is only right that his sincere views be presented to the American people. He believes there is no use in sending money to Europe unless that money will beget production of goods by European countries, and through that production, a revival of world trade—trade which will allow the countries of Europe to support themselves in years to come without a constant draining of American resources.

In a recent address "CURLY" BROOKS declared that the American people have been and still are the most charitable people on the face of the earth. "To be generous, even amazingly generous," he continued, "is magnificent. But to be stupidly generous is akin to sin." Senator BROOKS then pointed out:

"We must remember constantly that we are only 7 percent of the world's people; we occupy only 7 percent of the earth's surface; and in our bumper years we produce only 12 percent of the world's food supply. We are already carrying the largest national debt ever carried by any people supposed to be solvent—the largest debt in the history of mankind. The average American citizen today is [illegible]

and they are not going to meet their own problems. Their problems are those of incentives to work and to produce to the maximum. Even that would not meet their difficulty completely, for no matter how much they produce, if they continue to take the proceeds of that production and devote it to the extension of their socialistic practices, they will never close the gap of their 'balance of payments,' and we will merely continue to pay for their trade deficit indefinitely."

Senator BROOKS has a solution to the problem which America faces in the rehabilitation of Europe. His criticism is not destructive analysis. He sees what he believes to be the way out. He is against the State Department and the military controlling the funds going to Europe under the Marshall plan. In condemnation of the State Department and the military, "CURLY" BROOKS declares they "stood startled, stunned, and confused when we were struck at Pearl Harbor, following the policies which they had advocated. Then it was that we had to call the experts of American industry, labor, and agriculture to provide the industrial genius, the labor, and the food to produce the essentials to bring our enemies to their knees. The

creation of incentives to work and to produce in western Europe and to apply the proceeds of that production to support stable currencies, balanced budgets, and stable gov-

rent a separate home of their own, we didn't notice that we had a housing shortage.

Then the war came along. Millions of our young men were taken from their homes and into the armed services. The population shifted in many areas of the country. And people began to make enough money to be able to stop doubling up and move into separate homes of their own.

Meantime, new housing construction was held to the minimum necessary to the war effort.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That's right. We channeled all of our materials into the war effort. Outside of war housing, construction was stopped. And I remember that even with millions of our young men in barracks here and millions more serving overseas, housing was still mighty tight in the United States.

Mr. WAGNER. That's the story, all right. So when the fighting stopped and our servicemen returned to civilian life, they were greeted with huge banners saying, "Welcome Home," but after the welcome was over we found that the homes weren't there. Pretty soon the "Welcome Home" signs were taken down and all the veteran could see was that "No Vacancy" sign which greeted him everywhere.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We did make a start toward solving the problem, but it was a tremendous task. More than 2,500,000 families were formed faster than new homes were built.

Mr. WAGNER. One reason we didn't do more was that a major portion of the housing legislation requested by President Truman has never been passed. All during the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress, the veterans have been given promises that the long-range housing bill, now known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill would be passed. But nothing happened.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That's right. A bill which bears the name of the Republican Senatorial Policy Committee chairman has been bottled up by his own policy committee.

Mr. WAGNER. And that's why I am in Washington today and why those 1,500 other indignant veterans were here. We want to know why that measure isn't passed so that we can get more rental housing, lower cost housing, and public housing for the lower income groups that can never be served by private builders.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, the Democratic leadership wants that bill passed, but unfortunately, we don't have control of the Congress at this time. The Republicans are working on their own bill and I supposed you fellows talked about the Republican housing bill at your session today.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; we did. In some aspects the bill is pretty good. It incorporates quite a few of the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and the measures urged by President Truman in his recent housing message. But there are several important omissions, and particularly two which I feel should be emphasized now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think I can guess what you are going to say. The Republican proposal leaves out provisions to get better rural housing and it also does nothing about the 125,000 units of public housing for lower income groups which the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill proposes to build each year during the next 4 years.

Mr. WAGNER. I suppose you're specially interested in rural housing, since you come from a predominantly rural area.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I am interested in rural housing; also in slum clearance. I'm interested in them both. Too many people forget that we do have rural slums in the United States as well as city slums. We should act to clean them both up. We have need for better rural housing in my State and also for more public housing projects in the cities.

Mr. WAGNER. I can certainly emphasize the need for it in the cities. I know how badly it is needed from my own experience in New York City.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, the report your father has just completed shows that it is badly needed throughout the Nation. He polled governors, mayors, and civic leaders all over the country and nine out of ten of them said the need for housing for low-income families is acute and that Federal aid is needed to get this housing. I hope that the report will have some effect on the Republican leadership. Why, the mayors of 78 cities representing 41 percent of the city population, estimated that 1,800,000 housing units in their cities need major repairs or lack decent plumbing facilities. And of 230 replies, 206 state that they do not expect private builders to be able to meet the needs of low-income families in the foreseeable future. That shows the need for Congress to act.

Mr. WAGNER. I agree with you. This public housing doesn't compete with private enterprise. But it's awfully important in making good, healthy citizens out of people who grow bitter and disillusioned from living in the slums.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That's what a lot of the mayors wrote your father. For example, Mayor David Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, wrote that every city is "endangered by the growth of slums and the failure to provide decent homes for our citizens." And Mayor Perrine Palmer, Jr., of Miami, Fla., wrote: "Let's stop for once and for all this understandable discontent that leads to even a consideration of philosophies strange to American ideals."

Mr. WAGNER. In my city many of the members of low-income groups have no immediate hope for decent housing other than public housing. Many live in festering slums and it is among people like them that communism and radical ideologies find a fertile recruiting ground.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think that is one of the reasons why everyone should support the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Mr. WAGNER. Getting away from the problem of more and adequate housing for a moment, veterans who are lucky enough to have a place to live now are worrying about what is going to happen to rent control when the present temporary 1-month extension is over.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am hopeful that we will finally get a bill which will keep a fairly effective control on rents until the pressure is eased. The Senate bill continues pretty much the present set-up until April 1949. But it does work one bad injustice on the tenants who signed the so-called voluntary 15-percent rent increase leases under the present law. These people are only protected until April 1949, while persons who sign such leases in the future will be protected until the end of 1949. I hope that the Republican majority will see fit to correct this injustice. I also wish that the Republicans would give the Housing Expediter more power to police the rent-control law. But I do believe that Congress will give tenants better protection than no rent control at all and considerably more protection than the original Republican proposals would have provided.

Mr. WAGNER. Of course, if the Republican Congress had passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill last year we would be much closer to the condition all of us want to see—when the supply of housing is great enough to do away with the need for rent controls.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think we would also be making progress on a matter which I believe is just as important as the volume of housing—and that is the cost.

Mr. WAGNER. That is certainly a major point. In 1947 nearly 1,000,000 housing units were added to the Nation's supply. But less than 15 percent was rental housing. And most veterans should be renting at this time and not buying a home until later.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is quite true. Many of them are working on small salaries and have no idea what their future income is likely to be.

Mr. WAGNER. And veterans in general have no business buying a $15,000 house or paying $70 or $80 a month rent. They just aren't making that kind of money. In fact, it's not just veterans who find the prices of new homes too high today. Millions of others also see new housing selling or renting at prices far beyond their means.

Mr. SPARKMAN. President Truman warned against the danger of housing pricing itself out of the market in his message to the Congress the other day. He pointed out how construction fell off after the last war when prices got so high in 1925 that people just couldn't afford to buy.

Mr. WAGNER. The way to keep the building industry in a continued state of good health is for it to produce homes at prices which the mass market can afford. One of the important points of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is the provision it contains to expand research on new housing methods and the other efforts it provides to lower housing costs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Democratic administration is in full support of those measures. What sort of session did you have with the Republican congressional majority at your meetings today?

Mr. WAGNER. Well, we got a lot of promises. What one Congressman or Senator didn't promise, another did. Senator TAFT said he was going to try to get public housing back into the McCarthy bill. The only trouble is that veterans have been getting those promises ever since the Eightieth Congress convened more than a year ago and yet the legislation never materializes.

I think veterans have been mighty patient. We've put up with a standing-room-only sign for two long years. We remember how the country spent money during the war and how it built barracks for us in a hurry. Now we're back in civvies and paying taxes to reduce the debt of those expenses necessary to win the war, and we're tired of being told that the Nation doesn't have the money or the energy to do anything about housing.

This Republican Congress loves to talk about economy. What sort of economy is it which squanders the hopes of veterans for decent lives in decent homes because it might cost a few million dollars?

The young people of the country made great sacrifice during the war. I don't think they should be asked to keep on making them forever.

And we want a better answer than the Republican real-estate lobby line that there is no housing shortage, just an overconsumption of existing space that could be ended by junking rent controls and letting rents go sky high. Many of our veterans are young, but they're not young enough to be fooled by that one.

I hope that this Congress passes an adequate housing bill. If it doesn't, I think veterans will see to it that the next Congress is composed of men who will do something about decent housing for veterans.

We're tired of promises. We want results.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You will get them if the Congress adopts the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. And if this Republican Congress doesn't do it, I think we'll have a Democratic Congress on the job in 1949 and then you'll see some real results in the field of veterans' housing.

Position of Hon. C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois, on the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the remarks of Mr. Cedrick Foster, the able radio commentator, delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System, on March 3, 1948.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is Cedric Foster reporting to you from Boston.

Today in Washington, as the Ambassador from Czechoslovakia resigned in order to fight for the freedom of his country from Communist rule—as Secretary Marshall and Secretary Forrestal asked that financial aid for military purposes be given to Greece and Turkey—today in Washington, as these events occurred, the United States Senate was to receive an amendment to the Marshall plan—one which called for the United States to assume the initiative in the creation of a supreme international council apart from the United Nations.

This amendment was the result of a meeting by 14 revisionist Republican Senators, OWEN BREWSTER, of Main, called it an "offensive-defensive alliance," but the blueprint of it was drawn up by Senator BALL, of Minnesota. The gist of the duties of this supreme international council would be to call out armed forces in cases of aggression, cases which would be determined by a majority of the permanent members and a grand total of 7 out of the 11 members. Thus we have a proposal whereby the veto power is eliminated and whereby the United States is asked to sound out other nations as to their willingness to participate; with the Soviet Union, if possible; without the Soviet Union, if necessary.

One of the strongest opponents of the Marshall plan in its broad and unlimited scope is United States Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS from the State of Illinois.

Despite the fact that he won the Distinguished Service Cross and the Navy Cross and was wounded seven times in the First World War, "CURLEY" BROOKS has long been known as an isolationist. He is not an isolationist in the commonly-accepted interpretation of the word which means that he is like an ostrich with its head buried in the sand. "CURLEY" BROOKS is an isolationist only in the sense that he does not believe that the Federal Government should pour uncountable millions of dollars into Europe when he is convinced in his own mind that the money will not be properly expended and that the whole venture will become, to use his own words, "operation rat-hole."

Through a curious line of reasoning, which many people employ, "CURLEY" BROOKS' isolationism has been characterized as appeasement of the Soviet Union. Those who assail his beliefs have charged that he is following the Russian line, but nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, it is so far from the truth that no less a person than Andrei Vishinsky named the distinguished Senator from Illinois as one of the leading anti-Soviets in the American political scene.

Some weeks ago, I reported on this broadcast that Senator BROOKS had laid particular emphasis, in a statement which he made on the Marshall plan, on the need for obtaining production in Europe if the continent is to survive the ravages of postwar inflation and ills. The Senator from Illinois believes, and firmly so, and I believe, that it is only right that his sincere views be presented to the American people. He believes there is no use in sending money to Europe unless that money will beget production of goods by European countries, and through that production, a revival of world trade—trade which will allow the countries of Europe to support themselves in years to come without the constant draining of American resources.

In a recent address "CURLY" BROOKS declared that the American people have been and still are the most charitable people on the face of the earth. "To be generous, even amazingly generous," he continued, "is magnificent. But to be stupidly generous is akin to sin." Senator BROOKS then pointed out:

"We must remember constantly that we are only 7 percent of the world's people; we occupy only 7 percent of the earth's surface; and in our bumper years we produce only 12 percent of the world's food supply. We are already carrying the largest national debt ever carried by any people supposed to be solvent—the largest debt in the history of mankind. The average American citizen today is already working 3 days out of 10 to pay his taxes, and he is working the other 7 days to pay the ever-increasing cost of living.

"This heavy burden," Senator BROOKS continued, "is carried not only to support our own Government but to support socialistic governments abroad—governments who foster and follow policies of socialistic schemes, price fixing, rationing, regulations, restrictions, unbalanced budgets, and false values of currencies."

In that statement, of course, you have the very nub and heart of the economic beliefs and political beliefs of the Republican Senator from the State of Illinois. You may agree or disagree with his thesis, but it is impossible not to take cognizance of some of his words because he strikes home through vulnerable spots in his opponents' armor. In amplification of his stand, Senator BROOKS declares:

"Since the Socialist government of Great Britain gained power, it has taken the mines, the railroads, communications systems, and other industries, including more than 2,500 farms, from their owners. If you add up the total amount that they paid these owners, it would just about equal the four billion four hundred million which we gave them in the British loan and in credits a little more than a year ago. They now announce that they are instituting their socialistic health and hospital program that will guarantee government hospitalization, medical and health care—literally from the cradle to the grave—at an annual cost of about seven hundred million a year.

"No one can complain about costly socialistic schemes being carried out in any country if their economy can support it. But to adopt programs at our expense which retard private initiative, while we are taxing our people to rehabilitate the sponsors of the programs, that is quite another matter. What we are actually engaging in is vast and far-reaching socialism at the expense of the American taxpayer. We are doing this at a time when our Veterans' Administrator declares that many of the badly needed veterans' hospitals in America could not be built because of the lack of essential material and the ever-increasing cost."

The clinching argument advanced by Senator BROOKS is simply this: "To consider the plight of these countries as temporary is the wrong approach. As long as we guarantee their constant deficits of 'balance payments,' they are not going to change their course, and they are not going to meet their own problems. Their problems are those of incentives to work and to produce to the maximum. Even that would not meet their difficulty completely, for no matter how much they produce, if they continue to take the proceeds of that production and devote it to the extension of their socialistic practices, they will never close the gap of their 'balance of payments,' and we will merely continue to pay for their trade deficit indefinitely."

Senator BROOKS has a solution to the problem which America faces in the rehabilitation of Europe. His criticism is not destructive analysis. He sees what he believes to be the way out. He is against the State Department and the military controlling the funds going to Europe under the Marshall plan. In condemnation of the State Department and the military, "CURLY" BROOKS declares they "stood startled, stunned, and confused when we were struck at Pearl Harbor, following the policies which they had advocated. Then it was that we had to call the experts of American industry, labor, and agriculture to provide the industrial genius, the labor, and the food to produce the essentials to bring our enemies to their knees. The creation of incentives to work and to produce in western Europe and to apply the proceeds of that production to support stable currencies, balanced budgets, and stable governments is a major operation like our operation in the war. It demands the leadership of the best brains in America in agriculture, industry, and labor to administer this program.

"We believed then, and we believe now, that American dollars will not save Europe. Production and hard work, plus the proper application of the proceeds of that work and production, will constitute the sound bulwark against the miseries of communism. We hear altogether too much talk about needing a third force in Europe, halfway between the totalitarianism of Russia and the free enterprise system of the United States. This is called democratic socialism.

"But if we continue our unprecedented undertaking of rebuilding our former enemies and many of our former allies by constantly paying the trade deficits as they develop their so-called democratic socialism—if we do this—it will mean a drain so constant and so heavy upon the free enterprise system of America that we, too, will finally be drawn into the depths of despair, we, too, will be bound by the mesh of rules, regulations, and controls that form the chains that presently bind the energies of the countries of Europe.

"None of us wants to see people starve, but since we are limited and cannot feed all the hungry, clothe all the naked, fire all the furnaces and hearthstones of the world, we want to help those who will intelligently help themselves. We want to help people who will work, produce, and take steps to meet their own difficult problems. It is to our advantage to have a strong, prosperous western Europe. But in our future contributions we must insist upon having intelligent, sound, constructive management so that, while helping them, we may preserve our own Republic, so that we may preserve our own way of life to which our forebears and we of the present, living and dead, have made such tremendous contributions.

"We hate oppression and we would like to extend human liberties. But we must remember that to preserve our own form of government, our own solvency, and our own security—these are the major challenges of this day."

As I said a moment ago, there will be many who agree and who disagree with Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS of the State of Illinois, but his views command attention and serious consideration. Senator BROOKS poses a very

fine and exact question when he asks, in effect, what recks it if we pour money into Europe if in so doing we finance socialism and if the production attained is used to further advance that theory of government instead of closing the gap in the trade deficit? If to the asking of that question, "CURLY" BROOKS is labeled an isolationist, then he is perfectly willing to stand or fall.

While Palestine Burns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the procrastination on the part of our State Department on the recommendation of the United Nations is being severely criticized by nearly every outstanding newspaper in the United States.

I have read many of the editorials on this subject, but the one that I am inserting, under the leave granted me, appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on March 5, 1948, and impressed me to a greater degree than most of the others.

Consequently, I am inserting this editorial and at the same time I hope the President and the Secretary of State will not permit the small inner clique, consisting of Secretary of Defense Forrestal, Loy W. Henderson, Director of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, and a few others, who are more interested in two of the oil companies than they are in the destruction of the lives of hundreds of people, the future of the United Nations, and the peace of the world, to continue to misinform and mislead them and nullify the President's action and assurances.

The editorial follows:

WHILE PALESTINE BURNS

Now that the three big powers have spoken on Palestine, the need for immediate Security Council action on the General Assembly's recommendation for partition is urgent.

Not only the fate of Palestine, but the prestige of the United Nations is involved. If the Arab world, by force and threats of force, can successfully defy a decision adopted by more than two-thirds vote of the Assembly, then the future of the UN as a strong and effective peace organization will be clouded with uncertainty.

Unfortunately, the American delegation has not offered positive and clear leadership toward firm execution of the Assembly's partition plan. Even if there had been better plans there would have been strong reason for backing it up. Partition seems the fairest possible plan. It was accepted after months of impartial study by a UN commission. Our own Government took the lead in securing its adoption by the Assembly last fall.

Delegate Warren Austin told the Council that we still support partition, but his fuzzy approach to what the Council should do about it reflected the State Department's struggle with itself over the conflicting claims of middle eastern oil, strategy, rivalry, and loyalty to the UN.

While he proposed that the Council formally accept the Assembly's request that it implement the plan, Mr. Austin argued that the Council could implement it only by peaceful measures, which are now demonstrably inadequate.

Then he went on to suggest formation of a Big Five committee to do two things: (1) To determine whether peace is threatened and (2) to seek conciliation between the Jews and Arabs.

Under point No. 1, if the Council found that peace is indeed threatened, it could then consult on whether to supply armed forces. But meanwhile Palestine is burning. The leisurely pace set by the American policy left Russia an opening and Russia is taking advantage of it.

Mr. Gromyko says there is no need for another committee. He proposes that the Council accept the task of implementing partition. And that delays be short-cut by direct Big Five consultations on the question of peace enforcement. He rightly says that more talk about conciliation is futile, and urges that the Big Five decide within 10 days whether a threat to the peace exists.

If the American policy makers in Washington are wise they will now drop their doubts and hesitations and press for UN action with all possible speed. Time is running out in Palestine. Disorders increase daily. Every hour's delay increases the likelihood of utter chaos when the British lay down their mandate on May 15.

The debate at Lake Success over the Council's power to impose what Mr. Austin called a "political settlement" has been reduced to absurdity by Britain's own statement that she regards the UN's Palestine Commission as the legal successor government to her administration.

This is not a case of imposing political conditions on a sovereign state. It is a case of the world community assuming temporary jurisdiction over a trusteeship which the trustee has resolved to give up.

The purpose of UN administration is to make possible the peaceful transfer of sovereignty to the people of Palestine, organized in two independent states. The UN Commission declares that this cannot be accomplished without the aid of an outside armed force. The UN's moral and legal responsibility to supply that force is clear.

There might be objections if the people of Palestine were a sovereign state. But they are not. Until May 15 Britain will exercise that sovereignty. After May 15 nobody will exercise it unless the UN takes over.

Essentially, the Security Council is asked to do in Palestine what it already has agreed to do in Trieste. There the council accepted a request of the big powers that it govern and police an area of special international concern.

When Trieste came before the Council, doubts were raised about the legal position. They were resolved on the ground that the UN Charter clearly intended that the Council should exercise general peace-keeping powers so long as it acted in accordance with the basic purposes of the UN. The Council took jurisdiction over Trieste by a vote of 10 to 0, the United States voting in the affirmative.

If there was a good case for such action in Trieste there is a better one for it in Palestine. For in this case it is the General Assembly, representing the preponderance of world opinion, which requests action, and not merely the drafters of the Italian peace treaty. In this case the U. N. is asked to intervene in an area which has been an international responsibility for 25 years. The UN's obligations are reinforced by Britain's inability or unwillingness to carry the responsibility any longer.

The issue is not whether members of the Security Council have authority to intervene in Palestine. The issue is whether they have the will to do so. All who cherish the UN have but one possible course—to back to the limit the General Assembly's recommendation for partition.